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WHY DID THE KANGXI EMPEROR GO TO WUTAI SHAN? PATRONAGE, PILGRIMAGE, AND THE PLACE OF TIBETAN BUDDHISM AT THE EARLY QING COURT

Natalie Köhle

Historians studying the Qing period have traditionally argued that the completely sinicized Manchu Qing emperors had no personal commitment to Buddhism, and that their lavish patronage of Tibetan Buddhism was mere political expediency, in what was essentially an attempt to create a new stronghold of Tibetan Buddhism in the Chinese interior in order to orient the Mongols towards China and away from Tibet. Lately, however, some scholars, such as Patricia Berger, have offered evidence which renders this argument questionable.¹ At the same time, a new trend in Qing studies stresses the Inner Asian heritage of the Qing rulers. This “New Qing History,” in particular the work of Pamela Crossley, Évelyn Rawski, and Mark Elliott, has shown that the Qing emperors’ successful rule was not achieved through sinicization, but rather through conscious and successful construction of a distinctive Manchu identity that allowed the Manchus to sustain their rule over a decidedly Inner Asian empire as a conquest regime.² Whether understood as a borrowing from, and elaboration on, Yuan precedents, or as addressing the Qing empire’s Tibetan

* I wish to thank Mark Elliott for his supervision of my M.A. thesis, of which this essay is a revised version, and for his generosity with his time and knowledge. Gray Tuttle gave me much precious advice and shared his unpublished work with me. Robert Gimello and Leonard van der Kuijp provided invaluable guidance, while Hoong Teik Toh helped me to prepare the translations of the Rāhula monastery and Pusading stele inscriptions. I further wish to thank Susan Naquin and the other participants of the “Wutai Shan and Qing Culture” conference, held at the Rubin Museum of Art, New York City, 12.–13. 5. 2007, for their encouragement, and the anonymous readers for Late Imperial China for their incisive critique. My debt to their suggestions will be apparent to them. Thanks are also due to David Brophy, Isabelle Henrion-Dourcy, Daniela Helbig, Nathan Hill, Arthur McKeown, and Oriana Walker for reading and commenting on various drafts of this work.
¹ See especially Berger, Empire of Emptiness.
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and Mongolian constituencies, Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism occupies a prominent place in both Rawski’s and Crossley’s arguments. More than an incidental strategy designed to win over the Mongols, this patronage is seen as a central Inner Asian component of the Manchu emperors’ political ideology and strategies of rule. Perhaps the most important predecessor of New Qing scholarship on Tibetan Buddhism is David Farquhar’s 1978 article “Emperor as Bodhisattva in the Governance of the Ch’ing Empire.” This was the first study of the identification of the Yuan and Qing emperors as emanations of Mañjuśrī as propagated in Mongol-language texts, and, in the case of Qianlong, by means of a much-discussed series of thang ka. He traces the development of this identification to precedents in the Tibetan tradition and thus sees it as part of the Qing emperors’ Inner Asian mode of rule. In Farquhar’s study, Wutai shan, one of the main centers of Tibetan Buddhism in the Chinese interior, plays an important role: he sees the wish to propagate the “Mañjuśrī-emperor belief” in the eyes of the Mongols as the main reason for the Qing emperors’ patronage and visits to Wutai shan:

It may be, as has been asserted, that the emperors were interested in orienting the Mongols towards China and away from Tibet by this and other imperially supported Tibetan-style monastic establishments built on and near Chinese soil, but I suspect that the wish to spread the Mañjuśrī-emperor belief was the main reason for the new imperial concern with Mount Wu-t’ai.

Since Farquhar finds comparable modes of rulership and self-legitimation in the conquest dynasties of the Yuan and Qing, his argument readily corroborates the thesis of New Qing historians, according to which rule as a Buddhist emperor and generous patronage of Tibetan Buddhist institutions is particular to the form of rule of conquest regimes.

---

3 Farquhar, “Emperor As Bodhisattva in the Governance of the Ch’ing Empire.”
4 According to Farquhar, there is late Yuan evidence that Qubilai (r. 1260–94) was identified as the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī (“Emperor As Bodhisattva,” 11–12), but Farquhar’s evidence is questioned by Tuttle, who dates the earliest clear identification of Qubilai with Mañjuśrī to the late sixteenth century. See Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan in the Qing.” On the identification of Qianlong with Mañjuśrī see also Uspensky, “The Previous Incarnations of the Qianlong Emperor According to the Panchen Blo bzang dpal ldan ye shes”; Henss, “The Bodhisattva-Emperor”; Berger, Empire of Emptiness, 2, 4, 43, 54–61, 63, 63, 92, 157, 162, 172, 226 n. 67, 8, 15, and “Lineages of Form”; Ishihama, “Study on the [sic] Qianlong as Cakravartin, a Manifestation of Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Tangka.” For a reproduction of one of these thang ka, held at the Freer/Sackler collection, see Henss, The Qianlong Emperor as a Grand Lama. It needs to be pointed out that these thang ka could only have been addressing a very small audience.
5 Farquhar, “Emperor As Bodhisattva,” 29.
In contrast, Hoong Teik Toh argues that “[m]ost of the Ming emperors practiced Tibetan Buddhism,” that “Ming patronage of Tibetan Buddhism was one of the most important factors contributing to the florescence of the religion in this period,” and that therefore, “in terms of popularity, the Ming was indeed the “golden age” of Tibetan Buddhism in China.”

Johan Elverskog likewise, though from an entirely different perspective, distances himself from the current position of the New Qing History. He contends that it is “tautological” to claim that the Manchus gained legitimacy among the Mongols because of their adoption of a “Buddhist persona,” since such reasoning is based on a “static” conception of Buddhist rule. What is needed, he argues, is a more sophisticated investigation of the processes by which “being Mongol and Buddhist” came to imply being part of the Qing.

The present essay takes its inspiration from the prominent place accorded to Tibetan Buddhism in New Qing History and, following Farquhar’s attention to the relationship between the emperor-Mañjuśrī identification and the patronage of Wutai shan, aims, on the basis of an examination of the early Qing emperors’ patronage of this mountain, to think further about the place of Tibetan Buddhism at the court of the early Qing.

In connection with the arguments outlined above, I would like to raise the following three issues. First, Toh’s findings, which show strong and sustained imperial interest in Tibetan Buddhism up to the late Ming, keenly demonstrate that, before it becomes possible to suggest that the generous patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan was particular to the rule of the conquest elites of the Yuan and Qing, it is necessary to examine the imperial attitude towards Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan during the intermediate (indigenous) dynasty of the Ming. Second, considering that from the Tang onward, Wutai shan served as an important site for the ritual protection of the Chinese state, and since the political ideology of rule as cakravartin was also (or, indeed, mainly) present within the Chinese Buddhist traditions, it might be the case that Qing scholars, in their zeal to find Altaic traditions of rulership in Qing imperial ideology, have not only neglected Ming patronage of Tibetan Buddhism, but

---

6 Toh, “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China,” 238–40. Naquin, too, notes that “Tibetan Buddhism, too often associated only with the Qing dynasty, was established in Peking in the Ming.” Naquin, Peking, 208, 228.

7 Elverskog, Our Great Qing, 8–13, 90–126; “Two Buddhisms in Contemporary Mongolia”; and “Tibetocentrism, Religious Conversion and the Study of Mongolian Buddhism.”

8 See especially Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom, 143–5, 161, 191–205, and Ku Cheng-mei, Cong tianwang chuantong dao fowang chuantong (From the tradition of the heavenly emperor to the tradition of the dharmarāja), 377–424; but also Birnbaum, Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī, 7–38; Berger, “Preserving the Nation,” 90–93; Li Kecheng, “Cong Bukong zhi Zhangjia” (From Bukong to Lcang skya); Barrett, “Śūpa, Sutra, and Śārīra c. 656–706 CE,” 17–20, 27–30, 43–4; Wang Junzhong, Dongya Han-Zang fojiao shi yanjiu (Research in East Asian, Chinese, and Tibetan Buddhist history), 41–80.
may also have overlooked Qing imperial patronage of Chinese Buddhism at Wutai shan. Third, it is likely that, in addition to the wish to strengthen the emperor-Mañjuśrī association in the eyes of the empire’s Mongolian subjects, the Kangxi emperor’s travels to the mountain had other underlying motives and objectives. Indeed, it is even possible that patronage of Buddhist foundations at Wutai shan might not have been the most compelling reason for the Kangxi emperor’s Western Tours. Thus the emperor’s actions on the road, as reflected in imperially sanctioned contemporary sources, need to be analyzed for what they can tell us about the meanings of his personal travels to this mountain range.

By comparing early Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan to Ming imperial patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at the same site, the present essay will suggest answers to the question whether the patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at the mountain was a unique characteristic of conquest dynasties, based mainly on an examination of epigraphical records in conjunction with records of imperial patronage in Ming and Qing editions of the Wutai shan gazetteer, and Lcang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje’s (1717–86) Tibetan-language redaction of the Chinese gazetteers. It will then consider whether early Qing emperors, in their patronage of Buddhism at Wutai shan, might also have intended to follow Chinese precedents, by examining records of the Kangxi emperor’s patronage of monastic establishments at the mountain, such as imperially authored stele inscriptions, records in the Wutai shan gazetteers, and (published Chinese translations of) Manchu documents. Through the investigation of early Qing patronage of Buddhist foundations at the mountain, this essay further seeks to raise some problems concerning the historical complexities and motivations that underlay the Kangxi emperor’s tours to Wutai shan. No firm conclusions can be reached here. Rather, I will simply question whether the notion of pilgrimage is an appropriate way of understanding the Kangxi emperor’s excursions to this Shanxi mountain range.

---

9 The Chinese-language gazetteers are the *Qingliang shan zhi* (1596, 1661, 1755), *Qingliang shan xin zhi* (1701), *Qingliang shan jiyao* (1780), *Qinding Qingliang shan zhi* (printed 1811). Throughout this paper my citations of the *Qingliang shan zhi* refer to an 1887 print of the 1755 recarving of the 1661 edition, Harvard-Yenching Library: 3035 3239.83c; citations of the *Qingliang shan xin zhi* refer to a reproduction in *Qingliang shan zhi, Qingliang shan xin zhi, Qinding Qingliang shan zhi* (Haikou: Hainan chubanshe, 2001), 123–233; citations of the *Qingliang shan jiyao* refer to an original edition held at Harvard-Yenching: Rare book T3035.17323.83b; and citations to the *Qinding Qingliang shan zhi* refer to a reprint in *Qingliang shan zhi, Qingliang shan xin zhi, Qinding Qingliang shan zhi*, 245–463. For the Ming period, I have relied on the 1887 *Qingliang shan zhi* print, which reproduces the relevant passages from the Ming gazetteer without any alterations.

10 Published sources do not yield definitive answers to these questions, and it is doubtful whether archival research could indeed provide clearer answers, as only an extremely small number of palace memorials exist for this period. See Elliott, “The Manchu-Language Archives of the Qing Dynasty and the Origins of the Palace Memorial System.”
For this purpose, I will look at the Kangxi emperor’s western tours in their entirety and place them in relation to earlier imperial tours. This section will be based on the descriptions of the imperial tours in the *Veritable Records*, a travel diary by the minister Gao Shiqi (1644–1703), and other contemporary sources. A consideration of these issues leads to the conclusion that there is no clear-cut break between Ming and Qing attitudes toward Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan and that the Kangxi emperor’s patronage of and tours to the mountain addressed an audience much wider than just Mongolian followers of Tibetan Buddhism. I will also suggest that in the study of Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism there is, perhaps, a need for revision of the concept of “Tibetan Buddhism” itself.

I will be discussing the concept of “Tibetan Buddhism” at the end of the essay, but here I should offer a preliminary caveat: in distinguishing between “Tibetan Buddhism” and “Chinese Buddhism,” I do not intend to make an *ethnic* distinction between (Han) Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist practitioners. Rather, I speak of a distinction between monasteries of the East Asian, or Chinese, Buddhist traditions, and those which adhere to the Northern, or Tibetan, Buddhist traditions not only practiced by ethnic Tibetans and Mongols, but also by Han Chinese. Obvious markers of distinction between monasteries of the Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist traditions would be the reliance on different canons (the Chinese Tripiṭaka vs. the Tibetan *Bka’gyur* and *Bstan ’gyur*), as well as differing liturgical language, doctrines, rituals, and schools, and last, but not least, ritualia and the monks’ vestments. Heinrich Hackmann, an early German visitor to Wutai shan, notes just that: “despite the rapprochement [of Tibetan and Chinese Buddhism at Wutai shan] one easily distinguishes Chinese and Mongolian monasteries, especially by way of the language of their rituals and the canon.”

I. Commonalities in Ming and Early Qing Patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan

Qing editions of the Wutai shan gazetteer abound with examples of imperial patronage devoted to Tibetan Buddhism. The large scale construction of Tibetan monastic establishments at Wutai shan, and the conversion of several Chinese monasteries to Tibetan monasteries—in short, much of what cre-

---

11 Citations of the *Veritable Records* refer to *Daqing lichao shilu, Shengzu shilu.*
14 Virtually all of the secondary literature about Wutai shan agrees that the Kangxi emperor converted ten Chinese monasteries into Tibetan monasteries in 1705. See, for example, Rawski, *The Last Emperors*, 253,
ates the distinctly Tibetan flavor that the mountain in Northern Shanxi has preserved until the present day—can be dated to the Qing. Generous imperial gifts (such as large amounts of silver, imperial dragon robes, ka-da [kha btags, ceremonial prayer scarves], statues, and copies of the Bka’ ‘gyur were often donated specifically to monasteries of the Tibetan tradition. The two state monasteries on the mountain, Pusading and Tailu si, which were the site of imperially sponsored rituals, were also Tibetan monasteries. These monasteries were led by one imperially appointed Jasa Lama and one Da Lama respectively, and staffed with a resident population of imperially supported Tibetan Buddhists. Moreover, we know that during the Qing period Tibetan Buddhists continuously presided over the mountain starting from 1659, when the Shunzhi emperor (r. 1644–61) sent A-wang-lao-zang (< Ngag dbang blo bzang) (1601–87) to preside over the mountain and take charge of the affairs of Chinese and Tibetan Buddhists.

The important place of Tibetan Buddhism on the mountain is further confirmed by public acknowledgment of the leading positions of Tibetan Buddhists at the mountain in the Qing gazetteers: A-wang-lao-zang wrote a preface for the first reprint of the Ming edition of the Wutai shan gazetteer in 1661; Lao-zang-dan-ba (< Blo bzang bstan pa), the third Jasa Lama, edited and wrote the preface for an important amended Chinese-language edition, the Qingliang xin zhi, printed in 1701, and the second Jasa Lama, Lao-zang-dan-bei-jian-can (< Blo bzang bstan pa’i rgyal mtshan), edited the Manchu-language edition of the Qingliang xin zhi (Cing liyang šan alin-i ice jy bithe), also printed in 1701.

379 n. 102, drawing on Xiangyun Wang, “Tibetan Buddhism at the Court of the Qing,” 108, n. 1, drawing on Cui Zhengsen, “Wutai shan fojiao wenhua” (The Buddhist culture of Wutai shan), 83 (no primary source cited). I have not yet been able to find the primary source that records this conversion, but it is interesting to note that a 1748 Tibetan-language description of Wutai shan also speaks of exactly “ten monasteries and temples in which Tibetan Buddhism is practised.” Sum pa mkhan po Ye shes dpal byor, Dpa’ gsum ljon bzang, 956.

15 See Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 3, 18a–19b, and Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan,” table 2.
16 Qinding Daqing huidian zeli, juan 142, 84a, in Siku quanshu vol. 624, 514. Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 7, 3b; Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 3, 20b.
17 Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 7, 21b. A-wang-lao-zang was a lama from Xishen, Beijing who had been trained in Chongguo si (Beijing). Cui Zhengsen, Wutai shan fojiao shi (History of Buddhism at Wutai shan), vol. 2, 752. For a detailed discussion of the subsequent Tibetan Buddhist leaders at Wutai shan, see Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan,” especially appendix 2 and Cui, ibid.
18 This preface is preserved in the Qingliang shan zhi reproduction in Qingliang shan xin zhi, Qingliang shan xin zhi, Qingliang shan zhi, 3–5.
19 For a detailed overview of the extant Chinese, Tibetan, Manchu, and Mongolian editions of the Wutai shan gazetteers, see Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan,” table 3. See also Brook, Geographical Sources of Ming-Qing History, 99; Heissig, Die Pekinger Lamaistischen Blockdrucke in Mongolischer Sprache, 12–13.
A-wang-lao-zang and Lao-zang-dan-bei-jian-can were further honored by the inclusion of their biographies in this new edition of the gazetteer.20

In summary, the foundation of Tibetan monastic establishments, imperial patronage, placement of Tibetan Buddhists in leading offices at the mountain, and public acknowledgment of the leading role of Tibetan Buddhists in the gazetteers, all confirm the important position of Tibetan Buddhism at the mountain during the Qing.

The extent of imperial patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan was certainly unprecedented in previous dynasties. However, before one can relate this patronage pattern to the Inner Asian heritage of the Qing emperors and the logic of conquest rule, one should ask whether imperial patronage of Tibetan Buddhism really constituted a new development under the Qing. In fact, an examination of sources pertaining to imperial patronage of Buddhism at Wutai shan during the Ming Dynasty reveals that almost all the above aspects of Qing imperial patronage of Tibetan Buddhism, such as (1) imperially sponsored construction of monasteries for Tibetan Buddhists, (2) sponsorship of rituals for the protection of the state performed by Tibetan Buddhists, (3) placement of Tibetan Buddhists in leading offices, and (4) recognition of the prominent place of Tibetan Buddhists in the Wutai shan gazetteer, were already present during the Ming.

First, imperial patronage of a number of monastic buildings, which was either requested or carried out by Tibetan Buddhists, or carried out in Tibetan style, is recorded in the Ming gazetteer. On the occasion of the Fifth Kar ma pa De bzhin gshegs pa Chos dpal bzang po’s (1384–1415) stay at the mountain in 1406, the Yongle emperor (r. 1403–24) renovated the mountain’s main monastery, Xiantong si. At the request of De bzhin gshegs pa, he also restored a stūpa in Tibetan style, said to contain King Aśoka’s relics.21 When De bzhin gshegs pa left, the emperor had a statue of the lama made and installed at Xiantong si.22

In 1426, Sariputra, an eminent Indian monk who had been invited from the country (guo) of Wu-si-zang (< Dbus gtsang, Central Tibet), died. He had resided in the capital where he had given “the emperor and his retinue many tantric teachings.” He thus had gained the esteem of the Yongle, Hongxi (r. 1425), and Xuande (r. 1426–35) emperors. After his death, the Xuande emperor

---

20 Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 16, 21a–22b; Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 7, 21b–24b. For a partial translation of these biographies into English, see Toh, “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China,” 228–37.
21 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 9b; Wang Lu, “Wutai shan yu Xizang” (Wutai shan and Tibet), 26.
22 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 9b, juan 8, 21a–22a; Yu Qian, Xinxu Gaosengzhuan (New continuation of biographies of eminent monks), juan 52, 1525–6; Lcang skya II Rol pa’i rdo rje, Zhing mchog ri bo (A guide to the holy places of the Clear and Cool Mountain. . .), 122–4.
divided his ṣarīra in two parts and built a Tibetan style stūpa on the ground of Puning si at Wutai shan to house one part of the relics. On this occasion, the emperor also founded a new monastery on which he bestowed the name “Yuanzhao”. Yuanzhao si was presided over by a Tibetan Buddhist from at least 1458. Even later, in 1507, the Zhengde emperor (r. 1506–21) commanded the “Indian” monk fanseng [1 in glossary] Duo-er-zhi-jian (< Rdo rje rgyal [mtshan]) to build a hall with cast iron tiles at Middle Peak, on which he imperially bestowed the name Guangzong si, and gave the order “protect and support” it.

Second, the Ming gazetteer also records imperial sponsorship of a ritual for the protection of the state carried out by Tibetan Buddhists, along with a regulation that might mark the beginning of the conversion of Pusading (the principal state [Tibetan Buddhist] monastery on Wutai shan during the Qing) to Tibetan Buddhism: in the summer of 1481 the emperor ordered that Pusading should be restored, that twenty monks should be installed there and be given a monthly allowance of grain, and should, under the leadership of Duan-zhu-ban-dan (< Don grub dpal ldan) chanshi—a high-ranking monk with a Tibetan name—“pray for the happiness of the country and the prosperity of the people (fenxiu shang zhu guo xi xia qi min fu).” Although the term seng, used to refer to the twenty monks headed by Duan-zhu-ban-dan chanshi, does not indicate whether they belonged to the Tibetan or Chinese Buddhist traditions, the fact that the leader of these monks had a Tibetan name suggests that by the time of Chenghua (r. 1465–87) Pusading had already become a site for the performance of imperially sponsored Tibetan Buddhist rituals.

Third, just as the mountain was under Tibetan Buddhist administration during the Qing, at some point the leadership of the mountain was similarly in the hands of Tibetan Buddhists during the Ming: in 1458 a stele inscription records that Yingzong issued a proclamation in which he ordered “Ban-ma-gu-ma...”

---

23 Lcang sky I Rol pa’i rdo rje, Zhing mchog ri bo, 39. Šāriputra’s biography, “Dashan guoshi zhuàn,” may be found in Ming He, ed., Buxu gaoseng zhuàn (Amended record of eminent monks), juan 25, 334b–335b. See also Qingliang shan zhi, juan 3, 2a–b; “Chongxiu Yuanzhao si beiwen” and “Xitian shanshi da chanshī—a high-ranking monk with a Tibetan name—“pray for the happiness of the country and the prosperity of the people (fenxiu shang zhu guo xi xia qi min fu).”


27 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 14a, juan 3, 2b; Xiao, “Pusading de fojiao lishi,” 10.

28 I am referring to Yingzong with his temple name, because he reigned under two different reign names, Zhengtong (r. 1436–49) and Tianshun (r. 1457–64).
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luo (< Padmakumāra) to replace Mang-ge-luo-la-jia (< Maṅgalapūraka) as Overseer Dugang [of Wutai shan], while acting as abbot zhuchi of Yuanzhao si and to head, together with the Right Enlightener of the Central Buddhist Registration Senglusi youjueyi Cong-ling-cheng-cun (< Drung Rin chen brtson ['grus]), all the Tibetan and Chinese monks who are present to freely perform religious practice there.”

This proclamation shows that Yingzong had made the newly founded Yuanzhao si the seat of the overseer of Wutai shan, and that he had chosen two monks with Sanskrit and Tibetan names, Padmakumāra and Drung Rin chen brtson ['grus], to be in charge of the two highest official positions at the mountain: Overseer and Right Enlightener.

The fact that Wutai shan was under Tibetan administration during the Ming was already remarked upon by the Japanese scholar Ryūchi Kiyoshi, who writes that the number of “western” monks who were awarded with official posts started to increase in the Tianshun reign, to the extent that there were foreign monks who were even put in charge of Han monks in the provinces. In support of his argument, he quotes a May 1448 entry in the Ming Veritable Records which refers to the monk Cong-ling from Wutai’s Xiantong si as “Right Enlightener of the Central Buddhist Registration in charge of all the monasteries on Wutai shan.”

Thus, from these two entries we may infer that, during the reign of Yingzong, Xiantong si and Yuanzhao si were Wutai shan’s administrative seats—Xiantong si was the seat of the Right Enlightener of the Central Buddhist Registration, and Yuanzhao si was the seat of the Overseer—and both of their leaders were Tibetan monks. I suspect that the fact that these two monasteries had become the administrative seats of the mountain must be the reason why in 1458 Yingzong issued two separate proclamations in which he ordered that Xiantong si

---

29 “Huangdi chiyu hu chi Shanxi Wutai shan Yuanzhao si beiwen,” Cui and Wang, Wutai shan beiwen, 11; Zhen Lin, “Yuanzhao si fojiao jianshi” (Short history of Yuanzhao monastery) 11. The reprint in Cui and Wang, Wutai shan beiwen, gives Senglusi youjueyi Tong-ling cheng cun, whereas the reprint in Zhen, “Yuanzhao si fojiao jianshi,” gives Senglusi youjueyi Zong-ling cheng cun. Because of the occurrence of Cong-ling in the 1438 Ming Veritable Records passage quoted below, I have followed the reading Cong-ling given in the “Yuanzhao si fojiao jianshi” reprint. This reading was confirmed for me by Guang Kuang, resident monk of Bishan si, Wutai shan, who has seen the original stele at the mountain. (Personal communication, London, August 2005). I thank Hoong Teik Toh for making the identifications of Padmakumāra, Mangalapūraka, and Drung Rin chen brtson ['grus].

30 On the government administration of the clergy during the Ming, see Yü, The Renewal of Buddhism in China, 166–7; Ryūchi, “Mindai no sókan” (Ming Dynasty Buddhist officials).

31 Ryūchi, “Mindai no sókan,” 45. Since there is a time span of only 10 years between the edict inscribed on the stele and the entry in the Ming Veritable Records, I strongly suspect that Cong-ling-cheng-cun of the previously quoted stele inscription and the Cong-ling of the entry in the Veritable Records refer to the same person.

32 According to Xiao Yu, Xiantong si had already been made the seat of the Subprefectural Buddhist Registration sengzheng si of Wutai shan in 1405. Xiao, “Xiantong si fojiao shilue” (A brief history of Xiantong monastery), 5 (no primary source cited).
and the newly built Yuanzhao si should be especially protected and that the military should not be allowed to approach them.\textsuperscript{33}

There is evidence that a succession of Tibetan Buddhists maintained at least part of the mountain’s administration. The entry for Yuanzhao si in the *Qingliang shan zhi* records that “during the time of Zhengde, Zhang Jian-can (<Lcang\textsuperscript{34}rgyal mtshan) was enfeoffed as Dharmarāja (Fawang) and was given a silver seal while he was concurrently holding the seal of Overseer (Dugang-yin).”\textsuperscript{35} Moreover, in a stele that was erected on the mountain in the fourth month of Jiajing (r. 1522–66) 17 (1538), reference is made to an “imperially appointed Commander of Wutai, concurrently in charge of all the Tibetan and Chinese monasteries, greatly compassionate national preceptor (*Hongci yijiao guoshi* [1 in glossary]) who is assisting the teaching, resident of Da Yuanzhao si, Jian-can.”\textsuperscript{36} In another stele erected in the seventh month of Jiajing 17 (1538) we meet again with the “imperially appointed commander of Wutai, in charge of all the Tibetan and Chinese monasteries, greatly compassionate national preceptor (*Hongci yijiao guoshi* [2 in glossary]) who is assisting the Teachings, resident of Da Yuanzhao si, Jian-can, imperially granted the title of Buddha of the Western Regions greatly enlightened Dharmarāja (Xitianfozi dahui fawang).”\textsuperscript{37} Because of the correspondence of part of the name (Jian-can [<Rgyal mtshan]), monastic affiliation (Yuanzhao si), title (Fawang), and responsibility (leadership of Tibetan and Chinese monasteries on Wutai shan), one cannot help but conclude that the Zhang Jian-can *Fawang* referred to in the first stele and the Jian-can mentioned in the second are same person. If this inference is correct, the mountain’s Tibetan and Chinese Buddhists were led by a succession of Tibetan Buddhists who were installed at Yuanzhao si starting from 1448 until at least 1538. However, the second Jiajing period inscription also refers to an “imperially appointed commander of Wutai, in charge of all the Tibetan and Chinese monasteries, Overseer of the Prefectural Buddhist Registration *Senggangsi dugang*, concurrently residing at Da Jixiang Xiantong si, Mingxu.” This shows that while the Tibetan Buddhist Jian-can of

\textsuperscript{33} *Qingliang shan zhi*, juan 4, 11b–12b; “Huangdi chiyu huchi Shanxi Wutai shan Xiantong si beiwen,” “Huangdi chiyu Wutai shan sengsuren deng beiwen,” and “Huangdi chiyu huchi Shanxi Wutai shan Yuanzhao si beiwen,” in Cui and Wang, *Wutai shan beiwen*, 1, 9, 11.

\textsuperscript{34} Zhang is not necessarily a transliteration of a Tibetan name. It might indicate that this Tibetan Buddhist monk originally had a Chinese surname, as was the case with the Lcang skya reincarnation lineage. See Tuttle, *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*, 248–9 n. 15.

\textsuperscript{35} *Qingliang shan zhi*, juan 3, 2b. According to Zhen Lin, Zhang Jian-can was a Dge lugs monk and the third abbot of Yuanzhao si. Zhen, “Yuanzhao si fojiao jianshi,” 21 (no primary source cited).


Yuanzhao si was still “in charge of all the Chinese and Tibetan monasteries of the mountain,” by 1538 the office of Overseer had been moved to Xiantong si, and its officiant was a monk with a Chinese name. One possible explanation for this change is that the seat of the office of Overseer had been transferred to Xiantong si in the early Jiajing period. Another possible explanation is that this was the outcome of the inflation of offices that started after the mid-fourteenth century and that by 1538 there was more than one overseer in charge of the mountain.  

Fourth, the presence of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan was almost as publicly acknowledged in the Ming gazetteer as it was in those of the Qing, albeit with the important difference that the Ming edition did not carry an imperial preface, whereas the Qing editions were imperially sponsored. The Ming edition not only records that the first copy of the Yongle Bka’ ’gyur (printed 1410) was presented to Pusading, but also includes the biographies of the abovementioned De bzhin gzhegs pa (1384–1415) and of Shākyā ye shes (1354–1435), who was dispatched to China in Tsong kha pa’s (1357–1419) stead, and first arrived at Wutai shan in 1414. The gazetteer also reproduces prominently and in great detail the imperial correspondence and the gifts given to Shākyā ye shes at Wutai shan, such as a monk’s robe to protect the master from the harsh winter climate at the mountain. Further letters and gifts sent by the emperor to Shākyā ye shes in spring 1419, summer 1421, summer 1427 (by which time the Tibetan hierarch seems to have already returned to Tibet) are also recorded in the gazetteer. As regards the visit of De bzhin gshegs pa, the gazetteer records the name of Dazhifawang Dpal ldan bkra shis who was imperially dispatched to Central Tibet to invite him. The gazetteer also

---

38 On the inflation in the number of monk officials towards the late Ming, see Ryūichi, “Mindai no sōkan,” 45; Yü, The Renewal of Buddhism, 168–9.


40 Short biographies of Shākyā ye shes may be found in Qingliang shan zhi, juan 8, 23b–24a; reprinted in Yu Qian, Xinxu Gaosengzhuan, juan 4, 3a–b and translated into Tibetan by Lcang skya II Rol pa’i rdo rje, Zhing mchog ri bo, 126–8. See also the partial translation of the biography into English by Sperling in his “Early Ming Policy Toward Tibet,” 117.

41 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 10a. The dating in the Qingliang shan zhi may be flawed, as it is in contradiction with Sperling’s dating which is based on the Ming Veritable Records and Cha har dge bshes Blo bzang tshul khrims’ Rje thams cad mkhyen pa Tsong kha pa chen po’i rnam thar go sla bar brjod pa bde legs kun gyi ’byung gnas. Sperling, “Early Ming Policy Toward Tibet,” 152, 153, 191 n. 85, 192 n. 92.

42 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 10a–11a. These dates, too, do not correspond with the dates of the missions from the court to Shākyā ye shes as recorded in the Ming Veritable Records. Sperling, “Early Ming Policy Toward Tibet,” 153, 193, n. 93, 94.

43 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 9b; juan 8, 21a–22b. In contrast to the Qingliang shan zhi, the Ming Veritable Records, as well as a reproduction of Ming Chengzhu’s original letter to Kar ma pa V, record that the eunuch Hou Xian was dispatched to summon Kar ma pa. See Toh, “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China,” 126; Sperling, “The 1413 Ming Embassy to Tsong-kha-pa,” 106. On Dpal ldan bkra shis, see Toh, “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China,” 181–2, and Debreczeny, “Sino-Tibetan Artistic Synthesis in Ming Dynasty Temples at the Core and Periphery,” 52, 68–9 n. 27–9.
records an imperial correspondence in which the emperor expresses his deep appreciation of De bzhin gshegs pa and remembers the miraculous manifestations that had appeared when the lama had carried out ritual performances at Linggu si in Nanjing.\(^{44}\)

Thus it is clear that almost all aspects of Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism had precedents in the Ming. Those differences that we do find are that the Ming emperors, unlike the Qing emperors, did not personally travel to the mountain, nor did they sponsor the printing of the Ming Wutai shan gazetteer. The imperially sponsored Qing editions of the Wutai shan gazetteer render a very explicit portrait of the preeminence of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan and the ways in which it was favored by the court.\(^{45}\) The Ming gazetteer, too, mentions visiting Tibetan dignitaries, and the performance of Tibetan Buddhist rituals at Wutai shan, but, in contrast to the Qing editions, does not bring the imperial patronage of Tibetan Buddhism to the fore. This certainly shows a greater emphasis on the part of the Qing emperors on (the public display of) their patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan. However, it may also reflect the unequal nature of the sources: in contrast to the imperially sponsored Qing editions which were edited by imperially appointed Tibetan Buddhists and clearly part of the courts’ attempt to create legitimacy, the Ming edition was a local production which was compiled by the eminent Chinese monk Zhencheng (1547–1617) at the request of the abbot of Tayuan monastery, Wutai shan.\(^{46}\) As it was a local production that was authored by a Chinese Buddhist, the Ming edition would likely put less emphasis on the prominence of another (competing?) tradition, and on imperial patronage itself.\(^{47}\) Thus, when comparing Ming and Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan as depicted in the gazetteers, it is important to keep in mind that the difference in emphasis on the imperial patronage of Tibetan Buddhism might, at least partly, be introduced by the different authorship of the source texts.

II. The Persistence of Imperial Patronage of the Chinese Buddhist Traditions

Notwithstanding the unevenness of the sources, it is clear that while the Manchu emperors favored Tibetan Buddhist institutions, Qing imperial patron-
age of Tibetan Buddhism had ample precedents both in the Yuan and Ming. This should cause us to rethink how uniquely “Inner Asian” such patronage was. Another factor to consider is that Qing imperial patronage was not limited to Tibetan Buddhism. For example, in 1698 Kangxi renovated Bishan si and Shuxiang si, two predominantly Chinese monasteries, with 6000 taels of gold, and in 1683 Kangxi “offered incense” and “worshipped the Buddha” in “all the temples,” and “presented each monastery of the mountain with 200 taels of silver.” Moreover, while the recipients of exceptional gifts are in most cases specified to be ge-long (dge slong, fully ordained Tibetan Buddhist monks), or monasteries of the Tibetan Buddhist traditions, the gazetteers clearly state that after each imperially sponsored prayer ceremony “all the Tibetan and Chinese monks” received imperial gifts. Kangxi also inscribed approximately fifty tablets and seventeen stelae for the main monasteries on the mountain, and these inscriptions were donated evenly to Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist monasteries.

A reading of the Kangxi emperor’s Chinese-language stele inscriptions shows that while they acknowledge the presence of Tibetan Buddhists, none of the inscriptions, not even those for monasteries of the Tibetan Buddhist tradition, make any reference to the Tibetan Buddhist traditions or the legacy of the Yuan emperors. Rather, they note the origin of the monasteries in the Tang, and contain numerous references to the Chinese (and Indian) Buddhist traditions. Thus, in the example of the dedication for Rāhula monastery, the Kangxi emperor explicitly aligns his own dynasty’s patronage with that of the “defeated dynasty” of the Ming, and expresses the hope that—under the guidance of a Tibetan Buddhist abbot—the monastery might once again flourish, and become the site of miraculous manifestations that it had been during the Song:


49 Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 3, 18a–19b; Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 65a–b, emphasis mine.

50 See, for example, Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 3, 18a–19b; Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 64a–65b; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 7, 2a–b. More research is needed to determine whether ge-long exclusively referred to ethnic Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhists, or whether Han Chinese Tibetan Buddhists could also be denoted by this term.

51 Qingliang shan xin zhi, juan 3, 17a, 18a–19a, 21a, 22a–23b; Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 63a, 64a–65a, 67b–68a; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 1, 1a, juan 7, 2a–b, emphasis mine.

52 See, for example, Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 60a–62b and Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 1, 1a–15b. For later reprinted versions, see, among others, Zhang Yuxin, Qing zhengfu yu lamajiao (Qing government and lamaism), 232–75; Cui and Wang, Wutai shan beiwen, 31–97.

53 It is an interesting question whether or not the Qing emperors acknowledged the Yuan precedent over and above that of the indigenous dynasties in their Mongol- and Tibetan-language stele inscriptions. However, these inscriptions are only found at the site of Wutai shan, and I have not had the chance to examine them.
As for this Rāhula monastery, its location is near to where Mañjuśrī [once] manifested himself [while] its name seems to signify the seeking of refuge of the sixteenth western patriarch. It was founded in the Tang, became prominent in the Song and was, subsequently, restored by the “virtuous [prince of the] outlying province” of the defeated dynasty (shengguo xianfan). Coming to the reign of the former emperor of Our Dynasty a hall had been constructed to provide accommodation for monks from all directions. Even myself had also favored it with calligraphy, [but] in the vicissitudes of time, the carved beams collapsed, colors faded away, and the inscribed calligraphies have become barely legible. Now the abbot Yuan-dan (< Yon tan) has, again, renovated and embellished it further. A monk, according to Buddhist precepts, should not tarry for more than three nights under the same mulberry tree. [Should one be able] to equate that which is supported with that which has no support then where on this earth is it not cool? Nonetheless it is also the duty of a Buddhist disciple to secure a vihāra wherever a Buddhist master passes by and educates [the people]. In the past, upon hearing the Rāhula monastery’s bell being struck, the monks would assemble to distinguish the Śrāvakas. The Song premier Zhang Shangyin once beheld a miraculous lamp within this monastery. Now that Yuan-dan will raise [the monastery] before it becomes defunct, perhaps the sound of the bell and the shadow cast by the lamp will be heard and seen again? For this reason I take up my brush and confer this record upon it.

Continuity with the patronage of previous dynasties is also emphasized in the gazetteers. The imperial preface for the Qingliang xin zhi notes that imperial patronage of Wutai shan’s monasteries persisted “from the Tang up to the present day,” and, as Gray Tuttle points out, the chronological arrangement of the entries in the gazetteers themselves serves to underscore this continuity.

54 The “virtuous [prince of the] outlying province” of the defeated dynasty most likely refers to Prince Zhaohui of the Chenghua period, whose patronage of Rāhula monastery is recorded in the gazetteers. Qingliang shan zhi, juan 3, 3a.
55 This is a reference to the Shunzhi emperor. On the construction of this hall, see Li Shiming, “Luohou si yu shifang tang” (Rāhula monastery and the hall of the ten directions), 29.
56 This is an allusion to the Diamond Sūtra. See Poppe, The Diamond Sutra, 59.
57 See Gimello, “Chang Shang-yin on Wu-t’ai shan.”
58 “Chongxiu Qingliang shan Luohou si Beiji,” Qingding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 1, 10a–b, reprinted in Zhang Yuxin, Qing zhengfu yu lamajiao, 261; Kangxi di yuzhi wenji (Anthology of the Kangxi emperor’s writings), vol. 3, juan 23, 7a–8b,1672; Zhu Ye, “Luohou si beiwen” (Stele inscriptions of Rāhula monastery), 30. On the history of Rāhula monastery, see Qingliang shan xin shi, juan 2, 10b; Qingliang shan zhi, juan 3, 3a; Xiao Yu, “Luohou si fojiao shilu,” 6–13. References to a Tibetan Buddhist presence at Rāhula monastery date back to the late Ming. Wang Siren (1574–1646), “You Wutai shan ji,” 7.
59 Qingliang shan xin shi, xu 2b.
60 See Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan.”
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The fact the Chinese-language materials emphasize the patronage of previous dynasties and the legacy of the Chinese Buddhist traditions at Wutai shan should not be surprising. Yet it highlights an important and often overlooked point: in contrast to Farquhar’s assertion that the main audience that the Qing emperor’s patronage of Wutai shan was intended to address was the empire’s Mongolian subjects, the emperors also addressed a Chinese audience. Laozang-dan-ba’s preface to the 1701 Qingliang shan xin shi provides further evidence to support this view, as it refers to Kangxi as “the present emperor, teacher of the previous seven Buddhas, who has manifested as the sage of the ninth layer.” Since it was Mañjuśrī who was the “teacher of the previous seven Buddhas,” the preface contains a veiled reference to Kangxi as an emanation of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī that could easily be understood by Chinese Buddhists. This reference suggests that the Qing emperors were not only addressing a Chinese Buddhist audience, but that the image of the emperor as an emanation of Mañjuśrī was also known and (carefully) propagated in Chinese-language publications, and must therefore have been meaningful also for Chinese Buddhists.

Epigraphical evidence further indicates that another central motive for early Qing patronage of Buddhism at Wutai shan, in addition to creating legitimacy in the eyes of Tibeto-Mongolian and Han Chinese Buddhists, was to ensure the support of rituals for the protection of the state. These rituals continued to be performed for the court by Wutai monks:

Since Our Dynasty was established, the Court annually confers grants and gifts [on Pusading] so that it may pray for the prosperity of the State. As its region is too secluded to be suitable for secular activities of the four classes of people, it is fit for the residence of monks. It is desolate, remote, and very mountainous, located somewhere within an almost uninhabited land, and too far away to be visited by donors. And yet, under the influence of the Teaching of Images, offerings of provisions accumulate here from the four directions. Those who reside here should in general also be able

---

61 In this respect my conclusion concurs with those reached by Tuttle in “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan.”
62 Ch. jin huangdi qiansheng qi fo zhi xian zai jiu chong zhi sheng, Qingliang shan xin shi, yuzhi xu, 21b. The ninth layer (jiu chong) is a reference to the emperor.
63 That Mañjuśrī is the teacher of all the previous Buddhas is stated in many scriptures. See Étienne Lamotte, who quotes a relevant passage from the Ajātasaṅkāyavatana in his “Mañjuśrī,” 93–4. To my knowledge, this phrase in the Qingliang shan xin shi is the first written reference to the emperor as an avatar of the bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in a Chinese-language document that has been found to date.
64 This, again, contrasts with Farquhar’s claims. See Farquhar, “Emperor as Bodhisattva,” 25–6.
65 For examples of late Ming rituals for the protection of the state performed at Wutai shan, vide supra, note 27. See also Sung-peng Hsü, A Buddhist Leader in Ming China, 74; Yü, “Ming Buddhism,” 938; Cui Zhengsen, Wutai shan fojiao shi, 669–71. For Tang precedents vide supra, note 8.
to observe carefully the philosophical teachings as well as monastic disciplines, and strictly restrain minds and behaviors to attain purity and piety, so that all together are subject to the teachings of the Compassionate One. Then they might be compatible with the generous patronage of the Court.  

Numerous Manchu archival documents confirm this “generous patronage” of rituals for the protection of the state and the longevity of the imperial family. One record even indicates that long-life rituals were performed up to six times a month. Such an abundance of references to imperial sponsorship of rituals at Wutai shan in records that were not widely accessible suggests that the stele inscription’s public emphasis on Wutai shan as a site for the ritual protection of the state was not merely rhetorical, but that the rituals were genuinely thought to be efficacious.

An intriguing passage from a 1714 stele inscription suggests that some of these rituals for the protection of the state were, on a regular basis, jointly performed by monks of the Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist traditions:

Every new and full moon the Qingxiu chanshi [Ding-ceng-jian-cuo Bstan ‘dzin rgya mtsho] leads the ge-long and ban-di (ban de, Tibetan Buddhist monks) and all Tibetan and Chinese monks to ascend to [Jingang]ku [Banruo si] in unison, to reverently offer mystic incantations and make solemn prostrations (fengyan mizhang qiao chi [qin] wu ti). They wish an eternally stable imperial realm and longevity to the emperor above, and pray that the beings of the four births and the nine existences below all cross to the other shore.

Unfortunately, neither the stele inscriptions nor the gazetteers’ records of the imperially sponsored prayer ceremonies tell us just what kind of rituals

---

66 “Yuzhi Pusading Da Wenshu yuan bei,” Qingliang shan xin shi, yuzhi beiwen, 9a–b, reprinted in Zhang Yuxin, Qing zhengfu yu lamajiao, 241; Kangxi di yuzhi wenji, vol. 2, juan 34, 21a–b. See also the annotated reprint by Wang Zhichao, “Wutai shan beiwen xuanzhu” (Selection of annotated Wutai shan epigraphy), 38–9. On the history of Pusading Da Wenshu yuan, see Qingliang shan zhi, juan 3, 2b; Qingliang shan xin shi, juan 2, 9b–10a; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 10, 2a–3b; Xiao Yu, “Pusading de fojiao lishi” (Pusading’s Buddhist history), 3–17.

67 See Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan,” table 1, compiled from First Historical Archives, comp., Kangxichao manwen zhupi zouze quanyi (Translation of Manchu-language vermillion rescripts of the Kangxi period).

68 See Tuttle, “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan,” referring to First Historical Archives comp., Kangxichao manwen zhupi zouze quanyi, 261, #460.

69 “Huang qing cifeng qingxiu chanshi tidu Wutai fan han Zha-sa-ke Da lama chongxiu Jinggangku Banruosi gongde beiji,” Cui and Wang, Wutai shan beiwen, 346. Qingxiu chanshi Ding-ceng-jian-cuo was Wutai shan’s fourth Jasay Lama.
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were performed by the Tibetan and Chinese monks who resided at Wutai shan. While in some cases the records specify that a ritual was performed by ge-long, which suggests that it must have been part of the Tibetan tradition, in most cases the rituals are referred to by such generic terms as “long-life ritual” (yanshou wujiang daochang),\(^70\) or “ritual for the protection of the state” (xiujian zhuguo youmin daochang),\(^71\) which does not indicate whether they were part of the Tibetan or Chinese Buddhist traditions. Although the terminology is similar to that used in the description of rituals of the Ming period, the generality of these terms does not allow the conclusion that similar rituals were performed during the Ming and Qing dynasties. Perhaps this vagueness was intentional, as it served in yet another way to create an appearance of continuity between the patronage of the Qing emperors and that of earlier dynasties. It might have also served to give an impression of commonality between practices of the Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist traditions. However, it is also possible that these terms only seem vague to us, because we are imagining very distinct (Tibetan vs. Chinese Buddhist) audiences to be addressed in terms of the patronage of their respective traditions. But, as the above quoted 1714 record of joint ritual practice by Tibetan and Chinese Buddhists suggests, it may be the case that these two traditions were not perceived to be so far apart. The vague description of the ritual performances in the gazetteers may indicate that it was simply not important for the chroniclers in late imperial China to clearly distinguish between the performance of (protective) rituals of the Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist traditions at Wutai shan.

On this point, let me quote, once more, the observations of Hackmann, the early twentieth-century visitor to the mountain:

The most curious feature of Buddhism on the Wutai shan is the amalgamation of Chinese Buddhism and Lamaism. . . . Where the two doctrines meet on Chinese ground as they do on the frontier of Tibet, they stand apart. Lama is Lama, Hoshang [heshang, Chinese Buddhist monk] is Hoshang as the Chinese say. But things are different on the Wutai shan. Both doctrines borrow from one another in habits and arrangements. . . . The structure of the temples is for the greater part Chinese, but the form of the pagodas is mostly Indo-Tibetan. Chinese and Tibetan idols stand side by side, Tibeto-

---

\(^70\) Qingliang shan xin shi, juan 3, 18a; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 7, 2a; Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 64a.

\(^71\) Qingliang shan xin shi, juan 3, 17a; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 1, 1a; Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 63a. The Veritable Records, Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce (Diaries of activity and repose from the Kangxi reign), and Daqing huidian shili do not give detailed descriptions of these rituals either.
Mongolian inscriptions are next to Chinese ones, Tibetan butter lamps, praying cylinders, also boards on which the monks throw themselves for prayer, all such things are seen here in Chinese temples. In their services, too, one style blends with the other.72

At least one further reference indicates that the early Qing emperors did not themselves entertain, or publicly promote, the notion of an exclusive association between Tibetan Buddhism and Wutai shan. For at the same time in 1659 that the Shunzhi emperor sent A-wang-lao-zang to preside over the mountain’s Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist affairs, he also entertained close relations with a number of Chan masters, and sent one of them, Maoxi chan-shi (1614–77) to Wutai shan. Maoxi’s biography, which clearly states that he was favored by Shunzhi, was also included in one of the imperially sponsored Wutai shan gazetteers.73

What seems clear from a reading of the Kangxi period stele inscriptions, and the Qing editions of the gazetteer, is that the level of patronage of monasteries and rituals of both the Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist traditions was considerably elevated under the Qing. This increase in imperial patronage of Buddhism at Wutai shan corresponds to an overall increase in the patronage of religious institutions under the Qing,74 but also indicates that Wutai shan figured much more prominently in Qing imperial ideology than that of the Ming. The Qing emperors’ inscriptions at Wutai shan not only outnumber those of the Ming emperors, but differ in content. The Ming emperors’ inscriptions are proclamations that mark particular events, such as an imperial order to protect a monastery or an imperially sponsored restoration of a building, and, for the most part, do not align Ming patronage with that of preceding dynasties.75

---

72 Hackmann, A German Scholar in the East, 118–9. See also the original passage in Hackmann, Welt des Ostens, 237–8. Similar observations were made by Emil Fischer, in his The Sacred Wu Tai Shan, 10. Of course, both accounts are from a much later date than the period discussed in this essay.

73 Qingliang shan zhi, juan 8, 27a–28b. Since Maoxi chan-shi’s biography is dated 1734, it could only have been added to the 1755 recarving of the 1661 edition of the Qingliang shan zhi (I was not able to consult the 1661 edition). Maoxi chan-shi was a disciple of the National Preceptor Yulin Tongxiu guoshi (1614–75). On the Shunzhi emperor’s interest in Chan Buddhism and his wish to be tonsured by Maoxi, see especially Liu Er, “Yulu yu Shunzhi gongting.” On Shunzhi’s interest in Chan, see also Chen Yuan, Qing chu seng zheng ji (Record of monastic disputes of the early Qing); Jiang Weiqiao, Zhongguo fojiao shi (A history of Chinese Buddhism), 325–6. On Yulin Tongxiu guoshi, see Guo Peng, Zhongguo fojiao shi (A history of Chinese Buddhism), 324–8, and Ming-Qing fojiao shi (Ming and Qing Buddhist history), 322–29. According to Cui, the myth that Shunzhi faked his death in order to become a monk at Wutai shan originated in the Shunzhi emperor’s having dispatched Maoxi to Wutai shan while preparing to take the tonsure (Cui Zhengsen, Wutai shan fojiao shi, 705–9). This legend, in turn, led to the popular myth that Kangxi had gone to Wutai shan in order to visit “Shun Chih, his father, the first Emperor of the Manchus, who gave up his imperial power, and who had retired and lived for 30 years a Priest on Mount Wutai.” Fischer, The Sacred Wu Tai Shan, 19.

74 See Naquin, Peking, 316, 331–2.

75 The Ming stele inscriptions are reproduced in Cui and Wang, Wutai shan beiwen, 1–30.
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contrast, most of the Kangxi emperor’s inscriptions do not record specific events, but make a clear effort to draw on the legacy of the longstanding history of previous dynasties’ involvement with Wutai shan. This greater concern on the part of the Qing emperors with the creation of legitimacy through the patronage of Buddhism at Wutai shan is also suggested by the Qing emperors’ personal tours to the mountain, to which I now turn.

III. Multiple Meanings of the Kangxi Emperor’s Western Tours

Altogether the Kangxi emperor personally visited Wutai shan five times: twice in 1683, and again in 1698, 1702, and 1710. Following Farquhar, in much of contemporary scholarship these imperial tours to Wutai shan are referred to as “pilgrimages,”76 and in the case of the second tour, during which the Kangxi emperor accompanied his aging Mongolian grandmother on her pilgrimage to Wutai shan, such a description seems apt.77 For this tour, it is recorded that the emperor prohibited his retinue from taking life while in the mountain precincts,78 that he “reverently sponsored a ritual for three days,” “worshipped respectfully” in Pusading, and “prayed on behalf of his grandmother in all the monasteries.”79 The Wutai shan gazetteers even record that one of Mañjuśrī’s apparitions, for which Wutai shan is famous, could be seen during the imperial visit:

Only at the Western Terrace there was an auspicious, five colored, and majestic appearance of the bodhisattva. [When] the imperial carriage arrived at Middle Peak, the place was mysterious and among all the princes and imperial guardsmen, as well as officials serving in the capital and in the outer provinces, there was no one who did not praise it.80

---

77 The Diaries of Activity and Repose explicitly state that Kangxi embarked on his second tour to Wutai shan because he wanted to fulfill the Grand Empress Dowager’s longstanding wish to worship at the temples there. By contrast, one of the Kangxi emperor’s reasons for undertaking his first tour to the mountain was to prepare the road for his grandmother’s trip. Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce, 1073. See also Spence, Emperor of China, 104.
78 Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce, 1070; Veritable Records, juan 112, 151a.
79 Qingliang shan xin shi, juan 3, 19a–b. Qingliang shan jiyao, shang juan 65a–b; Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce, 1072–74; Veritable Records, juan 112, 152b–153a.
In Lcang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje’s edition of the gazetteer, this manifestation is explicitly described as a result of the emperor’s prayers:

The Kangxi emperor renovated all old temples and monasteries. He personally came to make pilgrimage, and, after worshipping, made costly gifts to the samgha. In particular, at the time when he prayed on behalf of his mother, a light of five colors appeared above the western mountain. Thereupon, the Venerable One showed his body, and, it was seen, unfading, until the emperor had arrived at Middle Peak.\(^{81}\)

However, if Kangxi’s tours are examined in more detail, it soon becomes clear that the records of the tours he undertook on other occasions, without his grandmother, contain few descriptions of religious activities and no injunctions against consumption of meat or the taking of life. Moreover, patronizing temples and sponsoring rituals were only two of the many activities performed by the emperor on his tours to Wutai shan, as Kangxi took part in a wide range of activities with dissimilar ideological resonances. He not only inscribed stelae and tablets for monasteries, but also composed and enjoyed classical Chinese poetry together with his retinue,\(^{82}\) sacrificed to Confucius,\(^{83}\) appraised local officials,\(^{84}\) displayed his benevolence to local people, had a county student recite from the Classics,\(^{85}\) inspected waterways and dike works,\(^{86}\) competed with and trained his sons and imperial guardsmen in archery,\(^{87}\) and

\(^{81}\) Lcang skya II Rol pa’i rdo rje, Zhing mchog ri bo, 204–5. See also the (recent) translation of the Tibetan gazetteer into modern Chinese: Wang Lu, “Shengdi Qingliang shan zhi” (Guide to the sacred land of Wutai shan), 45.

\(^{82}\) See, for example, the description in Gao Shiqi’s travel diary which records that the retinue was reading a verse from a poem of Yuan Haowen (1190–1257) while ascending Middle Peak: “[A couplet] of Yuan Haowen’s poem reads ‘The wind of the peaks forcefully clears shady mists, the sunny and clear sky opens vistas in the four directions. This truly is the visage of the [Wu]tai mountains, how could it be possible that Master Po did not come here!’ While we were ascending [Middle Peak], we read [these lines] so much as to feel majestic.” (Gao Shiqi, Hucong xixun rilu [Following in the retinue of the (Kangxi emperor’s) Western tour], 1159b–60a). Gao Shiqi quotes here from the fourth couplet of Yuan Haowen’s “Song of [Wu] Taishan in Sixteen Verses.” Master Po is a reference to reference to Dongpo, the hao of Su Shi (1037–1101). See Zhao Lin’en, Wutai shan shi ge zongji (General anthology of Wutai shan poems), vol. 2, 81–5. The poems written by the Kangxi emperor himself were prominently included in some of the Qing editions of the gazetteer (Qingliang shan xin shi, xu 15a–17a; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 2, 1a–3b). For annotated reprints of the Kangxi emperor’s poems, and the poems of the accompanying imperial princes Yunreng and Yinzhen, the future Yongzheng emperor, see Zhao Lin’en, Wutai shan shi ge zongji, 405–13, 464–70, and Qingchao huangdi yong Wutai (Qing emperors singing about Mt. Wutai), 13–22, 30–37.

\(^{83}\) Veritable Records, juan 187, 5b.

\(^{84}\) Kangxi chao qijiuzhu ce, 961; Veritable Records, juan 107, 94–1.

\(^{85}\) Gao Shiqi, Hucong xixun rilu, 1155b. For similar occurrences during the Southern Tours, see Chang, A Court on Horseback (2007), 265–71.

\(^{86}\) Veritable Records, juan 207, 10b–11a.

\(^{87}\) Veritable Records, juan 207, 6b–7a.
even engaged in hunting himself! In fact, Kangxi’s swift killing of a tiger that had menaced local people, pilgrims, and merchants at Changcheng ling road, appears to be the most widely reproduced scene of all of Kangxi’s tours to Wutai shan. The memorial of the Shanxi governor, Mu-er-sai (< Mursai), and the surveillance commissioner Ku-er-kang (< Kurkang), requesting the bestowal of a place name by the emperor in commemoration of the event, is recorded in the *Veritable Records*, and in Gao Shiqi’s *Hucong xixun rilu*; two stele inscriptions by Mu-er-sai that treat this incident are included in the Qianlong edition of the gazetteer; the event was further commemorated by the construction of the abovementioned imperially sponsored (Tibetan Buddhist) monastery, Tailu si, at “Tiger Shot Stream” (*Shehu chuan*), which was the new name given to the site of the tiger killing; and stele inscriptions bestowed on Tailu si by Kangxi also refer to this event, as does a poem written by a contemporary monk, Chao Kui, that was immediately included in the new edition of the gazetteer. The Qianlong emperor, too, wrote poems about the history of the site, and included them in the Qianlong period edition of the text.

It is possible—even likely—that, since the only day-to-day records of Kangxi’s tours are Confucian court annals and a travel diary of a Confucian minister, this emphasis on worldly activities is a distortion brought about by the authors and the nature of the sources. However, even if we may assume that
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89 *Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce*, 961; *Veritable Records*, juan 107, 94a. Chang translates the relevant passage from the *Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce* in *A Court on Horseback* (2007), 84–5.
91 “Shehu chuan beiji” and “Shenwu quan beiji,” *Qinding Qingliang shan zhi*, juan 19, 18a–20a.
92 *Qinding Qingliang shan zhi*, juan 1, 8b–9b.
93 “Shehu chuan Tailusi bei,” bestowed by the emperor in direct response to the killing, and “Tailu si bei” which also mentions the incident. Zhang Yuxin, *Qing zhengfu yu lamajiao*, 242–3, 259–60.
94 *Qingliang shan xin zhi*, juan 10, 16a; see also the annotated reprint in Zhao Lin’en, *Wutai shan shi ge zongji*, 447–8.
95 *Qinding Qingliang shan zhi*, juan 4, 4a–5b; juan 5, 16b, juan 6, 3a. See also the annotated reprints of these poems in Zhao Lin’en, *Wutai shan shi ge zongji*, 501, 522, 566, and *Qingchao huangdi yong Wutai*, 41, 67, 89, 110, 132.
96 For example, the above described manifestation of Manjūśrī, which, as the gazetteer records, was praised by “all the princes, imperial guardsmen, as well as officials serving in the capital and in the outer provinces,” is not mentioned in any of these official sources. The sources are the *Veritable Records*, the *Kangxi chao qijuzhu ce* (only covering the first and second tour) and *Hucong xixun rilu*, a day-to-day account of the Kangxi emperor’s first tour to Wutai shan in 1683 written by one of the emperor’s favorite literati and minister, Gao Shiqi. Gao Shiqi’s biography may be found in Arthur Hummel’s *Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period* (1644–1912), 413–5. The entry on Gao Shiqi notes that he “often lingered with the emperor till late night, helping him in calligraphy and poetry.” On Gao Shiqi, see also Silas Wu, *Passage to Power*, 42–3. It is interesting to note that in the *Veritable Records* the entries for some days of the tour to Wutai shan are completely missing. For example, one of the missing days is the day after the emperor’s
religiosity played a greater role for the emperor than extant sources divulge, is it, in view of the above described array of polyvalent activities, useful to think of the emperor’s tours to Wutai shan as “pilgrimages”?\footnote{See Naquin and Yü, “Pilgrimage in China,” 6–8; Dott, \textit{Identity Reflections}, 9. See also Birnbaum, “Thoughts on T’ang Buddhist Mountain Traditions and their Context,” 10, 21–2 n.7; Pei-yi Wu, “An Ambivalent Pilgrim to T’ai Shan in the Seventeenth Century,” 66–8. In his study of Wutai shan during the early Jin Dynasty, Gimello alludes to Turner’s notion of liminality to describe the location of the mountain as a place that is particularly conducive to mystical experience. This shift of Turner’s concept from the notion of liminal state to a notion of liminal place is an example of meaningful use of Turner’s ideas in the case of China. See Gimello, “Wutai shan during the Early Chin Dynasty,” 503, 554–5 n. 2.}

Answering this question is difficult, since, although pilgrimage was widely practiced in late imperial China, there exists neither a Buddhist term, nor a definition of this activity which would allow analysis according to emic categories.\footnote{Turner, “Pilgrimage and Communitas”; Turner and Turner, \textit{Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture}.} Discussing this issue based on Victor Turner’s model of pilgrimage as a liminal state\footnote{See Naquin and Yü, “Pilgrimage in China,” 5, 11, 15; Pei-yi Wu, “An Ambivalent Pilgrim to T’ai Shan in the Seventeenth Century,” 65; Birnbaum, “Thoughts on T’ang Buddhist Mountain Traditions and Their Context,” 10, 21 n. 6.} (a theoretical concept widely applied in the comparative study of pilgrimage in monotheistic religions) is also difficult, since this model has proven to be of limited use for the study of East Asian pilgrimages. As Susan Naquin and Chün-fang Yü note, in the case of China this is due mainly to the different nature of records of religious travel in the Chinese Buddhist and the Christian traditions respectively. Whereas in the \textit{corpus} of pilgrimage records in the Christian traditions (on the basis of which Turner developed his model) descriptions of pilgrimage as \textit{process} abound, in China such descriptions of pilgrimage as a journey (as opposed to descriptions of the pilgrimage destinations) are almost non-existent. Therefore, while there is a substantial body of data on the history of pilgrimage sites, we are not as well served by what is said about what pilgrims actually did during their tours to and from these places.\footnote{Naquin and Yü, “Pilgrimage in China,” 6–8; Dott, \textit{Identity Reflections}, 9. See also Birnbaum, “Thoughts on T’ang Buddhist Mountain Traditions and their Context,” 10, 21–2 n.7; Pei-yi Wu, “An Ambivalent Pilgrim to T’ai Shan in the Seventeenth Century,” 66–8. In his study of Wutai shan during the early Jin Dynasty, Gimello alludes to Turner’s notion of liminality to describe the location of the mountain as a place that is particularly conducive to mystical experience. This shift of Turner’s concept from the notion of liminal state to a notion of liminal place is an example of meaningful use of Turner’s ideas in the case of China. See Gimello, “Wutai shan during the Early Chin Dynasty,” 503, 554–5 n. 2.}

This problematic extends to the case in point, the Kangxi emperor’s tours to Wutai shan: even though Gao Shiqi’s \textit{Hucong xixun rilu} is a document that focuses explicitly on the imperial tour to Wutai shan, it mostly consists of quotations which are culled from the records of local gazetteers.

Naquin and Yü further argue that it is wrong to carry over the distinction between the sacred and the profane (which, they note, only seems natural in the three great monotheistic traditions) into the study of East Asian religions.\footnote{Naquin and Yü, “Pilgrimage in China,” 4. See also Dott, \textit{Identity Reflections}, 204, 315 n. 23.} In order to “study pilgrimage cross-culturally, scholars have had to shake off...
the influence of Western religions—with their clear definitions of religion and believer, identifiable acts of worship, and assumption of hardship as part of the pilgrimage journey” and accepted for comparison “any journey to a sacred place to perform some religious act.” In consequence, following this broad definition of pilgrimage, Naquin and Yü include the ancient pre-Buddhist imperial practice of touring the empire’s sacred peaks as one instance of a Chinese “pilgrimage-like activity” in the introduction to their volume.

Indeed, I think that it is precisely this contextualization of the Kangxi emperor’s journeys in the tradition of imperial touring that is key to an understanding of the emperor’s ideologically dissimilar activities on his western tours. Early instances of the practice of imperial touring can be (and were by the Qing emperors) traced back to examples in the Book of Changes, the Book of Documents, the Liji and the Rites of Zhou. The first historical emperor who embarked on an imperial tour of inspection was Qin Shihuangdi (r. 221–209 BCE). Following that, emperors of the Qin, Han, Sui, and Tang dynasties frequently embarked on such tours before the practice was abandoned in Central China in line with the increasing bureaucratization of the empire that began during the Song. In contrast, imperial touring continued to be practiced as an integral part of government in the northern traditions of the Liao, Jurchen, and Jin, as well as under the Mongol Yuan and the early Ming emperors.

As imperial tours of inspection were taken up again by the Qing emperors, Kangxi’s western tours were only one part of a larger project of imperial touring of the empire, and the tours were modeled after (Han) Chinese as well as Inner Asian styles of rulership. Moreover, the timing of the first series of Kangxi’s tours, undertaken shortly after the consolidation of the empire in the wake of the suppression of the Three Feudatories in 1683, shows that the tours were also designed as tours of victory over the newly consolidated realm.

In his study of the Qing emperors’ Southern Tours, Michael Chang argues that the dovetailing of Han and Inner Asian modes of ruling within the single
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101 Naquin and Yü, “Pilgrimage in China,” 3. “Sacred place” here is defined as a place “where the power of a deity is manifest, places that are ling (numinous, efficacious),” Naquin and Yü, “Pilgrimage in China,” 11.
104 Wutai shan did not, however, form part of the circuit of the previous imperial tours of inspection, which centered on the four (later five) marchmounts. On the marchmounts vs. the “four famous [Buddhist] Mountains,” see Robson, “Imagining Nanyue,” 35–100; Kleeman, “Mountain Deities in China,” 226–30.
105 See Spence, Ts’ao Yin and the K’ang-hsi Emperor, 125; Kessler, K’ang-hsi and the Consolidation of Ch‘ing Rule, 1661–1684, 75–111; Chang, A Court on Horseback (2007), 81.
practice of imperial touring made this practice capable of “generating meanings within a variety of different social formations.” According to Chang it was precisely this “multivalent” quality of imperial touring that allowed the rulers to use it as a means to simultaneously address the culturally different populations of the empire.

Chang critiques the previous scholarship which has tended to view the Southern Tours as exclusively directed towards a Han Chinese audience and approached them as “phenomenon sui generis to be analyzed in isolation,” as well as the tendency of (some) New Qing historians who, while recognizing that Qing imperial ideology was composed of culturally different constituencies, continue to study them as separate phenomena.

Such a reductive “one-to-one instrumentalism,” argues Chang, “overlooks Crossley’s insight into the ‘simultaneity’ of universal emperorship.” According to him, “tours of inspection were intended to make the court simultaneously comprehensible to a heterogeneous, not a homogenous, audience of imperial subjects that included Manchu, Mongol, Muslim Uigur, Han, and even Tibetan and Kazakh subjects.”

Chang’s argument is useful in trying to understand the multiple ideological resonances of Kangxi’s Western Tours to Wutai shan. Seen not as a “Tibetan Buddhist pilgrimage” that only addresses the Mongolian population of the empire, but rather as “pilgrimage” in the broad definition as introduced by Naquin and Yü, or viewed simply as the western part of a series of ideologically polyvalent tours, seemingly incoherent and ideologically contradictory actions of the emperor, such as practicing archery while descending the sacred mountain, begin to make sense.

Thus, when the emperor shows concern for an impoverished local county student, chastises local officials for extorting provisions from the local population, and inspects the local infrastructure such as waterways and dike works, he shows himself in the role of a benevolent Confucian monarch to his Han Chinese subjects; and when he and his retinue recite and write poetry that extols the beauty of the mountain, they partake in a time-honored activity of the (Confucian
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109 Chang, “A Court On Horseback” (2001), 33, emphasis in the original.
110 As mentioned above, apart from a few prescriptive documents, we neither have information on how Chinese Buddhists conceptualized pilgrimage, nor on what they actually did during their journeys to and from religious sites. At the very least, however, it seems safe to say that hunting and the practice of archery would certainly not be part of a Buddhist pilgrimage. On dietary restrictions placed on Wutai pilgrims and their retinue while on the mountain precincts, see Gimello, “Chang Shang-yin on Wu-t'ai Shan,” 103, 132 n. 28.
Why Did the Kangxi Emperor Go to Wutai Shan?

and Daoist) literati elite. In order to ensure appreciation of and enthusiastic response to his actions, Kangxi even enforced local participation:

Statutes of 1675 had laid down that whenever the Emperor traveled through an area, all officials living within a hundred li must come and welcome him; those failing to do so were to forfeit one year’s salary for the first offence, on the second offence they were to be lowered two grades and transferred. These statutes were enforced in 1684 by officials from the Court of State Ceremonial [sic], who rode out ahead of the cortege ordering all officials within a hundred li to assemble the local elite (hsiang-shen) and scholar-commoners (shih-min) in their area to kneel and greet the Emperor on his arrival and departure.

Contrary to this, when we see the emperor hunting and competing with his retinue in martial skills, he displays his excellence in one of the prime virtues of the “Manchu Way” before a different group of admirers. Farquhar was also correct when he concluded that by journeying to the mountain the Qing emperors sought to reinforce the emperor-Maṇjuśrī connection in the eyes of their Mongolian subjects, and communicate to them their support of Buddhism. Apart from sponsoring the production of a number of Mongolian editions of the Wutai shan gazetteer, in 1698 Kangxi also took with him on his third tour the newly surrendered Kokonor Ölōd Mongol nobles Bkrašis bayatur, Tüsiyetü dayičing, Namčar erdeni, Punčurγ tayiji, the first Rje btsun dam pa Khutukhtu (1635–1723).

Although they were undoubtedly an impressive spectacle for people who witnessed them up close, the tours of inspection served as more than just

111 On literati and mountains see Dott, Identity Reflections, 194–224; Demiéville, «La montagne dans l’art littéraire chinois.»
112 Spence, Ts’ao Yin and the K’ang-hsi Emperor, 126, speaking of the Kangxi emperor’s southern tours.
114 Veritable Records, juan, 187, 1b, 7a–b; Sagaster, Subud Erike, 117.
115 Ye shes thub bstan (19th cent.), Khayb bdag ’khor lo’i Mgon po Rje btsun dam pa Blo bzang bstan pa’i rgyal mtshan gyi rnam thar (Biography of Rje btsun dam pa’i rgyal mtshan), 41b. I thank Vladimir Uspensky for this citation and for sending me a copy of the text. On this biography, see Sh. Bira, Mongolian Historical Literature of the XVII-XIX Centuries Written in Tibetan, 57–58. See also Uspensky, “The Legislation Relating to the Tibetan Buddhist Establishments at Wutai shan”; Bawden, The Jebtsundamba Khutukhtus of Urga, 58; Chen Lu, Menggu yishi (Unofficial history of Mongolia), 514–5; Cheng Chongde and Shen Xiaoting, Qingdai Menggu gaosengzhuan yiji (Translated collection of biographies of eminent Mongol monks of the Qing period), 231. These are all rather late sources and may not be reliable. Moreover, Chen’s source may be corrupt as it records that the Rje btsun dam pa accompanied the Kangxi emperor twice to Wutai shan, in 1689 and 1698, even though there was no imperial tour to the mountain in 1689.
a display of palpable imperial presence; they also helped in a much more concrete way to create a connection between the alien rulers and the Chinese soil. As the emperor traveled the country, his actions were both remembered and recorded, and thus became part of local lore. In one case, a site along the imperial itinerary where the emperor had shot three arrows, was named “Three Arrow Mountain” (San jian shan). The erection of stelae and naming of a site as “Tiger Shot Stream,” in commemoration of the emperor’s killing of a tiger, mentioned earlier, is another case in point. Gao Shiqi’s Hucong xixun rilu may also be read in this way, since by combining quotations from local gazetteers with a description of Kangxi’s actions, a connection between Kangxi and the previous emperors is established in the reader’s mind. It certainly is not coincidental that Gao Shiqi and Zhu Yizun (1629–1709), two eminent literati, accompanied the emperor on his first tour and left records of the journey in highly sophisticated classical Chinese — all of these activities illustrate what Peter Perdue calls “the determination of the king to mark the expanse of his territory with his personal presence.”

Even Kangxi’s bestowal of the above-quoted stele inscriptions takes on additional meaning if one bears in mind that many of the stelae had been inscribed during Kangxi’s first inspection of the newly conquered empire, and that most of them were donated on the occasion of the emperor’s personal visits to Wutai shan. All eulogies, they describe the origin of the monasteries on Wutai shan (which, in some cases, they even push back to the legendary introduction of Buddhism to China at the time of Han Mingdi [58–75 CE]), and extol the beautiful scenery of the mountain. Not surprisingly, few stelae

116 Gao Shiqi, Hucong xixun rilu, 1164a; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 4, 9b–10a, 42b, juan 5, 3a–b, 16b–17a, juan 6, 1a–b.
117 “Tiger Shot Stream” even crops up in a contemporary Tibetan record, where mention is made of a certain Da Lama Bkra shis yer phel of Shee hu chon (< Shehu chuan). Thu'u bkwan II Ngag dbang chos kyi rgya mtsho, Ri bo rtse inga'i gzi bdag rnams la bsang mchod 'phul tshul legs tshogs lhun grub (The way of offering to Mt. Wutai local gods that is called “heaps of what is good come about spontaneously”), 5b. See also the depiction of the Kangxi emperor’s killing of the tiger on a map that was printed from a set of wood blocks carved in 1846 by a Mongol lama at Cifu si, Wutai shan. Rubin Museum of Art, Wutai shan Interactive Map, and Wen-shing Chou, “Ineffable Paths,” 124. On the significance of Three Arrow Mountain, Tiger Shot Stream, and the Kangxi emperor’s “presence in the landscape more than a hundred years after he visited Wutaishaan,” see also Wen-shing Chou, “Ineffable Paths,”123–4.
118 Hucong xixun rilu was published by Gao Shiqi around 1700, in a collection of his writings entitled Qingyin tang ji.
119 Zhu Yizun authored a number of poems about Kangxi’s western tour and Wutai shan. See Wutai shan shi ge zongji, 417–20; Qinding Qingliang shan zhi, juan 20, 10b. He was a renowned scholar and poet. At the time of Kangxi’s first western tour he had already helped editing the official history of the Ming dynasty, published several literary collections, was serving in the imperial study and living inside Di’an men. See his biographies in Hummel, Eminent Chinese of the Ch’ing Period, 182–5 and Wang Zhonghan, Qing shi lie zhuan (Qing period biographies), 5776–7.
120 Perdue, China Marches West, 422.
were erected to record specific historical events. This suggests that the tablets and stele inscriptions, as much as they were ostentatious religious patronage directed at a Mongol and Chinese Buddhist audience, were also intended to be the Qing emperor’s superscription of the stelae of previous dynasties, a sign of the Kangxi emperor’s taking possession of this sacred site which, though remote in location, was one of the ritual centers of the newly conquered empire.\(^\text{121}\) This is not to say that, once erected, these imperially inscribed stelae did not also add to the sanctity of the mountain. In a sense, since the Kangxi emperor himself was, by the Tibeto-Mongolian world and in certain circles of Chinese Buddhists, regarded as an emanation of Mañjuśrī, these inscriptions were a powerful sign of the continued tangible presence of the bodhisattva at the site of Wutai shan. In Robert Gimello’s words, the imperial inscriptions became “points at which the secular and sacred orders of meaning and power intersect, . . . junctures of the mundane and the transmundane.”\(^\text{122}\)

Considering such skillful manipulation of the empire’s constituencies by means of imperial touring, is it appropriate to conclude with Brian Dott, that the Qing emperors were “intent on transforming not themselves but sacred spaces”?\(^\text{123}\) In other words, does a careful consideration of the politics of imperial touring disprove Berger’s suggestion that the Kangxi emperor might, among other objectives, have also followed a religious pursuit? I would suggest it does not. First, it is obvious that pilgrims can (and certainly do when they are performing such complex roles as, in Chang’s sense, truly simultaneous rulership as sage-king, cakravartin, and qayan) have multiple identities which entail that they have multiple, and even mutually contradictory, expectations of their pilgrimage.\(^\text{124}\) In this light, the search for the “real face” vs. the “façade” of the Qing emperors seems somehow misplaced.\(^\text{125}\) Second, Mahāyāna Buddhism in general, and the performance of esoteric Buddhist ritual in particular, is based on recursive cosmology; that is to say, a cosmology in which the world of samsāra and the world of nirvana are one, which leads to the possibility of simultaneous achievement of mundane and transmundane goals through the practice of esoteric ritual.\(^\text{126}\)

---
\(^\text{121}\) The new Qing editions of the Wutai shan gazetteer are another example of religious patronage which, at the same time, serves as the superscription of; and a means to create a link with, the history of previous dynasties.


\(^\text{123}\) Dott, *Identity Reflections*, 227, speaking of Taishan.

\(^\text{124}\) Dott makes this point himself in reference to ordinary pilgrims to Taishan. Dott, *Identity Reflections*, 10.

\(^\text{125}\) By the same token, such an argument implies that *prima facie* Tibetan Buddhism did not necessarily take absolute precedence over other imperial ideologies of the Qing.

The ultimate soteriological element of Esoteric ritual is “identification,” or the generation of the adept in the body of the divinity for the purpose of insight into emptiness. Nevertheless, most rites . . . focus on the effect of such identification in the world. Thus most rituals are apotropaic, and the adept, acting as the divinity, secures various sorts of blessings for a community. . . . Indeed the two kinds of siddhi may be considered the ritual realization of the Two Truths, a realization in which the adept simultaneously becomes “world renouncer” and “world conqueror.”

In such a cosmology, any kind of pilgrimage, patronage, and performance of ritual, even with the intention to attain otherworldly goals, would be expected also to have worldly effects. Conversely, it is wrong to argue that because the western tours were undertaken with mundane intentions, they therefore necessarily have to be seen merely as a cynical manipulation of the empire’s Mongol constituency on the emperor’s part. Mundane and supramundane goals are not necessarily mutually contradictory. In line with Buddhist cosmology it is therefore possible to amend Dott’s words and allow for the possibility that by transforming themselves the emperors transformed sacred spaces and by extension the whole empire.

Conclusions

In answer to the three issues raised at the outset of this essay—1) Was the patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan particular to the rule of conquest elites? (2) Did the Qing also patronize Chinese Buddhism? (3) Why did the Kangxi emperor personally travel to Wutai shan?—I suggest the following tentative conclusions.

The above evidence calls into question the argument made by New Qing historians which posits that patronage of Tibetan Buddhism was one of the defining characteristics of conquest dynasties. At least in the case of Wutai shan—a case often invoked as a demonstration of the Qing emperors’ particular attention to Tibetan Buddhism—it would seem that this claim has to be modified. Although their patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan eclipsed that of the preceding dynasty, most aspects of Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at the mountain were already present during the Ming.
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127 Orzech, Politics and Transcendent Wisdom, 152.
128 See, for example, the above quoted 1714 stele inscription which refers to bi-weekly prayer assemblies which were at the same time conducted to ensure the stability of the empire and to cause all sentient beings to attain nirvana. “Huang qing cifeng qingxiu chanshi tidu Wutai fan han Zha-sa-ke Da Lama chongxiu Jinggangku Banruosi gongde beiji,” Cui and Wang, Wutai shan beiwen, 346.
129 See, for example, Rawski, The Last Emperors, 253; Waley-Cohen, “The New Qing History,” 199.
130 Such a conclusion is also implied by the findings of Toh in his “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China.”
Of course, it is not known whether Tibetan or Chinese Buddhists were in charge of the mountain after 1538, and there is no evidence of Ming patronage of Tibetan Buddhism on Wutai shan after the Zhengde reign (1506–21). This lack of evidence may suggest that patronage of Tibetan Buddhism had lapsed toward the late Ming. Therefore it might still be possible to argue that, despite the similarity of their patronage patterns, the Qing emperors were still following the precedent of the Yuan rather than that of the Ming. However, references to preceding Chinese dynasties in the Qing gazetteers and stele inscriptions, such as the invocation of the “defeated dynasty” of the Ming in the Kangxi emperor’s inscription for Rahula monastery, suggests that the early Qing emperors were clearly aware of the Ming Dynasty’s patronage of Buddhism at the mountain. These references, together with the absence of references to the Yuan Dynasty in the Kangxi emperor’s Chinese-language stele inscriptions, also suggest that the Qing emperors consciously wanted to project an appearance of continuity between their patronage of Buddhist institutions at Wutai shan and that of the Ming, at least to a Chinese audience. It is possible that the Qing emperors may have highlighted Yuan precedents when they were addressing an Inner Asian audience, but a discussion of this question will require the examination of the Mongol-, Tibetan-, and Manchu-language stele inscriptions at the site of Wutai shan.

There is also evidence that, at least during the early Qing, the emperors, while clearly favoring Tibetan Buddhist monks, sponsored monasteries of both the Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist traditions. Moreover, there are strong indications that, in addition to appealing to a Tibeto-Mongolian audience, the early Qing emperors made efforts to address Chinese Buddhists, and even propagated the image of the emperor as an emanation of Mañjuśrī among them.

Since the Kangxi emperor’s public stele inscriptions emphasize the Qing Dynasty’s generous patronage of the performance of rituals for the protection of the state at Wutai shan, it further appears that, during the Qing, Wutai shan continued to be the important center for the ritual protection of the state that it had been in preceding dynasties. Moreover, the fact that Manchu archival records, which were not written for public display, confirm generous and frequent imperial patronage of these rituals, seems to indicate that the Manchu emperors genuinely believed in their efficacy. Thus a number of dif-
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131 In my opinion, as the Ming gazetteer was compiled by a Chinese Buddhist, printed in 1596, and the Qing editions may not have updated the patronage record of the preceding dynasty, the absence of late Ming evidence for imperial support of specifically Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan does not compellingly indicate that late Ming support for Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan had waned. Non-specific patronage records for the Wanli period (r. 1573–1620) exist. *Qingliang shan zhi, juan* 4, 15b–20b.

132 In contrast, Dmitrii Pokotilov’s eyewitness account provides evidence that in the late eighteenth century the state only sponsored Tibetan Buddhist monasteries. Pokotilov, “Der Wu tai Shan und seine Klöster,” 58.
ferent sources indicate that patronage of both Tibetan and Chinese Buddhist institutions considerably increased under the Qing. But as an examination of the Ming and Qing emperors’ stele inscriptions reveals, their difference lies not only in number but also in content and style. This is an indication that the way the Qing emperors attached meaning to their patronage of Buddhism at Wutai shan differed considerably from that of the Ming. Such a difference is also suggested by an examination of their personal tours to the site.

For the Qing emperors, these tours, though partly undertaken in order to patronize Buddhist institutions, were a means to simultaneously address the empire’s various (Han and non-Han) constituencies, to enhance the emperors’ connection to Mañjuśrī in the eyes of Mongol as well as Chinese subjects, and to inscribe a Manchu presence onto the soil and historical records of the newly conquered Chinese empire. These characteristics of Qing patronage clearly differ from those of the patronage of the Ming emperors who, while also patronizing Buddhism on the mountain, never personally toured the mountain, and did not—at least not according to present knowledge—propagate the idea that they were emanations of Mañjuśrī. These meanings that the Qing emperors deliberately associated with Wutai shan seem to indicate that, in addition to following the precedent of the Ming, the Qing emperors were also mindful of the legacy of the Yuan. Moreover, they suggest that by comparison with the Ming, the mountain figured more prominently in Qing imperial ideology, particularly in their attempts at self-legitimation. This greater need of a conquest dynasty to create legitimacy (both within the Chinese and Inner Asian cultural spheres) is, of course, precisely what the arguments of the New Qing historians, which posit a similarity between Yuan and Qing methods of legitimation, seek to address. And yet, evidence like the above-quoted reference to the emperor as Mañjuśrī in a widely propagated Chinese text, should caution against presuming the existence of clearly demarcated constituencies that were addressed in their respective traditions of rule, or hasty identification of propaganda directed at the Mongols as the main objective of the Qing emperors’ Western Tours.

There is another question concerning the significance of Tibetan Buddhism in Qing imperial ideology which needs to be addressed. The documents examined above demonstrate that during the Ming and early Qing periods at Wutai shan a number of monasteries jointly housed Tibetan and Chinese monks.

133 It is suggestive that De bzhin gshegs pa, when at the court of the Yongle emperor, performed ceremonies that posthumously designated Emperor Hongwu as an emanation of Mañjuśrī (Farquhar, Emperor as Bodhisattva, 16), and that Zhu Qiyu (r. 1449–57) was addressed as ‘Jam dbyangs gong ma rgyal po kyi n tha’i” — “his Highness, the Mañjughoṣa emperor, Jingtai.” Toh, Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China, 182.

134 Chinese and Tibetan monks also co-resided at monasteries in Beijing. Naquin, Peking, 208 n. 133.
Additionally, Toh has shown that a considerable number of Tibetan Buddhist practitioners in Ming and Qing China were of Mongol and Chinese ethnicity, and the evidence presented above suggests joint performance of rituals by monks of the Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist traditions and it appears that no descriptive division of the rituals of the Tibetan vs. the Chinese Buddhist traditions was upheld. Moreover, until the late Ming, Tibetan Buddhism was not yet known as “lmaism” (lama [zhi] jiao), a term that would later set it apart and exclude it from (Chinese) Buddhism (fojiao). Both during the Ming and Qing periods, Tibetan Buddhist monks were commonly referred to as fanseng [2 in glossary]. Much the same situation seems to have prevailed during the Yuan. This already led Herbert Franke to ask “whether it is at all appropriate to speak of Tibetans in China as if their nationality would be relevant,” and to suggest that “it would perhaps make more sense to speak of Buddhist clerics who happened to be Tibetans.” In other words, despite the records of Ming prohibitions of the practice of Tibetan Buddhism for Han Chinese, and despite the at times xenophobic depiction of Tibetan Buddhist

---

135 A prohibition against (Han) Chinese becoming Tibetan Buddhist monks was issued in 1397 (Naquin, Peking, 209), but in my opinion it is likely that this prohibition, rather than pointing to the absence of (Han) Chinese Tibetan Buddhist practitioners, indicates that such practitioners existed. This judgment seems to be borne out by a later prohibition dating from 1500, which reads: “Any Chinese who became a monk and practiced Tibetan Buddhism (fanjiao), regardless of his being military personnel or a commoner, or having been granted a permit (dudie) or not, should without exception be examined and sent back to his birthplace to work for the military officials there. As for the Chinese who pretend to be Tibetan (fanren), banish them to the frontier for military service.” Toh, Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China, 212.

136 See the above quoted 1714 stele inscription which notes that every new and full moon Tibetan and Chinese monks assemble for prayer ceremonies. There also exist records which indicate that, in addition to members of the court elite, ordinary Chinese monks were also practising Tibetan Buddhism. See, for example, the passage in Lcang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje’s biography: “From every area, many hwa shang (<heshang> who were studying the Dharma, and were experiencing difficulty, came forward to the presence of Lcang skya Rin po che, prostrated themselves in front of him and pressed their heads against his feet. According to the hwa shang’s wish, Lcang skya started to gradually transmit the view-points of the Middle Way and thus caused many people to attain enlightenment.” Thu’u bkwan III Blo bzang chos kyi nyi ma, Khyab bdag rdo rje sems dpa’i ngo bo dpal ldan bla ma dam pa Ye shes bstan pa’i sgron me dpal bzung po’i rnam par thar pa mdo tsam brjod pa dge ldan bstan pa’i mdzes rgyan (The biography of Lcang skya II Rol pa’i rdo rje), 154; see also Chen Qingying and Ma Lianlong, transl., Zhangja Guoshi Ruo-bi-duo-ji zhu (The biography of the National Preceptor Lcang skya Rol pa’i rdo rje), 92. For other examples, see also Tuttle, “A Tibetan Buddhist Mission to the East,” 80–1, and “Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan.”

137 Naquin records the (earliest?) occurrence of the term lamajiao in 1573. By contrast, the term lama was, along with other terms, in use from a much earlier time on. Naquin, Peking, 49, 208.

138 Franke, “Tibetans in Yuan China,” 297. For the Yuan (as well as Tangut and early Ming) period there also exist records of Tibetan Buddhist texts that were translated into Chinese, which strongly suggest Chinese interest in the practice of Tibetan Buddhism. See especially Shen Weirong, “Tibetan Tantric Buddhism at the Court of the Great Mongol Khans,” and “Xixia Heishuicheng suo jian Zangchuan fojiawuyi yixi yi gwiwenshu yanjiu [I]” (Research on the sGyu lugs kyi man ngag found in Xixia, Heishuicheng documents); Beckwith, “A Hitherto Unnoticed Yuan-Period Collection Attributed to ‘Phagspa.”

139 Franke, “Tibetans in Yuan China,” 298.
monks, the question of whether Tibetan Buddhists in Yuan, Ming, and Qing China were at all times perceived as a distinct ethnic group, or sometimes rather as followers of liturgically and doctrinally different schools, needs further examination.

This question cannot be addressed without further study, but even a cursory consultation of the Qing Veritable Records yields interesting results. While it is already well known that the term lama [zhi] jiao as a designation for Tibetan Buddhism started to be used only towards the end of the Qianlong reign, it is worth noting that there are merely five occurrences of the term lamajiao and thirteen occurrences of the term lama zhi jiao in the Veritable Records of the entire Qing Dynasty altogether. In only two out of those thirteen occurrences does the term lama zhi jiao stand on its own, while in nine cases it reads Dalai Lama zhi jiao—School of the Dalai Lama[s]. What seems to be used much more frequently instead of lama [zhi] jiao, is the term Huangjiao—Yellow School (Dge lugs pa). In fact, even in the famous Lamashuo Qianlong uses the term Huangjiao rather than lamajiao to denounce Tibetan Buddhists. Now “School of the Dalai Lamas” and “Yellow School” seem to express both a little more and a little less than the generic term “lamaism.” These terms are less of a global way to designate Tibetan Buddhism, and at the same time they are more precise—they refer to a specific school.

No doubt, a detailed examination of the Chinese terminology used to refer to Tibetan Buddhism is needed before any conclusions can be drawn. However, it is possible that “Tibetan Buddhism” is a category that was not, until recently, operative in Asia as such, and did not function as an ethnic category until perhaps the very late Qing, or even the early Republican period. This possibility demonstrates the need for a more nuanced understanding of the Manchu emperors’ interest in “Tibetan Buddhism”—a term that had no equivalent in

141 Charleux also points out that much of the critique directed at Tibetan Buddhists did not differ from the critique that was leveled at Daoists and Chinese monks. Charleux, “Les «lamas» vus de Chine,” 139, 141, 145.
143 In the two remaining cases lamajiao also appears after a title.
144 Altogether, it occurs in 237 edicts of the Qing Veritable Records, some of which have multiple occurrences of the term.
145 For a reprint of the lamashuo see Zhang Yuxin, Qing zhengfu yu lamajiao, 339–43. It was translated into English by Ferdinand Lessing in Yung-ho-kung, an Iconography of the Lamaist Cathedral in Peking, 58–60.
146 On the separation of “Tibetan Buddhism” (lamajiao) and Chinese Buddhism during the Republican period, see Tuttle, Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China, 70–2. Elverskog makes a related point about the absence of the category of “Tibetan Buddhism” in Mongolian sources. See his “Two Buddhisms,” 38.
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Chinese for much of the Qing. It is likely that the Qing emperors’ patronage relations with Tibetan Buddhist leaders and early Qing patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan, while clearly seen as related, were not understood to be conceptually the same. Although the Shunzhi emperor’s audience with the Fifth Dalai Lama certainly involved geopolitical considerations and harkened back to precedents of the Yuan, the Kangxi emperor’s preference for Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan might have been motivated by entirely different concerns. It might be the case that these concerns had less to do with the Buddhism of their choice being “Tibetan” than with the wish to continue the time-honored (Chinese) tradition of state protection by means of esoteric Buddhism at the site of Wutai shan. Although in its origin an Inner Asian tradition, “Tibetan Buddhism” had continually been practiced and imperially supported in the Chinese interior since the Yuan, and had thus become a familiar feature of the religious landscape there. Therefore scholars need to clarify what they mean by speaking of Tibetan Buddhism in Ming and Qing China as an Inner Asian tradition. As Chinese esoteric Buddhism had declined, rituals of the Tibetan Buddhist traditions—irrespective of the ethnicity of the officiant—might have been perceived as the most potent esoteric rituals, offering the best available protection for the fledgling dynasty, then available in China, and not necessarily as Inner Asian traditions or as elaborations of precedents from the Yuan. Perhaps in their very patronage of Tibetan Buddhism at Wutai shan the early Qing emperors were, after all, following what they perceived to be a Chinese tradition of rule.

Glossary

A-wang-lao-zang (Ngag dbang blo bzang)  Ban-ma-gu-ma-luo (Padmakumāra)
阿王老蔵   班麻孤麻羅
ban-di (ban de)  Bishan si
班弟   碧山寺
Changcheng ling
长城嶺

147 One should note however, that the Third and Fourth Dalai Lamas (1542–88, 1589–1617) were repeatedly invited by the Ming Wanli emperor in 1579, 1588, and 1616, and that both accepted the invitation but died shortly thereafter. Zahiruddin Ahmad therefore points out that the Qing might have wished to renew these Ming invitations “so as to [also] indicate, to the Tibetans, the succession of the Ch’ing to the Ming.” Ahmad, Sino-Tibetan Relations in the Seventeenth Century, 154, emphasis in the original.

148 Note, for example, that the early generations of Tibetan Buddhist abbots who were sent out to preside over Wutai shan by the Shunzhi emperor were Tibetan Buddhists who had received their education in Chongguo si, in Peking. Vide supra (note 17) and Cui Zhengsen, Wutai shan fojiao shi, 752.

149 Robert Sharf and Richard McBride II have recently argued that the use of the term “Esoteric Buddhism” in reference to a distinct school in medieval China constitutes itself an imposition on earlier materials of a category that was only constructed later. See Sharf, Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism, 263–78; McBride, “Is there Really ‘Esoteric’ Buddhism?”
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Chao Kui 超揆

fanseng (1) 梵僧
fanseng (2) 番僧

Chanshi 禪師

Chongguo si 崇國寺

fenxiao shang zuo guo xia qi min fu 樊修上國釐下祈民福

Chongxiu Qingliang shan Luohou si beiji 重修清凉山羅睺寺碑記

fengyan mizhang qiao chi [qin] wu ti 奉寅秘章翹敕[勤?]五體

Cong-ling-cheng-cun (Drung Rin chen brtson ['grus]) 從[同]鈴澄存

Da Jixiang Xiantong si 大吉祥顯通寺

Gao Shiqi 高士奇
gc-long (dge slong) 格隆

Da Wenshu yuan 大文殊院

Guangzong si 廣宗寺
guo 國

dalai lama jiao 達賴喇嘛之教

hongci yijiao guoshi (1) 洪慈翊教國師
hongci yijiao guoshi (2) 弘慈翊教國師

dashan guoshi zhuan 大善國師傳

Hou Xian 侯顯

Ding-zeng-jian-cuo (Bstan 'dzin rgya mtsho) 頂增堅錯

Huangdi chiyu hu chi Shanxi Wutai shan Yuanzhao si beiven

Dongpo 東坡

Huangdi chiyu hu chi Shanxi Wutai shan Xiantong si beiven

Duan-zhu-ban-dan (Don grub dpal ldan) 短竹班丹

Huangdi chiyu Wutai shan sengsuren deng beiven

dudie 度牒

duzi 五體

dugang 都綱

dugangyin 都綱印

Huangqing chifeng qingxiu chanshi tidu Wutai fan han Zha-sa-ke Da Lama chongxiu

Duo-er-zhi-jian (Rdo rje rgyal [mtshan]) 朵而只堅

Jingangku Banruo si gongde beijii

fawang 法王

Jingangku Banruo si gongde beijii

fan 番

Jingangku Banruo si gongde beijii

fanjiao 番教

 Klingon nga saat-kam kasat si gongde beijii

fanren 番人

huangjiao 黃教
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Hucong xixun rilu  弘從西巡日録
Jian-can (Rgyal mtshan)  堅參
Jin huangdi qiansheng qi fo zhi shi xian zai jiu chong zhi sheng  今皇帝前生七佛之師現在九重之聖
Kangxi chao manwen zhupi zouzhe quanyi  康熙朝滿文朱批奏折全譯
Ku-er-kang (Kurkang)  庫爾康
Lao-zang-dan-ba (Blo bzang bstan pa)  老藏丹巴
Lao-zang-dan-bei-jian-can (Blo bzang bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan)  老藏丹貝堅參
Lama  喇嘛
Lamashuo  喇嘛說
lama [zhi] jiao  喇嘛[之]教
ling  靈
Linggu si  靈谷寺
Mang-ge-luo-bu-la-jia (Mangalapuraka)  忙葛羅不剌加
Maoxi chanshi  茗溪禪師
Mingxu  明續
Mu-er-sai (Mursai)  穆爾賽
Puning si  普寧寺
Pusading  菩薩頂
Qinding Qingliang shan zhi  欽定清涼山志
Qingyin Tangji  清吟堂集
Qingliang laoren  清涼老人
Qingliang shan  清涼山
Qingliang shan jiyao  清涼山輯要
Qingliang shan zhi  清涼山志
Qingliang shan xin shi  清涼山新志
Qingxiu chanshi  清修禪師
Rāhula monastery  羅睺寺
Rāhulabhadra  羅睺羅多
San jian shan  三箭山
seng  僧
senggangsi dugang  僧綱司都綱
senglusi youjueyi  僧錄司右覺義
Su Shi  蘇軾
sengzheng si  僧正司
shengguo xianfan  勝國賢藩
Shehu chuan  射虎川
Shehu chuan Tailusi bei  射虎川台麓寺碑
Shehu chuan beiji  射虎川碑記
Shenwu quan beiji  神武泉碑記
shifang tang  十方堂
Shuxiang si  殊像寺
Tailu si  臺麓寺
Tailu si bei  臺麓寺碑
Tayuan  塔院
Wu-si-zang (dbus gtsang) 鳥思藏

Wutai shan 五臺山

Wutai shan Datayuan si chongxiu Ayuwang suo jian Shijiawen zhenshen sheli baota bei bing ming" 五臺山大塔院寺重修阿育王所建釋迦文真身舍利寶塔碑并銘

Yanshou wujiang daochang 延壽無疆道場

Yinzen 膺禎

senglusi youjueyi Cong-ling-cheng-zun 僧錄司右覺義從鈴澄存

senglusi youjueyi Tong-ling-cheng-zun 僧錄司右覺義同鈴澄存

Yuan Haomen 元好問

Yuanzhao 圓照

Yuanzhao si 圓照寺

Yulin Tongxiu 玉琳通琇

Yunreng 允鉉

Yuzhi Pusading Dawenshu yuan bei 御製菩薩頂大文殊院碑

Zhang Jiancan (Lcang Rgyal mtshan) 張堅参

Zhaohui wang 趙惠王

Zhencheng 鎮澄

Zhenrong yuan 真容院

Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊

zhuchi 住持

Zifu shan 紫府山

Xiangshan 香山

Xiantong si 顯通寺

Xishan 西山

Xitianfozi dahui fawang 西天佛子大慧法王

Xitian shanshi da chanshi pan-di-da gong shili ta ming you xu 西天善世大禪師板的達公設利塔銘有序

Yiujian zhuguo youmin daocheng 修建祝國佑民道場
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