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It is usually said that Lamaism was first introduced into Mongolia during the Yüan Dynasty, then after the collapse of the Mongol Yüan House disappeared from Mongolia only to be reintroduced in the late 1570ies by the Altan-qayán of the Twelve Tümed tribe. This Twelve Tümed tribe roughly occupied that part of Suiyüan Province east of the Yellow River Bend (Ordos). The Altan-qayán invited the Third Dalai-lama from Tibet: they first met somewhere in Köke-nuur region, then after the qayán's death, the Dalai-lama visited Ordos and Tümed territories, established contacts with several Mongol princes and leaders from other regions, the Çaqar and the Qalqa, who accepted the new religion and began to spread it among their people. This in short is how we are told Lamaism took hold of Mongolia. W. HEISSIG speaks of a second conversion to Lamaism of the Mongols.

In this paper I propose to show that the "re-introduction" of Lamaism was less a re-introduction than a revival and a new expansion and consolidation of something that had never completely disappeared from Mongolia and was only waiting for the right opportunity to reassert itself. When the Altan-qayán and his great-nephew Qutuytai-sec·en qung-tayiji of the Ordos invited the Tibetan Dalai-lama, they did so because they already knew Lamaism and for some reason hoped that certain advantages could be derived from such a visit.

During the Yüan, Lamaism undoubtedly had great influence in the capital, Ta-tu (modern Peking), especially at the court itself, but probably was never much of a power among the native tribes of Mongolia. Yet, however superficial Lamaism may have been in Mongolia proper, it must have had some influence upon the local nobility, in imitation of court circles of the capital, and even, although to a far lesser degree upon the common people. We may almost a priori presume that after the collapse of the Yüan Dynasty Lamaism never entirely disappeared from Mongolia until it was given new life by the visit of the Third Dalai-lama. Nor did Lamaism in Mongolia exist in a pure and undiluted form. We should bear in mind that Buddhism upon its introduction into Tibet had already absorbed many elements of the pre-Buddhist native religion; during the 17th century and later Lamaism was to do the same again in Mongolia.

---

proper, and we can be sure that whatever Lamaism existed in Mongolia in the 15th and 16th centuries, it lived side by side with Shamanism and most of the people probably practiced a mixture of both. Moreover it is my impression that wherever Lamaism was known it was but a thin veneer, and it was Shamanism that had the greater influence and commanded the loyalty of the large majority of the people.

The Mongol chronicler Sayang-secen, himself a member of the nobility of Ordos and a descendant of Qutuytai-secen qung-tayiji, never mentions the existence of Lamaism in Mongolia before the invitation of the Dalai-lama. He gives all the credit for introducing Lamaism to the Altan-qayan and Qutuytai-secen qung-tayiji. Sayang-secen tells us how in 1566, Qutuytai-secen undertook a campaign against the Tibetans of the Three Rivers and destroyed their armies; and how immediately hereafter, he sent envoys to such Tibetan dignitaries as the Great Borsa Lama, Čanši Lama, Darqan Lama, Usungdur-sanjin, Altan-sanjin, and others, with the message that if they surrendered to him (i.e. Qutuytai-secen) the Mongols would accept the Tibetan religion (sasin-nom kiy-a). During the negotiations following this message, Qutuytai-secen is described as familiar with such magic as was often practised by lamas. The result of the affair was that the Tibetans of the Three Rivers submitted to Qutuytai-secen qung-tayiji who brought bLargin Lama, Astuy-sayin-bandj, and Astuy-wačihtowanmi-sanggasba with him back to Mongolia and granted to the latter the title of Gūi-ong-qonjin. Qutuytai-secen's campaign no doubt was conducted in the general area of Amdo, Köke-nuur, and perhaps Northern Tibet. Since the Yüan period, Mongols and Tibetans have lived intermingled in those areas and have greatly influenced each other.

Sayang-secen speaking of the Altan-qayan himself, relates how in 1573, he too organized a campaign against the Black Tibetans. As a result of this campaign, the Altan-qayan came back with a large number of prisoners, the lamas Ariy-Lama and sGümi-bsüge-baysi among them. According to the Mongol chronicler, Ariy-Lama immediately began to explain to the qayan the essentials of the Buddhist doctrine of salvation, and the qayan, we are told, became slightly devout and began to recite the “Six-Syllable Formula”.

G.N. Roerich, judging from the name, believes that this Ariy Lama came from the Ariy tribe in Southern Amdo, a tribe of Mongol origin but strongly tibetanized.

---

2 Schmidt, Geschichte, pp. 210—211; Schulemann, Dalai-lamas, p. 207.
3 Schmidt, Geschichte, pp. 210—211; Schulemann, Dalai-lamas, p. 207.
The Mongol historian then goes on to relate that Qutuytai-sečen qung-tayiji in 1576 paid a visit to his great-uncle the qayan of the Tümed and on that occasion explained to him that no genuine prosperity was possible without religion, meaning of course, Buddhist religion in its Lamaist form, the only form known to him. Then he went on to tell the qayan that he had heard that in the southern regions of the Wide Snows “there was the perceptive, powerful, and compassionate Qongsim Bodhisattva in real person” and he suggested that the qayan, inspiring himself on the example of emperor Qubilai of the Yüan who invited the hP'ags-pa lama from Tibet to the Capital, also send a delegation to invite the Bodhisattva to come to Mongolia. The Altan-qayan approved of this plan and after consultation with the Three Western Tümen, both he and Qutuytai-sečen qung-tayiji appointed a number of envoys to invite the "Saintly all-knowing bSowadnams-rgyamts'o Qutuytu?". This was the Third Dalai-lama, as he would be known from this time on, and it is this invitation by the two Mongol princes which led to his visit to Köke-nuur in 1578 and to Ordos and Tümed in 1585. He died in Mongolia in 1588.

Just as in 1576 Qutuytai-sečen qung-tayiji had recalled to his great-uncle the former relationship between the Yüan emperor and the Tibetan religious leader, so was he now to mention those earlier relationship to the Dalai-lama himself when he and the Altan-qayan met him for the first time; not however before the Dalai-lama himself had made a similar remark concerning the Yüan period.

To continue with Sayang-sečen's narrative, on the occasion of this first encounter with the Dalai-lama at a newly built monastery in a place called Čabčiyal "narrow defile", the Altan-qayan related to him how lama prisoners in 1573 had taught him the rudiments of the Lamaist religion: on a previous occasion, an apparition had already warned him against the taking of animal life, which warning he could not understand, yet it could not fail to alarm him greatly, until the bTangyud Asiy-lama made him

---

5 Qongsim is from Kuan-shih-yin, Chinese name for Avalokiteśvara.
6 After the fall of the Yüan dynasty, the Mongol nation came to be known as the Six Tümen (tümen means "ten-thousand", and indicates a military division; the word appears in several tribal names), or the Six Nations. The Three Western Tümen are usually said to comprise the Ordos, the Twelve Tümed, and a combination of tribes including the Yüngsiyebü, the Asud, and the Qarašin. There were also Three Eastern Tümen, namely the Caqar, the Qalqa, and the Uriyangqan. See my "The Mongols in China during the Hung-wu period, 1368—1398", in MCR 11, 1959, pp. 47—50; also MS 19, pp. 546 for some of the literature. The assignment, however, of a Mongol tribe to any of the Six Tümen must not be taken too literally. Even before the Yüan, Mongol tribes and clans had become widely scattered and the wars under the Yüan and the Ming continued to intensify this dispersion. By the time of the Ming, representatives of every clan and tribe could be found in any part of Mongolia.
7 SCHMIDT, Geschichte, pp. 224—225, J. R. Kruger, Poetical Passages in the Erden-yin tobči, 1961, pp. 213—214, translates the first part of this passage, but with several serious inaccuracies. In the Urga manuscript, for bSowadnams-rgyamts'o, we read a simpler form: bSodnam-rjamso.
8 SCHMIDT, Geschichte, pp. 232—233.
familiar with the "Six-Syllable Formula", and the other lama, sGümi-bayisi, instructed him in the use of the Buddhist rosary. After the Altan-qayan had related his story, his nephew recounted a similar experience.

Sayang-secen invariably suggests that the initiative came either from the Altan-qayan or from Qutuytai-secen. But this is not necessarily so. Tibetan sources point to a Tibetan initiative. For example, in 1571, a certain Dzoge-a-seng from Amdo visited the residence of the Altan-qayan and suggested that the qayan invite the Dalai-lama of Lhasa.

The facts suggest that long before 1566, 1571, and 1573, the Mongols had at least a rudimentary knowledge of Lamaism. And Lamaism must have had enough appeal to them to make the visit of the Dalai-lama possible and desirable. It would indeed seem improbable that a few lama prisoners of war, or an occasional visitor, could influence the Mongols so profoundly and bring about changes that were to affect the further history of their nation. We must also bear in mind that the visit of the Dalai-lama to the Ordos and Tümed Mongols was to have a profound significance for the Dalai-lama himself and his Yellow Sect dGe-lugs-pa as well. It was the prestige caused by this visit and the title Dalai-lama "Ocean, or Universal Lama" bestowed for the first time by the Altan-qayan, which were to consolidate both his spiritual and temporal power in Tibet.

At the first meeting of the Dalai-lama with the Mongols, a number of laws were enacted to guarantee the status and privileges of the lamas, and
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10 Schmidt, Geschichte, pp. 228–229. Asiy-lama perhaps is the same as Ariy-lama of the aforementioned passage of Schmidt, op. cit., pp. 210–211. P. S. Pallas, Sammlungen historischer Nachrichten über die Mongolischen Völkerschaften, vol. 2, p. 425, relates essentially the same facts with only minor variants, and interestingly enough notes that one of the two lamas belonged to the reformed Yellow Sect (of Tsung-k'a-pa, 1357–1419) while the other belonged to the unreformed Red Sect. Pallas' text is quoted in full by Cleaves, HJAS 17, pp. 431–432.


12 Sayang-secen (Schmidt, Geschichte, pp. 236–237) gives the title as Vajra-dhara Dalai-lama "Universal Lama, carrying the Thunderbolt", and G. Roerich, op. cit., p. 194, says that the qayan presented him with a seal bearing the inscription rDo-rje-čaṅ Ta-la-li biama, with the same meaning. The Chinese, too, knew the word rDo-rje-čaṅ: to-erh-ch'i-ch'ang. On June 2, 1581 (Mindai Mammō shiryō, Minjitsuroku-sho, Mokohen 8, p. 430 abbr. Mok.) the emperor decreed to give a patent-letter and a seal to the rDo-rje-čaṅ (in Mo. Dörjéch'ang) and his disciple Tai-kuei-ku-erh. This rDo-rje-čaṅ certainly is the Third Dalai-lama. Strangely enough, however, the Ming later seem to have forgotten this title for on January 19, 1586 (Mok. 8, p. 546), the late Altan-qayan's son, Sečen-qayan and the Tibetan monk Dalai (-lama?) presented a tribute. Then again on November 6, 1587, the Sečen-qayan's successor, Čürüké, and others including the Tibetan lama-monk Čhush-i Dalai (see note 29) presented a tribute of horses. Finally, a few days later, on November 11, when many promotions were granted, the Tibetan monk Dalai was once more granted the title (ming-hao) of To-erh-ch'i-ch'ang (Mok. 8, pp. 645, 647). Compare Wang Shih-ch'i, San-Yin ch'ou-tsu-k'ao 2, 30b — 39a. The Fourth Dalai-lama, a great-grandson of the Altan-qayan's, was given the same title rDo-rje-čaṅ in 1592. San-Yin ch'ou-tsu k'ao 2. 40b; H. Sengbus, "Pel-lou long-sou", MS 10, 1945, p. 139; Genealogical Tables of the Descendants of Dayan Qan, 1958, p. 69. I have found nothing concerning him in the Mindai Mammō shiryō.
regulations concerning fasts, abolition of the custom of grave escorts, and other things were promulgated. It is quite possible, even probable, that such laws were promulgated at the time, but as G. Schulemann points out, those statutes and regulations had been known for some time in Mongolia, at least outside the territories of the Altan-qayan, and most probably there, too. Indeed, Sayang-secen relates how the great-qayan of the Çaqars, Tümen-qayan, came in contact with one Ildün-i janggiduyçi Garma Lama (G. Lama, who ties a sword!) and under his influence “entered the Gate of Religion”, then after consultation with the Six Tümen, in 1576, promulgated a “Great Law” (Yeke čayalıjin). Tümen-qayan entrusted the execution of the law to the Çaqar Amudai qung-tayiji, the Qalqa Uijeng-subuqai, the Ordos Qutuytai-secen qung-tayiji, the Asud Nomdara-qulaci noyan, and the Tümed Çürüke qung-tayiji. These men represented every important tribe of the Mongol people, here called the Six Tümen. For this action, Tümen-qayan became known as Jasaytu-qayan, i.e. the Qayan-with-the-Law.

Tümen-qayan’s delegation of a number of noblemen from various tribes presupposes a definite interest on the part of the nobility in Lamaism. As has already been explained in the foregoing pages, Tibetan lamas had yielded great power at the Mongol court in Peking, and we are reasonably certain that under the Yüan in imitation of the court, such nobles as had continued to reside in Mongolia became interested in some measure in the Tibetan religion, even if the common people remained largely unaffected by this movement. It is quite possible that under the Yüan, influence of Lamaism, superficial as it was, gradually further decreased as one went northwards farther away from the urban centers where monasteries could be found, although even in Upper Mongolia in such places as the Qara-qorum one could find monasteries and monks. The measures taken by Tümen-qayan, the delegation of noblemen to put the Buddhist law into effect in Mongolia, the invitation of the Dalai-lama by the Altan-qayan and Qutuytai-secen qung-tayiji, etc. indicate that the nobility of at least Southern Mongolia never completely lost the memory of Lamaism. At this particular time, Lamaism must have begun to have a new appeal for the nobles; the old Shamanism no longer satisfied them. We must bear in mind that everywhere it was the nobility who made the first move to reinstall Lamaism at the expense of Shamanism. The common people must have remained largely Shamanist and hardly touched by Lamaism until the nobles in the 16th century began to take measures to suppress Shamanism and make it give way to the newly favored religion imported from Tibet.

The memory of the close cooperation between Lamaism and the temporary power of the Yüan court certainly was of paramount importance in this

---

14 Schmidt, Geschichte, pp. 200—201. “Garma-lama” as his name indicates belonged to the unreformed Kar-ma-pa sect. After writing these lines I found that the Kar-ma-pa sect had had earlier contacts with Mongolia. See H. E. Richardson, “The Karmapa Sect” in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society 1958—1959, esp. pp. 150 sq.
renewed interest in Lamaism. The problem, however, remains why this interest should be reved precisely at this particular time. Here we are very poorly informed. I may venture to suggest that the Altan-qayan and his nephew and their other relatives of the Ordos and Tümed first had to organize a political power before they could feel the need for a religion with more ritual and ceremony, more cultural background than the native Mongol Shamanism was able to offer. Their proximity to China and their, be it superficial, knowledge of Chinese culture must have promoted such a need. Esen-tayisi of the Oyirad in the middle of the 15th century, much farther away from China, apparently did not feel such a need, although he had become paramount in Mongolia. We must add, however, that at that time, too, Lamaism was not completely unknown in ruling Oyirad circles, as we shall see below.

Ch'ü Chiu-ssu in his Wan-li wu-kung lu[11] devotes a short biographical note to Qutuytai-sečen qung-tayiji. In this note we read that he was versed in literature and familiar with Buddhist writings. Indeed Qutuytai-sečen is credited with a rewriting of the Arban buyan-tu nom-un čayan teüke “White History of the Doctrine of the Ten Meritorious (works)” originally ascribed to Qubilai[16]. For a warrior like Qutuytai-sečen, such literary activity is rather surprising and it betrays a more than superficial interest, and even some sort of tradition of reading and writing. In 1571, when the Altan-qayan finally came to terms with the Ming court and for the first time was allowed to present the tribute, it was Qutuytai-sečen who wrote for him the necessary vassal-letter to be presented together with the tribute. And in connection with this vassal-letter, Ch'ü Chiu-ssu remarks that when this document was presented to Chinese border officials it had to be entirely rewritten in order to make it conform to the accepted style. One thing the Chinese officials objected to was that Qutuytai-sečen's document was full of Buddhist expressions[17]. We have every reason to believe that Qutuytai-sečen qung-tayiji was a devout Buddhist long before his first contact with lamas from Amdo and Köke-nuur.

We have no indication that the Altan-qayan himself was literate, but his interest in Lamaist literature was no less than Qutuytai-sečen's. Shortly after 1579, he had the Suvarnaprabhāsa sūtra translated into Mongol, and from then on he had his sons would-be patrons of a large group of translators, both Mongols and Tibetans[18]. Once again such wholehearted interest would never have been possible if the Mongol nobles had only recently been converted from Shamanism and had had no knowledge of Lamaism until their "conversion" in 1578.

---

[17] No doubt the vassal letter had to be rewritten in standard form, and also translated. On this see my "Four Documents relating to the Sino-Mongol peace of 1570—1571," MS 19, 1960, pp. 52—53.
Indeed throughout the Ming period we find, if not a large number, at least a few facts pointing to continued presence of lamas and Lamaism in Mongolia. First the fact that in 1431 a new edition of a collection of dhāranī in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan and Mongol was printed in Peking; and that a second volume was put out the same year comprising sūtras in Chinese with an introduction in Mongol\(^\text{19}\). Prof. Heissig presumes that such publications were intended for the many Mongols serving in the Ming armies in China. This is quite possible, but the inference is that a goodly number of them were Lamaists, and this again means that they were Lamaists when they crossed into China.

Then there are direct indications in the Chinese sources that there were lamas in Mongolia. Where they came from is not clearly indicated. I guess that most were Tibetans, who had entered Mongolia either directly from Tibet or by way of China. There were always many Tibetans in China as we shall see further on. This should not come as a surprise; just as the Ming always tried to exert a measure of influence over Mongolia and to keep informed about the state of affairs there, so too did they always work to maintain their ties with Tibet. The possibility, however, that there were Mongol lamas, too, must not be dismissed.

We shall review here a few passages from the Ming shih-lu which refer to lamas in Mongolia. On the date of April 27, 1407\(^\text{20}\), the Shih-lu has the following text:

"[The court] sent back the Tatar monks Erh-i-ch'ih, Yeh-erh-chi, Ni-erh-hui, and made them take colored satins to present to the Tatar t'ai-shih and Right ch'eng-hsiang Mar-haza\(^\text{21}\), the chieftain Toyöči, and and others. [The emperor] sent a rescript to Ho Fu\(^\text{2}\), commissioner-in-chief to the Left and commander-in-chief of Ning-hsia, and other border commanders: 'Erh-i-ch'ih, Yeh-erh-chi, Ni-erh-hui, etc., on their way home will have to pass through border towns: you should treat them well and let them pass; you should also provide them with an escort until they have crossed the borders.' [The emperor] also sent secret instructions to [Ho] Fu and Sung Ch'eng\(^\text{3}\) (commander-in-chief in Kansu): 'Erh-i-ch'ih is Tuyülići's Master [of the Empire]; some say that it certainly is Tuyülići who has sent him. Tuyülići, indeed, intends

---

\(^{19}\) Heissig, CAJ 1, pp. 268—269.

\(^{20}\) Mok. 1, pp. 322—323.

\(^{21}\) This man, possibly a Christian, with a Syrian name (< Már-hasiā), was from around 1400 to 1418 an influential personality in Mongolia. He cooperated with Tuyülići (see next note).

\(^{22}\) Kuei-li-ch'ih, Tuyülići, according to most Chinese sources, for a while was supreme in Mongolia although he does not seem to have been a descendant of the Mongol emperors. It is hard to identify him with any person known through Mongol sources. He has been identified with Ugeči-qašaqa. See W. Franke, Addenda and Corrigenda to Pokotilov's Hist. of the Eastern Mongols, SS. 1949, p. 22: 26,18. He was murdered in 1408 by Aruytai. Sayang-sečen (Schmidt, Geschichte, pp. 154—155) mentions a person by the name Tuyülići, and Kuei-li-ch'ih must be a Chinese rendering of the same name, not the same person. See also Sīra tuujı, Shastina ed., p. 63, line 9, and other chronicles. Chinese sources give many variant spellings of the same name: Kuei-li, Kuei-lin, Wei-li-ch'ih, Hui-li-ch'ih, etc.
to go westward to fight the Oyirad, and he wants to settle his family-dependents closer to the South, but he is afraid that governmental troops of border garrisons might attack them. Therefore he has sent [Erh-i-ch'ih] in order to prevent governmental troops from crossing the borders. Others say that Iuyishi intends to surrender but has not yet made up his mind; therefore he has sent [Erh-i-ch'ih] to sound out the court's feelings. Others again claim that the Caitiffs will soon follow [Erh-i-ch'ih] with border raids: you, gentlemen, must redouble your vigilance and be ready.”

The problem raised by this embassy for the Ming government need not detain us.

Erh-i-ch'in, Yeh-erh-chi, and Ni-erh-hui are called "Tatar monks" but the names rather seem of Tibetan origin. Many Mongols in recent times bore Tibetan names, and the same was true already in Yuan and post-Yuan times. It seems more probable, I believe, that the three monks were Tibetans; they may have been called Tatar because they came from Mongolia and acted as envoys for Mongol princes.

Erh-i-ch’ih appears again under the date of December 30, 1407 (summarized): "The Ching-hsiu san-tsang, Master of the Empire, Erh-i-ch’ih; the Ching-chiheh san-tsang, Master of the Empire, Pa-erh-ssu (Bars?); together with the Tatar official, Commandant Liang Shun-li, and others; the vice lu-kang of Liang-chou, Shih-li-ts’an-pu, and others, all sent envoys to present a tribute of horses; they were given a proportionate amount of paper currency." This time, although Erh-i-ch’ih did not travel personally to the capital on behalf of some Mongol chieftain, it is clear that he and the other lamas, whether Tibetan or Mongol, bearing Tibetan names, remained associated with Mongols of the West. Liang Shun-li, in spite of his Chinese name, is a "Tatar official" that is a Mongol in the Ming service, most probably in Kansu.

Erh-i-ch’ih is mentioned a third time under the date of January 24, 1410: "The Tatar official, commandant Chang Kuang-ching, the Ching-hsiu san-tsang, Master of the Empire, Erh-i-ch’ih, and others came to court to present a tribute of horses." In view of the fact that in December, 1407, Erh-i-ch’ih had not come to court in person, it is not certain that he did in 1410. It is not always clear whether the formula "come to court and present a tribute" means that the persons mentioned are the ones who actually made the trip to Peking, or those who sent the embassy. I have found cases in the Shih-lu where the persons thus named did not go to the capital but sent their men. This question is of little importance here.

On February 23, 1413, Erh-i-ch’ih’s son, Erh-i-nu, presented a tribute of horses. Whether this means that the Master of the Empire, Erh-i-ch’ih

---

23 Erh-i-ch’ih’s tribute mission, for such it certainly was, is not mentioned in the Ming-shih.
24 Mok. 10, Appendix on Tibet, pp. 56—57. The lu-kang was the head of a Prefectural Buddhist Registry, Ming-shih 75. 24a.
25 Yung-jo shih-lu 67. 7b. This passage is not in the Mindai Mammō shiryō.
26 Mok. 10, App. Tib., p. 62.
had died, is not certain. At any rate, no other Ching-hsiu san-tsang Master of the Empire was appointed by the Ming court until 1440. And incidentally, the fact that Erh-i-ch'ih had a son shows that he belonged to an unreformed Lamaist sect.

On January 4, 1438, the Shih-lu mentions another Lamaist dignitary acting as an envoy, this time for the ruling prince of the Oyirad. The text runs as follows:

"[The emperor] ordered Ha-ma-la-shih-li, envoy of Toyon, the Shunning-wang of the Oyirad, to become Tz'u-shan-hung-hua 'Compassionate and good, widely civilising' Master of the Empire; Ta-tsang, to become Right Chüeh-i in the Central Buddhist Registry; Dalan-temür and others, to become commandants, chiliarchs, and commissaries, etc. Ha-ma-la-shih-li had previously declared that on several occasions he had come to court to present the tribute, and had received generous gifts and that he had requested an official title to facilitate his coming and going; the Ministry of Rites had reported on this, and hence the present order. Ha-ma-la-shih-li was presented with a monk's robe, and Dalan-temür and the others with caps and belts [as symbols of their new ranks]."

This Ha-ma-la-shih-li seems to have served on several previous embassies. At any rate, in 1439—1440, he was a member of an Oyirad embassy sent by the qayan Toytö-buqa, then completely dominated by Toyon's son, Esen-tayisi. On January 27, 1440, he requested a silver seal from the Ming government. The request was granted. The granting first of a title and then of a silver seal lets us suppose that he was an important personality and may have had a number of ordinary lamas under him.

Another lama serving as envoy to China for the Oyirad ruler appears in the entry of February 15, 1438: "[The emperor] ordered the Oyirad envoy Wu-ssu-t'a-a-li to be made a high-secretary-commandant; and the monk Yeh-k'o-ch'u-t'o-li-yeh (Yeke? . . . ) to be made a tu-kang. They were given caps and belts, and [Yeh-k'o-ch'u-t'o-li-yeh], monks robes and other objects." We may add that Wu-ssu-t'a-a-li and his party of 5 men had been in the capital since February 12.

High-ranking lamas cannot have been a very rare sight among the Oyirad since we find another one referred to in the Shih-lu entry of February 7, 1446, and once again he is a member of a tribute and trade mission:

"Esen, tayisi of the Oyirad, memorialized that the lama 'Anointed on the head' (kuan-ting) and Master of the Empire, Ch'än-ch'üan, perfectly understood the religion of Sä [kyamuni-Buddha], and he
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27 Ibid., p. 143.
28 Mok. 2, p. 497; Mok. 10, App. Tib., p. 137.
29 Chüeh-i, one for the left and one for the right, are the fourth ranking officials in the Central Buddhist Registry. Ming-shih 74. 22 b.
30 Mok. 2, p. 593.
31 Ibid., p. 507.
32 Mok. 3, p. 131; Mok. 10, App. Tib., p. 169.
requested [the emperor] to grant him generously a title with a silver seal and a gold [-woven] gown together with a kasaya robe; [Esen] further demanded [11] pictures [12] and statues [13] of the Buddha of the Five Regions [14], bells and drums, sea conches with tassels, chu-shih [15], Law-food [16], and other objects used in Buddhist religious ceremonies. The matter was referred to the Ministry of Rites for discussion, and the Minister of Rites Hu Jung [17] and others reported that after investigation they had found no precedent for this and they begged [the emperor] to make a decision. The emperor said: ‘In controlling the Outer Barbarians, I take as sole rule the regulations established by my Ancestors; now since there is no precedent for acceding to Esen’s unseemly demands, how could we [grant them and thus] encourage his greed? Don’t grant [his request]’.

A similar request from Esen-tayisi, equally unsuccessful, came six years later. In the entry of December 13, 1452 [33], there is a long list of objects requested by Esen and other chieftains of the Oyirad. The last lines of the passage run as follows: “Esen made a separate request for his Master of the Empire San-ta-shih-li and the Tibetan (Fan) monks Saqui-temür and others, and asked for monks hats, monks garments, statues of the Buddha, tents, golden seals and silver bottles, offer vessels, and other things. All were refused.”

The fact that those objects needed for the cult were refused does not mean that they were not available in China. Had they not been available, no better reason for refusing could have existed, and we would have been told. The fact is that all those objects were found in China. We have already mentioned that Tibetan lamas traveling to China were not a rare sight. There were always a number of them present at the capital. The Blue Annals, compiled between 1476 and 1478, mention many high-ranking lamas traveling to or returning from Peking during the Yuan period. The accession of the Ming does not seem to have put any major obstacles in the way of those relations. At first Sino-Tibetan relations slowed down, but by 1400 they became more regular again, and the Blue Annals refer to visits by several high lamas to Peking [34]. Moreover this information from Tibetan sources is amply confirmed by such Chinese sources as the Ming shih-lu. Many Tibetan tribute (or trade) missions were headed, or at least accompanied, by lamas; high lamaist dignitaries often visited Peking and other places and sometimes stayed there for considerable lengths of time. We may even believe that some of them remained permanently in China, for at times the Ming used them as ambassadors to Tibet just as they employed Mongols in their service as envoys to Mongolia and Koreans to Korea. In 1452, with the ever-growing tribute embassies from the Oyirad and the resulting expenses for the government, a Shih-lu passage mentions some officials whose stipends could be reduced. Among

33 Mok. 3, p. 445.
those receiving daily stipends from the Court of Imperial Entertainment (Kuang-lu ssu) there are Masters of the Empire, Dhyana Masters, and "monk-officials"\textsuperscript{34a}. Chinese Buddhist dignitaries received no such stipends and only Tibetans living at the capital can be meant. Apart from the capital\textsuperscript{35}, another famous place regularly visited by Tibetans was the Wu-t'ai-shan in Shansi province\textsuperscript{36}. The tribute from Tibet usually comprised such objects as images or statues of the Buddha, reliquaries\textsuperscript{18}, and relics\textsuperscript{18}. The Ming court also regularly sent statues, sūtras, and other objects for the cult to Tibet as return presents for the presentation of the tribute\textsuperscript{37}.

Esen-tayisi's request thus can hardly have been a cause of surprise in Chinese governmental circles. They knew very well that there were a number of lamas in Mongolia. The objects requested by the Oyirad were available in Peking. Yet the Chinese court refused the request without proper explanation, apart from the excuse that there was no precedent for such a great one. Could the Chinese refusal by any chance mean that they were not interested in promoting Lamaism in Mongolia? — perhaps with a view to preventing a rapprochement between the Tibetan rulers and the Oyirad who lately had caused so much concern to the Ming?

The case of the Master of the Empire Erh-i-ch'ih, mentioned in connection first with the Mongol ruler Guyилич, then with Mongols from the Kansu area, is an indication of relations between Tibet and Mongolia. That Tibetan lamas visited Mongolia from time to time appears from the records. The Blue Annals\textsuperscript{38} relate the visit of a Tibetan to Hsi-ning and Mongolia in the middle of the 15th century, and the Shih-lu entry of September 16, 1446\textsuperscript{39}, confirms the lamas' abilities to travel far and wide:

"The Ministry of War reported that the Tibetan (Fan) monk Chia-shih-ling-ch'en from Ho-chou (Kansu) had been living for many years in Han-tung-wei\textsuperscript{20} and had gone as envoy to Esen of the Oyirad on behalf of the [Han-tung] high-commandant Pan-ma-ssu-chi to negotiate marriage and a close relationship. Now that the same monk has come to court [in Peking] it means that he intends to spy on Chinese affairs for the Outer Barbarians. This envoy must not be permitted to go back to his own country; instead, he should be sent to Nan-ching to settle in the Guard with Embroidered Clothes. This proposal was approved [by the emperor]."

\textsuperscript{34a} Mok. 3, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{35} E. g. Mok. 10, App. Tib., pp. 126, 136, passim. ROERICH, Mong. Sbornik, p. 189. Many of those early visitors belonged to the Kar-ma-pa sect, the rival of the dGe-lugs-pa sect from which the Dalai-lamas were to come and which was to become supreme in Tibet. The Ming tried to consolidate their influence over Tibet while the Tibetan rulers or heads of sects or monasteries used their relations with China to improve their own position. In fact during the first half of the 15th century, the Ming favored the Kar-ma-pa sect over the dGe-lugs-pa which was not yet strong enough.
\textsuperscript{36} Mok. 10, App. Tib., pp. 54, 56, 169.
\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., p. 57 (1408), 64 (1414), 66 (1416), etc.
\textsuperscript{38} Blue Annals, p. 551.
\textsuperscript{39} Mok. 3, p. 142; Mok. 10, App. Tib., p. 172.
Coming from Ho-chou which has always had a mixed population, there is little doubt that Chia-shih-ling-chen was a Tibetan lama. On a visit to the Oyirad, he seems to have been attached to an Oyirad mission to Peking.

This lama, we are told, had lived for a number of years among the people of Han-tung. A little farther to the north, in Qamil, if not Lamaism, at least Buddhism in its older form, was also very much alive, as we can gather from two Shih-lu passages. On October 16, 1463, "Nu'undasiri, mother of the Chung-shun-wang of Qamil, memorialized to recommend Pi-la-ya-shih-li to inherit his uncle's rank of Master of the Empire. The emperor answered: Master of the Empire is an important dignity used by the court to treat Tibetan monks: unless one's observance is outstanding one cannot measure up to this dignity. Who is this Pi-la-ya-shih-li that all of a sudden he aspires to this dignity? He may only be granted the rank of a tu-kang." A few days later, on October 24, Nu'undasiri again presented a memorial to report that "Wu-tai-nu, a monk of our own country, has gone to Beg-arslan's place where he recklessly declared that in the year of the Sheep (wei: 1463) the capital city of our country is going to be destroyed, with the result that Beg-arslan believed it, raised troops and has besieged our city for two months. Now Beg-arslan is sending this monk to the capital to go to court and present the tribute. We beg that this monk be arrested and sent to the South*. After due deliberation, the Ministry of War reported to the emperor that Nu'undasiri's request could not be granted without antagonizing the Outer Barbarians, and the emperor accepted this point of view.

This fragmentary information on the presence of Buddhist or Lamaist monks in Eastern as well as Western Mongolia, is further complemented by valuable though scanty information on the construction of Buddhist temples or shrines. Immediately after 1400, the Ming began to attract the Jürced people into the Chinese orbit and by military and diplomatic means to influence the northeastern territories as far as the lower Amur. In 1411, a eunuch was sent to the Amur with over 1000 troops in 25 ships. In 1412, the same eunuch led a second expedition, and in 1413, a temple (ssu) was constructed with a statue of the Buddha, in a place where formerly there had been a Hall of Kuan-yin. On that occasion, a stele with an inscription in three languages was erected. The temple was even rebuilt in 1431, and a second inscription in Chinese set up. Besides the ruins of the temple and the inscriptions, a bell was found there some time in the 17th century, although I have seen no later reference to it. N. Winter writes:

"It was related there that some 30 or 40 years ago, Russian soldiers discovered a big bell, weighing some 660 pounds, Dutch weight, at about a two days' journey south from the mouth of the Amur and on the shore of the sea, on a spot which seemed to have been ploughed

---

40 Mok. 10, App. Tib., p. 227.
41 Mok. 3, p. 693.
over, and there lay several stones there with Chinese writings carved on them. The natives living there said that a certain emperor of China had come with ships by sea and had left and set up there those bell and writings as a memorial. From which one can judge that navigation was possible out of the mouth of the Amur to China and also to Japan.\footnote{42}

Ts’ao T’ing-chiêh\footnote{28} who explored those regions in 1885 describes the site as follows in his *Hsi-pi-li tung-p’ien chi-yao*\footnote{29} (“Brief account of a survey in Eastern Siberia”):

*More than 250 li upstream from Miao-erh\footnote{39} (i. e. modern Nikola­yevsk), in the T’ê-lin\footnote{31} region on the East bank of the Hun-t’ung-chiang\footnote{32} (i. e. Amur), there is a rock ledge forming the edge of the river: it resembles a city wall, more than ten chang high. On top of it there are two Ming steles; one has an inscription commemorating the construction on imperial orders of the Yung-ning ssu\footnote{33}; the second has an inscription commemorating the reconstruction of the Yung­ning-ssu in the sixth year Hu­suan-te (1431). Both relate the expeditions of the eunuch I-shih-ha against Nu-erh-kan . . . \footnote{43}*

These expeditions conducted by I-shih-ha (written Išiqa in the Mongol text of the inscription) did not lead to a military conquest in the strict sense of the word, nor to an occupation by Chinese forces. The local rulers were forced to recognize Chinese overlordship, were given Chinese military ranks, and for the rest were entrusted with the administration of their people in the name of the Ming. In other words, the area became

\footnote{42} N. WITSEN, *Noord en Oost Tartaryen*, 1785, I, p. 67b “Daer werd verhaelt dat, omtrent dertig of veertig Jaeren geleden, Russche krygslieden van by den mond van de Rivier, d’Amur, na gissing twee dagreizens Zuidwaerts, en aan den Oever van de Zee in een plaetze, die omgraven scheen te (68 a) wezen, een groote klok, zwaer ruim 660 pond, Hollands gewigt, gevonden hebben: waer by verscheide steenen, daer op Sirreesche schritten uitgehouwen stonden, lagen. De Inlanders, aldaer woonachtig, zeiden, daer er in oude tijden zeeker Keizer uit Sina ter Zee, tot in de Rivier d’Amur, met schepen was gekomen, die aldaer deze klok en schritten, tot een gedenkteken, had nagelaten, en opgerecht. Waer men uit oordeelt, daer vaert uit de Rivier d’Amur, tot in Sina, konde zijn: als mede naer Japan”. The date of the discovery is to be calculated from Witsen 's first edition: 1692. This would put the discovery around 1650—1660. WITSEN must have obtained his information from “Spatarius” who corresponded with him (WITSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 101). This Spatarius, or Spatary, was a Greek in the service of the Russians, who call him Spafary. He saw the inscriptions 1675. They were rediscovered in 1856 (BADDELEY, *Russia, Mongolia, China*, II, pp. 224, 229). The Chinese text of the 1413 inscription, as far as it is legible, is in Ikekui Hiroshi, “Chôsen no tohoku kyô to Joshin no kankei”\footnote{27} in *Mansen chiri rekishi kenkyû hôkô*\footnote{40} 4, p. 321; also in parts in WADA Sei, “Minshô no Manshû keiryoku”\footnote{24} in *Tôa shi kenkyû*\footnote{38}, *Manshû hen*, pp. 333, 357. For the Jûrced text see L. Ligeti, “Les Inscriptions Djurtchen de Tîr; La Formule Om Mani Padme Hûm” in *Acta Or. Hung.* xii, 1961, pp. 5—26. Ligeti gives a bibliography of the three versions. The Mongol text has recently been tentatively restored and translated by ŌSADA Natsuki, “Nurukan Eineiji hi Môko-Jochukubun shakukô”\footnote{39} in *Ishihama sensei kohi kinen Tôyôgaku ronsô*\footnote{37}, Osaka, 1958, pp. 36—47.

\footnote{43} Chinese original in Kurakichi SHIRATORI, “The Santan in the Tôtatsu-kikô (Travels in East Tartary)”, in *MTB* 13, 1951, p. 27, and WADA, “Minshô no Manshû keiryoku”, in *Tôashi kenkyû, Manshû hen*, p. 351.
a protectorate of Ming China. The term ssu, and the very words of the inscription make it clear that this was a Buddhist temple, not a native shrine for Shamanism or other native cults. On the other hand, the presence of the steles and the inscriptions, and the bell mentioned by Witsen leave no doubt that it was Chinese craftsmen who set up the buildings and carved the steles. Furthermore, the text itself states that even before 1413 there had been a shrine of Kuan-yin in this place. We have no indication as to its origin and date. It may well have dated from the Yuan.

The location of the 1413 temple was west of Nu-erh-kan, just to the east of a postal station called Man-ching. On September 19, 1412, eleven commanderies had been created in the Amur area, Nu-erh-kan and Man-ching among them. This Man-ching must refer to the same place. Its status as relay station dated from the Yuan, but with the collapse of the Mongol empire, the relay system in these parts had fallen into disuse. It was restored, however, as soon as the Ming could make their influence felt again in these outlying regions: on November 19, 1412, 45 relay stations, Man-ching among them, were reestablished. In modern Russian works, the place is called Tyr, corresponding, I guess, to Ts’ ao T’ing-chieh’s T’ e-fên.

There is no doubt that the Chinese would not have built a temple so far out of the way if there had been no need for it among the native population. These people, however, were not Mongols. But the fact that Buddhism had penetrated that far to the northeast would at least help us to understand that similar circumstances could exist in Mongolia proper. In fact we have a comparable case from the West, namely the case of the Cigil Mongols in modern westernmost Kansu, who in 1443 requested Chinese help towards the construction of a Buddhist temple. In the 1440-ies, these Cigil Mongols as they increasingly felt the pressure of the Oyirad, contemplated moving eastward and coming if not under direct Ming control, at least close enough to avail themselves of some measure of protection by the Chinese forces in Kansu. The entry of May 28, 1443, in the Shih-lu says:

"Previously Čewang-šiga, tu-tu ch’ien-shih of the commandery of the Cigil Mongols had sent the commandant Badma with a letter to Jen Li, earl of Ning-yüan and military commander [of Kansu], [to inform him] that they (i.e. the Cigil Mongols) intended to move into the territory of Yeke-bulay, in order to avoid the Oyirad. [Jen] Li was of the opinion that this could not be granted because that territory was all too close to Su-chou. But Čewang-šiga had already memorialized [to the court] asking permission to build a temple (ssu) in the mountains of that area; he had also requested paints and craftsmen. The matter was referred to the Ministry of Rites which was of the
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44 Mindai Mammi shiryō, Manshū hen 1, p. 263 (Man.).
46 Mok. 3, p. 32. For particulars of the Cigil Mongols at this time see my "The Mongols of Kansu during the Ming" in MCB 10, pp. 309–316.
opinion that the Barbarian Caitiffs were of a different race, and if permission was granted to build the temple they would certainly move into that area and occupy it, and it was to be feared that misfortune would follow later (through clashes with local Chinese?). [The officials of the Ministry] proposed to deny permission and the emperor followed this advice.46

This report by the Ministry of Rites shows how well the Chinese were aware of the role of a temple in the life of a Mongol tribe: once a temple was constructed on the proposed site, the Mongols would certainly follow. This sounds almost like an anticipation of the numerous complaints from the latter half of the 16th century by officials in Kansu: then it was the Tümed and Ordos Mongols who had built a temple in the Köke-nuur area (see below) and were constantly crossing Chinese territories on their way to or from that temple, until the Chinese burned it!

Another fact shedding further light on this interest of the Cigil Mongols in a Buddhist temple is that early in 1444, one of the officers of the Cigil Mongol commandery, together with a number of Tibetan lamas, presented a tribute of horses47. This can hardly be a coincidence; it must mean that here, too, there were lamas, if not all the time, at least intermittently.

This desire for a temple in the neighborhood of their settlements is further illustrated by a request from October 1446 made by the people of Sha-chou, neighbors of the Cigil Mongols, and who with the growing might of the Oyirad faced the same difficulties. As the people of Sha-chou apparently were rent by factions and the Chinese suspected that they would fall victim to Esen-tayisi’s aggressiveness, they planned to have the whole tribe removed into Ming-controlled territory. Just at that time, the leading prince of Sha-chou expressed his intention to move and settle in the vicinity of the Little Po-ho37 temple of Su-chou48. The inhabitants of Sa-chou were a mixture of Mongols and Turkish-speaking people.

The fact that the Mongols needed Chinese craftsmen and materials for the construction of their temples is no proof for the novelty of Buddhist temples in the country and the rarity of such constructions. When in the 1570-ies, the Altan-qayan built his temple in Köke-nuur, he too needed many Chinese craftsmen49, and when immediately upon his return to Köke-qota (Kuei-hua-ch‘eng) he wanted to set up a statue of Sākyamuni adorned with precious stones, gold and silver, the qayan needed "laborers", no doubt Chinese.50. In fact, throughout the Ming period the Mongols

46 Mok. 10, App. Tib., p. 159.
47 Mok. 3, p. 144; October 1, 1446. The Huang-Ming Pien-cheng K’ao 4. 58b — 59a indicates a Ta Po-ho ssu outside of Chia-yü-kuan, and a Po-ho ssu, presumably the Little Po-ho Temple inside the barrier. Also Ibid. 8. 1 b. Cf. MCR 10, p. 306. Now I believe ho-po to be the Turco-Mongol word qap: "bag, pocket". For this word see my note in MS 16, 1957, pp. 160—161.
50 SCHMIDT, Geschichte, pp. 236—237. Schmidt’s translation is not very accurate.
needed the services of Chinese laborers and craftsmen and building materials as well, as I have tried to show in an earlier publication. Even up to recent times, all Lamaist temples in Mongolia were unvariably built by Chinese craftsmen.

We are able to further supplement this information on Buddhism in Mongolia with the widespread use of names with a Buddhist meaning by the Mongols and the Jürčed. In 1408, an envoy from the Oyirad ruler Mahmud bears the name of Nuan-ta-shih. This spelling of the name, however, is not the original one. We have to go back to an earlier spelling with nam < nam in the first syllable. Nan / nuan-ta-shih is Mo. nomdaš. This word indicated those who took Buddhist vows together with the emperor. In 1425, we meet with another Nomdaš (~ Nomdaš), this time belonging to the Fu-yü commandery in the western part of modern Manchuria, and in 1428, one of Aruytai's envoys, in modern Chahar Province, is named Na-t'a-shih, probably another aberrant spelling for No(m)daš. A few years before, in 1414, the same Aruytai had sent an envoy by the name of To-erh-chi-ts'an-pu: Dorji-tsambu, a name of Tibetan origin: rDo-rje-Tsang-po (?). One other Ts'an-pu, a Mongol serving in Liang-chou, has already been mentioned in a text of December, 1407. There was also a Ts'an-pu in Chien-chou (Manchuria) in 1410.

One of the Jürčed chieftains around the middle of the 15th century was also named Dorji. As has been pointed out, Tibetan names were already popular with the Mongols during the Yüan; they became particularly popular under the Ch'ing, but it appears that Tibetan names were not unknown in Mongolia under the Ming, and were even being borrowed by other tribes. In 1417, one of the officers of T'ai-ning commandery was named So-nan: bSodnams.

Another type of names, of Indian origin, is that in shih-li, Skr. sri. Several individuals with names in shih-li appear in the foregoing pages. On November 7, 1431, the Shih-lu mentions an envoy by the name of

52 Mok. 1, p. 339.
53 PELLiOT's note in L. HAMEIS, Le Chapitre xvii du Yuan-che (Suppl. au Vol. 39 du TP) 1945, p. 61. PELLiOT's explanation comes from the Shan-chü hsin-hua. H. FRANKE's attempt (Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Chinas unter der Mongolenherrschaft, Das Shan-kü sin-hua des Yang Yü, 1956, p. 30, n. 4) to derive Nuan-ta-shih from a supposed noyandas cannot be accepted. It fails to take into account that once nam began to be read nan, any other character with -n could easily be substituted.
54 Mok. 2, p. 48.
55 Ibid. 2, p. 147.
56 Ibid. 2, p. 459.
57 Man. 1, p. 246.
58 Man. 2, p. 332.
59 Man. 1, p. 290.
60 Mok. 2, p. 242.
Sang-ko-shih-li, Sanggasiri, Sarhgha-sri "Fortune of the Congregation" who had been sent by king Ya-na-shih-li, Yānaśri "Fortune of the Vehicle" of the Oyirad. The Shih-lu also mentions a Sang-ko-shih-li among the Jūrcēd in 1412. We find a Ta-na-shih-li in 1406, either a Mongol or a Jūrcēd, and a little later a Nu-ta-shih-li among the Jūrcēd of Chienchou. We must also mention here an individual with the name Samandaširi, Skr. Samanta-sri, one of the leading Mongol chieftains of Sha-chou who wrote their famous Mongol letter to the Ming emperor in 1384. In the first half of the 15th century, one of the influential chieftains of the Jūrcēd of Mao-lien bore the same name.

We have already mentioned the ruling prince of the Čigil Mongols in westernmost Kansu of the 1440-ies. His name was Ch'ieh-wang-shih-chia for Čewang-šiga. Čewang appears also as Čeben. Šiga is from Śākya. At one time this Čewang-šiga sent an envoy to the Chinese court by the name of Badma, Skr. padma: Lotus flower.

In the middle of the 15th century, among the Jūrcēd chieftains there is a Shih-chia: Šiga < Śākya, and one Ta-erh-ma, Darma, Skr. Dharma "Law." In Chien-chou there was a Darmabal. These names may have been borrowed from their Mongol neighbors as was this other one: Pu-erh-han, or Po-erh-ha: Burqa(n), the Mongol name for Buddha. Compare Po-lo-han, and Po-lai-han of the T'ai-ning Mongols: Borqan, Burqan.

Moreover there exists an extremely large family of names with Buddhist connotation but Chinese in construction which means that these names must have been introduced from China. At this particular time, it is especially among the Jūrcēd rather than among the Mongols that we find those names. In an earlier paper I have attempted to describe how those names were liable to influence each other, how elements from one series of names could be substituted for parts of another series. In this way, as the original meaning became more or less obscured, Chinese characters with similar but not exactly identical readings were substituted for the original ones, etc. In fact, those names present an almost endless list of variants, at any rate much too long for a complete discussion. Here I can do no more than list a number of examples found among non-Chinese.
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81 Man. 1, p. 260.  
82 Man. 1, p. 204.  
84 For this letter see MCB 10, pp. 250—252.  
85 Man. 1, pp. 414, passim.  
86 Mok. 3, p. 7 et passim.  
87 Mok. 2, p. 407; Mok. 3, p. 32.  
88 Man. 2, p. 343.  
89 Man. 2, p. 366.  
90 Man. 1, p. 287.  
91 Man. 2, pp. 184, 334, 352, 356; Mok. 5, pp. 58, 78, 129, 132, sq.  
In 1432, one of the Oyirad envoys in the tribute mission of that year bore the name Fu-dlia-nu, certainly an aberrant spelling for Fo-chia-nu, "Slave of the Buddha's Family". This name, already well known in Yüan times, remained in use in Mongolia after the fall of the Mongol dynasty, and among the Jürčed as well: we find a Fo-chia-nu in Chien-chou, and one in another Jürčed tribe.

What is basically the same name appears also in a slightly different form: instead of the Chinese Fo (Buddha) we may have Shih-chia, or Sha-chia, from the Skr. Sākya. One of the ancestors of the Manchu imperial family was Shih-chia-nu, "Slave of Sākya". The matter is further complicated by the fact that the same name is also spelled with chia, "family". Indeed there exists such a long list of names comprising the elements chia "family" and nu "slave", that it becomes easy to see how one spelling contaminated the other, and a spelling with chia "family" making better sense for ordinary people, came to be preferred to the original transcription shih-chia, sha-chia "Sākya". But new combinations were possible involving other elements as well. Thus, derived from an original Sākya, we have such a name as Shih-chia-pao, lit. Protected by the Family of the Buddha, but originally meaning "Protected by Sākya"; the same name with a different spelling: Sha-chia-pao, and in perfect Chinese translation: Fo-pao, "Protected by the Buddha".

In fact there began a real proliferation of names comprising such elements as "pao: protected" and "nu: slave" combined with names of deities and other words. Thus in 1415, an Oyirad envoy bore the Chinese name of Kuan-yin-nu: "Slave of Kuan-yin, i.e. Avalokiteśvara", and there is also one such name among the Jürčed in 1440. But then for some reason the original characters were often replaced by new ones so as to obscure the real meaning and the original pronunciation: Kuan-yin was reduced to Kuan, and pao may be reduced to pa, p'a, etc. Thus we come across such names as Kuan-yin-pao "Protected by Kuan-yin", Kuan-pao, Kuan-yin-p'a, Kuan-yin-pa; also Kuan-nu with various spellings, and Kuan-pao-nu "Slave protected by Kuan [yin]", and Kuan-pa-nu, with pa for pao.

The name of the deity may even be dropped altogether. Thus we have one Pao-nu "Protected slave". But another explanation is possible here:
pao\[47\] could well be a misspelling for pao\[48\]: jewel, a term often used by the Buddhists. Pao-nu, then would mean “Slave of the [Three] Jewels”. Indeed, in 1468, the name of one of the envoys from the Mongols of T'ai-ning, is spelled San-pao\[49\], certainly intended for the “Three Jewels”\[87\], and among the Jürçed the name San-pao-nu\[52\] “Slave of the Three Jewels” seems to have been rather popular\[88\]. There is also a Pao-t'ung\[53\] “Servant of the [Three] Jewels”\[89\]. These names have no meaning unless we take pao\[47\] to stand for pao\[48\].

We may further list a few examples of other combinations along the same lines: Wen-shu-nu\[54\] “Slave of Manju(sri)”\[90\], and Kuan-chu-nu\[55\]\[91\], where kuan is for Kuan-yin, and chu\[56\] probably stands for shu\[57\] “Slave of Kuan-yin and Manjuśri”. There is even a name Tai-pao-nu\[58\] “Slave protected by Tai”\[92\] and one is inclined to speculate that tai here is another incomplete writing of character shu\[57\], for Wen-shu: Manjuśri. There exist more combinations comprising puzzling elements.

The name Chin-pa-nu\[59\]\[93\] must mean “Slave protected by the Diamond” with chin being an abbreviation of chin-kang, and pa standing for pao as in the other examples listed above. The name Chin-kang-nu “Slave of the Diamond” was rather popular at an earlier period.

A purely Chinese name, with a Buddhist connotation, more used among the Jürçed than among the Mongols, though not unknown by the latter, is Chiao-hua\[60\] “Civilized by Religion”. The religion in question is Buddhism. The name Tan-pao-nu “Slave protected by Tan (?)” was known among the Uriyangqad Mongols and among the Jürçed as well\[94\]. One other interesting name in use among the Jürçed, Sang-ko-nu “Slave of the Sangga, Samgha”, reminds us of a class of people in early Buddhism in China\[95\].

These combinations in fact are endless and it would be fruitless to continue listing them. Indeed more and more elements, not related to Buddhism, or without any meaning at all (at least no detectable meaning) are drawn into this system of name formations. Let us mention only one interesting name in use among the Jürçed of the 15th century, T'ien-pao-nu\[61\]\[96\], where t'ien stands for “Heaven”\[98\]. It will be remembered that in the latter part of the 14th century the two sons of the Mongol qayan Toqus-temür were called T’ien\[89\]-pao-nu “Slave protected by Heaven” and

\[87\] Mok. 4, p. 126. The famous eunuch Cheng Ho\[59\], though a Mohammedan, was popularly known as “the eunuch San-pao”\[94\].
\[88\] Man. 1, p. 510; Man. 2, pp. 170, 331, 369.
\[89\] Man. 1, pp. 241, 264.
\[90\] Man. 1, pp. 64, 378; Man. 2, p. 217.
\[91\] Man. 2, p. 319.
\[92\] Man. 2, p. 332.
\[93\] Man. 2, p. 312.
\[94\] Mok. 1, p. 282; Man. 2, p. 97.
\[96\] Man. 2, pp. 172, 200.
Ti[pao-nu] "Slave protected by Earth". Here we seem to have an association of pre-Buddhist elements (Heaven and Earth) with a name formation originally combining only Buddhist, and in some cases Taoist, elements.

A fact even more interesting than names and testifying to the presence of Buddhism among the Jürčed of Chien-chou, is the erection in 1417 by the Ming of a local Buddhist Registry and the appointment of the "local monk" Darmabal (see above) as its chief. That indeed there were local monks appears from a few passages from 1428, 1432, and 1434: the Nü-chih monks Ch'o (~Ch'u) Sihan and others from Chien-chou presented a tribute; and just as in Mongolia there were also Tibetan monks as we see in a passage from 1440.

In the foregoing lines we have mentioned one Samandasiri and one Shih-chia-nu, both influential leaders of the Jürčed tribes of Mao-lien and Chien-chou, respectively, and ancestors of the Manchu imperial house. Shih-chia-nu, in 1410, was granted the Chinese name Li Hsien-chung. His father was A-ha-ch'u, who during the Yung-lo period was given the name Li Ch'eng-shan. Samandasiri was a grandson of A-ha-ch'u, alias Li Ch'eng-shan, and a cousin of Li Hsien-chung. He, too, was known by the surname Li. Li Hsien-chung's son was a certain Li Man-chu, mentioned for the first time in 1426, who had at least four sons: Ku-na-ha, Tu-hsi, I-li-ha, and Po-erh-ha-tai. Li Manchu and his son Ku-na-ha were killed in a clash with the Koreans, apparently in 1467 (the report is from the early days of 1468).

If the names Samandasiri and Shih-chia-nu show Buddhist influence, the name of Li Man-chu's son, Po-erh-ha-tai, looks so much like Pu-erh-ha, or Pu-erh-han (=Burqan) that it becomes almost certain that the name Po-erh-ha-tai, too, is derived from the name of the Buddha in Mongol. Among the Mongols, too, we find such variants as Po-erh-hatu, Po-erh-kan, Po-erh-yat, Pu-erh-ha-t'u, etc., all in final analysis deriving from Burqan. (Many more Mongol names, with or without religious connotation, were borrowed by the Jürčed). The natives may somewhat change the external appearance of the names, and the Chinese transcriptions are liable to further disfigure them. Since Buddhist names were definitely popular in this Li family of

---

97. Ming-shih 327. 4ab. With regard to this substitution of one t'ien character for another, we may refer to the title which Esen-tayisi of the Oyrad assumed in the early 1450-ies. In the Shih-lu (Mok. 3, p. 484) his title is written Ta-Yüan Tien-sheng [t'ien-sheng] ta-k'o-han "Great qayan T'ien-sheng of the Great Yuan", and the text goes on to explain that t'ien-sheng [t'ien-yüan] is the same as "Heavenly-Saint" [t'ien-yüan]. And his reign title is written t'ien-yüan [t'ien-yüan], the same, no doubt, as T'ien-yüan [t'ien-yüan], which had already been the reign title of an earlier qayan, Toyus-temür: 1379—1388. Cf. MCB 11, p. 389.


88b. Man. 2, p. 71. It sometimes happens that tribute missions from widely different countries are listed together in the Shih-lu. This is rather unusual and there is no reason to suspect that it happened in this case. The formulation of this passage clearly indicates that a number of lamas came from the northeast in the company of native Jürčed.

99. The relevant passages in the Ming shih-lu are: Man. 1, pp. 246, 350; 2, p. 15, 34, 109, 167, 182, 479—471, 508.
Chien-chou and Mao-lien, it is almost certain that (Li) Man-chu, too, is a Buddhist name: (Li) Manju(-sri). It is this very name which some time later was to become the name of the "Manchu" people.

Now, nobody would claim that people whose names show traces of Buddhist (or Lamaist) influence, were all confirmed Buddhists. It is not even quite certain that the Mongol or Jürčed bearers of those names always understood their meanings. There may have been quite a bit of fashion or custom involved in this business of name giving. Yet after what has been said about the presence of lamas and temples, those names once more tend to confirm Buddhism cannot have been unknown in Mongolia and in Jürčed territory. True, many aspects escape us: there may have been a strong Buddhist influence, but how strong was the Lamaist variety of Buddhism? Many factors point to Chinese influence, and thus to Chinese Buddhism. Other facts undeniably show Lamaist and Tibetan influence. For the time being we must leave this question unanswered.

It is at first glance surprising that from the middle of the 15th century to 1572, we find no more direct indications in the Shih-lu concerning Lamaism in Mongolia (at least judging from the Mongolia excerpts in the Mindai Mammmō shiryō). This absence of information, perhaps is not so strange. Apart from personal names of Buddhist origin, most of the information on Lamaism and lamas in Mongolia came to us in texts regarding tribute missions. From 1450 on, tribute missions both from the Oyirad and the Eastern Mongols gradually became rarer, and in due time disappeared from the records altogether. Only the Three Commanderies of Dően, T'ai-ning, and Fu-yū on the border of Mongolia and present-day Manchuria continued to present the tribute regularly, but we have found no traces at Lamaism there, except for a few names. Now it cannot be pure coincidence that as soon as tribute and diplomatic relations were restored between the Mongols and the Ming, new indications concerning Lamaism.

101 Both the Ch'ing-shih kao and the new Ch'ing-shih (1960), following the Man-chou shih-lu 1. 15a, state that one of Nurhači's ancestors made "Man-chou" the official name of the nation. But this is an anachronism. "Man-chou/Manchu" became the official name only in 1635, and its origin has long been debated. In 1777 (Ch'ien-lung 42), an imperial edict stated that "Man-chou" was derived from Chu-shen [71], the same as Su-shen [72], and Ju-chen, Nü-chen [23]. Others derive it from the name Manjusrī, e. g. (Ch'ing) Man-chou yüan-lu k'ao (completed in 1783; ed. 1904: I.1 b). Er. HÄFNER, Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache, p. 641: "Manju: Abkürzung von Manjusrī", L. GIEBERT, Dict. Hist. et Géogr. de la Mandchourie, pp. 602—603, also lists this interpretation but doubts its correctness. The origin of the name seems to be that the Tibetans used to refer to the "Manchu" ruler as "the great religious king Manjusrī". Hsiao I-shan, Ch'ing-tai t'ung-shih [74], 1927, vol. 1, pp. 46 (50), discusses the controversy and agrees that Man-chou comes from the name Li Man-chu, itself derived from Manjusrī. In a later shorter version of his Ch'ing History, Ch'ing-shih (T'ai-pei, 1957, p. 9), Hsiao reverses his stand and derives Man-chou from Li Man-chu, but he says that "man-chu" means "chieftain of the Jürčed". In fact he is following Meng Sen's opinion (Ch'ing-ch'ao ch'ien-chi [74], 1930, pp. 1—5). Such an explanation Man-chu = chieftain seems absolutely unwarranted. The fact that the Manchus themselves sought an explanation of their name indicates that the word "Manchu", or "Man-chou" was not a native one. Several of these references I owe to Mr. FANG Chao-ying.
reappear in the records. Indeed, in 1570 and 1571, an arrangement was reached between the Ming government and the Altan-qayan, whereby the Mongols promised to stop all border razzias and the Chinese agreed to a yearly tribute presentation by the Tümed and Ordos Mongols, and to establish trading facilities in a number of places along the border where the Mongols at regular intervals would be given the opportunity to exchange horses and cattle against Chinese goods. With peace restored the Ming became very anxious not to give the Altan-qayan reasons for discontent when the latter from time to time requested favors from the Chinese court.

Thus in the entry of February 2, 1572, the Shih-lu says:

"Altan, Shun-i-wang of the Northern Caitiffs, requested Tibetan (Fan) sūtras in gilt script and to send him Tibetan (Fan) lama-monks to spread the study of the sūtras and formulas (Dharani). The governor-general (of the military districts of Ta-t'ung, Hsüan-fu, and Shai-hsi) with the rank of a minister, Wang Ch'ung-ku reported on this request (to the court) and said that since the Caitiffs wanted to worship the Buddha and abstain from killing, they were showing repentance from evil and desire for good: in order to penetrate darkness with light and also to apply the policy of civilizing (i.e. sinicizing) the Barbarians, we must go along with his wishes and so implement the policy of tribute and trade. The Ministry of Rites too was of the opinion that the request must be granted, and the emperor followed this advice."

By the end of the year, however, nothing had been done apparently, and Wang Ch'ung-ku presented a new memorial on the subject: in the entry of November 12, 1572, we read the following:

"Wang Ch'ung-ku, governor-general with the rank of a minister, memorialized: 'the Shun-i-wang Altan at the beginning of his surrender requested a seal; after the conclusion of the barter exchanges he repeatedly asked for sūtras and monks, and he obtained a promise from the court to grant them. Since [this seal] will enable him to boast and show off in front of the Barbarians, it will greatly help us in breaking the customs of the Barbarians; since the Caitiff king knows how to turn a seal into a cause of pride he will show it to all the tribes: he will attach great importance to the observance of the agreements and for ever discharge the tribute duties. Since the Caitiff people know how to worship the Buddha and venerate the monks, from

---

102 The only reference concerning supernatural events or religious activities among the Mongols during all those years, are two cases of divination by the Altan-qayan in 1546 and 1547: Mok. 6, pp. 445, 493.

103 For a summary of this agreement see my "Four Documents relating to the Sino-Mongol peace of 1570—1571" in MS 19, 1960, pp. 1—66.

104 Mok. 8, p. 55.

105 Mok. 8, pp. 109—110.

106 A seal had already been sent to the qayan a few months before. From this text it would appear that he had requested a second one.
now on they will strictly abstain from killing; and as they are seeking merits of happiness, they will not dare commit evil again. With this pledge of the court to give a seal and grant sūtras, we may be confident in the feelings of the Barbarians. I beg to turn it into an opportunity to civilize and teach [them]. It will greatly help to secure for ever the tribute and trade.

Some advisers have pointed out that a seal must not be given lightly and that the religion of the Buddha is not an orthodox doctrine, and how then does one understand its ability to transform and subdue the Barbarians? It is a matter of record that the imperial ancestor by decree has founded the Temple of the Widely-civilizing, Illuminating Religion (Hung-hua ch' an-chiao ssu107) in the T'ao [-chou and] Ho [-chou region]107; sūtras from the (Tri)pitaka108 were written in gold and given [to the temple] and we made [some of them Incarnate] Buddhas and Kings of the Law109; we sent the King of the Illuminating Religion and others out to control separately [the various sections of] the Western Regions110, and there was none who did not follow [the local] customs and found a Religion. This is a precedent for sinicization of the Barbarians. Now the King of the Caitiffs ask for Fan sūtras in Tatar script110 in order to read them; it seems that we must grant them so as to illustrate the unifying influence of the Heavenly (Ming) Dynasty. [Should] these lama-monks from Tibet (Hsi-fan) succeed in teaching the Caitiff people and turn savages into good men, their merit would not be inferior to that of killing or capturing (an enemy). We must give everyone [of those

107 In 1442. Cf. Mok. 10, App. Tib., pp. 152 et passim. The temple was lavishly endowed with land, gardens, dattle, etc. The name here is given simply as Hung-hua-ssu. This temple was not associated with the Ch' an-chiao-wang, but with the Ta-tz'u fa-wang “Greatly Compassionate King of the Law”109 [King of the Law of the Great Compassionate?] (on him Mok. 10, App. Tib., pp. 104, 217, 152), who apparently was then residing in Peking. The Hung-hua-ssu in indicated on the maps of the Huang-Ming pien-cheng k' ao 1.7 b; 3,64a; 5,50 b.

108 The sūtras referred to here must be those sent in 1460: 5 sets (pu) of the Huayen sūtra109 written with gilt letters, statues (?) and other objects, together with two collections (tsang) of sūtras completely written in gilt script by the Ta-tz'u fa-wang and others, and a sūtra of collected sayings109 written with vermilion ink to be deposited (in the temple). Mok. 10, App. Tib., pp. 217—218.


110 “Fan” strictly speaking means “Tibetan” as I have translated above. In Ming texts, however, “Fan” is often used for the Mongols, too, (= Barbarian), and since, according to Wang Ch'ung-ku's report, the qayan had asked for “Fan sūtras”, in Tatar, or Mongol script, it would seem that he wanted sūtras in Mongol, or perhaps Tibetan sūtras translated into Mongol. All the monks sent to Mongolia were Tibetans, and it is not to be supposed that the sūtras they took with them were in Mongol. Perhaps Wang's expression is a lapsus for chin-tzu fan-ching: “Tibetan sūtras in gilt script”, which would make better sense especially since the qayan had repeatedly asked for such sūtras.
monks to be sent a rank in the Central Buddhist Registry, and grant them Dhyana garments, monks hats, sitting cushions, and other such objects, so as to delight the Caitiff people in order to make all the Caitiffs feel grateful for those favors and follow their religion: then the tribute agreements will be much better observed and the borders will be at peace for ever. The Ministry of Rites in its reply [to the emperor] suggested to follow Wang Ch'ung-ku's request, but there were no sutras [available] that could be sent."

Nothing was done until April 20, 1573, at least that is the date on which the sending of Tibetan (Fan) sutras is mentioned. No names of the sutras forwarded are given; nor does the text say that any Tibetan monks were sent to Mongolia. Yet from a subsequent passage it would appear that the sutras were not actually sent then, for in the entry of May 8, of the same year, we are again informed that the Altan-qayan had memorialized concerning the selection of Fan sutras in gilt script and lama-monks to read the scriptures. The Ministry of Rites proposed to send 3 (sets of) sutras in gilt script printed in Shun-t'ien-fu (i.e. Peking), 4 old (sets of) sutras in gilt script, and 5 (sets of) sutras in black letters. The Tibetan monks selected (for this mission) were ordered to return soon, and not to tarry in order to avoid incidents. The emperor approved.

It is evident that the "Fan seng" repeatedly mentioned in the foregoing passages were Tibetans. As has already been pointed out, there always were a goodly number of them at the capital, some of them practically residing there permanently. We may be sure that the sutras they took along with them, whether printed or manuscript, were Tibetan. It is quite possible that the Altan-qayan had had in mind sutras in Mongol, but it is extremely doubtful that the Chinese had any available. Although as we have seen, the Ming in 1431 had published a text in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, and Mongol, it is not probable that the Chinese had continued to publish Mongol sutras. The 1431 publication must have been a reprint of a Yüan book. Other Yüan translations certainly existed, but one cannot see as time went on what demand there could have been for keeping those Mongol works in print when there hardly were any relations except warlike ones with Mongolia. In May 1573, twelve sets of works were sent to the Altan-qayan. If they were Mongol, one cannot understand where they would have come from, and why Tibetan monks were sent to read them; and if Mongol sutras were easily available in China at the time, why after 1579 the southern Mongol princes displayed such an eagerness to have Tibetan texts translated into Mongol.

At the same time, however, Mongol translations of Chinese books of a more classical nature, first made during the Yüan, seem to have remained in print. How many such works were sent to Mongolia is not known, but it is certain that in 1441 a set of the Mongol version of the Hsiao-ching. 

111 Mok. 8, p. 140.
112 Mok. 8, p. 146.
(Classic of Filial Piety) was sent to the great-qayan Toytö-buqa 113, and some time in 1580 a set of the Mongol translation of both the Chung-ching [93] (Classic of Loyalty) and the Hsiao-ching was sent to Mongolia especially for the benefit of Baya-açi and Baya'ud tayiji, both grandsons of the Altan-qayan 114.

If it is extremely improbable that the Ming had translated or printed Buddhist sūtras in Mongol, there are many interesting evidences, besides the one in the aforementioned Shih-lu text from May 8, 1573, that the Ming had printed Tibetan books for the benefit of the numerous lamas coming to the capital. Thus in 1415, 1416, 1417, and 1460, pictures, images, sūtras, and various objects needed for their religious ceremonies were presented to lamas in Peking or sent to them through embassies 115. The Shih-lu does not say in so many words that the sūtras in question were in Tibetan, but the implication is clear enough. We must not assume that the Tibetan lamas were able to read Chinese. At the end of 1456, a large number of lamas were promoted to higher ranks as a reward for copying Tibetan sūtras 116. We have already mentioned the gift in 1460 of sūtras and texts copied by the Ta-tz'ü fa-wang and others. This was done in Peking, and it is clear from the context that the copies of 1456 were also made at the capital. Towards the middle of the Ming period, Chinese high officials often protested against the exaggerated influence of Lamaism in higher circles and more in particular at the court itself. For example, a text from 1468 complains among other things that the wealth of the nation is being spent on printing magic formulas, copying Buddhist sūtras, and painting pictures 117. There is a similar complaint from 1476 118. It is not clear whether the sūtras referred to in those protests were Chinese or Tibetan, but since the source of the malpractice stemmed from all too powerful influence of some Tibetan lamas, it would be quite natural that Tibetan sūtras were copied or printed, too. In 1441, a number of lamas from Wu-ssu-tsang memorialized to the court to beg for alms towards the carving of blocks and the printing of the sayings of a bandita and secret formulas 119. The request was rejected, and whether the printing was intended to be executed in China or in Tibet is not stated, but the request itself does not seem to have caused any great surprise at the capital. The Ming court, then, must have had an abundant supply of Tibetan texts, and it was from those sūtras, printed or manuscript, that they sent a few sets to the Altan-qayan in 1573.

The Tibetan lamas scheduled to go to Mongolia must have left the capital shortly after May 1573, for on November 30 of that same year, we learn that at least nine Tibetan monks (Fan seng) were living among the

113 Mok. 2, p. 633.
114 See Wan-lü wu-kung lu, 8, p. 156; 9, p. 15. I have been unable to find anything concerning this in the Shih-lu.
116 Ibid., p. 208.
117 Ibid., p. 250.
118 Ibid., p. 270.
119 Ibid., p. 144.
Mongols, and two more were sent to bring a variety of objects to the Altan-
gqayan. Once again it was Wang Ch’ung-ku who had made the request, no
doubt on the suggestion of the qayan himself, although this is not stated:

"Statues of the Buddha and Tibetan (Fan) sūtras were given to the
Shun-i-wang, Altan; two Tibetan monks who proceeded to spread the
sūtras were rewarded with Dhyana garments, sitting cushions, Tibetan
monks clothes in silk with boots and stockings. Nine Tibetan monks
actually living with the Caitiffs were given ranks, and also Dhyana
garments, sitting cushions, and monks hats; 4 Tibetan "officials" (Fan-
kuan) received [each] two inner and outer pieces of clothing of colored
satin, and two bolts of cotton cloth."120

Judging from those awards, the Chinese seem to have greatly approved
of the activities of the Tibetan monks in Mongolia. That the Chinese were
pleased with their work appears from a request from November 6, 1574,
by the governor of the military district of Shansi, Fang Feng-shin106. He
wrote that

"for a year now the king of the Caitiffs has been worshipping the
Buddha and reading sūtras; full of remorse he is abstaining from killing.
Since he has set his mind upon the practice of virtue we must display
our intention of sharing these customs. Four men: the chüeh-i Cha-pa,
the tu-kang Pan-ma, and the Tibetan 'official' Ma-ni-pu-la have gone
across the border to spread the sūtras. They have proved themselves
very efficient and meritorious. We submit that the chüeh-i Cha-pa, etc.,
all be made Masters of the Dhyana, with office above that of a chüeh-i;
and that the tu-kang Pan-ma, etc., all be made chüeh-i with offices above
that of tu-kang. We further submit that the Tibetan officials Ma-ni-pu-la
and Ma-pan (sic!) be presented with colored satin, cotton cloth, and
other objects."

Fang's suggestion was adopted121. These lamas must have come back to
Peking towards the end of 1574, or early in 1575, for the Shih-lu on the
date of April 6, 1575, notes that the Altan-qayan requested Tibetan lamas,
with the result that an interpreter was ordered to escort four lamas, one
of them by the name of Chien-ts'an cha-pa to the qayan's residence122.
Chien-ts'an cha-pa did not leave for Mongolia until early in 1576. We are
informed that on March 27, 1576, Chien-ts'an cha-pa and others were order-
ed to take Tibetan sūtras back to their country (kuei-kuo): an interpreter
was ordered to bring them to the headquarters of the governor-general of
Hsüan-fu and Ta-t'ung who would see to it that they were escorted to the
Caitiff camp.123 This text seems to mean that the lamas were on their
way to Tibet but were ordered to pass through the Altan-qayan's territories
from where they were to proceed probably to Hsi-ning or some other town
in Kansu and so to Tibet. One doubts, however, if the sūtras mentioned

120 Mok. 8, p. 180.
121 Mok. 8, p. 211.
122 Mok. 8, p. 234. Chien-ts'an cha-pa could well be the same as the Chüeh-i
Cha-pa of November 6, 1574. He reappears in a text of 1581. Cf. note 143.
123 Mok. 8, p. 271.
here were not to be delivered to the Altan-qayan rather than be taken all the way to Tibet.

Later in the year 1575 we find traces of another aspect of Lamaism introduced in southern Mongolia. In the entry of November 13, 1575, the Shih-lu records a new request by the Altan-qayan for more statues, sutras, and silks. And besides, he also requested that a name be given to the town and temple which he had constructed. This request was forwarded to the office of the governor-general in Ta-t'ung who reported to the capital. The Ministry of Rites noted that the qayan had been scrupulous in observing the agreements and that his request could not be rejected. The emperor concurred with this opinion and gave the name "Kuei-hua" to the qayan's town. As to the sutras and the statues, the governor-general of Ta-t'ung was given permission to have the statues cast and have the sutras copied and turned over to the Mongol prince. Many more presents were sent to him with the notification that he would receive similar presents every five years.

The Altan-qayan's town, first known as Bayising ("House") had been built by Chinese emigrants and refugees settled in Mongolia. It must have started as an agglomeration of houses constructed in Chinese fashion, hence the name Bayising. Some time before 1570, the Chinese had even constructed a "palace" for the qayan with high-sounding names for halls and gates in imitation of a Chinese imperial city. From 1575 on the town became known as Kuei-hua-ch'eng, and in Mongol the name Bayising was abandoned for Köke-qota "Blue City". Whether the Lamaist temple mentioned in the text of November 1575 was built at the same time as the qayan's "palace" is not known. I would rather think that the temple had been recently constructed for the convenience of the Tibetan lamas now regularly visiting his headquarters. It is a little surprising, however, that no title is mentioned for the temple.

Yet this was not the first time that the Southern Mongols began to feel a need to visit Lamaist temples: in the Shih-lu entry of February 2, 1575, we read that "previously Tatar-Caitiffs had crossed the borders and gone to the Hsi-na temple to burn incense, and had requested rewards. The governor of Kansu, Liao Feng-chieh asked that permission be given to them to build a temple in a far away spot outside Chia-yü-kuan and have them burn [incense] and perform [their ceremonies there], so as to prevent their demands for rewards." This means that the Mongols already had taken up the custom of visiting temples, and took advantage of such visits to temples in Ming territory to importune Chinese officials with extravagant demands. The governor here is seeking a means to avoid

124 Mok. 8, p. 256.
125 The Huang-Ming pien-cheng k'ao 4.3a (map), and 9.6b indicates a little Tibetan tribe by that name west of Hsi-n'ing. It counted some 800 men and women. The Hsi-na temple must have belonged to that tribe.
126 Mok. 8, p. 224. This habit of the Mongols of "demanding rewards" consisted in asking for special favors, gifts under all forms, outside the market periods. It would increasingly become a source of irritation for the Chinese.
all opportunities for such demands: a temple far away from Chinese territories, in his views, would solve the problem.

Visits by the Mongols were soon to grow into a major headache for the Chinese as we see from the following text under the date of May 15, 1575127:

"Pin-t'ū (Bingtū), Altan's son, is nomadizing in the Western Sea (Region, i.e. Köke-nuur) and has subdued such Tibetan tribes as the Tso-erh-ko, the Pal-li, etc., then has had letters sent to the Tibetans and Chinese of Sung-p'an198 pretexting that he was meeting the Buddha and building a temple. News of clashes have frequently been spread as far as Ssuchuan. The governor Tseng Hsing-wu199 and the Provincial Surveillance Commissioner Kuo Chuang100 reported on the matter and thought that orders should immediately be issued to the governor-general of Shensi to notify the Shun-i-wang, Altan, strictly to restrain Pin-t'ū from having designs upon the border areas which would result in destroying all the good effects of the agreements. But then the chief supervising secretary of the Ministry of War, T's'ai Ju-hsien101 memorialized: 'Pin-t'ū has conquered the Tibetan tribes and destroyed our vassals (lit. hedges); his rebellious intentions are apparent. The reporters (Tseng and Kuo) without investigating want to send instructions to Altan and make him restrain Pin-t'ū. But this chieftain (Altan) is exhausted with sickness and should have died long ago! How would he be able to bind all the chieftains, hand and foot? . . . Now concerning the trouble of Pa and Shu (i.e. Ssuchuan), it too started with that talk about [going to temples] to burn [incense] and practise [religion]! Indeed, if we permit [the Mongols] to built a temple, then there will be free access to the route to Tibet (Hsi-tsang); if we let them worship the Buddha, there will be unhindered contact between the Northern and the Southern tribes (i.e. Mongols and Tibetans). Do the wily Caitiffs really intend to practice virtue? It is not only Pin-t'ū who makes use of tricks and devices and attacks nearby while making contacts far away . . . "

The question of building one or two temples, and where to build them, comes up again in the entry of September 18, 1575128, and here we learn who was the principal instigator of the idea of having a temple outside of Chia-yū-kuan:

"Previously such Caitiff chieftains as (Qutuytai-)Sečen qung-tayiji and others had requested to build temples in Köke-nuur territory and outside of Chia-yū-kuan in order to burn [incense] and practice [religion]. The matter was referred to officials of Shensi and Ssuchuan for deliberation. The Ministry of Rites replied [to the emperor]: 'it has appeared from the deliberations that the Caitiffs have already gathered material and started building (outside of Chia-yū-kuan?) but we have demanded that they change the site to Wu-wang-ch'eng102. Under the circumstances we cannot but acquiesce and therefore we must give

127 Mok. 8, pp. 239—240.
128 Mok. 8, p. 251.
permission in order to encourage them to practise virtue and thereby prevent a request [to build another temple] outside of Chia-yü-kuan. Indeed, China's defense against the Barbarians rests on the preparedness of the border passes, but loyalty or rebellion of the Caitiffs does not depend on whether this one temple is near or far away. An edict ordered to follow the Ministry's advice."

Whether this temple was ever constructed in Wu-wang-ch'eng is not clear. But one thing is certain, namely that Pin-t'u early in 1576 proceeded to that area and caused considerable apprehension to the Chinese officials of Ssudhuan who were ordered to take appropriate military measures to forestall any surprise attacks. 129

We hear no more of a temple built or to be built in Wu-wang-ch'eng. But in the spring of 1577, we begin to come across mentions of a temple near Köke-nuur. The Shih-lu on the date of April 4, 1577 130, informs us that the Altan-qayan, intending to visit the Köke-nuur temple near Hsi-ning and meet with Tibetan monks in order to perform religious ceremonies, wanted to make arrangements with the Chinese to organize a great horse fair and a tea fair (near the temple); he further requested a golden seal to facilitate his travels (over Chinese territory: Kansu). An official presented a memorial in which he proposed to reject the request for a tea fair (no mention is made of the horse fair) and a seal; all means ought to be used to prevent the Altan-qayan from going to the west. This official considered the possibility of building a temple in the qayan's own territory (there was one already!) and sending him Tibetan monks, but otherwise keeping a close watch on the situation in Southern Mongolia. The Ministry (of War?) replied:

"Last year, the Altan-qayan and Pin-t'u have requested the building of a temple near the Western Sea (i.e. Köke-nuur) and the court has not refused to grant it a beautiful title and to assist with building materials. [The court] justly hopes to transform their ferocity and encourage them to become respectful and submissive. Now that the (Altan) plans to cross the borders and perform religious ceremonies, does that mean that he has ulterior motives? Should he request food-stuffs in order to perform the ceremonies, [officials] ought to accommodate him and provide them in order to soothe his feelings ..."

The emperor approved this proposal. From this text it is clear that the Altan-qayan, just as he had done previously for his own town, had requested a name for the temple built on the shores of the Köke-nuur. The emperor, it seems, had already given his consent but the title was officially announced on April 23 (1577): the temple was to be known as Yang-Hua 131. "Looking up to China" 132. There is no doubt that this is the very temple built near Köke-nuur in the place called Čabčiyal "Defile" by Sayang-sečen for the meeting of the Third Dalai-lama with the Mongol princes.
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The question of the qayan’s trip to the west comes up again in the entry of September 13, 1577: the qayan wanted to make arrangements with officials of the three military districts of Ta-t’ung, Hsüan-fu, and Shanhsi for the presentation of the tribute during his absence; he also wanted an arrangement with the authorities of Hsi-ning for a market there, so he would be able to purchase tea. When these officials reported to Peking, Wang Ch’ung-ku, by now Minister of War, reported:

“Early in the spring of this year, Altan sent a letter to the border officials who forwarded it to me. It said that his brother’s grandson (Qutuytai-)Secen qung-tayiji, chief of the (Ordos) Bend had requested him to go to the Western Sea to meet and worship the Living Buddha. I had heard a long time ago that the Ordos prince year after year had been plundering the Tibetans but had never been able to carry out his ambitions. Now he wants Altan to take his army west and assist him to take revenge. But Altan is getting old in years and finds it difficult to travel far. Every time I have written letters to discuss these matters with the governor-general of Hsüan-fu and Ta-t’ung, he has dispatched interpreters to detain [Altan]. Recently [Altan] has secretly told the interpreters, and has written to thank me: he considers it a great favor that I have detained him. Therefore, I know for sure that this trip to the West is not the Caitiff king’s idea. According to a present report by the governor-general, the qayan’s intentions are still loyal, therefore the authorities of all military districts must according to the circumstances soothe him while taking precaution ary measures; while securing a doubly strong defence, they must display perfect sympathy, so that when the qayan goes nomadizing he has no reason to become suspicious and start a conflict; if he travels far, he can find no pretext to cause trouble. Should he desire to plunder the Civilized Tibetans, then we must secretly instruct the Tibetan tribes to avoid him and so display benevolent confidence [in him].”

The Altan-qayan must have set out immediately, for on October 16, 1577, the Shih-lu relates that he had presented a letter to the military authorities of Kansu once again requesting a tea market. Most officials in the goverment seem to have been of the opinion that it would be bad policy to sell tea to the Mongols. The Tibetans, they argued, cannot live without tea now purchased from China; should the Mongols come into possession of a sufficient amount of tea, they might be able to draw the Tibetans into their own sphere of influence! The Ministry (of War?) per­functorily acknowledged this line of reasoning and then went on to remark that the Altan-qayan would need tea for the ceremonies at the temple, and therefore it would be difficult to deny it; the Ministry thought that the Chinese must accede to the qayan’s request and exchange horses for tea. On account of the circumstances, however, the amount to be sold was to be strictly limited, which was the decision finally adopted.
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The Altan-qayan’s meeting with the Dalai-lama is related in the follow­
ing text from April 30, 1578:

"Cha-shih-tsang-po, son of the illuminating and Civilizing King of Wu-ssu-tsang sent a Tibetan monk to the Western Sea to visit his teacher-monk, the Living Buddha, who near the Western Sea was explaining the Law to the Shun-i-wang, to his sons and grandsons, and exhorting the mass of the Tatars to practise virtue. Then [Cha-shih-tsang-po] entrusted the Shun-i-wang, Altan, with the presentation of the tribute in his name and [through him] requested an imperial rescript and an [honorary] appointment. The Ministry of Rites replied [to the emperor]: 'the [Ancient] Emperors and Kings in order to control the I and the Ti [Barbarians] always took advantage of their requests as a means to establish control over them; always took advantage of their turning towards civilization (i.e. their desire to come under Chinese influence, or to surrender) to favor them with honors and rewards. Now Cha-shih-tsang-po and others, for the sake of such things as felt cloaks, know how to desire the honor of an imperial appointment, civilize their cruel and arrogant people, make them respect China and observe the agreements attendant on tribute and trade relations. The Shun-i-wang, Altan, has succeeded in causing them to submit and furthermore has presented the tribute in their names and has requested [permission for them] to come to allegiance. Even when the Miao [chieftains] came there was a pantomime with shields, and when the [chieftains of the] Yüeh-shang came there was multiple translation: this was not considered too much. Without following any precedent we should grant them ranks and rewards. The emperor said: 'The Tibetan monks come to civilization and [with their teachings] soothe the Caitiffs: their respect and submissiveness are praiseworthy. Therefore we appoint each one to such ranks as Dhyana-master-with-the Great-Enlightenment, tu-kang, etc., and we grant them monks hats, kasaya robes, and proportionate gifts of inner and outer garments, food, tea, and colored satins'."

The "Living Buddha" both in this text and in the text of September 1577 is the Third Dalai-lama bSodnams-rgyamts'o as appears from the following passage dated March 2, 1579:

"The emperor ordered the Grand Secretary Chang Chü-cheng to accept presents [sent to him] by such tribute barbarians as the Wu-ssu-tsang monk bSodnams-rgyamts'o and others. The monk bSodnams-rgyamts'o is the one whom the Caitiff chieftain, the Shun-i-wang, Altan, calls 'Living Buddha'. Last year, under the pretext of meeting with the Living Buddha, the Caitiff chieftain intended to carry..."

---
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out a plunder campaign in the west but [the Living Buddha] taught him to do good and abstain from killing, stopped his western plunder campaign and urged him to return to his lair . . .

On March 14, 1579, the court decreed honors and presents for the Tibetan monks for their beneficial influence upon the Mongols, but strangely enough, the Dalai-lama is not listed among them:

"Proportionate ranks and presents were granted to such tribute Barbarians as the self styled eldest son of the Illuminating and Civilizing King (Ch' an-hua-wang) of Wu-ssu-tsang, Cha-shih-tsang-po (see above), to his second son Cha-shih-chien-ts'an, to the monks from Tsang So-nan-chien-ts'an (bSodnams . . . ), Hsing-chi-tsang-pu, and others. Presents were also granted to the Shun-i-wang, Altan, who had made the request in their names. Cha-shih-tsang-pu claimed to be the Ch' an-hua-wang's eldest son, but we know neither his father's name nor the year of this accession; besides, his statements do not agree with the date of tribute presented by the former (Ch' an-hua-)wang. We should wait for an investigation, yet in view of their surrender and coming to allegiance and their merits in civilizing the Caitiffs, we must first grant them presents in order to soothe their barbarian feelings."

Late in 1580, the Altan-qayan must have come back from Kôke-nuur, for on January 10, 1581, we are told, "The Shun-i-wang, Altan, offered his submission and came back to allegiance, therefore he sent barbarian envoys to request an imperial edict granting a name for the temple he had built and to promote the Tibetan monk Chüeh-i to the rank of Dhyana-master-with-the-Great-Enlightenment. The emperor granted the request."

For this entry, the Mindai Mammó shiryô gives also a variant text from another copy, slightly longer, in which among other things, the imperial title of the temple is given as Hung-tzu'u (Far-reaching Compassion). Unfortunately, we are not told where this temple was constructed. But it will be remembered that when the Altan-qayan in 1575 requested titles for his town and the temple he had constructed, only one title was granted by the court for the town. Probably this new imperial title was intended for that same temple which had been overlooked in 1575. This seems the more logical explanation: the qayan had just returned from the west, and his request was presented through the office of the governor-general of Hsüan-
fu and Ta-t'ung, who handled all matters pertaining to the qayan's territories. The qayan had been away so long and it does not seem probable that a second temple had been constructed during his absence. Besides, since his first temple had not been granted a title, there would have been little point in trying to secure a title for a second temple, if there was one.

Obviously these passages quoted from the Shih-lu do not give us a complete picture of the development of Lamaism in Southern Mongolia. Far from it. They are no more than incidental notes made in a number of reports on Chinese policy. Whether political measures taken at the time were well-founded must not detain our attention now. Yet we notice that the Ming were well aware of what was going on in Köke-nuur between the Mongol princes of Tümed and Ordos and the Tibetan Lamaist dignitaries. They knew about those meetings partly through the Altan-qayan himself who on more than one occasion intervened with the Ming government on behalf of the lamas. The Chinese, as we see from the texts, could not fail to be keenly interested in those affairs, and the possible results must have been a matter of lively debate at the court by officials holding divergent views. The Shih-lu texts quoted above contradict Roerich's contention that Chinese diplomacy both at the headquarters of the Altan-qayan and in Lamaist circles of the Bras-spuṅs monastery at Lhasa, that is the entourage of the Dalai-lama, was responsible for initiating contacts between the qayan and the Lamaist church which led to the qayan's invitation of the Dalai-lama to visit Mongolia. Roerich quotes no Tibetan or other sources for his assertion, extremely doubtful anyway. Chinese diplomacy did not work towards those ends in Southern Mongolia, and I doubt whether such an action was started at Lhasa. The impression one gets from reading the Shih-lu is that as long as Lamaism in Southern Mongolia tended to make relations with China stronger; as long as the Ming controlled the dispatch of Tibetan lamas and sutras, they were all for it, and expected beneficial results from it, especially in terms of converting the Mongols to a less violent way of life. But as soon as an occasion presented itself for the Mongols to establish direct and independent relations with Tibet, many Chinese officials began to have their doubts.

The Shih-lu presenting things from a strictly Chinese point of view help us very little to understand how these Mongol-Tibetan contacts were established. But what the Shih-lu do is to prove that Lamaism did not begin with the arrival of the Third Dalai-lama in Mongolia. No matter whether the initiative for a visit by the Dalai-lama to Mongolia came from the Tibetans or from the Mongols, the Shih-lu texts make it abundantly clear that long before 1578 there already existed a Lamaist tradition at least among the nobility; that there existed a Tibetan Lamaism in Mongolia coming from China before it came directly from Tibet. We may even assert that all the facts point to an uninterrupted Lamaist tradition in Southern Mongolia going all the way back to Mongol Lamaism of early Ming times and in final analysis to the end of the Yuan period.
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