

A Study on the Traditional Chinese Notion of *Lama Jiao*

BO HUANG 黃勃
Tsinghua University

Abstract: The name Lamaism has been used to describe Tibetan Buddhism for centuries, and probably came from the Chinese term *lama jiao* 喇嘛教. However, the origin of the Chinese term is still often shrouded in mystery. The Chinese term *lama jiao* is often assumed to carry the same meaning today as it did in imperial times and also to be similar to the western understanding of Lamaism. This paper argues that both the term *lama jiao* and its predecessor, the term *fanjiao* 番教 to designate Tibetan Buddhism as something separate from Chinese Buddhism, only appeared during the Ming dynasty. Furthermore, Chinese intellectuals in the late imperial era understood ‘Lamaism’ differently from Europeans, and only after the Qing dynasty did the Chinese understanding of *lama jiao* become more similar to the European and Japanese notions of Lamaism. Whereas the early Europeans understood Lamaism as a Tantric, impure form of Buddhism, Chinese intellectuals never thought orthodox ‘Lamaism’ was non-Buddhist and they often viewed it through the lens of Chinese Buddhism. These intellectuals used a similar rhetoric to either denounce or praise ‘Lamaism’ as they would Buddhism in general.

Keywords: Lamaism, *lama jiao* 喇嘛教, *fanjiao* 番教, Esoteric Buddhism, Chan Buddhism

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15239/hijbs.06.02.07>

Introduction

The Chinese term *lama jiao* 喇嘛教 (Lama's Teaching) is often translated as 'Lamaism' in English. Modern scholars have often interpreted the traditional Chinese understanding of Tibetan Buddhism through the lens of a western understanding of Lamaism. As a result, scholars often assumed that the term *lama jiao* carried the same sort of negative connotation as the term Lamaism did in the west.

Although the term 'Lamaism' probably derived from the Chinese term *lama jiao*, European stereotypes pertaining to Lamaism ultimately rested on the European understanding of Tantric Buddhism in the nineteenth century. To quote Donald Lopez:

Tantra functions as a lamented supplement in the European construction of an original Buddhism. As Monier Williams described Buddhism in his 1888 Duff Lectures, 'It had no hierarchy in the proper sense of that term - no church, no priests, no true form of prayer, no religious rites, no ceremonial observances.' In order for this pure Buddhism to be posited, it must eventually be made impure, and in the nineteenth century, the alien element added was generally named 'tantra.' The process of admixture was portrayed as a graft gone wrong. Whereas the Indian and Tibetan exegetes tended to portray tantra as the addition of what was essential to bring forth the fruit of enlightenment, Victorian scholars viewed tantra as a parasite that destroyed its host...The result in Tibet was a degenerate form so alien to the original that it no longer could be called Buddhism; it was more accurately termed 'Lamaism.'¹

Donald Lopez noted that Europeans used the term 'Lamaism' to describe Tibetan Buddhism as a corrupt form of Buddhism—deviating from the original teachings of the Buddha as they first encountered it—and often compared Lamaism to Catholicism for its papacy, corrupt clergy, and superstitious cults.² The term 'Lamaism' was hence

¹ Lopez, *Elaborations on Emptiness*, 99.

² Lopez, "'Lamaism' and the Disappearance of Tibet'.

directly associated with Tantric Buddhism, sexual degeneration, and was considered different from ‘true Buddhism’. Although Lopez did not write much about the Chinese understanding of Lamaism, he cited the Qianlong 乾隆 emperor’s (r. 1735–1796) inscription in the Yonghe Temple 雍和宮, the *Lama shuo* 喇嘛說 [Pronouncement on Lamas], and thought that the emperor also separated Lamaism from Buddhism, while formally distancing himself from a foreign religion. In doing this, Lopez implied that the Chinese term *lama jiao* was also negative.

Gray Tuttle also argued that Tibetan and Chinese Buddhists traditionally did not see each other as belonging to the same religion, and the Chinese only viewed the former to be an ethnic variation of a larger Buddhist tradition during the Republican Period. Tuttle directly equated Lamaism as *Lama jiao* and thought that the Chinese never had the notion that Tibetan Buddhism was really Buddhism until it was eventually influenced by the globalisation of world religions starting in the late nineteenth century.³

Western scholars were not the first to inquire into the Chinese notion of *lama jiao*. In the Republican period (1912–1949), Chinese intellectuals had already noted that the term was used incorrectly. For example, the 1936 *Xizang shidi dagang* 西藏史地大綱 [An Outline of the History and Geography of Tibet] written by Hong Dichen 洪滌塵 (1930–) argued that ‘the religion of Tibet is often referred to as *lama jiao* in books, but this is not accurate. This is because the two characters “*la ma*” have the meaning of utmost. Tibetan customs refer to those Buddhist disciples who passed examinations as lamas. This is similar to the *heshang* 和尚 of interior China, but it would be a great mistake to refer to that religion as *heshang jiao* (Heshang’s Teaching)’.⁴

Despite some people questioning the term *lama jiao*, it was still used widely in the Republic of China to describe Tibetan Buddhism, though scholars of the People’s Republic of China also became increasingly critical of the term as early as the 1980s. However, these

³ Tuttle, *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*, 4.

⁴ ‘Xizang shidi dagang’, in Zhang, ed., *Zhongguo Zhongguo Xizang ji Gan Qing Chuan Dian Zangqu fangzhi huibian*, vol. 53, 340.

criticisms, like Hong Dichen's criticism, was directed at the fact that *lama jiao* was not an appropriate academic term, rather than the fact that the term carried negative implications. For example, the Chinese Tibetologist Wang Furen 王辅仁 (1930–) wrote that *lama jiao* was not a scientific name and was only used casually by the masses. He suggested that the correct name of the religion should be *Xizang Fojiao* 西藏佛教 (Tibetan Buddhism) or *Zangchuan Fojiao* 藏傳佛教 (Tibetan tradition of Buddhism). Despite such explanations, Wang Furen still frequently used the term *lama jiao* in his papers and did not think it was insulting to Tibetan Buddhism.⁵ There were even Chinese scholars who defended the use of the term *lama jiao* as a response and argued that *lama* meant high level monk; hence, *lama jiao* was a term that carried respect.⁶

The famous Tibetan scholar-monk Tseten Zhabdrung (1910–1985) also pointed out in 1982 that 'lama' was a term that the Han people used to refer only to Tibetan Buddhist monks, and hence it was inappropriate to call Tibetan Buddhism a 'monk's religion' since there were lay practitioners of the teaching. Tseten Zhabdrung used the Han people's own definition of 'lama' to show how the word *lama jiao* was inappropriate to describe Tibetan Buddhism. Furthermore, he specifically mentioned that it was Westerners, rather than the Han people, who thought that *lama jiao* was different from true Buddhism.⁷

In recent years, in the most exhaustive study to date of the Chinese stereotypes of Tibetan Buddhism throughout history, Shen Weirong 沈衛榮 argued that from the Yuan (1271–1368) onward, Tibetan Buddhism was often described by the Chinese intellectuals as *yaoshu* 妖術 (demonic art), *yiduan* 異端 (heterodoxy), *guijiao* 鬼教 (ghost teaching), *fanjiao* 番教 (*fan* teaching), or *lama jiao*, all of which carried negative connotations. In sum, he stated that Chinese intellectuals often associated it with magic and sexual arts and not with real Buddhism.⁸ Shen's description of the Chinese understand-

⁵ Wang, 'Lamajiao shi zengyang xingcheng he fazhan qilai de?', 50–51.

⁶ Shang, 'Lama jiao zhi ming he xu gai', 105.

⁷ Caidan, 'Zangchuan Fojiao ge zongpai mingcheng bianxi'.

⁸ Shen, *Xiangxiang Xizang*, 118.

ing of Tibetan Buddhism was similar to the western notion that Lamaism was not authentic Buddhism because of its tantric teachings.

Outside of academia, some people in Chinese Buddhist circles in both Taiwan and the mainland also called Tibetan Buddhism the *lama jiao* in a derogatory way and tried to exclude it from real Buddhism because of its perverse tantric practises.⁹ Given the many interpretations above, did the traditional Chinese term *lama jiao* carry a positive connotation or did it carry a negative connotation like the western understanding of Lamaism?

This paper attempts to demonstrate that the confusion behind the modern interpretation of the term *lama jiao* was due to the influence of the western and Japanese understanding of Lamaism that was introduced to China beginning in the late nineteenth century, and does not reflect how the term was previously understood by Chinese intellectuals. Not all Chinese terms describing Tibetan Buddhism had the same meaning, nor were all of them negative. More importantly, unlike the western understanding of Lamaism, I have found no evidence that Tibetan Buddhism was ever denied its Buddhist identity before the late nineteenth century, nor was it even necessarily defined by tantric practises. I will examine the most common terms used to describe Tibetan Buddhism during the Ming (1368–1644) and the Qing (1644–1911) and their implications.

It should be noted that while Tibetan tantric practises had already entered China prior to the Ming period (1368–1644), there is no evidence that those who followed Tibetan esoteric practises considered themselves to practise a different system of Buddhism from the other Buddhists. More importantly, there was no specific term to describe the ethnic Tibetan characteristics of the Buddhism the Tibetans practised that would separate them from the Buddhism of any other ethnic group. Two main terms objectifying ‘Lamaism’ as a religious practise separate from Chinese Buddhism only appeared in the Ming dynasty. The first was the term *fanjiao*, which was used by Ming officials to generalise Tibetan Buddhism and used primarily from the late fifteenth century to the late sixteenth century. The term *fan* was

⁹ For example, see Zheng’an, *Zhenjia xieshuo*, 87.

purposely given to emphasise the foreignness and heterodox nature of the practise. The second term was the well-known *lama jiao*. This term first appeared in 1573 in an inscription erected by the Ming official Zhang Juzheng 張居正 (1525–1582) and passed on into the twentieth century to describe Tibetan Buddhism and was first used to describe the orthodox aspect of Tibetan Buddhism and was not meant to carry negative connotations.

The major difference between the European and pre-twentieth-century Chinese understanding of the notion of ‘Lamaism’ is that the former was more concerned about analysing Lamaism as a unique and degenerate branch of Buddhism and how it became that way; special emphasis was put on the tantric aspect of Lamaism. Chinese terms describing ‘Lamaism’ on the other hand, were largely a product of political rhetoric. Terms such as the *fanjiao* or *lama jiao* were coined with the purpose of rhetorical arguments and were not concerned with what normative Tibetan Buddhism actually taught. The government tropes and stereotypes surrounding Tibetan Buddhism were dependent on the time period and circumstances in question and carried different connotations depending on what arguments government officials wanted to make to the emperor and vice versa. However, in none of this rhetoric, positive or negative, was Tibetan Buddhism ever denounced as a form of authentic Buddhism until the end of the nineteenth century. Rather, *fanjiao* and *lama jiao* were both understood to be Buddhism by default and were vilified or praised based on that very fact.

Furthermore, unlike the western association of Lamaism with Tantric Buddhism, tantra was not central to the definition of the Chinese term *lama jiao*. The late-Ming and Qing era Chinese intellectuals often understood *lama jiao*, at least in its orthodox form, as similar to Chan Buddhism in doctrine and they were more concerned about how *lama jiao* could be integrated into the moral orthodoxy of the emperor. Instead of associating the orthodox *lama jiao* with Tantric Buddhism, the tantric element of Tibetan Buddhism was either excluded from the definition, downplayed, or placed in a secondary auxiliary position to seeing one’s Buddha nature and strict monastic discipline through Chinese Buddhist lenses by officials and emperors alike. These popular intellectual

understandings do not imply that some officials, royalty, and even emperors did not study Tibetan Buddhism. However, the few individuals who were deeply involved in Tibetan Buddhism might not fully understand Tibetan Buddhist doctrine, did not intellectually engage Tibetan Buddhism with mainstream Chinese thought, nor did they attempt to change popular ideas with their personal beliefs.

Fanjiao: The Rhetoric of Heterodoxy

Before the mid-Ming, when different ethnic groups in China still learnt Buddhist practises from one another, there was little notion of Buddhist sectarianism based on ethnic grounds. Chinese sources of the Yuan period treated prominent Tibetan lamas such as Pakpa (1235–1280) as similar to the esoteric masters of the Tang dynasty (618–907; notably Śubhakarasiṃha (Ch. Shanwuwei 善無畏), Vajrabodhi (Ch. Jin'gangzhi 金剛智), and Amoghavajra (Ch. Bukong 不空), and not as practitioners of some new Buddhist tradition with ethnic characteristics the way Ming and Qing writers viewed Lamaism. The Buddhist prosopographical history *Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載 [General Records of Buddhist Patriarchs through the Ages] written by the Chan monk Nianchang 念常 (1282–?) in 1341, for example, recorded that:

During the Tang and Song, the esoteric dharma was first heard. Even though it was recorded in texts, it did not become popular. At the beginning of our dynasty, this method first prospered in the west. During the Yuan, the great Sakya master, through having the way of the sages, was honourably made the Imperial Preceptor by the son of heaven. As a result, the esoteric dharma stood out like the sun in the centre of the sky and gradually spread to the four seas. 唐宋間始聞有秘密之法。典籍雖存，猶未顯行於世。國初，其道始盛西鄙。統元中天子以大薩思迦法師有聖人之道，尊為帝師。於是秘密之法日麗乎中天，波漸於四海。¹⁰

¹⁰ Nian, *Fozu lidai tongzai*, 140.

Yuan era sources used the terms ‘esoteric dharma’ (*mifa* 密法), ‘esoteric teaching’ (*mijiao* 密教), or ‘esoteric vehicle’ (*misheng* 密乘) to describe the tantric practises brought to China by the Sakya masters. However, these Sakya masters were merely viewed as the latest among the many foreign monks who had come and taught esoteric practises since the Tang. Contemporaries such as Nianchang explicitly equated these practises to the esoteric teaching of the Tang and Song (960–1279) periods and not as something inherently ‘Tibetan’. These new Tibetan esoteric teachings were not considered to be an ethnically specific system distinct from the Buddhism already practiced in China, since Chinese monks and lay Buddhists often practised them alongside other forms of ‘Chinese’ Buddhism. In sum, while there was the concept of a generic esoteric teaching, there was not yet a concept of ‘Lamism’ that separately described the characteristics of Tibetan Buddhism.

The first term in Chinese history which described a separate system of Buddhism with its own ethnic characteristics associated with Tibetans was the term *fanjiao*, appearing around the late fifteenth century. Unlike during the Yuan, *fanjiao* designated the ethnic Tibetan nature of the practise and had a legal religious identity separating it from the local Chinese Buddhism. *Fanjiao* was always considered foreign and heterodox by its very name of *fan*, which implied foreignness. Shen Weirong has argued that by branding Tibetan Buddhism as *fanjiao*, the Chinese literati during the Ming denounced it as a type of Buddhism.¹¹ However, a careful examination of Ming sources show that *fanjiao* was never actually stated as not Buddhist; in fact, Chinese intellectuals often made *fanjiao* the scapegoat for the heterodox nature of Buddhism itself. Ming officials did not specifically mention, let alone discuss, any specific practises of *fanjiao* that deemed it different from orthodox Buddhism and were simply not concerned about the contents of a normative Tibetan Buddhist teaching. Whether this teaching conformed to actual Buddhist principles was not of interest to the Chinese officials describing it, so long as the term was used to express a rhetorical theme. This can be seen through the fact that the arguments used against it during this period

¹¹ Shen, *Xiangxiang Xizang*, 133.

only pertained to economics (how the Fan monks were draining the resources of the state), or were motivated by ethno-centrism (how their teaching was not Chinese) rather than religious content. In fact, the rhetoric used to denounce *fanjiao* was similar to the older rhetoric Chinese officials used to denounce Buddhism as a whole during the Tang dynasty.¹² However, in the Ming, it would appear that only *fanjiao* came to represent all the negative characteristics of Buddhism, whereas Chinese Buddhism for the first time became relatively free of such direct attacks and became treated as a native practise. The term *fanjiao* was hence coined by the Ming court, for strategic reasons, to objectify Tibetan Buddhism and distance the Chinese masses from falling under foreign influence.

The origins of constructing the concept of a *fanjiao* can be traced to the Ming court attempting to ban Chinese from studying with Tibetan monks on the borders, although the term *fanjiao* did not make an appearance at the time. This can be seen in an official petition from 1453, which tried to put a stop to Chinese subjects of the Ming from interacting with Tibetans:

The people from the frontiers saw that they benefited from their [Tibetan] tribute missions so they let their sons and grandsons learn their [Tibetan] language, send them to become Fan monks and interpreters and mix them in for tribute missions. I petition a decree be sent to the Court of Censors to forbid this. From now on anyone who privately interacts with Fan monks in trading tea products, bronze, iron, magnet, and tin tools or sends their sons and grandsons to become Fan monks and interpreters will all be sent outside of the outposts to serve in the army. 邊民見其進貢得利，故將子孫學其言語，投作番僧通事，混同進貢。請敕都察院禁約，今後私通番僧貿易茶貨銅鐵磁錫器物，及將子孫投作番僧通士者，俱發口外充軍。¹³

¹² Arguments from scholars such as Han Yu 韓愈 (768–824) also denounced Buddhism as a barbarian religion and a waste of resource to the state. See Wang, ‘Tang zhongqi yilai de huayi zhi bian ji qi dui fojiao de yingxiang’.

¹³ *Ming yinzong shilu*, juan 232 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 38, 5079–80.

This petition did not describe the characteristics of the Tibetans' Buddhism at all; the focus was on Chinese people learning Tibetan and serving as interpreters, as well as people trading with the Tibetans who could strengthen the Tibetans and leak strategic information to them. In another word, people were banned from becoming the disciples of Tibetan monks because it posed a security threat to the Ming, not because their teaching was morally unacceptable or deviated from standard Buddhism.

Similar criticisms during the reign of Xianzong 憲宗 (r. 1464–1487) were directed at the Fan monks, but in addition to being a waste of resources, the Fan monks' practises were also attacked for being incompatible with Chinese ways. In 1468, the officials from the Board of Rites 禮部 said to the emperor: 'Your subject considers the Fan monks as heterodox heretics, trying to trick the people's heart, tainting China (Huaxia 華夏), and should be dealt accordingly' (臣以番僧者異端外教, 蠱惑人心, 污染華夏, 宜從所言). The emperor declined the request, stating that if he did that, he would lose the heart of people from afar.¹⁴ The attack on Fan monks here is based entirely on ethnocentrism; they were tainting China, but the reason was not given, suggesting that the very rhetorical argument of their foreignness was enough to deem their religion as heterodox.

The target of attack in all these cases are the Fan monks, rather than 'Tibetan Buddhism' as a doctrinal or ritual system. Moreover, the very reason that their non-Chineseness was emphasised was because many Chinese people were following them. This led to the objectification of the Tibetan religion as *fanjiao*, a term which first appeared in record in 1468 when an official complained about it to the emperor. The petition stated that:

Buddhism first came to China since [Emperor] Han Ming's time. Emperor Liang Wu [r. 502–549] followed it thoroughly, and he suffered the worst.¹⁵ The present court favours the Fan monks. There

¹⁴ Gu et al., *Mingshilu Zangzu Shiliao*, 667–68.

¹⁵ This refers to Emperor Liang Wu 武 of the Southern Liang dynasty (502–557). Emperor Liang Wu was known for his promotion of Buddhism, but eventu-

are titles of Buddhas, State Preceptors, and Dharma Kings. Their ceremonial retinue surpasses the kings and dukes, and their clothing and objects of amusement are on the scope of tributes. They have valuable clothing and food, hundreds of followers, and exhaust the people's wealth... There are Chinese people who practise *fanjiao* in order to gain favours. If these are real Fan monks, they already provide no benefit for administration, much less these kinds of frauds. An order should be given to the relevant officials to investigate; if they truly are Fan monks, then they should be sent back to their states. If they are Chinese, then they need to follow their duties of providing tax and not slowly eat away our people so heterodoxy will disappear. 佛自漢明以來始入中國，梁武事之甚謹，得禍尤慘。今朝廷寵遇番僧，有佛子、國師、法王名號，儀衛過于王侯，服玩擬于供御，錦衣玉食，徒類數百，竭百姓之脂膏... 又況其間有中國之人習為番教，以圖寵貴。設真是番僧，尚無益于治道，況此欺詐之徒哉！宜令所司審查，果系番僧，資遣還國。若系中國者，追其成命，使供稅役，庶不蠶食吾民而異端斥矣。¹⁶

We can see that this petition treated the *fanjiao* as a heterodox religion that was ethnically specific. The court again did not care to separate the religion from standard Buddhism; in fact, it made analogies to how *fanjiao* was harmful like how Buddhism harmed past dynasties, thus associating *fanjiao* with Buddhism. The worry was Chinese people would become Fan monks, and the traditional Confucian attack on Buddhism ever since the latter first entered China was used as a literary device to warn rulers of obsession with a foreign religion which could endanger the state. The argument against it was also fiscal; that the Chinese who pretended to be Tibetan monks were evading their tax duties, a rhetoric that was frequently used in past dynasties such as the Tang to denounce Buddhism. In response, in the same year, the Ming court passed the decree that 'those Chinese who already learnt the teachings of the Fan and already have a certificate are allowed [to continue practising it], but those without

ally fell to the rebellion of his general Hou Jing and died under the latter's custody.

¹⁶ *Ming xianzong shilu*, *juan* 58, in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 41, 1180.

a certificate should be cleared up and from now on, Chinese are not allowed to learn *fanjiao*' (中國人先習番經, 有度牒者已之, 無度牒者清出. 今後中國人不許習番教).¹⁷ This was the first instance of an official policy pertaining to a unique *fanjiao* separate from native Buddhism which the Chinese masses were banned from learning. The stated reason was, again, because many Chinese people pretended to be Fan monks to gain imperial favour.

Again in 1488, an official petitioned to the emperor complaining that 'the Dharma king (fawang) Ling Zhanzhu 領佔竹 (Rin chen grub), Zhaba Jianzang 扎巴堅讚 (Grags pa rgyal mtshan), and others; the Buddhas (fozi 佛子) Shijia Ya'erda 釋迦啞兒答 (Shākya mnga' bdag?), the State Preceptor Shela Xinji 舍刺星吉 (shes rab seng ge), and others, are all stinking followers of the Tibetans (Xifang 西番), staining the teachings of our Chinese rites' (法王領佔竹、扎巴堅贊等, 佛子釋迦啞兒答、國師舍刺星吉等, 俱以西番腥羶之徒, 污我中華禮儀之教).¹⁸ Shijia Ya'erda was a Chinese monk who received his teaching from an Indian Buddhist monk, but he was generalised as a follower of Tibetans. The argument was again that the Fan monks did not conform to orthodox Chinese rites (in this case, Confucian rites), not that their teachings were not Buddhist.

Fanjiao was increasingly reified over time, picking up more negative characteristics. At the turn of the sixteenth century, attacks were directed against it based on the notion that the Fan monks were perverse, but there was still no attempt at clearly separating *fanjiao* from Buddhism. A petition in 1502 by members of the Grand Secretariat 內閣 loosely lumped the perversions of *fanjiao* together with Buddhism in general:

The *Shi* 釋 [Teaching] (Buddhism) is the teaching of the barbarians; it is referred to as heterodoxy. The Fan monks also have no discipline, are especially impure, and greatly disrupt the sagely world. Since the time that the lord of the barbaric Yuan performed lewdness with no restraint and fell to their temptation, they gained increasing respect.

¹⁷ *Ming xianzong shilu*, juan 58, in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 59, 1210.

¹⁸ Du, 'Mingdai *Xitian seng kaolue*'.

When the celestial army [Ming] swept across [China], they didn't help in [preventing the Yuan's] collapse. This can serve as a clear reflection. 若釋教乃夷狄之教，稱為異端，而番僧全無紀律 尤濁亂聖世之大者。自胡元之君，肆為佚淫，信其蠱惑，始加崇重。及天兵掃蕩，無益販亡，可為明鑑。¹⁹

While the sexual practise of the last Yuan emperor was mentioned here, it was only one of the many negative characteristics listed for Fan monks; it was still the foreign nature of *fanjiao* rather than the sexual tantra which was the central focus of the attack. Furthermore, the official here did not separate the perverse practises of the last Yuan emperor from Buddhism itself nor cared whether Buddhism itself included perversion. Rather, like earlier cases, the Fan monks came to represent the negative aspects of Buddhism itself and officials were bent on warning the emperor that with the lack of proper rites among the barbarians, from whom Buddhism originated, any corrupt practise was possible.

Similar criticisms directed against *fanjiao* for being heterodox because it was foreign are later found throughout the official histories and collected works. For example, an official memorialized Ming Wuzong 武宗 (r. 1505–1521): 'The Tibetan [Teaching] was originally the teaching of the barbarians. It does not follow conventional reason. The sagely kings of the past never heard of it. When examining how their sayings entered China, they have introduced their sayings with sexual perversion for a long time without being quickly eliminated' (西番本夷狄之教，邪妄不經。古先王之世未聞有此。顧其說流入中國，侵淫已久，未能遽革).²⁰ Here again, we see a Ming official attacking the perverse characteristics of the religion that the Tibetans practised. However, perversion was still only mentioned after emphasising the barbarian nature of the religion, suggesting that the foreign element of *fanjiao* was more important than the actual contents of the sexual tantras. Furthermore, while the knowledge of the erotic esoteric dharma supposedly practised by Emperor Yuan Shun

¹⁹ *Ming xiaozong shilu*, juan 188 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming Shilu*, vol. 59, 3483.

²⁰ *Ming muzong shilu*, juan 67 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 51, 2614.

(r. 1333–1368) under the guidance of Indian and Tibetan monks had been known since the beginning of the Ming, invented details of such practises and serious attacks against it were not written until the late Ming, when the term *fanjiao* started to disappear from records.

During the Zhengde period (1505–1521), an official again questioned the utility of the Tibetan monks:

Seeing the Fan monks in the capital, they are nurtured with housing, provided with food and rich like officials only because they know *fanjiao*. I ask to test them. This winter is warm, the river and timing are lost; can they change the [balance of] the two Qi and straighten the season? The four directions are lacking funds, the treasury is empty; can they move things quickly with their powers, and replenish what the state needs? The caitiff bandits don't stop their raids, alarms have reached unceasingly; can they chant their mantra and pacify the troubles on the frontier? If tested and verified, they should be asked to do so forever, if not, please abolish them. 比見番在僧京者, 安之以居室, 給之以服食, 榮之以官秩, 為其能習番教耳. 請以其徒試之, 今冬暖, 河流天時失候, 彼能調變二氣, 以正節令乎? 四方告乏, 帑藏空虛, 彼能神輪鬼運, 以贍國用乎? 虜寇不庭, 警報數至, 彼能說法咒咀, 以靖邊難乎? 試有徵驗, 則遠求之可也. 如其不然, 請即罷止.²¹

In this statement, *fanjiao* is equated with special powers, and the connotation is again negative, since the official was clearly questioning the legitimacy of such teachings and suspected they were frauds who were leeching off of the state. However, once again, statements such as the one above did not claim that *fanjiao* was not Buddhist; after all, Buddhist miracles were well known in earlier times before Tibetan monks entered China.

In none of the petitions above were there any details about the doctrine that *fanjiao* actually taught. It was simply labelled as heterodox because it was foreign, a waste of resources, occasionally

²¹ *Ming wuzong shilu*, *juan* 32 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 67, 2625–26.

sexually perverse, or an unreliable form of magic in the eyes of the Ming officials. *Fanjiao* is therefore the first Chinese attempt at imagining ‘Lamaism’.²² However, the practise of *fanjiao* was considered to be tied to the Tibetan ethnic identity itself and represented the foreign and morally corrupt aspect of Buddhism rather than a practise that deviated from Buddhism. The usage of the term *fanjiao* was a rhetorical device used to attack the foreignness of the Tibetans and the Chinese who followed them, as well as to warn rulers themselves from following Buddhism and neglecting matters of the state; it was not a description of its Buddhist content. It was pragmatic, not religious, reasons that drove the Ming court to reify and then ban this teaching among the Chinese. While it was the precursor to the notion of the *lama jiao*, the later term in fact carried a different meaning.

***Lama jiao*: the Orthodox Aspect of Lamaism**

I have discussed the increasing hostility towards Tibetan Buddhism since the mid-fifteenth century and how Ming officials used *fanjiao* as a rhetorical device to denounce the negative and foreign characteristics of Buddhism during the mid-Ming. Following a period of open hostility, the official Ming attitude towards Tibetan Buddhism underwent a drastic shift after making peace with the Mongol ruler of Tumed, Altan Qa’an (1508–1582), in 1571. Among the many exchanges that followed was Altan Qa’an’s request of Tibetan sūtras and lamas from the Ming court. The Ming dynasty found itself in a situation where Tibetan Buddhism was of vital strategic importance and suddenly had to be legitimised. According to *Ming Muzong shilu* 明穆宗實錄 [The Veritable Records of Ming Muzong]:

The northern caiff *Shunyi wang* Altan asked for Tibetan sūtras in

²² Prior to the usage of the term *fanjiao*, Tibetan Buddhism was not objectified as an institutionally or legally separate form of Buddhism from other types of Buddhism in China. See Huang, ‘The Birth of Lamaism’.

golden script as well as Lama Fan monks who extensively study sūtras and mantras to be sent. The Governor General Wang Chonggu heard of this, and thus spoke; ‘the caitiff’s wish is to follow Buddha and abandon killing; it is the sprout of their repentance and love for good. I...will apply the stratagem of transforming barbarians with Chinese ways, adapt to the situation of the barbarians, and open up the tribute market’. The Board of Rites thought it was acceptable and the emperor agreed. 北虜順義王俺答請金字番經及遣刺麻番僧，傳習經況(咒)。總督尚書王崇古以聞，因言：虜欲事佛戒殺是即悔過好善之。我...亦用夏變夷之策，宜順夾情以維貢市。禮部亦以爲可許。上從之。²³

In this text, Wang Chonggu 王崇古 (1515–1588) not only accepted the request of Altan Qa’an, but also utilised the Fan monks as a stratagem of ‘transform barbarians with Chinese ways’. Wang further urged the emperor to provide the lamas with sufficient food and clothing ‘to demonstrate that China advocated for Buddhism’ (以示中華崇尚佛教之意). The notion that the Fan monks practised a barbaric and non-Chinese religion was now discarded. Wang’s petitions show that he did not think the Ming was just using the ways of the barbarians to rule the barbarians, since Wang considered Buddhism, alongside Confucianism, as a true civilising force that was inherent to China itself. This is reflected in what he told to the Wangli 萬曆 emperor (r. 1563–1620): ‘the caitiff king might not completely know that China is a place where the three doctrines of Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism are practised, but we Confucians have a deep understanding of Buddhism and what we say all have a basis’ (虜王或未書盡知我中國儒佛道三教並行。惟我儒流兼通佛教，所言具有根源)。²⁴

Two lamas were then selected by the Ming court to be sent to Altan Qa’an. For Tibetan Buddhism to represent the transforming power of the Ming emperor, it naturally could not be associated with heterodoxy and foreignness. Wang saw the need to clearly distinguish orthodox Buddhism from heterodox Buddhism. The lamas sent by

²³ *Ming muzong shilu*, juan 65.

²⁴ Wang, *Shaobao jianchuan wanggong dufu zouyi*, juan 8.

the Ming were classified under the former according to Wang:

Your subject is afraid that in the caitiff's camp, the Fan monks study mostly just mantras; the two monks [Ming lamas] might not know them and might be looked down on by them. [We] asked Altan about the Fan monks whom we saw and from which state these dharma masters belong to. The old monks who are going now [to Altan] used to go to the western region under the order of the lord [emperor] and know the Mahāyāna teachings of the west. China has a prohibition [on heterodox teachings], and people do not dare study heterodox teachings and nonstandard dharma. [I] am afraid their monks do not respect this and do not believe in this and hence are not real monks. 臣恐先在虜營番僧多習咒法，二僧未知被虜輕慢。仍貴問俺答，見在番僧不知系何國法師。今去老僧經二次西域奉王，備知西方大乘教法。中國有禁，不敢習旁門斜法。恐彼僧不尊不信，即非真僧。²⁵

The above passage implied that Wang separated a heterodox Tibetan cult from a standard Tibetan Buddhism; a distinction which earlier descriptions of *fanjiao* did not make. Wang further mentioned that there were seventy-two types of heterodox Buddhist teachings.²⁶ It should be emphasised that Wang's notion of orthodox and heterodox Buddhism is less based on normative Tibetan Buddhist standards but more on standards of what would be considered orthodox Chinese Buddhism. This is apparent in the Ming text *Wanli wugong lu* 萬曆武功錄 [The Record of Military Affairs during the Wanli Reign] which mentioned that 'the two monks brought the divine statues of Dizang 地藏 (Skt. Kṣītigarbha), the ten kings, as well as the *Xinjing* 心經 (Heart Sūtra), the *Jin'gang jing* 金剛經 (Diamond Sūtra), and *Guanyin jing* 觀音經 (*Avalokiteśvara Sūtra*), when they headed north' (二僧出地藏十王神像及《心經》、《華嚴》、《金剛》、《觀音》等諸經).²⁷ Dizang was one of the four major Bodhisattvas worshipped in China

²⁵ Wang, *Shaobao jianchuan wanggong dufu zouyi*, *juan* 8.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Qu, *Wanli wugong lu*, *juan* 8.

associated with liberating sentient beings in hell, but was not a major Bodhisattva in the Tibetan tradition. The *Guanyin jing* refers to the *Avalokitēśvara-vikurvana-nirdeśa* section of the *Fabua jing* 法華經 [Lotus Sūtra]. The characteristics attributed to the Buddhism practised by these Tibetan monks reflected what was commonly accepted as standard Buddhism in China or a mixed tradition, more than popular Tibetan Buddhist teachings in Tibet. Ironically, Tibetan mantras, which were typically associated with *fanjiao* by previous Ming officials, were viewed with suspicion. This hints that many educated lama monks, especially of ethnic Han background in China used Tibetan Buddhist rites and attire, but still followed Chinese Buddhist doctrines. This did not, however, affect Altan Qa'an's respect towards them. He later wrote back to the Ming emperor saying that 'Later the two lamas and two disciples from the Great Ming Renzong emperor arrived, [they] had the same scriptures as the lamas already at the camp, and were good with teaching and directing. I now follow the good path' (後又蒙大明仁聖皇帝欽差二喇嘛二徒弟前來，與同在營刺麻，經典相同，善言教導，我已歸善道).²⁸ Despite these Ming monks teaching scriptures that probably included texts in the Chinese Buddhist tradition, Altan Qa'an still saw them as belonging to the same Buddhist tradition.

It should be noted that the two lamas the Ming court sent, Sengge Zangpo and Gyeltsen Drakpa were both selected from the Ming Bureau for Buddhist Monks 僧錄司 and were hence both directly under the Ming bureaucracy. It is highly possible that like other Fan monks under the Ming government, they were from the Tibetan regions of Gansu where Tibetans and Chinese intermingled, or they might have been lamas who were ethnically Han. Before sending these two lamas, the Grand Secretary Zhang Juzheng noted that 'nowadays the Fan monks in the capital are generally sordid and wanton fellows who have no solid knowledge of Buddhist scriptures. If we send them, I fear that the Mongols may belittle us'.²⁹ Here, the teachings of the two lamas sent by the Ming were considered the

²⁸ Wang, *Shaobao jianchuan wangong dufu zouyi*, juan 8.

²⁹ Toh, 'Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China', 210.

legitimate ‘Mahāyāna teaching of the west’ (西方大乘教法), since they used Buddhist texts familiar to the Chinese and because they helped the Ming emperor ‘transform barbarians with Chinese ways’ (用夏變夷).³⁰ Instead of holding on to some preconceived idea of Tibetan Buddhism as inherently non-Chinese, the Ming government was in fact rather flexible in reinterpreting Tibetan Buddhism as a tool that transformed barbarians to ‘Chinese ways’, although the emphasis was on the Buddhist doctrine over the mantra in the rhetoric.

This ‘transformative’ characteristic of Tibetan Buddhism was further emphasised when Altan Qa’an demanded Buddhist sūtras in the Mongolian language. The Ming could not find Buddhist sūtras in Mongolian at first, but after searching thoroughly, some Mongolian sūtras were found in Gansu. In addition to providing Mongolian-language Tibetan Buddhist texts, the Ming court also found ‘Loyal and Filial Scriptures’ (*zhongxiao zhi jing* 忠孝之經) in the Fan language (Tibetan), which were brought north to guide the Mongols. In addition, Wang stated that a translator should be sent to make sure that Altan used the diction of submission in his memorial. Experts were also sent ‘to the caitiff camp, daily instructing the various barbarians in the Fan language, to check the meanings of their words and explain clearly the great meanings of loyalty and filial piety’ (同赴虜營，日於諸夷傳授番文，較對字意，講明忠孝大義).³¹ Tibetan Buddhism was hence conceived by Wang as a teaching which not only incorporated Chinese Buddhism but also included Confucian political doctrine and moral ideals. What Ming officials described as constituting the Buddhism practised by a Fan monk was therefore subject to change depending on what purpose it served.

A new term was coined to separate this orthodox Buddhism of Tibet from the more generic definition of *fanjiao*, which is tied to a foreign identity and heterodoxy. In fact, this term was the famous *lama jiao*. As Shen Weirong noted, the term first appeared in a 1573 inscription describing the Tibetan scripture translation-based workshop, the Fanjing chang 番經廠, written by Zhang Juzheng. Zhang

³⁰ *Shaobao jianchuan wangong dufu zouyi, juan 8.*

³¹ *Ibid.*

wrote that: ‘The Fan scriptures came from Ü-Tsang, which is today’s *lama jiao*. Boddhidharma viewed it as a side-branch’ (番經來自烏斯藏, 即今喇嘛教, 達摩目為旁支曲竇者也).³² The term ‘side-branch’ (*pangzhi* 旁支) implies a religious lineage separate from the mainstream lineage but still similar to it. Representing the Ming court, Zhang accepted Tibetan Buddhism as an authentic ‘side-branch,’ of the Sinicised Chan Buddhism rather than a heterodox teaching, and one which served a strategic purpose for the dynasty.

It is interesting that Zhang compared the *lama jiao* to Chan Buddhism instead of Esoteric Buddhism in the inscription, as that would have an impact on the way that Tibetan Buddhism was interpreted in the succeeding Qing dynasty. The reason for this needs to be examined from the background of the development of Chinese Buddhism at the time. By the late Ming, Buddhist schools in China became integrated and Chan Buddhism saw a major revival and came to dominate the Buddhist scene. Furthermore, the Confucian literati, especially followers of Wang Yangming 王陽明 (1472–1529), were heavily involved in the practise and patronage of Chan Buddhism and even authored their own Chan anthologies. This was coupled with a rising print culture in which Chan literature became widely known to those who could read, and there was a Chan craze among Chinese intellectuals in the late sixteenth century and the seventeenth century.³³ As a result, it is not a surprise that Zhang Juzheng and later Qing intellectuals projected the mainstream Buddhism that was most familiar to them onto what they considered to be orthodox Buddhism from Tibet.

It should be noted that Fan monks after the coining of the term *lama jiao* were often still associated with sexual perversion or sorcery. However, it was during this time that sexual tantra and illusory tricks were often considered to be non-Buddhist practises that were separate from the *lama jiao* itself in Chinese writings. For example, in the late Ming private book *Zui weilu* 罪惟錄 [Records of an

³² Cited from *Qinding rixia jiuwen kao*, fascicle 6, 8a–8b. Shen, *Xiangxiang Xizang*, 150–51.

³³ Wu, *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 107–08.

Accused] by Cha Jizuo 查繼佐 (1601–1676): ‘What the western monks practise are all [illusory] techniques, if [one holds on to] the nature of the mind, there would be no illusions’ (凡西僧所為皆術, 若以心性則無幻).³⁴ Here, the author thought that Tibetan monks only knew magic tricks rather than the doctrine of Buddha nature. The late Ming eunuch Liu Ruoyu 劉若愚 (1584–?) also commented in his *Zhuo Zhong zhi* 酌中志 [A Weighted and Unbiased Record] that the ‘Fan monk are all people of lewdness, they do not understand the scriptures’ (番僧皆淫穢之人, 不通經典).³⁵ The characteristics that both of the authors above attributed to Tibetan monks were the exact opposite of the characteristics Ming government officials of high position attributed to the authentic *lama jiao*; Wang Chonggu and Zhang Juzheng thought that the characteristics of the Fan monks they sent north to Altan Qa’an lay in their knowledge of the Mahāyāna doctrines, notably the Chinese Buddhist scriptures familiar to the literati, and not in exotic mantras and tricks. Cha Jizuo and Liu Ruoyu on the other hand, thought the characteristics of the Fan monks were those very magic tricks and their ignorance of the Buddhist scriptures. However, also different from earlier criticisms of *fanjiao*, Cha Jizuo and Liu Ruoyu considered these magic lewd practises of Fan monks as an illegitimate form of Buddhism, whereas the earlier Confucian literati often did not separate *fanjiao* from Buddhism and often equated *fanjiao* to all the negative and foreign aspects of Buddhism.

It was also during this time that the sexual tantra practised by the last Yuan emperor was specifically denounced as not Buddhist. This can be seen in the book *Dushu meiqiu ji* 讀書敏求記 [Exertions in Studying Books] compiled in the beginning of the Qing by the book collector Qian Zeng 錢曾 (1629–1701), which was comprised of three translated Tibetan esoteric texts from the Ming period: *Duanbiwa chenjiu tongsheng yao* 端必瓦成就同生要 [Dombiheruka’s Sahajasiddhi], *Da shouyin wuzi yao* 大手印無字要 [Letterless Mahāmudrā], and *Yindeluo puti shouyin daoyao* 因得囉菩提手印道要

³⁴ Shen, *Xiangxiang Xizang*, 148.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 150.

[The Key Points of Mudrā written by Indrabhūti]. The first is a text pertaining to the esoteric practise of the Path and Fruit (*daoguo* 道果) whereas the latter two are *Mahāmudrā* texts. The book collector Qian Daxin 錢大昕 (1728–1804) also wrote a supplement to Yuan history called *Bu Yuanshi yiwen zhi* 補元史藝文志 [Supplement to the Monograph on Arts and Literature of the Yuan Dynasty]. Qian placed the same *Da shouyin wuzi yao* under the section of ‘medical books’ (*yishu lei* 醫書類) instead of the section of ‘Buddhism and Daoism’ (*Shi Dao lei* 釋道類), which only included standard Chinese Buddhism and Daoism. In his other book *Yeshi yuan shumu* 也是園書目 [Catalogue of Books Collected in This Also Garden], the same text was directly placed under the chapter called ‘Fanzhong shu’ 房中術 [The Art of the Bedroom].³⁶ Like Cha Jizuo and Liu Ruoyu, these authors did not consider these tantric practises as legitimate Buddhism. It should be noted however, that Cha Jizuo, Liu Ruoyu, and Qian Daxin did not call what these Fan monks practised *lama jiao*. Perhaps due to the fact that the official government position was that *lama jiao* was a form of orthodox Buddhism, many intellectuals started to separate the ‘art of the bedroom’ and ‘illusory tricks’ practised by the Fan monks from the term *lama jiao* and did not consider the former as Buddhism.

It appears that there are broadly speaking, two views pertaining to Tibetan Buddhism in the Ming. In the first, the shamanic and sexual elements practised by lamas were viewed as part of *fanjiao*, but the teaching itself was still considered Buddhist while Buddhism as a whole was considered a heterodox teaching. This notion seems to still exist in the Qing period, typically among the common masses who probably did not bother to distinguish the different forms of Buddhism the Tibetans practised, although the term *fanjiao* largely disappeared by then and the term *lama jiao* became widespread and took its place. The second perspective is largely held by the government and the literati closely tied to the government after 1573; in this perspective, the Shamanic and sexual practises were separated from

³⁶ Meng, ‘Guojia tushuguan suo cang “da shou yin wu zi yao” yuanliu kaoshu’.

the authentic *lama jiao*; the latter was seen as the moral transforming agency of imperial rule. It was hence considered an orthodox form of Buddhism, having a doctrine similar to Chinese, and particularly Chan Buddhism. Although it is not uncommon that some Confucians still attacked the *lama jiao* together with all other forms of Buddhism, it was never denounced as not Buddhist. This second notion became much more popular under the following Qing dynasty and came to dominate the literature on Tibetan Buddhism.

Yellow Teaching vs. Red Teaching: Qing Notions of Buddhist Orthodoxy

As demonstrated earlier, by the late Ming, the negative statements about Fan monks or lamas did not necessarily mean an attack on the *lama jiao*. In fact, in Qing times, the lack of discipline among lamas was considered to be a deviation from their own Buddhist doctrine, and the *lama jiao* was in fact considered to be the legitimate Buddhist doctrine which could cure the very negative nature of the Fan monks. We see this idea expressed even before the Manchus entered China. In 1636 Huangtaiji 皇太極 (r. 1626–1643) wrote a decree to his subjects on the characteristics of lamas. The attacks used to denounce lamas were similar to those used by Confucian officials of the Ming court, that they were lewd and frauds: ‘Lamas make up false sayings, they use offerings to Buddha and holding on to abstinence as a pretext to hide their unrestrained perversion. [They] seek wealth, go against [the correct path] and commit sins. They also extort wealth and cattle from people. They falsely allege that they can exempt people from sins in the afterlife. Their delusional words are extreme.’³⁷ On the other hand, when writing directly to Mongol lamas in 1638, Hong Taiji reminded them that they are not heeding to the proper way of the lamas, which was defined by following monastic codes: ‘I have heard that you do not follow the way of lamas, [you] create chaos and carry out presumptuous behaviour. I am the

³⁷ Zhou, *Qingdai Fojiao yu zhengzhi wenhua*, 32.

one who administers the state; when you people do not follow the Vinaya, if I do not give out punishment, who will?' (聞爾等不遵喇嘛之道, 作亂妄行, 朕統理國政, 爾等不遵戒律, 朕不懲治, 誰則治之?).³⁸ By examining the different comments Hong Taiji made we see the typical stereotype of lamas: that they break rules and cannot restrain their desires. This is the trope that Hong Taiji used when he warned his officials to keep their distance from the lamas. However, there was the ideal 'way of the lamas' which was characterised by strict monastic codes, and Hong Taiji used this rhetoric when he tried to get Mongol lamas to follow regulations. In other words, the reason the lamas were lewd, greedy, and dishonest was in fact *because* they were not actually following orthodox Buddhism (the way of the lamas), not because the Buddhism they practised made them that way.

The two separate rhetorical expressions of the characteristics of lamas were then projected to different schools of Tibetan Buddhism after the Qing established Gelukpa orthodoxy in the mid-seventeenth century. The corrupt, illusionary tricks, magic, and heterodox mantras which people used to attack lamas became associated with all non-Gelukpa Tibetan Buddhist schools, collectively known as the Red Teaching (*Hongjiao* 紅教). The standard Buddhist teaching with monastic discipline, understanding of scriptures, and seeing one's Buddha nature was only associated with the Gelukpa school, or the Yellow Teaching (*Huangjiao* 黃教). This view appeared to have become widely adopted by officials of the Qing court. For example, in his story collection *Yuewei caotang biji* 閱微草堂筆記 [Random Jottings at the Cottage of Close Scrutiny] written in the late eighteenth century, Ji Yun 紀昀 (1724–1805), a member of the Hanlin Academy 翰林院, said that 'there are two types of *lama* [*jiao*], one is called the Yellow Teaching, and one is called the Red Teaching. They are both named after the clothing they wear. The Yellow Teaching speaks of morality, and clarifies cause and fruits; it is a different denomination from Chan but has the same origin. The Red Teaching only works on the art of illusion' (喇嘛有二種: 一曰黃教, 一曰紅教. 各以其衣別之也. 黃教講道德、明因果, 與禪家派別而同源. 紅教則惟工

³⁸ *Donghua lu*, *juan* 3 in *Xuxiu Siku quanshu*, vol. 369, 155.

幻術).³⁹ Here, Ji Yun thought that although Gelukpa Buddhism was different from Chan, they were related. This was similar to Zhang Juzheng's comments on *lama jiao* in 1573, which stated that it was a side branch of Chan and hence orthodox. For Qing scholars like Ji Yun, all the previous negative stereotypes, including illusion tricks, sorcery, and other possible negative characteristics associated with the Fan monks of the Ming period, were now classified under the Red Teaching. The Yellow Teaching was the orthodox *lama jiao* while the followers of the Red Teaching only adopted the title of lamas, but really followed tricks not originally taught by the Buddha.

What Ji Yun thought to be the distinguishing characteristics of the Yellow Teaching matched exactly the rhetoric that the late Ming court used to describe the orthodox *lama jiao*; its doctrine was similar to Chinese Buddhism, and particularly Chan Buddhism. The characteristics of the Red Teaching were similar to the illusionary tricks and art of the bedroom that late Ming intellectuals accused the Fan monks of practising. For example, Ji Yun created a narrative where he traced the origin of the Red Teaching to illusionary tricks from Central Asia:

Upon investigating the illusionist men of the western region who swallow knives and fire, they existed since the Former Han. These included the tricks that were passed down from the past and are not the original dharma of the Buddha. Therefore, the Yellow Teaching refers to the [followers of] the Red Teaching as demons or refers to them as Brahmins; what the Buddhist scriptures called evil masters and heretics. 考西域吞刀吞火之幻人，自前漢已有此。蓋其相傳遺術，非佛氏本法也。故黃教謂紅教曰魔。或曰：‘是即波羅門佛經所謂邪師外道者也’。⁴⁰

Ji Yun also mentioned a *Lifan yuan* 理藩院 (Board for the Administration of Outlying Regions) official who told him that the Red Teaching ‘has the art of summoning women [for sex], so the Yellow

³⁹ Ji, *Yuewei caotang biji*, 3305–06.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 3306.

Teaching considered it demonic' (有攝召婦女術, 故黃教斥以魔云).⁴¹ Here, the Red Teaching was also associated with the characteristics of sexual art that Ming intellectuals often attributed to Fan monks/lamas. In sum, while the term *lama jiao* under the Qing could describe all of Tibetan Buddhism, only the Gelukpa School was considered the orthodox *lama jiao* and legitimately Buddhist.

This view was not only widely held by Han literati, but was also stated by bannermen as well. In the late eighteenth century, the Mongol bannerman Song Yun 松筠, who became the Amban in Tibet in 1794, also associated magic with non-Gelukpa schools. However, he gave more details about the history of the different Tibetan schools of Buddhism than Ji Yun. Song Yun knew that the Gelukpa founder Tsongkhapa learnt from the other Tibetan schools of Buddhism. In his account of the frontier, *Suifu jilüe* 綏服紀略 [Brief Description of Suifu], Song Yun wrote that 'The Red and Yellow Teachings were originally the same, the Red Teaching with evil arts of recent times are the later Red Teachings and not the original lineage of the Sakya temples.' (蓋紅黃二教本同, 其近日邪術之紅教乃紅教之末失, 非薩迦廟之本宗也).⁴² This description shows that Song Yun probably did not consider the sexual practises and illusionary tricks the same as the legitimate Buddhism taught by the famous Sakyapa lamas during the Yuan dynasty.

In his *Shengwu ji* 聖武記 [Records of Holy Military Achievements], written in 1842, the Qing official Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794–1857) gave an even more detailed description of the history of the origin of the Gelukpa School than previous Qing scholars. Like Song Yun, Wei Yuan thought that the non-Gelukpa schools were originally orthodox but later became corrupted:

Later, the Red Teaching passed down secret mantras, the bad effects of swallowing knives and breathing fire to impress the masses, no different from teachers of shaman and completely lost the discipline, concentration, and wisdom of the teaching. Tsongkhapa originally

⁴¹ Ji, *Yuewei caotang biji*, 3593.

⁴² Wei, *Shengwu ji*, 207.

studied the Red Teaching.... This teaching (the Yellow) places emphasis on seeing [one's] nature and saving sentient beings. It attacks the smaller vehicle of Śrāvakas and the inferior vehicles of tricks of illusion. By the middle of the Ming it was already far above that of the Red Teaching. 其後，紅教專持密咒，流弊至以吞刀吐火炫俗，無異於巫，盡失戒，定，慧宗旨。宗喀巴初習紅教...其教皆重見性度生，斥聲聞小乘幻術下乘。當明中葉，已遠出紅教之上。⁴³

Although Wei Yuan recognised that the Gelukpa School had origins in the Red Teaching, what made it legitimate in his eyes was that it taught the method of 'seeing [one's] nature'. In contrast to the idea of an esoteric vehicle above the exoteric one in the standard doctrine of Gelukpa Buddhism, for Wei Yuan, who was interested in Buddhism himself, the line between secret mantras and other 'tricks' were not at all clear and seen as part of an inferior vehicle. Wei Yuan might have known that the Gelukpa School also recited mantras, but like many other Chinese officials, he likely saw mantras as a mere auxiliary practise to the central tenet of Buddhism: seeing the Buddha nature.

While the Gelukpa School was indeed stricter about monastic discipline, they were hardly free of the 'shamanic' elements of Buddhism in Tibet. Furthermore, while sexual yoga was not directly practised by the monastic community, some monks still visualised sexual tantra, and real sexual intercourse was still considered more effective. This, along with the death yoga, often played a role in the Gelukpa system of reincarnated lamas.⁴⁴ Chinese officials of the Qing were hence reading what was deemed orthodox and acceptable by Chinese social standards onto the complex Tibetan system, resulting in confusion. For example, it does not seem that Wei Yuan was aware that tantric sex was part of the Anuttarayoga Tantra in the Gelukpa School. This is shown in the *Sheng wuji*, in which Wei Yuan was

⁴³ Wei, *Shengwu ji*, 200–01.

⁴⁴ Geoffrey Samuel identifies two main orientations of Tibetan Buddhism: the clerical and the shamanic (including Tantric Yoga). While the Gelukpa School was more clerical, the 'shamanic elements' were still an indispensable part of the school. See Samuel, *Civilized Shamans*, 'Introduction'.

puzzled by monastic art depicting tantric sex:

The commonly called Buddhas of Bliss are shaped like [one making] secret performances. They are the techniques which guide and encourage licentiousness given by the Fan Monks during the end of the Yuan. The Emperor Yuan Shun makes offerings [to them] inside of various palaces. It ended his state. Anyone who knows a little about Vinaya should be ashamed of it and the government should also ban it. Yet in all the Lama Monasteries of Tibet (Xizang), Mongolia, and the capital, there were offerings to [these] pictorial images. It was not considered strange. [I] ponder from which scriptural teaching this originated, and from what faith did this rise. Their Khutukhtu does not ban it, and the government also does not ban it. 俗稱歡喜佛者，形同密戲，乃元季番僧尊導誨淫之術。元順帝供諸宮內，卒亡其國，稍知佛律既當恥之，且官府當禁之。乃西藏，蒙古及京師刺麻寺中皆有圖像供設，恬不為怪，試問本何經教？起何敬信？其胡土克圖不禁之，官府亦不禁之。⁴⁵

Like previous Qing officials, in his *Kangyou jixing* 康輶紀行 [An Illustrated Travelogue Depicting the Southwest China], the early-nineteenth-century Qing official Yao Ying 姚瑩 (1785–1853) also assumed that because the Yellow Teaching was orthodox; it was like Chan Buddhism. He wrote that the Red Teaching has lots of magic tricks while:

The Yellow Teaching only explains and recites the scriptures, practises quiet meditation, and does not do illusionary tricks yet the various evils cannot approach [one who practise it]. Therefore, even though the Tibetans are foolish, they seem to respect the Yellow Teaching above those of the Red Teaching. This is why Fotucheng is inferior to Kumārajīva, and why Kumārajīva is inferior to Bodhidharma. 蓋黃教惟講通佛典，習靜禪坐，不為幻法，而諸邪不能侵之。故蕃人雖愚，其敬黃教尤在紅教之上。此佛圖澄所以不如鳩摩羅什，而鳩摩羅什又不如達摩也。⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Wei, *Shengwu ji*, 207–08.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 212.

Yao Ying also held the notion that the Gelukpa teaching does not focus on spells and miracles, and thought that it was like Bodhidharma's Chan practises: superior to Kumārajīva (344–413) and Fotucheng 佛圖澄 (232–348), the early Buddhist masters who came to China. These two monks, especially Fotucheng, were known for their special powers and miracles which Yao Ying compared to the Red Teaching. Kumārajīva was also well versed in Buddhist scriptures and translated many Buddhist texts into Chinese, yet even that was considered by Yao Ying to be inferior to directly experiencing your Buddha nature without using language like Bodhidharma's method. This was perhaps why Yao Ying found it strange that the high status lamas were so focused on the doctrine of reincarnation and thought that the highest vehicle of the Tathāgata should not be like this.⁴⁷

The above descriptions of the views of Qing intellectuals on the distinguishing characteristics of the *lama jiao* were almost the opposite of what early western and modern scholars thought were distinguishing characteristics of Lamaism or Tibetan Buddhism as a category. It was not the tantric elements and sexual yoga which separated the *lama jiao* from other schools of Buddhism; rather, the Qing intellectuals thought that the sexual tantra and many of the magical esoteric elements were a corrupt practise which deviated from the true *lama jiao* that was Buddhism. They thought that Gelukpa Buddhism was the true orthodox *lama jiao* and had the same doctrine as Chinese Buddhist schools such as Chan in trying to see one's Buddha nature despite being expressed through different rituals and languages. Furthermore, it was the strict monasticism of Gelukpa which made it orthodox Buddhism, whereas western intellectuals thought that it was the monastic hierarchy of Lamaism which made it corrupt similar to the hierarchy of Catholicism and deviated from the original non-hierarchical Buddhism.

It should be noted that in all schools of Tibetan Buddhism, seeing one's Buddha nature and realising emptiness is not enough

⁴⁷ Wei, *Shengwu ji*, 212.

⁴⁸ The Gelukpa school in particular does not even see the doctrine of Tathāgata-garbha and mind nature as the ultimate truth and maintains the Madhyamaka

to become a Buddha.⁴⁸ This is because experiencing emptiness only pertained to cultivating one's own mind without concern of other sentient beings. Therefore, Chan (and mainstream Chinese Buddhism in general) focuses on the mind alone; this enlightenment without tantric empowerment only constituted the attainment of the dharma body (Skt. dharmakāya) and would not have allowed one to attain Buddhahood based on the Tibetan traditions. Only through perfecting the physical body (*rupakāya*), which includes both the manifestation body (*nirmāṇakāya*) and the communal enjoyment body (*sambhogakāya*), through acquiring meritorious virtues of the Buddha could one become a Buddha.⁴⁹ In the Tibetan tradition, tantric practises were the only way to gain all of the meritorious virtues in a lifetime. This is done by visualising the form of a deity after one meditates upon emptiness. The tutelary deity is then summoned, enters and melds with the visualised physical body, and then receives consecration from the Buddhas. Unlike Chan, where the cultivation of the mind to experience emptiness alone is often seen as the ultimate path, in the Anuttarayoga Tantra tradition of Tibet, the visualisation of one's own body as a tutelary deity within a maṇḍala (eventually performing sexual yoga) and the attainment of the Buddha's physical body from such practises were no less vital than the realisation of emptiness. The Gelukpa founder Tsongkhapa

view that when it comes to the ultimate truth, even the mind is empty. Popular Chinese Buddhism on the other hand considers the doctrine of the Buddha nature (Tathāgatagarbha) as a separate and higher doctrine than the Madhyamaka school or the Yogacara school.

⁴⁹ In *Mahāyāna* Buddhism, a Buddha has three types of bodies: the manifestation body (*nirmanakaya*), the communal enjoyment body (*sambhogakaya*) and the reality body (*dharmakaya*). The dharmakaya is the absolute reality behind the world and is beyond concepts. It is often referred to as the unborn and uncreated. The sambhogakaya is the body that feels the reward of the bliss of enlightenment. Unlike the dharmakaya, the sambhogakaya has a physical form, but not of the earthly world, and can also be an object of worship. The nirmanakaya is the physical body of a Buddha which is born on earth. In Tibetan Vajrayana, the three bodies were separately cultivated with spiritual practises (*sadhanas*) for each.

considered the ultimate realisation as a union of emptiness and the 'supreme bliss' of sexual tantra.⁵⁰

Qing intellectuals hence often misunderstood Tibetan tantric rituals and had trouble separating them from non-Buddhist shamanic practices. Sexual tantras of all kinds were denounced even though the Gelukpa school practised them too. It seems they treated even the orthodox Gelukpa tantric practices as having the same function as the mantras and rituals used in Chinese Buddhism without the central role that they played in Tibetan Buddhism. Qing emperors were also not free from misunderstanding Gelukpa Buddhism and often projected Chan Buddhist doctrines onto it. The Yongzheng 雍正 emperor (r. 1722–1735), for example, claimed that the Second Changkya Khutukhtu Ngawang Lobsang Chöden was his Chan mentor and engaged with him in a Chan style encounter dialogue.⁵¹ Since there is no evidence that Changkya knew Chan practices, Yongzheng most likely made up that narrative in order to create a legitimate line of dharma transmission for himself and find a teacher who could verify his enlightenment, as these elements were crucial to the authenticity of a Chan master at the time. Furthermore, Yongzheng needed to look outside of the Chinese heartland for a source of legitimacy in order to establish himself as the highest authority above all the Chan masters in China. This also reveals that as far as Yongzheng was concerned, what the Changkya Khutukhtu practised and taught was ultimately no different from orthodox Chan Buddhism.

Not only did Yongzheng not associate orthodox Buddhism with tantra, in fact, in his Buddhist writing the *Jianmo bianyi lu* 揀魔辨異錄 [Records of Pointing Out Demons and Discerning Heterodoxy], he explicitly attacked the Chan master Hanyue Fazang's 漢月法藏 (1573–1635) use of an esoteric symbol, the moon-disc (*yuelun* 月輪), represented by the perfect circle to guide people into enlightenment. There are few details in regard to this practise, but it might have been similar to the *ajikan* 阿字觀 meditation in Japanese Esoteric Buddhism where the practitioner also visualises a moon disc along

⁵⁰ Tsong Khapa Losang Drakpa, *Illumination of the Hidden Meaning*, 21–22.

⁵¹ See Qing, 'Yuxuan yulu', 68:18.696b.

with the Sanskrit letter *ab*.⁵² Yongzheng ridiculed the notion that the absolute truth can be expressed with an image and through some secret. He considered Hanyue's use of tantric elements a strange and redundant method for Chan enlightenment. Yongzheng stressed that only through one's own effort can one attain salvation. He found the notion that one can liberate others through some esoteric means to be the words of demons, not the Buddha, and wrote that 'outside of one's self nature and self-salvation, since when was there an ultimate peculiar secret which can strengthen those who do not understand self-nature and refuse to save oneself?' (何嘗於自性自度外有甚奇特秘密, 能強不了自性不肯自度者?)⁵³

As Robert Sharf argued, in traditional Chinese Buddhist understanding, the term 'esoteric teaching' could mean many things and has never been considered separate from the exoteric Mahāyāna teachings. With a few individual exceptions, such teachings did not have their own classified texts. Oftentimes, 'esoteric' in medieval China simply meant the highest teaching of Mahāyāna Buddhism.⁵⁴ This is also reflected in Yongzheng's writings; while Yongzheng refuted Hanyue and Hongren's 弘仁 (1610–1663) notion of 'esoteric' empowerment, which included (albeit was not restricted to) tantric practises, Yongzheng himself used the term 'esoteric' (*mimi* 秘密) with a broader meaning. For the emperor, the definition of esoteric was not to rely on mantra, mudrā, and visualisation. The emperor turned to the Five Dynasties period (907–979) Buddhist master Yongming Yanshou 永明延壽 (904–975) and wrote that the latter took the best of Tiantai 天台, Huayan 華嚴, and Vijnānavāda schools and 'compiled [them] into a book, one hundred fascicles, known as *Zongjing lu*, introducing learners to the highest esoteric dharma path' (編綴成書一百卷, 名曰'宗鏡錄', 使學者於無上秘密法門).⁵⁵ Like many Chinese Buddhist writers of medieval times, for Yongzheng, 'esoteric' did not mean tantric practises, but simply meant the

⁵² Wu, *Enlightenment in Dispute*, 151.

⁵³ *Yuzhi jianmo bianyi lu*, *juan 2*.

⁵⁴ Sharf, *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism*, 263–79.

⁵⁵ Yongzheng, *Yuzhi jianmo bianyi lu*, *juan 8*.

most profound Mahāyāna teaching which was beyond words, or the doctrine of the Buddha nature.⁵⁶

Even the Qianlong emperor, who was known to have been an ardent practitioner of Tibetan tantric meditation and had his tomb covered in Tibetan mantra seems to have interpreted Gelukpa Buddhism through a Chan lens. For example, in an inscription in the Tibetan Buddhist Xihuang Monastery 西黃寺 of Beijing in 1782, Qianlong compared the Panchen Lama's instructions for his disciple to the Buddha teaching Chan to Mahākāśyapa: 'He left his accomplished disciple Lobsang Dondrub and others at Tashi Lhunpo to study sūtras and vinaya and spread and explain the teaching of the king. This is like what the Tathāgata said when he was about to enter Nirvana: "I have the highest dharma of the mind which I passed to Mahākāśyapa for you people to rely upon"' (即留高弟羅卜藏敦珠布等於扎仕倫布傳習經律宣闡王教, 亦優如來涅槃所說, 我有無上心法, 悉付摩訶迦葉, 為汝等作大依止也).⁵⁷ This passage on Mahākāśyapa is also found in the Tibetan, Mongolian, and Manchu versions of the inscription, with small variations. Here, the reference to the famous Chan story of the Buddha passing on his teaching of the mind to Mahākāśyapa is made to describe the Gelukpa teaching, suggesting Qianlong likewise had the notion that the Yellow Teaching was similar to Chan Buddhism.

Another instance of Qianlong using Chan doctrine to understand Gelukpa Buddhism was in 1745, when the Zunghar Qan Galdan Tsering (1794–1857) wrote to Qianlong 'asking Tibet to bestow several lamas who are adept at sūtras and mantras, allowing the teaching of the sūtra and mantra to pass down into the distant future and spread without interruption' (請於土伯特賞給善於經咒喇嘛數人, 令經咒之教. 可垂久遠, 推廣不絕).⁵⁸ Here, Galdan Tsering

⁵⁶ Yongming Yanshou (and Yongzheng) considered the Tathāgatagarbha/Buddha nature doctrine as higher to the Yogacara and Madhyamaka schools because it is based less on theorising reality, and more on direct experience free from language.

⁵⁷ Qiaga, *Zangwen beiwen yanjiu*, 434.

⁵⁸ *Qing Gaozong shilu*, 480.

wanted Qianlong to pass a decree ordering lamas from Tibet to go to the Zunghar domain, and in the typical Tibetan fashion, divided Buddhism into the sūtra and mantra paths. In order to deny Galdan Tsering access to Tibet, Qianlong responded that ‘there are lamas in your region too, how could there not be one who is adept at sūtra and mantra? Furthermore, respecting the Buddha and spreading the teaching are only a matter of one’s mind, there is no need to rely only on sūtra and mantra. Why do you need to seek other people? I will not pass down a decree in regard to this matter’ (爾等地方亦有喇嘛, 豈無一善於經咒者? 且敬佛廣教隻在於心, 亦不必專憑經咒, 何必求諸他人).⁵⁹ Like Yongzheng, Qianlong argued that the Buddhist truth is only a matter of the cultivation of the mind, and not dependent on texts, mantras, or lamas. While the reason Qianlong denied Galdan Tsering’s request was political rather than religious, the fact that he chose a response based on Chan language shows that he either did not understand Galdan Tsering’s religious statements or applied the Chan rhetoric anyway to exert his own ideological dominance.

An examination of the Manchu Buddhist Canon compiled under Qianlong’s reign also showed that the Manchu Buddhist notions of ‘esoteric’ Buddhism was closer to the Chinese understanding than the Tibeto-Mongolian one. The Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhist Canons makes a clear distinction between two classes of texts; sūtra (Tib. *mdo*; Mong. *sudur*) and tantra (Tib. *Rgyud*; Mong. *dandr-a*). Based on the organisation of the Chinese Buddhist Canon, the Manchu Buddhist Canon contained only a handful of tantric texts. The few translated tantras in both the Chinese and Manchu Buddhist canons were, together with sūtras, indiscriminately translated as ‘scripture’ (Ch. *jing* 經; Man. *nomun*) without tantra forming its own class of texts. For example, the title of the well-known tantric text *Hevajra Tantra* found in the Manchu Buddhist Canon was *Fucihi nomulaha amba jilangga hafu sure urgungge wacir sere amba fulebe han i nomun* [The Buddha Speaks of the Scriptural Text of the Great King of the Teaching, the Hevajra with Great Compassion and Knowledge of the Emptiness]. This title was largely a translation of the *Foshuo*

⁵⁹ *Qing Gaozong shilu*, 481.

Dabei kongzhi Xijin'gang dajiaowang jing 佛說大悲空智喜金剛大教王經 [The Buddha Speaks of the Scriptural Text of the Ritual of the Great King of the Teaching, the Hevajra with Great Compassion and Knowledge of the Emptiness], the Chinese title of the *Hevajra Tantra* translated during the Song dynasty, and not a translation from Tibetan.⁶⁰ This further implies that like the Chinese Buddhist tradition, the Qing court and the state sponsored Manchu Buddhist texts did not have a clear notion of separate sūtras and a mantra/tantra path even though Manchu Buddhist monks were labelled Gelukpa lamas. Unlike the modern western interest in the tantric aspect of Tibetan Buddhism, the Qing government's view of Gelukpa Buddhism was often judged through orthodox Chinese Buddhist standards; whatever tantric practises were present, they did not form a separate system from the exoteric teachings and were merely supplementary to monastic discipline and seeing one's Buddha nature.

It should be noted that hostile rhetoric towards Gelukpa Buddhism also existed in the Qing. However, like with the attacks on *fanjiao* in the Ming dynasty, or attacks on Buddhism as a whole throughout Chinese history, the purpose was to warn officials or emperors not to follow any non-Confucian doctrines too closely. For example, the *Xiaoting zalu* 嘯亭雜錄 [Miscellaneous Records of Xiaoting] written by the Manchu prince Zhaolian 昭槿 (1776–1830) at the turn of the nineteenth century used the same stereotypes and explanation that Ming-era Confucians used to explain why the imperial dynasty patronised Tibetan Buddhism. Zhaolian explained that the Qing promotion of the Gelukpa School was a strategic necessity and not because of genuine faith in their religious beliefs:

The state patronises monks of the Yellow [Teaching] not because they follow their doctrine in order to seek blessing and fortune. It is only because the various Mongol tribes long revered the Yellow Teaching. Therefore, [the state] uses the divine (Buddha) way for indoctrination and relies on its followers to make them sincerely

⁶⁰ *Digital Database of Buddhist Tripitaka Catalogue*. Last modified October 26, 2021. <http://jinglu.cbeta.org/cgi-bin/man.pl>.

submit and serve as buffers. This is what the ‘Royal Institution’ (*wang zhi* 王制) meant by the way of ‘changing their rule but not changing their customs.’ 國家寵幸黃僧，並非崇奉其教以祈福祥也。只以蒙古諸部敬信黃教已久，故以神道設教，藉仗其徒，使其誠心歸附以障藩籬，正‘王制’所謂‘易其政不易其俗’之道也。⁶¹

Here, Zhaolian cited the ‘Wangzhi’ 王制 section of the Confucian classic *Liji* 禮記 [Book of Rites] and compared the Qing way (*dao* 道) to those of the Zhou kings, whose purpose was not to change local customs but their rule (*zheng* 政) through moral transformation. The same expression was also found in the inscription ‘Lama shuo’ 喇嘛說 [Pronouncement on Lamas] that Qianlong erected in the Yonghe Temple in Beijing. The later inscription also mentioned the ‘Wang zhi’: ‘Even though our dynasty protects the Yellow Teaching, it is in unison with what the *Royal Institution* calls “mend their doctrine but not changing their customs” (我朝雖護黃教，正合於《王制》所謂修其教，不易其俗，齊其政，不易其宜，而惑眾亂法者，仍以王法治之).⁶² None of these writings, however, made use of the rhetoric that Gelukpa Buddhism was not considered a legitimate form of Buddhism. Rather, such statements marginalising Tibetan Buddhism represented by the Gelukpa school are again a traditional rhetorical device that Confucians used against Buddhism as a whole and could just as well be applied to Chinese Buddhism had the later been subject to similar circumstances.

Introduction of Western Notions of Lamaism to China since the Late Nineteenth Century

As mentioned earlier, whereas both the Europeans and the Qing Chinese were hostile to shamanic and sexual practises, the Europeans considered Lamaism to be another term for Tantric or Esoteric Buddhism and also considered the strict monasticism of Tibetan

⁶¹ Zhaolian, *Xiaoting zalu*, 361.

⁶² Qiaga, *Zangwen beiwen yanjiu*, 456.

Buddhism to be a negative trait similar to papacy. On the contrast, the late Ming and Qing state did not consider tantric practises the distinguishing feature of the orthodox *lama jiao*; rather tantric practises such as mantra were viewed as only an auxiliary practise and the main positive characteristic of the *lama jiao* was considered to be seeing one's Buddha nature through Chan Buddhist lenses as well as its strict monastic discipline. While individuals of the Qing court also often tried to depict the emperor as following the Yellow Teaching only to pacify the Mongols, this was a traditional Confucian rhetoric against Buddhism in general and not an attempt at denouncing the Gelukpa school or the *lama jiao* as a form of Buddhism.

The idea that the entire Tibetan Buddhist tradition, including the various sects as well as all the esoteric practises, including sexual tantra, was called *lama jiao* and was different from authentic Buddhism was only an idea that the Chinese adopted after interacting with Western and Japanese Buddhist scholars, especially the latter. With the globalisation of Buddhism in the late nineteenth century, some of the Buddhists in China became more familiar with early Buddhology. Yang Wenhui 楊文會 (1837–1911) was the first Chinese scholar of Buddhism to have contact with western and Japanese Buddhist scholars. He became acquainted with Max Müller (1823–1900) and his Japanese assistant Nanjio Bunyiu 南条文雄 (1849–1927) in Oxford University in the late nineteenth century. Here, Yang was introduced to Japanese Buddhism and many texts found in the Japanese tradition which were not found in China.⁶³

People like Yang Wenhui introduced the western notion of Lamaism into China, and by the end of the Qing dynasty, some Chinese also began to explicitly state that *lama jiao* was not Buddhist. For example, the late Qing scholar Chen Kangqi 陳康祺 (1840–1890) wrote that lamas were cunning and malicious, with the tendency to drink wine, eat meat, marry women, and have no monastic discipline. Chen distinguished the Yellow Teaching from the Red Teaching and stated that the Yellow Teaching could draw talismans and chant man-

⁶³ Tuttle, *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*, 72.

tras for healing whereas the Red Teaching had mantras that cursed people. While Chen Kangqi treated the Yellow Teaching as less malignant, it was still something he thought the dynasty only paid respect to out of the need to govern people on the frontiers, and lamented that no one proposed to put a stop to the *lama jiao* in general.⁶⁴ Chen also wrote that the *lama jiao* as a whole was more deceptive than both Buddhism and Islam. Chen Kangqi is the first Chinese I am aware of who used the term *lama jiao* separately from Buddhism itself. Considering that he wrote his work in 1886, it is likely that he was already influenced by western and Japanese notions of Lamaism, which did not bother to separate the 'orthodox' Buddhist traditions from shamanic practises and sexual tantras, unlike the Qing government's notion of the *lama jiao*.⁶⁵

From contact with Japanese Buddhist scholars, Chinese scholars directly picked up the notion of Esoteric Buddhism as a single religious school with coherent characteristics, and how Lamaism and Japanese Esoteric Buddhism are both branches of a single esoteric lineage taught by the Buddha that spread to different parts of the world. Yang Wenhui started a school in 1908 to try to incorporate Buddhism from other traditions. Among Yang's students was the influential monk Taixu 太虛 (1890–1947), who was highly interested in 'Esoteric Buddhism' as a tradition and sent students to Japan and Tibet to study it specifically. The idea of a single esoteric Buddhist tradition of which Lamaism was one branch slowly appeared in Chi-

⁶⁴ Chen, *Lang qian ji wen chubi erbi sanbi*, 7–8.

⁶⁵ Some popular literature such as novels shows that some Chinese commoners held the stereotypes that all lamas were perverse and had magic tricks since the late Ming. It is possible that by the Qing, they already associated all of these stereotypes of magic and sexual practises with the *lama jiao* and had a somewhat different understanding of Tibetan Buddhism from the state or the literati. These diverse popular views during the Qing are outside the study of this paper. However, the term *lama jiao* is still used much less frequently than the term 'Yellow Teaching' during the Qing, and it was not until the twentieth century that the term became more commonly used to cover all schools of Tibetan Buddhism (often treating them all as Esoteric Buddhism).

nese writings from both translations of Japanese writings and from the writings of Chinese intellectuals educated in Japan. For example, in the March 6 issue of 1910, the magazine *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 [The Eastern Miscellany] with the title ‘Lama jiao’ introduced the *lama jiao* as follows; ‘Lama means pure and the supreme in the Tibetan language. Now, in order to study its teaching, one cannot but study its mother religion, known as the Esoteric Teaching (*mijiao*).’ The article traced both Japanese Shingon 真言 Buddhism and Tibetan Esoteric Buddhism to Nāgārjuna (ca 150–250). Shingon Buddhism received its transmission from Vajrabodhi of the Tang dynasty, who in turn received his line of esoteric teaching from Nāgārjuna’s disciple Nāgābodhi. Tibetan Esoteric Buddhism on the other hand was said to have received its transmission from Vasubandhu (ca. fourth–fifth c.).⁶⁶ Here the article constructed a single lineage of Esoteric Buddhism which was the origin of both the Sino-Japanese esoteric tradition and the Tibetan tradition.

The introduction of Japanese scholarship on Buddhism became even more pronounced after the Qing. The Chinese translation of Japanese studies of Lamaism by Lin Youren 林有壬 (1890–1976), published in *Dixue zazhi* 地學雜誌 [The Geographical Journal] in 1917 titled ‘Lama jiao zhi yanjiu’ 喇嘛教之研究 [A Study of Lamaism] again repeated the western notion that Lamaism was not a form of Buddhism: ‘There are extremely few things that the *lama jiao* share with the other branches of Buddhism in origin. Their history and habits are also vastly different.’⁶⁷ Here, the translated Japanese article used the term *lama jiao* to describe the entire tradition of Tibetan Buddhism since the eighth century, defined by its esoteric elements. The article mentioned that in 747 CE, the Indian monks ‘Śāntarakṣita and Padmasambhava brought many dharanis and esoteric practises to Tibet. This is a type of esoteric teaching which was spread into Tibet again and was suitable for it, also [known as] the *lama jiao*’.⁶⁸ Like the earlier article published in *Dongfang zazhi* in

⁶⁶ Lu, *Qingmo Minchu zangshi ziliao xuanbian*, 787.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 825.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 825–26.

1911, the *lama jiao* was defined as a type of Esoteric Buddhism, but it was considered to be different from other forms of Buddhism as early as Buddhism's first introduction into Tibet. This differed from the Ming and Qing intellectuals' understanding of *lama jiao* and also *fanjiao*, both of which did not consider esoteric practices to be central to Tibetan Buddhism, especially the former term. This *lama jiao* was then retrospectively described as having been introduced into China under the Yuan as a separate entity from the other forms of Buddhism even though the term *lama jiao* and its predecessor, *fanjiao*, only appeared in the Ming dynasty.⁶⁹

Despite the presence of a Japanese Buddhological understanding of Lamaism, the traditional Chinese understanding of the *lama jiao* as similar to Chan in doctrine still existed side by side with this new understanding up to the beginning of the Republican period and even became more elaborate. The gazetteer *Xizang xiaozhi* 西藏小識 [Brief History on Tibet], written by Shan Yunian 單毓年 sometime at the turn of the twentieth century mostly repeated the words of Wei Yuan and stated: 'During the time of Tsongkhapa, Buddhism in Tibet specialised in the esoteric school. It did not practise forbidden mantras. Later it became a method of swallowing knives and breathing fire to impress the masses, no different from teachers of Shaman and completely lost the doctrine of concentration, wisdom, and compassion.' (宗喀巴時藏中象教專尚密宗, 無持禁咒, 遂流為吞刀吐火術惑愚俗以求口食, 大失定慧慈憫之指).⁷⁰ The text further stated that 'when Tsongkhapa was alive, he alone demonstrated the meaning of the ocean of [Buddha] nature' (宗喀巴生時獨演性海之趣).⁷¹ Here, perhaps due to foreign influence, Shan Yunian used the term 'Esoteric School' (Mizong 密宗), but he, like others, did not seem to understand that the line between Tibetan Esoteric Buddhism and many aspects of what he considered Shamanism, such as certain mantras, was far from clear. Like the traditional Chinese intellectual perspective since the late Ming, these practises were also mostly associated

⁶⁹ Lu, *Qingmo Minchu zangshi ziliao xuanbian*, 826.

⁷⁰ 'Xizang xiaoshi', 404.

⁷¹ Ibid.

with the non-Gelukpa schools, and Tsongkhapa alone was said to be able to reintroduce the doctrine of Buddha nature that separates the Gelukpa from the other schools. This is, again, a Chinese Buddhist understanding of what the highest Buddhist teaching should be.

Xizang zongjiao yuanliu kao 西藏宗教源流考 [Research on the Origins of Tibetan Religions] written by Zhang Qiqin 張其勤 and also published in several sections over time in *Dongfang zazhi* in 1911, is probably the most detailed description of the *lama jiao* up to that point through the traditional Chinese perspective. Zhang also quoted verbatim Wei Yuan's description of the *lama jiao* and how the esoteric elements of Tibet were mostly associated with the non-Gelukpa schools: 'Later, the Red Teaching passed down secret mantras, swallowing knives and breathing fire to impress the masses, no different from teachers of Shaman and completely lost the teaching of discipline, concentration, and wisdom' (其後紅教, 專持密咒, 流弊至以吞刀吐火炫俗, 無異師巫, 盡失戒定慧). Zhang then cited the *Shoulengyan jing* 首楞嚴經 (Skt. *Śūraṅgama Sūtra*) to explain what he meant by Vinaya, the tranquillity of the mind, and wisdom; 'taking the mind as the Vinaya, giving rise to tranquillity of the mind because of the Vinaya, and giving off wisdom because of the tranquillity of the Mind' (攝心為戒, 因戒生定, 因定發慧). Zhang further explained the passage above by citing a Chan Buddhist work, the *Chuandeng lu* 傳燈錄 [Transmission of the Lamp]: 'no-recollection is known as Vinaya, no thought is known as tranquillity of the mind, and no delusion is known as wisdom' (無憶名戒, 無念名定, 無妄名慧).⁷² Zhang Qiqin's explanation was largely a Chan Buddhist explanation. He emphasised how the Vinaya was centered on mental cultivation rather than an inflexible set of rules; furthermore, his cited passages using the Chan Buddhist language of 'no recollection' and 'no thought' to describe the basis of Vinaya and tranquillity of the mind during meditation respectively. Zhang then again quoted Wei Yuan and stated that the Yellow Teaching focused on seeing one's nature and saving sentient beings. Different from earlier descriptions, which only described a Red and Yellow Teaching, Zhang also mentioned the

⁷² Lu, *Qingmo Minchu zangshi ziliao xuanbian*, 795.

Black (Bon) and White (Kagyupa) Teachings. Of these, Zhang only noted that the Black Teaching was not Buddhism, whereas the Red Teaching was an inferior vehicle to the Yellow Teaching.⁷³

Furthermore, Zhang Qiqin wrote a reincarnation lineage of the Red Teaching that began with Śakyamuni passing the teaching to Mahākāśyapa, who then passed it on through a series of incarnations in India and Tibet, including Songtsen Gampo and Pakpa—sixty-two people in total.⁷⁴ I am not aware of this lineage from Tibet, and given that Zhang put Mahākāśyapa, a figure of importance in Chan lineages, into the list, it is likely that he created this with the notion that both Chan and the *lama jiao* had the same origin. This is supported by the references he made to Chan figures (such as Bodhidharma and Huike 慧可) right before writing about this lineage. One can see that although Zhang Qiqin had a greater understanding of Tibetan Buddhism than previous Qing intellectuals, his thought was still heavily influenced by the traditional Chinese intellectual understanding of the *lama jiao*. This shows that toward the end of the Qing, *Dongfang zazhi* published articles both on the Japanese-introduced notion of *lama jiao* as well as the traditional Chinese understanding of the *lama jiao*.

Even in the early Republican period, these old Chinese notions of *lama jiao* still persisted. The book *Xizang shi dagang* [An Outline of the History of Tibet] written by Wu Yanshao (1868–1944) also cited Song Yun to describe the *lama jiao*: ‘Song Yun said: “I have tried to enquire about the reality of the Red Teaching. In the beginning, there was no magic and there was only the veneration of Padmasambhava and the devout recitation of dharma-protecting sūtras and mantras. Magic was originally born of delusions. The sages use the way of miracles to establish their teaching in order to loosely control [the foolish] based on customs”’ (松公云, ‘余嘗密訪紅教之實, 初無法術, 僅供奉巴特瑪薩木巴瓦虔誦護法經咒而已。蓋法術本屬妄誕, 聖人神道設教, 不過因俗羈縻之耳。’).⁷⁵

⁷³ Lu, *Qingmo Minchu zangshi ziliao xuanbian*, 821.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 790–95.

⁷⁵ *Xizang shi dagang* 西藏史大綱 [An Outline of the History of Tibet] in

However, by the late Republican period, this view disappeared as a result of not only foreign Buddhological influence, but also of the greater interaction between Han Chinese, especially Buddhists, and Tibet. Chinese monks and intellectuals studied in both Japan and Tibet and attained a greater understanding of Esoteric and Tibetan Buddhism. Taixu opened the Wuchang Buddhist Institute 武昌佛學院 in 1922 and one of Taixu's disciples, the monk Dayong 大勇 (1893–1929), first studied the 'esoteric school' in Japan from 1921–1923 and founded the first Sino-Tibetan education institution, the Buddhist Institute for the Study of the Tibetan Language (Fojiao Zangwen xueyuan 佛教藏文學院) in 1924. He also incorporated Tibetan esoteric teachings in his Buddhist schools as part of greater esoteric Buddhist learning.⁷⁶ Other Buddhist institutes pertaining to the teaching of Tibetan Buddhism were established throughout the 1930s. Unlike sponsorship in the Qing dynasty, these organisations were all private. Furthermore, throughout the Republican period, modern education was more widely introduced in China. A number of works on Tibetan Buddhism or the *lama jiao* were written and many Han Chinese monks and intellectuals often used Japanese and western studies of Lamaism and their methodologies to explain Tibetan Buddhism.

By the middle of the Republican period, esoteric Buddhism became largely considered as an impure form of Buddhism, though Buddhist monks themselves generally did not hold this view. By this time, a new understanding of 'lamaism' as an ethnicised branch of a greater Esoteric Buddhism had emerged and largely replaced the traditional Chinese understanding of Lamaism as a teaching similar to Chan Buddhism that characterised the Qing period. However, despite this, the debate over whether the *lama jiao* had positive or negative connotations in Chinese continued into the present.

Zhang, ed., *Zhongguo Xizang ji Gan Qing Chuan Dian Zangqu fangzhi huibian*, vol. 53, 94.

⁷⁶ Tuttle, *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*, 81–82.

Conclusion

This paper attempts to demonstrate how the traditional Chinese understanding of Lamaism as a concept differed from both the Tibe-to-Mongolian understanding of their own Buddhism as well as from the European and modern scholarly understandings of the term Lamaism. In sum, prior to the Ming dynasty, there was no concept of Lamaism per se; there was only the notion of an esoteric teaching in which Tibetan Buddhist masters were the last among a number of foreign Buddhist masters who had taught such practices in China since the Tang dynasty.

By the Ming, a notion of 'Lamaism' appeared, and there were both negative and positive rhetorics associated with it. By 'Lamaism', here, I mean a form of Buddhism specifically associated with Tibetans with its own characteristics and institutionally separate from Chinese Buddhism. The *fanjiao* that appeared in the late fifteenth century is associated with negative rhetoric, and was the first term that the Chinese used to objectify Tibetan Buddhism as a Buddhist practise separate from the native Buddhism of China. *Fanjiao* was specifically associated with ethnic Tibetan monks and represented the foreign and other negative aspects of Buddhism. However, at no time was this practise not considered as a form of Buddhism itself. Rather, the religion represented all the negative aspects of Buddhism that the Confucians denounced as heterodox. *Fanjiao* was a rhetorical expression aimed at emphasising the foreign nature of Buddhism itself and did not bother to clarify what was Buddhist and what was not Buddhist in the Tibetan tradition.

The *lama jiao*, as a term coined in the 1570s, was an expression of the orthodox nature of Tibetan Buddhism. The purpose of inventing this new term was most likely an attempt to remove the negative foreign connotation of the term *fan* in *fanjiao* since *lama jiao* was now considered a civilising force that China used to transform the Mongols. After the appearance of this term, we first see attempts by Chinese intellectuals to separate magic practises and sexual tantra, which were denounced as not Buddhist, from what the Chinese considered to be the orthodox Buddhist aspects of Tibetan Buddhism. The *lama jiao* itself represented orthodox Buddhism but was inter-

preted through Chinese Buddhist lenses; the Chinese understood the essence of this teaching as familiarity with popular Buddhist scriptures and seeing one's nature, much like the Chan school in China. The tantric element of Tibetan Buddhism, on the other hand, was purposely downplayed, whereas sexual tantra was completely denounced as non-Buddhist, put under the category of the art of the bedroom, and not considered part of the orthodox *lama jiao*. The negative rhetoric associated with *fanjiao* did not disappear after the term *lama jiao* was coined and was still applied to the orthodox *lama jiao* at times in the Qing dynasty, but like *fanjiao*, it was mainly associated with the heterodox nature of Buddhism in general rather than an attack on its corrupt tantric practises.

By the mid-seventeenth century, the Gelukpa School was considered the only school of orthodox *lama jiao*. The concept of the *lama jiao* as being doctrinally similar to Chan Buddhism in the Ming dynasty was carried on to the Qing and applied to Gelukpa Buddhism. What the Chinese considered to be the corrupt techniques practised by lamas, such as shamanic practises, illusionary tricks, and sexual tantra, were projected onto the non-Gelukpa Buddhist schools of Tibet, collectively known as the Red Teaching. There was a prevalent hostility towards sexual tantra among officials of the Qing court since it was viewed as the cause of the fall of the Yuan. Even emperor Qianlong's Manchu Buddhist translation projects saw only a limited amount of translation of Tibetan tantric texts and did not treat tantra as a class of texts separate from and higher than sūtras. This Chinese understanding of *lama jiao* was different to the western and modern Japanese notions of Lamaism, which either focused on the corrupt element of the tantric practises or saw Lamaism as a branch of a greater Esoteric Buddhist lineage. The Chinese under the Qing considered Tibetan tantra as a mere auxiliary practise to Buddhism, similar to the role of tantric practises in Chinese Buddhism. The European understanding of Lamaism slowly entered China in the late nineteenth century through Chinese Buddhists who interacted with western and Japanese Buddhist scholars, as well as through translated Japanese Buddhist scholarship. By the end of the Republican period, this new understanding of the *lama jiao* had largely replaced the traditional understanding, and continues to influence Chinese understandings of the term today.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Donghua lu* 東華錄 [Records of the Eastern Flower (Gate)]. 194 *juan*. By Wang Xianqian 王先謙 (1842–1917). In *Xuxiu Siku quanshu*, vol. 369.
- Fozu lidai tongzai* 佛祖歷代通載 [General Records of Buddhist Patriarchs through the Ages], by Nianchang 念常 (1282–?). In *Pinjia jingshe jiaokang dazangjing: zhuanji bu* 頻伽精舍校刊大藏經: 傳記部 [Buddhist Canon Collated and Printed by Pinjia jingshe, Section of Biographies], vol. 2. Shanghai: Pinjia jingshe 頻伽精舍, 1913.
- Langqian jiwen chubi erbi sanbi* 郎潛紀聞初筆二筆三筆 [Notes from the Langqian Studio, First, Second, and Third Collections]. 21 *juan*. By Chen Kangqi 陳康祺 (1840–1890). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1984.
- Ming Xianzong shilu* 明憲宗實錄 [The Veritable Records of Ming Xianzong]. *Juan* 58 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 41.
- Ming Muzong shilu* 明穆宗實錄 [The Veritable Records of Ming Muzong]. *Juan* 67 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 51.
- Ming Wuzong shilu* 明武宗實錄 [The Veritable Records of Ming Wuzong]. *Juan* 32 in Huang et al., eds., *Ming shilu*, vol. 67, 2625–26.
- Qinding Rixia jiuwen kao* 欽定日下舊聞考 [Hearsay of Old Matters from Under the Sun, Imperially Endorsed]. 160 *juan*. By Yu Mingzhong 于敏中 (1714–1779), Dou Guangnai 竇光鼐 (1720–1795) and Zhu Yun 朱筠 (1729–1781). Taipei: Guanwen shuju 觀文書局, 1968.
- Shaobao Jianchuan Wanggong dufu zouyi* 少保鑑川王公督府奏議 [Petition by the Shaobao Prefect Wang of Jianchuan]. 15 *juan*. By Wang Chonggu 王崇古 (1515–1588). Digital copy available at Peking University.
- Shengwu ji* 聖武記 [Emperor Shengwu's Conquest Wars]. By Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794–1857). 14 *juan*. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1984.
- Wanli wugong lu* 萬曆武功錄 [The Record of Military Affairs during

- the Wanli Reign]. 14 *juan*. By Qu Jiushi 瞿九思 (1546–1617).
<https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&res=711100>
- Xizang shi dagang* 西藏史大綱 [An Outline of the History of Tibet].
 By Wu Yanshao 吳燕紹 (1868–1944). In Zhang, ed., *Zhongguo Xizang ji Gan Qing Chuan Dian Zangqu fangzhi huibian*, vol. 53.
- Xizang xiaoshi* 西藏小識 [Occasional Notes on Tibet]. By Shan Yunian 單毓年 (d.u.). In Zhang, ed., *Zhongguo Xizang ji Gan Qing Chuan Dian Zangqu fangzhi huibian*, vol. 3.
- Yuewei caotang biji* 閱微草堂筆記 [Random Jottings at the Cottage of Close Scrutiny]. By Ji Yun 紀昀 (1724–1805). In *Biji xiaoshuo daguan, ershiba bian* 筆記小說大觀. 二十八編 [Great Perspective on Note Novels], vol. 6. Taipei: Xinxing shuju 新興書局, 1988.
- Yuxuan yulu* 御選語錄 [Imperially Selected Recorded Sayings]. 19 *juan*. By Qing Shizong 清世宗 (r. 1722–1735). In *(Wan) xu zangjing* (卍) 續藏經 [Man Extended Buddhist Canon], no. 1319. Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe 新文豐出版社, 1968–1970.
- (Yuzhi) Jianmo bianyi lu* 揀魔辨異錄 [Records of Pointing Out Demons and Discerning Heterodoxy, Imperially Composed]. 8 *juan*. By Qing Shizong 清世宗 (r. 1722–1735). In *Da Riben xuzangjing* 大日本續藏經 [Great Japanese Extended Buddhist Canon]. Shanghai: Shanghai Hanfenlou yingyin 上海涵芬樓影印, 1925.
- Xiaoting zalu* 嘯亭雜錄 [Miscellaneous Records from the Pavilion of Whistles]. 10 *juan*. By Zhaolian 昭槿 (1776–1830). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1980.

Secondary Sources

- Caidan Xiarong 才旦夏茸. 'Zangchuan Fojiao ge zongpai mingcheng bianxi' 藏傳佛教各宗派名稱辨析 [Analysis of the Names of Various Sects of Tibetan Buddhism]. Translated by Qujuang Cairang 曲江才让. *Xizang yanjiu* 西藏研究 [Research on Tibet] 1 (1984): 111–15.
- Du Changshun 杜常順. 'Mingdai xitian seng kaolüe' 明代'西天僧'考略 [A Study of 'Monks of the Western Heaven' in the Ming Period]. *Shijie zongjiao yanjiu* 世界宗教研究 [Research on World

- Religion] 1 (2006): 23–33.
- Gu Zucheng 顧祖成 et al., eds. *Ming shilu Zangzu shiliao* 《明實錄》藏族史料 [Historical Material on Ethnic Tibetans in the Veritable Records of the Ming]. 2 vols. Lhasa: Xizang renmin chubanshe 西藏人民出版社, 1982.
- . *Qing shilu Zangzu shiliao* 《清實錄》藏族史料 [Historical Material on Ethnic Tibetans in the Veritable Records of the Qing]. 9 vols. Lhasa: Xizang renmin chubanshe 西藏人民出版社, 1982.
- Huang, Bo. ‘The Birth of Lamaism: Religious Institution, Ethnic Identity, and Politics behind Tibetan-rite Buddhism in China from the 11th–19th Century’. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 2021.
- Huang Zhangjian 黃彰健 et al., eds. *Ming shilu* 明實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming]. 100 vols. Edition preserved in the Zhongyang yanjiuyuan Lishi yuyan yanjiusuo 台灣中央研究院歷史語言研究所 (Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica).
- Lopez Donald S., Jr. *Elaborations on Emptiness: Uses of the Heart Sūtra*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- . ‘“Lamaism” and the Disappearance of Tibet’. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 38.1 (January 1996): 3–25.
- Lu Xiuzhang 盧秀璋. *Qingmo Minchu Zangshi ziliao xuanbian* 清末民初藏事資料選編 [Selection of Materials on Tibetan Affairs from the Late Qing to the Early Republic]. Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe 中國藏學出版社, 2005.
- Meng Yu 孟瑜. ‘Guojia tushuguan suo cang *Da shouyin wuzi yao yuanliu kaoshu*’ 國家圖書館所藏《大手印無字要》源流考述 [On *Dasbouyin Wuzi Yao* in the Collection of the National Library]. In *Wenben zhong de lishi: Zangchuan Fojiao zai Xiyu he Zhongyuan de chuanbo* 文本中的歷史：藏傳佛教在西域和中原的傳播 [History through Textual Criticism: Tibetan Buddhism in Central Eurasia and China], edited by Shen Weirong 沈衛榮, 207–42. Beijing: Zhongguo zangxue chubanshe 中國藏學出版社, 2012.
- Qiaga Danzheng 恰嘎·旦正 (Chab ‘gag rta mgrin). *Zangwen beiwen yanjiu* 藏文碑文研究 [Study of Inscriptions in Tibetan]. Lhasa: Xizang renmin chubanshe 西藏人民出版社, 2012.

- Samuel, Geoffrey. *Civilized Shamans: Buddhism in Tibetan Societies*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Series in Ethnographic Inquiry, 1995.
- Shang Feng 尚風. 'Lama jiao zhi ming he xu gai' 喇嘛教之名何須改 [Why Change the Name of *Lama jiao*?]. *Xizang yanjiu* 西藏研究 [Studies on Tibet] 1 (1986): 105.
- Sharf, Robert H. *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001.
- Shen Weirong 沈衛榮. *Xiangxiang Xizang: Kua wenhua shiye zhong de beshang, huofu, lama he mijiao* 想象西藏: 跨文化視野中的和尚、活佛、喇嘛和密教 [Imagining Tibet: Monks, Living Buddhas, Lamas and Esoteric Buddhism from a Cross-Cultural Perspective]. Beijing: Beijing shifan daxue chubanshe 北京師範大學出版社, 2015.
- Toh, Hoong Teik. 'Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China'. Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 2004.
- Tsong Khapa Losang Drakpa. *Illumination of the Hidden Meaning Part 1: Mandala, Mantra, and the Cult of the Yoginis*. Translated by David Gray. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies, 2017.
- Tuttle, Gray. *Tibetan Buddhists in the Making of Modern China*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Wang Furen 王輔仁. 'Lamajiao shi zengyang xingcheng he fazhan qilai de?' 喇嘛教是怎樣形成和發展起來的 [How was Lamaism Formed and Developed?]. *Zhongguo minzu* 中國民族 [Chinese Ethnicity] 10 (1983): 50–51.
- Wang Hang 王航. 'Tang zhongqi yilai de Huayi zhi bian jiqi dui Fojiao de yingxiang' 唐中期以來的華夷之辨及其對佛教的影響 [The Discourse on the Hua-Yi Discourse since the Mid-Tang Period and Its Influence on Buddhism]. *Nanchang gongcheng xueyuan xuebao* 南昌工程學院學報 [Scholarly Journal of the Nanchang Faculty of Engineering] 32.2 (April 2013): 13–16.
- Wu, Jiang. *Enlightenment in Dispute: The Reinvention of Chan Buddhism in Seventeenth-Century China*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Xuxiu Siku quanshu* 續修四庫全書 [Supplement to the *Siku quanshu*

- (Complete Books of the Four Storehouses)]. 36,304 vols.
Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe , 2002.
- Zhang Yuxin 張羽新, ed. *Zhongguo Xizang ji Gan Qing Chuan Dian Zangqu fangzhi huibian* 中國西藏及甘青川滇藏區方志匯編 [Compilation of Local Gazetteers of Tibet, Gansu, Qinghai, Sichuan, Yunnan and Tibet in China]. Beijing: Xueyuan chubanshe 學苑出版社, 2003.
- Zheng'an Jushi 正安居士. *Zhenjia xiesshuo: Xizang Mizong Suodaji lama suozaq 'Pochu xiesshuo lun' zhenshi xiesshuo* 真假邪說: 西藏密宗索達吉喇嘛所造《破除邪說論》真是邪說 [True and False Doctrines: The 'Removal of False Doctrines' by the Tibetan Lama Sodargye of the Esoteric School is a True Heresy]. Taipei: Fojiao zhengjue tongxiuhui 佛教正覺同修會, 2004.
- Zhou Qi 周齊. *Qingdai Fojiao yu zhengzhi wenhua* 清代佛教與政治文化 [Buddhism and Political Culture in the Qing Dynasty]. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe 人民出版社, 2015.