



Anne Cheng and Sanchit Kumar (dir.)

India-China: Intersecting Universalities

Collège de France

Indian Mendicants in Ming and Qing China: A Preliminary Study

Matthew W. Mosca

DOI: 10.4000/books.cdf.7531
Publisher: Collège de France
Place of publication: Paris
Year of publication: 2020
Published on OpenEdition Books: 9 April 2020
Serie: Institut des civilisations
Electronic ISBN: 9782722605367



<http://books.openedition.org>

Electronic reference

MOSCA, Matthew W. *Indian Mendicants in Ming and Qing China: A Preliminary Study* In: *India-China: Intersecting Universalities* [online]. Paris: Collège de France, 2020 (generated 15 avril 2021). Available on the Internet: <<http://books.openedition.org/cdf/7531>>. ISBN: 9782722605367. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.cdf.7531>.

This text was automatically generated on 15 April 2021.

Indian Mendicants in Ming and Qing China: A Preliminary Study¹

Matthew W. Mosca

Part I. Background of Indian Mendicant Travel to the Ming and Qing Empires

Gosains and Tibet

- 1 Indian mendicants, often termed *gosains* in English-language scholarship, entered Tibet in considerable numbers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.² In India, *gosains* blended religious and commercial activities: travelling as pilgrims, they could undertake long-distance trade; residing in monasteries, they were able to take on the role of landlord, money lender, and trader.³ As Bernard Cohn has noted, “In effect the *Gosain* network of pilgrimages and *maths* [monasteries] could be viewed as branches of a far flung commercial house or banking house which facilitated their transmission of money and goods.”⁴ Active across many parts of India, Warren Hastings observed in 1773 that they “chiefly frequent the countries lying at the foot of the chain of mountains which separate Indostan from Tibet...”⁵ Himalayan pilgrimage and trade, as John Clarke has pointed out, were “relatively minor aspects of the overall activity of the *Gosains* in South Asia,” but their presence in Tibet was far from negligible.⁶ The Capuchin missionary Beligatti watched a procession of 40 in Lhasa in 1741; George Bogle found that the Panchen Lama supported a retinue of around 150 Hindu *gosains* and 30 Muslim “fakirs” in the mid-1770s; a decade later, another Company envoy found about 300 “Hindoos, Goseins, and Sunniasses” enjoying the munificence of his successor.⁷
- 2 Contemporary observers and later historians regard *gosains* in Tibet, like those in India, as mixing religion and commerce. Beligatti described those in Lhasa as “religious men from Hindustan, who are rich merchants.”⁸ To William Kirkpatrick, writing in 1793, they were “at once devotees, beggars, soldiers and merchants.”⁹ Gaur Dás Bysack, a pioneer of scholarship in this field, called them “great travellers in India or in the most distant countries beyond it, as seekers of knowledge and experience, or as enterprising merchants.”¹⁰ Luciano Petech dubbed them “that curious class of wandering monks, half traders and half religious mendicants [*sic*] (and sometimes robbers), the *Gosains*.”¹¹

More recently, Toni Huber succinctly dubbed them “mendicant pilgrim-traders.”¹² Some *gosains* came to visit western Tibet’s holy sites and then continued eastward to Lhasa or Tashilhunpo, attracted by the hospitality of Tibetan Buddhist leaders. Others were engaged by Tibetan clerics as teachers and advisors. The eminent Tibetan scholar Taranatha (1575-1635) is known to have received their guidance in the 1620s and 1630s. An even larger number are recorded as visiting the Fifth Dalai Lama (1617-1682) in the 1650s, of whom the names and details of at least sixteen are recorded, most from Varanasi. One visitor, who came twice to Tibet, is mentioned as having been sent from Varanasi to China “on a trade mission.”¹³ Other *gosains* evidently visited Tibet primarily for commerce, carrying pearls and coral from the Indian coast across the Himalayas to trade for gold and other valuables.¹⁴

- 3 Among these men, the only individual whose career has been studied in detail is Purangir (d. 1795), an intermediary between two successive Panchen Lamas and the East India Company. Beginning in 1771, partly using *gosain* envoys, the Third Panchen Lama established relations with Chait Singh in Varanasi, whose dominions included Bodh Gaya. Purangir was sent by the Panchen Lama to intercede with Warren Hastings during a dispute between the East India Company and Bhutan, and thereafter was involved in almost every interaction between British India and Tibet for the next two decades: in 1774-1775 he accompanied Hastings’s envoy to the Panchen Lama; according to his own account, he later reached Beijing in the retinue of the Panchen Lama and spoke with the Qianlong Emperor;¹⁵ in 1783 he escorted another Company envoy to greet the new Panchen Lama; in 1785 he visited the Panchen Lama as a Company envoy in his own right. One of his disciples reached Qing authorities in Tibet in 1793, carrying a message from the British governor-general in Bengal.¹⁶
- 4 Despite his prominence in diplomacy, Purangir fit the mold of a pilgrim-trader. Bysack identified him as a member of the order of Dasanami renunciates, specifically of the Giri sect initiated at Jyotirmath in the Himalayas, and assumes that he first came to Tibet as a pilgrim. In 1775 Purangir and his principal, the Panchen Lama, were jointly deeded a site on the Ganges to which Tibetan pilgrims could resort. As its resident custodian, Purangir traded on his own account and as an agent for others, and received traders arriving from Tibet. As Bysack remarks, “He used to be entrusted with valuable commodities, chiefly gold, for sale in Bengal, and he had a concern of his own also, but never amassed any fortune, which he could easily have done, but he bestowed what he gained in large and open-handed charities.”¹⁷

Travel from Tibet into China and Mongolia

- 5 For Indian mendicants in Lhasa wishing to travel onward, two primary trade routes reached the edge of China.¹⁸ One ran east through Khams to the city of Dajianlu (Tib. Dar rtse mdo), which in the Ming and early Qing periods lay on the western border of Sichuan province. Dajianlu lay within the Lcags la kingdom, whose Tibetan-speaking rulers maintained their internal autonomy despite being regarded by the Ming as subordinates. In 1652, not long after the expanding central Tibetan government in Lhasa started to levy taxes in their domain, these rulers acknowledged the overlordship of the rising Qing government. Dajianlu’s position at the juncture of Beijing and Lhasa’s administrative authority made it “the centre of Sino-Tibetan trade and commerce,” particular after it became a designated site of the vibrant tea trade in 1696. In the early eighteenth century the Qing cemented control over the region and made Dajianlu an

important hub on the newly-garrisoned route between Lhasa and Chengdu, bringing fresh heights of prosperity.¹⁹

- 6 Another route ran northeast through Amdo, reaching China at Xining on the edge of Gansu province.²⁰ The importance of this route rose with the resurgence of Tibetan Buddhism in Mongolia. Stimulated by the meeting of the Mongolian leader Altan Khan and the Third Dalai Lama in 1578, the infrastructure of Tibetan Buddhism began to spread more densely toward the northeast. The founding of Sku-'bum (Kumbum) Monastery in Amdo (1588) helped link monasteries in Tibet to southern Mongolia's largest monastic centre at Köke qota (Hohhot), northern Mongolia's first monastery at Erdeni Juu (founded 1585), the Tibetan Buddhist temple at Mukden (completed 1638), the first Qing-sponsored Tibetan Buddhist establishments in Beijing (completed 1651), and still later to the major temple complex commissioned by the Kangxi emperor at Dolon Nuur. Less settled and more grueling than the Dajianlu-Lhasa route, that through Qinghai offered the fastest way from Lhasa to Beijing and Mongolia, largely skirting Chinese provinces.
- 7 Whether they travelled in China or Mongolia, Indian mendicants relied heavily on Buddhist religious infrastructure, but the precise details of this support remain elusive. Those heading northeast could reach Beijing or Mongolia via a network of Tibetan Buddhist monasteries, and there is evidence that at least some favored Indian mendicants and scholars were issued *lam yig*, Tibetan travel documents that gave the bearer access to provisions during their travels.²¹ For those entering China via Sichuan, evidence outlined below shows that travel permits could be obtained from the local *Lcags la tusi* administration at Dajianlu, and accommodation found in temples throughout China. Whether there were standard itineraries for such journeys, or whether mendicants wandered adventitiously, is unclear. However, many chose to travel to the same holy peaks, notably Wutaishan.
- 8 Given the fragmentary evidence about Indian mendicant travel in China, it is illuminating to consider the roughly contemporary experience of the early Jesuits. It is well known that Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci were closely associated with Buddhism by their early Chinese patrons, and indeed initially described themselves in Chinese as "Buddhist monks" (*seng*) coming from India (Tianzhu). The perception that they were loosely associated with Buddhism, coupled with their ability to speak Chinese, allowed them to acquire the patronage of officials and literati. This support, which fit "into the pattern of gentry patronage of Buddhist monasticism," gave them access to official travel documents, introductions to Buddhist clergy and monasteries, and contact with new patrons who allowed them to journey onward.²² One can therefore extrapolate that Indian mendicants, many of whom could speak Chinese and virtually all of whom were associated with Buddhism by Chinese observers, resided and travelled in China via similar patronage.
- 9 At the same time, the Catholic mission in China labored under significant difficulties that did not hinder Indian mendicants. First, Catholic missionaries aimed to convert those they met, which led them to openly criticise other religious traditions, particularly Buddhism. Second, Catholic missionaries endeavoured to establish a religious infrastructure of churches and mission houses under their own control, rather than use existing monastic establishments. Third, Catholic missionaries were known for their connections to the Portuguese settlement at Macao. Ultimately, although some favored priests were allowed to reside in Beijing, Catholic priests were

banned from other parts of the empire except in imperial service. By contrast, the Indian mendicants did not criticise Buddhism, did not reject the imputed identity of Buddhist monks, dwelt in existing Buddhist monasteries, and had no problematic connections to powerful foreign states. Although occasionally arrested, there is no evidence that any systematic effort was made to find and expel them, or even that they were regarded as a security concern by the state.

- 10 Existing scholarship often stresses that Ming and Qing China was “closed” to foreigners, who could not enter the country without formal imperial authorisation. This is a fair description of Qing frontier vigilance at places like Canton and Kiakhta, where controls on foreign movement were tightly maintained. It is true that some underground European missionaries did manage to survive in China illegally after Christianity was proscribed, but they could travel only infrequently, relying on Chinese guides and adopting disguises and furtive expedients.²³ Very few European private travellers were able to make long journeys through Qing territory.²⁴ Of these, the journey of the Dutch traveller Samuel Van de Putte is most pertinent for the experience of Indian mendicants.²⁵ Van de Putte encountered a group of Tibetans near Patna in 1726, and then crossed the Himalayas and spent the next 16 years in Qing territory. After a sojourn in Lhasa, he went northeast through Amdo (in late 1731) to Xining. He had learned some Tibetan, and presumably travelled via the hospitality of monasteries. In Gansu he adopted Chinese dress and joined the retinue of a high-ranking Tibetan lama.²⁶ As the Beijing-based Jesuit Antoine Gaubil wrote to a French correspondent in 1734,

Un Hollandais qui se dit Samuel Wandepot est venu par le Tibet à Sinin dans le Chensi, par le moien d'un Lama. Il vint en may jusqu'aux portes de Pékin. Son conducteur mourut, et les Lamas l'ont conduit au Miao de Talnor en Tartarie, au Nord d'ici, entre 43 et 44° de latitude, mais à l'est. C'est de là qu'il nous a écrit en italien. ...La lettre nous a été donnée par un Mandarin ami des Lamas.

*L'Empereur aura sans doute été averti de cette aventure, et croira peut-être que c'est ou un espion, ou un missionnaire déguisé...*²⁷

A Dutchman who calls himself Samuel Van de Putte has come by Tibet to Xining in Shaanxi, by means of a lama. He came in May to the gates of Beijing. His conductor died, and the Lamas conducted him to the temple of Dolon Nuur in Mongolia, to the north of here, between 43 and 44° of latitude, but to the east. He wrote to us from there in Italian... The letter was given to us by a mandarin, friend of the lamas.

The emperor will doubtless have been warned of this venture and will perhaps believe that he is either a spy or a disguised missionary...

- 11 Van de Putte was not arrested, and after a return sojourn in Lhasa reached India via Ladakh and Kashmir. It seems that by travelling within Buddhist monastic networks he was largely insulated from contact with the Qing state. Indian mendicants would probably have had even readier access to the same networks.

Indian Mendicants and Buddhism in East and Inner Asia

- 12 The presence of Indian mendicants in China and Mongolia raises complex questions about the boundaries of Hinduism and Buddhism that can only be touched on here.²⁸ The majority of Indian mendicants in Tibet in the seventeenth and eighteenth century were non-Buddhist *gosains*. However, Chinese and Mongolian sources almost all represent these men as Buddhists, and sometimes explicitly link them to earlier Buddhist visitors from India. Chinese records almost invariably describe late Ming and

Qing Indian mendicants as *seng* 僧 (from *Sangha*), that is, as members of the Buddhist clergy, although it could be applied loosely to holy men from other religious traditions. Many Chinese-language accounts refer to these later mendicants as “Arhats” (*Luohan* 羅漢), accomplished Buddhist practitioners. This is likely to mean that for Chinese observers they resembled the distinctive figure of the Arhat still prominent in Buddhist religious statuary and painting. Some strands of Chinese and Tibetan Arhat painting depicted “features [that] seem to recall the Indian origins of Arhats, but through a stereotyping East Asian lens. Examples... show the darkened skin of Indians, overgrown eyebrows, dark beards, and extremely long earlobes.”²⁹ Three of the cases below mention that the monk resembled Bodhidharma, who reached China in the fifth century and is traditionally regarded as having introduced Chan Buddhist teachings, so it may be paintings of him were particularly influential for the identification of Indian mendicants. Familiarity with the Arhat figure is probably one reason Indian mendicants were welcomed in temples.

- 13 Another intriguing question is whether these mendicants knew that earlier Indian Buddhist travellers had found a warm welcome. The Indian monk Sahajasri (*Sahazanshili* 薩哈拏釋哩), also known as Pandita, reached China at the end of the Yuan period from Kashmir, where he had studied Tantric Buddhism. His ostensible motive was to visit Wutaishan, reputed abode of the bodhisattva Manjusri. He was patronised by the Hongwu emperor, and upon his 1381 death his remains were interred in the Xitian temple (西天寺), named in reference to his Indian origins.³⁰ After his death, as Du Changshun has pointed out, his disciples continued to receive imperial patronage, and maintained a distinctively Indian tradition of Buddhism in Beijing. Monks in this tradition were dubbed “Xitian” regardless of their origins, and indeed almost all were ethnically Chinese, although some came from Tibet, Annam, and even India.³¹ Another Indian Buddhist monk who arrived in China in the early Ming, Sariputra (d. 1424), was patronised by the Yongle emperor.³² When the last Indian Buddhist monk reached Ming China is open to debate, but there is little evidence of their presence after 1450, and it would seem that any lingering influence of these court-patronised lineages was interrupted by the withdrawal of imperial support for Buddhism during the long rule of the Jiajing emperor (r. 1521-1567).
- 14 The strongest case for commonalities between early- and late-Ming Indian travellers to China emerges from the geographic terms used for their places of origin. In many cases, late Ming and Qing mendicants were said to come from “Great Xitian” (*Da Xitian* 大西天, literally “Great Western Heaven”). Hoong Teik Toh has convincingly demonstrated the vague and unstable meaning of this term in the Yuan and Ming periods. When Tibetan Buddhist clergy first rose to prominence in China under Mongol rule, there was a tendency to associate them with India. Although Tibet and India were known to be geographically and politically distinct, Tibet came to be regarded as so sacred that it could in some religious contexts be called “India.” This “India~Tibet’ duality of Tibet” grew more pronounced as the Ming period progressed, and Toh therefore cautions that both “Great” or “Small” Xitian could sometimes refer to India, but elsewhere indicate Tibet, Tibetans, or Tibetan objects.³³ Such ambiguity disappears in the Qing period, when “Xitian” referred only to India. Zhang Yushu, writing in the second half of the seventeenth century, equated “Great Xitian” with Enetkek, the Manchu word for India. In the mid-eighteenth century, Chen Kesheng, a geographer of Tibet, added the gloss that “Great Xitian” “should mean India” (蓋即天竺國也).³⁴ In

1782, the Qianlong emperor obtained two jade seals, bearing “Great Xitian calligraphy” and explained that this was a colloquial reference to *Hendu* or the “five Indias.”³⁵ A Qing official with experience in Lhasa noted in 1823 that a Tibetan word for India, *Rgya-gar*, “is Great Xitian.”³⁶

- 15 Another common geographic claim was that these monks were from Kapilavastu, the city in which Gautama Buddha’s family lived in his youth. It is noteworthy that the biographical account of Sahajasri, written in the early Ming by a Chinese disciple, credits him with coming from “the country of Kapilavastu, in Central India” (天竺之中印度迦維羅衛國).³⁷ The Indian monk Dhyanabhadrā (d. 1363), who reached late Yuan China, was likewise supposedly from this place.³⁸ As we shall see below, Chinese accounts typically linked Kapilavastu to “Central India,” referring to the region containing the core holy sites associated with Gautama Buddha. It seems safe to hypothesise, then, that Kapilavastu was used in this context to refer to the region in north India containing the holiest Buddhist sites. Perhaps this is a more specific reference to the area around Varanasi, known as the base for many *gosains* in Tibet. The majority of mendicants mentioned in Manchu documents (Case S) specified that they originated in Varanasi.
- 16 In the Tibetan, Mongolian, and Manchu context, the term for Indian mendicants was most commonly Acharya. This was the term an Italian missionary used for these men in Lhasa in 1741, and was later applied to Purangir and other *gosains*. As Petech notes, it was used in Tibet in the eighteenth century for “every man of parts coming from India,” including the Scotsman George Bogle.³⁹ Klaus Sagaster found evidence that “Ācārya’s, Gelehrte, aus Indien” visited the first Lcang-skyā Khutughtu (d. 1714), a prominent Tibetan Buddhist incarnation closely associated with the Qing court, in Dolon Nuur sometime around 1705.⁴⁰ Manchu sources generally termed these mendicants “Adzar lamas.” In rare cases, Acharya is used in Chinese transcription for Indian mendicants by authors familiar with Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism. Qianlong, writing in the 1780s, noted that Acharya referred to “a mendicant monk from India” (大天竺遊募之僧).

Part II. Cases of India-China Travel by Mendicants

- 17 Since the study of Indian mendicants in China and Mongolia between the late sixteenth century and 1800 is at an early stage, this paper will not attempt to synthesise all available evidence into a general profile. Rather, it lays out all cases known to me in strictly chronological order, before attempting to identify patterns that emerge from this evidence.

Earliest Cases (A-C)

- 18 Indian Buddhists were present in China into the first decades of the fifteenth century. After an apparent gap of a century and a half, a sudden upswing in references to Indian mendicants begins in the last decades of the sixteenth century. The earliest such case I have been able to identify [Case A] concerns a monk named Zuo-ji-gu-lu 左吉古魯, said to be from “southern India” (Xizhu Nan Yintu 西竺南印土), who reached Beijing in Wanli 4 (1576). He was described as having “earrings, an alms bowl in hand, a red felt garment, a dark-complexioned face, and curling hair, the visage of the ancient Bodhidharma” (耳環, 手鉢, 紅罽衣, 蒼紫面, 而虬鬚, 古達摩相也). After lodging initially in the Tianning Temple, he passed through the Fuchengmen Gate into the western suburbs of Beijing and sat for a month without moving or eating. After a eunuch memorialised the throne about this, he was granted gifts.⁴¹ It seems almost

certain that his patron was the Empress Dowager Cisheng (Li, posthumous name Xiaoding, 1546-1614). Known for her Buddhist piety and support of the clergy, she was instrumental in the resurgence of interest in that religion in late Ming China.⁴²

- 19 A second reference to Zuo-ji-gu-lu, differing in some details, is offered by Tao Wangling (1562-1609). He encountered “a Western monk named Zuo-ji-gu-lu, who described himself as a person from the country of Kapilavastu; Kapilavastu is ancient Central India” (西僧左吉古魯, 自云迦毘羅國人, 迦毘羅, 古中印土也). Based on their conversation, Tao offered the following description:

左吉自其國東南行三十萬八千餘里, 經十五寒暑, 達於蜀, 居峨眉一歲, 習華言輒通曉, 自蜀抵京師, 慈聖以左吉遠人, 賜廩萬壽寺, 給紫衣, 居三年, 南游金陵, 萬曆乙巳冬十一月至越

Zuo-ji travelled southeastward from his country for over 308,000 *li* [*sic*], for a period of 15 years.⁴³ He reached Sichuan and dwelt on Emei mountain for a year. He studied the Chinese language and immediately became fluent. From Sichuan he reached the capital, and Cisheng bestowed on him, as a man from afar, an official ration in Wanshou Temple, and also presented him a purple robe of honour. He lived there for three years, and then travelled south to Nanjing, and in the 11th month of Wanli *yisi* [Dec. 10, 1605-Jan. 8, 1606] he reached Yue [*i.e.*, Zhejiang].⁴⁴

- 20 A third reference to this man is made by Lou Jian (1554-1631), who commented, 頃者, 左吉師餅錫至吳, 獲與之接, 惜其為漢音不甚了了, 無從而得其詳也

Recently, Master Zuo-ji⁴⁵ came to Wu [*i.e.*, Jiangsu] with his monk's water bottle and staff, and I was able to come into contact with him. Regrettably, his spoken Chinese is not very fluent, so there was no way for me to get his details.⁴⁶

- 21 Lou tells us that he was hoping to have a relatively abstruse conversation with Zuo-ji-gu-lu about Buddhist teaching, so this appraisal of his Chinese may reflect that he failed to pass Lou's high bar. These references show that this mendicant had lived in China for thirty years.

- 22 Yuan Zhongdao (1570-1623) described the following encounter [**Case B**] late in Wanli 41 (1613):

步至青蓮菴, 遇大西天僧, 能漢語, 自本國至中國, 途程凡八年, 曾入京, 以慈聖太后所賜千佛衣, 及金襴袈裟出觀。

When I reached the Qinglian Temple [in Huguang], I encountered a monk from Great Xitian. He could speak Chinese. From his home country to China, his journey had taken altogether eight years. He had once gone to Beijing, and took out for display his 'Thousand Buddha Robe' and gold-embroidered cassock bestowed upon him by the Empress Dowager Cisheng.⁴⁷

- 23 A third reference [**Case C**] to Cisheng is found in a record of a 1624 encounter by Li Rihua (1565-1635) in Jiaxing, Zhejiang. There Li met and spoke at length with a monk “with deep-set eyes and a slight beard, who could speak Chinese” (深眼微鬚, 能為漢音).⁴⁸ Despite his Tibetan name, this monk claimed to come from a country in “eastern India in the Western Regions” (西域東天竺), a claim that has been doubted by some modern scholars.⁴⁹ By his own account, he had been inspired by the example of a distant predecessor Pandita, whom he identified as preceptor to the Chenghua emperor (r. 1465-1487).⁵⁰ After a journey that supposedly covered over 90,000 *li*, he and his four

companions reached China. Although the details of this journey are difficult to follow, and include references to locations in Tibet and Central Asia, they apparently entered China via the Gansu corridor and sojourned at Wutaishan before being taken to Beijing by a eunuch, where he and his companions received the patronage first of the Empress Dowager Cisheng, in 1602, and later of the emperor himself. By the time Li met him in Zhejiang, two of his companions had died, in Beijing and on Wutaishan, and two were living beyond Beijing, on the northern edge of the Ming realm.

- 24 These early sources reveal something of a pattern: First, each went to Beijing and received patronage from the Ming court, some specifically from the Empress Dowager Cisheng. However, they did not remain there, and in cases A and C they specifically visited peaks known to be sites of Buddhist pilgrimage. There is also evidence that these monks could speak Chinese, likely evidence of a long sojourn in China. It is notable that the traveller in case C remarked that “there was a monk of a previous generation named Pandita who established a teaching lineage and then died in the East, that is, the national preceptor of the Chenghua emperor” (有先代和尚斑的答祖歿東土, 乃成化皇帝國師). This hints that at least some mendicants were aware of earlier visitors who had received patronage in China, but when, where, and how this information was transmitted remains to be established.

Case D

- 25 A second very early case is found in the writings of Wang Daokun (1525-1593). Since it describes an encounter at a temple on Songming Mountain, near the author’s home in Anhui, it probably took place between the time he was granted leave from office in 1575 and his death just under two decades later. Visiting a temple, he encountered a figure of whom he gave the following description:

西來比丘具佛子相, 繡頭環耳, 深目稜眉, 不袷不襦, 不冠不履, 其名日諾曩曩紇哩, 其國日迦毘羅, 其居日韋馱菴, 其師日庚迦哈哩, 是行也, 隨喜東方國土, 縱觀大地山河, 爰及九年, 始通三蜀, 因而遨遊諸夏, 瞻仰兩都, 諸佛地, 則瓦屋, 霧中, 普陀, 五臺, 峨眉, 伏牛, 九華, 諸名山, 則雲華, 雲臺, 岱岳, 衡岳, 廬岳, 玄岳, 白岳, 頃謁肇林精舍, 會逢大士生辰, 言語僅通, 機緣偶合, 叩之, 則再稽法臘, 將反化城, 曩忽亡繻, 茲求援節, 庶資利涉

The Bhiksu who came from the West had the appearance of the disciple of the Buddha [Arhat]. His hair was “embroidered”⁵¹ and he wore earrings, with deep-set eyes and a brow ridge. He wore neither a lined wrap nor an unlined garment. His name is Nuo-nang-li-he-li, he is from the country of Kapilavastu, his residence is the Skanda Cloister, his teacher is named Geng-jia-ha-li. As for this journey, he was going around to visit the Eastern countries, and he extensively viewed the earth and its features. After spending nine years travelling he had gone everywhere in Sichuan⁵², and then he roamed throughout China and looked with reverence on the two capitals [of Beijing and Nanjing]. [He visited] the various Buddhist sites, that is, Wawu Mountain [in Sichuan], Wuzhong Mountain [in Sichuan], Putuo Mountain [in Zhejiang], Wutai Mountain [in Shanxi], Emei Mountain [in Sichuan], Funiu Mountain [in Henan], and Jiuhua Mountain [in Anhui], and the various famous mountains, that is, Yunhua Mountain [in Gansu, then part of Shaanxi], Yuntai Mountain [in Henan], Daiyue [*i.e.*, Mt. Tai, in Shandong], Heng Mountain [in Hunan], Lu Yue [in Jiangxi], Xuan Yue [*i.e.*, Hengshan in Shanxi or Wudang Mountain in Hubei], and Bai Yue [*i.e.*, Qiyun Mountain in Anhui]. Recently I visited the Zhaolin Jingshe [on Songming Mountain in Anhui], and it so happened that it was this great monk’s birthday. Although linguistically we could hardly communicate, our destinies were by chance intertwined. I inquired of him, and [learned that]

he had again accumulated one more year of being a monk, and was about to return to his [home?] monastery, but in the past he had in haste lost his travel pass. Now he requested that I issue him a warrant, in the hopes that this would give him the means for a successful journey.⁵³

- 26 Although the mendicant here mentions visiting Beijing, his account is striking for the sheer number of sites he is said to have visited; only the far south of China seems to be excluded from his travels. It is also noteworthy that he mentions having lost his travel permit, and requests some form of travel documentation from Wang. The source of this original permit is not specified, but presumably it was issued in Sichuan. From later cases we learn that at least some mendicants were granted travel documents at Dajianlu, on what was then the edge of that province.

Case E

- 27 An entry in the *Ming Shilu*, under the date Tianqi 6/IC6/25 (Aug. 16, 1626), details the following encounter:

巡視南城御史王時英盤獲番僧於廣寧門外十方庵，頭結黃髮，面目異嘗，語若鳥聲，字如蛇跡，因而驗察，隨身番經數十葉，原領四川長河西，魚通，寧遠，軍民宣慰司批文一紙，內稱大西天羅漢噴哈喇，願遊漢地名山道院寺觀等語，踪跡可異，當今奴酋得計，全在姦細，乞刺法司譯審，刑部移文禮部取譯字生譯番，批文可據，又有上荊南道掛號，分守川西道查驗各印信關防，又蘭出西天銷本內番字真實名經一卷，與本番認識，本番即踴躍捧誦，法司審實係西番非東夷也

Wang Shiyong, Censor Inspecting the Southern City, interrogated and arrested a *fan* [Tibetan/foreign] monk in the Shifang temple outside the Guangning gate [of Beijing]. On his head he wore yellow-brown hair, and his visage was unusual. His speech was like the calling of crows, and his writing was like the tracks of a snake. For this reason I investigated him. On his person he bore several tens of leaves from a Tibetan/foreign sutra. He initially carried a permit from the Tribal Pacification Offices of Changhexi-Yutong-Ningyuan, which read: 'Jia-ha-wa, Arhat from Great Xitian; he wishes to travel to China's famous mountains, Daoist monasteries, and temples.' His travels can be regarded as suspicious. At present the chieftain Nurhaci is succeeding in his schemes wholly through the use of spies. I request an edict commanding the Judicial Offices to interrogate him via translation. The Board of Punishments sent a communication to the Board of Rites to select a translator and interrogate him via translation. The permit could be corroborated. Also, it bears a registration number from the Shangjingnan Circuit [in Huguang province] and the various seals of the Western Sichuan General Administration Circuit. Further, we took out the *Manjusri-namasamgiti* in one *juan* from the works in the Indian Office [*Xitian guan*] and gave it to this Tibetan/foreigner for recognition. This Tibetan/foreigner eagerly read it with care. The Judicial Offices determine upon investigation that he is truly a Tibetan (Xifan) and not an Eastern Barbarian [*i.e.*, Manchu].⁵⁴

- 28 This official record supplies interesting details rarely touched on in private accounts. First, we gain a fairly clear picture of the monk's itinerary within China: he reached China via Khams and entered Sichuan using a permit issued by the Chenghexi-Yutong-Ningyuan indigenous official (*tusi*) at Dajianlu (*i.e.*, the ruler of the Lcags la kingdom). He then passed through Huguang and made his way to Beijing. His stated purpose of visiting China was religious pilgrimage.
- 29 The origin of this mendicant is not entirely clear. Hoong Teik Toh, despite reconstructing his name as Rgya-gar-ba (Tibetan for "an Indian"), believes that this

monk was Tibetan because he was described using the word Xifan, normally applied to Tibetans. In my view, this evidence is offset by the fact that he was also termed an “Arhat from Great Xitian.” Toh also believes he was given a Tibetan text to read. However, it seems just as likely that the text the monk read was Sanskrit written in the Lantsha script.⁵⁵

Case F

- 30 The earliest evidence I have found for the presence of Indian mendicants in Mongolia in this period concerns the first Jebtsundamba Khutughtu (1635-1723). A Mongolian account states that three men visited him for a brief moment in his infancy and then vanished. The term used for these men in Mongolian was *yurban acira kümün* (literally, “three *acira* people”). Charles Bawden interprets *acira* as Acharya, and translates this phrase as “three Indians.”⁵⁶ According to another story, two Acharyas with spiritual powers, identified as coming from India (*enedkeg-ün oron-ača qoyar šidi-tei ačara kümün*) visited the first Jebtsundamba later in life and asked him the way to the mythical land of Shambhala.⁵⁷ A Tibetan-language version of this story refers to “Acharyas (*a tsa rya*) from India (*rgya-gar*).”⁵⁸ The elder of these men was said to have venerated the Jebtsundamba for his wisdom and permanently entered his retinue, marrying a member of his family. An Indian story cycle is said to have been translated into Mongolian by this man in 1686. The colophon to this tale identifies the narrator as

Bayaqan Pandita, disciple of Saši Pandita, who was fully versed in all the scriptures of Mahā Brāhmaṇa and who lived in the city of Vārānasi beside the river Gangā in India, which is the birth-place of Juu Sākyamuni... [he] translated the complete biography of Bodhisattva king Vikramāditya and king Tümen Jiryalangtu Kisan-a burqan into Mongolian from Indian language [*sic*]...⁵⁹

- 31 Although there are certainly legendary aspects to these stories, they do seem to indicate that the Jebtsundamba Khutughtu had contact with Indian mendicants.⁶⁰ Tsongol B. Natsagdorj has found evidence that Indian mendicants played a role in diplomatic missions sent by Khalkha Mongol khans to Russia in the 1670s and 1680s, strengthening the plausibility of this connection.⁶¹ As we shall see below in cases K and N, there is independent and reliable evidence that such mendicants were in northern Mongolia in this period and did encounter the Jebtsundamba Khutughtu.

Mendicants in the Ming-Qing Transition: Cases G and H

- 32 As suggested by the 1626 interrogation described above (Case E), Indian mendicants were not entirely immune to the rising tensions between the Ming and the Manchus, set against the backdrop of a chaotic breakdown in Ming internal order, especially in the north. Two records openly allude to the effect of these conditions. The first [**Case G**] is found in a gazetteer of Guangchang county, Jiangxi. It remarks:

僧諱麻耶卸納踏，大西天迦毘黎國產也，明崇禎壬午歲入中國，徧謁名山，順治開元避亂廣昌，時人見而異之，留住邑之東北隅蓮花菴，僧面目類達摩，身長九尺，鬚髯長七尺，清修苦行，不屑語言文字，終日合掌菩團，人莫能測

The monk was named Ma-ye-xie-na-ta, he was born in the country of Kapilavastu in Great Xitian. In the *renwu* [15th] year of the Chongzhen reign period of the Ming [1642] he entered China, and extensively visited famous mountains. At the start of the Shunzhi era [1644] he took shelter in Guangchang county from the unrest. At that time people viewed him as unusual. He remained and lived in the Lianhua Cloister in the northeast corner of the county seat. The monk’s visage resembled Bodhidharma, his body was nine *chi* [feet] high, and his beard was seven *chi* long. He was pure and practiced austerities. He disdained speaking and writing, and

spent all of his days with palms joined on his Bodhisattva mat. People could not fathom him.⁶²

- 33 The entry continues with a record of how the monk replied to religious questions posed to him, suggesting that he could speak Chinese.
- 34 The second [Case H] is one of the rare references to Indian mendicants in poetry. Relatively little is known about the author, Wang Siqian 王嗣乾, other than that he was a native of Shaoyang, Hunan, and sat the provincial examination in the *bingxu* year (1646).

宿尚山與迦毘廬國僧夜談

Night Chat with a Monk from Kapilavastu, while Staying Overnight at Zhuanshan

問師何事渡流沙

足半名山願尚賒

I asked the master why he had crossed the Flowing Sands,

He had set foot on half of China's famous peaks, but his desires led him further.

每入雲嵐尋淨地

卻將戎馬怪中華

Each time he entered those cloud-shrouded peaks, it was to seek the pure land,

But because of war horses he was stunned by China.

信知石丈能成佛

驚看玉蕊疑雨花

(自注:彼地石化為佛,無雨雪)

He certainly knew that one *zhang* of stone could become a Buddha.

But marveled to look at jade petals [snowflakes], and was astonished by raindrops.

(Author's note: In his land stone had turned into Buddhas, but it did not rain or snow.)

燈火深談如夢裏

明朝去去復天涯

Deep in conversation over the flame of a lamp, as if in a dream.

The next morning he set off, again for the edge of the sky.⁶³

- 35 It is possible that this reference to the Flowing Sands indicates the Gobi and means that this mendicant entered China from the north rather than Sichuan. Wang's reference to conversation suggests that this man could speak Chinese.

Case I

- 36 In a 1660 (Shunzhi *gengzi*/17) preface to his *Zhi Xian ji*, Lin Huawan explained that he had spent the previous three years as magistrate of Xianyu 鮮虞 (*i.e.*, Xinle 新樂 county) in Zhili. In 1659, during his tenure, he recorded that "there arrived an unusual [or, foreign] monk resembling an Arhat" (異僧類羅漢至). This struck him as strange, because on the exact same date the previous year he had commanded the rebuilding of a temple to house iron Arhat statues that long ago had gotten stuck in the locality on their way to Wutaishan. Observing him during an audience, Lin gave the following description:

其衣服容貌,即古圖畫中達摩一葦渡江,然其兩臂上現浮屠佛像如雕鏤...其學中國語,未甚了了,可聽者什之一二句耳,云自大西天來,幾萬里,不裹糧而自得食。

In his garments and visage, he was just like Bodhidharma crossing the Yangzi on a reed from an ancient painting. But on his two arms there were images of the Buddha as if they were carved [*i.e.*, tattooed?] there... In his study of Chinese he had not thoroughly mastered it, and I could make out only 10 or 20 percent of his speech. He said that he had come from Great Xitian, several tens of thousands of *li*. He did not pack provisions, but obtained food on his own [or, naturally].⁶⁴

- 37 Lin directly links the arrival of this monk to the supernatural behavior of the iron Arhat statues, and describes the episode in a “record of preserving the unusual” (存異紀). It is noteworthy that Lin identifies the type of man concerned by reference to Buddhist art work. Xinle county is very close to Wutaishan, although Lin does not state that the man was making a pilgrimage there.

Case J

- 38 The only evidence for the presence of mendicants in Yunnan comes from the account of Chen Ding (1650-?), probably dating to the last decades of the seventeenth century. When describing the Buddhist monasteries on Jizu Mountain, located between Lijiang and Dali, he noted:

僧多卷毛，鉤鼻，深目，穿耳，即曩在五臺京師及江浙閩粵所見乞食羅漢也。頗知漢語。

Many of the monks have curling hair, hooked noses, deep-set eyes, and pierced ears. These are the Arhats seen in the past begging food in Wutaishan, Beijing, and in Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Fujian, and Guangdong. They are very well-versed in Chinese.⁶⁵

- 39 The major religious patrons of Jizu Mountain, the most prominent site of Buddhist pilgrimage in Yunnan, were the Mu family who ruled the kingdom of Lijiang, recognised as *tusi* officials by the Ming and Qing. This Naxi kingdom combined in this period Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist influences. It is possible that some Indian mendicants may have headed south from Khams into Yunnan via Lijiang, bypassing Sichuan.⁶⁶

Case K

- 40 Zhang Pengge (1649-1725), a high-ranking Han Chinese member of an embassy sent in 1688 to meet with Russian officials on the border of Mongolia, included the following entry in his journal of the trip:

[康熙27年6月]二十七日... 遇番僧數人，面目類羅漢而身骨俱軟，能以足加首，以首穿腋，跏趺似羅漢狀。內一僧能華語，自言係大西天人，求活佛于中國，遍遊普陀，五台，峨嵋諸名山，不見有佛。聞打賴喇麻似之，及往見而知其非也。又聞外國有金丹喇麻是佛，涉窮荒往視之，又非也。值額諾德兵亂，搶去行李，散失同伴，僅存殘喘耳。張子謂之曰：爾捨生死遊遍中外求活佛而不得，究竟信得天下佛果有耶？無耶？僧笑曰：今日方知其無矣。張子曰：既知其無，蓋返而求心可耳。鹿鹿奔走，胡為哉。僧唯唯。從者報，道上有大石，鐫番字如拳，呼僧視之，不能識。

On July 24, 1688... we encountered several *fan* [Tibetan or foreign] monks. Their visages resembled Arhats, and their bodies and bones were flexible; they could put their feet on their heads, and put their heads through their armpits, and they sat cross-legged like Arhats. One among them could speak Chinese, and said that he was a man from Great Xitian. He had sought a living Buddha in China, and had travelled to the famous mountains of Putuo, Wutai, and Emei, but did not observe that there was a Buddha. He heard that the Dalai Lama seemed to be one, and went to see him, but learned that he was not. He also heard that in a foreign country [*i.e.*, Mongolia] there was the Jebtsundamba Lama who was a Buddha, and he trod the distant wastes to go see him, but he also proved not to be one. That was the time of the Junghar invasion; his luggage was stolen and his companions scattered –he escaped with only his life. Zhang said to him: ‘With no regard for your life, you have travelled everywhere inside and outside China seeking a living Buddha but have not found one. In the end, do you believe that in the world there actually is a Buddha, or not?’ The monk laughingly replied, ‘Only today have

I come to know there is none.’ Zhang said, ‘Since you know there is none, probably you can change course and seek it in your mind. Rushing about in a bustle is recklessness!’ The monk agreed. One in our retinue reported that on the road there was a great stone, inscribed with *fan* characters resembling a fist. We called the monk to look at it, but he could not read it.⁶⁷

- 41 This is the only Chinese-language record of encountering Indian mendicants in Mongolia. It is thus significant that the same terms used in China, Arhat and Great Xitian, are applied to these men and their country of origin. Their reported itinerary also shows that at least some mendicants were travelling in both China and Mongolia. Taken at face value, the reported itinerary also suggests that the men came first to China and only later visited Tibet and Mongolia. Such an itinerary would be possible only if they came from Central Asia through Gansu, or by sea. The latter possibility is made plausible by the fact that their first recorded destination was Putuoshan, a coastal monastery in Zhejiang. Although no other Hindu mendicant is known definitively to have reached China by sea, at least some included maritime itineraries in Southeast Asia on their travels.⁶⁸ It is also worth noting that the Russian Ivan Krusenstern learned in 1805 from a Muslim merchant that some time ago a native of Delhi, “of that class of people whom the Indians call fakeers” had arrived in Canton by sea after having visited Burma and Vietnam. He was accustomed to stand in the street “surrounded by a crowd of spectators, and exposed to the constant insults of a number of unruly boys,” wearing only a loincloth. The *faqir* was supported by local Muslims who respected his piety, Arabic and Persian learning, and his “being particularly skilled in the court dialect of Delhi.”⁶⁹

Case L

- 42 In his *Chibei outan* (1691), the scholar Wang Shizhen (1634-1711) remarks:

予在海陵一士夫家，見毘盧國僧，號羅漢，自言明英宗土木之變，始入中國，能風雪中裸體而浴。一日，席上有胡桃，羅漢以齒碎之，凡數十枚。舊住通州之軍山，以遷濱海界，徙居海陵。高郵守某之祖，傳有小像一軸，像上畫一老僧相向坐，自記此僧名羅漢，毘盧國人。一日，守聞軍山有毘盧僧，心疑即其人。試往謁，乃與畫上老僧了無差別。蓋已閱三世百年矣。

When I was with an official family in Hailing, I saw a monk from the country of Kapilavastu, who was called Arhat. He himself said that he had first entered China during the reign of Yingzong [1436-1449] of the Ming, at the time of the Tumu Incident [1449]. He was able to bathe naked in the wind and snow. One day, there was a walnut on the seat, and the Arhat shattered it with his teeth into scores of pieces. Formerly he lived at Junshan in Tongzhou, but in order to move to the seashore he transferred his residence to Hailing.⁷⁰ The grandfather of a certain Mr. Shou of Gaoyou [in Jiangsu] had handed down a small portrait scroll, and facing him on this small portrait was drawn an old monk. He himself recorded that this monk was named Arhat. One day, Shou heard that at Junshan there was a monk from Kapilavastu, and he suspected it might be this person, so he ventured to go visit with him. He turned out to be absolutely the same as the old monk who had been drawn. Three generations and a hundred years had already passed.

⁷¹

- 43 Although this monk gave Wang few details of his travels, two aspects are particularly noteworthy. First, in Wang’s account this monk had arrived in China during the fifteenth century. While the veracity of this claim must be discounted, this might again be oblique evidence that mendicants were aware of their predecessors. Second, the

monk's putative identification with his predecessor was based on the fact that he resembled a painted Arhat portrait. This reinforces the suggestion that the word Arhat was used for these men due to the depiction of Arhat figures in Chinese painting and statuary.

- 44 An epilogue to this tale is found in the jottings of Xia Quan (1793-1842), who cited an earlier work by Lu Shun 陸舜 (1614-1692) concerning longevity techniques. Lu discussed a Shunzhi-era contemporary, Yu Duo 俞鐸 (active SZ 9-14; 1652-1657), who claimed to possess a "Record in which an Arhat is taken as a teacher and the truth obtained" (師羅漢得真傳). Xia appended the comment:

夫順治時有西域僧來吾州，兩耳懸太玉環，人呼為玉環羅漢，漁洋在海陵所見毘羅國僧，即此僧，善導引積氣，壽數百歲，天木所師羅漢疑即此。

When I examine this, in the Shunzhi era there was a monk of the Western Regions who came to my home department. On his ears hung great jade earrings, and people called him the Jade Earring Arhat. This is the monk from the country of Kapilavastu that Wang Shizhen saw in Hailing. He was skilled in directing the accumulation of *qi*, and lived to be several hundred years old. He may perhaps be the Arhat whom Yu Duo took as his teacher.⁷²

- 45 Xia does not disclose how he knew such a monk had visited his native Taizhou over a century before, but given the relative proximity of Taizhou and Tongzhou, it is easy to see how he connected the two cases.

Case M

- 46 In an undated episode in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, Mao Qiling (1623-1716) records encountering on a riverboat near Ningbo a figure he described as an "ascetic sage Arhat in the flesh, of the country of Kapilavastu of the Western Regions" (西域伽毘羅國月[=肉]身牟尼羅漢), who "called himself an Arhat-Bodhisattva and spoke Chinese very clearly" (自稱羅漢菩薩，華音朗然). According to the man's testimony, "Kapilavastu is India, it is termed Great Xitian; it has many Arhats and Bodhisattvas" (伽毘羅國，西竺國，稱大西天，多羅漢菩薩). Mao recorded a long conversation with this man, including details of his travels:

...羅漢發願進中土，經歷百餘國土，凡一十萬八千零里，虎棲狼役，踰闕賚，蔥嶺，經小西天，回回，哈密，入伊吾廬，度婆息，足涉流沙，界朝五臺山... 其進中土時日十五歲首矣，朝華二室岱，所謂朝四大名山者也，岱華卑狹，西域入天不可望矣，今朝海，不得渡，緣禁海也...

The Arhat conceived a wish to enter China, and passed through over a hundred countries, totalling over 108,000 *li*, 'dwelling like a tiger and journeying like a wolf.' He crossed Kashmir and the Pamirs, passed through Small Xitian, the [lands of the] Muslims, and Hami, before entering Yiwulu [*i.e.*, Hami] and crossing Lake Barkol. He trod across the Gobi, and at the frontier he paid obeisance to Wutaishan... It took fifteen new years for him to enter China. He paid obeisance to Mt. Hua [in Shaanxi], Mt. Song [in Henan], and Mt. Tai [Shandong], what is termed paying obeisance to the four great famous mountains. Mts. Tai and Hua were low and narrow; those in the Western Regions enter the Heavens and cannot be seen from the distance. Now he is paying obeisance to the ocean, but he cannot cross it because he is prohibited from going to sea.⁷³

- 47 Although this mendicant does not explicitly state why he wished to travel to China, the reader is left with the impression that it was a pilgrimage to the four sacred peaks. Although we can expect that Mao was somewhat confused about Central Asian

geography (writing as he was prior to Qing expansion into Tibet and Xinjiang), is it clear that the man entered China via Central Asia, either via the Pamirs and the Tarim Basin or (as the claimed length of his journey would suggest) via more extensive travels to other areas.

- 48 Certain details of this account resonate with an earlier poem by Yu Shaozhi (1596-1648), probably written during the late Ming. Yu mentions encountering a mendicant from Kapilavastu who likewise claimed to have travelled 108,000 *li* on his way to China (a figure certainly based on the Buddhist significance of the number 108), in order to visit stupas and famous mountains. He too is said to have gradually learned Chinese.⁷⁴

Case N

- 49 The Scotsman John Bell (1691-1780) recorded the following encounter during a sojourn at Selenginsk in 1720, on the border between Russia and the Qing Empire:

June the 12th, walking along the bank of the river, I was a little surprised at the figure and dress of a man [setting free fish that had been caught]... I soon perceived, by his dress, and the streak of saffron on his fore-head, that he was one of the Brachmans from India.

After setting all the fish a-swimming, he seemed much pleased; and, having learned a little of the Russian language, and a smattering of Portuguese, began to converse with me. I carried him to my lodgings, and offered to entertain him with a dram; but he would taste nothing; for he said, it was against the rules of his religion to eat or drink with strangers.

...

After this interview, we became so familiar that he came every day to visit me. He was a chearful [*sic*] man, about seventy years of age... Persons of this character are called Faquers, and esteemed sacred everywhere.

He told me he was a native of Indostan, and had often been at Madras, which he called Chinpatan, and said it belonged to the English. This circumstance, added to several others, made me believe he was no impostor, but an innocent kind of creature, as are most of that sect. He came to this country, in company with some others of his countrymen, on a pilgrimage, in order to pay their devotions to the [Jebsundamba] Kutuchtu and Delay-Lama. They had been twelve months on their journey, and had travelled all the way on foot, over many high mountains and waste deserts, where they were obliged to carry their provisions, and even water, on their backs. I showed him a map of Asia, whereon he pointed out the course of his journey; but found many errors in the geography; and no wonder; since few Europeans would have had the resolution to undertake such a journey as this man had done.⁷⁵

- 50 Here again is an explicit statement that a party of Indian mendicants had entered Mongolia specifically with the purpose of making a pilgrimage to the Jebsundamba Khutughtu, the most prominent figure in the Tibetan Buddhist tradition outside of Tibet. The fact that this mendicant spoke some Russian suggests he may have arrived via Central Asia rather than Tibet. In 1724, the German naturalist Daniel Gottlieb Messerschmidt encountered an Indian merchant based in Udinsk [now Ulan-Ude] who was “semi-capable in Mongolian” (*anbei der mongalischen Sprache halb kündig*) and may also have entered Qing territory.⁷⁶

Case O

- 51 Li Dun (1662-1736) had an undated encounter with a “person from the country of Kapilavastu” (迦毘盧國之人) in Shaanxi, probably in the first decades of the eighteenth century:

樂哉，今日太白山中見異僧，稜稜容貌，一頭亂髮白于雪，手持大帚，隨眾掃院庭，原與西方羅漢無分別，我言彼不知，彼言我亦不知，但見其舞手而張舌，大眾與我言彼有技精絕，延入方丈中，垂簾地為席，赤身露體，團筋軟骨，一身如綿，百骸可摺，狀羅漢形，移魂奪魄，極巧窮工者，咄咄！此吾生所僅見，即精于畫者亦不能肖其丰格，彼非猶是人哉

Happily, today on Mt. Taibai [in Shaanxi] I saw a foreign monk, with a severe/bony appearance, and a head full of tousled hair whiter than snow. In his hand he held a great broom, and he followed everyone in sweeping out the temple courtyard. He was just like an Arhat from the West. When I spoke, he did not understand, and when he spoke I also did not understand, but I could see his gestures and the moving of his tongue. Everyone said to me that he had techniques of the utmost skill. He was invited to enter the room of the abbot, and putting the screen on the ground as a mat, he exposed his body. He had round muscles and soft bones, his whole body as if twisted together, and all of his bones bendable. In form he was like an Arhat, astonishing and of the utmost skill! Alas, this is something I had never before seen in my life, and even one skilled in painting could not reproduce his appearance and manner. He was not like an ordinary person!⁷⁷

- 52 Like Zhang Pengge in 1688, Li was struck by the yogic abilities of the mendicant.

Case P

- 53 Chen Kesheng (1705-?), an official with extensive experience in western Sichuan during the 1740s, included the following entry in a 1753 work:

小西天在後藏之西，程一月，大西天，又在小西天之西，程兩月。名毘羅國。濱南海，航海至粵，風利期半年，否則一年... 敬佛重僧，名僧日羅漢，彼地民有到爐中貿易者，以珊瑚珠璣，稱歪鬚子，又稱札卡拉，余親問其風土，云然。

Small Xitian is to the west of Further Tibet [Gtsang], a journey of one month; Great Xitian is further to the west of Small Xitian, a journey of two months. It is called the country of Kapilavastu. It is on the shore of the Southern Sea, and with a favorable wind one can sail to Guangdong in half a year, or one year without one... They reverence the Buddha and respect monks. Famous monks are called Arhats. Among the common people of that country are those who came to Dajianlu to trade coral and pearls. They are called “crooked beards” and also called *zhakala*. I personally inquired of them about their local conditions, and that is what they said.⁷⁸

- 54 This record confirms the evidence from Case Q (below) that men from Great Xitian were arriving in China via Dajianlu for the purpose of trade. Chen specifies that they traded coral and pearls. Coral originated in the Mediterranean, and was shipped via a “coral network” from European suppliers, of which the largest was the East India Company, to Indian ports such as Madras (Fort St. George) and Calcutta. Some coral was then sent onward by sea to Canton.⁷⁹ Clarke has found evidence that *gosains* travelled south to Madras (a city visited by the pilgrim Bell met in 1720) to buy coral to sell in Tibet.⁸⁰

Case Q

- 55 In 1750 the governor-general of Liang-Guang, Chen Dashou (1702-1751), submitted a long report, which I will summarise here.⁸¹ He reported that four men from the same home country of Great Xitian, whom he called “Luo Kuan, that is Fan Arhat,” “Old Arhat,” “Little Bearded Foreigner, also known as Guo Arhat”, and Luo Kuan’s adopted son “Fan the Youngest,” had been arrested at the Taiping customs post in Shaozhou, Guangdong, due to their suspicious appearance. They were found to have the large sum

of 49 *taels* of gold and 910 *taels* of silver, one travel pass, and one piece of paper with foreign writing. According to their statement, they had come to Guangdong to purchase such goods as coral and amber. Sent to the provincial capital of Guangzhou for further interrogation, officials were told that,

羅漢等均係大西天國人，向由小西天國，前藏，中藏，後藏等東至四川打箭爐及成都各處，往來貿易，歷有年所，羅寬先在爐地娶妻楊氏，生有三子，後于雍正十二年六月內進京寓居白塔寺三年，乾隆二年出京，又在四川郫縣娶妻羅氏，置有房屋，報縣輸稅，其來廣置貨則自雍正四年，乾隆三年，八年，十三年共有四次，因十三年內賒欠寶林店鄧姓貨銀六百兩，于十五年領有四川明正宣慰司印照，仍同小鬍番并老羅漢，範老么帶銀，來廣借欠置貨。隨查提寶林店鄧姓已于十五年九月內收舖往川，其雍正四年，乾隆三年寓居之店主均經物故，祇有八年，十三年店主崔玉可供認羅寬小鬍番前曾借住店內，收買雜貨

These Arhats are all people of the country of Great Xitian. Via the country of Small Xitian, and Nearer, Central, and Further Tibet, they came east to Dajianlu and Chengdu. They have for years been coming and going as traders. Luo Kuan married in Dajianlu a wife surnamed Yang, by whom he had three sons. Then, in the sixth month of Yongzheng 12 [July 1-29, 1734] he entered Beijing and dwelt at the Baita Temple for three years. In Qianlong 2 [1737] he departed Beijing and was again in Sichuan, in Pi Xian [just north of Chengdu], where he took a wife surnamed Luo. He owned a house, registered with the county magistrate, and paid taxes. He came to Guangzhou to buy goods a total of four times, in Yongzheng 4 [1726], and Qianlong 3 [1738], 8 [1743], and 13 [1748]. Because for the trip of 1748 he had made a purchase on credit of 600 silver *taels* of goods from a certain Deng of the Baolin Shop, he had in 1750 obtained a travel pass from the Mingzheng Pacification Office [Dajianlu] in Sichuan, and as before with the 'Small Bearded Foreigner,' and 'Old Arhat' and 'Fan the Youngest' had brought money to Guangzhou to pay off his debts and purchase goods. We then ascertained that in the 9th month of 1750 [Sept. 30 to Oct. 29] Deng of the Baolin Store had closed his shop and gone to Sichuan. The owners of the shops they had stayed in in 1726 and 1738 were deceased, but Cui Yuke, the owner related to the 1743 and 1748 trips, said that Luo Kuan and 'Small Bearded Foreigner' had lodged in his shop and purchased various goods.

- 56 Local translators were unable to read the document the men carried, but stated that they were not in a European language. Much of the subsequent discussion among Qing officials centred on the fact that the proper procedures had not been followed when the Mingzheng *tusi* in Sichuan (*i.e.*, ruler of the Lcags la kingdom) had issued these men travel permits for their journey to Guangzhou.
- 57 This is perhaps the most detailed description of a group of Indian mendicants available in Chinese. Luo Kuan, the leader of the group, had traveled via Nepal [Xiao Xitian], Tibet, Khams, and Sichuan. Apart from staying for a period in a temple in Beijing, he seems to have lived as a householder and merchant. He had traveled successfully between Sichuan and Guangdong four times. Like the man arrested in Beijing in 1626, he was traveling on a permit obtained from a *tusi* administrator at Dajianlu. Luo Kuan and his party may not have been the only Indian merchants plying this itinerary. Several decades later the British envoy George Bogle met in Tibet a Kashmiri trader who claimed to have traveled to Beijing via Lhasa, Khams, Yunnan, and Canton, very similar to Luo Kuan's route.⁸² Although the record does not say so explicitly, Luo Kuan must have been quite fluent in Chinese, given his business dealings and family life.

- 58 It is tempting to speculate that Luo Kuan had first come to central Tibet or Dajianlu with a load of coral, and realised that it would be easier and more profitable to acquire a further supply in Guangdong rather than returning overland to purchase it in Madras. Given the large sums he was carrying, it appears that his business ventures were successful.

Case R

- 59 This case concerns an arrest made in 1785 in Xuanhua prefecture, Zhili province, to the northwest of Beijing and just below the Great Wall. The governor-general, Liu E (1723-1795), reported that the magistrate of Xuanhua district had captured a suspicious individual, described as:

約年四十餘歲，身高，面黑，有鬚髮長七八寸，紅黃色，頭戴黃布秋帽，身穿紅布單袍，長領平袖，外披白布單一塊，內穿白布褲掛，足無鞋襪，兩手腕均刺有黑字跡數道，右手背亦有黑跡圓圈，右手腕帶黃木素珠一串，項下亦帶有素珠五粒，見人作拜狀，口似念經，亦能寫字，隨念隨寫，自左而右，均不能辯識，連番數次，語言不懂，難以錄供，[?]親筆所書字樣，稟請核辦前來

approximately in his forties, of high stature, a black face, and with a beard and hair of seven or eight inches in length, of a reddish-brownish hue, wearing a yellow cloth 'autumn cap' on his head, wearing a gown of a single piece of red cloth with a plunging collar and flat sleeves. Outside of this was draped a single piece of white cloth, and inside of it he was wearing a white loincloth. On his feet he wore neither shoes nor socks, and on both of his wrists he had tattooed several phrases in black characters, and there were also black circles on the back of his right hand. On his right wrist he also wore a band of brown wooden beads, and he had five beads draped around his neck. When he meets people he makes a gesture of obeisance. His mouth appears to be chanting scriptures, and he is also able to write, and he writes and recites at the same time, from left to right. We can comprehend neither. We have interrogated him several times successively, but do not understand his words so it is difficult to make a transcript. I have taken what he has written himself and reported it, requesting that you examine it...⁸³

- 60 The Qianlong emperor commented in reply:

詢其情形，即係阿訶拉喇嘛，乃大天竺遊募之僧。京城現有此等喇嘛，住雙林寺內。該督因未悉其語言書字，是以未知來歷。現已送京。交理藩院查詢照例辦理矣。

Examining his circumstances, he is an Acharya lama, that is to say a mendicant monk from Greater India. There are currently such lamas in Beijing, resident at the Shuanglin Temple. Because the said governor-general did not understand his words or writing, he did not know his origins. He has now been sent to Beijing, to the Lifanyuan, to be examined and dealt with according to the relevant statutes.⁸⁴

- 61 It is noteworthy that Qianlong eschews the standard Chinese vocabulary of Arhat and Great Xitian in favor of the Tibetan and Mongolian-derived term Acharya, indicating (as all evidence would suggest) that he knew of these men chiefly through Tibetan Buddhist intermediaries. Jin Shen (1702-1782) remarked that he had once showed a Yuan-era coin with an unknown script to a "Great Xitian lama" suggesting that he, like Qianlong, associated these mendicants with the world of Tibetan Buddhism.⁸⁵
- 62 Qianlong's reference to these "Acharya lamas" dwelling in the Shuanglin Temple brings us full circle. The Shuanglin Temple, sometimes called the "Western Regions Shuanglin Temple" (西域雙林寺), was created for the first mendicant noted above, Zuo-ji-gu-lu,

evidently not long after he reached Beijing in 1576.⁸⁶ The mendicant encountered by Li Rihua lived in the Shuanglin Temple before being moved elsewhere at the behest of the same Empress Dowager in 1602.⁸⁷ A 1774 court-ordered compilation states that by the Qianlong period the rear of the three halls of the temple contained a Mahakala statue, indicating Tibetan Buddhist usage, and “is used to lodge Indian monks from the Western Regions” (以處西域梵僧).⁸⁸ Although the expression *fanseng* is open to interpretation, given Qianlong’s testimony it seems very likely that these were the men he elsewhere called “Acharya lamas.” It also seems quite plausible that this was the temple the French Jesuit Fr. Gaubil had in mind when in a 1725 letter he described a temple inhabited by “idolatrous Indian priests” (*prêtres idolâtres indiens*), whom he clearly distinguished from Tibetan lamas.⁸⁹

Case 5: Evidence from Manchu-language Memorials

- 63 Manchu-language memorials and edicts illuminate the development of Qing policy toward these mendicants. The first available indication of Qianlong’s awareness of these mendicants dates to 1760, when he received a gift from the ‘Brahmin’ (Ch. *Polomen* 婆羅門, Ma. *Bolomen*) envoy of a ruler whose Manchu name was Birakišora han of Utg’ali (Ch. *Wutegali bilaqishila han* 烏特噶里畢拉奇碩拉汗), whom he described as the ruler of “Eastern India, a small state near our Tibet.”⁹⁰ This may refer to the king of Khurda in Orissa, Birakishore (or Virakišora) Deva (ruled 1743–80), who styled himself ruler of Utkala.⁹¹ Many of the *gosains* entering Tibet would have passed through his territory when visiting Jagannath temple in Puri, Orissa. This Brahmin envoy only reached Gtsang in Tibet, probably indicating the residence of the Panchen Lama at Tashilhunpo, and did not continue to Beijing.⁹² However, in the following year an imperial edict ordered the *ambans* in Tibet to arrange for two Acharya lamas arriving from Sichuan to be conveyed to India via Nepal.⁹³ Given Qianlong’s interest in their travel, they may well have been returning from Beijing. In 1780, as noted above, the *gosain* Purangir claimed that the Panchen Lama arranged for him to meet Qianlong.⁹⁴ Although this remains uncorroborated, the Panchen Lama did receive permission to take two unnamed Acharya lamas with him to Beijing in that year.⁹⁵
- 64 In 1777, a fixed Qing policy toward Indian mendicants emerged. In that year, the Xining *amban* Hoiling reported that troops guarding the frontier with China had detained seven Acharya lamas, who explained that they had come from Varanasi to make a pilgrimage to the major temples of Tibet and China. Having visited Tashilhunpo and Lhasa, they had set off for Qinghai. There they had received official passports (Ma. *g’ašuk*, Tib. *bka’ shog*) from leading reincarnate lamas, attesting to their status as mendicants and requesting alms on their behalf. Their stated intention was to enter Khalkha territory and visit the Jebtsundamba Khutughtu, followed by a pilgrimage to Wutaishan. Hoiling proposed to return them to India via Tibet, together with an eighth Acharya from Varanasi who had been detained in Pingfan 平番 county, Gansu, and sent to Xining. However, Qianlong ordered that they instead be escorted to Beijing and deposited in the custody of the Lifanyuan.⁹⁶ This established a precedent for such cases. Later that year Hoiling’s successor Fafuri reported that three further Acharya lamas from Bodhgaya (Ma. *Dorjidan*, Tib. *Rdo-rje gdan*) had come to request an official travel pass (Ma. *jugūn yabure temgetu bithe*) allowing them to go to the capital via Khalkha Mongolia. Fafuri instead sent them under escort to Beijing.⁹⁷ Also escorted to Beijing were four Acharya lamas who had arrived from Varanasi in 1785 hoping to reach Beijing and Wutaishan, and a further four the following year.⁹⁸ Since Fulu alludes in

1785 to an unknown number dispatched by his predecessor Liobooju in the early 1780s, at least 20 must have reached Beijing in this period.

Conclusion

- 65 Although much remains to be understood about the presence of Indian mendicants in Ming China and the Qing Empire, this study has found certain emerging patterns regarding geographic terminology, language ability, and routes of travel. Of the sixteen cases recorded in Chinese, half used the term Great Xitian to refer to the place of origin of these mendicants, and half used the term Kapilavastu. In three cases (G, M, P), these two terms occur together. Kapilavastu is usually specified to be the name of a particular country, whereas Great Xitian seems to refer to a larger region. In two cases (C, R) other terms are used for India, and in one case (J) no place of origin is specified. In half the cases, the men are described as Arhats. The terms Great Xitian, Kapilavastu, and Arhat are sufficiently consistent over time and space to be regarded as standard Chinese terms for Indian mendicants and their homeland. Several sources record that the mendicants themselves stated in Chinese that they had come from Great Xitian or Kapilavastu. Indeed, the Indian merchant encountered by Messerschmidt near the Qing border with Siberia in 1724 remarked that in Chinese India was called “Tassitænae” [*Da Xitian*], just as it was called “Dsshágær” [Rgya-gar] in Tibetan, and “Indostan” in Turkic languages.⁹⁹ In Tibetan, Manchu, and Mongolian, “Acharya lama” was used in place of “Arhat,” and Rgya-gar, Enetkek, or Enedkeg in place of Great Xitian. In Manchu documents most mendicants claimed to be from Varanasi, so perhaps “Kapilavastu” was regarded as an appropriate Chinese name for the region around Varanasi.
- 66 Claiming Indian origins allowed these men to travel in China and Mongolia. Virtually all those they met in Ming China and the Qing Empire associated India with Buddhism, and assumed them to be a type of Buddhist. One point on which the Chinese, Mongolian, and Manchu evidence agrees is that these men generally stated that they had come to make pilgrimages to major Buddhist holy sites, temples, and personages. Most mendicants traveled constantly to a range of destinations, and there is evidence that they reached every Chinese province except Guangxi. Among these destinations, Wutaishan and Beijing were the most popular in China, and the Jebtsundamba Khutughtu the most visited person in Mongolia. Identifying as pilgrims explained and justified their presence, and made it more likely that they would be offered charitable support. Although they were sometimes apprehended and questioned, no Ming or Qing official source suggests that their presence in China or Mongolia was illegal *per se*, and the Qianlong-era Manchu sources explicitly state that the men were not violating any law. However, many found it wise to seek some form of official permit, whether from high lamas in Khams and Amdo, the Tibetan ruler at Dajianlu (a *tusi* headman from the Ming and Qing perspective), or the *amban* at Xining.
- 67 Although contemporary observers closely associated the *gosains* in India and Tibet with commerce, this is not the case with the Indian mendicants described here. Very little detail is given in our sources about how these men supported themselves on their journeys. In Manchu documents they were described as impoverished pilgrims begging from pious Buddhists. Only one Chinese source (J) explicitly refers to begging, but since most mendicants in China were encountered at Buddhist temples it can perhaps be assumed that they were receiving support from those institutions and their lay visitors. Likewise, only one Chinese source (Q) unambiguously refers to Arhats from Great Xitian engaged in trade; another (P) specifies that “commoners” of Kapilavastu came to

Dajianlu to trade, but these are distinguished from the “famous monks” called Arhats. This raises two possibilities: either *gosain* commerce was specifically trans-Himalayan, so that those adventurous mendicants going onward to China and Mongolia planned to subsist only on charity, or their trade was discreetly ignored. Since most of their activity in China was recorded in private “jottings” that reflected polite conversation rather than interrogation, and that emphasised unusual qualities rather than prosaic details, the latter is quite possible. Certainly, being categorised as merchants rather than pilgrims, as in Case Q, would have raised obstacles for their travels.

- 68 Most mendicants made some form of meandering Lhasa-to-Beijing journey via either Dajianlu or Xining. Each route had distinct characteristics. That via Dajianlu would have involved extensive travel in China, necessitating some knowledge of Chinese. Indeed, most of the mendicants noted in Chinese sources are described as speaking Chinese. There is only one private record (O) concerning a mendicant in China who could not speak Chinese. This may in part be a function of the sources: literati were more likely to note an encounter with a mendicant whose details they could discuss and record. By contrast, it seems that those going to Beijing or Mongolia via Xining intended to skirt China’s northern edge or even avoid it entirely, travelling largely through the Tibetan Buddhist world. The mendicants hoping to reach Beijing via Khalkha Mongolia spoke no Chinese, and this was also true of the mendicant arrested at Xuanhua (R), probably coming from Mongolia or Wutaishan. This division was not absolute: the party encountered by Zhang Pengge (K) deep in Mongolia spoke Chinese and had travelled extensively in China. Still, it appears that most mendicants chose between a primarily Chinese or Inner Asian itinerary.
- 69 The relationship between these two routes is crucial for considering the rise and decline of mendicant travel in late Ming China and the Qing Empire. Based on the cases currently identified, it appears that these mendicants first reached China around 1570, after a century and a half in which few had arrived. Several trends probably facilitated their reappearance. In 1565 the Newari Malla dynasty shifted to using silver coinage, which led to the monetarisation of the Tibetan economy and stimulated India-Tibet trade via the Kathmandu Valley.¹⁰⁰ Meanwhile, from the 1570s onward, the Empress Dowager Cisheng began to vigorously restore official patronage for Buddhism in Beijing, and private gentry support for the religion also grew across China in this period. For Tibetans, patronage of Indian mendicants coincided with renewed interest in India and its holy sites which “began suddenly at the end of the sixteenth century with the arrival... of the widely-travelled Indian Buddhaguptanātha,” a member of the Nath Siddha tradition, who became teacher to the eminent Tibetan scholar Taranatha.¹⁰¹ The world of Tibetan Buddhism formed an increasingly prosperous nexus between the Himalayas and China. Lhasa reached unprecedented prosperity after 1642 under the rule of the 5th Dalai Lama. Traffic on routes linking Lhasa east to Dajianlu and northeast toward Xining also increased. These developments doubtless reinforced each other.
- 70 More enigmatic is the decline of mendicant travel. Most cases recorded in Chinese date to the seventeenth century. References after 1700 are far fewer, and the only case found after 1750 (R) is likely to concern a mendicant trying to bypass China as far as possible on the way to Beijing. Their departure from China did not mean their disappearance in the Qing Empire as a whole. Manchu sources from Xining show that the number reaching Beijing probably increased in the 1770s and 1780s, corroborating

Turner's 1783 evidence that hundreds of *gosains* continued to enter Tibet. This suggests that neither the Gurkha decision to close the Kathmandu Valley to *gosains* after 1769 or the East India Company's attempt to expel armed *gosains* from Bengal in the 1770s significantly impeded mendicant travel to the Qing Empire.¹⁰²

- 71 If sometime after 1750 Indian mendicants came to be found almost exclusively in Inner Asia –and Qing Beijing was as much a part of Inner Asia as it was of China– both push and pull factors were doubtless involved. The Tibetan Buddhist world of Inner Asia may well have come to appear more hospitable than China. We know that its richest and most powerful inhabitants, high-ranking lamas, supported mendicant travel. Mongol and Tibetan laypeople may have been more generous than their Chinese counterparts. It is also likely that China became less congenial to mendicants in this period. Economic factors may have played a role, but political factors were more important.¹⁰³ Yongzheng's 1724 decision to expel Catholic missionaries from China's provinces probably increased scrutiny on all foreigners. Two large-scale anti-Christian campaigns took place in 1746-1748 and 1784-1785.¹⁰⁴ In between was the "soulstealer" scandal of 1768, which drew more scrutiny to wandering beggars and the Chinese Buddhist clergy.¹⁰⁵ Before 1750, there is only one Chinese record concerning the official detention and interrogation of a mendicant (Case E in 1626). Between 1750 and 1785 there are two cases of their arrest by suspicious officials –tellingly, these cases are the last two Chinese-language records concerning their presence in China. Manchu evidence corroborates this. One party of mendicants was detained in 1777 by Chinese troops at a checkpoint near Xining, on the edge of China. A lone mendicant had been stopped in nearby Pingfan county two years earlier and kept in Xining. Both Pingfan and Xuanhua prefecture, where a mendicant was arrested in 1785, were adjacent to the Great Wall and sites of scrutiny for those entering China. While the Qing state in the late eighteenth century tolerated mendicants in Inner Asia, and even welcomed them in Beijing, it no longer approved of their presence in China. These Manchu documents show that by the 1770s and 1780s many Indian mendicants planned to avoid China, reaching Beijing via Mongolia. Although Qing officials were nervous about allowing them into Khalkha territory, they agreed that mendicant travellers would have far greater difficulty finding support in China. Although these men were ostensibly escorted to Beijing by officials out of concern for their welfare, it is clear that Qing rulers and officials no longer considered it feasible or desirable for Indian mendicants to wander through China.
- 72 If Indian mendicants remained numerous in Tibet, Xining, and Beijing in the 1770s and 1780s, why do they suddenly disappear from the historical record after that date? The Qing-Gurkha wars between 1788 and 1792 probably undermined their position in two important ways. After 1792, traffic from India into Tibet was tightly monitored. Pilgrims and traders were not prohibited from entering Tibet, but they came under greater scrutiny.¹⁰⁶ Once Qianlong concluded that the Gurkha invasions were due in part to rampant corruption among the Tibetan clergy, his lavish patronage of the 1780s gave way to harsh criticism. His son, the Jiaqing Emperor, seems to have had little personal interest in Tibetan Buddhism, and was unlikely to facilitate the arrival of "Acharya lamas."¹⁰⁷ Further research will be required to test these hypotheses of the rise and decline of Indian mendicants in Ming China and the Qing Empire.

NOTES

1. The author wishes to thank Prof. Anne Cheng for her kind invitation to participate in the seminar “Inde-Chine: Universalités croisées” at the Collège de France (June 23, 2017), which allowed him to complete this research. Feedback from all seminar participants, and particularly Prof. Timothy Barrett, proved invaluable for improving this paper. The author is grateful to Prof. Christopher Atwood, Prof. Purnima Dhavan, Prof. Johan Elverskog, Dr. Li Ren-Yuan, Mr. Luo Shengji, Prof. Arthur McKeown, Prof. Christian Novetzke, Dr. David Porter, Dr. Márten Söderblom Saarela, Prof. Stephen West, Prof. Anand Yang, and Prof. Yudru Tsomu, who agreed to read the paper, in whole or in part, and offered suggestions and corrections. All remaining errors are the responsibility of the author.

2. For definitions of the term *gosain*, evidently derived from the Sanskrit *goswamin* and indicating an ascetic, see Gaur Dás Bysack, “Notes on a Buddhist Monastery at Bhoṭ Bágán (Howrah)...,” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 59.1 (1890), p. 52n2; John Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” in *Pilgrimage in Tibet*, ed. Alex McKay (Richmond, UK: Curzon, 1998): pp. 52-53; Toni Huber, *The Holy Land Reborn: Pilgrimage & The Tibetan Reinvention of Buddhist India* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008), pp. 196-197. The term was used very loosely by eighteenth and nineteenth-century British observers.

3. Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” pp. 52-70. See also C. A. Bayly, *Rulers, Townsmen and Bazaars: North Indian Society in the Age of British Expansion, 1770-1870*, 3rd edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 222-226.

4. Bernard S. Cohn, “The Role of the Gosains in the Economy of Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Upper India,” *The Indian Economic and Social History Review* 1.4 (1964), p. 181.

5. Cited in William R. Pinch, *Warrior Ascetics and Indian Empires* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 84.

6. Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” p. 57.

7. Luciano Petech, “The Missions of Bogle and Turner According to the Tibetan Texts,” *T’oung Pao*, 39.4-5, p. 334; for Turner’s figure see Huber, *The Holy Land Reborn*, p. 197.

8. Petech, “Bogle and Turner,” p. 334.

9. Cited in Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” p. 59.

10. Bysack, “Notes on a Buddhist Monastery,” 55n4.

11. Petech, “Missions of Bogle and Turner,” p. 334.

12. Huber, *Holy Land Reborn*, p. 196.

13. Lobsang Shastri, “Activities of Indian *Paṇḍitas* in Tibet from the 14th to the 17th Century,” *Tibet, Past and Present* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 139. Shastri estimates that at least 30 *panditas* are recorded by name as having entered Tibet between the 1300s and 1600s.

14. Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” p. 54.

15. There appears to be no corroboration of Purangir’s encounter with Qianlong in Chinese, Manchu, or (as far as I can determine) Tibetan sources. It is noteworthy, however, that the Korean envoy Pak Chi-wŏn 朴趾源, in his *Yŏrha ilgi* 熱河日記, describes the “lamas” present at a meeting between Qianlong and the Panchen Lama in terms suggesting that some of those he saw were *gosains*. His description corresponds well to that given by Liu E of the “Acharya lama” interrogated in 1785 (see Case R, below):

喇嘛數千人，皆曳紅色禪衣，戴黃左髻冠而袒臂跣足，駢闐匝沓，面皆戕削，紫黑色高鼻深目，廣頤卷髭，手腳皆鑱兜脫。耳穿金環臂刺紋龍。

There were several thousand lamas, all draped in red monastic robes and wearing yellow ‘left bun hat.’ They had bared arms and bare feet, and were gathered together in disorder. Their faces were all thin and lean, of a purple-black colour, with high noses and deep-set eyes. They had

broad jaws and curling moustaches. On their hands and feet were ring-shaped metal bands. Their ears were pierced with golden rings, and their arms tattooed with dragon patterns.

Pak Chi-wŏn, *Yŏrha ilgi* (Seoul: Taeyang Sŏjŏk, 1973), v. 2, p. 261. I thank Prof. Sukhee Lee and Prof. Seunghyun Han for providing me with Korean translations of this passage. The translation of 鑲兜脫 as “ring-shaped metal bands” is uncertain and based on the interpretations of Korean translators.

16. The pioneering study of Purangir’s life was made by Bysack (“Notes on a Buddhist Monastery”); the most recent account is Huber, *The Holy Land Reborn*.

17. Bysack, “Notes on a Buddhist Monastery,” p.87.

18. Luce Boulnois, “Gold, Wool and Musk: Trade in Lhasa in the Seventeenth Century,” in *Lhasa in the Seventeenth Century: The Capital of the Dalai Lamas*, ed. Françoise Pommaret (Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 152.

19. Yudru Tsomu, “Guozhang Trading Houses and Tibetan Middlemen in Dartsedo, the ‘Shanghai of Tibet,’” *Cross-Currents: East Asian History and Culture Review* 19 (2016): 71-121; see also her “Political and Territorial Survival in the Sino-Tibetan Borderland: A Case Study of the Lcags La Kingdom during the Qing Dynasty,” in *Studies in the History of Eastern Tibet* (Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, 2009): 55-96.

20. Boulnois, “Gold, Wool and Musk,” p. 151.

21. Shastri, “Activities,” p. 140; Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” p. 66. On the *lam yig* see also Melvyn C. Goldstein, “Taxation and the Structure of a Tibetan Village,” *Central Asiatic Journal* 15.1 (1971), 17.

22. R. Po-chia Hsia, *A Jesuit in the Forbidden City: Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), p. 93.

23. For some of these cases see Joseph Krahl, *China Missions in Crisis: Bishop Laimbeckhoven and His Times, 1738-1787* (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1964), pp. 99-126.

24. Giovanni Careri, a Neapolitan layman who decided to travel around the world, used Catholic networks to make a return trip from Macao to Beijing in 1695. See Eugenio Menegon, “Desire, Truth, and Propaganda: Lay and Ecclesiastical Travellers from Europe to China in the Long Eighteenth Century,” in *Illusions and Disillusionment: Travel Writing in the Modern Age*, ed. Roberta Micallef (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018), pp. 16-20.

25. Frank Lequin, “A ‘Mandarin’ from Vlissingen in Lhasa and Peking: The Hidden Life of Samuel Van de Putte (1690-1745),” *Itinerario* 9 (1985), pp. 73-91.

26. Bernard Le Calloc’h, “Samuel Van de Putte, premier géographe du Tibet et du Népal,” *Acta Geographica* 107, pp. 35-56.

27. Letter of Antoine Gaubil to Fr. E. Souciet, July 23, 1734: *Correspondance de Pékin, 1722-1759* (Geneva: Droz, 1970), pp. 382-3.

28. This subject is treated in detail in Huber, *Holy Land Reborn*.

29. Rob Linrothe, *Paradise and Plumage: Chinese Connections in Tibetan Arhat Paintings* (New York: Rubin Museum of Art, 2004), p. 15.

30. On his life see the entry “Pandita,” *Dictionary of Ming Biography* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976), vol. 2, pp. 1111-13; Du Changshun 杜常順, *Mingchao gongting yu Fojiao guanxi yanjiu* 明朝宮廷與佛教關係研究 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 2013), pp. 129-131. See also Shen Weirong, “Tibetan Buddhism in Mongol-Yuan China (1206-1368),” in *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, ed. Charles D. Orzech et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2011), p. 560.

31. Du, *Mingchao gongting*, pp. 129-143.

32. Arthur P. McKeown, “From Bodhgayā to Lhasa to Beijing: The Life and Times of Śāriputra (c. 1335-1426), Last Abbot of Bodhgayā” (doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 2010).

33. Hoong Teik Toh, “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China” (doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 2004), pp. 17-58.

34. Chen Kesheng 陳克繩, *Xiyu yiwen* 西域遺聞 (Beijing: Yugong xuehui, 1936), p. 31b.
35. *Yuzhi shiji*, part 4, *juan* 85, and *Baxun wanshou shengdian*, *juan* 26. Qianlong, believing them to be of Indian origin, had them sent to his Buddhist advisor lCang-skyā khutukhtu for decipherment. It was reported that they were inscribed respectively with the Sanskrit words *sarva* and *mangalam* (*Sa'erwa manggalamu* 薩爾瓦莽噶拉穆). How these objects reached the Qing court is unclear.
36. Songyun 松筠, *Suifu jilue* 綏服紀略, in *Zhenfu shiyi* 鎮撫事宜 (Taipei: Huawen shuju, 1969), p. 105.
37. Ge Yinliang 葛寅亮, *Jinling fancha zhi* 金陵梵刹志, 37.1a-2a, in XXSKQS 718, p. 727.
38. McKeown, "From Bodhgayā to Lhasa to Beijing," p. 28.
39. Petech, "The Missions of Bogle and Turner," p. 341.
40. Klaus Sagaster, *Subud Erike: "Ein Rosenkranz aus Perlen"* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1967), p. 127.
41. Liu Tong 劉侗 and Yu Yizheng 于奕正, *Dijing jingwu lue* 帝京景物略 (Chongzhen reign), 5. 28a. HYC Rare Book T 3056 1114.7.
42. Susan Naquin, *Peking: Temples and City Life, 1400-1900* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 156-61.
43. This surely indicates the distance he had cumulatively travelled, not the direct route from his home territory to China. Two other cases below claimed that the mendicants in question had travelled 108,000 *li* to China.
44. Tao Wangling 陶望齡, *Xie'an ji* 歇菴集 10. 15a-b, XXSKQS 1365, p. 367.
45. It is likely that *gu-lu* 古魯 represents *guru*, which Lou here translates as 師.
46. Lou Jian 婁堅, *Xuegu xuyan* 學古緒言 25. 16b, SKQS 1295, p. 289.
47. Yuan Zhongdao 袁中道, *Yuan Xiaoxiu riji*, *Youju shilu* 袁小修日記, 游居柿錄 (Shanghai: Shanghai zazhi gongsi, 1935), p. 228.
48. Li Rihua 李日華, *Liuyanzhai biji* 六研齋筆記 (2. 1a-7a).
49. The monk asserted that he came from a country called Zhuhuo 主活, which had been renamed Qoco (Gaochang 高昌, near modern Turfan) when an earlier ruler had married the younger sister of Qoco's king. The monk therefore calls Qoco proper "old Qoco," and ostensibly denies that it is his home city. Toh believes he was in fact from Qoco, but claimed to come from "India" as a practitioner of Tibetan Buddhism. Toh regards the elaborate travelogue supposedly revealed by the monk to be simply a Uyghur translation of a Chinese account of the travels of the Tang-era monk Xuanzang ("Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China," p. 224-225). He is also described as a monk from Gaochang by Isabelle Charleux, *Nomads on Pilgrimage: Mongols on Wutaishan (China), 1800-1940* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), p. 103.
50. Both Sahajasri (d. 1381) and Sariputra (d. 1424) had been termed "Pandita" in Chinese sources; this could be a reference to them or another Indian monk who was regarded as a learned teacher or perhaps given the title "national preceptor" (*guoshi* 國師). On this point see McKeown, "From Bodhgayā to Lhasa to Beijing," pp. 142-144.
51. The *Emei shan zhi* 峨眉山志 (4.25a; XXSKQS, v. 725, p. 74) records a monk of unknown origin who was called Xiutou 繡頭 because "his hair was embroidered [i.e., matted?] into strands" (髮繡成縷). A later version of this work emends "strands" to "snail chignon" (螺髻), a hairstyle in which hair is gathered into a bun on the top of the head. Wang Daokun is probably using the term to describe the hairstyle of Indian mendicants, who gathered matted dreadlocks above their head. I am indebted to Paul Rouzer for noting this reference. Note references to curling hair elsewhere (case A: 虬髻, case J: 卷毛).
52. An alternative reading of the line 爰及九年, 始通三蜀 is "After travelling for nine years, he then entered Sichuan."
53. Wang Daokun 汪道昆, *Taihan ji* 太函集 85. 24a-b, XXSKQS 1347 p. 53.

54. *Ming shilu*, Tianqi juan 73 (Scripta Sinica). Toh does not translate this passage, but I have borrowed elements from his paraphrase for this translation. “Tibetan Buddhism in Ming China,” pp. 20-3. An account of this episode that differs in some details can be found in the *Songtian lubi* 頌天臚筆 of the late Ming author Jin Risheng 金日升 (juan 21; XXSKQS v. 439, pp. 636-7).
55. The text presented to the mendicant to read was the *Manjusri-nama-samgiti*, which as Toh acknowledges contained Lantsha script. For this reason, it seems difficult to say that the mendicant was definitively reading the Tibetan script. I am indebted to Mr. Luo Shengji for his assistance in identifying extant versions of this work.
56. Charles R. Bawden, *The Jebtsundamba Khutukhtus of Urga: Text, Translation and Notes* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1961), pp. 9, 43.
57. Sushama Lohia, *The Mongol Tales of the 32 Wooden Men (Tučin Qoyar Modun Kümün-ü Üliger) in Their Mongol Version of 1746 (1686)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968), p. 32.
58. *Eminent Tibetan Polymaths of Mongolia*, ed. Lokesh Chandra (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1961), p. 4.
59. Lohia, *Mongol Tales*, p. 17; see also Y. Rinchen, “Unknown Indian Translator of Vikramādiya Tales into Mongolian in the 17th Century,” *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture* 1 (1972): 205-209.
60. It is also worth noting that the masked “Acharya” or Indian mendicant is a figure in the Mongolian form of the *tsam* tradition of sacred dance, which emerged in the late eighteenth century. See Christopher P. Atwood, *Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire* (New York: Facts on File, 2004), p. 547.
61. Tsongol B. Natsagdorj, “ХАЛХЫН АНХДУГААР ЖАВЗАНДАМБА ХУТАГТЫН НАМТАРТ ХОЛБОГДОХ ХОЁР АЗАРЫН ТУХАЙ,” *Xiyu lishi yuyan yanjiu jikan* 西域歷史語言研究集刊 11 (2019): 29-52.
62. *Guangchang xianzhi yiwen buyi* 廣昌縣志藝文補遺 (Tongzhi 6 [1867]), 10.20a p. 1430. Accessed via Airusheng Zhongguo fangzhi ku 愛如生中國方志庫, July 9, 2018.
63. Deng Xianhe 鄧顯鶴, *Yuan Xiang qijiu ji* 沅湘耆舊集 (1843) 40.11a. I am indebted to Stephen West for correcting my translation of this poem.
64. Lin Huawan 林華皖, *Zhi Xian ji* 治鮮集, juan 3 XXSKQS, v. 880, p. 455.
65. Chen Ding 陳鼎, *Dianyou ji* 滇遊記, in *Baibu congshu jicheng*, series 24, v. 26 (Taipei: Yiwen yinshuguan, 1967), p. 13a.
66. On Jizu Mountain and the religious context of Lijiang in this period, see Karl Debreczeny, “Dabaojigong and the Regional Tradition of Ming Sino-Tibetan Painting in the Kingdom of Lijiang,” in *Buddhism Between Tibet and China*, ed. Matthew Kapstein (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2009), pp. 97-152.
67. Zhang Pengge 張鵬翮, *Fengshi Wuluosi riji* 奉使倭羅斯日記 (2015), p. 22. This case is also recorded in Liang Zhangju 梁章鉅, *Langji congshan, xutan* 浪跡叢談, 續談 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1981), pp. 380-81.
68. Giuseppe Tucci, “The Sea and Land Travels of a Buddhist Sādhu in the Sixteenth Century,” *The Indian Historical Quarterly* 7.4 (1931), pp. 683-702. Another reference to a Brahmin mendicant travelling by sea, from Surat to Muscat, can be found in Jonathan Duncan, “An Account of Two Fakeers,” *Asiatick Researches* 5 (London: T. Maiden, 1801), p. 50.
69. Adam (Ivan) Krusenstern, *Voyage Round the World in the Years 1803, 1804, 1805 and 1806* (Ridgewood, NJ: The Gregg Press, 1968) [reprint of 1813 edition], v. 2, pp. 325-27.
70. It would seem that this is the Tongzhou in Jiangsu.
71. Wang Shizhen 王士禛, *Chibei outan* 池北偶談 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1982), 2 p. 476 (juan 20).
72. Xia Quan 夏荃, *Tui’an biji* 退庵筆記, *Siku weishoushu jikan*, pt. 3, v. 28, p. 408.
73. Mao Qiling 毛奇齡, *Xihe ji* 西河集, juan 151 (SKQS, v. 1321, pp. 571-2).
74. Yu Shaozhi 余紹祉, *Wanwen tang ji* 晚聞堂集 (1837) 6.12a, in *Siku weishoushu jikan* 四庫未收書輯刊, pt. 6, v. 28, p. 462.

The poem reads in full:

贈迦毘羅國哈哩師 Bestowed upon Master Ha-li of the Country of Kapilavastu

師從何處來 Where did the master come from?

十萬八千里 For 108,000 li

所歷數百城 The hundreds of cities he passed through

如涉鄉井耳 Were like moving through his own neighborhood.

祖塔與名山 Stupas and famous mountains,

一一皆隨喜 He delighted in one by one on his way.

漸能作漢言 Gradually he was able to speak Chinese,

見我亦人事 And saw that we are also involved in human life;

我國本清平 Our state had always been peaceful,

僧俗皆寧止 And monk and layman alike all tranquil.

一自初祖來 Right from the founding ancestor [i.e., the Buddha]

陸地風波起 Troubles were awash on the land;

爾若效而尤 If you want to follow the example and excel,

打殺喂狗子 Beat him to death and feed him to the dogs.

The last lines of the poem are open to interpretation. The allusion is to the Chan master Yunmen Wenyan (864-949). Apropos of the purported claim of the Buddha at the time of his birth to be the sole exalted being in the world, Yunmen Wenyan remarked “If I had seen this then, I would have beaten him to death with my staff and fed him to the dogs. This would certainly have been a plan for the peace of the world.” 我當時若見，一棒打殺與狗子喫，貴圖天下太平。 This may be a reference to the monk’s origins in Kapilavastu, the home region of Gautama Buddha. It is possible that this also alludes to Bodhidharma, regarded as a founder of the Chan tradition in China, whom some believed these Indian mendicants to resemble.

75. John Bell, *Travels from St. Petersburg in Russia to Diverse Parts of Asia* (Glasgow: Foulis, 1763) v. 1, pp. 284-7. Bell’s encounter is also recorded in E. F. Timkovskii, *Travels of the Russian Mission Through Mongolia to China, and Residence in Peking, in the Years 1820-1821* (London: Longman, 1827), vol. 1, pp. 50-1.

76. D. G. Messerschmidt, *Forschungsreise durch Sibirien, 1720-1727, Teil 2*, ed. E. Winter, G. Uschmann, and G. Jarosch (Berlin: Akademie-verlag, 1964), 210. I am indebted to the work of Tsongol B. Natsagdorj for directing me to Messerschmidt’s diary.

77. Li Dun 李墩, *Songwuge shiji 松梧閣詩集*, 三集.13a-b, *Siku weishoushu jikan*, pt. 9, v. 27, p. 451.

78. Chen Kesheng, *Xiyu yiwen*, p. 31b.

79. Pippa Lacey, “The Coral Network: The Trade of Red Coral to the Qing Imperial Court in the Eighteenth Century,” in *The Global Lives of Things: The Material Culture of Connections in the Early Modern World*, ed. Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello (London: Routledge, 2016), pp. 81-102.

80. Clarke, “Hindu Trading Pilgrims,” p. 54.

81. The travels and activities of these men are outlined in a memorial from Chen Dashou, Governor-General of Liang-Guang, *et al.*, dated QL16/1/13, and received QL16/02/13 (National Palace Museum, Taiwan, Junjichu dang, item # 006452).

82. Alastair Lamb, ed., *Bhutan and Tibet*, 2002, p. 294. The merchant reported that he had been brought into the presence of the Emperor, “who asked him some questions about Hindostan.”

83. Memorial of Liu E 劉峩, QL50/5/24 [June 30, 1785] (rescripted 50/5/26): First Historical Archives, Beijing, Junjichu Lufu zouzhe, reel 98, pp. 1059-1060.

84. *Qing shilu*, Qianlong, *juan* 1231: QL50/5/26 (July 2, 1785).

85. Jin Shen 金旌, *Jinglianzhai shiji 靜廉齋詩集*, *juan* 15, XXSKQS v. 1440, p. 552.

86. Liu and Yu, *Dijing jingwu lue* (Chongzhen reign), 5.28a.

87. Li Rihua, *Liuyanzhai biji*, 2.6b.

88. *Rixia jiuwen kao* 日下舊聞考 (Beijing: Beijing guji chubanshe), *juan* 97, p. 1620.

89. Antoine Gaubil, *Correspondance de Pékin*, p. 70.

90. Qianlong Emperor, “Tianzhu wu Yindu kao’e” 天竺五印度考訖, *Yuzhi wenji* 御製文集, part 2, in *Siku quanshu* (Taipei: Taiwan shangwu yinshuguan, 1983), 1301:411-2 (21:2b-5a).
91. I am indebted to Mr. Brian Tawney for this suggestion.
92. First Historical Archives, Beijing [hereafter FHA], *Manwen chiyu* 滿文敕諭, QL 25/04/10 [May 24, 1760], document number 03-18-009-000029-0001. I am indebted to Dr. David Porter for making this document available to me.
93. FHA *Manwen lufu zouzhe* 03-0179-1867-017.1 (memorial of Guwambo 官保, QL26/3/1 [Apr. 5, 1761]). Transcriptions of this and the following Manchu documents were supplied to me by a friend after the draft version of this paper was completed. I hope to analyze their content in greater detail in a future publication.
94. Samuel Turner, *Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama, in Tibet* (London: W. Bulmer, 1800), p. 464.
95. FHA *Manwen lufu zouzhe* 03-0188-2820-010 (memorial of Umitai 伍彌泰 et al., QL45/3/10 [Apr. 14, 1780]).
96. FHA *Manwen lufu zouzhe*, 03-0187-2714-039 (memorial of Hoiling 患齡 QL42/4/6 [May 12, 1777]) and *Manwen zhupi zouzhe* 04-02-001-000162-0008 (memorial of Hoiling QL42/5/4 [June 8, 1777]).
97. FHA *Manwen lufu zouzhe* 03-0187-2723-011 (memorial of Fafuri 法福禮, QL42/10/22 [Nov. 21, 1777]).
98. FHA *Manwen lufu zouzhe* 03-0191-3072-028 (memorial of Fulu 福祿, QL50/5/20 [June 26, 1785]); *Manwen zhupi zouzhe* 04-02-002-000748-0021 (memorial of Fulu, QL50/12/3 [Jan. 2, 1786]); *Manwen lufu zouzhe* 03-0191-3102-009 (memorial of Fulu, QL51/1/22 [Feb. 20, 1786]).
99. Messerschmidt, *Forschungsreise durch Sibirien*, p. 226.
100. Boulnois, “Gold, Wool and Musk,” p. 179.
101. Huber, *Holy Land Reborn*, pp. 205, 207.
102. *Mission of George Bogle*, p. 127.
103. We do not know enough about mendicant activity in China or Mongolia to reach firm conclusions. If some mendicants brought trade goods from India to China, the rapid growth in sea trade between Indian ports and Canton after 1700 may have eroded their profit. It is at least ironic that mendicants departed from China just as the Indian population at Canton, primarily Parsi, began to increase: see Madhavi Thampi, *Indians in China, 1800-1949* (New Delhi: Manohar, 2005); Carl T. Smith, “Parsee Merchants in the Pearl River Delta,” pp. 36-49; Guo Deyan 郭德焱, *Qingdai Guangzhou de Basi shangren* 清代廣州的巴斯商人 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2005). Their departure also coincided with the dwindling of the (non-medicant) Indian trading diaspora in Russia, dated by Stephen Dale to the period between 1723 and 1747, perhaps indicating impediments to India-centred overland trade as a whole. See Stephen F. Dale, *Indian Merchants and Eurasian Trade, 1600-1750* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 128.
104. Eugenio Menegon, *Ancestors, Virgins, & Friars: Christianity as a Local Religion in Late Imperial China* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009), pp. 132, 145.
105. Philip A. Kuhn, *Soulstealers: The Chinese Sorcery Scare of 1768* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).
106. Matthew W. Mosca, “Kashmiri Merchants and Qing Intelligence Networks in the Himalayas: The Ahmed Ali Case of 1830,” in *Asia Inside Out: Connected Places* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015), pp. 219-42.
107. Max Oidtmann, *Forging the Golden Urn: The Qing Empire and the Politics of Reincarnation in Tibet* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2018).

INDEX

Keywords: mendicants, Indian mendicants, gosains, trade, pilgrimage, Tibetan Buddhism, monastic networks, Arhats, luohan, Acharya lamas, Wutaishan, Ming China, Qing Empire

AUTHOR

MATTHEW W. MOSCA

Matthew W. Mosca, associate professor of imperial Chinese history at the University of Washington (Seattle), is a historian of the Qing Empire. He has a particular research interest in the history of China-India relations, on which he has published the study *From Frontier Policy to Foreign Policy: The Question of India and the Transformation of Geopolitics in Qing China* (Stanford University Press, 2013).