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THE BODHISATTVA MAṆJUŚRĪ, MT. WUTAI, AND UYGHUR PILGRIMS

YUKIYO KASAI

Abstract

Once Mt. Wutai, or Five-Peak-Mountain, was recognised as the Bodhisattva Maṇjuśrī's domicile in this world, that mountain became a popular pilgrimage destination in China. During the Tang period, the special status of that bodhisattva as state protector was reinforced through the Tang emperors' Buddhist legitimation strategies, and the mountain enjoyed prosperity under royal patronage. Over time, the flourishing Maṇjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai was transmitted to Eastern and Central Asia. Some rulers in Eastern and Central Asia who legitimated their rule in Buddhist contexts seem to have been aware of the special status of the Maṇjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai for themselves and their states. However, the Uyghur rulers seem to have differed because they relied upon non-Buddhist legitimation strategies. The Maṇjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai flourished among Uyghur Buddhists during the Mongolian period. In that period, pilgrims from various regions, including the Uyghurs, visited the mountain. The activities of those pilgrims spread information about the Maṇjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai throughout Eastern and Central Asia.

1. Introduction

Maṇjuśrī, the bodhisattva of wisdom, is a significant figure in the Buddhist pantheon and appears in various texts as a central figure, both as a recipient of prayers and as a source of teachings. He is also a popular subject in artwork, where he is depicted in different scenes with a variety of partners and entourages.

On Mt. Wutai (Chin. Wutai shan 五台山, OU udai šan, Skt. Pañcaśikhaparvata), known as Maṇjuśrī’s domicile in China, Buddhist monasteries existed by at least since the period of the Northern Wei Dynasty (386–535, 北魏). The identification of the Bodhisattva Maṇjuśrī’s residence as Mt. Wutai was supported in particular by the Avatamsakasūtra, which explains that this bodhisattva dwells in the...
mundane world on a mountain. ¹ A foreword added to the Uṣṇīṣavijayadhāraṇīsūtra (T. 967) also contains a notable account. Buddhapālita, an Indian monk, translated this sūtra into Chinese. According to its foreword, composed in 689–730, he encountered the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī at Mt. Wutai, where Mañjuśrī asked Buddhapālita to carry and promote the text in China. This account probably contributed to proliferating the idea of Mt. Wutai as Mañjuśrī’s domicile. It also indicates that the mountain was a pilgrimage destination, even for monks from India, at the end of the 7th century.²

This bodhisattva and his Chinese domicile seem to have been known to the Uyghur Buddhists, too. Following their conversion to Buddhism, in the second half of the 10th century or at the beginning of the 11th century, they produced various Buddhist texts and Buddhist artifacts.³


² It also reveals that China’s perception was changed in Buddhist contexts in that period. Unlike in the previous period, China was no longer the Buddhist borderland, but became a centre of Buddhism. For a detailed discussion, see Tansen Sen, Buddhism, Diplomacy, and Trade. The Realignment of Sino-Indian Relations, 600–1400 (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2003), 56, 76–81; Nakata Mie 中田美繪, “Tangdai zhongguo fojiao de zhuaihuan–yi bianzhu zhongxin yi zhi wei qierudian 唐代中國佛教的轉換–以邊土、中心意識為切入點, Transitions of Chinese Buddhism during the Tang Period: From the Perspective of Peripheral Consciousness and Sino-centrism,” Tang yanjiu 唐研究 Journal of Tang Studies 18 (2012): 333–355.

Most of these are found in the Turfan oasis, the former centre of the West Uyghur Kingdom (second half 9th c. to 13th c.). However, among those materials, only a few Old Uyghur sources provide information on Uyghurs worshipping this bodhisattva. They include an eulogy on Mt. Wutai, a few Buddhist sūtras on the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, scribbles written by the pilgrims, and mural paintings. The first two text genres (for which good philological research already exists) provide the textual basis for the worship of Mañjuśrī, but these texts do not show how this bodhisattva’s cult developed and spread among the Uyghur Buddhists. The mural paintings also indicate Mañjuśrī’s popularity among the Buddhists in Turfan, but they were not necessarily completed by the Uyghurs, except when the corresponding inscriptions indicate otherwise. The pilgrims’ scribbles, on the other hand, could provide some real indication of the Uyghurs’ worship of Mañjuśrī and Mt. Wutai. Most of those scribbles are, however, fragmentary and short and mention only the name of this bodhisattva.

Scholars have already examined those limited Uyghur sources and prepared good philological works for the texts. If we remain satisfied with examining only those sources, we cannot expect any remarkable progress in research on the Mañjuśrī cult among the Uyghurs. Although there are individual textual comparisons between Old Uyghur and Chinese texts, the comparative study of that cult in Uyghur’s neighboring areas remains an important topic. In this paper, therefore, we get a picture of the Mañjuśrī cult in China and Central Asia, compare it with the above-mentioned Uyghur sources, and discuss the characteristics of that cult and its development among the Uyghur Buddhists.

2. The Mañjuśrī Cult at Mt. Wutai and its Political Significance in the Late Tang Period in China

The Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai in China is a well-researched topic, so that it is not necessary to repeat such research in detail. However, several

---

new studies were recently published that examine in particular the relationship of Mañjuśrī at Mt. Wutai with the legitimization of the Chinese emperors. Thus, an overview on that topic is relevant to a discussion later in this paper.

After the establishment of Mañjuśrī cult in China, Mt. Wutai drew considerably more attention as a sacred site and pilgrimage centre through imperial sponsorship under Empress Wu Zetian (625–705, 武則天). She intended her assiduous support of the mountain to reinforce her efforts to legitimise her rise to power after the illness and death of her husband, Emperor Gaozong (r. 649–683, 高宗).⁴

In the second half of the 8th century, the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī became particularly relevant for the Tang emperors. In that period, the Tang Dynasty was destabilised and its emperors’ authority was significantly damaged as a result of military invasion and rebellions, including that of An Lushan (703–757, 安祿山) and Shi Siming (703–761, 史思明). Thus, the dynasty had an urgent need to re-establish the rulers’ authority. In that context, Amoghavajra (705–774, Chin. Bukong Jin’gang 不空金剛),⁵ who was one of the most influential Buddhist monks at the Tang court, equated the contemporaneous Tang Emperor Daizong (r. 762–779, 代宗) with the Buddhist universal ruler, cakravartin⁶, specifically the Gold Wheel-turning Sage King (Chin. jinlunwang 金輪王), namely ekākṣaroṣṇīṣacakravartin. At the same time, he promoted the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai in connection with the protection of the state and its rulers.⁷ He gave much weight to the cult

---

⁴ See, e.g., Lin, Building a Sacred Mountain, 115–120.
⁶ See, e.g., Birnbaum, Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī, 37.
⁷ Many researchers have addressed Amoghavajra’s promotion of the Mañjuśrī cult. See, e.g., Birnbaum, Studies on the Mysteries of Mañjuśrī, 25–38; Lehnert, “Amoghavajra,” 357; Ku Cheng Mei 古正美, “Tang daizong yu bukong jingang de wenshu xinyang 唐代宗與不空金剛的文殊信仰. The Manjusri Belief of Emperor
and strongly lobbied Daizong to bestow royal sponsorship on Mt. Wutai. Daizong devoutly worshiped Mañjuśrī, and in 766, he sponsored the reconstruction of the Jinge Temple (Chin. Jinge si, 金閣寺) at Mt. Wutai in response to Amoghavajra’s request.8

According to recent studies, Amoghavajra’s teachings on the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī were materialized in Jinge Temple’s three levels. On the first level was a statue of Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī sitting on a lion, and on the second level were the five Buddhas, Aksobhya, Ratnasambhava, Mahāvairocana, Amitāyus, and Amoghasiddhi. The third level was devoted to five Buddha attendants (Skt. buddhoṣṇīṣa), which deify the protuberance at the top of the Buddha’s head, namely Baisangai fodingwang (白傘蓋佛頂王), Sheng fodingwang (勝佛頂王), Yizi fodingwang (一字佛頂王), Gao fodingwang (高佛頂王) and Guangju fodingwang (光佛頂王), which are based on the Bodhimaṇḍanirdeśaekākāṅṣṇīṣacakravartirājasūtra (T. 950.19).9 The sculpture on the first level seems to have been established before the reconstruction.

In Esoteric Buddhism, the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī is depicted with five knots of hair (Chin. Wuji Wenshu 五髻文殊) and alluded to by the five-syllabled mantra, a-ra-pa-ca-na, which purifies all kinds of sins and protects the state. His five knots are equated with the five terrains of Mt. Wutai, and each of them corresponds to one of the five Buddhas.


9 See Ku, “Tang daizong yu bukong jingang de wenshu xinyang,” 67; Nakata, “Godaisan monju shinkō to ōken,” 44.
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mentioned above, whose statues were located on the second level.\textsuperscript{10} Therefore, the sculptures on the first and second floors were closely connected in Esoteric Buddhist theory, a tradition that was promoted by Amoghavajra. Furthermore, the five \textit{buddhoṣṇīṣas} on the third level of the temple were also depicted on the diadem of the Buddha Mahāvairocana, one of the five Buddhas represented on the second level. This indicates that all \textit{buddhoṣṇīṣas} stem from the Buddha Mahāvairocana, who again cannot exist without the existence of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī.\textsuperscript{11}

The Japanese scholar, Mie Nakata, tries to connect Amoghavajra’s teaching, which was visualised in Jinge Temple, with his efforts to legitimize Emperor Daizong.\textsuperscript{12} She assumes that the temple that was reconstructed in the name of Emperor Daizong embodied Amoghavajra’s new Buddhist legitimation strategy. In her theory, the Tang emperors indirectly accrued from the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, the new source of their authority.\textsuperscript{13} Nakata’s idea remains controversial.\textsuperscript{14}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in Esoteric form does not ride on the lion, unlike the sculpture on the first level. In the so-called new type Mañjuśrī (Chin. \textit{xinyang wenshu 新様文殊}) which was widespread from the end of the Tang period onward, however, Mañjuśrī rides on the lion and possesses a five-syllable-invocation. Thus, Nakata deems that the sculptures in the Jinge Temple show the fusion of the two ideas of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Amogavajra’s Esoteric one and that which was popular before his period in China, see Nakata, “Godaisan monju shinkō to ōken,” 46–47.
\item Besides the works mentioned above, Lin also discusses Amoghavajra’s strong initiative on the reconstruction of this temple and the visualisation of his Esoteric Buddhist teaching through the iconographic programme in the temple and its architectural meaning, see Lin, \textit{Building a Sacred Mountain}, 132–154.
\item The connection between the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, his role as the state protector, and Emperor Daizong’s legitimation is discussed in many articles, including the above-mentioned one by Ku. Besides the Mañjuśrī cult, Ku, however, underlines a close relationship between the importance of the Avalokiteśvara cult for the emperors’ legitimation. See Ku, “Tang daizong yu bukong jingang de wenshu xinyang,” 69.
\item Nakata, “Godaisan monju shinkō to ōken,” 47–49. Dorothy C. Wong also points out the close connection between the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Mt. Wutai, and the rulers who were identified as the \textit{cakravartin}. See Dorothy C. Wong, “A Reassessment of the Representation of Mt. Wutai from Dunhuang Cave 61,” \textit{Archives of Asian Art} 46 (1993): 38.
\item Hideo Iwasaki, for example, criticises Nakata’s theory. See Iwasaki Hideo 岩崎日出男, “Fukū sanzō no godaisan monju shinkō senpu ni kansuru shomondai – tokuni Nakata Mie shi no setsuron ni taisuru hihan hento chūshin to shite– 不空三蔵の五台山文殊信仰宣布に関する諸問題-特に中田美絵氏の拙論に対する批判へ-” \textit{BuddhistRoad Paper} 5.4. Kasai, “The Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Mt. Wutai, and Uyghur Pilgrims”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
However, given Mañjuśrī’s function as a state protector, the special value of that bodhisattva’s domicile for rulers, including the Tang emperors, is worth considering.

3. Mañjuśrī Cult at Mt. Wutai in Chinese Neighbourhood

3.1. Tibetan Empire, Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms, Khitan, and Tangut Empires

The newly developed Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai in China was transmitted to its neighbouring states, and the mountain quickly became a popular destination for the pilgrims from those areas. In some states, this bodhisattva and mountain also seem to have been connected with their respective rulerships, as was the case in China. This section takes into consideration four Uyghur’s important neighbouring states, the Tibetan Empire, the two dynasties established after the Tang Dynasty in Northern China, the Khitan Empire, and the Tangut Empire, and discusses how the rulers of those state adopted the special role of Mañjuśrī and Mt. Wutai for their rule.

反論を中心として– The Mt. Wutai Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī Faith of Amoghavajra and Various Problems Related to its Propagation,” *Higashi ajia bukkyō kenkyū* 東アジア仏教研究 *The Journal of East Asian Buddhist Studies* 9 (2011): 3–15. The article was not accessible in Germany, so that I could not review the contents for further discussion.

In Chinese sources, pilgrims from various states from Central and Eastern Asia were reported. See, e.g. Rong Xinjiang 荣新江, “Cong Dunhuang de Wutai shan huihua he wenxian kan Wudai Songchu zhongyuan yu Hexi Yutian jiande wenhua jiaozhu 从敦煌的五台山绘画和文献看五代宋初中原与河西于阗间的文化交住 [Cultural Exchanges between Central China and Hexi, Khotan during the Five Dynasties Period and at the Beginning of the Song Period Seen from the Paintings and Manuscripts of Mt. Wutai in Dunhuang],” *Wenbo* 文博 *Relics and Museology* 4 (1987): 71–74; Rong Xinjiang 荣新江, “Dunhuang wenxian he huihua fanying de Wudai Songchu zhongyuan yu Xibei diqu de wenhua jiaozhu 敦煌文献和绘画反映的五代宋初中原与西北地区的文化交住 [Cultural Exchanges between Central China and the Northwestern Regions during the Five Dynasties Period and at the Beginning of the Song Period Reflected in Dunhuang Manuscripts and Paintings],” *Beijing daxue xuebao (Zhexue shehui kexue ban)* 北京大学学报(哲学社会科学版) [Beijing University Journal (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)] 2 (1988): 59–60. Those pilgrims often came with the emissaries from those states.
3.1.1. **Tibetan Empire**

In terms of the Uyghur’s neighbouring regions in Central Asia, Tibetan pilgrimage at Mt. Wutai is already recorded in the middle of the 8th century in one early Tibetan historical source, the *Testament of Ba* (*sba bzhes*). In 824 the Tibetan emperor officially requested a map of the mountain from the Tang court, indicating they likely followed the development of the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai with great interest.\(^16\)

However, whether this mountain was similarly connected with rulers in the Tibetan Empire (Tib. Bod chen po, ca. 7th c. to 842) has not yet been determined. A Tibetan source written in the 13th century reports that the first Tibetan Emperor Songtsen Gampo (r. ca. 605–649, Tib. Srong btsan sgam po) visited the mountain and built one hundred and eight temples there.\(^17\) This indicates that in the period when the source was written, the mountain also had special significance for Tibetan rulers. In this context, it is worth mentioning that the other Buddhist association of the Tibetan rulers as *cakravartin* or bodhisattva does not seem to have been established in the imperial period.\(^18\) This indicates that although the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai also gained a following among Tibetan Buddhists, in the imperial period it probably did not play an essential role for the Tibetan emperors’ legitimation strategies.\(^19\)

---


\(^{19}\) Tibetan kingship probably had its own tradition in which Indian, Chinese, and Central Eurasian elements are intricately interwined each other, see e.g., Michael L. Walter, *Buddhism and Empire. The Political and Religious Culture of Early Tibet* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2009), 18–23; Brandon Dotson, “Theorising the King: Implicit and Explicit Sources for the Study of Tibetan Sacred Kingship,” *Revue d’Études Tibétaines* 21 (2011): 83–103.
3.1.2. *Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms*

Some states whose territories covered the northern part of China during the Five Dynasties and Ten Kingdoms period (907–979), seem to have been aware of the special status of Mt. Wutai for rulers. In the Later Tang Dynasty (923–935, 後唐) and the Northern Han (948–979, 北漢), which were established by the Turkish speaking clan Shatuo (沙陀), the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai was actively promoted. The monks from that mountain were given relevant posts in the imperial court. The mountain and the monks played a vital role in the founding of the Later Tang Dynasty.²⁰ Mt. Wutai supported the legitimation of that dynasty, which claimed to re-establish the Tang Dynasty. Its significant role for the rulers, especially the Tang rulers, was pursued from then on.

3.1.3. *Khitan and Tangut Empires*

In the Khitan Empire (907–1125, in Chinese sources known as Liao 遼), the worship of Mañjuśrī at Mt. Wutai is also recorded. At the same time, the Khitan rulers were equated with the *caκravartin* such that Buddhism played an essential role in their legitimation strategies. Khitan rulers even created a ‘Little Mt. Wutai’ in their territory, to which the imperial offerings were donated.²¹ Mt. Wutai, therefore, seems to have been

---


devoutly worshipped by the Khitan imperial house, which worshipped it alongside a common pilgrimage site.

In the Tangut Empire (ca. 1038–1227, in Chinese sources known as Xixia 西夏), the imperial offerings were sent to Mt. Wutai probably because of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī’s state-protecting function. The connection between Mt. Wutai and the Tangut rulers began even before the establishment of the empire.²² Tangut rulers were also equated with the cakravartin, indicating their established Buddhist legitimation strategies. Like the Khitan rulers, Tangut rulers did not always have access to the mountain, and as a result, called a mountain in their territory ‘Northern Mt. Wutai.’²³ These facts indicate that the importance of the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai for the rulers was acknowledged in the Tangut Empire, and its rulers valued that mountain as devout Buddhist kings.²⁴

Some of the Five Dynasties, the Khitan Empire, and the Tangut Empire all adopted the equalisation of rulers with the cakravartin at some point. These regions probably also had a significant Chinese population under their rule. Some of them even acted as successors to the Tang Dynasty. The Khitan and Tangut Empires often diplomatically and militarily competed against the newly established Song Dynasty (960–1279, 宋), following its establishment. For the rulers in those states, the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai was an effective tool for ruling Chinese
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populations and establishing the legitimacy of their rule against Chinese rivals.

Even so, it is not likely that the rulers of those regions adopted the special relationship of certain Tang rulers, like Empress Wu or Emperor Daizong, with Mt. Wutai. Rather, what played an essential role for those states was probably the general idea of the connection between rulers, their states, and the cult at that mountain, which was emphasised during the Tang period. This connection probably formed an important part in legitimisation strategies of those rulers who justified their rule with assistance of Buddhism.

3.2. Dunhuang

Dunhuang is also an oasis state in Central Asia, thus one might suppose it should be dealt with in the former section together with other states in that region. This oasis, however, played a significant role in the introduction of Buddhism to the Uyghurs, and the Uyghurs’ Buddhist culture was developed under strong Chinese influence from Dunhuang. Thus, Dunhuang and the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai is discussed separately and in detail in this section.

After the local potentate Zhang Yichao (r. 851–867) drove Tibetans off in the middle of the 9th century, Dunhuang was ruled by the Guiyijun (851–1036?, 归義軍, Return-to-Allegiance Army). The governor of the Guiyijun officially acted as courtier of the dynasties located in Central or Northern China. In the Mogao Caves (Chin. Mogao ku 莫高窟) several mural paintings of Mt. Wutai were produced both before and during the Tibetan rule and in the Guiyijun period.25 Even the

---

25 The mural paintings of Mt. Wutai in the caves around Dunhuang are listed by Zhao Shengliang and Zhao Xiaoxing. According to this list, Mt. Wutai is depicted in the following seven caves at the Mogao Caves: Cave 9, 25, 61, 112, 144, 222, 237, 245, 361. In the Yulin Caves (Chin. Yulin ku 楠林窟) and the Five Temple Caves (Chin. Wugemiao shiku 五个廟窟), three caves and one cave respectively depict Mt. Wutai: Yulin Cave 32, 19 and 3; Five Temple Cave 1. Zhao Xiaoxing, furthermore, lists one painting on silk, EO. 3588. see Zhao Shengliang 赵声良, “Mogao ku di liuyi ku Wutai shan tu yanju 莫高窟第61窟五台山图研究” Study on the Picture of Mt. Wutai in Cave 61, Mogao Grottoes,” Dunhuang yanjiu 敦煌研究 Dunhuang Research 4 (1993): 90; Zhao, “Xixia shiqi de Dunhuang Wutai shantu” 229. Michelle C. Wang also lists the caves at Mogao Cave. See Michelle C. Wang, “The Thousand-armed Mañjuśrī at Dunhuang and Paired Images in Buddhist Visual Culture,” Archives of Asian Art 66.1
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eulogies on Mt. Wutai, *Wutai shan zan* 五台山贊 [Praise of Mt. Wutai] and *Wutai shan quzi* 五台山曲子 [Songs of Mt. Wutai] were transmitted and copied in Dunhuang. Furthermore, a prayer text P. 2854 (11), probably written between 853 and 858 in Dunhuang, equates the Tang emperor with the Gold Wheel-turning Sage King. Thus, inhabitants of Dunhuang were aware of the new method of legitimation for Tang emperors, as courtiers of the Tang Dynasty. This leads me to conclude

(2016): 104, fn. 74. On the dating of those caves, see also Lin, *Building a Sacred Mountain*, 164–178. While the Mogao Caves 112, 159, 222, 237 and 361 were (re-) constructed in the mid-Tang in Zhao Shengliang’s and Zhao Xiaoxing’s opinion, the (re-) construction of Cave 9 and 144 can be dated to the middle or late Tang period. Mogao Cave 61 and Yulin Cave 19 and 32 belong to the Five Dynasties period. Zhao Xiaoxing dates Mogao Cave 25 and the silk painting EO. 3588 to the Song period, while Mogao Cave 245 and 237 were (re-)constructed in the ‘Shazhou Uyghur’ period, in his opinion. Yulin Cave 3 and Five Temple Cave 1 were, on the other hand, dated to the Tangut-rulled period by Zhao Shengliang.


that Mt. Wutai’s special status for the protection of rulers and their states could be shared there, too.\(^{28}\)

In the 10th century, the Guiyijun rulers faced a significant turning point in terms of their legitimacy, when the Tang Dynasty collapsed and Central China subsequently fell into political instability. Because of the dramatical decrease of authority of the Chinese emperors, the Guiyijun rulers no longer equated the Chinese emperors with Buddhist kings, they instead compared themselves with bodhisattva kings or *cakravartin*. This reveals that they increasingly became independent from the Chinese regimes, and instead sought the legitimation of their rule in Buddhist contexts. There is even the prayer text BD09156 (3) in which the Guiyijun ruler, Cao Yuanzhong (r. 944–974, 曹元忠), was equated with the Gold Wheel-turning Sage King.\(^{29}\)

While the use of the idea of the *cakravartin* for the rulers’ legitimation is well attested, the connection between rulers, their state, and the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai is not documented in written sources. However, some visual materials hint at how that cult was recognised in Dunhuang. Cave 61, one of the largest caves in Mogao, is especially worth noting. This cave—called the Hall of Mañjuśrī—was constructed between 947 and 957 under the sponsorship of Cao Yuanzhong and his wife, Lady Zhai. When it was built, a large statue of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī riding on a lion would have been on the altar of the cave’s main floor. A mural on the west wall depicts the entire range of Mt. Wutai.\(^{30}\) The large scale of the painting of Mt. Wutai in Cave 61 differs

---

\(^{28}\) If Amoghavajra truly connected the cult and legitimation as Nakata claimed, his legitimation model was probably introduced in Dunhuang, too.

\(^{29}\) Akagi, “Jussēki Tonkō no ōken to tenrinjō’ō kan,” 242–249; Akagi, “Konrin jō’ō kara bosatsu no jinō he,” 6–9. Several dated Dunhuang fragments of eulogies on Mt. Wutai were probably copied in the 10th century. See, e.g., Cartelli, *The Five-Colored Clouds of Mount Wutai*, 58, 89–90; Du, *Dunhuang Wutai shan*, 98–108. Du also indicates that the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai became more popular in Dunhuang in that period.

\(^{30}\) For a detailed description of the construction of this cave see Lin, *Building a Sacred Mountain*, 178–192. The painting of Mt. Wutai in Cave 61 is discussed in several articles in particular. See, e.g., Zhao, “Mogao ku di liuyi ku Wutai shan tu,” 88–107; Wong, “A Reassessment of the Representation of Mt. Wutai,” 27–52. Besides Cave 61, in Yulin Cave 19 and 32, the Guiyijun rulers and their wives are depicted as donor figures. Yulin Cave 19 was constructed under the sponsorship of Cao Yuanzhong and his wife, Lady Zhai, like Mogao Cave 61. Yulin Cave 32, on the other hand, depicts the donor figures Cao Yanlu (r. 976–1002, 曹延祿) and his Khotanese wife. See e.g. Akagi Takatoshi 赤木
from its depiction in other caves, where the mountain appears as only a small component of the whole painting. Therefore, Cave 61 was likely meant to be a replica of Mañjuśrī’s sacred mountain in its entirety. Seen in this light, the cave’s iconographic programme is possibly comparable to the Khitan or Tangut emperors’ efforts to create their Mt. Wutai within their own territories, although its scale at Dunhuang is much smaller.

This large cave is also famous because of the number of depictions of donor figures, which display Cao Yuanzhong’s political connections through inter-marriage with Dunhuang’s neighbouring oasis states, Khotan and the Ganzhou Uyghur Kingdom (middle of the 9th c. to 1028). The fact that Mt. Wutai was chosen as a central motif of this cave indicates that it had an essential meaning for the sponsors, the Guiyijun ruler and his wife.

---

32 Lin, Building a Sacred Mountain, 179–180.
33 Cao Yuanzhong and his family established a multi-layered marriage relationship with both the Khotanese and the Ganzhou Uyghur royal families. Often Guiyijun rulers, including Cao Yuanzhong, had Khotanese and Uyghur wives. Takao Moriyasu points out that the order of the female donor figures indicates the importance of the relationship with those neighbouring states to varying degrees. See Moriyasu Takao, “Uiguru to Tonkō ウイグルと敦煌 The Uighurs and Tun-huang,” in Tonkō no rekishi 敦煌の歴史 History of Tun-huang, ed. Enoki Kazuo 榎一雄 (Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha, 1980), 322–325.
34 In this context, it is possibly worth mentioning again that Cao Yuanzhong was equated with the Gold Wheel-turning Sage King, like the Tang Emperor Daizong. Furthermore, in Cave 220, the cave of the Zhai family from which Lady Zhai stemmed, the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī was chosen as a motif for its mural painting, which can be dated to 925 by its inscription. See Lin, Building a Sacred Mountain, 173. Thus, it seems that in that period, the Mañjuśrī cult was widespread in Dunhuang’s ruling classes. In terms of the visual demonstration of the political relationship, the other motif, the Eight Protectors of Khotan, was also depicted in some Mogao Caves sponsored by Guiyijun rulers, when the Khotanese royal family and Dunhuang ruling family had a close political relationship. See Xinjiang Rong and Lishuang Zhu, “The Eight Protectors of Khotan Reconsidered: From Khotan to Dunhuang,” BuddhistRoad Paper 6.1 (2019): 62–84.
The discussion above indicates that Dunhuang, like its contemporary Central Asian states, shared the same notion of legitimation in which Mañjuśrī Cult at Mt. Wutai occupied a significant position.

4. The Mañjuśrī Cult among Uyghur Buddhists

4.1. Uyghurs and the Mañjuśrī Cult in the Turfan Area

Now, we turn our focus to the main subject of this paper, the Uyghurs. How did they accept the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai prevalent among their neighbours, where the connection between this cult, rulers and their states was often emphasised? As mentioned in the Introduction, there are only a few Uyghur sources that are connected with Mañjuśrī and Mt. Wutai. The section, therefore, considers all of the available Old Uyghur sources to discuss this topic. For the paintings, however, the direct involvement of the Uyghur Buddhists in their creation remains unclear, unless an accompanying inscription gives some indication of it. Thus, the focus remains on the written sources that were produced and used by the speakers of Old Uyghur, primarily the Uyghurs. The paintings are only used supplementarily.

The Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī was probably a significant bodhisattva for Buddhists who lived in the territory of the West Uyghur Kingdom (second half 9th c. to 13th c.). Several wall paintings and temple banners that depict this bodhisattva indicate the popularity of Mañjuśrī in that area.\(^{35}\) The *Vimalakīrtinirdeśasūtra*, a text in which Mañjuśrī appears as the bodhisattva, was translated into Old Uyghur by a monk named Muṣān ( mogelijk on *Paṇḍita Muṣān*). He translated this Mahayana sutra in the Turfan area in the 10th century.\(^{36}\)

---

35 Albert Grünwedel documented Mañjuśrī’s mural paintings in Bezeklik and other Caves around the Turfan area. See Albert Grünwedel, *Altbuddhistische Kultstätten in Chinesisch-Turkistan: Bericht über archäologische Arbeiten von 1906 bis 1907 bei Kuca, Qarashar und in der Oase Turfan* (Berlin: Reimer, 1912), 227, 232, 276, 283, 293, 297, 300, 305, 311–312; Gosudarstvennyj érmitaž and Institut vostočnyh rukopisej rossijskoj akademii nauk, *Pešery Tysâči Budd: Rossijskie ekspedicii na šelkovom puti: K 190-letiû aziatskogo muzeâ* (St. Petersburg: The State Hermitage Publishers, 2008), 216–217; Zhao Min 趙敏 and Zhang Yehan 張業漢, *Tu-yugou, Baṣikelike 吐峪溝, 柏孜克里克* [Toyok, Bezeklik] (Ürümqi: Xinjiang meishu sheying chubanshe, 1995), Cave 39 and 3 (Picture No. 144, 145, and 169). Thanks to Dr. Miki Morita (Iwakuni), whose information aided my study of those paintings. I appreciate her specialist support. Furthermore, four temple banners on which this bodhisattva is depicted were found from the Turfan area and are now preserved in Berlin. See Chhaya Bhattacharya-Haesner, *Central Asian Temple"
a conversation partner with the eponymous figure of the layman Vimalakīrti, was very likely translated into Old Uyghur in the pre-Mongolian period.36 Thus, Mañjuśrī was also well known to Uyghur Buddhists.

In the Vimalakīrtinirdesāsūtra, the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī plays only a supporting role. Conversely, texts like the Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti or the Mañjuśrī sādhanā are mainly concerned with that bodhisattva. Both texts were first translated into Old Uyghur from Tibetan in the Mongolian period.37 The extant Old Uyghur versions of the Avatamsakasūtra, which gave textual support for the establishment of the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai, was translated from Chinese by Anzang (安藏), a famous Uyghur translator who served in the Mongolian court.38 The Wutai shan zan 五台山赞 [Praise of Mt. Wutai] was also translated into Old Uyghur. The exact date of this translation is unknown, but the extant fragments from various manuscripts were all written in a cursive script, which is one of the important features for dating texts to the Mongolian period.39


36 Peter Zieme supposes the translation occurred in the 11th century. See BT XX, 19. The commentary on the Vimalakīrtinirdesāsūtra was also composed in Old Uyghur, probably in the same period. See BT XXIX, 13.

37 There is additionally a version of the Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti that is the phonetic transcription of the Chinese version in Uyghur script. For general information and previous research on those texts, see Johan Elverskog, Uygur Buddhist Literature (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 114–117.

38 The translation process of this sūtra is discussed in the next section. See section 4.2.

These written sources indicate that the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai flourished in the Mongolian period. Furthermore, as far as I can see, no mural paintings in Turfan show a connection between rulers, their states, and the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai, like in the other aforementioned states. The Uyghur rulers seem to have preferred to underline their legitimation as the successors of the East Uyghur Kaganate (ca. 744–840) in Mongolia and probably did not legitimate their rule in Buddhist contexts. Therefore, the Uyghur rulers in Turfan do not seem to have been drawn to the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai.

4.2. The Mañjuśrī Cult under Mongolian Rule

With the establishment of the Mongolian Empire (13th/14th c.), the political environment in Central Asia dramatically changed. Buddhism was promoted at the Great Khan’s court, which influenced inhabitants in

---

40 In the Chinese source Xu zizhi tongjian changbian 繼資治通鑑長編 [Extended Continuation of the Comprehensive Mirror in Aid of Governance], which was edited in 1760 and contains essential information on the history of the Song, Khitan, Jurchen, and Yuan dynasties, an Uyghur monk in 1009 begged permission to go on pilgrimage to Mt. Wutai at the border to the Song Dynasty. See Xu zizhi tongjian changbian 繼資治通鑑長編, volume 71, 102. Accessed July 5, 2019. https://ctext.org/wiki.pl?if=gb&chapter=820758&searchu=回紇. Whether this monk came from the West Uyghur Kingdom (second half 9th c. to 13th c.) or other regions remains unknown.

41 I could find only two mural paintings that contain the landscape of Mt. Wutai. One is now preserved in the Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg, while the other is in Bezeklik Cave 39. According to the catalogues, the former was probably painted in the 11th century and the other seems to date to the 12th–14th centuries. See e.g., Baizikelike shiku 柏孜克里克石窟 [Bezeklik Caves], ed. Zhongguo Xinjiang bihuaxunshu bianji weiyuanhui 中国新疆壁画运输编辑委员会 (Urumqi: Xinjiang meishu shying chubanshe, 2009), Cave 39, 237–239; Gosudarstvennyj ermitaž and Institut vostočnyh rukopisej rossijskoj akademii nauk, Pešery Tysâči Budd, 216–217. In Cave 39, the mural painting in question is located in the middle of the west wall, on which a mountain landscape is depicted. See Grünewedel, Altbuddhistische Kultstätten, 277, 280–283. The main figure is, however, the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, and Mt. Wutai appears as the background. The mural painting preserved in St. Petersburg seems to have been partly cut. How this piece is situated in the original complete painting remains unclear. As far as the extant mural paintings show, they cannot be compared with that in Mogao Cave 61, in which Mt. Wutai is depicted as an entire range. A comprehensive study on the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and Mt. Wutai in mural paintings in Turfan would advance research on the Mañjuśrī cult in that region.

the areas that became a part of that empire, including the Uyghurs. Shortly after the Tibetan monk Phakpa (1235–1280, Tib. ’Gro mgon Chos rgyal ’Phags pa) was appointed as the Imperial Preceptor (Chin. dishi 帝師) in 1270, he began to equate his contemporary, the Mongolian Great Khan Khubilai (r. 1260–1294), with a cakravartin in his Buddhist works.43

Phakpa was not, however, the first Tibetan monk who placed a ruler in a Buddhist context. Tibetans seem to have already adopted the practice of equating rulers with the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in the pre-Mongolian period. This probably first occurred after the collapse of the Tibetan Empire in the middle of the 9th century. Even before the encounter between Tibetans and Mongols in the 13th century, the practice of comparing rulers to the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī was well known in Tibet.44 The contribution of the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai to this Buddhist contextualisation of rulers is obscure, but for Phakpa, Mt. Wutai was of particular significance. Indeed, he went on a pilgrimage to that mountain and composed two poems about it.45


44 See, e.g., Doney, “Early Bodhisattva-Kingship in Tibet,” 33–39. He supposes that the Tibetan rulers were described as bodhisattvas first in the provinces, including Dunhuang, and that later this practice was also adopted in Central Tibet. If his supposition is correct, this legitimisation idea could stem from China, and may have been transmitted under the Chinese influence in Dunhuang to Central Tibet.

45 His two poems are listed by Kurtis R. Schaeffer along with other poems on Mt. Wutai, which were mostly composed in a much later period. See Kurtis R. Schaeffer, “Tibetan Poetry on Wutai Shan,” Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies 6 (2011): 216. About Phakpa and his activities on Mt. Wutai, see also Debreczeny, “Wutai Shan,” 18; Gao Lintao 郭林涛, “Basiba yu wutai shan 八思巴与五台山 [Phakpa
The first clear evidence in written sources to attest to the comparison of Khubilai with the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī at Mt. Wutai dates to the 14th century. However, the Great White Stupa, dedicated to Mañjuśrī, had already been constructed in Dadu (大都) and on Mt. Wutai during Khubilai’s reign, by the Mongol imperial architect Anige (1244–1278/1306). This indicates that this bodhisattva already held great significance for the Mongolian imperial court by Khubilai’s rule.46

Buddhist legitimation strategies for the Mongolian Great Khan seem to have made a substantial impact on Uyghur Buddhists. After the Uyghur king voluntarily submitted to Činggiz Khan (1162?–1227), the West Uyghur Kingdom became a part of the Mongolian Empire. Uyghurs worked in the Mongolian Empire in a number of different areas. Some of them even directly served members of the Mongolian royalty. Anzang (安藏), the aforementioned translator of the Avatamsakasūtra, is one such person. He began his career at the Great Khan’s court under the rule of Mönke Khan (1209–1269), and was sent to the Khan’s younger brother, Ariq Buka (?–1266), to participate in the debates between Daoists and Buddhists, which were held in 1255, 1256, and 1257. Those debates were instigated by Daoists, who praised their teachings by composing the Laozi bashiyi huatu 老子八十一化圖 [The Eighty One Charts of Laozi] and circulated it among the courtiers. Against this, Buddhists complained to the Great Khan that the text humbles Buddhist teachings and that the Daoists also illegally occupied Buddhist temples and destroyed Buddhist statues. The Great Khan, Mönke, ordered the debates be held to solve this conflict between

46. Gao translated a part of Phakpa’s poem into Chinese. Dr. Cathy Cantwell and Lopon P. Ogyan Tanzin (Sarnath) kindly helped me with the content of those poems that have not yet been translated into modern languages. I am extremely grateful for their specialist support. Considering Phakpa’s importance in the Mongolian Empire, his poems on Mt. Wutai probably made an essential contribution to promoting the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai. A comprehensive study of those poems, including their critical edition, would be beneficial.

Buddhists and Daoists. Concerning those debates, Arïq Buka ordered Anzang to make a translation of the *Avatamsakasūtra* from Chinese to Old Uyghur. Some scholars argue that Arïq Buka wanted Anzang to translate the text in order to legitimise the Buddhist teachings against Daoists ones during the first debate.

In this context, it is worth mentioning how Anzang chose the Chinese versions for his Old Uyghur translation of the *Avatamsakasūtra*. There are now three different Chinese translations of this *sūtra* by Buddhabhadra (T. 278), Śikṣānanda (T. 279), and Prajñā (T. 294) respectively. According to their length, they are called the sixty-, eighty- and forty-fascicle *Avatamsakasūtra*. Although there are no complete copies of the Sanskrit text(s) on which these Chinese translations are based, the first two longer Chinese versions appear to be complete

---


However, the last and shortest version corresponds to only the last chapter of the two longer texts, and is thus thought to be a partial translation. The extant Old Uyghur fragments contain parts that correspond to the Chinese eighty- or forty-fascicle texts. Those two corresponding Old Uyghur versions, however, do not seem to have existed independently. The upper edge of the Uyghur fragments give the number of the wrapping case and the scroll to which the fragments belong in the text. The wrapping-case numbers (OU čir, Chin. zhi (弔)) on the fragment of the eighty-fascicle version indicate that each wrapping case contains ten volumes. The numbers on the fragment of the forty-fascicle version, however, presents a problem. The content of the fragment belongs to the 37th scroll and bears the wrapping-case number ten, even though, according to the above-suggested organization method, this scroll should be put within the wrapping-case number four. This indicates that the forty-fascicle version was probably in an individual wrapping case, but was put together with other texts. Thus, scholars discuss which texts were put together with the forty-fascicle version. Many scholars agree that the other texts were probably the other versions of the Old Uyghur Avatamsakasūtra, but they suggest varying versions. Kögi Kudara and Juten Oda suggest that the sixty-fascicle version, which has not been found yet, and the forty-fascicle version were put together and regarded as one text in Old Uyghur. Aydar Mirkamal and Köichi Kitsudō, in contrast, assert that an eighty-fascicle text and a forty-fascicle text were put together as one text. Their assertion is confirmed by the newly identified fragment preserved in St. Petersburg, which gives not only the scroll number of the forty-fascicle version, but also a second number that reflects the fragment’s location within the complete Old Uyghur Avatamsakasūtra. Mirkamal supposes that the eighty-fascicle text was completely translated into Old Uyghur, but in Kitsudō’s

49 Some fragments in the British Library collection in London are identified by Hori Shin’ichrō. See Shin’ichrō Hori, “From the Kathmandu Valley to the Tarim Basin,” in From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field Stanford, June 15–19 2009, ed. Paul Harrison and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2014), 262–263. Prof. Dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann (Munich) kindly called my attention to this article.
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opinion, the last chapter that overlaps with the forty-fascicle version was not translated.\(^{50}\)

Although the original Sanskrit texts are no longer extant completely, we know from other records that a forty-fascicle text in Chinese, which was to provide the original for Anzang’s translation, was given as a tribute to Emperor Dezong (r. 779–805, 德宗) in the Tang Dynasty. A source indicates that the text was given to the emperor in the hope of unifying all his domain in peace under the rule of Dezong, who the text hails as a cakravartin. In comparison with the sixty- and eighty-fascicle versions, which were translated into Chinese in an earlier period, only the forty-fascicle one describes an ideal Buddhist ruler. Its Chinese translation was probably undertaken with the intention of aggrandising the Tang emperor’s authority, which had declined at that time because of the expansion of the Tibetan Empire.\(^{51}\)

It is not likely that Anzang knew the political situation at the time of the translation of the forty-fascicle Avatamsakasūtra in China and chose this text because of the involvement of the Tang emperor’s court in its translation. Its contents, which show the figure of an ideal Buddhist ruler and thus affirm the secular rulership, however, give a good indication of why one might translate the forty-fascicle version. As mentioned above, the debates between Daoists and Buddhists led Ariq Buka to order Anzang to translate the Avatamsakasūtra. Anzang’s translation was held under the name of the Great Khan. Providing a Buddhist text that supports rulers, therefore, was a significant benefit to Buddhists in the debates against Daoists. The translation of that text into Old Uyghur may

---

\(^{50}\) See Kudara and Oda, “Uiguru yaku hachiju kegon zankan,” 187; Mirkamal, “Anzang yu Huihu wen ‘Huayanjing’,” 80–82; Kitsudō, “Kodai Uigurugo ‘Kegonkyō’ kenkyū no shitenkai,” 2–4; Kitsudo, “New Light on the Huayan jing in Old Uyghur,” 111–113. The extant colophon informs us that Anzang was the translator of the forty-fascicle version. However, the translator of the eighty-fascicle version is unknown. Mirkamal and Kitsudō claim that Anzang was the translator of both versions.

have taken place in a political context that closely tied Mongolian sovereignty to Buddhist kingship.\textsuperscript{52}

The translation of the \textit{Avatamsakasūtra} into Old Uyghur was not primarily made in order to promote the Mañjuśrī cult. However, because of its close relationship with this, the text could offer advantages for spreading it among the Uyghur Buddhists once it was translated. Unlike the \textit{Avatamsakasūtra}, other texts dedicated to the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī were mostly first translated into Old Uyghur from Tibetan during the Mongolian period, as mentioned above.\textsuperscript{53} Among them, the translation of the \textit{Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti} was completed in 1302 by the famous Uyghur monk Karunadas (d. 1312, Skt. Karupādāsa), who was Phakpa’s disciple and served at the Great Khan’s court in the temple of the White Pagoda in Dadu, present-day Beijing.\textsuperscript{54} Its translation was, therefore, undertaken by a person who had a close relationship to both the Mongolian rulers and the Imperial Preceptor. Thus, the textual foundation for worshipping

\textsuperscript{52} Kitsudō Kōichi also raises the possibility that after the death of Mönke, Aриq Buka tried to claim his legitimacy as the Great Khan against Khubilai, his elder brother and rival, through this translation enterprise. See Kitsudō, “Kodai Uigurugo ‘Kegonkyō’ kenkyū no shitenkai,” 16–17. Before Khubilai officially chose Phakpa as the Imperial Preceptor, various Tibetan Buddhist schools had contact with different lineages of Mongolian royal families and individually established their religious relationships. See, e.g., Christopher P. Atwood, “The First Mongol Contacts with the Tibetans,” \textit{Revue d’Études Tibétaines} 31 (2015): 21–45; Nakamura, “Chibetto to mongoru no kaikō,” 121–132. Thus, the possibility that Aриq Buka already introduced the idea of legitimation through equating himself with the cakravartin cannot wholly be denied. However, the evidence to date indicates this idea was first introduced by Phakpa with respect to Khubilai, as mentioned above. This topic, therefore, warrants further investigation.

\textsuperscript{53} On the flourishing of Mañjuśrī literature in the Mongolian period, see also Matsui Dai 松井太, “Tonkō shosekkutsu no uigurugo daiki meibun ni kansuru sakki (2) 敦煌諸石窟のウイグル語題記銘文に関する箚記（二） Notes on the Old Uigur Wall Inscriptions in the Dunhuang Caves (II),” \textit{Jinbun shakai ronsō (Jinbun kagaku hen) 人文社会論叢 (人文科学篇) (Volume of Cultural Science)} 32 (2014): 30–31.

the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and for its cult’s flourishing among the Uyghur Buddhists, probably developed under the strong influence of Tibetan Buddhism, which was connected with the legitimation of Mongolian rulers.

4.3. Uyghur Pilgrims and the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī

As mentioned in the Introduction, the latest written sources that provide a trace of the Uyghurs’ worship of Mañjuśrī are pilgrims’ scribbles. Up to this last section of the paper, the discussion concentrates on the connection between the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī, Mt. Wutai, and sovereignty. That mountain was, however, also famous as the destination of international pilgrimage from the 7th century onward. The activity of the Uyghur pilgrims who were en route to that mountain, or acts oriented toward by a belief in Mañjuśrī, formed, therefore, a significant part of the Uyghurs’ Mañjuśrī cult.

In the Mongolian period, many Uyghur Buddhists traveled to various sacred sites as pilgrims. Thriving pilgrimage within the territory of the Mongolian Empire was mostly a result of physical accessibility to various sites, which became possible because the disaggregate regions in East and West were unified under the newly established Mongolian rule. In particular, the Uyghur pilgrims who visited Dunhuang Mogao and Yulin Caves left inscriptions or rather graffiti on the walls. Most of them simply record their visit in the Dunhuang caves. It seems that for the majority of them, individual choice of caves according to their religious motivations was not relevant.56

However, some of those graffiti mention the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī or Mt. Wutai. They were probably written in the Mongolian period in part

55 Under Mongolian rule the postal system, which connected various regions through stations, was officially re-established and enlarged for smoother traffic inside the Empire. See e.g., Adam J. Silverstein, Postal Systems in the Pre-Modern Islamic World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007). It was also incorporated into the taxation system of the Mongolian Empire. A part of its operation can be observed in Old Uyghur secular documents found in Turfan, see BT XLIII.

56 A similar tendency can be observed in Uyghur Buddhists’ choices of which sūtras to have copied or printed. See BT XXVI, 14–15, 19–20.
because of the use of the cursive script. Those scribbles mentioning the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and Mt. Wutai indicate that some pilgrims chose the specific cave as their destination because of their belief in that bodhisattva. As examples of this, Mogao Cave 61 and Yulin Cave 3 invite individual attention. As mentioned above, Mogao Cave 61 was known as the Hall of Mañjuśrī because of its large mural painting of Mt. Wutai. Yulin Cave 3 also features the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī as the primary subject of the painting on its west wall. Both of these caves have graffiti indicating they were visited by Uyghur pilgrims who worshipped the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and some of whom were even en route to Mt. Wutai. Thus, the Uyghur pilgrims who visited those caves

57 On Uyghur pilgrims and their graffiti and inscriptions, see e.g. Tibor Porció, “Some Peculiarities of the Uygur Buddhist Pilgrim Inscriptions,” in Searching for the Dharma, Finding Salvation: Buddhist Pilgrimage in Time and Space, ed. Christoph Cueppers and Max Deeg (Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2014), 157–178; Simone-Christiane Raschmann, “Pilgrims in Old Uyghur Inscriptions: A Glimpse behind Their Records,” in Buddhism in Central Asia I. Patronage, Legitimation, Sacred Space, and Pilgrimage, ed. Carmen Meinert and Henrik H. Sørensen (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 204–229. Those graffiti and inscriptions are collected and edited by Matsui Dai. See Matsui Dai, “Tonkō sekkutsu uigurugo, mongorugo daiki meibum shūsei 敦煌石窟ウイグル語・モンゴル語題記銘文集成 Uigur and Mongol Inscriptions of the Dunhuang Grottoes,” in Tonkō sekkutsu tagengo sūryō shūsei 敦煌石窟多言語資料集成 Multilingual Source Materials of the Dunhuang Grottoes, ed. Matsui Dai 松井太 and Akaraka Shintaro 荒川慎太郎 (Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asian and Africa, 2017), 1–161. According to his edition, the inscriptions in the following caves contain the name of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī or Mt. Wutai: M055, Uig01, lines 3, 11; M061, Uig02, line 2; M138, Uig01, lines 5, 13; M146, Uig02, line 1; Y02, Uig02, line 1 and Uig05, lines 1–2; Y03, Uig30, line 1 and Uig32, line 1; Y15, Uig01, line 1; Y16, Uig07, line 3; Y33, Uig07, lines 1–2. See Matsui, “Tonkō sekkutsu uigurugo, mongorugo daiki daiki,” 18, 21, 29–30, 32–33, 60, 62, 71–72, 98, 102, 120; Matsui, “Tonkō shosekkutsu no uigurugo daiki meibun (2),” 32–36. Only one inscription, M146, Uig02, is written in a semi-square script, which could be dated to the pre-Mongolian period. In this inscription, however, the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī is mentioned with Śākyamuni Buddha, and so probably appears as a flanking bodhisattva. An inscription at the White Pagoda in Hohhot also mentions the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī. See Bai Yudong 白玉冬 and Matsui Dai 松井太, “Huhuhot hakuwō no uigurugo daiki meibun フフホト白塔のウイグル語題記銘文 [Old Uyghur Inscriptions of the White Pagoda in Hohhot],” Nairiku ajia gengo no kenkyū 内陸アジア言語の研究 [Studies on the Inner Asian Languages] 31 (2016): 44–49.

58 See Matsui, “Tonkō sekkutsu uigurugo, mongorugo daiki,” M061, Uig02, line 2; Y03, Uig30, line 1 and Uig32, line 1; Matsui, “Tonkō shosekkutsu no uigurugo daiki meibun (2),” 37.

59 Those which were left by the Uyghur pilgrims en route to Mt. Wutai are in Yulin Cave 3. See Matsui, “Tonkō shosekkutsu no uigurugo daiki meibun (2),” 37.
and left graffiti is probably visited them while on pilgrimage because of
the apparent link to the Mañjuśrī cult presented on mural paintings in
these caves.

Furthermore, the aforementioned Old Uyghur version of Wutai shan
zan 五台山贊 [Praise of Mt. Wutai] possibly indicates flourishing
Uyghur pilgrimage to Mt. Wutai. This eulogy was translated from
Chinese, but the extant Old Uyghur and Chinese texts differ from each
other in the last phrase in the stanza XVI:

Chinese version
Disciple,
Within the Vajra Grotto is a sweetly flowing stream,
Inside is Buddhapāli, in the midst of meditation.
Once he entered, he stayed for several years,
Nowadays we directly go to Nārāyaṇa.60

Old Uyghur version
Buddha son! In the cave called [ ] cwr there is sweet and flowing brook
water.
The master called *Buddhapaḍa sits there in meditation.
Once entered meditation, numberless many years pass by.
As if one did not know up to this day God Vajrapāṇi!61

In the Chinese version, the last phrase just gives geographical
information about Mt. Wutai, that the grotto called Nārāyaṇa can be
reached directly from Vajra Grotto. The Old Uyghur version, in contrast,
suddenly introduces another topic, the deity Vajrapāṇi. It is possible that
there was another Chinese version of this eulogy, in which that deity
appears, and which served as a model of the Old Uyghur translation.
However, in the extant versions, this deity is not alluded to in any other

60 佛子，金剛窟裏密流泉，佛陀波利裏中禪。一自入來經數載，如今直至那羅延。This Chinese text follows Cartelli’s edition. See Cartelli, The Five-colored Clouds of Mount Wutai, 109. The translation also follows Cartelli. The Chinese eulogy is transmitted in several manuscripts with minor differences. See e.g., Du, Dunhuang Wutai shan, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38. Those differences are, however, not relevant for the current discussion.

stanzas in the eulogy. Thus, the reason for its inclusion in the Old Uyghur version remains obscure.

One Chinese source that is closely related to Mt. Wutai might give us a hint. *Wutai shan ji dengtai ji* 五臺山及燈臺記 [A Record of Mt. Wutai and the Lantern] is the inscription that was carved on a stone lantern originally located in Dongzhang (东张) village, in present-day Daixian (代县), Shanxi (山西) province, to the east of Mt. Wutai. The lantern is nearly 190 centimetres in height, and the inscription was carved on four contiguous sides of the eight-sided shaft, spanning twenty-six lines in all. It dates to the early 8th century. Side 3 contains the following sentence:

Mount Wutai [is the place] where five hundred venomous nāgas live, together with ten thousand bodhisattvas, as well as Vajrapāṇi, all these cannot be numbered.62

Here, Vajrapāṇi is mentioned with other bodhisattvas as one of those who dwell at Mt. Wutai. As mentioned above, the stone lantern with this inscription was erected near Mt. Wutai, so this quote was likely well known among the local people. It is probable that pilgrims who visited Mt. Wutai from various regions, gained access to detailed information about the mountain *in situ*, and transferred that knowledge to their homeland. It is possible that those pilgrims were a direct or indirect source of information for the Old Uyghur translator/Chinese author of *Wutai shan zan* 五台山贊 [Praise of Mt. Wutai].63 Considering the

---

62 其五臺山也，五百毒龍居此，一萬菩薩同臻，兼加密跡金剛，頗亦不知其數.


63 In this context, it is worth mentioning that in one Old Uyghur document probably from the Mongolian period, images of Vajrapāṇi were ordered together with those of the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra and Mañjuśrī. It is unknown whether those images were grouped together or if they were ordered for separate purposes. If they were put together, the close connection between the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī and Vajrapāṇi would have been known to the Uyghur Buddhists. Dolkun Kāmbiri, Hiroshi Umemura, and Takao Moriyasu suggest that those images could be drawn together and form a kind of *maṇḍala*, see Dolkun Kāmbiri 多魯坤・闞白爾, Umemura Hiroshi 梅村誌, and Moriyasu Takao 森安孝夫, “Uigurubun bukkō sonzō juryō meirei kenkyū–Usp. No. 64 nadori mieru ‘čuv’ no kaishaku wo kanete–ウイグル文仏教尊像受領命令文書研究–Usp. No. 64 などにみえる‘čuv’の解釈を兼ねて– A Study on the Uyghur Order Document of
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flourishing pilgrimage in the Mongolian period, it is likely that the information transfer occurred in that period.

There were, however, pilgrims who reached Mt. Wutai in the pre-Mongolian period, so it is possible that the inscription was already known in Central Asia at that time.

Whatever the case may be, detailed information on Mt. Wutai provided the Old Uyghur translator/Chinese author inspiration for changing the phrase in question. And for that information transfer, pilgrimage probably made an essential contribution.

5. Closing Remarks

Mt. Wutai was worshipped as the domicile of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī in this Buddhist world and became a famous pilgrimage destination not only for Chinese pilgrims with various Buddhist affiliations but also for those from Central and Eastern Asia, and even from India. The importance of this mountain increased again in the later Tang period, when Amoghavajra tried to re-establish the Tang emperors’ authority by equating them with a cakravartin, and simultaneously promoted the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai under royal sponsorship.

This newly flourishing in China was soon adopted by various neighbouring states in Central Asia to different degrees. Some of those rulers equated themselves with a cakravartin, similar to the Tang emperors, such that they seem to have drawn on the special value of the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai for rulers. Some positioned themselves as the legitimate successors of the Tang Dynasty, while others occupied parts of former Tang territory. In those states where the rulers were vividly aware of Chinese dynasties and their traditions, the cult thrived and was of particular value. In that respect, the West Uyghur Kingdom differed from its neighbours because its rulers did not position their rule in

---

64 Dai Matsui supposed that Uyghur Buddhist pilgrimage to Mt. Wutai flourished under the influence of the Mañjuśrī cult and the worship of Mt. Wutai in Tibetan Buddhism. See Matsui, “Tonkō shosekkutsu no uigurugo daiki meibun (2),” 37–39.

Buddhist contexts, but instead underlined their participation in the lineage of the ruling clan in the East Uyghur Kaganate in Mongolia.

The establishment of the Mongolian Empire dramatically changed the Uyghurs’ circumstances. Under Khubilai Khan’s rule, Phakpa introduced a legitimation model that equated the Mongolian rulers with a cakravartin. At the same time, he devoutly worshipped the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī at Mt. Wutai. The mountain also seems to have enjoyed the special attention of the Mongolian court. Thus, that cult thrived under Mongolian rule and also among the Uyghurs as the subjects of Mongolian Great Khan. In this period, most of the extant Buddhist texts that were mainly attributed to the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī were translated into Old Uyghur. The translation of at least two texts, the *Avatamsakasūtra* and *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*, was undertaken by those who served in the Great Khan’s court. Those translators played an essential role in the political scene. This indicates the close connection between the Mañjuśrī cult and rulers.

The Uyghurs’ worship of the Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī at Mt. Wutai was also increasingly documented in pilgrim inscriptions and graffiti. The growth of pilgrimage among Uyghur Buddhists was closely linked with the unification of the vast area in Central and Eastern Eurasia under Mongolian rule. It was, however, not only triggered by the physical accessibility to various Buddhist sacred sites but also by the religious policy of the court of the Great Khan, for whom the Mañjuśrī cult at Mt. Wutai was of particular significance.
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