Lamas and Shamans: Mongolian Orders of Knowledge from the Early 17th to the 21st Century. A Contribution to the Debate on Non-European Concepts of Religion

Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz

Translated by Anja Kirsch and Andrea Rota

Published on 29/01/2024

Translators' note

The following text reflects the discursive context of German-speaking religious studies in the 2000s, a period marked by prevalent generalizations about "Asia." For instance, it was commonly asserted that an umbrella concept of religion, comparable to the European notion, did not exist in Asia prior to colonial influence. The text frequently addresses and counters these types of assumptions.

In terms of style, we opted for a semantic translation approach, adapting the text to the nuances of the English language. This necessitated breaking up some sentences and anglicizing certain expressions to achieve a more natural flow in English. Consequently, the translation exhibits some distinctive features. For instance, to underscore the presence of female shamans, we systematically refer to "male and female shamans" to translate the German "Schamanen und Schamaninnen" into English. Although this choice may appear heavy-handed in English, we deemed it crucial, especially given Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz's emphasis on the historical underrepresentation of shamanesses in research (see footnote 74).

We are grateful to the publisher of the original German text, The Uppsala University Library, for granting us the translation rights free of charge. This translation has been approved by the author. Any errors in the translation are entirely our responsibility.

The author has elaborated on her concept of a *Global History of Religion* in a recent article. See Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz, "Nga rang gi chos khyod rang gi chos: 'My Religion and Your Religion?' About Some Fundamental Issues in the Global History of Religion," *Interdisciplinary Journal for Religion and Transformation in Contemporary* Society, published online ahead of print, 2023, 1–20.

Introduction*

[151] In his influential work, *Provincializing Europe*, historian Dipesh Chakrabarty asserts right from the beginning:

> Sad though it is, one result of European colonial rule in South Asia is that the intellectual traditions once unbroken and alive in Sanskrit or Persian or Arabic are now only matters of historical research for most—perhaps all—modern social scientists in the region. They treat these traditions as truly dead, as history. Although categories that were once subject to detailed theoretical contemplation and inquiry now exist as practical concepts, bereft of any theoretical lineage, embedded in quotidian practices in South Asia, contemporary social scientists of South Asia seldom have the training that would enable them to make these concepts into resources for critical thought for the present.[1]

The question "Is 'religion' a European invention?" which was discussed at the 6th conference of the "Workgroup on the History of Asian Religions" (AKAR) of the German Association for the Study of Religions directly addresses the issue raised by Chakrabarty. "Religion" is one of the key concepts of European orders of knowledge, through which parts of reality are selected and assigned to cohesive category, contributing to making the world accessible to us. As a classificatory concept, religion is a category of collective perception of reality that would not exist as such without the word and its associated concepts. Although Chakrabarty acknowledges the historical existence of non-European knowledge systems that have generated their own [152] analytical conceptualizations, their existence is still often not recognized. Chakrabarty refers to this phenomenon as "asymmetric ignorance"[2] in the academic world; non-European scholars cannot afford a similar lack of familiarity with European-American intellectual history without risking being deemed "outdated" and not taken seriously.

The realization that knowledge and systems of knowledge do not represent timeless universals but are culturally specific has led to critiques within cultural and social studies involved in postcolonial debates, particularly regarding the application of the European concept of "religion" to non-European contexts. Efforts have been made to prevent the imposition of European normative concepts onto non-European cultures by tracing the so-called "world religions",[3] primarily "Hinduism" and "Buddhism", back to their European orientalist presuppositions and subsequently deconstructing them.[4] This deconstruction is, however, often accompanied by the

---

1   D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton 2000), 5–6.

2   Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe*, 28.

3   See T. Masuzawa, *The Invention of World Religions Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism* (Chicago 2005).

4   See, among others, S.N. Balagangadhara, *"The Heathen in His Blindness": Asia, the West and the Dynamic of Religion* (Leiden 1994); D. S. Lopez, ed., *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*

argument that Asian societies do not conceptualize a field of "religion" separate from "culture"[5] and therefore have not developed a corresponding terminology.

In the German-speaking study of religion (*Religionswissenschaft*), an essay by sociologist Friedrich Tenbruck has been particularly influential, contending that "the concept of religion has been and still remains exclusive to European civilization. […] In non-European languages, one searches in vain for a term equivalent to 'religion,' as Christian missionaries repeatedly discovered to their great surprise and bitter embarrassment".[6] Tenbruck [153] goes as far as asserting that "the other peoples" could not even discuss religion in their own languages due to the absence of this concept.[7] Some proponents of Burkhard Gladigow's concept of "European History of Religion"[8] supported this claim.[9] However, even in a study of religion that perceives itself as postcolonial and discursive[10] [154] it is frequently postulated that non-European cultures have not developed

---

[5]   (Chicago 1995); R. King, *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and "The Mystic East"* (London 1999); T. Fitzgerald, "Hinduism and the World Religion Fallacy", *Religion* 20 (1999): 101–118.

[5]   See F. Staal, "Religions". In *Rules without Meaning: Ritual, Mantras and the Human Sciences*, edited by F. Staal (New York 1993), 387–419. Staal assumes a specific concept of "religion" that is based on the three monotheistic middle-eastern traditions as a prototype.

[6]   F. Tenbruck, "Die Religion im Maelstrom der Reflexion", *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Sonderheft no. 33: *Religion und Kultur* (1993): 37.

[7]   Ibid.

[8]   B. Gladigow, "Europäische Religionsgeschichte", in *Lokale Religionsgeschichte*, edited by H.G. Kippenberg and B. Luchesi (Marburg 1995), 21–42. See also B. Gladigow, "Europäische Religionsgeschichte seit der Renaissance", *Zeitenblicke* 5, no. 1 (2006), http://www.zeitenblicke.de/2006/1/Gladigow/index_html ([16/04/2023]). Gladigow also confirms Tenbruck's assumptions, see B. Gladigow, "Von der 'Lesbarkeit der Religion' zum iconic turn". In *Religionswissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft*, edited by B. Gladigow (Stuttgart 2005), 284, and ibid., note 61.

[9]   Christoph Auffarth proposes that distinguishing religion as a separate aspect of culture is a European invention, as seen in Ch. Auffarth, "Religion". In *Wörterbuch der Religionen*, edited by Ch. Auffarth et al. (Stuttgart 2006), 429. His notion of a "European Religious History" is riddled with untenable statements about "religions in other geographical areas" (Ch. Auffarth, "Europäische Religionsgeschichte – ein kulturwissenschaftliches Projekt". In *Aspekte der Religionswissenschaft*, edited by R. Faber and S. Lanwerd [Würzburg 2009], 37), exposing a startling lack of expertise. For example, he asserts that in Asia there is only a "regional coexistence" of religions, while Europe is characterized by an "ongoing confrontation with differences". The "concurrent alternatives" he outlines for medieval Europe (see Ch. Auffarth, "Mittelalterliche Modelle der Eingrenzung und Ausgrenzung religiöser Verschiedenheit". In *Europäische Religionsgeschichte: Ein mehrfacher Pluralismus*, edited by H. G. Kippenberg et al., Vol. 1 [Göttingen 2009], 193–218) can also be substantiated for Asian religious history using numerous examples, see, for example, the works of Hubert Seiwert and Joachim Gentz for China, and those of Michael Pye for Japan, to name but a few. In 8th-century Tibet, as just one example of many Asian cultures, we already have a Buddhist polemical text against non-Buddhist opponents, the "Summary of the Proofs for the True Revelation", which justifies the Tibetan ruler's decision to adopt Buddhism as the authoritative religion for the Tibetan empire; see bKa' yang dag pa'I tshad ma las mdo btus pa, *Tibetan Tripitaka* 144, No. 5839, folio 64r4-103v6. Also, refer to K. Kollmar-Paulenz, *Zur Ausdifferenzierung eines autonomen Bereichs Religion in asiatischen Gesellschaften des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts: Das Beispiel der Mongolen* (Bern 2007), 14. Auffarth's concept reads by no means as a serious proposal for a religious studies program, but as self-affirming rhetoric of a European "special path" constituted with the aid of long-debunked stereotypes of the non-European "Other". Here, religious studies research is adapted to the interpretative framework of a singular European modernity.

[10]   H. G. Kippenberg and K. von Stuckrad, *Einführung in die Religionswissenschaft* (München 2003), 14 and 69.

abstract concepts of order for their religious traditions, and thus, no common overarching term.[11]

The academic debate surrounding the definition and applicability of the concept of religion in non-European cultural contexts has been a contentious topic of discussion for quite some time. Rather than delving into the main arguments of this debate again, I will recall only one key aspect of it: the diversity of definitions suggested by researchers demonstrates that seeking a definition that claims universal validity is an impossible task. This is because the European notion of religion is a particular concept that has been universalized from a concrete historical tradition. Thus, attempting to strip the concept of its historical particularity is a futile endeavor.[12] Furthermore, our discourse and description of religion as a separate social domain in non-European societies are unavoidably dependent on a culture-specific preconception of what religion is as we equate it semantically, functionally, or structurally with the European realm of religion.[13] This cultural [155] preconception shapes our assumptions about "religion", and it determines not only the texts selected for our research corpus but also their analysis and comparison, including the comparison of discursive formations and strategies.[14] However, the realization of the cultural contextuality of academic languages should not lead to a rejection of a common academic vocabulary. Instead, we should use it in a controlled and reflective manner to ensure that we do not lose sight of the nuances and complexities of our subject matter.

Like Chakrabarty, I also assume the simultaneity and equivalence of various particular cultures of knowledge, in which access to reality is achieved through socially constructed concepts of order. Since the present volume [*Religion in Asien? Studien zur Anwendbarkeit des Religionsbegriffs*] deals with the European concept of religion and possible semantic, functional, or structural

---

[11] Cf. Kippenberg and von Stuckrad, *Einführung in die Religionswissenschaft*, 41–43. Specifically, non-European written cultures, such as Indian and Tibetan, are addressed here. The self-reflective analysis of one's own cultural forms of knowledge is described here as a response to European constructions, since these cultures, according to the postulate, did not possess their own conceptual definitions, "not even for the general term 'religion'" (p. 41), and also had no unified identity (p. 42). This claim is factually incorrect. Moreover, the argument is methodologically problematic because European-colonial discourses are not related to Asian discourses but rather to practices. The obvious question of which emic discourses were pervasive concerning these practices, is, however, not asked at all. This silence about emic discourses makes them disappear and leads to the "asymmetric ignorance" as outlined by Chakrabarty.

[12] This observation would, of course, apply equally to non-European terms. Descriptive and analytical terms that serve as concepts of order always have an inescapable, culture-specific component. In other words, every understanding is historical: "In truth, history does not belong to us, but we belong to it". Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik* (Tübingen 1990), 281.

[13] See also J. Schlieter, „Nachwort". In *Was ist Religion? Texte von Cicero bis Luhmann*, edited by Jens Schlieter (Stuttgart 2010), 250. Schlieter refers here to Ricœur's "hermeneutics of trust". See also Richard King's remarks on "cultural understanding" in *Orientalism and Religion*, 77–78; and Reinhard Schulze, "Weltbilder der Aufklärung: Zur Globalgeschichte neuzeitlicher Wissenskulturen". In *Vom Weltgeist beseelt: Globalgeschichte 1700–1815*, edited by M. Grandner and A. Komlosy (Vienna 2004), 166.

[14] On the method of discourse comparison see Oliver Freiberger, *Der Askesediskurs in der Religionsgeschichte: Eine vergleichende Untersuchung brahmanischer und frühchristlicher Texte* (Wiesbaden 2009), in particular pp. 255–258. In difference to Freiberger, however, I understand discourses as "patterns of order that are regulated and inextricably linked with forms of power" (see Achim Landwehr, *Historische Diskursanalyse* [Frankfurt am Main 2008], 98), in which societies organize their knowledge production.

equivalents in Asian religious history, my contribution focuses on historical Mongolian societies and the differentiation of "religion" as an autonomous social sphere. This differentiation can only be reconstructed based on the written sources of that time period and is reflected on the level of discourse. Therefore, my contribution focuses on the analysis of discourse formations.

In the following, I will provide insight into how elite[15] Mongolian orders of knowledge were constructed, through which reality was represented, interpreted, and modeled. My main focus is on the 17th to the 19th centuries, with a glimpse into the 20th and 21st centuries. The perspectives held and socially enforced by the elites were objectified in the historical process and [156] became constitutive of the, at times, significant changes in the socio-religious field.

The first part of this article explores a discourse in Mongolia spanning from the 17th to the 19th century, in which a socio-politically significant segment of its society was differentiated through descriptive practices.[16] I will elucidate how through the encounter and interaction between different actors a comparative terminology emerged that linguistically maps the differentiation of an autonomous field of "religion" within historical Mongolian societies.

My source corpus comprises individual texts across diverse genres in both Tibetan and Mongolian languages, including chronicles[17] and biographies, colophons of the Mongolian Buddhist Ganjur,[18] Buddhist ritual texts, legal texts, bilingual terminological dictionaries, a shamanic chronicle, recent records of orally transmitted shamanic songs, and modern Mongolian cultural studies analyses. These texts were generated over a period of approximately four hundred years, with the earliest dating to around 1600 and the most recent originating from the first decade of the twenty-first century. The diachronic depth of this corpus allows tracing the historical development of the discourse.

In light of the unique circumstances faced by the Mongols in the late 16th century, who experienced a sometimes-aggressive pressure from Tibetan Buddhist monks to adopt Tibetan Buddhism, the Tibetan Buddhist terminology[19] plays [157] a crucial role in this context. This intra-

---

[15] Given that non-European societies are still often viewed as sociologically undifferentiated, it is essential to note that linguistic representations of social reality are not inherent to the general understanding of the world, but rather created and imposed by social and political elites. As Bourdieu states, "symbolic power is the power to create things with words", Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge 1991), 153.

[16] I had already presented preliminary results on this complex topic in my 2007 study *Zur Ausdifferenzierung eines autonomen Bereichs Religion in asiatischen Gesellschaften des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts*. The present article delves deeper into the problem discussed there and situates it within the framework of a global history of religion.

[17] On Mongolian historiography see Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz, "Mongolische Geschichtsschreibung im Kontext der Globalgeschichte". In *Geschichten und Geschichte: Historiographie und Hagiographie in der asiatischen Religionsgeschichte*, edited by Peter Schalk et al. (Uppsala 2010), 251–257.

[18] I refer to the Mongolian Buddhist canon, translated from Tibetan at the beginning of the seventeenth century, see Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz, "The Transmission of the Mongolian Kanjur: A Preliminary Report". In *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism*, edited by Helmut Eimer and David Germano (Leiden, Brill, 2002), 151–176.

[19] See Ulrike Rösler, "Die Lehre, der Weg und die namenlose Religion: Mögliche Äquivalente eines

religious polemical terminology was employed and adapted within the cultural context that I am examining. I will discuss the Tibetan terminology only briefly but will delve into the specific connotations, adaptations, and developments in the Mongolian religious field.

The second part of my article aims to situate my empirical findings within the framework of a "global history of religion" giving equal consideration to both European and non-European theoretical perspectives on the discursive field of religion. The terminology that developed since the 17th century has profoundly influenced and continues to influence the perception and constitution of reality in the Mongolian regions, as an integral part of Mongolian orders of knowledge. Today, European-American discourses on "religion" have been incorporated into Mongolian epistemic systems. As I will demonstrate, this interweaving of Mongolian and European-American discourses plays a crucial role in shaping the religious field. This observation underscores the necessity of examining and contextualizing Mongolian terminology through a conceptual-history approach.[20] Similar to the longstanding practice of subjecting European terminology to consistent historicization, investigating the historical semantics of Asian descriptive and analytical terminologies appears as the most urgent methodological desideratum of a study of religion that claims a global scope for its subject matter.[21] [158]

Religionsbegriffs in der tibetischen Kultur". In *Religion in Asien? Studien zur Anwendbarkeit des Religionsbegriffs*, 129–150.

[20] The few religious studies works that examine non-European analytical terminologies often lack historicization and contextualization. For example, in *Der Religionsbegriff in den Religionen: Studien zum Selbst- und Religionsverständnis in Hinduismus, Buddhismus, Judentum und Islam* (Bodenheim 1999), Hans-Michael Haußig discusses the Buddhist concept of *dharma* (103–132). He relies heavily on general secondary literature on Buddhism, which is often interpreted through the lens of the European model as a "religious system" and cites primarily the Pāli canon and unspecified commentarial literature. Historical context is largely missing, and dates are rarely mentioned, making the concept of *dharma* appear as an ahistorical, Buddhist universal.

[21] This has also been demanded by Joachim Gentz in "Die Drei Lehren (*sanjiao*) Chinas in Konflikt und Harmonie: Figuren und Strategien einer Debatte". In *Religionen Nebeneinander: Modelle religiöser Vielfalt in Ost- und Südostasien*, edited by Edith Franke and Michael Pye (Münster 2006), 17–40; and in "Multiple religiöse Identität in Ostasien", in *Multiple religiöse Identität: Aus verschiedenen religiösen Traditionen schöpfen*, edited by Reinhold Bernhardt and Perry Schmidt-Leukel (Zürich 2008), 115–135.

1. The differentiation of an autonomous sphere of "religion" among the Mongols

1.1 The enforcement of Buddhism among the Mongols

In 1578, Altan Khan of the Tümed Mongols and bSod nams rgya mtsho,[22] the abbot of the `Bras spungs monastery in Central Tibet and the most important spiritual figure of the newly formed dGe lugs pa school, met at Lake Kökenor in northeastern Tibet. This meeting marked the beginning of the adoption of Buddhism by the Mongols.[23] During the meeting, participating princes and monks exchanged honorary titles, including the title "Dalai Lama", or "Ocean-Lama", for bSod nams rgya mtsho, who later became famous as the 3rd Dalai Lama. Shortly after this encounter, Tibetan lamas and their Mongolian disciples began spreading the Dharma among the Mongols. Within a period of just under fifty years, the majority of Mongolian peoples had embraced Tibetan Buddhist practices and concepts.[24] The "Buddhization" of the Mongols succeeded so quickly in part because the secular authorities actively supported the efforts of Buddhist monks through measures such as Buddhism-friendly legislation and material incentives. In the late 16th century, two legal codes were established that [159] both prohibited certain Mongolian practices, namely shamanizing[25] and related practices, especially bloody animal sacrifices.[26]

---

[22] Regarding bSod nams rgya mtsho, see K. Kollmar-Paulenz, "The Third Dalai Lama Sönam Gyatso and the Fourth Dalai Lama Yönten Gyatso". In *The Dalai Lamas: A Visual History*, edited by M. Brauen (Chicago 2005), 52–60.

[23] Regarding the historical significance of the meeting in the context of Tibetan-Mongolian religious-political relations, see K. Kollmar-Paulenz, *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur. Die Biographie des Altan qayan der Tümed-Mongolen: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der religionspolitischen Beziehungen zwischen der Mongolei und Tibet im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden 2001), 112–147.

[24] Buddhism was known among the Mongols since the 13th century and became widespread and popular among the elites during (and after) the Mongol Yuan Dynasty (1271–1368). Tibetan chronicles from the 15th and 16th centuries report on the travels of Buddhist dignitaries to Mongolian princes, for example in the *Deb ther sngon po* (`Gos lo tsa ba gZhon nu dpal, *Deb ther sngon po* [Chengdu, 1984], 651), regarding the journey of the 4th Zwa dmar pa Cod pan dzin pa in 1470 to the Mongols and his teaching activities there. See also H. Serruys, "Early Lamaism in Mongolia", *Oriens Extremus 10* (1963): 181–216, and "Additional Note on the Origin of Lamaism in Mongolia", *Oriens Extremus* 13 (1966): 165–173.

[25] The Mongolian bögele- is a denominal verb formed from the noun "böge", which means "shaman", and the suffix "le", which expresses the acquirement of the quality of the primary word. In this context, the term simply translates the Mongolian verb and by no means implies specific "features" as explicitly expressed in academic shamanism theories, such as trance, ecstasy, soul journey, etc.

[26] Animal sacrifices were banned because they violate the first of the five Buddhist precepts, to refrain from taking life, which are binding for both lay Buddhists and the Sangha. One of the most important topoi in Tibetan Buddhist discourse on the religiously and culturally "other" was the accusation that non-Buddhists are people who "eat and drink the flesh and blood of living beings", as described in K. Kollmar-Paulenz, "'Religionslos ist dieses Land': Das Mongolenbild der Tibeter", *Asiatische Studien/Etudes Asiatiques* LIV no. 4 (2000): 875–905, and "Uncivilized Nomads and Buddhist Clerics: Tibetan Images of the Mongols in the 19th and 20th Centuries". In *Images of Tibet in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, edited by M. Esposito, Vol. II (Paris 2008), 707–724.

These codes indirectly fostered the dissemination of Buddhist teachings and practices.[27] The legal texts were specifically directed against a certain social group, the so-called böge—male shamans—, and the *iduyan* or *udayan*—female shamans. Those who shamanized were subjected to sometimes draconian penalties. If we believe 19th-century orally transmitted legends of the Buryat Mongols, there were even instances of shamans being burned.[28] From Mongolian sources, we know that the most important tools for shamanizing, the *Ongyod*,[29] small figurines made of felt or wood, which represented [160] both the ancestral spirits and the helper spirits of the male and female shamans, were systematically collected and burned in many places.[30] Buddhist monks smoked out shamans by burning dog excrement in their yurts, an exorcism technique that was also applied in other contexts.[31] The vacuum created by the absence of shamanic actors was filled by Buddhist monks who offered the population relevant Buddhist rituals and practices.

An example of material incentives is the offer from the then Tüsiyetü Qan of the Qorčin Mongols. He pledged to give cows or horses to those who memorized and applied Buddhist mantras instead of summoning shamans. Besides local princes, Tibetan lamas also employed such "bribery" methods to make Buddhist teachings more appealing to people. The biography of the

---

[27] The legal code of Jasaɣtu Qayan and that of Altan Qayan are referenced in R. O. Meisezahl, "Die Handschriften in den City of Liverpool Museums (I)", *Zentralasiatische Studien* 7 (1973): 230–231, and in Š. Bira, "A Sixteenth- Century Mongol Code", *Zentralasiatische Studien* 11 (1977): 7–34. The legal code of Altan Qayan, which is only preserved in Tibetan language, is given in facsimile by Meisezahl in "Handschriften", 268–284.

[28] G. N. Potanin, *Ocherki severo-zapadnoj Mongolii. Rezul'taty puteshestviya, ispolnennago v 1879 godu po porucheniyu Imperatorskago Russkago geograficheskago Obshchestva*. (St. Petersburg 1881–1883), 289–290, and W. Heissig, "Persecution and Continuation: Some Recent Innermongolian Shamanist Traditions", in id. *Schamanen und Geisterbeschwörer in der östlichen Mongolei: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Wiesbaden 1992), 198–199.

[29] Regarding the *Ongyod*, see U. Harva, *Die religiösen Vorstellungen der altaischen Völker* (Helsinki, o.J.), 371ff., and W. Heissig, "Die Religionen der Mongolei", *Die Religionen Tibets und der Mongolei*, edited. by Giuseppe Tucci and Walther Heissig (Stuttgart 1970), 312–314. The Mongolian shamanic chronicle *Ongyod qara sakiyusun teüke sudur bičig orosiba* (Royal Library, Copenhagen, Mong. 41) deals extensively with the *Ongyod*. My thanks go to librarian Bent Lerbæk Pedersen from the Oriental and Judaica Collections, who made the text accessible to me. According to the chronicle, the *Ongyod* were originally the souls of powerful male and female shamans. A part of the chronicle was published in Latin transcription and English translation by W. Heissig, "A Mongolian Source to the Lamaist Suppression of Shamanism", *Anthropos* 48 (1953): 2–29, 493–536.

[30] See, for example, *Boyda neyiči toyin dalai mañjusryi-yin domoy-i todorqai-a geyigülügči čindamani erike kemegdekü orosiba* (short title *čindamani erike*), written in 1739 by Prajñasagara, folio 54r5–13. A German translation can be found in Heissig's "Mongolian Source", 42, as well as in K. Kollmar-Paulenz, "Der Buddhismus als Garant von 'Frieden und Ruhe': Zu religiösen Legitimationsstrategien von Gewalt am Beispiel der tibetisch-buddhistischen Missionierung der Mongolei im späten 16. Jahrhundert", *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft 11* (2003): 186. See also Isibaldan, *Erdeni-yin erike* (1835), folio 28v8. Tibetan sources also mention the burning of the *Ongyod*, see Ngag dbang blo bzang rgya mtsho, "rJe btsun thams cad mkhyen pa bsod nams rgya mtsho'i rnam thar dgnos grub rgya mtsho'i shing rta zhes bya ba bzugs so". In `Phags pa jig rten dbang phyug gi rnam sprul rim byon gyi khrungs rabs deb ther no bu'i phreng ba*, Vol. 2 (Dharamsala, 1984), 150, 2–5. Even in the early 19th century, the burning of *Ongyod* and shaman costumes ordered by Buddhist monks is reported in the Buryat-Mongolian regions, see *Selengge-yin mongyol buriyad-un darqan tayiša danbi jilčan lombočeren-ü jokiyaysan mongyol buriyad-un teüke bolai*, 34.

[31] According to the biography of the famous Jaya Pandita (1599–1662), see Heissig, *Religionen der Mongolei*, 340.

Western Mongolian monk Neyiči Toyin, perhaps the most renowned "missionary" among the Mongols, states:

> Of all the various types of jewels, gold and silver, and various items such as silk and sable that had been presented to him by many alms-givers, princes as well as great and small rulers, Neyiči Toyin distributed in all directions one ounce of gold each to those who could recite the Yamāntaka Dhāraṇī by heart, and one ounce of [161] gold and silver each to those who could memorize the Sādhana and the Bīja Mantra of Guhyasamāja, and to the poor people, according to their wishes, goods and livestock. Consequently, there were generally many people who learned the Yamāntaka and Guhyasamāja Dhāraṇīs by heart.[32]

These few indications may suffice to illustrate an important aspect of the initial interactions between indigenous religious specialists and the newly arrived Buddhist monks. These interactions were primarily characterized by economic competition. The issue was the limited material resources of the lay population who sought the services of religious specialists. Since the Tibetan Buddhist monks had the support of local rulers, they enjoyed certain competitive advantages.

The encounter between Tibetan Buddhist monks and shamans in the late 16th and early 17th centuries manifested discursively in a categorization of religious competition by the Buddhist actors. It is noteworthy, however, that we almost exclusively have Buddhist sources and are, thus, able to hear only one side of the dispute between indigenous and Buddhist actors. This is because shamanic practices were transmitted orally; this orality was elevated by the shamanic actors themselves as a distinctive feature of their culture. Even in the 20th century, some shamans sang of their "teachings without script".[33] As the Buryat-Mongolia chronicle *Qori-yin arban nigen ečige-yin jun-u uɣ učiɣur-un tuɣuji* from the year 1875 states,

> People who follow the teachings of the shamans (*böge-ner-ün šasin*) have never had any religious scriptures of their own. All instruction and teaching is given orally and learned by heart, as it has been passed down through tradition.[34]

Both the prevailing illiteracy and the political support of Mongolian princes, the Qing government, and, for [162] the Buryat Mongols, the Russian Empire,[35] gave Tibetan Buddhist monks the

---

[32] *Čindamani erike*, folio 74r16–74v5. The author of the biography calls this way of spreading the Dharma "the two paths, the inner path of giving Dharma and the outer path of giving material goods" (folio 74v5-8)".

[33] W. Heissig, "Schamanen und Geisterbeschwörer im Küriye-Banner". In id., *Schamanen*, 26–24.

[34] *Qori-yin arban nigen ečige-yin jun-u uɣ ijaɣur-un tuɣuji*, 92. Cf. also *Qori kiged aɣuyin buriyad-nar-un urida-daɣan boluɣsan anu*, 20.

[35] In the 18th century, on the eve of massive attacks against the Muslim subjects of the empire, Empress Elizabeth Petrovna (r. 1741–1762) allowed for the free practice of religion by her Transbaikalian Buddhist subjects. Although the corresponding written manifest must now be considered lost, it is regarded as the beginning of the official recognition of Buddhism in Russia. See N. Tsyrempilov, "Buddhist Minority in a Christian Empire: Buryat Religious Survival and Identity Problems in Russia in the 18th–early 19th Centuries". In *Religion and Ethnicity in Mongolian Societies: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives,* edited by Karénina

opportunity to impose their own definitions of reality. The Tibetan perception of Mongolian socio-religious reality was influenced by internal Buddhist polemical debates, which involved negotiating religious and social classifications and boundaries. For centuries, Tibetan societies had theoretically reflected upon and conceptually framed the social differentiation of an autonomous domain of "religion". Tibetan monks brought with them a nuanced analytical terminology, offering a conceptual toolkit that could also be applied in a comparative manner to interpret and make sense of the unfamiliar reality. Consequently, a discourse emerged that, on one hand, led to the reification of the diverse practices performed by male and female shamans, resulting in the "invention" of a distinct "doctrine of the shamans". On the other hand, a comparative concept emerged to describe teachings and practices that exhibit functional equivalence to the European category of "religion" within the Mongolian cultural context.

1.2 Mongol-Buddhist self-descriptions: *nom* and *šasin*

Sociologist Alois Hahn once aptly observed: "The self-thematization of religion can only occur once the religious interpretation of the world has emerged as a distinct form of knowledge".[36] In the following, I will explore such a process of differentiation. [163]

Before proceeding with terms that describe Buddhism (in the singular), I would like to clarify that I employ the generic term Buddhism solely for linguistic conventions. In reality, "Buddhism" did not denote an abstract "world religion"[37] among 17th-century Mongols; rather, it referred to a specific historical doctrine introduced by Tibetan monks. Frequently, there is even a very particular mention of the "doctrine of Tsongkhapa", to whom the dGe lugs pa school attributes its founding. Given the actual diversity of the Tibetan-Buddhist traditions[38] within Mongolian territories, the rhetoric of exclusion employed by the dGe lugs pa monks highlights their endeavors to steer the perception of their contemporaries towards a homogeneous Tibetan-Buddhist doctrine and its adherents. The written text functioned as an instrument of social manipulation.

Early 17th-century Mongolian biographies and chronicles use a standardized terminology to denote the Tibetan form of Buddhism. Two terms are omnipresent in the sources: *nom* (from the Greek *nomos*)[39] and *šasin* (from Sanskrit *śāsana*). Both terms translate the Tibetan terms *chos*

Kollmar-Paulenz, Seline Reinhardt, and Tatiana D. Skrynnikova. Wiesbaden (Harrassowitz 2014), 61–77.

[36] A. Hahn, "Glaube und Schrift – oder die Selbstthematisierung von Hochreligionen". In *Konstruktionen des Selbst, der Welt und der Geschichte* (Frankfurt am Main 2000), 237. Hahn initially developed his ideas on the importance of written culture in the self-thematization of religions with reference to the knowledge system of Protestant Christianity, but they are also applicable for analyzing Buddhist traditions.

[37] On the emergence and development of the discourse on world religions, see Masuzawa, *Invention*.

[38] This variety is documented in material evidence such as temples, statues, thangkas, ritual texts of the rNying ma pa, Sa skya pa, gCod pa, and other schools, incarnation lines of rNying ma pas like the famous Danzan Ravjaa, and references in chronicles and biographies (e.g., in *Erdeni tunumal*, folio 47r1–2, and *Erdeni-yin erike* of Isibaldan, folio 35v11–12).

[39] This Greek word was borrowed into Syriac and used by the Manichaeans as a technical term for "law, doctrine". In Sogdian, *nom* appears as *nwm* and translates the Sanskrit word *dharma* in Buddhist texts. In

("Dharma") and *bstan pa* ("[Buddhist] doctrine").[40] [164] Both *nom* and *šasin* often contain the attributive addition *burqan-u*, "of the Buddha", that is, *burqan-u nom/burqan-u šasin*, "Dharma of the Buddha, Doctrine of the Buddha". In addition to its previously mentioned meanings, *nom* is also used in the sense of "rule, norm" as in the 1662 chronicle *Erdeni-yin tobči*.[41] In this context, it is employed for both the secular and the religious domains within the religio-political concept of the "Two Orders" (Tibetan: *lugs gnyis*, Mongolian: *qoyar yosun*): *burqan-u nom* versus *kümün-ü nom*[42] and *sansar-un nom*. Although the word *šasin* is utilized to denote the Two Orders in the 16th-century treatise *Čaγan teüke*,[43] the use of *nom* (in the narrower sense of "Dharma") predominates in both texts, the *Čaγan teüke*[44] and the *Erdeni-yin tobči*.[45] The verse biography of Altan Qaγan, composed around 1607, *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur*,[46] mainly uses either *šasin* [165] ("doctrine") or *burqan-u šasin* ("doctrine of the Buddha") to refer to Buddhism.[47] *Nom* is

---

Turkish, it was used in both Manichaean and Buddhist texts and from there found its way into the Mongolian languages.

[40] In early *Ganjur* colophons and chronicles, *chos* and *bstan pa* were often unsystematically translated as *nom* and *šasin*. However, during the 18th-century large-scale translation project of the Tibetan *bsTan `gyur*, a standardization of translation terminology began. In the Tibeto-Mongolian terminological dictionary *Dag yig mkhas pa'i byung gnas/Merged γarqu-yin oron*, compiled in 1741/42 by a team of translators led by the 2nd lČang skya Qutuγtu Rol pa'i rdo rje, *bstan pa* is translated as *šasin* and *chos* as *nom*. For example, see chapter ka, folio 6v2, 7r1, 10r2. I consulted the Beijing block print that is part of the Ernst collection. I am grateful to Professor Ernst for his generous permission to access the block print.

[41] Composed by the Ordos noble Saγang Sečen. I used the Urga manuscript of the work, see Erich Haenisch, ed., *Eine Urga-Handschrift des mongolischen Geschichtswerks von Secen Sagang (alias Sanang Secen)* (Berlin 1955).

[42] This probably translates the Tibetan *mi chos*.

[43] *Arban buyantu nom-un čaγan teüke*. This religio-political treatise was edited by Qutuγtai Sečen Qung Tayiji in the 16th century. Some parts go probably back to the 13th century. A translation and analysis of the work is provided by K. Sagaster, *Die Weisse Geschichte (čaγan teüke): Eine mongolische Quelle zur Lehre von den Beiden Ordnungen Religion und Staat in Tibet und der Mongolei* (Wiesbaden 1976). The facsimile of the text can be found in W. Heissig, *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen, 16.–18. Jahrhundert*; I. (Wiesbaden 1959), 1–24.

[44] *Nom* is used in a variety of combinations in the *Čaγan teüke*, e.g., *nom-un ejen* (3v3/4, 6v7), *nom-un jasaγ*, *nom-un törö* (6v3, 7r7), *nom-un yosun* (6v5), *nom-un jerge* (7r12/13), *ünen nom* (15v1), *ünen nom-un jasaγ* (20r1). *Nom* is also used in the concrete sense of "instruction" in the phrase *qamuγ nom-ud* (7r2), "all instructions". In contrast to the omnipresent use of *nom* in its various meanings, from "rule, norm" to "instruction" and "religion", i.e., Buddhism, the term *šasin* is rarely found, either in its meaning as "Buddhism" (see e.g., folio 3v3: *degedü šasin*, "the sublime doctrine") or as part of the *qoyar yosun* (see folio 15v4 and 15v6).

[45] In the *Erdeni-yin tobči*, *nom* is used 42 times, compared to *šasin*, which is used 24 times.

[46] The *Erdeni tunumal*, authored by an anonymous writer, is one of the earliest known Mongolian historiographical sources today. It is only preserved in a single manuscript, which is kept in the library of the Institute of Language and Literature of the Inner Mongolian Academy of Social Sciences in Hohhot (People's Republic of China). The text is accessible in a modern Uighur-Mongolian version along with a facsimile edition, see Jorungγ-a, ed., *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur orosiba* (Beijing 1984). Meanwhile, translations into Japanese (T. Morikawa, *Study of the Biography of Altan Khan* [Fukuoka 1987]), Chinese (Zhu rong ga, *A-le-tan han zhuan* [Hohhot 1991]), German (Kollmar-Paulenz, *Erdeni tunumal*) and English (J. Elverskog, *The Jewel Translucent Sūtra: Altan Khan and the Mongols in the Sixteenth Century* [Leiden 2003]) are available. I had access to a photocopy of the manuscript.

[47] For example, in folios 20v2, 20v8/9, 20v18, 21v11, 21v15/16, 21v23, 22r1, 22v22, 25r10/11, 25v5, 25v18. *Burqan nom* is used only once (23r20).

also used, but in most cases, it means "scripture, book",[48] "Dharma",[49] in the triad "Buddha, Dharma, Sangha",[50] or in compound words like *nom-un qaγan*, "Dharmarāja".[51] The chronicle *Qad-un ündüsün quriyangγui altan tobči*,[52] which was composed in the first half of the 17th century, speaks of Buddhism as *šajin* (an orthographic variant of *šasin/sasin*), or occasionally as *Čongkaba-yin sajin*,[53] as does the 1677 historical work *Asaraγči neretüyin teüke*.[54]

In the colophons of the handwritten *Ganjur* edition,[55] which was produced under the last Mongolian Great Khan Ligdan in 1628/29 and largely drew on earlier translations, *šasin* and the combination *šasin nom* are used to designate Buddhism.[56] *Nom* alone is rarely found. [166]

In conclusion, both the early *Ganjur* translations and the 17th-century Mongolian historiographical and biographical works distinguish an autonomous domain of "religion", which continuous to remain synonymous with "Buddhism". The terminology used does not serve to represent a plurality of religions. Consequently, individuals who are not Buddhists are referred to as *nom ügei*,[57] which in this context signifies "without religion". Outside of Dharma, there is no religion. The domain of religion coincides with "Dharma". Non-Buddhists also belong to *nom*, but to a "false" *nom*, *buruγu nom* or *buruγu üjel*.

---

[48] Folios 2r22, 30v8, 31v8.

[49] Folios 21r2, 23r20.

[50] For example, in folio 17v13.

[51] Folio 29r10.

[52] Also known as *Altan tobči anonymus*, see Ch. R. Bawden, *The Mongol Chronicle Altan tobči: Text, translation and critical notes* (Wiesbaden 1955). In addition to Bawden's edition, I have used the modern reprint (*Qad-un ündüsün quriyangγui altan tobči* [Kökeqota 1980]).

[53] Ibid., 121 and 122.

[54] Written by the Qalqa noble Byamba erke Dayičing. The relevant passages can be found in Pringlai, ed., *Byamba: Asaraγči neretü-yin teüke* (Ulan Bator 1960), 67ff. There is also an Inner Mongolian edition of this chronicle with an extensive commentary, see Bayan-a, ed., *Asaraγči neretü-yin teüke* (Beijing 1984). H.-R. Kämpfe provides a description and translation: *Das Asaraγči neretü-yin teüke des Byamba Erke Daičing alias Šamba Jasaγ (Eine mongolische Chronik des 17. Jahrhunderts)* (Wiesbaden 1983).

[55] This *Ganjur* is stored in St. Petersburg, see Z.K. *Kas'yanenko, Katalog peterburgskogo rukopisnogo "Tanzhura": Sostavlenie, vvedenie, transliteraciya i ukazateli* (Moskva 1993).

[56] For example, in the colophon to *Bilig-ün činadu küruksen jaγun mingγan toγ-a-tu*, see Kas'yanenko, *Katalog*, no. 524, 136–138. The editorial committee appointed under Emperor Kangxi, which was to prepare the printing of the *Ganjur* in the years 1718–1720, did not change the terminology of *nom* and *šasin*, as a comparison of the colophons revealed. Compare L. Ligeti, *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé. Vol. 1, Catalogue* (Budapest 1942), no. 746, 166–168. See also the colophons of no. 510, 539, 545, 599, 616, 669, 727 in the manuscript *Ganjur*.

[57] As found in a fragment of the history of Güsü-Lama, dated around the year 1600, see E. Chiodo, *The Mongolian Manuscripts on Birch Bark from Xarbuxyn Balgas in the Collection of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, Part 2* (Wiesbaden, 2009), 166. For the narrative of Güsü-Lama, see A. G. Sazykin, "Die mongolische 'Erzählung über Güsü-Lama'", *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16 (1982): 111–140, and A. G. Sazykin, *Videniya buddijskogo ada: predislovie, perevod, transliteraciya, primechaniya i glossarii* (St. Petersburg 2004), 229–242. *Nom ügei* is also used in the *Erdeni tunumal*, folio 25r16, to refer to non-Buddhists. The term *nom ügei* appears again in a text from the mid-19th century, see the biographies of the Jebtsundamba Khutuktu, folio 1r4.

The discourses analyzed here are closely linked to strategies of political power employed by Tibetan Buddhist monks, who gained social and political control through the rhetoric of religious exclusion, equating "religionlessness" with a "lack of civilization", as well as through the dichotomy between literacy and illiteracy.[58] The effectiveness of these strategies is evidenced, on the one hand, by the Mongolian legislation of the late 16th century, which documents the social loss of power experienced by male and female shamans. On the other hand, following the integration of the Mongols into the Qing Empire,[59] the Buddhist Sangha was politically on par with the Mongolian princes. [167]

1.3 The religious "other": The categorization of male and female shamans

Analytical vocabulary for self-presentation and characterization of religious opponents often emerges in encounter situations in which existing differences need to be negotiated. When cultural boundaries are crossed and new, potentially competing traditions are confronted, religious practices and concepts are assigned names and treated as standardized entities. The inclination to reify religious practices and concepts into closed, coherent systems of order frequently stems from situations of religious rivalry, often accompanied by economic competition. Such circumstances can be observed in the Mongolian regions during the 17th century. To analyze the development from an exclusivist to a comparatist notion of "religion"[60] that emerged there, it is essential to closely examine the terminology Buddhist monks used to describe their religious adversaries.

The majority of Mongolian chronicles and biographies from the 17th to 19th centuries rarely mention the male and female shamans, who posed significant challenges to Buddhist monks at least until the mid-17th century in the regions of Inner and present-day Mongolia. The only source that extensively addresses the confrontation between Buddhist and shamanic actors is the aforementioned biography of Neyiči Toyin, written in 1739. Composed approximately a century after the events, it offers a retrospective account. Other 18th-century sources mention male and female shamans only incidentally. The terminology used in these texts for the religious "Others" effectively illustrates the reification processes to which male and female shamans and their practices were subjected.

1.3.1 *Buruγu üjel/Buruγu nom*

From early on, a discourse developed concerning the "true doctrine", Buddhism, and the "false view" held by the shamans. In a text fragment concerning the warding off of bad omens[61] from

---

58 Compare the very similar strategies of early modern Europeans towards the inhabitants of the American continent, see Ulrike Brunotte, "Religion und Kolonialismus". In *Europäische Religionsgeschichte: Ein mehrfacher Pluralismus* Vol. 1, edited by Hans G. Kippenberg et al. (Göttingen 2009), 342–344.

59 The Mongols of Inner Mongolia joined the Manchus in 1636, and the Mongols of Outer Mongolia in 1691.

60 See Haußig's remarks, *Religionsbegriff*, 29–31.

61 Text XBM 150, published in Chiodo, *Manuscripts*, *Part 2*, 182.

[168] the Xarbuxyn Balgas stupa,[62] which can be dated around 1600, we find the first mention of the term *buruγu üjel-tü böge [idu]*[63]*γan*, referring to "the male and female shamans who possess a false view". The term *buruγu üjel*, meaning "false view",[64] was primarily used in opposition to *burqan-u šasin*, the "teaching of the Buddha", as illustrated by the following example: "In this manner, the false view was brought to an end, and the teaching of the Buddha appeared pure and clear".[65]

The term *buruγu üjel* is a translation of the Tibetan *lta log*, which means "heretical view", and it originates from an intra-Tibetan polemical discourse. *Lta log*, or *chos log*, is employed in Tibetan polemical writings to designate the doctrinal adversary. The usage of *chos* and *chos log* is contingent upon the doctrinal standpoint of the respective authors. The application of the term *buruγu üjel* suggests that, at the onset of the Buddhist confrontation with male and female shamans, they were perceived from a normative Buddhist perspective, likely a dGe lugs pa one. Alongside *buruγu üjel*, we also find *buruγu nom*[66] and *qayučin ba buruγu üjel*.[67] The followers of *γadaγadu ongγod*, the "outer Ongγod", are [169] described in relation to the Mongolian term *γadaγadu*, which translates the Tibetan *phyi pa*, meaning "the one who is outside". This is in contrast to *nang pa*, "the one who is inside" or the one within the Dharma. The terms "outside" and "inside" not only form part of intra-Buddhist polemics, but also denote social group affiliations.[68]

The utilized terms—*nom*, *šasin*, and *buruγu üjel*—each correspond to Tibetan expressions and confirm the existence of an intra-Buddhist discourse about the religious "Other". On one hand, their application reveals the reification processes present in the Buddhist elite discourses of the

---

[62] In 1970, the Mongolian historian and archaeologist X. Pėrlėė and his Russian colleague E.V. Šavkunov discovered Mongolian manuscript fragments written on birch bark inside a partially destroyed stūpa near Xarbuxyn Balgas, a ruined settlement in the southern part of Bulgan Aymag, 240 kilometers west of Ulaanbaatar. About a thousand larger and smaller fragments, including fifteen complete texts, were deposited in the stūpa. This find is not the only one of its kind in Mongolia, cf. W. Heissig, *Die mongolischen Handschriften-Reste aus Olon süme Innere Mongolei (16.–17. Jhdt.)* (Wiesbaden 1976), but it is the largest so far. The manuscripts found in Olon Süme in Inner Mongolia and the manuscript fragments from Xarbuxyn Balgas share a common stock of eleven texts, suggesting a cultural and literary connection between early 17th-century "inner" and "outer" Mongols. E. Chiodo gives a description of the most important texts and text fragments from Xarbuxyn Balgas, *The Mongolian Manuscripts on Birch Bark from Xarbuxyn Balgas in the Collection of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences, Part 1* (Wiesbaden 1999), and Chiodo, *Manuscripts, Part 2.*

[63] Chiodo, *Manuscripts, Part 2*, 182, note 11, suggests *iduγan* for the incomplete word. However, the variant *udaγan* is equally possible. The *Čindamani erike*, folio 46r26/27, for example, writes *buruγu üjel-tü böge udaγan*.

[64] Mongolian *üjel* is a deverbal noun, formed from the verb *üje-*, "to see, to behold", with a suffix -l. A deverbal noun with this suffix expresses abstract ideas, see N. Poppe, *Grammar of Written Mongolian* (Wiesbaden 1974), 47.

[65] *Čindamani erike*, folio 54r11–13.

[66] For example, in Isibaldan, *Erdeni-yin erike*, folio 28r11.

[67] "Old and false view", *Čindamani erike*, folio 13v24–25.

[68] For example, in Saγang Sečen, *Erdeni-yin tobči*, Urga-Ms., folio 34r19–21, where the phrasing *dotoγadu nom-tan-u üjel*, translated as "the view of those who belong to the inner teaching", is used.

time; on the other, it reaffirms the previous observation that the concept of a plurality of different religions did not exist in the 17th century. The practices of male and female shamans are conceptually understood from a normative and exclusivist Buddhist perspective, in their deviation from the "true, Buddhist teaching". The terms *üjel*, referring to "[world] view", and *nom*, in this context "teaching", suggest a range of different concepts, particularly when placed in binary opposition to *burqan-u šasin*. It remains unclear which concepts or practices are systematically subsumed under these terms. To my knowledge, no 17th- or 18th-century texts provide an explication. It is only in the specific context of *böge udaɣan-nar-un buruɣu üjel*, or "the false view of male and female shamans", that the actors of this "false view" are identified.[69]

This personalization of religious discourse offers insight into the structural aspects that led Tibetan monks to regard male and female shamans as actors within the same social field, consequently assigning them to the same class concept. The activities of male and female shamans are described in competition with those of Buddhist monks, primarily as healers and exorcists. The *Ongɣod*, their auxiliary spirits, feature prominently in the texts, resulting in male and female shamans occupying, at least partially, the same social function as some Tibetan-Buddhist *chos pa*. The Tibetan term *chos pa* is precisely defined in a contemporary Tibetan-Tibetan [170] terminological dictionary as "male and female lamas and laypeople with knowledge in religious practice (*chos byed*)".[70] This term encompasses all religious practitioners, with the categorization of Mongolian male and female shamans being based on their societal roles.

The Mongolian terms employed, namely *üjel* (*lta*),[71] *nom* (*chos*), and *šasin* (*chos*), should be interpreted in light of the Tibetan terms, but they adapt to the new communicative contexts. The Tibetan terms already possess significant semantic breadth within their contextual references.[72] In various contexts, *chos* may denote (1) philosophical teaching systems or individual teaching opinions, (2) solely Buddhist teachings, the Dharma, (3) "teaching traditions",[73] referring to social communities or groups that adhere to specific teachings and ritual practices, and (4) even moral and legal rules, as in the compound *mi chos*. In relation to the communicative situation surrounding *chos* and *chos pa*, the statements encompass social groups and their communicative activities. By describing the practices and rituals performed by male and female shamans as "teachings", a transformed perception of Mongolian socio-religious reality emerged. Social structures were further solidified, while concurrently experiencing a reification process in

---

[69] This personalization of religion is also a defining characteristic of European religious history, as demonstrated by the use of the label "Mohammedans" for Muslims.

[70] *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (Beijing 1985), I, 840. Various religious specialists fall into the social category of *chos pa*: nuns and monks, *ser khyim*, often referred to as "village lamas", exorcists, weather-makers, and other ritual specialists.

[71] As in Isibaldan, *Erdeni-yin erike*, folio 28r12/28v1: *böge-yin üjel*.

[72] This is not exclusive to Asian knowledge cultures but also pertains to the concept of religion (or more accurately, the concepts of religion) in European historical contexts, as well as academic religious discourse, see Martin Riesebrodt's work, *Cultus und Heilsversprechen: Eine Theorie der Religionen* (Munich 2007), 27–29.

[73] Mostly, but not exclusively, in the composition *chos lugs*.

linguistic appropriation, culminating in the establishment of a "teaching of the shamans". This becomes particularly evident in the term *Udaɣun-u surtaɣun*, "the teaching of the female shamans",[74] which is employed in the shamanic [171] chronicle *Ongɣod qar-a sakiɣus-un teüke sudur bičig*.[75] In Mongolian, *surtaɣun* literally signifies "that which is taught or studied, science, rules, teachings". While the chronicle presents the practices of shamanic actors in an almost epic narrative, the rhetorical use of *surtaɣun* strikingly demonstrates how self-evident the—discursively produced—"teaching" of male and female shamans had become in the 18th century.

Alongside the *term buruɣu üjel*, additional terms are utilized to characterize the "shamanic teaching", which similarly suggest a homogeneous teaching or worldview. For instance, in the colophon of an early translation of the Tibetan *'Dzangs blun*, the phrase *qara jüg*, "black direction",[76] can be found, which continued as *qara šasin* or *qara nom*, "black teaching", from the 18th century onwards. Further elaboration on the latter two terms will be provided later in the text.

1.3.2 *Böge mörgöl*

To distinguish "Buddhist doctrine" from "shamanic doctrine", a binary conceptual pairing also was—and still is—in use, namely *šasin mörgöl* and *böge mörgöl*.[77] In the Mongolian language, *mörgöl* denotes "bowing" in a literal sense, placing emphasis on the physical act of reverence. Both terms can be translated as "bowing [172] before of the Dharma" and "bowing before the shaman", respectively. These terms underscore the visible and performative aspects inherent to the Mongolian understanding of religion and point towards the resulting success of the missionary strategies of the Tibetan monks. The rapid process of Buddhism being adopted into Mongolian societies occurred, in part, because Mongols and Tibetans shared a similar habitus

---

[74] This reference underscores the importance of female shamans in Mongolian societies. The texts under discussion mention female shamans as being equivalent to male shamans. However, it is no longer possible to determine today whether there were more female than male shamans in historical Mongolian societies. The significance and role of female shamans, particularly in Siberian societies, have long been a subject of contentious debate in research. See Ronald Hutton, *Shamans: Siberian Spirituality and the Western Imagination* (Hambledon; London 2001), 104–109. The European depiction of the shaman as primarily male can be partly attributed to the male perspective of early travelers and ethnographers.

[75] P. 4, 1–2.

[76] The Tibetan text *'Dzangs blun zhes bya ba'i mdo*, translated into Mongolian as *Üliger-ün dalai sudur orosiba*, see Ligeti, *Catalogue*, No. 1103. The original title of the translation, prepared by the renowned translator Siregetü güsi čorji, was *Siluɣun onol-tu kemegdekü sudur*. This work is still mentioned with its original title in the manuscript *Ganjur*, as indicated in Kas'yanenko's *Catalogue*, No. 839. However, the cited translation was carried out by a contemporary of Siregetü güsi čorji, Toyin guosi, under the title *Siluɣun budaɣun üye onoqui neretü sudur* between 1578 and 1612. I did not have access to this translation, but the colophon has been published in Latin transcription (alongside a German translation), see Walther Heissig, "Toyin guosi ~ Guisi alias Čorji: Versuch einer Identifizierung", *Central Asian Studies* 9 (1975): 361–446, specifically on pages 391–408. For the term *qara jüg*, see page 398.

[77] For example, in *Qori kiged ayuyin buriyad-nar-un urida-dayan boluysan* (1863), 21ff. and in *Qori-yin arban nigen ečige-yin jun-u uɣ ijaɣur-un tuɣuji* (1875), 91–93.

21

within a shared religious field.[78] The *habitus*, shaped by historical and social influences, is constituted by individual and collective experiences. Its structures are implicit and as such provide the basis for orientation within the social world. The habitus influences one's mode of existence extending to one's physical expressions; it is "a state of the body".[79] The swift dissemination and establishment of Buddhism within the Mongolian regions can be attributed to these performative strategies.[80] The call to "spread the Dharma" (*nom-i delgerekü*), as consistently mentioned in the works of that time, primarily entailed the enforcement and physical embodiment of Buddhist rituals and practices. This involved loud recitations of mantras and Dhāraṇīs as well as the implementation of various practices and rituals. The spread of the Dharma was based on physical performance, and as a second step, on the acquisition of social power through spatial presence. The Dharma needed to be performed publicly, before an audience. Therefore, when we speak of "religion" within this specific historical and local context, it is important to recognize that we are dealing with an understanding of religion that accentuates particular aspects, which often do not take precedence in our everyday understanding of religion and in the conceptual framework of the academic study of religion. "Religion" (*mörgöl*) refers here to the performance, the bodily enactment, of practices and rituals. However, to my knowledge, *mörgöl* is employed in the sources [173] solely in direct reference to "shamanism" and—more rarely—to "Buddhism", and even in these cases only as part of the pair *böge mörgöl / šasin mörgöl*.

The extent to which the reification of male and female shamans as a homogeneous group had advanced by the end of the 17th century is evident in an article in the so-called Kangxi Law Code for the Qalqa Mongols, which was published in Mongolian after 1694.[81] In 1691, the Qalqa Mongols had recently pledged their allegiance to the Kangxi ruler at the famous Assembly of Dolon Nor. The law code comprises a total of 152 legal articles, one of which addresses the "community of Buddhist lamas and the community of male and female shamans" (*lam-a-nar-yin ayimaγ: böge iduγan-u ayimaγ*). This article provides instructions on how to deal with lamas or

---

[78] According to Pierre Bourdieu, *habitus* forms are "durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them" (Pierre Bourdieu, *Entwurf einer Theorie der Praxis auf der ethnologischen Grundlage der kabylischen Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main 1976), 165 [English 1990, 53]).

[79] See P. Bourdieu, *Sozialer Sinn: Kritik der theoretischen Vernunft* (Frankfurt am Main 1987), 126.

[80] In this regard, see K. Kollmar-Paulenz, "Embodying the Dharma: The Buddhist Way into Mongolia". In *Transformations and Transfer of Tantra in Asia and Beyond*, edited by István Keul (Berlin; Boston 2012), 239–261.

[81] This collection of individual laws is kept in the State Library of Ulaanbaatar under the title *Γadaγadu mongγol-un törö-yin jasaqu yabudal-un yamun-un engke amuγulang-un üy-e-e-dü 1693 on-du keblegsen, dotora 1629 on-ača ekileged udaγ-a daraγ-a qaγad-un üy-e-dü jarlaγsan čaγaja-du-i jasamjilaγsan mongγol-un čaγajan-u bičig*; see D. Heuschert, *Die Gesetzgebung der Qing für die Mongolen im 17. Jahrhundert anhand des Mongolischen Gesetzbuches aus der Kangxi-Zeit (1662–1722)* (Wiesbaden 1998). As Heuschert points out, the publication date of 1693 mentioned in the title cannot be correct because the most recent law article in the collection is dated 1694.

shamans who have violated the rules (*yosun*) of their respective communities. The encounters and confrontations between Buddhist monks and local religious specialists, as well as the accompanying and formative discourse, resulted in new categorizations and practices: the Qing government came to consider and treat a number of ritual actors—referred to as *böge* and *iduɣan*—, who were previously loosely connected and very differently integrated in their respective local social contexts, as a homogeneous, supra-regional community with its own code of conduct. In this way, a process of reification that was initiated on a discursive level by the Buddhist Tibetan and Mongolian elites found its counterpart in legislation and, indeed, in social reality. Here, Foucault's dictum according to which discourses are practices that "systematically form the objects of which they speak" finds a striking confirmation.[82] [174]

1.4 *Šasin* as comparative concept

Šasin remained the preferred concept in Mongolian works of the 18th and 19th centuries, as evidenced by the analysis of three important Mongolian chronicles—*Altan kürdün mingɣan kegesütü bičig*,[83] *Bolor erike*[84] and *Bolor toli*,[85]—along with the biographies of the Jebtsundamba Qutuɣtus.[86] In the 18th and 19th centuries, the terms *šasin* and, to a much lesser extent, *nom*, emancipated themselves from their exclusively Buddhist meaning. *Šasin* was increasingly used in a comparative sense now serving to subsume various areas of reality, perceived as functionally equivalent, under a general or overarching term. This development was most likely prompted by the engagement with the male and female shamans. At this point, they were referred to using the term *böge-ner-ün šasin*,[87] but also increasingly [175] the pejorative *qara šasin* ("black

---

82 M. Foucault, *Archäologie des Wissens* (Frankfurt am Main 1997), 74.

83 Composed in 1739 by Siregetü guosi dharma, see Heissig, *Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung*, 134–159. I have used the manuscript edited by Heissig, see W. Heissig, ed., *Altan kürdün mingɣan gegesütü bičig: Eine mongolische Chronik von Siregetü Guosi Dharma (1739), Herausgegeben und mit Einleitung und Namensverzeichnis versehen* (Copenhagen 1958). Siregetü guosi dharma almost exclusively uses *šasin*, see III, folio 4r9 and 10, IV, folio 14v5 and 6, 20v1, and V, folio 2v8 and 13r2. Buddhism in Mongolia is also often specified as *bConggaba-yin šasin* (in the 4th and 5th books), reflecting the dominant dGe lugs pa discourse of the 18th century.

84 This chronicle was written in 1774/75 by the nobleman Rasipungsuɣ, see W. Heissig, *Bolur Erike "Eine Kette aus Bergkristallen". Eine mongolische Chronik der Kienlung-Zeit von Rasipungsuɣ (1774/75). Literarhistorisch untersucht* (Peiping 1946), and Heissig, *Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung*, 198–200. I have used the edition by Mostaert and Cleaves, see A. Mostaert and F.W. Cleaves, eds., *Bolor Erike. Mongolian Chronicle by Rasipungsuɣ*. 5 vols. (Cambridge, MA 1959). Rasipungsuɣ mostly speaks of *burqan-u šasin* and *bCongkaba-yin degedü šasin*.

85 Composed between 1834 and 1837 by the Buddhist monk Jimbadorji, see W. Heissig, ed., *Bolur Toli "Spiegel aus Bergkristall" von Jimbadorji (1834–1837). Buch III: Geschichte der Mongolen* (Copenhagen 1962). Jimbadorji deals with the conversion of the Mongols to Buddhism similarly to Saɣang Sečen, who he likely used as a model, see *Erdeni-yin tobči*, folio 76v14ff, and *Bolor toli*, Book III, 54–58.

86 Folio 1r1, 1r34 etc. The manuscript I used does not have a title, see Ch.R. Bawden, *The Jebtsundamba Khutukhtus of Urga. Text, Translation and Notes* (Wiesbaden 1961). Another manuscript of the text bears the title *Boɣda jebcundamba qutuɣtu-yin namtar-a*. This work by an anonymous author can be dated to 1859, as revealed by a note on folio 47v3–4.

87 See the chronicle *Qori-yin arban nigen ečige-yin jun-u uɣ ijaɣur-un tuɣuji*, 92s. The chronicle *Qori kiged aɣuyin buriyad-nar-un urida-daɣan boluɣsan anu* (1863) deals with *keristos-un šasin*, or "religion of Christ" (p. 15).

teaching"),[88] contrasted with *sira šasin* ("yellow teaching").[89] *Sira šasin* generally refers to the Tibetan form of Buddhism that was widespread among the Mongols, with the dGe lugs pa school elevated to the norm.[90] Interestingly, the shamanic actors quickly embraced *qara šasin* as a self-designation, also carrying a reifying connotation. Male and female shamans identified themselves with a "black teaching".[91] The color of male and female shamans among the Mongols has been white since the thirteenth century. It is unclear why they adopted this pejorative external designation. Even today, they identify themselves as belonging to *qara šasin*.

In addition to the "Buddhist" and "shamanic teachings", Mongolian sources dating back to the early 17th century, have also referenced Muslim peoples such as the Kazakhs or the Uighurs. From the 19th century onwards, Islam has been categorized under the organizing concept of *šasin* and labeled as *Lalu-yin šasin*. Attributive modifiers were employed to define group affiliations. For instance, Christianity is referred to as *Keristos-un šasin*. The "Inner" and "Outer" Mongols were only (re)introduced to this religion in the 19th century,[92] while the Buryat Mongols had been exposed to Christian missions at an earlier time. [176]

1.5 Preliminary results

In summary, we can state the following preliminary results: Throughout the centuries, Tibetan intellectual elites have developed a nuanced terminology to name their own doctrine or teaching system, as well as to identify both intra-Buddhist adversaries and non-Buddhist teaching systems. Within the Tibetan context, we find early instances of comparative terminological usage, for example, the term *kla klo'i chos* for Islam.[93] Yet, as a concept of social order, the semantic field of *chos* also encompassed the actors in the religious field, known as *chos pa*. In light of functional analogies with actors in the Tibetan religious field, corresponding classification terms were

---

[88] In the chronicle *Qori-yin arban nigen ečige-yin jun-u uγ ijaγur-un tuγuji*, the vilification of religious competitors is very severe. The author speaks of the *böge-ner-ün šasin* as a "corrupted system" (*qačaγai yosun*) and refers to shamans as *mekeči*, "frauds, charlatans", see *op. cit.*, 115.

[89] The term refers back to the yellow headgear worn by dGe lugs pa monks.

[90] For example, see the biographies of the Jebtsundamba Qutuγtus, folio 1r8.

[91] A further inner-shamanic division, which was still relevant at least in Eastern Mongolia in the mid-20th century, and which distinguished between so-called white shamans (*čaγan böge*) and black shamans (*qara böge*), cannot be discussed here. In this distinction, "black shamans" were considered the more powerful ones who follow the "old, pure" shamanic teachings, while "white shamans" were considered "Buddhicized" shamans, see Heissig, "Persecution", 205 and 210.

[92] Christianity, in its form as the Church of the East, had many followers among the Mongolian elite in the Mongol Empire.

[93] For example, see the explanatory commentary on the teachings of Islam in the Vimalaprabhā: "… the Creator Rahman creates all moving, living and immobile, inanimate things. By satisfying the Creator Rahman, the reason for their liberation (*thar pa*), the white-clad heretics called sTag gzig, certainly attain heaven (*mtho ris*), and by not satisfying him, hell. Thus is the doctrine (here: *bstan pa*) of Rahman" (*Vimalaprabhā-nāma mūlatantrānusārinī dvādaśasāhasrikālaghu kālacakra-tantrarāja-tīkā*; Tib. title, *bsDus pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po dus kyi `khor lo'i `grel bshad rtsa ba'i rgyud rjes su `jug pa stong phrag bcu gnyis pa dri ma med pa'i `od ces bya ba*. I use the edition compiled by Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364); see L. Chandra, ed., *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, Part II (KHA), text fig. 203,2–4).

applied to specific Mongol ritual practices and their practitioners within the socio-cultural context of the 17ᵗʰ and 18ᵗʰ centuries. The terms *šasin* and *nom* are derived from religious terminology.[94] They served a dual purpose: firstly, to establish a distinction from outsiders, and secondly, since the 18ᵗʰ century, to subsume particular aspects of one's own and other people's realities, perceived as functionally equivalent, under a generic term.

A certain degree of standardization of the comparative terms can be observed in the sources analyzed. Although *šasin* and, to a lesser extent, *nom*, had become prevalent, a variety of other designations can still be found in both the 18ᵗʰ and 19ᵗʰ centuries, which are used in a comparative sense. This is the case, for instance, of *surtaγun* or *yosun*,[95] a term that has a range of meanings in the [177] 18ᵗʰ century that extends from "custom, socially accepted rule", to "habit", and even to "system, method".

It is also worth noting that in Mongolian Buddhist elite discourses we can observe analogous processes of reification regarding so-called shamanism similar to those well-known from European intellectual history, especially in recent centuries, which also gave rise to the study of religion (as an academic discipline). As Michael Pye already pointed out at the 2ⁿᵈ conference of the "Workgroup on the History of Asian Religions" (AKAR) of the German Association for the Study of Religions:

> " Reification […] seems to be a characteristic of at least one phase in the emergence of any historical view of religions, in East Asia as well as in the Western world. Significantly, therefore, it is not just some kind of western disease.[96]

The extent to which the Mongolian discourse on "shamanism" has influenced the European one cannot be further explored here.[97]

---

[94] This is not a specific characteristic of Buddhist knowledge cultures. In Europe as well, the Enlightenment discourse emerged from a religiously framed tradition; see Schulze, "Weltbilder", 168.

[95] Thus in the biography of the 2ⁿᵈ lCang skya Qutuγtu Rol pa'i rdo rje, see *rDo rje `chang lcang skya rol pa'i rdo rje ye shes bstan pa'i sgron me dpal bzang po'i rnam par thar pa dad pa'i padmo rnam par `bye dpa nyi ma'i òd zer zhes bya ba bzhugs so/ Včir dhar-a ljang sky-a lilida bajar-a jñana šasan-a dibi srii badr-a-yin čadig süsüg-ün lingqu-a-yi teyin büged negegči naran-u gerel kemegdekü orosiba*, folio 140r21, where the Tibetan Bon religion and the dGe lugs pa teachings are referred to as *bomo-yin yosun* and *dge legs ba-yin yosun*, respectively. For the Mongolian *yosun*, the Tibetan text writes *lugs*. The biography was written in 1787 by Ngag dbang thub bstan dbang phyug. The facsimile of the Tibetan and Mongolian versions is included in H.-R. Kämpfe, *Ñi ma'i `od zer/ Naran-u gerel. Die Biographie des 2. Pekinger lČan skya-Qutuqtu Rol pa'i rdo rje (1717–1786). Herausgegeben, eingeleitet und zusammengefasst* (St. Augustine 1976).

[96] Michael Pye, "Overcoming Westernism: The End of Orientalism and Occidentalism." In *Religion im Spiegelkabinett: Asiatische Religionsgeschichte im Spannungsfeld zwischen Orientalismus und Okzidentalismus*, edited by Peter Schalk et al. (Uppsala 2003), 111, note 40.

[97] In this regard, see Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz, "The Invention of 'Shamanism' in 18th-Century Mongolian Elite Discourse." In *Rocznik Orientalistyczny / Yearbook of Oriental Studies* [T. 65, Z. 1 (2012), 90–106].

2. Towards a global history of religion

2.1 The "glocalization" of the religious discourse

2.1.1 *Mongolian shamanism*

The triumph of the comparative term *šasin* has continued into the 20th and early 21st centuries. Mongolian cultural and social sciences cannot do without this term [178], as evidenced by the titles of numerous book publications in the fields of social and cultural studies.[98] Today, *šasin* is consistently used in all scholarly works written in the Mongolian language. This is most clearly illustrated by the title of the bilingual "Dictionary of Religions", the *Šasin-u toli*,[99] literally "Mirror of Religions" [published by a collective of authors in 1996]. In addition to Tibetan-Mongolian Buddhism, to which it devotes the most space, the dictionary presents the historical and contemporary religious traditions of the world. Terms such as *yuda šasin* for "Jewish religion" or the already known *böge-yin šasin* for "religion of the shamans", continues the terminology developed over the past centuries. It would therefore be factually incorrect to assume that contemporary Mongolian authors, in the absence of their own term, adopted the European concept of "religion" and translated it with the Mongolian word *šasin*. Such an assumption would ignore the centuries-long conceptual history of Mongolian knowledge cultures. *Šasin* does much more than merely provide a translation of a European term: The modern concept draws upon corresponding historical Mongolian meanings. Along with the terminology, the respective orders of knowledge and conceptions of the world are also conveyed. However, the influence of globalized, primarily Protestant-influenced "Western" religious discourses is also unmistakable. In the following, various constructions of "shamanism" will serve to illustrate the interaction between local and globalized European-American discourses on "religion".

As discussed above, the terminological reification of the "teaching of the shamans" is quite tangible in the texts from the 17th and 18th centuries, but the discursively constructed "teaching of the Shamans" remains only vaguely defined in content. We learn merely that healing and exorcism are the only distinctive characters of male and female shamans. It is only 19th-century Buryat Mongolian chronicles [179] that first provide detailed and systematic representations of the "teaching of the shamans". The chronicle *Qori kiged ayuyin buriyad-nar- un urida-dayan boluysan anu* contains an origin story of the "teaching of the shamans". It also provides a description of the shamanic equipment, explains the purpose of shamanizing, and then elaborates on the various activities of the male or female shaman. These activities include healing

---

[98] See, for example, Altanyarudi und Bao De, *Mongyoljin-u šasin surtayun* ("The Religious Traditions of the Mongols") (Qayilar 1995); Coyiji, *Mongyol-un burqan-u šasin-u teüke* ("History of Mongolian Buddhism"), 2 Vol. (Kökeqota 1998 and 2003); Sutubilig, *Chos lugs kyi tshig mdzod/ šasin-u toli* ("Dictionary of Religions") (1996).

[99] Literally, the Tibetan title translates "Treasure House of the Religious Systems". For bibliographical information, see the previous note.

the sick through the evocation of an *Ongγon*; exorcising evil spirits (*čidkür*) by binding them to a substitute, which is then burned, or to an animal that is slaughtered; divination (*tölge*) using a sheep's shoulder blade bone; and driving out evil spirits that cause harm to a person's possessions (*ed tavar*). Male and female shamans also perform invocations through blessings, benedictions, and the like to protect the family, children, livestock, or hunters from evil spirits or contagious diseases, and to generally bring happiness, blessings, and prosperity.[100]

Male and female shamans shared the worldview of the communities they belonged to.[101] They were ritual specialists, primarily active in healing the sick. However, shamanic practices and rituals were only one aspect of the numerous Mongolian religious practices encountered by the Buddhist monks. Other ritual practices and beliefs played (and, in part, continue to play) an important role in daily life. This is the case, for example, of the mountain cult,[102] the fire cult,[103] and the worship of the hearth deity.[104]

In addition, a number of cults existed around the figure of the "White Old Man" (*čaγan ebügen*),[105] the epic hero Geser Qan,[106] as well as a variety of deities and spirits. [180] Buddhist

---

[100] *Qori kiged aγuyin buriyad-nar-un urida-dayan boluγsan anu*, 17,4–19,12. In the representation, the focus is on the practices. The author even emphasizes that the shamans possess neither writings (*nom bičig*) nor dogmatic teachings (*surγal*) (page 20).

[101] Heissig, *Religionen der Mongolei*, 349–420. Heissig distinguishes between a Mongolian "folk religion", "shamanism", and "Lamaism", that is, Tibetan Buddhism. See also Á. Birtalan, "Die Mythologie der mongolischen Volksreligion". In *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, edited by E. Schmalzriedt and H. W. Haussig. *I. Abteilung: Die alten Kulturvölker;* 34th edition (Stuttgart 2001).

[102] M. Tatár, "Two Mongol Texts Concerning the Cult of the Mountains", *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 30, no.1 (1976): 1–58.

[103] Fundamental on the fire cult, Nima, *Mongγolčud-un γal* (Kökeqota, 2003); see also Ch. Atwood, "Buddhism and Popular Ritual in Mongolian Religion: A Reexamination of the Fire Cult". *History of Religions* 36, no.2 (1996): 112–139.

[104] In this regard, see D. Dumas, *Aspekte und Wandlungen der Verehrung des Herdfeuers bei den Mongolen. Eine Analyse der mongolischen "Feuergebete"* (Bonn 1987).

[105] An indigenous Mongolian deity responsible for cattle and fertility; see Heissig, *Religionen der Mongolei*, 383–389. Čaγan ebügen, known in Tibet as *sGam po dkar po*, was introduced into the Buddhist pantheon, as evidenced by a series of ritual texts and prayers; see also A. Sárközi, "Incense-offering to the White Old Man". In *Documenta Barbarorum: Festschrift für Walther Heissig zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by K. Sagaster and M. Weiers (Wiesbaden 1983), 357–369. One of the most popular prayers to the "White Old Man", the *Γajar usun-i nomuγadqan daruγulun čidaγči neretü sudur*, has the form of a Buddhist sūtra and even presents an invented Chinese title, although no sūtra with such title is known in the Chinese canon. In the *Tsam*-dance, the "White Old Man" played the role of the jester; see the historical recording of the 1937 *Tsam*-dance in Urga, present-day Ulaanbaatar, in P. Berger, "Buddhist Festivals in Mongolia". In *Mongolia: The Legacy of Chinggis Khan*, edited by P. Berger and T. T. Bartholomew (San Francisco 1995), 152. During the Christianization of the Buryat Mongols in the second half of the 18th century, the White Old Man was identified with the Russian Orthodox Saint Nicholas.

[106] The classic work on the Mongolian Geser epic is still C. Damdinsüren's *Istoricheskie korni Gèsèriady* (Moscow, 1957). Early on, Geser was identified with Bisman tngri, Skt. Vaiśrāvana. In Mongolian Buddhism, he has a dual role: on the one hand, he is one of the four Lokapāla; on the other hand, he is a god of wealth and belongs to the so-called *Tngri*, a group of indigenous deities (which also entered into a symbiosis with Buddhist deities). The Qing rulers promoted the emerging Geser Qan cult and identified Geser with Guan Di, the hero of the Chinese historical novel "Three Kingdoms" and war god; see P. K. Crossley, *A Translucent Mirror: History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology* (Berkeley et. al., 2002), 244–245 and 284–285.

monks did not consider shamans as the primary actors in these rituals and practices. Thus, during the late 16th and early 17th centuries when Buddhism was established, these practices were not forbidden or persecuted, but gradually buddhicized.

As late as the 19th century, rituals such as mountain worship, the worship of the hearth deity, the *obo* cult, and other practices were not associated with the "teaching of the Shamans", as shown by the aforementioned Buryat-Mongolian chronicle, in which they are not mentioned. This is also confirmed by the chronicle [181] *Qori-yin arban nigen ečige- yin jun-u uγ ijaγur-un tuγuji*, which follows the chapter on Buddhism among the Buryat Mongols with a chapter on *Böge-ner-ün mörgöl*.[107] The chapter discusses the emergence of the male and female shamans and provides detailed information on their practices and objectives. In contrast to the first-mentioned chronicle, author Yamdan Yumsunov devotes considerable space to describing various *Tngri*,[108] which serve as "supports for invocation" (*jalbariday sitügen*). He does not mention other Mongolian everyday religious practices. From the 19th-century Mongolian accounts, readers gain the impression of a "teaching of the Shamans" that focuses on specific ritual practices, all aimed at providing practical life assistance to people.

Today, the representation of the "shamanic[109] teaching" (*böge mörgöl / böge-yin šasin*) has undergone significant changes. Over the past twenty years, Mongolian cultural studies research has explored nearly all everyday religious practices under the umbrella term "shamanism". Therefore, relevant publications discuss the sacrificial cult to the hearth divinity, the worship of mountains and waters, the cult of the "White Old Man", and more as components of "shamanism".[110] The uniquely Mongolian "shamanism" discourse, which had established a "teaching of the shamans" long before the European construction of "shamanism" as a distinct religious category, has merged with the European-American "religion discourse" that integrates everyday religious practices into its concept of shamanism.[111] In many contemporary Mongolian

---

However, there was also resistance from the Sangha against a Buddhist cult of Geser Qan, since already in the early printed version of the epic from 1617, some stories present a clearly anti-monastic tone. In one story, Geser Qan is transformed into a donkey by a monster (Mo. *mangγus*) disguised as an incarnated Lama (*qubilγan*). In the Buryat Mongolian versions of the epic, the Buddhist "setting" eventually disappears completely. Mongolian prayers to Geser Qan describe the epic hero as a mountain and warrior deity who is invoked for the protection of livestock herds and promises success in military campaigns, hunting, and male competitions such as wrestling, horse racing, and archery.

[107] P. 63–91: *šasin mörgöl-ün učira*; 91–115: *böge-ner-ün mörgöl-ün* učira.

[108] Literally: "heavenly"—an important group of Mongolian deities that were introduced into the Buddhist pantheon.

[109] The Mongolian languages do not have a grammatical adjective, only nouns. Nouns can perform nominal or adjectival functions in a sentence. Therefore, *böge* can mean either "shaman" or "shamanic", depending on the context.

[110] See, for example, the table of contents of the 1991 work by L. Qurča- baγatur and Č. Üjüm-e *Mongγol-un böge mörgöl-ün tayily-a takily-a-yin soyul* ("The Culture of Sacrifice of the Shamanic Religion of the Mongols").

[111] See, for example, Ch. Atwood, *Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire* (New York 2004), 465, or Á. Birtalan, "Die Mythologie der mongolischen Volksreligion". In *Dictionary of Mythology*, edited by E. Schmalzriedt and H. W. Haussig, *I. Abteilung: Die alten Kulturvölker*, 34th edition (Stuttgart 2001).

accounts, the Mongols possess two religions, shamanism and Buddhism.[112] Previously unsystematized religious rituals and practices from earlier centuries [182] are now subsumed under "shamanism". This categorization prevails not only in academic discourse, but also in the broader societal context. This view is widely accepted today, as evidenced by religion statistics that provide corresponding categories. Indeed, recent sociological surveys conducted in the Republic of Buryatia, for example, pose the question "If you are religious, what religion do you belong to?" and offer response categories such as (1) Shamanism, (2) Buddhism, (3) Russian Orthodoxy, and (4) Protestantism (Lutheran, Baptist, Adventist, etc.).[113]

2.1.2 *Christian religion from a Mongolian perspective*

Another example of "glocalization" in Mongolian and European-American religious discourses can be found in the previously mentioned Mongolian "Dictionary of Religions". This dictionary combines elements of traditional Tibetan-Mongolian Buddhist terminological dictionaries with modern European-American reference works, such as the "Oxford Dictionary of Religions". Of all the religions, Tibeto-Mongolian Buddhism has the most entries by far. Descriptions of non-Buddhist religions utilize Buddhist nomenclature.[114] Similar to European-American dictionaries that depict non-Christian religions using Christian terminology, this can result in intriguing shifts in meaning. For instance, the Christian term "God" is translated as "Qormusta Tngri, he who created the world".[115] Qormusta [183] Tngri presides over the group of so-called "Thirty-Three Gods";[116] he is also equated with Indra from Indian mythology. However, the idea of a personal and absolute divine omnipotence is foreign to this Mongolian-Buddhist conception. Quite on the contrary, the Thirty-Three Gods are part of *Saṃsāra*. Thus, translating "God" with "Qormusta Tngri" evokes entirely different associations in the Mongolian reader compared to the Christian understanding of God—resulting in a significant deviation from Christian self-understanding. Scholars should pay greater attention to such transformation processes that arise in non-

---

[112] Thus, historian Liu Jin Süe writes in his "Short History of the Mongols" (*Mongyol-un quriyangyui teüke*, Kökeqota 1998), 126, that after creating the empire, Chinggis Khan established the religion of the shamans. Although the ruler and his successors granted equal rights to all religions (*šasin bükün*), the Mongol's central faith was rooted in the religion of the shamans (*mongyolcud youl ni böge-yin šasin-i sitüdeg bayijai*).

[113] G.E. Manzanov, *Religioznye tradicii v kul'ture burjatskogo naroda* (Ulan-Ude 2005), 172–173.

[114] Thus, the Old and New Testaments are naturally described as *sudur*, sūtra (for example, *Šasin-u toli*, 46).

[115] *Šasin-u toli*, 506. Accordingly, Jesus is the "only son of Qormusta Tngri", see *Šasin-u toli*, 46. Conversely, in Mongolian Bible translations, the established term to translate "God" is *burqan*. In addition to a deity invoked in everyday religious practice, the Mongolian *burqan* refers especially to the Buddha or Buddhas. Recently, the use of *burqan* for "God" has sparked controversy among Buddhists in Mongolia. This was partly due to the considerable success of Christian, mostly Protestant, mission churches, which have made Buddhist institutions feel threatened.

[116] The *Trāyastrimśa* are assigned to the *kāmadhātu*, see G. Grönbold, "Die Mythologie des indischen Buddhismus". In *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, edited by H.W. Haussig (Stuttgart 1976), 393–394. For the status of "gods" in Buddhism in general, see also O. Freiberger and Ch. Kleine, *Buddhismus. Handbuch und kritische Einführung* (Göttingen 2011), 206.

European cultural contexts due to the utilization of terminologies specific to their own historical knowledge cultures.

2.2 Mongolian and European intellectuals

Scholars of religion have often lamented that the hegemonic dominance of the European Protestant concept of religion has led to the standardization of emic traditions worldwide according to this model. A thorough examination of the reception history of Asian religious traditions in Europe has indeed revealed the Protestant patterns upon which both "Hinduism" and "Buddhism"—but also "Confucianism", "Daoism", or "Shintoism"—were constructed. However, some scholars now criticize these genealogies of non-European religions for depriving the local actors of any initiative and instead degrading them to passive objects of their own history (which they have, in effect, lost). Charles Hallisey,[117] Richard King, and others have increasingly pointed out in recent years that "Hinduism", "Buddhism", etc. emerged through the active participation [184] of local actors. As Richard King emphasizes in his genealogy of the "Discovery of Buddhism": "It is important to reiterate at this point the role played by Asian Buddhists and specific Buddhist texts in the modern construction of Buddhism".[118] Early European Orientalists primarily obtained their knowledge from indigenous informants who were actively involved in shaping "Hinduism" and "Buddhism". Recognizing the "intercultural mimesis," as Hallisey calls these mutual relationships between the "West" and the "East",[119] represents a further step in overcoming the East-West dichotomy still perpetuated in Asian studies and the study of religion. However, it continues the familiar pattern that the "West" acts and the "East" reacts. Asian knowledge cultures are only relevant to us if "aspects of a culture of a subjectified people influenced the investigator to represent that culture in a certain manner".[120] This fixation is undoubtedly due to the asymmetry of knowledge and power in the orientalist discourses shaped by the colonial situation. However, it not only obscures our view of the equality between European and Asian knowledge cultures, but also suggests that the history of the latter only dates back to the 18th and 19th centuries—the centuries of colonial "encounters". Asia only enters history through its encounter with Europe, or, put another way: Asian knowledge systems gain their legitimacy through their engagement with and incorporation of European ideas.

This bias results in a peculiar timelessness that still clings to Asian societies and to local knowledge systems developed before the 18th century. This, in turn, has considerable influence on our view of the historical elite discourses in these societies. In Asian studies and the study of religion, these discourses were (and are) mostly read not as dynamic intellectual debates, but as repetitive and static confirmations of a timeless tradition. The carriers of these discourses, the local intellectuals,

---

[117] Ch. Hallisey, "Roads Taken and Not Taken in the Study of Theravāda Buddhism". In *Curators of the Buddha. The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, edited by D.S. Lopez (Chicago; London 1995), 31–61.

[118] King, *Orientalism and Religion*, 149.

[119] Hallisey, "Roads Taken", 33.

[120] Hallisey, "Roads Taken", 33.

are all too often perceived as representatives of a tradition that they merely substantiate and perpetuate, rather than as individual personalities. Thus, in the relevant publications on the history of [185] the Mongols in the 16th century, Qutuγtai Sečen Qung Tayiji, a Mongol prince, general, and intellectual who reconceptualized the "White History"—the doctrine of the two orders of state and religion—is seen more as the representative and administrator of a tradition than as an individual pioneering thinker of his time.[121] In contrast, Francis Bacon, who lived only a short time later, is praised as an "innovative natural scientist",[122] a scholar who, in the scientific context of the European early modern period, engaged with a wide variety of different traditions.

The still prevailing tendency to de-historicize Asian knowledge cultures also involves a de-individualization of their intellectual elites. One result of this often-unconscious attitude towards our research objects is that, so far, the study of religion has paid insufficient attention to the influences of emic analytical concepts on the discourse field "religion". The example provided here of the interweaving of emic and etic discourses in current Mongolian academic works on "shamanism" demonstrates the importance of considering particular Asian orders of knowledge in their historical depth, as they affect the modern "glocal" discourse. As "Western" and "non-Western" scholars continually meet and collaborate in the internationalized academic world, one can only hope that non-European knowledge systems will influence our own conceptualizations over time.[123]

2.3 Global history of religion

What theoretical implications do the results presented here have for the study of religion, specifically for research pursuing the project of a "global history of religion"?

First, it is essential to clarify the meaning of a [186] "global history of religion". The concept of global history of religion has been developed in response to the recent historiographical theoretical approaches to global history. These approaches concentrate primarily on examining the global interconnections of historical actors, focusing on the interrelationships between different world regions. Consequently, they abandon the fixation on Europe as the center of historical events and attempt to write a multi-centric history. This includes adopting a theoretical perspective that incorporates non-European historical concepts. Similarly, a global history of religion aims to de-Europeanize the theoretical perspectives on "religion". The concept seeks to implement what Richard King posed in his rhetorical question eleven years ago: "…why should theorists be limited by the Western framing of the debate?"[124] He further expounds:

---

[121] See W. Heissig, *Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung I*, 17–18.

[122] W. Reinhard, *Lebensformen Europas: Eine historische Kulturanthropologie* (München 2004), 567.

[123] However, this is counteracted by the normative primacy of English. For an examination of the significance of "unequal languages" in the academic discourse, see Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore; London 1993), 189–199.

[124] King, *Orientalism and Religion*, 198.

> [...] as if the European framings of the debate were the only options available to the postcolonial critic. The introduction of a variety of indigenous epistemic traditions is, in my view, the single most important step that postcolonial studies can take if it is to look beyond the Eurocentric foundations of its theories and contest the epistemic violence of the colonial encounter. This challenge requires engagement with the knowledge-forms and histories of those cultures that have been colonized by the West [...][125]

However, implementing this is easier said than done, as evidenced by Dipesh Chakrabarty's lament cited initially. While I would not want to restrict the issue formulated by Richard King solely to the peoples colonized by Western powers,[126] a global history of religion pursues exactly this specific interest. It aims to globalize theoretical perspectives on "religion", relinquish Europe's primacy in favor of a multi-centric viewpoint, and equitably incorporate European and non-European analytical perspectives within the discourse field of "religion". Thus, the concept of a "global history of religion" relies on the premise that the development of secondary orders of knowledge is not exclusive to Europe. Rather, various regions worldwide have developed distinct analytical instruments and knowledge classification systems. [187] Despite differences in content, these systems can be brought into functional and structural analogy with each other and in this way, explored comparatively. Consequently, a global history of religion challenges European hegemony over the analytical concept of "religion". It adopts a multi-perspectivity that relates European and non-European analytical perspectives within the discourse field of "religion".[127]

The research topics of a global history of religion include:

– local cultural conceptualizations of the field of "religion",
– historical interactions among different world regions,
– long-term developments from global perspectives and
– micro-studies focusing on regional developments,
– inter-regional and transcultural historical comparisons, and finally,
– possible connections, interdependencies and transfer processes between various knowledge cultures, such as "religion", "science", "literature", and others, in both non-European and European societies.

2.4 Mongolian orders of knowledge as a case study of a global history of religion

In the first part of this article, we delved into a specific aspect of Mongolian historical orders of knowledge and analyzed the ordering concepts that reveal the linguistic differentiation of an

---

[125] King, *Orientalism and Religion*, 199.

[126] Thus, the Mongols, with the exception of the Kalmyks and Buryat Mongols, were colonized by one of the other early modern colonial powers, the Qing Empire.

[127] Michael Pye called for this already in 1994: "[...] there is also a need for an Afro-critical approach and a Sino-critical approach—that is, for approaches that allow African and Chinese perceptions of religion to influence our view of its shape" (M. Pye, "Religion: Shape and Shadow", *Numen* 41 (1994): 56).

autonomous domain of "religion" from a diachronic perspective. The case study presented here contributes to a global history of religion in several ways:

– It demonstrates that within historical Mongolian societies, an autonomous domain of "religion" emerged and was conceptually delineated at the level of discourse;
– It thoroughly historicizes Mongolian analytical terminology effectively capturing the dynamics of Mongolian discourse on "religion"; [188]
– It identifies the substantive differences between European and Mongolian discourses on religion and highlights the functional similarities that provide a basis for comparison;
– It unveils the entanglements and discrepancies between the empirical field and the discourse, and traces the reification processes that transform heterogeneous practices into a homogeneous "system";
– It directs attention towards the societal power dynamics that shape the discourse on religion;
– It lays the groundwork for analyzing the historical interconnectedness of European and Mongolian religious history within the "shamanism" discourse. Using the example of the invention of the "shamanism" construct, which has been previously attributed to Europe, it reveals hitherto unexplored connections between European and Asian discourses on religion.

2.5 Outlook

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize some aspects that I consider particularly significant for a future, globally oriented study of religion. It has become evident that the concept of a "global history of religion" not only aims to expand the scope of the subject area but also carries structural implications. I find three desiderata to be especially pressing: First, the same research fields must be opened for non-European knowledge cultures as for their European counterparts. So far, neither Asian studies nor the study of religion have explored whether there have been processes of appropriating of foreign cultures and religions [189] through the medium of science, or knowledge transfers between different knowledge cultures[128]—as has been established for

---

[128] So far, there have been no studies on the intellectual exchange between the Indian scholars who visited Lhasa in the 17th century and the Tibetan monastic scholars, led by the Dalai Lama. In the period between 1654 and 1681, almost forty Indian scholars visited Lhasa. Most of them were intellectuals, medical practitioners, philologists, and mathematicians, many of whom came from Varanasi, a center of Indian scholarship at the time. The 5th Dalai Lama not only mentions his scholarly conversations with the Indian visitors in his autobiography, but also generally praises the city of Varanasi as an intellectual center "where gather many scholars of vast intellect, skilled in all linguistic and philosophical topics", K. R. Schaeffer, "The Fifth Dalai Lama, Ngawang Lobzang Gyatso (1617–1682)." In *The Dalai Lamas: A Visual History*, edited by Martin Brauen, 70. Furthermore, 19th century Tibetan doxographical works, such as the famous *Grub mtha' shel gyi me long* ("Crystal Mirror of Teachings"), written in 1802 by the Mongolian scholar Thu'u bkvan Blo bzang chos kyi nyi ma, contain their own chapters on Indian philosophical-religious teachings. Which were the effects of these representations of Indian religion, conveyed in texts, among Tibetan scholars, and how does this transmission of systems of meaning differ from the situation in Europe, where "philosophy and

European history of religion.[129] The fact that these questions have not yet been asked and these issues have not yet been investigated should make us aware of our own epistemological foundations that shape our academic discourse. Central to this understanding of "science" is a notion that defines this category as inconceivable outside Europe. It is noteworthy that the categories "science" and "natural science" can be applied diachronically to Europe without any issues;[130] however, both categories are not employed comparatively to describe non-European knowledge traditions. They remain exclusive to European knowledge cultures. The rules underlying this discourse can be easily identified in the distinction between "Greco-European science" and "Oriental philosophy". Consequently, only "Europe" or the "West" has produced secondary orders of knowledge [190] in the form of generalizable theoretical reflections. From this perspective, certain research questions do not even emerge for non-European contexts. The primacy of the European master narrative thus persists in the study of religion, or rather, scholars of religion continue to perpetuate this master narrative instead of challenging it.[131] It is also striking in this context that the few, but extant, studies on non-European theoretical

---

philologies [...] have presented traditions and heritage over many centuries" that "no longer had any 'bearers,' or had never had bearers (in the Weberian sense) and were thus only conveyed through the medium of academic disciplines" (Gladigow, "Europäische Religionsgeschichte", 29)?"

[129] This was done especially by Burkhard Gladigow, see his aforementioned contributions "Europäische Religionsgeschichte" and "Europäische Religionsgeschichte seit der Renaissance". However, his contributions also establish the unique path of the "European history of religion" by distinguishing it from (a never explicitly mentioned, but implicitly postulated) non-European religious history. If European religious history is characterized by a "choice between systems of meaning" (Gladigow, "Europäische Religionsgeschichte", 21) and a "pre-enlightenment pluralism" (Gladigow, "Europäische Religionsgeschichte", 27), then this characteristic is missing in "other" religious histories. But what distinguishes, for example, the Tibetan situation in the early 18th century, in which people could choose between Buddhism, *Bon*, Catholicism (consider the edict issued on September 9, 1741 by the Tibetan regent Pho lha nas for the free practice and preaching of the "teachings of the white-headed Lamas", that is, the Capuchins in Lhasa) and Islam (Tibetan women who married into the Muslim community established in the 17th century in Lhasa usually embraced Islam), from the situation in Italy, France, or Spain in the early 18th century?

[130] For example, by H. Blumenberg for the early modern period; see his contribution *Pseudoplatonismen in der Naturwissenschaft der frühen Neuzeit* (Mainz 1971).

[131] Chakrabarty points to the implicit tragedy of this theoretical production in the humanities and social sciences when he states: "For generations now, philosophers and thinkers who shape the nature of social science have produced theories that embrace the entirety of humanity. As we well know, these statements have been produced in relative, and sometimes absolute, ignorance of the majority of humankind—that is, those living in non-Western cultures. [...] What allowed the modern European sages to develop such clairvoyance with regard to societies of which they were empirically ignorant?" (*Provincializing Europe*, 29). The answer lies in the very exclusionary discourse that separates the rational and reflexive Europe from the mythic-religious rest of the world. This discourse is inscribed and reproduced even in a study of religion that understands itself as "postcolonial" and "discursive". An example is provided by the already cited *Einführung in die Religionswissenschaft*, published in 2003 by H.-G. Kippenberg and K. von Stuckrad, which does not dedicate a single chapter to non-European theoretical approaches to religion. The world outside of Europe plays a role in the historical and current constitution of religious studies, on the one hand in the process of *intercultural mimesis* (Charles Hallisey), and on the other as a research object.

conceptualizations of religion receive limited attention within the discipline.[132]

The second desideratum, namely the historicization of non-European knowledge cultures, has already been addressed. While European categorizations such as "religion" are consistently historicized, with their conceptual histories extensively investigated, there is often a lack of analogous conceptual histories for corresponding Asian terms. For example, the conceptual history of the Tibetan term *chos* remains to be written. The absence of such history is no coincidence—on the contrary. We treat non-European categories as though they possess no historicity, but rather exist within a temporal void. Consequently, they appear timeless and, thus, [191] static, and rigid. Yet, non-European terminologies look back on a longstanding written tradition and feature complex historical semantics. Only by considering these terminologies as *historical* terms, instead of timeless, ahistorical entities, can we begin to challenge the prevailing rhetoric of European superiority.

Thirdly, we must discover new linguistic methods of description. The attempt to avoid the cognitive imperialism of imposing our terminology on other cultures often produces unwanted—and probably completely unintended—consequences. The use of untranslated emic terms or newly created terminology leads to an exclusion of other cultures from European modernity. This creates cultural particularity that resists comparison, solidifies an insurmountable difference, and simultaneously singles out specifically European cultural achievements in which the "Others" have no share. What would happen if we described these cultures using our terminology? Few dare to attempt this experiment due to the looming specter of "cultural imperialism" in the academic community.

American Tibetologist Kurtis Schaeffer took the risk and authored a wonderful book. *The Culture of the Book in Tibet* delves deeply into the Tibetan book culture that emerged from the 10th century onward. Deploying the same vocabulary used to describe medieval and early modern scriptoria, printing houses, monastic universities, and scholarly circles in Europe of the 12th to 18th centuries, Schaeffer describes the Tibetan writing rooms, printing houses, learned circles, and monastic universities during the same period. The result is quite astonishing: an image of a Tibetan scholarly world focused on philological and editorial ideals and striving to understand the world through rational means emerges. By utilizing terms such as "editorial theory and method", "philology", "philological methods", "textual scholar and bibliophile" (as Schaeffer describes the great Tibetan scholar Bu ston), "cultural history of scholarship", etc., historical Tibetan societies are inadvertently stripped of their religious garb in which they usually appear firmly encased.

---

[132] For example, the important work of M. Pye, *Emerging from Meditation: Tominaga Nakamoto Translated with an Introduction by M.P.* (London 1990). Pye also points out repeatedly "that most accounts of the history of theories of religion(s) are restricted to western intellectual history" ("Overcoming Westernism", 109). On this topic, see also Ch. Kleine, "Wozu außereuropäische Religionsgeschichte? Überlegungen zu ihrem Nutzen für die religionswissenschaftliche Theorie- und Identitätsbildung". *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 10, no.1: 3–38.

Suddenly, the Tibetan scholarly world appears compatible with European societies of the same era. "Philology" is not exclusively a European academic discipline; it is also Tibetan, even though some philological principles in Tibet may differ from those in Europe. The same likely holds true for "religion".

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Arban buyantu nom-un čaɣan teüke. Facsimile reproduction. In *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen. I. 16.–18. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Walther Heissig. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959, 1–24.

Baɣan-a, B*., ed. Asaraɣči neretü-yin teüke.* Beijing: Ündüsüten-ü keblel-ün qoriy-a. 1984.

Bawden, Charles R*. The Mongol Chronicle Altan tobci. Text, translation and critical notes.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1955.

Biographien der Jebtsundamba Qutuɣtus. Mongolian text in *The Jebtsundamba Khutukhtus of Urga. Text, Translation and Notes*, ed. by Charles R. Bawden. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1961, 5–33.

Dag yig mkhas pa'i byung gnas zhes bya ba bzhugs so/ Merged ɣarqu-yin oron neretü toɣtaɣaysan dayiɣ orosiba. Block print, Beijing. Private collection of Professor Richard Ernst.

Degedü šasin erdeni ber mongɣol oron-i tügegülügsen uy-i üjegülügsen iraɣu kelen-ü kürkirel neretü. Buryat block print.

Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur. Photocopy of the manuscript, Library of the Institute of Language and Literature of the Inner Mongolian Academy of Social Sciences, Hohot (People's Republic of China).

ɣadaɣadu mongɣol-un törö-yin jasaqu yabudal-un yamun-un engke amuɣulang-un üy-e-dü 1693 on-du keblegsen, dotor-a 1629 on-ača ekileged udaɣ-a daraɣ-a qaɣad-un üy-e-dü jarlaɣsan čaɣaja-ud-i jasamjilaɣsan mongɣol-un čaɣajan-u bičig. Photocopy of the text, Mongolian National Library, Ulaanbaatar.

Gong gsal zhal lce bcu gsum gyi dgong pa'i gzhung. Decree of the Altan Qaɣan. Facsimile reproduction of the text. In Richard O. Meisezahl. "Die Handschriften in den City of Liverpool Museums (I)." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 7, 1973, 268–284.

`Gos lo tsa ba gZhon nu dpal. *Deb ther sngon po.* 2 Vols. Chengdu: Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1984.

Haenisch, Erich, ed. *Eine Urga-Handschrift des mongolischen Geschichtswerks von Secen Sagang (alias Sanang Secen).* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955.

Heissig, Walther, ed. *Altan kürdün mingɣan gegesütü bičig. Eine mongolische Chronik von Siregetü Guosi Dharma (1739).* Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1958.

Heissig, Walther, ed. *Erdeni-yin erike. Mongolische Chronik der lamaistischen Klosterbauten der Mongolei von Isibaldan* (1835). Facsimile with introduction and index of names*, ed. by Walther Heissig. Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1961.

Heissig, Walther, ed. *Bolur Toli "Spiegel aus Bergkristall" von Jimbadorji (1834–1837). Buch III: Geschichte der Mongolen*. Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1962.

Jorungγ-a, ed. *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur orosiba*. Beijing: Ündüsüten- ü keblel-ün qoriy-a, 1984.

bKa' yang dag pa'i tshad ma las mdo btus pa. Tibetan Tripitaka 144. No. 5839, folio 64r4-103v6.

Khobituev, Širabningbo. *Rus-un kür-ün jegün sibiiri-yin dotora aγci buriyad kemekü yasutan jun-u terigün γaruγsan ba tegün dotora-ača qori 11 ečige-yin buriyad jun-u tegüke egüni siirabningbova qubitu-yin eblegülen bičigsen bülüge.* In *Letopisi khorinskikh buryat.* Vyp. 2. *Khronika Širab-nimbo Khobitueva,* ed. by Nikolaj N. Poppe. Trudy instituta vostokovedeniya, IX. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1935.

Lombotseren. *Selengge-yin mongγol buriyad-un darqan tayiši danbi jilčan lombočeren-u jokiyaγsan mongγol buriyad-un teüke bolai.* In *Letopisi selenginskikh buriyat.* Vyp. 1. Khronika Ubashi Dambi Dzhalcan Lombo Cerenova 1868 g., ed. by Nikolaj N. Poppe. Trudy instituta vostokovedeniya, XII. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1936.

Mongγol čaγajin-u bičig. Manuskript. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. Signature: MS Mongol 132.

Mostaert, Antoine and Francis W. Cleaves. *Altan Tobči. A Brief History of the Mongols by bLo bzang bsTan `jin with A critical Introduction by The Reverend Antoine Mostaert, C.I.C.M., and An Editor's Foreword by Francis Woodman Cleaves*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Mostaert, Antoine and Francis W. Cleaves. *Bolor Erike. Mongolian Chronicle by Rasipungsuy*. 5 vols., Cambridge, MA: The Harvard Yenching Institute, 1959.

Ngag dbang blo bzang chos kyi rgya mtsho. *rJe btsun btsun thams cad mkhyen pa bsod nams rgya mtsho'i rnam thar dngos grub rgya mtsho'i shing rta zhes bya ba bzhugs so.* In *`Phags pa `jig rten dbang phyug gi rnam sprul rim byon gyi `khrungs rabs deb ther nor bu'i `phreng ba*, Vol. 2. Dharamsala: Tibetan Cultural Printing Press, 1984, 1–171.

Ongγod qara sakiγusun teüke sudur bičig orosiba. Mong. 41, Royal Library of Copenhagen.

Prajñasagara. *Boγda neyiči toyin dalai mañjusryi-yin domoγ-i todorqai-a geyigülügči čindamani ke kemegdekü orosiba*. Photocopy of the block print.

Pringlai, ed. *Byamba. Asaraγči neretü-yin teüke*. Ulaanbaatar: Erdem šinžylgeenij khevlekh ujldver, 1960.

Qad-un ündüsün quriyangγui altan tobči. Kökeqota: Öbör mongγol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a, 1980.

Siluγun onul-tu kemegdekü sudur. Translated by Siregetü güsi corji. Manuscript *Ganjur*, Manuscript Collection at Saint Petersburg State University Library, no. 839.

Siluγun budaγun üye onoqui neretü sudur. Translated by Toyin guosi.

Thu'u bkvan Blo bzang chos kyi nyi ma*. Grub mtha' thams cad kyi khungs dang `dod tshul ston pa öegs bshad shel gyi me long.* Indian reprint in pothi format, n.y.

Toboev, Tuγultur. *Qori kiged aγuyin buriyad-nar-un urida-dayan boluγsan anu*. In *Letopisi khorinskikh buryat.* Vyp. I. Khroniki Tuγultur Toboeva i Vandana Yumsunova, ed. by Nikolaj N. Poppe. Trudy instituta vostokovedeniya, IX, 1–47. Moskva, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1935.

Vimalaprabhā-nāma mūlatantrānusārinī dvādaśasāhasrikālaghu kāla- cakra-tantrarāja-tīkā. Tibetan title: *bsDus pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po dus kyi `khor lo'i `grel bshad rtsa ba'i rgyud rjes su `jug pa stong phrag bcu gnyis pa dri ma med pa'i `od ces bya ba*. In *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, ed. by Lokesh Chandra. New Delhi, 1965. Part I (KA), Part II (KHA).

Yumsunov, Vandan*. Qori-yin arban nigen ečige-yin jun-u uγ ijaγur-un tuγuji.* In *Letopisi khorinskikh buryat.* Vyp. I. Khroniki Tuγultur Toboeva i Vandana Yumsunova, ed. by Nikolaj N. Poppe. Trudy instituta vostokovedeniya, IX, 48–172. Moskva, Leningrad: Izadatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1935.

Secondary Literature

Altanγarudi, and Bao De*. Mongγoljin-u šasin surtaγun.* Qayilar: Öbör mongγol-un soyul-un keblel-ün qoriya, 1995.

Asad, Talal. *Genealogies of Religion. Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam.* Baltimore / London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Atwood, Christopher. "Buddhism and Popular Ritual in Mongolian Religion: A Reexamination of the Fire Cult." *History of Religions* 36 no 2 (1996) 112–139.

Atwood, Christopher. *Encyclopedia of Mongolia and the Mongol Empire*. New York: Facts on File, 2004.

Auffarth, Christoph. "Religion." In *Wörterbuch der Religionen*, ed. by Christoph Auffarth, Hans G. Kippenberg and Axel Michaels. Stuttgart: Kröner, 2006, 429–431.

Auffarth, Christoph. "Europäische Religionsgeschichte – ein kulturwissenschaftliches Projekt." In *Aspekte der Religionswissenschaft*, ed. by Richard Faber and Susanne Lanwerd. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2009, 29–48.

Auffarth, Christoph. "Mittelalterliche Modelle der Eingrenzung und Ausgrenzung religiöser Verschiedenheit." In *Europäische Religionsgeschichte: Ein mehrfacher Pluralismus*, ed. by Hans G. Kippenberg, Jörg Rüpke and Kocku von Stuckrad. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009, 193–218.

Autorenkollektiv. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 1985.

Balagangadhara, S.N. *"The Heathen in His Blindness": Asia, the West and the Dynamic of Religion*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Bawden, Charles R. *"*Two Mongolian texts Concerning Obo-worship.*"* *Oriens Extremus* 5 no 1 (1958): 57–61.

Bawden, Charles R. *The Modern History of the Mongols*. London / New York: Kegan Paul International, 1968.

Berger, Patricia. „Buddhist Festivals in Mongolia." In *Mongolia. The Legacy of Chinggis Khan*, ed. by Patricia Berger / Terese Tse Bartholomew. San Francisco: Thames and Hudson, 1995, 149–184.

Bira, Šagdaryn. "A Sixteenth Century Mongol Code." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 11 (1977): 7–34.

Birtalan, Ágnes. "Die Mythologie der mongolischen Volksreligion." In *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. by Egidius Schmalzriedt and Hans Wilhelm Haussig. I. Abteilung: Die alten Kulturvölker. 34. Lieferung. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 2001.

Blumenberg, Hans. *Pseudoplatonismen in der Naturwissenschaft der frühen Neuzeit*. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1971.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Sozialer Sinn: Kritik der theoretischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1987.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power.* Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Rede und Antwort*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *Entwurf einer Theorie der Praxis auf der ethnologischen Grundlage der kabylischen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2009.

Brunotte, Ulrike. "Religion und Kolonialismus." In *Europäische Religionsgeschichte. Ein mehrfacher Pluralismus*, ed. by Hans G. Kippenberg, Jörg Rüpke and Kocku von Stuckrad, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009, 339–369.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Chiodo, Elisabetta. *The Mongolian Manuscripts on Birch Bark from Xarbuxyn Balgas in the Collection of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences*. Part 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1999.

Chiodo, Elisabetta. *The Mongolian Manuscripts on Birch Bark from Xarbuxyn Balgas in the Collection of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences*. Part 2. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2009.

Coyiji. *Mongyol-un burqan-u šasin-u teüke. Yeke mongyol ulus-un üy-e (1206–1271).* Kökeqota: Öbör mongyol-un soyul-un keblel-ün qoriy-a, 1998.

Coyiji. *Mongyol-un burqan-u šasin-u teüke. Yuvan ulus-un üy-e (1271– 1368)*. Kökeqota: Öbör mongγol-un soyul-un keblel-ün qoriy-a, 2003.

Crossley, Pamela Kyle. *A Translucent Mirror. History and Identity in Qing Imperial Ideology*. Berkeley et al: University of California Press, 2002.

Damdinsüren, C. *Istoricheskie korni Geseriady*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Aka- demii Nauk, 1957.

Dumas, Dominique. *Aspekte und Wandlungen der Verehrung des Herdfeuers bei den Mongolen. Eine Analyse der mongolischen "Feuergebete"*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1987.

Elverskog, Johan. *The Jewel Translucent Sūtra. Altan Khan and the Mongols in the Sixteenth Century*. Leiden und Boston: Brill, 2003.

Fitzgerald, Timothy. "Hinduism and the World Religion Fallacy." *Religion* 20 (1999), 101–118.

Foucault, Michel. *Archäologie des Wissens*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997.

Freiberger, Oliver. *Der Askesediskurs in der Religionsgeschichte: Eine vergleichende Untersuchung brahmanischer und frühchristlicher Texte*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009.

Freiberger, Oliver and Christoph Kleine. *Buddhismus. Handbuch und kritische Einführung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Wahrheit und Methode: Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1990.

Gentz, Joachim. "Von der ,Lesbarkeit der Religion' zum iconic turn." In *Religionswissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft*, ed. by Christoph Auffarth and Jörg Rüpke. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005, 274–288.

Gentz, Joachim. "Die Drei Lehren (sanjiao) Chinas in Konflikt und Harmonie: Figuren und Strategien einer Debatte." In *Religionen Nebeneinander: Modelle religiöser Vielfalt in Ost- und Südostasien*, ed. by Edith Franke and Michael Pye. Münster: Lit-Verlag, 2006, 17–40.

Gentz, Joachim. "Europäische Religionsgeschichte seit der Renaissance." *Zeitenblicke* 5 no 1 (2006). http://www.zeitenblicke.de/2006/1/Gladigow/index_html (26/10/2007).

Gentz, Joachim. "Multiple religiöse Identität in Ostasien." In *Multiple religiöse Identität: Aus verschiedenen religiösen Traditionen schöpfen*, ed. by Reinhold Bernhardt and Perry Schmidt-Leukel. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2008, 115–135.

Gladigow, Burkhard. "Europäische Religionsgeschichte." In *Lokale Religionsgeschichte*, ed. by Hans G. Kippenberg and Brigitte Luchesi. Marburg: diagonal, 1995, 21–52.

Gladigow, Burkhard. "Europäische Religionsgeschichte seit der Renaissance", *Zeitenblicke* 5 no. 1 (2006). http://www.zeitenblicke.de/2006/1/Gladigow/index_html (16/04/2023).

Gladigow, Burkhard. "Von der 'Lesbarkeit der Religion' zum iconic turn". In *Religionswisschaft als Kulturwissenschaft*, ed. by Burkhard Gladigow. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2005, 274–288.

Grönbold, Günter. "Die Mythologie des indischen Buddhismus." In *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, ed. by Hans Willhelm Haußig. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 1976, 393–394.

Hahn, Alois. "Glaube und Schrift – oder die Selbstthematisierung von Hochkulturen." In *Konstruktionen des Selbst, der Welt und der Geschichte*, ed. by Alois Hahn. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2000, 237–260.

Hallisey, Charles. "Roads Taken and Not Taken in the Study of Theravada Buddhism." In *Curators of the Buddha. The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, ed. by Donald S. Lopez Jr. Chicago / London: The University of Chicago Press, 1995, 31–61.

Harva, Uno. *Die religiösen Vorstellungen der altaischen Völker*. Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, n.y.

Haußig, Hans-Michael. *Der Religionsbegriff in den Religionen: Studien zum Selbst- und Religionsverständnis in Hinduismus, Buddhismus, Judentum und Islam*. Bodenheim: Philo, 1999.

Heissig, Walther. *Bolur Erike "Eine Kette aus Bergkristallen" Eine mongolische Chronik der Kienlung-Zeit von Rasipungsuy (1774/75). Literaturhistorisch untersucht*. Peiping: The Union Press, 1946.

Heissig, Walther. "A Mongolian Source to the Lamaist Suppression of Shamanism." *Anthropos* 48 (1953), 493–536.

Heissig, Walther. "Neyici Toyin. Das Leben eines lamaistischen Mönches (1557–1653). Aus seiner mongolischen Biographie übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung." *Sinologica* 3 (1954), 21–38.

Heissig, Walther. *Die Familien- und Kirchengeschichtsschreibung der Mongolen. I. 16.–18. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1959.

Heissig, Walther. "Die Religionen der Mongolei." In *Die Religionen Tibets und der Mongolei*, ed. by Giuseppe Tucci and Walther Heissig. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970, 312–314.

Heissig, Walther. "Toyin guosi ~ Guisi alias Cortu guisi: Versuch einer Identifizierung." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 9 (1975), 361–446.

Heissig, Walther. *Die mongolischen Handschriften-Reste aus Olon süme Innere Mongolei (16.-17. Jhdt.)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976.

Heissig, Walther. "Persecution and Continuation: Some Recent Innermongolian Shamanist Traditions." In *Schamanen und Geisterbeschwörer in der östlichen Mongolei. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Walther Heissig. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992, 198–214.

Heissig, Walther. "Schamanen und Geisterbeschwörer im Küriye-Banner." In *Schamanen und Geisterbeschwörer in der östlichen Mongolei. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Walther Heissig. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992, 1–50.

Heuschert, Dorothea. *Die Gesetzgebung der Qing für die Mongolen im 17. Jahrhundert anhand des Mongolischen Gesetzbuches aus der Kangxi-Zeit (1662–1722)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1998.

Hutton, Ronald. *Shamans. Siberian Spirituality and the Western Imagination*. Hambledon and London: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Kämpfe, Hans-Rainer. *Das Asarayci neretü-yin teüke des Byamba Erke Daicing alias Šamba Jasay (Eine mongolische Chronik des 17. Jahrhunderts)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

Kas'yanenko, Zoya K. *Katalog peterburgskogo rukopisnogo "l'anzhura". Sostavlenie, vvedenie, transliteraciya i ukazateli*. Moskva: Izdatel'skaya firma „Vostochnaya literatura", 1993.

King, Richard. *Orientalism and Religion: Postcolonial Theory, India and "The Mystic East"*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Kippenberg, Hans G. and Kocku von Stuckrad. *Einführung in die Religionswissenschaft*. München: Beck, 2003.

Kleine, Christoph. "Wozu außereuropäische Religionsgeschichte? Überlegungen zu ihrem Nutzen für die religionswissenschaftliche Theorie- und Identitätsbildung." *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 18 (2010), 3–38.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "'Religionslos ist dieses Land': Das Mongolenbild der Tibeter." *Asiatische Studien / Etudes asiatiques* LIV no. 4 (2000), 875–905.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. *Erdeni tunumal neretü sudur. Die Biographie des Altan qayan der Tümed-Mongolen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der religionspolitischen Beziehungen zwischen der Mongolei und Tibet im ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 2001.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "The Transmission of the Mongolian Kanjur: A Preliminary Report." In *The Many Canons of Tibetan Buddhism: PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Ninth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, ed. by Helmut Eimer and David Germano. Leiden: Brill, 2002, 151–176.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "Der Buddhismus als Garant von 'Frieden und Ruhe'. Zu religiösen Legitimationsstrategien von Gewalt am Beispiel der tibetisch-buddhistischen Missionierung der Mongolei im späten 16. Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 11 (2003), 185–207.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "The Third Dalai Lama Sönam Gyatso and the Fourth Dalai Lama Yönten Gyatso". In *The Dalai Lamas. A Visual History*, ed. by Martin Brauen. London: Serindia Publications, 2005, 52-63.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. *Zur Ausdifferenzierung eines autonomen Bereichs Religion in asiatischen Gesellschaften des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts: Das Beispiel der Mongolen*. Bern: Schweizerische Akademie der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften, 2007.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "Uncivilized Nomads and Buddhist Clerics: Tibetan Images of the Mongols in the 19th and 20th Centuries." In *Images of Tibet in the 19th and 20th Centuries*, ed. by Monica Esposito. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2008, 707–724.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "Mongolische Geschichtsschreibung im Kontext der Globalgeschichte." In *Geschichten und Geschichte: Historiographie und Hagiographie in der asiatischen Religionsgeschichte*, ed. by Peter Schalk, Max Deeg, Oliver Freiberger, Christoph Kleine and Astrid van Nahl. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press, 2010, 247–279.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "Embodying the Dharma: The Buddhist Way into Mongolia." In *Transformations and Transfer of Tantra in Asia and Beyond*, ed. by Istvan Keul. Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter, 2012, 239–261.

Kollmar-Paulenz, Karénina. "The Invention of 'Shamanism' in 18th-Century Mongolian Elite Discourse". In *Rocznik Orientalistyczny / Yearbook of Oriental Studies* 65 no 1 (2012), 90–106.

Landwehr, Achim. *Historische Diskursanalyse*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008.

Ligeti, Louis. *Catalogue du Kanjur mongol imprimé.* Vol. 1*, Catalogue*. Budapest: Société Kőrösi Csoma, 1942.

Liu, Jin Süe. *Mongyol-un quriyangyui teüke*. Kökeqota: Öbör mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a, 1998.

Lopez, Donald S. Jr. *Curators of the Buddha: The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Manzanov, Georgij E. *Religioznye tradicii v kul'ture burjatskogo naroda*. Ulan-Ude: Izdatel'stvo Burjatskogo nauchnogo centra SO RAN, 2005.

Masuzawa, Tomoko. *The Invention of World Religions Or, How European Universalism Was Preserved in the Language of Pluralism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2005.

Meisezahl, Richard O. "Die Handschriften in den City of Liverpool Museums (I)." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 7 (1973), 221–284.

Morikawa, Tetsuo. *Study of the Biography of Altan Khan*. Fukuoka: Kyushu University, 1987.

Nima. *Mongyolčud-un yal*. Kökeqota: Öbör mongyol-un arad-un keblel-ün qoriy-a, 2003.

Poppe, Nicholas. *Grammar of Written Mongolian, 3rd edition*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1974.

Potanin, Grigorij N. *Ocherki severo-zapadnoj Mongolii. Rezul'taty pute- shestviya, ispolnennago v 1879 godu po porucheniyu Imperatorskago Russkago geograficheskago Obshchestva*. St. Petersburg, 1881–1883.

Pye, Michael. "Religion: shape and shadow." *Numen* 41 (1994), 51–75.

Pye, Michael. *Emerging from Meditation. Tominaga Nakamoto. Translated with an introduction by M.P.* London: Duckworth, 1990.

Pye, Michael. "Overcoming Westernism: the End of Orientalism and Occidentalism." In *Religion im Spiegelkabinett. Asiatische Religionsgeschichte im Spannungsfeld zwischen Orientalismus und Okzidentalismus*, ed. by Peter Schalk, Max Deeg, Oliver Freiberger and Christoph Kleine. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2003, 91–114.

Qurčabaɣatur, L., und C. Üjüm-e. *Mongɣol-un böge mörgül-ün tayilɣ-a takilɣ-a-yin soyol*. Öbör mongɣol-un soyul-un keblel-ün qoriy-a, 1991.

Reinhard, Wolfgang. *Lebensformen Europas. Eine historische Kulturanthropologie*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2004.

Riesebrodt, Martin. *Cultus und Heilsversprechen. Eine Theorie der Religionen*. München: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2007.

Rösler, Ulrike. "Die Lehre, der Weg und die namenlose Religion: Mögliche Äquivalente eines Religionsbegriffs in der tibetischen Kultur". In *Religion in Asien? Studien zur Anwendbarkeit des Religionsbegriffs*, ed. by Peter Schalk, Max Deeg, Oliver Freiberger, Christoph Kleine and Astrid van Nahl. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2013, 129–150.

Sagaster, Klaus. *Die Weisse Geschichte (Čaɣan teüke). Eine mongolische Quelle zur Lehre von den Beiden Ordnungen Religion und Staat in Tibet und der Mongolei*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1976.

Sagaster, Klaus. "The History of Buddhism among the Mongols." In *The Spread of Buddhism,* ed. by Ann Heirman and Stephan Peter Bumbacher. Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2007, 379–432.

Sárközi, Alice. "Incense-offering to the White Old Man." In *Documenta Barbarorum. Festschrift für Walther Heissig zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. by Klaus Sagaster and Michael Weiers. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

Sazykin, Andrej G. "Die mongolische 'Erzählung über Güsü-Lama'." *Zentralasiatische Studien* 16 (1982), 111–140.

Sazykin, Andrej G. *Videniya buddijskogo ada. Predislovie, perevod, transliteraciya, primechaniya i glossarii*. St. Petersburg: Isdatel'stvo A. Teren'eva "Nartang", 2004.

Schaeffer, Kurtis. "The Fifth Dalai Lama, Ngawang Lobzang Gyatso." In *The Dalai Lamas: A Visual History*, ed. by Martin Brauen. London: Serindia, 2005, 65-91.

Schaeffer, Kurtis R. *The Culture of the Book in Tibet*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Schlieter, Jens, ed. *Was ist Religion? Texte von Cicero bis Luhmann*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 2010.

Schulze, Reinhard. "Weltbilder der Aufklärung: Zur Globalgeschichte neuzeitlicher Wissenskulturen." In *Vom Weltgeist beseelt: Globalgeschichte 1700–1815*, ed. by Margarete Grandner and Andrea Komlosy. Wien: Promedia Verlag, 2004, 161–179.

Henry Serruys. "Early Lamaism in Mongolia." *Oriens Extremus* 10 (1963), 181–216.

Henry Serruys. "Additional Note on the Origin of Lamaism in Mongolia." *Oriens Extremus* 13 (1966), 165–173.

Staal, Frits. "Religions." In *Rules without Meaning: Ritual, Mantras and the Human Sciences*, ed. by Frits Staal. New York: Peter Lang, 1993, 387–419.

Sutubilig. *Chos lugs kyi tshig mdzod. Šasin-u toli*. Öbör mongɣol-un surɣan kümüjil-ün keblel-ün qoriy-a, 1996.

Tatár, Magdalena. "Two Mongol Texts Concerning the Cult of the Moun- tains." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 30 no 1 (1976), 1–58.

Tenbruck, Friedrich. "Die Religion im Maelstrom der Reflexion." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Sonderheft 33 *Religion und Kultur* (1993)*, 31–67.

Tsyrempilov, Nikolay. "Buddhist Minority in a Christian Empire. Buryat Religious Survival and Identity Problems in Russia in the 18th–early 19th Centuries." In *Religion and Ethnicity in Mongolian Societies: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz, Seline Reinhardt and Tatiana D. Skrynnikova. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2014, 61–77.

Zhu rong ga. *A-le-tan han zhuan*. Hohhot: Nei Menggu Renmin Chubanshe, 1991.

About the author

Karénina Kollmar-Paulenz is Professor Emerita of Science of Religion and Central Asian Cultural Studies at the University of Bern, Switzerland. Her research focuses on the global history of religion, the Tibet-Mongolia interface, the history of non-European knowledge systems, and the relationship between politics and religion in Inner Asian Buddhism. Publications include: *Die Mongolen. Von Dschingis Khan bis heute.* München: 2024 (2nd edition); *Grenzen der Religion. Säkularität in der Asiatischen Religionsgeschichte.* Leiden: Brill 2023 (ed. with M. Deeg, O. Freiberger, C. Kleine).

Mail: karenina.kollmar-paulenz@unibe.ch

About the translators

Anja Kirsch is a professor of Religious Studies at the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies at NTNU, Trondheim. Her research focuses on the relationship between religion and "the secular" in contemporary and historical perspective, nineteenth-century utopia and migration, and narrative and cognitive approaches to the history of religion. Publications include: *Narrative Cultures and the Aesthetics of Religion*, ed. with Dirk Johannsen and Jens Kreinath. Leiden: Brill 2020; "Narrative Strategies" (with Dirk Johannsen), in *The Bloomsbury Handbook of the Cultural and Cognitive Aesthetics of Religion*. London: Bloomsbury 2020, pp. 143–153.

Mail: anja.kirsch@ntnu.no

Andrea Rota is an associate professor of the Study of Religion at the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages (IKOS), University of Oslo. He obtained his PhD from the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, and received his Habilitation from the University of Bern, where he served as an assistant professor for the systematic study of religion. He is the current coordinator of the IKOS Religion and Politics research initiative. Publications include: *Religion and Academia Reframed. Connecting Religion, Science, and Society in the Long Sixties*. Leiden: Brill 2023; *Collective Intentionality and the Study of Religion. Social Ontology and Empirical Research*. London: Bloomsbury 2023.

Mail: andrea.rota@ikos.uio.no