The Bulletin of Tibetology seeks to serve the specialist as well as the general reader with an interest in this field of study. The motif portraying the Stupa on the mountains suggests the dimensions of the field.

EDITORS

GYALMO HOPE NAMOYAL
T. SHERAB GYALTSHEN
NIRMAL C. SINHA
## CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Historical &amp; Symbolical Origin of Chorten</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lama Anagarika Govinda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilgit in Ancient Times</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddha Prakash</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes &amp; Topics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nirmal C. Sinha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klinga Yonten Hochotsang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTRIBUTORS IN THIS ISSUE—

LAMA ANAGARIKA GOVINDA An Indian national of European descent and Buddhist faith; began as a student of humanities in Western discipline, switched over to Buddhist literature studying Pali in Ceylon and Burma and Sanskrit & Tibetan in India; well known authority on Buddhist psychology, mysticism and symbolism; spent several years in Tibet for initiation into Kargyupa Order; was a pupil of Tamo Geshe Rinpoche, Acharya, Arya Maitreya Mandal, Almora, India.

BUDDHA PRAKASH Well-known scholar in ancient Indian history and culture; authority on ancient geography of India and adjoining countries; has been Professor of Ancient Indian History in several Indian Universities; at present Director: Institute of Indic Studies, Kurukshetra University, Haryana.

NIRMAL C. SINHA Director: Namgyal Institute of Tibetology; formerly teacher of history, University of Calcutta and editor, National Archives of India.

KUNGA YON TEN HOCHOTSANG Follower of Sakya Order from Derge (Khamp); resident in Sikkim since 1959 and attached to the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, first as a student of Sanskrit and English, later English Language Teacher Nyingma Sheda and Tibetan Teacher, Tashi Namgyal Academy and presently Research Assistant at the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology.

*Views expressed in the Bulletin of Tibetology are those of the contributors alone and not of the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology. An article represents the private individual views of the author and does not reflect those of any office or institution with which the author may be associated.*
THE HISTORICAL AND SYMBOLICAL ORIGIN OF THE CHORTEN

—LAMA ANAGARIKA GOYINDA

The mysteries of life and death were always the greatest agents of religious ritual and speculation. Through the experience of death man becomes conscious of life. Thus the cult of the dead stimulated primitive man to build the first great monuments (tumuli), while the other side of religious activity, which was concerned with the living and the mundane aspects of life, found expression in the simpler forms of tree-and fire-worship. The tumuli originating from the burial mound, were massive structures of stone, tuing the forms of hemispheres, cones, pyramids and similar plain geometrical bodies containing small cells which preserved the bodily remains and other relics of heroes, saints, kings and similar great personalities. In India, as in many other parts of Asia, the hemispheric form seems to have been the prevalent type of such monuments. According to the oldest tradition they were erected for great rulers (cahtrarins), as the Buddha himself mentions in his conversation with Ananda (Digha Nigha XVI, 5).

While the tumuli and the cult of the dead had their place outside the village, the sanctuity of the life-giving and life-preserving forces (personified in the sun-god) had its place in the centre of the village. It consisted of a simple altar (a sanctified form of the domestic hearth), the fire of which was always regarded as sacred as a symbol of family life, or a small shrine (an idealized form of the village hut) which stood in the shadow of the sacred tree (the Tree of Life) and was surrounded by a fence as a demarcation of the sacred place.

The Buddhist era combined the elements of the village sanctity with the monumental dome of the ancient tumulus (outya), thus uniting the two oldest traditions of humanity, as expressed in the lunar and solar cult, fusing them into one universal symbol which recognized formally for the first time that life and death are only two sides of the same reality, complementing and conditioning each other. To think of them as separate is illusion, and only as long as the veil of Maya has not been lifted, the worship of these two forces proceeds separately, sometimes even as two separate forms of religion. But since it has been understood that there is no life without transformation, and that the power of transformation is the essence of life - then the great synthesis takes place and the foundation of a world-religion is established.
The Buddhistupa originally consisted of an almost hemispherical turban and an altar-like structure (harimah) on its top, surmounted by one or several superimposed lotus-like umbrellas. The flattened hemisphere was compared to an egg and therefore called “unda”, a term which did not only allude to the shape (which was also compared to a water-bubble) but to its deeper signification as well, namely, as a symbol of latent creative power, while the quadrangular harimah on the summit of the canopic symbolized the sanctuary enshrined above the world (unda was also a synonym of the universe in the oldest Indian mythology) beyond death and rebirth. A similar parallelism exists between the harimah in the shade of the sacred tree, because the Holy One, whose ashes were enshrined in the altar-like sanctuary of the harimah, instead of sacrificing other beings, had sacrificed himself for the welfare of all living beings. According to the Buddha there is only one sacrifice which is of real value, the sacrifice of one’s own desires, our won ‘self’. The ultimate form of such a sacrifice is that of a Bodhisattva, who renounces even the ultimate peace of final nirvana (parinirvana) until he has helped his fellow-beings to find the path of liberation.

The honorific umbrella finally, as an abstract representation of the shade-giving tree, in this case the sacred Tree of Life - is one of the chief solar symbols, and in Buddhism that of Enlightenment (sanyak-sambodhi). The importance of this symbol becomes clear from the Buddhist Scriptures, describing the struggle of the Buddha and Mara, the Evil One, for the place under the Bodhi Tree, the hollow spot in the world, later on known as the Diamond Throne (sukhavati, Tib. chen-je gyan).

It must have been an old custom that the head of the community had his seat of honour under the sacred tree in the centre of the settlement where public meetings used to take place on religious and other important occasions. Consequently the umbrellas, which replaced the tree when the head of the community moved about or presided over similar functions in other places, later on became one of the insignia of royalty. In order to mark the distinction in rank the ceremonial umbrella was doubled or trebled, or increased by even greater numbers of umbrellas, which were fixed one above the other, thus transforming the umbrella back again to the original tree-like, with its numerous layers of branches spreading around the man and gradually getting shorter towards the top.

In order to understand the transformation of the ancient religious-tantric into the universal constitution of the Gauja, from which
later the Tibetan Chorten (gy chor thron) developed, we must have a look at the earliest known Buddhist Stupa at Sanchi. The great Sanchi Stupa was crowned by a threefold honorific umbrella and the altar-shrine on top of the hemispherical main structure was surrounded by a railing (vedika), exactly as in the case of the village sanctuary. Similar railings were repeated at the foot of the stupa and on the low circular terrace upon which the flattened hemisphere rested. The lowest railing was provided with four gateways (torana) which opened towards the east, the south, the west & the north, emphasizing the universal character of Buddhism which is open to all the four quarters of the universe and invites all mankind with the call “Come and see!” and which exhorts its followers to open their hearts to all that lives, while radiating love, compassion, sympathetic joy and equanimity towards the whole world. The inner space between the stone railing and the stupa, as well as the circular terrace (medhi) at the base of the cupola were used as preedhina pathi for ritual circumambulation in the direction of the sun’s course. The orientation of the gateways equally corresponds to the sun’s course: to sunrise, zenith, sunset, nadir. Just as the sun illuminates the physical world, so does the Buddha, the Enlightened One, illuminate the spiritual world. The eastern gateway represents his birth, the southern (which was regarded as the most important and therefore built first) his enlightenment, the western his “setting in motion the Wheel of the Law” (dharma abha prapanana): the proclamation of his doctrine, and the northern his final liberation (parinirvana).

This universal attitude and orientation remained one of the characteristics of the stupa, especially in the northern countries of Buddhism, like Tibet, even after railings and gateways had disappeared. In the course of time all these details were fused into a quadrangular substructure, which finally took the form of four terraces (sometimes furnished with four staircases, if the size of the monument permitted or required them) upon which the hemisphere was raised.

As the layers of superimposed umbrellas became more numerous they were transformed into the more architectural slope of a solid cone with a corresponding number of horizontal notches, which finally amounted to thirteen. With this transformation the original idea of the Tree of Life and Enlightenment was visibly restored and steadily gained in importance. That the conical spire was no more regarded as a set of umbrellas, can be seen from the fact that later on an honorific umbrella was again fixed on top of the cone.
The different strata of the cone (separated by horizontal notches) were now explained to correspond to certain psychic faculties or stages of consciousness on the way to enlightenment and to the respective world-planes. Thus the spiritual rebirth of the world starts in the mind of man, and the Tree of Life grows out of his own heart, the centre of his world, and spreads into ever new infinites, into ever higher and purer realms, until it has turned into a Tree of Enlightenment.

"Verily, I tell you", the Buddha once addressed his disciples, "the world is within this six feet high body!" And on another occasion he defined the world in these words: "That in the world through which one, perceiving the world, arrives at his conception of the world, that in the Order of the Blessed One is called "the world"."

(Samyutta Nikaya IV, 37, 166).

In other words, the universe, according to the Buddha's definition, is the universe of our conscious experience. The symbolism of the maha, therefore, can be read in the cosmic as well as in the psychic sense; its synthesis is the psycho-cosmic image of Man, in which the physical elements and laws of nature and their spiritual counterparts, the different world-planes and their corresponding stages of consciousness, as well as that which transcends them, have their place. That such ideas go back to the earliest periods of Indian history can be seen from representations of the ancient Jain world system in the shape of a human figure.

Nepalese stupas, which in many respects have preserved archaic features, decorate the harmika (the cubical structure above the cupola) with painted human eyes, thus suggesting a human figure in the posture of meditation hidden in the maha; the crossed legs in the base, the body up to the shoulders in the hemispheres, the head in the harmika. This also corresponds to the psycho-physical doctrine of the centre of psychic force (akasa) which are located one above the other in the human body, and through which consciousness develops in its ascending order, from the experience of material sense-objects through that of immaterial worlds of pure mental objects, up to the supramundane consciousness of enlightenment, which has its base in the crown-cakra of the head (ahatmara). This cakra is symbolized by a dome-shaped or flower-like protuberance on the head of the Buddha, and by the cone-shaped Tree of Enlightenment which forms the spire of the maha or the Chhires, or its various equivalents, like the dagoba (chashgiri) of Ceylon or the pagoda (a reversal of the word dagoba) in Burma, Thailand and India-China.
The cakra itself is a sun symbol. It was one of the attributes of the sun-god, either in the form of a discus or in the form of the wheel, representing the rolling sun-chariot. The solar origin is testified by the description of the shining and radiating wheel which appears in the sky with its thousand spokes (rays) when a virtuous ruler has established a reign of righteousness and has attained the spiritual power which entitles and enables him to extend the Good Law (dharma) over the whole world and to become a world-ruler (cakravarana). Similarly, the "turning of the Wheel of the Good Law" has become a synecdoche for the Buddha's first proclamation of his doctrine (dharma-chakra-upavatana-sutta), by which the thousand-spoked sun-wheel of the universal law was set in motion, radiating its light throughout the world.

Thus, the Buddha himself was a cakravarana, though not in the ordinary sense, but as one who has conquered the world within himself by realizing the highest faculties of his mind in the thousand-fold cakra of his spiritual centre (cakravat-cakra). The Buddha, therefore, rightly demanded that the remains of the Enlightened Ones and their three disciples should be treated with the same respect and veneration as those of a cakravarana.

"As they treat the remains of a king of kings, so, Ananda, should they treat the remains of a Tathagata. At the four crossroads a cairn should be erected to the Tathagata. And whosoever shall there place gelsands or perfumes or paint, or make salutation there, or become in its presence calm in heart, that shall long be to them for a profit and joy." (Digha Nikaya, VII, 6).

The cakras as radiating centres of psychic force gave a new impetus to the interpretation of the human body as a cosmic manifestation. Not only was the spinal column compared to Mount Meru, the axis of the universe, and therefore called "men-danda" but the whole psycho-physical organism was explicated in terms of solar and lunar forces, which through five channels, the so-called pada, moved up and down between the seven cakras, which in their turn represented the elementary qualities of which the universe is built and of which the material elements are only the visible reflexes.

The unity of body and mind, and consequently the inclusion of the body into the spiritual training, so that the body actually participates in the highest experiences and achievements, has always been a characteristic feature of Buddhist psychology and meditative practice. While describing the four states of deep absorption (in Pali: jhana, and often,
though incorrectly, translated as “trance”), the Buddha in the 7th discourse of the Majjhima Nikaya, for instance, adds to the explanation of each of these fundamental stages of meditation: “And he (who has attained the first, second or third degree of absorption) penetrates and permeates, fills and saturates his body with the bliss of unification and serenity, so that not even the smallest particle of his body remains unsaturated by this blissful experience.”

Thus, in early Buddhism as well as in the later Tibetan yoga and Tantric practice, bodily harmony was both the effect and the conditio sine qua non of all higher spiritual attainments. In Tantric terminology: liberation and enlightenment are attained by the reconciliation of solar and lunar forces which on the physical plane are the two kinds of vital energy, on the psychic plane the intellectual and the emotional consciousness, and on the spiritual, i.e. most sublime plane, wisdom (prajña) and compassion (karuna).

On the basis of this profound parallelism transcendental ideas and psychic processes could be expressed by material equivalents, either in terms of the human body (as in cakras, nadis, nādas, āsanas) or in terms of colors, elements and architectural forms. Thus, the Buddha, when speaking about the four great elements (mahabhuta) or states of aggregation, distinguished in each case between a subjective and an objective aspect, namely, the elementary qualities of matter in their vital forms, as represented by the organs and functions of the human body* and in their fundamental or abstract forms, as the solid, the fluid, the fiery and the gaseous state of inorganic matter. The realization of the fundamental laws of the universe, and of one’s own nature through the observation of bodily functions plays an important role in the Buddhist system of meditation and is one of the four pillars of insight (Sīyāpattā).

*The following passage from Majjhima Nikaya 28, may serve as an example: “What is the ‘heating element’ (cittabhuta)?—The heating element may be subjective or it may be objective. And what is the subjective heating element? The dependent properties which on one’s own person and body are heating and radiating, as that whereby one is heated, consumed, scorched, whereby that which has been eaten, drunk, chewed or tasted, is fully digested, or whatever other dependent properties which on one’s own person and body are heating and radiating—this is called the subjective heating element.”
By carrying on this tradition, the same parallelism was established with respect to the psychic organism whose vital centres (cakras) were found to correspond to the elementary qualities of matter; the basic vital centre or 'root support' (mudilhara-cakra) situated in the perineum at the base of the spinal column, (which latter represents the Tree of Life**) and corresponding to the element Earth, the solid state; the navel-centre (manipura-cakra) to the element Water, the fluid state; the heart-centre (anahata-cakra) to the element Fire, the heating, incandescent or radiating state; the throat-centre (vijadhara-cakra) to the element Air, the gaseous state; and the centre on the crown of the head (sahasrara-cakra) to the element Ether (or in its passive aspect; Space), the state of vibration.

Each of these elements is symbolized by a sound (japa-mantra), a mystic syllable of creative power, a colour and a basic form. The latter two are of special interest to us, as they have been directly applied to the architecture of the mChad-rin. Earth is represented by a yellow cube, Water by a white sphere or a white round pot, Fire by a triangular body of either round or square base, i.e. a cone or, less frequently, a pyramid. Air is represented two dimensionally as a semi-circular bow-shaped form of green colour, three dimensionally as a hemisphäre with the base upwards, like a cup. Ether is graphically represented by a

**Mount Meru and the Tree of Life have become identical in the course of time, in fact the whole Meru was imagined to have the form of a mighty tree, composed of many storeys of circular terraces, comparable to the rings of a maple's conical spire. (The horizontal layers of Mount Kailas, the terrestrial replica of Meru, give further emphasis to this conception and its symbolism.) In the Tibetan treatise on the Yogo of Psychic Heat (gTan-mo) we are told that the 'median nerve' (rumma Til; dku-nu Tsa) in its perpendicular straightness symbolizes the trunk of the Tree of Life from which the various cakras branch out and open up like lotus blossoms. Form each cakra a great number of subsidiary psychic nerves radiate upwards and downwards, "appearing like the ribs of a parasol or like the spokes in the wheel of a chariot". This passage again shows the close symbolical relationship between parasol, wheel, lotus (padma is another name applied to psychic centre, which are generally represented as lotus blossoms) and tree, all of which are related to the sun. It may be mentioned in this connection that the Buddhist interpretation of the cakras differs from that of the Hindu tradition, as demonstrated in my "FOUNDATION OF TIBETAN MYSTICISM". (Hinde, London)
small acuminate circle or blue dot (binda) and appears in three-dimensional form as a multi-coloured flaming jewel, i.e., a small sphere from which a flame emerges.

If we put all these elements together in due order, namely, the sphere upon the cube, a cone or a pyramid upon the sphere, and upon the cone or pyramid a cup-like hemispherical vessel which carries a flaming drop on its inner surface, then we get the ideal figure or the abstract stereometric form which represents the basic principles of superarchitecture, as preserved in the Tibetan Chorten as well as in the Japanese Shōkū. In the Chorten the central cupola of the Indian type has been reversed into a vase-or pot-shaped vessel (Tib.: him-pa) which rests on a cubic substructure and is crowned by a tall cone, owing in a small upturned hemisphere, which carries on its inner surface a crescent, a sundisc and the 'flaming jewel', one upon the other.

In addition to this, the main parts of the Chorten are generally given the colours of the 'great elements' (mahabhūta): the cubical substructure yellow (earth), the pot-shaped central part white (water), the conical spire red (fire), while the fourth element (air) which should show a green surface, is generally hidden under the hemispheric umbrella, a symbol which, especially in its Tibetan form, is closely connected with the concept of air. Without taking into account its tree-origin and its natural relationship to sun, air and sky, it may be mentioned that according to the later Indian and Tibetan tradition hemispheric umbrellas were supposed to appear in the sky, when a saint had realized certain magical powers. Between the umbrella and the flaming drop (Tib.: rig-le), the respective symbols of air and fire, there is a white crescent, in whose inner curve rests a red sundisc. They repeat the colours of the two main elements of the Chorten, namely that of the moon-related, waterpot-shaped central part and that of the sun-related conical spire. The meaning of this repetition becomes evident if we remember the role of the lunar and solar forces moving through the main channels or nānis of the psycho-physical organism of man. The most important one runs through the spinal column and is called mūlamā (dhā-ma by the Tibetans), while ida (Tib.: mū-ru-ma) and pingala (Tib.: rö-ru-ma) coil round the central channel in opposite directions, the pale white-coloured ida starting from the left (or, according to Tibetan tradition, controlling the left side of the human body), the red-coloured pingala from the right (or controlling the right side). Ida is the conductor of the lunar or 'moon-like' (cāndana-rupa) forces, which have the regenerative properties and the unity of undifferentiated subconscious life, as represented by the latent creativeness of
seed, egg and semen, in which all chronic telluric cults are centred. Pingala is the vehicle of solar forces (naga-narupa), which have the properties of intellectual activity, representing the conscious, differentiated individualized life. Individualization, however, if separating itself from its origin, is as death-spelling as knowledge severed from the sources of life. This is why wisdom and compassion (prajna and karuna) must be united for the attainment of liberation. And for the same reason pingala, the solar energy, without the regenerating influence of ida, the lunar energy, acts like a poison, while even the elixir of immortality (amrita), to which the regenerating lunar energy is compared, has no value without the light of knowledge.

It is for this reason that only when the solar and lunar energies are united in the central channel, the sushumna, and carried up from the root-centre (muladhara-kala) through all the other centres of psychic power and consciousness until they reach the universal level in the Thousand-Petalled Lotus of the sahasrara-kala, that the final integration of these two forces takes place and results in the ultimate state of illumination (sambhadhi). In the spherical and conical parts of the Chakras the two currents of psychic energy are represented by their separate and elementary aspects; in the crescent and the sun-disc they are represented in their sublimated or spiritualized form as knowledge (prajna) and compassion (karuna), from the union of which the dazzling jewel of perfect enlightenment is born. This symbol of unity and ultimate reality has its latent counterpart in the form of a blue dot (bindu; Tib.; thig-le) or seed (bij;), the creative germ or spiritual potentiality, inherent in every sentient being as the potential consciousness of enlightenment (sadbhava; Tib.; byahing char-kun). The unfolding of this latent principle is the aim of the spiritual path, which is achieved when all our psychic faculties as embodied in the various centres—are permeated by it. When the mystic union between the sun of knowledge and the moon of compassion has reached its zenith and consummation on the highest spiritual plane, the Thousand-Petalled Lotus, then it comes to pass that the dark seed, containing the essence of the universe and the ever-present reality of the dharma-dhatu, breaks open and bursts forth into the dazzling flames of enlightenment, the crowning symbol of the most universal type of the Tibetan Chakras.
RGYAN-DRUG MCHOG-GNYIS (Six Ornaments and Two Excellents) reproduces ancient scrolls (1670 A.C.) depicting Bhahiba, Nagarjuna, Asanga, Vasubandhu, Dignaga, Dharmakirti, Gunaprabha, and Saksaprabha; reproductions are as per originals today after 300 years of display and worship with no attempt at restoration or retouching. The exposition in English presents the iconographical niceties and the theme of the paintings, namely, the Mahayana philosophy; the treatment is designed to meet also the needs of the general reader with an interest in Trans-Himalayan art or Mahayana. A glossary in Sanskrit-Tibetan, a key to place names and a note on source material are appended. Illustrated with five colour plates and thirteen monochromes.

April, 1962.
GILGIT IN ANCIENT TIMES

—BUDDHA PRAKASH

Gilgit is the name given to the western frontier districts of Kashmir which are now under the occupation of Pakistan. It corresponds to the region called Dardistan. Its subdivisions are Astor, Bunji, Chilas, Gilgit, Hunza, Nagar, Panjal, Yasin and Chitralt. Adjacent to it is the territory of Baltistan consisting of the subdivisions of Kharmang, Kaplu, Shigar Skardu and Rondon. More strictly Gilgit signifies the lower valley of the Gilgit river joining the Indus at its acute bend north of Nanga Parbat. This whole area is extremely mountainous exceeding 30,000 feet on the north and west, but the lower valley is about 5000 feet and grows maize, millet, temperate cereals and even some cotton and rice. The total area of the region is 12,355 square miles. Along river valleys and mountain passes run routes connecting this region with the outside world. One route passing through the Tragbal and Berril passes joins Gilgit to Srinagar 233 miles south of it. Another route connects Gilgit with the Albonabad frontier of the Punjab along the Balootar Pass. In the north, narrow sterile mountain valleys measuring some 100 to 150 miles in width, separate the province from the Chinese frontier beyond the Mantogh and Karakoram ranges.

The region of Gilgit and Baltistan is known as Daradades in old texts like the Rajatarangini. Its people, the Daradas, are said to have played an important part in the history of Kashmir. According to the Tibetan historian Taranatha, the route between it and Kashmir was opened by Buddhist pilgrims and missionaries who reached Kashmir with and following Mahayana the emissary of Mogalliputta Tissa at the time of Asoka. Since then it became a resort of Buddhist monks and preachers who made it an important centre of their religion. Hence, in the beginning of the fifth century, when the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien passed through it, he found Buddhism in a flourishing condition there. From Khotan, Fa-hien and his party travelled for twenty-five days to reach Tse-sho-bok which Watters identifies with Tashkurgan in Siikikil. "Its king was a strenuous follower of our Law and had around him more than a thousand monks, mostly students of Mahayana." Here the travellers stayed for fifteen days. Then they went south for four days and reached Yo-lwya, Aktash according to Watters, in the Tsang-ling (Oxion) mountains. There they passed
their retreat. Then they moved among the hills and, travelling for twenty-five days, reached Kielch's which Klaproth and Watters take to be Skarlo in Baltistan. It was a great centre of Buddhism. At that time the king was holding the Pancha Parishad and had invited monks from all quarters to attend it. The function was marked by great pomp and show and the venue of the assembly was gorgeously decorated. "Silken streamers and canopies are hung out in it and wide-flung in gold and silver are made and fixed up behind the places where the chiefs of them are to sit". At the conclusion the king and his ministers distributed gifts and charities among the monks, uttering vows all the time. A spionet of Buddha and also his tooth was believed to be there. The monks were followers of Hinayana and observed numerous remarkable rules. From there, the pilgrims travelled for one month to reach Tázulâk (Darada) where they found many Hinayana monks. There they found a eight cubit high wooden image of Maitreya which was believed to be a true copy of him as he lived in the Tushti heaven. People of the neighboring countries vied with each other in making offerings to it. From there, Fa-hien and his party crossed the hills. "In former times men had chiseled paths along the rocks and distributed ladders on the face of them, to the number altogether of 200, at the bottom of which there was a suspension bridge of ropes, by which the river was crossed, its banks being there 80 pace apart". It took the travellers fifteen days to negotiate this difficult and dangerous path. People informed Fa-hien that in old times the Stambhas, of India had crossed this river carrying with them Sutra and Vinaya scriptures. From that place he and his men reached the kingdom of Wu-ch'ang (Udyana) where the diet, vessels and objects of the people are said to be like those in "central India". The region was abounded with monasteries (stupharams), their number being no less than 200, where the newcomers were provided with all necessities for three days. The Buddha was believed to have visited that region and left his foot imprint there which was highly venerated. Passing through Soo-ho-to (Swatzen) the pilgrims reached Gandhara and were at Takhtasala.

This account of Fa-hien's itinerary shows that a route lay from Khooten via Tushkurgen, Akrech, Skarlo and Daral (Darasa), across the Indus, to Udyana Swat and Gandhara and that it took one 99 days, say one hundred days to complete the journey from Khooten to Udyana along it. It is also clear from it that this route was made and used by Buddhist pilgrims, monks and missionaries and by it they carried their faith to the Central Asian and eastern world. Daral and Skarlo were flourishing Buddhist centres radiating their influence in all directions. Further it is patent that the region to the south of the Queen Range was
considered part of India, for, as Fa-hsu says, "When the travellers had got through them (the Onion Mountains) they were in North India". Sometimes after Fa-hien another Chinese monk, Che-mosq, crossed the Pamirs and travelling through Gilgit, entered into Kashmir, probably through the Buzul Pass route. A little after, the Chinese monk, Fa-yung, took the same route for reaching Kashmir from the Pamirs. In the next century Sung-yun travelled from Tsai-mo (Tash-kurgan), through Pabo (Wakhsh) to the-ni (Chitrail), but, instead of advancing through Gilgit on the way to Kashmir, he journeyed on the road to Uddayana and thence to Gandhara. In the later part of the eighth century the pilgrim and monk Wu-Long followed this route of Yashihach Gilgit to reach the India region and thence to Uddayana and Kapisa. Thus it is clear that the Gilgit route was an important link between India and the coast-stations of the southern part of the Tarim Basin linking the passage to China. The flourishing of Buddhist centres along it invented it with a singular significance in an age when the intensity of faith belittled the difficulties of travelling and eclipsed the risks of life which it presented.

However, the people of Gilgit region, the Dardas, were somewhat different in customs and manners from those of the Kashmir valley. In a verse, found in the Calcutta and Paris manuscripts of the Kajalani, there is a reference to their custom of having illicit relations with their daughters-in-law. Another place their custom of continual wine-drinking is pointedly mentioned. They are also said to be adepts in the washing of gold which was found in the beds of rivers like the Kishangang. According to Javaraja, Sultan Zain-ul-abadin (1413-57) imposed a levy of one-sixth of the produce on the gold washed by these people. More than once the rulers of these regions are said to have invaded the Kashmir valley. Similarly the kings of Kashmir are reported to have marched into the Dardas country and chastised its people and even converted them to their culture and religion. For example, Mihirakula is said to have "reestablished pious observances in this land which, overrun by the impure Dardas, Bhuttas and Miochus, had fallen off from the sacred law (brahmanism)". This shows that at that time the valley was over-run and dominated by the Dardas and others, who had swept down upon it in the confusion caused by Hephthalite invasions, and that Mihirakula put an end to their menace and cleared them off and rehabilitated the Aryas there.

The early history of Gilgit, the Dardas country, in relation to the Kashmir valley, consists of the activities of Buddhist monks and missionaries, on the one hand, and the frequent raids and counters Raids, incursions
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and Bolivia, an instance of which at the time of Mihirakula is given above, on the other. Detailed information of this process becomes available from the end of the 6th century onwards when the interplay of tribal movements and imperialist adventures determined the trends of history in Asia and affected these regions through which the routes of trade and communication passed.

The Chinese text Pei-shie, based on the accounts of the mission of Sung-yun in 519, notes that the regions of Tschi-kua (Konggar), K’ti-p’u (Tsakturgan), Pe-hue (Wulkan), Pe-tcho (Zehak), She-ni (Chitral) and K’u-t’e (Gandhara) formed part of more than thirty kingdoms which were included in the empire of the Hephthalites. This shows that Gilgit, particularly the route between it and Gandhara, on which Sung-yun travelled, was under the Hephthalites. We may equate this fact with the account of the conquest of the Daradas by Mihirakula given in the Sajbungsam, cited above. But in the second half of the 6th century, between 523 and 567, the Khan of the Western Turk’s (Tou-k’ue), Isan’s, called She-ti-mu in Chinese texts and Sila-bone or Dili-bone in Byzantine records, with the collaboration of the Sassanid monarch Khusraw Anushirvan, destroyed the Hephthalite empire. According to Dinosavri, Th’athi and Mirkhand, the Sassanids occupied Tukharistan, Zabadistan, Kabolistan and Jaghistan, whereas the Turks wrested the regions of Turbland, Ferghana, Samackand Bukhara, Kish and Nishapour. Tabriz, however, states that Khusraw sent an army in Transoxiana and encamped at Farghunak and that his authority extended up to Kasmir and Ceylon (Samarin). Chavannes thinks that the Oxus was the boundary between the empires of the Sassanids and the Turks, while the Iron Gates to the north of that river act the main divide. Thus it appears that, with the dismemberment of the Hephthalite empire, the Sassanids became the overlords of the region up to the Indus including Kasmir.

Soon the aforesaid political pattern changed. The Turks broke off with the Sassanids about the sale of Chinese silk. They began to negotiate with the Byzantines on this subject along the northern route which circumvented the Sassanid empire. In 547 they sent an envoy, named Mamukh, to Constantinople by the route of the Lower Volga and the Caucasus and the emperor, Justinian II, reciprocated the gesture by sending an ambassador, named Zemarchus, to the court of Islam in 548. As a result of these diplomatic exchanges, an alliance was formed between the Turks and the Byzantines against the Sassanids. In accordance with it, the Turk ruler turned the cold shoulder to the envoy of the Sassanids and some afterwards declared war against them, from the west the Byzantines also marched against Persia. Though,
with the accession of Islam's son Tardu as the Khan of the western Turks, the relations between him and the Byzantines became strained on the score of the help which the latter extended to the Avars and the Nepthalites, who had taken refuge in South Rusaq they continued their opposition to the Sassanids and in 588–89 attacked it from the east and the west respectively. Tahar says that the Turk chief Shaba marched with 500,000 soldiers against the Persians but the general Bahram Shubin defeated him and put an end to his life. It appears that this Turk chief was some feudatory of the Great Khan Tardu. Just after this victory Bahram was sent to fight with the Byzantines but he was defeated. This led to his disgrace and eventual revolt, which resulted in the deposition of Hormizd IV and the accession of Khurram Parwez. However, Bahram chased him out of Persia and drove him into the arms of the Byzantines. With their support he returned to fight with Bahram and vanquished him. In this battle the Turks also played an important part having sided with Bahram. So, after his defeat, Bahram sought refuge among them but Khurram encompassed his assassination by suborning the Khans. About that time the Turks conquered Turkistan and appointed the local Hephtalite and Kushan rulers to administer it, for in 593-98 we find Khurram Parwez sending his general Smbat Bagratuni to out them. Yet the authority of the Sassanids could not extend beyond Media.

As the seventh century dawned, war again flared up between the Sassanids and the Byzantines. The third of these wars lasted till the end of the reign of Khosrau I in 628. In those fruitful times the Turks extended their rule to the west and north of the Oxus with the result that by 610, when Huien-thsang toured through that region, the sway of the Turks reached the Indus. Thus the supremacy of the Sassanids over the region from the Oxus to the Indus was replaced by that of the Turks.

Buddhist traditions relate to the rule of the Turushkha or Turc over wide regions including Kashmir. Taranatha says that King Turushka ruled for 180 years as a Dharma raja in Kashmir and his son Mahasangama brought the kingdom of Kashmir, Turkistan and Ghani under one administration and spread Mahayana Buddhism there. The Aryavarta nirmanika mentions a king Turushka, who ruled over the Uttarakshpa up to Kashmar and under whom the Mahayana doctrine, specially that of the Prajnaparamita spread in that north, and his successor, Mahasangama, who erected numerous Buddhist shrines and monasteries and propagated the images and the worship of Tara Devi. In this text Turushka is called Gimi or Gounumikha and Mahasangama Buddhapalaka. It is clear that Turushka and
Mahasammata of Taranatha are the same as Turushka and Mahatarushka or Gomacikriya and Buddhapalaka of the Ayasamaghrumupakalapa. N. Dutta has proposed to identify Turushka with Mihirakula and Mahaturushka or Mahasammata with his son Bala mentioned in the Rajatarangini. But this view is manifestly wrong because Mihirakula is represented as the persecutor of Buddhism rather than its preserver or protector and Bala is shown to have founded the shrine of Bakesha (Shiva) and not built any Buddhist establishment, while Turushka and Mahaturushka are known as zealous Buddhists. It appears that Turushka of these traditions stands for the king called Meghabhana by Kalkuna. The grounds of this identification are that Meghabhana is said to have been invited by the people and ministers of Kashmir from Gandhara, which was, as we have seen above, under the rule of the Tukin, he is depicted as a great patron and protector of Buddhism and the builder of many viharas, he is represented as undertaking a conquest of the world (gilgiraja) to promote the observance of the sacred law, particularly, to enforce the prohibition against the killing of living beings for which season he is said to have acted like a Jina, and one of his queens is named as Khana, whose name is preserved in the locality called Khana, about 4 miles below Varamulla (Baramulla), containing a monastery built by her, seen by Wu-kuei, and remodelled by the title Khatun borne by the queens of the Turks. As I propose to show in another study, Meghabhana and his successors were Tu-kine or Turk rulers some of whose had their rule in Gandhara but whom Kalkuna jumbled in the lines of the kings of Kashmir. Thus it is clear that the Turks created a mighty empire including Gandhara and Kashmir and even extensive parts of North India. But sometime between 637 and 649, the founder of the Karkota dynasty Durghabhavardhana, called Tuk-lopa in Chinese texts, established his rule in the Kashmir valley obviously driving the Turk rulers in the neighboring regions. It appears that some of the Turks set up their rule in Gilgit in the north-west of the valley and founded a strong state there which played a very significant part in history.

That the state of Gilgit became a great power in the seventh and eighth centuries is known from an inscription found one mile south of Hatun on the right bank of the Ribbon river in the Gilgit Agency. It refers to the reign of Parnabhatrika Mahapatira Pramokesara Patoladeva Shahi, Navasundradityanadhihira belonging to the family of Bhagavata, and records that, in the 47th year of his reign, his chief minister, Bakrasimha, who bore the titles of 'great lord of the elephants' (Mahapati), 'great lord of the elephants' (Mahasamastadhapat), and 'chief of the army at Gilgitta or Gilgit' (Gilgithaaram-
The king Navasurendrayanandadeva, mentioned in the Hatun inscription, is obviously identical with Shahanshah Padotasha Bhārata Kārmapuru, a prince of the Mahānāyudha dynasty, as recorded in a Nāma, three miles to the north of Gilgit, along with his queen Anangdevi. He is said to have caused the manuscript to be written to ensure his longevity. Further it may be possible to identify him with Ṣafdar Shah Surentra Vikramaśila Nārada, who, along with one Shami devi Tālalakadevi Bhattarakka, probably his wife, is mentioned in the colophon of another manuscript as its donor. Another king of the same line Patoladeva Shah Vajrayanandadeva is known from the colophon of another manuscript.

King Surentra Yanandadeva of the Hatun inscription and colophon of Gilgit manuscripts is undoubtedly Sou-lin-t'o-i-tche, ruler of Great Hou-lu, who sent a mission to China with the products of his country in the period J'ai-yuen (717-741), according to the T'ang shu (chapter COXXI, b). From the Chinese Encyclopaedia Ta-h's fu yuen kōi we learn that in the year 710 the Chinese emperor sent ambassadors to the court of this Sou-lin-t'o-i-tche conferring on him the title of the king of Hou-lu. The T'ang shu further states that his predecessor was Sou-fou-sho-li-tche-li-ni and that he also sent an envoy to the Chinese court and that it sent a letter of investiture to him in 717. This king reigned up to 719 and, the following year, Sou-lin-t'o-i-tche came to the throne.

The T'ai fu yuen kōi states that in 728 a dignitary of the kingdom of Hou-lu, named T'u-mao-tian (yen)-mo she went to China to render
homage and received the present of a violer robe and 2 golden belts.
In 735 another dignitary of that kingdom visited the Chinese court.
His name is given as Pa-han-k'iu. He got the title of lang-tsiang and fifty
pieces of silk as gifts from the court.

In the letter, which the Chinese emperor sent to Sou-fou-sho-li-
tche-shen in 737, he stated that the predecessors of the latter had been
ruling and showing respect for the Tang for the last many generations
which shows that they were diplomatic contact with the Tang emperors
at least from the latter part of the seventh century.

We have seen above that Navangendradityanandi was called
Patobdsahi showing that he was the king of the region known as Babstan,
but his sway extended over Gilgit also and its governor, Makaraishma,
acted as his subordinate. However, Chinese sources treat Babstan, called
Great Po-lu, and Gilgit, called Small Po-lu, as separate courts and the Tang
shu mentions Soun-lin t'o-i-tche as the ruler of the former and Mok-hi-mang
as the ruler of the latter during the same period. If Soun-lin t'o-i-tche is
identical with Navangendradityanandi of Baltistan (Patola), Mok-hi-
mang would be the same as Makaraishma, the military chief of Gilgit
(Gilgitta Sarangha). The Tang shu states that Mok-hi-mang went to
China to render homage to the court and was treated by the emperor
Hsien-tsang like his son. This he is said have done to seek succour
from China against the Tibetans who were forcing their way through
his territory to attack and occupy the Fort Garrison of Kula, Kasglhar,
Khoten and Karashab as Tzennak. In 732, in accordance with the
arrangement between China and Gilgit, the commissioner of Pei-tang
Gutscheg, Tchang-Ho-sang, ordered the prefect of Szula (Kashgar),
Tchang-o-i, to march with 4000 troops for the help of Mok-hi-mang, streng
thened by this succour, Mok-hi-mang moved against the Tibetans (Tson-
po) and inflicted a crushing defeat on them killing many of their men
and taking nine of their cities. Following these events, the Tang emperor
issued a decree conferring the title of king of small Po-lu (Gilgit),
on Mok-hi-mang and the latter also sent his envoy, Tch'a-ts'o-shen no-
mo-chesg, to express his gratitude to the Chinese court. In 733
Mok-hi-mang is said to have sent another envoy to China, on his death
his son Navet assumed power. He also died soon and in 644 his elder
brother Mo-shi-hi ascended the throne and was confirmed by the Chinese
through a letter. He too passed away shortly and Sou-chel-li-tche
became the ruler. He changed the policy of his predecessors and befriended
the Tibetans in preference to the Chinese. Hence in 743 the
Chinese general Kao-shen-tche invaded Gilgit. As a result, the ruler
Gilgit returned to the policy of friendship with China and in 748 sent an ambassador to China offering golden flowers. Again in 752 an ambassador from Gilgit reached the Chinese court. Thus it is clear that the chiefs of Gilgit, Makarishwa and his successors, believed as autonomous rulers and were treated by the Chinese as such in the disturbed conditions created by the incursions of the Chinese. Not only they, but also some chief under them, like the chief of Chirral (Khow), were sometime considered autonomous as in 750 when a letter of investiture was addressed to him by the T’ang court.

It has been observed above that the kings of Baltistan were called Shahi, a title borne by the Sakas, Kushans, Hepthalites and Turks. But the days of the Sakas and Kushans were over in the fourth century and the Hepthalites had been conquered and eclipsed by the Turks and the Sassanids in the last quarter of the sixth. In the first quarter of the seventh century the Turks had even ousted the influence of the Sassanids from the region between the Oxus and the Indus and emerged as the paramount sovereigns of it. We have seen that the tradition of Turushka and Makataurkha, referred to in the Aryamgavanmudalapka, the history of Tarantha, and that of Bostan, is based on the supremacy of the Tu-kime or Turks in that period. It is, therefore, quite likely that they conquered Kashmir, Gilgit and Baltistan also at that time. From Kashmir they were driven out by the Karakas, but in Gilgit and Baltistan they continued to rule and flourish and, as all probability, the Shahi rulers of Baltistan, tracing their lineage from Bhugada, represented one of their stocks. This view is strengthened by the tradition of the rule of the Turks over this region reported by Al-Biruni. He writes on this subject as follows:

"The river Sind rises in the mountains Unom in the territory of the Turks, which you can reach in the following way: leaving the ravine by which you enter Kashmir and entering the plateau, then you have for a march of two more days on your left the mountains of Bolur and Shamian, Turkish tribes who are called Bhattarayun. Their king has the title Bhattashah. Their owns are Gilgit, Aswira and Shitun and their language is the Turkish. Kashmir suffers much from their incursions."

The Shias of this region say that they are of the same race as the Moghuls of India. According to tradition Gilgit was ruled by the rajas of a family called Traksha."
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It appears that the tradition of Turkish rule over this region goes back to the early seventh century when the Tu-kine dominated the vast area up to Gandhara and Kashmir. Thus the Shabits of Bactriana, Nasaavrand, Arthyanadhi and others, were a branch of the Tu-kine or Turks. They set up a strong state there and made it a flourishing centre of Buddhism. The Gilgit manuscripts, revealing the names of a number of devotees like Sulkhina, Sulivraja, Mansati, Mangalasura, Aryadeva and Arthyanadhi and others, are lasting contributions of that age.

However, the supremacy of the Tu-kine or the Turks, established in the first part of the seventh century, was challenged by imperialist movements from China and Tibet and also by the campaigns of conquest launched by the Arabs and later by the Karkots of Kashmir. As Bactriana and Gilgit controlled the strategic routes connecting Kashmir, Gandhara, Udyana, Tibet, the Tarim Basin and China, they became the cockpit of all these struggles and encounters.

In the seventh century the rulers of T'ang dynasty, particularly T'ai-tung (616-649), adopted an aggressive policy towards the Turks in Central Asia. In 630 he gave a crushing blow to the Turks, in 640 occupied Turfan (Kao-ch'ing), in 644 attacked Karasahr (Yen-k'i) and imprisoned its king, and in 646 demanded the principal cities of eastern Turkestan, Kucha, Khoto, Kashgar, Kugiar and Takshurgan, from the Khan of the western Tu-kine. Shou-kou, in return for the hand of a Chinese princess for which the latter was solicitous. Soon afterwards, as these negotiations broke down, he advanced on Kucha and took its king captive in 648 A.D.

T'ai-tung's work was completed by his successor Kao-tung (649-652). In 650, with the help of the Uighurs, he annihilated the T'ch'en-yue, who lived in the neighbourhood of Goutchen, and captured the chief of the Tch'en-ni who inhabited the banks of the river Manas. In 656 he fought with the Karilu chiefs and the Tch'en-yue whereas one of his generals plunged into the Tarhagati, where the Tch'en-nou lived, and occupied their city Yen, while a third army passed to the south of the Tien-shan and attacked the Shou-ni-shu in the valley of Yuldiz. Lastly, in 652 the Chinese, accompanied by the Uighurs, marched against Ho-lou, the Khan of the western Tou-kine, defeated him to the north of the Illi and compelled to pass that river and flee towards the west beyond the Taras. At the same time another Chinese army won a victory over a lieutenant of Ho-lou at Shuang-ho.
near the Ishanur and a third force defeated the chief of Kucha who made common cause with Ho-hou. The finishing touch to this campaign was given in 659 when the Tou-kwei chief, Tuheng-tou-shou-hou, was vanquished. Henceforth the Chinese were the masters of all the territory under the suzerainty of the Tou-kwei. They established their own administration over this vast region. For administrative purposes they divided the entire Tou-kwei empire into two parts, one comprising Transoxiana and the other the territory to the north of the Iron Gates from the Oxus to the Indus. The T'ang shu states that the second part was organized into 16 provinces, the latter into 80 districts, 118 subdivisions and 156 military commands. The 16 provinces were: Tou-tche (Tukharistan with Kucha as its administrative centre), Ta-hou (the region of Hecat and Badhagis formerly under the Hephthalites), T'iao-tche (the territory of Anokhai, Arachosia of the Greeks and Zabulistan of the Arabs, with Ghana as its administrative centre), T'ou-hou (the country of Shumand and Kharan to the north of the Oxus or the upper course of the river Kairan which, at the time of Hiuen-tsiang, a Turk of the tribe of Hi-iin ruled, Kao-fu (Khabul with its administrative centre at Ul-b-sho or Wakhsh, or Lowakand on the river Wakhshah or Surkhan), Sam-sien (Kapisa with Las-kien (Lamghan) and Pan-tche (Panjshir) as its main cities, Sict-ling (Bamyan towards the northern side of Hindukush near the sources of the river Kunduz), Yit-pang (Jagardar, a dependency of Tukharistan or better Kuran on the upper course of the river Kuksha), Ki-sha (Juzjan or the territory between Balkh and Berut), Tz-mo (Timurz on the Oxus), On-lu-lo (to the west of the Oxus and 200 li to the southeast of Ma, modern Charq), Te-le-kiin (Taleqan, a part of upper Tukharistan, to the east of Kunduz), Tse-pa (Karakogin), Niao-foi (Wakhsh), Kaseu-yu-bou-kiin (Kawadhijan on the lower course of the river Kairan), and Tiao-ling (Seistan with its administrative seat at Zarang where the claimant to the Sassanian throne, Fritig had taken refuge. This was the height of Chinese power in the 'Western' regions and eventually in the assembling of envoy from Uchana to Korea in the imperial entourage in 663. But soon afterwards the Chinese were challenged in that area by the Tibetans and the Arabs.

The Tibetans emerged into the limelight of history under Songtsen-gum-po (640-688). He subdued the provinces of Dbus and Guung and united the whole of Tibet under his rule. He had matrimonial relations with Nepal, on the one hand, and China, on the other. At first he was quite friendly towards the T’ang emperors of China. From 643 to 645 he let the Chinese envoy Li-k’iao and Wang Hiuen-ch’ou pass through his territory on their way to the court of Hara and in 649
helped the latter to conquer Kasaq and capture the king. 
the relations between Tibet and China began to worsen.
In that year Srong-brtan-sgam-po destroyed the Tonga tribe of Tou
nyo-kho-n on the banks of the Kokonor. The defeated king took refuge
at Leang tihsiou. In 651 the Chinese emperor tried to restore him
in his kingdom and for that purpose sent an army. It, however, sustained
a heavy defeat in the valley of the Ta-fei (Bukhara gol, a tributary of the
Kokonor). Following it, the Tibetans sacked the Four Garrisons, i.e.,
Kashghar. The Chinese tried to win the favour of a Turk chief A-shen
Tou-tehe and made him governor of Fuxun in the territory of Tchou
mun-kouen. But soon the Tibetans won him over to their side. In 652
the Chinese officer Pen Hsing-hien, marching under the pretext of
restoring the Sasanid pretender, who had sought Chinese help, surprised
this Turk chief near Tokmak and made him captive. Following his
success Wang Fang-i strengthened the fortifications of Tokmak and in 652
defeated the Turk rebel Ashe-nok-poun-chon near the ill and, soon
afterwards, triumphed over Ken-nien and his allies on the banks of the
book-kul. In 653 the Chinese regained the Four Garrisons of Kashgha-
riz and vanquished the Turk Kagan A-shen Tou-tehe, who was a
nominee and stroge of the Tibetans. Thus the Chinese acquired
what they had lost in 628.

To put an end to hostilities the Tibetans proposed an arrange-
ment whereby the Chinese would evacuate the Four Garrisons or
Kashgharia and give them the region of bayt-kul and the basin of the
rivers Tchou and Talau, where the five Turk tribes called Non-shé-
pi lived. And in exchange, the Tibetans would let the Chinese rule
over the valley of the ill and the region to the north of the T'ien shan,
which was the home of the five Turk tribes called Tou-kou. But
the Chinese court declined this offer following the advice of Kung
yuen-yen, who addressed an eloquent memorial to the throne ex-
atollating on the great military importance of the Four Garrisons.
Rather the Chinese followed a policy of saving decimation among the
Tibetans and their nomadics. In 654, after Srong-brtan-sgam-po had
died and his son, Nang-srong-nung-btsan (669-712), came to the
throne, they sent a general to restore their nominee Hau-shé-lo on
the throne at Tokmak and killed by treachery a chief of the tribe of
Non-shé-pi. But this success was shortened since the successor of
Hau-shé-lo was a renegade and mostly lived in China. The real power
was passing into the hands of the Northern Turks who were witnessing
a resurgence under their chief Kuruks (683-691) and his brother
Kapaghan Kagan (691-716) and had brought the Ten Tribes, consti-
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ting the western Turks, under their supremacy. However, the Chinese successfully intervened in the affairs of the Turks in 714-715. After the death of Kaphchou Kagen, a chief of the Turgesh tribe, proclaimed his independence and, with the help of the Arabs and the Tibetans, attacked the towns of Yaka-ark and Agna in Kagharia in 717. The Chinese offered the carrot with the stick to him. On the one hand, they conferred on him titles in 718 and 719 and gave him the hand of the daughter of A-she-nu Boāl in 719, and, on the other, sent A-she-na Hien to take the help of the three Karulk tribes to fight with him. In 718 he was assassinated by a chief of Yellow tribes. Henceforth the scene was dominated by the squabbles of the Yellow tribes and the Black tribes as a result of which the Uighurs emerged as the paramount power occupying Tokmak and Tales in 765.

After regaining their control over Kagharia in 718, the Chinese asserted their supremacy in the Pamirs and Gilgit and Baltistan through which lay routes connecting Tibet with Central Asia. To face the might of China, the Tibetans tried to form a league with the Arabs who were pressing into Central Asia from the West in the opening decades of the eighth century. They combined in 714 with the Arabs in naming a certain A-loo-za the king of Penjandah driving the legitimate sovereign to seek refuge at Kucha. That refugee king sought the help of the Chinese, who rushed an army in the West which drove the state of the Tibetans and the Arabs from Penjandah into the mountains. This increased their prestige so much that eight kingdoms, including those of the Arabs, Tashkent, Samarkand and Kogur, sent envoys to China offering their submission.

Just as the Tibetans helped the Arabs in the valley of the Jaxartes, the Arabs also assisted them in Kagharia. In 717 they collaborated in assisting the Turgesh in an attack on the Four Garrisons and laid siege to Yaka-ark and Agna, as a report of the Chinese commissioner, posted at Kucha, indicated. In that situation the Chinese tried to block the routes of Baltistan and Gilgit to the Tibetans and, for that purpose, Win over their ruler who was the pied-piper of Navaurendu Sahjanad. The letter addressed to him reads as follows:

"Those who resemble the eses and those who follow the paths of virtue are not found in China only. When it comes to foundling a dynasty and complicating a bureaucratic prose, there is no difference among the peoples of diverse manners. You, therefore, the great dignitary, Soo-lou-lo-li-cher-li-zi, king of the Kingdom of Powsi since many genera-"
tions, (you and your ancestors) have been the chiefs who have conserved in your heart fidelity and respect; at distance you display your sincerity, you know to discharge your duty and bring your tribute. Sse-Tehe-sin has been able to put into execution his distant plans and it is because of you that Komo-K'ii-n-kean could get sufficient soldiers. We call upon the king of You-tch'eng to deliver his head, how can we limit ourselves to cut the wing of the Huung-mul? This is why I order that you be king of the kingdom of Pou-lu. Let you commence in an excellent manner and finish in a perfect one, observe for a long time the Chinese calendar (a sign of Chinese suzerainty), give peace to your people and security to your kingdom and let happiness extend to your descendants. Come and respect it. You will commence by receiving this official missive and respect the investiture which I do the favour of giving you. How you can be otherwise than attentive."42

While this document is couched in the traditional imperialist terminology, characteristic of Chinese diplomacy, it reminds the king of Pou-lu of the help that he gave the Chinese earlier and expresses the hope that he would continue to do so in future.

In 319 the king of Ngun (Bukhara), Tou-sa-po-t'i, the king of Kiu-mi (Kunduz), Na-lo-yen (Narayana) and the king of K'ang (Samarkand) On-le-kia (Ghaurk) sought the aid of China against the Arabs. The same year the ambassador of the king of Jahjurian and Jaghlu of Tukharistan, Ti-sha (Tesh) went to China to appeal for help. He was accompanied by the Manichean priest Ta-nou she who introduced this religion in China. But the Chinese emperor could not intervene in favour of these applicants. He only encouraged them to continue the struggle and sent emissaries to the kings of Ou-tch'ing (Udraza), Kou-ton (Khuttal), Kin-wei (Yasin) conferring on them the title of kings in recognition and recompose of the resistance they put up against the Arabs. The same year they give the title of king to the ruler of Hou-mi (Wakhân), recognized the king of Zabulistan or Arakhja as the suzerain of Kattâ, and conveyed the acknowledgement of royal status to king Candrapida of Kashmir. Thus it is clear that all these kingdoms and states joined to solicit help from China which shows their antipathy both to the Tibetans and the Arabs.

To counter these alliances and alignments the Tibetans launched an invasion against Gilgit in 722. Its ruler Mo-kin-mong (Makarasimha) sought the help of China. The commissioner of Pei-ting, Tchang-Hiao-song, ordered the prefect of Sou-le (Kashghar), Tchung Se-li,
to go to the help of Mo-kim-mang. At the head of 4,000 soldiers he reached Gilgit by forced marches. Mo-kim-mang also moved his army which inflicted a crushing defeat on the Tibetans killing many of their men and seizing nine of their cities.

At that time a curious incident occurred. Fifteen years earlier the Tibetan monarch Dung-rom (512-530) had married a Chinese princess, Kwach'eng. In the atmosphere of hostility between Tibet and China her position became untenable. She wanted to take refuge in Kashmir. The king of Kashmir was ready to receive her, but, to repel the Tibetans in that event, he sought the assistance of the king of Bhalistan. This brought the king of Kashmir and that of Bhalistan together but the Chinese princess continued to live in Tibet and died there in 541.

From the west the pressure of the Arabs was constantly mounting. In 711 the Khalif of Tulharistan, who claimed a paramount position from the Oxus to the Indus, bitterly complained to the Chinese emperors that the Arabs had captured his father andbled his people white by their exactions so that he had nothing to present to the court. About the same time, in 716, the younger brother of the king of Bukhara reached the Chinese court, in 717, the king of Kesh sent an envoy there, in 718, the kings of Waikhan and Maimarz, in 729, those of Waikhan and Khuttal, in 730, that of Maimarz, in 731, that of Samarkand and, in 732, that, calling himself the king of Persia, sent embassies to China— all supplicating for help. In 733 Lalitadeya Mukudas of Kesh sent his envoy to China stating that if the emperor were to send an army to Gilgit and also Bhalistan, he would arrange food supply for two lakh soldiers. These preparations show the intense competition round the Pamirs at that time.

The assassination of Su-ho, the chief of the Northern Turks, in 739 gave an opportunity to the Chinese to march again in Central Asia. In 739 one of their generals cooperated with the kings of Kesh and Samarkand to imprison Su-ho’s son Tou-wu-sien near Tokmak whereas another army joined hands with the king of Ferghana for suppressing the Kogan of the Black tribes or Kara Turgush on the Talas. Following these campaigns China again asserted her supremacy in Transoxiana and the emperor conferred titles on the kings of that region, on the king of Talas in 740, on that of Ferghana in 739, on that of Keshkhan in 742. The king of Kesh gave the Chinese name of Lai wei huo (kingdom which moves towards glory) to his kingdom and that of
Fergana began to call his kingdom by the Chinese name of *Ning yuen* (peaceful distant land) by way of acknowledgement of Chinese influence. In 744 a Chinese princess was even given in marriage to the king of Fergana Avolan Taskar. Chinese influence even reached the south of the Caspian Sea in the region called Tashistan as is clear from the titles conferred by the emperor on its kings in 744 and 747.

To the north of the Oxus and the Pamirs the Chinese kept vigilance and maintained their influence by recognizing *Jo-mo-fon-ta* as the legitimate successor of his father in Zabistan in 718 and conferring investiture on Peu-fou-tshoo, king of Kapisa and Udynsa, the two kingdoms having become united, in 744. They also tried their best to keep their hold on the route of Wuhhan and Gilgit in order to conserve their relations with Kashmir, Udyana, Kapisa and Zabolistan, since from 670, as *T’ang* reported, the route of Bamiyan and Balkh had been closed to the Chinese on account of the incursions of the Arabs. As the Wukhan-Gilgit route was the only artery of communication between China, Kashgaria and the west, the Chinese were very keen to preserve it and keep it from falling into the hands of the Tibetans. We have seen how they rendered military aid to Gilgit in 772 and helped in ousting the Tibetans from there. In 716 the Tibetans, under their new monarch *Kho-kho-gan-buran* (705-825) made a show of submission to China, but, side by side, soon afterwards, intensified their pressure on Gilgit. Hence, in 733, the Chinese attacked the Tibetans near Kokonor for diverting the latter to that side and thereby relieving the king of Gilgit. Again, in 743, the Chinese nominated or recognized *Ma-ho-ho-lai* as the king of Gilgit and, in 747, fettered the king of Wuhhan for breaking away with Tibet.

The situation changed with the death of Ma-ho-ho-lai. We have said above that, just after making a show of submission in 716, the Tibetans launched an attack on Baltistan and Gilgit. They succeeded in reducing Baltistan and in 738 totally defeated a Chinese army stationed there. But Gilgit was saved for the time being by the Chinese. However, after the death of the Chinese ally, Ma-ho-ho-lai, the Tibetans brought round his successor, Seu-shi-lish-tche, to their side and married a Tibetan princess to him. With Gilgit under their influence, the Tibetans were supreme in the whole of that area. From 744 to 747 they had a firm hold from Ladakhi to Gilgit. As a result, as the *T’ang* says, more than twenty kingdoms of the northwest became subject to the Tibetans, none of them sending presents or having communication with the Chinese court. The commander of Kucha (Ngen-su) undertook three expeditions against Gilgit but
failed. At last, in 749, the Chinese emperor order an General Kan-Sien-tche to attack. He sent an officer St Yuen-k'ing with one thousand horsemen to Gilgit in advance to tell its king Sou-she-li-tche "we ask you to lend us your route for reaching Baltistan (Great Pe-k'ing)." But in the capital of Gilgit five or six of the big chiefs were devoted to the Tibetans. Hence the mission of St Yuen-k'ing fell through. However, he acted as he was briefed by Kao Sien-tche. He published an imperial edict reassuring the people and giving them presents of silks. Thus winning their support, he attacked the places of those chiefs who favoured the Tibetans. This course met with a signal success. Even the king Sou-she-li-tche fled with his Tibetan wife and nobody could find where he had gone. Kao Sien-tche dominated the scene. He executed all those who were in favour of the Tibetans. He also destroyed the bridge on the river Se-i (Yasin) to check the movement of the Tibetans. Hence, when, the same evening, the Tibetans arrived they could not find a passage nor their allies. Kao Sien-tche promised peace to the Kingdom of Gilgit if its king surrendered to the Chinese. This success of the Chinese arms created a stir in the neighbouring regions, rather the whole "West", for the Arabs (Is-he) and the sixty-two kingdoms, including that of Fou-lin (Syria), are said to have submitted to China. Kao Sien-tche returned to China with the king of Gilgit, Sou-she-li-tche, and his Tibetan queen as prisoners. Gilgit became a Chinese territory; its name was changed to Kozi-joen; a military establishment was set up there and one thousand men were enrolled to garrison it. The emperor, Hsien-tsung, however, pardoned Sou-she-li-tche, gave him a violet robe and golden belt and the title of the General of the Right Guard.

Inspite of the aforesaid success, stirring though it was, the Tibetan resistance was not entirely broken. For, in 749, we find the Jlabghu of Buddhism She-li-mong-kia-lo (Stimungal?) seeking the aid of Chinese troops against the king of Kie-he, a small mountain prince who was in alliance with the Tibetans and had intercepted the communications between Gilgit and Kashmir. She-li-mong-kia-lo formulated the grand strategy of forming an invulnerable bulwark against the Tibetans from Tukharian across the Pamirs and Kashgharia to China. In 750 the Chinese court responded to his suggestion and sent Kao Sien-tche again to the west. He defeated and imprisoned the king of Kie-he, Pou-te-cho, and put on the throne his elder brother, Sou-kia. This success of Chinese arms again sent a shudder in the West. Hence the ambassador of Samarkand, Ho-yee-ten, envoy of Kupna, Neco-tarkan, and representatives of Ferghana, Kameh, Khwarizm, Bhukara
refugee court of Persia visited the Chinese court. On his return Sa-po-
terkan was accompanied by the Buddhist pilgrim Ouk-Leong in 721.

However, the success of Kao Siien-teh turned his head. In 722 he
intervened in the affairs of Taikend. The king of that kingdom offered
his submission. But, false to his word, Kao Siien-teh captured and
executed him and appropriated his wealth. His son fled to the Arabs.
The people were also enraged by the treachery of the Chinese. Taking
this opportunity, the Arab general Abu Musir sent an army under
Zivad-bin-salih to fight with the Chinese and reinterest the son of
the chief of Taikend. Kao Siien-teh united his troops with those of
the king of Ferghana and marched against the Arabs. Just then the
Karlik tribes revolted and attacked his rear. Thus Kao Siien-teh
switched between the Arabs in the front and the Karlik in the
rear and was completely defeated in the great battle at Aldalat, near
the river Talas, in July 723. Most of his men perished and he had
great difficulty in finding his way home with his bedraggled and battered
staff. This decisive battle put an end to the domination of the Chinese
in the western regions and ensured the success of the Arabs there. The
troubles in Yunnan and Ta-li and the revolt of Nguyen Long-thien diverted
the attention of the Chinese from the west and prevented them from
retrieving the disaster of the Talas. Thus ended the role of China in
Turkestan for the time being.

But at that time the Arab world was also in a crisis. In 749 Abu
Muslim had gone away with the Umayyad Caliph. This gave the signal
for revolt and uprising in the whole Islamic world. Neither the Arabs nor the Persians were satisfied. At Nishapur the Magian Bih
Afarid raised his head and at Bukhara the Arabs, led by Sharik-bin-
shaikh al-Mahri, unfurled the banner of revolt. Abu Muslim's deputy
Ziyad-bin-salih had to crush them with a hard hand. But soon the rule
turned against Abu Muslim himself. The Abbasids, whom he brought to
the Caliphal throne, became his enemies. In 752-53 they instigated
Sibs-bin-an-Nunan and Ziyad-bin-salih, whom Abu Muslim had appointed
governors of Transoxiana, to revolt against him. But this revolt failed
out. Sibs-bin-an-Nunan was executed at Amul and Ziyad-bin-salih,
abandoned by his armies, fled to the dihqan of Barkah who got him
killed and sent his head to Abu Muslim. Another supporter of Abu
Muslim, named Abu Dawud, was also over by the Abbasids and
eventually Abu Muslim himself was assassinated in 755. But the party
of Abu Muslim did not die out. It carried on the struggle against the
Abbasids in Khorasan and Transoxiana under a new white standard which
give the insurgents the name of White Clothes (Sapid Jamagan Arabic al-muhayyan)⁸. This created so much fright among the Abbasids as to force them to seek the assistance of China. It is significant that Chinese records repeatedly refer to the tribute-bearing missions of the Ta-chi wearing Black Clothes, meaning the Abbasids, to the Tang court in and after 731, as we shall presently see.

Evidently in this state of affairs a vacuum appeared in the politics of Central Asia which was filled by another power, namely Kashmir. The Rashkeenagani states that the Karota ruler of Kashmir Lalitaditya Muktapida launched an expedition in the northern regions (Uttarapatha) and is said to have defeated the Karhojas (of Badakhshan), Tukhara (of Turkistan) or Sukhara (of Buhara), Boustas (of Tibet), Darabs (of Gilgit), Pragjyotisa (probably Balistan) and fought against Mominu (representing the Mowins or Muslims) inflicting three reverses on him⁹. He is also reported to have planged into the 'sea of sand' (Valukambali), which signifies the desert of Taklamakan, and reduced the mythical Uttarakumar, meaning the people of the oases-states of the Tum basin or Kashgharia. That he completely crippled the Turks is clear from the remark that "it is by his command, to display the mask of their bondage, that the Turushkas carry their arms at their back and shave half their head"⁰. Some writers think that Muktapida undertook his southern campaigns at the instance of and as the instrument of the Chinese. One of them goes to the extent of saying that "the expansion of Karota Kashmir was not merely an expansion of an Indian kingdom, it seems to have been, in reality, the expansion of the supremacy of China in the Himalayan regions"¹⁰. He adds that "Lalitaditya's expeditions against the Tukharas and the Darabs probably had the same objective in view, namely, to assist in the establishment of Tang supremacy in these regions"¹¹. But Chinese records, which give fulsome details about the happenings of this period and do not omit to mention those who undertook campaigns on their behalf, for example, the king of Pu-tu in 771, are entirely silent about the expeditions of Muktapida. There is also nothing in the account of Kahun to indicate that he received or utilised Chinese assistance in his campaigns. Hence the theory of Chinese hand in the campaigns of Muktapida is gratuitous. What appears likely is that, when the Chinese suffered a setback in the battle on the Tala and lost their interests in Central Asia and when the Arabs also were embroiled in their own struggles, Muktapida stepped on the scene to extend his influence in the region around the Pamirs from the Turan basin to Turkistan. Ob-
vainly this happened after 752 and made the king of Kashmir the master of Balistan and Gilgit which gave him the control of the routes to Central Asia. That he succeeded in worsening the Turk rulers of Baltistan and Gilgit and the states of Central Asia from the Tarim basin to Takharistan is indicated by the tradition that the victory of Muttar (Muktapa) over the Turks was celebrated in a festival held on the second day of the month of Caizra in Kashmir, reported by Alkunpri. One can presume that it was Muktapa who put an end to the imperial house of Nasasturendra-diyasaundhi in Balistan and that of Makaraja, who had become subservient to China, in Gilgit and who gave the coup de grace to the Western Turks in Central Asia.

The astounding success of Muktapa made not only the Turk houses but also the Arabs nervous. This is clear from the fact that even after the disaster of the Chinese on the bank of the Talas and their own difficulties at home which made them disinterested in the affairs of the "West" they begged them as their props and supports and repeatedly sent them ambassadors to seek their aid. The Tahi'jan-min-kori states that in 752 the king of Khuttal, Lu-ttemien-ten, contacted the Chinese court and received the letter of investiture and that, in the same year, the ruler of Gilgit (Koci-jen) sent an envoy there and even Sio-to-ko- mi, the chief of the Ta-ke (Arzua) with Black Clothes, the Abbasids, dispatched a mission to China. In 753, the rulers of Kuchgar (Sou-le) Kapoor (Ki-pi), Zabulistan (Si-si), Gilge (Koci-jen) and of the Abbasids (Ta-ke with Black Clothes) sent their envoys with presents to the Chinese court. In the seventh month of that year the kings of Ferghana (Ning-yao), Badhura (Niko) and Takharistan (Tou-ho-lo) also sent ambassadors. It is remarkable that in that year the Abbasids sent four missions in the third, fourth, seventh and twelfth month respectively. Last time they presented thirty horses to the emperor. In 754 the kings of Ferghana, Moynagh, Taragh, Quinbhir, Takharistan, Chitral (Ki-wei), Samarkand (Ka-chip), Bukhara and the Abbasids again sent envoys. In 755 the kings of Takharistan (Tou-pa), Samarkand, Takkan, Khwazon (Ho-sian), Sogdiana (Tu-si), Taragh, Ferghana and Gilgit sent fresh ambassadors. In 756 the Abbasids sent two missions, one in the seventh month, which consisted of twenty-five great chiefs, and the other a bit later. In 756 the kings of Wakhan (Chou-men), Gandhara (Kun-tshen-ko), Takharistan, Samarkand, Khorezm, as well as the Abbasids sent their missions, the last consisting of six Arab chiefs who raised a dispute regarding protocol each claiming priority in reception which was resolved by making them enter the cite simultaneously in the line. In 758 the kings of Ferghana, Bukhara, Taragh, offered tribute.
throughout the seven fifties the kingdoms of Central Asia were keen on
having diplomatic contacts with China and, in particular, the Abbasids
were very solicitous of their alliance. The question arises, why these
kingdoms were banking so much on the help of China and why, particular-
ly, the Abbasids were sending envoy after envoy, mission after mission,
almost every year, to the Chinese court. It is true that the Abbasids
were faced with the revolts of the followers and puritans of Abu
Muslim, as we have seen above, but it should also not be ignored that,
according to the Rajavanta-King, Muktapida had suffered three defeats on
the Arabs (Mamuni) and established his supremacy from the Tarim basin to
Tukharistan which must have made the Abbasids feel shaken. If everything
should have gone well with them there was no cause for them to be so
keenly and persistently desirous of the alliance and friendship of China.
It was some deeper danger which inclined them so much towards China and
it appears that it was no other than that of the rapid advance of Muktapida.
Not only they, but all the other states and kingdoms of Central
Asia, realized the intensity of the menace of Muktapida and sent unending
trains of envoys and ambassadors to China in the hope of assistance.

Lalitaditya Muktapida ruled for 36 years, 7 months and 11 days. His
reign must have ended about 768 or a little later. He died fighting
in some obscure northern region. His successor Kuvalajapida is said to
have maintained his hold over his empire extending over the disc of the
earth. However, his rule was very short lasting for one year and
fifteen days only. Then another son of Lalitaditya ruled for seven
years. During his reign the Mcchas, possibly meaning the Arabs,
became assertive for he is said to have sold many men to them and
introduced many of their practices into his kingdom. Here we find a
reference to the raid of Hisham bin-Abd-al-Alahibi, governor of Sind,
into Kashmir, as a result of which he carried many men as prisoners or
slaves, reported by Balazari. The next two rulers Prithyapida and
Sangramapida were also weak and cruel rulers and the kingdom seems to
have suffered under them. But the next ruler Jayapida was again, like
his grandfather, a man of parts and is said to have set out for the conquest
of the world. His campaigns in the Himalayan region seem to underlay
the reference to the defeat of the king of Nepal at his hands. It may
be conjectured that he asserted his power in Baltistan and Gilgit also.
But after him his dynasty declined and its hold over the neighbouring
regions became loose.

After the eighth century the Tibetans again seem to have become
dominant in Baltistan and Gilgit. This appears from the fact that Al-
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Birmi refers to the rule of one Bhuttashaka in Gilgit, a title which bears the echo of the Tibetans. Besides this the Bajitarangini of Srivara (III, 345) mentions Gilgit and Baltistan as Sivakakshuttashika and Bhatthimudshika respectively. This means that these regions had come to be considered as parts of Bhuttadenta or Tibet.

Kalbooa occasionally refers to the invasions of the Dzarkha in Kashmir, for example under Vuddhasha, and also the attacks from Kashmir on them, as under Vardu, showing that the Gilgit region continued to play some part in the history of Kashmir.

The aforesaid study shows how important Saltistan and Gilgit have been in the political, diplomatic and military history of Tibet, China, Kadghuria, Tukharistan, Kapiya, Gandhara, Kashmir and North India in ancient times. This importance of these regions has been mainly due to the routes which pass through them. It was for the possession of these routes that the various imperialist powers wanted to keep their hold over these regions. Therefore, the authorities of Tibet told the king of Gilgit in the eighth century: "It is not against your country that we plot, rather we take your route for attacking the four Garriets (Kucha, Kadghar, Khotan and Karashahr or Tokmak)." Likewise, from the Chinese, noble, Tching song, the imperial commissioneer of Tel-Cing, observed: "Pou-lu is the western gate of the T'ang that is to say of China; if Pou-lu is lost to us then the countries of the West will all become Tibetan." All the powers, in all the ages, had this point of view in regard to this region.
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ब्रम्हान्धियां भजनाए भजनते भजते।।
स विभक्ताः तन्मलसुक्तं विभक्ताः।।

कहाॅली न निष्पादितारम्यविशेष स।।
हर्षदासी उद्विटाय लघोनिष्टलोकः।।

Vishva Bandhu’s edition (p. 66) reads विश्वासर्पियां instead of भजनाए।


17. ibid, lines 3-4.

निरस्त्र भौतिकसंगतिपर ब्रह्मणम् राम।।
भजनोऽवलोकितो विभक्ताः।।

मनवादिन्यं नाम उपाश्चालितः सीताप्रसादपुरुषं घुमः नवनुः।।

18. In this connection it is significant that according to the Kikhindhe Kanda (42, 31) of the Ramayana there was a Pragyottisha in the western direction. The Mahabhara (II, 43, 7; II, 31, 9-10; II, 33, 15; V, 3, 13-14) also suggests the existence of Pragyottisha in the western region. In the Bajotwara (II, 146) the marriage of king Mergusavana with Anurupabha daughter of the king of Pragyottisha who had 2 Tibetans. Guru also suggests the existence of this region near Kalimie and Tibet. It appears that Baltistan somehow acquired the name of Pragyottisha.

19. M.S. Kaul, Gilgit Excavation Report, 1819
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WHAT IS VAJRA? —?

In the previous issue (Vol VI, No. 2) of this Bulletin I wrote in protest of the new fangled Powerbolt in place of the customary Thunderbolt as the English rendering of Sanskrit Vajra. Several scholars write in support. Some think that I have overstated in my zeal of writing English. My expression "Thunder and not Bolt is the essence of Thunderbolt" is suspected as an exercise in English.

My knowledge of Sanskrit (language) is poor and my knowledge of English (language) is poorer. I happen to read and write English as a student of history. For writing I try to follow the ideal of Japanese English and never care to practice Indian English or Chinese English. For translation I try to follow the Tibetan tradition e.g. Nirmanakaya as Sprul-sku and not Avatara or Living Buddha. I thus say that Thunder is the essence of Thunderbolt and that Bolt is not its essence.

In Sanskrit Vajra begins as the weapon of Indra, and both in Brahmansism and Buddhism this weapon is Thunder or Thunderbolt. One of the many names of Indra is Vajrapani. In the most important Upanishad, Brahdatanayaka, occurs an interesting dialogue about the king of gods.

Q. Who is Indra? A. Indra is thunder (stanaayitna). Q. What is thunder? A. Thunder is thunderbolt (stanaanlitva). [Sankara renders 'stanaan' as 'vajrayam' and derives 'vajra' from 'viryam' which is destructive like Indra.]

Brahdatanayaka III, 9.6. with Sankara's commentary is reproduced below:

कथम इतः कथम्: भ्रातस्तिरितिः तत्तत्त्तपिरियतिः तदम्: प्रायातिरितिः कथम्: सन्तानारुदिर्मानितिः कथम्: यद्य इति यथा इति

श्रीहरिस्वरोणियः श्री. 9.9

कथम इतः: कथम्: प्रायातिरितिः सन्तानारुदिर्मानितिः तदम्: सन्तानारुदिर्मानितिः। अयातिकं यथो तदम्: यथा यथायम्: यथायम्: इति इति; इति यथा यथा इति; इति यथा यथा इति।

निर्मल C. Sinha
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In Sakya Kangrim (ས་ཀྱི་ཐང་ཁོལ།) we find four meanings of rDo-rje (Vajra): 1. Dharma Vajra (་རྒྱ་རྟེ་) 2. Lakshana Vajra (ལེགས་མོ། རྟེ་) 3. Guhya Vajra (གྱུ་རྟེ་) and 4. Rupa Vajra (རུ་པ་རྟེ་).

Dharmatva Vajra is Sunyata khul. In Kanjur the question is posed: "You say Vajra Vajra. What you mean by Vajra?" and the answer is offered "Vajra is hard, void, superindensible, indestructible, which can not be cut, which cannot be burnt, that is, what it is called Sunyata Vajra." In Kanjur a more precise definition is found: "Vajra is Dharmakayasamaka which is like Akasa (space)."

Lakshana Vajra that is the symbol of Vajra is made of iron, bronze or some sacred metal. The form of the symbol may be: nine spokes, five spokes, three spokes and sometimes with even unlooked spokes. The spokes represent virtues and functions. In a Vajra with nine spokes, the central spoke stands for Dharmadhatu. A Vajra with five spokes represents the five Jina or Buddhas in upper half and the five mother goddesses in lower half. The five Buddhas are Vairocana, Aranyasiddhi, Akshobhya, Ratnasambhava, and Amitabha, that is the Five Wisdoms ( རྣ་མགོན་). The five deities are Mambts, Pandhavastri, Tara, Lachan, and Vajradhatvairi, that is the Five Elements ( ནང་དབྱུང་). The two sunmata, called DharmaLhotu, are the two vanishing points and thus also known as Sunyata. The spokes are known to represent the horns ( མི་) projecting from crocodile’s mouth and are regarded as instruments to draw out the sufferings of transmigration. The spine or centre of the Vajra consisting of the moon and eight lotus on either side of the moon is itself the rTen-pi-tshir or sunyata.

The Secret Vajra at its name suggests has no known appearance. The Substantial Vajra is also a matter more for meditation than for portrait. Diamond has two names in Tibetan: rDo-rje rin-poche and rDo-rje-phab-lam (་རྒྱ་རྟེ་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་) and in hardness it is compared to the bones of Shou-thang (ཐོ་ནག་) that is Dali-chi. Hindu legends describe Indra’s weapon, thunder or thunderbolt, as made of Dali-chi’s bones. In Tibetan legends and literature rDo-rje is thought of in its material form as thunder or thunderbolt. I give below the extracts from Kanjur, Tangjar and Sakya Kangrim describing rDo-rje as rTen-pi-tshir or Sunyata.
(5) नायक ।

(6) नायक ।

Kunga Yonten Hochetsang

GILGIT IN ANCIENT TIMES

Professor Buddha Prakhar, in a learned account of ancient Gilg (pp 15-40), has narrated the fascinating events of political history. For a non-specialist reader of the Bulletin it is necessary to state that the English renderings of Chinese terms like "tribute" or "tribute-bearers" are not to be understood in modern sense. The Han diplomatic diction has its own terms to describe protocol, gifts, etc. Vide Hugh Richardson's article on Fish-Sag in Bulletin, Vol VII No. 1.

Gilgit (Bruga), belonging to Tibet-Buddhist complex, has an equally fascinating cultural history. A non-specialist reader may read Kumaraksha Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts (Srinagar 1938), Vol 1, pp 1-45.

Nirmul C. Saha
PRAJNA or the famous Sanskrit-Tibetan Thesaurus-cum-Grammar was compiled by Tenzing Gyaltser, a Khampa scholar educated in Nyingma and Sakya schools of Derge, in 1771 A.C. Though this book was preserved in xylograph few copies of the block-prints are found outside Tibet. The lexicon portions are now presented in modern format with Tibetan words in Tibetan script and Sanskrit words in Sanskrit script with an elaborate foreword by Professor Nalinaksha Dutt.

October 1961.

The entire xylograph (637 pp: 21 inches x 4 inches) containing both lexicon and grammar parts is now presented by offset (photo-mechanic); most clear reproduction of any Tibetan xylograph ever made anywhere. A table of typographical errors etc., found in the original (xylograph), compiled by late lamented Gegan Palden Gyaltser (Mentsikhang: Lhasa and Enchay: Gangtok) makes the present publication an improvement upon the original.

November 1962.
OBITUARY

SABI LA

Muhammad Shahir, popularly known as Sabi La, died in the early hours of October 26, 1970.

A life full of years and full of honours has ended. Yet to his friends and admirers, who count many, this death at 83 has the grief which one feels when a pet child goes out of this life. While some dispute whether Sabi La was old enough others dispute his nationality. Was he a Sikkimese, a Tibetan or an Indian? He spoke Sikkimese and Tibetan, Urdu and Chinese, Hindi and Nepali. A scholar's finding is that Sabi La was Central Asian par excellence; he was the synthesis of Indic and Mongoloid, Sufi and Sunyata. Sabi La was a link with that rich heritage which expressed itself, among others, in Khache Phalu, the popular mystic poem of Tibet.

For centuries, till the middle of the current one, mercantile families from Ladakh had a welcome home in Shigatse and Lhasa. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century a family from Srinagar came with several Ladakhi migrants to Lhasa. A child born to this family in 1887 had grown into "the seventeen year old Ladakhi Sabi La" at the time of the Youngusband Expedition to Lhasa. Sabi La was then articled to a Ladakhi mercantile house and was himself a trader on his own at the time of the expulsion of the Ambans from Lhasa (1913). He had married into a Ladakhi family; the pious consort predeceased Sabi La in 1947. In the early twenties Sabi La shifted to Sikkim and settled down in Gangtok. His imports from Tibet were mostly Yak's wool and exports from Sikkim were cotton goods, cardamom and dry fruits. As in Lhasa so in Gangtok he was held in esteem in the mercantile community.

Sabi La however was great not because he was a merchant. There were in Sikkim many bigger merchants than him and there will be in Sikkim many bigger merchants than him. Sabi La was good, humble and pious. He was truly religious in any sense of the term. His piety was not confined within his own community and significantly he could evoke responsive tears. He built the Gangtok Masjid (1943).
and till his death was the President of Anjónan Sikkim. The land for the Mosque was a gift from the late Chogyal Tashi Namgyal who also donated much building materials. Much of the funds was raised in Tibet while the publicity for assistance in English medium was drafted by a Buddhist. Sabi La evinced a deep interest in the work of the Namgyal Institute of Tibeology. While the scholars connected with the Institute would learn from him much about the Central Asian trade or the Dalai-Panchen relations, this writer profited materially and morally from what he would describe as a prize association of life.

Those who love Sikkim and those who loved Sabi La mourn an irreplaceable loss.

Nirmal C. Sinha