

**John Powers and David Tempelman. 2012. *Historical dictionary of Tibet*. Lanham, Toronto, Plymouth, UK: The Scarecrow Press. xxxvii + 794 pages. 8 maps. 125 \$ (80 £), ebook: 119,99 \$ (75 £).**

Reviewed by  
Bettina Zeisler

**G**iven the general lack of useful reference tools on Tibet and her history, any compendium or dictionary dealing particularly with the history of Tibet is more than welcome. The volume under review is part of a series of historical dictionaries covering Asia, Oceania, and the Middle East. The goal is to “describe the main people, events, politics, social issues, institutions, and policies” of the country in question (front matter). The *Historical Dictionary of Tibet* meets at least some of these ambitious goals.

In the following section 1, I shall first describe the formal features of the volume, before discussing some issues of the content in section 2 (2-1. Prehistory, 2-2. Mythical beginnings, 2-3. The Old Tibetan empire, 2-4. Ethnic diversity and the kingdom of Zhang zhung, 2-5. Tibet’s peripheral areas, 2-6. Ladakh). Some concluding remarks will be found in section 3.

### *1. Structure and layout of the dictionary*

The introductory part of the book consists of a reader’s note on the problem of transcribing Tibetan (pp. xiii-xv), a glossary of common semi-phonetic spellings of Tibetan terms with their Wylie equivalent (pp. xvii-xx), a list of abbreviations (pp. xxi-xxii), an arbitrarily chosen set of maps featuring the Indian subcontinent and *the Mauryan dynasty* (p. xxiii), *the Qing empire* (p. xxiv), *Nepal* (p. xxiv), *Aruchanal Pradesh and surrounding regions* (p. xxv), *the Tibet Autonomous Region and adjacent autonomous prefectures* (p. xxvi), *Tibet and adjacent regions* (p. xxvi), *the Tibetan Plateau and surrounding regions* (p. xxvii), and *Zangs dkar* (Zanskar, p. xxviii), and finally a chronological table (pp. xxix-xxxvii).

The dictionary part starts with a general introduction (pp. 1–49)

with sections on the land and the people (pp. 1–10), on *Tibetan prehistory, the imperium, and Buddhism* (pp. 10–25), *political instability and restoration of central government* (pp. 25–37), and *intrigues, invasions, and independence* (pp. 37–47) plus notes. The dictionary ends with a thematic bibliography (pp. 761–794),<sup>1</sup> introduced by a table of contents (p. 761). Indexes are missing.

In the entries between, the Tibetan terms are sorted according to the principles of the Roman alphabet, “listed according to the first letter, whether pronounced or not” (p. xiv). This principle is, however, violated for the letter *l* or *ᳵ*, which following the Wylie transcription rules is not rendered by a letter but by an elision sign *’*. Syllables starting with this letter are therefore sorted according to their second letter. Capitalisation of names follows an awkward convention of capitalising the letter that is pronounced in modern Central Tibetan, which might be the second or third letter of a word (and only the first letter of a letter combination, such as *ng*, *ny*, or *tsh*, etc.).<sup>2</sup> The pronunciation rules of modern Central Tibetan, certainly, did not apply in Old Tibetan and still do not apply in the western- and easternmost Tibetan languages (Balti, Standard Ladakhi, and the so-called Nomadic Amdo dialects). The Central Tibetan pronunciation is additionally provided in a simplified style, but a copy-and-paste error has supplied us with the vowel *ii*, where one would least expect it: before an *-m*, as in “Drigüm tsenbo” for [d̥igum ts̄ē:bo] (*Dri gum btsan po*), or before an *-ng*, as in “Yarlüng” for [jarlun] (*Yar klungs*). Surprisingly, while Chinese names are also given in Chinese characters and Mongolian names in Cyrillic script, Tibetan terms are only given in transliteration and not in Tibetan script. Neither are Sanskrit words rendered in Devanāgarī.

Headwords are given like catch-lines in capital letters and bold face. Sometimes they are additionally in italics. Cross-references are likewise indicated (not always consistently) by bold face, instead of marking them with a small arrow. Typographically, these are certainly not the best available options, and they do not make for pleasant reading.

The treatment of non-Tibetan (and sometimes also Tibetan) terms is confusing. Indian names tend to be cross-referenced to their Tibet-

---

<sup>1</sup> The order of the titles (if an author has more than one) is unconventional: in most cases, they are not listed according to their publication date, but also not necessarily according to an alphabetic order, as the four titles of the International Campaign for Tibet (p. 767) show: *The Communist Party* ... 2007; *Jampa*: ... 2001; *A Season to Purge*: ... 1996; *When the Sky fell to Earth*: ... 2004.

<sup>2</sup> I shall follow this style here in order to avoid confusion, but I think it is very unfortunate that it has become a sort of ‘standard’ which tends to be forced on authors who have good reasons not to adhere to it.

an translation, be it the Hindu god *Brahmā* (→ *Tshangs pa*), the Mauryan emperor *Aśoka* (→ *Mya ngan med*), or the historical Buddha: Siddhārtha Gautama (→ *Don grub Gau ta ma*) or Śākyamuni Buddha (→ *Sangs rgyas Shā kya thub pa*), whereas the general title *Sangs rgyas* is cross-referenced to *Buddha*. The same happens to the *Tā lai bla ma*, who is cross-referenced to the English form *Dalai Lama*.

The same tendencies are found with place names, such as Sarnath (→ *Drang srong lung pa*), and ethnical groups, such as the Dogrā-s (→ *Shin pa*<sup>3</sup>). *Ka ta man du*, however, is first cross-referred to *Yam bu rgyal sa*, but here we are referred back to *Kathmandu*, where the information on the town is eventually located.

Religious terms are treated even more arbitrarily, some are cross-referenced from Tibetan to Sanskrit, e.g., *chos* (→ *dharma*), *rgyud* (→ *tantra*), and *las* (→ *karma*), some from Sanskrit to Tibetan, e.g. *stūpa* (→ *mchod rten*) and *maṇḍala* (→ *dkyil 'khor*), and some are cross-referenced from Tibetan to English, e.g. *legs sbyar skad* (→ *Sanskrit*), *a ni* (→ *nun*), and *dge slong* (→ *monk*), whereas *monastery* is cross-referenced to Tibetan *dgon pa*.

The definitions are not always satisfying. The *Ḍākinī*-s (→ *Mkha' 'gro ma*), e.g., are described as “female buddhas”. Originally, they were rather dangerous beings between fairies and witches, but often acted as advisors to the spiritual practitioners. The designation was also used for the much tamer tantric consorts.

The dictionary contains a couple of photographs, sometimes only loosely related with the surrounding entries. While a list of photographs, their source, and their dating is not supplied, it is quite apparent that the number of photographs from Bhutan and Ladakh is disproportional high, quite in contrast to the rather cursory treatment both countries receive. It may be noted that the photograph on p. 391 does *not* depict the Khrig rtse (Thikse) monastery 18 km east of Leh (Ladakh), as the caption has it, but the kLu dKyil (Likir) monastery 52 km west of Leh. Neither monastery has an entry.

The only monasteries of Ladakh that receive an entry are Alchi and Lamayuru. The first one is not to be found under the local Tibetan (and Old Tibetan) spelling *A lci*, which underlies the actual pronunciation [altʃi], but under the Central Tibetan variant *A phyi* (p. xvii, 53; by chance, both words refer to a respectable lady or grandmother). The second monastery, on the other hand, is not listed under its traditional spelling *bLa ma gYung drung*, but under the modern

<sup>3</sup> The word *shin pa* is not attested in the dictionaries. It is most probably not a Tibetan word but adopted from the self-designation of Shina-speaking tribes. In the *rGya-Bod kyi chos byung rgyas pa* by mKhas pa lDe'u (ed. 1987: 22), the compound *shin trat* seems to refer to the Shina language (Dardic), which is only distantly related to Dogri (Western Pahari), the language of the Dogrā-s.

form *Lamayuru* (pp. 394). The captions of the photographs on pp. 150, 395 wrongly locate the monastery in Zanskar (Kargil district), while it belongs to Lower Ladakh (Khalsi block, Leh district).

## 2. *The content*

For the greater part of her history, Tibet was under clerical rule. It is thus not surprising that most of the entries deal with religious history, the individual clerics, monastic institutions, the religious pantheon, and with religious tenets. With respect to this aspect of Tibetan history, the dictionary certainly provides useful information, and some of the biographical sketches invite the reader to bury him or herself in the dictionary.

Unfortunately, not all interesting and important persons who are mentioned under an entry receive an entry of their own. 'Gyur med rnam rgyal, e.g., who reigned Central Tibet from 1747–1750, is only mentioned in the entry concerning the 7<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama bsKal bzang rgya mtsho (1708–1757) and in the entry concerning his father, the aristocrat Pho lha nas bSod nams stobs rgyas, who reigned Central Tibet from 1727–1747. A particular difficulty any lexicographer has to deal with is that many Tibetan personages are known under different official names and names of fame. A detailed index would have allowed to find such names or the names of all the people (or places) mentioned along with the main personages, such as the just mentioned 'Gyur med rnam rgyal.

The lineages of the most important abbot lines, the Dalai Lamas, Panchen Lamas, and Karmapas are given, but they are not well cross-referenced. Highlighting (as a sign that each individual has an entry) has been omitted in the case of all Karmapas and Panchen Lamas, and for the first, second, third, and fifth Dalai Lama. Among the Panchen Lamas, the entry for the 7<sup>th</sup> incarnation, bLo bzang bstan pa'i nyi ma phyogs las rnam rgyal (1781–1854) seems to be missing (or at least the cross-reference to his entry name is missing), the entry for the 10<sup>th</sup> Panchen Lama, Chos kyi rgyal mtshan 'phrin las lhun grub (1938–1989) definitely got lost with the process of cross-referencing: under the head word *Chos kyi rgyal mtshan 'phrin las* we are referred to *bLo bzang 'phrin las lhun grub chos kyi rgyal mtshan*, but the corresponding entry does not exist. The list has dGe 'dun chos kyi nyi ma, the boy confirmed by the Dalai Lama, as the 11<sup>th</sup> Panchen Lama (p. 511), but as the entry states correctly, he has been deported to an unknown place and does not function as Panchen Lama. The boy chosen by the Chinese government, rGyal mtshan nor bu (p. 510), is the de facto Panchen Lama, and is accepted as such by the population

and the monks in Tibet. rGyal mtshan nor bu should thus have been mentioned in the list as the 11<sup>th</sup> Panchen Lama instead, or perhaps besides, dGe 'dun chos kyi nyi ma. Similarly surprising is the lack of an entry for the present 17<sup>th</sup> Karmapa and the controversies around him.

While the 'Brug pa bKa' brgyud lineage is mentioned in a separate entry (p. 107–108), only few lineage holders are mentioned: gTsang pa rGya ras ye shes rdo rje (1161–1211), the founder of the main lineage, Dar ma senge (1177–1237) and gZhon nu seng ge (1200–1266), and the two founders of the Lower and Upper 'Brug lineages: rGyal ba lo ras pa (1187–1250) and rGod tshang pa mGon po rdo rje (1189–1258). None of them receives an entry of his own.

Incarnation lines of important lineages or important religious figures outside Tibet are not considered, except for the highest lineages in Inner and Outer Mongolia. The lineage for Inner Mongolia is listed under the entry *Lcang skya Hu thog tu*, but except for lCang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje ye shes bstan pa'i gron me (1717–1786), the second Khutagt, none of the incarnations receives an entry.

The outer Mongolian lineage actually receives two entries. One is an extremely short note under the head word *Hu thog tu*, without any cross-reference, the second, under the head word *rJe btsun dam pa Hu thog tu*, describes briefly the lineage of the Javzandamba Khutagt (the transliteration of the Mongolian name is given as "Jibzundamba"). Only the first member, Zanabazar (1635–1723), is mentioned, cross-referenced, and described in an entry. The remaining 8 members are not listed. The 8<sup>th</sup> Javzandamba Khutagt (1869–1924) had ruled (Outer) Mongolia as Bogd Khan in its short period of independence. The Bogd Khan is briefly mentioned under the entry on *Mongolia* (p. 455), but not as a member of the Khutagt lineage. The 9<sup>th</sup> Bogd Javzandamba Khutagt (1932–2012) spent most of his life in Tibet and the Indian exile, his identity being kept secret until 1990. See Wikipedia<sup>4</sup> for some information on this lineage.

Bhutan and Ladakh have their own monastic lineages, but one might argue that they are simply not important enough to be considered. One person, however, should have been mentioned for his political role and his involvement with Mongolia. The 19<sup>th</sup> Bakula Rimpoche (Ba ku la thub bstan mchog nor, 1917–2003), abbot of the Spituk (sPe thub) monastery in Ladakh, contributed to the welfare of Ladakh as much as to the spiritual progress in Mongolia. He served as Minister of State in the Jammu and Kashmir Government (1953–1967) and as Member of Parliament in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Lok Sabha (the Parliament of India, 1967–1977). He was also India's ambassador to

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jebtsundamba\\_Khutuktu](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jebtsundamba_Khutuktu).

Mongolia (1990–2000), where he set up a new monastery in Ulaanbaatar: sPe thub bstan rgyas chos 'khor gling (see also his autobiography, *Ba ku la rin po che* 2001).

The major Tibetan monasteries get a short description with respect to their foundation date and their further fate. Sometimes, their layout is described in some detail, as in the case of Bsam yas. Only occasionally is the number of monks given, as in the case of Se ra, north of Lhasa. Not always is the location of the monastery specified: in the case of Se ra, only the location of the successor monastery in Byalakuppe, India is mentioned. No information is given about the extent of the land holdings of the monasteries or the villages on which the monasteries depended or perhaps rather: which they exploited.

The dictionary also provides quite detailed information on the rather sad part of Tibet's history under Chinese occupation, with entries such as "communism", "cultural revolution", "great leap forward", "serf liberation day", "seventeen point agreement for the peaceful liberation of Tibet", etc.

One further finds entries on some important Tibetologists and Sinologists, among them Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, Guiseppe Tucci, Paul Pelliot, Ellis Gene Smith, and on the Indologist and adventurer Sir Marc Aurel Stein, who discovered the Dunhuang caves and acquired the first set of Old Tibetan manuscripts. Rolf Alfred Stein (1911–1999), however, whose unparalleled study on the Gesar epic, *Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet* (Paris 1959) is a treasure trove of historical and cultural notes,<sup>5</sup> was apparently not thought worth an entry, and one of his earlier works, *L'épopée tibétaine de Gesar dans sa version lamaique de Ling* (Paris 1956) is falsely ascribed to Sir Marc Aurel Stein (p. 249, entry on Gesar; the bibliography, on the other hand, does justice to Rolf Alfred Stein).

It is obvious that the two authors of the dictionary are competent enough to deal with the modern and the classical epoch and with the Central Tibetan region. Nobody would expect them to be experts on all aspects of Tibetan political and cultural history. While the authors got some help for the topic of Tibetan literature, they were left alone with the early history of Tibet and with the peripheral areas, which they treated rather poorly. The reviewer was informed that it was the publisher's decision not to involve more than two scholars in the project. I shall discuss the topics related to prehistory, the Old Tibetan Empire, and the border areas turn by turn.

---

<sup>5</sup> Not to mention his works on the history of the Tibetan tribes: *Mi-nag et Si-hia, géographie historique et légendes ancestrales* 1951, *Les K'iang des marches sino-tibétaines, exemple de continuité de la tradition* 1958, *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines*, Paris 1959.

2-1. *Prehistory*

The publisher proudly announces that the dictionary covers the period from 27,000 BCE to the present, but this astonishing feat dissolves into very short remarks in the introduction (pp. 11f.), the entry *archeology* (pp. 58f.), and into the following notes in the chronology (p. xxix): “27,000–3,000 BCE Early Neolithic period; settlements in Chu bzang. 3,000 BCE Prehistoric settlements in mKhar ro. 480–400 BCE Life of Siddhārta Gautama, Śākyamuni Buddha. 100 CE Beginnings of Mahāyāna Buddhism in India. 1st century CE Buddhism enters Central Asia and China. 150–250 Life of kLu sgrub (Nāgārjuna). 233 Buddhist texts and relics fall on the roof on Lha Tho tho ri’s palace ...”.

The reviewer is not quite convinced that the entries for the period from 480 BCE to 250 CE relate to Tibet’s prehistory. She also wonders whether Tibetan historical fictions, such as in the last-mentioned line of the chronology should be presented as if they were historical facts, without the appropriate caveat. This holds also for all statements concerning the alleged founder of the Bon religion, gShen rab mi bo che, of whom it is said that he “was born 18,000 years ago” (p. 278) or that he “lived there [in ’Ol mo lung ring] 18,000 years ago and later travelled to Zhang zhung” (p. 750, entry on *Zhang zhung*) without any further note that such dating has no historical value.

2-2. *Mythical beginnings*

The historico-political development of Tibet is treated mainly in the introduction and the various epochs do not receive further entries in the dictionary. The period of the Old Tibetan Empire is lumped together with the rush through the first 26,000 years of prehistory. The section on the *Early Tibetan Empire* (pp. 13–18) starts with the legendary kings of the official Buddhist tradition, although it should be clear that there could not have been any such thing like an Empire at a period the Tibetans like to set in the first or even third century BCE. Not to speak about the fact that an unbroken genealogical line over more than 30 generations has no likelihood, at all; nor could it have been remembered in a not yet very sophisticated, scriptless society. No mention is made of the Bonpo accounts, which, although as fictive as their Buddhist counterparts, seem to preserve some more splinters of memories of pre-imperial history than the re-written official version.

A special focus lies on the legend of the seventh king, Dri gum btsan po. In a fit of egomania he is said to have challenged his vassals

and, before being killed, to have cut a magic rope that connected him with the sky, so that he could no longer return to heaven after death and became the first king to be buried. The name is rendered according to the later classical spelling as *Gri gum btsan po* with the traditional but grammatically incorrect 'translation' as "King killed by a knife" (pp. 14, 273; this would be \**gris bkum pa* or \**gri(s).bkum* in a compound; only the entry on the *Yar klungs dynasty*, p. 731, gives the "alternative", that is, original form *Dri gum*). The authors follow the received Buddhist pretension that the genealogical accounts form a single coherent narrative. Forgotten the work of Eric Haarh (1969), who had tried to show that the 'lineage' must have been manipulated and that the story of *Dri gum* covers up nothing less than a dynastic break.

### 2-3. *The Old Tibetan Empire*

It seems that none of the authors has ever taken a closer look at the source of the *Dri gum* legend, the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (Pelliot tibétain 1287). It stands to fear that the authors are not even aware of the existence of this important text, as they do not mention it, at all. The narrative about the coming into power of the *Yar klungs* dynasty at the point when Tibet entered history in the late 6<sup>th</sup> century: the conspiracy of *Stag bu gNya' gzig*s, the grandfather of *Srong brtsan sgam po* (introduction, p. 15), likewise to be found in the *Chronicle*, is falsely ascribed to the *Old Tibetan Annals* (Pelliot tibétain 1288 and Indian Office Library Tib J 750).

Under the entry on the *Yar klungs dynasty* (pp. 731f.), we find a list of Tibetan kings, which is again falsely associated with the *Annals*. The Tibetan historical tradition knows several such genealogical lists, differing somewhat with respect to the number of kings, their order, and their names (see Haarh 1969: 34–60 and Linnenborn 2004: 27–58 and their comparative charts p. 40 and p. 54 respectively; Linnenborn's publication should be added to the bibliography). The first historical king, *Khri Srong brtsan sgam po* is usually placed either on position 32 or 33, his father *gNam ri slong rtsan* (Old Tibetan also *mtshan*) alias *sLon btsan rlung nam* accordingly on position 31 or 32.

The dictionary list, which is additionally based on unspecified "other sources", inserts one more king, *Srong lde brtsan*, between *sLon btsan rlung nam* (position 30) and *Srong btsan sgam po* (position 32). *Srong lde brtsan*, however, is merely a variant of *Srong brtsan sgam po*'s name in the *Royal Genealogy*, another important Old Tibetan document (Pt 1286; see Haarh 1969: 52 and Dotson 2009: 145 with n. 419). The dictionary list, otherwise, corresponds exactly to the *Roy-*



*al Genealogy*, except that some of the names have been rendered unnecessarily in a slightly different form (no. 1: *gNyag khri* instead of *lDe Nyag khri btsan po*; no. 7: *Gri gum* instead of *Dri gum btsan po*; no. 8: *sPu lde* instead of *sPu de Gung rgyal gnam la dri bdun*; nos. 9, 13, and 14: *Tho legs, Ti sho legs, I sho legs* instead of *Tho leg, Ti sho leg, and I sho leg*; no. 26. *Lha Tho tho ri gnyan brtsan* instead of *Lha Tho do snya brtsan*; nos. 34, 35, 38, and 39 with the additional title *Khri*, which is missing in the corresponding entries of the *Royal Genealogy*). It is not comprehensible, why this important Old Tibetan document has not been mentioned and why it is cited incorrectly and mixed up with other unidentified sources.

In the dictionary list, all rulers who receive an entry of their own are highlighted in bold face, except for *sLon btsan rlung nam*, perhaps because the corresponding entry is found under the more common name *gNam ri slon btsan*. In this entry, the alternative name is not mentioned, nor is there a cross-reference from *sLon btsan rlung nam* to the entry of *gNam ri slon btsan*.

Among the Old Tibetan documents, only the *Old Tibetan Annals* receive an entry. They are correctly described as a pair of lists with year-by-year annalistic entries covering the years between 641 and 764. They cannot, therefore, contain narratives about the prehistory or genealogical charts. Unfortunately, the authors remain silent about the fact that the two Dunhuang versions of the *Annals* are only late copies or perhaps rather extracts of a master list, which was most probably kept at the central chancellery in Tibet (cf. Uray 1975). The insight that the *Annals* contain “bureaucratic registers of events” (p. 497) is cited from Brandon Dotson (2009; one of the extremely rare citations in the dictionary), but the annalistic style and its possible function to date official documents has been first described by Geza Uray (1975). Tsuguhito Takeuchi (1995: 18, 25, n. 5) adds that the regional annals may also have been used to date contracts.

In the introduction, *Srong brtsan sgam po* (d. 650) dominates the description of the foreign politics of the *early Tibetan Empire* (pp. 15–17). The conquests of his immediate successor, *Mang slon mang rtsan* are briefly mentioned (p. 18). After that, the introduction concentrates on the *early propagation of Buddhism* (pp. 18–20), the *religious controversy* between the Buddhists and Bonpos (pp. 20–22), the *debate of bSam yas* (which may have never taken place; pp. 22f.), and the *intrigues at the center*, with the “untimely demise of several monarchs” (p. 23; but only *Mu ne brtsan po*’s murder by his own mother is mentioned), and finally the *demise of the Empire* (pp. 23–25).

In the entry on *Mang slon mang btsan* (Old Tibetan: *rtsan*), the ruler’s year of birth is given with 650 and the first year of his reign with 663 (pp. 18, 363, 366), apparently following the popular myth that the

emperors regularly ascended the throne at the age of thirteen.<sup>6</sup> However, Srong brtsan sgam po's only legal son Gung srong gung rtsan had died in 646 (introduction, p. 17). Hence, Mang slong mang rtsan must have been born in 647 at the latest – or he could not have been Srong brtsan sgam po's legal grandson. According to Dotson (2009: 18), Mang slon mang rtsan was already seven years old, when Srong brtsan sgam po died, which means that he was born 642 or 643. Furthermore, with respect to the succession, the *Old Tibetan Annals*, year 650/51 speak of the “*btsan po*, the grandfather” (*btsan po myes KhrI Srong rtsan*) and the “*btsan po*, the grandson” (*btsan po sbon*<sup>7</sup> *KhrI Mang slon mang rtsan*), and thereafter simply of the *btsan po*. Neither the entry for 663/64 nor any other entry mentions an investiture. This means that during the regency under the *de facto* ruler, the famous great minister mGar sTong rtsan yul zung, Mang slon mang rtsan was already the official, *de jure* ruler from 650 onwards, and it remains unknown when (or whether) he effectively gained power.

The *Royal Genealogy*, l. 63–64 states that Mang slon mang rtsan was born to Gung srong gung rtsan and Kong co Mang mo rje khri skar. The title *kong co*, for Chinese *gongzhu*, would imply that the mother was identical with the Chinese princess Mun cang kong co alias Wencheng gongzhu (see also Dotson 2009: 22 and 83, n. 132). According to the *Old Tibetan Annals*, the Chinese princess arrived in Tibet in ca. 641/42, early enough to have a child by 643.<sup>8</sup> However, according

<sup>6</sup> In the case of his son 'Dus srong, the first year of reign is given with 677 (p. 363), while the year of birth is omitted. Do the authors thus assume that he was already thirteen years old or of an unknown age? According to the *Old Tibetan Annals*, 'Dus srong was born in 676/77 – after the death of his father.

<sup>7</sup> For *dbon*. Like *tsha bo*, the term *dbon* is ambiguous between the reading 'grandson' and 'nephew'. Both terms refer to a younger kin, related to *ego* (or the reference person) via two steps. These two steps can both be vertical, that is, over two generations (hence *grandson*), or one step is vertical and the other horizontal, that is, within the set of *ego*'s siblings (hence *nephew*). The pairing of *myes* and *sbon* leads to a disambiguation towards 'grandson', similarly to the pairing of *phI* 'grandmother' and *sbon* in the year 707/08. The reading 'nephew', by contrast, is triggered by the pairing of *dbon* and *zhang* as in the Sino-Tibetan treaty of 821/22. The spelling variant *sbon* is perhaps intentional, in order to additionally disambiguate the two meanings.

<sup>8</sup> Helga Uebach (1997: 66), argues that the Chinese princess could not have been the mother of an emperor, because she is mentioned in the *Annals* only as *btsan mo* 'queen', but not as *yum* 'imperial mother'. The *Genealogy* would have been wrong in assigning the Chinese title *Kon co* to Mang slon mang rtsan's mother. The latter would have been identical with the 'grandmother' (*pyI*) Mang pangs, who died in 706/07 according to the *Annals*. One may ask however, whether the *Annals* were really so consistent as Uebach assumes, and why Srong brtsan sgam po would have officially married Mun cang kong co, if she was not the heir-bearing mother – or did that happen only on the pressure of the Chinese court? Even if a dictionary cannot give answers to such intricate questions, shouldn't it

to the dictionary entry on the queen (under *Wencheng*, p. 721f.), the latter would have arrived in Tibet only after Gung srong gung rtsan's death. One would like to know on which tradition this is based and why this is preferable to the older documents. The entry on *Wencheng* further gives her death with 680 and ends with the statement that after Srong brtsan sgam po's death, "no records from the Imperium indicate that she played any role in Tibetan affairs" (p. 722). But the *Annals* mention her funeral in the winter 683/84, which means that she died in 683 or early 684 and that she was seen as a personality, important enough for an annalistic entry.

In the entry for the great minister *mGar sTong btsan* (Old Tibetan: *rtsan*) *yul zung*, the reigns of Mang slon mang rtsan (r. 650–676/77) and his son 'Dus srong (676/77–704/05) are hopelessly mixed up. The great minister is said to have resigned in 650. When he resumed his office, he

regained even greater power than before because the new *btsan* po 'Dus srong (r. 677–704) (!) was an infant. The queen mother Khri ma lod (d. 712) was unable to exert significant influence (!) because she was born into the nobility of the 'A zha (!) – a people with whom the Tibetans were at war at that time (!). *sTong btsan* remained chief minister until his death in 667 (p. 434).

According to the *Old Tibetan Chronicle*, ll. 102-103, the said replacement happened only six years before *mGar sTong rtsan yul zung's* death, that is, in 661/62 and not around 650.<sup>9</sup> He was reinstated after just a short time, when his successor 'O ma lde lod btsan was executed for disloyalty. The 'A zha were conquered in the year 663/64 (see also Dotson 2009: 87, n. 150), that is, during the rule of Mang slon mang rtsan. Whether his mother was an 'A zha lady is an open question, since only post-imperial sources have called her so ('*A zha bza'*), while giving her also the title of the Chinese princess in a deviant spelling: *kho 'jo* (see Haarh 1969: 54). Khri ma lod, on the other hand, was 'Dus srong's mother and "one of the most powerful figures in the politics of the Imperium following his [Mang slon mang rtsan's] death", as the corresponding entry (p. 365) states correctly, adding that "[s]he belonged to the 'Bro clan, one of the leading families of the Imperium", and hence was not an 'A zha lady.

---

at least point to the problematic points and inconsistencies in the historical tradition?

<sup>9</sup> The reviewer is unaware of the reasons for this dating. It is insignificant that the *Annals* are silent about *mGar sTong rtsan yul zung* in the first two annalistic entries (650/51 and 651/52), because there is no fast rule that the respective great minister has to be mentioned every year. There is, e.g., no such mentioning in the years 668/69–762/73, 674/75, 677/78–679/80.

The authors state that at “its greatest extent, the [Old Tibetan] empire controlled most of the Tibetan Plateau and annexed large regions of neighbouring countries through military conquest” (p. 15). Which countries these were, how far east, south, west, or north the Tibetan power ever reached is not specified or depicted on a map. Only in the entry on *Khri Mang slon mang btsan* do we find a remark that “the westernmost extent of his conquests was the narrow neck of modern-day Afghanistan at its north-east frontier, the Wakhan Valley, which extends in an arch above Pakistan” (p. 366). We are not informed about how long the Tibetans could hold this area, which other areas the Tibetans held, lost, and reconquered, not to speak about historical details, e.g., that in 747 the Chinese troops (in quite a heroic act) crossed the Pamirs, came down through the Hunza valley to the Gilgit river, and eventually destroyed the bridge across the Indus that had allowed the Tibetans to campaign in the Pamirs (see M.A. Stein 1922).

The eventual breakdown of the Empire is explained as being caused by economic factors, among them the treaty of 821/22. “This agreement brought Tibet’s outward expansion to a close and also eliminated sources of possible additional revenue. (...) The Tibetan empire needed new territories to maintain its income, and following the treaties of 821–23, it was forced to stay within the borders of that time” (p. 24, introduction; similarly p. 364, entry on *Khri gLang Dar ma*: “the treaties of 821/23”; read: *the* treaty of 821/22 in both cases). As if treaties had not been broken earlier or as if Tibet could have only expanded towards China – Tibet’s interaction with India, Kashmir, and the Himalayan border areas seems to be completely out of focus.

Speaking about treaties, we read in the introduction that “[b]eginning in 821 a series of treaties were negotiated between Tibet, China, and Uyghur chieftains” (p. 23). This gives the wrong impression that the 821/822 treaty was the only treaty between Tibet and China. Several major and minor treaties had been concluded before: 730, 756, 765 (and/ or 766), 783, two of which (730 and 783) had been documented also in stone inscriptions, installed along the border.<sup>10</sup> Neither China nor Tibet always played fair, and the local lords pursued their own politics. In 787, an entire Chinese delegation at a treaty ceremony was assaulted and about 500 persons were killed, while the person targeted by the local lord could escape (Bushell 1880: 494–498, Pelliot 1961: 59–53/ 116–118). A separate entry on the treaties in gen-

<sup>10</sup> See Bushell (1880: 466: treaty of 730, 475: of 756, 479: of 765, 481: of 766 (?), 487ff.: of 783, 516ff.: of 821/22) and Pelliot (1961: 21: treaty of 730, 29/ 107: of 756, 31/ 108: of 765, 37: of 766 (?), 43ff./ 113ff.: of 783, 72f./ 128ff.: of 821/22). According to R.A. Stein (1988: 136), the date 756 is erroneous for 762, but in this case, one or two more treaties in 765 and/ or 766 are rather unlikely.

eral or at least on the treaty of 821/822 is missing. Apart from the political importance of the treaties, there are rich descriptions in the Chinese sources concerning the rituals associated with the ceremonies, not to speak of the wording of the agreements.<sup>11</sup>

#### 2-4. *Ethnical diversity and the kingdom of Zhang zhung*

Hardly anything is said about the political (and ethnical) situation on the Tibetan plateau prior to the advent of the empire. The Qiang (or Ch'iang), commonly (but inaccurately) taken to be the immediate and sole forefathers of the Tibetans, are not mentioned, nor the four or six 'original' clans or tribes of the Tibetan tradition (see here R.A. Stein 1961). The Sum pa, an important tribe of the northern Changthang (Byang thang), are only casually mentioned with respect to the administrative unit *ru* 'horn' (p. 600).

The 'A zha or Tuyuhun receive a short entry (p. 54). They are located correctly in the region west of lake Kokonor and in the Qaidam basin. What is not mentioned, however, is that some Tibetan sources, e.g. the *Inquiry of Vimalaprabhā* (*Dri ma med pa'i 'hod kyis zhus pa*, Thomas 1935: 137–258), also locate them in the West as neighbours of the Bru zha (or Bru sha), the people of Gilgit and Hunza-Nagar, which is possibly due to their campaigns in Khotan and Gandhāra or Kashmir in the mid 5<sup>th</sup> century. The important study on the Tuyuhun

---

<sup>11</sup> See Bushell (1880): treaty of 756: sacrifice of three victims, their blood being smeared on the lips of the oath takers (p. 475); treaty of 783: 200 participants on both sides, half of them armed, 7 officials on both sides, who had purified themselves by three days of fasting, performed the rites, horse and ox had been chosen as sacrificial animals, but were replaced by less important animals, sheep, ram, and dog were sacrificed on the north side of the altar, their blood was collected in two vessels and smeared on the lips, this was followed by a Buddhist ritual, the consumption of wine and the exchange of presents, the ceremony was then repeated on the Tibetan side; the treaty, which establishes the borders as well as neutral land, is cited in detail (p. 488ff.); similarly the text of the 821/22 treaty is given (p. 517-18) and with respect to the oath taking on the Tibetan side, a detailed description of the *btsan po's* camp is given: the tent, ornamented with gold figures of dragons and the like, was surrounded with a fence of spears of about 300 paces, the three gates of which were guarded by warriors and ritualists, the latter wearing bird-shaped hats and tiger-girdles and beating the drum, in the centre was a platform, surrounded by jewelled balusters, the *btsan po* sat in the middle of the tent, dressed in plain cloth, his head enveloped in folds of red silk; a further interesting note refers to the area south-west of the Yellow River: here the mountains are covered with sepulchral mounds accompanied by buildings of plastered red earth on which white tigers were painted, these were the tombs of the noble warriors, their comrades, who committed suicide at the time of the burial, being buried alongside (p. 521, cf. also Pelliot 1961: 130). See also R.A. Stein (1988) for a detailed analysis of the sworn oaths.

by Gabriella Molè (1970) is missing in the bibliography. The study on the Tuyuhun graves by Tong Tao (2008) should be added, as well. The territory of the 'A zha must have been at some time contiguous to Zhang zhung, since according to the *Old Tibetan Annals*, the already mentioned great minister mGar sTong rtsan yul zung performed a registration in Du gul of Zhang zhung in 632/33, just after and just before staying in the 'A zha country (cf. also Dotson 2009: 87, n. 149). This may either corroborate an extent of the 'A zha country far to the west or an extent of Zhang zhung far into the east (and it may also point to a certain overlap of the nomadic tribes associated with both entities).

In the entry on *Zhang zhung* (pp. 749f.) we read that the "kingdom was conquered by the Yar klungs kings, either during the reign of Srong btsan sgam po (ca. 605–650) or Khri Srong lde btsan (r. 754–ca. 799)". The *Tang Annals* are quoted as stating that Yangtong (the Chinese name for Zhang zhung) surrendered in 634 (p. 749). More precisely, the *Tang Annals* speak only of the *rendering of homage to the Tibetan Emperor* in 634,<sup>12</sup> and only later with respect to the year 678 of the *annexation* of several territories<sup>13</sup> or of the *submission* of various Qiang tribes associated with Yangtong in 680,<sup>14</sup> leaving some room for interpretation, despite the use of *all* or *entièrement* and *complètement*. Shortly after 'paying homage', the Yangtong acted as allies of the Tibetans and the combined Tibetan and Yangtong troops attacked the Tuyuhun, then the Qiang tribes, finally China (Bushell 1880: 444, Pelliot 1961: 634).

In the *Taiping huanyu ji* (a geographical work, completed 983), Greater Yangtong (that is, the eastern part) is identified with a kingdom that was conquered by the Tibetans in 649 (Pelliot 1963: 708), a conquest associated with severe destruction and a redistribution of the apparently nomadic people. The *Old Tibetan Annals* date the fall of the Zhang zhung king Lig myi rhya into the year 644, and they further mention a 'great sale of fields' (*zhing gi tshong chen*) in connection with the installation of a new fiscal governor for Zhang zhung in the year 652, which may, in fact, relate to the said redistribution. The people of Yangtong, however, continued to send embassies to the

<sup>12</sup> Bushell (1880: 443); Pelliot (1961: 3): "Les royaumes voisins, comme celui de Yang-t'ong et les tribus des K'iang lui [=K'i-tsong-long-tsan] avaient tous rendu hommage."

<sup>13</sup> Bushell (1880: 450): "At this time [the last year mentioned is 678], the Tufan acquired all the territory of the Yangt'ung, Tanghsiang, and different Ch'iang tribes". Pelliot (1961: 9): "A ce moment, les Tibétains s'étaient entièrement annexé les territoires du Yang-t'ong, des Tang-hiang et des divers K'iang."

<sup>14</sup> Pelliot (1961: 89): "[Les Tibétains] ... soumièrent complètement les K'iang Yang-t'ong et Tang-hiang."

Chinese court (Denwood 2008: 9), which indicates that the region or at least major parts of it were not fully integrated into the Tibetan empire. The *Old Tibetan Annals* mention a last rebellion for the year 677/78, which corresponds well with the date of the *Tang Annals* for the 'complete annexation'. Khyung po sPung sad zu tse (not *sgam po* as the last part of the name is erroneously noted on p. 433), a Zhang zhung noble, great minister under Srong brtsan sgam po, and most probably a collaborationist and war profiteer, has not received an entry, unlike his successor, the above-mentioned mGar sTong btsan yul zung.

With respect to the geographical extent of Zhang zhung, we can read that it "was probably an area in western Tibet with Ti se (Mt Kailash) as its center" (p. 101, entry on *Bon*). In a late and somewhat unreliable description of mNga' ris (see also below), the 'lower' (i.e., eastern) part of mNga' ris is identified with Zhang zhung, described as being surrounded by the cliffs of Gu ge (p. 450, entry on *mNga' ris*). Accordingly, the entry on *Gu ge* defines it as an "area in western Tibet, that roughly corresponds to the ancient Zhang zhung kingdom" (p. 284). This identification would confine Zhang zhung to a quite limited area on the Satlej river. This stands not only in contrast with the seemingly a-historic Bon po tradition, according to which Zhang zhung covered a large region from the Pamir region to at least Central Tibet. It also stands in contrast with the Chinese sources on Yangtong. An entry on Yangtong (or a cross-reference from Yangtong to Zhang zhung) is missing, and the Chinese accounts on the region (accessible through Bushell 1880, Pelliot 1963, and others) have been fully ignored.

According to the *Chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston* of dPa' bo gtsug lag, the two moieties of Zhang zhung, *stod* (west) and *smad* (east) were located at the boundary of Tibet and the Western Turks (*Gru gu* for *Dru gu*) and between Tibet and the Sum pa respectively (Ja 19 a, as cited by Tucci 1956: 91). At least the western extension is corroborated through the V<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama's biography of bSod nams mchog ldan bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan (Tucci 1956: 73), where Zhang zhung is anachronistically associated with mNga' ris, divided into three provinces (*skor gsum*) as in the later history. But the second *skor* contains Khotan (*Li*), Hunza-Gilgit (*Gru zha* – a common variant for *Bru zha*), and Baltistan (*Sbal te*).

Similarly, the Yangtong of the Chinese sources, divided into a Lesser (western) and a Greater (eastern) part, covered an area from Baltistan or at least Lower Ladakh up to possibly the Kokonor region. It should be noted that the term 'Lesser' and 'Greater' has nothing to do with the importance of the region, but is relative to the observer, 'Lesser' / 'Little' meaning close by, 'Greater' / 'Great' further away

(here in relation to the Chinese troops in Chinese Turkestan or even in the Pamirs), or in relation to a sacred landmark, such as the Pamirian Meru (possibly the Nanga Parbat). The Bonpo division of 'Outer', 'Middle', and 'Inner Zhang chung', with the latter being located somewhere in sTag gzigs 'Persia' and thus in the immediate neighbourhood of Mt Meru, seems to follow the same kind of convention. The notions of 'Inner' and 'Outer', therefore, do not say anything about where the actual political centre lies. (In a similar vein, the people of Kashmir knew of a 'Little Tibet' in Baltistan and a 'Greater Tibet' in Ladakh, while Tibet itself was out of focus.)

Quite obviously, place names are not at all stable. Over time, they may refer to different regions, and a given region may have quite different extensions at different times. All this is not taken into account and no attempt is made to differentiate between pre-imperial and post-imperial concepts of Zhang chung.

#### 2-5. Tibet's peripheral areas

A similar vagueness can be observed also with respect to other regions. mNga' ris is described as an entity without "a fixed border" (p. 449), although the present-day prefecture is well defined and the seven districts listed on p. 450 are actually the present-day districts, not the traditional ones as claimed. The traditional division was into three provinces (*skor gsum*). The definition of these provinces varies. One such description is mentioned, as usual without citing the source, where the upper (western) region Mang yul is said to be surrounded by the lakes of Zangs dkar. This oddity seems to have been triggered by the shifting references of the name *Mang/ Mar yul*: Zanskar certainly does not have a single lake (as evident from the map on p. xxviii), not to speak of a multitude of lakes that could surround a region. That the reference to Zanskar is illogical and in need of an explanation has escaped the attention of the authors of the dictionary.

The designation *Mang yul* alters with *Mar yul*, the alleged old name of Ladakh. Under the entry "Mar yul (Maryül; alt. Mard yul) (La dwags)", we can read that this designation was "used in documents from the period of the Tibetan Imperium (...) for an area roughly corresponding to modern La dwags. The domain of Mar yul comprised the westernmost part of Tibet around the town of sKyid grong [Kyirong] to the eastern borders of La dwags" (p. 419). The reviewer has some problem in harmonising the contradiction between an area *corresponding to* and an area *bordering on* Ladakh.

The designation *Mard*, certainly not with the addition of *yul*, appears only once in the Old Tibetan documents (*Old Tibetan Annals*,



year 719), and it is not very obvious to which region it actually referred. As it is mentioned immediately after Zhang zhung, and since place names are typically enumerated from west to east, equalling the notion from 'above' to 'below', Mard was most probably located east of Zhang zhung or perhaps to its south (a possible candidate could be Spiti or also the above-mentioned Kyirong). It cannot be identical with present-day Ladakh, which seems to have been part of Zhang zhung itself. The use of the designation *Mar yul* for Ladakh is not attested before the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century Alchi inscription. While modesty should forbid any self-reference, the reviewer nevertheless feels compelled to mention her study on Yangtong (Zeisler 2010), where these place names and the problem of their volatility have been dealt with in quite some detail.

Regrettably, the entries on *mNga' ris* and *Gu ge* in western Tibet and on *Amdo* and *Kham* in the North-East and East do not contain any information about the history of the partially independent principalities or kingdoms. *Gu ge* is somewhat privileged, as a brief outline of the Kingdom of *Gu ge* is given in the introduction (pp. 25–28) and some of the *Gu ge* kings are mentioned in separate entries. A short, one page long entry deals with Bhutan, surprisingly under the head word *Bhutan* instead of '*Brug yul*. The historical description, however, starts only with the year 1616. The reviewer is astonished that there should not have been any documents or at least some traditions relating to the period before that date.

## 2-6. *Ladakh and Zanskar*

The rich history of Ladakh is dealt with in a substantially longer entry (*La dwags*, pp. 387–392), but, despite the available genealogies, only some of the attested rulers are mentioned. Only the alleged first offsprings of the Imperial line, Skyid lde Nyi ma mgon, who settled in *mNga' ris*, and his eldest son, Dpal gyi mgon, who, according to the tradition, inherited (parts of) Ladakh, receive an entry of their own.<sup>15</sup>

Under the main entry, we further read that Ladakh "was an independent kingdom, and it has been ruled by Tibetan governments from time to time" (p. 387). This is again a rather contradictory statement, and one would have liked to know which Tibetan government, apart from the Empire, would have *ruled* which part of

---

<sup>15</sup> The pronunciation of the names is given as "Gyidé Nyimagön" and "Belgigön", but in Ladakh, the two rulers are better known as Kidé or Skidé Nyimagon and Pal- or Spalgigon.

Ladakh in which particular period. It is further stated that in the distant past, Ladakh had been part of the Kuṣāṇa empire (p. 388), a hypothesis that one can come across in the literature, but which has never been substantiated.

With respect to modern history, we read correctly that Ladakh was divided into the Kargil and Leh districts in 1979, we further read about the riots of 1989 between Buddhists and Muslims and the following anti-Muslim boycott called for by the Ladakh Buddhist Association. The authors continue with the formation of the Ladakh Autonomous Hill Council (finally established in 1995), but the reader cannot guess that this Council covers only the Leh district, and that a separate Hill Council has been set up subsequently for the Kargil district in 2003. One further reads that beyond the ongoing border dispute and repeated border violations, the People's Republic of China would claim "La dwags as part of its territory" (p. 392). This rather unexpected information is not further substantiated and no references are given.

Zanskar is presented as if it had been only temporarily part of Ladakh and had become an independent entity after the annexation of Ladakh to Jammu and Kashmir (p. 387: "La dwags sometimes included ... Zangs dkar"; p. 746: Zangs dkar "was formerly a part of the kingdom of La dwags"; and p. 748: "it remained a part of the kingdom of La dwags until it was incorporated into Jammu and Kashmir"). As a "valley of the Kargil district" (p. 746), it is naturally part of Ladakh, which consists of the two districts, Leh and Kargil.

A short note on the particularities of the Ladakhi language is found unexpectedly under the entry for *Zangs dkar*. Here we can read that "[t]he main language is Ladakhi (La dwags skad),<sup>16</sup> a dialect of Tibetan (Bod skad), that differs from it in pronunciation of some consonants that are not voiced (!) in central Tibetan" (p. 747). There is certainly not only one Ladakhi variety, and the various dialects, of which the Zahare ḍau (*Zangs dkar gyi zla bo*) is a distinct member, do differ not only in their pronunciation and lexicon from Central Tibetan and among themselves, but more importantly also in their grammar. Generally, it would be better to view Tibetan not as a single language as under the entry *language* (p. 396), but as a language family (just like the Germanic or Romanic languages; cf. Tournadre 2005: 17 and 2014: 106–107), and the various regional varieties as individual languages (just like English is not merely a dialect of German).

---

<sup>16</sup> It may be noted that the local designation (Leh standard) of the language of Ladakh or rather the central area around Leh is *Ladakse skat* (La dwags *kyi* skad).

### 3. Final remarks

It is further not fully correct to state that the Tibetan script was based on the north Indian Brāhmī script (p. 750, entry on *Zhang zhung*,) or on the “north Indian Gupta and Brāhmī alphabets” (p. 676, entry on *Thon mi Sam bho ta*, emphasis added – there is no separate entry on the Tibetan script). The Brāhmī script was developed in the 3<sup>rd</sup> c. BCE and bears little similarity with the modern Indian scripts, which are all derived from it. The Gupta script, which served as a model for the Tibetan script, was a comparatively late development (see Róna-Tas 1985: 231–260 with further literature on the development of the *dbu can* script; and van Schaik 2012 on the *dbu med* script).

Finally, under the entry *Sanskrit*, we find the most astonishing consideration that the “classical Tibetan language was modified so that translators could reflect grammatical constructions such as case endings, compounds and verb forms” (p. 618). Does that mean that Old Tibetan had no case markers or no compounds? One does not really like to read contradictory and/ or misconstrued sentences, such as “Tibetan translations were also interpretations, linguistic facsimiles (!) of the originals and in many texts when there was no equivalent or suitable Sanskrit (!) term, they created neologisms from indigenous vocabulary” (p. 618).

Such entries had better not been written, at all. A historical dictionary on Tibet does not necessarily need an entry on language and even less one on Sanskrit. (Would it be necessary to have an entry on Latin in a history of England or the Americas?) Neither are entries on Ladakh and Bhutan, both independent political entities, indispensable, when the authors lack an in-depth knowledge of their respective histories. The reviewer is also not convinced that the dictionary should have contained summarising entries on the history of India, Mongolia, and China with passages that have no bearing on the Tibetan history at all, particularly since the information given in these sections is barely more detailed than what one could find in Wikipedia.

Each of the lamented imprecisions and lacunae may seem marginal in itself, and a few smaller mistakes, unavoidable in such a work, would certainly not have diminished the value of the dictionary. However, in their sum they indicate at least a certain neglect and haste. Since the reviewer found so many inaccuracies in the fields where she happens to have some basic knowledge, she would find difficulties to rely on information where she would need it most, that is, on subjects she is not familiar with and cannot, therefore, judge their accurateness. As it stands, the *Historical Dictionary of Tibet*, despite the useful information that it does contain, is somewhat disap-

pointing for scholars in the field. Whether it can be recommended for high school and college students or 'anyone wanting to know more about Tibet' (back matter), depends on what the targeted audience for this publication actually expects.

The reviewer certainly appreciates the hard work the two authors must have invested in this dictionary. She should like to emphasise that she does not want to put the blame solely on the two authors, as possibly no individual (and no team of only two persons) could have done a better job with the limited historical sources and studies available. The blame lies thus mainly on the publisher who apparently did not understand that such a project would need the (remunerated) expertise of at least a dozen scholars and a much longer editorial process. It can only be hoped that the dictionary will be updated quickly in a new edition, in order to make it a truly useful reference tool.

If that is to happen, first of all, a detailed index should be added, which would allow to access all names and terms, those that are mentioned without receiving an entry of their own, those that are treated under more than one entry, or those that are cross-referenced because the person or place in question is known under more than one name. Secondly, all entries should be re-sorted under the original name of a person, place, item, or concept, independent of whether this name or its Tibetan translation might be more familiar to the potential users. It would be quite beneficial if the introductory section was enlarged by lists of rulers, not only of the empire, but of all major principalities of Tibet (and possibly also of Bhutan or Ladakh), and by lists of all reincarnation lineages, including those of the Mongolian Khutagt (the present lineage holders or their offices will certainly assist in providing such lists). Finally, the publisher should employ a cartographer to design a set of informative historical maps, which would depict the gestation period, the expansion, and the break down of the Tibetan empire, the various regional principalities (and their conquests or losses), the Mongol and the Chinese conquests of Tibet, the present administrative units in the TAR and the Chinese provinces, Ladakh and Bhutan, and the location of the most important (historical) monasteries in Tibet, Bhutan, Ladakh, and Mongolia. It would certainly be no fault if the dictionary were enlarged to two or more volumes.

#### *References*

- Ba ku la rin po che. 2001. *Rang rnam padma dkar po'i phreng ba* [Garland of white Lotuses: an autobiography]. Leh: Bakula Foundation.
- Bushell, Stephen Wootton. 1880. Early history of Tibet from Chinese

- sources. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 12: 435–541.
- Denwood, Philip. 2008. The Tibetans in the west. Part I. *Journal of Inner Asian Art & Archaeology* 3: 7–21.
- Dotson, Brandon. 2009. *The Old Tibetan Annals. An annotated translation of Tibet's first history. With an annotated cartographical documentation by Guntram Hazod.* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 381.) Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Haarh, Eric. 1969. *The Yar-luñ dynasty. A study with particular regard to the contribution by myths and legends to the history of Ancient Tibet and the origin and nature of its kings.* København: Gad.
- Linnenborn, Hildrud. 2004. *Die frühen Könige von Tibet und ihre Konstruktion in den religiösen Überlieferungen.* (Asiatische Forschungen, 147.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- mKhas pa Lde'u (13th c.). Ed. Chab spel Tshe brtan Phun tshogs. 1987. *rGya bod kyi chos byung rgyas pa* [The religious history of India and Tibet *in extensio*]. S.l. [Lhasa]: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang [The People of Tibet Publishing House].
- Molè, Gabriella. 1970. *The T'u-yü-hun from the Northern Wei to the Five dynasties.* (Serie Orientale Roma, 41.) Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Pelliot, Paul. 1961. *Histoire ancienne du Tibet.* (Oeuvres Posthumes de Paul Pelliot, 5.) Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- . 1963. *Notes on Marco Polo, II, ouvrage posthume.* Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Róna-Tas, András. 1985. *Wiener Vorlesungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte Tibets.* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde, 13.) Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- Stein, Marc Aurel. 1922. A Chinese expedition across the Pamirs and Hindukush, A.D. 747. *The Geographical Journal* 59.2: 112–131.
- Stein, Rolf Alfred. 1951. Mi-Ñag et Si-Hia. *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 44.1: 223–265.
- . 1956. *L'épopée tibétaine de Gesar dans sa version lamaïque de Ling.* (Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études, 61.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1957. Les K'iang des marches sino-tibétaines, exemple de continuité de la tradition. *L'Annuaire 1957–1958 de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*: 3–15.
- . 1959. *Recherches sur l'épopée et le barde au Tibet.* (Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 13.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1961. *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines. Légendes,*

- classifications et histoire.* (Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises, 15.) Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- . 1988. Les serments des traits sino-tibétains (8e–9e siècles). *T'oung Pao* 74: 119–138.
- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito. 1995. *Old Tibetan contracts from Central Asia*. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan.
- Thomas, Frederick William. 1935. *Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. Part I: Literary texts.* (Oriental Translation Fund, New Series, 32.) London: The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Tong Tao. 2008. *The silk roads of the northern Tibetan plateau during the early Middle Ages (from the Han to the Tang dynasty) as reconstructed from archaeological and written sources.* Tübingen: Univ. Diss. <http://tobias-lib.uni-tuebingen.de/volltexte/2008/3628>, accessed XII/ 2008.
- Tournadre, Nicolas. 2005. L'aire linguistique tibétaine et ses divers dialectes. *LALIES, Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature d'Aussois*, 25: 7–56.
- . 2014. The Tibetic languages and their classification. In: Thomas Owen-Smith and Nathan Hill (eds.), *Trans-Himalayan Linguistics. Historical and Descriptive Linguistics of the Himalayan Area.* [Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs, 266.] Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 105–130.
- Tucci, Guiseppe. 1956. *Preliminary Report on two scientific expeditions in Nepal.* (Serie Orientale Roma, 10, Materials for the study of Nepalese history and culture, 1.) Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Uebach, Helga. 1997. Eminent ladies of the Tibetan empire according to Old Tibetan texts. In: Samten Karmay and Philippe Sagant (eds.), *Les habitants du toit du monde. Études recueillies en hommage à Alexander W. Macdonald.* Nanterre: Société d'ethnologie, pp. 53–74.
- Uray, Géza. 1975. L'annalistique et la pratique bureaucratique au Tibet ancien. *Journal Asiatique* 1975: 157–170.
- van Schaik, 2012. The origin of the headless script (*dbu med*) in Tibet. In: Nathan W. Hill (ed.), *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages IV.* (Brill's Tibetan Studies Library, 13.) Leiden: Brill, 411–446.
- Zeisler, Bettina. 2010. East of the moon and west of the sun? Approaches to a land with many names, north of ancient India and south of Khotan. In: Roberto Vitali (ed.), *The Earth Ox Papers. Proceedings of the International Seminar on Tibetan and Himalayan Studies, Held at the Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, September 2009 on the Occasion of the 'Thankyou India' Year.* Special Issue of *The Tibet Journal* 34.3–4/ 35.1–2: 371–463.

