


Red Faced Barbarians, Benign Despots and Drunken Masters: Khotan as a Mirror to Tibet

Sam van Schaik¹

1. *The Buddha on the Silk Road*

The way of the Mahāyāna has been sought by the accomplished in the auspicious places where our Teacher placed his feet, such as the Vajra Seat, the Vulture's Peak, and the Shady Willow Grove of Khotan.²

From Nub Sangyé Yeshé's
Lamp for the Eyes of Contemplation (early 10th c.)

t the beginning of the tenth century, a chaotic time for Tibet, the scholar Nub Sangyé Yeshé wrote these lines on the sacred places visited by the Buddha. Two of them are well-known throughout the Buddhist world, but the third is a little more obscure. Is the Buddha really supposed to have visited the Silk Road city of Khotan? According to the Khotanese, he did indeed, and the fact that this was accepted without any need of explanation by an educated Tibetan writer like Sangyé Yeshé shows how far the Khotanese understanding of Buddhism had penetrated into Tibet at this time.³

¹ Aspects of this article first appeared as a series of posts on my website earlytibet.com, and I would like to thank those with whom I discussed them in the comments sections, especially Dan Martin. I would also like to thank Lewis Doney for his many useful comments and suggestions on the article itself, which was completed with the support of the European Research Commission under the EU's 7th Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement no.609823.

² *Bsam gtan mig sgron*, 5–6: rgyu'i theg pa chen po'i lugs kyis kyang sngon ston pas zhabs kyis bcags pa'i rdo rje'i gdan dang/ bya rgod phung po'i ri dang/ li yul lchang ra smug po la stsogs pa bkra shis pa'i gnas dag bya ba grub par byed pas btsal lo/.

³ The Shady (lit: "Dark Red") Willow Grove of Khotan (*li yul lchang ra smug po*) appears in a few other later Tibetan sources, including a pilgrims' guide to the Khadrug temple, which includes a story of how the temple's statues were obtained from Khotan by the Tibetan army, during the reign of Songtsen Gampo. See Sørensen and Hazod 2005: 62–64. Later, when the real location of Khotan had been forgotten in Tibet, the "Shady Willow Grove of Khotan" came to be identified with one of the tantric holy sites known as *pīṭha* – associated with parts of the body and with pilgrimage sites in India. The site associated with Khotan was Gṛhadevatā, a problematic site unlocateable in India. On the divine body, Gṛhadevatā represented the anus, a rather ignominious development in the

Khotan was the most important kingdom on the southern Silk Route, situated between the Taklamakan desert and the Kunlun mountain range. Two rivers coming down from the mountains brought the water that allowed cultivation of the land, also bringing down jade, the stone prized by the Chinese and the source of much of Khotan's wealth. Khotan was thus ideally placed to take advantage of east-west trade, becoming in the process open to influences from a variety of cultures. Indigenous legends of Khotan's early history emphasise both the country's cultural plurality and its allegiance to Buddhism.

These legends do indeed tell of the Buddha visiting Khotan. In one version, he flies over from Vulture's Peak to hover above the lake that covered Khotan in ancient times, before descending to rest upon a lotus throne in the middle of the lake.⁴ Other legends also brought to Khotan the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara and the protector deity Vaiśravaṇa. Re-imagining themselves as the centre of their religious world became a surprisingly consistent feature of Khotanese culture. When Aurel Stein visited Khotan at the turn of the twentieth century, he noted of the Muslim Khotanese: "Pious imagination of a remarkably luxuriant growth has transplanted into the region of Khotan the tombs of the twelve Imāms of orthodox Shiite creed, together with a host of other propagators of the faith whose names are known to local legend only."⁵

It may be true, as Stein suggested, that the people of Khotan are a *gens religiosissima* particularly given to pious invention, but a solid Buddhist sangha was resident in Khotan from at least the third century AD, when the Chinese translator Zhu Shixing 朱士行 went to Khotan to look for the 25,000 verse *Prajñāpāramitā sūtra*.⁶ Zhu Shixing found the sūtra, settled in Khotan and never returned to China, dying there at the age of 80. He did send the text back with his disciples, and it was taken to several cities before being translated by a Khotanese monk and a Sinicized Indian monk in 281. This translation, known as *The Scripture of the Emission of Rays*, became very popular in China at the time.⁷

Tibetan uses of Khotan. See Huber 2008: 95–96. Dates for Nub Sangyé Yeshé are from Vitali 1996.

⁴ The *Prophecy of Khotan*; translation and Tibetan in Emmerick 1967: 8–9. See also Thomas 1935: 89–90.

⁵ Stein 1907: 140.

⁶ *The Annals of Khotan* state that Buddhism was adopted by a Khotanese king in 86 BC. This is not entirely unlikely, although the evidence throughout Central Asia suggests that an established Buddhist sangha was not present till the 2nd or 3rd century AD.

⁷ Zürcher 2007 [1959]: 61–63.

Discoveries of Khotanese manuscripts in archaeological sites in the areas once ruled by the kingdom have shown that the major Mahāyāna sūtras were all known in Khotan. These were first written in their original language, then after the fifth century increasingly translated into Khotanese. The *Suvarṇaprabhāśa sūtra* seems to have been particularly influential, informing the notion of Khotan as a Buddhist realm under the protection of bodhisattvas and divine kings.⁸ Alongside this Buddhist material are many examples of Khotan's literary tradition, stories on Indic themes, like the trials of Rāma, and poems on the ever-popular subjects of nature and love. One unique text, the so-called *Book of Zambasta* marries the Khotanese poetic tradition with Buddhist subject matters in a lengthy and wide-ranging survey of Buddhism.⁹

During the seventh to the ninth centuries, the Tibetans were sporadically active in Central Asia, fighting the Chinese Tang empire over strategically situated and highly profitable Silk Route oasis cities. The Khotanese first encountered the Tibetans in the seventh century as one among many threatening barbarian armies. After a brief period of Tibetan occupation in the late seventh century, Khotan was returned to Chinese rule, to be conquered again by the Tibetans at the end of the eighth century. After the final fall of the Tibetan empire in the middle of the ninth century, Tibetans and Khotanese met in Silk Road towns like Dunhuang in the role of Buddhist teachers and disciples, sharing their knowledge, and translating each other's religious texts.¹⁰

We are fortunate to have a number of Khotanese Buddhist texts that the Tibetans translated into their own language preserved in the Tibetan canon and among the manuscripts from the Dunhuang cave. In addition, the Khotanese manuscripts from Khotan and Dunhuang provide us with evidence of a close relationship between Tibetans and Khotanese during the second Tibetan occupation of Khotan in the late eighth to mid-ninth centuries, and later at Dunhuang in the tenth century. These sources display some very different perceptions of the Tibetans, and because some of these Khotanese works were known in Tibet, they came to inform the way later Tibetan Buddhists constructed their own identities, reconciling the two aspects of their imperial history: conquest and religion.

⁸ A thorough study of the Khotanese *Suvarṇaprabhāśottoma sūtra* is contained in Skjaervø 2004a.

⁹ For a review of Khotanese literature, see Emmerick 1992. See also Emmerick's translation of *The Book of Zambasta* in Emmerick 1968.

¹⁰ For a single-volume account of Tibetan activities in Central Asia during the Tibetan empire, see Beckwith 1987. On Tibetans and Khotanese at Dunhuang during the tenth century, see Takata 2000.

2. *The Red Faced Ones*

There will come a time when the Red Faced Ones seize the country, destroying and burning monastic groves, temples and great stūpas. They will form the perverse aspiration to annihilate my teachings, come what may.

The Buddha, speaking in the
Enquiry of the Goddess Vimala (7th c.)¹¹

Tibetan histories usually present the Tibetans before their conversion to Buddhism as a crude and unlearned race, without writing, law or the civilizing effect of the dharma, and possessing a number of unsavoury customs, including blood sacrifices and painting their faces red with vermilion before going into battle. The description of the Tibetans as Red Faced Ones (*gdong dmar can*) came to be a signifier of all of this pre-Buddhist barbarity, and of the civilizing effects of Buddhism. In the early tenth century the Tibetan scholar mentioned at the beginning of this study, Nub Sangyé Yeshé, wrote of his country, “these kingdoms at the borderlands, these lands of the Tibetans, the red faced demons.”¹²

The idea of the Tibetans as barbarians is part of the narrative of their conversion to Buddhism, which sees the transformation from the barbaric to the religious as predestined, foretold by the Buddha himself in these words: “Two thousand five hundred years after my *parinirvāṇa*, the true dharma will be propagated in the land of the Red Faced Ones.”¹³ This prophecy was cited in one the earliest surviving Tibetan histories of Buddhism, that of the Sakya patriarch Sōnam Tsemo. It was then reproduced in many later works, becoming a standard topos in the history of Buddhism in Tibet.

Yet the prophecy's provenance is unclear. It is ascribed to a text called *The Enquiry of the Goddess Vimala* (*Lha mo dri ma med pa'i zhus*, Skt. **Devī-vimala-pariprcchā*), yet no text of that title appears in the Tibetan canon. We do, however, have a text called *The Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* (*Dri ma med pa'i 'od kyis zhus pa*. Skt. **Vimalaprabhā-*

¹¹ P.835, 238a.1: gang gi tshe gdong dmar dag gis yul bzung ste/ dge 'dun kyi kun dga' rab dang/ dri btsang khang dang/ mchod rten chen po rnam 'jig par byed cing sreg par byed de/ de dag gis ci nas kyang nga bstan pa gzhig par bya ba'i phyir smon lam log par btap pas. See also Thomas 1935: 203 (f.363a-b).

¹² *Lamp for the Eyes of Contemplation* (494.3ff): dus lan cig mtha' khob kyi rgyal khams / bod srin po gdong dmar gyi yul 'di dag tu//. This work has been dated to the early tenth century (see Vitali 1996). The same phrase, “red-faced demons,” appears in a Tibetan ritual text from Dunhuang in a list of malign spirits (see IOL Tib J 279).

¹³ *Introduction to the Dharma* (50a.3): lha mo dri ma med pa'i zhus las/ gdong dmar can gyi yul du ston pa mya ngan las 'das nas lo nyis stong lnga brgya na dam pa'i chos rgyas par gyur ro zhes gsungs so//.

pariprcchā).¹⁴ Given that in this text the Vimalaprabhā of the title is indeed a goddess, it seems that two titles may refer to the same text. *The Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* is indeed full of prophecies, some of which do speak of the Red Faced Ones, but none of them is the prophecy quoted above.

The *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* is a Khotanese work that was translated into Tibetan, and found its way into the Tibetan canon. Cast in the form of a prophecy, it deals with the fears of the Khotanese Buddhists under the onslaught of the Tibetan war machine, fears that the structures and institutions of the dharma will be destroyed by Tibet's barbaric and cruel Red Faced Ones. The text has a heroine, the goddess Vimalaprabhā, who takes rebirth as the Khotanese princess Praniyata in order to save Buddhism in Khotan.¹⁵ F.W. Thomas somewhat whimsically suggested that the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* was the Khotanese Romance of its age and that Praniyata was Khotan's Joan of Arc.¹⁶ Closer to home, the text belongs with the late sūtra literature, being a mixture of narrative, prophecies, rituals and *dhāraṇī* spells. Interestingly, many of the rituals address female concerns, including women's illnesses and childbirth.

The historical sequence of events laid out in the text has the Tibetans battling the Khotanese in alliance with the Supīya people.¹⁷ In this battle the Khotanese king Vijayavikrama is killed and his daughter, Praniyata, forced into exile. The new Khotanese king Vijayakīrti is disparaged in the text, presumably because of his weakness in the face of the invaders. The hopeful scenario laid out in the text is that a neighbouring prince, Vijayavarman, will come to Khotan with the funds to pay off the Tibetans and take the throne. For the future security of Khotan, hope is placed in the Chinese. This aspiration is summarized in the following prayer:

May we come together with one accord and consecrate
Vijayavarman to be the king of Khotan. When the Red Faced Ones

¹⁴ Tib. *Dri ma med pa'i 'od kyis zhus pa*. Q.835.

¹⁵ The Sanskrit name Praniyata is a reconstruction from the Tibetan *rab nges*. Many Khotanese had Sanskrit names; however, there are other ways of reconstructing the Sanskrit.

¹⁶ Thomas 1935: 171. More recently, the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* has been discussed by Eva Dargyay (1988: 109–12), who suggests that its structure provides the basis for the later Tibetan stories of the emperor Songtsen Gampo; see the following section where I discuss further parallels between Khotanese texts translated into Tibetan and the legends of Songtsen Gampo.

¹⁷ Along with Thomas (1935: 156–157) I read Tibetan *sum pa* as Supīya. Khotanese texts confirm that the Supīya were a threat concurrently with the Tibetans (see Skjaervø 2004).

and the Chinese battle each other, may Khotan not be destroyed. When monks come from other countries to Khotan, may they not be treated dishonourably. May those who flee here from other countries find a place to stay here, and help to rebuild the great stūpas and monastic estates that have been burned by the Red Faced Ones. In order that this happens, may [Vijayavarman] pay the ransom for Khotan and mutually exchange brides with the Chinese.¹⁸

Here and elsewhere in the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* we are told that the Tibetan forces burned down Buddhist structures, making life very hard indeed for the Buddhists of Khotan. In the passage quoted at the beginning of this section, the Buddha himself castigates the Tibetans for harbouring the perverse aspiration to destroy his dharma. The Khotanese survival strategies expressed in the text are: (i) the defeat of the Tibetan forces by the Chinese, and (ii) to buy off the Tibetan forces with a ransom. There is certainly no suggestion of any recourse to the Tibetans as fellow Buddhists.

The text leaves the situation unresolved, and the threat of the Tibetans hangs over it, clearly still present at the time of composition. Thus it was probably written in the years immediately before the first Tibetan conquest of Khotan, which took place in the second half of the 660s. The year 665 was particularly marked by conflict, as Khotan attempted to defend itself from attacks by Turks, Kashgaris and Tibetans.¹⁹ Given the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā*'s obsession with contemporary events and plans for their resolution, it was probably composed in the midst of this turbulent period.

Given this date, the portrayal of a Tibetan army lacking any respect for Khotan's Buddhist institutions in the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* is credible. Though there may have been some Tibetan interest in, and patronage of, Buddhism in the mid-seventh century, any such interest would probably have been restricted to the court, and any Buddhist monks resident in Tibet would have been

¹⁸ Q.835: 271a: /bdag cag thams cad kyi nram par rgyal ba'i go cha ni ci nas kyang li yul gyi rgyal por 'gyur bar thams cad sems pa thun pas lhan cig tu dbang bskur bar bgyi'o//gang gi tshe gdong dmar dang brgya[=rgya] 'thab par 'gyur ba de'i tshe/ ci nas li yul 'jig par mi 'gyur ba dang/ gang gi tshe yul gzhan nas li yul du rab tu byung ba nams 'ongs pa na der ci nas rim 'gro med par mi 'gyur ba dang/ yul gzhan nas der sems can bros pa de dag der gnas 'thob par 'gyur zhing gdong dmar gyis bsregs pa gang yin pa'i mchod rten chen po de dag dang/ dge 'dun gyi kun dga' rab dag[=kun dga' rwa ba] mchos[='chos] pa'i grogs byed par 'gyur par bya ba'i phyir li yul gyi blud 'jal ba dang/ brgya[=rgya] dang phan tshun du bag ma btong ba dang/ len par byed do/. The translation here is my own. See also Thomas 1935: 254.

¹⁹ Beckwith 1987: 34.

foreigners.²⁰ The attacks and occupations inflicted upon Khotan by its enemies (among which the Tibetans are counted), and the threat to Buddhism constituted by these depredations, are a theme that reappears in Khotanese literature, including *The Book of Zambasta* which, like the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā*, characterizes these political enemies as enemies of Buddhism as well:

There are Māmkuayas, Red Khocas and Hunas, Ciṃggas, Supīyas, who have harmed our Khotanese land. For a time we have not been angry about this. When he hears, “The Buddha does indeed exist”, the unbeliever is angry.²¹

An interesting reference in the *Annals of Khotan* suggests that once Khotan had come under Tibetan rule, Buddhist institutions were no longer endangered, and may even have been supported. The text records the construction of a major new monastery — the first to be built in four generations — during the reign of the Khotanese king Vijayakīrti. It adds: “This monastery was built at the time when Khotan, being attached to the old Tibetan dominions, was governed by the Gar councilor Tsenyen Gungtön.”²² The Gar clan effectively ran the Tibetan empire after the death of the emperor (*btsan po*) Songtsen Gampo in the middle of the seventh century. This particular official is also mentioned in the *Old Tibetan Annals*. Here the entry for the year 695/6 states that he was executed for disloyalty, a killing that marks the beginning of reassertion of authority by the Tibetan emperor.²³ In any case, the construction of the monastery is said to have taken place while Gar Tsenyen Gungtön was the governor of Khotan, during the first Tibetan occupation of the city.²⁴ Thus the

²⁰ The early reception of Buddhism at the Chinese court offers a useful analogy – see Zürcher 1959.

²¹ *The Book of Zambasta* has been translated by Ronald Emmerick (1968). In Emmerick’s opinion (1992: 40), this work could not have been composed before the seventh century. It may thus be roughly contemporaneous with the *Enquiry*. The lines of the invaders, including the Tibetans, are found at chapter 15, verse 9 (pp.228–229 of Emmerick’s edition):

Z Fol.271v, vv.9-10:

(9) māmkuaya rro īndā heinā kho—ca u huna ciṃgga supīya

kye nā hvatāna-kṣīru bajo—ttānda ttu ju ye gāvu ne oysde .

(10) balysāṣṣai aṣṭā ci pyūṣḍe . varī oysde aṣṣaddā cau ka—

rma cu tā yiḍe haysgu ku jso aṣṭā śśāru mā vaska

²² See Thomas 1935: 125.

²³ See Dotson 2009: 98–99. In the *Old Tibetan Annals* the name is spelled Mgar Btsan nyen gung rton. See also Beckwith 1987: 56.

²⁴ Based on an identification of king Vijayakīrti with a Khotanese king mentioned in Chinese source as having fled Khotan in 674, Hill (2008: 181) dates the founding of this temple to the period 670–674.

panicky tone of the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* seems to have been somewhat premature. Buddhism in Khotan would survive for another three centuries, during which time its connections with Tibetan culture would become even stronger.²⁵

3. *Subjects of the Bodhisattva King*

“Then a bodhisattva will take birth as the king of the Red Faced Ones and the practice of the true dharma will come to the land of Tibet.”

From *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* (9th c.)

The idea of the Tibetan emperors as emanations of bodhisattvas is equally, if not more, important in the Tibetan construction of a Buddhist self-image than the motif of the red faced barbarians. The idea of the bodhisattva king came to be associated primarily with the first imperial ruler, Songtsen Gampo (ruled early to mid seventh century), but probably not until after the end of the Tibetan empire. And while there is some early evidence from Dunhuang manuscripts of the ninth or tenth century of the Tibetans viewing Songtsen Gampo as a Buddhist king, most references to a Tibetan Buddhist king in these sources are to Tri Songdetsen (ruled 756–c.800).²⁶ When Tibetan historians of the eleventh and twelfth centuries came to formulate and defend the notion that Songtsen Gampo was a bodhisattva, they seem to have turned to the Khotanese records. In some of the earliest Tibetan histories (including *The Pillar Testament* and *The Testimony of Ba*), Songtsen Gampo's status as an emanation of the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara is established through a story about Khotanese monks.

The story involves the visit of two Khotanese monks to Tibet. The monks hope to see Avalokiteśvara face to face, and have been told that they may do so by travelling to Tibet and looking upon Songtsen Gampo, who is in fact Avalokiteśvara in person. Upon their arrival in

²⁵ For a recent survey of the Tibetan administration of Khotan, see Zhu Lishuang 2013.

²⁶ For example, Pelliot tibétain 149 links the activities of Tri Songdetsen to the events of the *Gandhavyūha sūtra*. IOL Tib J 466/3 pays homage to Tri Songdetsen as a Buddhist king, and places him in the company of the Buddhist kings Aśoka, Kaniṣka and Harṣa. A poem in another manuscript, IOL Tib J 370, probably dating to after the fall of the Tibetan empire, places Songtsen Gampo alongside Tri Songdetsen, designating him a Buddhist king but not identifying him as a bodhisattva. Kapstein 2000: 56–58 discusses this same process in terms of the gradual re-reading of the early legislation of the Tibetan empire in Buddhist terms.

Tibet, the monks are shocked to see the execution, imprisonment and corporal punishment of criminals. Thinking that the bodhisattva of compassion could never countenance such cruelty, they resolve to go back to Khotan immediately. However, Songtsen Gampo, hearing of this, has them brought to the palace and shows himself to them in the form of Avalokiteśvara. Speaking to them in Khotanese, the king assures the monks that the atrocities they witnessed were just magical illusions created by the king to ensure the rule of law in his land. The monks are filled with faith; they fall asleep in the palace and wake up back home in Khotan.²⁷

This story addresses doubts regarding the compatibility of the king's enforcement of Tibet's laws with his identity as the bodhisattva of compassion, Avalokiteśvara, by employing the common topos of magical illusion.²⁸ In some sources the barbaric nature of the Tibetans is invoked at this point to justify the king's use of these violent illusions in enforcing the law, showing again the close link between the cultural emblems of the Red Faced Ones and the bodhisattva king.²⁹ The prominence of this story in the histories does suggest that by the eleventh century there were some doubts among Tibetan Buddhists regarding the compatibility of the Tibetan kings' status as bodhisattvas, and the violence required of them as imperial rulers.³⁰

The Pillar Testament attributes the story of the Khotanese monks to a *Prophecy of Khotan*.³¹ A text of this name is to be found in the Tibetan canon and the Dunhuang manuscripts. Like the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā*, it was probably translated into Tibetan from Khotanese.³² In the Dunhuang manuscript version, it has the longer

²⁷ The version in *The Testimony of Ba* is briefer, though not necessarily earlier (see Wangdu and Diemberger 2000: 32–33). The version in *The Pillar Testament* (302–305) is more extensive and contains most of the details found in later versions. The different versions of the story are discussed in Sørensen 1994: 303, 584. See now also the discussion of these versions, and the different presentations of the story therein, in Mills 2012.

²⁸ In the earlier version of *The Testimony of Ba* the magical illusion explanation is absent. If this is an earlier version, it may be that the king's status as Avalokiteśvara was originally considered sufficient to allay doubts regarding his oppressive penal practices.

²⁹ See Sørensen 1994: 305.

³⁰ Kapstein 2000: 51–52 suggests that no such incompatibility was felt by Tibetans during the Buddhist period of the Tibetan empire. This may well be true, and the discomfort may be directly linked to the gradual elevation in Tibetan histories of Songtsen Gampo to the status of a personified bodhisattva of compassion.

³¹ *The Pillar Testament* (p.305.1–4) gives two sources, a *Prophecy of Khotan* (*Li lung bstan*) and a *Prophecy Regarding the Great Compassionate One King Songtsen Gampo* (*Rgyal po srong bstan sgam po thugs rje chen por lung bstan pa*). No text corresponding to the second title has been found.

³² See Appendix.

title *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*. Yet the story of the Khotanese monks' encounter with Songtsen Gampo is not found in any of the versions of this text. Perhaps this is why many later Tibetan histories, following the *Testimony of Ba*, change the attribution of the story slightly to a *Great Prophecy of Khotan*.³³ While there may have been a *Great Prophecy of Khotan*, now lost, it is perhaps more likely that the word *Great* was added to the title when it was realized that the story was not to be found in *The Prophecy of Khotan*.³⁴

Yet the attribution of the story of the two Khotanese monks does have a parallel in the *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*. The narrative of the prophecy is primarily concerned with the flight of a group of monks from Khotan to Tibet, where they are welcomed and supported by Tri Songdetsen's father Tri Detsugtsen (ruled 712–c.754), and in particular, by his Chinese queen, who may be identified as Jincheng Gongzhu 金城公主. The prophecy seems to have been written in response to a genuine calamity that forced a group of monks to seek refuge in Tibet. Adopting the narratives of the end of the dharma that are found in many earlier Indian sources, in particular the *Candragarbha sūtra*, the *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* ties in this local calamity to the end of the dharma itself.³⁵

The *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* credits the Chinese queen with building monasteries for the monks, who may well have constituted a genuine Buddhist sangha in Central Tibet for several years.³⁶ It goes on to describe how this pleasant period came to an end when a disease killed the queen, along with many Tibetans. The epidemic was taken as a sign that the local deities were unhappy with the Buddhist presence in Tibet, and the foreign monks were expelled. The epidemic seems to be a genuine historical event, and the *Old Tibetan Annals* mentions the death of the queen in the year 739/40.³⁷

This narrative appears in three overlapping texts (see Appendix) which differ in certain details, but agree in the broad outlines of the story. Modern scholarship has tended to take this narrative as derived from a genuine series of historical events. However, the

³³ In *The Testimony of Ba* it is just *The Great Prophecy* (*Lung bstan chen mo*).

³⁴ This is the conclusion that Per Sørensen arrived at (see Sørensen 1994: 584). Similarly, we find 'great' versions of several tantras that seem never to have existed as texts, but function as a notional repository and source of material not found in the extant tantra.

³⁵ On the Kauśāmbī prophecy of the end of the dharma and its various versions, see Nattier 1991.

³⁶ The *Testimony of Ba* also mentions the temples built by Gongzhu, but does not contain the narrative of the refugee monks. See Pasang and Diemberger 2000: 34–35.

³⁷ See Dotson 2009: 121. Roberto Vitali (1990: 11) argues that death of the queen was not caused by epidemic, but by political intrigue.

assumption in recent studies of this episode that these were *Khotanese* monks has recently been questioned by Antonello Palumbo. This seems reasonable, given a close reading of the narratives. The *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* implies that at least some of the monks were not Khotanese, referring to their arrival in Khotan from Anxi (*'an se*) and Kashgar (*shu lig*). The *Religious Annals of Khotan* implies that all of the monks were foreign refugees, stating that they came to Khotan from the "four western garrisons" (*stod mkhar bzhi*).³⁸

Two versions of the narrative state that the foreign monks stayed in Tibet for three or four years, which, given the death of the Chinese queen in 739/40 would place their arrival in Tibet in 736/37.³⁹ As Palumbo points out, the year 736 also saw the expulsion of large numbers of foreign monks from China, at the order of the emperor Xuanzong 玄宗, apparently due to a suspicion that a foreign Buddhist monk had been involved in an attempted coup earlier in the same year. Those monks classified as foreigners were generally from Indo-Iranian backgrounds.⁴⁰ The arrival of these monks in Khotan in 736/7, travelling from the east, may well be connected to this imperial edict. As Khotan was then under Chinese rule, the same edict would have applied there, precipitating their departure from the Tang empire to Tibet and elsewhere. It may be significant that the monks are described in some versions of the narrative as *lho bal*, a term equivalent, as R.A. Stein has shown, to the Chinese *fan* 番 "foreigner."⁴¹

The *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* also contains a passage about the Chinese emperor's support of Daoism resulting in the immigration to Tibet of many monks from China.⁴² Xuanzong's support for Daoism over Buddhism is well known; thus if this passage is not a further reference to the expelled foreign monks, it may suggest that a number of Chinese monks travelled separately to Tibet to enjoy the patronage of Gongzhu. In any case, for the Tibetans the arrival of these foreigners in the 730s was probably the largest

³⁸ See Thomas 1935: 313. The Tibetan is *stod mkhar bzhi*. Thomas doubts that the phrase refers to the four garrisons, but only based on the preconception that this was a local Khotanese affair. Vitali (1990: 8) refers to this passage, but continues to refer to the refugee monks as Khotanese.

³⁹ The event is discussed in detail in Kapstein 2000: 41–42.

⁴⁰ I am grateful to Antonello Palumbo for sharing his unpublished work on this episode. Palumbo (forthcoming) also suggests that certain well-known monks who were close to the emperor, such as Amoghavajra, were temporarily exempted from this edict, but were nevertheless forced to leave by 741.

⁴¹ Stein 1983. See also *lho bal* see Vitali 1990: 7–8.

⁴² IOL Tib J 598, f.4b.1: kong co gdong dmar gyl yul du 'ongs pa'I 'og tu rgya'I rgyal pos de'u sh'i chos spyod pas rgya'I dge slong rll gdong dmar gyl yul du 'ong bar 'gyur ro/. Translation in Thomas 1931: 84.

single influx of Buddhist monks that the Tibetans had yet encountered. The impact of this movement on the development of Buddhism in Tibet was significant. After the epidemic, fears that the old gods of Tibet had been angered caused a suppression of Buddhism by the elite Tibetan clan leaders. Members of this elite also conspired to assassinate Tri Detsugtsen; so when his son Tri Songdetsen came to power, opposition to Buddhism was embodied in the same people who opposed his own royal line. Tri Songdetsen brought the centre of power in Tibet back to his own family line, and aligned himself with Buddhism, making it the official religion of Tibet.⁴³

In the context of this narrative, and in contrast to the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā*, the *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* presents the Red Faced Ones as idealized patrons of Buddhism.

At that time the king of the Red Faced Ones will use their great power and strength to seize and hold numerous countries belonging to others. Then a bodhisattva will take birth as the king of the Red Faced Ones and the practice of the true dharma will come to the land of Tibet. Scholars and the sūtric scriptures will be brought from other countries, and then temples and stūpas will be built and the two kinds of sangha established in the land of the Red Faced Ones. Then everyone, including the king and ministers, will practice the true dharma. Khotan too, under the power of the king of the Red Faced Ones, will work to spread the true dharma, and the property of the three jewels—the stūpas and so on—will be honoured, and be made to increase rather than diminish.⁴⁴

The passage states clearly the concept of a bodhisattva (though which bodhisattva is not specified) manifesting as the king of Tibet. Here we have a link to the story in the *Testimony of Ba*, though neither the

⁴³ The suppression of Buddhism is recounted in a pillar inscription by Tri Songdetsen. In the inscription, the ministers are said to have referred to Buddhism as the religion of 'foreigners' (*lho bal*). See Richardson 1998: 93, 97. Richardson's translation of *lho bal* as "Nepal" here is almost certainly inaccurate.

⁴⁴ IOL Tib J 598: 1b.5: de'i tshe gdong dmar gyI rgyal po dbang dang mthu [2a] che bas gzhan gyI yul khams mang po phrogs nas 'dzIn par 'gyur ro/ /de'i dus su byang chub sems dpa' gcIg gdong dmar gyI rgyal por skye ba blangs nas/ bod khams du dam pa'I chos spyod par 'gyur bas/ /rgyal khams gzhan nas chos kyI mkhan po dang gsung rab mdo sde la stsogs pa spyang drangs nas/ gdong dmar gyI yul du gtsug lag khang dang mchod rten mang du brtsIgs te/ dge 'dun sde gnyis btsugs nas/ rgyal po dang blon po la stsogs pa 'khor ril kyis dam pa'I chos spyod par 'gyur ro/ /li yul gyang[=kyang] de'i tshe gdong dmar gyI rgyal po'i ris su dbang bar 'gyur bar dam pa'i chos rgyas par spyod cing mchod rten la stsogs pa dkon mchog gsum gyI mnga' ris kyang myI dbrI ste rgyas par 'dzugs shing mchod par 'gyur ro/. The translation here is my own, based on the oldest Dunhuang manuscript containing the text. See also Thomas 1935: 79.

name of the Tibetan king nor the identity of the bodhisattva are stated. The passage is supposed to describe a king seven generations before Tri Detsugtsen.⁴⁵ Some, pointing out that the number seven may be more a symbol than an exact calculation, have identified this bodhisattva king as Songtsen Gampo, the emperor who came to be seen as an emanation of Avalokiteśvara.⁴⁶ In any case, we certainly have here one of the first literary examples of the movement toward the transformation of the figure of Songtsen Gampo into a bodhisattva king, which became fully expressed in the *Testimony of Ba* and the *Pillar Testament*.

Along with the literary sources, there are several Khotanese manuscripts dating from the second Tibetan occupation of Khotan in the first half of the ninth century which contain references to the Tibetan “masters” of Khotan. Some of these speak of the Tibetans in glowing terms. One such document concerns an invitation extended by the Khotanese king to two reverend monks, to stay for a year at a Buddhist temple at Mazar Tagh.⁴⁷ It begins with a celebration of the king's merits, stating:

There is abundance here in everything because of the merits of the king, as well as because of the Tibetan masters, who are guarding this land of Khotan.⁴⁸

Among the Tibetan manuscripts found at the sites of Endere and Mazar Tagh, there are several Buddhist texts and documents that deal with Buddhist matters. From Endere, we have a Mahāyāna prayer, fragments of the *Śālistamba sūtra* and a substantial manuscript of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra*. From Mazar Tagh we have more fragments of Buddhist texts, and also several wooden slips (usually used for brief communications) with messages involving monks and temples.⁴⁹ These manuscripts suggest that when the Tibetans

⁴⁵ The dates here are based on Beckwith 1987.

⁴⁶ This is the tentative conclusion of Thomas (1935: 75) and Vitali (1990: 7). Vitali points out how often the number seven occurs in the text. In any case, the succession of the Tibetan monarchy went through a difficult period prior to and during the reign of Me Agtsom, which makes the reckoning of generations somewhat uncertain (see Beckwith 1983). Due to the eclipse of the Tibetan emperors during the second half of the seventh century, it would have been difficult for outsiders to calculate the generations between Songtsen Gampo and Tri Detsugtsen.

⁴⁷ The king is named as Viśa' Kīrta (Skt. Viśvakīrti), whose reign dates are reconstructed by Skjaervø as 692–706+.

⁴⁸ IOL Khot 50(4). Translation from Skjaervø 2004: 35–36.

⁴⁹ The *Śālistamba sūtra* fragments are Or.8212/168 and Or.15000/271, 370, 434, 435, 436 and 437 (see catalogue entries and reproductions in Takeuchi 1998). The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka sūtra* manuscript is in the National Museum of Stockholm,

returned to Khotan, a century after they had been forced out of the previous occupation, their engagement in Buddhism and support of Buddhist institutions led to their being lauded as enlightened guardians by the local Buddhist sangha.

4. *Wandering Buddhists*

“Bring a bowl! The Tibetan teacher has become ill.”

From a Khotanese-Sanskrit colloquy (10th c.)

The final stage of cultural relations between the Khotanese and Tibetan Buddhists can be traced through the manuscripts found in the Dunhuang cave. A substantial Khotanese population was resident in the Silk Route city of Dunhuang during the tenth century, as were a number of Tibetans.⁵⁰ The Sanskrit-Khotanese colloquy from which the exclamation quote above is drawn is written on the back of an official letter from Viśa Śūra, the king of Khotan, to his maternal uncle in Shazhou (Dunhuang) dated to 970.⁵¹ Thus we can date the colloquy to the years between 970 and the closing of the library cave in the early eleventh century, as the letter occupies the full length of the scroll and is clearly the primary text here.

The first conversation in the colloquy concerns pilgrimage; the pilgrim being questioned is from India and has come via Khotan. His destination would have been Wutaishan, famed throughout the Buddhist world as the dwelling-place of Mañjuśrī. Later the conversation moves on to the subject of a travelling Tibetan teacher:

A foreign monk has come.
Why has he come?
I don't know.

and has been studied in Karashima 2005. Buddhist fragments from Mazar-Tagh include Or.8212/961, Or.8212/1911 and Or.15000/76. Wooden slip documents mentioning monks or temples include IOL Tib N 1844, 1573, 1851, 1875, 1894. Furthermore IOL Tib N 1647 contains a mantra, and IOL Tib N 2189 seems to reference a Vajrayāna ritual.

⁵⁰ On the Khotanese population at Dunhuang see Kumamoto 1996 and Takata 2000. On the continuing influence of Tibetan language and Buddhism after the end of Tibetan rule in Dunhuang, and into the tenth century, see Takeuchi 2012.

⁵¹ This bilingual text was translated and transcribed in Bailey 1938: 521–543. A more recent study is Kumamoto 1988. The letter was first transcribed in and translated in Bailey 1964: 17–26. Both sides of the scroll are transcribed in Bailey 1956: 121–129. While I have in the past referred to this text as a “phrasebook” I now prefer to characterise it as a colloquy as its purpose is more likely to have been educational. The Sanskrit of the colloquy is highly irregular, but remains closer to Sanskrit than any known Prakrit.

What does he want.
It's a Tibetan monk.
Liar! I'll ask him.
Ask!⁵²

Many of the following lines concern some kind of strife. It seems that the Tibetan teacher may not be very well-behaved:

He is dear to many women.
He goes about a lot.
He makes love.

...
Bring a bowl! The Tibetan teacher has become ill.⁵³

It is probably unwise to try to extract a narrative from these disconnected phrases, but it is interesting that the Tibetan teacher is associated with making love to numerous women. In the genre of Buddhist tantra known as Mahāyoga, which is represented in many Tibetan manuscripts from Dunhuang, sexual practices are discussed under the euphemism 'union' (*sbyor ba*). One of these Mahāyoga manuscripts defines 'union' as sexual intercourse with many women, mentioning the need to avoid criticism by using coded language:

Indiscriminate [union] is the greatest path of the three realms. In this case, if one is engaging in union with all women in accordance with the ritual manuals, one should avoid criticism by using *vajra* speech.⁵⁴

Criticism of this kind of behaviour was a common theme in Tibetan writings by the late tenth century. For example, in a famous edict, the ruler of the kingdom of Gugé, in Western Tibet, wrote:

False mantras bearing the name of the Dharma have spread through Tibet,
Bringing disaster upon the kingdom in the following ways:
As 'liberation' spreads, goats and sheep are roped up and killed;

⁵² Pelliot 5538: (93) agaduka baikṣū agatta / ināvaka āśīā (94) kīma prratya agatta / aśtai keṇa ā (95) na jśanamī / na bvai (96) kīma kṣamattī / aśtū-v-ai kṣamai (97) bauṭa baikṣu / ttāhaṅtta āśī (98) mrraiṣavadī / yālaṣa (99) prraitsamī / pvaisūmai (100) praitsa / pvaise.

⁵³ Pelliot 5538: (107) prrabhūta narī prrīya / phaṅrāka maṅḍī brrai (108) prrabhatta attaṣṭamuttāṣṭa satsattī / pharāka hāṣṭa vāṣṭa jśvai (109) maithūnadarma karaiyattī ... (117) kaṣṭa bajana anīya / hamāka vā bara (118) baṭa baikṣu rāga babūva / ttāhaṅtta āśīāchanai hamye.

⁵⁴ Pelliot tibétain 656, ll.47–49: phyal ba ni khams gsum dag kyi lam mchog/ na/ bud myed ci snyed yod pa rnams/ thams cad cho ga bzhin sbyor na/ rdo rje gsung kyis myi smad do zhes 'byung ba'o/

As 'union' spreads, the different classes of people are mixed up.⁵⁵

The Khotanese colloquy certainly suggests that by this point in time itinerant Tibetan teachers had acquired something of a reputation. Yet not all Tibetan teachers attracted this kind of criticism. Another Khotanese manuscript from Dunhuang reflects, in much more positive terms, the fame of a Tibetan teacher:

To the great teacher, the eyes of the Buddha, who sees lowly ones like us with the eyes of wisdom. Although we do not share a language, and we are not skilled in the Tibetan language of the lords of the dharma, the local rulers, please do not break your commitments. This is addressed to the great master: I respectfully enquire whether you are well, and in particular whether your precious and noble body has become fatigued. We humble ones have ridden to see the face of the Noble Mañjuśrī and are returning to [the land of] Śākya, the god of gods. May we be permitted to come and make an offering to all who have seen the face of Mañjuśrī?⁵⁶

The letter itself is in Tibetan transliterated into the Khotanese script. It was probably written by a Khotanese with an understanding of spoken Tibetan, but without ability in written Tibetan. The letter follows the polite conventions of that we see in other Tibetan letters of the tenth century. Given that this letter refers to Tibetan as the language of the Buddhist masters (*chos rje*) and secular rulers (*sa bdag*), the letter may have been intended for the Tibetan kingdoms to the southeast of Dunhuang.⁵⁷ What we have here is probably a copy — it is appended to a long *dhāraṇī* text, written on the back of a

⁵⁵ ll.47–50: chos par ming btags sngags log bod du bar/ de yis rgyal khams phung ste 'di ltar gyur/ sgrol ba dar bas ra lug nyal thag bcad/ sbyor ba dar bas mi rigs 'chol ba 'dres/ (Karmay 1998: 15).

⁵⁶ This translation is from Pelliot khotanais 2782 (ll.73–80). Note that my translation here differs greatly from the one in Bailey 1973. The following is my own reading of the Khotanese transliteration which in most places follows that of Ryotai Kaneko (which was published in Bailey 1973):
om slob dpon chen po la sangs rgyas kyi spyen bdag cag ngan pa spyen ras la mthong[/] skad myi 'thun yang chos rje dpal sa bdag bod kyi skad myi rtsal slob dpon thugs dang myi 'gal[/] slob dpon chen po yi zha snga nas[/] thugs bde 'am myi bde[/] khyad 'phags pa'i sku gces pa'i snyun nam gsol zhing mchis[/] bdag cag ngan pa 'phags pa 'jam dpal kyi zhal mthong du chibs las[/] shakya bla'i lha star don mchis[/] 'phags pa 'jams dpal gi zhal mthong kun phul du phyin bsnyal te chogs sam[/]

⁵⁷ The most relevant group of letters are those written on behalf of a Chinese pilgrim visiting Tibetan monasteries in primarily Tibetophone areas of Hexi and Qinghai in the 960s. These are discussed in van Schaik and Galambos 2011. See also Takeuchi 1990.

Chinese *sūtra* scroll. This fascinating multilingual manuscript also contains a few lines of Uighur writing.

The Khotanese phrasebook and this letter suggest a milieu in which Khotanese and Tibetan Buddhists met frequently, and shared an interest in the Vajrayāna practices that were very popular during the tenth century. Further evidence of this shared interest is a series of manuscripts from Dunhuang written in Tibetan, but numbered in Khotanese; suggestive of a Khotanese scribe well-versed in Tibetan. These are IOL Tib J 338 (on stūpas), 340 (on water offerings), 423, 424, and 425 (on the *homa* ritual). The contents of these manuscripts indicate an interest in ritual and Vajrayāna, shared with the scribes of other Tibetan manuscripts dated to the tenth century.⁵⁸

Finally, it is in this context that we should understand the apparent popularity of the *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* at Dunhuang, where it is found in several manuscript versions. This work valorises both Khotan and Tibet as Buddhist chosen lands, and draws them together with the story of the refugee monks. It is quite likely that these texts were translated into Tibetan in Dunhuang, where Khotanese and Tibetan Buddhists mingled. The statement by Nub Sangyé Yeshé at the beginning of this article that the Buddha taught the Mahāyāna in Khotan is eloquent testament to the general acceptance among Tibetans at this time of Khotan's central place in the Buddhist world. For Tibetans, Khotanese texts like the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* and the *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* were elements from which they could begin to form their own Buddhist identity, when they began to put together the first "histories of the dharma" (*chos 'byung*) in the eleventh century.⁵⁹ In particular, the images of the barbaric Red Faced Ones and the subjects of the bodhisattva king become a fruitful symbolic realm in which Tibetan Buddhist historians could conceptualize the conversion of their own culture to Buddhism.

*

⁵⁸ The Khotanese numbers on these manuscripts are discussed in Maggi 1995. On the forensic analysis by which the manuscripts have been identified as being written by the same scribe, see Dalton, Davis and van Schaik 2007.

⁵⁹ As well as the *Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*, some other early Buddhist historical works have been found in Dunhuang (see van Schaik and Iwao 2008; van Schaik and Doney 2007). These are the kind of texts that the first Tibetan Buddhist historians would have used to construct their narratives. The scribe who wrote the manuscript version of the *Prophecy* in IOL Tib J 597 also wrote other works of Buddhist history (see van Schaik and Doney 2007: 180–181).

APPENDIX I

The Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā, The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat, and related texts

1. *The Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā* (*Dri ma med pa'i 'od kyis zhus pa*) is found only in the *Bka' 'gyur* (P.835). It was probably written in or near Khotan, around the time of the Tibetan conquest of Khotan in the late 660s. F.W. Thomas argued that the original was probably written in Sanskrit (Thomas 1935: 140–141). The date of its translation into Tibetan is not known, but may have been around the same time as *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*, during the first half of the ninth century.

2. *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* (*Li yul gyi dgra bcom pas lun bstan pa*) appears in several Dunhuang manuscripts:

- IOL Tib J 597 (probably tenth century, copied from IOL Tib J 598).
- IOL Tib J 598 (from the ninth or tenth century).
- IOL Tib J 601 (perhaps from the ninth century).
- Pelliot chinois 2139 (a Chinese translation made by Go Chödrup in 848).

Thomas believed that this text was composed in Dunhuang itself, probably in the Tibetan language (Thomas 1935: 42–43); this has been disputed by Jan Nattier who argues that it represents a translation from the Khotanese (1990: 189–190). R.A. Stein has argued that the presence of Chinese transcriptions and loan-words in the Tibetan text indicates that its redaction was based on the Chinese translation, done perhaps by Chödrup himself (Stein 1983: 217).

3. The *Bka' 'gyur* contains a *Prophecy of Khotan* (P.5699: *Li yul lung bstan pa*), which includes the text of *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*, along with a history of Khotan; the latter part of the text is also known independently as *The Annals of Khotan*. There has been some disagreement about whether to view *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* and *The Annals of Khotan* as separate texts or a single entity. Thomas (1935: 73–74) considered them separate, while Emmerick (1967) presented them as a single text. Geza Uray, though originally of the same opinion as Emmerick, later came to agree with Thomas

(Uray 1990: 422–423).⁶⁰ I have followed Thomas's view here. There has also been some disagreement over whether the canonical versions represent different versions of the same text (Thomas 1935: 42, 59–51) or a different translation of the Khotanese original texts (Nattier 1991: 189). Working from the *Bka' 'gyur* texts without reference to the Dunhuang manuscript versions, John Hill (1988: 184–5) suggests that *The Prophecy of Khotan* was composed in 746, adding rather fancifully “quite likely by one of the monks who had fled to central India.” Hill suggests a similar dating for *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*.

4. The *Bka' 'gyur* also contains a text called *The Prophecy of the Arhat Saṃghavardana* (P.5698: *Dgra bcom pa dge 'dun 'phel gyis lung bstan pa*), which is very similar to *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*, though the narrative of the monks' stay in Tibet is somewhat expanded here. Thomas (1935: 42–43) argues that the *Prophecy of the Arhat Saṃghavardana* is far older than *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat* because the title of the former appears in the *Enquiry of Vimalaprabhā*. However, the text as we have it seems more like a later, expanded version of the *The Prophecy of the Khotanese Arhat*, as Nattier has pointed out (1991: 194).

5. Finally, *The Religious Annals of Khotan*, found in the unique manuscript Pelliot tibétain 960, is another prophecy text, not identical nos.2–4 above, but overlapping with them in various places. The colophon states that this is a “new” translation by the *mkhan po* Mo gu bde shil. As Thomas (1935: 109–110) has noted, this name appears in the *Annals of Khotan*, where it is stated that respected ascetics are given the name Mo rgu de shi. Here also is given a popular Sanskrit etymology *mārgadeśin*. Nattier (1991: 199) prefers *mārgaupadeśai*. The text itself may have been redacted in Tibetan from other Khotanese and Tibetan versions of the story. Strikingly, it is the only version of this narrative that does not end with the destruction of the dharma, and Nattier (1991: 203–204) suggests that it may represent the latest version of the Kauśāmbi story, in which the sad tale of the destruction of the sangha is no longer presented as a prophecy, but as a limited cataclysm that happened in the past, and can be avoided in the future. Note however, that the handwriting style of Pelliot tibétain 960 resembles other Tibetan manuscripts from the first half of the ninth century, suggesting that this may be the oldest extant manuscript copy of any of the Khotanese prophecies. The manuscript has been proofread, and we also see at the end the

⁶⁰ See also Vitali 1990: 6–11.

editor's mark of *zhus*, characteristic of manuscripts written during the Tibetan occupation of Dunhuang.

APPENDIX II

Tibetan names in phonetic transliteration and Wylie transcription

Khadrug (place)	Kha 'brug
Nub Sangyé Yeshé (b.844)	Gnubs sangs rgyas ye shes
Songtsen Gampo (605?–649)	Srong btsan sgam po
Tri Detsugtsen (704–c.754)	Khri lde gtsug btsan
Tri Songdetsen (742–c.800)	Khri srong lde btsan
Tsenyen Gungtön (d.695)	Btsan nyin gung ston

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TIBETAN TEXTS

A History of Buddhism — Bu ston rin chen grub. *Chos 'byung gsun rab rin po che mdzod*. Beijing: Khrung go bod kyi shes rig dpe skrun khang. 1988.

An Introduction to the Dharma — Bsod nams rtse mo. *Chos la 'jug pa'i sgo*. In *Sa skya bka' 'bum*, vol.I.

The Lamp for the Eyes of Contemplation — Gnubs sangs rgyas ye shes. *Bsam gtan mig sgron / Rnal 'byor mig gi bsam gtan*. Leh, Ladakh: S. W. Tashigangpa, 1974.

The Pillar Testament — *Bka' chems ka khol ma*. Kan su'i mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

The Testimony of Ba (Sba bzhed) — Mgon po rgyal mtshan (ed.). Mi rigs dpe skrun khang. 1980, 1982.

The Testimony of Ba (Dba' bzhed) — Pasang Wangdu and Hildegard Diemberger. 2000. *dBa' bzhed: The Royal Narrative Concerning the Bringing of the Buddha's Doctrine to Tibet*. Wien: Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Beckwith, C. 1980 "The Tibetan Empire in the West." In Michael Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi (eds), *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*. Warminster: Aris and Phillips. 30–38.

— 1983. "The Revolt of 755 in Tibet." In Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher (eds), *Contributions on Tibetan Language, History and Culture: Proceedings of the Csoma de Korös Symposium Held at Velm-*

Vienna, Austria, 13–19 September 1981. Vienna: Universität Wien. I: 1–16.

— 1987. *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Cannata, Patrizia. 1990. "La profezia dell'arhat della terra di Li." In Paolo Daffina (ed.), *Indo-Sino-Tibetica: Studi in onore di Luciano Petech*. Rome: Bardi. 43–79.

Dalton, Jacob, Tom Davis, and Sam van Schaik. 2007. "Beyond Anonymity: Palaeographic Analyses of the Dunhuang Manuscripts." *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 3. <http://www.thlib.org?tid=T3106>

Dargyay, Eva. 1988. "Srong-btsan sgam-po of Tibet: Bodhisattva and King." In Phyllis Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (eds.), *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*. Oakville, New York, & London: Mosaic Press. 99–114.

Emmerick, Ronald E. 1967. *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*. London: Oxford University Press.

— 1968. *The Book of Zambasta: A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*. London: Oxford University Press.

— 1992. *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan*. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies.

Hill, John E. 1988. "Notes on the Dating of Khotanese History." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 31: 179–190.

Huber, Toni. 2008. *The Holy Land Reborn: Pilgrimage and the Tibetan Reinvention of Buddhist India*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Kapstein, Matthew. 2000. *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestation and Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KARASHIMA Seishi. 2005. "An Old Tibetan Translation of the Lotus Sutra from Khotan." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 8: 105–190.

Karmay, Samten. 1998. *The Arrow and the Spindle : Studies in History, Myths, Rituals and Beliefs in Tibet*. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.

KUMAMOTO Hiroshi. 1996. "The Khotanese in Dunhuang." In *Cina e Iran: Da Alessandro Magno alla Dinastia Tang*, *Orientalia Venetiana* 5, Florence: Leo S Olschiki Editore. 79–101.

— 1999. "Textual Sources for Buddhism in Khotan", in *Buddhism across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*, Taipei, Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education. 345–360.

— 2009. "A St. Petersburg Bilingual Document and Problems of the Chronology of Khotan." *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 3: 149–156. 75–82.

Maggi, Mauro. 1995. "Late Khotanese Numerals from 1 to 36 in Tibetan Transcription." In Bert G. Fragner et al (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second European Conference of Iranian Studies*. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente. 425–443.

Mills, Martin. 2012. "Ritual as History in Tibetan Divine Kingship: Notes on the Myth of the Khotanese Monks." *History of Religions* 51.3: 219–238.

Nattier, Jan. 1991. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley, California: Asian Humanities Press.

Palumbo, Antonello. forthcoming. *Visions of the Ruler: Studies in the Religious History of Medieval China. Essays 4*. Kyoto: Italian School of East Asian Studies.

Pasang Wangdu. 2002. "King Srong btsan Sgam po According to the *Dbā' bzhed*: Remarks on the Introduction of Buddhism into Tibet and on the Greatest of the Tibetan Royal Ancestors." In K. Buffetrille and H. Diemberger (eds), *Territory and Identity in Tibet and the Himalayas*. Leiden: EJ Brill. pp.18–32.

Richardson, Hugh. 1983. "Bal-po and Lho-bal." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 46: 136-8.

— 1998. *High Peaks, Pure Earth: Collected Writings on Tibetan History and Culture*. London: Serindia.

van Schaik, Sam and Lewis Doney. 2007. "The Prayer, the Priest and the Tsenpo: An Early Buddhist Narrative from Dunhuang." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 30.1–2: 175–217.

van Schaik, Sam and Imre Galambos. 2011. *Manuscripts and Travellers: The Sino-Tibetan Documents of a Tenth-Century Buddhist Pilgrim*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

van Schaik, Sam and Kazushi Iwao. 2008. "Fragments of the Testimony of Ba from Dunhuang." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 128.3: 477-488.

Skjaervø, P.O. 1999. "Khotan: An Early Center of Buddhism in Chinese Turkestan." In *Buddhism across Boundaries: Chinese Buddhism and the Western Regions*, Taipei, Fo Guang Shan Foundation for Buddhist & Culture Education. 265–344.

— 2002. *Khotanese Manuscripts from Chinese Turkestan in The British Library*. London: The British Library. 2002.

— 2004a. *This Most Excellent Shine of Gold, King of Kings of Sutras. The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Dept. of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations.

— 2004b. "Iranians, Indians, Chinese and Tibetans: The Rulers and the Ruled of Khotan in the First Millenium." In Susan Whitfield (ed.), *The Silk Road: Trade, Travel, War and Faith*. London: The British Library.

Sørensen, Per. 1994. *Tibetan Buddhist Historiography: The Mirror Illuminating the Royal Genealogies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Sørensen, Per and Guntram Hazod, in cooperation with Tsering Gyalbo. 2005. *Thundering Falcon: An Inquiry into the History and Cult of Khra-brug, Tibet's First Buddhist Temple*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Stein, M.A. 1907. *Ancient Khotan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Stein, R.A. 1983. "Tibetica Antiqua I: Le deux vocabulaires des traductions indo-tibétaine et sino-tibétaine dans le manuscrits de Touen-houang." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 72: 149-236.

TAKATA Tokio. 2000. "Multilingualism at Dunhuang." *Acta Asiatica* 78: 49-70.

TAKEUCHI Tsuguhito. 1984. "On the Old Tibetan Word Lho-bal," T.Yamamoto (ed.), *Proceedings of the 31st International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa [CISHAAN]*. Tokyo: The Toho Gakkai (The Institute of Eastern Culture). 986-87.

— 1990. "A Group of Old Tibetan Letters Written Under Kuei-I-Chün: A Preliminary Study for the Classification of Old Tibetan Letters." *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 44.1-2: 175-190.

—. 2012 "Old Tibetan Buddhist Texts from the Post-Tibetan Imperial Period (mid-9 C. to late 10 C.)." In Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (ed.), *Old Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the IATS*, 2003. Leiden: Brill. 205-214 [Revised version distributed by the author.]

Thomas, F.W. 1935. *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Part I. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.

Uray, Geza. 1990. "The title *dbaṅ-po* in Early Tibetan Records." In Paolo Daffinà (ed.), *Indo-Sino-Tibetica: Studi in Onore di Luciano Petech*. (Studi Orientali 9). Roma: Bardi Editore. 419-433.

Vitali, Roberto. 1990. *Early Temples of Central Tibet*. London: Serindia Publications.

—1996. *The Kingdoms of Gu.ge Pu.hrang: According to mNga'ris rgyal.rabs by Gu.ge mkhan.chen Ngag.dbang grags.pa*. Dharamsala: Tho.ling gtsug.lag.khang lo.gcig.stong 'khor.ba'i rjes.dran.mdzad sgo'i go.sgrig tshogs.chung.

ZHANG Guangda and RONG Xinjiang. 2009. "On the Dating of the Khotanese Documents from the Area of Khotan." *Journal of Inner Asian Art and Archaeology* 3: 149-156.

ZHU Lishuang. 2013. "A Preliminary Survey of Administrative Divisions in Tibetan-Ruled Khotan." In B. Dotson, K. Iwao and T.

Takeuchi (eds.), *Scribes, Texts, and Rituals in Early Tibet and Dunhuang*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag. 43–52.

Zürcher, E. 2007. *The Buddhist Conquest of China: The Spread and Adaptation of Buddhism in Early Medieval China*. (First published in 1959.) Leiden: E. J. Brill.

