

*OFFPRINT FROM:*

# CENTRAL ASIATIC JOURNAL

EDITED BY  
LARS PETER LAAMANN

SPECIAL ISSUE:  
OLD TIBET AND ITS NEIGHBOURS

CO-EDITED WITH LEWIS DONEY, EMANUELA GARATTI AND  
QUENTIN DEVERS (GUEST EDITORS)

61 (2018) 1

HARRASSOWITZ VERLAG · WIESBADEN

## **Editorial Board**

### **Editor**

Lars Peter Laamann (SOAS, University of London), LL10@soas.ac.uk

Co-Edited with Lewis Doney, Emanuela Garatti and Quentin Devers (guest editors)

### **Editorial Board Members**

Nathan W. Hill (SOAS, University of London)

Ron Sela (Indiana University)

Agata Bareja-Starzyńska (University of Warsaw)

Wang Tao (Sothebys)

Aleksandr Naymark (Hofstra University)

Pamela Kyle Crossley (Dartmouth University)

### **Publisher**

Harrassowitz Verlag, 65174 Wiesbaden, Germany

### **Subscriptions and access to electronic format**

Please contact [verlag@harrassowitz.de](mailto:verlag@harrassowitz.de) for queries concerning subscription rates and modalities. The *Central Asiatic Journal* can also be accessed electronically via JSTOR ([www.jstor.org](http://www.jstor.org)).

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2018

This journal, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Layout and typesetting: Dr. Petra Himstedt-Vaid

Printing and binding by ⊕ Hubert & Co., Göttingen

Printed on permanent/durable paper

Printed in Germany

[www.harrassowitz-verlag.de](http://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de)

ISSN 0008-9192

## A few words by the editor

Tibet occupies a pivotal place in the Asian discourse. Historically inaccessible to the average western Asian or European traveller, due to the majestic proportions of its topography and the perceived closed nature of its society, Tibet only rarely featured as a destination for commercial or religious travellers from the West prior to the late nineteenth century – the age of the “Great Game”, engaging the imperial ambitions of Russia and Britain. The opposite was the case from the South Asian perspective: Whilst the political constellation of the Indian subcontinent frequently changed, the states and populations of its Himalayan northern horizon belonged firmly into the definition of Indic civilisation(s). The almost instantaneous expansion of Buddhism, that hallmark of India’s Aśokan era (268–232 BCE), into the Tibetan empire, where by the seventh century CE it had formed a complete symbiosis with the indigenous Bön culture, transforming both Tibet’s social and political structures within less than one century, is further proof to how inclusive Tibet appeared to ancient India.

The same is true for ancient China as well as Central Asia, albeit being situated in a “receiving” position. Whereas India bequeathed upon Tibet the fundamental imprint of Buddhism, Tibet would act as a conveyor of inculturated Tibetan Buddhism into the adjacent Chinese provinces, into Turkestan and eventually into the plains extending to southern Siberia and towards the Korean peninsula. However, this expansion of Tibetan civilisation took place over many centuries, starting with the erection of stupas and monasteries in Shanxi (Wutaishan 五台山) from the early Tang period (618–907) onwards, and after a long history of mutual affiliation with imperial China, culminating in the propagation of the Manchu-led Qing dynasty as a champion of Tibetan Buddhism. The Qing period, however, is far removed from the scope of the present issue.

Rather than dealing with Tibetan influence in Manchuria, Mongolia or even Tibet’s role in imperial China, we shall be focusing on Dunhuang as the nodal point for interaction between ancient Tibet and its immediate neighbours. “Tibet seen from Dunhuang” could therefore have been an alternative title for this issue, although “Old Tibet and its Neighbours” sums up the same close inter-reliance between the populations in this part of Central Asia. This special issue of the CAJ would not have been possible without the energy invested by Lewis Doney, Emanuela Garatti and Quentin Devers, who are therefore rightly referred to as Guest Editors. Due to their academic devotion to Old Tibet, six of the eight contributions in this volume are derived from their efforts, as well as the thematic introduction by Lewis Doney. The survey on Old Tibet is preceded by Johan Vandewalle’s analysis of Uzbek grammar, as a linguistic reminder of how close-knit the interactions of the travellers encountering each other in ancient Dunhuang really were. From today’s Xinjiang into the steppes of western Asia, the Turkic populations left behind an

imprint which both China and Tibet could not ignore. The historical setting for Old Tibet proper is given by Devers in an eye-opening presentation of recent archaeological evidence on inter-regional contacts in and beyond Ladakh. Iwao Kazushi expands on the territorial dimension by providing insight into the ramifications of the inter-ethnic “centre and periphery” policy in Tibet on the eve of the An Lushan rebellion. Sam van Schaik’s account of the “sutras that fell from the Sky” announces the arrival of Buddhist thought in Tibet and the intricate connections with Buddhism as it had been developing in China up to this point in time. Ai Nishida, Lewis Doney and Emanuela Garatti all analyse Tibetan manuscripts encountered in Dunhuang in order to prove the intellectual and religious contacts between old Tibet and the neighbouring Chinese and Zhangzhung states. Doney’s emphasis on Tibetan praise literature as proof of the links between Indic and Chinese Buddhism also serves to prove that literature from the Tibetan imperial period formed the basis for the later Buddhist historiography in Tibet. The article by Florence Hodous on the nature of the Mongolian revenge system and impact on the states created in the wake of the Mongolian conquests reminds us of the final cycle of Buddhism’s inculturation in Central Asia, namely by virtue of the introduction of Tibetan Buddhism into the minds and law codes of the Mongols, a process culminating in the sixteenth century. Small wonder, then, that Nurhaci, the progenitor of the Manchu nation, based the authority of his new state, and the solution for making a multi-ethnic entity of such a size function for three centuries, on the religious and legal statutes of the authorities in Tibet.

This issue is concluded by three reviews and two obituaries: A review article by Stefan Georg on the *Comprehensive Dictionary of Ket*; Michael Knüppel’s verdict on Tatiana Pang’s and Giovanni Stary’s historical analysis of Nurhaci’s “proclamation” to the Ming empire; finally – and fittingly – a review by Franz Xaver Erhard on the Bavarian Academy of Sciences’ comprehensive dictionary (or rather: lexical project) of literary Tibetan. The obituaries by Hartmut Walravens (John Krueger) and by the Berkeley Mongolia Initiative (James Bosson) complete the contributions written for this issue. Finally, an expression of gratitude to our readers (“for your faithfulness”), to our contributors (“for your patience”), to the members of our editorial board (“for your insight”) and to the publisher of the *Central Asiatic Journal*, Harrassowitz (“for sorting out 1001 little problems at once”). I also wish to thank Mr Kwok Fai Law 羅國暉 (“Grand merci! – 多謝, 多謝!”) for critically proof-reading my translation into Chinese of the abstracts. My special gratitude, as always, goes to Dr Petra Himstedt-Vaid, without whom this collective effort would not have been possible. But now, dear reader, allow me to take you on a journey to and beyond ancient Dunhuang, leading your minds straight into Old Tibet ... and to its neighbours.

Lars P. Laamann  
Summer 2018

# The Past is a Foreign Country – A thematic Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Lewis Doney, Emanuela Garatti & Quentin Devers

Tibetan Studies situates its perspective as an area studies rather than a discipline. A discipline, as J. Fabian described Anthropology, “patrols, so to speak, the frontiers.... In fact, it has always been a *Grenzwissenschaft*, concerned with boundaries” (Fabian 1983, 117). Tibetan Studies, or Tibetology, encompasses many disciplines within its purview, and its centre is the rather amorphous-boundaried place called Tibet (Tib. Bod). One of the qualities of Tibetan Studies, though, is that this boundary is not fiercely patrolled, and so as long as some part of what we call Tibet is mentioned, addressed or linked to other regions then such research can be contained within Tibetan Studies. This is not to say that any such study, if it follows the method of its own discipline, does not also patrol its own borders, but this is less of an issue for its eligibility into the field of Tibetan Studies. Dan Martin, who quotes Faber in his 1990 article on boundaries and the relation of Tibetan Studies to anthropology (Martin 1990, 1), goes on to discuss the border-crossings of some early pioneers of the non-Tibetan study of Tibet, and the Tibetan study of non-Tibet (*ibid.*, 125–31). He finds that both “were looking for lands far away from those of their births. Each ended up describing for their peers a faraway land that was (we may assume) not the one for which they looked” (*ibid.*, 130).

The contributions to these selected proceedings are also addressing a land that is not theirs, though they have all travelled there—Tibet. These papers were first presented in the Old Tibetan Studies IV and V panels at the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> seminars of the International Association for Tibetan Studies respectively, held in Ulaanbaatar in 2013 and Bergen in 2016. Since these panels concerned Old Tibetan Studies, the contributors were also stepping into the “foreign country” that is the past (Lowenthal 1985) and finding it in some ways, as Fabian (1983) suggests, not so foreign. With the addition of the qualifier “Old,” we add another restriction of sorts to the breadth of the focus of these papers. Old Tibetan is a concept that stems from the eponymous language of the Tibetan imperial period (*circa* 600–850 CE), which was becoming replaced by Classical Tibetan by the end of the first millennium but retains traces of its past existence even today (Hill 2015, 917–21). Important sources of Old Tibetan writing are epigraphic (Iwao *et al.* 2009) or come from the famous Dun-

---

1 The following is a brief contextualised introduction of five papers which have been selected for publication in the CAJ, all from the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Old Tibetan Studies panels held at the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> seminars of the International Association for Tibetan Studies.

huang Mogao Cave 17 that was sealed in the early decades of the eleventh century (Rong 1999; Imaeda 2008). This walled-up ante chamber housed a unique and priceless cache of documents in many languages including Chinese, Khotanese, Sanskrit, Sogdian and Uyghur among others; the Tibetan sources are almost exclusively written in Old Tibetan. Language is a carrier of culture, and so the concept of Old Tibetan has also come to describe a certain outlook that was influenced more by Tibetan ethnic and imperial ideals (which have yet to be properly described) than Buddhist norms as the latter were assimilated into Tibetan culture especially from the tenth century onwards. This means that Old Tibetan Studies is not limited to linguistics or philology, as some of these contributions ably demonstrate.

In order to introduce the contributions comprising these selected proceedings, it may help to briefly sketch the extent and history of the Tibetan Empire. The empire developed out of allied nomadic-pastoralist and agricultural families or clans centred around the fertile region through which the Tsangpo River (Tib. gTsang po; also known as the Brahmaputra) flows in central Tibet. The increase in power of the hereditary Yarlung Dynasty (Tib. Yar [k]lung) who came to rule over the empire as emperors (Tib. *btsan po*) meant gradually extending their sphere of influence out over a far larger but relatively sparsely populated area, corresponding to the Tibetan plateau (an area of some 1.2 million square miles, equalling 3.1 million km<sup>2</sup>; Kaps-tein 2006, 3). The Tibetan Empire even expanded farther, reaching its greatest extent during the reign of Emperor Khri Srong lde brtsan (756–ca. 800). Though obstructed from expansion in the south by the Himalayas, in the northwest, the empire threatened the territory of the fourth and fifth Abbasid caliphs, Al-Mansur (714–775) and Harun al-Rashid (763/766–809), on the banks of the Oxus; in the north, it held the lucrative southern branch of the Silk Road. In the east, the Tibetan army even occupied the Chinese capital Chang'an for a few weeks in 763, during which time the Tibetans named a new Chinese emperor (Beckwith 1987, 148).

The central Tibetan kin, family or clan groups initially allied to the Yarlung Dynasty resembled each other and the Yarlung clan in ethnicity, livelihood and culture, from which the gradually increasingly stratified aristocracy at the court of the emperor were drawn. In contrast, the farther the empire extended into the north, east and west especially, the more the kingdoms, regions and groups incorporated into the empire felt distinctly *other* to the ruling powers. Kazushi Iwao's paper in these proceedings deals with the issue of centre and periphery that were created by the Yarlung Dynasty privileging a place-based ordering of the empire at times, in disputes over the status of officials working for the empire who were ethnically Tibetan and *inter alia* Chinese, especially in the ninth century. In the process, Iwao uncovers serious problems that this created for keeping control of outlying areas towards the end of the imperial period.

Some of the officials with whom Iwao's paper is concerned were living around Dunhuang, which was controlled by the Tang Dynasty (618–907) before being ruled by the Tibetan Empire from some time between 755 and 777 up until 848 (Horlemann 2002). This area is not only critical for our understanding of Old Tibetan lan-

guage and culture, but also was itself pivotal for trade and connectivity during the later part of the Tibetan imperial period – since it was where the northern and southern Silk Roads came together before entering the Gansu Corridor that led to Liangzhou and Chang’an. Dunhuang was therefore a valuable but peripheral part of both the Tibetan and the Tang Dynasty at different times. Inhabitants of the area came from diverse ethnic backgrounds, and were visited by embassies, armies, pilgrims and merchants from many more lands during the imperial period. Thus Dunhuang was a centre in its own right. In these proceedings, Emanuela Garatti reflects on one Old Tibetan Dunhuang document presenting a paraphrase of a Chinese classic in Tibetan. Analysis of its content, its physical characteristics and the context in which it was realised reveals that this document, composed under official patronage, also epitomises the connections between different centres: the Tibetan court and its officials, the Chinese imperial power with its classic political texts and Dunhuang as a centre of translation projects.

In the southwest, the growing Tibetan Empire bordered the Zhangzhung (Tib. Zhang zhung) kingdom. Zhangzhung was culturally and economically connected with central Tibet even before the imperial period (Beckwith 1987, 20), but incorporated into the Yarlung Dynasty by the middle of the eighth century (Denwood 2008, 10; Dotson 2009, 25–26). Ai Nishida in these proceedings identifies Zhangzhung terminology that has been incorporated into Old Tibetan dice divination manuals, found in Dunhuang and so perhaps spread throughout the Tibetan Empire. Along with the terminology, may also have come cultural elements such as a pre-existing Zhangzhung form of divination adopted into a Tibetan context.

Old Tibetan religion was not only limited to divination practices. Farther west, the expanding Tibetan Empire met and incorporated largely Dardic-speaking Indo-Aryan groups in Baltistan, Gilgit, so-called Great Palūr, and Little Palūr (Tib. Bru zha) in the Yasin Valley, northwest of Gilgit (and north of Greater Palūr) in the early eighth century (Denwood 2008). This created the conditions for a flow of Buddhist traders and artisans into the Tsangpo region and the eventual Tibetan adoption of Buddhism (Kapstein 2006, 65; Heller 2001, 19). Buddhism was then spread throughout the late eighth-century Tibetan Empire. For example, Emperor Khri Srong lde brtsan provides an almost first-person “explanatory edict” (Tib. *bka’ mchid*) of the background to his (re)establishment of Buddhism as a state religion once he gained power in 755 (Doney 2017, 311–12). In this “explanatory edict”, he recounts that he spread (or perhaps imposed) the religion throughout his empire, in the west as far as Zhangzhung and Little Palūr (if it was not already or still Buddhist itself) and in the east up to the administrative region that included Dunhuang and more besides, by means of councils held with his loyal nobility (Richardson 1998 [1980], 92–93). Emperor Khri Srong lde brtsan thereby apparently by-and-large succeeded in his intention of granting all Tibetans access to Buddhist liberation from the mundane world of suffering (San. *saṃsāra*; van Schaik 2016, 59–62). As Lewis Doney relates in these proceedings, this emperor is remembered in a Dunhuang prayer that reflects older Indic Buddhist devotional traditions as a Dharma King who has attained *nir-*

*vāṇa*. In its allusions, this Tibetan prayer orients itself towards the south, focusing on South Asian historiography and incorporating Tibet into that sacred cosmology and worldview.

The way that the introduction of Buddhism to Tibet is recounted in later Tibetan historiography differs greatly from this emperor's "explanatory edict". As Sam van Schaik explains in these proceedings, the traditional narrative states that five generations before the first historically recorded emperors, a number of Buddhist books dropped from the sky and fell on the roof of the royal palace of King Lha Tho tho ri. Van Schaik explores the possible identity and provenance of one of these texts, which has a particularly "foreign" sounding name to Tibetan ears, and locates its entry into Tibet not in a pre-historical miracle but as part of the mass translation exercise funded and led by imperial power.

When the Tibetan Empire began to collapse in the mid-ninth century, it gave up control of many of its former conquests, including Dunhuang which in the middle of the ninth century fell to the local Zhang clan (848–c.915; Taenzer 2016, 19). The power of the Yarlung Dynasty became split between two rival factions and then over the next fifty years disintegrated into what later histories call the "time of fragmentation" (Tib. *sil bu'i dus*; Kapstein 2006, 81–85). Although the Tibetan Empire's glory days were behind it, its effects continued to be felt. This is true not only at Dunhuang, where Tibetan remained *lingua franca* for both international and local communication (Takeuchi 2004) and Tibetan tantric Buddhism gained further devotees among East and Central Asian individuals, groups and kingdoms (Takeuchi 2012). In the west too, the empire continued to be remembered in Ladakh, which has remained largely culturally Tibetan up to modern times, and in the Gu ge kingdom of Ngari (Tib. mNga' ris) in western Tibet (tenth to seventeenth century), which proudly charted its royal lineage back to the "bodhisattva kings" of the Yarlung Dynasty (Doney 2015, 44–47). In these proceedings, Quentin Devers provides an account of this region from the proto-historical period to the time of the Namgyal Dynasty (sixteenth to nineteenth centuries) through recent archaeological surveys of the area and brings to our attention previously undocumented sites of great importance. The links between the Yarlung Dynasty and this western region constitute just one of the examples of the far reach of the Tibetan Empire and its continued influence for centuries after the great extent of its expansion was forgotten.

We would like to thank all the contributors to the Old Tibetan Studies IV and V panels, but especially the conveners – Tsuguhito Takeuchi, Kazushi Iwao and Brandon Dotson – for their efforts in their organisation and willingness for us to edit the proceedings. Also deserving thanks are Lars Laamann, Petra Himstedt-Vaid and the Editorial Board of the *Central Asiatic Journal* for their help and industry in bringing the articles to press. We hope that these selected articles will provide the reader with a glimpse of the intellectual vistas opening out on the land of Old Tibet today.

## Guest Editors

**Lewis Doney** (Lead Guest Editor) is a philologist and scholar of Buddhist Studies. He received his MA and PhD (Study of Religions) from SOAS, London, in 2004 and 2011. Since then he has been engaged in postdoctoral research on Tibet at LMU, Munich and FU, Berlin. Before coming to Bonn as Replacement Professor of Tibetology, he researched reflections of India in early Tibetan Buddhist historiography as part of the European Research Council-funded project “Asia Beyond Boundaries” at the British Museum. His publications include books with the titles *The Zangs gling ma: The First Padmasambhava Biography*. (International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies, 2014) and *History, Identity and Religious Dynamics in Tibet: The Textual Archaeology of the dBa’ bzhed Narrative* (De Gruyter, forthcoming 2019).

**Emanuela Garatti** is a PhD student under international co-supervision at École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, and Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich. After graduating in Tibetan studies (at INALCO, Paris), in Chinese studies (at EPHE), and history (Paris I Panthéon-Sorbonne), her doctoral research deals with cultural, diplomatic and political relationship between the Tibetan Empire and the Chinese court during the Tang dynasty. Working on Tibetan and Chinese primary sources, on both textual and epigraphic documents, her research has been published by *Revue d’Études Tibétaines*, *Journal Asiatique* and *Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France*.

**Quentin Devers** is a researcher at the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), in the Research Centre for East Asian Civilisations (CRAO, Paris). He trained as an archaeologist at the University of Lyon 2, the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), and the École Pratique des Hautes Études (Paris). His PhD about the fortifications of Ladakh won a prize from the Chancellery of the Universities of Paris in 2015. He has been conducting extensive fieldwork in Ladakh since 2009, surveying over 700 archaeological sites. An important part of his research consists of studying these in a spatial perspective, so as to understand ancient route networks and territorial dynamic variations over time.

## General Bibliography

- Beckwith, Christopher I. (1987): *The Tibetan Empire in Central Asia: A History of the Struggle for Great Power among Tibetans, Turks, Arabs, and Chinese During the Early Middle Ages*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Denwood, Philip (2008): “The Tibetans in the West. Part I.” *Journal of Inner Asian Art & Archaeology* 3: 7–21.
- Doney, Lewis (2017): “Narrative Transformations: The Spiritual Friends of Khri Srong lde brtsan.” In: *Interaction in the Himalayas and Central Asia: Processes of Transfer*, Trans-

- lation and Transformation in Art, Archaeology, Religion and Polity, edited by Eva Allinger et al. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. 311–20.
- Doney, Lewis (2015): “Early Bodhisattva-Kingship in Tibet: The Case of Tri Sondétse.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 24: 29–47.
- Dotson, Brandon (2009): *The Old Tibetan Annals: An Annotated Translation of Tibet’s First History, With an Annotated Cartographical Documentation by Guntram Hazod*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Fabian, Johannes (1983): *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Heller, Amy (2001): “Indian Style, Kashmiri Style: Aesthetics of Choice in Eleventh Century Tibet.” *Orientalism* 32 (10): 18–23.
- Hill, Nathan W. (2015): “Languages: Tibetan.” In: *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill. 917–924.
- Horlemann, Bianca (2002): “A Re-evaluation of the Tibetan Conquest of Eighth-Century Shazhou/Dunhuang.” In: *Tibet, Past and Present*, ed. by Henk Blezer. Leiden: Brill. 49–66.
- Imaeda, Yoshiro (2008): “The Provenance and Character of the Dunhuang Documents.” *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* 66: 81–102.
- Iwao, Kazushi, et al. (2009): *Old Tibetan Inscriptions: Old Tibetan Documents Online Monograph Series II*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. (2006): *The Tibetans*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lowenthal, David (1985): *The Past is a Foreign Country*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, Dan (1990): “Anthropology on the Boundary and the Boundary in Anthropology.” *Human Studies* 13: 119–145.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward (1998 [1980]): “The First Tibetan Chos-’byung”. In: *High Peaks Pure Earth*, Michael Aris. London: Serindia. 89–99.
- Rong, Xinjiang (1999): “The Nature of the Dunhuang Cave and the Reasons for its Sealing.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 11: 247–75.
- Schaik, Sam van (2016): “Tibetan Buddhism in Central Asia: Geopolitics and Group Dynamics.” In: *Transfer of Buddhism across Central Asian networks (7<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> Centuries)*, edited by Carmen Meinert. Leiden: Brill. 57–81.
- Taenzer, Gertraud (2016): “Changing Relations between Administration, Clergy and Lay People in Eastern Central Asia: A Case Study according to the Dunhuang Manuscripts Referring to the Transition from Tibetan to Local Rule in Dunhuang, 8<sup>th</sup>–11<sup>th</sup> Centuries.” In: *Transfer of Buddhism across Central Asian networks (7<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> Centuries)*, edited by Carmen Meinert. Leiden: Brill. 19–53.
- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (2004): “Sociolinguistic Implications of the Use of Tibetan in East Turkestan from the End of Tibetan Domination through the Tangut Period (9<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> c.)” In: *Turfan Revisited: The First Century of Research into the Arts and Cultures of the Silk Road*, edited by Desmond Durkin Meisterernst et al. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer. 341–348.
- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (2012): “Old Tibetan Buddhist Texts from the Post-Tibetan Imperial Period (mid-9<sup>th</sup> c. to late 10<sup>th</sup> c.)” In: *Old Tibetan Studies Dedicated to the Memory of R.E. Emmerick: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the IATS, 2003*, edited by Cristina Scherrer-Schaub. Leiden: Brill. 205–215.

## Contents

Foreword .....	III
Introduction .....	V
Abstracts .....	XIII
 <b>Contributions</b>	
Johan VANDEWALLE	
On the Uzbek Converb Construction Starting with <i>olib</i> , its Reanalysis, and its Grammaticalisation .....	1
IWAO Kazushi 岩尾一史	
<i>Dbus mtha'</i> : Centre and Periphery in the Old Tibetan Empire .....	49
Sam VAN SCHAİK	
Dharma from the Sky: The Pangkong Prayer .....	61
Lewis DONEY	
Imperial Gods: A Ninth-Century <i>Tridaṇḍaka</i> Prayer ( <i>rGyud chags gsum</i> ) from Dunhuang .....	71
Quentin DEVERS	
Archaeological Ladakh: Contribution of Recent Discoveries to Redefining the History of a Key Region between the Pamirs and the Himalayas .....	103
Ai NISHIDA 西田 愛	
Two Tibetan Dice Divination Texts from Dunhuang: Pelliot tibétain 1046B and IOL Tib J 740 .....	133
Emanuela GARATTI	
Pelliot Tibétain 986: New Approaches to a Tibetan Paraphrase of a Chinese Classic among Dunhuang Manuscripts .....	151
Florence HODOUS	
The Impact of the Mongol Vengeance System on Sedentary Peoples .....	163

**Book reviews**

Stefan GEORG

Elizaveta Kotorova & Andrey Nefedov [Которова, Е. Г. & Нефедов, А. В.]  
 (eds.), *Comprehensive Dictionary of Ket – Большой словарь кетского  
 языка* ..... 181

Michael KNÜPPEL

Tatiana A. Pang & Giovanni Stary, *Manchu versus Ming. Qing Taizu  
 Nurhaci's "Proclamation" to the Ming Dynasty* ..... 185

Franz Xaver ERHARD

Herbert Franke, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Thomas O. Höllmann (eds.),  
*Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache*, vol. 1 ..... 187

**Obituaries**

James E. Bosson (1933–2016) ..... 191

Hartmut WALRAVENS

John R. Krueger zum Gedenken (1927–2018) ..... 193

Conference Communication ..... 197

## Abstracts 摘要

Quentin DEVERS

### **Archaeological Ladakh: contribution of recent discoveries to redefining the history of a key region between the Pamirs and the Himalayas.**

This paper aims at revisiting the history of Ladakh from its Protohistory (3<sup>rd</sup> millennium BCE) to the Namgyal dynasty (16<sup>th</sup>–19<sup>th</sup> century CE). It is based on the rich discoveries carried out by a variety of researchers over the past three decades, including the hundreds of fortifications, temple ruins, religious complexes, gravesites, rock art sites, etc. documented by the author. Material, cultural and religious influence from the Pamir corridor, Kashmir, Upper Tibet and Northern Central Asia have shaped Ladakh since times immemorial, and made the region to much more than solely a ‘Little Tibet’. This paper presents this data in chronological order, and shows how our understanding of Ladakh is in the process of important transformation.

### **再談拉達克考古：帕米爾與西瑪利亞山脈歷代地區最近的文物出土成果**

本文重溯拉達克自原史時代至清代的歷史。根據最近三十年進行的考察研究，本篇文章記錄幾百項文物的資料，包括堡壘、佛廟、寺院及佛廟、墓地、石碑、等。拉達克不但算是一種《小西藏》，並且是自古而來帕米爾山關、開始米、西藏高原以及中亞北部之物質、文化和宗教共同衍生的結晶。這篇文章的內容正正就是反映拉達克地區的歷代變遷。

Lewis DONEY

### **Imperial Gods: A Ninth-Century *Tridaṅḍaka* Prayer (*rGyud chags gsum*) from Dunhuang**

This article offers some more detail on a Tibetan prayer dating from the ninth century and recently discovered in Mogao Cave 17. This *Tridaṅḍaka* prayer was perhaps first written, translated or compiled in the the late Tibetan imperial period (*circa* 600–842). Some phrases in the prayer correspond to the bSam yas Bell Inscription written during the eighth century, and others point towards similarities between this prayer and the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* and closely connected *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī sūtra*. Analysing the content of this prayer helps to assess early Tibetan Buddhist praise literature and its connections with contemporaneous Indic and Chinese Buddhism. It also links Tibetan imperial literature to later Tibetan Buddhist historiography in Tibet.

### 國神——一篇出自晚唐敦煌名為rGyud chags gsum的禱文

本篇文章分析唐代晚期在莫高第十七穴所發現的禱文。禱文的來源不明，有機會出自吐蕃時代晚期（即600至842公年）的鐘刻文，又可能與《佛頂尊勝陀羅尼經》密教經典有關。分析這一禱文不但使我們更明確地了解藏傳佛教的稱頌傳統以及同時代的印度和中國佛教，並且反映吐蕃文學與佛教史之間的關係。

Emanuela GARATTI

### Pelliot Tibétain 986: New Approaches to a Tibetan Paraphrase of a Chinese Classic among Dunhuang Manuscripts

Pelliot tibétain 986, a manuscript found in Dunhuang containing a Tibetan paraphrase of the Chinese classic *Book of Documents*, helps to uncover the processes behind the creation of Tibetan versions of non-Buddhist texts composed in Chinese upon official request in Dunhuang. This article first describes the transfer of Chinese canonical classics between the Chinese and the Tibetan courts. It then examines the physical characteristics and the writing style of the manuscript. Finally, the article analyses the structure of the text and the Tibetan rendering of several key Chinese political and philosophical concepts. This in-depth study helps to dismiss the hypothesis that Pelliot tibétain 986 was a writing exercise or the result of a single scribe's initiative. It also reveals insight into the original text and a coherence in the Tibetan version that can only be explained by manuscript's official patronage.

### 《書經》之藏語意譯本：重新分析伯希和敦煌藏文庫PT986的文獻

本文主題是一件有關敦煌PT986的文獻——一個產自吐蕃國時代御製非宗教性翻譯工作的獨特例子。本文首先介紹西藏與中國之間在交換經典卷籍方面的交流，接著再討論《書經》PT986文獻之外型及字體上的特點，最後分析該文獻的結構以及在政治和哲學上不同的翻譯方法。本篇文章的作者認為PT986文獻並不是一本由個別文官所寫的書，而是兩國政府之間宗教政策合作的成果。

Florence HODOUS

### The impact of the Mongol vengeance system on sedentary peoples

This paper will argue that the historical influence of nomads on sedentary societies (notably China and Persia) has been profound, contrary to received wisdom, which is especially true in the realm of law. Since most extant legal sources in China and in Persia are written from a sedentary perspective, they give only limited insight into the workings of Mongol practice. This article is therefore based on a close re-reading of the available chronicles and other extra-legal material. The nomadic Mongols, founders of the largest continental empire, had no legal specialists, no law books and

no courts of law. Yet, the Mongol vengeance system governed society by firm rules, and the lasting influence of this system can be testified in three aspects. Firstly, in transnational terms, peoples who the Mongols perceived as having refused to submit were in fact dealt with by legal documents based on the logic of vengeance. Secondly, the vengeance system shaped the legal structures within the Mongol empire. In both Persia and China, culprits were often not executed by the authorities but rather handed over to their sworn enemies, to prevent vengeance from being directed against the khans. Finally, personal vengeance was to some extent accepted, and in Yuan China it was codified in law that sons who avenged the killing of their fathers were merely to be punished by a monetary fine. The effects of such small yet significant legal changes lasted throughout the late imperial era.

### 蒙古懲處制度對於農耕社會的影響

本文認為游牧民族對農耕社會的影響並不少，特別關於蒙古族所控制的中國及波斯。由於大部分歷史的材料多是從農耕文化的角度編纂的，本文以編年史和其他法外資料為主。談到法律方面，歷代的蒙古游牧民族沒有法律專家、書籍、或法院，然而法律在蒙族後來建設的大帝國的影響卻不小。古代蒙古雖然缺乏律師、成文法、法院等法律制度的象徵，但是懲處傳統表達一種由規則和治理社會統治的制度，歸類於三種方面。其一是外交：被蒙古認為“不忠”的部落或國家以屬於懲處制度的命令而處置，命令文件實際上含有具體的法律性。其二是政治：懲處制度影響了蒙古帝國以及後來波斯和中國帝國的的法律系統，匪徒往往不是直接被處決，而是交給他們一直以來的敵人，以捍衛可汗的安危。其三是社會觀：以懲處自己父親的謀殺案，一位“孝子”在元明清時代由於受到弑父的某種法律保護，他僅被處予罰款而免於遭受其他刑罰的懲處。

IWAO Kazushi 岩尾一史

### *Dbus mtha'*: Centre and Periphery in the Old Tibetan Empire

The history of the Old Tibetan empire is strongly related to its policies concerning non-Tibetan groups. Previous research has revealed that the empire introduced several units, such as *khrom* and *khams*, in order to rule the various ethnicities and the empire's vast new territories. In addition to these units, this paper aims to focus on a previously unnoticed term used for "ruling": *dbung* (*/dbus*) *mtha'*, "central area and peripheries" which is actually an administrative term relating to the empire's territory. This territorial distinction functioned not only as an administrative division but also as criteria for official ranks and commodity prices. The concept was most probably introduced when the empire acquired the vast Hexi region, following the An Lushan rebellion (755–763).

### 吐蕃國之邊疆與中心

古代西藏帝國的歷史與其對非藏族人士的政策緊密相連。一些學者以往曾經研究吐蕃國所設立負責管理不同民族和地區政府單位。除了這些政府單位外，本文提出一個一直在學界被忽略的詞彙：【中心地帶與邊疆】。這個詞彙大概是在安史之亂之後才被使用，用以劃分全國的行政區域，以及規範官職和貨物價格。

NISHIDA Ai 西田愛

### Two Tibetan Dice Divination Texts from Dunhuang

This article demonstrates that the omens in two Old Tibetan dice divination texts (Pelliot tibétain 1046B and IOL Tib J 740) overlap, by providing transliterations and translations. It then argues that the divination system in these dice divination texts is similar to that in Pelliot tibétain 1047, a text made famous by Ariane Macdonald. Although it is still not clear what method was used in Pelliot tibétain 1047, the article focuses on the special terms used to refer to omens or to material elements to lend support to Macdonald's hypothesis that cards or dice were cast onto a divination board or astrological chart. The article then goes on to make a few points to reinforce Macdonald's further assumption that the terms in question are of Old Zhangzhung origin.

### 關於骰子占卜的兩件敦煌文獻

本文透過意譯以及譯文為基礎，顯示兩件敦煌算命文獻有同樣的預兆功能。作者認為PT1046B和IOL Tib J740 與亞麗安娜·麥克唐納教授所討論的PT1047文獻具備同類的預兆佛法的特質。由於文獻顯示若干預兆和文物的術語，作者認為占卜骰子被投擲於卜筮法盤或天空地圖上。此外，本文肯定並強化麥克唐納教授所主張的古老象雄文化影響的理論。

Sam van SCHAIK

### Dharma from the Sky: The Pangkong Prayer

The traditional story of the first appearance of the dharma in Tibet tells of a number of books that fell from the sky onto the roof of a Tibetan king's palace. When these books are listed, most are familiar texts, such as those dedicated to the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. But one prayer that usually appears in this list is more mysterious: a confession liturgy, even the name of which became garbled in the later Tibetan tradition. This paper traces this liturgy back to Dunhuang, where we can reconstruct its name as "The Hundredfold Pangkong". The latter part of the name, which has not previously been understood as a transliteration from Chinese, ultimately derives

from a Chinese apocryphal *sūtra*. Finally, comparison with the role of confession liturgies in royal courts in China offers some clues as to why they temporarily became important enough to Tibetans to be included in the list of the first Buddhist books that fell from the sky into Tibet.

### 降世神道：龐孔禱文

按照藏傳佛教的傳說，佛法源自上天降下在西藏王宮房頂上的經書，如此給人類彰顯佛教之美。這些經書包括著名的佛經，例如致阿米多佛菩薩的書卷。只有一本與眾不同：一本念罪類的經書。經書書名後半部分缺乏較明確的來源，但可以確定是敦煌佛教文化的產物。其名可被翻譯為【百次龐孔】。雖然“龐孔”的音譯不被大眾視為中文，但始終都是中文異教經文的一個例子。總括而言，由於這些經文很快在西藏受到歡迎，成為第一批被列為自天降下的佛宗經文。

Johan VANDEWALLE

### On the Uzbek converb construction starting with *olib*, its reanalysis, and its grammaticalisation

Converb constructions are widely used in Uzbek, as in many other Turkic languages. A less studied type of converb construction is the one which can be referred to as the Converb Construction of Motion (CCM). In this article, firstly, four groups of Uzbek CCMs are distinguished and it is argued that the CCMs starting with *olib*, the converb of the verb *ol-* ('take'), constitute an important subgroup within the second group. It is further claimed that these *olib* CCMs are unique in that their first converb shows signs of grammaticalisation, accompanied by reanalysis. Based on data from a monolingual Uzbek corpus, a specific path is tracked down, leading through a number of syntactic levels from the use of the converb as a clause chaining device to its final univerbation with the following verb. It is demonstrated that the different levels of this process exhibit different morphosyntactic, prosodic and/or phonological behaviours. Reanalysis is especially apparent in the transition from a biclausal syntactic structure to a monoclausal structure, while the changes occurring in a set of parameters allow us to characterise the entire process as grammaticalisation.

### 烏茲別克語句頭 $olib$ 連桿動詞的再分析及其語法化

與所有土耳其語言一樣，烏茲別克語經常使用連桿動詞。甚少被研究過的『運動連桿動詞』也是其中一種的連桿動詞。本文首先分析四組烏茲別克語的『運動連桿動詞』， $olib$  就是取自  $ol-$  『拿』的重要分組之一。接著，本文進一步說明此類連桿動詞的獨特之處在於其第一部分說明語法規則和再分析。根據烏茲別克語的文獻顯示，一個特殊的做法能被追蹤，因為按照不同的句法層次，每個連桿動詞經過單動詞化連接前後的動詞。每一層次表示不同的形態、韻律

以及語音屬性。從雙分句句法演變到單分句句法的過程中，重新分析更為明顯。而且一組參數之內的變化使我們認識到語法化的全部過程。

# Imperial Gods: A Ninth-Century *Tridaṅdaka* Prayer (*rGyud chags gsum*) from Dunhuang

Lewis Doney

University of Bonn – Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

## Introduction

This article<sup>1</sup> offers some more detail on an important and recently discovered Tibetan prayer dating from the mid to late ninth century. The exemplar, IOL Tib J 466/3, comes from the famous Mogao Library Cave closed around the turn of the eleventh century. Yet the core of this *Tridaṅdaka* (*rGyud chags gsum*) prayer was perhaps first written, translated or compiled even closer to the Tibetan imperial period (*circa* 600–842). Some phrases in IOL Tib J 466/3 (and Pelliot tibétain 177 from the same cache) correspond to the bSam yas Bell Inscription written during the eighth-century lifetime of the Tibetan emperor Khri Srong lde brtsan (742–c.800). The content of this *rGyud chags gsum* prayer lies somewhere between the genre of devotional prayers dating from the end of the imperial period and the later descriptions of songs at the Tibetan court contained in mythographic histories from the twelfth century onwards of how the Dharma came to Tibet. It thus sheds important light not only on early Tibetan Buddhist praise literature and perhaps its wider connections with Indic and Chinese Buddhism, but also the types of sources used in the later historiography in Tibet. Here I shall draw points of comparison between IOL Tib J 466/3 and some earlier, imperial prayers such as the bSam yas Bell Inscription and others, as a contribution to the future investigation of Old Tibetan devotional literature. Of especial interest is the increasing replacement of “four directions” imagery of the *imperium* with a “ten directions” cosmology of Buddhism (especially connected with the Three Jewels) and the incorporation of Indic deities into the Tibetan cosmology that this Tibetan *Tridaṅdaka* displays.

## Imperial Buddhism

According to a number of early histories of Buddhism’s introduction into Tibet, the construction and consecration of bSam yas Monastery in the eighth century is a cause of miraculous wonders and great celebration.<sup>2</sup> What little evidence we have of

---

1 This article was completed with funding from the European Research Council, while employed by the project “Beyond Boundaries: Religion, Region, Language and the State” (ERC Synergy Project 609823 ASIA).

2 On these works, see Doney 2013a. The scene is not depicted in the *dBa’ bzhed* (Pasang Wangdu and Diemberger 2000), but a similar account is found in *sBa bzhed G* (57), *sBa bzhed S* (48)

the imperial-period marking of the construction of bSam yas may be found chiselled in large letters on a red rock pillar located against its east wall and to the south of its main entrance, and so undoubtedly would have been conspicuous to many of those visiting the monastery.<sup>3</sup> The proclamation it contains establishes state patronage for Buddhism in perpetuity by means of a written oath (see Scherrer-Schaub 2012). Such inscriptions perhaps imposed a Buddhist world order on the public space in the same way as the architecture and murals of bSam yas did. All the documents described below should thus be read carefully, with an eye for their various expressions of the royal and religious “self-presentation” of the empire (Doney 2013b). The inscription states that “in order that no violations of the oath shall be perpetrated or caused to come about,<sup>4</sup> the supra-mundane and mundane gods and the spirits are all invoked as witnesses” to the oath to maintain the shrines of the Three Jewels (or Triple Gem; *triratna*; *dkon mc[h]og gsum*) and thereby the practice of Buddhism in central Tibet.<sup>5</sup> As Cristina Scherrer-Schaub has observed (2014, 151), neither the tone here nor the deities invoked are so explicitly Buddhist as to cause offense to the non-Buddhist factions at court:

The edict orders the maintenance of the Buddhist foundations, asseverated in the name of the future generation of emperors, granted by oath by the emperor and his executive, and validated by the mundane and supramundane deities functioning as witnesses, but neither Khri Srong lde btsan nor his executive appear here nominally as donor(s) (*yon bdag*) of the Buddhist institution. Khri Srong lde btsan was a skilfull monarch.

In a longer version of this proclamation, most likely also by the eighth-century emperor, the deities in question are listed in greater detail and within a more obviously Buddhist context.<sup>6</sup> This passage reads:

---

and *sBa bzhed* P, i.e. *KGT* (354–55). It also features in the *Mes dbon gsum gyi rnam thar* (117a–b), while the *Chos 'byung me tog snying po sbrang risi'i bcud* (MTNd 302.20–03.12) presents a congruent but somewhat different version. Compare with Sørensen 1994, 398.

- 3 Transliterated and translated in Tucci 1950, 43 and 94–95; Richardson 1949, 57–58 and 1985, 26–29; and Li and Coblin 1987, 186–92. Transliterated in Iwao *et al.* 2009, 11–12; translated most recently in Willis 2013, 152, and Schaeffer, Kapstein and Tuttle 2013, 65. This inscription is discussed in relation to the self-representation of empire and Emperor Khri Srong lde btsan in Doney 2013b, 69–71. Helga Uebach (2010) questions the eighth-century date given in Richardson 1985, 27 and elsewhere on palaeographic grounds. See now Scherrer-Schaub 2014, 146.
- 4 Hugh Edward Richardson (1985, 29) translates *myi bsgyur bar* as “in order ... that it [the oath] shall not be changed”; but I follow Li and Coblin and Tucci in connecting that phrase with *mma' kha dbud pa dag* rather than just *mma' kha*, because of the *gyang*.
- 5 The transliteration system used for Old Tibetan orthography in this article may not be familiar to some, but it follows the policy of Old Tibetan Documents Online (see <http://otdo.aaken.jp/site/editorialPolicy>). The bSam yas Inscription, lines 14–18, reads: *myi bgyI myi bsgyur bar / 'jlg (15) rten las / 'da's pa' dang / (16) 'jlg rten gyi lha dang / myI ma yin (17) ba' / thams cad gyang dphang du / (18) gsol te /*.
- 6 See Tucci 1950, 44–47 and 95–97; Richardson 1998 [1980], 91–93 and 95–96 for translations and transliterations of dPa' bo gTsong lag phreng ba's (1504–1566) evidently faithful transcrip-

And invoking as witnesses to the oath thus made, in the ten directions: all the buddhas, all of the holy law, all of the community of the enlightened / all monks who are *bodhisattvas*,<sup>7</sup> all the self-perfected buddhas and disciples, whatever order of gods there are in heaven and earth, the personal gods (*sku lha*) of Tibet, all the nine gods, and all the *nāgas*, demons and spirits, let it be made known that this edict is unalterable.<sup>8</sup>

The role of the deities in this proclamation accords well with that in the bSam yas Inscription, above. They are invoked as witnesses of the oath and in order to ensure that it is kept in perpetuity. These deities then, both the mundane and supramundane, are tied to the fate of Buddhism in Tibet from the earliest extant proclamations for its support.

The above bSam yas Inscription, corroborated by the content of the longer proclamation, shows Khri Srong lde brtsan placing himself at the centre of Buddhism's maintenance and propagation. One other imperial-era inscription found at bSam yas also prays that this emperor reach enlightenment (*byang chub*). In the religiously oriented inscription on a bell at bSam yas Monastery,<sup>9</sup> one of the queens of Khri Srong lde brtsan prays for his enlightenment:

Queen rGyal mo brtsan, mother and son, made this bell in order to worship the Three Jewels of the ten directions. And [they] pray that, by the power of

---

tion of this eighth-century text found in his *KGT* 370–76. Richardson (1985, 27) dates this text, like the bSam yas Inscription, to between 779 and 782 CE. He also notes that “[i]n the detailed edict in PT [i.e. *KGT*] 109a the invocation has a more Buddhist appearance” (*ibid.*, 31 n. 2).

- 7 This alternative is my own addition. Richardson also translates the genitive in *byang chub sems dpa'i dge 'dun* as something like a genitive of substance: just a splinter of wood (*shing gi tshal ba*) is only one part of a larger set of wooden things, so the group *dge 'dun* is only one form that *byang chub sems dpa'* can take. It is difficult to know whether this text intends that *dge 'dun* means the whole monastic community (as Richardson has it) or individual monks and nuns, and more importantly considers *byang chub sems dpa'* to refer to enlightened beings or beings on their way to enlightenment. For a discussion of the term *byang chub sems dpa'* as applied to Tibetan emperors in early Tibetan Buddhist historiography, see Doney 2013b, 75–76 and Doney 2015.
- 8 Translation following Richardson 1998 [1980], 92 with minor editions. The *KGT* 371.19–72.1 (with references to the mostly erroneous variants from Richardson 1998 [1980], 96 in brackets) reads: # [no *mgo yig*] / 'di ltar yi dam bcas pa / phyogs bcu'i sangs rgyas thams cad dang / [no *shad*] dam pa'i chos thams cad dang / byang chub sems dpa'i dge 'dun thams cad dang / rang sangs rgyas dang nyan thos thams cad dang / gnam sa'i rim pa lha 'o [lha'o] cog dang / bod yul gyi sku lha dang / lha dgu thams cad dang / klu dang / gnod sbyin [gnods byin] dang mi ma yin pa thams cad (p. 372) dbang du gsol te [ste] / gtsigs 'di [di] las mi 'gyur bar mkhyen par bgyis so //.
- 9 Transliterated and translated in Richardson 1985, 32–35 and Li and Coblin 1987, 332–39. See Iwao *et al.* 2009, 70 for other references. Walter and Beckwith 2010, 304 dates the bell to the imperial period. See Doney 2013b, 71–72 and Scherrer-Schaub 2014, 146 for a discussion of its epigraphy in the context of the imperial representation of Khri Srong lde brtsan, and Doney *forthcoming* for a description of all the imperial-period Tibetan temple bells within an art-historical and material-culture context.

that merit, *lHa bTsan po*<sup>10</sup> Khri Srong lde brtsan, father and son, husband and wife, may be endowed with the harmony of the sixty melodious sounds, and attain supreme enlightenment.<sup>11</sup>

Like the longer proclamation, this prayer references “the ten directions” rather than the “four directions” mentioned in *inter alia* the *Old Tibetan Annals* (Or. 8212/187, lines 16–19).<sup>12</sup> I have elsewhere described this Buddhist *topos* as important for the changing representation of the Tibetan emperor, marking the shift in orientation of the central Tibetan universe away from the wider Eurasian notion of the four compass points towards an Indic Buddhist landscape surrounded by personifications of enlightenment and with a *bodhisattva*-emperor at its centre (Doney 2015, 38–39). Yet here the queen uses the odd phrase, “Three Jewels of the ten directions”, found almost nowhere else in Tibetan Buddhist literature.<sup>13</sup> For this reason, I have altered the translation of the longer proclamation, above, to reflect the possibility that the ten directions are claimed to be the habitation not only of the buddhas but also of the Dharma, the Saṃgha (and perhaps the other deities, at least the Buddhist ones) too.

I was surprised to find that the same odd phrase, “the Three Jewels of the ten directions”, *also* occurs in a manuscript first preserved in the famous library cave of Mogao near Dunhuang and now housed in the British Library, classified as IOL Tib J 466.<sup>14</sup> The prayer that forms the third section of this manuscript, IOL Tib J 466/3,

10 See Doney 2013b, 76 and n. 61 on the title/epithet (*'phrul gyi lha btsan po* in the 'Phyongs rgyas Inscription, which appears to possess both a mundane and supramundane meaning.

11 The panels around the bSam yas bell read: jo mo rgyal mo brtsan yum (panel 2) sras kyls phyogs bcu'I (3) dkon mchog gsum la (4) mchod pa'I slad du cong (5) 'di bgyis te // de'i bso- (6) -d nams kyI stobs kyis (7) lha btsan po khriI srong lde b- (8) -rtsan yab sras stangs dbya- (9) -l gsung dbyangs drug (10) cu sgra dbyangs dang ldan te (11) bla na myed pa'I byang chub (12) du grub par smond to //.

12 The texts marked “Or. n” or “IOL Tib J n” in this article come from the Dunhuang cave complex in Mogao, China, as do texts that I refer to as “Pelliot tibétain n”. The former two types are now housed in the British Library, the latter in the Bibliothèque nationale de France. Images of most of these manuscripts can be found on the International Dunhuang Project website (<http://idp.bl.uk>) or Artstor (<http://www.artstor.org/index.shtml>).

13 I recently discovered that praise to the Three Jewels of the ten directions may appear in Chinese literature of the Tang period (618–907; Michelle Wang personal communications 25<sup>th</sup> of June 2017). It seems the petitioner is instructed to worship the Buddha, Dharma and Saṃgha of the ten directions in the thirty-fascicle *Buddhanāma sūtra* (*Fo shuo fo ming jing* 佛說佛名經; T14.441, 300c19–20: “Now, worship the Buddhas of the ten directions, worship the Dharma of the ten directions, worship the Saṃgha of the ten directions” (*jin zhe guiming shifang fo, guiming shifang fa, guiming shifang seng*. 今者歸命十方佛、歸命十方法、歸命十方僧。). This work was associated with repentance rituals and evidently popular, as attested by the Dunhuang corpus (see Kuo 1994). Such a phrase also appears to be given in prefaces or commentaries to the *Avatamsaka sūtra* (Xuanhua 1982, 120), in which the *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra* and *Bhadracarayāprajñhāna* are found (see below), but not in the main text – and not in the Tibetan version either. These intriguing avenues of research will have to await further exploration in the future.

14 See Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 209–12. Also discussed in van Schaik and Doney 2007, 195–96, Dalton 2011, 62–66, Doney 2015, 40–41, briefly in Doney 2013, 78 and 2017, 314–15.

opens with this interesting image and provides an almost historiographical account as part of its praise and in this way differs from the content of the bSam yas bell epigraphy, which resembles more of an aspirational prayer. Most of the bell's prayer inhabits an aspirational future (ending in *smond to*) more commonly found in donor inscriptions and later aspirational prayers (*smon lam*). It depicts Khri Srong lde brtsan as on his way towards enlightenment (*byang chub*). However the prayer that I wish to discuss treats his enlightenment as either historical fact or at least narrates it as a devoutly held belief.

### Early Prayers Mentioning Tibetan Emperors

IOL Tib J 466/3 was found in Mogao cave 17, closed in the early eleventh century, but its text was perhaps first written closer to the Tibetan imperial period and heartland. Several facts suggest that this prayer only just post-dates the Tibetan imperial period, if at all. The prayer is scribed on the same paper, and in the same handwriting style, as the many copies of the *Aparimitāyurnāma (mahāyāna)sūtra (Tshe dpag tu myed pa zhes bya ba theg pa chen po'i mdo)* that were written in the 840s, during or soon after the last years of the Tibetan occupation of Dunhuang (see Dotson and Doney *forthcoming*). IOL Tib J 466 is marked with the site reference Ch.79.XIII.4, probably assigned by Aurel Stein when he first accessed the manuscripts. Another manuscript from the same site is found in another volume: IOL Tib J 310.4 (volume 88:002, site ref. Ch.79.XIII.1).<sup>15</sup> The number IOL Tib J 310 was created to encompass all of the Dunhuang Tibetan copies of the *Aparimitāyurnāma sūtra*. This document is indeed such a copy, written over three panels and with a colophon that identifies its scribe and editors. The scribe possesses a Chinese name, transcribed into Tibetan as Lu Dze shing (panel 3, line 38: *lu dze shing bris / /*), and the editorial team consists of at least two monks, Shes rab and dPal mchog (panel 3, line 39, in red ink, reads: *\$/ : / shes rab zhush / jI ^i na yang zhush / dpa+l mchog sum zhush /*). The fact that both documents are written on panels and share a site reference suggests that Stein found them together; this also raises the possibility that they were placed in the cave together (perhaps with the Chinese documents sharing the site reference?) and may be historically connected in some way.

The Tibetan *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer is at once devotional, historical, cosmological and local. Its middle section, set to melody, begins by paying homage to the imagined Indic pantheon of the time of the Buddha and his disciples. This part ends with offerings to the indigenous deities surrounding Tibetan centres of worship (such as 'Phrul snang Monastery in Lhasa), veneration of the imperial preceptors of Tibet, and mention of Emperor Khri Srong lde brtsan himself (modelled after the great Indian *dharmarājas*). In addition to Indic references and *dhāraṇīs* the text includes archaic Tibetan concepts in the description of the "Great King" (*rgyal po chen po*), in-

<sup>15</sup> All the other documents contained under site reference Ch.79.XIII are Chinese. It should be noted that, at present, IOL Tib J 310.4 does not correspond to the images under that IOL reference on the IDP website.

cluding the difficult to identify *phyva*. IOL Tib J 466/3 also depicts Khri Srong lde brtsan holding the sword of the sky-gods (*gnam gyI lde*), a reference perhaps to the early legends of the kings' ancestral lineage of deities descended from the sky. In its depiction of gods and emperors, therefore, IOL Tib J 466/3 warrants comparison with earlier, imperial prayers such as the bSam yas Bell Inscription (above), and others discussed below, as part of a wider investigation of Old Tibetan devotional literature.

Huang Weizhong (2007a) offers a useful contribution devoted to Dunhuang prayers, relating to the Tibetan imperial period and with references to secondary literature on them.<sup>16</sup> Hugh Edward Richardson (1992) has discussed some of these sources, including those mentioning Khri Srong lde brtsan. He states:

---

16 At the opening of the piece (Huang 2007a, 29), he lists the manuscripts containing them, together with a brief indication of their genre and the number of lines of which they comprise (my thanks to Emanuela Garatti for help with the Chinese):

- Pelliot tibétain 1 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文 and invitation to the buddhas of the ten directions / fengqing shifang fo fayuanwen 奉請十方佛發願文); 16 and 18 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 2 (aspirational prayer of invitation to the Buddha / yingqing zhu fo yuanwen 迎請諸佛願文 and aspirational prayer of offering butter lamps / fengqing suyou deng yuanwen 奉請酥油燈願文); 43 and 32 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 16 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 106 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 17 (penance prayer for the dead and causes (?)) / wei wangzhe er zuo de chan yuanwen 為亡者而作的懺願文); 82 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 18 (penance prayer related to the dangers and causes (?) of death and re-incarnation / wei siwang he zhuanishi de weixian er zuo de chan yuanwen 為死亡和轉世的危險而作的懺願文); 29 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 45 (aspirational prayer related to butter lamps / suyou deng yuanwen 酥油燈願文); 53 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 130 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 20 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 131 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 34 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 132 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 38 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 134 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 50 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 154 (aspirational prayer of penance or confession / chan yuanwen 懺願文); 19 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 175 (aspirational prayer offered by (?) the Tibetan court of religious affairs (?) / Tufan fashi fayuanwen ben 吐蕃法事發願文本); 30 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 230 (the *verso* / fanmian 反面 contains an aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); (25+) 11 lines.
- Pelliot tibétain 1123 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 33 lines.
- IOL Tib J 76/2 (aspirational prayer related to butter lamps / suyou deng yuanwen 酥油燈願文); 22 lines.

Compared with the fundamental contribution to the early history of Tibet in the Annals and Chronicles from Tun-huang the other manuscripts ... disclose little about the doings of the *bitsan-po* except in a formal religious context. ... Khri Srong-lde-brtsan is named ... in the India Office Library document no. 370 (5), “A volume of the Dharma that came down from Heaven”.<sup>17</sup> He is presumably also the ruler in Pell. T. 1091, a fragmentary text which I understand to concern the rising against the Tibetans at Sha-cu in about 797. (Richardson 1992, 5)

IOL Tib J 466/3 was thus unknown to Richardson at the time of writing this, but he goes on to detail other Dunhuang documents containing references to the emperors, especially Khri gTsong lde brtsan (r. 815–841).<sup>18</sup> This emperor is remembered to have been assassinated by the anti-Buddhist emperor, Glang Darma (’U’i dum brtan, r. 841–842),<sup>19</sup> but Richardson draws attention to a prayer to this supposedly apostate ruler (Pelliot tibétain 134; *ibid.*, 6). He then translates two prayers (Pelliot tibétain 131 and 230) dedicated to ensuring the well-being of his successor, ’Od srung (c.846–c.893), that he may continue to protect the *dharma* (*ibid.*, 7–10).<sup>20</sup> Thus, the

- 
- IOL Tib J 452/2 (aspirational prayer of penance or confession / chan yuanwen 懺願文); 40 lines.
  - IOL Tib J 751/1 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 54 lines.
  - IOL Tib J 1107 (the *verso* / fanmian 反面) contains an aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); (11+) 2 lines.
  - IOL Tib J 1371 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor / zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文); 15 lines.
  - IOL Tib J 1772/5 (invitation to the buddhas of the ten directions / fengqing shifang fo fayuanwen 奉請十方佛發願文); 9 lines.
  - Ganbo 甘博10565 (aspirational prayer for the Tibetan emperor zanpu yuanwen 贊普願文). 15 lines.

Huang does not go into detail on all of these prayers, and he also omits IOL Tib J 783 (in Thomas 1951, 112–13) for some reason. He more understandably may not have been aware of IOL Tib J 374, discussed below. Chen 2014, 249 and 254, n. 44 cites another work by Huang Weizhong on Tibetan prayers, which was published in the same year (2007b). However, I have not yet been able to gain access to this work.

- 17 This source (which he discusses at length in Richardson 1977) is now known as *the Single Volume of the Dharma that Fell from Heaven* and identified within the Dunhuang corpus as IOL Tib J 370/6 (the sixth part of IOL Tib J 370, rather than the fifth). See Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 105; van Schaik and Doney 2007, 196–97 for further discussion and references.
- 18 One more prayer referencing this emperor, which Richardson neglected to mention though it is included in Thomas 1951, 112–13, is IOL Tib J 1371. Thomas there claims that this prayer is “clearly another copy, or version” of IOL Tib J 751.
- 19 Brandon Dotson (2009, 143) follows Yamaguchi 1996 in these dates. Others seem to differ, including Michael L. Walter (2009, 233; 2013, 417), who gives his regnal dates as 815–836 without explanation.
- 20 Pelliot tibétain 131 and 230 are reproduced in Macdonald and Imaeda 1978–1979, plates 153 and 166–67 respectively. Scherrer-Schaub (1999–2000, 219, n. 7 and *ibid.*, 235, n. 62) discusses these prayers to ’Od srung based on Richardson’s introduction. At *ibid.*, 239, n. 73,

Dunhuang witnesses attest to the Buddhist depiction of the Tibetan emperors (at least rhetorically) after the collapse of the Yar klung Dynasty as a continuous single lineage and into the “time of fragmentation” (*sil bu 'i dus*).

Yamaguchi Zuihō (1996) and Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (1999–2000) both address the prayer to 'U'i dum brtan contained in Pelliot tibétain 134,<sup>21</sup> and provide translations of the second half and the whole text respectively.<sup>22</sup> The precis given by Samten Karmay runs thus:

It begins with a salutation on behalf of the emperor to the three Buddhist Ratna [Jewels]. This is followed by the formula of making offerings and confession. The confession is made on behalf of the ruler who in protecting Buddhism and in dealing with the affairs of state of a great empire, carried out political executions of those who became enemies. The prayer continues by beseeching Buddhas to continue their preaching, while the dependents of the ruler beg that the emperor may ensure his subjects are free in their worship and make them suitable for attaining salvation, capable of rendering benefit and happiness to other living beings ... It concludes: “We pray that the emperor may see no evil presages, that he is immune from the harm of obnoxious spirits and from all the opposing enemies and [that he] live an everlasting life; we pray that he may be given power and glory by Brahma, Indra, the four Lokapala [Guardians of the World], and the protectors of the ten directions; we pray that he may be immune from all the obnoxious spirits and that he be protected.” (Karmay 2003, 58–59)

IOL Tib J 466/3 shares with this prayer praises to the Three Jewels, a paeon to a Tibetan emperor as both a ruler and a Buddhist, and a cosmology that includes both local deities and great Indian gods. Scherrer-Schaub (1999–2000, 218) identifies the “*Bhadracarīprañidhāna*”, which she calls “la prière mahayanique par excellence”, as providing an influential Indic Buddhist model for such Tibetan aspirational pray-

---

Scherrer-Schaub notes that Richardson 1988, in a later reference to Pelliot tibétain 132 (on Khri gTsong lde brtsan) and Pelliot tibétain 134 as incredibly similar prayers to two successive rulers, has confused Pelliot tibétain 134 with Pelliot tibétain 131, which shares far more with Pelliot tibétain 132 than Pelliot tibétain 134 does with either. See also below on the physical description of these manuscripts. Pelliot tibétain 230 is provided with a short entry in Huang 2007a, 38, and all three manuscripts are mentioned at various places throughout that contribution.

21 Scherrer-Schaub (1999–2000, 233–234) highlights that Pelliot tibétain 134 shares certain stereotypical descriptions of the emperor with another prayer, Pelliot tibétain 175. The latter prayer is discussed in *ibid.*, 219–20 (where she describes it as a “prayer of repentance and vow of the divine emperor of Tibet and his court” [“Prière de repentance et vœu du divin empereur du Tibet et de sa cour”]) and *ibid.*, 221, n. 16 (where the content is given as “a prayer to counter the instability of the kingdom, the enemies of Tibet, evil magicians and other calamities” [“une prière adressée pour contrer les instabilités du royaume, les ennemis du Tibet, les mauvais magiciens et autres calamités”]).

22 This prayer is also mentioned in van Schaik and Doney 2007. To this, again we should add the bibliographic work of Huang 2007a, 37–38. See now Scherrer-Schaub 2014, 136.

ers (*praṇidhāna*; *smon lam*) or public salutations, along with the *\*triskandhaka* (*pung po gsum pa*) prayer of the three accumulations evidenced in the Dunhuang library (*ibid.*, 220). The *Āryabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna* prayer, like the *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra* that extolls its virtues, exerted great influence on early Tibetan Buddhist practice and literature, and its sevenfold structure can be found in a number of the prayers under discussion below.<sup>23</sup> As Jacob P. Dalton (2011, 62–66) has shown, the seven-limbed formula (*van lag bdun*) is followed in IOL Tib J 466.

Of equal importance, and with a longer history within Tibetology, is the so-called “Prayer of De ga g.yu tshal Monastery”, which commemorates the founding of De ga g.yu tshal’s “Temple of the Treaty-Edict” (*gtsigs kyi gtsug lag khang*; see Kapstein 2009, 65, n. 47) during the reign of Khri gTsong lde brtsan.<sup>24</sup> A recent contribution devoted entirely to this prayer by Michael L. Walter (2013) argues that the work is a later pastiche rather than an early ninth-century work, based on a detailed palaeographic analysis but in contrast to Walter’s earlier conclusions (2009, 233). This chapter should be followed shortly by an accompanying translation and commentary on the text itself. At a pivotal point, Walter (2013, 425) draws attention to the similarity of the language in this text not only to Pelliot tibétain 1<sup>25</sup> (perhaps

23 See Scherrer-Schaub 1999–2000, 220; van Schaik and Doney 2007, 185–86; Sernesi 2014, 144. See Osto 2010 for a discussion and translation of the Sanskrit text and its relation to the *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra*. Richard K. Payne and Charles D. Orzech (2011, 135–36) provide an outline of the *Saptavidhā-anuttarapūjā*, the “sevenfold supreme worship” typified by this prayer: “The seven elements of the *saptavidhā-anuttarapūjā* are praise (*vandanā*), worship (*pūjanā*), confession (*deśanā*), rejoicing (*modanā*), requesting the teaching (*adhyeṣanā*), begging the buddhas to remain (*yācanā*), and transfer of merit (*nāmanā*)”, though they are quick to add the caveat that not all prayers adhere strictly to the seven-fold structure (*ibid.*, 136). A later testimony to the endurance of the genre is found in Yönten 1996.

24 The text was written on a single *pothī* manuscript of 20 folios that is now divided into two parts, Pelliot tibétain 16 (fols. 22–34) and IOL Tib J 751 (fols. 35–41) with 4 lines on each side. It was first discussed extensively and transliterated and translated in bulk by F.W. Thomas (1951, 92–109; 1955, 4–5 and 42–46). A full transliteration is available online on OTDO (<http://otdo.aaken.jp/text/93>; accessed 4<sup>th</sup> of June 2017) along with references to secondary literature on the text dating up to around the turn of this millennium. The last entry there is to Kapstein 2004 which offer a translation of the prayer’s description of the temple (Pelliot tibétain 16, 26b1–28b3; Kapstein 2004, 111–14). Kapstein has also published a much more in-depth study on this text and issues surrounding its historical and geographical referents (Kapstein 2009, including an improved but shortened translation on *ibid.*, 45–47) and a short reconsideration of the location of the temple (Kapstein *forthcoming*) that settles on Daxia in southern Gansu, strategically placed between Tang China and imperial Tibet, as the most probable candidate. In the former contribution, he shows the structure of the prayer as consisting of a series of benedictions, seven of which survive (with the sources of five of these being identifiable, Kapstein 2009, 33). To this list, we can now also we can now add the footnotes in Scherrer-Schaub 1999–2000 (especially *ibid.*, 219, n. 6), the bibliographic work in Huang 2007a, 32–37 and the short discussions of Old Tibetan terminology on divine rulership and the *sku bla* rite respectively referred to in Pelliot tibétain 16 in Hill 2013, 174–75; 2015, 54.

25 Walter 2013, 419 *et passim*. Huang 2007a, 32 also deals with Pelliot tibétain 1 from a bibliographic perspective. There he mentions IOL Tib J 1772/5, a Chinese prayer to the Buddhas of the ten directions in Tibetan transcription, with reference to Pelliot tibétain 1/3 (i.e. the third

by the same scribe) but also with Or.15000/379 also noted by Takeuchi Tsuguhito, containing the title *The Prayer of Repentance and Aspiration* ('*Gyod tshangs dang smon lam*).<sup>26</sup> Other documents bearing this title are found in the Dunhuang library cave, though their content is different.<sup>27</sup> For example, Pelliot tibétain 177 begins with the phrase “All those who do good [should] express [their faults] and confess in the presence of all the *ratna* of the ten directions” (Pelliot tibétain 177, 1r1: *dge ba cI bgyIs pa de dag thams cad phyogs bcu'I dkon mchog thams cad kyi spyang sngar 'thol zhIng bshagso / /*), which is a comparable phrase to that in the bSam yas Bell Inscription discussed at the start of this article.<sup>28</sup> There seems to be a nexus of Buddhist terminology emerging that one would be tempted to call imperial-period Tibetan.

However, Walter (2013, 425) then makes an important distinction: “The language of these documents is similar overall, and does not seem particularly old, certainly not Imperial-period. In some ways, the language of PT016 [Pelliot tibétain 16 and IOL Tib J 751 taken together] is not like that of these confession materials, with which it is otherwise similar in subject matter. This is because there is a greater degree of antiquity in some passages, some stylistic peculiarities, and a more narrow base of application, i.e., to specifically named, important personages.” He ends his contribution thus:

A subsidiary conclusion might be that the compilation of PT016—as well as of PT001—was to give models to Sanghas when offering confession rites at courts and to important officials in a post-Imperial world. By using material drawn from Imperial-period texts and combining them into a coherent document, Sanghas in the Dunhuang area would have provided themselves with

---

section of Pelliot tibétain 1). He furthermore cites Simon 1957 as the secondary source making that link previously. I do not have this source to hand at present, but since the ten directions play an important part in this article, the connection requires further investigation.

- 26 See Takeuchi 1998, volume 1, 159, no. 491. F.W. Thomas (1951, 112–13, no. 21) describes another prayer in IOL Tib J 783 as also similar to the De ga g.yu tshal text. He states: “This passage is clearly a portion of another copy, or version, of the long document No. 19 [i.e. IOL Tib J 751] above. Though it is for the most part too fragmentary for a connected rendering, the general sense is evident. It prays that in virtue of the action of the prince (*lha sras*) Khri Gtsug lde brtsan the *Samghas* of both sexes and all creatures may enjoy happiness and unlimited life; that the prince himself, free from sickness, exalted in dominion, rid of all opposition and so forth, may attain to Buddhahood in his present life; that all those under his sway may have long life and freedom from disease; and that ‘innumerable living beings and all throughout the realm of Tibet, in complete felicity and happiness, free from disease in man and beast, may be perpetually prosperous in the produce of the year’” (Thomas 1951, 113).
- 27 Takeuchi (1998, volume 1, 159) states: “The title '*Gyod tshangs dang smon lam* is found in r1 and v2, but the text does not agree with the Dunhuang mss. bearing the same or similar title: VP [de la Vallée Poussin 1962] 208.2, 209–10, 247, 452.2; P[elliot tibétain] 17, 18, 24, 175–177.”
- 28 Aside from this, it is a standard prayer making no mention of Tibet (though it contains similar phrases and punctuation to IOL Tib J 466/3 and it mentions *kalyānamitra* f. 3r2–3). On the *verso* of the manuscript is a Chinese translation of the *Vajracchedikā*. A scribal exercise is written after the prayer, apparently consisting of lines from that prayer.

rites which rested on the status of a powerful and venerated Buddhist ruler. Since the point of reference is the reign of Ral-pa-can, it would seem that these documents were aimed at Tibetan rulers in the area who we know continued to control parts of far eastern Turkestan and northern Amdo until around 866 and perhaps even later, as in the kingdom of Chingthang. (Walter 2013, 432)

This provocative argument against dating the De ga g.yu tshal prayer to the reign of Khri gTsong lde brtsan is not of direct concern to us here. Instead, Walter’s highlighting of the mixture of older and newer *strata* within a single prayer will have a bearing on our discussion of IOL Tib J 466/3, below.

A further example of prayers important for assessing Sino-Tibetan relations during the imperial or early post-imperial period is a lantern-lighting prayer [*randeng wen*; Tib. *mar mye kha*], preserved in Pelliot tibétain 1123.<sup>29</sup> It is dedicated to Khri gTsong lde brtsan (Richardson 1992, 6) and praises his military accomplishments alongside conveying what we may consider more conventional Buddhist (and Confucian?) values.<sup>30</sup>

Finally, perhaps a more Indic milieu is represented in an incomplete “prayer for Tibet”, contained in the three-folio manuscript IOL Tib J 374 (Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 108–109).<sup>31</sup> Intriguingly, every instance of the word for Tibet, Bod Khams, has been *incompletely* defaced, presumably before the Dunhuang library cave was closed in the early eleventh century (*ibid.*, 108). The prayer itself invokes the *jinas*, *bodhisattvas*, *arhats*, gods of the form and desire realms, the Four Great Kings and the ten local protectors, to come and clear away the obstacles of Tibet, for which they are offered unsurpassed praise/offerings (*bla myed mchod pa 'di phul*

29 Pelliot tibétain 1123 is reproduced in Macdonald and Imaeda 1978–1979, plate 452 and on the International Dunhuang Project (IDP) website. The prayer is written in scroll format, on a sheet measuring 30 x 48 cm.

30 See Chen 2014, 249–52. Chen Huaiyu mistakenly writes “Khri lDe srong brtsan” while providing Khri gTsong lde brtsan’s regnal dates. Macdonald and Imaeda 1978–1979, plate 452, lines 10, 14, 16, 20, 23, 27 and 32 clearly mention Khri gTsong lde brtsan; for example Plate 452, lines 32–33 reads: *btsan po khri gtsug lde brtsan gyi sku la gnod byed kyi / bgegs thams cad kyi myi tsugs / par srung zhing bskyabs par bskul lo ...*

31 For a discussion, translation and transliteration of the “prayer for Tibet” portion of the manuscript, see Sam van Schaik’s blog: <https://earlytibet.com/2009/05/22/a-prayer-for-tibet/> (posted 22<sup>nd</sup> of May 2009; accessed 4<sup>th</sup> of June 2017). Here, he updates the entry in Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 108–109, having since discovered that the *verso* of the final folio consists of another, tantric prayer. This fact was obscured because a later reader (who lacked the earlier part of the prayer preceding folio 1 and ending with ... *dgong shlg / on 1a1?*) wrote the final folio number, *gsum*, on the *verso* rather than the *recto*. I suppose that this manuscript should therefore be split into IOL Tib J 374/1 and IOL Tib J 374/2. IOL Tib J 374/1 ends by calling it “the chapter of collected worship” (*// \$ // mchod pa bsdu pa 'I le 'u rdzogs+ho /*; van Schaik in his blog translates this as “The chapter summarizing the offerings”) and with a colophon attributing the “chapter of worship/offerings” to the monk dPal brtsegs (*dge slong dpal brtsegs gyi mchod pa 'I le 'u <g>lags s+ho // : //*), which may or may not mean the famous eighth-ninth century translator, sKa ba dPal brtsegs (Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 108).

*bas* /). Each group is given a stanza of eight to eleven lines long, which occasionally conforms to a seven-syllable metre, and their number is usually embodied by a named individual or sub-group. This latter pattern is found in IOL Tib J 466/3, as are these deities (though not in that order). Moving on to its content will bring up a number of other connections between this *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer and the wider genre of praise literature that are perhaps reflective of deeper traditions of devotional practices existing around this period.

### The Content of IOL Tib J 466/3

I cannot add anything on IOL Tib J 466/1 and 466/2 to the useful information in Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 209–210. However, there is evidence to suggest that the first folio, on which is written IOL Tib J 466/1 (an unidentified prayer) and 466/2 (the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya-dhāraṇī* spell), does not form a unified whole with the later panels of the manuscript. This would increase the importance of the *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer found from folio 2 onwards. IOL Tib J 466/3 is scribed on thin, light brown paper, in small square-ish *dbu can*. IOL Tib J 466/4 and the subsequent sections follow on from one another in the same hand and without much of a break. In contrast, it seems that IOL TIB J 466/1 and 466/2 are written in a different hand, or at least at a different time. Written on panel one are two columns of text, the latter consisting of 24 lines, and in this it is consistent with the later panels.<sup>32</sup> However, the scribal hand of panel one shows marked differences from that of the later panels in the bends of its *shads* and the ductus of *ka, kha, ga, nga*. For instance, I especially noted the horizontal angle of *na ro*'s right tick from panel 2 onwards, and the thin straight *'greng bu* that returns back on itself rather than lifting the pen from the page. Corroborating these differences are panel one's rougher paper quality, lack of lines, absence of circle ornamental *shad* or red, and other such *merkmals*.<sup>33</sup> IOL Tib J 466/3 also begins on a new panel at line 1. However, panels one and two were ob-

32 de la Vallée Poussin (1962, no. 466) states that each folio (read column) consists of “ll. 24 and 25”. The first folio comprises two columns of 16 and 24 lines respectively. It is unknown of how many lines column 1 originally consisted. Some conservation of the panel has taken place before the manuscript was sealed in the cave. Paper that is now darker than the original paper was stuck to the reverse in order to patch up this panel *before* it was (re-)written on. On line 11, [rgyal m]tshan is written on the darker paper, on line 12 [su] gsol / / is written there, and perhaps other letters too. Unfortunately, the panel has been attached to archiving paper during its conservation at the India Office or British Library, and so the original back of the panel is no longer visible. The darker paper patch is also obvious in column 2, line 23.

33 There are no guidelines, borders or gutter lines evident on this panel, although the scribe stays within a flexible undrawn border consisting in column 2 of 0.6–1.6 cm gutter, 0.8–1.3 cm right margin, unknown top margin (the top of the panel now being lost), 0.5–1.8 cm bottom margin, as well as 1–1.2 cm leading (the space between lines). This column contains some interlinear additions, very minor (*'i* line 15, *-d* line 17), marked with a cross. This form of marking is also found on later panels, but crosses used in this context are hardly a rare occurrence in Tibetan manuscripts.

viously glued together (at some point), since signs of the glue appear on the obverse of panel one's column 2 and the reverse of panel two, column 3.

This conclusion regarding panel one makes our text, IOL TIB J 466/3, more important. This is because, if we mentally remove IOL Tib J 466/1 and 466/2, this reveals IOL TIB J 466/3 as the first (“*rgyud chags dang po*”) section of the original manuscript, not just one part buried in a collection of texts. These findings also mark IOL TIB J 466/4, 466/5 and 466/6 as dependent sections, either following on from, or appendicized to, IOL TIB J 466/3. In contrast, IOL TIB J 466/1 and 466/2 are not primarily linked to IOL TIB J 466/3. Yet the panel which contains these two sections was then attached to the panels on which were scribed the other texts, beginning with IOL Tib J 466/3, perhaps due to the ritual and literary connections that I shall describe below between the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī* and the *rGyud chags gsum* prayer that now follows it.

Panel two, and thus the beginning of our IOL TIB J 466/3 document, begins: “This is the first *rgyud chags*, recite without melody” (column 3, line 1: \$ / : / *rgyud chags dang po ste / dbyangs tang myI sbyor bar klags /*). The opening statement distinguishes the first section of IOL Tib J 466/3 (column 3, line 1–19) from a middle part (*rgyud chags bar ma*; column 3, line 19–column 11, line 15) and a final one (*rgyud chags tha ma*; column 11, line 15–21). The opening instruction, which is repeated at the start of the final section (column 11, line 15), indicates that the first and last section were to be recited without melody. However, the middle section (by far the longest one of the three) was to be accompanied by melody, according to the instruction that heads that part (column 3, line 20: *dbyangs dang sbyar ba / : /*).

The *rGyud chags gsum (pa)* or *Tridaṇḍaka* is mentioned in Buddhist canonical material, but no Indic Buddhist example has been found so far.<sup>34</sup> As a work set to melody, it was one of only two exceptions (at least rhetorically) to the general prohibition against monastic music-making, the other being the *Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher (Śāstrgūṇasaṃkīrtta)*, which may not be an actual text) praising the Buddha. Gregory Schopen (2010, 118 and n. 35) informs us that both these prayers were to be recited with a “measured intonation”, but that the *Vinaya* suggest this discipline was not always adhered to. It appears from IOL Tib J 466/3 that not even the whole of the *rGyud chags gsum* was to be accompanied by music, only the middle praise part.

Later Tibetan tradition retains a *rGyun chags gsum pa*, for example in the bKa’ bryud school’s *sMon lam chen mo* (vol. 1, 1–6). The *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen*

34 See Schopen 1997, 231–233, n. 62 on the *Cīvara-vastu* and the *Vinayakṣudraka-vastu* of the Buddhist *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. No such text appears to exist in the Jaina religion either. Peter Flügel (2010, 455, n. 176) suggests that each of the five principal ritual elements of the monastic funerals described by Schopen (including the *Tridaṇḍaka* which is listed as the second rite), “have Jaina equivalents which points to an ancient common monastic funerary culture”. However, Flügel (personal communications 8<sup>th</sup> of March, 2017) indicated that the *Tridaṇḍaka*, rather than existing as a specific written Jaina monastic ritual, may have been more generally reflected in parts of the death ceremonies that Jaina mendicants tended to leave to the laity.

*mo* (Zhang *et al.* 2003 [1985], volume 1, 576) defines *rgyud gsum* as identical to the *rgyun chags gsum* and also as a part of the Sa skya *Lam 'bras* fruition practices. However, the *rGyud chags gsum* and *rGyud gsum pa* appear to be different but related in IOL Tib J 466. IOL Tib J 466/3 consists of the *rGyud chags gsum* whereas IOL Tib J 466/4 is the *rGyud gsum pa*, on which see below and Dalton 2011, 62–66 and now Dalton 2016.

### The rGyud chags dang po

As can be seen from the first line, the scribe rather consistently writes *tang* for *dang*, *stug* for *sdug* and so forth.<sup>35</sup> Occasionally other grammatical and orthographical mistakes are made, making a full translation of the long and unique IOL Tib J 466/3 prayer impossible at present. Thus, I shall settle for a précis of the most important parts for our purposes. The prayer in this section comprises three parts: The Three Jewels (*dkon mchog gsum*), i.e. the Buddha, Dharma and Saṃgha, are prayed to in the first part, all three as a whole in the second part, and in the last part is recited the *Pūjāmegha dhāraṇī* that suffuses the Buddha fields of the ten directions – addressed to the first of the Three Jewels (though perhaps synecdochically all three).<sup>36</sup> The copy of the *dhāraṇī* used in this part agrees with IOL Tib J 369 2r3–5, except for a slight divergence in one place.<sup>37</sup> Lines 16–17 describe the *Pūjāmegha dhāraṇī* as “the *dhāraṇī* for the clouds of offerings arising in all the Buddha fields of the ten directions” (*phyogs bcu 'I sangs rgyas kyl zhIng thams cad du // mchod pa 'I sprIn byung ba 'I gzungs*). This emphasis on the ten directions is in keeping with the *Pūjāmegha dhāraṇī* contained in IOL Tib J 369/2. It also feeds into our wider discussion of the increasing replacement of “four directions” imagery with “ten directions” cosmology in Tibet with the introduction of Buddhism. Note that in Khri Srong lde brtsan’s longer eighth-century proclamation (translated in the section “Imperial Buddhism”, above), the ten directions were also where the buddhas reside, as part of a reference to each of the Three Jewels, or where all of the Three Jewels are situated, cosmologically.

35 The manuscript is not unique in this regard, or even the most extreme example. See for example the entry on esp. Pelliot tibétain 1030 that Lalou 1950, 40, described thus: “Fragment où les *d* sont toujours écrits comme des *t*. Débute: *bcom ltan 'tas la 'ti skat cig gsol to // bcom ltan 'tas 'dzam bu ling gi sems can 'ti 'tag na // gcig gis gcig bskyet te // thog ma ...*”

36 The text is written in 7-syllable poetry with occasional slips. Here, I use the term *rkang pa* (lit. “foot”) to distinguish lines of poetry from lines of the more conventional sort that make up a column. The only explicit indications of subsections are a circle at the end of the opening prayer to each of the Three Jewels (line 11) and a rubricated vertical double circle 15 *rkang pas* later after the prayer to all Three Jewels together (line 16).

37 This iteration of the *dhāraṇī* agrees with IOL Tib J 369 2r3–5 almost *verbatim* (orthographic variants/mistakes and some divergent placings of *shad* aside), except for a different reading in line 17, where IOL Tib J 466 gives: *ma h'a bo di / man fo / pa sang gra ma na {bad}* (SHAPE: b+d) *dzre /* and ITJ 369 2r5 reads: *ma h'a bo d+hi man to pa sang kra ma na [bad rdze vacat] /*. The *dhāraṇī* found on the concertina, IOL Tib J 140 verso 1r2 agrees with IOL Tib J 466 against 369 in reading *pa sang gra ma na ba dzre / ...*

### The rGyud chags bar ma

The Three Jewels, praised and petitioned in the *rGyud chags dang po*, are described in the opening of the *rGyud chags bar ma* as “the Three Jewels of the ten directions”, the object of the first stanza of worship in this section (/ : / 'phyogs bcu'i dkon mchog gsum la mchod pa / : /). The eighth-century bSam yas Bell Inscription also contains this phrase, as well as some of the other words and phrases found at the opening of the *rGyud chags bar ma* column 4, line 1, *dbyangs* and *bla myed*.<sup>38</sup>

This raises the intriguing possibility that the bSam yas Bell Inscription's text references this rare sung prayer, which could have entered Tibet from any number or combination of Buddhist lands surrounding it during the imperial period. If so, it would be especially fitting since the epigraphy is on a sound-emitting bell and consists of sixty syllables meant to reflect the sixty melodious sounds of the Buddha mentioned in the inscription itself (Richardson 1985, 35, n. 3).<sup>39</sup> The monastic connection is strengthened by the fact that the later Khra 'brug Bell Inscription (which also plays on musical themes) claims that it was cast by a Chinese monk at the request of the now-ordained queen behind the bSam yas bell (*ibid.*, 82–83). Furthermore, the Yer pa Bell Inscription includes part of another popular prayer, the *Āryabhadracaryāpraṇidhana* (mentioned in the introduction), along with a transcription of the famous *ye dharmā* formula in an Indic script (Richardson 1985, 144–47). Alternatively, IOL Tib J 466/3 may refer to the bSam yas Bell Inscription, or merely form part of the general genre of imperial and early post-imperial Tibetan Buddhist prayer with a shared vocabulary. We shall see that Khri Srong lde brtsan, the object of the praise in the bSam yas Bell Inscription, appears in the *rGyud chags bar ma* below as a deceased emperor. This reference strengthens the imperial link of the prayer, but also dates at least that *stratum* of the text to after the death of Khri Srong lde brtsan around the turn of the ninth century.

The rest of the *rGyud chags bar ma* consists of stanzas of worship to the Buddhist deities, deified heroes of Buddhist historiography, and the important human and non-human figures of Tibet. These stanzas describe whom they praise, offer one or two named examples or subgroups and end with a repeated praise formula. In this they resemble the “prayer for Tibet”, IOL Tib J 374 discussed above, as well as the final “exhortation of the protectors” in Pelliot tibétain 1345 (Scherrer-Schaub 1999–2000, 227, line 48f.). Yet, in this early part there is nothing to suggest a Tibetan milieu apart from the language of the prayer (nor a Chinese one for that matter).

38 See these italicised parts of bSam yas Bell Inscription: jo mo rgyal mo brtsan yum (panel 2) sras kyIs *phyogs bcu'i* (3) *dkon mchog gsum la* (4) *mchod pa'i* slad du cong (5) 'di bgyis te // de'i bso- (6) -d nams kyI stobs kyis (7) lha btsan po khrl srong lde b- (8) -rtsan yab sras stangs dbya- (9) -l gsung *dbyangs drug* (10) cu sgra *dbyangs dang ldan te* (11) *bla na myed pa'i* byang chub (12) du grub par smond to //.

39 The Prayer of De ga g.yu tshal claims that the Buddha possesses the sixty two-melodied voice of Brahmā (Pelliot tibétain 16, 30r2–3: *gsung tshangs pa'i dbyangs (30r3) drug cu rtsa gnyls dang ldan bas*).

The stanzas of the *rGyud chags bar ma* appear to begin with Bhagavant Vairocana in first place before the Buddha, though perhaps they are represented as on a par in their respective Buddha fields (column 4, line 1–2: *bcom ldan rnam par snang mdzad tang / / 'dren pa shag kya thub ba lastsogs / /*). Certain *tantras* identify the two by referring to Śākyamuni as “Resplendent” (Vairocana; see Snellgrove 1987, 120 and 152), including the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana*.<sup>40</sup> The prominent presence of Vairocana here may reflect links to the *tantra*, to imperial Tibetan Buddhism especially under Khri Srong lde brtsan and his successors, or later trends in tantric Buddhism.<sup>41</sup> Next come *śrāvakas*, *jinas* and so forth, and at times the referents are obscure, but this early part gives little indication to suggest a Tibetan milieu for its compilation, apart from the language of the prayer. Nor is any suggestion of a Chinese context given. It may be that much of this prayer is taken from the Indic *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer.

### Tibetan References in the *rGyud chags bar ma*

After this (column 10, line 12f.), the prayer breaks off from its four-*rkang* pa form again, and into shorter *rkang pas*, until it hardly constitutes verse. Here, it finally brings human actors related to Tibet onto the stage:

40 The *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* (“Tantra Purifying all Evil Destinies”; *Ngan song thams cad rnam par sbyong ba'i rgyud*; Q.116) aims at the purification of the ways to inferior rebirths and is closely connected to the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī sūtra* (“Cranial Protuberance Spell”; *gTsong tor rnam par rgyal ba'i gzungs*; Q.197 and Q.198) of which the *dhāraṇī* alone is transcribed in IOL Tib J 466/2. The *tantra* was also one of the closely guarded rituals thought to ensure imperial power in Tibet, and its translation and dissemination seem to have been strictly controlled as a result (Dalton 2011, 57). However, a commentary written by Buddhagupta during the reign of Khri Srong lde brtsan is recorded in the lHan kar ma catalogue (Kapstein 2000, 63).

41 On the possible identification of Khri Srong lde brtsan with Vairocana, especially in the layout of bSam yas Monastery, see Kapstein 2000, 60–65. He identifies the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* as “one of the primary texts related to Vairocana in Tibet” (*ibid.*, 63). Vairocana was also installed as the central deity in De ga g.yu tshal Temple (Pelliot tibétain 16, 27a4); see the translation and discussion in Kapstein 2009, 46 and 48f. respectively. Dalton and van Schaik (2006, 280–81) have also suggested a possible textual source for the bSam yas *maṇḍala* in IOL Tib J 579. They describe the document written in a *pothī* thus: “A complete ritual manual for an initiation ritual (dbang chog) associated with the Durgatipariśodhana-tantra (Q.116). ... Drawing mostly upon the second chapter of the *tantra*, the first section describes a forty-three deity *maṇḍala* which ... may be a significant description, as its forty-two deities may explain the layout of the top storey of the Bsam yas temple, which is said to have held a Sarvavid Vairocana (associated with the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana-tantra*) surrounded by forty-two deities” (Dalton and van Schaik 2006, 280). This offers a tantalising clue for future research. However, in discussing the importance of Vairocana in early Tibetan Buddhism, we should not forget the Indic background contained also in the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* and indeed the *Mahāvairocana tantra* in which Lord “Vairocana” Śākyamuni preaches (Snellgrove 1987, 152).

Praise to former scholars (*upādhyāya*), holymen (*āryan*): the source of many treatise (*śāstra*) rivers, the wide and deep ocean of mental capacity, endowed with the waves of poetry (*kāvya*) knowledge, unmoved by heretic (*tīrthika*) winds. Nāgārjuna (1st–2nd c.), and Āryadeva (2nd–3rd c.) [and] Ashva ka (Aśvagoṣa?),<sup>42</sup> Ma tri tse ta (Mātrceta; 2nd–3rd c.?) [and] Klu mtsho (= *tsho*, Nāgarakṣita?),<sup>43</sup> and Ārya Asang (Asaṅga; 4th–5th c.) [and] dByig gi gnyen (po) (Vasubandhu; 4th–5th c.), Phyogs kyi glang po (Dignāga; ca. 480–540) [and] Shu ra (Āryaśurā; 4th c.?) and Shan ta ra kshI ta (Śāntarakṣita; 8th c.) etc. To [those] teachers who have gone to *nirvāṇa*, who open the eyes of those blind [from] ignorance, and who are the descendants of the [Three] Jewels (/precious [Buddha]), I offer prostration, reverence and praise.

IOL Tib J 466 column 10, line 12–column 11 line 1; sngon gyi mkhan po  
 'phags pa nams la mchod pa // bstan bcos chu klung mang po'i gnas // blo  
 dkyel mtsho chen gting yangs shIng // snyan dngags rIlg pa'I mtsho rlabs can  
 // mu stegs rlung gls myI bskyod pa // {'phags} (SHAPE: g+s) pa na ga  
 rdzu na {(interline<)d>(interline)ng} (READ: dang) // ^a rya de ba ^ashva  
 ka // ma trI tse ta klu mtsho dang // ^a rya ^a sang dbIlg gl gnyen // phyogs  
 kyi glang po shu ra dang // shan ta ra {kshI} (SHAPE: k+sh) ta lastogs //  
 ston pa mya ngan 'das {phyI na} (READ: phyIn) // ma rIlg dmus long dmyIlg  
 'byed cing // dkon mchog gdung 'dzIn thams cad la // phyag 'tshal bsnyen  
 bkur mchod pa dbul /.

This constitutes one of the earliest indications of Tibetan Buddhists' knowledge of Indian Buddhist historiography. It shows that, in the imperial or early post-imperial period someone not only knew of these authors but could place them roughly in chronological order (except Āryaśurā). Moreover, these South Asian Buddhist luminaries appear to be split into two lineages: Nāgārjuna preceded Āryadeva in the tradition of Indian philosophy and Mātrceta followed within Aśvagoṣa's school of poetics – could the same be true of “Nāgasaras” (Klu mtsho) / “Nāgarakṣita” (Klu 'tsho)? Once again, another reference chimes with the nature of the *rGyud chags bar ma* as a chanted prayer. As we shall see, the *dharma* kings below are also placed in chronological order. Like them too, these great figures “have gone to *nirvāṇa*” after teaching people the Buddhist path.

42 Aśvagoṣa (c. 80–150 CE) was apparently known as *Aśvaka* in the seventeenth century (Kilty trans. 2010, 143), which from our perspective is very late. The same work also gives two other names for him (Mātrceta and Matrcitra) that are the same name transcribed differently, and refer to the next person on the list (*ibid.*).

43 I have been unable to find any references to a Nāgasaras (Klu mtsho). Klu 'tsho is (part) of a name of Tibetans in OT documents (Thomas 1951, 131, M.I. xxviii, 2) so if there was an Indian Buddhist named Nāgarakṣita, then it could well have been transcribed as such in the exemplar of ITJ 466/3. This would mean that the scribe mistook a common name for “naḡa lake/sea”, which is unlikely. We are probably looking for someone *traditionally held* to have lived in the 3<sup>rd</sup>–4<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Śāntarakṣita ends this lineage and is the only master to have trodden on Tibetan soil, in the late eighth century.<sup>44</sup> It is perhaps unwise to highlight absences in such a short list, but the text makes no mention of Candrakīrti or Dharmakīrti, with whom Śāntarakṣita (and Kamalaśīla who also visited Tibet during the the reign of Khri Srong lde brtsan) were associated. No Chinese masters make the list either, suggesting that this description was not originally compiled by an ethnic Chinese who knew Tibetan and cared to showcase anything of the history of Buddhism in his own land.

The prayer then goes on to praise royal figures of the Buddhist tradition:

Praise to the Spiritual Friends (*kalyāṇamitra*) of our own Tibet, the great Dharma Kings (*dharmarāja*) such as the great king, Khri Srong lde brtsan. I offer prostration, reverence and praise to all those teachers who have gone to *nirvāṇa*, who propagated the teachings: 'Phrul rje (Lord) Khri Srong lde brtsan—who has mastered the royal methods of the *phyva* and [rules] the kingdom with the weapon of the sky-gods—and Dharmāśoka, Kaniṣkā, Śīlāditya (Harṣa) and so on.

IOL Tib J 466, column 11, lines 1–4: bdag cag bod khams kyI dge ba'I bshes nyen // rgyal po chen po khri srong lde brtsan lastsogs pa // chos kyi rgyal po chen po rnam la mchod pa // phyva'I rgyal thabs mnga' brnyes shing // chab srId gnam gyI lde mtshon can // 'phrul rje khri srong lde brtsan dang // dar ma sho ka / ka ni sk'a / shI la ^a tI da tya lastsogs // ston pa mya ngan 'das {phyI na} (READ: phyIn) // bstan pa rgyas mdzad thams cad la // phyag 'tshal bsnyen bkur mchod pa dbul //.

Here, another eighth-century figure is included in a list of Indic Buddhists, but unlike Śāntarakṣita this figure is a Tibetan, the Tibetan emperor, Khri Srong lde brtsan. That he is mentioned alone could suggest that we date this work or this stanza to the eighth century. For one thing, if later emperors had reigned between the eighth century and the creation of the work, one assumes that they would have included the ruler(s)'s name(s) alongside that of Khri Srong lde brtsan. That is unless this prayer is written very late in the tenth century and this emperor is merely one whom the compiler thinks worthy of mention as an exemplary Buddhist monarch. However, the codicology, palaeography and linguistic *merkmals* argue against this.

The *rGyud chags gsum* prayer, as it is extant in IOL Tib J 466, praises Khri Srong lde brtsan as a Spiritual Friend like Śāntarakṣita. It also apotheosises the emperor as a fully enlightened teacher. The bSam yas Bell Inscription (above) records a prayer indicating that he will attain enlightenment. This prayer states that, like his royal Indian predecessors, Khri Srong lde brtsan has now gone to *nirvāṇa*. It also

44 See IOL Tib J 689/2, where he heads the lineage of the Spritual Friends (*kalyāṇamitra*; *dge ba'i bshes gnyen*) of bSam yas and Ra sa 'Phrul snang Monasteries (Karmay 1988, 76–80; Uebach 1990, 407–13). van Schaik and Doney 2007; Doney 2015 and 2017 contain further references to this figure in later Tibetan historiography.

gives Khri Srong lde brtsan the title *'Phrul rje*, which is perhaps similar to the title or epithet *'Phrul gyi lha bTsan po* used in other imperial-period inscriptions (see Stein 1985). Lastly, it uses terms like *phyva* (“royal ancestral deities”?) and *gnam gyi lde* (“sky-gods”) in unique descriptions of the emperor.<sup>45</sup> The text thus singles out Khri Srong lde brtsan as ruling both Tibet and its indigenous deities. It furthermore describes the emperor as a *kalyāṇamitra*.<sup>46</sup> Perhaps it is best not to say Khri Srong lde brtsan was described as a Spiritual Friend in a prayer compiled during the imperial period. However, if this *rkang pa* is interpolated, then whoever did that seems to have intended to portray of Khri Srong lde brtsan as a *kalyāṇamitra* of “our Tibet”.

The next stanza praises the deities (*lha rnams*) of Tibet (*bod yul*), or perhaps the local gods (*yul gyi lha rnams*) of Tibet (*bod*):

Praise to the deities of Tibet, such as King of the Gandharvas [and] “One with Five Top-Knots”, father and son. To all the awesome local gods (*yul bdag gnyan po*), such as the powerful deities and *smān* [deities] who [cause to] arise the jewels of men and of treasure in the iron, silver, gold, crystal and snow mountains surrounding [Tibet] and practise the good religion and way of heaven, I grasp the method of venerating [with] respect, and offer sub-

45 See note 17, above, on previous studies of this stanza.

46 The description of Khri Srong lde brtsan and the other rulers as *kalyāṇamitras* of “our” Tibet is odd, to say the least. Its strangeness, in the light of what we know about the relationship between Spiritual Friends and the Tibetan emperors (see van Schaik and Doney 2007, 192–93; Doney 2017, 311–14), propels us to look for signs of scribal error. The *rkang pa* lacks a syllable, and so we could wish to add an ergative after *dge ba 'i bshes gnyen*, and then read the sentence as addressed by the Spiritual Friends rather than to them. However, this is out of keeping with most of the other stanzas, each of which begins by stating the object of its praise. These stanzas never state who is speaking; I assume they are whichever monks are charged with reciting the *rGyud chags gsum* – rather than the exalted (and singular) heads of the monasteries called Spiritual Friends (one of whom is the *object* of the previous stanza). In fact, “our” Tibet is the closest they get to being self-referential, which may be another reason to be cautious in interpreting this *rkang pa*.

Are we instead missing not a mere syllable, but most of a stanza? Perhaps other *kalyāṇamitras* like Śāntarakṣita, and not kings, should have been the object of praise in the next stanza after that on the Indic masters. This would mean to argue that such a stanza is missing most of its content, save for the opening *rkang pa*, through a scribal mistake. This is possible, but the first line of the stanza concerning kings is also missing, which is quite a coincidence (though it would explain why the mistake was not noticed). Against this, we can argue that rulers may not be Spiritual Friends in imperial Tibet, but they are depicted as teachers soon afterwards. For example, Pelliot tibétain 149 represents Khri Srong lde brtsan as having privileged access to Śāntarakṣita. The latter is the emperor’s spiritual superior here, but Pelliot tibétain 149 reports the king as saying that dBa’ dPal dbyangs (another Spiritual Friend of bSam yas and Ra sa ’phrul snang Monasteries) “is a student (*slob ma*) of mine, a monk” (Pelliot tibétain 149 *recto*, line 8: *bdag gi slob ma dge shyong zhig lags so zhes gsol ba dang /*). Thus, the text suggests that Khri Srong lde brtsan is a teacher, perhaps even a *kalayāṇamitra*, like our prayer.

stances of pure auspiciousness, such as good fragrance, incense (or fragrant incense, *dri spos*) and flowers.

Column 11 lines 4–8: / drl za'i rgyal po gtsug pud lnga pa {yab} (SHAPE: y+b) sras lastsogs pa / : / bod yul gyI lha rnam la mchod pa // lcags rI dngul rI gser gyI ri // shel rI gangs rI khyad kor na // myI dang nor gyi dbyig 'byung zhIng // chos bzang gnam lugs spyod pa yI // mthu chen lha dang sman <ma> lastsogs // yul bdag gnyan po thams cad la // rje sa rI mo'i tshul bzung ste / drl spos men tog bzang lastsogs // bkra shis gtsang ma'I rdzas rnam 'bul /.

Three of the types of deity praised in this stanza, *yul bdag*, *sman* and perhaps *yul lha*, are also included in one of our oldest sources of evidence of non-Buddhist rituals in Tibet, wooden slips. Sam van Schaik (2013, 246) states: “One of these sticks (IOL Tib N 255) records a ritual directed towards local deities designated *yul lha yul bdag*, a construction that also appears in Pelliot tibétain 1042. The ritual is also addressed to the spirits known as *sman*.”<sup>47</sup> In this stanza, *sman* seem to be a subclass of *yul bdag* rather than another type of deity. The specified gods should be singular, and “One with Five Top-Knots” is usually the name given to the King of the Gandharvas. In later works the owner of this name is identified as the autochthonous Tibetan deity *gNyan chen thang lha*.<sup>48</sup> However, the text here seems to distinguish between a father and son (*yab sras*), and the “One with Five Top-Knots”, (in Classical Tibetan, *zur phud lnga pa*) can also be an epithet for Mañjuśrī. These deities also include the powerful/able (*mthu chen*) as a subgroup. The term *mthu chen* reappears at the end of the *rGyud chags bar ma* (below), and *mthu* alone is paired with *byin* in descriptions of the emperors from prayers such as Pelliot tibétain 134. Scherrer-Schaub (1999–2000, 238 *et passim*) translates these terms as “la force et la magnificence (du souverain)”. There, perfectly pure power also describes the the *dharmatā* (*ibid.*, 227 line 44: *chos nyid rnam par dag pa'i mthus*). The gods of this stanza practise the good religion (*chos bzang*) and way of heaven (*gnam lugs*), which could mean Buddhism or the imperial cult of divine kingship (see Stein 1985).

The prayer moves back into firmly Buddhist territory for the final stanzas. First: “Praise to those beings who have each been accepted by *bodhicitta*. ...” (Column 11, line 8: *byang chub kyI sems kyIs zin pa'I so so 'i skye bo rnam la mchod pa // ...*) in

47 This wooden slip is pictured in van Schaik 2013, 246 and its text transliterated in *ibid.*, n. 39: “IOL Tib N 255 (M.I.iv.121): \$//yul lha yul bdag dang/ sman gsol ba'i zhal ta pa/ sku gshen las myi[ng] b[sgrom] pa/ gy-d [-] zhal ta pa/ gsas chung lha bon po/ blo co [com] [rno]/ -m pos sug zungs/ la tong sprul sug gzungs/.” See also Thomas 1951, 395 (though Thomas mistranslates *sman* as physician). van Schaik 2013, 247 and *ibid.*, n. 42 transliterates another, similar wooden slip: “IOL Tib N 873 (M.I.xxvii.15): \$://yul lha yul bdag dang sman gsol ba'i zhal ta pa/ dang sku gshen dpon yog/ /:/blon/ man gzigs blon mdo bzang.” Again, see also Thomas 1951, 395.

48 Padmasambhava refers to *gNyan chen thang lha* as “Dri za'i rgyal po Zur phud lnga pa” in the *Zangs gling ma* of Nyang Nyi ma 'od zer (1124–1192). See *ZLh* 28a3–4 and *ZLi* 23b5” in Doney 2014, 128 and 248. However, this is one of his many names in the work, and may reference the earlier narrative of the Gandharva King.

seven *rkang pas*. Then “praise to ritual objects/offerings endowed with blessings”. (Line 10: *lha rdzas byin can la mchod pa*). The term *lha rdzas* is mentioned fairly often in De ga gyu tshal prayer in 12 *rkang pas*.

The *rGyud chags bar ma* ends with a request “May all the powerful [and?] ascetics who rule/control all the world cause supreme happiness and the teachings to spread [throughout] the entire world!” (lines 14–15: *’jlg rten kun la ’ang mnga’ mdzad pa’I // mthu chen drang srong thams cad kyls // ’jig rten mtha’ bdag mchog tu skyid pa dang / bstan pa rgyas par mdzad du gsol /*). Apart from this expression of hope, the *rGyud chags bar ma* contains nothing but praise. There may be some connection between this fact and the instruction to recite only that section together with a melody. Bear in mind that the only other “text” allowed to be recited by the monastic community accompanied by music was the *Proclamation of the Qualities of the Teacher* (*Śāstrīguṇasaṃkīrtta*) praising the Buddha.

### **rGyud chags tha ma**

Just before concluding, we should deal with the conclusion to the *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer. The *rGyud chags tha ma* is specifically *not* to be recited accompanied by melody (column 11 lines 15–16), as with *rGyud chags dang po* (column 3, line 1, above). It begins with the Buddhas (rather than Three Jewels) of the ten directions, hoping that their intentions be fulfilled (lines 16–18). Mention is also made of the Buddhas of the ten directions in the longer proclamation (above). However, this phrase is a lot more common (it is in the *Bhadracaryāpraṇidhāna* for instance), and so I do not claim to make a connection here.

This final *rgyud chags* is more of an “aspirational prayer” (*smon lam*), as befitting the end of a prayer. No rubrication is added to split up parts of this short section, only rubrication at the beginning and end. Perhaps this is intended as ornamentation or to mark off what should not be said out loud at all, in other words the instructions at the start (lines 15–16), and the ending phrase: “The *rgyud chags* is finished” (line 21). On the different *rGyud gsum pa* prayer that follows this, see Dalton 2011, 62–66 and now Dalton 2016. This need not concern us here. Only note that IOL Tib J 466/3 could bring the *rGyud gsum pa* more into the imperial sphere by association here in the same manuscript, if this portion were not just added on later.

### **Conclusion**

The core work of IOL Tib J 466/3 was perhaps first written, translated or compiled closer to the Tibetan imperial period and heartland than the Dunhuang destination of this exemplar suggests. Palaeographic and codicological analysis and comparison with other manuscripts suggest that the exemplar itself only just post-dates the Tibetan imperial period, if at all. The use of the same panels of paper and *mis en page*, as well as the possibility that this manuscript was found in Cave 17 with a copy of the *Aparimitāyurnāma* (*mahāyāna*)*sūtra* suggests the re-purposing of panels from

the imperial copying of that *sūtra* and perhaps its connections to the scriptorium of Lu Dze shing.

Further palaeographical attention to the differences between the first and second panel of IOL Tib J 466 has consequences for the content. It makes our text, IOL TIB J 466/3, more important, as perhaps the first section of the original manuscript. The content of the *rGyud chags gsum* prayer in its extant form lies somewhere between the imperial bSam yas Bell Inscription prayer and the later descriptions of songs at the Tibetan court contained in the histories cited at the beginning of this article (n. 2). Here we see the increasing replacement of “four directions” imagery of the *imperium* with a “ten directions” cosmology of Buddhism (especially connected with the Three Jewels) and the incorporation of Indic deities into the Tibetan cosmology. IOL Tib J 466/3 warrants further comparison with earlier, imperial prayers such as the bSam yas Bell Inscription and others in the future, as part of a wider investigation of Old Tibetan devotional literature.

We saw at the start that Michael L. Walter draws attention to what he sees as a mixture of older and newer *strata* within the De ga g.yu tshal prayer and therefore ascribes the whole compilation to a later stage of the development of Buddhist praise literature in Tibet. He (2013, 435, n. 9) suggests that Old Tibetan phrases found in close proximity to references to Khri gTsug lde brtsan in the Prayer of De ga g.yu tshal *could* have been lifted from inscriptions (see also above). Unlike Walter, I do not feel we need to worry so much about IOL Tib J 466/3, because the emperor depicted in it is evidently dead. Leaving aside the notion of forgery, Walter (*ibid.*, 427–28) notes the extreme closeness of the Treaty Temple prayer to the Treaty Inscription, including in very rare phrases. He claims this is closer than any other manuscript to the inscriptions apart from the *Old Tibetan Annals*, but perhaps now we can add to this list some phrases in both IOL Tib J 466/3 and Pelliot tibétain 177 corresponding to the bSam yas Bell Inscription (and by extension perhaps the longer proclamation of Khri Srong lde brtsan).

Looking further within this devotional genre, IOL Tib J 466/3 includes praises to the Three Jewels, a paeon to a Tibetan emperor as both a ruler and a Buddhist, and a cosmology that includes both local deities and great Indian gods, like Pelliot tibétain 134’s prayer to ’U’i dum brtan. Each group is given a stanza of eight to eleven lines in length, which occasionally conforms to a seven-syllable metre, and their number is usually embodied by a named individual or sub-group. This latter pattern is found in IOL Tib J 374’s “prayer for Tibet” and Pelliot tibétain 134’s “prière pour un apostat”.

The early part of IOL Tib J 466/3 indicates a South Asian milieu, while the latter betrays a Tibetan context. No particular Chinese or northern Central Asian referents are included, although it may be that praise to the Three Jewels of the ten directions also appears in Chinese literature of the contemporaneous Tang period (see above, n. 13). However, we cannot rule out the possibility that the latter draws on the *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer, rather than that the *rGyud chags gsum* quotes Chinese sources. A great deal of the terminology is pan-Buddhist; Cristina Scherrer-Schaub (2014,

150–51) also notes that the inscriptional corpus “shows that starting from the edict of Bsam yas the public records progressively introduce a terminological set, known for centuries and in common use in the Buddhist world at large”. Care should be taken not to ascribe influence from *one single* direction too firmly. Nonetheless, it appears that much of this prayer in Tibetan is taken from the Indic *Tridaṇḍaka*, to which are added tantric and Tibetan elements (many of which are obscure) at a late imperial or early post-imperial time. Some of these Tibetan elements are loosely historiographical, or perhaps mythographical. Someone seemingly knew of the lineages of Indian Buddhist philosophers, poets and kings. This Tibetan *Tridaṇḍaka* also apotheosises the Tibetan emperor, Khri Srong lde brtsan, as a fully enlightened teacher like his predecessors to the south.

Finally, IOL Tib J 466/3 includes three types of deity found elsewhere in a non-Buddhist ritual context, *yul bdag*, *sman* and perhaps *yul lha*, as practising the good religion. It also shares the “non-Buddhist” descriptions of gods and the sky found in IOL Tib J 1746.<sup>49</sup> In contrast to the latter, which contains an attack on non-Buddhist religion, we have just seen that the extant *rGyud chags gsum* prayer explicitly connects such indigenous qualities with the power of the emperor. Sam van Schaik states:

As an alternative to such rituals, IOL Tib J 1746 promotes the figure of the Buddha as a figure of compassion who treats everyone equally. ... IOL Tib J 1746 is one of very few early sources that makes explicit reference to Tibetan non-Buddhist practices in general (rather than specific ritual techniques); these are consistently discussed as a form of *chos*: either as ‘the bad religion’ (*chos ngan pa*) or ‘the little religion’ (*chos chu ngu*). Buddhism, on the other hand, is the Buddha’s religion, or buddhadharma (*chos ’b’u dha*), the good religion (*chos bzang po / chos legs pa*), the correct religion (*chos yang thag pa*) or the great religion (*chos chen po*). (van Schaik 2013, 233)

49 Sam van Schaik (2013, 230–33) discusses IOL Tib J 1746, which he dates to the imperial period on the basis of codicology, palaeography and linguistic analysis. He notes the similarity between the layout of its two panels (measuring 28 x 41.5 cm and each split into two columns) and that of the *Aparimitāyurnāma sūtra* copies produced during and perhaps just after the reign of Khri gTsug lde brtsan, while its handwriting (van Schaik’s “square style”) and orthography (such as the use of *da drag*, below) are more archaic in style and reflect the writing on the *Old Tibetan Annals* (*ibid.* 231). Although the panels used for copies of the *Aparimitāyurnāma sūtra* measure slightly larger than IOL Tib J 1746, their sizes do vary and the latter manuscript only comprises two panels which is not much of a scientific sample. IOL Tib J 466 consists of eight panels measuring roughly 31.5 x 45 cm, in other words the standard panel size in Tibet-controlled Dunhuang (see Iwao 2012, 103). The content of IOL Tib J 1746 is Buddhist, namely “a treatise on the advantages of Buddhism over Tibetan beliefs and rituals ... [and] a characterization of the non-Buddhist religion from the Buddhist point of view—propitiation (*bskurd*) of the gods and the sky” (*ibid.*, 231–32). Although IOL Tib J 1746 does not contain any reference to the imperial court of its rulers, it shares with IOL Tib J 466/3 the latter “non-Buddhist” descriptions of gods and the sky, which our text explicitly connects with the power of the emperor.

IOL Tib J 466/3 apparently makes no such connection between sky-gods and the “bad religion” as contrasted with Buddhism, since it betrays no sense of inconsistency in using both types of language to describe the dharma-protecting emperor, Khri Srong lde brtsan. IOL Tib J 1746 seems instead to present the “good” and “bad” religions as competing registers of discourse, reflecting the statuses of Buddhists and non-Buddhists with regard to truth and society.

IOL Tib J 466/3 appears to share some connection to the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra*, as a ritual means of praying for the dead. This evident ritual nexus is shared by other works from Dunhuang such as the post-imperial *History of Birth and Death* (*sKye shi'i lo rgyus*) narrative of conversion to Buddhism, which was modelled on the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* as much as on the *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra* mentioned in the introduction to this article.<sup>50</sup> It tells of the death of King 'Od 'bar rgyal (a name emulating one found in the *tantra*; Kapstein 2000, 206, n. 20) and relates his son Rin chen's search for a remedy against death and (re)birth aided by Buddhist deities (as in the *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra*). At the end of the *History of Birth and Death* (Pelliot tibétain 218 folio *ng-na verso* line 7f.), Śākyamuni lambasts those who follow the erroneous religion (*log pa'i chos*) as fools who will never remedy death (a similar stance to that held in IOL Tib J 1746, but not in our *Tridaṇḍaka* prayer). He instead recommends that Rin chen recites the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī* as a remedy against death and “presents its rituals as the only reliable means to avoid falling into the evil destinies (*durgati*)” (Imaeda 2007, 170). In fact, one of the *dhāraṇī*'s epithets in the Tibetan canonical version is “one that purifies all bad destinies” (*\*sarvadurgatipariśodhana; ngan 'gro thams cad yongs su sbyong ba*; see Imaeda 2007, 132). Perhaps this nexus of ritual tradition in imperial and early post-imperial Tibet is one of the reasons that panel one, including the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī*, seemed a fitting addition at the head of the manuscript IOL Tib J 466. The praise of IOL Tib J 466/3 is concerned with glorifying the dead, in so far as all the humans it praises in its more historiographical part are explicitly said to have died (and gone to *nirvāṇa*). The after-death state is also important in the *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra* (which extolls instead the *Āryabhadracaryāpraṇidhāna*) and once again the depiction of Khri Srong lde brtsan is somehow seen as an important person for Tibetans to mention in this context (see van Schaik and Doney 2007 on Pelliot tibétain 149).

At the opening of this article, I mentioned the later historiographical depictions of the joyous music-making at the consecration of the newly created bSam yas Monastery. These actually form a continuity with IOL Tib J 466/3, as later Tibetan Buddhist narrativisations of imperial praise. However, apparently something more som-

50 Imaeda Yoshiro has devoted two studies to this (1981 and 2007). The nine Dunhuang fragments that Imaeda discovered and pieced together (*ibid.*, 114) are: Pelliot tibétain 218; Pelliot tibétain 219; Pelliot tibétain 220; Pelliot tibétain 366; Pelliot tibétain 367; IOL Tib J 99; IOL Tib J 345; and the manuscript found in the Stein collection, volume 69, folio 17 (i.e. IOL Tib J 1302). Imaeda highlights the importance of the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* and *Gaṇḍavyūha sūtra* to the narrative in *ibid.*, 119–20 and 132–33.

bre was in the mind of the compilers of the Tibetan *Tridaṇḍaka* as it has survived in the Dunhuang library cave, and so we should briefly address the afterlife instead. Imaeda Yoshiro (2007) insightfully describes the influence of the Indic works discussed in the last paragraph on the changing Tibetan conception of death, rebirth, and cosmology during the imperial and early post-imperial periods (see also the more general discussion in Kapstein 2000, 42–46). The Indic works themselves inhabited a literary milieu that incorporated the greater and lesser gods of Brahmanism as a means of converting them and their followers to Buddhism (Snellgrove 1987, 150). The expansive cosmology and historiography expressed in the *rGyud chags gsum* prayer reveals both of these processes at work in early Buddhist Tibet.

I thought it fitting to end, then, with a later charter myth of Tibetan imperial funerary rituals. This is found in the *History of Food Provisioning* (*Zas gtad kyī lo rgyus*), a precious early narrative extant only as an appendix to the *dBa' bzhed* history of the introduction of Buddhism to Tibet and of the construction of bSam yas Monastery.<sup>51</sup> Just as the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* begins with the death of the god Vimalatejāḥrabha (Pure Splendrous Light) and the point of departure for the *History of Birth and Death* is the death of King 'Od 'bar rgyal (King of Blazing Light), the *History of Food Provisioning* opens: “In the first spring month [of] the horse year, Emperor Khri Srong lde btsan died. [His] son Mu ne btsan po was very young,<sup>52</sup> [so he] had little interest in practising the religion (*chos*) ...”<sup>53</sup> The Bon pos seize this opportunity to re-establish their religion over Buddhism by performing the funerary rituals for his father. However, he then recounts a dream in which he saw Khri Srong lde btsan seated with Śrī Vairocana, Vajrapāṇi and Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta ('Jam dpal gzhon nu gyur pa) in Aḍakavatī heaven, preaching from the *sūtras* and *śāstras*. Mu ne btsan po says “When this prophetic dream is connected with the funeral feast of my father the *devaputra*, I find that it is unsuitable for it to be done in accord with Bon because it must be done in accord with the white Dharma (of Buddhism; *dkar chos*).”<sup>54</sup> He orders a council to be convened in order to decide the matter, and Pa gor Vairocana eventually wins the day for the Buddhists (see Dotson 2013, 70–75). Just as Śākyamuni recommends that Rin chen recites the *Uṣṇīṣavijaya dhāraṇī* as a remedy against death in the *History of Life and Death*, the *History of Food Provisioning* ends with the statement:

51 *dBa' bzhed* 26a2–31b6; see Pasang Wangdu and Diemberger 2000, 92–105. A connection between this work, the *History of Birth and Death* and the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* has also been made by Zeff Bjerken (2005).

52 Perhaps Mu ne btsan po is confused here with Mu rug btsan (r. 800–c.802; d. 804). Mu ne brtsan (r. 797–798) seems to have predeceased his father in 798; see Dotson 2009, 143.

53 Translation following Pasang Wangdu and Diemberger 2000, 95. *dBa' bzhed* 26a2–3: // rta'i lo'i dpyid zla ra ba'i ngo la btsan po khri srong lde btsan 'das / sras mu ne btsan po ni sku chungs / chos spyod pa la dga' ba'ang nyung ste /.

54 *dBa' bzhed* 26a8: mtshan ltas 'di dang sbyar na lha sras yab kyī 'dad ni bon du byar mi rung gi / dkar chosu bya dgos pas ...

Thereafter, funerals were performed in accord with the *tantra* for rebirth in lower realms and in accord with the *maṇḍalas* of the nine *uṣṇīṣa* (Buddhas) and the all-knowing (Vairocana). From that time onward, all funerals came to be performed according the *dharma* system. ... Moreover, foolish practitioners of Bon are supposedly said to have concealed much wealth (of the deceased) as hidden treasure. In view of that, realising such a practice was very deleterious and of little benefit, the masters of the *dharma* system (*lugs*) instituted the ritual of food provisioning [for the dead] (*zas gtad*). The account of the food offering ritual is finished.<sup>55</sup>

The *History of Food Provisioning* appendix describes the Buddhist system of post-death rites as following the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana tantra* and practised on the basis of the All-knowing (*sarvavid*) Buddha Vairocana's *maṇḍala*. Furthermore, these postmortem ceremonies prevail over non-Buddhist (this time "Bon") funerary practices, specifically for the performance of rituals at the funeral of Khri Srong lde brtsan. It therefore seems that later Buddhist historiography on the emperors took its description of prayers for the dead from the prayers themselves. In this way, they are heir to the kind of devotional historiography present in the *rGyud chags gsum* prayer from Dunhuang.

## Bibliography

### *Tibetan-Language Works*

- dBa' bzhed*: 2000. "dba' bzhed." In: *DBa' bzhed: The Royal Narrative Concerning the Bringing of the Buddha's Doctrine to Tibet*, edited by Pasang Wangdu, and Hildegard Diemberger, 123–56. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- sBa bzhed* G: mGon po rgyal mtshan, ed. 1980/1982. *sba bzhed: sba bzhed ces bya ba las sba gsal snang gi bzhed pa bzhugs*. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.
- sBa bzhed* P: *verbatim* quotes contained in dPa' bo gTsong lag phreng ba. 2002. *chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*. Varanasi: Vajra Vidya.
- sBa bzhed* S: 1961. "btsan po khri srong lde btsan dang mkhan po slob dpon padma'i dus mdo sngags so sor mdzad pa'i sba bzhed zhabs btags ma." In: *Une Chronique ancienne de bSam-yas: sBa-bzed*, edited by R. A. Stein, 1–92. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- KGT*: dPa' bo gTsong lag phreng ba. 2002. *chos 'byung mkhas pa'i dga' ston*. Varanasi: Vajra Vidya.
- Mes dbon gsum gyi rnam par thar pa*: "mi rje lhas mdzad byang chub sems dpa' sems dpa' chen po chos rgyal mes dbon mam gsum gyi rnam par thar pa rin po che'i phreng ba." In:

55 *dBa' bzhed* 31b2–6: de nas phyis ngan song sbyong rgyud la brten nas kun rig dang gtsug tor dgu'i dkyil 'khor la brten nas shid rnaMs byas so // grir shi ba la khro bo nyi ma'i dkyil 'khor la brten nas shid byas / de'i gtad yar dang ! gri 'dul laswo pa rnaMs mdo sde'i khungs dang sbyar nas mdzad / dus de nas shid thaMd chos lugs su byed pa byung ste / de yang bon lugs glen pa dag nor longs spyod mang po gter du sbed pa yod skad / de ni god che la phan chung bar dgongs nas chos lugs mkhas pa dag gis zas gtad kyi phyag bzhes 'di mdzad skad do // zas gtad kyi lo rgyus rdzogs+ho //.

- rin chen gter mdzod chen po'i rgyab chos* collected by Dingo Chhentse Rinpoche, 1980. Paro: Ugyan Tempai Gyaltzen, vol. 7.
- sMon lam chen mo*: Bokar Rinpoché, ed. 2004. *zhal 'don gces btus / dbu lags so // 'gro mgon bka' brgyud pa'i dge 'dun smon lam /*. Dharamsala: Dhorphen.
- MTNd: *chos 'byung me tog snying po sbrang rtsi'i bcud*. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.

### *Works in Other Languages*

- Bjerken, Zeff (2005): "Of Mandalas, Monarchs, and Mortuary Magic: Siting the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhana Tantra* in Tibet." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 73, 3: 813–41.
- Chen, Huaiyu (2014): "Multiple Traditions of One Ritual: A Reading of the Lantern-Lighting Prayers in Dunhuang Manuscripts." In: *Buddhism Across Asia: Networks of Material, Intellectual and Cultural Exchange*, edited by Tansen Sen. Singapore: Institute for South-east Asian Studies. 233–57.
- Dalton, Jacob P. (2011): *The Taming of the Demons: Violence and Liberation in Tibetan Buddhism*. London: Yale University Press.
- Dalton, Jacob P. (2016): "How *Dhāranīs* WERE Proto-Tantric: Liturgies, Ritual Manuals, and the Origins of the Tantras." In: *Tantric Traditions in Transmission and Translation*, edited by David B. Gray, and Ryan Richard Overby. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 199–229.
- Dalton, Jacob, and Sam van Schaik (2006): *Tibetan Tantric Manuscripts from Dunhuang: A Descriptive Catalogue of the Stein Collection at the British Library*. Leiden: Brill.
- Doney, Lewis (2013a): "Nyang ral Nyi ma 'od zer and the *Testimony of Ba*." *Bulletin of Tibetology* 49, 1: 7–38.
- Doney, Lewis (2013b): "Emperor, Dharmaraja, Bodhisattva? Inscriptions from the Reign of Khri Srong lde brtsan." *Journal of Research Institute, Kobe City University of Foreign Studies* 51: 63–84.
- Doney, Lewis (2014): *The Zangs gling ma: The First Padmasambhava Biography. Two Exemplars of the Earliest Attested Recension*. Andiast: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.
- Doney, Lewis (2015): "Early Bodhisattva-Kingship in Tibet: The Case of Tri Songdétse." *Cahiers d'Extrême Asie* 24: 29–47.
- Doney, Lewis (2017): "Narrative Transformations: The Spiritual Friends of Khri Srong lde brtsan." In: *Interaction in the Himalayas and Central Asia: Processes of Transfer, Translation and Transformation in Art, Archaeology, Religion and Polity*, edited by Eva Allinger et al. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Austrian Academy of Sciences Press). 311–320.
- Doney, Lewis *forthcoming*: "Temple Bells from the Tibetan Imperial Period: Buddhist Material Culture in Context." In: *Comparisons Across Time and Space: Papers from the Seventh Leiden Asian Studies Symposium*, edited by Elizabeth Cecil, and Lucas den Boer. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Dotson, Brandon (2007): "'Emperor' Mu-rug-brtsan and the 'Phang thang ma Catalogue." *Journal of the International Association for Tibetan Studies* 3 ([www.thdl.org?id=T3105](http://www.thdl.org?id=T3105)): 1–25.

- Dotson, Brandon (2009): *The Old Tibetan Annals: An Annotated Translation of Tibet's First History, With an Annotated Cartographical Documentation by Guntram Hazod*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Dotson, Brandon (2013): "The Dead and Their Stories: Preliminary Remarks on the Place of Narrative in Tibetan Religion." In: *Tibet after Empire: Culture, Society and Religion between 850–1000*, edited by Christoph Cüppers et al. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute. 51–83.
- Dotson, Brandon, and Lewis Doney forthcoming: *A Study of the Tibetan Aparimitāyur-nama mahāyāna-sūtras kept in the British Library in cooperation with Dongzhi Duojie*.
- Flügel, Peter (2010): "The Jaina Cult of Relic Stūpas." *Numen* 57, 3: 389–504.
- Hill, Nathan (2013): "'Come as lord of the black-headed' – an Old Tibetan mythic formula." In: *Tibet after Empire: Culture, Society and Religion between 850–1000*, edited by Christoph Cüppers et al. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute. 169–80.
- Hill, Nathan (2015): "The sku bla Rite in Imperial Tibetan Religion." *Cahiers d'Extrême Asie* 24: 29–47.
- Huang, Weizhong 黄维忠 (2007a): "Dunhuang zangwen fayuanwen yanjiu zongshu 敦煌藏文發願文研究綜述" [A Summary of Dunhuang Literature.]. *Dunhuangxue jikan* 敦煌學輯刊 [Journal of Dunhuang Studies] 1: 29–39.
- Huang, Weizhong 黄维忠 (2007b): *Ba zhi jiu shiji zangwen fayuanwen yanjiu: yi Dunhuang zangwen fayuanwen wei zhongxin* 八至九世紀藏文發願文研究：以敦煌藏文發願文為中心 [A Study on Tibetan Prayers from the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: With Special Attention to the Tibetan Prayers from Dunhuang]. Beijing 北京: Minzu chubanshe 民族出版社.
- Imaeda, Yoshiro (1981): *Histoire du cycle de la naissance et de la mort. Étude d'un texte tibétain de Touen-houang*. Geneva, Paris: Librairie Droz.
- Imaeda, Yoshiro (2007): "The History of the Cycle of Birth and Death: a Tibetan narrative from Dunhuang." In: *Contributions to the Cultural History of Early Tibet*, edited by Matthew T. Kapstein, and Brandon Dotson. Leiden: Brill. 105–81.
- Iwao, Kazushi (2012): "The Purpose of Sutra Copying in Dunhuang under the Tibetan Rule." In: *Dunhuang Studies: Prospects and Problems for the Coming Second Century of Research*, edited by Irina Popova, and Liu Yi. St. Petersburg: Slavia. 102–05.
- Iwao, Kazushi et al. (eds.) (2009): *Old Tibetan Inscriptions: Old Tibetan Documents Online Monograph Series, 2*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.
- Iwao, Kazushi et al. (eds.) (2012): *Old Tibetan Texts in the Stein Collection Or.8210*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. (2000): *The Tibetan Assimilation of Buddhism: Conversion, Contestation, and Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. (2004): "The Treaty Temple of De ga g.Yu tshal: Iconography and Identification." In: *Essays on the International Conference on Tibetan Archaeology and Art*, ed. by Huo Wei 霍巍. Chengdu 成都: Sichuan Renmin Chubanshe 四川人民出版社. 98–127.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. (2009): "The Treaty Temple of the Turquoise Grove." In: *Buddhism Between Tibet and China*, edited by Matthew T. Kapstein. Boston: Wisdom. 21–72.
- Kapstein, Matthew T. forthcoming: "The Treaty Temple of De ga g.yu tshal: Reconsiderations." *Journal of Tibetan Studies* (Sichuan University) 10: 32–47.

- Karmay, Samten Gyaltzen (1988): *The Great Perfection (Rdzogs Chen): A Philosophical and Meditative Teaching of Tibetan Buddhism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Karmay, Samten Gyaltzen (2003): “King Lang Darma and his Rule.” In: *Tibet and Her Neighbours. A History*, edited by Alex McKay. London: Edition Hansjörg Mayer. 57–68.
- Kilty, Gavin, trans. (2010): *The Mirror of Beryl: A Historical Introduction to Tibetan Medicine* by Desi Sangyé Gyatso. Somerville MA: Wisdom.
- Kuo, Li ying (1994): *Confession et contrition dans le bouddhisme chinois du Ve au Xe siècle*. Paris: Publications de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- Lalou, Marcelle (1950): *Inventaire des manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale (Fonds Pelliot tibétain) Nos 850-1282, Volume 2*. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale.
- Li, Fang-Kuei, and W. South Coblin (1987): *A Study of the Old Tibetan Inscriptions*. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Macdonald, Ariane, and Imaeda Yoshiro (1978–1979): *Choix de Documents tibétains conservés à la Bibliothèque nationale complété par quelques manuscrits de l’India Office et du British Museum*. Vols. 1–2. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale.
- Osto, Douglas (2010): “A New Translation of the Sanskrit Bhadracarī with Introduction and Notes.” *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 12, 2: 1–21.
- Pasang Wangdu, and Hildegard Diemberger (2000): *Dbā’ bzhed: The Royal Narrative Concerning the Bringing of the Buddha’s Doctrine to Tibet*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Payne, Richard K., and Charles D. Orzech (2011): “Homa.” In: *Esoteric Buddhism and the Tantras in East Asia*, edited by Charles D. Orzech et al. Leiden: Brill. 133–40.
- Richardson, Hugh, Edward (1949): “Three Ancient Inscriptions from Tibet.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* 15: 45–64.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward (1977): “‘The Dharma that Came Down from Heaven’: A Tunhuang Fragment.” In: *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization: Essays in Honor of Herbert V Guenther on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Leslie S. Kawamura, and Keith Scott. Emeryville, CA: Dharma Publishing. 219–29.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward. (1985): *A Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions*. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward (1988): “The Succession to Glang Darma.” In: *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dicata*, edited by Gherardo Gnoli, and Lionello Lanciotti. Roma: Serie Orientale. 1221–29.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward (1992): “Mention of Tibetan Kings in Some Documents From Tunhuang.” *Bulletin of Tibetology* new ser. 2: 5–10.
- Richardson, Hugh Edward (1998 [1980]): “The First Tibetan chos-’byung.” In: *High Peaks Pure Earth*, edited by Michael Aris. London: Serindia. 89–99.
- Schaeffer, Kurtis R., Matthew T. Kapstein, and Gray Tuttle (eds.) (2013): *Sources of Tibetan Tradition*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schaik, Sam van (2013): “The Naming of the Tibetan Religion: Bon and Chos in the Tibetan Imperial Period.” *Journal of the International Association for Bon Research* 1: 227–57.
- Schaik, Sam van, 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: 175–218.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina A. (1999–2000): “Prière pour un apostat: Fragments d’histoire tibétaine.” *Cahiers d’Extrême-Asie* 11: 217–46.

- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina A. (2002): "Enacting Words: A Diplomatic Analysis of the Imperial Decrees (bkas bcad) and their Application in the sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa Tradition." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 25, 1–2: 263–340.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina A. (2012): "Tibet: An Archæology of the Written." In: *Old Tibetan Studies: Dedicated to the Memory of R. E. Emmerick. Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, 2003*, edited by Cristina A. Scherrer-Schaub. Leiden: Brill. 217–54.
- Scherrer-Schaub, Cristina A. (2014): "A Perusal of Early Tibetan Inscriptions in Light of the Buddhist World of the 7<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> Centuries A.D." In: *Epigraphic Evidence in the Pre-Modern Buddhist World. Proceedings of the Eponymous Conference Held in Vienna, 14–15 Oct. 2011*, edited by Kurt Tropper. Wien: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien. 117–65.
- Schopen, Gregory (1997): *Bones, Stones, and Buddhist Monks. Collected Papers on Archaeology, Epigraphy, and Texts of Monastic Buddhism in India*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Schopen, Gregory (2010): "On Incompetent Monks and Able Urbane Nuns in a Buddhist Monastic Code." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 38: 107–31.
- Sernesi, Marta (2014): "A Prayer to the Complete Liberation of Mi la ras pa." In: *Narrative Pattern and Genre in Hagiographic Life Writing: Comparative Perspectives from Asia to Europe*, edited by Stephan Conermann, and Jim Rheingans. Berlin: EB Verlag. 141–85.
- Simon, Walter (1957): "A Chinese Prayer in Tibetan Script." *Sino-Indian Studies*, 5, 3–4: 192–99.
- Snellgrove, David L. (1987): *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and their Tibetan Successors*. London: Serindia.
- Sørensen, Per K. (1994): *Tibetan Buddhist Historiography: The Mirror Illuminating the Royal Genealogies. An Annotated Translation of the XIV<sup>th</sup> Century Tibetan Chronicle Rgyal-rabs Gsal-ba'i Me-long*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Stein, R. A. (1985): "Tibetica Antiqua III: à propos du mot gcug-lag et de la religion indigène." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 74: 83–133.
- Takeuchi, Tsuguhito (1998): *Old Tibetan Manuscripts from East Turkestan in The Stein Collection of the British Library*, Vol. 2. London: British Library Press.
- Thomas, Frederick William (1935): *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Vol. 1. London: Luzac & Co.
- Thomas, Frederick William (1951): *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Vol. 2. London: Luzac & Co.
- Tucci, Giuseppe (1950): *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*. Rome: Serie Orientale.
- Uebach, Helga (1990): "On Dharma-Colleges and Their Teachers in the Ninth Century Tibetan Empire." In: *Indo-Sino-Tibetica. Studi in Onore di Luciano Petech*, edited by Paolo Daffina. Roma: Bardi Editore. 393–417.
- Uebach, Helga (2010): "Notes on the Palaeography of the Old Tibetan Inscriptions: Zhol and bSam yas." In: *Édition, éditions: l'écrit au Tibet, évolution et devenir*, edited by Anne Chayet et al. Munich: Indus Verlag. 411–28.
- de la Vallée Poussin, Louis (1962): *Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-Huang in the India Office Library* (entries 333 to 765). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walter, Michael L. (2009): *Buddhism and Empire: The Political and Religious Culture of Early Tibet*. Leiden: Brill.

- Walter, Michael L. (2013): “Analysis of PT016/IO751: Language and Culture of a Dunhuang Document, Part One.” In: *Tibet after Empire: Culture, Society and Religion between 850–1000*, edited by Christoph Cüppers et al. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute. 417–40.
- Willis, Michael (2013): “From World Religion to World Dominion: Trading, Translation and Institution-building in Tibet.” In: *‘Trading Religions’: Religious Formation, Transformation and Cultural Exchange between East and West*, edited by Peter Wick, and Volker Rabans. Bochum, Germany: Ruhr-Universität. 141–57.
- Xuanhua (1982): *The Great Means Expansive Buddha Flower Adornment Sutra*, Vol. 40. Talmage, Calif: Dharma Realm Buddhist University & International Institute for the Translation of Buddhist Texts.
- Yamaguchi, Zuihō (1996): “The Fiction of King Dar-Ma’s Persecution of Buddhism.” In: *De Dunhuang au Japon – Études chinoises et bouddhiques offertes à Michel Soymié*, edited by Jean-Pierre Drège. Genève: Droz. 231–258.
- Yönten, Damchö (1996): *Ganden Lha Gye: The Guru Yoga of Lama Tsong Khapa*. Bedminster, Bristol: Dharma Therapy Trust.
- Zhang, Yisun 張怡蓀 et al. (1993 [1985]): *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo / Zang-Han dacidian 藏漢大辭典*. 3 vols. Beijing 北京: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.