

HOW CHINESE WAS CHINA'S TIBET REGION?

by

Nirmal Chandra Sinha

A paper delivered at the Seminar on the Teaching of
Chinese History & Language in Indian Universities

Panjab University, Chandigarh
December 12-14, 1966

(Reproduced by kind permission. This paper will come
out in a joint publication of the Panjab University
and Asia Publishing House. The author is Director
of the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, Sikkim. His
latest publication is "Tibet: Considerations on
Inner Asian History", issued from Calcutta (May 1967)
by Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, priced at Indian Rupees Ten.)

INTERDOC
Van Stolckweg 10
The Hague
The Netherlands

July, 1967

HOW CHINESE WAS CHINA'S TIBET REGION?

by Nirmal Chandra Sinha

I

A question of history

On 23 May 1951 Tibet signed away her independence by a treaty with China. This treaty called 17-point Agreement on Measures for the Peaceful Liberation of Tibet opens thus: "The Tibetan nationality is one of the nationalities with a long history within the boundaries of China." Three years later on 29 April 1954 China signed a treaty with her (the then) best ally India "on Trade and Intercourse between Tibet Region of China and India." Tibet was now not merely one of the nationalities within the boundaries of China: Tibet was also a region of China. It seems that the process called Peaceful Liberation of Tibet has been completed in a matter of fifteen years. When at the rally of the Red Guards in Peking this year (19 August 1966) Lin Piao emphasized the need to "vigorously destroy all the old ideas, old culture, old customs and old habits of the exploiting classes" he perhaps did not think of Tibet in particular. Three years ago a British journalist and his wife, who toured under the auspices of the People's Republic of China and who remain admirers of their sponsors, had found "the few harmless monks who shuffled round the silent streets and altars which had once been alive with more than a thousand men." They add "The greatest religious foundation is now a splendid stage set for a majestic play which cannot be produced because only 400 of the cast of 3000 who were needed to perform it are still there. Those who remain are figures in a small charade in which, lost among the colossal props, they can hardly be seen." (1)

Purpose of this paper is, however, not to discuss the prospects and realities of Tibet's liberation. It is proposed to enquire here into Tibet's entitlement to be called Tibet Region of China at the beginning of the Peaceful Liberation. An enquiry as to how far traditional Tibet (that is, Tibet till 1950) conformed to the pattern of traditional China (that is, China till 1950) can help us considerably in tracing the frontiers of Chinese history and comprehending the mystique called Chinese civilization.

Bn
1464

The answer to our query is to be sought in the pages of history and not in the documents circulated by the opposing interests today.

II

Tools for the enquiry

An element of mystery pervades the history of China as well as Tibet. Hence notice of obscure facts or controversial events will only add to our problem; therefore widely known facts and features will be laid under contribution here.

Constituent contents of a civilization - language, religion, polity, arts, literature, legends and history, food and dress, family life and occupational pattern - are the primary tools for an enquiry as this. Political history takes a secondary role. Ireland was a part of Britain (United Kingdom) for more than seven centuries against legitimate claims of separate identity. Polish people, on the other hand, remained split for a century and a half against all logic of integrated existence. Political and administrative boundaries may not reflect the true image of oneness or otherwise.

A minimum use of publications and records since 1950 will be made and made only when necessary to support a fact known before 1950.

Apropos of above methodology, let it be mentioned that the Chinese have been consistent about their reading of history through the successive Dynasties (Chinese, Mongol, Chinese and Manchu), the Republican regime and the current People's Republic. The Chinese view of their place in the world has remained constant. The Chinese view about Tibet since the Mongol conquest of both Tibet and China in the thirteenth century is no exception to this norm.

In 1956 a Chinese scholar, who was also a diplomat of the KMT period and later settled in USA as professor of international relations, published a book entitled The Historical Status of Tibet. A second edition came out under the title Tibet Today and Yesterday (New York 1960). The author Tieh-Tseng Li's wide and diverse diplomatic assignments

did not include Tibet. He is not known to be a scholar in the language or history of Tibet and all his original and unpublished sources are in Chinese. The KMT diplomat's thesis that Tibet is an affair of China fully conforms to the policy and practice of the People's Republic and can be taken as typical of Chinese opinion, past or present.

One important consideration for Li's thesis is that in the past Tibet had "two giant neighbours, China and India and (Tibet) absorbed civilization mainly from the former and only in a lesser degree from the latter." (p.211)

III

Language

The dust cover of Li's second edition (Tibet Today and Yesterday) has a Tibetan rendering of the title and the author's name in Tibetan script. A vertical layout is provided for the Tibetan inscription with calligraphic effects unknown to the Tibetans. A few Tibetan scholars, who cannot read English, saw the cover of this book and described the Tibetan inscription as "gzugs yagpo mindug" (Skt. asundara rupa), that is, uncouth appearance. The author however intended the book with this queer inscription for the Western readers. Many Western readers infer from this inscription that the Tibetan writing is vertical and that the Tibetan alphabet is perhaps a pictograph.

Li's book does not contain any reference to the history or character of Tibetan alphabet as the author obviously considers the vertical writing on the dust cover sufficient for his Western readers.(2) On the other hand the author heavily pads the book with Chinese forms of Tibetan names. These Chinese forms have never been current with the Tibetan nor the scholars of Tibetan history would recognize them with ease and would much less use them. This would be like writing Indian history in English with forms like Gandee (for Gandhi) and Menu (for Manu). And Li does this in "his definitive history of Tibet" as the publisher's blurb inside the dust cover claims the book to be.

The facts about Tibetan alphabet are precisely these. The alphabet is phonetic and had never any pictographic associations. The script current from about 640 is derived from some Indic (Brahmi) scripts prevalent in Kashmir and Nepal and is reminiscent of the Gupta epigraphs.⁽³⁾ The set of alphabet is an adaptation from Sanskrit. While the script for correspondence and such quick expression has a natural cursive character, that for books and epigraphs is a most faithful testimony to its Indic origins. The writing is horizontal. A traveller who knows Sanskrit or some Sanskritic script makes his first and foremost discovery in Tibet when he is face to face with OM MANI PADME HUM, which decorates endlessly the rocks and walls, the boulders and stupas or the prayer wheels and altars all over the country. The traveller does not require a knowledge of Karandavyuha to feel that the mystic legend is from India. Only if there is no space for horizontal writing on the rock the inscription is vertical. Otherwise no Tibetan, however illiterate he may be, would ever sign his name or write a letter in a vertical layout; no block-printer would think of changing the horizontal lines into vertical. When a Nepali Buddhist pays homage to the Tibetan script as LHASA SANSKRIT he consciously or unconsciously affirms two historic facts, that the script is derived from Sanskrit and that it eventually preserved the treasures of Sanskrit learning.

While the Tibetologists have not yet come to an agreement about the exact sources of the Tibetan alphabet and of the two scripts: the Umed or written form and the Uchen or book form, the question why Tibet did not borrow alphabet or script from her great neighbour in the east has a direct bearing upon the present enquiry.

As the medium of expression in the Celestial Middle Kingdom, the Chinese ideograph had a sanctity of its own. Inside the Kingdom its mastery was the hallmark of intellectual and bureaucratic power, outside it was a symbol of civilization. A barbarian speaking the Celestial language was a lesser barbarian, and if he read and wrote the script his access to the Court and to power and privilege was ensured. Besides, dissemination of the language and the script beyond the Wall has been through centuries the principal item of imperial statecraft. Thus the Manchu, the Mongol and even the Turki (Uigur) had to learn
Chinese

for varying periods and to varying degrees, and the vertical form was accepted for writing in Manchu and Mongol languages. It is therefore an inexplicable phenomenon for many Sinologists that the Tibetans did not take to the Celestial language as the key to civilization, that they did not borrow the pictograph for their own language and would not even write in vertical lines. (4)

For a specialist of Tibetan civilization the problem is not inexplicable. Both Tibetan and Chinese are Mongoloid languages - the term Mongoloid being used in a wide sense. Yet Tibetan may not be as near Chinese as many Sinologists believe. Tibetan is no doubt a tonal speech like Chinese. But Tibetan is not so predominantly monosyllabic as Chinese. Even if the Chinese ideograph could be introduced when Tibet needed a script, Chinese orthodoxy would have caused shambles of Tibetan words. Such puritanism in Roman transcription of Chinese names continued till the second quarter of this century and reformers like Lin Yutang had to warn against forms like Ra Bin Dra Nath (for Rabindranath). (5)

While linguistics and morphology conceal the secrets of failure of Chinese ideograph in Tibet, Tibetans have their own explanation. Years ago in Drepung (Lhasa) and Tashilhunpo (Shigatse) the writer of this paper had talks with some scholars there. The writer had questioned that when the pictograph was found unsuitable for transcription of Tibetan speech how did they assess the comparative merits of different Indo-Iranian and Mediterranean scripts. The answer was as simple as the Tibetan mind. There was no question of trying different phonetic scripts. The need for a script arose from the task of translating Buddhist texts into Tibetan. It was thus quite natural to import the script from the country from where the Sacred Doctrine and the Sacred Books were imported. The process did not close with the script or its horizontal run from left to right. The Tibetan book though made of paper did not follow the scroll format of China but adopted the palm-leaf format of India. An honorific description for a Tibetan loose-leaf book is Poti (Skt. Punthi/Pustika). (6)

The language of Tibet not only withstood invasion from the east. It also spread upto the steppes of Siberia. Tibetan was not merely a

language for Enlightenment; it became the handy language for trade in Mongolia and even Turkestan. The Magyar savant Alexander Csoma de Coros (1784-1842), observing in 1830s, found Tibetan to be the lingua franca in the highlands of Asia and its prestige corresponding to that of Latin in Europe. (7)

From about 1880 expanding Chinese population and a determined colonialism planted Chinese speech in north-eastern and eastern border-lands of Tibet. In the opening years of this century Chinese language thus got a foot-hold in these border-lands, conveniently called China's Inner Tibet. Even then before 1950 a very small percentage of natives spoke Chinese. If the Baba (offspring of Sino-Tibetan marriages) be excluded the natives speaking Chinese all over Inner Tibet till 1950 would just not be even 5 per cent.

Language is no proof of race. It is however a positive evidence of culture. National consciousness like national identity is more a matter of culture than of race.

IV

Religion

A form of Buddhism described in English as Lamaism, was the national religion of Tibet in 1950. Official beginnings of Buddhism in Tibet are traced back to the middle of the seventh century. Srong-btsan-sgam-po (c. 605-650), the king who admitted Buddhism to the Court, had two consorts: a princess of Nepal and a princess of China. Each was a devout Buddhist and had not only carried images to her husband's country and built shrines in Lhasa for worship of these images but also persuaded the husband to adopt and propagate Buddhism. An inference is often made that Buddhism came to Tibet from China. All facts of history, history of China as much as history of Tibet, are against such inference.

National religion of China through ages has been Confucianism. Confucianism and Buddhism are totally different systems and can hardly accommodate each other. Confrontation of Buddhism and Confucianism was an encounter between denial of soul, equality for all (men as well as women) and immunities for the monks on the one side and ancestor worship,

privileges for literati and refuge in the Son of Heaven on the other side. The encounter was not merely a matter of conflicting metaphysics or ethics, it was a clash between two different patterns of living each with its own schedule of objectives, classes and privileges. The outcome was the eventual survival of Buddhism in China as the religion of a small minority and even as such metamorphosed into what is called Chinese Buddhism.(8)

Misapprehension about the realities of Buddhism in China has been due to three reasons. First, the Western enthusiasts, mostly Buddhists and Theosophists, with their own notions of Buddhism and its spread over a moiety of mankind, roundly claimed China to be a first among the Buddhist countries of the world. (9) Secondly, in the days of British rule Indian scholars lacking on-the-spot knowledge of China joined this chorus of Western Buddhists and wrote panegyrics about the Buddhist conquest of China. (10) Thirdly, after Indian independence (1947) this obsession about Buddhism in China emerged as a factor in India's foreign policy while the diplomacy of the People's Republic of China nursed this psychosis most adroitly. China celebrated 1500th anniversary of the Ajanta frescoes in September 1955 and invited Indian antiquarians and painters to visit Tunhuang, the Chinese copy of Ajanta. In summer 1956 Kalidasa was commemorated in Peking. In the winter China joined India's 2500th Buddha Jayanti celebrations in a most telling manner. (11) The Chinese publications on Buddhist art and archaeology were on par with, if not superior to, Indian production. Naturally Hiuan-tsang, the greatest pilgrim-scholar from China to India, would be an appropriate object of remembrance on the occasion. The Dalai Lama, who it is now understood had forced his participation in the Buddha Jayanti against hindrances from the Central Government of the People's Republic, presented on behalf of China to India the cranium of Hiuan-tsang to be preserved in a Stupa at Nalanda. Such veneration for the relics of an ancestor obviously did not detract from Marxian rectitude. Neither any doctrinaire objection was raised against reconstruction of the Pagoda of the Buddha Tooth which had been damaged by European soldiers in the last century. To enable the foreign Buddhists to venerate the Tooth China would even export it abroad; it was loaned to Burma (1955) and Ceylon (1961).(12)

An event from the Tang Period (618-907), admitted to be Buddhism's most prosperous days with a true Chinese dynasty, may be recalled in this connexion. When in 819 Emperor Hsien-tsung arranged for the adoration of Buddha's relics, an eminent scholar-bureaucrat, Han Yu, objected to the adoration of "the bone of a man long since dead and decomposed." The preamble of Han-yu's memorial had these memorable words:

"For Buddha was a barbarian His language was not the language of China. His clothes were of an alien cut. He did not utter the maxims of our ancient rulers nor conform to the customs which they have handed down. He did not appreciate the bond between prince and minister, the tie between father and son." The Emperor wanted to execute Han-yu but could not do so as the Court was dominated by the Confucian literati.

Except the Tang, the Dynasties which embraced or championed Buddhism were of foreign descent. The Wei (385-550), whose rule witnessed the first great victory of Buddhism in China, were Toba from the north-west (Tokhar). The Yuan (1270-1368), who not only recognized the Sakya Lamas as rulers of Tibet but also made Lamaism the established church of the Empire, were Mongol from the distant north. The Ching (1644-1911), who formed patronpriest relations with the Dalai Lama and built the famous Lama Temple (Yung-ho-kung) in Peking, were Manchu from the north-east. While the Sinic nomenclature of Chinese annals attempt to conceal their origins the un-Confucian predilections of the dynasties betray their foreign affiliations. For while only the real Chinese could be the real Confucianist, all-barbarian or civilized - could tread the High Way (Mahayana) of Buddhism. Besides certain material advantages could be gained by adoption of Buddhism. For a barbarian on the Celestial throne of the Middle Kingdom the Buddhist Sangha was a handy instrument against the overbearing Chinese gentry. Moreover the imperial interests in Inner Asia dictated an identification with the leading religion of Inner Asia. (13) The barbarian conduct of the barbarian dynasty however did not in any way strengthen the life of Buddhism in the Middle Kingdom, and Buddhism as "a dying religion in China" (Bagchi) was an established fact of Chinese civilization even a century before the expulsion of the Manchu.

The above notice of Buddhism in China should make it clear that the Chinese as a people would not engage in Buddhist proselytism among the barbarians on the west. On the other hand Tibetan legends preserve vague memories of the first advent of Buddhism from India nearly four centuries before Srong-btsan-sgam-po. Archaeological evidence from Khotan, Kashgar and Turfan suggests the entry of Buddhims (Mahayana icons and rituals) from the west into Tibet quite before the rise of Srong-btsan-sgam-po. This king's Chinese consort was no doubt a devout Buddhist as was his Nepalese consort. In the trail of this Chinese consort a few Buddhist monks and scholars came from China. Between the Indian Panditas and Chinese Ho-shangs, the Tibetans expressed their preference for the former in no uncertain terms and ceremoniously expelled the Chinese exponents of the Dharma.(14) Buddhism developed in Tibet in answer to the needs and abilities of the children of the soil, and its only foreign inspiration was that from India.

In this connexion a few words may be said on the Dalai Lama-Manchu relations. The political implications of this relationship are treated elsewhere.(15) In spiritual and doctrinal side the relationship meant one way traffic between Priest and Disciple, between Lhasa and Peking. In Peking this matter did not move beyond the Lama Temple and the Palace. If the Manchu Emperor was recognized as a high incarnation (Black Manjusri), the veneration implicit in such honour did not cover the Chinese in any way. Far from that, the Buddhists of Inner Tibet or Inner Mongolia had even prayers to the Black Manjusri for protection against all wicked Chinese and for chastisement and then rehabilitation of the wicked Chinese. One such invocation has been recently transcribed and translated in the pages of the Central Asiatic Journal. (16)

V

Art & Appearance

Religion (Tib. Chos = Skt. Dharma) came to pervade all aspects and all layers of life in Tibet. (17) This is best noticed in Tibetan art.

Every religion has its element of symbolism; Buddhism in Tibet developed symbolism to a fantastic degree. As a consequence the expressions and forms of art became so symbolic that to a foreigner they appear to be absolutely grotesque, meaningless and even repulsive. (18) The reactions of a foreigner would not be the same to the expressions and forms of Chinese art. One need not be a connoisseur to distinguish between Tibetan and Chinese art. The writer is by no means a critic of art and could yet rapidly arrive at the firm conclusion that it is absolutely unfair to the genius and tradition of Chinese art to claim that the Tibetan art is a branch of the same school.

Deeply rooted in esoteric mysticism (Tib. Rgyud = Skt. Tantra) and limited by canonical injunctions, Tibetan art has its own anatomy and geometry and its own world of colours and subjective phenomena. (19) Chinese art has its own sense of depths and dimensions. Yet the Chinese art does not confound an uninitiated foreigner as does the Tibetan art. The greatness of Han aesthetics lies in the fact that it can satisfy the barbarian mind as well. An artist's originality or imagination is not cramped in Chinese tradition. Tibetan tradition on the other hand demands a dedication which Marco Pallis aptly describes as egonegating.

Three years after the 17-point Agreement for Peaceful Liberation of Tibet, a team of Czechoslovak art-critics was invited by the People's Republic of China to go round the antiquities and art-objects in Tibet. The lovely album produced by this team has a learned introduction entitled "The Background and History of Tibetan Art," from the expert pen of Lumir Jisl. (20) The concluding words are quoted here.

"In summing up briefly what has been said about the characteristic features of Tibetan art, let us stress the general principles only. Mention was made of its origins and the influences that were brought to bear during its growth. All these influences can be identified today, as they never merged but continue to exist side by side. We laid stress on the Indian basis. Tibetan art did not grow out of Indian art merely superficially, or by taking over large sections of its iconography. It has to it a mother-daughter relation; the one gave life to the other, they have common features, yet are independent personalities. The Chinese influences were peripheral, without affecting the basis itself.

The Chinese absorbed the Indian influence into their native culture, whereas in Tibet the Indian roots remained much more obvious and therefore in many ways Tibetan works of art differ comparatively little from their Indian patterns. What, then, is the characteristic feature, the basic element which makes such a work of art typically Tibetan? It is, in the first place, that principle of placing borrowed features side by side even in composition. Further, the typical colour scheme, the immense dynamic vitality, demonic appearance, ferocity, savageness and rapacity, The unconditional service and submission to the religious cult, the piety, mysticism and magic. And the great contrasts, in which two contradictions are clasped together and forced to live side by side in constant tension."

"The submission to the religious cult, piety, mysticism, and magic" is apparent in art as in other aspects of Tibetan life. Yet as in art what is apparent is not necessarily the real. Too often a foreigner may identify, as admitted by Gelders, "the outward forms of Lamaism with the spiritual convictions of Buddhism."(21)

In a village of Medu-gonkar (east of Lhasa) the writer of this paper had noticed an illiterate woman of eighty turning incessantly the prayer-wheel in her hand. The writer had asked her what was the inscription inside and what was the meaning of the inscription. This is what the rustic woman confided:

"I cannot tell you what Mantra is inscribed on the roll inside. I cannot read the Mantra as I do not even know the alphabet. I simply utter Om Mani Padme Hum. I do not know the full meaning of Om Mani Padme Hum. In this life I am born with very low abilities and I thus concentrate on this Mantra to earn merits for higher abilities in the next life. In the next life I may be able to read and apprehend this Mantra better. In the life after next, I hope to do even better and study Transcendental Wisdom (Tib. Ses-phyin = Skt. Prajnaparamita). In the last life before Liberation I shall do away with these books and prayer wheels and even the deities and Mantras - I shall drop all lower disciplines - and then realize the Absolute (Tib. Dondam = Skt. Paramartha). My son the way is long. My abilities in the present life

are small but I must do the best with these abilities. I know this Mani in my hand is not the last stage into void (Tib. Stong-nyid = Skt. Sunyata.)"

VI

Literature & History

Indic stimulus contained Sinic influence in Tibet in the matter of literature also. Indian legends and legend patterns made a smooth passage into the Trans-Himalayas along with Avadana and Jataka. Asoka became a sort of national hero for Tibet. Imagery and idiom of Sanskrit became a part and parcel of Tibetan (and later Mongolian) literature. The Indian science of dialectics, including probes into consciousness and matter, flourished in refuge in Sakya, Drepung and Urga (Ulan Bator). (22) As Laufer remarked, the waters of the Ganges made fertile the arid steppes of Inner Asia. In Tibetan cosmography India and Tibet (and vaguely Mongolia) formed one zone called jambu-gling (Skt. Jambudvipa.) Therefore whether his special interest be canonical or non-canonical, a scholar of Tibetan literature has to look for background more in India than in China.

Containing of Sinic influence is felt most by a scholar whose interest is secular history. In the beginning Tibetan chroniclers were inspired by the Chinese tradition of Shih-chi (the Records of the Scribe = the Records of the Historian). This meant a meticulous regard for events and their dates. The Indian tradition with its indifference to mundane happenings and their chronological sequence was the antithesis of the Chinese tradition. (23) Under the Indian impact the Yig-tshang (Tib. for archives or records) changed its character and Tibetan scholarship founded its own school of historiography. (24) Though the habit of chronological sequence and firm dating lingered all emphasis was now on the history of religion, its origins in India and its spread in the Trans-Himalayas. The Dharma was eternal and everything else was transitory. Therefore nothing but the story of the Dharma deserved recording. The ideal history was no longer the Records (Yig-tshang) or the Dynastic Annals (Rgyal rabs) but the Growth of the Religion (Chos-byung). The scholars of Tibet, from Bu-ston onwards, drew

inspiration not from China, nor from India but from their own Social Milieu - to adopt a label from Arnold Toynbee.(25)

As Sinologist Balazs says, Chinese history was written by bureaucrats for bureaucrats. It will be true to say that Tibetan history was written by believers (Tib. Nangpa) for believers, by Lamas for Lamas.

VII

Conclusion

What is said above clearly suggests that Tibet (till 1950) did not belong to the history of China. Tibet's traditions mark the frontiers of Chinese history. The events of political history do not enter Tibet into the history of China except for about a century between 1750 and 1850.(26)

Chinese scholars hold that Tibetan society and polity came under the impact of Chinese traditions. Tibetans do not accept this and point out that Chinese influence was confined to certain items of protocol, precedence and documentation, official dress, cuisine or domestic decorations and that Chinese influence did not deeply penetrate into their way of life. Space forbids a detailed discussion here. It has however to be noted that the ecological basis of one was quite different from that of the other. In China we have an agricultural community crowding around the hydraulic assets; in Tibet we have a sparse community moving with the livestock. China evolved a polity in which the Confucian literati were the dominant class; Tibet evolved a polity in which the Buddhist priests were the dominant class. China was anxious to keep her doors closed to foreign trade; Tibet depended considerably on foreign trade.(27)

Tibet Region of China has no sanction in the past history. It has no doubt sanction today. As a pidgin coinage it has come to circulate. Even then Sinologist Alastair Lamb, who views Tibetan, Russian, British and Indian as culpable barbarians vis-a-vis Chinese, prefixes Tibet Region with "so-called" or marks it with inverted commas.(28)

This paper is confined to the facts of history till 1950 and does not prognosticate the future. It takes stock of the past and concludes that traditional Tibet was not a part of traditional China.

NOTES

- (1) Stuart and Roma Gelder: The Timely Rain (London 1964), p. 29.
- (2) No mention is made by Li of Thonmi Sambhota, the reputed inventor of Tibetan script (c.640). Thonmi Sambhota naturally occupies the place of a national hero and was apotheosized as an incarnation of Manjusri (Tib. Hjam-dbyang), the Buddha of Wisdom.
- (3) Inner Asian evidence of different styles of Indic script is collected and analysed in Thomas: "Brahmi script in Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts" in Asiatica Festschrift Friedrich Weller (Leipzig 1954). The 7th cent. Buddhist texts of Kashmir generally followed the Upright Gupta style. Vide Nalinaksha Dutt: The Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol I, (Srinagar 1939) p. 42
- (4) As for example Carrington Goodrich: "For some unexplained reason the Tibetans, who under the direction of Indian pundits in the seventh century of our era, used Sanskrit as the basis of their script, never adopted this arrangement despite their long and close association with the Chinese and their heavy borrowings from the latter's culture." A Short History of the Chinese People (London 1962), pp 13-14 fn.
- (5) My Country and My People, Appendix II.
- (6) It is well known that one bundle of Tibetan loose leaves may contain more than one book, sometimes twenty to thirty tracts. The whole bundle has one single pagination running from one book to another without any space between the end of one book and the beginning of another. Tibetans would ascribe this practice to Indic origins. It has been found that the Buddhist manuscripts in Kashmir had this feature of running pagination. Vide Nalinaksha Dutt: Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol I, Preface, p. iv.
- (7) Grammar of the Tibetan Language in English (Calcutta 1834) and Tibetan-English Dictionary (Calcutta 1834).
- (8) Varying fortunes of Buddhism in the political history of China are treated by the writer in an article entitled "Man-chu-shih-li: An Essay on Polity and Religion in Inner Asia" in Man in India, July-Sept. 1966.
- (9) Even an intellectual like H.G. Wells accepted this notion while speaking about effects of Asoka's propagation in his The Outline of History.
- (10) Sinologist Bagchi (d. 1956), whom the writer had the privilege to know intimately, was however lukewarm about this Buddhist conquest of China.
- (11) These anniversary dates ignored the unsettled chronology and answered the convenience of diplomacy.

- (12) For an account of China's cultivation of Buddhists abroad see Herbert Passin: China's Cultural Diplomacy, (New York 1963/Bombay 1965).
- (13) See the writer's article "Man-chu-shih-li" in Man in India, July-Sept 1966.
- (14) Till 1950 Expulsion of Ho-shang was an important mystery play in Kumbum and other big monasteries.
- (15) See the writer's article "Man-chu-shih-li."
- (16) The issue for July 1965. Bischoff: "Une Incantation Lamaïque Anti-chinoise."
- (17) See the writer's article "The Missing Context of Chose" in Bulletin of Tibetology, Vol II, No. 3.
- (18) For an understanding of the repulsive forms and rituals one may see Marco Pallis: Peaks and Lamas (New York 1949), Evans-Wentz: The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation (OUP 1954) and Lama Anagarika Govinda: Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism (London 1959).
- (19) For a brief authoritative exposition see Marco Pallis: Introduction to Tibetan Art in The Tibetan Tradition (London: Tibet Society 1965).
- (20) Vladimir Sis & Jan Vanis: Tibetan Art, Eng. Tr. Gottheiner (London: Spring Books).
- (21) Gelder: op. cit. pp 140-41.
- (22) Vide Stcherbatsky: The Buddhist Logic (Leningrad 1930-32), for an account from a great Soviet scholar.
- (23) It is not implied that Indian historical compositions - Itihasa, Purana, etc - have no use for a modern enquirer. U.N. Ghoshal: Studies in Indian History and Culture (Calcutta 1957/1965) may be seen in this connexion.
- (24) The writer has under compilation a paper on Tibetan historiography; mainly based on the pioneer works of S.C. Das (1849-1917), A.H. Vostrikov (1904-37) and Professor Giuseppe Tucci, the conclusions are the writer's own. The paper is to be published in Bulletin of Tibetology in summer 1967.
- (25) A Study of History, Vol X, Sec. XIII. The Inspirations of Historians.
- (26) See the writer's articles, "Historical Status of Tibet" in Bulletin of Tibetology, Vol I, No. 1, "Tibet's Status during the World War" in Bulletin of Tibetology, Vol II, No 2 and "Asian Law and Usage in European Expression" in Man in India, Jan-Mar 1966.

- (27) "Forbidden Country" is a misnomer which blurs Tibet's trade relations. George Bogle in 1774 was amazed to find a system of free trade in Tibet. Vide Markham: Narratives of the Mission of George Bogle to Tibet, etc. (London 1876). Macartney on the other hand even after he paid "tribute" to the Manchu Emperor (1793) was dismissed with these words "I set no value on objects strange or ingenious, and have no use for your country's manufactures."
- (28) See his latest work The Momahon Line (London 1966).