BUDDHISM among Iranian peoples.

i. *In pre-Islamic times.*

ii. *In Islamic times.*

iii. *Buddhist literature in Khotanese and Tumshuqese.*

(*Buddhist Literature in Sogdian and Bactrian*; *Buddhist influence on Manicheism*; *Early Iranian influence on Buddhism*; *Buddhist influence on Sufism.* See Supplement.)

i. In Pre-Islamic Times

Origin and early spread of Buddhism. Buddhism arose in northeast India in the sixth century B.C. as the result of the teaching of the historical Buddha Śākyamuni, who died about 483 B.C. During the years after his death his followers were active in establishing the canonical scriptures and the religious rules for daily life among Buddhist communities. Unanimity was never attained, and the Buddhist community divided into increasingly more numerous sects. That Buddhism did not remain a minor sect despite these internal dissensions may be due largely to the patronage extended to the religion by the famous Indian emperor Aśoka (q.v.), who acceded to the throne in about 268 B.C. After his conquest of Kalinga (Orissa) in about 260 B.C., he was so affected by the massacre that occurred that he resolved thereafter to refrain from violence, and he took the vows of a lay Buddhist.

Much is known of Aśoka's reign from his own inscriptions, which have been found in widely distant parts of his kingdom (see AŚOKA ii). Most famous are the so-called Rock Edicts and Pillar Edicts. The inscriptions are of varied content, but consistently promulgate the ethical standards of Buddhist teaching that he wished to inculcate. They are mostly inscribed in the local Prākrits using Brāhmī (q.v.) script, although in the northwest the Kharoṣṭhī script, derived from Aramaic writing, was used for two of his edicts. The Aramaic language itself was used for several inscriptions from the northwest (see ARAMAIC i-ii). One of these, discovered only in 1958, was the remarkable bilingual inscription from Qandahār in Afghanistan. Its two languages are Greek and Aramaic. The use of Aramaic and of the Kharoṣṭhī script indicates Iranian influence, and even the two rock edicts written in Prākrit in Kharoṣṭhī script at Ṣāhbāzgaṛhī and Mānsehrā contain Iranian loanwords. It is in this border region including Iranian territory under Greek control and Indian territory, where Indians, Greeks, and Iranians lived side by side, that we see the first indications that Buddhism was to be adopted by non-Indian peoples.

In 1963 a long inscription entirely in Greek was found in Qandahār. It was subsequently identified as a translation of parts of two of Aśoka's edicts and thus bears testimony to the missionary activity supported by Aśoka. Further visible testimony is provided by the remains of his considerable building activity. By popular legend he was credited with the erection of 84,000 *stūpa*s. The *stūpa*s of the time of Aśoka and his immediate successors were markedly distinct in style from those built later under the Kushans. This difference had already been noticed by the famous 7th-century Chinese pilgrim Hsüan-tsang, who observed a large number of *stūpa*s in the Aśokan style in the northwest, e.g., three at Takṣaśilā (Taxila), two in Uḍḍiyāna, five in Gandhāra, three near Nagarahāra (Jalālābād), dozens in Jāguḍa (near Qandahār), and even one at Kāpiśī (Begram).

Introduction of Buddhism into Bactria. Exactly when Buddhism became established in Bactria is still much disputed. Some scholars argue in favor of the first century B.C., or even earlier, while others maintain that its spread was due to the Kushans (Staviskij, pp. 201ff.). Kushan influence certainly extended well into China in the first centuries A.D. This is clearly shown by, among other things, the use of the northwest Prākrit written in the Kharoṣṭhī script as the language of administration in the kingdom of Shan-shan, a short distance east of Khotan. These documents have been dated to between A.D. 200 and A.D. 320 (see Brough, esp. pp. 594-604). A Kharoṣṭhī well inscription dating probably from the second half of the second century A.D. was found at Loyang in China (Brough). Even in the early years of the third century there were at least two monasteries in Loyang, and many foreign translators were active in Loyang in the second half of the second century (Zürcher, 1959, pp. 30ff.). By about A.D. 400 Fahsien estimated that there were more than 4,000 monks in Shan-shan (Beal, I, p. xxiv).

Introduction of Buddhism into Chinese Turkestan. It is similarly uncertain at what date Buddhism penetrated into Chinese Turkestan. Late traditions associated the foundation of Khotan with the son and minister of Aśoka (see AŚOKA iv). According to these accounts the foundation of Khotan was effected by a compromise between exiled groups of Indians on the one hand and of Chinese on the other. These accounts have been dismissed by many scholars as merely eponymous legends. However, several considerations seem to lend them credence. Certainly in the first century B.C., when our first records of the history of Khotan begin, in the Early Han Annals, Khotan was clearly divided in two halves, no doubt the Indian and Chinese colonies respectively. Moreover, from Yotqan, the ancient site of Khotan, we have a collection of coins from the first centuries A.D. bearing Chinese legends on the obverse and Indian Prākrit ones in Kharoṣṭhī script on the reverse (Stein, pp. 204-05, 575-76; Hoernle, pp. 1-16; Thomas; Cribb). If it had been the aim of the authors of these accounts to assign as early a date as possible for the arrival of Buddhism in Khotan, they would have attributed its introduction to the Aśokan period, but the tradition handed down in Tibetan explicitly states that Buddhism was introduced 165 years after the origin of Khotan, that is about 84 B.C. (Emmerick, 1967, p. 23). It is generally considered that even that date is rather early for Buddhism to have been established in Khotan (Daffinà, pp. 187-91), but it is not entirely impossible (Zürcher, 1959, p. 23).

Buddhism under the Kushans. The Kushans, a people of uncertain ethnic extraction but speaking the Iranian Bactrian language (q.v.), controlled the famous caravan route that proceeded from Taxila via Bāmīān to Balḵ (qq.v.) and thence to Termez on the Afghan border. It was no doubt by this route that Buddhism reached central Asia and Chinese Turkestan and maintained contact with India. All along the route and to the east of it there have been found archeological remains of Kushan Buddhist occupation. To the Kushan period dates the most famous example of Buddhist rock-hewn architecture among Iranians, the colossal rock-hewn Buddhas, 35 and 53 m tall, at Bāmīān (q.v.) in Afghanistan. They greatly impressed Hsüan-tsang in the seventh century (Beal, I, pp. 49-53) but seem to have been first mentioned in the west by Thomas Hyde in A.D. 1700 (Hyde, p. 132).

Buddhist *stūpa*s at Kushan sites include those at Wardak, thirty miles west of Kabul, those around Kāpiśī (Begram), the Haḍḍa and Bīmarān *stūpa*s in the Jalālābād district, ancient Nagarahāra, and the Tepe Rostam outside Balḵ. On the Soviet side of the Afghan border are the sites of Termez (Dharmamitra) and nearby Airtam, where Russian expeditions have found Buddhist remains of the Kushan period. The most interesting are the Airtam frieze and the cave monastery at Qara Tepe. The huge Buddhist monastery at Qara Tepe in the northwest corner of Termez is thought to have been founded at about the beginning of the second century A.D. (Frumkin, p. 111; Litvinsky, p. 21).

Sorḵ Kotal. East of the main caravan route is the renowned site of Sorḵ Kotal (Surkh Kotal), the ancient Baḡlān (q.v.) mentioned by Hsüan-tsang (Beal, I, p. 43). It was here that the first major Kushan inscription was found written in the Northeast Iranian language that is nowadays called Bactrian (q.v.). The inscription concerns the restoration of the sanctuary founded there by Kanishka, the famous Kushan ruler, under whose patronage Buddhism flourished. The site seems to have no Buddhist connections, but like Buddhist sites elsewhere it seems to have suffered from the attacks of the Sasanians in the 3rd century. It may have been the site of a dynastic cult or of an unusual Buddhist sect.

Nowbahār. It has been suggested that the term "Nowbahār," a Persian form of Sanskrit *nava-vihāra* "new temple," may designate the sites of a specifically Iranian Buddhist sect (Bulliet; see also ii, below). The most famous Nowbahār was at Balḵ, but the name is attested as far north as Bukhara and Samarkand and as far west as beyond Hamadān. As long as it is not known exactly what significance the term had, it would be inadvisable to conclude from its attestation alone that the sites associated with it were important centers of Buddhism.

Buddhism in Chorasmia and Sogdiana. Kushan influence is known to have spread northward into Chorasmia and Sogdiana, but it seems doubtful whether these regions were ever under Kushan rule, and there is not much evidence of Buddhism in these regions in the Kushan period. The fact that some of the early translators of Buddhist scriptures into Chinese were of Sogdian origin, such as K'ang (= Samarkand) Meng Hsiang, who worked at Lo-yang from A.D. 194-99 (Zürcher, 1959, p. 23), can hardly be regarded as evidence for the early establishment of Buddhism in Sogdiana. Nor has archeology brought to light any early Buddhist monuments north of the Oxus region (Termez, Airtam, etc.). The sites excavated at Varakhsha (near Bukhara), Afrāsīāb (q.v.), and Panjikent (near Samarkand) are conspicuously non-Buddhist, while the Buddhist sites further east at Ajina Tepe (q.v.) near Kurgan-Tyube, at Kuva in Farḡāna, and at Ak-Beshim near Frunze all belong to the 7th or 8th centuries. Even at this date Buddhism cannot have been of much importance around the capital, as the sites near Bukhara and Samarkand show clearly enough. Hsüan-tsang in the 7th century found little Buddhist following in Samarkand (Beal, 1911, p. 45; Litvinsky, p. 42), and despite his claim to conversions there, when the Korean pilgrim Huei-ch'ao visited Samarkand early in the 8th century, he found only a solitary Buddhist monastery with a solitary monk (Fuchs, p. 452). Everywhere Zoroastrianism was practiced. Moreover, there is hardly a trace of Buddhism in the 8th-century Sogdian documents from Mt. Mugh.

Buddhism in western Iran. As for the westward extension of Buddhism it is still not clear how far to the west Buddhism penetrated. On the basis of archeology it had been inferred that it never flourished west of the line joining Balḵ to Qandahār, the so-called "Foucher line," named after the famous French archeologist (Foucher, I, pp. 155-57; II, pp. 281-82). After Zoroastrianism had become the official religion of the Sasanians in A.D. 224, other religions, including *šamans* and *brahmans* (i.e., Buddhists and Hindus) were not tolerated, as we know from the inscriptions of the priest Kartīr (Back, p. 415). Consequently it is only to be expected that the main expansion of Buddhism should have been eastward rather than westward. Nevertheless, the Russian discovery of a Buddhist *stūpa* at Gyaur Kala near Bagram-'Alī more than 400 km west of Balḵ in the Marv oasis was thought to have disproved the Foucher hypothesis (Koshelenko). However, even if there were isolated instances of Buddhist communities farther west, the main thesis that Buddhism flourished predominantly in the east seems unassailable. Even in the case of Gyaur Kala, it appears that the building of the *stūpa* was interrupted in the 3rd century and that it was destroyed in the 5th (Litvinsky, p. 29).

The Iranian contribution to Buddhism. It is no longer possible to determine what the specifically Iranian contributions to Buddhism may have been. That Buddhism should have passed through Iranian territory to Chinese Turkestan without being affected by Iranian influence seems highly improbable. In particular, the spread of Buddhism under the Kushans coincides with dramatic developments in Buddhist doctrine, art, and literature, developments that are characteristic of northern Buddhism exclusively, and in which Bactrians, Sakas, and Parthians must certainly have participated.

Among these developments are the rise of the

Mahāyāna school of Buddhism and the style of Buddhist art known as "Gandharan." These developments were no doubt closely connected with each other and may have arisen as a result of the contact between Greek, Iranian, and Indian influences in the northwest. In Mahāyāna Buddhism the historical Buddha Śākyamuni is regarded as only one of many Buddhas and hence less as an almost unattainable ideal. Characteristic of Gandharan art is the representation of the Buddha in human form. The increasing prominence of the layman in Mahāyāna is reflected in the common portrayal of laymen in art. Probably not without significance is the fact that one of the most commonly depicted episodes in the Kushan period is the giving of food to the Buddha by the two merchant brothers Trapusa and Bhallika. They were depicted in Indo-Scythian dress and bearded in a 2nd-century relief at Shotorak (Meunié, pp. 45-46; Rosenfield, pp. 220-22). Bhallika was early associated with Balḵ.

The cult of the Bodhisattva is also reflected in Gandharan art. The ideal of the Bodhisattva in the Mahāyāna supplanted the ideal of the Arhat. The most famous of the Bodhisattvas commonly represented in the Kushan period is the future Buddha Maitreya. His rise to prominence has often been associated with the contemporary belief in the Messiah among the Jews and the soteriology of the Zoroastrian future savior Saošyant (q.v.; Rosenfield, pp. 227ff.). In the Mahāyānist conception of the Bodhisattvas Amitābha and Avalokiteśvara, who subsequently became enormously popular in the east, the influence of the Iranian Zurvān and Miθra has been detected (de Mallmann, pp. 85-95). Such matters necessarily remain highly speculative, and it is not possible to do more than point out some of the spheres where Iranian influence is likely to have played a part.

Iranians played an important part in the transmission of Buddhism to the east. Among the early translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese were Parthians, Sogdians, and Khotanese. (The earliest known of these translators was An Shih-kao, a Parthian; q.v.). But although these Iranians no doubt had contact with the west and were acquainted with Iranian cultural traditions, it was in Chinese Turkestan that they were active, and it is likely that much of the influence of Iranians on Buddhist thought and culture was actually exerted in Chinese Turkestan. There are grounds for thinking that there was a mutual exchange of ideas between Iranian Buddhists in eastern Iran and those further to the north and east.

Buddhism and Manicheism. The founder of the Manichean religion, Mānī (A.D. 215-74), spent a year in the northwest of India, where he would have had contact with Buddhism (cf. Sundermann, pp. 87-90). But the introduction of Indian Buddhist terms into some of the Manichean Parthian texts makes it likely that they were composed in one of the centers where Manicheism and Buddhism flourished side by side (Sims-Williams). Such a center, indeed the most notable center, was Balḵ from the 3rd to the 8th century. The Sogdian Manichean texts on the other hand all come from the Turfan region in Chinese Turkestan, whither the Manicheans had fled from the Arabs. In this region also Manicheism coexisted with Zoroastrianism, Christianity, and Buddhism (cf. Lieu, esp. chaps. VII-VIII).

Buddhism in Chinese Turkestan. At the beginning of the Christian era the main towns along the northern route across Chinese Turkestan, Kučā, Qarāšahr (earlier Yen-ch'i), and the towns of the Turfan region, were mainly occupied by people who spoke the so-called Tocharian language. But Chinese influence in the Turfan region goes back to the first century B.C., when they founded Kao-ch'ang (Qočō), which was the chief city of the Turfan region during most of its history (Pelliot, 1959, pp. 162ff.). Buddhism came early to all these regions, and Kucheans were among the early translators of Buddhist texts into Chinese (Zürcher, 1959, pp. 68-69, 103, 226). Sogdians of Buddhist, Manichean, and Christian beliefs lived in Qočō from about the 5th to the 9th century.

The Buddhist texts written in the Sogdian language come from the Turfan and Tunhuang regions of Chinese Turkestan. They are almost all Mahāyānist texts translated from Chinese and are on the whole rather inaccurate translations made by Sogdians who used Chinese as the language of trade. The Sogdians evidently acquired Buddhism from the Chinese.

According to the testimony of Huei-ch'ao, in Kučā the local population followed the Hīnayāna school of Buddhism, as is borne out by the texts surviving in the Kuchean (Tocharian) language, while the Chinese community practiced the Mahāyāna (Fuchs, p. 456). We have a solitary case of a fragment of a translation of an unidentified Buddhist text from Kuchean into Sogdian (Henning, pp. 59-62). The Kuchean translations of the same period were made from Indian originals.

It was among another Iranian people, the Sakas, that Buddhism found its most enthusiastic reception. They formed the ruling class in Khotan, the chief kingdom of southern Chinese Turkestan during much of its history. There was a Buddhist community in Khotan by the 2nd century according to Chinese sources, and as early as the middle of the 3rd century we hear of a Chinese Buddhist pilgrim going to Khotan (Beal, I, p. x). It was a major center of Buddhist studies when Fa-hsien visited it about A.D. 400 on his way to India, and it had expanded still further when Hsüan-tsang spent some months there in the 7th century on his way back from India to China. Both pilgrims noted the very large number of monasteries in Khotan (Beal, I, pp. xxv-xxvii, II, p. 309). So too did the Korean Huei-ch'ao in the 8th century (Fuchs, p. 456). That Buddhism flourished there in the 9th and 10th centuries we know from Khotanese sources.

The influence of Khotan was certainly considerable. A Tibetan text records how the king of Khotan converted the king of Kashgar to Buddhism (Emmerick, 1967, pp. 45ff.), but the Hīnayāna was mainly followed there, which suggests that its subsequent links

were rather with the cities of the north. Such was the case also with Tumshuq, whose Buddhist monastery is thought to date from the 4th or 5th century A.D. (Hambis, 1964, p. 43; Pelliot, 1923, p. 59). We know nothing of its history, but the style of its artistic remains shows strong links with Qızıl in the Kučā region. That it was inhabited by Saka monks is shown by the find of a manuscript containing the ceremonial formulae for the dedication of laywomen (Emmerick, 1985), written in Tumshuqese, an Iranian language closely related to Khotanese.

It is not possible to assess the part played by Khotan in the development of the Mahāyāna, but its role is likely to have been of considerable importance. The Khotanese did not confine themselves to translating Indian Buddhist texts into their native tongue, although an impressive array of Mahāyānist texts in Khotanese translation survives in part or in full, but there were also original works composed in the Khotanese language itself (cf. Emmerick, 1979). Of these the best known and the most popular was the book that the official Zambasta ordered to be written (see BOOK OF ZAMBASTA), a compendium of Buddhism in verse form. In the second half of the 10th century original Tantric texts were being composed in Khotanese. It is likely that earlier original works would usually have been written in Sanskrit, which was regarded in Khotan as the sacred language of Buddhism. (See also iii, below.)

The demise of Buddhism among Iranian peoples. Buddhism was fluorishing more in Khotan than in India by the 10th century, from which period most of the surviving Khotanese literature comes. But it is not likely to have persisted long after the Muslim invasion at the beginning of the 11th century, when the capital at Yotqan, near the modern city of Ho-tien, was abandoned (Barthold, *Turkestan*^{2}, p. 281; Grenard, pp. 5-79; Samolin, pp. 80-82). According to Marco Polo, who visited Khotan in the 13th century, all the inhabitants were Muslims (Yule, I, p. 188).

Buddhism seems to have survived longest in Qočō, an early haven of Buddhism, where it continued long after it had disappeared from most of Chinese and western Turkestan. Even in A.D. 1420 there were reportedly Buddhists and great temples in Qočō (Pelliot, 1959, p. 164).

In the west Buddhism suffered a serious setback at the hands of the Sasanians during the 3rd century, but although the Buddhists were persecuted and many of their sanctuaries were fired, they survived to a much later period. At such places as Bāmīān they were still active as late as the 8th or 9th centuries (cf. Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, p. 292; Melikian-Chirvani, pp. 21ff.). Nevertheless, although Buddhism persisted for some time after the rise of Islam and the Arab invasions from the 7th century onward, when the rulers of Bāmīān gave their allegiance to Islam in the latter part of the eighth century, the end of Buddhism in this area was in sight.

Bibliography: M. Back, *Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften*, Acta Iranica 18, Tehran and Liège, 1978. S. Beal, *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*, 2 vols. in one, London, n.d. Idem, tr., *The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang by the Shaman Hwi Li*, London, 1911, repr. New Delhi, 1973. A. Belenitsky, *Central Asia*, tr. J. Hogarth, London, 1969. J. Brough, "A Kharoṣṭhī Inscription from China," *BSOAS* 24, 1961, pp. 517-30. Idem, "Comments on Third-Century Shan-Shan and the History of Buddhism," *BSOAS* 28, 1965, pp. 582-612. R. W. Bulliet, "Naw Bahār and the Survival of Iranian Buddhism," *Iran* 14, 1976, pp. 140-45. M. Bussagli, "Afghanistan," in *Encyclopaedia of World Art* I, New York, 1959, cols. 32-47. J. Cribb, "The Sino-Kharoṣṭhī Coins of Khotan," pt. 1, *NC* 144, 1984, pp. 125-52; pt. 2, *NC* 145, 1985, pp. 136-49. P. Daffinà, "Sulla più antica diffusione del buddismo nella Serindia e nell'Iran orientale," in *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg* I, Acta Iranica 4, Liège and Tehran, 1975, pp. 179-92. R. E. Emmerick, *Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan*, London, 1967. Idem, *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan*, Tokyo, 1979. Idem, *The Tumshuqese Karmavācana Text*, Mainz, 1985. A. Foucher, *La vieille route de l'Inde de Bactres à Taxila*, 2 vols., Paris, 1942, 1947. G. Frumkin, *Archaeology in Soviet Central Asia*, Leiden and Cologne, 1970. W. Fuchs, "Hueich'aos Pilgerreise durch Nordwest-Indien und Zentral-Asien um 726," *SPAW*, phil.-hist. Kl., Berlin, 1938, pp. 426-69. A. von Gabain, "Der Buddhismus in Zentralasien," in *HO* I/VIII, 2, Leiden, 1961, pp. 496-514. S. Gaulier, R. Jera-Bezard, and M. Maillard, *Buddhism in Afghanistan and Central Asia*, 2 pts., Leiden, 1976. F. Grenard, "La légende de Satok Boghra Khân et l'histoire," *JA* 15, 1900, pp. 5-79. L. Hambis, "Asia: Central," in *Encyclopaedia of World Art* I, cols. 815-38. Idem, *Toumchouq* II, Paris, 1964. G. Hambly, ed., *Zentralasien*, Fischer Weltgeschichte 16, Frankfurt am Main, 1966. H. W. Haussig, *Die Geschichte Zentralasiens und der Seidenstrasse in vorislamischer Zeit*, Darmstadt, 1983 (esp. pt. II). W. B. Henning, *Sogdica*, London, 1940. A. F. R. Hoernle, *Report on the British Collection of Antiquities from Central Asia* I, JASB 68, Suppl. 1, 1899. T. Hyde, *Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum, Eorumque Magorum*, Oxford, 1700. G. Koshelenko, "The Beginning of Buddhism in Margiana," *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 14, 1966, pp. 175-83. E. Lamotte, "Sur la formation du Mahāyāna," in *Asiatica. Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 377-96. Idem, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère Saka*, Louvain, 1958. S. N. C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China. A Historical Study*, Manchester, 1985. B. A. Litvinsky, *Outline of Buddhism in Central Asia*, Moscow, 1968. B. A. Litvinskiĭ and T. I. Tseĭmal', *Adzhina Tepa*, Moscow, 1971. G. P. Malalasekera, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Ceylon, 1961-. M.-T. de Mallmann, *Introduction à l'étude d'Avalokiteçvara*, Paris, 1967. A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, "L'évocation littéraire du bouddhisme dans l'Iran musulman," *Le monde iranien et l'Islam* 2, 1974, pp. 1-72 (reviewed by G. Fussmann, *JA*, 264,

1976, pp. 197-200). G. Meunié, *Shotorak*, MDAFA 10, Paris, 1942. P. Pelliot, review of A. von Le Coq, *Die buddhistische Spätantike in Mittel Asien*, pt. 1, Berlin, 1922, in *T'oung pao* 22, 1923, pp. 57-59. Idem, *Notes on Marco Polo*, Paris, 1959. J. M. Rosenfield, *The Dynastic Arts of the Kushans*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967. W. Samolin, *East Turkestan to the Twelfth Century*, The Hague, 1964, pp. 80-82. N. Sims-Williams, "Indian Elements in Parthian and Sogdian," in *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*, ed. K. Röhrborn and W. Veenker, Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 132-41. B. Ja. Staviskij, *La Bactriane sous les Kushans. Problèmes d'histoire et de culture*, rev., ed., and tr. by P. Bernard et al., Paris, 1986. B. Y. Stavisky and G. M. Bongard-Levin, eds., *Central Asia in the Kushan Period*, 2 vols., Moscow, 1968. M. A. Stein, *Ancient Khotan*, Oxford, 1907. *Shinsho Hanayama Bibliography on Buddhism*, Tokyo, 1961. W. Sundermann, "Zur frühen missionarischen Wirksamkeit Manis," *Acta Orientalia Hungarica* 24, 1971, pp. 79-125. F. W. Thomas, "Sino-Kharoṣṭhī Coins," *NC* 4, 1944, pp. 83-98. H. Yule, *The Book of Ser Marco Polo, the Venetian, Concerning the Kingdoms and Marvels of the East*, tr. and ed., with notes, 2 vols., London, 1903. E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, Leiden, 1959; repr. 1972. Idem, *Buddhism. Its Origin and Spread in Words, Maps and Pictures*, London, 1962.

(RONALD E. EMMERICK)

ii. IN ISLAMIC TIMES

The Muslim conquerors of eastern Iran, Afghanistan, and Transoxania in the mid-8th century found Buddhism flourishing in a series of prosperous trading communities along the old caravan routes to India and China. Descriptions of rich monastery complexes have been preserved in the reports of Hsüan Tsang, a Chinese Buddhist pilgrim who traveled west between 629 and 645 (Beal, pp. xviii-xix), passing through Qočo (Kučā), Termeḏ, Balḵ, Bāmīān, Kāpiśī, and number of Gandharan sites on his way to India (ibid., pp. 19-24, 38-39, 43-48, 49-68). Modern excavations have confirmed the existence and wealth of Buddhist communities along the Great Silk Route. Aside from the painted cave complexes in the Tarim basin and Turkestan, Bāmīān (q.v.), Šotorak, Fondūqestān, and Haḍḍa are among the sites that have yielded the most extensive Buddhist remains (see, e.g., Godard et al.; Hackin, 1933, 1940; Meunié; Barthoux). By the 5th/11th century, however, Buddhism had so thoroughly disappeared from eastern Iran and Afghanistan that Bīrūnī, usually a reliable reporter on religious minorities, was able to pass on only the most confused and fragmentary information: "Before the establishment of their rites and the appearance of Būḏāsaf people were *šamanīs*, inhabiting the eastern part of the world and worshiping idols. What remains of them now is to be found in India, Ṣīn [China], and Toḡozḡoz [eastern Turkestan]. In Khorasan people call them *šamanān*, and their monuments, the *bahārs* [from Sanskrit *vihāra*; see below] of their idols, and their *farḵārs* [from Sogdian *βrγ'r*, an adaptation of *vihāra*, which it also renders in translations of Buddhist texts; Gauthiot, pp. 52-59; Gershevitch, p. 54, par. 362 with refs.; MacKenzie, pt. II, p. 208] can be seen in the border areas between Khorasan and India" (*Āṯār*, p. 206; cf. Bīrūnī, *Āṯār*, tr. Sachau, pp. 188-89). Ḵᵛārazmī (4th/10th cent.; *Mafātīḥ al-ʿolūm*, ed. G. van Vloten, Leiden, n.d. [1895], p. 123) mentions that *buhār* designates idol houses in India, and *farxār* idol houses in China and Sogdia.

Descriptions of Buddhist monuments and rites in eastern Iran and Afghanistan are recorded, though not explicitly identified as Buddhist, in early Islamic historical sources. The most famous such monument was the shrine at Balḵ known as Nowbahār (from Sanskrit *nava-vihāra* "new shrine," a derivation that has long been recognized). In the 4th/10th century detailed descriptions were provided by Ebn al-Faqīh (pp. 322-24) and by Yāqūt, who spent many years in Marv (*Boldān* IV, pp. 817-20), both drawing on a single 2nd/8th-century source. Sir Henry Rawlinson noted in 1872 that the monument described by Yāqūt must have been a Buddhist *nava-vihāra* (pp. 510-11), which was confirmed by V. V. Barthold (*Turkestan*³, p. 77; *EI*², s.v. "Barāmika"). P. Schwarz pursued some of the implications of this description in 1933 (pp. 439-43). Both Yāqūt and Ebn al-Faqīh sought to explain the monument and the rites performed there as inspired by the Kaʿba and the Islamic pilgrimage; this explanation was clearly suggested by the description of a domed structure around which Buddhist worshipers performed circumambulation (*pradakṣiṇa*), which would have immediately reminded a Muslim observer of the *ṭawāf* around the Kaʿba. Ebn al-Faqīh added that "the kings of Ṣīn and the *Kābolšāh*" were Buddhists and "went there on pilgrimage." Other rites, as well as architectural characteristics, which had no parallel in Islam, were also faithfully noted. The circular arcades (*arweqa mostadīra*; Ebn al-Faqīh, p. 323, *Boldān* IV, p. 818) mentioned in both 4th/10th-century texts probably represented the kind of blind arcade (still called *rewāq* in modern Afghanistan) commonly articulating the double drums of stupas. In another passage the draping of silks on the shrine and the attachment of banners (*aʿlām*) to the cupola are recorded (Ebn al-Faqīh, p. 323; *Boldān* IV, p. 818). Banners were indeed placed on early Buddhist stupas (for contemporary representations in the wall paintings from Kakrak and Bāmīān, see Bussagli, pp. 39, 124; for fragments of such banners excavated at Buddhist sites along the Silk Route, see Stein, II, pp. 840-45 and passim). Yāqūt also noted that the worshipers at Balḵ "fixed" idols to the shrine, which agrees with archeological evidence from stupa sites, where large carved buddhas and boddhisattvas and smaller stucco images were attached to the walls. Yāqūt glossed *nowbahār* as "new *bahār*," explaining that it was customary at Balḵ to "crown" important buildings with fragrant plants upon completion. The first plant to appear in the season was chosen. At Balḵ it happened to

be the *bahār* (a plant with yellow flowers that blossoms in the spring, see, e.g., Lane, I, p. 266); hence the name Nowbahār. Other writers left briefer notices or descriptions of this monument. In 372/982-83 the usually sober and terse author of *Ḥodūd al-ʿālam* mentioned "the wonderful works in dilapidated condition called Nowbahār" (ed. Sotūda, p. 99). In the late 15th century Nowbahār still stood, in ruins but with some of its frescoes remaining; it was known locally simply as *bahār* (Asfezārī, I, p. 155). In early Persian poetry there were frequent metaphorical references to this shrine. On the other hand, there is some evidence that the pre-Islamic meaning of *nowbahār* as a certain type of shrine was retained until the 5th/11th century; Gorgānī, for example, used the word as a common noun (p. 56). Today no fewer than ten villages in the Mašhad-Nīšāpūr area are called Nowbahār (Razmārā, *Farhang* IX, pp. 423-24); in Afghanistan there are two Nowbahārs, one near Andarāb and another near Farāh (*Qāmūs-e joḡrāfīāʾī-e Afḡānestān* IV, p. 132). According to Jovaynī (ed. Qazvīnī, I, p. 76) the name Bukhara is still another version of *bahār*, or *baḵār*.

Although the fame and splendor of the structure at Balḵ would account for repeated references to it in Persian literature, the occasional mention of less well-known monuments leaves no doubt that there was a general, if somewhat confused, awareness of Buddhist structures. In the 11th-century *Garšāsb-nāma* there is a verse about the "shrine of Sūbahār," which has "the pleasantness of the spring (*bahār*)" (as quoted by Enjū Šīrāzī, II, p. 2023; differently Yaḡmāʾī's *por negār* "full of paintings," p. 255). In another reference the author associates the shrine with the *bod-parastān* (Yaḡmāʾī, p. 245). Two other unusual monuments, the gigantic stone Buddhas carved out of the cliff at Bāmīān, were known to geographers and poets (*Ḥodūd al-ʿālam*, p. 101; Samʿānī, ed. Margoliouth, II, p. 64; Enjū Šīrāzī, I, p. 1018; II, p. 1808) as *sorḵ-bot* "red idol" and *ḵeng-bot* "white idol." The exact identity of these images was unknown to medieval writers, however. In dictionaries they are said to represent two lovers, and it is mentioned that they were made before Islam by "polytheists" (*mošrekān*; Enjū Šīrāzī, I, p. 1019). Popular stories about them became the subject of a treatise by Abū Rayḥān Bīrūnī (Saʿīd Khan, p. 74), and a lost *maṯnawī* entitled *Ḵeng-bot wa Sorḵ-bot* ('Awfī, *Lobāb* II, p. 32) by Abu'l-Qāsem Ḥasan ʿOnṣorī Balḵī (d. 431/1039-40). The theme lived on in the works of later poets, such as Ḵāqānī Šervānī and Sūzanī Samarqandī as an image dimly remembered from ancient times.

These lingering memories of Buddhist structures and idols—the word *bot* is probably derived from *buddha*—were paralleled in Persian poetry by an array of clichés celebrating idealized beauty. For example, the *bot-e māhrūy* (the moon-faced idol) is described as having a face round as the full moon, eyes shaped like almonds below arched brows, and a tiny carnelian mouth; the body is said to be "silvery" (*sīm-tan*). Asadī Ṭūsī quotes in his dictionary the following line by Abu'l-Maṯal Boḵārī to illustrate the meaning of *farḵār* or *bot-ḵāna* "temple of an idol" (*Loḡat-e Fors*, ed. Horn, p. 122): "My idol (*bot*) came alive; its monk became inanimate/Here I am a monk to it with my house as its *vihāra*." The metaphor presents the beloved one as a beautiful idol into which life has been breathed, while the lover is rendered inanimate as he is overcome with emotion. In an elaborate variation on this theme Manūčehrī celebrates a garden that has become like a monastery (*bot-ḵāna-ye farḵār*), where the roses are like idols and the birds like monks (*šaman*), whose soles the roses/idols would seem to be kissing (Biberstein Kazimirski, p. 8; Manūčehrī, p. 1). At a fairly early date, however, the word *bot* came to mean not only an image of the Buddha but also more generally "idol" and to be associated with the theme of the "beautiful Turk" (see BOT). The resemblance of Turkic facial types to the idealized moon face with narrow eyes of late Buddhist sculpture may have encouraged the fusion of these poetic metaphors. Often the idol is related to places that literary and archeological evidence prove to have been Buddhist centers, as in *bot-e Balḵ* "the idol (Buddha) of Balḵ" (Farroḵī, pp. 166-68), *bot-e Qandahār* "the idol of Gandhara," *bot-e Čīn* "the idol of Turkestan," *bot-e Barbar* "the idol of Barbar" (the highlands around Ḡazna, where the Hazāras of Jāḡūrī were still called Hazāra-ye Barbarī at the turn of the century; Melikian-Chirvani, 1974, pp. 42, 43, 47). In the 5th/11th-century romance *Varqa o Golšāh* ('Ayyūqī, pp. 67, 115), Qandahār is one of two geographical areas associated with the *bot*, the other being Čīn. Neẓāmī (d. 605/1209) wrote: "He saw in it a *bahār* as beautiful as the Nowbahār/ A worshiping place by name of Qandahār" (p. 200). Kashmir is similarly associated with *bot* in early poetry. Awareness of Buddhist sculpture may also be reflected in references to the idol maker (*botgar*). In the 6th/12th century the poet Mahsatī wrote, "The image of the idol of Čīn is shamed by thy breast/The idol maker [himself] could never make thy portrait at Čegel" (*Dīvān*, p. 55; quoted in Jājarmī, II, p. 1163).

In the Iranian world and its periphery the memory of Buddhism thus seems to have been crystallized at the time of the Islamic conquest in the 2nd/8th century, and some writers seem to have been ignorant of the realities behind their references. As would be expected, it was the poets of the Ghaznavid court (ʿOnṣorī, Farroḵī, Manūčehrī, and later Masʿūd-e Saʿd) and the northeastern districts (Nāṣer-e Ḵosrow from Badaḵšān and later Sayf-al-Dīn Esfarangī), the parts of the Iranian world where Buddhism had flourished before the coming of Islam and survived until Bīrūnī's time (see above), who most frequently used Buddhist imagery. Among the most evocative examples are these lines of ʿOnṣorī (p. 260): "Smiling rose, the *bahār* dweller [idol] is shamed/For you bring better colors than the *bahār* [spring] and its roses/The Qandahār image does not have sweet lips/But thou, sweet-lipped one, art a Qandahār image." As late as the 6th/12th century ʿOṯmān Moḵtārī, a poet from Ḡazna, wrote this line (quoted in Enjū Šīrāzī, II, p. 214, and ʿOṯmān Moḵtārī,

be the *bahār* (a plant with yellow flowers that blossoms in the spring, see, e.g., Lane, I, p. 266); hence the name Nowbahār. Other writers left briefer notices or descriptions of this monument. In 372/982-83 the usually sober and terse author of *Ḥodūd al-ʿālam* mentioned "the wonderful works in dilapidated condition called Nowbahār" (ed. Sotūda, p. 99). In the late 15th century Nowbahār still stood, in ruins but with some of its frescoes remaining; it was known locally simply as *bahār* (Asfezārī, I, p. 155). In early Persian poetry there were frequent metaphorical references to this shrine. On the other hand, there is some evidence that the pre-Islamic meaning of *nowbahār* as a certain type of shrine was retained until the 5th/11th century; Gorgānī, for example, used the word as a common noun (p. 56). Today no fewer than ten villages in the Mašhad-Nīšāpūr area are called Nowbahār (Razmārā, *Farhang* IX, pp. 423-24); in Afghanistan there are two Nowbahārs, one near Andarāb and another near Farāh (*Qāmūs-e joḡrāfīāʾī-e Afḡānestān* IV, p. 132). According to Jovaynī (ed. Qazvīnī, I, p. 76) the name Bukhara is still another version of *bahār*, or *baḵār*.

Although the fame and splendor of the structure at Balḵ would account for repeated references to it in Persian literature, the occasional mention of less well-known monuments leaves no doubt that there was a general, if somewhat confused, awareness of Buddhist structures. In the 11th-century *Garšāsb-nāma* there is a verse about the "shrine of Sūbahār," which has "the pleasantness of the spring (*bahār*)" (as quoted by Enjū Šīrāzī, II, p. 2023; differently Yaḡmāʾī's *por negār* "full of paintings," p. 255). In another reference the author associates the shrine with the *bod-parastān* (Yaḡmāʾī, p. 245). Two other unusual monuments, the gigantic stone Buddhas carved out of the cliff at Bāmīān, were known to geographers and poets (*Ḥodūd al-ʿālam*, p. 101; Samʿānī, ed. Margoliouth, II, p. 64; Enjū Šīrāzī, I, p. 1018; II, p. 1808) as *sorḵ-bot* "red idol" and *ḵeng-bot* "white idol." The exact identity of these images was unknown to medieval writers, however. In dictionaries they are said to represent two lovers, and it is mentioned that they were made before Islam by "polytheists" (*mošrekān*; Enjū Šīrāzī, I, p. 1019). Popular stories about them became the subject of a treatise by Abū Rayḥān Bīrūnī (Saʿīd Khan, p. 74), and a lost *maṯnawī* entitled *Ḵeng-bot wa Sorḵ-bot* ('Awfī, *Lobāb* II, p. 32) by Abu'l-Qāsem Ḥasan ʿOnṣorī Balḵī (d. 431/1039-40). The theme lived on in the works of later poets, such as Ḵāqānī Šervānī and Sūzanī Samarqandī as an image dimly remembered from ancient times.

These lingering memories of Buddhist structures and idols—the word *bot* is probably derived from *buddha*—were paralleled in Persian poetry by an array of clichés celebrating idealized beauty. For example, the *bot-e māhrūy* (the moon-faced idol) is described as having a face round as the full moon, eyes shaped like almonds below arched brows, and a tiny carnelian mouth; the body is said to be "silvery" (*sīm-tan*). Asadī Ṭūsī quotes in his dictionary the following line by Abu'l-Maṯal Boḵārī to illustrate the meaning of *farḵār* or *bot-ḵāna* "temple of an idol" (*Loḡat-e Fors*, ed. Horn, p. 122): "My idol (*bot*) came alive; its monk became inanimate/Here I am a monk to it with my house as its *vihāra*." The metaphor presents the beloved one as a beautiful idol into which life has been breathed, while the lover is rendered inanimate as he is overcome with emotion. In an elaborate variation on this theme Manūčehrī celebrates a garden that has become like a monastery (*bot-ḵāna-ye farḵār*), where the roses are like idols and the birds like monks (*šaman*), whose soles the roses/idols would seem to be kissing (Biberstein Kazimirski, p. 8; Manūčehrī, p. 1). At a fairly early date, however, the word *bot* came to mean not only an image of the Buddha but also more generally "idol" and to be associated with the theme of the "beautiful Turk" (see BOT). The resemblance of Turkic facial types to the idealized moon face with narrow eyes of late Buddhist sculpture may have encouraged the fusion of these poetic metaphors. Often the idol is related to places that literary and archeological evidence prove to have been Buddhist centers, as in *bot-e Balḵ* "the idol (Buddha) of Balḵ" (Farroḵī, pp. 166-68), *bot-e Qandahār* "the idol of Gandhara," *bot-e Čīn* "the idol of Turkestan," *bot-e Barbar* "the idol of Barbar" (the highlands around Ḡazna, where the Hazāras of Jāḡūrī were still called Hazāra-ye Barbarī at the turn of the century; Melikian-Chirvani, 1974, pp. 42, 43, 47). In the 5th/11th-century romance *Varqa o Golšāh* ('Ayyūqī, pp. 67, 115), Qandahār is one of two geographical areas associated with the *bot*, the other being Čīn. Neẓāmī (d. 605/1209) wrote: "He saw in it a *bahār* as beautiful as the Nowbahār/ A worshiping place by name of Qandahār" (p. 200). Kashmir is similarly associated with *bot* in early poetry. Awareness of Buddhist sculpture may also be reflected in references to the idol maker (*botgar*). In the 6th/12th century the poet Mahsatī wrote, "The image of the idol of Čīn is shamed by thy breast/The idol maker [himself] could never make thy portrait at Čegel" (*Dīvān*, p. 55; quoted in Jājarmī, II, p. 1163).

In the Iranian world and its periphery the memory of Buddhism thus seems to have been crystallized at the time of the Islamic conquest in the 2nd/8th century, and some writers seem to have been ignorant of the realities behind their references. As would be expected, it was the poets of the Ghaznavid court (ʿOnṣorī, Farroḵī, Manūčehrī, and later Masʿūd-e Saʿd) and the northeastern districts (Nāṣer-e Ḵosrow from Badaḵšān and later Sayf-al-Dīn Esfarangī), the parts of the Iranian world where Buddhism had flourished before the coming of Islam and survived until Bīrūnī's time (see above), who most frequently used Buddhist imagery. Among the most evocative examples are these lines of ʿOnṣorī (p. 260): "Smiling rose, the *bahār* dweller [idol] is shamed/For you bring better colors than the *bahār* [spring] and its roses/The Qandahār image does not have sweet lips/But thou, sweet-lipped one, art a Qandahār image." As late as the 6th/12th century ʿOṯmān Moḵtārī, a poet from Ḡazna, wrote this line (quoted in Enjū Šīrāzī, II, p. 214, and ʿOṯmān Moḵtārī,

p. 8): "As long as the gem owes its splendor and value to light/As long as the world in spring becomes like the idol in the *bahār*." In the late 9th/15th century Jāmī still referred to "the Buddhist shrine of Čīn and Čegel" (p. 627).

Although indigenous Buddhism thus seems to have effectively disappeared from the Iranian world shortly after the Islamic conquest, in the late 7th/13th century an imported version flourished briefly under the Mongol Il-khanids. Initially, at least, all faiths were tolerated within the Mongol empire (barring such practices as offended against Mongol customary law), and the "religious classes"—Buddhist lamas, Christian priests and monks, and Islamic *qāżīs* and *'olamā'*—were exempted from the poll-tax, on the understanding that they prayed for the imperial family.

Representatives of minority religious groups, moreover, served as a useful instrument of Mongol rule over a hostile majority of the subject population: in Iran, Buddhists benefited from the il-khans' favor along with Christians and Jews. The first il-khan, Hülegü (Hūlagū, q.v.; 654-63/1256-65), had been entrusted by his brother, the Great Khan Möngke, with the protection of certain Tibetan Buddhist sects while he was still in Mongolia and is known to have maintained contact with them after his arrival in Iran (Petech, pp. 182-83). Possibly, therefore, Tibetan lamas—or *bakšīs* (q.v.), as they were known—accompanied him. It is unlikely that Hülegü himself became a Buddhist, but the sources testify that he was under the influence of lamas (e.g., Kirakos Ganjakeči, pp. 237-38), and he built Buddhist shrines in Iran (Rašīd-al-Dīn, III, Baku, p. 90; cf. Mīrḵᵛānd, V, p. 330). Like his father, Abaqa (663-80/1265-82; q.v.) welcomed *bakšīs* at his court, and their position does not seem to have suffered even with the succession of his brother, the Muslim Aḥmad-Tegüder (Takūdār; q.v.), in whose reign we find *bakšīs* along with shamans serving as investigating magistrates (Rašīd-al-Dīn, III, Baku, p. 172; *Tārīḵ-e ḡāzānī*, p. 46). It was Abaqa's son Arḡūn Khan (q.v.; 683-90/1284-91), however, who furthered Buddhist interests most assiduously. Temples were built, estates were granted to followers of the Buddha, and Arḡūn himself relied on the advice of the *bakšīs*; he died as the result of a drug prescribed by one of them. Arḡūn's son Ḡāzān (q.v.), who had been reared as a Buddhist on the orders of his grandfather Abaqa, built temples (*bot-ḵānahā*) at Ḵabūšān while governor of Khorasan on Arḡūn's behalf (Rašīd-al-Dīn, III, Baku, pp. 295-96, 373-74; *Tārīḵ-e ḡāzānī*, pp. 78, 166). Nevertheless, it was Ḡāzān who, with all his dignitaries, finally converted to Islam on his accession as il-khan in 695/1295 and began the suppression of Buddhism in Iran. The temples were destroyed and following unsuccessful efforts to impose Islam on the lamas they were allowed to leave the country for their original homes in Tibet, India, and Kashmir.

Rašīd-al-Dīn himself, in preparing his universal history, the monumental *Jāmeʿ al-tawārīḵ*, relied on a Buddhist monk at the Mongol court who had been summoned to Tabrīz from Kashmir to assist in producing Persian translations of texts relating to the life of Śākyamuni (Jahn, pp. 9-12). In one fragmentary manuscript of this work copied in his lifetime (714/1314), episodes from the life of the Buddha are among those illustrated (Gray, pp. 33-35, pls. 25-27); although the influence of Chinese pictorial conventions is clear in these miniatures, it is equally clear that the artists did not copy specifically Buddhist originals but rather devised their own imagery to accompany the text (cf. the illustrations of Buddhist events in an 8th/14th-century illustrated copy of *Āṯār al-bāqīa*; Soucek, 1975). Occasionally Buddhist motifs appear in Il-khanid courtly art, but their original symbolism seems to have been lost in the borrowing (see, for example, one minature from the Demotte *Šāh-nāma* in which a *cintāmaṇi*, q.v., is visible on the back of Żaḥḥāk's throne; Blair and Grabar, pp. 58-59, pl. 1; Soucek, 1980). Nor do the many Persian copies of Buddhist motifs in the albums at the Topkapı Sarayı in Istanbul have apparent religious content (Sugimora, chap. 2 et passim).

Bahār. Buddhist *vihāra* seems to have survived in the place-name Šāhbahār (cf. Taddei, p. 110 with n. 6). For instance, there was a Šāhbahār in the Kabul area that according to Yaʿqūbī (d. 284/897; *Boldān*, pp. 390-91) contained an idol and was destroyed by fire by the Barmakid Faẓl b. Yaḥyā b. Ḵāled b. Barmak in 176/792 (cf. Gardīzī, p. 129; Ebn al-Aṯīr, p. 114). Gardīzī (p. 186) and Bayhaqī (p. 334 and elsewhere) mention a Dašt-e Šāhbahār around Ḡazna in the first half of the 5th/11th century, which, as suggested by A.-ʿA. Kohzād, may have been part of the Buddhist complex excavated by the Italians at Tepe Sardar (see also Taddei, pp. 109-24).

Bibliography: Abū Naṣr ʿAlī b. Aḥmad Asadī Ṭūsī, *Garšāsp-nāma*, ed. Ḥ. Yaḡmāʾī, Tehran, 1317 Š./1938. Moʿīn-al-Dīn Moḥammad Zamčī Asfezārī, *Rawżāt al-jannāt fī awṣāf madīnat Herāt*, ed. M.-K. Emām, Tehran, 1338 Š./1959. Asadī Ṭūsī, *Loḡat-e Fors*, ed. P. Horn, Göttingen, 1897. ʿAyyūqī, *Varqa o Golšāh*, ed. Ḏ. Ṣafā, Tehran, 1343 Š./1964. W. Ball, "The Imamzadeh Maʿsum at Vardjovi. A Rock-cut Il-khanid complex near Maragheh," *AMI* 12, 1979, pp. 329-40. J. Barthoux, *Les fouilles de Hadda* I, MDAFA 4, Brussels, 1933. S. Beal, *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*, popular ed., London, n.d. M. Benisti, "Étude sur le stupa dans l'Inde ancienne," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* 50/1, 1960, pp. 37-116. A. de Biberstein Kazimirski, ed., *Menoutchehri, poète persan du 11ème siècle de notre ère, du 5ème de l'hégire*, Paris, 1887. M. Bussagli, *Painting of Central Asia*, Cleveland, 1963. Mīr Jamāl-al-Dīn Enjū Šīrāzī, *Farhang-e jahāngīrī*, ed. R. ʿAfīfī, 3 vols., Mašhad, 1351 Š/1972. M. R. Gauthiot, "Quelques termes techniques bouddhiques et manichéens," *JA*, 10th ser., 18, 1911, pp. 49-67. I. Gershevitch, *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*, Oxford, 1954. A. Godard, Y. Godard, and J. Hackin, *Les antiquités bouddhiques de Bāmiyān*, MDAFA 2, Paris, 1928. Faḵr-al-Dīn Asʿad

Gorgānī, *Vīs o Rāmīn*, ed. M. A. Todua and A. A. Gwakharia, Tehran, 1319 Š./1940. O. Grabar and S. Blair, *Epic Images and Contemporary History. The Illustrations of the Great Mongol Shahnama*, Chicago and London, 1980. B. Gray, *The World History of Rashid al-Din*, London and Boston, 1978. J. Hackin, *Nouvelles recherches archéologiques à Bāmiyān*, MDAFA 3, Paris, 1933. Idem, "The Buddhist Monastery of Fondukistan," *Journal of the Greater India Society* 7, 1940, pp. 1-14, 85-91. K. Jahn, ed. and tr., *Die Indiengeschichte des Rašīd-ad-dīn*, Vienna, 1980. Moḥammad b. Badr-al-Dīn Jājarmī, *Mo'nes al-aḥrār fī daqā'eq al-aš'ār*, ed. M. Qazvīnī, Tehran, 1350 Š./1971. 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Jāmī, *Dīvān-e kāmel*, ed. H. Ražī, Tehran, 1341 Š./1962. Kirakos Ganjakeči, *Istoriya Armenii*, tr. L. A. Khanlaryan, Moscow, 1976. A.-'A. Kohzād, "'Šābahār, Šāvīhāra'. Ma'bad-e šāhī-e būdā'ī dar Ḡazna," *Eṣlāḥ* (Kabul) 1-6 Mīzān, 1346 Š./1967. E. W. Lane, *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, Beirut, 1968. D. N. MacKenzie, *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library*, Acta Iranica 10, Tehran and Liège, 1976. Mahsatī Ganjavī, *Dīvān*, ed. Ṭ. Šehāb, Tehran, 1336 Š./1957. Manūčehrī Dāmḡānī, *Dīvān*, ed. M. Dabīrsīāqī, Tehran, 1326 Š./1947. A. S. Melikian-Chirvani, "L'évocation littéraire du bouddhisme dans l'Iran musulman," *Le monde iranien et l'Islam* 2, 1974, pp. 1-71. Idem, "Le roman de Varqe et Golšāh," *Arts asiatiques* 22, 1970, pp. 1-262. J. Meunié, *Shotorak*, MDAFA 10, Paris, 1942. Neẓāmī Ganjavī, *Eqbāl-nāma* [*Šaraf-nāma*], ed. W. Dastgerdī, Tehran, 1317 Š./1938. 'Onṣorī Balḵī, *Dīvān*, ed. M. Dabīrsīāqī, Tehran, 1342 Š./1963. Abū 'Omar Bahā'-al-Dīn 'Oṯmān Moḵtārī Ḡaznavī, *Dīvān*, ed. J. Homā'ī, Tehran, 1341 Š./1962. L. Petech, "Tibetan Relations with Sung China and with the Mongols," in *China Among Equals*, ed. M. Rossabi, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983, pp. 173-203. *Qāmūs-e joḡrāfīā'ī-e Afḡānestān*, Kabul, 1339 Š./1960. H. C. Rawlinson, "Monograph on the Oxus," *JRGS* 42, 1872, pp. 482-513. Sam'ānī, ed. Margoliouth. Aḥmad Sa'īd Khan, *Ketāb-šenāsī-e Abū Rayḥān Bīrūnī*, tr. 'A. Ḥabībī, Tehran, 1352 Š./1973. P. Schwarz, "Bemerkungen zu den arabischen Nachrichten über Balkh," in *Oriental Studies in Honour of Cursetji Erachji Pavry*, ed. J. D. C. Pavry, London, 1933, pp. 434-43. P. Soucek, "An Illustrated Manuscript of al-Bīrūnī's Chronology of Ancient Nations," in *The Scholar and the Saint*, ed. P. Chelkowski, New York, 1975, pp. 103-68. Idem, "The Role of Landscape in Iranian Painting to the 15th Century," in *Landscape Style in Asia*, ed. W. Watson, Colloquies on Art and Archaeology in Asia 9, London, n.d. [1980], pp. 86-110. A. Stein, *Serindia. Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1921. T. Sugimura, *The Encounter of Persia with China*, Osaka, 1986. M. Taddei, "Tapa Sardār. First Preliminary Report," *East and West* 18/1-2, 1968, pp. 109-24.

(Asadullah Souren Melikian-Chirvani)

iii. Buddhist Literature in Khotanese and Tumshuqese

A substantial number of manuscripts and manuscript fragments have come to light since the end of the last century that contain texts written in the Middle Iranian language known as Khotanese (sometimes called Khotan Saka), the language spoken in the realm of Khotan, as well as a small number in the somewhat related language now commonly called Tumshuqese (earlier the designation Tumshuq was used, actually the name of the place where some of these manuscripts were found). Most of the Khotanese tests have been published in transcription by H. W. Bailey in his *Khotanese Texts* (*KT* I-V) and *Khotanese Buddhist Texts* (*KBT*). The principal exception is the *Book of Zambasta*, for which see R. E. Emmerick's edition (1968). The Tumshuqese texts were published with translation and glossaries by S. Konow (1935, with facsimilies, and 1947). For other text editions see in the following.

Khotan played an important role in the transmission of Buddhism during the period represented by the extant material (probably from around 700 to the end of the kingdom of Khotan ca. 1000, see below; see also i, above). This material contains a number of local compositions or compendiums of paramount importance for our knowledge of the development of Mahayana (*Mahāyāna*) Buddhism in this area. However, no attempt has yet been made by Buddhologists to assess its importance, though editions and translations of numerous texts are available. The Khotanese texts have hitherto been dealt with exclusively by philologists, who have concerned themselves primarily with the decipherment of the texts and their language.

As most of the Khotanese Buddhist texts are concerned with doctrine few of them possess any special literary merit. The long *sūtra* texts occasionally contain passages that rise above the usual doctrinal humdrum, such as the parables in the *Saṅghāṭa-sūtra* and some passages in the *Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra*, and the *avadāna* and *jātaka* texts contain many well-written narratives and descriptions. The most important exception to the rule, however, is the *Book of Zambasta*, which contains narrative and lyrical passages of real literary interest; among the latter the description of spring in chapter 20 and the unfortunately very fragmentary description of the mountains in the four seasons in chapter 17 deserve special mention.

Almost all Khotanese texts show traces of Buddhist influence, even texts that themselves do not belong directly to the Buddhist tradition. Thus there is a Khotanese poem containing in essence the well-known Hindu Indian story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which has been given a Buddhist interpretation: the heroes Rāma and Lakṣmaṇa are identified with the Buddha Śākyamuni and the future Buddha Maitreya. In the following survey only texts belonging directly to the Buddhist tradition will be discussed.

Khotanese Buddhist texts.

Almost all the Khotanese Buddhist texts are translations from Sanskrit. Only some of the Sanskrit originals are now extant, and many of the texts are otherwise known only from translations into Tibetan and Chinese. The Khotanese versions range from close translations to loose paraphrases of the originals. Sometimes Buddhist tales are retold in such a way that it is unlikely that a closely corresponding Indian text ever existed. The extant texts range from early Mahayanist texts, such as the *Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra* "*Sūtra* of Golden Light" and the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* "Lotus *sūtra*," to 10th-century Tantric texts. The language varies from the oldest Old Khotanese in archaic orthography written in the old ornamental script (e.g., *Śūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra*) to the latest Late Khotanese written in late orthography in cursive script (e.g., *Mañjuśrīnairatmyāvatāra-sūtra*).

Since the Khotanese translations were made directly from Sanskrit originals they also provide evidence for early forms of the Sanskrit texts themselves, which is important not only for texts that are no longer extant in the Sanskrit original, but also for extant Sanskrit texts, as the oldest Sanskrit manuscripts are often much later than the Khotanese translations.

Most of the Khotanese Buddhist texts occupy single manuscripts, but there are a few large manuscripts or scrolls that contain several texts. For example, the manuscript P[elliot] 3513 (84 folios) in the Bibliothèque Nationale contains a *namo* text (reverential address of the buddhas) on folios 1-12, the commentary of the *Hṛdaya-sūtra* on folios 13-42, and three *deśanā* (confession) texts: the *Bhadracaryā-deśanā* on folios 43-58, the *deśanā* chapter of the *Suvarṇabhāsa-sūtra* on folios 59-75, and a text written by Prince Tcūṃ-ttehi on folios 76-84 (on these texts see below). The long scroll Ch[ien fo t'ung] c.001 (British Library, India Office Library division, London) contains six Mahayana and Tantric texts, the first two in Sanskrit, which are said (Shūyo Takubo) to constitute a unified collection of esoteric *sūtra*s in conformity with Buddhist ritual practice: the first three are invocational texts, inviting those who are invoked to take part in the ritual: *Buddhoṣṇavijaya-dhāraṇī* (Bailey, *KT* V, p. 368 lines 1-11), *Sitātapatra-dhāraṇī* (*KT* V, pp. 368-76 lines 12-198; this text is found also in another manuscript: *KT* V, pp. 359-67), *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* (*KBT*, pp. 76-90; see below); then follow a *deśanā* text (*Deśanā* I; *KT* V, pp. 249-52), the *Sumukha-sūtra* (*KBT*, pp. 135-43), and finally another *deśanā* text (*Deśanā* II; *KT* V, pp. 253-55). The central text is the *Sumukha-sūtra* (see below).

Several Khotanese manuscripts are dated, most of them to the 10th century: the obverse of the first folio of the manuscript of the *Vajracchedikā* contains the date 14 April 941 (Hamilton, 1979, p. 51); the Khotanese colophons in scroll Ch. c.001 (see above) at the end of *Sitātapatra*, *Sumukhasūtra*, and *Deśanā* II specify the year as a hare year, probably the year 943 (Hamilton, 1979, pp. 53-55; cf. Emmerick, 1978a, p. 285; 1978, p. 254 n. 2); these two manuscripts were accordingly written during the rule of King Viśa' Saṃbhata (r. 912-66). The *Jātakastava* and *Mañjuśrī* text were written during the reign of King Viśa' Śūra (r. 967-78?), as probably was one of the Vajrayāna texts (*KBT*, pp. 143-46), which contains a date in lines 44-45 that may correspond to 10 August 971 (Hamilton, 1979, 51). The scroll Ch 0048, containing the *Pradakṣiṇā-sūtra*, was perhaps written in 995, about 10 years before the conquest of Khotan by Yūsof Qadr Khan b. Boḡrā Khan Hārūn, the Muslim ruler of Kashgar (see, e.g., Samolin, pp. 81-82). (Only the Chinese name, Tienshou, r. 987?-88 plus, of the Khotanese king ruling at the time is known; Hamilton, *JA*, 265/3-4, 1977, p. 369; 1979, p. 51.)

None of the manuscripts containing texts in Old Khotanese contain dates, but one unpublished text in early Late Khotanese contains a colophon that perhaps allows it to be dated to the end of the 8th century (Skjærvø, forthcoming). For the *Book of Zambasta* it has been argued that it should not be dated earlier than the seventh century (cf. S. Konow, *NTS* 11, 1939, pp. 35ff.). One may tentatively conclude that the bulk of the extant Khotanese manuscripts were written from about 700 to 1000, that is, over a period of 300 years.

The Prince Tcūṃ-ttehi mentioned above has been plausibly identified as one of the sons of King Viśa Saṃbhata, Chinese name Li Shengtian, who was married to a sister of Cao Yuanzhong (Ts'ao Yüenchung), ruler of the kingdom of Dunhuang (Tunhuang; see Kumamoto, 1986; T. Takata, in Emmerick and Skjærvø, II, pp. 49-50; for a summary of the research on the dates of the Khotanese kings see Skjærvø, forthcoming). Both the king and his sons are depicted in cave paintings from Dunhuang, and it may be these princes who are said in a Chinese text from Dunhuang to have come to the temple and taken the fourth volume of the *Lotus Sūtra* (Takata). From the Khotanese colophons in the scroll Ch c. 001 (see above) we learn that it was written at the request of Saṃgaka Śāṃ Khīñä Hvāṃ' in the city of Shazhou (Dunhuang), which was no doubt an important center of scribal activities.

Following is a survey of the major Buddhist texts in Khotanese. For complete discussions of individual texts see these. For further details, also on the history of Khotanese studies, see Emmerick, 1979, which contains an alphabetical list of texts with complete references. The following groups of texts are discussed: 1. Mahayana *sūtra*s, 2. various texts translated from Sanskrit, 3. indigenous Khotanese compositions.

1. The following major Mahayana *sūtra*s are known in Khotanese (all these *sūtra*s are miscellanies of doctrinal passages, parables and narratives, so no summary of contents are given here):

Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra, the *Lotus Sūtra*, was an extremely popular text as seen from the numerous complete and fragmentary Sanskrit manuscripts discovered in Chinese Turkestan, Gilgit, and elsewhere. Only one *śloka* is actually found in Khotanese translation (quoted in the *Book of Zambasta* 6.3), but several versions of a metrical summary of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* are extant (Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 57-63, the most

complete; *KT* II, pp. 5-6 III, p. 55; ed. Bailey, 1971; tr., comm., and glossary). A manuscript of the Sanskrit text discovered at Khotan has a colophon written in Khotanese at the end of the manuscript and three Khotanese colophons at the end of three of the chapters of the Sanskrit text (Emmerick, 1974).

Saṅghāṭa-sūtra is a very long text mostly dealing with the merit accruing from reciting, copying, etc., the text itself, but containing a number of interesting parables. Many complete folios and numerous fragments are extant (now in London, Munich, Washington, and Leningrad), indicating that it enjoyed great popularity in Khotan. It was one of the first long Old Khotanese texts for which a parallel version (in this case Tibetan) was known, and it therefore played an important role in the elucidation of Khotanese vocabulary and grammar (ed. Konow, 1932, with tr., Tibetan parallel texts, glossary; von Hinüber, 1973, with tr., ed. of the recently discovered Sanskrit parallel text, glossary, concordances of the fragments). Since von Hinüber's edition numerous fragments have been identified in the British Library (Oriental Manuscripts and Published Books and India Office Library divisions, London) and in the Völkerkundemuseum, Munich (see Emmerick, 1984, p. 127; Gropp).

Śūraṅgamasamādhi-sūtra, about forty more or less well-preserved folios of one manuscript are preserved, as well as one fragmentary folio of another manuscript. Twenty-four of the folios were edited by Emmerick (ed. Emmerick, 1970, with tr., comm., glossary, facs., and Tib. parallel text). Since his edition fifteen additional folios and numerous small fragments in the India Office Library have been identified by P. O. Skjærvø (cf. Emmerick, 1984, p. 139). The Khotanese text is distinguished by its archaic and consistent orthography (see ed. Emmerick, pp. xix-xxi). A folio of the Sanskrit text published by Thomas (pp. 125-32) shows Khotanese influence in the use of the form Manyuśrī for Mañjuśrī.

Suvarṇabhāsottama-sūtra is known from a large number of manuscripts and manuscript fragments in both Old and Late Khotanese (now in London, West and East Berlin, Munich, Paris, New Haven, and Leningrad). The chapter on confession was included in the composite manuscript P 3513 (see above). Numerous folios and fragments of folios have been published in transcription by Bailey in *KT* I and V, cf. Emmerick, 1970b, pp. 105-06; ed. Skjærvø, 1983, with tr., commentary, and concordances). All the material in Old Khotanese corresponds more or less to the Sanskrit text as edited by Nobel, but some of the Late Khotanese parts also correspond to the later Tibetan versions and the Chinese version by I-tsing (Skjærvø, II, pp. xxxi-xliv).

Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra is extant in an Old Khotanese translation in three complete and six fragmentary folios of the same manuscript (ed. Skjærvø, 1986, with tr., parallel Tibetan version, commentary, and facs.). The name of Vimalakīrti is mentioned several times in a late Khotanese text, which for this reason was named by Bailey the *Book of Vimalakīrti* (see below).

Among minor *sūtra*s in Khotanese translation the following may be mentioned:

Aparimitāyuḥ-sūtra (q.v.) is known from two Late Khotanese manuscripts. It was one of the first Khotanese texts to be edited together with its Sanskrit original (ed. Konow, in Hoernle, pp. 289-356, with tr., and comm.; Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 94-100, *KT* V, pp. 243-48; ed. Duan Qing, with tr., commentary, and glossary).

Bhadrakalpika-sūtra (q.v.), in Late Khotanese, a sacred text concerning the names of the Buddhas to appear in the good aeon. Originally, the good aeon was considered to be one in which five Buddhas will appear, the fourth being the historical Buddha Śākyamuni and the fifth the future Buddha Maitreya, but according to another tradition 1000 Buddhas will appear in it. The Khotanese version of this text has apparently combined both traditions since the introduction speaks of 1,005 names and the rewards that will come to those who learn or recite them, etc. However, the only extant Khotanese manuscript that contains the names lists only 998 names, and several of those are duplicated (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 75, 76-90; ed. Konow, 1929). This manuscript contains another long list of Buddha names in two copies (*KBT*, pp. 249-55), which represents a tradition according to which there were billions of Buddhas in countless good aeons, a tradition found in other lists as well (*KBT*, pp. 91-93, 100-04, *KT* III, pp. 55-57, 112-16), some of which include a second list of Buddhas that incorporates local Khotanese Buddha names not known to Indian tradition.

Bhaiṣajyaguruvaiḍūryaprabharājatathāgata-sūtra (q.v.) is one of the earliest Mahayanist texts, dating perhaps from A.D. the third century. The work has four main themes: the twelve vows of Bhaiṣajyaguru, the Buddha of healing; the blessings obtained by those who hear or recite etc. the Buddha's name; the way to worship Bhaiṣajyaguru; and the twelve *yakṣa* generals. A number of fragments of an Old Khotanese version are extant (see Emmerick, 1985). Two fragments of Sogdian versions of this text are extant (cf. Utz, p. 13).

Sumukha-sūtra is a long text in Late Khotanese (including numerous *dhāraṇī*s), in which the bodhisattva Vajrapāṇi and various deities (Brahman, Śakra, Vaiśramaṇa, Hāritī, etc.) promise to protect whoever copies, recites, etc., the *sūtra* (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 135-43).

2. Many other kinds of Sanskrit texts were translated into Khotanese. Among them are various doctrinal texts, *prajñāpāramitā* texts, *deśanā* texts, *dhāraṇī*s (i.e., texts containing spells), *avadāna*s, *jātaka*s, etc.

A very long Old Khotanese text that it has not yet been possible to identify discusses the duties of a bodhisattva (i.e., somebody who aspires to buddhahood), known from 18 folios (there are folios numbered 427-31, 457, 611). Most of the text was published by Leumann (1920, pp. 116-50; Bailey, *KT* V, pp. 91-101), who pointed out some similar texts in the Chinese canon; some additional fragmentary folios, some of which join with those published by Leumann, have recently been identified by P. O. Skjærvø (e.g., *KT* V, pp. 148-50 nos. 276-80). The text is of special interest in

that Late Khotanese forms of words (vowel marks and subscript *akṣaras*) have been superimposed upon the original.

The most important of the *prajñāpāramitā* texts (for detailed bibliographies see Conze) is the *Vajracchedikā* (ed. Konow, in Hoernle, pp. 239-88, 330-56, pls. V-XI, tr., parallel Sanskrit text, facs., and glossary; Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 20-29). The introductory verses of this Late Khotanese text (2a4-2b2) explain the name *Vajracchedikā* (Bailey, 1953, p. 530). The Khotanese *Vajracchedikā* deviates considerably from the Sanskrit text, even including commentarial additions. Most striking is the replacement of a translation of the concluding stanza—quoted literally in the *Book of Zambasta* 6.15—by a commentary in 34 verses, itself quoted in the manuscript of the *Mañjuśrī* text (lines 261-77; Bailey, *KBT*, p. viii ad 11; ed. Emmerick, in Lancaster, with tr., and commentary; for some general problems surrounding the Khotanese *Vajracchedikā* see Itō).

Two other *prajñāpāramitā* texts are:

Adhyardhaśatikā (q.v.), a bilingual Sanskrit-Khotanese text and one of the first Khotanese texts to be studied in depth (ed. Leumann, 1912, pp. 92-99; text, tr., and glossary by Leumann, 1930).

Hṛdayasūtra, a Late Khotanese text (Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 110-12) recently identified by P. O. Skjærvø (1989, ed., tr., comm., glossary, and refs.). A Late Khotanese commentary on the *Hṛdayasūtra* published by Bailey (*KBT*, pp. 54-61) under the title "Prajñāpāramitā" (tr. Bailey, 1977; tr. Lancaster, pp. 15-18, contributes some useful additional information; parts of the text were edited and translated by Skjærvø, 1988).

Dhāraṇīs range from fragments of spells in single manuscript folios to extensive texts, some of which are known from Sanskrit (or Tibetan and/or Chinese); among the latter are the following two:

Anantamukhanirhāri-dhāraṇī (q.v.), a Tantric text of which only one Sanskrit fragment is known. Three folios of an Old Khotanese version were edited and translated by E. Leumann (pp. 151-55). Ten additional folios or fragments of folios, containing partly overlapping text, apparently from four different manuscripts, have recently been identified by P. O. Skjærvø (9 folios or fragments belonging to Leumann's manuscript: *KT* III, pp. 127-28, *KT* V, pp. 30, 37, 102, 103, 103-04, 265, and one unpublished fragment in the India Office Library; the other four: *KT* V, p. 43 + p. 171; p. 176, p. 234, p. 145). None of them contains any part of the *dhāraṇīs* themselves, but the main *dhāraṇī* is known also from a separate manuscript (ed. Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 77-78).

Jñānolka-dhāraṇī. Twelve partly overlapping folios from four (five?) manuscripts are extant, of which one is in Japan (Leumann, 1920, pp. 157-64; Bailey, *KT* V, pp. 36-37, 105). Both Tibetan and Chinese versions of *Jñānolka-dhāraṇī* are extant, but they do not correspond closely to the Khotanese.

Amṛtaprabha-dhāraṇī (q.v.), a Late Khotanese text (Bailey, *KT* V, pp. 61-64 no. 150) that refers to itself several times as a *sūtra*. It contains a date in the body of the text (line 12). The as yet untranslated text is devoted to veneration of the Buddha Amitāyus (Late Khotanese form Armyāya), of whom Amṛta is another name in esoteric Buddhism.

Avalokiteśvara-dhāraṇī, 19 folios in archaizing Late Khotanese (Bailey, *KT* III, pp. 1-13), containing at the end a *dhāraṇī* that is preceded by homage to the bodhisattvas with Avalokiteśvara at the head. Avalokiteśvara is frequently addressed in the vocative.

Three *avadāna* texts are attested in Khotanese:

Aśokāvadāna, a text known from two Late Khotanese manuscripts (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 40-44; tr. Bailey, 1966). The text appears to be a Khotanese paraphrase of a story known from Indian and Chinese sources (see Przyluski; Sujitkumar Mukhopadhyaya; G. M. Bongard Levin and O. F. Volkowa; tr. Strong; cf. AŚOKA iii).

Nandāvadāna, the story of Nanda the merchant (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 45-47; tr. Emmerick, 1970c, with comm., and Sanskrit parallels).

Sudhanāvadāna, the story of Prince Sudhana, known from three main manuscripts, two of which agree closely while the third differs significantly, and five fragments (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 11-39, *KT* V, p. 327; tr. Bailey, 1966; see also Kumamoto, p. 242 n. 6 (for a comparative study of some of the motifs in the Khotanese *Sudhanāvadāna* see Degener). This text is written in Late Khotanese and presents many difficulties in the way of interpretation. It is not yet known whether the variation between the manuscripts is due to discrepancies in the manuscript tradition or whether it reflects the oral transmission of an epic style poem.

Of the *deśanā* texts only one, *Bhadracaryā-deśanā*, has a known original. The others may be translations or local compositions (on these see below):

Bhadracaryā-deśanā (q.v.) is a Late Khotanese metrical translation of a popular Mahayanist devotional work stressing the merits of good conduct and containing a confession of sin. The title is given by the colophon of the Khotanese version (Bailey, *KT* I, pp. 222-30; ed. Asmussen, 1961, with tr., facs., Sanskrit original, and glossary). It corresponds fairly closely to the extant Sanskrit version.

Another text that deals with the actions of men is the *Karmavibhaṅga*, a large number of fragments of which are extant (*KT* III, p. 132 no. 62; *KT* V, p. 292 no. 638, pp. 296-302 nos. 647-60; several more have recently come to light in Munich). Bailey (*KT* V, p. 296 n. 1) refers to their similarity to the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, ed. S. Levi, Paris, 1932. They are characterized by the phrase *aśtä karma tcamäna hve'* ... "there is an act by which a man..." (= Sanskrit *asti karma... -saṃvartanīyam*). Their direct source has not been traced.

3. Indigenous Khotanese compositions.

Khotan was an important center of Buddhism throughout the first millennium of our era, and in addition to their extensive translation activities and the compilation of doctrinal compendiums the Khotanese Buddhist monks also composed texts themselves. The necessity for texts on the Law (*dharma*) in Khotanese is expressed by the author (one of the authors?) of the

Book of Zambasta (23.4-5): "the Khotanese do not value the Law at all in Khotanese. They understand it badly in Indian. In Khotanese it does not seem to them the Law. For the Chinese the Law is in Chinese. In Kashmirian it is very agreeable, but they so learn it in Kashmirian that they also understand the meaning of it." (ed. Emmerick, p. 343). The summary of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* contains a similar statement (1.44, ed. Bailey, 1971, pp. 3, 55) "in Khotanese language so that they may understand the meaning of that Law (i.e., the *sūtra* itself)."

Few of the local compositions are extant, but three long texts in particular stand out as monuments to this activity: the Old Khotanese *Book of Zambasta* and the Late Khotanese *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatāra* and the so-called *Book of Vimalakīrti*. These three texts are original Khotanese works concerning various aspects of Buddhism. The *Book of Zambasta* and the *Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatāra* are both metrical, the *Book of Vimalakīrti* at least in part. All three are based on Indian sources although they are not direct translations. The two Late Khotanese texts contain quotations from known Old Khotanese texts, and the *Mañjuśrī* text even cites long passages from the *Book of Zambasta*.

The *Book of Zambasta* (q.v.), the longest extant Khotanese text (207 folios extant), is a poem on Buddhism written at the request of an official called Ysaṃbasta (i.e., Zambasta; ed., tr., Emmerick, 1968). The poem is composed in three different meters (Emmerick, p. xxi) and is the chief source of our knowledge of Khotanese metrics. Chapter six is of special interest as it claims to contain a verse from each *sūtra*. However, only three citations have been identified, those from the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, the *Suvarṇabhāsottama*, and the *Vajracchedikā*. Numerous fragments of manuscript copies, from five or more different manuscripts, have been identified, which shows that the text was popular in Khotan (cf. Emmerick, 1984, p. 141).

Mañjuśrīnairātmyāvatāra-sūtra (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 113-35; the colophon = lines 435-45 in *KT* II, 123-24), written early in the reign of Viśa' Śūra (r. 967-78), contains many quotations from the *Book of Zambasta* (for which see Emmerick, 1968, pp. 440-53). The following quotations from other sources have also been identified: lines 261-77 correspond to *Vajracchedikā* 41a4-43b4 (see above); the series of comparisons (*upamānas*) in lines 282-92 corresponds closely to those found at the beginning of the sixth chapter of the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* (Degener, 1986b); lines 204-12 correspond to *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra* verses 871-79 (Emmerick, 1988). The importance of the *Mañjuśrī* text in assessing the role played by Khotan in the development of Buddhist doctrine is considerable. Thus, lines 54-82 (verses 42-69) contain a description known only from this text of the three *kleśas*, Moha (Folly), Rāga (Desire), and Dveṣa (Hate), as three doctrinal monsters, kings of the *rākṣasas*, and the parts of their bodies are identified with details of Buddhist doctrine (see Emmerick, 1977a, text of lines 54-82 verses 42-69, tr., and comm.; cf. Emmerick and Skjærvø, II, pp. 99).

The *Book of Vimalakīrti* is a very difficult Late Khotanese metrical text, in which the name Vimalakīrti occurs five times (*KBT* lines 316, 328, 342, 344, 362), sometimes a speaker; however, no part of the text has yet been proved to be from the *Vimalakīrtinirdeśa-sūtra* (cf. above), though the general tenor of the passages where the name Vimalakīrti occurs in the text does bear considerable resemblance to the text as given by Lamotte. The text is known from two manuscripts (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 104-13, beginning and end missing; *KT* III, pp. 48-50 no. 18, beginning missing; 11.2-22 overlap with lines 368-86 of the copy in *KBT*). Lines 293-310 contain a quotation from the *Anantamukhanirhāridhāraṇī* (lines 293-94: *Ana⟨nta⟩mvakhanaihārasūttra*) concerning the symbolism of the *akṣaras* (cf. Bailey, *KT* V, p. 103 no. 202 verso). The copy in *KT* III (verses 27ff.) contains injunctions against drinking wine and eating meat that are closely similar to the Sogdian text P[elliot] 2, especially the mention of eating the flesh of one's parents (ed. Benveniste, p. 11). The text also mentions some *sūtras* by name: *Mañjuśrī-parivarta* and *Tathāgatajñānasamudra-sūtra* in lines 261-62, *Vajramaṇḍala-sūtra* in line 264, *Karmāvaraṇaviśuddhasūtra* in line 265.

Jātakastava, a collection of *jātaka* stories (i.e., stories about the previous lives of the Buddha; Bailey, *KT* I, pp. 198-219; ed. Dresden, 1955, with corr. and adds. in *IIJ* 14/1-2, 1972, pp. 104-06; facs. Bailey, 1938, pls. 145-83). This text seems not to be a translation but a Khotanese composition containing succinct summaries of fifty-one *jātaka* stories, of which all but about nine have been traced in other sources.

Of special interest are two poems composed by Khotanese princes at the court of Shachou: the *Homage of Hūyī Kīma-tcūna* and the *Invocation of Prince Tcūsyau*:

The *Homage of Hūyī Kīma-tcūna* (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 91-93) is a *namo* ("I do reverence to...") text. The introduction (lines 1-24) bears a strong resemblance to the "Invocation of Prince Tcū-syau" (lines 1-14). A variant of the text was published in transcription by Bailey, KT III, pp. 5557.

The *Invocation of Prince Tcū-syau* (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 146-48; 11.2-35 tr. Bailey, 1942, pp. 891, 893), contains the name of the "great prince" Tcū-syau in lines 39, 47, and 57. He is probably to be identified with the son of Li Shengtian (King Viśa' Saṃbhata; r. 742-55), who is called Zong/Congchang (Tsung/Ts'ung-ch'ang) in the Chinese sources, that is, a brother of Prince Tcūṃ-ttehi (see above; Kumamoto, 1986, p. 232 with n. 7 p. 242).

Other texts on confession are found in several Late Khotanese manuscripts. The text called *Deśanā* by Bailey (*KBT*, pp. 53, 62-66; tr. Bailey, 1962) contains the word *deśana* in folio 84r4. In the two *deśanā* texts contained in the scroll Ch c.001.828-29 (*KT* V, pp. 249-55 nos. 530, 531; variants in *KT* III, pp. 112-16 no. 47; *KBT*, pp. 100-04) it is said that anyone who orders the Buddha names of this text to be written or who recites them will obtain "atonement for sins" (*karmāṃ deśana*). The main text of *KBT*, pp. 91-93, beginning with

sidhamä in line 25 is also closely related to these texts. Still another Late Khotanese text on the theory of the atonement for sins (*karmāṃ deśana*) found in three variants (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 66-71) has been edited by Emmerick (1977b, with tr. and glossary).

Three Late Khotanese Vajrayana (a late development of Buddhism, containing a strong element of *tantra* or mysticism) texts are extant:

One of the three texts (four folios) is a prose treatise on the rosary (*KBT*, pp. 143-46; tr., comm. Bailey, 1965). Similar texts concerning the rosary have been found in Tibetan manuscripts from Tunhuang (Stein). The other two Vajrayana texts (*KBT*, pp. 149-51 [cf. *KT* II, p. 57 no. 15]; and 151-56, lines 1-32 tr. Bailey, 1978) are in verse (the first contains a date that may correspond to 10 August 971; Hamilton, 1979, 51).

Tumshuqese Buddhist texts.

Among the Tumshuqese texts are several letters written by political and religious officials. At least one of the texts appears to have been written by a Manichean, and three or four of them are Buddhist texts. The longest Buddhist text is a *karmavācanā* text, that is, a description of the ceremony of dedication of Buddhist laymen and laywomen. This text is our main source for the interpretation of Tumshuqese grammar and vocabulary (latest edition Emmerick, 1985, with Skjærvø's additions and corrections in Skjærvø, 1987). The beginning of the text is a *triśaraṇa* formula ("I take refuge with the Buddha, the Law/*dharma*, and the community/*saṅgha*"), Khotanese versions of which are also extant (Bailey, *KBT*, pp. 156-57; cf. *KT* III, p. 64, and the beginning of *KT* II, pp. 101-02).

There is one very small fragment of the *Araṇemi-jātaka*, a text known also from Tokharian (Bailey, 1968) and a fragment from a similar text, mentioning the king Vajradaṇḍa (Konow, 1947, pp. 172-73). Both these fragments contain Tokharian words.

Bibliography: H. W. Bailey, *Codices Khotanenses*, Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Maioris II, Copenhagen, 1938. Idem, "Hvatanica IV," *BSOAS* 10/4, 1942, pp. 886-924. Idem, *Khotanese Texts* [*KT*] I-VI, Cambridge, 1945-67. Idem, *Khotanese Buddhist texts* [*KBT*], London, 1951. Idem, "Ariaca," *BSOAS* 15/3, 1953, pp. 530-40. Idem, "The Profession of Prince Tcūm-ttehi," in E. Bender, ed., *Indological Studies in Honor of W. Norman Brown*, New Haven, 1962, pp. 18-22. Idem, "The Sudhana Poem of Ṛddhiprabhāva," *BSOAS* 29/3, 1966, pp. 506-32. Idem, "Vajrayāna texts from Gostana" in *Studies of Esoteric Buddhism and Tantrism in Commemoration of the 1150th Anniversary of the Founding of Koyasan*, Koyasan, 1965, pp. 27-39. Idem, *Sad-dharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. The Summary in Khotan Saka*, The Australian National University, Faculty of Asian Studies, Occasional Paper 10, Canberra 1971; repr. 1973. Idem, *Saka Documents. Text Volume*, Corpus Inscr. Iran. II/V, London, 1968. Idem, "The Pradakṣiṇāsūtra of Chang Tsiang-kuin," in L. Cousins et al., eds., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I. B. Horner*, Dordrecht, 1974, pp. 15-18. Idem, "*Mahāprajñāpāramitāsūtra*" in Lancaster, ed., pp. 153-62. Idem, "Vajrayāna in Gostana-deśa", *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 1/1, 1978, pp. 53-56. E. Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd ed., The Reiyukai Library, Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series, Maior I, Tokyo, 1978. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, ed. G. P. Malalasekera, Ceylon, 1961. A. Degener, "Sudhanas Wanderung in khotanischer Fassung", *Studien zu Indologie und Iranistik* 11-12, 1986a, pp. 21-32. Idem, "The Four *apramāṇas* in Khotanese," *Stud. Ir.* 15/2, 1986b, pp. 259-64. M. J. Dresden, *The Jātakastava or "Praise of the Buddha's Former Births*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, N.S. 45.5, Philadelphia, 1955. Idem, "Khotanese (Saka) Manuscripts. A Provisional Handlist," in *Varia 1976*, Acta Iranica 16, Tehran and Liège, 1977, pp. 27-85. R. E. Emmerick, *The Book of Zambasta. A Khotanese Poem on Buddhism*, London, 1968. Idem, *The Khotanese Śūraṅgama-samādhi-sūtra*, London, 1970a. Idem, *The Sūtra of Golden Light*, London 1970b; repr. 1979. Idem, "Nanda the Merchant," *BSOAS* 33/1, 1970c, pp. 72-81. Idem, "The Concluding Verses of the Khotanese Vajracchedikā," in Lancaster, ed., pp. 83-92. Idem, "Some Khotanese Donors," in Ph. Gignoux and A. Tafazzoli, eds., *Mémorial Jean de Menasce*, Louvain, 1974, pp. 383-88. Idem, "Three Monsters in Khotan," *Stud. Ir.* 6/1, 1977a, pp. 65-74. "The Confession of Acts," in *Varia 1976*, Acta Iranica 12, Tehran and Liège, 1977b, pp. 87-115. Idem, review of Takubo, in *IIJ* 20, 1978, pp. 253-56. Idem, *A Guide to the Literature of Khotan*, Studia Philologica Buddhica, Occasional Paper Series III, The Reiyukai Library, Tokyo, 1979. Idem, in W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, eds., *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*, Leuven, 1984, pp. 127-45. Idem, "Some Verses from the Laṅkāvatārasūtra in Khotanese" in *A Green Leaf. Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*, Leiden, 1988, pp. 125-33. Idem and P. O. Skjærvø, *Studies in the Vocabulary of Khotanese*, Vienna, I, 1982; II, 1987. G. Gropp, "Eine neuentdeckte Sammlung Khotanischer Handschriftenfragmente in Deutschland," in W. Skalmowski and A. van Tongerloo, eds., *Middle Iranian Studies. Proceedings of the International Symposium Organized by the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven from the 17th to the 20th of May 1982*, Leuven, 1984, pp. 147-50. J. Hamilton, "Les règnes khotanais entre 851 et 1001," in M. Soymié, ed., *Contributions aux études sur Touenhouang*, Geneva and Paris, 1979, pp. 49-54. O. von Hinüber, *Das Saṃghāṭasūtra. Ausgabe und kommentierte Übersetzung eines nordbuddhistischen Lehrtextes in Sanskrit und Sakisch*, Habilitation thesis, Mainz, 1973. A. F. R. Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature Found in Eastern Turkestan*, Oxford, 1916. Y. Itō in "A Few Problems Concerning

the Khotanese Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 2/2, 1954, pp. 207-09 (560-62). S. Konow, *Saka Studies*, Oslo, 1932. Idem, "The Oldest Dialect of Khotanese Saka," *NTS* 14, 1947, pp. 150-90. H. Kumamoto, "Some Problems of the Khotanese Documents," in R. Schmitt and P. O. Skjærvø, eds., *Studia Grammatica Iranica. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach*, Munich, 1986, pp. 227-44. L. Lancaster, "A Study of a Khotanese *Prajñāpāramitā* Text After the Work of Sir Harold Bailey," in idem ed., *Prajñāpāramitā and Related Systems. Studies in Honor of Edward Conze*, Berkeley, 1977, pp. 163-83. E. Leumann, *Buddhistische Literatur. Nordarisch und Deutsch. I. Teil: Nebenstücke*, AKM 15/2, Leipzig, 1920; repr. Liechtenstein, 1966. Duan Qing. *Aparimitāyuḥ-Sūtra und das S 2471*, Ph.D. dissertation, Hamburg, 1987. *Prolegomena to the Sources on the History of Pre-Islamic Central Asia*, ed. J. Harmatta, Budapest, 1979. W. Samolin, *East Turkistan to the Twelfth Century. A Brief Political Survey*, Central Asiatic Studies 9, The Hague, etc., 1964. P. O. Skjærvø, *The Khotanese Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, Habilitation thesis, Mainz, 1983. Idem, "Khotanese Fragments of the Vimala-kīrti-nirdeśa-sūtra," in E. Kahrs, ed., *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, Oslo, 1986, pp. 229-60. Idem, "On the Tumshuqese *Karmavācanā* Text," *JRAS*, 1987, pp. 77-90. Idem, in the proceedings of the colloquium on Central Asia, Paris, 1988 (forthcoming). R. A. Stein, "Un genre particulier d'exposés du tantrisme ancien tibétain et khotanais," *JA* 275/3-4, 1987, pp. 265-82. S. Takubo, *Tonkō shutsudo utengo himitsu kyōtenshū no kenkyū* [= Studies on the Khotanese "Collection of the esoteric sūtras" found in Tunhuang], Tokyo, 1975. D. A. Utz, *A Survey of Buddhist Sogdian Studies*, Bibliographia Philologica Buddhica, Series Minor III, Tokyo 1978.

(RONALD E. EMMERICK AND PRODS OKTOR SKJÆRVØ)

BŪF, owl, commonly called *jogd*.

Of the thirteen species of Strigiformes reported by Hüe and Étchécopar (pp. 401-19) for the Near and Middle East eleven species, from two families, occur in Iran (see also Scott et al., pp. 197-206): 1. the barn owl, *Tyto alba* Scop. (fam. Tytonidae); 2. the eagle owl, *Bubo bubo* L.; 3. the brown fish-owl, *Ketupa zeylonensis* Gm.; 4. the long-eared owl, *Asio otus* L.; 5. the short-eared owl, *Asio flammeus* Pontop.; 6. the scops owl, *Otus scops* L.; 7. the striated (or Bruce's) scops owl, *Otus brucei* Hume; 8. the little owl, *Athene noctua* Scop.; 9. the spotted little owl, *Athene brama* Temm.; 10. the tawny owl, *Strix aluco* L.; 11. Hume's tawny owl, *Strix butleri* Hume (fam. Strigidae).

Several other general names are found for the owl in classical Persian dictionaries and other sources, e.g.: *jogd* (var. *čogd*, e.g., in Asadī Ṭūsī, *Loġat-e fors*, ed. Eqbāl, p. 86, quoting Ferdowsī); *būm* (Ar.), now only in literary use; *būf* (Pahl. *būf*, sometimes written *būg*), a term that became popular after the revival of Ṣ. Hedāyat's novel *Būf-e kūr* (The blind owl) in the 1320s Š./1940s (cf. *bū* in the dialect of Jāf, *bo* in Lakī and in the dialect of Kermānšāh, and *būk* in the dialects of Sanandaj and Garrūs; Mokrī, p. 31); *kūf*, now obsolete (e.g., in Farroḵī Sīstānī, quoted by Asadī, p. 246, who explains: "*Kūf* is [a synonym of] *kūč*, a species of small birds; found in Azerbaijan, they call it [*kongor*?]"; also in *ḵar-kūf*, for which see below); *kūč* (also "cross-eyed," cf. the Māzandarāni name for the owl, *pet/pīt(-e/-ə) kole*, lit. "the cross-eyed birdie," probably because of the apparent squint in the owl's eyes), now obsolete (Asadī, p. 63, quoting Kesā'ī Marvazī); *kongor*, obsolete ("*Čoġd* is *kūč*, and some common people call it *kongor*," Asadī, p. 86). More specific terms are: *ḵar-kūf* (big owl) and *šāh-būm* (king owl) for the largest native species, *Bubo bubo* (called *šā-bū/-bo* in Kurdistan, Mokrī, loc. cit., and *šā-bīf* in Lorī), and (*morḡ-e*) *šab-āvīz* (night-hanging [bird]), also called *čūk* (Asadī, p. 297: "a bird that suspends itself from trees," quoting Bahrāmī and Manūčehrī), *čark* (Nasavī, *Bāz-nāma*, p. 163; see also *Borhān-e qāṭeʿ*, s.v.), and *morḡ-e ḥaq(gūy)* (the *ḥaq-*[uttering] bird) for one of the smaller species (see below). The name *bāy(a)-qūš* (Asadī, p. 63, s.v. *kūč*) is from southern Turkish *bay-/bāy-qūš* (the rich bird, see Doerfer, II, pp. 260-61; see also below).

To this writer's knowledge, the earliest differentiation of the owls in Persian sources is by Tonokābonī (fl. 1077-1105/1667-94), *Toḥfat al-moʾmenīn*, p. 245: The *būm* "is of several kinds: the largest, called *sār-qūš* in Turkish, *būf* or *šāh-būm* in Persian; the smallest and humblest, called *morḡ-e ḥaq*, the size of a turtledove; the kind called *yaplāq* [misprinted *bīlāq* in the text] in Turkish, larger than the latter, but smaller than the other kinds; an intermediate kind—black—called *jogd* [in Persian] and *kūr-e bū* [blind owl] in Tonokābon" (the "blindness" of owls, which are mostly nocturnal birds, is a popular interpretation of their reduced vision and, hence, awkward, foolish-looking behavior in broad daylight; cf. also other (nick)names with *kūr* "blind": *būa-kūra* "the blind owl" in Kurmānjī and Kermānšāh dialects (Mokri, p. 36), and *kūr(-ə) qūqū* "the blind *būqū*" in Gīlakī).

The next inventory of owls is to be found in Teymūr Mīrzā's treatise on falconry (written in 1285/1869; pp. 19-23). He speaks of "eight or nine kinds of *būf*" but discusses only those that, supposedly, could be of some use to falconers: the *šāh-būf*, *yāp(a)lāḡ*, *ʿarūs-e čāh*, *bāy(a)-qūš*, and *morḡ-e šab-āhang*.

The author describes at length the long and tedious procedure of training the *šāh-būf*, "the best of all," to serve as a decoy for attracting and netting other birds, especially some falcons and hawks highly prized by falconers, which, instinctively recognizing in the *šāh-būf* a ruthless nocturnal predator, rush to molest or kill it while it is visible and vulnerable in daylight.

The *yāp(a)lāḡ* (cf. Azeri Turk. *yāpālāq* "owl") is said by the author to be of two kinds, both smaller than the *šāh-būf*: the *yāpalāq-e ṣaḥrāʾī* (plain/field *yāpalāq*, probably *Asio flammeus*), and the *yāpalāq-e bāḡī* (garden *yāpalāq*; probably *A. otus*), which is usually found in