GILGIT IN ANCIENT TIMES

—BUDHĀ PRAPANSHA—

Gilgit is the name given to the western frontier districts of Kashmir which are now under the occupation of Pakistan. It corresponds to the region called Dardistan. Its subdivisions are Askor, Bunji, Chils, Gilgit, Jumra, Nager,Panial, Yasin and Chitrál. Adjacent to it is the territory of Baltistan consisting of the subdivisions of Kharmang, Kaplu, Shigar Skardu and Rondu. More strictly Gilgit signifies the lower valley of the Gilgit river joining the Indus at its acute bend north of Nang Parbat. This whole area is extremely mountainous exceeding 20,000 feet on the north and west, but the lower valley is about 5000 feet and grows maize, millet, temperate cereals and even some cotton and rice. The total area of the region is 12,355 square miles. Along river valleys and mountain passes run routes connecting this region with the outside world. One route passing through the Traghal and Bussil passes joins Gilgit to Nigar 225 miles south of it. Another route connects Gilgit with the Afghanistan frontier of the Punjab along the Balasat Pass. In the north, narrow sterile mountain valleys, measuring some 100 to 150 miles in width, separate the province from the Chinese frontier beyond the Mantogh and Karakoram ranges.

The region of Gilgit and Baltistan is known as Daradadea in old texts (like the Rajastangini). Its people, the Daradas, are said to have played an important part in the history of Kashmir. According to the Tibetan historian Taranatha, the route between it and Kashmir was opened by Buddhist pilgrims and missionaries who reached Kashmir with and following Matthayamaka and emissary of Moggaliputta Tissa at the time of Asoka.

Since then it became a resort of Buddhist monks and preachers who made it an important centre of their religion. Hence, in the beginning of the fifth century, when the Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien passed through it, he found Buddhism in a flourishing condition there. From Khotan Fa-hien and his party travelled for twenty-five days to reach Tshe-ho which Watters identifies with Tashkurgan in Stizkul. "Its king was a strenuous follower of our Law and had around him more than a thousand monks, mostly students of Mahayana". Here the travellers stayed for fifteen days. Then they went south for four days and reached Yu-lien, Aktash according to Watters, in the Tsing-ling (Oxion) mountains. There they passed
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their retreat. Then they moved among the hills and, travelling for twenty-five days, reached Kledch's which Klapproth and Watters take to be Skardo in Baltistan. It was a great centre of Buddhism. At that time the king was holding the Pancha Parishad and had invited monks from all quarters to attend it. The function was marked by great pomp and show and the venue of the assembly was gaily decorated. "Silken streamers and canopies are hung out in it and wide fences in gold and silver are made and fixed up behind the places where the chiefs of them are to sit." At the conclusion the king and his minions distributed gifts and charities among the monks, uttering vows all the time. A statue of Buddha and also his toshu was believed to be there. The monks were followed by Hinayana and observed numerous remarkable rules. From there the pilgrims travelled for one month to reach T'a-linh (Darada) where they found many Hinayana monks. There they found a eighty cubit high wooden image of Maitrey which was believed to be a true copy of him as he lived in the Tushita heaven. People of the neighbouring countries came here to make offerings to it. From there Fa-hien and his party crossed the Indus. "In former times men had chiselled paths along the rocks and distributed ladders on the face of them, to the number altogether of 576, at the bottom of which there was a suspension bridge of ropes, by which the river was crossed, its banks being there 90 paces apart." It took the travellers fourteen days to negotiate this difficult and dangerous pass. People informed Fa-hien that in old times the Sammas of India had crossed this river carrying with them Sutra and Vinaya scriptures. From that place he and his men reached the kingdom of Woo-chung (Udyana) where the diet, dress and dialect of the people are said to be like those in "Central India." The region was quilled with monasteries (viharas), their number being no less than 600, where the newcomers were provided with all necessities for three days. The Buddha was believed to have visited that region and left his foot imprint there which was highly venerated. Passing through Soo-ho-jo (Swinou) the pilgrims reached Gandhara and were at Takhapala.

This account of Fa-hien's itinerary shows that a route lay from Khoto via Tashkurgan, Akurch, Skardo and Daral (Darasa), across the Indus, to Udyana Swat and Gandhara and that it took one 99 days, say one hundred days to complete the journey from Khoto to Udyana along it. It is also clear from it that this route was made and used by Buddhist pilgrims, monks and missionaries and by the they carried their faith to the Central Asian and eastern world. Darala and Skardo were flourishing Buddhist centres radiating their influence in all directions. Further it is patent that the region to the south of the Queen Range was
considered part of India, for, as Fa-hsu says, "When the travellers had
got through them (the Union Mountains) they were in North India."8

Sometime after Fa-hsin another Chinese monk, Che-moung, crossed the
Pamirs and travelling through Gilgit, entered into Kashmir, probably
through the Buxar Pass route. A little after, the Chinese monk, Fa-
young, took the same route for reaching Kashmir from the Pamirs. In the
next century Sung-yun travelled from Tsao-mo (Tash-kurgan), through
Fa-lou (Wakhan) to She-kei (Chitral), but, instead of advancing through
Gilgit on the way to Kashmir, he journeyed on the road to Uddana and
thence to Gandhara.9

In the later part of the eighth century the pilgrim and writer Wu-Vong followed this route of Yashandel Gilgit to reach
the Indo region and thence to Uddana and Kapisa. Thus it is clear
that the Gilgit route was an important link between India and the coast-
states of the southern part of the Tarim Basin linking the passage to China.

The flourishing of Buddhist centres along it invented it with a singular
significance in an age when the intensity of faith belittled the difficulties
of travelling and eclipsed the risks of life which it presented.

However, the people of Gilgit region, the Daradas, were somewhat
different in customs and manners from those of the Kashmir valley.
In a verse, found in the Calcutta and Paris manuscripts of the Rajatarangini,
there is a reference to their custom of having illicit relations with
their daughters-in-law.10 At another place their custom of continual
wine-drinking is pointedly mentioned11. They are also said to be
adept in the washing of gold which was found in the beds of rivers like
the Kishanganga.12 According to Janaraja, Sultan Zain-ul-abidin (1410-72)
imposed a levy of one-sixth of the produce on the gold washed by these
people.13 More than once the rulers of these regions are said to have
invaded the Kashmir valley. Similarly the kings of Kashmir are reported
to have marched into the Darada country and chastised its people and even
converted them to their culture and religion. For example, Mihrakulak
is said to have "reestablished pious observances in this land which,
overrun by the impure Daradas, Bhauttas and Mlechhas, had fallen off
from the sacred law (brahmanism)."14 This shows that at that time
the valley was overran and dominated by the Daradas and others, who
had swept down upon it in the confusion caused by Hephthalite invasions,
and that Mihrakula put an end to their menace and drove them off and rehabilitated the Aryas there.

The early history of Gilgit, the Darada country, in relation to the
Kashmir valley, consists of the activities of Buddhist monks and missionarys,
on the one hand, and the frequent raids and counterraidas, incursions
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and investigations, an instance of which at the time of Minhaj al-Din is given above, on the other. Detailed information of this process becomes available from the end of the sixteenth century onwards when the interplay of tribal movements and imperial adventures determined the trends of history in Asia and affected those regions through which the routes of trade and communication passed.

The Chinese text Pei-shih, based on the accounts of the mission of Sung-yan in 519, states that the regions of Tsu-kiu (Kongur), K'uo-li (Tsashkurg), Po-he (Wakhan), Po-teho (Zebak), She-mi (Chitrat) and Kan-te (Gandhara) formed part of more than thirty kingdoms which were included in the empire of the Hephthalites. This shows that Gilgit, particularly the route between it and Gandhara, on which Sung-yan travelled, was under the Hephthalites. We may equate this fact with the account of the conquest of the Dardas by Mihiragula given in the Rajatarangini, cited above. But in the second half of the sixth century, between 533 and 562, the Khan of the Western Turc's (Tou-kho), Istant, called she-te-mi in Chinese texts and Sibarbone or Dizirebone in Byzantine records, with the collaboration of the Sasanid monarch Khurram Anushirvand, destroyed the Hephthalite empire. According to Dusiovat, Thadrimi and Mekhands, the Sasanids occupied Takharistan, Zaidistan, Kabolsitan and Jaghatalan. whereas the Turks wrested the regions of Tashkand, Fergana, Samackand Bukhara, Kish and Nisa. Tabari, however, states that Khosrau sent an army in Tirmaziana and encamped at Farghanak and that his authority extended up to Kashmir and Ceylon (Samarthiy). Chavannes thinks that the Oxus was the boundary between the empires of the Sasanids and the Turks. If the Iron Gates on the north of that river be the real divide. Thus it appears that, with the dismemberment of the Hephthalite empire, the Sasanids became the overlord of the regions up to the Indus including Kashmir.

Soon the aforecited political pattern changed. The Turks broke off with the Sasanids about the sale of Chinese silk. They began to negotiate with the Byzantines on this subject along the northern route which circumvented the Sasanid empire. In 567 they sent an envoy, named Mamukh, to Constantinople by the route of the Lower Volga and the Caucasus and the emperor, Justinian II. reciprocated the gesture by sending an ambassador, named Zeinarchus, to the court of Israim in 568. As a result of these diplomatic exchanges, an alliance was formed between the Turks and the Byzantines against the Sasanids. In accordance with it, the Turk ruler turned the cold shoulder to the envoy of the Sasanids and soon afterwards declared war against them. From the west the Byzantines also marched against Persia. Though,
with the accession of Istazib’s son Tardu as the Khan of the western Turks, the relations between him and the Byzantines became strained on the score of the help which the latter extended to the Assan and the Nepthalites, who had taken refuge in South Russia, and during this time they continued their opposition to the Sassanids and in 588–6 attacked it from the east and the west respectively. Tahari says that the Turk chief Shaba marched with 700,000 soldiers against the Persians but the general Bahram Shabum defeated him and put an end to his life. It appears that this Turk chief was some feudatory of the Great Khan Tardu. Just after this victory Bahram was sent to fight with the Byzantines but was defeated. This led to his disgrace and eventual retirement, which resulted in the deposition of Hormizd IV and the accession of Khusrav Parvez. However, Bahram chased him out of Persia and drove him into the arms of the Byzantines. With their support he returned to fight with Bahram and vanquished him. In this battle the Turks also played an important part having sided with Bahram. So, after his defeat, Bahram sought refuge among them but Khusrav encompassed his assassination by suborning the Khatis. About that time the Turks conquered Tukharistan and appointed the local Nepthalite and Kushan rulers to administer it, for in 593–98 we find Khusrav Parvez sending his general Smbat Bgratsuntq to over them. Yet the authority of the Sassanids could not extend beyond Heru.

As the seventh century dawned, war again flared up between the Sassanids and the Byzantines. The third of these wars lasted till the end of the reign of Khusrav in 628. In those fruitful times the Turks extended their rule to the west and north of the Oxus with the result that by 610, when Huen-tsong toured through that region, the sway of the Turks reached the Indus. Thus the sovereignty of the Sassanids over the region from the Oxus to the Indus was replaced by that of the Turks or the Turks.

Buddhist traditions refer to the rule of the Turushka or Turks over wide regions including Kashmir. Taranaha says that King Turushka ruled for 150 years as a Dharmaraja in Kashmir and his son Mahasamata brought the kingdom of Kashmir, Tukbara, and Ghami under one administration and spread Mahayana Buddhism there. The Attharapamisakha mentions a king Turushka, who ruled over the Utrataputha up to Kshasha and under whom the Mahayana-doctrine, especially that of the Prajaparamita, spread throughout, and his successor, Mahatmashuma, who erected numerous Buddhist shrines and monasteries and propagated the Dharma and the worship of Tara Devi. In his text Turushka is called Gomi or Guanamu-khya and Mahatmashuma Buddharpakha. It is clear that Turushka and
Mahanamnata of Tanaga is the same as Turuska and Mahatuarushka or GomacukDecember and Buddhaphala of the Ayutthayamahamuladhata. N. Dutta has proposed to identify Turuska with Mihiraka and Mahatuarushka or Mahamahamnata with his son Bala mentioned in the Rajatangiri. But this view is manifestly wrong because Mihiraka is represented as the persecutor of Buddhism rather than its preserver or propagator and Bala is shown to have founded the shrine of Baktala (Shiva) and not built any Buddhist establishment while Turuska and Mahatuarushka are known as zealous Buddhists. It appears that Turuska of these traditions stands for the king called Meghavahana by Kalkhana. The grounds of this identification are that Meghavahana is said to have been invited by the people and magistrates of Kashmir from Gandhara, which was, as we have seen above, under the rule of the Tuy-Kine, he is depicted as a great patron and protector of Buddhism and the builder of many viharas. He is represented as undertaking a conquest of the world (bilagriya) to promote the observance of the sacred law, particularly, to enforce the prohibition against the killing of living beings which he is said to have acted like a jina, and one of his queens is named as Khadga, whose name is preserved in the locality called Khadiya, about 4 miles below Varanamula (Baramulla), containing a monastery built by her, seen by Wu-Kung (Baramula), and remains of the site Khotan born by the queen of the Turks. As I propose to show in another study, Meghavahana and his successors were Tuy-kine or Turk rulers some of whom had their rule in Gandhara but whom Kalkhana jumbled in the lines of the kings of Kashmir. Thus it is clear that the Turks created a mighty empire including Gandhara and Kashmir and even extensive parts of North India. But sometime between 647 and 649, the founder of the Khurana dynasty Durlabhavahana, called Tuy-lo-pa in Chinese texts, established his rule in the Kashmir valley obviously driving the Turk rulers in the neighboring regions. It appears that some of the Turks set up their rule in Gilgit in the north-west of the valley and founded a strong state there which played a very significant part in history.

That the state of Gilgit became a great power in the seventh and eighth centuries is known from an inscription found some 50 miles south of Hatem on the right bank of the Kishnum river in the Gilgit Agency. It refers to the reign of Paramaratulakara Maharatadhiraja Paramevara Patoladeva Shahi Sri Navasurenradityamadhishika belonging to the family of Bhagavata, and records that, in the 47th year of his reign, his chief minister, Makaramimba, who bore the titles of 'great lord of the elephants' (Mahapalaspati), 'great lord of the fortresses' (Maha-samastadhipati) and chief of the army at Gilgitta or Gilgit' (Gilgittaraam-
The king Navasunradriyananddeva, mentioned in the Hatun inscription, is obviously identical with Shahanshah Patolasahi Sri Navasunradriyananddeva, mentioned in a manuscript of the Mahamaya, discovered in a stupa, three miles to the north of Gilgit, along with his queen Anangdevi. He is said to have caused the manuscript to be written to ensure his longevity. Further it may be possible to identify him with Sri Deva Shahi Surendra Vikramaditya Nanda, who, along with one Shami-devi Trailokadevi Bhattachari, probably his wife, is mentioned in the colophon of another manuscript as its donor. Another king of the same line Patolasaha Shahi Vajrajyayanandi is known from the colophon of another manuscript.

King Surendriyananddeva of the Hatun inscription and colophon of Gilgit manuscripts is undoubtedly Sou-lin’-o-i-tche, ruler of Great Poush, who sent a mission to China with the products of his country in the period K’ai-yuen (713-741), according to the T’ang shu (chapter CXXI, l). From the Chinese Encyclopaedia T’ih’s fu yuen ksei we learn that in the year 710 the Chinese emperor sent ambassadors to the court of this Sou-lin’-o-i-tche conferring on him the title of the king of Poush. The T’ang shu further states that his predecessor was Sou-sou-ko-li-tche-li-ni and that he also sent an envoy to the Chinese court and that it sent a letter of investiture to him in 717. This king reigned up to 719 and, the following year, Sou-lin’-o-i-tche came to the throne.

The T’ih’s fu yuen ksei states that in 728 a dignitary of the kingdom of Poush, named T’u-mao-tai (yen) mo she went to China to render
homage and received the present of a violet robe and 2 golden bells. In 715 another dignitary of that kingdom visited the Chinese court. His name is given as Pa-han-k’iu. He got the title of lang-ti-an and fifty pieces of silk as gifts from the court.

In the letter, which the Chinese emperor sent to Ssu-fou-shu-li-tche-lin in 717, he stated that the predecessors of the latter had been ruling and showing respect for the Tang for the last many generations which shows that they were diplomatic contact with the Tang emperors at least from the latter part of the seventh century.

We have seen above that Nangzen-drub-tshan-ma was called Patolzhala showing that he was king of the region known as Balistan but his sway extended over Gilgit also and its governor, Makarazhi, acted as his subordinate. However, Chinese sources treat Balistan, called Great Pousha, and Gilgit, called Small Pousha, as separate units and the Tang shu mentions Sou-lin t’o-it-he as the ruler of the former and Mo-k’i-mang as the ruler of the latter during the same period. ‘Sou-lin t’o-it-he is identical with Nangzen-drub-tshan-ma of Balistan (Patola), Mo-k’i-mang would be the same as Makarazhi, the military chief of Gilgit (Gilgitta Sarangha). The Tang shu states that Mo-k’i-mang went to China to render homage to the court and was treated by the emperor Hsien-tsung like his son. This he is said to have done to seek succour from China against the Tibetans who were forcing their way through his territory to attack and occupy the Fort Garrison of Kukha, Kargill, Khitten and Karonbala or Tsamak. In 721, in accordance with the arrangement between China and Gilgit, the commissioner of Pei-tang Kuitchu, Tchang-Hao-sang, ordered the prefect of Sou-tse (Kashgar), Tchang-li-k, to march with 4,000 troops for the help of Mo-k’i-mang, streng thened by this succour, Mo-k’i-mang moved against the Tibetans (Tom-po) and inflicted a crushing defeat on them killing many of their men and seizing nine of their cities. Following these events, the Tang emperor issued a decree conferring the title of king of small Pousha (Gilgit) on Mo-k’i-mang and the letter also went his envoy, Tch’i-tche-lin-mo-no-cheq, to express his gratitude to the Chinese court. In 733 Mo-k’i-mang is said to have sent another envoy to China, on his death his son Nang-zi assumed power. He also died soon and in 644 his elder brother Mo-k’i-lin took over the throne and was confirmed by the Chinese through a letter. He too passed away shortly and Sou-she-li-tche became the ruler. He changed the policy of his predecessors and befriended the Tibetans in preference to the Chinese. Hence in 743 the Chinese general Kao-lin-tche invaded Gilgit. As a result, the ruler
of Gilgit returned to the policy of friendship with China and in 748 sent an ambassador to China offering golden flowers. Again in 751 an ambassador from Gilgit reached the Chinese court. Thus it is clear that the chiefs of Gilgit, Makarishana and his successors, behaved as autonomous rulers and were treated by the Chinese as such in the disturbed conditions created by the incursions of the Chinese. Not only they, but also some chieftains under them, like the chief of Chitral (Khowar), were sometime considered autonomous as in 710 when a letter of investiture was addressed to him by the T‘ang court.

It has been observed above that the kings of Baltistan were called Shahi, a title borne by the Sakas, Kushans, Hepthalites and Turks. But the days of the Sakas and Kushans were over in the fourth century and the Hepthalites had been conquered and eclipsed by the Turks and the Sasanids in the last quarter of the sixth. In the first quarter of the seventh century the Turks had even ousted the influence of the Sassanids from the region between the Oxus and the Indus and emerged as the paramount sovereigns of it. We have seen that the tradition of Turunkha and Makaturakhli, referred to in the Aramqusurulmahal, the history of Taranatha, and that of Bosten, is based on the supremacy of the Tu-kins or Turks in that period. It is, therefore, quite likely that they conquered Kashmir, Gilgit and Baltistan also at that time. From Kashmir they were driven out by the Karakans, but in Gilgit and Saltistan they continued to rule and flourish, and, as is probable, the Shahi rulers of Baltistan, tracing their lineage from Bhagadalpa, represented one of their stocks. This view is strengthened by the tradition of the rule of the Turks over this region reported by Al-Biruni. He writes on this subject as follows:

"The river Sind rises in the mountains Unong in the territory of the Turks, which you can reach in the following way: leaving the ravine by which you enter Kashmir and entering the plateau, then you have for a march of two or more days on your left the mountains of Bolor and Samsital, Turkish tribes who are called Bhuttawarz. Their king has the title Bhattashah. Their towns are Gilgit, Assira and Shulitas and their language is the Turkish. Kashmir suffers much from their invasions."

The Shias of this region say that they are of the same race as the Moghuls of India. According to tradition Gilgit was ruled by the rajas of a family called Trakans.
It appears that the tradition of Turkish rule over this region goes back to the early seventh century when the Tu-kine dominated the vast area up to Gandhara and Kashmir. Thus the Shabhs of Baltistan, Nasserudahrabtewari, and others, were a branch of the Tu-kine or Turks. They set up a strong state there and made it a flourishing centre of Buddhism. The Gilgit manuscripts, revealing the names of a number of devotees like Sulkhina, Sudraj, Mantshi, Mangalasura, Aryadevendrahusta, Aryaithrubabhi and others, are lasting contributions of that age.

However, the supremacy of the Tu-kine or the Turks, established in the first part of the seventh century, was challenged by imperialist movements from China and Tibet and also the campaigns of conquest launched by the Arabs and later by the Karkotsa of Kashmir. As Baltistan and Gilgit commanded the strategic routes connecting Kashmir, Gandhara, Ulyana, Tibet, the Tarim Basin and China, they became the cockpit of all these struggles and encounters.

In the seventh century the rulers of T'ang dynasty, particularly T'ai-tung (616-649), adopted an aggressive policy towards the Turks in Central Asia. In 630 he gave a crushing blow to the Turks, in 640 occupied Turfan (Kao t'eh-ling), in 644 attacked Karasahr (Yen-ki) and imprisoned its king, in 646 demanded the principal cities of eastern Turkestan, Kucha, Khoton, Kashghar, Kuigiar and Toukurgan, from the Khan of the western Turkine, She-koi, in return for the hand of a Chinese princess for which the latter was solicitous. Soon afterwards, as these negotiations broke down, he advanced on Kucha and took its king captive in 648 A.D.

T'ai-tung's work was completed by his successor Kao-tung (649-661). In 653, with the help of the Uighurs, he annihilated the Tchou-yue, who lived in the neighbourhood of Goutchen, and captured the chief of the Tch'on-ni who inhabited the banks of the river Maras. In 656 he fought with the Kairuli chiefs and the Tch't'ou-yue whereas one of his generals plunged into the Tarhagatai, where the Tch'tou-mou lived, and occupied their city Yen, while a third army passed to the south of the Yien-shan and attacked the Shoo-ni-shu in the valley of Yelduz. Lastly, in 657 the Chinese, accompanied by the Uighurs, marched against Ho-lou, the Khan of the western Tou-kine, defeated him to the north of the Ili and compelled to pass that river and flee towards the west beyond the Talas. At the same time another Chinese army won a victory over a licutenant of Ho-lou at Shooang-bo.
near the Bhisor and a third force defeated the chief of Kucha who made common cause with Ho-hou. The finishing touch to this campaign was given in 619 when the Tou-kioe chief, Tenthong-shou-khan, was vanquished. Henceforth the Chinese were the masters of all the territory under the domination of the Tou-kioe. They established their own administration over this vast region. For administrative purposes they divided the enervated Tou-kioe empire into two parts, one comprising Transoxiana and the other the territory to the north of the Iron Gates from the Oxus to the Indus. The Tang-shu states that the second part was organized into 10 provinces, the latter into 84 districts, 160 subdivisions and 116 military commands. The 16 provinces were Loo-te (Turkestan with Kucha as its administrative centre), Ta-hou (the region of Kshat and Badhagis formerly under the Hephthalites), Tu-lo-te (the territory of Arachosia, Aria, and Bactria), T'sha-ba (the country of Shumt and Xuran to the north of the Oxus or the upper course of the river Kafirnag where, at the time of himen-tang, a Turk of the tribe of Hi-su ruled), Ke-su (Khotan with its administrative centre at Kho-shou or Wakshu or Louskouan on the river Wakhshu or Surikhu), Sun-dzun (Kapishu with Las-kuen (Lamhard) and Pan-teh (Pamshir) as its main cities, Sue-ling (Bompan towards the northern side of Hindukush near the sources of the river Kunduz), Tse-pot (Jaghardan, a dependency of Turkestan or better Kuran on the upper course of the river Kshishu), K'iu-hou (Juzian or the territory between Balkh and Bero), Tse-po (Timur in the Oxus), Shou-la-ho (the west of the Oxus and 290 li to the southeast of Mu, modern Harjak), To-ke-hou (Tahka, a part of upper Turkestan, to the east of Kunduz), To-fru (Karategin), Niou-fei (Wakhsh), Ke-su-mo-po-kien (Kavadhjian on the lower course of the river Kafirnigan), and Tse-lung (Seistan with its administrative seat at Zeresp where the claimant to the Sassanian throne, Piot, had taken refuge. This was the height of Chinese power in the Western regions symbolized in the assembly of envoys from Uyana to Korea in the imperial entourage in 643. But soon afterwards the Chinese were challenged in that area by the Tibetans and the Arabs.

The Tibetans emerged into the limelight of history under Songtsen-gam-po (614-648). The subdued the provinces of Dbus and Gyung and unified the whole of Tibet under his rule. He had matrimonial relations with Nepal, on the one hand, and China, on the other. At first he was quite friendly towards the Tang emperors of China. From 643 to 644 he let the Chinese envoys Li-shou-pao and Wang Huisheng to pass through his territory on their way to the court of Han and in 643
helped the latter to conquer Kosiand and capture the king G-la-ma-choen. But from 603 the relations between Tibet and China began to worsen. In that year Srong-btsan-sgam-po destroyed the Tengpa tribe of Tou-yun-hoon on the banks of the Koshi. The defeated king took refuge at Lhasa. In 602 the Chinese emperor tried to restore him in his kingdom and for that purpose sent an army. It, however, sustained a heavy defeat in the valley of the Ta-hsin (Bukhsk, a tributary of the Koshi). Following it, the Tibetans seized the Four Garrisons, i.e., Kangyira. The Chinese tried to win the favour of a Turk chief A-she-na-Tou-tehe and made him governor of Fu-yin in the territory of Tcho-su-ma-kon. But soon the Tibetans won him over to their side. In 637 the Chinese officer Pei-Hsing-teien, marching under the pretext of restoring the Sa-said pretender, who had sought Chinese help, surprised the Turk chief near Tokmak and made him captive. Following his success Wang Fang-ji strengthened the fortifications of Tokmak and in 652 defeated the Turk rebel A-she-na-kim-pou-tseu near the Ill and, soon afterwards, triumphed over Kei-nieri and his allies on the banks of the Il-kul. In 647 the Chinese regained the Four Garrisons of Kangyira and vanquished the Turk Kagan A-she-na Tse-lie, who was a nominee and vassal of the Tibetans. Thus the Chinese acquired what they had lost in 650.

To put an end to hostilities the Tibetans proposed an arrangement whereby the Chinese would evacuate the Four Garrisons of Kangyira and give them the region of Il-kul and the basin of the rivers Tchou and Tala, where the five Turk tribes called Nou-sha-pi lived, and in exchange, the Tibetans would let the Chinese rule over the valley of the Ill and the region to the north of the T'ien shan, which was the home of the five Turk tribes called Tou-kou. But the Chinese court declined this offer following the advice of Kang-yuen-sha-chen, who addressed an eloquent memorial to the throne exalting on the great military importance of the Four Garrisons. Rather the Chinese followed a policy of sawing disunion among the Tibetans and their nomadic tribes. In 649, after Srong-btsan-sgam-po had died and his son, Mang-srong-mung-bshon (691–712), came to the throne, they sent a general to restore their nominee Nou-sha-pi on the throne at Tokmak and killed by treachery a chief of the tribe of Nou-sha-pi. But this success was shortlived since the successor of Hou-sha-po was a mouvement and mostly lived in China. The real power was passing into the hands of the Northern Turks who were witnessing a resurgence under their chief Kurrik (683–691) and his brother Kaspghan Khan (691–716) and had brought the Ten Tribes, constituted...
ting the western Turks, under their sovereignty. However, the Chinese successfully intervened in the affairs of the Turks in 714-715. After the death of Kaphghaw Kagen, a chief of the Turgesh tribe, proclaimed his independence and, with the help of the Arabs and the Tibetans, attacked the towns of Yaka-aray and Apa in Kadgaria in 717. The Chinese offered the carrot with the stick to him. On the one hand, they conferred on him titles in 717 and 719 and gave him the hand of the daughter of A-she-na-hoei in 719; and, on the other, sent A-she-na-hoei to take the help of the three Karak tribes to fight with him. In 718 he was assassinated by a chief of Yellow tribes. Henceforth the scene was dominated by squabbles of the Yellow tribes and the Black tribes as a result of which the Uighurs emerged as the paramount power occupying Tokmak and Talas in 765.

After regaining their control over Kadgaria in 793, the Chinese asserted their supremacy in the Pamirs and Gilgit and Baltistan through which lay routes connecting Tibet with Central Asia. To face the might of China, the Tibetans tried to form a league with the Arabs who were pressing into Central Asia from the West in the opening decades of the eighth century. They combined in 714 with the Arabs in naming a certain A-ho-ri to the king of Peristanah driving it to legitimate sovereign to seek refuge at Kucha. That refugee king sought the help of the Chinese, who rushed an army in the West which drove the stroke of the Tibetans and the Arab from Peristanah into the mountains. This increased their prestige so much that eight kingdoms, including those of the Arabs, Tashkerti, Satarbani and Kopala, sent envoys to China offering their submission.

Just as the Tibetans helped the Arabs in the valley of the Jassar, the Arabs also assisted them in Kadgaria. In 713 they collaborated in assisting the Turgesh in an attack on the Four Garrisons and laid siege to Yaka-aray and Asoh, as a report of the Chinese commissioner, posted at Kucha, indicated. In that situation the Chinese tried to block the routes of Baltistan and Gilgit to the Tibetans and, for that purpose, win over their ruler who was the predeceessor of Naskurendiiltumanshi. The letter addressed to him reads as follows:

"Those who resemble the seges and those who follow the paths of virtue are not found in China only. When it comes to founding a dynasty and composing a luxurious prose, there is no difference among the peoples of diverse manners. You, therefore, the great dignity, Soo-lou-lo-li-che-li-ui, king of the kingdom of Poo-li since many genera-
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tions, (you and your ancestors) have been the chiefs who have conserved in your heart fidelity and respect; at distance you display your sincerity, you know to discharge your duty and bring your tribute. Sie-Tche-

sin has been able to put into execution his distant plans and it is because of you that Kom-K’un-k’ean could get sufficient soldiers. We call upon the king of You-tch’eng to deliver his head, how can we limit ourselves to cut the wing of the Huung-mu? This is why I order that you be king of the kingdom of Pou-li. Let you commence in an excellent manner and finish in a perfect one, observe for a long time the Chinese calendar (a sign of Chinese suzerainty), give peace to your people and security to your kingdom and let happiness extend to your descendants. Come and respect it. You will commence by receiving this official missive and respect the investiture which I do the favour of giving you. How you can be otherwise than attentive.”

While this document is couched in the traditional imperialist terminology, characteristic of Chinese diplomacy, it reminds the king of Pou-li of the help that he gave the Chinese earlier and expresses the hope that he would continue to do so in future.

In 219 the king of Ngun (Bukhara), Tou-so-po-t’i, the king of Kiu-mi (Kunduz), Na-lo-ye (Naryana) and the king of K’ang (Samarkand) On-le-kia (Ghourck) sought the aid of China against the Arabs. The same year the ambassador of the king of Jaghurian and Jahghu of Tukharistan, Ti-shu (Tesh) went to China to appeal for help. He was accompanied by the Manichean priest Ta-mou-shu who introduced this religion in China, but the Chinese emperor could not intervene in favour of these applicants. He only encouraged them to continue the struggle and sent emissaries to the kings of Ou-tch’eng (Udiana), Kou-ton (Khotan), Kin-wei (Yasin) conferring on them the title of kings in recognition and recompose of the resistance they put up against the Arabs. The same year they give the title of king to the ruler of Hou-mi (Walshun), recognized the king of Zabulistan or Arkhaj as the suzerain of Kafisha and conveyed the acknowledgement of royal status to king Candrapala of Kashmir. Thus it is clear that all these kingdoms and states joined to solicit help from China which shows their antipathy both to the Tibetans and the Arabs.

To counter these alliances and alignments the Tibetans launched an invasion against Gilgit in 712. Its ruler Mo-kin-moung (Makarashma) sought the help of China. The commissioner of Pei-ting, Tchang-Hiao-song, ordered the prefect of Sou-le (Kashgar), Tchang Se-li,
to go to the help of Mo-kim-mang. At the head of 4,000 soldiers he reached Gilgit by forced marches. Mo-kim-mang also moved his army which inflicted a crushing defeat on the Tibetans killing many of their men and seizing nine of their cities.

At that time a curious incident occurred. Fifteen years earlier the Tibetan monarch Dung-song (712-730) had married a Chinese princess, Kwe-tch'eng. In the atmosphere of hostility between Tibet and China her position became untenable. She wanted to take refuge in Kashmir. The king of Kashmir was ready to receive her, but, to repel the Tibetans in that event, he sought the assistance of the king of Zululistan. This brought the king of Kashmir and that of Zululistan together but the Chinese princess continued to live in Tibet and died there in 741.

From the west the pressure of the Arabs was constantly mounting. In 712 the Jalghu of Tabharistan, who claimed a paramount position from the Oxus to the Indus, bitterly complained to the Chinese emperor that the Arabs had captured his father and bled his people white by their exactions so that he had nothing to present to the court. About the same time, in 716, the younger brother of the king of Bukhara reached the Chinese court, in 717, the king of Kesh sent an envoy there, in 718, the kings of Wakan and Maimugh, in 719, those of Wakan and Khutlal, in 720, that of Maimugh, in 731, that of Samarkand and, in 732, that, calling himself the king of Persia, sent embassies to China— all supplicating for help. In 733 Lalitadesya Mekupula of Kashmir sent his envoy to China stating that if the emperor were to send an army to Gilgit and also to Zululistan, he would arrange food supply for two lakh soldiers. These preparations show the intense commotion round the Pamirs at that time.

The assassination of Su-ho, the chief of the Northern Turks, in 739 gave an opportunity to the Chinese to march again in Central Asia. In 739 one of their generals cooperated with the kings of Kesh and Samarkand to impress Su-ho’s son Tou-wu-sien near Tokmak whereas another army joined hands with the king of Ferghana for suppressing the Kugan of the Black tribes or Kao Turgesh of the Talas. Following these campaigns China again asserted her supremacy in Transoxiana and the emperor conferred titles on the kings of that region, on the king of Temkhend in 740, on that of Ferghana in 739, on that of Kashghar in 741. The king of Kesh gave the Chinese name of Lai su hou (kingdom which moves towards glory) to his kingdom and that of
Fergana began to call his kingdom by the Chinese name of Ning yen (peaceful distant land) by way of acknowledgement of Chinese influence. In 744 a Chinese princess was even given in marriage to the king of Fergana Avon Taskar. Chinese influence even reached the south of the Caspian Sea in the region called Taharian at is clear from the titles conferred by the emperor on its kings in 744 and 747.

To the north of the Oxus and the Pamirs the Chinese kept vigilance and maintained their influence by recognizing Jou-mo-fon-ta as the legitimate successor of his father in Zalhistan in 718 and conferring investiture on Pao-fou-tchou, king of Kapisa and Udyana, the two kingdoms having become united, in 744. They also tried their best to keep their hold on the route of Wuhann and Gilgit in order to conserve their relations with Kashmir, Udyana, Kapisa and Zalhistan, since from 670, as L'Hom reported, the route of Bannu and Balkh had been closed to the Chinese on account of the incursions of the Arabs. As the Wuhann-Gilgit route was the only artery of communications between China, Kashgar and the west, the Chinese were very keen to preserve it and keep it from falling into the hands of the Tibetans.

We have seen how they rendered military aid to Gilgit in 722 and helped in ousting the Tibetans from there. In 726 the Tibetans, under their new monarch Kho-khs-hso-geeng-brtan (726-857) made a show of submission to China, but, side by side, soon afterwards, intensified their pressure on Gilgit. Hence, in 733, the Chinese attacked the Tibetans near Kokonor for diverting the latter to that side and thereby relieving the king of Gilgit. Again, in 743, the Chinese nominated or recognized Ma-hso-lai as the king of Gilgit and, in 747, facilitated the king of Wuhann for breaking away with Tibet.

The situation changed with the death of Ma-hso-lai. We have said above that, just after making a show of submission in 716, the Tibetans launched an attack on Baltistan and Gilgit. They succeeded in reducing Baltistan and in 718 totally defeated a Chinese army stationed there. But Gilgit was saved for the time being by the Chinese. However, after the death of the Chinese ally, Ma-hso-lai, the Tibetans brought round his successor, Sou-sha-lthe, to their side and married a Tibetan princess to him. With Gilgit under their influence, the Tibetans were supreme in the whole of that area. From 744 to 747 they held a firm hold from Ladakh to Gilgit. As a result, as the T'ang sin says, more than twenty kingdoms of the northwest became subject to the Tibetans, none of them sending presents or having communication with the Chinese court. The commander of Kucha (Ngen-si) undertook three expeditions against Gilgit but
failed. At last, in 745, the Chinese emperor ordered General Kan-Sien-tche to attack. He was an officer of St Yu'en-king with one thousand horsemen to Gilgit in advance to tell his king Sou-she-li-tche "we ask you to lend us your route for reaching Baltistan (Great Pekin)". But in the capital of Gilgit five or six of the big chiefs were devoted to the Tibetans. Hence the mission of St Yu'en-King fell through. However, he acted as he was briefed by Kao Sien-tche. He published an imperial edict reassuring the people and giving them presents of silks. Thus winning their support, he attacked the places of those chiefs who favoured the Tibetans. This course met with a signal success. Even the king Sou-she-li-tche fled with his Tibetan wife and nobody could find where he had gone. Kao Sien-tche dominated the scene. He executed all those who were in favour of the Tibetans. He also destroyed the bridge on the river So-i (Yasin) to check the movement of the Tibetans.

Hence, when, the same evening, the Tibetans arrived they could not find a passage nor their allies. Kao Sien-tche promised peace to the kingdom of Gilgit if its king surrendered to the Chinese. This success of the Chinese arms created a stir in the neighbouring regions, rather the whole 'West', for the Arabs (i.e. the) and the sixty-two kingdoms, including that of Fou-lin (Syria), are said to have submitted to China. Kao Sien-tche returned to China with the king of Gilgit, Sou-she-li-tche, and his Tibetan queen as prisoners. Gilgit became a Chinese territory, its name was changed to Koo-jen; a military establishment was set up there and one thousand men were enrolled to garrison it. The emperor, Hien-tsung, however, pardoned Sou-she-li-tche, gave him a violet robe and golden belt and the title of the General of the Right Guard.

Inspite of the aforesaid success, stirring though it was, the Tibetan resistance was not entirely broken. For, in 749, we find the Japhu of Tibetaristan Shei-she-lung-ki-lo (Simangala?) seeking the aid of Chinese troops against the king of Kie-the, a small mountain prince who was in alliance with the Tibetans and had intercepted the communications between Gilgit and Kashmir. Shei-she-lung-ki-lo formulated the grand strategy of forming an invulnerable bulwark against the Tibetans from Tibetaristan across the Pamirs and Kashgaria to China. In 756 the Chinese court responded to his suggestion and sent Kao Sien-tche again to the west. He defeated and imprisoned the king of Kie-the, Fou-te-mo, and put on the throne his elder brother, Sou-kia. This success of Chinese arms again sent a shudder in the West. Hence the ambassador of Samarkand, Mo-yue-tee, envoy of Kopa, Ngoy-tarkan, and representatives of Ferghana, Kuneheh, Khwarizm, Buhara.
refugee court of Persia visited the Chinese court. On his return Sapo-
teran was accompanied by the Buddhist pilgrim Ou-Лоег in 751.

However, the success of Kao Shien-teh turned his head. In 752 he
intervened in the affairs of Taikeng. The king of that kingdom offered
his submission. But, false to his word, Kao Shien-teh captured and
executed him and appropriated his wealth. His son fled to the Arabs.
The people were also enraged by the treachery of the Chinese. Taking
this opportunity, the Arab general Abu Muslim sent an army under
Ziyad-bin-salih to fight with the Chinese and reinstated the son of
the chief of Taikeng. Kao Shien-teh united his troops with those of
the king of Ferghana and marched against the Arabs. Just then the
Kuruk tribes revolted and attacked his rear. Thus Kao Shien-teh
was sandwiched between the Arabs in the front and the Kuruk in the
rear and was completely defeated in the great battle at Adlaza, near
the river Talas, in July 751. Most of his men perished and he had
great difficulty in finding his way home with his bedraggled and battered
staff. This decisive battle put an end to the domination of the Chinese
in the western regions and ensured the success of the Arabs there. The
troubles in Yunnan and Ta-li and the revolt of Nguyen Lou-sun diverted
the attention of the Chinese from the west and prevented them from
retrieving the disaster of the Talas. Thus ended the role of China in
Turkestan for the time being.

But at that time the Arab world was also in a crisis. In 749 Abu
Muslim had done away with the Umayyad Caliphs. This gave the signal
for revolt and uprising in the whole Islamic world. Neither the Arabs nor the Persians were satisfied. At Nishapur the Magian Bih
Afard raised his head and at Bukhara the Arabs, led by Sharik-bin-
shaykh al-Mahri, unfurled the banner of revolt. Abu Muslim's deputy
Ziyad-bin-salih had to crush them with a hard hand. But soon the tide
turned against Abu Muslim himself. The Abbasids, whom he had brought
to the Caliphal throne, became his enemies. In 752-53 they instigated
Sibs-bin-an-Numan and Ziyad-bin-salih, whom Abu Muslim had appointed
governors of Transoxiana, to rebel against him. But this revolt failed
out. Sibs-bin-an-Numan was executed at Amul and Ziyad-bin-salih,
abandoned by his allies, fled to the diban of Barkad who got him
killed and sent his head to Abu Muslim. Another supporter of Abu
Muslim, named Abu Dawud, was also won over by the Abbasids and
eventually Abu Muslim himself was assassinated in 755. But the party
of Abu Muslim did not die out. It carried on the struggle against the
Abbasids in Kurrassan and Transoxiana under a new white standard which,
give the insurgents the name of White Clothes (Spit Jamgon Arabic al-muhayyirin). This created so much fright among the Abbasids as to force them to seek the assistance of China. It is significant that Chinese records repeatedly refer to the tribute-bearing missions of the Ta-chi wearing Black Clothes, meaning the Abbasids, to the T'ang court in and after 711, as we shall presently see.

Evidently in this state of affairs a vacuum appeared in the politics of Central Asia which was filled by another power, namely Kashmir. The Rajputangiri states that the Karkota ruler of Kashmir Lalitaditya Muktapida launched an expedition in the northern regions (Uttarapatha) and is said to have defeated the Kukhazas (of Badakhshan), Tukhars (of Tukharistan) or Sukhazes (of Bukhara), Bhattas (of Tibet), Dzarus (of Gilgit), Pragjyotisa (probably Balistan) and fought against Mominu (representing the Moorns or Muslims) inflicting three reverses on him. He is also reported to have planged into the 'sea of sand' (Yulukambohusi), which signifieds the desert of Taklamakan, and reduced the mythical Uttarakuras, meaning the people of the oases-states of the Pamir basin or Kasghariya. That he completely crippled the Turks is clear from the remark that "it is by his command, to display the mask of their bondage, that the Turushkas carry their arms on their back and shave half their head".

Some writers think that Muktapida undertook his northern campaigns at the instance of and as the instrument of the Chinese. One of them goes to the extent of saying that "the expansion of Karkota Kashmir was not merely an expansion of an Indian kingdom, it seems to have been, in reality, the expansion of the supremacy of China in the Himalayan regions". He adds that "Lalladitya’s expeditions against the Tukhars and the Dzuras probably had the same objective in view, namely, to assist in the establishment of T'ang supremacy in these regions". But Chinese records, which give fullest details about the happenings of this period and do not omit to mention those who undertook campaigns on their behalf, for example, the king of Pu-yu in 711, are entirely silent about the expeditions of Muktapida. There is also nothing in the account of Kaian to indicate that he received or used Chinese assistance in his campaigns. Hence the theory of Chinese hand in the campaigns of Muktapida is gratuitous. What appears likely is that, when the Chinese suffered a setback in the battle on the Talas and lost their interests in Central Asia and when the Arabs also were embroiled in their own struggles, Muktapida stepped on the scene to extend his influence in the region around the Pamirs from the Turin basin to Tukharistan. Oh-
viciously this happened after 743 and made the king of Kashmir the master of Balistan and Gilgit which gave him the control of the routes to Central Asia. That he succeeded in worsening the Turk rulers of Baltistan and Gilgit and the status of Central Asia from the Tarim basin to Takhtaristan is indicated by the tradition that the victory of Muttaz (Muktapala) over the Turks was celebrated in a festival held on the second day of the month of Caliza in Kashmir, reported by Alorun. One can presume that it was Muktapala who procured the imperial house of Nasiruddin-divaysandini in Baltistan and that of Makzapala, who had become a subject of the Turks in Central Asia.

The astounding success of Muktapala made not only the Turk houses but also the Arabs nervous. This is clear from the fact that even after the disaster of the Chinese at the battle of Talas and their own difficulties at home which made them disinterested in the affairs of the "West," they begged them as their props and supports and repeatedly sent them ambassadors to seek their aid. The Tadj-fun-un-koi states that in 752 the king of Khuttal, Lo-tu-ten-kon, contacted the Chinese court and received the letter of investiture and that, in the same year, the ruler of Gilgit (Koci-jen) sent an envoy there and even Tien-tu-ho-ni, the chief of the Ta-che (Arabs) with Black Clothes, the Abbasid, despatched a mission to China. In 753, the rulers of Karbghar (Shu-le) Kapisa (Kir-pa), Zabadistan (Zie-si), Gilgic (Koci-jen) and of the Abbasid (Ta-che with Black Clothes) sent their envoys with presents to the Chinese court. In the seventh month of that year the kings of Ferghana (Ning-yao), Bakhara (Ning) and Takhtaristan (Tou-ho-ji) also sent ambassadors. It is remarkable that in that year the Abbasid sent four missions in the first, fourth, seventh and twelfth month respectively. Last time they presented thirty horses to the emperor. In 754 the kings of Ferghana, Mianzagh, Torgesh, Ouiphara, Takhartistan, Chitrul (Kai-wai), Samarkand (Kai-ring), Bukhara and the Abbasid again sent envoys. In 755 the kings of Takhtaristan (Tou-pa), Samarkand, Takhkand, Khwamun (Ho-suan), Johkhan (Tao), Torgesh, Ferghana and Gilgit sent fresh ambassadors. In 756 the Abbasid sent two mission, one in the seventh month, which consisted of twenty-six chief, and the other a bit later. In 756 the kings of Wakhan (Kou-mu), Gandhara (Kou-tu-ki), Takhtaristan, Samarkand, Kepa, as well as the Abbasid sent their missions, the last consisting of six Arab chief who raised a dispute regarding protocol each claiming priority in reception which was resolved by making them enter the court simultaneously in the line. In 755 the kings of Ferghana, Bakhara, Torgesh offered tribute. Thus
throughout the seven fifties the kingdoms of Central Asia were keen on having diplomatic contacts with China and, in particular, the Abbasids were very solicitous of their alliance. The question arises, why these kingdoms were banking so much on the help of China and why, particularly, the Abbasids were sending envoys after envoys, mission after mission, almost every year, to the Chinese court. It is true that the Abbasids were faced with the revolts of the followers and puritans of Abo Muslim, as we have seen above, but it should also not be ignored that, according to the Nizam al-Mulk, Muktapida had suffered three defeats on the Arabs (Mamuni) and established his supremacy from the Tarim basin to Tukharistan which must have made the Abbasids feel shaky. If everything should have gone well with them there was no cause for them to be so keenly and persistently desirous of the alliance and friendship of China. It was some deeper danger which inclined them so much towards China and it appears that it was no other than that of the rapid advance of Muktapida. Not only they, but all the other states and kingdoms of Central Asia, realized the intensity of the menace of Muktapida and sent unending trains of envoys and ambassadors to China in the hope of assistance.

Lalitaditya Muktapida ruled for 36 years, 7 months and 11 days. His reign must have ended about 760 or a little later. He died fighting in some obscure northern region. His successor, Kusula Muktapida is said to have maintained his hold over his empire extending over the disc of the earth. However, his rule was very short lasting for one year and fifteen days only. Then another son of Lalitaditya ruled for seven years. During his reign the Mucchus, possibly meaning the Arabs, became assertive for he is said to have sold many men to them and introduced many of their practices into his kingdom. Here we find a reference to the raid of Hisham-bin-Hum-al-Yaghabi, governor of Sind, into Kashmir, as a result of which he carried many men as prisoners and slaves, reported by Balazuri. The next two rulers Prithiviyapida and Sangramapida were also weak and cruel rulers and the kingdom seems to have suffered under them. But the next ruler Jayapida was again, like his grandfather, a man of parts and is said to have set out for the conquest of the world. His campaigns in the Himalayan region seem to underlay the reference to the defeat of the king of Nepal at his hands. It may be conjectured that he asserted his power in Baltistan and Gilgit also. But after him his dynasty declined and its hold over the neighbouring regions became loose.

After the eighth century the Tibetans again seem to have become dominant in Baltistan and Gilgit. This appears from the fact that Al-
Brunt refers to the rule of one Bhasshaba in Gilgit, a title which bears the echo of the Tibetans. Besides this the Rajtarangini of Srivara (III, 445) mentions Gilgit and Baltistan as Sivamaharashtra and Bhasshabharpada respectively. This means that these regions had come to be considered as parts of Bhasshaba or Tibet.

Khalastu occasionally refers to the invasions of the Darachs in Kashmir, for example under Vudalisba, and also the attacks from Khorasan on them, as under Yarsha, showing that the Gilgit region continued to play some part in the history of Kashmir.

The aforesaid study shows how important Saltistan and Gilgit have been in the political, diplomatic and military history of Tibet, China, Kadzharia, Tukharistan, Kapiz, Gandhara, Kashmir and North India in ancient times. This importance of these regions has been mainly due to the routes which pass through them. It was for the possession of these routes that the various imperialist powers wanted to keep their hold over these regions. Therefore, the authorities of Tibet told the king of Gilgit in the eighth century: "It is not against your country that we plot, rather we take your route for attacking the four Garrisons (Kucha, Kadzharia, Khoton and Karashahr or Tokmak)." Likewise, from the Chinese, in 792, Tchung T'ung, the imperial commissar of Tchou-King, observed: "Pou-la is the western gate of the T'ang (that is to say of China); if Pou-la is lost (to us) then the countries of the West will all become Tibetan." All the powers, in all the ages, had this point of view in regard to this region.
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