THE MOLLAS OF MUSTANG

Historical, Religious and Oratorical Traditions of the Nepalese-Tibetan Borderland

DAVID P. JACKSON
THE MOLLAS OF MUSTANG

Historical, Religious and Oratorical Traditions of the Nepalese-Tibetan Borderland

by

DAVID P. JACKSON
The Library of Tibetan Works & Archives is very happy to publish *The Mollas of Mustang* by David Jackson.

As explained in the author's preface, the research on the historical and cultural traditions of Mustang has just begun. The publication of this study of the *Mollas* within the historical, religious and oratorical traditions of Mustang and Tibet will shed much-needed light on these areas and will prepare the way for future research.

Gyatso Tsering
Director
1984
## CONTENTS

Preface ix  
Notes xii

### Chapter 1 The Land and People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The People</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Place of Lo in Traditional Tibetan Geography and the Spellings of Its Names</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Name Lo</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Names Mustang and Mönthang</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 2 Previous Research on the History and Historical Sources of Lo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author/Authorship</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G. Tucci (1956)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Peissel (1967)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. von Fürer-Haimendorf (1975)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Peissel (1965, 1977)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.G. Smith (1970)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 3 What Is a Molla?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsection</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Etymology of <em>Molla</em></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Extant Mollas</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Molla of Tsarang</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Molla of Namgyal</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Molla of Mönthang</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Molla of Garphu</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The Molla of Tsarang-B</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Gelung Speech</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
O Dharmarāja, because your excellent fame exists as far as the [distant] shores of the ocean, to behold your face brings great happiness to the mind. Therefore I have come in order to look [upon you].

—Śiromāṇi, a pundit of Magadha, speaking to the Lo king Bkra-shis-mgon (d. 1489), as related in the Lo gdung rabs.

**PREFACE**

Five hundred years ago, a diverse and colourful stream of travelers made their way along the roads that lead to Lo Mustang. In those days, a person standing at the gate of the capital city might see Indian pundits and yogis, Tibetan traders with their trains of donkeys and sheep, pilgrims bound for Mount Kailash or Central Tibet, scholar-monks returning from the great seminaries of Gtsang, officials or messengers from states near and far, ragged beggars, and perhaps even a wandering minstrel or a mad saint. Many of these travelers were just passing through Mustang, for it was situated on an important north-south trade route and it was also the only major Bhotia settlement on the east-west axis between Kyirong or Dzongka and Purang. But some travelers were also drawn specifically to Mustang because it was then a famous and prosperous principality ruled over by the illustrious king and patron Bkra-shis-mgon.

Today, however, it is hard to imagine that Lo Mustang was ever such a thriving center, for it is now one of the most remote, backwards, and inaccessible valleys in the Nepal Himalayas. Though the area was previously an important conduit for the movement of both trade and culture, today it is closed to foreign visitors and culturally it is an isolated backwater. Still, traces of the area’s past greatness have survived in the temples and palaces that remain there. And as one of the few areas in the Himalayas still relatively untouched by outside influences, the ancient principality exerts a strong fascination over both specialized scholars and ordinary travelers.

In 1976 when doing research in Nepal on Tibetan literature,
I too became interested in Lo Mustang. It was clear to me that the largely unknown history of the area deserved to be investigated more thoroughly. At that time only Nepalese nationals were allowed into Mustang, and therefore I was prevented from actually visiting there. But I did not consider this to be an impossible handicap. I knew that even those previous scholars who had managed to set foot in Mustang had not succeeded in finding out much about the local history. I could also see that many valuable historical sources were available outside Mustang.

One of the first goals I set for myself was to establish the genealogy and approximate chronology of the old ruling line of Lo Mustang. For this one of my main sources was a book called *Molla*. Though a work by this name had already been discovered by an earlier traveler to Mustang, Michel Peissel, it remained something of a mystery because neither its text nor translation was ever published. And when other scholars working on nearby areas of Nepal and Tibet reported the existence of other "Mollas," the mystery persisted for nobody attempted to describe these writings in detail.

As I continued with my own studies, I found that the Mollas did not belong to any standard genre of Tibetan historical literature. The Mollas were speeches. They were texts that were formally recited in the midst of a religious gathering. Very little was then known about either such speechmaking traditions or the Buddhist concepts underlying them. Therefore I decided to make the Mollas in their three main aspects—historical, oratorical, and religious—the main focus of my investigations. The result was an M.A. thesis that I submitted at the University of Washington in 1979. That thesis became the basis for the present book.

In the four years since then, I have been able to locate a number of additional sources, both on the history of Lo Mustang and on traditions of speechmaking related to the Mollas. I was able to find one of the *gdung rabs* (genealogical histories) of the Lo kings as well as several more examples of speeches from other parts of the Himalayas and Tibet. I also learned more about the similar traditions of speechmaking in eastern Tibet. It was not practicable to integrate all of this new material into the main body of this book. Nevertheless, I have tried to incorporate the most important new data, and I have listed the remaining sources below in Appendix K for the benefit of future researchers.

Without the help of my many Tibetan and Western teachers
and friends, this study could not have succeeded. From among all those who helped or contributed in some way, I want to acknowledge my gratitude here first and foremost to the Venerable Chogyay Trichen Rinpoche. His kind generosity made possible my main historical discoveries, but I am very grateful to him for many other reasons as well. I am likewise deeply indebted to the Venerable Dezhung Trulku Rinpoche for his kind and learned explanations. I must also express my sincere appreciation to Mr. E. Gene Smith, who not only pointed me toward many of the important sources at the beginning of the project but also offered vital help many times later on. I likewise owe special thanks to Professor D. Seyfort Ruegg for his invaluable suggestions and criticisms when I was writing my thesis. I also wish to thank Geshe Ngawang L. Nornang for help in reading some of the most difficult Tibetan sources, and Professor T.V. Wylie for his useful comments on early drafts of the thesis.

I would like to take this opportunity also to thank Dr. Prayag Raj Sharma and the Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies at Tribhuvan University for their assistance during my affiliation with them. Likewise I should express here my sincere thanks to Dr. Michael Vinding, who continues to encourage me in this line of research, and to Ms. Sidney Schuler. In the following pages I mention only a few of the many reasons I am indebted to them. Furthermore, I am very grateful to Professors R.A. Stein and A.W. MacDonald for kind help in obtaining important materials, and to Mr. Tashi Tsering for generously sharing his knowledge about Tibetan literature, speechmaking and history.

Here I would also like to thank Ms. R.S. Nudelman for her hours of work typing and retyping the thesis, and Ms. Lea Terhune for proofreading an early draft of this book. Finally, I must express my gratitude to my wife, Janice, for her many kinds of help, for her loving companionship through all these years of study and travel, and for her patience when research conditions or researcher became difficult.

*   *   *   *   *   *   *

In this book my basic goal is to introduce the Mollas, the cultural traditions they embody, and the histories they tell. Chapters 1 and 2 introduce the land and people of Mustang and give a synopsis of previous research on the history and literary traditions of Lo. Chapters 3 through 9 contain the main investigations of the Mollas
and the related oratorical, religious, and historical traditions. The last chapters and the appendices present some of the important sources and supporting materials. Chapter 10 consists of the first translation of a Molla history, while chapter 11 and the appendices contain the texts of two Mollas and excerpts from another Molla and related sources.

Mustang for the moment is still a "forbidden kingdom" of sorts, being off limits to all but Nepalese citizens and a select few foreigners. Though its history is now more accessible than ever before—thanks to the survival of various writings—much more research remains to be done on Lo, past and present. This book, being an investigation of only a few facets of the local traditions, is just a small beginning. Ultimately what one would like to see is a systematic survey of the major buildings, artworks, books, and other important artifacts that survive in Mustang. Though such a project would disperse some of the romantic haze that still clings to the mountain principality, it would also concretely establish the cultural and historical importance of Lo Mustang in the eyes of the world.

Kyoto
September, 1983

DAVID JACKSON

Notes

1. Genealogical histories (gdung rabs) of the Lo Mustang rulers are known to have existed since at least the early 16th century. See below, chapter 6, pp. 61 f.

The most detailed and complete gdung rabs of the Lo kings was formerly in the possession of the Mustang rajas, but unfortunately it disappeared sometime in the mid-1960s after the death of the late raja 'Jam-dpal-bstan-'dzin-dgra-'dul (d. 1964). The Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche informed me that this lost gdung rabs was a lengthy manuscript. Its contents had been brought up to date at various times through the addition of supplements in which the names and accomplishments of the newer generations were listed. The last supplement had been composed c. 1924 by Thar-rtse Byams-pa-nam-mkha'-kun-bzang (1905-1939), the seventieth abbot of Ngor (brother of the late raja's wife) during his visit to Mustang.

How this manuscript disappeared is not clear, but it was lost at about the same time that a number of other books were "borrowed" from the raja's library by a group of Khampa soldiers. There is still a chance that this work may turn up in Nepal, India, or abroad.
Fortunately, at least two other gdung rabs have survived. I learned of one of these from the thesis of Michel Peissel, “L’organisation politique et sociale du royaume tibetain de gLo dit le royaume du Mustang” (U. de Paris, 1969), the bibliography of which mentions a “Chos-rgyal-a-ma-dpal gyi gdung-rabs, texte trouvé à Tarap par Mr. C. Jest et actuellement en sa possession.” Subsequently Mr. Jest himself informed me in a personal letter dated February 12, 1979, that he had “found a manuscript of the A-ma-dpal gyi gdung-rabs in the library of the Lama of Kagar-Tarap, MS/ 32 folios on Nepalese paper in dbu-chen.”

The second Lo gdung rabs is a work that I located in Nepal in 1983. It is a tshug thung manuscript of sixty-four folios, entitled Blo bo chos rgyal rim byon rgyal rabs mu thi li’i ’phreng mdzes. It is described below in chapter 9, and it will be the subject of a separate study in the future.
CHAPTER I

THE LAND AND PEOPLE OF LO MUSTANG

Lo Mustang is an area of Bhotia (Tibetan) people and culture in northwestern Nepal. It is located north of the Annapurna and Dhaulagiri mountain ranges at approximately eighty-four degrees longitude and twenty-nine degrees latitude. Called Lo by its inhabitants and Mustang by others, the area is one of the last places in the Himalayas where the old Tibetan ways of life have not been radically supplanted.

The Climate

Because it lies north of the Main Himalayan Range, Lo is largely cut off from the moist summer winds of the Indian monsoon. As a consequence, its climate is quite arid. In the daytime, strong winds blow northward up the narrow gap between the two huge mountain masses of Annapurna and Dhaulagiri, keeping the valley usually free of clouds. The intense sunshine at twenty-nine degrees of latitude, combined with the winds and the attendant dryness, has given a barren and rugged appearance to much of Lo—an appearance that is found throughout most of the borderlands of western Tibet.

Nevertheless, some moisture does find its way up the narrow Kali Gandaki valley. The wettest time in Lo is the monsoon season; during July and August the sides of the valley above 14,500 feet are often enshrouded in mists and clouds. In the winter there is also some precipitation in the form of snowfalls. The center of the valley is much drier than the hillsides. Most of the people of Lo live in the valley center, between the altitudes of 11,000 and 13,000 feet, below the area of maximum precipitation. Since agriculture is one of the main means of subsistence in this arid land, the people of Lo must irrigate to grow their crops. To do this, they conduct the mountain streams through communal irrigation ditches to their fields below.

In the eyes of its people, Lo is and was a beautiful place. Jo-nang Kun-dga'-grol-mchog (1507-1566), a great scholar born in Lo, described its capital thus:

The palace of the king of Lo is surrounded on all sides by a
garland of white rocky mountains from which flow continual streams of cascading water, clear and clean like a crystal orb . . . . From time to time, all needful objects of enjoyment spring forth like fruit and leaves from the valleys that branch out from it in all directions.  

Indeed, compared with the arid highlands of western Tibet that surround it, Lo is a hospitable place. Modern travellers too find the villages and fields of Lo to be welcome islands of green and white in the otherwise bleak expanses of stone and sand.

The People

Just as the climate and landscape of Lo are very similar to those of a number of valleys north of the Main Himalayan Range in Tibetan territory to the east and west of Lo, so too are there great similarities between the people, language, and culture of both Lo and the analogous valleys in Tibet. One anthropologist has gone so far as to say that “culturally, linguistically and ethnically, Lo is almost purely Tibetan,” a statement that would be sure to startle many Central Tibetans but one that is certainly true as a general observation. It must be pointed out that neither the language of Lo (which actually includes many different dialects) nor its people nor its local customs have ever been studied in detail. Nevertheless, its people definitely are “Bhotias”—the general name for Buddhist Tibetan-dialect speakers in the Himalayas—and there is no doubt that throughout its history Lo has been a participant in Tibetan civilization.

Like the communities in similar Tibetan valleys, the people of Lo derive their subsistence in three main ways: agriculture (for Lo this now includes migrant agricultural work in the fields of Baragaon to the south), animal husbandry, and trading. All three of these means of livelihood have probably been important in Lo since ancient times.

Of the three, agriculture is and probably always was the main source of human sustenance. The most important crops (barley and buckwheat) and also the growing methods have probably remained unchanged for the last millenium or more. Agriculture in Lo, moreover, had certain definite limitations. There was always only so much land for planting, water for irrigation, dung for fertilizing, and people for doing the work of cultivation, irrigation,
and harvesting. This more or less static agricultural base could not support a large or greatly expanding population; furthermore, it is clear that farming alone could never produce enough wealth to make Lo a prominent political or economic power in the Kali Gandaki region or in western Tibet.

The second important source of livelihood in Lo is livestock breeding and herding. Yaks and goats can be grazed on the alpine pastures high above the villages of Lo, though the available pastureage is not enough to support large herds. Especially in the winter, any large herds of animals have to be taken to the Tibetan “steppes” north of the border. This was the customary practice in the past. Since about 1960, however, grazing on the Tibetan side of the border has been forbidden by the Chinese. But even though the importance of animal husbandry has diminished in recent times, in the past it was an important source of local wealth.

The third important means by which people in Lo gained their livelihood was their participation in the transit trade between Tibet and Nepal or India. The importance of this trade in the economy of Lo seems to have fluctuated a great deal, but for the Kali Gandaki region as a whole it was always an economic mainstay. Formerly the most important form of trade pursued by the people of Lo was bartering grain for Tibetan salt. But compared with the Thakalis, who lived just to the south, the people of Lo were never great traders. It was far more typical for them to stay close to their homes and fields, and even nowadays they seldom permanently move away from their villages.

The Kali Gandaki river valley was an important route for trade passing back and forth between western Tibet and western Nepal or northern India. The main flow of trade passing through Lo involved the exchange of Tibetan salt, minerals, and nomadic products for grain and manufactured goods from the south. The passes at the head of the valley, which form the border between Lo and Tibet, are relatively low—the main ones are all lower than 15,000 feet. The southern part of the Kali Gandaki connects with easy routes through the hills of Nepal to the plains of India. Since Lo controlled the passes leading to Tibet, it occupied a strategic position. But from the point of view of traders, Lo was not the most important point on the route.

Economically, the crucial spot was Thak Khola, the entrepot for goods coming from both north and south. Traders from the south
seldom went all the way to Tibet; Tibetan traders and donkey-drivers almost never travelled the whole distance to India. And since the southern and northern trails were best travelled at different times of the year, it was convenient to have a central meeting point where goods from both directions could be stored and later exchanged. The half-way point for this trade was in the Thakali-inhabited area of Thaksatsae. At times in the past, the meeting point for trade was at Kobang (Larjung) at the "Temple of the Lower Place" (smad kyi lha khang); in later times the entrepot was at Thukche.

Effective control of the trade passing through the Kali Gandaki valley could lead to great wealth, as was demonstrated by certain Thakali families who in the last century monopolized the salt trade under a Nepalese customs contract. In earlier times, too, the salt trade must have been particularly important. The benefits to be derived from controlling the Kali Gandaki trade were no doubt obvious to the ancient rulers of Lo, as well as to the rulers of the adjacent regions. During Prithvinarayan Shah's unification of the Nepalese hill states, for instance, one of that great ruler's main goals was to cut off the side routes of trade to and from Tibet and to channel it all through his central capital. Probably the long series of incursions by Jumla into Thak Khola was also motivated primarily by the desire to control or profit from this commerce. Lo itself has not dominated the Kali Gandaki trade for several centuries. But its past periods of great wealth and power such as in the 15th century must have been linked to its ability to control the north-south trade.

The wide mountain valley of Lo is bordered on three sides by Tibet. These borders are clearly defined on the east and west by snow mountains, and on the north by a high, relatively flat ridge that forms the divide between the Tsangpo (Brahmaputra) and Kali Gandaki rivers. The territory of Lo thus consists of the upper watershed of the Kali Gandaki. Its southern border, however, is less clearly defined. If Lo (glo bo) is taken as a name that indicates the ethnic identity of its inhabitants, its southern border would be formed by the non-Bhotia groups adjoining it to the south, i.e., by the Baragaon or Panchgaon communities that do not speak Tibetan dialects. And one would include within "Lo" parts of Baragaon where Tibetan dialects are spoken, such as Kag (Kāgbeni) and the Muktināth valley. Past writers from Lo and Tibet did in fact consider the latter areas too as parts of Lo.
Since as early as the 13th century (and probably even earlier), Lo was considered to have at least two main subdivisions: upper Lo (glo bo stod) and lower Lo (glo bo smad). Several written works indicate that lower Lo included the Muktināth valley and Kag, whereas upper Lo included the areas around the city of Mönthang (smon thang; Mustāng on the maps). Such a division into upper and lower parts would be expected since there is a group of five non-Bhotia villages lying between Kagbeni and the parts of Lo that are higher up the Kali Gandaki valley. But at times these five villages too may have been counted a part of lower Lo, just as now they are lumped together with Kagbeni and Muktināth as parts of Baragaon. In that case, Lo would have been a wider administrative district that included more than just Bhotia communities.

Lo is better known to outsiders as Mustang. This was the name by which its capital city, Mönthang (smon thang), was called by the people of neighboring Hindu areas. The kings of Lo, whose main seat has been in Mönthang since the 15th century, were known to outsiders as the “Mustang rajas.” The name Mustang became the basis for Mustāngbhot, the name that early cartographers applied to Lo, and recently the name Mustang District has been given to the entire administrative district in the upper Kali Gandaki, including even Thakkhol.

The Place of Lo in Traditional Tibetan Geography and the Spellings of Its Names

Before the inclusion of Lo within the kingdom of Nepal at the end of the 18th century, the people of Lo considered their land to be part of eastern or lower Ngari—Ngari (mnga’ ris) being the Tibetan name for what is now far-western Tibet. Also included within eastern Ngari (mnga’ ris smad) were the districts of Gungthang to the east and Dolpo to the west. This geographical classification, however, is not indicatory of any permanent political alignment between the parts of Ngari or of any fixed relationship between Ngari and other regions of Tibet. Such alliances were notoriously unstable. Still, the above classification does indicate in general that Lo belonged to the western Tibetan cultural world and that its closest ties probably lay with Gungthang and Dolpo.

The Name Lo

Even before the regional name Ngari became established, the
name *Lo* (glo bo) itself seems to have been in use. It appears in the earliest Tibetan chronicles, the *Tun Huang Annals*, as the name of a distinct territory and people in the western borderlands of the early Tibetan empire. Lo is also mentioned in the *Ladakh Chronicles* in a passage that refers to the same early period, the 7th century A.D. Thus the name goes back more than twelve hundred years.

The English spelling *Lo* that has been adopted in this book is, of course, only a phonetic approximation of the Tibetan word. By speakers of western Tibetan dialects, the word is pronounced as the word *low* is pronounced in English. Speakers from Lhasa pronounce it lōo, to use a more precise phonemic notation.

Writers from Tibet and Lo used many different spellings for the name *Lo*. Of these, the oldest and best-established is *glo bo*. This was the form that the greatest native scholars of Lo preferred. Nevertheless, other writers sometimes used abbreviated forms such as *glo’o* and *glo*, though these are not pronounced very differently from the full form, *glo bo*.

In addition to such abbreviated forms, there are a number of other, largely homophonous spellings for *Lo*, of which the most common is *blo bo*. This form appears quite regularly in writings from Dolpo, and it also is found in documents from Ladakh in the far west of Ngari. It was also used by some writers from Lo itself. Because the two spellings *glo bo* and *blo bo* appear almost interchangeably in certain old texts from Lo, one can conclude that their pronunciations were identical several centuries ago, just as they are today.

Another homophonous spelling for *Lo* is *klo bo*, and it is found in a small number of sources. One occurrence is in the *‘Dzam gling rgyas bshad*, a work composed by an author from the far-eastern end of the Tibetan cultural world. This spelling may have derived from the author’s or a copyist’s association of Lo with *klo yul*, a southern bordering land inhabited by *klo pa* or *klo ba* people on the southeastern border of Tibet. Klo pas are generally thought of as bordering “barbarians” or “savages” to the south, and this association may have prompted the author of the *‘Dzam gling rgyas bshad* to use the form *klo bo* since he viewed the people of Lo as being primarily non-Tibetan. Another interesting occurrence of this spelling is in a biography of a ‘Brug-pa bka’-brgyud-pa lama, the writer or scribe of which may have also wrongly connected *Lo*
with klo yul.  

Finally, there even occurs the spelling lho or lho bo in a few places. Lho is standard written Tibetan for “south,” and hence this is another variant spelling that might be expected from scribes who viewed Lo as a southern borderland. This spelling, however, is doubly unacceptable. Not only is the orthography lho objectionable, but its pronunciation too is quite different from that of glo bo; for while glo bo is unaspirated, lho is both preaspirated and postaspirated.

The Names Mustang and Mönthang

Unlike the name Lo, which was used by the people of Lo and by Tibetan speakers in general, the name Mustang was primarily used by non-Bhotia outsiders. Nepalese speakers use this name, spelling it mustān, and from it there derived the Moostang of early Western writers as well as the familiar Mustang.

Mustang is generally believed to have derived from the name Mönthang (smon thang), which is Tibetan for “Plain of Aspiration.” Scholars from Lo commonly expand this name into the form yid smon thang, which could be translated as “the plain of the mind’s aspiration” or “the plain aspired for by the mind.”  

Mönthang, like Lo, was not immune to misspellings, and in writings from outside Lo there are found such forms as sman thang “plain of medicine,” mon thang “plain of the Mon” (the Mon are a non-Bhotia bordering people), and even mo sdang. The last spelling appears in the Ladakh Chronicles, and it is interesting because it probably was pronounced in a manner close to that spelling. By spelling it in that way, the Ladakhi compiler of those chronicles probably indicated his familiarity with the form Mustang, by which other outsiders knew Lo Mönthang.

Sometimes Lo or Mustang may also have been known to outsiders by the names of Muktināth, a shrine in southern Lo that was sacred to both Buddhists and Hindus. This is indicated in the writings of Kah-thog rig’dzin Tshe-dbang-nor-bu (1698-1755) where it is said that the “Mukhunkṣetra” of Indian geography is [the district] of Tibet called “Lo” (glo bo). In the account of his trip to Mukti-nāth in 1729, Tshe-dbang-nor-bu discusses the names of Mukti-nāth in more detail. We are told that the Tibetan name for that sacred place is Chu-mig-brgya-rtsa, “The Hundred and Some Springs.” As its Sanskrit names, he lists Mumunikṣetra and Mukhunkṣetra,
which are explained in a Tibetan gloss as meaning “field of liberation” (grol ba’i zhang). Last of all, he gives the name of Muktinātha in a corrupted dialect (zur chag gi skad) as mu ta sa ta (Tibetan pronunciation: mu tra kha tra). This would appear to be his recording of the pronunciation of muktiksetra in a nearby dialect. There is no way of telling which “corrupted dialect” was meant, though the same words, zur chag gi skad (Skt.: apabhramśa), are also used in a following passage to indicate dialects spoken in areas dominated by Jumla, i.e., probably Khāsa dialects.

A great deal remains to be learned about Lo Mustang. Even its names and its geographical subdivisions are not thoroughly understood, and there are still greater gaps in current knowledge about its dialects, culture, and history. Nevertheless, it cannot be doubted that Lo has existed for a long time as a distinct regional grouping and that it has belonged to the Tibetan cultural world since the earliest recorded times. What remain to be worked out are the details of the special identity of Lo and the nature of its relationships with the adjoining areas.

Notes
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5. Führer-Haimendorf, p. 171.
9. For a more detailed account of the patterns of trade in the upper Kali Gandaki, see Führer-Haimendorf, pp. 181-200.
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16. The names upper Lo (glo bo stod) and lower Lo (glo bo smad) are found in two lists that date back to the late 13th century, which are given in the genealogical history of the Ngari Gungthang kings by Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, Kah-tog rig-'dzin, *Bod rje Iha btsad po'i gdung rubs rnnga* ris smad mang yul gung thang du ji ltar byung ba'i tshul deb gter dwangs shel 'phrul gyi me long* (MS, ff. 20). On p. 7b a list of 13 forts or defensive structures that were built in the reign of 'Bum-lde-mgon (1253-1280) is given. The third fort on the list is mentioned as follows: *mtsho dbar nye ba'i glo stod du* [8a] ni ri g.yag rdzong dkar po brtsegsl. The fifth fort on the list is mentioned thus: *ta mang se mon kha gnon du/glo smad mu khun srin rdzong brtsegsl*. For a more detailed discussion of the latter fort, see my “Notes on the History of Se-rib, and Nearby Places in the Upper Kali Gandaki,” *Kailash*, vol. 6 (1978), pp. 212-213. For the full list of the thirteen forts, see my “The Early History of Lo (Mustang) and Ngari,” *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, vol. 4 (1976), p. 53.(Both articles were early and imperfect essays. The one on Se-rib in particular is marred by dozens of printing errors; caveat lector.)

The second list given by Tshe-dbang-nor-bu is that of the thirteen districts (tsho) of Eastern Ngari during the same period. The fifth and sixth districts were *glo stod* and *glo smad*. For the full list see Jackson, “Se-rib,” p. 211, note 59.

17. See above, note 2, for the inclusion of Kag and Muktinath within lower Lo. For the inclusion of Mönthang within upper Lo, see Brag-dkar-rta-so rig-'dzin Chos-kyi-dbang-phyug, p. 90b.

18. The people of these five villages speak a language closer to Thakali than to Tibetan. See Surendra Gauchan and Michael Vinding, “The History of the Thakaali according to Thakaali Tradition,” *Kailash*, vol. 5 (1977), p. 101 and note 4. This same area seems to have been a part of the old regional grouping called Se-rib.

19. David L. Snellgrove, for instance, in his *Four Lamas of Dolpo* (Oxford: 1967), vol. 1, p. 7, described Lo as a provincial district “which extended down the valley of the Kali Gandaki as far as Kagbeni.” Bstan-'dzin-ras-pa’s *Mgur*, 26b, shows that “lower Lo” was also sometimes inclusive of another non-
Tibetan ethnic area, Manahg or Nyeshang: “blo bo smad snye shang du. . . .”

20. The designations Mustangbhot for the upper part of Lo, and Thākkhola for Baragaon, Panchgaon, and Thakatsaie have persisted for instance on the map of Nepal (West Sheet, reference number U462) published in 1967 by D. Survey, Ministry of Defence, United Kingdom.

through Nepal (Kathmandu).”

21. In the list of the thirteen myriarchs (khri skor) given in the Rgya bod yig tshang, Ngari is listed, whereas in most other lists it is omitted. See Shri-bhūtibhadra, Rgya bod gyi yig tshang mkhas pa dga’ byed chen mo’i dkar chab (MS., East Asian Library, University of Washington), p. 168b. But “Ngari” here is identical with what is known as eastern or lower Ngari (mnga’ ris smad), since it is made up of the districts Glo, Dol, and Ljongs or Rdzong (i.e., Glo-bo, Dol-po and Rdzong-dkar).

These lands are outside Ngari as it is often described. The usual classification of Ngari is into its three districts (skor): Purang, Guge and Mangyul (or Maryul), the last of which is usually understood as indicating the far-western regions of Ngari and not the Mangyul of Gungthang and Kyirong. See G. Tucci, Preliminary Report on Two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal (Rome: 1956), p. 74, n. 1.

But Mangyul Gungthang was considered to be in eastern Ngari, as is seen from the title of Tshe-dbang-nor-bu’s history of the Gungthang kings: Bod rje lha brtsad po’i gdung rabs mnga’ ris smad mang yul gung tshang du. . . . Lo itself was also consistently said to have been a part of eastern Ngari. See, for instance, Kun-dga’-grol-mchog, Dpal ldan, p. 7a. See also the biography of Legs-ladan-bdud-joms-ro-ri (1500-1577): Padma-phrin-’las, Rdo-ri-ge-brag Rig’dzin II (1640-1718), ’Dus pa mdo dbang gi bla ma brgyud pa’i rnam thar ngo mtshar dad pa’i phreng ba (Leh: S.W. Tashigangpa, 1972), p. 370.

22. See above, note 21.


26. See, for example, the translation colophons of Glo-bo lo-tsā-ba Shes-rab-rin-chen in the Tanjur, or the usage of Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub (1456-1532) in his autobiography, Rje btsun bla ma’i rnam par thar pa ngo mtshar rgya mtsho (MS., 16ff.), p. 2b, and passim.

27. glo bo and glo ’o both would be pronounced with a geminate vowel in Lhasa dialect, while glo would be pronounced [lō], with a single vowel. Sometimes in texts the final bo of glo bo has been dropped for metrical reasons, for instance in the two lists mentioned above in note 2. glo may also appear as an abbreviated form in lists of regions. See Shri-bhūtibhadra, Rgya bod yig tshang, p. 168 b.

28. See, for instance, the Bonpo writings from Dolpo: Tenzin Namdak (ed.), Sources for a History of Bon (Dolanji, H.P.: Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Center,
1972), p. 455. The *Ladakh Chronicles* usually contain the spelling *blo bo* or *blo*.


33. The spellings have become even more prevalent in the modern Ladakhi historical compilations. See *Bsod-nams-tshe-brtan Yo-seb dge-rgan* and *Bsod-nams-skyabs-dge-rgan*, *Bla dwags rgyal rabs 'chi med gter* (Srinagar: S. S. Gergan, 1976), pp. 471, 472 and *passim*.

34. See, for example, below in the text of the *Tsarang Molla*, p. 9a. See also *Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub*, *Bka’ bum gyi dkar chag gsal ba'i sgron me, Collected Works*, vol. 3 (New Delhi: Ngawang Topgay, 1977), p. 332.6: “'gro ba kun gyi yid la smon pa'i thang.”


36. *Francke*, vol. 2, p. 120: *C MS. reads lho mon thang.*

37. Francke, vol. 2, p. 120: *B MS. reads lho mo sdang*, which Francke amended to read *lho mo[n] sdang*.

38. The initial *sa* of initial consonant combinations, which is silent in most Tibetan dialects, is audible in many words in Ladakhi and other far-western Tibetan dialects.


40. *Brag-dkar-rta-so rig-'dzin Chos-kyi-dbang-phyug*, p. 90a-90b: *mnga’ ris glo bo phyogs su phebs/ dpal dges pa rdo rje'i rtsa rgyud rtags pa gnyis pa nas lung gis zin pa'i [90b] mu mu ni se ta 'am mu khun kshe ta (grol ba'i zhing: mchan) zur chag gi skad du mu ta sa tar bod pa yongs grags phyi nang gnyis ka'i gnas su 'dod pa chu mig brgya rtsa zhes rdo dang [chu la rang byung gi me 'bar ba dikki sprin ltar 'du ba'i gnas der byon te zhag shas bzhugs].

41. The name *Mumuni* is met with in at least two other places. One is M. A. Stein, *Kāhāna's Rājatarangini, A Chronicle of the Kings of Kasmir* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1961), vol. 1, p. 98, verse 332, footnote: “Mumuni is named between the Tuhkaras and the Bhauttas.” Also, *Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub (Collected Works*, vol. 3, p. 18) discusses Mumuni, saying that it is mentioned in the *(Kye rdor rgyud) brag pa gnyis pa, the Chos rgyal ma chen mo* (a versified eulogy of Sa-kya Paññita), and the biography of *Glo-bo lo-tsa-ba Shes-rab-rin-chen*. *Glo-bo mkhan-chen* takes the position that Mumuni is a country in southeast India, and for this also cites the *'Jam dpal zhal lung gi 'grel pa.*

*Muktikṣetra* seems to be the main name of the Muktināth area in modern-
day Hindu Sanskrit writings. G. Tucci (Preliminary Report, p. 11, n. 1) mentions a Sanskrit work containing references in the Purāṇas and Tantras to Muktināth and nearby places.

*Muktiksetra*, however, is also the name of a class of shrines (tīrthas), one of which was the region of Śālagrāma, the headwaters of the Kali Gandaki where the Śālagrāma stones are found. Śālagrāma probably also included Muktināth. A list of muktikṣetras is given in sections of dharmā-sāstra texts entitled Tīrtha-pratyāmnāyāḥ, which give a basis for ranking Hindu places of pilgrimage. The earliest such classification probably belongs to the late 12th century. See Richard Salomon, “Tīrtha-pratyāmnāyāḥ: Ranking of Hindu Pilgrimage Sites in Classical Sanskrit Texts,” Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, vol. 129 (1979), pp. 102-128.


41. Brag-dkar-rta-so rig-'dzin Chos-kyi-dbang-phyug, p. 91b: rim gyis rgya gar 'phags yul gyi cha shas sngon gyi dus ya rtse rgyal po zhes chos bzhin du spyod pa byung ba'i shul dus kyi 'gyur bas da lta'i skdəs də li ra dza zhes phyi rol mu stegs byed kyi grub mtha' la mos shing/ rgyal phran nyi shur dbang bsgyur ba 'dzum lang du grags pa'i rje bo de'i mnga 'og zur chag gi skad smra ba'i yul der...
CHAPTER 2

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON THE HISTORY AND HISTORICAL SOURCES OF LO

Before the 1950s, almost nothing was known to outsiders about the history of Lo except that it had formerly been a part of western Tibet and that in more recent times it had become Nepalese territory. Indeed, the earliest Western sources did not always agree even on that much. The first Western writers to mention Lo Mustang for the most part remarked only about its geographical position and political allegiances, and regarding the latter they often contradicted each other.

Michel Peissel in the bibliography to his book Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom has compiled most of the early Western references to Lo Mustang. This list includes references made by early visitors to Nepal, beginning with W. J. Kirkpatrick’s An Account of the Kingdom of Nepaul, in the Year 1793, and it also contains the first published accounts of Lo made by foreigners who had travelled to Lo itself. To this helpful list one could now also add several early Tibetological works such as A. H. Francke’s Antiquities of Indian Tibet, which was first published in 1926. But even if one expands that list, those early sources still do not suffice for even the most elementary sketch of the history of Lo.

More detailed investigations of the history of Lo began only in the 1950s when two scholars of Tibetan studies made separate journeys to Lo. The first of this pair of scholars was Professor Giuseppe Tucci, who in 1952 journeyed to the capital, Mönthang, and to the Tibetan-Nepalese border. The second was Professor David Snellgrove, who in 1956 journeyed up the Kali Gandaki as far as Tsarang. Of the pair, Tucci was the first to attempt an account of some of the main events in the history of Lo and to discuss the origins of the early rulers of Lo.

G. Tucci (1956)

In his Preliminary Report on Two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal, Tucci expressed the opinion that “Buddhism entered the country in the 15th century.” To this, he added the following,
basing his account mainly on the biography of Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzang-po (1382-1456) that he possessed: 5

This was due to A me dpal. This person belonged to the gNam ru k’yuña pa family (gduṅ rus), the members of which were officials (druṅ skor) of mNa’ ris rdson. The c’os rgyal of mNa’ ris āBum Ide mgon appointed A me dpal as rdson dpon of [p. 18] the frontier-rdson (rgyab rdson) gTsan raṅ bya p’oi že va (Charang). A me dpal tried his very best to spread Buddhism in the country under his rule. His first attempt with Bo doṅ was not successful. He was more successful with the Sa skya pas, but the real person who greatly contributed to the spread of Buddhism in this part of the world was Kun dga’ bzan po who was invited three times by A me dpal. . . . 6

Tucci concluded his account of this period by summarizing the activities of Ngor-chen and of the Lo rulers who were Ngor-chen’s patrons during his three visits to Lo.

Not surprisingly, Tucci’s contribution to the study of the history of Lo was largely based on his collection of historical texts from Tibet. These included two biographies of Ngor-chen and the general history of Tibet known as the New Red Annals (Deb ther dmar po gsar ma). 7 One of the few local documents that he mentioned was a monastic injunction (bca’ yig) that was written in 1446 by Ngor-chen. 8


Professor Snellgrove’s first mention of the history of Lo appeared in his Himalayan Pilgrimage, which was published in 1961. In that book he related a curious story about the origins of the present ruling family of Lo:

The present dynasty only dates from the end of the eighteenth century, the time of the Gorkha-Tibetan wars, when a younger son of the Gorkha Raja was sent to this part of the frontier as General Commanding. He established himself as a ruler and married a Tibetan wife. 9

Six years later, in his book Four Lamas of Dolpo (1967), Snellgrove did not repeat that account. Instead, he wrote the following
sketch of the early political situation in Lo:

Lo itself was a dependency of Nga-ri (Western Tibet), which in the 10th and 11th centuries consisted of the three kingdoms, Mar-yul, Gu-ge, and sPu-hrangs. Mustang belonged to the kingdom of bKra-shis-mgon, king of Purang, who seems to have gained control over the other two kingdoms and established his capital in Gung-thang. The ruler of Lo... seems to have had little local power. There was a chain of strong-holds (all now in ruins) the whole length of the Kali Gandaki valley from Kagbeni to Mustang, and the 'lords' of these castles seem to have ruled as absolute masters in their own small domains. They were fighting continually among themselves.¹⁰

In the second account, Snellgrove clearly asserts that Lo was once part of the domain of the old rulers of Ngari. In particular, Lo is said to have been ruled by a king of Purang, Bkra-shis-mgon, who "established his capital in Gung-thang." A second assertion that Snellgrove makes is that Lo itself was insignificant as a political entity, and that there was no strong, central leadership in Lo. These assertions by Snellgrove seem to have been based primarily on the biographies that made up his Four Lamas of Dolpo, i.e., on materials belonging to the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. No doubt Snellgrove was aware of Tucci's previous work, but the history of Lo was at the periphery of his study. He had focussed mainly on Dolpo and did not dwell on the history of the adjoining districts.

M. Peissel (1965, 1967)

Neither Tucci nor Snellgrove were led by their sources to assert that Lo had formerly been politically or economically important. Nor did they assert that the modern noble house of Lo was connected with the early kings such as A-ma-dpal. Indeed, such assertions were first put forward by Michel Peissel on the basis of a historical work he had found and on the basis of the then-living Mustang raja's oral accounts.

Peissel visited Lo in the spring of 1964, staying there for two and one-half months. The next year he published an article in the National Geographic describing his trip. The article was entitled "Mustang, Remote Realm in Nepal," and in it he mentioned
his discovery of "a manuscript of the history of Mustang from the 1380's to the present day."11

According to Peissel:

This unique manuscript proved that the small mountain state boasts a long and continuous history. In the past, Mustang had apparently been a relatively rich kingdom. The ruins of abandoned towns and monasteries support the written evidence. Mustang had also played a significant political role in the past . . . .12

Peissel also interviewed the then king of Lo:

From the king, and later research, I learned that Mustang was founded in the 1380's by Ama Pal, a fierce soldier who had conquered the 20 great fortresses whose mighty ruins overlook the present villages of Mustang. Angun Tenzing Trandul claims to be the 23rd king in line since Ama Pal . . . .13

Then in 1967 a little over one year after the National Geographic article, Peissel brought out his Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom, the full-length travelogue of his trip to Lo. There one finds an even longer sketch of the history of Lo.14 Peissel's book is an engaging and fast-moving narrative meant primarily for the armchair explorer, and thus it should not be criticized as if it were a study of more serious pretensions. Nevertheless, part of the book was devoted to telling the history of Lo, and there it has a few shortcomings. To mention just one thing, Peissel did not adopt an exact system for transcribing the Tibetan language. Hence one can never be sure of the important names he cites. Yet in spite of such things, the book contained some seven pages about the history of the Lo kings. This was the longest and most detailed attempt so far.

In Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom too, Peissel mentioned his discovery of a local manuscript that told the history of the kings of Lo. Peissel presented several excerpts from that book, but these are too long to quote in full. Still, two observations should be made about that account. First, the origin of the Lo rulers recounted there did not agree with the accounts of either Tucci or Snellgrove. According to Peissel's manuscript, which was called "the Molla," the Lo royal line was descended from the old Yarlung dynasty of Tibet.15
Second, the beginning of the history possessed several anachronisms and suspiciously legendary elements. Moreover, no attempt was made to make the full contents of the Molla available or to verify them. The text itself was not published, and no new works supporting it were brought forward. (The two other sources in Peissel’s list of Tibetan texts mentioning Mustang were in fact already known to either Tucci or Snellgrove.)

C. von Führer-Haimendorf (1975)

Another writer to attempt a brief sketch of the history of Lo was Professor Christoph von Führer-Haimendorf, and he included it in his Himalayan Traders (published 1975). This well-known anthropologist of the Himalayan region had helped prepare Peissel for his 1964 journey to Lo, and thus would have been expected to make use of Peissel’s findings. In Himalayan Traders, Führer-Haimendorf did in fact mention Peissel’s book, but only to indicate the origin of a “theory.” As it turned out, he did not draw any information from Peissel’s account of his Molla. Instead, he based his sketch entirely upon the synopsis of Snellgrove in the Four Lamas of Dolpo.

M. Peissel (1977)

Two final sketches of the history of Mustang were presented by Peissel in his book Himalaya Continent Secret. This book, which was published in 1977, retells the story of the author’s previous travels to Mustang, as well as to Bhutan, Ladakh, Zanskar, and the Sherpa region of Nepal. To summarize Peissel’s main assertions in the first sketch (p. 114):

Mustang was first set up as an independent kingdom in about 1380 by the ruler Ame Pal. He was the founder of the capital Mönthang with its surrounding wall. The principal monasteries in Lo were founded by the great abbot of Ngor, who visited there in 1460. Mustang became rich by controlling the salt trade between Tibet and India. It governed an extensive territory in the upper Kali Gandaki valley, extending as far south as Tukche. But its richness and strategic position attracted the envy of others; there were many lengthy quarrels with neighboring rulers, especially Jumla. Near the end of the 18th century the armies of Jumla crushed the forces of Mustang, and the latter passed under the suzerainty of Jumla. But when (two or three decades later) Jumla was con-
quered by the Gurkha rulers, the symbolic tribute formerly paid to Jumla was transferred to Nepal. Meanwhile, to reconcile themselves with their northern neighbor, Tibet, the kings of Mustang sat in the Tibetan Assembly [?], and continued to marry daughters of the Tibetan aristocracy. In 1855 the Nepalese armies when invading Tibet passed through Mustang, and the raja was honored for his fidelity by the Rana ruler. In 1890 the salt monopoly was given to the Thakali of Tukche, and from this time Mustang became impoverished.

The second historical sketch is found in Appendix II (pp. 265-266). There Peissel repeated much of the foregoing account. In addition, he mentioned Purang for the first time as a powerful force in Mustang prior to Ame Pal. He also said that it was open to doubt whether the present ruler is directly descended from Ame Pal by the male line, though he gave no reason for this.

All in all, it seems that in Himalaya Continent Secret Peissel had reappraised his earlier account based on the manuscript history he had found. Nowhere did he mention his Molla, and he did not repeat any of the names and details deriving from it.

E. G. Smith (1970)

The last original contributions to the study of the historical and literary traditions of Lo were made by Mr. E. Gene Smith, the preeminent bibliographer of Tibetan literature. Here and there in the many English prefaces to modern Tibetan-language reprints that he had penned, Smith has called attention to some of the important people and literary works out of Lo’s past. He discussed, for instance, Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub (1456-1532) and his writings. He also mentioned Glo-bo lo-tsä-ba Shes-rab-rin-chen (13th century), Mnga’-ris paq-chen Padma-dbang-rgyal (1487-1542), and that master’s younger brother Rig’dzin Legs-ladan-bdud-’joms-rdo-rje (1500-1565/1577).

On the history of Lo, Smith ventured the following:

Under the first few generations of the successors of A-mes-dpal, Buddhism flowered in Mustang; Glo-bo gained a reputation as a center of artistic and literary creative energy. Why Mustang declined is a complicated problem. Undoubtedly, two of the important factors were the bitter and constant warfare that plagued the western Bhotia states for almost two
centuries and the rise of the Gorkha state. The unsettled conditions led to a redirection of trade to the eastern passes. As the Valley and, later, Solu grew prosperous, Mustang and its western neighbors fell upon hard days.

Glo-bo mkhān-chen belongs to the late 15th century when the princes of Mustang had reached the apogee of their power.\textsuperscript{24}

Furthermore, Smith mentioned "the eclecticism that flourished in the Nepalese borderlands during the 15th and 16th centuries,"\textsuperscript{25} noting that the religious developments in Dolpo in that period should be understood "within the broader picture of the trends that were also predominant in the richer Mustang and throughout southwestern Tibet."\textsuperscript{26} In other introductions Smith has translated or discussed literary passages dealing with specific episodes out of Lo's past,\textsuperscript{27} or he has referred to important historical sources and other writings coming from Lo.\textsuperscript{28}

Summary

Past accounts of the history of Lo were thus few in numbers, brief, and until recently they were based on only a small number of sources. In the pioneer study, Tucci was mainly concerned with the people and events in Lo at one high point in the cultural development of the area. In the works of Snellgrove, the history of Lo was peripheral to the main area of study, and Snellgrove was of the opinion that Lo Mustang and its kings had been insignificant local powers. Peissel (1967) was the first to attempt a more continuous account. He stressed that Lo was once a prominent political power and that its modern ruling family was descended from the early great kings.

The sketches of Snellgrove (1967) and Peissel (1967) were the longest attempted. Of these, Peissel's did not find later acceptance, while Snellgrove's was repeated by Fürer-Haimendorf in his book published in 1975. In his latest attempt, Peissel (1977) presented a simplified account, omitting the specific details of his earlier-historical sketch. The last original contributions were made by Smith, who revealed the existence of many previously unknown sources.\textsuperscript{29}

Notes

1. Peissel, \textit{Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom}, pp. 309-311. This work will hereafter be cited as \textit{MFK}.  
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5. This biography by Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs, Rgyal ba rdo rje ’chang kun dga’ bzang po’i rnam par thar pa legs bshad chu bo ’dus pa’i rgya mtsho yon tan yid bzhin nor bu’i ’byung gnas, was published with the Kye rdor rnam bshad of Sde-dge Yab-chen (New Delhi: Trayang and Jamyang Samten, 1976).


13. Peissel, MRR, p. 593.


16. Ibid. According to Peissel’s account, that Molla portrays the Lo king Ame Pal, who flourished in the 15th century, as being five generations removed from the Tibetan king Trisun Detsin (Khri-srong-lde-btsan), who flourished in the 8th century.

17. One of the sources cited in Peissel’s bibliography was the biography of Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzang-po by Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs, on which see above, note 5. The only other Tibetan-language source cited by Peissel (besides his Molla) was the autobiography of Tenzin Repa (Bstan-'dzin-ras-pa), also mentioned by Snellgrove in his Himalayan Pilgrimage, p. 201. This is the work Rnal 'byor gyi dbang phyug rje btsun bstan ’dzin ras pa'i rnam thar mdzad pa nyung ngu gcig, the xylograph blocks of which are preserved at Shey in Dolpo. See also Snellgrove, Four Lamas, vol. 1, p. 11.


20. E. Gene Smith, “Preface to Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s Rigs gter bshad pa”:


 CHAPTER 3

WHAT IS A MOLLA?

The existence of books called Mollas was thus first reported by Mr. M. Peissel, who mentioned them both in his travelogue and in the dissertation that he submitted in 1969 at the Université de Paris. He did not study or analyze the Molla materials in detail in either work. Still, from his writings one can glean a few facts about these books.

Peissel first heard of a Molla in Mustang in 1964, during a conversation with the late Mustang raja 'Jam-dpal-bstan-'dzin-dgra-'dul. During his second meeting with the raja, Peissel was told that Mollas "were not history books, that anyhow they were only books of legends." In spite of that, Peissel became convinced by other informants that the Mollas were the main local histories and that they contained "the names of all the kings and all their deeds." After a number of unsuccessful attempts, he finally managed to locate and buy a copy of one Molla, and having done so he believed that he had found "a recently compiled history of the land [of Lo], written by a certain 'Ayupa, monk of Tsarang,'...which brought the history of the kings up to date, as it mentioned Angun Tenzin, King of Lo, and his three sons." But because Peissel neither described his Molla fully nor published its text or translation, there remained a number of uncertainties about its nature and contents.

In Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom, Peissel did not make clear whether his Molla was the only such text, or whether other Mollas might also exist. But in his later dissertation, he mentioned two Mollas, which he called "la 'Molla' (mo-lha) de Garphu" and "une Molla trouvée à Tsarang." In addition, scholars have subsequently reported the existence of other "Mollas" in nearby areas of Nepal and Tibet, though nobody has described them in detail or published their texts. And now, the full texts or fragments of three other Mollas from Lo have become available. On the basis of these newly accessible works and with the help of various other sources, it is now possible to explain in more detail what a Molla is.

The Etymology of Molla

Although the term Molla is unfamiliar to many Tibetologists
as the name of a genre of Tibetan historical literature, it is nevertheless a recognizable Tibetan word. That word is *mol ba*, which H.A. Jäschke in his *Tibetan-English Dictionary* defined as the "usual respectful term, especially in Western Tibet, for 'to say, to speak'."\(^9\)

The pronunciation "molla" results from the reduplication of the final *l* in the first syllable *mol*, a progressive assimilation that occurs in some dialects when a written Tibetan word has a syllable ending in *-l* that is followed by the unstressed syllable *ba*.\(^10\) Jäschke (*loc. cit.*) himself indicated this reduplication in his example phrase "mol-la tan-wa," which he gave as a Central Tibetan phrase meaning "to make known." One of the Molla texts also attests to the fact that *mol ba* is the written Tibetan equivalent of Molla: the *Molla of Namgyal* refers to its main contents (*dngos gzhi*) as being a "*mol ba'i legs bshad*."\(^11\)

If Molla (*mol ba*) is a word whose basic sense is "to say, to speak," in what way is this word proper as the title or designation of a historical source? The answer to this question makes much clearer the unusual position of the Mollas within Tibetan literature. The word *mol ba* does not signify speaking or talking in general, but refers in particular to public discourse or speech-making. The Mollas were the written texts of speeches whose contents included historical information. This is a special, restricted sense of *mol ba*. In its wider sense, however, it signifies the giving of a discourse by a speaker, or it signifies the discourse itself.

In general, the stem *mol* is used in Tibetan to form words meaning both reciprocal types of speech—such as back-and-forth discussion—and the one-way accounts given by a speaker to a listener or group of listeners. In the *Tibetan-English Dictionary* of S.C. Das, both senses are indicated by the synonyms given for *mol ba*: *gtam smra ba* and *gros byed pa*.\(^12\) The latter synonym means to discuss or to consult one another. In such a usage, *mol ba* has the same meaning as the compound *mol mchid*. On the other hand, the first synonym, *gtam smra ba*, indicates the telling of news or the giving of an account, narration, or discourse. Used in this way, *mol ba* as a verbal noun can be synonymous with the word 'bel *gtam* which Melvyn C. Goldstein in his *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan* defined as "discourse, narrative,"\(^13\) and which Das in his dictionary defined as "holy discourse, sermon, a speech on some sacred subject." The word 'bel *gtam* was suggested to me by the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche as a synonym for *mol ba*, and indeed the element
mol can also combine with gtam to form mol gtam, another word for "Molla."

The latter word appears in the colophon of the Molla of Namgyal and in the title of a speech composed by Shâkyamchogldan. A third word that is formed using the element mol and that means "speech" or "discourse" is mol tshig. This word also occurs in the Molla of Namgyal, where it is a part of that work's formal title Mol tshig bstan pa'i 'phrengs [sic] mdzes ("A Speech that is a Beautiful Rosarie of the Doctrine"). From their usage it is clear that mol gtam and mol tshig are synonyms of mol ba in the sense of 'bel gtam.

At least two other spellings of mol ba are found in the written materials from Lo. On the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche's copy of the Molla of Tsarang, for instance, one finds the spelling mo lha. In Tsarang M. and the Gelung Speech, there are also found other spellings for this word, such as what appears to have been the phonetic rendering of unlettered writers or scribes: mo la.

Thus in the western Tibetan dialects spoken in Lo, the words mol ba, mol gtam, and mol tshig signified the act of speechmaking, and thus by extension they also signified the manuscripts in which speeches were set down in writing. This was the origin of Molla as the title of a book and as the name of a genre of writings. These words made from the stem mol, however, are not yet attested in the dictionaries. In the dictionary of Das, even mol ba itself is marked with the sign for an archaism. But this is unjustified since the word was and is current in some dialects. Das's predecessor Jäschke indicated that the word was widely used in western Tibet since he called it a "usual respectful term." Moreover, even before Jäschke, Csoma de Körös had noted the word, and it has appeared in almost every dictionary since. Goldstein in his Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan, for instance, gives the verbal stem mol as an active verb meaning "to speak, to say, to talk." And the even more recent Dag yig gsar bsgrigs of blo-mthun Bsam-gtan et al. also includes it.

The word mol ba also occurs in the literature of Tibet proper in the sense of "speech" or "discourse" ('bel gtam). One finds the word, for example, in the biography of Pañ-chen Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan (1352-1405), a Bo-dong-pa master who was influential in La-stod Lho and Rdzong-dkar during the late 14th century. In the water-male-horse year (1403), one of Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan's
great patrons, Ta'i-si-tu Chos-hy-ri-rin-chen, died. The biography states:

When [Pa-p-chen Grags-pa-r-gyal-mtshan] was conducting a great religious assembly, he [gave an account of] that great religious king's qualities of greatness, and [recited] the histories of his noble ancestry by way of his "lineage" (rigs), "clan" (rus), and line of maternal descent (cho 'brang), expressing these matters through poetical constructions, poetical figures, synonyms, etc.

Everyone assembled there marvelled exceedingly, and they said, "There are very few discourses (mol ba) which contain as much as this one delivered by this precious master today."^^

In that 15th-century biography, the word mol ba was thus used to denote a formal, commemorative speech dealing with the noble ancestry of a great ruler. This very usage persists in Lo, where the word continues to be understood as signifying a solemn speech or a book containing such a speech—that is recited before a religious assembly and that eulogizes the local rulers and their ancestry.

The Extant Mollas

Before going on to discuss the specific characteristics of the Mollas in more detail, it would be best to begin by listing the Molla texts that are now known to exist. So far at least six Mollas or fragments of Mollas from Lo have come into the hands of Western researchers. Two of these are the Mollas that Peissel discovered. A third is the text of a speech that Peissel had copied in Gelung. In addition, three other Mollas are now accessible as complete texts or fragments, having been discovered during my own studies research in Nepal.

1. The Molla of Tsarang (Tsarang M.)

The Molla of Tsarang was the first Molla that I came across while doing research on the history of Lo. It was also the most valuable. It is a small manuscript that was composed for recitation during a religious gathering. Through it, the reciter announced the offerings made by a patron to the assembly of Buddhist clergy, and stated the requests that the patron wished to make. A large section
of the speech consisted of a eulogistic genealogy of the ruling family of Lo Mustang.

The original copy of the *Tsarang Molla* belonged to a monk from the monastery of Tsarang, and hence it has been given the name *Tsarang M.* in this study. The place where it was primarily intended to be recited was also Tsarang monastery. Only a single copy of this work had survived until it was discovered and copied in the early 1970s by the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche. Through his kindness, I in turn gained access to that second copy in Nepal during the summer of 1976.

The Rinpoche first located *Tsarang M.* while searching for historical sources that could be used for writing a new genealogy of the Lo kings. The original copy that he found was a badly worn manuscript that was missing one or more folios. Because of its importance, he had a manuscript copy made of it. This was the copy I first saw, and it thus became the main source for the text of *Tsarang M.* that appears below.

The Rinpoche's copy of *Tsarang M.* was written on sheets of handmade paper that had been folded in half lengthwise and sewn together at the crease to make an oblong “bound” book (Tib.: *mgo tshem* or *ltek mgo ma*). The text consists of sixteen folios, including two blank sides at folio 13. On the outside cover was written the title *Mo lha* in dbu can characters. The text began inside, on the first interior folio, and it was written in smaller dbu med (*tshugs thung*) characters. Pages 1a to 3a were written four lines to the page. Pages 3b to 7b were written five lines to the page and from page 8a onward (excepting the lacuna at pages 13a-13b) there were six lines per page.

In the new copy, the gap at folio 13 was not the only missing part; the text also lacked a number of folios at the end of the text. But fortunately I was able to complete this missing last section in 1983 when I had the chance briefly to examine the old original of *Tsarang M.* The original was a manuscript of fifty-eight leaves 19 by 7.7 cm. in size, with no numbering of the folios. The book was made of sheets of paper that were folded and sewn on the long edge. There was writing only on one side of each leaf. The colophon of the work is extremely short. It simply states that the compiler was one “sngags (-pa)? Migs-dmar-legs-bsam [sic].”

From the names of the last rulers mentioned in it, the time of
its compilation or final revision can be assigned to the mid or late 19th century.

2. The Molla of Namgyal (Namgyal M.)

The *Molla of Namgyal* was another speech that was designed to be recited during a religious assembly in Lo. It came into my possession by a happy coincidence during a journey to southern Mustang district (Panchgaon and Baragaon) in the summer of 1977. The acquisition of the work was actually the culmination of several efforts made by Mr. Michael Vinding, the Danish anthropologist, and Mr. Krishna Lal Thakali, who was then working as his assistant. Several months prior to my visit, they had requested Tenpay Gyaltsen of Mönthang to find and copy another Molla that he knew to exist. After a long delay, he finally succeeded in borrowing *Namgyal M.* from the monk in Lo who owned it, and made a copy of it in his own hand.

I had been told about the possible arrival of this copy by Vinding and Thakali, both of whom had been very helpful to me during my stay there. By a fortunate coincidence I happened to be passing through Jomosom on the very day that Tenpay Gyaltsen arrived from Upper Lo, and with their kind consent I purchased the newly made copy from him. At the same time I was able to examine briefly the original of *Namgyal M.* that Tenpay Gyaltsen had also brought, and I was able to ascertain that the new copy was complete.

The older copy of *Namgyal M.* was similar in appearance to the old and new copies of *Tsarang M.*, in that it was also written on sheets of handmade paper that had been folded and then sewn together along the crease. It was in worn but readable condition, and according to Tenpay Gyaltsen it was still used on occasion by the monks of Namgyal and Tsarang monasteries. I have called it *Namgyal M.* in this study because of its present connection with Namgyal monastery, and because within the speech itself there are what appear to be references to the monastery of Namgyal. In it, the monastery “Thugs-dam Dar-rgyas-gling” is referred to as the monastery where the speech is to be recited; this appears to be the formal name of Namgyal monastery as it was understood by the author of the work. Some of the historical contents also link the work to Namgyal monastery.

The speech was composed by a man who identifies himself in the colophon as “Khri-dpon ming-ba Tshe-lhun.” His full name
was probably Tshe-dbang-lhun-grub, for a Glo-bc-stod khri-dpon Tshe-dbang-lhun-grub is also known from a manuscript from Skag (Kagbeni). The title khri dpon marks him as a high official. He states that he wrote the work during the last year of a three-year retreat at Lha-gdong-phug, and that he wrote it at the request of Drung-tsho Tshe-ring, “the kind and wise healer.” From internal evidence and from the dating of the Skag manuscript, we can infer that the author wrote this Molla at the end of the 18th or beginning of the 19th century.

The new copy of Namgyal M. that came into my possession was written on the lined pages of a student’s notebook. Tenpay Gyaltshen was himself the scribe, and he wrote the new copy in dbu can, characters. He used only one side of each 14.5 by 20 cm. leaf, and the text consisted of a total of nineteen pages (see Appendix J). The new copy contained many corrupt spellings, but almost all of them were easily decipherable. A quick comparison of the new text with the original confirmed that Tenpay Gyaltshen had preserved the incorrect spellings of the original and that his copy was quite accurate.

3. The Molla of Mönthang (Mönthang M.)
When I first read the historical section of Namgyal M., I thought that it was another Molla that I had heard about earlier. In the previous year during my stay in Lumbini, the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche had told me that another Molla existed at the Mönthang monastic center (smon thang chos sde) but that it was not very valuable as a historical source. At that time he showed me in his own notebook the historical contents which he had copied out from that Molla.

The history found in Mönthang M. is obviously similar to the one in Namgyal M., especially the beginning, which agrees with Namgyal M. almost word for word. But when I compared the texts carefully, I noticed that whereas the account of Namgyal M. stopped at the time when the ruler Bkra-shis-snying-po was a prince (c. 1790?), the history of Mönthang M. went on for a few more generations. On that basis, it is possible to date the compilation or final revision of the work to the second half of the 19th century, about the same time as the compilation of Tsarang M.

4. The Molla of Garphu (Garphu M.)
The Molla of Garphu was the main Molla that M. Peissel dis-
covered during his stay in Lo. In *Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom* he mentions that he located and bought this Molla in Garphu through the help of a man named Pemba Gyaltshen. This man was actually Tenpay Gyaltshen (Bstan-pa-'i-rgyal-mtshan) of Mönthang who in 1977 sold me a copy of *Namgyal M.*

According to Peissel's description of it, the book was a complete manuscript. It was "composed of eighteen pages of coarse paper about seven inches long and two inches wide... The pages were quite dirty, and the characters difficult to read—especially the names, as these were written in pale red ink." According to its colophon, it was the work of a monk from Tsarang named "Ayupa" (=Ayur-pa; Tshe-ring or Tshe-dbang)." In July of 1979 through the kindness of Mr. A.W. Macdonald I had the chance to obtain a photocopy of what appears to be the same text. The work was entitled *Glo bo chosr gyal byon tshul dang go sa mtho man* [sic] *yul so sor ming 'brel cas* [sic], and it was an *dbu med* manuscript of fifteen folios.

As Peissel himself noted, this was a very late composition. It was probably written in the 1960s, possibly as late as in 1964 when Peissel was in Mustang and actively searching for such a book. In its structure and content, *Garphu M.* does not resemble any other accessible Molla. As its full title indicates, it deals not only with the genealogy of the Lo rulers but also with such unexpected topics as the various levels in the social or political hierarchy in Lo and the meanings of local place names. Moreover, it possesses none of the typical features of a speech, and thus it is not a traditional Molla or speech text.

5. The Molla of Tsarang-B.

The Molla about which I know least is the second Molla mentioned by Peissel in his dissertation. He cites it as "la Molla de Tsarang," and he describes it as a historical narration that told of the past Lo Mustang rulers' deeds. It seems that he was only able to copy a part of this text because he lists it in the bibliography of his dissertation as "extraits d'une Molla trouvé à Tsarang." Apparently he only used this work for its account about an early king named Mgon-sde-nyi-ma-mgon and about how in the time of that king there were many independent fortresses in Lo. *Garphu M.* is the only other Molla to mention a ruler by this name, and this raises the possibility that these two texts are somehow connected.
6. The Gelung Speech

A sixth "Molla" from Lo is a manuscript copy of a speech from the village of Gelung (the Ghilinggaon on most maps). The work differs markedly from the Mollas of Tsarang and Namgyal in its structure and contents. It was written to be recited at the village meeting house (spyi khang) of Gelung, and its recitation was actually witnessed by Peissel during his visit to Gelung in 1964. According to Peissel the original was written on a three-foot-long scroll, and it was recited by a "spokesman" as a part of a village celebration. At the time of his visit, he had a handwritten copy made, a photocopy of which I have been able to consult through the kind help of Professor R.A. Stein.

The copy of the scroll made for Peissel was written rather hurriedly or carelessly in a cursive (’khyug-yig) script. It came to fill thirteen pages of a lined student’s notebook (one side of text per leaf) on pages that measured approximately 14.5 by 20 cm. The final lines of the speech record that it was the composition of a certain Tshe-ring-dar-rgyas and that it was to be recited to the participants in local celebrations.

The speech is not easy for an outsider to understand. It is written in an informal style, and it abounds with words and phrases from the local dialect. Even the words of standard literary Tibetan that occur in it are constantly misspelled. Nevertheless, one thing is clear: the content of the speech has little in common with its description in Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom.

With assistance from Geshe Ngawang Nornang, I was able to determine the main features of the speech. It begins with an invocation, and then gives an account of the origin of speeches (according to this legend, the original speechmakers were birds). Then one reaches the main contents of the speech, which begin with a stylized description of the local area, and also mention the past connection of the Lo rulers with the area. The speech recounts the establishment of various customs and institutions in the time of the great king A-ma-dpal, the religious master Ngor-chen Kundga’-bzang-po, and an important minister of the Lo rulers named Bka’-blon Zla-ba-bzang-po. It comes to an end with a few obscure words that allude to the value of speeches at celebrations:

If there is no prayer with the beer
one is like a donkey drinking beer.
If one has no time for doing that, one is like a mute white . . . (?).\textsuperscript{46}

Though it is a difficult work, the \textit{Gelung Speech} illustrates that more than one type of speechmaking were practiced in Lo. One may call it a Molla since it is a speech, and in fact the author refers to it as “Molla” within the work itself. Nevertheless, its radical difference in form and content from the other Mollas make it of little use for understanding the other traditions of speechmaking in Lo. And as a historical source, we need not discuss it any further for it contains no special details and the orientation of its historical accounts is different from that of the other Mollas. Whereas the other Molla histories are concerned with the genealogy of the Lo rulers, the \textit{Gelung Speech} mainly relates, how certain customs and institutions were established in the local community.

Notes

1. Peissel, \textit{MFK}, p. 140. See also his \textit{MRR}, p. 581. Peissel’s dissertation was entitled “L’organisation politique et sociale du royaume tibétain de Glo, dit le royaume du Mustang” (Thèse pour le doctorate de 3ème cycle, U. de Paris, 1969). This work is listed in several bibliographies, such as in L. Boulnois, \textit{Bibliographie du Népal}, Supplement 1967-1973 (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975), vol. 1, no. 3049. I am much indebted to Professor R. A. Stein for his help in obtaining a copy of this thesis, and also to Mr. Peissel for his authorization to consult it.
6. Peissel had mentioned in \textit{MFK}, p. 311, that a translation of that Molla had been done at his request by Mr. Samten Karmay and that this translation was in 1967 “awaiting publication.”
8. Corneille Jest, \textit{Dolpo, communautés de langue tibétaine du Népal} (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1975), p. 369, describes the Mollas he found in Dolpo as follows:

Le texte du mo-la est récité à la fin des cérémonies religieuses importantes, aux mariages et funérailles; Kagar Rinpoche le définit ainsi «les laïcs ne peuvent comprendre le sens profond des textes, c’est la raison pour laquelle nous leur donnons des exemples, dpe, afin qu’ils puissent accumuler des mérites; c’est dans cette intention que le roi A-ma-dpal a composé les chants
des _sum-cu-smad_, et que j’ai écrit un _mo-la_, recueil de préceptes de lamas vénérables et maîtres de la religion. Le _mo-la_, appelé _rten-brel gyi lugs so_, traduction de bon augure, est récité par Tsering Puntsog de Trangmar et Lhagpa de Ribo bumpa.

Le _mo-la_ de Kagar Rinpoche comprend:
une invocation aux rois des quatre Orient;
une liste des huit héros _dpa’-bo_;
en religieux _chos-pa_;
en religieux _bon-po_;
en magiciens _shags-pa_;
en médecins;
en astrologues;
en guerriers;
le chant des neuf signes.

Jest asserts in a footnote that the _mo-la_ tradition is proper to Tarap in Dolpo and to Lo, but that it is not found in the other districts of Dolpo. He also mentions a _mo-la-bc’ad-rgyud rin-po_ which is recited in the Sherpa region on special occasions: marriage ceremonies, funerals, formal affirmations of friendship, and at important donations to a monastery. He also rightly comments in footnote 170: "Le _mo-la_ doit faire l’objet d’une prochaine étude."


10. Such "reduplication" was described by Sir Charles Bell, _Grammar of Colloquial Tibetan_ (New York: Dover, 1977), p. 17: "When... -l... [is] followed by _pa_ or _ba_, the sound of the final consonant is reduplicated."

However, this pronunciation change in most Tibetan dialects originally followed a general rule: following a syllable ending in a vowel or in -ng, -r, or -l, a final unstressed syllable _ba_ or _bo_ becomes pronounced "wa" or "wo". See H. A. Jäschke, _Tibetan Grammar_ (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1966), p. 18. The final consonant _bu_ usually does not undergo this change, for it is usually stressed. Bell (loc. cit.) gives the example _tshil bu_, where the _bu_ is unstressed.

In some modern dialects of Central Tibet, such as the Lhasa dialect, two additional pronunciation changes occur that would affect the pronunciation of _mol ba_: 1) where written Tibetan has the dental endings (-d, -n, -l, -s), non-front _u_, _o_, become the front vowels _ü_, _ö_, _ç_; 2) the single vowels followed by _l_ of written Tibetan become geminate oral vowels, e.g., _ol->öö_. See Kun Chang and Betty Shefts Chang, _Spoken Tibetan Texts_ (Nankang, Taipei: Academia Sinica, 1978), p. xlvi.

According to the above rules, the word _mol ba_ would be pronounced _mōōwa_ in Lhasa dialect. (The word does not occur in that spoken dialect in the sense of a discourse or speech-text, though _mol_ is still productive in words such as _bka’ mol_.) Moreover, in other words similar to _mol ba_ the above rules are not always or consistently applied. See for example the pronunciations of written Tibetan _sol ba_ and _skal ba_, which some Lhasa speakers pronounce as _sōla_ and _kēla_ (gēia in Chang and Chang’s phonemic system), respectively. See also M.


18. *Tsarang M.*, p. *17a*: bdag mo la mkhan por gyur pa; the Gelung Speech, p. 1.3, 1.5. Elsewhere in the *Gelung Speech* the spelling mo lha is found.

The spelling mo la is also found in the manuscripts of Dolpo and elsewhere. See C. Jest, *Dolpo, Communautés de langue tibétaine du Népal*, p. 369. Jest, footnote 169, also mentions a text from the Sherpa tradition of speechmaking called the *Mo la bshad rgyud ring mo*.

19. According to the revisors of his dictionary, Das, "it seems, has marked such words as he considered archaic or gone out of present use with a swastika." Das, *Dictionary*, Revisor’s Preface, p. xv.


23. Blo-mthun dmu-dge Bsam-gtan, *Dag yig gsar bsgrigs* (Mtsho-sngon: Mi rigs dpe bs krun khang, 1979). I have consulted an Indian reprint of this work (Dharamsala?: 1982?) in which no publication data is given. Unfortunately this reprint has been expurgated by someone who considered many of the words in the original to be objectionable.

24. The biography is apparently by Bo-dong pañ-chen Phyogs-las-nam-rgyal (1375-1451), and it appears in Gsang ’dus lung rigs man ngag ston par byed pa’i bla ma tshad ma’i lo rgyus, which was published as a part of his De kho na nyid ’dus pa. Bo-dong pañ-chen Phyogs-las-nam-rgyal, *Encyclopedia Tibetica*, vol. 64, pp. 451-490.

25. Bo-dong pañ-chen Phyogs-las-nam-rgyal, *Gsang ’dus lung rigs*, p. 481. Also present at this religious convocation was Theg-chen-chos-kyi-rgyal-po Kun-dga’-bkra-shis (1349-1425) of the Sa-skya Lha-khang bla-brang. The text of this passage reads:
chös 'khor rgya chen po mdzad pa'i tshe chos rgyal chen po de'i sku tse [read: che] ba'i yon tan dang/ rigs rus cho 'brang khungs btsun pa'i lo rgyus rnams snyan ngags tshig brgyan/ mgon rjod la sogs pa'i sgo nas skabs don rda [read: brda] sprod mdzad pas tshogs pa thams cad shin tu ngo mtshar bar gyur te/ chos rje rin po che 'dis de ring gsungs pa'i mol ba 'di tsam yang yod pa shin tu nyung zhes gleng bar byed. . .

26. For these terms I am indebted to Mr. Tashi Tsering. Such “bound” books were common in Lo.

27. Namgyal M., p. 15.10, 15.14. In Tsarang M., p. 10b, the monastery at Namgyal is called Thub-bstan-dar-rgyas-gling. This name is very similar to the name of Tsarang Monastery as mentioned in Tsarang M., pp. 9a, 11b: Thub-bstan-bshad-sgrub-dar-rgyas-gling.

28. The longest biographical passage in the text is devoted to the life of Gser-mdog pan-chen Shākya-mchog-Idan, who visited Lo in 1472 and stayed about two years. On p. 15 Shākya-mchog-Idan is said to have taught more than one hundred monks at “Thugs-dam-dar-rgyas-gling,” and his repelling of an army of “Mongols” is linked to a mgon-po image of the monastery. I am also told that the special protective deity (srung ma) of the monastery is not one of the Ngor-pa protectors, but is the personal protector of Shākya-mchog-Idan.


30. Gu ru padma'i rnam thar las thang yig ga'u ma'i dkar chag (pp. 1-13 of the Thang yig ga'u ma, Skag MS.) (Dalhousie: Damchoe Sangpo, 1981), p. 13.4. I am indebted to Mr. Tashi Tsering for bringing this text to my attention.


32. There is, for example, the reference to the then-living throne-holder of Sa-skya (p. 13.9-13.11): dpal sa skya pa chen po tum drag khams gsum dbang sdu ndag dbang dpal ldan chos skyong, whom the Venerable Dezhung Rinpoche identified as Dbang-sdud-snying-po, the son of Sa-chen Kun-dga'-blo-gros. The text, p. 7.8 also refers to the prince Bkra-shis-snying-po. Tsarang M., p. 14a, records that Bkra-shis-snying-po’s father, Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje, was a patron and disciple of Sa-chen Kun-dga'-blo-gros and his son.

33. This may have had something to do with the fact that as Tenpay Gyaltshen wrote out the new copy of Namgyal M. that he later-sold me, he was at the same time making another copy with carbon paper—a copy for his own use!

34. For the text of that extract see Appendix A.

35. Peissel, MFK, pp. 248-250. In his “L’organisation,” p. 31a, Peissel also adopted the designation Molla de Garphu

36. Peissel, MFK, p. 250f. But in “L’organisation,” Bibliographie, p. 5, it is said to be “15 pages doubles manuscrites”


40. In Tsarang M. no Mgon-sde-nyi-ma-mgon is mentioned. The passage
in Tsarang M.-B is reminiscent of a passage referring to this period found in Padma-'phrin-las, p. 272.

41. Map of Nepal, U462 West Sheet, published by D. Survey, Ministry of Defence, U. K. (1967). This form of the name apparently goes back to the original Survey of India map. Documents from the 15th century give the Tibetan spelling dge lung ("Virtue Valley"), while in more recent times the spelling sger lung ("Private Valley") has become common.

42. Peissel, MFK, pp. 95-97.

43. Peissel, MFK, p. 95.

44. It closes with the injunction that a prayer (i.e., a benedictory speech) should accompany beer (i.e., beer-drinking at a celebration). This is the author's rationale for delivering the speech. So saying, he closes: zhes bu tshe ring dar rgyas nges [sic] phull. See Gelung Speech (MS.), p. 13.

45. Gelung Speech, p. 8. The Tsarang Molla, however, gives a different list of these three (p. 9b): Ngor-chen Kun-dga'-bzang-po, A-me-dpal-bzang-po, and Tshe-dbang-bzang-po the minister.

46. Gelung Speech, p. 13: chang la smon lam med na bong bu chang mthong [read: 'thung] ba itar/ de la byas 'dus [=dus] med na kar [=dkar?] po skug [=lkugs?] pa 'dra/. Cf. Peissel, MFK, pp. 95-97. As I was shown by Mr. Tashi Tsering, these same obscure lines occur in a speech from Tingri, but there the spellings are even worse, and the sense of the passage is no clearer.
CHAPTER 4

THE CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE OF TWO MOLLAS

Of the four intact and accessible Mollas, only two are in fact examples of traditional religious speechmaking. The Gelung Speech is a different sort of speech. It was not designed to be recited in the midst of a religious gathering, nor does its historical account contain a eulogistic history of the local rulers. The Molla of Garphu too is not a traditional Molla as strictly defined. Though it ostensibly contains a history of the Lo rulers, Garphu M. was not meant to be recited at a religious gathering, nor indeed is it a speech at all. (Its value as a historical source is a separate question that will be discussed below in chapters 8 and 9.) Thus, for investigating the contents and structure of the traditional Mollas of Lo, we are limited to studying two texts: Namgyal M. and Tsarang M.

The Contents and Structure of the Namgyal Molla

As a written work, Namgyal M. has three basic parts: I. beginning matter, II. the speech, and III. concluding matter. Part I, the beginning matter, is almost inconsequential, being just a title and a short Sanskrit invocation. Part III, a colophon that constitutes the concluding matter, was likewise not an essential part of the speech, for it was not recited aloud. Thus, really only part II, the speech itself, requires detailed investigation.

The speech has three main sections: A. an introduction that consists of the mentioning of offerings, B. the main recitation, which is essentially a history, and C. the conclusion, which is a formal request for prayers of merit dedication. The introductory section consists of a recital of praises and a mentioning of offerings made to the Buddha, to the exterior “supports” (rten) of enlightened body, speech, and mind (i.e., to sacred images, scriptures and stupas), to the temple that contains them, and to the members of the religious congregation. For the benefit of the reciter, there are listed a number of possible respectful salutations that may be used to address the leader of the assembly, according to his religious rank.

The main recitation is by far the longest section. It consists of
two parts: a formal, eulogistic description of the gathered assembly, and a historical (lo rgyus) recitation. This history too is subdivided into two parts: "mundane" (mi chos) and "religious" (lha chos).

The third of the three main parts is a concluding request for the religious assembly to pray that the merit of the offerings will produce both general and particular good results. In this connection, the speech mentions a number of motives for making the beginning offerings and for sponsoring the ceremony. These include the hope of bringing about a good rebirth (for a deceased person) and the desire for freedom from illness (in the case of a living person).

Those three main parts of the speech show how the Molla functions as a liturgical work. Its recitation was a religious rite, for it was a means by which a patron could formally make offerings and request that prayers be performed. As such, the inclusion of a history as its main contents, framed within the beginning offerings and the concluding requests, might seem at first sight a little strange. But even from a strictly religious point of view, the recitation of a history is not totally extraneous. The author of Namgyal M. has actually mentioned several reasons for reciting his history. In the first place, the history is an offering to the assembly; he likens it to a "strand of jewels offered as an ornament." Furthermore he sees three special reasons for relating such histories: In the beginning they are beautiful to hear and they produce delight. In the middle, they inspire one to have faith in the career of saints, and they make one rejoice in saintly deeds. And in the end histories make one's own mind engage in the practice and realization of religion.

Namgyal M. helps one to begin answering several other important questions about the Mollas. Since a Molla is an oration of sorts, it must have a place of recitation, a group of listeners, a reason or occasion for being recited, and a person who recites it. Furthermore as a speech to be recited in a religious ceremony, it would be expected to have a patron or sponsor, and it would also require a number of religious functionaries to participate in the ceremony.

The place where this Molla was recited was a temple. Most likely the original temple was Namgyal monastery, for the monastic center of "Thugs-dam-dar-rgyas-gling" is given special mention in the speech. The witnesses of the recitation are more clearly specified. The prologue to the historical narrative mentions a presid-
ing ecclesiastic and the ordinary monks, and also members of the lay community such as men of high position (i.e. noblemen), men of learning, patrons, and workers. The work also specifies the main reasons for its recitation. As mentioned above, the Molla is recited for the sake of bringing about good rebirths for the deceased and freedom from sickness for the living. Thus one would expect it to have been recited following the death or during the illness of a local patron.

One thing that is not clarified is the identity of the person who actually recites the text. In the requests for the dedication of merit, the heretofore unmentioned reciter is instructed by the author of the Molla to “make the request in a respectful way, holding hat in hand.” But this is the only allusion to the reciter.

The identity of the offerer or patron is also not specified in the beginning offering section. But in the final pages it is implied that the offerer and main sponsor may be a living lama or nobleman, and in either case a request is made that prayers be undertaken for his long life, etc. Likewise, an ordinary patron who is yet alive can sponsor the ceremony, and similar prayers are requested for his or her well-being. One of the main occasions for reciting the Molla was, however, following the death of someone. Here it should be understood that the makers of offerings and requests would usually be that dead person’s family members, or his disciples if the deceased was a lama.

The ones who received the offerings and requests were the lamas and monks of the religious assembly. It is these persons who are respectfully addressed at the beginning of the speech, and they are also briefly mentioned in the requesting section at the end of the speech.

The request made by the offerer is, once again, that the religious assembly perform prayers of merit dedication (dge ba bsngo ba). Such prayers of dedication (bsngo ba'i smon lam) are thought to bring about the requested benefits by directing the force of virtuous deeds to specific good results. Since for the Buddhist all happiness and suffering are believed to be the result of past good or bad actions, there is also the hope that future experiences of this life can be improved by doing virtuous things in the present. Merit, then, is in general a positive force. And in particular it is held to be something that can be directed by means of prayer to specific good results, such as long life and good health, and also to the ultimate good result, the perfect Awakening of Buddhahood.
The request made through the recitation is similar when the ceremony follows someone's death, the main difference being just that here other people, such as the relatives or disciples of the deceased, are producing merit that will benefit the dead person. In this case the request is that the religious leader and the whole assembly perform prayers by which the merit of the offerings, etc., will be directed to the deceased person's attainment of a fortunate rebirth and ultimately to his or her attainment of enlightenment. In the requesting section, four specific formulae of request are given. These include two that are to be used for nobles and high ecclesiastics, one for a living person and one for a deceased. The remaining two are to be used in ceremonies involving ordinary patrons, one for a funeral memorial and the other for a living patron. But whether the intended beneficiary is dead or alive, the request is first that the merit be dedicated to the continuance and well-being of Buddhism and its followers, and second that it be dedicated to the specific short-term and ultimate goals of the individual.

The Content and Structure of the Tsarang Molla

Like Namgyal M., Tsarang M. has three basic parts: I. beginning matter, II. the speech, and III. concluding matter. The speech too is arranged in an identical way, with an introductory mention of offerings, a historical account as the main recitation, and a concluding request for the dedication of merit. This is not to say that these are more or less the same speech, for the two differ widely in their particulars. But an identical plan is evident in both.

A comparison of the contents of Tsarang M. with those of Namgyal M. clarifies a few more points about the Mollas. The beginning matter of Tsarang M., which is longer than that of Namgyal M., begins with the author's commitment (dam bca') to write a text to be used in ceremonies for producing longevity (zhabs brtan) and in funeral (dgongs rdzogs) observances. These ceremonies are conducted for "the great patrons of Buddhism, the superiors, the lords of men." The beginning matter also contains instructions for the monastic proctor or disciplinarian (chos khrims pa or dge bskos) to rise from his place in the assembly, to prostrate himself thrice, and to recite the following text. Here one thus learns who should recite the Molla.

The first part of the speech proper is occupied with the enumeration of offerings and the praising of the recipients of the offerings.
The order of offerings is very similar to that found in *Namgyal M.* As in that text, the offerings begin with the praises of the Buddha; both, in fact, quote the same stanzas of praise.\(^{23}\) Also, for the sake of worshipping the Buddha, *Tsarang M.* mentions that offerings of incense, lamps, and so forth can be made before the "supports" (*rten*) of enlightened body, speech, and mind. Here the reciter of the Molla is supposed to mention each offering individually. If there is a brocade ornament being offered to the temple, this is also to be mentioned here.

Next, for the sake of praising the presiding ecclesiastic and mentioning the offerings made to him, a number of possible eulogistic salutations are presented, different ones for different religious ranks.\(^{24}\) The last recipients of offerings, as in *Namgyal M.* before, are the monks in the assembly. Here too the monastic assembly is introduced with the famous verses beginning: "*grol nas grol ba'i lam ...*"\(^{25}\) *Tsarang M.*, however, concludes the enumeration of offerings with a prayer that is not found in *Namgyal M.*: "Since [the above-mentioned things] have been offered, may you [the recipients] be kindly disposed, and accept them with delight. Having become supremely pleased, may you bestow your sustaining spiritual power (*byin brlabs*)."\(^{26}\)

The second section of the speech, the main "historical" recitation, contains material that again closely parallels *Namgyal M.* One of its key parts is the eulogistic description of the assembled listeners, which functions as a prologue.\(^{27}\) This, however, is more detailed than the one in *Namgyal M.* It contains two stylized descriptions of the assembly that are not found in the other: a description of how the gathering is perfectly complete in five respects (*phun tshogs lnga*)\(^{28}\) and also a description of the assembly through cosmological similes (somewhat like the prologue to the dedication requests in *Namgyal M.*).\(^{29}\)

The first passage in the *Tsarang M.* main recitation begins with a number of phrases that point out the auspicious interrelations between all the people in the assembly. An almost identical passage appears in *Namgyal M.*, but it is used there to conclude, rather than to start, the prologue to the actual history.\(^{30}\) As for *Tsarang M.*, its historical contents are much more detailed than those of *Namgyal M.* It has a section on cosmology and geography, whereas the writer of *Namgyal M.* specifically declined to speak on these subjects.\(^{31}\) Then, after the origins of the world and its inhabitants are
briefly accounted for, one meets with “histories” of a more recognizable sort: royal genealogies and also a history of Buddhism.

As in Namgyal M., the composer of this speech draws a distinction between “mundane” (mi chos) and “religious” (lha chos) histories. The “mundane” history tells of the origins of both the kings of Tibet and the rulers of Lo. But most of the speech is devoted to the latter. This is the most detailed and comprehensive history found in the accessible traditional Mollas, and it is a major source for the history of Lo. By contrast, the religious history has little importance. Though it follows the same format as the religious history in Namgyal M., it is much shorter. One feature of note is that both religious histories end in a formal statement of gratitude to the various propagators of Buddhism.

The conclusion of the speech in Tsarang M. has a section in which the speaker requests that any mistake he has made in reciting the speech be patiently forgiven by the assembly. Otherwise it is the same as Namgyal M. in its possession of requests for the recitation of dedication prayers.

By comparing both Mollas one can see that these speeches were not meant to be recited only once. Each Molla was like a form letter. Different salutations and closings could be used to suit different individuals and occasions, but the body of each speech was designed to be recited again and again. Moreover, as the concluding matter in Tsarang M. states, the history can be abridged to a medium or very brief length according to the particular occasion.

One main difference between the two Mollas is that Tsarang M. was intended for a more restricted use. Its main sponsoring patrons were not ordinary persons, but were the “lords of men” (mi'i dbang po), the “great patrons of religion.” In short, the special patrons during the recitation of Tsarang M. were probably either the Mustang rajas or their families. The introduction to the history similarly emphasizes the importance of the great patron; this history is to be recited because the great patron himself has ordered it to be recited.

The appearance of a history in the midst of an offering and requesting ceremony is thus easily understandable in the case of Tsarang M., owing to the identity of the main patron and his connection with the history to be recited. The main history was precisely the history of the kings of Lo. With the Lo ruler present as the great patron, it is not at all surprising that a spokesman of the religious assembly would praise him and his ancestors by reciting a eulogistic history.
1. My copy of Namgyal M. begins with the title *Mol tshig bstan pa'i 'phrengs mdzes ces bya ba bzhugs so* and commences its text with the Sanskrit invocation *om swasti siddhan*.  
4. Namgyal M., p. 5.3-5.6.  
6. Namgyal M., p. 15.8-15.17. In this passage, the main monastery mentioned was called Thugs-dam-dar-rgyas-gling. According to this account, it was founded by Ngor-chen Kun-dga'-bzang-po, who in so doing combined three other previously existent monasteries into one. The work mentions the later visit to the monastery by Gser-mdog pan-chen Shakya-mchog-ldan at the invitation of the Lo king Bkra-shis-mgon and his sons, and that Shakya-mchog-ldan at that time repelled a horde of "Mongols" (*sog dmag*). A sacred image of a protective deity, called the "Thugs-dam mgon-po" (an image of Mahākāla?), is also mentioned in this connection.  

As noted above (chapter 3, n. 27), Namgyal monastery had the name Thub-bstan-dar-rgyas-gling. This is also stated by Glo-bo mkhan-chen in his autobiography (*Rje btsun bla ma*, p. 6a). But there are differences between the sources as to how and when the monastery was founded.  
The reference to Ngor-chen being involved in the founding or restoring of the monastery may be correct. According to Glo-bo mkhan-chen's autobiography, p. 7b, the old Namgyal monastic centre (*rnam rgyal chos sde rnying pa*) was already founded in the time of A-ma-dpal and Ngor-chen, but this was not called Thub-bstan-dar-rgyas-gling. Some said that the first mkhan-po of Namgyal was the scholar Ratnāśrī, but he was the leader only of the old monastic center and in any case did not stay there for much longer than a single winter session. The first mkhan-po of the new monastery was 'Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho (1396-1474), who may have accompanied Ngor-chen to Lo in 1446 (and who definitely was residing in Lo in 1457).  
The account in Namgyal M. of Ngor-chen's having combined three monasteries into one at the founding of Namgyal is probably incorrect, at least insofar as the names of the three are concerned. The three monasteries enumerated there, namely, Phu-phag Bsam-gtan-gling, Re-shid Sdom-gsum-gling, and Byams-pa Bshad-sgrub-gling, are mentioned as still existing in the 16th century by Jo-nang Kun-dga'-'grol-mchog. In his autobiography (*Zhen pa rang grol*), p. 4b, he says that he visited Phu-phag dgon-pa at age three (=1510), and on the way passed by Byams-gling. Later (p. 31a) he mentions giving a speech in Ri-shed (*sic*) monastery.  
Ngor-chen's biographer Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs (*Rgyal ba rdo rje chang*, p. 238.6) states that the Namgyal monastic center was restored by Ngor-chen during his first visit to Lo (1427).
According to *Tsarang M.*, p. 10b, however, it was Tshangs-chen Bkra-shis-mgon who was king when it was founded. But Bkra-shis-mgon is never mentioned as having been the main patron of either Ngö-chen or 'Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho. His greatest teachers were Shākya-mchog-ldan and Rgyal-tshab Kun-dga'-dbang-phyug.

It seems that the author of *Tsarang M.* has schematized the history of the three great monasteries in Lo—Tsarang, Namgyal, and Brag-dkar—by assigning the foundation of one of them to each of the three great early kings, A-ma-dpal, A-mgon-bzang-po, and Bkra-shis-mgon. Probably neither *Tsarang M.* nor *Namgyal M.* are to be trusted concerning the foundation of these monasteries.


For example, we find the following in *Namgyal M.* (p. 18.11): yang 'jig rten pa'i rigs la 'jig rten 'di nas pha rol tshe las 'das pa ming 'di zhes bya ba chog ga rnams [read : rnam] par dag pa'i n/mtsu la rien nas nyon mongs pa'i sdig sgrub sbyangs rnams [read : rnam] mkhyen sangs rgyas kyi dgo phang [read : go 'phang] thob par bya ba'i ched du sgrub pa yin pas/

But the first possible request mentioned was for recital at the death of a nobleman or lama (p. 18.3): bla ma dang dpon po lta bu yin na mtshan 'di zhes bya ba'i thugs kyi dgongs pa yongs su sdpogs [read : rdzogs] par bya ba'i ched du/ sgrub ba [read : sgrub pa] yin pas/ bsdo bo [read : gtso bo] rin po che slob dpon dbu mzaad gtso mzaad a ge 'dun 'das pa rgya mtsho'i tshogs dang bcas pas sngo ba [read : bsngo ba'i] smon lam mthar bkra shis kyi tshing [read : tshigs] su b cad pa/ thugs la 'jog par bsu [read : zhu]/


15. The perfect Awakening of Buddhahood is the main fruit toward which merit is dedicated, for this is the ultimate goal of all Mahāyāna practices. For mentions in canonical passages of the dedication of merit in conjunction with acts of generosity and in other contexts see Edward Conze *et al.*, *Buddhist Texts through the Ages* (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. 132-135, 137, 183.

16. *Namgyal M.* makes an additional distinction between lords and lamas on the one hand, and lesser people on the other. The ceremony is indeed for the dedication of merit, but for the former group their deaths are referred to as "thugs kyi dgongs pa yongs su rdzogs pa." These words imply that the nobles too had reached a high spiritual attainment, though this is probably just a con-
vventional honorific usage. See above, note 12.
17. See above, notes 10 and 12.
18. See above, notes 11 and 12.
20. Tsarang M., p. 1a: bstan pa’i sbyin bdag chen po gong ma mi yi dbang phyug rnams kyi zhaps btran| legs ‘bul/ dgongs rdzogs rnam dkar ba’i mdzad srol la gzhir bzhag ste ’bri bar bya ste/
21. Ibid.
22. Tsarang M., p. 1a: thog mar chos khrims pas gral nas langs te phyag gsum btsal nas ’di skad brjod do/
23. Tsarang M., p. 1a; Namgyal M., p. 1.4: gang tshe rkang gnyis gtso bo khyod btams tshe . . . . According to the Venerable Dezhung Trulku these verses are from a canonical source.
24. Tsarang M., p. 1b, gives some verses of praise for the presiding religious masters, beginning: ’chad na legs bshad sgrogs pa’i rnga chen/. These lines, I am informed by the Venerable Dezhung Trulku, belong to a eulogistic poem known as the Rba brlabs ma, the composition of ‘Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho (1396-1474). This was one of three great eulogies of Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzang-po. The other two were the Rab dkar ma by Rong-ston Shes-bya-kun-rig (1367-1449), and the Sde snod ma by Mus-chen sens-dpa’-chen-po Dkon-mchog-rgyal-mtshan (1388-1469).
26. Tsarang M., p. 2b: ’bul ba lags na thugs brtse ba chen pos dgongs te dgyes rab kyis bzhes/ mnyes rab kyi mchog thob nas byin gyis brlabs par mdzad du gsol/
28. Tsarang M., pp. 3a-4b. The phun tshogs Inga are: place, time, teacher, listeners, and teaching. These five categories are commonly used to begin speeches, as the Tsarang M. text states on p. 3a: gnas dus ston pa chos dang ’khor/ phun tshogs Inga ldan gtam gyi sgo. I have witnessed the Venerable Dezhung Rinpoche introduce speeches using these categories, and he explained to me that the five “excellences” are derived from the time of the Buddha’s first teaching of the Dharma, when all five factors came together. Another grouping along these lines is the five determined factors (nges pa Inga) of the Sambhogakāya.
30. Tsarang M., pp. 2b-3a; Namgyal M., p. 4.13-4.18.
31. Tsarang M., pp. 5b-6b; Namgyal M., p. 5.10.
32. Tsarang M., p. 6b.2.
33. Tsarang M., p. 16b.9; Namgyal M., p. 11.3.
34. Tsarang M., p. 1a, as quoted above, note 20.
35. Tsarang M., pp. 2b-3a: da lan gyi skabs 'dir bdag la/ rgyu sbyor sbyin pa'i bdag po chen po nas ... sngon byung gi lo rgyus zur tsam zhig zhus shig ces bka' phebs byung bas/
CHAPTER 5

THE PLACE OF THE MOLLAS IN TIBETAN BUDDHIST RITUAL AND BELIEF

When I first heard of the Mollas, I supposed that they were the products of a purely local tradition. I was wrong. Speeches very similar to the Mollas were commonly composed and delivered in many other parts of the Tibetan cultural world. And as my subsequent investigations revealed, the Mollas are in fact the direct outgrowth of the religious, oratorical, and historical traditions of Tibet.

The Mollas as Speeches of Offering and Request

One of the most obvious connections between the Mollas and Tibetan culture is religion. The Mollas were, in effect, ritual works. The occasion for their recitation was a Buddhist ceremony, and they acted as a vehicle for a formal exchange between the lay community in its role as patron, and the monastic community in its role as protector and helper.

From the point of view of Buddhist monasticism, the primary function of the lay community is to provide the material support that allows the monastic community to exist. In return, the monastic community from time to time attempts to benefit its lay patrons, usually by teaching them what is spiritually beneficial, but also sometimes by helping or advising them regarding problems of more mundane sorts. Within traditional Tibetan society in particular, one often sees the laity seeking help from the religious community in times of trouble. When disasters such as droughts or epidemics threaten, lay patrons commonly ask individual Buddhist masters or the monastic community as a whole to intercede on their behalf. The same is true in times of individual or family woes, such as when a family member is very sick or has died.

Patrons commonly make their request for help in a formal way, accompanied with offerings. Such requests are often made directly to the leader of a monastery when he is seated at the head of an assembly of monks. This usually entails a certain amount of ceremony; nowadays in the Tibetan Buddhist monasteries of India and
Nepal, the supplicant (or someone representing him or her) prostrates three times before the assembly and shrine, and presents scarves and offerings to the head of the assembly and to the other monks present according to their standing. In the meantime, his or her request is formally announced to the whole assembly by the monastic proctor who stands at the rear of the assembly and reads a supplication. Though in Lo the proctor in such instances often reads a Molla, elsewhere in the Tibetan cultural world the text of the supplication was commonly a formal “letter of request” (skyabs tho) that had been specially written for the occasion.

Such letters of request were composed in standardized forms; like all types of Tibetan letters, the requesting letter had to conform to certain well-established conventions. The supplicant was often not sufficiently literate to compose his or her own letter of request, so he or she usually was aided by a local scribe or by a secretary from the monastic assembly that was to be addressed. For the benefit of inexperienced letter writers, there existed letter-writing manuals (yig bskur rnam gzhag) that presented specimens of various types of letters including letters of request. Such manuals enable one to determine some of the main features of requesting letters, and thus one can compare them with the Mollas.

An analysis of what seems to be a typical letter of request in one letter-writing manual reveals that the letter has four main parts (for a detailed outline see Appendix D):

I. Opening salutation, mentioning the recipients of the offerings and the ones to whom the request was addressed.

II. The supplication, including both general requests, such as for the welfare of Buddhism as a whole, and also particular requests, giving here the name of the patron or deceased person involved.

III. Mention of offerings: a list of offerings made by the supplicant with the intention of bringing about the benefits mentioned in the supplication.

IV. Concluding summary of the request, stating the supplicant’s hope and trust that his or her requests will be fulfilled.

The first three of the above parts are found in Namgyal M. and Tsarang M. Both the skyabs tho letter and the Mollas have sections in which the recipients of the offerings are formally addressed,
presented with offerings, and requested to help. But the order of these parts is different in the Mollas. If the two Mollas and the offering letter are typical of their class of writings, one structural difference between them is that in the former the enumeration of offerings occurs at the beginning, while in the latter it follows the main supplication.

One important element of the Mollas missing from the letters of request is the historical narration. In the available examples of such letters, nothing can be found that even faintly resembles a historical passage.

**Stylistic Differences Between Mollas and Offering Letters**

Another important difference between the Mollas and the skyabs tho letters is the language in which they were written. Although both types of text were composed in what would be considered acceptable literary Tibetan, their styles are very different. One finds in the diction of the Mollas several features that strike one as to be expected in traditional Tibetan speechmaking. Some passages consist of series of short sentences or clauses, many being of parallel construction and similar length. Repetitions of typical phrases or flourishes are in evidence, and there is also a predilection for classification and enumeration—the speeches sometimes becoming a recitation of lists of persons or things. In the historical passages of Tsarang M. in particular, one finds a paucity of connective and subordinating particles, as well as a lack of verbal endings. These features give a non-literary flavor to the work, and they are reminiscent of the verbal usages found in modern storytelling and everyday speech. In places the lack of particles and verbal endings continues throughout a series of paired short sentences of parallel construction. Here these laconic lines evoke a formal and archaic tone, calling to mind an epic poem.

The Mollas, however, are not stylistically consistent throughout. Where Buddhist topics are discussed in Tsarang M. for instance, the author has employed a more literary style. And in general the writer of Namgyal M. has kept to a more typically literary style throughout his work. Yet certain passages even of Namgyal M. embody oratorical conventions at the expense of standard literary style. One such instance, which has parallels in Tsarang M., is the prologue to the history where the gathered assembly is described. Here the composer describes each group of people with a series of
short phrases, usually eight syllables in length, that lead to a longer concluding clause. Each of the preliminary phrases expresses a complete adjectival idea, usually by means of a metaphor. But in the remainder of Namgyal M. such features are less in evidence. There one finds longer and more complex sentences that typify a more consciously literary style. The author of Namgyal M. by his own admission in the colophon did not have much access to previous Mollas, and he based his work partly on standard historical writings. But as we shall see in more detail below, even Namgyal M. at crucial points resorts to the use of certain typical phrases that mark it as a continuation of traditional speechmaking.

The style of the skyabs tho letters, however, has nothing in common with speechmaking. The available examples are formal letters written in the typical modern epistolary style. They consist of interminable strings of long, spliced-together phrases and clauses, without appreciable cadence or convenient stops for breath. As letters, these written supplications are also subject to certain physical prescriptions and limitations. There exists in formal Tibetan letter writing strict rules that govern the size and shape of the paper used, the type of script, and the layout of the letter on the page. The Mollas, however, do not conform to such rules; they are written on leaves of rectangular paper which are usually made up into “bound” (mgo tshems) books with pages folded and sewn along the longer edge.

The Common Request:

Prayers for the Dedication of Merit

In spite of such differences of structure, diction, and physical makeup, at bottom both Molla and requesting letter function as a means for a patron to indicate his offerings and to express his requests to the religious assembly. In both classes of writings the offerings of the patron or sponsor (shyin pa’i bdag po) are accompanied by the particular request that the merit resulting from the offerings be dedicated through prayers to the achievement of the patron’s purposes. Many lay patrons probably had no idea of the exact process by which these benefits were supposed to be achieved; they simply made their offerings and relied on the religious community to do the rest. But learned patrons and religious masters considered there to be one main means for affecting the desired ends. This was the “dedication of merit” (dge ba bsngo ba).
Merit Dedication in the Mahāyāna

Dedication (Tib.: yongs su bsngog ba; Skt.: parīñāmanā) of merit is a central part of Mahāyāna practice and theory. Mahāyānists hold that the merit which grows out of virtuous deeds can be made to result in a specific desired end through “dedication.” More importantly, they believe that merit can reach its highest fruition only through this dedication. For them the highest result of any meritorious deed is the perfect enlightenment of a Buddha, and all religious practices should be accomplished with that goal in mind.

Buddhahood is believed to be attained as a result of completing two vast processes of preparatory accumulation (tshogs gnyis rdzogs) and two long processes of purification (sgrib gnyis sbyang). Of the two accumulations, the first is the accumulation of merit (bsod nams kyi tshogs). This involves gathering a great store of merit through virtuous deeds, and this accumulation in particular is added to by means of good acts that involve an objectifying apprehension (dmigs pa) of things. The second accumulation, that of Gnosis or transcendent awareness (ye shes kyi tshogs), is more subtle. It is added to by means of virtuous acts that do not involve objectification (dmigs med), such as the meditative cultivation of insight into śūnyatā. To complete these two, the Mahāyānist should cultivate the perfections of the Bodhisattva. And for that, he or she should bring into play the “three supreme factors” (dam pa gsum).

This threefold practice consists of (1) beginning every virtuous practice or action with the supreme motivation: the aspiration to attain enlightenment for the sake of benefitting all sentient creatures (sbyor ba sms bskyed dam pa); (2) the supreme view through which the virtuous deed is actually accomplished: a way of proceeding in which nothing is objectified or apprehended as an ultimately real entity (dngos gzhi mi dmigs dam pa); and (3) the supreme conclusion for all virtuous acts: the dedication of the merit to the attainment of enlightenment (rjes bsngo ba dam pa).

The last of the three supreme factors, the dedication of merit, is extremely important for the following reasons. Mahāyāna Buddhists look at merit (dge ba) from the relative viewpoint as something that has been created through causes (rgyu) and conditions (rkyen). Thus merit is a conditioned (‘du byas) thing that is necessarily impermanent. Ordinary merit, because of the unbreakable law of moral causation or karma, will produce a good result and then become exhausted. But since all merit should be made the cause
for attaining perfect Buddhahood, followers of Mahāyāna try to avoid letting it become exhausted in anything less than that. For this reason they try to avoid the four causes for exhausting merit. These are: (1) not dedicating the merit (ma bsngos pa), (2) incorrect dedication (log par bsngos), (3) making one’s merit known to others (gzhan la bsgrags), and (4) regretting one’s virtuous deeds afterward (‘gyod pa bskyed).\textsuperscript{16} The first two of the fourfold list point to the single most important cause of preserving merit: the correct dedication of merit. What is “correct” dedication? It is the dedication of merit to the highest goal through the correct motivation and view. It begins with the motivation of bodhicitta, the first of the “three supremes.” During its actual accomplishment, correct dedication also proceeds through the “supreme” view. If so performed, it is called “the dedication that is perfect in three respects” (’khor gsum yang dag pa’i bsngo ba), which means that the one who dedicated the merit did not apprehend either the merit to be dedicated, himself the dedicator, or the person for whom the dedication was directed to be real, objectively existing entities.\textsuperscript{17} The result of such correct dedication is held to be the preservation of the merit forever. This is explained in the Blo gros rgya mtshos zhus pa’i mdo by the following simile: Just as a drop of water that is poured into the ocean will merge with it and will not dry up for as long as the ocean endures, so too the merit that has been dedicated to the attainment of perfect enlightenment will never be exhausted before enlightenment is reached.\textsuperscript{18}

The real accomplishment of such dedication is thus thought to require special spiritual insight, and it is not within the capabilities of ordinary persons (so so’i skye bo). It cannot be done by anyone who has not reached the first Bodhisattva bhūmi. Nevertheless, all Mahāyānists should continually exert themselves in making dedication prayers as an important part of the spiritual training that will eventually lead to the ability to dedicate effectively. For this reason, dedication prayers commonly include the recitation of two verses from the Bzang po spyod pa’i smon lam and other verses which acknowledge that one’s own prayers of dedication are offered as an attempt to follow after and emulate the perfect dedication prayers of the Bodhisattvas and Buddhas.\textsuperscript{19}

Prayers of dedication that have been composed for recitation in merit-dedication ceremonies commonly have three parts: (1) the dedication that becomes worship and offerings for the gurus and
enlightened ones (mchod pa'i bsngo ba), (2) dedication for the deceased (gshin po'i bsngo ba), and (3) the dedication of merit for the benefit of those still living (gson po'i bsngo ba). These three parts are exemplified in a very brief prayer called the Bdag gzhan ma, composed by the Ngor abbot Sgrub-khang-pa Dpal-lidan-don-grub.20 The first part of the prayer is that through the power of one's own and all other beings' merit, all the intentions of the gurus, Buddhas, and Bodhisattvas may become fulfilled. The second part is the prayer that the specific deceased person, together with all six classes of sentient beings, having become completely cleansed of the obscurations and perfected in the accumulations, may quickly attain perfect enlightenment. The third and final part of the prayer is that oneself and all of one's family, servants, etc., may be free from all declines and setbacks in this life (such as illness or poverty), and that having accomplished one's goals in conformity with the Dharma, oneself and all others may achieve a wealth of temporal and religious attainments.

All three of the above parts of the prayer should be directed, ultimately, to the attainment of enlightenment. Anything less would be "incorrect dedication" and would thus be a cause for the exhaustion of the merit. The patron who requests the prayer of dedication may have a simpler understanding of the benefits that dedication will bring, but for the dedication to be correct, the ultimate benefit aimed at must be enlightenment.

The Patron's Role in the Dedication of Merit

Although lay patrons as a rule did not consider themselves capable of performing the dedication (they entrusted that task to the men of religion), they still were responsible as the creators of the thing to be dedicated: a "root of merit" (dge ba'i rtsa ba). The prayer actually invokes more than just one's own merit; the merit to be dedicated includes that of oneself and all others, including all of the merit of the past, present, and future.21 Still, a patron must exert him or herself to create as much merit as possible for the purpose at hand.

The usual ways in which a lay patron created merit were acts of almsgiving and religious patronage.22 These virtuous acts, too, should be made as powerful as possible, and for this reason they should be accomplished, ideally, by means of the three "supremes." Furthermore, for acts of generosity or patronage to have the greatest effect, they should be directed toward special objects. The recipients
of offerings should be especially exalted, such as the Triratna, the guru, or the Buddhist monastic assembly (a group of four or more bhikṣus). Or they should be especially lowly, such as completely destitute people, or starving or otherwise direly threatened animals. (The Mollas and letters of request, however, only mention offerings of the first kind: those directed to exalted, religious recipients.)

Dedication of merit, then, was the patrons' request. They did their part by making a virtuous offering, and at the conclusion the monastic assembly was expected to do its part, which was the actual dedication of merit through prayers that entailed a special frame of mind. The patrons in this way hoped that they and their dear ones would receive immediate benefits and, ideally, that they would eventually reach the goal of Buddhahood.

Notes

1. The recital of such formal supplications can be witnessed in the modern Tibetan Buddhist temples of Nepal and India, before the breaks for tea or food during major teachings.

2. Sarat Chandra Das edited a small collection of illustrative letters, which were published in his An Introduction to the Grammar of the Tibetan Language (Delhi: 1972), Appendix VIII, pp. 28-32. This is probably the same as the work Yig Kur Nam Shag (Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, 1901) listed separately in S. Chauduri, Bibliography of Tibetan Studies (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1971), p. 23. Another text of this sort appears to be the work by E. H. C. Walsh, Examples of Tibetan Letters (Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot, 1913) as mentioned by Bruce Walker, A Bibliography of Books About Tibet, published in English (typescript, 1974), no. 782. Walsh also published a related article, “Examples of Tibetan Seals,” JRAS (1915), 1 and 465, as listed by Chauduri, Bibliography, p. 157.

Modern printings of Yig bskur rnam gzhag include two from the pen of Nor-rgyas-nang-pa Dbang-'dus-tshe-ring: Dpal ldan mi rje bka' drung nor nang mchog nas brtsams mdzad mkhas rnam dgyes pa'i yig bskur rnam gzhag (Kalimpong: G. Tharchin, 1968), and a slightly differing version of the same: Dpal ldan mi rje bka' drung nor rgyas nang pa mchog nas brtsams par mdzad pa'i yig bskur rnam gzhag (n. p.: n. d.). Published along with the second version was another work: Dpal ldan sa skyong mi dbang bka'i drung blon bshad sgra chen po mchog nas brtsams par mdzad pa' yig bskur rnam gzhag (pp. 53-150).

In addition, another letter-writing manual was recently printed in Dharamsala: Rang re rnam la shin tu mkho ba'i yig bskur rnam gzhag di'i nang bla lha khag dang skyabs tho/ skyabs zhul/ gzhung sger gyi snyan zhiu mdza/ grogs gnyen gsum phan tshun gyi phrin yig gtong stangs blo gsar sgron me (Dharamsala: 1975). The author's name is not mentioned.

For a traditional Tibetan account of letter writing in India and Tibet see 'Jam-dbyangs-bzhad-pa'i-rdo-rje, Collected Works (New Delhi: Ngawang Geleg


4. See, for instance, Tsarang M., p. 10a: *bk’a’ bum gser dngul sha stag gis bzhengs/ brag dkar theg chen gling bzhengs/ ’dge dun gyi sde btsugs/ nyams pa sor chud/ ma nyams pa gong ’phel kyi bdag rkyen bskyangs/.*

5. When a series of actions are described in oral accounts, speakers of Central Tibetan dialects commonly drop the “gerundive” particles (*nas, te, etc.*) and the conjunctive particles (*pa/ ba dang, zhing, etc.*) In the same way, the final verbal complements (*pa/ ba yin, gi yod, gi’ dug, etc.*) are also commonly omitted. See, for example, Melvyn C. Goldstein and Nawang Nornang, *Modern Spoken Tibetan: Lhasa Dialect* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1970), p. 162, lines 7 and 8, where in an example of storytelling the verbal stems appear at the end of a clause without complement or other grammatical particles. For a description of a similar usage in Tibetan historical literature, see E. Gene Smith, *Forward to Tibetan Chronicle of Padma dkar-po*, *Samyata Series* (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1968), Vol. 75, p. 6.

6. See Tsarang M., pp. 7b-8a:

   | 'od gsal lha nas phebs| lha ’od de gung rgyal|
   | lha nas btsan du phebs| btsan rgyal kha che|
   | btsan nas dmu ru phebs| dmu khyi’u chung|
   | dmu nas mi ru phebs| mi rje gung rgyal....

7. **Namgyal M.**, pp. 3.9-4.13; **Tsarang M.**, pp. 4b-5a. This passage will be discussed below in more detail.

8. **Namgyal M.**, p. 19: “Even though previously there existed detailed and extensive Molla accounts (*mol gtam*), a few enemies of Buddhism destroyed them. Things having [thus] deteriorated ... [I composed] this, writing down the things that are clearly stated in [surviving] old books from the past, and arranging those things that were not so stated using the [texts] *rnam thar ’brom ston rgyal rabs* (=a biography of or by ’Brom-ston, and a royal genealogy?).”


10. Both Tsarang M. and the letter-writing handbook *Rang re rnams* use the same technical term for ‘patron’ *rgyu sbyor ba* (“compiler of wealth”). In Tsarang M. (p. 2b), we find the form *rgyu sbyor sbyin pa’i bdag po*, while in various skyabs tho letters the patron is just *rgyu sbyor ba*. See Rang re rnams, pp. 27, 30f.

11. For the following account I have followed the explanations of the Venerable Dezhung Trulku, Kun-dga’-bstan-pa’i-nyi-ma. Similar accounts are found in Sa-skya Paṇḍita, *Bsngo ba yon bshad dang bças pa*, *Sa skya bka’ bum* (Tokyo:
Toyo Bunko, 1968), vol. 5, pp. 419.3ff, and Bkra-shis-'od-zer, mkhan-chen, *Dam pa gsum gyi rnam bshad sku gsum sa bon* (ms., 6 folios., Library of Jigdral Dagchen Sakya), as will be noted below.

12. The dedication of merit is clearly identified as a Mahāyāna practice by Nāgārjuna in his *Ratnāvali*, chapter IV, verse 70: (Peking Bstan 'gyur, Nge, 147a.7):

\[\text{nyan thos theg pa de las ni/}
\text{byang chub sms dpai'i smon lam dang/}
\text{spyod pa yongs bsngo ma bshad des/}
\text{byang chub sms dpal ga la 'gyur/}
\]

Bkra-shis-'od-zer, *Dam-pa*, p. 4b, states:

\[\text{de lta bu'i bsngo ba 'di ni nang pa sangs rgyas pa/}
\text{theg pa chen po kho na'i khyad chos te/}
\]

But compare Sa-skya Pa'dita, *Sdom pa gsum gyi rab tu dbye ba, Sa skya bka' 'bum* (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1968), vol. 5, p. 304.4.6:

\[\text{so sor thar pa'i mdo bzhin du/}
\text{bsngo ba nyan thos rnam kyang byed/}
\]


Although the dedication of merit as such does not have a place in Theravāda doctrine, the similar concept of merit transference is found among Sri Lanka Buddhists. A formal transference of merit is commonly performed following the making of a donation to the monastic community by a patron. According to Richard F. Gombrich, *Precept and Practice: Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon* (Oxford: Claredon, 1971), p. 226, in the transferring of merit the patron merely "offers to others the chance to earn merit by rejoicing at one's own [merit]."

Gombrich shows that in the Pali canonical sources the transference of merit is usually done for gods (p. 228) or for pretas (p. 232). However, in actual practice the transference is commonly undertaken for deceased relatives and near ones at a sort of funeral feast where food offerings are made to monks.


15. The division of Buddhist practice into the three parts, preparation (*sbyor ba*), actual practice (*dngos gzhi*) and conclusion (*rjes*), is common to all schools of Tibetan Buddhism. Furthermore, such threefold divisions commonly resemble the *dam pa gsum* in that *sems bsKyed* is usually part of the preparation (*sbyor ba*), and *bsngo ba* is essential to the conclusion (*rjes*). We find, for example, the following scheme in the *sngon 'gro'i khrig* to the *Lam-'bras* (*tshogs bshad*) cycle composed by Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub, *Lam 'bras bu dang bcas pa'i gdams ngag gi gzhung shing rgyas pa gzhung ji lta ba bzhin bkri ba'i lam gyi sngon 'gro'i khrig*
yig snang gsum mdzes par byed pa'i rgyan (Varanasi reprint), p.6a.5:

sbyor ba skyabs su 'gro zhing gsol ba gdab/
dngos gzhi rang rang dmigs pa nyams su blang/
rges ni dge rtsa bsn go zhing dran shes brten/

16. These four causes, according to the Venerable Dezhung Trulku, are mentioned in the Bṣngo ba'i bstan bcos of Rgyal-sras Thogs-med.

17. Sa-skya Paṇḍita, Bṣngo ba, p. 420.4.6. The same “threelfold purity" is necessary for the Bodhisattva's supramundane perfection of giving. See E. Conze (ed.), Buddhist Texts, p. 137.

18. Bkra-shis-'od-zer, Dam pa gsum, p. 4b, makes the same point, and quotes the following:

ji ltar rgya mtsho che na chu thig lhungh/
de bzhin byang chub rgyur bṣngo dge rtsa yang/
byang chub ma 'thob bar du de mi zad/

This is the passage from the Blo gros rgya mtshos zhus pa'i mdo, Peking Bstan 'gyur, Mdo sna tshogs, Pu, pp. 1-124a.

19. See, for example, the verse from the 'Phags pa bzang po spyod pa'i smon lam quoted by Bkra-shis-'od-zer, p. 4a; and Sa-skya Paṇḍita, Bṣngo ba, p. 421.4.3:

'jam dpal dpa' bo ji ltar mkhyen pa dang/
kun tu bzang po de yang de bzhin te/
de dag kun rgyi rjes su bdag slob cing/
dge ba 'di dag thams cad rab tu bṣngo/

The next verse from the Bṣang spyod is also commonly recited (Peking Bstan'gyur, Rgyud, Ya, p. 271a):

dus gsum gshegs pa'i rgyal ba thams cad kyi/
bsngo ba gang la mchog tu bṣṅags pa yis/
bdag gi dge ba'i rtsa ba 'di kun kyang/
bsang po'i spyod phyir rab tu bṣṅgo bar bgyi/

20. Dpal-ldan-don-grub was the 16th abbot of Ngor, and he flourished in the early 17th century. His short dedication prayer appears in a collection of prayers xylographed by the Sa-ngor chos-tshogs of Sikkim under the single title, 'Phags pa bzang po spyod pa'i smon lam gyi rgyal po (25 folios), pp. 20a-21a:

bdag dang gzhan gyi dus gsum dge ba'i tshogs/
dpag med ma lus gcig tu bsdoms pa'i mthus/
rtsa brgyud bla ma rgyal ba sras bcas kyi/
zag med thugs kyi dgongs pa yongs rdzogs shog/
dmigs yul 'di dang rigs drug thams cad kyi/
sgrib gnyis bag chags bcas pa kun sbyangs nas/
bsod nams ye shes tshogs gnyis rab bsags te/
rnam mkhyen sku bzhi'i dbang phyug myur thob shog/
khyad par bdag cag 'khor dang bcas rnam kyi/
tshe 'di'i rgyud pa ma lus zhi ba dang/
bsam don chos dang mthun pa legs grub nas/
shid zhi'i phun tshogs rgyas pa'i bkra shis shog/

21. See above, note 20, the first line of the Bdag gzhan ma prayer; and Sa-skya Paṇḍita, Bṣngo ba, p. 420.2.4.
22. The traditional means for lay followers to create merit were especially generosity, moral discipline, and patience. See Nāgārjuna, *Ratnāvali* (*Rin chen 'phreng ba*), chapter 4, verse 99 (*Peking Bstan-'gyur*, v. nge, p. 147b.5):

\[\text{der ni sbyin dang tshul khrims dang/} \\
\text{bzod pa'i chos ni khyad par du/} \\
\text{khyim pa la bshad. . . .}\]


CHAPTER 6

SPEECHMAKING IN TIBET

Mollas and skyabs tho letters were only two of the many kinds of ceremonial recitations that were performed in Tibetan Buddhist monasteries. In the collected writings of Sum-pa mkhan-po, for instance, one finds examples of several other kinds of speech-making, including speeches that were composed to be recited during ceremonies for a religious master’s long life, during enthronement ceremonies, or during celebrations that followed the completion of a great religious teaching. Other typical occasions for composing speeches were the consecration ceremonies that concluded the building of a temple or the making of a large Buddha image. Most ceremonies entailed the giving of a ceremonial scarf to the leader of the assembly, and thus the speeches given at this time accompanied with the scarf can be called by the general name “silk-scarf discourse” (dar bshad).

All such speeches could contain histories. The nature and contents of the history depended on the occasion, on the identity of the main guests, and on the skill of the speaker. I once witnessed (and acted as translator at) a speech given by the Venerable Dezhung Rinpoche at a formal reception and scarf-offering ceremony for the present Sakya Trizin Rinpoche during the latter’s first visit to Seattle in 1974. The speech, which I was hard-pressed to translate with even a fraction of its original beauty and elegance, contained a brief account of the genealogy of the Sa-skya ‘Khon family and also a list of the previous masters whose rebirth H.H. the Sakya Trizin is considered to be.

Similarly appropriate historical accounts are also found in other types of ceremonial speeches. A speech commemorating the restoration of an old temple would call for a history of how the temple was founded and an enumeration of the religious masters who had been associated with it in the past. Likewise, an enthronement ceremony could entail a speech that mentioned some or all of the masters who had previously occupied the same throne. Naturally, the more important the occasion, the longer and more detailed the speech might be. In a major gathering, such as when a great reli-
gious or political leader was present, even speeches of simple offering and request could be expanded to contain historical contents.

According to the Venerable Dezhung Trulku, all such formal recitations delivered in religious assemblies can be classified as “assembly speeches” (tshogs gtam). And according to him, these can be subdivided into two further types depending on the identity of the reciter. When a speech is delivered to the assembly by the presiding master, it is called a “speech from above” (yas gtam). A speech delivered by a lesser member of the assembly is a “speech from below” (mas gtam). I have not come across the latter term in any text, but Dezhung Rinpoche spoke of it as the most common type of assembly speech.

“Speeches from below” included many kinds of recitations sponsored by patrons, such as the skyabs tho letters. It must be remembered that whether a speech is “from above” or “from below” is determined by the identity of its reciter and not by the contents of the speech. A yas gtam mentioned in a 16th-century biography, for instance, was a speech that requested prayers of merit dedication, but its reciter was the head or chief (gtso bo) of the assembly and not a lower monastic functionary. A mas gtam, on the other hand, was recited by the proctor (dge bskos), or sometimes by another eloquent monk. In Dezhung Rinpoche’s monastery, such speeches were recited by the precentor (dbu mdo). One type of yas gtam was an “explanation of the offerings made for dedication” (bsngo ba’i yon bshad), a speech usually given only by learned lamas. Through it, the presiding master would explain in detail what kinds of objects should be envisioned as the objects offered in preparation for merit dedication. A long version would include an account of the universe as a mandala, with this world Jambudvīpa being one continent among the many continents and islands surrounding the central axis Sumeru. The regions and countries in Jambudvīpa were commonly enumerated, and the speeches could also include accounts of the ancestry of the local ruler. Dezhung Rinpoche recalled one such particularly detailed yas gtam that Rdzong-gsar Mkhyen-brtse Chos-kyi-blo-gros gave when bestowing the Sgrub thabs kun btus collection of Mantrayāṇa initiations.

A detailed mas gtam (“speech from below”) could also have historical contents, and I am informed by Dezhung Rinpoche that such a speech, longer and more detailed than ordinary letters
of offering and request, was commonly recited at his home monastery at the conclusion of rituals that lasted for several days or weeks, such as at the end of sgrub mchod ceremonies. According to the Rinpoche, such speeches commonly began with telling how the assembly was auspiciously replete in five respects (phun tshogs lnga). In addition, they often included a traditional description of the assembly, such as in terms of each participant’s position in the rows (gral) of the assembly. The speech itself could include topics belonging to the categories of mi chos (“mundane”) and lha chos (“religious”) histories; but these topics were usually not developed in much detail, the historical accounts usually being kept to the bare minimum. If the local ruler was present, however, the speech commonly included some praises of him, usually through mentioning his genealogy in a brief or detailed form. Such accounts were, common, for example, in speeches delivered in Derge when the local king participated in the capacity of royal patron. And such histories were also sometimes recited in honor of lesser nobles such as the Spra’o-dpon-tshang chief, who was the ruler of the district where Dezhung Rinpoche’s monastery Sga Thar-lam-dgon was located.

An Early Molla in Lo

Given the conservative nature of Tibetan culture, one would expect that Molla-like speeches, with religious functions and historical contents, were also delivered many centuries ago in formal assemblies of Tibet. Indeed, sources attesting to this do survive, and there is even one source that refers to the recitation of speeches closely resembling the Mollas in 16th-century Lo. This source is the autobiography of Jo-nang Kun-dga’-grol-mchog (1507-1566), a noble monk from Lo Mönthang who went on to become one of the foremost Buddhist masters of 16th century Tibet. In circa 1523 the Ngor-pa lamas Lha-mchog-seng-ge and Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub visited Lo, and at that time a number of great religious assemblies were held. At some of these, the youthful Kun-dga’-grol-mchog himself delivered formal speeches. He tells about it in some detail in his autobiography:

At that time I was ordered to come and act as leader of the assembly on the holy day observed on the fifth of the month at Ri-sheng Monastery. Some people compassionately
told me that [since] I had never done that task before, [and] since an extremely large gathering would be present at that time, I would not be able to remain collected if I made some embarrassing blunder. Therefore they urged me again and again to read the genealogical histories of the Mönthang rulers and to study diligently the texts of speeches \((yas \text{ tgam gyi dpe cha})\). I insincerely replied, “The study of genealogies, a mundane tradition \((mi \text{ chos})\), seems difficult for me to grasp.”

When the time arrived, I set forth in a garland of beautiful praises the religious and political deeds of each generation of the ruler’s family. It was a lengthy composition, correct and free from confusions. I delivered it with the voice of a swan and the tone of a bee. The whole assembly was delighted.

Early the next morning, several teachers and students who had been in the ranks of the assembly the previous day came to me and said, “You must lend us the text of the speech that you delivered yesterday.” I replied to them, “I merely spoke extemporaneously. I have no written text.” But none of them thought I had told the truth.

Nevertheless, in the monastery it was necessary to perform merit-dedications, and for that I had to recite the speech given that day many times each day, in long, medium, and short versions, applying the speech to the different circumstances of each recitation. [Therefore] I composed a complete text for such speeches, in which appropriate phrases could be selected and inserted to fit the needs of each individual speech.

The great learned sage Gnas-brtan Bzang-po-brtan-pa ... sincerely praised this work both directly to me and indirectly .... At that time Drung-pa chos-rje also said, “This merit-dedication [speech] is a philosopher’s stone-panacea \((gser ‘gyur gyi rtsi’i sman mchog)\); it increases the excellent deeds of both oneself and others.”

The speech described in the above account is in most respects very similar to the more recent Mollas of Lo. Like the Mollas, it was recited in conjunction with a ceremony for the dedication of merit, and it included certain historical subjects. In particular, it related the genealogy of the Lo Mönthang ruling family. The main difference between the speeches pertains only to the persons who
delivered them. Instead of being the monastic proctor, here in Kun-dga’-grol-mchog’s account the reciter was the “chief” monk (gtso bo). This, it will be recalled, was the term used in the Mollas for the main recipients of the offerings and requests. The speech itself, which the “chief” delivered from his superior position, was called a yas gtam (“speech from above”).

Kun-dga’-grol-mchog’s reminiscences reveal several interesting facts about the literary and oratorical traditions of early Lo. To begin with, one learns that in that period there existed written genealogies (gdung rabs) of the Mönthang rulers. In addition, there were “books of speeches” (yas gtam gyi dpe cha). These books or manuals consisted of speeches that were written down and that were recommended to beginners as patterns for their attempts at speechmaking. Furthermore, the speech that Kun-dga’-grol-mchog finally set down in writing was, like the Mollas, designed in such a way that it could be used over and over.

Tibetan Speechmaking

According to a 15th Century Compendium

The recitation of that speech at a major religious convocation in 16th-century Lo indicates that such speeches were customary in the Tibetan Buddhist monasteries of those times. The giver of a speech, especially in a great assembly attended by august personages, would have hesitated to recite anything that was contrary to established monastic custom. The existence of speechmaking manuals is another indication that such recitations formed a part of a widespread tradition with its own rules and conventions.

Fortunately, a number of such speeches or speechmaking manuals from Kun-dga’-grol-mchog’s time or earlier have survived intact. A comparison of these with the Mollas reveals a number of striking similarities. One very useful account of Tibetan speechmaking comes down to us in the Bshad mdzod yid bzhin nor bu, an encyclopedic work composed in the late 15th or early 16th century by the otherwise unknown writer Don-dam-smra-ba’i-seng-ge. Three manuscripts of the work are known. One is in the Royal Library in Copenhagen, and sections from it have already been studied by European Tibetologists. I was not able to consult it. The second example of the Bshad mdzod is in the library of Burmiak Athing in Sikkim. This was reproduced in 1969 by Dr. Lokesh Chandra under the English title “A 15th-Century Compendium
of Knowledge.” This publication includes a lengthy English intro-
duction by Mr. E. Gene Smith.\(^\text{17}\) The third example known at present
is a manuscript from Bhutan that Kunsang Topgey published from
Thimbu in 1976.\(^\text{18}\)

The *Bshad mdzod* is a compendium—a systematic formulation
of Buddhist lore and doctrine. It was written in the Lho-brag district
of southeastern Tibet for the benefit of the local princes who claimed
descent from the ancient royalty of Tibet. Speechmaking was one
of the last subjects discussed in the work. In both available examples
the section on public discourses takes up about eight folios.

The explanation of speechmaking has eight parts:

1. The nature of speechmaking (p. 495.4, Bhutanese reproduc-
tion)\(^\text{19}\)
2. Etymological definition of “oration” (*bka’ ‘chid*) (495.6)
3. Similies for good speechmaking (496.2)
4. Similies for faulty speechmaking (496.3)
5. The technique of speaking: eight similies of the arrow
(496.5)
6. The way for determining the historical emphasis of the
speech (497.4)
7. Examples of beginning salutations and eulogies for different
heads of the assembly, including typical salutations for
seven classes of assembly leaders (498.2)
8. An example of a celebration speech (501.1)

Of the eight sections, the last three are particularly illuminating.
Number six, even though it is designated by the uninformative
title “The Traditional Way for Reciting Speeches” (*bka’ ‘chid kyi
gleng lugs*), actually states the important principle of how to deter-
mine what sort of historical contents a speech should have. The
passage shows how fundamentally important the recitation of his-
tories was for Tibetan oratory. It is assumed that a history will be
recited; the only question is *what kind* of history.

The sixth section states the following rule:

With the king seated in the “high-center” (*gung*), one
must speak of the ruler’s genealogy. When a great ecclesiastic
is seated at the head (*dbu*), one must relate a history of the
origin of Buddhism. During the propitiation of [local?]
divinities, one must speak of the “evidence” (gtan tshigs) for the Bonpo religion [i.e. one must recite the stories of origin that bear witness to the authenticity of Bonpo practices relating to those divinities].\textsuperscript{20}

Histories thus had an essential place in traditional Tibetan speechmaking. Whether the history would be religious or genealogical or both was determined by whether the persons in the most important positions of the assembly had a primarily religious or political identity. A religious man at the head of the assembly necessitated a religious history. If a king was present, a history of his lineage was not to be omitted. In both cases, the histories related the origins of the institution with which the important personage was identified.

In that passage, the most important people in the assembly are said to be seated either at the “head” (dbu) or the “high-center” (gung). These are the pivotal positions for determining the contents of the history. The next passage (part seven) reveals more about what sorts of people may occupy these positions. It is entitled “how to express [the salutations in] the speech” (bka' 'chid brjod tshul). Here are taught the eulogistic phrases that are suitable for addressing the persons seated at the “head” or “high-center.” The passage includes examples of introductory salutations for seven types of people likely to become heads of assemblies:

a. a king from the old royal line (498.2)
b. an ecclesiastic (dge bshes: 499.1; slob dpon: 499.3)
c. a doctor (499.4)
d. a lay Vajrayāna priest (sngags pa) (500.1)
e. a Bonpo priest (500.3)
f. a scribe (500.5)
g. a monk retained as chaplain for the reading of scriptures, etc. (501.1)

One is reminded here of the possible phrases of salutation listed in the opening sections of the Mollas. In the Mollas, however, the “head” of the assembly was always an ecclesiastic.\textsuperscript{21} After all, they were to be recited in a religious ceremony that was led by a lama or monk. And therefore according to the above-mentioned rule for determining the type of history, religious histories should always be expected in them.
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Like section six, the seventh section of the Bshad mdzod account of speechmaking contains terms that seem to discriminate two positions of importance: one position is at the highest spot—the “head” (dbu) or “top” (thog) of the assembly—and a second position is at the “center” (gung) of the assembly. The term gung, however, does not indicate only centrality. It is actually an ancient term that originally meant not just a “center” but an “elevated central position,” a “central heaven.” Terms for both “head” and “center” are likewise found in the Mollas, where they also apparently indicate two different positions in the assembly.

In the Mollas from both Tsarang and Namgyal, the preeminent personages in the assembly are said to be at the “head of the file” (gral gyi dbu) or at the “superior-middle of the file” (gral gyi gung). The rest of the assembly is also described in relation to the “file” or “row” (gral) of assembled participants. The Mollas specify a religious leader at the head, while mentioning “great men” (mi che ba rnams) at the center. This latter group no doubt consists of men of high position, i.e., the local rulers or nobility. In both Mollas the “great men” are said to “weigh down” (gnan) the center (gung) of the file. And with the rulers or nobles thus at the “center” during the recitations, one would therefore expect to find, according to the rule of oratory given in part six, a royal genealogy in the Molla recitations.

Although the positions of “head” and “center” seem usually to be distinct in the speeches, the distinction is not always carefully observed. In part seven, for instance, the two classes of terms are sometimes used interchangeably. The examples of eulogistic address for both doctors and sngags pas begin with “if they are seated at the head of the file” (gral gyi dbu la bzhugs na) and end with “[they] occupy the middle” (gral gyi gung skabs [read: bkab]).

Part eight, the conclusion of the Bshad mdzod description of oratory, gives a specimen of one type of speech. This speech is suitable for being recited at a celebration (dga' chang), and it is called “an oral account for celebrating the enjoyment of happiness” (skyid kyi longs spyod kyi dga' chang byed pa'i gtam). The most important members of the assembly during its recitation were ecclesiastics and nobles, and therefore it would be expected to contain both religious and secular histories. Its historical passage, however, does not take the expected form. The speech mentions many bygone people and things, but only within the framework of a
“speech of gratitude”—a formal statement to the effect that all those present owe a great debt of gratitude to the past individuals who have been very kind to humanity, very kind to the country of Tibet, and very kind to the local community.25

The speech of celebration in the Bshad mdzod served to remind the celebrants at some sort of festival or party that they had much to be grateful for. As such, it was not part of a merit-dedication ceremony. Nevertheless, this “gratitude speech” has some remarkable similarities with the Mollas.

In Lo and Tibet, as in so many places throughout the world, speeches of commemoration or thanksgiving often went hand-in-hand with festive gatherings. One instance that we have already seen of a speech recited at a time of local merrymaking in Lo was the Gelung Speech. The Mollas too could be recited during celebrations. The final pages of Namgyal M. state that it may be recited during “living people’s celebrations” (gson pa’i dga’ ston).26 Moreover, in its tone and contents, the Bshad mdzod speech of gratitude is by no means foreign to what one finds in Namgyal M. and Tsarang M. The historical section of Namgyal M. contains a very similar recitation, complete with a commemoration of all those to whom gratitude is due (bka’ drin che ba’i lo rgyus), and there is a similar though shorter section in Tsarang M.27

The celebration speech in the Bshad mdzod can itself be divided into two main parts. The first part is an introductory description and benediction of the assembled listeners. The second part is the commemorative main contents. Both parts are closely paralleled in the Mollas.

The opening consists of a formalized description of the gathered assembly.28 The assembly is analyzed into component groups, each of which has a position in relation to the main row or file (gral). This introductory section mentions the ecclesiastics who are at the top of the row (gral gyi thog drangs) and also mentions those in the “elevated center” of the row (gral gyi gung skabs [sic!]), such as old men and ministers.29 The assembly also includes young men of good family, who ornament the sides of the row (gral gyi zur brgyan), and the women, who support the extremity (gral gyi ’dab brten).

Nearly identical passages are found in the passages that introduce the histories in both Mollas. The Molla of Tsarang, for instance, describes the following five groups as making up the assembly:
1. Presiding ecclesiastics head the row (gral gyi dbu mdzad)
2. The monastic assembly forms the basis of the row (gral gyi gzhi bzung)
3. Men of high position weigh down the center of the row (gral gyi gung gnan)
4. Learned men ornament the sides of the row (gral gyi zur brgyan)
5. Workers support the end of the row (gral gyi mtha' brten)

Likewise, Namgyal M. introduces five groups within its assembly:

1. Presiding ecclesiastics are the first in the row (gral gyi thog mar mdzad)
2. Men of position weight down the middle of the row (gral gyi gung gnan)
3. The monastic assembly forms the basis of the row (gral gyi gzhi bzung)
4. Learned men ornament the sides of the row (gral gyi zur brgyan)
5. Patrons and workers support the end of the row (gral gyi mtha' brten)

Clearly, these passages contain a single established formula of introduction that was a typical feature of an old and widespread tradition of Tibetan speechmaking. And there are other strikingly similar passages shared by the Mollas and the Bshad mdzod speech. But before going on to describe these, it would be best to introduce one more speech—this one being even older than the others.

The Rgyal-sras Thogs-med Speech (GTS)

A very early speech has been preserved in the writings of Rgyalsras Thogs-med-dpal-bzang-po (1295-1369), a great meditator and teacher of the late Bka'-gdams-pa tradition. His miscellaneous writings (gsung thor bu), together with his biography by Dpal-idan-ye-shes, have survived in a Bhutanese manuscript of 194 folios that was published in 1975. The miscellaneous writings include small liturgical works, prayers, letters, and so forth. One of the last works is the speech, which begins on page 414 of the reproduction (f. 184b). The speech is introduced as "an account (i.e. a history) that
conveys the matter at hand" (skabs don brda sprod par byed pa'i lo rgyus). The speech has two main parts: a descriptive introduction of the assembly, and a "history" (lo rgyus), the function of which is to introduce and express the main topic of the speech. It concludes with a colophon which states that Thogs-med composed it at Dpal E (Bo-dong E) for the sake of those whom he calls "bshad gsar pa rnams." In the biography one is told that Thogs-med stayed at Dpal E between the years 1309 and 1326. He probably composed the speech in the last decade of that period.

The bshad gsar pa rnams mentioned in the colophon of the speech are probably not "new speakers" only in the sense of monks who are new to the task of speechmaking. This term means, more precisely, monastic students who are giving their first public exposition (bshad pa) of a religious text, as a sort of graduation exercise following their first major course of scriptural studies. The speech indeed mentions its reciter’s "being delighted to explain this year certain meanings of phrases that come to mind, concerning the basic scriptures."

Even though GTS was set down in its final form long before the other speeches—probably five centuries before the Tsarang and Namgyal Mollas—it is the least corrupt and most easily understandable of all the texts. GTS is also the most elegantly written of the four; its introduction of the assembly, for instance, displays a poetical expertise much greater than what one finds in the others. Here, however, it will be enough to outline the main features of the introduction. GTS describes the groups within the assembly in the following way:

1. In the sky: immediate and lineal gurus, and the Triratna
2. Their supports (rten) of body, speech and mind
   b. In particular: in this great religious school
3. The great abbot (mkhan chen), seated on the first or highest seat (gdan gyi thog ma la bzhugs) [415.3]
4. Masters of scripture and reasoning, led by the great masters (slob dpon chen po), are the leaders (thog drang) [415.6]
5. The three "superior positions" (bla sgo) form the basis of the row (gral gyi gzhi bzungs)
   a. In the first "superior position" (bla sgo dang por) are those who uphold both sūtra and mantra systems [416.1]
b. In the middle “superior position”: monks of royal descent

c. In the lowest of “superior positions”: nobles and those of high position

6. Great men, such as attendant patrons, suppress the center of row (mi che ba rnams kyis gral gyi gung mnan)

7. Experts of specialized talents beautifully ornament the row from the sides (yon tan mkhan po rnams kyis gral gyi zur nas mdzes par brgyan)

8. Workers support the end (bya ba byed pa rnams kyis gral gyi mtha' brten)

The above passages demonstrate that all four speeches made use of one and the same oratorical convention. These almost identical introductions are actually variations of a single formula that speechmakers in this tradition used to express the order of precedence existing within the assembly. Such introductions gave every group, and each individual within the groups, a relatively higher or lower position in relation to the row (gral). This was an expression of both a religious hierarchy and a social order.

Further Comparisons of the Four Speeches

This ordering of the assembly is followed in both the GTS and the Bshad mdzod speech by yet another passage that possesses close similarities with parts of the Mollas. The subsequent passage is a benediction that begins, in the Bshad mdzod, with a statement that the assembly had a good foundation. Then the speechmaker points out the various wholesome connections ('brel ba) that link up the people in the assembly. The gathering is said to be an “excellent assembly” (tshogs pa bzang); it is linked together by past deeds and prayers, and in particular by the Buddhist religion and sacred vows.

GTS too has a very similar passage following the introduction of the assembly and before the main account of the speech. It begins with the poetical image of the assembly as a strand of jewels (each jewel is a precious human existence produced by excellent deeds and aspirations). This assembly, furthermore, is said to be linked together in a very profound way, since it is joined by religion and by sacred vows (chos dang dam tshig gis sbrel bas na 'brel ba shin tu zab). Finally, since the assembly has come together in this “happy glade” for a religious festival in which the Mahāyāna doctrine is expounded, it is an “excellent assembly” (tshogs pa bzang).
Once again the Mollas contain very similar passages. Two places in Tsarang M. mention the auspiciousness of the gathering, pointing out the good nature of the assembly and the wholesome links binding it together. In the first such passage, the group of listeners is said to be “assembled beneath the protection of the Three Jewels and therefore is an excellent assembly” (tshogs pa bzang). It is joined together by religion and sacred vows and therefore has profound interconnections (’brel ba zab). Since the gathering is so auspicious, a historical account (lo rgyus) should be recited.45

The second such passage in Tsarang M. concludes the introduction to the history and is immediately followed by the main section on cosmology and history. Here the gathering is stated to be “founded in virtuous deeds” (dge ba'i las kyis gzhi bzung), “joined by pure prayers” (dag pa'i smon lam gyis mtshams sbyar), and “interdependently connected, and assembled in connection” (brten zhing 'brel/ 'brel zhing tshogs).46

Namgyal M. too contains a passage that closely resembles the above:

The whole group assembled here has a vast general connection in virtue. It is founded in white [meritorious] deeds and is joined by pure prayers. In particular, there is an authentic connection—an excellent connection through religion and pure prayers. It is an excellent assembly because it brings together the highest special means for increasing the crops of the immediate and long-term benefits of virtue (dge ba).47

One and the same oratorical device is evident in each example. The similar passages appear before the historical sections but immediately after the other introductory descriptions of the assembly. Though these passages consist of what are now set, stock phrases, their obvious function is to introduce and sanctify the assembled congregation. The first part establishes the order within the assembly, mirroring the religious and social order in the community. The second part formally sanctifies the assembly by proclaiming its virtues. Such introductions were crucial within a widespread oratorical tradition, as is attested by their regular appearance in speeches given many centuries and hundreds of miles apart. Not only were these introductions important in speeches of 14th-century Gtsang and 16th-century Lho-brag, but also they continue to be essential in the Mollas still recited in 20th-century Lo.
Notes


2. Geshe Ngawang L. Nornang, personal interview. Cf. the use of *dar bshad* as the name for a speech within the Tingri marriage ceremony: B. N. Aziz, *Tibetan Frontier Families*, p. 175f.

3. As will be discussed below in more detail, this principle is clearly stated by the *Bshad mdzod yid bzhiin nor bu* (Thimbu: Kunsang Tobgyey, 1976), pp. 497.4-498.1, in the section entitled *bka' 'chid gleng lugs*.

4. The Venerable Dezhung Trulku, personal interview, Seattle, October, 1978. The word *tshogs gtam* is found for example in Sum-pa khan-po, *Collected Works*, vol. 7, p. 1026.5. The word is also found in the dictionaries, from Csoma de Körös down to Goldstein, as meaning a speech addressed to a meeting. In the dictionary of Dge-bshes Chos-grags, however, a more specialized meaning is given: "to deliver a speech that teaches the monastic regimen in the midst of a gathering of many monks" (*tshogs dge 'dun mang po'i dbus su sgrigs lam slob pa'i gtam bshad pa*). Cf. also the *Tshogs kyi gtam* (*Sambhāra-parārikatha*) by Vasubandhu preserved in the Tanjur. See Peking nos. 5422 and 5666.

5. The term *yas gtam* also occurs for instance in Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, *Zhen pa rang grol gyi lhug par brjod pa'i gtam skal bzang dad pa'i shing rta 'dren byed*, p. 31a. See also Appendix K, nos. 1, 3, and 4.

6. The Venerable Dezhung Trulku, personal interview.

7. The Venerable Dezhung Trulku, personal interview. An example of a *yon bshad* is found in the work of Sa-skya Pandita, *Bsngo ba yon bshad dang bcas pa*. See also Appendix K, no. 5.


9. The *phun tshogs Inga*, which are described above in chapter 4, note 28, are used to begin the speech in *Tsarang M.* (p. 3a). There it is said, "The possessing of five 'consumate excellences' is the door to a speech" (*phun tshogs Inga ldan gtam gyi sgo*). On this convention in other types of speechmaking, see Tucci, *Les religions*, p. 168. See also Appendix K, no. 5.

10. This feature is found in many speeches, and it will be discussed below in more detail.

11. The existence of such traditions of speechmaking elsewhere in Khams was confirmed independently by T. G. Dhongthog Rinpoche and by Mr. Tashi Tsering. The latter informed me that works called Molla were recited in 'Brong-pa, an outer nomadic district of Nang-chen in Khams. These Mollas contained abridged histories, and they were recited mainly at celebrations such as marriages. Similar recitations in Nyag-rong and southern Khams were called *gtam bshad* or *gtam rphan*. Elsewhere in Khams there were similar recitations called *srid pa' bshad*.

12. Kun-dga'-grol-mchog eventually became the head of Jo-nang monastery; the famous Taranātha is considered to have been his immediate rebirth. For a brief mention of Kun-dga'-grol-mchog and an account of the Jo-nang-pa
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13. Kun-dga’-grol-mchog, Zhen pa rang grol, p. 35b, states that in the autumn of the ape year (=wood-ape, 1524) the Ngor lamas departed from Lo. Elsewhere, in his biography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen (Dpal ldan bla ma ’jam pa’i dbyangs kyi rnam par thar pa legs bshad khyar par gsum ldan), p. 91a, Kun-dga’-grol-mchog mentions the invitation of the Ngor abbot Lha-mchog-seng-ge and his nephew (Sangs-rgyas-seng-ge?) to Lo in Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s 68th year (=1523). On page 101a there is also mentioned the visit of Dkon-mchog-lhung-grub to Lo soon thereafter.

14. Kun-dga’-grol-mchog, Zhen pa rang grol, p. 31a: de dus ri sheng du tshe lnga’i dus chen gtsos bo la yang dgos nan bskyed byung ba la/ sha tsha’i nye sbyor gyis ’ga’ zhog na re/ sngar mdzad pa med pa la da res tshogs shin tu che ba yog bas sngun bslu phyar na gtan [-brtan?] mi stub pas/ smon thang pa’i sde pa rnam kyi gdung rabs shig kyang gzigs dgos/ yas gtam gyi dpe cha la’ang nan [31b] tan yang dag pa gnang ba zhu zhes bs kul ma yang bygid pa la/ mi chos kyi gdung rabs la slob gnyer byed pa rang blos lcogs pa dka’ mo ’dra zhes zol gys lan btab/ dus la bab pa na dpon sa gdung bsgnyud na rim re re na lugs gnyis kyi bya ba ci dang ci mdzad pa de dang de snyan par bsgnags pa’i phreng ba spel ba/ gtsang zhang ma ’dres pa’i tshig sbyor rgyas pa ngang pa’i skad dang bung ba’i abyangs ltar rjes su bsgrags pas/ tshogs pa thams cad mgu ba skyes/ de’i sang snga bar kha sang gral na yod pa’i dpon slob ’ga’ zhog yong nas/ drung gis khar sang gnang ba’i yas gtam de’i dpe cha g.yar po gnang dgos zer ba la/ nges kha nas gang thon byas pa ma rtags dpe cha med byas pas/ bden bsam pa su yang mi ’dag ’on kyang de nyid btang ba’i yas gtam phyogs go [=bsgo?] ba’i rnam par bzhag pa rgyas ’bring bs dus gsum longs skabs dang sbyar bygon par bsngo ba byed dgos nyin re la bzia/ pa du mar dgos pa’i [==pas?] re re la yang mi ’dra ba’i rnam dp yad kyi [==kys?] khyad par re re sbyar ba’i byed tshig phun sum tshogs pa chos snang la brten spel bas mang du thos pa’i drang srong chen po gnas brtan bzang po brtan pa thugs nges shes lhag par ’drong ba’i zol ma yin pa’i gzengs bstod dgos dang bsgnyud par stsol bar mdzad/ skabs der drung pa chos rje pa’i bka/’las kyang/ bsngo ba ’dis rang gzhan thams cad kyi legs byas spel ba’i gser ’gyur gi rtsi’i sman mchog yin/ Several unusual vocabulary items and phrases are met with in the above passage. The phrase sngun bslu phyar, for instance, is not attested in the dictionaries. Ven. Dezhung Trulku, however, understood it to be the phrase sngo lo ’phyar, which he said could mean “to make an embarrassing mistake, e.g., in speaking.” Perhaps it is the same phrase as sngo lo ’char ba, for which Das’s dictionary gives the meanings “1. to sprout., 2. ‘to become notorious.’”

15. On other gdung rabs of the Lo ruling family see above, Preface, note 1, and below, chapter 9.


19. Except where otherwise noted, all pagination in the following citations is that of the Thimbu publication by Kunsang Topgey (= *Bshad mdzod T.*).


21. In the *Bshad mdzod*’s introduction of the king (*Bshad mdzod T.*, 498.2-498.3), the Guru-Triratna (*bla ma dkon mchog*) is evoked as “actually or by nature dwelling at the head” (*dngos* [sam] rang bzhin gyi [s] dbu la bzhugs). For the reading *dngos sam* cf. the *Śatapitaka* reprint, p. 509.6; *dngos bsam*. Thus the Triratna is evoked as at the head whether it is bodily present or not. In all other instances the position of *dbu* is actually occupied by a person.

22. G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, p. 719, tied in the term *gung* with the word for heaven, *gnam*: “Heaven here as with the Turks indicates the deity as well as the highest celestial sphere, above all other planes and heavens and at their very centre (guii).” Tucci (*loc. cit.*) also includes *gung* in his description of the Tibetan cosmos: “The atmosphere is like a tent pitched upon the universe: ‘The wheel of the sky is a tent with eight ribs’ (*IJai* glii 7ff). The pole is Mount Te-se, Ti-se Sumeru. On the top there is a hole through which the summit of this mountainpole passes. This is the centre of the higher plane of the atmosphere. It is a window (*dkar-khu*) and a centre (guni).’”

E. Haarh, *Yar-Ilu*, p. 221f., discusses Tucci’s accounts and concludes: “It appears that Guñ, besides having a specific significance of the middle of, or the entrance to, Heaven, may be conceived in a more general sense of Heaven and thus identically to *gNam*.” Haarh also points out that the above-mentioned picture of the cosmos is commonly found among the tent-dwelling nomads of Central and Northern Asia, and that in Tibet it may derive from the traditions of nomadic Tibetans (*’brog pa*). On the above image of the world see M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1959), pp. 37, 53.

23. The “center” (*gung*) is not actually said to be “dwelled in” (*bzhugs*), but instead is said to be “covered” (*skabs*). Here we should read *bkab*, perfective of *geb*. The verbal idea is preferable, making it parallel with the *gral gyi gung gnan* of the Mollas, and also in agreement with the parallel phrases used to describe the rest of the assembly.

24. On the reading *bkab*, see above, note 23.

25. For the topical outline of this speech see below, Appendix E. Compare the commemorative observances found in Indian traditions as mentioned by R.K. Mookerji, *Ancient Indian Education* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969), p. 192:

On Upākarma [a day observed at the opening of the school term] Yajur-vedins first offered oblations to the sacrificial deities...,” then they invoked
the deities of Samkitas and their Rishis . . . . The Yajurvedins also paid their homage to the memory of scholars who had built up their studies . . . . The Samavedins in their turn recalled such names . . . . This ritual of recalling with worshipful gratitude on the opening day of the school the names of those who have contributed to its studies and traditions was the best inspiration to its students to keep up the culture.

27. Namgyal M., pp. 11.2-17.9.
29. A better reading is gral gyi gung btab, as discussed above, note 23.
30. Tsarang M., pp. 4b-5a.
31. Tsarang M., p. 3f.
32. Rgyal-sras Thogs-med-bzang-po (1295-1369), Rgyal sras 'phags pa dngul chu thogs med kyi rnam thar dad pa'i shing rta dang gsung 'thor bu bcas (Thimbu: Kunsang Tobgey, 1975), pp. 414-420. See also P. Denwood, Catalogue of Tibetan MSS and Blockprints Outside the Stein Collection in the India Office Library, no. 23. The latter is the printed version of the speech, forming part cha of volume ma of his printed collected works.
33. His biography by Dpal-ldan-ye-shes is entitled Rgyal sras rin po che thogs med pa'i rnam thar bdud rtsi'i thigs pa. It forms the first 22 folios of the gsung 'thor bu.
34. According to Dpal-ldan-ye-shes in the biography, p. 13, Thogs-med's major writings included commentaries on the Mdo sde rgyan, the Rgyud bla ma, and the Spyod 'yug. None of these was included in the newly reproduced po ti.
35. Cf. Bshad mdzod T., 507.3.
36. GTS, 420.4: ces pa bshad bsar pa rnam kyi don du/ chos smra ba'i btsun pa thogs med kyis dpal er sbyar ba'o/]
37. From the rnam thar by Dpal-ldan-ye-shes, pp. 7-8, we learn that Rgyal-sras Thogs-med began his studies at the Dpal E chos-grwa chen-po at age 14 (1309) and received the vows of full ordination there at age 28 (1323). From 1326 to 1335 he acted as gdan-sa-ba at Rta-ra. During this time he was asked to become the monastic leader of E by 'Jam-dbyangs-don-yod-rgyal-mtshan (1310-1344) and his brother (Bla-ma dam-pa Bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan, 1312-1375), but he did not assent (p. 14). From 1336 until 1359 he stayed at Dngul-chu (p. 18), and after a visit to Central Tibet he returned to Dngul-chu (p. 27). Therefore it seems likely that he composed the speech before 1326, near the end of his stay at Dpal E.
38. The Venerable Dezhung Trulku after reading the GTS explained that at the Rdzong-bsar seminar near Derge most monks in the student body of fifty to eighty would have to give an exposition of scripture at the end of the five-year term, before they left and a new group of monks began their studies. This exposition was compulsory for each monk who received support from the college itself, even the dullest ones, who would have to select a short and simple work to explain. Monks and lay people from miles around would come to witness the
spectacle. To introduce the expositions, formal speeches were made before the great assembly. These speeches, however, did not incorporate the various formulas of introduction, etc., found in the GTS, the Bshad mdzod, and the Mollas.

39. GTS. p. 419.5.
40. GTS. pp. 414.3-416.4. The term bla sgo is not found in the other accessible speeches. The Venerable Dezhung Trulku suggests the equivalent go sa.
41. See also the sources cited above, note 28.
42. Bshad mdzod T., p. 503.1.
43. Bshad mdzod T., p. 503.4-503.5.
44. As discussed below in chapter 7, there is also another passage in GTS and Tsarang M. that summarizes the description of the assembly. See GTS, p. 416.4, and Tsarang M., p. 5a.
45. Tsarang M., pp. 2b-3a.
46. Tsarang M., p. 5a.
47. Namgyal M., p. 4.13; 4.18. Cf. A-mes-zhab Ngag-dbang kun-dga'-bsod-nams, 'Dzam gling byang phyogs kyi thub pa'i rgyal tshab chen po dpal ldan sa skya pa'i gdung rabs rin po che ji ltar byon pa'i tshul gyi rnam par thar pa ngo mtshar rin po che'i bang mdzod dgos 'dod kun 'byung (Delhi: 1975., p. 257.5). The earliest occurrence of this schema known to me is in the Bka' gams glegs bam (Varanasi: Kalsang Lhundup, 1973). Bul ba'i tshoms, introduction to the Lung bstan, section, p. 266. This passage, or its earliest kernel, may go back to the mid-11th century. (I located it when this book was in the (press);
CHAPTER 7

THE MOLLAS AND TIBETAN HISTORICAL TRADITIONS

Just as the Mollas are the products of old Tibetan oratorical traditions, so too are their historical contents the offshoots of Tibetan traditions of history and myth. Some connection with Tibetan historical accounts is clear from the very beginning of the Molla histories, since in each speech the historical passage begins with a twofold distinction that Tibetans have applied to histories since very early times. The two categories of history are called lha chos and mi chos. These terms have had different significances in ancient and modern times. Therefore, before trying to determine what they mean in the Mollas, it may be worthwhile to begin by ascertaining what they meant in other times and contexts.

Nowadays most learned Tibetan Buddhists understand the term mi chos (literally: “human religion”) as signifying the ethical norms of ordinary men in the world. By contrast, they understand lha chos (literally: “divine religion”) as meaning the more sophisticated religious teachings of Buddhism. Classical Buddhist treatises usually refer to the ethics of ordinary worldlings by means of another term: 'jig rten tshul lugs; and in opposition to “the world” ('jig rten), such works usually employ the term dharma (Tib.: chos). Still, a commonly quoted verse attributed to Nāgārjuna opposes “human” (mi) to “divine” (lha), and instead of mentioning the “system of conduct pertaining to the worldly sphere” ('jig rten tshul lugs), this verse speaks of the “religious system of men” (mi yi chos lugs):

\[
\begin{align*}
mi \ yi \ chos \ lugs \ legs \ spyad \ na/ \\
lha \ yul \ byrod \ par \ thag \ mi \ ring/
\end{align*}
\]

If one practices well the religious system of humans, one does not have far to go to reach the realm of gods.\(^1\)

As indicated here, mi chos can signify the ethical codes that should be followed by ordinary people. These ethical norms were taught in some detail by Tibetan scholars and saints in books of collected moral aphorisms. Such traditions were much influenced
by similar collections of elegant sayings that had been translated from Sanskrit and that belonged, generally speaking, to the tradition of the Indian nitiśāstra (Tib.: lugs kyi bstan bcos).

The term lha chos, on the other hand, would signify here the religious doctrines and theories of the philosopher and meditator. Such teachings were systematically expounded by Tibetan scholars in their treatises on doctrine and tenet. What separates the worldling's system from that of the Buddhist scholar and sage is that the ordinary person lacks philosophical sophistication. The Gzhung lugs legs par bshad pa, a treatise on Buddhist tenets falsely attributed to Sa-skya Paññita, explains the simplistic view of the ordinary person and the critical outlook of the meditator or philosopher:

According to the worldling's system, the “aggregates of appropriation” (i.e., the skandhas wrongly apprehended) are believed to be pure, [permanent, possessing a self,] and so forth. Those [who view things in that way,] whose motivations for behavior include shame and self-respect, and who accomplish their bodily and verbal actions in accordance with proper norms are said to be noble persons. Those [people in the world] who, without shame or self-respect, accomplish vile deeds are said to be evil persons.

And:

Those whose minds have not been changed through philosophical tenets say: “This ‘aggregate of appropriation’ is real, and such things as the moon reflected in water are illusory.” Those whose outlooks have been changed through tenets say: “That which is not shown to be invalid by reasoning is real. Such things as the ‘aggregates of appropriation’ are unreal, being like an illusion.” Also, it is stated in the Bodhisattvacaryāvatāra [chapter 9, verse 5]: “The worldling sees objects and considers them to be real. Because he does not [agree with the meditator-philosopher in viewing them] as being like an illusion, here the meditator and the worldling disagree.”

Mi chos is thus the system followed by those whose outlooks have not been altered by philosophical views but who nevertheless act in accordance with propriety.
It is an ethical system for those who operate within the ontology of naive realism. The *mi chos* system does follow certain principles, chief of which is the law of moral cause and effect. One finds, in fact, the 16th-century Ngor-pa scholar Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub quoting an old passage in which *karma* is called the “correct theory of the worldly” (*'jig rten pa yi yang dag lta*). *Mi chos* in this sense thus includes the foundation for more advanced religious and philosophical activities, for only when one has based oneself on correct ethics can one proceed to fruitful learning, reflection, and realization-through-meditation.

Though the use of *lha chos* and *mi chos* in the Mollas is related to these Buddhist notions, it probably did not derive from them directly. The two terms are very old, and they may even predate Buddhism in Tibet. In ancient times the “religion of men” (*mi chos*) consisted of a number of traditions of early religion and folklore, each possessing its own “priesthood” and sacred rites. Thus *mi chos* did not signify the secular, the profane, or the negation of religion. Each of the “human” or “mundane” traditions that the ancient *mi chos* included, such as cosmogony, geography, and genealogies, were in their own way sacred traditions. As the centuries passed, however, the original *mi chos* traditions gave way or were reconciled to other religious systems, especially those that centered on celestial or exalted beings (*lha*): first Bon and then Buddhism.

Though little of the *mi chos* survives intact, the concept or category of *mi chos* was preserved as a useful means of classifying rites and recitations. Recitations belonging to the high traditions of Buddhism could be classified as *lha chos*. Recitations on such topics as cosmogony, the origin of men, the original tribes, and the genealogies of kings—whether they were filled with later Buddhist conceptions or not—were classified as *mi chos*. This twofold classification became a necessary part of Tibetan historical recitations because the speechmaker on every occasion had to decide whether to recite one or the other or both types of history. The decision was in fact already made for him by the identity of the main person or persons in the assembly. But it became an established practice to introduce the narration by mentioning these two possible choices. See for example the *Bzhad mdzod* celebration speech:

A history will be recited. [There is traditionally] the recitation of the history of the Supreme Dharma as like a wish-granting
tree, and the recitation of the traditional accounts of the human religion as like a garland of flowers. [But] since it is an excellent practice... for a speech to be short and thereby pleasant to hear, ... I shall condense [both topics] into a "history of past kindnesses" (bka' drin che ba'i lo rgyus) and respectfully recite.9

Since the Bshad mdzod example speech was intended to be a typical model for speechmaking, it is not surprising that these lines closely resemble the parallel passage in Namgyal M.:

With regard to historical tradition (lo rgyus), there are two kinds of histories: the historical accounts of the human ["mundane"] religion, the human foundation, and the historical accounts of the origin of Dharma, the supreme ornament. For the first, [the mi chos tradition], there are recited the genealogies of the rulers above and an account of the generations of subjects below. There is an account of the foundation of the four "divisions," and many systematic presentations of worldly traditions. However, here I shall not give a detailed account. To offer merely an abridged account [of the above]:10

In Tsarang M., however, one does not find the same degree of similarity. Its "history" begins with an account of the origins of the physical universe and then enumerates the divisions and distribution of its human inhabitants. Nevertheless, following that, there appears this passage:

There are two kinds of histories: the historical accounts of mi chos, the foundation, which was achieved through the merit of human beings, and the historical accounts of lha chos, the supreme ornament. The first of these [i.e., the mi-chos history] ... [entails telling] how the genealogy of kings above became established.11

What topics do the speeches actually deal with under each heading? For their histories of "human tradition," the Mollas tell of the origins and descent of royalty and ordinary men. Tsarang M. in addition contains a cosmogony that explains the origins and layout of the universe.12 Only a part of that account, a cursory des-
scription of the countries of the world, is paralleled in Namgyal M. This is found in the section dealing with the "generations of subjects below," i.e., the origin of ordinary men. The most important of the mi chos histories, judging from the space allotted them in both Mollas, was the origins and descent of the rulers. Here both works contain what purport to be genealogies of the Tibetan Yarlung kings and the Lo rulers.

But under the heading of "divine tradition" (lha chos), the Mollas present histories of Buddhism. The account found in Namgyal M. is by far the most detailed. It follows for the most part a chronological sequence. The history begins with the story of the Buddha's coming into the world, goes on to discuss the spread of his teachings in India, and afterwards mentions the spread of Buddhism in Tibet during an earlier and a later period. The final part consists of the already mentioned "gratitude speech," which enumerates the people to whom a great debt of gratitude is owed. These very kind persons were mainly religious masters to whom the people of Lo in particular were indebted. As would be expected, Ngor-chen Kundga'-bzang-po and some of the later abbots of Ngor had a high place in this enumeration. But here Namgyal M. is remarkable because it devotes the most space to Gser-mdog pa'i-chen Shakyamchog-ldan, who was active in Lo in the years 1472 to 1474. Namgyal M. contains, in fact, what amounts to a brief biography of that master. Furthermore, any mention of Glo-bo mkhan-chen is conspicuously absent.

The religious history in Tsarang M., though it follows basically the same pattern, is much shorter. It gives a very brief outline of the career of the Buddha, of how he taught his doctrine, and of how there appeared adherents to his doctrine in many countries. At the end one also finds a brief formal expression of gratitude to the past religious teachers and great religious kings of Tibet and Lo. But this is placed immediately after the lha chos history.

Related Literary Traditions in Tibet

Works dealing with the historical topics found in the Mollas are common elsewhere in Tibetan literature, but seldom does the treatment of these topics resemble that found in the Mollas. The Molla histories only explore one or two topics in detail, being little more than roughed-in outlines throughout their remainders. This lack of detail probably derives from the facts that the Mollas
are speeches and that speechmakers are restrained by the time limits of a single speech. The writers of standard histories had no such limitations. Although writers of histories often cited their fear of prolixity (tshig mang bas dogs pa) as an excuse for brevity, such limitations were largely self-imposed. The composer of a Molla speech, on the other hand, faced the necessity of treating a vast subject matter within a short period of time.

Let us briefly examine how the writers of Tibetan histories would have divided up the historical topics of the Mollas among the standard genres of histories. To begin with, the lha chos sections of Mollas would have been the subject of a history of Buddhism. Such a history of religion is called in Tibetan chos 'byung (chos kyi 'byung tshul), the very words that characterize the religious histories in both Namgyal M. and the Bshad mdzod speech. The mi chos histories, however, are more diverse and are more difficult to correlate to the standard historical genres. Nevertheless, the mi chos topics in the Mollas can be reduced to two main groupings: cosmological-geographical and genealogical.

Cosmology and Geography in the Mollas

Although the notion of mi chos itself goes back to ancient times, the "mi chos" sections on cosmology and geography in the Mollas contain little that can be linked to old, pre-Buddhist traditions. The cosmology of Tsarang M., for instance, comes straight from the Buddhist canonical sources. It quotes from the "'Phags pa mdo sdu pa" for its account of how the universe was founded upon the basic elements, while its description of the cosmos as continents and islands centered on the great central pillar of Mt. Meru is derived from the Abhidharma scriptures. It is not until we reach the description of this world-continent, Jambudvipa, that these sources are departed from. Here Tsarang M. follows a geographical system that is pervaded by ideas from the later Mahāyāna of India.

Tsarang M., pp. 5a-6b, divides Jambudvipa into five main parts: a middle region and one region in each of the cardinal directions. At the center is Bodhgaya of India. To the east is the Five-Peaked Mountain of China; to the south, Mount Potala; to the west, Ō-rgyan (Oḍḍiyāna = Swāt?); and to the north, Śambhala. This maṇḍala-like geographical scheme is not essential to the Abhidharma cosmology, but reflects instead a later body
of ideas. Several such later Buddhist systems of Jambudvīpa's geography exist, and this one is identical to the one found in the Shes bya rab gsal compendium of ‘Phags-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan (1235-1280). The passage on cosmology and geography in Tsarang M. concludes with a short list of Central Asian states, including Khotan (Li), Gilgit (Bru-sha), and greater and lesser Tibet (Bod and Bod-chen).

As noted above, cosmology and geography did not have the same importance in Namgyal M. as in Tsarang M. The brief mention of geographical ideas in Namgyal M. was included within the genealogy of ordinary men, but here there is found neither cosmogony nor a description of the cosmos according to the Abhidharma system. Nevertheless, one does find in that Molla a brief description of the geographical divisions of Jambudvīpa. Again, Jambudvīpa is like a maṇḍala with five main parts, but here the center is different: it is the Land of Snows, Tibet. Around this center, at the cardinal points of the compass, there are China in the east, India in the south, Kashmir in the west, and Mongolia (hor yul) in the north.

The Molla cosmologies and geographies are thus pervaded by Buddhist notions, and one does not find much that would link them as mi chos histories to the ancient mi chos traditions of Tibet. Yet disregarding the specific contents of the cosmology, one can still discern traces of an important old tradition in the mere fact that it contains a cosmology at all. Significantly, the La dwags rgyal rabs, another history dealing mainly with a royal genealogy, also prefaces its royal history with an account of the origins of the world and its inhabitants. This work too relates a tale of the divine origins of kings. For this it employs a sacred myth. But even before that, it employs another type of myth, the most basic origin myth possible: cosmogonies and cosmologies.

Telling the myth of the world's origin opens the way for the subsequent narration of how men and their institutions came into the world. Though modern historians have no use for such myths of origins (M. Bloch once made a point of describing the preoccupation with origins as an "idol" and "demon"), the story of the world's genesis commonly appears as the starting point for origin myths and histories in other parts of the world. At earlier stages in European historiography one can also find a similar approach: local histories in Medieval Europe often began with the story of the creation of the world.
Genealogy in the Mollas

The second main category of the Molla mi chos histories—genealogy—is easier to place within the established genres of Tibetan historiography. The Molla of Namgyal mentions two kinds of genealogy: that of rulers and that of ordinary men. Neither Molla, however, devotes much space to the genealogies of ordinary men, and consequently the majority of the Molla histories consists of royal genealogies. There are two such genealogies. One tells of the origins and descent of the ancient Tibetan monarchs. The second gives an account of the Lo ruling line. In Namgyal M. both genealogies are introduced under the single heading “ruler’s genealogy” (rje'i gdung rabs), while in Tsarang M., the parallel passages are called “king’s genealogy” (rgyal po'i gdung rabs). In both name and content, these passages have obvious similarities with the rgyal rabs and gdung rabs genres of Tibetan historical literature.

A rgyal rabs, generally speaking, is a history of a royal family. In practice, however, almost all rgyal rabs of Tibet told the history of just one royal dynasty, that of the old Yarlung kings and their descendants. The term gdung rabs, on the other hand, signifies the history of any great family line; it was the generic term that could include even the genealogies of kings (rgyal po'i gdung rabs). Yet as the name of a literary genre, gdung rabs usually meant a history not of the Yarlung kings, but of some other great religious or noble family.

A.H. Francke, one of the first Western scholars to study a rgyal rabs history (the La dwags rgyal rabs), speculated that such genealogies might have been patterned after the vamśāvali tradition of India. But as A.I. Vostrikov later observed, outwardly similar historical traditions are found among many widely removed cultural groups. Many elements of the rgyal rabs derive, in fact, from indigenous traditions. Tibetan genealogical histories usually start their account as a tale of origin that almost invariably contains archaic, mythical elements. These tales of origin are old, and they had a sacred significance within the pre-Buddhist mi chos traditions. Owing to the later supremacy of Buddhism, many of the other old myths were superseded and eventually forgotten. But one of the few instances where the old myths were not completely uprooted was in the origin myths of the old noble houses. Even here, Buddhism often influenced the later restatement of the myths, though the primitive traits can usually be discerned beneath a thin veneer.
imposed by later Buddhist compilers and editors.\textsuperscript{32}

Before Buddhism arrived, oral recitations in general and tales of origin (such as genealogies) in particular were of crucial importance.\textsuperscript{33} In pre-Buddhist, pre-literate times, the recitations of singers and story-tellers were some of the main means for transmitting and preserving culture. According to traditions preserved by later Tibetan Buddhist historians, moreover, priests, singers, and bards once had the function of “guarding” the Tibetan dominion. Those early priests included a group called “Bonpos,” and in addition there were “storytellers” (sgrung) and “riddlers” or “singers” (lde’u).\textsuperscript{34} In such references, Tibetan historians thus preserved a dim recollection of a time when the keepers of certain oral traditions played a key role in establishing and maintaining the political and social order of Tibet.

The singers and bards concerned themselves with, among other things, reciting the origin myths of various features of the world and of various institutions in society. Their songs were religious acts. By means of them, the singers ritually expressed the sacred origins of things and thus affirmed and established those things in the present.\textsuperscript{35} In common with the general functioning of myths elucidated by M. Eliade, the singer probably was thought to gain control over things by knowing their origins. And he was thought to reach that knowledge by ritually repeating the myth and thereby reliving the story of origins.\textsuperscript{36}

What topics did the ancient Tibetan recitations address? The \textit{Blon po bka’ thang}, a gter ma from the mid 14th century, enumerates nine kinds of old \textit{mi chos} recitations, each of which corresponded to one of the main parts of a lion’s body:

1. The right foot: reciting the manner in which the world came into being;
2. left foot: relating the fashion in which living beings appeared;
3. hindquarters: relating the divisions of the earth;
4. right ‘hand’: telling the genealogy of rulers;
5. left ‘hand’: telling the genealogies of the subjects;
6. ‘middle finger’: telling the way in which the (Buddhist?) doctrine was born;
7. neck: relating the tribes (or villages) of each ruler(?)
8. head: recounting the families of father and mother;
9. tail: songs of joy with symbolic allusions.\textsuperscript{37}
These recitations thus ranged over a diverse subject matter, and what survives of them constitutes an important part of the rich and varied amalgam of traditions that is Tibetan popular religion.\(^{38}\)

We should note in particular the special place of the noble genealogies among the other origin myths. In the *Blon po bka’ thang* list, the telling of noble genealogies constituted the right forepaw of the lion. And in a list of the ancient *mi chos* categories contained in the *Sba bzshed Chronicle*, the genealogy of rulers is the first item in the list.\(^ {39}\) The early importance of the royal genealogies, their later survival, and their very origins can be attributed in large part to their usefulness as means for the powerful noble houses to lend prestige and legitimacy to their rulership.\(^ {40}\) Because of the political and social value of the genealogies, the myths of family origins could almost be guaranteed a prominent place and a continued existence for as long as a family maintained any importance.\(^ {41}\)

The genealogical myths originally took form in a Tibet that was fragmented into many petty principalities, each with a separate ruling lord.\(^ {42}\) The local chieftains or ruling lines often identified or linked themselves with the sacred mountain in the vicinity that dominated the theogony of the community.\(^ {43}\) In addition, they often claimed that their forebears were gods of the sky who at some remote time had descended to earth.\(^ {44}\) The cult of sacred mountains and the idea of celestial descent could also be combined—the myths sometimes relate an account of a sky-god’s descent from the sky onto such and such a sacred mountain. But whatever the details of the myths, they invariably point to the sacred, exalted origins of the rulers.

The myths of the rulers’ divine genealogy fulfilled their main function through being publicly recited. By reciting the myth, a singer ensured the normality of the sovereign’s position in society.\(^ {45}\) Indeed, repeating the myth gave the king his status in reality, he became the real king only insofar as he embodied the archetype of myth.\(^ {46}\) Such recitations probably had to be repeated from time to time even though a king or a ruling family was incontestably in control. On the other hand, the repetition of the origin myths no doubt also had great significance for rulers newly come to power, whether through family succession or by usurpation. In these latter instances the myth served to validate the new state of things by announcing and demonstrating how the new monarch’s position was in conformity with the sacred paradigm of myth.\(^ {47}\) The fact that
similar myths might be evoked by different rivals for the kingship—by both old rulers and new claimants—accounts for many of the confusions, inconsistencies, and overlappings that are found in rgyal rabs histories. Conflicting genealogical claims were no doubt even commoner in ancient times before the tradition of recording genealogies was established:

Ancestral legends were like the armorial bearings of noble families. They would squabble over them, each family claiming divine origin and trying to annex famous ancestors. Fluctuations and variations were all the commoner because these legends were recited on the occasion of various contests at the festivals celebrated in honour of the gods of the soil. The colloquies held to this day at horse races, evidence for which goes back at least as far as the fourteenth century, extolled clans or families in hymns and fine speeches.48

Myth and History in the Mollas
The Mollas thus deserve to be studied as the continuation of Tibetan traditions of oral recitations and myths. Mollas are very conservative, preserving as they do certain phrases and structures that are over six centuries old. Perhaps future discoveries will demonstrate direct links between the Mollas and still earlier oratorical traditions. But even at present, one can find in the Mollas some elements that must have originated ultimately in the pre-Buddhist oral traditions of Tibet.

They contain, for example, two ancient features that are by now very familiar. First, their historical accounts express the notion of the sacred nature of the royalty. Second, the recitation of the myth of divine descent and the genealogy was to be formally delivered in public at a special, sacred gathering. Here we have—though in a late, diluted form—the essence of an ancient ceremony which embodied the religious sentiments and expressed the sacred realities of pre-Buddhist Tibet.

By means of their tales of origin, the Mollas and similar speeches set forth the status of the king, the greatness of religion, and the order of the world. Even parts of the recitations that are not actually tales of origin can contribute to the affirmation of the world order. The formalized introduction of the assembly, for instance, announces and affirms the order existing within the human world, i.e., within
the local community. This section thus has a function that parallels that of the cosmological and geographical passages: it imparts order to the world.

Such an introduction of the assembly, followed by a formal benediction of the group as an “excellent assembly” (tshogs pa bzang), occurs in the Mollas before the beginning of the true tales of origin and histories, and it is a necessary prelude to the history (lo rgyus) that follows. This formal description of the assembly also has other links with the cosmological recitations that follow. Not only do these passages describe and thus give order to the assembly, but also immediately after the introductory descriptions (in Tsarang M. and in GTS), there is a comparison of the assemblies to certain important elements in the cosmos. See, for instance, in Tsarang M.:

The upper part of the row is magnificent,  
like the king of mountains.
The middle of the row is brightly shining,  
like the sun.
The lower part of the row is of a deep hue,  
like land with a lake accumulated (in its midst?).

Likewise, in the speech by Rgyal-sras Thogs-med we find the following:

The upper part of the row is magnificent like  
the king of mountains by virtue of the  
glory of its enlightened qualities.
The center of the row is brightly shining with  
intelligence, like the sun.
The lower parts of the row enchant all, like the  
moon.

And finally, this is also echoed by a section of Namgyal M., though there it comes as the conclusion of the history. Here is an established—and perhaps ancient—oratorical schema by which the speechmaker identifies the assembly with the macrocosm.

An analysis of the Mollas merely in terms of such features, however, will only give part of the picture. One cannot ignore that every extant Molla and speech is the product of Tibetan Buddhist
culture. The function of the speeches and the occasions for their recitations are different from what might have been the case in ancient Tibet. For while continuing to embody such mi chos traditions as the divine origins of kings, the Mollas, like the ma ni pa and similar traditions, also express and uphold Buddhist culture.52

The Mollas contain, in fact, a blending of both political and secular values, in harmony with the Tibetan conception of the conjoining of secular (srid) and religious (chos). The participation of the Mollas in the Buddhist religion is obvious from the setting of the speeches: they are to be recited within a Buddhist ceremony wherein a patron makes offerings and requests prayers for the dedication of merit. Here the Mollas exalt, in particular, the leaders of the Buddhist religious community, acknowledging them as helper and refuge in times of need. The special occasion for the Molla recitations was a Buddhist convocation wherein offerings and requests were made to the religious assembly. On the political side, we see that the ruler too has an important role in the ceremony: he is the great patron (shyin bdag chen po) who supports the monastic order by means of his generous gifts.

The descriptive introduction of the assembly at the start of the histories also makes clear the special positions of both the religious and political leaders. At the head of the assembly (as defined in terms of position in the row) are the religious leaders. Their superiority is in conformity with Buddhist ideas because monks are held to have gone beyond all positions of lay life. The king, of course, is supreme within lay society. Yet in Namgyal M., the king is placed above part of the religious assembly; the religious leader is at the head of the gathering, but beneath him in precedence come the local rulers or noblemen (mi che ba rnams), and only after them are the ordinary monks mentioned.53 This is a deviation from the normal observance in Tibet, and it expresses the reemergence of the claim of high position by birth over the original Buddhist ideal.54

Finally, the status of the kings is expressed by the genealogies proper. These are the main parts of the Molla histories, and for Tsarang M. the genealogical history of kings is the central part of the speech itself. The beginning of that "history" actually is just a mythical tale of origins. The last part, however, consists not of legends of fictive ancestry but of a generation-by-generation account of the historical personages born into the royal line. The majority
of the Tsarang M. history thus deals with rulers who presumably were real persons. The reciting of their histories seems to have been motivated partly by the desire to recount their real names and deeds. But the genealogy is also intent upon portraying each ruler in an ideal light: each past king was a great dharmarāja, a worthy ancestor for the present ruler. The past kings had both religious and secular attainments. They were wise and were learned in Buddhism. They were also great warriors, possessing the bravery and martial prowess necessary for guarding their domain. Their various acts of religious patronage are enumerated, and this also contributes to the continuing exaltation of the monarchy and of Buddhism.

Tsarang M. was designed to be recited in the presence of the Lo rulers or their families, and so it is natural that it lays more stress on the history of these local nobles. But even Namgyal M., with its brief account, succeeds in reinforcing the patterns of both religious and political allegiances within the community. Whatever histories are recited are mainly those that involve the whole local community. The Mollas, like the other examples of similar speeches in Tibet, tell about those persons to whom the community was linked by great debts of gratitude. The recitation of the speech places each of the listeners in a position of humble indebtedness toward the early saints, scholars, and kings. And all listeners were united by these shared feelings of reverence and gratitude.

The Mollas thus express both secular and religious values, both mi chos tradition and Buddhist practice, and both Indian ideals and Tibetan usages. Furthermore, the Mollas contain myth and eulogy, and particularly in the latter they possess a potential as historical sources. Even though their contents have been thoroughly penetrated by Buddhism, one can still detect in their basic structures and functions certain features that very likely were inherited from pre-Buddhist times. Cosmogony and cosmology—albeit Buddhist ones—continue as the necessary preludes. Royal genealogies take a central place, especially when the king is present. Even the accounts of Buddhism are given in a typically Tibetan way: by tales of its origins. Similar usages of tales of origin can, of course, be found in Indian traditions as well as in many other cultures. But here the approach is also in perfect consonance with the telling of origins found in old Bonpo religious rites, and with the preoccupation with origins that is typical of the ancient mi chos recitations. It is fair to sum up by saying that the Mollas, as thoroughly influenced by
Buddhism as they are, have also retained their identities as typically Tibetan speeches.

Notes

1. Sangs-rgyas-bstan-'dzin, *Legs bshad don 'grel* (Kalimpong: Tharchin, n.d.), p. 3:

   mi yi chos lugs legs spyad na/
   lha yul bgrod par thag mi ring/
   lha dang mi yi them skas la/
   'dzegs na thar pa'ang gam na 'dug/

   Compare that with *Tsarang M.*, p. 6b:

   mi yi chos lugs legs shes na/
   lha yi chos lugs shes pa 'byung/
   lha dang mi yi chos lugs la/
   brten na thar pa ga la ring.

2. The *Legs par bshad pa rin po che'i gter* of Sa-skya Paṇḍita, for instance, indicates the author's familiarity with other collections of aphorisms. For a translation of this work see James E. Bosson, *Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels*, Uralic and Altaic Series (Indiana University Publications), vol. 92 (1969).

3. *Gzhung lugs legs par bshad pa* (a forgery falsely attributed to Sa-skya Paṇḍita), *Sa skya bka' bum* (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1968), vol. 5, p. 62.1:

   'jig rten pa'i lugs ni nye bar len
   pa'i phung po la gtsang ba la sogs par 'dzin
   zhing ngo tsha khrel yod kyis kun nas bslangs'
   te| lus ngag gi bya ba tshul dang mthun par
   sgrub pa ni skye bo ya rabs yin la/ ngo tsha
   khrel med kyis kun nas bslangs te yid du mi' ong ba'i
   bya ba sgrub pa ni skye bo ngan pa yin no/

4. *Ibid.*, p. 61.4:

   grub mthas blo ma bsgyur bar nams na re/ nyer
   len gyi phung po 'dl bden pa yin zhing/ chu zla
   la sogs pa brdzun pa yin no zer ro/ grub mthas
   blo bsgyur ba rnam s na re/ rigs pas ma gnod pa
   ni bden pa yin zhing/ nyer len gyi phung po la
   sogs pa na (read: ni) brdzun pa sgyu ma lta bu
   yin zhes zer ro/ de skad du yang spyod 'jug las/
   'jig rten pa yis dngos mthog zhing/ yang dag nyid
   du rtog byed kyi/ sgyu ma lta bu min pas 'dir/
   rnal 'byor pa dang 'jig rten rtsod/
5. See Nāgarjuna, *Ratnāvali*, chapter 1, verse 44 (Peking Bstan 'gyur, Nge, 131a.5):

```mdor na yod par lta ba nyid/
las kyi 'bras bu yod ces pa/
bsod nams bde 'gro rgyu mthun pa/
yang dag lta ba zhes bshad do/
```

By contrast, Dkon-mchog-'jigs-med-dbang-po (1728-1791) in his *Grub pa'i mtha'i rnam gzhag rin po che'i phreng ba* states: "Those whose minds have not been affected by tenets seek only the pleasures of this life with the inborn intellect which, since they have never studied a system of tenets, neither investigates nor analyzes." (Translation by Geshe Lhundup Sopa and J. Hopkins in their *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism* [New York: Grove Press, 1976], p. 53.) This statement is excessive since it denies that the simple-minded worlding (byis pa; Sopa and Hopkins’ “children”) can understand and follow the ethical systems that lead to happy rebirths in future lives.

6. Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub, *Lam 'bras bu ... snang gsum mdzes par byed pa'i rgyan*, p. 66b.4:

```de lta bu'i las 'bras la yid ches nas blang dor tshul
bzhin du spyod na ngan 'gror mi 'gro ba'i gdeng thob
pa yin te/ slob dpon āryadevas/ 'jig rten pa yi
yang dag lta/ chen po gang la yod gyur ba/ de ni
bskal pa stong du yang/ ngan 'gror 'gro ba mi
srid do/
```


7. Learning, reflection, and meditation were the ways by which the “philosopher” (or, as he is usually called, the yogin) transformed his outlook by means of tenets. On the importance of *śīla* for the above three, Dezhung Rin-poche quotes the following from the writings of Vasubandhu:

```tshul ldan thos dang bsam ldan pas/
sgom ba la ni rab tu sbyor/
```

Here *tshul ldan* is glossed as *tshul khrims dang ldan*.


9. *Bshad mdzod T.*, p. 504.3-504.5. *Lha chos* and *mi chos* are also mentioned just above in the *Bshad mdzod*, p. 503.5.

10. *Namgyal M.*, p. 5.6-5.12.
12. *Tsarang M.*, p. 5b, before the mention of *lha chos* and *mi chos*.

16. Glo-bo mkhan-chen is known to have disagreed with the doctrinal interpretations of Shākya-mchog-Idan, but being one of Lo's greatest scholars, he would be expected to have a prominent place in the history.

17. Namgyal M., p. 8.11; Bshad mdzod T., p. 504.3: dam pa'i chos kyi 'byung tshul.

18. Tsarang M., p. 5b. The same passage is quoted in the La dwags rgyal rabs. See Francke, Antiquities, vol. 2, 19.21, where the text is cited as "Yon tan bsdus pa." Cf. Bshad mdzod T., pp. 7.1; 13-16.

This system of the elemental maṇḍalas mentioned in Tsarang M. is taught in detail in the canonical sources chiefly by the Avatāmśakā Sūtra (Tib: Mdopal po che). This system is briefly described by the Tibetan scholar Klong-chen-pa Dri-med-'od-zer, in his Teg pa chen po'i man ngag gi bstan bcos yid bzhin rin po che'i mdzod (Gangtok: Dodrupchen Rinpoche, n.d.), p. 5b. And in the encyclopedia ("Collected Works") of 'Ba'-ra-ba Rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang (Dehra Dun: Ngawang Gyaltse and Ngawang Lungtok, 1970), vol. 7, p. 681f, one finds an account drawn from the 'Jig rten bzhag pa'i mdo (also cited as 'Jig rten dgag pa). These references are given by Kennard Lippman, "How the Samsra is Fabricated from the Ground of Being," Crystal Mirror, vol. 5, (1978), 344.

Because this section of the Tsarang Molla is so brief, one cannot be sure whether a cosmogony is being described, or whether the description of the elemental maṇḍalas is merely a description of the basic structure of the universe. Actually, even the phrase used by Tsarang M. to describe this passage, 'jig rten chags tshul, can convey either meaning. See Jäschke, Dictionary, p. 163, and Goldstein, Dictionary, p. 378. Goldstein's dictionary errs (probably a printing mistake) in equating chags tshul with chags. Probably chags stangs was intended, and for the latter he gives the meanings "structure, composition, situation." For the term chags rabs he gives the meanings "origin, genealogy, ancestry."

The cosmological texts also participate in this ambiguity. In 'Ba'-ra-ba, vol. 7, 697.4, for example, chags is an antonym of 'jigs. Elsewhere (pp. 272.5, 278.4) chags tshul is equated with gnas tshul.

I am inclined to believe that what is meant is a cosmogony, and not just a description of the elemental basis of the cosmology. The passages cited above from 'Ba'-ra-ba and Klong-chen-pa are the descriptions of the reemergence of the universe after its cyclical destruction. Moreover, the parallel passage in the La dwags rgyal rabs clearly leads to a cosmogony. See Francke, Antiquities, vol. 2, pp. 20, 63-64.

19. Not only does the third chapter of the Abhidharmakosā deal with this cosmology, but also there is a sūtra called in Tibetan 'Jig rten bzhag pa i mdo, which is cited by 'Ba'-ra-ba, p. 502.4 and elsewhere, but which I was unable to locate as such in the Bka' gyur.

20. See, for example, the Bshad mdzod (Satapitaka reprint), pp. 183-188, as outlined in appendix II (p. 15) of E. Gene Smith's English introduction.

21. 'Phags-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, Shes bya rab gsal, Sa skya bka' bum (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1968), vol. 6, p. 3.2.


26. A similar approach can be found in Medieval literature in works dealing with even as disparate a subject matter as painting technique. See for example the treatise by Cennino d’Andrea Cenini, *Il Libro dell’Arte*, the first chapter of which begins with the words, “In the beginning, when almighty God created heaven and earth . . . .” The text goes on to explain the fall of man, the necessity for some productive occupation, and finally reaches the main topic, painting technique. See C. Cennini, *The Craftman’s Handbook*, Transl. Daniel V. Thompson (New York: Dover, 1968), p. 1. For similarities in the Indian tradition, see M. Winternitz, as quoted below, note 55.

27. Namgyal M., p. 7.10. In Tsarang M., the only similar passage occurs on p. 6a, following the heading “Origin of Sentient Beings” (nang bcud sans can chags tshul).


29. Tsarang M., p. 6b.

30. Francke, *Antiquities*, vol. 2, p. 7. Francke (ibid.) made the interesting observation that the Varāśāvali of Chamba and the La dwags rgyal rabs both “begin in an introductory hymn, in which the book is called a necklace. The necklace is represented as being worn around the neck of a deity or saint to whom the book is dedicated.” Namgyal M. (p. 5.2) similarly likens its recitation to a strand of jewel beads strung on a silken thread, and offered as an ornament for each one in the assembly. The simile or metaphor of a literary production as a necklace or throat ornament (mngrin pa’i rgyan or mgul rgyan), however, is common elsewhere in Indian and Tibetan literature since any elegant composition can be “throat ornament” for one who recites it. See for example, Bco-brgyad khri-chen Thub-bstan-legs-bshad-rgya-rtshi, *Bstau pa’i rtsa ba chos sgor zhugs stangs dang . . .* (New Delhi: N. Topguy, 1971), p. 20: nyung ngu’i tshig gi rgyal rabs rnams . . . gsar bu’i mgul ba’i rgyan du ’os . . . .”


34. Stein, *Civilization*, pp. 191, 198; on the ide’u see Tucci, *Les Religions*, p. 303f.; on the sgrung see ibid., p. 296ff.


38. Tucci (Les Religions, p. 220f), mentions the diversity of later Tibetan popular religion, also pointing to its link with the most ancient traditions of Tibet:

Religion populaire ne se limite pas au mythe, à la liturgie ou à une attitude pieuse envers les numina que nous avons mentionnés; elle est aussi l'action concertée de traditions cosmogoniques et cosmologiques, de légendes généalogiques des groupes et de familles particuliers, de rites magiques et expiatoires, de sagesse populaire gnomique (comme l'entend le Blon po bka' than), bref, un héritage universel et séculaire, qui fut certes exposé de toutes parts à l'influence des systèmes religieux ayant pris pied au Tibet, mais qui en même temps a subsisté auprès d'eux en sauvegardant sa diversité, son contenu propre, et même les contradictions qui s'y trouvaient incluses.

Il était impossible à une telle religion populaire de présenter un caractère homogène: elle est assujettie à des particularités géographiques, des formes de vie d'une nature très diverse, qui sont liées pour une part au pastorat et à l'agriculture, à la vie nomade et au mode de vie sédentaire (non sans un loin-tain écho de la chasse primitive); elle est en relation étroite avec des traditions tribales, qui ont sauvé en le transmettant à des époques ultérieures l'héritage de plus anciens substrats.

42. Tucci, Les Religions, p. 276.
43. Ibid.
44. Tucci, Les Religions, p. 296. D. Snellgrove, writing on Tibetan Buddhism in the Encyclopedia Britannica (1966) states that one of the original features of Bon was indeed the cult of god-kings whereby the rulers were manifestations of sky deities. In addition to those traditions, there also existed among the great families of Tibet the tradition of descent from one of the ancient great “tribes” of Tibet. See R. A. Stein, Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines (Paris: Mélanges publiés par l'Instutut des Hautes Études chinoises, 1961), p. 2.
45. Cf. Eliade, Patterns, p. 33.
46. Ibid.
47. Eliade, Myth and Reality, p. 33.
49. Tsarang M., p. 5a. The exact sense of the last line is not clear to me.
50. GTS, p. 416.4.
52. On the ma ni pa see Tucci, Les religions, p. 263.
53. Namgyal M., pp. 3f.
54. The royalty of the old Yar-lung lineage continued to be shown the highest marks of respect even by monks, right down to the present century. Geshe Nawang Nornang (personal interview) recalled that all of the monks of his monastery in Dwags-po on occasion had to bow before the Lha-rgya-ri khri-chen, who was believed to be the descendant of the ancient Yar-lung kings.

Within the monastic communities, too, a monk of royal descent (lha btsun) continued to occupy a special place. See GTS, 416.1. The sons of certain noble families were also automatically accorded especially high esteem as monks. This was the case with the noble families that became closely identified with a particular religious lineage, as for example that of Sakya. The Lo ruling family, according to Tsarang M., traditionally supplied the “abbots” of Tsarang monastery, beginning with Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub, thus further establishing the position of the family in both temporal and spiritual spheres.


The Indian could not write history without beginning from its very commencement. For the purpose of getting up to the history of the dynasty of their own age, the authors of the Purānas begin with origin of the world, the Buddhist monks with the first Buddha... and the authors of more recent historical epics, with the heroes of the Mahābhārata or with gods or demigods, from whom earthly kings derive their origin.
CHAPTER 8

THE MOLLA HISTORIES

The Mollas contain two genealogies: that of the old Tibetan monarchy (the Yarlung kings) and that of the Lo Mönthang ruling house. Unfortunately for the modern historian, the Molla composers were careless—or perhaps overzealous—when they came to describing the origins of the Lo ruling line. The late raja 'Jam-dpal-bstan-'dzin-dgra-'dul was himself aware that something was amiss with at least some of the Molla histories, because he is said to have called them “only books of legends.” Yet even though one must therefore be cautious in accepting these histories, a careful examination of them and all other pertinent sources reveals that some of the Mollas indeed contain valuable information.

Of the two royal genealogies in the Mollas, that of the old Tibetan kings is typical of Tibetan rgyal rabs accounts, and it is of no special importance. The version of this dynasty's origins that the Mollas give is the so-called gsang ba chos lugs ("secret—the Dharma tradition") account. According to it, the Tibetan kings were descended from a prince of the Mahāsammata royal lineage of India who had fled to Tibet and established a kingdom there.

The historical value of the Mollas derives from their second genealogy, that of the Lo kings. These accounts give information about two subjects: 1) the origin of the family and 2) the names of past rulers. The more detailed of the Mollas also purport to tell about some of the political and religious doings of individual kings. Although the latter sort of details will no doubt be important for future studies on the history of Lo, they will not be systematically investigated in this book. Here the basic task is merely to investigate the Mollas for the sake of determining the ancestry, names, and sequence of rule of the Lo kings. This limited investigation is a preliminary step that will help establish a chronological framework for later studies.

The Origins of the Lo Ruling Line

All the accessible Mollas agree that a king named A-ma-dpal (also spelled A-me-dpal) was one of the great founders of this ruling
line. But the Mollas give two quite different accounts of who A-ma-dpal's ancestors were. Of the four Mollas whose histories can be compared, three state that the Lo rulers were ultimately descended from the Yarlung dynasty of Tibet, whereas only one, Tsarang M., does not.

Namgyal M. gives the following account:

[From among the Tibetan kings'] later generations, there came our own royal line of Lo. To give just an abridged account of its origin: The lineage descended by stages from the great religious king Khri Ral-pa-can. The later generations in the line [included] such kings as Mu-khri-btsan-po, [and] the one known as A-ma-dpal, who is as famous as the sun and moon.4

The historical extract from Mønthang M. contains the same account. According to it, the progenitor A-ma-dpal was descended from Khri Ral-pa-can and Mu-khri-btsan-po. This passage is, in fact, almost identical in its contents and wording with the previously quoted passage from Namgyal M. (for the Tibetan text see appendix A). Later on, the Mønthang M. account diverges from Namgyal M. But the almost word-for-word identity of the two accounts in their beginnings is good reason to suspect that Mønthang M. derived from Namgyal M. or from a common precursor.

The Molla of Garphu too posits that the Lo kings descended from the old Tibetan royalty. It states that the ancestry of A-ma-dpal included the Tibetan kings Khri-srong-lde'u-btsan, Mu-khri-btsan-po, and a certain Mgon-lde-nyi-ma-'bum. Peissel gives the following account (the names in parentheses are my own additions):

Trisun Detsin (=Khri-srong-lde'u-btsan), the holy King of Tibet, spread the doctrine, as his son Mutre Sempo (=Mu-khri-btsan-po) did after him. This son had two children; the eldest lived in Tibet and "supported the teaching of the doctrine," while the second son "did not get along well with his elder brother, and he went to the North [the great plains of northern Tibet], and married a rich nomad girl by whom he had three children; the second and third [of these] sons looked after all the animals as their father and mother had done before them, while the eldest son, called Gunde Nyma Bum (=Mgon-lde-nyi-ma-mgon), left his parents and went to Lo, and settled
there. In Lo there were many independent castles." Now followed the names of the four castles whose ruins we had seen near Lo Mantang, along with the name of Mantang Radjinpa-no doubt a war chief, who had a castle where Lo Manthang stands today.

... Gunde Nyma Bum had two sons, both of whom wanted to be monks, but were not allowed to practice their religion because of the Demon Black Monkey, the leader of the fort of Mustang. These two brothers prayed and had a son .... “This son,” said the history, “was truly an incarnation of Chenresi,” and he was named Ame Pal.5

The above account immediately arouses one’s suspicions because of an obvious anachronism. The Tibetan kings Khri-srong-lde’u-btsan and his son Mu-khri-btsan-po (in Garphu M. spelled: Mu-khri-g-btsan-po) were both born in the 8th century. A-ma-dpal himself was born in the second half of the 14th century and flourished in the first decades of 15th century. Even though some six centuries intervene between Mu-khri-btsan-po and A-ma-dpal, Garphu M. portrays the latter as the great-great-grandson of the former.

Although the Garphu M. account cannot be wholly historical, it embodies the same general tradition regarding the Lo kings’ ancestry as was found in Namgyal M. and Mönthang M. In addition, it may be significant that all three Mollas contain the tradition that Mu-khri-btsan-po, an otherwise unimportant Tibetan king, was one of A-ma-dpal’s direct ancestors.6

Traditional Tibetan accounts of the old Yarlung kings ascribe the name Mu-khri-btsan-po to two different rulers. The first was the mythical successor to Gnya'-khri-btsan-po (founder of the line), and the second was the relatively little-known son of Khri-srong-lde’u-btsan.7 Descendants of this second Mu-khri-btsan-po are not mentioned in the standard histories: according to the usual accounts, he was succeeded by his half-brother. Garphu M. and Mönthang M. are also atypical in that they mention Mu-khri-btsan-po as the descendant of Ral-pa-can, while in the standard genealogy Ral-pa-can was Mu-khri-btsan-po’s nephew. But it is even more curious that all three Mollas would mention Mu-khri-btsan-po at all.

In contrast to those three, Tsarang M. does not mention any of
the well-known Tibetan kings as A-ma-dpal's ancestor. This Molla does, however, contain a myth of origin that points to both a royal and divine origin for A-ma-dpal and his line. As already mentioned, one legend of royal origin maintained by the Tibetans linked their kings to an Indian dynasty. This was the version of origin that ultimately gained acceptance among later Tibetan Buddhists, but in early times it was apparently not a widely known tradition. This version had the name "secret—the Dharma system" (gsang ba chos lugs) according to later references to it by Tibetan historians. Opposed to this version was a tradition of quite a different sort called "famous—the Bon system" (grags pa bon lugs).8 The latter probably embodied the most prevalent notions of royal origins current in Tibet at the time of the first penetrations of Buddhism.

In a nutshell, "famous—the Bon system" held that the Tibetan kings were the descendants of divine (lha) forebears who had themselves come down from the sky to rule the earth. Different versions of such myths exist. Nevertheless, the feature of divine descent from the sky is common to all of them. Such divine descent, moreover, was also commonly claimed by many of the ancient aristocratic lines as well as by the hereditary lines of Bonpo priests.9 (European parallels also exist—there were similar myths about the pre-medieval Germanic kings.) The Tsarang Molla myth of royal origins belongs to this same general "Bon system."

According to Tsarang M., the ultimate ancestor of the Lo royal line was a lha divinity, 'Od-de-gung-rgyal by name.10 He descended from the sky to earth by stages, passing first to the realm of another class of gods, the btsan. In that realm he became the btsan Rgod-kha-che.11 From there he descended another step, to the region of the dnu gods, and there he was dnu Khyi’u-chung.12 From there he finally dropped to the earth.

That god, now on the ground, became the divine ruler Gnam-lha-gung-rgyal or Mi-rje-gung-rgyal.13 The spot of his descent was a sacred place possessing traditional characteristics that are also mentioned elsewhere in Tibetan oral literature: The sky was like an eight-petalled wheel, the earth was like an eight-petalled lotus, and the sides were like the eight facets of a jewel.14 Once on the earth, he took possession of the region, which was called the "white earth of Yarlung" (yar klung sa dkar), he built a castle called 'Om-bu-lha-mkhar,15 and he divided up his dominions. The first local god (lha) was Yar-lha-sham-po,16 and among men the first groupings were
the six clans (*rus*) of Zhang-zhung.

The initial reaction of many people who read the foregoing would be that *Tsarang M.* was probably claiming for the Lo ruling family a descent from the old Yarlung dynasty. After all, that Molla mentions several names and places that are traditionally associated with the old Tibetan kings. But if the writer of *Tsarang M.* were trying to impute this ancestry to the Lo rulers, why did he not do it more clearly, as the preceding three Mollas did?

In spite of the shared elements, it does not necessarily follow that *Tsarang M.* is identifying the two lineages as one. Looking back to the historical passage in *Tsarang M.*, one can see that the real beginning of the history occurs not with that myth, but with a brief quotation from "early writings":

Here in this country that contains all needful and desired things without exception, this land of Lo, which possesses the splendor of perfect abundance, there appeared this person of widespread fame:

"Shes-rab bla-ma of the Sky-divinity (*gnam lha*) lineage."\(^{17}\)

The account continues: "And, as it was stated there, the genealogical lineage of the Lo religious kings, masters watching over the Tibetan realm, came down from the clear-light gods (*'od gsal lha*)."

The myth of *'Od-de-gung-rgyal* or *Gnam-lha-gung-rgyal*’s coming down from the heavens immediately follows, and its whole point is to illustrate the manner in which Shes-rab-blama and the other kings in the lineage were ultimately descended from gods of the sky. To do this, the author of *Tsarang M.*—or the compiler of some earlier work that it was based on—borrowed a myth having a number of elements that were also associated with the Yarlung royalty.\(^{18}\)

Such a usage of the myth was internally consistent within *Tsarang M.* because the Yarlung kings had already been accounted for in the other traditional way—i.e., as the descendants of an old Indian royal line.

Thus the Molla accounts contain two main traditions of the Lo kings’ origins. The first tradition, represented by *Namgyal M.*, *Mönthang M.*, and *Garphu M.*, links the Lo kings directly to the Yarlung royalty of old Tibet. *Namgyal M.* in particular links the line ultimately to the Indian dynasty of Bimbisāra.\(^{19}\) The second tradition, represented by *Tsarang M.*, attributes a divine descent to the
Lo kings but does not explicitly designate them as the descendants of the old Tibetan kings.

The Historical Rulers of Lo Mentioned in the Mollas

When one examines the names of the historical kings of Lo mentioned in the Mollas, the first thing one finds is that each Molla gives a different account. But as was the case with their accounts of the lineage's origins, here too it is Namgyal M. and Mönthang M. that show the greatest similarities. Both begin their list of kings with A-ma-dpal, and then continue as follows (the numbers here represent only the sequence in which the names appear, and not necessarily the sequence of generations):

Namgyal M. 20

(1) A-ma-dpal
(2) A-mgon Bzang-po
(3) Bkra-shis-mgon
(4) A-mo-ga
(5) A-bzang-rdo-rje
(6) Am-mgon Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje
(7) Byam-dpal-rdo-rje (sic)
(8) Bkra-shis-snying-po (the brother of number 7)

Mönthang M. 21

(1) A-ma-dpal
(2) Am-mgon-bzang-po
(3) Am-bzang
(4) Am-mgon Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje
(5) 'Jam-dpal-rdo-rje
(6) Rgyal-sras Bkra-shis-snying-po
(7) 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul
(8) A-mgon Kun-dga'-nor-bu
(9) Rgyal-sras Khams-gsum-dbhang-'dus
(10) Dngos-grub-dpal-'bar
(11) A-mgon 'Jam-dbyangs-rgyal-mtshan

While the account in Namgyal M. breaks off at its eighth name, Mönthang M. lists five kings after Bkra-shis-snying-po. Mönthang M., however, omits rulers numbers 3 and 4 of Namgyal M.

When we come to Garphu M., we meet with a completely diffe-
rent tradition. Here follows a generation-by-generation list of the rulers mentioned in it, extracted from the work itself (I have left the spellings uncorrected):

(I) Khri-srong-lde'u-btsan
(II) Mu-khrig-btsan-po
(III-a) Nam-mkha'-rgyal-mtshan
(III-b) Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyal (father of IV-a)
(IV-a) Mgon-lde-nyi-ma-'bum (and two younger brothers)
(V-a) (no name specified?)
(V-b) A-ham 'Byam-dbyangs-dbyang-'dus
(V-c) Shes-rab-zil-non

(1) A-ma-dpal

(2-a) Ang-mgon Bstan-'dzin-bzang-po
(2-b) Tshe-rten-dgra-'dul
(2-c) Tshe-spel-srid-skyong

(3-a) Dpal-bzang-po-rgyal-mtshan
(3-b) Khams-gsum-lha-rgyal

(4-a) Mi-dbang Chos-rgyal-bsod-nams-can-grags
(4-b) Lha-sras-bcung-lha [?]

(5) . . . rgyal-sras . . . rdo-rje? [illegible]

(6-a) Grags-pa-bsam-yas
(6-b) Bla-chen Bsod-nams-rtse-mo (m)
(6-c) Gzhon-nu-grags-pa (common father with 6-a of generation 7)

(7-a) Sa-skyong-dbang-po
(7-b) [illegible] (m)

(8) A-ham Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang

(9-a) Ye-shes-gzigs-pa
(9-b) Tshe-dbang-dbang-'dus
(9-c) Dngos-grub-dgra-'dul (all had the same consort)
A-mgon Ren-dzin-snying-po (12)

Byam-dbyangs-dpal-par (20)

Bzang-po-lde-rgyal-mtshan (19-9)

Dnag-gsum-dpal-par (without issue) (19-4)

Dpgos-gsum-lde-rgyal (18-c)

Khrims-srum-lde-rgyal dngs-phre (18-p)

Dngos-gsum-lde-rgyal dngs-phre (18-4)

Shi-ge-ha (17-p)

Byam-dpal-phrul-chen (17-8)

Dbang-rgyal-don-grub (16-p)

Dbang-dns-sa-shen-dgra-dul (16-4)

Dngos-rgyal-sgra-yedus (15-d)

Dpal-bzang-yos-shes (15-c)

Lde-rgyal-don-grub (15-p)

Byam-dpal-dgra-dul (15-4)

Bzang-dzin-dbang-dns (14-c)

Bzang-dzin-dngos-grub (14-p)

Dbang-dns-myon-pa (14-4)

Kun-dbang-dns-rgyal-sr [sic] (13-p)

The-mchos-seng-she (13-4)

Bsa-la-gnas (12-p)

Gsum-dbang-dbang-po ("established Namgyal") (12-4)

Tbyo-dbang-stan-pa (11-e)

Rdo-rgyal-dgra-dul (11-d)

Chos-mdzad Dpal-dlain (m) (11-e)

Dngos-rgyal-dpal-ri (m) (11-p)

A-dbang Rgyal-mtshan-pa (11-4)

Rgyal-mtshan-dnag-sgra-rgyud (11-p)

Rgyal-mtshan-dnag-sgra-rgyud (11-4)
When one compares the above list with the lists of rulers in Namgyal M. and Mönthang M., a disturbing fact becomes apparent. From among the names of early rulers mentioned in Garphu M., only two similar names are found in the other two Mollas: A-med-pal and Ang-mgon Bstan-'dzin-bzang-po (if the latter can indeed be equated with A-mgon-bzang-po). And among all the later names none can be found in the other two Mollas.

Turning now to Tsarang M., we meet with still a different account. Like the other Mollas, Tsarang M. is exclusively concerned with the male members of the noble lineage—it describes only the agnatic line of descent (gclrtng brgyud). It is helpful in that it specifies the total number of male siblings in each generation. But it gives the names of only the main ruler in each generation and any brothers that became monks.

Tsarang M. indicates that the eldest layman son in each generation had the greatest claim to the position of ruler. Monks, even though they were the oldest sons (as in generations 4, 6, and 9), in normal circumstances would not ascend the ruler’s throne. (If they did become king, they also gave up their monk’s vows.) In some generations, a younger lay brother would follow his older brother on the throne. Such cases, however, are ignored by Tsarang M. Sometimes, too, lay siblings entered into polyandrous marriages, and in such cases one thus cannot be sure who the natural father or fathers of the next generation were. According to Tsarang M., however, the main ruler in each generation is always the father of the children in the next generation.

From Tsarang M. one can extract the following list, which is incomplete because of a lacuna in the text. In this list (m) signifies that the person was a monk. A-ham is a title of any ruler in this lineage after the time of A-mgon-bzang-po.

(22-a) Dbang-dus-snying-po
(22-b) Tsa-drang Zhabs-drung
(22-c) 'Byig-med-dgra-'dul

(I) Stag-seng-ge-'bum
(II) Shes-rab-bla-ma
(III-a) no name mentioned
(III-b) Chos-skyong-’bum
(I) A-me-dpal
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(2) A-mgon-bzang-po and three brothers
(3-a) A-ham Tshangs-chen-bkra-shis-mgon and three brothers, including
(3-b?) Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub (m)
(4-a) Chos-kyi-blo-gros-rgyal-rtshan (m)
(4-b) A-ham Grags-pa-mtha’-yas, and two brothers, including number 4-a
(5) A-ham Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang, and one brother
(6-a) Chos-rje ’Jam-dbyangs-pa (m), older brother of 6-b
(6-b) A-ham Don-grub-rdo-rje, and two brothers, including number 6-a
(7-a) A-ham Bsod-nams-dpal-rdo-rje, and his younger brother
(7-b) Bsod-nams-dpal-'byor (m)
(8) A-ham Bsod-nams-grub-rab-brtan
(9-a) Bsod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dbang-po (m), 9-b’s elder brother
(9-b) A-ham Bsod-nams-grub-dpal-'bar and two brothers (including 9-a above)
(10) A-ham Tshe-dbang alias Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu
(11) missing—lacuna in the text
(12?) missing—lacuna in the text
(13?) missing—lacuna in the text
(14-a?) A-ham Bkra-shis-snying-po and two brothers, (including 14-b below)
(14-b?) Rdo-rje-'phrin-las (m)
(15?) A-ham 'Jam -dpal-dgra-'dul
(16?) A-ham Kun-dga’-nor-bu
(17?) A-ham Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-'dul

In addition, the following names are given outside the historical passage, at the conclusion of the work: A-ham Dngos-grub-dpal-bar, A-ham 'Jam-dbyangs-rgya[1]-mtshan, and A-ham Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-'dul. These seem to be listed as alternative members of the same generation, but this is not certain.

Concerning A-ma-dpal and his immediate successors, there is a slight (though imprecise) agreement between Tsarang M. and the other Mollas. Then, after either A-mgon-bzang-po or Bkra-shis-mgon, and for the space of several generations, there is no agreement. At generation 8 of Garphu M. the king Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang
is listed. This name also appears in *Tsarang M.*, in generation number 5. Then it is not until generation 14 of *Tsarang M.* that we find a name mentioned in three of the Mollas. *Tsarang M.*, *Mönthang M.*, and *Namgyal M.* all mention the ruler Bkra-shis-snying-po. He is said in the latter two to have been the son of Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje, and therefore Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje was probably the king missing at number 13 where there is a gap in *Tsarang M.* The list from *Tsarang M.* continues to correspond with *Mönthang M.* for two more generations: *Mönthang M.* numbers 7 and 8 are number 15 and 16 of *Tsarang M.*—'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul and Kun-dga '-nor-bu. The names Dngos-grub-dpal-'bar and 'Jam-dbyangs-rgyal-mtshan, which appear at the end of *Tsarang M.*, are also listed in *Mönthang M.*

*Garphu M.*, however, represents by and large a separate tradition. Whereas *Tsarang M.* clearly states that A-ma-dpal had four sons, *Garphu M.* asserts that he had three. Then for fourteen generations the two accounts have only one name in common, that of the obscure ruler Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang. At a very late stage *Garphu M.* finally begins to show some agreement with the other accounts, at least with regard to the names of the main rulers. Its numbers 17-a and 19-a are also mentioned in both *Tsarang M.* and *Mönthang M.* But these similarities are of little significance because some common names must be expected as the account approaches the period of living memory.

**Notes**

2. One deviation from the typical account is the mention of a descendant of the Tibetan kings named Mgon-ide-nyi-ma-mgon. According to Peissel, *L’organisation*, pp. 30a-31a, some details about him are given in *Tsarang M.*-B. This probably fictitious person is also mentioned in *Garphu M.* as an ancestor of the Lo rulers.
7. Haarh, pp. 45-46, 57. The later Mu-khri-btsan-po was number 39A. Mu-khri-btsan-po was also an erroneous name for Mu-ne-btsan-po.
9. Some of the better-known Tibetan lineages claiming such divine descent were the Sa-skya 'Khon, the Zhwa-lu Lee, and the Phag-mo-gru-pa Rlangs. For examples of such myths among hereditary Bonpo lineages, see S. Karmay, *Treasury of Good Sayings*, pp. 6, 9-11.

10. 'O-lde-gung-rgyal was the name of a sacred mountain, and as a god he was included among the divine ancestors of the Yarlung kings. See Stein, *Civilization*, pp. 28, 194.

11. Cf. Haarh, p. 225, where one Btsan-rgod 'Bar-ba-spu-bdun is mentioned as the original leader of the *btsan*.


15. A famous ancient palace in Yarlung, also spelled 'Om-bu-bla-sgang.

16. Name of a sacred mountain and god, which is often associated with the descent of the Yarlung kings of Tibet.


18. For their tales of divine ancestry, the various noble families made use of analogous themes. See Stein, *Recherches sur l'épopée*, p. 203. The same divine ancestors are sometimes claimed by different families; for example, 'O-lde-gung-rgyal, who appears in the myth of the Lo kings' ancestry in *Tsarang M.*, is also found in accounts of the Rlangs family's genealogy. See Stein, *Civilization*, p. 194.


21. For the historical passage from *Mønthang M.*, see below, Appendix A.

22. Peissel's partial description of the contents of *Garphu M.* contained a few inaccuracies. In *MFK* he mentioned the following names of rulers, sometimes with an approximate dating:

   (?) Anjia Dorje, who ruled in c. 1760 when Jumla dominated Lo (see *MFK*, p. 255).

   (10-a?) Ahan Geltsin, who had five sons (p. 265)

   (16-b) Anjia Thondup, who died young, whereupon his brother disputed the succession (a mistake for 16-a?) (see p. 256)

   (18-a) Jamiam Angdu, who died c. 1860 without an heir (a mistake for 19-a?) (see p. 257)

   (19-b?) The brother of the above. He was abbot of Tsarang, and he wed the queen of his brother, fathering the following ruler.

   (20) Jamiam Pelbar, who ruled until c. 1905

   (21) Tenzing Trandul, who ruled c. 1905-1964.

   (22-a) The eldest son of the above, who died after a short reign, whereupon his father resumed his rule

   (22-b) The lama of Tsarang
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(22-c) Jigme Dorje Tradul (the name given on p. 176)

I cannot find any "Anjia Dorje" (Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje) in Garphu M., though perhaps his is the name in generation 5 that is illegible in the photocopy of Garphu M. that is accessible to me. In his dissertation (L’organisation), Peissel also mentioned the following kings:

(8) Jaho Pasang, who is said to have flourished in c. 1790 (probably Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang) (see p. 41a)

(16-a) Wangdu Sachin Trandul, who died c. 1840 and whose brother is said to have disputed the succession (p. 44a)

(18-a) Jamyan Angdu, who flourished c. 1855 (p. 46a)


24. Chogay Trichen Rinpoche, Rin chen phra tshom, p. 8, for instance, mentions the following: rgyal rabs bcu gcig pa/ gong sku mched gnyis kyi sras a ham tshe dbang . . . . See also below, 'Chi med, Appendix G.

CHAPTER 9

OTHER ACCOUNTS OF THE GENEALOGY
OF THE LO RULERS

On the face of it, Garphu M. appears to be a late fabrication of almost no historical value. Tsarang M., by contrast, would seem to be a genuine account of some reliability. It contains some details, it has no easily noticeable anachronisms, and it provides references also to important persons or events contemporaneous with many of the rulers. To the extent that it is complete and accurate, it establishes the genealogy and approximate chronology of the Lo kings. But how far can it be trusted? Without comparing it with other, outside sources, there is no way to ascertain the accuracy of it or any other Molla.

The number of sources available for comparison with the Mollas is now surprisingly large. A few important sources are still inaccessible, but through the generous help of several Tibetan and Western teachers and colleagues, I have been able to locate more than enough sources to begin evaluating the Molla histories. These sources include both primary and secondary sources, and both intentional records and unintentional remains. They do not agree on every point. But the vast majority of them combine to give a unified composite picture of the origins and later descent of the Lo ruling family.

The Origins of the Lo Ruling Line According to Other Sources

One group of sources speaks in particular about the clan (rus) origins of the lineage, about the early religious affiliations of the family, and about its former political importance at one of the royal courts in Ngari. These sources paint a picture somewhat different from what is presented by the Mollas. In Mönthaṅ M., Namgyal M. and Garphu M., the ruling line of Lo is portrayed as an extension of the Tibetan royal lineage. Or, as in Tsarang M., the family is portrayed as being an ancient and seemingly independent ruling line. By contrast, several other sources say that the line had its origins in one of the old clans of Tibet. These sources also explain that the family attained eminence not as independent princes, but as nobles.
who owed their allegiance to a branch of the old Tibetan royalty in western Tibet.

Five sources are particularly helpful for ascertaining the clan origins of the Lo rulers. They are:

A) The autobiography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lun-grub (1456-1532) entitled Rje btsun bla ma'i rnam par thar pa ngo mtshar rgya mtsho, composed in the dog year (1514 or 1526).

B) The colophon to Glo-bo mkhan-chen's Mkhas 'jug rnam bshad, completed in 1527.

C) The biography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen by Kun-dga'-grol-mchog (1507-1566) entitled Dpal ldan bla ma 'jam pa'i dbyangs kyi[sic] rnam par thar pa legs bshad khyad par gsum ldan composed in 1535.

D) The biography of Ngor-chen Kun-dga'-bzang-po by Sangsrgyas-phun-tshogs entitled Rgyal ba rdo rje 'chang kun dga' bzang po'i rnam par thar pa legs bshad chu bo 'dus pa'i rgya mtsho yon tan yid bzhin nor bu'i 'byung gnas, composed in 1688.

E) An untitled text from Dzar in the Muktinath valley commemorating the erection of a mapi wall by the Dzar nobleman 'Jam-dbyangs-lha-mo and his consort, the Lo princess Su-ga-siddhi in the water-female-sheep year (1703?). This was one of a number of similar documents from this period that were recently photographed by Ms. Sidney Schuler.

The passages in these texts that bear on the clan affiliations of the Lo Mustang ruling house are brief, and I present their contents here in full.

A) Glo-bo mkhan-chen, a noble monk of the Lo Mustang ruling family and our greatest authority on the question, writes:

As regards our clan and so forth, we are [from] the division of the Khyung-po clan of Tibet known as Sa-gnam. It is a lineage which served the Mnga'-ris Gung-thang rulers [as officials]. First, in an early period, several powerful Bonpo seers and several [Buddhist adepts] such as Mi-la [ras-pa] appeared [in this clan]. But from a certain intervening time until the time of the ruler-monk A-ma-dpal, service toward religion was not established in equal measure.

B) The same author gives another reference to his ancestry in the colophon of one of his major works, a commentary on the
Mkhas pa 'jug pa'i mgo of Sa-skya Paṇḍita. In that colophon he states his name as “the monk of gshen-bon Sa-gnam, Bsod-nams-lhun-grub...”7

C) Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, probably basing himself on source A, states the following:

The most venerable master [Glo-bo mkhan-chen] belonged to the rnam-gshen Sa-gnam clan, the supreme family lineage (gdung brgyud) in which in past times there appeared seers (drang srong) of wonderful abilities, and innumerable adepts such as Mi-la [ras-pa].8

D) In writing this section of Ngor-chen’s biography, Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs probably had access to A and perhaps also to C. Discussing A-ma-dpal, Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs states: “He was an official of Rdzong-ka in the Tibetan district of Ngari. His lineage (gdung rus) was Gnam-ru Khyung, the same lineage as that of previous adepts (grub thob) such as Rje-btsun Mi-la.”9

E) This manuscript from Dzar contains near its conclusion a rambling description of the ancestry of the Lo rulers. Because it was written for the princess Su-ga, daughter of the Lo ruler Gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu (=Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu alias Tshe-dbang), it probably represents an established tradition. The work does not directly mention the clan affiliations of the Lo rulers. Nevertheless, it makes the following assertions:

[As a Buddhist] religious lineage [their ancestors included] Mi-la ras-pa.
[As a] Bon lineage. [their ancestors included] Zing-pa mthu-chen.
[As a] human lineage, [their ancestor included] Stag-rgya’o.10

Sources A and D clearly state the connection of the Lo ruling line with the Khyung-po clan. The word khyung signifies a great soaring bird, and nowadays a khyung or bya khung is identified with the eagle, the greatest of the soaring predatory birds. In ancient Tibet (perhaps especially among the nomadic peoples) the khyung was one of the primal animals of myth. All later theogonies retained it as a divine being of the sky. According to the surviving legends, the four branches of the Khyung-po clan ultimately descended
from four eggs miraculously produced by a great khyung.  

As a clan or tribe in the early 7th century, the Khyung-po people probably were but one of several nomadic groups within "the loose confederation of peoples known as Zhang-zhung, whose areas of migration and settlement were along the northern borders of Tibet from East to West." Some of the Khyung-po clan continued as pastoral herdsmen in the northern plains, while others rose to positions of power under the Yarlung kings. Nobles from the Khyung-po clan became especially important in parts of Gtsang and Ngari. Even until modern times, descendants of the Khyung-po lineage persisted in those places, as well as in the Khyung-po region of Khams, elsewhere in Khams, and in the Rgyal-mo-rong district on the Chinese frontier.

Glo-bo mkhan-chen, himself a member of the Lo royal family, in source A not only indicates the original link of his lineage with the Khyung-po clan, but also goes on to state that it belonged to a particular subdivision of the Khyung-po called Sa-gnam. According to an account found in the Gung thang gdung rabs by Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, the Sa-gnam was one of the early noble lines in the Gung-thang region. The ancestor of the Sa-nam (sa nam gyi mes po) Stag-rgya-bo chu-ral-can, is said to have been one of three notables who moved with their followers into the area of Gung-thang from Central Tibet during the reign of Gnam-ri srong-btsan (r. early 7th century). Arriving in the eastern part of Gung-thang, the three threw dice in a helmet to decide who got which parts of the newly found territories. The Sa-nam ancestor received the worst portion, and being unsatisfied, he continued on. To the south he found many fine areas, including Kyirong, and it was in that region that he settled. The name Stag-rgya'o appears in source E, and the similar name Stagsky-a-bo is found thirty-nine generations before A-ma-dpal in the newly accessible gdung rabs of the Lo rulers (this gdung rabs will be described in more detail below).

Since the Sa-nam or Sa-gnam was a subdivision of the Khyung-po, it is clear that sources B and C also link the ancestry of the Lo rulers to the Khyung-po clan. The calling of the lineage "Gnam-ru Khyung" by Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs was perhaps an attempt to indicate the geographical origin of the line in the area of Gnam-ru, a nomadic region north of the Gnam-tsho lake, to the north of Central Tibet. This statement agrees with the well-known account of Mi-la ras-pa's origins, which says that his family hailed from the
nomadic regions of Dbu-ru.

Besides the question of the clan identity of the family, two other basic themes are dealt with in the above passages, one religious and the other secular. We learn from some of the sources that the Khyung-po clan, or perhaps here specifically the Sa-gnam, was closely connected in early times with the Bon religion. Glo-bo mkhan-chen (A) states that past members of his line were Bonpo seers. The next two sources (B and C) attach the Bonpo titles rnam gshen or gshen bon before the lineage name Sa-gnam. Since hereditary religious lines were common in earlier times in Tibet both among Buddhists and Bonpos, the presence of these titles probably indicates that the family once was a hereditary line of Bonpo gshen priests. Source E alone gives the name of a Bonpo master who belonged to this lineage: Zing-pa mthu-chen.

The assertion of a special religious calling among the members of the lineage is further developed by four of the sources to include Buddhism. Sources A, C, D and E all cite the famous Buddhist poet-saint Mi-la ras-pa as an example of a past Buddhist master who was born in the line. In addition, Glo-bo mkhan-chen states elsewhere that this lineage was the same as that of Mi-la ras-pa, asserting this in the colophon of another of his works where he uses for himself the appellation “the Mi-la monk” (mi la'i btsun pa). The biography of Mi-la ras-pa by Gtsang-smyon He-ru-ka indeed asserts that Mi-la was from the Khyung-po clan, though without specifically mentioning the Sa-gnam subdivision.

A second basic theme that the above sources treat is the former political importance of the family line. Sources A and D assert in particular that members of the family traditionally acted as high officials at Rdzong-dkar in Mnga'-ris Gung-thang, the capital of a surviving branch of the old Tibetan royalty. The sources thus claim that the ancestors of the Lo kings before coming to Lo had established themselves as an influential noble family in the area of Gung-thang, just as the Sa-nam ancestor is said to have done in the Gung thang gdung rabs.

In addition, a number of sources mention the link between the Lo ruling line and the Gung-thang kings during the era of A-ma-dpal and prior to it. One such reference is contained in the above-mentioned Gung thang gdung rabs, a compilation by the widely travelled master Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, who was deeply interested in history and also familiar with Lo and its ruling family. That source men-
tions the ancestors of the Lo rulers twice. It mentions first of all the Lho-sde khri-dpon Byir-ma, an official under the Gung-thang king Bkra-shis-lde (ruled 1352–c. 1372). Second, it mentions the younger brother of Byir-ma, Chos-skyong-'bum by name, who was a great general beneath the Gung-thang king Bsod-nams-lde (1371-1404). Tshe-dbang-nor-bu asserts in particular that the later rulers of Lo were descended from this same family of nobles.

Another reference to the Lo rulers’ family origins is given by Bsod-nams-grags-pa (1478-1554) in his historical work Deb ther dmar po gsar ma (“The New Red Annals”). This work too identifies the Lo nobles as having been officials for the Gung-thang rulers: “Concerning Lo, its district leadership belonged to Skya-'phar-ba, a noble [lady?] of the Rdzong-kha ruler. Furthermore, during the time of A-ma-dpal . . . .”

Thus there is a general agreement among many of the sources regarding a connection between the Lo rulers and the kings of Gung-thang. I now know of only one source that deviates from this, though even it links the Lo rulers to Gung-thang in a different way. The work giving contradictory information is the Rin chen phra tshom compiled by Chogay Trichen Rinpoche. It states that A-ma-dpal’s father was a king of Khyung-rdzong-dkar-po (=Rdzong-dkar) in Gung-thang, Dbang-phyug-yon-tan-'bum by name. The Rinpoche told me that he had based the above account on a document in the possession of the Lo raja. The name Dbang-phyug-yon-tan does appear in the accessible gdung rabs of the Lo rulers as one of A-ma-dpal’s ancestors. He was a minister to the king Khri Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal and he came to Gung-thang in the service of that king. But he was seventeen generations earlier than A-ma-dpal.

The Rulers of Lo Mentioned in Other Sources

Just as several sources besides the Mollas give accounts of the Lo rulers’ origins, so too a number of outside sources exist that mention individual rulers by name. Some of these sources are just stray references to single rulers, while others are longer accounts that list several or many generations. Let us briefly go through some of these sources for the sake of determining the names of the kings, trying at the same time to identify them with the names found in the Mollas.
The Generations Before A-ma-dpal

It is now much easier to establish the genealogy of the Lo kings because a gdung rabs history of the lineage complete through the 18th century has recently become accessible. This work is entitled Blo bo chos rgyal rim byon rgyal rabs mu thi li'i 'phreng mdzes. The accessible copy is a manuscript that is sixty-four folios long and written mainly in black tshugs thung characters. The main part of the work (up to f. 48) was composed in the first half of the 17th century, the time of king Bsam-grub-rdo-rje and his son Bsam-grub-rab-brtan. Part two, a later addendum, was written during the life of the king Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje (fl. 1790); and this addition brought the account up to date at that time. This book will be the subject of a future study. For now, a brief outline of its contents will suffice.

For our purposes this gdung rabs can be divided into three parts: 1) the myth of ultimate origins, 2) the lineage before A-ma-dpal, and 3) A-ma-dpal and his descendants. The account of the lineage's mythical origins is almost identical to that in Tsarang M. One notable difference is that the divine ancestor who descended into the world of men is not referred to as Mi-rje-gung-rgyal in the gdung rabs; there he is consistently called Gnam-lha-gung-rgyal. Regarding the lineage before A-ma-dpal, there is also some agreement. Tsarang M. mentions a Stag-seng-ge-'bum as the sixty-first in the lineage and the great-grandfather of A-ma-dpal. In the gdung rabs a person named Seng-ge-'bum is also mentioned as A-ma-dpal's great-grandfather, and he is the sixtieth person in the lineage. The subsequent nobles Shes-rab-bla-ma and Chos-skyong-'bum are also listed in the gdung rabs. The following is the full list of the generations up to A-ma-dpal:

1. Gnam-lha-gung-rgyal


   2-d. Stag-sman-rtse

3. Stag-lha-rtse ("minister of Gnya'-khri")
4. Stag-khrom-rje
5. Khri-gnam-lha
6. Khri-lha-lod-chen
7. 'Od-bzang
8. Bzang-rje
9. 'Phrul-chen-'od
10. Bzang-khri-btsan-po
11. Btsan-mgon
12. Btsan-rje-grags
13. Dpal-'od
14. Khri-dpal
15. Zi-ra-mgon
16. Dpal-mgon-grags
17. Grags-'od
18. Rje-mgon
19. Mgon-ne
20. Mgon-pa-dpal
21. Dpal-le
22. Rtse-mgon
23. Stag-mgon
24. Stag-skya-bo
25. Stag-khri-gzar-po-che
26. Stag-sngo-ring
27. Stag-skya-ring ("minister of Lha-tho-tho-ri-gnyan-btsan")
28. Stag-khri-zings-chen
29. Stag-smar-go-chen
30. Stag-yer-sman
31. Stag-lha-chen
32. Stag-gung-bzang
33. Stag-'od-rtse

34a. Stag-lha-chen 34b. Rtse-lha-'od-bzang

35. Rdo-rje
36. Kun-bzang-rje
37. Bzang-rje
38. Bzang ("minister of Srong-btsan-sgam-po")
39. Mgon-po
40. Dpal-le
41. Dpal-mgon
42. Rgyal-mtshan
43. Stag-gdong-ri-pa
44. Yon-tan
45. Bde-mchog-mgon
46. Dbang-phyug-yon-tan ("minister of Khri Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal")
47. Yon-tan-rgyal-mtshan (= "Sa-gnam-tshad-mi")
48. Zi-chung
49. Rgyal-rin
50. Rgyal-mchog
51. Rgyal-bu-chung
  52a. Smom-ne  52b. Rin-chen
  53a. Mgon-po  53b. Mi-la-ras-pa
54. Bzang-mchog
55. Dpag-shri-dar-ma
56. Bde-bzang
57. Bde-legs
58. Bkra-shis
59. Dpon Dbang-phyug-sgom-le (= Lu-gu-dar-re)
60. Seng-ge-'bum
61. Shes-rab-bla-ma
Besides this gdung rabs, only one other known source gives details about the generations before A-ma-dpal. This is the gdung rabs of the Mnga'-ris Gung-thang Rdzong-dkar kings by Ka-thog rig-'dzin Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, already mentioned several times above. This work tells about Chos-skyong-'bum and his older brother Khri-dpon Byir-ma (also spelled 'Jir-ma). According to it, Chos-skyong-'bum was the nobleman to whom a Gung-thang king gave the rulership of Lo as a reward for that noble's having led the reconquest of Purang. The mention of Chos-skyong-'bum and his brother accords with Tsarang M. and the Lo gdung rabs, both of which state that Shes-rab-bla-ma had two sons, the younger of whom was Chos-skyong-'bum.

A-ma-dpal and His Descendants

Generation 1: A-ma-dpal. There is, of course, no doubt that a ruler named A-ma-dpal was a crucial figure in the lineage. The historical traditions of Lo count him as the great founder of the line, even though some sources state that his father and grandfather were instrumental before him in establishing the position of the family in Lo. The preferred spelling of this king's name—the spelling found in the writings of Glo-bo mkhan-chen—is A-ma-dpal. Several other sources, however, use the spelling A-me-dpal.

Though the Mollas say nothing about A-ma-dpal's having had a brother, according to the Lo gdung rabs he had an older brother named Mi-dpon Bkra-shis-bzang-po. The gdung rabs, moreover, continues to give a detailed account of the fourteen generations that ensued. The chart on pages 120-122 has been extracted from there.

This account agrees by and large with Tsarang M., and it also supplies several names that otherwise would be impossible to fill in. Indeed, Tsarang M. and the gdung rabs probably are products of the same historical tradition, even though the former differs slightly and lacks most of the details of the latter. Therefore both accounts need to be verified by comparing them with still other sources.

Generation 2. Almost every available source, the Mollas included,
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   2-c. A-phan 2-d. A-rgyal

   3-c. Chos-kyi-rje Bsod-nams-lhun-grub
       3-d. Bde-legs-rgya-mtsho’i-dpal-mnga’-ba

4-a. Rje Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan 4-b. A-ham Grags-pa-mtha’-yas
   4-c. Brtan-pa’i-rgya-mtsho

5-a. Khri-thog-pa Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyal 5-b. Sde-pa Kun-dga’-blo-gros
   *5. Sde-pa A-drung
gives the name A-mgon-bzang-po for A-ma-dpal’s main son and successor. What remains to be determined is the names and number of A-mgon-bzang-po’s brothers. Fortunately, the writings of Glo-bo mkhan-chen provide some authoritative details.

Glo-bo mkhan-chen, who was the son of A-mgon-bzang-po, wrote in his autobiography that his father was the eldest of four brothers. He lists the remaining three brothers—his uncles—from oldest to youngest: the general (dmag dpon) Amogha, the noble monks (dpon btsun) Kun-dga’-rgyal-mtshan, and the monk Rinchen-bzang-po (as in most of the sources, no females are mentioned). The last two names do not appear in the gdung rabs. There one finds instead the names A-phan and A-rgyal, which were probably nicknames. These two brothers were not important because both died young.

Thus we learn that A-ma-dpal had four sons, as was also stated by Tsarang M. Furthermore, the above shows that the name Amogha contained in Namgyal M. indeed occurs in the lineage, though its placement as number 4 is incorrect. The account of Garphu M. here as elsewhere is spurious.

Generation 3. Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s writings also contain some valuable information on himself and his three brothers, the sons of A-mgon-bzang-po. He states in his autobiography that they were four boys in all. Glo-bo mkhan-chen also states that one of A-mgon-bzang-po’s sons, the prince Bkra-shis-mgon, was a boy at the time of Ngor-chen’s last visit to Lo (1446-1447).

Of A-mgon-bzang-po’s four sons, the two eldest were laymen who looked after temporal matters, while the younger two, one of whom was Glo-bo mkhan-chen, at first were dedicated to the monkhood. But as Glo-bo mkhan-chen goes on to say, later on his third brother too became active in worldly affairs, leaving Glo-bo mkhan-chen as the sole monk in his generation of the family.

Glo-bo mkhan-chen does not mention all his brothers by name; in his autobiography he usually refers to them as just the “great (i.e., oldest) ruler” (sde pa chen po), the “middle ruler” (sde pa bar pa), and the “smaller (i.e., youngest) ruler” (sde pa chung ba). Only a single passage in the autobiography explicitly states one of their names: the great ruler was called Bkra-shis-mgon. This ruler died in the earth-female-bird year (1489) as is mentioned in a work that Glo-bo mkhan-chen composed to be read at a “funeral” (dgongs rdzogs) ceremony at Sa-skya following his death.
work also states that Bkra-shis-mgon was survived by the ruler A-seng Rdo-rje-brtan-pa and his brother.38

The “middle ruler” thus was probably named A-seng Rdo-rje-brtan-pa, and this is corroborated by the gdung rabs. This ruler was the recipient of a number of letters written by Glo-bo mkhan-chen and preserved in the latter’s collected works.39 He is also no doubt identical with the ruler mentioned as Klo-bo (sic) rgyal-po A-seng in the biography of Gtsang-smyon Heruka.40 This “middle ruler” died c. 1496 while Glo-bo mkhan-chen was visiting Central Tibet for the first time.41

Glo-bo mkhan-chen in his autobiography mentions that the youngest of the three ruling brothers took control at the death of the middle brother. The “younger ruler” and Glo-bo mkhan-chen were on very good terms.42 No names for him are given by Glo-bo mkhan-chen, but the biography of Gtsang-smyon Heruka mentions meeting the king of Lo named Bde-legs-rgya-rtsho after the mention of A-seng.43 In Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s collected works, moreover, there is found a short work entitled Rin po che bde legs rgya mtsho'i brgyad stong pa'i dkar chag. The contents of this brief work indicate that it was written for a living ruler who was probably the person in question.44 The name Bde-legs-rgya-rtsho’i-dpal-mnga’-ba also appears in the gdung rabs as the name of A-mgon-bzang-po’s youngest son. One reason we are lacking much information on this ruler is that he died just a few years after his older brother A-seng’s passing, at about the same time that Glo-bo mkhan-chen found himself involved in difficulties with the Rin-spungs-pa ruler of Tibet (c. 1500).45

Returning now to the Molla accounts, we see that the contents of Tsarang M. are substantiated again. A-mgon-bzang-po had four sons, among whom two were Tshangs-chen Bkra-shis-mgon and Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub. Namgyal M. also mentions Bkra-shis-mgon as number 3 in the lineage.

As for A-seng Rdo-rje-brtan-pa, a similar name occurs in both Mönthang M. and Namgyal M. The third king in Mönthang M. is listed as “A-m-bzang,” instead of the missing Bkra-shis-mgon who is completely absent from that Molla. Namgyal M., on the other hand, lists “A-bzang-rdo-rje” as number 5, after Bkra-shis-mgon and Amogha. Perhaps both A-m-bzang and A-bzang-rdo-rje were corruptions of the name A-seng Rdo-rje-brtan-pa.

Generation 4. Beginning here, and for the next six or seven
generations, only Tsarang M. from among the Mollas supplies us with any useful names. Namgyal M. and Mönthang M. do not resume their accounts until the ruler Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje, who flourished c. 1790 and who belonged to generation number 14. Fortunately there also exist several other sources for generations 4 through 10 or 11. One of these is the bem chag of ‘Chi-med-dpal-’dren-bzang-mo, a nun in the Lo ruling line who was the daughter of Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal and the Ladakhi princess Nor-’dzin-dbe-legs-dbang-mo. The term bem chag is a synonym of dkar chag, especially in the sense of “historical record.” This bem chag is presumably a record of ‘Chi-med-dpal-’dren-bzang-mo’s life that was composed after her death, and thus it probably dates to the mid to late 18th century. I have not had access to this complete work, but have only used an extract copied from it by the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche. The passage copied out by the Rinpoche deals with the Lo royal genealogy, and it contains the following names:

(1) A-ma-dpal
(2) A-mgon-bzang-po
(3) Tshangs-pa Bkra-shis-mgon
(4) Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan
(5) Don-grub-rdo-rje
(6) The son of the above; his name is not given
(7) A-mgon Bsam-’grub-rab-brtan-phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal
(8-a) Bsam-’grub-dpal-’bar
(8-b) A-mchog Brtan-pa’i-rdo-rje
(9) Tshe-dbang alias Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu

This account is very similar to that of Tsarang M. It nevertheless is missing two generations between Bkra-shis-mgon and Don-grub-rdo-rje. Furthermore, whereas Tsarang M. calls Bkra-shis-mgon’s son and successor Grags-pa-mtha’-yas, here he is called Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan.

The name Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan is prominent among the names of those to whom Glo-bo mkhan-chen wrote letters and instructions. Some of those writings address him as “ruler” (mi yi dbang), and one of the titles contains a word for “prince,” rgyal sras. The ruler Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan is mentioned for instance in a dedicatory work entitled Bka’ ’bum gyi dkar chag gsal ba’i sgron ma which was appended to a Lama’s collected works. There the real patron was one A-ham Brtan-pa’i-rgya-mtsho (also spelled Bstan-
pa'i-rgya-mtsho) who was mentioned together with Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan and who seems to have been his brother.53 Incidentally, this work also gives the name of Brtan-pa'i-rgya-mtsho's son; he was the monk ’Jam-dbyangs-rin-chen-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po.54

Thus two names—Grags-pa-mtha’-yas in Tsarang M. and Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan in other sources—are given for Bkra-shis-mgon's main son and successor. These are probably alternative names for the same person. A good indication that this is the case is given by the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche in his Rin chen phra tshom, a newly compiled history of the Lo rulers that is based mainly on Tsarang M., but which also incorporates material from other sources. This work mentions A-ham Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan-grags-pa-mtha’-yas-pa’i-sde as the ruler in this generation.55

Outside sources thus provide the names of the main ruler in generation 4 and one of his layman brothers. Furthermore, there was one male sibling in this generation who lived the life of a monk. Tsarang M. and the gdung rabs state that Grags-pa-mtha’-yas had an older brother, the noble monk (zhabs drung) chos-rje Chos-kyi-blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan or just Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan.56 References to this person can also be located elsewhere. One important source that mentions a monk with this name is a prayer to the monks born in the Lo ruling house entitled Shri mi yi dbang phyug mahādharma-raja a ham gyi gdung las zhabs drung mkhas shing grub brnyes rim par byon pa rnams la gsol ba ’debs byin rlabs chu rgyun. It was composed by the Ngor Khang-gsar mkhan-po Ngag-dbang-bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan-blo-gros-mi-zad-pa’i-sgra-dbyangs in the fire-dog year of the 15th cycle (rab tshes), which is equivalent to the year 1886.57 The work contains invocational prayers to the following lamas:58

1. Bsod-nams-lhun-grub-legs-pa’i-byung-gnas-dpal-’bzang-po
2. Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan
3. Bla-ma ’Jam-dbyangs
4. Bsod-nams-dpal-’byor-bzang-po
5. Chos-rje Bsod-nams-bstan-’dzin-dbang-po
6. Rdo-rje-’phrin-las
7. ’Chi-med-phan-bde’i-snying-po

Except for the last one, all of these names are found in Tsarang
The first lama mentioned, Bsod-nams-lhun-grub, is the Glo-bo mkhan-chen. Following him there appears the name Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, no doubt identical with the Chos-kyi-blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan named in Tsarang M. as Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s nephew. This person, moreover, is probably to be identified with the individual called “Drung-blo-pa” for whom Glo-bo mkhan-chen composed a number of short letters and instructions. Finally, the biography of Gtsang-smyon Heruka also mentions that one of Gtsang-smyon’s disciples during that master’s last visit to Lo was Chos-rje Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan.

**Generation 5.** Were it not for the Lo gdung rabs, we would know nothing about this generation. The gdung rabs states that Grags-pa-mtha’-yas had three sons:

- 5-a Khri-thog-pa Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas
- 5-b Sde-pa Kun-dga’-blo-gros
- 5-c Chos-mdzad Bsod-nams-dpal-’bar

No details are given about them or their deeds, except that Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas had two sons. From the titles of the three members of generation five, it is clear that the first two were active in the secular sphere while the third was a noble monk. Strangely, the latter is not mentioned in the prayer to the noble monks Shṛi mi yi dbang phyug.

The gdung rabs also states that Grags-pa-mtha’-yas’s younger brother, Brtan-pa’i-rgya-mtsho, had a son named Sde-pa A-drung. His title indicates that he had a political role. As noted above, a son of Brtan-pa’i-rgya-mtsho is also mentioned in a minor work of Glo-bo mkhan-chen, but that son was a monk and was named ‘Jam-dbyangs-rin-chen-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po. Either Brtan-pa’i-rgya-mtsho had more than one son, or else his one son at different times was both a monk and a secular leader.

Not a single member of this generation is mentioned in Tsarang M. Because the account of this generation is very brief in the gdung rabs, perhaps the compiler of the Molla overlooked it. It is also curious that this and the following generation are not mentioned in the extract from the hem chag of ‘Chi-med-dpal-’dren-bzang-mo.

**Generation 6.** According to Tsarang M., the ruler Grags-pa-mtha’-yas had two sons, one of whom was the ruler Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang. But as we have seen, that Molla skipped generation 5.
Instead, it should have said that Khri-thog-pa Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas had two sons—Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang and one other brother. The name of this brother is given in the *gdung rabs* as Sde-pa Bkra-shis-'od-'bar.

The main ruler of this generation, Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang, seems not to have fathered any children. According to the *gdung rabs*, the father of the next generation was “Bsod-nams-bkra-shis,” apparently an alternative name or mistake for Bkra-shis-'od-'bar.

*Generation 7.* The *bem chag* of 'Chi-med-dpal-'dren-bzang-mo (hereafter cited as 'Chi med) after skipping two generations continues its list by mentioning the next two generations together as “Don-grub-rdo-rje and son” (*don grub rdo rje yab sras*). This account is also supported by one of the important sources for the history of Lo in the late 16th century, the biography of Chos-skyabs-dpal-bzang in D. Snellgrove’s *Four Lamas of Dolpo*. That work, in passages which refer to the last decades of the 16th century, mentions rulers named Don-grub-rdo-rje and Bsam-grub-rdo-rje, and it also mentions a person called 'O-lo who was the younger brother of one of them.

This 'O-lo was a devoted disciple of Chos-skyabs-dpal-bzang and he is the first member of the Lo ruling line to be mentioned in the biography. At that time 'O-lo’s elder brother is said to be the Lo ruler. Then 'O-lo himself died. Soon thereafter the Lo ruler Don-grub-rdo-rje is recorded to have come with his retinue from Tsarang to Dolpo. A little while later in the book the ruler Bsam-grub-rdo-rje visits Dolpo from Lo. It is impossible to date these events precisely, but the work clearly indicates that both Don-grub-rdo-rje and Bsam-grub-rdo-rje were alive near the end of the 16th century.

Rulers named Don-grub-rdo-rje and Bsam-grub-rdo-rje indeed figure prominently in *Tsarang M.*, as well as in the Lo *gdung rabs*. In *Tsarang M.*, the main ruler in this generation was Don-grub-rdo-rje who is said to have had two brothers. It states furthermore that Don-grub-rdo-rje’s older brother was the monk Chos-rje 'Jam-dbyangs-pa. This person is no doubt identical with the Bla-ma 'Jam-dbyangs mentioned third in *Shrī mi yi dbang phyug*, the collection of prayers to the noble monks of the lineage. The remaining brother probably was the person called 'O-lo in the *Four Lamas of Dolpo*. In the *gdung rabs*, however, he is called Sde-pa Rab-brtan.

*Generation 8.* According to *Tsarang M.*, Don-grub-rdo-rje had
two sons, the eldest of whom was his successor, Bsam-grub-rdo-rje.70 The younger of the two, it states, was the monk Bsd-nams-dpal-byor.71 This same person is one of the noble monks to whom prayers are addressed in Shrī mī yi dbang phyug; his prayer is the fourth out of seven, and it immediately follows that of Bla-ma 'Jam-dbyangs.

Generation 9. For the ruler that followed Don-grub-rdo-rje's son, 'Chi med gives the name Bsam-grub-rab-brtan-phoygs-thams-cad-las-rnam-par-rgyal-ba. This agrees with Tsarang M. and the gdung rabs, which list a Bsam-grub-rab-brtan as the next ruler.72 This king, however, is not mentioned in any other presently accessible source. Neither Tsarang M. nor the gdung rabs mention his having had any brothers.

Generation 10. Here 'Chi med supplies the names of two brothers: Bsam-grub-dpal-'bar and A-mchog Brtan-pa'i-rdo-rje. Of this pair, the former is also mentioned in a historical document from Ladakh.73 Tsarang M. basically agrees with these sources, stating that the ruler in this generation was Bsam-grub-dpal-'bar, who had two brothers.74 This Molla also states that Bsam-grub-dpal-'bar's elder brother was the monk Bsd-nams-bstan-'dzin-dbhang-po.75 The latter is in fact mentioned as the fifth noble monk in Shrī mī yi dbang phyug. The Lo gdung rabs also confirms the above, but it gives the name Mi-dbang A-mchog Brtan-pa for the younger brother.

Generation 11. The passage from 'Chi med copied by the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche concludes at this generation with the assertion that the son of Bsam-grub-dpal-'bar and A-mchog Brtan-pa'i-rdo-rje was the Lo ruler Tshe-dbang alias Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu. This king, who flourished c. 1710, is mentioned in two different documents from Dzar in the Muktināth valley that were photographed by Ms. Sidney Schuler. One document—a letter from the Lo ruler 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul dated the water-horse year (1822?)—mentions the earlier ruler Tshe-dbang- lhun-grub in connection with an order sent by him to the Skye-sky-a-sgang-pa nobles in Dzar and Dzong.76 Another document, this one dating to the 18th century, mentions the Lo ruler Gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu and his daughter Rgyal-mo Su-ga.77 The latter married the Dzar nobleman 'Jam-dbyangs-lha-mo (d. 1728?).

These sources tend to agree with Tsarang M., 'Chi med, and the gdung rabs; the name Tshe-dbang is most probably a shorter form
of Tshe-dbang-lhun-grub, and Gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu is an abbreviation of Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu.

**Generation 12.** Here we face some problems that only the *gdung rabs* can solve. The account of 'Chi med ends at generation 10, and at this point Tsarang M. is missing one or more folios. In this lacuna the names of some three generations of rulers are missing. According to the *gdung rabs*, the ruler Tshe-dbang had two main sons: (12-a) A-ham Bkra-shis-nram-rgyal and (12-b) Zhabs-drung Sprul-pa'i-sku. In addition, he also fathered several children with women who were not his main consort.

Bkra-shis-nram-rgyal is referred to as the ruler who received the 8th Zhwa-dmar Karma-pa and the Si-tu Rin-po-che when the latter two visited Lo in 1724. The same ruler is recorded to have been received by the 7th Dalai Lama.

**Generation 13.** Bkra-shis-nram-rgyal's consort was the Ladakhi princess Nor-'dzin-bde-legs-dbang-mo. According to the *gdung rabs*, their children were the ruler A-mgon Bsod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal and his sister, the nun Kun-dga'-'chi-med, elsewhere called 'Chi-med-dpal-'dren-bzang-mo. A king named Bstan-'dzin is mentioned by other sources from this period; the biography of Kab-thog rig-'dzin Tshe-dbang-nor-bu (1698-1755) states that he visited Lo Mönthang in 1729 upon the invitation of a descendant of A-ma-dpal, the king A-ham Bstan-'dzin. Elsewhere in the surviving writings of Tshe-dbang-nor-bu there is found a letter that he wrote in the year 1749 to the Lo ruler Bstan-'dzin.

Bstan-'dzin's sister 'Chi-med-dpal-'dren-bzang-mo was an influential noble nun, and her *bem chag*, an important source for this period, still survives in Lo, as mentioned above. She and her mother are the only females given prominent notice in the *gdung rabs*.

**Generation 14.** The sole son of Bsod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal was, according to the *gdung rabs*, the ruler Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje, one of the better-known kings of Lo. He is mentioned in both Namgyal M. and Mönthang M. His name would also be mentioned in Tsarang M. except for the lacuna that continues through the beginning of the passage about him. Nepalese sources speak of Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje as being the ruler of Lo immediately after the conquest of Jumla by Gurkha. Thus he can be identified with the ruler mentioned in Tsarang M. who received high recognition from the Chinese emperor on account of his skillful (diplomatic?) actions during the Tibetan-Nepalese war of 1788-1792.
Generation 15. Two sons of Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje are mentioned in Mönthang M. and Namgyal M. They are 'Jam-dpal-rdo-rje and Bkra-shis-snying-po. Tsarang M., however, mentions only the latter, Bkra-shis-snying-po, by name. But it also states that Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje had a total of three sons, one of whom was the monk Rdo-rje-'phrin-las. Shri mi yi dbang phyug too mentions a Rdo-rje-'phrin-las; he is the sixth noble monk to whom a prayer is directed.

The account of the gdung rabs, which draws to a close with this generation, is similar. It speaks of three sons of Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje: (15-a) Bkra-shis-snying-po-phyogs-las-rnam-par-rgyal-ba'i-sde, (15-b) 'Chi-med-phan-bde'i-snying-po, and (15-c) Sprul-pa'i-sku Rdo-rje-'phrin-las. This confirms that Bkra-shis-snying-po was the name of the main ruler in this generation and that Rdo-rje-'phrin-las was the name of a younger brother who was a lama. For the third brother, however, there is a new name, one that also appears in Shri mi yi dbang phyug as the name of the last religious leader to whom a prayer is addressed. Thus this generation seems to have had two men of religion.

Generation 16. The main ruler in this generation is 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul. Concerning him, the Rin chen phra tshom—which here supplies many details not found in Tsarang M.—states that this ruler also had the name Theg-mchog-seng-ge. The ruler 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul is also mentioned in Mönthang M. as the successor to Bkra-shis-snying-po.

We have already met with the name 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul above as that of the sender of a letter to a nobleman in the Muktināth area. Its recipient was one Kun-dga'-rab-brtan of the Chongkhor (chos 'khor) lineage, and the letter was dated the water-horse year (probably 1822). Many other documents mentioning him and both the prior and succeeding kings no doubt survive in Lo; such documents probably can also be found in the archives of the Nepalese government.

Generation 17 and 18. These are probably the last generations mentioned in Tsarang M. This Molla specifies Kun-dga'-nor-bu as the next ruler, and this name is also found in Mönthang M. as that of 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul's son and successor. The last name to appear in the historical section of Tsarang M., however, is Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-'dul. That passage refers in particular to "the present ruler and dharmarāja, A-ham Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-
'dul, with consort and son.' The Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche in his *Rin chen phra tshom* interpreted this passage as simply referring back to 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul of generation 16. His son would then have been Kun-dga'-nor-bu of generation 17. But in *Tsarang M.* after the close of the historical section, on the concluding page of the work, three alternatives are listed for the "present ruler and dharma king": A-ham Dngos-grub-dpal'-bar, A-ham 'Jam-dbyangs-rgyal-mtshan, and A-ham Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-'dul. Two of these names also conclude Mönthang *M.:* Chos-rgyal Dngos-grub-dpal-'bar and A-mgon 'Jam-dbyangs-rgyal mtshan. But instead of Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-'dul, and in fact immediately after Kun-dga'-nor-bu, one finds mentioned the ruler Rgyal-sras Kham-gsum-dbang-'dus. Thus Bstan-'dzin-'jam-dpal-dgra-'dul seems to have been a separate later ruler, perhaps 18-a. But one will need more documentation to confirm this.

The Genealogy of the Lo Mönthang Kings from the 14th Through the 19th Centuries: A Summary

The foregoing compilations and comparisons have shown that most of the outside references that mention the Lo rulers support the general history found in *Tsarang M.* To sum up these findings, here follows a list of the males in the Lo ruling line as mentioned in *Tsarang M.*, the *gdung rabs*, and the other sources. This list spans the twenty generations of the *Tsarang M.* history: three generations before A-ma-dpal and sixteen generations after him. The period covered by the lives of these men is from the mid 14th until the mid 19th centuries, roughly five centuries in all.

In the following list, the names of the main rulers mentioned by *Tsarang M.* have been italicized. As in some of the above lists, those persons whose career was primarily that of a monk have been indicated by an "m" in parentheses. There were several instances in this lineage of monks who later reverted to lay life and of laymen who took ordination after long secular careers. But it is not practicable to indicate all such cases here. In the list I have also not given such titles as A-ham and A-mgon before the personal names.
5-a. Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas (fl. c. 1530)
5-b. Kun-dga'-blo-gros
5-c. Bsod-nams-dpal-'bar (m)

*5. A-drung (Ọ Jam-dbyangs-rin-chen-rgyal-mtshan, the monk?)

6-a. Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang (fl. c. 1550)
6-b. Bkra-shis-'od-'bar

*6. Chos-dpal-bzang-po (m)

7-a. 'Jam-dbyangs-pa (m)
7-b. Don-grub-rdo-rje (fl. c. 1580)
7-c. Rab-brtan (also called 'O-lo ?)

8-a. Bsam-grub-rdo-rje (fl. c. 1620)
8-b. Bsod-nams-dpal-'bar (m)

9. Bsam-grub-rab-brtan (fl. c. 1650)

10-a. Bsod-nams-bstan-'dzin dbang-po (m)
10-b. Bsam-grub-dpal-'bar (fl. c. 1675)
10-c. Brtan-pa'i-rdo-rje
11. *Tshe-dbang*, also known as *Gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu* (fl. c. 1700)

12-a. *Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal* (fl. c. 1720)

12-b. *Zhabs-drung Sprul-pa'i-sku* (m)

13. *Bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal* (fl. c. 1740)

14. *Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje* (fl. 1780)

15-a. *Bkra-shis-snying-po* (fl. c. 1800)

15-b. *'Chi-med-phan-dbe'i-snying-po* (m?)

15-c. *Rdo-rje-'phrin-las* (m)

16. *'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul*, also known as *Theg-mchog-seng-ge* (fl. c. 1825)

17. *Kun-dga'-nor-bu* (fl. c. 1845)
1. Glo-bo mkhan-chen wrote his biography at the request of Sa-skya lobs-ka 'Jam-dbyangs-kun-dga'-bsod-nams (1485-1533), the twenty-second occupant of the Sakya throne. The copy I used was a recent 16-folio tshugs thung manuscript that was copied from the set of Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s collected works preserved in Gelung. In addition, two beautiful dbu can manuscripts of the autobiography are now in the Tōkyō Bunko (Oriental Library) Tokyo. See Z. Yamaguchi (ed.), Catalogue of the Tōkyō Bunko Collection of Tibetan Works on History (Tokyo: 1970), numbers 41-683 and 44-694.

2. The full title of this work is: Mkhas pa rnam sjug pa'i sgo'i rnam par bshad pa rig gnas gsal byed. I consulted a 302-folio dbu can manuscript of this work, which constitutes volume 43 in the Tōkyō Bunko Tibetan manuscript collection. Glo-bo mkhan-chen completed this work at Bsam-grub-gling in the year 1527.

3. The copy I had access to was a 125-folio dbu med manuscript. It was missing a few folios, for example, fol. 10. According to the colophon, Kun-dga 'grol-mchog composed the work at Rdo-rje-brag, in 1535.

4. This work was cited by Tucci, Preliminary Report, p. 17. The author of the biography was the Ngor abbot Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs. He completed it in 1688. This work was reprinted in New Delhi in 1976 by Trayang and Jamyang Samten, together with the Kye rdor rnam bshad of the Sde-dge yab-chen.

5. This and most of the other texts photographed by Schuler were written on unnumbered folios in dbu med script. This work in particular is 10 folios long, and it is pp. 42 to 51 of the text according to my pagination. It begins with the six-syllable mantra om mani padme hum and goes on to tell the legend of the monkey and the rock demoness. For the extract see Appendix I.

6. From the autobiography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen, p. lb:

bdag cag gi rigs rus la sogs pa ni/ bod kyi mi rigs khyung po'i rus tshan sa gnam zhes bya ba/ mnga' ris gung thang gi rje btsad rnam kyi las kha 'dzin pa'i rigs yin/ dang po snga mo'i dus su bon po'i drang srong mthu bo che 'ga' re dang/ rje btsun mi la la sogs pa'ga' zhig byung kyang/ bar skabs gcig nas dpon po dge sbyong a ma dpal yan la/ bstan pa la bya ba byas pa'i rnam bzhag dod pa'i tshang [read: tshad?] ni ma byung]

The translation of dod pa'i tshang (=tshad?) as “in equal measure” is conjectural.

7. From the colophon of the Mkhas 'jug rnam bshad:

gshen bon sa gnam' gyi btsun pa bsod nams lhun grub legs pa'i 'byung gnas rgyal mthshan dpal bzas pos thub bstan dar rgyas gling gi chos sder bris shing/ blo bo lo tstsha ba chen po shes rab rin chen dang/ rje btsun sa skya pa chen po'i dngos kyi slob ma rong sgm gyis kyang bzhugs par grags pa'i gnas chen bsam grub gling gi dgon par thams cad 'dul gyi lo la legs par bris pa'o/

8. From the biography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen by Kun-dga' grol-mchog, p. 9a:

da ni yab yum sogs gang la 'khrungs pa'i tshul cung zad brjod pa' di ltar thos

de’ang spyan’dren pa glo bo sde ba bstan pa’i sbyin bdag chen po dge sbyong a me dpal zhes pa yab sras kyi lo rgyus ni| drung dge sbyong pa ’di ‘jam dpal rtsa rgyud dang/ slob dpon pad ma’i lung bstan la yong [read: yang] gsung zhung [p. 236] bod mnga’ ris rdzong ka’i drung skor yin gdung rus gnam ru khyung yin| sгон гири груб щоб ре бсут ми ла согс данг гсг/ а ма дпал ’ди мкхёйн па ньонг [read: yang] пас/ бод чос ргьял гири гдунг брыуд дри ма мед па мнгай’ ris rdzong kar gyi chos rgyal ‘bum lde mgon gyis gling gi las thabs bcu gsum yod par bshad pa’i glo bor gtsang rang bya pho’i ze ba zhes pa’i rdzong rgyab yong ba’i rdzong dpon la brkos pa las/ phyis glo bo khong gis sger du chong/dol po hu hrangs/ gu ge sogs la’ang lung gro bar byung|

10. On p. 49 (my pagination, the text itself has no page numbers):

chos brgyud mi la ras pa| bon brgyud zing pa mthu chen| mi brgyud stag rgya’o| sa stengs gnam ’og la dbang bsgyur ba dang|

11. I know of five sources that contain a legendary account of the origins of the Khyung-po clan:

I.) Kun-grol-grags-pa (b. 1700), Sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa spyi yi ’byung khungs yid bzhin nor bu ’dod pa ’jo ba’i gter mdzod. Published as the second of Three Sources for a History of Bon (Delhi: 1972), pp. 426-428.


IV.) Kong-sprul Blo-gros-mtha’-yas (1813-1899), Phyogs med ris med kyi bstan pa la ’dan zhung dge sbyong gi gzugs brnyan ’chang ba blo gros mtha’ yas kyi sde’i byung ba brjod pa nor bu sna tshogs mdog can (the second of the two works published under the English title The Autobiography of ’Jam-mgon Kong-spr’ul Blo-gros-mtha’-yas) (Kangra: 1973), pp. 94-95. For this account in English see E. Gene Smith, “Introduction to Kongtral’s Encyclopedia,” pp. 28-29, note 57.
V.) Kong-sprul, Dpal spungs yang khrod kun bzang bde chen 'od gsal gling rten dang brten par bcas pa'i dkar chag zhi gis kun tu khyab pa'i sgra dbyangs, Collected Works, (Paro: 1975), vol 11, p. 17.

Here is the legend that they contain:

The ultimate originator of the Khyung-po clan was a divine figure named Rig-snang 'Od-kyi-rgyal-po (I, II, III, IV, V). He was the emanation of Samantabhadr (I, II, III, VI and V), and is further called “teacher of the upper realm” (steng phyogs kyi ston pa) (IV, V), and one of the six Rig-'dzin zhig-po (V). From Rig-snang 'Od-kyi-rgyal-po there emanated a khyung bird (bya khyung, I; khyung chen, IV; mkha' lding khyung chen, V) or three khyung birds (II, III). The khyung or khyungs descended to a special spot (Zhang-zhung kha-yug, I, II, III; Gyim-shod ri-bo-rtse-drug, IV).

The descent was noticed by the people of the country (II, III, IV), who said that the bird(s) was a male khyung (khyung pho, II, IV) because it had horns (II, III).

The khyung(s) landed, and then took to flight again. On the spot of ground where the clawed feet (spar mo, II, III, IV) had touched, as a consequence of the heat and moisture from that contact (II, III), four eggs came into existence. Of these four, the first three were respectively white, black and yellow (I, II, III). The fourth egg (or third in the sequence of IV and V) was variegated (khra, I, II, III) or green (ljang, IV) or turquoise-green (g. yu, V).

After three nights and four days (I), four boys emerged from the four eggs. As to their order and names, the sources give the following:

1. Khyung-dkar thog-la-'bar (I, II, III)
   Khyung-rgod thog-'bar (I, p. 428)
   Khyung-rgod thog-la-me-'bar (IV)
   Khyung thog-'bar (II)
2. Khyung-ser-lha-khyung (II, III)
   Lha-khyung-rgyan-pa (I, p. 428)
   Lha-khyung (IV)
3. Khyung-'phags khra-mo (I, II, IV, V)
   Khyung-'phags-khra-bo (III; Khyung-'phags-khro-bo (III, p. 31)
4. Khyung-nag-Mu-khyung-rgyan (III)
   Mu-khyung-rgyan (I, II)
   Mu-khyung-brgyan (I, p. 428)
   Mu-khyung (IV)

For each of the four boys there also came into existence a “life-stone” (bla rdo'i pha bong or pha wang, I), “precious castle” (rin chen sku mkhar), and a “turquoise lake” (g. yu'i mishes) (I, II, III). Furthermore, each of the four boys built special castles (skyid kyi mkhar, I, II; gsas khang, III).

Of the four youths, three remained closer to the original spot of the khyung's descent, while a fourth, Khyung-'phags-khra-mo who was the second to the youngest (tha ltag, I, II, III, IV, V), rode east on a turquoise dragon (g. yu 'brug, II, IV, V; g. yu 'brug sngon po, I; g. yu 'brug sngon mo, II). He landed in Rgyal-rong in far-eastern Tibet, where he founded a family line (I, II, III, IV, V).

12. H. E. Richardson, “Ministers of the Tibetan Kingdom,” The Tibet

13. The ancestors of Mi-la-ras-pa, for example.


16. See above, the last paragraph in note 11.

17. Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, Bod rje (=Gung thang gdung rabs) (MS Dujom Rinpoche), pp. 2a-2b:

de yang gung thang gi yul thog mar ’dzin pa po ni/ sngon rgyal po gnam ri srong btsan gyi sku rings tsam du dbus gtsang nas mi gtsos gsum ’khor dang bcas te yul tshol la ’ongs nas gung thang shar pa’i riser slebs tshe bla’as pas ljongs bzang po mthong nas rmgog la chol phor byas te yul rgyan du dor te bsgos pas/ rgyan po che rim gyi[s] ’dzang gshong lta sdong gsum mes po pha tsher ’thug pos ’dzang gzhung thob/ mes po ’dam seng g.yu rl ra can gyi[s] gshong gzhung thob/ sa nam gyi mes po sta skya bo chu ral can gyi[s] lta gdong thob ste/ sa nam rgyan pham te yid ma tshim par slar yang sho la smad du yul tshol la phyin pas yul bzang mang ba rnyed de yid dga’ ba glu blang ba/

This manuscript copy in the possession of Dujom Rinpoche was copied from an original in the library of Burmiak Athing (Ka 27). I first learned of this work from Mr. E. Gene Smith, who generously loaned me his own copy for some time. Mr. Smith’s copy was made in Sikkim from the same original, but instead of Sta-skya-bo as the name of the Sa-gnam mes-po, it gives the spelling Stagrgya-bo (“Bearded Tiger”). Through the help of Mr. Tashi Tsering I was able to confirm that this is also the reading in the Burmiak Athing manuscript. But in the Logdung rabs the name of generation 24 in the pre-A-ma-dpal lineage is Stagsky-a-bo.

18. The word I have translated as “seer” is drang srong, the usual equivalent for the Sanskrit rṣi. In the later systematized Bon religion, however, the word is the title of a fully ordained monk, equivalent to the term dge slong in Tibetan Buddhism (Sanskrit: bhikṣu). See Karmay, Treasury, p. 350. Here the term seems not to be used in its special Bonpo sense.

19. Perhaps one should read gnam gshen instead of rnam gshen in source C. Gnam gshen is possibly an abbreviation of gnam bon gshen po chen po, a high ranking Bonpo priest whose religious function was linked to the political power of the early Tibetan kings. See Haarh, p. 108.

Gnam (sky or heaven) had a special significance in ancient Tibetan theogonies, as noted above. But for the Mustang ruling line the term was especially important since it forms part of two of their lineage names: sa gnam and gnam lha gdung brgyud. The latter appears in both Tsarang M. (p. 7b) and in Shri mi yi dbang phyug.

20. See Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsdod-nams-lhun-grub, Rje btsun mi las mthar thug gi lta ba ji ltar bzhed tshul bkod pa ’khrul med snang ba. This short work was


22. Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, *Bod rje (=Gung thang gdung rabs)* (MS Dujom Rinpoche), p. 14b:

khri dpon byir ma'i rigs rgyud glo bo khri dpon du grags pa rim can da lta'i bar byung ba de rnamz zer or/

23. Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, *Bod rje*, p. 16a:

pu hreng dbang du mdzad pa'i dng mag dpon khri dpon jir ma'i gcung chos skyong 'bum gyi[s] byas pas de yi bya dgur glo bo dol po'i mi dpon du bskos pa'i rigs rgyud glo bo rgyal por grags pa da lta'i bar rgyun mi chad pa'di'o/


25. The Venerable Chogay Trichen, *Rin chen phra tshom*, p. 3: de'i sras gung thang khyung rdzong dkar po'i chos rgyal dbang phug yon tan 'bum gyi sras glo bo'i rgyal thog dang po chos rgyal a ma dpal ni/

No ruler by the name of Dbang-phug-yon-tan-'bum is listed in the *Gung thang gdung rabs*. The most likely rulers would have been Khri Phun-tshogs-lde (1338-1370), and his sons Khri Mchog-grub-lde and Khri Rgyal-bsod-nams-lde (1371-1404).

26. This gdung rabs will be described more fully just below.

27. *Blo bo chos rgyal rim byon rgyal rabs mu thi li* i'phreng mdzes, p. 3b:

dang po phibs tshul ni/ 'od gsal lha nas phibs/ lha 'od de gung rgyal/ lha nas btsan du phibs/ btsan pa kha che/ btsan nas dmu ru phibs/ dmu sde rigs khyi chung/ dmu nas mi ru phibs pas/ gnam lha gung rgyal zhes bya ba de yang/ thog mar bod kyi sa cha la dbang che ba ma sangs/ bar du dbang che ba zhang zhung/ tha mar [4a] bod zhes grags pa byung/ de la zhang zhung gis dbang byed pa'i dus/ yul la snga ba yar lung sa mkhar/ mi la snga ba zhang zhung rus drug/ lha la snga ba yar lha sham po zhes grags/ de dus yul mtha' bzhi phyogs ri/ mi byed/ mi la rigs sur kyi shan mi 'byed/ mi dang la ru ma phyel/ de tsam na/ gnam lha gung rgyal zhes bya ba/ gnam la yar gizgs pas 'khor lo rtsibs brgyad du 'dug/ sa la mar gizgs pas padma 'dab brgyad du 'dug/ logs la phar gizgs pas rin chen zur brgyad du 'dug/ de'i tshe sa dang gnam gyi bdag po nga min su yang med do byas nas/ sa la mkhar btab/ yul la ming btags/ phyogs dang ris su bcad pas/ sa gnam zhes grags pa yin/

See also below, chapter 10, note 3.

On other gdung rabs of the Lo kings see above, Preface, note 1.
28. Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, *Bod rje (=Gung thang gdung rabs*) (MS Dujom), p. 16a, See also above, n. 23.


30. The basic name seems to have been A-ma-dpal. I have not found any explanation for the form “A-ma.” Had the form been “A-me,” one would have been tempted to link it to a-mes, a-ame or a-myes. Cf. the names of two early Derge kings, A-mye-dge-ba-dpal and A-mye-byams-pa-dpal. Joseph Kolmaš, *A Genealogy of the Kings of Derge* (Prague: Oriental Institute in Academic, 1968), pp. 46-47.


35. Ibid.: a jo kha che ba sku mched gnyis sde srid skyong ba dang/ bdag bcag [sic] chung ba gnyis chos thog tu gnas pa'i lugs yin pa la/ phyis ni khong sku mched gsum kas 'jig rten gyi lugs byed.


38. Glo-bo mkhan-chen, *Chos rgyal chen po*, p. 199.3.


41. Glo-bo-mkhan-chen, *Rje btsun bla ma*, p. 14a. Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, in his biography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen (*Dpal ldan bla ma*, p. 50a), states that Glo-bo mkhan-chen returned to Lo in his thirtieth year (1485), having visited Ngor and Rtse-gdong for the first time. See also A-mes-zhabs Ngag-dbang-kun-dga'-bsod-nams, *Dpal sa skyi pa'i yab chos kyi snying khu 'khor lo sdom pa'i dam pa'i chos byung ba'i tshul legs par bshad pa bde mchog chos kun gsal ba'i nyin byed* (New Delhi: Ngawang Topgay, 1974), p. 549. Glo-bo mkhan-chen's first trip to Gtsang, however, was probably some ten years later, since Sa-lo Kun-dga'-bsod-nams was not born until 1485 and took dge bsnyen vows from Glo-bo mkhan-chen at age ten (=1495). See *ibid.*, p. 553.7. Glo-bo mkhan-chen states in his autobiography (*Rje btsun bla ma*, p. 13a) that at the time of his first trip the great ruler (Bkra-shis-mgon) was not alive. As mentioned above, that king died in 1489. Also, according to Kun-dga'-grol-mchog's biography of Glo-bo mkhan-chen, *Dpal ldan bla ma*, P. 48b. Dkon-mchog- 'phel (d. 1514) was the abbot of Ngor during that visit. Had the visit been in 1485, Go-bo rab- 'byams-pa Bsod-nams-seng-ge would have been the abbot.

The confusion of Kun-dga'-grol-mchog and the sources that follow him probably derived from the scarcity of dates and other details in Glo-bo mkhan-
chen's autobiography.

43. Rgod-tshang-ras-pa, pp. 177, 186.
46. This work will be described below in more detail. According to the Rin chen phra tshom, p. 9, 'Chi-med-dpal-'dren-bzang-mo was the younger sister of the ruler Bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal: de'i gcung 'chi med dpal 'dren bzang mo zhes lugs gnyis kyi spryan yangs pa de sa rnying dkar gsum gyi chos gsan rgya che lo gsum phyogs gsum dang kye rdor gzhi brnyen sogs sgrub pa'i rgyal mtshan btsugs/
47. S.C. Das, Tibetan-English Dictionary, p. 876, equates bem chag with dkar chag, but then lists only one limited signification of the term: “list of contents.”
48. For the text of this extract from 'Chi med see below, Appendix G.
49. Tsarang M., p. 11a.
50. Three replies by Glo-bo mkhan-chen to the queries of Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan are found in his Collected Works, vol. 3, pp. 5-28.
51. Glo-bo mkhan-chen, Mi'i dbang mgon po rgyal mtshan gyi dris lan rgyal sras bshad pa'i me tog, Collected Works, vol. 3, pp. 5-15. Rgyal-sras is also a common designation for a Bodhisattva.
55. Rin chen phra tshom, p. 6.
56. Tsarang M., p. 11a.
57. The colophon states: yul gtsang rong gi 'khyams pa mkhan ming ngag dbang bsod nams rgyal mtshan blo gros mi zad pa'i sgra dbyangs su bod pa'i (read: pas) rab tshe me khyi gnam lo gsar... The same author wrote a Pu rang 'khor chags jo bo'i dkar chag and a commentary on the Sdom gsum 'jam dbyangs bla ma'i dgongs rgyan.
58. For the full text in transcription see below, Appendix F.
59. In the Lo gdung rabs, the last name is said to belong to the younger of Rdo-rje-'phrin-las's two older brothers, i.e., to the middle brother in generation 15.
67. Snellgrove, *Four Lamas*, vol. 1, p. 68, gave the following dates for Chos-skyabs-dpal-bzang: 1476-1565. This, however, is one sixty-year cycle too early. See Jackson, “Se-rib,” p. 218, n. 86. His dates therefore should be 1536-1625. (The birth date, however, is problematical.) Part of the *rnam thar* itself was completed in the wood-horse year (1594), but more was added later. The mention of the Glo-bo kings should probably be dated c. 1590 since it immediately precedes the end of the first part of the *rnam thar*.

68. Tsarang M., p. 11b.
69. Ibid.
70. Ibid.
71. Tsarang M., p. 12a.
72. Ibid.

74. Tsarang M., p. 12a.
75. Tsarang M., p. 12b.
77. This work has been mentioned earlier in this chapter and also above in note 5.
78. L. Petech, *Kingdom*, p. 90, contributes the main outside references to this king:

“When early in 1724 the 8th Zhva-dmar-pa and the Si-tu Pan-chen passed through Glo-bo en route to the Kailasa, they were received by the chief or king bKra-shis-rnam-gryal and his wife, as well as by the chief’s father and mother. Apparently the old chief, i.e., the man who had been made prisoner by the Mon, had abdicated in favour of his son. His wife was the elder (a-pi, literally grandmother) Nor-'dzin-dbang-mo; at that time there were two Ladakhi princesses of the same name, who had married in the Glo-bo family. Upon their return from the Kailasa, the Zhva-dmar-pa and the Si-tu met again chief bKra-shis-rnam-gryal as well as the *rje-btsun-ma* (his widowed mother?) and the La-dvags-pa(?).”

As cited by Petech, the visits by the 8th Red-hat (zhva-dmar) Karmapa were mentioned by Bai-lo Tshe-dbang-kun-khyab, *Sgrub brgyud karma kam tshang brgyud pa rin po che’i rnam par thar pa rab byams nor bu zla ba chu shel gyi phreng ba* (New Delhi: 1972), vol 2. pp. 200a, 201a. Petech also referred to the visits of Si-tu Pan-chen from the Si-tu’s own autobiography: *Ta’i si tur ‘bod pa kar ma bstan pa’i nying byed kyi rang tshul drangs por bhyod dri bral shel gyi me long [The Autobiography and Diaries of Si-tu Pan-chen]* (New Delhi: 1968), pp. 65a, 66b-67a.
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CHAPTER 10

TRANSLATION OF THE TSARANG MOLLA
HISTORY OF THE LO RULERS

[p. 7b] When the kings [known as] the three lords of the West were alive, [they] ruled the three [districts of Ngari]: Purang, Guge, and Mangyul. [Thus] there appeared a spotless lineage of kings who, by making the Noble Dharma [brightly illuminated] like the day, lived up to the name “religious king” (dharmarāja). [This has been] just a little about [these kings and] how they initiated a succession of excellent deeds that have survived as their legacy.

[Concerning the lineage of the Lo kings,] in early writings it is said:

Here in this country that contains all needful and desired things without exception,
This land of Lo, which possesses the splendor of perfect abundance,
There appeared this person of widespread fame: Shes-rab-bla-ma of the Sky-divinity (gnam lha) lineage.

And as it was stated there, the genealogical lineage of the Lo religious kings, masters watching over the Tibetan realm, came down from the clear-light gods ('od gsal lha). [The original ancestor was] the lha [divinity] 'Od-de-gung-rgyal. [That forebear] went from the lha [realm] to the [realm of the] btsan [divinities]. [As a] btsan [he was] Rgod-kha-che. From the btsan he went to the dmu [realm of divinities]; [as a] dmu [he was] Khyi'u-chung. From the dmu he went to the human world, ]8a] where he was called Mi-rje-gung-rgyal.

Looking up at the sky, he saw it as the eight-spoked wheel of the sky. Looking down at the earth, he saw the earth as an eight-petalled lotus. Looking to the sides, he saw them as an eight-sided jewel. At that time he said, “I am the master of the earth [and] sky,” and he established a castle (mkhar) on the ground, named the country and divided it into sections and divisions. Consequently, the first country was the “white earth” of Yar-klung. The first castle
was 'Om-bu-lha-mkhar. The first clans (rus) were the six clans of Zhang-zhung. The first divinity (lha) was Yar-lha-sham-po. And the first ruler was the one famed as Gnam-lha-gung-rgyal, who became the master of both earth and sky.

He had four sons, who spread both human conventions (mi chos) and divine religion (lha chos). Then there appeared a succession of generations in the royal lineage, and the sixty-first royal generation in this lineage whose extraordinary activities equalled the sky was Stag-seng-ge-'bum. His son was called Zhang [?] Shes-rab-bla-ma.6 [8b]

He controlled the activities [in the political domains] of Bla and Zhang.7 In the latter half of his life [c. 1385?], [Shes-rab-bla-ma] ruled the lands of upper and lower Lo.8 He established laws of the two systems [i.e., secular and religious]. When Zhang and Shes [=Shi-sa] came into conflict, [Shes-rab-bla-ma] defeated the glorious attacking forces and was victorious in the battle of heroes.

He had two sons, the younger of whom was Chos-skyong-'bum, [who was like] the war-god Ge-sar.9 A-me-dpal-bzang-po-rgyal-mtshan, the Bodhisattva religious king, was this one's son.10

About this [king, A-me-dpal], it is said in a prophecy by Padmasambhava:

In the land called Lo [there will appear] the emanation of me, the one from Orgyan.

[He will be] sustained by Vajrapañi, [and] famed as "A-me."
That one will subdue many sri mo demons.
But even having subdued them, men will not be pleased;
Even though [the sri mo] try, [they] will not be able to overcome [A-me-dpal].11

This above-mentioned exalted being had as a youth [already] become complete in the basic skills of intelligence, and he possessed the wealth of wisdom. [From that early age] he was victorious in battle. He was wise and powerful both in eliminating [harmful opposition] and in favoring [those who deserved it]. [9a]

He became the master of the Ngari myriarchy.12 He directed the dominion. He made his headquarters fort (rdzong) at Mkha'-spyod-steng, [and] he built his palace (mkhar) at Mönthang (yid smon thang). He appointed people to official duties that were appropriate for great men, such as three [to the rank of] khri dpon sgo sgo, four
[to the rank of] bu sgo, four [to the rank of] rgyal ba sgo, [and others] to such [positions] as lha dpon, rdzong dpon, and tsho dpon.\textsuperscript{13} He also founded many towns.

Because he possessed both [Buddhist] religion and human conventions which contained [respectively.] religious and political laws, he paid respect to the [Three] Jewels and kindly protected the terribly destitute. He fostered the livelihood of his own people, [and] by his magnificence he overawed outsiders. [Thus] he became the master of the two [classes of] laws.

In particular, [A-me-dpal] invited Ngor-chen rdo-rje-’chang Kun-dga’-bzang-po [to Lo,] and honored [him] as his chief religious preceptor.\textsuperscript{14} [From him,] he heard profound and vast religious instructions. He [A-me-dpal] founded the Tsarang Thub-bstan-bshad-sgrub-dar-rgyas-gling seminary (chos grwa).\textsuperscript{15} He established a monastic center that included more than two thousand monks who had the vows of a correct bhikṣu.\textsuperscript{[9b]} He erected inconceivably many supports (rten) of the Conqueror’s body, speech, and mind [i.e. sacred images, scriptures and stūpas]. He gave respectful recognition to the Buddhist monastic community and discontinued the taxation of his subjects.

Because of his accomplishing such a great service to the Doctrine, even down to the present the Three Excellent Men (bzang po rnam gsum)—the religious master Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzang-po, the king A-me-dpal-bzang-po, and the minister Tshe-dbang-bzang-po—fill every direction with their fame.\textsuperscript{16} [He] was this [excellent king, A-me-dpal].

This great king had four sons, [from among whom his successor was] the religious king A-mgon-bzang-po.\textsuperscript{17} In this valiant and heroic great being’s youth, he subdued the three [regions?]: Mon, Ko, and Dol.\textsuperscript{18} He attained the position of lord who watches over the realm. He systematically appointed people to thirteen official positions that were suitable for great persons. He honored as his chief religious preceptor the third abbot of [Ngor] E-wam, ’Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho [1396-1474].\textsuperscript{19} [10a] He sponsored the building of the great Maitreya [image and temple in Mönthang]; and he commissioned the making of sacred scriptures, including the Kanjur, the Tanjur, the collected works of the Five Sakya Founders, and the collected writings of Ngor-chen rdo-rje-’chang [Kun-dga’-bzang-po], all of them being written with only powdered gold.
He sponsored the building of the Brag-dkar-theq-chen-gling [monastery].

He established monastic centers. He was the main force behind the restoration of those monastic centers that had declined and the expansion of those that had not deteriorated.

Because his activities in the political and religious domains were insuperable, he spread the law of the four limits. He ruled [men of] many different languages; consequently, the line [of rulers] descending from him was called A-ham, and his signet (phyag rtags) was the A-seal (a tham), [both of which] pervaded everywhere beneath the sun.

He had four sons, [from among whom his successor was] A-ham Tshangs-chen Bkra-shis-mgon [d. 1489]. By the power of his past deeds, [this king’s] strength was mighty, and his activities in the two spheres [religious and secular] were beyond compare. Because of that his fame permeated up to the [far] shores of the ocean. He subdued [all lands] from the three districts of Ngari down to the capital of Gru. He honored the fourth abbot of [Ngor] E-wam, Rgyal-tshab Kun-dga’-dbang-phyug [1424-1478], and the learned master of Gser-mdog-can Shākya-mchog-Idan-dri-med-legs-pa’i-blogros [1428-1507], as well as many other scholars and accomplished yogis, as his chief spiritual preceptors.

In particular, many [foreign] pundits, such as Loktāra, the fully ordained Indian monk and pundit who was energetic in observing his vows, came to Lo and were venerated [by this king]. [The king also] sponsored the translation of many religious teachings that had never before been translated in Tibet. By virtue of his great merit, he amassed people and many kinds of wealth from all areas within India and China.

He [sponsored the building of] both the temple and sacred image of the Thub-chen-rgyal-ba’i-pho-brang [a temple in Mōnthang housing a great image of Shākyamuni Buddha], and he established the monastic center at Namgyal called Thub-bstan-dar-rgyas-gling. He left an excellent legacy through his commissioning inconceivably many images, sacred scriptures, and stūpas—[making them] on a large scale and with pure materials.

This religious king’s younger brother was the lord of learning Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub-legs-pa’i-byung-gnas-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po [1456-1532]. [He] was enthroned as “abbot” (mkhan po) of the great monastic center Thub-bstan-bslad-sgrub-dar-rgyas-gling. He continuously [taught] the profound and vast cycles of religious teachings. And he became famous
in all monasteries as a model of pure monastic discipline and of propagating the teaching and realization of religion.

That [king, Bkra-shis-mgon,] had three sons, [from among whom his successor was] A-haṃ Grags-pa-mtha'-yas. [This king] maintained the religious and secular laws of his fathers and ancestors. He worshipped the saints ('phags pa) with offerings and revered those who upheld the Doctrine. In particular, he invited from [Ngor] E-wam the ninth mkhan-po, Rgyal-ba Lha-mchog-seng-ge, and the tenth mkhan-po, the omniscient Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub (1497-1557), and revered them as his chief spiritual preceptors. He spread the doctrine of the Buddha and made the monastic centers flourish. He fostered the well-being of his own people, while overaweing outsiders.

This king's own older brother, the zhabs-drung Chos-kyi-blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, ascended the religious throne of his uncle [Glo-bo mkhan-chen] at Thub-bstan-bshad -sgrub-dar-rgyas-gling, and he accomplished acts of service. [11b]

[The king] was reverent toward the [Three] Jewels and was profound in his worshipful service [to them]. Because he guarded the excellent traditions of his early ancestors, his domain spread and became vast.

He had two sons, [from among whom he was succeeded by] A-haṃ Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang. [This king] kept his own domain in order and maintained the traditions of his ancestors. His deeds, such as the making of sacred images, books, and stūpas, were vast.

He had three sons, [from among whom his successor was] A-haṃ Don-grub-rdo-rje. [This king] had great wisdom; he conquered the enemy hosts and increased his own forces. He built the Tsarang Palace, Bsam-grub-dge-'phel, restored [the temple of] Lo Gekar, and in many other ways was vast in his activities.

This king's older brother, the religious master 'Jam-dbyangs-pa, ascended the religious throne, and he expanded the monastic community.

The above [king] had two sons [from among whom he was succeeded by] A-haṃ Bsam-grub-rdo-rje. [This ruler had] intelligence beyond compare, and he upheld the two systems of law [=religious and secular]. He erected at Tsarang the Thub-bstan-bshad-sgrub-dar-rgyas-gling main temple hall (gtsug lag khang) which was excellent in its distinctive features and its pictorial decorations. He commissioned many sacred painted images and
three-dimensional images. [12a]

The king’s younger brother, the religious master Bsod-nams-dpal-byor, was enthroned on the religious seat and he spread the doctrine of both teaching and practice.

That [king had one] son: A-ham Bsam-grub-rab-brtan. [This one] cherished the royal law of the ten virtues [and] his understanding of the two domains [—religious and secular—] was vast. He maintained as his spiritual preceptors such persons as the great master from illustrious Sakya 'Jam-mgon [A-mes-zhaps] Ngag-dbang-kun-dga'-bsod-nams [1597-1659]; the abbot of [Rta-nag] Thub-bstan monastery, Chos-rnam-rgyal; and Rig-'dzin Mnga-bdag Chos-rgyal-phun-tshogs together with his [spiritual?] son.31

He commissioned the making of sacred images, scriptures and stūpas [on a scale that] is difficult for the mind to measure. He was peerless in his feats of courage.34 He protected his own domain while intimidating outsiders. He constantly passed his days and nights in continual meditation and virtuous practice alone.

He had three sons [from among whom his successor was] A-ham Bsam-grub-dpal-bar. [This king] had a vast knowledge of virtuous ways and he ruled his domain according to religious principles. [12b]

[Bsam-grub-dpal-bar’s] older brother, Bsod-nams-bstan-dzin-dbang-po, was enthroned on the religious seat, and the doctrine of the Muni became [brightly illuminated] like the day.

[Bsam-grub-dpal-bar] possessed the force of heroism, and skill in deeds. And when Lo, Jumla, Tibet, and others were at war, he won fame for being victorious against whoever opposed him. He revered the venerable Rtag-rtse-ba Mi-pham-shes-rab-phun-tshogs as his chief preceptor.35 Everywhere, both within [Lo] and without, he sponsored the making of inconceivably many sacred images, books, and stūpas. Because he worshipped the [Three] Jewels with offerings, reverently served the monastic assembly, and was energetic in his meditations, he truly lived up to the name “religious king.”

His son was A-ham Tshe-dbang, who was also known as Phuntshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu. [This king] was the rebirth (sprul pa’-sku) of Stag-sham Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje, and he was vastly knowledgeable about both religion and the world. He established the Mgon-dga’-byang-chub-gling monastic center.36 He understood the Sakya, Kargyu, and Nyingma religious systems without confounding them. Both inner and outer enemies and harmful obstacles . . . [lacuna].37
[p. 14a] Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje supported and received religious teachings from learned and realized teachers of the Sakya and Nyingma traditions, such as the great master from illustrious Sakya, Ngag-dbang-kun-dga'-blo-gros and his son [Dbang-sdud-snying-po].

He restored the Lo Gekar [temple] and built the Smon-grub lha-khang, Dbang-'dus lha-khang, and 'Bam-mkhar. He established monastic centers at Khyung-tshang, Bsam-gtan-chod-gling, and Bsam-grub-gling. He endowed [those temples] with wealth sufficient to support regular offerings in them, and [he also accomplished] vast deeds and activities such as making offerings to the [great] sacred images, scriptures and stūpas in Central Tibet (dbus), Southwest Tibet (gtsang) and Monthang (smon); respectfully serving the monastic order; upholding the laws of the two systems; desiring mutual happiness and tranquility; and sponsoring the making of sacred images, scriptures and stūpas.

The king's son zhabs-drung Rdo-rje-'phrin-las was enthroned on the religious seat. He made the doctrines of the religious domain spread widely. [14b]

When [Nepal under the] Gorkha [rulers] fought with Tibet [in 1788-1792] [Dbangs-rgyal-rdo-rje] used a combination of skillful means and wisdom [to help resolve the conflict]. Consequently, from the great heavenly ruler (gnam bskos gong ma) [the emperor of China], he received great recognition, [including] verbal praise, official name and rank, [and high insignia, such as] a crest-ornament and a feather [to be worn atop] the head. From that time forth, the fame of the Lo religious king filled all lands—[from] Rdza-ri dbyug-pa'i-rgyu in the west [to the land of] the weavers of the queen's silk in the east [==China].

This king had three sons, [from among whom his successor was] A-ham Bkra-shis-snying-po. [This king ruled over] the whole realm and in particular [watched over] upper Lo. He upheld the traditions of his ancestors.

His son was A-ham 'Jam-dpal-dgra'-dul. [This king had] great wisdom and intelligence, and he possessed tremendous might. He ruled over [both] the royal and religious dominion. He greatly revered the Bsam-gsang sprul-sku Chos-kyi-nyi-ma as his main preceptor. He was one who appeared on the outside to be an [ordinary] ruler watching over his dominion, while in fact his inner nature was that of an adept who had achieved a high level of attainment. [15a]
That [king, 'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul]'s son was A-ham Kun-dga'-nor-bu. [This king constantly] maintained the mind of a Bodhisattva. He devoted himself to the two stages [of Vajrayāna meditation, bskyed rim and rdzogs rim] alone.

Following in the successive genealogical lineage of such religious kings, there is the present ruler and religious king, A-ham Bstan-dzin-jam-dpal-dgra-'dul, together with his consort and their son. His merit is great, like [Meru] the king of mountains. His physical line of descent (sku brgyud) is long, like a river. His subjects sparkle like stars. He partakes of the lustre of perfect happiness.

This has been a recounting of the mundane histories [pertaining to] the basis: men.

Notes

1. Perhaps the “early writings” (sngon gyi yig cha rnams) were old gdung rabs. In the quotation, the lineage is referred to as gnam lha gdung brgyud (“sky-divinity lineage”). This name indicates that the lineage had a divine (lha) origin, though it may also derive from the name of the original forebear: Gnam-lha-gung-rgyal.

2. “Master watching over the Tibetan realm” (bod kham skyon ba'i bdag po) seems to have been an established appellation for a ruler in Tibet. Bod kham is perhaps short for bod kyi rgyal khams. The phrase bod kham also occurs later in Tsarang M. (p. 14b.7), but there it can hardly be translated as “Tibetan realm.” The raja Bkra-shis-shis-snying-po (fl. c. 1800) who is referred to in the second passage could not—except through the wildest hyperbole—be said to have “ruled the realm of Tibet in general,” for he was not an important raja and he ruled at a time when Lo had already become the subject of Nepal. Therefore the above phrase could also be translated simply as “master watching over the realm.” It was one of a number of stock expressions used by speechmakers to characterize a ruler, much like rang sde la 'tsho skyon/ gzhon sde la zil gyis gnon (p. 7a and elsewhere). A longer set phrase for “this Tibetan realm” is found in the Bshad mdzod T. (pp. 171.5; 182.5): mnga' ris bod kyi rgyal khams 'dir.

3. The same myth for the origin of the line is found in the Lo gdung rabs. See above, chapter 9, note 27. For a very similar manner of descent as claimed by the Dzar-Dzong rulers of the Muktināth valley, see the dkar chag to the Skag MS of [the Bka' thang ga'u ma, Gu ru padma'i rim nam thar las thang yig ga'u ma'i dkar chag (Dalhousie: Damchoe Sangpo, 1981), p. 7. I am indebted to Mr. Tashi Tsering for showing me this work.

4. On this vision of the sacred spot, see Stein, Tribus, p. 12, note 29.

5. Cf. his clan (rus) name, sa gnam khyung po. Cf. also the term gnam sa'i lugs “the pattern of heaven and earth,” which apparently was a synonym of lha chos. See D. Snellgrove and H. Richardson, A Cultural History of Tibet (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), p. 59.

6. Zhang is an old clan name. It is also a title that indicates a person's rela-
tionship (or the relationship of one of his ancestors?) as a maternal uncle of a member of the old Tibetan royalty. See H. Richardson, “Names and Titles in Early Tibetan Records,” *Bulletin of Tibetology*, vol. 4 (1967), pp. 9-10.

It may be that a compiler or scribe of *Tsarang M.* added the element Zhang to Shes-rab-bla-ma’s name. This may have happened by mistake since another Zhang occurs in the same passage. In addition, a person named Zhang Shes-rab-bla-ma (who, however, lived in approximately the 12th century) is mentioned in other histories. According to the *Ngor chos byung*, he was a translator who invited the Pandit Amoghavajra to Tibet. See Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub, *Dam pa’i chos kyi byung tshul legs par bshad pa bstan pa’i rgya mtshor jug pa’i gru chen* (New Delhi: Ngawang Topgay, 1973), p. 271.6.

In the *gdung rabs* he is called simply Shes-rab-bla-ma.

7. In the Lo *gdung rabs* too, Shes-rab-bla-ma is described as a minister of both “Bla” and “Zhang.” He is said to have come to the rescue of the Zhang-pa rulers during the latter’s conflict with the Shi-sa-pa.

The same Zhang-pa is mentioned by Glo-bo mkhan-chen in his autobiography *Rje btsun bla ma*, p. 6a, in a reference to the brief tenure of Ratnashri as mkhan-po in Lo during the time of the dge-sbyong-ba A-ma-dpal:

```
de dus rnam rgyal chos sde rnying pa ‘di zhang pa rnam s kyi yin pa’i khong dbang che bar yod kyang| rje’i phyag dam la brten nas| dge sbyong bas zhang pa la zhus nas dgung thog gcig tsam chos sde rnying pa’i mkhan po mdzad nas bzhugs lags sam/
```

Previously I had thought the “Zhang-pa” might be linked with the place Shang near Guge or with the place Shangs in Gtsang. See my “Se-rib,” p. 215. Now I am even less sure. Perhaps they were a powerful noble family of Gung-thang or La-stod.

8. It is difficult to determine precisely which lands are meant by “upper Lo” and “lower Lo” (*glo bo stod smad*) in this period. However, lower Lo probably included the area of Muktināth. See also Jackson, “Se-rib,” p. 212. Although in the following sentence Shes-rab-bla-ma is said to have instituted laws, it is not clear whether he became the ruler of Lo through conquest or by appointment from Rdzong-dkar.


10. The alternative spelling *A-ma-dpal* is found in the writings of Glo-bo mkhan-chen and is probably to be preferred. Dpal-bzang-po-rgyal-mtshan was the ordination name that Ngor-chen gave him. See Glo-bo mkhan-chen, *Rje btsun bla ma*, p. 3a.

11. This sort of prophecy is typically found in *gter mas*. In translating it, I have followed the Venerable Dezhung Rinpoche’s explanations. I was not able to locate the original source of the passage, but it is also quoted by Glo-bo mkhan-chen, *Rje btsun bla ma*, p. 1b; Kun-dga’-grol-mchog, *Dpal ldan bla ma*, p. 9b; and the Dzar MS.

12. This *mnga’ ris khri skor* is probably the one mentioned in Shri-bhūti-bhadra, *Rgya bod yig tshang*, p. 168b. See above, chapter 1, note 21.
13. Perhaps 'go or 'go pa should be substituted for sgo.

14. Further details about the three visits of Ngor-chen to Lo during the reigns of A-ma-dpal and his son A-mgon-bzang-po can be learned from Glo-bo mkhan-chen, Rje btsun bla ma, pp. 1b-7a, and from Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs, Rgyal ba rdo rje 'chang, pp. 235-241. See also Tucci, Preliminary Report, pp. 17-18.

15. The spelling rtsang drangs seems to be a corruption of gtsang rang or gtsang rong. The latter form appears in a list of forts ruled by the Gung-thang kings. See Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, Bod rje (Dujom MS), p. 11a.

16. No other source known to me links the founding of Tsarang monastery to A-ma-dpal or Ngor-chen. Indeed, this passage in Tsarang M. may simple be a fictitious claim made by someone who hoped to establish that Tsarang monastery was founded before the other monasteries of Lo and was thus superior to them. See also above, chapter 4, note 6.

17. One famous minister named Tshe-dbang-bzang-po was the father of Kun-dga 'grol-mchog. He was in his fifties in the year 1507 and was not a contemporary of A-ma-dpal or Ngor-chen. On other versions of the bzang po rnam gsum see above, chapter 3, the passage citing note 45, and Peissel, MFK, pp. 95 and 97.

18. It is difficult to determine what place or places are meant. A mon ko rdol gsum is also mentioned in the Lo gdung rabs, but in connection with A-ma-dpal.

19. According to Glo-bo mkhan-chen, Rje btsun bla ma, p. 5b, 'Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho was the first mkhan po of the monastic community at the new Namgyal monastery. On his stay in Lo, see the extract from the Ngog gdan rabs published in Khetsun Sangpo, Biographical Dictionary, vol. 11.

'Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho was the author of the completing section to one version of Ngor-chen's history of the Lam 'bras, not Kun-dga 'dbang-phyug as I erroneously stated in "The Early History of Lo (Mustang) and Ngari," p. 51, note 12. This version was included in volume 12 of the collected works of Go-rams-pa.

20. Brag-dkar-theg-chen-gling, according to Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs (Rgyal ba rdo rje 'chang, p. 327.5), was founded during Ngor-chen's first visit to Lo.

21. A speech to be read at Sa-skya following the death of this king was written by Glo-bo mkhan-chen and is preserved in his Collected Works (New Delhi: 1977), vol. 3, pp. 197-202.

22. Here gru probably does not signify gru gu, the Turks. Gru seems to have been the name for Parbat, the principality on the Kali Gandaki south of Thak Khola. The Gru king is mentioned in later sources. See, for example, Francke, vol. 2, p. 234.

23. Rgyal-tshab Kun-dga'-dbang-phyug visited Lo twice (1466 and 1477-8) and passed away in Lo during the second visit. A brief biography of this master entitled Bla ma'i rnam thar rin chen phreng ba was written by Glo-bo mkhan-chen.

24. An account of Shākya-mchog-Idan's visit to Lo (1472-1474) is found in Glo-bo Mkhan-chen, Rje btsun bla ma, pp. 10a-11a. A biography of Shākya-
mchog-ldan was composed by Kun-dga'-grol-mchog and is preserved with Shākya-mchog-ldan's bka' 'bum.

25. On the visits of a number of foreign monks and pundits to Lo in the late 15th century, see Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, Dpal ldan bla ma, pp. 17b-19b.

26. Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, Dpal ldan bla ma, pp. 18b-19a, mentions some of the translation activities in Lo during this period. Active in Lo at this time were Lo-chen Manju-ba, Gu-ge pan-chen Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan, the Singhalese Chos-kyi-nyin-byed, and Snye-shang lo-tsā-ba. A work composed by Chos-kyi-nyin-byed was translated into Tibetan and preserved in the Tanjur. See the Peking Bstan gyur, Rgyud grel, vol. u, pp. 16a-18b: Nāg po chen po phyag gnis pa'i bstod pa.

27. On the problem of this monastery's name and date of foundation, see above, chapter 4, note 6.

28. See Glo-bo mkhan-chen's own account in Rje btsun bla ma, pp. 11a-11b. See also Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, Dpal ldan bla ma, pp. 22a-24a, and A-mes-zhabs Ngag-dbang-kun-dga'-bsod-nams, Dpal ldan sa skyā pa'i, p. 548.3, where he is not said to have been mkhan-po of Thub-bstan-bshad-sgrub-dar-rgyas-gling (i.e., Tsarang) but is said to have been the chos-dpon of Thub-bstan-dar-rgyas-gling (Namgyl).

29. On the visits of these two Ngor-pa masters to Lo see A-mes-zhabs, Dpal ldan sa skyā pa'i, p. 553.

30. According to the Lo gdung rabs, Grags-pa-mtha 'yas had three sons, the eldest of whom was Khri-thog-pa Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyal. The latter had two sons, the elder of whom was Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang. The father of the next generation, however, is said to have been not Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang, but the younger son, Sde-pa Bkra-shis-'od-'bar.

31. Lo Gekar is one of the oldest religious establishments in Lo. It is said to have been the site of the first discoveries of the earliest gter-ston, Sangs-rgyas-bla-ma. On this see Jackson, "Early History," p. 42 and notes 16 and 17.

32. The painting of a Tsarang Iha-khang in c. 1675 is mentioned in Snellgrove, Four Lamas, vol. 1, p. 245.

33. Concerning Rigs-dzin mnga'-bdag Chos-rgyal-phan-tshogs and his activities in Lo, see the biography of Dpags-bsam-ye-shes (1598-1667): Bod-mkhas-pa Mi-pham-dge-legs-rnam-par-rgyal-ba'i-lha, Rje btsun grub pa'i dbang phyug dam pa dpag bsam ye shes zhabs kyi rnam par thar pa mchog gi spyod tshul rgya mtsho'i snying po (Xylograph, ff. 67, Library of E. Gene Smith), p. 48a: de nas glo bo drung ram pa tsho ring lhun grub/byams sprin gyi gu ru rgyal sras/ sgo mang ka bcu pa/ rdza nang pa sogs dad 'dus mang po la phyag chen gnang/ drung ram pa sgo m bsang po g'ylung du thon pa 'khrungs/ mnga 'bdag rigs 'dzin phun tshogs kyi kyang/ glo bo sde par/ rgyal po rgyal mo'i khengs pa ma byed par khong la chos zhus/ nga las khong lhag pa yin gsung bsngags pa mdzad/ da lta'ang glo bo'i bla ma gnis par gyur/

34. Alternatively: He was peerless in his deeds of magnanimity.

35. The xylograph blocks of the "Collected Works" of Stag-rise sku-skye Mi-pham-phan-tshogs-shes-rab have been preserved in Lo Mustang, and prints from them were obtained in 1971 by the U.S. Library of Congress.

36. According to the Venerable Chogay Trichen Rinpoche, the Mgon-dga'
byang-chub-gling was a Nyingma monastery at Tsarang, and it is now in ruins.

37. As seen above in chapter 9, Tshe-dbang’s son was Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal. The latter married the Ladakhi princess Nor-'dzin-bde-legs-dbang-mo, daughter of the king of Ladakh Nyi-ma-rnam-rgyal. Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal’s son and successor was Bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal. His son was Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje.

38. According a C. W. Cassinelli and R. B. Ekvall, *A Tibetan Principality; the Political System of Sa-skya* (Ithica, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 20, Kun-dga'-blo-gros lived from c. 1728 to c. 1790. According to the same source, his son Dbang-sdud-snying-po lived from c. 1763 to c. 1806. However, on the preliminary Library of Congress catalogue card for the *Dam tshig rdo rje'i sgrub thabs sdig sgrib kun 'joms* of Kun-dga'-blo-gros, the dates 1729-1783 are given for its author.
CHAPTER 11

EDITED TEXT OF THE TSARANG MOLLA

Molba¹
[1a]
bstan pa'i sbyin bdag chen po gong ma mi yi dbang phyug rnams kyi zhab bsrtan/ legs 'bul/ dgongs rdzogs rnam par dkar ba'i mdzad srol la gzhir bzhag ste 'bri bar bya ste/ thog mar chos khrims pas² gral nas langs te phyag gsum btsal nas 'di skad brjod do/

gang tshe rkang gnyis gtso bo khyod bltams tshe/
sa chen 'di na goms pa bdun bor nas/
nga ni 'jig rten 'di na mchog ces gsungs/
de tshe mkhas pa khyod la phyag 'tshal lo/

zhes bstod yul dam pa phyogs bcu rab 'byams mu mtha'

[1b]
med pa'i rgyal ba sras dang slob mar bcas pa'i sku gsung thugs kyi rten gsum gzi 'od 'bar ba'i spyan sngar spos mar me sogs mchod pa'i rnam grangs/ gso phan³ yod na/ gtsug lag khang la dar gyi cod pan/ zhes brjod gang ltar bcas 'bul ba lags/

'chad na legs bshad sgrogs pa'i rnga chen/
rt sod na phas rgol 'joms pa'i gnam lcags/
rt som na thub bstan gsal ba'i nyin byed/
yongs rdzogs bstan pa'i bdag por phyag 'tshal/

zhes bstod 'os dam pa mkhas btsun bzung gsum gyi bdag nyid mkhan rin po che'i drung

[2a]
du bkra shis pa'i lha gos sogs 'bul ba gang yod kyi ming bgrangs te 'bul ba lags/ yang bla ma lta bu yin na/ mtshungs med chos kyi spyan ldan bla ma rin po che'i sku drung du lha gos brjod de 'bul ba lags so/ yang dge slong lta bu yin na/ yongs kyi dge ba'i bshes

1. mo lha
2. pa'i
3. 'phan
gnyen dam pa'i drung du lha gos sogs brjod de 'bul ba lags¹ so/ gtso de go² sa che chung gang yin skabs thob rtsis te tshig phreng sgyur³ shes par bya'o/ grol nas grol ba'i lam yang ston sogs zhes bstod yul 'phags pa 'phags pa'i dge 'dun 'dus pa rgya

[2b]
mtsho'i tshogs dang bcas pa'i spyan lam du lha gos sogs rnam grangs ming smos 'bul ba lags na thugs brtse ba chen pos⁴ dgongs te dgyes rab kyis⁵ bzhes/ mnyes rab kyi mchog thob nas byin gyis brlabs par mdzad du gsol/
da lan gyi skabs 'dir bdag la rgyu sbyor sbyin⁶ pa'i bdag po chen po nas/ rang re 'dir bzhugs pa thams cad skyabs gnas dam pa dkon mchog rin po che rnam pa gsum gyi skyabs kyi 'og tu tshogs shing 'dzoms pa ni tshogs pa bzang/ chos dang dam tshig zab mos⁷ 'brel bas na 'brel

[3a]
ba zab/ de lta bu'i tshogs shing bzang 'brel zhing zab pa'i skabs 'dir sngon byung gi lo rgyus zur tsam zhig zhus shig ces⁸ bka' phebs byung bar/ de yang lo rgyus rgyas pa 'khor lo'i rtsibs 'dra ba ni blos mi lcogs/ don zab pa rdo rje'i rwa ba 'dra ba ni lees mi thegs kyang/ tshig⁹ nyung la don 'dus pa mu tig dar la brgyus pa lta bu zhig zhu¹⁰ ba¹¹ la/ ji skad du/
gnas dus ston pa dus dang 'khor/
phun tshogs lnga ldan gtam gyi sgo/

zhes pa ltar gnas phun sum tshogs pa chos dbyings rang bzhin rnam par dag

[3b]
pa'i gnas/ nges pa lnga ldan stugs¹² po bkod pa'i zhing/ gnas yul dur khrod/ rgya gar rgya nag li dang bal yul bod dang bod chen po glo bo sa longs dkar po gnas chen gangs brag mtsho gsum la sogs

1. legs
2. gong
3. bsgyur
4. po'i
5. kyi
6. byin
7. mo
8. zhes
9. tshigs
10. zhus
11. pa
12. bstugs
pa [lags/ dus phun sum tshogs pa] sgron me'i bskal pa bzung po'i sangs rgyas stong rtsa gnyis byon pa'i dus/ ston mchog shākyā'i rgyal po'i sgrub 'bras lung gsum gyi bstan pa Inga brzya pa phrag gsum dang rtags¹ tsam 'dzin pa'i bstan pa Inga brzya phrag gcig ste/ bstan pa Inga brzya pa phrag bya gnas pa las 'dul ba'i lung gi dus lags/ ston pa phun sum tshogs pa 'das dang ma 'ongs da ltar dus gsum gyi ston pa sangs rgyas chos longs sprul gsum gyi bdag nyid can rnam dang/ bstan 'dzin skyes bu dam pa rgya gar gyi paṇ grub/ bod kyi

[4a]

mkhas btsun/ khyad pa- dpal sa skya pa chen po rje btsun gong ma rnam² Inga dang/ rgyal ba gnyis pa ngor chen rdo rje 'chang chen po/ glo bo mkhan chen mnyam med bsod nams lhun grub legs pa'i 'byung gnas rgyal mtshan dpal bzung po sog/ kun mkhyen e wam pa'i gdan rabs mu tig dar la brzyus pa lta bu byon dang 'byon³ 'gyur 'byon bzhin pa rnam kyis⁴ dbus/ ris su ma chad pa'i bstan 'dzin gyi skyes bu chos ston pa rnam lags so/ chos⁵ phun sum tshogs pa/ gdul bya dbang po rno brtul gyi bsam pa dang mthun par gsungs pa'i bka’ tshad ma rgyu pha rol tu phyin pa'i theg pa dang/ 'bras bu gsang sngags rdo rje theg pa gnyis/bstan bcos tshad ma rgya bod kyi mkhas grub tshad ldan rnam kyi

[4b]

gzhung lugs che 'bring⁶ chung gsum bstan bzhin mos pa rnam lags/ 'khor phun sum tshogs pa/ rgyal ba'i gdung 'tshob pa byang chub sems dpa’ dang sems ma/ rgyal ba'i⁷ gsung las skyes pa'i nyan thos dang rang rgyal/ rgyal ba’i bka’ sgrub⁸ pa'i skyes bu'i⁹ tshogs lha dang mi dang/ lha ma yin dang dri zar bcas pa'i 'gro ba rigs drug gi sems can thams cad dang/ rang cag 'dir tshogs shing 'dus pa dang bcas pa lags¹⁰/

'o legs so/ 'di lta bu phun sum tshogs pa Inga dang ldan pa 'dzoms pa'i dus tshe bzung po la/ ston mchog nyi ma'i gnyen gyi lung rtogs bstan pa'i sgron me/ mkhas btsun bzung gsum gyi bdag

1. rtag
2. rnam
3. byon
4. kyi
5. 'khor
6. phrang
7. po'i
8. bsgrub
9. bu
10. legs
nyid/ mtshungs med chos kyi rje mkhan rin po ches¹ gral gyi dbu mdzad/ yang gtso bo bla ma lta bu yin na/ bla ma rin po che dang

[5a]
dge slong yin na/ dge ba'i bshes gnyen dam pa'i sogs tshig² phreng³ bsgyur/ dge ba'i bshes gnyen dam pa bslab gsum bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan/ 'phags mchog 'dus pa'i rgya mtshos⁵ gral⁶ gyi ghzi bzung/ mi che ba rnams kyi⁷ [gral gyi] gung⁸ mnan⁹/yon tan mkyen pa rnams kyi¹⁰ gral¹¹ gyi zur brgyan/ bya ba byed pa rnams kyi¹² gral¹³ gyi mtha' brten/ gral¹⁴ stod¹⁵ ri rgyal lhun po ltar brjid chags/ gral¹⁶ rked nam mkha'i nor bu ltar mdangs gsal/ gral¹⁷ sham yul mtsho¹⁸ 'khyil pa¹⁹ ltar smug khrig²⁰ ge²¹ bzhugs pa 'di/ dkar po dge ba'i las kyi²² ghzi bzung/ dag²³ pa'i²⁴ smon lam gis²⁵ mtshams²⁶ sbyar/ rten²⁷ zhing 'brel 'brel zhing tshogs pa'i bskal pa bzang po'i dus 'dir/ lab²⁸ pa 'ong ba'i²⁹ gtam/
dang po ni phyi snod 'jig rten chags tshul dang/ nang bcud sens can grub

[5b]
tshul gnyis las/ 'phags pa mdo sdud pa las/ mkha' la lung brten³⁰ de la chu yi phung po brten/ de la sa chen 'di brten de la 'gro ba brten/ nam mkha' 'di stong pa la rlung me chu sa 'dir 'byung ba bzhi dkyil rang rang gi brgyad spangs tshang gsum dang ldan pa rim brtsegs su chags pa las/ dma' na rags³¹ dmyal ba nas/ mtho srid pa'i rtse mo'i bar grub ste/ ri'i rgyal po ri rab/ gser gyi ri bdun/ rol pa'i mtsho bdun/ gling bzhi gling phrang brgyad/ gnas rigs gtsang ma bcu bdun gyi lha gnas rnams rim³² par chags te³³ stong gsum gi stong chen po mi rjed³⁴ 'jig rten gyi kham sa las gling bzhi pa'i nang tshan lho 'dzam bu gling gi dbus su grya gar rdo rje gdan/ shar du rgya nag ri bo rtse lnga/ lhor ri bo

[6a]
po tā la/ nub o rgyan mkha' 'gro'i gling/ byang du sham bha la/ bod dang bod chen po/ li dang bru³⁵ sha/ sgeng gling sog gnas yul zhing kham dpag tu med pa chags shing grub pa lags/

| 1. che'i | 10. kyi | 19. par | 28. bslab |
| 2. tshigs | 11. bral | 20. smugs |
| 3. phrang | 12. kyi | 21. gi |
| 4. pa'i | 13. bral | 22. kyi |
| 5. mtsho'i | 14. bral | 23. bdag |
| 6. bral | 15. bstod | 24. pa |
| 7. kyi | 16. bral | 25. gyi |
| 8. dgung | 17. bral | 26. tshams |
| 9. sman | 18. 'tsho | 27. bstan |
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gnyis pa nang bcud sems can chags tshul ni/ mgon pa mdzod
las/ sngon dus sring 'byung sha tshug can/ zhes gsungs pa ltar/
bskal pa dang po chags dus lha srid 'pho bas mi yi rigs byung ste/
de yang rgya gar du rgyal rigs/ rje rigs/ bram ze'i rigs/ dmangs rigs
te bzhi las gyes pa'i mi rigs dang/ rgya nag tu rgyim shang/ hung
kong phyogs kyi rigs byung/ bod dang bod chen po'i ljongs su
spre'u dang/ brag srin mo'i rigs las mched pa'i sga/ 'bru/ dpal/ ldong/

[6b]
sbra rmu ste bod mi'u gdung drug gi¹ rigs las byung ste/ 'dzam bu
gling 'dir mi rigs mi gcig pa gsum brgya drug cu/ skad rigs mi 'dra
ba bdun brgya bdun cu/ zas dang yo byad so so'i lugs kyi cha byad
dbyibs tshul mi 'dra ba lags/

'di ltar 'gro ba mi yi bsod nams las grub pa'i gzhi skyes bu mi
chos² kyi lo rgyus dang/ rgyan³ dam pa lha chos kyi lo rgyus gnyis
las/ dang po ni/ slob dpon arya de was/

mi yi chos lugs legs shes na/ lha yi⁴ chos lugs shes pa 'byung/
lha dang mi yi chos lugs la/ brten na thar pa ga la ring/

zhes gsungs pa ltar/ chos tshad ma bcu drug yi byed po steng du
rgyal po'i gdung rabs chags tshul ni/ rgya gar 'phags pa'i yul du
mang

[7a]
pos bskur ba'i rgyal po nas bzung bskal pa bzang po'i rgyal lnga
la sogs pa'i rgyal rabs sa ya gcig dang gnyis 'bum nyi khri lnga
brgya'i bar du byon zhing/ rgyal brgyud de las chad⁵ pa'i bod gangs
can gyi rgyal po rje gnya' khri btsan po nas rims par gnam gyi khri
bdun/ steng gi⁶ steng gnyis/ bar gyi legs drug/ sa yi sde brgyad/ 'og
gi btsan gsum ste rgyal rabs nyi shu rtsa bdun pa lha tho tho ri⁷
snyan bshal gyi dus su/ dam pa'i chos kyi dbu brnyes/ 'phags pa
rigs gsum mgon po'i rnam 'phrul chos rgyal mes dbon rnam⁸ gsum
gyi sku dus su/ dam pa'i chos kyi srol gtod cing dar smin rgyas gsum
mdzad/ bstan phyi dar dus su lha bla ma ye shes 'od kyis⁹/ jo bo dl

1. gis
2. lus
3. brgyan
4. yis
5. 'chad
6. kyi
7. ris
8. rnam
9. kyi
paṃ kā ra shī jnyā na spyan drangs/ mnga’ bdag

[7b]
rgyal po stod gyi mgon gsum bzhugs¹ pa’i dus su pu hrang/ gu ge mang yul gsum la dbang bsgyur/ dam pa’i chos nyin mo ltar mdzad pas² mtshan dang don mthun pa’i chos rgyal gyi gdung dri ma med pa byon zhing phyag rjes bzang po’i rgyun btsugs tshul ste zur tsam dang/
sjong gyi yig cha rnams las/

phun tshogs dpal dang ldan pa’i glo bo’i yul/ ’dod rgu ma lus ’dzoms pa’i ljongs chen ‘dir/
gnam lha’i gdung brgyud shes rab bla ma zhes/
mtshan yongs su grags pa ’di nyid byon/

zhes gsungs pa ltar/ bod khaps skyong ba’i bdag po/ glo bo chos kyi rgyal po’i gdung ni/ ’od gsal lha nas phebs/ lha ’od de gung rgyal/ lha nas btsan du phebs/ btsan rgod kha che/ btsan nas dmu ru phebs/ dmu khyi’u chung/ dmu nas mi ru phebs/

[8a]
mi rje gung³ rgyal zhes bya ba des/ gnam la yar gzigs pas gnam gyi ’khor lo rtsibs rgyad du gzigs/ sa la mar gzigs pas sa padma ’dab brgyud du gzigs/ logs la phar gzigs pas logs rin chen zur brgyad du gzigs/ de’i tshe sa gnam gyi bdag po nga yin gsungs⁴ nas/ sa la mkhar btabs⁵/ yul la ming btags/ phyogs dang ris su bcad pas/ yul la snga ba⁶ yar klung sa dkar/ mkhar la snga ba ’om bu lha mkhar/ rus la snga ba zhang zhung rus drug/ lha la snga ba yar lha sham po/ dpon la snga ba gnam lha gung rgyal zhes yongs su grags pa’i sa gnam gnyis kyi bdag po gyur te/ sras bzhi ’khrungs te⁷ lha chos dang mi chos dar bar mdzad/
de nas rgyal rabs rim par byon te ’phrin las nam mkha’ dang mnyam pa’i rgyal rabs drug cu re gcig pa stag seng ge ’bum gyi sras/ zhang shes rab bla ma zhes bya bas⁸ bla zhang gnyis kyi ’phrin⁹ las la dbang

1. zhugs
2. pa’i
3. rgung
4. gsung
5. btabs
6. sde pa; corrected to snga ha by a different hand
7. ste
8. ba’i
9. phrin
[8b]
bsgyur/ sku tshe smad la glo bo stod smad kyi sa la dbang bsgyur/
lugs gnyis kyi bka' khrims bcas pa/ zhang shes gnyis 'khon pa las/
phas rgol shis pa'i g.yul ngo bcom ste dpa' bo'i g.yul las rgyal bar
mdzad/
de la sras gnyis te/ gcung ge sar dgra bo'i chos skyong 'bum gyi
sras/ byang sms chos kyi rgyal po a me dpal bzang po rgyal
mtshan te/ 'di ni o rgyan gyi padma'i lung bstan las/
glo bo zhes gyi lung pa ru/
o rgyan nga yi sprul pa ni/
phyag na rdo rjes byin gysis brlabs/
a me zhes bya kun tu grags/
de ni sri mo mang du btul/
btul yang mi la dga' tshor med/
bsdos kyang thub par mi 'gyur ro/

zes gsungs pa'i1 skyes bu dam pa blo gros kyi rtsa rtsal rdzogs
shing/ mkhyen rab kyi nor dang ldan pa'i gzhon nu nyid nas dpa'
bo'i g.yul las rgyal/ tshar gcad pa dang rjes su 'dzin pa la mkhas
shing mnga' brnyes/

[9a]
mnga' ris2 khri skor3 syi bdag por gyur4/ rgyal sril kha lo bsgyur5/
mkha' spyo steng du rdzong bzung/ yid smon thang du mkhar btab/
chen po la 'os pa'i las mtshan khrir dpon sgo sgo gsum/ bu sgo bzhi/
rgyal ba sgo bzhi/ lha dpon rdzong dpon tsho6 dpon sogs bskos
bzhag gnang ste grong 'khyer sde mang po'i gzhi bzung/ rgyal khrims
chos khrims gnyis ldan gyi lha chos mi chos gnyis dang ldan pas7
dkon mchog la 8zhe sa8/ ngan slong la byams skyong/ rang sde
la 'tsho skyong/ gzhon sde la zil gys9 gnor/ khrims gnyis kyi bdag
por gyur10/ khyad par ngor chen rdo rje 'chang chen po kun dga'
bzang po gdan drangs/ dbu yi mchod gnas su bkur/ zab pa dang rgya

1. pas
2. ri
3. bskor
4. 'gyur
5. 'gyur
6. mtsho
7. pa'i
8. zhes
9. gya
10. 'gyur
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che ba'i chos gsan/ rtsang drangs thub bstan bshad sgrub dar rgyas
gling gi chos grwa btab/ dge slong rnam par dag pa'i sdom ldan

[9b]
nyis stong rwa can gyi grangs ldan dge 'dun gyi sde bstugs/ rgyal
ba'i sku gsung thugs kyi rten bsam gyis mi khyab pa bzhengs/
dge 'dun la bkur bzos dang/ mnga' bangs la khral chag/ bstan pa
la bya ba chen po mdzad pas dus da lta'i bar du'ang bla ma kun
da' bzang po/ rgyal po a me dpal bzang po/ bka' blon tshe dbang
bzang po ste bzang po rnam gsum zhes pa'i snyan pa'i grags pa
phyogs kun tu khyab pa 'di lags/
chos rgyal chen po 'di la sras bzhi ste/ chos rgyal a mgon bzang
po ni/ dpa' mdzangs brtul phod khyab gyi sde su mon ko dol gsum dbang du 'dus/ bod khams skyong
ba'i bdag por che 'don mdzad/ chen po la 'os pa'i las 'dzin bu
gsum gyi rnam bzhag mdzad/ e wañ pa'i gdan rabs gsum pa 'jam
dbyangs shes rab rgya mtsho dbyangs dbyangs dbyangs dbyangs
chen dang bka'

[10a]
'gyur/ bstan 'gyur/ sa skya gong ma lnga/ ngor chen rdo rje 'chang
sogs kyi bka' 'bum gser dul sha stag gis bzhengs/ brag dkar theg
chen gling bzhengs/ dge 'dun gyi sde btsugs/ nyams pa sor chud/
ma nyams pa gong 'phel gyi bdag rkyen bskyang/ rgyal srid chos
srid kyi mdzad pa bla na ma mchis pas mtha' bzhis'i khrims dar
skad rigs mi gcig pa mang po la dbang bsgyur bas/ chos rgyal 'di
gung la a ham dang/ phyag rtags la a tham ste nyi 'og kun tu
khyab pa byung/
'
di la sras bzhi ste/ a ham tshangs chen bkra shis mgon ni/ las
dbang stobs shugs btsan zhing lugs gnyis kyi mdzad phrin 'gran
zla bral ba'i snyan pa'i grags pa rgya mtsho'i mtha' tshun chad
du khyab stod mnga' ris skor gsum nas gru rgyal sa yan la
dbang bsgyur/ e wañ pa'i gdan rabs bzhi pa rgyal tshab dam pa
kun dga' dbang phyug

1. gtsugs 11. stags
2. gyi 12. gi
3. bzod 13. pa'i
4. chags 14. ra
5. pa'i 15. 'byung
6. rnam 16. bsnyen
7. mdzang 17. khyabs
8. skyongs pa'i 18. bskor
9. po 19. ni
10. 'dul
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[10b]
dang/ gser mdog can mkhas pa' chen po shākya mchog ldan dri 
med legs pa'i blo gros la sogs pa' i mkhas grub mang po dbu yi 
mchod gnas su bkur/ khyad par rgya gar gyi sdom brtson dam pa 
bhikṣu paṇḍita lokatāra1 la sogs pa' i paṇḍita mang po 'dir byon2 
zhing bsnyen bkur mdzad/ sngar bod du ma bsgyur ba' i chos mang 
po bsgyur ba' i bdag rkyen3 mdzad/ sku bsod che bas4 rgya dkar 
nag mtha' gru kun gyi mi dang nor sna mang po bsdu/ thub chen 
rgyal ba' i pho brang rten dang brten par bcas pa dang/ rnam rgyal 
du thub bstan dar rgyas gling zhes pa'i dge 'dun gyi sde btsugs/ 
rgyal ba' i sku gsung thugs kyi rten rgya che la dngos gtsang5 pa 
bsam gyis6 mi khyab pa bzhengs par mdzad pa' i phyag rjes bzang/ 
chos kyi rgyal po 'di yi gcung mkhas pa' i dbang phyug glo bo mkhan 
chen mnyam med bsod nams lhun grub legs pa' i byung gnas rgyal 
mtshan dpal

[11a]
bsam gyis po chos sde chen po thub bstan bshad sgrub dar rgyas gling 
gi mkhan por mnga' gsol/ zab rgyas chos kyi 'khor lo rgyun mi 'chad cing/ dgon sde thams cad [du] 'dul khrims gtsang la bshad sgrub 
'phel ba' i dper grags pa byung7/ 
'di la sras gsum ste/ a ham grags pa mtha' yas ni/ yab mes kyi 
khriims gnyis bskyangs/ 'phags pa mchod cing bstan 'dzin bkur/ 
khyad par e waṃ pa' i gdan rabs dgu pa rgyal ba lha mchog seng ge 
dang/ gdan rabs bcu pa thams cad mkhyen pa dkon mchog lhun 
grub gnyis gdan drangs shing/ dbu yi mchod gnas su bkur/ sangs 
rgyas kyi bstan pa dar zhing/ dge 'dun gyi sde spel/ rang sde skyon8 
zhing gzhan sde zil gyis gnon/ rje nyid kyi jo jo zhabs drung chos kyi 
blo gros rgyal mtshan thub bstan bshad sgrub dar rgyas gling du 
ku bo'i chos kyi khri la mnga' gsol dang zhabs 'degs9 bsgrubs10/ 
dkon mchog la

[11b]
gus shing bsnyen bkur zab/ yab mes gong ma'i bka' srol bzang po

1. lo ka ra
2. 'byon
3. mkhyen omitted following rkyen
4. ba'i
5. gtsangs
6. gyi
7. 'byung
8. skyongs
9. 'degs
10. bsgrubs
bskyangs pas¹ mnga’ ris dar zhing rgyas/
’di la sras gnyis te/ a ham rgya hor dpal bzang ni/ rang sde tshags² su bcug cing yab mes kyi srol bzung/ sku gsung thugs kyi rten bzhengs pa sogs mdzad pa rgya che/
’di la sras gsum ste/ a ham don grub rdo rje ni/ mkhyen rab che zhing dgra dpung bcom zhiŋ³ rang dpung dar/ rtsa brang pho brang bsam grub dge ’phel btabs⁴ glo bo ges dkar la nyams gsos mdzad pa sogs ’phrin las rgyas/ rje nyid kyi phy bo cho rje ’jam dbyangs pa chos khrir mnga’ gsol zhiṅ dge ’dun gyi sde dar bar mdzad/
de la sras gnyis te/ a ham bsam grub rdo rje ni/ blo gros mtshungs pa [dang] bral zhing khrims gnyis bskyangs/ rtsa brang du thub bstan bshad sgrub dar rgyas gling gi gtsugs⁵ lag khang bzhengs bzo khyad dang ri mo bkod pa bzang/ bris sku dang ’bur sku mang po bzhengs/ rje nyid kyi gcung

[12a]
chos rje bsod nams dpal ’byor chos khrir mnga’ gsol/ bshad sgrub kyi bstan pa dar bar⁶ mdzad/
de’i sras a ham bsam grub rab brtan⁷ ni/ dge bcu’i rgyal khrims gces zhiṅ/ lugs gnyis la mkhyen pa rgyas/ dpal sa skya pa chen po ’jam mgon ngag dbang kun dga’ bsod nams dang thub bstan mkhan po chos rnam rgyal/ mnga’ bdag chos rgyal phun tshogs rig ’dzin yab sras dbu lhar brten⁸/ de bzhin bsheds pa’i sku gsung thugs kyi rten⁹ bzhengs blo sgs dpag dka bar mdzad/ blo stobs kyi sgyu rtsal la ’gran zla bral zhing/ rang sde skyong zhiṅ gzhan sde dpa¹⁰ bkongs¹¹/ rgyun du nyin mtshan ’khor yug tu thugs dam dge sbyor kho na ru¹² ’da’ bar mdzad/
’di la sras gsum ste/ a ham bsam grub dpal ’bar ni/ lugs bzang la mkhyen pa rgyas zhiṅ rgyal srid chos bzhin bskyangs¹³ rje nyid kyi jo lags bsod nams bstan ’dzin dbang po¹⁴

1. pa’i
2. tshags
3. shing
4. btabs
5. gtsugs
6. ba
7. brten
8. rten
9. brten
10. dpal
11. skong
12. du
13. skyang
14. pos
chos khrir mnga' gsol zhing thub bstan nyin mo' ltar gyur/ dpa' ba' i stobs dang mdzad pa' i sgyu rtsal dang ldan zhing glo 'dzum bod sogs 'khrugs kyang pha rol gang dang gang gi g.yul las rgyal ba' i grags pa thob/ rje btsun stag rtse ba mi pham shes rab phun tshogs dbu yi mchod gnas su bkur/ phyi nang kun tu rgyal ba' i sku gsung thugs kyi rten bsam gyis2 mi khyab pa3 bzhengs/ dkon mchog la mchod/ dge 'dun la bsnyen bkur/ thugs dam la brtson pas4 chos kyi rgyal po' i mtshan dang don mtshungs pa byung/ 'di yis ras a ham tshe dbang ngam phun tshogs gtsug rgyan nor bu ni/ stag sham rol pa' i rdo rje' i rnam sprul te/ chos dang 'jig rten gnyis kar mkhyen pa rgyas/ mgon dga' byang chub gling gi chos sde btab/ sa kar rnying gsum gyo chos lugs ma 'dres pa mkhyen/ phyi nang gi dgra bgegs[ lacuna : folio 13 missing]

dpal sa skya pa chen po yab sras rje nag dbang kun dga' blo gros la sogs pa' i sa rnying mkhas grub kyi bla ma brten zhing gdamgs nag bzhes/ glo bo ges dkar la nyams gso dang/ smon grub lha khang/ dbang 'dus lha khang/ 'bam mkhar bcas gsar btab/ khyung tshang5' bsam gtan chod gling/ bsam grub gling bcas chos sde btab/ de dag la mchod rgyun sbyor 'dzugs pa dang/ dbus gtsang smon gsum gyi rten gsum la mchod pa/ dge 'dun la bsnyen bkur/ rang zhaps mnga' 'bangs ni 'tsho skyong/ lugs gnyis kyi khrims bzung/ phan tshun bde 'jags 'dod6 kyi sems chags/ rgyal ba' i sku gsung thugs kyi rten bzhengs pa sogs mdzad pa dang 'phrin las rgyas/ rje nyid kyi rigs sras zhaps drung rdo rje 'phrin las chos khrir mnga' gsol/ chos srid kyi bstan pa rgyar par mdzad/ gor bod dmag 'khrugs kyi skabs su thabs shes zung 'brel gyi

mdzad pa bskyangs pas7 gnam bskos gong ma chen po las lung gi bstod mtshan dang cho lo8 dbu tog/ dbu sgro 'tshal9 te bdag10 rkyen che/ de phyin chad stod rdza11 ri dbyug pa' i rgyu/ smad rgyal mo' i dar thags pa kun la/ glo bo chos kyi rgyal po' i snyan pa' i grags pas12 khyab pa byung/

'di la sras gsum ste/ a ham bkra shis snying po ni/ bod khaps spyi dang bye brag glo13 bo' i14 stod15 rnam[skyong]/ yab mes kyi

srol bzung bar mdzad/

'di'i¹ sras a ham 'jam dpal dgra 'dul ni/ mkhyen rab dang blo
gros che zhing mthu stobs la mnga' brnyes/ rgyal srid chos srid la
dbang bsgyur/ bsam gsang sprul pa'i sku chos kyi nyi ma rtsa ba'i
rig² 'dzin³ la bsnyen⁴ bkur che bar mdzad/ phyi ltar mi rjes srid
skyong/ nang ltar sa chen grub pa'i dbang phyug gi rang

[15a]
bzhin du bzhugs pa byung/

de'i sras a ham kun dga' nor bu ni byang chub kyi thugs skyong/
rim gnyis la gcig tu gzhol/

de lta bu'i chos kyi rgyal po'i gdung brgyud rim⁵ par byon pa
nas bzung da lta chos kyi rgyal po a ham bstan 'dzin
'jam dpal dgra 'dul yum btsun sras bcas pa sku bsod ri rgyal ltar
che/ sku brgyud⁶ chu rgyun⁷ ltar ring/ mnga/ 'bangs skar tshogs ltar
khra/ bde skyid rdzogs ldan gyi dpal la longs su spyod pa 'di ni
gzhi skyes bu mi⁸ chos⁹ kyi lo rgyus dang/

[*15b]
gnyis pa rgyan dam pa lha chos kyi lo rgyus ni/ rgyal srid dang chos
srid bskyangs¹⁰ tshul¹¹/ bstan pa dam chos gsungs¹² tshul/ bstan 'dzin
dge 'dun dar tshul dang gsum las/ dang po ni/ bdag cag gi ston pa
mnyam med shäkyä'i rgyal po 'dis¹³/ (mchan: dang po byang chub
mchog tu thugs bskyed¹⁴/ bar du grangs med gsum du tshogs bsags¹⁵/
tha mar rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas/) 'gro ba sems can rnam s kyì don
mdzad phyir/ sku skye ba'i gzhi bzuug ste/ mdzad pa bryad dam
bcu drug gam/ brgya rtsa la sogs pa'i sgo nas sems can kyi don
mdzad/ mdzad pa de rnam s kyì nang nas gto bo chos kyì 'khor
lo rim¹⁶ pa gsum du bskor te/ bka 'dang po bden pa bzhì yi chos
tyi 'khor lo bskor/ bka' bar pa¹⁷ mtshan nyid [med] pa'i chos kyì
'khor lo bskor/ bka' tha ma legs par rnam par

[*16a]
phye¹⁸ ba'i¹⁹ chos kyi 'khor lo bskor/ gnas yul nges med du gsang²⁰
sngags rdo rje theg pa'i chos kyi 'khor lo bskor nas gdu²¹ bya
rnam smin gro l gyi lam la 'god pa mdzad pa lags/
gnyis pa ni/ rgyal ba thugs rje can der/ gdu bya dbang po rtul²²
po dag la dgongs¹ te² rgyu pha rol tu phyin pa’i theg pa gsungs³/ dbang po rnon po dag la dgongs⁴ te⁵ ’bras bu snags rdo rje theg pa gsungs⁶/ de dag gi dgongs pa ’grel⁷ pa⁸ ’phags bod mkhas pa’i bstan bcos rnams lags⁹/

gsum pa ni/ bstan ’dzin gyi skyes bu dam pa/ rgya gar ’phags pa’i yul du rgyan drug dang mchog gnyis/ sgrub pa’i rig ’dzin chen po brgyad la sogs pa’i paṇḍita dang grub¹⁰ pa thob pa rig pa ’dzin pa’i sa la gnas pa mang du byon/ rgya nag po’i yul du’ang mkhas pa hä shang

[*16b]
dang/ rtsis mkhan la sogs pa bsam gyis¹¹ mi khyab¹² pa byon/ bod dang/ bod chen po gangs can gyi ljongs ’dir snga phyir rgya gar gyi paṇḍita brgya phrag gcig byon te/ chos gsungs/ thon mi¹³ sambhota¹⁴ la sogs pa’i lo tsä¹⁵ ba brgya phrag gnyis byon nas dam pa’i chos bsgyr/ thos bsam sgom gsum gyis¹⁶ rgyal ba’i bstan pa rin po che nam¹⁷ langs pa’i¹⁸ nyi ma shar ba ltar mdzad pa ni/ rgyan¹⁹ dam pa²⁰ lha chos kyi lo rgyus lags/
de ltar ston pa sangs rgyas shākyā’i rgyal po ni khams gsum sems can spyi la bka’ drin che/ chos rgyal mes²¹ dbon rnam²² gsum bod khams la bka’ drin che/ mchod²³ yon bzang po rnam²⁴ gsum thugs bskyed dang/ mdzad phrin bka’ drin che/
de ltar bu’i bka’ [drin] rjes su dran te/ mol

[*17a]
gtam cung zad tsam zhus pa lags te/ bdag mol ba²⁵ mkhan por gyur pa sems ma rig pa’i dbang du gyur pa’i tshig nor ba dang/ ’khrul pa dang/ ’gal ba’i²⁶ char gyur pa rnam s bzod pa bzhes dgos te/ mdo las/

bzod pa dka²⁷ thub bzod pa dam pa ni/ mya²⁸ ngan ’das pa’i chos²⁹ zhes rgyal bas gsungs/

zhes gsungs pa ltar/ bzod pa chos kyi rtsa ba yin pas bzod pa bzhes

1. dgong 11. gyi 21. me
2. ste 12. khyabs 22. rnam
3. gsung 13. mu 23. mchos
4. dgong 14. sambhota 24. rnam
5. ste 15. ba 25. la
6. gsung 16. gyi 26. pa’i
7. bral 17. gnam 27. bka’
8. ba 18. pa’i khur 28. mnya
9. legs 19. brgyan 29. mchos
10. sgrubs 20. pa rnam
dgos te/ bzod gsol thar pa'i smon lam yin pas mtshungs med chos kyi rje rin po ches\(^1\) dbu mdzad/ 'phags pa'i dge 'dun 'dus pa rgya mtsho'i tshogs dang bcas pa rnams kyi thugs smon rnams par dag pas\(^2\) rgyas btabs ste/ spyir phan bde'i 'byung gnas sangs rgyas kyi bstana rin po che dar zhung rgyas la yun ring du gnas pa dang/ khyad

[*17b*]
par du gong ma mi yi dbang phyug chen po yab sras rnams sku tshe dang mdzad 'phrin yar ngo zla ltar rgyas pa dang/ yul phyogs 'dis\(^3\) mtshon yangs pa'i rgyal khams kun tu char dus su 'bab/ lo phyug rtag tu legs\(^4\) mi nad dang phyug nad rgyun chad de/ bde\(^5\) skyid rdzogs ladan gyi dpal la longa su spyod de/ bkra shis pa dang/ phun sum tshogs pa'i dga' ston la longa spyod pa'i phyir/ 'khor gsum yongs su dag pa'i bsngo ba dang/ smon lam thugs la 'jog\(^6\) par zhu/

zhed brjod nas phyag gsum bsal nas gral la 'khod pa dang gtsob des bsngo ba dang/ tshogs pa'i smon lam mdzad cing bkra shis kyis\(^7\) mtha' brgyan par bya'o/ gal te de tsam mi lcogs par 'bring tsam byed\(^8\) na/ gong

[*18a*]
gi chos rgyal de'i gdung la a ham dang/ phyag rtags la a tham ste nyi 'og kun tu khyab pa byung\(^9\) zhes pa'i mtshams nas/ de lta bu'i rgyal po'i gdung brgyud rim\(^10\) par byon pa nas bzungs da lta'i mi dbang chos kyi rgyal po a ham dngos grub dpal 'bar ram/ a ham 'jam dbyangs rgyal\(^11\) mtshan nam/ a ham bstana 'dzin 'jam dpal dgra 'dul/ zhes man chad gong ltar dang/ yang de las kyang bsdu sams tsam byed na/ phun tshogs lnga ldan tgam gyi sgo/ zhes pa'i mtshams su/ zla drug pa'i tshes brgyad gnas bcu yi nyin phyed la zhal\(^12\) zhus\(^13\) 'tshal lo/ sgrig\(^14\) mi sngags [pa] mig\(^15\) dmar legs bsam/ tshig la gong 'og shog ma mkhyen mkhyen\(^16\) no// /bkra shis// dge'o//

ABBREVIATIONS

’Chi med. See ’Chi med dpal ’dren bzang mo’i bem chag.
GTS. See Rgyal-sras Thogs-med-bzang-po.
Gung thang gdung rabs. See Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, Bod rje.
Lo gdung rabs. See Blo bo chos rgyal.
Peissel, MFK. See M. Peissel, Mustang, the Forbidden Kingdom.
Peissel, MRR. See M. Peissel, “Mustang, Remote Region in Nepal.”
Rin chen phra tshom. See Bco-brgyad khri-chen, Rin chen phra tshom.
Shri mi yi dbang phyug. See Ngag-dbang-bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan.
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APPENDICES
THE HISTORICAL EXTRACT FROM THE MÖNTHANG MOLLA

glo bo chos rgyal brgyud pa byon tshul mdor 'dus tsam zhig phul na/ chos rgyal rin po che khri ral pa can zhes rim par brgyud/ mu khri btsan po sogs phyi rabs brgyud pa a ma dpal zhes bya ba mtshan 
nyi zla ltar grags pa de nas bzung ste/ chos rgyal am mgon bzang 
po am bzang am mgon dbang rgyal rdo rje'i sras mchog dam pa 
jam dpal rdo rje dang rgyal sras bkra shis snying po sras rim par 
brgyud cing/ lcags zam thang stong rgyal po'i rnam sprul 'jam 
dpal dgra 'dul gsang 'dzin rdo rje theg pa'i rnam sprul a mgon kun 
dga' nor bu nyid yin/ rgyal sras khams gsum dbang 'dus chos rgyal 
dgos grub dpal 'bar a mgon 'jam dbyangs rgyal mtshan
APPENDIX B

OUTLINE OF THE MOLLA OF NAMGYAL

I. Beginning Matter
   A. Title: *Mol tshig bstan pa'i 'phrengs* [sic] *mdzes*
   B. Invocation: *Om swasti siddham*

II. The Speech
   A. Offerings (*che 'bul*) [1.9]
      1. Obeisance and offerings to the Buddha; and offerings to the “supports” (*rtan*) of enlightened body, speech, and mind, as well as to the temple that contains them
      2. Praise and offerings to the presiding leader of the monastic community
         a. To the monastic master or “abbot” (*mkhan po*), if present
         b. To the monastic master’s representative, if present
         c. To the assembly leader, if he is an ordinary monk
      3. Praise and offerings to the monastic assembly
   B. The main recitation: an eloquent speech (*dngos gzhi mol ba'i legs bshad*) [2.2]
      1. Prologue: eulogistic introduction of the assembled witnesses of the speech
         a. Auspicious invocation
         b. Eulogistic mention of gurus and Triratna
            i. Dwelling in pure lands
            ii. Their “supports” in this temple
         c. Introduction and description of listeners according to their position in the assembly [3.9]
            i. Presiding ecclesiastics: form the head of the row (*gral gyi thog mar mdzad*)
            ii. Men of high position: occupy the “high middle” of the row (*gral gyi gung mnan*)
            iii. The monastic assembly: forms the basis of the row (*gral gyi gzhi bzung*)
iv. Learned men: ornament the edges of the row (gral gyi zur brgyan)

v. Patrons and workers: support the end of the row (gral gyi mtha’ brten)

d. Auspicious interrelationships among the assembly as a whole [4.13]

i. A vast general connection ...

ii. Founded in ... (gzhi bzung)

iii. Joined by ... (mtshams sbyar)

iv. Excellent [=profound?] interconnection ('brel ba bzang [=zab?] )

v. Excellent assembly ... (tshogs pa bzang)

2. The discourse (bka’ mchid) offered in the midst of the above assembly as an ornament [4.18]

a. Motives for reciting history [5.3]

b. History: mundane and religious [4.7]

   i. “Mundane” history: (gzhi skye bo mi chos kyi lo rgyus)

      (A) Refusal to speak at length on cosmology

      (B) Royal genealogies

         (1) Genealogy of the Tibetan kings

         (2) Genealogy of the Lo rulers

      (C) Genealogy of ordinary men [7.10]

         (1) Origin and races of men

         (2) Division of countries

      (D) Summary of mundane history

   ii. “Religious” history (rgyan dam pa chos ‘byung gi lo rgyus) [=lha chos kyi lo rgyus] [8.11]

      (A) The coming of the Buddha

      (B) The spread of the Buddha’s teaching

         (1) In India

         (2) In Tibet [9.15]

            (a) The early spread of the teachings

            (b) The later spread

      (C) The kindness of the Buddhist “translators and scholars” [11.3]

         (1) Kindness of all Buddhas and Bodhisattvas
(2) Kindness of the Buddhas in this fortunate aeon
(3) Kindness of our Buddha, Śākyamuni
(4) Kindness of Indian Buddhist masters
(5) Kindness of Tibetan Buddhist masters
   (a) In general
   (b) In our own religious tradition
      (i) Ngor-pa
      (ii) Shākyamchog-Idan
      (iii) Later successors
   (c) Request that living followers of tradition perform dedication prayers
(6) Summary
   (a) Kindness of religious teachers in general
   (b) Kindness of parents
   (c) Kindness of one’s religious teachers and friends,
   (d) Kindness of patrons

C. Conclusion of the Speech: request for prayers of merit dedication [17.9]
1. Prologue: concluding descriptions of offerings and assembly (with similies from nature)
2. Request that general prayers be made by the assembly
   a. For the endurance of the teaching
   b. For the long life of religious persons
3. Special prayers of merit dedication
   a. Dedication for the sake of a deceased person, if he is a lama or nobleman
   b. Alternative special prayers
      i. Prayers for a long life, etc., if the speech is recited at a celebration sponsored by a lama or nobleman
      ii. Prayers for the well-being of a deceased person if the speech is recited at the time of an ordinary funeral
      iii. Prayers for the patron’s freedom from illness, etc., when the speech is recited for an ordinary living patron
III. Concluding matter: the colophon
   A. Reason for writing: loss of previous Mollas
   B. Prayer that this text be the cause of various good things, and that it not be destroyed
   C. Mention of the writer's name, and the name of the person at whose request it was written
OUTLINE OF THE MOLLA OF TSARANG

I. Beginning matter
   A. Title: Mo lha [=mol ba]
   B. Author’s commitment to write [a speech used in ceremonies for the sake of] “the longevity, offerings and death observances of the rulers, the exalted ones, the patrons of the Doctrine.”
   C. Instructions to the reciter [1a]

II. The speech
   A. Mention of offerings
      1. Mention of recipients, and the offerings made to each
         a. Offerings to the “supports” of enlightened body, speech and mind [i.e., the sacred images, books, and stūpas]
         b. Offerings to the presiding ecclesiastic
         c. Offerings to the assembly of monks
      2. Request for the recipients to accept the offerings and to bestow their blessing [2b]
   B. The main recitation: a historical oration [2b]
      1. Introduction
         a. The patron [ruler] has mentioned the auspicious interrelationships within this assembly, and has asked that a history be recited
         b. The difficulties of giving an exhaustive account
         c. Statement that a brief account will be given
      2. Prologue: eulogistic mention of assembly [3a]
         a. General description of assembly’s circumstances, by virtue of its being perfectly complete in five respects:
            i. Place
            ii. Time
            iii. Teacher
iv. Teaching
v. Retinue of disciples

b. Description of whole assembly [4b]
i. Introduction of listeners according to the different groups making up the assembly
   (A) Presiding ecclesiastic: heads the row (gral gyi dbu mdzad)
   (B) The monastic assembly: forms the basis of the row (gral gyi gzhi bzung)
   (C) Men of high position: occupy the middle... (gral gyi gung snan [sic])
   (D) Learned men: ornament the sides (gral gyi zur brgyan)
   (E) Workers: support the end (gral gyi mtha' brten)

ii. Symbolic description of assembly in terms of geography or cosmology [5a]
   (A) Head of assembly as like the king of mountains
   (B) Middle of assembly as like the gleaming sun
   (C) Recesses of assembly as like land with an accumulated lake

iii. How this occasion for assembly is auspiciously interconnected [5a]
   (A) Founded in virtuous deeds (dge ba'i las kyiis gzhi bzung)
   (B) Joined by pure prayers (dag pa'i smon lam gyis mtshams sbyar)
   (C) Interdependently connected and assembled (brten zhing 'brel/'brel zhing tshogs pa'i...)

3. Cosmology and geography [5a]
a. Origin of the universe (and its arrangement) [5b]
i. Origin of the universe from the basic elements

ii. Geography
   (A) Abhidharma system of continents, islands, etc.
   (B) Layout of Jambudvīpa according to a Mahāyāna tradition
   (C) List of a few Central Asian countries
b. Origin of sentient beings [=origin and dispersement of human beings] [6a]
i. India
ii. China
iii. Tibet
   (A) Myth of origin
   (B) Six original tribes
iv. Summary of humans in Jambudvīpa

4. History: mundane and religious
   a. History of mundane traditions (mi chos kyi lo rgyus): the origin of kings [6b]
i. Introduction
ii. The old Indian line of Śākya kings
   (A) In India
   (B) In Tibet
      (1) Early kings
      (2) Kings of the first spread of Buddhism
      (3) Kings of the later spread of Buddhism
iii. The Lo ruling line [7b]
   (A) Introductory quotation
   (B) Legend of the ultimate ancestor’s coming down from the heavens
   (C) Historical rulers
b. History of religious tradition (lha chos kyi lo rgyus) [15b]
i. How the Buddha ruled his temporal and spiritual domain
ii. How the doctrine, the Noble Dharma, was taught
iii. How the community of those who upheld the doctrine came to flourish
   (A) In India
   (B) In China
   (C) In Tibet
iv. Remembering the kindness of those in the past [16b]
   (A) The kindness of the Buddha
   (B) The kindness of the three great early Tibetan kings
(C) The kindness of the great founder of Sakya and his sons

(D) The kindness of the three excellent persons who were priest and patrons (mchod yon bzang po rnam gsum)

C. Conclusion of the speech [17a]
1. Request for patient forgiveness of any mistakes the reciter makes
2. Requests made for the presiding ecclesiastic and the assembly to perform prayers of dedication, etc. [17a]
   a. The general purpose of the prayers: that the doctrine spreads and endures
   b. Particular purposes
      i. That the lifespans and activities of the kings be expansive
      ii. That rain be timely
      iii. That diseases come to an end
      iv. That men enjoy a festival of good fortune and perfect happiness

III Concluding matter
A. Final instructions to the reciter [17b]
   1. How to conclude the speech
   2. How the speech may be abridged
      a. A medium-length abridgment
      b. A very brief version

B. Colophon [18a]
APPENDIX D

OUTLINE OF A SKYABS THO

[Outline of a skyabs tho for recitation at the New Year’s Prayer Festival (smon lam chen mo), from Rang re rtams, pp. 25-28.]

I. Opening salutations
   A. Mention of the recipients of the offerings and requests
   B. Reverent introduction

II. Supplication
   A. General requests of the supplicant
      1. Religious
         a. May the Buddhist doctrine long endure
         b. May the followers of Buddhism have a long life
         c. May the monastic assembly grow and flourish
      2. Secular
         a. May the world and its inhabitants prosper
         b. May one’s own land [Tibet] in particular prosper
   B. Particular requests of the supplicant
      1. Requesting benefits for the deceased
         a. Mention of the names of the deceased
         b. Request that the above-named, together with all beings who have died, attain liberation
      2. Requesting benefits for the sick
         a. Mention of the names of particular sick people
         b. Request that the above, together with all sick beings, become well

III. Mention of offerings
   A. Offerings to the Enlightened Ones as symbolized by sacred images, scriptures, and stupas
   B. Offerings to the monastic assembly as a whole
   C. Offerings made to each member of the assembly individually
   D. Offerings to be made in the coming year

IV. Concluding summary of the supplication, stating the supplicant’s hope and trust that the foregoing requests will be granted
OUTLINE OF THE RGYAL-SRAS THOGS-MED SPEECH

I. Prologue
   A. Introduction and description of members of the assembly according to their position [414.3]
      1. In the sky: immediate and lineal gurus, and the Triratna
      2. Their supports (rten) of body, speech, and mind
         a. In general: in the Buddha fields
         b. In particular: in this great religious school
      3. The great "abbot" (mkhan chen) seated on the highest or first seat (gdan gyi ihog ma la bzhugs) [415.3]
      4. Masters of scripture and reasoning, led by the great teaching master (slob dpon chen po), are the leaders (thog drang) [415.6]
      5. The three "superior positions" (bla sgo) form the basis of the row (gral gyi gzhi bzung)
         a. In the first superior-position (bla sgo dang por) are those who uphold both sutra and mantra systems [416.1]
         b. In the middle superior-position: monks of royal descent
         c. In the lowest of superior positions: nobles and those of high position
      6. Great men, such as attendant patrons, suppress the center of the row (mi che ba rnams kyis gral gyi gung mnan)
      7. Experts of specialized fields beautifully ornament the row from the sides (yon tan mkhan po rnams kyis gral gyi zur nas mdzes par brgyan)
      8. Workers support the end (bya ba byed pa rnams kyis gral gyi mtha’ brten)
   B. Symbolic description of the row (gral) of assembled persons, with cosmological similies [416.4]
      1. Upper part of the row as like the king of mountains
      2. Middle as like the sun
      3. Lower part as like the moon
C. Statement of auspicious interrelationships within assembly [416.5]

1. The assembly is a strand of jewels, each jewel being a precious human existence produced by excellent deeds and aspirations

2. Linked together in a very profound way, since joined together by religion and sacred vows (chos dang dam tshig gis sbrel bas na ’brel ba shin tu zab)

3. Also a very excellent assembly (tshogs pa yang shin tu bzang)

II. The historical account (lo rgyus) [416.7]

A. Introduction

1. Many possibilities for religious histories mentioned in Sūtras
   a. According to the Bskal pa bzang po
   b. According to the Snying rje pad ma dkar po
   c. According to the Rgya che rol pa

2. Reason why those are not suitable here

B. A short history recalling great kindnesses of others (bka’ drin che ba’i lo rgyus) [417.2]

1. Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of the three times, and their disciples: kind to beings in the dark universe

2. Śākyamuni: kind[est] in this cosmos

3. In this world Jambudvipa: eight great Buddhist Masters

4. Other Indian masters

5. In Tibet: kings, ministers, translators, and pundits who brought Buddhism on Tibet

6. In particular: one’s own parents and monastic preceptors

7. And especially: the initiator and perpetuators of this doctrine, from Maitreya down to the present teachers

C. Speech for the sake of the present occasion (dgos pa skabs don gyi dbang du bgyis na) (Cf. Bshad mdzod T.: 507.3)

1. Introductory statement of speaker’s religious background

2. Mention of recent studies, and declaration of his happiness to expound a little on those topics this year

3. Announcement of offerings made in advance of that exposition [419.6]
   a. Introduction
b. Actual mention of offerings [420.3]

4. Concluding statement of requests [420.3]
   a. Specific requests to religious masters and assembly
      i. gtor ma byin brlabs
      ii. theg pa chen po'i mdo
      iii. prayer of merit dedication
   b. General request for the convocation to continue to assemble for the sake of merit and good fortune
APPENDIX F

THE TEXT OF SHRĪ MI YI DBANG PHYUG

Shrī mi yi dbang phyug mahādharmaṛaja a haṃ kyi gdung las zhabs drung mkhas shing grub brnyes rim par byon pa rnams la gsol ba ’debs byin rlabs chu rgyun zhes bya ba bzhugs so/

Namo//

’od gsal gnam lha’i rigs kyi dga’ tshal du//
rlabs chen thugs bskyed rmad byung lo ’bras g.yo//nam ’dren ’gro ba’i re bskong dpag bsam dbang//
skyes mchog rim par byon la gsol ba ’debs//

bsod nams rab rgyas lhas bjam lhun gyis grub//
mdo ru legs par ’chad pa’i ’byung gnas che//
bstan pa’i rgyal mtshan che mthot ’dzin mdzad pa’i//
phrin las dpal ’byor bzung por gsol ba ’debs//

mkhyen pa’i blo gros dkhyil ’khor yongs rdzogs shing//
brtse chen bsil zer ’bul spros gzi brjed ’bar//
nus pa’i ’gro khams mun pa’i g.yul las rgyal//
gsum ldan mtshan mo’i mgon la gsol ba ’debs//

’jam mgon bla ma’i thugs kyi sras mchog gyur//
’jam dpal dbyangs zhes ’gro la rab tu grags//
’jam dbyangs dgyes pa’i mkhyen brtse’i dkyil ’khor can//
’jam mgon nyin byed dbang por gsol ba ’debs//

bsod nams ye shes tshogs gnyis dpal rab rdzogs//
rdzogs sangs rgyas kyi yon tan dbang ’byor zhirg//
zhing khams kun tu bzang po’i mdzad phrin khyab//
khyab bdag dpal ldan bla mar gsol ba ’debs//

chos kyi dbang phyug chos smra yongs kyi rje//
bsod nams ye shes bsod nams mchog tu grub//
bstan 'dzin gtsug rgyan bstan pa'i snang byed mchog//
dbang phyug brgyad ldan dbang por gsol ba 'debs//

rdo rje 'dzin pa'i rgyal thabs dbang bsgyur rje/
rje btsun bla ma'i rgyal tshab lung bstan phrin//
phrin yig rna ba'i rgyan du bkod pa las/
las kun rnam par 'byed la gsol ba 'debs//

lhag pa'i tshul khrims 'chi med khang bzang du/
lhag pa'i ting 'dzin phan bde'i khri la bkod//
lhag pa'i shes rab chos spyan snying po bkra/
lhag bsam mchod sbyin brgya bar gsol ba 'debs//

de ltar bstod pa'i dge tshogs chu rgyun gyis/
'gro kun dad pa'i zhing sa gshin gyur te/
spangs rtogs yon tan lo 'bras rab rgyas pa'i/
bsam don yid bzhin 'grub pa'i rgyur gyur cig//

ces pa 'di'ang bstan 'dzin dam pa 'di rnams kyi rnam par thar pa
mthong thos dran gsum gyi dad pa brnyed de/ yul gtsang rong gi
'khyams po mkhan ming ngag dbang bsod nams rgyal mtshan blo
gros mi zad pa'i sgra dbyangs su bod pa'i rab tshe me khyi gnam lo
gsar 'char gyi rgyal zla'i dkar phyogs kyi dga' ba dang po'i nyin/
dga' ston du gzims chung smin grol gsang sngags pho brang du
gang dran du bris te gsol ba btab pa de de bzhin du 'grub par byin
gyis brlab tu gsol//
sarvamañgalaṁ
EXCERPT FROM THE BEM CHAG OF 'CHI-MED-DPAL-'DREN-BZANG-MO

stobs kyi rgya mtshor gyen du gyur pa'i mi dbang a ma dpal bzang po rgyal mtshan/ chos kyi rgyal po a mgon bzang po/ tshangs pa chen po bkra shis mgon/ mi dbang mgon po rgyal mtshan/ snyigs dus su mthu stobs dbang phyug mi dbang don 'grub rdo rje yab sras/ de rnams kyi thugs sras lungs brgya ma 'dres par gsal bar mkhyen pa'i bdag nyid chos rgyal mtshan dang ldan pa'i mi dbang dam pa a mgon bsam 'grub rab brtan phyogs thams cad las rnam par rgyal ba/ de sras mi dbang chen po bsam 'grub dpal 'bar/ a mchog brtan pa'i rdo rje'i sku mched/ de'i sras su stag shams sku'i snang snyan rol gar/ mi rje chos rgyal a mgon tshe dbang ngam rje phun tshogs gtsug rgyan nor bu nyid mes dbon gsum sog bstan po rtsis po che gyen du 'degs pa la spobs pa mtshungs pa dang bral ba'i chos kyi rgyal po'i gdungs [sic] su sku 'khrungs pa'i rgyal sras sems dpa' chen po rnams rim par byon pa'i tshul ni so so'i dgongs rdzogs kyi bem chag chen po rnams nas gsal lo/
APPENDIX H

OUTLINE OF THE CELEBRATION SPEECH IN THE
BSHAD MDZOD YID BZHIN NOR BU

(pagination based on the Bhutanese reproduction)

I. Introduction of assembly [p. 502.1]
   A. Invocation of Gurus and Three Jewels above
   B. The present assembly
      1. Monastic master (mkhan po): heading the row (gral gyi thog drangs)
      2. Old nobles or ministers: occupy the center (gral gyi gung skabs)
      3. Capable heroes: surround the superiors (gong bskor)
         [Alternatively (?):] heroes in their prime occupy the center
      4. Young men of good families: ornament the sides (gral gyi zur brgyan)
      5. Women: supporting the "extremities" of the row (gral gyi 'dab brten)

II. The recitation itself [503.1]
   A. The assembly and its interconnections
      1. The basic situation of the assembly (gzhi tshogs lugs): an excellent assembly (tshogs pa bzang)
      2. The causal connections (rgyu 'brel ba) (503.4)
         a. Ultimate connection: ultimately by deeds and prayers
         b. More specifically, joined by religion and vows
         c. In particular, connected by divine religion (lha chos) and by mundane tradition (mi chos)
            i. Buddhism
            ii. Bon
         d. Summary
   B. The historical account (lo rgyus) to be recited, based upon such a coming together and interconnection [504.3]
1. Introduction
   a. Distinction of religious versus mundane
   b. Qualities desired in oratory (reasons for the following speech)

2. Account of great past kindnesses (*bka' drin che ba'i lo rgyus* [504.5]
   a. The kindest in the threefold universe: the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas
   b. The kindest being in this degenerate time: Buddha Śākyamuni
   c. The kindest among beings of this world: the great Buddhist masters of India, the six “ornaments” (*rgyan*) and two “supremes” (*mchog*)
   d. The kindest in Tibet [506.2]
      i. The three early religious monarchs
      ii. Bla chen mkhan brgyud
      iii. Atiśa
      iv. Similarly other translators and scholars
         (A) Dam-pa Sangs-rgyas
         (B) Padmasambhava
         (C) Marpa the Translator
         (D) Vairocana the Translator
   e. The kindest here in Lho-brag G.yu-ru [506.5]
      i. G.yu-ru Chos-kyi-dbang-phyug
      ii. 'Gro-mgon Mnga'-bdag yab-sras
      iii. Sgrub-chen Phyag-na-rdo-rje
      iv. Lha-ri Sde-snod-'dzin-pa
      v. Dge-bshes chen-po Byang-chub-'od
   f. The kindest to each of us [507.2]
      i. Parents
      ii. Religious preceptor

3. Oration for a special purpose [507.3]
   a. Introduction
      i. Religious tradition, the supreme
      ii. Mundane tradition, the middling [509.2]
      iii. A complete man in the world
   b. Mention of the special reasons for celebrating this occasion [509.3]
APPENDIX I

EXCERPT FROM THE DZAR MANUSCRIPT

nye ba sa yi thig le 'di nyid du1/ slob dpon padma'i lung bstan pa bzhin/

o rgyan nga yi sprul pa ni//
phyag na rdo rje'i byin brlabs pa//
a ma zhes bya kun tu grags//
de ni su myur mang du brtul//
brtul kyang yid la dga' sems med//
bsdos kyang thub pa mi 'gyur ro//

zhes dang/ chos brgyud mi la ras pa/ bon brgyud zing pa mthu chen/
mi brgyud stag rgya'o/ sa steng gnam 'og la dbang bsgyur ba dang/
mnyam med chos kyi rgyal po bsod nams lhun grub/ sa skya pan
chen gyi sku'i skye ba yin par/ ngag gi dbang po rtse2 gdong bdag3
chen nas kyang . . . .

1. su
2. brtse
3. dag
(१)

१ | मैरिएला मण्ड्याकुश्ती इमारती तथोंतमस्तु नसुपालगन

२ | श्रीमाती मण्ड्याकुश्ती लिन्यात्मकात

३ | मैरिएलाकुश्ती इमारती तथोंतमस्तु नसुपालगन
(3)

(བ) འབྲས་འབྲི་བུད་། རུབུམ་གཤེར་སུམ་སྡུག། ཅི་བོ་
གསེར་བོད་ལྟོགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་ལེ་ནོར་ཞིག་དེར་ནོར་
བྱས་པས། ཞིང་ངོ་གཟིགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་ལེ་ནོར་ཞིག་
ལྟ་བཅས་འདི་མ་ལྟར་དུ་བསྐྱོད་བྱས།

(བ) འབྲས་འབྲི་བུད་། རུབུམ་གཤེར་སུམ་སྡུག། ཅི་བོ་
གསེར་བོད་ལྟོགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་ལེ་ནོར་ཞིག་དེར་ནོར་
བྱས་པས། ཞིང་ངོ་གཟིགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་ལེ་ནོར་ཞིག་
ལྟ་བཅས་འདི་མ་ལྟར་དུ་བསྐྱོད་བྱས།

(བ) འབྲས་འབྲི་བུད་། རུབུམ་གཤེར་སུམ་སྡུག། ཅི་བོ་
གསེར་བོད་ལྟོགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་ལེ་ནོར་ཞིག་དེར་ནོར་
བྱས་པས། ཞིང་ངོ་གཟིགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་ལེ་ནོར་ཞིག་
ལྟ་བཅས་འདི་མ་ལྟར་དུ་བསྐྱོད་བྱས།
(3) བོད་ཀྱི་མ་ལས་ཞིང་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་སྡེ་བར་བོད་པོ་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན་ཐོབ་པ་མཉམ་པར་མེ་ཟིན
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[Translation or content not provided]
(३)

[Text in Tibetan script]

[Page number 208]
བོད་སུམ་ཅིག་པར་ལམ་བཞི་བོད་སུམ་ཅིག་པར་བཞི་བོད་
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད་
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི་བོད
སུམ་ཅིག་བཞི་བཅས་བོད་སྲུང་བཞི
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ཐོན་ཐོ་ལུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ཐུ་ Tibeto-Brahmi script
(8)

བདེ་བེན་བ་མི་དོན་བོད་ཀྱིས་རང་ཐོབ་གྱི་
དབང་བཞག་བོད་ཀྱིས་རང་བཞག་བོད་ཀྱིས་
བོད་ཀྱི་གོང་དང་ཉེས་དབེན་དགོངས་
དབང་བཞག་བོད་ཀྱིས་རང་བཞག་
རང་ཐོབ་བོད་ཀྱི་ཐོབ་ཕུན་
སྐྱེས་ཚིགས་དབང་བཞག་
བོད་ཀྱིས་རང་བཞག་
སྐྱེས་ཚིགས་དབང་བཞག་
རང་ཐོབ་བོད་ཀྱི་ཐོབ་ཕུན་
སྐྱེས་ཚིགས་

བདེ་བེན་བ་མི་དོན་བོད་ཀྱིས་རང་ཐོབ་
གྱིས་རང་བཞག་བོད་ཀྱིས་
བོད་ཀྱི་གོང་དང་ཉེས་
དབེན་དགོངས་
དབང་བཞག་
བོད་ཀྱིས་
སྐྱེས་

བདེ་བེན་བ་མི་དོན་
བོད་ཀྱིས་
བོད་ཀྱི་

བདེ་བེན་བ་མི་
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བཞི་ཐུབ་མ་ཐོན་པ་ཐོག་མེད་པ་ཐོག་ཞེས་པ་
བཟོད་པ་དྲི་དམ་ཐེ་མོ་ཚེ་ད་མི་བཞི་
ཡི་མི་ཏུ་མོ་ཚེ་ད་མི་བཞི་
དད་པར་མདོ་ནི་ལེ་གུ་ནི། ཏོས་མི་བཞི་
གཟོག་མ་ཐོག་མེད་པ་ཐོག་ཞེས་པ་
བཟོད་པ་དྲི་དམ་ཐེ་མོ་ཚེ་ད་མི་བཞི་
བཞི་ཐུབ་མ་ཐོན་པ་ཐོག་མེད་པ་ཐོག་ཞེས་པ་
བཟོད་པ་དྲི་དམ་ཐེ་མོ་ཚེ་ད་མི་བཞི་
བཞི་ཐུབ་མ་ཐོན་པ་ཐོག་མེད་པ་ཐོག་ཞེས་པ་
བཟོད་པ་དྲི་དམ་ཐེ་མོ་ཚེ་ད་མི་བཞི་
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"यदि सुनिश्चित नहीं जानिए कि तुम्हारे कथितत्त्व का क्या उपयोग हो रहा है; तो तुम्हारे जानकारी के लिए कुछ ज्ञान की आवश्यकता होगी। अतः सुनिश्चित करें कि तुम्हारे कथितत्त्व का क्या उपयोग हो रहा है।"
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(16)

དོན་པའི་དེ་བཟོད་བཞི་ལ་ དེ་བསྟན་པ་དོན་ོད་
བཟོད་དོན་ོད་དེ་བཟོད་ོད་དེ་བཟོད་
བཟོད་ལ་ དེ་བཟོད་ནི་ནི་དེ་བཟོད་ནི་
དོན་པ་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་
དོན་པ་དོན་དོན་དོན་དོན་
དོན་པ་དོན་དོན་དོན་
དོན་པ་དོན་དོན་

does not overlap the page boundary.
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་དེ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་དོན་དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་དོན་དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་
སུ་མོ་གསུང་བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
དོན་དེ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་གནང་བསྡུག་བསྐོོལ་
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་དེ་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་དོན་
དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་
བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་
དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་
བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་
དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་
བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་
དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་
བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་
དུ་ཁོ་མ་�ཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་
བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་
བོད་ཀྱི་དོན་
དུ་ཁོ་མ་གཞི་སྒྲུབ་བཞི་
སྲེང་བརྒྱུབ་སུ་མོ་གསུང་
བརྟེན་པོ་དེ་ཡིན་པའི་ཐོབ་
བརྒྱུབ་དེའི་
སྡུག་བསྐོོལ་བ་ེས་
(၄၈)

(၄၈)
B. Map of Lo and Environs

Map drawn by Lobsang Tsultim
C. Map of Nepal and Western Tibet

Map drawn by Lobsang Tsultim
APPENDIX K

SPEECHES THAT WERE NOT ANALYZED OR WERE NOT ACCESSIBLE

(1) Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzang-po, Phyī’i gtam bshad, Sa skya bka’ bum (Tokyo: Tōyō Bunko, 1969), vol. 10, pp. 395.3.4-396.1.6, and also: Nang gi yas gtam, vol. 10, pp. 396.1.6-396.4.4.


(3) Glo-bo mkhan-chen Bsod-nams-lhun-grub. Yas gtam bsdoms tshan. This title is listed as no. 29 of the second volume of his collected works as listed in E. G. Smith’s English introduction to Glo-bo mkhan-chen’s Tshad ma rigs gter gyi rnam bshad.

(4) Dkon-mchog-lhun-grub, Ngor-chen. Yas gtam rin po chei’ phreng ba. This work was probably printed at Derge with his other writings.

(5) ‘Jam-dbyangs-mkhyen-brtse’i-dbang-po. Phun sum tshogs pa lnga ldan dang maṇḍal gyi rnam bshad zung ’brel du ’chad tshul shul nyung gsal. Collected Works, vol. 2 (kha), pp. 168-195. This work was brought to my notice by Mr. Tashi Tsering.


(7) Skug spa [sic] ’kha spyod zhu s. ho [sic]. Dbu can MS, 26ff, Library of Tibetan Works and Archives, Dharamsala. This work was brought to my notice by Mr. Tashi Tsering.
INDEXES

I. Place Names, II. Tibetan Personal Names, III. Tibetan Terms, IV. Other Names and Terms

I. PLACE NAMES

Annapurna, 1
'Bam-mkhar, 151
Baragaon, 4, 5, 9, 27
Bhutan, 17, 63
Bodhgaya, 81
Bo-dong E, 68
Brag-dkar (monastery), 43, 148
Brag-dkar-theg-chen-gling, 148, 154
'Brong-pa, 71
Bsam-grub-dge-'phel, the Tsarang palace, 149
Bsam-grub-gling, 136, 151
Bsam-gtan-chod-gling, 151
Byams-chen (in Mönthang), 147
Byams-gling, see Byams-pa-bshad-grub-gling
Byams-pa-bshad-grup-gling, 42
Chamba, 93
Charang, see Tsarang
China, 81f, 148, 151, 192
Chu-mig-brgya-rtsa, 7
Copenhagen, 62, 72, 225
Dbang-'dus-lha-khang, 151
Dbu-ru, 113
Derge, 60, 74
Dga'-ldan, 71
Dhaulagiri, 1, 12
Dngul-chu, 74
Dol, 147
Dolpo (Dol-po), 5, 6, 10, 14f, 19, 31f
Dpal E, 68, 74
Dwags-po, 95
Dzar, 110f, 129, 152
Dzong, 129, 152
Dzongka (r) (Rdzong-dkar; Rdzong-ka), ix, 10, 24, 111, 113, 119, 153
E-wam, see Ngor
Garphu, 22, 28f
Gelung (Ghilinggaon), 25, 30f, 136
Gilgit, 82
Gnam-ru, 14, 112
Gnam-tsho, 112
Gorkha, 14, 18-20, 130, 151
Gru, 148, 154
Gtsang ix, 70, 112, 141, 151, 153
Gtsang-rang (see also Tsarang), 14
Guge, 10, 15, 145, 153
Gungthang, 5, 10, 15, 112-114, 119, 153f
Gurkha, see Gorkha
Gyim-shod ri-bo-rtse-nga, 138
India, xii, 3, 17, 81f, 89, 95f, 99f, 148, 192, Jomosom, 27
Jo-nang, 71
Jumla, 4, 7, 17f, 130, 150
Kag (Kāgbeni), 4f, 9, 15, 28, 152
Kailash (Kailāsa), ix, 143
Kali Gandaki, 1, 3f, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 154
Kashmir, 11, 82
Kathmandu, 8
Kham, 71
Khotan, 82
Khyung-po (Khams), 112
Khyung-rdzong-dkar-po (see also Dzongkar), 114
Khyung-tshang, 151
Ko, 147
Kobang (Larjung), 4
Kyirong, ix, 10, 112
Ladakh, 6f, 11, 17, 129f, 143
La-stod, 153
La-stod Iho, 24
Lha-gdong-phug, 28
Lho-brag, 63, 70, 202
Lo-Gekar, 149, 151, 155
Lumbini, 28
Magadha, ix
Manang, 9
Mang-yul, 10, 145
Mantang, see Mönthang
Maryul, 10, 15
Meru (or Sumeru), 59, 73, 81, 152
Mkha'-spyod-steng, 146
Mnga'-ris, see Ngari
Mnga'-ris-rdzong, 14
Mngon-dga'-byang-chub-gling, 150, 155f
Mon, 143, 147
Mongolia, 82
Mon Ko Dol, 147
Monthang, 5, 7, 13, 17, 28, 60-62, 96, 130, 146, 148, 151
Mukhunksetra, 7
Muktiketra, 11f
Muktinäth, 4f, 7, 9, 11f, 110, 129, 131, 152 f
Mumuni, 11
Mumuniksetra, 7
Namgyal (Rnam-rgyal), 27, 34, 37, 42f, 65, 148, 154f
Nang-chen, 71
Ngari (Mnga'-ris), 5f, 9f, 14f, 109, 111-113, 119, 145f, 148
Ngor, 56, 72, 80, 136, 141, 147-149, 155, 188,
Nyag-rong, 71
Nye-shang, 9
Odšilyana, 81
'Om-bu-bla-sgang, 107
'Om-bu-lha-mkhar, 99, 146
O-rgyan, 81
Panchgaon, 4, 9, 27
Parbat, 154
Phu-phag Bsam-gtan-gling, 42
Potala, Mount, 81
Purang (Pu-rang, Spu-hrangs, etc.), ix, 10, 15, 18, 119, 145
Rdo-rje-brag, 136
Rdza-ri-dbyung-pa'i-rgyu, 151
Rdzong-dkar, see Dzongka
Rdzong-gsar, 74
Re-shid Sdom-gsum-gling, 42, 60
Rgyal-mo-rong, 112, 138
Ribo bumpa, 32
Ri-shed, see Re-shid
Ri-sheng, see Re-shid
Rnam-rgyal, see Namgyal
Rnam-rgyal-chos-sde-rying-pa, 42
Rta-nag, 150
Rta-ra, 74
Rtsang-drangs (see also Tsarang), 154
Rtse-gdong, 141
Sakya (Sa-skya), 95, 123, 136, 150, 154, 193
Śālāgrāma, 11f
Śambhala, 81
Sa-ngor-chos-tshogs, 56
Se-rib, 9
Sga Thar-lam-dgon, 60
Shang, 153
Shangs, 153
Sherpa region, 17, 32f
II. TIBETAN PERSONAL NAMES

A-bzang-rdo-rje, 101, 124
A-drung, Sde-pa, 120, 134
A-ham, see the personal names that follow this title
A-mal-dpal (A-me-dpal), 14-18, 20, 30, 35, 42f, 96-99, 101f, 104-106, 110f, 113f, 119f, 123, 125, 130, 132f, 141, 146f, 153f
A-ma-dpal-bzang-po-rgyal-mtshan, 119f, 146. See also A-ma-dpal.
Ama Pal, see A-ma-dpal
A-mchog-brtan-pa, 121, 129, 134
A-mchog Brtan-pa’i rdo-rje 125, 129, 134
A-mchog Seng-ge [Rdo-rje] brtan-pa, 120. See also A-seng.
Ame Pal, see A-ma-dpal
A-mes-zhab Ngag-dbang-kun-dga’-bsod-nams, 75, 141, 150, 155
A-mgon-bzang-po, 43, 101, 104f, 119f, 123-125, 133, 147f, 154
A-mo-gha, 101, 120, 122-124, 133
Amoghabadzra, Dnag-dpon, 120, 133. See also A-mo-gha
A-mye-byams-pa-dpal, 141
A-mye-dge-ba-dpal, 141
A-mi-bzang, 101, 124
Angun Tenzing Trandul, see 'Jam-dpal-bstan-'dzin-dgra-'dul
A-phan, 120, 123, 133
A-rgyal, 120, 123, 133
A-seng Rdo-rje-brtan-pa, 120, 124, 133
Ayupa (A-yur-pa), monk of 'Tsarang' 22, 29
Bai-lo Tshe-dbang-kun-khyab, 143
'Bai-ra-ba Rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang, 92
Bco-brgyad-khri-chen Thub-bstan-legs-bshad-rgya-mtsho, (Chogay Trichen Rinpoche), xi, xii, 23f, 26, 28, 33, 93, 108, 114, 125f, 129, 132, 140, 155
Bde-bzang, 118
Bde-legs, 118
Bde-legs-rgya-mtsho, 124, 133
Bde-legs-rgya-mtsho'i-dpal-mnga'-ba, 120, 124. See also Bde-legs-rgya-mtsho Bde-mchog-mgon, 118
Bkra-shis, 118
Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal, 114, 118
Bkra-shis-bzang-po, Mi-dpon, 119f, 133
Bkra-shis-lde, 114
Bkra-shis-mgon, ix, 15, 42f, 101, 105, 123-126, 133, 141, 148
Bkra-shis-mgon-dpal-bzang-po, 120. See also Bkra-shis-mgon Bkra-shis-mgon, "king of Purang," 15
Bkra-shis-'od-'bar, Sde-pa, 121, 128, 134, 155
Bkra-shis-'od-zer, Mkhan-chen, 55f
Bkra-shis-rgyal-mtshan, Shar-rdza, 137
Bkra-shis-rnam-rgyal, 122, 124, 130, 135, 143, 156
Bkra-shis-snying-po, 28, 34, 101, 105f, 122, 131, 135, 151f
Bkra-shis-snying-po-phyogs-las-rnam-par-rgyal-ba'i-sde, 131
Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas, Khri-thog-pa, 120, 127f, 134, 155
Bla-ma-dam-pa Bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan, 74
Bla-ma 'Jam-dbyangs (-pa), see 'Jam-dbyangs-pa
Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, Rje, 105, 120, 126f, 133, 149
Bod-mkhas-pa, 155
Bo-dong (pan-chen Phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal), 14, 33
Brag-dkar-rta-so sprul-sku Chos-kyi-dbang-phyung, 9, 11f, 144
'Brom-ston, 54
Brtan-pa'i-rdo-rje, A-mchog, 125, 129, 134
Brtan-pa'i-rgya-mtsho, 120, 125-127, 133
Bsam-grub-dpal-'bar, 105, 121, 125, 129, 134, 143, 150
Bsam-grub-rab-brtan, 105, 115, 121, 125, 129, 150
Bsam-grub-rab-brtan-phyogs-las-rnam-rgyal, see Bsam-grub-rab-brtan
Bsam-grub-rdo-rje, 105, 115, 121, 128f, 134, 149
Bsam-gsang sprul-sku Chos-kyi-nyi-ma, 151
Bsam-gtan, blo-mthun Dmu-dge, 24, 33
Bsod-nams-bkra-shis, 128
Bsod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dpang-po, 105, 121, 126, 129, 134, 150
Bsod-nams-bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal, 122, 130. See also Bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal
Bsod-nams-dpal-'bar, Chos-mdzad, 121, 127, 134

231
Bsod-nams-dpal-'byor (-bzang-po), 105, 121, 126, 129, 150
Bsod-nams-grags-pa' Pan-chen, 20, 114
Bsod-nams-lde, Khri-rgyal, 114, 140
Bsod-nams-lhun,grub-legs-pa'i 'byung-gnas, see Glo-bo mkhan-chen
Bsod-nams-rgyal-mltshan-Bla-ma-dam-pa, 74
Bsod-nams-skyabs-ldan dge-rgyan, 11
Bsod-nams-tsbe-brtan-Yo-seb dge-rgyan, 11
Bstan-'dzin, [Glo-bo rgyal-po], 130
Bstan-'dzin-dbang-rgyal, 122, 130, 135, 142, 156
Bstan-'dzin-jam-dpal-dgra-'dul, 105, 131f, 152
Bstan-'dzin ras-pa, 9, 20
Bstan-rgod 'Bar-ba-spu-bdun, 107
Btsan-rgod kha-che, 99
Btsan-rje-grags, 116
Btsan-mgon, 116
'Bum-lde-mgon, 9, 14
Byam-dpal-rdo-rje, 101. See also 'Jam-dpal-rdo-rje
Byang-chub-'od, Dge-bshes, 202
Byir-ma, Khri-dpon, 114, 118f, 133
Bzang, 117
Bzang-khri-btsan-po, 116
Bzang-mchog, 118
Bzang-rje, 116f
'Chi-med-phan-bde'i-snying-po, 122, 126, 131, 135
Chos-dpal-bzang-po, Chos-mdzad, 121, 134
Chos-grags, Dge-bshes, 71
Chos-kyi-blo-gros-rgyal-mltshan, 105, 126f, 149. See also Blo-gros-rgyal-mltshan, Rye
Chos-kyi-nyin-byed of Langka, 155
Chos-kyi-rin-chen, Ta'i-si-tu, 25
Chos-kyi-rje Bsod-nams-lhun-grub, see Glo-bo mkhan-chen
Chos-rgyal-phun-tshogs, Rig-'dzin mnga9-bdag, 150, 155
Chos-rje 'Jam-dbyangs-pa, see 'Jam-dbyangs-pa
Chos-rnam-rgyal, Rta-nag mkhan-po, 150
Chos-skyabs-dpal-bzang, 128, 143
Chos-skyong-'bum, 104, 114f, 118f, 133, 146, 153
Dalai Lama VII, 130, 143
Dam-pa Sangs-rgyas, 202
Dar-ma-rin-chen, Rgyal-tshab, 71
Dbang-chen-mo, see Rgyal-sras Khams-gsum-dbang-'dus
Dbang-'dus-smyon-pa, 103
Dbang-'dus-tshe-ring, Nor-rgyas-nang-pa, see Nor-rgyas-nang-pa
Dbang-phyug-sgom-le, 118
Dbang-phyug-yon-tan, 118
Dbang-phyug-yon-tan-'bum, 114, 140
'Jam-dbyangs-rin-chen-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po, 126f
'Jam-dbyangs-shes-rab-rgya-mtsho, 42-44, 147, 154
'Jam-dpal-bstan-'dzin-dgra-'dul, xii, 16, 22, 96
'Jam-dpal-dgra-'dul, 101, 103, 105f, 129, 131f, 135, 151f
'Jam-dpal-rdo-rje, 101, 131
Jo-nang Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, see Kun-dga'-grol-mchog
Kagar Rinpoche, 31f
Khams-gsum-dbang-'dus, Rgyal-sras, 101, 132
Khetsun Sangpo, 154
Khri Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal, see Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal
Khri-dpal, 116
Khri-dpon Byir-ma, see Byir-ma, Khri-dpon
Khri-gnam-lha, 116
Khri-lya-'od-chen, 116
Khri Mchog-grub-lde, see Mchog-grub-lde
Khri Phun-tshogs-lde, see Phun-tshogs-lde
Khri Ra-lpa-can, see Ra-lpa-can
Khri-rgyal Bsdod-nams-lde, see Bsdod-nams-lde, Khri-rgyal
Khri-rgyal-bu-chung, 115
Khri-strong-lde'u-btsan, 20, 97f, 102
Khri-thog-pa Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas, 120, 127f, 134
Khye'u-chung, 107
Khyi'u-chung, Dmu, 99, 145
Khyung-dkar Thog-la-'bar, 138
Khyung-nag Mu-khyung-rgyan, 138
Khyung-'phags Khra-mo, 138
Khyung-po Spung-sad zu-rtse, 139
Khyung-ser Lha-khyung, 138
Klo-bo rgyal-po A-seng, 124. See also A-seng Rdo-rje-brant-pa
Klong-chen-pa Dri-med-'od-zer, 92
Kong-sprul Blo-gros-mtha'-yas, 137f
Kun-bzang-rje, 117
Kun-dga'-blo-gros-a-chen, 34, 151, 156
Kun-dga'-blo-gros, Sde-pa, 120, 127, 134
Kun-dga'-'med, Mchog-sprul rje-btsun, 122, 130. See also 'Chi-med-dpal-'dren-bzang-mo
Kun-dga'-dbang-phug, Rgyal-tshab, 43, 148, 154
Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, Jo-nang, 1, 8, 10, 42, 60-62, 71f, 110f, 136, 141, 153-155
Kun-dga'-nor-bu, 101, 105f, 131f, 135, 144, 152
Kung-dga'-'rab-brant of Chos-khor, 131
Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan, Dpon-btsun, 123, 133
Kun-grol-grags-pa, 137
Kun-gzigs-chos-kyi-snang-ba, 'Brug-chen, 11
Lcang-skya Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje, 143
Legs-ldan-bdud-'joms-rdo-rje, Rig-'dzin, 18, 21
Lha-khyung-rgyan-pa, 138
Lha-mchog-seng-ge, 60, 72, 149

Kun-grol-mchog, see Kun-dga'-grol-mchog
Kagar Rinpoche, 31f
Khams-gsum-dbang-'dus, Rgyal-sras, 101, 132
Khetsun Sangpo, 154
Khri Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal, see Bkra-shis-brtsegs-pa-dpal
Khri-dpal, 116
Khri-dpon Byir-ma, see Byir-ma, Khri-dpon
Khri-gnam-lha, 116
Khri-lya-'od-chen, 116
Khri Mchog-grub-lde, see Mchog-grub-lde
Khri Phun-tshogs-lde, see Phun-tshogs-lde
Khri Ra-lpa-can, see Ra-lpa-can
Khri-rgyal Bsdod-nams-lde, see Bsdod-nams-lde, Khri-rgyal
Khri-rgyal-bu-chung, 115
Khri-strong-lde'u-btsan, 20, 97f, 102
Khri-thog-pa Bkra-shis-stobs-rgyas, 120, 127f, 134
Khye'u-chung, 107
Khyi'u-chung, Dmu, 99, 145
Khyung-dkar Thog-la-'bar, 138
Khyung-nag Mu-khyung-rgyan, 138
Khyung-'phags Khra-mo, 138
Khyung-po Spung-sad zu-rtse, 139
Khyung-ser Lha-khyung, 138
Klo-bo rgyal-po A-seng, 124. See also A-seng Rdo-rje-brant-pa
Klong-chen-pa Dri-med-'od-zer, 92
Kong-sprul Blo-gros-mtha'-yas, 137f
Kun-bzang-rje, 117
Kun-dga'-blo-gros-a-chen, 34, 151, 156
Kun-dga'-blo-gros, Sde-pa, 120, 127, 134
Kun-dga'-'med, Mchog-sprul rje-btsun, 122, 130. See also 'Chi-med-dpal-'dren-bzang-mo
Kun-dga'-dbang-phug, Rgyal-tshab, 43, 148, 154
Kun-dga'-grol-mchog, Jo-nang, 1, 8, 10, 42, 60-62, 71f, 110f, 136, 141, 153-155
Kun-dga'-nor-bu, 101, 105f, 131f, 135, 144, 152
Kung-dga'-'rab-brant of Chos-khor, 131
Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan, Dpon-btsun, 123, 133
Kun-grol-grags-pa, 137
Kun-gzigs-chos-kyi-snang-ba, 'Brug-chen, 11
Lcang-skya Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje, 143
Legs-ldan-bdud-'joms-rdo-rje, Rig-'dzin, 18, 21
Lha-khyung-rgyan-pa, 138
Lha-mchog-seng-ge, 60, 72, 149
Lha-rgyal-bu-chung, 115
Lha-rgya-ri khri-chen, 95
Lha-ri sde-snod-’dzin-pa, 202
Lha-tho-tho-ri-gnyan-btsan, 117
Lho-sde khri-dpon Byir-ma, 114. See also Byir-ma
Lo-chen Mañju-ba, 155
Lu-gu-dar-re, 118
Mantang Radjinpa, 98
Mar-pa lo-tsā-ba, 202
Mchog-grub-lde, Khri, 140
Mgon-ne, 116
Mgon-pa-dpal, 116
Mgon-po, 117f
Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan, 125f, 133, 142
Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan-grags-pa-mtha’-yas-pa’i-sde, 126, 133. See also Mgon-po-rgyal-mtshan.
Mgon-sde-nyi-ma-mgon (Mgon-lde-nyi-ma-mgon), 29, 34, 97f, 102, 106
Mi-dpon Bkra-shis-bzang-po, see Bkra-shis-bzang-po, Mi-dpon
Migs-dmar-legs-bsam, 26
Mi-la-ras-pa, 110-113, 118, 139
Mil-rje-gung-rgyal, 99, 115, 145
Mu-khyung-rgyan, 138
Mu-ne-btsan-po, 106
Mkhas-grub-rje Dge-legs-dpal-bzang, 71
Mnga’-ris pač-chen Padma-dbang-rgyal, 18, 21
Mu-khri-btsan-po, 97f, 102, 106
Mus-chen Dkon-mchog-rgyal-mtshan, 44
Ngag-dbang-bsod-nams-rgyal-mtshan-blo-gros-mi-zad-pa’i-sgra-dbyangs, Ngor
Khang-gsar mkhan-po, 126, 199.
Ngag-dbang-kun-dga’-blo-gros, 151. See also Kun-dga’-blo-gros, Sa-chen
Ngor-chen Kun-dga’-bzang-po, 14, 17, 20, 30, 35, 42-44, 80, 110f, 123, 147
153f 225
Nor-’dzin-bde-legs-dbang-mo, 124, 130, 143, 156
Nor-’dzin-dbang-mo, 143. See also Nor-’dzin-bde-legs-dbang-mo
Nor-rgyas-nang-pa Dbang-dus-tshe-ring, 53f
Nyi-ma-rnam-rgyal, La-dwags rgyal-po, 156
’Od-bzang, 116
’Od-de-gung-rgyal, 99f, 145. See also ’O-lde-gung-rgyal.
’O-lde-gung-rgyal, 107
’O-lo, 128, 134
Orgyan-gling-pa, 93
Pad-dkar-yid-bzhin-dbang-po, 21
Padma-phrin-las, Brag-dkar rig-’dzin II, 10, 21, 35
Phag-mo-gru-pa Rlangs, 107
’Phags-pa Blo-gros-rgyal-mtshan, 82, 92
’Phrul-chen-’od, 116
Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu, 105, 111. See also Tshe-dbang
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Phun-tshogs-lede, Khri, 140
Phyag-na-rdo-rje, Gru-chen, 202
Rab-brtan- Sde-pa, 121, 128, 134
Ral-pa-can, 97f
Ratna-shri, 42, 153
Rdo-rje, 117
Rdo-rje-'phrin-las, 105, 122, 131, 135, 142, 144, 151
Rdzong-gsar Mkhyen-brtse Chos-kyi-blo-gros, 59
Rgos-kha-che, Btsan, 99, 145
Rgod-tshang ras-pa Sn-tshogs-rang-grol, 21, 141f
Rgya-hor-dpal-bzang, 102, 105f, 108, 121, 127f, 134, 149, 155
Rgyal-ba Lha-mchog-seng-ge, see Lha-mchog-seng ge
Rgyal-bu-chung, 118
Rgyal-mchog, 118
Rgyal-mo Su-ga, 129. See also Su-ga
Rgyal-mtshan, 117
Rgyal-rin, 118
Rgyal-sras Khams-gsum-dbang-'dus, 132, 144
Rgyal-sras Thogs-med-dpal-bzang-po, 56, 67f, 74, 87
Rgyal-tshab Kun-dga'-dbang-phyug, see Kun-dga'-dbang-phyug
Rig-'dzin mnga'-bdag Chos-rgyal-phun-tshogs, see Chos-rgyal-phun-tshogs
Rig-'dzin Zhig-po, 138
Rig-snang 'Od-kyi-rgyal-po, 138
Rin-ch'en, 118
Rin-ch'en-bzang-po, Dpon-btsun, 123, 133
Rin-spungs-pa, 124, 142
Rje-mgon, 116
Rong-ston Shes-byan-kun-rig, 44
Rtag-rtse-ba Mi-pham-shes-rab-phun-tshogs, 150, 155
Rtse-lha-'od-bzang, 117
Rtse-mgon, 116
Sa-gnam-mes-po, 112, 139
Sa-gnam-tshad-mi, 118
Sa-lo, see Sa-skya lo-tsâ-ba
Sangs-rgyas-bla-ma, Gter-ston, 155
Sangs-rgyas-bstan-'dzin, 90
Sangs-rgyas-phun-tshogs, 20, 42, 110-112, 136f, 154
Sa-skya 'kthon, 58, 107
Sa-skya khri-'dzin Rin-po-che, 58
Sa-skya lo-tsâ-ba 'Jam-dbyangs-kun-dga'-bsod-nams, 136, 141
Sa-skya Pandita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan, 11, 54-57, 71, 77, 90, 111
Sde-dge yab-chen, 20, 136
Sde-gzhung sprul-skhu Kun-dga'-bstan-pa'i-nyi-ma, xi, 34, 44, 54, 56-70, 71f, 74f, 91, 153
Sde-pa A-drung, 120, 127, 134
Seng-ge-'bum, 115, 118
Sgrub-khang-pa Dpal-ldan-don-grub, see Dpal-ldan-don-grub
Shākyā-mchog-ldan, Gser-mdog pañ-chen, 24, 33f, 42f, 80, 92, 148, 154f, 188, 225
Shākyā-rin-chen, 225
Sheś [=Shi-sa], 146
Shes-rab-bla-ma, 100, 104, 115, 118f, 133, 146, 153
Shi-sa-pa, 146, 153
Shri-bhūtibhadra, 10, 153
Si-ti Pañ-chen Choṣ-ky-'byung-gnas, 130, 143
Skya-'phar-ba, 114
Skye-skya-sgang-pa, 129
Smon-ne, 118
Sna-tshogs-rang-grol, Rgos-tshang ras-pa, see Rgod-tshang ras-pa
Snye-shang lo-tṣa-ba, 155
Spra'o-dpon-tshang, 60
Spu-lde-gung-rgyal, 107
Spung-sad zu-rtses, Khyung-po, 139
Srong-btsan-sgam-po, 117
Stag-gdond-ri-pa, 117
Stag-gung-bzang, 117
Stag-khri-gzar-po-che, 116
Stag-khri-zings-chen, 117
Stag-khrom-rje, 115
Stag-lha-chen, 117
Stag-lha-rtses, 115
Stag-mgon, 116
Stag-'od-rtses, 117
Stag-rgya-bo, 111f, 116, 139
Stag-rgya-bo chu-ral-can, 112
Stag-rgya’o, 111. See also Stag-also Stag-rgya-bo
Stag-seng-ge-'bum, 104, 115, 133, 146
Stag-sham Rol-pa’i-rdo-rje, 150
Stag-skya-bo, 116, 139
Stag-skya-ring, 117
Stag-smān-rtses, 115
Stag-smar-go-chen, 117
Stag-sngos-ring, 117
Stag-yer-sman, 117
Sta-skya-bo, 139
Su-ga, 110f, 129
Su-ga-siddhi, see Su-ga
Sum-pa mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal-'byor, 44, 54, 58, 71
Tenpay Gyaltsen, 27-29, 34
Thar-rtses Byams-pa-nam-mkha'-kun-bzang, xii
Theg-chen-chos-kyi-rgyal-po Kun-dga'-bkra-shis, 33
Theg-mchog-seng-ge, 103, 131, 135
Tshangs-chen Bkra-shis-mgon, see Bkra-shis-mgon
Tshangs-pa Bkra-shis-mgon, see Bkra-shis-mgon
Tshe-dbang *alias* Phun-tshogs-gtsug-rgyan-nor-bu, 105, 111, 121, 125, 129f, 135, 150, 156

Tshe-dbang-bzang-po, the Minister, 35, 147, 154

Tshe-dbang-lhun-grub, [Glo-bo rgyal-po], 129f. *See also* Tshe-dbang

Tshe-dbang-lhun-grub, Glo-bo-stod khri-dpon, 27f

Tshe-dbang-nor-bu, Kaḥ-thog rig-'dzin, 7, 9g, 21, 112-114, 119, 130, 139-141, 144, 153

Tshe-lhun, Khri-dpon, *see* Tshe-dbang-lhun-grub, Glo-bo-stod khri-dpon

Tshe-ring-dar-rgyas, 30

Vairocana, lo-tṣa-ba, 202

Wangyal Dorje, *see* Dbang-rgyal-rdo-rje

Yar-lha-sham-po, 99, 146

Yon-tan, 117

Yong-tan-rgyal-mtshan, 118

Zhabs-drung Sprul-pa’i sku, 122, 130

Zhang, 146, 152f

Zhang-pa, 153

Zhang Shes-rab-bla-ma, 146, 153. *See also* Shes-rab-bla-ma

Zhwa-dmar Karma-pa VIII, 130, 143

Zhwa-lu Lce, 107

Zi-chung, 118

Zing-pa mthu-chen, 111, 113

Zi-ra-mgon, 116

Zla-ba-bzang-po, Bka’-blon, 30

III. TIBETAN TERMS

(in Tibetan alphabetical order)

klo-pa, 6
klo bo, 6
klo yul, 6
dkar khung, 73
dkar chag, 125, 142
bkab, 73
bka’ brgyud, 150
bka’ ’chid, 63, 187
bka’ ’chid kyi gleng lugs, 63, 71
bka’ ’chid brjod tshul, 64
bka’ drin che ba’i lo rgyus, 66, 79, 196, 202
bka’ gdams pa, 67
bka’ mol, 32f
rkyen, 50
skabs, 73
skabs don brda sprod par byed pa’i lo rgyus, 68
skal ba, 32
sku brgyud, 152
skyabs tho, 47-49, 54, 58f, 194
skyid kyi mkhar, 138
skyid kyi longs spyod kyi dga’ chang byed pa’i gtam, 65
bskyed rim, 152
khyung, 111f, 138
khyung po, 110-113, 137-139
khyung pho, 138
khra, 138
khri skor, 10
khri dpon sgo sgo, 146
mkhan chen, 68, 195
mkhan po’ 148, 154, 186, 201
mkhar, 145f
’khor gsum yang dag pa’i bsngo ba, 51
’khyug yig, 30
gung, 63-65, 73
gung rgyal, 107
go sa, 75
gong bskor, 201
grags pa bon lugs, 99
gral, 60, 65f, 69, 195
gal gyi gung, 65
gral gyi gung bkab (or: skabs), 66, 74, 201
gral gyi gung gnan (or : mnan), 67, 69, 73, 186, 191, 195
gral gyi thog drangs, 66, 201
gral gyi thog mar mdzad, 67, 186
gral gyi mtha’ brten, 67, 69, 187, 191
gral gyi ’dab brten, 66, 201
gral gyi dbu, 65
gral gyi dbu mdzad, 67, 191
gral gyi gzhi bzung, 67f, 186, 191, 195
gral gyi zur brgyan, 66f, 187, 191, 201
gral gyi zur nas mdzad par rgyan, 69, 195
gru gu, 154
grub thob, 111
grol ba’i zhing, 7
gros byed pa, 23
glo bo, 4-7, 10
glo bo stod, 4, 9, 153
glo bo smad, 4, 9
dga’ chang, 65
dge bskos, 39, 59
dge bsnyen, 141
dge ba bsngo ba, 38, 49
dge ba’i rtsa ba, 52
dge ba’i las kyis gzhi bzung, 191
dge lung, 35
dge bshes, 64
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chos grwa, 147
chos dang dam tshig gis sbrel bas, 69
chos pa, 32
chos dpon, 155
chos ’byung, 81
mchog, 202
mchod pa’i bsngo ba, 52
mchod yon bzang po rnam gsum, 193
jo nang pa, 71f
’jig rten, 71
’jig rten chags tshul, 92
’jig rten pa yi yang dag lta, 78
’jig rten tshul lugs, 76
’jigs, 92
rje btsun ma, 143
rje’i gdung rabs, 83
rjes, 55
rjes bsngo ba dam pa, 50
ljang, 138
rnying ma pa, 150f, 156
gtan tshigs, 64, 73
gtam rgan, 71
gtam smra ba, 23
gtam bshad, 71
gter ma, 84, 153
gtor ma byin brlabs, 197
lteb mgo ma, 26
steng phyogs kyi ston pa, 138
brten zhing ’brel/ ’brel zhing tshogs, 70, 191
tha ltag, 138
thugs kyi dgongs pa yongs su rdzogs pa, 43
thugs dam mgon pa, 42
theg pa chen pa’i mdo, 197
thog, 65
thog drang, 68
dag pa’i smon lam gyis mtshams sbyar, 70, 191
dam bca’, 39
dam pa gsum, 50, 55
dar bshad, 58, 71
dod pa’i tshang [tshad?], 136
drang srong, 111, 139
drung skor, 14
gdan gyi thog ma la bzhugs, 68, 195
gdung brgyud, 104, 111
gdung rabs, ix-x, xii-xiii, 62, 72, 83, 112, 152
gdung rus, 14, 111
’du byas, 50
btsan, 99, 107, 145

tshig mang bas dogs pas, 81
tshugs thung, 26, 115, 136
tsho dpon, 147
tshogs gnyis rdzogs, 50
tshogs gtam, 59, 71
tshogs pa bzang, 69f, 87, 187, 196, 201

mishams sbyar, 187, 191
rdzogs rim, 152
rdzong, 146
rdzong dpon, 147

zhang, 152f
zhabs brten, 39
zhabs drung, 126
zhwa lu lce, 107
gzhan la bsgrags, 51
gzhi skye bo mi chos kyi lo rgyus, 187
gzhi tshogs lugs, 201

gzhi bzung, 187
zur chag gi skad, 7f

bzang po rnam gsum, 147, 154, 193

'od gsal lha, 100, 145

yar klung sa dkar, 99

yas gtam, 59, 62, 71

yas gtam gyi dpe cha, 61f

yid smon thang, 7, 146

ye shes kyi tshogs, 50

yongs su bsngo ba, 50

yon tan mkhan po rnams, 69, 195

yon bshad, 71

bshad pa, 68

bshad gsar pa rnams, 68
sa skya 'khon, 58, 107

sa nam gyi mes po, 112
IV. OTHER NAMES AND TERMS

Abhidharma, 81f, 92, 191
Amoghavajra, Paṇḍita, 152
Atiśa, 202
Aziz, B., 32f., 71
Bacot, J., 10, 20
Bell, C., 32
Beyer, S., 55
Bhauttas, 11
bhikṣu, 53, 139, 147
bhūmi, 51
Bimbisāra, 100
Bka’-gdams-pa, 67
Bloch, M., 82, 93
bodhicitta, 51, 56
Bodhisattvas, 51f, 187
Bon, 78, 94, 113, 139, 201
Bonpo, 32, 64, 84, 93, 99, 107, 110, 113, 139
Bosson, J. E., 90
Bouloinois, L., 31
Buchanan, F. W., 20
Burmiak Athing, 62, 139
Cassinelli, C. W., 156
Cennini, C., 93
Chang, Betty Shefts, 10f, 32
Chang, K. 10f, 32
Chauduri, S., 53
Chogay Trichen Rinpoche, xi, xii, 23f, 26, 28, 33, 93, 108, 114, 125f, 129, 132, 140, 155
Chongkhor lineage, 131
Conze, E., 43, 55f
Csoma de Körös, A., 24, 33, 71
Das, S. C., 23f, 33, 53, 72, 142
Denwood, P., 74
Dezhung Trulku Rinpoche, xi, 34, 44, 54, 56-60, 71f, 74f, 91, 153
dharma, 76
dharmarāja, 89
Dujom Rinpoche, 139
Dzar-Dzong nobles, 152
Ekvall, R. B., 156
Eliade, M., 73, 84, 91, 93f
Francke, A. H., 10f, 13, 20, 83, 92f, 143, 154
Führer-Haimendorf, C. von, 8, 17, 20
Gauchan, S., 9
Germanic kings, 99
Gnam-sa Khyung, 111f
Goldstein, M. C., 23f, 33, 54, 71, 92
Gombrich, R. F., 55, 57
Gustavson, C. G., 94
Haarh, E., 72f, 106f, 139
Heissig, W., 57
Hermanns, M., 74
Hopkins, J., 91
Jambudvīpa, 59, 81f, 191
Jäschke, H. A., 23f, 32f, 92
Jest, C., xiii, 12, 21, 31-33
Jo-nang-pas, 71f
Kargyu (bka brgyud), 150
karma, 50, 78
Karmay, S. G., 31, 107, 137, 139
Khāsa, 8
Khyung-po clan, 110-113, 137-139
Kirkpatrick, W. J., 13, 20
Kitamura, H., 8
Kolmaš, J., 141
Kunsang Topgey, 63, 73
Lippman, K., 92
Lokatāra, Paṇḍita, 148
Lokesh Chandra, 62
Macdonald, A. W., 12, 29
Macdonald, Ariene, 72, 139
Mahāsammata, 96
Mahāyāna, 50f, 69, 81
Maitreya, 196
manḍala, 59, 81f, 92
Mantrayāna, 59
Meru, see Sumeru
Messerschmidt, D. A., 12
Mookerji, R. K., 73
Nāgārjuna, 55, 57, 76, 91
nītiāstrā, 77
Nornang, Ngawang L., xi, 30, 54, 71, 95
Nyingma (rnying ma), 150f, 156
Padmasambhava, 146
parināmanā, 50
Peissel, M., x, xiii, 8, 15-20, 22, 25, 28, 30f, 33-35, 97, 106-108
Petech, L., 143
Phag-mo-gru-pa Rlangs, 107
preta, 55
Prithvinarayan Shah, 4, 8
purāṇas, 95
Rana Bahadur, 144
Regmi, D. R., 144
Richardson, H. E., 138f, 152f
Roerich, G. N., 20
ṛṣi, 139
Sa-gnam, 110, 112f
Śākyamuni Buddha, 148, 188, 196
Śakyapa, see Sa-skya-pa
Śakya Trizin Rinpoche, 58
Salomon, R., 12
Śāmavedins, 74
Samantabhadra, 138
Śāmkitas, 74
Sa-nam, see Sa-gnam
Sa-skya 'Khon, 58, 107
Sa-skya-pa, 14, 95, 150f
Schuler, S., xi, 110, 129, 136
Seyfort Ruegg, D., xi, 72
Shaha, Rishikesh, 8
Sharma, Jyoti, 12
Sharma, Prayag Raj, xi
Shefts, B, 10f. See also Chang, Betty Shefts
šīla, 91
śiromani, ix
skandhas, 77
Smith, E. G., xi, 18-21, 54, 63, 73, 92, 137, 139, 225
Snellgrove, D., 8f, 12-17, 19f, 94, 128, 142f, 152, 155
Sopa, L., 91
Stainton, J. D. A., 8
Stein, M. A., 11
Stein, R. A., xi, 30f, 74, 93f, 107, 152
stūpas, 147-152
Sumeru, 59, 73, 81, 152
śūnyatā, 50
Tashi Tsering, xi, 34f, 71, 139, 152, 225
Thakali, Krishna Lal, 27
Theravāda, 55
Thomas, F. W., 10, 20
Thompson, D. V., 93
Tibetan-Nepalese War of 1788-1792, 130
Toussaint, Ch., 10, 20,
Triratna, 52, 68, 73
Tucci, G., 10f, 13-17, 19-21, 33, 57, 71, 73f, 93f, 107, 136, 139f, 154
Tuhkaras, 11
Turks, 73, 154
Upākarma, 73
vāṃśāvalī, 83, 93
Vasubandhu, 71, 91
Vinding, M., xi, 9, 27
Vostrikov, A. L., 83, 93
Walker, B., 53
Walsh, E. H. C., 53
Warren, H. C., 43
Winternitz, M., 93, 95
Wylie, T. V., xi, 10f
Yajurvedins, 73
Yamaguchi, Z., 136
Yarlung dynasty or kings, 16, 80, 83, 95-98, 100, 107, 112
yogin, 91
Zhwa-lu Lee, 107
Lo Mustang, a remote Himalayan principality on the border of Nepal and Tibet, has long been considered a "lost" and "Forbidden" kingdom. Till now little has become known of its ancient culture and traditions because it has remained closed to all but a handful of foreign explorers and scholars.

*The Mollas of Mustang* by David Jackson is the first detailed study of the royal history and related traditions of this hidden land. In it the author explores the enigmatic local histories known as the *Mollas*. These *Molla* manuscripts not only tell the history of the colourful princes who have ruled Mustang since the 14th century, but they also incorporate even older traditions of Tibetan religious speechmaking. Therefore this book also investigates the origins of the *Mollas* within the Buddhist beliefs and oratorical practices of old Tibet.

*The Mollas of Mustang* presents for the first time the full texts of two *Mollas* and a translation of one of their royal histories. It is thus an indispensable source for anyone who wishes to know more about the history and culture of this important Tibetan cultural area in the Nepal Himalayas.