

Zeitschrift:	Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie
Herausgeber:	Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft
Band:	46 (1992)
Heft:	1: Études bouddhiques offertes à Jacques May
Artikel:	Dating the two Lde'u chronicles of Buddhism in India and Tibet
Autor:	Kuijp, Leonard W.J. van der
DOI:	https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-146968

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 09.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

DATING THE TWO LDE'U CHRONICLES OF BUDDHISM IN INDIA AND TIBET

Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, Seattle

A great deal of our information on the historical developments of Buddhism in India to which Professor J. May, who is honored in this volume, has made many a key contribution, is still owed to the Tibetan historians of ideas, especially to those authors of texts that belong to the “history of Buddhism” (*chos-'byung*) genre. Indeed, we owe to them the broad outlines of Indian Buddhism with which we are all so familiar, often unconsciously so, and which, to be sure, have now been modified in some places and are better understood by way of microphilological studies in the corpus of the canonical literature itself. To be sure, the most famous of these are the works by Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub (1290-1364) and Tāranātha (1575-1635), if only because these were fairly widely available in blockprint form, and for this reason were able to enter into non-Tibetan scholarship at relatively early dates. It remains to be assessed to what extent these two authors have influenced modern scholarship, but it goes without saying that an understanding of the development and intertextual relationships that exist among the *chos-'byung*-s in general will not only deepen our awareness of how the history of Indian Buddhism came to be understood in mainstream Tibetan scholarship, but also shed further light on how we have come to understand these and why.

The *chos-'byung* genre can essentially be subdivided into two subgenres, namely one under which are subsumed those texts in which Buddhism in India is not mentioned, and those in which it is. A very large number of treatises falling in this literary genre are known to have been written although, to date, only a handful have been retrieved and published. When they do indeed predate Bu-ston, then the two works to which this paper is devoted appear to be among the earliest Tibetan histories of Buddhism in India and Tibet that have been published to date. This essay hopes to shed some light on their dates of composition since these are beset with uncertainty and some confusion.

These two extremely rare texts were published in Lhasa in 1987. The first is ambiguously titled and undated; the editor ascribes it, for no self-evident reason, to a certain *Lde'u Jo-sras and entitles it as *Lde'u chos-'byung* [LD] or, as it is apparently also known to him, the *Chos-'byung*

chen-mo bstan-pa'i rgyal-mtshan.¹ The absence of a colophon renders its identification virtually impossible, not to mention the fact that there is nothing in the main body of the text that would otherwise hint at the identity or name of its author. The second chronicle, which is a great deal more detailed and for this reason more significant than the first, was published under the title of *Rgya-bod-kyi chos-'byung rgyas-pa* [LD1]. We learn from the colophon at LD1 412 that the author of this *Chos-'byung rgyas-pa* or “the way in which the holy religion came to Tibet and the very detailed royal chronology” (*bod-du dam-pa'i byon-tshul dang rgyal-rabs shin-tu rgyas-pa*) was a certain Mkhlas-pa Lde'u. This work is prefaced by a valuable discussion of the hazy identity of Mkhlas-pa Lde'u and a survey of its contents from the pen of Chab-spel Tshe-brtan phun-tshogs at LD1 *1-*9, an analysis of the state of the manuscript by Chab-spel and Nor-brang O-rgyan at LD1 *10-*13, and an excellent table of contents at LD1 *14-*21. Neither text was ever printed and both are based on what could be unique cursive *dbu-med* manuscripts. It is unclear whether the significant number of errors (not variants!) in the orthography that remain either unchallenged or unsignalled in the texts are owed to these single textual witnesses, or whether they are editorial oversights.

Neither work seems to have enjoyed widespread circulation in Tibet. In two interlinear notes in the chronicle of Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag phreng-ba (1504-1566) there is registered a “*Chos-'byung* of Lde-ston”; at DPA'(p)1 168 [DPA' 166] and then in the “bibliography” at DPA'(p)1 458 [DPA' 460]. We read in the first of these two that “Lde-ston’s *Chos-'byung*” stated that Lha-tho-tho-ri Gnyan-btsan was a wondrous manifestation (*sprul-pa*) of the Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha. It is not very obvious which of the two texts the author of these glosses, who may not have been Dpa'-bo, had in mind. Chances are that it was LD1, for at LD1 183 it suggests that he was such a manifestation of this Bodhisattva. However, something similar to this is also found at both LD 105 and LD1 249 where both have it that he was “a wondrous manifestation of Buddha Kaśyapa or Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha.”

The only other notice of one of these texts known to me is given by Brag-dgon Dkon-mchog bstan-pa rab-rgyas (1801-?) who lists the “*Chos-'byung* of Sde-ston” — “sde” is homophonous with “lde” — in the bibliography which forms the preface of his work.² As far as I have been able to

1 My thanks to Prof. Wang Yao who presented me with a copy of this book which was no longer to be had in the Lhasa and Beijing bookshops.

2 See his *Mdo-smad chos-'byung*, Vol. 1, New Delhi, 1974, 7 [ed., Xining, 1982, 3].

determine, he nowhere explicitly cites this work in the body of his text. Of interest is furthermore that neither *Lde'u Jos-ras nor Mkhas-pa Lde'u are mentioned in Bu-ston's listing of authors of various *Chos-'byung*³ which can mean one of two things: he was unaware of them, or he ignored them. Indeed, Ne'u Pandita's *Chos-'byung* of 1283 is also absent from this listing as are the writings attributed to Nyang-ral Nyi-ma 'od-zer and the work by Bcom-l丹 Rig-pa'i ral-gri, all of which were written before 1326.⁴

3 See his reply, dated 1326, to queries anent his work raised by Rin-chen ye-shes, in *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, New Delhi, 1971, 192, where the following authors are mentioned: Phywa[-pa] Chos-kyi seng-ge (1109-1169), Gtsang-nag-pa Brston-'grus seng-ge*, Khrö-phu Lo-tsâ-ba [Byams-pa-dpal (1172/73-1225)], Chag Lo-tsâ-ba [?Chos-rje-dpal (1197-1265)] and Mkhan-po Mchims [?Nam-mkha'- grags (1210-1289)]. So far, the only study done on the sources used by Bu-ston for his *Chos-'byung* — this work may now be judged as having been slightly overrated by the Tibetan tradition when compared to the LD1 — is J. Szerb, "Two Notes on the Sources of the *Chos-'byung* of Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub", in *Reflections on Tibetan Culture. Essays in Memory of Turrell V. Wylie*, eds. L. Epstein and R.F. Sherburne, Lewiston, 1990, 143-148; see now also his posthumously published edition of Bu-ston's text, section on Tibet, in Szerb (1990). LD 118 and LD1 298-299 state that Srong-btsan sgam-po had no sons with either his Chinese, Nepalese or Zhang-zhung wives, and that a son by the name of Gung-srong gung-btsan was born to his Tibetan wife Mong-bza' khri-lcam. In turn, his son was Mang-btsan. Szerb notes the name "btsun-pa Śākyā-rin-chen" in the final page of a work on the earliest historical emperors attributed to Nyang-ral Nyi-ma 'od-zer**, and tentatively proposes that "the person in question might be identical with ..the [second, vdK] sgom-pa of 'Bri-gung.'"; see also Szerb (1990: XXIV, note 56). I think this unlikely if only because none of the available sources suggest that he was a monk [?of noble ancestry] (?!ha-) btsun-pa). He might very well be the Śākyā-rin-chen who is otherwise known as Yar-lung Jo-bo, the author of a *Chos-'byung* of 1376 for which we have two textual witnesses [YAR, YAR1]; see my forthcoming "Notes on the Fourteenth Century Chronicle by Yar-lung Jo-bo Śākyā-rin-chen".

* In my *introduction to Gisang-nag-pa's Pramānavinīścayañikā* (Otani University Tibetan Works Series, Volume II, Kyoto, 1989, 2-5), I gave a survey of his oeuvre. I should like to take this opportunity to make three additions to this dossier. The first of these is a citation from his eulogy to Sgom-tshul (1116-1169) found in DPA' (p)1 816 [DPA' 801-802]. I also failed to mention that he apparently authored two works on the *prajñāpāramitā* literature, namely an *Abhisamayālamkāra* commentary and a text entitled (in part) *Sher-phyin-gyi mdo-sbyor*, see L. Chandra, *Materials for a History of Tibetan Literature*, Part 3, New Delhi, 1963, nos. 11496-7. I might mention that he is no doubt the same as the "mkhas-pa Gtsang-nag-pa" who is referred to by Bu-ston; see Szerb (1990:83).

** Essentially two sets of dates are given for him, namely 1124-1192 and 1136-1204. His biography by Mṅga'-bdag Lhun-grub 'odzer (?-?) follows the former; see the *Mṅga'-bdag Myang Nyi-ma 'od-zer-gyi mam-thar gsal-ba'i me-long*, in *Mṅga'-bdag bla-ma bryud-pa'i mam-thar*, Rewalsar, 1985, 109, 144-154.

4 Bcom-l丹's work was written before his compilation of the canon during the first decade or so of the fourteenth century since Nel-pa/ne'u Pandita criticizes him in his *Chos-'byung* of 1283; see Uebach (1987:15-17, 54-55). We may also have to include here the *Chos-'byung* of Dbus-pa Blo-gsal, a senior disciple of Bcom-l丹. Aside from the

Lastly, that they were extremely rare in Tibet is also indirectly attested by the absence of their mention in Kah-thog Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbang nor-bu's (1698-1755) comparative study of the ancient imperial families, and the various chronologies associated with them.⁵ We know that Kah-thog Rig-'dzin was extremely well-read in Tibet's historical literature and that he had a soft spot for old books. However, he does not appear to have had access to either text.

Both LD and LD1 are conceived not as independent works but rather as commentaries on a verse-text, the prosody of which consists of nine syllables per metric foot, a work which is simply and laconically referred to as the "[fundamental] treatise" (*gzhung*). The authorship of this unknown treatise is beset with virtually insurmountable problems which, though urgently requiring discussion, cannot be dealt with here.⁶ The

indigenous bibliographies, the only mention of the latter work I have come across so far is found in Blo-bzang ye-shes bstan-pa rab-rgyas' (1759-1817) *Sog-yul sogs nas mdo-sngags-kyi gnad-mams-la dru-ba thung-ngu-byung rigs-mams-kyi dri-ba dang dri-lan phyogs-gcig-tu bsdebs-pa*, in *Collected Works*, Vol. II, Dharmasala, 1985, 278.

- 5 As far as I am aware, two manuscript witnesses of this work with two different titles have been published to date, namely TSHE(d) and TSHE(n). The first to draw attention to the text which was completed in 1745, was R.A. Stein, "Une source ancienne pour l'histoire de l'épopée tibétaine, le *Rlangs Po-ti bse-ru*", in *Journal Asiatique CCL* (1962), 88-89, in which a passage corresponding to TSHE(d) 342-343 [TSHE(n) 26-27] was freely translated and paraphrased.
- 6 Chab-spel goes to some lengths at attempting to identify Mkhlas-pa Lde'u. He observes that the Zhi-byed section of 'Gos Lo-tsā-ba's *Deb-ther sngon-po* [Roerich 1976:883] signals a Dge-bshes Lde'u. As is noted by Chab-spel at LD1 *6, an indication of the author of the *gzhung* occurs in a passage at LD1 182 where Mkhlas-pa Lde'u comments somewhat cryptically on an invocation (*mchod-brjod*) with which the section on the development of Buddhism in Tibet commences; he writes:

gang zag gang gis btsal na / sngon byung rig pa'i gnas la mkhlas pa'i dge bshes jo 'bum / da ltar mkhlas pa jo nam / ..

"Which individual has paid his respects? [We reply:] Dge-bshes Jo-'bum who is learned in the sciences of yore; the contemporary Mkhlas-pa Jo-nam.."

The fact that Jo-'bum is styled "Dge-bshes" may indicate that he belongs to the Bka'-gdams-pa school where, to be sure, several members are known to have made attempts at linking certain of its doctrinal entities to Rdzogs-chen thought of the Rnying-ma school. An individual by the name of Jo-'bum is known as the progenitor of Sa-skya's House of Shar; for some remarks on him, see note 8 in my forthcoming monograph, "The Mongol Text of the *Cagan Teüke* and Lama 'Phags-pa". We also know of a Rta-ston Jo-'bum (1123-1175). Moreover, a Mkhlas-pa Jo-nam is attested as a disciple of the Rdzogs-chen master Zhig-po bdud-rtsi (1149-1199) and he may perhaps be identical to the "Jo-nam" who served as one of the abbots of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog monastery's Lower College from circa 1258 to 1272; see my "The Monastery of Gsang-phu ne'u-thog and Its Abbatial Succession from ca. 1073 to 1250", in *Berliner Indologische Studien* 3 (1987), 112. As Mr. Dan Martin was kind enough to point out to me in a letter of 8 November 1989, there is an attested connection between Jo-'bum and

editors attribute these two texts to two different authors and provide but very approximate datings for their composition. The first to address briefly the question of their authorship and date is a recent paper by H. Uebach. There it is suggested that both were written by "the same author" and that they were "compiled approximately in the mid-twelfth century".⁷ In the ensuing I shall hope to show that the *terminus a quo* for both works must be squarely placed in the thirteenth century, and that the extreme paucity of information they contain about their authorship does not really warrant the view that they were written by one and the same author, despite the fact of their obvious close affinity.

1. *Dating the LD*

LD 1-90 deals with the development of Buddhism, exoteric as well as esoteric, in India in the course of which a number of texts, including those belonging to the Rnying-ma-pa school, are cited. At the end of his deliberations, the author writes that this concludes his study of Buddhism in India "from/according to the *Gsal-byed mig-gi thur-ma*" which may therefore be either an alternative title of this work or one of a still unknown

Jo-nam inas- much as one of the former's sons was a fellow disciple of Zhig-po bdud-rtsi; see the survey in DPA' (p)1 624-625 [DPA' 618-619]. If he be the same "Jo-nam" of the above cited passage, then we can presume that LD1's author lived at least around the middle of the thirteenth century which, in fact, tallies rather well with the upper end of the dates of composition of both the LD and LD1 that are argued for below. Furthermore, in the same letter he indicated that Seng-ge rgyab-pa (middle of the 13th cent.), an important exponent of the Rnying-ma-pa *Snying-thig* cycles, had been ordained by a Mkhan-po Lde'u-sgang-pa, among others; "Lde'u-sgang" is a place-name. The Lde'u- riddle may be solved when more materials are at hand. Suffice it to say for the present, that it is very likely that Mkhlas-pa Lde'u, and at least LD1, will have to be placed in a Rnying-ma-pa environment, maybe in some sort of a connection with Zhig-po bdud-rtsi and his students.

LD and LD1 do not provide any leads regarding the author of this elusive *gzhung*. We can, however, be certain that he was doctrinally affiliated with the Rnying-ma-pa school, or that at a minimum he was well-disposed to this school's textual and doctrinal entities, for this is brought out in *inter alia* the discussion of the classification of tantric literature at LD 66 and LD1 142-143.

7 See "On Dharma-Colleges and Their Teachers in the Ninth Century Tibetan Empire", in *Indo-Sino-Tibetica, Studi in Onore di Luciano Petech*, ed. P. Daffina, Rome, 1990, 395. Another recent publication in which use is made of the Lde'u texts are Chab-spel Tshe-brtan phun-tshogs, "Gnya'-khri btsan-po ni bod rang-gi mi zhig yin", in *Bod rig-pa'i ched-rtsom gces-btus*, Lhasa, 1987, 4; an English translation of this paper appeared as "Gnya'-khri btsan-po was a True Tibetan — The Origin of the Genealogy of Spu-rgyal", in *Tibet Studies. Journal of the Tibetan Academy of Social Sciences* 1 (1989), 1-13.

account of Indian Buddhism. The second part has to do with Buddhism in Tibet [LD 90-163] and is virtually completely devoted to a descriptive genealogy of the Tibetan royal families [LD 99-163] of imperial and post-imperial times. At LD 159 we find mentioned a *Chos-'byung spyi'i lo-rgyus* which just might indicate an [alternative] title. LD 154-159 closes the second part with a brief exposition of the “subsequent propagation” (*phyi-dar*) of Buddhism in Tibet — it dates its inception to the year 949 (*sa-mo-bya*)⁸ — and the activities of Atiśa (?982-?1054) and his disciples. It concludes with what an editorial note calls an appendix (*kha-gsab*) on the “annals of the two Steng-stod”, namely Gri-gum btsan-po and Spu-de gung-rgyal.⁹ Of probable importance is that it makes no mention of either the Sa-skya-pa or Bka'-brgyud-pa schools.

At LD *1, the editor assigns LD's *terminus a quo* to postdate Rngog Lo-tsā-ba Blo-l丹 shes-rab (1059-1109) since he is mentioned in its discussion of the royal houses of Mnga'-ris skor-gsum [LD 146-149]. There is a problem with this if, as the editor apparently did, we simply take it in isolation of the remainder of the text. For the pertinent passage of LD 148 does not indicate the year in which he passed away, the last entry on him merely having it that he studied Prajñākāragupta's *Pramāṇavārttika* commentary with the non-Buddhist Skal-l丹 rgyal-po (*Bhavyarāja) in Kashmir which, from other sources, we know took place from circa 1076 to 1093. LD's survey of the “subsequent propagation” (*phyi-dar*) of Buddhism in Tibet ends by noting that Atiśa was invited to Snga(=Mnga')-ris and that he and his disciples such as Khu-ston Brtson-'grus g.yung-drung (1011-1075), Rngog Legs-pa'i shes-rab and 'Brom-ston Rgyal-ba'i 'byung-gnas (1004/5-1063/64) did much in the way of propagating Buddhism in Dbus. We can, however, be a touch more precise than this dating for, at LD 141-153, the author addresses himself at length to the genealogies that issued from Glang-dar-ma's two sons, 'Od-srung and Yum-brtan.¹⁰ The lines of descent from Khri Skyid-lde Nyi-ma-mgon, the

8 See also LD1 394. This is the same year proposed by Ne'u/Nel Pandita; see Uebach (1987:128-129, note 745) — there “950” is an oversight; an unannotated Chinese translation of Ne'u Pandita's text can be found in Wang Yao and Chen Jian, “Naiba jiaofa shi”, in *Zhongguo Zangzue* 1 (1990), 108-127. The *gzhung*, and thence LD 154 and LD1 390, writes that the renewed interest in Buddhism was due to the efforts of Mnga'-bdag Khri-chung, Khri-lde mgon-btsan and Tsha-la-na? Ye-shes rgyal-mtshan.

9 For these, see E. Haarh, *The Yar-lung Dynasty*, Copenhagen, 1969, 135-136.

10 LD 141-142 and LD1 369-370 date the birth and death of 'Od-srung — LD writes that he died aged fifty-four, whereas LD1 has it that he passed away aged forty-four! — to a monkey (840) and an ox-year (893), with Yum-brtan being born shortly after

eldest son of Mn̄ga'-bdag Dpal-'khor-btsan¹¹, himself 'Od-srung's son,

'Od-srung. Both have it that they were born in Yum-bu Bla-sgang ('Od-srung) and Dbu-ru (Yum-brtan) after the death of their father Glangdar-ma with Tshe-spongs bza' g.yor-mo yum-chen btsan-mo 'Phan and 'Ban-bza' 'Phan as their respective mothers. We may add here that LD1 376 writes that 'Od-srung was murdered with Rtse-ro(?) poison (*dug*) because of discord between the senior and junior queens (*chen chun-ma*).

It is not true as was claimed most recently in Petech (1977:14) that the early Sa-skyapa authors — he mentions here Rje-btsun Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan (1147-1216) and 'Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan (1235-1280) — only know of 'Od-srung. To be sure, 'Phags-pa's *Royal Genealogy* omits Yum-brtan but this may be explained by the fact that he is only intent on providing the reigns of the early Tibetan rulers, and Yum-brtan never reigned as king. Both 'Od-srung and Yum-brtan are mentioned in Slob-dpon Bsod-nams-rtse-mo's (1142-1182) work of 1167 at BSOD 343/3/4 as well as in the undated *Royal Genealogy* by his younger brother Rje-btsun Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan; see Tucci (1971: 131-132). The latter gives the water-female-pig (783) to the wood-female-ox years (845) as 'Od-srung's dates, that his place of birth was Spur-phu, and that he died three years after he assumed the reign. For Yum-brtan he writes: "It is alleged that Yum-brtan died aged thirty-six [= thirty-five]". They are also noted in the undated chronicle of Nyi-ma 'od-zer at NYANG 483a-b [NYANGb 527]. Nyi-ma 'od-zer may be the earliest source to provide the water-female-pig year (783/843) as the year of 'Od-srung's birth and the names of their mothers, Tshe-spong-za for 'Od-srung and 'Bal-'phan-za-ma for Yum-brtan. Ne'u Pandita records that 'Od-srung's dates are 819 to 845; see Uebach (1987:82-83). The first time the name for 'Od-srung's mother reappears in the published literature is in YAR 67-68 [YAR1 68-69] where we read G.yor-mo Tshe-spong-bza' yum-chen btsan-mo 'Phan. Moreover, there the basic information given is that 'Od-srung was born in the wood-female-sheep year (815) in the Yum-bu palace (*pho-brang*), and that he died aged thirty-eight which would be in 853. But this is not possible inasmuch as, according to the text itself, his son Dpal-'khor-btsan was born in the wood-female-hen year, that is, in 865! Lastly, we may mention here the interesting dates that were proposed by Kah-thog Rig-'dzin at TSHE(d) 340-341 [TSHE(n) 23-25]. There are a number of yet unsettled problems with his chronological calculations in general, however; for some of these in another context, see R. Prats, "Tshe-dbang nor-bu's Chronological Notes on the Early Transmission of the *Bi-ma snying-thig*", in *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 2, ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest, 1984, 197-209. For the fortunes of the post-Glang-dar-ma families, one may consult H.E. Richardson, "A Tibetan Inscription from Ryal Lha-khang; and a Note on Tibetan Chronology from A.D. 841 to 1042", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1/2 (1957), 57-78, H. Satō, "On the Descendants of King Darma [in Japanese]", in *Tōyō Gakuhō* 46,4 (1963), 34-74, H.E. Richardson, "Who Was Yum-brtan", in *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, Paris, 1971, 433-439, L. Petech, "Ya-tse, Gu-ge, Pu-rang: A New Study", in *Central Asiatic Journal* 24 (1980), 85-111 — a revised version with additions can be found in Petech (1988:369-394), H.E. Richardson, "The Succession to Glang Darma", in *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dicata*, Vol. 3, eds. G. Gnoli and L. Lanciotti, Rome, 1988, 1221-1229, and most recently Mkhār-rme'u Bsam-gtan rgyal-mtshan, "Btsan-po lha-sras dar-ma dang de'i rjes-su byung-ba'i rgyal-rabs mdor-bsdus", in *Krung-go'i bod-kyi shes-rig [Zhongguo Zangzue]* 1 (1989), 81-103. The last three papers do not make use of either LD or LD1.

11 LD 142-143 and LD1 370-371 date the year of his birth to an ox-year, and that, aged thirteen (= twelve), he ruled for eighteen years. He was killed by a Stag-rtse'[i] snyags,

formed the royal houses of Mn̄ga'-ris skor-gsum. The following extracts from LD – the passages are edited in conjunction with LD1 whereby only the most important variants are noted – that deal only with the members of these houses indicate that they must be dated to around the middle of the twelfth century. To be noted is, firstly, that the text does not appear to be free from contamination and, secondly, that there are numerous differences with the cognate genealogies in other sources which though sporadically indicated, will not be discussed here since they throw up a plethora of problems the examination of which would render this paper too long. LD 146-149 – see also LD1 380-381 – says:¹²

*de ltar mn̄ga' bdag dpal 'khor gyi sras che ba khri skyed sde nyi ma mgon gyi sras stod
kyi mgon gsum gyi gdung rabs ston te /
de yang rje yis kheng log pa'i 'khrug pa byung bas / sras gnyis(a) gtsang du bzhud pa
las / gcen po khri skyid lde nyi ma mgon / pu rangs(b) su gshegs te mkhar nyi phug
bya ba brtsigs nas btsun mo(c) zangs dkar gza' dang stag gzig gza' gnyis bzhes / blon
po mang dkar dang khyung pos byas / sras stod kyis mgno gsum 'khrungs te / che dag*

the means used are specified only by LD1 371, namely by *?a sham-po mchu-nag*, a phrase for which I do not have a satisfactory explanation; see also LD1 376. BSOD 345/1/5 writes that, ruling over Gtsang and G.yon-ru, he, this *btsad-po*, had effected a calendrical calculation in the wood-female-ox year, in 905, and that his contemporary was a [petty-]king (*rgyal-po*) called Mgon-spyan who resided in Brag-mkhar located in 'Phan-yul.

12 There are many problems with these passages, and they start with the *gzhung* quoted at LD 141:

chos kyi me ni gdung rabs 'ga' ru sbas

“The fire of the dharma was hidden for some generations.”,

to which LD 141 writes:

*de nas dar ma'i sras 'od srungs / de'i sras dpal dgon / de'i sras nyi ma dgon / bbra
shis mgon / 'od kyi rgyal mtshan / de'i sras lha bla ma'i bar du gdungs rabs drug tu
chos snubs skad /*

“It is said that then the dharma had set for six generations: from 'Od-srungs, the son of Dar-ma, his son Dpal-dgon[mgon], his son Nyi-ma-dgon [mgon], Bbra-shis-mgon, 'Od-kyi rgyal-mtshan, up to Lha Bla-ma.”

On the other hand, LD1 368 reads here:

chos kyi me ni gdung rabs bdhun du sbas

“The fire of the dharma was hidden for seven generations.”

*de'i sras 'od srung / de'i sras dpal mgon / de'i sras nyi ma mgon / bbra shis mgon /
'od kyi rgyal mtshan / de'i sras lha bla ma'i bar du gdungs rabs drug tu chos snubs
skad /*

“It is said that the dharma had set for six generations: [from] his [Glang-dar-ma's] son 'Od-srung, his son Dpal-mgon, his son Nyi-ma-mgon, Bbra-shis-mgon, 'Od-kyi rgyal-mtshan, up to his son Lha Bla-ma.”

I have not been able to solve a number of these; wherever this has been the case, they have been duly noted by a question mark.

dpal gyi mgon la mang yul gtad / 'bring po bkra shis mgon la pu rangs gtad / chung
 ba lde gtsug mgon la gu ge(d) gtad pas stod lnga(e) ris skor gsum lags so //
 ched po dpal mgon gyi sras ni dpa'(f) tshab 'od kyi rgyal mtshan ste / gcen kho re zer
 ro // de la sras gsum chen po lha(g) bla ma lde ste / lha bla ma ye shes 'od gong ma
 gnyis grongs nas rjes la btsas / gong ma de ba rat tsa dang na ga ra tsa ste rab tu
 byung yang zer /

..
 gcung po strong nge'i bkra shis lde btsan zhes pa kho re'i gcung po strong nge'o //..
 mtshan gsha' me bkra shis lha lde btsan no // de la sras gnyis te 'od lde byang chub
 'od zer /

- a. LD1 *sras gcig*, “one son”.
- b. LD1 *spu-rang*.
- c. LD omits.
- d. LD1 *zhang-zhung*.
- e. LD1 *mnga'*.
- f. LD1 *spa*.
- g. LD omits.

“So, the family line (*gdung-rabs*) of the three Mgon of Stod [the West], the sons of Khri Skye[i]d-s[l]de Nyi-ma-mgon, the eldest son of Mnga'-bdag Dpal-'khor, will be shown. Now, since a rebellion broke out, the two sons settled in Gtsang; from [among these two,] the eldest Khri-skyid Lde Nyi-ma-mgon went to Pu-rangs and, having constructed Nyi-phug castle, he married [the] princess[es] (*bstun-mo*) Zangs-dkar-gza' and Stag-gzig-gza'. Mang-dkar and Khyung-po functioned [as his] ministers. [To him] were born [as] sons the three Mgon of Stod. Since [he] handed Mang-yul to Dpal-gyi-mgon, the eldest, Pu-rangs to Bkra-shis-mgon, the middle one, [and] Gu-ge [or: Zhang-zhung] to Lde-gtsug-mgon, the youngest, [this] is Mnga'-ris skor-gsum [of] the West.

The son of Dpal[-gyil]-mgon, the eldest, was Dpa'-tshab 'Od-kyi rgyal-mtshan; [he] is also called Gcen Kho-re+. He had three sons [of whom] the eldest [was] Lha Bla-ma-lde [,that is,] Lha Bla-ma Ye-shes-'od[.] After the two “supreme ones” (*gong-ma*) were killed, [he] became cherished in [their] wake¹³; it is also said that *gong-ma*[?s] De-ba-ra-tsa (*Devarāja) and Na-ga-ra-tsa (*Nāgarāja)¹⁴ were religious renunciates (*rab-byung*). + +

13 The text is difficult to interpret here and I may very well be wrong.

14 Petech (1988:372) observed that Nāgarāja of the “Dullu list” is “almost certainly identical with Nāgadeva of the Tibetan texts.” In connection with Professor Petech’s article, we may note that, at YAR 72 [YAR1 72], Yar-lung Jo-bo sheds some light on the origin of the house of Ya-tse [= Semjā, or “the little village of Sija (or Lamathada) in Western Nepal”, Petech (1988:87)]. note 9). Namely, he states that it issued ultimately from 'Gar/Mgar Srong-btsan, the famous minister under Sprong-btsan sgam-po. Yar-lung Jo-bo notes that Shar-pa’s account of the house of Ya-tse was based on the reply he had received from a certain Gser-thog-pa Rin-chen rdo-rje. According to Bla-ma dam-pa Bsod-nams rgyal-mtshan’s (1312-1375) chronicle of 1368, at RGYAL 246, Gser-thog-pa was the author of a text (*yig-tshang*) on this issue.

“Srong-nge, the younger brother of Kho-re, was called Bkra-shis lde-btsan. ? + + His name was Gsha’-ma Bkra-shis lha-lde-btsan. He [had] two sons called ‘Od-lde [and] Byang-chub’-od.”¹⁵

+ LD1 381 reads here:

che shos dpal mgon gyi sras la spa tshab tshe 'od kyi rgyal mtshan te / de dang bkra shis lha lde btsan gnyis te / gcen po kho re yang zer ro //

“As for the son[s] of the eldest Dpal[-gyi]-mgon, [there were] two, Spa-tshab tsha(?) ‘Od-kyi rgyal-mtshan; him and Bkra-shis lha-lde-btsan. The eldest [one] was also called Kho-re.”¹⁶

15 The earliest datable genealogy of these western rulers is the one found in BSOD 343/4/5-344/1/3:

Lde-gtsug-mgon	Bkra-shis-mgon X ? Khri Dpal-srong-nge (= Lha bla-ma Ye-shes-'od)	Dpal-gyi-mgon Khri Dpal-'khor-sde X ? Rgyal-po Lha-sde X ? Byang-chub-'od
----------------	---	--

Rgyal-po 'Od-lde + X ?
[R]tse-lde

+ His line of descent is not explicitly given. BSOD 345/2/3 notes that he – there he is referred to as Mnga’-bdag ‘Od-lde-btsan – had invited Btsad-po Bkra-shis khri-lde-btsan for reasons that are not made clear. The later texts generally assume that he was the younger brother of Byang-chub’-od.

16 S.G. Karmay, “The Ordinance of Lha Bla-ma Ye-shes’-od”, in *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*, eds. M. Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi, Warminster, 1980, 150, 158, note 5, makes a reference to TSHE(d) 348 [= TSHE(n) 34-35] where Kah-thog writes that the actual names of both were Drang-srong-lde and ‘Khor-lo-lde. Kah-thog Rig-'dzin then writes at TSHE(d) 348-349 [TSHE(n) 35-36].

drang srong lde yi sras na ga ra ja dang / dhe wa ra jar grags / ..[mnga’ ris gung thang lo rgyus] lo rgyus der na ga ra ja dang / de wa ra ja rab tu phyung bas byang chub 'od dang zhi ba 'od + yin zer ba sogs / lo rgyus khungs ma da dung btsal dgos par snang / sku tshe smad rang gi rgyal srid gcung 'khor rer gtad de / yab sras gsum ka rab tu byung / yab la lha bla ma ye shes 'od du grags / 'khor re'i sras lha lde / de la sras gsum / da lta'i lo rgyus spyir bar pa byang chub 'od yin smre la / ..gcung 'od lde.. 'od lde'i sras rtse lde..

The sons of Drang-srong-lde are known as Nāgarāja and Devarāja. .. In the annals of Mnga’-ris Gungthang, [we read items such as that] inasmuch as Nāgarāja and Devarāja had renounced the world, they are said to be Byang-chub’-od and Zhi-ba’-od+ etc. It would appear that one needs now to look for authoritative chronicles. [During] the last [part of his] life, Drang-srong-lde handed his reign to his younger brother ‘Khor-re. The three [of them,] the father [and his two] sons renounced the world; the father became known as Lha Bla-ma Ye-shes’-od.

Lha-lde, the son of ‘Khor-re [had] three sons. Contemporary chronicles generally state that the middle one was Byang-chub’-od..[his] younger brother ‘Od-lde.. ‘Od-lde’s son [was] Rtse-lde..”

++ Again, LD1 381 is more clear:

*de la sras gsum lha bla ma lde ste / lha bla ma ye shes 'od do // de'i 'og ma de ba
ra dza dang / na ga ra dza'o / de gnyis rab tu byung /*

“He [had] three sons: Lha Bla-ma-lde [, that is,] Lha Bla-ma Ye-shes-'od; after [him]
*Devarāja and *Nāgarāja. These two [were] renunciates.”

++ LD1 381 reads:

gcung po strong nge'i ming bkra shis lha lde btsan dang gcung po strong nge'o //

“The name[?]s of the younger brother Srong-nge were Bkra-shis lha-lde-btsan and
Younger Brother Srong-nge.”

LD 149 then goes on to say that:

*gcen po rtse lde zhes pa byang chub 'od kyi phu bo te / 'od lde / de'i sras rtse lde /
de'i sras 'od 'bar / de'i sras dbang lde / de'i sras bsod nams lde / de la sras gsum te
bkra shis rtsegs(a) gar log gis bskrongs / 'bring po mnga' thang skyong yang bskrongs
/ chung dag 'od 'bar lde gar log gi yul na bzhugs..*

a. LD1 *rtse*.

“The so-called elder son (*gcen-po*) [of 'Od-lde], Rtse-lde¹⁷: The son of 'Od-lde, the

+ It is thus not the case, as S.G. Karmay writes in his “An Open Letter by Pho-brang Zhi-ba-'od to the Buddhists in Tibet”, in *The Tibet Journal* V,3 (1980), 11, 22 note 63, that Kah-thog Rig-'dzin omitted his name.

Nyi-ma 'od-zer has Dpal-gyi-mgon as the eldest son, but predicates Kho-re and Sron-re of Bkra-shis-mgon, where Kho-re was the father of *Devarāja and *Nāgarāja; see NYANG 495a [NYANGb 542]. Rje-btsun Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan also takes Dpal-gyi-mgon as the eldest son but adds nothing further - see Tucci (1971:133) -, and the same is found in TSHAL 42 [TSAL1 19b, Inaba-Satō 1964:99-100]. Tshal-pa's genealogies are based on the *Rgyal-rabs dpag-bsam ljon-shing* of Byang-ji Shes-rab-'bum of 1286. It is also cited at RGYAL 62 and at YAR 74 [YAR1 74] in an interlinear note; see further MacDonald (1963:90). It is very strange that neither LD nor LD1 knows of Pho-brang Zhi-ba-'od whom other chronicles identify as the first or second son of Lha-lde.

17 Rtse-lde is not really formally or, to my understanding, unambiguously introduced in either LD or LD1. Another individual by the name of Rtse-lde is found at LD 151 and LD1 386; there we obtain the following line of descent in connection with G.yuthog, the first son of Khri-lde-'bar, himself the oldest brother of G.yu-spyan on whom see below: Khri-lde-'bar X

1. G.yu-thog
2. Bye-chung Lha-ston
3. Dgung-lde
4. Zla-ba
5. Khri-thog
6. Dbyangs-spyan-'bar (LD1 “Dbyangs-can-'bar”)

G.yu-thog X

elder brother (*phu-bo*) of Byang-chub-'od, was Rtse-lde; his son 'Od-'bar; his son Dbang-lde; his son Bsod-nams-lde. He had three sons: Bkrashis-brtsegs was killed by the Gar-log. The second, although protecting Mnga'-thang, was [also] killed, 'Od-'bar-lde, the youngest, lived in the land of the Gar-log."

The above can be schematically represented as follows — “X” will be used henceforth to denote “had offspring with”, and when “X” is followed by a blank space, it means that the name of the lady (or ladies) is (are) not given:

Table 1

'Od-srung X

Mnga'-bdag Dpal-'khor X

Khri Skyid-lde Nyi-ma-mgon

X Lady from Zangs-dkar
X Lady from Stag-gzig

Dpal-gyi-mgon X

Bkra-shis-mgon

Lde-gtsug-mgon

(1) Dpa'-tshab 'Od-kyi rgyal-mtshan X
(alias Kho-re)

Lha Bla-ma-lde
(alias Lha Bla-ma Ye-shes-'od)

*Devarāja

*Nāgarāja

(2) Bkra-shis lha-lde-btsan X
(alias Srong-nge)

'Od-lde X

Byang-chub-'od

Rtse-lde X

'Od-'bar X

G.yu-thog X

Gnam-lde (LD1 “Nam-lde”) Jo-dga’ Tse-lde(a)

a. LD writes *khu mtshan yar stod drang ba na bzhugs*, whereas LD1 has here *zhu tshan gnyis yar stod dra ngar gshegs*. Both texts indicate that his unnamed son lived in Don-mkhar.

There are some curious inconsistencies for LD 148-149 states that Dbang-lde and 'Od-'bar-lde were Rtse-lde's sons, and LD1 384 reads:

gcen po rtse lde zhes pa mnga' bdag byang chub 'od kyi phu bo ste 'od lde'o / de' sras bsod nams lde / de la sras gsum..

“The eldest son, the older brother (*phu-bo*) of Mnga'-bdag Byang-chub-'od called Rtse-lde, was 'Od-lde. His son [was] Bsod-nams-lde. He [had] three sons..”?

Dbang-lde X

Bsod-nams-lde X

Bkra-shis-brtsegs — ? — 'Od-'bar-lde

Now we know that Rtse-lde convened the famous council of 1076 at which the cream of Tibetan scholars, both young and old, were present. LD records some four generations subsequent to him and this allows us, when we estimate conservatively a generation to represent twenty years, to calculate the implicit *terminus a quo* of this passage to the middle of the twelfth century.

But this is not all. Bracketing the possibility of subsequent interpolation — my impression, and that is all it is, is that the main body of the text was not tempered with since it appears to be homogeneous in terms of content and style; the “appendix” may, however, be a later addition inasmuch as Gri-gum btsan-po and Spu-lde gung-rgyal are dealt with, albeit far less extensively, in LD 103 — its genealogy, at LD 149-152, of 'Od-srung's younger son Mchims-tsha Bkra-shis brtsegs-dpal, would push the composition of this text well into the thirteenth century. This genealogy, which is headed by “the three Lde of Smad”, as well as some of the names given by LD — the same holds for the cognate text of LD1 384-388 for which see below — are problematic in a number of places when we compare them to the ones found in other texts. Again, differences from other accounts will only at times be indicated. LD 149 opens his genealogy by stating:

*da ni mnga' bdag dpal 'khor gyi sras chung ba mchims tsha bkra shis brtsegs dpal gyi
lo rgyus rton (ston) ste / smad kyi lde gsum zer ro // dpal lde / 'od lde / skyed lde
mam pa gsum po ni / dbus gtsang ru bzi'i rtsad po'o [//]*

“Now the annals (*lo-rgyus*) of Mchims-tsha Bkra-shis brtsegs-dpal, the youngest son of Mnga'-bdag Dpal-'khor will be shown (*ston*).

[The lines of descent] are called “the three Lde of Smad [the East]”. The three, Dpal-lde, 'Od-lde and Skyid-lde are the rulers (*rtsad-po*) of the four horns of Dbus and Gtsang.”

For my present purpose, it will be sufficient to commence with the genealogy of G.yu-spyan and his younger brothers Lha-spyan and Da-ra dbang-phyug for whom LD 151-152 provides the following lines of descent:

*..g.yu spyan gyi sras jo dga' / de'i sras gsum te chen po mi chung dga' / lha chen dpal
'bar / 'bring khri dar ma / chung dag rab tu byung bas lha btsun zhi ba / gcen chung
rab tu byung nas bya sar dpon mdzad /*

'bring po khri dar ma la yang sras gsum ste / khri gtsug / rnal 'byor / smon lam mo //

khri gtsug la langa las gcig zo thang du skrongs / ched po khri btsan sras / bu chung / srong btsan / shag khri / jo'i khams yin / go ma gnyis gdung chad / shag khri'i sras lha khri no /

jo khams sras rdor rin / ri na 'od gnyis so / lha spyan khra 'brug pa yin no [//] gdung chad /

chung dag da ra dbang phyug la sras gsum te / chen po thang la dga' / 'bring lha dga' / chung ba gser thog go thang la dga' khra 'brug na bzhug go lha dga' 'or mo na bzhugs / gser thog gdung chad do /[]

“..G.yu-spyan's son [was] Jo-dga'. His three sons: the eldest [was] Mi-chung-dga' [or] Lha-chen dpal-'bar; the middle Khri-dar-ma; the youngest *Lha-btsun* Zhi-ba since he was a renunciate. The eldest and the youngest [sons] having renounced the world, [they] became the chiefs in Bya-sa.

The second [son] Khri-dar-ma, moreover, [had] three sons: Khri-[g]tsug, Rnal-'byor, Smon-lam. From among five [sons of] Khri-gtsug, one was killed in Zo-thang. The sons of the eldest (*ched-po*) Khri-btsan were Bu-chung, Srong-btsan, Shag-khri and Jo'i-khams. The lines (*gdung*) of the first two (*go ma < gong-ma*) were discontinued (*chad*).

Shag-khri's son was Lha-khri.

Jo-khams' son[s were] Rdor-rin [= Rdo-rje rin-chen and] Ri-na-'od [= ?Rin-'od = Rin-chen-'od].

Lha-spyan [the younger brother of G.yu-spyan] was one living in Khra-'brug. [His] line was discontinued.

Da-ra Dbang-phyug, the younger [brother of G.yu-spyan], had three sons; the eldest Thang-la-dga', the second Lha-dga', and the youngest Gser-thog. Thang-la-dga' dwelled in Khra-'brug. Lha-dga' dwelled in 'Or-mo. Gser-thog's line was discontinued.”¹⁸

A schematic representation would look as follows:

Table 2

(1) G.yu-spyan X

Jo-dga' X

Lha-chen dpal-'bar

Khri-dar-ma X

Lha-btsun Zhi-ba

18 Tshal-pa writes at TSHAL 45 [TSHAL1 21a, Inaba-Satō 1964:103] that “The descendants of 'Od-btsan, Lha-btsan and Gung-btsan [TSHAL1 *dgung-btsan*] are the rulers of Bying-pa [TSHAL1 *byings-pa*]. The descendants of Lhun-po are in Byar. The descendants of Da-ra [dbang-phyug] are those of Khra-'brug and Chu-mig gog-po. Bla-ma dam-pa states at RGYAL 247: “The descendants of Da-ra, Lhun-po, 'Od-btsan and Gung-btsan are said (zer) to be those living in Khra-'brug, Bying-pa and Chu-mig Gog-po.”; not surprisingly, the same is found in YAR 74 [YAR1 74].

Khri-gtsug X	Rnal-'byor	Smon-lam
? Khri-btsan X		
Bu-chung	Srong-btsan	Shag-khri X
		Lha-khri
		Jo'i-khams X
		Rdor-rin
		Ri-na-'od
(2) Lha-spyan		
(3) Da-ra dbang-phyug X		
Thang-la-dga'	Lha-dga'	Gser-thog

This needs to be juxtaposed with the genealogies from G. yu-spyan onward given in LD1 387 which is more detailed and includes several important variants:

g.yu spyan gyi sras jo dga' / de'i sras lo lha sta ba can / de la sras gsum / che po mi 'thung dge' zhes sam lha chen dpal 'bar zhes kyang bya / 'bring po khri dar ma / chung ba lha zhi ba rab byung ngo //
lha chen dang gcung zhi ba gnyis bya sar rab tu byung nas dpon mdzad do //
khri dar ma la sras gsum / khri btsun / mal 'byor / smon lam gsum / khri btsun la sras Inga / gcig zo thang du 'khrug pas grongs / de 'og khri btsan lde / brtse kha bo ste bu chung gi bus pha bkrongs / jo bo sgom pa do [= jo] dbang dang Inga'o //
jo dbang gi bu jo bo btsan khri dpal lo //
khri btsan la sras bzhi / che po bung chung sring mos bkrongs / de 'og ngom tsha spung gsum la / che po srong btsan gdung chad / 'bring po shag khri mkhar thog na yod / de'i sras lha khri chug pa kham pa la bu gnyis / stor rin dang rig 'od gnyis so //

"The son of G.yu-spyan was Jo-dga'. His son was Lo-lha sta-ba-can. He had three sons. The eldest was Mi-'thung-dga' who is also called Lha-chen dpal-'bar. The second son was Khri Dar-ma; the youngest Lha Zhi-ba who renounced the world.

After Lha-chen and Zhi-ba, the youngest, renounced the world in Bya-sa, they acted as chiefs [of this monastic estate].

Khri-dar-ma had three sons: Khri-btsun, Rnal-'byor and Smon-lam. Khri-btsun had five sons. One was killed in Zo-thang due to [local] troubles. After [him], Khri-btsan-lde, Brtse-kha-bo - ?the father was killed by the son of Bu-chung - Jo-bo sgom-pa [and] Do[=Jo]-dbang.

Jo-dbang's son was Jo-bo Btsan-khri-dpal.

Khri-btsan[-lde] had four sons. Bung[Bu]-chung, the eldest, was killed by [?his] younger sister (*sring-mo*). As for the three [remaining] remarkable (*ngom-tsha* < *ngo-mtsha*) brothers, the line of Srong-btsan, the eldest, was discontinued. Shag-khri, the second one, lived in Mkhari-thog. His son Lha-khri chung-pa kham-pa had two sons, the two of Stor [= Rdor]-rin and Rig-'od.

Table 3

G.yu-spyan X

Jo-dga' X

Lo-lha sta-ba-can X

Mi'-thung-dga'
(or Lha-chen dpal-'bar)

Khri-btsun X

? Khri-btsan-lde X

Bung-chung

Rnal-'byor

Brtse-kha-bo

Srong-btsan

Khri-dar-ma X

Smon-lam

Jo-bo sgom-pa

Shag-khri X

Lha Zhi-ba

Jo-dbang X

Jo-bo Btsan-khri-dpal

?

Lha-khri chung-pa kham-pa

Stor [= Rdor]-rin Rig-'od.

Of somewhat greater importance are Bla-ma dam-pa's observations at RGYAL 247 which are to a significant extent reflected by those of Yar-lung Jo-bo at YAR 74 [YAR1 74-75]:

mn̄ga' bdag g.yu can gar mi yon tan g.yu rung gis bya sar gdan drangs / de'i sras jo dga' / de'i sras gsum gyi che ba / bya sa lha chen gyis bya sa'i gtsug lag khang so ma bzhengs < 'ga' zhig na re / g.yu can gyis dbu rtse bzhengs / jo dga' [YAR: dwags!] 'khyams brtsigs /[YAR: omits /] lha chen gyis gser sku chen mo legs [YAR logs] bris dang bcas bzhengs zhes [YAR omits] zer> / sangs rgyas dbon ston gyis rab tu gnas pa mdzad / dpal phag mo gru pa la sogs mkhas grub mang po'i zhabs tog mdzad / gcung po'ang rab tu byung nas lha zhi bar grags pa de / lo mo sgom khang du bzhugs / bar pa khri dar ma la sras bzhi / gtsug lde / khri gtsug / mal 'byor / smon lam / gtsug lde la sras med / khri gtsug gis bya sa dang do sngon la sogs bzung / de'i sras khri btsan / de'i sras sha khri / de'i sras lha khri sogs yar mda' na yod pa mam yin no //

'Mnga'-bdag G.yu-can was invited to Bya-sa by Gar-mi Yon-tan g.yu-rung[= g.yung-drung]. His son was Jo-dga'. The eldest of his three sons, Bya-sa Lha-chen, built the temple of Bya-sa <note: Some allege that G.yu-can erected the pinnacle [of the monastery] (dbu-rtse); Jo-dga' built the courtyard; Lha-chen erected a large golden statue together with well-drawn [murals]). The consecration was performed

by Sangs-rgyas dbon-ston [1138-1210].¹⁹ [Lha-chen] served many scholar-practitioners such as the lustrous Phag-mo gru-pa [Rdo-rje rgyal-po (1110-1170)] etc. After also the youngest brother had renounced the world, he became known as Lha Zhi-ba and stayed in the meditation-temple of Lo-mo. The second brother Khri-dar-ma had four sons: Gtsug-lde, Khri-gtsug, Rnal-'byor and Smon-lam. Gtsug-lde had no sons. Khri-gtsug took Bya-sa, Do-sngon etc. His son was Khri-btsan. His son was Sha-khri. His son Lha-khri etc. are those who stay in Yar-mdā'."

Table 4

G.yu-can X

Jo-dga' X

Bya-sa Lha-chen	Khri-dar-ma X	Lha Zhi-bar-grags
Gtsug-lde X	Khri-gtsug X	[Jo-bo] Rnal-'byor X
Khri-btsan X		
Sha-khri X		
Lha-khri X		

Contrary to the accounts of Bla-ma dam-pa and Yar-lung Jo-bo, both LD and LD1 state that Khri-dar-ma had three and not four sons since they omit Gtsug-lde. Whatever the case may have been, all of this allows us to aver that Lha-chen's *floruit* must be placed in the second half of the twelfth century. Since LD lists some four additional generations we can confidently place this passage to refer to the first half of the thirteenth century and, provided that it is not a later addition to the text, we may

19 Notes on his life can be found in in the histories of the Bka'-gdams-pa school by Bsod-nams lha'i-dbang-po (1423-1496) of 1484 — *Bka'-gdams rin-po-che' chos-'byung mam-thar nyin-mor byed-pa'i 'od-stong*, in *Two Histories of the Bka'-gdams-pa Tradition*, Gangtok, 1977, 356-358 — and especially in the one of ?1494 by Las-chen Kun-dga' rgyal-mthan, the *Bka'-gdams-kyi mam-par thar-pa bka'-gdams chos-'byung gsal-ba'i sgron-me*, Vol. I, New Delhi, 1972, 384-413; see furthermore 'Gos Lo-tsā-ba at Roerich (1976:315-316). Also referred to as Dbon-ston Rin-po-che, no doubt because he was the nephew (*dbon*) of the great Sgyer/Dgyer Sgom Gzhon-nu grags-pa (1090-1171), his actual name was Gzhon-nu 'byung-gnas. His uncle founded the "old temple" of Rin-chen-sgang in Rgya-ma in 1119, whereafter he built the "new temple" and other structures in 1182.

therefore conclude that the *terminus a quo* of this passage, if not of LD as a whole, must fall at that time as well.

2. *Dating the LD1*

LD1, too, consists of two parts where, as with LD, several texts peculiar to the Rnying-ma-pa are cited: a history of Buddhism in India [LD1 1-181] and a chronicle of the imperial family and their descendants in post-imperial Tibet [LD1 181-398] to which is appended a section [LD1 398-411] in which the author succinctly deals with such chronological issues as the duration and the decline of Buddhism, and the coming of the future Buddha Maitreya. In the course of the latter, he cites two readily identifiable chronological calculations at LD1 408-409, one by a certain 'Chims (or: Mchims) and one by a Rin-po-che Chos-rje which enable us to revise the earlier proposed dating of this work to at least the second half of the thirteenth century; the passage in question, which is prefaced by *Abhidharmakosa* III:9, reads:

*de la 'chims kyis rtsis pas lo Inga stong gnas pa la / sngar sum stong nyis brgya dang
gya gnyis so // stong dang bdun brgya bco brgyad lus zer ro //*

“In that [connection], according to the calculation by 'Chims, [the Teaching] will last for five thousand years. Previously, three thousand and two hundred and eighty-two [years have passed]. One thousand seven hundred and eighteen [years] remain.”

“Chims” can be none other than Mchims Nam-mkha'-grags whose calculations are dated to the year 1257.²⁰ The above text is then followed by a calculation by a “Rin-po-che Chos-rje”. The corresponding passage from Bu-ston's *Chos-'byung*, as do all subsequent Tibetan works on chronology, attributes this calculation to Śākyasrībhadra (1127-1225).²¹ At LD1 387-388, Mkhās-pa Lde'u continues LD's earlier genealogies of Lha-dga' – see Table 2 – by adding three more generations.

20 For his calculations, see the valuable discussion in MacDonald (1963:118-120, note 55).

21 See McDonald (1963:67, 121-122, note 57); her interpretation of the dating of the Buddha's death to 543 B.C. was recently criticized in Z. Yamaguchi, “Methods of Chronological Calculation in Tibetan Historical Sources”, in *Tibetan and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. 2, ed. L. Ligeti, Budapest, 1984, 420-421, where on 420, note 37, “esp. p. 167” should read “..67”. He arrives at the year 544 B.C. which we also find in A. Vostrikov, *Tibetan Historical Literature*, trs. H. C. Gupta, Calcutta, 1970, 111-113, notes 341-342.

de'i sras khri dbang btsan / de'i sras btsun pa dga' dang / btsun chung dga'o / btsun a dga'i sras e sho legs /

"His son was Khri-dbang-btsan; his sons Btsun-pa-dga' and Btsun-chung-dag'. Btsun-pa-dga's son [was] E-sho-legs."

This is not all, however. LD1 387-388 also details a number of other descendants of Rnal-'byor — see Table 2 — who are not registered in LD; it writes:

mal 'byor 'ban tshig na yod de la sra bzhi / che po spyil bu ba / de 'og 'bag so / 'bag chung / chung ba bkra shis mgon no //²² 'bag chung 'bring khung du thar par gshegs / bkra shis mgon grongs / 'bag so la sras bzhi / che po saky a mgon / de'i sras saky a bkra shis lhag ru na yod / lde chung grongs / chung ba jo rgyal de'i sras jo 'ber bu lu na bzhugs / lha spyan khra 'brug pa yin te gdung chad / chung ba da ra dbang phyug la sras gsum / thang la dga' / lha dga' / chung ba gser thog go / thang la dga' khra 'brug na bzhugs / de'i sras mal 'byor / de'i sras yod re dar / lha btsun no / bu yor gyi sras don grub / de'i bu jo bsod do / lha dga' 'or mo na bzhugs / de'i sras bstun pa dga' dang / btsun chung dga'o // btsun pa dga'i sras e sho legs / gser thog gdung chad do /

"Rnal-'byor who lived in 'Ban-tshig had four sons: Spyil-bu-ba²³, the eldest, then 'Bag-so, 'Bag-chung [and] the youngest Bkra-shis-mgon. 'Bag-chung passed into deliverance in 'Bring ['Bri]-khung[gung monastery]. Bkra-shis-mgon was murdered (grongs). 'Bag-so had four sons: the eldest was Śākyā-mgon. His son Śākyā-bkra-shis

- 22 At YAR 106-115 [YAR1 105-113], Yar-lung Jo-bo provides further biographical data on his ancestors who occupied the see of Spyil-bu monastery where, however, he is a trifle laconic in his dates. He has it that Byang-chub rin-chen, alias Lha-chen-po or Lha Lung-gi dbang-phyug 'od-zer, was born on the morning of the fifteenth day of the first month (*cho-phrul zla-ba*) of a tiger-year and that he passed away in the water-male-dragon year, aged seventy-four. His dates can therefore be calculated as 1158 to 1232 and these tally with other sources.
- 23 Regarding Lha 'Gro-ba'i mgon-po whose mother was Lha-gcig 'Dzam-gling-rgyan, a/the sister (*lcam-mo*) of Lha 'Bri-sgang-pa, YAR 108-111 [YAR1 106-110] provides neither the year of his birth nor the precise year of his death. At YAR 111 [YAR1 109], he merely has it that he died on the twenty-first day of the last autumn month (*ston-zla tha-chung*) of a sheep year. 'Gos Lo-tsā-ba [Roerich 1976:278-279] identified this sheep-year as the earth-sheep year which would be 1259, and this was adopted by all subsequent Bka'-gdams-pa histories. However, this would be chronologically impossible if the accounts of his meeting 'Phags-pa and Minister (YAR: *ching-pang*, YAR1 *ching-sang* (Chinese: *chengxiang*) Zam-kha (?-1291) are taken to be authentic. Zam-kha is of course none other than the *bka'-ma-log* Tibetan known in Chinese sources as Sangge who rose to prominence under Qubilai, ultimately to be executed in ignominy. He is supposed to have met 'Phags-pa while the latter was en route to the Mongol court in 1267! I would therefore be inclined to submit that the year of his death was 1271, the iron sheep year.

is in Lhag-ru. Lde-chung was killed. Jo-'ber, the son of Jo-rgyal, the youngest [son of 'Bag-so], dwells [or dwelled] in Bu-lu.

[G.yu-spyan's] younger brother Da-ra dbang-phyug had three sons: Thang-la-dga', Lha-dga' [and] the youngest Gser-thog. Thang-la-dga' dwelled in Khra-'brug. His son was Rnal-'byor; his sons were Yod-re-dar and Lha-btsun. The son of ?Bu-yor (= ?Yod-re-dar) was Don-grub; his son was Jo-bsod.

Lha-dga's dwelled in 'Or-mo. His sons were Btsun-pa-dga' and Btsun-chung-dga'. The son of Btsun-pa-dga' was E-sho-legs. The line of Gser-thog was discontinued."

Table 5

Rnal-'byor X

Spyil-bu-ba	'Bag-so X	'Bag-chung	Bkra-shis-mgon
-------------	-----------	------------	----------------

Sākya-mgon X	Lde-chung	?	Jo-rgyal X
--------------	-----------	---	------------

Sākya-bkra-shis			Jo-'ber
-----------------	--	--	---------

Da-ra dbang-phyug X

Thang-la-dga' X	Lha-dga'	Gser-thog
-----------------	----------	-----------

Rnal-'byor X

Yod-re-dar

Bla-ma dam-pa at RGYAL 247-248, and Yar-lung Jo-bo, at YAR 75-78 [YAR1 75-78], who is indebted to him, provide some crucial information on the line from Rnal-'byor or, as they write, Jo-bo Rnal-'byor who, together with his younger brother Jo-bo Smon-lam, had taken religious vows and functioned as important sponsors of Spyān-snga Grags-pa 'byung-gnas (1175-1255), a scion of the famous Rlangs family, abbot of Phag-mo-gru and 'Bri-gung monasteries, and ruler of Central Tibet for the Mongols from 1240 to 1255. Jo-bo Rnal-'byor fathered several sons prior to having taken his vows, but problems with his line of descent already start with the number of his sons since, for example, in contrast with LD and LD1, Bla-ma dam-pa and Yar-lung Jo-bo only list three sons, namely Jo-'bag, Lha-chen-po and Lha Ngam-shod-pa, and omit Bkra-shis-mgon — for the text and translation of the passage in question, I refer to my paper

signalled in note 3. For the present, we may draw attention to the fact that, firstly, LD1's "Spyil-bu-pa" ought to be identified as Lha-chen-po (1158-1232).²² Secondly, LD1's "Bag-so" must be identical to Jo-'bag of whom Bla-ma dam-pa and Yar-lung Jo-bo write that he had not four but five sons, namely Jo-bo Śākyā-mgon-po, Lha 'Gro-ba'i mgon-po (?1186-?1259)²³, alias Byang-chub-'od, Lde-po, Lde-chung and Jo-rgyal. Thirdly, the youngest of Jobo Rnal-'byor's sons was a monk at the residence of Bla-ma Gcung-rin-po-che [= Rdo-rje-grags (1210/1211-1278/1279)] in 'Bri-gung monastery. As for Śākyā-mgon, or Jo-bo Śākyā-mgon-po, only Yar-lung Jo-bo writes that he had been a sponsor of Sa-skyā Paṇḍita, and that, as a matter of course, he received teachings from the latter. Inasmuch as these two men are mentioned in connection with the birth of 'Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan, we can roughly date their meeting, if it not be the only one, to the year 1235. The dates for Śākyā-bkra-shis are not known. Again, only Yar-lung Jo-bo observes that his wife was a lady by the name of Skyo-mo Dar-rgyan and that he died aged seventy-three. His two sons were Lha Brag-kha-ba Ye-shes blo-gros (1250-1287) and Mnga'-bdag Grags-pa rin-chen. The latter was an attendant (*nye-gnas*) of Bla-ma Rgyal-ba Rin-po-che [Grags-pa brtson-'grus (1203-1267)]. Presumably after his master's death he became a disciple of 'Phags-pa and accompanied him to China in the capacity as one of his *nye-gnas*. While in China, Rubilai apparently granted him a decree (*lung*) which placed Mnga'-ris under his control. Grags-pa rin-chen's dates can be deduced from the following passage at YAR 77 [YAR1 77-78]:

"Having heeded his reign in accordance with the dharma for forty years, [he] resigned [his] governance to Mnga'-bdag Sakya-mgon-po in the sheep-year, aged fifty-three [= fifty-two]. [Then,] after having dwelled in the meditation of the profound ultimate, he passed away in the earth-male-dragon year [1328], aged seventy-four [= seventy-three]."²⁴

This remark allows us to infer that he was born in 1255, meaning that Śākyā-bkra-shis must have been alive at least until that time. However,

24 The text reads:

*dgung lo bzhi bcu'i bar chab srid chos bzhin du bskyangs te / dgung lo Inga bcu
nga(a) gsum lon pa lug gi lo la mnga' bdag sakya mgon po(b) la rgyal srid gtad nas /
nges don zab mo'i thugs dam la bzhugs(c) nas glang la ba bdun cu rtsa bzhi lon pa /
sa pho 'brug lo la zhi bar gshegs so //*

a. YAR1 *rtsa*.
b. YAR1 omits.
c. YAR1 *zhugs*.

since LD1 does not mention either son, it is possible that this genealogy may have been composed slightly before the year 1250. Lastly, Bla-ma dam-pa and Yar-lung Jo-bo have it that Jo-rgyal had gone to a place called Bu-lu, and that his son was King (*btsad-po*) Jo'-phel ['Bel]. The latter states at YAR 112 [YAR1 110-111] that his son was Lha Zur-khang-pa (1277-1337), abbot of Spyil-bu until the year 1316.

The upshot of the above considerations is that, as was the case with LD, the *terminus a quo* of LD1 must be placed in the second half of the thirteenth century. Whether both were authored by one and the same person is well nigh impossible to say at the present level of our ignorance of basic historical and text-historical data. Clearly, both texts draw from a common store of information, and both *appear* to have been written in a similar cultural ambience. So far, the *Lde'u chos-'byung* is mentioned for the first time by Dpa'-bo and, strictly speaking, this means that the *terminus ad quem* for one (or both) must fall sometime during the first half of the sixteenth century. Given the remark made in LD1 anent Mkhas-pa Jo-nam (see note 6), I would be inclined to place at least its date of composition in the second half of the thirteenth century, something which finds indirect corroboration in its survey of the Indian Madhyamaka where one of its branches, the *thal-'gyur-ba* (**prāsaṅgika*), is absent from Mkhas-pa Lde'u's exposition.²⁵ And this in turn argues for its composition to be prior to the enormous upsurge in Tibetan Madhyamaka analyses, especially in terms of Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka, during the latter part of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth century. Another distinguishing feature is the total absence of any references to the series of religious debates that allegedly took place in Tibet during the latter part of the eighth century between an Indian and a Chinese party,

25 It is noteworthy that Mkhas-pa Lde'u does not identify those Madhyamaka-s whom other (?later) histories of Buddhism, as does for instance the one by Bu-ston, hold to be exponents of the *prāsaṅgika* persuasion. LD1 176 does note, however, that:

de nas legs ldan 'byed kyi rjes su 'brangs pa ye shes snying pos bden gnyis mdzad / thogs med kyi rjes su 'brangs pa zhi ba 'tshos dbu ma rgyan mdzad / ka ma la shi las dbu ma snang ba mdzad do // de gsum la dbu ma shar gsum zhes bya ste / rang rgyud pa zhes bya'o // de mams ni phar phyin dang lta ba mthun pas dbu ma'i bstan chos so //

"Then, Jñānagarbha, a follower of Bhāvaviveka, composed the *Dvayasatya* [*vibhāga*]; Śāntarakṣita, a follower of Asaṅga wrote the *Madhyamakālāmkāra*; Kamalaśīla wrote the *Madhyamakāloka*. These three are called the "Three Eastern Madhyamaka [scholars, as all hailed from East India]", [they are also] called *Svātantrika*-s. These [texts of theirs] are Madhyamaka texts since [their] philosophical view agrees with the [prajñā]pāramitā."

with the Tibetan emperor Khri-srong lde'u-btsan as arbiter, although the Chinese monk (*heshang*) Mahāyāna — according to other sources, he was a major player in these events — is mentioned in LD and LD1.²⁶ Both LD and LD1 contain mines of information on Tibet's imperial period which most likely will result in a thorough revision of many of the conclusions reached so far about the etiology of the imperial families and the administration and organization of the Tibetan empire. In the latter respect, LD1 in particular, eclipses all of the Tibetan histories that are so far available, and to a significant extent vies with the materials of the Dunhuang documents. We owe a debt of gratitude to the authorities in Lhasa for their foresight in making these two inordinately rare and interesting works available to the scholarly world.

Addendum:

Nam-mkha' no-bu dates Mkhlas-pa Lde'u from 1123 to 1163, albeit without giving the source for this information; see his *Zhang bod gna'-rabs-kyi lorgyus nor-bu'i me-long*, Chengdu, 1990, 4. This cannot be maintained in light of the above. The chronicle of Rgyal-sras Thugs-mchog-rtsal knew of LD1, for which see, for instance, his *Chos 'byung rin-po-che'i gter-mdzod bstan-pa gsal-bar byed-pa'i nyi'-od*, Vol. 1, Gangtok, 1976, 298-300, in which is reproduced a passage corresponding to LD1 172-173. Rgyal-sras is sometimes identified as Klong-chen-pa (1308-1364), but this is not unproblematic. The colophon in Vol. 2, p. 473 observes that the text was completed in 1362. However, the year "earth-hen", that is, 1369, occurs in a passage in Vol. 2, pp. 389 ff.

26 See, for instance LD 122 where he is styled a "meditation master of both China and Tibet" — "meditation master" (*bsam-gtan-gi mkhan-po*) is to be sure a calque of Chinese *chanshi* — and also LD1 301 where his name is first mentioned.

Bibliography and abbreviations

BSOD = Bsod-nams rtse-mo, *Chos-la 'jug-pa 'i-sgo*, in *Sa-skya bka'-bum*, ed. Bsod-nams rgya-mtsho, Vol. 2, no. 17. 318/3-345/3. Tokyo, 1968.

DPA' = Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag phreng-ba, *Chos-'byung mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston*, 2 vols. Bejing, 1986.

DPA' = Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag phreng-ba, *Chos-'byung mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston*, 2 vols. New Delhi, 1980.

Inaba, S. and Satō, H. (1964). *Hu lan deb ther - Chibetto Nendaiki*, Kyoto.

LD = Lde'u Jo-sras, *Lde'u chos-'byung*, Lhasa., 1987.

LD1 = Mkhas-pa Lde'u, *Rgya-bod-kyi chos-'byung rgyas-pa*, Lhasa, 1987.

MacDonald, A. (1963). "Préambule à la lecture d'un *Rgya-bod yig-tshang*, in *Journal Asiatique* CCLI:53-159.

NYANG = Nyang-ral Nyi-ma 'od-zer, *Chos-'byung me-tog snying-po'i sbrang-rtsi'i-bcud*, in R.O. Meisezahl, *Die grosse Geschichte des Tibetischen Buddhismus nach alter Tradition*, Sankt Augustin, 1985.

NYANGb = Ibid, Manuscript B, Paro, 1979.

Petech, L. (1977), *The Kingdom of Ladakh (c. 950-1482)*, 2nd ed., Rome.

Petech, L. (1988). *Selected Papers on Asian History*, Rome.

RGYAL = Bla-ma dam-pa Bsod-nams rgyal-mtshan, *Rgyal-rabs gsal-ba'i me-long*, Beijing, 1982.

Roerich, G. (1976). *The Blue Annals*, New Delhi.

Szerb, J. (1990), *Bu ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet*, Wien.

TSHAL = Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rdo-rje, *Deb-ther dmar-po*, ed. and comm. Dung-dkar Blo-bzang 'phrin-las. Beijing, 1981.

TSHAL1 = Ibid., Gangtok, 1961.

TSHE (d) = Kah-thog Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbang nor-bu, *Lha btsad-po'i rabs dam pa'i-chos ci-ltar byung-ba'i-rim mdo-tsam smos-pa*, in *Collected Works*, vol. IV: 337-362. Dalhousie, 1977.

TSHE (n) = Rgyal-ba'i bstan-pa rin-po-che byang-phyogs-su 'byung-ba'i rtsa-lag / Bod-rje lha-bstan-po'i gdung-rabs tshig[s]-nyung don-gsal yid-kyi me-long, in *Rare Tibetan Historical and literary Texts from the Library of Tsepón W.D. Shakabpa*, Series I: 1-59. New Delhi, 1974.

Tucci, G. (1971). *Deb-ther dmar-po gsar-ma*, Vol. 1. Rome.

Uebach, H. (1987). *Nel-pa Pan3ditas Chronik Me-tog phreng-ba*, Munich, 1987.

YAR = Yar-lung Jo-bo Śākyā-rin-chen, *Yar-lung chos-'byung*, ed. Dbyangs-can. Chengdu, 1988.

YAR1 = Ibid., ed. Ngag-dbang. Lhasa, 1988.