


Bulletin of Tibetology



VOL. IV

No. 3

**24 NOVEMBER 1967
NAMGYAL INSTITUTE OF TIBETOLOGY
GANGTOK, SIKKIM**

—The Bulletin of Tibetology seeks to serve the specialist as well as the general reader with an interest in this field of study. The motif portraying the Stupa on the mountains suggests the dimensions of the field—


EDITORS

GYALMO HOPE NAMGYAL

T. SHERAB GYALTSHEN

NIRMAL C. SINHA

Bulletin of Tibetology



VOL. IV

No. 3

24 NOVEMBER 1967
NAMGYAL INSTITUTE OF TIBETOLOGY
GANGTOK, SIKKIM

ལྷ་པོ་ལྷ་མོ་ལྷ་མོ།

24 NOVEMBER 1967

PRINTED BY THE MANAGER, SI KIM DARBAR PRESS
AND PUBLISHED BY THE DIRECTOR, NAMGYAL INSTITUTE
OF TIBETOLOGY, GANGTOK.

4/68

CONTENTS

	Page
A TIBETAN ANTIQUARIAN IN THE XVIII TH CENTURY HUGH E. RICHARDSON	5
BEGINNINGS OF THE LHASA EXPEDITION: YOUNGHUSBAND'S OWN WORDS PARSHOTAM MEHRA	9
NOTES & TOPICS MYNAK R. TULKU NIRMAL C. SINHA	19

CONTRIBUTORS IN THIS ISSUE—

HUGH EDWARD RICHARDSON Held diplomatic assignments in Lhasa (1936-40 & 1946-50) and Chungking (1942-44); reputed for linguistic abilities, knows several Asian languages, speaks Lhasa cockney and reads classical Tibetan with native intonation, conversed with the poet Tagore in Bengali; for several terms Professor in Tibetan Language and History at University of Washington, Seattle, USA; recipient of the Gold Medal of the Royal Central Asian Society, UK; leading authority on history of Tibet, ancient as well as modern.

PARSHOTAM MEHRA Head of the Department of Central Asian Studies in the Panjab University; well-known scholar of Inner Asian history since 1880; written on Anglo-Russian diplomatic encounters and a volume entitled YOUNGHUSBAND EXPEDITION is due shortly; presently working on India's north-eastern frontiers.

MYNAK RIKHU TULKU Presiding incarnate of Rikhu, the leading Sakya monastery in Mynak (Khams); resident in Sikkim since 1959 and attached to the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, first as a student of Sanskrit and English and now as a member of the staff.

NIRMAL CHANDRA SINHA Director: Namgyal Institute of Tibetology; formerly teacher of history, University of Calcutta and editor, National Archives of India.

Views expressed in the Bulletin of Tibetology are those of the contributors alone and not of the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology. An article represents the private individual views of the author and does not reflect those of any office or institution with which the author may be associated.

A TIBETAN ANTIQUARIAN IN THE XVIIIITH CENTURY

—HUGH E. RICHARDSON

It is a common place that Tibetan historians after the re-establishment of Buddhism in Central Tibet in the Xth century gave little space to events before that time which did not have an obvious religious significance. Nevertheless, several of them can be seen to have had some acquaintance with the early inscriptions, which existed in front of their eyes, and with records in monastery archives. For example, 'Gos Lo-tsa-ba, the author of the careful and invaluable "Blue Annals", quotes the 5th and 6th lines of the inscription on the east face of the Lhasa Treaty pillar of 821/822 (vol.nya. f 108 a.) He also states (vol. ga f.40 b) that he has seen a letter on blue silk recording the grant of property to Myang Ting-nge-'dzin bzang-po, but he makes no mention of two inscriptions on stone pillars at Zhwa'i Lha-khang which still survive as witness of that fact.

The Lhasa Treaty Inscription was also known to the author of the rGyal-rabs gsal-ba'i me-long who picks out words and phrases as though from a hazy and inaccurate recollection of its contents (f. 92 a) and recommends his readers to study the inscription if they want fuller information.

The comparatively recent discovery in the Chos-byung of dPa'-bo gtsug-lag 'phreng-ba (1565) of an exception to this sketchy approach to ancient documents was, therefore, a welcome event. A manuscript copy of this work was lent to me at Lhasa in 1947; and it appears that Professor Tucci saw a printed copy on his visit to Tibet about the same time. After widespread enquiry I succeeded in locating the blocks at the Lha-lung monastery in Lho-brag and it was possible to arrange for a number of copies to be printed, some of which were sent to scholars in Europe. At that time the book was known to few Tibetans at Lhasa, probably because it had been mentioned unfavourably by the Vth Dalai Lama who may have been inspired in part by the fact that the Karmapa school, to which dPa'-bo gtsug-lag belonged, had been his principal opponents when, with the support of Gushri Khan, he had invaded Tibet and defeated the gTsang king in 1642. In fact, where he criticizes dPa'-bo gtsug-lag, it is the Dalai Lama who appears to be mistaken; but his disapproval was enough to remove the work from the libraries of the Lhasa intellegentsia.

In that history is found, for the first time, the careful quotation of a complete VIIIth century inscription—that at bSam-yas. The author mentions the inscribed pillars at Zhwa'i Lha-khang (f108). There is also a passing reference to the Lhasa Treaty pillar and short quotations from its east face (Ja f. 132). In addition to this evidence of familiarity

with ancient inscriptions there is the unique contribution of what appears to be verbatim quotation from the archives of some monastery, probably bSam-yas, of two Edicts of Khri Srong-lde-brtsan and one of Khri-LDe-srong-brtsan. These remarkable documents are authenticated by the survival on a stone pillar near Lhasa of an inscription recording an edict which is clearly the counterpart of the Edict of Khri lDe-srong-brtsan. The inscription has been published by me in JRASB 1949 and has been examined more fully by Professor Tucci in his edition of it in *Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*, Rome, 1950.

Much of the other material in this history has the appearance of being drawn from ancient sources but it cannot be so clearly linked to its originals as can be the passage mentioned above.

From the foregoing examples it can be seen that Tibetan scholars had acquaintance, in differing degrees, with ancient documents although the fact that detailed reference rarely found their way into the surviving histories suggests that such documents were not regarded as of prime importance. It was, therefore, an unexpected thrill to be presented not long ago through the kindness of Athing Densapa of Barmiak, with a photograph of a collection of copies of early inscriptions which had recently come into his possession. These were stated to be the personal papers of the Ka:thog Lama, Rig-'dzin tshe-bdang nor-bu who lived in the XVIIIth century and they show that at the time of the Age of Reason in Europe and the scholarly researches of Sir William Jones in India, there was a Lama in Tibet who had taken pains to collect and to annotate the text of many important inscriptions of the VIIIth and IXth centuries.

One of these inscriptions was hitherto unknown because the lettering on the pillar which contained it had become illegible through time. It dates from the reign of Khri Srong-lde-brtsan and has now been edited by me in JRAS 1964. The other inscriptions are: that at the tomb of Khri lDe-srong-brtsan at 'Phyong-rgyas, which has been published by Professor Tucci in *Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*; the inscription from rKong-po published by me in JRAS 1954; the so-called sKar-cung inscription published by me in JRASB 1949 and by Professor Tucci in *Tombs of the Tibetan kings*; and two of the four inscriptions on the Lhasa Treaty Pillar which are known from the editions of Professor Li Fang-kuei, Bisashi Sato and myself.

Missing are what is probably the oldest of such documents—that from the *Zhol rdo-rings* at Lhasa (c.764) which does not appear to be mentioned by any historian although the conquest of the Chinese capital which is described there is known to them. Perhaps the tradition that this pillar was erected by a lay minister who was hostile to Buddhism led to it being ignored. Other inscriptions missing from the collection

are those at Zhwa'i Lha-khang and at mTshur-phu, both of which relates to Buddhist foundations.

What is in the collection is, nevertheless, of great importance especially when it is seen that some of the material which the Lama acquired in the XVIIIth century may have been either originals or, more likely copies made as much as 250 years before his lifetime. This appears from a note at the end of his copy of the Lhasa Treaty Inscriptions to the effect that the copy was made in a water-tiger year 599 years after the water-hare year in which the pillar was set up. That is known to have been 823. It may be necessary to allow for a confusion in Tibetan chronology which has affected much of their dating from that period by the apparent omission of a cycle of sixty years; but, even so, the date of the copies is put firmly in the XVth century. Further, a note, perhaps made by the Lama himself, on the copy of the rKong-po inscription indicates that when the text was checked on the spot with the original, about six and a half lines of the inscription were buried under sand. His copy was, therefore, taken some time before it came into his possession.

I am gradually making new editions of the inscriptions in the light of the Lama's texts. Although comparison with photographs etc., showing the state of the inscriptions as they were some 20 years ago, discloses many inaccuracies in the Lama's copies, these are largely orthographic and his contribution provides much new information of real value. It is not my intention to discuss that aspect here; but I should like to attempt a short sketch of Lama's life in the hope that others with better source at their disposal may be inclined to enlarge upon it. In a recent article "Nouveaux Documents Tibétains sur le Mi Nyag Si Hia" in *Melanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demieville*, published by the Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1966, Professor R.A. Stein mentions two biographies of Rig'dzin tshe-dbang nor-bu which he saw at Gangtok. I have not had access to those works and have drawn only on the *Rin-chen gter-mdzod* and on verbal and written information from the present Ka:thog dBon sPrul-sku and the Sa-skyapa Lama, sDe-gzhung Rim'oche,.

Tshe-dbang nor-bu was born in 1698 in the Sa-ngan region of East Tibet and was soon recognized as the reincarnation of one Grub-dbang Padma nor-bu who carried on the spiritual line of gNubs Nam-mkha'i snying-po a teacher at the time of Khri Srong-lde-brtsan. The boy was ordained by the rGyalsras Rimpoche of Ka:thog the famous rNying-ma-pa monastery some 40 miles S.E. of sDe-dge, founded in 1099 by Lama Dam-pa De-bshegs sand which takes its name from a hill, on the slopes of which the monastery lies, bearing near its summit marks resembling the letter Ka. Tshe-dbang nor-bu studied with the leading rNying-ma-pa teachers and also with those of the Karmapa with whom Ka:thog had

a close connection. One of his contemporaries and friends was Karmapa Si-tu Chos-kyi byung-gnas, a famous XVIIIth century scholar; and, later, Tshe-dbang nor-bu became the tutor of the XIIIth Karmapa Zhwa-nag incarnation, bDud-'dul rdo-rje.

From Kham he went to Central Tibet where he received instruction in the Jo-nang-pa doctrines. Among the skills he developed was that of *gtar-ston*, discoverer of religious texts and objects believed to have been concealed in the remote past. He travelled widely and his activities included the founding or repairing of monasteries in Western Tibet and in Sikkim, and the repair of *mchod-rten* (stupas) in Nepal. He was greatly revered by Pho-lha-nams stobs-rgyas, the ruler of Tibet; and in 1751/52 when trouble arose between the princes of upper and lower Ladakh and there was danger of interference by the Dzungar masters of Kashgaria, Pho-lha and the VIIth Dalai Lama commissioned him to restore peace. That incident was referred to recently by the Chinese Government in their frontier dispute with India as evidence that Ladakh was at that time under the authority of Lhasa. In spite of complimentary remarks in Tibetan sources, it seems that his efforts did not bear lasting fruit. From Ladakh he went to Nepal and not long after, in about 1755 he died at sKyid-grong where there is a *mchod-rten* containing his relics.

The Lama is brought vividly to life by a passage in the biography of the 'Brug-pa Lama Yon-tan mtha'yas which shows his active personal interest in verifying his antiquarian material. Yon-tan mtha'yas describes how when he was at Lhasa about 1744 he met Ka:thog Rig-'dzin chen-po Tshe-dbang nor-bu sitting by the *rdo-ring* outside the gTsug-lag-khang and reading the inscription on it. A copy of that inscription is, as mentioned above, included in the collection now in Athing Barmiak's possession and it may well be that the notes and corrections on it were being made at that very time by the Lama himself.

BEGINNINGS OF THE LHASA EXPEDITION: YOUNGHUSBAND'S OWN WORDS

—PARSHOTAM MEHRA

For a student of Tibet and its affairs, the expedition led by Colonel Francis Younghusband to Lhasa in 1903-4 is an event of the utmost significance in the recent history of India's relationship with our neighbouring land. Nor has that significance, and import, become less relevant today than it was a half century ago. For the specialist apart, any intelligent student of our foreign policy, more specifically in the context of relations with the People's Republic of China, would find it exceedingly hard to grasp the meaning of much that has lately passed over a country traditionally known only for its Lamas, its mystery and its snow, without a reasonable familiarity with the aims and objectives visualised and the results that flowed from this expedition. One could go a step further and underline the fact that even today the framers of India's policy have not been able fully to assess the varied ramifications that flowed from the entry of an armed force into Lhasa, in the opening years of this century. For the viewpoint that tends to regard this episode as though it marked the end of an old chapter in Britain's imperial history has been completely misplaced; in reality, it is more pertinent to view it as a watershed that opened a new phase whose end is not yet in sight.

In its beginning the story is a simple one—the end, however, was to become extremely complicated and gave rise to controversies that have remained live to-date - and relates to the summer of 1903 when Baron Curzon of Kedleston Hall in Derbyshire, then Viceroy and Governor-General of India, chose Major Younghusband, temporarily promoted to the rank of Colonel, to lead a small number of 'frontier diplomats' to negotiate some trading rights, and settle a few long standing border disputes, with the representatives of Tibet's 'god-king', and of the Imperial Chinese Resident, chosen always from among the Manchus, at Lhasa. Two letters, which are reproduced in full in the pages that follow relate to Younghusband's choice as the leader of what, to start with, was a commercial mission. Being of a private nature, written in strictest confidence to his father* in England, they afford an insight

*Younghusband's father, to whom, all through life, he was very much devoted, was Major General J.W. Younghusband who served under Charles Napier in the Sind Campaign of 1843 and later under John Nicholson on the North-West Frontier. Invalided home in 1856, he married Clara Jane Shaw, sister of Robert Shaw, the well-known Central Asian explorer.

into men and events which Lord Curzon's ponderous despatches, not to talk of State Papers and Blue Books, succeed remarkably well in concealing. Inasmuch as the writer has had access to these in the fullest degree, and has made use of them in the annotations, the end picture that emerges of the launching of the expedition is as nearly complete as one could construct.

I am deeply indebted to Dame Eileen Louise Younghusband, Sir Francis' daughter, through whose courtesy these letters have, for the first time, been made available for re-production.

II

On the way to Simla
May 1903

My dear Father,

The mystery⁽¹⁾ is solved. I am to go to Tibet in charge of a very important mission. Very strictly in confidence Lord Curzon had intended to send me to Lhasa with an armed force capable of putting down all resistance.⁽²⁾ The Home Government would not, however, agree to this. But they have agreed to a mission being sent to Tibet to meet Chinese and Tibetan representatives and I have been nominated British Commissioner⁽³⁾ with a man called White⁽⁴⁾ (who had been for 14 years Political Officer in Sikkim) as Joint Commissioner. This is all I know at present but I have been summoned to Simla to receive instructions and am now on my way there.

That Lord Curzon should have selected me for so important a mission is of course a great compliment and I am to discuss "frontier, trade and general matters" with Tibet. It sounds a pretty comprehensive mission.

Just seen Small Boy⁽⁵⁾ at Umbala. He seems v. flourishing but wants a billet. If I get half a chance I will take him with me.

Poor Kathleen⁽⁶⁾ must have had a bad time. I only heard of the new arrival two days ago.

Must send this off from Kalka to catch this mail. Love to Emmie.⁽⁷⁾
Your affectionate son,
Frank.

III

Confidential

Simla May 21 1903

My dear Father,

This is a really magnificent business that I have dropped in for. Lord Curzon's original idea of sending an imposing mission- like Malcolm's to Persia and Burnes to Kabul in old days⁽⁸⁾-to Lhasa has not been sanc-

tioned: and I am not to go to Lhasa itself as far as is present settled, but only just inside Tibet, still what I have to do is as important. I have to try and induce the Tibetans and Chinese to allow a permanent British Agent in Lhasa if possible or at any rate in some town in Tibet.(9) I have to put our trade relations with Tibet upon a proper footing: and I have to settle the boundary between us. What has brought matters to this head is that the Russians have concluded, or tried to conclude, a secret treaty with Tibet(10)-though their Ambassador in London has sworn to Lord Lansdowne that such a thing is the very last thing in the world that his government would dream of doing.(11) However, from India, Peking, Paris and St. Petersburg identical reports arrive so evidently an attempt at least has been made by the Russians to get hold of Tibet(12) and so I am to be up there to forestal them and to put our relations with Tibet on such a footing that we will be able to prevent any other Power gaining a predominant influence there-that more or less is the official phrasology.

The Chinese and Tibetans are being informed that I am a high and important official- which of course the Resident at Indore is - and they are to treat the matter seriously and send an equally high official. I am to have the rank of Colonel and an escort of 200 men while a battalion of Pioneers is to be kept in reserve in Sikkim-I am to go up from Darjeeling through Sikkim to a place called Khamba Jong, and afterwards perhaps to Gyantse. I am to have as Joint Commss'oner (and what Lord Curzon calls inferior colleagues) a Mr. White, at present Political Officer Sikkim, and who, poor beggar, has been there for fourteen years and always looked upon this job as the object of his life. He is very sore at not getting the charge of the mission but he seems a good chap(13) for what I have seen of him here and of course I will make it as easy for him as I can. Then an officer of the China Consular Servie(14) is to accompany us as an interpreter - and there will remain at Sikkim at my disposal ready to be brought forward when required and opportunity offers-an Intelligence Officer, a Survey Officer and a Doctor.

They are most determined about the thing up here. Even the Madras member of Council is excited about it. The Home Government of course are going a bit slower but even they acknowledge that it is a matter of urgent necessity that our relations with Tibet should be put upon a satisfactory basis.(15)

All this has been breeding up for some months and though I knew nothing of it lots of other men did and numbers have been applying for the billet. I hear that Dane(16) himself would like to have had it and so would Major General Sir Edmund Barrow who was in China and with Lockhart in Chitral in 1885. And of course crowds of fellows would like to have come with me. I should like to have got the Small

Boy in somehow or other but there is a chap in Sikkim now who speaks Tibetan fluently and knows the whole question and I am afraid he will have to come as Intelligence Officer(17)-which is the only billet for a Military Officer.

I had lunch with the Viceroy and met Lord Kitchener. The former very enthusiastic. He first of all told me how much he appreciated my work in Indore. He said when he looked back and thought of all the trouble with Holkar there used to be in the former times he never could have believed it possible that in so short a time things should have become so quiet as they now are. I hear too that an unusually warm appreciation has arrived from the Secretary of State.

Lord Curzon then talked away about the Mission saying he was convinced the Russians were upto some (harm?) and he was determined to forestal them and that there was no man in India he could trust better than me to carry out his plans.(18) In his telegram to the Secretary of State about this mission he wrote, "I propose to appoint as Commissioner Major Younghusband who is at present Resident at Indore. He has great Asiatic experience, and he is an officer on whose judgement and discretion I can confidently rely. He should occupy temporarily the rank of Colonel".

The Viceroy said to me "You will be glad to get back to your old work and away from all the administrative work." So of course I am. Nevertheless I would not have missed those years of internal work for anything and even if I had remained on the frontier I would never have had anything better than this.

Kitchener was very pleasant and agreeable - inclined I think to be a little more cautious than the Viceroy but thoroughly in earnest about this business. What of course is to be feared is not any armed invasion of India by the Russians through Tibet. That is impossible. But an effort by the Russians if they are in Tibet to get hold of the Nepalese. Say Russia was in Tibet we should undoubtedly have to keep a considerable force to watch Nepal. By timely action now we can prevent her gaining any predominant influence in Tibet. I hear from a gossiping little man that it is practically settled that the Viceroy stays on two years but he wants four months leave and the Home people will give him only six weeks, so they are squabbling over that.(19)

The same man also tells me that there was a great flutter in the F.O. over that letter I wrote them from Deoli about Tonk when they would not accept the British Officer whom the Nawab asked for but insisted on sending a Native. The F.O. got in a great stew, though they must have put their foot in it badly and begged the Viceroy to get

them out of the mess. The result as you will remember was that I was informed that the Gov. Gen. in Council highly appreciated my work and Government went back on their former orders and accepted my proposal for a European. The F.O. have apparently had a good whole some respect of me ever since and yet that weak-kneed nonentity Martindale when I wrote that letter suggested to me privately that I should withdraw it and he would send it back to me privately and say no more about it. It was only when on the receipt of his letter I wired to him that I fully intended to maintain my position that he sent it on.

I am staying up here with Dane. He is really not half so bad as I thought. He had lots of go and enterprise in him and good robust commonsense. The Viceroy hops on to him(20) and everybody else too badly though when anything goes wrong.

Mrs. Dane was Edith Norman and is also much better than I expected. She has no side on and is throughly devoted to her children.

I am dining with the Viceroy on 25th - leave here 26th probably. Go for a day to Indore. Then to Darjeeling till June 15th and probably reach Khampa Jong July 1st. Beyond that I am not to go without the Secretary of State's orders.

Helen(21) will I think go to Darjeeling and I shall be able to get back occasionally to see her.

Your affectionate son,
Frank

Notes

1. In the bunch of 53 letters from Youngusband bearing on the Lhasa expedition there is one preceding it. This is date-lined 'Indore Residency May 7 03' and refers to 'a mysterious letter' which he had received from Simla and wherein his correspondent, one Cabriel, had asked 'to take him with me on my journey and saying he supposes he will see me shortly at Simla.' 'Evidently', Youngusband concluded, 'something is up'. But what I do not know. Probably a mission to Nepal or Tibet.' How correctly had he guessed?
2. In his well-known despatch of January 8, 1903, Lord Curzon had suggested, inter alia, that the venue for the conference, which the Chinese Amban had proposed, should be Lhasa; that the meeting be held in the spring of 1903 and that a representative of the Tibetan Government should be associated with the discussions.

For the text see, *East India (Tibet) Papers Relating to Tibet*, Cd.1920, (London, 1904), No. 66. pp. 150-56. There were 23 enclosures and 19 annexures to this despatch. Abbreviated, et., seq., as *Tibet Papers*.

3. The British Government had rejected Curzon's proposals but had given him the go ahead for his negotiations with the Chinese and the Tibetans. *Ibid.*, No. 85, p. 188.
4. This was John Claude White, Political Officer in Sikkim since 1889. His book, *Sikkim and Bhutan; Twenty-one years on the North-east Frontier, 1887-1908*, (London 1909), refers only briefly to the Lhasa expedition.
5. 'Small Boy' was the nick-name always used for Leslie, Young-husband's younger brother. He later rose to be Major General Leslie Napier Younghusband, followed his brothers in active service on the North-west Frontier and, during World War I, commanded the force covering the Persian oilfields.
6. Kathleen was the name of Leslie Younghusband's wife.
7. Emmie was Younghusband's unmarried sister who lived for most part with their father. This would explain why quite a few of the letters from Tibet in this collection are addressed to her. Younghusband was, for long time, very close to his sister.
8. John (later Sir John) Malcolm, who rose to be Governor of the Bombay Presidency (1827-30) was sent by Lord Wellesley in 1799 to Persia. After about a year's stay, and 'by his prodigal use of gold,' Malcolm was able to arrange two treaties with Fath Ali Shah, the then ruler of the country. The first was commercial and provided for the establishment of factories in Persia, it also ceded some islands in the Persian Gulf to the East India Company. The second was political and was directed against the aggression of Afghanistan and the extension of French influence in Persia.

Alexander (later Sir Alexander) Burnes led a mission, ostensibly commercial, to Dost Muhammad, the then Amir of Kabul, in 1837-38. In reality its aim was political namely, to conciliate the rulers of Afghanistan so as to 'secure their friendly cooperation in resisting the tide of Russo-Persian invasion'. Burnes, however, did not get very far, for Dost Muhammad was anxious to recover Peshawar with the aid of the British and this

Lord Auckland, the then Governor-General, would not hear of. In 1841, Burnes, who had accompanied the expeditionary force to Kabul, to restore Shah Shuja was murdered alongwith Macnaghten.

The idea of an 'imposing mission' to Lhasa, and its comparison with Malcolm's and Burnes', is characteristic of Curzon's entire mental make-up and his penchant for the grandiose and the magnificent.

9. In a private letter to Lord George Hamilton, the Secretary of State for India on May 7, 1903, Curzon had written:

'My idea would be to frighten the Chinese and Tibetans into the acceptance of Gyantse by offering them as the only alternative to a representative at Lhasa itself. They will be so ready to bribe us out of the latter proposal that they may concede the former.'

Curzon to Hamilton, *Curzon-Hamilton Correspondence*, in the India Office Library, referred subsequently as *Hamilton papers*.

10. There had been, in the spring of 1902, persistent rumours about a Russo-Chinese deal on Tibet. Rumours apart, there was the Viceroy's own conviction that 'some sort of relations' existed between Russia and Tibet. In his despatch of January 8, 1903, alluded to earlier, Curzon had talked about the degree to which 'we can permit the influence of another great power' to be exercised for the first time in the history of Tibet. For Tibet's relations in the past, he had pointed out, had always been with China, Nepal or the British in India and Tibetan exclusiveness had been tolerated because it had carried with it no element of political or military danger.'

For details, *Supra*, n 2.

11. On April 8, 1903, on instructions from St. Petersburg, Count Benckendorff, the Russian Ambassador in London, informed Lord Landsowne, the then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, in the most emphatic manner that 'Russia had no agreement, alliance, or treaty of any kind or sort with Tibet; nor does it contemplate any transaction of the kind'. There were no Russian agents, much less a mission in Lhasa, nor was there any intention of sending them there. Russian policy, the Count, explained, could best be summed up in the phrase, 'ne viserait le Thibet en aucun cas.' Hamilton to Curzon, letter, April 8, 1903, *Hamilton Papers*.

12. Despite denials from Peking and St. Petersburg, about the 'apocryphal' text of the agreement, the Viceroy was clearly convinced of its existence. As he wrote to the Secretary of State, 'I am myself a firm believer in the existence of a secret understanding, if not a secret treaty.'
13. Younghusband's opinion of White was to undergo a complete change in the weeks and months ahead when he began to distrust and, later, even ignore him.
14. This was to be Ernest (later Sir Ernest) Wilton.
15. Hamilton had written to Curzon.
'it is self-evident that if negotiations break down and the Tibetans still decline to give assent to the obligations, we must express our disapproval. . . . (and that could only) take the shape . . . of either a blockade or the occupation of the Chumbi Valley'. Hamilton to Curzon letter, May 28, 1903, *Hamilton Papers*.
16. Louis (later Sir Louis) Dane, then Foreign Secretary to the Government of India.
17. This was Captain William (later Sir William) Fredrick O'Connor who accompanied the expedition to Lhasa as Secretary ('Intelligence Officer') to the Mission.
18. Curzon had enjoined Younghusband 'not to look upon him as Viceroy, but as an old friend and fellow-traveller.' He confessed, however,
'The first part of his injunction was difficult to obey. It would have taken a man with a larger imagination than I have not to look upon Curzon as Viceroy.' Cited in George Seaver, *Francis Younghusband*, (London, 1952), p. 198.
19. There was an unseemly quarrel about Curzon going on leave. The king, Edward VII, had entered strong objections and as his Secretary (Lord Knollys) wrote to Arthur Balfour, then Prime Minister, 'His Majesty is still of opinion that the Viceroy should only be allowed to remain six weeks, or at the most two months', to which the Prime Minister had replied by recommending that 'his (Curzon's) plans should in substance be accepted'. And this 'in spite of Curzon's extraordinary behaviour and still more extraordinary'-letter, at whose 'tone and temper' he (Balfour) 'confessed to being much disappointed.' *Balfour Papers*, British Museum, Vol. I.

20. In a subsequent letter Younghusband, remarked that, 'At the interview when Dane was present he (Curzon) always called Dane-Mr. Dane and was exceedingly stiff with him. I think he might with advantage unbend to others as well as me - but I suppose being a youngman when he came out he stiffened himself up to assert himself and so keeps stiffened up.'
21. Helen was Younghusband's wife.
-

Notes & Topics

SOME ASPECTS OF TIBETAN LEARNING

Mr. Richardson's article (pp.5-8) throws light on a little recognized aspect of Tibetan learning, namely, interest in antiquities and objects which are not directly connected with the Chhos (Dharma). He has appropriately hinted that Tibet in the first half of the 18th century (A.C.) had produced a Lama who had the same spirit of scientific enquiry as Sir William Jones, the founder of Asiatic Society of India, in the second half of the same century.

It is not denied—and such denial will be against the spirit and soul of Tibetan civilization—that from the time that the Sacred White Lotus (Dam-chhos-ped-dkar) blossomed in Tibet, all learning grew around and under the auspices of religion. History or historical scholarship was no exception. This process can be described in the words of a non-Tibetan scholar as in the following quotation.

“In the beginning Tibetan chroniclers were inspired by the Chinese tradition of Shih-chi (the Records of the Scribe—the Records of the Historian). This meant a meticulous regard for events and their dates. The Indian tradition with its indifference to mundane happenings and their chronological sequence was the antithesis of the Chinese Tradition. Under the Indian impact the Yig-tshang (Tib. for archives or records) changed its character and Tibetan scholarship founded its own school of historiography. Though the habit of chronological sequence and firm dating lingered all emphasis was now on the history of religion, its origins in India and its spread in the Trans-Himalayas. The Dharma was eternal and everything else was transitory. Therefore nothing but the story of the Dharma deserved recording. The ideal history was no longer the Records (Yig-tshing) or the Dynastic Annals (Rgyal-rabs) but the growth of the Religion (Chos-'byung). The scholars of Tibet, from Buston onwards, drew inspiration not from the China, nor from India but from the dominant phenomenon around them, the Social Milieu—to adopt a label from Arnold Toynbee's repertory”.

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

“Tibetan historical writing has as its subject the dominant phenomenon—the Spread of the Doctrine. The facts recorded mostly relate to propagation, rise and development of different schools and sects,

building of monasteries and temples and the lives of saints and preachers. Much of the narrative is informed with faith and miracle. Yet a hard core of historicity with an authentic chronology makes the Tibetan historical literature an indispensable source today. It preserves most valuable data for the history of the neighbouring countries like India and Mongolia too''.

I have taken the above excerpts from *Tibet: Considerations on Inner Asian History* by N.C. Sinha, with the kind permission of the publishers Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.

I propose to draw the notice of the reader to the habit and custom of collecting and preserving ancient historical objects in the monasteries, temples and private houses in different parts of Tibet. Some of these objects were no doubt used in ritual and some were non-ritualistic objects used by Religious Kings, incarnations, monks and scholars, while quite a good number would have no direct connection with the propagation.

I may first mention Khyentse Rimpoche's (mKhyen-brtse-rin-po-che) well-known guide book for pilgrims in Central Tibet (composed little more than a century ago), which is now available in English translation by Ferrari with notes by Petech and Richardson (Rome, 1958). The book gives an insight into the rich collection of relics, sacred art objects and many non-ritualistic items in the monasteries and temples concerned. Though there is much which a modern reader will call legendary, those objects and their description make a good source of information for historical enquiry. Date and provenance of an object can very well throw light on the chronology and contemporary life.

The objects which are directly connected with religion are kept in a separate apartment called Nang-ten (Nang-rten) in big monasteries and temples. The Nang-ten may contain a Dorjee (rDor-rje) or a Phurpa (Phurpa) used by an eminent Lama, a religious painting presented by a Mongol emperor to a Tibetan Lama, a set of Neten-chudug (gNas-brtan-bcu-drug/16 Mahasthviras) in a unique clay model, a bell with the Sutra of Yedharma (All those things springing from cause etc.). Now any of these may have an inscription in some obscure and archaic form, throwing light on Tibetan script. An unusual decorative motif on a sacred object can tell a story of its own. The different types of representation of Neten-chudug contains much of iconography not yet known.

The objects which are not sacred relics or directly connected with the religion are known as Yang-ten (gYang-rten). The observations about Nang-ten would also hold good for the collection called Yang-ten. Besides much can be learnt about costumes and ornaments or bows and

swords used from time to time. The cap of king Gesar and the sword of his uncle (Khro-thung) preserved in a monastery of Eastern Tibet, if available now, would stimulate a modern historian as much as they cause wonder to a Tibetan believer.

Among the important collections would be those of the great Sakya (Sa-skya) monastery, Tsorphu (mTshur-phu) and Tashi Lhumpo (bKra-shis-lhun-po) in Central Tibet, Ka:thog (Ka:-thog) and Kashi (Ka-bshi) in Kham and Jeykubum (rJe-sku-'bum) in Amdo, besides of course Jokhang, Samye and Potala. Private houses like that of Ragasha in Lhasa also could hold the attention of historians or antiquarians.

The coins and seals alone as collected in monasteries and private houses would bring to light many unknown facts and features not only about the history of Tibet but also about the surrounding countries. Catalogues containing most faithful illustrations of coins and seals with description of such objects were popular. It is understood a few such books have been brought by some Tibetan refugees. It is much desired that these books are read by experts like Mr. Richardson along with Tibetan Lamas versed in reading ancient scripts and motifs.

Tibetan interest in geography other than religious geography is now known thanks to Professor Turrel Wylie's publication of *Zamling-gyeshed* ('Zam-gling-rgyas-bshad) (Rome, 1962). The previous Situ incarnation had written a book of travels to Central Tibet in 1920s. Though much of the book is about monasteries and sacred places, it has much valuable information on roads and stages, rivers and passes, towns and villages.

Another scholar of 20th century (A.C.) Gedun Chhophal (dGe-'dun-chhos-'phal) took much interest in rock inscriptions and ancient books as can be seen from the pages of his wellknown *White Annals* (Tibetan text, printed in Darjeeling, 1964).

I have not written this note to supplement or to contradict in any way Mr. Richardson's article. On the other hand as a Tibetan I am thankful that a great saint scholar of Tibet, Ka:thog Rigzin Tsewang Nurbu, has been properly appreciated for his many sided intellect. I understand that Mr. Richardson did not readily agree to publish what he considered a very hastily done first draft. I must thank the editor of the *Bulletin* who persuaded Mr. Richardson to contribute this first draft. Mr. Richardson will no doubt tell the modern scholars about the great scholars of Tibet later.

MYNAK R. TULKU

THE CONTENTS

The contents of this *Bulletin* are of varying size; requirements of an article determine its size, and size does not suggest its merits. We do not apologize for an article of two and a half pages from Sir Harold Bailey, the leading authority on Central Asian languages as we do not ask the readers to be patient with the ninety pages on an obscure Mahayana text from Pandit Aiyaswamy Sastri. Our readers, even the so-called general readers, appreciate the varied fare of Tibetology irrespective of varying dimensions.

Though we do not go by quantity we have a schedule of 120 pages (text matter besides prefaces) for a year as without a schedule fixed in advance regular publication can not be organized. Though this issue (No.3) has just 20 pages (in a small type) of text matter the total for this year exceeds 150. In the coming year we look forward to 150 pages (in a small type as in this issue) without increasing the annual subscription. This increase will be mainly because prayers and hymns of different sects (original in Tibetan script and English translation) will be a feature in 1968 and 1969. Mr H.E. Richardson's new findings about archaic scripts and Mr. N.C. Sinha's introductory chapters from his work on Lamaist Polity will be among other contents.

MRT

DEMCHOK

In his article on the Kathog Lama, Hugh Richardson refers (p 8) to the modern Chinese reading of the civil war in Ladakh and the Lama's peace efforts in 1751-52. For the general reader of this *Bulletin*, the facts may be detailed here.

Disputes between princes (or tribes or sects) in Inner Asia often led to alignments with or interferences by other powers in the neighbourhood. Such alignments or interferences would not ipso facto presume questions of sovereignty but could change the power structure. There would be thus anxiety on the part of the old and established powers to maintain status quo and peace.

When in 1750 the Dzunggar power threatened to interfere in the dispute between the princes of Upper and Lower Ladakh, the Tibetan authorities (Dalai Lama VII and Pho-lha) had reason to strive for peace. Ladakh, though dominantly Nyingma and Kargyu, had intimate cultural and commercial relations with Lhasa. Pho-lha had veneration for the Kathog Lama and knew that being not a Gelugpa the Kathog's stock would be high in Ladakh. The peace mission was therefore entrusted to a saint-scholar acceptable to the old Sects in Ladakh. His efforts however did not produce lasting peace.

Two centuries later the People's Republic of China read these infructuous peace efforts as the proof of Lhasa sovereignty over Ladakh. Besides a specific claim to Demchok (bde-mchhog/mahasukha or sambhara) was advanced by the Chinese on the strength of a statement attributed to the Kathog Lama. The statement, as per Chinese quotation, runs thus: I arrived on the 10th day of the second half of this month at the sacred place of the Guru-Lhari Karpo of Demchok-which is the boundary of the King of Tibet with the King of Ladakh". *Report of the Officials of the Governments of India and of the People's Republic of China on the Boundary Question* (New Delhi 1961), p CR-38. The Chinese officials added "The "Guru" referred to here is a term of respect for the Dalai Lama and "the sacred place of the Guru" means a territory of the Dalai Lama" and therefore claimed Demchok within Tibetan territory. (Ibid)

Demchok is a sacred place within the Hemis complex. The Hemis complex is very ancient (old Sects) and antedates considerably the Yellow Sect and the rise of the Dalai Lamas. Along with Hemis, Demchok is associated with the wanderings of Maha Guru Padmasambhava, also called Guru Rimpoche or simply Guru. The great Nyingma Lama from Ka-thog undoubtedly referred to Mahaguru Padmasambhava and would not use the epithet Guru for the Dalai Lama. There is no evidence that the Nyingma Lama had any initiation or wang (dbang) from the then

Dalai Lama. It is not customary for a Nyingma Lama, to describe a Dalai Lama to be his Guru without such special initiation.

The Chinese officials were aware of their weak contention or discovered the weakness of their contention later. In their own report, published nearly two years later and without any date of publication, the expressions "King of Tibet" and "King of Ladakh" are changed into "Rjewo of Tibet" and "Prince of Ladakh". *Report of the Officials of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of India on the Boundary Question* (Peking n.d.), p 42. The expression King has the flavour of Austrian sovereign. "King of Ladakh" makes this king independent of the Dalai Lama and worse still "King of Tibet" reduces the Manchu sovereignty over Tibet. So *rjewo* (lord, master or ruler), one of the several titles of the Dalai Lama, is introduced on second thoughts.

NIRMAL C. SINHA

Price per copy Rupees Five

