

"LAMA TO THE KING OF HSIA"

Elliot Sperling

It has become possible, over the course of several decades, to discern with increasing clarity the outlines of a variety of ties that linked Tibetans and Tanguts in the period prior to the destruction of the Tangut state in 1227. The works of E. I. Kychanov, Luciano Petech, R. A. Stein, and others, have served to highlight the historical reality of this relationship,¹ and to stimulate further interest in it. The northeastern Tibetan region of A-mdo was where Tibet bordered the Tangut state; the area in fact has a well-established history as a traditional highway for Tibet's commercial and cultural relations with other peoples and countries. It is an honor, then, to be able to offer this article dealing with an aspect of Tangut-Tibetan relations in felicitation of the sixty-fifth birthday of my mentor, Stag-'tsher rin-po-che Thub-bstan 'jigs-med nor-bu, surely one of A-mdo's worthy sons.

Though Tibetan source materials on this subject are yet to be fully sought out and analyzed, it is already clear that some of the lacunae characterizing current knowledge on the question may be cleared up through increased attention to classical Tibetan works. Bearing this in mind, I would like to call attention in this article to one interesting aspect of the relationship between Tibetans and the Tangut state just prior to its destruction: the

I am pleased to acknowledge the influence and encouragement of my friend Dr. Samuel M. Grupper with regard to the subject of this paper. On the basis of his own research he long ago confided to me his opinion that the antecedents of the dual sacred and secular relationship which linked Tibetans and Mongols in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries might well be found in the Tangut state.

appearance of Tibetan Buddhist clerics at the Tangut court in the role of "imperial preceptor" (Ch. *ti-shih* > Tib. *ti-shri/shri*).

At the outset, we should point out that the presence of Tibetan clerics among the Tanguts is not something hitherto unremarked upon. Over two decades ago, R. A. Stein made note of contact between the Karma Bka'-brgyud-pa and the Tangut throne.² Shortly thereafter, E. Gene Smith called attention to links between the founder of the 'Bri-gung Bka'-brgyud-pa, 'Jig-rten mgon-po, and the early thirteenth-century Tangut court, symbolized by the hierarch's dispatch of an image of Mañjuḥṣa to the court at the time of the 1207 campaign of Činggis Qan.³ The same Tibetan source which mentions this incident also elaborates slightly on the contacts between 'Jig-rten mgon-po and the Tangut ruler:

A Tangut [Tib. Me-nyag = Mi-nyag] king presented to 'Jig-rten mgon-po, the 'Bri-khung-pa [= 'Bri-gung-pa (hierarch)], silk garments and gold; and then, inasmuch as he entreated him, 'Jig-rten mgon-po dealt with the auspices, and there was peace then in the Tangut realm for a period of twelve years. As a result, the gold-robed [Tib. *gos ser-po-can*] Tangut king who follows this example offers homage [i.e., to the 'Bri-gung-pa].⁴

The spiritual link between the Tangut court and various Bka'-brgyud-pa subsects goes beyond religious offerings of homage, however. This fact becomes manifestly apparent as we delve further into other Bka'-brgyud-pa sources. Specifically, we find in works of the Karma-pa and 'Ba'-rom-pa subsects evidence of the institutionalization of the post of imperial preceptor at the court, a post that was held (at least in the final decades of the Tangut state's existence) by Tibetan clerics. Readers may well be struck by the fact that this state of affairs appears to parallel that which later developed at the court of the Mongols—conquerors of the Tangut state—during the time of Qubilai and 'Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan. As will be seen below, an awareness of this parallel almost certainly informed certain elements of later Tibetan writing on Tangut history.

Some of the earliest intimations that we have had about a sacral relationship between the Tangut court and Tibetan clerics derive from the work of Prof. R. A. Stein. In one article in particular, translating from the chapter of the *Mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston* dealing with Tangut history, he rendered into French a significant allusion to that relationship:

Le roi Tha'i-hu avait invité le Seigneur de la Religion Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa (1110-1193) lorsque celui-ci demeura à mChur-phu (monastère, siège des Karmapas au Tibet), mais il ne vint pas, «Eh bien!», dit le roi, «envoie-moi comme chapelain à ta place un élève

qui soit ton égal!» (Le lama) envoya alors le savant gCañ-so-ba, et le roi le vénéra comme son lama.⁵

This bit of information can be further supplemented by textual material that has become available since the publication of Professor Stein's article. The cleric dispatched by Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa was his disciple, Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge (?-1218/1219),⁶ concerning whom we have a brief biographical notice in an important Karma-pa historical work, the *Zla-ba chu-shel-gyi phreng-ba*.⁷ In view of its brevity, we may quote it in full:

As regards Gtsang-pa Bkra-shis, or Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge: by miraculous means he was accepted as a disciple (by Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa) at La-stong Thang-chung [sic; = La-stod Thang-chung⁸]. Afterwards he went through all of the teachings at Mtshur-phu. When the king of the Tangut [state of] Hsia [Tib. Mi-nyag 'Ga'⁹] invited the lord himself (Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa), he sent Gtsang-po-pa in his stead, having bestowed on him the *utpattikrama* and *saṃpannakrama* teachings of [Rdo-rje] phag-mo and then exhorted him, (saying) "meditate in the mountains of Ho-lan-shan [Tib. Ha-lashan]!"¹⁰ There he served as lama to the king of Hsia and received the appellation "Gtsang-pa ti-shri." Successively, he presented to the great see of Mtshur-phu: first, cloth for golden vessels¹¹ and facilities for the erection of an outer stupa; second, a gallery for the divine temple; and third, ritual offering items. And with a series of presentations of thirteen of the monastery's most extraordinary items, etc., he performed extensive works for the doctrine. Then, in the Earth-Male-Tiger year [i.e., 1218/1219], he died in Liang-chou [Tib. Byang-ngos¹²] in [the state of] Hsia. As for his students, 'Gro-mgon Ti-shri ras-pa, an adherent of the doctrines of the 'Ba'-dbram Bka'-brgyud-pa, was state chaplain [Tib. *dbu-bla*] to the Tangut king. The funereal affairs [and matters relating to] the chapel and the reliquary [of Gtsang-po-pa] were carried out by Ti-shri ras-pa.¹³

This biographical notice, though curt, provides us with added detail on the life of Dkon-mchog seng-ge and on his activities at the Tangut court. Strikingly, however, it gives us a sense of continuity, for it clearly notes the succession of another Tibetan cleric to fill the position of imperial preceptor that Dkon-mchog seng-ge had held. It is appropriate then that we now turn our attention to this successor, the 'Ba'-rom-pa cleric Ti-shri ras-pa, as we take up the next strand in our story.

The 'Ba'-rom-pa are a far less well-known subsect of the Bka'-brgyud-pa than the Karma-pa. With its name variously rendered as 'Bab-rom-pa, 'Ba'-ram-pa, 'Ba'-sgrom-pa, 'Ba'-dbram-pa (as in the passage just cited), etc., the subsect nevertheless constituted one of the four primary branches of the Dwags-po Bka'-brgyud-pa, that division of the sect derived from the schools established within the lineage of Dwags-po lha-rje Sgam-po-pa Bsod-nams rin-chen.¹⁴ The founder of the 'Ba'-rom-pa subsect, 'Ba'-rom-pa

Dar-ma dbang-phyug (1127/1128-1203), was a direct disciple of Sgam-po-pa; and it was a disciple of his, Ti-shri Sangs-rgyas ras-chen (1164/1165-1236), who appears in the *Zla-ba chu-shel-gyi phreng-ba* as 'Gro-mgon Ti-shri ras-pa, imperial preceptor at the Tangut court and successor to Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge.¹⁵ Unfortunately, our sources for the history of the 'Ba'-rom-pa are by no means as full as those that lay at our disposal regarding the Karma-pa. Thus, the materials available to us concerning the emergence of Sangs-rgyas ras-chen at the Tangut court all tell us the same story:

. . . [Sangs-rgyas ras-chen] at the age of thirty-three, in the Dragon Year [i.e., 1196/1197], went to the Tangut realm. After serving as the venerated and supported lama of the Tangut king and his attendants [of the lineage of (?)] Sho-ho Rgyal-rgod¹⁶, he dwelled there for thirty-three years. He set everyone on the path of the dharma. He founded four great monasteries, and an unimaginably (extensive) monastic community spread. At the age of sixty-three he came (back) to Tibet.¹⁷

Ti-shri Sangs-rgyas ras-chen, the second of the Tibetan imperial preceptors known to us, is also the last, for the Tangut state was destroyed several years before his death. Nevertheless, his tenure in the Tangut lands was not made wholly fruitless by subsequent political events. His successor in the 'Ba'-rom-pa lineage was himself from the Tangut realm. This was Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po Shes-rab byang-chub (1198/1199-1262),¹⁸ born there in a region named as "Gdung-phyar-chu" in our Tibetan sources.¹⁹

Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po Shes-rab byang-chub not only survived the upheaval that put an end to the Tangut state, he is supposed to have gained at least some favor in the eyes of the Mongol emperor Qubilai. Although he would not appear to have been the only Tibetan cleric among the Tanguts to have survived the state's collapse,²⁰ the fact of his special position among the Tanguts makes his reappearance at Qubilai's court worth noting. We have clearly seen that the establishment of Tibetan imperial preceptors at a foreign court predates the patronage accorded the Sa-skya-pa by the Mongols, and therefore that it was not the rise of the Mongols that first drew Tibetan clerics into international affairs as sacral figures serving non-Tibetan monarchs. Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po then was no less than a living link to this earlier, brief tradition.

Unfortunately, the paucity of information provided on this point by our 'Ba'-rom-pa sources is acute to the point of frustration. The 'Ba'-rom-pa materials do not permit us to expand upon much of the speculation that their remarks on

Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po's link to Qubilai provoke. These sources merely state that ". . . the Mongol king known as Qubilai [Tib. Go-be-la] bowed his head [to Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po's link to Qubilai [Tib. Go-be-la] bowed his head [to Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po]. He presented him with six places as myriarchy subjects."²¹

This brief statement, however, still permits us to draw some inferences about Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po, and to allude to another facet of Tangut-Tibetan links. Our 'Ba'-rom-pa writers, as we have just seen, speak of a myriarchy being presented to Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po; a curious comment, since it is generally known that insofar as Qubilai is concerned Tibetan sources describe the presentation of the thirteen myriarchies of Central Tibet as a donation given by the emperor solely to 'Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan, the renowned Sa-skyapa cleric and Yüan imperial preceptor. The story of the emperor's donation (in which no other sects or sectarian leaders figure as recipients of the presentation) is sufficiently recounted in a number of modern works as to allow us to forego a discussion of it here.²² The generally-accepted list of the thirteen myriarchies over which 'Phags-pa and the Sa-skyapa were given dominion warrants our attention, however, because it includes two bearing a name that we have already mentioned in connection with Tangut-Tibetan ties: Lho La-stod and Byang La-stod.²³ We may recall that it was at "La-stod thang-chung" that Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge is said to have first encountered Karma Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa, his guru and the one who later dispatched him to serve at the Tangut court.

The reference to myriarchy subjects being presented to Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po Shes-rab byang-chub ought not to be taken to suggest that Qubilai maintained a link with the 'Ba'-rom-pa that in some ways incorporated a grant of power and authority similar to what he had accorded the Sa-skyapa both at court and in Tibet. On the contrary, it would appear that any favor shown by the court to the Tangut 'Ba'-rom-pa heirarch fell within the context of the cleric's recognition and acceptance of the supremacy of the Mongol alliance with the Sa-skyapa. This interpretation suggests itself not simply because of the weight of Tibetan historical tradition concerning 'Phags-pa and Qubilai, but because of what is known about the ruling house of Byang La-stod in Gtsang, one of the myriarchies of thirteenth-century Central Tibet.

Byang La-stod seems to designate that area north of the Gtsang-po with its administrative center at Ngam-ring, or Byang Ngam-ring, while Lho La-stod is the region directly to the south of the river.²⁴ Sometime after the events recounted above the two regions seem to have become united.²⁵ There exist works

that tell us something about the ruling lineage of Byang La-stod, and to which references have been made by western scholars.²⁶ To these we may add the *Sde-pa G.yas-ru Byang-pa'i rgyal-rabs rin-po-che bstar-ba*, by Dpal-ldan chos-kyi bzang-po (fl. 15th century?), reprinted in India in 1974. This work expands upon information that R. A. Stein brought to light almost four decades ago indicating that the myriarchy's lords were descended from the rulers of the Tangut state. It was Professor Stein, in fact, who pointed out at that early date the link between the Tangut royal line, the myriarchy's rulers, and the cleric dispatched by Dusgsum mkhyen-pa to the Tangut court.²⁷ In the *Sde-pa G.yas-ru Byang-pa'i rgyal-rabs rin-po-che bstar-ba* the origin of Byang La-stod's ruling lineage is described as follows:

The lineage of the glorious G.yas-ru Byang-pa: earlier, from a branch which had gradually emerged from the kings of China, [came] the Tangut Si-tu [*sic* = Si-hu²⁸] king who took the capital by force and held sway over the great country. Those of the sixth generation from him, members of the great and high lineage [of] the nephew of the Tangut Rgyal-rgod [king], gradually came west via Gtsang. Some time after the country had been taken they moved from Ra-sa rgad-po-lung and took Stag-ste seng-ge-lung [*sic* = Stag-bde seng-ge-lung in La-stod].²⁹

The next several lines of the text describe Byang La-stod as a region in which a number of Tanguts settled and held sway, and over which there was a ruling house that had allied itself with the Sa-skyapa sect during the time of Sa-skyapa paṇḍita. Much as the rulers of Byang La-stod had accepted Sa-skyapa domination of Central Tibet, so too it would appear that the Tangut monk Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po Shes-rab byang-chub had also accepted the rule of Qubilai. His presentation with myriarchy subjects surely signifies this, rather than his actual empowerment over one of the myriarchies of Central Tibet (irrespective of whether the myriarchy in question was in fact Byang La-stod). It could not have been, however, simple submission that was at issue in this instance. Acquiescence to the sacral alliance between Qubilai and the Sa-skyapa on the part of the successor to the Tibetan imperial preceptors at the Tangut court was no less than an acquiescence to the transfer to the new order of the sacral power generated by the relationship that Tibetan clerics had previously entertained with the Tangut ruler.

The significance of the earlier relationship can be detected in certain Tibetan writings. It is by now well known that one Tibetan tradition linked the Mongol prince Köden (to whose court Sa-skyapa paṇḍita and his nephew 'Phags-pa had been attached) with the Tangut rulers by designating Köden an incarnation of the emperor Rgyal-rgod.³⁰ A further indication in

this regard is the mention made in the *Sa-skya gdung-rabs chen-mo* of a recreated seal of the Tangut emperor Rgyal-rgod that figures in the bestowal upon 'Phags-pa of the title *ti-shih*. According to this source this was in conjunction with Qubilai's request for an initiation. The events are recounted as follows:

Then, after the great lama [i.e., 'Phags-pa] had gone himself to the emperor, in the (hierarch's) sixty-sixth year, the Iron-Male-Horse Year [i.e., 1270/1271], the king once more requested initiation. At that time a crystal seal of the Tangut Rgya-rgod [= Rgyal-rgod] king was made up. Then, [this] crystal seal adorned with six continents³¹ and a special edict were presented [to 'Phags-pa], and the title "Prince of India's deities below the heavens and above the earth, emanated Buddha, creator of the script, he who sets the nation on (the path of) peace, the *paṇḍita* sage in the five sciences, 'Phags-pa *ti-shih* (Tib. *ti-shi*)," was bestowed on him.³²

The event described in this passage relates to a series of initiations, rites, and bestowals that marked the relationship between 'Phags-pa and Qubilai; they have been dealt with by others and there is no need to say more about them at the moment.³³ We ought simply to note the implicit acknowledgment by our source of the Tangut emperor's connection to the sacral relationship that had evolved between Qubilai and 'Phags-pa. We may also reiterate here that the textual evidence at our disposal up to this point indicates a Tangut link to one of the myriarchies under Sa-skyapa domination, apparently one (or possibly even both) of the La-stod myriarchies. The textual evidence further indicates that this link was maintained in a peaceable manner within the context of Sa-skyapa domination of Central Tibet.

There were of course other Sa-skyapa clerics besides 'Phags-pa who came to hold the position of imperial preceptor under the Mongols, just as earlier Tibetan clerics had held the position at the Tangut court. While we have alluded to the continuity between the respective positions of the Sa-skyapa and Bka'-brgyud-pa clerics with whom we have been dealing, we have not noted one other aspect to all of this, one which adds a further element of continuity to the story that we have so far recounted. This is the evidence offered by our Bka'-brgyud-pa sources to the effect that the position held by the Bka'-brgyud-pa clerics at the Tangut court was in fact one that had devolved upon them from Chinese predecessors.

The existence of such Chinese predecessors should not be considered altogether unexpected. It is a well-known fact that Chinese Buddhists and Chinese Buddhism had important roles in the spiritual life of the Tangut state. Chinese Buddhism already had several centuries of strong tradition behind it by this

time. By contrast, Tibetan Buddhism (then just at the beginning of the *phyi-dar* period) was only in the earliest stages of its emergence as an organized religious force during most of the Tangut state's existence. The subsequent rapidity of its development as a spiritual and temporal force is reflected in its ultimate appearance at the Tangut court in the state's last decades and then in its prominent place in the Mongol state. The earlier role of certain Chinese clerics at the Tangut court may well have set the stage for this rapid growth in Tibetan Buddhism's international prominence.

We find mention of the Chinese predecessors to the Tibetan imperial preceptors at the Tangut court in biographies of Dusgsum mkhyen-pa, the first "Black Hat" Karma-pa hierarch and the cleric who dispatched Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge to the court. Part of the biographical tradition devoted to him deals with his recounting to his disciples the details of their past lives (an ability that is reflected in his Tibetan name). According to the *Zla-ba chu-shel-gyi phreng-ba*:

In that the precious lama was fully realized, they asked him who among the first ranks of those in his entourage had been whom during the times of the enlightened ones. Thus he said "There were four [in one incarnation lineage]: one called Mitrayogin [Tib. Mi-tra dzo-ki], the yogin in the *vihāra* of Lokavihāra in southern India;³⁴ there was also a monk called Dge-ba'i blo-gros in the upper reaches of Mnga'-ris who did much for the benefit of sentient beings;³⁵ and there was the lama of the Tangut *dharmarāja* called Rgya Be-bum ring-mo and also called Rgya Byang-chub sems-dpa'; and you, Dge-bshes Dkon-mchog seng-ge."³⁶

The main import of this passage lies in the revelation that Gtsang-po-pa had three previous lives during the times of the "enlightened ones" (Tib. *sangs-rgyas*). For our interests, however, particular significance rests with the notion that Gtsang-po-pa was actually part of an incarnation lineage that included at least one previous spiritual master at the Tangut court. This information places our discussion in a richer context, even though it is presently impossible to further identify that incarnation whom our text names as Rgya Be-bum ring-mo or Rgya Byang-chub sems-dpa'. We may note that the element "Rgya" in both names must denote, in this context, a regional identification with China. Such designations in Tibetan appellations are quite common; so we can at least assume that the figure in question was a Chinese monk.³⁷ This implies that a tradition of sacral empowerment existed at the Tangut court, one in which Chinese monks served as spiritual masters to the emperor; and the evidence we have examined earlier shows that

late in the twelfth century that sacral role devolved upon Tibetan clerics, specifically monks belonging to Bka'-brgyud-pa subsects.

If we may be allowed to draw this conclusion from the evidence thus far presented, then there are any number of further questions that now arise. These relate to the nature of the Chinese empowerment tradition at the Tangut court (i.e., the extent of its derivation from and relationship to earlier Buddhist ideas of sacral rule in China); the significance of the rise of Tibetan clerics at that court, and its meaning in terms of ritual and textual change in the actual process of ritual empowerment; and the precise way in which the Mongol conquerors of the Tangut state dealt with this tradition. We have already seen the perception in Tibetan tradition of links between the situation that existed at the Tangut court and the "priest-patron" relationship involving the Sa-skyapa at the Mongol court. One is well justified in speculating that the hostility that later marked Qubilai's relations with some of the Bka'-brgyud-pa subsects had its origins in hostile sentiments deriving from the Mongol destruction of the state whose ruler had relied on Bka'-brgyud-pa clerics and rituals for sacral empowerment. It is not my intention to address these diverse issues here, but merely to call attention to them as avenues for further investigation.

NOTES

1. E.g., works such as E. I. Kychanov, "Tibetans and Tibetan Culture in the Tangut State Hsi Hsia (982-1227)," in Louis Ligeti, ed., *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium* (Budapest, 1978), pp. 205-211; Luciano Petech, "Tibetan Relations with Sung China and with the Mongols," in Morris Rossabi, ed., *China Among Equals* (Berkeley, 1983), pp. 173-203; and R. A. Stein, "Mi-ñag et Si-hia," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* XLIV (1951), pp. 223-265 and "Nouveaux documents tibétains sur le Mi-ñag/Si-hia," in *Mélanges de Sinologie offerts à Monsieur Paul Demiéville* (Paris, 1966), pp. 281-289.

2. See Stein, *op. cit.* (1966), p. 285.

3. EGS [= E. Gene Smith], "Introduction," in *Mnyam-med 'Bri-gung-pa chen-po skyob-pa 'Jig-rten mgon-po' i bka'-'bum* [= *The Collected Writings (gsung-'bum) of 'Bri-gung chos-rje 'Jig-rten-mgon-po Rin-chen-dpal*] (New Delhi, 1969), I, p. 2. Mr. Smith cites the biography of 'Jig-rten mgon-po by Shes-rab 'byung-gnas, *'Gro-ba'i mgon-po 'Bri-khung-pa'i mdzad-pa rnam-par thar-pa phyogs-bcur bkod-nas dus-gsum mtshon-pa*, f. 83r, in the same volume.

4. Shes-rab 'byung-gnas, *op. cit.*, f. 79r.[a]

5. Stein, *op. cit.*, p. 285. Prof. Stein cites the passage found in Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag 'phreng-ba, *Chos-byung mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston* (New Delhi, 1961), p. 790.^[b]

6. We may easily take the second syllable in the appellation given by Stein ("gCart-so-ba") to be the product of scribal confusion at some point between the Tibetan letters *pa* and *sa* as written in their *dbu-med* forms. Cf. the parallel passages in Dpa'-bo, *op. cit.*, p. 434 ("Gtsang-so-ba") and Si-tu paṅ-chen Chos-kyi 'byung-gnas and 'Be-lo Tshe-dbang kun-khyab, *Sgrub-brgyud Karma kam-tshang brgyud-pa rin-po-che'i rnam-par thar-pa rab-'byams nor-bu zla-ba chu-shel-gyi phreng-ba* (New Delhi, 1972), I, f. 22v ("Gtsang-po-pa").

7. This work is perhaps not cited as often as Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag 'phreng-ba's famous *Chos-'byung mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston*. Although it was completed by 'Be-lo Tshe-dbang kun-khyab in 1775 (a year after the death of the Si-tu paṅ-chen), more than two centuries after the appearance of Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag 'phreng-ba's work, and although it does not deal with the vast range of Tibetan history that the *Mkhas-pa'i dga'-ston* takes up, it is nevertheless the most extensive chronicle of the history of the Karma-pa subsect presently available. One may clearly note that what seems to be a wide array of original documents and archival records (in most cases no longer extant) were utilized by the Si-tu paṅ-chen and in several cases copied into his text.

8. Further references to the same events in Dpa'-bo, *op. cit.*, pp. 431 and 790; and Si-tu paṅ-chen, *op. cit.*, I f. 12v, make it clear that the region referred to is correctly rendered as La-stod thang-chung. This of course denotes the area of La-stod in Gtsang, concerning which cf. Alfonsa Ferrari, *Mk'yen Brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet* (Rome, 1958), p. 153; and Turrell V. Wylie, *The Geography of Tibet According to the 'Dzam-gling rgyas-bshad* (Rome, 1962), p. 129. I cannot make any further comments on the name Thang-chung ("Small Plain"); however, we may note that the area of Byang La-stod has further important links to the Tanguts beyond its association with Gtsang-po-pa Dkon-mchog seng-ge. These will be mentioned below.

9. On the transcription of Ch. "Hsia" by Tib. "'Ga' (as well as by "Gha")," see Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), p. 226.

10. The Ho-lan-shan range lay to the west of the Tangut capital of Hsing-ch'ing-fu (the modern city of Yin-ch'uan); see T'an Ch'i-hsiang, ed., *Chung-kuo li-shih ti-t'u chi* (Shanghai, 1982) VI, map 36-37. Concerning the name of the range, see Paul Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo* (Paris, 1959-1973), pp. 132-137. The sacral significance of the Ho-lan-shan range for the Tangut rulers is attested to by the location of the royal tombs in the vicinity of its eastern foothills; see Li Fan-wen, *Hsi-hsia yen-chiu lun-chi*

(Ning-hsia, 1983), pp. 154–155. Perhaps more importantly, we should note the remarks of R. A. Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), p. 226: “Or le Dieu du Sol (*gñi-bdag*) de Gha et de Byañ-ños est précisément Ha-la šan, c’est-à-dire la chaîne montagneuse du Ho-lan chan ou Alachan qui s’étend en effet entre Kan-tcheou et Ning-hia.” Concerning “Gha,” see note 9, above; on Byang-ngos (“Byañ-ños”), see note 12, below.

11. I.e., for *gser-'bum*, read *gser-bum*.

12. Byang-ngos is identified with Liang-chou in one of the Ming dynasty Sino-Tibetan glossaries studied by Nishida Tatsuo, *Seibankan yakugo no kenkyū* (Kyoto, 1970), p. 112. N.b., however, the reference to the name given by R.A. Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), p. 227, and his general references to Byang-ngos as the Chinese town of Kan-chou (pp. 239 ff.).

13. Si-tu paṅ-chen, *op. cit.*, I, f. 26v.^[c] Regarding the first portion of this biographical notice on Dkon-mchog seng-ge, cf. the following passage from the biography of Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa given in Dpa'-bo, *op. cit.*, p. 431:^[d]

[Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa,] during his return trip [from a cemetery in India to Mtshur-phu], covered the road from Kashmir and Pu-rangs in but an instant and [arriving] in La-stod Thang-chung expounded the *Rnam-bzhi rgyud-grol* [teachings] learned from Indrabodhi the Middle One [Tib. Indra-bho-dhi Bar-ba] to the *kalyāṇamitra* [Tib. *dge-bshes*] Gtsang-so-ba [sic] “Go to Mtshur-phu!” he exhorted him, and then he said that previously, in four births, he had been a disciple [i.e., of Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa]. Thereupon he brought him to the consummate goals [of his spiritual studies]. Afterwards he presented him as chaplain to the Tangut king.

A few things brought up by Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag 'phreng-ba merit further reference. The trip to an Indian cemetery and then to La-stod to which he makes reference is described unequivocally in Si-tu paṅ-chen, *op. cit.*, I, f. 12v, as having occurred in a dream; hence the mention of a miraculous aspect to the meeting between Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa and Gtsang-po-pa in the Si-tu paṅ-chen's short biographical account of the latter. Concerning Indrabodhi the Middle One, see Eva K. Dargyay, *The Rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet* (Delhi, 1977), pp. 39-40 (“Indrabhūti”); and Mkhas-btsun bzang-po [= Khetsun Sangpo], *Rgya-gar paṅ-chen rnam-skyi rnam-thar ngo-tshar padmo'i 'dzul-zhal gsar-pa* [= *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism*, I] (Dharamsala, 1973), p. 253-256 (“Indrabhuti”). Note that both authors mention an apparent identification of him with Indrabodhi/Indrabhuti the Younger One. The reference to four previous lives of Dkon-mchog seng-ge is also of interest to us,

for in two of these he is specifically said to have dwelt as a monk at the Tangut court. This last point will be dealt with further on.

14. On the 'Ba'-rom-pa and their place within the organization of the Bka'-brgyud-pa, see the introduction (by E. Gene Smith?) to *Rgyal-ba rdo-rje 'chang dang grub-thob bka'-bzhi'i rnam-par thar-pa zur-tsam-cig* [= *Dkar Brgyud Gser 'Phreng A Golden Rosary of Lives of Eminent Gurus*] (Leh, 1970) p. 5. In spite of the diverse forms of the subject's name they should not be confused with the 'Ba'-ra Bka'-brgyud-pa, an offshoot of the 'Brug-pa subject.

15. At present the biographical sources on the 'Ba'-rom-pa hierarchs at my disposal are all rather meager. Short biographical notices on them can be found in a collection of "biographical songs" (Tib. *rnam-mgur*), apparently put together by one "Shrībhadrā" (= Dpal-bzang-po) and available in two modern printings: *Bka'-brgyud rdo-rje 'chang-nas bzung gsang-bdag phyag-rdor dngos-byon karma dznya-na'i du-byon-pa* [sic] *grub-pa brnyes-pa'i sgrub-brgyud bstan-pa'i srog-shing dpal-ldan Ba-sgrom pa'i rnam-mgur thos-grol nyin-byed 'od-stong phyogs-las rnam-par rgyal-ba'i phreng-ba*, in *Bab-rom Bka'-brgyud-kyi chos-skor thor-bu sna-tshogs* (Delhi, 1982), vol. II; and *Bka'-brgyud rdo-rje 'chang-nas bzung gsang-bdag phyag-rdor dngos-byon karma dznya-na'i bar-du byon-pa grub-pa brnyes-pa'i sgrub-brgyud bstan-pa'i srog-shing dpal-ldan 'Ba'-rom-pa'i rnam-mgur thos-grol nyin-byed 'od-stong phyogs-las rnam-par rgyal-ba'i phreng-ba*, in *Ritual Texts of the 'Ba'-rom Bka'-brgyud-pa Tradition* (Delhi, 1985). The first print, recopied by a modern scribe in a contemporary *dbu-can* hand, will be referred to hereafter as *Mgur* (1982); the second (which seems to be a photocopied printing—only slightly touched up—of an old *dbu-med* manuscript) as *Mgur* (1985). Note that the two printings often differ significantly with each other. Biographical notices on 'Ba'-rom-pa Dar-ma dbang-phyug can be found in *Mgur* (1982), ff. 33r–41r; *Mgur* (1985), ff. 22v–28r; and George N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals* (New Delhi, 1975), pp. 469–470. In addition, there exists a modern collection of 'Ba'-rom-pa biographies said to be culled from a *'Ba'-rom gser-'phreng* seen by its author while in Tibet: *Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal* [= *Bla ma Sku-rgyal Karma-phrin-las-'od-zer*], *Bka'-brgyud che-bzhi-las dpal 'Ba'-rom-pa.chen-po'i brgyud-pa gser-gyi phreng-ba'i rnam-thar thos-grol nyin-byed 'od-stong phyogs-las rnam-par rgyal-ba* (Tashi Jong, 1985). N.b., however that the biographies of Dar-ma dbang-phyug and Sangs-rgyas ras-chen contained in it (pp. 23–29 and 29–35, respectively) are essentially identical to those in *Mgur* (1982) and *Mgur* (1985): cf. the notices on Dar-ma dbang-phyug already cited and, for the life of Sangs-rgyas ras-chen, *Mgur* (1982), ff. 47v–51v; and *Mgur* (1985), ff. 35v–38r. All three of these 'Ba'-rom-pa texts deal with the lineage up

through Skyo-brag Karma ye-shes, a contemporary of the Karma-pa hierarch Dbang-phyug rdo-rje (1556-1603), which may give us an indication of the date of compilation of the original biographical notices that all three texts carry. It is presently not possible to say much more about the background of these collections as historical texts.

16. *Mgur* (1985), f. 37r, (from which we are quoting) describes Sangs-rgyas ras-chen's supporters as: *Mi-nyag rgyal-po spyan-snga Sho-ho Rgyal-rgod-rnams*. *Mgur* (1982), which (as noted) is a thoroughly recopied modern *dbu-can* version, renders the same passage on f. 50r as: *Mi-nyag-yul rgya-sgo spyan-snga Sho-ho Rgya-rgan-rnams*. Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal, *op. cit.*, p. 33., follows the latter text. However, *Mgur* (1982) may well suffer from an excess of scribal rationalizations. While *Rgya-rgan* might seem to make sense as a readily understandable term in Tibetan, *Rgyal-rgod* is in fact a well-attested name found in Tibetan accounts of the lineage of the Tangut rulers. Note though that it is also commonly encountered as *Rgya-rgod*; see Stein *op. cit.* (1951), pp. 234-235. At present we cannot say anything substantive about the name Sho-ho, but cf. "Si-hu" and its variants in note 28, below.

17. *Mgur* (1985), f. 37r.^[e] Cf. *Mgur* (1982) f. 50r; and Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-33. There is a clear problem in this passage concerning the dates and/or length of Sangs-rgyas ras-chen's stay in the Tangut state. Obviously he could not have gone there at age thirty-three, remained for another thirty-three years, and then gone back to Tibet at age sixty-three. Both versions of *Mgur* give identical dates. Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal, our modern author (whose text essentially agrees with that in *Mgur* [1985]), appears to have attempted to resolve the question by assigning the cleric a stay in the Tangut state of only three years. That, however, cannot be accepted as a possibility in view of Sangs-rgyas ras-chen's attested presence there at the time of Dkon-mchog seng-ge's death in 1218/1219. We might better consider a stay closer to thirty years; i.e., allowing for Sangs-rgyas ras-chen to have gone to the Tangut realm at age thirty-three and to have left at age sixty-three. Such a conjecture would permit us, moreover, to postulate that his departure was possibly linked to the imminent destruction of the state at the hands of the Mongols.

18. See the brief biographical notes on Gsang-ba ras-pa dkar-po in *Mgur* (1982), ff. 81r-82v; *Mgur* (1985), ff. 57r-57v; and Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36. The first two sources state that he died in his sixty-fifth year (i.e., 1262/1263). *Mgur* (1982) refers to the month as *rta-zla*, *Mgur* (1985) as the first month of the year. Note, however, that *rta-zla* can refer to either the fifth month of

a year or to the period from the sixteenth day of the twelfth month of one year through the fifteenth day of the first month of the next year. See "Tsang-Han ta tz'u-tien" pien-hsieh-tsu, *Bod-rgya skar-rtsis rig-pa'i tshig-mdzod* [= *Tsang-Han li-suan-hsüeh tz'u-tien*] (Ch'eng-tu, 1985), p. 163. Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal mentions the *ria-zla* month, but in what is a clear error says that he died in his twenty-fifth year.

19. Gdung-phyar-chu is not readily identifiable. We may note though that the Tibetan word *chu*, aside from obviously designating a river, has also been used in different periods to transcribe the Chinese administrative term *chou*. Nishida *op. cit.*, p. 109 provides the well-known example (from the Ming period) of Ho-chou transcribed into Tibetan as Ga-chu.

20. Petech, *op. cit.*, p. 180 (citing Dpa'-bo, *op. cit.*, pp. 792-793), mentions a tradition that he considers at least partly suspect, concerning one cleric, Gtsang-pa Dung-khur-ba, who along with his students had travelled to Mongolia and then to the Tangut realm where he was found shortly thereafter by Činggis Qan during his incursion in 1215. The Mongol conqueror is then supposed to have grown to respect Dung-khur-ba as a religious figure. It is clear from Dpa'-bo's remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 792), however, that he mentions this story in an attempt to rebut the notion that the Sa-skyapa were the first to bring Buddhism to the Mongols. Dung-khur-ba was a Tshal-pa Bka'-brgyud-pa cleric, and is mentioned in Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rdo-rje, *Deb-ther dmar-po* (Peking, 1981), p. 130, in the account of the Tshal-pa subsect. In his recent annotations to this work Dung-dkar Blo-bzang 'phrin-las (p. 452) gives his full appellation as Gtsang-pa Dung-khur-ba Dbang-phyug bkra-shis and states that he had been invited to serve as the lama of the Tangut emperor. He then is said to have preached to and served Činggis Qan following his destruction of the Tangut state (i.e., after 1227). Petech considers the story to be without historical foundation, at least as far as it concerns Činggis. But even with regard to the comments just cited concerning Gtsang-pa Dung-khur-ba's activity among the Tanguts there is presently no way to substantiate them further. Our information on Gtsang-pa Dung-khur-ba is meager, and if we are to consider the remarks concerning Činggis and the Mongols suspect, then we may also have to cast doubt upon the veracity of those remarks concerning the Tanguts, since it is not unlikely that they were incorporated into the story as a necessary corollary, deriving from an awareness of the Tangut precedent for the later relationship between Sa-skyapa clerics and the Mongol throne.

21. *Mgur* (1985), f. 57r: . . . *Hor-gyi rgyal-po Go-be-lar grags-pas gtsug-gis btud/ gnas-drug khri-skor chab-bangs-su phul/*. Cf. *Mgur* (1982), f. 81v, and *Skyo-grwa Sku-rgyal*, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

22. Cf., however, the comments on the chronology of the donation made by János Szerb, "Glosses on the Oeuvre of Bla-ma 'Phags-pa: II. Some Notes on the Events of the Years 1251–1254," *Acta Orientalia Hungaricae* XXXIV (1980), pp. 270–271.

23. For the thirteen myriarchies, see the lists in Giuseppe Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Rome, 1949), pp. 681–682.

24. Cf. Ferrari, *op. cit.*, p. 153, and the appended map of Central Tibet. On Ngam-ring as the seat of Byang La-stod, see Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), p. 237.

25. See Giuseppe Tucci, *Deb T'er Dmar Po Gsar Ma* (Rome, 1971), p. 191.

26. See the reference to Tāranātha's *Rigs-ldan chos-kyi rgyal-po Nam-mkha' grags-pa bzang-po'i rnam-par thar-pa bsngags-ldan-pa'i 'brug-sgra* given by Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), p. 237; and Tucci, *op. cit.* (1971) pp. 191–192.

27. Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), pp. 236–238, and 260.

28. Si-hu (also written Si'u, Se'u, or Se-hu) is a well-attested name on Tibetan lists of Tangut rulers. See Stein, *op. cit.* (1951), p. 238. On the movement of the name during the Tangut migrations to Khams, see Ke-le [= Dge-legs], *Kan-tzu Tsang-tsu tzu-chih-chou shih-hua* (Ch'eng-tu, 1984), pp. 71–72; and Teng Shao-chin, "Hsi-k'ang Mu-ya-hsiang His-wu wang k'ao," in Pai Pin, *Hsi-hsia shih lun-wen chi* (Ning-hsia, 1984), pp. 680–694.

29. Dpal-ldan chos-kyi bzang-po, *Sde-pa G.yas-ru Byang-pa'i rgyal-rabs rin-po-che bstar-ba* in *Rare Tibetan Historical and Literary Texts from the Library of Tsepon W. D. Shakabpa* (New Delhi, 1974), f. 1v.^[f] Ra-sa rgad-po-lung cannot be identified, although one is naturally tempted to place it in the Lha-sa region. Concerning Stag-bde seng-ge-lung, cf. Roerich, *op. cit.*, p. 1008 (on Nying-phug-pa): "He was born . . . in the valleys of sTag-bde señ-ge after they had come to La-stod . . ."

It is not my intention to deal with the difficult subject of interpreting the Tibetan genealogies of the Tangut kings; however, I ought to write down here a few sentences on those whose names have figured in our considerations so far. In the preceding note we have made brief mention of Si-hu, who appears as the first Tangut ruler. Rgyal-rgod (a name that also occurs as Rgya-rgod: see note 16) is also important as one of the most frequently mentioned Tangut emperors. He figures in a number of Tibetan works; we have just seen him linked to the ruling house of Byang La-stod, while other works (as will be seen) link him to the Mongol prince Köden. Rgyal-rgod is said to be the son of the Tangut emperor The-hu in the A-mdo history

by Brag-dgon-pa Dkon-mchog bstan-pa rab rgyas, *Mdo-smad chos-'byung* [= *Deb-ther rgya-mtsho*] (Lan-chou, 1982), p. 20, wherein he is identified as the emperor who had invited Dus-gsum mkhyen-pa to his court (i.e., he is the Tha'i-hu to whom we have already seen Stein make reference). Much as Rgyal-rgod is linked to a Tangut line that developed in Tibet, so too Tha'i-hu appears in one of our sources linked to a Tangut line found in eastern Khams, after the migration and growth of Tangut communities in the area. Among the prominent Karma-pa clerics who emerge in that region in the fifteenth century are some belonging to a clan bearing the name "Rma-se," which the Si-tu paṅ-chen, *op. cit.*, I. f. 255r, describes as "part of the clan of the Mi-nyag [i.e., Tangut] king Tha'i-hu and others" (Tib. *Mi-nyag-gi rgyal-po Tha'i-hu la-sogs-pa'i gdung-rigs-kyi nang-tshan*). The form Tha'i-hu/The-hu clearly seems to derive from a Chinese original.

30. See Stein *op. cit.* (1964), p. 285. Cf. also Ngag-dbang kun-dga' bsod-nams, *Sa-skya'i gdung-rabs ngo-mtshar bang-mdzod* [= *'Dzam-gling byang-phyogs-kyi thub-pa'i rgyal-tshab chen-po dpaldan Sa-skya-pa'i gdung-rabs rin-po-che ji-ltar byon-tshul-gyi rnam-par thar-pa ngo-mtshar rin-po-che'i mdzod dgos-'dod kun-'byung*] (Peking, 1986), p. 126.

31. On the "six continents" (Tib. *gling-drug*), see Chang I-sun, ed., *Bod-Rgya tshig-mdzod chen-mo* (Peking, 1985), p. 423 ("*gling-drug longs-spyod-kyi sa*").

32. Ngag-dbang kun-dga' bsod-nams, *op. cit.*, p. 212.[g]

33. Cf., however, the translation of the title presented to 'Phags-pa on this occasion in Tsepon W. D. Shakabpa, *Tibet. A Political History* (New Haven, 1968), p. 68. The title is also found in Chinese sources: see Sung Lien, et. al., *Yüan-shih* (Peking, 1976), 202/4518; and the translation of the Chinese version of the title given by Miyoko Nakano, *A Phonological Study in the 'Phags-pa Script and the Meng-ku Tzu-yün* (Canberra, 1971), p. 37.

34. On Mitrayogin see Roerich, *op. cit.*, pp. 1030-1034.

35. Dge-ba'i blo-gros, an important translator, was contemporaneous with Atiśa and the Buddhist revival in Western Tibet in the eleventh century. See Roerich, *op. cit.*, p. 70. Note that he is described as being from Rma, a name that we have seen as an element in the appellation "Rma-se," which is ascribed to a branch of the Tangut royal line. The name Rma can be linked with areas of northeastern Tibet that were associated with the Tang-hsiang ch'iang (forebears of the imperial Tanguts), most visibly, perhaps, in the Tibetan name for the Huang-ho ("Yellow River"): Rma-chu. See R.A. Stein, *Recherches sur l'épopée et la barde au Tibet* (Paris, 1959), pp. 197-199; and *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines*, (Paris, 1961), pp. 52-54.

36. Si-tu paṅ-chen, *op. cit.*, I, f. 19r.^[h] Cf. also Dpa'-bo, *op. cit.*, p. 433.

37. The other elements in the two names ascribed to this figure offer us nothing from which we can make a further identification. "Byang-chub sems-dpa'" ("Bodhisattva") can easily be rendered into Chinese as "P'u-sa," but it is not possible at present to identify this name with a known Chinese monk at the Tangut court. The same is true for "Be-bum [i.e., Be'u-bum] ring-mo." The last element in this name clearly means "long," while the first denotes a brief work along the lines of a handbook; see Chang I-hsun, *op. cit.*, p. 1841 ("be'u-bum"). It is difficult to imagine a possible Chinese name that a monk might have borne as an equivalent to the Tibetan term, although another, more basic meaning for *be'u-bum*, denoting a cow's nipple, can suggest something such as "Niu-ju." Sarat Chandra Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (Delhi, 1973), p. 876, defines *be'u-bum* as a "cow's dug from which the calf sucks milk; fig. that which yields nourishment to . . . spiritual life." With regard to *niu-ju*, used similarly in Chinese to denote the teachings of the Buddha, see Ting Fu-pao, *Fo-hsüeh ta tz'u-tien* (Peking, 1984), p.361 ("niu lü erh ju").

[a]

ལེ་ཉག་གི་རྒྱལ་པོས་འཇིག་རྟེན་མགོན་པོ་འཕྲི་ཁུང་པ་ལ་གོས་ཚེན་དང་
 གསེར་ལྷལ་ནས་གསོལ་བ་བཏབ་པས་འཇིག་རྟེན་མགོན་པོས་རྟེན་འབྲེལ་
 མངོད་ནས་ལེ་ཉག་གི་རྒྱལ་ཁམས་ལོ་བཅུ་གཉིས་ཀྱི་བར་དུ་བདེ་བར་བྱུང་
 བས་དེ་མཚོན་པར་བྱེད་པའི་ལེ་ཉག་གི་རྒྱལ་པོ་གོས་སེར་པོ་ཅན་མཚོད་པ་
 འཕུལ་བ་ཡིན་ནོ།

[b]

ལྔ་པའི་རྒྱལ་པོ་ཐའི་དུས་ཚོས་ཀྱི་རྗེ་དུས་གསུམ་མཁུན་པ་མཚུར་ལུར་
 ལེབས་རྟེ་བཞུགས་པ་ལ་བྱུན་འདྲེན་བཏང་བས་མ་བྱོན། འོན་ཀྱང་རང་
 གི་སྐྱེ་ཚབ་ལེར་བའི་སློབ་མཁུག་མཚོད་གནས་སུ་གཏོང་བར་ཞུས་པས་དགེ་
 བཤེས་གཙང་སོ་བ་བཏང་རྗེ་རྒྱལ་པོས་སྐྱ་མར་བསྐྱར།

[c]

རྗེ་གཙང་པ་བཟླ་ཤིས་སམ་གཙང་པོ་པ་དགོན་མཚོག་སེང་གེ་ལོ་ལ་རྟོང་
 ཐང་རྒྱུ་ན་རྒྱ་འཕུལ་གྱིས་རྗེས་སུ་བཟུང་ནས་སྐར་མཚུར་ལུར་གདམས་
 དག་རྗོགས་པར་མངོད་དེ། ལེ་ཉག་འགའི་རྒྱལ་པོས་རྗེ་ཉིད་བྱུན་བྱངས་
 པར། གཙང་པོ་པ་ལག་ལོའི་བསྐྱེད་རྗོགས་འགྲོ་ཚོས་སུ་གནད་ནས་ཉ་ལ་
 བཞུ་གྱི་རི་བོར་སློབས་ཤིག་ལུང་བཞུན་ཉེ་སྐྱེ་ཚབ་ཏུ་བརྒྱུད་སྤེལ། དེར་
 འགའི་རྒྱལ་པོའི་སྐྱ་མ་མངོད་དེ་མཚན་གཙང་པ་ཉི་ཤིར་བོགས། ཁོང་
 གིས་གདན་ས་ཚེན་པོ་མཚུར་ལུར། དང་པོ་གསེར་འཕུལ་གྱི་ན་བཟུང་
 དང་། ལྷིའི་མཚོད་རྟེན་བཞེངས་པའི་ཆ་རྒྱུན། གཉིས་པ་མཚོད་ཁང་
 བོང་མའི་ཁྱལ་ས། གསུམ་པ་མཚོད་རྗེས་དང་དགོན་པའི་ཁྱུང་འཕགས་
 བཅུ་གསུམ་རྣམས་རིམ་པ་བཞིན་དུ་ལུལ་བ་སོགས་བཞུན་པའི་བྱ་བ་རྒྱ་ཚེན་
 པོ་མངོད་ནས་ས་ལོ་རྟུག་གི་ལོ་ལ་འགའི་བྱུང་ངོས་སུ་སྐྱེ་གཤེགས། དེའི་
 སློབ་མཁུག་ལོ་ལོ་མགོན་ཉི་ཤིར་ས་པ་རྟེན། འབའ་དབུལ་བཟུང་བརྒྱུད་ཀྱི་

བསྐྱབ་པའི་ཅ་ལག་མི་ཉལ་རྒྱལ་པོའི་དབུ་མའོ། ག་སེགས་རྫོང་རྒྱ་ཁང་།
གདུང་རྟོན་དང་བཅས་པ་ཉི་ཤི་རལ་པས་མཛད།

[d]

ཚུར་ལམ་ལུང་ཅམ་གྱིས་ཁ་ཆེ་དང་ཕུ་རངས་ནས་ལམ་ལུང་རྟོ་ལ་རྟོད་མང་།
ཚུང་དུ་དག་བཤེས་གཙང་སོ་བ་ལ་མི་རྒྱ་པོ་རྟེ་བར་བ་ལ་གསལ་པའི་རྣམ་
བཞི་རྒྱུད་ལྟོ་ལ་གསུངས་ཞིང་མཚུར་ལུར་སོང་ཞིག་པར་ལུང་བསྐྱབ་ནས་
རྟོན་རྟེ་བ་བཞིར་སྟོབ་ལ་ཡིན་གསུང་ནས་རྒྱལ་པོ་ལ་བཅུག་གྱིས་མི་ཉལ་
རྒྱལ་པོའི་མ་མཚེད་དུ་གནང་།

[e]

དལུང་ལོ་སོ་གསུམ་ལ་ལྷུག་ལོར་མི་ཉལ་ལུལ་དུ་ལེབས་ མི་ཉལ་རྒྱལ་པོ་
ལུལ་རྩ་ཤོ་ཉོ་རྒྱལ་རྩེད་རྣམས་ཀྱི་མ་མཚེད་མཛད་ནས་ལོ་སོ་གསུམ་
བཞུགས། མལས་ཅད་ཆོས་ལ་བཀོད་ ཆོས་རྩེ་ཆེན་པོ་བཞི་བཏབས་
ལྷ་ཆོགས་བསམ་གྱིས་མི་བྱུང་པ་བསྐྱུངས་ དལུང་ལོ་དུག་བཅུ་ཅ་གསུམ་
ཐོག་ལར་བོད་ལ་ལེབས་

[f]

དཔལ་རྩན་གཡས་རུ་བྱང་པའི་གདུང་རབས་ལོ། རྟོན་རྒྱུ་རྒྱལ་པོ་
རིམ་པར་བྱུང་བའི་ལག་ནས། རྟོབས་ཀྱིས་རྒྱལ་པོ་བསྐྱུངས་ཏེ་རྒྱལ་ཁབ་
ཆེན་པོ་མངའ་ལ་མཛད་པ། མི་ཉལ་གི་སིདུ་རྒྱལ་པོ། དེ་ནས་གདུང་
རབས་དུག་པ། མི་ཉལ་རྒྱལ་པོ་ཉི་དཔོན་པོ་རིགས་ཆེ་ཞིང་མཐོ་བ་དག་
རིམས་ཀྱིས་གཙང་གིས་རྟོད་དུ་ཡོངས་ཏེ། ལུལ་བསྐྱུང་པ་ལས་རིང་ཞིག་
ནས། ར་ས་རྩད་པོ་ལུང་ནས་ལུལ་ལ་ལོས་ཏེ། རྟོན་རྟེ་སོང་གི་ལུང་དུ་
ལུལ་བསྐྱུང་དོ།

[g]

དེ་ནས་མ་ཆེན་ལ་དི་ཉིད་ལོང་དུ་ལེབས་ནས་དལུང་ལོ་སོ་དུག་པ་མཉམས་པོ་

རྩ་ལ་རྒྱལ་པོས་སྐར་ཡང་དབང་བསྐྱར་ཞུས་པའི་ཚེ། མི་ཉལ་རྒྱ་ཚོད་རྒྱལ་
 པོའི་སྐལ་དམ་ལ་བཅོས་བྱས་ནས་སྐལ་དམ་སྲིད་རྒྱལ་མ་དང་། ༡༩༡
 ས་བྱུང་པར་ཅན་སྐལ་ཏེ། གནམ་གྱི་ལོག་སའི་སྲིད་ན་རྒྱ་གར་སྐྱའི་
 སྐལ་པོ། སྐལ་པོའི་སངས་རྒྱལ། མི་ལོ་རྩོམ་མི། རྒྱལ་ཁམས་འཇགས་
 སྤུ་འཇུག་པ་པོ། གནམ་རྩ་རིག་པའི་པརྟེན་འཇགས་པ་རྟེན་སྲི་ཞེས་པའི་
 མཚན་གསོལ།

[h]

ལྷ་མ་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་མདོན་པར་རྫོགས་པར་སངས་རྒྱལ་པའི་དུས་ན་འཁོར་གྱི་
 དང་པོ་གང་དང་གང་ལགས་ཞུས་པས། རྒྱ་གར་སྲི་བྱེད་ལས་ལོ་ལ་ལྷ་
 རའི་གཞུག་ལག་ཁང་ན་རྣལ་འབྱོར་པ་མི་རྟོག་གི་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་ཅིག་ཡོད་པ་དེ་
 དང་། ཡང་མངའ་རིས་ཀྱི་སྲིད་ན་སེམས་ཅན་གྱི་དོན་མང་པོ་མངོན་
 པའི་དཔེ་རྫོང་དཔེ་བའི་སྲི་བྱེད་སྐལ་བྱ་བ་ཞིག་ཡོད་པ་དེ་དང་། ཡང་མི་
 ཉལ་ཚོས་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་པོའི་ལྷ་མ་རྒྱ་ལེ་བུམ་རིང་ལོ་ཞེས་ཀྱང་ཟེར། རྒྱ་བྱུང་
 རྒྱལ་སེམས་དཔའ་ཞེས་ཀྱང་བྱ་བ་དེ་དང་། དཔེ་བའི་སྐལ་དམ་ལོ་ལོ་ལོ་
 སང་ལོ་ལྟོད་དང་བཞི་ལོ་ལོ་གསུངས།

