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This is the first of a series of volumes dedicated to the history of Nepal and of its culture. The next volume will contain the text of the inscriptions so far discovered in Nepal and belonging to the ancient period from Mānadeva up to Vijayadeva.

In the third volume these inscriptions will be translated and commented upon. In the following issues of this series we will publish and translate the inscriptions of the Malla period: we will also edit the Tibetan texts which in some way throw light on the history and culture of Nepal. Other volumes, by Prof. L. Petech, will investigate the history of the Malla period.
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INTRODUCTION

During my Tibetan travels I realized the importance of a better knowledge of the cultural and political history of Nepal for the investigation of the evolution of Tibetan culture. Then in five journeys in Nepal it appeared to me that the history of this country is not contained within the limits of the valley where Kathmandu, Patan or Bhatgaon are located. The conquests of Prthvinārāyaṇa gave a political unity to a country in which many principalities with different traditions and different cultures had for centuries developed or crumbled down, fought one against the other or been compelled to submit to the suzerainty of changing paramount powers.

I therefore thought it necessary to visit the interior of Nepal and specially its central and western parts which are practically unknown; they were ruled over by many families, the chaubis rāj of the Kali Gandaki and the bāts rāj of the Jumla side. Nothing is practically ascertained about the history of these families, their origin, or the causes of their decay beyond the scantly information collected by Kirkpatrick, Hamilton, Wright, and Lévi, the interest of scholars having been chiefly concentrated upon the history of the Nepalese Valley.

1) The spelling of the geographical names follows that of the map of Nepal 8-mile 1928, 2nd ed. 1934.

[1]
Has any trace of the past been left in other provinces? How far did the wave of Tibetan Buddhism descend from the trans-Himalayan regions? Have Buddhism and Hinduism completely cancelled the traces of previous cults and beliefs? What can be gathered from the Nepalese side on the events referring to the history of the frontier states or to the localities on the borders of Tibet which, like Mustang, were of great importance both to the Tibetans and the Nepalese because of their location and their significance as trade centres?

To give an example, we know that some of those places carry great weight in the history of the relations between Tibet and Nepal, from the very early times and were disputed for centuries by both countries. Kuti and Kirong, for instance, are two such places. Some of the information found in certain Nepalese documents sheds occasional light on the vicissitudes through which Kirong passed. To give an example, from an inscription of Pratāpamalla in Kathmandu, which gives the genealogy of the Malla family, we find the record of the campaigns of that king against the Tibetans and the conquest of Kuti and Kirong:

\[ \text{yo 'kārṣīt kūṭīkhāsākiram iti sahasā bhoṭabhūpasya desāt} \]

This example is not isolated; what is needed is a careful investigation of the manuscripts or epigraphic records. With the purpose of giving a reply to some questions such as those put forward above, I undertook in 1952 a journey to Gorkha, Pokhara, the valley of the Kali Gandaki up to Mustang and the Tibetan-Nepalese border; then on the way back I stopped at Muktinath and Dsarkot, and proceeded down to Baglung, Palpa.

1) Near Palpa there are two places in which ruins of old buildings are still to be seen; one is on the top of the hill which overlooks the town: it is called Śrinagar and according to tradition it was there that the castle and the old town were
Rummindei: from Rummindei I came back to Pokhara through Nuwakot.

In 1954, I set out on a new journey, my aim being chiefly the valley near Jumla. In fact, if we follow the clues of some Tibetan sources, it was probably from those parts of Nepal that a rMal, sMal, viz. Malla family entered Western Tibet—Guge—and ruled over it for about two centuries. My itinerary ran from Pokhara to Tukuchā; then, crossing some high passes, I went to Charkābhotgaon and Tarapgaon. From these villages I came back to the Bārbung Kholā—Thuli Bheri—(rMu lūn of the Tibetans) and through Tibrikot I reached Jumla: from Jumla I proceeded to Chilkā, then to Dullu; from Dullu through Surkhet I reached India at Nishangara. The materials which I discovered during these journeys being numerous and very important, I think it useful to write now a preliminary report on some of the documents discovered, so that

located: other important ruins are found down in the valley along the Palpa-Nuwakot route.

In Palpa itself there is nothing old; a few buildings, which at present are used either as a cantonment or as offices, are not older then the 18th century.

In this tour a poet and teacher of Sanskrit in the local school who became my friend brought me for inspection some leaves of a manuscript, unfortunately fragmentary, 12 leaves only being left. It is a kāvya which relates the conquests of Prthvīnārayana and his successors; the title of the kāvya is Śrīvijaya vatilaka; the author was Agnīdhara. It is divided into three sargas, and these into adhyāyas.

The following chapters are preserved:
1st sarga—Gorakṣese varasenājīgataghatagamaṇa
2nd adhyāya. Śrīrāṅgacokāgata vairivadhānaṇtaram śrūga-
yugato vairipalāyanam
2d sarga—lakṣayugagrahaṇaṇaṇtaram rāgināsagamanam
3rd sarga—(? = adhyāya?) Kāśkisthāpanam.

It contains the story of some conquests of Damodara, Amarasiṃha etc. and it ends with the expedition against Kaskikot and the establishment of Siddhinārayana as king of that place. I did not find trace of any manuscript of this work in Kathmandu.

1) The diary of this journey was written in Italian, its title being: Tra Giungle e Pagode, Roma, Libreria dello Stato, 1953.
2) Indico-Tibetica, vol. II. Rin c'en bzaṅ po e la rinascita del Buddhismo nel Tibet intorno al Mille, Roma, Accademia d'Italia, 1933.
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scholars may have a summary account of the new sources now at our disposal and of the first conclusions which may be drawn from them.

I shall of course come back again to these documents and shall edit them fully, but considering the importance of some of them I thought it preferable not to delay this preliminary report. Now I shall chiefly insist on those records discovered, which change or complement our current ideas on the history of Western Tibet and Western Nepal. I may say that the detailed publication of some documents has already been undertaken: this is the case with the inscriptions; with the intelligent help of my friend H. E. Kaisher Bahadur, now Secretary for Education, Health, and Local Self-Government, who takes a great interest in the records of his country I was able to collect the rubbings of about three hundred inscriptions of which about ninety are written in gupta characters and partly unedited.

The first fascicle containing the inscriptions in gupta characters is in the press and will be out shortly, in this section of the "Serie Orientale Roma" dedicated to Nepal.

The other inscriptions will follow up to Prthvíñaśyaṇas' times. The vamśavaliś (I took photos of many thousand pages of them) are being studied in the hope of preparing a critical edition of the most important.

Some Buddhist manuscripts are also being edited, as for instance, the Abhisamayālāṅkāravyākhyā of Vimuṅktisena.

I must add that these pages are mere notes of travel, which give a short account of the most important things I have seen, and they are chiefly concerned with historical or archaeological documents or details and the conclusions they authorize. They do not refer, or very rarely, to ethnological, anthropological, or linguistic facts.
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I cannot conclude these preliminary remarks without expressing my gratitude to my pupil and collaborator Doctor Gnoli, who undertook the painstaking task of transcribing from the rubbings or the photos the text of the most important inscriptions. We discussed together all the difficult readings and made the best of those documents, generally very badly preserved.

H. E. Richardson, who has been many years in Tibet and possesses a great knowledge of things Tibetan has been so kind as to read the proofs of my book and made many useful suggestions.

My gratitude is also to be expressed to Miss Francesca Bonardi who accompanied me in both expeditions and was responsible for the photographic documentation. The photos here published are all due to her.

Special thanks are also due to my friend H. E. Kaishe Bahadur, who once more was very generous of all sorts of assistance during my stay in Nepal and facilitated my researches with his learned and friendly cooperation. If my work has been successful, this is largely due to his suggestions and help. Nor can I forget the kind assistance I was given by General Toran Sham Sher, Acting Commander in chief, and by the Governors of the various districts I passed through.

The Sher Chan family in 1952 and in 1954 greatly facilitated my journeys, giving me suggestions as to the routes and affording me all sorts of help. They all, Lalitman, Shankar Man, Indra Man and the others who enjoy great authority all over the Tukuchā area and beyond it, have been very nice to me.

But even villagers and porters should be thanked for their patience and kindness, which in Nepal made me feel completely at home.
null
Chapter I.

THE LAMAIST AREA

§ 1. — Kathmandu — Lete. There is nothing important on the way from Kathmandu to Pokhara: the temples of Nawākot as they now stand are not very old.

In Nawākot there is an inscription of Pārthivendra Malla, Nepāli Saṃvat 803 = 1682 A.D.

In Gorkha itself, in the temples of Śiva and Viṣṇu near the parade ground, I took rubbings of three inscriptions; two of them are of Rāma (Shāh) dated respectively śrīśākā 1558 = 1636 A.D. and śrīśākā 1536 (also Viṃṣṭamā saṃvat 1671) = 1614 A.D.

The first inscription would show that the dates given by S. Lévi 1606-1633 (Le Népal, II, p. 262) should be changed; now we have a document which proves the existence of Rāma Shāh up to 1636 at least. In Gorkha there is another inscription of Prthvīpati Shāh. This name is not found in Lévi, but his inscription is dated śākasaṃvat 1602 = 1680 A.D.

The temple of Kāli in Gorkha, where the throne of Prthvīnārayaṇa is said to be still preserved, is almost collapsing and requires urgent repair. In the Gorakṣa-cave there is a long inscription in gupta characters but so effaced that only a few letters can be read here and there.

Even in Pokhara there is nothing deserving mention: along the track to Sarangkot and Kaskikot many ruins of castles can be seen on top of the hills: they are built with irregular stones. Near Nodana some huge pillars with no designs or carvings are still extant; near the village, where there is great scarcity of water, there are many water-tanks which look ra-
ther old. Many of them are no longer in use. All these facts show that this part of the country was rich in castles and was much more populated than it is now. The villages never recovered after the conquest of Kaskikot.

§ 2. — The Thāk district and Mustang. At Lārjung 1) about two hours march before Tukuchā, capital of the Thāk district, Lamaism begins: we find there the first temple, GP, p. 68. The Tibetanization becomes more marked as one proceeds northwards. The Tibetan language is spoken side by side with Thākali and in Tukuchā it supersedes the latter almost completely. Near the Tibetan frontier, Mustang is the capital of the district of Glo smant'añ which even at the time of the author of the ĄDsām bu gliṅ rgyas bşad (died according to Vassiliev 1830) was Tibetan: it passed over to Nepal after Pṛthvīnārāyaṇa 2).

Lamaism and Buddhism join hands here: but after an early expansion of Hinduism it would seem, at least to judge from the small lha k’añ newly built in this place and in Tukuchā, that Lamaism is again recovering.

GP, p. 71. “At Tukuchā there are only Lamaist temples (lha k’añ); one cannot, strictly speaking, refer to gom-pas, (the name given to convents) as there are no monastic communities, but only custodians (dkon gün), almost all laymen, belonging to the Karmapa sect which has its chief monastery at Tshurpu, N.W. of Lhasa. The principal temple stands outside the little town and is placed under the custody of a lama, native of Tukuchā. He studied medicine at Lhasa

1) But the local pronunciation is rather Nadsung. So also Tukuchā is pronounced Tukchā.

2) Sometimes it is written also Klo sman t’an. Perhaps the form klo is better; the Klo po are the southern tribes of Tibet also in the east, bordering with Bhutan, ĄDsām bu gliṅ rgyas bşad, p. 44 of my ms. In the same work p. 12 Klo sman t’an is described as being to the East, downwards of sPu rañ, not very far from it; “though it has a Tibetan population, its majority is Indian; formerly this country was subject to Tibet, but now it has been taken by the Gorkhas”.

[8]
in the famous convent of the Chagpori, but the vicinity to Nepal and India has induced him to adopt a curious synchretism consisting in the use of herbs that he learnt in Tibet, and allopatriy of European mark. He dispenses pills that have been blessed, magic formulae and charms, but he also prepares European medicines, including penicilene, and he does not hesitate to give injections if he finds a patient brave enough to submit to such treatment.

In the chapel in the old house of the Sher Chan I found nothing worthy of note except an old copy of the bKa’ag yur written in letters of gold on great sheets of blue paper and the manuscript of a liturgical work with some references to the region; as I could not purchase it, I had the sheets that interested me photographed by my companions.

A third little temple, the most ancient of all, is in the heart of the city; it is called the “temple of the queen”, in memory I know not of what event and of what person. My attention was attracted by some paintings on wood representing the Arhat who are entrusted with the task of preserving the tradition of the law, Padmasambhava, Milaraspa, the celebrated ascetic and poet of the Land of the Snows, and finally the cycle of the Ži k’ro. These are very important divinities, some terrifying, others peaceful, who appear to the conscious principle of the deceased in the intermediate period between death and rebirth, and determine his future destiny. They are described in a famous book which is recited by the bedside of the dying to instruct them on the dangers they will meet as they have exhaled their last breath, and on the means for avoiding them 1).

High up on the walls of this same little temple there are the painted images of the ascetics of the bKa’rgyud

p a sect. They wear the usual cassock of coarse cotton with a scarf of the same material slung over their shoulders which they use to fix their limbs in those uncomfortable and difficult positions prescribed by some schools of the Yoga (yogapataṯa).

These paintings are important, for, so far as I know, they are the only example of local art unaffected by Nepalese influences. It is difficult to date them. But it seems to me that they cannot be earlier than the 16th century”.

From this place upwards many caves are excavated in the abrupt cliffs: the fact that on the rocks in the proximity small gompas either in ruins or still open to worship can occasionally be seen, does not mean, as one might at a first glance suppose, that these caves were retreats (mgonk’aṅ, rik’rod) for hermits. The country was never inhabited to such an extent or so rich and productive as to maintain so big a community of ascetics as that which one may suppose to have taken shelter in these caves. There is hardly any doubt that the grottos were old settlements before the introduction of Buddhism and with it, of a higher culture. The aboriginal people were troglodytes, using the caves in winter and shifting to the plateaus in summer for grazing, just as was the case for a long time in Western Tibet also. But the fact that caves are excavated in cliffs of very difficult access might also suggest a certain insecurity and a standing danger of incursions. When the situation changed and civilization increased, villages grew and developed in the valleys along the rivers; the old location of Tukuchā also was not where the town is now built but on the plateau which overpowers it to the north east.

For the use of the Tibetan pilgrims a guide book has been written of the country, its title being: C’u mig brgya rtsa brgyad, sku ts’ab gter lūa, mu le gaṅs, guru gsaṅ p’ug sogs kyidkar c’ag gsal bai me loṅno mts’ar can rnam. This booklet contains
the legends concerning C'u mig, and its 108 springs, viz. Muk-tnath (it connects it with Manasarovar, Padmasambhava and the 84 siddhas 1), the mountain Mu le ga'ns ri, the cave of Padmasambhava, the monastery of gKu gzung sde luna, in the proximity of a village called 'Od gsal gling or gSum pa sgan.

Mu le sga'ns 2 is the local name of the Dhaulagiri and it gives the name to the Bahrung Kholä, called by the Tibetans Mu luna (rMu luna), the valley of Mu, rMu. It is the abode of a sadb dag C'u bya snon po “the blue water-bird”. The Dhaulagiri is conceived as a gur k'a'n, a tent of five colours: on the top there is the gYu 'brug, the turquoise 3 dragon, to the right there is a lion, to the left a gK'yun.

The gSa'n p'ug “the secret cave” is the cave of Guru Rin po c'e, Padmasambhava, on which see GP, p. 79:

“From Samar the road to Ghiling branches off in two directions. We took the shortest and most fatiguing as it led us to a famous grotto. The Tibetans call it the ra'n abyu'n mc'od rten, “the self-born shorten” i.e. that appeared miraculously. The cave owes this name to a great

1) On Muktinath some Hindu pandits have collected much information from the Purapras and Tantras referring to places in this part of Nepal, cf. Bha-vanitašākara Śāstri, Śalagrāmarahasyam, śrīmuktikṣetra-gaṇḍakīprabhṛtivividhatirthavaranapurahsaram, Janakpur Dham, Darbhanga.


The fact that the valley bordering on the north the group of the Dhaulagiri is called rMu luna excludes to my mind any connection with m u l e, m o l e, m o l a i “girl” in the ŋbrug pa dialects of W. Tibet. Shaw, JASB, 1878, I, p. 57, F. W. Thomas, TLT, I, p. 102. Mu le ga'ns ri, is perhaps an amphigloss: the snow mountain.

3) In some lists of the sadb dag, gYu 'brug is located in the South: Bya, the bird, in the North: but in this case it is red. TPS, p. 722.
natural pillar, round in shape, which stands in the middle, almost as though to support the weight of the vault. Many images are carved on the rough stone of the walls. Personages who cannot be identified alternate with one another; tradition holds that a noble and ancient figure represents mÑa' rîs jets bo, Atiśa, the Indian teacher who was invited in the 11th century 1) by the king of Western Tibet, and was the chief instrument in the revival and rebirth of Buddhism in the Land of the Snows. But the images of Padmasambhava are the most numerous. Thus the two sects that struggle one against the other for the possession of the souls, the Red sect, said to have been founded by Padmasambhava, and the Yellow sect that traces its origins back through Tson-khapa to Atiśa, dwell together in the grotto. There is however no doubt that the grotto was a sacred spot prior to the arrival of the Buddhist missionaries. Facing the central monolith, on the further side, some steps lead to a wider space that would seem to have been an altar. In some holes excavated by man, cinders and branches of juniper have been found. Juniper is the plant held sacred by the Bonpos; the smoke of the juniper drives off evil spirits and for this reason the Buddhists make use of it in certain rites and for exorcisms, and in the popular liturgy it is known by the name of sang (bsaṅs). Pilgrimages from all parts of the country come to this famous grotto and fictile images of deities, and more especially of Padmasambhava, are heaped in corners in memory of the pious visit” (Fig. 1).

The gompa of sKu gzugs sde lña (GP, p. 97) is built on a ridge to the NE of Mârpha: it is ruined but contains important works of art which were spared when the temple was burnt down during the Nepalese-Tibetan wars. It

1) He came to Tibet in the year 1042 A.D. This is the local tradition: but I think is wrong; though Atiśa spent some time in Guge (mÑa' rîs) he was an Indian; the person here alluded to is perhaps mÑa' rîspu, Blue Annals, p. 862 ff.
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is rNiṅ ma pa: a dkon gñer takes care of it. The monastery was enlarged by a Lama from Eastern Tibet, who was responsible for the revival of Lamaism in this district. The rNiṅ ma pa penetration followed that of the Sa skyā pas who left their dgon pas in the northern part of Glbo bo.

This lama was Saṅs rgyas bzaṅ po; I found a rnam t’ar containing his biography: Saṅs rgyas bzaṅ po i rnam t’ar šes bya bai me loṅ, fol. 75, mss.; he was born in K’am s in rMa zla sgaṅ in the year šiṅ rta. Unfortunately since there is no number to the cycle and no fact or person referred in it is chronologically known, it is impossible to state when this lama lived. He travelled extensively in Tibet, India, Nepal (the places are recorded in the biography). After India and Western Tibet he entered Glbo bo sman t’aṅ (Mustang) both upper and lower (sTod and sMad) and he went to Mar p’ags viz. the Mārpha of the maps 1); then he proceeded to meet the sgom pa of sKu gzugs sde lña (but at p. 77, b sKu ts’ab sde lña, which is the same) near the village of Som bhi 2); in the monastery there is an effigy (sku ts’ab) self-created (raṅ byon) of the gter ston bDud adul rdo rje 3). Then he goes to T’ag p’yogs 4) viz. the Thāk district, the capital of which is Tukuchā, and there he paid a visit to gu ru bsgrub gnas gsaṅ p’ug, the cave of Padmasambhava already referred to. Other places of his pilgrimage are recorded towards the northern part of this district: Sa dkar dgon, Ts’e rog rdsoṅ (not located) where he met the Ts’e rog sprul sku, then

1) See GP, p. 72. It is still now bKa’ brgyud pa.
2) Perhaps the small village below the monastery itself on the NE of the same.
3) Most certainly the 13th (from Po to pa) Žva nag Karmapa, TPS, p. 682.
4) But in the colophon of a mss. of rDo rje gcod pa in the small lhā k’aṅ of the Sher Chan family: sprug c’es pronounced: tugce, transcribes Tukuchā: it is said there to be between Cu mig, sKu ts’ab sde lña, and gSaṅ p’ug.
Glbo dge dkar, p. 55 and 79, b (written also k’re dkar 1) 75, b), Ts’ugs (Chhuk of the maps), Ts’ele (Chele), P’ye legs (probably Ghiling), sKags viz. Kägbeni on the confluence of the Muktinath river with the Kali Gandaki which is considered a very important place of pilgrimage and from where the pilgrims going to Muktinath take back home some water for the pīṇḍa to the ancestors. In T’ag a merchant Tise smar becomes his dänapati. He spends most of his time near Märpha and sKu gzugs sde lünä, Tukuchä and dGe k’ar (the name of the temple was ’Od gsal kuñ k’yab, p. 81). As a whole, he says, (p. 79, b) Glö sman t’añ is largely under the control of the Sa skyä pas; this fact is confirmed by my survey of the temples of the country and by some literary sources.

In these places he put an end to the slaughter of animals for sacrificial purposes as was the custom of the black Bon. This shows that at that time the Thäkalis were still practising their original religion, uninfluenced or influenced only very slightly by Buddhism. (GP, p. 70). This area seems therefore to have been at the time of Sañs rgyas bzañ po inhabited by many non-Buddhists, as some survival of ancient beliefs still show. Sañs rgyas bzañ po is the author of minor works such as mTs’o skyes gsañ gsum c’os ābyun pad mai rgyal ts’ab, foll. 25 written in the year sa-stag in Glö boi gnas mc’og dge dkar printed in bDe c’en c’os grva. It is a brief summary of the rD sogs c’en doctrines composed for the purpose of spreading the doctrine in this country.

In Kägbeni I was able to buy two books; one is an old and correct manuscript of the Pad ma t’añ yig: O

1) Which is perhaps better, dGe dkar being a learned spelling: K’re dkar = dGe dkar corresponds to Tegar about three and half miles to the NW of Mustang.
rgyan pad ma rnam t'ar rgyas pa, divided
into two parts, Ka and K'a (pages 134 and 149 respect-
ively). It is composed of 117 chapters. In the dKar c'ag
it is written that it was made to be copied in the country of
Mu le ga'ns can, Dhaulagiri, and properly in sKag
rدوذ (Kāgbeni) of La dbya'n c'ags 1) by dru'n
dam Pad ma rgyan and sGrub pa mo dba'n
bza'n, two ladies (mo gnis); the first belonged to the
school of mK'an po C'os skyabs rnam rgyal,
abbot of the monastery or seminary C'os grva c'en
po T'ub bst'an rnam rgyal, and a descendent of
Kun dga' bsam ṣp'el, probably monks of the
rNi'u ma pa sect.

The other manuscript is a rnam t'ar of a Tibetan
ascetic K'yu'n po rnal ṣbyor (TPS, p. 586) who
was originally a Bon master of Ra ma'ns of sNe mo,
and then was converted to the rDoogs c'en sect; he
went to India and there travelled extensively. The biography
was written summarizing what had been told to his pupils:
Ža'n rGan mo C'os se'n, Bla ma sMeu ston
pa, Bla ma rMog cog 2) and Ne gu'as Rin c'en
rdo rje 3).

§ 3. — Mustang 4). In GP, p. 87 I have given a short ac-
count of the main temples of Mustang: generally belonging to
the Sa skya pas they are now collapsing and I am afraid that
in a few years only the ruins will remain of these imposing
buildings which belong to the best period of Tibetan art. The
paintings on the walls, though greatly damaged by the water
leaking from the ceiling, are executed with great accuracy:
they are strictly related by style and composition to the Ži'n

1) This was therefore the name of the territory near Kāgbeni.
2) On rMog cog pa see Blue Annals, pp. 733-741, Kl'o'n rdo'l vol. za, p. 32 a.
3) Blue Annals, p. 749.
G. Tucci

k'ams "paradises" of the sKu 'abum of Gyantse. This means that they were the work of the same schools of painting which flourished in the 15th and 16th centuries in the Sa skhya monasteries, the richest and most influential, at least until then, not only in gTsañ but also in the adjoining provinces. The Sa skya pas dominated in Glosman t'añ: the bKa' brgyud pas and the rNiñ ma pas could not compete with them and generally they represent a second wave of Lamaism which penetrated at a late date into the country.

The style of the metrical inscriptions also is very similar to that of Gyantse and is equally highly elaborated and pretentious.

In the inscription of the T'ub c'en lha k'añ under the painting representing the Abhirati, the paradise of Akṣobhya, allusion is made to its authors (expert in the art of painting = pir gyi ḥdu byed)¹).

From the inscription of the other temple of Byams c'en gzi'od ābar ba, we know that the author of the murals was a Nepalese Bal po Dheva Lha dga' (part of his name is given in sanskrit, dheva = deva, and part in Tib. lha = deva, Lha dga': devāpriya devanandin, devaratapa?) This fact confirms once more what I have stated in TPS, that the Sa skya pas had very often recourse to Nepalese artists, whom they invited to Tibet to embellish the temples they were building.

It is not surprising that Nepalese painters worked in these temples of Mustang, so near to the artistic centres of Nepal. A revival of Lamaism took place in these parts through the zeal of the Nor sub-sector of the Sa skya pas, started by Kun dga' bzañ po²) who came from its chief monastery, Nor.

²) TPS, p. 124 and 157. The date of his birth there given is wrong; he was born in the year c'u k'yì 1382 (not 1387 as proposed by S. Cn. Das, Reu mig, pp. 62–66); he died in the year me glañ 1457; he founded the Nor monastery in the year 1429.
PRELIMINARY REPORT

Many of the temples and dgon pas of Mustang side still belong to the Nor pas, of which some of the most important were beside those of Mustang, in Chārāng (Fig. 2) and Ghiling. According to a bca’ yig, preserved in the monastery of Ghiling (called dGe luṅ c’os sde) dated mεstag, 1446, Kun dga’ bzaṅ po came personally to these places from sMar t’aṅ, bKra šis lhun gyi sgrub gliṅ¹), and prescribed stricter discipline for the monasteries.

These data are fully confirmed by literary evidence which, when compared to the inscriptions of Mustang, allows us to fix the date of the paintings.

In fact, in the biography of Kun dga’ bzaṅ po we find the names of some princes of Mustang who were responsible for the expansion of Lamaism in this part of the world: some of these names are also recorded in the inscriptions in the temples.

From the rnam t’ar of the founder of the Nor monastery, Kun dga’ bzaṅ po: rGyal bar do rje ac’añ kun dga’ bzaṅ pòi rnam t’ar pa legs bṣad c’u bo ădus pâi rgya mts’o yon tan yid bžin nor bui ăbyuṅ gnas (p. 76), we know that Buddhism entered the country in the fifteenth century. This was due to A me dpal. This person belonged to the gNam ru k’yuṅ pa family (gduṅ rus), the members of which were officials (druṅ skor) of mŅa’ris rdo sön ²). The c’os rgyal of mŅa’ris ăbum lde mgon ³) appointed A me dpal as rdo sön dpôn of

¹) Not identified.
²) It is the same as rDo sön k’a of the rGyal rabs ăp’rul gyi lde mig of bSod nams grags pa fol. 39b; it is the chief town of the Tibetan districts north of Kyirong. In the map of Nepal: Tongkha-Dzong.
³) One would think of Grags ăbum lde king of Ladakh—who is supposed to have lived between ca. 1480-1470. But from the second biography of Kun dga’ bzaṅ po (rDo rje ac’añ kun dga’ bzaṅ pòi rnam t’ar legs bṣad
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2. – Tucci, Preliminary Report.
the frontier-rdson (rgyab rdsom)\textsuperscript{1)} gTsan ran bya p'o i že va (Chārāṅg). A me dpal tried his very best to spread Buddhism in the country under his rule. His first attempt with Bodon\textsuperscript{2)} was not successful. He was more successful with the Sa skya pas, but the real person who greatly contributed to the spread of Buddhism in this part of the world was Kun dga' bzañ po who was invited three times by A me dpal to the territory to which he had been appointed, in order to preach Buddhism there.

On the first occasion he brought a set of the Holy Scriptures and dedicated the paintings on the walls (log ris = logs bris) representing the 12 maṇḍalas of the Yoga class in the bKa' agyur lha k'ain; then he founded sTeṅ c'en ṣadul grva and dedicated its gtsug lag k'ain in which there were about one hundred monks. He led the foundations of Brag dkar c'os sde t'eṅ c'en dar rgyas glin\textsuperscript{3)}.

The dānapati A me dpal was ordained, rab ṣbyun pa, and on being initiated he was given the name c'u bo ṣdus pai rgya mts'o) contained in the De bzin gšegs pa t'ams cad kyi bkrod pa gcig pai lam c'en gsuṅ naṅ gi rin po c'ei bla ma brgyud pai rnam t'ar, vol. 2, p. 32 a we gather that this jabi lde mgon was the c'os rgyal of mNa' ris rdson, now Dsogka, a descendent of the "spotless progeny of the C'oṣ rgyal of Tibet." A me dpal after being sent to Tsan ran bya p'o acquired Glo bo as his private property (Glo bo k'ōṅ gis sger du ts'oṅ).

Kun dga' bzañ po, during his first visit completed the bKa' agyur which he found there, (this means that some chapels existed before) and he laid the foundations of Brag dkar c'os sde T'eṅ c'en dar rgyas glin. During his second visit he made the žal da (other biography: žal lta) of the bKa' agyur which had been dedicated on the occasion of this first coming to Glo bo and repaired the rNam rgyal c'os sde (now rNam rgyal, two miles North of Mustang. See GP, p. 87). Perhaps during this time the building of the royal palace now in ruins was started (Fig. 3).

\textsuperscript{1)} But according to the work quoted in the preceding note he was appointed dpon sa of sKya ṣp'ar pai sde: he is called in this same work A ma dpal.

\textsuperscript{2)} P'yog las rnam rgyal, TPS, p. 704, n. 848. Blue Annals, II, p. 777 ff.

\textsuperscript{3)} To the east of Mustang.
of bZaṅ po rgyal mts'an. Before being ordained he had had a son, C'os rgyal A mgon bzaṅ po, whose sons were Ts'aṅs pa bkra šis and the Globo mk'an c'en 1).

On the occasion of his second visit, Kun dga' bzaṅ po brought with him the Sa skya pa scriptures and held a religious meeting, c'os ḡk'or, and did his very best to maintain religion on a pure and high level (record of that in the bca' yig of Ghiling). Following the advice of the King of Guge K'ri nam mk'a' dbaṅ po 2), he invited the Guge mk'an c'en C'os ņid sen ge, the C'os rje rin po c'e from Pu hrāṅs and the mk'an po Rin c'en bsod nams of Spiti. The third time in the year me yos (1447) he returned, invited by A mgon bzaṅ po and inspected (ža lta sogs mdsad) some copies of the bKa' ḡgyur written in golden letters and a golden image of Byams pa and many religious objects (s Ku gsun t'ugs rten) and inspected about one thousand monks in T'ub bstan dar rgyas gliṅ 3).

1) So we have the following genealogy, completed with data of the rGyal rabs ḡp'ru l gyi lDe mig, p.39 b:

A me dpal (bZaṅ po rgyal mts'an, so called in honour of Kun dga' bzaṅ po).

C'os rgyal A mgon bzaṅ po (not recorded in lDe mig)

Ts'aṅs pa bkra šis

Globo mk'an c'en

(lDe mig: bKa' śis mgon).

2) K'ri Nam mk'a' dbaṅ po is perhaps the same as king Blo bzaṅ rab brtan, a contemporary of ṅag dbaṅ grags pa, a pupil of Ts'aṅ k'a pa (1357-1419), see Tucci, Tibetan Notes, Hijas, XI, p. 484-5 (where “list of Abbots” i a misprint for “list of Kings”). Blo bzaṅ rab brtan in fact looks like a religious name taken by the king considered a very pious man and a strong supporter of the Yellow sect when he was ordained. The same is the case of A me dpal who had two names, one as a layman and the other after he had been ordained.

In fact we read in the second biography already referred to that the king of Guge K'ri nam mk'a' dbaṅ po was at a certain time ordained just as A me dpal: but the name he then took is not given.

3) Besides there are in these temples many stucco images now collapsing (Fig. 4).
In the inscriptions we find mentioned either directly or indirectly the names of A me dpal bzaṅ po, dGe bai dpal most probably the son of Ts’aňs pa bkra śis; C’os ñid bzaṅ po is perhaps the C’os ñid seṅ ge bzaṅ referred to above: in the inscriptions n. 1 Ts’aň pa contains most probably an allusion to Ts’aňs pa bkra śis.

I publish here the fragments of the inscriptions preserved in both temples.

T’ugs c’en lha k’aň:

--- [sku]---
Zur p’ud lña pai brgyud ...... bžin yan lag drug cu sñan pai gsuň ||
rin c’en ahyuň gnas c’u yi gter bžin zab ciň rgya c’ei t’uga mña’ ba |
kun mk’yen rgyal bai sras kyi mt’u bo sa yi sñuň po rgyal gyur cig ||
mi dbaň sa yi dbaň p’yug ădi yis legs byas dpal śbyor bzaň po la ī)---

lan cig min par rgyal bai spyod pa rlabs c’en bstan pa yis ||
srid las ădas kyaň agro bai lam ădir srid pai ts’ul ădsin pa |

--- --- --- --- ---
ha le rnam dkar las kyi ri mo ădi ni a ma mts’ar ||
lugs gnis bya bai k’ur gyi mi dal bžin |
rmam dpod blo gros mc’og tu mi smin la ||
loňs spyod gser gyi dra bas gdoň pai –
rdson dpon a me dad pai sbyin bdag yin ||
’od zer dra bai ri mo ădi ni ajig rten gyi. |
--- --- --- --- --- ---
gžan gyi min ||
’on kyaň sri (?) btsan pir gyi ădu byed sprul pa na |
ts’aňs pa bdag kyaň gdoň bži sprul nas blta bar hrtsoms ||

ī) Allusion to the king’s name [A me] dpal bzaň po.
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gžan p’an sems kyi ’od ston can |
sniṅ stobs c’en poi rta lhaṅ gi[s] ||
agro bai ma rig mun sel ba |
sems dpa’ mc’og gi dge legs gyur ||
tsaṅs daṅ bhrgya sbyin dbaṅ poi dgra la sogs |
ajig rten c’e bar grags pa t’ams cad kyi ||
ral pai cod pan sa la ḡrems mdsad pa |
t’ub pa dpal sbas mc’od pas mṅes par byas ||
gser gyi sa gzi bai ṭur rya me tog gsar pas rnam par spras – |
mdzes sdoṅ bai ldiṅ k’aṅ daṅ ldan byi rui k’ri šiṅ mgo |
sogs gyo ||
in c’en ba gam… ’od kyi ņe bar k’yud |
mu tig dmar pas spras pai k’ri la ḡos kyi bdud rtsi…

|| om svastip mar rgad ņi ’od daṅ ṭgrogs sku yi dpal ni mṅon dga’ šiṅ 1) |
šiṅ mc’og gtsos bo t’ub dbaṅ – – do šal na [b] zas mdses ||
mdses sdoṅ ’od kyis ṭgro ḡdi sgrīb sel ņes pa kun las

bsruṅs |

mi dbaṅ mc’og tu mi zad mt’u ldan gaṅ |
gaṅ na bsod nams p’ul byuṅ dar bai mc’og ||
mc’og tu mṅon sum gyi mts’on dge bai dpal |
dpaṅ ṭdi skye ba gžan duṅ ņe ba ņid ||
lha dbaṅ druṅ na ņe dbaṅ ltar gnas ciṅ |
legs pai spyod la rjes su spyod byed pa ||
yab rabs mc’og ḡdis ya rabs ji bžin du |
c’os ņid bzaṅ pos nor bu ṭdi bsgrubs ||
 rig pa p’ul byuṅ mk’as pai mdun sar mk’as pa yi |
yid kyi dga’ ston ston par de la skal bzaṅ can ||
ri moi rnam ap’rul – – ||

1) Verse in imitation of yamaṅa, madhyaṅtayamaṅa, Kavyādārśa III, v. 47.

[ 21 ]
bsod nams rgya mts’os rab bs[krun pai |
ye šes c’en poi dpag bsam šiṅ ||
اغро ба ре skon nor bu c’e |
dge legs dpag med rtsol bar mdsad ||
rin c’en sna bdun ra ba daṅ ldan rab gsal ’od kyi ap’reṅ bas
  ḋak’yud |
za šiṅ ra bai skyed ts’al do rar srid me pa la yun ma ldem ||
bžin bzaṅ nu mai ge sar ŋom žiṅ yid bžin nor bui dogs pas
  brtsen |
Lha mai (?) — bde ts’ogs Ḇbyor bas mṅon dga’ t’os pai groṅ
de la sṅiṅ rje yun riṅ ŋabri ba bžin |
de ni sṅiṅ rje nam yāṅ yoṅs ma btaṅ ||
las kyi dbaṅ gi[s] de ltar de gyur tam |
de ŋid mt’u yi de ni de ltar gyur ||

Byams c’en gzi ’od #abar bai gtsug lag kaṅ:

k’ams gsum ḋak’or ba ŋon moṅs las — — |
— — — — — — — |
rgyal mdsad rdo rjei sems dpai skur bstan nas ||
mi bskyod rdo rje k’ro boi ts’ul ḇadsin pa |
gsum pai k’ams gsum rnam rgyal la p’yag ḋats’al ||
lha c’en la sogs Ḇjig rten rjes bzuṅ p’yir |
rmam par snaṅ mdsad t’ugs las sprul pa’i yis ||
k’ro boi rgyal po me ltar #abar ba la |
lha c’en brgyad ky[i][s] bskor la p’yag ḋats’al lo ||
ṭagro ba c’os can sgrīb pai bud šiṅ rmams |
— — — — — — — — — |
— — — — — — — — — |
ṭadi Ḇjīgs byed dgu yis bskor la p’yag ḋats’al lo ||
k’ro bo rmams kyi bgegs dpuṅ ži bar mdsod |
p’yogs skyoṅ rmams kyi las rmams dge bar mdsod ||
ṭajig rten skyoṅ bas Ḇjīg rten c’os bžin skyoṅs |
brtan bsruṅ ḋak’or beas rmams la p’yag ḋats’al lo ||
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rgyal bai sruñ t'ugs kyi gtsug lag adi |
mtoñ t'os reg pa ts'am gyi grol ba dañ ||
p'yag sogs bskor ba ts'am gyi[s] grol ba dañ |
yid la bsum pa ts'am gyi[s] grol bar šog ||
ådi bžeñs dge ba rab dkar dri med des |
sbyin bdag sku mc'ed sras dañ btsun mor bças ||
ågro kun sgrïb sbyañ ts'ogs gñis rab brdsogs nas |
kun mk'yen rgyal bai go áp'añ myur t'ob šog ||
gañ žig mt'oon ba ŋi mai mdañs ap'rog pa |
byams c'en ågro bai mun sel nor bu ådi ||
druñ c'en brtsong pai gru gziñs la brten nas |
gdul bya skal ldan ts'añs pas mt'oon ba mts'ar ||
dus gsum rgyal bai bstan pa sruñ bai p'yir |
k'ro bo can la k'ro boi skur bstan nas ||
log ådren bdud dpuñ ajoms par mdsad pa yi |
k'ro c'en åjig rten skyoñ la p'yag ãts'ãl lo ||
stoñ pa ŋid kyi ye šes rdo rje yis |
dños por blta bai ri bo mt'oon po rnamz ||
kun nas ajoms mdsad rdo rje sens dpa' la |
k'ro c'en bryagad kyi[s] bskor la p'yag ãts'ãl lo ||
dus gsum rgyal bai sprin las gcig bsdus pa |
agro bo ådul p'yir k'ro boi skur ston pa ||
rab åjigs k'ro c'en me ltar ābar ba la |
gza' bryagad rgyu skar gyis bskor p'yag ãts'ãl lo ||
ñon moñs dug ldan rnam par dag pai dños |
ye šes lña yi ŋo bos gžan p'an mdsad ||
rdo rje sens dpa' rigs rnamz kun gyi bdag |
p'yogs skyoñ bce yī[s] bskor la p'yag ãts'ãl lo ||
rgyal bai kun gyi ye šes gcig bsdus nas |
äk'or lo agyur bai gzugs su legs ston pa ||
rab dkar ågyiñ bag (?) rdo rje dril bu bsnams |
p'yag rdor rgyal c'en bžis bskor p'yag ãts'ãl lo ||
---

ser sna sbyoñ p'yir nam mk'ai rgyal poi sku ||
mñam ñid bya grub ye šes ño no ñid |
don yod grub pai las rigs p'yag āts'āl lo ||
gdul bya gdul p'yir 'od dpag med pai gsuñ |
kun k'yab spyan ras gzigs kyi skur ston pa ||
so sor kun rtog ye šes ño bo ñid |
tagro ba ādul bai las rigs p'yag āts'āl lo ||
rdo rje sens dpa' mi ḥgyur rdo rjei t'ugs |
gsal mdsad me loñ ye šes ño bo ñid ||
———
k'ams gsum rnam rgyal las rigs p'yag āts'āl lo ||
rnam par snañ mdsad ye šes sgyu mai sku |
mig ap'rul lta bur gzugs kyi skur ḥstan nas ||
c'os kyi dbyiñs kyi ye šes ño bo ñid |
de bžin gšegs pai las rigs p'yag āts'āl lo ||
mi zad nam mk'a' mdsod kyi smon lam kyi |
gdul bya mt'a' yas nam mk'a' k'yab pa rnam ||
mt'a' med ḥk'or bai ājigs las skyob mdsad pa |
rtsa rgyud rtsa bai nam sñin la p'yag āts'āl ||
gañ gi k'yod sku mt'oñ bar gyur pa'm 1) |
k'yod gsuñ lan gcig t'os pa tsam gyis kyañ |
srid źii rgyud pa mt'a' dag skyob byed pa |
rtsa rgyud rtsa bai āgro ādul la p'yag āts'āl ||
dbañ poi gžu ltar bkra ba yis |
dkyil ḥk'or t'abs šes zuñ ājug ḥdi ||
bal po dhe va lha dga' yis |
yid lag —— ñi mas ap'rul ||
om svasti |

1) Verse defective; corr.: pa ḥm bisyllabic.
§ 4. — The survivals of pre-Buddhistic religion. The road to Charkā (a C'ar d g a' according to the local lamas) branches off opposite the bridge of Jomoson, where there is, on the left of the Kali Gandaki, the custom-house and, now, on the right, a police check post. One proceeds to Dāngarjong, (Fig. 5) where only some ruins are left.

The local priest is a layman who attends to his priestly functions in a small chapel of his humble house. He is a r Niṅ ma pa, though his relation with a sect is very loose. I obtained from him the information as regards the existence of Bonpo communities in Charkā and Tārāp and a Bonpo manuscript. This book is composed on the pattern of the Buddhist Tantras and contains various mantras in which the essentials of the Bon doctrine are said to be expressed. The interlocutor of Mi bo gšen rab is Ha ža g s a n b a; it contains allusion to the division of the universe into two sides, y o d p a and m e d p a, corresponding to the good and evil creation 1).

Its main point is the fundamental difference between be-

1) Cf. TPS, p. 731.

As to Ha ža, it is the name of a much discussed people. See fundamental literature in PETECHI, Alcuni nomi geografici nel "La-drags-rgyal-rabs", RSO, vol. XXII, p. 83. THOMAS, TLT, P. II, p. 1 ff. and P. III, p. 1 ff.
ings and their painful existence, and the purpose of the revelation is to come to their rescue. Ha ža asks the master, sTon pa, which path should be followed in order to help the suffering creatures. The reply is that the only help to universal sorrow is the "shining gem of the Bon". Before the revelation is announced, the demons try to prevent it but the force of the Bon placates them.

Pv'ya yul 1), the country of Pv'ya, is overrun by the b'd u d: the help of sT o n p a is requested; they also are submitted (important list of liturgical instruments).

The same story is told of the Klu. Then, m a n d a l a of Ts ' e b d a g and Ts ' e l c a m, their iconography and invocation in order to get g y a n viz. s i d d h i. It consists of sixteen chapters. The title of the Ms. has become illegible.

During my journey in 1952 I noticed some survivals of non-Buddhist rituals; I refer to what I wrote in the diary of that journey.

GP, p. 90-91. "On our way back to the camp we saw a lama on horseback coming towards us. He was bearing a puppet, stuffed with green plants that looked like juniper, covered with a green tunic; its face was hidden behind a white mask on which human features were drawn. A five-pointed wooden tiara was placed like a crown on its head and each of the five triangular rims was inlaid with the figure of one of the five supreme Buddhas; round its neck hung silver pendants. A young man followed, carrying a kind of tray on which were placed offerings and little branches of burnt juniper. Alongside the man on horseback walked a lama intoning psalms and beating the drum of the sorcerers (d a m a r u). Another lama led the horse, holding in his hand a while scarf, the other end of which was tied to the steed's neck. As soon as they reached the river bank, they stripped the puppet of its clothes, pendants

1) Pv'ya yul is quoted in the geographical catalogue of p. 80 and p. 107.
and diadem, and threw it in the river with the juniper and the offerings. It was the first time that I had witnessed such a rite, which confirmed my opinions on the survival in these districts of aboriginal rites, the memory of which Buddhism in its advance had been unable to obliterate. Evidently here are superimposed, one on the other, the Buddhist and the Bonpo rites. The person whose straw image was thrown in the river, had died yesterday and had been cut into pieces and left on the mountain for animals to devour. That also is a pre-buddhistic rite which Buddhism has been unable to eliminate for the simple practical reason that there is no wood in Tibet to waste on the dead.

Lamaism introduced here the habits of Tibet; but it met here with other customs which enjoined, in conformity with the practices formerly observed in Tibet by some Bonpo, that the corpse should be cast in the river. And so the white scarf, still used in the funeral rites of some Bonpo tribes on the boundaries of China, is the emblem of the rope which, in the original shaman form, joined, like a bridge, the earth to the sky and on which the deceased walked up. The old beliefs have not been fully abandoned; a compromise has been reached, and instead of casting the corpse into the river his image is thrown in it."

Another survival is to be found in the cult of the hearth still existing among the Thākali of Tukuchā.

G.P, p. 72. "A thorough study of the religious beliefs of Thākali would show that any denomination we might give them would be inexact. We should see that in each Hindu the Lamaist of former times survives and that the lamaist, on his side, preserves in the depths of his soul no small place to Hinduism; we should see that in each soul the one religion does not exclude the other, but they dwell together in harmony, in a safe and joyful symbiosis; and were we to look more closely, we should perceive that in even greater secrecy
the primitive aboriginal beliefs still burn, and that they burn more brightly when man feels himself more solitary, sad and frightened and when he notes dire omens in his silent anguish; above all we should see this heritage from remote times holding its own in the domestic worship and in funeral rites. My visit to the palace of the Subha confirmed me in these opinions. The sanctum sanctorum of each home is still today the hearth that stands in the middle of the kitchen protected by a low earth wall that surrounds it. No one who is not a member of the family may approach it or pass beyond a line that fixes the space that must remain inviolable. For us an exception was made. On the low surrounding wall are placed jars full of barley for the manes of the deceased, a tall brass lamp burns in a corner.

It is a very serious sin to defile the hearth, to let any thing or object fall there that would contaminate its sacred purity.

Things are quite different in Charka and Tarap.

In these villages Lamaism has suffered a set back in so far as the communities living there claim to be Bonpo. Bon reaches Pale and even a few other places on the way to Jumla. Certainly this Bon is very much contaminated by Buddhism, chiefly by the rDso gs c'en and the bKa' brgyud pa (Brigun sub-sect), but this diffusion of Lamaism seems to be of recent date and caused by the arrival of some lamas who, a few decades ago, came into this part of the world, preached, made some converts and built some shrines. The limits between the two religions are difficult to define: anyhow it is easy to explain why Buddhism penetrated here through the rDso gs c'en and the bKa' brgyud pa; these two sects are in fact not only very tolerant towards Bon, but they did not abstain from accepting a part at least of its lore; on the other hand, local communities accepted many a doctrine of Lamaism. But it is certainly surprising to find in such a far away corner of Nepal a Bon island.
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It would certainly escape the notice of a traveller not acquaint-
ed with things Tibetan, because only those who can read
Tibetan can realize that the stones piled up on the so called
maṇi walls are not inscribed with the usual formulae Ōṁ
maṇi padme hūm, but with the Bonpo mantras;
(Fig. 7) Ōṁ ma tri mu ye sa le ṣadu; ōṁ a dkar sa le ḏod;
ōṁ yar ōṁ ḏod a.

Evidently, this so-called Bonpo religion which is diffused
in this corner of Nepal and which in former times was cer-
tainly even more powerful than now, as is proved by some
literary references, as for instance by those quoted at p. 14,
does not represent the original Bon. It is itself an adapta-
tion of primitive beliefs into a scheme greatly influenced
by Buddhism, and by what we may call the secondary form
of Bon: which is the result of the contact of the aboriginal
cults and ideas, differing widely from place to place, though
moving within the same religious forms, with more advanced
religions such as Buddhism, or Hinduism, and even other
creeds.

There has been in these parts a wave of this secondary Bon,
coming in older times straight from Žaṅ žuṅ, and more
recently from pilgrims and missionaries from Kham coming
on pilgrimages to Kailāsa and K'yuṅ luṅ dṇul dkar¹),
both holy places for the Bonpo.

To take an example, the small shrine bSams cgliaṅ, near Mu-
ktinath, of which I spoke in GP, p. 96, is certainly late and
founded by a Bonpo lama from Kham. But of course these
Bonpo masters found a favourable ground that enabled them
to contend with the local Lamaism; which is here represented
by the Sa skya pa and the rNiṅ ma pa, and more
recently by the bKa' bṛgyud pa.

¹) On this place cf. Tucci, Santi e Briganti nel Tibet ignoto, pp. 130-137, and
below p. 74.
G. Tucci

There is a religious hinterland which survives within the villages of Northern Nepal, and preserves a great deal of the former aboriginal ideas, neither Bon nor Buddhist. But it would now seem that as a whole it is nothing else than an aspect of the secondary Bon of which I was speaking. Thus, for instance, above the door of the bSam gI dü shrine near Muktinath hang some paintings representing some Bonpo deities. I was able to buy from the local priest (he is a layman) a few of them (Front plate); on their backs are written some formulae, manta ras and the invocation of some gods. But as one can judge from the text which I publish here, we are confronted with deities belonging to the literary and secondary stage of the Bonpos; the general trends of the invocations are very similar to those of the rNü ma pas and the liturgical and dogmatical background is the same as that concerning the nairatmya jñaṇa, upāya and prajña, śunya tā etc.

VII

a)
stön p’yogs bön dbyin[s] yas [g]żal nas |
stön pai naŋ la sdzu sprul pa |
su haŋ duŋ k’yuṅ mṭ’u’o c’e ||
żal 3 p’yag drug aŋjigs pai sku ||
žabs 1 bṣtabs kyis lha rnam gnon |
sku mdog 1) mṭ’iṅ k’a gyu ’od aṅbar ||
ṣugs sgrol yum daṅ ʔak’r’il |
t’abs daṅ ʔes rab sprul pa . . . 2) ||
ʔabrug stön k’yuṅ gi gho can aŋyey |
ñoṅ mons 1) lha bdud aḥoms pai lha ||

1) Abbreviated.
2) Cancelled.
yab yum ¹) sprul pai dbañ bskur bas |
gtum gi las su gsal bai dbañ t'ob šog |

b)
'og p'yogs bon dbyiñ[s] [g]žal yas nas |
gsañ bai ñañ la sku sprul pa ||
sku lha 5 p'ud mt'u c'e ²) |
žal 3 p'yag drug ājigs pai sku ||
žabs 1 stabs kyis sa bdag non |
sku mdo ³) ser nag 'od ābar ||
gso' byed yum dañ 2 de āk'ril |
t'abs dañ šes rab sprul pa las ||
p'ag rgod spyana moi gho can ągyer |
āk'ril bdud . . . ³) ajoms pai lha |
yab yum sprul pai dbañ skur bas |
dbyiñs dañ ye šes dbyer med lhun gyis grub pai dباñ t'ob šog |

VIII

gzuñ pa gañ yañ de āid ŋo bos grub |
ādsin pai ts'ig la kun gžii bag c'ags bral ||
lcags kyi snar šad gdeñs pai ādsin byed can |
hūm yig gsal ba ābras bui brygan pa ądi ||
skal ldan skies bu k'yd la dbañ bskur bas |
āk'or ba rtag par byed pai bdud bcom nas ||
bzuñ gnas kun bool nam mk'ai mt'a' dañ ąbral |
gsañ mco'og ye šes dbañ rnams t'ob ągyur cig ||
bsvo om pus pa li dha ba dhi la ha ra va rtse ka ya bag ci ta hūm, hūm, hūm.

¹) Abbreviated.
²) Abbreviated.
³) Reading not clear.
bdag med ye šes mc'og c'en bla na med |
k'ams gsum dbaṅ skur žiṅ gi dpal gyur pa ||
gnam lcags k'a traṅ 1) rtse gsum dbal me ḡabar |
hūṃ yig gsal ba ḡbras bui 2) rgyan pa ḡdi ||
skal ldan skyes bu k'yod la dbaṅ bskur bas |
sa rnams gyo daṅ sa rnams ḡp'ag pa daṅ ||
sa lam ston t'ob pai bdag ŋid mc'og | 3)
gsaṅ mc'og ye šes dbaṅ rnams t'ob ḡgyur cig ||
bsvo om pus pa li dha ba dhi la kri šu la kā ya bag ci ta hūṃ,
 hūṃ hūṃ ||

XX

dbal k'a gso ba drag po las kyi sdsas |
srid pa las kyi rdsu ḡp'rul 4) mc'og c'en po ||
dbal gyag dar mai ru co rtse dbal can |
hūṃ yig gsal ba ḡbras bui rgyan pa ḡdi ||
skal ldan skyes bu k'yod la dbaṅ bskur bas |
gaṅ yaṅ mi ajigs rnam par bral bai sku ||
gzuṅ bya no bor ḡdas pai mc'og c'en po |
gsaṅ mc'og ye šes dbaṅ rnams t'ob ḡgyur cig ||
bsvo om pus pa li dha ba dhi la
ha ra dha va ri tse ka ya
bag ci ta hūṃ, hūṃ, hūṃ.

The priest officiating in the temple of Tarāp pretends to be
a descendant of Mi bo gšen rab but there is nothing to prove

1) Khaṭvaṅga.
2) Written: ḡbruī.
3) Sic but one syllable is missing; these verses are of nine syllables.
4) Abbreviated.
his claims. On the other hand there exists near Charkā a temple now abandoned, which looks very similar to the old shrines of Western Tibet belonging to the time of Rin c’en b.zaṅ po and his activity (Fig. 8); it is a small g a n ḍ h o l a with the p r a d a kṣiṇā; the floor of the chapel is much higher (about two yards higher) than the surface of the corridor for the p r a d a kṣiṇā. Now a days the temple is called “the temple of the 84 siddhas”; the images of some of these s i d d h a s are carved on slabs of stone. Along the track there are many m c’ō d r t e n which look very old and remind one of those of Western Tibet. But exploration of them being impossible, nobody can say if they are Bonpo or Buddhist.

In Charkā the temples are on the left of the river on the other side of the village; they are survivals of more imposing buildings: one must cross the swollen river and ascend to the shrines along a track which runs near the m a ṇ i - w a l l s with Bonpo mantras. The first temple is called B l a m a ni m a: it contains many images and the r n a m t’ar of Mi bo gšen rab in its larger redaction, (g Z e r m i g in 12 volumes).

In another shrine (no name: B o n p o l h a k’ a n only) there are many brass images: one of them represents a curious goddess standing: on the palm of her right hand she holds the images of a deity and on the left a vase. Another temple is dedicated to the G u r u r i n p o c’ e: on the walls there are many frescoes not very old which represent Buddhist (K u n t u b z a n p o, Y u m c’e n m o, T s’e d p a g m e d) as well as pure Bonpo deities.

One can see that this Bon is greatly contaminated by Buddhism: but to judge from the images on the altars, which look very old and do not betray great analogies with Buddhist deities, the process of Buddhism in the spread of the country would not seem to be very old.
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The temple of Tarāp (Fig. 10) is called T’ar rgyas p’un ts’ogs gliṅ: it contains images of sTon pa mi bo gšen rab, of Yum c’en mo, rNam par rgyal ba: on a shelf there is the rnam t’ar of Mi bo gšen rab (gZer mig), large edition in twelve volumes. In the Roṅ to the north-east there are two rNiṅ ma pa temples: Me c’ims (?) on a mountain spur and Gad dkar in the plane. Huge mc’od rten with the Bonpo svastikas are erected along the road.

As to the disposal of the dead I was told by the local priest that as a rule the corpse is thrown into the river: but in some cases it may also be burnt; then a circle of stones is arranged round the place where the ashes have been deposited. Along the track before reaching Charkā I noticed some stones arranged in a circle which I was told were burial places (Fig. 6). They are absolutely similar to those published by G.N. Roerich many years ago, which show the same arrangement of stones 1).

To conclude, this Bon po is a mere contamination of Lamaism with aboriginal cults and ideas, but it cannot be considered to represent the old Bon of Tibet.

Pale is the last village where Tibetan is still understood; the population is largely Bonpo; the headman, himself a Bonpo, is a painter (lha bris pa), acquainted also with Hindu iconography as can be seen from the frescoes, of which he is the author, in the pronaos of the temple of Tibrikot. In this temple side by side with Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Śiva, Kṛṣṇa we find Śākyamuni and Mi bo gšen rab, the Bonpo Master.

1) J. N. ROERICH, The animal style among the Nomad tribes of Northern Tibet, Seminarium Kondakovianum, Prague 1930, ff. 1, 2. Cf. J. MARINGER, Gräber und Steindenkmäler in der Mongolei, in Monumenta Serica, Vol. XIV, 1949-55, p. 303 ff., fig. 5, 6. Taf. III. 6. Some stones are erected in the fields as are considered to shelter the lha protecting the field itself (Fig. 9).
PRELIMINARY REPORT

After leaving Pale one finds on the way some mc’od rt'en (Fig. 11); they look like gates under which the road passes.

The ceiling is covered with frescoes which a person not well acquainted with things Tibetan might take for Buddhist: but they represent Bonpo deities displayed round the five Bon sku, the center being rTog rgyal ye säs mk’yen (Figg. 12, 13).
§ 5—*From Pale to Jumla*. Pale is the meeting place of Buddhism, Lamaism, and Bon. After that village Hinduism rules unopposed, except for a gompa in Tārākot and a few others scattered on either side of the valley. A Buddhist center is in Cha, at the bottom of the Moria-lekh; the people here are Kheti, but follow Lamaism.

Bon reaches as far as Muni on the other side of the Moria-lekh, a village inhabited by Khampas breeding ponies and trading on them.

Between Pale and Tibrikot nothing of great importance is found: the first villages are chiefly inhabited by Magars, then the Bāman and Kheti infiltration begins.

In Tibrikot the temple dedicated to *Trīpuraśvarī* (Fig. 15) does not seem to be very old; the goddess is represented by a stone inside the shrine; the stone is said to have descended there from heaven. A puja is in charge of the shrine. The country is inhabited by Bāman, Kheti, Rājput and Magar. Before reaching the village of Sarasvatīrtha a kind of stupa is seen: near by there is a yupa for the sacrifice of the buffalo which takes place at the Dussera festival: in the interior the image of an ox head roughly carved on a stone can be noticed. Then after the village (inhabited by Bāman

---

1) Before reaching Pale one sees to the left of the Tarāpkholā the bSa m gSUM gSUM dSUM dGoN pA (on the map: Chhandul Gompa): other small shrines are in the valley of the Barbung kholā: bDe c’EN dPal ri and gSUM gSUM gSUM dGoN pA. They have been founded some years ago by a bla ma of gSUM gSUM. In Tārākot there is also a small lha k’aN called bSa m bDe gLiN.
and governed by a Panchayat) a stone mask of the devi is placed on a heap of stones in the middle of the paddy fields.

During all this part of the journey one comes across some wooden images erected near the houses. The most conspicuous is in Rimi (inhabited chiefly by Kheti) (Fig. 17). Though I did not stop in the village and therefore could not get that familiarity with the people which is likely to inspire confidence in them, and to help the traveller to collect reliable information, I was told that those images are the effigies of the builders of the village itself. This custom is found in many places and I had many of these sculptures, often also in stone, photographed (Fig. 36).

Along the route, heaps of stone are also noticeable which seem to be inspired in their shape by the stupa; they have nothing in common with Buddhism, but certainly have a sacred character. Some of them are found in a corner of the paddy fields, regularly surmounted by a stone in the shape of a linga: inside there is a hole or a kind of window, meant for burning offerings to the bhut before harvesting (Fig. 14).

Of special interest is the temple of Litākot on the route Jumla–Chilkhā: it is located below the village and is dedicated to a goddess called Māi. It is nothing but a hut facing east and opened in front (Fig. 33). Some stones placed inside represent the deity; wooden images roughly carved leaning against the walls or standing outside the temple are said to represent the builders of the temple and its donors (Fig. 34); similar images are found along the route wherever there is a sacred tree and a stone underneath supposed to represent respectively the shrine and the deity. The pandit who accompanied me insisted on calling all those people worshippers of bhut; according to him they cannot be called Hindu.

As regards the temple of Litākot, it strikes one as being very primitive; still it is very near to Jumla and in an area where ruins of stone temples are not rare; more than a survival
it looks like the expression of a different culture which has not yet completed its hinduization.

Such temples as that of Litākot, as well as the wooden pillars which I mentioned before, show great analogy to similar buildings or images among the Nāgas 1). In a few cases some rough stone sculptures appear (Fig. 16) as if the primitive intuition worshipping the aniconic stone participating in a sacred presence were beginning to assume a human form. This world is not definite: it is complex, many cultural elements of different origin coexist and some of them are beginning to evolve and change.

There is no doubt that future exploration of Nepal and of the sub-Himalayan valleys will find other islands of these cultures and new links with the probable centers of their diffusion. Instead of these primitive wooden images, in the places where the hinduization was deeper and older, one finds stone pillars. The first were found immediately after Jumla (Fig. 32) and the last was met in the Tarai, just below Surkhet (Fig. 59). They are carved, and very often they bear also inscriptions; but the quality of the stone is such that it does not resist the impact of time, the consequence being that generally no inscription is now legible. The images carved on the surface represent a stūpa, with three flowers symbolising the three jewels, a mountain, (Fig. 47) a lotus, the sun and the moon, a warrior holding the bridle of a horse, a horse. They are quadrangular and very often terminate in a pear-shaped top (Figg. 46, 48, 56, 57, 58). On the top of a wooden pillar (Fig. 35) a kind of bird si perched which reminds me of an animal (a bird? a lion?) on a stūpa of Michagaon (Fig. 28).

Only in a few cases some letters of the inscriptions can be read: on a pillar to the right of the track before reaching Tatopani 2) one reads: Dhau lapānī which is the name of the

2) Marked on the map as Hot Spring, immediately after Jumla.
village above (Fig. 37). The following are the places where these pillars are specially to be found; between Tatopani and Nāgma, before and after Chilkā; at Kālikot, at Gumlikali and Dangargaon, before Dullu, at Dullu, on the road Dullu-Surkhet, in the Tarai (about six miles from Surkhet).

Before reaching Jumla, in a large maidan called Guḍíchour one meets the first stone monument (Fig. 18), which appears as a surprise in a country where there seems to exist no trace of older and higher culture; no ancient stone building is found before reaching this place. It is a small temple near which huge stone pillars are erected (Fig. 19). It is impossible to state whether it was Buddhist or Hindu. Some images are carved on the basement of the door and they probably represent the donors. On other slabs flowers are engraved (Fig. 20).

Jumla is now a small town (Fig. 27), the seat of a governor; it is surrounded by many villages scattered in a very fertile valley. The cultivation of rice as well as the breeding of horses is the greatest resource of the country, the rice of Jumla is very much appreciated and it was formerly, so I was told, sent also to Kathmandu. The ponies are sold in India. The place is rich and potentially it can feed a population much larger than the present one. There is therefore some reason for the former importance of Jumla, fully attested by historical documents.

In the village itself no monument is left: the Gorakṣa temple (Fig. 26) is not old.

The first ruins are found to the north of Jumla on the way to Mūga; in a place called Bhadaribhaḍā there are a stūpa and a shrine (Figg. 22-24); the proximity of the stūpa to the shrine suggests that the latter also was dedicated to some Buddhist deity. On the ceiling—in the shape of the so called lantern-roof—(Fig. 25) the figure of lotus is engraved: on one of the panels traces of graffiti are visible.
PRELIMINARY REPORT

I was told in Jumla that in the village of Michagaon there were many temples: I visited the place and found that there was no trace of temples but in the proximity of the village I saw many stone stupas of a peculiar shape (Figg. 29-30). To my enquiries if there were inscriptions, the headman replied that he was not aware of their existence: other villagers, on the contrary, insisted on having noticed some characters engraved on the basement of the biggest stūpa. Yielding rather unwillingly to my requests at last they removed some shrubs and underneath, on the front-side of the basement, traces of an inscription appeared: Om svasti śrīśāke 1423 māse 11 tithau ne... jīta rāula ja- van mātya puṇya | ku...

On the basement of another stūpa of smaller proportions I had only the time to read Om svasti śrīśāke 1404, because an old witch started a great row and excited the people against us. To avoid unpleasant consequences it was necessary to desist from any further excavations.

Javan is a family name and probably the name of some members of the nobility of Jumla ¹).

Chapter III.

THE KHASA RULERS OF WESTERN TIBET
AND WESTERN NEPAL

§ 6. — Inscriptions and temples of Prthvîmalla and the Malla dynasty. Some of the most important discoveries made in the course of the expedition concern a king unknown so far and the monuments which were built by his immediate predecessors or by himself. This king is Prthvîmalla: his inscriptions were found in a village near Jumla (Shitushka) 2), on the road to Jhelli, at Đakachour, and two, the most important, in Dullu. Those of Jhelli and Đakachour give us only the names of the king; the first is carved on a big boulder along the track: Oṁ maṇi pādme hūṁ. Māṃgalaṁ bhavaṁ ṣrīprthvīmallaṁ devaṁ | likhitam idaṁ puṇyaṁ jagati sīdayasyā 3) (Fig. 60).

All over the country there are stone temples such as those of Chilkhā (Figg. 38, 39,) and Jhelli (Figg. 40-42): two are seen in Kālikot (Figg. 44, 45), another village of Rājput. The temples can be divided into two groups: one (Fig. 40) is similar to the shrines very common all over the Himalayan region: Bajnāth (Kīragrāma) in Kangra 3), Dwarahat, ASAR, 1923-1924, Plate IV, c.; Joshiṇāth, A. Heim und A. Gansser, Thron der Götter, Zürich, Morgarten, 1938 fig. 198.

1) See below § 15: in this village on the spur of a hill there is a stūpa (Fig. 31): on one side oṁ maṇi pādme hūṁ is engraved in big raṅjanaḥ characters.
2) The reading is clear; mistake for siddham syāt?
3) Jamadagni Temple, Fig. 165 in J. Fergusson, History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, Vol. I, p. 298.
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The other type is that of Chilkhā: large square basement piramidal roof surmounted by a wheel. On the side pillar of the door of the shrine in Kālikot an image in the shape of Atlas is carved. The carvings on some stone stele near by represent lotus flowers (Fig. 43). Proceeding on the way to Dullu one looks down to the village of Mānma where another ancient stone temple is visible; another, I am told, is preserved in Auri on the road to the Karnāli; a Buddhist stūpa is also at the bottom of the Auri pass near the small village of Daakachour: near to it there is a stone stele. It was my Pandit who discovered it while halting in the place: he told me that there is a short inscription of which he could read only: oṁ māṇi pādme hūṁ: aṇena puṇyena sarve sattvā śrī . . . . . . . . . . bhaṅantu śrīpṛthvīmallaḥ jagati . . . . .

I will now pass to the inscriptions at Dullu which suggest many problems.

Dullu (at present under a petty rāja who was deposed when the revolution was at its start, but was then reinstated) is a place of great archaeological interest. There are two stone temples (Fig. 49) similar to those which I discovered near Jumla, Jhelli and elsewhere; they are no longer officiated and it is difficult to say to what deity they were consecrated. In front of the royal palace there is a stone lion (Fig. 51) of rather crude workmanship; not very far under an image of Hanumān, there is a fragment of a small but very fine statue of some god or Bodhisattva (Fig. 50) of which the head is missing.

In Dullu there are three inscriptions: one is engraved on a pillar emerging from the paddy fields before one reaches the village, to the left of the Auri-Dullu road. The letters are completely effaced and only the mantra: Oṁ māṇi pādme hūṁ can now be read. The mantra is written in Tibetan characters (Fig. 52).
A second inscription is engraved on a reservoir about one mile from Dullu on the way to Surkhet. This reservoir of water (vāpi) is an imposing building made of large and massive stone blocks; on the lintel on the top of the door there is a well preserved inscription (Fig. 55). The reservoir of water is covered; above the roof, at the four corners, the foundation can still be seen of four stupas; a bigger stupa is in the middle; therefore five stupas in all were then disposed according to the mandalic arrangement (Fig. 54). The inscription is the following.

ο μ m a n i p a d m e h u m (in r a u j a n a characters)  
1. o m svasti śrīśāke 1276 pauṣe vadi 2 śukravāśare 1) mahārājādhirājaparamesvaraparamabhaṭṭarakaparama 2) dhārmī[ka]  
2. paramakalpadrumāvatāraśrīmatprthvimalladevavijayarājye mahāmatyaśrīyaśovarmadevānām samaye ||
3. naṣṭā śrīr hhi(sic) 3) marājasya dhanarājasya dhīmataḥ | echatyālavamśatilakaḥ sūnur graṃthadvavarmanāḥ || nāvalladevyā samjāto ||
4. devavarmanā mahāmatiḥ | tenāpūrvatarā vāpi nirmīta amara-vallabhā || caityapamcakasamyanūtā vasati[r] buddhasaṃtateḥ | vi
5. šrāmabhūmi śrāntānāṃ jvitaṃ sarvadehināṃ 4) mahāmatya śrīmaddevavarmadevaiḥ sarvasattvopakārārtham svakiyokta
6. budhyā (sic) nūtanarītyā | devānām api vallabhā | vāpi viracitā || likhita dharmadāsena | iti subham astu

Meanwhile in the S a m s k r t a s a m d e s a published in Kathmandu (nn. X-XII, p. 54) the same inscription has

1) Corr.: vāsare.
2) ma written above.
3) Corr.: bhā.
4) Metre: naṣṭā-dehināṃ, śloka; in l. 4, read: nirmiṭām a r a .
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been edited by Bāburām Ācarya and Nayarāj Panta, on
a rubbing sent to Kathmandu by an official on tour in that
part of Nepal.

This edition differs in some points from mine and has not
been commented upon.

The inscription was written during the victorious reign of
Prthvīmallā in the śāka year 1276 = A.D. 1354/5 while the
prime minister was Yaśovarman.

The fortune (Śrī) of Bhīmarāja, evidently a local chief, came
to an end, viz. probably his family had no issue or he was elimi-
nated by Prthvīmallā; then Devarman of a new family, the
Chatyāla, took his place; he was the son of Gramthadvā and
Nāvalladevi; he had a reservoir of water made along with the
five caitya alluded to before as a seat of the progenies
of the Buddha, a refuge for those who are tired and a source
of life to all living beings. This work was undertaken by
Devarman for the spiritual benefit of all living beings. The
man who wrote it was Dharmadāsa. The inscription (apart
from the formula om maṇi padme hūm written on
top) is of evident Buddhist inspiration.

Another inscription, was found at the extreme end of the
village on the road Dullu-Surkhet (Figg. 53, 61 A, B). It is engraved on both sides of a huge pillar: it is badly preserved. I took rubbings and photos of it and I am now in a condition
to reproduce the readable portions of the same. On both sides
there is engraved the image of a stupa and the mantra:
Om maṇi padme hūm in raṇjanā characters.

I - Front)

1 svasti || seve padmollasadvaktram
2 dānasauṇḍam vināyakaṁ || yo dosa ²)

¹) Italics are used for doubt ful readings.
²) Read: 'dosa.
3 ś caturdhatte prajā naḥ śivabhāvitaḥ |
4 1 || adityavāṃśe bhavad ādipālo nṛpas su
5 to syāmarapālabhūpaḥ | sutas tadiyo jaya
6 pālabhūpas tatsūnur āśid vijayādipālaḥ ||
7 2 || śrīvīrapāla nṛpatis tato bhūt tasmā
8 d abhūt vikramaḥ pālabhūpaḥ | śrīpālabhūpas ta
9 nayas tadiyaḥ śrīdhiṣrapālam tanayam sa le
10 bhe || 3 || somapālo nṛpas tasmāt sūryapāla
11 s tato bhavat | tajjaḥ samudrapālo bhūt sukha
12 pālas tādātmajah || 4 || tataḥ khyāto dhī
13 śo jani vigahaḥ pālakṣiptipatis tato
14 jātaḥ śrīmān varagajamahīpālanṛpa
15 tiḥ | sa jītvā saṁkhyaṁ rūṇ vihitavasati
16 r gohavisaye su = = = dhīkhyātakṛtavi
17 pulān cinaṇḍpatiṁ || 5 || sugīta –
18 – – – – – – – – – – – – – –
19 – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – śṭakrame
20 – – – – || 6 || viṣaye – – kārākhye
21 – – – – – – stambhakatvāt sapatnā
22 – – – – . avāpa saḥ || 7 || inarendra
23 kule jāto jīvapālāhvayo nrpa [h] | śrī
24 – – – – – – – – gelāhvam i
25 – || 8 || – – – – cala – – – –
26 – bhūpaḥ | śrījayaḥkhyo nṛpas tasmād aja
27 niṣṭa mahāyasāḥ || 9 || puṇyamallāhva
28 yaḥ śrīmān bhūpas tasmād ajāyata | sādhvī
29 śākunamālākhyā saddharmyā tanmahisy a
30 bhūt || 10 || śrīmallaṇāmadheyo sti prathama
31 s tanayas tayoḥ | jayanta iva lakṣmīvā
32 n śacīnamucīvidviṣoḥ || 11 || atha
33 khyāti – – – yo jāv īśvaratām agāt | tena
34 śrīnāgarājena semjāpuryāṁ sthiti[h] kṛtā || 12 ||

1) The syllable ma written below the line.
2) Metri causa for vigrahaḥ?
1 oṃ svasti | tasmāc cāpas tasmāc cāpilla
2 krāśicalla iti tasmāt | tasmāt krādhi
3 calla krācallas tata iti kramād bhūpāḥ | 13 |
4 krācallajo bhūbhṛd aśokacallo digbhitti
5 śu kṣāntilatām tatāna | jītārimalla
6 s tanayo tha tasya tasyātmajo thākṣaya
7 mallanāmā | 14 || aśokasuta ānāmda
8 mallas tadanu tadbhavāḥ | ripumallo tha saṃgrāma
9 mallas tasya tanūbhavāḥ || 15 || āditya
10 malla tho jītārisūmuh kalyāṇa
11 mallasya nrpasya mātā | kālyāṇa
12 mallih prathate sma bhūmau pratāpamaḷā
glayabhṛt kṣitiśaḥ || 16 || sa svayaṃ nā
garājasya naivāseṣaṣyaḥ anvayaṃ | atha
15 gelānvyayāḥ pūṇyamallas tatrābhyaṣi
cyāta | 17 || tataḥ śakunamālāya
17 ś caṃdrāmālābhidhām1) sutā | sutas ca pr
18 thvīmallaḥkhyo jātāu tatra kramādi
19 mau || 18 || samrājaṣakulārṇava
20 samāyātamahēbhṛtāṃ | vīraśriprthi
21 vīmallaḥ khyātakirtir vījāte || 19 ||
22 dhanāni dadatārthibhyo dharmakarmāṇi
23 kurvatā | prthvī mallena bhūbhārtrātithya
24 kṛtayugikṛtā || 20 || tasyaikā dha
25 rmaṃālākhyā dipamālāhavayāparā
26 ubhe devyau vījāte viṃśor bhumiśri2)
27 yāv iva || 21 || bhiksūṇāṃ dvijadhā

1) Sic for abhidhā.
2) bhumi metri causa for bhūmi: bhūdevī is the second wife of Viṣṇu:
28 mabhāṇakāṇāṁ sūtradhārakā
d 29 ṇām ca njarājye sarvakarās te
30 nācāmdrārkatārakaṁ tyaktāḥ || 22 ||
31 bālasarasvatisumatiṃpraśastim aka
32 rod imāṁ kalāṇipuṇah | abhivija
33 yasimhaḥ sudhiḥ caturaḥ śivarājasū
34 tradhāraś ca || 23 || grahamśisūryaganābde
35 śāke jyeṣṭhaḥ — — cakre | sudyahe bhānu
36 vāre sau kirti — — rāśināḥ 1) || 24 2) ||

Then on the left side, at the bottom: śrīśāke 1279.

§ 7. — Pālas and Mallas. The great importance of this inscrip-
tion is evident. It gives us the genealogy of two families, who a
at a certain moment coalesce. The Mallas here mentioned have
nothing in common with the Mallas against whom Mā-
nadeva fought; theirs is a title which they took, as we shall
see, after a certain time of their rule. I give here the series of
the kings of the two families as far as the names are still legible.

A) (ādityavamśa)

Ādipāla
Amarapāla
Jāyapāla
Vijayādipāla
Śrīvīrapāla
Vikramapāla
Śrīpāla
Śrīdhārapāla
Somapāla
Śuryapāla
Samudrapāla
Sukhāpāla
Vigrahapāla

1) The reading of this stanza except the date is uncertain. After jyeṣṭhaḥ one
could read śatame; in this case ā would be missing. But the date can be either
sunday 2 or 9 jyeṣṭha, śukla, 21 or 22 May 1357.

2) Metres: 1 śloka, 2 upajāti, 3 indravajrā, 4 śloka, 5-8 uncertain metres 9-13 śloka, 14 upajāti, 15 śloka, 16 upajāti, 17-21 śloka, 22-23 gīti.
Mahāpāla

Śrījāyākhyā

Pūṇyamalla + who marries Śakunamālā

Śrīmalla

B)

1 Nāgarāja
Cāpa
Cāpilla
Krāśicalla
Krādhidealla
Krācalla
Asokacalla

Jitārimalla

Ānandamalla

Akṣayamalla
Ādityamalla
Kalyāṇamalla 1)

Ripumalla
Sangrāhamalla

Pratāpamalla

Puṇyamalla + Śakunamālā
(from the previous family)

Candraśāla Prthvimalla

Dharmamālā

Dipamālā

It appears that Pratāpamalla had no scions and that after him Puṇyamalla of the other family of the Sela 2) was enthroned, thus continuing the progeny of Nāgadeva. This Puṇyamalla married Śakunamālā and was the father of Prthvimalla; the sister of the latter was Candraśāla; Prthvimalla married Dharmamālā and Dipamālā who shone as two śrī of Viṣṇu descended on earth.

Prthvimalla is praised for having exempted for ever from taxation, the bhiṣu, the brahmins (dvija), the preachers (dharma bhāṇaka) and the artisans sūtra dharma raka. The inscription distinguishes the poet Abhivijayaśimha and the sūtra dharaka Śivarāja; the former is the author of the praśasti and the latter engraved

1) From the inscription it is uncertain whether this is the son of Ādityamalla or of Sangrāhamalla. I follow DT, GR, DM.

2) Or Gela.
it on the jayastambha. The sūtradhāra, sūtra-
dhāraka is the artisan, as is well known in epigraphic
records.

§ 8. — The inscription agrees with the Tibetan Chronicles.
This incRIPTION has a great bearing on the history of Western
Tibet and it confirms that the genealogies of the kings of Guge,
as preserved in the Tibetan chronicles, apart from orthographical
errors, are fairly exact; their accuracy goes as far as to mention
the change which took place after Pratāpamalla.

We know in fact from the rGyal rabs gsal bai
me loṅ, the Deb t'er snon po, dPa'o gtsug
lag ap'ren ba, Sum pa mk'an po and other
historical books or authors that a dynasty, called in Tibet
rMāl or sMāl, ruled over Guge in Western Tibet. They
succeeded, at a certain time, to the IDe family, which claimed
to descend from the kings of Lhasa, conquered Guge and
settled in the later country when, after the murder of gLaṅ
dar ma (842 A.D.), Tibet fell into great disorder. I have
given in Indo-Tibetica, vol. II, Rin c'en bzaṅ po e la rinascita
del Buddhismo nel Tibet intorno al mille, p. 17 ff.1) the list
of these kings of Guge, but it will now be useful to republish
it here according to the various Tibetan historical sources.

Grags pa rgyal mts'an (1147-1256) Vol. Ta, p. 199

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K'ri sKyid ldiṅ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dPal gyi mgon rules over:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hKra šis mgon:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žan žuṅ p'yī and naṅ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu roṅ (sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya rtse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sDe gtsug mgon:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K'u bu la soqs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon yul rnams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Roma, Accademia d'Italia, 1933.
G. Tucci

ṣP'ags pa, Vol. Ba, p. 361, b

ṣKyid lde

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dPal mgon:</th>
<th>bKra ṣis mgon:</th>
<th>lDe gtsug mgon:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mar luṅs kyi</td>
<td>Žaṅ ṣuṅ p'yi naṅ,</td>
<td>K'u ḷbu pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>btsad mo rnam:</td>
<td>P'u raṅs pa,</td>
<td>Mon yul na 'ā ci rigs pa yod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all the rulers of</td>
<td>Ya ts'e pa.</td>
<td>(all sorts of tribes in the country of the Mon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar luṅs are descended from him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buston, Ya, p. 131, b

(Obermiller, p. 200 and 215)

Ni ma mgon banished to mña' ris builds Ni sṅu in Pu raṅ (in the Lhasa ed.: Ni gzuṅs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dPal gyi lde</th>
<th>bKra ṣis</th>
<th>lDe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rig pa lde</td>
<td>gtsug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgon: mgon:</td>
<td>mgon:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar yul (Lhasa Pu raṅ)</td>
<td>Žaṅ ṣuṅ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.: Maṅ yul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ṣK'o r lde (Lhasa ed.; ṣK'o re) (Ye ṣes 'od)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he founds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mT'o līṅ (līṅ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sroṅ lde (Lhasa ed.; Sroṅ ṅe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lha lde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 'Od lde, mña' | Zi ba 'od (cal- |
|---------------| led p'o braṅ)1) | Byaṅ c'ub |
| bdag, ruler | 'od (btsun pa) |
| rTse lde |
| dBaṅ lde |

1) ṣP'o braṅ is the title of the second son in a ruling family.

This fact helps us to understand a document found in Tun-huang and edited some years ago by Marcelle Lalou (IHQ, XVI, 1940, p. 292). This document belongs to the time of K'rī gtsug lde btsan viz. Raṅ pa can and it tells of some meritorious actions such as writings of holy texts and building of a mc'od rten. Then the document adds Jo m'o btsan mo ṣP'an gyi sras gyi p'o braṅ 'od srṅ gi sku yon du, which Mlle Lalou, ibid., p. 297 translates: "the queen as a gift from the 'Od srṅ Palace of the ṣP'an yun sras".

I think that the text should be understood in a different way: "as a gift of prince 'Od srṅ the son of the mother ṣP'an btsan mo". As a matter of fact we gather from PT that 'Od srṅ was the son of bTsan mo ṣP'an of the Ts'e spoṅ clan (Ts'e spoṅ bzn').

This interpretation confers a special importance to the text in question because it confirms the validity of the Tibetan genealogies which tell us that 'Od srṅ was one of the two sons of gLaṅ dar ma and exactly of bTsan mo ṣP'an: the fact that he is called p'o braṅ shows that he was the younger of the two: on the other hand, the reference to his mother implicitly indicates that the wives of gLaṅ dar ma were more than one.
Debe't'or (Blue Annals, p. 37)

Ñi ma mgon (moved to mña' ris)

dPal gyi mgon:
Mar yul

bKra šis lde mgon:
sPu hrañs

IDe gtsugs mgon:
Cuge, viz. Žañ šuña

qK'or re
(became a monk)

Sroñ ñe

Nāgarāja
Devarāja
became a monk
became a monk

Lha sde [corr.: lde]

'Od lde

rTse lde = 1076
his son was: (but p. 325: his son: dBañ p'yug lde,

aBar sde
bKra šis lde
Bha lde
Nāgadeva
bTsan p'yug lde
bKra šis lde
Grags btsan lde
Grags pa lde
A šog lde

Then:

p. 913 P'yar c'en, other son)
his sons:

ţji dar rmal   A nan rmal
A jid rmal    Reu rmal; then:
Ka laň rmal   Sangha rmal
Bar btab rmal

with him the royal lineage of Ya rtse came to an end.

dPao gtsug  āp′reũ ba
Ja. p. 141, b.

Ni mgon
(mNa′ ris)

Two ministers:
ţaň Pa ts′ab Rin c′en sde and Cog ro Legs sgra(?) lha legs accompanied him up to
Bye ma gyuñ druñ 1); he was asked to be king of the people of mNa′ ris
b skor gsum. He founded the castle of Ňi bzuũs in sPu raũs and,
as agreed, the two ministers sent him their daughters as wives.

from Cog ro bza′:
the three sTod mgon are descended:

dPal gyi lde rig    bKra′ šis  lDe gtsug
pa mgon:    lDe mgon:    mgon:
Mar yul      sPu raũs   Ňaň ţaň

Sroñ ſe               ŇK′or re
Nāgarādsa and Devarādsa
(then called Lha Bia ma ye šes′od)
K′a c′ar(Kojarnāth)
founded mT′o liñ
dpal gyi lha k′aň
Lha lde

′Od lde               P′o brañ   btsun pa Byaũ
rTse lde               Ži ba′ od   c′ub′od
(invites Atiša)

sBar lde; then in succession:

bKra′ šis lde          became rulers
Lha lde                  (btsan po) of
Nāgadeva               mNa′ ris
(then his son:)
bTsan p′yug lde
became mna′ bdag
of Ya tse (Follows on page 55)

1) This is the river Chemayungdrun, Chema yundung, (discussion in SVEN HEDIN,
Southern Tibet, s.v. Chema-yund(o)ung(gl)—chu, General Index. Vol. IX. Bye ma sa
t′aň is near Kojarnāth; see below p. 61.
PRELIMINARY REPORT

bKra šis lde
Grags btsan lde
Grags pa lde
A šo ga lde

(he bought from the Sog po forty-two groñ, villages, which had been offered by A šo ka to rDo rje gdan, Bodhgayā)

qJi t’ar smal
A jid smal (4)
(lha btsun in Sa skyā; afterwards he takes over again the kingdom.
(the family of Ya tse is extinguished. Therefore from Pu raña bSod nams lde is invited)
Punya smal (bSod nams lde) (5)
Priti smal (6) who with his minister dPal ldam grags acted as dānapati of Sa skyā).

Nor Chronicles
p. 130, b

Ni ma mgon
dPal gyi mgon:
bKra šis mgon:
Maṅ yul
he took possession of the castle (sku mk’ar) of the father: Ni zuñ:
Pu hraña, Glo bo, Dol po, Gu ge
Ya tse etc.

'Od kyi rgyal mts'an
Sroṅ ṇe
he founds T'o liṅ and hands over the kingdom to the son of his brother (he is ordained as Ye šes ’od)

4K’or re
Lha lde

1) The numbers within brackets refer to the order of succession.
2) Sources: Bu ston and Yar luña Jo bo rje. The kings between A jid smal and bSod nams lde are missing. Perhaps the copyists left out a few lines.
G. Tucci


sKyid sde ŋi ma mgon
king in mña' ris but: sPu rañ la'ñ dbañ bsgyur ("ruled also over sPu rañ")

dPal gyi mgon: bKra šis mgon, sDe (corr.: lDe) btsun mgon;
Mar yul
(from him up to
Jo bo ras c'en)
ŠK'o re
(he founded K'a c'ar)
Bla ma Ye šes 'od
he founded mT'oñ mt'iuñ
Lha lde
Nāgarāja, Devarāja

Ži ba 'od
Lha bla ma 'Od lde
Byañ c'ub 'od

bTsan lde
(dei sras: his son)
Bha le

bKrašis lde
(de nas rim pa bzin du ḍdi rnams kyis gu ge spu rañs mar yul
la sogs dbañ byas pa yin no, then there were in succession
the following kings (names) who became rulers of Guge, sPu rañs, Mar yul etc.)

bTsan p'yug lde
Ya rtser byon te rgyal po mdsad ("he went to Ya rtse
and became king")

bKra šis lde
Grags btsan lde
Grags pa lde
A roq lde
A sog lde

Dsì dar smal and A nan ta smal

Ri lu smal
he presented the gser t'oñ to

San gha smal əDsì t'ar smal
dBu t'oñ of the jo bo of Lhasa

San gha smal əDsì t'ar smal
əDsì smal
Ka len smal
Par rti smal
bSod nams sde
(Pu ni smal)
Pri tì smal

the royal lineage (rgyal rgyud) of
Ya rtse comes to an end with Par rti
smal. The mña' bdag bSod nams
de is invited from Pu rañs

with his minister dPal ldan grags he
presents the gser t'oñ of sPyan
ras gzigs with eleven heads of Lhasa.
PRELIMINARY REPORT

Debt'er dmarp'o, p. 38

Ni ma mgon

(mNuna' ris)

founds Ni bzañ in sPu brañas

Rig ma  bKra šis  IDe gtsug
mgon:  mgon:  mgon:
Mar yul  sPu brañas  Žan šuñ

스크'ор ре  Sroñ ņe

(Ye šes 'od)

Lha lde  Na ga ra dsa  De va ra dsa

'Od lde  Ži ba 'od  Byañ c'ub 'od

rTse lde
aBar lde
bKra šis lde ("then in succession");
Bha e
Na ga lde
bTsan p'yug lde

(again; yañ)  bKra šis lde
Grags btsan lde
A sog lde
A nan smal
Reu smal
JI dar smal ("then in succession");
A aji rmal
Ka lan rmal
Par ti rmal; the Ya tse family comes to an end.
bSod nams lde (from sPu brañas)
sPri ti smal

1) The contrary statement concerning these two princes contained in Bustin is attributed to the Yig tsañ of K'ri t'añ Dsña na i.e., Jáña, a man of Western Tibet (cf. Blue Annals, I, 68; II, 1085); he was the author of a biography of Rin c'en bzañ po.

[ 57 ]
Fifth Dalai Lama's Chronicles, 46 b.

Ñi ma mgon:
  mña' ris

dPal lde
  rig mgon:
    Mana yul
bKra šis
  lde mgon:
    sPu raňs
  gtsug mgon:
    Zaň žuň
  qK'or re (Ye šes 'od)
    Sroň âne
    Lha lde
  'Od lde: Ži ba Byaň c'ub 'od 'od
    rTse lde
    qBar lde
    bKra šis lde
    Bha ne ("his son"): Nâ ga de va
    bTsan p'yug lde: he goes to Ya ts'e
    bKra šis lde
    Grags btsan lde
    Grags pa lde
    A so lde

qDsi dar rmal
A dsid rmal (but wrongly: dei
[Sangha rmal] sras qdsi dar rmal
gyi sras); he first goes to Sa
skya then back to the throne
Ka lan rmal
Par btab rmal (the family of Ya
ts'e coming to an end bSod nams
lde from Pu raň is invited and
is called:) Puñya rmal

A nan rmal
Riu rmal
San gha rmal
Preliminary Report

Pad ma dkar po
p. 107 a.

Ni ma mgon:
banished in mNaN' ris stod:

dPal gyi mgon
lDe gtsug mgon
bKra shis mgon
(they are called Žva tsam c'ags 1) or Ya rtse rgyal po
'Od kyi rgyal mts'an

Sroñ ânc
he founds mT'o ldiñ in
Guge (Ye šes 'od); his two sons are ordained;
he hands over the government to Lha lde
'Od lde Byañ c'ub 'od Ži ba 'od

Sum pa mk'an po, p. 152

Ni ma mgon

dPal lde rig pa mgon: bKra shis lde mgon: lDe btsun mgon:
Mañ yul spu rañs Žañ žuñ, Gu ge

Sroñ ânc
Lha lde

'Od lde Byañ c'ub 'od Ži ba 'od
rtse lde
qBar lde
bKra shis lde
Bha lde
Na ga de va
bTsan p'yug lde (Ya ts'er byon, he went to Ye ts'e)
bKra shis lde
Grags btsan lde
Grags pa lde (Folows on the page 60)

1) Viz.: the “hat” the other descendents of bKra shis brtseg are called; Lham tsam c'ags, “the boots”.
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A so lde
A dsin dar rmal and An na rmal
Reu rmal
(des rgya gar pai mi sde ma'n po blaṅ pa:
"he took possession of many territories in India")
Saṅ gha rmal
sdSin dar rmal
A gdsin rmal
(his is ordained in Sa skyā; he then comes back
to his seat)
Ka lan rmal
Par tab rmal
(Ya ts'ei rgyud c'ad: "the family of Ya rtse
comes to end")
bSod nams lde comes to Ya ts'e
(his is then called Pu ṣya rmal)
Prat'i rmal
(his minister is dPal ldan grags pa)

Chronicles of Ladakh
p. 92

'Od srun protected mNa' ris according to religion
lDe dpal šk'or btsan; 8 monasteries are founded by him in
Upper mNa' ris
sKyid lde Ni ma mgon
K'ri bKra šis rtseg dpal
he proceeds to the west:
he is invited to Pu hraṅs and founds Ni xuṅs
he conquers; mNa' ris skor gsum

Lha 'en dPal gyi mgon:
Mar yul of mNa' ris
bKra šis mgon:
Guge, Pu-hraṅs
IDE gtsug mgon:
rtse ( = Ya rtse)
Zaṅs dkar, Spiti,
Spi lcogs

As we can see, the Tibetan sources generally agree as
regards the genealogies of the kings of Guge, the only differ-
ence being that some of them, depending on the early Sa
skyā pa chronicles, ignore the sMal, rMal, Malla family; on
the other hand, later chronicles like DT, PT, GR, fifth Dalai Lama, contain the list of the kings of Malla descent and record the fusion of the two branches of Purang and Guge.

We also know from GR and PT that the source responsible for this supplement was the yig tsa'ani of gSer t'og pa Rin c'en rdo rje (GR) which must be the same as the c'os ab yu'n of the Yar lu's jo bo rje (PT, ja, 142, b) 1).

The concordance between the Tibetan chronicles (viz. their source) and the inscription proves that Rin c'en rdo rje had access to the family archives of the Mallas or even, which is more probably, that he had a copy of a prasasti similar to that of Dullu: it is quite probable that Prthvimalla had many javastambhas such as that of Dullu erected in the most important centres of his kingdom. It is likely that some of them, written in Tibetan, where made for his Tibetan territories. We can thus explain how the Tibetan author so faithfully relates the genealogy, giving the same particulars as those found in our inscription. The minister of Prthvimalla is also rightly mentioned in the Tibetan chronicles: he is the Yaso-varman recorded in the inscription on the reservoir near Dullu.

We can add to the sources quoted the partial genealogy contained in the guide (dkar c'a'g) of Kojarnath, a famous Sa skya temple on the border between Tibet and Nepal, to the E. of Taklakot (G. Tucci, Santi e Briganti, p. 38 ff. 2). The title of this guide is Lhar bcas ągro bai m'od sdo'n jo bo d'nul sku mc'ed gsum ąon byu'n gi gtam ran brjod pai rin c'en... vai ąurya ąon poi pi wa'n. The booklet is an eulogium of ąK'or ąc'a'gs (Kojarnath in Bye ma sa t'a'ni founded by ąK'or re) and of the three silver

1) See TPS, p. 635.
images still worshipped there (G. Tucci, *Santi e Briganti*, p. 40). They were the work of two artists, a Nepalese Aśvadharna and a Kashmirian Vañ ku la, p. 6, a) and represent: Šes rab gyi lha ājam dpal ye šes sems dpal’, carved according to the rgya lungs, Indian system, with P’yag na pad ma to his right and P’yag na rdo rje to his left 1). After king sBa le (= Bha le of GR), Koj. adds: “after him there arose, in succession, Bla c’en sTag tsa k’ri ąbar, then his sons K’ri bkra šis dnos grub mgon and gNam mgon sde. At that time bkra šis sde of the family of the c’oš rgyal of Guge came to ḳK’or c’ags in Pur aṅ (p. 12, a)”. “Afterwards the C’oš rgyal A mgon bzaṅ po 2) had in mind the fortune of the holy teaching and of the living beings and repaired the three sorts of religious objects (ṛten gsūm 3) p. 12, b)”. Then the Hor invaded Guge and robbed the temple 4).

On the genealogy of the kings this book is rather vague; it once says that Nāgarāja and Devarāja were sons of Sroṅ ne (= Ye šes ‘od) and then states that K’o c’ar was founded by ḳK’or re before he was ordained and attributes Lha deva to him as his son, this view being accepted also by other writers: but this name seems a reduplication of Devarāja, lha and deva being identical, (one is Tib. and the other is Sanskrit) or deva is a mistake for sde as in DT etc. Anyhow, the genealogy of these kings is according to the book as follows:

1) There is a tradition that an image of T’ugs rje c’en po was brought there from Chitor by two princes who fled when the town was captured by the Mohammedans and went to the Manasarovar to take shelter (aDsam gliṅ rgyas bṣad). The connection of Kojarnath with Jumla is referred by the same source which states that some images of Kojarnath were made in Jumla.
2) This is the c’oš rgyal of Glo bo: A mgon bzaṅ po, see above p. 19, f.
3) sku, gsun, t’ugs.
4) Most probably the invasion here alluded to is that of Zain ul-Abidin (1420-1470) who went as far as Guge, L. PETECH, *A study on the chronicles of Ladakh*, Calcutta 1939, p. 115.
Guide of Kojarnath

ña ma mgon: Mañ yul and Pu rañ

Dpal gyi mgon:
Mañ yul
(up to Jo bo ras c'en
cf. GR above p. 56)

bKra śis
mgon:
Pu rañ

IDe tsg mgon:
žañ žeñ
occupies ńis bzuñ
of Pu rañ and
marries ęBrom bza'

őK'o röl)
Lha-deva

Sroñ âe
(Ye sès 'od)

3 sons the
middle one being
Byañ c'ub 'od and
the youngest 'Od lde

bTsan lde

śBa le; then in succession:

śTag ts'a k'ri ąbar

K'ri bKra śis
dńos grub mgon

ǹam mgon sde; he marries ą:
Jo ąbum rgyal mo
K'ri bKra śis rgyal po lde
K'ri bKra śis stobs btsan lde
Lha btsun rDo rje seà ge
K'ri bKra śis bsod nams lde

1) He also was ordained choosing as his b'Ia m a Dsam giñ C'os rje of dKar duñ (on this place see Tucci, Senti e Briganti, p. 52 ff): he founded the castle of dKar duñ and that of őK'o c'ags.

2) Under his rule K'ri bkra śis sde of Guge came to őK'o c'ags in Pu rañ and protected the temple from the danger of the river.
This list starts with the usual genealogy of the descendants of De g t s u g m g o n, ruler of Ža n žu n, and with many omissions follows it up to ṣa B a l e. Its probable source has been the GR; in fact it gives the same information about Ma n y u l and Jo b o r a s c e n and it agrees with GR on the general spelling of the names: (b Ts a n l d e as the successor of O d l d e instead of the usual r T s e l d e etc.). But there the agreement with other lists ceases. The family name or title K’rī is added to many names.

Moreover, it is said, as we saw, that at the time of K’rī b K r a ś i s d ū o s g r u b and g N a m m g o n the king of G u g e b K r a ś i s s d e came to P u r a n (where Kojarnath is located) which seems to imply that here the genealogy of the kings of Purang or at least a fragment thereof is contained. Most probably these names prefixed by the family name K’rī are those of the local rulers who had become vassals of the founders of the Malla dynasty of which we are now speaking.

As can easily be realized there is a general agreement among these lists: the major difference concerning the identity of Ye š e s ’ o d who according to one group of texts was ṣa K’or re B, DT, VDL, SP, while according to others he was Sro n ū e; PT, N, GR, DM, PK, Koj; this implies that Nāgarāja and Devarāja are said by B, SP to be the sons of ṣa K’or re who begot them before being ordained, and by PT, GR, DM, PK, the sons of Sro n ū e; in any case they are the sons of the king who when ordained took the name of Ye š e s ’ o d.

As regards Lha l d e (in Koj, Lha deva mistake for Lha l d e? see p. 62) “who continues the family” he is the son of Sro n ū e according to B, DT, SP, but according to PT, N, GR, DM, VDL, PK of ṣa K’or re, though for the VDL ṣa K’or re is Ye š e s ’ o d; this means that there has been a confusion between Devarāja the son of ṣa K’or re before being ordained and Lha
PRELIMINARY REPORT

Ide: the confusion was perhaps caused by the similarity of the name Lha = deva.

Then we cannot fail to notice that there are two names which are differently spelt in our sources and which follow RTse Ide: these two names being ʰBar Ide, ʰBar sde and Bha le, ʰBha le, Lha Ide (PT) (Bha ne in VDL, who calls him the father of Nāgadeva) predecessor of Nāga Ide, Nāgadeva. For the first name a Tibetan origin may be possible (ʰbar, ʰbar ba) but DT which praises his devotion calls him dBaṅ p’yuṅ Ide— and speaks also of one brother: so the tradition as regards this prince is not certain. The case of Bha le, ʰBha le, Lha Ide, Bha ne is more complicated; the uncertainty of the spelling points to some change in the lineage That there was a kind of split, that the record was preserved of some new occurrence in Western Tibetan history is proved not only by the new dynastic title rMal, sMal, Malla and by the Sanskrit turn of the royal names but also by the statements contained in some of these lists:

After ʰBar Ide PT says: "then in succession bKra ʰsīs Ide, Lha Ide, Nāgadeva became generally (p’al c’er) masters of mNa’ ris "; after ʰBha le GR states: "then in succession bKra ʰsīs Ide, Bha re, Nāga Ide became masters of Guge, sPu raṅs, Mar yul etc." as to show that there was a change. We shall see how far the data of the inscription throw some light on this problem; for the time being we can only state, as we saw, that these Western Tibetan genealogies seem to go back to two main sources one being represented by DT, VDL, SP and the other by PT, Ñ, GR, DM, PK, Koj.

Now comparing the data of the Tibetan chroniclers and the list on our inscription, it would appear that there is almost complete agreement between the two series of documents, as is shown by the following scheme:
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The succession is clear except for Kalyāṇamalla and Pratāpamalla, but from DT, GR (see p. 50) DM we gather that Kalyāṇa was the son of Ādityamalla. GR duplicates the name of āDsī dar smal, see p. 56.

§ 9. — Chronology. Now as to chronology, we have some points which seem well ascertained. The religious council of rTse lde was held in the year 1076. An inscription at Balesvar (Sui Bisung) dated 1223 (cf. G. Goetz, Chronology of the Chand dynasty, p. 51 from Führer and Atkinson) mentions king

Kṛacalla Deva Jina of Kāntipura who most probably is the Kṛacalla of our list.

The translation of this inscription has been published, so far as we can guess (because the text is not reproduced), in a very imperfect way by Atkinson vol. II, p. 516 ff.; from it we learn that Kṛacalla was a devout Buddhist and that he had destroyed Kārtipura. The inscription was issued in Dullu and it is dated 1145 Sāka = A.D. 1223. Aśokacalla is also not unknown; (see Kielhorn, Inscriptions of Northern India, EI, V, p. 79; Kielhorn reads wrongly Aśokamalla; so also in Bhandarkar's list of Inscriptions of Northern India, EI, IX ff., nn. 1454, 1467, 1468). Mention of him is made in three inscriptions found in Bodhgayā; one of them (Journ. Bo. As. Society, XVI, p. 357, Cunningham, Mahābodhi, p. 78, plate XXVIII), is dated in Lakṣmaṇa era 51 (reedited EI, XII, p. 29).

The second inscription records a Sahaṇapāla a treasurer of Daśaratha younger brother of Aśokacalla king of the Khaṣa in Sapādalakṣa mountains and is dated Lakṣmaṇa era 74 (IA, X, p. 346. EI, XII, p. 29).

Mention of the same king is made in an inscription of Puruṣottamamśimha of the Kama (Kumaon) country, dated nirvāṇa era 1813, IA, X, p. 341 ff. and XLVIII, 43 ff., JBORS, IV, 273.

The nirvāṇa era begins in 543 B.C.: as regards the Lakṣmaṇa era much has been written; according to Kielhorn it should start in 1118 A.D. according to Majumdar in 1200 ca. A.D.

According as we accept the one or the other theory we have two different datations:


The calculation of Kielhorn must be excluded on account of the date of Krācalla: that of Majumdar is highly probable; there are, it is true, only 83 years to cover the reign of 9 kings from Jitārimalla successor of Aśokacalla and the first inscription of Prīthvimalla dated 1357: but some of these kings ruled, if they ruled at all, for a short time; Ādityamalla took the vows; the reign of Pratāpamalla seems also to have been short 1).

As regards ḍrisi, Dit, in other sources wrongly written ḍrisin smal = Ādityamalla, we know from the DT, Blue Annals, p. 605 that in the year 1219 he was initiated by Sesābyuṇ: he is called in DT mna’ bdag gya’ts’epa, lord of gYat’s.e. But there is no doubt that this date is wrong; Ādityamalla cannot be younger than Krācalla and a longer interval than required is thus given between him and Punyamalla: the date of DT cannot therefore be accepted. As regards Prīthvimalla the stele of Dullu is dated Śāka 1279 = 1357; the kana karatra of Jumla (see below) is dated Śāka 1289 = 1376 A.D.

But let us now return to the front of the inscription. Why is it that in this we find another genealogical list? The reply is clear when we remember what we read in the inscription itself and in the Tibetan chronicles as well, that when Pratāpamalla died without leaving any issue (he had been a monk in Sa skya), the throne of Guge (capital Ya rtse) fell into the hands of the rulers of sPu raṅ, sPu hraṅs. This explains why the inscription contains two vaṃṣāvalīs, that of Punyamalla from sPu raṅ and that of the kings of Guge whose throne he occupied, when the lineage of the c’os

1) It is worthy of notice that the Tibetan tradition have preserved the record of the pious activities of Aśokacalla in Gayā, see p. 55.
rgyal of the latter country came to an end. It is also clear why, if this is the case, Prthvīmallā begins the genealogical table engraved on the inscription with his own family and places on the second face of the stele the genealogy of the Mallas (from Nāgarāja) whom he succeeded and of whom he took the dynastic name. But if the reading of A. l. 16 is exact the Pālas had also entered Guge. (Goha = Goggadesa of Jonarāja?).

Now this inscription raises many a problem: are these two families, of which the vamśāvalīs are here preserved, directly descended from the Lhasa kings as the chronicles would have us to believe?

One might have been tempted to see a change in the royal genealogy of Guge just when the name sMal, rMal, i.e. the Indian name Malla, takes the place of the older dynastic title ldē. But our inscription points out that this change took place before, at the time of the king called Nāgarāja evidently the same as Nāgadeva of the Tibetan sources.

More than that, we may recall what we said before that there are traces of some new events in the history of Western Tibet also in the Tibetan lists: they show, though indirectly, that some change happened with _ability, (see above p. 65) though the real, definitive split happens to be during the times of Nāgadeva: with him the series of the Tibetan names gives place to a purely Indian name; after Aśoka that becomes the rule. On the other hand, the name of the ancestor, Nāgadeva is followed by strange names Ćāpilla, Kṛāśicalla, Kṛādhicalla, Kṛācalla, Aśokacalla: we have seen that they correspond to the Tibetan names:

Ćāpilla = bsTan p'yug ldē
Kṛāśicalla = bKra šis ldē
Kṛādhicalla = Grags btsan ldē
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Krācalla = Grags pa lde
Aśokacalla = A sō ga lde

Krāśi, corresponds phonetically to Tib. bKra śis 1), A sō ga is evidently Aśoka. In Krādhi—calla, Krā—calla, the syllable Krā, in spite of the analogy with Tib. Grags has nothing to do with it. Even now in Western Tibetan grags is pronounced: rag (cf. Jäschke s. v.) nor is there any possibility to explain Krādhi with Grags btsan. The second part of their names calla has as its regular counterpart Tib. lde, but it cannot be a transcription of lde; names like Cāpilla occur in other places, in Kashmir, e.g. Cavillākara the predecessor of Kalhana; in Chambā, Sāhilla (on the suffix: illa cf. Pischel, Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen, p. 402 ff.). On the other hand, we may rightly surmise that bKra śis, Grags pa, Grags btsan etc., are adaptations into Tibetan of personal names of foreign or non-Tibetan character; calla may be an epithet rendered when their names were given a Tibetan form, into lde on the pattern of the title of the previous Tibetan kings; in other words it may be that these rulers, coming from some other part of the Himalayas, and who called themselves Khasa as Aśokalla did in his Gayā inscription (see p. 67), took in Tibet or were given the dynastic names of their predecessors; that there was in the Tibetan part of their kingdom a Tibetanization appears also, as I stated, from the fact that after the sanskrit name Nāgarāja, the genealogical lists followed for a while the Tibetan onomastic patterns.

From our inscription we also gather another very important item of information. We know from the Tibetan sources that the son of Nāgadeva bTsan lde p’yug took possession of Ya ts’e, Ya rtse, Ya tse (PT, GR, VDL, SP) and that when the lineage of the Malla came to an end with Pratāpamalla, Pūnyamalla from Purang came to the capital of the

1) Though most probably, at that time, final s was pronounced.
kings of Guge; this capital being Y a t s ’ e . The first conclusion to be drawn from these statements is that the ancestors of Puṇyamalla were the rulers of Purang and those of Nāgadeva of Guge. We shall come back to this point.

In conclusion the lists preserved by the Tibetan sources cannot be taken as representing the linear succession of rulers of one and the same family. An invasion from the south-west followed the arrival in Guge of some families from Central Tibet, who were responsible for the first efficient introduction of the Tibetan culture after the colonization started with K’ri sröṅ lde btsan and its conquests. Though the inscription of Dullu is very difficult to read, from what is legible we gather that there was a kingdom in Cīna \(^1\) and that in a battle “a j a u” Nāgārāja defeated it and therefore he established his capital is Semjā. There followed a period of unrest during which these families tried to enlarge their dominions at the expense of their neighbours, and with varying fortunes. But which were the territories they occupied? How far did their dominions go? it is difficult to say which were the boundaries and limits of these two countries Purang and Guge: the problem is related to that of the extension of mÑa’ris skor gsum, more complicated than it appears at first hand because the limits and the divisions of this large province varied at different dates. A few words should therefore be added concerning the Tibetan country over which these kings ruled, now generally called Guge, as being a part of mÑa’ris skor sum.

§ 10. – Žaṅ žuṅ and its extension. I refer to what I have written in TPS; it appears from the sources there collected (Vol. I, p. 252, n. 36 and vol. II, p. 681, n. 52) that mÑa’ris was included in the division of the country into c’ol k’a and k’ri skor made by the Yüan emperors. The

\(^1\) Perhaps another reference to being a king of Cīna and therefore of Guge (Goha) is, as we saw in A. II. 16-17; but the reading is doubtful (see above, p. 47).
Yüan shih, chap. 87, p. 14 records a Yüan shuai in Na li su ku erh sun which is evidently mNa’ ris skor sum. This shows that mNa’ ris was already divided at the time of the Yüan into three skor or districts. Which were at that time the three districts? It seems to me that Mar yul, viz, Ladakh and surrounding centres, Guge and Purang had at different times different extensions.

We infer from the Chronicles of the V Dalai Lama that the mNa’ ris, over which the Mongols extended their nominal suzerainty, stretched as far as Lartse in Purig, the rulers of Ladakh, Guge and Purang maintaining their principalities under the distant supervision or control of the Mongols and their vicars the Sa skyā pa hierarchs. This is implicitly stated by the Dam p'ai c'os abyun ts'ul which tells us that mNa’ ris skor gsum was represented by Mal yul mts’o Guge and Purang. Guge and Purang are well defined, the name Mal yul of the same text can be corrected either into Mar yul or into Mañ yul 1).

Mañ yul is a district of Southern and South Western Tsang, bordering on Nepal, its foremost place being Skyid grön, Kirong. Mañ yul at the time of the Mongols had become an integral part of Tibet. That region had been to a large extent the theatre of the activity of Milaraspa. It should therefore not be considered as being identical with Mar yul which corresponds roughly to Ladakh. Indeed mNa’ ris means literally: "part, share of power" as distinct from the provinces of Tibet proper which formed the original confederation of the Tibetan clans united under the king's sway. mNa’ ris represented an area which was the private territory of the king, conquered in the course of wars. Indeed from an old source we know that under the name of Bod yul stod,

1) Or it has preserved the original form: Mal from Mālava name of an himalayan tribe (Ladakh and bordering countries); cf. below, p. 94, n. 1.
Upper Tibet, mNa' ris, many border provinces were included, TPS, vol. I, p. 252, n. 36:
1. skor: Pu raṅs, Mar yul, Zaṅs dkar.
2. skor: Li (Khotan), Gru ża (Bru ża, Gilgit; sBal te (Baltistan).
3. skor: Zaṅ žuṅ, K'ri te stod and smad.

This division is recorded also by the aDsam bu gлин rgyas bśad though here (at least in my copy) some names are misspelt:
1. skor: sPu raṅ, Maṅ yul (= Mar yul), Zaṅs dkar;
2. skor: C'i ba (= Li), Bru ża, sPal ti;
3. skor: Zaṅ žuṅ, K'riig pa (for K'ri ta) stod gsum (corr.: stod smad gsum).

This division is much wider than the usual one: it covers first the westernmost countries of Purang, and Mar yul, which is here evidently Ladakh (and must not be confused with Maṅ yul much farther to the east) and Zaṅs dkar.

Then it includes the northern and north western countries Khotan, Gilgit, and Baltistan. Then it passes to the land between Tibet and the above said provinces, viz. Zaṅ žuṅ, K'ri te upper and lower; in K'ri te (Hsūn tsang: Ki li to) we must recognize the Kirāta, who lie to the east of the Kali-Ganga.

This division though attributed to the Mongols is clearly taken from old sources and reflects a situation going back to the times of the Tibetan kingdom when Tibet controlled a great part of Central Asia. Later, as we gather from the other catalogue contained in the V Dalai Lama's Chronicles and in another passage of the aDsam bu gлин rgyas bśad which reproduce the situation at the time of the

1) From the biography of bSod nams me'og Idan bstan pai rgyal mts'an written by the fifth Dalai Lama, p. 28 a.
Mongols, mña' ris or stod mña’ ris\(^1\) included the following 3 skor:

1. sTag mo, La dvags,
2. Mañ yul, Žaṅ ṣuṅ
3. Guge, Pu hraṅs.

It is difficult to locate sTag mo; it may be the same as Lartse in Purig alluded by the V Dalai Lama’s Chronicles or sTag poi la in the S. W. of Baltistan. Anyhow it is clear that this skor is the westernmost, and included Ladakh. Mañ yul, Žaṅ ṣuṅ corresponds approximately to the country to the right and left of the Indus from Tirthapuri up to Demchog, and Chumurti.

This again shows that this Mañ yul cannot be confused with Mañ yul of Kirong\(^2\). Such a division is no doubt that adopted also at the times of the ōDsam bu glin rgyas bṣad; anyhow it is clear that all catalogues proceed from West to East and not vice versa: therefore this Mañ yul = Mar yul, is different from Mañ yul of Kirong; still this confusion is frequently found in Tibetan sources (cf. f.i. Vai Ḟu rya ser po in Tucci, Tibetan Notes, HJAS, Vol. XII, 1949, p. 491).

It also appears that Guge and Žaṅ ṣuṅ were, at least for a certain time, two different things: Guge is ignored in the oldest list referred to above, and it appears only once in TH and to be exact in the latest fragments when Žaṅ ṣuṅ had already been annexed: Žaṅ ṣuṅ is the only name of the country recorded in the older sections of TH. It was only at a later period that Žaṅ ṣuṅ appears as divided into three parts, one retaining the name of Žaṅ ṣuṅ and corresponding to the country to the west of the Kailāsa up to Toling: K’yuṅ luṅ dūl dkar was its center; Guge was the

\(^1\) Because Mañ yul of rDsoṅ ka also was sometimes considered as mña’ ris it was mña’ ris smad (see above p. 17).

\(^2\) It shows also that Ladakh and Mar yul (Mañ yul) are not coextensive.
portion to the south of the Sutlej, and Purang the southeastern part. In the Bon po books only Žana žuṅ is mentioned.

In fact in the aDsam gling rgyas bsad, p. 10, we read that Guge was to the east of the sde called aDar ba, which is certainly the present Dabadzong to the East of La dvags, Ladakh.

On the other hand, Purang is said to be to the east of Guge straight in front (viz. to the south) of Gaṅs ri viz. Kailāsa, its capital being Ya tṣ'e. We shall return to Ya rtse, but there seems to be little doubt that at the time of the author of the aDsam gling rgyas bsad the capital of Purang was, as it is now, Taklakot.

Therefore Žana žuṅ and Guge are not synonyms. Žana žuṅ was the old name of all western Tibet of which Guge was a part, as is evidenced by some of the sources quoted above.

Žana žuṅ itself was divided into two parts: stod and smad; the name Žana žuṅ slowly disappeared, superseded by that of Guge given to all the country though originally this was only a part of Žana žuṅ. It is the same division recorded by Grags pa rgyal mtshan, the oldest source at our disposal (1147-1216), who makes bKra šis mgon rule over Žana žuṅ exterior and interior, Pu raṅ and Ya rtse. The third share allotted to sDe (= lDe) gtsug mgon was “K'u bo la sogs mon yul, K'u bo ¹) together with the other territories of the Mon”.

The division of Žana žuṅ in stod and smad, upper and lower, goes back at least to the times of K'ri sroṅ lde btsan.

§ 11. – The organization of the Tibetan state during the old dynasty. A very interesting section is contained in PT which gives an idea of the organization of the State said to be in use

¹) Perhaps Kunu.
at the time of Sroṅ btsan sgam po: but references to Buddhism and the names of some officials (rgyal gzig k'ri, sKyes bzaṅ etc.), prove beyond doubt that the document refers, at least in the form known to PT, to the times of K'ri sroṅ lde btsan¹. As a matter of fact the document may be composed of two parts which belong to two different periods: while in the first catalogue the territory is divided into five ru, banners, the non-Tibetan banner being that of the Sum pa, in the military catalogue we have seven banners, Upper Žaṅ žuṅ and Lower Žaṅ žuṅ being included; but we know that Žaṅ žuṅ was definitely annexed under K'ri sroṅ lde btsan though from the times of Sroṅ btsan sgam po it had been reduced to a state of vassalage. The Sumpas on the other hand had already been annexed by Sroṅ btsan sgam po (TH, p. 130). The most ancient catalogue is perhaps that of the army. It is also certain that PT, as usual, copied from the archives to which he had access: this is proved by the similarity with analogous passages contained in bk'ag t'aṅ studied by Prof. F. W. Thomas and myself². Though I am here interested in Žaṅ žuṅ, and

¹ But this does not mean that the organization of the state was not made by Sroṅ btsan sgam po; he was certainly the real founder of the Tibetan power in so far as he succeeded in establishing his unchallenged authority upon the feudal chiefs (the movement had already started with his grand father see TH, p. 133).

PT makes him say that the peace in the kingdom is not caused by the ministers; the ministers are appointed by him: formerly there was no law and the kings or feudal lords (rgya l p'raṅ) were divided and independent. He appointed four ministers for the settlement of the state: (k'os dpön):

mGar sTon btsan yul bzuṅ (TH, p. 139) as k'os dpön for Tibet, K'yuṅ po pun zuṅ tse (TH, p. 139) for Žaṅ žuṅ, Hor bya žu rīn po for Sum pa.

Superintendent of cavalry (c'i bs kyi k'o d dpön): dBas bZaṅ dpal legs.

Superintendent to information, of spies, mt'oon k'yaṅ kyi k'o d dpön (THOMAS, TLT, II, pp. 121, 424 "watchtower" TH, mt'ooṅ k'yaṅ k'ri "division territoriale"): Cog ro rgyal mts'an γyaṅ mgon. They resided respectively in Skyi šod so ma ra (cf. TH, p. 48, 49, 52), K'yuṅ luṅ run mk'ar (the then capital of Žaṅ žuṅ), Nam gza don gram pa ts'ak; the last two in Ri bo γYa'kidmar.

² TLT, p. 276 ff., TPS, p. 737. But the present catalogue reflects the period of the largest expansion of the Tibetan kingdom: it contains 61 sToṅ sde instead of
the passage in question is fully examined in my translation of the work of PT, which is ready for the press, I think it useful to summarize its contents, because it gives the best survey of the Tibetan organisation at the time of the successors of Sroṅ btsan sgam po and allows us to have a better idea of Žañ žuñ.

PT. Ja – 19 a

BOUNDARIES OF THE FIVE BANNERS (Ru)

(Ru mts’ams)

A) dBus

I. – dBu-rū

E. 'Ol k’ai šuṅ pa dpun bdun
S. rMaI la la brgyud (the passes of rMa la)
W. gZhū sñe mo
N. Prags kyi glaṅ ma gur p’ub;
   center 1): Lha sa Ra mo c’e

II. – γYo-rū

E. Koṅ yul bres sna 2)
S. Sa ’ug stag sgo 3).

34 of KT, though the number of districts of Tibet proper is still eighteen. Žañ žuñ and Sum pa are considered from the military point of view as an integral part of the country. It appears from this catalogue that the South Eastern parts of present day Tibet are not included and were not under the control of Lhasa.

1) dBus t s’aṅ; once only dBus. 'Ol k’a is well known: see f. i. G. Tucci, To Lhasa and beyond, p. 130 ff.: Glän ma gur p’ub may be near Glän t’aṅ. sñe mo is to the SW of Tshurpu and E of Uyung IT, I, p. 19-20. As to rMal la one may think of rMal agro SE of Lhasa: a rMal agro rin c’en glän was near ‘Olk’a; see life of bSod nams grags pa by the V Dalai Lama, p. 46, b. But H. R. Richardson would rather think to a part of the range south of Lhasa which contains the Gokar and Tekar La.

2) Viz Koṅ po between the gTsaṅ po and the Žaṅ c’u and to the E of rGyal me tog t’aṅ.

3) Not located.
G. TUCCI

W. K'a rag gaṅs rtse 1)
N. rMal la
    center: Yar luṅs K'ra ʿbrug 2)

B) gTs'aṅ

III. - ŋ Yas - ru

E. Prags kyi gliṅ ma gur p'ub
S. gÑa' nam γyag poi sna 3)
W. Bye ma la dgu 4)
N. sMri ti c'u nag 5)
    center: Zoṅ pa ts'āl in Šaṅs 6)

IV. - Ru 1ag

E. ʿJam ne bkra 7)
S. Bał po gliṅ sna 8)
W. La kem γyag mig 9)
N. Bye ma la snoon 10)
    center: Braṅ kyi dur pa snal 11)

V. - Sum pai ru
    (supplementary banner)

E. gÑe yul bum nag
S. sMri ti c'u nag

1) Group of mountains to the South of the gTs'aṅ po and to the east of Gam pa la. Cf. G. Tucci, To Lhasa and beyond, Rome 1956, p. 67.
2) On K'ra ʿbrug see G. Tucci, To Lhasa and beyond, p. 136.
3) Not identified.
4) Not identified. NW of Gyantse there was Bye mda' IT, IV, I, p. 56.
5) I cannot locate this river: perhaps it is to be found the SW of Amdo (Nagkṣaṅ? c'u nag means: black river; ti might be related to ti = water, river, in which case we would have here a Žaṅ żuṅ word or of some related dialect). We must remember that gTs'aṅ was much bigger than at present and that the direction of the banners was from NE to SW, TPS.
6) Zoṅ in Šaṅs to the north of gTs'aṅ po and NW of Shigatze.
7) Not identified.
8) Perhaps some place near the border with Nepal.
9) Perhaps Yamik-tso in which case the place should be located near Tok-jalung.
10) Not identified.
11) Not identified. H. E. Richardson would refer to rDur pa of TH.
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W. Yel žabs sdiṅs po c'e
N. Nags šod gzi ap'raṅ
   center: rGya šod stag pa ts'al

**Total:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gTsaṅ</td>
<td>γYas ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ru lag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dBu</td>
<td>dBu ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>γYo ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum pai ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(but in the text: yan lag gsum pai ru; gsum for sum)

*The 18 shares of power (dbaṅ ris)*
as assigned to different clans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>CLANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 dBu ru šod c'en, the great btsan po mña' bdag, the btsan po, lower tracts</td>
<td>btsan po mña' bdag, the btsan po, the master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 p'o braṅ sne c'e, the palace btsan po rgyal šbaṅs, btsan po and its border-lands</td>
<td>btsan po rgyal šbaṅs, btsan po [and] royal subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yar luṅs etc.</td>
<td>K'u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gNags ²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Ya ąbrog Gaṅs k'ym ku riṅs 5 sde
2 ąC'iṅ da [ňa?] ąC'iṅ mGos (see *Indo-Tibetica*, IV, I, p. 50 in KT yul [TPS, p. 737] included in lower gTsaṅ) sNubs
3 Bya 'ug sa ts'igs ³ 5 Draṅ rje ⁴ p'a

---

¹) gNe yul bum nag corresponds probably to rGyal roṅ. H. E. Richardson would suggest a possible relation with Yul Yel of TH; Nag šod often recorded in TLT (II, p. 30; 125 b-130, 156, 240, 275, 299, 318, 348-50) cannot be in the Lop region (see below p. 91): Nags šod "the forest low land" is a toponymical term applicable to several areas.

²) So also in the Cat. of KT, TLT, I, p. 280.

³) Perhaps either U yug, or Ug pa; we know of a Ba'ug in gTsaṅ. IT, IV, I, p. 56.

⁴) Draṅ rje = lord of Draṅ (border country of γYas ru KT in TLT, I, p. 280) as regards p'a lña cf. p'a drugh, Pherugh, near Mount Everest. *Das, Journey*, pp. 34, 38, TLT, III, p. 16. There is a Bya in sNemo (east of Uyug).
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4 Brad and Žon pa sNa nam (located in - KT, TLT, I, p. 280 - gYo ru)

5 Brag rum upper Ts’e spoň (located in KT, TLT, I, p. 280 in gYo
and lower ru, properly in P’yi luň Near P’yon rgyas,
see TTK, p. 31. P’yiň na, P’yiň stag rtse).

6 gTsän, upper and lower Bro
aK’yun po
dl

7 Nam po ądru in Kluň šod P’yugs mts’ams missing.

8 ąP’an yul sGro stoň sde (See above p. 52, n. 1) rMa

9 Ňaň ro and ąBre ągrom pa 3) lCe

10 Śaňś and Gle P’yiri Gle 4)

11 Yuň pa great Bran ka (in the catalogue of KT, TLT, I, p. 279
and small Yel žabs belongs to the Bran k’a).

12 three sde of sBas blon po (in TLT, I, p. 279) upper and lower
Ža gaň sKyid

13 Nam ra (Nam ąBriň
ru to the W. and (cf. in KT, TPS, p. 738 ąBriň and P’yag)
of Amdo)
C’ag goň C’ag

14 ąDam šod (perhaps P’ya
Dam north of Lhasa) dKar mo Rva

15 mDo k’ams mDo c’en 8 rgod stoň sde

18 districts

1) According to KT (see TPS, p. 736) ąBro in Upper and K’yun po in lower
gTsän (ru lagn).
2) In Amdo. Cf. THOMAS, Nam, p. 32 ff.
3) On Ňaň ro (Mynč ro) viz. Ňaň ro stod and smad, see TUCCI, IT, V. I, p. 49,
ąGrom pa is also in gTsän, cf. KT catalogue in TLT, I, p. 277.
4) Cf. KT (TPS, p. 738) Riň sle bya of Śaňś. gTsän Gle luň is in the valley
of the Mus c’u.
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MILITARY DIVISION 1

As regards the rgod ston sde

each banner has:

- 8 rgod ston sde = great military chiliarchies
- 1 ston bu cuñ = small chiliarchy
- 1 sku srün gi ston sde = chiliarchy of guards, personal guards.

\[ 10 \]

I. - dBu ru

1) Dor sde (TLT, I, p. 279; it is in rMa but the rMa clan being in aP'an yul Dor sde could be just in aP'an yul (suggestion of H. E. Richardson)
2) sDe mts'ams (TLT, I, p. 279 from KT sTe ajam)
3) P'yugs mts'ams (Ibid.)
4) aBrañ mts'ams (Ibid.)
5) Com pa (TLT, I, p. 279 bCom pa)
6) aBri mts'ams (TLT, I, p. 279 aBrin mts'am; a aBri mts'ams is in gTsan, perhaps on the boundary with dBu s IT, IV, I, p. 83; we can also think of aBri k'un)
7) sKyid stod (Ibid.)
8) sKyid smad (Ibid.)

1 ston bu cuñ = Yel rab (in TLT, I, p. 279 better: Yel žabs, because Yel rab is in γYas ru)

1 sku srün = the eastern side

\[ 10 \]

1) The division into chiliarchies, thousand-districts, is a territorial division, as can be gathered from their names which correspond to places: chiliarchies were so called because each territory was obliged to contribute in case of war a regiment of one thousand men. This military partition of the country is later than that reflected in the catalogue of the five banners (see p. 76); in fact we can easily perceive that the boundaries of dBu ru of that catalogue are more restricted than those shown in the military classification. P'yug mts'ams, Com pa, Dor sde (if the identification proposed by Thomas is exact, and if we are not confronted with duplication of place names) are far beyond the actual limits of dBu as specified at p. 77.

It should also be remembered that this list roughly corresponds to that of KT, (= TLT, p. 276 ff. and TPS, p. 737). Moreover the sku srün regiments are so disposed as to form a kind of protection on the four sides of dBu, which was the residence of the bTsan po, mña' bdag and therefore the center of the state; the sku

[ 81 ]
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II. - γYoru

1) Yar luņs
2) aP'yiņ luņ (Cf. above p. 80)
3) Yar mts'ams perhaps Byar east of Yar lha šam po and north of Lho k'a
4) γYu ābaņs (cf. Yu sna of TH, p. 137)
5) Dags po (South of the gTsān po East of Yar luņ)
6) Ńag ŋi
7) dMyal (in TLT, I, p. 280 gÑal to the SE of Gri gu mt'so between Lo ro c'u and gÑal c'u Ncchu of the maps)
8) Lho brag (to the SE of P'u ma ts'o and the northern boundary of Bhutan)

Lo ro (to the south of Lho k'a)

the northern side

III. - γYasru

1) sToņ c'en (perhaps a mistake for sTod yoņs of KT, TLT, p. 279; TPS, p. 738)
2) Šaņs c'en (see above pp. 79, 80)
3) Laņ mi
4) P'od dkar
5) Ŋen gar. The place is frequently quoted in TH; it was the residence of the kings and a fertile country (TH, p. 158) probably between lower γYoru and gTsān
6) aBraņ mts'ams
7) sPo rab
8) gŽoņ (= Žoņ žoņ in the valley of the Šaņs c'u cf. Blue Annals, I, p. 733)

those of the western side

sruņ of dBu ru were on the east, those of γYoru provided to the defence of the North, those of γYasru of the West, those of the supplementary banner of the South.

1) Ńag ŋi is connected with Dags po in TH, p. 82, III: the list of KT instead of γYu ābaņs, Yar mts'ams, Ńag ŋi has: lJaņ kyan, Luņ pa, Ŋaņ: our list is chiefly concerned with the countries to the south of the gTsān po: therefore Ńag ŋi might also be found there: as lJaņ kyan, for that same reason, cannot be the well-known lJaņ, otherwise we must surmise that the two lists belong to two different periods.

2) The localities quoted in this catalogue belong to γYasru viz. to gTsān: therefore P'od dkar must be located there and not in NE Tibet as suggested by Prof. THOMAS, TLT, II, p. 294; as to sKyaņ ro named in connection with the samep lace it is
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IV. - Ru lag

1) Mañ gar (To the south of the gtSañ po and the NW of Sa skyåa)
2) K'ri som
3) Grom pa (the district of Lha rtse)
4) Lha rtse (to the north of Sa skyåa)
5) Myañ ro (See IT, IV, I, p. 49; see above p. 80, n. 3)
6) K'ri ṣt'añ (TLT, I, p. 272 K'ri t'a)
7) K'añ sar
8) Gad pram (TLT, I, p. 277 Gad bkram; Gad in IT, IV, p. 173)

1 s t o n b u c' u n : mTs'o ūnōs
1 s k u s r u n those of the southern side

V. - Upper Žañ źuñ

1) 'O co 1) \{ On the boundary of Bod and Gru gu
2) Mañ ma \{ Between Bod and Sum pa
3) gNe ma 2)
4) Tsa mo

1 s t o n b u c' u n : Ba ga

VI. - Lower Žañ źuñ

1) Gug ge 3) \{ between Bod and Sum pa
2) Cog la \{ SByi gtSañ

also in gtSañ and properly near Iwang cf. IT, IV, I, p. 135, rKyañ ro; rKyañ p'u = Samdu ibid., p. 93 ff.; gBräñ luñ is also recorded in some rGyal rtse's inscriptions, IT, p. 153, 263; as regards sPo rab cf. sPo k'añ in gtSañ, ibid., p. 69.

1) 'O tso ('Otso bag) of TLT, II, p. 293, 460-1, etc. Has it anything to do with 'Oañ, Oañ ūn in Gru gu according to a passage of Pad ma t'añ yig? TLI, I, p. 279; II, p. 238.

2) Perhaps Ni mo (Ni mo bag) of TLT, II, p. 293. The 'og dpon there named belongs to a clan called Rhye lig: cf. Lig, dynastic name of the kings of Žañ Žuñ, and the name of one of these kings: Lig Myi rhya, see below, p. 106.

3) But later: Gug. Cf. GURAN, TH, p. 34, year 675: the place is in Žañ Žuñ but near the Dru gu.

[83]
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4) Yar gTsaṅ

I s t oṅ b u  c’uṅ: Ci di (Perhaps the same as Ce ti TLT, II, p. 272)

VII. - S u m  p a i  r u

1) rTse mt’on
2) Po mt’on
3-4) rGod ts’an upper and lower
5-6) gJoṅ upper and lower
7-8) Dra upper and lower
9) K’a ro
10) K’a zaṅs

I s t oṅ b u  c’uṅ: Nags ṣod 1).

total 61 r g o d 2) s t oṅ s d e under 61 s t oṅ d p oṅ , chilarchs.

ARMY.

I. - dBu ru { Upper 2 Ru d p oṅ { sNa nam rgyal rgan
  Lower sBas skyes bzaṅ stag sna
  2 d p a’zla (KT sgb, TLT, I, p. 285), sub-
  gNon ap’an gsum
  Sod bu k’on btsan commanders.
  banner horse: tawney-horse with white spotted mane.

m t s’al b u 3): g z i g r iṅ (= g z i g r i s? leopard coloured, spotted).

1) Many of these places are known from TLT, On N a g s ṣ o d see above p. 79, n. 1: K’a ro is probably K’a dro, C a ũ r o t a, Niya, T h o m a s) so gJoṅ, upper and lower, is = D s o m upper and lower, rGod ts’an upper and lower = rGod upper and lower, rTse mt’on = rTse mton TLT, II, p. 161 and 318 also Se t’on, rTse t’on see T h o m a s, AO, 1934, p. 47, probably Ch’i t’un in Shan Shan.

2) r g o d = warrior: r g o d n i ḡ a b aṅs r a b ts’an d m a g g i l a s b y e d p a i m iṅ st e.

3) In the corresponding place of KT (TLT, I, p. 277) regular mention is made of y i g t s’aṅs p a: therefore the meaning should be “certificate, diploma” cf. below,
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banner ensign, (ru dār) red; lee k’ra probably a kind of a hawk, k’ra, (cf. lee spyān, cē spyān, jackal); silk of the flag (dpal dār) red.

II. — γYo ru 2 Ru dpōn Myaṅ stag gzig γyu btsan mcİims rgyal gzigs šud
2 dpā’ zla gYas maṅ bžer So gad gnān bžer
banner horse: yellowish brown horse.
mts’al bu: blue (ṛtīṅ dkar 2)
banner-ensign: red lion.
silk: white with black dots (dar dkar sűiṅ nāg).

III. — Ru lag 2 ru dpōn qBro rgyal mts’an sēu ge K’yuṅ po γyui zuṅ
2 dpā’ zla gNam sde gur ts’ab mcİims?... gzigs
banner horse: horse isabell coloured with red and brownish tufts of hair: black mane.
banner-ensign: white lion flying in the air.
silk: black.

IV. — γYas ru 2 ru dpōn K’yuṅ po stag bzaṅ sṭoṅ mGos k’ri gnēn γyaṅ śp’yos
2 dpā’ zla Pa ts’ab mts’o žer tsan Lod Lāṅ pa migon ne
banner horse: blue horse.
mts’al bu: meṣṭag, sparkling.

p. 88; mts’al bu may be connected with mts’al vermilion, cf. gorkhali: laṅ mōhor: royal rescript or with mts’al bu, small piece of wood, slath. As a matter of fact many of these slaths found in Central Asia bear only names of soldiers cf. W. C. Vorob’yev−Dejytowski, Коллекция тибетских документов на дереве, собранных С. Е. Маловым, Ученые записки Института Востоковедения, АН СССР, Tom. VI, 1953, pp. 167-175 and the review of C. Uray in Acta Orient. Hung., Tom., IV, fasc. 1-3, 1955, p. 304 1). Perhaps each mts’al bu had a different colour according to the army and also a symbol of the regiment.

1) Ru dār dmar po lee k’ra daṅ dpal dār dmar po: text corrupt; the text usually gives both the emblem which is an animal and the colour of the flag: KTK, V, p. 9, me lee, flame (Thomas, TLT, p. 279, n. 10).

2) ṛtīṅ dkar = mṭ’iṅ k’ā or mṭ’iṅ dkar, whitish blue.
ensign: ḷ y uān
silk: black with spots

civilians, labourers

γ y uān mi sde (γ y uān opposite to r g o d)
also called k'eṅ (it has nothing to do with Ch. 耕 kēng to cultiv-
vate, to till.) d b aṅ s l a s b y e d k y i m iṅ
also called: y aṅ k'eṅ (= b r aṅ) or n iṅ = γ y o g
over them Sris pa sNubs rje (TH, p. 83) etc. 9 r j e , masters,
in all.

7 rdsi; lo ņam rta rd si etc. equerries, grooms
7 garoṅ sga mk' an saddle makers etc.
5 rgya ja ts'oṅ pa merchants of Chinese tea, etc.; 3 holders of
woven tents etc. (?) gdags sbra ḷ dsin etc.

4 kings who should procure all necessary things:

Nama pa lde rgyal
Bal po li rgyal (king furnisher of bell metal)
Sum pa l c aṅ s rgyal (iron)
Mon rtse rgyal (amusements: it should be remembered that
even now in Ladakh the musicians etc. are said to be
Mon)

They collected taxes (d p y a), offered tribute and were included
among subjects.

1) Therefore some passages of TH should be translated accordingly: f.i., p. 26,
year 94 skyi r nam s u r g o d γ y uāṅ g i p'a l o s c'en p o b k u k: a
great p'a los of military men and civilians were summoned; p a los has the
meaning of census; the same at p. 51.

2) Lo ņam is the name of the equerry who killed the king Gri gum: he also was
a r t a r d s i : therefore it is not a personal name but a name of an officer: chief
groom. Cf. TLT, III, p. 60.

3) But the meaning of g a r oṅ is uncertain.

4) s B r a is tent: gdags perhaps from ŏ t'a g? On the tents (black) and the
Tibetan army, see TLT, I, p. 273.

5) It is difficult to ascertain the meaning of lde here: it may be: p e a s; or
ornament, ointment, medicine, or generally treasure; since each kingdom supplies some
useful goods I think the meaning of ornament is here preferable.

6) On the Mon in Ladakh cf. R. Biasutti e G. Dainelli, Spedizione italiana
stod aBro
smad mC’ims 3 sku žaň
bar sNa nam
sBas blon blon c’en

3 dpa’ bai sde, regiment of the brave men

1) Upper countries (st o d)
(aBro, K’yuň, mGar, sNužs, gNOn; these were dpon of the 5
de of Gug and C’og) from Ri braň stag pa goň up to Mon dbral
k’a bži subduers of the Gru gu.
intermediate countries (b a r): sBas, dpon of Nags šod from Ri
penn ma luň up to C’a skod daň pa subducer of lJaň.
lower country (s m a d): 9 sde of mT’on k’yab srid and 6 stoň sde
of the A ža, from rMa bom ra (?reading doubtful) up to Ka t’aň
klu ts’e 2); the son of lTon lton, officer of P’yugs mtš’am, subduer
of China.

7 dpon3) 1 yul dpon — judicial power in small places (yul
c’uň k’rims)
2 d mag dpon — subduers of the enemíes
3 c’ibs dpon — guides (gšegs pai bšul mtš’on)
road department
4 răn dpon — (aBru daň gser daň daňul gyi
gňer byed pa)
finance officer
5 p’ru dpon — (abru mdso p’ru mai gňer)
supintendent of
cattle
6 draň dpon police,
   magistrates — (žal ce gcod pa)

1) For other lists of officials see H. E. Richardson, Ancient Hist. Edicts at Lhasa,
2) For a reference to victorious wars of the Tibetans against Dru gu, lJaň and
   China see TLT, II, p. 107, p. 267 ff., III, p. 43.
3) The 7th is missing.
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6 great precepts bka’ agros,
6 patents yig ts’aus
6 seals, marks bka’i p’yag rgya
6 peculiarities rkyen
6 military distinctions dpa’ mts’an

On top: 6 k’rims yig, the Laws: = total 36, institutions
(Bod kyi k’os)

I. – 6 great precepts:

1 not to curb the neck of the soldier, to support the old among the
labourers
2 not to appoint a military man in place of a labourer
3 not to issue a command to, give orders to (bka’ la mi gags)
a woman or a priest (mo btsun)
4 to defend the boundaries,
to provide rations for (ats’al for ats’al ma?) the subjects
and not to weary the horse by fast riding
5 to subdue enemies and to protect subjects
6 to practice the 10 virtues and to avoid the ten sins.

II. – yig ts’as, highest: gold,
patents, diplomas: turquoise
middle: silver,
silver inlaid (p’ra men)
lowest: copper
iron

= 12; that is:

blon c’en big turquoise letter
blon c’en of middle rank and nañ blon } turquoise letter, small
c’en po

lower blon and middle nañ blon and } great judge bka’ yo gal ac’os pa

lower nañ blon and middle bka’ blon } gold letter, big
c’en po

lower bka’ blon silver inlaid (p’ra men)

[88]
master of seminary (c’os grai slob dpon),
exorcist (sku’i sna’gs mk’an)
dbañ blon higher stod and lower smad
(stod smad dbañ blon) 1)
sku ts’o bai bon po viz. the bon po who
makes one recover from a disease,
gzims mal pa, officer of the bed-chamber;
c’ibs k’ab equery
byañ t’añ gi sa mk’an, guide of Byañ t’añ;
mt’ar so k’a sruñ frontier guard
sku mk’ar rtse sruñ officer in charge
of the castle
yab abañs rus drug etc. descendents of the
six ancestral tribes? bronze
(TPS, p. 716)

chiliarchs and banner officers, stoñ dpon, and ru dpon copper
heroes in battle, γyul du dpa’ ba iron

6 p’yag rgya 2): 1) bka’ btags – government seal of a pro-
claim, an order
2) box, sign of market 3),
(sgr o m bu, k’rom rtags)
3) banner-ensign, sign of the country
(ru mts’on, yul rtags)
4) temple, sign of the Law
(lha k’añ c’os rtags)
5) castle, sign of the heroes
(sku mk’ar dpa’ rtags) 4)
6) tiger-skin coat, sign of the nobles
(stag slag mdasañ rtags),

1) The expression is very difficult; the fact that here priests and exorcists are
mentioned makes it probable that the dbañ blon were also priests conferring a kind
of initiation in religion: dbañ = dbañ bskur, as usual.
2) The usual meaning of seal does not seem appropriate here: it certainly means
mark, sign.
3) Perhaps here box is taken in the sense of measure.
4) In the text sku mk’ar and lha k’añ are inverted.
6 rkyen, things pertaining to, peculiarities of:
dpa' ba heroes: leopard, guñ, and tiger stag;
misñar witty people: va žur, muzzle of a fox:
yarbs, high rank people: lha c'os, doctrine of the gods
(Buddhism);
gyuñ po, folk: t'ags dañ bon, weaving and Bon religion;
mdsañs pa, nobles: diplomas, yig ts'ans;
ñan pa, wicked: theft rkun ma:

6 dpa' mts'an: stag stod tiger (skin), upper part
symbols of a
   stag smad lower part,
   zar c'en gold brocade, big
   zar c'uuñ gold brocade, small
   rgod ras cotton cloth for the rgod, the
   military men
   stag slag tiger-skin coat.

9 great Blon po:
1) higher dguñ blon like a husband they looked after external
2) middle dguñ blon affairs
3) lower dguñ blon

4-6) nañ blon (higher, middle, lower) like a wife they looked after
     affairs they rewarded even the son of an
     enemy if he had behaved properly,
     but punished even their own son if he had behaved wrongly.

7-9) bka' yo gal ac'os pa judges

Ja p. 18a

6 Bod k'os, institutions, administration 1) three žañ along with the blon took
   hold of the assembly, (adun sa) of
   dBus; three dpa'sde protected the
   boundaries 2).

It is not my purpose to discuss here all the complicated
problems which these passages suggest: as I said, I have dealt

1) The meaning of k'os, mk'os, is to administrate a country, to appoint offi-
cers, to make a census, to register the population and its resources.
2) See above p. 87.
with them in the notes to my translation of PT: suffice it to say that from this document also we gather that Žaṅ ṭuṅ was divided into two parts, s t o d and s m a d , s t o d being the remotest, westernmost portion; the fact that in Žaṅ ṭuṅ s m a d , Lower Ž. ž. we find a country called G u g e or Gug should not make us believe that this name is the equivalent of Guge and therefore identify Lower Žaṅ ṭuṅ with Guge, viz. with the south-western part of Western Tibet 1). This is excluded by the mention of the Sumpas, between which and Bod, Žaṅ ṭuṅ s m a d is said to be: it was therefore bordering on the Sum pas the Supiya of the kharoṣṭhī documents 2) who, according to this catalogue, were considered to dwell between East Tibet and China, approximately in the rGyal roṅ region. Žaṅ ṭuṅ stod, on the other hand, or at least a part of it was bordering, as we saw, on the Gru gu 3) country viz. approximately the Lob-Niya region.

It is clear that during the times of the Tibetan kings Žaṅ ṭuṅ designated a country much bigger than was supposed: it covered not only all Western Tibet, but also Byaṅ t’aṅ up to Turkestan, as far as Khotan and the territory to the South of Shan Shan bordering to the East on the Sumpa, viz. reaching the Niachu. This is suggested not only by the very important catalogue preserved by PT, but also by other texts, which though their final redaction is late, certainly contain very old elements: I refer e.g. to a ritual influenced by Bon po ideas, in which Žaṅ ṭuṅ is recorded along with the Garlog (Qarluq) and the Grugu as a border land (TPS, p. 257, n. 151: G r u gu Žaṅ ṭuṅ G a r l o g s o g s m t’a’ ḫ k‘ob yul gži b d a g).

1) Names in Ku, Gu, Hu are very common in Central Asia: Khotan-Xuten, Kucha, Guchen, Guran.
2) P. PELLLOT, TP, XX, p. 330. L. PETECH, RSO, XXII, p. 87-88; TLI, I, p. 78, 156 ff., Concile, p. 38, n. 3.
3) L. PETECH, RSO, XXII, pp. 87-88; T. YAMAMOTO, Tōyō gahōkō, XXV, 1938, pp. 1-43.
G. Tucci

It is also worthy of notice that to the North-East of the Tengri-nor there is a Shang shung pass (Sven Hedin, Southern Tibet, Map. XV, C. 9). There is therefore evidence, which further research will certainly confirm, that before the Tibetan State reached its acme there was on the mountain plateau surrounding dBus and gTsaṅ, which were to be the core of the new kingdom, another State or Confederation of States ruling over the marches of the Tibetan Highland from Ladakh to the Drichu touching on the north the southern trade routes of Central Asia.

This does not necessarily imply that Žan žuṅ originally was as extensive as this, because the catalogue of PT reflects the situation at the time of the highest development of Tibetan power; it is quite possible that some of the new territories conquered in the north and north-east by the Tibetan generals were annexed, in the new military organization of the state, to Žan žuṅ proper; which was then called Žan žuṅ smad so as to distinguish it from the new districts forming Žan žuṅ stod.

§ 12. — Žan žuṅ, Suvarṇabhūmi, Strīrājya, Cīnadeśa. The great civilization of Asia knew very little of those countries; because Žan žuṅ, a country of nomads and robbers, never rose to such a degree of cohesion as to form a real empire; but they did not completely ignore them. Some news of the vast, inaccessible land filtered through the barrier of mountains which surrounded Žan žuṅ, and in spite of the legendary elements which always conceal peoples or things of which it is difficult to have direct knowledge, they show, as was to be expected, that those regions were not considered as a blank. It would be, indeed, surprising if the Indians had not been aware of the country near the Manasarovar and the Kailāsa, which still occupy so great a place in their religious ideas. I am inclined to think that Žan žuṅ corresponds to Suvarṇabhūmi, Svar-
ṇaḥhūmi, Suvarṇagotra of the Sanskrit sources; Hsüan-tsang locates Suvarṇagotra to the north of Brahmāpura which is situated near Baijnath in Kumaon, or, according to Goetz, in Chamba (The early wooden temples of Chamba. Memoirs of the Kern Institute n. 1, p. 74 ff. Leyden 1955).

"The country is bounded on the north by the great Snowy Mountains in the midst of which is the land called Su-fa-lana-k’iu-ta-lo (Suvarṇagotra). From this country comes a superior sort of gold, and hence the name. It extends from East to West, and contracts from north to south. It is the same as the country of the ‘Eastern women’. For ages a woman has been the ruler, and so it is called the kingdom of the women. The husband of the reigning woman is called king, but he knows nothing about the affairs of the State. The man manages the wars and sows the land, and that is all. The land produces winter wheat and much cattle, sheep, and horses. The climate is extremely cold (icy). The people are hasty and impetuous.

On the eastern side, this country is bordered by the Fan kingdom (Tibet), on the west by San-po-ho (Sampaha or Malasa?) on the north by Khotan". (Beal, Siyuki, Buddhist Records of the Western World. London, s.d., popular edition pp. 198-9; Watters, I, p. 330).

Therefore the boundaries of this country, as the Chinese pilgrim was able to gather from his informants, were, N. Khotan, E. Tibet, W. San po ho.

As regards Tibet, there is no difficulty; but when the Chinese pilgrim was in India (639-644) Zaū zuū had not yet been definitely conquered by the Tibetans, though it was certainly a kind of vassal state, which had to provide soldiers etc. 1); nor is there any difficulty about Khotan.

1) TH. p. 29, 31-34.
San po ho is considered to be Sāmbi. But it is also called Mo lo so 1).

The special features, of that kingdom are therefore that it lies between mountains, it is located to the north of Brahmapura, it produces winter wheat, and is rich in sheep and cattle, it has plenty of gold, and women enjoy greater authority than men: there is a king but in fact women reign: the country is therefore considered to be the same as the Strirājya. I refer now more especially to the Inquiry of Vimalaprabhā translated by prof. F. W. Thomas in TLT, I, p. 137 ff.

Prof. Thomas is of opinion that the Gold-kingdom is in Nagar and he finds in the name of Nagar itself a confirmation of this view.

He refers to a passage of the "Inquiry" in which one of the previous incarnations of Vimalaprabhā is remembered: she was then a Rākṣasī called Huśa who after alluring the merchants coming to the Gold mountain for their trade in gold, and enjoyed their company, killed them as soon as new merchants arrived. One of these merchants having once fled because he was made aware of the danger by his daughter (a bodhisattva) she ran after him in the form of an earless creature, as on account of some previous sin, the Devas had cut off her ears. But when she caught the fleeing merchants, their leader asked her "who could cut off your ears, since you are so strong?" In fulfilment of the decision of the gods she was liberated of that curse and resumed her original form. She then said "Because of ears the name of this country shall be Gold Race". This suggests that the name of the Gold country or race could be also understood as having some analogy with the

1) Mo lo so 粜羅婆 (CUNNINGHAM, Ancient Geography of India ed. S. N. Majumdar, p. 164: Mar po yu l. FRANCKE, JRAS, 1908, pp. 188-9: Mar sa) should be corrected in 粜 Mo lo p'o, its original being Mālava and the bordering countries; the Mālava are recorded as Himalayan tribes by Abhidharma vībhāṣā (BEFEO, 1905, p. 207) and Rāmāyaṇa (S. Lévi, Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyaṇa. JA, 1918. Tome XI, p. 125). Cf. above p. 72, n. 1.
word "ear" or better "ear-cut". Prof. Thomas finds this element in the name Nagar, in which he distinguishes an element variously spelled gar, sgar, dkar, very common in the toponomy of Western Tibet and surrounding countries, and another element na: this may be nothing else but Tib. rna, ear = skr. karṇa. But this etymology would seem more probable, Prof. Thomas adds, if the word Nagar is connected not only with "ear" but also with "earless cat" as the Rākṣasī was. This earless cat cannot but be the marmot, which brings to mind the story of the gold-digging ants, located in that part of the world since the times of Herodotus (III, 102): but when we remember that in 717 A.D. the Chinese received from the king of Khotan "an animal of the species of na(k)" (Chavannes, Documents, p. 127) described in later dictionaries, in a rather puzzling way, as a cat-catcher (TLT, p. 168), one may surmise that this na(k) is nothing else but the marmot, mistaken for a mongoose, called in Sanskrit nakula and in Tibetan ne-hule. There may have been a Himalayan word for the marmot, na or nak, from which the Sanskrit nakula is derived: just as the word pipīlika for ant as well as for the gold collected by the ants may be derived from the Tibetan name for marmot, viz. p'yi or p'yī bi. Therefore Nagar may well be the "marmot place", which explains the story of the gold digging marmots (in India taken for big ants) and the etymology of the Inquiry concerning the ears.

Prof. Thomas, who supposes that the ogress Hu ša was sometimes imagined in the form of a marmot (p. 169), finds support for his view in the story that the cause of her being punished by the Devas was that "she had become a cat" p'yī la p'yīn pās; but I venture to disagree from my revered friend and I think that the sentence only means "she had gone outside", she had left the celestial world, as is often narrated of Gods in India or in Tibet. So no support remains for assimilating the ogress to the marmot.
The learned arguments of Prof. Thomas, which testify to his unrivalled mastery in the most complicated fields of oriental philology, seem so cogent that one hesitates before attempting to propose a different theory. But, as I have said, the translation of the above passage by eliminating any relation between the Rākṣasī and the marmot, renders the arguments now expounded less cogent; moreover it appears to me that there is an etymological play between the name of the country and the earless being and that it can be cleared only if we establish the precise correlation of the two terms in the reply of the Rākṣasī: because that etymological play is comprehensible only if both terms can be taken by the reader as analogous or similar. The fundamental terms are “Gold-(race)” and “ear” or “ear-cut”: if I am not wrong Prof. Thomas worked only on one element of the riddle, “ear”, but I venture to say that the other element, its counterpart, “gold”, remains unexplained.

The sentence of the Inquiry in question has a meaning only if we suppose in the original a word which can be connected at the same time with ear and with gold. In other words we require a name which could be taken as meaning at the same time gold and ear or ear-cut. Nothing unfortunately can be said as regards the original language in which the Inquiry was written: though most probably it was Sanskrit (this is also the opinion of Thomas, TLT, I, p. 125) or Prakrit.

We must look therefore for some sanskrit or prakrit word which could explain that etymology. Prakrit savaṇa for ear and sōṇa, for gold, give ground enough for the etymological speculations of the pandits who are, we know, much inclined to such fanciful comparisons: I refer, as an example to the etymology of pudgalā or āyatana in Buddhism, Āyam, vijñānam, tanvantity āyatana; pudgala “because it clings to a new form of existence” and so on. One may also think of a pun based
on kāncaṇa, gold (Khotanese kāmjana) taken in its proper meaning and assumed also to signify ear-cut kāṇa, kān, ear and echiṇna cut.

Thus, many of the arguments in favour of Survaṇabhūmi—Nagar lose their force. Now, let us pass to the other essential characteristic of Suvaṇabhūmi: it was the land of gold. That Western Tibet—and when we say Western Tibet, we cannot specify its extension during the times of which we are speaking, because we do not know, for instance, its relation to Ladakh and Zanskar, which were probably under its control—was rich in gold is a well ascertained fact. It was there, or in its immediate proximity, or in some of its provinces, that the legend of the gold-ants was localized.

A king of Ladakh assigns to one of his sons the gold mines of āGog near Rudok. (Francke, Chronicles of Ladakh, p. 44). The gold mines of Thokjalung are famous; the gold fields of Manasarovar and Kailāsa are equally known (G. Tucci, Santi e Briganti, p. 61); the territory near Byi’u gompa, near the Manasarovar, is called gSer ka, Ch. A. Sherring, Western Tibet, pp. 140, 156, 157, Journ. R. Geogr. Soc., XIV, 210, XXXVIII, 174. Cf. Fr. Schierm, The Tradition of the gold-digging ants, Ind. Antiquary, vol. IV, 1875, p. 224; B. Lauffer, Die Sage der Goldgrabenden Amaisen, TP, vol. IX, 1908, p. 429 locates the legend in the Altai, Shiraigol.

When we read in the Inquiry that under the threat of the Tibetan invasion the kings of Li (Khotan) take shelter in the Gold-race country and try to get from it the gold needed for their ransom, we cannot fail to remember the story of the invasion of Žaṅ żuṅ by the Qarluqs and the gold they requested for the ransom of the King Ye śes ’od. It is true that once we read in the Inquiry that Vijayavarman boasted that he belonged to the Gold-race: but the text of the Inquiry has been transmitted in such a bad condition that this one reference creates no serious difficulty: it may also be an allu-
sion to one of his many incarnations, or to his marrying a queen of the Women-kingdom. Moreover, as has been well established by Thomas, there is no doubt that Khotan and Skardo, on the one hand, and the Gold-country on the other, where this prince takes shelter when the Tibetan invasion approaches, are distinct countries, though on friendly terms.

For all these reasons I think that we must go back to the old views, such as those expounded by Lassen (IAK, p. 1023), and locate in Western Tibet the gold country, Suvarṇabhūmi and its ruling family, Suvarṇagotra. It is there indeed that the Mahābhārata, II, 28, 1040-42 near the Mānasā, places Hāṭaka, the country of gold. According to the Śṛṭyupasṭhāna that is the country of the Kirāta or Krita (S. Lévi, Pour l’histoire du Rāmāyaṇa, JA, 1918, p. 19) mentioned also in our catalogues, but, according to Mbh., its guardians are the Gūhāha, the attendants of Kubera, the god of wealth.

On the other hand, I do not know that Hunza-Nagar was ever known as a country as rich in gold as Western Tibet. Before concluding with the Inquiry I want to add as regards the Rākṣasī Huṣa, that this Rākṣasī, who returns to her former condition of a goddess, is imagined as dressed in a short shirt (ṭabma) made of the hair of wild animals (yivaga) with her hair tied up on her head. This last description reminds us of the goddess Ekajaṭā, later assimilated with Tārā. She also takes her name from the hair tied up on her head and is covered with a tiger skin. Indian tradition tells us that this goddess was accepted into the Buddhist pantheon from China. The siddha responsible for that

1) Though the Kirāta are also placed in the East, there is no doubt that the Western Himalayas are their home: many authorities in Rönnov, op. cit., pp. 95, 96, 98-9, 100, 113 ff.
2) It is interesting to note that in the Jayadrathayāmala one of the Lāmās is called Hiṣā: but the reading seems doubtful, P. C. Bacchi, Studies in the Tantras, part. I, p. 52.
introduction was the Siddhānāgārjuna who got the sādhana of the goddess among the Bhoṭa (Sādhana-mālā, N. 127, p. 287), just as Vasiṣṭha is advised by the Buddha to go to Mahācīna, Cīnabhūmi in order to get from there the siddhi (Rudrāyamala, ed. Jīvānanda Vidyāśāgara, Calcutta 1892, p. 149).

It was there, according to the Sammohatantra on a lake called Chola (mts'o?) on the Western side of the Meru, that Nīlogratārā was born (Bagchi, Tantric Studies, University of Calcutta, 1939, p. 46, and IHQ, VII, 1931, p. 1).

It is also most probable that from those transhimalayan countries the Lāmākrama (where Lāmā is a transcription into Sanskrit of the Tibetan word: Lha mo) originated; because their people, chiefly women, were considered by Tantric teachers as greatly experienced in magic, so that it was commonly accepted that it was there the Mahācīnakrama had its origin (G. Tucci, Animadversiones Indicae, JASB, 1903, p. 155, P. Ch. Bagchi, op. cit., p. 41 f. and p. 45 ff. TPS, p. 215).

Moreover, there is another Chinese source which confirms my opinion that Suvarṇagotra is in Western Tibet and that it cannot be located in Hunza-Nagar. I refer to the diary of another Chinese pilgrim, viz. Huei Ch’ao (W. Fuchs, Huei-ch’ao’s Pilgerreise durch Nordwest-Indien und Zentral-Asien, Sitzb. phil.-hist. Klasse, Preuss. Akad. d. Wissensch. 1938, p. 418). Huei Ch’ao also speaks of Suvarṇagotra as a small kingdom under the Tibetans; it is reached from Jālandhara in one month’s journey; viz. the same distance as from Ťakka to Sindh Gurjjarā. That Suvarṇagotra cannot be Nagar is to my mind proved by the fact that access to Nagar can hardly be had through Jālandhara: the easy approach, and therefore the trade-route to Nagar, is through Kashmir. On the other hand, Jālandhara is relatively near to Western Tibet.
From there one reaches the Bias river, crosses the Rotang La, and through Spiti enters W. Tibet: another route is through the Sutlej and proceeds up to the Shipki pass. There is no reason why such a distant country as Nagar should be heard of in Jālandhara, or be in trade relations with it.

On the other hand, when Huei Ch’ao reaches Kashmir he tells us about great and small Bolor, two countries very near to Nagar; but on that occasion there is no mention of of Su-varṇagotra. This could hardly be explained if Su-varṇagotra was in Hunza-Nagar.

We are led to this same conclusion by the passage of T’ang shu, translated by Chavannes, Doc., p. 121, for Chu-chü-po is there said to be one thousand miles to the West of Khotan and three thousand miles to the north of the kingdom of Women. This means that between that place and Strīrājya-Su-varṇagotra there was a distance three times greater than from it to Khotan. This passage excludes Sarikol or Hunza which would be much nearer, and points again to Western Tibet.

Nor can we object that in some Buddhist texts, most probably elaborated in Central Asia, Su-varṇagotra is mentioned along with Udḍiyāna (S. Lévi, Notes Chinoises sur l’Inde, BEFEO, V, pp. 11, 22, 31, 37) Sūlīka etc. (but at p. 32 from Tathāga trúghya after Banaras there is a country called Gold-root). In fact we have seen that Žan źuň was in older times a rather big country covering Chang-thang, reaching Turkestan, and perhaps controlling Ladakh and the adjoining States.

The equation Su-varṇabhūmi, 124,5, 169,1, Su-varṇagotra = Strīrājya seems to lead us to the same conclusions. It is true that there are two kingdoms of women in Central Asia (though many more are recorded in Chinese Literature (P. Pelliot in TP, 1912, p. 357, n. 4, Lévi, Alexander and Alexandria in Indian Literature, IHQ, XII, 1956, p. 132, W. Eberhard, Lokal Kulturen im Alten China, I,
p. 278) but the one with which we are here concerned is not unknown to Indian literature and is located in the trans-Himalayan countries: Strīrajya is known to Mbh., III, 51, 1991, XII, 4, 114, it lies between Hūna and Taṅgana.

Elsewhere it is mentioned along with Cīna, Tukhāra, Kulūta (Mbh., III, 51, 1991, XII, 4, 114).

Strīrajya is known also to Varāhamihira, Brha-tsam hitā, Chapt. XVI v. 6, as noted by Kern (in his translation of the same work Verpreide Geschichten, I, p. 240) and suggested by Bhaṭṭopala in his comm. (Vizianagam Sanskrit Series, vol. I, p. 308) following Kāśyapa who writes:

Parvatā Jaladurgaś ca Kosalaś Taṅganā

Hālā |

Strīrajyam Bharukacchaś ca Tuṣārā Vanitya-

vāsinah |

No specific location is given, but from some of the names of the other people mentioned, and from the other references, it would appear that Kāśyapa placed the Strīrajya in the North-West of India. No geographical indication can be drawn from Rājatarāṅginī, IV-173-74 and 185 when the conquests of Lalitāditya Mukṭāpiḍa are recorded. (Stein, Kalhana’s Rājatarangini, A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir, vol. I, p. 138).

The fact that many kingdoms of women were known, caused a certain confusion, all the more so as some of them were purely fantastic. It is not my purpose to discuss on this occasion the very complex problem; I just want to say that the mention of Nū kuo of the East of the P’ei shih (Pe na pen, edition, 97, f. 27 a, b) reproduced in Sui shu, 83, f. 10 a, b (cf. also Chiu T’ang shu 197, ff. 5 a, 6 b, T’ai p’ing yü lan 796, 5 a, Tung Tien 1043 e) already presupposes this confusion between the Su pi of the East and the Nū Kuo of
the West. As a matter of fact that text was concerned with the Western Nū kuo (resumé in Bushell, p. 531, note 42); this is proved by the fact that a Nū kuo is located to the South of the Ts'ung ling mountains (omitted in Bushell) which would be impossible if the Eastern country of Women were concerned, and by the allusion to the trade of salt with India: mineral salt is even nowadays one of the largest products of Eastern Ladakh and Western Tibet, traded with Kashmir, Nepal and the Simla and Almora hills. The text mentions as products of the very cold country: horses, musks and yaks, gold-dust, cinnabar and copper; polyandry is referred to. The palace of the queen is nine stories high (nine, as known, is a sacred number with the Bon po, whose religion, according to tradition, was codified in these parts). The husband of the queen is called Kin ch'ū 金聚 "gold-accumulation".

These characteristics point again to Western Tibet and its neighbouring countries, where P. Pelliot also was inclined to locate Suvarṇagotra Strīrājya, identifying with this Nū kuo the Si li 息立 recorded by the Fa yūan chū lín as being near Kiu lu ta (Kuluta) (TP, 1912, p. 357, n. 4); he explains that name-old pronunciation Sit (Sir)-lip (lap)-as = Tib. gser rabs gold-race; but the original of Sili is not necessarily Tibetan.

These names Suvarṇabhūmi, Suvarṇagotra, Strīrājya are derived from some peculiarity of the country to which they refer, and are left in that vagueness which is the common characteristic of the information given by Indian geographical literature concerning the border lands; the name Strīrājya may be suggested by the authority the women in that country were supposed to exercise, as they still do in most parts of Tibet; Suvarṇabhūmi refers to the gold mines of which the country is very rich. But most probably the geographical name was Cīna, (quite different, of course from Cīna = China) a fact already acknowledged
by many scholars 1) and now made certain by our inscription referring to the Western Tibetan country as Cīna, the country that Varahanihira quotes alongside with the Kirāta, Kauninda, Khasa (Bṛhat samhitā, XIV, 29) the country which the Tantratattva includes in Bhāratavarṣa, immediately before Nepal 2) and Kashmir (Cīna, Mahācīna, Nepāla, Kāśmira; Avalon, Principles of Tantra, p. 129), the country which Arjuna, according to Bhāna (Harṣacarīta, ed. P. V. Kane, vol. 2, p. 59) had to cross before reaching that Hemakūṭa, the golden mountain, which he wants to subdue, that country also, which from the times of Mbh., II, 26, 987, 584, XII, 65, 2429 and Milindapañha, p. 327, 331 is quoted along with the Chilāta, Kirāta (in the text Vilāta, false reading for Chilāta, S. Lévi, Ptolomée, le Niddesa et la Bṛhatkathā, Études Asiatiques, Paris 1925, p. 24, cf. Epigraphia Indica, XX, pp. 7-35), an Himalayan people divided into various groups (Rönnow, op. cit. and S. K. Chatterjee, Kirāta-janakīrti, The Indo-Mongoloids, RASB, 1951 3), or along with the Hūnas Mbh., XII, 326, 12229, or Hārahūna, Mbh., III, 51, 1990.


2) The "Jaina" of Bṛhavapraṅkāśana by Śaradātanaya, GOS, XLV, p. 310: Nepāla jainabāhlikā must be corrected into Cīna, Cāīna.

3) The Catalogue of the mss. in the Indian Office by Eggeling p. IV, n. 2563 pp. 873-876, analysing the Mahācīnakramaṇa, states that the rituals implied the use of some twigs of Mahācīnadrūma, the tree of Mahācīna: it would be interesting to collect some information on this tree because one cannot but recollect the great importance that the āg pā, the juniper tree enjoyed in the Bon po ritual. S. Lévi referring to this passage, IHQ, XII, p. 208, thinks that Chinese (Mahācīna) and Central Asia (Cīna) cultures had strongly influenced the birth of Tantric literature. But one should remember that the Mahācīnakrama is chiefly connected with worship of deities in female form, and indulges in sexual symbolism which is so repulsive to the Chinese that when they translated Tantric works they often omitted or changed the passages which seemed objectionable to their moral sense. The Mahācīnakrama, Cīnakrama would rather point, as its center of origin, to places where
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I must add here that it is highly probable that Ṣaṅ ṣuṅ included also the country of Yang t'ung 羊 同 or that this was its part; Yang t'ung was located to the east as well as to the West of Tibet viz. little Yang t'ung and great Yang t'ung. The great Yang t'ung were to the south of Khotan and their country extended from West to East for about 1000 li, and was ruled by four ministers. They were subjugated by the Tibetans about 679. Other sources of the IX century place them clearly in the East. All these facts have been summarized by Demiéville (Concile, p. 28 ff.); they show that there was to the south of Khotan an extensive country long more than large, just as Suvarṇagotra is said to have been: it split, perhaps on account of the Tibetan wars and a division imposed by them into two parts one in the East and one in the west just as we find a Ţaṅ ṣuṅ stod and a Ţaṅ ṣuṅ s mad. We also know that the famous clan Mulu (ibid., p. 26) = Bro originated from the Yang t'ung and we infer from the catalogue of PT that the Bro clan was in gTsaṅ viz. a country bordering Western Tibet and Byaṅ t'aṅ: its members were dp on of the 5 sde of Gug and C'og in Ţaṅ ṣuṅ.

All these facts adds weight to the view of Prof. Thomas who proposed to identify Yang t'ung with Byaṅ t'aṅ (though phonetically the equation is impossible).

an extreme sexual symbolism is normal: these elements are to be found among the Himalayan tribes and also in Tibet.

To give an example, some of the rituals recommended by the Mahācānakrama (chapter 21 of Śaktisamgamatantra, vol. II, GOS, XLI, p. 104; it is quoted, along with Svācchendabhairava, Siddhāntasamgraha etc. as a fundamental book on the Mahācānakrama by the Puraścaryārṇava of Pratapasinha Shah, Banaras 1904, p. 843) are sexual practices, such as no need of bathing, the use of wine, long hair besmeared with oil, the position for greeting is to remain kneeling, placing the forehead on the ground, the use of rosaries made of the bones of cows, men, elephants etc. Some of these customs are followed by the Tibetans. Mahācāna does not seem to be here necessarily connected with the country of Mahācāna; it is a method "the big method of Cina"; the text distinguishes five methods brahmacīna, divyacīna, viracīna, mahācīna, niskalacīna.
PRELIMINARY REPORT

The conclusion of this long, though preliminary discussion to which the inscription of Dullu has given rise and to which the passage of PT has contributed with new arguments, is that Žaṅ żuṅ was a big State (or rather confederation of tribes?) before the foundation of the Tibetan Empire, but destined to succumb when that empire started its expansion. Žaṅ žuṅ bordered on the Indian Himalayas, controlled most probably Ladakh, stretched as far as Baltistan and Khotan, and extended its control over the highlands of Chang-thang in a word covered West, North and north-eastern Tibet. Its southern provinces were vaguely known to India as Suvara-ṇabhūmi, Strīrājya and chiefly as Cīna, when it passed under the control of the rising power of the Tibetans.

Unlike the Sum pa’s district, Žaṅ žuṅ was not a ru, a banner; it became an integral part of the Tibetan state during the times of K’ri sroṅ lde btsan, when it was annexed.

§ 13. – Survey of the history of western Tibet. Formerly Žaṅ žuṅ was ruled by a Lig dynasty; its events are partly recorded in TH chronicles. At the time of Sroṅ btsan sgam po, 644 A.D., Lig sña šur revolted.

Sroṅ btsan sgam po submitted all Žaṅ žuṅ and became master of it. ¹ (cf. the story of Zu tse TLT, II, p. 54 ff. ²). In the year 653 Spug gyim rtsan rma c’uṅ is appointed to govern it.

662 sToṅ rtsan makes the settlement of (m k’ o s)
Žaṅ žuṅ

675 bTsan sña makes the settlement of (m k’ o s)
Žaṅ žuṅ

¹) This conquest became necessary when the Tibetan expansion towards Central Asia started; Sroṅ btsan sgam po wanted to control Changthang and Western Tibet before starting his campaigns.

²) For the reasons here stated To yo chas la, said to be in northern Žaṅ žuṅ, cannot be identified with Do yo in Purang as proposed by THOMAS, TLT, II, p. 55.
677 Žaṅ žuṅ rebels
719 the census (p’a los) of Žaṅ žuṅ was ordered
724 the minister sTa gu ri tsab makes the settlement (m k’o s) of Žaṅ žuṅ; in TH, p. 83 the king of Žaṅ žuṅ and his two ministers are recorded:
Lig sNa šur, king:
K’yuṅ po ra saṅs rje ministers.
sToṅ lom ma ce.

In TH, p. 155 ff. the story is told of the marriage of Sad mar kar, daughter of K’ri sroṅ lde btsan, to the king of Žaṅ žuṅ, Lig Myi rhya as a result of the alliance between Žaṅ žuṅ and Tibet, and of the unhappiness of this queen in Žaṅ žuṅ, the campaign of K’ri sroṅ lde btsan against Žaṅ žuṅ, the elimination of Lig Myi rhya and the definite submission of Žaṅ žuṅ are recorded. This implies that up to that time Žaṅ žuṅ was in a state of vassallage but had not completely lost at least nominally its independence.

When that happened Žaṅ žuṅ was divided for military purposes into ten chiliarchies, s t o n s d e (four s t o n s d e and one s t o n b u c’uṅ in upper Žaṅ žuṅ and four s t o n s d e and one s t o n b u c’uṅ in Lower Žaṅ žuṅ see above p. 83). Another name for the two parts was inner and outer Žaṅ žuṅ. It never recovered.

When a Tibetan dynasty took control of the country, it had lost most of its northern and north-western provinces: the Qarluq greatly contributed to weakening and dissolving the state 1): independent chiefs took control of Byaṅ t’aṅ. Then the Pāla family first and afterwards Nāgarāja and his successors conquered the country and controlled it along with
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western Nepal up to the 14th century, when some local family rose again to power: to succumb later to Señ ge rnam rgyal, king of Ladak, (in 1630) and then to be included in the Tibetan state after the Tibetan-Ladakhi war (1683).

Žañ žuñ had its own language of which documents have been found in Central Asia; only at a later time after the Tibetan conquest Žañ žuñ language gave way to Tibetan which slowly but definitely superseded and cancelled it. This is a fact acknowledged also by some Tibetan sources (Bon rgyal rabs, p. 24, b).

Let us now discuss the other problem, that of the capital; we read in our inscription that Nāgarāja established his capital in Semjä: according to the Tib. sources (PT, GR, SP) it was bTsan p’yug lde the successor of Nāgadeva who went to Ya tse: the fact was so important that it is recorded in the Tib. chronicles: at that time there was a change of the capital of Žañ žuñ, Guge. Semjä appears also in the tāmrapatras of Shituska as the capital of Prthvimalla. Where should this town be located? In TPS, I proposed to identify Ya tse with Taklakot, capital of Purang. But it appears unquestionably from these texts that Ya tse, Semjä are one and the same place, the capital of the Malla dynasty, but Semjä is certainly not Taklakot.

It is a well established fact that for sometime the capital of Guge was Tsaparang which to day also is the seat of a rdson dpön: it was so at the times of D’Andrade 1). But we cannot be certain that this had always been the case; at the times of the Lig dynasty, when Žañ žuñ was independent, its capital was K’yuñ luñ dñul dkar. (cf. TH, p. 116, l. 8 where we should read K’yuñ luñ dñul dkar for: K’yuñ luñ rdul dkar). We have no reason to distrust the historical tradition of Tibet according to which

1) C. M. Toscano, La prima missione cattolica nel Tibet, Istituto Missioni Estere, Parma, s. d., p. 63.
G. Tucci

Toling was built under advice of Rin c’en bzaṅ po, by the early kings of Guge; being the chief temple of the kingdom, it could not presumably have been very far from the capital; as a matter of fact Tsaparang and Toling are near. But we cannot argue that Tsaparang was also the capital of Western Tibet under the new dynasty, started by Nāgadeva. With him the lDe family was ousted or made a vassal family: the capital was shifted from Tsaparang to a place nearer to the country whence the conquerors had come. The establishment of the new capital was so important that it is recorded in the inscription as well as in the Tib. chronicles; it was a great change. Then, at a later time, when the Malla dynasty came to an end, most probably after Prthvīmallā, the old family of Guge or some other local family profitted by the situation to return again to power and was reinstated in the old capital Tsaparang. In fact, the kings who came after the Mallas belonged certainly to the local aristocracy and prefixed their names by the word K’ri as the old Tibetan kings had done 1). It is also possible that Tsaparang remained the capital of Western Tibet under the local rulers, reduced to the condition of vassals, and that Semjā was the capital of the Malla Empire, including both the provinces to the North and to the South of the Himalaya. All these facts seem to force us to the conclusion that, at a certain period, about the 11th century, two aryanspeaking tribes broke into Western Tibet. The one took control of Purang and the other of Guge: that of Guge came to an end with Pratāpamalla and was succeeded by the Purang family which then took the name of Malla unifying the dominions of the two families. I am inclined to believe that the appearance of Utpala, king of Ladakh, should be viewed in the same light; he also, as a bearer of a Sanskrit name, comes suddenly into the history of that country.

1) Also the Purang rulers were called K’ri: see above p. 64.
and according to the tradition, which we have now no means to control, he was the author of the emancipation of Ladakh from Guge of which the former had been a vassal state. We do not know whether his family adapted itself to the new surroundings so as to be completely Tibetanized (as the invaders of Guge seem to have done) or if after Utpala the old rulers of Ladakh ousted the new comers. One fact seems certain to me, that about the 11th century there was unrest among the Himalayan tribes, and that some groups crossed into Western Tibet and there founded new principalities, going so far as to Tibetanize their habits and names.

As to what these invaders from the South Himalaya countries were, we can safely state that they were, as we saw and they themselves state, Khasa, who as a war-like aristocracy controlled a fluctuating mass of other tribes, those K'ri ta (Kirāta) or Mon to which the old Tibetan chronicles make allusions.

Let it be as it may, it appears that the Mallas reached the height of their power under Prthivimalla who ruled over a great kingdom which included Guge, Purang and the Nepalese territories as far as Dullu to the SW, Kaskikot to the East (as we gather from the ka n a k a p a t r a of Shituska, p. 113; but there the reading is Kaskot).

§ 14. — Prthivimalla. Was Prthivimalla a buddhist or a hindu? There is no doubt that his family must have been Buddhist: there is no record of any apostasy or heresy of the Mallas, as rulers of Guge in the Tibetan chronicles. His inscriptions bear always the Buddhist symbol of the s t ū p a and start with the Buddhist m a n t r a. But after the extension of the kingdom to the south and the increased contacts with India which according to the Tibetan sources were undertaken by his ancestor Ripumalla, and the slow but constant penetration of Hinduism, the hinduization of his court, and consequently of the upper classes, was in progress.

[ 109 ]
A great difference is noticeable between the praśāsti of Dullu and the kana kapata of Shītuska (p. 113): while in the praśāsti Buddhism predominates with its symbols, mantras and perhaps invocations, the kana kapata is fundamentally hindu. In Pṛthvimalla’s seal on the kana kapata of Jumla there are the symbols of a padma and a śaṅkha; his two wives are compared to Bhūmi and Śrī of Viṣṇu; he is praised as an avatāra of Viṣṇu; in the Dullu stele the bhikṣus come first in the list of those exempted from taxes, but in the kana kapata the court poet invokes Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara, the Buddha, Dharma, and Saṁgha. This can be explained more than by a change in the faith of the rulers by the different public to which the documents were addressed and the different entourage; the kana kapata was not a mere genealogy and glorification of the royal family but a donation interesting a part of the country which had already become prevalently hindu.

Most probably, though he could not forget that his was the throne of the c’os rgyal of Guge and that the most vital part of his kingdom was Western Tibet, his religious policy was a wise adaptation to the beliefs dominant in the various provinces of his dominions.

In all those parts where his name is found there are many stone temples and stūpas which have no continuation. They are the evident signs of a period of great prosperity and certainly of a liberal patronage: but they are too many, and so widely scattered over the country that it is difficult to believe that they were all built at the same time. It appears to me that Pṛthvimalla, after Nāgadeva, the ancestor, and Ripumalla whose conquests in India are recorded by Tibetan sources, is the most conspicuous scion of a family which ruled both over what is now Western Nepal and Western Tibet. We do not know anything of the organization of the state
but it seems almost certain that it was based on a feudal system, the members of the local aristocracy being turned into officials of his kingdom.

Political unity resulted in economic unity, because the two countries, that to the north of the Himalayas and that to the south, were economically strictly connected. The kingdom of Guge, as we learn from D'Andrade, drew large resources from its trade with India: even now-a-days, Taklakot and Gyanima are very important trade centers. Western Tibet produces and exchanges salt, skins, borax, probably in older times gold, woollen cloth: on the other hand it imports all sorts of commodities from India: utensils, clothes etc. But the Tibetans did not descend down the valleys: they do not like the hot climate. The trade was chiefly in the hands of the hill tribes, acting as intermediaries and as porters on tracks rarely practicable to horses.

The political unity under the Mallas certainly benefitted both Western Tibet and Western Nepal, and made the exchanges with the bordering countries easier and more profitable. It is a fact that unlike what one finds in other parts of Nepal, the road beyond Jumla up to Dullu (and I am told also to Tanakpur) is generally something better than a dangerous track: in some parts it is very wide and easy; there are also bridges which are regularly repaired by the villagers; this road was called by some of my informants rāj-mārg a royal road: it is along it that I found the inscription in praise of Pṛthvīmalla (see above p. 43); it is along it that there rise the stone pillars. It is to be surmised that at the time of the Mallas the roads were much better looked after than at present; horses bred in Jumla, and which made this place renowned, must have been more common than now; we see their figure engraved on many pillars along the road. The trade did not suffer those limitations and difficulties which certainly arose when the kingdom collapsed and from
its ruins many small states emerged, jealous of one another and not always on good terms.

Prthvimalla had a great dream and did his best to realize it; but it seems that somewhere he met with a disaster. The Tibetan chronicles stop with him: no inscription of any of his successors has yet been found. But without anticipating what new researches and new documents may one day bring to light, I venture to suggest that with Prthvimalla the kingdom which his forefathers had started and he had greatly extended, crumbled to pieces, and so the feudal chiefs whom he had subdued but left in charge of their possessions reconquered their freedom: the country was split again into small states too poor to claim with some fortune his succession and, as often happened in India, fighting one against the other. There is no doubt that his conquests extended very far, coming near to the Valley of Nepal. From the kanakapatra which I discovered in Jumla, but in the possession of a brahmin of Sijā now in Shituskā, it appears that his domains reached Kastkot, a place now in ruins on a ridge overlooking, to the northwest, on the Pokhara valley. The fact remains, as I have said, that for reasons which we are not now in a condition to ascertain, perhaps on account of some unfortunate expedition and the consequent rebellion of the feudatory chiefs in Tibet and in Nepal, for the impact of new invasions from the west and the south, the Malla kingdom, came, with Prthvimalla, to an end.

§ 15. — Semjā, Ya ts’e. We have not yet solved the location of a Ya ts’e, Ya tse, Semjā. That this was the capital of the Mallas is proved not only by the inscription of Dullu, and the Tibetan Chronicles referred to above, but also by the kanakapatra from Sijā a village, a few miles to the North-West of Jumla (Fig. 21). This gilded kanakapatra was said to be in possession of a Brahmin; with the kind assistance of
the acting Boro Hakim of Jumla I sent a man to get the document. It was in my hands for a little while and so I had the opportunity to photograph it. It is dated Śrīśāka 1298 (= A.D. 1376); it was written in Semjānagara. The beginning and the end of the kaṇaka pātra are in sanskrit, the central portion in parvatiyā.

The Sanskrit portion is written in the most artificial Sanskrit by a poet, probably a court poet, in the style of the campukāvyā. It opens with a very flowery and redundant description of the town of Semjā, śrīmati Semjānagare, and it praises with very emphatic eulogy King Prthvīmalla.

Then in parvatiyā the donation of some lands and privileges is proclaimed; (mention of Aditya Malla rāi, Puṇya-malla rāi, Tārā dei gosainī is made). The donation was made in the king's birthday; the order is notified to the adhikārins and other officials of Jumlā, Dullu, Kudvanā, Palātārā, Kaskot. The order was issued in two copies one of which was given to Gohnu Joisi who was appointed to enjoin its contents.

It ends with the usual reference to the duty of the king, to dharma and the code of moral law recomended by Hinduism. The pandit who composed the Sanskrit text was Śivadeva.

The inscription is of evident Hindu inspiration.

To witness that the order of the king is not transgressed, the sun, the moon, Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśvara, Buddha the Dharma and the Samgha are called on. This shows that the king, though giving precedence to the Hindu gods, did not forget Buddhism: but anyhow, as I said, the accent is strongly Hindu.

The similarity of the names of Semjā and Sijā makes me certain that the latter place should be identified with the old capital of the Mallas: and therefore with Ya ts'e, Ya tse, Ya rtse of the Tibetans. It is true that the ḍsam buṅgliṅ rgyas bṣad identifies Ya ts'e with
Taklakot but this may be due to a misunderstanding or to the fact that when that book was written, at the end of the 18th century, when mña' ris had become the remotest corner of Tibet and Taklakot was nothing more than a frontier market, Ya tse of the old sources had been identified with that city in Purang. But that originally Ya tse could not be Taklakot seems proved by the fact that Taklakot is in Purang while it is ascertained from the inscription and the old sources that Semjä—Ya tse was the city where Nāgarāja or his successor had transferred the capital of their kingdom, and where consequently Puṇyamalla came leaving his ancestral home in Purang, when the family of Nāgarāja become extinct. To conclude I like to quote another document which indirectly proves that the identification Ya tse—Semjä is right. It is a letter sent by Kun dga’ bzaṅ po to a king of Ya tse. This letter is preserved in vol. A of the complete works p. 349 a of that lama and it is directed to the king of Ya tse (Ya ts’e) Haśtirāja (ya tse pa rgyal po ha sti rā ja), to his eldest son A hrurā ja and to the chief queen (btsun mod pa) Dsa gaśad smal. Kun dga’ bzaṅ po sends his thanks for the presents he had received (things to eat žal zas, a chair gdan, a prabhāmaṇḍala rgyab yol for the images and some robes c’os sgos). He gives the king some instructions, and recommends him to avoid in every way, as if they were poison, the doctrines of the worshippers of Hindu gods such as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Indra, of the heretics as well as those of the Mohamedans.

ts’aṅs daṅ k’yab ąjug dbaṅ p’yug sogs daṅ |
mu stegs byed daṅ kla kloś c’os lugs rnams |
 rnams pa kun du dug bžin spoṅ bar mdsod |

Moreover he adds that all sorts of pūjā which prescribed the killing of animals be they birds or goats should be equally avoid-
ed because they are cause of a great sin, which causes rebirth in the hells (ñān sōn).

Then he advises the king to follow the example of the former great c’os rgyal of Ya ts’ei (instead of Ya tse used before) – who used to contribute to the embellishment of the Sa skya monastery: would it not be good to repair all these previous gifts to Sa skya which are now collapsing? Then he goes on recommending charity towards the monks, dge slob, the Brahmins (brahma), the poor, the sick etc. A much shorter letter with brief advice is also sent to the Ya ts’e blon po, the minister of Ya ts’e A ya dhañ p’yug, who had sent him a bronze vase and some medicines.

It is clear that the ruler of Ya ts’e, Ya tse was a petty chief who could not compete with the c’os rgyal of former times; those had sent to Sa skya precious gifts, gold and silver for enlarging the temples but the new rulers are presenting Kun dga’ bzañ po with modest gifts; moreover this ruler is no longer a Malla: perhaps a Malla(devī)\(^1\) was his wife. What is far more important, there is no trace of his being a buddhist; in his small kingdom hinduism had many followers, sacrifices of chicken (still in use in Nepal) and goats were practised; brahmins were so important in Ya tse that, in spite of the instructions concerning the hindu sacrifices, Kun dga’ bzañ po, thinks it necessary not to forget them as recipients of the royal charity. All these facts point to a country greatly hinduized: such as Semjā, or Jumla might be, but could not be understood if referred to Taklakot which is and, to our knowledge, always was Lamaistic.

Therefore the Hastirāja must be one of the kings who after the collapse of the Mallas ruled over their ancient capital Semjā and the neighboring countries (Jumla): one may also suppose that he is the same as Nāgarāja (nāga hasti) of Doc. C.

\(^1\) Or: Jaganmālā? Cf. the names of the wives of Prthvimalla, p. 50.
For all these reasons it seems to me that Ya tse cannot be identified with Taklakot and that the analogy Semja = Sijja, Sijja, cannot be dismissed. All the more so when we take into consideration that Sijja, Sijja after the Mallas, enjoyed, at least for a certain period, a paramount importance in the Jumla district and was the seat of a dynasty which came immediately after the Mallas. The establishment of the capital in Ya ts'e, Semja, was considered a very important event in the history of the kingdom since it was recorded, as we saw, not only in the inscription of Dullu but also in the Tibetan chronicles. This locality Semja, Sijja, is not marked on the map of Nepal one inch = 8 miles of 1928, but to the north-west of Jumla there is marked a river Sinjakholah which unmistakably points to Sijja, Simja, Semja: on the same map, second edition, and on the map XIII of Sven Hedin, Southern Tibet, Simja is marked to the north-west of Jumla. It was a well placed town between the Sinja river, the Karnali and the Mugu, at the junction of many roads leading to the passes through the Himalayas into Tibet and therefore well connected with the Tibetan territories conquered by Nagaraja and his successors.

§ 16. — Minor chronicles or documents concerning the Jumla district and other parts of W. Nepal. What happened to the Mallas after the collapse of their kingdom and its division into many petty states? From some inscriptions of Doti it seems that a branch of the Malla remained in the district of Doti.

I refer to two tāmrāpatra; one dated Śaka 1480, A.D. 1558 is issued by Nṛpatimalla and contains particulars about some donations of land; it quotes also other names of the predecessor of the king viz. Gaja Malla and Arjuna Malla.

The other is dated Śaka 1550, A.D. 1628 and issued by Rāika Aruddha Śahi. Though the title Śahi takes here the place of that of Malla there is no doubt that the king belongs to the
Malla family; in fact, the inscription ends with the formula in broken sanskrit: pāṣāṇām kṣīyate reṣā samudram kṣīyate jala | pṛthivī kṣīyate reṇu mallabhāṣā na kṣīyate: "the word of the Malla is never destroyed".

I think that these Malla are related to the family of Pṛthvīmalla because Doti is very near Garhwal which perhaps was the original home of the Malla, at least so far as we can now guess; the Mallas to which Doc. A refers (see below), viz. the rulers of Baglung, took this title in rather later times and have no relation with them.

We know very little about the events which followed the collapse of their kingdom except the fragmentary information that can be gathered from some documents which I collected in Jumla and elsewhere. These documents may be divided into two groups a) tāmrapatrās containing donations and b) family chronicles. One of them (Doc. A) is called Mallarājakovamśāvalī and was procured for me by Dirgha Bahadur, the Boro Hakim of Baglung. Though it cannot claim to be a historical document of great interest, still it contains some useful information for more recent times and it shows that there existed the tradition of certain relations among the various feudal families ruling over this part of the world.

These Mallas are distinct from the family of Pṛthvīmalla: they belong to a second and later irruption which tradition would have come from Rājasthān after the fall of Chitor. This vamśāvalī is composed of various parts and as regards the mythic ancestors follows closely the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas:

I) Candravāṃśa – of Atreya gotra: Brahmā is born from the navel of Viṣṇu. Atri was born from the eye of Brahmā; Atri performs penance and after one thousand years Candra-
mas is born; so Dattātreya from Viṣṇu and Ćurvāsa from Śiva. Candramas conquered heaven, earth and the nether world. He took away Tārā, the wife of Bṛhaspati, and he was the cause of a battle between the Gods and the Asuras; Indra and Śiva were on the side of Bṛhaspati, the Asuras and Śukra on that of Candramas.

The son of the latter was Budha.

Vaivasvat Manu of Śūryavamśa had no sons: therefore he performed putreṣṭi-yajña, but he begot a daughter called Ilā: Vasiṣṭha intervenes and according to Manu's wish turns the girl into a boy, who is called Sudyumna.

Sudyumna came one day to a place sacred to Pārvatī and which no man could enter without being changed into a woman: so he and his attendants were turned into women: his horse also became a mare.

Wandering in the forest Sudyumna met Budha and fell in love with him; Purūravas was then born who became a Cakravartin; then Āyu, then Nahuṣa, who on account of a curse became a snake; but in the Dvāpara age on being touched by Yudhiṣṭhira, he became again a man: his son was Yayāti who by his two wives begot five children, the eldest being Yadu and the youngest Puru. Puru became a Cakravartin; the other four were given four kingdoms in the four corners: 25 kings up to Bharata Cakravartin. Many of these names have nothing to do with those of the Pauranic lists: Pārce Vahān, Parbir, Sudu, Vahuga, ...Rityaya, Rantati etc.

They performed 55 Āsvamedhas on the bank of the Ganges and 78 on the bank of the Yamunā. They reconquered the things which had been taken into the nether world by the Asuras. They ruled for 27,000 years.

II) nn. 26-49 from Bhāradvāja up to Yudhiṣṭhira (sic ¹).

¹) The spelling of the names is here maintained as found in the documents even if is irregular or mistaken.
III) Descendence of Abhimanyu.
nn. 50-79, up to Laksmanandra.

IV) Laksmanandra defeats Tāratak Rumdin: in battle his family acquires the name of Raithor (but below Raithor) and settles in Kanauj.

nn. 80-89:

IV) When the Sultan Bādshāh asked for the surrender of Chitor, Mathi Mal refused and fought a fierce battle: he and his son Jayamalla died and the women committed sati. The Bādshāh ordered that the name Raithor should no longer be added to that of the followers.

After the Raithor the progeny of Deva Sharma starts. They married Brahmin girls and became Brahmans.

V) nn. 90-95:
Deva Sharma pāḍhya (sic)
Kasyap pāḍhya
Atrīva pāḍhya
Hariśankar pāḍhya
Sivaśankar pāḍhya
Kāṣidās pāḍhya

VI) nn. 96-105:
Narasimha Muḍulā and others asked Kāṣidās to be allowed to go and went near Kanauj; Kāṣidās desired to go to Mānasarovar, reached the Darbar of Jumla, was not allowed to proceed further and was given the daughter of the king. Names of these rulers of Jumla: Viṣṇudās, Deud. Dharmad., Devakhar, Sevakhar, Śrīkhar, Udayan, Bhāskara, Yom, Nimu.

VII) nn. 106-112.
Nimu had four sons: Gosalele, Kāpṛya, Saguni, Kedaru; the son of the first was Gotami Brahman, of the second Samāl, of the third Bagāle Thāpā, of the last Mājjhale (who) become
Bādshāh of Tibet; from Kāpṛya the progeny (pādavī) of the Śāhī starts:

Kāpṛya Śāhī
Dhandurāj Ś.
Medinīrāj Ś.
Jaiṛāj Ś.
Manīrāj Ś.
Kemadār Ś.
Jagaratha (sic) Ś.

VIII) nn. 113-119

The brother of Jagaratha Śāhī was Mairāj Śāhī; his lāmā was Pokharel Bāhun. The son of Jagaratha (Jagadratha) Śāhī was Garje Bhīm who was given the throne of Jumla: after him the Bam progeny started:

Gajai Bhīm Bam
Bhāra Bam
Jagatra Bam
Goṭhāli Bam
Deu Bam
Śrīvasu Bam
Malāyī Bam

The youngest wife of Malāyī had a son called Kṣānti Bam who was king of...Lālāsultan.

Descendence of Malāyī:

elder son: Śaśācakra (Kharācakra) ruler of Jājarkot;
younger son: Jagatra Bam:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Daraijaithum</th>
<th>2 Ananta Bam</th>
<th>3 Jagadratha</th>
<th>4 Candra Bam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ruler of Rukum</td>
<td>ruler of Jāhāri</td>
<td>ruler of Sāmākot</td>
<td>ruler of Sallyāna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second son of Daraijaithum (also written Darejai) was taken away by Bhujel to be his king, and was called under three
different names: Gothānāthi, Pithāmava and Ānamava; nine castes, called the Tharthok, went with him: Muḍulā, Kārki, Paudel, Brahman, Rucāl, Bahik, Mahaṭho, Munavasti, Kām; first he became ruler of Anārkot; his son was Cakra Bam; his son was Diṃ Bam, the son of the last were Nāga Bam and Narsīṅga Bam: Nāga Bam practised athletics and defeated an Indian wrestler; he was therefore called Malla. His son Nārāyaṇa Malla married the daughter of Mani Mukunda of Tāņsen (Palpa); he set up an image of Devī in Baglung Chaur and extended the kingdom to the river Seti. He had three sons: Jitāri Malla, Rāja Malla, Kallyāṇa Malla. Jitāri Malla became ruler of Jalkot, Kallyāṇa Malla of Kaskikot; Rājamalla ruled over 80000 people including Parvat, Beni and Tholthān. A list of names follows some of whom have already been recorded.

In Jumla, I photographed or copied also a set of vamśāvalīs or other documents which all come from Sijā (Sinjā). Of the Document “B” posterior to Prthvīnārāyaṇa, the Gurkha conqueror, and which seems to be a summary of previous chronicles, I could have only a copy in hindi; in it the story is narrated of Balrāj. This king, the scion of a glorious family, was blessed by the vision of Candranāth who appeared to him assuming the appearance of a Brahmin and acted as his guru.

They went together to the Mānasarovar where they spent some time and then came back to Jumla: here Candranāth invested Balrāj with the Rāja-tilak of Jumla, i.e. he was made king of this place: he left his imprints on a stone, and enjoined on the king the worship of them and having so done he disappeared. King Balrāj then defeated the powerful Jālandhari Sijāpati of Jumla who ruled over Jumla; this town therefore was dependent on that state. He enlarged his fief

1) Explanation: because a) he was brought up in a cowshed, b) he was carried on the back, and c) because he had come.
both to East and West. His glory was known as far as China; the Government of China promised to give him seven dhārnis (= 17 seers) of gold, good horses, brocades etc. A religious treaty was also signed between China and him and many kinglets both to the East and to the West of Jumla became his vassals and paid tribute to Jumlesvara.

This dynasty lasted for 16 generations until the Vikrama Sāṃvat 1845, A.D. 1788 when the kingdom of Jumla was taken over by Pṛthvīnārayaṇa.

The succession of the rulers follows:
Balīrāj; his brother was Avīrāj
Vakṣarāj
Bijairāj
Viśeṣarāj; he had five brothers who went to Humla
Vibhośaṇa (sic)
Manirāj
Śrīmān Sāh who went to the village of Bhudān Jang
Sijam Sāh whose brother went to Tipṛkot
Vikram Sāh whose brother went to Byams Gaṅ (?)
Bahādur Sāh whose brother went to Rārā Chāprū
Vīra Bhadra Sāh whose brother went to Tiprākot Dunahi
Pṛthvipati whose brother went to Tipprākot Raccī
Suratha Sāh, whose brother went to Tiprākot Tārā 2)
Sudarśana, his brother was Subhān Sāh
Śrīśūrya Bhān
Pṛthvīnārayaṇa
Naranārayaṇa
Prabhūnārayaṇa
Vikrama Bahādur
Narendra Bahādur
Vīrendra Bahādur

1) Evidently in the district of Tibrikot.
2) Probably Tārākot; all this shows that Tibrikot was the chief-place of a big district.
The statements which follow are taken from another document (C) which claims to be an old copy from an original dated Śāka 1315, Śaṃvat 1516 (sic! the two dates do not correspond) Kārtik 7 Sunday (Sunday 12, October 1393 accepting Śāka era).

It starts with the names of five kings: Mahārāj Jālandhari Parameśvara, 7 generations
Śrī Mahārāj Sijāpati Gāneśvori, 11 generations
Nāgarāj Jakti Siṃg of Haradvār, 5 generations
Mahārāj Parameśvara Gaganirāj, 13 generations
Mahārāj Balirāj Badrīnāth Parameśvara, 22 generations

The document first records the boundaries of the territory of Gaganirāj which are given as follows:
North: Badri and Cyāvnī Gumba of Lhāsā
South: Lamjung
East: Tārīkkot
West: up to Parakhya¹ and the pass of Mahājkhed (?)

We gather also that Gaganirāj was of the Āṅguṭṣīgotra (Agastyagotra?) and that he had given his territory to Balirāj, the same as that of Doc. B. There is no mention of the rebellion of the latter, but the fact remains that the territory of Gaganirāj or part of his territory (Jumla) passed over to Balirāj.

On the other hand Doc. C, which is a kind of ballad, places Mukti Sāh and Javani Bhān in a wrong chronological order as compared to other texts: in fact Javani Bhān is said in Doc. D to be a contemporary of Gaganirāj.

Then, in the same Doc. C, a genealogy follows which in many places differs from the previous ones:
Balirāj
Vivagrāj

¹ As usual ś for kha.
Syamrāj
Bhogrāj
Pyāj?
Caṁnarāj
Musarāj
Jasarāj
Abhikrāj
Bakrarāj
Prabhūrāj
Bhānā Śāhi
Vikrama Śāhi
Vravadra (Vrabhadra?)
Mukti Śāhi and his brother Javani Bhān

Then Mukti Śāhi became jealous of his brother Javani Bhān, the trials of the latter and his fight against a snake are told in an epic mood; in his feats he was aided by Bālajit Rāu of Botā (sic), Akarbīnāy Rāul of Lamtu and others. Rewards were given by him to these followers and other champions who received many के का, fiefs, from him.

In document D dated Śrīśāke 1516, śrīsaṁvat 1617 we find Jalandhari, Sijāpati Gaṇesvār, Jakti Simq Harudar (Haridvār), Gaganirāj, Balirāj, Badrināth.

Then it goes on to say that the son of Sijāpati was the Dharmaputra Gaganirāj: the son of the latter was Karnarāj (for Karna?).

This document then tells the story of Dham Mahatra, Jas Mahatra and Bum Mahatra who had come from Kanaui Gāḍ and had served Karna, son of Gaganirāj; then they misbehaved with a girl whom the king loved; the king was angry with them and tore their sacred thread to pieces. Then they went for 12 years to Tibet in the Cyāṃni (above: Cyāvni) Gumba of Lhāsā in Bhoṭ; later they proceeded to the sacred river Kharpū (written Sharpu) Gāṅgā where they purified themselves for
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three years. But the king was not satisfied; then they went to Bhaṭṭyā (Bhāṭākātya?) Cauḍ Karnāli and remained there for seven years. So they went to the Cināṃsiya–Darbār. In the month of Kārtik, Karnarāj died. They performed the Masān–jap (smaśāna–japa) and Karnarāj came to life again. They got back the sacred thread; as a reward they received some kṣekā, fiefs, which are listed: donations of other kṣekā to others personages follow among whom Jāwani Bhān is mentioned.

Then we are told that Karnarāj went to Lhāsā being accompanied by Jyāmyā Parānyā Bogti (sic) Kārki who was with him for 12 years. Jāmyā Bogti Kārki was allowed to have a market in Mugu, Cavākholā, Ṭākyā, and Tāklakhār. The devotion shown by Jāmyā Bogti Kārki on other occasions and other donations he received are then mentioned.

The donation of these kṣekā given by Gaganirāj is now respected by Bakrarāj (=Vakṣarāj), and Takra Jāvani Bhān.

Doc. E. Śrīgaganirāj had come from Citaudi gaḍ (Chitor): he was attended for three years by Kālyā Caṃn rāṇā rāhul. The king was levying the tax called sīk in Aechām: Caṃn rāṇā Kālyā rāul (so written now) and Kāli Bum were with him. They started attending the king. Donations and privileges granted to them or to others.

It is difficult at present to ascertain the correctness of these documents; sometimes they agree sometimes they contain contradictory statements. They cannot be said to be chronicles; they are rather records of donations made or better claimed to have been made by ancient kings to some leading families. They are not original documents but family copies; there is no agreement between the eras noted: Doc. C Šāka Saṃ. 1315 Śrisam. 1516; Doc. D Šāka Saṃ. 1516 Śrisam. 1617.

Moreover, Šāka 1315 would represent a date very near to the documents issued by Pṛthvīmallā; but in those documents
there is no mention of him. The memory of his kingdom had vanished.

The only thing upon which these documents agree is that at Sijā, Sijjā (Semiā) there was a ruling family which claimed descent from Jālandhari Sijāpati (Doc. B) Ganeśvori (Gaṇeśvara?) Sijāpati (Doc. C); Gaganirāj who plays a prominent part in these documents was a dharmaputra of Sijāpati. But he had given his territory to Balirāj, who appears in Doc. A and B as the king of Jumla. According to other sources (Doc. D) Gaganirāj had a son Karna (Karna) who went (or fled?) to Tibet. Another story, not dated, claims that Balirāj defeated Sijāpati and was the founder of the Jumla kingdom (Doc. B).

Jālandhari Sijāpati appears in almost all the documents as the chief ancestor. He is also found in the vamśavali of the rājas of Dullu which starts with Rāṭhor rāja Ratan Jot. The seventh in this list is Nārāyaṇa who is said to have come to Chitaur Gaḍ from Jotpur: he had two sons, the elder being Sūryavaṃśi, and the younger Jālandhari: both went to Mānasarovar where Sūryavaṃśi remained: Jālandhari married Kālikādevi and came to Candannāth of Jumla (cf. Doc. A) and received food (bhōjan) from the Brahmans.

In that same vamśavali most of the kings have the name of Bāmm added to their personal name. One of them, Malai Bāmm, is said to have subdued 48 kinglets of the four quarters; his eldest son became the ruler of Dullu, and the youngest the ruler of Dailekha. This Malai Bāmm is certainly the same as Malayī Bām of Doc. A, whose fourth ancestor is Gothāli Bām in the same Doc. A, just as Gothādi Bām is the fourth ancestor in the Dullu Vaṃśavali.

On the other hand, Candranāth of Doc. A is evidently the same as Candannāth of the Dullu vamśavali. Garje bhīm of Doc. A, is probably the same as Gaganirāj of Doc. B and C. All these facts seem to show that the various vamśavalis have, at least in part, some common source and
secondly that some of the families who settled as rulers in those parts of Nepal are descended from a common ancestry.

The existence of some rulers recorded in the genealogical lists is confirmed by tāmrapatras, or copies of tāmrapatras, which I could find; three rulers are testified by them; one is Vakṣarāja recorded in the copy of a tāmrapatra in Litākot.

The copy, to judge from its present condition, is old but the man who made it was unacquainted with the alphabet in which the tāmrapatra was written: there are therefore in this copy not only many dots marking the points in which he was unable to read anything, but also the remaining portions are almost meaningless. Anyhow, the name of the king and the date can be read and we can gather that the style of the document is very similar to that of the kanakapatra of Shituska; it shows that the formulae of the chancellery used at the time of Prthvimalla were copied by the following rulers; the same can be said of the concluding formula containing the curse against the transgressors of the royal order. So far as one can judge from the miserable mess that the copyist made, the tāmrapatra contains a list of privileges granted to Rāul Goth and it was addressed to the adhikārins and other officials of upper and lower Jumla: Buddha, Dharma Samgha, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Maheśvara are invoked and the names of witnesses follow, among whom many ācārya and Rāula can be discerned. Some Rāula are called rāja.

Another tāmrapatra of which I was given a copy in Jumla records Surath Sāh and establishes some boundaries; it is dated Śāka, 1646. Witnesses: Suhit rāj, Kālubiṣṭaca DyāmA Bhanḍāri, Khavās Joṣi; in the seal there is the name of the king and the design of a śaṅkhā: it starts with the invocation of Badrināth and Muktināth. A third tāmrapatra from Jumla is dated Śāka 1704, A.D. 1782, and is issued by Mahārajādhirāja Śrikrṣṇa Sāh who donates some
fields to Śrī Viṣṇupadhyāya. An invocation to Badrināth and Muktināth preceeds. This Kṛṣṇa Śāh cannot be found in the previous lists. On the other hand, in the biography of the Vth Dalai Lama we read that in 1679 a mission to Lhasa was sent by Narasiṃha of Ḍsum lan, viz. Jumla.

But we are not interested in establishing the lists of these local chiefs: they ruled over a few villages and had little historical importance. We are more concerned with the events in general that happened in this part of the world after the political unity created by the Mallas came to an end.

The records mention that the new chieftains came from Rājasthān, a few courageous leaders with a few followers who conquered new possessions for them in the sub-Himalayan countries; the name of Chitor recurs very often in the documents; that these chiefs claimed such a descent was known also to the Tibetans, and mention of this claim is contained in the Ḍsam bu gliṅ rgyas bṣad (p. 10 of my copy¹). There is no reason to disbelieve this tradition.

Around these rulers many families are recorded and their fiefs delimited; these families represent the new aristocracy or the minor vassals. Some of them appear to be prominent and have left traces of their names on certain monuments, as for instance Rāul Javan in Michagaon. Though the political unity which the Mallas had established in Guge, Purang and Western Nepal, had come to an end, there are traces that a connection between the two countries continued for many centuries; and with it Buddhism resisted the impact of Hinduism. The stūpas of Michagaon, the latest to my knowledge, are as I said before, of far more modest proportions than those of Jumla or Shituska (a place a few miles to the w. Jumla); even their form does not follow the traditional scheme of the

¹) When Chitor was captured two princes escaped and brought the images of T'ugs rje c'en po with them up to Kojarnāth; same story in the Dulla Vamśāvalī.
stūpa. They evidently show that Buddhism was in great decline. But commercial relations between Tibet and this part of the country went on for a long time: we find that some members of this aristocracy were allowed to trade in Tākla-khar, i.e. Brag la mk’ar, Taklakot; we see that many of these people took shelter in some Lamaistic monasteries (here Gumba, = dgon pa) such as, Cyāṃni, Cyāvni Gumba: others went to the Mānasarovar and to Lhasā: some of them offered images to the temples of Tibet. In the Tibetan texts there are traces of the importance of Jumla; some agents sent from this place to Lhasa are recorded in the biography of the 5th Dalai Lama. But a part of this aristocracy, chiefly in the north, was of local extraction, an old nobility which survived either as landlords or traders. Such for instance, is Jāmyā Bogṭi Kārki, who has probably a Tibetan name, Jāmyā (ṣaJam dbyaṅs). The traces of old cultural connections with Tibet still survive in some names: kṣekā is the general name of the fiefs donated by the kings: and this word is nothing else than Tib. gzi ga, gzi k’a, fief, appanage: lāmā is Tib. bla ma, guru.

But now there is no mention of Guge: the Tibetan territory is simply called Lhāsā: which implies that Guge had lost all its importance and that the documents were compiled after Guge had been annexed to Lhasa, which conquered the territory already subjected by Seṅ ge rnam rgyal of Ladakh, in the year 1683, when the Guge kingdom lost for ever its independence.

Let us now summarize the final results we may draw from a first examination of the documents discovered.

In the end of the 12th century some tribes, certainly Khasa, invaded respectively the kingdom of Purang and that of Guge (and probably also Ladakh). The conquerors of Guge established their capitals in Semjā, Sijā to the north of Jumla. In the 13th century Purang and Guge and western Nepal were united and this marked the climax of the power of
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the Mallas. Conquests on a large scale were undertaken; as far as Dullu and Kaskikot. It was a large state, based on a feudal system which united the local chiefs under the paramount power of the Mallas; a new aristocracy was also created at the service of the rulers. Hinduism began to supersede Buddhism in the Nepalese part of the kingdom. Later there was a new influx of invaders, most probably Rajput. Under the impact of the newcomers, the cohesion maintained by Pṛthvīmallī was weakened, his kingdom collapsed, the feudal chiefs became independent. Guge also regained its independence and Purang seems to have been nothing more than one of its provinces. Sembā, Sijā, after the fall of the Mallas and the independence reconquered by Western Tibet, fell into the hands of some new rulers, and retained for a while a certain prestige; the Sijāpāti seems to have been recognized, at least nominally, as a kind of overlord possessed of a certain prestige in West Nepal. Its dominions included Jumla. Then Jumla became independent under Balirāj and as had happened before, a new aristocracy came into being by the donation of fiefs, etc. Hinduization progresses and Buddhism completely disappears; it only remains on the very border, where it could maintain a spiritual and rejuvenating contact with the monastic centers of Tibet. A more detailed investigation of the material which has now came to light and the discovery of new documents will complete this scheme which, for the time being, seems to me to correspond fairly well to the real facts.

It is to be noted that some of the documents which are mere records of donations, introduce some rudimentary epic elements (as in the case of those concerning Javani Bhān), and that the tradition is already well established that some of these newcomers claimed to have hailed from Kanauj and Chitor.
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Chhandul Gompa 37 n. 1.
Chhuk 14.
Chilita 103.
Chilkha 3, 38, 40, 43, 44.
China 27, 87 and n. 2, 91, 102, 103 n. 1, 122.
Chin ch'ui 102
Chitaur Ga' 126.
G. Tucci

Chitor 62 n. 1, 117, 119, 125, 128 and n. 1, 130.
Ch’ti tun 84 n. 1.
Chiu T’ang shu 101.
Chola 99.
Chronicles of Ladakh 60, 62 n. 4, 97.
Chu-chu-po 100.
Chumurti 74.
C’i ba 73.
C’ibs k’ab 89.
c’ibs dpon 87.
c’ibs kyi k’od dpon 76 n. 1.
Ci di 84.
Cina 71 and n. 1, 98, 101, 102, 103 and nn. 1–2–3, 105.
Cinabhumî 99.
Cinadsa 92.
Cinakrama 103 n. 3.
Cinâmsiya–Darbar 125.
Citaud ga’d 125.
Cog 87, 104.
Cog la 83.
Cog ro Legs sgra 54.
Cog ro rgyal mts’an gyañ mgon 76 n. 1. c’ol k’a 71.
Com pa 81 and n. 1.
c’os ‘byuñ 61.
c’os 9k’or 19.
c’os grai slob dpon 89.
c’os niñ bzañ po 20.
c’os 9id sen ge [bzañ] 19, 20.
c’os rgyal 17 and n. 3, 62 and n. 2, 68–69, 110, 115.
c’os rje rin po c’e 19.
c’os sgs 114.
c’os skyabs rnam rgyal 15.
C’u bya shom po 11.
C’u mig 11, 13 n. 4.
C’u mig brgya rtsa brgyad, sku ts’ab gter la, mu le gua, gu ru gsan p’ag sog sgyi dkar c’ag gsal bai me loñ no mts’ar can rnam 10.
C’u nag 78 n. 5.
Cunningham, Sir Alex., 67, 94 n. 1.
Cyânni (or Cyàvnì) Gumba 124, 129.
8c’ar dga’ 25.
8c’In da 8c’in yul 79.
bCom pa 81.
legs rgyal 86.
lee 80.
lee k’ra 85.
lee spyan 85.
mC’ims 87.
mC’ims...gzig 85.
mC’ims rgyal gzig šud 85.
mc’od rten 33, 34, 35, 52 n. 1.
Dabdzong 75.
Dags po 82 and n. 1.
Dailekh 126.
Dainelli, G., 86 n. 6.
Dakachour 43, 44.
Dam 80.
jamdaru 26.
Damodara 3.
Damtai c’os ‘byuñ ts’un 72.
danapati 14, 18, 55.
D’Andrade 107, 111.
Dangargaon 30.
Dangurjong 25.
Dara’ yath cum 120.
Darbar 119.
dar dkar sün nag 85.
Darejai 120.
Das, S. Ch., 16 n. 2, 79 n. 4.
Dašaratha 67.
Dattatreyà 118.
Deb t’er damar po (DM) 50 n. 1, 57, 64, 65, 66.
Deb t’er shon po (DT) (s. also Blue Annals) 50 n. 1, 51, 53, 61, 62, 64, 65, 66, 68.
De bzin gṣeṣa p’ams cad kyi bkrod pa geig pai lam c’en gsun nag gi rin po c’ei bla ma brgyud pai rnam t’ar 17 n. 3.
Demchog 74.
Demiéville, P. 91 n. 2, 104.
Deu Bam 120.
Deudás 119.
Devakh 119.
devanandin 16.
devapriya 16.
Devaraja 62, 64.
devarata 16.
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Devata Sharma (or Deva Sharmā pādhyā) 119.
Devavarman 46.
devī (Devi) 38, 121.
Dham Mahatāra 124.
Dhandurāj Śāhī 120.
Dharma 110, 113, 127.
dharmabhāṣaka 50.
Dharmādēśa 119.
Dharmadēsā 46.
Dharmamālā 50.
Dharmaputra Gaganiraj 124.
dhārni 122.
Dhulagirī 11 and n. 2, 15.
Dhulapāṇi 39.
dheva 16.
Dhira Śāh Raithor 119.
Dīp Bām 121.
Dipamkāra 50.
Dirgha Bahadur 117.
Dit 68.
divyācīna 103 n. 3.
Dol po 55.
Dor sde 81 and n. 1.
Do yo 105 n. 2.
Doti 116, 117.
Dra 84.
Draṅ 79 n. 4.
draṅ dpon 87.
Draṅ rje (pa) 79 and n. 4.
Drichu 92.
Dru gu 83 n. 3, 87 n. 2.
drūṅ skor 17.
Dsa gad smal 114.
Dsam gliṅ c'iṅ rje 63 n. 1.
Dsarkot 2.
Dsongkha 17 n. 3.
Duvāsā 118.
Dvāpāra 118.
Dussera 37.
Dwarahat 43.
ṇaṅ ṭod 80.
ṇaṅ ba 75.
ṇaṅ ṭod rin chos rgya mtsho 8 and n. 2, 62 n. 1, 73, 74, 75, 113, 128.
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Goñhāli Bam 120, 126.
Gothānāthī 121.
Gnoli 5.
Grags 70.
Grags album lde 17 n. 3.
Grags btsan 70.
Grags btsan lde 69.
Grags pa 70.
Grags pa lde 70.
Grags pa rgyal mts'an 51, 75.
Gramthadva 46.
Gri gum 86 n. 2.
Gri gu mts'o 82.
gro'n 55.
Grom pa 83.
Gru gu 83 and n. 1, 87, 91.
Gru ža 73.
Guchen 91 n. 1.
Guñchour 40.
Gug 83 n. 3, 87, 91, 104.
Guge, list of the kings of, 51-60, 63, 66.
Gug ge 83, 91 (s. also Gug).
Guhyaka 98.
Gumba 123, 124, 129.
Gumlikali 40.
gu'n 90.
Guran 83 n. 3, 91 n. 1.
gur k'a'n 11.
gu ru bsgrub gnas gsa'n p'ug 13.
Guru rin po c'e 11, 33.
gya'n 26.
Gyanima 111.
Gyantse 16 n. 1, 78 n. 4.
gya t'sa 68.
gyu'n po 90.
øGog 97.
øGrom pa 80 and n. 3.
dGe bai dpal 20.
dGe dkar 14 and n. 1.
dGe lu'n c'os sde 17.
dge sla'n 115.
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dguñ blon 90.
mGar 87.
mGar ston btsan yul bzuñ 76 n. 1.
mgon k’añ 10.
mGos 79.
mGos k’ri gñen yyañ q’p’yos 85.
rgod 84 p. 2, 86.
gr 84 n. 1.
gr ras 90.
gr ston sde 80, 81, 84.
gr ts’an 84 and n. 1.
rgyab rdsoñ 18.
rgya ja ts’oñ pa 86.
rGyal rabs q’p’rul gyi lde mig 17 n. 2, 19 n. 1.
rGyal ba rdo rje qe’añ kun dga’ bzañ
poi rnam t’ar pa legs bshad c’u bo q’dup
pai rgya mts’o yon tan yid bhin nor
bui qbyuñ gnas l7.
rGyal gzigs k’ri 76.
rGyal me tog t’añ 77 n. 2.
rgyal p’ran 76 n. 1.
rGyal rabs gsal bai me loñ (GR) 50 n. 1, 51, 56, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 70.
rgyal rgyud 56.
rGyal roñ 79 n. 1, 97.
rGyal rtsé 82 n. 2.
rgya lugs 62.
rGya šod stag pa ts’al 79.
sgab 84.
sgar 95.
sgom pa 13.
sGro 80.
sgroñ bu 89.
sGrub pa mo bdañ bzañ 15.
Hamilton, Francis 1.
Hanumán 44.
Haradvār 123.
Hārāhāna 103.
Haridvār 124.
Hariśaṅkar pādhyā 119.
Harṣacarita 103.
hasti 115.
Hā sti rā ja (Hāstirāja) 114, 115.
Hāṭaka 98.
Hāzā 25 n. 1, 26.
Ha ša gsañ ba 25.

Heargreaves 41 n. 1.
Hedin, Sven 15, 54, 92.
Heim, A. 43.
Hemakūja 103.
Herodotus 95.
Himalaya 70, 98 n. 1, 105, 108, 109, 111.
Hinduism 2, 8, 27, 37, 109, 113, 115, 128, 138.
Hisā 98 n. 2.
Hoffmann, H. 106 n. 1.
Hor 62.
Hor bya žu riñ po 76 n. 1.
Hsüan tsang 73, 93.
Huei Ch’aö 99.
Huima 122.
Hūna 101, 103.
Hunza 100.
Hunza–Nagar 98, 99, 100.
Hu ša 94, 95, 98.
Hutton, J. H. 39 and n. 1.
Iha 16, 34 n. 1, 62, 63.
Iha bris pa 34.
Iha btsun 55.
Iha c’os 90.
Iha deva 62, 64.
Iha dga’ 16.
Iha k’añ 8, 13 n. 4, 37 n. 1, 89 n. 4.
Iha k’añ c’os rtags 89.
Iha lde 59, 64, 64–65, 65.
Iha mo 99.
Iha tsam c’ags 59 n. 1.
Lhar brzas agro bai me’od sdoñ jo bo diul
sku me’ed guam ston byuñ gi gum
rañ brjod pai rin c’en... vai dū rya
sbon poi pi wen 61.
Lha rtsé 83.
Lha sa 8, 55, 56, 69, 76–77 n. 2, 77
n. 1, 80.
Lha sa Ra mo c’e 77.
Lho brag 82.
Lho k’a 82.
Lhā 118.
Indra 114, 118.
Indra Man Sher Chan 5.
Indus 74.
Iwang 82 n. 2.
Jaeschke, H. A., 11 n. 2, 70.
Jagadhratha 120.
Jagamāla 115 and n. 1.
Jagan Rāul Jogi 41 n. 1.
Jagaratha (Jagadhratha) Śāhī 120.
Jagatra Bām 120.
Jageśvar 41 n. 1.
Jāhāri 120.
Jaina 103 n. 2.
Jairāj Śāhī 120.
Jājakot 120.
Jakti Sing Harudar 124.
Jālandhara 99, 100.
Jālandhari Prāmeśvara 123, 124, 126.
Jālandhari Sījāpati 121, 126.
Jalkot 121.
Jāmīyā 129.
Jāmīyā Bogti Kārki 125, 129.
Jasaratī 124.
Jas Mahatra 124.
Jata Rāul Jogi 41 n. 1.
Javan 41.
Jayanī Bān 123, 124, 125, 130.
Jayadrathayāmala 98 n. 2.
Jayadrath Śāh Raithor 119.
Jayamalla 119.
jayastambha 51, 61.
Jhelli 43, 44.
Jitārimalla 68, 121.
Jāhna 57 n. 1.
Jo ṣubum rgyal mo 63.
Jo bo 56.
Jo bo ras c’en 64.
Jomoson 25.
Jonalāja 69.
Jotpur 126.
Jumlesvara 122.
Jaṃ Bān 129.
Jaṃ ne bka’ 78.
Joā 84 and n. 1.
Jān 82 n. 1, 87 and n. 2.
Jān kyanā 82 n. 1.
rje 86.
k’a c’ar 54, 56.
k’a dro 84 n. 1.
Kāgbeni 14, 15 and n. 1.
Kailāsa 29, 74, 75, 92, 97.
Kaisher Bahadur 4, 5.
Kalhaṇpa 70, 101.
Kāli 7.
Kāli Bum 125.
Kali Gandaki 1, 2, 14, 25.
Kali-Ganpa 73.
Kālikādevī 126.
Kālikot 40, 43, 44.
Kalubīṣṭaca Dyāmā Bhaṇḍāri 127.
Kāłyā Caṃr rāṅgā rāhul 125.
Kālyāṇamalla, 66, 121.
Kām 121.
Kāmā 67.
Kāmjana 97.
K’aṃs 13.
kān 97.
kanakapatra 68, 109, 110, 112, 113.
Kanauj 119, 130.
Kanaujī Gaṅ 124.
Kangra 43.
Kane, P. V., 103.
K’aṅ sar 83.
Kāntipura 67.
Kāpṛya 119, 120.
Kāpṛya Śāhī 120.
K’a rag guṇa rtse 78.
Kārki 121.
Karmapa 8.
Kāṛa 124.
Karṣadhetu Raithor 119.
Karnāli 44.
Karṣaraj 124, 125.
K’a ro 84 and n. 1.
Kārtipura 67.
Kashmir 79, 99, 100, 102, 103.
Kāsidās pāḍhya 119.
Kaskikot 2 n. 1, 7, 8, 109, 112, 113, 121, 130.
Kaskot 109, 113.
Kāśmir 103.
Kāśyapa 101.
Kāśyap pāḍhya 119.
k’a t’āṅ klu ts’e 87.
K'uń po rnal ǵbyor 15.
K'yuń po stag bzań stoň 85.
K'yuń po ǵyui xuń 85.
šK'or c'aṅgs 61, 62, 63 nn. 1, 2.
šK'or re 61, 62, 64.
šK'yuń 11.
šK'yuń po 80 and n. 1.
ška' ǵyros 86.
šKa' ŋgyur 9, 17 n. 3, 19.
ška' ẗgyur lha k'ań 18.
ška' blon 86.
ška' ṭtags 89.
škai p'yag rgya 87.
ška' ṭgyud pa 3-10, 13 n. 1, 16, 28, 29.
šKa' tan sde lla (KT) 76 and n. 2, 79
and n. 2-4, 80 and n. 1-3-4, 81 and
n. 1, 82 and n. 1, 84 and n. 3, 85 n. 1.
ška' yo gal ǵc'os pa 90.
ška' yo gal ǵc'os pa c'en po 88.
šKra ǵis 70.
šKra ǵis brtseg 59 n. 1.
šKra ǵis lde 65, 69.
šKra ǵis lhun gyi sgrub gluń 17.
šKra ǵis mgon 19 n. 1, 75.
šKra ǵis sde 62, 64.
dkar 95.
dkar c'ag 15, 61.
dKar duń 63 n. 1.
dKar mo 80.
dkon gñer 8, 13.
mk'an c'en 19.
mk'an po 19.
mk'os 90 n. 1, 105, 106.
rkun ma 90.
rkyań pu 82, 83 n. 2.
rKyań ro 82, 83 n. 2.
rkyen 88, 90.
šKag rdsoń 15.
šKags 14.
Škardo 98.
skor 73, 74.
sku 62 n. 3.
sku bum 16.
sKu gzugs sde lla 11, 12, 13, 14.
sKu gsun t'ugs rten 19.
skui sńags mk'an 89.
sku mk'ar 55, 89 n. 4.
sku m'kar dpa' rtags 89.
sku mk'ar rtse sruń 89.
sku sruń 81 and n. 1, 82, 83.
sku sruń gi stoń sde 81.
sku ts'ab 13.
sKu ts'ab sde lha 13 and n. 4.
sku ts'o hai bon po 89.
sku žań 87.
sKya ap'ar pai sde 18 n. 1.
sKyań ro 82 n. 2.
sKyes bzań 76.
sKyid 80.
sKyid groń (s. also Kírông) 72.
sKyid smad 81.
sKyid stod 81.
sKyi šod so ma ra 76 n. 1.
Labak 17 n. 3, 72, 73, 74 and n. 2, 75, 80
and n. 6, 92, 97, 100, 102, 105, 107, 108, 109, 129.
La dbyań c'ags 15.
La dvags 74, 75.
lag pai ṣdu byed 16.
La kem ǵyag mig 78.
Lakṣmaṇa era 67.
Lakṣmicandra 9.
Lāḷāsūltān 120.
Lālītāditya Muktāpiṇḍa 101.
Lalitman 5.
lālmōhor 84-85 n. 3.
Lalou, M. 52 n. 1.
Lal Paul, Pr. 67 n. 2.
lāmā 120, 129.
Lāmā 98 n. 2, 99.
Lamaism 8, 13, 16, 17, 27, 28, 29, 34, 37.
Lāmākrama 99.
Lamjung 123.
Lamtu 124.
Lāń mi 82.
Lāń pa mgon ne 85.
Lārjung 8.
Lartse 72, 74.
Lassen, Ch. 98.
Laufir, B. 97.
Lete 7.
Lévi, Sylvain 1 and n. 2, 7, 94 n. 1, 98,
100, 103 and n. 3.
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Lhāsa 123, 124, 125, 128, 129.
Li 104.
Li 73, 97.
Lig 83 n. 2, 105, 107.
Lig Myi rhya 83 n. 2, 106.
Lig. sNa šur 105, 106.
linga 38.
li rgyal 86.
Litākot 38, 39, 127.
Lob 91.
log ris (= logs bris) 18.
logs bris s. log ris.
Lo nam 86 n. 2.
Lo nam rta rdsi 86.
Lop 79 n. 1.
Lo ro 82.
Lo ro c'u 82.
Luṅ pa 82 n. 1.
Magara 37.
Mahābhārata 98, 101, 103, 117.
Mahācīna 99, 103, 103–104 n. 3.
Mahācīnadruma 103 n. 3.
Mahācīnakrama 99, 103–104 n. 3.
Mahācīnakramācāra 103 n. 3.
Mahājkhed 123.
Mahāl 121 n. 2.
Mahālakṣmi 121 n. 2.
Mahārajaśhiraja Śrīkṛṣṇa Śāh 127.
Mahātasatvati 121 n. 2.
Mahātro 121.
Mahāśvara 110, 113, 127.
Māi 38.
Mairāj Śaṁ 120.
Mājihale 119.
Majumdar, R. C. 67 and n. 2, 68.
Majumdar, S. N. 94 n. 1.
Malai Baṅgm 126.
Mulasā 93.
Malayī Bam 120, 126.
Mālanga 84 n. 1.
Malla(devt) 115.
Mallarājako 117.
Mal yul s. Mar yul.

Mal yul mts'o 72.
Mānadeva 49.
Mānasā 98.
Manasarovar 11, 62 n. 1, 92, 97, 119, 121, 126, 129.
Manchad 11 n. 2.
maṇḍala 18, 26.
Maṅ gar 83.
maṇ (walls) 29, 33.
Mani Mukunda 121.
Manirāj 122.
Manirāj Śāhī 120.
Maṅ ma 83.
Mānma 44.
mantra 25, 29, 30, 46, 109, 110.
Manu 118.
Maṅ yul, s. Mar yul.
Maringer, J. 34 n. 1.
Mar loṅś 52.
Mar p'ags 13.
Mārpha 12, 13, 14.
Mar po yul 94 n. 1.
Marsa 94 n. 1.
Mar yul (or Maṅ yul, or Mal yul) 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 63, 64, 65, 72, 73, 74 and n. 1–2.
Masān-jap 125.
ma sāṅ 90.
Mathi Mal 129.
Mathimal Raiṭhor 119.
Me c'ims 34.
Medinirāj Śāhī 120.
med pa 25.
me lce 85 n. 1.
Mentang 15 n. 4.
Meru 99.
me stug 85.
Mi bo gṣen rab 25, 32, 33, 34.
Michagau 39, 41, 128.
Milaraspa 9, 72.
Milindapaṁha 103.
Mitrasena Raiṭhor 119.
mo 88.
mo lai 11 n. 2.
mo le 11 n. 2.
Mo lo p'o 84 n. 1.
Mo lo so 94 n. 1.
Mon 86 and n. 6, 109.
Mon dbral k’a bzi 87.
Mongols 72, 73, 74.
Mon 109.
Mon (yul) 51, 52, 75.
Moria lekh 37.
mu 11 n. 2.
Mu 11.
Muḍulā 121.
mug 11 n. 2.
Mugu 125.
Māgū 40.
Muktināth 2, 11 and n. 1, 14, 29, 30, 127, 128.
Mukti Śāh (Śahi) 123, 124.
mu le 11 n. 2.
Mu le gaṅs can 15.
Mu le gaṅs ri 11 and n. 2.
Mu le sgaṅs 11.
Mu la 104.
Mu luṅ 11.
Munavasti 121.
Muni 37.
Munshi Shew Shunker Singh 1 n. 2.
Musarāj 124.
Mus c’u in 80 n. 4.
Mustang 2, 8, 13, 14, 16, 17 and n. 3, 18 and n. 3.
Myaṅ ro 80 n. 3, 83.
Myaṅ stag gzig γγyu btsan 85.
dmag dpon 87.
dMyal 82.
rMa 80, 81.
rMal 3, 51, 60, 65, 69.
rMal agro 77 n. 1.
rMal agro rin c’en gīṅ 77 n. 1.
rMal la 77 n. 1.
rMal la brgyud 77, 78.
rMa zla sgaṅ 13.
rMog cog (pa) 15 and n. 2.
rMu 11.
rMu luṅ 3, 11 and n. 2.
smad 80 n. 3, 87, 89, 91.
sMād 13, 75.
sMal (s. also rMal and Malla) 3, 51, 60, 65, 69.
sMar t’aṅ 17.

Mceu ston pa 15.
Mri ti c’u nag 78.
a 95.
Nadsung 8 n. 1.
nāga 115.
Nāga Bam 121.
Nāga 1de 65.
Nagar 94, 95, 97, 99, 100.
Nāgarāja 62, 64, 69, 70, 71, 106, 107, 114, 115.
Nāgarāj Jakti Singh 123.
Nāgas 39.
Nag dbaṅ grags pa 19 n. 2.
Nagkshug 18 n. 5.
Nāgma 40.
Nāg ni 82 n. 1.
Nāg ni 82.
Nag ṣod 79 n. 1.
Nags ṣod 84 and n. 1, 87.
Nags ṣod gzi ṣp’raṅ 79.
Nahuṣa 118.
nairāṭmyajñāna 30.
nak 95.
nakula 95.
Na li su ku erh sun 72.
Nam gza don gram pa ts’al 76 n. 1.
Nam pa 86.
Nam po ḍrū 80.
Nam ra (Nam ru) 80.
naṅ 51, 52.
Naṅ 82 n. 1.
naṅ blon 88, 90.
Naṅ c’u 77 n. 2.
naṅ pa 90.
Naṅ ro 80 and n. 3.
Naṅ soṅ 115.
Narāṇārāyaṇa 122.
Narasimha 128.
Narasimha Muḍulā 119.
Nārāyaṇa 126.
Nārāyaṇa Malla 121.
Narendra Bahadur 122.
Narsingh Bam 121.
Nāvalladevi 46.
Nawākot 7.
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Nayarāj Panta 46.
Ne gnas Rin c’en rdo rje 15 and n. 1.
ne hu le 95.
Nen gar 82.
Nepal 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 n. 1, 13, 16,
27 n. 2, 28, 29, 30, 39, 45, 61, 72, 18
n. 8, 102, 103, 106, 110, 111, 112,
Nepāla 103.
Niachu 91.
Ni bruńska 54, 57.
Ni gnuš s. Ni šuṇ. 
Nīlogratārā 99.
Ni mo or Ni mo bag 83 n. 2.
Nimu 119.
niš 86.
Nis bzuņ 63.
Nishangara 3.
iškalacina 103–104 n. 3.
Ni šuṇ (or Ni gnuš) 52.
Niya 84 n. 1, 91.
Ni xuņ(s) 55, 60.
Nodana 7.
Nor 16 and n. 2, 17.
Nor Chronicles (N) 55, 64, 65.
Nor pas 17.
Nṛpatimalla 116.
Nū kuo 101, 102.
Nuwākat 2–3 n. 1, 3.
Nyecchu 82.
dūl 87.
gNal 82.
gNal c'u (Nyecchu) 82.
gNags 79.
gNam mgon 64.
gNam mgon sde 62.
gNam ru kyuņ pa 17.
gNam sde gur ts'ab 85.
gNa' nam ḡaŋ poi sna 78.
gNē' ma 83.
gnē 87.
gNē' yul bum nag 78, 79 n. 1.
gNōn 87.
gNōn ap'ăn gsum 84.
muņ' bdag 54, 56, 68.
mNa' ris 12 n. 1, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58, 59,
60, 65, 71 and n. 1, 72, 73, 74 and
n. 1, 113.
mNa' ris aBum Idr mgon 17.
mNa' ris (b)akor gsum 54, 60, 71, 72.
mNa' ris jo bo 12.
mNa' ris pa 12 n. 1.
mNa' ris rdson 17, 17–18 n. 3.
rNam par rgyal ba 34.
rNam rgyal 17–18 n. 3.
rNam rgyal c'os sde 17–18 n. 3.
rnam t'ar 13, 15, 17, 33, 34.
rūn dpon 87.
rNū ma pa 13, 15, 16, 25, 29, 30, 34.
sNa nam 80, 87.
sNa nam rgyal rgan 84.
sNe mo 15, 77 n. 1, 79 n. 4.
sNubs 79, 87.
Obermiller 52.
'O co 83.
'Od gsal gln 11.
'Od gsal kuņ k' yab 14.
'Od Idr 64.
'Od srun 52 n. 1.
'og dpon 83 n. 2.
'Ol k'a 77 n. 1.
'Ol k'ai šug pa dpun bdun 77.
'Oñ 83 n. 1.
'Oñ ñu 83 n. 1.
O rgyan pad mai rnam t'ar rgyas pa
14–15.
'O tso 83 n. 1.
'O tso bag 83 n. 1.
padavi 120.
p'a los 106.
Pad ma dkar po 59, 64.
Pad ma rgyan 15.
Padmasambhava 9, 11, 12, 13.
Pad ma t'an yig 14, 83 n. 1.
p'a drug 79 n. 4.
Pāla 49, 69 (for the genealogy of the
kings of the Pāla family see 49–50).
Palatārā 113.
p'al c'er 65.
Pale 28, 34, 35, 37 and n. 1.
p'a lha 79 n. 4.
p'a los 86 n. 1.
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Palpa 2, 121.
Pamirs 103 n. 1.
Pančhayat 38.
Parakhyā 123.
Paraṃśvara Gaganirāj 123, 124, 125, 126.
Parbir 118.
Lāree Vahān 118.
Pārthivendra Malla 7.
Par rti smal 56.
Parvat 121.
Pārvatī 118.
pārvatīyā 113.
Panā 1.
Pa ts’ab mts’o žer tsaṅ lod 85.
Pauḍe 121.
P’ei shih 101.
Pelliot, P. 91 n. 2, 100, 102.
Petech, L. 25 n. 1, 62 n. 4, 91 nn. 2, 3.
Pherugh 79 n. 4.
piṇḍa 14.
pipilika 95.
pīr 16 n. 1.
pīr gyi dzu byed 16.
Pischel 70.
Pīthāmava 121.
p'o braṅ sne c'e 79.
P’od dkar 82 and n. 2.
Pokhara 2, 3, 7, 112.
Pokharel Bāhun 120.
Po mt’on 84.
prabhāmaṇḍala ṛgyab yol 114.
Prabhūnārāyaṇa 122.
Prabhūrāj 124.
Prangs kyi glaṅ ma gur p’ub 77, 78.
prajñā 30.
p’ra men 88.
Pramedakumar Caṭṭopādhyāya 61 n. 2.
praśasti 50, 61, 110.
Pratāpamalla 2, 50, 51, 66, 68, 70, 108.
Pratapasinha Shah 103–104 n. 3.
Pṛthvinārāyaṇa 1, 2–3 n. 1, 4, 7, 8, 121, 122.
Pṛthvīpati 122.

Pṛthvīpati Shāh 7.
p’ru dpon 87.
Pu hraṅs 19, 55, 60, 74.
P’u ma t’s’o 82.
Puṇyamalla (or Puṇya rmal) 50, 58, 60, 68, 70, 71, 114.
Puṇānas 11 n. 1, 117.
Puṇang 61, 64, 70, 71, 72, 73, 75, 105 n. 2, 107, 108 and n. 1, 109, 114, 128, 129, 130.
Pu rāṣ(a) 52, 55, 56, 58, 62, 63 and n. 2, 64, 73, 75.
P’u raṅs pa 52.
Puṇāscaryārṇava 103–104 n. 3.
Puṇirig 72, 74.
Pu rōṅ 51.
Puṇu 118.
Puṇuravas 118.
Puṇuṣottamasimpha 67.
putraṣṭi–yajña 118.
Pv’ya yul 26 and n. 1.
Pv’ya 80.
Pv’yang 80.
Pv’yang na pad ma 62.
Pv’yang na rdo rje 62.
Pv’yang rgya 89.
Pvāj 124.
Pv’ye legs 14.
p’yī, p’yī bi 95.
P’yi luṅ 80.
P’yin na 80.
P’yin stag rtse 80.
P’yī ri 80.
P’yog las rnam rgyal 18 n. 2.
P’yon rgyas 80.
P’yugs mts’ams 80, 81 and n. 1, 8.
āP’ags pa 52.
āP’an btsan mo 52 n. 1.
āP’an yul 81.
āP’an yul Dor sde 81.
āP’an yul stōṅ sde 80.
āP’o braṅ 52 and n. 1.
āP’yin luṅ 82.
dpa’ ba 90.
dpa’ bai sde 87.
dpal dar 85.
dPal ldan grags(pa) 55, 56, 60.
PRELIMINARY REPORT

dpa’ mts’an 88, 90.
dPoo gtsug las ap’reña ba 51, 52 n. 1, 54, 61, 64, 65, 70, 75, 76 and n. 1, 77, 91, 92, 104, 105.
dpa’ sde 90.
dpa’ zla 84, 85.
dpon 87, 104.
dpon sa 18 n. 1.
dpya 86.
spal ti 73.
spi logs 60
spi ti (Spiti) 19, 60, 100.
spug gyim rtsan rma c’uñ 105.
spu k’añ 82–83 n. 2.
spu rab 82, 82–83, n. 2.
spug c’es 13 n. 4.
spu brañas 57, 68.
spu rauñ(s) 2 n. 2, 54, 55, 58, 59, 65, 68, 73.
spyan ras gzigs 56.
qarluq 91, 97, 106 and n. 1.
rañbuñ pa 18.
räikä Aruddha Sähi 116.
ratrior or Ratrior 119.
räja Malla 121.
räjasthän 117, 128.
räjatarañginí 101.
räja–tilak 121.
räjput 37, 43, 130.
räksasi 94, 95, 96, 98.
ral pa can 52 n. 1.
räma (Shäh) 7.
ra mañs 15.
rämyaña 94 n. 1.
rantati 118.
rära Chäpré 122.
räthor 126.
räul 41 n. 1.
räul 127.
räul Goñ 127.
räul Javan 128.
raychandhuri, R. C. 67 n. 2.
red sect. 12.
rei mig 16 n. 2.
rhye lig 83 n. 2.
ri bo gyYa’ dmar 76 n. 1.
ri brañ stag pa goñ 87.

Richardson, H. E. 5, 77 n. 1, 78 n. 11, 79 n. 1, 81, 87 n. 1.
ri k’rod 10.
Rimi 38.
Rin c’en bsod nams 19.
Rin c’en bzañ po 3 n. 2, 33, 37 n. 1, 108.
Rin c’en rdo rje s. gSer t’og pa Rin c’en rdo rje.
Riñ sle bya 80 n. 4.
Ri pen ma luñ 87.
Ripumalla 109, 110.
Rityaya 118.
Roerich, G. 34 and n. 1.
Roñ 34.
Rönnow, K. 73 n. 2, 98 n. 1, 103.
Rotang La 100.
ru 77, 105.
Rucal 121.
ru dar 85 and n. 1.
Rudok 97.
ru dpon 84, 85, 89.
Rudrayamala 99.
Rukum 120.
ru lag 78, 79, 80 n. 1, 83, 85.
Rummindei 3.
ru mts’ams 77.
ru mts’on 89.
Rva 80.
sa bdag 11 and n. 3.
Södhanamäla 99.
Sa dkar dgon 13.
Sad mar kar 106.
Sagunñ 119.
Sahaçañpälá 67.
Sähí 120.
Sähilla 70.
Saktisangamatantra 103–104 n. 3.
Sakunamäla 50.
Säkyamuni 34.
Sälagrāmarahasyam śrimuktikṣetragandaki-prabhṛtivividhatīrthavāraṇapuṣprasam 11 n. 1.
Sallyäna 120.
Samada 82–83 n. 2.
Sämäkot 120.
Samáil 119.
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Sui Bisung 66.
Sui shu 101.
Śukra 118.
Śūlīka 100.
Sum pa 76 n. 1, 76–77 n. 2, 78, 83, 105.
Sum pa (people) 91.
Sum pai ru 78, 79.
Sum pa mk'an po 51, 59, 64, 65, 70.
śānyatā 30.
Su pi 101.
Sūpiya 91.
Surajān Raithor 119.
Surasena Raithor 119.
Suratha Śāh 122, 127.
Surkhet 3, 39, 45, 46.
Śāryavāṃśa 118.
Śāryavāṃśi 126.
Surtej 75, 100.
sūtradvāraka 51.
sūtradvāraka 50, 51.
Suvarṣabhāmi (or Svarṣabhāmi) 92, 93, 97, 100, 102, 105.
Suvarṣapātra 93, 97, 99, 100, 102, 104.
Śvetāśthāna 104.
Śwami Pranavānanda 61 n. 2.
Śyānapāj 124.
bSam ḥuṅ dgon pa 37 n. 1.
bSam bde glin 37 n. 1.
bSam glin 29, 30.
bstan 12.
bSod nams grags pa 17 n. 2, 77 n. 1.
bSod nams lde (or bSod nams sde) 55, 56, 58.
bSod nams mc'og ldan bstan pa rgyal mts'an 73 n. 1.
gSam 'ug 11, 13 n. 4.
gsugs pa bual mts'an 87.
gser 87.
gSer ka 97.
gser rabs 102.
gser t'og 56.
gSer t'og pa Rin c'en rdo rje 61.
gSum pa sgaṅ 11.
gsuṅ 62 n. 3.
T'ag 14.
T'ag p'yogs 13.
t'ags 90.
T'ai p'ing yū lan 101.
Ṭakka 99.
Ṭākālāhār 125, 129.
Ṭāklakot 61, 75, 107, 111, 114, 115, 129.
Ṭakra Jāvānī Bhān 125.
Ṭākyā 125.
tāmrapatra 107, 116, 117, 127.
Tanakpur 111.
Ṭāṅgana 101.
Ṭārīkkot 123.
Ṭānsen 121.
Ṭantras 11 n. 1, 25.
Ṭantrataṭṭa 103.
Ṭārā 98, 113, 118.
Ṭarai 39, 40.
Ṭārākot 37 and n. 1, 122 n. 2.
Ṭārāp 25, 28, 32, 34.
Ṭaraphaṅ 3.
Ṭārāṅkhālī 37 n. 1.
Ṭārataṅ Ṛumdīṅ 119.
Ṭār's ṛgyas p'un ts'ogs glin 34.
Ṭūṭhāṅgotuṅhāka 100.
Ṭatopāṇi 39, 40.
Ṭegar 14 n. 1.
Ṭekar la 77 n. 1.
Ṭengri-nor 92.
Ṭhāk 8, 13.
Ṭhākālī 8, 14, 27.
Ṭharthok 121.
Ṭholthān 121.
Ṭhokjalung 97.
Ṭhomās, F. W. 11 n. 2, 16 n. 1–2, 25 n. 1, 76 and n. 1, 79 n. 2–4, 80 n. 2–3, 81 and n. 1, 82 and n. 2, 83 and n. 1–2, 84 and n. 1–3, 85 n. 1, 86 n. 2–4–6, 87 n. 1–2, 91 n. 2, 94, 95, 96, 98, 104, 105 and n. 2.
Ṭhūli Ṣheṛ 3.
ti 78 n. 5.
Ṭibet 2, 8 n. 2, 9, 13, 16, 27, 34, 51, 71, 72, 73, 76 n. 1, 76–77 n. 2, 82 n. 2, 91, 93, 95, 102, 103–104 n. 3, 104, 105, 106, 107, 112, 114, 120, 124, 129, 130.
Ṭibetan Buddhism 2.
Ṭibrikot 3, 34, 37, 122 n. 1–2.
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Tipðkot Dunahi 122.
Tipðkot Juphal 122.
Tipðkot Racci 122.
Tipðkot Târâ 122.
Tirthapuri 74.
Ti se smar 14.
Tok-jalung 78 n. 9.
T'ø liñ (Toling) 55, 74, 108.
Tongkha-Dzong 17 n. 2.
Toran Sham Sher 5.
Tosecano, G. M. 107 n. 1.
To yo chas la 105 n. 2.
Tripureśvarî 37.
Tsa mo 83.
Tsang 72.
Ts'añ pa 20.
Tsâñ rañ bya p'o 17-18 n. 3.
Ts'añpa bkra šis 19 and n. 1, 20.
Tsaparang 107, 108.
Ts'e bdag 26.
Ts'e dpag med 33.
Ts'e leam 26.
Ts'e le 14.
Ts'e rog rdsoñ 13.
Ts'e spoñ 80.
Ts'e spoñ bza' 52 n. 1.
Tshurpu 8, 77 n. 1.
Tsonkha 12, 19 n. 2.
Ts'ung ling 102.
Ts'uðgs 14.
T'ugs rje c'ên po 128 n. 1.
T'ub bstan dar rgyas glich 19.
T'ub bstan rnam rgyal, 15.
T'ub c'ên lha k'añ 16.
Ts'ug, G. 3 nm. 1-2, 8 ff., 9 n. 1, 11 n. 3, 13 n. 3, 14, 15, 16 and n. 2, 17-18 n. 3, 18 n. 2, 19 n. 2, 25 n. 1, 26, 27, 29 and n. 1, 51, 61 and n. 1, 62, 63 n. 1, 71, 73, 74, 76 n. 2, 77 n. 1, 78 nm. 1-2-5, 79, 80 and nn. 3-4, 81 n. 1, 82, 89, 91, 96, 97, 99, 107, 121 n. 2.
T'ugs 62 n. 3.
T'ugs c'ên lha k'añ 20.
T'ugs rje c'ên po 62 n. 1.
Tukhâra 101.
Tukuchû 3, 5, 10, 13 and n. 4, 14, 27.

Tung Tien 101.
Tun-huang 52 n. 1.
Turkestan 91, 100.
št'ag 86 n. 4.
b'Tsan lde 64.
b'Tsan mo qP'an 52 n. 1.
b'tsan po mña' b'dag 79.
b'tsan po rgyal šbañs 79.
b'Tsan p'yug lde 107.
b'Tsan sña 105.
b'tsun mo dam pa 114.
g'Tsan 16, 78 and n. 5, 79 and n. 3, 80 and n. 1-3, 81, 82, 82-83 n. 2, 92, 104.
g'Tsan Gle luñ 80 n. 4.
g'Tsan po 77 n. 2, 78 n. 1-6, 82 and n. 1, 83.
g'Tsan rañ bya po'i že va 18.
I'Ton Iton 87.
mt'ar so k'a sruñ 89.
mt'iñ dkar 85 n. 2.
mt'iñ k'a 85 n. 2.
m'To ldiñ 59.
m'To liñ 52.
m'To liñ dpal gyi lha k'añ 54.
m'Tom ra 87.
m'toñ k'yab k'ri 76 n. 1.
m'toñ k'yab kyi k'od dpon 76 n. 1.
m'Ton k'yab srid 67.
m'Ton mt'iñ 56.
m'ts'ol 84-85 n. 3.
m'ts'ol bu 84, 84-85 n. 3, 85.
m'ts'ol 99.
m'Ts'o nos 83.
m'Ts'o skyes gsañ gsum c'os qbyun pad mai rgyal ts'ab 14.
rtiñ dkar 85 and n. 1.
rTog rgyal ye šes mk'yen 35.
rtse, s. Ya rtse.
rtse lde 64, 65, 66.
rtse mton 84 n. 1.
rtse mt'oon 84 and n. 1.
rtse rgyal 86.
rtse t'oon 84 n. 1.
s'Ta gu ri tsab 106.
s'Tag mo 74.
s'Tag po'i la 74.
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Vivagrâj 123,
Vorobev–Desjatovskij, V. 'S. 84–85 n. 3.
Vravadra 124.
Watters 93.
Weller, Fr. 104.
Western Tibet 3, 4, 10, 11 n. 2, 12, 13, 33, 51, 57 n. 1, 65, 69, 70, 75, 91, 95, 96, 97, 98, 100, 102, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 111, 128, 130.
Wright, Daniel 1 n. 2.
Women–kingdom 98, 100, 102.
Ya šbrog Gaṇs k’yim ku riṅs 79.
yab ḍhaṅs rus drug 89.
Yadu 118.
Yamamoto, T. 91 n. 3.
Yamik–tso 78 n. 9.
Yamunā 118.
Yang t’ung 104, 105.
yān k’êñ 86.
Ya rabs 90.
Yar gTsaṅ 84.
Yar lha šam po 82.
Yar luṅs 79, 82.
Yar luṅs Jo bo rje 55 n. 2, 61.
Yar luṅs K’ra šbrug 78.
Yar mts’ams 82 and n. 1.
Ya rtse 51, 54, 56, 60, 68, 70, 75, 113.
Ya rtse rgyal po 59.
Yaśo varman 46, 61.
Ya tse (Ya ts’e) 54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 60, 70, 75, 107, 112, 113, 114.
Ya ts’ei 115.
Ya ts’e pa 52.
Yayāti 118.
Yellow sect 12, 19 n. 2.
Yel rab 81.
Yel ṣeh’od 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 91.
Yel ṣabs 80.
Yel ṣabs adiṅs po c’e 79.
yi dvags 98.
Yig tsaṅ 57 n. 1, 61.
yig tsa’angs 88, 90.
Yig tsa’angs pa 84 n. 3.
yod pa 25.
yoga 10, 18.
yogapaṭṭa 10.

[ 149 ]
G. Tucci

Yom 119.
Yian (dinasty) 71, 72.
Yian shih 72.
Yian shuai 72.
Yudhishṭira 118.
yul c'uñ k'irms 87.
yul dpun 87.
yul rtags 89.
Yul Yel 79 n. 1.
Yum c'en mo 33, 34.
Yuñ pa 80.
yupa 37.
Yu sna 82.
yYa' ts'e pa 68.
yYa's mañ bzer 85.
yYa's ru 78, 79 and n. 4, 81 and n. 1, 82 and n. 2, 85.
yYo'ru 77, 79, 80, 81 n. 1, 82, 85.
yYu abans 82 and n. 1.
yYu abrug 11 and n. 3.
yyul du dpa' ba 89.
yyuñ 86.
yyuñ mi sde 85.
Xuten 91 n. 1.
žab ma 98.
ža gañ 80.
Žaṅ ul–Abidin 62 n. 4.
žal ce gcod pa 87.
žal da (or žal lta) 17–18 n. 3.
žal lta, s. žal da.
žalzas 114.
žaṅ 90.
Žaṅ Pa ts'ab Rin c'en sde 54.
Žaṅ rGan mo C'os sen 15.
Žaṅs dkar (Zanskar) 60, 73, 97.
Žaṅ žuñ 29, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 63, 64, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76 and n. 1, 76-77 n. 2, 77, 78 n. 5, 83 and nn. 2-3, 91, 92, 93, 97, 100, 104, 105 and n. 2, 106, 107.
zar c'en 90.
zar c'uñ 90.
ži k'ro 9.
žiṅs k'ams 15–16.
Žoṅ 78 n. 6.
Žoṅ pa 80.
Žoṅ pa ts'al 78.
Žoṅ žoṅ 82.
Zu tse 105.
Žva nag Karmapa 13 n. 3.
bZaṅ po rgyal mts'an 19.
gZeṅ mig 33, 34.
gzi ga (or gzi k'a) 129.
gzig riñ (or gzig ris) 84.
gzims mal pa 89.
gŽoṅ 82.
gŽu sñe mo 7.
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ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

P. 1, n. 2  
read: Edinburgh

P. 18, n. 2  
read: P'gyogs las rnam rgyal

P. 39, l. 28  
instead of reminds, read: reminds

P. 45, l. 17  
with reference to: granthadvavarmaṇaḥ, add, as a note: may be alternately read: granthahva?

P. 46, l. 1st  
read: Ācārya

P. 49, l. 21  
read: Jayapāla

P. 49, il. 34-35  
add: 5 śikharipā, 6 uncertain metre, 7-13 śloka

P. 50  
read: Gela for Sela

P. 50, il. 25-26  
read: Dīpamālā for Dīpamālā

P. 52, n. 1  
instead of ṣP'o braṅ, read: P'o braṅ

P. 68, l. 29  
read: vaṃśāvaliṣa

P. 69, l. 28  
read: Krāṣicalla

P. 70, l. 21  
read: Aśokacalla

P. 71, l. 26  
read: mīNa' ris skor gsum

P. 71, dele n. 1

P. 92, l. 17  
instead of Žaṅ žuṅ smad, read: Žaṅ žuṅ stod

" il. 18-19  
instead of Žaṅ žuṅ stod, read: Žaṅ žuṅ smad

P. 94, n. 1, l. 1st: 婆  
read: 婆

P. 94, n. 1, l. 3  
婆  
read: 婆

P. 95, l. 19  
read: nakula

P. 98, l. 16  
read: Guhyaka

P. 102, l. 15  
read: Chin ch'ū instead of Kin ch'ū

P. 103, l. 2, l. 1  
read: "now made probable by our inscription if the reading of l. 17 is cinanpatin, as it appears"

P. 103, l. 3  
read: Varāhamihira

" l. 7  
read: Kāśmira

" n. 3  
read: Mahācānakramācāra

P. 104, l. 22  
instead of adds, read: add

P. 104, end of note read: niṣkalaçīna

P. 104, end of note add: All that has previously been said does not refer, of course, to the Čina of the Arthaśāstra

P. 110, l. 15  
read: kanakapatra

P. 117, l. 3  
read: kṣiyate

P. 123, note  
read: In the text, kh is usually found for ṣ

P. 124, l. 20  
read: Śrīśāke 1516, Śrīsaṃvat

P. 125, l. 32  
read: Śrīsam

P. 127, l. 31  
read: śaṅkha

" l. 34  
read: Mahārājādhirāja
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The Report had been printed and was ready to be delivered to the public when I received though Doctor Gnoli, whom the Italian Institute for the Middle and Far East had sent to Nepal for further researches on the Nepalese inscriptions, a copy of the Magazin written in Gurkhali, *Iithāsa Prakāśa* n. 2, V. S. s. 2013 = 1956, part first, containing the report of a journey undertaken in Western Nepal by yogī Naraharinātha.

The ascet visited the same parts of Western Nepal as myself, went as far as Sēmjā, Sijā and copied inscriptions, prāsastis, vaṃśāvalīs some of which were accessible to me and others which escaped my notice. Moreover Naraharinātha being a well known ascet of the Gorakṣa school (Kāṇphāṭa) enjoys among the people a prestige which opens to him all the doors without the suspicion that often surrounds foreigners.

I am glad that his visit to Sēmjā, Sijā confirmed fully what I had anticipated; he describes the place and gives a detailed notice of the extensive ruins which still exist there and of the frequent finds of coins, ornaments, old utensils and antiquities of various kind. He also came to the conclusion that Sēmjā of our inscriptions was the capital of Pṛthivīmalla as is evidenced by the kancakapatra and other documents. He discovered in Sēmjā, Sijā three fragments of inscriptions in which only the name of Ripumalla is mentioned (pp. 79-81). Various inscriptions or tāmrāpatras of Pṛthivīmalla were discovered in different places.

I join here the list of the most important:

1) one inscription of Pṛthivīmalladeva of Śrīsāka 1260 near Kālikot (p. 45).

2) one in Kuṇcīgaon in Accham of year 1273; in it mention is made of Śridevaman certainly the some of that of inscription published above p. 45. The writer of the inscription was Iṣṭidāsa (45).

Another inscription near Dullu records the erection of a caitya on a well by Pṛthivīmalla giving order to that purpose to Devavaran. The inscription is dated Śrīsāka 1280 and was written by lekhakānām anekānām cārucaudāmaṇīr gūnt iṣṭidāsa (p. 68).

A tāmrāpatra dated Śrīsāka 1280 was issued in Durlanghyanagara (which is a learned rendering into Sanskrit of the name of Dullu); the introduction in Sanskrit extolls the merits of the king called inter alias: gargyāyaṇagautamādipraṇīṭtarājanitiśāstrapraviṇa (p. 69).
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As regards the inscription on the vāpi of Dullu I. 3 yogi Naraharinātha reads nāpta śrīr. I still think (as Bāburām ācārya) that the exact reading is: nāṣṭā śrīr.

As regards the kirtistambha of Dullu Naraharinātha was able to read the two last lines (p. 49, ll. 8-9):

grahaṛṣisūryaganābde śāke jyeṣṭhasya mecake |
rudrāhe bhānuvāre sau kirtistambho dhiropitaḥ ||

The date of Ripumalla can be better established on account of colophon of a mss. of the Abhisamayālankāra published by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana, JBOAS, Vol. XXIV, p. 163 dated Vikrama S. 1370 = 1313 A.D. My attention on this mss. has been drawn by Prof. Petech.

Two orders of Balirāja are respectively dated Śrīśāka 1320 and 1328 = 1398 and 1406; of Suratharāja we have two documents dated Śrīśāka 1641, 42 = A.D. 1719, 1720; Sudarśanashāh is dated Śrīśāka, 1679 = A.D. 1757.

As regards the chronology of these Malla rulers we have therefore the following well ascertained dates:

Krācalla 1223
Aśokamalla 1251-1274
Ripumalla 1313
Prthvtmalla 1338, 1351, 1357, 1358, 1376.
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Fig. 24. Entrance of the shrine of Bhadaribhada (p. 40)
Fig. 25. Lantern-roof of the shrine of Bhadaribhada (p. 40)
Fig. 26. Gorakṣa temple of Jumla (p. 40)
Fig. 30. Stūpa and pillars in Michagaon (p. 41)
Fig. 31. Stūpa of Shitushka (p. 43, n. 1)
Fig. 32. Stone pillars along the road Jumla-Litākot (p. 39)

Fig. 33. Temple of Litākot (p. 38)
Fig. 34. Wooden images in the temple of Lítakot (p. 38)
Fig. 35. Wooden pillars with a bird on top (p. 39)
Fig. 36. Wooden pillars near a bridge (p. 38)
Fig. 37. Stone pillar near Daulapāni (p. 40)
Fig. 38. Entrance to the shrine of Chilkha (p. 43)
Fig. 39. Door of the enclosure surrounding the shrine of Chilkha (p. 43)
Fig. 41. Shrines of Jhelli, group of four (p. 43)
Fig. 43. Stone pillars in Kālikot (p. 44)
Fig. 44. Shrine of Kālikot (p. 43)
Fig. 45. Another small shrine at Kālikot (p. 43)

Fig. 46. Stone pillars on the road Dullu-Surkhet (p. 39)
Fig. 47. Stone pillar with image of a stūpa on a mountain along the road Dullu–Surkhet (p. 39)
Fig. 48. Stone pillars before reaching Dullu (p. 39)
Fig. 52. Stela in Dullu with buddhist mantra in Tibetan characters (p. 44)
Fig. 53. The stela of Dullu containing the genealogy of the Mallas (p. 46)
Fig. 54. The väpi-reservoir of water-in Dullu (p. 45)
Fig. 57. Stone pillars near Pusakot (p. 39)
Fig. 58. Stone pillars near Pusakot (p. 39)
Fig. 59. Stone pillars in the Tarai below Surkhet (p. 39)
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