

**Dynastic Origins and Regal Successions.
Etiological Theories and the Pre-historic Line
in the Tibetan Yar-lung Dynasty Reflected in
Tibetan Sources: New Material and Assessments**

Per K. Sørensen
*Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität
Bonn*

Etiological Genealogical Theories

Prior even to Bu-ston's time (1290–1364) a corpus of ancient texts was still in circulation in Tibet or, at least, the genealogical theories embedded in these accounts were generally known. Rather early in the *phyi dar* period these texts turned out to be some of the most authoritative sources concerning the various indigenous etiological speculations and genealogical theories ('*chad lugs, gleng ba, lo rgyus, rgyal rabs*) prevailing then and which presented the origin myth and the historical-mythological background of the Tibetan dynastic progenitor and of the Tibetan dynasty.

These original sources are regrettably no longer extant. Many of these myths of origin and accounts—whether Buddhist, pre-Bon, Bon, or (most often) mixed—of either the progenitor's Indian dynastic or native divine background have long attracted the interest of Tibetologists, beginning with G. Tucci. The problems involved in these studies are many and complex, all the more so as we only possess scattered references and extracts that are often presented in a bewildering disorder in later historical works, and a number of these long lost basic works or theories are usually only known by their names or titles, or from scattered quotations, and then again mostly in a corrupted fashion. Nevertheless, a few of these works may well turn out to be quite old, even dating from the dynastic period. The odd indication of their authorships alone may indicate, as in the case of the **sBa-bzhed**, their relative antiquity, although to date no references to them have been traced in the Dunhuang material.

Equally importantly, some (perhaps all) of these texts or theories/systems apparently incorporated, in addition to the progenitor myths, lists with the

* The following essay is part of the Appendix attached to my annotated translation of rGyal-rabs gsal-ba'i me-long, forthcoming in *Asiatische Forschung* (Wiesbaden). This translation was made possible during an Alexander von Humboldt Research Fellowship at the University of Bonn, for which I wish to express my sincere gratitude.

names and successions of the pre-historic kings of the dynasty. This may deduced from a brief reference by Nyang-ral,¹ where he refers to the text/system *lHab* (or ‘*Dab, lTab*’)-*ma dGu*-[*b*]rtseg[*s*]-*can* (cf. item no. 3 below) and where the texts/systems “Brother Pentad” (*can lnga*) of the so-called Tibetan “accidentally originated” dynasty (cf. below) are maintained to (count the royal figures) singly and in pairs (*rkyang dang khug*). This also includes the division of the pre-historic line into different groups as discussed in the subsequent part of this essay.

Brief piecemeal references so far, brought to our attention by Karmay and Blondeau, to the names of these works and theories have been traced in the following works: Nyang-ral’s **CHBYMTNYP**: MS. B 588.5–6, 594.5–6 = Berlin MS. (Meisezahl) Tafel 361.1.4–6, 364.2.2–3; the Autobiography of Guru Chos kyī dbang-po, Vol. 1, Chap. 3, pp. 14–20 (Blondeau, 1990a, pp. 39–40); **sBa-bzhed** (zhabs-btags-ma): 75.9–12 (Stein, 1961); dPa’-bo’s **lHo-Brag Chos-’byung**, Vol. JA, 5a7; Don-dam smra-ba’i seng-ge’s **bShad-mdzod yid-bzhin nor-bu** (cf. Haarh, 1969, pp. 213ff; Macdonald, 1971, p. 20); **La-dvags rgyal-rabs** (Francke ed.), p. 28. To this we can now add: **KCHKKHM-1** 656.3–4; **KCHKKHM-2** 61.6–11; **KTHDNG CA** 434.7–435.22; and in particular the detailed synopsis provided by mKhas-pa lDe’u in **BGCHBY**, 226.12–243.17 and lDe’ujo-sras’ **DCHBY** 98.21–99.4ff.

In the light of the new material that has now come to our notice, the preliminary survey presented by Karmay, 1988, pp. 219–22, and Blondeau, 1990a, pp. 37–54, can now be somewhat rectified and expanded. No doubt, when in the future hitherto unheeded Bon materials are properly explored, new data will come to light. Recent research has already shown with compelling clarity that many of the older historical narratives were detected, compiled and transmitted in a mixed Bon-Buddhist milieu.

The Tibetan royal myth of origin is conceived, as first noted by Macdonald, 1971, pp. 202–13, as evolving out of a cosmogonical-evolutionary narrative that initially delineates the royalty of man in general. The Tibetan genealogy is then eventually defined as the “accidental genealogy or royalty” of Tibet (*Bod glo bur [gyi] rgyal po*, cf. **GBCHBY** 226.10ff, **KTHDNG CA** 435.2ff, etc.; on the basis of which three or four types of human royalty were formulated: (*mi’i rgyal po*), i.e. the “lineage-type of royalty” (*gdung brgyud kyī rgyal po*), the “elected/chosen type of royalty” (*bskos pa’i rgyal po*), the “dharma type of royalty” (*chos kyī rgyal po*), and the “accidental[ly originated] type of

¹ Cf. **CHBYMTNYP** Tafel 361.2.3: *dGu rtseg can na lde brgyad zer*. But see also **KTHDNG CA** 435.2ff:

| *glo bur rgyal po can lnga rkyang dang khug*
 | *gnam la khri bdun sa la legs drug dang* |
 | *logs la lde brgyad tshigs la btsan lnga dang* |
 / *khirms med rgyal po nyi shu rtsa lnga byon* /

royalty” (*glo bur gyi rgyal po*); cf., e.g., **KCHKKHM-2** 61.6–12; **CHBYMT-NYP** 359.2.3–361.1.4; **GBCHBY** 196.3ff; **DCHBY** 97.12–98.20;). This contingency, or *glo-bur*, theory appears to be a narrative element in the tradition, introduced along with the emergence of the figure gNya’-khri btsan-po in the garb of a Indian-born prince arriving (accidentally and unaccountably) from the Himalayas, i.e. *grosso modo* reflecting the [late?] Buddhist gSang-ba chos-lugs system. However, we find in these traditions various legends and quasi-historical systems formulated, and although the testimonies in the texts themselves occasionally are somewhat contradictory, often mingled beyond extrication, the “accidental type of royalty” soon became the favourite theory dominating the narratives of the origins of the Tibetan dynasty.

It appears that the main bulk of texts in which these theories and accounts are handed down, and which were usually universally known under the triad, *gSang [bs]Grags Yang-gsang* (extensively researched by Haahr, Macdonald, Blondeau, Karmay, etc.), were, around the middle of the XI–XIIth century at least, known basically from seven works. Five of these were apparently known as the “Brother Pentad” (*spun-po lnga-can*, often laconically just *cart-lnga*, cf. **CHBYMTNYP**, **GBCHBY**, **DCHBY**, **KTHDNG CA**, and also Karmay, 1988, p. 222, where I think that **BZH** should be read as *spun-po* [= sPun-po gSer-skas dgu-ba, rGyal-rabs spun-po; separate work(s?)] *can-lnga*, and not *spun-po-can lnga* as Karmay does, see below), a corpus of texts or titles specified as follows:

1. *The Yo-ga lHa-gyes-can* [= ?*Bon-po’i yi-ge [las] lha-dge* [= *gyes*]-*can* (**CHBYMTNYP**), *Yo-ga lHa dgyes-can* (**DCHBY**) *Yo-ga lHa-dge-can* (**BZH**)], i.e. the theory [of how] the gods [became] divided [according to the Bon] texts, cf. also Karmay, 1988, pp. 221–2. The name of one of the three etiological theories (*spyad |* [= ‘*chad*] *lugs gsum*, or *gleng lugs*: i.e. gSang [bs]Grags Yang-gsang, cf., e.g., **CHBYMTNYP** 361.1.4–5; **GBCHBY** 226.12–14); cf. below. lDe’u jo-sras, **DCHBY** maintains that this *Yo-ga lHa-gyes-can* was composed by the sPa-sa bon-po-s [*sic!* Nyang-ral in his list has sBags-pa, probably = sPun-po]. For an elaboration of this [bs]Grags system (for this term, cf. Blondeau, 1990a) or *lo rgyus* adducing e.g. the royal house’s descent from the *srid pa phy[v]a* gods, etc., cf. **GBCHBY** 227.13–238.13 and below. The latter source here asserts that the evolution developed through three stages: the succession or enumeration of the gods in the upper sphere/in the beginning (*stod, lha rabs*), how the[ir?] power spread in the intermediate sphere/time (*bar mnga’* [= *mnga’ thang?*] *dar*) and how the [gods] below [or in the end] were divided, split or fragmented (*tha ma* [also: *smad*] *gyes mda’am* [also *mdo’am*] *sil chad*).
2. The *Zangs-ma gZhugs-ral-can* [= *Za bzhugs rgan-rabs-can* (**CH-BYMTNYP**), =*Thang-ma ‘Jug-dral-can* (**DCHBY**)] being the the-

ory, one among three ways of a minute counting (*zhib rtsing [=rtsis] gsum*) in the exposition concerning the Tibetan genealogy, here, Nyang-ral adduces, the one counting the genealogy singly (*rkyangpa*), i.e. successively?); mKhas-pa lDe'u, **GBCHBY** 243.5–17, while briefly rendering it, maintains, followed by lDe'u Jo-sras, that this theory was composed by Yab-'bangs (lDe'u Jo-sras: Yab-tshan-'bangs) and he provides its genealogy (the eighteen rulers of the superior (*bla na bzhugs pa bco brgyad*): 'Gro-rje-legs-pa, gNam-lha dkar-gsum, sKar-ma Yol-lde, rGya-lha 'Brong-nam, 'O-de gung-rgyal, Yab brdal-drug, bDud-rje chen-po, lDe [=rJe] gNya'-khri btsan-po, rMu-rje btsan-po, sTang-sa mgon-bu, Dog-lha smin-bu, Mer-lha smongs-bu, Sa-lha 'khor-mo, sTing-[=sTengs] lha gar-chen, gSang-lha de-ba, bDud-rje chen-po.

3. The *lHab-ma dGu-brtsegs-can* [= 'Dab-ma dgu-brtsegs-can (**CH-BYMTNYP**), = *lTab-ma dgu-brtsegs-can* (**DCHBY**); = *lTab-ma dgu-tsag-can* (**BZH**)]; lDeu Jo-sras maintains that it was composed by the Zhang-blon-s and Nyang-ral defines this theory with the words, *khug pa yum sgom smos*, which Karmay, perhaps correctly, construes as the “pair” (*khug pa*, i.e. royal couple) theory enumerating the [successive] kings along with their queens; accordingly the reading given in Guru Chos dbang's list: *kyang lugs gnyis* should in this light perhaps be corrected to *rkyang [pa dang] khug [pa] gnyis?*, cf. Blondeau, 1990, *op. cit.*, p. 39. Cf. also note 1, *supra*.
4. The *Zing[s]-po mgo-sngon-can* [= *Zings-po sna-tshogs-can* (**CH-BYMTNYP**, **BZH**)]; lDe'u Jo-sras maintains that it was composed by sKye-nam but defined by Nyang-ral as the extensive exposition by a certain sPun-po, cf. **CHBYMTNYP**, and also Karmay, p. 222].
5. The *gSang-ba phyag-rgya-can* (**CHBYMTNYP**, **BZH**), possibly (and confusingly) also called *Grags-pa chos-lugs*, cf. **GBCHBY** 238.14–239.2. lDe'u Jo-sras maintains that it was composed by the ruler himself (*rje nyid kyis brtsams pa*) and the reading in Nyang-ral should also be seen in this light: *rje nyid gsungs pa phyag rgya can*, instead of correcting *gsungs pa* to the more obvious *gsang ba* which is tempting, cf. above *ad* text no. 1 and Karmay, *op. cit.*, p. 220. The overall Buddhist, official tradition of the origin of gNya'-khri btsan-po.

In addition to this, both mKhas-pa lDe'u and lDe'u Jo-sras mention two more important writings, books which may well contain similar material. These probably originated in the eleventh century and thus may be considered supplementary: the **Lo-rgyus chen-po/mo**, also called **Log-non chen-po**, written by dGe-bshes Khu-ston brTson'sgrus g.yung-drung (AD 1011–75)

of lHa-sdings [and by] a certain rGya-lha-po. This work, regrettably lost, was well known to Tibetan historians (as, e.g., dPa'-bo) until the fifteenth century. Finally, the **gSang-ba Yang-chung**, “The Extraordinary Small [i.e. Supplementary?] Secret [gSang-ba, i.e. to gSang-ba chos-lugs?]”, a text already known, as in the case of the previous text, to dPa'-bo, cf. Panglung, 1988, p. 351. It is a major source for an account of the succession and description of the tombs of the deceased Tibetan kings (*gshin bang so btab pa'i rabs; grongs nas bang so btab pa*).

Nyang-ral's Position

Leaving this brief survey, we may also take a brief look at the material offered by Nyang-ral, where we similarly encounter data at greater length. It consists in his presentation of different theories, which he duly refutes until he reaches the last one.

1. The [Mahābhārata-inspired] theory about gNya'-khri btsan-po's descending from one of the Pāṇḍava sons, hinted at in Prajñāvarman's celebrated passage about Rupati; cf. **CHBYMTNYP** 165a3–166a2.
2. The theory that gNya'-khri btsan-po's ancestry is to be linked with the third of the five sons of Kṣudrabala, who again is one of the two sons, i.e. Varabala and Kṣudrabala, of Ajātaśatru, being again the son of Udāyana (*sic!*), the son of King Bimbisāra, cf. **CHBYMTNYP** 166a3–b4: *la la na re 'di ni rgya gar yul bdun nas chad de ma ga ta'i rgyud la ma ga ta'i rgyal po gzugs can snying po'i bu ma skyes dgra | de'i bu gzhon nu 'char byed | de'i bu gnyis dang stobs mchog dang stobs chung ngo | stobs chung la sras lnga yod pa'i lnga tshig[s] mtshan dang ldan pa bram ze mtshan mkhan la bstan pas | mkhan pos mtshan 'khrul te 'di mched la ngan pas spyugs na bzang zer re nas g.yog bdun dang bcas te spyugs pa yin zer te de yang ma yin zer te bu phu bo stobs mchog gi rgyal pos nu bo phrogs ste pham pas bu phos lha ma hā de ba bsgrubs te mthu btang bas stobs chung gi 'khor thams cad shi ste phu bos 'dul byas te | rgyal sa gtad nas nu bo la yang rgyal srid dgos [= bgos?] te byin | bod du byung zhing 'phel ba ma yin no |*
3. The theory that gNya'-khri btsan-po is the third son in the fifth generation from the Kosala king Prasenajit, cf. **CHBYMTNYP** 166b4–5: *la la na re [s]ko[s] sa la'i rgyal po gsas [= gsal] rgyal gyi rgyud las rabs lnga na sras lnga tshigs gcig mtshan mkhan 'khrul nas spyugs pa las 'phel zer ba yo | de yang ma yin te de rnam la khungs thub pa'i gtan tshigs med do |* For these theories, cf. also **GBCHBY** 238.3–242.6.
4. The [Bon] theory that he is to be identified with lHa gar-ma, the fourth (*bdun tshigs*) among the seven *raba mched* of the Srid pa'i lha (cf. here

the parallel in Haarh, p. 213), **CHBYMTNYP** 166b6–167a4: *la la na re 'gro ba mi la rje med | dud 'gro rngog chags la skyen bu med nas lha [ri] gyang mtho 'i kha nas phyis mi [= phya 'i] rgad po gcig gis lhas spyon lan gsum byas pas lha 'i snongs phyug [= bcu] [g]cig byung [ste] de la mi 'i lhar mi 'dod byas nas gnam du spur te btang | srid pa 'i lha rabs mched bdun gyi bdun tshigs gsungs so | ming yang lha gar ma zhes bya 'o | de nas yang lha ri 'i kha nas phya 'i rgan mos lhas spyon lan gsum byas pas gnam rim bcu gsum gyi kha nas gnya ' khri btsan po by on pa yin zer |*

5. The Bon theory (sharing elements with **Po-ti bse-ru**, cf. Haarh, *ibid.*, pp. 253–62) proclaiming gNya'khri btsan-po to be the son of gZig-dgu[, who is the son of] sTag-dgu, being the son of dBu-nag, who again is the son of sMon-mi dbu[s]-dkar, and further down through Shes-rab sMon-pa btsan, mThing-gi, Yab lha brda[l]-drug, Bar-[pa] bdun-tshigs, etc., and ultimately descends from Yin [=Ye?]-smon; **CHBYMTNYP** 167a4–167b1: *bon po la la na re sems can yin smon byas pa las gnam nas lha 'i lha bzang re [= ste] bar la [= pa?] bdun tshig[s] | rje yab lha brda' drug sras rgyal bu mthing gi byung | de 'i sras shes rab smon pa btsan | de 'i sras smon mi dbus dkar | dbu nag de 'i sras stag gu gzig dgu de 'i sras gnya' khri btsan po | de 'i sras khri rtse 'bum bzher | de sras lha tho re byon zer te de rmams thams cad ma yin no | = Yo-ga lha-gyes-can theory, cf. also the more detailed mKhas-pa lDe'u, **GBCHBY** 227.14–238.5 and lDe'u Jo-sras, **DCHBY** 99.17–102.12.*
6. Finally, Nyang-ral cites (his favourite) theory (adopted by Bu-ston also) maintaining that gNya'khri btsan-po should be the off-spring of King Udayana of Vatsa. What follows now in **CHBYMTNYP** (and Bu-ston's **CHBY**), here being bound up with the present provenance theory, is a description of this miraculous being as being endowed with features such as eyes closing from below and his fingers being connected by a web etc. (cf. for details, Haarh, *ibid.*, pp. 179, 197–212). This description, however, most of the later Tibetan Buddhist historiographers agree, is part of the legend originating within the *gSang-ba chos-lugs* tradition. Where the historians disagree is on the question as to which Indian royal figure, as enumerated, e.g., by Bu-ston, should be identified as the alleged Tibetan progenitor. Also the tale winds up here with this Indian-born progenitor's escape to Tibet and his descent upon the lHa-ri gYang-mtho and lHa-ri Rol [or Yol]-po, etc., as delineated for instance in **rGyal-rabs gsal-ba'i me-long**, Chap. 8; **CHBYMTNYP** 167b7–169a4: *'o na gang ltar yin zhes na | rgyal po srong btsan rgam bu 'i [= sgam po 'i] zhal nas | 'di ni rgya gar gyi bha [= bad] sa la rgyal po [']char byed la | sras rgyal po shar pa 'o | de la sras gnyis byung ba 'i nu bo 'i rgyud la btsun mo dam pa la sras shig btsas te phu bo mig bya [r]mig ltar mas gyi[s] yar 'gebs | dpral ba 'i dbyes che na [= ba] | g.yu 'i smin ma yod pa | sna 'i gzengs legs pa | so dung so 'khor ba yod pa lag pa 'i sor mo ngang pa lta bu 'brel ba |*

gzi brjid yod pa zhig zhig byung ngo | des yab rgyal po 'i snyan du gsol bas | de ltas ngan zhig 'dug pas
 gsod cig par gnang ngo | de la blon po rnam s kyi[s] mtshon gyis 'debs par ma phod te zangs kha sbyar
 du bcug [nas] de nas shing sgrom byas te nor skal dang bcas pa chu bo gha gha [= gang gā] bsk[y]ur
 btang ngo | de grong khyer yangs pa can gyi chu kha nas zhing pas rnyed de | de nags khrod du gsos pas
 de mkhar gyi rgyal po yin pas | ri duags thams cad kyi[s] rtsed zla byas | gcan gzan thams cad kyi[s] zas
 [b]skyal | shing thams cad kyi[s] mgo bsdu [= dud?] | bya thams cad kyi[s] skad 'don no | der me tog
 thams cad kha ba ston [= kha bstan?] | de la rgyal bu na re 'khor ngan pa ji ltar yin nga 'i pha su yin zer
 ba dang | khyed pha yis ltas ngan du byas nas [g]sod zer | blon po rnam s kyi[s] ma gsad par chur bor ba
 yin pas de nged mams kyi[s] rnyed pa 'i gtam rgyud bshad pas | yid ma dga ' nas gangs kyi phrag tu bro
 pas | byang phyogs thams cad kyi ri lha ri gyang [ma] mtho 'i khar byung | de nas bltas pas kha ba can
 gyi rgyal khams kyi dbus na yar mo sna bzhi | lha yar l[h]a sham po mthong nas | bsod nams 'od kyi
 dmu skas la babs te | lha ri yol ba 'i [= po 'i] khar byon no | | de nas btsan thang sgo bzhir byon pas | de 'i
 dus su bod 'dir spre 'u 'i rgyud rnam s bdud dang | gnod sbyin la sogs pa mnga mdzad rim pa bdun gyi
 tha ma la | rgyal sil bu 'am bcu gnyis | rgyal phrati mo ngan la sogs pas dbang byas nas | gcig zer la
 gcig mi nyan te | ma 'chms pas dmangs rnam s mnar nas brdungs [= gdungs] pa la | 'gal lha 'i sras | smu
 [= dmu] bon po dang | co la bon po dang | zhang zhung bon po dang | tshe mi bon po dang | zings pa
 bon po dang | ze ba bon po dang | shes pa mkhan bcu gnyis phyugs skyongs bai sar byon pa dang | de
 dag gi[s] mthar sgam gyis khye 'u su yin byas pas | btsan po yin zer | gang nas 'ongs dris pas | 'dzub mo
 gnam du bsgrengs | de 'i rgya gar gyi skad pa ra pi ra ma go nas | 'di ni gnam nas byon pa 'i lha | mi rje
 ngo mtshar can zhig 'dug pas 'di khyim gyi mi rnam s la ston no zer te | shing la khri byas mi 'i gnya ' ba
 la khur nas grong khyer gyi mi rnam s la bstan pas | 'di ni gnam las byon pa 'i btsan po ngo mtshar can
 zhig 'dug pas | 'o cag rnam s kyi jo bo bya 'o zer te | bon po rnam s na re | gnam [r]gung nas sa dog pa la
 gnyags pa 'i rgyal po sa thams cad la dbang ba yin zer | ming yang gnya ' khri btsan po bya bar grags so
 |

Regal Names and Successions: The Pre-historic Line

A remarkable consensus has long been maintained concerning the transmission of the pre-historic line of the Tibetan Yar-lung Dynasty. This assumption can be culled from the extensive concordance delivered by Haarh,² where it has been amply documented that the entire lineage of the dynasty numbered forty-two kings from its mythical foundation by gNya'-khri btsan-

² Erik Haarh, *The Yar-lung Dynasty*, pp. 33–98.

po until the collapse of the dynasty in AD 842. As reliable contemporary data at our disposal only allow us to reckon Srong-btsan sgam-po as the first documented historical figure, all royal figures prior to him must necessarily be assigned to a pre-historic lineage. Moreover, as the historical line usually counts ten royal heads, this pre-historic stemma is thus considered to number thirty-two kings.

Since the synoptic listing of twenty-two sources by Haarh, which offers a representation of the pre-historic line, it has been a commonly accepted dictum that the Tibetan [Buddhist] historiographical tradition evinces a fairly clear consensus both in terms of the sub-divisions and grouping of the kings as well as in what concerns the names and number of kings that adhere to each royal group. Since the publication of Haarh's survey, new sources, and in particular sources of considerable antiquity, i.e. all prior to the fourteenth century, have come to light. The present survey offers a schematic representation of a number of new pre-fourteenth century Tibetan historiographical sources published or traced within the last twenty years. As quite a number of Haarh's sources are relatively late, secondary and, moreover, fairly uniform, they only add a little information to the possible existence of any earlier and thus more original representation of the line and groups.

Here we shall not attempt to reconstruct a proto-version of the pre-historic line, nor will any attempt be made to answer the intriguing question as to the origin of this segmentation of the lineage into separate bodies and their nomenclatura. Rather, it adds a bulk of new data, or a *corpus comparationis*, for further research. What is to be adduced is that, despite occasional discrepancies in terms of the names and number of kings in some of these groups, the overall number of thirty-two kings would seem to be confirmed.

As already noted by Haarh, *loc. cit.*, p. 72, the king lHa Tho-tho-ri gnyan-shal, the first "Buddhist" king in the pre-historic line and variously listed as the twenty-sixth to the twenty-eighth king, constitutes the turning-point between a pre-Buddhist strata of kings divided into more or less well defined groups and a remaining pre-historic Buddhist lineage, usually numbering four kings. The fact that this division into groups comprises almost exclusively the pre-Buddhist part of the lineage should arouse our suspicions (which Haarh also noted), namely that the entire construction and representation are an integral part of a later Buddhist mythographical tradition that attempted to reconstruct the origins of the Tibetan Dynasty. That the material has been substantially reworked by later Buddhist historiographers cannot surprise us. But we have cogent reason to assume that, as Haarh also hinted, behind this reworking and these schematic representations of the lineage, earlier pre-Buddhist structures may be assumed, though to what extent this postulate holds true still remains to be documented.

The lineage usually consists of the following five defined groups:³

1. *The Seven Throne Kings of Space (gnam gyi khri bdun)*

This group, which enumerates the kings with the name-element throne descending from/originating in space, is uniformly transmitted while almost all sources list seven figures. Do note that the complement *btsan-po*, or king, should be added to the first two name-elements; thus gNya'-khri is gNya'-khri btsan-po and so forth, *mutatis mutandis*.

When comparing the lists below against the lists given in Haarh, *op.cit.*, p. 40, we observe that both **GBCHBY** and **DCHBY** are closely related to the Buddhist division found in particular in Haarh's division A. The royal figures, Nos. 1–3, show full conformity throughout all sources. The problems and discrepancies emerge with figure 4 and henceforth. Noteworthy also are the apparent metathetical (?) Khri-begs (-pe/pan) and Khri-ye[r] forms, where *khri* usually forms the second element and not the first. Could we here assume a scribal error similar to Khri-gum, which clearly is mistaken for Gri-gum, usually considered the first king in the next group? This inclusion, incidentally, characterizes the division called C in Haarh, but see also the next group.

	KCHKKHM-1 (665.12–15)	KCHKKHM-2 (84.12–15)	CHBYMTNYP (A) (169a6–b4)
1.	(1) gNya'-khri	(1) gNya'-khri	(1) gNya'-khri
2.	(2) Mu-khri	(2) sMu-khri	(3) Mu-khri
3.	(5) Ding-khri	(4) Deng-khri	(2) Ding-khri
4.	(3) Khri-btsan	(3) lHa-khri	(6) gNya, -khri-po
5.	(4) Dad-khri	(5) Ngos-khri	(5) Ye-shes-khri
6.	(7) Khri-begs	(6) Khri-pe	(7) Khri-pan
7.	(6) Srab-khri	(7) Gung-khri	(4+8 <i>sic</i>) Srib-khri
	CHBYMTNYP (B) (Tafel 362.1.1–3)	GBCHBY (243.18–244.5)	DCHBY (102.13–17)
1.	(1) gNya'-khri	(1) gNya'-khri	(1) gNya'-khri
2.	(2) Mu-khri	(2) Mug-khri	(2) Mug-khri
3.	(3) Ding-khri	(3) Ding-khri	(3) Deng-khri
4.	(4) So-khri	(4) So-khri	(4) So-khri
5.	(5) Khri-ye	(5) 'Dar-khri	(5) Dog-khri
6.	(6) Khri-yer	(6) gDags-khri	(6) gDags-khri
7.	(7) Gri-gum*	(7) Srib-khri	(7) Srib-khri

³ Please note that the numbers in the first column at the very left, set in bold type, refer to the number and corresponding royal names given in the prevailing list in Haarh, p. 40, and that the number in parentheses indicates the relative position of the names in the succession in the relevant text; *x* = deest.

BGR (197a1–2)	NGTMTPH (2b6–7)
1. (1) gNya'-khri	(1) gNya'-khri
2. (3) Mu-khri	(3) Mu-khri
3. (2) Deng-khri	(2) Ding-khri
4. (6) Khri-ye	(6) Khri-so
5. (7) Khri-gum*	(7) Khri-gum*
6. (5) gDags-khri	(5) gDags-khri
7. (4) Pri-khri	(4) Srib-skhri

*In **BGR** and **NGTMTPH**, king number seven, Khri-gum, is no doubt Gri-gum btsan-po, who is usually considered the eighth king in the pre-historic line and one of the subsequent sTeng gnyis kings; cf. below and Haarh, *op. cit.*, p. 75. Cf. also abbreviated **MBNTH** 26a2ff.

2. *The Two Superior Kings of the Upper Sphere (stod kyi steng gnyis)*

This small group numbers two figures, the two Upper or Superior kings originating in/descending from the Upper sphere. It is interesting to see the supplementary nomenclature prevailing, i.e. the Father and the Son of the Upper Sphere. Not unsurprisingly, in **CHBYMTNYP**, **BGR** and **NGTMTPH**, similar to Haarh's division C, Gri-gum is discounted from this group, and possibly occasioned by the *btsan-po* in Gri-gum btsan-po, this figure is included among the *btsan-po* kings of the first group. The total absence in **CHBYMTNYP** of both Gri-gum and sPu-lde/'O-lde, two highly important figures in the mythological tradition, is particularly noteworthy. This makes Nyang-ral's testimony unique in the transmission. Significant also is the fact that a number of texts characterize this group as the two kings of the Upper Sphere, other texts designate them the two Upper kings of the Intermediate Sphere (*bar gyi steng*), cf. Haarh, *op. cit.*, pp. 73–7.

KCHKKHM-1 (668.2)	KCHKKHM-2 (88.18–19)	CHBYMTNYP
1. Gri-gum/Pha-stengs	Gri-gum/Pha-stengs	x
2. sPu-lde/Bu-stengs	sPu-lde/Bu-stengs	x
BGCHBY (244.5–248.11)	DCHBY (103.1–18)	BGR (197a2)
1. Gri-gum	Gri-gum/Yab-stengs	x
2. 'U-de gung-rgyal	sPu-lde/Sras-stengs	sPu-lde
NGTMTPH (2b7)		
1. x		
2. 'O-ste spu-rgyal		

3. *The Six Excellent Kings of the Intermediate Sphere (bar gyi legs drug)*

The group in which the six Excellent Kings of the Intermediate Sphere are listed similarly evinces a fair consensus in terms of its transmission. Some sources again designate this group the six Excellent kings of the Intermediate Sphere, others the six Excellent kings of the Terrestrial Sphere. See Haarth for a fuller discussion, and also the next group. Conspicuous too is the second name found in **BGR** and by Nel-pa Paṇḍita.

<p>KCHKHM-1 (668.3–4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (1) I-sho-legs 2. (3) Di-sho-legs 3. (2) Di-sho-legs 4. (4) Gu-ru-legs 5. (5) 'Gro-ije-legs 6. (6) [g]Shog-legs 	<p>KCHMMHM-2 (89.3–6)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) lHa-sho-legs (4) The-sho-legs (5) Tho-sho-legs (2) Go-ru-legs (3) 'Brong-zhi-legs (6) I-sho-legs 	<p>CHBYMTNYP (A) (172a5–b3)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) A-sho-legs (6) The-sho-legs (4) dGe-sho-legs (3) Go-ru-legs (5) 'Brang-rje-legs (2) I-sho-legs
<p>CHBYMTNYP (B) (362.1.5–361.2.1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (1) Sho-legs 2. (2) De-sho-legs 3. (5) I-sho-rno-legs 4. (3) Phu-ru-legs 5. (4) 'Bring-shar-legs 6. (6) I-sho-legs 	<p>GBCHBY (248.11–17)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Ni-sho-legs (2) De-sho-legs (5) The-sho-legs (3) Gor-bu-legs (4) 'Bro-bzhi-legs (6) I-sho-legs 	<p>DCHBY (104.1–4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Sho-legs (2) De-sho-legs (5) The-sho-legs (3) Gor-bu-legs (4) 'Bro-bzhi-legs (6) I-sho-legs
<p>BGR (197a2–3)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (5) I-sho-legs 2. (3) Sho-legs 3. (1) Ngo-legs 4. (2) 'Og-rgyu-legs 5. (4) 'Bro-zhing-legs 6. (6) Ring-gnam zi-legs/Zi-gnam zi-legs* 	<p>NGTMTPH (3a2–3)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (5) I-sho-legs (2) Tho-legs (3) Sho-legs (4) mGo-ru-legs (5) 'Bro-sho-legs (6) Ri-gnam-zin/Zha-gnam zin-legs* 	

*This latter name belongs to the subsequent list according to other sources, but carrying the element *legs*, it properly belongs to this group. See next group.

4. *The Eight lDe/sDe Kings of the Terrestrial Sphere (sa la sde/lde brgyad)*

This group enumerates the eight lDe/sDe Kings of the Terrestrial Sphere in the authorized Buddhist tradition. It is also confirmed in our new sources, although some of our texts show some remarkable *lacunae* in the transmission.

KCHKKHM-1 (668.5–6)	KCHKKHM-2 (89.7–11)	CHBYMTNYP (A) (172b4–173a2)
1. <i>x</i>	(1) Za-nam-zin-te	(1) rGyal-nam-zin-te
2. (2) lDe-'od gzhung-btsan-lde	(2+3) lDe-'phrul-po gNam-gzhung-btsan gNam-zhung-btsan	(3) lDe-'sprul gNam-zhung-btsan
3. <i>x</i>	(6) bSe-rnol-nam	(7) lDe [rgyal]-nam
4. <i>x</i>	(5) sDe-rnol-nam	(2) gNam-spu'o gZhung-btsan-lde (!)
5. (1) lDe-rnol-nam	(7) bSe-rnol-po	(4) lDe-snol-nam
6. <i>x</i>	(4) sDe-rnol-po	(6) lDe-gso-nam-nam
7. <i>x</i>	(8) sDe-rgyal-po	(5) lDe-rgyal-po
8. (3) lDe-srin-btsan	<i>x</i>	(8) lDe-khri/Srid-btsan
CHBYMTNYP(B) (Tafel 361.2.1–3)	GBCHBY (248.18–22)	DCHBY (104.5–14)
1. (1) bZa'-nam-zin-te	(1) Gyal-zan Nam-zin-lde	(1) Gyal rNam zin-lde
2. (2) lDe-'khrul-po	(2) lDe-'Phrul-po Nam-gzhung-btsan	(2) lDe-'Khrul-po gNam-gzhung-btsan
3. (3) lDe-snol-nam	(4) lDe-gnol-nam	(4) bSe-rnol-gnam-de
4. <i>x</i>	(5) bSe-lde gnol-po	(5) bSe-rnol-po-lde
5. <i>x</i>	(6) bSe-lde gnol-nam	(3) lDe-rnol-nam
6. <i>x</i>	(3) lDe-gnol-po	<i>x</i>
7. (4) lDe-rGyal-te <i>x</i>	(7) lDe-rgyal-po <i>x</i>	(6) lDe-rgyal-po (7+8) rGyal-po sprin [<i>dang?</i>] btsan-lde
8.		
BGR (197a3)	NGTMTPH (3a3–4)	
1. (1) lDe-mnam (!) zin-lde	(2) lDe-rmul-bu (!)	
2. (2) 'Phrul-po gzhung-btsan	(1) lDe-gnam 'Khrul-po gzhung-btsan	
3. (6) lDe-se-snol-lam	(5) lDe-bis rnol-gnam	
4. (7) lDe-se rnol-po	(7) lDe-se-mol-po	
5. (4) lHo-snol-nam	(3) lDe-rnol-nam	
6. (5) lDe-snol-po	(4) lDe-rnol-lo	
7. (8) lDe-rgyal-po	(8) lDe-rgyal-po	
8. (3) rMan-bum	(6) lDe-rmu-la-gnam	

5. *The Three/Five Mighty Kings of the Underworld ('og gi btsan gsum/ Inga)*

The last group of the pre-Buddhist lineage of the pre-historic kings is also very unevenly transmitted. As already shown by Haarh, *op. cit.*, pp. 74–6, the name of the group alone varies markedly. In some texts the group

is called the *btsan*-kings of the Lower Sphere (*'og, smad*), in others of the Intermediate Sphere, or of the Sphere of Juncture [?, *tshigs*]. The number of kings belonging to this group also differs pronouncedly, including from three to seven kings. As discussed by Haarh, the crucial figure in this list is King lHa Tho-tho-ri-gnyan-shal, who is included in the *btsan*-group and then always under the name lHa Tho-tho ri gñan/snyan-btsan.

<p>KCHKKHM-1 (668.6–669.2)</p> <p>1. (1) rGyal-lde long-btsan</p> <p>2. (2) Khri-de'i btsan-gnam</p> <p>3. (3) Khri-sgra dpung-btsan</p> <p>4. (4) Khri-thog-rje-thog-btsan</p> <p>5. (5) lHa Tho-tho-ri-snyan-shal</p> <p>16. x</p>	<p>KCHKKHM-2 (89.12–15)</p> <p>(1) [rGyal-po sPrin-btsan]*/ Thog-re long-btsan</p> <p>(2) Khri-btsan-nam</p> <p>(3) Khri-sgra spung-btsan</p> <p>(4) Thog-rje-thog-btsan</p> <p>x</p> <p>x</p>	<p>CHBYMTNYP (A) (173a3–176a4)</p> <p>(1) rGyal-thod re-long-btsan</p> <p>(2) Khri-btsan-nam</p> <p>(3) Khri-sgra dpung btsan</p> <p>(4) Khri-thog-rje-thog-btsan</p> <p>(5) lHa Tho-tho-ri-snyan-shal</p> <p>(6) Khri-gnyan gzung-btsan*</p>
<p>CHBYMTNYP (B) (Tafel 361.2.3–4)</p> <p>1. (1) To-re long btsan</p> <p>2. (2) Khri-btsan rnam-rnal</p> <p>3. (3) Khri-btsan rgyal-dpung-btsan</p> <p>4. (4) Thog-rje thog-btsan</p> <p>5. (5) Tho-tho gnyan-btsan</p> <p>[6.]</p>	<p>GBCHBY (249.6–250.16)</p> <p>(1+2) rGyal-po sPrin-btsan†/ rGyal sto-re-lo-btsan</p> <p>(3) Khri-btsan-nam</p> <p>(4) Khri-sgra sgrungs-btsan</p> <p>(5) Khri-thog-rje thog-btsan</p> <p>(6) lHa Tho-tho-ri btsan</p> <p>(7) Khri-gnyan gzung-btsan‡</p>	<p>DCHBY (104.15–105.12)</p> <p>(1) rGyal-to-to re-long-btsan</p> <p>(2) Khri-btsan-nam</p> <p>(3) Khri-sgra bsgrungs-btsan</p> <p>(4) Khri-thog-rje thog-btsan</p> <p>(5) lHa Tho-tho-re-snyan-btsan</p>
	<p>BGR (197a3–6)</p> <p>1.(1) rGyal-tho los-btsan</p> <p>2.(2) Khri-btsan-nam</p> <p>3.(3) Khri-sgra yungs btsan</p>	<p>NGTMTPH</p> <p>(1) rGyal-po-long btsan</p> <p>(2) Khri-btsan</p> <p>(3) Khri-sgra spungs-btsan</p>

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 4. (4) Khri-thog-rje-thog-btsan | (4) Khri-thog-ije thog-btsan |
| 5. (5) Tho-tho-ri-snyan-btsan | (5) lHa mTho-tho-ri snyan-btsan |

*This text lists this group as the six bTsan-kings of the intermediate sphere (*bar ka btsan drug*). See also next section.

†This is in fact the last king of the eight lDe-kings, see above.

‡This text, as the only one, lists seven bTsan-kings (*tshigs la btsan bdun*), among them also the son of lHa-tho-tho-ri snyan-shal.

The Group of Buddhist Kings of the Pre-historic Line

This last group of kings carries no name in the Tibetan transmission of the pre-historic kings.

<p>KCHKKHM-1 (674.6–675.1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (1) Khri-snyan bzung-btsan 2. (2) 'Bro-snyan lde-ru 3. (3) sTag-gu gzigs 4. (4) gNam-ri long-btsan 	<p>KCHKKHM-2 (97.1–10)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Khri-gnyan bzung-btsan (2) <i>x</i> (3) sTag-gu gnyan-gzigs (4) gNam-ri srong-btsan 	<p>CHBYMTNYP (A) (176a3–176b4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Khri-gnyan gzung-btsan* (2) mNyes lde-gu (3) sTag-ri gnyan-gzigs (4) gNam-ri srong-btsan
<p>CHBYMTNYP (B) (Tafel 361.2.4–5)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (1) <i>x</i> 2. (2) 'Brong-gnyan lde'u 3. (3) sTag-gu gnyan-gzigs 4. (4) gNam-ri long-btsan 	<p>GBCHBY (250.15–252.4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Khri-gnyan gzung-btsan (2) 'Bro-snyan lde-ru (3) sTag-gu nyan-gzigs (4) gNam-ri srong-btsan 	<p>DCHBY (107.1–108.4)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Khri-snya[n] zungs-btsan (2) 'Bro-gnyen lde'u (3) sTag-gu snyan-gzigs (4) gNam-ri srong-btsan
<p>BGR (197b6–197a1)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (1) Khri-gnyen bzung-btsan 2. (2) 'Bro-gnyen lde-ru 3. (3) sTag-ri gnyen-gzigs 4. (4) gNam-ri srong-btsan 	<p>NGTMTPH (3a5)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Khri-gnyan gzung-btsan (2) 'Brong-gnyen srong-btsan (3) sTag-ri gnya'-gzigs (4) gNam-ri srong-btsan 	

*This king actually belongs to the previous group.

Sigla

BZH: *sBa-bzhed*, also *bSam-yas kyi dkar-chag chen-mo* or *mNga'-bdag Khri-srong lde'u-btsan gyi zhal-chems bSam-yas Ka-brtsigs chen-mo*.

1. pp. 1–92, ed. Stein, 1961. 2. Modern book ed., pp. 1–82, Mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khang. 1980.

Author: sBa gsal-snang.

Date: The core (oldest part) probably from the mid-9th cent., but from the *phyi dar* period, **BZH** was repeatedly revised. The annotated (*zhabs btags ma*) (Stein ed.) at the earliest from c. AD 1300 and later recensions revised during the 13–14th cent.

TV.: cf. paraphrase, Stein, 1961.

CHBYMTNYP: *Chos-'byung me-tog snying-po'i sbrang-rtsi'i bcud, rNying-ma'i chos-'byung chen-mo*, or *mNga'-bdag Nyang gi chos-'byung, Dam-chos chos-'byung*.

1. ed., Facsimile of MS, 515 fols (Tafel 1–366), ed. R. O. Meisezahl, 1985.

2. Mod. book ed., pp. 1–544, *Gangs-can rigs-mdzod*, Vol. 5, ed. Chab-spel Tshe-brtan phun-tshogs, Bod-ljongs mi-dmangs dpe-skrun-khang, 1988.

Author: mNga'-bdag Nyang-ral Nyi-ma 'od-zer (AD 1136–92/1204).

Date: ? c. AD 1175–90.

Tr.: cf. L. S. Dagyab's survey in Meisezahl, 1985, pp. 21–3.

DCHBY: *lDe'u chos-'byung*; also *Chos-'byung chen-mo bstan pa'i rgyal-mtshan lDe'u Jo-sras kyi mdzad-pa*.

Ed. pp. 1–163, Bod-ljongs mi-dmangs dpe-skrun-khang, 1987.

Author: lDe'u Jo-sras.

Date: around AD 1175. Cf. intro, and intro, to **GBCHBY**, *infra*.

Thematically and textually closely affiliated with **GBCHBY** and as in the case with the relationship between **CHBYMTNYP** and **MBNTH**, both by Nyang-ral, this may add credence to the contention that lDe'u Jo-sras and mKhas-pa lDe'u are one and the same person. If this contention holds true, it must be assumed that lDe'u Jo-sras, or the Noble-son lDe'u is the younger and mKhas-pa lDe'u is the older lDe'u, in which case it must be assumed that **DCHBY** predates **GBCHBY**, in contradiction to what is currently assumed.

GBCHBY: *mKhas-pa lDe'us mdzad-pa'i rGya-bod kyi chos-'byung rgyas-pa*.

1. Modern ed., pp. 1–412; *Gangs-can rigs-mdzod*, III, ed. Chab-spel Tshe-brtan phun-tshogs, Bod-yig dpe-rnying dpe-skrun-khang, 1987. Author: dGe-bshes alias mKhas-pa lDe'u.

The contention that the nebulous figures lDe'u Jo-sras (cf. **DCHBY**) and mKhas-pa lDe'u refer to one and the same person (as younger and older, resp.) still remains to be proved. Cf. above. Date: possibly around AD 1141–5, prior to **DCHBY**, q.v. Chab-speVs intro., I–X.

KCHKKHM: *bKa-chems ka-khol-ma*: two different versions:

KCHKKHM-1: A: *rGyal-rabs dang | gser gyi lha shākya mu-ne bzhengs na bod-yul dbus-su gdan-drangs lugs dang rigs-gsum mgon-po mdzad-spyod | rgyal-po srong-btsan sgam-po rnam-thar bsdus-pa* (also denoted *passim*: *rGyal-po 'i bka'-chems*), MS, 1b1–81a2, Collection Dybykov, Akademija Nauk SSSR, Institut Narodov Azii, St. Petersburg; cf. Vostrikov, 1962, pp. 25–9. B: *id.*, but differently titled: *'Phags-pa sPyan-ras-gzigs dbang-phyug gyi rnam-thar | rigs gsum mgon-po 'i mdzad-spyod | jo-bo-rje 'i bzhengs lugs | ma-ñi padme 'i lung-bstan | mes-mgon gsum gyi dpe 'i rgyal-po srong-btsan sgam-po 'i rnam-sprul | bod-yul dbus kyi yon-tan gtsug-lag-khang gi bshad-pa | rgyal-po bka'-chems kyi shog-ril mdo-tsam byas-pa | bka khol-ma*, MS, fasc., reprod. 613.1–803.4, embodied in *Ma-'ongs lung-bstan gsal-ba 'i sgron-me*, Vol. 1, The Stog Manuscript, Leh 1973. 13 chapters.

KCHKKHM-2: *Bod kyi rgyal-po Srong-btsan sgam-po 'i bka'-chems gser gyi 'phreng-ba* (or *bKa'-chems Ka-khol-ma*).

1. book ed., pp. 1–321, copied from two identical MSS kept in Beijing Nationalities Library and the Library of Bla-brang bKra-shis 'khyil; ed. sMon-lam rgya-mtsho, Kan-su'u mi-rigs dpe-skrunkhang, Lanzhou, 1989.

16 chapters.

The above versions are all later revised apographs (*dpe phyi mo*) of an original (*ma phyi*)

KCHKKHM, now no more extant, if or when version 2 is identified as the original version.

Author: Apocryphon (*gter ma*), putative authorship rGyal-po Srong-btsan sgam-po; *gter ston* Atiśa, alias *Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna*, discovered (*spyang drangs*) c. AD 1049–50 beneath the *ka-ba bum-pa-can* pillar of Ra-sa 'Phrul-snang or Jo-khang in Lhasa. Such mythographical-revelatory discoveries (*spyang drangs*) usually stand for a compilation of such texts. **KCHKKHM** was originally part of **MÑKB** mdo-skor, cf. **MÑKB**, *dkar-chag*, 6a2, and *infra*.

Date: Parts of the original plausibly already from the dynastic period, but probably first compiled in the 12th cent. The **KCHKKHM**-apographs from the 13th–15th centuries.

KTHDNG: *bKa'-thang sde-lnga*: 5 books: (1) KA: *lHa-'dre bka 'i thang-yig*; (2) KHA: *rGyal-po bka 'i thang-yig*; (3) GA: *bTsun-mo bka 'i thang-yig*; (4) NGA: *Lo-paṅ bka 'i thang-yig*; (5) CA: *Blon-po bka 'i thang-yig*.

Ed.: 2. Tib. print Mundgod, 1975. 3. book ed., (based upon a sDe-dge print, pp. 1–539, Mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khang, Beijing, 1988.

Author: Apocryphon (*gter ma*). Discovered/compiled by O-rgyan gling-pa (1323–67/74?) and Kundga' tshul-khrims.

Date: Various dates, cf. most convincingly, but still tentatively, Blondeau, 1971, pp. 42–48: KA: AD 1347; KHA: prior to AD 1368; GA: AD 1368–93; NGA: AD 1393–95; CA: AD 1368–93. Cf. also Vostrikov, 1962, pp. 39–42; Tucci, 1949, pp. 110–15.

Tr.: Vol. KA paraphrased by Blondeau, 1971; Vol. GA, cf. B. Laufer, 1911.

MBNTH: *Mi-rje-lhas mdzad byang-chub sems-dpa' chen-po Chos-rgyal Mes-dbon rnam-gsum gyi rnam-par thar-pa rin-po-che'i phreng-ba.*

1b1–151a4 (= 1.1–302.4), in *Rin-chen gter-mdzod chen-po'i rgyab-chos*, Vol. 7, Paro 1980.

Author: Myang (or Nyang)-ral Nyi-ma 'od-zer (1136–92/1204)? Ascribed, in all probability, to Nyang-ral, but the colophon (151b4 = 301.3) asserts that it was the work [(*bya'i dpe*) = compilation?] of a certain bTsun-pa Shakya Rin-chen of 'Bri-khung, whom Szerb, 1990, *op. cit.*, XXVI, a. 56, makes a contemporary of *spyang-snga* Grags-pa 'byung-gnas (1175–1255). See below.

Date: c. AD 1190–1200 (written simultaneously with or slightly posterior to Nyang-ral

CHBYMTNYP, q.v.).

Judging from the contents, Nyang-ral's *Mes-dbon rnam-gsum gyi rnam-thar* appears to be nothing but a condensed or abbreviated version of the *magnum opus* **CHBYMTNYP**, as large parts of the text and topics both sequentially and textually are completely congruous. This topical concordance corroborates that **MBNTH**, whether formally compiled or copied from **CHBYMTNYP** by bTsun-pa Shakya Rin-chen or not, should in all likelihood be attributed to Nyang-ral.

MÑKB: *Chos-skyong-ba'i rgyal-po Srong-btsan sgam-po'i bka'-'bum*, alias *Ma-ñi bka'-'bum*: 3 Glegs-bam: *stod kyi cha*: I. *dkar-chag* + *Bla-ma'i brgyud-pa*

II. Vol. E (= A–D)

mdo-skor:

A. *Sangs-rgyas stong-rtsa'i zhal-gdams zhes-bya-ba Lo-rgyus chen-mo* (36 le'u).

B. *Ārya-Karaṇḍavyūha-nāma-mahāyānasūtra*.

Ba. *'Phags-pa byang-chub sems-dpa' sPyan-ras-gzigs dbang-phyug phyag-stong spyan-stong dang ldan-pa thogs-pa mi-mnga' ba'i thugs-rje chen-po'i sems rgya-cher yongs-su rdzogs-pa zhes-bya-ba'i gzungs*.

C. *Chos-skyong-ba'i rgyal-po Srong-btsan sgam-po'i mdzad-pa rnam-thar gyi skor*.

Ca. *Sangs-rgyas Shākya thub-pa'i bstan-pa la mdzad-pa'i lo-rgyus* (16 skabs).

Cb. *Sangs-rgyas gzhan gyi bstan-pa la mdzad-pa'i lo-rgyus* (11 skabs).

Cc. *rGyal-bu 'Jig-rten dbang-phyug gi skyes-rabs*.

Cd. *rGyal-po'i mdzad-pa nyi-shu rtsa gcig-pa* (21 le'u).

sgrub-skor:

D. *Thugs-rje chen-po'i sgrub-thabs kyi cho-ga skor*.

Da. *bShad-thabs kyi yan-lag bShad-'grel chen-mo spyi'i khog-dbub sogs* (or *Thugs-rje chen-po nor-bu'i rgyan gyi bshad-'grel chen-mo*).

smad kyi cha:

III: WA' (= F–G).

zhal-gdams-skor:

F. *Chos-skyong-ba'i rgyal-mo Srong-btsan sgam-po'i bka'-'bum smad kyi cha zhal-gdams kyi skor*.

G. *sGrub-thabs kyi phran* (incl. *Gab-pa mngon-phyung gi skor*).

Ed.: Two-vol. fasc. of a Punakha-block.

Author: Apocryphon (*gter ma*). Putative authorship Srong-btsan sgam-po. Non-Tantric vita-cycle.

MÑKB represents a corpus of variously transmitted text-cycles. The *sūtra-cycle* (A+B (minus C)

+G) was discovered/compiled (*spyan drangs*) by gTer-ston rJe-btsun Shākya bzang-po;

the *sādhana-cycle* (D+E) by Mahāsiddha dNgos-grub; and the bulky instruction-cycle (*zhal-gdams-skor* (F)) was recovered by mNga'-bdag Myang (or Nyang)-ral Nyi-ma 'od-zer.

Date: Some of its core material, albeit mythographical, no doubt dates from the dynastic period, but the detailed and elaborate composition of **MÑKB** and the dates of the gTer-ston-s suggest a date for the overall composition-cum-composition of **MÑKB** between AD 1150–1200.

NGTMTPH: *sNgon gyi gtam me-tog phreng-ba*, alias *Ne'u chos-'byung*.

1. Ed. Uebach, 1987 2. Mod. print ed., pp. 3–54, *Gangs-can rig-mdzod IX*, Bod-ljongs Bod-yig dpe-rnying dpe-skrun-khang, Lhasa 1990. Author: Ne'u (or Nel-pa) Pañdi-ta Grags-pa smon-lam blo-gros.

Date: AD 1283, col. *chu-mo-lug*.

Tr.: Uebach, 1987.

Western Sources

Blondeau, A. M., 1971

“Le Lha-'sre bka'sthang”, A. Macdonald (ed.), *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, Paris, pp. 29–126.

———, 1985

“mKhyen-brce'i dbang-po—la biographie de Padmasambhava selon la tradition du bsGrags-pa Bon et ses sources”, *Orientalia Iosephi Tucci Memoriae Dictata*, SOR, LVI, Vol. I, Roma, pp. 111–58.

- , 1990
 “Identification de la tradition appelée bsGrags-pa bon-lugs”, in: T. Skorupski (ed.), *Indo-Tibetan Studies*, Buddhica Britannica II, Tring, pp. 37–54.
- Haarh, Erik, 1969
The Yar-lung Dynasty. A Study with Particular Regard to the Contributions by Myths and Legends to the History of Ancient Tibet and the Origin and Nature of its King, Copenhagen.
- Karmay, S. G., 1988
 “The Etiological Problem of the Yar-luñ Dynasty”, Uebach and Panglung (eds.), *Tibetan Studies*, pp. 219–222.
- Macdonald, A., 1971
 “Une Lecture des Pelliot tibétain 1286, 1287, 1038, 1047, et 1290”, Macdonald (ed.), *Études tibétaines dédiées à la memoire de Marcelle Lalou*, Paris, pp. 190–321.
- Meisezahl, R. O., 1985
Die große Geschichte des tibetischen Buddhismus nach alter Tradition, Monumenta Tibetica Historica, Abt. 1, Band 3, Sankt Augustin.
- Panglung, J. L., 1988
 “Die metrischen Berichte über die Grabmäler der tibetischen Könige. Ihre Überlieferung und ihr Beitrag zur Identifizierung”, Uebach and Panglung (eds.), *Tibetan Studies*, München, pp. 321–68.
- Sorensen, P. K.
The Clear Mirror of Royal Genealogies, Asiatische Forschungen, Wiesbaden (forthcoming).
- Stein, R. A., 1961
Une chronique ancienne de bSam-yas sBa-bzhed, Paris.
- Szerb, Jánóš, 1990
Bu ston's History of Buddhism in Tibet, Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, Vol. 5, Wien.
- Uebach, Helga, 1987
Nel-pa Paṇḍitas Chronik Me-tog Phreng-ba, Studia Tibetica, Band I, München.