

## CHHOS SRID GNYIS LDAN

—NIRMAL C. SINHA

A description of the traditional Tibetan government (1642-1951) was Chhos-srid-gnyis-ldan, that is, one which is possessed of both Dharma (Chhos) and Samsara (Srid). While in organizational sense Chhos-srid-gnyis-ldan meant a dyarchy of clerical and lay elements, in ideological sense it meant a synthesis. In this view Chhos-lugs (the norm of Dharma) and hJig-rten-lugs (the norm of Samsara) are complementary components of the mundane norm. Was this concept in accordance with the traditions of Buddhism, Indian and Tibetan? For any discussion of this question, it is essential to underline that the word 'religion' is only one and an inadequate rendering of the word Dharma, and that the Tibetan word Chhos expresses the multiple and varied content of the Sanskrit form Dharma.<sup>1</sup>

(i)

The Brahmanical (Hindu) goal of liberation (Moksha) is to be attained through a balanced pursuit of virtue (Dharma), wealth (Artha) and pleasure (Kama).<sup>2</sup> For the man in society there is no inconsistency between Dharma and Artha or between Dharma and Kama as material well-being is the means for moral endeavour.<sup>3</sup> In Vaiseshika view, material prosperity (Abhyudaya) as well as beatitude (Nihisreyasa) are realized through Dharma.<sup>4</sup> Right from the Vedic times there has been a quest for harmony between the spiritual and the temporal needs of existence. In time this became the dominant ethos of Brahmanical (Hindu) civilization and had its reflection on the State.

In the Vedic scale of values Dharma was topmost, the pursuit of sacrifices and rituals was superior to that of government and war, and the priest was the kingmaker.<sup>5</sup> This was soon challenged. In the interests of a fruitful existence Rajasastra (science of government) was equated to Dharmasastra: Arthaniti (economics) and Dandaniti (politics) were duly admitted into the category of sublime sciences.<sup>6</sup> It was realized that "when the polity becomes lifeless, the Three Vedas sink and all the Dharmas completely decay".<sup>7</sup> Therefore the custodian of the polity, the Kshatriya Varna, effectively shared the supremacy of the Brahmana Varna. By a complex code of legal fictions the

---

Concluding paper of the series 'Prolegomena to Lamaist Polity'.

Brahmana perpetuated his first place and continued to be the power behind the throne. There was no stigma for the Brahmana to be engaged in Arthaniti or Dandaniti as the Rajasastra was sublimated into Rajadharmā.

“The Rajadharmā is the refuge of the entire world.  
In Rajadharmā is found every form of renunciation,  
In Rajadharmā is combined every faculty of learning”.

*Mahabharata* <sup>8</sup>

These were not altogether idle sentiments or frothy expressions; the ethos for harmony between spiritual and temporal needs created an ideal of philosopher-king (Rajarshi). Chandragupta Maurya, who in his youth beat back the battalions of Seleukos Nikator, ended his days as a Jaina recluse. His grandson Asoka remains the solitary grandeur of a saint-king in the entire history of mankind. In medieval India, Sivaji the Maratha gained the esteem of his people more because of his code of renunciation (Bhagwa Jhanda) than because of his genius in war. When Gandhi in our own time applied the ideal of renunciation in politics he was recalling the traditional polity of India.

An idealistic view of politics as the Rajadharmā not only sanctioned the participation in statecraft by the sages and seers: the priests and monks. The Rajadharmā summoned the philosophers and priests to a high moral obligation.

(ii)

Buddhism began with a sharp antithesis between Politics and Ethics. The *Brahmajala Sutta* list of the wrong means of livelihood and low arts—that is, the occupations forbidden for the monks and recluses—included Kshatravidya.<sup>9</sup> In Buddhist view Kshatravidya involved violence and deceit, parricide and cannibalism; and vivid accounts of such crimes characteristic of the Kshatriya are found in *Mahabodhi Jataka*, *Mahasutosama Jataka* and *Mahaummagga Jataka*.<sup>10</sup> Kshatradharma was in short Mithyajiva.

The Buddhist concept of politics as a dismal science was no doubt due to the wars and intrigues rampant in Shodasa Mahajanapada (sixteen principalities in North India struggling for paramountcy) at the advent of Buddhism; Buddhist ethics (non-violence and quietude) reacted sharply to the Brahmanical statecraft eulogised in the Artha works. This disapproval of Kshatradharma continued into the Mahayana literature and the works of Aryadeva (*Chatuhsataka*), Asvaghosha (*Buddhacharita*) and Aryasura (*Jatakamala*) abound with exposition and con-

denomination of Kshatra attributes like quest for security (vis-a-vis quietude), attachment to state (vis-a-vis renunciation) or frenzy for fighting (vis-a-vis forbearance) and above all the recourse to unfair means to realize a fair objective (as in Brahmanical works like *Bhagavadgita* where slaughter of kinsmen on the wrong side is not an offence ipso facto). But the Mahayana literature developed a tendency "to justify the application of statecraft within its own sphere".<sup>11</sup>

The reason for this accommodation is not to be traced in the Mahayana literature but in the national ethos which Buddhism could not altogether deny. Buddhism had to seek rapprochement between Politics and Ethics in its own way.

The Buddhist antithesis between Politics and Ethics was all through involved with a quest for temporal authority sublimated into righteous rule. This syndrome, as it may be described in current Western phraseology, is manifest right from the beginning in the Buddhist diction. CHAKRA and CHAKRAVARTI, SASANA and SASTA are expressions fraught with temporal implications. 'Chakra' is the symbol of power of a dynamic (victorious) ruler while 'Chakravarti' is the world ruler. 'Sasana' is common to Dharma as well as Danda while 'Sasta' is master either as teacher or ruler. Before the Buddha, the term 'Sangha' was more used to denote occupational and political groups and less for a body of religious. When eventually Sangha became "the foremost Gana" it was the Buddha Sangha: it was then an active participant in social, economic and even political affairs. The Sangha, as the Third Jewel, did not accept Varna or Asrama: it was a corporation partly patterned on the oligarchic republics.<sup>12</sup>

Buddhist hostility to the Varnasrama had the best and the most significant expression in its attitude to the Kshatriya Varna. The Buddhist Book of Genesis, *Agganna Sutta*, records the Buddha's discourse about the creation of social order. It is a highly scientific enquiry into the early history of man: the Buddha's accounts about origin of property and election of king amazingly anticipate the Western philosophers of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In this discourse while the monks and recluses are acclaimed as the best of men, the Kshatriya is recorded as the best of the social classes and the Brahmana is placed second.

The people, according to this discourse, fixed their choice for king on the most handsome and capable individual and called him Mahasammata (one who is chosen by the multitude), Kshatriya (one who is lord of Kshetra=fields) and Raja (one who gratifies others according to Dharma); peers of this man came to be called Kshatriya. Next came the Brahmana or the class engaged in Dhyana (meditation)

and Adhyayana (teaching the sacred texts), then the Vaisya or the class engaged in trades and last the Sudra or the class engaged in hunting and such low occupations.

The Buddha concluded his discourse thus:<sup>13</sup>

The Kshatriya is the best among this folk  
Who put their trust in lineage.  
But one in wisdom and in virtue clothed  
Is best of all among spirits and men.

(trans. Rhys Davids)

The precedence of the Kshatriya over the Brahmana was consistently followed in later literature (e.g. Vasubandhu: *Abhidharmakosha* and Buddhaghosha: *Visuddhimagga*) and duly incorporated into Tibetan canon. The crux of the sentiment was however not the precedence over the Brahmana but the Kshatriya title to reign. Otherwise a democratic order open to merchants, courtesans and untouchables would not be so enthusiastic about Kshatriya birth of the Buddha. Nor would the Bhikshus and Sramanas anxiously record the Kshatriya origins of Asoka without such consideration.

While the Brahmanical works like the *Puranas* and *Mudrarakshasa* describe the Mauryas as Sudras, the Buddhist works like *Mahaparinibbana Sutta*, *Diyavadana* and *Mahavamsa* meticulously record details in support of the Kshatriya ancestry of the Mauryas.<sup>14</sup> It is not unlikely that the Mauryas were not good Kshatriyas in Brahmanical view; Chandragupta the founder of the Maurya Empire had no inhibition to enter into matrimonial alliance with the Yavana (Greek) nor did he perform the Asvamedha sacrifice. The Brahmanical esteem for Chandragupta was based on an admiration for the low-born while the Buddhist description of Asoka's father as Raja Kshatriya Murdhabhishiktah (an annointed Kshatriya king) was to affirm the Maurya entitlement to sovereignty.

The emphasis on the Kshatriya birth was so deep that even after Nirvana the Buddha was honoured as a Kshatriya. King Milinda, identified with the Bactrian King Menander, is known to have asked Sthavira Nagasena thus: "If Nagasena, the Blessed One were a Brahmana then he must have spoken falsely when he said he was a king. But if he were a king then he must have spoken falsely when he said he was a Brahmana. He must have been either a Kshatriya or a Brahmana. For he could not have belonged in the same birth to two castes. This too is a double-edged problem, now put to you which you have to solve". (trans. Rhys Davids)

The sage was indeed on the horns of a dilemma and had to direct his logic to the common feature between 'a true Brahmana'

and 'a true Kshatriya'. Both are righteous beings: one is Emancipated and Enlightened through practice of righteousness and the other establishes himself and his dynasty through righteous rule.<sup>15</sup>

While any theological contradiction between a Buddha and a Raja was thus solved, Nagasena's answer lifted the Kshatradharma from the level of Mithyajiva (wrong means of livelihood) to that of Sila (morality). Nagasena's equation, however unintended, was a logical sequence of the legends about the Buddha's birth. An Immaculate Being was to be born and all prognostications from Maya's dream till the sage Asita's visit concurred that the Immaculate Being was to be either a Chakravarti Raja (Universal Sovereign) or a Samyak Sambuddha (Fully Enlightened).

Thus the edification of monarchy or the sublimation of statecraft in Mahayana literature was a continuation of the tradition expounded by Nagasena. In Mahayana thought the king was Dharmaraja and not unoften Bodhisattva. The climax was reached in *Suvarnaprabhasa Sutra* which depicted the king as Devaputra. The Buddha's discourse about elective kingship yielded ground to Manu's divine creation. The Kshatriya now possessed an aura of divinity.<sup>16</sup>

Kshatriya-hood or royalty was merit worthy of a Bodhisattva. The greatest of Indian saints propagating in Tibet were born in the purple; Santarakshita, Pandmasambhava and Atisa had renounced their temporal heritage to tread the trail of the Buddha. The Kshatriya origins of these teachers, not less than that of the Buddha and Asoka, made due impression on Tibetan mind. The Tibetans could comprehend Kshatriya-Brahmana equation of Nagasena, from the living examples of the Indian masters preaching on the spot.

States with Buddhism as 'established church' were few, if any, in India and not much is on record about the matter of Church and State. The fact of Sramana/Brahmana participation in state business is however known. Far from being a taboo such participation was a norm. When Buddhism was migrating across the Himalayas, both Buddhist and Brahmanical traditions had accepted Sramana/Brahmana as the foundation of the state.

It will not be out of place to quote here a French scholar (Paul Masson-Oursel) about the destiny of the Indian concepts of state.

"...the Brahmanic notion of *dharmā* which implies the special constitution of each caste and maintains a social order rather than it encourages the appearance of a political spirit, and the Buddhist notion of *dharmā*, which aims at a law applicable to all mankind

and makes for unlimited imperialism. The one conception stands short of monarchy, the other leaps beyond it and aspires to world empire .....”<sup>17</sup>

Certain flaws in the above proposition are pointed out by the leading Indian authority on the subject, Professor Upendra Nath Ghoshal.<sup>18</sup> The broad conclusion however stands firm that the state in Buddhism could be more sovereign than its counterpart in Brahmanism.

If the Buddhist notion of Dharma facilitated the growth of state authority this must have been so in the interests of the Dharma. The Sangha as a body or through individual members would thus have no inhibition about Kshatrawidya (science of government).

(iii)

“In Tibet Buddhist monks had the same rights as the laymen to be appointed state officials, both military and civil”.

*Yuan Shih*, trans. Tucci<sup>19</sup>

This statement, from the Chinese chronicle about the ‘barbarian’ dynasty (Mongol: Yuan), has an element of surprise since the monks (particularly the Buddhist monks) could not be in the government of the Celestial Empire nor could they ever share power with the Confucian literati. When the Mongols made Tibet a part of their Empire, the monks of Sakya and Kargyu sects were active participants in the politics of their country; Lamas sharing power with the secular nobles was already a tradition. Qubilai Khan, resident in Khan Balyk (later called Peking), had to reckon with “the vastness, distance and difficulties of that region inhabited by a wild and war-like population” and “decided to rule it in accordance with local usage so as to subdue the people”.<sup>20</sup> The acceptance of “local usage”—the Buddhist monks as state officials—was an imperative need of the Mongol imperialism as these quotes from the *Yuan Shih* bear out.

Therefore the justification of the Buddhist monks holding temporal offices has to be sought not in the ‘civilized’ code of the Celestial Empire but in the ‘barbarian’ tradition of Tibet.

The accepted date for first propagation of Buddhism in Tibet is about the first quarter of the seventh century and that for the ordination of Tibetan monks is about the last quarter of the eighth century. The Dge-hdun (Sangha) was an established fact by about c 800; its activities were not confined within the walls of the monasteries; the monks were organizing the schools and advising the kings. When king

Glang-darma's persecution of Buddhism reached the height, a monk assassinated the apostate (c. 842). The regicide was an act of piety for the monk and an act of redemptive compassion to the king. Persecuted people recalled the injunction of the scriptures about redress from distress (*Sarvadurgatiparishodhana*): Forbearance and meditation cannot to be practised while harm is done to the Three Gems and the Spiritual Teachers are endangered.<sup>21</sup>

On the decline of the Central dynasty and the break-up of the country into numerous principalities, the abbots of big monasteries exercised law and order in their respective localities. This became a normal feature long before the advent of the Mongols. Meanwhile Indian works on the role of Brahmana/Sramana were under study; all these texts were not strictly canonical but were found worthy of incorporation into Tanjur. One such was *Rajanitisastra* attributed to Chanakya; the translator was Rinchen Bzangpo, the great monk-scholar who marked the regeneration of Buddhism in Tibet and collaborated with Atisa. Four successive verses of the Tibetan version (Chapter VIII) describing the limbs of society emphasize the parity between the ruler (rgyal-po) and the monk/priest (dge-sbyong/bram-ze).

The king is the summit of Chhos  
 The monk/priest is the root  
 The root bears the fruit  
 Thus the root may not be hurt.

The king is the fruit of Chhos  
 The monk/priest is the flower  
 The flower bears the fruit  
 Thus the flower may not be damaged.

The king is the tree and the monk is the root  
 The ministers are the branches and the people the leaves  
 If the root is preserved the tree does not perish  
 The monk/priest has thus to be well preserved.

All (interests/estates) being dependent on each other  
 The king preserves the monk  
 The Chhos, wealth and fame are attained  
 When the monk is ever preserved.<sup>22</sup>

These words not only affirmed the high status of the monk but also advised a patron-priest relationship between king and monk in the total interest of Chhos.

The Tibetan kings responsible for propagation of Buddhism, appropriately designated as Dharmaraja (Chhos-rgyal) and later recalled in

Mongolia as Chakravarti, no doubt practised patron-priest relationship. The regicide (c. 842) and the sequel created a new situation and the priest had to take a larger and a more direct part in temporal affairs. In the 13th century, when the Mongol Emperors and the Sakya Lamas formed patron-priest relations, the monks were more than priests and had added statecraft to their routine. The Sakya Lamas categorically approved such conduct as in the interests of Chhos.<sup>23</sup>

The Sakya Pandita (c. 1182-1251) made the famous pronouncement that mastery of the acts of this world (hjig-rtcn-bya-ba) led to the path of the Sacred Doctrine. His nephew Chhos-rgyal hPhags-pa (c. 1235-1280) when accused of secular (Mongol) style of dress answered thus. 'The Buddha had predicted the rise and fall of the Doctrine (according to exigencies of time): the happiness of the people would depend on their own Karma (and not on the style of dress): one (Lama) must behave (preach) in a way that suits (wins over) the other (devotee)'. This elastic conduct (hdul-ba) no doubt earned dividends. *Rgya-bod-yig-tshang* sums up thus: 'Under the auspices of the Patron (Qubilai) and the Priest (Chhos-hphags) the riches of Mongolia and China made Tibet the centre of the Sacred Doctrine'.

About the administrative system during the Priest-Patron Regime the same work says: 'Tibet was happy and the Sacred Doctrine glittered like a mirror because of the Two Laws, the Lama's Command and Emperor's Rule'.<sup>24</sup> As there were two sets of laws—one for the Lha-sde (domain of the church) and one for the Mi-sde (domain of the state)—there were two sets of officials (monk and lay) not necessarily working exclusive of each other. The monks and the nobles were closely connected and there could not be any absolute separation between spiritual and temporal estates. Besides the Lamas held a good number of civil posts. The apex, the Sakya hierarch, was the meeting point of both ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions.<sup>25</sup> Here was a government possessed of both Chhos (Dharma) and Srid (Samsara).

The contemporary Mongol chroniclers noticed "the succession of Indian and Tibetan traditions" in "the principle of dual government".<sup>26</sup> The Mongol bias to affiliate much of Lamaist theories and institutions to India is well known. While the germs of Chhos-srid-gnyis-ldan may be traced to Indian thought, its practical application is no doubt a phenomenon of Tibetan history. While Indian scriptures contain sanction for the Sangha to engage itself in Rajadharmā, Indian history had no institutional precedent for Tibet.



## NOTES

1. I have discussed the translation of Dharma into Chhos in my *Tibet : Considerations on Inner Asian History* (Calcutta 1967), pp.49-54.
2. धर्मधिकामाः सममेव सेव्याः यो हि एकसक्तः स जनो जघन्यः ॥
3. शरीरम् आद्यम् खलु धर्मसाधनम् ।
4. यतोऽभ्युदयनिःश्रेयससिद्धिः सः धर्मः ।
5. The kingpin of the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* Book of Genesis (Bk I, Ch IV) is the role of Brahmana and Dharma. Macdonell: *Vedic Index*, entry on Purohita and Keith: *The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads* (Harvard Oriental Series), pp.223-230 & 289-99 describe the ascendancy of priestly houses. For Brahmana as the kingmaker see K.P. Jayaswal: *Hindu Polity* (Calcutta 1924/Bangalore 1943), Chs XXIII-XXV; A.K. Coomaraswamy: *Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government* (New Haven 1942); and U.N. Ghoshal: *Studies in Indian History and Culture* (Calcutta 1965), pp.211-236.
6. For Brahmanical (Hindu) attitudes to political science and statecraft see U.N. Ghoshal: *A History of Indian Political Ideas* (Oxford 1959) and P.V. Kane: *History of Dharmasastra* (Poona 1930-62), Vol III, Chs I & X.
7. मज्जेत् लयी दण्डनातौ हतायां सर्वे धर्माः प्रक्षयेयुर्विवृद्धाः ।
8. सर्वस्य जीवलोकस्य राजधर्मः परायणम् ॥  
सर्वे त्यागाः राजधर्मेषु दृष्टाः ।  
सर्वे दीक्षाः राजधर्मेषु युक्ताः ।  
सर्वे विद्याः राजधर्मेषु चोक्ताः ।  
सर्वे लोकाः राजधर्मेषु प्रविष्टाः ॥
9. ब्रह्मजालमुत्तः दीर्घनिकाय  
Eng. Trans. in Rhys Davids: *Dialogues of the Buddha* (Pali Text Society 1921/1956), Pt I, p.18.

10. Eng. Trans. in Cowell: *The Jatakas* (Pali Text Society 1895/1957), Stories nos. 528, 537 & 546.
11. Ghoshal locates an instance in *Jatakamala* of Aryasura; *Indian Political Ideas* (cited under note 6 above), pp.339-41.
12. See Gokuldas De: *Democracy in Early Buddhist Sangha* (Calcutta 1956) and Ghoshal: *Indian History & Culture* (cited under note 5 above), pp.260-65.
13. **सत्तियो सेट्ठो जनेतस्मिं, ये गोत्तपटिसारिणो ।  
विज्जाचरणसम्पन्नो, सो सेट्ठो देवमानुसे ति ॥**  
**अगळजसुत्तः दीघनिकाय**
- Eng. Trans. in Rhys Davids: *Dialogues*, Pt II, p.94
14. The conflicting opinions about the ancestry of the Mauryas may be read in Hara Prasad Sastri's paper in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* for 1910 and Hemchandra Raychaudhuri: *Political History of Ancient India* (Calcutta 1953), pp.194, 266-8 & 355-6.
15. Eng. Trans. in Rhys Davids: *The Questions of King Milinda* (Sacred Books of the East), Dilemma no 48.  
William Tarn: *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (Cambridge 1938/1951) holds that Menander was not a Buddhist but contends on numismatic evidence that Menander proclaimed himself a Chakravarti in a Buddhist sort (pp.263-68). Ghoshal: *Indian Political Ideas*, p.303., note 9 and A.K. Narain: *The Indo- Greeks* (Oxford 1957), p.98 reject this. In my submission the Chakra on Menander's coin could symbolize either Dharma or Danda and possibly did symbolize both. To substantiate this, it is not necessary to answer whether Menander was a Buddhist in a denominational sense or whether Menander could have claimed Dharmavijaya. I contend that Chakra is common to both Buddha (Brahmana) and Chakravarti (Kshatriya). Nagasena's Brahmana-Kshatriya equation could have no better motif for a coin or an ensign than Chakra.
16. An exhaustive and critical note on the epithet Devaputra is found in the contribution by F.W. Thomas to *B.C. Law Volume*, Part II, (Poona 1946). The usage, according to Thomas, may be traced back to Nagarjuna's time. Re: Devaputra as Kushana title, Raychaudhuri rightly insists on Chinese and Greek influence, *Political History*, pp.518-9. Divine Right was much in the air; the Brahmana and the Saka-Yavana no doubt communicated the new fangled concept

to the Buddha engaged in exaltation of the Kshatriya. As the Brahmanical theorists had to formulate Divine Creation in accordance with the Brahmanical notion of Deva, the Buddhist theorists had to respect the Buddhist notion of Deva. The Mahayana world of gods (Devaloka) is a kingdom ruled by Indra and 32 'royal gods'; this assembly of 33 Devarajendra recalls oligarchic republics like Sakya or Lichchavi. Thus the the Devaputra, according to *Suvarnaprabhasottama Sutra*, was a Raja made up of the contributions of Indra and his 32 colleagues. Ghoshal finds this an adaptation of Manu's Divine Creation of the temporal ruler out of the essences of the Regents of the Quarters, *Indian Political Ideas*, p.262.

कथं मनुष्यसंभूतो राजा देवस्तु प्रोच्यते ।

केन च हेतुना राजा देवपुत्रस्तु प्रोच्यते ॥

अपि वं देवसंभूतो देवपुत्रः स उच्यते ।

लयस्त्रिंशैः देवराजन्द्रैः भागो दत्तो नृपस्य हि ।

पुत्रत्वं सर्वदेवानां निर्मितो मनुजेश्वरः ॥

The origin of Devaputra was indeed most high; the word Nirmitra suggests Nirmanakaya; a Nirmanakaya containing features of more than one Deva or Bodhisattvas has well-known significance; Devaputra is the quintessence of the Divine Royalty in its totality. The numerous character of the progenitor (33) or the legend of 10,000 Devaputras does not suggest a numerous class of minor deities as Thomas thinks; in Mahayana myriads of Bodhisattvas are usual. It is not warranted to equate Devaputra with minor deities (like the Dikpala) or with kinglets (like those of Kucha-Khotan). The suffix 'putra' is not demeaning. Manjusri Kumarabhuta is more beloved than Manjusri. Either form Jina (Buddha) or Jinaputra (Buddhaputra) may be used to describe a saint or a hierarch as I have experienced in the monasteries of Tibet. Franklin Edgerton regards Devaputra as a synonym of Deva, *Dictionary of Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*. In the above extract from *Suvarnaprabhasa* both forms Deva and Devaputra are used.

Devaputra, in my submission, is not a title characteristic of local or minor kings and whoever sported this title was no doubt claiming divinity. Devaputra is not an elective ruler and has divine title, possibly of pluralistic origin (Greek, Iranian, Chinese, Hsiung Nu and Brahmanic).

The point for notice is the apotheosis of the Kshatriya, that is, the progress from popular contract to divine status. In *Agganna Sutta* the Kshatriya is Mahasammata. In *Visuddhimagga*

(अभिज्जा-निद्द स : पुब्बेनिवासानुस्सति) the first Kshatriya is none else than Bhagavan Bodhisattva (Gautama Siddhartha). In *Suvarnaprabhasa* the Raja, though born of mortal parents, is Devanirmita.

17. Masson-Oursel, Willman-Grabowska & Stern: *Ancient India and Indian Civilization* (History of Civilization Series, London 1934/1951), pp.93-97.
18. Ghoshal: *Indian Political Ideas* pp.73,214 & 220.
19. Giuseppe Tucci: *Tibetan Painted Scrolls* (Rome 1949), p.31.

In 1368 the Mongol (Yuan) dynasty in China was overthrown and succeeded by a native (Ming) dynasty. In the beginning of 1369 Emperor Tai-tsu, founder of the Ming dynasty, ordered the the court to compile the official history (Shih) of the Yuan. Sixteen Yuan scholars worked on the Yuan documents and completed the the work in a year; the work was supervised by the Emperor himself. The *Yuan-Shih* preserves a valuable record of Tibet and Tibetan government during the Mongol (Yuan) period.

[Ignorant of the language I owe my knowledge of Chinese historiography to the works of Charles Gardner, Carrington Goodrich and Lien-Shen Yang. Beaseley and Pulleyblank (ed): *Historians of China and Japan* (London 1961) contains on pp.44-59 a critique of the annals from the Tang to the Ming from the pen of Lien-Shen Yang.]

20. Tucci: op.cit., p.31.

21. །དཀོན་མཚོག་གསུམ་ལ་གནོད་བྱེད་དང་། །ཟླ་མ་སྟོན་བྱེད་མ་ཅུངས་པ།  
 །དམ་ཚིག་ལས་ནི་འདས་པ་དང་། །དེ་ལ་སོགས་པའི་གནོད་བྱེད་ལ།  
 །བཟོད་པ་བསྐྱོམ་པར་མི་བྱ་ཤི། །དེ་ལྟར་གྱུར་ན་ཀུན་རིག་གིས།  
 །གསུངས་པའི་དངོས་གྲུབ་ཐོབ་པར་འགྱུར།

[ བཀའ་འགྱུར། རྒྱུད་འབྲུམ། 5 ]

།དཀོན་མཚོག་གསུམ་ལ་གནོད་བྱེད་དང་།

།ཟླ་མ་སྟོན་བྱེད་མ་ཅུངས་ནམས།

།དམ་ཚིག་འདས་ལ་བཟོད་མི་བྱ།

[ བཀའ་འགྱུར། རྒྱུད་འབྲུམ། 5 ]

22.

ཚོས་ཀྱི་ཙེ་མོ་རྒྱལ་པོ་ལྷོ། ཚོས་ཙེ་དག་སྤྱོད་བྱས་ཟེ་ཡིན།  
 ཚ་བ་ལས་ནི་འབྲས་བུ་སྤྱོ། རི་བས་ཙེ་བ་གནོད་མི་བྱ།  
 ཚོས་ཀྱི་འབྲས་བུ་རྒྱལ་པོ་ཡིན། མེ་དོག་དག་སྤྱོད་བྱས་ཟེ་ཡིན།  
 མེ་དོག་ལས་ནི་འབྲས་བུ་སྤྱོ། རི་ཕྱིར་མོ་དོག་ལ་མི་གཞོ།  
 རྒྱལ་པོ་ཤོང་དེ་དག་སྤྱོད་ཙེ་བ་ཡིན། རྒྱལ་པོ་ཡལ་བ་གྲོང་མི་འདབ་མ་ཡིན།  
 ཚ་བ་བསྐྱུངས་ན་ཤིང་དེ་མི་ཉམས་པ། རི་ཕྱིར་དག་སྤྱོད་བྱས་ཟེ་ཡིགས་  
 པར་བསྐྱུང་།  
 བམས་ཅད་གཞན་ལ་རབ་ལས་གྱུར་གྲུང་ནི། མི་ཡི་དབང་བོས་དག་སྤྱོད་  
 བྱས་ཟེ་བསྐྱུང་། ཚོས་དང་མོར་དང་གྲོང་དང་སྤྱན་པ་དག། དག་སྤྱོད་བྱས་ཟེ་  
 ཡིགས་པར་བསྐྱུངས་ལས་འབྲེལ།

[ བསྐྱུང་འགྲུང། ལྷ་ཚོགས། རོ་ ]

23.

འཇིག་རྟེན་བྱ་བ་ཡིགས་ཤེས་ན། རི་ཡི་དམ་པའི་ཚོས་ལྷགས་འགྲུབ།  
 རིས་ན་ཚོས་ལྷགས་སྤྱོད་པ་དེ། བྱང་ཚུབ་སེམས་པའི་ནམ་ཐར་ཡིན།  
 [ ས་སྐྱ་བཀའ་འབུམ། ཐ་ ]

བསྐྱུང་ལ་འཕེལ་འགྲིབ་འགྲུང་བ་རྒྱལ་བས་གསུངས། མེས་ཙེ་བའི་སྤྱིད་  
 རང་རང་ལས་ལ་རབ། བཀང་ལ་གང་འདུལ་དེ་ལ་དེ་སྤོན་བྱེད། འདི་གསུམ་  
 མ་གཏོགས་མཁས་པ་མིན་པར་གོ།

[ དཔལ་ས་སྐྱའི་གདུང་རབ་ཚེན་མོ་ ]

24.

འདྲེ་མགོན་ཚོས་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་པོས་གོ་བོ་ལ་ཚོས་ཀྱི་རྒྱལ་པོར་བྱིན་གྱིས་བརྒྱབས་  
 བས། ཉོར་དང་རྒྱ་ནག་གི་འབྲེལ་བ་ཚེན་བོས་ས་སྐྱས་མགོ་བྱས། བའི་ཡུལ་  
 འདིར་བསྐྱུན་པའི་མཐོལ་ཡོད་ས་ཡོན་མཚོད་འདི་གཉིས་ཀྱི་བཀའ་དྲིན་ཡིན་  
 པར་གདའ།

[ རྒྱ་བའི་ཡིག་ཚང་ ]

ལྷ་མའི་བཀའ་དང་རྒྱལ་པོའི་ལྷང་བཞེན་དུ།  
 འབྲིམས་གཏྲིས་བསྐྱེད་སྲིད་ལྷུ་ལྷུ་ལྷུ་བཞེན་བའི་བ་དང་།  
 བསྐྱེད་པའི་གསལ་བྱེད་གུར་པའང་བྱུང་བ་སྣང་།

[ ལྷ་པོའི་ཡིག་ཚང་ ]

25. A description of the Sakya administrative system is not called for here. Chinese and Mongol chronicles besides Tibetan literature provide data for considerable study. Tucci: op. cit., pp.31-39 may be seen for a brief notice.

Extracts from two Chinese state papers may be made in corroboration of the Tibetan claims about equality in status between the Mongol Emperor and the Sakya Lama.

The official history (*Yuan Shih*), compiled immediately after the overthrow of the Yuan, states: "The orders of the Ti-shih, Imperial Master (=Sakya Lama), and of the Emperor were equally valid in Tibet. For a hundred years the Emperors showed the greatest respect and confidence for the Imperial Master. The Empresses and all the princes took the vow and used to salute the Imperial Master, kneeling to receive his blessing. In the Court gatherings, when the different officials took place allotted according to their rank, the Imperial Master sat next to the Emperor. Each Emperor on ascending the throne, publicly addressed a message of praise and protection to the Imperial Master". (trans. Tucci).

The Manchu Emperor Chien-lung in his famous Dissertation on Lamaism, inscribed in 1792 on a marble stele in Yung-ho-kung (the Lamaist Cathedral in Peking), said: "During the Yuan dynasty the Lamas were worshipped in a way that interfered with the government. This led to abuses which no one dared to question. For instance decrees given by the Teacher of the Emperor had the same force as the decrees emanating from the Court. At official audiences, while all the officials had to stand at places assigned to them according to rank, the teacher of the Emperor alone was allowed to remain seated in his place of honour in the corner. His disciples bore titles such as Minister of Interior, Minister of Finance, Duke of the Empire. There was an unbroken succession of them who carried seals of jade or gold. Presuming on their prestige they carried themselves haughtily and ostentatiously which resulted everywhere in great vexations difficult to describe here exhaustively". Eng. trans. in F.D. Lessing: *Yong-ho-kung* (Stockholm 1942), p.59.

The inference is unavoidable that the Patron-Priest relations between the Mongol Emperor and the Tibetan Teacher did not much affect the authority (? sovereignty) of the Teacher in the Teacher's homeland.

26. Cyben Zamcarano: *The Mongol Chronicles of the Seventeenth Century* (Wiesbaden 1955), pp.50-55 may be seen for an account of the Mongol *White Annals* containing contemporary impression of the Sakya tradition.
-