12 November 1987
SIKKIM RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF TIBETOLOGY
GANGTOK, INDIA
- The Bulletin of Tibetology seeks to serve the specialist as well as the general reader with an interest in this field of study. The motif portraying the Stupa on the mountains suggests the dimensions of the field -

EDITORS
NIRMAL C. SINHA
JAMPAL K. RECHUNG
Bulletin of Tibetology

NEW SERIES

1987 No. 3

12 November 1987
SIKKIM RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF TIBETOLOGY
GANGTOK, INDIA
Price per copy Rs. 10/-

1/88
PRINTED AT THE HIMALINDIA PHOTO OFFSET
NAM-NAM ROAD, GANGTOK
PUBLISHED BY DIRECTOR, SIKKIM RESEARCH
INSTITUTE OF TIBETOLOGY, GANGTOK - 737 101
SIKKIM
CONTENTS

EARLY TIBETAN INSCRIPTIONS:
SOME RECENT DISCOVERIES
— H. E. RICHARDSON 5

A PREFACE TO MAHAYANA ICONOGRAPHY
— NIRMAL C SINHA 19

THE OFFENCES AND RETRIBUTIONS
IN THE VINAYAPITAKA
— JAYETA GANGULY 25

NOTES & TOPICS
— B. GHOSH 32
CONTRIBUTORS IN THIS ISSUE:

HUGH EDWARD RICHARDSON Leading authority on Tibet past and present; epigraphist and historian; reads, writes and speaks Tibetan like one born in Tibet; lived more than two decades in Asia: India, Tibet and China; was in Tibet for more than eight years. Fellow, Keble College, Oxford; Fellow British Academy.

NIRMAL CHANDRA SINHA Founder Director, Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology; recipient of PADMASRI Award from the President of India 1971; recipient of ASIATIC SOCIETY BI CENTENARY PLAQUE 1986.

JAYEETA GANGULY Lecturer in Chinese, Visva-Bharati University; engaged in study of Vinaya from Pali, Tibetan and Chinese sources.

Views expressed in the Bulletin of Tibetology are those of the contributors and not of the Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology. An article represents the private individual views of the author and does not reflect those of any office or institution with which the author may be associated. The editors are the publishers of the article(s); copyright of an article belongs to the author, unless otherwise indicated.
EARLY TIBETAN INSCRIPTIONS:  
SOME RECENT DISCOVERIES

— H. E. RICHARDSON

Inscriptions on stones from the eighth and ninth centuries are among the best sources of information about the early history, social conditions and religion of the Tibetans and also about the state of the language at that time. Not long after I had completed an edition of all those I was able to collect in Central Tibet two hitherto unrecorded inscriptions and additional material on one other have come to light. One of the new discoveries was made by Geshe Pema Tsering of Bomd on a visit to his homeland in East Tibet. On a free-standing pinnacle of rock, known as Brag Lhaso, in the district of Lda-don-khoj he discovered a short inscription of obvious antiquity with a group of Buddhist images in low relief alongside it. He has referred to his discovery briefly in Zentralasiatische Studien of the University of Bonn, vol. 19, where there is also an illustration of the rock; and in collaboration with Dr. Helmut Einser he is preparing a full analysis and description which it is to be hoped will soon be published. In the meantime he has very kindly sent me a photograph of the inscription and valuable information about the site and has generously allowed me to mention it in advance of his detailed study.

From the photograph it can be seen that the inscription, though badly damaged, is of considerable interest not only for its contents but also as showing that such documents are still to be found. Tibetans write in the past did not generally attach sufficient importance to these relics of their past to record them as full. Exceptions were the Karmapa historian Dpa'-bo Gnaug-dag stong-gyi-ba(1504-1566) and the great Ka-thog scholar Rig-bzan Tibe-chang mdo-bu (1696-1735). The discovery of this inscription by Geshe Pema Tsering and of those at Lho-brag, to be mentioned later, show that a new generation of Tibetan scholars is aware of the value of such documents; and it is to be hoped that the greater freedom of travel in Tibet may lead to further discoveries.

Previously known inscriptions from Central Tibet are carved on stone pillars of dressed stone but this one at Lda-sad-khoj, like that from Rkong-po, is on a natural rock face, perhaps implying either an absence of suitable stone or a less affluent milieu; and going to the nature of the surface the lettering lacks the precision and regularity of that on the stone pillars and tends more to the character of some of the eighth and ninth century manuscripts from Dunhuang.

What has survived places the inscription in the reign of Khi Snang-tde-brtan (755-780) and most probably within its last ten or fifteen years.
It is remarkable for its strong emphasis on the devotion of the btsam-po to Buddhism. Other inscribed pillars of his time and the Chronicle from Dunhuang certainly record his acceptance of the faith, his vow to maintain it, and the foundation by him of the great temple of Bsam-yas; but in the commemorative inscription near the royal burial rounda at Phyang-rgyas he figures as combining devotion to Buddhism with responsibility and regard for the old religious practices. In the first part of that inscription he is described as maintaining the wisdom of the gods—phun-gtsang lha—and acting in accordance with the religion of sky and earth—gnam sti chos—for the customs of his ancestors; at the end he is seen as a convert to Buddhism—'jie-rin pas 'das pa'i cho bzang-po brgyas nas. But even in that last paragraph the title accorded to him—phrub-gyi lha byang chub chen po, “Great enlightened supernaturally wise divinity”—brings together elements from both the old faith and the new.

By contrast, in the Brag Lhaso inscription Khi Srong-bde-brtsan is known from the start by the purely Buddhist epithet, Byang-cub-sems-dpa’, “of perfect spiritual enlightenment”. In the damaged line that follows, it seems possible to detect references to the traditional qualities of royalty reflecting his glory, by-la, and military might, dbu-rtag brtsan; but there does not seem to be any mention of the old religion; and the inscription is unique in referring to the current translation of Mahayana scriptures (bshad-po chen po mdo) ade mung-po zha gan la bsdur par brag to. The text seems to go on to state that by that merit, the cho riya—a title by which Khi Srong-bde-brtsan is designated in the Phyang-rgyas inscription—and hundreds of thousands of others entered into deliverance. He is credited also with the extensive foundation of temples. Certainty on these readings and interpretations must, however, await the result of Geshe Pema Tsering’s study.

More substance is added to these significant passages by the edicts of Khi Srong-bde-brtsan preserved in vol 25 of the Cho-byang of Dpas-po gtsang-lag which I have described elsewhere as embodying the first Tibetan Cho-byang and which can be dated between 779 and 782 A.D. They show that even at that time, generally regarded as the early years of the flowering of Buddhism in Tibet, there were centres of Buddhist practice not only at Lhasa, Bsam-yas and Khra-s ‘brug but also in Bru-zha (Gyig), Zhang-zhang territory in the north west, and Mdun-sam in east Tibet.

The inscription and group of Buddhist edifices at Brag Lhaso suggest that there was an early religious foundation in the vicinity, Tethylu, which visited “Dengko” in 1918 mentions “the celebrated Drolma Lhatkhang” which had been seen earlier by A.K. that indoubtable pandit of the Survey of India. The temple is said to have contained a famous image of Drolma (Sigrol-ma) which is supposed to have flown from from Peking Dr. Elmer has pointed out that the Sigrol-ma Lha-khang of Lasu-khang, not far from Brag Lhaso is claimed—in spite of differences in the orthography in several writers—to be one of the temples founded by Srong-brtsan sgam-po to
dominate the frontiers. The name might reflect some tradition about his Chinese bride who was deemed to be a goddess; but it cannot be overlooked that there is a possible later connection with A-pshi Chos kyi skyed-rje, the protecting deity of the 'Utri-khang sect whose founder came from the Sky-i Rin-chen Dru rgyal family which was all powerful in that region.

Whatever may be made of these confused traditions, the inscription clearly shows the influence of Kyi-brong lde-btsan in that region. Whether the Buddhist carvings are contemporaneous with the inscription is a matter for consideration. The Bodhisattva figure, the only one of which I have seen a photograph, appears to be the supporter on the left side of a central figure within a circular arcade in a group which Pema Tsering has identified as Amityas, Avalokiteshvara and Vajrapani. It recalls drawings in manuscripts of the eighth or ninth century from Dunhuang and some paintings in cave temples there of which the style seems to show more Central Asian than Chinese characteristics. Dr. Elmer has pointed out that an adjustment to the end of the first line of the text shows that the inscription was made after the carving; but the impression, to me, is that both are part of a single devotional exercise.

It would be tempting to see the carving as a rare example of early Tibetan art. Ldan-khor was former territory of the Sum-pa or Mo-nag which was conquered by the Tibetans in stages between the seventh and early eighth centuries and there is no suggestion that the Chinese had any presence or influence there during the Tang dynasty. But especially after the Tibetan conquest of the border area of China's north-west there was a good deal of coming and going between the two countries, Chinese religious teachers visited Central Tibet and a Chinese craftsman cast the great bell of Bas-yas. Chinese worksmen and artists are traditionally, and credibly, said to have taken part in the building of Bas-yas; and it is possible that the carvings at Brag Lhanvo were the work of the Chinese or of the non-Chinese people who, as documents from Dunhuang show, were employed in many capacities in that region.

Dr. Elmer has informed me of a short Chinese inscription at Ldan-khor which might have a bearing on the matter; it appears to refer to a "heavenly woman" or "women" but neither its meaning nor date is clear.

It may be remembered that Ldan-khor was among the many boring territories conquered by Cha-yi Erk-tong in 908. He planned to establish a district headquarters there and, although his death and subsequent Tibetan successes frustrated that design, Teichman found a Chinese name there in 1938 and it continued side by side with a Tibetan official until at least 1932.

Elucidation of that and many other questions awaits Geshe Pema Tsering's forthcoming work. In the meantime I am grateful that he has permitted me to bring his important discovery and some of its problems and implications to the notice of students of Tibetan epigraphy and history.

The second discovery is described in Bod Ljongs Zhub tseg (2) 1982 in
two articles by Pa-sangs dbang-dus, one in Tibetan, the other in Chinese. For an understanding of the latter I am greatly indebted to Professor South Coblin of the University of Iowa who has translated relevant passages and gives me valuable advice.

It appears that there are two inscriptions, similar in meaning, on rock faces in Lho-brag near the headquarters town of Do-bo rdong (Towa) now known as Lo-cha. There is some confusion about the exact sites as the position of one of them is given in the Tibetan text as near the village of 'Dus-byang 50 le-bar to the west (chu ba'i phungs) of the district town of Lho-brag Hision, while the Chinese version indicates that the distance is 5km. north-west of the same place. The position of the other is more easily determined being to the north-east (dbang phungs) of the same place, at the junction of the Lho-brag nun-cha and the Sman-srang Chu. The Chinese version agrees generally except that it gives the direction as east of the country seat of Lo-cha. The Sman-srang Chu can be identified with the Maadong Chu of the Survey of India map, 1925, which though approximate in that area, shows it a short distance to the east of Towa. If the two inscriptions are similar and relate to the estates and privileges of the same family it seems probable that they would not be very far apart and the distance of 5km. for the 'Dus-byang site is the more acceptable. In the Tibetan text 50, lnga-bu may be an error for lnga-ba.

The Tibetan article (T.) states that out of more than 150 tshig rtags, only eighteen or nineteen survive in an obscure condition (gsal la mi gsal). Each article contains a copy of what can be read at one of the sites—its not specified which. In each the number of syllables is about 140. According to Tibetan dictionaries tshig rtags means mtshes gsal, but in the Chinese article (C.) it is rendered as "syllable or word"—i.e. a single Chinese character. In classical Tibetan usage, as I am informed by Mr. Ngawang Tondrup Nekyid a scholar with a special interest in Tibetan linguistics, tshig-bru is a syllable and tshig a complete word—e.g. brtsan and po are tshig-bru and brtsan-po is a tshig; so it appears that Pa-sangs dbang-dus has treated tshig-brug as the equivalent of tshig-bru. The number of lines is marked in T. as 18; in C. it is apparently 34. C. may have tried to show single affixed letters while in T. the same author may have estimated missing words.

Such differences and many other points could be elucidated if there were a photographic record but it appears there is none and it must be assumed that both copies come from field-notes of an eye-copy or eye-copies by the same person from the same original. It is, therefore, surprising that there are so many differences between the two versions and perhaps more surprising that in most instances the Roman transcription in C is preferable to the Tibetan text in T. Some of the differences are in presentation: T shows the reversed li gu and writes dang—rather badly—with the d above the ng. In C a number of words are improbably run together, e.g. expression, skudung and so on; and there is no punctuation, which is indicated in a
few—probably by no means all—instances in T. These are of less significance than fifteen differences in the readings. In nine of these C is clearly preferable; and it is unacceptable in only two but there are also two omis-
sions and one printer's error. One difference is debatable as will be mentioned, later. In the last line of both T and C comparison with other inscriptions shows that srong bu is an error for srong.

Out of this careless confusion I have collated the following test: I have not inserted additional punctuation.

Bstan po lha stas gyi zha sngar lde sman lde'u cung / glo ba nye sre skur
dang chab yod in dphem phel'i tse bla skar' ba bkas byed nas bka'i sngang
lde'u cung gi pha'lo sngag gi bu sva phed gyung nam 'zar sril gyung
drug dang mthun-pa pha dang kyi yul las stong pa myi dbi myi
nyi-yang ba dang / lde'u cung gi mchog gyi-lrin gro bka'i las mdan-dde
nem ci dpho sre dang gi rgyun 'la yang / bka' nas stong 'sde bting phar sngang
ue lde'u cung gi pha'lo sngag gi bu sva phed gyung x phu na nu x cig
yang bka' sbyod x guigs shan x lha sngang ba dang sngag
kar po lha bstan x x sa x xxx sron po dang bu bahl zhang len gi bo bok
bu'i guigs gyi srgom' bu ni phya skul du sngag rgyo

Notes: 1. T reads kha sngag, this is discussed later
2. C omits kha sngag gi
3. T and C read srgom

A provisional translation follows:

"Whereas Lde Sman Lde'u cung has been very loyal to the bstan-po,
the divine son, and has continuously taken trouble in performing the duty of
rje bla to the benefit of our person and the state, it has been granted by
order, that the status in perpetuity, the service tenure lands and so on, of
the line of male descendants of Lo-sngang the father of Lde'u-cung shall never
be decreased and never diminished, and that the rites for the tomb shall be
performed by the higher authority and, for ever, in the time of our desc-
endants' dasease it shall be repaired by the higher authority, the Stong-ade.
And if older or younger brothers of the line of male descendants of Lo-sngang
the father of Lde'u-cung are involved in an acutation, for one occasion a
decree dismissing the imputation shall be given. This has been granted on
oath and the certificate containing the edict which has been sworn, as witnesses,
by R Kong Kar-po Lha-bstan..............and the . . minister and the four Zhang-lon sons has been imposed in the archives".

The language regarding the grant of status and privileges is generally
similar so that in the edicts on the north side of the Zhal-de-rings and those
at Zhwa'i Lha-khang and De-nor in R Kong-po. The terms rje-blas, khel-yul,
don rna, phu nu etc. have been studied by several scholars whose work
reference is made in my Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions, Royal Asiatic
Society, 1985. The passage about overlooking an accusation on one occasion
is supplied on the basis of the west inscription at Zhwa'i Lha-khang, 1-40 and
the supposition that the lacuna after then would contain some such word as brtags implying an imputation against someone's character. As in other inscriptions leading persons in the state took part in the royal row. The first named here is the feudatory ruler—rgyal phun,—of Rong-po or a member of his family; other names are lost in the eroded passage and the last—bu bshi shang lkon—which I have taken to refer to four brothers, perhaps local, holding the rank of shang lkon which covered the main body of officials, might perhaps be understood as the bu-bshi minister although there is no instance of a family holding that name.

The most unusual part of the inscription relates to the provision that the burial rites of Lde'u-cung should be attended to by the Stang-sde, the Governor of the Thousand Districts, presumably of Lho-brag. The only other record of such a favour is from the presentation by Srong-btsan sgam-po of a stone, on which an oath had been sworn, to be the foundation of the tomb (khash) of a noble minister of the Dpe'a clan (Dunhuang Chronicle f. 109).

The recipient of so signal a distinction must have been of very high standing; but there is no mention of Lde'sman Lde'u-cung or any similar name in the list from Dunhuang or in the lists of witnesses to the edicts of Krhi Srong Lde-brtsan and Krhi Lde-strong-brtsan or to the Sino-Tibetan treaty of 821/822; nor is there any trace in later works which show some knowledge of early records such as the Bka'-chhang-sde-lha and the Chos-'byung of Dpa'-bo gtsang-lag. The question may, therefore, be asked whether the name is that of an office or function and denotes the Sman of the royal family, whose patronymic was Lde. Lde'u-cung might imply an aedet member of that family.

Sman immediately suggests a physician and it may be significant that one of the memorials to Lde-sman Lde'u-cung is near Sman-chang—the plain of medicinal plants? There is an extensive later tradition about the introduction of medical science to Tibet which has been examined fully by Professor C. Beckwith in J.A.O.S. 1979. The account in Dpa'-bo gtsang-lag vol tsa tells now after a basic medical treatise was brought to Tibet in the seventh century by the Chinese bride of Srong-btsan sgam-po physicians were invited from India, China and Khmer of Styag-gzi—"Persia Rome" (Byzantium). A century later more physicians came from other neighbouring countries, Kashmir, the Turkeic lands, and Zhang shung; and Tibetan physicians were trained, beginning with the famous Gyu-thon Yon-nna Mgon-po. The association of the name of Galenos, the second century Greek physician, with the first group of visitors shows that the tradition is overlaid with legend but that is not to deny that it has some historical basis; and there is evidence of the practice of medicine in the time of the Tibetan kingdom in at least three mon from Dunhuang. In one them, Pelliot Tibetan 1044, the method is attributed to India and is linked with the name of the Lha'i Dron-garng 'Phurts-chun Ha ta na bya thag; another, Pell. T. 1057 is in similar language; and in another, Pell. T. 127 there are references to medical
knowledge from Tu-vig, Dru-gu (the Turko), and Zhang-shuang; but there is no definite mention of a Sman-pa in this connection unless perhaps in 1.160 of Pell. T. 127—sman ba'i (sman pa'i) yon-tan.

On the other hand there are numerous references, principally in works on divination, to sman of another sort—supermundane beings, many of them female such as the mu-sman and mtho sman; others were sman of the earth, sky, water, mountains and so on. They have survived in the demonology of Tibetan Buddhism and of Bon as protectors of the faith. In the early times they were associated with other godlings and were especially concerned with the fortunes of the royal family and noble ministers about whose well-being or the opposite, they made prophecitions. Many instances, described as chu sman gyi mchab, mu sman gyi zhal nas, etc. can be seen in mnr from Dunhuang, e.g. Pell, T 1043 I.0.L. 740.

In order to communicate such messages a medium was needed. Madame A. MacDonald (Spanier) who has made a profound study of those divination mns in Fudze Tshkalma, '97, notes that the mma-mans spoke through the mouth of an old woman. Perhaps the persons stated in Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents (F.W. Thomas) II pp. 394, 395 to have been appointed to serve, or petition, (ggsi) various local deities had a similar function. Madame MacDonald also suggests that some of the beings connected with divination may have been part human and part divine; and it may be possible to see the Lde Sman Lla'ru-cung as a forerunner of such present day spirit mediums as the State Oracle of Gnas-chang who in ordinary life is a human being but when possessed by his patron deity becomes a sort of god.

The reference to the performance of sgsi bshas implies that the Lde Sman had some official status. Certainly, the art of astrology, closely allied to divination, had official recognition in the Rtag-pa Chen-po who is named among the ministers who witnessed the Sino-Tibetan treaty; and the inscription at Skar-cung shows that there were persons who advised the ruler about dreams and emens. The second edict of Khri Srong-lde-brtsan in the Chos-byang of Dpe-'od gtsang-leg also refers to interpreters of signs and portents who exerted influence on the royal court.

The debatable reading where the Tibetan text of the inscription has kha lo smang and the Chinese has pha la'o (lo) smang might have a bearing on the matter. The Tibetan version would be quite out of keeping with normal usage by which either a personal or family name follows that of the clan or family without the particle gi, gyi, or kyi; so, if it is correct, there must be something unusual. Kha-lo means "guidance" and Kha-lo-smang might mean a person who gave guidance, perhaps an interpreter of the sayings of a sman. But too many problems follow from the speculation and the general reliability of the version in the Chinese article makes the reading Pha Lo-smang the more probable.

Whether Lde Sman Lla'ru-cung was a physician or a spirit medium (or, indeed, neither) his services to the Khram-po were such that the privileges
granted to him were extended to future generations of his family. Seemingly he had no son so the grant is made to the other male descendants of his father. Similar grants are seen in the north inscription on the Zhob rdo-rings where it is made not only for the direct descendants of Stag-gra Klu-khong himself but also to other male descendants of his father; and in the Zhwa'i Lha-khang inscriptions where since Myung Ting-seng-Dzin was a celibate monk, his father received the favour.

The name of the bstan-po who gave the edict for Lde smas Lde'u-cung has not survived so the regnal period of the inscription cannot be definitely determined. There is no evidence that the title Bstan-po Lha-sras was used in the time of Khri Lde-gtug-brtan but it is applied to Khri Srong-lde-brtan, Khri Lde-srong-brtan, and Khri Gtug-lde-brtan Ral-pa-can alike.

Orthography may provide the significant clue. The de drag, which is found in the Lho-brag inscription appears in all other surviving inscriptions in varying numbers; but in its extensive use of the archaic pha for pa that at Lho-brag is comparable only with those on the Zhob rdo-rings which are the earliest known and can be dated c. 766. In later inscriptions that usage is very rare. Another point in common between the Lho-brag and Zhob inscriptions is that in neither is there any trace of Buddhist influence. It is arguable that the latter date from a time when the revival of Buddhism in the twentieth year of Khri Srong-lde-brtan—i.e., c. 762 A.D.—was in its very early stages. The possibility that the Lho-brag inscription reflects popular non-Buddhist religion is not necessarily convincing evidence that it antedates the Buddhist revival, for their memorial inscriptions show that both Khri Srong-lde-brtan and Khri Lde-srong-brtan combined respect for the old religion of the gods and worship of earth and heavens with their acceptance of Buddhism; but it certainly does not run counter to the early date suggested by the orthography and allows the Lho-brag inscription to be tentatively assigned to the early years of the reign of Khri Srong-lde-brtan.

It is to be hoped that Pa-sangs dbang-dus who has made this valuable discovery, can provide further information which might throw light on the many uncertainties, in particular details of the second inscription and, if possible, photograph or at least a sketch of the lay-out of the texts.

The third subject is some important new information about the inscription at the ba-te-so—the tumulus tomb—of Khri Lde-srong-brtan at Phyonangsrgyud. When Professor Tusi and I visited the place in 1949 only the upper part of the pillar could be seen above ground; the rest was buried in a field-bank which had been built up over the centuries. Some twenty-two lines of the text were immediately visible but, with the help of the monk guardian, a local woman and boy were engaged to dig a narrow trench which allowed a further twenty-five lines to be seen with considerable difficulty and discomfort. Of most of these only fragmentary, and sometimes doubtful, readings could be recorded. My findings were published in J.R.A.S. 1969 (1).

Now the Chinese authorities have had the whole pillar excavated and
enclosed in a small building. Mrs. Tamara Hill of San Francisco, who was able to photograph the pillar, very kindly sent me some colour slides showing that it rests on a stone tortoise and has a carved decoration of snakes and dragons on its east face. It proves to be a monument of even more imposing dimensions than I had supposed.

Subsequently through the kindness of Professor South Cobbin I have seen an article in Chinese by Biod-nam dbang-dus and Chang Chien-lin in Wen-wu 1965 (9) of which Dr. Roderick Whitfield, Professor of Chinese and East Asian Art at the University of London, has generously given me a summary. The article, which describes the excavated pillar is illustrated with rather poorly reproduced photographs and drawings of the remarkable reliefs on the side of the pillar and on the underside of the small stone canopy, also of the stone tortoise which is carved from the upper part of a block of dressed stone over one metre high. The pillar itself is said to be 5.6 metres in height and the monument overall from base to finial to be 7.18 metres.

The article includes twelve lines of the inscription. In Tibetan letters with a transcription in roman. They are said to be the last of a total of fifty-nine lines and therefore appear to join up with the fragmentary readings in my article mentioned above. The text is too badly damaged to allow a continuous translation and some of the readings are dubious. For example sge has been read three times for what must be dang written with the letter as subscribed under the d as is frequently seen in other inscriptions. Srim in 1.10 is highly improbable and zhugs in 1.11 is doubtful. Nevertheless enough survives to show that there are echoes of some passages in the first part of the inscription eulogizing the traditional attributes of royalty—phag-rgom bka-bris (1.4)—and the martial prowess of the btsam-po in commanding the allegiance of neighbouring rulers (ts. 7 and 9) but what is important is the dear reference to the Buddhist faith which has not been mentioned earlier. That is not really surprising for Khri Lde-stron-brtseas's devotion to Buddhism is attested in his Skar-cung inscription and the related edict preserved in the history of Dpt-sod gtsug-lag, also in the Sgra-shyur of which fragmentary mas from Dunhuang survive. Although much damaged, the closing lines on the pillar appear to mention the death of the btsam-po and end by ascribing to his lugs-po the name Rgyal-chen-pa rul by which it is known also to later historians.

The final burial rites of a btsam-po customarily took place about two years after his death in a tomb which had probably been prepared while he was still alive. The pillar can therefore be dated between 815, the year in which Khri Lde-stron-brtseas died, and 817 by when the burial would have taken place.

The decoration on the pillar, about which and connected matters I have had much valuable advice from Professor Roderick Whitfield and Mr. Vladimír Zwalf of the British Museum, combines Indian and Chinese motifs with the latter strongly predominating. On the east and west faces
elongated dragons appear to pursue each other in a scattering of Chinese "cloud-heads" above a group of wirting serpents. The cloud design also appears on the underside of the canopy together with flying aparas or vishvabhutas figures at each corner and the sun in the centre of the east side and the moon on the west. The sun and moon are also carved at the head of the inscription on the pillar itself.

The whole is a substantial example of the progress of glyptic art in Tibet, the earliest survivals of which appear to be two carved doorways in the Jokhang of Lhasa which was founded in the seventh century (see Liu I-sau, Hut-tung fo-chiao loku, pl. 3, and Siif and Vanii, Der Weg nach Lhasa pl. 32). These resemble Lhasavi work ascribed to the seventh century illustrated in pls. 12-15 of The Arts of Nepal by Pratapaditya Pal I, 194. Their Indian lineage may be seen in many examples from the elaborate 5th century doorway at Deogarh (B. Rowland, The Art and Architecture of India, 1967, pl. 77 (B)) to Bodh Gaya in the early Pilla period (Asher, The Art of Eastern India, pl. 11, pl. 119). There are also in the Jokhang massive wooden pillars, probably of the same period, with carved capitals showing scolling and flying figures (Liu I-sau op. cit. pl. 6 and Jid, Siff and Vanii, Tibetan Art pl. 17). The antecedents of such work can be seen in carving at Cha Balil in Nepal and Nilandiz (Pal p. op. cit. pls. 79 and 157). The carved lions and grotesque human head on beam-ends in the Jokhang (Liu I-sau op. cit. pl. 5) may also be from the seventh century but while there are similar figures of a later date—e.g. at Samadha c. 12th century (Tsossi, Transalhikaya, 1973 pl. 126) there is a lack of earlier examples.

The next survivals are the rock carvings at Brag Lhanno. From the small part I have seen the iconography appears to be of Indian origin—perhaps modified by passage through Central Asia and executed by Chinese trained craftsmen as I have suggested above (p. 5). When a photograph of the whole group is available it may be possible to draw comparisons with groups of a central Buddha accompanied by supporting Bodhisattvas on either side, from Swat to Dunhuang.

Of the same reign are the dragon and lion figures on Khri Lrong Lde-brtan's commemorative pillar at Phyang-gyas (Richardson, Early Burial Grounds in Tibet and Tibetan Decorative Art of the VIIIth and IXth Centuries, C.A.J. 1963 pl. 15). The carving is badly effaced but the appearance of the quite freely drawn lion on the upper part of the pillar is generally similar to that of the lion supporting Manjusri in paintings from Dunhuang, while the traces of dragon figures on the lower part resemble the stylized carvings on the pillar of Khri Lde-strong-brtan which are in a tradition that can be traced back to the Han dynasty. I have seen nothing closely comparable to the serpent design on the same pillar; it may be inspired by Indian mythology (see e.g. Pal op. cit. pls. 90 and 252). Sun and moon symbols like those on the Khri Lde-strong-brtan pillar appear on a painting from Dunhuang of Akšagata with an inscription in Tibetan (R.M. Stein 168). The tortoise base is a Chinese symbol of longevity.
Other examples from the reign of Khri Lobs-rgyal-brtan are the rdzogs-chos Relief stood with a thick pattern on the back which the Gnar-do image in Nepal (Par op. cit. p. 100) but there is also a Chinese element in the depiction of a muscle on the foreleg rather like that in a well-known Tang glazed lion (L. Sickman and A. Soper, *Art and Architecture of China*, p. 1. 61b); but the attitude of the latter is quite different. A pair of lion figures of the 8th century from Nepal are rather nearer (Par, op. cit. p. 163) but the closest similarity is with a lion from Tunhuang illustrated in Von le Coq, *Von Land und Leuten in Ost Turkistan*) so the artistic origin of the figure is uncertain.

Another recent article in *Wenwu* shows that excavation of the base of the Sinic-Tibetan Treaty pillar at the Jo-khang of Lhasa reveals that the pillar rests on a stone tortoise. Further, at *U-shang* (On-chang-do), where Khri Gtsug-lde-brtan founded a temple, there is an eight-foot tall pillar of well-dressed stone with an elegant stone capital, but uninscribed, which also stands on a stone tortoise. In the courtyard of the chapel which was said to have been completely restored by the late Dalai Lama, there is another pillar of reddish stone with a rather heavy capital; it is decorated on its sides with the Rhad-phyo ring-brgyud and other religious symbols. Although the pillar looks old, the carvings are in such good condition that I was doubtful whether they could be original; nevertheless these symbols are found in drawings from Dunhuang (e.g. The Silk Route and Diamond Path, UCLA Art Council 1982, p. 148).

Conclusions from a limited body of evidence are necessarily speculative. It is known from Chinese records that the Tibetans were highly skilled in fine metalwork and also that they decorated the tombs of their warriors by painting white tigers on them; but nothing of that survives and from the examples considered above it appears that after the initial influence of Indian models, probably by way of Nepal, Chinese influence prevailed. That is not really surprising for after the brief honeymoon period during the reigns of Srong-rgyan sgam-po and Tan-btsanbhostilites, which were almost continuous, brought Tibetans into close contact with Chinese frontier towns. Moreover, there was rarely a complete interruption of diplomatic relations. Envoy from each side regularly visited the court of the other and for forty years from 641 to 681 and a further twenty-nine years from 710 to 739 a Chinese princess with her own ministers and retainers lived at the Tibetan capital. But a new closeness of relationship came with the establishment from the decade 776 to 786 of a Tibetan colonial regime in
the Chinese fortress cities of the north-west on the approaches to the Silk Route. There the Tibetans employed Chinese gentry as officials and other local people as translators, artists and so on; and there they were in contact with Chinese teachers of Buddhism in a tradition which preceded their own conversion. Recent scholarship, notably that of Yoshiro Inaeda and R.A. Stein, has shown the extent to which Tibetan official thought and language were influenced by those of the Chinese classics. Chinese teachers and craftsmen made their appearance in Central Tibet in the later part of the reign of Khri Srong-lde-brtan and the tradition that Chinese artists as well as Indian and Nepalese, took part in the decoration of Bsam-yas c. 779 is not impossible to accept.

Lesser examples of monumental art in the capitals and finials of several inscribed pillars may support that trend. The earliest on the rdo-rigs at Lhasa Jhol which dates from c.764 before the main influx of Chinese visitors, is small, simple and slightly upcurved; it is surmounted by two stone steps on which rests a small stone dome not unlike the drum of a stupa, crowned by a well-carved finial consisting of three circular ornaments enmeshed in a scrolled border. Tibetan observers regarded it as the Yid-khön nor-lha, the cintāmāni; in this case perhaps three in one. The canopies of two other pillars of the same reign—that at Bsam-yas dating from c.779-782 and the memorial of the brum-po about twenty years later—are also plain; the former is surmounted by a gilded ornament symbolizing the sun resting on an upturned quarter moon and topped by a small knoll; it can hardly be original and is not an integral part of the pillar. The other supports a dome-shaped stone, like that at Zhol, with a badly weathered cone-shaped finial, possibly a lotus.

Several of the capitals of the next reign beginning c.800, have a more marked Chinese appearance. The canopy of the Slar-cung pillar is haughtily fluted and is topped by an elaborate object which, again, Tibetans described as the cintāmāni.

The capitals at Zhwa'i tha-khang are absolutely plain and lack finials, having apparently been damaged when the pillars fell down some time after the tenth century. The carving on the underside of the canopy on the pillar at Khri-Lde-srong-brtan's tomb has already been described; there is also a small scroll decoration round its edge; and the comparatively flat canopy is surmounted by a round lotus bud supported by a beaded collar. From a recent photograph there appears to be some cement at its base suggesting it had been knocked off and replaced since I saw it in 1949.

Of the pillars from the reign of Khri Lde-gsung-brtan (813–c.838) that at Loang-ba has sharply upturned corners and the sides are decorated with a Chinese pattern of clouds. The canopy on the treaty pillar near the Jo-khang is simple and has a decoration of clouds. That on the uninscribed pillar at 'U-shang is slightly upturned and has a simple decoration on its side. Those three and the small pillar in the courtyard at 'U-shang all have conical cintāmāni finials in slightly different forms and in varying states of preser-
viation. That on the Treaty Pillar similar to the finals at Siak-cung.

The valuable contributions to the study of early Tibetan art as well as history, social conditions, and language in the three articles examined above give hope that the interest in such matters by Tibetan and Chinese scholars is only the beginning of a continuous search for survivals of Tibet's past. Apart from further possibilities in less well-known parts of central and south-west Tibet, it is probable that the Tibetan empire which extended from Hunza to the north-western frontier of China has left more traces than those discovered by Sir Aurel Stein and Paul Pelliot. Wilhelm Fiechter has mentioned in *A Scientist in Turan*, 1929, p. 144, the finding of small lion figures of heavy stone and many other relics at the site of a Tibetan burial at Tsaigan Uzu some ninety miles south-west of the Khekonor. The Tibetan scholar Cedin Chephel notes in *The Blue Annals* (Boerlitz) L, p. 63 that there was near Xaring an inscribed stone pillar narrating the Three Learned Men of Tibet in the late ninth century; and Mrs Mildred Cable recorded an old Tibetan temple in a thinly populated area near Dnhuang. The former fortress towns of the Chinese border from Liangzhou to Anxi where there were Tibetan administrative centres in the eighth and ninth centuries might be worth investigating; and so might Ba-brang Zhen-shi dkyi. Further, there are throughout Tibet large numbers of ancient burial mounds, often not recognized as such, and although Tibetan susceptibilities might be offended by the excavation of hallowed places like the ba-gmo of Strong-btsan gsal-po, scientific exploration of lesser sites could yield much evidence of the past. There is a series of great conical mounds some 500 feet in circumference seen by the pandit A.K. near the monastery of lador north of the Gom-tenmo (Tengri Nor). In one of them there are open passages and nearby there is a large gateway in the rock through which the god Nymchen Tengtsha, the protecting deity of the Tibetan Kings, is said to pass. Many remains may have been destroyed by time and by man but there is still a chance of some significant discoveries; and it is important that anyone fortunate enough to find some unknown monument, document or artifact should not fail to record it photographically.

Reproduced from the *The Tibetan Journal*, Vol XII, No 2, Summer, 1957

A note from the author is added on the following page.
Since completing the above I have seen in _The Religions of Tibet_ by the late Professor Tucci, pp. 232 and 238, reference to the lde/nu as a group of diviner-priests possessing a sacred character as protectors of society.

Dr. Michael Aris has drawn my attention to a tradition from Ngang in Bhutan that Ktri Srong-lde brtan had a "beloved natural son" (Guge rgya-ba’i sras zur-pa) called Lde-chung Don-grub upon whom he conferred the province of Lho-brag. (Michael Aris, _Bhutan_, p. 138). Even though the tradition seems to be distorted it shows that the name of Lde-chung survived in the memories of the Bhutarese who had long connections with Lho-brag.

H.E. Richardson
A PREFACE TO MAHAYANA ICONOGRAPHY

— NIRMAL C SINHA

Indian art, particularly iconography, is well-known as idealistic, that is, not realistic. Indian icons are not illustrative of realities or facts of nature. No species of flora or fauna finds exact representation or faithful reproduction in traditional Indian iconography. This is as true of Brahmanical/Hindu images as of Buddhist/Mahayana images.

This tradition is rooted in India’s age-old belief that the divine being or transcendental entity cannot be defined or described in man’s limited vocabulary or in man’s limited vision. In India sers of all creeds and schools consider the five senses as led by a sixth sense called “mind”. Buddhist as well as Brahmanical saints find even the master sense too little to comprehend the Absolute so as to define or describe it in language or form. An illumined mind can comprehend the Absolute but may not express it. Gautama Buddha chose to be silent.

Krishna tells Arjuna:

But thou canst not see Me.
With this same eye of thine own,
I give thee a supernatural eye:
Behold My mystic power as God!

(Bhagavad Gita XI.4, Eng. Tr. Edgerton)

Oldest Indian scriptures, the Vedic Samhitas, speak of many deities or divinities like Indra or Varuna but are not clear or categorical about RUPA, that is, the form of the deity. On the otherhand images or icons worshipped by the uncivilized or unenlightened people are positively decried. Perhaps these images were gaining popularity with the less advanced among the Vedic community. That is why in the later Vedic works, the Upanishads, we find the sages frequently referring to the Absolute as incomprehensible by the senses and that the likeness of the Absolute PRATIMA was not to be found. Transcending all known expressions and forms the Brahman was known as Transcendental.

Kena Upanishad rules out the sense organs as instruments for comprehending the Brahman. Any material object like stone or wood may be noticed by the eye but the eye cannot notice the Brahman. "That which one sees not with the eye, that by which one sees the eye’s sightings, know that indeed to be the Brahman, not this which men follow after here". (I.6 Eng. Tr. Sri Aurobindo).

Katha Upanishad elaborates further. "God has not set His body within the ken of seeing, neither does any man with the eye behold Him but to the heart and the mind and the super mind He is manifest. Who know Him are immortals". (II.3.9)
Eng. Tr. Sri Aurobindo). Svetasvatara Upanishad, which interalia speaks of manifested Brahman, lays down: "His form is not to be seen; no one sees him with the eye. Those who through heart and mind know Him as abiding in the heart become immortal". (IV. 20 Eng. Tr. Radhakrishnan). The term RUPA occurs in the Upanishads as in Vedic Samhitas while any concrete representation is denied. Even any visualization within self is not adequate. As Kartha Upanishad (II 3 5) says: "In the self one sees God as in the mirror but as in a dream in the world of the Fathers and as in water one sees the surface of an object, so one sees Him in the world of the Gandhavas. But He is seen as light and shade in the heaven of the Spirit" (Eng. Tr. Sri Aurobindo).

It is now fairly established that the images in stone or wood censured in the Upanishads were infiltrations from the religion of the conquered Dravidian people. Phallic symbols and iconic forms of Siva Pasupati and Yog from the Indus Valley made inroads into the religion and cult of the conquerors. Thus the sages who composed the Upanishads no doubt spoke only for the elites among the conquering community. Nevertheless Brahmanical images or icons were on the way when Gautama Buddha appeared.

Bhagavad Gita, whether composed before or after Gautama Buddha, is known to be a work of the Upanishad class. It preserves and projects the Upanishadic speculations about RUPA. Arjuna, after having a vision of the Cosmic Form, exclaims "O abode of the world. You are the imperishable, the manifest and the unmanifest, and that which is beyond both". (XI. 37 Eng. Tr. Vireswarananda).

II

Buddhism begins with reservations and inhibitions about form but flowered into countless forms, THOUSAND BUDDHA!

Gautama Buddha came in a milieu when the quest for Brahman, Brahma- jijnasa, trod the path of dialectic tending to agnostic thought. The Absolute in each thought could be RUPA(form), ARUPA(formless) or both. Buddha rebelled against the Vedic rituals and sacrifices as did the seers teaching Sanhya and Vedanta. Buddha could not encourage the cult of image or icon; thus he deplored the tendency to adore the Master’s Body.

In Samyutta Nikaya, also Majjhima Nikaya, is related the story of disciple Vakkali who in his deathbed was most eager to see Buddha in person. Buddha came to him and said “O Vakkali why you crave to have look at this body of impure matter. Vakkali one who perceives Dharma perceives me. One who perceives me perceives Dhamma”. In the same Nikayas, Buddha is on record thus “One who perceives Pratipasamutpad, perceives Dharma; one who perceives Dharma, perceives Pratipasamutpad”. In short Buddha said that his Teachings were important and not his Body (body). It was an injunction against adoration of the Master’s image, that in Buddha Rupa.
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Five centuries later sage Nagasena told the Greek king Menander "Who perceives Dharma perceives Bhagavan (Buddha) for Dharma was preached by Bhagavan". Further "Bhagavan can be pointed out in the body of his Dharma for the Dharma was preached by Bhagavan". The Dharmakaya was to be visualised and not the physical body of Buddha who passed away long ago. It was obvious that Buddha Rupa (image of Buddha) was not unknown and worship of such image was not uncommon.

Relics enshrined in Stupa were worshipped after the passing away of the Master. Worship of stupa was an ancient pre-Buddhist custom and the Master had approved of such adoration of his relics after Mahaparinirvana. These stupas came to be decorated with 'sacred symbols' like Aswatha tree or Dharmachakra and 'sacred animals' like elephant, horse, bull or lion. When events of the Master's life came to be depicted by Maurya and Sunga artists, Buddha Rupa in relief and in round was not far off.

In the first century of Christian era Buddha's Rupakaya was popular with the common people who took refuge in Buddha while only the intellectually advanced like Maharanil Milinda would be taught by sages like Nagasena how to visualize Buddha's Dharmakaya through Dharma. A common believer in first century A.D. could have been Hinayana and not necessarily Mahayana. Buddha Rupa in Theravada countries like Sri Lanka or Thailand bears full testimony down to our time. Buddhaghosa the great Theravada saint-scholar of fifth century A.D. describes in Visuddhimagga the Two Bodies thus:

"That Bhagava, who is possessed of a beautiful rupakaya, adorned with eighty minor signs and thirty-two major signs of a great man, and possessed of a dharmakaya purified in every way and glorified by sva, samatha, ..., full of splendour and virtue, incomparable and fully awakened". (Eng. Tr. Nalinakshita Dutt).

Rupakaya in Hinayana/Theravada tradition referred to the reality, that is, the historical Buddha, a human being. Yet this Hinayana tradition was not altogether free from the religious bias of attributing super human powers and signs extraordinary to Gautama Buddha. The Buddha Rupa in Theravada countries has never been completely realistic. "A beautiful Rupakaya, adorned with 80 minor and 32 major signs could not inspire a grossly realistic form. In the homeland of Buddhism in the four centuries prior to Buddhaghosa sculptors of different regions—Amaravati, Mathura, Gandhara—produced different styles of Buddha Rupa. Gandhara, under influence of Hellenistic aesthetics, tended to be most realistic and least idealistic; Gandhara style failed to spread all over Jambudvipa.

Mahayana iconography along with Mahayana doctrine was firmly established all over the country except some places in south and east in Buddhaghosa's time. In the seventh century A.D. Buddhism made its entry into Tibet with a multi-splendoured iconography depicting a multi-splendoured pantheon. The images were not from the imagination of the artists; the images were from the vision—the meditation—of the saint-scholars, all mystics.
In Mahayana, Rupakaya came to be designated Nirmakaya and an
intermediate Body designated Sambhogakaya emerged. The Trikaya are:
Dharmakaya or Cosmic Body which is Absolute Reality; Sambhogakaya or Body
of Bliss which in a personal manner blesses the believers; and Nirmakaya or
Mundane Body which appears on earth to teach Dharma. Dharmakaya cannot be
adequately depicted and is generally depicted by a skull; for a believer's
comprehension Gautama Buddha after Mahaparinirvana or Adi Buddha like
Amitabha may be cited. Sambhogakaya is depicted by a divine Bodhisattva like
Avalokiteśvara or Manjūśri. Nirmakaya or Manusha Buddha is depicted by
Gautama Buddha while on earth; Nagarjuna, Padmasambhava, Aita or a Guru
is more often cited as Manusha Budda, and Gautama Buddha less often since
he is in Dharmakaya.

This is a brief and insufficient account of the figures featuring in Trikaya which
formed the theme of Mahayana iconography in Tibet and Mongolia. A separate
notice of the doctrine of Three Bodies and the diverse forms of the multiple deities
will follow.

This notice may be concluded with a quote from Vairachchedika that Dharma
and not Rupa is to be visualized.

Those who by my form did see me,
And those who heard me by voice,
Wrong the efforts they engaged in,
Me those people will not see.

From the dharma should we see the Buddhas,
For the dharma-bodies are the guides.
Yet dharma's true nature should not be discerned,
Nor can it, either, be discerned.

(Eng. Tr. Edward Conze)
संस्कृत और पाल ग्रंथों का जोड़

(1) न तु भीं भलेसे हिमद्रामेंत्र श्रवणम्।
धिवम् द्रामों ते तुहूँ पाया से केसुमीभरम्।

(2) नीमद भरहद्रीशा ए II. 5. 8
वधारणाः न गृहायिनी गृहायिनी गृहायिनी।
तृतीय द्राम से हिमरंगे नेलं कविषुतमणासे।

(3) केनसोमविशद 1. 6
नं संतोषी शास्त्र कृत्वा न गृहायिनी गृहायिनी गृहायिनी।

(4) नयनायिनी 5. 9
नं न तिरंगं न मधौँ परिचयम्।

(5) नं कत्रिता खरणेवचन ए IV. 19
नं संदेही चित्तगति रूपम् न तनायः प्रपति कृत्यं नाम।

(6) नं कत्रिता खरणेवचन ए IV. 20
अला शंकानन्दे भगवान्ये गाथा लोकी तथा भीतर्के।

(7) कृत्यं विश्वासं शंकानन्दे भगवान्ये गाथा लोकी तथा भीतर्के।

(8) नं कत्रिता खरणेवचन ए II. 3. 5
संभवं ते नं संमुखसाधारण्यं धरींनाम धर्मोऽधारितं भवाय।

(9) नं कत्रिता खरणेवचन ए X. 37

(10) नं संभवं गृहायिनी अभूतं।
इन्द्रिया मानसिपुलस्य हन्ते।

इम्लं निवासं VI. 47. 18
उल्लम्ब बक्षि किंमि ते पुलिकात दित्तेन। तो रो वक्षि
धम्मं प्रसस्ति से रे पपत्ति। 
त म पपसति शैधम्म पससति।
संभवत/ जलिपालका
धौ परिवारसमुपागो पससति।
(10) दर्शाम धम्मम पससति दौ धम्मम
पससति से परिवारसमुपागो पससति।

(11) दर्शाम धम्मम पससति से महाराज महसति।
धम्मम हि
महाराज महसति।

(12) 'मिलिपालक
धम्ममकालेन पन रे महाराज शुक्रा भगवा निर्दर्शसमु, धम्मम रे
धम्मम हि महाराज महसति।

(13) 'मिलिपालक
धौ पी से भद्धा अर्धीति अनुवाचउपालित-ममकाला-
पुरिलकाला, विनविज- सुपकोका महाकालसुलभकलकसा-
धोटी, रुपकालसम्पत्ति-धम्ममकालो बसामले पुश्मलल....
.... अपारंबुली असे सम्मासमुहुः।

(14) 'मिलिपालक
धौ से पपसति सभ्यम से म पपसति वक्षिते।
आपस्सममाता ममम मम म पर्यस्रो रो न पपसति।

(15) 'मिलिपालक
धौ से म रोगम चारा जरुर रो रोगम आनवता।
मित्राय प्रत्यक्षमपत्ता न म दृष्टि माते अन्तमा।

'धम्ममो बुद्धम दृष्टम धम्ममकाला हि महाराजः
'धम्मम' च रे विजेता रे श बहादुर विजातमदुः।

वाक्यसेतिका प्रसामारिता
THE OFFENCES AND RETRIBUTIONS IN THE VINAYAPITAKA

— JAYEETA GANGULY

Offences And Retributions in The Sāṃgha (1)

The organization of the Buddhist Order (Sāṅgha) developed through a continuous process, as it may be seen in the different versions of the Vinaya texts available to us. After a few centuries from the Mahāparinirvāna of Gautama Buddha, the Buddhist Sāṅgha was divided into numerous sects (2). Each sect might have possessed a Vinaya-Pitaka of their own, amongst which some texts have come down to us in different languages. The Vinaya-Pitaka is a code of Buddhist monastic discipline. Sākyaputra Gautama came across several unprecedented happenings on which he had to lay down different monastic rules for the maintenance of discipline. These rules have been enumerated in details in the Sāṃghadipika sections of the Vinaya-Pitaka. Often the Group of six monks (3) is said to be responsible for doing certain misdeeds which led Gautama to prescribe such rules. He used to specify the nature of offence (Aṭṭhikī) for which punishment was to be inflicted on the monks in every case according to the gravity of the misconduct. The offences likewise received different appellations such as Dukkade, Thulacheva, etc.

The Sāṅgha As A Living Organism

It may appear to be a lofty ideal for those who are conversant with the Science of Organizations. The Buddhist Order basically consists of a group of persons coming from different strata of society and having their distinct mental attitudes and aptitudes. The Buddha claimed that his teachings had been imbued with the eight great characteristics of the ocean (4).

It is well known that there were no restrictions of Vedic caste or social order among the members of the Sāṅgha. But a human being (jātva) always bear an individual outlook on account of their mental conditions and efficacies. Consequently, the Buddha had to face several incidents of resistance, disorderliness and even insubordination amongst the members of his Sāṅgha. These incidents prove that the Sāṅgha was comparable to a living organism in which the monks were like living cells.

Aṭṭhikī (Offence)

According to the monastic rules an offence (Aṭṭhikī) may be either major (parikṣetikī) or minor (Lahulikī). A major one, as a potential cause of schism, must be different from all other ecclesiastical minor offences referred to in the canonical texts. In this regard Dr. Nivedita Mukherji has rightly pointed out: Aṭṭhikī can therefore only mean the minor offences which are outside the scope of the seven types of major offences included in the ‘Vinaya’ (5).
Apatī may be derived from a *pad.Pali-English Dictionary* by Rāya Davida and Sridevi, *any transgression of the “sikkhāpada” or precepts laid down by the Buddha* is considered to be an āpatī. Among the offences enlisted in the Pātimokkha (Skt: Pātimokṣa) the Pāṭhika and the Sādhyāṭīsasa are said to be included among the Garukkāpatti (also known as Aśasaṭṭhīsama āpatī or Dūṣṭhullāpatti) and the remaining are said to be grouped under Lehukkāpatti (also known as Deseṇdgāmini āpatī or aduṭṭhullāpatti). There is also another classification of the āpatī viz. āvasesāpatti and avasesavasesa āpatī. Among the offences of the Pātimokkha, only the Pāṭhika is said to belong to the āvasesapatti while the remaining are all said to belong to the āvasesavasesapatti.

**Dukkataśapatti (6)**

Dukkata refers to a fault or transgression or a kind of offence on account of “wrong action”. All the Sikkha rules if violated involve the Dukkata offence. The dukkata offence has also been classified into eight groups (7). According to the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya preserved in Chinese, “wrong-doing” has been distinguished under two heads—of body and speech, which are together known as “wrong-doing” (8). Some examples of the infliction of the dukkata offence may be cited from the Skandhakha of the Theravāda tradition:

1. After the Buddha had granted the monks the permission to carry out the Upasata like the other hermit sects, he further enjoined the monks to recite the Pātimokkha rules during the Upasata assembly. But a few of the monks began to recite the Pātimokkha daily being ignorant of how often the pātimokkha ought to be recited. The matter was reported to the Buddha, whereupon he prescribed that the Pātimokkha ought not to be recited daily but only on the day of the Upasata. Whosoever transgressed this rule, the offence of dukkata would be inflicted upon him.

2. Similarly, the Buddha said down that the recital of the pātimokkha thrice a fortnight (i.e. on the 8th, 14th and 15th days) would also lead to the infliction of the offence of dukkata and it was permissible to recite the Pātimokkha only on one day, i.e. the fourteenth or the fifteenth (9).

3. The offence of dukkata was also to be inflicted upon the persons who committed the following offences:
   a) Asking questions on the contents of the Vinaya while the assembly is in progress;
   b) Responding to questions on the Vinaya uncalled upon in the midst of the assembly;
   c) Reckless a monk for an offence without taking his leave;
   d) To perform indiscretionary acts in the midst of the assembly (10).

Many other instances of infliction of the dukkata offence may be cited from other chapters of the Vinaya which require a separate study.

As regards the retribution of the dukkata offence, it may be said that the retributions depended on the gravity of the offences.
The opinion of Rhs Davids & Oldenberg may be cited ‘Those slight offences which were not embodied in the Pātimokkha are called dukkāta offences. They range, as to their gravity, with the Pācittīya offences of the Pātimokkha. For him who had committed a dukkāta offence, no further penance was required than a simple confession of his fault’ (11).

Dubbhāṣīāpatti (12)

(Skt) Durbbhāṣīta, (Ch) Wu Shuo refers to ‘An offence of bad speech. It may be against the Buddha, Dharma or Saṅgha or against any person. It is one of the āpattis grouped under Adutthullāpatti or Lāhulāpatti or Desanāgāmini Āpatti (i.e. light offence)” (13).

The Pariśāra mentions ‘Dubbhāṣīta is that which has been heard according to the truth. Dubbhāṣīta is bad speech, those words that are impure are termed in this way (dubbhāṣīta). (14) The dubbhāṣīta is of rare occurrence as compared to the other offences mentioned. It is clear that all kinds of offensive language or speech used by the monks when speaking to anyone was considered to be an offence of “Dubbhāṣīta”.

As it has been grouped under minor offence, its retribution would therefore evidently correspond to that of other minor offences, viz. a simple confession before any other monk or before the Saṅgha would probably suffice in this case.

Thullaccaya (15)

Thullaccaya is however “A grave offence. Thullaccaya is one of the offences which may be amended for by confessing the “offence” before another monk, it is the most serious one amongst all such offences”.... An offence similar to Pāṭbhāka or Saṅghātīdīsāsa may be considered as Thullaccaya” (16).

In the parivāra we find the following interpretation of “Thullaccaya”:—

“The Thullaccaya is that which has been heard according to the truth. That which is confessed for one reason, is considered to be (a Thullaccaya). A transgression of which there is no equal, is known as (the Thullaccaya) (17).

Some examples may be cited from the Vinaya-Piṭaka (Theravāda) regarding the infliction of the Thullaccaya. In the Uposatha-khaṇḍhaka of the Mahāvagga in Pali, it has been recorded that on the day of the Uposatha if four or more resident or guest monks have assembled to carry out the Uposatha and a number of monks either fewer, equal or greater in number arrive during the course of the Uposatha, if the monks already present carry out the Uposatha and recite the Pātimokkha with the intention of creating schism among the Saṅgha, then the offence of Thullaccaya is inflicted upon them (18).

Similarly, on the day of the Uposatha if four or more resident or guest monks have assembled to carry out the Uposatha and having seen or heard signs of the presence of other resident or guest monks, carry out the Uposatha and recite the Pātimokkha with the intention of creating schism among the Saṅgha, then the offence of Thullaccaya is inflicted on the monks concerned (19).
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As regards the retribution of the Thullaccaya offence, it has already been mentioned above that the Thullaccaya is the most serious of the offences that may be amended for by confession.

Dutthulappatti (20)

The Pirajjika and Saighadissesa are called Dutthulappatti. It is also known as Garulappatti (21). A dutthulappatti is a grave transgression of the Rules of the Order, viz. the four Pirajjika and the thirteen Saighadissesa (22).

"The term dutthulappatti is used also in the ninth Paccittiya rules, and the Old Commentary (Sutta-bhaṅga) there states that by "grave offences" those belonging to the Pirajjika and Saighadissesa are understood" (23).

In the Patimokkha, the word dutthulappatti appears in the ninth and the sixty-fourth Paccittiya rules as follows:

Paccittiya 9. "Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhusa dutthulann āpattim anupasampannassa bhikkhu anānissma sammutiyā paccittiyam. [Trans. — If a monk tells an unordained (anupasampanna) about the grievous offence (dutthulappatti) of another monk without his permission, a paccittiya shall be inflicted upon him.]

Paccittiya 64. Yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhusa ānān dutthulann āpattim pañcchādikīya paccittiyam. [Trans. — If a monk knowing conceals a grievous offence (dutthulappatti) of another monk—a paccittiya shall be inflicted on him.]

Its retribution may correspond to that of the Pirajjika or Saighadissesa according to the gravity of the offence committed.

The offences discussed in the present paper are mostly to be found in the Suttanipata. These names have not been used in the Patimokkha (except Dutthulla) although some of the offences referred to in the Patimokkha are equivalent to those mentioned in the Suttanipata. Similarly, we find no mention of the offences of the Patimokkha in the Suttanipata. The reason may be presumably that "the authors of the final recension of the Vinaya" did not consider it reasonable to introduce new names into the Patimokkha or to the latter offences, in order to retain the original character of the Patimokkha (24).

In the Suttavibhaṅga, consisting of two books—the Pirajjika and the Paccittiyaka—there are different kinds of offences (āpatti) in the Patimokkha have been classified in detail. The occasion for the offence as given in the Patimokkha has been quoted, along with the injunctions by the Buddha, followed by the commentary on each of the rules and the different conditions for the perpetration of the offences. Apart from the main offences enumerated in the Patimokkha, the Thullaccaya and Thakkata etc. also have been enlisted, among which the offence of dubbihaṭta also rarely appears.

As it has been rightly pointed out by I. B. Horner regarding the origin of such rulings, it is probable that some of the rules were prescribed during the lifetime of
Sākyaputra Gautama, and some by his disciples after his parinirvāṇa as and when the need arose. It is also quite likely that some of the offences were actually committed by the monks while other rules were prepared beforehand as a preventive measure for the monks and nuns.

Similarly regarding the authorship of the rules, although all the rules were attributed to the Buddha himself, we cannot be sure that all the rules enunciated in the Skandhaka were prescribed by the Buddha in person. It does not seem probable that each and every rule and sub-rule was framed by the Buddha personally nor that every trivial matter was reported to him. Inconsistencies in the fixing up of the penalties also leave room to hold that the rules were drawn up on different occasions (25). For example, an incident from the “parivāra” may be cited:

“How many offences are associated with theit? Three offences are associated with it. Pāñcika, if it is an article worth five māsās or more, ‘Thullaccaya’ if it is an article worth more than one māsā, but less than five; and ‘Dukkata’, if it is an article worth one māsā or less” (26).

On scrutiny of such offences and retributions, some new light may be thrown on the development of the monastic organization founded by Sākyaputra Gautama in the pre-Christian period in India. In this regard, the Chinese sources help us to make a survey of the growth of the saṅgha from its earliest times and that requires a separate study.

NOTES

2. Skandhaka (P. Khandhaka) refers to the different sections in the Vinaya-Pitaka dealing with ordination, Uposatha, (monastic observance for self-purification) rainy-season retreats, etc. in Pali, the Khandhaka includes two books—The Mahāvagga and the Cullavagga. In Chinese it is translated as Fa and in Tibetan as Gahi. Tibetan Gahi suggests “vastu” in Sanskrit, Fa in Chinese means dharma.

2. Sīravasāśādīna (Theravāśādīna) Viśālāśiṇī, Dhammottiyas, Bhadravāśādīnas, Sammagga, Mahāśāgādas, Dhammagattiyas, Kāyāśikas, Sakkatās, Uttarāśikas, Mahāsāgādas, Āyavāśādīnas, Kāyatattiyas, Prajñapāśādīnas, Caityakas, Purvāśikas, Apatrāśikas, Sāvatthiyas (Vide Buddhist Sects in India—Nalineko Dutt Ch.4)

3. P. Chaavattigya Bikkhi (Skt. Sādvyagga Bikkhu) Ch. Līang Chun Pi Chin. A group of monks who lived during the Buddha’s time and are known to have committed different vinaya offences. The names of the monks are Assajī, Paraballasu, Paṇḍuka, Lohitaka, Mettpiya and Bhumaga. These monks were all from Sāvatthi and were said to have divided into three groups after entering the Buddhist Order. Each group had about five hundred followers. Of them, the followers of Paṇḍuka and Lohitaka were said to be the most virtuous. They accompanied the Buddha on his tours and did not transgress Vinaya rules like the others.
Also Arghuttaranikôya (Upasahasutta, Paha/ôdasutta).


6. Skt. Dukkha Ch. Tu Chi Luol Tib. Nyas Byas Maha Xuyapast (abbrev Moky, 9225). The Mulasarvatadvinda (Transliteration) hold Sitasara bhamati (Glit Manuscripts Vol. 3, Pt. 4 Posadhabhumaj for dikkata (Tib.Hagi.chal can tu Hguor ro) whereas the Chinese versions record Tu, Chi, Luo in all the cases.


8. Foxue Ta Tau Tien—Ting Fu Pao, Pg. 1578, Wrong-doing has been translated in Chinese as Wu Tsuo.


In the other Vinaya versions, viz. the Dharmaguptaka and the Mahàñjika preserved in Chinese, similar incidents have been narrated although the infliction of the dikkata offence has not been mentioned. (Comp. Dh. Vinaya Talho Vol. 22, Pg. 817c22; Mi Vinaya Pg. 12b17f). However, the point that the Prkr. rules were to be recited only once a fortnight (the fourteenth or the fifteenth) has been emphasized in all the cases.


It may be noted in this connection that these rules have not been mentioned in any of the other Vinaya versions.


12. Skt. Durëhâra. Ch. Wu Shuo


15. Skt. Sãtãbhãya Ch. Tûo Lan Che (Transliteration) Tib. Nes Pæ Sham Po, 
(Moky, 9224)


"Dubbhãsitañ ti yam vuttak, tæh suno hi yathâthothan. Dubbhãsitañ durëhârañ, suhkitthathax ca yam padeñ. Tañ cavinø garâbanî, tenetañ iti vucacah."
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20. Skt. Daśṭhūla or Daṇḍhūla Ch. Kuśa Wu Tīb. Gnas Nan Len Møy, 2102 8424, 8473


22. Pali English Dictionary—Rhȳs Davids & Steele under "duṭṭhumāpaceti".


24. Rhȳs Davids & Oldenberg


Also Vinaya Pitakaı Vol. I. Edited by Hermann Oldenberg. Introduction Pp. XIX-XX.

Similar opinions have also been shared by Vidyāsekharā Sastri (Pāṭimokkham, with Bengali translation and commentary Introduction Pp. 18).
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With due acknowledgement, Mr. H. E. Richardson's 'Early Tibetan Inscriptions' is reproduced from Tibet Journal because of the great importance of the subject. Mr. Richardson has kindly added a note to the reprint. We have requested Mr. Richardson to write for our Bulletin an account of all epigraphs found so far in Tibet. Being the leading historian and epigraphist Mr. Richardson's writing should be of interest and informative to all scholars.

Mr. N. C. Sinha is engaged in writing serially on Mahayana Iconography both for the lay reader and the specialist. The first writing published in this issue answers the common query why the icons from Himalayas and trans-Himalayas are more grotesque than picturesque. The second article which is booked for the next issue of the Bulletin deals with the question of numerous images conventionally called Thousand Buddhas.

Ms. Jayeeta Ganguly in her article makes a comparative study of the Buddhist concept of sin and retribution based on Pali, Chinese and Tibetan sources.

It is not the policy of this Journal to be involved in any news paper controversy or polemic relating to our discipline of studies. Recently an unfruitful and unfounded allegation has been made by a former Dewan of Sikkim about the purpose and object of this Institute of Tibetology. Mr. N. C. Sinha has replied to this allegation in the local newspaper dated even, Lhabab Duschen. With due acknowledgement to Sikkim Express this is reproduced in response to many requests from scholars and others interested in our study in the following pages.

B. GHOSH
Tibetology Contra Nepalese?

—NIRMAL C SINHA

Nari Kaikhosru Rustomji, better known as Nari Rustomji, was a brilliant member of the Indian Civil Service and is now widely recognized as an authority on the Eastern Himalayas. Mr. Rustomji's scholarship is founded on his lifelong contact with the races and tribes all over the Himalayas east of Nepal, his mastery of the languages and dialects of the peoples concerned, his on-the-ground experience as an administrator all over the eastern regions and his access to archives and records while in service. I have known Nari Rustomji for thirty years now and respect him as an elder in the field of Himalayan Studies though he is eight years younger than me.

I am however constrained to question a recent statement of Nari Rustomji which runs thus: "The late Chogyal made strenuous efforts to revive Sikkim's ancient traditions. As a counter to Nepalese dominance the support of the Government of India and of the Dalai Lama was enlisted to establish in Institute to Tibetology". This was in his paper read on 10 March this year before the Centre for Himalayan Studies, University of North Bengal and is circulating in mimeograph currently. His latest book Sikkim: A Himalayan Tragedy cut two months earlier, i.e. January 1987 while dealing with "Nepalese influx" and "Nepalese influence" has quite intriguing matter. I quote: "The Institute was set up as a focus for Tibetan based research and was eventually inaugurated under the joint auspices of His Holiness the Dalai Lama of Tibet and India's Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru. There could have been no firmer assurance for Sikkim's minorities of India's rejection of the traditional policy of seeking for a guarantee against a revival of Tibetan influence". (pp. 43-44)

The British rulers had discovered "the surest guarantee against a revival of Tibetan influence in Sikkim" in the increasing immigration of Nepalese "the hereditary enemies of Tibet". The Lepchas and Bhutias being followers of Tibetan Buddhism are—in view of Claude White, Herbert Risley and Nari Rustomji—ipso facto wed-Hindu and therefore anti-Nepalese. The Institute of Tibetology in Sikkim therefore in such logic would be anti-Nepalese.

In his first publication, Enchanted Frontiers (Oxford University Press 1971) Nari Rustomji no doubt says much about Nepalese majority and Bhutia-Lepcha minority in Sikkim. He however says nothing on Tibetology contra Nepalese in describing the Sikkim Mahajakumur's project. I quote in extenso.

"There should be, according to his idea, a centre for research into Tibetan literature and Mahayana Buddhism, where scholars and lamas of Sikkim would give and receive guidance in their avocations. The centre should include a library of Tibetan books, religious and secular, which could be availed of for study.

Reproduced from Sikkim Express, 11 November, 1987

33
at the centre itself and mimeographed for the use of research scholars in other parts of the world. There was apprehension that, with the growing tide of Chinese infiltration into Tibet, the ancient books and historical records in the monasteries might be pillaged or destroyed. The idea thus emerged of establishing an institute which would serve as a refuge and repository of Tibetan culture where the old values could be kept alive.” (p. 230)

“Nehru was infected by the Prince’s enthusiasm and unhesitatingly pledged his support. The Dalai Lama too gave his blessing to the venture and promised to assist with books and to encourage learned scholars and lamas to give the benefit of their scholarship to the centre. The corner stone of the Ramgual Institute of Tibetology, as the centre was named, was laid by the Dalai Lama during his return from India through Sikkim and we invited Jawaharlal Nehru to perform the formal opening during the following year, by when we hoped to complete the main central building. The Institute was the Prince’s own, beloved brain child.” (p. 230)

II

I was present at the North Bengal University Centre for Himalayan Studies (10 March 1987) when Mr. Kustamji read his paper and I did protest about any anti- Nepalese objective of the Institute of Tibetology. Now that the Paper (in mimeograph) and the book TBIREM (Allied Publishers) are in circulation I am urged by my friends who count as many Tibetans as Nepalese all over India as also Lepchas, Bhutias and Nepalese in Sikkim to record in print the facts about the foundation and objectives of this Institute of Tibetology in Sikkim. My credentials are clear to my friends in Sikkim as in other states of India and also abroad in the Universities or centres specializing in studies relating to Himalayas or Buddhism in Himalayas and Trans-Himalayas. Readers other than such friends are not expected to know an obscure specialist like me. I thus submit first my biography relevant to this matter.

I was the first Director of the Sikkim Institute of Tibetology serving from 1958 to 1971. I was Director again from 1976 to 1978 and was called in 1983 to organize the Silver Jubilee and shall stay at this post till next summer. All these years have been for me happy years, years of education and not years of employment only.

My association with this project goes back to the Buddha Jayanti Year (1956). I was then Cultural Attaché with the India Mission for Sikkim, Bhutan and Tibet. The Sikkim Maharajkumar (later Chogyal) had programmed for collection, preservation and Study of Tibetan texts of all sects in one centre and sought support from the Prime Minister of India currently celebrating 2500 years of Buddhism. Maharajkumar chose the right year and the right man. For Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru’s veneration for Gautama Buddha was as high as his reverence for Mahayana philosophy which can be recovered fully from Tibetan translations of lost Sanskrit originals.

Besides the Head of our Mission, Apsahb Balsahab Pant, better known as Apa Pant, not withstanding Oxford Modern Greats and London Inns of Court,
was a great enthusiast about Oriental Learning and would openly affirm his faith in the ancients' valor and mystic lore. Apa Pant loved me and esteemed me despite my purely academic leanings to Yoga and Prana-pranayama. He lent all his weight to Maharajkumar in this task of securing Prime Minister's official support and made me handle all papers and correspondence re: Sikim Project of Tibetology. The Maharajkumar came to like me from the first day we met and when promise of Pandit Nehru's official support was received, Maharajkumar entrusted me with drafting a Chariar for incorporation of an Institute of Tibetology.

This Draft was ready in February 1958, when I was negotiating for a Readership in History with emphasis on Inner Asia in a Central University. Maharajkumar threw a surprise on Government of India by asking for my services to be the Director of this Institute. I pleaded my poor knowledge of the Language (Tibetan) and the Religion (Buddhism) and was keen to be back to purely academic pursuits. Even Apa Pant could not persuade me. My good friend Jagat Singh Mehta, then Deputy Secretary and later Foreign Secretary, told me on spot (South Block) that after Nari Rustogi I was the first from Government of India to be asked for by name by the Sikkim Darbar and that even the Prime Minister had heard this and approved Maharajkumar's choice. Jagat Mehta warned me against negotiating with the Central University. I had to forget the calls from any University and joined as Director of the Institute on 1 July 1958, three months prior to its opening by the Prime Minister of India. I joined with all warmth, and have never regretted this.

I state the above details to say that I was not ignorant of any controversies that could arise and would begin my reign by saying that I had never known any anti-Nepalese posture of Apa Pant or Nari Rustogi in my ten Inauguration. Apa Pant because he was instrumental in obtaining Prime Minister's official support. Nehru's individual moral support was there from the beginning but his official support, that is, support of the Prime Minister of that Government of India was much else.

Nehru's advisers in South Block had objections, not related to ethnolinguistic philosophy of Nari Rustogi. One objection was that Government of India's support would annoy the Chinese authorities. Gangtok reply was that Communist China was also celebrating Buddha Jayanti in many ways and had offered to bring to India the skull of the great Mahayana pilgrim scholar Huen Tsang. Another was that an Institute of Tibetology in Sikkim would attract all sorts of Western tourists and special visas for Sikkim was a growing problem. Gangtok replays that the foreigners' quest for Butterflies and rhododendrons of Sikkim would be there as long as Tourism authorities' quest for foreign exchange was there. And about Maharajkumar being anti-Communist and anti-Chinese, Gangtok drew the Prime Minister's notice to the lavish hospitality and generous travel facilities extended by the Chinese to Maharajkumar on his Tibetan pilgrimage previous year.
Enjoying the confidence of both Apa Pant and Maharajkumar I was witness to all talks and was the keeper of all records re: Sikkim Project. I never came across any ethno-linguistic considerations like checkmating "Nepalese dominance" or "revival of Tibetan influence" in Sikkim weighing in the minds of the makers of the Institute.

IV

I take the Dalai Lama first, as His Holiness would consider any notice of such controversy beneath his dignity. I would only say that why the Dalai Lama should at all be interested in a statecraft to counter both "Nepalese dominance" and "revival of Tibetan influence" in Sikkim. About Jawaharlal Nehru I would reiterate that such considerations did not inspire him to support Sikkim Project. About Apa Pant, I say that his pro-Nepalese as well as pro-Tibetan sentiments are well-known and he would never be party to such strange statecraft as propounded in Nan Rustomi's latest book (SIKUSM pp. 41-44). I consider last Maharajkumar Palden Thondup Namgyal, "author of Sikkim Project for Tibetology" in Nehru's words if my memory does not fail.

I would not claim the degree of closeness to Maharajkumar (later Chogual) as Mr. Rustomi can rightly claim. I only affirm that I had enjoyed his affection, love and confidence from the very beginning till I asked for release (1976) to respond to offer of Professorship from my alma mater (Calcutta University). I too knew the mind of Maharajkumar (Chogual) and I cannot deny that his one constant concern was about the Nepalese majority and Lepcha-Bhutia minority. To the best of my knowledge, Maharajkumar had never brought the ethno-linguistic politics to the planning and building up the Institute of Tibetology. Maharajkumar's stakes were much high as he wanted to tell the world that "small Sikkim could build a repository for preservation of learning associated with Chhos (Dharma) and this Institute was the first such" (Maharajkumar's words to me again and again). In this endeavour Maharajkumar counted as much on Nepalese as on Tibetan co-operation.

In summer 1962 when Maharajkumar returned from New Delhi after releasing our well-known art-book dedicated to Jawaharlal Nehru he told me: "Panditji and your Professor (Humayun Kabir) say that Maharajkumar's Tibetology has already put Sikkim on the map of academic world. I say you have put Sikkim on the map". With humility and pride I received these words. I did not feel that all my good efforts had the ultimate objective of countering "Nepalese dominance" and "Tibetan influence" and do not feel that way even after I read Nuri Rustomi's latest book. I have silently swallowed remarks like "Nehru fooled by Lasaqat Ali Khan" or "Nehru fooled by Chou En-Lai". I shall not accept any remark like "Nehru fooled by Sikkim Maharajkumar". Such denigration covers both, Jawaharlal Nehru and Palden Thondup Namgyal.

I write later on the role of Nepalese in building up this Institute. I refer meanwhile to an incident in the General Council (Institute's Governing Body)
meeting in 1970. A VIP lady as member of the General Council demanded to know why the Director of this Institute had so far made no programme about Lepcha culture or literature; further why should this Institute not work mainly, if not solely, for study of Sikkim history and culture. I had replied that this was never earlier required from this Institute and that for any change in emphasis from Tibetology the Charter of Incorporation should be amended. The Chogyal as President agreed with me. I understood that our objectives as laid down in the Charter were to remain the same. It is not necessary here to name the VIP. It is necessary to point out that Mr. Rustomji, though a Founder Member of this Institute, is reconstructing the history of this Institute.

Though I am the last in the list of Founder Members I can say that in rewriting the history of this Institute, Nari Rustomji is unwaveringly guilty to character assassination of a dead friend, Chogyal Palden Thondup Namgyal.

The list of Founder Members (Annexure I of the Charter, reproduced in Sikkim Act IV of 1976) includes these Nepalese: Gomchen Pema Tamang Lama, Shri Motichand Pradhan, Shri Manishina Jyoti and Shri Bhim Bahadur Pradhan. Gomchen was abbot of Nanchi monastery. Motichand Pradhan, retired Chief Magistrate of Sikkim, was as good in Tibetan as in his own language and an ardent collector of Sanskrit and Tibetan works about the Pandita in the Land of Snow. Manishina Jyoti—of the famous industrialist house Jyoti Brothers spread over Kathmandu, Lhasa, Calcutta, Singapore and Borne—is a patron of Nepali Vajrayanis and Tibetan Lamas and was useful in Maharajkumar’s procurement of xylographs and manuscripts in Tibet. Bhim Bahadur Pradhan, retired Forest Manager, famous as an authority on Himalayan flora, was close to the Lepcha as well as Tamang temples and monasteries. I may add that Maharajkumar had very much in mind the names of Tenzing Norgay, the famous mountaineer and Guru Lama, the famous soldier and due to some slip in papers moving between different authorities concerned these names were not in the Annexure when the Charter was promulgated on 28 October 1958.

From this promulgation in 1958 through the amendment as Sikkim Act IV of 1976 Nepalese association is continued. In the General Council after 1976 there have been scholars and scholars Nepalese like Kashiraj Pradhan and C.D. Rai. At this moment of writing the Vice President, elected from the General Council members, is a Nepalese Brahmin Hon’ble K.N. Uperti, Education Minister, and the prestigious post of Financial Adviser cum Treasurer is held by late Bhum Bahadur Pradhan’s son, K.C. Pradhan, Finance Secretary to the Government of Sikkim. Mr. Pradhan like his father is as much close to Sikkim monasteries as to Sikkim forests.

I would fail in acknowledging the Institute’s indebtedness to “Nepalese majority” of Sikkim. If I do not record that a Nepalese dominated government with a Nepalese Chief Minister, Hon’ble N. B. Bhandari have evinced the same
interest and concern about this Institute as the previous government would. Annual Maintenance Grants come without complex audit conditions, and any Extra Grant needed is issued on application only. Facilities from all Government Departments are received irrespective of ethnolinguistic or religious or denominational affinities of the Ministers and Secretaries concerned.

VI

The ethnolinguistic and communal mechanisms of ruling India were devised by the British authorities in pre-1914 years and the same authorities had their first shock in 1919, the year Mr. Rustomjee was born at Lahore. In Jallianwala Bagh Hindus, Muslims and Sikhs faced soldiers commanded by a British General and the dead counted six hundred. In 1930 summer, when Mr. Rustomjee was abroad in Bedford School, the famous Garhwal soldiers refused to fire on Pathans at 54 prayers in Peshawar maidan. In 1940-42 when Mr. Rustomjee was an ICS probationer, the British were recruiting Nepali Hindus, Nepali Buddhists and even Bhutas into the armed forces. Inter arma leges silent and even the forbidden Buddhists in the Hinayanas were welcome. The Two-Nation theory and the Partition of India came no doubt in the aftermath of war. In this aftermath the theory of "the hereditary enemies" of each other: Nepalese and Tibetan was dead mutton for British.

In his anxiety to propound the doctrine of counteracting "Nepalise dominance" and "revival of Tibetan influence" in one stroke, Nari Rustomjee ignores and suppresses the great historic fact that Central Hinayana or Nepal have been the stop over in the journey of Buddhism (Mahayana) to Tibet and Mongolia. Padmasambhava, Santarakshita, Karmalalahia and even Atisa Dipankara stopped and studied in Nepal on way to Tibet. Nepal gave away to Buddhist scholars from the plains. Nepal preserved the Buddhist scriptures and exegetics, sent these to Tibet and Nepalese Pandits also joined in the translation of Sanskrit works into Tibetan. The iconography of Guatama Buddha and Mahayana deities was further developed in Nepal, and Nepali style was model for Tibet and Mongolia. The great king Songtsen Gampo and his Nepali consort are equally adored in Tibet. Sites in Nepal are sacred for Tibetan and Mongol pilgrims. Nepali Hindu have apotheosized Guatama Buddha far more than other Hindus. I can not digress further here. I can tell the readers that these great pioneers Brian Hookham, Rajendra Lal Mitra and Sylvain Levi have acquired their knowledge of Tibetan Buddhism by residence in Nepal and these three noticed the harmony between Hindus and Buddhists. Any picture of "hereditary enemies" was not for them.

I conclude my writing at length with two quotes from the Charter of Incorporation of this Institute:

"Chhoe in Tibet is equivalent to Dharma in Sanskrit but is generally used in all Tibetan speaking countries in a special sense as the Doctrine of the Buddha".
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"In our belief and in deference to the teachings of all Sangyas (Buddhas) and Changchub Semnas (Bodhisattvas), Chöpa is eternal and all embracing. Study of the doctrines of other Sects and Schools such as Theravada, Jaina and Brahmana may enable us to see more clearly the historical development of Chöpa. May the great catholicity of Chöpa enlighten the quest of the Sikkim Research Institute of Tibetology."
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