VIE ET CHANTS DE 'BRUG-PA KUN-LEGS LE YOGIN, A REVIEW

Jamyang Namgyal

New Delhi

VIE ET CHANTS DE 'BRUG-PA KUN-LEGS LE YOGIN, TRADUIT DU TIBETAIN ET ANNOTE. By R. A. Stein. 443 *p.* 3 *plates. Collection UNESCO d'oeuvres representatives. Published by G. P. Maisonneuve et Larose, Paris,* 1972. *Price:* 80 *F.*

The appearance of a new monograph by Prof. R. A. Stein is always a major event in the Tibetological world. No exception is this long-awaited translation of the autobiographical reminiscences of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs, one of the most popular cultural heroes of the Lamaist world. In two previous works Prof. Stein has dealt with the greatest epic of Tibet and Mongolia, the adventures of Ge-sar, King of Gling. In 'Brug-pa Kun-legs he has the opportunity to elaborate some of the themes set forth in his earlier works. Prof. Stein is no gatherer of minutiae; his interests focus on the significant cultural patterns and structures.

If Stein's translation of the Holy Madman sounds occasionally wooden, the fault should be sought in the differences between Tibetan and French. No doubt other reviewers will have something to say about his theory and practice in rendering philosophical terminology: the translator has set forth his views in a superb "à propos de la traduction" following his learned historical and cultural introduction. One of the admirable characteristics of Prof. Stein's works is that he invariably examines any text he chooses to study in a relevant historical and cultural context. He eschews mystification. I think that the present effort shows that he has learned a good deal about esoteric Buddhist thought. No one, I think, will dare to call Prof. Stein's present effort one of the "pseudoscholarly translations of Buddhist philosophical texts by linguists who deliberatley close their eyes to the fact that an etymological dissection of an isolated word is not a meaningful proposition...[1]"

Prof. Stein acknowledges the help in preparation of this translation of Jhampa Gyamtshog (Dwags-po Rin-po-che Byams-pa-rgya-mtsho). The "Rs" scattered throughout the footnotes are evidence of an active collaboration that must become more and more the rule rather than the exception as Tibetan studies develop.

---

1. *H. V. Guenther, The Royal song of Saraha; a study in the history of Buddhist thought. Seattle, University of Washington Press,* 1969, p. 18.

The introduction includes a concise and useful survey of the various schools of Tibetan Lamaism, a breakdown of the subsects of the Bka'- brgyud-pa, and a detailed account of the Rgya lineage of Rwa-lung into which 'Brug-pa Kun-legs was born. The author touches, one might think too superficially, upon the significance of the holy madman (*smyon-pa*) in the Indo-Tibetan tradition. He describes the historical backgound against which 'Brug-pa Kun-legs lived and sets forth some of the chronological problems. He points out some of the inconsistencies and difficulties of the sources which were at his disposal.

Prof. Stein registers perplexity over an account of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs' adventures in Bhutan, published some five or six years ago in a mimeographed form. A corrected version of this rather interesting work appeared last year in a moveable type edition. This text was written by one of the most competent Bhutanese scholars on 'Brug-pa Kun-legs, Geshe Chaphu (Dge-bshes Brag-phug Dge-'dun-rin-chen) in 1966 at Kun-dga' chos-gling, a lovely hermitage on the ridge below Gsang-chen chos-'khor above the Spa-gro Valley. The mimeographed publication was intended for limited circulation to elicit comments and criticism. A comparison of the two versions of this text (*'Gro ba'i mgon po chos rje kun dga' legs pa'i rnam thar rgya mtsho'i snying po mthong ba don ldan)* gives an interesting insight into the traditional methodology of Lamaist scholarship. Geshe Chaphu received suggestions from a number of Bhutanese savants including Lopon Nado, Lopon Pema, and Lopon Kunleg. Lopon Nado was responsible for the printing of the revised text in Kalimpong. Most of the points which puzzled Prof. Stein have been corrected or deleted in the printed edition.

For example, the crucial statement in the mimeographed version regarding 'Brug-pa Kun-legs' place in the Rwa-lung genealogy, which leads Prof. Stein to observe, "L' incertitude qui règne au sujet de 'Brug-pa Kun-legs vaut aussi pour sa proche famille," reads (ff. 3v-4r):

> .../'brog sde chen po zhig gi khrod du/ yab rgya'i rus can zur po tsha pe dang/ yum ma bza' dar skyid gnyis la rgyal srid kyi nor mchog lta bu'i sras bdun 'khrungs pa'i tha chung srid na 'gran zla dang bral ba gangs can gyi nyi ma lta bu 'gro ba'i mgon po gdung dang na bza'i mtshan can dpal ldan 'brug pa rin po che 'di nyid rab byung gsum pa'i nang tshan khyu mchog ces pa leags mo sbrul gyi lo la sku bltams pa dang/ de'i sku mched 'bring po jo tshul gyi gdung rabs las byon pa yab nang so rin chen bzang po dang/ yum mgon mo skyid la sras nyi zla lta bu gnyis 'khrungs pas/ che ba dpal ldan ra lung par grags pa ngag dbang chos kyi rgyal po dang/ tha chung 'gro ba'i mgon po chos rje kun dga' legs pa'i dpal bzang po 'di nyid 'phags yul grub brgya'i gtsug rgyan sa ra ha pa dang shā wa ri pa zung du 'jug pa'i skye mtha' bzung nas rab byung brgyad pa'i nang tshan na tshod ldan zhes pa shing mo phag gi lo la sku 'khrungs so/.

In the new edition (f. 3 r–v) the same passage has been revised and expanded:

.../'brog sde chen po zhig gi khrod du/ yab rgya'i rus can zur po tsha pe dang/ yum ma bza' dar skyid gnyis la rgyal srid kyi nor mchog lta bu'i sras bdun 'khrungs pa'i tha chung srid na 'gran zla dang bral ba gangs can gyi nyi ma lta bu chos rje 'gro ba'i mgon po gdung dang na bza'i mtshan can dpal ldan 'brug pa rin po che 'di nyid rab byung gsum pa'i nang mtshan khyu mchog ces pa lcags mo sbrul gyi lo la sku bltams pa dang/ de'i gcen po lha' bum gyi sras las slob dpon dbon stag 'khrungs shing/ de las rdo rje gling pa sengge shes rab dang spos skya pa chen po sengge rin chen gnyis 'khrungs/ phyi ma spos skya pa chen po las bcu gsum pa chen po sengge rgyal po 'khrungs/ de las 'jam dbyangs kun dga' sengge 'khrungs shing/ de'i sras blo gros sengge las gcen chos rje shes rab seng ge dang/ gcung 'jam dbyangs sprul pa ye shes rin chen gnyis 'khrungs/ phyi ma ye shes rin chen las gsang bdag sprul pa nam mkha' dpal bzang dang spyan ras gzigs sprul shes rab bzang po/ tha chung drung pa rdo rje rgyal po bcas gsum 'khrungs/ phyi ma rdo rje rgyal po las nang so rin chen bzang po 'khrungs/ de lta bu'i gdung rabs dri ma med pa las byon pa'i yab nang so rin chen bzang po dang yum mgon mo skyid gnyis las rab byung brgyad pa'i nang tshan shing phag gi lor chos rje kun dga' legs pa 'di nyid sku 'khrungs pa'o/.

The statement on f. 56v of the mimeographed issue:

.../sras 'di phyis su ngag dbang rnam rgyal lho la chibs kha bsgyur dus phyag phyir yod pa las/ phyis lho mon kha bzhi la dbang bsgyur ba'i sde srid gnyis pa sa skyong bstan 'dzin 'brug sgra zhes pa de sras dam de nyid yin skad do// de'i brgyud pa drug song ba'i tha ma da lta phag ri bsam grub lha khang na yod pa'i sde pa gsol dpon pa de tsho yin ces zer ro/

has completely been deleted in the printed edition (cf. f. 36 v). It is upon the basis of this statement that Prof. Stein postulated the date of 1786 for the composition of this work. One would speculate that this was a statement occurring in one of the sources used by Geshe Chaphu and that the revisers saw that it was misleading and consequently eliminated it from the printed edition.

Another of the difficulties observed by Prof. Stein (pp. 15—18) centers around the question of the identity of the Rdo-rje-gdan-pa, Father and Son, and the implications for the dating of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs. Prof. Stein apparently had access to the biography of the Rdo-rje-gdan-pa (*Chos kyi sprin chen po'i dbyangs kyi yan lag rnal 'byor gyi dbang phyug dpal rdo rje gdan pa'i rnam par thar pa* in 34 ff.) This text is a supplement to the full length *rnam-thar* of Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal (1594-1651) by Gtsang Mkhan-chen 'Jam-dbyangs Dpal-ldan-rgya-mtsho (1610-1684). The blocks were carved at Punakha (Spungs-thang Bde-ba-can) during the abbacy of the 18th Rje Mkhan-po 'Jam-dbyangs-mtshan (1743-1802), i. e. 1797-1802. They

are apparently no longer extant, having been burned in one of the many fires that destroyed the great religious center.

Bhutanese tradition records that 'Brug-pa Kun-legs took as a *mudra* one Nor-bu-'dzom, who bore him a son at Bkra-shis-rgyas-pa Phal-sna in the Stod-pa-lung-pa Valley between Thed and Thim.[2] Prof. Stein has erroneously located this place in Central Tibet (p. 16, fn. 1: "Vallée de l'affluent du skyid-chu (sic!), à l'Ouest de Lhasa. C'est aussi au pays de sTodluṅ, dans le grand stūpa d'argent de Lam'-phar que les restes de 'Brug-pa Kun-legs etaient conservés"). This locality is in Bhutan to the east of the Thim-phu Valley on the way to Dbang-'dus Pho-brang. The biography of Bstan-'dzin-rab-rgyas (*Mtshungs med chos kyi rgyal po rje rin po che'i zman par thar pa bskal bzang legs bris 'dod pa'i re skong dpag bsam gi snye ma,* 383 ff. 1) notes that the birth of this son, Ngag-dbang-bstan-'dzin, took place at the end of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs' life.

Ngag-dbang-bstan-'dzin met 'Brug-pa Ngag-gi-dbang-phyug (1517–1554) when the latter was visiting Bhutan and became his disciple. We know that Ngag-dbang-bstan-'dzin founded Rta-mgo Ri-khrod in his 50th year and that towards the end of his life he produced two children. The eldest, a daughter, died in her youth after manifesting remarkable signs of an accomplished yogini. The son was Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-bstan-'dzin *alias* Pha-jo Rta-mgrin-rgyal-mtshan (1574–1643). Ngag-dbang-bstan-'dzin died when his son was 17 (*ca.* 1590). It would appear that he was born between 1520 and 1529.

Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-bstan-'dzin received his monastic vows at the age of 17 at Rwa-lung from Mi-pham-chos-kyi-rgyal-po (1543-1604[3]). He also received teachings from Ngag-dbang-lhun-grub, Grub-thob Rin-po-che (the rebirth of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs), Pha Dam-pa Ngag-dbang-'brug-rgyal, Zangs-dkar Ras-chen, Lha-dbang-blo-gros Sureśamati), and Stag-rtse-pa Sprul-sku Pad-dkar-dbang-po (regarded to be a rebirth of 'Brug-pa Gcung Rin-po-che Ngag-gi-dbang-phyug (1517–1554). Prof. Stein has, in error, identified the last with the Fourth 'Brug-chen Padma-dkar-po (p. 16: "Parmi ses maîtres figure s Tag-rce-pa Padma dkar-po (1527–1592, voir le Tableau)".

Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-bstan-'dzin produced two sons and a daughter. His eldest child was Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-rgya-mtsho *alias* Dpon-slob 'Brang-rgyas-pa Sbyin-

---

2. *The biography of the Rdo-rje-gdan-pa reads* (*f.* 6v)*: thed thim gyi mtshams/ stod pa lung pa'i sa'i cha/ bkra shis rgyas pa phral sna zhes bya ba'i yul du khrungs/; the rnam-thar of Rgyal-sras Bstan-'dzin-rab-rgyas states* (*f.* 9r)*: sku tshe'i mtha' dang nye ba'i skabs su nyi 'og lho phyogs kyi thed yul gzhung du stod pa khyags nags nang zehs bya bar nor bu 'dzom zhes pa'i bud med mkha' 'gro... The latter work was written by the 6th Rje Mkhan-po Ngag-dbang-lhun-grub* (1673?–1733?).

3. *The dates given by Prof. Stein for Mi-pham-chos-kyi-rgyal-po are* 1543–1606.

pa-rgyal-mtshan. The two younger children were born of a different mother, the daughter of the Cang Sgang-kha lineage, Dam-chos-bstan-'dzin (b. 1606). This lady had previously been the *mudra* of Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal, who for some reapassesd her on to Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-bstan-'dzin. She gave birth to two children, Rje-btsun Drung Rin-chen-dpal-'dzom (1634–1708) and Rgyal-sras Bstan–'dzin-rab-rgyas (1638–1798). This branch of the House of 'Brug-pa Kun–legs died out when Bstan-'dzin-rab-rgyas failed to produce a male heir. One daughter, however, was born in 1691. This personage was known as Lcam Kun-legs and is regarded to be the first of the Rta-mgo Bla-ma incarnation line.

The dating of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs still presents us with problems. Most of the available sources, past and present, are in agreement that his birth took place in the Wood-Pig year corresponding to 1455. Prof. Stein has noted the difficulty in accepting the date of 1455 given in Geshe Chaphu's life of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs (p. 17):

"Selon ce texte, le préfet Rin-chen bzaṅ-po et sa femme mGon-mo-skyid auraient eu deux fils, 'Brug-pa Kun-legs, né en 1455, et son frère aîné, le glorieux abbé de Ra-luṅ, Nag-dbaṅ chos-kyi rgyal-po (No XIV du Tableau). Or selon les sources anciennes, celui-ci est né en 1463 et il n'est pas le frère aîné, mais le cousin de 'Brug-pa Kun-legs."

With the revision of the family affiliations in the printed edition there is no problem: Ngag-dbang-chos-kyi-rgyal-po (1465–1540)[4] is no longer described as the elder brother of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs. Geshe Chaphu cites an oral tradition current in Bhutan that 'Brug-pa Kun-legs passed away in 1570 at the age of 115 but notes that this dating was a subject of dispute. There seems to be no reason not to accept the traditional date of 1529 for the death of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs. It is not impossible that he sired Ngag-dbang-bstan–'dzin in his sixth decade of life and that Ngag-dbang-bstan– 'dzin produced his heir Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-bstan-'dzin when he was over 50. Mi-pham-tshe-dbang-bstan-'dzin was sixty- four when he sired Rgyal-sras Bstan–'dzin -rab-rgyas. Late fatherhood and prolonged fertility seem characteristic of the later princes of Rwa-lung.

'Brug-pa Kun-legs' style is charmingly colloquial yet elegant.He introduces himself:

> /de la ding sang lnga brgya pa rnams kyi nang du skye ba blangs pa'i/ 'brug pa kun legs nga'i byung tshul cung zad bshad na/ dga' la ngu bro ba skyid la gu yangs pa/ 'dzom tsa na ya cha ba/ ma 'dzom tsa na 'tshol ba/ sdod bsam tsa nal' 'gro ba 'gro bsam tsa na sdod pa/ su'i kha la yang mi nyan cing/ su dang yang mi mthun pa/ don dang mthun la khad la/ mi mthun pa mang ba/ brtag par dka' ba de'i rus ni rgya/...

4. *The dates given by Prof. Stein are* 1463–1538.

This Prof. Stein cleverly renders in French (p. 42):

"Si j'expliquais maintenant un peu de quelle manière j'ai pris naissance, moi, 'Brug-pa Kun-legs, au milieu de nos âges actuels de cinq cents ans, c'était:

dans la joie, j'éclatais en pleurs,
dans le bonheur, tranquille et à l'aise,
quand j'étais riche, je m'émerveillais,
quand je n'étais pas riche, je cherchais,
quand je pensais rester, je partais,
quand je pensais partir, je restais,
n'écoutant les paroles de personne,
avec personne je n'étais d'accord,
dès que tout s'accordait avec l'affaire (de ma vie),
d'innombrables affaires ne s'accordaient plus du tout.

De cet homme difficile à comprendre, le clan paternel était rGya."

One may, of course, find inadequate his explanation of *lnga -brgya-pa-rnams* as "de nos âges actuels de cinq cents ans", which he footnotes "périodes de déclin du bouddhisme qui s'aggrave de plus en plus."The usual Lamaist scholastic explanation for this expression is *snyigs-ma lnga, tshe-lo brgya.* The five *snyigs-ma* (kaṣāya) are: 1) *tshe'i* (āyuh); 2) *lta-ba'i* (dṛṣṭi); 3) *nyon-mongs-pa'i* (kleśa); 4) *sems-can-gyi* (sattva); 5) *dus-kyi* (kalpa). During this degenerate age, the life of man is no more than a hundred years.

One also has the feeling that the translator is missing something when he renders the expression *ya-cha-ba* as "je m'émerveillais".The term is applied to behaviour done in an extraordinarily free–handed and capricious manner without a thought to the future. It is this behaviour which provokes amazement in others. Such expressions which are not to be found in the dictionaries deserve a footnote or at least an entry in a glossary of unusual words and expressions.

The notes occasionally contain factual errors. On page 49 (fn. 2), the *Zab mo nang don,* the famed synthetic study of the Anuttarayoga tantras by the Third Karma-pa Rang-byung-rdo-rje (1284-1339) is curiously attributed to the Second Karma-pa Karma-pakshi (1206-1283). The translator refers the reader to p. 489 of Roerich's English rendering of the Blue Annals where there seems to be no mention whatsoever of the *Zam mo nang don.*

The mention of the *Snying thig* precepts on p. 57 gives rise to a footnote: "Cf. le Kloń-chen sñiń-thig de Kloń-chen rab-'byams-pa (1308–1363)." The *Snying thig* teachings of which 'Brug-pa Kun-legs speaks are the *Snying thig ya bzhi,* a collection of five sets of precepts which were transmitted by Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa Dri-med 'od-zer. This collection contains: 1) the *Bi ma snying thig* precepts of Ldan-ma Lhun-

rgyal; 2) the *Bla ma yang thig* teachings representing the essence of the *Bi ma snying thig* by Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa; 3) the *Mkha' 'gro snying thig* group rediscovered by Padma-las-' brel-rtsal (Rin-chen Tshul-rdor); 4) the *Mkha' 'gro yang thig* precepts, an elaboration of the *Mkha' 'gro snying thig* by Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa; 5) the *Zab mo yang thig* teachings containing the essence of the four previous sets (*ya-bzhi*) as expressed by Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa. In addition to the *Snying thig ya bzhi*, there were current at the time of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs a number of rediscovered Rdzogs-chen teachings which were called *Snying thig* precepts. The *Klong chen snying thig* cycle was a much later development; it was delivered by Klong-chen Rab-'byams-pa in a vision to Kun-mkhyen 'Jigs-med-gling-pa (1729/1730–1798). The *Klong chen Snying thig* teachings are the most widely used Rdzogs-chen practices of our time.

In attempting to identify the Lha-btsun-pa who was the most important guru of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs, Prof. Stein was wisely hesitant about equating him with Lha-btsun Rin-chen-rnam-rgyal (1473–1557), the disciple of Gtsang-smyon He-ru-ka (1452–1507). An interesting manuscript biography of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs' teacher, Lha-btsun Kun-dga'-chos-kyi-rgya-mtsho (1432–1505), has recently become available in India. This work (85 ff.) bears the title *Grub pa'i dbang phyug ('Brug smyon Kun dga' legs pa'i rtsa ba'i bla ma) Lha btsun Kun dga' chos kyi rgya mtsho'i rnam par thar pa mdo tsam brjod pa rmad byung yon tan rgya mtsho 'jigs zab skal bzang dga' ba bskyed pa'i dod 'jo* and is the work of Kun-dga'-mi-'gyur-rdo-rje *alias* G.yung-mgon-rdo-rje (b. 1721), regarded to be the 4th or 5th in the series of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs incarnations of Gnyal Dre'u-lhas. G.yung-mgon-rdo-rje, the son of the extraordinary Sle-lung Bzhad-pa'i-rdo-rje (b. 1697), began his work at the behest of Kah-thog Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbang-nor-bu (1698–1755) and completed it after a lapse of some years in 1768. He relied heavily upon the *Ngo mtshar utpa la'i do shal byin brlabs kyi zil mngar 'ba byed* a bulky biography of Lha-btsun by Snyug-la Paṇ-chen Ngag-dbang-grags-pa (1458-1515), the biographer of Dbus-smyon Kun-dga'-bzang-po (1458–1532).

Kun-dga'-chos-kyi-rgya-mtsho was born into the Gle-ma-kha branch of the Lha Btsad-po, the clan of the ancient kings of Tibet. Thus, he was entitled to the epithet Lha-btsun applied to all monks of the royal lineage of Lha. This title is comparable to the Mongolian *toyin/toin*, applied to monks of royal descent, His chief gurus were Mon-rtse Rtogs-ldan Kun-dga'-dpal-ldan (1408–1475?), Rgyal-dbang Kun-dga'-dpal-'byor (1428–1476), and Bsod-nams-mchog-ldan.

His two chief disciples were 'Brug-pa Kun-legs and Drung Grags-pa-mtha'-yas. Grags-pa-mtha'-yas was the master of Chos-sku Nam-mkha'-rin-chen and of Jo-nang-pa Kun-dga'-grol-mchog (1507–1566). The lineage passed from Kun-dga'-grol-mchog through Brag-stod-pa Lha-dbang-grags-pa to the great Tāranātha (b. 1575). A bulky *rnam-thar* and *mgur-'bum* of Lha-btsun's other disciple, Grags-pa-mtha'-yas (*Rnal*

'byor gyi dbang phyug grags pa mtha' yas dpal bzang po'i rnam thar mgur' bum ngo mtshar nor bu'i phreng ba, a xylograph in 242 ff.) exists, but the present reviewer never had the opportunity to study it at length.

The dating of the compilation of the several parts and the carving of the blocks for the Dre'u-lhas edition are further unsolved problems. Prof. Stein has outlined his findings (pp. 24-26) and would identify Mon-ban Smyon-pa, the personage responsible for the four part Dre'u-lhas edition with the Sde-pa Grub-thob Rin-po-che, an incarnation of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs mentioned in Lha-rtse-ba Ngag-dbang-bzang-po's (1546-1615) supplement to the biography of 'Brug-chen IV Padma-dkar-po. This Sde-pa Grub-thob Rin-po-che is mentioned under the entries for 1591 and 1592, in the latter instance in association with Lo-chen Sprul-sku 'Phrin-las-dbang-phyug and the Lo-ro Dol Dmag-sde. Stein would tentatively date the Water-Dragon year in which these blocks were carved to either 1592 or 1652. The reviewer would tend to disagree: the style of the blocks and the oral tradition point to 1892.

The few Dre'u-lhas monks in India unfortunately do not have their *chos-spyod*, nor are they able to reproduce a list of the incarnations of 'Brug-pa Kun-legs. They are aware of the eight or nine volume *gsung-'bum* of G.yung-mgon-rdo-rje, of which there is reputedly a set in Bhutan. One of these monks has also shown the reviewer two works by one 'Gro-'dul-rdo-rje, etiher G.yung-mon-rdo-rje's predecessor or successor in the Dre'u-lhas incarnation series (*Bde mchog lhan skyes kyi sgo nas slob ma rjes bzung gi rim pa nag 'gros su bkod pa nyung ngu rnam par gsal ba'i brjed byang,* a xylograph in 20 ff., and *Btsan gyi rgyal po srog bdag a bse chen po gdug pa snying 'byin gyi byung khungs lo rgyus mdo tsam snying por dril ba gcig shes kun grol,* a manuscript in 17 ff). The latter work was written in a Wood-Rat year and mentions the *gter-ma* rediscoveries of Stag-sham Nus-ldan-rdo-rje. Because it does not mention Sle-lung Bzhad-pa'i-rdo-rje's masterful *Dam can bstan srung rgya mtsho'i rnam par thar pa cha shas tsam brjod pa sngon med legs bshad* (1734) and seems to have been one of the sources inspiring Sle-lung Rje-drung, one would tentatively date this Wood-Rat year to 1684. The informants state that a number of lamas of the Dre'u-lhas and Bhutanese tradition have produced works about 'Brug-pa Kun-legs. It is sad that many of these works are up to now unavailable.

One could point out a few other minor questionable translations and explanations. On p. 162, he translates the term *hor-'dra* as "cruel brigands" with a footnote "*hor-'dra,* ici les colleeteurs d'impôts". The dictionary of Chos-grags defines the term: *chen po'i bkas dpya khral sdud byed mngag gzhug pa.* The sixth of the Thirteen Laws (*Zhal lce bcu gsum*) bears the title *Hor 'dra za rkang gi zhal che. Hor-'dra* probably originally meant "belonging to or pertaining to the Mongolicised administrative class" rather than with the current pejorative connotation seen in the 1963 *Kratkii Tibetski-Russkii slovar* 'where the term is defined "konfiskatsiia", i. e. confiscation.

There are occasional typographical errors which may give rise to considerable confusion, e. g. the footnote (p. 43, fn. 2) identifying Kun-tu-bzang-po of Rin-spungs which reads "Chef (rjoń-dpon) de Rin-spuń in 1246. . ." These are fortunately few indeed.

Prof. Stein's translation of 'Brug–pa Kun-legs, autobiography is a work of significance. He has chosen a text that will have an interest not confined to simply the Tibetologist. U.N.E.S.C.O. is to be commended for including this title in its series of Representative Works. Maisonneuve, the publisher, is also to be commended for the classical layout.

How much more useful would have been this study had he been able to discuss the problems, historical, cultural, linguistic, and geographical, with the Bhutanese scholars who have been working along somewhat parallel lines. It is sad that Prof. Stein seems to have been forced to produce this monograph without access to many of the essential parallel sources such as the complete *Rwa-lung gser-'phreng*.

* * * *