On the Composition of the *Sum cu pa*
and the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*

By Zuihō YAMAGUCHI

INTRODUCTION

According to Tibetan tradition, the Tibetan alphabet was created by Thon mi Sambhoṭa, a minister of the king Sroṅ btsan sgam po, and it is also said that he wrote works outlining the basic grammar of the Tibetan language, *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*.

Judging by the contents of the *Annals* included in the Tun-huang documents, it is almost certain that the Tibetan alphabet was in use by the middle of the seventh century A.D. However, Thon mi Sambhoṭa's name is not found among the ministers of Sroṅ btsan sgam po given in the Tun-huang documents, and so it is open to question whether the Tibetan alphabet was created by an individual of that name. It is also clear that some rules of Tibetan grammar outlined in the two works said to have been composed by him are inapplicable to inscriptions in Central Tibet dating from the end of the eighth century. In this paper we shall investigate the significance of these facts.

I

Following an account of a banquet held in celebration of the subjugation of Shaṅ shuṅ found in the *Chronicles* of the royal house of T'u-fan 吐蕃, there is a passage extrolling the achievements of the reign of Khri sroṅ brtsan (= Sroṅ btsan sgam po).
There it is stated as follows (DTH, p. 118, ll. 16–24):

> bod la sña na yi ge myed pa yaṅ//btsan po ḥdi ḥi tshe byuṅ nas/
> Previously there was no alphabet in Tibet, but it was created at the time of this king.

It is thus clear that the Tibetan alphabet was created at the time of the king Sroṅ btsan sgam po. Furthermore, in the section of the *Annals* on 655 A.D. (DTH, p. 13, ll. 26–27) it is indicated that the alphabet was in existence in 655.

> blon che stroṅ rtsan gyis/ḥgor tir bkaḥ khrims gyi yi ge bris phar lo gcig/

The chief minister [mGar] sToṅ rtsan wrote at ḥGar ti the law laid down by royal edict.

This took place six years after the death of Sroṅ btsan sgam po, and so there is no doubting the fact that the alphabet was created during his reign. In the *Chiu T'ang shu* 舊唐書 (Fasc. 196, "Records of T'u-fan" I 吐蕃傳上) there is to be found the expression "although he was unacquainted with writing" 「雖不識文記」 in reference to mGar sToṅ rtsan, so he might have been illiterate when he first visited T'ang. At the beginning of the "Records of T'u-fan" I in the *Chiu T'ang shu*, it is also stated that "there being no alphabet, they make notches in trees and knots in string, thus creating the conventions [of communication]" 「無文字刻木結繩爲約」, but this probably refers to the period prior to Sroṅ btsan sgam po.

The *Annals* relate events starting from the year 640 A.D., and from 649 onwards the events of each year are recorded in itemized form. The documents presented by Thomas relating to the Chinese princess Wên-ch'êng 文成公主 (TLTD, II, pp. 8–10) take the form of separate sections for the events of each year from, according to Thomas, 634 (in the view of the present writer, 635) until 643. In the *Annals* the account for 716 is missing, but from 673 onwards the accounts become more detailed. Since there is no evidence of a special rhythm to aid the memory, it seems natural to consider that they were written on wooden tablets rather than transmitted by word of mouth, and so one must assume that the alphabet was already in existence in the 630's[1].

In reference to this alphabet, Bu ston writes in his *History of Buddhism* as follows (SRD, f. 118b, ll. 5–6):

> *de las bod la yi ge med pas/thon mi a nuḥi bu ḥkhor bcu drug daṅ bcas pa yi ge slob tu btaṅ bas/paṇḍi ta lhaḥi rigs seṅ ge la sgra bslabs te/ bod kyi skad daṅ bstun nas gsal byed sum cu/ā li bshir bsdus te/gzugs kha cheḥi yi ge daṅ bstun nas/lha saḥi sku mkhar ma rur bcos nas/yi ge daṅ sgraḥi bstan bcos brgyad mdzad de/rgyal pos lo bshi ru mtshams bcad de bslabs so/*

Since there was no alphabet in Tibet except for those [letters from abroad], the King sent Thon mi A nuḥi bu together with an escort of sixteen (persons) to study the alphabet. Thon mi studied grammar under Paṇḍita lHaḥi rigs seṅ ge and, adjusting it to the Tibetan language, composed thirty consonants and four vowels, imitating the shape of the Kashmir alphabet. After touching it up at the Ma ru castle in lHa sa[2], he composed eight treatises[3] on the alphabet and grammar, and the king shut himself up for four years [in the castle] and studied them.

In the *Chronicle* there is no reference whatsoever as to who created the alphabet. By way of contrast, Bu ston gives the name Thon mi A nuḥi bu

and states that he studied under lHaḥi rigs seṇ ge, imitated the Kashmir
script, and also wrote some works on the alphabet and grammar.

   A similar account appears in the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* (GSM, f.
29b, l. 6-f. 31a, l. 6) in reference to a person by the name of Thon mi Anuḥi
bu/Thon mi Sambho ṭa, with the place he studied at being given as Southern
India and the name of his teacher as the Brahmin Li byin. In addition, it
is stated that Lañtsha, "the divine alphabet," and Wartula, "the dragon
alphabet," were the prototypes for the *dbu can* (standard) and *dbu med*
(cursive) scripts respectively. Thon mi mdo rdzi's *sGra mdo* is also mentioned,
and he is described as a translator who studied under Paṇḍita lHa rigs seṅ
ge and translated twenty-one works related to Avalokiteśvara.

   Bu ston's *History* (SRD, f. 119a, l. 6-f. 119b, l. 1) and the *Hu lan deb
ther* (HLD, p. 16b, l. 9–p. 17a, l. 1) both give separately the name lo tsā ba
Thon mi Sambhoṭa together with his disciples Dharma koça and lHa luṅ
dPal gyi rdo rje (according to Bu ston, rDo rje dpal).

   As stated previously, there is no mention of Thon mi Sambhoṭa, let alone
A nuḥi, bu, in the Tun-huang documents as one of Sroṅ btsan sgam po's
ministers. In the works referred to in the previous paragraph Thon mi
Sambhoṭa is described as a "*lo tsā ba*" (translator of sūtras) and "*mdo rdzi*"
(supervisor of sūtras)[4], and it should be noted that in both cases the appel-
lation is connected with the translation of sūtras.

   For Tibetans of later generations, the king Sroṅ btsan sgam po was be-
lieved to be an incarnation of Avalokiteśvara and an outstanding promoter
of Buddhism. Thus they found nothing strange in accounts describing the
translation of sūtras related to Avalokiteśvara during his reign. However,
when considered from the standpoint of modern historical research, there is
virtually no evidence to support the image of Sroṅ btsan sgom po as a
propagator of Buddhism[5]. Therefore, there is almost no possibility of there
having been translators and translations of Buddhist scriptures during this
period[6].

   lHa luṅ dPal gyi rdo rje, mentioned as one of Thon mi Sambhoṭa's
disciples, is of the same name as the well-known assassin of the king gLaṅ
dar ma ḥuḥi dum brtan[7]. If he is the same person, it means that he lived
in the ninth century, and Thon mi Sambhoṭa must also be counted among
the translators of the first half of the ninth century. The *bLon po bkaḥ thaṅ*
(BKT, f. 16a, l. 4) includes lHa luṅ dpal gyi rdo rje among the first seven
monks to receive ordination (*Sad mi mi bdun*) in Tibet. According to dPaḥo
gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba (KGG, f. 104a, ll. 4–5), lHa luṅ is also counted among
these seven in the *Lo rgyus chen mo*, the oldest work on Tibetan history
apart from the Tun-huang documents and known today only in the form of
quotations preserved in other works. Of course, it must be noted that dPaḥo
gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba gives the name as lHa luṅ rab ḥbyor dbyaṅs, who was
the elder brother of dPal gyi rdo rje, both ordained as monks by Vimalamitra.

In addition, Myaṅ Tiṅ ḥdzin bzaṅ po, who lived around the end of the eighth century and the start of the ninth century, is also given as one of the people with whom he had contact during his period of training[8].

Next, let us move on to the *Lo paṇ bkaḥ thaṅ*, one of the *bKaḥ thaṅ sde lṅa*, which differs somewhat from the general traditions. There the following passage is to be found (LKT, f. 65b, l. 6–f. 66a, l. 1):

> *rgya gar mkhas pa li byin la : bod kyi thu mi ḥbri tho rigs : a nus yig*
> *bslabs mkhas par gyur : rgya yig lṅa bcu tham pa ni : bod yig sum cus*
> *chog pa çes : kha che jo bo a nan ta : spyan draṅs mdo sde pad dkar*
> *daṅ : ... rnams : lo tsā thu mi sam bhos bsgyur : bod du dam chos bsgyur*
> *ba sṅa :*
>
> The Tibetan Thu mi ḥBri tho rigs a nu learnt the alphabet from the Indian scholar Li byin and became a scholar himself. The Indian alphabet consists of fifty letters, but he realised that thirty sufficed for the Tibetan alphabet. The Kashmir scholar A nan ta was summoned, and the translator Thu mi Sam bho (ta) translated the *Puṇḍarīka-sūtra* ......and others. This was the first translation of the true teachings in Tibet.

Thu mi ḥbri tho rigs a nu in the above passage represents a completely new form, having become himself A nu instead of A nuḥi bu[9], and with Thu mi sam bho instead of Thon mi sambho ta. The *bKaḥ thaṅ sde lṅa* consists of five *gter kha* (hidden works), and its orthography frequently resembles forms found in the Tun-huang documents. Thu mi is a disintergrated form of Thon mi, found in the Tun-huang documents as mThon myi and in the general tradition as Thon mi. A nu corresponds to A nuḥi bu (*gSal baḥi me loṅ*), and Sam bho to Sambhoṭa (Bu ston's *History*). ḥBri tho rigs calls to mind the title *ḥbriṅ to re*[10] and associations with mThon myi ḥbriṅ po rgyal btsan nu[11], the chief minister of the Yar luṅ royal house, but no connection beyond this is possible.

However, the appearance here of the name Kha che jo bo Ananta is, together with that of the afore-mentioned lHa luṅ dPal gyi rdo rje, worthy of note. It was in fact Kha che Ananta who is said to have acted as interpreter when Śāntarakṣita first visited Tibet (BSS, p. 16, l. 11; KGG, f. 81a, l. 4; BSS, p. 17, l. 9; KGG, f. 81b, l. 3). He is also said to have participated in the translation of scriptures (BSS, p. 52, ll. 2–3)[12], and in the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* his name is mentioned along with that of lCe khyi ḥbrug (GBN, f. 2b, l. 1). Judging from these facts, one must assume that Thon mi Sambhoṭa lived during the latter half of the eighth century and the first half of the ninth century. Thon mi Sambhoṭa and lCe khyi ḥbrug are connected through Kha che Ananta, and since both were grammarians, one is tempted to look upon them as having been the same person. However, with our

present historical sources no such conclusion can yet be drawn[13].

On the basis of the above discussion, the suspicion grows that Thon mi Anuḥi bu, a translator and grammarian during the reign of Khri sroṅ lde brtsan, was mistakenly shifted back in time to the period of btsan po Sroṅ lde btsan, i.e., Sroṅ btsan sgam po. On the other hand, since it is stated that "the Indian alphabet consists of fifty letters, but he realised that thirty sufficed for the Tibetan alphabet", the fresh suspicion arises that there was a mistake in the tradition surrounding the composition of the grammar book *Sum cu pa* and the creation of the thirty-letter alphabet itself.

Today no one entertains any doubt as to the fact that it was Thon mi Sambhoṭa who both created the thirty-letter alphabet and wrote the *Sum cu pa* and other grammatical works. However, if it should turn out that he lived during the reign of Khri sroṅ lde btsan, he can no longer be in any way connected with the creation of the alphabet. The two grammatical works *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*[14], included in the bsTan ḥgyur as works by slob dpon A nu, have been ascribed by Bu ston to Thon mi Sambhoṭa (SRD, f. 199a, l. 2). The image of Thon mi as the creator of the Tibetan alphabet had already developed by around the eleventh century, and it seems that his name came to be mentioned in connection with the creation of the alphabet during Sroṅ btsan sgam po's reign[15]. In order to be able to say that the two works *Sum, rtags* were composed during the reign of Khri sroṅ lde btsan, an examination of their contents is necessary, but this shall be taken up later on in this paper. Let us first examine what is described in the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* (GSM, f. 31a, l. 4) as Thon mi mdo rdzi's *sgra mdo*. There, after having outlined the structure of the alphabet itself, said to have been created by Thon mi, it is stated as follows:

> rgyas par ḥdod na thon mis/daṅ po yi geḥi rnam ḥgyur gyi bzo brtsam/
> ka smad sum cur bsgyur/sdeb sbyor bsgrig paḥi gshi ma/thon mi mdo
> rdziḥi sgra mdo bya ba yod kyis de dag la gzigs çig/
>
> If one should wish [to know] in detail, the various forms of the letters were first conceived by Thon mi and fixed at the thirty letters beginning with *ka*. There are what are called Thon mi mdo rdzi's *śabda-sūtra* [which expound] the basics of adjusting orthography, so please refer to them.

Here it seems that the term *sgra mdo* (*śabda-sūtra*) is being used as a common noun meaning "grammar book", and that by adding the modifier Thon mi mdo rdzi a specific work is being indicated, although S. Inaba interprets it as the title of a work[16]. It must be admitted that Paḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba too refers to Thon mi mdo rdzi's *sGra mdo* and *Sum rtags*, and includes them in what Bu ston calls Thon mi's "Eight Treatises" (KGG, f. 16b, l. 1). However, Bu ston writes that he knows none other than the

Sum rtags (SRD, f. 199a, ll. 1–2), and in the *gSal baḥi me loṅ* only "*sgra mdo*" appears. Thus dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba's judgement cannot be correct, all the more so when one considers the fact that in the above quotation the dual/plural word "*de dag*" (those, them) is used and reference to "them" is recommended, thus indicating that the word "*sgra mdo*" is being used in the sense of Thon mi's grammatical works in general.

"The basics of adjusting orthography" is given as the contents of these *sgra mdo*, so no doubt *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* is the central work. Here one notices that the main contents of this treatise too consist of thirty verses of four lines each[17]. The Tibetan alphabet is made up of thirty letters; at the same time the treatise which explains the basics of Tibetan orthography, the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, consists of thirty verses[18]. It is quite possible that this fact and the tradition surrounding the creation of the thirty letters of the alphabet were mistakenly linked. This could be a more realistic interpretation than that which considers only the link with the title of the *Sum cu pa*[19].

II

Next, we shall make a further examination of Thon mi Sambhoṭa and the contents of the *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* said to have been written by him, and we shall also attempt to ascertain the date of their composition.

The first part of the *Sum rtags*, the collective name for these two grammatical works, i.e., the *Sum cu pa*, after having classified the letters of the Tibetan alphabet, introduces the various "particles", indicating their functions and occasionally the rules of liaison, and ends with an explanation of the demonstrative pronoun "*de*" and the interrogative pronoun "*gaṅ*". As shall become clear later, its style is rather crude in comparison with that of the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* and its contents give an impression of inconsistency.

The companion work, the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, begins with the classification of the letters and their division according to gender. It picks out the post fixed and prefixed letters and attributes gender to them also. Having thus summed up the orthographical rules, it next specifies the functions of verbs, adjectives, etc., designates the three genders of the postfixed letters, and lays down the rules for the suffixion of the after-postfixed letters and for the application of post-particles. Finally, after having enumerated and explained the functions of the case-particles and particles in general, the work ends by saying that all depends upon the various combinations of the thirty letters and the vowel signs.

The *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* forms in itself a complete "*sgra mdo*", giving an impression of consistency throughout and displaying no incongruencies. As shall be indicated later on, in this respect we agree with the views of R. A. Miller.

If, as Bu ston claims, the author of the *Sum rtags*, slob dpon A nu, is in fact Thon mi Sambhoṭa[20] and identical with A nuḥi bu who created the alphabet, it is to be expected that the rules laid down in the *Sum rtags* were in existence from the time of Sroṅ btsan sgam po, when the alphabet first appeared. In the event of there being rules, it is natural that they should be found applied to Tibetan writing in general from that time onwards. However, one finds that in the stone-pillar inscription of Shol, inscribed at a considerably later date during the latter part of the reign of Khri sroṅ lde brtsan, the rules for the liaison of genitive particles given in the *Sum cu pa* are in part not followed. Furthermore, in some of the Tun-huang documents, e.g., the *Annals*, these rules are not observed at all, and the rules laid down in the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* are also ignored. In the case of the Tun-huang documents, the level of education of the scribes, living as they did in an outlying district, might be considered suspect. However, the stone pillar of Shol was set up by the royal sanction of the king Khri sroṅ lde brtsan (742–797) in Shol in Lhasa, so the suspicion attendant to the Tun-huang documents is not valid in this case[21].

According to the research of S. Inaba, judging from the style of the Thon mi grammatical works, his grammatical theory follows that of the Kātantra school. Inaba writes as follows (OCT, p. 13):

> Thon mi composed the independent work *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* no doubt because there was a need to classify according to gender the letters of the alphabet in order to explain the rules of liaison given in the *Sum cu pa*[22], and it was in this feature that the uniqueness of Tibetan grammar was to be found. Perhaps he had as a model some grammar book such as the *Liṅgānuçāsana* (Teachings on Gender). It is true, of course, that in the Kātantra school the *Liṅgānuçāsana* is ascribed to Durgātma, who seems to be different from and later than Durgasiṁha, and it thus becomes a work later than Thon mi. Yet it is possible that there was some work (of prototype) in existence at the time of Thon mi which acted as a hint.

Judging from this passage[23], it seems that Inaba bases his arguments on the assumption that Thon mi Sambhoṭa lived during the reign of Sroṅ btsan sgam po. He suggests that Thon mi Sambhoṭa's *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* was written from a viewpoint peculiar to the Tibetan language, with some other Indian prototyped work acting as a hint. However, if Thon mi did in fact live at the time of Sroṅ btsan sgam po, it is highly improbable that he could have composed such an intricately well-organised work as the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* on the basis of a simple hint. If, furthermore, the *Liṅgānuçāsana*, which possibly served as a model for the *Sum rtags*, was in fact written by Durgātma of the Kātantra school, there is the strong possibility that Thon mi studied

under someone belonging to his school. Thus it is obvious that the author
of the *Sum rtags*, Thon mi, must have lived later than Durgātma, and it
follows that the author of the *Sum rtags* cannot have belonged to the period
of Sroṅ btsan sgam po.

> On the subject of the *Sum rtags*, G. Uray writes as follows (TLB, p. 121):
> We must conclude that the *Sum-rtags* was compiled at a date later than
> the introduction of writing. Hence we assume that writing had been
> used in Tibet even prior to Thon-mi, and that Thon-mi's role was
> confined to a certain kind of script reform—primarily the systematization
> of the alphabet—and to the normalization of the literary language
> (grammars), but his reforms did not prevail for a long time, the lay
> clerks using the old alphabet and ignoring Thon-mi's normative rules[24].
> Another possibility, which also can be allowed, is that writing was in-
> troduced by Thon-mi, but in this case the *Sum-rtags* must be regarded
> as a later apocryphal work.

Uray's views seem quite reasonable as they stand, but insofar as he does
not question the existence of Thon mi during the reign of Sroṅ btsan
sgam po, he does not differ from Inaba. On the subject of Thon mi, Uray
questions whether he simply systematized the writing system or actually in-
troduced the script itself, and as regards the composition of the *Sum rtags*,
he considers the possibility that it was a later work which simply borrowed
Thon mi's name. This is quite contrary to the views of the present writer.

Accepting Inaba's view that there are new tendencies apparent in the
rTags kyi ḥjug pa, and having divided the *Sum rtags* into its two separate
parts on the basis of the existence of the characteristics of the period following
the adoption of the "finally revised words to be used for translation" (*skad
gsar fcad* in Tibetan) in the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* and the characteristics of
the previous period in the *Sum cu pa*, R. A. Miller puts forth the view that
Thon mi Sambhoṭa/Anu ḥi bu did not in fact exist[25]. We shall now proceed
to examine these views and at the same time present those of the present
writer.

III

Miller is correct in refusing to identify Thon mi with Tu-hun-mi 吐渾彌
found in Chinese sources and Thoṅ myi appearing in the *Annals*[26]. How-
ever, one finds that he sometimes writes ḥThon mi, Thu-mi and mTho mi
instead of Thon (/mThon) mi, and it is difficult to comprehend his arbitrari-
ness in chosing his sources. When wishing to ascertain the spelling found
in old records, one should base one's arguments on, apart from Bu ston's
works, the *Hu lan deb ther*, *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* and *Ka bkol ma*

through a comparison of the various edictions. Quotations from other re-
search works have of course no validity in this case[27]. In the above sources
only the form *"Thon (/mThon) mi"* is given, and in no way is it possible
to extract the forms *"ḥthun"* and *"mthun"*, as Miller wishes to do. What is
more, it can be confirmed from the name of the chief minister who appears
in the *Records*, namely, mThon myi ḥbriṅ po rgyal mtshan nu (DTH, p. 100,
l. 18; p. 101, ll. 15–16), and the name of his younger sister, mThon myi za
Yar steṅ (*ibid.*, p. 100, l. 19), that *"mThon myi"* is a family name, so one
need not hesitate in regarding this as an old form of Thon mi. Therefore,
the attempt to link it with the verb *"mthun/ḥthun"* (TGT, p. 488 a–b) is
not justifiable. Even less so is the farfetched explanation linking this
"m(/ḥ)thun" with the Sanskrit *"sama"* and the Tibetan *"bu"* with *"putra"*,
and identifying *"mthun pa"* with *"anu"*, resulting in the conclusion that the
"A nuḥi bu" given by Bu ston corresponds to *"sama-putra/sambhoṭa"*.
"mthun/ḥthun pa" is a verb, and in Sanskrit there is no corresponding verb
"sama". *"Sama"* is translated in Tibetan by *"mñam pa"*, meaning "equal",
and is not synonymous with *"mthun"*, meaning "to agree, harmonize, be
corresponding to" (J. Dic., p. 241). Furthermore, *"anu"* is a prefix translated
by *"rjes su"* and does not always mean the same as *"mthun pa"*. The dis-
crepancy between *"sama-putra"* and *"sambhoṭa"* goes without saying. There
is no need to regard *"A nuḥi bu"* as having been "retranslated" from
"sama-putra", since there are other examples such as *"mChims A nuḥi bu
Çākya prabha"* (KGG, f. 103a, l. 5), and in general it is a common form found
in the first half of names made up of two parts, such as *"rBa Khri bsher
gyi bu Khri gzigs"*[28] Therefore, Bu ston gives Thon mi A nuḥi bu and
Thon mi Sambhoṭa separately[29], and the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* notes
them side by side, probably because both made use of sources employing such
a manner of appellation.

"Sambhoṭa" would seem rather to be, as it were, a nickname meaning
something to the effect of "Mr. Tibet", and it also reminds us of *"sambhūta"*
meaning "born of", so Thon mi Sambhoṭa could be an epithet signifying "the
man of the Thon mi Family". In addition, as mentioned above, Thon mi
Sambhoṭa had disciples who included lHa luṅ dPal gyi rdo rje, and he is
said to have been active in association with Kha che Ananta. Thus one ought
rather to reconsider the time when he lived, and there is no reason whatsoever
to deny his existence altogether.

Miller considers that the *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* were not
written at the same time and, especially in the case of the former, he does
not feel that it was written by a single author all at one time (TGT, p. 490b).
Since the *Sum cu pa* lacks unity in comparison with the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*,
and especially since the verses from v. 24 onwards seem to be superfluous and
those from v. 20 onwards also give the impression of being supplementary,
we can in part agree with Miller's views[30]. However, we cannot go along

with his ideas that the *rTags kyi hjug pa*, dates from after the adoption of the "*skad gsar bcad*" (TGT, p. 491) and that part of the *Sum cu pa* dates from an especially early period (TGT, p. 500b)[31]

<div align="center">

IV

</div>

First, in connection with the rules indicating the functions of the prefixed letters as given in the *rTags kyi hjug pa*[32], we find that the inscription on the stone pillar of Shol, considered to be the oldest extant inscription, follows these rules in exactly the same way as the verbs of the classical period after the 11th century do[33]. The pillar of Shol was erected in honour of Ṅan lam sTag sgra klu goṅ, who succeeded mChims shaṅ rGyal zigs śu teṅ as prime minister (DTH, p. 102, l. 16) and had fallen from power prior to 782[34]. Since the inscription mentions the occupation of Chang-an 長安 by the T'u-fan troops in 763 (AHE, p. 18, ll. 59ff.)[35], the date of the pillar's erection can be estimated to a reasonable degree of accuracy. It is not clear in what way Miller interprets the rules concerning prefixed letters in the *rTags kyi hjug pa* (TGT, p. 491), but since there is no indication that they can apply only to the period following the adoption of the *skad gsar bcad*, there is no reason for placing the composition of the *rTags kyi hjug pa* after that of the *Mahāvyutpatti* (in 814).

In addition, the *rTags kyi hjug pa* gives a rule for the agreement of gender between suffixes and post-particles, namely, "*ma niṅ gis ni ma niṅ ṅo*" (a neuter postfixed letter takes a [post-particle with a] neuter radical letter). In accordance with this rule, spellings such as "*ston kha*", "*btsan pho*", "*chen pho*" and "*rgyal pho*" are quite legitimate, but after the adoption of the *skad gsar bcad*, except for the first example, the spellings "*btsan po*", "*chen po*" and "*rgyal po*" became general, as in the inscription of the peace treaty in 822[36]. However, among the inscriptions prior to the adoption of the *skad gsar bcad*, there are many examples of this usage on the south face only of the Shol pillar, considered to be the oldest of existing inscriptions (*btsan pho* : AHE, p. 16, ll. 8, 11; p. 17, ll. 16, 21; p. 18, ll. 42, 52; *chen pho* : p. 16, l. 6; p. 17, ll. 38, 39; p. 18, ll. 56, 60; *rgyal pho* : p. 19, l. 70), whilst on the north face there is only one example (*btsan pho* : ibid., p. 26, l. 5), the later spelling being used elsewhere. Such usage can also be found in the *Annals*, but since the *Annals* tend to replace the first row of the syllabic table by the second row, this cannot be considered a case in point. Nor can examples be found in other inscriptions either. Thus it may be assumed that this reflects the fact that the rules given in the *rTags kyi hjug pa* were in use prior to a certain period during the eighth century, and the present usage came about around the time of the erection of the Shol pillar (before 780).

According to Miller, the *Sum cu pa* contains contents dating from before the adoption of the *skad gsar bcad*. The present writer has no objection to

this view in itself. However, Miller's interpretation of *la don* and *"ste"* seems to based to a large extent on mistranslations, and so we shall now proceed to clarify this point, presenting our own views on the *Sum cu pa* at the same time.

Miller gives his own translation, together with that of Bacot, of the eighth[37] verse (TGT, p. 493) which deals with *la don*, but both seem to be mistranslations. The relevant passage is

Gaṅ miṅ mthaḥ na bcu pa gnas de la a li gñis pa sbyar

and should be translated as follows:

> Whenever *sa* comes in [the position of] the post-particle, the vowel *u* is
> added to that [*sa*].

Any translation which ignores the relationship between the relative-demonstrative pronoun *"gaṅ....de"* is incorrect. This *"gaṅ"* is in apposition to *"bcu pa"*, and thus differs completely from that in the previous verse, *"miṅ gaṅ gi ni mthar sbyar ba/de la."* Here, the *"gaṅ"* in *"miṅ gaṅ"* qualifies *"miṅ"*. *"miṅ gaṅ gi mthar sbyar ba"* means "the [same][38] letter attached to the end of any word"[39], and the last *"de"* refers to *"...mthar sbyar ba"*[40]. In addition, *"miṅ mthaḥ"* in the former case is a grammatical term meaning "post-particle", and is given in the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*[41]. Therefore, as Si tu states, *"de dag miṅ mthaḥi rjes ḥjug daṅ sbyar tshul mi gsal"* (the method of connection with postfixed letters of the end of a word is not explained for these [post-particles])[42] there. Miller seems to have misunderstood this, and on the basis of material full of scribal errors develops meaningless theories about nonexistent rules of liaison (TGT, pp. 494b, 496b).

Miller also notes that the thirteenth verse gives only *"ste"* and omits both *"te"* and *"de"*. However, this merely indicates that the *Sum cu pa* is incomplete (either in its original form or in its present recension), and it is inconceivable that there was a time when *"ste"* was the only conjunctive particle in use (TGT, pp. 495–496). It is clear that the quotation given by Miller is taken from Thomas's transcription of a manuscript-copy for *"Mo"* divination (V. Poussin, 738, II), one of the Tun-huang documents, and so it cannot have been written any earlier than 786[43], thus making it later than the Shol pillar. In that case, we can also see the other examples of the almost exclusive use of *"de"* in the Pelliot Collection, no. 1073, and that of *"te"* in the first half of no. 1072 of the same Collection[44]. Meanwhile, if one examines the inscription on the Shol pillar, one finds, apart from nine examples of *"ste"*, *"blaṅs te"* (AHE, p. 14, l. 9) and *"sñoms te"* (l. 13) on the east face, *"dard te"* (*ibid.*, p .16, l. 9), *"gyurd te"* (p. 17, l. 19), *"brtand te"* (ll. 23–24), *"soṅ(/d) de"* (l. 29), *"phul te"* (p. 18, l. 48), *"stsal te"* (l. 58), *"byas*

te" (l. 60, 72) and *"stsogs te"* (l. 64) on the south face, and *"stsogs te"* (*ibid.*, p. 28, l. 52), *"srid de"* (p. 29, l. 67) and *"mdzad de"* (l. 68) on the north face. In other words, the particles *"te"* and *"de"* were already in existence, and it is evident that the examples given by Miller contain such copying errors as the above examples in Pelliot's Collection, nos. 1073 and 1072[45].

Miller further refers to the fact that the *Sum cu pa* does not mention *"tu"* among the *la don* particles (TGT, p. 496b). However, the use of *"tu"* is a comparatively recent development. If Richardson is to be trusted, *"tu"* appears just once in the Shol inscription (AHE, p. 18, l. 48), and all instances which later became *"tu"* are given as *"du"*. In the sKar cuṅ inscription *"tu"* appears once, and in the inscription of Shvaḥi lha khaṅ twice[46], but elsewhere *"du"* is given. The inscription of the peace treaty in 822 dates from after the *skad gsar bcad*, and Richardson's text alone gives one example on the east face (AHE, p. 56, l. 28) and three on the west face (*ibid.*, p. 68, ll. 43, 57; p. 69, l. 76). However, in Sato's text only *"du"* appears, and so there is the strong possibility that Richardson's text contains misreadings[47], in which case it is quite natural that the particle in question, *"tu"*, should not be mentioned in the *Sum cu pa*. This is because the *la don* particle used after the postfixed letters *"ga"* and *"ba"* and after the omitted after-postfixed letter *"da"* was rarely fixed as *"tu"* even after the adoptation of the *skad gsar bcad*. As a matter of fact, we have no example of *"tu"* being used in the Tun-huang text of the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* (PT, 843, 854) which gives an explanation of *"skad gsar bcad"*.

We have seen that there is nothing surprising in the fact that the *Sum cu pa* does not mention the particle *"tu"*. However, since it does not refer to rules of liaison for *la don* particles or to the particles already in use such as *"te"* and *"de"*, one must assume that if the present version is the same as the original, this work must have been rather incomplete[48].

The statement above that the *Sum cu pa* "does not refer to rules...or to the particles already in use...." is based on the fact that the Shol pillar inscription in which the liaison rules for *"te"* and *"de"* are used was erected prior to the composition of the *Sum cu pa*. This can be verified in the following way.

The *Sum cu pa* explains the liaison rules for only the genitive particles in what are generally referred to as the ninth and tenth verses[49]. These rules are still in use today. There the use of the genitive particles *"kyi"* is clearly indicated as follows:

> *sum lṅa bcu la kya daṅ sbyar//...de dag i sbyar ḥbrel paḥi sa/*
> *kya* is added after the third [*da*], fifth [*ba*] and tenth [*sa*] postfixed letters.... If [the vowel] *i* is added to these, they become the genitive case.

However, in the Shol inscription one finds on the east face (AHE, p. 14) "*stsald gyis*" (1. 5, n. 2), and "*gñis gyi*" (1. 9), on the south face (*ibid.*, pp. 16–19) "*srid gyi*" (1. 25), "*stsald gyis*" (1. 28), "*gros gyis*" (1. 29), "*gros gyi*" (ll. 43, 55) and "*bod gyis*" (ll. 54, 60), and on the north face (*ibid.*, pp. 26–29) "*blas gyi*" (1. 18), "*rgyud gyis*" (1. 21), "*gyod gyi*" (1. 24), "*ḥpheld gyis*" (ll. 51, 61) and "*peld gyis*" (1. 59). Not only is the genitive particle "*kyi*" not used at all[50], but the other genitive particles "*gi*", "*gyi*" and "*ḥi*" are used in conformity with the rules, as one would expect in the case of an inscription erected by royal sanction.

It is a fully verified fact that all inscriptions except that of the bSam yas pillar after the Shol inscription, including of course the inscription of the peace treaty and the bell inscription at bSam yas (TTK, p. 108), use "*kyi*" and "*kyis*"[51].

From these facts it is clear that the tenth verse cannot have been written prior to the Shol inscription, and one must conclude that it was composed at about the same time as or after the bell inscription at bSam yas[52]. When compared with the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, the *Sum cu pa* lacks in consistency, but, as mentioned above, it is improbable that the former was composed after the adoption of the *skad gsar bcad*. Thus, if both were the work of a single person, they must have been composed around the time of the erection of the Shol pillar. It is unlikely that they were composed at different and considerably distant times.

CONCLUSION

In 779 during the reign of Khri sroṅ lde brtsan twelve monks were invited to Tibet from India. With their arrival the study of Sanskrit began, and the first steps towards the translation of Buddhist scriptures into the Tibetan language were taken. It goes without saying that what was urgently needed at this time was a systematization of the orthography of the Tibetan language. The import of the *Sum rtags* is most easily understood if one assumes that they were written to meet this need. In the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* the structure of the "word" was elucidated on the basis of grammatical theory, whilst the *Sum cu pa*, after briefly outlining the structure of the "word", goes on to explain the function of "particles", although such pronouns as "*de*" and "*gaṅ*" are given before having completely dealt with the "particles"[53], and ends with a series of injunctions from v. 24 onwards. These last verses are somewhat strange in the context, and as Miller suggests, the *Sum cu pa* may not have been written by a single person at one time[54].

In the view of the present writer, the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* is a work complete in itself and was not composed merely in order to augment the incomplete *Sum cu pa*[55]. Rather, it was the *Sum cu pa* which attempted to explain in detail what was mentioned only briefly in the *rTags kyi ḥjug*

pa. It is possible that some additions were made later to the *Sum cu pa* owing to its incompleteness. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that usages conforming with the contents of the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* are found in the Shol inscription whereas the *Sum cu pa* mentions liaison rules not yet known at the time of the erection of the Shol pillar.

At any rate, if one regards the present *Sum rtags* as being the work of someone by the name of Thon mi A nuḥi bu (or A nu) or Sambhoṭa, he cannot have been active at the time of Sroṅ brtsan sgam po. It is possible that the systematization of Tibetan orthography was due to his efforts, but the merit for the creation of the Tibetan alphabet itself cannot be credited to him as well.

The story of Thon mi Sambhoṭa's life has developed over the years as that of a person who lived during the reign of Sroṅ btsan sgam po, so it is virtually impossible to extract any factual truth from his biography. On the basis of the above observations, one must be content with saying simply that he cannot have lived during Sroṅ btsan sgam po's reign. However, this does not of course exclude the possibility that there was a person at this time by the name of Thon mi..., and that he introduced writing into Tibet.

There have been discussions since the research of A. H. Francke and B. Laufer on the origins of the Tibetan alphabet. However, if one ignores for the time being the accounts of the introduction of the alphabet any Thon mi, it is probable, as suggested by Inaba, that it derives from a script similar to that discovered at Gopālur and reported by E. H. Jonston and, in the view of the present writer, came into formal use around the reign of Sroṅ brtsan sgam po[56].

* The original text of the present article was entitled "⟨Sanjūju⟩⟨Shōnyuhō⟩ no seiritsu-jiki o megutte" in Japanese and appeared in the *Tōyō Gakuhō*, Vol. 57, no. 1, 2 (1976), pp. 1– 34. As the present writer has since then abandoned his former incorrect interpretation of *vyākaraṇa* in his article entitled "*Nikanbon Yakugoshaku* kenkyū" (A Study on the Preface of the *sGra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*; *Naritasan Bukkyō Kenkyūsho Kiyō*, No. 4, 1979, p. 17) only the passages concerning this question were revised in preparing this translated text.

ABBREVIATIONS

AHE	H. E. Richardson: *Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa*, London 1952.
Annals	"Royal Annals", DTH, pp. 13–27, 55–61.
BKT	*bLon po bKaḥi thaṅ yig*, gter kha by O rgyan gliṅ pa, Shol Ed., 77 fols.
BSS	bTsan po Khri sroṅ lde btsan daṅ mkhan po slob dpon Padmaḥi dus mdo sṅags so sor mdzad paḥi *sBa bshed shabs*

	btags ma, ed. by R. A. Stein, 92 pp., Paris 1961.
Chronicls	"Royal Chronicle", DTH, pp. 97–100, 102–122.
CL	P. Demiéville: *Le Concile de Lhasa,* Paris 1952.
DTH	J. Bacot, F. W. Thomas, Ch. Toussaint: *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet,* Paris 1940.
GBN	*sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa,* Peking Ed. (bsTan ḥgyur), No. 5833, Vol. 144.
GSM	Sa skya pa bla ma dam pa Bsod nams rgyal mtshan: *rGyal rabs rnams kyi ḥbyuṅ tshul gsal baḥi me loṅ chos ḥbyuṅ,* sDe dge Ed., 104 fols.
HLD	Tshal pa Kun dgaḥ rdo rje: *Hu lan deb ther,* Gantok Ed., 1951.
J. Dic.	H. A. Jäschke: *A Tibetan-English Dictionary,* London 1949.
KCI	H. E. Richardson: "The sKar-cung Inscription", *JRAS,* London 1973, pp. 12–20.
KGG	dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba: *Chos byuṅ mkhas paḥi dgaḥ ston gyi Yan lag gsum pa las Bod kyi rgyal rabs,* lHo brag gNas Ed., 155 fols.
LKT	*Lo paṇ bkaḥi thaṅ yig,* gter kha by O rgyan gliṅ pa, Shol Ed., 81 fols.
MBT	G. Tucci: *Minor Buddhist Texts II,* Roma 1958.
NIR	H. E. Richardson: "A Ninth Century Inscription from Rkoṅ po", *JRAS,* London 1954, pp. 157–173.
OCT	S. Inaba: *An Outline of Classical Tibetan Grammar (Chibettogo Kotenbunpōgaku),* Kyōto 1954 (rev. ed. 1966).
PT	Fonds Pelliot tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale.
Record	"Record of the Prime Ministers", DTH, pp. 100–102.
SAT	H. Satō: *Historical Study of Ancient Tibet (Kodai Chibettoshi Kenkyū),* Kyōto 1959.
SRD	Bu ston Rin chen grub: *bDe bar gçegs paḥi bstan paḥi gsal byed chos kyi ḥbyuṅ gnas gsuṅ rab rin po cheḥi mdzod,* sDs dge Ed., 203 fols.
SST	Si tu Chos kyi ḥbyuṅ gnas: "Si tuḥi Sum rtags", *An Introduction to the Grammar of the Tibetan Language with the Texts of Si tuḥi sum rtags etc.,* by Sarat Chandra Das, Darjeeling 1915.
TGT	R. A. Miller: "Thon mi Saṃbhoṭa and His Grammatical Treatises", *JAOS,* 1963, pp. 485–502.
TIS	H. E. Richardson: "Tibetan Inscription at Shvaḥi lha khaṅ", *JRAS,* 1952, pp. 133–154, pp. 1–12.
TLT, II	F. W. Thomas: *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan,* Part II: Documents, London 1951.

TPG   Padma dkar po: *Chos ḥbyuṅ bstan paḥi padma rgyas paḥi*
                 ñin byed, sPuṅ thaṅ Ed., 189 fols.
TTK   G. Tucci: *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*, Roma 1951.

NOTES

1) For example, in the *Chronicle* many patterns derived from songs are adopted, and even those parts corresponding to prose passages follow a fixed rhythm, indicating that they were originally transmitted orally. However, in the *Annals* and documents relating to the Chinese princess Wên-ch'êng nothing of this kind is to be found.

2) It is related in many later accounts that Sroṅ btsan sgam po lived in Lhasa. According to the *Chronicle*, in the latter part of Khri sroṅ brtsan (= Sroṅ btsan sgam po)'s reign Khyuṅ po sPuṅ sad zu tse committed suicide and his son Ṅag re khyuṅ went with his father's head to "sku mkhar Pyiṅ ba", i.e., the castle of Pyiṅ ba in Yar luṅ (DTH, p. 112, ll. 8–10). From this it is to be assumed that the permanent residential castle was in Yar luṅ and that Lhasa was chosen as the *"dbyar sa"* (summer residence). This is corroborated by the fact that only Ra mo che and ḥPhrul snaṅ, both said to have been built during this king's reign (KCI, p. 14, ll. 4–6; KGG, f. 109a, ll. 1–2; f. 128b, l. 5), stand in present-day Lhasa, and by confirmation that Lhasa's former name was Ra sa (cf. CL, p. 154, n. 5). "Ma ru" is a variant form of "Mar bu", but any connection with present-day "dMar po ri" is as yet not known. Cf. Z. Yamaguchi: "Shichi-seki-zenpan no Toban to Neparu no kankei" (The Connections between T'u-fan in the First Half of the Seventh Century and Nepal; *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange*, No. 2, 3, Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo, 1978, pp. 29–57), pp. 43ff.

3) The term "eight treatises" when taken literally means that six works apart from the *Sum rtags* were also composed. However, in his *Outline of Classical Tibetan Grammar* (1st ed., 1954), S. Inaba points out that the two works *Sum rtags* form a consistent whole as they stand, and suggests that the term "eight treatises" perhaps derives from Pāṇini's grammatical treatise, which was divided into eight chapters and entitled *Aṣṭādhyāyi* (*ibid.*, p. 3). R. A. Miller draws attention to Inaba's views, and then goes on to mention the *Gnas bragyad chen poḥi rtsa ba* by lCe Khyi ḥbrug and to point out that the author's name is recorded in the *sGra sbyor bam po gñis pa* (GBN, f. 2a, l. 6–f. 2b, l. 1; TGT, p. 487a), suggesting that Bu ston's reference is connected with this. dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba also alludes to lCe Khyi ḥbrug (KGG, f. 125a, l. 2), but gives no new information.

4) The meaning of *"rdzi"* is probably related to the original meaning of present-day *"rdzi bo"* (herdsman; J. Dic., p. 468b). This is supported by the famous Lo ñam rta ḥdzi (DTH, p. 97, l. 16–p. 98, l. 17), by the fact that mChims Maṅ bsher naṅ pa, who gave advice for T'u-fan's military organization, is recorded to have been a *"lug rdzi"* (KGG, f. 19a, l. 4), and furthermore by the fact that in the state-organization of T'u-fan, in which were established a *"rgod sde"* (military community) and *"gyuṅ sde"* (civilian community), *"lo ṇam rta rdzi sogs rdzi bdun"* (seven varieties of *rdzi* [such as] Lo ñam rta rdzi; KGG, f. 20b, l. 2) were set up as "civilian communities". Jäschke's example *"mi rdzi"* (guarder of man; *ibid.*) is also suggestive.

5) This is substantiated, for example, by the fact that the *Chronicle* from Tun-huang (DTH, p. 118, ll. 16–24) extols Khri sroṅ brtsan whilst making no mention of Buddhism.

6) As regards the translation of Buddhist scriptures, it is related even in the *sBa bshed* that Khri sroṅ lde btsan, upon having been told by Saṅ çi of the superiority of the Buddhist scriptures, replied, "It is fortunate that such wonderful teachings were acquired during our reign", and then undertook to have them translated (BSS, p. 10, ll. 4–14; KGG, f. 78a,

l. 5–f. 78b, l. 4). According to this account, Buddhism was totally unknown prior to this event.

7) SRD, f. 124b, l. 6–f. 125a, l. 2; HLD, p. 18b, l. 7; GSM, f. 98b, ll. 1–5.

8) In the KGG, f. 106a, l. 3–f. 108a, l. 3, there is a short biography of the three lHa luṅ brothers. It is given as being based upon the *Yer paḥi dkar chag*, said to have been discovered when bla ma Zaṅs ri ba carried out restoration work on Yer pa.

9) In the colophons of the *Sum cu pa* and the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* contained in the bsTan 'gyur the author is given as "slob dpon A nu".

10) DTH, p. 109, l. 7, *ḥbriṅ tho re*. There is also the variant *ḥbriṅ tog rje* (ibid., p. 100, l. 13).

11) DTH, p. 100, l. 10; p. 101, ll. 15–16.

12) He seems to be identical with rGya Ananta, who is said to have undertaken the translation of the Buddhist scriptures for the first time together with rGya mes mgo (Bss, p. 10, l. 14; KGG, f. 78b, l. 3). However, there is a strong possibility that this account fictional.

13) R. A. Miller seems to be doubtful of any connection between Thon mi's "bstan bcos brgyad" and lCe Khyi ḥbrug's *Gnas brgyad chen poḥi rtsa ba* (TGT, pp. 486b–487a).

14) *Tōhoku Catalogue*, Nos. 4348, 4349. They are included in the miscellaneous section because they are the works of Tibetans.

15) It is generally considered that the achievements of Khri sroṅ lde brtsan came to be ascribed to btsan po Sroṅ lde brtsan (=Sroṅ btsan sgam po) at the time of the Buddhist revival movement after the tenth century. This is quite evident in the biography of Sroṅ btsan sgam po entitled *Ka bkol ma* and considered to be one of Atīśa's *gter kha* (cf. the quotation in KGG, f. 15a, l. 1 *infra*). Thon mi's name is given as Thon mi sam bho dra mi chuṅ and mentioned in connection with mGar sToṅ btsan yul sruṅ (ibid., f. 26a, l. 4). As regards Thon mi's period of study in India, one finds the following passage which seems to be a quotation from the *Ka bkol ma*:

It is related that Thon Sam bho dra, a bright child and son of Thon mi A nu rag ta from Lug ra kha in Thon, was given one *bre* of gold-dust and sent [to India] (KGG, f. 15a, l. 7–f. 15b, l. 1).

The passages before and after this were written by dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba and their source is unclear, but there is no reason for doubting that the quotation above is being related as an event during Sroṅ btsan sgam po's reign. The period of study of Thon mi A nu ḥi bu Saṁ bho ṭa is also mentioned in the *Ma ṇi bkaḥ ḥbum* (MKB, f. 89a, l. 6–f. 89b, l. 4).

16) OCT, p. 3; S. Inaba: "Tonmi ni kiserareta chosaku ni tsuite" (On the Works Attributed to Thon mi), *Ōtani-gakuhō*, 46–4, p. 25. Here Inaba presents the view that the contents of *Thon mi mdo rdziḥi sgra mdo* consist of the statements themselves of bla ma dam pa on the composition of the Tibetan alphabet in the *gSal baḥi me loṅ*. However, in that text it has "because this is an outline" (*ḥdi ni zur tsam [sdud pa] yin gyis*; GSM, f. 31a, l. 4), thus indicating that it is not an excerpt (cf. J. Dic., p. 489a). If it were only one part, one would find some such phrase as "cha tsam" or "cha ḥdra tsam".

17) At the start of his commentary on the *Sum rtags*, Si tu asks himself whether *Sum cu pa* means a commentary on thirty letters or consisting of thirty verses. He comes to the conclusion that it must be the latter, because if it were a commentary on thirty letters, the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* would also have to be entitled *Sum cu pa* (SST, p. 2, ll. 8–14). However, he does not seem to have noticed that the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* also consists of thirty verses. Although Inaba regards the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* as consisting of thirty-one verses (OCT, p. 10), the last verse contains one additional line, forming the conclusion together with the previous line, thus making the whole work one of thirty verses.

18) Inaba's view that the *Sum cu pa* is the basic treatise and the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* a secondary one (OCT, p. 4) is no doubt in accordance with the traditional interpretation, but when one considers the contents of these two works, it is rather the *rTags kyi ḥjug*

pa, which explains the structure of the word itself, that would seem to be more basic than the *Sum cu pa*, which descibes such matters as the function of particles. Furthermore, since neither contents corresponding to an explanation of the *Sum cu pa* nor an explication of the liaison rules for particles (OCT, p. 10) are to be found in the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, it is obviously wrong to regard it as a secondary treatise.

19) Si tu implies that there are people who ascribe the meaning "Treatise on Thirty Letters" to the title *Sum cu pa*, but he suggests that in that case the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* would also have to be entitled "Treatise on Thirty Letters" (cf. n. (17)). However, the title "Treatise on Thirty Letters" is far more appropriate for the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, which explains the method of orthography, than for the *Sum cu pa*.

20) SRD, f. 199a, ll. 1–2.

21) According to the rules given in the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, the prefixed letters "ga" and "da" cannot be affixed to the second vertical row of the thirty-letter syllabary. Therefore, combinations such as "gchig" are theoretically impossible. However, violations of this rule are to be found throughout the *Annals*, but nowhere in the Shol inscription.

22) Cf. n. (18).

23) In his paper "On the Works Attributed to Thon mi" (v. n. (16)), Inaba follows the views of R. A. Miller and expresses doubts about the existence of Thon mi during Sroṅ btsan sgam po's reign. His reason is that the Shol pillar does not follow the rules given in the *Sum cu pa* and *rTags kyi ḥjug pa*, but no details are given. Like Miller, he seems to be entertaining the possibility that the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* was composed at a later date than the *Sum cu pa* (*op. cit.*, pp. 34–35).

24) Even if one assumes that the Shol pillar does not accord with Thon mi's rules (cf.nn. (21) and (23)), such a forced interpretation is possible. However, since the Shol pillar was erected by royal sanction, this interpretation is not valid. Furthermore, the inscription does in fact adhere in part to the so-called Thon mi rules (v. pp. 12ff.).

25) One can discern Inaba's influence in Miller's views; but at the same time Inaba is also influenced by Miller (cf. n. (23)).

26) The present writer is in complete agreement with Miller's criticism of F. W. Thomas's views (TGT, p. 487b).

27) TGT, p. 488. We know that *Tucci* quotes erroneously from the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* at second hand on the basis of Thomas's work (cf. Z. Yamaguchi: "Matrimonial Relationships between the Tʻu-fan and Tʻang Dynasties", *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*. No. 27, 1969, p. 166, Abbreviations, GS). In the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* there is not a single instance of the spelling "mTho mi" in place of mThon (/Thon) mi both in the Lhasa and sDe dge editions. Therefore, there is no doubt a mistake in Tucci's quotation. Bu ston's *dkar chag* of the bsTan ḥgyur has "Thu mi" only in the new Lhasa edition (by Dalai Lama XIII), but "Thon mi" both in the bKra śis lhun po and sDe dge editions.

28) There are further examples in the *mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston* (KGG, f. 103a, l. 5; f. 103b, l. 4). Cf. "Shaṅ ḥbriṅ rtshan khyi (/gyi) bu" (DTH, p. 24, ll. 6–7).

29) Miller emphasizes the fact that Bu ston gives Thon mi a nuḥi bu and Thon mi saṁ bho ṭa separately (TGT, p. 490a), but this is simply the result of Miller's having examined only one part of Bu ston's *History*. In his discussion of works by Tibetans (SRD, f. 199a, l. 2,) Bu ston mentions Thon mi Saṁ bho ṭa's *Sum rtags*. Yet in the colophon to the *Sum rtags*, one finds only slob dpon A nu. Therefore, it is evident that Bu ston looked upon slob dpon A nu and Thon mi Sambhoṭa as being identical. It is only that the *Sum rtags* in the bsTan ḥgyur has only A nu, whereas the SRD has A nuḥi bu.

30) TGT, pp. 491b–493a. Cf. n. (52).

31) TGT, p. 494b. As indicated in this paper, there are no liaison rules given for the "*la don*". Due to a mistranslation, Miller is under the false impression that there existed liaison rules no longer known today. Even if one were to assume that any such rules did in fact exist, it must have been after the latter half of the seventh century. This

means that the special features of these liaison rules were completely ignored in the Shol and other inscriptions, as well as in the *Annals*. It also means that there are no "*la don*" particles which can follow postfixed letters other than "s", "r" and "d", which results in a usage of "*de ñid*" for qualifying verbs which can be used only by means of liaison rules, thus being applicable to only a limited number of words.

32) In regard to "*gshan bsgrub phyir*", Miller criticizes the views of Bacot and Inaba and invokes those of Chos skyoṅ bzaṅ po (TGT, p. 491b). However, Sha lu lo tsa bā Chos skyoṅ bzaṅ po (1441–1528) does not necessarily have any more authority than Si tu Chos kyi ḥbyuṅ gnas (1699–1774). Furthermore, Miller does not seem to realise that separating "*dṅos po gshan*" and "*bya ba*" has no meaning, for it renders the explanations of the Tibetan grammarians incomprehensible. According to Si tu, in the former case the prefixed letter "*ba*" is affixed "in order that the activity through which the subject of the action and the other (indicated by the object word) are actually connected may be completed and realised in the past" (*byed pa po gshan daṅ dṅos su ḥbrel baḥi bya ba byas zin ḥdas pa bsgrub paḥi phyir*), while in the latter case it is "in order that [the connection between[the object (i.e., the other), through which the subject of the action and the other (indicated by the object word) are actually connected, and the activity may be [actually] realised" (*byed pa po gshan daṅ dṅos su ḥbrel baḥi bya baḥi yul daṅ bya ba bsgrub paḥi phyir*; SST, p. 46, ll. 24–25). In the latter case, in, for example, the sentence "the child throws a stone", the subject of the action is "the child", the other is "a stone", and the activity is "being thrown". It is only when "the child" is actually connected with "a stone" that *the connection* between the object "stone" and the activity "being thrown" *is realised*. The realization of an action is indicated through its objective aspect, and we have here in other words the "passive voice". The Tibetan grammarians distinguish two aspects, in a single action, namely, "the activity relating to the subject of the action" (*bdag daṅ ḥbrel baḥi byed pa*: SST, p. 55, l. 14), i.e., the subjective aspect, and the above-mentioned objective aspect. Thus an action is described from either its "*bdag*" aspect or its "*gshan*" aspect, and any such division as "Dṅos po gshan und Bya ba bsgrub-pa" is grammatically nonexistent.

33) The prefixed letter "*ba*" is affixed only to the past or future forms (both objective) [or transitive verbs], whilst "*ga*" and "*da*" are prefixed to the present form [of transitive verbs].

34) On the basis of the section for the ninth month of the third year of the *Chien-chung* 建中 era in the *Chiu T'ang shu* ("Records of Tu-fan"). H. Satō places the date of sNa nam rGyal tshan lha naṅ's assumption of office during the period between the second and third years of the Chien-chung era (SAT, p. 626), and this view is followed here. In addition, by reason of mention of the interchange of 尚結息 shaṅ rGyal zigs çu steṅ and 結贊 rGyal tshan lha snaṅ in the *Chiu T'ang shu's* account of this event, Satō corrects the account in the *Record*, which inserts Ñan lam sTag rgra klu goṅ between the two (DTH, p. 102, l. 16), and states that he became prime minister after the death of rGyal tshan lha snaṅ in 796 (this date is based on the "Recrods of T'u-fan" in the *T'ang shu*; SAT, p. 666). However, one cannot change so easily the order of assumption of office given in the *Record* on the basis of a single account taken from Chinese sources. For example, in the event of Ñan lam sTag sgra klu goṅ's tenure of office having been brief, there is the possibility that it was recorded as if the other two took office directly one upon the other. In Khri sroṅ lde btsan's written pledge in spring of 779 upon the completion of the *dbu rtse* at bSam yas, vowing to embrace Buddhism thenceforth, the subsignatories are given in the order of shaṅ rGyal gzigs çu ther (/theṅ), blon sTag sgra klu goṅ and shaṅ rGyal tshan lha snaṅ. This order cannot be changed all that easily. Furthermore, according to the *sBa bshed* (BSS, pp. 8–11; KGG, f. 91a, ll. 1–2), sTag ra (/sgra) klu goṅ embraced Bon contrary to the king's orders and fell from office, being banished to the north. Since this took place during the reign of Khri sroṅ lde btsan, and if rGyal tshan lha snaṅ took office in 782, Ñan lam sTag sgra klu goṅ's assumption of and

fall from office must have taken place between 779, the year of the pledge at bSam yas, and 782. On the observation that Nan lam sTag sgra klu gon probably corresponds to Ma Chung ying 馬重英 in the Chinese sources, see Li Fang kuei's paper ("Ma Chung ying k'ao "Kuo li T'ai wan ta hsüeh wên shih chê hsüeh pao, 1956, pp. 1–8) and Satō's views (SAT, pp. 554–555).

35) SAT, pp. 534–537. In the account of the occupation of Chang-an 長安 in the *Annals* there is no indication of the year in which it took place. It was Thomas who augmented the year of the tiger (DTH, p. 60; SAT, p. 537).

36) In the classical period of the Tibetan language this rule given in the *rTags kyi hjug pa* existed almost only in name. Troubled by being unable to give any examples, Si tu, on the basis of the subsequent verse in the *Sum rtags*, states that it is "a liaison to facilitate pronunciation, and (although neuter) it takes a feminine [post-particle]" (*brjod bde bas sgra mthun pa*; SST, p. 70, l. 4). However, the purport of the subsequent verse starting with "*min mthah de dag ñid kyis*" is that "there is liaison in connection with the various particles", and there is no examination of irregularities in post-particles. In this regard, the criticism quoted by Si tu that "someone might say that, although you determine paradigms relating to gender agreement, you yourself are violating them" (*hdir kha cig/ khyod kyis rtags mtshuns hdren pahi dper bkod pa hdi rnams la khyod kyis khas blans pa dan hgal ba yod de*; ibid., l. 11) is valid. Therefore, it is possible that there was a period when there were more examples of this usage.

37) The verse numbers in general follow those of Inaba (OCT, 1st ed., p. 314ff).

38) It means literally "that which comes after a word" (*min mthah*) and signifies "post-particle". Si tu has trouble distinguishing between "*min mthahi rjes hjug*" (the post-fixed letter at the end of a word) and *min mthah*" (post-particle). Cf. (*des na min sña mahi mthahi rjes hjug rnams kyan min mthah yin mod kyi, hdir bstan gyi min mthah shes pa ni rjes hjug gis min du grub pahi min sña ma de nyid kyi cha šas min dehi mthar sbyar rgyu shig la ños hdzin dgos so //* SST, p. 69, ll. 12–13). In the case of the phrase "*min mthah na*", it is possible to regard this as an abbreviation In the case of the phrase "*min mthah na*", it is possible to regard this as an abbreviation of "*min gi mthah* na", translatable as "at the end of a word". Thus, it is not at all surprising that Si tu should be confused in the case of the *Sum cu pa*. For example, in the section explaining the particle "*ni*", one finds the passage: "gan min mthah na (/dan) thun pa yi/ bshi pa la". Especially when one sees the variant "*dan*" this may be translated as "the letter *na* harmonizing with any word-ending whatsoever", in which case "*min mthah*" means no longer "post-particle" but rather "postfixed letter", and the uniformity of terminology within the *Sum cu pa* is destroyed. The weakness of the above reading is that in order to translate it thus, the original would have to be *gan gi min mthah...*" or "*min mthah gan...*". From the standpoint of terminological uniformity, it was probably "*gan dan min mthar mthun pa yi/ bshi pa*", which means "the letter *na* harmonaizing with any [word-ending] [comes] in [the position of] the post-particle", or should at least be interpreted thus.

39) The meaning "the [same] letter" is not clear from this passage alone. This has been assumed simply from the actual examples.

40) The word "*gan*" in "*min gan*" is here being used as an indefinite adjective derived from the interrogative adjective, and "*de*" does not refer to this "*gan*".

41) Verse 21 of the *rTags kyi hjug pa*, when counting four lines to one verse, with the exception of the verse of homage.

42) SST, p. 12, ll. 10–11. Cr. n. (38).

43) Demiéville gives the date of the fall of Tun-huang as 787 (CL, p. 177), and A. Fujieda suggests 781 ("Shashū kigigun setsudoshi shimatsu" I, *Tōhō Gakuhō*, 22–9, p. 94, n. 50). However, in order to fit in with Tibetan history, the former must be amended to 786. Cf. Z. Yamaguchi: "Toban shihai jidai" (On the Period of T'u-fan Rule; *Tun-huang Studies* Vol. II: *The History of Tun-huang*, IV, pp. 197–232) pp. 197–198.

44) As to the diversity of the Tun-huang documents, cf. Z. Yamaguchi; "Chibetto go bunken",
Tonkō kogo-bunken, Tokyo, 1985, pp. 451–555; M. Lalou; *Inventaire des Manuscrits
tibétain de Touen-houang conservé à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 3 vols, Paris, 1939–1961;
and Tōyō Bunko Chibetto-kenkyu Iinkai *A Catalogue on the Tibetan Manuscripts
Collected by Sir Aurel Stein (Sutain shūshū Chibetto-go bunken kaidai-mokuroku)* 12 vols,
1977–1988.

45) Previously the present writter examined the origin of the conjunctive particles *"te"* *"ste"*
and *"de"*, and presented a wrong interpretation on the process of their formation wtih
unreliable sources (cf. "Chibetto-go no setsuzoku-ji 'te' ni tsuite"; *Tōyō Gakuhō*, Vol. 39,
No. 4, 1957, pp. 49–88).

   Now, however, the writer is of the following opinion. Namely, in forming these con-
junctive particles, the demonstrative *"de"* was transformed into *"te"* after the *"da drag
po"* and the postfixed letters *"-n"* *"-r"* and *"-l"*, which can take only the same after-
postfixed letter *"-d"*, and kept the same form *"de"* after the postfixed letter *"-d"*, while
after the postfixed letter *"-s"* and the after-postfixed letter *"=s"*, as well as after the
postfixed letters *"-g"*, *"-n"*, *"-b"*, *"-m"* and *"-ḥ"* in combination with their characteristic
after-postfixed letter *"=s"* it became *"ste"*. The form *"-s ste"*, as for example in *"legs ste"*
and *"groṅs ste"* (AHE, p. 18, l. 44, 50) which still co-exists with the form *"=s te"* in the
Shol inscription, eventually became, together with that of *"-s ste"*, *"=s te"* and *"-s te"*
in order to avoid the repetition of *"s"*.

46) Both Richardson (KCI, p. 13, l. 2) and Tucci (TTK, p. 104, l. 2) give *"yun tu"*. TIS,
p. 153, l. 41 *"yun tu"*; l. 42 *"phyag tu"*. In both the sKar cuṅ inscription and the in-
scription of Shvaḥi lha khaṅ *"yun tu"* must be corrected to *"yun du"*, leaving only one
valid example of *"tu"*.

47) One example of Richardson's attitude in decipherment is given here. This is from the
fifth line on the east face of the Shol inscription, where the text reads *"stsald kyis kyaṅ"*;
Richardson adds the note 'Bell reads *"gyis"* but it is clearly *"kyis"*, *which is the correct
form after a final "d"* '. The part italicized here indicates the assumption upon which
Richardson's decipherment is based. However, as is made clear in this paper, *"gyis"* is
used in the Shol inscription even where *"kyis"* would be used in later times, leading the
present writer to adopt Bell's reading.

48) Inaba states that "Thon mi makes no mention whatsoever of these after-postfixed letters.
Therefore there is no reference to the particles following after-postfixed letters" (OCT,
p. 75). There is certainly no phrase corresponding to "after-postfixed letter" in the
Sum rtags. However, if one does not assume the existence of after-postfixed letters, the
passage in the *rTags kyi ḥjug pa* from the second half of the fifteenth verse (*sgra yi
ḥjug tshul don gyi tshul/ pho gsum mo gñis ma niṅ gsum*) to the nineteenth verse
becomes incomprehensible. Therefore one must consider the omission of any mention in
the *Sum cu pa* of the particle *"te"* following after-postfixed letters (*da drag po*), together
with the omission of mention of *"de"* (and even more so its confusion with the demon-
strative pronoun), shortcomings of no small order.

49) The term "liaison rule" is usually expressed in the *Sum cu pa* by the phrase *"mthun lugs"*.

50) Cf. n. (45).

51) In the bell inscription at bSam yas, *"kyi/kyis"* is used three times after *"—s"*: *"sars kyis"*,
"bsod nams kyi stobs kyis" (TTK, p. 108). In this inscription one also finds the forms
"ldan te" and *"smond to"* (NIR, p. 167), and the *da drag po* are still in evidence. As
for the sKar cuṅ inscription, there are texts by Richardson (KCI, pp. 13–14) and Tucci
(TTK, pp. 104–108). *"kyi/kyis"* appears in the following instances (Richardson's text;
numbers in parentheses indicate the line of the inscription): *saṅs rgyas kyi* (5, 19, 24, 30);
rgyud kyis (18, 25, 29); *gtsigs kyi* (27, 56); *gsold kyis* (33); *chab srid kyi* (34); *yoṅs kyis* (37);
bcom ldan 'das kyi (40, 41); *yab sras kyis* (44, 52); *lha ris kyi* (50); *kun kyis* (27, 55). This
last example, since it belongs to the period when there was as yet no abbreviation of
the *da drag po*, should be *"gyis"*. Examples of *"kyi/ kyis"* in place of *gyi/gyis* after the

postfixed letter "-n" are found in the inscription of Shavaḥi lha khaṅ: e.g., *"kun kyi"*
(TIS, p. 152, ll. 16, 25) on the west face and *"tiṅ ṅe ḥdzin kyis"* (*ibid.*, p. 6, l. 11) on the
east face. There is no omission of the *da drag po* in this inscription either. Perhaps
there was excessive use of *"kyi/kyis"* upon their appearance.

52) The bell at bSam yas was donated by Jo mo rgyal mo btsan and her child, and the
inscription states that "Jo mo rgyal mo btsan and her child made this bell in order to
pay respect to the Three Treasures in the ten directions, and we pray that lha btsan po
Khri sroṅ lde btsan and his son, together with their respective wives, shall be in the
presence of the voice of the Buddha having sixty variations of sound, and that they shall
attain supreme enlightenment" (TTK, p. 108; Tucci's translation, *ibid.*, p. 69, is in-
correct). This Jo mo rgyal mo btsan ḥBro bzaḥ is identical to Khri rgyal mo sten, who
was later ordained and took the name Jo mo Byaṅ chub rje. According to Tucci's
comments on her (MBT, pp. 36–37, n. 2), she was ordained in the same year of the sheep
as the "Sad mi", i.e., 779. But this is incorrect, and she was actually ordained by sBa
dPal dbyaṅs in the year of the sheep twelve years later, in 791, after the arrival of Hva
shaṅ Mahāyāna (Z. Yamaguchi: "riṅ lugs rBa dPal dbyaṅs" *Felicitation Volume in*
Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor A. Hirakawa: Dharma in Buddhism,
Tōkyō 1975, pp. 641–664). It is said that she had a child at the time that she donated
the bell (NIR, pp. 168–169). The construction of bSam yas began in 775, the *dbu rtse*
(main temple) being completed in 779, the year in which the Sad mi ("the men of trial")
were ordained. The bell had no doubt been completed by this time too. In the in-
scription on the bell, together with "mother and child", the phrase "father and son
together with their wives" also appears, referring probably to the consrots of Khri sroṅ
lde brtsan and others and their children, and implying that Tshes poṅ za's son Mu ne
btsan po (born 774/ 775; KGG, f. 126a, l. 3) had also already been born. Jo mo was
permitted to donate the bell no doubt because her child would have been the eldest
at the time. Tucci writes (MBT, p. 37) that the expression "皇后没盧氏" in the "Chêng
li chüeh hsü" 「正理決敍」 (CL, p. 25) is incorrect, the queen's name being given as Tshes
poṅ za in Tibetan sources. It is true that the mother of Mu ne brtsan, who succeeded
Khri sroṅ lde btsan, was Tshes poṅ za rMa rgyal ldoṅ skar (DTH, p. 82, ll. 32–33).
However, Mu ne brtsan po had an elder brother born of ḥBro bzaḥ and if, for example,
he should have died before succeeding to the throne (NIR, p. 169), it is quite possible
that ḥBro bzaḥ would have been given the title of Jo mo gcen (KGG, f. 104b, l. 2; BSS,
p. 51, ll. 10–11) as a sign of respect. *"gCen"* derives from *"chen"*, and indicates not
only age but also that she held first place among all the other consorts. Despite the
fact that she was the mother of neither Mu ne btsan po nor Khri lde sroṅ btsan, it is
not at all surprising that she should have been the object of special respect if one con-
siders the fact that she had this title and donated a second bell to Khra ḥbrug during
the reign of Khri lde sroṅ btsan (NIR, pp. 169–170). According to the *Annals*, Khri
sroṅ lde btsan's first child was born in 760. Since this child was not Mu ne btsan po,
there is a strong possibility that it was ḥBro bzaḥ's child.

53) Even with particles, liaison is explained in detail only in the case of the genitive particles,
and there is no mention whatsoever of particles such as *"ciṅ"*, *"shiṅ"* *and* *"śiṅ"* let alone
their liaison rules. However these particles are used in the Shol inscription (AHE, p. 14,
l. 13; p. 17, ll. 26, 40; p. 18, ll. 47, 68; p. 19, l. 73; p. 27, ll. 13, 20, 26) and, as is pointed
out by Miller (TGT, p. 493a), are also found in the *Sum cu pa* after v. 23 (cf. n. (52)).

54) Miller picks out v. 8, which gives the *la don*, and v. 23, which gives only *"ste"* (*op. cit.*,
p. 494b), and, considering these to be especially old and mistranslating *"miṅ mthaḥ"* as
"postfixed letter", he assumes that there existed a usage unknown today (*ibid.*, p. 494b).
He suggests that the reason that v. 13 should mention only *"ste"* is that there was a
period when *"ste"* only was in use, and gives as evidence for this view documents from
the occupied territory in the north, well-known for the fact that they do not follow the
rules of the *Sum rtags* (*ibid.*, p. 496a; cf. pp. 11–12). Thus he considers that vv. 8 and 13

were originally connected. However, were this to be the case, one would not find any such clumsy wording as "*la don su la...*" at the start of v. 13, since there would be no need for repeating what had been just mentioned. It is because the two verses stood apart that such an expression became possible. Furthermore, it is quite natural that the "*la don*" should be followed by "*hbrel sgra*" and "*byed pa pohi sgra*" when one considers the grammatical function of inserting verbs, and it would be quite strange to disrupt this order. In this respect the present writer disagrees with the views of Miller, but agrees when he writes that the verses from v. 24 onwards are a "late non-grammatical accretion" (TGT, p. 492b).

55) This is the traditional view, followed by Inaba (OCT, p. 4) and by Miller when he looks upon the *Sum cu pa* as being the older work. In the opinion of the present writer, the addition of "*mūla*", i.e., "*rtsa ba*", to the title of the *Sum cu pa* is, judging from the contents of the extant version of this work, somewhat strange and, if used at all, it would be more appropriate to add "*mūla*" to the *rTags kyi hjug pa*. We would even like to suggest that the *rTags kyi hjug pa*, composed of thirty verses, originally contained the phrase "*mūla trim śad*" or "*rtsa ba sum cu pa*" in its title.

56) OCT, p. 2; TGT, p. 502b.