

On the “Annals” Relating to Princess Wen-ch‘eng

By Zuihō YAMAGUCHI

G. Uray, who in 1955 published a paper entitled “On the Tibetan letters *BA* and *WA*”⁽¹⁾, gave the impression of being a scholar given to handling the Tibetan documents of Tun-huang with extreme care. However in recent years he has followed in the footsteps of Bacot in reading “shañ shuñ lte bu” mistakenly as “shañ shuñ lde bu”⁽²⁾, and construed this indefinite suffix synonymous with “lta shig” in the meaning of “lde sras”⁽³⁾, something which one would not have expected from him.

More recently, when he reviewed the revision and interpretation made by the present writer⁽⁴⁾ on the Annals relating to Princess Wen-ch‘eng 文成公主 and formerly dealt with by F. W. Thomas⁽⁵⁾, he gave the impression of not having looked thoroughly at the material of the Tun-huang document⁽⁶⁾, thus causing me no little surprise.

At the conference held in commemoration of Csoma de Körös, Uray took the view of Petech⁽⁷⁾ in looking upon the Annals as a work originally relating to Princess Chin-ch‘eng 金城公主 and which was miscopied as if relating to Princess Wen-ch‘eng, and he furthermore opposed my attempt⁽⁸⁾ to ascertain the date of the document by taking the “sar” found in the said document to mean “tshar”.

The present writer felt it natural that Petech should have doubts on the matter, and made an investigation of the known facts, as a result of which I reached the conclusion that the said documents did pertain to Princess Wen-ch‘eng after all, and so when I published “The Territory of Su-p‘i” 「蘇毗の領界」 in 1968 I explained this point at the outset⁽⁹⁾.

However as I showed only my conclusions in the Japanese text, I would like to take this opportunity to restate my view and also to answer Uray’s criticism.

As for the question of “tshar/sar”, one must deal with the matter from both the point of view of spelling and that of meaning. I shall first deal with the spelling. Since if one looks at the actual manuscript in London one is forced to acknowledge that those words which Thomas looked upon as being synonymous with “soñ” and which he read as “sor”⁽¹⁰⁾ can only be read as “sar”, I shall confine myself to recommending personal inspection of the actual manuscript.

Next, in order to look at the relationship between “sar” and “tshar” (to be finished, completed, terminated) [Jäschke’s Dic., p. 458b], I shall list for the sake of reference the conjugation of a number of verbs of the same category. The verbs in the upper line are intransitive and those in the lower line transitive, and they relate to each other in both having the same root.

	Present	Future	Past
to awake to cleanse	ḥtshañ sañ		sañs bsañs ⁽¹¹⁾
to live to nourish	ḥtsho ḥtsho	gso	sos gsos ⁽¹²⁾
to collect to collect	ḥtshogs sog	bsag	tshogs/sogs bsags ⁽¹³⁾

“tshogs” in the fifth line is the original form of “sogs” in “la sogs pa”, and can have “sogs” as an alternate form⁽¹⁴⁾. The process of change is as follows:

*las tshogs pa / las *stshogs pa / la stsogs pa / la *sssogs pa / la sogs pa*

In the examples in the columns above the base-letter “tsha” is changed to “sa” in the past forms of the intransitive verbs. Furthermore, in the case of the transitive verbs the prefixed letter is either lost or changed, and apart from one exception⁽¹⁵⁾, the base-letter changes similarly to “sa”.

There are also verbs in which in the past form of the intransitive verb the “tsha” is retained, whilst in the case of the transitive verb the base-letter changes to “sa” as in the above examples. They are as follows:

	Present	Future	Past
to be blocked to block	ḥtshub [s] sub	bsub	tshubs bsubs ⁽¹⁶⁾
to be afraid to cause to tremble	ḥtsher *ser	*gser	ḥtsherd *bser (cold wind) ⁽¹⁷⁾
to take the place of to supply	ḥtshob gsob	gsab	ḥtshobs bsab ⁽¹⁸⁾

As an example of synonymous words of different spelling, there is:

	Present	Future	Past
to seek	ḥtshol *ḥtshol	btsal gsol	btsald gsold ⁽¹⁹⁾

and “tsha/sa” corresponds well with this. Furthermore as an example of the nominalization of a verb there is “tshom pa” (to doubt) [Jäschke’s Dic., p. 453b] giving “som ñi” (=the tshom) [Chos grags’ Dic., p. 916b].

Here one would expect "tshar" as the past form of "ḥtshar", but as can be seen from the above examples it is possible to have "sar" as a variant spelling. In addition, the form of the transitive verb can be conjectured as follows:

	Present	Future	Past
to complete	ḥtshar sar	gsar	gsard

As an example using this "gsard" there is the form "gsar gcod" used in the meaning of "tshar gcod", and given in Jäschke [Dic., p. 458b, 588b]⁽²⁰⁾ and Desgodin [Dic., p. 1046a]. The former gives the translation as "to search, inquire into, investigate thoroughly, to examine etc.", and the latter as "faire de nouvelle invention". The explanation of "tshar gcod" according to dge bces Chos grags is "tshar mthaḥ gcod", "tshar thag gcod" (to pass a final decree) [Dic., p. 695a, cf. 364b, 380b], and one can see that Jäschke's is a free translation of this. I was not able to confirm elsewhere the meaning given by Desgodin (cf. "skad gsar bcad" "the conclusively specified terms").

In any case it is evident that "gcod" is "to decide", "tshar" "to finish (intr.)", and "gsar" "to finish (tr.)". It is not difficult to conjecture that the meaning of the adjective "gsar ma" (new [thing]) arose from the meaning "(something old) has been finished".

It is not clear whether the present form of the transitive verb was "ḥtshar" or "sar". However since in the Annals relating to Princess Wen-ch'eng the form

. . . *loḥi lo sar dan* (1.5, 21, 36, 50) "when the year of . . . had ended" is repeatedly used, one can see that "sar" was the past form. Therefore the "sar" in this case must be considered as a variant form of "tshar" or "gsard".

This mode of expression is exactly the opposite to the pattern

. . . *lo la babste* "reaching the year . . ."

found in other Annals. In the case of the latter expression, it always comes at the start of a sentence treated as a separate unit, whereas with the former the sentence is not started anew, the expression in question being used as part of a single sentence. One must take careful note of the difference between the two in this respect.

These facts can be discovered by examining the microfilm copies only, not to mention the actual manuscripts themselves.

Next, let us take a look at the view of L. Petech, who expresses doubt concerning the name of Princess Wen-ch'eng found in this document (Nugae Tibeticae, *RSO*, XXXI, 1956, pp. 291-293). He claims that because the names of 7 people belonging to the period of Khri lde gtsug brtan Mes ag ḥtshom (704-755) are to be found in the document in question relating to Princess

Wen-ch'eng, this document must be one in which the name of Princess Chin-ch'eng has been miscopied, and he also places the date of the document as corresponding to the period 706–714.

Petech's assertion is constructed on the assumption that there are no mistakes whatsoever in the text of F. W. Thomas. Furthermore, as regards the date of the document, he similarly reaches his conclusion without giving any critical comment at all.

First let us look at the names of the 7 people.

1) He considers Cog ro Cuñ bzañ ḥdam koñ to be the same as ḥBro Cuñ bzañ ḥor mañ. However neither the family nor personal names are the same⁽²¹⁾.

2) He considers Khri bañs to be identical with Princess Khri bañs who, according to the Annals, became the wife of the ruler of Ḥa sha in 689. Since the names are the same, and she is said to have gone to the place of the ruler of Ḥa sha, this assumption is quite natural.

3) Shañ bTsan to re—he suggests this to be the shañ bTsan to re lhas byin who betook himself to T'ang in order to bring back Princess Chin-ch'eng. In line 23 of the text it is impossible to identify for certain the word "shañ". Although the shañ bTsan to re (尙贊吐) who went to meet Princess Chin-ch'eng was accompanied by Myes slebs (名悉臘), the latter's name is not to be found. Furthermore, bTsan to re is not a personal name but a variety of title, and other examples of it exist in the period of Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan⁽²²⁾.

4) He gives shañ Khri bzañ; but since this is elsewhere given as ḥBro shañ Khri bzañ kha che stoñ⁽²³⁾, it is of no avail to carry out a comparison using the form with that coming after Khri bzañ abbreviated. This person is completely different to the shañ Khri bzañ stag tsab found in the Annals. The name Khri bzañ is very frequent.

5) He considers ḥBro shañ brTan sgra sto (ḥBro shañ brTan sgra ya stoñ in its correct form) to be the same as shañ rGya sto. There is absolutely no basis for this claim.

6) He states that he wishes to consider dBaḥs Khri bzañ spa skyes as being the child of dBaḥs Khri gzigs shañ ñen. There is no guarantee whatsoever as to whether the words before "shañ ñen" were "Khri gzu" or "Khri bzañ".

7) He says that he wishes to consider Cog ro sToñ re khoñ zuñ as being Cog ro Nañ khoñ. The name sToñ re khoñ zuñ is found as often as three times⁽²⁴⁾. There is no reason at all for this to be the same as Nañ khoñ.

8) dBaḥs sTag sgra khoñ lod—this name is given as dBaḥs sTag sgra khoñ [lod (?)] in Thomas' text. However in actual fact only "kho" is visible and it is unclear whether there is [lod] or not, and so it is impossible to take it as being "khoñ lod"⁽²⁵⁾.

Of the above, only Khri bañs is worthy of investigation, and none of the others deserves any attention.

As can be seen in the Tun-huang document "The Chart of the Royal Lineage", the names of the royal wives of T'u-fan are given as "khon co Mañ mo rje Khri skar", "ḥBro za Khri ma lod Khri steñ", "Mon za Khri mo mñen lDon steñ", "mChims za bTsan ma thog Thog steñ" etc. (DTH, p. 82), and consist of three parts. The first part indicates the place of origin, whilst the middle part is a titular name, and sometimes in cases such as mañ mo rje is itself a title. The appellations found remaining in documents of later periods are either the corrupted forms of titular names, or else, in cases where the middle part is clearly a title, one finds in the last part a few instances such as "Khri skar" and "Shi steñ", which can be regarded as personal names.

Among titular names one finds ḥBal bzaḥ Khri bstun and ḥJañ mo Khri bstun⁽²⁷⁾, and ḥBro za Khri ma lod and je ba Khri ma lod, who married the king of Bru-sha in 740; and it is not unusual for them to have parts in common. In the case of bstan mo Khri bañs who married the ruler of Ḥa sha in 689 it is also possible to assume that the personal name followed. In other words one is probably justified in considering that, as in the above examples, the personal name differed to that of the Khri bañs who appeared in Tsogs at the time of Princess Wen-ch'eng's entry into Tibet. The name of this Khri bañs appears three times in the above-mentioned Tun-huang documents. On the other hand Princess Wen-ch'eng's name, which also appears three times, is the personal name itself, and unless one presumes that the copyists made a mistake in copying three times, it is not possible to look upon it as indicating anyone apart from Princess Wen-ch'eng⁽²⁸⁾.

Petech seems to think that if, on top of taking the date given by Thomas ahead to the equivalent of six cycles of the duodenary calendar system, one simply changes the name of Princess Wen-ch'eng in this document to that of Princess Chin-ch'eng, one will be able to gain an account corresponding to that of the Annals. However is this really the case? The document in question runs as follows:

The year of the boar ends, and in the year of the rat (640 [... 712]) the Princess is taken in marriage. In winter she resides in Tsha ḥod. The year of the rat ends, and in the year of the ox she resides in Tsha ḥod. She resides in Tsha ḥod during both the summer and the winter. During the year of the ox the royal residence is built anew.

The year of the ox ends; in the year of the tiger (642 [... 714]) she resides in Tsha ḥod, and during the summer in Tsha ḥod [a prince was born?]. The exchange of many presents takes place.

The year of the tiger ends, and in the year of the hare (643 [... 715]) her residence appears to be still Tsha ḥod. There is a dispatch of forces to Ḥa sha, and evidence of the death of Guñ sroñ guñ brstan is to be seen. The appellation "yum sras" (mother and child) is found in connection with the Princess⁽²⁹⁾.

However all that can be found out about Princess Chin-ch'eng from the Chinese sources and the Annals etc.⁽³⁰⁾ is as follows:

In the third year of Chin-lung 景龍 (709) Shang-tsan-t'u 尙贊吐 (shañ bTsan to re lhas sbyin) reaches the court of T'ang in order to fetch Princess Chin-ch'eng. At the New Year of the fourth year of Ching-lung (710) Princess Chin-ch'eng departs together with Yang-chu 楊矩. Kim çañ khoñ co arrives at Ça tsal together with shañ bTsan to re lhas sbyin. During the winter the royal couple resides in Brag dmar. In the year of the boar (711 [corresponds to 639]) btsan po rGyal gtsug ru resides in Bal po during the summer and in Brag dmar during the winter.

In the year of rat (712 [corresponds to 640]) btsan po resides in Bal po during the summer and Brag dmar during the winter.

In the year of the ox (713 [corresponds to 641]) btsan po resides in brDzen tañ in Mal tro during the summer and again in Brag dmar during the winter.

In the year of the tiger (714 [corresponds to 642]) btsan po resides in brDzen tañ in Mal tro during the summer and in Ñen kar during the winter.

In other words, the places of residence in the corresponding period are in the case of Khri lde gtsug brtsan (=rGyal gtsug ru), who took Princess Chin-ch'eng as his wife, in the winter always Brag dmar⁽³¹⁾, and in the summer mainly either Bal po or Mal tro were chosen⁽³²⁾. Since Khri lde gtsug brtsan was at this time seven years of age, it is not possible for the Princess to have become a mother, nor is there any sign of the royal residence having been rebuilt during the year of the ox for that reason. It is also worthy of note that in later Annals there is no mention at all of the mother and child Ma ga tho gon kha gan⁽³³⁾.

Subsequent to the winter of 640 the residence of Princess Wen-ch'eng and Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan was Tsha çod during both the summer and winter. Tsha çod is in the district of Khams. Brag dmar is the place where the monastery of bSam yas was later erected, and lies on the north bank of the gTsañ po in a northwesterly direction from Yar luñ.

Therefore, although the suggestion offered by Petech did no doubt deserve being brought up, on no account is it possible to claim that the records relating to Princess Chin-ch'eng became, owing to a mistake made during transmission, the Tun-huang documents relating to Princess Wen-ch'eng.

To sum up, apart from the name Khri bañs there is no evidence anywhere to support such a claim, whilst, if on the other hand one considers them to be documents relating to Princess Wen-ch'eng, elucidation on many points is obtained, as I have shown on previous occasions⁽³⁵⁾.

It is hoped that this paper, by pointing out anew that Petech's claim is unfeasible, will be of some help in showing Uray's stand, which is based on Petech's explanation, to be unacceptable.

NOTES

- (1) *Acta Orient. Hung.*, V, 1955, pp. 101-122.
- (2) "Note on a chronological problem in the *Old Tibetan Chronicle*", *Acta Orient. Hung.*, XXI, 1968, pp. 289-299; p. 292, n. 3.
- (3) This question is dealt with in detail in Z. Yamaguchi: "The interpretation of a Tibetan word, lte bu, found in documents in Tun-Huang", *Annual Report of the Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange*, Faculty of Letters, The Univ. of Tokyo, I, 1975, p. 31-41.
- (4) Z. Yamaguchi: "Matrimonial relationship between the T'u-fan and the T'ang dynasties" (abbr. MRT), *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tōyō Bunko*, no. 27, pp. 141-166; no. 28, pp. 59-100.
- (5) F. W. Thomas: "*Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan*" (abbr. TLT), II, 1951, pp. 8-16.
- (6) Körösi Csoma Memorial Symposium, Sept. 1976, Budapest. cf. *JA*, 1975, p. 167. n. 1.
- (7) cf. pp. 125 ff. of the present paper.
- (8) For a summary see the paper given in n. 4: p. 61, n. 11; p. 78, n. 101.
- (9) *Tōyō Gakuhō* 『東洋學報』, 50-4, pp. 3-7.
- (10) There is no basis whatsoever for "sor" to be translated as "came" (TLT, II, pp. 10-12), nor is any given.
- (11) Chos grags' Dic., pp. 713b, 904a-b; Jäschke's Dic., p. 571b; *rGya Bod miñ gi rgya mtsho* (abbr. GMG), II, p. 117a.
- (12) Jäschke's Dic., p. 760a; Chos grags' Dic., pp. 716a, p. 917b, p. 938b, 941a; GMG, II, p. 130b. There is also the pattern "gso" (pres.), "gsos" (fut.), and "bsos" (past) (GMG, II, p. 130b, 131b, 133a).
- (13) Chos grags' Dic., pp. 717a, 703a; Jäschke's Dic., p. 579a. In addition the forms "gsog" (pres.), "bsag" (fut.), and "bsags" (past) are given in GMG, II, p. 122a.
- (14) There are also cases where "sogs" is used without a preceding "la" (Jäschke's Dic., p. 579b). But this too is not used in any meaning apart from that of "la sog pa". "las tshogs pa" means "that which gathers (behind) from . . .", and is translated as ". . . and others (of the same kind)".
- (15) cf. the end of n. 12.
- (16) GMG, II, p. 62a; Jäschke's Dic., p. 459b; *ibid.*, p. 574b.
- (17) "ser, gser, bser" is not found as a verb in the dictionary. It is accompanied by the diminutive "bu" and translated as "a fresh, cold breeze" (Jäschke's Dic., p. 593b), or "vent doux, zéphir" (Desgodin's Dic., pp. 1050a, 1026a). As an example of its being used in the meaning of "a biting wind", there is the example "skyi bser ni spu ru ru" (the biting wind is shivering cold), found in a song of Princess Sad mar kar in the Chronicles among the Tun-huang documents (Bacot: "*Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*", Paris, 1964, abbr. DTH, p. 116, 1.35-36). "skyi bser" derives from "skyi tsher" ("a thorn in the skin", Chos grags' Dic., p. 50b), and means "to send a shudder as far as the thin subcutaneous membrane". It is to be conjectured that "bser" used in the meaning of "something which causes to shudder" came to mean "wind".
- (18) GMG, II, p. 62b; Jäschke's Dic., p. 461a; GMG, II, p. 131a; Jäschke's Dic., p. 591b.
- (19) The corresponding intransitive verb is "ḥtshal, ḥtshald" ("have a mind", Jäschke's Dic., p. 458b), of which a variety of usages are known. Apart from the transitive verb "ḥtshol" (*op. cit.*, p. 461a), there is "stsol, bstal, btsald" meaning "to permit, grant" ("to cause a wish"), which is the causative of "ḥtshal" (*ibid.*, pp. 441b-442a). As for the future and past forms of "ḥtshol", there are "btsal" and "btsald" (Chos grags' Dic., p. 675a; GMG, II, p. 62b), and also "gsol" and "gsold" (Chos grags' Dic., p. 940b; Jäschke's Dic., pp. 591b-592a; GMG, II, pp. 131b), and these correspond to the meaning of the transitive verb. In addition, Chos grags gives the correspondence "stsel/sel" and "btsal/bsal" (Dic., p. 687b).

- (20) Although it is said to be used in “*pad ma than yig*”, its whereabouts has not been identified.
- (21) However it requires the major premise that people with the same name or the same title can not appear at different times.
- (22) According to “*mKhas pañi dgañ ston*” (Vol. Ja, f. 47b, 1.3) the ministers of state of Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan were Myañ Mañ po rje Shañ snañ and sNubs bTsan to re. Myañ was ousted by Khyuñ po, and mGar Mañ sham sum snañ took up the post after Myañ, with Khyuñ po following him (DTH, pp. 100–105). After Khyuñ po came mGar sToñ rtsan, and it is possible that Myañ was Guñ sroñ’s prime minister. Therefore, although there is no other information on sNubs bTsan to re, if one takes him to have been Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan’s minister of state, it means that he was the bTsan to re mentioned in the Annals in question, and that shañ bTsan to re is no longer of immediate concern.
- (23) Bu ston Rin chen grub is known as “Bu ston kha che”. The text gives “kha che stoñ”, but not “kha cher btañ”.
- (24) Is to be found in ll. 48, 49, 51 of the same Annals.
- (25) “khoñ [lod(?)]” is a complete guess made without any foundation by Thomas. It is not possible to discuss the miscopying of documents with this as material.
- (26) cf. “*gSal bañi me loñ*”, f. 83b, 1.3, sNa nams bzañ Shi steñ; “*mKhas pañi dgañ ston*”, Vol. Ja, f. 72b, 1.5, sNa nams bzañ Shi steñ; “*The tombs of the Tibetan Kings*”, Roma, 1950, p. 59.
- (27) Jo mo Khri btsun found in the section for 745 (DTH, p. 26) is probably hJañ bzañ.
- (28) The enumeration of these facts alone is already sufficient to rebuff Petech’s claim, the reason being that the problem is solved by a comparison of the relative importance of the titular title “Khri bañs” found three times and the personal name “Mun çeñ khon co” found three times.
- (29) A summary of the Annals, 1.21 infra, MRT, pp. 65–75.
- (30) cf. *Chiu T’ang-shu* 『舊唐書』 7; DTH, p. 20 (710 A.D.)–p. 21 (714 A.D.).
- (31) Brag dmar is well-known as the site of dPal bSam yas. Nën kar, Mer ke and Brag dmar were “dgun sa” (winter residence) of the kings of T’u-fan, and the kings spent their childhood there. After the end of the seventh century Brag dmar became the principal “winter residence”. *b’uät-liek-muan* 勃鬱漫 found in the famous *Tun-wu-ta-ch’eng-cheng-li-chueh-hsu* 『頓悟大乘正理決序』 is a transcription of Brag dmar.
- (32) The “dbyar sa” (summer residence) of Mal tro (悶懼盧) is the Mal gro district of today (P. Demiéville: “*Le Concil de Lhasa*”, Paris, 1952, p. 202; H. Sato: 「吐蕃王の夏牙悶懼盧川について」 *Kodai Bunka*, 15–2, 1965, pp. 41–45). However the position of Bal po is not certain. “Pa-pu-hai 拔布海” in the direction of “贊普牙帳西南” (*Le Concile de Lhasa*”, pp. 200–201, n. 1; *T’ang-shu* 『唐書』, 40, note on Shan-ch’eng 鄯城) is related to “*b’uät-puo*” of “其贊普居跋布川或邏婆川” found in *T’ang-shu* 216A. Its pronunciation being *b’uät-puo*, it probably corresponds to Bal po; but as for its location, one can go no further than placing it in the direction of Yar hbrog.
- (33) If the Annals in question were dealing with Princess Chün-ch’eng, Ma ga tho gon kha gan, the personal name of Khri bañs, and the names Tsog and Tsha çod should appear in the account of the period around 710 in these Annals; yet there are no such references whatsoever.
- (34) L. Petech offers no suggestion for the location of Tsha çod. Concerning Tsha çod, cf. MRT, p. 78, n. 103.
- (35) cf. n. 4.