

Matrimonial Relationship between the T'u-fan and the T'ang Dynasties

(Part II)

By Zuiho YAMAGUCHI

Contents

- IV. Princess *Wên-ch'êng*'s Advent to Tibet and her Remarriage.
- V. Chronology on *Khri sroñ brtsan*.
- VI. Mixing of the Traditions of Princess *Wên-ch'êng* 文成公主 and Princess *Chin-ch'êng* 金城公主.

IV.

Princess *Wên-Ch'êng*'s Advent to Tibet and Her Remarriage

Among the Tibetan documents collected by Sir Aurel Stein from Central Asia, there is a fragmentary text which tells the circumstances of the advent of a Chinese Princess, *Wên-ch'êng* to Tibet. This text was already introduced with a deciphered reading by Dr. F. W. Thomas⁽¹⁾. However, since there are many parts where his version is not acceptable, the present writer will try to present here a new translation with his own reading⁽²⁾.

The text in question was obtained by Stein on his third expedition. Thomas refers to this text as *Vol. 69, fol. 84* of the Stein Collection. About two/fifths of the width of paper is missing from the right side of every sheet, and as a result 16 or 17 words from every line cannot be read.

Although it is somewhat long, the whole text will be examined here on the basis of the photo-copies offered by the India Office Library. On the sentences difficult to get the meaning, a decipherment of Thomas, when acceptable, is given in [] brackets. A reading by the present writer, when differently deciphered, is given in (()) brackets. For reference's sake, Thomas' reading is given in (⊗) at the end of the lines. The parts that Thomas reconstructed, when acceptable, are given in Italics, while a tentative reconstruction by the present writer is given in () brackets.

(1) TLTD. II, pp. 8-15.

(2) As to the doubt entertained by L. Petech, see Yamaguchi: "rTsañ yul and Yan lag gsum pañi ru," *The Toyo Gakuho*, Vol. 50, No. 4, (March 1967), pp. 2-7.

1. gy((i Mu tho))...((g-Yañ ca))n *Mu tho* of. *g-Yañ can* fort.
m((khar))[⊗] (⊗g-yañ~na mdz...)
2. ...s ston[⊗] khri [g]das dañ/ Cog *s ston khri gdas*⁽³⁾ and *Cog ro*⁽⁴⁾
[ro] Cuñ bzañ ḥdam koñ *Cuñ bzañ ḥdam koñ* (and).....
(dañ)... (⊗...s sto(?))
3. ...*Ma ga tho gon kha gan la* paid respects⁽⁵⁾ to *Ma ga to gon kha gan*,
phyag b((gyi))so/ston mo ched respectfully held a great banquet⁽⁶⁾
po gsol... (⊗[bgisol])
4. sras.((u)).((ston)) mo pha ḥbabs the Son [of God] [=the Crown prince]⁽⁷⁾
d[nul] lña dañ/ bya dgaḥ ched graciously holding a banquet⁽⁸⁾,
po (stsal te)... gave, as the royal grants⁽⁹⁾, five pieces
of silver(?) and a great number of re-

(3) This *gdas* is the last part of a personal name. Cf. TLTD II, pp. 394, 409, 610, and 634, n. 18. Thomas' reconstruction to read *sGra ya sto-* (p. 10) cannot be accepted.

(4) In this text there are two men with the name of *Cog ro*. Especially one of them, *sToñ re khoñ zuñ*, was promoted to a higher rank when his daughter became a queen of the *Ḥa sha* King. (Cf. Lines 48, 49) According to *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba* (KG, Ja, f. 18b-19a), *Sroñ brtsan sgam po* appointed five *khos pon/khod pon* (=mkhos dpon), the highest responsible officers, each for every region. The name of *Cog ro rGyal mtshan g-yañ goñ* is cited as *mThoñ khyab khod pon* among the list. *Cog ro*, as is mentioned in a form of *Cog ro za* of *ḥDam* in the *T'un-huang* documents (DTH, p. 120), seems to be a tribe settled around *ḥDam* (達木), i.e., 玉樹, 納克書 (*Yos çus*, *Nags çod*). See Yamaguchi, "*rTsañ yul* and *Yan lag gsum paḥi ru*", *op. cit.*, p. 56, n. 117.

(5) Those who *paid respect* to the *Ḥa sha* ruler must be the retainers of *lha sras Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan* when he stepped into the *Ḥa sha* territory. This visit must have taken place after the eleventh month in the 9th year of Chên-kuan (635), when he made *Mu-jung shun* 慕容順 killed.

(6) It may refer to the feast held by the *T'u-fan* retainers together with the *Kha gan* to celebrate the victory over *Mu-jung shun*, puppet ruler support by the *T'ang* Court.

(7) *lHa sras* (*Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan*) must have been at the 15th year of age at that time. If we are to accept Thomas' version "*rtahī lo*", then the prince was at his 14th year of age.

(8) There is a space for about four words after *sras*. After that, *gyis* (*kyis*) or *nas* must have followed. Before *mo*, which appears next, *ston* must have been there. The reason for that is explained in Note 9.

(9) *pha ḥbabs* is used as *lo gsar gyi pha babs*, to mean the gift or grant given from a superior person to a man in lower position. (See Desgodins: *Dictionnaire Thibétain-Latin-Français*, DTLF, 1889, Hong Kong, p. 621). The translation by Thomas is not acceptable here either. (Cf. TLTD II, p. 10; III, p. 22). *Bya dgaḥ* is another word to mean "reward", given by a superior person to a man in lower position. In this case, it sounds a little presumptuous for *gnam gyi sras* of *Ḥa sha*, who became *ḥbañs* (vassal) to give *bya dgaḥ* to the retainers of *lHa sras*. Judging from the context of the document as a whole, it is not appropriate to take *kha gan* as the subject of the sentence. This sentence, just like the one in Line 33, should be interpreted that the reward was given by *lHa sras* to important *T'u-fan* persons. It must be the reward in recognition of their services in having overthrown *Mu-jung shun* and made *Ḥa sha* a vassal of the *T'u-fan* Court.

- wards⁽¹⁰⁾.
5. [du bta]((b nas l))u(gi lohi)was built and then the Sheep
 lo sar[⊗] dan/ dbyar sla ra ba^{hi} year⁽¹¹⁾ passed into a new year [636
 [sku bla] ched po g((s))o((l))... A.D.], when the great feast⁽¹²⁾ in the first
 (⊗ lo sor) summer to pray for the king's longevity
 (was respectfully held).
 6. ((ston mo)) (gsol / dehi) dbyar(respectfully held) a banquet.
 rMa chab ((g))yi Mu to lyin na (That) summer, a cluster of tents were
 chud du btab... (⊗ spyen) pitched⁽¹³⁾ at *Mu to lyin*⁽¹⁴⁾ on the River
rMa chab⁽¹⁵⁾.
 7. ...(gnag) li^{ns} ched po bgyis te/ When hunting for yaks was held⁽¹⁶⁾, the
 ri dags kyan n... wild beast⁽¹⁷⁾, too,
 8. ((Khri s))(roñ brtsan gyi sra)s The royal residence of (the son of) *khri*
-
- (10) Just as in the case of Line 33, there should be a continuation to make the sense that such rewards were granted in recognition of the services of the retainers. Then probably there came a sentence to the effect that prior to celebrating the new year the residence of winter was built somewhere.
 - (11) From the photographic copy, the present writer could not confirm the presence of *rta hi* here. But a vowel sign *u* can be figured out in the preceding space. That makes the present writer think that there was a phrase *lugi lohi*. According to Thomas, because of the presence of *hi*, *lugi* or *sbrul gyi* cannot come in here and only *rta^{hi} lo* fits here. However, since there are many occasions of the usage "*lohi lo*", his theory does not convince us in this case though we can agree with him that there was *hi*. Cf. Note 20. The word *sor* does not mean "came". To mean "came", there is a Tibetan expression of "...*lo la bab*". As far as can be deciphered from the photographic copy, *sor* is more likely to be *sar*. *sar* is the verbal form of an adjective *gsar ma* and means "be renewed", "change into", or actually to mean "pass into". Its related word *htshar* means "is completed". See Note 101. This can be confirmed from a similar expression for the date in Line 41 (Note 80), and also from the fact that the verb "*sar*" is generally used here in combination with *dan*, which means "then". For the grounds to read *lugi lo*, see Notes 5, 6, 9 and 20.
 - (12) *sku bla* is an honorific for *bla*, and is taken to mean the King's *bla*. This word is discussed in T. V. Wylie: *The Geography of Tibet according to the Dzam-glin-rgyas-bshad*, Roma, 1962 p. 130, n. 143; Nebesky-Wojkowitz: *Oracles and Demons of Tibet*, the Hague, 1956, pp. 481-483. It means the source of life. There is an etymological relation among the words of *bla/la/lha*. The passage here can be interpreted to mean that at the festival of *sku lha*, the King's longevity was prayed for. From this document, we can tell that the *sku bla* festivals were held in early summer and in early winter.
 - (13) *chud du* is an ancient form of *chun btu*, or *hchun hthu*. The words mean "cluster" of *hphru*, or *sbra*, tents, that is *hphru ma=dmag sgar* (military encampment).
 - (14) TLTD II, p. 14, n. 6.
 - (15) *rMa chab* is probably another form of *rMa chu*. Cf. TLTD II, p. 15; R. A. Stein: *Les tribus anciennes des marches Sino-Tibetaïnes*, (TAMS), Paris, 1958, p. 48, n. 131.
 - (16) (gnag) *li^{ns}*. *gnag* means the wild animals like *g-yag* or *hbri*, which can be domesticated. *li^{ns}* is an old form of *gli^{ns}* or *rli^{ns}*, meaning "to gather" or "to collect". The form *gnag li^{ns}* is often found in the *T'un huang Annals*.
 - (17) *ri dvags*, wild animals which cannot be domesticated.

- ((gyi)) pho brañ deñi dg[u]n (sroñ brtsan)⁽¹⁸⁾ was built at g-Yañ can
 Sra bal gyi g-Ya[n ca]n (mkhar fort of Sra bal in that winter, (and the
 du btab nas dgun sla ra bañi great feast, also, of the first winter to
 sku bla ched po yañ der gsol) pray for the king's longevity was respect-
 (⊗ khriñ sa) fully held there)⁽¹⁹⁾.
9. de nas [deñi] (dgun)...gnam gyi Then in that (winter)⁽²⁰⁾.....(as a
 sras Ma ga tho gon kha gan gyi queen) of *Ma ga tho gon kha gan*, the
 (btsun mor)... (⊗ gi) son of heaven⁽²¹⁾,
10. s[e] t[o] ((ñiñ)) khab tu bshe[s] Se to ñiñ⁽²²⁾ was taken in marriage; the
 te Ħa sha rjeñi dpyaň [lagi] long-held wish of *Ħa sha*'s ruler was ful-
 ((sa)) bkañ nas/... (⊗ ñañi) (⊗ su) filled⁽²³⁾. After that.....
11. ((re dañi ltoñ)) jeñ du spar/de-re was promoted to *Dañi ltoñ*
 nas spreñu ((loñi)) lo((sar)) Sra jeñ⁽²⁴⁾. And then the Ape year passed

(18) *n* in *khriñ* in Thomas' reconstruction is quite unclear. So, the present writer deciphered the phrase as shown in the text above. Perhaps there was *hphrul gyi lha btsan po*, before this line.

(19) This part is supplied, taking into consideration the number of letters and also from the context as a whole.

(20) Although Thomas places the change of years in Line 6, there is no ground for doing so. As it is clearly seen in Line 41 that they built the royal residence during the winter and welcomed the new year. If we are to yield to Thomas and place the phrase *lugi (loñi) lo sar* somewhere, then it can be placed only in Line 8. In order to check if the number of letters would fit to the space or not, a Tibetan sentence would be tentatively supplied (see Line 50, Note 88) as follows: "*mkhar du btab nas lugi loñi lo sar dañ dbyar sla ra bañi sku bla yañ der gsol*". This, even spelled in an abbreviated way, is much too long for the space. It would be more natural to think that there was no change of the year in Line 8, too. What should be supplemented is shown in our reconstructed text. As a result, we can assume that the marriage of the *kha gan* took place in the winter of that year (*deñi dgun*). Cf. Lines 47 and 48.

(21) The phrase *gnam gyi sras* is a title put on top of the name *Ma ga to gon kha gan*.

(22) This seems like the last part of the name of the consort who was then married by the *kha gan*. Thomas translates this as a place name, perhaps suggested by the word *Sa toñ* in Line 17. *Sa toñ* is the name of the place where a summer residence for *lha sras* was built.

(23) *dpyaň [lagi sa]* is more correctly *dpyaň lag gi sa*. *lag* is *ldag*, and can be taken as a different form of *thag* in today's usage. Then, *dpyaň thag gi sa*, thus formed, means "a position suspended for a long time". Thomas reads *sa* as *su*, but what he thought as the sign for the *u* vowel is actually a stain on the sheet. *bKab* is a transitive verb form of *hkhob* or *hgab*, meaning "to fill vacance". It also means "to take a woman as bride". Since the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* 冊府元龜 and the Chapter of *T'ai-tsung pên-chi* in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 旧唐書 recorded the visiting of *Mu-jung No-ho-po* 慕容諾曷鉢 for the twelfth month of 636 A.D., he could not be *Ma ga to gon kha gan*. It will be all the more certain if there be actually a phrase *deñi dgun* in Line 9. Cf. Note 20.

(24) This sentence shows that the daughter's father was promoted to a higher rank. *spar* means "to increase". The phrase ((*r*))*e dañi* might be a mistake for *da re dañi*. And *dañi* is possibly derived from *d'ai* 大 in Chinese.

- ba[l] (gyi g-Yañ can mkhar du into a new year [637 A.D.], (since the
bshugste dbyar sla ra bañi sku king was at gYañ can fort of) Sra bal,
bla ched)... (the great feast of the first summer)
(⊗[b]d[e?]hi Lyoñ)(⊗spreñulosor)
12. po yañ [der] gsol/deñi dbya[r] also, was respectfully held there. In the
yum btsan mo Khri bañs gyi summer of that year. Queen Khri
sham ((riñ)) (du... bañs⁽²⁵⁾, mother of [King Ha sha], ac-
(⊗ du is not deciphered) companied by.....
13. stoñ ((re yo sar bkral)) nas/pho A new levy of 1,000....was imposed
brañ rMa chab gyi g((La))ñ respectively⁽²⁶⁾, and a [new] royal resi-
ma luñ du b((tab))... dence was built at gLañ ma luñ⁽²⁷⁾ on
(⊗ stoñ sde mo [spar] bkal) the River Ma chab.....
14. deñi ston pho brañ Tsogi Sra In the autumn⁽²⁷⁾ of that year, a royal
bal gyi g-Yañ can mkhar du residence was built at gYañ can fort of
btab nas (bya loñi lo sar dañ Sra bal in Tso. And then (the Cock
dbyar sla ra bañi sku bla yañ year passed into a new year—[638
dergsol/deñi) (⊗ lacks Tsogi) A.D.]—, the great feast, also, of the first
summer to pray for the king's longevity
was respectfully held there. Of that
year)⁽²⁸⁾
15. dbyar ((g-Yañ)) [ca]n mkhar du In the summer, the king stayed at g-Yañ
bshugste/shañ rGyal tsan sug can fort⁽²⁹⁾, when Shañ rGyal tsan (ful-

(25) Considering for the fact that her son reached the marriageable age, *yum btsan mo Khri bañs* should be around forty years old at that time. *Khri sroñ brtsan* was at his 57th year of age in that year. So, *Khri bañs* should be either his eldest daughter, or a daughter of his father in the father's later years of age, i. e. *Khri sroñ brtsan's* younger sister. There seems to be more likelihood that she was his own daughter.

(26) Thomas translated the sentence as "lady of the Stoñ-sde having been commissioned to erect." However, as seen above, it refers to a new taxation on the needs for construction of a royal residence. The reading *sde* in *stoñ sde* seems to be a mistake for *re* because of a stain, and *mo* is possibly *yo*, and *spar* is correctly *sar*. Thomas improperly deciphered the part where *sar* was cut in between and was shown out of position. "*yo sar*" seems to be the abridged form of "*yo byad gsar ma*". *bkal* should be definitely read as *bkral*.

(27) Continuing on from Line 12, it refers to the event in the summer. Cf. Line 14.

(28) Since it says in Line 14, "the autumn of that year", and at the beginning of Line 15, it says, "in the summer", we know that the change of years must have been mentioned in the part missing in Line 14. In addition to this fact, *Sra bal gyi g-Yañ can mkhar* is the settlement where they spent the cold season every year. Since the place they spent the winter season was fairly regularized as we see also in the *T'un huang Annals*, a fixed building for that purpose must have been there, or in the course of time they must have begun to live in a fixed residence. The missing part was tentatively supplemented on the basis of the number of letters to fill up the space.

(29) Against the custom of changing the royal residence in summer, they stayed at *g-Yañ can mkhar*, winter residence, in the summer of that year. We should remind of the fact that it was the year of his enthronement. Cf. Notes 30, 35.

- las... filled) his task⁽³⁰⁾.....
16. shañ lo[n] ḥdi gñis [sug las] After⁽³¹⁾ the task was completed, a big
 rjes[⊗] nas rtsis ched po bgyis/ (de inspection was conducted by the two
 nas khyi loḥi lo sar dañ dbyar *Shañ lon*. (And then the Dog year
 sla ra baḥi sku bla ched) passed⁽³²⁾ into a new year—[639 A.D.]
 (⊗ [rjes]) —, when the great feast of the first sum-
 mer to pray for the king's longevity,
 also, was respectfully held there.) In
 17. [p]lo ya[n] der gsol/[de]ḥi that summer, a royal residence was built
 dbyar pho brañ Sa toñ du btab/ at *Sa toñ*. And then⁽³³⁾,
 de nas... (⊗ se)
 18. ((ḥi sku)) bla yañ der gsol/de the feast, also⁽³⁴⁾, to pray for the king's
 nas ḥphrul gyi lha btsan po[ḥ]li longevity was held there. And then,
 (shal ña nas?)... (⊗ Ḥa sha sla) (His Majesty) *btsan po*, who is the
 God's incarnate, [= *Guñ sroñ guñ*
brtsan⁽³⁵⁾]

(30) The missions or duties (*sug las*=*lag las*) of *Shañ rGyal mtshan* mentioned here in Line 15 and those of the two *Shañ lon* in Line 16 must respectively be related with the expelling of *No-ho-po* and the expedition to the *Sung-chou* 松州 area where a battle was fought against *Hou-chün-chi* 侯君集 in 638 A. D. Cf. Notes 105, 108.

(31) Thomas' translation for *rjes nas* "having changed" is not acceptable. This word means "after" or "and then". The battle with the T'ang army ended in the ninth month of that year in the Chinese calendar.

(32) A "big census" or "inspection" (*rtsis ched po*) was generally carried out in winter. It was the time during which there were little movements for the nomad (*ḥbrog pa*), and no busy tasks for the farmers (*shiñ pa*), nor the military men (*rgod sde*) were engaged in battles. From this census (in winter), we could tell that the change of years was mentioned in the missing part in Line 16. Also we can guess from the beginning of Line 17 that the *sku bla* festival of early summer was held there (= *g-Yañ can mkhar*). It is indicated that the royal residence was then changed for summer. From the context in the beginning of Line 18 we can tell that something on the royal residence for winter was continuously mentioned at the end of Line 17. From the fact that another audit (*rtsis ched po*) was referred to in Line 20, we can tell that a complete cycle of seasons for one year was dealt with between the end of Line 16 and Line 20.

(33) In the missing part, there must have been sentences which refer to the following: After they moved to the royal residence for winter, the feast, also, to pray for the king's longevity was held there. This succession can be confirmed by the phrase in the beginning of Line 18. Possibly the place was *g-Yañ can mkhar*.

(34) Thomas reads this sentence as "invited the *Ḥa sha* again (*sla yañ*=*slar yañ*) there". However, the part he reads as *Ḥa sha* can only be deciphered as *ḥi sku*. There is no *r* for *slar* and it is more likely to *bla* than to *sla*. It is quite obvious when we compare this sentence with other letters in this document. See Line 21.

(35) After the ceremony of enthronement, the Prince (*lha sras*) came to be called here by the official title of the King: *ḥphrul gyi lha btsan po*. The missing part was tentatively supplemented by the author. It should be noted that the royal residence which had been called by this year, "*sras gyi pho brañ*" or "*lha sras gyi pho brañ*", was thenceforth called simply "*pho brañ*". It was none other than *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* who became the King of God's Incarnate (*ḥphrul gyi lha btsan po*) from the Prince (*lha sras*) at that time.

19. dB((aḥs)) sToñ re gnad ñuñ la dBaḥs⁽³⁶⁾ sToñ re gnad ñuñ⁽³⁷⁾ and
stsogs pa mchis te/hdun ma others came, and the Council (was held)
(bsduste?)... (⊗ dben sa)
20. rkañ [bkris] sna drugi ((sruñ)) Six obligatory⁽³⁸⁾ services for rkañ⁽³⁹⁾
btāb/rkañ ton dañ rtsis ched [=a unit of groups] were imposed to
po bgyi... (phagi loḥi) perform⁽⁴⁰⁾. Conscription(?)⁽⁴¹⁾ and a big
(⊗ [g]yuh) inspection were carried out. (The
Hog year⁽⁴²⁾)
21. lo sar[⊗] dañ/dbyar sla ra baḥi passed into a new year—[640 A.D.]—
sku bla ched po gsol/de nas The great feast, also, of the first summer
zla ba... (ḥphrul gyi lha btsan to pray for the king's longevity was re-
po Guñ sroñ guñ) spectfully held.
(⊗ sor) And then⁽⁴³⁾formonths
(the God's incarnate, btsan po Guñ
Sroñ guñ⁽⁴⁴⁾)

(36) Thomas reads this part "an assemblage . . . at the hermitage (dben sa)". Since there is no *la don* to express the locative sense of "at the hermitage", the author takes this as one of the famous clan names: *dBaḥs* of *dBaḥs sToñ re gnad ñuñ*.

(37) *gnad ñuñ* should be read as the last part of a personal name since it is followed by *la stsogs pa*.

(38) Usually, *bkris* is taken to be another form of *ḥkhrid* (to lead), but here it can be considered to be derived from the causative form of *ḥkhri* (to be engaged in), to mean "obligation" "compulsion". Thomas' interpretation, "foot wrapping" is not acceptable here (TLTD, II, p. 11).

(39) *rkañ* is the name for a unit of groups. In Desgodins: DTLF, p. 36 b, there is *rkañ rub*, an ancient form for the presentday form, *gar mo*, to mean "masse compacte". *rub pa* is "to forge", therefore, *rkañ rub* means "a lump of material which was forged". Even today *rkañ* has the meaning of "a basic group", "material", or "one's place of origin".

(40) There are two divisions of *g-yuñ sde* and *rgod sde*. As to the meaning of *g-yuñ sde*, there are different opinions. It is supposed to mean functional groups of citizens, while *rgod sde* is the organization of military groups. According to KG, f. 20b, *g-yuñ sde* is defined as the (*kheñ=bran*) and their servants (*yañ kheñ=yañ bran*). It enumerates 9 lords (*rje dgu*) (=agriculture), 7 shepherd groups (*rdzi bdun*), 6 artisan groups (*mkhan drug*), 5 tradesmen groups (*tshon pa lña*), and three underservant groups (*hdzin gsum*). If the 6 kinds of *g-yuñ* are referred to here in this line, then it can be taken that the allocation of 6 professions (*mkhan drug*) was carried out. As to *rgod* and *g-yuñ*, see R. A. Stein: "Deux notules d'histoire ancienne du Tibet", *Journal Asiatique*, 1963, pp. 327-330. From the photographic copy, all I could decipher is *sruñ*, which means with *btāb* "were imposed to perform".

(41) *rkañ ton* means "drawing out (*hdon*, *btōn*) from the unit of group (*rkañ*). This phrase is often used in the *T'un huang Annals*. Thomas' interpretation is untenable (TLTD II, p. 428).

(42) "The Hog year (*phagi loḥi*)" is supplemented here on the grounds discussed in the Note 32.

(43) It should be noted that, contrary to the usual style, no shift of the royal residence for summer is mentioned here, and it goes right into the story of Princess *Wên-ch'êng*.

(44) The end of the missing part of Line 21 must have been what is shown in () brackets in the present text.

22. btsan gyi (btsun mor) (khab tu?) rGya rjeḥi sras mo Mun ḥ[e]ñ kon co bshe[s]... Princess *Wên-ch'êng*, a daughter of the Chinese ruler, was taken [as a queen of (the God's incarnate, *btsan po Guñ sroñ guñ*) *btsan*]⁽⁴⁵⁾...
23. shañ bTsan to re dañ ḥBro shañ Khri bzañ kha ce stoñ dañ/Cog ro... (ḥBro shañ brTan) (ḥBro shañ brTan) (⊗ btañ) *shañ bTsan to re*⁽⁴⁶⁾ and *ḥBro shañ Khri bzañ kha ce stoñ*⁽⁴⁷⁾ and *Cog ro*⁽⁴⁸⁾... .., (*ḥBro shañ brTan*)⁽⁴⁹⁾
24. [sg]ra ya sto mch[is] nas/de nas btsan mo Khri bañs dañ/ sras Ma ga tho gon kha gan... (⊗ ya is not clear) *-sgra ya sto* came⁽⁵⁰⁾, and then Queen Khri *bañs*, [the Mother of King *Ha sha*], and her Son *Ma ga (tho gon kha gan)*
25. gḥegs nas/yum sras kyī sham riñ du/Ḥa shaḥi shañ lon [ched po]... arrived, and then as the Lord chamberlain for the Queen Mother and the Prince, Great *shañ lon* of⁽⁵¹⁾ *Ḥa sha*....
26. Da ((re da)) blon yi dañ/ Mug lden daḥi dvon svoñ dañ/ ((daḥi)) son ḥvañ... *Da re da blon yi*, and *Mug lden daḥi dvon svoñ*, and *Daḥi son ḥvañ*⁽⁵²⁾...

- (45) In the missing part, it must have been indicated where and for what purpose the persons mentioned in Line 23 were dispatched. There is absolutely no reason for them to go to Kashmir as Thomas suggested (see Note 46). Possibly they were sent to China to welcome the Princess on the way.
- (46) The KG, *Ja f.* 47b, mentions a *sNubs bTsan to re* as a minister for *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*. However, this is not suitable here, for there is no evidence in documents that *sNubs* was a *shañ*.
- (47) *kha ce* is a part of a personal name; Thomas' translation "sent to Kashmir" is not acceptable. There is no particle of locative, *la don*, here, and in the old Tibetan literature there are hardly any example of locative in lack of a particle *la don*.
- (48) As to the *Cog ro* family, see Note 4. *Cuñ bzañ ḥdam koñ* is mentioned in Line 2 and *sToñ re koñ zuñ*, in Line 48.
- (49) *ḥBro shañ brTan sgra ya sto* is mentioned as *mDo blon ched po* in Line 32. He came to pay respects to the *bTsan po* after a new royal residence for summer had been founded. See Note 64.
- (50) *sgra* cannot be clearly read in the photographic copy. The one who is referred to must be *mDo blon ched po brTsan sgra ya sto*. Probably he came from *Khams* (see Line 32 and Note 64) and other officials of high ranks came from Tibet proper to welcome the Princess.
- (51) In Line 34, it says that *shañ lon gyi gtso (bo) Da re da soñ (da poñ?)* of the *Ḥa sha* Court died. It is possible for us to take that a *shañ lon (ched po)* mentioned first as one of the retainers of the *Kha gan* could have been he. The *Kha gan*'s party came to welcome Princess *Wên-ch'êng*.
- (52) Thomas' reading of this line is not acceptable. Both *dñi dbon* and *rta dpon* in his reading is untenable. The vowel sign *i* of *dñi* is not clear. It should rather be deciphered as "*Mug lden daḥi dvon svoñ*" (Cf. Line 52). The word in Line 27 is not *dpon* to mean "chief", but must be the end of a place name where a cluster of tents were pitched.

(⊗ Da red blon yi dañ/
(Mug lden dñi dbon sor dañ/
[rta] dpon Wañ...)

27. o(ñ) dur/phuñi thob pa/thabs at.....oñ du, the residences⁽⁵³⁾ and
can gi mchis brañ la stsogs e... others of the men⁽⁵⁴⁾ of high rank⁽⁵⁵⁾
(⊗[p]on dañ) who were assigned (to welcome the
Chinese Princess) and of men with
titles⁽⁵⁶⁾ were
28. Mun çeñ khon co dañ mjal granted an audience⁽⁵⁷⁾ to Princess Wên-
nas/phān tshun phyag bgyis/ ch'êng and [the two] each exchanged the
ston (mo ched po gsol nas... greetings. (A great) banquet (was held)
hbul skyems)(from the Princess to bTsan po the
presents)
29. sna mañ po phul/de nas Mun of many sorts were offered⁽⁵⁸⁾. After
çe[n kho]n co rTsañ yul dbusu that, at the center of the rTsañ coun-
... (⊗ Dboñ) try⁽⁵⁹⁾, Princess Wên-ch'êng.....

(53) In the presentday *mchis brañ* means "madam", but in old documents it means a residence for the aristocracy, in contrast to the royal residence (*pho brañ*). See Yamaguchi: "Retrospect and Prospect", in the *Shigaku Zasshi*, 75-5, 1965, p. 257.

(54) The word *thob pa* means "the men on duty", "one who is entrusted to do something", "one who is chosen, (or assigned) to do things". It seems to be derived from the same root with *thabs*. See Note 55.

(55) The word *phu*, together with the meaning of "the recesses of a mountain", means "men of high ranks", "men of the upper class" or "the superior". It is known also in the sense of "elder brother".

(56) Judging from the usage of *thabs spar* in Line 49, *thabs* means clearly "a rank of officials". It can be confirmed by its usage seen on the South Face of the T'ang fan-hui-meng-pei 唐蕃會盟碑.

(57) This paragraph refers to the event that Guñ sroñ guñ btsan granted an audience to Princess Wên-ch'êng and the two exchanged the greetings. In today's usage, *mjal* is a honorific term to say an act of meeting by a person in the superior position. For instance, the king grants an audience to his subordinate (*mjal kha gnañ*); A subordinate begs to have an audience of the King (*mjal kha shu*). In the text, it says, "*khon co dañ mjal*", so that it cannot mean that some one in the lower position than the Princess saw her, it must be Guñ sroñ guñ btsan who met the Princess. It is just impossible to take this passage in the sense that the *Kha gan* of the *Ha sha* court, whose authority the T'ang Court did not recognize, exchanged greetings (*phyag bgyis*) with the Chinese Princess. Nor in the documents there is any scriptural evidence to prove such an incident. (Cf. TLTD, II, pp. 14-15) One should always keep in mind that the main concern of the description of this document is on Guñ sroñ guñ btsan.

(58) This was done by the Princess to Guñ sroñ.

(59) The reading of the rTsañ Country (*rtsaṅ yul*) is verified by other sources; *rtsaṅ* (DTH, p. 17), *rtsaṅ chen* (*ibid.*, pp. 16, 17, 21, 22, 24), *rtsaṅ bod* (*ibid.*, pp. 100, 106, pp. 111-112), *rtsaṅ brañ* (*ibid.*, p. 107). Thomas' reading, "in the middle of the *Dbon* country", is not acceptable, because his *o* vowel for *dboñ* is based on the misreading of the upper part of the letter *tsa* and what was taken for the prefix *d-* by him, compared with other occurrences of *d-* and *da* in this document, must be *r*. The letter *rtsis* in Line 16 should be consulted.

30. dur btab/de nas pho brañ erected at... *du*⁽⁶⁰⁾. Then⁽⁶¹⁾, a royal residence was built at *Joñ yo du*⁽⁶²⁾ of *Tsog*; in winter (the residence of *bTsan po*, God's incarnate, was moved to *Tsha çod du çod*⁽⁶³⁾, and)
31. sla ra bañi sku bla ched po yañ the great feast, also, of the first (winter) to pray for the king's longevity was respectfully held there⁽⁶⁴⁾.
 der gsol/deñi dbyar pho
 bra^(ñ)...
 (⊗[brañ]Lda(?) mñ[mj]?) —[The following is the record of that year having no direct relevance to the Princess Wên-ch'êng.]

(60) Perhaps this can be reconstructed for some place name as *Tsogi Joñ yo du*.

(61) The phrase "after that (*de nas*)" refers to "after the marriage" in the autumn. (See Note 100).

(62) Thomas' reading "*Tsogi Rboñ yo du*" can be replaced by "*Tsogi Joñ yo du*, (?=*rDziñ bu hdu*, a cluster of swamps in *Tsog*)". *Tsog* is a place name (see TLTD, III, p. 23). This cluster of swamps possibly refer to *Pai-hai* 栢海. *rboñ* is a misreading of *Joñ* which is not clearly written.

(63) Judging from the entry on Line 31, the shift to a new royal residence for winter must have been referred to in the missing part. In Line 37, as an event of the next year, it says, "In the winter of that year also, (*bTsan po*) lived in *Tsha çod*," Therefore, it must have been no other place but *Tsha çod* that the King moved to live in the winter of this year. See Note 28. After the King gave up *Sra bal gyi g-Yañ can mkhar* for the winter residence, he stayed at *Tsha çod* during the winter season since this year. And, after he had settled well at *Tsha çod*, he spent the summer time also in this place. Possibly, a passage in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*: "He had such a fine castle built for the Princess as to be proud of in later years" refers to his royal residence at *Tsha çod*. According to the *T'un-huang Annals*, the Princess's settlement at *Bod yul* happened in the year 640. (See DTH, p. 13 and Note 70 in the first half of this article.) The country of *Ha sha* cannot be called *Bod yul*, while *Tsha çod* is *Tsha ba roñ* (Note 103) of today, in *kham*s, so-called *Bod drañ po* (*Bod* proper). Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that they settled in the royal residence at *Tsha çod* in this year (640 A. D.).

(64) From the conclusion reached in Note 63, it is the word *dgun*, not *dbyar*, that comes at the end of Line 30. After the King's settlement at *Tsha çod*, the indispensable feast to pray for the King's longevity was held there. To place a change of years in the missing part of Line 30, which is found just between "*dgun*" and "*deñi dbyar*", is too mechanical (cf. TLTD, II, p. 11). The royal residence at *Tsogi Joñ yo du*, in Line 30, is a special one built immediately after the Princess's advent to Tibet, in late autumn, and it was not a regular *pho brañ* for summer. After the phrase "*deñi dbyar*" in Line 31, what happened in that year, other than those related to the advent of the Princess, are retrospectively described from the summer of that year (see Note 43). This can be proved on the following reasons: 1) Even considering for the missing parts, there is no room than here in Line 30, for the most important references to the shift of the royal residence for winter to *Tsha çod* and to the feast of winter to pray for the King's longevity, down to Line 35. 2) On Line 32, there is a reference to the visit of *hBro shañ brTan sgra ya sto*. Since he was a minister (*blon ched*) of *mDo* (*Kham*s), it is very probable that the primary purpose of his visit was to welcome the Princess Wên-ch'êng at *Ha sha*. As for the sequence of the matters, the events described in Line 24 come after these mentioned in Line 32. See Note 65.

- In the summer of that year, royal residence⁽⁶⁵⁾
32. mDo blon ched po ḥBro shañ brTan sgra ya sto la stsogs pa phyag ḥtshal (te ston mo ched po gsol...) ḥBro shañ brTan sgra ya sto, Minister of mDo⁽⁶⁶⁾, and others paid respects to [bTsan po.] (A great banquet was held . . .)
33. pha ḥbabs dañ/bya dgaḥ ched po stsal te rlag brdzañs/deḥi s((t)o((n))...) Royal grants and big rewards were given to remunerate their services⁽⁶⁷⁾. In the autumn of that year.
34. deḥi dgun Ḥa shaḥi shañ lon gyi ((gtso))/Da ((re da soñ)) yi gum/de nas... In the winter of that year, *Da re da soñ* yi, chief⁽⁶⁸⁾ of *shañ lon* of *Ḥa sha*, passed away. Then later⁽⁶⁹⁾,
- (⊗ gco/ da red poñ)
35. g-yuḥi yi ge ni deḥi rtsa rol du thob/nañ gi blon po shal ce p[olr... (byi ba loḥi) A warrant of appointment⁽⁷⁰⁾ written in turquoise powder was given⁽⁷¹⁾ to the family⁽⁷²⁾. As the Home Minister⁽⁷³⁾

(65) On Line 21, *dbyar sla ra baḥi sku bla* (the feast of the first summer to pray for the King's longevity) is mentioned. Between Line 21 and Line 31, nothing is mentioned on the summer residence (*dbyar sa*). The feast of summer to pray for the King's longevity was held after the royal residence was built at a new place (see Lines 11 and 12), but more often was held before the shift of the royal residence (see Lines 5, 6, 16, and 17).

(66) See Notes 49 and 64.

(67) This sentence seems like a cliché for the the deeds of the King for his subjects. See Lines 3 and 4.

(68) It should definitely be read *gtso*. See Note 51.

(69) Possibly, something like "from the Tibetan court, in praise of the meritorious deeds of *Da re soñ yi*" was written in the missing part. There is no room for another personal name in the missing part and it is continued to Line 35, which say that a higher rank was granted to his family (*rtsa rol*), *Ḥa sha* was already in vassalage (*ḥbañs*) to the Tibetan court.

(70) *g-Yuḥi yi ge* is an official notice, given to a person of the highest rank. It corresponds to *sê-sê* 瑟瑟 (*kao-shen* 告身) in the Chinese books. According to KG (*Ja*, f. 21a, l. 5), there are 12 kinds of the official notes, consisting of 6 classes each with the upper and the lower divisions. (See Note 87). In the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* there is a detailed description and in the beginning of the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* there is a short description of these official notes. The first is *g-yu*, and the second is *gser gyi yi ge*. The *g-yu yig chen po* is given only to *dguñ blon chen po*, and *g-yu yig chuñ nu* is a form of the official notice given to *dguñ blon ḥbriñ po* and *nañ blon chen po*. The official notes for the other tribes have not always the same value as these for Tibetan to indicate the official rank. See M. Lalou: "Revendication des Fonctionnaires du Grand Tibet au VIII siècle", *Journal Asiatique*, 1955, pp. 171-212.

(71) *Thob* is related with *thabs*, or *ḥdams* meaning "to allot", and corresponds to *gtams* or *bltams* of the present-day.

(72) The word *rol* means "gap", "room" and "groove", and then it comes to mean "about there". *rtsa* means "blood relationship". *rtsa rol* means "kinsman" or "clan-member".

(73) *Nañ gi blon po shal ce po* must the same as *nañ blon chen po*. *shal ce* is *shal lce*, meaning a title given by the order of the *bTsan po* himself. The following is a list of the nine ministers (*shañ blon ched po dgu*; *shang-lun-ch'ê-pu-t'u-chü* 尚論掣逋突瞿)

36. lo s((a))[⊗]r dañ/dbyar sla ra bañi the (Mouse) year passed into a new year
 sku bla yañ der gsol/de nas [641 A.D.], the great feast, also, of the
 ston [mo]... (⊗ s[a]r) first summer to pray for the king's
 longevity was respectfully held there
 [=Tsha çod]⁽⁷⁴⁾. Later a great banquet

 37. de nas deñi dgun yañ Tsha çod Then, in the winter of that year also
 du bshugste/btsan mo Khri [b'Tsan po and the Queen] lived in Tsha

in the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* and in KG, Ja. f. 21b, 1. 3:

Hsin T'ang shu T'u fan ch'uan	論 莖	論 莖 屬 莽	悉 編 掣 逋
Tibetan equivalents to the above Chinese	blon che	blon che hog pon	spyān (=spyān khyab) ched po
KG	1. dguñ blon chen po	2. dguñ blon ḥbriñ (po)	4. dguñ blon chuñ
Notes	They behave like a husband, and have the exclusive power to appoint and dismiss officials. (KG f. 21b, 1.3)		

Hsin T'ang shu T'u fan ch'uan	曩 論 掣 逋	曩 論 覓 零 逋	曩 論 充
Tibetan equivalents to the above Chinese	nañ blon ched po	nañ blon ḥbriñ po	nañ blon chuñ
KG	3. nañ blon chen po	5. nañ blon ḥbriñ (po)	7. nañ blon chuñ
Notes	They behave like a wise woman, and manage to find temporizing financial measures. (KG. f. 21b, 1.3)		

Hsin T'ang shu T'u fan ch'uan	喻 寒 波 掣 逋	喻 寒 波 覓 零 逋	喻 寒 波 充
Tibetan equivalents to the above Chinese	yo gal (ḥchos) pa ched po	yo gal (ḥchos) pa ḥbriñ po	yo gal (ḥchos) pa chuñ
KG	6. bkaḥ yo gal ḥchos pa chen po	8. bkaḥ yo gal ḥchos pa ḥbriñ (po)	9. bkaḥ yo gal ḥchos pa chuñ
Notes	They praise a virtuous act of an enemy's son and punish even their own son for a sinful act. (KG f. 21b, 1.6)		

See KTK pp. 719-723. The figures in the table show the ranking of the nine ministers in KG.

* *btsan poñi bkaḥ la yo ḥgal byed pa bcos pa* means "to rectify those who disobey the *bTsan po*'s words".

- (74) The description between *dgun* in Line 30 and *der gsol* in Line 31 is followed by the entry on the New Year and the feast in this line.

- bañs (dañ sras Ma ga to gon kha gan gyi ħbul skyems nod du mchiste dBaħs...)
38. shañ ñen gyi bu/dBaħs Khri bzañ spo skyes la stsal te brdzañs... *Ma ga to*
39. gon kha gan gyi khab du/Mug lden Ha rod par gyi bu mo/Mug (lden)...
40. bkvag nas/mtshan yañ A lye bañ dig shiñ du btags/...
41. de nas [glañ] gi lo la/pho brañ Tsha çod du btab nas/lo sar dañ dbya[r] (sla ra baħi sku bla yañ der gsol/... (⊗ s[o]r)
42. las pyuñste/skyin bar Çud pu Khri gzu sbur cuñ bskos/byuñ (baħi)... (⊗ byuñ)
43. deħi dbyar pho brañ Tsha çod du bshugste/lcam Khon co gñi ħod (dañ ħdraħ bar gdañs paħi lha sras sku bltamste ston mo)
- çod⁽⁷⁵⁾. From *Khri bañs*, Queen Mother, (and her son *Ma ga to gon kha gan*, *Ha sha* King, the presents were brought. *dBaħs*).....⁽⁷⁶⁾
- shañ ñen's* son, *dBaħs Khri bzañ spo skyes*⁽⁷⁷⁾ was ordered to deliver presents [in return].... For *Ma ga to -gon kha gan*, as his queen a daughter of *Mug lden Ha rod par*, *Mug (lden)*.....
- was taken⁽⁷⁸⁾ and was named *A lye bañ dig shiñ*⁽⁷⁹⁾.
- Then, within the Ox year, a royal residence was built at *Tsha çod*. Thereafter, the year passed into a new year⁽⁸⁰⁾ [642 A.D.], the feast, also, of the first summer was respectfully held there to pray for the king's longevity.....
- was relieved of (his office). In his place, *Çud pu Khri gzu sbur cuñ* was appointed. Discharged
- In that summer, residing in the royal residence of *Tsha çod*, the Queen (*Wên-ch'êng*) *Khon co* (bore a prince who was as radiant as) the sun-beam⁽⁸¹⁾. For

(75) Cf. Notes 63 and 64.

(76) This is a tentative reconstruction.

(77) The words *spo skyes* must be a part of a personal name. In the modern usage, *skyes* means a gift, but in the old days, *skyems* was used to mean a gift. The word *brdzañs* is "sent a gift", and here it means "delivered something (in return)". Considering this exchange of gifts together with *ston (mo)* in Line 36, we can take this envoy for the purpose of celebrating the Princess's conception.

(78) The word *bkvag* seems to be the same as *khab tu bshes*. If the spelling *bkvag* is right, it shows the word in a process of change from *bkug* to *bkag* and it retains the original meaning of "to keep in custody". Or it may be deciphered *bkab*.

(79) This *dig shiñ* comes at the end of the name of the *Ha sha* queen. Probably it was a title for the queen. Cf. Line 49. See TLTD, II, p. 16.

(80) "Then, within the Ox year, a royal residence was built at *Tsha çod*. Thereafter, the year passed into a new year..." Since, prior to this line, already there was the description of the events in the Ox year, *lo sar*, qualified explicitly by no name of year, should mean that "the Ox year passed into a new year". If *lo sar* is to mean "the year came", then the sentence here would be contradictory like "after building the royal residence within the Ox year, the Ox year came". Cf. Note 11.

(81) The word *gñi ħod* should be read as *ñi ħod*, and it cannot be the name of the Princess. *lCam khon cho* is none other than *Wên-ch'êng*, and the term needs not any qualification more. In the T'un-huang documents, it is not unusual that *ñi* is

- celebration,)
44. ched po gsol te/rdzoñs kyañ a great (banquet) was respectfully held
nod du mchis/slar yañ yañ... and (congratulatory) presents were
brought. Furthermore, again and
again.....
45. ((gzah[⊗])) brgyaḥ dañ/rña mo hundred pieces of silk⁽⁸⁴⁾, camels to-
yañ rña rdzi dañ bcas/rta yañ gether with men in charge of camels,
rta rdzi dañ bcas... and horses together with men in charge
of horses.....
- (⊗g[z]a)
46. dañ bcaste brdzañs/((de nas[⊗])) together with.....) were presented⁽⁸³⁾
[m]chis paḥi dBaḥs dpon g-yog [in return]. Then⁽⁸⁵⁾, to all of dBaḥs
ri[l] (por ston mo pha babs dañ and his followers who came, (a banquet
bya dgaḥ stsal...) (⊗ pha sde) was given and the gifts and rewards were
granted⁽⁸⁶⁾.....)
47. de nas pho brañ Tsha ḥod du Then, [*bTsan po* and the Queen] stayed
bshugste/dgun sla ra baḥi sku at the royal residence of *Tsha ḥod*, while
bla ched po gsol/(deḥi dgun... the great feast, also, of the first winter,
gnam gyi sras) *Ma ga tho* to pray for the king's longevity was re-
spectfully held [there.] (In that winter,
..... for (the son of the heaven,) *Ma-*
ga tho gon kha gan, as a consort, *Cog*
ro sToñ re koñ zuñ gi ro, daughter of *Cog ro sToñ re*
48. gon kha gan gyi khab tu/Cog
ro sToñ re koñ zuñ gi

written in the form of *gñi*. On Line 44, it says that a great feast was held and the congratulatory presents were brought, probably for celebrating the birth of the Prince. From the context, the missing part in Line 43 can be reconstructed, for example, as shown in the above text. This reconstruction is supported in view of the fact that the year of birth of *Mañ slon mañ brtsan*, as critically calculated on the basis of the theories of the later historians, fell on this year and also that there was no other important incident, concerning *lcam Khon co* at that time, than this birth of the Prince. *gdañs* is an ancient form of *mdañs*.

- (82) The verb *nod* is explained as *thob*, *bshag*, *brnag* or *len* to mean “to receive”, or “to accept”. (See DTLF, p. 566a). It is an intransitive verb, originally to mean “to contain”, out of which a noun *snod*, “a vase, container”, is formed.
- (83) In the missing part, there must have been an entry about the gifts from the father, *Khri sroñ brtsan*. In Line 46, it is mentioned that *ḥBaḥs* and his followers were present at *Tsha ḥod*. (As to the relation between *dBaḥs* and *Khri sroñ brtsan*, see DTH, pp. 108–110.) The gifts given in return, mentioned in Line 45, must have been addressed to *Khri sroñ brtsan*, in view of their scale and quantity.
- (84) Thomas' notation in TLTD, III, p. 23, cannot be accepted. *gzah* is an archaic form of *za*. Seen from the modern usage like *za ber*, *za bab*, *za ḥog* or *na bzah*, in all except in the last case, *za* means silk fabrics. *za ḥdzom* is fine cotton fabrics but seems to be derived from *za rdzu ma* (fake silk).
- (85) *Pha sde* in Thomas' reading means “parental relatives.” If this word comes to mean “people who came from the father's side”, then it must have been written, not as *pha sde*, but as *yab sde*. The present writer chose to read *de nas* as shown in the text, after distinguishing the stains on the sheet.
- (86) The missing part could be reconstructed approximately as shown in the above text.

- bu mo Cog ro... (bsheste mtshan yañ)...
 49. dig shiñ du btags/sToñ re khoñ
 zuñ thabs spar te dñul gyi yi
 ge...
 50. btab nas/stagi loñi lo [⊗] sar dañ
 ((dbyar sla)) [⊗] ra bañi sku bla
 ched po (yañ der gsol/...)
 (⊗ s[o]r) (⊗ d[gun sla])
 51. riñ lugs/dBañ sTag sgra khoñ
 -o- [⊗] dañ/Cog ro sToñ ((re))
 (khoñ zuñ) (⊗ [lod(?)dañ]) (⊗ na)
 52. sToñ ñen ((sb))urkoñ dañ/Mug
 lden dañi dven sven dañ/Da
 re [⊗] da (⊗ [ur(sbur?)]) (⊗ Da red)
 53. stsal te/Ha sha yul du mchis
 nas/hbañs Ha sha phrogs...
 (⊗ phyogs)
- koñ zuñ, (was taken and she was named
)
 -dig shiñ. [Her father] sToñ re
 khon zuñ was promoted to a higher rank
 and [given] an official warrant of ap-
 pointment in silver letters⁽⁸⁷⁾
 was built. Then, the Tiger year
 passed into a new year [643 A.D.],
 when the great feast, also, of the first
 summer⁽⁸⁸⁾ (was held there to pray for
 the king's longevity)
 a commissioner⁽⁸⁹⁾ [of bTsan po], and
 dBaḥs sTag sgra khoñ -o- and Cog ro
 sToñ re (khoñ zuñ)
 sToñ ñen sbur koñ and Mug lden dañi
 dven sven⁽⁹⁰⁾ and Da re da
 were ordered, so that [they] went to the
 country of Ha sha. Later, Ha sha, which
 was in vassalage, was plundered⁽⁹¹⁾,

(87) He was promoted to a higher rank in recognition of his services in offering his daughter as a consort of the Ha sha king. As to the word thabs, see Note 56, and as to spar, see Note 24. A similar context can be found in Lines 10 and 11. In the present case, however, it is clear that the promotion of ranks was accorded by Tibetan court. There are twelve kinds of the official notes of appointment: 1. g-yu; 2. gser; 3. phra men; 4. dñul; 5. zañs; 6. lcags; each class having the upper and the lower divisions. KG (Ja. f. 21a, l. 5) gives a different order of rankings as 2, 1, 4, 3, 5, 6. See Note 70. According to K.G., (Ja, f. 21a-b), the official note in silver (dñul gyi yi ge) comes in reality at the 10th or 11th in grades.

(88) Thomas reads this word dbyar erroneously as dgun. These two words are similar in script and are apt to be mistaken. In the photocopy in TLTD, III, it is more clearly seen as dbyar rather than dgun.

(89) It seems to mean "high commissioner" here (Cf. TLTD, II p. 16). riñ lugs, as in the case of riñ lugs of bSam yas in the rBa bshed, means the cardinal abbot (都僧統). It can be paraphrased as "bkañ la hbrin ste (in accordance with the words of the Buddha or King), lugs (put in a mold or develop into a definite shape)". The original meaning of lugs is "to pour", and then here it means "to realize (a project)". Derived from this original meaning, riñ lugs sometimes comes to mean "an ordinance". (Cf. DTH, p. 23, stagi lo (726); *ibid.*, p. 27, phagi lo (747); TLTD, III, p. 182. TLTD, II pp. 56, 59, 66, 139. For the latter usage: TLTD, II, pp. 51, 81.

(90) Tañi dven sven seems to be the name of an office, probably of Chinese origin. Cf. Line 26. Thomas' interpretation is not acceptable. (See TLTD, III, p. 23).

(91) "Later, Ha sha, which was in vassalage of Tibetan court, was plundered." Naturally, the persons mentioned on the Line 51 and 52 were those who were mobilized to take precautionary measures against the disturbance.

The relationship between T'u-yu-hun with the support of the T'ang court and Ha sha with the support of the Tibetan court, as the present writer understands it, is as

follows:

In DTH, p. 111, it says: "After that, before *bTsan po* himself started for subjugative expedition (*byañ pa*, to tame), or moved his forces, there took place already a diplomatic complication (*dpyah gcal/dpyah hchal*; such as dispute on the tributary relations) between China and *Ha sha* (=T'u-yu-hun). *Thog ma Ha sha*, who had been in alliance with the Tibetan camp, after that, came to be in vassalage (to the Tibetan court)." With this occurrence as the turning point, *Thog ma Ha sha* came to be called as *Baṅs Ha sha* in the succeeding part of this document.

As we could see in the *T'ung-tien*, *T'u-fan* Tibet was no despicable power already in the beginning of the *T'ang* period (618—). The reference in DTH, as quoted above, is found in the entry on *Myañ Mañ po rje shañ snañ*, the Chief Minister (*blon che*) of *Khri sroñ brtsan* in his earliest time. These two facts lead us to conclude that the diplomatic complication mentioned in DTH must be the one caused by *Fu-yün* 伏允 of T'u-yu-hun and his battle against *Yang-ti* 楊帝 in the 5th year of *Ta-yeh* 大業 (609), which is described fully in Bk. 181 of the *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑. It is not clear what "after that (*de nas*)" actually means, according to this document alone.

Thog ma Ha sha, as named in p. 111 of DTH, seems to refer to *Ha sha* in association with the Tibetan court after *Khri baṅs* of the *T'u-fan* family got married to the *Ha sha* King. When did this marriage of *Khri baṅs* take place? Since her son, *Kha gan*, took a consort in 636, he must have been 15 or 16 years old by that time. If so, her marriage should have taken place in a year prior to 620 at least. On the other hand, *Fu-yün* recovered his old territory at the end of the *Sui* Dynasty and later he attacked *Li-huei* 李軌 after taking *Kao-tsu's* pledge to return *Fu-yün's* eldest son, *Mu-jung shun(-kuang)* 慕容順 (光), who had been held as hostage in the *T'ang* court and who became in later years the Prince of *T'ai-ning* 太寧王. It is dated in the 2nd year of *Wu-tê* 武德 (the 1st and the 5th months in 619. *T'ung-chien*, Bk. 187) After the battle with *Li-kuei*, *Fu-yün* "frequently sent envoys to the *T'ang* court with tributes, requesting the return of *Shun*". (頻遣使朝貢以順爲請 in the *T'u-yu-hun ch'uan* of the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 198). (According to the Chapter of the Foreign Tributaries 3 in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, Bk. 970, the envoys were sent in the second, the ninth, and the eleventh months of that year—619.) After that, *Fu-yün's* request was granted, *Shun* was released from hostage. It must have been after 620. *Shun* was held as hostage in *Sui* in the fifth year of *Ta-yeh* 大業 (609) after the defeat of *Fu-yün*. And, he was out of his home country about ten years. During his absence, it is said that his younger brother (according to the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, but *t'a-tzu* 他子 according to the *Chiu T'ang-shu*) was made the heir apparent to the Crown. It is very probable, therefore, that the husband of *Khri baṅs* was this younger brother. *Fu-yün* invaded *Shan-chou* 鄯州 right after the ascension of *T'ai-tsung* in 626. When *T'ai-tsung* accused him of his invasion, he dared to ask *T'ai-tsung* to grant a Chinese princess as a bride of his son, *Tsun-wang* 尊王. (See the *T'u-yu-hun ch'uan* in the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, Bk. 198). Wasn't it right that the heir apparent mentioned above was this son? It is possible that *Fu-yün* requested a Chinese princess with an intention to hold the balance between the *T'ang* and the *T'u-fan* pressures, rather than to find how *T'ai-tsung* felt toward him as said in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*.

Later, *Shun* slew *T'ien-kuei-wang* 天桂王 and betrayed *T'u-yu-hun* to the *T'ang* side. As a result, isolated *Fu-yün* fled to west and committed suicide there. Then, *Shun* himself was murdered by his subjects. All these happened between the 4th and the 11th months of the 9th year of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀 (635). When we check these events with the descriptions in this Stein document, we can tell that *Shun* was killed by a deliberate maneuver of the *T'u-fan* side. Having *lha sras Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* as their chief the *T'u-fan* army was provided against the *T'ang's* move, in the *Ho-yüan* 河源 district.

54. slar Ȧ sha [yul du]((brla))d de Again⁽⁹²⁾, *bTsan po* went out to support⁽⁹³⁾ the country of *Ȧ sha*, and in his absence⁽⁹⁴⁾,

They did not give positive support to *Fu-yün* nor to *T'ien-kuei-wang*. Their reluctance may be explained partly by the tributary relation they established the year before with the *T'ang* court and the visit of *P'ing tē-chia* 馮德假 to the *T'u-fan* court. But, it is more likely that *Khri sroñ brtsan* was biding his time to get *Ȧ sha* under his rule without taking too much trouble. Needless to say, it was the most undesirable for them to recognize, as the *Khan* 汗, *Shun* who was on the *T'ang* side. The passage "after that, *Ȧ sha* came to be in vassalage (*de nas bañs su mñah ho*)" in DTH (p. 111) refers to *Ȧ sha* after these events of 635. Judging from the context of this document, the husband of *Khri bañs* seems to have been dead by that time. In Chinese books, in reference to the revolt of *Su-ho-kuei* 素和貴, *T'u-fan* is said to be in the relationship of "chiu" 舅 for *T'u-yu-hun*, "sheng" 甥. (See the entry on *Chung-tsun* 仲孫 of the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*). This description of their relationship seems to endorse the above statement on *Khri bañs*' husband. For the view of Thomas on this point, see TLTD, II, pp. 13-16.

- (92) As it is said here, "Again, *bTsan po* went out to support the country of *Ȧ sha*", we can tell that *bTsan po*'s first stay in *Ȧ sha* since 635 was also for the purpose of "supporting *Ȧ sha*". Prior to the second expedition of the King *Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan*, in *T'u-yu-hun*, *Hsüan-wang* 宣王 (*Ch'êng hsiang wang* 丞相王, in the *Chiu-T'ang-shu*) plotted treason against *Mu-jung* 慕容諾曷鉢 and Princess *Hung-hua* 弘化. The plot was laid bare and the latter two took a refuge in *Shan-shan* 鄯善. *Hsüan-wang* himself hoped to flee to the *T'u-fan* camp, but was attacked by the Chinese force led by *Hsi-chün-ku* 席君買 (*Tu-fêng* 杜鳳 in the *Chiu T'ang-shu*) and was killed together with his three brothers. According to the *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*, it was the event in the 4th month of the 15th year of *Chên-kuan* (641). It is rather difficult, therefore, to find a direct connection between the King's second expedition of assistance and the incident described here. According to the two *T'ang-shus*, and the *T'ung-chien*, after the disclosure of the treason, the country of *T'u-yu-hun* fell in a utterly chaotic state and *T'ai-tsung* sent *T'ang-chien* 唐儉 (and *Ma-chou* 馬周, who is mentioned only in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*), for pacification. The *Chiu T'ang-shu* described this pacification after the entry of "the report of the envoy 遣使言狀". According to the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, after the upheaval, the *T'u-yu-hun* court dispatched the official envoys to China twice, in the first month of the 16th year (642), and in the first month of the 17th year (613) of *Chên-kuan*. Therefore, it was after either one of these two official envoys that *T'ang-chien* was sent for pacification. *Ma-chou*, who is mentioned only in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, might have been sent separately from *T'ang-chien*. If so, the Chinese expedition for pacification might have taken place twice. It is possible that *Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan* went to *T'u-yu-hun* at the time of the second disturbance in order to support *Ȧ sha* in alliance with the *T'u-fan* court. The above line of incidents could be supposed on the basis of the descriptions in the Stein document and the Chinese historical data.

- (93) Thomas reads this as *bslad*. But the present author deciphers *brlad*. The phrase *brlad de gcegs* can be translated as "returning into" with difficulty. (TLTD, II, p. 12) The verb *brlad* is another form of *bslad* which can be interpreted to mean "to cooperate with followers" or "to do something in cooperation with someone inferior". Probably, it is derived from the same root as *slad* "behind" (The usage of *slad du* to mean "for the sake of" or "in favor of", is similar to the usage of *phyir* (<*phyi*) in the same connotation.)

- (94) In the historical documents of later years, *lȦ bon*, but not *Mañ slon mañ rtsan*, is said to have died by the fall from a horse. Cf. Note 196.

55. (gçegste) yum *sras* [he] died. The Mother [Chinese Princess] and the Son, [*Mañ slon mañ rtsan*]⁽⁹⁵⁾

Thomas seems to have made a mistake, first of all, in determining the dates. There are only three dates that are clearly mentioned in the above-quoted text: *sprehu lo* (the Ape year) in Line 11, *glañ gi lo* (the Ox year) in the Line 41 and *stagi lo* (the Tiger year) in Line 50. The Ape year falls on 636 A.D., the Ox year 641 A.D., and the Tiger year corresponds to 642 A.D. A cause of his mistake⁽⁹⁶⁾ is that he paid no attention whatsoever to the way the dates are mentioned in the Chinese historical documents⁽⁹⁷⁾ and that he was not aware of the miscalculations of the dates made by A. Csoma de Körös in the translation⁽⁹⁸⁾ of the *bstan rtsis* of the *Vaidūrya dkar po*⁽⁹⁹⁾. This led Thomas to confusion, and as a result, he took *khyihi lo* (the Dog year) in one place for 638 A.D. and in another place for 639 A.D., attributing the discordance to the two different calendars used in China and in Tibet. The year 639 in Körös' Chart was wrongly calculated, which should have been 641, and there is no difference in the calendric system in China and Tibet, so far as this point is concerned⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. In the second place, Thomas took

(95) Thomas, too, deciphers this word as *sras*.

(96) TLTD, II, p. 13.

(97) So far as the present writer sees it, a date mentioned at the beginning of an item in the Chinese annals generally refers very often to the last incident recorded under that item or to the main subject. Incidents mentioned as factors at the first part of the entry were not necessarily dated. Cf. Note 104.

(98) Alexander Csoma de Körös: *A Grammar of the Tibetan Language in English*, Calcutta, 1834, pp. 181-191.

(99) The *Vaidūrya dkar po* is a work on calendar and astrological systems, written by *sde srid Sañs rgyas rgya mtsho* (1653-1705) in 1687. It was customary for a book of this nature to have an independent chapter to discuss the dates of important events in Buddhist history, starting from the Buddha's death as the first year. This is called *bstan rtsis*. In his translation of *bstan rtsis*, Csoma de Körös made a mistake by one year and put down the Fire-Hare Year (*me yos*) of the *rab byuñ dañ po* as 1026 (p. 181). In his Chart he made another miscalculation by two years. (p. 183). Thomas just copied these mistakes without checking them. What *Sañs rgyas rgya mtsho* actually indicated was that the Princess came to Tibet in 641 (f. 19b). This date is based on the information from a Chinese document which was known to Tibet through the *rGya yig tshañ*, but not on the Tibetan tradition as Thomas asserts. There is no supporting evidence either, to set the date for the Dog year (*khyihi lo*) or 639.

(100) Concerning the Tibetan calendric system of this period, the *T'ang-jan-hui-meng-pei* 唐蕃會盟碑 furnishes important historical materials. The Tibetan name of the era, *skyid rtag*, was based on a translation of *Ch'ang-ch'ing* 長慶, the name of an era of the T'ang Dynasty. The Tibetans invented this name as they seemingly understood it as a matter of dignity to have a proper name for each reign. This inscription gives the oldest example in the Tibetan historical documents in which the Five Elements in Male and Female were employed together with the Twelve Animals to show the dates. The dates mentioned in the 58th and 59th lines of the East Face of this inscription correspond completely with what is known from the Chinese sources:

"skyid rtag lo bdun (=the 7th year of *Ral pa can*'s reign) ... lcags mo glañ gi lohi dgun sla ra ba tshes bcu" = "年在癸丑, 冬十月癸酉", (the Pact of Alliance, in the Section of the Foreign Subjects 外臣部, 盟誓 of the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, Bk. 981).

We cannot generalize, however, just by this example alone that Tibet adopted from the old days the Chinese calendar. As the improvised naming of a Tibetan era insinuates us, it seems true that the system of calendar actually used at that time in Tibet was not shown in the inscription of the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei*.

In a book on calendar, entitled as *rTsis dkar nag las brtsam pañi dri len ñin byed dbaṅ poñi snañ ba*, written by the Fifth Dalai Lama *Ñag dbaṅ blo bzah rgya mtsho* (1617-1682), it says, "it is said that under the influence of the Chinese calendric system introduced to Tibet at the time of Princess *Chin-ch'êng*, the Tibetan methods of calculation and of setting up the beginning of a year were greatly disturbed." (f. 28b). This book enumerates the four stages of the introduction of the Chinese calendar to Tibet: 1) the period of Princess *Wên-ch'êng* (actually it means the period of Princess *Chin-ch'êng*), 2) the Period of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, 3) the period of *Ral pa can*, 4) the later period. The four stages are classified into two groups. The former two, 1) and 2), are thoroughly identical. The *Phug lugs*, which became the dominant school in the science of calendar in later years, were the followers of this system (f. 28). According to this system of calendar, the month which contains the winter solstice within is the basic month 正月 and it is the eleventh month of a year (f. 29b). (See *Kloñ rdol gsuñ hbum*, Chap. Ma, f. 21a, l. 3; *Saṅs rgyas rgya mtsho: Vaiḍūrya dkar po*, f. 12b.) It is clearly a copy of the calendric system called *Chou-chêng* 周正 established under the reign of *Tsê-t'ien-wu-hou* 則天武后. (See Takeo Hiraoka: *Tōdai no Koyomi [Calendar in the T'ang Period]*, Kyoto, 1954, p. 8.) Therefore, this calendar which is said to have been brought by Princess *Wên-ch'êng* is definitely a mistake for the one introduced around the time of Princess *Chin-ch'êng*. And the calendar which is said to have been translated by *Vairocana* at the time of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* (742-797) must have been the same system. The *Chou-chêng* was an irregular calendar adopted in a limited term of the T'ang Dynasty. Once that was introduced to Tibet, there must have been unavoidable confusion, as is described in the above-quoted passage in the book of the Fifth Dalai Lama. Prior to the *Phug lugs*, there was the *Nag rtsis pa*, which means "the school of the Chinese calendric science". They followed the Chinese calendric system of *Hsia-chêng* 夏正 which sets the basic month in the first month of a year. (See *Kloñ rdol gsuñ hbum*, Chap. Ma, f. 21a). It is probable that this method, introduced at the time of *Ral pa can* (= *Khri gtsug lde brtsan*, 815-841) and employed for the dates in the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei*, was traditionally preserved among the Tibetan *Nag rtsis pa* since then.

The division of four seasons, however, was different from that in China, owing to the climatic conditions of Tibet proper. According to these Tibetan calendar specialists (*sKar rtsis pa*, different from the *Kālacakra* school), *dpyid zla ra ba* corresponds generally to the second month in the Chinese lunar calendar. (See *Kloñ rdol, op. cit.*, f. 24a). Moreover, the second month in the Chinese lunar calendar and *Hor zla gñis pa* can be one month apart, since the method to place intercalary months (that should always come theoretically at an interval of 32.5 months) is different from the Chinese calendar, so long as the calculation was based upon the same system as that of the *rtsa rgyud* and *bsdus rgyud* of the *Kālacakra*, which is considered to have started from 1027. It is natural that the naming of four seasons mentioned in the *T'un-huang* documents must have been the same as traditional ones which have been handed down to the *sKar rtsis pa*, and even to the present day. Therefore, their seasons are generally behind at least by one month to those of the Chinese calendar. So, even when the T'u-fan court set *dpyid sla (/zla) ra ba* at the beginning of a year, it should have been a month later than the New Year of the T'ang calendar. Furthermore,

“sar” for “sor” to mean “came”, but this word *sar* should be taken for a verb of *gsar* (new), to mean “to be renewed”, “to change” or “to turn into”⁽¹⁰¹⁾. This can be verified by the usage found in a sentence of Line 41. As chance would have it, though, because of these dual mistakes, the dates mentioned in Lines 11, 41, and 50 happen to be correct ones. As Professor Hisashi Sato pointed out, the other dates are allotted rather in a haphazard manner⁽¹⁰²⁾, which cannot be accepted.

In the text, a frequent reference is made to the royal family of *Ha sha*, but it is always related in terms of its relationship with the Tibetan royal family. Therefore, *pho brañ* (royal residence) in this chronological text means *lha sras kyi pho brañ* in the entries preceding to the year 638 A.D., but after that year, the word came to allude to *hphrul gyi lha btsan poñi pho brañ*. It was really a remarkable event that Princess *Wên-ch'êng* stayed in the country of *Ha sha* in the autumn of 640 A.D. and then moved to *Tsha çod*⁽¹⁰³⁾ of the

the following examples should be examined carefully. In the *T'un-huang Annals*, the spring season (*dpyid*) is mentioned at the beginning of a year in some cases (675, 705), but in other cases (701, 708, 725, 726), it fell on the end of a year. This fact leads us to understand that the beginning of a Tibetan year should not be *dpyid zla ra ba*, but either *dpyid zla hbrin po* or *dpyid zla tha chuñ*. The latter two months correspond to the 3rd and the 4th months of the Chinese calendar which practically coincides, apart from the distance produced by the difference of the methods to place the intercalary month, with the *Hor zla*, a popular Tibetan calendar of later periods. In the *T'ung-tien*, it is said, “The time when the wheat ripens is the beginning of a year: 以麥熟爲歲首” The *T'u-fan-chuan* of the *T'ang-shu* mentions the same. This is the so-called New Year of Husbandry (*so nam pañi lo gsar*), and is based on the etymological explanation of the word *lo tog* or *lo thog* (the beginning of a year = harvest.) Since the Tibetan wheat is sown in spring, this statement is at variance with the actual state of things. Anyway, it has nothing to do with the Administrative New Year (*rgyal poñi lo gsar*) in question here. It is rather difficult to determine whether the beginning of a year in the old Tibetan calendar came on the third month or the fourth month of the Chinese calendar. If we admit that *nag zla*, i. e., the third month of *Hor zla* which is made the beginning of a year in the Kālacakra calendar of the later period, was the beginning of a year in Tibet at that time, the beginning of a year in Tibet in old days was at least two months behind to that of the Chinese calendar.

(101) It is more appropriate to compare *sar* with *tshar*, (to be completed). Generally speaking, *tsha* (*tsa*) and *sa* match well. Examples of correspondence could be found among *tshogs* (*tsog*)/*sogs*/*bsags* or *tshañs*/*sañs*/*gtsañ*. See Note 11.

(102) KTK, pp. 279-280.

(103) *Tsha çod* is not near *Sha-chou* 沙州 as Thomas says. (See TLTD, II, p. 15). It is in a region called *Tsha ba roñ* today, situated in lat. 29° N. and long. 98° 30' E. It is not the same as *rGya mo* (*tsha ba*) *roñ*. The place is mild in climate so that it is named as *Tsha ba roñ* (warm valley), it is said. It can be reached by going down south from *Pa thañ*. It is an important spot on the route passing from *sKye dgu mdo* 玉樹 to reach *Ta-li* 大理. The *rGyal rab gsal bañi me loñ* gives, for the names of the places where Princess waited *mGar*'s arrival, *lDan ma brag rtsa*, *Phuñ po ri*, *Khamis kyi Padma çañ* and *sGo doñ sgo mo* (GS f. 54a). *lDan ma* is *lDan khog*, *Têng-ko* 鄧柯 of today and *Padma çañ* would be a corrupt form of *Padma thañ*, *Pa-ma-t'ang* 八馬塘, which is found to the north of today's *Yen-ching* 鹽井, and in the district of

Tibetan territory in the following winter, and it was in this period that *thog ma Ha sha* (*Ha sha* in alliance) became *hbañs Ha sha* (*Ha sha* in vassalage). These must be the reasons for the frequent references to the country of *Ha sha* in the text. This text, however, is not a history of the country, but rather an independent chronicle centering around the history of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*. The date mentioned in the text corresponds to the date (640 A.D.) of the advent of the Chinese Princess in the DTH. And the parts already reconstructed by the present writer as for the birth of *Mañ slon mañ brtsan* in 642 and the death of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* in 643 would be accepted with references to the general context of this fragmentary text.

In the text, there is no direct reference to *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* except simply as *btsan* in the beginning of Line 22. But, all of those dates mentioned in the text, including the date of ascension to the throne, correspond well to the dates of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* which have been chronologically arranged on the basis of the theories of the Tibetan historians of later periods. As regards the date of enthronement, the appellation *lha sras* (God's son) changes to *hphrul gyi lha btsan po* (King, God's incarnate) on Line 18 and subsequent lines. From the fact that the entries on Line 18 refer to the events in the summer of 639, we may safely take it to mean that the ascension took place in the expected date of 638 A.D.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾. If so, it comes to be clearly indicated in the text that Princess *Wên-ch'êng* was the queen of *bTsan po Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*. In combination with the conclusion we reached in the first half of this article, it will be reasonable to infer that *Khon co mañ mo rje khri skar* is none other than Princess *Wên-ch'êng* herself.

Concerning the above, a Chinese document, *T'u-fan-ch'uan* 吐蕃伝, Bk. 1 of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* 新唐書 says as follows:

十五年，妻以宗女文成公主，詔江夏王道宗持節護送，築館河源王之国，弄贊率兵次相海親迎，見道宗執婿礼恭甚，見中国服飾之美縮縮媿沮，歸国自以先未有昏帝女者，乃為公主築一城以夸後世，遂立宮室以居。

In the 15th year (of *Chên-kuan* 貞觀), for the wife [of *bTsan po*] Princess *Wên-ch'êng*, a daughter of the imperial family, was given. *Tao-tsung*, Prince of *Chiang-hsia*, 江夏王道宗, was ordered to accompany her

Tsha god. See Wang-chung: *Hsin T'ang-shu T'u-fan-chuan chien-chêng* 王忠: 新唐書吐蕃伝箋証 pp. 30-31. Note 150, T. V. Wylie: *The Geography of Tibet according to the 'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad*, Roma, 1962, pp. 178-180, n. 584 and n. 594.

(104) According to the *T'ung-chien* Bk. 195, in the 8th and 9th months of the previous year in the Chinese calendar (638), the *T'u-fan* forces were engaged in a battle at *Sung-chou* 松州. Prior to that incident, already the influence of *Mu-jung No-ho-po* had been cornered to the north of *Chin-hai* 青海. Because of these situations, the *T'ang* Court eventually had no other means but to grant a Princess to *T'u-fan*, accepting their wish. Examining the series of events, we can tell that it was not necessarily the *T'ang*'s decisive victory as recorded in the Chinese sources. It is very probable that the enthronement of *Guñ sroñ* was realized taking the opportunity of this Tibetan advantage. (See Notes 29, 35).

from China, holding an emblem of official dispatch. Her residence was built in the country of *Ho-yüan* King 河源王. *Lung-tsan* 弄贊 led his men and stayed at *Pai-hai* 栢海 to welcome them in person. He had an audience with *Tao-tsung* and paid deep respect as the son-in-law. *Lung-tsan* was very much ashamed of himself seeing how beautiful the Chinese costumes were. He went back to his country thinking, 'There has been no one in Tibet who took a daughter of the Chinese Emperor as the wife before me. Therefore, I should have such a fine castle built for the Princess as to be proud of in later years.' Finally, he had a palace built for her and let her stay there.

The passage in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* 旧唐書 is approximately the same. The *Tzū-chih t'ung-chien* 資治通鑑 gives the sixteenth day of the first month 正月 丁丑 of the fifteenth year of *Chên-kuan* (641 A.D.) as the date for the equivalent events. However, the *T'ung-chien*, under the passage for the twenty-third day of the intercalary tenth month of the previous year (640 A.D.), says, "... gave Princess *Wên-ch'êng* for the wife." From this, it is quite reasonable to infer that the marriage took place in 640 and that *Tao-tsung*, Prince of *Chiang-hsia*, returned to the Chinese Court with the report of the marriage in the first month of the year, 641⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. Instead of *Lung-tsan* 弄贊 in the

(105) "The sixteenth day of the first month of the fifteenth year of *Chên-kuan* (641)", which the *T'ung-chien* give at the beginning of the item reporting the Princess' marriage, might be rather the date for the general report of the mission that *Tao-tsung* 道宗, Prince of *Chiang-hsia* 江夏王, accomplished. As to the dates in the Chinese Annals, this kind of examples can be found elsewhere. (See *supra* p. 27) Therefore, in this column, all events leading to the construction of the new royal residence for the Princess in Tibet are reported. In the *T'ung-chien*, there is another entry for the 23rd day of the intercalary 10th month of the previous year (640), which says, "The Princess was given for the wife". This must refer to the date of the first report of Princess *Wên-Ch'êng*'s marriage. Because Line 30 of the Stein document tells us the arrival of winter just after the departure of *Wên-ch'êng* for *Tsha çod*. The winter of Tibetan calendar began usually from the 11th Chinese month. According to Tibetan version of the story, *mGar sToñ btsan yul zuñ* who had been sent to the *T'ang* Court to welcome the Princess was detained there for more than three months and less than five months since that time (GS, f. 51a, 54a). It also says that the Princess left for Tibet in disregard of *mGar stoñ*'s detainment. Or, the date mentioned above in the *T'ung-chien* may be taken as that of the arrival of the Princess to Tibet, if the 23rd day of the intercalary 10th month fell on the last month of autumn (*ston zla tha cuñ*) in Tibetan calendar (cf. Note 100). The fact that *mGar stoñ btsan yul zuñ*'s name is not mentioned in this *T'un-huang* document may confirm the story that he was detained in the *T'ang* Court as hostage until they were sure of the Princess' marriage. The conferment of the rank of *Yu-wei ta-chiang-chün* 右衛大將軍 on *Tung-tsan* 東贊 (= *mGar sToñ btsan*) on the 12th day of the 1st month of 15th year of *Chên-kuan*, as recorded in the *T'ung-chien* Bk. 196, should be understood as a reward in recognition of his services after the return of the Chinese mission. This record indicates that he was detained at the Chinese Court in reality. Until this date he seems to have passed 5 months after the departure of the Chinese mission which, then, could have taken place in the 9th month of the year before. The story of Princess *Lang-*

Hsin T'ang-shu, the person who welcomed the Princess on the way was referred to as *Tsan-p'u* 贊普 in one Chinese document⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. This fact helps us in identifying *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* with *Lung-tsan* in the two *T'ang-shu*s. As far as the Stein document in question explains, it is clear that the king referred to in this Chinese text should be *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*, and not *Sroñ btsan sgam po* who is usually referred to by the Chinese characters *Lung-tsan* 弄贊. The country of *Ho-yüan* King means the *Ho-yüan* province which was nominally in the domain of *No-ho-po*, king of *T'u-yu-hun*.

In the *T'ang* Court only *No-ho-po* was acknowledged as the authentic King of *T'u-yu-hun* and that is the reason why his name was especially mentioned to indicate the place of *Ho-yüan* in the *T'ang-shu*. The *Hsin T'ang-shu* says simply that a house for the Princess was built in the country of *Ho-yüan* King, and there is no reference as to whether the King himself or his wife, Princess *Hung-hua* 弘化公主, came there to welcome Princess *Wên-ch'êng*. This is worthy of special note. The Tibetan text in the Stein Collection says that, after the retainers of the Tibetan Court arrived to welcome Princess *Wên-ch'êng*, *Ma ga to gon kha gan* and his mother, *Khri bañs* together with the subordinates went out to welcome her. The Chinese documents ignored of their presence because he was acknowledged to be the king of *T'u-yu-hun* only by the Tibetan Court⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. The meaning of "built a house 築館"⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ if

hsieh 琅邪公主 is also preserved more or less accurately in the Tibetan tradition. (GS, f. 51a-b).

- (106) The Chapter of *T'u-fan-chuan* in the two *T'ang-shu*s and the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* Bk. 978 tell that *Lung-tsan* 弄贊 (= *Khri sroñ brtsan*) went out to welcome the Princess in person. The Chapter on the Defense of Frontiers 5, in the *T'ung-tien* Bk. 190 通典一九〇边防五 tells merely that *Tsan-p'u* 贊普 went out to receive the Princess personally, in the passage which relates that "She reached her husband *Ch'i-su-nung-tsan* 至其主棄農贊". The *T'ung-chien* mentions no name at all which can correspond to *Khri sroñ brtsan*.
- (107) If Thomas is right to say that *Ma ga to gon kha gan* was no other than *Mu-jung No-ho-po* (TLTD, II, p. 16), then there should have been, in this *T'un-huang* document of the Stein Collection, a passage of some sort about Princess *Hung-hua* who was married to him in the 12th month of the previous year (639), and also some reference to her in such passages as quoted in the present article from the Chinese historical books. In reality there are no allusion in this Tibetan document about such serious incidents as those of the 12th months of the 10th year (636) and again of the 13th year (639), of *Chên-kuan*, when *No-ho-po* himself came to pay respects at the *T'ang* Court (as recorded in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* Bk. 999), and the event (which is recorded in the *T'ung-chien* Bk. 195,) that the *T'u-fan* forces drove out *No-ho-po*, to the north of *Chin-hai* before the 8th month of the 12th year of *Chên-kuan*, who had interferred (probably on the occasion of his visit to the *T'ang* Court in 636.) with the Chinese princess' marrying into the *T'u-fan* royal family. What is more, at the end of the 10th year of *Chên-kuan*, when *No-ho-po* visited in fact the *T'ang* Court, *Ma ga to gon kha gan* got married under the *T'u fan*'s influence (Lines 9 and 10). Prior to that, from the entry in the present Stein document for the summer of the 9th year of *Chên-kuan* (Line 3), we could get some indication that they celebrated over the banishment of *Shun* 順. (See Notes 91 and 105).

it is to be explained, corresponds to the fact described by the sentence, "... was built at ... *du* in the country of *rTsañ*", from Line 29 to Line 30 of our Tibetan text. Possibly, *Pai-hai* may mean the same place. The castle which he built, after the return to his country, would be the "*pho brañ*" built at *Tsha çod*. From the Tibetan text, the royal couple seems to have spent both summer and winter there, so that the house must not have been a group of tents (*hphru ma* or *sbra*)⁽¹⁰⁸⁾, but a fixed building. *Tsha çod* was in a Tibetan territory from an old time, and is called *Tsha ba roñ* today⁽¹⁰⁹⁾.

dPañ gtsug lag hphreñ ba and *hJigs med rdo rje's History of Mongolian Lamaism*⁽¹¹⁰⁾, both tell that the King was at the 20th year of age when Princess *Wên-ch'êng* arrived in Tibet. Naturally in those documents the King is referred to as *Sroñ btsan sgam po*, not as *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*. If we apply this age of twenty to the chronology of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*, it falls also on 640 when the Princess arrived in Tibet. In the Chapter *Ha* of the *Collected Works of Kloñ rdol bla ma*, she is referred to as *Zan chin* in a Chinese name⁽¹¹¹⁾.

It is possible that *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan's* expedition to *Ha sha* in 643 was related to the incident that *Hsüan-wang* 宣王, Prime Minister, rebelled against the king *Mu-jung No-ho-po* 慕容諾曷鉢. When *Hsüan-wang's* plot was detected, he was attacked by *Hsi-chün-ku's* 席君賈 Chinese forces and as a result the country was plunged in an utter confusion in this period. Thus, King *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* died⁽¹¹²⁾.

As for *yum-sras*, Princess *Wên-ch'êng* and her son, who were left alone in *Tsha çod*, there is a following passage in DTH⁽¹¹³⁾:

After that (643 A. D.) six years passed (i.e. 649), when *bTsan po Khri sroñ rtsan* died. He had had three years of married life with his queen, Princess *Wên-ch'êng*.

(108) The entry that "a residence for the Princess was built in the country of *Ho-yüan* king" is found only in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*. Other Chinese documents (the *T'ung-tien*, the *T'ung-chien*, the *Chiu T'ang-shu* and the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*) all say only that they arrived at *Ho-yüan*. It seems probable that a temporary residence consisting of a group of tents was prepared at the place where the Princess was welcomed, *Tsogi Joñ yo du*.

(109) See Note 3, 28, 63. Yamaguchi: "Retrospect and Prospect", in *Shigaku Zasshi* 75-5 (1965), p. 257.

(110) *ñi çu pa me sprel* (636) *rgya bzah phebs*. KG, 41b. "At the 20th year of age, he took a Chinese woman, *Kluñ cu*, as his consort. (*dguñ lo ñi çu la rGya bzah kluñ cu btsun mor bshes*). *kluñ cu* is a corrupt form for *Khon co*". Koho Hashimoto ed.: *Hor chos hbyuñ*, 1940, p. 7.

(111) The collection (*gsuñ hbum*) of *Kloñ rdol bla ma Nag dbañ blo bzañ* (1707/19-1805) has 31 chapters. Chapter *Ha* is "the names of the patrons of Buddhism (*bstan pañi sbyin bdag byuñ tshul gyi min gi grañs*)", which has 20 folios in the *Kun bde gliñ* edition. See *ibid.* f. 10a.

(112) See Notes 91, 92 and 94.

(113) *de nas lo drug nañ/ btsan po khri sroñ rtsan dguñ du gçegs so/ DTH*, p. 13.
btsan muñ cañ koñ co dañ dguñ lo gsum bços so/ DTH, p. 13.

With regard to the above-quoted passage in DTH, Sato argued that the King's married period was between 641 and 643, on the basis of the assumption that the punitive expedition to *Shan shun* was carried out for six years, in 643 and afterwards⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Sato's argument, however, is not acceptable, as DTH itself tells under the column of 641 A.D. that the expedition was completed after the reascension of *Khri sroñ brtsan*. Therefore, the passage in question should be interpreted as follows: "...was quelled, and was kept under subjugation. (. . . *ḥbañs su bkug ste mñaho*)."

Princess *Wên-ch'êng*, after spending three years in mourning for her husband⁽¹¹⁵⁾, had three years with the father of her deceased husband, from 646 to 649. This is the interpretation of the present writer.

There is a following entry in the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* of the *Chiu T'ang-shu*.

太宗伐遼東還，遣祿東贊來賀奉表曰。聖天子平定四方，日月所照之國並為臣妾，而高麗恃遠闕於臣禮，天子自百萬度遼致討，驛城陷陣指日凱旋，夷狄纔聞陛下發駕，少進之間已聞歸國，雁飛迅越不及陛下速疾，奴忝預子婿喜百常夷，夫鵠猶雁也，故作金鵠奉獻。

"*T'ai-tsung* 太宗, after conquering *Liano-tung* 遼東, came home. Tibet sent *Lu-tung-tsan* 祿東贊 [*mGar stoñ rtsan*]⁽¹¹⁶⁾ to congratulate the Emperor. He addressed a memorial of [*bTsan po Khri sroñ brtsan*] to the throne which says, "The Holy Emperor has pacified the four directions; the whole land under the sun and the moon is subject to Him. Only, Kao-li 高麗, complacent of being in a remote area, was remiss in paying respects to the Emperor as a vassal. The Emperor personally led a million of his men, crossed the River *Liao* to make a punitive expedition. After destroying castles and purging the enemy forces, he came back victorious in a short while. We, ignorant provincials, heard a rumour of the Em-

(114) KTK, p. 284.

(115) "The Princess was riding a white mule (*drel*), and *Dar rgyal mañ po rje* was conducting her (*koñ jo dre dkar mo shig la bcibs te dar rgyal mañ po rje(s) sna khrid*)" in KG, Ja f. 30a. *Dre dkar mo* must be the corrupted form of the princess' name, *khri skar*. *Dar rgyal mañ po rje* (= *Da rgyal mañ po rje*) was one of the influential retainers (*mīng wang* 名王) of the *T'u-yu-hun* camp and, fighting with *Su-ting-fang* 蘇定方, died in action in 656. (DTH, p. 14). This entry sounds as if *Da rgyal mañ po rje* conducted the Princess to Tibet from *Tsha çod*, after the death of *Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan*. But, it would be more reasonable to interpret this as a remnant part of the record that they passed *Ha sha* and went to *Tsha çod*. It is traced in the passages of the *mKhas pañi dgañ ston* (f. 33 a-b) or the *rGyal rabs gsal bañi me loñ* (f. 56b) that the Princess might have once determined to return to China before she saw *Sroñ brtsan sgam po*.

(116) The Chinese character *lu* 祿 can be a transcription of *r* in *mGar*. See KTK, pp. 303-304, R. A. Stein: "Deux Notules d'histoire ancienne du Tibet", *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1963, pp. 330-333. *ḥBri Se ru guñ ston* who appears as a rival for *mGar* in the Tibetan historical works of later years (GS, ff. 32b, 49b, 51a; KG, f. 29b) seems to be a fictitious character who was erroneously reconstructed, in combination with the corrupt form of *ḥBro*, from the Chinese wrong transliteration *hsüeh lu kung tung tsan* 薛祿公東贊.

peror's departure for the expedition. In no time at all, we also heard that He is already back at home. Wild geese can fly very fast, but they are no faster than the Emperor. I am fortunate to be your *son-in-law*, and my pleasure is hundred times greater than that of the foreign subjects. Since a goose 鵝 is like a wild goose 雁, I had a goose made in gold. I would like to present it respectfully to the Throne."

The *Chiu T'ang-shu* tells that the goose bottle was seven feet tall, and it could contain three *hu* 斛 of wine. According to the *T'ai-tsung pên-chi* in the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, the Emperor came back from the expedition in the third month of the twentieth year of *Chên-kuan* (646 A.D.) In the Chapter of the Tributaries (in the Section of the Foreign Subjects) of the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* Bk. 970 it says, "In the seventh month, the twentieth year of *Chên-kuan*, the Tibetan addressed a congratulatory memorial to the Throne and dedicated a gold goose to the Emperor." In China, goose bottle would be emblematical of conjugal fidelity⁽¹¹⁷⁾. We know that Princess *Wên-ch'êng* was already, by this time (646), married again to *Khri sroñ brtsan* after her first widowhood. *bTsan po Khri sroñ brtsan*, who ascended to the throne for the second time after the death of his son, called of himself that "I am fortunate to be your son-in-law." It may be the case that he, taking advantage of the opportunity to congratulate the victorious return of the Chinese Emperor, was asking the tacit approval from the Chinese Court on Princess *Wên-ch'êng*'s remarriage. In the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, after the above-quoted entry, it reads as follows:

高宗嗣位，授弄贊為駙馬都尉，封西海郡王，賜物二千段。

Kao-tsung 高宗 succeeded to the throne. He conferred to *Lung-tsan* [*Khri sroñ brtsan*] the rank of *Fu-ma tou-wei* accorded him the title of *Hsi-hai chün-wang* and gave him two thousand pieces of grants.

This passage shows that on the occasion of enthronement of *Kao-tsung Khri sroñ brtsan* was recognized officially as the "husband" of the Princess⁽¹¹⁸⁾.

It may be noted in this connection that there were only two cases of the personal visits of the Tibetan chief minister (*blon che*) to the *T'ang* Court during the period of the *T'u-fan* Dynasty: once, when to invite Princess *Wên-ch'êng* to Tibet, and the other, when to ask for the approval of the Princess' remarriage⁽¹¹⁹⁾. Both times *mGar stoñ rtsan yul zuñ* was dispatched. We can tell the

(117) See H.A. Giles: *A Chinese English Dictionary*, London, 1912, p. 404 a 鵝酒禮.

(118) According to the *T'ung-chien*, this is an event in the 10th month, in the winter of the 23rd year of *Chên-kuan*. *Mu-jung No-ho-po*, ruler of the *T'u-yu-hun*, got Princess *Hung-hua* as his consort in 639, and was conferred the rank of *Fu-ma tou-wei* ten years later, in 649. In view of this similar case, it sounds probable that *Khri sroñ brtsan* (弄贊) also got married to Princess *Wên-ch'êng* about ten years before the conferment of the rank. (f. 33 a-b)

(119) In the *T'un-huang Annals*, *mGar stoñ rtsan yul zuñ*, who was sent for the invitation of the Princess to Tibet, is not called with the title of *blon che*. It is, also, a little

importance of these two occasions for the Tibetans. It seems probable that Princess *Wên-ch'êng*'s reluctance to remarriage caused her to remain widow for three years from 643 to 646. There is small wonder if the T'ang Court tried to suppress the fact of her remarriage from the public notice deliberately. It would have infringed on the authority of the T'ang Court to record that they impossibly left the Chinese Princess to obey to such a barbarous customs as being remarried with her deceased husband's father.

V.

Chronology on *Khri sroñ brtsan*

There have been several studies made concerning the chronology of *Khri sroñ brtsan*⁽¹²⁰⁾ and there is no space here to examine all of them. The date of his death is definitely known, since there is a reference in DTH. As to the date of his birth, on the other hand, some scholars are misled in the interpretation of the tradition that the King lived till his 82nd year of age, while some others discard the tradition thoroughly thinking that it was a groundless prediction (*luñ bstan*) in the *Mañjuçrīmūlatantra* (*hJam dpal rtsa rgyud*). While discarding the tradition, those people come to make another mistake in adopting to the chronology of the King the dating system of "the Five Elements in Male and Female", which was a sheer invention of the later Tibetan historians. As a result, they assert unduly that the King was born in 617 or 629.

What is accepted in common among the Tibetan historians is that the King was born in the Ox year that he ascended to the throne at his 13th year of age, that he ruled the country for 69 years, that during his life-time in his place *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* ruled the country for some period, and that he died at his 82nd year of age.

His death is confirmed to be in 649⁽¹²¹⁾ by DTH⁽¹²²⁾. A passage in the *Kao-tsung pên-chi* 高宗本紀 of the *Chiu T'ang-shu* Bk. 4, reads:

永徽元年五月，吐蕃贊普死，遣右武衛將軍鮮於匡濟，齎璽書往弔祭。

strange that there is no mention of his name in our Tibetan document from the Stein Collection. (Cf. Note 105). According to KG, Ja f. 47b, the Chief Ministers (*blon che*) for *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* were *Myaṅ mañ po rje shañ snañ* and *sNubs Tsañ to re*. The former is the *blon che* for the early period of *Khri sroñ brtsan*'s reign. (DTH, pp. 101-111). The name of *shañ bTsañ to re* appears in Line 23 of the Stein document, but it is not known that *sNubs* was *shañ po*. It could be explained that a fragmentary record about the time of the ascension of *Khri sroñ brtsan* and that of *shañ bTsañ to re* (DTH, p. 20) who went to welcome Princess *chin-ch'êng* were mixed up into the story of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*.

(120) See KTK, p. 206.

(121) The years in the Christian Era do not correspond exactly with those in the Chinese or Tibetan calendars. In this article, a year in the Christian Era is shown for a convenience's sake, when a year in the Christian calendar is common in the duration more than half of the annual term with the other calendars.

(122) DTH, p. 13.

In the fifth month of the first year of *Yung-hui*, *tsan-p'u* (*btsan po*) of Tibet died. The Emperor dispatched *Yu-wu-wei* *chiang-chün* *Hsien-yü-k'uang-chi* with an Imperial letter to mourn for the King's death.

This date should be taken to be that of the dispatching of the Emperor's envoy to mourn for the King's death, or rather, the date of the envoy's report to the Chinese Court on his return from Tibet.

One this date of 650 in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* was introduced to Tibet through the *rGya yig tshan*⁽¹²³⁾, the date of the King's death was fixed to be in 650, Dog year. Since this date agrees well with both of the established traditions that the King was born in the Ox year, and that he lived till the 82nd year of age, no Tibetan historians have ever doubted its veracity⁽¹²⁴⁾.

However, if we calculate retrospectively, not from 650, but from 649 as we have known from DTH, the two traditions, of the Ox year for the King's birth, and of his 82nd year for the date of his death, contradict each other with a discrepancy of one year. The calendar by means of the Twelve Animals, not with a combination of the Five-Elements in Male and Female, was established in Tibet from the old time. So, as to the Ox year we have no reason to deny the veracity of the tradition. At first, therefore, we will examine the tradition that the King lived till the 82nd year of age and see how this tradition was formed.

From various works of the later Tibetan historians, I will take up those descriptions especially contradictory so as to draw out some hints from them. In the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ*⁽¹²⁵⁾, it says as follows:

Thus, the Great Dharmarāja, God's incarnate, stayed on the throne just for 70 years . . . When he reached his 82nd year of age, . . . he dissolved himself into the heart of his protector God.'

Here it is maintained that the King died at the 82nd year of age, while it is asserted that, instead of 69 years which are more commonly accepted, the King stayed on the throne for 70 years. Naturally what is meant here is that his reign extended to his 70th year of reign. However, it seems probable that the 70 years was the alteration by the author of the *rGyal rabs* or others from the original 72 years. Because *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphren ba*⁽¹²⁶⁾ says as follows:

(123) The *rGya yig tshan* comes to be known well since this book is quoted in the *Hu lan deb ther*. As to the details, see A. Macdonald: "Préambule à la lecture du *rGya-Bod yig chan*", *Journal Asiatique*, 1963, pp. 69-83.

(124) See KTK pp. 214-224.

(125) de ltar sprul paḥi chos rgyal chen po de/ dguṅ lo bdun cu tham pa rgyal sa bzuṅ/ .../ dguṅ lo brgyad cu gya gñis bshed pa na/.../yid dam lha yi thugs kar thim par gyur/ GS, f. 77a; f. 81a.

(126) sprul paḥi rgyal po des dguṅ lo bcu gsum la chab srid mṅaḥ mdzad pa nas lo don gñis su chab srid chos bshin du bskyaṅs te dguṅ lo brgyad bcu rtsa gñis bshes pa sa

This King, incarnate of God, assumed the power at his 13th year of age, and his rule extended for 72 years in a lawful manner. On the 10th day of the 10th month⁽¹²⁷⁾ in the Male Earth Dog year, at his 82nd year of age, he laid his hand on the head of *Mañ sroñ*, his grandson, and said, . . . These were his last injunctions.

Here, the two traditions that the King was enthroned at the 13th year of age and that his reign extended for 72 years are accepted without deliberate consideration. However, the King's death at his 82nd year of age evidently conflicts with those two traditions. How should we explain the co-existence of the contradictory passages in this literature? There must be also some grounds for the tradition of the King's reign for 72 years. In order to get a clue, we would like to examine the age of *Khri sroñ brtsan* when he ascended to the throne.

As seen in the first half of this article⁽¹²⁸⁾, almost all the historical works accept the tradition that the King was at his 13th year of age at the time of enthronement. Only *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba*⁽¹²⁹⁾ introduces the view of the *Ka bkhol ma*⁽¹³⁰⁾ that the King was enthroned at his 4th year of age⁽¹³¹⁾. If the present writer is permitted to run his imagination, the view that the King's reign extended for 72 years might be derived from the combination of the two traditions that he was enthroned at his 4th year of age and that he lived till his 69th year of reign. There must have been originally, before this tradition of "reign for 72 years", a tradition that the King died at his 72nd year of age. The conclusion thus derived, however, would have lost its persuasiveness because of the defect that his birth does not fall on the Ox year if they take that he lived till the Cock or Dog year. For its place, the tradition that the King died at his 82nd year of age became more dominantly supported (more so especially after the tradition that the King died in the Dog year was formed from the *rGya yig tshañ*). Finally the tradition on the length of the King's reign was modified in the form as we see in the *rGyal*

pho khyi lo smin drug gi zla baḥi tshes bcuḥi (53b/54a) ñin dbon sras mañ sroñ gi spyi bor phyag bshag ste bkaḥ tsal pa/...shes shal chems su mdzād to/ KG, Ja ff. 53b-54a.

(127) If this date is credible, the year of King's death must be in the Cock year. Because the Chinese ambassador for mourning returned to China or started out in the fifth month of the Dog year, the first year of *Yung-hui*, as seen above.

(128) Cf. Note 72, p. 161 in the first half of this article.

(129) KG., Ja. f. 15a.

(130) This work is the last injunctions (*bkaḥ chems*) of *Sroñ btsan sgam po*, which is said to have been discovered (*gter kha*) by *Atiḥa*. It is quoted in the *mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston* (KG, Ja, f. 15a).

(131) Reading the sentence in the *Ka bkhol ma*: "After hearing that a king in a remote area, of four years old, administered his territory in an ideal manner (*mtḥaḥi rgyal po lo bshi lon pa cig gis rgyal srid chos bshin du bskyoñ shes thos nas*)", *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba* interprets it as follows: "It seems that his father died at his fourth year of age and he came to administer the country."

rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ. The inconsistent passages by *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba* must be a reflection of the state a little before the modification took place. There is another tradition to take the King's enthronement at his 10th year of age⁽¹³²⁾. This will be discussed in a later part of this article.

As stated above, the tradition to take the King's enthronement at his 13th year of age requires a careful consideration. If there was a tradition that after his enthronement at the 4th year of age, he died at the 72nd year of age, then it will be reasonable for us to doubt that the tradition to take his death at the 82nd year of age after his enthronement at the 13th year of age might be another invention of later period as well. There is found a basic figure, 69 years, that is given for the term of the reign both in the two traditions. Only this figure is left now for us to believe the veracity.

As we have already seen, the tradition of the King's death at his 82nd year of age could not be trusted, since by retrospective calculation it does not give us the Ox year in which he was supposed to have been born; there is a discrepancy of one year. However, if the figure 69 designates the number of age at his death, but not of years of his reign as usually taken, then this discrepancy of one year in the calendar of the Twelve Animals will be eliminated instantly; *Khri sroṅ brtsan* died in 649 at his 69th year of age; he was born in 581, in the Ox year⁽¹³³⁾.

As we have already examined⁽¹³⁴⁾, the death of *Guṅ sroṅ guṅ btsan* and the re-ascension of *Khri sroṅ brtsan* to the throne took place in 643. This would be confirmed also by the Tibetan text in the Stein Collection which we discussed at the beginning of this part of article. As the present writer has already asserted (p. 165), *Khri sroṅ brtsan* was at the 63rd year of age at the time of re-ascension. This assumption goes without conflict with the present theory that the King died at the 69th year of age in 649.

Because *Khri sroṅ brtsan* (*Sroṅ btsan sgam po*) had another name of

(132) The story of his enthronement at his 10th year of age is known from the *Hor chos ḥbyuṅ*, (Cf. Note 110). This story seems to have been formed to find a compromise between the death at the 82nd year of age and that at the 72nd year of reign. As to another interpretation, see the Text p. 93. In the Tibetan history, there was another king, *Khri gtsug lde brtsan* (= *Ral pa can*), who was enthroned at his 10th year of age in 815. *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*, too, is said wrongly to have been enthroned at the 10th year of age. (G S, f. 82a; DMS, f. 19b). See Notes 72 and 85 in the first half of this article.

(133) In the case of the enthronement at the 13th year of age, consisting of twelve full years, the dates of death represented by the Twelve Animals does not differ ordinarily one from other, whether the original age of death was erroneously modified to mean the years of reign until his death or not, so far as the figure was not counted in full year. In the present case, as it is lucky for us, the figure of age was altered to mean the full years of reign, in order to settle the date of death at the Dog year (650), misled by the Chinese source, so that the contrivance is now disclosed unsuccessful with a discrepancy of one year in the calendar of the Twelve Animals.

(134) pp. 164-5 in the first half of this article.

Sroñ lde brtsan, by attaching *Khri* at the top, he would be easily mistaken for *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*. *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, on the other hand, is referred to in the chronicle of DTH as *btsan po Sroñ lde brtsan*⁽¹³⁵⁾. As for the year of death of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, too, the influence of the confusion between the two Kings can be clearly observed.

Generally it is held that *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* abdicated the throne at his 55th year of age in 796⁽¹³⁶⁾ in favor of *Mu ne brtsan po*, the eldest son borne by *Tshe spoñs bzah*⁽¹³⁷⁾, and he died at his 56th year⁽¹³⁸⁾ of age in the Ox year, in 797 A.D.⁽¹³⁹⁾. However, in the *Bu ston chos byuñ*⁽¹⁴⁰⁾, the *Deb dmar gsar ma*⁽¹⁴¹⁾, the *bsTan pa dañ bstan ḥdzin gyi lo rgyus*⁽¹⁴²⁾, the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*⁽¹⁴³⁾ and the *Kloñ rdol gsuñ ḥbum*⁽¹⁴⁴⁾, the King is said to have passed away at his 69th year of age. This must be a result of confusion with the date of *Sroñ btsan sgam po* (= *Sroñ lde brtsan*)'s death. *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba*⁽¹⁴⁵⁾ quotes the following passage from a certain unearthened text (*gter ma*)⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ to tell the circumstances:

(135) Note 85 in the first half of this article.

(136) He was enthroned at the 13th year of age and he was on the throne till his 43rd year of reign (HD f. 17a). Then he abdicated the throne in the Mouse year (*byi ba lo*) at his 55th year of age. (KG, Ja, f. 126a). Cf. Note 82 in the first half of this article.

(137) The eldest son was *Mu khri btsan po* (?) who was born in 760 (DTH, p. 58), but died young. His mother was famous *ḥBro bzah*, and he was mentioned as "sras" in the inscription on the bell of the *bSam yas* Monastery. At his death, his mother took the tonsure and became a nun follower of *Ha ṣan Mahāyāna*. Her name as a nun was *Jo mo Byañ chub rje*. *Mu ne brtsan po* was a son of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, born of another queen, *Tshes poñ za rMa rgyal ldoñ skar* (DTH, p. 82) or *Me tog sgron* (according to the historians of later period. GS, f. 93a; KG, Ja, f. 126a). He was born in 774. His younger brothers were *Mu rug brtsan po* and *Khri lde sroñ brtsan* alias *Sad na legs*. See Note 83 of the first half of this article.

(138) GS, f. 92b. KG (Ja, f. 126b-127a) introduces several different theories and says "it is recorded in an old royal chronicle (*rgyal rabs*) merely that the King disappeared for meditation at the 55th year of age."

(139) GS, f. 92b; HD, f. 18a. However, in KG, Ja, f. 126b, the Ox year (*glañ lo*) is given only as the year for the death of *Mu ne brtsan po*. The 5th Dalai Lama alone gives the Male-Iron-Dragon year (*lcags pho ḥbrug gi lo*=800) as the date of his death. (See SG, f. 39b)

(140) DC, f. 123b.

(141) DMS, f. 22b. a Fire-Tiger year (*me stag lo*) falls on 786. If it was 798, 12 years later, it was the year of *Mu ne brtsan po*'s death; if 60 years later, it was the year of *Glañ dar ma*'s death.

(142) *bsTan pa dañ bstan ḥdzin gyi lo rgyus*, f. 65b. (Note 79 in the first half of this article.)

(143) S G, f. 32a.

(144) Note 112. *Kloñ rdol gsuñ ḥbum*, *Ha*, f. 7b.

(145) *gter mar grags pa kha cig las, khri sroñ gi sku tshe lña bcu rtsa lña las med pa la slob dpon gyis tshe sgrub mdzad pas bcu gsum bsriñs te drug* (126b/127a) *bcu rtsa dgu la gcegs ces/ KG, Ja, f. 126b.*

(146) The word *gter kha (ma)* is here an unearthened article like those discovered at T'un-huang.

According to a certain text called *gter ma*, *Khri sroñ* could not live over the 55th year of age, but since *slob dpon* (*Padmasambhava*) held a rite of prolongation, his life was prolonged by 13 years, and he died at the 69th year of age."

If we follow this version, at first the accounts do not tally; his natural term of existence at the 55th year of age, and then 13 years of additional existence by force of the rite do not fit in with his death at the 69th year of age. As we have seen on the other hand, if we take his 55th year of age as the time of abdication and his 56th year of age in the Ox year as the time of his death, an addition of 13 years by force of the rite of prolongation fits well in with his death at the 69th year of age. Apart from those who believe in the efficacy of sorcery, I think the truth was that the editor of this *gter ma* got to know from some reliable source the 55th year of age, which actually falls on the age of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*'s abdication, and also from some other source the 69th year, which is the age of *Sroñ lde brtsan* alias *Sroñ brtsan sgam po* at his death. Being ignorant of the fact that these were the two different Kings, the editor of the *gter ma* worked out a story of *Padmasambhava*'s magical skillfulness⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. He alone cannot be blamed here, since even such a man of profound knowledge as *Bu ston* made a similar mistake without distinguishing these two Kings⁽¹⁴⁸⁾.

Thus we conclude that *Khri sroñ brtsan* (= *Sroñ lde brtsan* = *Sroñ brtsan sgam po*) died at his 69th year of age.

In a Chinese historical work, the *T'ung-tien* 通典⁽¹⁴⁹⁾, there is a following passage:

隋開皇中，其主論贊率弄贊，都特柯西疋播城，已五十年矣。

In the *Kai-huan* era of the Sui Dynasty, the Lord *Lun-tsan*, with *Lung-tsan*, held the court at *P'i-po-ch'êng*⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ in the west of the *Tsang-ko*."

Sato quotes the phrase "*Lun-tsan Shuai-lung-tsan*" and said, "The author of the *T'ung-tien* overlooked the fact that the name of *gNam ri sroñ brtsan* is repeated twice in the original document, and understood the phrase to mean a single name of the King⁽¹⁵¹⁾." But, as the present writer showed above in his translation, they are two different kings; *Lun-tsan* 論贊 is *gNam ri slon mtshan*, (*Khri slon btsan* in DTH and *sLon btsan rlun nam* in the Table of the Royal Lineage in DTH) (= *so-lun-tsan* 索論贊)⁽¹⁵²⁾, and *Lung-tsan* 弄贊 is *Khri*

(147) This is one of the examples of the later additions to the original text of the *gter ma*.

(148) DC, f. 123b.

(149) *T'ung-tien* Bk. 190, *pien-fang*, 6, *T'u-fan* (通典, 卷一九〇, 辺防六, 吐蕃)

(150) As to the identification of the place of the royal residence, see KTK, p. 191.

(151) *Ibid.*, p. 190; Wang-chung: *Hsin T'ang-shu T'u-fan-chuan chien-chêng* (See Note 103), p. 22. Wang-chung takes it as a corruption of *Slon brtsan rlun nam*.

(152) DTH, p. 101; p. 106; p. 82. As to the royal lineage, see DTH, p. 81.

sroñ brtsan (= *Sroñ brtsan sgam po*). In the case of “*Lun-tsan-so-lun-tsan* 論贊索論贊” in the *Wen-hsien t'ung-kao* 文獻通考,⁽¹⁵³⁾ on the contrary, it was a mistake of the compiler to read the above original two names “*Lun-tsan* 論贊 with *lung-tsan* 弄贊” into one name 論贊索論贊.⁽¹⁵⁴⁾

If we apply our present interpretation to the passage of the *T'ung-tien*, *shuai* is understood, neither a replacement for *so* nor a mistake, but to mean “leading”, “together with”. The *Kai-huang* era of the *Sui* Dynasty falls on 581–600 in the Christian calendar. Since *Khri sroñ brtsan* was born in 581, there is no contradiction in the entry. Does this passage refer particularly to the 9th year of the *Kai-huan*, when the *Sui* Dynasty succeeded in bringing the whole Chinese land under one sway? *Khri sroñ brtsan* was at his 9th year of age at that time. However, as it will be explained later, we can take another view.

As it has been mentioned already, there are three theories as to the year of *Khri sroñ brtsan*'s enthronement: at his 4th year of age, at his 10th year of age, or at his 13th year of age. It is difficult to decide which to follow. In DTH⁽¹⁵⁵⁾, there is a following passage:

Father, *gNam ri slon mtshan*, was poisoned to death⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. Son, *Sroñ brtsan*, driven⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ by youthful ardor, showed no mercy in exterminat-

(153) *Wen-hsien t'ung-kao* Bk. 334, *Ssü-i-k'ao* 11, *Tu-fan*, (文獻通考, 卷三三四, 四裔考十一, 吐蕃)

(154) Perhaps a cause of this mistake may be found in the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* which contains the following passage:

詎素生論贊索論贊生棄宗弄讚

“*Chü-su* had a son *Lun-tsan*. *So-lun-tsan* had a son *Ch'i-tsung-lung-tsan*”.

The compiler of the *Wen-hsien t'ung-kao* probably overlooked the fact that the name of *Slon-btsan* is repeated twice here and replaced, upon his own discretion, “*Lun-tsan shuai Lung-tsan*” in the *T'ung-tien* by this “*Lun-tsan-so-lun-tsan*” of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*. *So-lun-tsan* corresponds to *Slon btsan* as Sato correctly analyzed (KTK, p. 189). The first *Lun-tsan* in *Lun-tsan-so-lun-tsan* also means *Slon btsan*. *So* is dropped or omitted from it. There are several similar cases in the Chinese historical documents that, while transcribing foreign names, once the form in the Chinese letters is established, the Chinese writers sometimes take the liberty of dropping or omitting certain letters out of the established form. Therefore, *Lun-tsan* 論贊, whether with or without *so*, indicates only *slon btsan*. The reading “*Lun-tsan-so*” cannot be accepted here. *Ch'i-tsung-lung-tsan* is abbreviated as either *Lung-tsan* 弄讚 or *Lung-tsan* 弄贊, and invariably means *Khri sroñ brtsan*. Incidentally, *Chü-su* 詎素 is an abbreviation of *Chü-su-jo* 詎素若 which corresponds to the Tibetan *g-sñā*. The Chinese letters which correspond to *sTa* in *sTag* (*bu*) *sñā* (*gzigs*) are possibly dropped out.

(155) DTH, p. 111.

(156) *yab gnam ri slon mtshan dug bon te bkroñs so//sras sroñ brtsan sku gshon ma phan te//gzod ma dkuñ ba dañ/dug pa nams rabs bchad do//deñi rjes la/deñi myi log kun hbañs su slar bkug goñ//* As to the correspondence of *bon*=*gsol*, see G. Uray: “The old Tibetan verb *bon*”, *Acta Orientalia*, Hungary, 1964, pp. 323–334.

(157) “*ma phan te*” should be taken in a positive meaning “to turn out unfortunately.” See Note 160.

ing⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ treacherous and suspicious persons⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. After a while all of those who had been once against him became totally submissive to him.

This paragraph tells us that *Khri sroñ brtsan* was in his vigorous youth when his father was murdered. The passage "*sku gshon*" was usually translated to mean his childhood, but it is more likely to mean that the King was in his vigorous youth to do things without mature judgment⁽¹⁶⁰⁾.

The *Ka bkol ma* says that the enthronement of *Khri sroñ brtsan* took place at his 4th year of age. In other texts there are passages telling that he stayed in one place for 4 years to learn how to write, or that he meditated for 4 years. We cannot ignore this period of 4 years, whatever it may mean, so far as there is a tradition of the King's death at his 72nd year of age. The King's enthronement at his 10th year of age is asserted only by *hJigs med rdo rje*⁽¹⁶²⁾. Possibly this is a product of combination of the two traditions: the King's rule for 72 years and his death at his 82nd year of age. The passage quoted above from the *T'un huang* document would interfere with the interpretation in taking the King's enthronement at the 4th year of age. *dPañ'o gtsug lag hphreñ ba*⁽¹⁶³⁾ gives a following interpretation on this point:

When the God's son reached his 13th year of age, his father gave him the authority to administer the State affairs. [The following in the translation of the explanatory remarks written in finer letters.] It is generally known that at his 13th year of age, his father passed away and the Son [=he] was enthroned⁽¹⁶⁴⁾. However, according to the Testament of the King's Injunctions⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ and others, even after the abdication of the Throne, Father *gNam ri sroñ brtsan* made several requests to the son. From this fact, it is definite that the Father, while in life, ab-

(158) Probably *rabs bcad* means "to exterminate a lineage". The usage is found in other texts. (AHE, p. 27, Inscript., Line 28).

(159) The word *dug pa* or *gdug pa* means "a suspected person of rebellious intention."

(160) DTH, p. 147. The translation "le fils *Sroñ brtsan* était trop jeune pour agir utilement" is perhaps wrong. In KG, (Ja f. 15a) too, it says that he was enthroned when he was very young (*cin tu gshon nu*). However, we know that *gshon* is now used as **gshon bu/gshonhu/(gsho nu)/gshon nu*, always by adding a diminutive to the original *gshon*. DTH (p. 112) refers to *Khri hdus sroñ* as "From his infancy, he bravely, killed a big bore and trapped wild yaks (*sku chuñ nas gshon gyis kyañ//phag rgod la bñan gyis mdzad//g-yag rgod sgog du bcug//*". In view of such a word as *shon pa*, "to ride a horse", *gshon* has not always "puerile", but rather "young and virile", for its connotation.

(161) DC, f. 118b; KG, f. 18b.

(162) See Note 110.

(163) *lha sras dguñ lo bcu gsum bshed pañi tshe/yab kyis rgyal poñi chab srid mñah dbañ phul/bcu gsum lon dus yab gcegs nas sras rgyal sar bskos ces grags kyañ shal gdams kyis bskor las gnam ri sroñ brtsan gyis rgyal srid phul nas shus pa sogs gsuñs pas yab bshugs dus rgyal srid phul par ñes so/ KG, Ja. f. 14a.*

(164) GS, f. 29a; f. 30a.

(165) *Mañi bkañ hbum*, Part II.

icated the Throne in favor of his son.

Even after *Khri sroñ brtsan* was enthroned at his 13th year of age, his father still held substantial power of the State affairs for four years. When his father was poisoned to death, he was at the 16th⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ or the 17th year of age, (if four years be counted as four years in full). In his vigorous youth, he resorted to merciless means to retaliate. This is how the present writer looks at the case on the basis of the above-quoted passage.

If this assumption be acceptable, the sentence in the *T'ung-tien*, "In the *Kai-huan* era of the *Sui* Dynasty, . . ." could be taken as a report on the situation in Tibet between 593 and 596/7. If it was true also in the case of *Khri sroñ brtsan* that the enthronement was held at the 13th year of age, this fact would have misled people easily to mix up *Khri sroñ brtsan* with *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*.

The tradition of his enthronement at the 10th year of age could be composed also out of the assumption that the King ruled his country together with his father for four years preceding his father's death which took place at his 13th year of age. Even if we grant that his father's abdication and death took place respectively at his 10th and 13th years of age, still the King seems to be too young to fit the description of his vigorous vengeance in DTH.

After the passage quoted above, in the *T'ung-tien* there is the following entry:

國界西南與波羅門接，自大唐初，已勝兵數十萬，號為強國。

"The south-western border of the country is contiguous to *Po-lo-mên* 婆羅門 (=Nepal). From the early *T'ang* period, there were hundreds of thousands of strong soldiers and it called itself a powerful country."

It is possible that "the early *T'ang* period" might refer to the *Wu-tê* 武德 era of Emperor *Kao-tsu*'s reign. In the first year of *Wu-tê* (618), *Khri sroñ brtsan* comes to have been in his 38th year of age.

"He made his Minister *Myaṅ maṅ po rje shaṅ snaṅ* to secure all the *Sum pa* Later, when the King himself was ready to depart for the front, *Ha sha* came to be at discord with China⁽¹⁶⁷⁾." This discord between *Ha sha* and China possibly refers to the subjugation of *T'u-yu-hun* made by *Yang-ti* in the 5th year of *Ta-yeh* 大業五年 (609). At that time *Khri sroñ brtsan* was at his 29th year of age. Within ten years after the event, *btsan mo yum Khri baṅs*, who is mentioned in our text from the Stein Collection, married to the *Ha sha* royal family. Nearly from that time, there must have existed a country of *T'u-yu-hun*, which was referred to by the Tibetans as

(166) It is said that he was at the 16th year of age when for the first time his marriage became the topic of consideration. (GS, f. 38b; KG, Ja f. 41b). However, the similar story could be found in the case of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*, too.

(167) This is based on DTH, p. 111. See Note 91, for the translation and explanation of this part.

“*thog ma Ha sha* (*Ha sha* in alliance with Tibet)”. The time of *thog ma Ha sha* corresponds well to the time of the *T'u-yu-hun* in the description of the *T'ung-tien*, “it boasted of itself as a powerful country”. The King of *T'u-yu-hun*, *Fu-yün* 吐谷渾王伏允, after recovering his son *Mu-jung shun* 慕容順 who had been held in hostage in China, plundered frequently the bordering areas of China around the 5th year of *Wu-tê* (622 A.D.) and afterward⁽¹⁶⁸⁾. With this fact in mind, it is quite reasonable to assume that at least around that period *Fu-yün* cannot be antagonistic to *Khri sroñ brtsan*⁽¹⁶⁹⁾. However, *Fu-yün*'s *T'u-yu-hun* was not yet submissive (*hbañs su mñah*) to *Khri sroñ brtsan* at the time. *T'u-yu-hun* under *Fu-yün*'s rule must have had a considerable military influence. In fact, *Fu-yün* had a tributary relationship to the *T'ang* Court as an independent country. Soon after *Tai-tsung*'s ascension to the throne, *Fu-yün* dared to request a Chinese princess to be granted for a bride of his son *Tsun-wang* 尊王.⁽¹⁷⁰⁾

Khri sroñ brtsan waited to see a better opportunity to beat *Fu-yün* without effort. In the 9th year of *Chên-kuan*, when *Fu-yün* met the punitive force of the *T'ang* Court, *Khri sroñ brtsan* did not render any aid to *Fu-yün*, but looked on him defeated. What the Tibetan King did was only to help *Ma ga tho gon kha gan*, the son of *Khri bañs*, to be enthroned as *Fu-yün*'s successor. After the event, there came into existence two different *T'u-yu-hun* courts; one, *Ha sha* in Tibetan vassalage (*hbañs Ha sha*), and the other, *T'u-yu-hun* supported by the *T'ang* Court (*rGyañi kham su/rGya la gtogs pañi Ha sha*)⁽¹⁷¹⁾. The latter one was established by *Mu-jung shun* and his son *No-ho-po* 諾曷鉢. Some time between the 11th year of *Chên-kuan* and the seventh month of the 12th year of *Chên-kuan*, they were driven out of the country to the north of Koko Nor to become a tenacious enemy to Tibet, in *Shan-shan* 善善 and *Ch'ieh-mo* 且末, known as “Ten thousands households of *T'u-yu-hun* in the west (*Ha sha khri sde stod pa*)”⁽¹⁷²⁾.

(168) *Tzu-chih T'ung-chien* Bk. 190, *T'ang-chi* 6 (通鑑, 卷百九十, 唐紀六)

(169) *T'u-yu-hun* could not dare to oppose to the *T'ang* Court, when they had an enemy of the powerful forces of *T'u-fan* at the back. This also led me to think what the *T'u-fan* called *thog ma Ha sha* might be the force of *Fu-yün* and that *Khri-bañs* might be the wife of his son.

(170) Chapter of *T'u-yu-hun*, in the two *T'ang-shu*-s; entry for the 5th month of summer in the 8th year of *Chên-kuan*, in the *T'ung-chien* Bk. 194; entry for the 14th year of *Chên-kuan*, Chap. of Reconciliation, Section of Foreign Subjects, in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* Bk. 978 (冊府元龜, 九七八, 外臣部, 和親)

(171) *Ha sha khri sde stod pa rGya la gtogs*, TLTD, II, p. 30; *rGyañi kham su gtogs pañi Ha sha*, *ibid.*, p. 32. In the latter case, *thog ma* of *thog ma drañs pañi dmag dpon* is translated as “first”, but it should be translated as “the allied forces”. (cf. Note 91). This usage can be confirmed by the example found in the inscriptions (AHE, p. 17, Inscrp. 1. 27) and in the *T'un-huang* documents (TLTD, II, p. 32; p. 74; p. 279).

(172) See KTK, p. 252, n. 31. *T'u-yu-hun* was invaded by the *T'u-fan* forces who had it as an underlying motive that the King of *T'u-yu-hun* had interfered, in the occasion of his visit to the *T'ang* Court, with the Chinese princess' marrying into the *T'u-fan*

After these events *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* ruled Tibet for five years⁽¹⁷³⁾. After his death, *Khri sroñ brtsan* ascended to the throne for the second time in 643. This King got married with Princess *Wên-ch'êng* in 646 and died in 649. This is what we have already discussed above.

VI.

Mixing of the Traditions of Princess *Wên-ch'êng*
and Princess *Chin-ch'eng*

In the first half of the present article, the writer discussed the dates of the Tibetan kings on basis of the assumed confusion of traditions concerning the two Chinese Princesses⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ and the similar mixing of the history of *Khri sroñ brtsan* with that of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*.

While examining the Tibetan tradition that *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* was born of Princess *Chin-ch'êng*, we already introduced the entries in *Bu ston Chos ḥbyuñ* and *Hu lan deb ther*⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ that Princess *Chin-ch'êng* was at first married to *ḥJañs tsha lha dbon*, son of *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* and *ḥJañs bzaḥ Khri btsun*, and that after her husband's death she was married for the second time to *Mes Ag tshom*. In addition to these two books of history, there are similar entries in the *Deb dmar gsar ma*⁽¹⁷⁶⁾, the Chapter *Ḥa* of the *Kloñ rdol gsuñ ḥbum*,⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ the *dPag bsam ljon bzañ*,⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ and the *mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston*⁽¹⁷⁹⁾: the Princess was married at first to *lHa dbon*, and later she was remarried to his father *Mes Ag tshom*. Together with this version, the *mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston* introduces a divergent story that *lHa dbon* had been dead before the arrival of the Chinese Princess. This latter version is introduced

royal family. This visit of the T'u-yu-hun King to the T'ang Court is recorded in the entry for the 12th month of the 10th year of *Chên-kuan*. (The visits of the Foreign Subjects, *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* Bk. 999 冊府元龜, 九九九, 外臣部, 入覲) The return of the T'u-fan messenger from the T'ang Court must have been later than the beginning of the next year as the earliest possibility; therefore, the attack by the T'u-fan forces against T'u-yu-hun could be after the beginning of the 11th year of *Chên-kuan*.

(173) See Notes 91 and 92.

(174) The confusion in the description concerning the two Chinese princesses was quite extensive. It was indicated in Note 100 already that one example of the confusion can be found in the Tibetan tradition concerning the introduction of the T'ang calendar to Tibet.

(175) See pp. 152-153 in the first half of this article.

(176) DMS, f. 19b.

(177) *Kloñ rdol gsuñ ḥbum*, Chap. *Ḥa*, f. 10a.

(178) *dPag bsam ljon bzañ* (*ḥPhags yul rGya nag chen po Bod dañ Sog yul du dam paḥi chos byuñ tshul*), fol. 317. The present writer used the text in the collection of l'Ecole Française d'Extreme-Orient, f. 97b. (cf. Das edition, p. 151).

(179) KG, *Ja*, ff. 71a-73a.

in the *Chronicle of the Fifth Dalai Lama*⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ and the *rGyal rab gsal baḥi me loṅ*⁽¹⁸¹⁾. The *rBa bshed* has a similar version⁽¹⁸²⁾.

The *Chronicle of the Fifth Dalai Lama* describes most simply the latter version in the following way⁽¹⁸³⁾:

Khri lde gtsug brtsan Mes ag tshom took *Khri btsun* of the *hJaṅ* family in marriage. Their child *lHa dbon*, grand-son of *hJaṅ*, was a handsome boy, no less handsome than God himself. Since there was no young girl in Tibet suitable to be his bride, many presents were sent together with the messenger to receive as his bride a princess (*koṅ jo*), a daughter of the Chinese sovereign *Yag hjam*⁽¹⁸⁴⁾ *khri bsher laṅ ma* of the *Li* family. (The princess) looked into the mirror (of miracle) in her possession which told her luck. . . . There appeared (for her groom) in the mirror, a figure of a prince so handsome as God's own son. She left for Tibet. (In the meanwhile in Tibet), *gÑags Khri bzaṅ yaṅ ḥdon*, resentful of the prince's not marrying a daughter of the *gÑags* family⁽¹⁸⁵⁾, murdered the prince. . . . At that time, the princess looked (again) into the mirror, and saw an ugly figure which did not bear the slightest resemblance with the prince she had seen before. From Tibet, there came a man with the sad news (of the prince's death). (Without being troubled about the news) the princess resumed her journey for Tibet. . . . At *mChims phu*, she was asked to be the consort of *Mes ag tshom*, (father of the prince).

This version, however, does not correspond at all to what is informed from the *T'un-hung Annals*⁽¹⁸⁶⁾. In the entry for the year 739, in the *T'un-huang*

(180) (*Khri lde gtsug brtan mes ag tshom gyis*) *hjaṅ mo khri btsun khab tu bshes par sras hjaṅ tsha lha dbon shes pa lha bas chog mi ṣes paḥi mdzes sdug can shig ḥkhrunṣ par, bod la deḥi btsun mor ḥos paḥi na chuṅ ma rñed pas/ rgya rje yag hjam li khri bsher laṅ maḥi sras mo koṅ jo bsa baḥi skyes kyi dños po daṅ pho ṅa mñags par, legs ṅes ston paḥi me loṅ shig yod par bltas pas. . . . rgyal bu de ḥahi khyeḥu ltar mdzes pa shig tu mthoṅ nas byon naḥaṅ/ gñags kyi bu mo ma blaṅs paḥi ḥkhon gyis gñags khri bzaṅ yaṅ ḥdon gyis rgyal bu bkroṅs/ / dus der koṅ jos me loṅ la bltas pas/ rgyal bu bshin mi sdug pa shig tu mthoṅ ba bshin, bod nas gтам nan pa skyel mi byuṅ naḥaṅ byon/ / mchims phur mes ag tshoms kyi btsun mor mñahṅ gsol lo/ SG, f. 31a.*

(181) GS, ff. 82b-83a.

(182) BSh, pp. 2-3.

(183) SG, f. 31a.

(184) *Khri bsher laṅ ma* or *Khri bsher maṅ ma* (KG, Ja f, 71a-b) should be *Yung-wang Shou-li* 雍王守禮, but we do not know why he came to be called so in the Tibetan documents. Since *naṅ blon ched po* is called *Lun-mang-jé* (論莽熱 *blon maṅ bsher*) in the Chinese documents, *khri bsher* may be taken as a rank next to *khri (btsan po)* in importance, and *maṅ bsher*, next to *maṅ po rje*. As to *Yag hjam*, see Note 37 in the first half of this article.

(185) *gÑags* is written as *rÑags* in the *T'un-huang* documents.

(186) *yos buḥi lo la/ / sras lhas bon dron na bshugs pa las noṅs/ btsan po yab dgun bod yul du slar gṣegs/ btsan mo kim ṣen khoṅ co noṅs par lo gcig/ DTH, p. 25.*

Annals, there is the following passage:

In the Hare year, Prince *lHas bon* was at *Dron*, and died there. His Father, *bTsan po*, went to the Bod district again in winter. Queen Princess *Kim çen* died. One year (passed over).

This was the 30th year after Princess *Chin-ch'êng*'s arrival at Tibet. It is not known at what year of age *lHas bon* died. What we know is that his father was *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* and his mother was, as the legends would have it, the so-called *hJañ mo Khri btsun*. However, it is not very clear whether she was the same as *Jo mo Khri btsun* whose funeral is said in the *T'un-huang Annals* to have taken place in 745⁽¹⁸⁷⁾. In any case, there is no trace which suggests Princess *Chin-ch'êng*'s marriage with *lHa dbon*. Far from the marriage with this Prince, according to what we know from the *T'un-huang Annals*, in 710 when the Princess came to Tibet, *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* (father of *lHas bon*), who was called "*Meg ag tshom* (grandfather with white beard)" in the books of later years was only at his 7th year of age⁽¹⁸⁸⁾. Again, it was in the same year (704) that the said King *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* (= *rGyal gtsug ru*) was born and his father died. Therefore, one could hardly mistake for the tradition of her remarriage with the father of the deceased prince the impossible case of her remarriage with the father of *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*.

Here again, we can find three factors which led to the confusion of the two Princesses: 1. *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* died in a Hare year just as *lHa dbon* died in another Hare year. 2. Princess *Chi-ch'êng* and *lHa dbon*

(187) Generally speaking, it takes about two or three full years after one died (*noñs*), until to be buried (*mdad blañ*). In the *Annals* in DTH, the death of *yum* (*sNa nams*) *mañ mo rje*, the mother of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, is recorded, but not her "funeral". On the other hand, no reference is there to the death of *Jo mo khri btsun*. Besides, the word *khri btsun* can be taken as a sort of title for the queen. Then, considering for the lapse of three years between "death" and "funeral", it is possible that these two names are actually of the same person. If so, this *Jo mo khri btsun* cannot be *hJañ mo khri btsun*. Another possibility is that *Jo mo* was *hJañ mo* herself, because *Myava la kag* paid a visit to the T'u-fan Court in 733. (DTH, p. 25).

(188) Sato explains in minute details the circumstances concerning this part. (KTK, pp. 393-411). Sato translates *bltams* as "birth" (*ibid.*, p. 395). In the preceding parts, however, he translates *bltams* of the same context to mean "ascension to the throne" (*ibid.*, p. 331; p. 336). Naturally, in both cases, the word should have been translated as "birth", and we cannot accept his contention (*ibid.*, pp. 382-383, n. 33).

Sato takes the word "re-naming, *mtshan gsol* (*mtshan bond*)" to mean "ascension to the throne" (KTK, pp. 396-397; p. 401; p. 409), but we cannot find any ground for it. Again, he follows Bacot in translating *rGyal gtsug ru* as "Crown Prince". This was, in fact, another name for *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*, and did not mean "Crown Prince". If the change of name is to be taken for ascension to the throne, then how can Sato explain the fact that *Khri hdu sroñ* who was enthroned in 676 according to Sato (KTK, p. 331; p. 336) changed the name in 685?

The story in the Chinese documents that *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* was enthroned at his 7th year of age (KTK, p. 393) can only be explained reasonably as a mistake of his age at the time of the advent of the Princess to Tibet.

died in the same year. 3. When "the Princess and *Khri btsun*" are mentioned, they can be taken to mean either Princess *Wên-ch'êng* and *Bal bzah Khri btsun*, or Princess *Chin-ch'êng* and *hJan bzah Khri btsun*.

The conclusion the present writer built up on the mixed traditions of the two Chinese Princesses was as follows: *Guñ soñ guñ btsan*, son of *Khri sroñ brtsan*, took Princess *Wên-ch'êng* as a consort. As he died shortly afterwards, his father *Khri sroñ brtsan* got married with her. *Khri sroñ brtsan* was really the grandfather (*Mes*) to *Mañ slon mañ brtsan*, the Princess' son. It is permitted for her to borrow the appellative from her son. And it is not strange for him at his 66th year of age (646) to have a white beard (*Ag tshom*).

According to *Bu ston Chos hbyuñ*⁽¹⁸⁹⁾, after the death of her husband, Princess *Chin-ch'êng* obtained an image of the Buddha from China. It must be based on the mistaken report for the fact that Princess *Wên-ch'êng* did so to have the *Ra mo che* Shrine built for the sake of her deceased husband.

As we discussed already, *dPaḥo gtsug lag hphreñ ba*, a great historian who lived almost at the same period as the Fifth Dalai Lama, introduced the two different stories concerning to the marriage of Princesses *Chin-ch'êng*; first he told us the story of her remarriage⁽¹⁹⁰⁾, and then he introduced a different version that she was married to *Mes ag tshom* for the first time⁽¹⁹¹⁾. Let us now examine the story of her remarriage introduced by *dPaḥo gtsug lag hphreñ ba*:

When it was known that there was a daughter of *Khri bsher mañ ma* of the Chinese royal family *Li*, called *Kyim çan koñ jo*, it was agreed to take her as the Prince's bride. *Khri bzah yañ ston* of *gNags* was dispatched with thirty retainers to take the bride, and a box (with the letter from *bTsan po*) was presented to the Chinese ruler. The Chinese ruler told his daughter to go (to Tibet). She looked into the magical mirror in her possession which would tell the lives of the past, present and future. . . . She came to Tibet. Before long⁽¹⁹²⁾ the Prince, while he was riding⁽¹⁹³⁾ at night, was shot by the sorcerer's arrow, and died⁽¹⁹⁴⁾ at *hJan thañ dge ra*.

(189) See p. 152 in the first half of this article.

(190) *rgya rje li khri bsher mañ mañi sras mo kyim çan koñ jo bya ba yod zer de blañ bar hcham/gñags khri bzah yañ ston la hkhör sum bcu dañ bcas nas gñe bor btañ nas rgya rje la sgrom bu phul bas, rgya rjes bu mo la bsgo bas, bu mos rañ gi hphrul gyi me loñ srid gsum mthoñ ba shig yod pa la bltas pa. . . . rgyal bu lhañ bu hdra ba mthoñ nas hgro bar byas nas bod du hoñs/ çul du rgyal bus mtshan la rta bcags pas hjan thañ dge rar sñags pañi zor mdañ hphañs pas phog ste groñs/ KG, Ja f. 71a-b.*

(191) *Ibid.*, ff. 71b-72a.

(192) The meaning of the word *çul du* is "immediately after".

(193) The word *bcags* means "to whip a horse to run". Cf. *rta lcag*, "whip"; *lcag po* = *mggyogs po*, "speedily".

(194) The story of the Prince's death by a fall from the horse is also told connected with the record concerning Princess *Chin-ch'êng*. For instance, in KG, Ja f. 71b, l. 5, it is told as a quotation of a Chinese book as follows: "*rgyañi deb las rgya rje hkhör*

In the above-quoted entry, *gNags Khri bzañ yañ ston*, who was referred to by the Fifth Dalai Lama as the murderer of the Prince, is mentioned as the royal envoy for China. Does not the passage that the Prince was killed while riding a horse remind us of the 54th line⁽¹⁹⁵⁾ of the text in the Stein Collection which was introduced in the very beginning of this fascicle?

Those facts that *Tsha çod*, the place of residence of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*, was in immediate north of *hJañ yul*, and that the place name where the murder of the Prince took place is thus clearly indicated by *dPañ gtsug lag hphreñ ba* lead us to suspect that *hJan thañ dge ra*⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ might be the spot where *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* died⁽¹⁹⁷⁾.

I heard that the porcelain image of "Princess *Wên-ch'êng*" which is made and sold in market in China today has a mirror in her hand. So far, however, I cannot substantiate this story. In any case, this story may serve as an evidence of possibility of the switch of the traditions of the two Chinese Princesses. A considerable number of the readers of the present article may not be quite satisfied when they are told that there was a switch, or a mixing up of the stories on the two Princesses. I did not say anything so far about the evidences that the stories on Princess *Chin-ch'êng* were switched to mean Princess *Wên-ch'êng*. Although I am going to discuss about these cases in a later occasion, I wish in the meanwhile that the readers will refer to the examples I collected in the Note 100.

Explanations were made in the pertinent places of this article as to the reasons why the stories originally meant for Princess *Wên-ch'êng* were changed to designate Princess *Chin-ch'êng*. To make the new stories sound natural, several distortions and falsifications of the historical facts must have been made. E.g. The Princess's remarriage came to be told as if it were her first marriage and so on. However, the historical truth is not to be easily concealed in this way.

dañ bcas pas koñ jo la mkhar chen po shiñ pheñ hen gyi bar du skyel thuñ mdzad, mkhar deñi ñes pa can hthar du bcug, dmag dañ ldab nor lo gcig med par byas". The part of this quotation corresponds to the passage of "The Emperor went to *Shih-ping*... He granted amnesty to the *Shih-ping* District. Death punishment was repealed and the people were exempt from the imposition for one year 帝爲幸始平,... 爲赦始平県, 罪死皆免, 賜民繇賦一年" in the *T'u-fan-chuan* of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*. The sentence following it, however, which describes the death by a fall from the horse (*rgyal bu bod tu rta brgyugs pas rtas bskyur ste hdas*) has no corresponding passage in the Chinese document. This part must be a later addition to the original story after the confusion of the histories of the two princesses.

(195) In the missing part of Line 54 of the Tibetan document must have been a description of the death by a fall from a horse.

(196) As seen in Note 103, *Tsha çod* was an important strategic spot leading to *hJañ yul*.

(197) The death by a fall from a horse is said of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* and also of his son, *Mu rug brtsan po*. It is in this text only that the place-name of the accident is mentioned. In one version of the stories about *Mu rug brtsan po*'s death, he is said to be on the way home from *Mon yul*. In compliance with the extension of *Mon yul* in old days, *Tsha çod* might have been confused with the place where *Mu rug brtsan po* died. However, there is no positive ground for that.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AHE Richardson, H.: *Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa*, London, 1952.
- BC *dGe ḥdun chos ḥphel: Bod chen poḥi srid lugs dañ ḥbrel baḥi rgyal rabs deb ther dkar po*, 46f., 1946.
- BSh Stein, R. A. (ed.): *Une chronique de bSam-yes: sBa-bzed*, Paris, 1961.
- DC *Bu ston rin chen grub: bDe bar gcegs paḥi bstan pa gsal byed cho skyi ḥbyuñ gnas gsuñ rab rin po cheḥi mdzod*, 203f., 1322/3. (The Chronicle of Tibet begins from f. 122b)
- DMS *bsod nams grags pa: Deb ther dmar poḥi deb gsar ma* (rGyal rabs ḥphrul gyi lde mig), (Mr. gDan sa pa's MS), 80f., 1538.
In his 'Tibetan Historical Documents' (*Tōhōgaku* 14, 1956, p. 12), Tucci ascribes this work to *bsod nams rgyal mtshan*, a monk from the *ḥBras spuñs* Monastery. It is cited as the work of *Panchen bsod nams grags pa* in the *Vaidūrya gser po*, p. 72 (*Ḥatapitaka*).
- DTH Bacot, J., F. W. Thomas, Ch. Toussaint: *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*, Paris, 1940. (Pelliot nos. 1286, 1288; Stein Or 8212 (187).)
- GR *Grags pa rgyal mtshan: rGyal rabs, Sa skya pa grags pa rgyal mtshan* (1147-1216) gyi *bKaḥ ḥbum, Ta*; ff. 196b-200a.
- GS *bsod nams rgyal mtshan: rGyal rabs rnams kyi byuñ tshul gsal baḥi me loñ chos byuñ* 104f., 1368(?).
Bla ma dam pa bsod nams rgyal mtshan (1312-1375); cf. DMS f. 4 a, *Sa skya gduñ rabs* (Mr. gDan sa pa's MS) f. 156b, and *Bla maḥi rnam thar [Lam ḥbras, Ka.]*, f. 201a.
Accepting Thomas opinion, Tucci mistakenly admits of influences of the *Deb ther shon po* in this work, TPS. p. 141. The work, wrongly named by Thomas *gsal baḥi me loñ* (TLTD II. p. 34), is in fact none other than the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*; cf. Note. 51 of the first half of this article and TPS p. 142. Incidentally, *Kloñ rdol bla ma* cites a work entitled *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loñ* by *gShu khañ ba legs paḥi ces rab* in his *gsuñ ḥbum, Ha*, f. 57a, The details of which is not known however.
- HD *Kun dgaḥ blo gros: Hu lan deb ther*, 1346. (*The Red Annals*, Pt. I, Gangtok, 1961.)
- KG *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba: mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston* [*IHo brag chos ḥbyuñ*] (1545-1565), *Ja* (*Ḥatapitaka*, New Delhi, 1962).
- KTk Sato Hisashi: *Kodai Tibetto shi no Kenkyū* (The Study of Ancient Tibetan History) 2 vols., Kyoto, 1958/59.
- MBT Tucci, G.: *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part II, Roma, 1958.
- SG *Blò bzañ rgya mtsho: Gañs can yul gyi sa la spyod paḥi thos ris kyi rgyal blon gtso bor brjod paḥi deb ther rdzogs ldan gshon nuḥi dgaḥ ston*, 113f., 1643.
- TAMS Stein, R. A.: *Les tribus anciennes des marches Sino-Tibétaines*, Paris, 1958.
- TLTD II Thomas, F. W.: *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning the Chinese Turkestan*, Pt. II, London, 1951.
- TPS Tucci, G.: *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, 3 vols., Rome, 1949.
- TTK Tucci, G.: *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*, Rome, 1950.
- TY Yamaguchi Z.: *rTsañ yul and Yan lag gsum paḥi ru*, pp. 1-69, *The Tōyō Gakuho* Vol. 50, No. 4, Tokyo, 1968.