

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

(Part I)

By Zuiho YAMAGUCHI

Contents

- I. Examination of the *Chiu-sheng* 舅甥 Relation Seen in the Chinese Materials and the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei* 唐蕃會盟碑.
- II. Disagreements between the Accounts Given by Tibetan Historical Works and the *Tun-huang* Documents.
- III. Chronology of *Guñ sron guñ rtsan*.

I.

Examination of the *Chiu-sheng* Relation Seen in the Chinese Materials and the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei*.

The matrimonial relationship was twice established between the *T'ang* 唐 and the *T'u-fan* 吐蕃 (=ancient Tibetan) dynasties. According to Chinese traditions, Princess *Wen-ch'eng* 文成, for the first time, in the first month of the 15th year of *Chen-kuan* 貞觀 of *T'ai tsung* 太宗 (=641), and Princess *Chin-ch'eng* 金城, for the second, in the 4th year of *Ching-lung* 景龍 of *Chung-tsung* 中宗 (=710), were given in marriage to the kings of *Tu'-fan*.

The point to be examined here is whether either of them gave birth to a son by a king of *T'u-fan*. As it is touched upon by the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei* or the Inscription of the Sino-Tibetan Alliance, I shall take it up as the first step in my consideration. However, I shall not go into details about the texts, which may be referred to in the studies already made by many scholars.⁽¹⁾ The inscription was erected in the third year of *Chang-ch'ing* 長慶 (=823). The texts quoted below are based on those given by *Li Fang-kuei* 李方桂 and *Satō Hisashi* 佐藤長 with a few additional reconstructions of mine, and wherever they offer different emendations, I have chosen one or the other at my own discretion.

First, let us see the Chinese text on the West Face. (Numbers indicate lines.)

(1) A detailed history of the studies of the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei* is contained in KTK pp. 874-931.

- 1 大唐文武孝德皇帝□□□□大蕃聖神贊[普]□□□舅甥二主、商議社稷如一、結立大和盟約、永無淪替、神人俱以證知、世世代代使其稱贊、是以盟文節目、題之於碑也。
- 2 文武孝德皇帝與□□□□□□贊陛下二聖舅甥、···商議叶同、務令萬姓安泰、所思如一、久遠大善、再續慈親之情、重申隣好之義、爲此大和矣、今···
- 3 蕃漢二國···今社稷叶同如一、爲此大和然、舅甥相好之義善···

The term *Chiu-sheng* occurs three times in the above lines, and the 4th line, which is not quoted here, contains another.

The corresponding Tibetan text is also inscribed on the West Face, which runs as follows:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. /bod gyi rgyal po chen po | The Great King of Tibet, the God Incarnate |
| 2. ḥphrul gyi lha btsan po dañ | <i>bTsan po</i> and the Chinese Sovereign |
| 3. rgyaḥi rgyal po chen po rgya rje hvañ te | <i>Huang ti</i> , both <i>dbon</i> and <i>shañ</i> , having conferred on a State affair and |
| 4. <i>dbon shañ</i> gñis//chab srid ⁽²⁾ | come to an agreement, held a great gathering for peace, and made a treaty |
| 5. gcig du mol nas ⁽³⁾ //mjal dum | oath. In order that it may never change, |
| 6. chen po mdzad de gtsigs bca[s] | it was made known to and witnessed by, |
| 7. pa//nam shar yañ myi ḥgyur bar | all gods and men. The main terms of |
| 8. lha myi kun [(gyis)] ⁽⁴⁾ ces çin dpañ byas | [the treaty oath made at the gathering |
| 9. te//tshe tshe [rabs rab]s su//brjod | for peace] was [engraved on] a stone-pillar so as to be handed down by word |
| 10. du yod paḥi [mjal dum gyi gtshigs] | of mouth for generations [and generations.] |
| 11. kyi mdo rdo riñs [la bris paḥo] | |

(2) The compound *chab srid* is variously translated: 'State' by Sato in KTK pp.913, 923, 924, 'Kingdom' by Richardson in AHE pp.60, 61, 62, 70, 71, and 'government' by *Li Fang-huei* in his 'The Inscription of the Sino-Tibetan Treaty of 821-822,' *T'oung Pao* 64, 1956, pp. 55, 62, 63, 65. But none of them can be adopted here. The meaning 'State' may be expressed by the compound *rgyal khab*, while *chab srid* means 'State affair,' i.e. diplomatic contacts, political negotiation, etc. Although the Chinese counterpart *she-chi* 社稷 signifies 'State', the phrase *shang-i she-chi* 商議社稷 as a whole has the meaning 'to confer on a State affair' just as its Tibetan equivalent in the inscription has. I have not yet come across the term *chab srid* used in the sense of 'State' in the *Tun-huang* documents. The phrase *chab srid gcig du* is translated by Sato 'to make their States be as one', and similar translations are made by both Richardson ('to unite their kingdom') and *Li* ('their government be as one'). Nevertheless, in view of the promise made by the countries concerned to observe their boundaries and not to interfere each other, none of these translations could be considered appropriate to the context.

(3) The suffix *nas*, inserted in between two clauses, always indicates the sequence of actions or states in relation to time, and should not be confounded with the suffix *te* (/de/ste). For the usage of the latter suffix, cf. my 'On the Tibetan Conjunctive Suffix -te -ste and -de,' *Tōyō Gakuhō*, Vol. 39, No. 4, pp.49-88.

12. ḥphrul gyi [lha btsan po khri gtsug] The God Incarnate, [(His Majesty)]
[*bTsan po Khri gtsug*] *lde brtsan* [and]
13. lde brtsan gyi [(sha sña nas dañ)]⁽⁴⁾ [rgya rje] the Chinese Sovereign *Wen-wu-k'ao-te*
[*huang-ti*, both *dbon*] and *shañ*,...
14. bhun bhu heḥu ti[g hvañ te dbon]
15. *shañ gñis*/...
.....
19. ...//mañ po kun bde ...With the similar intention to make all
20. skyid par bya ba la ni dgoñs people happy, they agreed on the great
pa gcig truth of the everlasting good.
21. yun riñ por legs paḥi don chen po
22. la ni bkaḥ gros mthun te//gñen After having conferred that the [desira-
23. rñiñ paḥi sri shu ni sa khyim ble] respect to old relatives [is realized]
tshes through repeating the [(occasions)] for
24. dgyes paḥi cha [(rkyen)]⁽⁵⁾ brt- the neighbouring countries to become
segs par friendly, they held the great gathering
25. mol nas//mjal dum chen po ni for peace. Both Tibet and China, now,...
26. mdzad de//bod rgya gñis/da
ltar
.....
36. da chab srid gcig ciñ/mjal Now that they concurred on the State
37. dum chen po ḥdi ltar mdzad affair, and held such a great gathering
pas/ for peace as this, they should also frequ-
38. *dbon shañ* dgyes paḥi bkaḥ ently exchange their messages for *dbon*
ḥphrin and *shañ* to become friendly.
39. sñan pas kyañ ḥdrul⁽⁶⁾ dgos te//

The *chiu-sheng* relation is expressed in reverse order in Tibetan as *dbon shañ*. Next, let us proceed to read the lines from the Tibetan text on the East Face where the *chiu-sheng* relation is manifested in a more concrete form.

21. ...//dañ po rgya rje li rgyal sar Since the Chinese Sovereign *Li* had as-
shugs nas//deḥe tañ gi srid lo cended the Throne for the first time, 23
[ñi ḥu] years elapsed in the reign of the *Ta-t'ang*
22. rtsa gsum lon//rgyal rabs gcig [Great *T'ang*]. The God Incarnate

(4) I have given a reconstruction [(gyis)], and [(*sha sña nas dañ*)] 'His Majesty, and'.

(5) The phrase *sa khyim tshes*, together with *yul khyim tshes* in the 38th line of the East inscription, means 'neighbouring countries'. 'dgyes' is the verbal form for *dgah*. Its meaning is 'to be intimate with'. In addition, [(*rkyen*)] is tentatively provided for the damaged part, following *cha*, as a possible reading.

(6) Might this be an old form of *grul*? At any rate, its meaning is 'to be active.' cf. DTH. p. 197; KTK. p. 915, n. 5.

- gi hog tu//hphrul gyi lha btsan. [po] *bTsan [po] Khri sron brtsan*, succeeding to a single royal line, and the Chinese Sovereign *T'ai-tsung Wen-wu-sheng-huang-ti*, both, having conferred on a State affair and come to an agreement, *Wen-ch'eng-kung-chu* was received in marriage at the Court of *bTsan po* in a year of *Chen-kuan*. Thereafter, the God Incarnate *bTsan po Khri ld[e gtsug] brtsan* and the Chinese Sovereign *San-lang-k'ai-yüan-sheng-wen-shen-wu-huang-ti* both conferred on a State affair, and came to an agreement. Thus after they had renewed friendship, *Chin-ch'eng-kung-chu* was received in marriage at the Court of *bTsan po* in a year of *Ching-lung*. Thereafter, they became friendly, related as *dbon* and *shañ*.
23. khri sron brtsan dañ//rgya rje thehe tsoñ bhum bu çin hvañ te gñis [//chab]
24. srid gcig du mol nas//ceñ kvañ gi lo la//mun ceñ koñ co
25. btsan poñi khab tu blañs//phyis hphrul gyi lha btsan po khri ld[e gtsug]
26. brtsan dañ//rgya rje sam lañ khahe hgvan ceñ bhun çin bhun hvañ te [gñis]
27. [/cha]b srid gcig du mol te//gñen brtsegs nas//keñ luñ gi lo [la]
28. kim] çin koñ co//btsan poñi khab du blañs nas⁽⁷⁾//dbon shañ du gyur
29. te dgyes pa las//bar hgañ phan tshun gyi soñi blon pos gnod po
30. dag rdul byas kyañ//gñen bañi tshab gañ du bya ba⁽⁸⁾//thugs brel⁽⁹⁾ che nas
31. do [ba]⁽¹⁰⁾ dag gi tshe//dmag stoñs kyis phan thogs par byas pa dañ//phan tshun
32. [thu]gs noñs⁽¹¹⁾ byuñ ño chog
- In the meantime, however, frontier officers on both sides caused troubles by infringements, but their friendship was never affected; [rather] it was enhanced.
- At the time of calamities assistance was offered by dispatching military forces.
- Whenever death occurred in the mutual

(7) This suffix should be so translated that it could be made clear that the succeeding event, i.e. *dgyes pa*, 'to become friendly' took place in either case after the two marriages had been concluded. To show that the *dbon shañ* relation was formed as the result of the second marriage, the suffix *te* must be used instead of *nas*, thus directly connecting *dbon shañ du gyur* with the clause preceding *nas*. Later Tibetan historians seem to have held that this relation was brought into being by the second marriage, that is, by Princess *Wen-ch'eng's*.

(8) *Tshab gañ du bya ba* in fact expresses a strong denial.

(9) *Thugs brel che nas* means 'after enhancing the sentiments of mutual connection'. The word *brel* is now spelled *hbrel*.

(10) *Li Fang-kuei* gives a reconstruction *do [ha]*. But it may probably be *do [ba]*, and thus referring to the actual event that is known as the revolt of *Chu-tzu* 朱泚. The context, anyhow, gives a hint that a word signifying 'calamity, disaster' should be supplied for the place. I take this word as an old form of *sdo ba*.

(11) *Thugs noñs* denotes 'grief at a sorrowful matter such as death'. In the *Tun-huang* documents *noñs* appears combined with *legs* as *noñs legs*, which is employed in the sense 'unhappiness and happiness'. The use of *noñs* in the meaning 'death' is also

- na//dgyes snañ dag kyañ ma court, they strictly refrained from the
tshad par bsr̥is te// cheerful conduct.
33. ḥdi ltar ñe çin gñen ba yin na They were thus closely related, and their
//dbon shañ gi tshul kho na ltar faith [in each other] remained unshaken
//thugs exactly as the relationship between *dbon*
34. yi dam phabs pa⁽¹²⁾ las⁽¹³⁾//... and *shañ* should be.

In lines 28 and 29 it is mentioned that the *dbon shañ* relation was established after one of the two marriages had been concluded between the two dynasties. But which one brought about this relation remains unknown. At any rate, the inscription on the East Face confirms that the relation of *dbon* and *shañ*, or *chiu* and *sheng* in the Chinese text, was formed after that of *chiu* 'father-in-law or wife's father' and *hsü* 'son-in-law or daughter's husband' had been established. As to the relation of *dbon* and *shañ*, I propose to take it as that of grandson and maternal grandfather. Let us now examine a typical view concerning this relation expressed by Tucci.

He says, 'That *zan* means uncle can hardly be doubted: this is the usual sense of the word and this is testified by the Tibetan and Chinese tradition as well, when it refers to the relation existing between the Tibetan king and the Chinese emperor as being that of *dbon* and *zan*, uncle and nephew.'⁽¹⁴⁾ So far as the first half of this remark is concerned, he rightly explains a later usage of the word. But, to be more exact, he should put it as 'maternal uncle.' The second half of the remark will be inquired into in the following.

It appears that *shañ* (*po*) was originally an appellative term used by a husband for his wife's father.⁽¹⁵⁾ The usage of the word as such precisely agrees with that of the Chinese *chiu* or *chiu-fu* 舅父. By the analogy of this, however, it cannot be concluded that *dbon* (*po*) also has the same particular sense of the Chinese *sheng* that is defined in a gloss to the *Erh-ya* 爾雅: 然則亦宜呼壻爲甥 'Thus *hsü* (son-in-law) may be called *sheng* as well', which is directly adopted from the passage in the *Erh-ya*: 謂我舅者吾謂之甥 'One who calls me *chiu* (father-in-law) is called *sheng* by me.'⁽¹⁶⁾ Even though the Chinese *sheng*

met. In the present context the compound *thugs noñs* refers to the exchange of ambassadors for condolence on the inauspicious occasions, between the two royal families.

(12) *Thugs yi dam phabs pa* means that their confidence in each other had been stable.

(13) This suffix *las*, closely linked with the abverb *lhag par* in Line 38, indicates comparison. This passage mentions that, in spite of the fact that the two dynasties were on better terms during the reign of *Khri lde sroñ brtsan* than in these periods, a treaty such as this never came into being. This refers to the fact that their relationship had completely improved towards 804, lasting as such until the end of his reign (=815).

(14) TTK p. 58. It must be noted, however, that the relation of *dbon* and *zan* 'in this sense' has not been testified yet by the Tibetan and Chinese tradition.

(15) cf. TTK p. 58: '*zan* cannot always mean *father-in-law*.'

(16) In the 4th of the *Shih-ch'in* 釋親 chapters in the '*Erh-ya-cheng-i*' with its annotation 「爾雅正義」及釋文, Book V, (8 vols., 20 books) is said: 妻之父爲外舅, 妻之母外姑 'The wife's father is [called] *wai-chiu*; the wife's mother *wai-ku*.' The second quotation in the

has the sense of *hsü* as well, we cannot expect that the Tibetan *dbon* (*po*) has the same sense (which is expressed by 'mag pa' in Tibetan). The original meaning of *dbon* (= *sbon*) (*po*) was 'grandson' in relation to *mes* (= *myes*) (*po*) 'grandfather.'⁽¹⁷⁾ From old times 'dbon' have been used in close combinations with 'mes' as in *yab myes dbon sras* 'father-grandfather-grandson-son.'

As a grandson regarded himself as *dbon* (*po*) in relation to his father's father, so he must have regarded himself as a grandson in relation to his mother's father. In addressing to the latter, however, he did not call him *mes* (*po*), for the maternal grandfather did not belong to his *rus pa* or family. Instead, he borrowed the term *shañ* (*po*) for him that was originally used by his father to refer to his mother's father. In short, *shañ* (*po*) thus came to be adopted as the appellative term for the maternal grandfather in relation to the grandson.

The same relation could be indicated by the Chinese *chiu-sheng*. Thus it is clearly stated in the *Yin-hui* 韻會, which is said to be compiled at *Chin* 晉 time: 甥外孫曰甥據外祖而言也 'Sheng refers to *wai-sun* (daughter's son); it is in relation to *wai-tsu* (maternal grandfather) that he is called *sheng*.'⁽¹⁸⁾ Accordingly, it may be allowed to say that the Chinese *chiu-sheng* and the Tibetan *dbon shañ* both could be used to indicate the relation of maternal grandfather and grandson.

Then, how were these two relations indicated by the term *chiu-sheng*:

text is found at the end of the passages of *Mu-tang* 母黨 used for an explication of the above two phrases and followed by the first quotation. As an example 婿親迎見於舅姑 is cited in the gloss.

(17) In *myes khri sroñ rtsan*..., *sbon khri mañ slon mañ rtsan* in DTH p.13, *myes* is the old form of *mes*; *sbon* a variant form of *dbon*. Instances of the use of *myes* and these compounds (*yab myes*, *dbon sras*, *yab myes dbon sras*) are met in the Karchung Inscription, the revised text of which is given in TTK pp. 104-107. As a result of his misinterpretation of *sbon*, attached to *Mañ slon mañ brtsan* in the *Tun-huang Annals*, to correspond to its later usage as in *khu dbon* 'paternal uncle and nephew', the author of the *Deb ther dkar po* (BC. ff. 35a-b, 41b) suspects him to be the son of *Khri sroñ brtsan*'s younger brother *brTsan sroñ* (cf. Richardson H.: A fragment from Tun-huang. *Bulletin of Tibetology*, vol. II. no. 3, 1965, Sikkim) This erroneous identification is due to his disregard of the later development of the meaning of *dbon*. *dBon* became the honorific form of *tsha*, and is later found in a compound like *dbon brgyud*, a term concerning the inheritance system, as well. In this case, it represents the *khu dbon* relation, namely, that of 'paternal uncle and nephew.' The term *khu dbon* might have come into idiomatic use by analogy of *dbon shañ* when *dbon* had acquired the meaning 'nephew' in relation to *shañ* 'maternal uncle.' In such instances as *rGya tsha* or *hJañ tsha*, *tsha* denotes 'child' related to the Chinese or the people of *hJañ* on the maternal line. But it also means 'grandson' although, unlike *dbon*, it is the term used on the side of *mes po* with reference to the maternal line, and therefore, can be rather a despiteous term. *dBon*, a term relating to the lineal descendant to *shañ*, but the honorific form for *tsha*, precedes *shañ* in *dbon shañ* as against *khu dbon*. This may be considered to demonstrate the status of *dbon* superior to *shañ*.

(18) Fragments of the now lost *Yin-hui* by *Meng-ch'ang* 孟昶 of *Chin* are found in the second book of the *Hsiao-hsüeh-sou-i* 小學蒐佚, which was compiled by *Lung-chang* 龍璋 of *Min-kuo* 民國.

that of wife's father and husband, and that of maternal grandfather and grandson (= *dbon shañ*), distinguished in the *Sui* 隋 and *T'ang* period?

In the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* 吐蕃傳 of the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* 舊唐書 is found a memorial addressed to *T'ai-tsung* by Princess *Wen-ch'eng*'s husband *Khri sroñ brtsan* on the occasion of the Emperor's return from *Liao-tung* 遼東, where he mentions: 奴恭預子壻 'I, your servant, enjoy the honour of being [Your Majesty's] *tzu-hsü*.' Here it is seen that he calls himself *hsü*, not *sheng*. Again, Masao Mori says in his article 'The *Sui-T'ang* China and the Turkic Countries' that when the emperors of the *Sui* and *T'ang* dynasties gave their daughters (*kung-chu*) in marriage to foreign rulers, their relationship was always expressed as that between *chiu* and *hsü* or *fu-chün* 府君 and *fu-ma* 駙馬, namely, wife's father and husband.⁽¹⁹⁾ The term *chiu-sheng* was never applied to such a relationship. Therefore, it must have generally indicated another relationship, that of maternal grandfather and grandson in this epoch.

Then might it be said that the term *chiu-sheng* was so used in the inscription concerned as to show the relation of maternal grandfather and grandson? Our interpretation of the term as such cannot sufficiently explain the relationship between the two dynasties shown in the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei*. *Khri gtsug lde brtsan* (806–841) who erected the inscription and therein called himself *sheng* or *dbon* was a great-grandson of Princess *Chin-ch'eng*'s husband *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* (704–754). Thus, although we regard the princess as a daughter of the Emperor *Chung-tsung*, and *Khri gtsug lde brtsan* as related to her by blood,⁽²⁰⁾ the only possible relationship between the Emperor *Mu-tsung* 穆宗 and this *T'u-fan* King will be that between the descendant of *chiu* or *shañ* (*po*) and that of *sheng* or *dbon* (*po*).

The Tibetan *mes* (*myes*) (*po*) could denote 'ancestor above and including the great-grandfather,' as well as 'the grandfather,' on the father's side.⁽²¹⁾ Therefore, we may suppose that *shañ* (*po*) had the meaning 'ancestor above and including the great-grandfather' on the mother's side also. Similarly, the grandson and his male descendants must have been called *dbon* (*po*) by both *mes* (*po*) and *shañ* (*po*). In spite of such extensions of their meaning, as *Khri gtsug lde brtsan* is not allowed to call *shañ* (*po*) those emperors who belonged to the younger generations than the Emperor *Chung-tsung*, we need further consideration of them.

Now, might it be possible to assume the following process of a further development of their meaning? On hearing his father call his maternal grandfather *shañ* (*po*) in accordance with its original meaning, one began to call *shañ* (*po*) his maternal uncle as well. It is supposed that such might have

(19) MORI Masao: 隋唐とチュルク國家 'The *Sui-T'ang* China and the Turkic Countries' in 古代史講座 (*Lectures on Ancient History*), X, Tokyo, 1964, pp. 83–117.

(20) As for the fact that she was not the daughter of the Emperor *Chung-tsung*, see KTK pp. 415–417, and Demiéville, P.: *Le concile de Lhasa*, Paris, 1952, p. 1.

(21) TTK p. 104; as for the Karchung Inscription, see n. 17.

been the origin of its present-day usage. This newly accepted usage then occasioned a further extension of usage by which the son of *dbon* (*po*) was allowed to call that of his maternal uncle *shañ* (*po*). And it can hardly be doubted that the range of application of the terms was gradually enlarged in this way, so that a usage as seen in the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei* was finally brought into being. This is the newly acquired meaning of *dbon shañ* or *chiu-sheng*.

Concerning the title *shañ* that some important officials assumed under the *T'u-fan* dynasty, Tucci says that it appears to be applied to the members of the family from which the king has chosen his queen,⁽²²⁾ and lists the names of four officials with this title. Finally, in view of the fact that all the families to which they belonged provided the queens who bore heirs, his definition 'zan is the title given to officials related by marriage with the king'⁽²³⁾ is by no means satisfactory. If the word *shañ* (*po*) is taken in its original sense, the number of fathers-in-law would be very limited as each queen provides only one father-in-law, while the families which thus became related to the royal family would be by far more numerous than known to us today. Even if taken in its present-day sense as maternal uncle, *shañ* (*po*) presupposed the existence of *dbon* (*po*) related to him by his sister. Therefore, Tucci's definition is not enough to explain the use of the word as a title, much less the origin of its present-day usage. It may be considered that as *shañ*, used to refer to the high officials in the *T'u-fan* period, was an appellative term addressed to them by the king, the members of any family were not permitted to assume the title *shañ* unless the queen who came from their family bore a heir, who then ascended the throne.

Richardson gives an explanation that the title was assumed by the family which provided 'queen mothers', and points out that, in spite of the fact that the *Cog ro* clan provided two queens, its members were not entitled *shañ* since they had not borne children.⁽²⁴⁾ Apparently, he considers that only when a clan was related to the royal family by blood, its members obtained the title.

Among the signatures placed on an ancient edict is found a name of an official without the title *shañ* although other members of his clan are so entitled.⁽²⁵⁾ The interpretation offered by Richardson concerning this is

(22) TTK p. 58.

(23) TTK p. 61, and DTH p. 28. Queens of the clans *hBro*, *mChims*, *sNa nams* and *Tshes poñ* were, all of them, mothers of *bTsan pos*.

(24) AHE pp. 50 ff.

(25) *hBro ldog sroñ ston.* cf. KG f. 130b; the point is also taken into consideration in AHE p. 51. Richardson's trouble that the occurrence of the title *shañ* in the name of a minister of the *Myañ* clan might constitute an exception to his delimitation of the application of the title is utterly groundless since the name in question is not entitled *shañ*, even in his text. Incidentally, it may be noted that in case of the name *Myañ shañ snañ* in DTH pp. 101, 107 and 111 *shañ* is part of the name, and hence, here again, offering no problem.

different from mine, which is as in the following.

As we have seen above, the term *chiu-sheng* or *dbon-shañ* in the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei* does not represent neither the relation of 'father-in-law' and 'son-in-law', nor that of 'maternal grandfather' and 'grandson', nor that of 'maternal uncle' and 'nephew'. It seems to show the relationship between the offspring of both sides in the last mentioned relation. It must be noted here that the *chiu* or *shañ* in both of the second and third relations is a collateral ascendant in relation to the *sheng* or *dbon*. Thus, it seems that the distinction between ascendant and descendant was observed even when the off-spring of *chiu* or *shañ* and *sheng* or *dbon* called each other. Considering that the name of the official without the title *shañ* appears at the end of the list of signatures, the lack of the title may be due to the fact that as he was the youngest of all the high officials from his clan, probably one generation younger than the other co-signatories from his clan, he could not be entitled *shañ po* in relation to the king.

In the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* of the *Chiu-t'ang-shu* is quoted a memorial, addressed to the Emperor *Hsüan-tsung* 玄宗 by *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*:

外甥是先皇帝舅宿親，又蒙降金城公主，和同爲一家，天下百姓普皆安樂
I, who had been already related to the late emperor [*Chung-tsung*] as *wai-sheng* and *chiu*, had again a favour of receiving Princess *Chin-ch'eng* in marriage. Thereafter, we have been friendly as in a family, and all the people are happy and comfortable.

It is seen here that *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* refers to *Chung-tsung*, but not to *Hsüan-tsung*, as *chiu*.⁽²⁶⁾ Therefore, we may regard this as an example to show that the aforementioned distinction between ascendant and descendant is deliberately made.

From this memorial it becomes apparent that the *chiu-sheng* relationship had existed between the *T'ang* and the *T'u-fan* dynasties before Princess *Chin-ch'eng*'s marriage with him. Needless to say, the relationship here mentioned refers to the one that we have already considered above. To repeat the point, *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* and the Emperor *Chung-tsung* became related as *hsü* and *chiu* by his marriage with Princess *Chin-ch'eng*. But before this marriage, they were already in the *chiu-sheng* relation. It is, of course, the king who married Princess *Wen-ch'eng* that had been related as *hsü* and *chiu* with the

(26) *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* does not refer to the Emperor *Hsüan tsung* who was nearly 20 years older than himself, as his *chiu* or *shañ*. The fact that Princess *Chin-ch'eng* addressed the Emperor *Hsüan-tsung* as the 'elder brother' may imply that they also treated each other in accordance with this relationship. (A reign of each emperor is counted as one generation, through.) This and the following two citations in the text further explain that the suffix *nas* does not directly connect *dbon shañ du gyur* with what precedes it in the text of the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei*, for which see n. 7 above. In other words, it is because *Hsüan-tsung* and *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* were not related as *chiu* and *sheng*.

T'ang royal family before him. As *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* was already a *wai-sheng* to the *T'ang* royal family, the above passage proves that Princess *Wen-ch'eng* was the mother of a *T'u-fan* King.

In the passage regarding the Emperor *Hsüan-tsung*'s expedition against *T'u-fan* in the *Ch'üan-t'ang-wen* 全唐文, it is stated:

爰自昔年慕我朝化，申以婚姻好，結爲舅甥國，歲時往復，信使相望。

[The *T'u-fan*,] aspiring from earlier days to adapt themselves to our culture, entered into an alliance with us by the matrimonial relationship, and then became a country related to us as *chiu* and *sheng*. Exchanging envoys seasonally, we have been in mutual confidence.

Rather ambiguous as it is, it shows that the relation of *chiu* and *sheng* had been long established between the two dynasties. The *T'u-fan-ch'uang* of the *Chiu-t'ang-shu*, citing passages concerning the treaty concluded on the occasion of the *Chien-chung* Negotiation 建中會盟 (in 783), shows that nearly two hundred years have passed since the establishment of the *chiu-sheng* relationship between two countries:

與吐蕃贊普，代爲婚姻，固結隣好，安危同體，甥舅國將二百年。

If so, we cannot but admit that this relation was formed by Princess *Wen-ch'eng*.

II

Disagreements between the Accounts Given by Tibetan Historical Works and the *Tun-huang* Documents.

Let us now examine the conclusion arrived at in the preceding chapter in the light of the main Tibetan works composed after the 12th century downward.

First of all, the oldest extant *Chronicle* by *Sa skya pa Grags pa rgyal mtshan* (1147–1216) states:⁽²⁷⁾

Guñ sroñ guñ btsan, the son of a *Moñ* queen *Khri mo gñan*, who was one of the three queens married to *Sroñ btsan sgam po*.

Whether Princess *Wen-ch'eng* bore a son to *Sroñ btsan sgam po* or not is not indicated here.

Similarly, no mention is made of the son born by Princess *Wen-ch'eng* in the famous *Chos byuñ* composed by *Bu ston rin chen grub* (1290–1364).⁽²⁸⁾

(27) GR f. 197b. sroñ btsan sgam po/des btsun mo gsum las/mo(ñ) bzañ khri mo gñan gyi sras/guñ sroñ_འguñ_ལbtsan/

(28) DC f. 118b.

Neither is it recorded in the *Hu lan deb ther*,⁽²⁹⁾ nor is even touched upon by the *Deb ther sñon po*. Both the *Deb ther dmar poñi deb gsar ma*⁽³⁰⁾ and the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*⁽³¹⁾ just remark that neither Princess *Wen-ch'eng* nor Queen *Khri btsun* had a son. In the *rGyal rabs gsal bañi me loñ*, the alleged work of *Bla ma dam pa bsod nams rgyal mtshan* (1312–1375), a famous *Sa skya pa* monk, we find the following passage:⁽³²⁾

Then as neither of the queens, the Chinese woman [Princess *Wen-ch'eng*] nor the Nepalese woman, bore a son, a *Shañ shuñ* woman was taken as a queen. She did not bear a son either. She erected the *Thim bu skog pa* Temple. This is at *lCag kha khoñ*. . . . [A statement follows that neither of two other queens had a son.] . . . Then *Khri lcam*, a *Mañ* woman from *Mañ* in *sTod luñ* was taken as a queen. It was prophesied that she would give birth to a son. Thus, after a lapse of nine months, in the course of the 10th one, a son named *Goñ ri guñ btsan*, the Unrivaled, and Heir to the Royal House, was born at the Palace of *Brag lha bkra çis* in the Female Iron Serpent year.

In this passage, too, it is clearly stated that Princess *Wen-ch'eng* did not bear a son.

The *Mañi bkañ hbum* contains two stories relating to *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, but neither of them touches on the matter under consideration.⁽³³⁾ Without saying anything about whether Princess *Wen-ch'eng* had a son or not, the *mKhas pañi dgañ ston*, a work of *dPaño gtsug lag hphen ba* (1504–1566) which includes records of various kinds, some with their source indicated, simply says that the *Moñ* queen *Khri lcam* bore *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* at the Place of *Brag lha bkra çis gshal yas khañ*.⁽³⁴⁾ These only assure us that Princess *Wen-ch'eng* had not a son. Next, let us proceed to make the same inquiry about Princess *Chin-ch'eng*.

(29) HD ff. 16b–17a.

(30) DMS f. 17b.

(31) SG f. 28a.

(32) GS ff. 68b–69a: de nas rgya mo dañ bal mo bzañ gñis la sras ma ñkhruñs par/shañ shuñ bzañ bya ba khab tu bshes/de la sras ma ñkhruñs/des thim bu skog pañi lha khañ bsheñs/ñdi lcags kha khoñ na yod/da(sic!) nas ru yoñ bzañ bya ba khab tu bshes/de la sras ma ñkhruñs/des mig mañs tshal gyi lha khañ bsheñs/ñdi go ça gliñ na yod/de nas mi ñag bzañ bya ba khab tu bshes/de la ñañ sras ma ñkhruñs/des kha brag gser gyi lha khañ bsheñs/ñdi mkhar sna gdoñ na yod/de nas stod luñ mañ gi nañ nas/mañ bzañ khri lcam bya ba khab tu bshes/de la sras cig ñkhruñs par luñ bstan te/zla ba dgu ño bcu lon pa na/sras goñ ri (68b/69a) guñ btsan shes pa/rgyal poñi gduñ brgyud ñgrañ zla dañ bral ba cig lcags mo sbrul gyi lo la brag lha bkra çis kyi gshal yas khañ du ñkhruñs te/

(33) *Chos skyoñ bañi rgyal po sroñ btsan sgam poñi bkañ hbum*. It contains two *gter kha*, the *gter ston* of which are regarded as *Yogin dÑos grub* and *mÑañ bdag Ñañ Ni ma ñod zer* (1136–1203/4), respectively.

(34) KG f. 46a.

Surprisingly enough, in the above quoted work of *Sa skya pa grags pa rgyal mtshan*, *Khri sroñ lde btsan*, who is said to have introduced Buddhism into Tibet, is recorded as the son of Princess *Chin-ch'eng*:⁽³⁵⁾

Khri sroñ lde btsan was born by Princess *Chin-ch'eng*,⁽³⁶⁾ who was the daughter of the Chinese Sovereign *Yag ḥbyam*,⁽³⁷⁾ and one of the six queens the Progenitor *Khri lde [gtsug brtan]* married.

Bu ston adds a little more detail to this:⁽³⁸⁾

He [= *Khri lde gtsug brtan*] married *lHa dbon*, a son born by his Nanchao queen, to Princess *Chin-ch'eng*, the daughter of the Chinese Emperor. Afterwards, when his son died, she was united in marriage with the 'grandfather' [i.e. *Khri lde gtsug brtan*].⁽³⁹⁾ Thereafter, she obtained an image of *Çákya mune* [from China], and enshrined it [for the sake of her deceased husband]. Then as a son with propitious signs was born in the Male Earth Horse year, she departed for *ḥPhan thañ* to show her son to the king when a queen of *sNa nams* origin deprived her of her son, and thus making him be of *sNa nam* origin. Then he is known under the name of *Khri sroñ lde btsan*.

The first half of the passage will be considered later; in the second half it is said that *Khri sroñ lde btsan* was made the son of a *sNa nam* queen, though he was, indeed, born by Princess *Chin-ch'eng*.

The *Hu lan deb ther* tells a similar story:⁽⁴⁰⁾

That son *lHa dbon*, a child born of the Nanchao queen, was married to

(35) GR f. 197b. me(s) khri lde (gtsug brtan [sic!])s btsun mo drug bshes pa las/rgya rje yag ḥbyam gyi sras mo Gyim phya goñ juñi sras khri sroñ lde btsan/

(36) This transliteration of her name (*Gyim phya goñ ju*) is found in no other Tibetan works.

(37) Whom *Yag ḥbyams* refers to is not known. In the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*, f. 31a, the name is spelled as *Yag ḥjam*. The Emperor *Chung-tsung* adopted a daughter of the king of *Yung* 雍 *Shou-li* 守禮, and gave her in marriage to the T'u-fan King. *Yag ḥbyams* may have been a corrupted form of a transliteration for 楊矩 *Yang chu* or 楊卿 *Yang ching*, (*Yañ Kheñ* in 713. cf. DTH. p. 21) who escorted Princess *Chin-ch'eng* to Tibet.

(38) DC f. 119b: de (=khri lde gtsug brtan [sic!]) ni sras ḥjañ tsha lha dbon la rgyaḥi rgyal poñi sras (mo) gyim cañ oñ jo blañs pas bu çi ste/mes dañ ḥdus nas çákya mu ne btsal te mchod pa byas so/de nas sras mtshan ldan shig sa pho rta la ḥkhruñs te/rgyal po la ḥphan thañ du bstan par chas pa na/bu sna nam zas phrogs te/sna nam gyi bur byas nas/khri sroñ lde btsan shes grags so/

(39) *Mes* here refers to *Mes ag tshom* 'Grandfather with a beard,' which is generally said to be a name for *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*. Cf. n. 86.

(40) HD f. 17a: deñi sras ḥjañ tsha lha dbon la rgyaḥi rgyal po wiñ dzuñ gi sras mo kim çin koñ jo blañs pa/ḥjañ tsha lha dbon blon pos bsad nas yab dañ ḥdus pa las rgyal po khri sroñ lde btsan lcags pho rta la ḥkhruñs./

and KG f. 71b, where an account of his murder is mentioned.

Princess *Chin-ch'eng*, the daughter of the Chinese Emperor *Jui-tsung* 睿宗. After *lHa dbon* was killed by a minister, she was united in marriage with his father, and thus King *Khri sroñ lde btsan* was born in the Male Iron Horse year.

With an important change that *lHa dbon* had already been dead before the princess arrived in Tibet, almost the same account is given by both the *Deb dmar gsar ma*⁽⁴¹⁾ and the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*. They also ascribe to *Khri sroñ lde btsan* the same date of birth as *Bu ston's Chos byuñ*. Regarding the chronology of ancient Tibetan history, it is the agreement in the Twelve Animals [十二支 *shih-erh-chih*] only, to the exclusion of the Ten Elements [十干 *shih-kan*], that is relevant to it, as Tucci has rightly pointed out.⁽⁴²⁾

Though richly coloured, much the same story is related by the *rGyal rabs gsal bañi me lon*.⁽⁴³⁾ A story, developed to nearly the same degree, is also found in the *mKhas pañi dgañ ston*.⁽⁴⁴⁾ Besides, the *rBa bshed*, which may be called the history of the *bSam yas* Temple, contains the same story,⁽⁴⁵⁾ which may be considered to be developed to about the same extent as the two works just mentioned above.

From what we have seen so far, it is learned that all the native Tibetan historians after the 12th century downward considered *Khri sroñ lde btsan* to be the son of Princess *Chin-ch'eng*—it is obvious that even the *sBa bshed* contains some later additions. In other words, we have ascertained that what is recorded by native Tibetan historians turns out to be the very reverse of the conclusion I have drawn in the preceding chapter.

That *Khri sroñ lde btsan* was the son of Princess *Chin-ch'eng*, however, was immediately denied by those scholars who have had the opportunity to read the *Tun-huang* documents.⁽⁴⁶⁾ For an account as in the following from the *Tun-huang Annals* (DTH. p. 25) leaves no doubt on this point:

In the summer of the Hare year (=739) *bTsan po* went away to *Beg* on account of a State affair. . . . *bTsan mo Chin-ch'eng-kung-chu* passed away [, and the like], a year [elapsed].

And three years after, it is recorded:

In the Horse year (=742) *Khri sroñ lde btsan* was born in *Brag dmar*.

Therefore, the relation between Princess *Chin-ch'eng* and *Khri sroñ lde btsan*

(41) DMS f. 19b.

(42) MBT p. 26.

(43) GS f. 103a-b.

(44) KG ff. 71a-73a.

(45) BSh pp. 2-3. The story will be given later.

(46) AHE p. 47, and KTK p. 512.

as mother and son, recorded by native Tibetan historians, is disproved by the *Tun-huang Annals* beyond all doubt. The very account from the *Annals*, however, also compels us to regard as fictitious the *chiu-sheng* or *dbon-shan* relation in the *T'ang-fan-hui-meng-pei* and all the Chinese records so far quoted. Fortunately, an examination of an account in the list of royal lineage in the *Tun-huang* documents enables us to find a way out of the difficulty: ⁽⁴⁷⁾

Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan, a child born of *Sroñ lde brtsan* [= *Khri sroñ brtsan*] and the *Moñ* queen *Khri mo mñen ldoñ steñ*. *Mañ slon mañ rtsan*, a child born of *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* and *Khon co Mañ mo rje khri skar*.

To our surprise, it is said here that *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*, the son of *Khri sroñ brtsan*, begot *Mañ slon mañ rtsan* by his royal consort *Khon co*. In view of the date of the record we cannot identify the *Khon co* with any other person than Princess *Wen-ch'eng*. *Mañ mo rje* is the title for women that corresponds to *mañ po rje* for men often conferred on vassal kings. It seems to have been given to the royal consorts who gave birth to the Crown Prince. Three other queens in the same list of the royal lineage are entitled *mañ mo rje*. Though none of the later Tibetan historians record *Khri skar* as a name of Princess *Wen-ch'eng*, this is not to be wondered at since the names of queens cited in the *Tun huang* documents are rarely recorded in full.⁽⁴⁸⁾ An account almost in parallel to the one just quoted is seen in the *Chronicle of Sa skya pa*

(47) DTH p. 82.

(48) Generally speaking, they are mostly styled *ḥBro bzaḥ*, *mChims bzaḥ*, and the like in later works. I shall give a list of the names of the successive chief queens below.

DTH	<i>Moñ za khri mo mñen ldoñ steñ</i>	<i>Khon co mañ mo rje khri skar</i>
GS	<i>Mañ bzaḥ khri lcam</i>	
GR	<i>Mo bzaḥ khri mo gñan</i>	<i>Wa shva bzaḥ mañ po rje</i>
KG	<i>Mañ bzaḥ khri lcam</i>	<i>Ha sha bzaḥ moñ [=mañ mo] rje khri dkar</i>
SG	<i>Moñ bzaḥ khri lcam</i>	<i>Ha sha bzaḥ kho ḥjo moñ rje khri dkar ti cags</i>

DTH	<i>ḥBro za khri ma lod khri steñ</i>	<i>mChims za btsan ma thog</i>
GS	<i>ḥBro bzaḥ khri ma lod</i>	<i>mChims bzaḥ btsun mo tog</i>
GR	<i>ḥBro pa khri chen khri ma lod</i>	<i>mChims bzaḥ mtshams me tog</i>
KG	<i>ḥBro bzaḥ khri loñ</i>	<i>mChims bzaḥ btsan mo tog</i>
SG	<i>ḥBro bzaḥ khra bo khri ma lod</i>	<i>mChims bzaḥ btsun mo rtog ge</i>

grags pa rgyal mtshan:⁽⁴⁹⁾

In favour of *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*, the son of the *Moñ* queen *Khri mo gñan*, who was one of his three queens, *Sroñ btsan sgam po* abdicated the Throne. But he [= *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan*] died before his father, and [his reign] being thus calculated a half-generation. The son born by his union with the *Wa shva* queen *Mañ po rje* was *Mañ sroñ mañ btsan*. *Tshe spoñ* assumed the position of the *shañ [po]*.

Here the name of the queen is changed to *Mañ po rje*, and *Khri skar* being deleted. Besides, *Khon co* is also changed to *Wa shva bzañ*. That *Wa shva* is a variant form of *Ha sha* is testified by the occurrences of *Ha sha* in her variant names such as *bTsun mo Ha sha bzañ moñ* [= *mañ mo*] *rje khri dkar* in the *mKhas pañi dgañ ston*⁽⁵⁰⁾ and *bTsun mo Ha sha bzañ kho hjo moñ rje khri dkar ti çags* in the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*.⁽⁵¹⁾ The reason why *Ha sha bzañ* came to be attached to her name in later works will be explained later; in the following I should like to show that the proof that she could not be *Ha sha bzañ* is already found in the above quotation.

This can be gathered from the last sentence of the quotation: '*Tshe spoñ* assumed the position of the *shañ [po]*.' It may be considered to mean that because she was of *Ha sha* origin, *Tshe spoñ* assumed the position instead. But, unfortunately, the account by *Grags pa rgyal mthan* must be denied in many

DTH	<i>sNa nams za mañ mo rje bshi steñ</i>	<i>Tshes poñ za rma rgyal ldoñ skar</i>
GS	<i>sNa nams bzañ</i>	<i>Tshe spoñ bzañ ma tog sgron</i>
GR	(<i>Gyim phya gon ju</i>)	<i>Tshe spoñ bzañ rma rgyal mtsho skar ma</i>
KG	<i>sNa nams bzañ</i>	<i>Tshe spoñ bzañ me tog sgron</i>
SG	<i>sNam snañ bzañ</i>	<i>Tshe spoñ bzañ</i>

The list shows that it is no wonder that *Khri skar* should not have been transmitted to later ages as the name of Princess *Wen-ch'eng*. Apart from the fact that her origin was changed to *Ha shva bzañ*, her name itself has been transmitted rather correctly.

(49) GR f. 197b: *sroñ btsan sgam po/des btsun mo gsum las/mo(ñ) bzañ khri mo gñan gyi sras/guñ sroñ guñ btsan/deñi shal hbros byas te yab kyi siñon du h̄das pas phye ces bgyiño/des wa shva bzañ mañ po rje bshes pañi sras mañ sroñ mañ btsan/deñi shañ tshe spoñ gis bgyiño/*

(50) KG f. 47b.

(51) SG f. 28a: *btsun mo ha sha bzañ kho hjo moñ rje khri dkar ti çags bya ba khab tu bshes pas/*

Incidentally, F. W. Thomas wrongly says in TLTD II p. 34 that the passage is quoted from the *rGyal rabs gsal bañi me loñ*. Of course, it cannot be found anywhere in the *gSal bañi me loñ*: Bacot remarks in DTH p. 88 that this *Khon co* is a 'princesses impériale de Chine', but this view is rejected by Sato as utterly wrong in KTK p. 815, n. 14; However, Sato doesn't explain the reason why *Ha sha bzañ* could be called *kho hjo*. *Ti çags* at the end of her name also appears in the name of a queen of *Shañ shuñ lig myi rhya*. DTH p. 115.

places by the evidences afforded by the *Tun-huang* documents. First, *Ha sha* was an allied country of Tibet, from the time when *Myañ mañ po rje shañ snañ* was *blon che* or Prime Minister, at the early part of King *Khri sroñ brtsan's* reign, and formed the Northeastern section of the Tibetan kingdom.⁽⁵²⁾ As will be seen later, there had been a queen mother who came from the royal family of *T'u-fan*, and whose son succeeded to the *Kha gan*, before Princess *Wen-ch'eng* came over to Tibet.⁽⁵³⁾ A document from the Stein Collection reveals that the *Kha gan* had already attained manhood and married several queens at that time. After 635 *Ha sha* was practically under the control of Tibet, and was 'a country of a daughter's or a sister's son [*wai-sheng*]'⁽⁵⁴⁾ in relation to *Khri sroñ brtsan*. Therefore, *Ha sha* then had to hold close contacts with Tibet and could do so without difficulty. A little later, *Ha sha* kings as well as high officials of *Ha sha* took part even in the deliberation of important state affairs of Great Tibet,⁽⁵⁵⁾ so much so that it is most unlikely that a king of *Ha sha* had to get *Tshe spon* to assume the position of *shañ po* in his stead. If, however, such a substitution was really made, it would be necessary for no other person than the *Khon co* or *Kung-chu* who came all the way from China. Therefore, *Khon co mañ mo rje khri skar* could not be a *Ha sha bzah*, but must have been Princess *Wen-ch'eng* herself.

In a certain document of the Bon religion⁽⁵⁶⁾ is found a passage that may give a better account on the origin of the disagreements between the traditional views by native historians and the records in the *Tun-huang* documents. The text in question, which contains quite a few mistakes, is as follows:

Rluñ sroñ rluñ tsan gyi khab du rgyal mo za oñ chuñ dañ mnañ nam za
mañ po rje bshes/der oñ chuñ la sras hkhruñs/khri sroñ bde tsan bu chuñ
dus na oñ chuñ ci bas/na nams mañ poñi sras bu byas paño/

(52) DTH p. 111.

(53) TLTD II. pp. 8-9.

(54) In 635 *Fu-yün* 伏允, King of *T'u-yu-hun* 吐谷渾 killed himself, and *T'u-fan* places a son of *Khri hbañs* on the throne of *T'u-yu-hun*. Then *T'u-fan* seems to have had his (paternal uncle and) rival *Mu-jung-shun* 慕容順 murdered. It was not until 689 that a princess of the royal family of *T'u-fan* was given in marriage to a *Ha sha* King. Towards that time, there appears to have arisen a necessity for re-establishing the matrimonial relationship between *T'u-fan* and *Ha sha*. I cannot accept the view expressed by Petech on this point, though; (Petech, L.: *Nugae tibeticae* p. 292, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, vol. XXXI, Roma, 1956.) cf. TY pp. 2-7.

(55) According to the *Tun-huang Annals*, some high officials (名王) of *Ha sha* origin took part in the deliberation of the important affairs of State, and seem later to have entered into rivalry with their fellow-officials of *Shañ shuñ* origin. To mention some of their names, *Da rgyal mañ po rje* appears first in 653 and 656, followed by *hBon da rgyal khri zuñ* and *hBon da rgyal btsan zuñ* in 675, 687, 688, 690 and 694, and in 706, 712, 713 and 714, respectively, in the *Annals*. *hBon* has nothing to do with *dbon*, but seems to be rather the transliteration of something like 慕容 *Mu-yung*.

(56) *Bon chos dar nub gyi lo rgyus grags pa rin che gliñ grag ces bya ba dmoñs pa bloñi gsal byed*, 93f. (MS in *dbu med*), f. 45b.

A possible interpretation of the passage is that *Khri sroñ bde tsan* was born by Princess *Chin-ch'eng*, and *mNaḥ nam [=sNa nams] mañ po rje* brought him up as her son. If so interpreted, it may be considered to be equal with the accounts given by *Bu ston* and others. However, it is obvious that *Rluñ sroñ rluñ tsan* is clearly a scribal error for *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*, and that *rGyal mo za oñ chuñ* is another for *rGya mo za oñ chuñ*, which refers not to Princess *Chin-ch'eng*, but literally to Princess *Wen-ch'eng*. Again, *mNaḥ nam za mañ po rje* seemingly derives from such words as *rGya mo za oñ chuñ [miñ gshan naḥam] mañ mo rje*. Since *Khri sroñ bde tsan* can be, as will be explained later, another name of *Khri sroñ rtsan*, then the original text of the above passage must have been as follows:

Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan married *rGya mo za oñ chuñ mañ mo rje*, and a son was born of *Oñ chuñ*. [*Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*], son of *Khri sroñ rtsan* died young. Thereafter, *Oñ chuñ mañ mo rje* brought up his son by herself.

Apart from the passage quoted before, this princess' husband *Guñ sroñ guñ btsan* is mentioned nowhere in the *Tun-huang* documents. Accordingly, let us first look for his accounts in the Tibetan works composed after the 12th century downward, and then try again to find and examine the related accounts in the *Tun-huang* documents.

III

Chronology of *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*.⁽⁵⁷⁾

Sa skya pa grags pa rgyal mtshan says:⁽⁵⁸⁾

After *Guñ sroñ* attained the 13th year of age, he occupied the Throne for 5 years, and died before his father at the 18th year. Then his father is said to have assumed the Throne again.

In the *Hu lan deb ther* it is told:⁽⁵⁹⁾

Guñ sroñ guñ btsan occupied the Throne for 5 years, and died prior to his father at the 18th year of age.

That he was in his 13th year at his accession to the throne is not referred to

(57) His name is also spelled as *Guñ ri guñ btsan*; cf. GS ff. 70b, 71a and 81a, KG *Ja.* f. 47b, and SG f. 28a.

(58) GR f. 198a: *guñ sroñ bcu gum bshes nas chab srid ni/lō lñar bzuñ ste bco brgyad/ on nas ḥdas/slar yañ yab gyi(s) rgyal srid bzuñ ño skad/*

(59) HD f. 17a: *guñ sroñ guñ btsan gyis chab srid lo lña bzuñ/dguñ lo bco brgyad pa la yab kyi goñ du ḥdas/*

here. Much the same story is provided by the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ*:⁽⁶⁰⁾

Guñ ri guñ btsan occupied the Throne for 5 years. At his 18th year he died at *Po ta la*. *Guñ ri guñ btsan* died before his father. Thereafter, his father assumed the Throne again.

The only difference here is in the addition of the place of his death. Apart from the reference to *Guñ sroṅ guñ rtsan*'s accession to the throne at his 13th year, and the replacement of *Guñ sroṅ guñ rtsan* with *Mañ sroṅ mañ rtsan* following *Bu ston*'s description,⁽⁶¹⁾ the *Deb dmar gsar ma*⁽⁶²⁾ gives a similar account.

dPaḥo gtsug lag hphreṅ ba⁽⁶³⁾ tells the same account as the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* in the text, but it affords an annotation written in small characters:

His father was in the 53rd year of age, when this [king] *Guñ sroṅ* [*guñ btsan*] was born in the Female Iron Serpent year.

The year of his birth, 'the Female Iron Serpent', corresponds to 621, which agree with that given by the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loṅ* in the passage quoted at the beginning of Chapter II. That *Khri sroṅ brtsan* was allegedly then in his 53rd year shows that the date of his birth was considered to be 569.⁽⁶⁴⁾ And that his age at death is said to be the 82nd year suggests that the Chinese tradition of assigning his death to 650, accepted in Tibet ever since the *Hu lan deb ther*, is adopted here also, and that the chronological calculation is based on it. Though the author unwittingly gives 12 years earlier dates to his birth and death in some other place of the work, it appears that his original intention was to follow the general tendency after the *Hu lan deb ther*. In any case, as the terms representing the Ten Elements in the two works are not in conflict with my own chronological calculation, I shall adopt it for the time being, and set the date of *Guñ sroṅ guñ rtsan*'s birth at 621.

Before we proceed to consider his chronology, we have to disprove first the traditional view that *T'u-fan* kings should have succeeded to the throne

(60) GS f. 71a: *guñ ri guñ btsan gyis rgyal srid lo lña bzuñ/dguñ lo bco brgyad bshes dus/po ta la ru sku gcegs so/guñ ri guñ btsan yab kyi goṅ du ḥdas/...../de nas slar yab rgyal pos rgyal srid bzuñ ste/*

(61) DC f. 119b: *rgyal po de (sroṅ btsan sgam po) ḥi sras mañ slon mañ btsan/deḥi sras guñ sroṅ guñ btsan/*

(62) DMS ff. 17b and 18a.

(63) KG f. 47b: *guñ sroṅ ḥdi yab kyis ña gsum bshes pa lcags mo sbrul la ḥkhruṅs/*

(64) KG f. 53. But he is said to have died in the Female Earth Dog year (638). In f. 13b the Female Fire Ox year (557) is also given as date of his birth. However, as it is said in f. 47b that he was in his 53rd year in the Female Iron Serpent year (621), he was considered to be born in 569. Generally speaking, about the time when the *Hu lan deb ther* was compiled (1346), the year of *Khri sroṅ brtsan*'s death was set at 650 in Tibet, according to the statement in the *rGya yig tshañ* which was a translation of the *T'u-fan-ch'uan* in the *T'ang-shu*.

at the 13th year of age. (The case of *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* is also counted as an instance of this theory as seen in the above quotations.) This can be done by comparing the related accounts in the *Tun-huang* documents with those provided by native historians. First of all, among the kings of the T'u-fan dynasty *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* alone can be ascertained to have succeeded to the throne at his 13th year. However, as two of the kings happened to be born in the year when their predecessor died,⁽⁶⁵⁾ and thus, the dates of their birth being set one duodenary cycle earlier, it came to be easily suspected that their accession to the throne took place at the 13th year of age. But, it may be noted that some later prudent historians did not give the dates of their accession to the throne.⁽⁷²⁾ Another 13th year of age could be calculated from 18 and 5 years, assigned to *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*'s lifetime and reign, respectively. Finally, it may be pointed out as the most important reason that the prediction⁽⁶⁶⁾ made in the *Mañjuçrīmūlatantra*, which will be explained in detail later, could be fully applied to the case of *Khri sroñ brtsan* by considering him to be in his 13th year at his accession to the throne and his age at death (69th year) as the duration of his reign, and thus getting the 82nd year by a simple addition of 13 years to his age at death. Such appear to be the reasons that led to the consideration that the 13th year of age is really 'that at which a child becomes able to ride a horse',⁽⁶⁷⁾ that is to say, at which the succession from father to son is to be carried out. Thus having been once established, this theory allowed later historians even to divide the 27 years of reign of *Mañ slon mañ rtsan* into two parts, the 13th year of age for his accession to the throne and 15 years for his reign.⁽⁷¹⁾

Now, considering the case of *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* from the reverse point of view, we cannot help thinking that his 18th year of age was the year at which he ascended the throne, and that he died at his 23rd year after 5 years of reign, in case its length is counted in full.⁽⁶³⁾ If he died at his 23rd year

(65) DTH p. 15: *Khri ḥdus sroñ* and p. 19: *Khri lde gtsug brtsan=rGyal gtsug ru*; cf. n. 72 below.

(66) A detailed consideration is given on this point by Sato in KTK pp. 217-221.

(67) KG f. 53b, n. 7: *sras kyi chibs kha thub par gyur na / rmu thag la ḥjus nas na mkhar ḥegs so skad* 'It is said that when a child becomes able to ride a horse, he will depart for Heaven, grasping *rMu thag*. (=be killed).

Tucci used to cite the number 13 as a sacred one in the Bon religion, but he has changed his opinion recently; cf. G. Tucci: *Tibetan Folk Song*, Rome, 1966 p. 53, n. 111, p. 69. The belief in this number as a sacred one is also observed both in India and among the Buddhists. Nevertheless, an instance where this number is clearly shown for the age at which the succession from father to son is to be carried out is known nowhere else. Incidentally, it may be interesting that, in a passage on the Bon religion in the *Grub mthoḥ ḥel gyi me loñ* (209 f. composed by *Thuḥu kwan sprul sku blo bzañ chos kyi ṅi ma dpal bzañ po* (1737-1802) and engraved at *sDe dge* in 1802) it is told that a *ḥDre* (demon), disguising himself as a young man called *Ru gcen*, travelled round Tibet for 13 years from his 13th year and so forth (f. 165a).

Among the Buddhist terms are found such as the 13 images of the disciples of Buddha (BSh pp. 34, 35) and an offering of 13 kinds of food (BSh pp. 46, 53).

the date of his death will be 643, and that of his accession, 638. Therefore, if he married Princess *Wen-ch'eng* in the meantime, there will be no chronological conflict. Moreover, by this assumption only, the meaning of the following account from the *Tun-huang Annals* can be fully understood.⁽⁶⁹⁾

3 years after that [time], during the reign of *bTsan po Khri sroñ rtsan*, . . .

Immediately after this appears the phrase *de nas lo drug nah* '6 years after that [time]', which refers to the year 649. Accordingly, the date '3 years after that [time]', corresponds to the year 643. So far no one has paid attention to the phrase *btsan po khri sroñ rtsan gyi riñ lah* 'during the reign of *Khri sroñ rtsan*'. But we may ask why it was necessary to insert it in the context suggesting the date as 643, provided that all the incidents including Princess *Wen-ch'ung* entering into Tibet occurred during his uninterrupted reign. As the later authors of the history of Buddhism remarked (see the above quotations, especially that in p. 155), this suggests that there had been *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*'s reign in between that lasted 5 years, ending in 643, which was then taken over again by *Khri sroñ brtsan*'s in the same year. The dates to be assigned to *Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan* should be set, I think, as in the said manner.

The full passage in the *Tun-huang Annals* including the phrases just quoted, which precedes the entry for the year 650, is as follows:⁽⁶⁹⁾

Princess *Wen-ch'eng*, led by *mGar stoñ rtsan yul zuñ*, came over to Tibet. . . 3 years after, . . . 6 years after, *bTsan po Khri sroñ rtsan* went to Heaven [=died].

That is to say, Princess *Wen-ch'eng* is said here to have entered Tibet in 640.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Therefore, if this princess is to be identified with *Khon co khri skar*, the date of birth of *Mañ slon mañ rtsan* who was the son of her and *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*

(68) Since his reign from the 13th to 18th year of age is counted in full as 5 years, we should also add full 5 years, in case of counting his reign from the 18th year of age.

(69) DTH p. 13: *btsan mo mun chañ koñ co/mgar stoñ rtsan yul zuñ gyis spany drañste bod yul du gcegs so/.../de nas lo gsum na btsan po khri sroñ rtsan gyi riñ lah/....* (..../) *de nas lo drug nah btsan po khri sroñ rtsan dguñ du gcegs so/*

(70) As for the determination of this date, considering that the Chinese sources give 641 as the year of Princess *Wen-ch'eng*'s entering Tibet, Sato says, '6 years afterwards, strictly speaking 5 years afterwards, in 649, *Sroñ brtsan* died, . . .' in reference to the phrase *de nas lo drug nah* (KTK p. 284). By the remark 'strictly speaking 5 years afterwards,' it may probably be considered to mean '5 years if counted in full.' But this is not correct. For, in this context, the account of the princess' entering Tibet is followed by the phrase *de nas lo gsum na* '3 years afterwards', which is in turn succeeded by the phrase *btsan po khri sroñ rtsan gyi riñ lah* 'in the reign of *bTsan po Khri sroñ rtsan*', and then comes the phrase in question *de nas lo drug nah*, to be concluded by the mention of *Khri sroñ rtsan*'s death. In the next entry, the year 650 being given, the events of the year are recorded. Therefore, the date of '6 years later' corresponds to 649, and the original year on which the calculation was based falls in 643. And thus it is not 641 but 640 that was taken as the base of the calculation by which 643 is made to come 3 years afterwards.

must be placed at some time between 641 (640+1) and 644 (643+1). Since *Mañ slon mañ brtsan* succeeded to the throne in 649 at which his grandfather *Sroñ brtsan sgam po* died, his age at that time will probably enable us to determine the date of his birth.

Here again, however, contrary to our expectation, later histories indicate that his accession to the throne took place when he was in his 13th year, as was mentioned above,⁽⁷¹⁾ and give only the Dog year as the date of his birth by counting backwards from the Dog year ascribed to that of *Sroñ brtsan sgam po's* death by Chinese historical materials. I have already shown the reason why we should not accept the traditional view of succession at the 13th year of age. If we examine the dates of accession of *T'u-fan* Kings to the throne by comparing the *Tun-huang* documents with later native histories,⁽⁷²⁾ in the *rGyal rabs gsal bañi me loñ* and the quotations from the *rBa bshed* contained in the *mKhas pañi dgañ ston*, we find an account about *Khri sroñ lde brtsan's* accession to the throne that is given neither in the *Tun-huang* documents nor in other histories.⁽⁷³⁾ I shall quote that given by the *rGyal rabs gsal bañi me loñ* below:⁽⁷⁴⁾

Then he was acknowledged as the son of the Chinese queen [*Kung-chu*]. Thereafter, a grand banquet was celebrated. Then, when he attained the

(71) GR f. 198a, where it is stated that his father died when he was in his 13th year and then he occupied the throne for 15 years. In HD f. 17a, it is just recorded that his reign lasted 15 years. However, instead of 27 years of reign, here he is said to have died at his 27th year of age. Accordingly, his age at accession to the throne should have been placed at the 13th year to avoid the chronological disaccordance. The *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama* simply says of his death at the 27th year of age. (f. 30b).

(72)

	DTH	GR	GS	DC	HD	DMS	KG	SG
<i>Khri sroñ brtsan</i>	[13]	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
<i>Guñ sroñ guñ brtsan</i>	[18]	13	[13]	?	[13]	13	13	13
<i>Mañ slon mañ brtsan</i>	[8]	13	13	?	13	13	13	?
<i>Khri ḥdus sroñ</i>	1	1	1	?	?	[1]	1	1
<i>Khri lde gtsug brtsan</i>	1	1	10	?	?	10	?	?
<i>Khri sroñ lde brtsan</i>	13	13	8	13	13	13	13[8]	13

(73) As is seen in n. 72 above, these two works only records that his accession to the throne occurred at the 8th year of age. Incidentally, the *Deb ther dkar po* gives an account that *Khri ḥdus sroñ* ascended the throne at the 8th year of age (BC f. 84b).

(74) GS f. 84b: der rgya moñi sras yin par ño ces nas/dgañ ston gyi ston mo chen po byas so/der sras dguñ lo lña lon dus yum ḥdas so/yab rgyal po mes ag tshom ni/dguñ lo drug cu re gsum la yar ḥbrog sba tshal mkhar du gcegs so/..../de nas chos rgyal khri sroñ lde brtsan gyis dguñ lo bryad lon pa dañ/rgyal srid bzuñ nas rgyal khams la dbañ bsgyur/

5th year of age,⁽⁷⁵⁾ his mother died. His father *Mēs ag tshom* died at the 63rd year of age at [the castle of] *sBa tshal* in *Yar ḥbrog*. . . . Thereafter, when the *Chos rGyal Khri sroñ lde btsan* attained the 8th year of age, he took over the throne, and reigned over the Kingdom.

dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba criticized this account long ago, saying that it differs from what is stated by the other native historians, and is inappropriate as an account relating to *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*. The pertinent part of his remark in the *mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston* is as in the following:⁽⁷⁶⁾

Now, as for the birth of the *Chos rgyal Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, it is related in the *rBa bshed*: 'He was born in the Hare year, and later ascended the Throne at his 8th year.'⁽⁷⁷⁾ But, when his father [*Khri lde gtsug brtsan* (704–754)], who was born in the Iron Dragon year, died at the 63rd year of age, the son would be in his 16th year in case he was born in the Fire Hare year, or he would be only in his 4th year in case he was born in the Earth Hare year. If it is correct that he attained the 8th year of age [at that time], he must have been born in the Wood Hog year.

(75) This is also mentioned in KG f. 73b. According to the *Tun-huang Annals*, in 680, when Princess *Wen-ch'eng* died, her grandson *Khri ḥdus sroñ* was in his 5th year. In my opinion, it may be due to a wrong transmission of this fact, death of the '*Khun-chu*'.

(76) KG ff. 72a-72b: de nas chos rgyal khri sroñ lde btsan sku bltams paḥi tshul la rba bshed las yos lo la bltams nas lo brgyad la rgyal sa mdzad par ḥcad kyañ, yab lcags ḥbrug la ḥkhruñs nas lo drug bcu rtsa gsum la ḥdas paḥi tshe, sras kyis me yos la ḥkhruñs na lo bcu drug, sa yos la ḥkhruñs na lo bshi las mi ḥgro shiñ, brgyad soñ da bag na cñi phag la ḥkhruñs dgos pas, yi ge nor ba shig byuñ yod par snañ la/yig tshañs ḥas che bar lcags po rta la ḥkhruñs nas lo bcu gsum na rgyal sa mdzad pa ḥas cher snañ bas ḥdi dag pa sñams la/

(77) Nothing is recorded of his accession to the throne at his 8th year but a statement: *yos buḥi lo la rgyal bu bltams*. (BSh p. 3.) *The Choonicle of the 5th Dalai Lama* says that it is related in the *rBa bshed* that the King was born in the Hare year, and built a temple [*bSam yas*] at his 13th year of age. (f. 36b). The corresponding passage in BSh p. 34 is as follows: 'Then, in the Hare year, when *bTsan po* attained his 13th year of age . . . , he laid the foundation of the *dBu rtsu* [main building]. Though *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba* maintains that the account of his accession at the 8th year of age, together with the assignment of his birth to the Hare year, is both quoted from the *rBa bshed*, this is due to his misunderstanding. We should consider that he based them on some other sources like the *rGyal rabs gsal baḥi me loñ* I have quoted in the text. In view of the above quoted statement from the *rBa bshed* his 13th year corresponded to the Hare year; as I have said in the text, the Hare year corresponding to 643 at which the succession to the throne by *Sroñ lde brtsan* [*Khri sroñ brtsan*] took place, was mistaken for that fictitious Hare year at which *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* took over the throne from his father, and thus, counting backwards from the year, a different view ascribing his birth to another Hare year, earlier by 12 years, came to get mixed therein. This Hare year was further confounded with another real Hare year at which the construction of the *bSam yas* Temple was launched. In this connection, I may remark also that the construction of the temple was started in the Hare year corresponding to 775, and is considered to have been completed in 787. (cf. MBT, pp. 28–32.)

Thus it seems that wrong characters got mixed herein. As, in the greater number of documents, in fact, the view that he was born in the Male Iron Horse year, and ascended the Throne at his 13th year is in the main accepted, this may be thought to be correct.

As to the dates concerning *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, later native historians generally based their calculation on the records of his birth in the Horse year (742) and his accession to the throne at the 13th year of age afforded also by the *Tun-huang Annals*.⁽⁷⁸⁾ However, as is seen in the passages quoted above, they introduced confusion by adding terms of the Ten Elements to them as in the Iron Horse year or the Earth Horse year. In any case, let us first consider the view that his accession to the throne occurred at the 8th year of age.

As *dPaḥo gtsug lag hphren ba* pointed out, this age is inappropriate as the one at his accession. Believing without the slightest doubt that *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* was the son of Princess *Ching-ch'eng*, he discarded the said view as a mere mistake. We have learned, however, that Princess *Chin-ch'eng* was not the mother of *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, and that a Princess *Mañ mo rje khri skar* had a son named *Mañ slon mañ brtsan*. Moreover, we now suspect that this princess was, in fact, Princess *Wen-ch'eng* herself. If this is the case, it is not unnatural that we should further suspect that the son of the princess who ascended the throne at the 8th year of age was originally *Mañ slon mañ rtsan*, but was, in the course of transmission, mistaken for *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*. In Tibet, most frequently, both Princess *Wen-ch'eng* and Princess *Ching-ch'eng* have been equally called and written just as *Khon/Koñ co*, *Koñ/Oñ jo* or *Kho'jo*. There must have been an ample opportunity for the loss of their distinction which caused confusion later.⁽⁷⁹⁾ Therefore, we may safely conclude that the tradition concerning Princess *Wen-ch'eng* and her son came to be applied later to the explanation of the fictitious relation between Princess *Chin-ch'eng* and her son *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*. Now, accepting the view that *Mañ slon mañ rtsan* ascended the throne at his 8th year, if we calculate the date of his birth on the Western calendar, it falls in the year 642 since he succeeded the throne in 649 at which his grandfather *Khri sroñ brtsan* died. We are thus assured that this date comes in between 641 and 644, as I have assumed above for his birth. (p. 161)

dPaḥo gtsug lag hphren ba offered criticism on the assignment of the Hare year to *Khri sroñ lde brtsan's* birth by the *rBa bshed*. This is, however,

(78) DTH p. 26 and p. 56. The description of events in the Sheep year (755) enables us to understand that his accession to the throne took place one year before (754).

(79) An instance occurs in which *mTshoḥi padma*, generally shown as a name of Princess *Wen-ch'eng* (HD f. 8b.: It says of Princess *Wen-ch'eng* as the daughter of the *T'ang* Emperor *T'ai tsung*, *Shu-lien-kung-chu*, the Tibetan equivalent for which is *mTshoḥi nañ gi padma*), is cited as another name of Princess *Chin-ch'eng*: (*bsTan pa dañ bstan ḥdzin gyi lo rgyus yoñs ḥduḥi me tog gser baḥi do ḥal*, 91f, composed by *Sa skya pa dge sloñ Chos rnam rgyal*, in the lifetime of his donor *Miḥi dbaṅ phyug phum tshogs rnam rgyal* (1586-1623?) f. 62b.)

as seen above, combined with the view that *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* died at his 63rd year, which was a widely accepted view among later historians⁽⁸⁰⁾ as well as *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba*. The fact is, as the *Tun-huang Annals* shows, that he died at his 51st year.⁽⁸¹⁾ Owing to the fact that the ages given for his death differed exactly by 12 years, both happened to fall in the Horse year. Again, this figure happened to fill up the gap of so many years resulting from the ascription of 27 years of *Mañ slon mañ rtsan's* reign to his age at death (and the 13th year of age at his accession to the throne). The said figure of 63, assigned originally to the figure of a different bearing, as will be explained later, has driven out the real age at death of *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*, namely, the 51st year of later records without a trace. Nevertheless it must be noted that an instance like this is quite rare. Apart from this, all the original figures representing numbers of years, which pertain to either the age at death or the duration of reign, though not without confusion in some cases, were handed down to later ages.⁽⁸²⁾ Consequently, we may duly suspect that the 63rd year of age in question was not obtained by the simple addition of 12 to the 51st year, but was given as a well-grounded figure to an event somewhere else.

There was a close connection between this 63rd year of age and the Hare year mentioned by the *sBa bshed*. But even a great scholar like *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreṅ ba* did not notice it. As is known already, among the successive kings of the *T'u-fan* dynasty, none but *Khri sroṅ brtsan* lived to be over 60 year of age.⁽⁸³⁾ Thus this age must be considered to pertain to him. Even what happened to him at his 63rd year will remain unknown to us until we can fix the date of his birth. All the problems about *Khri sroṅ brtsan* will be treated in detail later. For the time being, I shall proceed with my analysis

(80) HD f. 17a, DMS f. 20a, GS f. 84b and GR f. 198a.

(81) DTH p. 19 and p. 56, (704-754).

(82)

	DTH	GR	GS	DC	HD	DMS	KG	SG
<i>Khri sroṅ brtsan</i>	[69]	$\frac{13+69}{82}$	"	"	82	"	"	"
<i>Guñ sroṅ guñ brtsan</i>	[23]	$\frac{18}{[+5=23]}$	"	?	18	"	"	"
<i>Mañ slon mañ brtsan</i>	$\frac{35}{(8+27)}$	$\frac{27}{[=13+15]}$	"	?	27	"	"	"
<i>Khri ḥdus sroṅ</i>	29	29	"	?	29	"	"	?
<i>Khri lde gtsug brtsan</i>	51	$\frac{63}{[=13+51]}$	"	?	63		"	?
<i>Khri sroṅ lde brtsan</i>	$\frac{56}{(=55+1)}$	$\frac{56}{[=55+1]}$	56	69	56	69	55	? -

Square and round brackets indicate the writer's calculation and its basis, respectively. The underlined figure shows that it is not counted in full. In the case of *Khri sroṅ lde brtsan*, +1 indicates that he died one year after he entered the priesthood.

(83) cf. n. 82. The complete this list, *Mu ne brtsan po* (774-798...25), *Khri lde sroṅ brtsan* (777-815...39), *Khri gtsug lde brtsan* (806-841...36), and *Dar maḥuḥi dum brtsan* (804-846...44) are to be added to it (according to KG).

in the following tentative conclusion.

As I have briefly touched on before, *Khri sroñ brtsan* died at his 69th year in 649. Thus his birth can be assigned to 581. Then his 63rd year, which corresponds to 643, falls in the Hare year. In the same year, his son *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* died, and he resumed the throne. Unlike the usual case in which the year at which a son succeeded to the throne on his father's death and his father's age at death were indicated, in the case of *Khri sroñ brtsan* and his son *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan*, the year at which the father resumed the throne on his son's death must have been indicated with his own age. Supposing that his father should be referred to not as *Khri sroñ brtsan* but by another one of his names, *Sroñ lde brtsan*,⁽⁸⁴⁾ he could be easily mistaken for *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* who was born in less than 100 years later, by just prefixing *Khri* to the said name.⁽⁸⁵⁾ Besides, as I have mentioned above, the erroneous ascription of the 63rd year of age to the death of *Khri lde gtsug brtsan* could not only bring about no difference in the term of the twelve Animals, but also was very useful to fill up the chronological gap which had been produced by the preoccupation relating to the royal succession (see p. 159). Consequently the deceased son *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* came to be taken for the deceased father *Khri lde gtsug brtsan*,⁽⁸⁶⁾ and the former's father *Sroñ lde brtsan* who resumed the throne was replaced with the latter's son and successor *Khri sroñ lde brtsan*, without any doubt. Again, from the resultant tradition that this year at which the change of kings took place corresponded to the Hare year, when *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* assumed the throne at his 13th year,⁽⁷⁷⁾ a different view was newly formed that the year of his birth was also the Hare year, which came to be transmitted to later ages.

In the preceding discussion, I adopted the tentative conclusion regarding the date of *Sroñ brtsan sgam po*'s birth, and I feel assured that I could analyze all the relations here concerned consistently. Because the said change of kings in 643 is attested by the *Tun-huang Annals*, this tentative conclusion about the theory of the assignment of *Sroñ brtsan sgam po*'s birth to the year 581 can be maintained as it is, admitted that the above analysis could be regarded as a justifiable ground.

(84) DTH p. 82.

(85) For example, by attaching *khri* to *Man sroñ mañ brtsan*, *hDus sroñ mañ po rje*, *Ral pa can*, and the like, such names as *Khri mañ slon mañ brtsan*, *Khri hDus sroñ* and *Khri ral pa can* are made. An instance of misunderstanding is found in DC f. 118b, in which, by mistaking *lde sroñ brtsan* for another name of *Khri sroñ brtsan*, instead of *Sroñ lde brtsan*, *Khri* was added to it, with the result that *Khri lde sroñ brtsan* (777-815) was excluded from the royal line of the T'u-fan dynasty. Also, in the work of *Sa skya pa* cited in n. 79, *Khri lde sroñ brtsan* is regarded as a variant name of *Sroñ brtsan sgam po* (f. 62a). On the other hand, in the entry for the year 742 (*rta*) of the *Tun huang Annals*, *Khri sroñ lde brtsan* is recorded as *bTsan po sroñ lde brtsan*.

(86) He was styled *Mes ag tshom*. *Mes* means 'grandfather'; cf. n. 39. *Mes ag tshom* might seem to have been originally said of 'the bushy-bearded *Khri sroñ brtsan*'.

Now, by a critical examination of later Tibetan documents, the following conclusion concerning the chronology of *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* can be drawn: *Guñ sroñ guñ rtsan* was born in 621, and ascended the throne in 638. In 642, he begot a son *Mañ slon mañ rtsan* by Princess *Khri skar*, and died in 643.

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-bshed*, 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. But it is cited as the work of *Panchen bSod nams grags pa* in the *Va durya gSer po*, p. 72 (*Çatapitaka*).
- 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 nams 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 nam thar [Lam ḥbras, Ka.]*, f. 201a.
Accepting Thomas opinion, Tucci mistakenly admits of influences of the *Deb ther sñon po* in this work, TPS. p. 141. The work, wrongly named by Thomas *gSal baḥi me loñ* (TLTDII. p. 34), is in fact none other than the *Chronicle of the 5th Dalai Lama*; cf. n. 52, of this present text and TPS p. 142. Incidentally, *Klon 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, Gantok, 1961.)
- KG *dPaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba: mKhas paḥi dgaḥ ston* [*Ho brag chos ḥbyuñ*] (1545-1565), *Ja* (*Çatapitaka*, New-Delhi, 1962).
- KTK Sato Hisashi: *Kodai Tibetto shi no Kenkyu* (*The Study of Ancient Tibetan History*) 2 vols., Kyoto, 1958/59.
- MBT Tucci, G: *Minor Buddhist Texts*, Part II, Roma, 1958.
- SG *Blo bzañ rgya mtsho: Gañ scan yul gyi sa la spyod paḥi thos ris kyi rgyal blon tso 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.
- TLTDII Thomas, F. W.: *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents. concernig 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, 1963.