The most valuable sources of information about Tibetan names and titles in the VIIIth to IXth Centuries are:

The Tun Huang Annals and Chronicles contained in *Documents de Touen Houang Relatifs a l'Histoire du Tibet*. Bacot, Thomas, and Toussaint, Paris 1946. (THD)

*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*. Vol. II. F.W. Thomas, London 1951. (TLTD)

*Inventaire des Manuscrits Tibetains de Touen Houang*. M. Lalou. (LINV)


Tibetan Inscriptions of the VIIIth to IXth Centuries, variously edited by Professor G. Tucci, Professor Li Fang-kuei, and myself, in *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings* (TTK), *T'oung Pao* (TP) and the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (JRA) respectively.

The first and third of the three *bka' tshigs* (edicts) quoted in the XVIth Century Chos Byung of Dpa' Bo Gtsug Lag 'Phreng Ba (PT) which can be accepted as copies of genuinely ancient documents. The edicts have been translated and transcribed by Tucci in TTK.

The names of Tibetan officials are recorded in a variety of forms. They can be written in extenso or abbreviated in different ways. In either case they usually contain elements the significance of which is quite well documented. One source of such documentation is the Lhasa Treaty Inscription of 821—822 which has the particular value of being bilingual. On that important occasion the appellations of the Tibetan ministers who witnessed the treaty were given in their fullest form; and it was stated at the beginning of the list that it contains the *thabs dang mying rus* of the witnesses.
Taking those terms in reverse order: (1) *rus* signifies the clan or patrilineal family name. Many of these *rus* are frequently recorded e.g. Khu; Mgar; Mgos; Ngan Lam; Rngegs; Cog Ro; Mchims; Gnubs; Sna Nam; Pho Yong Braa Ka; Dba’s; 'Bring Yas; 'Bro; 'Brom; Myang; Tshes Pong. I reserve for a later occasion a study of the original location of the various *rus* and their individual part in Tibetan politics; but it appears that one group of families of Central Tibetan origin, headed by the Dba’s, were in constant competition with families, of which 'Bro was the most prominent, who came from the border regions or beyond and who acquired influence in Tibet through the marriage of ladies of their clan to a Tibetan king.

(2) *Mying (ming)* is the current word for a personal name. A list of *mying* in early use, with some comments on them, is given later.

(3) *Thabs*, although unknown with that meaning in current Tibetan, clearly relates to rank or official title. It is found in TLTD II 361 and 370—rather obscurely; and in REV quite clearly in the form *gral thabs*. The meaning is confirmed by the Chinese version of the Lhasa Treaty Inscription where, as Dr. Li has shown in TP XLIV, *thabs* is the equivalent of the Chinese *wei* “position, rank, title”.

The *thabs* include a number of official posts whose function is reasonably clear and others more open to speculation. The general word for a minister is *blon*. The Chief Minister was known as *blon che*; and he had as colleagues several Great Ministers or *blon chen po* who are described in the Lhasa Treaty Inscription as *bka’ chen po la gtoogs pa* which I have translated as “privy to the great command”, and Dr. Li as “participating in the deliberations of important state affairs”. Below these was a body of ordinary or lesser (*phal* or *phra*) ministers, described as *bka’ la gtoogs pa*; and at least one instance is found of the term *bka’ blon*—TLTD II 47—which is still used in Tibet as a title of the Zhabs Pad or members of the Bka’ Shag.

Within those broad categories of greater and lesser, some ministers held titles describing their specific duties. In the higher rank are found a *ban de chen po*, Great Monk Minister (this post only appears in the later years of the royal period), and a *dmag dpon chen po*, Commander-in-Chief. In the lower grade some ministers are described
as nang blon and others as phyi blon, probably referring to their duties respectively within Tibet at the king’s court and outside it on the frontiers or in occupied territory; of these the nang blon took precedence over the phyi blon.

Important posts, apparently connected with district administration were those of the brung pa and the mngan dpon. The brung pa, whose history has been examined in detail by Dr. G. Uray in Acta Orientalia Hungarica 1962, were closely linked with the organisation of Tibetan territory into ru. They cease to appear in the records after 745.

The mngan dpon appear to have been the administrative officers of districts and the Lhasa Treaty Inscription indicates that they were connected with other officers known as khab so whose duties may have been similar to those of the modern rdzong dpon. The khud pa chen po appears from the one surviving mention of this post (THA p 23) to have been concerned with the receipt of property. Perhaps khud pa explained by S. C. Das at p. 148 of his Dictionary as “anything sent... an article presented” is relevant. Another post appearing more frequently is that of snam phyi pa (Treaty Inscription; THD 106; TTK 103). This ranked third in the list of ordinary officials and preceded the military officers and officers of the Exterior. A group of fifteen snam phyi pa witnessed the third bka’ tshigs quoted in TTK; their duties, therefore, seem to have been important and extensive. Snam phyi with the meaning “latrine” does not seem appropriate, for it is improbable that in VIIth century Tibet menial service around royal persons would have acquired the status of a formal privilege as it did in the court of Louis XIV. The number of such officials also militates against any such interpretation.

Further posts which are frequently recorded are: the bka’ phrin blon (Treaty Inscription; TLT; LIN; REV) whose duties were perhaps similar to those of the present day mgon gnyer which include making known the orders of the ruler; the rtsis pa (Treaty Inscription; TLT; REV) who can be assumed to have been the equivalent of the modern rtsis dpon, an officer responsible for the assessment of revenue and the keeping of revenue records: the zhal ce pa (Treaty Inscription; LIN; TLTD) who were judicial officers the name of whose post survives in the title of the code of laws attributed to Srong Brtsan Sgam Po—the zhal ce bcu gsum. Another judicial officer, named only in the Zhol
inscription and in the XVIth century Chos Byung of Dpa Bo Gtsug Lag, was the yo 'gal 'chos pa. According to reliable Tibetan informants the term implies mediation and reconciliation ('chos) of conflicting parties ('gal).

REV contains a long list of official posts in the Sha Cu (Tun Huang) region most of which do not appear in documents relating to Central Tibet. Several of them—e.g. ru dpon, khri dpon, stong dpon—are based on the organisation by "horns", ten thousands and thousands, combining perhaps civil and military functions.

A general term for officers connected with military duties was dgra blon or dmag dpon another seemingly military rank—chibs dpon,—master of horse—survives as that of an officer of the Dalai Lama's retinue; the term dbang po also seems to have a military significance; and F. W. Thomas sees army rank in the word stag; but many of the instances he quotes are doubtful, although stag so in TLTD II 211 does appear to support his contention.

Official posts were divided into grades each with its special insignia consisting of ornaments and diplomas of different precious substances. In general the highest was turquoise, followed by gold, 'phra men, silver, brass, and copper (LINV 1071); but in THA p.60 there is mention of ke ke ru as the insignia of an award of special merit, apparently higher even than turquoise. Ke ke ru is described in Jaeschke's Dictionary as "a precious white stone": perhaps it was jade or some hard stone. During recent road-making work near Rgya Mda' an ancient tomb was uncovered in which the remains of the dead were decorated with a circular medallion of turquoise; and a similar ornament is said to have been found much earlier in a tomb near Nag Cgu Kha.

Some information about the grading and ornaments of Tibetan ministers is also found in the T'ang Annals (Hsin T'ang Shu). The Chief Minister is there called lun ch'e and his assistant lun ch'e hu mang. These two are further described as great and little lun. There is a Commander-in-Chief called hsi pien ch'e pu; a chief minister of the interior called nang lun ch'e pu or lun mang jo; an assistant called nang lun mi ling pu and a lesser one called nang lun ch'ung; a chief consulting minister—yu han ch'e po with assistants also designated mi ling and ch'ung. All the ministers taken together are described as shang lun ch'e po t'u chu.
Their ceremonial ornaments are, in descending importance, of se se, gold, gilded silver, and copper; they hang in large and small strings from the shoulder.

The above information can be generally reconciled with that from Tibetan sources; but the post of lun ch’è hu măng is not easily identified. 'Or Mang is the personal name of a Chief Minister who held office from 727 to c. 750; there may be confusion with that, or with the term ’og dpon which is applied in THD 102 to an assistant under training with the Chief Minister. The words mi ling and ch’ung stand for 'bring and chung “middling” and “small”. Hsi pien is an unidentifiable term for a military officer. It might represent srid dpon (otherwise unknown) or as suggested by Professor Li Fang-kuei, may stand for spyan, a title appearing in REV. T’u chu, as suggested by Professor Li, may represent Tibetan dgu which may have either a plural force or its intrinsic meaning of “nine”; and it may be significant that in the Treaty Inscription the list of senior ministers contains exactly nine names, as does that in the Edict of Khri Srong Lde Brtsan—that of Khri Lde Srong Brtsan lists eight senior ministers. The Chinese records may, therefore, have preserved a trace of a Board of Nine Senior Ministers of which no mention has survived in Tibetan documents. From the list of ornaments, it would appear that phra men was gilded silver; but the Chinese list is shorter than the Tibetan and, on the analogy of mu men, a precious stone, I still have doubts whether phra men might not have been a variegated hard stone such as agate or onyx which has long been highly prized in Tibet.

I do not propose to examine the rather scanty evidence about the personal names of the Tibetan royal family or the regnal titles of the kings, which fall into a pattern of their own: but some other terms applied to important personages, and not designating specific official functions, may be mentioned. Chen po, “Great One”, is sometimes used as a sort of title (TLTD 97.98; and 339); but this is rare and probably provincial. Rje blus, a term used of officials in high position, has caused some speculation. Thomas, although translating it in TLTD II as “Your Excellency”, later, and more satisfactorily, concluded that it means “succession, or successor in a post”.

The title zhang, in certain clearly definable circumstances, signifies that the person so described or a member of his
family was at some time in the relationship of maternal uncle to a king of Tibet. Families with this distinction, which figure prominently in early records, are Mchims, Sna Nam, 'Bro, and Tshes Pong. From this title must be distinguished the term zhang lon (sic) which seems to be used as a general designation of ministers of all ranks and may there be the equivalent of the Chinese shang as in shang shu "head of an office".

Another zhang relationship was that described as zhang dbon, "uncle and nephew" which existed between the Emperor of China and the King of Tibet as the result of the marriage of Srong Brtsan Sgam Po, and later of Khri Lde Gtsug Brtsan, to Chinese princesses. There was a similar relationship between Tibetan kings, as zhang, and the 'A Zha chiefs, as dbon, through the marriage in 689 of the Tibetan princess Khri Bang to the 'A Zha ruler. Other Tibetan princesses also married neighbouring rulers—in 671 a Zhang Zhung prince; in 736 a Khagan of the Dur Gyis (Turgesh); and in 740 the Bru Zha Rje. None of those rulers is specifically mentioned as dbon nor are they recorded as rgyal phran—"vassals", although at some times Bru Zha and parts of Zhang Zhung may well have been claimed as tributary. The King of Nanchao, at times a powerful ally, at others a formidable enemy of the Tibetans, was accorded the title of Btsan Po Gcen—the Younger Brother King; and it is possible that when Nepal was under Tibetan domination their king held the title of Btsan Po Gcen—the Elder Brother King. But by the time of the edicts of Khri Srong Lde Brtsan and Khri Lde Srong Brtsan the only princes to be mentioned as rgyal phran are the Dbon 'A Zha Rje whose name is given as Dud Kyi Bul Zi Khud Bor Ma Ga Tho Yo Gon Kha Gan, the Rkong Dkar Po Mang Po Rje, the head of a princely family of Rkong Po who were ancient congeneres of the Tibetan royal family; and the Myang Btsun Khri Bo, the head of a Myang principality which may have been the heritage of the great minister Myang Mang Po Rje Zhang Snang who was all-powerful in the early days of Srong Brtsan Sgam Po and was disgraced and executed in about 636.

Other personages who may have been included among the rgyal phran can be seen in documents in TLTD and LINV relating to the administration of the border regions. The term rtse rje appears frequently, sometimes with a territorial label e.g., the rtse rje of Sha Cu (Tun Huang); of
Ka Dag; of Nob Chen (Greater Lob Nor; of Nob Chung; others are known by names e.g., rtse rje Khrom Bzher Bzang Khong; rtse rje Ju Cug; and one is described as to dog rtse rje. That title to dog, which also appears frequently and is found in THD, is related by Thomas to the Turkic tu tuq; another title co bo (jo bo; zho co; jo cho, etc.) is related to the Kharoshti cojhbo; and a ma ca, a title used in Khotan, is identified as representing the Sanskrit amatyra. The title ra sang rje is also found in connection with distinctly non-Tibetan, possibly Zhang-Zhung, names—Rid Stag Rhya and Spung Rhye Rhya—; and the title nang rje po, although similar in appearance to the well documented Tibetan rank of nang blon, may have had a special local significance. There is scope for further study of the distribution of these non-Tibetan forms.

Returning to the mying: it has been surmised that some frequently recurring elements in Tibetan names, apart from those identifiable as thub and rus, signify some sort of rank or title. Bacot, etc. have translated the names of Khri Sum Rje Rtsan Bzher and 'Bal Skye Zang Ldong Tshab as “le bzher Khri Sum Rje Rtsang de Dba’s” and “Bal Skye Zang, le Tshab de Ldong”; and it is noted there that bzher means “haut fonctionnaire”. This is apparently mere guesswork; and a key to the significance of such syllables is found in three early documents—LINV 1240, 1415, and TLTD II p. 370 B—which seem to have been overlooked. Taking the first and last as examples, they read: (1) rus ni 'brom/mkhan ni mdo bzher/mying ni 'jong bu/rus ni 'brung yas/mkhan ni rgyal gzigs/ (quotation left incomplete); and (2) rus ni schu myes/mkhan ni brygal gzigs/mying ni nya slebs/rus ni 'gra had/mkhan ni lang skyes/mying ni don rtse/rus ni 'bre/mkhan ni. . . (document damaged).

The important element in each case is the word mkhan which seems to signify some sort of title by which the person was known. Mkhan with that specific meaning is not current in Tibetan today but is familiar as a suffix (like the Hindi wala) indicating a man’s skill or profession—what he knows, and also what he is doing, e.g., shing mkhan, a carpenter; mdza mkhan, a potter; and 'gro mkhan, one who is going; bsad mkhan, one who has killed. Jaeschke, in his dictionary—followed as usual by Das—states that this suffix can also be used in a passive sense, e.g., sad khan ni lug, “the sheep which was killed”. Such a use would be in line with the suggestion that mkhan in the old documents
could mean how a man was known; but well educated Tibetans have denied that such a form is permissible in Tibetan today and I cannot recall any instances in classical Tibetan. Jaeschke's example is attributed to Western Tibet; and even if the practice is not now known in Central Tibet, the step between the two forms is perhaps not a very long one.

At all events, it is possible in the light of the two passages quoted above to analyse official names and titles even further than in terms of thabs, rus, and mying. For example: (1) Dba's Khri Sum Rje Rtsan Bzher. His rus is Dba's; his mkhan Khri Sum Rje; his mying, Rtsan Bzher. (2) 'Bal Skye Zang Ldong Tshab: his rus is 'Bal; his mkhan Skye Zang; his mying, Ldon Tshab. (3) Taking a name from the Treaty Inscription, Nang Blon Mchims Zhang Rgyal Bzher Kho Ne Brtsan. His thabs is Nang Blon; his rus, Mchims, he is zhang through relationship with the royal family; his mkhan is Rgyal Bzher his mying, Kho Ne Brtsan. (4) A name from THD, Blon Che Dba's Stag 'gra Khong Lod. His thabs is Blon Che; his rus, Dba's; his mkhan, Stag Sgra; his mying, Khong Lod.

Abbreviations of the names of officials take different forms in different documents but generally in each document a consistent practice is adopted. In THD two systems are used. For example (1) the full name and title of Blon Che Dba's Khri Gzigs Zhang Nyen is abbreviated to Blon Che Khri Gzigs i.e. thabs + mkhan; and (2) when a rus is mentioned the mying is used and not the mkhan, e.g. Mgar Stong Rtsan Yul Zung, Dba's Mang Po Rje Pu Tshab, and Cog Ro Snya Zing Kong appear as Mgar Yul Zung, Dba's Pu Tshab, and Cog Ro Zing Kong respectively. These systems are followed in the majority of the documents in TLTD and LINV but two other systems also are found there, although in fewer instances than (1) and (2) above. They are: (3) some officials are described by their thabs, mkhan and mying but their rus is omitted. There is also an example of this in the Zhwa'i Lha Khang inscriptions where a member of the Myang rus is described as Blon Snang Bzang 'Dus Khong. In system (4) both thabs and rus are omitted and we find such names as Rgyal Bzher Legs Tshan—mkhan and mying only. Yet a further two systems appear in the edicts from PT which, it may be remembered, are not original documents. In the third edict there are a few instances of system (2) e.g. Cog Ro Khyi Btsan; Khu Mye Gzigs. These are rus + mying; but the greater
number of the abbreviations are in the form \((5) \text{rus} + \text{thabs} + \text{mying}\), e.g. Cog Ro Blon Gung Kong. Persons who are \textit{zhang} are described in a different manner from that used in the Treaty inscription. There the practice is Mchims Zhang, etc., etc.; in the edict the form is Zhang Mchims, etc., etc. The first edict produces system \((6)\) using the \textit{thabs} and the \textit{mying} only, e.g. Blon Ngan Lam Stag Sgra Klu Gong is abbreviated to Blon Klu Gong; and in this edict \textit{zhang} are also described by their \textit{mying} only, e.g. Zhang Legs 'Dus. This usage may perhaps also be found in THD where the names Zhang Rgya Sto and Zhang Tre Gong look more like \textit{mying} than \textit{mkhan}; but there is also an instance there of the name Zhang Bstan To Re which is an established \textit{mkhan}.

The forms of abbreviation are, therefore, numerous; but on the available evidence the most common system is \((1)\), i.e. \textit{thabs} + \textit{mkhan}. The existence of a \textit{rus} + \textit{mying} abbreviation, however, makes it impossible to say with certainty whether all nobles possessed a \textit{mkhan}; but as there are examples where the names of persons known to have possessed a \textit{mkhan} are abbreviated to \textit{rus} + \textit{ming}, and as a very large number of \textit{mkhan} existed—lists are given below, it seems probable that all nobles who attained ministerial rank were known by a \textit{mkhan}. It seems equally probable that ordinary people did not have a \textit{mAhan}. LINV 2169, for example, refers to persons only by their \textit{rus} and \textit{mying}; and many documents in TLTD and LINV relate to persons who can be seen from the context to have been farmers, soldiers, workmen and ordinary citizens. The names usually consist of two syllables only and many of them can be shown from established examples to be \textit{mying}; the form of others differ from the usual mould of a \textit{mkhan}, as can be seen from the lists which follow. Many of the names are prefixed by a \textit{rus}, usually differing from the well established \textit{rus} of the Tibetan nobility, and in many cases of non-Tibetan appearance. This is not surprising as the documents originate in the border regions and the \textit{rus} fall into distinctive groups in the different regions. From Sha Cu (Tun Huang) there are such family, clan or racial names as 'Im; Hong; Le; Le'u; K'eu. The usual prefix for names from Khotan is Li and from the Tu Yu Hun, 'A Zha. The \textit{rus} Ngan does not appear often but may perhaps refer to people of Sogdian origin." Similarly the personal names fall into distinctive groups. From Sha Cu are found for example—Le Shing; P'eu P'eu; Hyan Ce; 'Im 'Bye Le'u; Wang Kun.
Tse: from Nob (Lop Nor) Spong Rang Slong; Nga Srong; Lbeg Ma; Nung Zul; Nir Sto: from Li (Khotan) Ku Zu; Ye Ye; Shi Nir; Gu Dod; Bu Du. Lists of such names have been collected by Thomas and can be seen in TLTD II.

Although it is not intended to examine in any detail names other than those of lay officials but it may be noted that the Tibetan monastic names which make their appearance towards the end of this period follow their own line, drawing on the Buddhist religious vocabulary, e.g. Ting Nge 'Dzin Bzang Po; Dga' Ldan Byang Chub; Rdo Rje Rgyal Po; Dpal Gyi Shes Rab; Byang Chub Bkra Shis; Don Grub; Ye Shes; etc.

To conclude this study I have extracted lists to show the nature of the mkhan and mying. The lists, which are not intended to be a full catalogue, are in two parts; the first contains examples established by their appearance in names given in extenso, the second contains mkhan and mying which are found in close association with established examples and show a similar character. They may, therefore, be assumed to be respectively mkhan or mying.

**MKHAN**

[A] Klu Bzher: Klu Bzang; Skye (Skyes) Bzang; Khri Gang; Khri Sgra; Khri Snya; Khri Snyan; Khri Mnyen; Khri Mnyes, Khri Do Re; Khri 'Bring; Khri Btsan; Khri Gzu; Khri Gzigs; Khri Bzang; Khri Sum Rje; Khri Sum Bzher; Kh. om Bzher; Glu Bzang; Dge Bzher; Rgyal Sgra; Rgyal Nyen; Rgal Ta; Rgyal To Re; Rgyal Stong; Rgyal Tsha; Rgyal Tshang; Rgyal Bzher; Rgyal Gzigs; Rgyal Bzang; Rgyal Legs; Chung Bzang; Snya Do Re; Snya Do Re; Snya Brtsan; Snya Bzher; Snyan To Re; Stag Gu; Stag Sgra; Stag Rma; Stag Bzher; Stag Gzigs; Ston Nya; Ston Re; Ston R-san, Brtan Sgra; Brtan Bzher; Mdo Bzher; Ldon Bzang; Snang To Re; Snang Bzher; Snang Bzang; Dpal Bzher; 'Bring To Re; 'Bring Po; 'Bring Rtsan; Mang Rje; Mang Nyen; Mang Po Rje; Mang Bzher; Mang Rtsan; Mang Zham; Smön To Re; Btsan Sgra, Btsan To Re; Brtsan Nyen; Brtsan Bzher; Zha Nga; G Yu Legs; Legs Snyan; Legs To Re; Legs Bzher; Legs Sum Rje; Lha Bzher; Lha Bzang.

[B] Klu Sgra; Klu Mayen; Klu Gzigs; Khri Dog Rje; Khri Rma; Khri Bzher; Glu Bzher; Dge Bzang; Rgyal
The general appearance of the *mkhon* and *myung* can be seen from the above lists. Although most of the components are common to both, certain pairs of syllables
occur far more frequently—though not exclusively—in one group or another. In the examples I have collected bzher is almost exclusive to the mkhan; while slebs, legs, and kong, as final syllables, are exclusive to the mying. The instances where one pair of syllables appears to be used as either a mkhan or a mying are not a large proportion of the available material. Uncertainty on this point is increased by the apparently indiscriminate use of either mkhan or a mying after the title zhang; and perhaps also personages of border clans—e.g. those described as jo co—may not always have possessed a mkhan. Ordinary people on the border may have taken as personal names forms used in Tibet itself only as mkhan. In general one can detect a characteristic pattern in both mkhan and mying; and further research might remove doubt about the equivocal examples.

The same mkhan occurs in more than one family; and although some components appear rather frequently in certain rus—e.g. many Dba’s names contain the syllable bzher—none is exclusive to any particular rus. More obviously, many people shared the same mying. Here, too, some syllables recur in particular noble families e.g. many Cog Ro names end in kong. That syllable is not exclusive to Cog Ro nor is it found in all their names; but it does seem to be a frequent part of names from rus connected with the border regions and this may be significant.

Some of mkhan and mying can be translated after a fashion. Stag Sgra ‘Tiger Voice’; Stag Gzigs, ‘Tiger Look’; Khri Sum Rje ‘Lord of Three Thrones’; Lha Bzang, ‘Excellent Deity’; Stag Tshab ‘As Good As a Tiger’; Smon Btsan, ‘Powerful Prayer’; Lhas Byin, ‘Blessed by God’; and so on. The translation of other syllables—e.g. the frequent bzher—is not clear; but it is not my intention to speculate on their meaning here. Generally, the mkhan appear more grandiose and complimentary than the mying. The existence of so large a member of mkhan excludes the probability that they were systematic titles (though an exception might be made for mang po rje) and the conclusion is that mkhan was a sort of sobriquet or name of honour conferred on persons of noble birth or high rank.

2. There are three instances in THD of the proclamation of the name of a King: Khri 'Dus Srong in 685 at the age of nine; Khri Lde Gtsug Brtsan in 712 at the age of eight; and Khri Srong Lde Brtsan in 756 at the age of thirteen. Of these the original name of Khri Lde Gtsug Brtsan is recorded-viz. Rgyal Gtsug Ru.

3. See Zhol Inscription S. lines 3 and 4 and TLTD 22-25; 59; 302; 339; and 404. Of these TLTD 22-25 is the most illuminating: "Bdag cag pha tshan spyi'i gnang ba 'i rje blas ni ma lags//bdaggi pha Ma Ko Can sgos zho sha phul ba'i rje blas 'dir bdag cag Ld Kong gi bu tsha rngo thog las bsko bar" "That rje blas (right to office) which our father's family regularly enjoyed, does not (now) exist. The rje blas earned by the performance of services especially by our father Ma Ko Can let one from the descendants of our Ld Kong who is capable be appointed to that rje blas."

4. A branch of Mchims seems to have been known as Mchims Rgyal; see the well attested Mchims Rgyal Gzigs Shu Steng (Zhol and THD) also in the third edict in TTK: Mchims Rgyal Btsan Bzher Legs Gzigs; Mchims Rgyal Snya Mon Btsan; Mchims Rgyal Stag Bzher. Rgyal Gzigs, Btshan Bzher and Stag Bzher, without a prefixed Rgyal, are known *mkhan*. That prefix does not appear in the names of other zhang who are identified as belonging to the Mchims *rus*.

5. See TTK, p 58. Tucci does not however, notice the unexplained spelling lon which is most frequent in this term Zhang blon does appear in LINV 1166: Zhang Blon Chen po Zhang Khri Sum Rje; in TLTD II 222 Zhang Blon Khri Bzher; also in LINV 981 and TLTD II 148. But for zhang lon see LINV 113, 1155, 1083; REV passim; TLTD II 9, 21 137, and a dozen other instances. To these can be added ten instances of the form zhang lon chen po and some significant examples e.g. 139 and 153 where a distinction is made between lon and blon, viz. Zhang Lon Chen po Blon Dge Bzang. The shang lon che phra; and chags srid kyi blon po nams dang
zhang lon che phra are recorded as witnesses to a decree in the Zhwa'i Lhakhang inscription. In the Zhol inscription it seems that a person not related to the royal family by marriage could be given the rank of zhang lon. It may also be noted that no examples are found of e.g. lon che, nang lon, phyi lon, etc.

6. THD records relations between Tibet and 'Jang (Nanchao) as early as 703 in the reign of 'Dus Srong. In the next reign Khri Lde Gtsug Brtsan, who had a wife from 'Jang, received an envoy from the Myawa—a part of the Nanchao kingdom. He is described in THD as having given the title btsan po gcung to the Nanchao ruler who is named Kag La Bong (Ko Lo Feng c. 768-779). This passage has been mistranslated by the editors on p. 150. Collation of information on Nanchao from Tibetan and Chinese sources needs to be undertaken. For the latter see W. Stott in TP 1963, where earlier works both in French, English and Chinese are cited.

7. See THD p. 19 (46) relating to the year 707. "Pong Lag Rang du btsan po gcen lha balpho rgyal sa nas phab/" A Rebellion in Nepal about this time is recorded in the T'ang Annals; and if the reading is lho bal (as the editors seem to have taken it in their translation at pp 40-41), it seems that the Nepalese king was described as Btsan po Gcen. "the elder brother king."

8. The 'A Zha were conquered by the Tibetans in the time of Srong Brtsan Sgam Po; his son Gung Srong married an 'A Zha princess. When the 'A Zha later tried to defect to China the Tibetans in fury totally defeated them (670). Some, under a family called Mou Jong fled east and were settled by the Chinese around Liang Chou. The rest remained as vassals of Tibet. The marriage of princess Khri Bangs to the 'A Zha chief in 689 established the zhang dpon relationship which is referred to in a THD p. 78: "Bon 'A rje dang/ zhang dpon gdad sa chom." The editors, reading dpon, quite miss the mark by translating 'Bon chef de 'A Zha (fut nomme [zhang dpon gdan tshom]. Thomas, TLTD II. pt 6, reading dbon, gets nearer: "The 'Bon 'A Zha chief and the uncle (nephew?) resigned (exchanged?) their posts."
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Zha chief were established in their proper places as Uncle and Nephew.

The matter is complicated by frequent references to the 'Bon 'A Zha (which must be distinguished from bdon) who seem to have been a tribe or section of the 'A Zha. Perhaps the 'A Zha chief was both a 'Bon 'A Zha as well as being dbon to the Tibetan king; but the existence of such similar words may have caused confusion even in early days. There is no mention of 'Bon 'A Zha in Tibetan records until the 'Bon Da Rgyal in 675. This name is represented in the T'ang Annals as P'en Ta Yen, and the holder was a valiant ally of the Tibetans. Da Rgyal seems to be a princely title and other Da Rgyal, not described as 'Bon, are mentioned before 675. E.H. Parker in A Thousand Years of the Tartars, p. 110, says that the Tu Yu Hun who fled to China (670) became known as Hwun. Perhaps Sinologists can find a key there, or in the name Mou Jong.


10. In JRAS 1952 (Zhwa'i Lhakhang) I suggested placing Myang in the Gyantse Nyang (Myang) Chu region; but I now think it far more probable that the home of the Myang family was in and to the west of the headwaters of the Myang Chu of Rkong Po - now known as the Rgya mda' or Kam chu. The legend of Dri Gum Btsan po, although claimed in recent times for the Gyantse valley, is properly connected,—as I am assured by several learned Tibetans—with the lower course of the Rkong-po Myang Chu. The site of Zhwa'i lha khang, where a leading member of the Myang family built a chapel, also points towards Rkong po.

11. The character which is most naturally represented in Tibetan, as in French, as ngan, is one of several names indicating Sogdian origin. There were colonies of Sogdians in Eastern Central Asia from Hami and Lop Nor to the Ordos, see J. R. Hamilton, Les Ouighoures; Li Fang-kuei, "Sog", in Central Asiatic Journal, 1957; E. Pulleyblank in TP, XLI, 1952. Perhaps the origin of Ngan Lam Ştag Sgra Klu Khong may be sought there. The Zhol Inscription suggests that his family had newly come to prominence in Tibet. Might he have been not
only a contemporary but also a fellow countryman of
An Lu Shan whose Sogdian origin and whose name—
Rokshan—have been established by Pulleyblank in "The
Background to the Rebellion of An Lu Shan"?

12. I note examples I have detected; there may well be several
more. (1) Klu Bzher is found in REV as apparently a
*mkhan*—Blon Klu Bzher Sngo Btsan; but in TTK third
edict, where many other names are quoted with an
established *mying*, it appears as Le'u Blon Klu Bzher;
and in TLTD II the name appears without any title
and therefore looks like a *mying*.

(2) Legs Bzang. I.INV 1230 and TLTD II 138 have
Blon Legs Bzang—a usual *mkhan* form. TLTD II 20
has Zhang Legs Bzang which is equivocal; but in LINV
1094, 1127 and 1175 it appears to be a *mying*.

(3) Khri Sgra is an established *mkhan* in THD pp. 65,
66; also in TTK third edict but in TLTD II 50 it
seems to be a *mying*.

(4) Stag Bzang is quoted by Thomas in TLTD III from
a Miran document in the name Stag Bzang Khri Dpal;
there are several instances in TLTD II of Blon Stag
Bzang—the usual *mkhan* form; but in LINV 540 it is
found with what looks like a non-Tibetan *rus* name—'Bi
Stag Bzang—apparently as a *mying*.

(5) Mdo Bzher, described as a *mkhan* in LINV 1240,
appears in LINV 1078 apparently as a *mying*—Shag
Mdo Bzher.

13. Rkong Dkar Po Mang Po Rje is an attested *rgyal phran*
(JRAS 1954 and TTK third edict). The Da Rgyal
Mang Po Rje appears to have been an 'A Zha prince.
The third edict mentions a Myang *rgyal phran*; the great
minister of Srong Brtsan Sgam Po whose father led
the movement which put Srong Brtsan's grand-father in
power, is called Myang Mang Po Rje Zhang Snang.
His family may have been awarded the status of *rgyal
phran* for this service. Mang Po Rje is also found as
part of the names of persons of special distinction from
the Mgar Khu, Dba's and Cog Ro *rus*; but evidence is
not conclusive.