

ANCIENT HISTORICAL EDICTS
AT LHASA.

BY
L. A. WADDELL, C.B., LL.D.

[*From the* JOURNAL OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, *October, 1910.*]

ANCIENT HISTORICAL EDICTS AT LHASA

By L. A. WADDELL, C.B., LL.D.

(Continued from *JRAS.*, 1909, p. 952.)

THE other and most ancient historical edicts discovered by me at Lhasa are inscribed upon a lofty pillar of victory which stands at the foot of Potala Hill, under the castle of the ancient kings, now incorporated in the palace of the Talai Lamas.

These edicts, three in number, are of the first importance, and two of them, dating between 730 and 763 A.D., are the earliest historical Tibetan documents hitherto discovered. They disclose to us much of the lost history of those stirring times, and throw a sidelight on the ancient history and geography of China. Each of the edicts, fortunately, deals with a different epoch in the national life, and furnishes us with trustworthy contemporary accounts at first hand of important events for which there has hitherto been no authentic indigenous record whatever.

They open up to us a vivid picture of the rise of Tibet as a great military power. We see her engaged in carving out for herself an empire, traces of the northern portion of which have lately been unearthed by Dr. Stein in Eastern Turkestan. We see her, a generation later, waging victorious devastating wars in the heart of China, and actually forcing the latter to pay tribute, occupying the imperial capital, putting the Son of Heaven to precipitate flight, and threatening to annex the celestial empire itself. Again, two generations still later, we are shown the causes which led to the collapse of Tibet as a great Asiatic power, and to the sudden disappearance of her menace to China, which hitherto has been somewhat inexplicable. Now,

however, we see the king, a zealous patron of Buddhism and founder of Lamism, described as of unsound mind, and deposed by a family of soldier-nobles who have usurped the power, and who in their reactionary policy have restored the pre-Buddhistic native religion, the *Bon*. One of the edicts is a manifesto by this party, obviously to justify their action and allay public clamour, which soon, however, vented itself in internecine civil war, that extinguished the monarchy altogether and broke up the country into petty principalities. Many of these were permanently lost to the country for ever, and the remainder were only reunited under the rise of the priest-kings, several centuries later.

Yet the native Tibetan "histories", so called, with characteristic worthlessness in regard to the earlier periods, as is usual in the East generally, excepting China, know nothing of the great events chronicled in these edicts. The very names of the heroic warriors who built up Tibet and won renown for their fatherland have all been forgotten! So too even the names of the great battle-fields on which China lost to her victorious neighbour whole provinces are nowhere mentioned, nor even the very name of the ancient capital of China, Tse-ngan or Changan, the modern Singan Fu, which was the objective of the Tibetan armies for several centuries!

These edicts, however, have preserved for us for over a thousand years the records of those times; and by means of the facts which they provide, we are enabled to set aside the current fiction and conjecture of the "native historians" and to reconstruct the true history.

The pillar bearing these edicts is one of the landmarks of Lhasa. Its exact location is shown in my plan of that city (No. 87) in my *Lhasa and its Mysteries*.¹ Its form and appearance are well seen in my photograph at p. 336

¹ p. 331.

of the same work. It stands on the old bank of the Kyid River, in the middle of the wide road to allow of circumambulation. Its tall needle-like shape is well described by its native name of "the long stone" (*rdo-ring*). It is a four-sided monolith column of dark basaltic stone, standing upon a broad three-stepped (and probably originally five-stepped) plinth of masonry, into which it is built. Its projecting shaft rises to a height of about 25 or 30 feet, and is surmounted by a wide-brimmed pyramidal cap or finial.

No rubbing could be taken, for political reasons, and my detailed photographs of it were unfortunately destroyed, but I secured very careful eye-copies of the inscriptions, taken with the aid of field-glasses, and these are the source of my translation.

The writing engraved upon the stone is in fairly good preservation, on the whole, though some of the record is lost in each inscription. This has manifestly occurred less by weathering and scaling than by deliberate removal at the hands of the Chinese. For the obliteration is mainly confined to those portions relating to the defeats of the Chinese by the Tibetans. At such places whole lines are deliberately erased, and the marks of the obliterating chisel are evident. In the paragraphs describing the occupation of the Chinese capital and the appointment by the Tibetans of a new emperor the record has been so deeply dug out as to leave depressions like cup-markings. Fortunately for history, however, this obliteration has evidently been carried out by persons who either could not read the Tibetan text or did not trouble to remove it entirely. In particular, the names of the emperors remain, as these were too sacred to be tampered with or touched. Enough of the text, however, remains at most of these places to enable us to restore considerable portions of it.

The Chinese manifestly recognized the great importance of this native memorial, for in addition to obliterating in

part its humiliating references to themselves they have erected at its side two imperial edicts as a counterblast. These edicts are on small tablets enshrined in two miniature Chinese temple-like buildings, seen on the left side of my photograph above-cited. Although both of these buildings were locked up during our stay in Lhasa and not accessible, the edicts in question are known. One was erected by the Emperor K'ang-hsi in the year 1721 A.D., on his occupation of Lhasa and suppression of a civil war there. It is entitled "The Pacification of Tibet", and its text has been published in this Journal by Mr. Rockhill¹ from Chinese sources. The other is an edict by Chien-lung in the year 1794 A.D.²

The great pillar of victory of the Tibetans is inscribed on three of its sides, namely, (1) that facing Lhasa city on the east, which, as the most conspicuous side, bears the inscription for which the pillar was originally erected, (2) facing Potala on the north (or rather north-west), and (3) facing the old bank of the River Kyid. The west is devoid of inscription.

The characters in all three are in the "headed" or *U-chan* form of letter, and are identical in shape with that in use at the present day. This shows how rigidly the Tibetans stereotyped the form of their letters from the earliest times, as one of these inscriptions dates to within a century of the first introduction of writing into Tibet.

The language in all is archaic Tibetan prose of the pre-classical period, as regards its orthography and grammatical construction. That archaic element, the "*d-drag*" (see Part I, pp. 942, etc.) is present as a very frequent and conspicuous feature. It is present in the following words:—

¹ JRAS., 1891, pp. 185-7, and p. 264, "Imperial Autograph dated 60th year of K'ang-hsi."

² Ibid., p. 264, "Imperial Autograph dated 59th year of Chien-lung (1794)." It is entitled 十全記.

<i>stsald</i>	<i>'p'eld</i>
<i>gchald</i>	<i>bskyun</i>
<i>ldard</i>	<i>gstsand</i>
<i>gsold</i>	<i>bskyid</i>
<i>t'ild</i>	<i>rgyurd</i>
<i>brtand</i>	<i>bstand.</i>

Its presence, indeed, even in the last edict of the three, dating to about 840 A.D., that is about sixty years *after* the establishment of the classical epoch, lends support to my previous suggestion (p. 944), that the remarkable classical purity in the Tibetan orthography of the joint treaty-edict of 783 A.D. was owing to its revision by the staff of scholarly Indian and Tibetan monks working under the orders of the king, K'ri Sron-lde-btsan, who had themselves, only a short time previously, erected the new classical standard for their systematic translation of the Buddhist scriptures into Tibetan. That an edict of later date should retain the old popular style of orthography sixty years after the introduction of the classical standard is easily explained. For this edict is a manifesto by a reactionary and revolutionary party returning to the old religion and ways of their forefathers, and openly hostile to the Buddhist religion and the royal patron of those literary monks who had erected the classical standard. This edict, therefore, was not likely to have had the benefit of revision by the latter. These circumstances thus enable us to fix with greater precision an initial date for the commencement of the classical period of literary composition in Tibet.

The grammatical construction, too, presents many archaic features which render the translation a matter of some difficulty at times. This arises from the somewhat condensed and rudimentary form of the sentences owing to the absence of many of the differentiating prefixes and case affixes and postpositions of later times. Although in

these difficulties I have not enjoyed the benefit of any native assistance I believe that I have elicited the meaning in most instances correctly. When this is obviously doubtful I have made a note to that effect.

Although, like most Tibetan records, these lithic documents are undated, the references which they contain to contemporary events and kings in Chinese and Tibetan history enable us to fix the dates with more or less precision.

In translating and commenting on these three edicts, I will designate them Potala Pillar Inscription *A*, *B*, and *C* respectively. This will distinguish them from those of the Lhasa Treaty Pillar at the door of the great temple within the city, which also displays three inscriptions, one of which, namely, the Tê Tsung joint edict, I have described in the first part of my article. This will also sufficiently distinguish them from the other inscriptions on various sites in and around Potala, which are in Chinese and on small tablets, not pillars.

II. POTALA PILLAR INSCRIPTION *A*, *circa* 730 A.D.

This inscription, the shortest and most obliterated of the three, is the oldest of all; and it is the one for which the pillar was originally erected. Though its text is badly defaced in the portion which manifestly referred to victories over China, it retains much that is important; and its information is supplemented and complemented by the text of the other inscriptions (*B* and *C*) of the same pillars.

It is an edict by the king K'ri *g*'Tsug-*lde-btsan*, the father of the king of the Tê Tsung joint treaty-edict (pp. 924, etc.), in honour of his greatest minister, named Je-lä, who had guarded him since his accession to the throne as a child of 8, had procured him an imperial princess from China as consort, had widely extended the dominions of Tibet by conquest from China, and, to crown all, had with retention of these conquered provinces

actually extracted from the Emperor of China twenty years later an honourable peace. Such great achievements were no doubt worthy of commemoration by such a fine pillar of victory.

He belonged to the *lDon* tribe (pronounced *Dong*), so we are informed in Inscription *B*, where this tribe is given the epithet of '*bal* or "the parted hair".¹ This is the term applied to the mode of dressing the hair as prevalent in the Kham province of Eastern Tibet, where it is combed out and hangs down nearly to the shoulders. So it is probable that *Je-lä* came from the borders of China and inherited a higher civilization than the generality of Tibetans, who doubtless wore their hair shaggy in those days. The pig-tail appears to me probably to have been introduced only in the reign of the great-grandson of this king, namely, the sovereign of the edict *C*, or thereabouts, who is only known to Tibetans by his nickname of "the long-locked or pigtailed"—*Ral-pa-chan*. This king is noted for having introduced many Chinese customs into Tibet, amongst others, it would thus appear probable, the pigtail.

Although in his own country the name of this great general is now quite forgotten and unknown in the native history books, *Je-lä* is well known to Chinese history under the name of *Hsi-lieh* (see p. 1252). The Chinese chronicles of the *T'ang* dynasty of the eighth century A.D. record as follows regarding him :—²

"In the 18th year (730 A.D.), the 10th month, *Ming-Hsilieh* and the rest arrived at the capital. The Emperor received them in the *Hsüan-chêng* palace, surrounded by his armed guards. *Ming-Hsilieh* was a scholar learned in literature; he had been before to *Ch'angan* (the Chinese capital) to receive the Princess of *Chinch'eng*, and on that occasion all the Court talked of his ability and eloquence. On his arrival the Emperor invited him to a banquet in the palace, conversed with him, and treated him most graciously, presenting to him a purple robe and gold girdle with fish-bag, as well as seasonable apparel, a silver plate and wine vase, and afterwards entertained him sumptuously at a separate

¹ *Jaeschke, Dict.*, p. 392.

² *Bushell, JRAS.*, 1880, p. 466.

hotel. Hsilieh kept the robe and girdle as well as the other presents, but declined the fish-bag, excusing himself thus: 'In our native country we do not wear this, and I dare not keep such a new and rare gift.' The Emperor approved and consented."

For the text of the edict see p. 1276.

Translation of Edict.

(Curved brackets enclose doubtful readings and restorations of the text, whilst explanatory interpolations are placed within square brackets.)

"By the command [of the king] this tall [pillar] to (?honour the minister) *rJe (blas)* was ordered. The order was obeyed. *rJe-blas* having (?defeated the Chinese at . . . and extended) the dominions (?and made Tibet) master of [to] the river (?Tibet and China) were made equal. The victory was good for the dominion of the black-headed people [Tibetans]. It made them contented."

The very first word¹ reveals an archaic feature in the presence of the *drag*² of the pre-classic period.

The loftiness of the monolithic column is well described by the term which is ordinarily used to describe tall trees.³

The name *rJe-blas* is pronounced by Tibetans *Je-lä*. We never find exact literal transcriptions of foreign proper names into Chinese, but merely the phonetic form as the Chinese render it. In the Chinese records this minister is called *Hsila*⁴ on the occasion of his first visit to China, and bears the title of *Shang-tsan-cho*, which we shall see later is a royal title, which may be bestowed upon the highest ministers. On his subsequent visit to China he is called *Hsilieh* with the prefixed title of "*Ming*", which may simply be that this Tibetan word for "named" has got joined on to it by oversight. Both of these forms are, for the Chinese, fairly good attempts at reproducing his proper

¹ *stald.*

² v. p. 1250.

³ But see n. 2, p. 1277.

⁴ Bushell, *JRAS.*, 1880, p. 456. He seems to be the same person as "Jê-ku" there also named.

name of Je-lä. Some further particulars in regard to him are furnished by Inscriptions *B* and *C*.

The Tibetans are here termed by their own king "the black-headed people". This epithet is met with in other of the inscriptions, also in old ballads; and probably may denote, I think, that in those days the Tibetans did not wear caps. Indeed, the caps at the present day are all of Chinese pattern and manufactured in China.

The date would appear to be within the period 731-5 A.D., and most probably the former. The text describes the country as being at rest after its accession of dominion, acquired through the achievements of Je-lä. This would place it shortly after the peace treaty of 730 A.D., secured by this minister. For, six years later, in 736 A.D., the two countries were again actively at war, and Tibet was wresting Baltistan, Khotan, etc., from China. Moreover, we do not find Je-lä mentioned after 730 in Chinese annals, and we are told in Inscription *B* that he died before the "time" of K'ri Sron-lde-btsan, who was born, according to my calculation, in 739 A.D. As he already was "the chief minister of Tibet" when he headed the mission to China in 709, he may be presumed to have been at that time not less than 40 years of age, seeing that his conspicuous ability made such an impression at the imperial court. All this would be in keeping with his death occurring, at an age over sixty, before 739 A.D., also with 731 A.D. as the probable date of the dedication to him of this pillar of victory.

III. POTALA PILLAR INSCRIPTION *B*, circa 764 A.D.

This inscription¹ relates to the epoch-making events which happened a generation later than the era of Inscription *A*. It records a glorification of the successor and, as it tells us, the kinsman of Je-lä, who occupied a similar relation to King K'ri Sron-lde-btsan that Je-lä

¹ A preliminary note on it by me appeared in the *Times* of July, 1910.

did to his father. He was a mighty warrior as well as politician; and this edict bears internal evidence of it having been promulgated by the king in the first flush of victory, after the occupation of the imperial capital of China, and the appointment by Tibet of a new emperor to the throne of China, events which happened, as we know from the annals of China itself,¹ in 763 A.D.

The edict occupies the next place of honour on the pillar to the original dedicatory one. It covers a large portion of the south face, towards the old bank of the river.² It faces the direction in which people coming from the city must pass the pillar in going to Potala, or to the west gate of the city; for the Tibetans, in passing a monument, invariably do so in the respectful way of circumambulation, that is with the right hand towards the venerated object.

It records the Tibetan version of the chief victories by Tibet over the Chinese in the eighth century, which the Chinese with admirable impartiality have chronicled against themselves, and so provided the only record of these events hitherto known. The accuracy of the Chinese accounts is confirmed and supplemented to a remarkable extent by this Tibetan version, which throws fresh light on this invasion of China.

The date of this edict is manifestly 764 A.D., i.e. immediately after the occupation of the imperial capital and the setting up of a new emperor, as it stops short at the record of these events; whereas we know from Chinese sources that the latter arrangement was upset six months later by the return of the old emperor to his capital.

The credit for the most important conquests is given not to the king himself but almost entirely to his minister-general, Lu-koñ. This may be partly owing to the king's

¹ Bushell, *loc. cit.*, p. 476.

² The modern bank of the river is about a quarter of a mile further to the south.

modesty as author of this proclamation. Hitherto this king, under whom Tibet reached its zenith as an Asiatic power, was believed to have been personally a great warrior, leading his troops into battle like his ancestors; and the title which he assumed in his joint treaty-edict with China, about twenty years after the date of the present edict, namely "the helmeted king" (see JRAS., 1909, p. 934), supported this view. Here, however, we see that the two greatest of the campaigns were conducted by his militant minister, Lu-koñ, in person.

For the text of this inscription see p. 1276. The peculiarities of the letters and the orthography have already been noted.

Translation.

(Curved and square brackets as formerly.)

.

"There arose [the minister] named *rJe-blas*¹ of the smooth-haired *lDoñ* tribe,² who became the intimate counsellor [of the king] and was looked up to by men. The great minister worked swiftly and was at the side³ [of the king] in sudden emergencies. He extended [the dominions] in the time of the king's father, *K'ri-lde*

¹ Pronounced *Je-lä*. ² See p. 1253.

³ *glo-ba*. This term presents some difficulties, as it is never used in such a sense nowadays. *glo* literally is the ordinary term for "the side" of a person or thing; but is not the respectful form of the word to be applied to a king, which now would be a different root, e.g. *gz'ogs*. It also means a "cough", with reference apparently to the movement of one's side which a cough entails. In its determinative form as *glo-ba*, as here used, it ordinarily means a cough with the sense of sudden movement, so that when compounded with *'bur* itself, meaning sudden, the word *glo-'bur* means "suddenly", though here again it may merely mean the sudden "side" or aspect. I have therefore treated it as meaning "side", and it recurs very often throughout these edicts in connexion with advice tendered to the king or State on emergencies by an adviser on the spot or at the "side" or ear of the State or king.

gTsug-rtsan, until he died. He extended [it] until near the time of the prince *K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan*. He made the dominion of the black-headed Tibetans to fight.

kLu-k'oñ also, like [*rJe-*]-*blas*, was one who was systematically quick in sudden emergencies. [This] came to the ear of the prince, *K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan*, that another smooth-haired one has arisen [who is] quick in sudden emergencies. This having been found to be true, he, even *kLu-k'oñ*, was sent for and taken to be the intimate [counsellor] at the side of [the prince].

“During the reign of the king, *K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan*, *kLu-k'oñ* was the intimate [counsellor] at the side [of the king] on the *Tshe-ngan* high road [to China]. After the great conference¹ he became firm in mind and was appointed to the rank of Minister of the Interior.² He viewed with warm apprehension the dominion of China.

“No sooner was he commanded to go in the direction of *K'ar-chan*³ as commander of the leading upper division of the army than he set out, taking heed of resourceful precautions like a god of war. With a force greatly more numerous than that assembled [?in or ?by] the *z'a-z'a*⁴ of rank in the territories of China he beat⁵ the Chinese.

¹ See p. 1261.

² *Nañ-blon'*. This rank is mentioned in several of these edicts (see after), and is also noted in the Chinese records of the seventh century as “*Nanglun*” (Bushell, loc. cit., p. 440) as a title of ministers of rank.

³ The “*Kachan*” or “*Cachan*” of Marco Polo, see p. 1262.

⁴ རྩ་ལྔ་ཚ'འ་ཚ'འ་ is evidently a Chinese word. If intended for རྩ་ལྔ་ཚ'འ་ཚ'འ་, it might probably mean “by each cap (or ‘button’) of rank”.

⁵ ལྷོ་གོང་སྒྲི་ is not a recognized expression nowadays. It literally means “bamboo”, “became uppermost”; and this might mean “made themselves uppermost [over the Chinese] by beating [the latter]”. Probably the first component of the phrase should be ལྷོ་ spo, which means “overthrow”, and the sentence then would read “overthrew [the Chinese] and became uppermost”. It is noteworthy that the latter word ལྷོ་ is the same root which is used as the ordinary designation of the Emperor of China, namely, “The Supreme One”—*Gon-ma*. Another possible though less probable form might be ལྷོ་གོ་ “to smack” or “lick”.

Of those who took the part of China at Byar-mo-t'añ¹ some [escaped] towards T'ong-k'a also during the rising of the night to neighbouring The [new] boundary was laid out. kLu[-k'ön] of the war by the great dominion A great conference was requested . . [?by the Chinese. He] having become [again] confidential counsellor at the side [of the king] he was a continual pattern to the State by what [he] did.

“The king . . [K'ri Sron]-lde-btsan with profound prudence of mind treasured up with full precautions what dominions [he conquered]. Being ever experienced by practice he conquered a great many countries of rank and forts in the territories of China, and joined them together.

“The lord of China [the emperor] Heū-'di Wang-te² [and] the lord's minister, being terrified, offered tribute for ever of fifty thousand pieces of silk cloth a year. The Chinese were made to pay the tribute.

“After this, the lord of China, Yang³ Heū-'di Wang-te, having died,⁴ the son of the lord of China, Wang Teng Wang,⁵ became king. He was unable⁶ to pay the tribute to Tibet. On this account kLu-k'ön begged the Tibetan king, who was heartsick of the accursed road [to Tshengan], that Tibet issue a war-order for a great army to march straight to the Keng-shi palace of the lord of China. To be the great commanders of the army [marching]

¹ Pronounced “Char-mot'ang”. It is possible that the word here may be རྩ་འོ་ i.e. *byar-o*, pron. “*char-o*”, instead of རྩ་མོ་ *byar-mo* as transcribed in my eye-copy, especially as a Chinese town named “Chao-yi” exists in this neighbourhood at the present day, see p. 1263.

² The Emperor Su Tsung, whose regal title in 756-8 was *Che-Teh*.

³ *Yang* here may not be part of the proper name, but merely the conjunction meaning “or”.

⁴ Su Tsung died in 763 (Mayer's *Chinese Reader's Manual*, p. 382).

⁵ Kwang Teh, the reigning title of Tai Tsung, who succeeded to the throne in this year 763.

⁶ *groñ-ste*.

straight for Keng-shi were appointed Z'ang *mCh'ims*,¹ prince² of the royal race of Shu-teng, and the minister *sTag-sgra kLu-k'oñ*, and they both [proceeded] straight to Keng-shi.

"A great battle was fought on the bank of the ford of Chiū-chi.³ China and all its great households⁴ were defeated. Tibet made the enemy flee from battle. Many Chinese were struck down.⁵ The lord of China, [the emperor] Kwang-t'eng Wang,⁶ also having come forth from the fort of Keng-shi fled to Sheng-chiū.

"Keng-shi having been brought down, the inner minister of the lord of China . -byeu . -keng covered and ceased [digging] entrenchments and of the Tibetan king. Whatsoever Tibet . [?demanded] in Keng-shi causing disturbances minister . [?Tibet set up as Chinese emperor] the king Che-chung⁷ . . [?to hold] the dominion for the future.

"*kLu-k'oñ* having done . . [this] became [again] counsellor at the side [of the king]. [?His soundness] of judgment has caused happiness for the dominion."

One of the most striking facts revealed by this edict is the vast distance eastwards to which the Tibetans had overrun China at this time, in the middle of the eighth century A.D. They had extended their dominion half-way across the continent of China to the great bend of the Yellow River, and beyond the imperial capital itself, so as to outflank it.

The eastern limit of the boundary of Tibet in 755 as

¹ *mCh'ims* is a small principality or district near Samyäs, south of Lhasa, a princess of which was married to King K'ri Sroñ-*lde-btsan*, so that this commander was probably the *uncle* of the king, and thus was entitled Z'ang, which literally means "maternal uncle" (Jaeschke, *Dict.*, 471), though it also is the name of a district of Western Tibet to the north of Shigatse.

² *rgyal*.

³ The modern Chou-chih, see p. 1265.

⁴ བཟོ་མོ་

⁵ བཏུངས་པས་ cf. Jaeschke, *Dict.*, p. 285.

⁶ The Emperor Kwang Teh.

⁷ See p. 1266.

inherited by K'ri Sron-lde-btsan from his father is uncertain, especially as the name of the frontier river has been erased in his father's edict, as we have seen. But it must have been to the east of Koko Nor and have included a considerable portion of Kansu, as the Chinese records show incessant Tibetan aggression in Kansu in his father's reign.¹

In 755, the very first year of the son's reign, the whole of Kansu up to the Lung Mountains, which separate that province from Shensi on the east, were annexed by Tibet. In the following year, 756, this loss of territory appears to have been accepted by the Chinese at a sworn treaty held at the imperial capital, Ch'angan.² This is manifestly "the great conference" of this edict, which the militant Tibetan minister Lu-koñ attended, and at which he formed the resolve, as the edict tells us, to carry the campaign of conquest further, despite the formal treaty. For there is no other Chinese record of any conference or peace-meeting of these two powers between the years 756 and 762, whilst the first of the two great conquests by Lukoñ is chronicled by the Chinese to have been made in 758.

In that year the Chinese record³ that they lost to the Tibetans *the key to Central China*, namely, the famous pass of T'ung-kwan, together with the important districts which it commanded to the east, to wit, the Ho and Lo River tracts and beyond. By this loss the Chinese state they were completely cut off from all communication with Western Asia and with the remains of their possessions in Turkestan, which they now completely lost.

The contemporary Chinese chronicle in the *T'ang-shu* records—

"When the T'ung-kwan [pass] was lost and Ho and Lo cut off by troops, all the soldiers stationed in Ho, Lung, and Sofang were recalled to settle the difficulties of the State, to accompany the Emperor in his flight. Thus, at this time, all the old camps and border cities were left

¹ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 439.

² Ibid., p. 475.

³ Ibid., p. 475.

ungarrisoned, and from the period Chien-yuan (758-9) the T'u-Tan [Tibetans], taking advantage of our difficulties, daily encroached on the borders, and the citizens were either carried off and massacred or wandered about to die in ditches, till after the lapse of some years all the country west of Fêng shiang and to the north of Pinchou belonged to the Fan barbarians, and several tens of *chous* [principalities] were lost."

T'ung-kwan was, moreover, the recognized key to Central China, as it existed in ancient and even mediaeval times. The vital importance of this pass, strategically, to China is owing to its closing the passage between the Yellow River and the mountains. Its fortress was, says Yule,¹ "constantly the turning point of the Mongol campaigns against that dynasty (the Kin), and held a prominent place in the dying instructions of Chinghiz for the prosecution of the conquest of Cathay [China]."

The possession of T'ung-kwan at a point commanding the River Wei, on which higher up and only a few days' march distant stood the imperial capital of Ch'angan, placed the latter completely at the mercy of the Tibetans, who it appears from the edict were paid an annual subsidy to leave the capital unmolested. And it was the stoppage of this annual "tribute" some years later which the edict tells us was the cause of the Tibetan sack of the imperial capital in 763 A.D.

The capture of the T'ung-kwan was manifestly the first great campaign of Lu-koñ referred to in the edict as the expedition to *K'ar-ghan*. This latter is clearly the *Cachan* of Marco Polo, which he places as the chief city and fortress in this locality, though the name apparently cannot be traced in the native Chinese account.² It is therefore interesting to recover the name through the Tibetan.

Kachan, "the noble city of Cachan-fu" of Marco Polo, was found by the Venetian traveller in the latter end of the thirteenth century, i.e. five centuries after our edict, to be "a city of great trade and of work in gold tissues of

¹ *Marco Polo*, by H. Yule, 1st ed., ii, p. 16.

² *Ibid.*, p. 16.

many sorts".¹ It is identified by Colonel Yule, following Klapproth, as P'uchau-fu, close to the great elbow of the Yellow River.² But this is on the eastern bank of the great river, whereas Polo places its city and fortress two days' march to the west of the river, and after crossing the latter in his journey westwards to Ch'angan. Here in the exact position indicated by Polo, and only eight days' journey from Ch'angan, as stated by him, is the *fu* or capital city of Tung-chow, on the mouth of the Lo River and on the high road from Mongolia to Ch'angan. This, then, I would tentatively identify with Kachan, the Karchan of the edict.

The battle-field here is called in the edict Byar-mo-tan, or "the Meadow of *Char-mo*", or *Char-ō*³ as it is pronounced. At the junction of the Ho or Lo here, a few miles to the east of Tungchow (= ? Karchan) and above the Pass of T'ung-kwan, is a site named in the modern maps "Chaoyi", which possibly preserves the name of this ancient battle-ground. The *Tong-k'a* to which some fugitives escaped is probably the T'ung-kwan Pass.

The army which Lu-koñ collected to compass this conquest would appear from the edict to have been assisted by mercenary troops; and we find in the Chinese account of the campaign of a few years later against Ch'angan that the Tibetans were actually assisted by great hordes of the Turkish tribes of Tu'kuhun (*Drugu*) and Uighur (*Hiuho*), as well as mercenary Chinese, who are stigmatized as "rebels" and "traitors".⁴

The occupation and sack of the imperial capital in 763 A.D. was the greatest of all the Tibetan military achievements, as recorded in the edict.

Ch'angan, the modern Singan or Sian-fu, was the metropolis of China since 220 B.C. for over a thousand years, and it still is the second capital of China on

¹ Yule, op. cit., p. 13.

² Ibid., p. 15.

³ See p. 1259, n. 1.

⁴ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 479.

emergencies. It was to it that the late Emperor and the Empress-Dowager fled in 1900 during the Boxer rising. As Yule truly says,¹ "it was probably the most celebrated city in Chinese history and the capital of several of the most potent dynasties." It was the metropolis of Shi Hoang-ti of the Tsin dynasty (which gave the country the name of China),² the great emperor whose conquests almost intersected with those of his contemporary Ptolemy Euergetes. It was certainly the *Khumdan* of the early Mohammedans, and the site of flourishing Christian churches in the seventh century, as well as of the remarkable monument³ of these Nestorian Christian missionaries, the discovery of which a thousand years later disclosed their forgotten existence. *King-chao-fu* formerly was the name the city bore when the Mongol invasion brought China into communication with the west, and Klapproth supposes that this was modified by the Mongols into *Kenjan-fu* (the name used by Marco Polo). The same name is traceable in the *Kansan* of [friar] Odoric, which he called "the second best province in the world and the best populated".

It stands on the south or right bank of the Wei River, and is glowingly described by the mediaeval traveller Martini.⁴ He speaks of the splendour of the city as regards both its public edifices and its site, sloping gradually up from the banks of the River Wei so as to exhibit its walls and palaces at one view like the interior of an amphitheatre. West of the city was a sort of water park, enclosed by a wall 30 *li* (= about 6 miles) in circumference, full of lakes, tanks, and canals from the Wei, with which were seven fine palaces and a variety of theatres and other places for public diversion. To the

¹ Yule, op. cit., ii, p. 16.

² As is usually stated.

³ A *stèle* in Chinese, reproduced by Yule, op. cit., ii, p. 17, and translated by others.

⁴ Yule, op. cit., ii, p. 16.

south-east of the city was an artificial lake with palaces, gardens, park, etc., originally formed by the Emperor Hiaowu (B.C. 100), and to the south of the city was another considerable lake called *Fan* (= ? Tibetan). It was visited and described during the present year by Dr. G. E. Morrison.

The Tibetan form of the name in the eighth century was Tse-ngan, which shows a softening almost identical with the modern name Singan. The second syllable of the name means in Tibetan "accursed", and it shows the bitter temper of the Tibetans as well as a sense of punning that in two out of the three instances in the edicts in which this place is mentioned in the text, the first syllable is dropped, so that "the Ch'angan road" reads "the *accursed* road". After the hardships they must have suffered on it, the toll of thousands of lives which it had cost them, and the weary miles of it (nearly a thousand miles from Lhasa) which nearly every able-bodied Tibetan must for several generations have trodden, they were doubtless as heartily sick of it, as the edict tells us, their king actually was.

The *Keng-shi* of the edict is perhaps the *King-chao*, which Klapproth has shown was the name of this *fu* or capital, and which Polo calls *Kenjan* in his quaint description of Ch'angan. "A very great and fine city it is, and the capital of the Kingdom of Kenjan-fu which in old times was a noble, rich, and powerful realm, and had many great and wealthy and puissant kings."¹ In the edict, however, *Keng-shi* seems more particularly to be used as the title of the palace of the emperor.

Chiū-chi, where the great battle was fought, "on the bank of the ford," is clearly Chou-chih,² that very ancient town on the south bank of the Wei River, about 40 miles to the west of Ch'angan, on the high road to Tibet.

¹ Yule, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 14.

² Or *Chen-ché(t)* Professor Parker tells me it is called.

Professor E. H. Parker informs me that the *Ta'ng-shu* records that Chou-chih was taken by the Tibetans in this invasion of 763, and that a general Lu Jih-tsiang was defeated there.

Sheng-chiū, to which the emperor fled, is certainly Shang-chou, one hundred miles to the south-east of Ch'angan, on the only road of retreat open to him. The Chinese annals themselves record that it was to this place the Son of Heaven fled.

The Chinese chronicles of this invasion state ¹—

“ In the 1st year of Kuangtê (763), the 9th month, the T'ufan (Tibetans) attacked and took Chingchou, the governor of which, Kao Hui, surrendered to them. In the 10th month they invaded Pinchou and took Fengt'ienhuen [or Fêngt'ien and Wu-kung].² Kuo Tzūyi was sent to the west to oppose the T'ufan, but an army of over 200,000 T'ukuhun and Tunghsiung had penetrated from Lungkuang to the east, and Kuo Tzūyi led back his troops. The imperial chariot was driven to Shangchou, and the capital was left unguarded. The traitor general Kao Hui led the T'ufan into the imperial capital, and in concert with the T'ufan generalissimo Machungying set up the son of the late Prince of Pin, Chênghung, the Prince of Kuangwu, as Emperor, who chose Tashê as the title of his reign, and appointed the various officers of state. The T'ufan after occupying the city fifteen days retired.”

With this account the Tibetan version in the edict is in remarkable agreement.

Kwang T'eng Wang is the Emperor Kwang Têh, who had only ascended the throne that year, whilst *Heū-di Wang-te*, who paid the tribute in 757, is obviously intended for Che-Têh, the reigning title of Su Tsung in 756–8. The new emperor set up by the Tibetans, given as *Che-chung* in the edict, is the *Cheng-hung* of the Celestial version. The Chinese name for the Tibetan general, namely *Machungying*, cannot be reconciled to either Lu-koñ or his assistant-general, for whose surname of *mChims* it is not likely to be intended. More probably

¹ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 476.

² Professor Parker, who has kindly referred again to the *Ta'ng-shu*, writes to me that “ Bushell's ‘Feng-t'ien-huen’ ought to be ‘Feng-t'ien and Wu-king’, I think ”.

it is a corruption of the word for the title of "junior general" or "*Mag-chung*".

In the light of this edict we now see that the joint treaty-edict with the Emperor Tê-Tsung twenty years later in fixing the eastern boundary of Tibet must have specified a line about 600 miles to the west of Koko Nor, and that the mutilated word there in question cannot be restored as "the Great Lake".

IV. POTALA PILLAR INSCRIPTION *C*, circa 842 A.D.

This proclamation, two generations later, reveals the enormous change that had overtaken Tibet in the interval of about eighty years which has elapsed between this edict and the previous one (Inscription *B*) on this pillar.

In that one, the king was in the height of his power and was spoken of with respect, as was only proper in his own proclamation in which he recorded the prowess of Tibetan arms under his great general, Lu-koñ, while China was still prostrate at his feet.

Now, however, all that is changed. In this edict, the last of the series on the Potala pillar, the monarchy has evidently been overthrown by a revolution. We find the king apparently deposed and the rule in the hands of the descendants of the militant Lu-koñ. The whole family, *en bloc*, seems to have usurped the power, and is ruling by a sort of confederate dictatorship, and the edict is a manifesto of this revolutionary party.

The epoch of this edict appears to fall at the beginning of the civil war, which we know from the Chinese records and the indigenous history ensued on the downfall and extinction of the dynasty in the person of Darma, a grandson of K'ri Sron-lde-btsan. A few particulars in regard to this event are mentioned in the contemporary Chinese history, which enables us to fix the date with certainty at 842 A.D.¹

¹ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 439.

This revolution in the later Tibetan histories, compiled by Buddhist priests in relatively modern times, is ascribed to the feud between the rival religions. The adherents of the old Bon religion, we are there told, revolted against the Buddhist faith which had been actively patronized by the kings for two generations, and especially so by Ral-pa-chan, a grandson of K'ri Sron-lde-btsan. Ral-pa-chan was assassinated by his brother Darma, who embraced the Bon faith, but he too in his turn was soon assassinated by the Buddhists, and with him the dynasty became extinct and civil war ensued.

The edict seems to be a manifesto of this period. It is issued by the family of descendants of the minister Lu-koñ, after they have usurped the power, and it evidently is intended to appease the people and to justify their own high-handed action in monopolizing the control of the government and in helping themselves to the property of the State. In it they pose as patriots of their country, and recite in rhapsody fashion the heroic deeds of their ancestors, on which they base their claims to the government.

Its references to the kings are disrespectful. King K'ri Sron-lde-btsan is stigmatized as being of unsound mind—a condition regarding which there never has been the slightest hint in the national histories—and the rule of the kings generally is declared to have caused a cycle of misfortunes to the country. Even the spelling of the word for “king” appears to be intentionally disrespectful. Instead of the form *gyal-po* or “the potent one”, we find here usually *gyal-p'o* or “the powerful father”, in which the element *p'o* is the common generic word for father as applied to the lower animals as well as human beings, and never found in polite language with regard to persons even in those early days. It is possible, no doubt, that this may have been the primitive form of the title of the tribal chief in the patriarchal stage of society, and that

it may have been reintroduced by the reactionary revolutionary party.

Its text indicates a period of internal disorder and dissension in which the ex-minister nobles are helping themselves to large estates and royal honours and titles. It is quite in keeping with the contemporary Chinese history, which in 835 A.D. recorded that in the reign of Ral-pa-chan "the government [of Tibet] was in the hands of the chief ministers", and it is added, with a feeling of evident relief and satisfaction, "consequently they [the Tibetans] were unable to rival China, and the frontier guards were left in peace."¹

The language is Tibetan of the pre-classic period, although it dated from about sixty years after the initiation of the classical period. This apparent anomaly is to my mind easily explained, however, by the fact that the text was composed by the reactionary patriotic party, who were reverting to the ancient customs of their country and who were openly hostile to the Buddhist party who had originated the classical standard of Tibetan literature.

The style of its composition is verbose and somewhat conversational, and it wants the stately dignity of the earlier records by the kings. Its translation presents many difficulties from its elementary construction.

For the text of this inscription see p. 1280.

Translation.

(Curved and square brackets as formerly.)

"[To] the minister sTag-sgra-lu-k'oñ
 [?honour be] given.

"The king's father's² father, K'ri Sroñ-lde-btsan of old,

¹ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 522.

² Instead of the usual title of king, བཅེན་པོ་ btsan-po, we find here བཅེན་པོ་ btsan-p'o or "the mighty father", and this word recurs in line 12 of text. Although པོ་ p'o is not nowadays a respectful form of name but merely the generic term for "father", applicable even to the

was sick [with his] head, and the family descendants¹ of *sTag-sgra-kLu-k'on* directed . . . [the government]. On them² shall be bestowed a large silver title³ to command under the Sacred Cross [of the Bon],⁴ the enjoyment [of which distinction] to descend hereditarily.

“Moreover, the king’s⁵ grandson having died,⁶ to the family descendants of *Zla-goñ*, as a moderate reminder for their collective work in sitting above the inner circle [? of the government], there shall be bestowed *Tshal-Z’ar*⁷ as a residence for ever.

“Amongst all the capable descendants of *Zla-goñ*, who so capable, fearless, and esteemed as *rJe-blas* [= *Je-lä*] ? Let him be praised ! May the descendants of *Zla-goñ* [exhibit] a mighty spirit as of old.⁸ If [they are] not suddenly uprising in emergencies what other eyes can see to faults properly ? Their name will descend as long as the dominion lasts!⁹ In the knotty points¹⁰ of quarrels and orders¹¹ to whom more than to these descendants

lower animals, yet in ancient times, in the primitive social state when the king was regarded as a patriarch, it was probably, I think, used to denote also the king himself, as we find it surviving in the word for the king’s palace, namely, *p'o-bran*, literally “the father’s residence”.

¹ Literally “the increased line of the family”.

² I have treated གཅིག་ as standing for the family collectively. The word which follows རྗེ་ཐུང་ if correctly transcribed may be a proper name, but I have read the second element in its usual sense.

³ ཡི་གེ་ literally “a letter”, also a symbol and document.

⁴ གཡུང་རྩུང་ *gyuñ-druñ*. See p. 1275 for explanation.

⁵ Here again *btsan-p'o*, as in n. 2, p. 1269.

⁶ Literally “the life having sunk” (བབས་). My transcription has ཚོ *tso*, which is manifestly a mistake for ཚེ *tshe*, probably in copying.

⁷ These are two districts to the west of Lhasa.

⁸ Or may read “with the king’s disposition as of old may they [be present]”, with ll. 60-1.

⁹ Literally “throughout the life of the dominion”.

¹⁰ Literally the “knots of strings”.

¹¹ Or possibly “conferences” if the second element in བཀའ་ཐུང་ may have been copied in mistake for རྗེས་, which is unlikely.

[can we go]? In quarrels and orders, after having been reviled, they effect a settlement. If there be any break or curtailment in the line of the sons of Zla-goñ, land or wealth cannot be again offered. Endowments therefore are bestowed on the elder and younger brothers and [all] male relatives whatsoever, on the condition that if one of the race of the minister *sTag-sgra-kLu-k'oñ* be taken holding a letter of the rebel king¹ in his hand, he shall be bound and chastised and the succession be broken and no silver title [-banner?] be offered again.

“Unto the descendants of the minister *sTag-sgra-kLu-kon* and Zla-goñ, whatever the relationship, unto each is bestowed a large silver title [?-banner], to command unto the Sacred Cross [of the Bon].

“Unto all the descendants of Zla-goñ, the father of the minister *sTag-sgra-kLu-k'oñ*, whatever their relationship, is bestowed the title of ‘Uncle-minister’ (*Z'añ-blon*)² and ‘The Withstander and Turner aside of Three Armies’.³

“As commander of the thousand men of the P'an country⁴ of the Secret Presence⁵ [of the Bon deity], who else amongst men could be appointed more [fitly] than a descendant of the glorious ancestors⁶ of the minister *sTag-sgra-kLu-k'oñ*? What one as leader of the populace⁷ is so capable? Let [him] be appointed to command under the Sacred Cross⁸ as commander of the thousand men of

¹ Or “intriguing king”, རྟུ་རྒྱུ་པ་

² On this title see p. 1274.

³ The text here is not quite clear as to the title; it may read “to the descendants of the withstander and turner aside of three armies is given the title”, etc.

⁴ A district to the north of Lhasa now spelt 'P'an; it contains a celebrated shrine of the Bon deity.

⁵ This obviously refers to the Bon deity, and cannot be intended merely for “guardian of the king's body”, as the final *s* in *Sruñs* recurs each time this word is met with in the text.

⁶ Or literally the “ancestors who have attained brightness”, which possibly may be a euphemism for “died”.

⁷ The word used རྟུ་རྒྱུ་པ་ means ordinarily “the mob”.

⁸ See p. 1275.

the P'an country of the Secret Presence! Let the succeeding appointments to the Secret Presence be from amongst the steadfast¹ class of the descendants of "The clearer of the road to [Tsē] *nyan*²! Let the title³ of "Lifter of Misery from the Tents"⁴ be given, [and] may it never be changed!

"Rather than the descendants of Zla-goñ be uprooted from residence⁵ at Ts'al may all⁶ the power be united in their hands! No one else shall take it back or reduce it. The helmet-crest⁷ of these honourable ones, who bring happiness near and far and are impartial, shall not be taken away!

"If anyone bear the descendants of Zla-goñ any grudge in hand, as to state business or do dishonour to them, let the highest power [in the land] compel their obedience! If the descendants of Zla-goñ are not suddenly uprising in emergencies let no one seek to blame them or listen to slander, [or they] will be punished! If the descendants of [this] family be inside [the government], then let troubles⁸ come what may!

"With the king's mental disposition, as of old, in further uprisings and emergencies what happiness can there be? What a cycle of misfortunes! What painful quarrels and disorder! By the instruction of [these] elder and younger brothers and fathers men become wise in the business of life and of the State. May [they] descend more abundantly.

¹ Literally "stamped", in sense of stereotyped, undeviating, unvarying.

² The capital of China (see note, p. 1265).

³ ལྷོ་ཆོ་

⁴ ལྷོ་ཆོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ This implies a widespread nomadic habit.

⁵ The construction is intricate.

⁶ ལོག་ is a form of འཕྲོག་ལས་ Cf. Jaeschke, *Dict.*, pp. 142, 460.

⁷ ལྷོག་

⁸ Literally "discord", ལོལ་

“In short, may the descendants of Zla-ḡon, the father of the minister s’Tag-sgra k’Lu-k’oñ increase and live in happiness . . . [like] the most exalted one [i.e. ? the emperor of China]”. . . .

The date of this inscription is fixed conclusively by its reference, in line 5, to the “king’s father” or “father’s father” as being K’ri Sroñ-lde-btsan; and by its reference, in line 12, to “the king’s grandson having died”, coming immediately after the reference to K’ri Sroñ-lde-btsan. Ral-pa-chan, the grandson of this latter king, died, according to the trustworthy Chinese accounts,¹ in 838 A.D., and his younger brother Darma, who assassinated him, was in his turn assassinated in 842 A.D.,² when civil war, we are told by both Chinese history and native tradition, ensued.³ Of Ral-pa-chan the Chinese chronicles record⁴—“The *tsan-p’u* [i.e. the king] during his reign of about thirty years was sick and unable to attend to business, and the government was in the hands of the chief ministers. . . . After his death, his younger brother Tamo succeeded to the throne. Tamo was fond of wine, a lover of field sports, and devoted to women, and besides, cruel, tyrannical, and ungracious, so that the troubles of the State increased. . . . In the 2nd year of Hiuch’ang (842) the *tsanp’u* [Darma] died. . . . He had no sons, and Ch’iliku, a son of Shangyenli, the elder brother of his wife, whose name was Lin, was made *tsanp’u* . . . *Within three years the people, in consequence of the illegal election of the tsanp’u, were in a state of revolt.*”⁵

This clearly was the epoch of the present proclamation, which thus would date to 842–4 A.D. The people are addressed in it as if they were without a king, the

¹ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 439.

² Ibid., pp. 439, 523.

³ My *Buddhism of Tibet*, p. 34.

⁴ Bushell, loc. cit., p. 522.

⁵ Ibid., p. 523.

advantages of being without a king are insisted on, and the reference in line 32 to a "rebel" king is probably to a royalist claimant of collateral descent. The disrespectful word which is generally used here for "king" has already been remarked upon. The proper and usual term for "king" occurs only twice, namely, in reference to the "rebel" above mentioned, and in line 61 when disparaging the kings as being the cause of the nation's misfortune.

The family of ministers who have usurped the government seek by this proclamation to justify their action in keeping the government in their own hands and within their own family as a despotic nepotism. They base their claims on the patriotic achievements and services rendered to the State not only by Lu-koñ but also by his brother, thus showing that some of the party were descendants on the brother's side. No personal names are mentioned here, but the native histories give the name of sBas-stag-ma as that of the minister who assisted Darma in his support of the old Bon religion against the Buddhists.¹

The title of *z'añ - blon* (pronounced *zhang-lon*) or "Uncle-minister", a sort of privy councillor, to which they freely helped themselves, had previously been borne apparently only by the highest ministers, some or most of whom were of the blood-royal. And in the concluding word of the text which is decipherable, they appear to have arrogated to themselves the titular privileges of "emperor" by using the same word which designates the Emperor of China, namely, "The most high" or "The most exalted one".

Their active patronage of the ancient pagan religion of Tibet, the Bon, is evidenced throughout the edict, and is in keeping with Tibetan tradition, which records the ascendancy of the Bon over the Buddhist religion at this

¹ My *Buddhism of Tibet*, p. 34.

period.¹ The frequently recurring expression “according to the mystic cross” (the reversed *swastika*, T. *yun-drun*)² is the epithet usually employed to denote the Bon religion and customs at the present day. And whilst there is no reference to anything Buddhistic, the guardianship of one of the most sacred places of the Bon deities is expressly provided for, and is called “the place of The Secret Presence”.

Linguistically, beyond the light shed on many other points these edicts yield us indisputably conclusive material for fixing within relatively precise limits an initial date for the origin of the classic period of literature. In the Inscription *B* of K’ri Sroñ - lde - btsan of the year 764 A.D. *circa* we find the archaic pre-classic style, whilst in the inscription of the same king for the year 783 A.D. (see Part I of my article, pp. 944, etc.) we find the fully-fledged classic style. This manifestly fixes the origin of the classic period at a date between 764 and 783 A.D.

The remaining inscriptions on the Lhasa treaty-pillar will be described in a subsequent article.

¹ My *Buddhism of Tibet*, pp. 34, etc. Rockhill’s *Life of Buddha*, p. 226.

² *Yun-drun ’k’yiil*, or “the twisted cross”, has been used as an equivalent of “king’s palace”.

TEXT OF THE POTALA PILLAR EDICTS

Note.—In this copy the distinction between the long and short *i* has not been recorded. The length of the line is as in the original. The number of the line is prefixed by me for reference.

INSCRIPTION A (EAST)

- 1. ལྷལ་དྲ་ལྷིས་ཀྱང་ཇི་
- 2. བཀའ་སྤྱངས་
- 3. བར། ། ། ཇི་སྤྱིས་
- 4.
- 5. ཉི་
- 6. ཆབ་སྲིད་
- 7. དཔོན་
- 8. ཅུ་
- 9. སྤང་སྤྱོད་སྤྱི་
- 10. མགོ་ནག་པོ་འི་སྲིད་
- 11. ལ་པན་པ་ལེགས།
- 12. མག་བྱས་སོ།།

INSCRIPTION B (SOUTH)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4. ལྷོས་ཉི་བའི་ཇི་སྤྱིས་བྱས་པ་
- 5. འབལ་ལྗོང་ཙ་བར་ལང་
- 6. ལྷིས་གཟིགས། ལྷོན་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་
- 7. བྱ་ར་བྱིད་པ་ལས། ལྷོ་བ་རིངས་

¹ There may have been one line above this which has been erased
² This phrase recurs in l. 28 of Inscription B.

8. ཅམ །། | བཅན་པོ་ཡབ་ཁྱི་ལྡེ་
9. གཙུག་ཅན་གྱི་སྐུ་ལ་དར་ད་ལྷེ་
10. དགའ་དུ་བཞེགས་སོ།
11. བཅན་པོ་སྐམ་ཁྱི་སྤང་ལྡེ་བཅན་
12. གྱི་སྐུ་ལ་ནི་དར་ད་དུ་ཉི། བོད་
13. མགོ་ནག་པོ་དེ་སྤོང་ནི་འབྲུག་དུ་
14. སྤེད་པ་ལས། ལྷ་ཁོང་གིས་ (? རྩེ) ལྷ(ས)
15. དང། ལྷོ་བ་རིངས་པའི་གདན་
16. གཅིགས། །། བཅན་སྐམ་ཁྱི་སྤང་
17. ལྡེ་བཅན་གྱི་སྐུ་དུ་གསོལ་ད་ནས།
18. འབལ་དང་ལང་ལྷོ་བ་རིངས་
19. བདེན་པར་རྒྱུ་ར་དེ་ཁོང་ད་ནི་
20. བཀྱན་བབ་ལྷེ་ལྷ་ཁོང་ལྷོ་བ་ཉིའོ།།
21. ༄། བཅན་པོ་ཁྱི་སྤང་ལྡེ་བཅན་གྱི་རིང་
22. ལ་ཚོ་ངན་ལས་ལྷ་ཁོང་ལྷོ་བ་ཉི་ལ་
23. བཀའ་བྲོས་ཚེ་ན། བྲུགས་བདེན་
24. . . ཅང་ལྷོན་བཀའ་ལ་གདོགས་
25. པར་བཅུག་ནས། ། རྒྱའི་སྤོང་གྱི་ཉམས་
26. དོད་རྟོག་ཅིང་ཁར་ཅན་བྲོགས་སུ་
27. བོག་ས་དྲངས་པའི་དམག་དཔོན་
28. དུ་བཀའ་སྐུ་ལ་ད་གྱིས་ཀྱང་དག་ལྷ་
29. བབས་མཁས་ལ་གོས་གྱིས་སོང་ལྷེ་
30. རྒྱའི་ཁམས་སུ་གདོགས་པའི་འ་ཞ་
31. . . བསྐྱས་རྒྱ་ལས་མངས་པལ་

¹ Or possibly ཚོ་.

² This phrase is similar to that in l. 1 of Inscription A ; but here I translate ཀྱང་ as the adverb "like".

32. པོ་ཚེ་བསྐྱད་པས་ཀྱི་སྤྱོད་གོང་ལྟེ། ཀྱའི་
33. . . . ཕྱོགས་པ་དེ་བྱར་མོ་ཐང་
34. ད་རེ་ཐོང་ཁ་ཕྱོགས་
35. དང་ནས་ལས་སྤྱོགས་
36. ཐོ་གཙལ་ད། ། །ལྷོ་
37. ལུགས་པའི་
38. སྲིད་ཚེན་པོས་
39. ལྱོས་ཚེན་པོ་གསོལ་(? ད)
40. ཉེ་ཞིང་ཚབ་སྲིད་ལ་དཔེ་ནར་
41. བྱས་སོ། ། བཙན་
42. ལྷོ་བཙན་ཕྱགས་སྐྱམ་ལ་ལ་
43. ལྱོས་ཀྱི་ཀྱི་ཆ་བས་ཆབ་སྲིད་གང་
44. མཛིན་དེ་ཚོ་མས་དུ་འང་ལེགས་སྟེ་ཀྱའི་ཁམས་
45. སྤྱོད་གོང་པའི་ལྷལ་དང་མཁར་མང་པོ་
46. བཙན་སྟེ་བསྐྱམ་ནས། ཀྱི་རྗེ་ཉེ་འདི་ལྷང་
47. ཉེ་རྗེ་སྟོན་སྐྱེ་ཉེ་ལོ་གཅིག་ཅིང་དག་དུ་དཔུ་
48. དར་ལྷག་ལྷ་ཁྱི་ལྷལ་ཉེ། ཀྱི་དཔུའ་འཇལ་དུ་
49. བཙན་གོ། ། ཉེ་ལོ་ལྷལ་དུ་ཀྱི་རྗེ་ལང་ཉེ་འདི་¹
50. ལྷང་ཉེ་གྲོང་ས་སྟེ། ། ཀྱི་རྗེ་སྐས་ལྷང་ཐོང་ལྷང་
51. ཀྱལ་པོར་ཞུགས་ནས། བོད་ལ་དཔུའ་འཇལ་
52. དུས་རུང་སྟེ། ། བཙན་པོ་ཕྱགས་སྐྱེང་བའི་ཚོ་
53. ངན་ལས་ལྷོ་ཁོང་གིས། ཀྱི་ལྷལ་གྱི་ཐིལ་དང་ཀྱི་
54. རྗེ་པོ་བྲང་ཀེང་ཤིར། བོད་ཀྱིས་དམག་དུང་

¹ This possibly might read ཅིང་.

² Or possibly ལིག་.

³ Possibly ཐིང་ or ཐིལ་.

- 55. བའི་བཀའ་བྱོམ་གྱི་མགོ་ཚེན་པོ་གསོལ་ད་ནས།
- 56. ཀའ་ཤིར་དྲང་བའི་དམག་དཔོན་ཚེན་པོར།
- 57. རང་མཚིམས་རྒྱལ་རྒྱལ་ཟློགས་ཤུ་ཐེང་དང།
- 58. རྫོན་ལྷག་རྒྱ་ཁྱེད་གཉིས་བཀའ་སྤྲུལ་དེ་
- 59. ཀའ་ཤིར་དྲངས་ནས། །། ཅིའུ་ཅིར་གྱི་རབ་ངོགས་
- 60. སུ་རྒྱ་དང་ཐབ་མོ་ཚེན་པོ་བྱས་དེ། བོད་གྱིས་གཡུལ་
- 61. བསྐྱོག་ནས། ། རྒྱ་མང་པོ་བདུངས་པས། རྒྱ་ཇེ་ཀུང་
- 62. པེང་པེང་ཡང་ཀའ་ཤིའི་མཁར་ནས་བྱུང་ལྟེ།
- 63. རྗེ་ཅིའུར་བྲོས་པས། ཀའ་ཤི་ལ་ལྟེ་རྒྱ་ཇེའི་ནང་
- 64. རྫོན་ . . . བྱེའུ་ . . . ཀའ་ལས་སྤྱོགས་ཏེ་དོང་ཀན་དང་
- 65.
- 66. བཙན་པོའི་
- 67. བོད་ . . . ཀའ་
- 68. ཀའ་ཤིར་
- 69. འཁྲུག་ཤིང་
- 70. རྫོན་པོ་
- 71. རྒྱལ་པོ་ཚེ་རུང་
- 72. སྤིད་ལྷག(ས)་སུ་
- 73. བྱས་ཏེ་ཁྱེད་ཁྱོད་
- 74. བ་ཉེ་ཞིང་ཚབ་སྤིད་(? ལ) . . . བསྐྱནད་བ(འི) . . .
- 75. དཀའ་བ་བྱས་མོ།།

1 Probably ཏའི་
 2 Might also read སྤིང་.

INSCRIPTION C (NORTH)

1. སློན་ལྷག་སྐྱ་ལྷོང་།
2. ས་གནང་།
3.
4.
5. ཡབ་བཙན་པོ་བྱི་སྲོང་ལྷེ་བཙུན་
6. ཀྱིས་སློན་པ་དབུ་སྐྱང་གནང་།
7. ལྷེ་སློན་ལྷག་སྐྱ་ལྷོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་
8. རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་དམན་¹
9. དབུལ་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་ཚེན་པོ་གཅིག་
10. རྟོ་རྟུང་བབ་པར་གཡུང་དུང་།
11. དུ་སྐྱེལ་དཔར་གནང་རོ།།
12. བཙན་པོ་སྐུ་དཔོན་སྐྱ་ཚ་བབས་
13. པ་ཞིང་ཡང་ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་
14. འཕེལ་དཔར་གཅིག་གཞས་འབྲིང་།
15. བ་ནང་ཀོར་ཡན་ཅད་དུ་བཞགས་
16. ཅིང་ཚལ་ཟར་དྲག་དུ་མཆིས་པར་
17. གནང་ངོ། ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་
18. འཕེལ་དཔར་ཇི་སྐུས་ཀྱི་ངོ་ཐོག་པའི་
19. རྣམས་ཇི་ཅས་དུ་ངོ་ཐོག་པར་བགས་
20. བཀུར་ཞིང་བསྟོན་པར་གནང་ངོ།
21. ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་ཀྱིས་བཙན་
22. ཞེ་སྤར། ལྷོ་བ་ས་རིངས་ན། རོངས་

¹ Possibly མའ་ or ཚད་.² Or པོ་.

23. མྱིག་གཞན་ཅི་བྱང་ཡང་རུང་། མྱོག་
24. མྱིང་ལ་མྱིང་བབ་པར། བཀའ་གྲོང་གྱི་
25. ཚོགས་ཅི་ལ་བབ་པ་ལས། བཀའ་གྲོང་
26. ན་གཅིག་གིས་སྤང་ཅིང་བསྐྱུང་བར་
27. གནང་ངོ། ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་འཕེལ་ལས་
28. ལ་ལ་ཞིག་རབས་ཆད་ན་རབས་ཆད་
29. གྱི་ཁོལ་ཡུལ་དང། རོར་ཕྱགས་སྐར་ཕྱི་
30. བཞེས་པར། བྱ་རྒྱ་པོ་གང་ཉེ་བ་སྐྱུལ་ད་
31. པར་གནང་ངོ། ལྷོན་ཕྱག་སྐྱ་ཁྲུ་ཁོང་
32. གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་ད། དཀྱ་རྒྱལ་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་
33. ལག་ན་འཆང་འཆང་བ་ཞིག་རབས་ཆད་
34. དམ་བཞུན་བབ་ན་ཡང། །དབུལ་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་
35. ལྷར་ཕྱི་བཞེས་པར། ལྷོན་ཕྱག་སྐྱ་ཁྲུ་ཁོང་
36. དང། ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་གང་ཉེ་བ་གཅིག་
37. དབུལ་གྱི་ཡི་གེ་ཆེན་པོ་གཡུང་རྒྱུད་ཏུ་སྐྱུལ་ད་
38. པར་གནང་ངོ། ལྷོན་ཕྱག་སྐྱ་ཁྲུ་ཁོང་
39. གི་པ་ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་ད་ཀྱི་རྣམས་
40. ཞང་ལྷོན་ཡི་གེ་པའི་ཐང་དང་དམག་གསུམ་སྐྱུར་
41. གནང་ངོ། །སྐྱ་སྐྱུངས་འཕན་ཡུལ་པའི་
42. མྱོང་དཔོན་ཏུ་གཞན་སྐྱ་ཡང་ཕྱི་གཞུག་པར།
43. ལྷོན་ཕྱག་སྐྱ་ཁྲུ་ཁོང་གི་བྱེས་པོ་གསལ་སྤེལས་
44. ཀྱི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་ཕེལ་ད་ལས་གང་ངོ་ཐོག་པའི་
45. དམངས་འདྲང་བ་གཅིག། ལྷ་སྐྱུངས་པན་
46. ཡུལ་པའི་མྱོང་དཔོན་གཡུང་རྒྱུད་ཏུ་སྐྱུལ་ད་
47. པར་གནང་ངོ། ངན་ལམ་གསལ་སྤེལས་

This is evidently a mistake in copying for གསལ་.

² See note 1.

- 48. ཀྱི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་དང་། ཅམ་ཞར་གྲང་སྡེ་སྤྱོད་
- 49. སྤྱངས་སྤྱ་གནང་བ་ལས། སྡེ་ཚ་གྱུ་ཅུ་སྤྱོད་སྡེ་¹
- 50. བསྐྱར་པར་གནང་ངོ། ། ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་ལ་
- 51. རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་དང་གྱི་ལག་ན་བྱང་ཞིང་འབོག་སོག་
- 52. ཚལ་ལས་སྡེ་གས་ཉེ་དབང་ངོ་ཙོག། ལྷར་སྤྱི་བཞེས་
- 53. སྤྱི་དབྱི་གཞན་གྱིས་སྤྱི་དབྱི་ཁོང་ཉ་བདག་སྤྱི་
- 54. དགའ་ན་ཉེ་རིང་དང་བཟང་ངན་སྤྱི་བཞེས་བར་
- 55. གནང་ངོ། ། ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་དང་ལ་
- 56. ལ་ལ་ཞིག་གིས་ཤེས་ཀྱིས་ལག་དུ་སྤོག་སྤྱིད་ལ་
- 57. དམའ་བར་བྱེད་པ་ཞིག་ཡོད་ན་བཀའ་ནོན་ལྷ་
- 58. ཅམ་མཚན་པར་གནང་ངོ། ། ལྷ་གོང་གི་བྱ་ཚ་
- 59. རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་དང་གྱི་སྡོལ་བ་མ་རིངས་ན་བྱ་མ་སྤྱི་གསུམ་ནང་
- 60. ལྷན་ཀ་སྤྱི་བཙལ་སྤྱི་བཀྲོན་པར་གནང་ངོ། །
- 61. བྱ་ཚ་འཕེལ་དང་གྱི་ནང་ན་སེལ་ལ་ཞིག། བཙན་པོ་
- 62. ཞེ་སྤར་སྡོལ་བ་རིངས་ཡང་དགེ་བར་རྒྱུད་ན་གང་
- 63. ཉེས་པའི་སྡོར། བཀའ་བྱོད་མཐོ། ལུ་ལུ་པོ་གཞན་
- 64. འཇིག་ལ་སྤྱི་གདགས་སྤོག་སྤྱིད་ལ་སྤྱིད་བབ་པར་གནང་
- 65. ངོ། །
- 66. ༄། མདོར་ན་འཇིག་ལུག་སྤྱི་ལྷ་ཁོང་གི་པ་ལྷ་གོང་
- 67. གི་བྱ་ཚ་རྒྱུད་འཕེལ་ལོ་ དང་བསྐྱིད་བདེ་བར་བཞུགས་
- 68. གོང་མ་ །

¹ Or སྤོལ་.

