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 Hoouang Relatifs a l'Histoire du Tibet*, Bacon, Thomas, and Toussaint, Paris 1946. *(THD)*

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

*Inventaire des Manuscrits Tibétains de Touen Hoouang*. M. Labou. *(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), *Thoung Pae* (TP) and the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (JRAS) respectively.

The first and third of the three *bla'i rsi-glas* (edicts) quoted in the XVIIth 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 epellations 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 myung rgs* 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. Khar, Ngor; Mgos: Ngi Lang; Rinpog; Cog; Koy; Mab.; Gnaub.; Sna Nor; Plo Yong; Brah Ka; Dha’s, ‘Bro: 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 Dha’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 *bsum*. The Chief Minister was known as *blo bzhi*; and he had as colleagues several Great Ministers or *blo chen po* who are described in the Lhasa Treaty Inscription as *ka’i* *chen po la bsogs pa* which I have translated as “prince 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 *phru*) ministers, described as *ka’i la bsogs pa*; and at least one instance is found of the term *bkra’i* *blo-* TLTD II 47—which is still used in Tibet as a title of the *Zhabs Pad* or members of the *Bka’i* *Shag*.

Within those broad categories of greater and lesser, some ministers held titles describing their specific duties. In the higher rank are found a *bu’i* *chen po*. Great Monk Minister (that post only appears in the later years of the royal period), and a *damg bzhin po*, Commander-in-Chief. In the lower grade some ministers are described
as nagrang 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 nagrang blon took precedence over the phyi blon.

Important posts, apparently connected with district administration were those of the bzung pa and the morgan dpon. The bzung 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 morgan 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 khad so whose duties may have been similar to those of the modern rabsun dpon. The khad pa chen pa appears from the one surviving mention of this post (TIA p. 23) to have been concerned with the receipt of property. Perhaps khad pa explained by S. C. Das at p. 148 of his Dictionary as "anything said. an article presented" is relevant. Another post appearing more frequently is that of sna sm 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 sna gm phyi pa witnessed the third bkod tshigs quoted in TTK; their duties, therefore, seem to have been important and extensive. Sna sm phyi with the meaning "latter" does not seem appropriate, for it is improbable that in 7th century Tibet mental 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' phrub blon (Treaty Inscription; TLID; LINV; REV) whose duties were perhaps similar to those of the present day mgron gyer which include making known the orders of the ruler; the stis pa (Treaty Inscription; TLID; REV) who can be assumed to have been the equivalent of the modern stis dpon, an officer responsible for the assessment of revenue and the keeping of revenue records; the zhal ce pa (Treaty Inscription; LINV; TLID) who were judicial officers the name of whose post survives in the title of the code of laws attributed to Ngon Brtan Sgam Po—the zhal ce bvos gsum. Another judicial officer, named only in the Zbol
inscription and in the XVth century Chos Byung of Dpa
Bo Gisug Lag, was the ya 'gal chos pa. According to
reliable Tibetan informants, the term implies mediation
('chos) of conflicting parties ('gal). The
REV contains a long list of official posts in the Sha Ca (
Tan Huang) region most of which do not appear in docu-
ments 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 per-
haps civil and military functions.

A general term for officers connected with military duties
was dgra blon or dmog dpon another seemingly military rank
—chubs dpon—master of horse—survives as that of an
officer of the Dalai Lama's retinue; the term dmog 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,
appearing higher than turquoise. Ke ke ru is described
in Jageshie's Dictionary as "a precious white stone"; perhaps
it was jade or some hard stone. During recent road-mending
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 Cgc Kha.

Some information about the grading and ornaments of
Tibetan ministers is also found in the Tang Annals (Hsin
Tang Shu). The Chief Minister is there called lun ch'ê
and his assistant lun ch'ê h'as mang. These two are further
described as great and little lun. There is a Commander-
in-Chief called hsi p'un ch'ê pu; a chief minister of the
interior called nang lun ch'ê pu or lun mang jo; an assistant
called nang lun mi ling pu and a lesser one called nang
lun ch'ang; a chief consulting minister—yu han chê po with
assistants also designated mi' ling and ch'ung. All the ministers
taken together are described as yung lun chê po t'eu 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 che hu mang 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 chi'ung stand for brin g and chung "middling" and "small". Hai 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. Tu 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 Stong Lde Britsan—that of Khri Lde Stong Britsan 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 97.38; and 339); but this is rare and probably provincial. Rje blas, 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 Michim's, Sna Nam, 'Bro, and Tshes Pong. From this title must be distinguished the term zhang len (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 zhang 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 Stong Brtan Sgam Po, and later of Khi Lo 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 889 of the Tibetan princess Khi Bangs to the A’Zha ruler. Other Tibetan princesses also married neighbouring rulers—in 671 a Zhang Zhung prince; in 736 a Khagan of the Dar Gysis (Turgesh); and in 746 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 Tibeans, was recorded the title of Btsan Po Gtsang—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 Khi Lo Brtan and Khi Lo Stong Brtsan the only princes to be mentioned as rgyal phran are the Dhon A’Zha Rje whose name is given as Drol Kyi Bul Zi Khri Sum Skor Brtse Pho Cho Yo Gon Kha Gan; the ‘Rong Dkar Po, Mang Po Rje, the head of a princely family of Rkong Po who were ancient congener of the Tibetan royal family, and the Myang Btsun Khi Lo, 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 Stong 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 rje ston appears frequently, sometimes with a territorial label e.g., the rje ston of Sha Cu (Tun Huang); of
Ka Dag; of Nob Chen (Greater Lob Nor ; of Nob Chung; others are known by names e.g., rite rje Khrom Bsher Bzang Khong; rite rje Ju Cug; and one is described as ta dog rite rje. That title to dog, which also appears frequently and is found in THD, is related by Thomas to the Turkic tu tu; another title co bo (jo bo; zho co; jo cho, etc.) is related to the Kharoshhi cynthia; and a ma ca, a title used in Khotan, is identified as representing the Sanskrit amitya. The title ra sang rje is also found in connection with distinctly non-Tibetan, possibly Zhang-Zheng, names—Rid Stag Rhya and Spung Rhye Rhya—; and the title sang rje po, although similar in appearance to the well documented Tibetan rank of sang bshan, 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 rhbs and ras, signify some sort of rank or title. Bacon, etc. have translated the names of Khri Sum Rje Rtsaana Bhzer and ‘Bal Skye Zang Ldongs Tshab as “le bsher Khri Sum Rje Rtsang de Dba’s” and “Bal Skye Zang, le Tshab de Ldongs”; and it is noted there that bsher means “haut fonctionnaire”. This is apparently mere guesswork; and a key to the significance of such syllables is found in three early documents—LNV 1240, 1415, and TLTD II p. 370 B—which seem to have been overlooked. Taking the first and last as examples, they read: (1) ras ni bren/mkhan ni mdo bsher/mying ni Jiang bu/ras ni ’brang ras/mkha’ni ’gyal bzigs (quotation left incomplete); and (2) ras ni chu myes/ mkhan ni bgyal gsigs/mying ni nyi stobs/ras ni ’gra had/mkhan ni lang skyes/mying ni don rie/ras ni bren/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; ndza mkhan, a potter; and ’gra 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

11
could mean h·w 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 Bzer. His _rus_ is Dba’s; his _mkhan_ Khri Sum Rje; his _mying_ Rtsan Bzer. (2) ’Bal Skye Zang Ldon 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 Bzer Kho Ne Brtsan. His _thabs_ is Nang Blon; his _rus_, Mchims, he is _zhang_ through relationship with the royal family, his _mkhan_ is Rgyal Bzer 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 Kongs 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 Kang inscriptions where a member of the Myang _rus_ is described as Blon Snang Brang ‘Das Khong. In system (4) both _thabs_ and _rus_ are omitted and we find such names as Rgyal Bzer 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 Khya Btsan; Khu Mye Gzigs. These are _rus_ + _mying_; but the greater
number of the abbreviations are in the form (5) r us + shahs + m ying, e.g., Cog Ro Blon Gung Kong. Persons who are zh ang are described in a different manner from that used in the Treaty inscription. There the practice is Mehmis, Zhang, etc., etc.; in the edict the form is Zhang Mehmis, etc., etc. The first edict produces system (6) using the shahs and the m ying only, e.g., Bon Nga Lam Sga Klu Gong is abbreviated to Blon Klu Gong; and in this edict zhang are also described by their m ying only, e.g., Zhang Leg 1' Dus. This usage may perhaps also be found in THD where the names Zhang Rgya Sto and Zhang Tre Gong look more like m ying than m kh an; but there is also an instance there of the name Zhang Bstan To Re which is an established m kh an.

The forms of abbreviation are, therefore, numerous; but on the available evidence the most common system is (1), i.e., shahs + m kh an. The existence of a r us + m ying abbreviation, however, makes it impossible to say with certainty whether all nobles possessed a m kh an; but as there are examples where the names of persons known to have possessed a m kh an are abbreviated to r us + m ying, and as a very large number of m kh an existed—lists are given below, it seems probable that all nobles who attained ministerial rank were known by a m kh an. It seems equally probable that ordinary people did not have a m kh an. LINV 2169, for example, refers to persons only by their r us and m ying; 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 m ying; the form of others differ from the usual mould of a m kh an, as can be seen from the lists which follow. Many of the names are prefixed by a r us, usually differing from the well-established r us 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 r us fall into distinctive groups in the different regions. From Sha Cu (Ten Huang) there are such family, clan or racial names as 'lm; Hong; Le; Le'u; K'eu. The usual prefix for names from Khotan is Li and from the Tu Yu Hun, 'A Zha. The r us Nga 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; Peu Peu; Hyan Ce; 'lm 'Bye Le'u; Wang Kun
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 Bbra Shis; Don Grub; Ye Shes; etc.

To conclude this study I have extracted lists to show the nature of the mkhan and nyed. 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 esteem, the second contains mkhan and nyed which are found in close association with established examples and show a similar character. They may, therefore, be assumed to be respectively mkhan or nyed.

MKHAN

[A] Klu Bzher; Klu Bzang; Skye (Skyes) Bzang; Khri Gang; Khris Sgra; Khris Snyan; Khris Snyon; Khris Myen; Khris Mynes; Khris Do Re; Khris Bzing; Khris Btsan; Khris Gu; Khris Czigs; Khris Bzang; Khris Sum Rje; Khris Sum Bzher; Khrom Bzher; Gru Bzang; Dge Bzher; Rgyal Sgra; Rgyal Nyen; Rgyal Ta; Rgyal To Re; Rgyal Stong; Rgyal Tsha; Rgyal Thang; Rgyal Bzher; Rgyal Czigs; Rgyal Bzang; Rgyal legs; Chung Bzang; Snya Do Re; Snya Do Re; Snya Btsan; Snya Bzher; Snyan To Re; Stag Gu; Stag Sgra; Stag Rma; Stag Bzher; Stag Czigs; Ston Nya; Ston Re; Stien Rtsan; Britan Sgra; Britan Bzher; Mdo Bzher; Ldon Bzang; Snang To Re; Snang Bzher; Snang Bzang; Dpal Bzhe; 'Bring To Re; 'Bring Po; 'Bring Rtsan; Mang Rje; Mang Nyen; Mang Po Re; Mang Bzher; Mang Rtsan; Mang Zham; Smon To Re; Btsan Sgra; Btsan To Re; Btsan Nyen; Btsan 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 Czigs; Khris Dog Rje; Khris Rma; Khris Bzher; Gru Bzher; Dge Bzang; Rgyal
Sgra; Rgyal Tshan; Stag Po Rje; Stag Bzang; Stag Sum Rje; Stag Sum Bzer; Brtan Bzer; Mdo Sgra; Mdo Bzang; Dpal Bzang; Dpal Sum Rje; Phan Po Rje; Phan Bzer; Byang Bzer; Mang Po Brtan; Mang Zigs; Rma; Sgra; Rma Bzer; Gtsug Btsan; Gtsug Bzer; Btsan Bzer; Btsan Zigt; Btsan Bzang; Rtsang Bzer; Mtshan Bzer; Mtsho Bzer; Zhang Brtan; Zhang Bzang; Zla Bzer; Zla Bzang; Gzu Sgra; Gyu Sgra; Gyu Rmang; Gyu Bzer; Legs Sgra; Legs Bzang; Lha Dpal.

MYING

[A] Klu Gong; Klup Dpal; Skar Kong; Skyi Zung; Kha Ce; Khar Tsi; Khong Ge; Khong Sto; Khong Zung; Khong Lod; Khyi Chung; Khyi Ma Re Dod; Khri Gong; Khri Gda Khrislebs; Gung Rton; Dge Tshugs; Rgan Kol; Rgya Gong; Rgyal Kong; Rgyal Sum Gzigs; Rgyal Slebs; Sngos Btsan; Rje Gol; Rje Chung; Rje Thang; Nya Sto; Mnyen Lod; Stag Skyes; Stag Snyas; Stag Snang; Stag Rtsan; Stag Tshab; Stag Lod; Brtan Kong; Brtan Sgra; Mdo Btsan; Mdo Lod; 'Dam Kong; 'Dus Kong; 'Dus Dpal; Rdog Rje; Ldongs Tshab; Ldongs Zhi; Ldom Bu; Ne Stang; Ne Brtsan; Ne Shags; Gnas Kong; Dpal 'Dus; Spe Brtsan; Speg Lha; Spe Skyes; Phes Po; 'Phan Gang; Byin Byin; Stor Cung; Sbeg Chung; Mon Chung; Mon Tshan; Myes Snang; Myes Rma; Rmang Chung; Smon Brtsan; Smon Zung; Btsan Kong; Btsan 'Brod; Zhang Snang; Zhang Yen; Bzhi Brtsan; Zu Brtsan; Zin Kong; Zla Gong; Bzang Kong; 'Or Mang; Ya Sto; Yab Lag; Gyu Gong; Gyu Btsan; Ram Shags; Ri Tshab; Ri Zung; Le Gong; Legs 'Dus; Legs Po; Legs Tshan; Legs Gzigs; Shu Steng; Sum Snang; Gnas Mthong; Lha Sgra; Lha Mthong; Lha Bo Btsan; Lha Zung; Lha Lod; Lhas Byin; Lha Goog; Hab Ken.

[B] Klu Rton; Klu Rma; Klu Brtsan; Khys Bu; Khys Ma Re; Khris Legs; Stag Chung; Stag Legs; Stag Sibs; Dge Legs; Tre Gong; Thom Po; 'Dus Dpal; 'Dus Rma; 'Dus Tshan; Ldongs Gang; Dpal Ston; Spe Rma; Gtsug Legs; Btsan Zigt; Rtsang Brtan; Brtsan Legs; Gnas Sto; Gnas Btsan; Gnas Slebs; Lha Skyes; Lha Gong; Lha 'Bring Brtsan; Lha 'Brug Brtsan; Lha Legs.

The general appearance of the mchön and mying 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 *bzhi* is almost exclusive to the *mchab*; while *slugs*, *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 *mchab* or a *mying* are not a large proportion of the available material.¹¹ Uncertainty on this point is increased by the apparently indiscriminate use of either *mchab* or a *mying* after the title *chang*; and perhaps also personages of border clans—e.g. those described as *pa co* may not always have possessed a *mchab*. Ordinary people on the border may have taken, as personal names forms used in Tibet itself only as *mchab*. In general one can detect a characteristic pattern in both *mchab* and *mying*; and further research might remove doubt about the equi-voal examples.

The same *mchab* occurs in more than one family; and although some components appear rather frequently in certain *ru*—e.g. many Dbas' names contain the syllable *bzer*—none is exclusive to any particular *ru*. 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 *ru* connected with the border regions and this may be significant.

Some of *mchab* and *mying* can be translated after a fashion: Stag Sgra ‘Tiger Voice’; Stag Gzigs ‘Tiger Look;’ Khei Sum Rje ‘Lord of Three Thrones’; Lha Bzang, ‘Excellent Deity’; Stag Tshab ‘As Good As a Tiger’; Snor Bstan, ‘Powerful Prayer’; Lhas Byin, ‘Blessed by God’; and so on. The translation of other syllables—e.g. the frequent *bzer*—is not clear; but it is not my intention to speculate on their meaning here. Generally, the *mchab* appear more grandiose and complimentary than the *mying*. The existence of so large a member of *mchab* excludes the probability that they were systematic titles (though an exception might be made for *mang po rje*¹²) and the conclusion is that *mchab* was a sort of sobriquets or name of honour conferred on persons of noble birth or high rank.
NOTES


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 Brtsas in 712 at the age of eight; and Khri Srong Lde Brtsun in 756 at the age of thirteen. Of these the original name of Khri Lde Gtsug Brtsun is recorded—viz. Gyal Gtsug Bu.

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 tshun spyi’i gnang ba ‘i rje bla’i ma legs/legs gi pha Ma Ko Can sgs gsh a sa phul bo’i rje blas’ dir ’bdag cag Led Kong gi bu tsha rango thog las bko 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 Led 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 Brtsun Bsher Legs Gzigs; Mchims Rgyal Srong Shya Mon Brtsun; Mchims Rgyal Stag Bsher. Rgyal Gzigs, Bsham Bsher and Stag Bsher, without a prefixed Rgyal, are known mkhyan. That prefix does not appear in the names of other shang who are identified as belonging to the Mchims ras.

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 Bion Chen po Zhang Khri Sum Rje; in TLTD 222 Zhang Bion Khri Bsher; also in LINV 961 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 pira; and chags srid kyi blon po nam sams dang
zhàng lèn cē pha or are recorded as witnesses to a decree in the Zhwa'i Lakhang inscription. In the Zhol inscription it seems that a person not related to the royal family by marriage could be given the rank of zhàng lèn. It may also be noted that no examples are found of e.g. lèn cē, nang lèn, phyt lèn, etc.

6. THD records relations between Tibet and Yāng (Nanchao) as early as 703 in the reign of 'Dus Srông. In the next reign Khi Lodr Gsug Brtian, who had a wife from Yāng, received an envoy from the Myawa—a part of the Nanchao kingdom. He is described in THD as having given the title btsaw po to one of the Nanchao ruler who is named Kāg La Bong (Ko Lo Fung c. 768-779). This passage has been mistranslated by the editors on p. 150. Collection of information on Nanchao from Tibetan and Chinese sources needs to be undertaken. For the latter see W. Stött 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. "Pang Lag Rong du btsas po gzen lha kalbo rgyal sa nas pha'i." A Rebellion in Nepal about this time is recorded in the T'ang Annals; and if the reading is lha ber (as the editors seem to have taken it in their translation at pp 40-41), it seems that the Nepalese king was described as Btsas po Gcen, "the elder brother king."

8. The 'A Zha were conquered by the Tibetans in the time of Srông Brtian Sgam po; his son Gung Srông 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 Khi Bangs to the 'A Zha chief in 689 established the zhàng dgon relationship which is referred to in a THD p. 78: "Bon 'A zhe dang zhàng dgon edad sa dehn." The editors, reading dgon, quite miss the mark by translating 'Bon chief de 'A Zha (but not mine zhàng dgon gdan tshom)." Thomas, TL 1911, p. 6, reading dgon, gets nearer: "The 'Bon 'A Zha chief and the uncle (nephew?) resigned (exchanged?) their posts.", but the point is that on the king's visit, which was expressly to assert his authority, he and the 'A
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 bden) 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 bden 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 Tang Annals as Pen Ta Yen, and the holder was a vassal ally of the Tibetans. Da Rgyal seems to be a prince 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 Hwan. Perhaps Sinologists can find a key there, or in the name Mou Jong.


10. In JRAS 1952 (Zhwai Lhakhang) I suggested placing Myang in the Gyanse Nyang (Myang) Chu region, but 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 ma’ or Kam chu. The legend of Dr. Gum Itsan po, although claimed in recent times for the Gansu 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 Zhwai 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 nag, is one of several names indicating Sogdian origin. There were colonies of Sogdians in Eastern Central Asia from Hami and Lop Ner to the Ordos, see J.R. Hamilton, Les Ouighours: Li Fang-kuei, "Sog", in Central Asiatic Journal, 1957: E. Pulleyblank in TP, XLI, 1952. Perhaps the origin of Nyan Lam Stag Sgra Khu 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 Nu Shan whose Sogdian origin and whose name—Rokshan—have been established by Pulleybank in "The Background to the Rebellion of An Nu Shan"?

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

(2) Legs Brang. LINIV 1230 and TLTD II 138 have Blon Legs Bzang—a usual mchun form. TLTD II 20 has Dzag Legs Bzang which is equivocal; but in LINIV 1094, 1123 and 1175 it appears to be a mying.

(3) Khri Sgra is an established mchun 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 Tsomas 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 mchun form; but in LINIV 54 it is found with what looks like a non-Tibetan rta name—'Bi Stag Bzang—apparently as a mying.

(5) Mdo Bzer, described as a mchun in LINIV 1240, appears in LINIV 1074 apparently as a mying—Stag Mdo Bzer.

13. Rkong Dkar Po Mang Po Rje is an attested rgyal phran (IRAS 1954 and TTK third edict). The Da Rgyal Mang Po Rje appears to have been an 'Agra prince. The third edict mentions a Rgyang rgyal rgyud; the great minister of Strong Britan Sgags Po whose father led the movement which put Strong Britan's grand-father in power, is called Rgyang 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 Ngar Dru, Dga's and Cog Rgyud; but evidence is not conclusive.