

ritory of Chinese administration history as a whole, and of this matter in particular.

The economic elaboration of the rich material analyzed here — a merit of this book, utilizable without the problems of the topic and its sources — represents the main reason for the limits of the scholarly work published here; and this important survey of Sung government history will be welcomed by readers. Namely, the limitation of the administrative material to the “civil service of Sung China” underlines the body of the administration, the daily life and historical problems of the entire Empire, taking into consideration both civil and military affairs and problems. However, the related administration seems to be separated from the other aspects of the problem only with severe difficulties. The other limitation, i.e. that of dealing with the officials of state offices, their rank, titles and tasks concerned, seemingly helps the author to overcome the many-sided problems of the functioning of the whole state machinery and its bodies and the institutions including the official persons named, titled, and registered among the persons involved. The lack or at least limitation of *institutional history* in the Sung period — since Étienne Balázs evaluated this type of contribution of the Chinese sources, and offered an example of the due analysis concerned — results in a “one-wing” history of Sung China, one could even say: a too-Confucian aspect of the time, however, an excellent reference work for the Confucian examination of officials, without investigating the main instruction of Confucian historical source and historiography, i.e. the life and work of official institutions of the state. This type of work is left for another volume on this subject, with those philological problems of the source material utilized here, not mentioned in connection with the clear conclusions. The latter are added with just a few notes for a short reference of the related literature concerning the wide and rich topic, treated with a due quantity of different types of original

material. After the list of Tables and Figures, and the acknowledgements, respectively, the Introduction (pp. 1–34) gives a short and superficial characterisation of Chinese administration, especially in the Sung empire, described according to some sociological patterns that were chosen at random; but the body of the book represents a thorough and intrinsic review of the problems concerned: the problems of “the context of public administration”, “Evolution of the Sung civil service”, “Function and recruitment of the civil service”, “Job assignments and the functional rank system”, “The personnel rank system”, “Performance evaluations and personnel supervision”, and “Regional variations in personnel administration”, respectively. Valuable and interesting appendixes are attached to the book on “Civil service examination degree output”, on the *Li-pu T'iao-fa* (Itemized Law of the Board of Personnel), issued in the 12th century, a “selected list of members of the Sung civil service recruited from the personnel of the annexed kingdoms”, a register of provincial schools and career patterns, as well as a “Standard form for merit evaluation for circuit intendant”. Short notes, glossary, bibliography and index (pp. 245–297) (throughout provided with Chinese characters) in this reference book, offered to historians and “to the more adventurous students of administration in general”, will undoubtedly be used in further study of the Sung-period administration.

Ildikó Ecsedy

RICHARDSON, H. E., *A corpus of early Tibetan inscriptions*. Royal Asiatic Society, 1985, 186 p., 16 plates James G. Forlong Series, No. XXIX.

The early Tibetan inscriptions were written in the second half of the 8th and the first half of the 9th century, and were preserved on stone or metal

until our time. Though their extraordinary great importance has been recognized long ago, their systematic investigation begun only in the 1940s. In their collection and edition a key role was played by H. E. Richardson, who discovered and fixed many of them in Central Tibet, before he left the country in 1950. Since then Richardson devoted a large part of his scholarly efforts to their edition and re-edition. Even the earlier known inscriptions deserved re-edition, since on the one hand at the time of their discovery their physical state was not always excellent, and on the other hand the early drawings, rubbings or photographs did not escape the ruining efforts of time and circumstances. There were two major tools which helped a more accurate edition of the inscriptions. For a long time, it seemed that the vast later Tibetan literature was not especially instrumental in reconstructing the original inscriptions damaged by nature and pious successors. But the discovery of the *Chos-byun* of Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag phreñ-ba, which was written around 1565 changed this situation. This historical work preserved many of the inscriptions and verbatim quotations from early archives, and enabled reconstruction of damaged passages or missing lines, also providing help for interpreting difficult places. The activity of a "Tibetan antiquarian in the XVIIIth century" as Richardson styled him (*Bulletin of Tibetology* 4, No. 3, 5-8, 1967) turned out to be of likely major importance. Rig-'dzin tshe-bdañ nor-bu (quoted since as RT in literature) lived between 1698 and 1755. He acquired a collection of copies made from many of the inscriptions. This collection was made perhaps some 250 years earlier. He or somebody whom he entrusted checked these copies. We have an eyewitness who saw RT in 1744 copying one of the inscriptions. It is one of Richardsons great merits that he discovered Dpa'-bo Gtsug-lag's work and the collection of RT, and initiated their critical evaluation. In the last forty-odd years the study of the

other Old Tibetan sources has also made considerable progress, therefore it is understandable that H. E. Richardson prepared a re-edition of all known inscriptions in a form of a Corpus.

The book contains a short introduction and then the publication of the following inscriptions:

Reign of Khri Sron-lde-brtsan 755-c. 794 A. D.

The Lhasa Zhol *rdo-rins*

The Bsam-yas *rdo-rins*

The bell at Bsam-yas

The *rdo-rins* near the bridge-head at 'Phoñs rgyas

Reign of Khri Lde-sron-brtsan c. 800-815 A. D.

Inscriptions at Zhwa'i Lha-khañ

Fragmentary inscription near Zhwa'i Lha-khañ

The Rkoñ-po Inscription

The Skar-cuñ *rdo-rins*

The bell at Khra-'brug

Rdo-rins at the tomb of Khri Lde-sron-brtsan

Reign of Khri Gtsug-lde-brtsan 815-836 A. D.

The Leañ-bu inscriptions

The treaty of 821/822 A. D.

The bell at Yer-pa

The Zhol inscription can be dated approximately to 764 A. D. and thus the time-span of the inscriptions is not larger than sixty years.

In the *Addendum* further inscriptions are published, which are either of unknown date or surely later than the 10th century. These are the *rdo-rins* at Rgyal Lha-khañ, the *rdo-rins* at Gtsañ Groñ, some lines of a pillar inscription at Nyabzo, and short lines of inscriptions at Ka-ru Ko-sa and near Ger. The book also contains a short bibliography of the cited works, a list of abbreviations, a vocabulary of words and terms, which seemed to be of special interest, an index of names in the inscriptions and a general index. Photographs of inscriptions can be seen on 16 plates.

The Tibetan text of the inscriptions is given in the original script and orthog-

raphy, and was accomplished with the calligraphy of Ngawang Thondup Nar-kyid, it runs on the even pages facing the translation on the odd ones. The notes are kept to a minimum.

The text edition does not aim to be a philological one. The very few notes to the text part offer in most cases possible reconstructions, alternative readings, and corrections of former readings, but the reader has to find out in most such cases which of these alternatives he is confronted with. E.g. 'Ėhos: added as footnote 1 to three x-es in line 3 of the East inscription of the Zhol rdo-rinś is, as we learn from a note to the translation, a reconstruction based on Dpa'bo gtsug-lag phreñ-ba and recent data, surely correctly, but we do not understand why we find three x-es, if after 'Ėhos there is a double *tseg*, i.e. four signs are reconstructed. The other four Tibetan syllables given in footnotes 2 to 5 could have been reconstructed with the help of the context, but we do not know what kind of corroboration support them. To line 31 after an | and before a *na* a footnote is added where *man*: is given though only the aksara *ma* is lacking in the text.

The reconstruction is an important part of the work since in many cases neither good rubbings nor readable photographs are at our disposal. And indeed progress was achieved in many cases by Richardson's better readings. We, however, do not learn from this edition what has been reconstructed and what has been seen on the original, when Richardson himself checked it. It is inevitable to use some of the earlier editions of the inscriptions, in many cases those of Richardson, but even then we do not get always answers to these questions.

E.g. in the case of the *rdo-rinś* at the tomb of Khri Lde-sroñ-btsan if we compare the 1969 edition of Richardson (JRAS 29–38) with the Corpus under review, we find the following: in line 1 after *sras* 1969 has one *shad* Corpus a double one, on the end of line 3 1969 says

that only the aksara *ma* is visible and there is only place for one letter. No such remark is given in the Corpus. In lines 5 1969 reads *yun du*, Corpus *yun tu*, in line 9 after *dan* 1969 has a double *shad* Corpus a simple one etc.

We are not informed (with the exception of a few loci discussed as the above one in the notes) how great are the illegible gaps, which are partly indicated by x-s partly by dots, though the former editions of Richardson contain many important observations in such cases. All to all one has the impression that Richardson intended to give his readings rather than a strict philological edition of the texts and we have to be grateful for this, because he is the most competent scholar to do this. To give one example where an at least proportionate rendering offers new insights I would quote the second part of the Inscription at the tomb of Khri Lde-sroñ-brtsan. As we learn from Richardson, when he visited the inscription in 1949, he was allowed to have the buried part of the north face partly excavated. He also found a parallel text in the Rgyal-po Bka'-thañ which was used for reconstructing the text of the lower part of the inscription. In the time of RT, 29 lines above the earth were well visible, 14 lines below them were not clear and it was unknown to RT how many lines were under the earth. Richardson stated that the north inscription consisted of 46 lines, thus in the time of RT, only 3 lines were under the earth. But even with this help, he could not make too much from the lower part of the text, because it was so damaged and his possibility to copy it was also hampered by the circumstances. In 1969 he gave a somehow reconstructed passage from lines 39 to 47, which is of great interest. In the Corpus these lines bear the number 38 to 46, but the picture is drawn more proportionate to the original. In line 23 the text mentions the King of the East, the Chinese Emperor, and the wars and peace made with him in line 29 follows the King of India.

Assuming that the affairs with India took equally about 6 lines, the next cardinal point should be the West and this should begun about line 35 and in fact in line 36 there is a *zi* which may be *ta-zig*, but was according to the notes of Richardson not clear and in line 38 *dru-gu*. North had to be the last cardinal point and the story about the King of the North had to begun about line 41 or so. And in fact in line 42 the name *hor kha-ga(n)* can be read. We know (see Ariane Macdonald *JA* 1962, 531–548), that in the Tun-huang text P. 958 the king of the West is 'Phrom Ge-sar and the kings of the north are those of Tazig, and Dru-gu. The Dru-gu of the West was very likely the Turk Shahi dynasty in Ghandara which flourished until 809 when the later Khaliph Mamun defeated them. Mamun is the Amir Mamun Abdallah who is figuring in the GKT as the king of the Ta-zig quoted by Richardson (on the identification of the first part see Petech 1947 in ANLRC, and the second in my Wiener Vorlesungen 1985, 51). And now we know from numismatic evidence that the rulers of the Turk Shahi dynasty carried the title Phrom Ke-sar. We know from Arabic sources that the Turk Shahi dynasty was Buddhist, which meant that they had to have contacts with Tibet at least during the reign of Khri Lde-sroñ-brtsan. In the same time the rulers of the North were the Uighurs who were in power from the 750s until 840, this was the Hor king. In other words the situation as shown by the text of the *rdo-rins* at the tomb of Khri Lde-sroñ-btsan reflects an earlier situation than that of the inscription of the treaty of 821/22, where Tazhig is in the West and Dru-gu is in the North. This *dru-gu* has to be another one. Richardson has in Corpus Dru-gu No-smel (E 14–15) with no remarks, though in his 1978 edition (JRAS) Richardson made important remarks after having discussed that Li Fang kuei and Sato read *drug ni*, he read earlier *dru gu ne* and RT read *gru gu no* Richardson goes on: "The following line

begins *smel la stsogs pa*. There is possibly space for one more letter at the damaged end of the preceding line and it would be tempting to read *dru gu ni ba smel la stsogs pa* as a reference to the Turkic people, the Basmyl, living near Beshbaliq (read Beshbaliq); but though the letter is damaged, the vowel sign appears to be attached to the *na*, as with *'gren bu* and *na ro*, rather than separate from it, as with *ki gu*. RT's reading has, therefore, been accepted, reluctantly" (JRAS 1978, 143). I do not know what could be this *dru-gu No smel* (?*nob ba-smel*), but the precise data in Richardson's 1978 work offers help. The information we get in the Corpus is that in this case Richardson's has no new reading, which in a way is also instructive. With this example I wanted only to show that the new Corpus has to be used together with Richardson's earlier works and not instead of them. I consider the *Corpus of Richardson's works* as a whole which contributed essentially new knowledge to Tibetan studies.

A. Róna-Tas

DON-GRUB RGYAL, *Bod-kyi mgur-glu byun-'phel-gyi lo-rgyus dan khyad-čhos bsdu-par ston-pa; Rig-pa'i khye'i rnam-par rcen-pa'i skyed-chal. Mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khañ*. Beijing 1985. 332 pp.

The Nationalities Publishing Houses in People's Republic of China have produced many valuable publications in recent years. This publication policy maintains two kinds of this activity. It is reproduction of texts that have a "classical value" and scholarly works. Concerning the first, some well known works — in Tibetan studies should be mentioned:

1. Dictionary of Dge-bšes Čhos-kyi *grags-pa*, 1981
2. Hu-lan deb-ther of *Chal-pa Kun-dga' rdo-rje*, 1981