

NOTES

Taking the names singly, we notice the following deviations from the list given in the *Chronicles of Ti-nan* :— The first chief is here called Ra-tan, instead of Ra-na ; the dynastical name is here spelt Pāl, not Pha-la. The chief of the seventh generation is here called Bkra-śis-dpal-ḥbyor, against Bkra-śis of the chronicle. The Chief Ha-ri-ya's brother is omitted here.

But there is another radical difference between the two lists, viz. that, according to the chronicles, Bkra-śis-rgyal-po and Tshe-riñ-rgyal-po are Bsod-nams-rgya-mtsho's younger brothers, whilst here they are stated to be his sons. Which of the two versions is correct will perhaps remain obscure for ever.

With regard to the second half of the genealogy, which contains entirely new material, it is remarkable that it consists of nine generations only, whereas we should expect about eleven, considering that it covers a period of about 350 years, from 1550 to 1900 A.D.

I do not think that, beside that given under No. 5 below, there exist any stone inscriptions containing the names of Ti-nan chiefs. But, as there are a number of paper documents in the country which commemorate the erection of certain stūpas, or the acquisition of important books, we might examine them in search of names of Ti-nan chiefs.

1. Bar-ḥbog document, commemorating the acquisition of a Sūtra *Za-ma-tog* in the time of Pirtib-Singhe of Kuḷū (Partāb-Siñgh, 1569 A.D.). It mentions Tshe-riñ-sa-grub and Bkra-śis-rgya-mtsho, father and son, chiefs of Bar-ḥbog. Then other chiefs of Kar-sdañ (Mkhar-dañ), Kye-(g)lañ, Ti-no, Ha-yar, Lcug-dra, Sa-rañ, Bi-liñ, etc., are also mentioned, but none of Ti-nan.

2. Bar-ḥbog document, commemorating the acquisition of a *Bkah-ḥgyur* during the reign of Tre-tru-Siñ of Kuḷū. This Kuḷū king is, as I believe, Pṛithvī-Siñgh, c. 1618 A.D. The syllable *Pri* is pronounced *Tri* in Tibetan. The *v* was changed to *u* in Tibetan. The following chiefs of Bar-ḥbog are mentioned in this document :—Hbrug-rnam-rgyal, Tshul-khrims-rdo-rje, No-no-Phun-tshogs, Hbrug-bde-legs, all of whom belong to the third generation after Bkra-śis-rgya-mtsho, which circumstance again speaks in favour of my identification of Tre-tru-Siñ with Pṛithvī-Siñgh. Again, other contemporary chiefs of Lha-brañ, Pa-spa-rag, Kar-dañ, Guñ-rañ, Ti-mur, and even Ti-nan are mentioned ; in the latter place a certain No-no (younger chief) Rnam-rgyal. This Rnam-rgyal is in all probability one of the three Rnam-rgyals who are mentioned in the genealogical tree of Ti-nan as Dpal-ḥbar's sons, viz. the two Tshe-riñ-rnam-rgyals and Do-tug-rnam-rgyal.

3. Decree of Riddhi (Riddhi)-Siñgh of Kuḷū to the Gandhola monastery (c. 1663 A.D.). Although Ti-nan is mentioned in this decree, the chief's name is not given.

4. Document from Ko-loñ, commemorating the erection of a *mchod-rten*, in the time of Parbat-Siñgh, of Kuḷū (c. 1584 A.D.). It does not mention Ti-nan, but Śi-la, which name may refer to the same principality. There it mentions a Rgyal-po-Tshe-riñ (or Rgyal-po-Tshe-riñ-dpal-lde). It is, of course, possible that this prince is identical with Ha-ri-ya's brother, Rgyal-po, Rgyal-po being the abbreviated form of the name ; but there is no certainty about it.

5. Votive tablet from Ko-loñ (?), time of Spri-tim-Siñgh of Sur-stan-pur of Kuḷū (Pritam-Siñgh of Sultanpur, c. 1767 A.D.). It mentions a No-no (younger prince) Tshe-dbañ-nor-bu of Ti-nan, who cannot be found in the genealogical tree given above.

6. An unknown queen, Rani Dzvivanti (Rānī Jīvantī, perhaps of Ti-nan), is mentioned in an inscription at Gandhola.

That is practically all that can be gathered from documents.

When Dr. Vogel travelled in Lahul in 1902, he made the personal acquaintance of the Chief Hirā-cand, who showed him the Mañi monastery at Ti-nan. Of this monastery the Chief said that he had built it himself in 1880 A.D. A small image in this sanctuary had the inscription : *Jo-Bsod-nams-stob-rgyas-la-na-mo*. It was stated to refer to the Chief Hirā-cand's deceased brother. This inscription apparently contains the spiritual name of the prince. The following ancient monasteries are situated within the principality of Ti-nan :—Gandhola (Padmasambhava's time), Chos-skor (Atīśa's time), Śi-la (of unknown origin). But the chronicles of the country do not tell us anything about them, nor do they contain the date of the erection of the stately castle of Ti-nan by a Kuḷū king, as tradition has it.

(Bisahi or Pṛithvī)