FOR LOVE OF THE WORD: A NEW TRANSLATION OF PELLIO
TIBÉTAIN 1287, THE OLD TIBETAN CHRONICLE, CHAPTER I

BETTINA ZEISLER*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Dunhuang text P.t.1287, better known as the Old Tibetan Chronicle (OTC), was fully translated in 1940 by Bacot & Toussaint, while the first chapter was re-translated 29 years later by Eric Haarh in 1969 and then again 37 years later by Nathan W. Hill in 2006, when he was working in our linguistic research project. According to mathematical principles, then, a further translation could not have been expected to appear before 2051, and one might perhaps wonder why a new attempt comes so shortly after the last one.

One of the goals of the said research project was to annotate Tibetan texts for syntactic evaluation. Already published translations of these texts were to be provided for readers not acquainted with Tibetan. It was not at all planned to generate new translations. Nevertheless, my colleague being eager to attempt a new translation and OTC constituting a particularly difficult text, his proposal was accepted with the objective that the translation reflected the annotation, so that it could have been a useful tool in the process of annotation and validation. But this did not work out, and since the resulting translation was technically unsuitable to accompany the annotation in as much the same way as the previous translations by Bacot & Toussaint (Bacot & al. 1940: 123-128) and Haarh (1969: 402-406), I eventually decided to provide yet another translation,† a translation, however,
which does not strive for originality or literary elegance, but is as faithful to the structure of the original as possible.

Hence I made no attempt to streamline the endless convoluted chains of non-finite clauses, which must throw any native English speaker into a state of terror. Hill’s solution of marking sentence boundaries through the layout is certainly a good compromise, and I will follow his example in part. I should think, however, that the style chosen here has at least the benefit to not only reveal the flavour of the text, but also, and more importantly, to immediately expose the different rhetoric strategies of representation, such as the mere enumeration of (possibly historical) facts in short simple sentences in § 6, which stands in sharp contrast to the more condensed and complex mythological narrative in § 5, the latter consisting of only few sentences, but a lot of embedded structures. Like in literary German, Tibetan complex sentences may be helpful in representing complex situations, but they may also be used to veil facts and reasons (or their absence). And, like in German, they may be prone to linguistic accidents.

Despite, or perhaps rather because of, sticking slavishly to the text and the grammatical rules of Tibetan, I arrived in several cases at quite different an interpretation than previous translators. These results, I hope, should justify the over-hurried resumption of the translation task.

Tibetan prehistory is a difficult terrain, for lack of independent witnesses and because the authors or compilers from the earliest historical narratives and documents onwards always had their own vested interests in presenting an event from a certain perspective or in the reinterpretation of historical facts and legends in order to legitimate a new ruler, a ruling dynasty, or even to create a notion of unity or ‘Tibetanness’ amongst the rivalling clans of the most diverse tribal units. This constructive aspect of all historiographic narration and compilation has typically been ignored, even among western Tibetologists, as if the debates of postmodernism is hardly ever challenged, I am definitely missing a similar faithfulness towards the text, when it comes to ‘translating’ or rather re-narrating its content.

Semantic and grammatical negligence, however, easily leads to misconceptions and hoaxes, which will then be repeated in citation chains from generation to generation. This will be sufficiently illustrated by the accompanying notes. But in order to demonstrate that this is a general problem, not restricted to a particularly difficult text, I should like to cite an example from Richardson (1998a [1980]: 93/97), whose translation of Šihlavarman’s Bkaḥmchid gives the impression that the early Tibetans not only used to paint their faces (like the Ḥaža and other Central Asian people), but also anointed their whole body with red colour (and run
around naked?), and that this custom was apparently abolished only by the Buddhists.

The crucial passage runs as lala ni skula dmar yan dogs / ‘Some were addicted to colouring their bodies red’. First of all, Richardson overlooks the honorific character of sku (cf. clause v211 with note 81 for the same, clauses v169 and v170 with notes 51 and 52 for the opposite mistake). He further does not seem to be aware that the verb dogs ‘fear, doubt’ needs a second argument or a proposition, typically in the instrumental (as in the clauses immediately following), but occasionally also in the locative-purposive (as on p. 98). The latter case marker is to be found as suffix to the verb dmalḥ ‘be low, decay’ (dma-r, with regular omission of the final -ḥ), thus the whole passage should be translated as ‘Some feared that with respect to the (emperor’s) person [it] will become low’ or more freely ‘that the emperor gets common’, indicating that one of the main objections against the introduction of Buddhism as state religion was that the divine status of the emperor might be affected.

dmar, as an adjectival basically of verbal nature, could only mean ‘be, become red’ but never ‘make red’. The contrast between intransitive and transitive-causative verbs is constitutive for Tibetan verb morphology, but quite unfortunately many translators seem to either lack this distinction in their own language or might think that verb semantics is as irrelevant as grammar (see also notes 4, 5, 44, 61, and 83), and that one can freely change, e.g., the causative meaning of the verb ḡdogs, btags, gdags, thogs ‘fasten, fix, attach something’, via a reflexive ‘attach o.s.’ to an intransitive meaning ‘be attached’ and, with a further shift from the physical to the mental sphere, to the desired ‘be addicted’. The verb dogs ‘fear, doubt’, for certain, can be easily confounded with ḡdogs, btags, gdags, thogs ‘fasten, fix, attach to’, but only if one does not pay attention to the spelling in the text — or if one holds (a) that notably the Old Tibetan authors did not master the principles of standardised orthography set up between the 16th and 19th century, or (b) that Tibetan orthography, whether standardised or not, is not based on realities in the spoken language, and (c) that, therefore, the Tibetan authors’ use or non-use of prefixes or their choice of radicals would be arbitrary and irrelevant (see also note 46).

As a constant source of errors, our treatment of Old Tibetan texts solely from the point of view of Classical Tibetan grammar (or our limited understanding thereof) is based on the reverential fiction that the written language did not change over the last millennium, cf., e.g., Gedun Choephel 1978: 72 (the original Tibetan statement can be found in Dgebdun Chosphel, ed. 1979: 135):

1,300 years have evolved since the time writing was introduced in Tibet. Yet, orthography and forms of writing have not witnessed much transformation
through the years, and today, those with knowledge of Tibetan can decipher and comprehend inscriptions carved on stone pillars of old.

That this fiction is the outcome of a particular political situation is understandable, but the seeming coherence between past and present orthography was mainly achieved by repeated re-editions of earlier texts with ‘corrections’ following the orthographic fashion of the day, and sometimes improving for the worse. Like any other language, written Tibetan did undergo changes, particularly in its earlier phase, not only in the lexicon or in ways of spelling, but also in its grammar. Interestingly, many Old Tibetan particularities, be it second syllable de-aspiration or intervocalic voicing, be it the pragmatic use or non-use of case marking, continue into the modern spoken varieties, bypassing Classical Tibetan, which by virtue of the standardisation process almost became an artificial language. This is one of the reasons why I will often turn to the modern varieties, notably to Ladakhi. In doing so I do by no means want to insinuate that Ladakhi or West Tibetan in general were closely related to Old Tibetan and that there could be one-to-one equivalents. It is only that I have studied this variety in some detail.

In other instances, we can — if we only pay attention to it — observe shifts in meaning, going along, in the case of verbs, with a reorganisation of the argument structure, that is, the way case markers are used. The verb *sleb*, e.g., can be found in Old Tibetan documents with the transitive (possibly non-controlled) meaning ‘reach out (for), try, be able to reach somebody’, following the standard ergative pattern for transitive verbs (ergative – absolutive, our pattern 08, cf. Takeuchi 1995: 139, 149, nos. 01r08 and 03r08). In Classical Tibetan the meaning has shifted to an intransitive ‘(be able to) arrive at’, but we can still find the verb in early classical texts with ergative plus locational (*ladon*) marking (our pattern 07), as in TVP, or, as, e.g., in the biographies of Milaraspa and Nāropa, varying between pattern 07 and the modern pattern 03a: absolutive – locational.‡

We should thus be careful with statements about the non-grammaticality of a certain passage. Like with ‘non-standard’ but *originally correct* spellings we might well be confronted with ‘non-standard’ but *originally correct* syntax, and such cases should definitely be taken more serious. Uray (1960: 50) already pointed out that the verb *stsol*, *stsal(d)*, *stsal*, *stsol(d)* ‘give’ can be found in the Old Tibetan annals constantly with double absolutive for the RECIPIENT as well as for the PATIENT, the thing given (OTA I, IOL Tib J 0750, ll. 130, 246, OTA II, Or 8212.187, ll. 35, not mentioned by Uray are Or 8212.187, ll. 48f., 59-61 (3x) and

‡ See Zeisler (2007a) and http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b11/b11fieldwork05.html#Clauses. The first eleven patterns are common to all Tibetan languages, including Old and Classical Tibetan (cf. also Zeisler 2004: 255, but without *sigla*).
OTC II. 200, 221f., 223, 229, 265f., 385f., and 415f., see also note 12; in all these instances, persons are granted a distinction and/or some reward). Uray’s observation, however, went largely unnoticed, as can be seen by Dotson’s note (2009: 116, n. 277) when dealing with exactly the same passages. This astonishing construction may perhaps be typical only for a particular genre, such as the bureaucratic documents of the imperial administration, and as such it may constitute an archaic formula, preserving the trace of some meaning shift. It could also be due to the pragmatic use of case marking, and it could even constitute a selective violation of grammar. In any of these cases, the choice of an apparently non-standard (or no longer standard) construction may have conveyed a political message: the recipients of the imperial favour should not think that they are more than willing patients, victims, so to speak, of the benevolent act. We use to play with grammar in our particular mother tongues, and Tibetans, too, have ever since been doing so.

This does not mean that anything goes, and more particularly, any selective violation of grammar as much as the pragmatic usage of markers first of all presupposes, besides a suitable context, a commonly accepted rule. Conversely, we can only detect such violations and pragmatic usages, if not only we are familiar with the rules, but also take them seriously. Case and other grammatical markers may perhaps be used more flexible than in standardised Indo-European languages, but in the way they are used they are also limiting our freedom of interpretation, just as fences limit our freedom of rambling: trespass forbidden.

If it is asking to much from translators to first generate a faithful interlinear gloss for each clause before re-narrating its content according to a context yet to be established, it would already be quite beneficial if they would at least take into benevolent consideration such elementary features as compound formation (see especially note 46, but also notes 20, 54, 55, 66, and 68), word order rules (notes 20 and 24), case marking (notes 34, 39, 53, 54, and 60), or the functions of the Tibetan verb stems together with the two negation markers (notes 3, 4, 40, 61, 71, and 84). Nevertheless, only a strict glossing with no room for ambiguities and self-delusion may also lead to the detection of misconstrued sentences as indicators for manipulations of a given tradition.

The text of the Chronicle itself, with all its reordering, contradictions, and linguistic accidents (the extent of which became apparent to me only in the course of our annotation), indicates that it was most probably only a draft version, meant to be elaborated for a certain political purpose. The final version could have been expected to present the facts or fictions more ‘orderly’ in a more consistent interpretation, as known from later historiographic works. Whether this final version was ever written and whether it could have influenced later traditions, is only one of the minor mysteries surrounding the Tibetan past. The linguistic annotator and
the faithful translator may curse misconstrued or ambiguous sentences, which fall out of the annotation scheme, but for the historian, the unfinished character of the Chronicle is a piece of luck. The unpolished text reveals where texts of different provenience had been mounted, and the conflicting statements may shed light not only on the process of construing a political identity and a history, but also on facts and events that were suppressed or reframed in later times.

Given the problematic nature of the text, it is of course impossible to always arrive at a single, or the only feasible, solution, and for lack of independent evidence my interpretations cannot be much more than suggestions. Wherever I happened to overlook a crucial detail or came to a wrong conclusion, I should humbly ask to take the resulting error as an incentive for a better argument and further research.

While working on this translation, I enjoyed an intensive exchange of ideas with Dr. Helga Uebach, formerly Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, and I am particularly grateful for her patiently listening to my ideas and reading earlier versions, even more so for sharing her experience through critics, advice, background information, and suggestions for alternative interpretations. I should also like to acknowledge the contribution of my former colleague Nathan W. Hill, who forced me, mainly through what I immodestly believe to be errors, to take much closer a look than planned at the semantic constituents of our syntactic units, and consequently at their historical underpinnings. This had implications far beyond this translation. Dissent, forcing one to reread the texts and to rethink and refine one’s arguments is always an important, maybe the most important, facilitator of new insights. In this sense, I should be glad if the readers would see the repeated critics of previous translations not as product of pernicketiness, but as a welcome opportunity to refine our still quite restricted knowledge of (Old) Tibetan syntax and semantics.

**TECHNICAL NOTE**

In accordance with the annotation, the translation is divided into six main paragraphs. Following Hill’s example, a new line is started with every new sentence, imbedded speech, however, will not be marked off.

§ The technically sophisticated representation built by Frank Müller-Witte, where text, translation, and the annotated information are combined, had become unavailable and is presently under reconstruction by Fabian Kliebhan. A much more simplistic graphical and non-searchable tree view of text and annotation, together with a mere interlinear version can be found in two different realisations for each paragraph under http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b11/b11corpora.html#clarkTrees.
In our annotation, each verb has been assigned an index number (v1-v225), in linear order, such as the verbs occur in the text. These index numbers are added to their equivalents in the translation, such as “small v1”. Incidentally, this will help to monitor the original clause order, and thus allow a greater flexibility in the translation. The index numbers will also serve to refer in the notes to text passages further up or further down. Each clause is defined as containing not more than a single, possibly complex, verb. Clauses without verbs remain without index. A sentence is defined as containing not more than one finite clause (for exceptions of this rule and further details of these definitions, see http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b11/b11annotation.html#elements).

Line breaks will be indicated only approximately by the mark \textendash, ideally placed after the index number of a verb or after an introductory phrase for direct speech, whichever comes last in a line (or starts at the end of the line). Where no verb and no introductory phrase are available, it will follow the noun phrase (NP) closest to the end. For better orientation, clause numbers and line numbers are resumed in the paragraph headers.

Uncertain readings receive a question mark prefix; truly questionable readings will get a double prefix. The reasons for such marking are typically discussed in a following note. Literal readings, etymologies, and alternative interpretations will be indicated in round brackets. The sign / will be used in place of the word “or”. Any addition to the text will be presented in square brackets. Notes to the translation will be indicated by angle brackets, in order to better distinguish them from the index numbers, and since most of them are quite substantial, they will follow the translation as endnotes.

As usual in historical linguistics, an asterisk * is used for hypothetical or non-attested forms. The phonemic representation of spoken forms is indicated by slashes: /…/, while square brackets are reserved for phonetic representations. Braces indicate that the morpheme given has several allomorphs.

While citing written Tibetan forms, I will represent Tibetan polysyllabic words (including case markers) as what they are: (inflected) words. Morpheme boundaries will not be indicated, as they are not necessarily identical with syllable boundaries. (Whoever happens thus to read out the name of the nurse accidentally as Skyib-rlig-ma would do so correctly, cf. also note 48.) Postpositions, however, are joined with a hyphen, since it is not entirely clear whether or not they are clitics, belonging to the intonational unit word, as in Ladakhi or Balti. Names will be flagged by a capital initial, which we can expect to be still pronounced in most, albeit not all Old Tibetan varieties. Epigraphic features will not be distinguished, except when necessary for the discussion. In that case, I shall particularly discriminate between the triangular Central Asian va and the quadrangular Tibetan ba — both having the double value of a voiced labial stop [ba], or a bilabial [Ba]
or labiodental [va] voiced fricative —, and both will be differentiated from the semi-subscribed -u-, the precursor of the wažur. Epigraphic questions will be discussed and illustrations of the letters involved will be given separately after the textual notes.

To the three previous translations as well as to the summary provided by MacDonald (1971: 221-223), I will refer only by the name of the respective author(s), assuming that the reader can easily locate the quoted passages. All other references will be given in full.

**TRANSLATION**

1. § 1, clause v1-v27 (OTC ll. 1-6): Drigum’s naming

When Drigum, the scion <1> was still small v1 in size, [they] asked v3 the nurse Grožama Skyibrliŋma: “How (lit. as what) shall [he] be named?” v2 [and] from the words of the nurse: 1/ “The Golden Rock of Skyi, <2> did it crumble to pieces v4 or not? v5 Daŋma, the Meadow of the ʰbri, did it get burnt by fire v6 or not? v7 Lake Damle, the Pointed Lake, did it dry up v8 or not?”, v9 2/ <3> thus it was spoken. v10

“The rock did not crumble. v11 Nor did the lake dry up. v12 Nor did the meadow get burnt by fire”, v13 so [they] answered (lit. said), v14 3/ [but] the nurse Grožama, being aged, v15 heard v16 it just the opposite way as due to her ears: “Not only did the rock crumble into pieces, v17 but the meadow got burnt by fire, v18 and the lake dried up, v19 as well”, having heard v20 4/ it this way, [she] spoke: v24 “Well then, in order to perform the rulership (appropriately) (lit. to perform v21 water to per-form v22 existence) / in order to kill the water spirit (lit. to kill v21 the water, to kill v22 the spirit) <4> name v23 5/ [him] as Drigum, <5> the scion!”, and thus they named v25 [him] as Drigum, the scion, but the name-giving was an error v26 <6> and [it] affected (lit. entered) v27 also his mind (/ personality).

2. § 2, clause v28-v73 (OTC ll. 6-21): fight between Loŋam and Drigum

The divine son, not being comparable to (lit. not having the manner v28 6/ of) [ordinary] men, <7> [namely as] possessing v30 great gifts and magical powers, such as verily going to heaven, v20 was unable to withhold v31 7/ heat and pride and when, being full of violence, v32 <8> vying v33 and chasing v34 [everyone], [he] called upon v37 all (lit. nine) paternal bondsmen [and] relatives and all (lit. three) maternal bondsmen [and] relatives: <9> “Dare [you] to fight v35 [Us] as an enemy and stand up v36 8/ against [Us] as a yak?”, v39 “I shan’t dare”.
When marshal Loṇjam likewise said, 

"[I] shan’t dare", the emperor did not accept it and thereupon Loṇjam prayed: “If you do not accept such answer, if you then confer to me the divine treasures, such as the self-stabbing spear, self-cutting sword, self-donning mail, and self-parrying shield, etc., the great magical treasures that you possess, then I shall dare”, thus he prayed.

Then the emperor conferred to Loṇjam all the divine treasures.

Thereupon marshal Loṇjam, on his part, went ahead to his castle and arranged the battle in the grove Thalba and then, as from the words of the marshal it was prayed to cut the divine cord made of coral, and as it was further prayed to also turn upside down (lit. to show with the opening downwards) the nine-stepped divine ladder, the emperor granted these two requests accordingly.

Thereupon Loṇjam fastened two hundred golden spear heads on the horns of a hundred oxen and loaded sacks of ashes on their backs, following which Loṇjam and the emperor started to fight among the oxen, so that the ashes got whirled about because the oxen pushed against each other and the sacks got torn by the spear heads, and within that haze Loṇjam attacked the emperor.

As for the emperor Drigum, the ancestral deity Ldebla Gujar tried to pull him up to heaven, but Loṇjam drew out a monkey from his own armpit, who then cast Ldebla Gujar into the womb of the glacier Titse, where the latter betook himself to heaven.

Since the monkey had killed emperor Drigum likewise at this place, Loṇjam placed the corpse into two juxtaposed vessels, with copper seals (with hundred iron nails/ with the Chinese Ornament) and discarded it in the middle of the Rtsang river.

At Chabgžug Sertshangs [it] went into the stomach of the water spirit Hodde Bedde Rinmo. Having, in turn, named the two sons as Šakhyi and Ākhi, he banished them to the land of Rkoŋ and separated them (/ redistributed their property)).
the dominion: Honzugsyargrags (?), and [into the fur] of the two [dogs] of Ḥjāŋ: Zulemahjān 22 and Ḥonrku (?), and when, passing v75 the ?rock shelter (/ ?rocks and slates) <24> at (lit. of) the narrow passage, [they] examined (lit. looked at) v76 a [bird’s] stomach <25> for the signs: the signs were good, v77 23 thus arriving v78 in the land [of] Myangro Šampo, [they] infiltrated (/ ?fastened; lit. stringed), v79 [the dogs] with a trick, and while there was v80 poison in the dogs’ fur, now my marshal(s) led v81 24 [them] along, and as for the good dogs, Loǰam’s hand patted v82 them, and since our marshal(s) had anointed v83 the dogs’ fur with poison, [his=Loǰam’s] hand got besmeared, v84 and [so] [they] killed v85 25 [him] and took v86 his life (lit. flesh) in revenge. <26>

4 § 4, v87-v119 (OTC ll. 26-35): the Rhya-Rulaskyes fraternal war, ṇarleskyes’ birth and his inquiry about father and lord

Thereafter, <27> the son of Bkrags, the divine son Rulaskyes, <28> a paternal cousin, fought v87 26 with Rhya <29> as a paternal cousin [i.e., in a fraternal war]. <30>

Rhya cut off v88 the Bkrags lineage. [He] ?drove away v89 <31> the livestock. <32>

One consort <33> of Bkrags fled v90 and was able to rescue v91 herself in the land of her father and brother(s).

Carrying v92 27 a child in her womb (lit. belly), [she] had gone, v93 and [thus it] was born (lit. appeared) v94 [there].

As soon as the son was able to stand upright v95 among the [men of the] Spu [clan], <34> [he said] to his mother: “If every man and every bird (/ ?human) <35> has v96 a lord, where is? v97 28 my lord? <36> If every man and every bird (/ ?human) <35> has v98 a father, where is? v99 my father?” [lit. as] [he] said. v100

“Show v101 [both of them] to me!” , having spoken v102 thus, from the words of the mother: 29 “Child little, don’t talk big (lit. don’t be big v103 with your mouth)! Colt little, <37> don’t talk strong (lit. don’t be strong v104 with your mouth)! <38> I don’t know v105 [nothing]”, having spoken v106 thus, from the words of the son of the Spu,  bırarleskyes: 30 “If [you] do not show v107 [them] (/ if you do not explain [this]) to me [I am going v109 to die” v108 it was thus uttered v110 and [his] mother explained v111 [it, right from] the beginning: <40> “As for your father, Rhya has killed v112 31 him. As for your lord, marshal Loǰam killed v113 him, placed v114 32 the corpse into [two] juxtaposed ?vessels?, with copper ?seals, <41> and discarded v115 [it] in the middle of the Rtsaŋ river. At Chabgžug Sertshaŋ [it] went v116 33 into the stomach of the water spirit Hode Riŋmo. As for the royal sons, the two brothers, having named v117 [them] as Šakhyi and ḉakhyi, [he =Loǰam]
banished \[v_{118}\] [them] to the land of Rkoŋ and separated \[v_{119}\] 34i [them] (/ redistributed [their property])."

5. § 5, v120-v182 (OTC ll. 35-49): ransom of Drigum’s corpse

Thereafter, from the words of the son of the Spu clan, Njarlaskyes: “The one destroyed by men (/ the destroyed man) [i.e. Bkrags], his traces to follow, \[v_{120}\] and the one destroyed by water [=Drigum], his remnants <42> to search, \[v_{121}\] I shall go”, \[v_{122}\] this was uttered, \[v_{123}\] and \[he\] started off, \[v_{124}\] 35i

In Bresnar [in] the land [of] Rkoŋ [he] met \[v_{125}\] with the sons Šakhyi and Ėakhyi, on the one hand.

On the other hand, [he] met \[v_{126}\] 36i with the water spirit Hode Bedde Riŋmo.

“By what that you wish \[v_{127}\] [in exchange] for the corpse of the emperor may [I] ransom \[v_{128}\] [it]?”, having said \[v_{129}\] this, [the water spirit] spoke: \[v_{130}\] “[I] do not desire \[v_{131}\] anything else: [I] want \[v_{132}\] one who has \[v_{133}\] human eyes like bird eyes, <43> one who covers \[v_{134}\] 37i [them] from beneath”, \[<44>\] but although the son of the Spu clan, Njarlaskyes searched \[v_{135}\] 38i towards the four confines of heaven, [he] did not find \[v_{136}\] [one with] human eyes, [but] similar \[v_{137}\] to the eyes of a bird, [one] who covers \[v_{138}\] [them] from beneath; then, [his] provisions finished, \[v_{139}\] his boots having got holes, \[v_{140}\] [he] came back \[v_{141}\] 39i to [his] mother and after telling \[v_{154}\] her:

“As for the one destroyed by men (/ the destroyed man) [i.e. Bkrags], [I] was able to follow \[v_{142}\] his traces, as well as for the one destroyed by water [=Drigum], [I] found \[v_{143}\] his remnants. [I] met \[v_{144}\] 40i with the sons Šakhyi and Ėakhyi, and when [I] also met \[v_{145}\] with the water spirit Hode Riŋmo, [the spirit] said: \[v_{149}\] ‘As ransom for the corpse [I] want \[v_{148}\] 41i [one with] human eyes, [but] similar \[v_{146}\] to the eyes of a bird, one who covers \[v_{147}\] [them] from beneath’, and since [I] have not [yet] found \[v_{150}\] [any such], [I] must set out \[v_{152}\] again to search \[v_{151}\] [this being]. Pack up (/ ?Give me) <45> [some] provisions!”, \[v_{153}\] he went off \[v_{155}\] 42i [again].

As [he] came \[v_{156}\] to [a place] below Ganparphrun and went up \[v_{158}\] 43i to a daughter of the family Manbird (/ ?Manman), \[v_{46}\] [incidently] someone who was working \[v_{157}\] on a canal (lit. was making a canal)/ ?was preparing to sleep (/ ??and went up to [someone] who was trying to make a daughter of the family Manbird—/ ?Manman asleep), \[v_{47}\] and when, [realising that] [s/he] had \[v_{162}\] lying \[v_{159}\] in a cradle, \[v_{48}\] a baby-boy [who] covers \[v_{161}\] the eyes from below, similar \[v_{160}\] to bird eyes, [he] asked, \[v_{165}\] the mother: “If [I] shall ransom \[v_{163}\] that one, what do [you] wish \[v_{164}\] 44i [in exchange]?”, “[I] do not wish \[v_{166}\] anything else: Forever and ever, whenever the emperor, lord or wife, dies, \[v_{45}\] as for [one’s] top-knot ?ribbon (=?turban) / ?fine ?plaits, \[v_{49}\] having tied it (/ ?them) up, \[v_{168}\] <50> having [one’s] face anointed \[v_{169}\] with vermilion, <51> having applied ornaments \[v_{170}\] <52> on [one’s] body, [one] assembles \[v_{171}\] 46i; \[v_{53}\] at the corpse of the emperor. For ("
Towards) the people: swag and swaggering (hphrogriom).  

For (/ Towards) the fare: eating and drinking!  

Shall you act v172 like this or not?" v173 the mother having spoken v174 thus, [he] laid down a solemn vow (lit. declared v176 a vow, declared v177 a high [one]), v178 [he] made a commitment (lit. made the promise, v179 made the word v179) to act accordingly, v175 and went, v181 leading along v180 the daughter of the family Manbird (/ ?Manman).

[He] deposited v182 [the child / ??the daughter] in the belly v183 of the water spirit Ḥode Rĩŋmo as ransom for the corpse.

§ 6, v183-v226 (OTC ll. 49-62): Spude Guŋrgyal assumes power

Ña[khyi] and the [future] majesty (lha or lhasras) both v184 took hold v183 of the corpse of the emperor.

Into the flank v59 of Mt. Gyanṭo, v60 spanning [itself] aloft (/the lofty tent-pitcher/ ?the massive (=aloft and concave); Blahbubs), v61 [they] built v185 a funeral monument. v62

As for the younger brother ṑakhyi, he hosts v186 the funeral repast.

As for the elder brother šakhyi, he goes (/ ?went) v188 with an army [of] about three thousand three hundred [men].

[He] goes (/ went) v191 to [his] castle (/ encampment) Pyinba.

“If there is no lord as (lit. of/ who is) the patron (lit. father) of the country, v192 the outer nomads and the vassals will, one by one, turn/ run away (and leave). v193 If the rain as (lit. of/ who is) the patron of the inhabited places (dog) v194 does not come [in time], seeds and ?insects v195 will one by one decay”, v196 thus [he/ ?they] spoke. v197

[He] crossed v197 the pass of the Menpa chain.

[He] passed through v198 the long gorge of Tiŋsparb.

[He] came v199 to Bachos Guŋdan.

When [he] came v200 to Myanṛo Šampo, the hundred men [of the] Loṇjam [clan], having sheltered v201 their heads with pots, [nevertheless] run (/ ?jumped) v202 into death.

The hundred women [of the] Loṇjam [clan], having pressed v203 large iron pans against their breasts, were [nevertheless] disgraced (/ ?were scared shitless). v204

[He] overthrew v205 Myanṛo Šampo.

The bipeds [he] took v206 as prisoners, the quadrupeds [he] confiscated v207 as [his/ the state’s] livestock, v73 and went v208 [back] to Bachos Guŋdan.
[He] sang the following song [of triumph]. <74>

“ḥabañi-ñepañid. In every <75> bird (?)man) <76> the tip of the lance. <77> In every hare the tip <78> of the boot. 57; The thigh has been hit/ slapped. <79>

The royal corpse has been disposed off. v211 Wode [?:Holde Guŋrgyal] is [the] true [ruler/ deity] (/ The pit is no more). v212 <80> Spude [?:Spu(l)de Guŋrgyal] is [the] true [ruler] (/ The spu (?=man/ ?=spur) is no more” v213 <81> thus sang (lit. spoke) [he]. v214

[He] went again (back) to Pyiŋba Stagrtse.

v215 [He] went [there] as the lord of the local patrons.

[Thus:] “[In] the country, the outer nomads and the vassals will not turn away. v216 Because the water as the patron of the inhabited places has come, v217 seeds and insects will not decay.” v218 Such sang (lit. spoke) v220 [he] that song.

[As] if a hearth were to be established below v221 iron ore from high above and came as the lord.

When he was engendered: v223 Spude Guŋrgyal; when he died: v224 Graŋmo Gnam Bseňbrtsig. <84> [He] came as the lord for the black-headed bipeds, and as the assistance for the maned quadrupeds.

NOTES TO THE TRANSLATION

<1> btsanpo.

The title or attribute is usually related to the adjective btsanpo ‘strong, mighty, powerful, violent’ and to a class of spirits, the btsan, which are taken to be ‘violent’ or ‘powerful’. Some traditions (particularly also those of Western Tibet) have btsadpo instead of btsanpo, some only for individual names. This alternation indicates that we deal here with a derivation from an open verb root, like in the case of ltanmo ~ ltadmo ‘spectacle, show’ related to lta, bltas, blta, ltos ‘look at’ (see Francke & Simon 1929: 120-121 and Simon 1977 for many more examples). The root in question is ṭsha. While the corresponding inagentive verb I: *ḥtsha, II: *tshas ‘be born’ is reflected only in nominal derivations such as butsha ‘son’, also in names as X-tsha ‘son of the X-clan’, tshabo ‘grandson, nephew’, or tshas ‘woman in labour’ (tsha-s ‘garden’ might be equally related as a place where plants grow up), the agentive-causative counterpart is I/III: btsaḥ, II/IV: btsas ‘bear, bring forth’. Note also btsazug ‘labour pains’ (JĀK), which clearly shows that this is, in fact, exclusively a female task.

The derivation btsa-n or btsa-d most probably refers to the product, the child(ren), and if, as I think, the suffixes could indicate plurality or collectivity, the expression refers primarily to a group of siblings from the same mother (for
other examples of the suffixes -d and -n as collective markers, cf. also Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4, § 2.4.3, notes on smin-(drug), spun, (ma)smad, (pha)spad, and spud). With the derivative morphemes -po and -mo, a specific son or daughter would be singled out of the collective. Literally then, btsanpo or btsanmo could be translated as ‘(immediately) co-gnate son’ or ‘daughter’. As second syllable in names, -btsan most probably had exactly the same function as its intransitive sibling -tsha (and in at least in the former case, the preceding name should have ideally been the mother’s name).

In the context of the princelings of early Tibet, who were not in the least as powerful or even terrifying as their historical counterparts or as their later construction as supernatural beings might suggest, I would think, that the attribute btsanpo merely indicates that the person in question was, in fact, brought forth from, or belonging to, the ruling lineage. Rulers who do not bear this attribute, might then be suspect to be outsiders or usurpers.

As Dotson (2009: 119, n. 294) remarks with respect to the princesses mentioned in the Annals, “all those ladies referred to as btsan-mo — that is, excluding in-marrying foreign princesses — appear to be sisters of the reigning emperor.” That means that in this context, at least, btsanmo can be translated as ‘lady of same birth’, and most probably, or at least ideally, as ‘having the same mother’ as the legitimate heir. Similarly, in the case of the Tibetan emperors, the title btsanpo most probably only means that the person is (accepted as) an offspring of the heir-bearing mother (cf. Richardson 1998b [1988], according to whom Hodsrung’s main problem in being accepted as btsanpo was that he was not a child of Glan Darma’s wife). This would be just another indication for the important role of the heir-bearing wife and her family (cf. also Dotson 2004 for the role of her male relatives). Giving an incoming princess the title btsanmo, would likewise indicate that she is at least presumed to be of same birth as the ruler or the heir apparent of her home country or that she is of legitimate birth, and in any case equal to the legitimate heir in Tibet. Cf. also Uebach (1997), according to whom a btsanmo was primarily a daughter of the ruling btsanpo, a position she has since given up (p.c.).

<2> mar.

As a reference to a particular place, it is not unlikely that the Žanžuñ-ian meaning ‘golden’ had been intended and not the CT meaning ‘red’ for which the spelling would be dmar-. For the respective colour terms cf. also Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.1.
Contrary to the preceding translations, Hill (2006a: 89f, n. 4) insists on a present tense reading, explaining this as follows:

The three verbs ṛṅgil ‘crumble,’ tshig ‘burn,’ and skams ‘dry’ appear to be present stems. They are here unexpectedly negated with ma rather than mi. Bacot et al. translate these passages with the passé composé (1940: 123), and Haarh with a present perfect (1969: 402). To me present makes better sense. If these events had taken place very far in the past the nurse would already know about them. Additionally, to ask about them in the past implies some expectation on part of the nurse that they are likely, whereas a present simply asks about their current condition.

This is unfortunately not the only misleading note on Tibetan, cf. particularly also Hill (2006a: 95, n. 27), where he declassifies an absolutely common construction: verb plus {kyay} as “odd”.

skams is clearly not a ‘present’ stem, but quite evidently (an old) stem II of the adjectival I: skam, II: skams ‘get, be dry’. The derived nominal adjective skampo ‘dry’ indicates that the final -s did not belong to the root, and that we are, in fact, dealing with two verb stems. Stem II can have a resultative or present perfect function (present result of a past event), notably in the case of adjectivals. The question how far away in the past the event took place is not crucial for the use of stem II, particularly not when used with the function of a present perfect. Stem I, by contrast, may denote the inchoative meaning of adjectivals: get X (cf. Zeisler 2004: 450). ṛṅgil and tshig are verbs with no (apparent) stem alternation, although the form ṛṅiltam points to an inherent -d suffix as a potential stem II morpheme. In the case of verbs without stem alternation, the negation markers ma and mi (OT myi) help to locate the event or rather non-event on the time axis, ma usually indicating a past or anterior situation, and apart from its use with verbal nouns or in prohibitions and similar modal contexts, never referring to ongoing or future situations (the use of the negation markers is described in some detail in Zeisler 2004, part II, sections 2.4, 3.3.3 (towards the end), 3.3.4, 3.6.4, 3.6.5, and 3.7.1).

Presumably not all native speakers of American English would follow Hill’s argument above, and even if so, the somewhat particular restrictions for the use of a present perfect in English cannot be the measure for its use in other languages. In German as well as in French the present perfect or passé composé makes perfect sense in this context: the nurse is asking about a present state resulting from an event that necessarily took place or started before the speech act. As all three events imply a transition, it would be rather strange to ask about them in the sim-
ple or progressive present tense. It may be further noted that apart from English, present perfect constructions may compete with present tense constructions in so far as they can describe the ongoing result of an already past (in itself bounded) beginning of an unbounded state or activity (e.g., Ancient Greek ἔστηκα ‘I stand/am standing’ = ‘I have stood up’, πέφρικα ‘I stare/am staring’ = ‘I have started staring’). With expressions such as γαλ σον ‘[I] am tired (JÄK) = ‘[I] have become tired’, Tibetan behaves rather like Ancient Greek (Zeisler 2004: 102, with further references for Ancient Greek, section II.3.5.3. for the perfect function of stem II in OT and CT, sections II.4.2.5, II.5.2.5, and III.3.8.2 for the perfect constructions in the modern varieties).

<4> chu dgum, sri dgum.

It seems to be a common poetic or rhetorical means in Old Tibetan to divide up a compound and duplicate the predication (R.A. Stein 1962: 216), cf. also the division of dmaḥmtho in clauses v176 and v177 (II. 47f.), and of damtshig in clauses v178 and v179 (I. 48). A similar example, but without predication, is the division of phatshan in clause v37 (I. 8). Bacot & Toussaint translate the phrase as ‘pour tuer les humeurs et les Sri’. Haarh renders it as ‘because there is water-death, and there is sri-death’. Similarly Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 79, n. 127) interpret this phrase as the having died (šiba) in the water or under a knife (they apparently take sri as a mystical Bonpo expression for gri). All three overlook that the form dgum, first of all belongs to a transitive verb ‘kill’, and secondly, that it is stem III, the so-called future stem, which has a patient-oriented gerundive function with a strong obligational character, hence referring to the ‘(item) to be killed’ (cf. Zeisler 2004: ).

Gñaḥgonj Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 21, n. 1) rejects this interpretation (… don yinpar bkralpa yodkya: ‘it has been explained as …, but’, not “I explain that this means…” as rendered by Hill 2006: 90, n. 6). According to him, chusri may be an old variant (brdarñi) of chabsrid ‘dominion, rulership’. If the meaning were thus not (a prediction) that the sovereignty would decay (ḥdir chabsrid šamsdamssu ḡyur ḡrobaḥi don mayinnam), the phrase should otherwise refer to hindrances and annihilation caused by evil spirits (gdongyis bgegbar chad-byed-pahi don). Quite interestingly, in legal contexts, the verb ḡ gum(s), bkum, dgum, khum ‘kill’ or at least its stem III can have a quite different meaning: ‘carry out, perform appropriately’ (Dotson forthcoming, p. 79, n. 10 with further references). Although some doubts remain with respect to the equation of chusri and chabsrid, not so much because of the missing final -d, but rather because chab is a honorific variant of chu and we should not expect a non-honorific variant for ‘dominion’, I should think that Gñaḥgonj Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan’s first interpretation comes
closest to the intended meaning. The phrase, however, is not a prediction but rather a directive or wish. The name is given in view of a (misperceived) impending crisis and should have empowered the ruler to steer through this crisis. Of course, this name is only an attempt in retrospect to etymologise an unknown name.

<5> Drigum.

Disregarding the fundamental intransitive vs. transitive-causative distinction of Tibetan verbs, Macdonald suggests the meaning ‘tué par les démons’. The compound in question should have been *Dribkum. The same objection holds against the standard interpretation of Grigum as ‘killed by/ through a knife’. The grammatically only possible interpretation would be either ‘the Dri who died/ vanished’, Dri being the undergoer, or ‘having died because of the Dri’ (or ‘because of/ through a knife’), Dri (or knife) being the cause, not the agent of the event. See the end of note 84 for a theoretically possible interpretation of this name.

<6> noŋste.

Bacot & Toussaint translate this likewise as ‘ce fut une faute’, Haarh more freely as ‘was ominous’. Hill chose the possible meaning ‘regret’, but then, given the close connection between two events indicated by the lhagbcas morpheme {ste}, which does not easily support a ‘subject’ switch without contextual support, the ‘subject’ of regretting should also have been the ‘subject’ of entering Drigum’s mind in the following clause, which would not make much sense.

It should be noted, however, that the verb noŋs also means ‘be dead’. In this connection it might not be irrelevant that according to a minor Tibetan tradition, Drigum (or Grigum) was the ruler’s posthumous name (Khyuŋpo Blogros Rgyalmtshan, 81.4, as cited by Linnenborn 2004: 80 with n. 115, and Ñaŋral Ñima Ḥodzer, Metog sñiŋpo, A 240.3; I.1, T. 116.2.2, as cited ibid. p. 81 with n. 118).

<7> myiḥi myitshulte.

With Hill (2006a: 90, n. 8) I follow Bacot & Toussaint, since it is more probable that the emperor, styled a descendant of the gods, is not like other human beings, than that he is (as suggested by Haarh). The word tshul is normally a noun. The lhagbcas morpheme {ste} may well combine with nouns, especially when introducing an enumeration, but in our case the resulting meaning ‘the human manner of man’ would be extremely infelicitous with the enumeration of super-human faculties. Therefore, the syllable myi can only be interpreted as a negation morpheme and not as the word ‘man’ for the story to make sense. But because nega-
tion markers only combine with verbs, tshul must function here as a verb, with the extremely rare case frame absolutive – genitive (14b). Note the similar use of the genitive with the modal verb rigs ‘be suitable, proper, necessary’: mismrabahi mirigsso ‘it is not right not to say [anything]’ (JÅK sub rigs, rigspa vb).

<8> btsan.

Bacot & Toussaint avoid an exact translation. Haarh and Hill take btsan to be the agent, the former keeping the word untranslated, the latter taking it as a short form of btsanpo. Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 129) interpret btsan as an adverb of manner: btsanśedkyis ‘by intimidation’ (cf. TETT; and possibly not “with imperial authority” as Hill 2006: 91, n. 10 renders this phrase). Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 21, n. 4) suggests to read btsan and the following verb as a collocation with the meaning ‘compete with respect to bravery’ (dpahritsa dgrang). This is a possibility, I do not want to rule out completely, but according to the context of the story, the competition is what Drigum intends to do, but not what he is already doing before or when challenging his vassals. Macdonald renders the phrase very freely as ‘sur de sa force’. All translations thus take btsan as noun, either meaning ‘emperor’ or ‘force’. In all these cases (except Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan’s collocation), a case marker would be missing, either for marking the agent or to derive an adverbial phrase.

btsan is certainly not related to the above root √btsa, but a non-derived adjective, and thus basically a verb ‘be mighty, powerful, violent, strong, etc.’. It cannot refer to the ruler’s legitimising attribute btsanpo, mainly because the individuating derivational morpheme -po is missing. Like the following two words this verb describes the uncontrolled behaviour of Drigum. Since Drigum is already the implicit subject or topic of the preceding clauses, there is also no need for an explicit mentioning, either under his name or under his attribute. The use of stem I (or its neutral equivalent) in its non-finite function, binds correlated or like events closer together and suspends the sequential order as suggested by the linear presentation, giving thus the impression of simultaneity (cf. Zeisler 2004: 355-357). Such constructions are actually instances of cross-clausal group inflection, since the morpheme of the last verb in the row extends over the preceding verb(s).

<9> yabḥbañ pha dguḥdany / yunḥbañ tshan gsum.

Here, again, a compound or, perhaps more likely, two compounds: phatshan and matshan ‘paternal’ and ‘maternal relative’, are split up (cf. also Hill 2006a: 91, n.11, who chooses an interpretation in terms of only one compound: phatshan). Somewhat against the text, Bacot & Toussaint decide for a different distribution:
'neuf sujets de son père et trois cousins de sa mère'. Most probably, the numerals are not to be taken literally.

<10> druj-phod.

Cf. Bacot & Toussaint, who translate this clause as indirect speech: ‘s’ils oseraient … le traire en yak’. The word *druj* is not attested as verb or adjectival, but only as noun or postposition. Haarh’s translation ‘Are we equal in prudence to the Yak?’ (p. 402), based on the adjective *druoppo* ‘prudent’, does not really fit the context (are yaks really wise animals?). Nor does it fit the grammar of the verb *phod₂* ‘come up to, be nearly equal in worth to’, which requires a locational (ladon) marker (cf. JĀK). Wang & Bsodnams Skyid 1992: 34 emend *g.yogdu* for *g.yagdu*, which apparently is intended to yield the meaning ‘dare you to fight [us] in front of the servants (as witnesses)?’, but is completely against the syntax (the postposition should take the form *g.yoggi-druj* and should precede *dgraru rgal-phod*). Hill (2006a: 91, n. 12) suggests a similar inversion: “I wonder however if it could be odd syntax for *g.yagdu druj dgraru rgal-phoddam*?” (transliteration adjusted). An alternative interpretation of *druj* as an archaic form of *ruj* ‘be fit, suitable’ (for a possible alternation *rV* ~ *ḥdrV*, cf. Sprigg 1970: 16-17, Hill 2005) is ruled out by the subsequent modal verb *phod₁* ‘dare, be able’.

Dotson (2009: 114, n. 268) renders the whole passage not very literally as ‘who dares serve as an enemy and take the role of the yak’. It is certainly possible that the one who is intended to take the role of enemy and yak is the vassal, although I would have thought that Drigum in his folly assigned the two roles to himself. My translation keeps the (intended?) ambiguity. It is, however, not without some circularly that Dotson arrives at his interpretation. He suggests “that the Btsan-po’s relationship with the yak may be described as one of ritual combat”. “This sentiment” would also be “apparent” in the present case. A similar idea is followed by Hazod (2000: 219), who argues that the “condition of the sacral power of the ruler” would be “measured in terms of equality” with the “paternal yak”, which would constitute an “image for the stability of the throne”. A weak Grigum would have been compelled “to call his equivalence in question in the course of a royal hunt”. I am unable to identify any hidden reference to a royal hunt in this passage. Nor does the subsequent showdown have any resemblance with a hunting scene. As for the notion of ‘equivalence’, this is based solely on Haarh’s wilful interpretation, but not on a close reading of the text.
According to Hill (2006a: 91, n. 14), this has to be “read” as ral gri. There is no need for an emendation. The CT clusters velar plus alveolar trill are regularly palatalised in various Amdo dialects (cf., e.g., Roerich 1958: 21-23). As the form ralgyi and the names Šakhyi and őakyi indicate, this feature is of great age. Such forms also demonstrate the great influence of East Tibetan speakers in the Tibetan administration. Some words, such as Balti and Shamskat Ladakhi /raγi/ ~ /raγi/ ‘sword’, were borrowed even into West Tibetan. In BRGY sub skadgsarbcad, the ‘New Language Instruction’, we find the following remark:

ḥbriklog mibdeba bi brdarɲi hγaŋhziγgi zur dorte kloγhdon bdebaγi yigskad gtanla phabpa dperna dadrag dorbaŋγ myeŋa hγyo ʒespa meŋa hγro ʒespa zoryaŋdu btaŋba ltaγu l

‘Some ancient spellings, inconvenient for writing and reading, were cast aside and a more conveniently ‘recitable’ written language was imposed, for example the dadrag was discarded and spellings such as mye (‘fire’) and hγyo (‘go’) were simplified to me and hγro.’

In this clause, the RECIPIENT-argument, Loŋam, is omitted, but somewhat earlier, in clause v46 (l. 11), the RECIPIENT-argument is explicitly mentioned as bdagla ‘to me’ (the speaker is Loŋam), marked, as expected, with the dative-locative case. In our annotation we thus assigned the standard frame 09a for verbs of transfer, where the RECIPIENT is in the dative-locative case, and did not refer to a possible alternative frame as first observed by Uray (1966: 50). I overlooked the following passages much further down, ll. 200, 221f., 223, 229, 265f., 385f., and 415f. where, as elsewhere in the annals, the RECIPIENT-argument remains in the absolute (our pattern 35).

ḥuŋnas l btsanpo Slonbtsangiyis l Rtsaŋ-Bod khyim ɲiγri l Zutse globa ɲebahi byadgaŋ γrstalo l

‘Then, the imperial scion Slonbstan bestowed Zutse the 20.000 households of Rtsaŋ-Bod as reward for [his] loyalty.’ (l. 200)

slalbo ni l Lhe-Rŋegs stsal l ... gsabgsob ni Lho-Rŋegs stsal l

‘As for the sla and the ?belly fur,a Lhe (=Lho) and Rŋegs were bestowed with. … As for the gsab and the ?feather cloak, b Lho and Rŋegs were bestowed with.’ (ll. 221f., 223 Zutse’s song of complaint)
In his song, Zutse complains that although it was him who conquered land for the emperor, the Lho and Rjęgs were given the reward. In the corresponding simile Zutse had hunted down a tiger of Monka and a white-breasted vulture or white-tailed eagle (thangphrom ni rgod) of Yastod and handed over the best parts (guŋbkros ‘select parts of the tiger’ — not the ‘killed tiger’ as Baco et al., 1940: 140 and Uray 1972: 21 suggest, emending bkros to bkrons — and rgodgšog ‘the wings of the raptor’) to the emperor, but the Lho and Rjęgs were then given certain valuable items processed from these parts as reward. Baco et al. (1940: 140), reading slalvo (with wazur), have taken the compound as being identical with slabo ~ zlabo ‘assistant, friend’ and the names of Los and Ręģes as titles given to the ‘helpers’. In the context of hunting, however, one should expect parts of the animal being redistributed. This is what happens in the song of Sadmarkar (ll. 415f., see below). In that song, a yak has been killed and its lbo and šog have been given to the Ša and the Spug as a reward. As there are always two persons to be rewarded, it could be expected that two different items are handed over, but it is also possible that the two persons received the same items. Thus the compounds may or may not be dvandva compounds. In any case, we are dealing here with various hapax legomena, specialised terms of hunting, butchering, and/or processing.

Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 83, n. 223), reading slalvo (with wazur) interpret the compound as ‘lungs and intestines’. The identification of lvo as ‘intestines’ is given also in TETT with Btsanlha as source. Admittedly, here and in l. 416, where, in the song of Sadmarkar, the same word forms part of another compound: lbošog (see also below), the labial is rather small and lacking the top bar, quite in contrast to other occurrences of the cluster lb- in other documents (see epigraphic notes and illustrations). Given the fact, however, that a wazur implies a rounded semi-vowel (cf. Laufer 1898: 307, 1899: 95-96) and thus, apart from representations of Indian loan words, does not occur with rounded vowels but alternatively to the rounded vowel u, as in rwa ~ ru ‘horn’ or grwa ~ gru ‘corner’, we should not expect here a combination with the wazur, except the word is actually a loan [**-lu] (from Chinese?).

‘Lungs and intestines’ could hardly have been a reward to get envious, and the interpretation would also not really fit to the suggested meaning of the second reward, the ‘feather cloak’ (gsabgsob). If, like in this latter case, the compound should not designate two separate items, but only one (handed over to each person), one could think of another textile with twists or braids (sla for sle; perhaps a particular weaving technique) combined with the tiger fur. As Matisoff (2003: index, p. 599) indicates, there might have been a proto-Tibeto-Burman word *s-la ‘trouser’. But in both cases, the order of the compound elements should be inverted. The same holds if we would emend sla to slag for slagpa ‘fur coat’. Uray offers the meaning ‘thin’ for sla-, disregarding, however, the fact that this meaning is associated mainly with liquids (in the case of slabo and slamo) rather than with solid things, for which phramo might be more suitable.

The ZhNN dictionaries are of little help. sla is given with the meaning ‘earth’ in ZhNN and ZhEH (in the latter only in combination with gži) and as ‘moon’ in ZhEH. A derived form of this word, slas, is listed in both dictionaries with the meaning ‘earth’, in ZhNN additionally with the meaning ‘thigh’. The latter meaning is attributed to the form slid in ZhEH. One might conclude that sla could perhaps have had the meaning ‘thigh’ as well. But are tiger thighs of any value? I would have expected claws instead.

lbo might be related to sho ‘the upper part of the belly’. This is not a very common sound change, but the verb sbos ‘swell’ is, in fact, pronounced /lbs/ in a few Lower Ladakhi dialects, otherwise /šbos/ in Balti or /rb/o/ in Leh and Nubri, and as /kwal, /rul, /rul, /bul, or /we/ in various Amdo varieties. The Balti form as well as the first of the Amdo forms would suggest a classical correspondence *dbos (cf. CDTD). If we allow the same correspondence here, we would get dbo, for which only JAK gives ‘the belly side of the
fur’. This solution is also suggested by Uray (1972: 21, n. 34; reading lbo) without any explanation for this choice. While BRGY indicates that the spellings dbo and sbo are variants in the case of dbo being a lunar constellation, TETT also gives the meaning ‘high’ for sbo, which does not seem to fit. See also the further discussion in the context of the song of Sadmarkar below.

Siberian tigers, generally having a fuller fur than other tigers, have considerably longer hair at the belly (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tiger). This may not hold, however, for the Southern Tibetan (Mon) tiger, but in general the hair at the belly, and particularly between the legs appears somewhat longer and perhaps softer, as judged from some photographs. Since there should be some relation between the lbo of a tiger and that of a yak, I should think, that the word refers to some longer hair at the belly side. If the reading ‘thigh’ for sla would be correct, the compound might perhaps refer to the softest part of the fur, at the junctions of belly and thighs.

While gsab as a verb means ‘fill, stuff’, gsob, which is obviously related, has also the connotation of something ‘fake, put around oneself or stuffed out’ (cf. TETT). The compound could thus well refer to a stuffed animal, but if two different parts are meant, one could think of the skin as the outer shell, and the bones, meat, and intestines as the stuff inside. But the problem with this interpretation is that only the wings not the whole body were handed over to the ruler. According to Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 83, n. 226), the meaning of the compound would be something like a feather cloak (sputhullu; cf. the entry for sputhul in TETT, where it is described as a kind of winter cloak with long hairs). Such a cloak could well correspond to the above definition of gsob alone. Uray (1972: 21 with n. 35) translates gsabgsob as ‘payment’, taking gsab as an echo form of the verb gsob with the not all-too-common derived meaning ‘return, repay’ (as this is based on the meaning ‘heal (one’s debts)’, it is also not clear whether it would be applicable in the context of giving a reward). I cannot avoid the feeling that here as above and below we are dealing with some kind of textile insignia.

At the end of this song, one can further find an apparently incomplete sentence:

\[
dbupyiŋ ni grobola / thama ni g.yagis bskord / Zutse ni stsellags-kraŋ\]

‘As for the ?granaries [of] ?Central Phyiŋ, their environment (lit. rim) is surrounded with yaks/ As for the head-felt [that is, a kind of cap worn (only) by the ruler],\(^b\) it [is] dappled/ of reddish grey and as for [its] brim, it is edged with ?(precious) fur/ is surrounded ?with yak [applications].\(^d\) As for Zutse, should he not be bestowed [something/ ?the ruler’s hat]?\(^e\) (l. 229)

\(^a\) Apparently an OT variant of CT gray, a kind of question marking auxiliary.

\(^b\) Bacot & al. (1940: 141) and Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 83, n. 234) take the phrase dbupyŋ grobo as a place name. According to the latter, Dbu-Pyiŋ would refer to Phyiŋa Stagrtse of the Central Horn (Dburuh Phyiŋa Stagrtse), a quite problematic reading, since the division into horns can hardly have existed at the time of Gnamri Slonmtshan, to whom Zutse complains. They further interpret the word grobo, which is usually listed with the meaning ‘reddish grey’ or ‘dappled’ as baŋmdzod ‘granary’. This is most probably based on the word gro ‘wheat’, but seems to be an ad hoc solution. A further problem with this interpretation is that the case marker la at the end of the first line cannot really be accounted for. The relation between the granaries and their envi-
The word should have been expressed by a relational (genitive) marker. R.A. Stein (1962: 119) thinks of a ‘beginning’, but cannot make sense of the rest of the line.

c One could think of a high rising conical cap as worn by Saka nobles. Such caps had applications of gold foil or (gilded) wooden animals, cf. particularly Samašev (2007: 166, fig. 9; there were also simpler caps as, e.g. represented in Molodin & Polos’mak 2007: 144, figs. 10.11), but one could equally think of applications out of felt or other materials. A coin of the Parthian ruler Sinatruces (ca. 77-70 BCE) shows the ruler wearing a tiara or helmet ‘surrounded’ by stags “in acknowledgment of the help he received from the nomadic Sacaraucae (Sakas) in his successful struggle for the throne” (Lerner 2009: 86 with fig. 6 on p. 85).

d The reading ‘(precious) fur’ would be in need of an emendation g.yaŋ (or rather g.yaŋlug or g.yaŋzi) for g.ya(g). I am, of course, not very happy with this ad hoc solution, but a cap or any other headdress could hardly be surrounded by real yaks. Yak hair or fur also does not seem to be a suitable material. I do not really think that the text refers to yaks as decoration, but this might perhaps be the best alternative solution. The first part of this translation corresponds roughly to Uray’s (1972: 22) suggestion: ‘Though at first the felt is gray (= raw?)’, which is then continued by ‘at last it is rolled by the yaks’, supposing that skor ‘surround, encircle’ could be synonymous to sgril ‘roll up’. This is quite impossible, even more so because Uray’s interpretation of dbupyiŋ as ordinary ‘felt’ overlooks the honorifying element dbu, by which the felt should belong to the ruler — and should be related to the ruler’s head (honorifying elements are always chosen in relation to an appropriate body part; ordinary felt in the possession of the ruler would most probably have been ‘p(h)yaqp(h)yiŋ). Actually, Zutse seems to be asking for nothing less than the crown of the ruler. This would also explain, why Gnamri appears to be quite embarrassed and looks for one of the Lho or Rŋegs to give an adequate reply. As the situation is tense, they prefer to remain silent.

As the case may be, despite the problems mentioned, both, Uray’s and my reading would at least have the benefit that the sentence would no longer lack an item to be granted: the empty argument in the third line would refer back to the ‘felt’ or ‘head-felt’ of the first line.

e Bacot & al. (1940: 141) as well as Uray (1972: 22) take Zutse to be the actor, but they apparently overlook the honorific character of the verb stsal, which implies that something is bestowed by a high-ranking person upon a person of low(er) status. lag is likewise the honorific form for the future tense auxiliary yin, ideally following a verbal noun (the mere stem might have been used here metri causa). Zutse’s own act of giving is accordingly rendered more modestly as phyagtu phul ‘offered into the hand [of the ruler]’. R.A. Stein (1962: 219) mistakes kran for greŋ and translates, quite against the syntax (adverbs or converses cannot follow the verb that they are supposed to modify): ‘Debout, Sutse fut gratifié’.

… butsha gaŋ ruŋba gchig || gsergyi yige myichadpar staلدpar bkaḥ l stsalto ||
‘… decreed that … whichever son it might be, [he] would be bestowed the golden insignia unremittingly.’ (ll. 265f.)
Among the subjects, [the men of the thousand districts of] Dorte, Pyugtshams, and Stehdzom were bestowed ‘tiger tops’ as insignia of bravery. (ll. 385f.)

As for the horns and intestines/ sinews [of the slain yak], Ldoŋ and Toŋ were bestowed with. As for the flesh and skin, Lhe (i.e., Lho) and Rŋegs were bestowed with. As for the floating belly hair (the belly hair like wings), Ša and Spug were bestowed with.’ (ll. 415f., song of Sadmarkar)

Bacot & al. (1940: 156) translate this as ‘la fibre des cornes’, but I am not sure I understand what they mean by this. One could have expected that the text starts with bones and sinews, but the first should be rus and the latter, like fibres, should be rgyud. Another possible translation would be ‘horns and sinews’, as suggested by R.A. Stein (1961: 25), Macdonald (1971: 266), and Uray (1972: 24), with the same problem concerning the second part. Finally, one could think of ‘horns and intestines’ (ru plus rgyu(ma) plus collective marker -s). The interpretation depends somewhat on the question whether any of the parts given away is perceived of having value. In the context of hunting, it is to be expected that the participants get some valuable reward. In the case of meat and skin, the second gift, the value is beyond doubt, and so possibly also the first and the third gift could be of value. Most probably the value is increasing.

Cf. also R.A. Stein (1961: 25), Macdonald (1971: 266), and Uray (1972: 25). None of them remarks upon the uncommon form lko. In a similar context, in the Tragedy of the Horse and Yak, IOL Tib J 0731, ll. 116 and 118, Thomas (1957: 27) likewise translates lgo and lko with ‘skin’; and in this case there cannot be much doubt as this item is (to be) cut into pieces (dreste (!), dros). It seems, then, that lko is related to koba ‘leather’. The Žanžun word rko, however, is typically paraphrased as lus ‘body’ or gzugs ‘outer form’ (cf. ZhEH and ZhNN). While Hoffmann (1972: 197) points to the fact that rko is at least one time also equated with lpo ‘skin, ZhNN sub rkopug manthun ‘meat offering’ also shows an association with Ša (manthun). Lko might well have been a dialectal variant of rko, and the compound šako could perhaps have been a translational compound, simply meaning ‘meat’. That the skin was not given away to the Lho and Rŋegs would make sense if lbošog would refer to the fur and not just to the hairs of the yak as suggested in the translation by Hummel (1994: 169). If so, then perhaps other compounds might be translational compounds, as well.

Bacot & Toussaint (Bacot & al. 1940: 156) translate šasko (!) as ‘viande sèche’ in opposition to šaspug, which they see as ‘viande cuite’ (p. 157) or, as they specify in their note 1, as ‘viande fraîche’, but see below.

For the element lbo see also above. šog is most probably the clipped form of šogpa ‘wing, fin’ or ‘bundle, group’. Uray (1972: 25) thinks that the notion of ‘wing’ or ‘feather’ ‘in the present case, obviously denotes the long hair hanging on the sides of the yak’. I would thus think that we deal here with a karmadhāraya compound since it seems unlikely that the hair and the fur were given, if the skin (which is part of the fur) was al-
ready given to another party. Apart from the long hair, there is no specific belly hair that could have been shaved off from the skin. The down wool or khulu grows over the whole body, and is usually combed out, not shaved.

Otherwise, if one takes belly to be the meaning of the first element, šog should be taken as being related to the verb gšog 'split, break open, rend, tear', and thus the translation should be 'parts of the belly'. Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 87, n. 337) interpret lvošog (written with wazur) as hbroṣṇus 'bone(s) of the wild yak', but it is by no means clear how they arrive at their solution, particularly in view of their interpretation of lvo as 'intestines' in Zutse’s song above. Most probably the bones are not the most valuable parts to share with the helpers of a hunt.

Bacot & al. (1940: 157) translate šaspug as ‘viande cuite’ or ‘fraîche’, but as Uray (1972: 14ff.) already explained, they miss the parallelism of the clauses. Ša and Spug are infrequently mentioned clan names (ibid.). Spug, in addition, can be analysed as Spu-gu, ‘offspring, man of the Spu clan’ (see note 34 below). Most probably it is identical with the form Spu(s) that we also find in the name of one of the most important ministers, Khyunpo Spuṣsad Zutse or in the name of the Žaṣu chief Sñaṣur Spuṣsrye (for the not infrequent exchange of oral and nasal stops, cf. Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.3 and Beckwith 2006 for a similar feature in Chinese; see also notes 13, 14, and 35).

Given all these occurrences, one has to differentiate between stsol, stsal(d), with the ordinary meaning ‘give, confer to s.o. (hon; private setting)’, following the standard frame of transfer verbs (09a), and stsol, stsal(d)2 with the particular meaning of ‘bestow s.o. insignia, rewards (official setting)’ with double absolutive as the standard frame (35).

Tibetan case marking can serve pragmatic purposes. There is some evidence for the ‘unexpected’ use of the dative-locative marker for definite and specific PATIENTS in case of special emphasis (Tournadre 1994: 645, Zeisler 2006: 73-80). Conversely then, the ‘unexpected’ non-use of a dative-locative marker may indicate quite the opposite of emphasis: casualness and unspecific RECEIVERS, which are depersonalised, replaceable, and thus, as mentioned in the introduction, rather PATIENT-like.

<13> dbuḥḥbreg zaṭyag.

The first element would suggest a reading as ‘head-ribbon’. Haarh and Hill leave this and the following item untranslated. Bacot & Toussaint render it as ‘courroie de chef’, Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 131), suggest the readings helmet (rmog) or dmathag. Similarly, Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 8) explains this as a helmet made out of leather and copper (kodan zaṣlas bgyispahi rmog), a support for the dgralha (war-god) to which is added a (set of) helmet ribbon(s) (rmogdang bcaspaḥi dgralaḥi rten), or simply as a head ornament, that is, an ornament for the crown of the head consisting of a helmet (dburgyan rmogdang bcaspaḥi gtsugrgyan).
As there is some evidence for an interchange of oral and nasal stops, *dbuḥ* might be taken as a dialectal variant of *dmu ~ rmu*, designating a particular tribe, deity or demon, or the realm of the heaven (cf. R.A. Stein 1941: 226-230, Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.3 for some interesting oral and nasal doublets, as well as Beckwith 2006: 187 for similar sound changes in Chinese, cf. also notes 12 (c), 14, and 35). Other mythological narrations have Drigum accidentally cut the *dmuthag*, a rope that allows the defunct to ascend to heaven (as a matter of course, it is fastened to the head) and thus he is the first king whose body remains on earth after death, and the first king to be buried. It seems thus not to be too far fetched to assume, that the ribbon, which Drigum cuts according to the request of Loŋam, is exactly the crucial connection to the heaven. Compare the quite parallel form *rmuhbraŋ zaṣyag* in Mhaspa Ldeḥu (ed. 1987: 234). Here, the item in question belongs to the magic tools given to the primordial king before his descent to earth. Linnenborn (2004: 320), overlooking the mostly quatro-syllabic structure of the items given (di-syllabic name plus disyllabic attribute), renders this single NP with two individual NPs belonging to separate sentences: ‘rmu- rope’ and ‘good copper tools’. While such an interpretation might not be totally impossible in the enumeration of gifts, in our context *zaṣj(s)yag* is clearly an attribute of *dbuḥḥbpren*.

Jim Valby (TETT) lists the variant without intermediate - *s*- as a “fabulous numerical figure”. Similarly BRGY takes it as a kind of number. According to Dan Martin (TETT) the variant with intermediate - *s*- would be identical, referring to “a specific high number”. But he further refers to the word *bzayag*, for which he gives the definition: = *zaṣyag = byuruday rtsernon*, taken from “Karmay, Treasury”. As all these expressions would usually occur with the *dmuthag*, he (that is, Karmay) suggests a translation as ‘the red cord of *dmu* (?)’ or ‘a sharply pointed coral (?)’.

The word seems to be of Žaŋžuŋ origin. In ZhEH we find it in the form *zaṣyag* with the meaning ‘coral’. As for the notion of a magic rope or string made of gems or a rope with special colours, this is, in fact, a not uncommon motive in Tibetan as well as in Indian folk or fairy tales (e.g., in the tale of Prince Norbzaŋ in the Khams version published by Magret Causemann, *Füchse des Morgens*, Eugen Diedrichs Verlag 1986, the fisher boy catches a fairy with a lasso made of gems; in the jātaka of Prince Asadisa, we hear of a bowstring that looks like a coral, Else Lüders, *Buddhistische Märchen*, Eugen Diedrichs Verlag 1961, Ro- wohlt 1991).

For the element *zaŋ* alone, Dan Martin (TETT), referring to Btsanlha, gives the definition *rkyaŋpaham sgribpa medpa* ‘bare or without defilement/obstruction’ (cf. also BRGY for *zaŋma*). This meaning also shows up in the compound *zaŋthal* ‘unobstructed’, ‘(all)-penetrating’, and ‘transparent’ (BRGY, TETT, cf. also JÄK
sub *zay*, where he refers to I.J. Schmidt’s entry *zaythaldu* ‘penetrating’). For a magic connection between sky and earth an attribute indicating the ability of ‘passing through without obstacles’, more specifically passing through *rocks and walls* (as in one of the examples of BRGY) might be quite suitable.

The single elements would suggest a reading such as ‘head-ladder’, qualified as having nine *sten* ‘?holders’ or perhaps something equal to *rim* ‘steps’. Bacot & Toussaint suggest the meaning ‘gorgerin’ (part of the armour or helmet that covers the throat), anachronistically reading *ske* for *skas*. This is followed by Gñañgon Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 9). Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 132) come to a similar conclusion, suggesting ‘breath or life protection, armour’ (*dbugsskyob* | *srogskyob* | *khrab*) or *dmuskas*.

It might be simply a kind of auspicious insignia or ornament. Most probably again a reference to the *dmuthag* (the rope that allows ascend to heaven) or, in mythical duplication, a reference to a similar tool, which is likewise made useless by turning it upside down. Cf. again the parallel form *rmuskas rimdgu* in Mkhaspa Ldeñ (ed. 1987: 234), listed among the gifts for the primordial king immediately before the above *rmuhbray zaysysag*.

It appears as if the ladder was mainly thought to be used for the descent to earth, while the rope would be used for the final ascent to heaven. A reference to the combined use can be found in a Bonpo text:

```
dmuthag gnamñas drañsbas ḡezgsskas bsan žiy /

‘In relation to the *dmuthag* that hung down (lit. was drawn up) from the sky, the ladder to climb up was good (i.e. the ladder was better than the rope)’ (Šarndza Bkrañis Rgyalmtshan *Legsbšad rinpocheñi gtermdzod*, p. 225, as cited by Linnenborn 2004: 196 with n. 264).
```

Concerning the interpretation of the elements *dbu* as *dmu*, Tucci (1955: 200) makes a similar suggestion for the word *dburmog* ‘helmet’, but he bases himself merely on his preconception concerning the mythical character of the early kings. He rejects the notion of military power connected with a helmet. One could, however, conversely argue that due to the sound alternations the notions of a *dmuhphreyj/-thag* and a *dmuskas* were only secondarily mystified as heavenly items and were originally derived from some more prosaic military tool or emblem attached to the helmet.

The word *dmu* or *rmu* also refers to an early tribe or clan. In this connection, it is interesting to note that among Xianbi tribes, the word *murong*, referring to a
certain headgear is also used as a designation for particular clans. In this case it may also appear in its shortened form *Mu*. The word for the headgear, again, is considered to be related, via another tribal name, to a proto-Mongolic word for shaman (Molè 1970: 68, n. 5).

\(<15\> \text{rbala (rv}- \sim \text{rya-).}\)

See also epigraphic notes and illustrations \(\Theta\; \text{rva} \sim \text{rya}\). Bacot \& al. (1940: 98, l. 1), Haarh (1969: 403), as well as the original TDD/OTDO version (cf. Imaeda \& al. 2007) represent the word as \text{rbal}, Wang \& Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 35) as \text{sbal}. The latter suggest an interpretation as ‘joined one behind each other’ (p. 80, n. 133). Without any comment, Bacot \& Toussaint as well as Haarh translate the word correctly as ‘horn’. In the newest version of OTDO (as accessed I/2010), the word is given as “rva la” (and all subscripted labials have been changed from “w” to “v”).

The superscripted consonant looks somewhat like the superscripted \(-s\)- in \linebreak \text{stendgu} just one line above (l. 15) and in \text{ḥtabste} just one line below (l. 17), but it lacks the small left lower diagonal stroke of the \(-s\)-. At a closer look, one will further realise that there is too much space between the initial cluster and the following \text{la}, enough to insert a syllable separating \text{tsheg}. The final right stroke of the apparent superscript \(-sa\) ends up exactly where one would expect a \text{tsheg} and the accurate eye can, in fact, perceive a \text{tsheg} at this point. The stroke apparently resulted from moving the pen too hastily from the base of the letter to the \text{tsheg} (a similar joining stroke, although much weaker, can be seen in the final \(-r\) of the first and the subscript \(-y\)- of the second element of \text{gsergyi} of the same line). Hill (2006a: 92, n. 16) gives a very condensed summary of this description as if due to his own insight. As mentioned by Hill, the honour for first representing the text (almost) correctly as \(\overset{55}{\\text{s}}\) might go to Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 17). Unfortunately, the latter does not comment his decision.

\(<16\> \text{glaŋpo bgryahla.}\)

Haarh analyses the additional locational argument (oxen) as the primary location and the locational argument (horn) as a manner adverb, translating this passage as ‘fastened two hundred spearheads like horns upon one hundred oxen’, which is somewhat against the grammar (one would have expected locative-purposive case marking in this case) as well as against the intended meaning (the expression would have made sense only if the oxen were hornless).
The clause is somewhat difficult to analyse. The problem does not get easier in view of the possible alternations in the argument structure of the verb ḥthab, ḥthabs. The fighting might be represented symmetrically as a collective activity (A and B fight) with only one collective argument in the absolutive (our pattern 01). One could expect three asymmetric constructions giving different weight to the PRIMARY ACTOR and the CO-ACTOR; the latter being viewed either as standing in CONTACT, or as a TARGET or PATIENT. 05: the primary actor is in the absolutive, the contacted CO-ACTOR has a comitative marker (A fights with B; cf. JÄK); 07: the PRIMARY ACTOR has an ergative marker, the CO-ACTOR as the TARGET a dative-locative marker (A fights against B); 08: the PRIMARY ACTOR has an ergative marker, the CO-ACTOR as a PATIENT is in the absolutive (A fights B, cf. BRGY, mostly for inanimate items). According to the classification thadadpa ’with difference’ or roughly ’transitive’ in BRGY, the PRIMARY ACTOR should have an ergative marker in all constructions, including that with the comitative for the CO-ACTOR (this would yield our pattern 19), which is rather unlikely.

The whirling up of ashes in the following clause indicates that the oxen with their spears and their sacks of ashes must have got into close contact with each other. This seems to rule out some human agency for the fighting in the present clause. Bacot & Toussaint, followed by Hill, prefer thus an interpretation where the oxen fight against or among each other. Hill (2006a: 92, n. 17) argues that the further context, where Loŋam is said to attack among the haze, does not really support the idea that Loŋam (and/or the emperor) should be the agent of the fighting, but he admits that his solution “may not be philologically justified”. According to Haarh, the oxen simply fight. Seen from a technical side, it is not absolutely necessary that the oxen fight each other in order to get the sacks of ashes torn by their lances. The same could happen, if they simply get somewhat to close to each other by being driven together or in a stampede. This even more so, if the ashes were not loaded upon the oxen in sacks, but simply ‘put’ upon their back, as Haarh translates (however, the little quantity of ashes that could be deposited so, might not yield the necessary haze).

One might think of an interpretation where the implicit agent Loŋam drives the oxen ‘inside’, i.e., into the forest or — since this evidently goes against the documented meaning of the verb ḥthab — where the oxen ‘get driven’, ‘get entangled’, or ‘huddle together inside’, assuming an etymological relation (intransitive or inagentive vs. causative) between ḥthab and ḥdebs ‘drive’, lost in CT. In that case, we should assume only a frame with the first argument in the absolutive (possibly 03a). But then again, the absolutive of the noun naŋ ‘inside’ could not be accounted for. Since postpositions can be realised as compounds, by which trans-
formation their case marker is dropped, the best solution seems to be to take glanəŋ ‘among the oxen’ as such compound, constituting a location adjunct, not an argument of the verb. The missing co-actors must then be Loŋjam and the emperor.

It would be quite infelicitous to state that the oxen fought among the oxen by using the full NP two times or by even dropping the first NP (cf. the corresponding sentences in English; nobody would ever assume that ‘they’ in a sentence like ‘they fought among the oxen’ refers to exactly the same oxen). Furthermore, the deletion of an agent argument is much better motivated when it continues a preceding agent, which by virtue of being human is also high on the animacy or empathy hierarchy, than when it continues an argument that although being animate, takes the role of a location (here for the ashes). That the empty argument actually refers to two different previous agents should not be a hindrance. On the contrary, this could be expected in the case of a collective reading. The fact that Loŋjam attacks the emperor in the resulting haze is also not really a contradiction to a previous statement that Loŋjam and the emperor fought, or perhaps rather started to fight, among the oxen. Nevertheless, there seems to be a passage lacking, describing how, and why exactly, the ashes got scattered.

While following the translation of Bacot & Toussaint, this seems to be also the linguistically most feasible interpretation. Fieldwork in Ladakh has shown that there is a strong preference to link up an empty argument with the PATIENT argument of the preceding clause. We do also have examples for the somewhat unexpected AGENT — PATIENT cross-reference relation in contexts of employment and assistance.

Nevertheless, from the perspective of Tibetan prehistory and mythology, monkeys seem to have played an essential role for the self-definition of particular ethnic groups, assuming the role of totems or ancestor-deities (cf. Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.2). One could, therefore, think that Loŋjam pulled out the monkey from the bosom of god Ldebla Guŋrgyal as a representation of the latter’s soul or magical power, and that this deprivation caused the latter’s disappearance. According to the later Tibetan tradition, Drigum lost his paternal protective deity (pholha) by putting a (dead) monkey on his right shoulder (cf. Linnenborn 2004: 205-208), but this might have been a distortion of the original mythical relations due to different religious affiliations. Could not the pholha Ldebla Guŋrgyal have manifested himself in the form of a monkey? In this case, Loŋjam could have drawn the monkey-god from the shoulder of the king and thrown it into the glacier. But with such an interpretation, the Tibetan sentence
would not be well-formed and the repeated mentioning of the deity and the switch between the deity and the monkey would be at least as irritating as in the following English translation:

?? ‘As for the emperor Drigum, [the ancestral monkey-deity] Ldebla Guₜrgyal tried to pull him up to heaven, but Loₜam drew the monkey (=Ldebla Guₜrgyal) from [Drigum’s] shoulder (lit. armpit), and cast Ldebla Guₜrgyal (=the monkey) into the womb of the glacier Titse.’

An even more annoying problem lies in the fact that according to the text, the duel took place near the Kailash in Myaŋro Šampo, the seat of the Loₜam. This region has been identified with Naŋ (/ Myaŋ) in Rkoŋpo (north of the Rtsaŋpo) and with the more western Myaŋ (/ Naŋ), south of the Rtsaŋpo, not far from Mt. Yarla Šampo. The latter identification has much more likelihood than the former, not only because of the shared place name element Šampo, but also because, according to the text, v197-v202 (ll. 53-54), Myaŋro Šampo is located only a few marshes from the castle Pyiŋba Stagrtse in Yar, apparently on the same side of the Rtsaŋpo. But even in this case, one wonders why Mt. Titse, that is, the Western Tibetan Mt. Kailash is mentioned here — and whether Drigum would have really been sent down the river all the way till Rkoŋpo where he is claimed to be buried. The preceding translators apparently do not see any problem. But even if the episode refers to a fight between supernatural forces, which are certainly not limited to the small radius of human activities, it does not seem plausible that the fight should be connected with some cosmic event distant by about 1000 km. Furthermore, even if the monkey should be a supernatural entity, the text explicitly states that Drigum dies there (at Titse) as well. This evidence cannot be brushed away as easily as Richardson (1998c [1989]: 125) does:

it is unlikely that it was so far in the west. Later tradition sees the site as being in the valley of the Nyang-chu near Gyantse; while the pandit Nain Singh of the Indian Survey found a similar story current near the Dang-ra G.yu-mtsho, [...] but many indications point to the valley of the Rkong-po Nyang-chu.

One could think of several solutions. First of all, as place names are transferable and multiplicable, Myaŋro Šampo is not necessarily identical with one of the historical Myaŋ/ Naŋ regions. Similarly, the not very telling appellation Titse could apply to more than one mountain, as we can observe in the case of the mountains bearing the name element Kailash or Mustagh: in all cases, we are
dealing simply with glaciers or ‘Ice Summits’. The question could then be, which prominent mountain might be the appropriate candidate?

Lake Yarḥbrog G.yumtsho has Mt. “Gangbzang” or “Gangwa Zangpo” as her consort, his name being understood as “Complete Good”. He is described as “a crystal tent piercing the sky” (http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Academy/1605/geography.html). The name might well have been ‘Good Glacier’ Ganbzan(s), suitable as translation for a Ti(t)se and suitable for identification with the other Ti(t)se, far away. Near the lake, one can also find Mt. Yarlha Šampo (one of the alternative candidates for the descent of the first king, accordingly the dynasty’s soul mountain). As a glacier, this mountain could well have borne the name element Ti(t)se. This would mean, however, that speakers of a Western Himalayan language had settled in this area before the arrival of Tibetan speaking tribes.

Nevertheless, the reference to Mt. Kailash should perhaps be taken more serious, particularly since it occurs in connection with a deity. In much later times, the itinerary of Stagtsan Raspa (ca. 1600-1645) mentions a Myaŋpo Rdzon, near Dulchu gompa at the Sutlej in the vicinity of Mt. Tise (Tucci 1971: 385, 406 with note 3). It is, of course, impossible to decide which of the many Myaŋ place names refer to original settlements of the tribe in question or would have been transferred at much later times with the spread or translocation of (parts of) the tribe.

Further to the east, but arguably still within the mythological reaches of Kailash-Tise, namely as the immediate neighbour of Žaŋžuŋ, we can find, according to the Catalogue of the Ancient Principalities, P.t.1286, ll. 7.f., the White Moiety (pyed.kar in P.t.1286, var. phyeddkar in Dpaḥbo Gtsuglag) of Myaŋro in Rtsaŋ, the ruler of which is described somewhat enigmatically as ‘the lord: [called] the Tocharian, from the rulers of Rtsaŋ’ (rje Rtsaŋrjeхи Thod.kar), while according to ll. 9f. an obviously legitimate ruler Loŋam Byibro(m).cha (=tsha?) (var. Loŋam Rdzihbrom) would reign in Šampo of Myaŋro (var. ṉaŋro Šampo; cf. R.A. Stein 1961: 9, n. 25, Haarh 1969: 241).

According to Bacot & al. (1940: 83), a tribal name appearing as a princely name would be quite surprising. But the name might be a family, rather than a personal name. Apart from this, the designation Thod(dkar) appears also in the name of Gšenrab Mibo’s father in the Gzermyig. The presence of people in Western Tibet and Western Central Tibet with family ties to the Oxus region and Bactria is not all too surprising. The communication from the Upper Oxus into the area of the ancient Upper Indus (i.e. the Gilgit river) seems to have been quite easy. From there, one could relatively easily reach Western Tibet via Purik and Ladakh. Whether such people were still Tocharians, in the strict sense, or merely kept the memory of a former affiliation in their clan or family names, is another question.

The modification of the ruler’s name with a possessor construction including his title appears somewhat unmotivated. It gives the impression as if in an original version more names might have been given or that the name was meant to be exemplary. One might
have expected a rendering parallel to the first entry, l. 7: Žaŋžuṅ Darpaṅi rjobo Lig Sñašur / ‘The lord of the Darpa of Žaŋžuṅ, Lig Sñašur’, but most of the following entries show the same structure: rje Gnubṣrje Srispa (l. 9), rje Skyirṣrje Rmaṅpo (l. 10), rje Dbyerṣrje Mḵarṣṇa (l. 12), rje Holrṣrje Žinbraṅṣṭsha (l. 13), rje Ryegṣrje Labraṅ (l. 14), rje Draŋṣrje Rṅolnaṅ (l. 16), rje Ṛṅgrṣrje Dkarpo (ll. 16f.), rje Mchimsrje Neṅu (l. 20). Based on these parallel constructions, it is possible to locate the White Moiety of Myaṅro in Rtsaṅ.

Macdonald (1971: 224, n. 137) thinks that a Myaṅ in western Central Tibet (Rtsaṅ) could well match with the description of Šakhyi’s campaign (v197-v199), although she is not able to identify any of these places. One of the most important Tibetan sources for this location is Dpaṅbo Gtsuglag (Karmay 1989: 535, n. 44). If the designation Šampo is derived from an original gšam ‘lower part’, as the OT phrase might suggest, this could point to an original political unity of the two moieties or a migration of one of the two moieties.

Karmay (1989: 535), like Richardson an adherent of the Ṛṅgoṅpo theory, thinks that the Rtsaṅ theory is solely due to a “great geographical confusion in later works between, on the one hand, Myang in Tsang […] and, on the other, Nyang or Nyangpo, adjacent to Kongpo”. The ‘great confusion’ may, however, result from an intentional con-fusion or blending of different mythologies into one.

That Western Tibet might have been the original place of the conflict is indirectly indicated by the Bkaḥchems kakholsma, a phyidar text of Western Tibetan origin, of course!, and in Šņal ųima Ḫodzer’s Metog sñiṅpo (which might thus partly depend on the Bkaḥchems kakholsma). It is not impossible that the authors were inspired by the Old Tibetan designation Titse to re-locate the narrative near their own Tise, but curiously the mountain name is not mentioned in their version. On the other hand, the narrative differs considerably from the Old Tibetan version, so that it might well have been an independent, although perhaps not indigenous, tradition appropriated by the Yarluṅs ‘historians’.

Grigum had been on a military campaign in Kashmir. On the way back, the officers arranged an arrow competition, during which a dispute arose between Grigum and a certain Masaṅ (Bkaḥchems, a Lokham in the Stog version Bkaḥthems [!] kakholsma, an unnamed minister in Metog) concerning the question who did the masterly shot. A commoner (ḥbaṅs) Liṅam (Bkaḥchems) var. Oṅam and Loṅam (Metog) then took side with the minister (or) Masaṅ.

In all three versions, the animals involved in the fight are water buffalos: mahe in Metog and Bkaḥthems, chuṅiṅaṅgĭ badmar gılanḍmar in Bkaḥchems, that is, bovine staying in water, and since this is not a common behaviour of ordinary bovines, these must be water buffalos (cf. also the descriptive name chur Ḫdres ‘mixed into the water’ in BRGY and TETT). Linnenborn (2004: 203) takes this phrase literally. Accordingly, the ashes would have whirled up over the water, where her ‘cows and oxen’ still stay during the battle, but since this would not
have had the desired effect, it is quite clear that \textit{chuḥinaŋgi} cannot be but a defining attribute. (The phrase is actually an ellipsis for something like \textit{chuhi-nayla yodpaḥi}; similar ellipsis have also been observed in Ladakhi, e.g. \textit{/tshaseaŋni mendok/} ‘flowers in the garden’ for \textit{/tshaseaŋna yotkhani mendok/} ‘flowers that are in the garden’.) The apparent colour term \textit{dmar} could be equally misleading, as a \textit{glaŋdmar} refers to a stallion ox (Jim Valby, TETT). \textit{dmar} could also be a remnant of \textit{migdmar}, another designation of the water buffalo (BRGY). The phrase \textit{badmar glaŋdmar}, either for \textit{baglaŋ dmar(po)} ‘red, hot bulls’ or for \textit{baglaŋ migdmar} ‘red-eyed cattle’ = water buffalos, reappears in Mkhaspa Ldehu, ed. 1987: 245, where it seems to refer to ordinary cattle. Cf. Linnenborn (2004: 199-206) for a synopsis of the four passages. In none of these versions do we find golden lance tops affixed to the horns. Apparently, the original intention got lost, turning this motive of OTC into a blind one.

Neither in Central nor in Western Tibet do we find water buffalos. It does not seem likely that the western tradition simply turned cattle into water buffalos, due to some prestigious influence, since ordinary cattle is common to Western Tibet as much as to her neighbours and to Atiśa’s homeland, hence the narreme should have its roots in the distribution area of water buffalos. Unfortunately, I am not aware of whether water buffalos live in the south-eastern provinces of Tibet. They definitely do so in Assam, China, Vietnam, and Thailand. But the fact that only the Western Tibetan tradition speaks of buffalos and that these have been turned into ordinary cattle in the ‘official’ version speaks against a borrowing from these regions. Water buffalos are also common in Nepal, Kashmir, and, of course, India, whence the narreme might have been borrowed (possibly via the former two regions).

If we have to choose between the likelihood of an ‘original’ Žaŋžuŋ-Indian tradition or of one of the Žaŋžuŋ languages being originally spoken as far east as Yarlũs, my preference would clearly be in favour of a borrowed narreme. Tales, and their segments (motifs or narremes), are even more mobile than nomadic populations. At least one thing should be clear: according to OTC, the event did not take place in Rkoŋpo, since Drigum’s sons could not have been expelled from Rkoŋpo to Rkoŋpo.

The Western Tibetan narrative could be a mere projection from the early 8\textsuperscript{th} century, when Tibet extended its rule up to Kabul. But if based on older local traditions, it might allow to link the Drigum episode with the mid 6\textsuperscript{th} century (or earlier) Bhauṭṭa incursions into Kashmir, as reported in the Kashmirian chronicle \textit{Rājataranginī} (i, 313; M.A. Stein 1900 (1961) I, introduction, p. 78, §76; cf. also Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4, §1.4.3). In that case, Drigum could by no means have been a ruler of Yarlũs, but must have been a ruler in Žaŋžuŋ. As OTC
seems to hint at, Spude Guñrgyal might have first usurped the rule in Žañžuŋ before extending his dominion to Central Tibet.

<19> gšegsso.

As an euphemism and combined with dgujdu ‘to heaven’, this verb typically indicates that a high-ranking person died. This usage is, of course, related to the belief that the first kings returned to heaven upon dying. In this case, however, the god as a representative of the afterworld, that is, the realm of the dead, would literally go to his own sphere of existence. He could thus hardly have died, but must have (temporarily) lost his power and then simply disappeared.

<20> zañṣ(-) brgyaḥ ~ zañṣ(-) brgyahma, v68. l. 20 and v114, l. 33.

Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 136) suggest reading sgam ‘box’ for brgyah(ma). The expression seems to be a hapax legomenon. While Macdonald renders this extremely freely as ‘plusieurs cercueils’, the translations have ‘hundred copper vessels’ in both instances, Bacot & Toussaint and Haarh omitting khasprod, Hill translating it as ‘closed’. One might wonder, then, whether the corpse was cut up in hundred pieces, and each part put separately in a small pot (but the latter could be expected to be a zañṣbu), or whether the whole body was encased in a giant matrushka. Whence should all the copper come?

Both interpretations are impossible already on linguistic grounds, because according to the standard word order within complex NPs, the numeral would be misplaced before a further adjective (here khasprod). Like other quantifiers, such as the totalisers kun or tshagsma, the collective marker dag, and the limiting quantifier {cig}, and like definite pronouns, numerals (possibly in combination with the latter two items) always take the last position of the nominal group, to which then conjunctions or case markers may be joined. Furthermore, in clause v114 (l. 33) below, the derivative morpheme -ma would only allow for an ordinal number ‘hundredth’ or for an expression of size.

The numeral might have been part of a compound, indicating the volume of the vessel with respect to a — at that time — well-known and thus omissible measurement, a suggestion by Helga Uebach. This is definitely a more preferable reading, and such big vessel could, if not swim, still move slowly downstream with the bed load of a river. Nevertheless, I would have expected an inverted order, *brgyahzãngs, to get the reading ‘hundred-unit vessel’ (cf. also the discussion of compound structure in note 46 below). One would further not be able to explain the use of the derivative morpheme -ma in clause v114 (l. 33). The same objections would hold against a reading ‘wide vessel’, where the modifying element
rgya, like in the case of the ‘wide lake, ocean’ rgyamtsho and many other such compounds should precede its head.

The non-use of the derivative morpheme -ma in the present clause also prevents the interpretation of brgyaḥma simply as a non-documented derived adjective ‘wide’ (actually, one would expect a derivation morpheme -po or -mo).

One could perhaps think of *brgyama as designating a vessel ‘having hundred [units]’, and hence one could think of a zaṅskyi *brgyama ‘a hundred-unit-vessel out of copper’. As a compound, however, this could only be *zaṅsbrgya and not *zaṅsbrgyama, since derivative suffixes belonging to only one of the elements get clipped. In any case, *brgyama ‘hundred-unit-vessel’ is completely conjectural, and one might further wonder whether such big vessels would not have been made of copper anyway, so that this specification would have been dispensable.

As we see, the derivation suffix -ma and its alternating use and non-use pose some problems. The suffix would be necessary for a derived adjective, such as brgyama ‘wide’ and it should be dropped if the adjective or any other derivation form part of a compound. It is, however, possible that compounds are combined with derivative suffixes, which then operate on the whole compound. The suffix -ma can have the meaning ‘having, be supplied with’, cf., e.g., zaṅs rūzbollahama ‘pot with for horns (i.e. handles)’ or the expression lcagslugma below. This morpheme is superfluous and may well be dropped when the compound itself is an exocentric or bahuvrīhi compound, expressing that something or someone not explicitly mentioned is supplied with the entity mentioned by the compound: the name Rotkäppchen (Little Red Riding Hood), e.g., does not refer to a red hood, but to a girl who is wearing it. In our case, the entity in question must then be something that can characterise a vessel. In correspondence with the expression rūzbollahima, one could perhaps think of a vessel that has one hundred zaṅs, or perhaps has the size of hundred vessels. To my taste, this interpretation appears more than strained.

Helga Uebach, however, also pointed to the expression, lcagslugma ‘having iron handles’ for the massive books that can only be moved with the help of the said handles. Except for the fact that in this case the head noun, namely the particular book title, should always be specified, a compound zaṅsbrgya(ma) would have an identical structure, which can be analysed as material & functional item (& derivation suffix -ma ‘with’). According to a purely Tibetan reading, the material might be copper (zaṅs), but the functional item (brgya) poses some problem. It does not seem to be likely that the item in question is simply the numeral hundred, as this would be much too unspecific and, as shown above, the notion of ‘hundred units’ should be ruled out. Despite the fact that all other possible items should not appear with a pre-radical (seals, nets or any abbreviated Chinese or Indian item), the most likely candidate might then be a seal (or several seals), particularly also
because in later times, graves were sealed off. Cf. also rgyama ‘a sealed paper, document’ (JÄK), lit. ‘having a seal (imprint)’. According to Helga Uebach this latter expression does not simply refer to sealed documents, but particularly to ‘forbidden’ books bearing a seal imprint. To my understanding, then, we might deal here with two rather big vessels (possibly, but not necessarily of copper) joined at the opening (khasprod) and bearing imprints of seals at this joint, in order to either prevent an unauthorised opening or to prevent (the soul of) the deceased to escape. The imprints could have been made into copper plaques, perhaps one should think of an engraving in the shape of a seal (imprint).

Later tradition speaks of iron nails, with which the copper vessel is closed:

\[zaŋskyi \text{ ga}\text{ḥur spur bcug lcags}\text{gzer btabs l} \] (Dpaḥbo Gtsuglag, cited after Haarh 1969: 144, Linnenborn 2004: 157 with n. 65)

‘Into a copper reliquary the corpse was put, iron nails were driven in.’

There is also mention of one hundred sticks (nails?) which have to be hit on, or driven into, the corpse (or perhaps rather removed?) as recompense for the bird-eyed girl:

\[pha \text{ nare rje}\text{ḥi spurla tshargyis lcag brgya thampa brdegtu chug zerbal}\text{a khas blaŋste l} \] (Mkhaspa Ldeu, ed. 1987: 247)

‘Upon the father’s speech: “Let a full hundred [of] sticks be successively (tshargyis) hit onto the corpse!” [Narlaskyes] promised this and ….’

\[ma \text{ nare sridkyi bu yoṅbalti-thabhssu spur dela mtshargyid brgyadbcu ḥdebhssu chug zernas} \] (Dpaḥbo Gtsuglag, cited after Haarh 1969: 145)

‘The mother having said: “Together with the coming [back of] a/ the son of the ruling lineage let one hundred ?magic\text{"} sticks and eighty vermillion lines be driven into that corpse!”’...

\[^a\] Possibly erroneous for the above tshargyis ‘by series’; the error might have been triggered by the following mtshalgyi. The meaning must have been distorted in more than one point, since the relation between one hundred sticks on the one hand, and only eighty lines, on the other, is not very intuitive.

The Žanžuŋ word for ‘iron’ or metal in general is zaŋs (ZhEH). A reading ‘iron’ instead of ‘copper’ would also make more sense in the context of clause v221 (ll. 60f.), cf. note 83. However, the expression ‘having an iron-hundred’ is as infelicitous as ‘having a copper-hundred’, as it does not really specify what item we are dealing with. It is interesting that in the above mentioned examples
we either have iron nails without a numeral or hundred sticks without indication of the material. It would appear that the Chronicle fused two different traditions, one that talked of iron nails, and one that talked of hundred sticks. The iron nails of the later tradition were apparently used for the same purpose as the implements in the Chronicle, namely to close (or seal off) the vessel, into which Drigum was put. The hundred sticks, on the other hand, appear in quite a different context, and it remains unclear to what purpose sticks (much bigger than nails) should be hit upon, or driven into, a corpse, and why this could be an adequate recompense for a human sacrifice. Perhaps the authors of the later tradition chose the slightly variant spelling lcag, because they could neither make sense of lcagsbrgya as equivalent to an original zangsbrgya ‘having an iron-hundred’.

In Ŋanral Ŋima Ḥodzer’s Metog sînpo we find the expression brgyalŋ (var. rgyalŋ) with the apparent meaning melon ‘mirror’ (Linnenborn 2004: 204, n.298). While the element -lon might indicate the shape of the mirror (or might perhaps correspond to an old proto-Tibeto-Burman word for ‘stone’, *r-luj, cf. Matison 2003, index, p. 669), the first element seems to describe either the colour (‘fire-like’ > ‘reddish’) or the material (‘fire-like’ > ‘shining’ > ‘bronze’), cf. also OTA I (IOL Tib J 0750, ll. 61, 110, 173) žugslon ‘mirror’ (here probably referring to documents; Dotson’s ‘fire raising [station]’, 2009: 674, 691, 709, is more than improbable; lon cannot have the meaning of ‘raise’, at best it could be the potentialis form of the intransitive verb lan ‘rise’ or of the transitive verb len ‘take’; a mirror could thus also be interpreted as ‘something that is able to take up fire, i.e., to reflect light’). It seems to me somewhat more likely that (b)rgya as a synonym to me- or žugs- ‘fire (-like)’ in the compound ‘mirror’ referred to some kind of metal than to the colour.

Helga Uebach further drew my attention to the compounds rgyagli ‘oboe’ and rgyasta, an ‘axe’ used in certain rituals, where rgya might likewise refer to the metal parts. But in both cases, and particularly also in the case of the mirror, rgya could also have the sense of ‘Chinese’, which could further refer to a certain type of ornament as in rgyalcags (lit. ‘Chinese Iron’) for rgyanag lcagsri ‘the Chinese Wall’, a kind of meander. If the original notion of our expression was something like a *zangs brgyalcags(ma) ‘a metal vessel with meander design’, the double occurrence of possibly synonymous words for ‘metal’ could have been quite confusing and could have led to a haplology (or -graphy) and a reinterpretation of the element rgya ‘Chinese’ as brgya ‘hundred’.

The problem with this last interpretation could be that the term rgyalcags might not be old enough or at least not significant enough to characterise a funeral vessel. Otherwise, I would prefer this interpretation, because it has the least mythological implications and could be explained by a common linguistic accident.
Looking for possible cultural parallels, Helga Uebach pointed to a recent article by v. Hinüber (2009), according to which, in India at the time of the historical Buddha and in the subsequent periods, the corpses of high-ranking persons could be kept for some time in iron vessels, filled with sesame oil. The main vessel was closed or covered with a smaller one. The main purpose seems to have been to prevent the body from decomposition while waiting for a politically more auspicious time for the cremation and the subsequent erection of a stūpa (such as the arrival of a heir, p. 54), although the resulting mess might not have been very appealing (p. 51). As for the building of a stūpa, it is stated in the Mahāparinibbānasuttanta by Buddha himself that only four classes of persons deserve this honour: a perfectly enlightened Buddha, a paccekabuddha, a disciple of a Buddha, and a cakkavattin (ibid.). The same might perhaps be applicable to the rather unusual temporary preservation of the corpse. There is, nevertheless, some evidence that also queens could undergo the same procedure and even have a stūpa built in their memory (p. 46, 51).

Such conservation techniques would not have been necessary in Tibet, and most probably it would have been also quite difficult to procure the necessary quantity of oil, and perhaps also of metal in early Tibet. But since this kind of burial was known from a Buddhist context and as suitable for a mahāpuruṣa and cakravartin, as which Tibetan emperors would understand themselves, it seems to be quite likely that the motive of temporary enshrining a corpse in a vessel, albeit only half-understood, was borrowed from Buddhist India.

<21> v67-v69.

The interpretation that the empty arguments actually refer to Loṇam is corroborated by the parallel episode, clauses v113-v115 (ll. 31-33), narrated by ṇarleskye’s mother: there Loṇam is the explicit agent of killing and, given the close connection between events indicated by the lhagbcas morpheme {ste}, which does not without further contextual clues support a subject switch, he is also the implicit agent of the following two actions.

<22> Chabgžug.

Most probably this is part of the place name. The meaning, as given in TETT would be something as a ‘bathing place (hon)’ or ‘bathing festival (hon)’ (possibly based on chabžugs, a monastic summer picnic). Karmay (1989: 535), however, reading chabgžub (!), renders this as ‘downstream’.
If the two persons in question were already bearing these names, as all previous translators accept, I would have expected a verbal noun (*btagspa*) but not the *lhagbcas* morpheme {*ste*}, which typically indicates that the event is closely connected with the following one and usually does not allow switching between different subjects without contextual support. Loŋam as an actor is mentioned some lines before as the one who causes the death of Ldebla Guŋrgyal and Drigum and indirectly also as the one who deposes Drigum’s corpse in the river. Except for Ldebla Guŋrgyal and possibly some co-acting monkey no other interfering actor is mentioned, which in all likelihood means, that no subject switch was intended here between the name-giving and the banishing (clauses v72 and v73). The latter act can certainly be associated with the agency of Loŋam. If, thus, Loŋam was the agent of the name-giving, this may imply two things:

One possibility is that the names given were thought to be non-auspicious and were literally understood by the author or compiler as ‘Stag-Dog’ and ‘Fish-Dog’. This would further imply that it was not generally known that the element *khyi* was an East Tibetan variant of *khri*, surfacing in so many regal names. The latter element, although unanimously translated as ‘throne’, seems to be related to the word *ḥkhrid* ‘lead’, and may thus correspond to the title of a ‘Duke’. Together with Byakhri, the ‘Bird-Leader’, known from later traditions, Šakhri, the ‘Stag-Leader’, and Šakhri, the ‘Fish-Leader’, represent the three realms of the world (Heaven, Middle-World, and Yonder-World, cf. also Haarh 1969, passim). The two orphans would certainly not have received such prestigious names from their foe. On the other hand, it also seems to be somewhat unlikely that Loŋam would have left them alive, if they had already been given such names (at birth or later). They would have been a constant thread to his usurpation.

The second possibility is, of course, that the contradictions: treating the slain foe as *cacravartin* (by putting him into the funeral vessel) and giving auspicious and highly prestigious names to the foe’s offspring, indicate that the whole episode was an invention, and, as it often happens in such cases, that it was fabricated without paying attention to consistency.

Although we are certainly not dealing with ‘real’ facts, it is noteworthy that according to the narrative, Loŋam does not attempt to cut off the progeny of Drigum. In the conflict between Rulaskyes and Rhya, narrated somewhat later, clauses v87-v89 (ll. 26 f.), the winner, Rhya, is said to do exactly that, although eventually one posthumous son, Ŋarleskyes, survives.
<24> bragg yahbo.

This is only one of several possible interpretations of a rather enigmatic passage. There are basically three options: g.yah or g.yahbo could either refer to the dogs or to the people who sent the dogs. In both cases the word could be interpreted as g.yahba ‘relative’ (BRGY) or perhaps rather ‘helper’ (cf. JÁK, GShS yado) or also as yapo ‘executioner’ (JÁK). However, the word order with the subject following a topicalised location seems to be utterly unmotivated, particularly because that location was not mentioned previously, whereas the apparent subjects in the focus position (either the dogs or the people who sent them) are given (previously mentioned), and should thus either be deleted or found in the topic slot (that is, in the beginning of the clause). I would likewise think that Haarh’s translation ‘Trembling [g.yahbo] they passed Hphaŋpoḥi brag (the rock at the narrow footpath)’ (transcription adjusted) is neither warranted by the word order nor by Tibetan grammar: As a non-finite verb form in a modal sub-clause, one would have expected either a verbal noun g.yahba or a converb g.yahnas, which should have preceded at least the location argument of the verb ‘to pass’. As an adverb modifying the verb ‘to pass’ the adjective should have taken the locative-purposive case marker.

While it is certainly possible that the sentence had been taken out of its context (where the word order might have been well-motivated) and was merely mounted to the preceding one, an interpretation in terms of ‘relative’, ‘helper’, ‘executioner’, or also ‘trembling’ appears to be rather forced, and it is more likely that the subject was deleted. The expression should be thus taken as a compound. Again there are several possibilities for the second element. g.yahbo could stand for g.yah ‘sign’ (GShS), g.yab ‘covert, shelter, overhang’ (cf. JÁK sub yabpa), or simply for g.yahma ‘slates’. In all these cases, the additional element -bo should perhaps be interpreted as a definiteness marker, as in West Tibetan. The marker could have been motivated if the whole expression referred to a then well-known place.

<25> pho for phoba.

All translations have ‘male’, leaving it however open to which of the previously mentioned dogs or persons this might refer. On the other hand, since we are dealing with some kind of oracle here, it is most likely that the stomach of a bird had been examined. This also fits with the description of the location (a narrow path among the rocks). Bird offering for prognostics is described by the Chinese sources Suishu and Beishi as being practised in prehistoric times (or up to the 7th century) in the ‘Women’s Dominion’ (Nüguo) or country of the ‘Gold Race’
(Suvarnagotra) apparently extended from Hunza through Ladakh into the Changthang and possibly up to Eastern Tibet, cf. Pelliot 1963: 694f; as well as Rockhill 1891 (2005): 339f. At New Year (at the winter solstice) a mountain fowl is killed, its stomach opened. If only gravel is found, the coming year will be bad, if grain is found, it is going to be prosperous. A reverberation of this technique might perhaps be found in the Chaŋraps, the ‘genealogy of the beer’, from the Ladakhi cycle of marriage songs: various birds are killed in search of the first grain; finally barley is found in the stomach of a pigeon and disseminated for the first time.

\(<26> v78 \text{ (or v81) to v86.}\)

Quite apparently, the clauses constitute a mounted citation. The narrative might have been part of a legal document, issued at much later times, bestowing a gratification for the assistance. This would explain not only the first person perspective, but also the use of the singular pronoun. Bacot & Toussaint put these words into the mouth of Loŋam ‘la caresse m’a tue’, Haarh and Hill interpret them as part of the omen. Haarh, however, interprets the second occurrence of the word rtardzi as referring to Loŋam, who then would have killed himself.

\(<27> \text{hungi-hogdu.}\)

The chronological ordering, suggested by the sequential marker ‘thereafter’, lit. ‘below that’, may well be a fiction. But the fiction of vertical order typically replaces a horizontal order, that is, events or persons belonging to different locations, whether contemporaneous or not, are transferred into a sequential order, mostly then an order of parentage. In our case, this would mean that the two events in question, far from being identical, happened, simultaneously or not, at two clearly distinct locations.

The principle of exchanging a horizontal with a vertical order seems to be inherited from Indian historiographers. Cf., e.g., the Indian section of the Debgtar sgonpo, where countless dynasties, ruling each in a different region, are associated with each other via a link of descend. For a western reader, this alleged genealogical order stretching over myriads of generations would be completely unbelievable. It would be less so if taken as an enumeration of places where comparatively few generations of rulers are listed (one still would have to eliminate a number of zeros). The same principle can be seen at work in the construction of spiritual lineages (Henk Blezer, p.c., for Bonpo lineages), and it is also visible, at least to me, in the reordering of the prehistoric ‘dynasties’ from a geographic or pseudo-geographic template: starting with the highest spheres (or the west)
downwards (or eastwards) towards the actual centre of dominion, into a pseudo-chronological order of successions.

As the sequential marker itself shows, the spatial notion of below suggests itself a temporal interpretation of sequence — at least for speakers in the habit of handling written texts. The replacement of a horizontal with a vertical order may well have been triggered by the substitution of an oral by a written tradition. The side effect of obtaining much longer genealogies may, nevertheless, have been most welcome.

<28> Rulaskyes.

Bacot & Toussaint translate this name as ‘né de la corne’, obviously influenced by the later Tibetan tradition of a boy being born as a lump of blood, which his mother deposits in a horn. Most probably this legend had been inspired by the name and not the name by the legend (cf. also Macdonald 1971: 225). One should bear in mind that the Tibetan rendering might well be an attempt to etymologise a name of foreign origin. Hill suggests the translation ‘a son of Bkrags, born into the family [of] divine sons’, assuming against Haarh (1969: 279ff.) that ru ‘military division’ or ‘horn’ can be taken to be identical with rus ‘lineage, family’ or ‘bone’. According to our discussions, he further thought that a finite verb is rather uncommon in Tibetan names, and in fact, one could have expected either a verbal noun: *Rula-skyespa or a compound: *Ruskyes. But the same objection should hold for the name Ṛarlaskyes, which Hill apparently has no problems to accept as name. He also does not mind that his proposed subordinated clause (born into a family...) is not closed by a nominalised or otherwise non-finite verb form. Given the fact that Old Tibetan names are not necessarily Tibetan names, and that names have their own logic or structures, the use of finite verbs forms in names (a topic yet to be researched) is not necessarily a violation of Tibetan grammar.

R.A. Stein (1959: 302: n. 22) has aptly pointed to the possible epic dimension of this name. In fact, in the later traditions, Rulaskyes, when born, bears all signs of a future Universal Ruler. This is, however, a blind motive, since Rulaskyes does not become ruler himself (except in one minor tradition, the Bkahchems kakholma, where (Hbrongi) Rulaskyes is Spude Guṇrgyal, cf. Linnenborn 2004: 127f.), but remains in a subaltern position, at best becoming minister. Such epic traits are completely missing in OTC, and the only indication of a special status may be seen in Rulaskyes’ title lhaḥi bu ‘son of the god(s)’. This is, however, a common attribute of nobility and not very telling. It would merely indicate that Rulaskyes is of royal blood. In the case of Rulaskyes, I do not see any link with the epic, but the narration concerning his ‘double’ (?) Ṛnarleskyes bears traits of epic folk-lore: the refugee-child deprived of his father, the quest for the truth, the
recovering of the ruler’s (father’s?) corpse, and possibly an act of revenge, here again ending in a blind motive, since Ňarleskyes does not become ruler himself and is usually not involved in the revenge. The motivation for integrating these narremes remains unclear, particularly in the later tradition. Only the author(s) of the Bkaḥchems kakhoma drew the obvious conclusion.

<29> Rhya, Rhya-.

A Žaŋžuŋ-ian dynastic name and/or title (cf. also OTC II. 399-433: Lig Myirhya, the last ruler of Žaŋžuŋ, and Rhyelig, a ruler or official in Nimobag mentioned in M.Tagh. c, iii, 0019, Thomas 1951: 293). It seems to be related to the Tibetan place names Rgya and as a title it seems to be related to the Tibetan verb rgyal ‘win’ and the corresponding title rgyalpo ‘king’ (cf. also Hummel 1994: 166, n. 14). Note that while final -l is pronounced in all Ladakhi varieties, in many (though not all) Ladakhi dialects, the word for king is /gyapo/, apparently going back to a form *rgyapo. The form rhya, on the other hand, might represent the first step of a sound change attested in Zanskar, where the cluster rgy- turned into /ɦj-/, thus /ɦjə-/ rgyalpo ‘king’. An early attestation of this sound change might be found in the word yalzugs of the OT contracts, being, according to BRGY and TETT, an old form of rgyalbtsugs. This word, however, is not listed, but we can find rgyalḥdzugs ‘bet’ (for the somewhat unexpected use of stem I for an activity instead of an agent, cf. the discussion in notes 54 and 55). In the contracts, the word yalzugs is used in the sense of ‘forfeiture or penalty [for breach of contract]’ (Takeuchi 1995: 143). The element -zugs could then be related to the inagentive verb zug, indicating here that the ‘stake’ or penalty is not paid in advance but establishes itself automatically in case of a breach.

It is interesting to see that while a Rhya is the antagonist of Rulaskyes, a man of the Rhyamo clan is instrumental in the murder of Loŋjam and thus loyal to Drigum. If Rhya and Rhyamo were related, this could indicate that Rhya as a vassal or ally of Drigum was first of all not antagonistic to Drigum and secondly not identical and not even related to Loŋjam. However, it does not follow with necessity that Rhya and Rhyamo are identical (as Macdonald suggests) or merely relatives, the similarity of the names might be rather accidental. Nor does the Rhyamo episode need to be related with the history of the Tibetan rulers. If one compares the contradictory accounts of the later traditions (cf. Linnenborn 2004: 198-206), it becomes quite evident that the figure of Loŋjam was merely built up as a scapegoat and has as much to do with the death of Drigum as the knife (gri) with the latter’s name. Loŋjam’s name might well have been chosen retroactively to give the massacre of the Loŋjam (and the usurpation of Loŋjam’s throne) a semblance of legitimacy.
That the later Tibetan historical tradition fused the two narrations or rather suppressed the Rulaskyes-Rhya episode (in order to redefine Rulaskyes as Drigum’s son) is by no means an indication for its identity with the Drigum-Loŋam episode, as Haarh (1969: 156) suggests and many authors still think possible (cf. Hazod 2009: 187; here identifying Rhya “with Rgya, a well-known lineage from Myang-stod (with the plain of Brgya-grong (SW of Sham-bu …) as one of the main settlements of the lineage …”).

It remains somewhat questionable whether this literal meaning is, in fact, the intended meaning. While the translation tries to do justice to the text, it appears to me as if some linguistic accident had happened when mounting this passage. Macdonald suggests to interpret the compound *phatshan* simply as ‘clan’, but then it would be even less comprehensible why the sentence is formulated in such a complicated way.

Cf. Hill (2006a: 93, n. 22). Dan Martin in TETT quotes Btshanla with the paraphrase *rgyunorda pʰyugszog thamscad hphrogpa* ‘the robbing of all material wealth and livestock’. Most probably Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 137) derived their definition *khyimnangyi dnospodaŋ norphyugs thamscad phrogste myerba l* ‘having forcefully taken away all cattle, property and wealth of within the household’ from the same source. These suggestions are certainly based on the context, but do not explain the phrase, which literally would mean ‘male year’, as proposed by Bacot & Toussaint (Bacot & al. 1940: 125, n. 4) and Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: p. 22, n. 11: *ḥbyunhgurgyi duslaŋ njugpa ḥdra* ‘like the time specification (lit. entry relating to the time) of a happening’). In his note, however, Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan reads *phola*, which he alternatively paraphrases as *phula* ‘in the upper part of a valley’ (the note is misplaced before note 12 on *dudsna* and is missing in the text, hence the difference in the numbering, noted by Hill 2006a on various occasions). An indication of a location after a verb would be against Tibetan syntax. The specification of a year only by the attributes ‘male’ or ‘female’ is impossible, and since the gender affixes seem to have been introduced together with the five elements for the 60-year cycle, their usage in a text of the 9th century or earlier (as in the source document) can likewise be ruled out.

One could think of a wrong segmentation instead of *pholo* or *phol.lo*. BRGY, BTSH, and TETT list *phol* only as an old word for ‘understand, perceive, be
aware’. ThDG, by contrast, lists this verb, for which he gives the stems I: ḥphol, II: phol, III: phol, IV: ḥphold, as ‘break through the difficulties of knowing’, but in his Tibetan paraphrase, the word is also given as being synonymous to rtol and ḥbigs, both meaning ‘pierce’ (it seems likely that the standard interpretation rtogs is due to an error in transmission for rtol). Haarh (1969: 453, n. 17) suggests a relation to dbol, ḥbol, and ḥbal. ḥbol and its stem IV ḥbol have the meaning ‘part, dress hair etc.’ (JĀK) or ‘pluck, card (wool)’ (BRGY). This can certainly be ruled out as can ḥbol- for ‘soft’ or ‘cushion’. DYGB gives a somewhat different meaning for ḥbal: ‘pluck out from the root’, which does not really correspond to what is done to the cattle.

The form phol could perhaps also constitute stem II of a hitherto unattested verb, with the ideal strong causative paradigm 1a (cf. Zeisler 2001: 188) I: *ḥbol or *ḥphol, II: phol (≪ *b-pol), III: dbol, IV: *phol, of which, strangely enough, only stem III would have survived. dbol is given in JĀK with the meaning rtol ‘pierce, perforate’, in SCD as ‘open the closure of a pond’, similarly in ThDG (the synonymous collocation rdziṅ rtol ‘pierce a pond’, i.e. ‘let the water flow out of a pond’ is attested also in present-day Ladakhi). In TETT the meaning is given as ‘extract, squeeze out’, and in BRGY the verb is described as an old expression for the verbs ‘make move, migrate’ (ḥphobar byedpar) and ‘pour out’ (gšo).

If the interpretation of BRGY is correct, one would see here an old causative derivation from the verb I: ḥpho, II: phos ‘change place, shift, migrate’, following the strong causative paradigm 1a, but with the help of an additional final -l. As this would be quite exceptional, one could think of an original suffix -d, which typically operates only on stem I, but might have been generalised for all stem forms (in order to disambiguate the meaning ‘make move’ from the meaning ‘pour out’). The merging of final -l and final -d into -l is attested in modern Amdo dialects (cf. Roerich 1958: 21). Its occurrence in the present word would indicate that, like other Amdo phonological features, the merger could have been of considerable age. But perhaps one should better think of an error in transmission (or a conflation with the verb ‘pierce’) and emend phoso (phos.so) for a likewise non-attested, but regular transitive causative derivation I: *ḥphod, II: *phos (≪ *b-pos), III: *dbo, IV: *phos ‘make migrate’, replaced by the verb of the weak paradigm 2a: I/III: spo II/IV: spos for the quite obvious reason of partial homophony with the non-causative verb form as well as with the verb I: ḥbo, II: phos (≪ *b-pos), III: dbo, IV: phos ‘pour out’.

<32> dudsna.

Most probably a compound derived from dudḥgro ‘quadruped’ (lit. ‘what is going in a bent manner’) and snatshogs ‘all kinds’ (cf. also Haarh 1969: 403 with n. 17,
p. 453; but cf. also clauses v207, l. 56 and v225, l. 62, where *dud* is used alone for
the meaning ‘stooped one, quadruped’). According to Uray (1966: 250 ff.) this
compound must refer here to the essential livestock. Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog
Tshesbtrtan (1995: 22, n. 12), suggests to read *dudna* instead, which he interprets
as ‘in the house’ (*khyimna*), based on the compound *dudtshay* ‘household’. To-
gether with his interpretation for *pholo*, this does not yield a grammatical and
meaningful sentence, and the emendation is useless.

Against the interpretation of *sna* as a clipped form of *snatshogs* in a compound,
Hill (2006a: 93, n. 22) objects:

I perfer [!] to see it as meaning ‘nose’ and here used as a classifier word for
cattle as synecdoche, in part because it seems likely that no cattle would
have been specifically spared.

This analysis does not account for expressions such as *darsna* *lya* ‘five sorts
of silk’, *rinpochesna* *bdun* ‘seven kinds of jewels’, *šiñsna*R *dudpa* ‘smoke of several
kinds of wood’ as well as the compounds *snatshogs*, *snamañ*, *snatshad* ‘of every
sort’, etc. (cf. JÄK sub *sna*, 5). When *sna* is used in combination with numerals,
one could perhaps describe it as a (kind of) classifier, but we have no prove that
the word used in such contexts originally meant ‘nose’ or is even distantly related
with the word for ‘nose’ (in the case of mere monosyllables, often resulting from
originally much longer word forms, it cannot be taken for granted that the look-
alikes always have a shared etymology), nor is there any prove that its application
was originally restricted to animals.

In his review of Bacot & al. (1940), R.A. Stein (1952: 82, n. 1) lists several
misprints, and in this connection he also suggests to read the present *dud* as *duñ*.
It is true that compared with the preceding *da*, the final letter looks more like a *ya*.
But both consonants show some variation in their shape, which even allows a cer-
tain overlap, cf. in the beginning of l. 29 the very similar letters *da* and *ya* in *pha
yodna* *nahi* *pha* *gare*. While the lower stroke of the *da* in *dud* should be more
slanted and more convex, and particularly somewhat longer, similar *da,s*, only
minimally more prolonged or crooked, are found in l. 12 *gched*, *phod*, l. 15 *gchad*,
l. 24 *bsgyud* (or *bsgyuñ*?; the latter form is likewise not attested in the dictionar-
ies), *khrid*, l. 29 *yod*, l. 31 the first *khyod*, indicating that the letter in question,
which is more slanted and longer than an average *ya*, might be at the extreme limit,
but still within the limit of *da*-forms. Apart from this, a reading *duñ* ‘conch’
would not really fit into the context. See also epigraphic notes and illustrations *dud*. 
<33> chuṅba.

Cf. Macdonald and Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 13). Demagnifying adjectives, such as ‘small, low (in rank or merit)’ are typically used for females, cf. skyedman ‘woman’ (lit. of low birth) vs. skyabo ‘man, person’ (lit. of birth), similarly bud-med ‘girl, woman’ < *bu-dmad ‘low offspring’. Bacot & Toussaint and Haarh translate chuṅba as ‘(male) child’, however, as Hill (2006a: 93, n. 23) correctly comments, a child of Bkrags would have no land of his or her father to return to. Moreover the chuṅba returns to the land of her father and brother (phamyiṅ gi yul), where the brother is referred to by a designation (miṅ(byo)) that is only used in relation to women (cf. JĀK sub miṅbo). The term /miṅbo/ is still used in Ladakh with reference to a female’s brother, irrespective of his relative age, while the compound /miṅšriṅ/ ‘sibling’ is used by both genders with respect to both genders. See also Yamaguchi (1970: 102, n. 25), although otherwise rather crudely making Rhya a wife of Loṇjam.

<34> Spus.

This is the collective form of the clan name Spu. For the collective suffix -s cf. Denwood (1986). Interesting examples for this suffix, appearing in the same syntactic context as the collective marker -dag, are found in RAMA D6: gyubrag sơnpo-s sprepla n[i], ‘as for the arranged (lit. joined, combined) (collective of) green-blue turquoise rocks’ and E3: neḥuseng sğerpo-s springyi ![for ablative] mtho ‘as for the (collective of) green-blue meadows, they are higher than the clouds’. The collective marker -dag is used in the same way in nagstshal stugpadag ‘(collective of) dense forests’ (D7) and darzakbyi loma lhubspadag ‘(a collective) of wide (=?=flittering) leaves of finest silk’ (E6).

The Spu (var. Spa) clan seems to have been instrumental in installing the Spuryal lineage (lit. ‘king over/ from the Spu’), the first member of which would be Drigum’s ‘successor’ and ‘son’ Šakhyi (or őakhyı or Byakhri) under the regal name Spude Guṟgyal (cf. clause v223, l. 61). The name must have been of very high prestige in order to be adopted by the Tuoba elites who took over power in prehistoric Tibet. There might be an etymological relation either with the Supi(ya) or with the clan name Dmu/ Rmu/ Rma (see also below, n. 35), which is also a designation for a certain class of deities (and demonised spirits). In the latter case, spu might have been a synonym for deva or lha (cf. Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.3 and § 3, particularly with notes ca. 170, 171). All three translations with an adjective ‘excellent’ or ‘noble’ (cf. also Macdonald’s “fils ‘de qualité’”), based on the CT noun (!) spus ‘quality’, therefore, totally miss the point. In the present clause, they also violate the grammar, since they all do not account for the fact
that the noun *Spus is followed by dative-locative case marker: *Spus-la hgreynus-tsam-nas.

<35> *bya.

I have some difficulties to understand the motivation of parallelising men and quite unspecific birds, even if *bya was only used to indicate just any living being. As it is far from evident that every bird has an overlord, one could have expected some social animal to serve for this simile.

On the other hand, there is some remote evidence for an early homophonous word *bya with the meaning ‘speaker, man’, ultimately related to the word for ‘human, man’ *myi < *rmi ~ *rma < *mri ~ *mra, the clan names Dmu/Rmu, Rma (< *Mra(o)), Bra (var. Sbra, Dbra, and Pra), Miao (*Mya/v), and Phiao (*Phya/v; see note 80 below for this transliteration), and the verb *smra < *mrao. The clan name Spu might equally belong to this set of derivations (for the various permutations that link these words: m < b/ph, *mr > smr > rm > dm and similarly p(h)rm > spr > sp (br > sbr), Cr- > Cy-, and the instability of the vowel, cf. Zeisler forthcoming, 4 § 2; for the interchange of oral and nasal stops cf. also R.A. Stein 1941: 226-230, as well as notes 12 (c), 13, and 14 above; for the metathesis of *Nr > rN and a more general metathesis of Cr, Cl > rC, IC cf. Simon 1975 and somewhat less convincingly 1949: 10-15). The most obvious trace of a former *bya ‘human’ might be found in the word *byi-s-pa ‘one out of the collective of human offspring’ > ‘child’, which could be derived immediately or via an intermediate *byehu ‘human offspring’: *bya ‘human’ plus filiation suffix -hu plus collective suffix -s, the latter apparently leading to the loss or fusion of the filiation suffix.

Synchronically, for the compiler of the Chronicle and his source(s), the word most probably signified only ‘bird’, but it cannot be precluded that some people were still half aware of the underlying word play that must have been at work when the lines were first composed. I suppose that we deal here with an original translational compound *myiba ‘man-man’ (later reinterpreted as a karmadhâraya or descriptive compound ‘man like a bird’), which was split up in accordance with the poetic convention, already mentioned in note 4 above.

It is obvious that as soon as the notion ‘speaker, man’ was lost, the compound myiba had to be interpreted as referring to a hybrid species, half human, half avian. We will have occasion to meet this creature further down, clause v157 (l. 43) with note 46. That we might well be dealing with a meaning shift is also indicated by the contradictory description of the victim in clause v131 (l. 37) and its parallels as someone “who has human eyes like bird eyes”, see note 43 below.
Not listed in the dictionaries. All translations have ‘lord’, according to the context. Quite obviously the word is related to jobo ‘lord, master’. Less clear is whether jobo, and thus also rjobo, is etymologically related to, or merely a dialect variant of, rjebo ‘lord, master’ (cf. roro for re re after clause v209 (l. 57) with note 75 for a similar alternation between e and o). Only the forms rje- (/ljel/) and jo- (/co/) appear to be attested in the phonetically conservative dialects. The historical chiefs of Ladakh, e.g., are commonly referred to as “Cho” (for /co/ < jo). As a trace of a former pre-radical, one could have expected at least a voiced representation or some fricativisation. This might indicate that we are dealing here with a conflation of the two words jobo and rjebo. The form rjobo, however, appears in the online documents in 21 instances (P.t.1084: 2x, 1283: 7x, 1286: 1x, 1287: 10x, and IOL Tib J 1375: 1x), the form jobo in 10 instances (P.t.1040: 3x, 1047: 1x, 1136: 2x, 1287: 4x), the form rjebo in 4 instances (P.t.1042, 1290: 2x, IOL Tib J 0740), and the form rjepo in a single instance (P.t.1285). Except for OTC, where we find an alternation between rjobo (10x) and jobo (4x), there is no overlap between the forms, which indicates that all three forms are dialectal variants. This is somewhat contrasted by the non-occurrence of rjo- and the quite frequent use of jobo (20x) and rjepo (18x, but no rjebo) in the documents of Eastern Turkestan (Takeuchi 1998; incomplete or questionable forms were not counted).

To my opinion, it is necessary to distinguish between verbal adjectivals that are monosyllabic and may have two stems (more frequently in OT than in CT, e.g. I: che, II: ches ‘be big’) and nominal adjectivals that are always derived (whether by a derivational morpheme or via composition) and thus at least disyllabic. Like other verbs, a monosyllabic verbal adjectival may occur as the second element of a compound. That we are dealing here with a compound is corroborated by the spelling -cuŋ, since non-first syllables within an intonation unit (word) tend to be de-aspirated. The OT orthography, however, switching between a more phonemic and a more phonetic rendering, is not very consistent with respect to this feature, hence in the preceding clause v103 the text has -chuŋ. All translations interpret the phrase as a normal noun plus (nominal) adjective. In our discussions Nathan W. Hill suggested to read the combination c(h)uŋkha as a derived form. In that case however, the remainder of the clause has to be translated as ‘don’t be big’, which is certainly less motivated than my ‘don’t talk big’ or Bacot & Toussaint’s ‘n’aie pas bouche trop grande’, cf. also note 38.
All three translators overlook the (intended) parallelism with *kha machešig* in the preceding clause v103, possibly because they think that a prohibition must always be marked with a directive marker {cig}. While the marker is not absolutely obligatory in commands and prohibitions (cf., e.g., OTC l. 99 *ltos* ‘look!’; l. 269 *magtaŋ* ‘Don’t forsake!’; l. 444 *khus magdab* ‘[one] is not to shout’, *rtas mabchag* ‘the horse is not to gallop’), it is certainly possible that in this special case, the marker got lost when the sentence was taken out of its original context.

For the compound *khdrag* JÄK has the meanings ‘mighty’ and ‘haughty’; for *khache* he gives a literal meaning ‘a large mouth’ as well as a figurative meaning ‘a person that has to command over much’. Given the antonym *khañu* ‘laconic, sparing of words’, *khache* should also have the meaning ‘someone who talks too much’. In may be noted, *en passant*, that the Tibetan name for ‘Kashmir’ or Muslims in general: *Khache*, is readily misunderstood as ‘loudmouth, braggart’ in Ladakh.

---

The name has the same structure as that of Rulaskyes. It might well be possible that one name is the translation of the other and the two persons were actually identical. This is what the later Tibetan traditions suggest, which know only of Rulaskyes (-Nlarlaskyes), making him a posthumous son of Drigum. In the version of Dphaḥbo Gtsuglag, the name Rulaskyes is equated with Ńarsospo (Haarh 1969: 145).

If one wants to translate Rulaskyes as ‘born from a horn’, one could translate Ńlarlaskyes correspondingly as ‘born from the strength/ thickness/ front side/ stalk/ corner’. Ńar is the Žaŋžuŋ word for ‘corner’, in Tibetan it might either refer to the ‘front side’, to the ‘stalk of plants’ Ńarpa, or to ‘strength’, cf. Ńarba and Ńarma. In the version of Mkhaspa Ldehu (see below) Ńarpa is associated with a woollen cloth, and it might be exactly from this context that Btsanlha gets his interpretation *dampo* ‘thick’ from (cf. TETT, Dan Martin). -le- as a variant of the dative-locative case marker is a Žaŋžuŋ form (cf. Haarh 1968: 20). As the variants Ru-las-skyes (*Debther dmarpo*, Haarh 1969: 143-146) and Rgyu-las-skyes (Buston, Haarh 1969: 154) indicate, the dative-locative marker in both names should be interpreted according to its ablative function (for which see JÄK sub la IV).

Mkhaspa Ldehu (ed. 1987: 246), who renders the name of this figure as Rvalasskyes Ńlarlashgreŋ Yulabrten (Grown-from-a-Horn Standing-up-from-the-Swansdown Based-on-a-Bootleg), motivates the first part of the second name...
like the first and the last name by the way the yet unformed child was kept: inside a yak horn (g.yagru), which again was placed in the leg of a boot (lhamyu), and then the child (or the horn or the bootleg) was covered by a thick woollen face-cloth or blanket: g.yarsnam ngarpas kha bcadde (g.yar does not mean ‘borrowed’ here, as Linnenborn 2004: 128 translates, but is a honorific word for ‘face, countenance’, serving also as a honorifyer, e.g., g.yarmkhar = skumkhar, cf. BRGY). While the last name inevitably calls into mind a much later Yumbrtan (or Yumrtan), the middle name is also reminiscent of the above clause v95 (l. 28) Spusla hgreynus-tsam-nas, which could be interpreted alternatively as Spuslahgre^n nus-tsam-nas ‘as soon as Spuslahgre^n was able’. As Mkhaspa Lde^hu’s Njarlashgrey demonstrates, the name Standing-out-among-the-Spu, would not be completely unlikely, but then, in the above context, one might wonder: able to do what? If Mkhaspa Lde^hu did, in fact, intend a parallel between a Spuslahgre^n and a Njarlashgrey, it would probably be better to read Nar as a clan name, as well. Njarleskyes could well mean something like ‘Born to the Nar’ or ‘Nar-Offshoot’.

What is definitely not possible is Bacot & Toussaint’s translation ‘né de lui-même’ (Bacot & al. 1940: 125, n. 6), which disregards that Nar would be an already case-marked form of the pronoun gna ‘I’ and that this pronoun does not refer to the third but to the first person. Furthermore, the reflexive meaning ‘self’ would have been expressed by the pronoun ragn, and the corresponding compound for this ‘translation’ would be *Rajskyes ‘Self-born’ or *Rajlaskyes ‘Born to/from oneself’. Incidentally, Nar is a mirror-inverted ragn, a fact that might have enhanced the misinterpretation.

Bacot & Toussaint’s interpretation was largely followed by Haarh (1969: 156), who only corrected the pronominal reference: ‘Born from (or by) myself’. For Haarh, this interpretation, although linguistically somewhat “doubtful”, would be “most adequate to the real nature of its bearer” (ibid.), which he connects with the realm of the defunct, from which the kings would derive their magic power. In this connection, he reinterprets Spuskyi bu as ‘son of the corpse’, insinuating that the nouns spus, spur, and spu would all signify ‘corpse’, spus being thus “an otherwise unknown derivative” (p. 157). Such metaphysical contemplation must be quite attractive compared to the uninspiring linguistic argument. Or else, it is not really intelligible why we still find Bacot & Toussaint’s ungrammatical rendering and Haarh’s over-interpretation uncritically quoted as, e.g., in Linnenborn (2004: 135).

<40> gdod.

All translations have ‘wish’ or ‘what he wanted’. The verb ‘wish, want’ ḥdod, however, does not have any stem form gdod; and such stem form, which would
represent the gerundival stem III ‘to be wished’, would also not make sense in the context. Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 139) interpret the phrase as ‘having a personal interview’ (gdoṅ thugpa), but what kind of personal interview should a mother and son conduct, particularly after already having started a conversation? Should we think that the following speech is given only secretly? There is no reason why gdod (for gdodma) should not mean ‘beginning’ here, since the mother explains everything from the very beginning. For the short form gdod cf. TETT and JĀK’s citations from Milaraspa.

<41> zanṣ(-) brgyaḥma.

For the possible alternative interpretations, cf. v68 (l. 20) with n. 20 above.

<42> churlaggi ni dbres

Bacot & Toussaint translate this as ‘celui qui est abîme dans le fleuve’, Haarh as ‘the destroyed man who is wrapped in the water’, Hill (who further renders tshol ‘shall search’ with ‘will find’) as ‘the filth of the destroyed water’. Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 14) suggests the following interpretations: ‘a waterlogged area after recession’ (chubriṣulgyi chuṅkhyil), drops (thigspa), ‘ice block’ (chabrom), waves (rlabs), or simply traces (rjes). He further suggests that the word might be the same as dbyes ‘magnitude, size, dimensions’. The only entry for dbres in BRGY is dbreskyi ḥtshams, lit. ‘suitable or necessary for dbres’ with the definition rgyamtshoḥi rlabs ‘waves of the ocean’. This is not really helpful.

Btsanlha’s definition of the hapax legomenon dbres as ‘water course or canal’ (chuḥ lammam yurba, TETT) is followed by Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 140) who paraphrase it with yurba. The latter reading is certainly out of place, but one could think that the boy is looking for traces caused by a destructive flood (churlag). No such flood is mentioned and I am not convinced that the compound churlag can be applied to the natural flow of a river. I would also not expect that the boy searches the river course or the traces of a flood. If he followed the course or the traces of the water, one could have expected again the collocation with gcod. Furthermore, given the parallelism with mirlag in the preceding clause v120, the compound churlag should refer to ‘one destroyed by water’, rather than to ‘destructive water’.

Haarh’s translation suggests a connection with the verb hbre, bres ‘spread (cloth, curtain, or net), wrap up (books or corpses)’. The problem is that the verb seems to presuppose solid not liquid types of wrappings, and even if we allow for a figurative usage, the form dbres would imply either a totally different verb
(dbre, dbres, that is, ‘be dirty’) or it would correspond to stem III, the gerundive, ‘to be wrapped’, in an ancient, but otherwise no longer attested, regular paradigm 1a: *ḥbres (or *ḥphres), II: *phres, III: dbres, IV: *phres. Furthermore, his translation does neither take into account the genitive nor the element rlag ‘destroyed’.

As Hill and perhaps also Gñaḥgoṇ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan seem to suggest, dbres might be related to the adjectival dbre ‘dirty, bad’ (cf. BRGY). As this meaning does not really fit, I would opt for ‘remains’ (which may or may not be filthy or dirty). The word dbres appears also in the compound dbrebisog ‘dirt filth’ (JĀK, BRGY, TETT), which could perhaps indicate that dbre(s) does not simply mean ‘dirty’, but a particular state, perhaps after being crushed or after having rotten.

Note the contradiction between the human eye and its allegedly avian features. By ordinary standards of communication and reasoning it should not be possible that our chimaera had at the same time human and avian-like eyes (except perhaps one eye was closed from above while the other was closed from below, but this is not really what our text suggests). A more straightforward description could have been a human being with bird eyes or a human being who covers his/her eyes like a bird. The strange formulation might thus indicate that some accident happened in the course of transmission, as already suggested in note 35.

It is very tempting to think of an avian totem in a pseudo-shamanic prehistoric culture (cf. Linnenborn 2004: 297), underlying the avian features characterising Drigum’s substitute and, in later tradition, the primordial king Gñaḥkhri, and even Rinchen Bzaṇpo (cf. Snellgrove & Skorupski 1980: 86). One might also count the apparent parallelism between men and birds in clauses v96-v99 (ll. 28f.) above as further evidence. Gñaḥkhri is additionally characterised by webbed fingers (and, in some traditions, toes), which would liken him to a water bird (the goose as the king of birds, an Indo-European totem?).

But part of the superhuman features of the primordial king, such as the webbed fingers, the long tongue that ‘may cover the [whole] circle of the face’ (that is, reach the hairline or ears; cf. Mkhaspa Ldeḥu, ed. 1987: 226; lces gdon gi dkyilhkhor khebspa; and not, as Linnenborn 2004: 291 renders it, “circles (in form of) tongues that covered his face”), and the full circle of teeth (cf. Linnenborn 2004: 292f.), belong to the 32 main lakṣana of a mahāpuruṣa and are definitely inherited from the iconography of the Buddha (who is also said to have flatfeet; the statement concerning the teeth shows that the Tibetans not always understood the meaning correctly: the mahāpuruṣa is said to have 40 teeth rather than the
normal 32; they are without gaps and equal in size). The webbed fingers, on their part, may simply derive from a technical solution in sculptural art to protect detached fingers from breaking (Bautze-Picron 2008: 179). *Bird eyes* could well have been a misunderstood secondary iconographic feature, developed perhaps in connection with the transition of widely opened eyes to half-closed eyes in the representation of the Buddha, which happened in the 2nd century CE in the art of Gandhāra (cf. Bautze-Picron 2008: 183). The lower lids of Buddha’s eyes are quite often very well articulated, which can make the eyes look like half-closed owl’s eyes. It should be noted that Gñāṭkhri bears his superhuman features especially in the context of the Buddhist tradition, which makes him an exiled Indian prince, exiled particularly because of his lakṣana.s.

If the bird eyes actually stood, *pars pro toto*, for an original bird head, this could lead us also to the mythology and iconography of Pehar, who at least in one tradition has a human body and the head of a raptor (R.A. Stein 1959: 288, referring to Nebesky-Wojkowitz 1956: 102). Pehar was ‘invited’ to Bṣamyas as war booty in the early 8th century, at a time when Tibet was at the height of its power or only shortly after. He served as a protective deity, particularly as guardian of the treasuries. The fact that a foreign deity was ‘imported’ shows its magical or ideological importance. There was thus motivation and time enough to amalgamate its mythology with the legends concerning the royal descent.

Given the possible secondary or borrowed nature of the avian features, the original substitute (if such existed) might have been characterised by quite the opposite features: it might have been a non-human being, bearing, however, the facial features of a human (*bya*), e.g. forward facing eyes, found with monkeys and certain carnivores, but also with birds of prey, particularly owls. While most birds close their eyes from below when sleeping, there are a few species that close them from above (parrots and hummingbirds) or from below *and* above, namely nightjars and owls. Pigeons, songbirds, and owls also move their upper lid downwards for protective blinking, the former two aslant, the latter strictly vertically (Curio 2001: 257, 263, Figs. 2b, 269). An owl, if one wants to insist upon an avian mythology, would have been the ideal counter model of a *bird with bird eyes* (that is, closing them from below) and at the same time *closing them like a human from above*.

<44> Ḥgebspa gchig.

All translations have an intransitive rendering, disregarding the fact that the verbal noun necessarily must refer to a human being, not to the eyes themselves. The water spirit does not wish ‘one that gets covered’ (a single eye) but ‘one who covers (the eyes)’. In Mkhaspa Ldeḥu (ed. 1987: 246), the phrase is
replaced by mig byamīgbzhin mas btsumpa gcig ‘one who (has) closed the eyes from below like bird eyes’, from the verb I: ḥdzum, II: btsum (zum), III: gzum, IV: tshum ‘close, shut’ with an equally transitive-agentive semantics. Apparently, all three translators reject the idea that there should be an agent in the case of shutting the lid of an eye, although first of all, OTC is not talking about ‘shutting’ or ‘closing’ the eye, but of covering the eye, where, in other contexts, the linguistic agent could well be the lid. None of them would probably mind that in their own languages, humans and various animals close and open their eyes for various purposes (examples such as Do crested geckos close their eye lid when they are asleep? Do guinea pigs close their eyes when they sleep? Which animal does not close its eyes while sleeping? can be easily googled), and they would even less mind that, when losing all potency of agency, one closes one’s eyes for ever, according to an agentive transitive rendering. In Shamskat Ladakhi we may equally find: /lo gyatcu soŋsena, khos mik tsums./ ‘Having become eighty years, s/he-ergative closed the eyes (for ever).’ In this variety, the ergative indicates agency and thus intention and control on the part of the ‘subject’. Non-control would be indicated by the aesthetive /khoa/ khoa. For an impersonal reading only the genitive /khoi/ khoi could be used.

Languages may differ considerably in which body-related events can have a human subject or agent and how they are represented in a [±control] or [±transitivity] paradigm. It would certainly be an interesting research topic to study how Tibetan languages in general or a particular Tibetan variety treats body-related events. As a first step, one could try to follow the wording as closely as possibly, and if one’s own or the goal language does not allow a transitive rendering, one could perhaps refer to the literal meaning in a note or bracket.

<45> thogsig.

I do not want to preclude that this form is simply an error for thonj, stem IV of gtonj ‘give’ or that the variant spelling is triggered by some dialectal alternation between oral and nasal stops. Nevertheless, one should not prematurely rule out the possibility that the word hdogs might have had a broader spectrum of meanings. In the present context it is also possible that the provisions will be ‘attached’ on some pack animal.

<46> cho Myibya.

See note 35 above. For the correct analysis of possible compounds, it is necessary to recapitulate the structure of two important types of noun-noun compounds: a) tatpurusa or determinative compounds and b) karmadhāraya or descriptive com-
pounds. In Tibetan, like in English, German, and many other languages, the modifying element of a tatpurūṣa compound always precedes the modified element. One could call this the flower garden vs. garden flower principle. The order within a Tibetan compound corresponds to the order of an ordinary Tibetan possessor construction and to the order of the German and English s-genitive. For instance: fatherland = father’s land, in Tibetan phayul = phaḥi yul. There is no indication that the order could have been different in Old Tibetan. The only type of noun-noun compound, where the order is inverted, is the so-called karmadhāraya compound, a poetical device, whereby the first element is likened to the second one, as in Skr. meghaduta ‘the cloud that is the messenger’, puruṣasimha ‘a man like a lion’, or rājadeva ‘a king like a god’ for which latter we have a Tibetan equivalent in rgyallha used as the translation for the Roman title Caesar (Kesar or G(y)esar) and as a generic term for a certain type of protective deities. A valuable description of (modern) Tibetan compound formation is found in Goldstein (1994: 13-22).

Bacot & Toussaint do not translate cho. Macdonald similarly neglecting this word, comes to the solution that the person in question is ‘une fille à moitié oiseau’. Haarh leaves the whole expression untranslated, although elsewhere (Haarh 1969: 209), he suggests a translation ‘family-man-bird’. The three words cannot form a compound, or otherwise the translation should be something like the ‘family’s men and birds’ (tatpuruṣa & dvandva) or the ‘family’s men that are like birds’ (tatpuruṣa & karmadhāraya). The expected reading ‘men-birds’ family’, that is, ‘family of the men-birds’ (however one analyses the latter compound), should have taken the form myibya-cho in Tibetan. I, therefore, think that cho has to be treated like a designation or title, which precedes a name: ‘the family Man-bird’. If man-bird thus functions as a name, the synchronic interpretation as karmadhāraya compound ‘a human who is like a bird’ would make more sense than the dvandva compound ‘men and birds’. As stated above note 35, the compound might be interpreted from a diachronic perspective as a translational compound ‘man-man’. I would also think that the hidden punchline is that an offspring of this family bears bird-like features just because of the family or clan name, whatever the rationale behind the name might have been, and not because it belongs to a family of, or descending from, birds and men.

Hill (2006a: 95, n. 29) suggests the translation ‘with a bird-man head’ on the basis that in

Zhang (1985) [=1993] the word co is defined as an archaic word for ‘head.’ It is because of this that I have the translation I have proposed, the difference in aspiration between co and cho being hardly relevant (cf. Hill, forthcoming [!] ‘aspiration’ [= Hill 2007]).
Apart from the facts that Hill completely inverted the order of the elements (the Tibetan equivalent to his translation would be something like byamyi-mgo/co), and that the genitive is not regularly used for the relation with, commonly expressed by can or ldan, I have quite some difficulties to conceive of this ‘bird-man head’: does the ‘bird-man’ have a human body and a bird’s head or is it the other way round? Or does Hill actually intend ‘a head with human and avian characteristics’?

In contrast to Hill, I do not think that the aspiration contrast is irrelevant word-initially (within words the contrast may be neutralised, depending on the dialect). Even if it could be proved that word-initial aspiration contrast was not phonemic with respect to the vocabulary inherited from proto-Tibetan (whatever language(s) this might have consisted of), Old Tibetan had already incorporated a large number of words from other languages of various affiliations, among them obviously a number of words with non-aspirated initials. It is a common feature that loanwords tend to be assimilated according to the phonologic structure of the receiving language. The fact, that the loans preserved their non-aspiration might thus be indicative, first of all, that the assumptions concerning the phonologic structure of proto-Tibetan might not be correct. On the other hand, one can also observe (e.g. in Baltistan and Ladakh with respect to the Urdu phoneme /q/) that speakers may get used to a foreign phoneme and begin to reinterpret and reorganise the phonological structure of their ‘own’ vocabulary even with respect to the complementary articulations (in this case /qh/ and /q/).

A third possibility, and the most likely one in a multilingual setting, is that loans may retain their phonetic features, by virtue of being loans. In that case, the alternation between aspiration and non-aspiration would at least have a pragmatic function, and it would certainly be semantically distinctive. Whatever the actual development, with Hill’s own words: “In the period of Old Tibetan inscriptions aspiration had begun to be phonemic” (2007: 489). This is, notably, the very period when OTC was compiled.

In the case of a somewhat questionable OT co ‘head’ and the much better attested OT cho ‘family, lineage’, surviving in the CT compounds choḥbraṅ ‘lineage from the mother’s side’ and chorigs ‘lineage from the father’s side’ (JÄK; the gender bias might not always hold), we would even have a clear minimal pair. Note also the relation with the verb I: ḥcho, II: ḥchos (possibly ~ *chos) ‘be born’ (a regular causative derivation would have led to the forms I: *ḥchod, II: bcos, III: bco, IV: chos ‘to engender’; we find the same derivation, but with stem I: ḥchos for the not unrelated meaning of production: ‘make, prepare, construct’, while the causative meaning ‘engender’ has survived only in the forms I/III: bṣo, II/IV: bṣos). Note further the possible relation with chos ‘dharma’ as something that
‘came into existence’ or ‘was able to be produced’ (potentialis function of stem IV of causative verbs). Whether or not both words, co ‘head’ and cho ‘family, lineage’, were ultimately of proto-Tibetan origin, only one of the two terms, or even none, should not make much difference synchronically. For the philologist, at least, the question of how these two apparently unrelated words are spelled should not be irrelevant. The recourse to ‘misspellings’ or to the ‘arbitrariness’ or ‘interchangeability’ of certain graphemes can only be the very last step, when all alternative attempts for an explanation have failed.

The context as well as the syntax of these and the following clauses is not very clear. All translators interpret the sentence in the sense that the daughter of cho Myibya was sleeping. Implied in this analysis is an identity between bumo ‘daughter, girl’ and bu ‘son, child’ in clause v159. Later tradition clearly speaks of a girl, bumo (cf. Linnenborn 2004: 164f.). There are several arguments speaking against this interpretation, and while each one might not be very strong, the sum might perhaps gain a certain momentum.

The first argument is the different wording. I should think that the gender distinction between bumo ‘daughter’ and bu ‘son’ cannot be ignored, and that the text would, in fact, be utterly messed up, if an identity was intended. I should further think that in a society of warriors it is more likely that a male child had to be offered in recompense for an emperor’s body than a female one (but cf. Linnenborn’s argument, 2004: 164, according to which the girl would represent the primordial birdlike female ancestor Mobyabtsun).

Secondly, while the verb yur or perhaps only the collocation gnid yur may have the meaning ‘slumber’ or ‘sleep’, it seems somewhat strange that this should be combined with the agentive verb byed ‘do, make, perform’, which leads to an agentive reading, such as ‘tried to slumber’, ‘pretended to slumber’, or ‘caused so else to slumber’. Except perhaps for the causative reading (see further below), these interpretations do not seem to be applicable. A more modest function, namely to highlight the agentivity or responsibility, would make sense only in contexts where the ‘act’ of slumbering is somehow important for the plot, but it does not seem to be well-motivated in the case of a simple background information (see also below). I would further think that a child lying in a cradle, lacks the necessary intentionality or responsibility for an ‘act’ of sleeping, but in such instances, languages may behave idiosyncratically.

Thirdly, the (male) child in question (bu) lies in a cradle, v159, while the girl (bumo) is led along (khrid) in v180 (l. 48). To my understanding, the verb ḫkhrid
implies that an animal or person led along can move by its own. By contrast, a child in a cradle would rather be carried along (ḥkhur, ḡkhyer).

Finally, if bumo and bu were identical, one would also not expect that the subject of clause v159 bu khuljona ḥdugpažig would be explicitly mentioned. Likewise one would not expect the repeated use of ḥdug in v159 and v162, if v162 expressed that the child had certain attributes or features, and one of these features would be the fact that it was ‘one who lay in the cradle’ (v159). One would also not expect to have the act of sleeping separated from the situation of lying in a cradle. The strangeness of this construction shows up, less dramatically perhaps, in the following English rendering: ‘When he came to a sleeping she-child of the family Manbird, [she] *was a child who lay in a cradle, one that closed her eyes from below, like bird eyes.’

Most crucially, however, any translation of ḥdug as an attributive copula (x is y) presumes that the evidential distinction between ḥdug (observed or new knowledge) and yod (intimate or assimilated knowledge) as found in the modern Tibetan languages had already fully developed in Old Tibetan, so that it could override the semantic distinction between the attributive copula (x is y) yin and the existential copula (at y there exists x) yod or ḥdug (the use of ḥdug as an existential copula is based on its full verb meaning ‘sit, dwell, stay’). To my present knowledge, such an assumption would be premature.

With the necessary reservation that the text might have been messed up, I would suggest to distinguish between the adult bumo who is doing some work (or perhaps even lies down to sleep), and her (male) child (bu) lying in the ‘cradle’ near to her or even on her back. Ladakhi women traditionally carried their small children in baskets on their back while working on the fields, and this custom might have been practised in other regions of Tibet as well.

The previous translations all take the limiting quantifier -žig ‘a, one’ to operate over a complex NP (indicated here by angle brackets and italics): ‘il arriva près d’une <fille, née d’un homme et un oiseaux, qui dormait>’ (Bacot & Toussaint); ‘he came across a <daughter of Cho-myi-bya who was lying asleep>’ (Haarh), ‘[He] went near to a <sleeping girl with a bird-man-head>’ (Hill). However, the limiting quantifier žig ‘a, some’, like other quantifiers, demarcates the right end of an NP, here <cho Mibyahi bumo>-žig. By no means can it operate on what follows subsequently. The following phrase yurba byedpa, however one wants to analyse it, thus cannot modify the preceding NP.

<cho Mibyahi bumo-žig> may be an argument of a causative construction yurba byedpa ‘lull, make sleep’. Similarly, both <cho Mibyahi bumo-žig> and <yurba> could be arguments of a nominalised clause with the verb byed. But in the latter case, this nominalisation would specify the place where 网站地图 ar-
rived (‘when he came to <where a daughter of ... did X>’), and one would thus expect the nominaliser -sa instead of -pa.

If one takes the first NP (ending with bumozig) as the CAUSÉE argument of the causative construction yurba byed ‘lull, make sleep’, ṇarleskyes would arrive in front of an unnamed person of unknown gender acting upon the girl: when he came to <[someone] making a daughter of ... asleep>. The latter, by contrast, would be specified by its particular affiliation. While grammatically not completely impossible, it appears pragmatically infelicitous that the person whom ṇarleskyes meets is not mentioned at all. One could at least have expected another limiting quantifier for the unspecified NP (that is, the referent of the nominalised clause). Likewise, from the point of stylistics, it is not very convincing that a few clauses further down this seemingly irrelevant person is suddenly identifiable (although not with necessity) as the mother of the child.

The phrase yurba byedpa can thus only be understood as an apposition or as an insertion or a kind of afterthought. Due to the linear order of speech, the postposition would have to follow the inserted phrase, but semantically and syntactically, it would be directly linked to the preceding NP on the matrix level (unfortunately, this is not reflected in our annotation). In English, this could only be simulated by inverting the information structure: ‘(he came up to — <[one] who was doing X> — <a daughter of ...>).’

To my opinion the apposition (or inserted and subordinated phrase) represents background information. Nominalised clauses behave like nominal adjectives and appear in the same syntactic slots as adjectives, that is, they may either precede or follow the head noun. The difference between these two orders corresponds in a way to the difference between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in English. The latter provide additional information, which is not necessary for the identification of the noun. Restrictive relative clauses, by contrast, serve to single out an item from a possibly larger set of like items. Tibetan adjectives and nominalised clauses that precede their head noun (and are linked to it with the genitive marker) serve exactly this purpose. In the case of rta nagpo, one would be talking casually about the colour of an already identified horse (or set of horses). In the case of nagpoḥi rta, one would refer contrastively to the colour in order to identify the horse (or set of horses) in question: (only) a horse that is black. With respect to (nominal) adjectives and nominalised clauses, we could thus speak of restrictive or foregrounding and non-restrictive or backgrounding word order. For the very reason that nominal clauses most often serve the purpose of identification, they are only infrequently found after the noun they modify, quite in contrast to nominal adjectives, which mainly serve to embellish a statement, and hence are most frequently found after the noun they modify.
Therefore, if ‘doing X’ in the sense of *sleeping* were crucial for the plot (because one can see the birdlike feature only when the eyes are closed), one could have expected the foregrounding or restrictive word order: *yurba byedpaḥi cho MyiByaḥi bumozig*. This would also have been the true counterpart for the translations of Bacot & Toussaint and Haarh.

<48> *khuljo*.

As Hill (2006a: 95, n. 30) already mentioned, *khuljo* is taken to be the equivalent of *khul.žo* ‘crib’ by Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22 n. 17) and Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 36 n. 142 on p. 80), but the latter word itself is classified as ‘archaic’ in TETT. The relation between the two forms could be explained by the *dorje-effect*, a common sound change in compounds: after an open syllable, such as *rdo*, the initial of a second-syllable consonant cluster, such as the *r*- in *rje*, migrates leftwards beyond the original syllable boundary, and is reanalysed by the speakers as a syllable final, in which position it may survive also in the modern Central Tibetan dialects: /dor-je/. This sound change has been described under various labels mostly for the modern Tibetan varieties, but cf. Hogan (1996) for Old Tibetan. The change from *j* to *ž* may have been triggered by the ‘loss’ of the original pre-radical, but we also find in West Tibetan a certain interchangeability between /j/ and /ž/.

Bacot & Toussaint give the grammatically possible, but in the context of the narrative quite unlikely, translation ‘sous un arbre de paradis’ emending *khuljo* as *khuljon*. Haarh’s translation ‘it was the daughter of Khuljona’ is simply incorrect. If at all, the sentence could be interpreted as ‘the boy *was Khuljona*’ or ‘it *was the boy Khuljona*’. However, as mentioned in note 47, we do not have any evidence that *ḥdug* ‘stay, live’ or ‘have’ could have been used in place of the attributive copula *yin* ‘be’ in Old Tibetan.

<49> *thorto ḡphrenmo*.

While *thorto* is attested as ‘top-knot’, *ḥphrenmo* appears to be a hapax legomenon. Bacot & Toussaint, Hill, and van Schaik (2008) leave the word untranslated, Haarh interprets it as ‘braid’, but his translation ‘the top-knot of the hair should be bound like a braid’ would require a locative-purposive marker: *ḥphrenmor* or an even more explicit equivalent for ‘like’. Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 19) suggests a reading *phramo* ‘fine thin’. While *phramo* or *phran* seem to be the closest forms available for an adjective, this would not only necessitate two emendations (elimination of the pre-radical and change of the vowel) but it would
also imply that the knot is thin or little. For an adjective modifying the topknot, one could expect the opposite meaning.

Dan Martin (TETT), citing Btsanlha, equates *thorto* with *thorgtshugs*, which Jim Valby (TETT) again describes as “plaited hair bound up on the head in a spiral, plaited tuft of hair, toupee, luxuriant locks dressed neatly on the crown of the head”. Similarly, Ives Waldo (TETT) paraphrases *thorto* as “hair bound like a *gtsugtor*” (transliteration adjusted), the latter word also meaning turban (Jim Valby, TETT). Only Rangjung Yeshe (TETT) indicates a meaning for *ḥphren*: *ḥphrenpa* ‘be possessive of’. Perhaps this could be paraphrased as ‘contain, hold sth. together’. In that case, a *ḥphrenmo* might be something that holds the hair tuft together, a ribbon or turban.

Otherwise, since *thor*- somehow implies a plaited tuft (cf. also JÄK for *thorcog* and *thortshug*), and since this meaning might perhaps be related to *thorbu* ‘single, separate, scattered’ (cf. also Jim Valby in TETT, who defines *thor* as ‘anything gathered into a single point, what is in a tangle, drawn out fine’), the whole expression might perhaps refer to *fine plaits*. Plaited hair is attested also for the male population of Greater Yangtong (cf. Pelliot 1963: 708), that is, most probably Upper Ladakh and parts of the Byangthang (Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 2, § 1.2.3), and was more generally found among the Iranian populations (cf. the Arsakid and Sasanian coins), particularly in Afghanistan (cf. the *Jaṭāsuras* of the 6th century *Brhatasthāpita*, north-eastern (!) section, Fleet 1973: 12 – the three northern sections are quite obviously mixed up, and it seems that most references belong to the north-western section, corresponding to present-day Afghanistan, otherwise one should locate the *Jaṭāsuras* in the Byangthang).

*Cf. Bacot & Toussaint.* Whatever the exact meaning of *thorto ḡphrenmo*, there is no doubt that the hair or headdress should have been bound up (*bciṃs*), which is quite surprising, since the typical mourning behaviour, at least for close relatives would have been to *cut* the hair, to blacken the face, and to wear entirely black clothes, as described in the *Jiu Tangshu* (2a, Pelliot 1961: 3). Quite in accordance with this description although without reference to it, van Schaik (2008) suggests that the topknot should have been cut off, pointing to similar usages among the Scythians, the Xiongnu, and Huns, where the mourners cut of their plaits and lacerated their faces. Nevertheless, if this were the intended meaning, the verb *ḥchiṃ* ‘bind’ would have been completely out of place. While one can argue about the meaning of the verb *bžags* (see note 52 below), I do not see any possibility to reconcile the notion of binding a topknot with the notion of cutting it. Either the text or the interpreter errs.
Given the fact, however, that also the next activity does not really correspond to a self-destructive or self-deforming mourning behaviour (see note 51), but rather to a festive act of dressing up, one should interpret the binding up of the top-knot similarly as a festive act of dressing up. The text seems thus to indicate that the ransom for Drigum’s corpse consisted in a change of mourning behaviour, at least with respect to a ruler. The intention could have been to set the ruler apart from ordinary beings.

<51> *gola mtshalgyis byugs.*

Cf. Bacot & Toussaint. Note the non-honorific form. The action is thus to be performed by the addressee and the mourners in general reflexively upon themselves (here and in the case discussed in the following note, this rather apparent, yet often neglected fact has been observed independently by van Schaik 2008).

The ordinary CT frame for the verb *ḥbyug* would be that the MEDIUM, that is, the colour etc., is in the absolutive and the SUBSTRATE, that is the item anointed, takes a locational marker (our pattern 09a, cf. BRGY). In this passage, however, the verb follows partly a pattern also known from the verb *rgyan* ‘adorn, decorate’, where the MEDIUM takes the instrumental and, as a consequence, the SUBSTRATE should be in the absolutive (cf. JÄK, sub *brgyanpa*). Here, however, we find the dative-locative marker *la*. As already mentioned (at the end of note 12), the use of the dative-locative instead of the absolutive can have an emphatic contrastive or identificatory function. But it also can have a partitive function, namely to indicate that the event did not concern the whole PATIENT-argument, but only part of it (cf. Zeisler 2006a: 75-78). In our case, this means, that not the whole face was covered, but only parts of the face. The difference could be simulated for English perhaps with the alternation ‘besmear the face with vermilion’ vs. ‘smear vermilion on the face’: only the first, not the second reading implies that the colour covers the whole face.

Like the colour, this is an important detail. While the Jiu Tangshu describes that the mourners besmear their (whole) face with a black colour, OTC speaks of putting red colour on parts of the face. While the former process corresponds to a kind of self-deformation, the latter is clearly an act of adornment, cf. Sam van Schaik’s posting [http://earlytibet.com/](http://earlytibet.com/)—2007/10/05/red-faced-men—iii, with photographs of coffins from the tombs in Guolimu, a village near Delingha in Qinghai Province (Amdo), excavated by Xu Xinguo in 2002. The photographs show paintings of Ḥaža (?) men and women, having their faces nicely decorated with red circles on the cheeks and the front.
Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 143) and Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 20) interpret this respectively as ‘having made lines upon the body’ (luspoḥi-thogla thig btab) and ‘beautifully ornament’ (lusla ni mdzespakstan). The word is only attested as a verb in BTSH (gžags ~ bžags) and ThDG (I/II/IV: gžags, II: bžags), whereas BRGY (sub bžags) lists it as an adjective ‘adorned or beautiful’ (brgyanpaham mdzespa). While BTSH defines the meaning as ‘adorn’ (rgyanphaḥi don), ThDG gives the meaning as ‘to beautify, ornament’, paraphrasing it, however, as mdzespa ‘beautiful’ and rgyanpa ‘adorned’, thus ultimately as an adjective. Neither BTSH nor BRGY give an example for the usage.

According to the BRGY the word also takes the forms gžags and gžabs, the latter with the meanings: 1. bžagspa, 2. brtagspa ‘considered’, 3. hjabpa ‘sneaking’, cf. TETT where the source for all three meanings is given as Btsanlha. The verb gžab, on the other hand, of which one might perhaps think in connection with gžabs (as alternative form to gžags), has the meaning ‘lick’ in JÄK (based on Schiefner) and ‘skim off’ in DYGB, and does not lead to a meaningful result.

Bacot & Toussaint, Haarh, and van Schaik (2008) translate the verb as ‘lace rate’ on the base of the verb ḥjog2 ‘cut, hew, carve, chip’, stem II of which, however, is bžog(s). Hill translates it as ‘lay down the body’ based on the verb ḥjog1, the regular stem II of which is bžag not bžags. This comes as a surprise, since he refers to the above-mentioned entry in BRGY and the interpretations of Wang & Bsodnams Skyid and Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan.

Van Schaik suggests that the mourners follow Central Asian rites of scratching one’s face, attested, e.g. for Scythians, Xiongnu, Hephthalites, and Huns (van Schaik 2008 with a citation of Herodotus). If such custom prevailed among the early Tibetans, it went unnoticed by the Chinese, cf. the above description in the Jiu Tangshu. But apart from the fact that the text speaks of the body and not of the face, and that neither case marking nor the stem forms match, the general use of ḥjog2 ‘cut, hew, carve, chip’ would indicate a much more forceful action, than just scratching. It would be also somewhat strange to combine the destructive act of scratching one’s body with the constructive act of anointing one’s face (and binding up the hair in a festive manner) just before.

Bacot & Toussaint, Haarh, van Schaik, and Hill, all overlook, that according to the case marking, something should be ‘lacerated’ or ‘laid down’ on the body. In the case of ‘lacerated’ and ‘adorned’, but certainly not in the case of Hill’s ‘laid down’, we may again deal with a partitive reading. Apart from this, none of the translations renders stem II correctly as a form signalling anteriority and not a
command (and likewise not corresponding to a simple present as suggested by van Schaik).

Given the fact that Chinese sources, linguistic analysis, and cultural comparison point to the presence of Iranian or Iranianised tribes, more particularly also Scythians, on the Tibetan plateau (Roerich 1930, Pelliot 1963: 695: tribes venerating the asura, Bellezza 2008, part I, section 6, section 9.3, part II sections 9.2-3), I wonder whether ‘applying an ornament on the body’ might not mean here ‘applying a tattoo’.

Something like this could be implied by Wang & Bsodnams Skyid’s interpretation, more probably they think of the 80 vermillion lines that are to be driven into Drigum’s corpse (in order to pay for the bird-eyed victim) as reported by Dpaḥbo Gtsuglag (cf. the discussion in note 20). But note again the non-honorific form for lus ‘body’ instead of sku or spur. The action is thus to be performed by the addressee and his compatriots reflexively upon themselves.

<53> htshog.

I follow Bacot & Toussaint, who translate ‘assemble at’, based on the verb htshog₁, Haarh translates ‘incision should be made into the corpse’, Hill, followed by van Schaik (2008) have ‘pierce the corpse’, the latter two again without accounting for the locational case marker. Both translations are based on the verb htshog₂, given as ‘beat’ in BRGY. BRGY gives an example for a locational marker on the second argument. Together with the classification as thadadpa this would yield our pattern 07 (ergative & dative-locative). Only JĀK offers the meaning ‘pierce, inoculate, vaccinate, but this meaning would not fit with a pattern 07 (but it might yield our pattern 09a: ergative & dative-locative & absolutive if something is inserted into something). Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 144) opt for the meaning ‘beat’, while Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 21, as cited by Hill 2006a: 96, n. 36) suggests the reading ‘embalm’. This latter suggestion looks rather like a mere guess and again does not account for the locational case marking.

Mkhaspa Ldeḥu and Dpaḥbo Gtsuglag are quite explicit that the corpse should be beaten or that nails should be driven in (see note 20 above), but I have great difficulties to understand why this could be a ransom or more generally why nails should be driven into a corpse or why it should be beaten (except perhaps to break the bones, but then this could have been made more explicit). This holds also for clause v210 (l. 57f.) below, where the thigh is beaten (this time, however, the verb rduŋ with our pattern 08: ergative & absolutive is used). The interpretation ‘assemble’, on the other hand, fits well with the fact that food and drinking is to be distributed (see the second nominal clause after this clause). The verb form does
not conform to the standard stem IV but to stem I. I do not think that it necessarily represents a command form. The clause is part of a conditional construction. A such it may also have a more general application.

<54> rlon.

See also epigraphic notes and illustrations on rlon. Bacot & al. (1940: 99) and Haarh (1969: 405) read phom, Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 37) bcom, which would yield the compound ḡphrogbcom ‘ravish and plunder’ (TETT). Dan Martin and Brandon Dotson in their comments to Sam van Schaik’s posting suggest a reading chom; the latter had suggested lom (cf. http://earlytibet.com/2008/10/27/between-death-and-the-tomb/). The first reading, phom, can definitely be ruled out. The second reading, bcom, cannot be corroborated by the corresponding letters in the manuscript. The next candidate, letter cha, likewise looks somewhat different in the manuscript: its two loops are usually smaller and somewhat more slanted, than the visible semi-square and semi-circle. The only letters that seem to fit the visible pattern are the cluster rl- of brliŋ in line 21 or rlag in line 35 and 40: in all these cases, the r- starts with a short head line, from which a vertical stroke descends in the middle, to this is added at the bottom an almost horizontal stroke, moving slightly upwards to the right side, where it is joined again by a vertical stroke, the right-most part of the -l-. The left part of the -l- forms a three-quarter circle, open at the bottom. From the low right end of this open circle a straight line leads to the lower end of the right vertical stroke of the l-. The straight bottom line of the -l-, its right-most vertical stroke, and the lower part of the r- form thus a semi-square. In the case of the defect letter, one can see this semi-square with slightly rounded edges, the middle vertical stroke of the r- and the left part of the circle of the -l-. In between these two parts the document shows a sort of white scratch, reaching even the head line. One might nevertheless guess a connecting diagonal stroke in the -l- subscript (as particularly visible in the edited photograph).

All translations take the preceding ḡphrog as a verb. According to Bacot & Toussaint, a pot is taken away from the people — but then its content, the food is distributed to the people. According to Haarh it is the corpse that should be taken away from the people, while van Schaik (2008) wants it to be ‘taken away to the people’ (emphasis added in both cases). All three translations play down the aggressive semantics of the verb ḡphrog ‘rob, deprive’. Hill captures this notion of force by his translation “expell [!] the men”, but none of the dictionaries gives this meaning, and it is somewhat odd that the entity expelled should bear a locational case marker.
All translations neglect the fact that the word ḥphrog does not take the last position in the clause or phrase, and thus cannot be a verb, except if the following word is again a verb. If rlom were an independent verb, it would lack a suitable argument, even more since ḥphrog is nowhere attested as noun. As for the intended meaning, I have difficulties to understand why the people should be either deprived of the corpse or be expelled, especially if the corpse is where people should assemble and where victuals are distributed. If ḥphrog and rlom denote two independent actions, it is also difficult to understand how one could command a forceful disappropriation (ḥphrog) in the same breath as a boasting behaviour (rlom), treated as inagentive verb in BRGY) or a sort of oppressing (rlom) the mind of the people.

I would think that Bacot & Toussaint’s translation comes closest to the intended meaning. But I should suggest reading this and the following clauses as nominal clauses. At least in the second nominal clause after clause v171 (l. 47) it is absolutely evident that za (stem I) cannot be the command form ‘eat!’: stem IV should be zo (some dictionaries give stem IV also as zos, but this might be an artificial form). zaḥthuy should thus be taken as a compound, see also note 55 below. Expecting a parallel construction in the present clause, I would suggest reading ḥphrogrlom as compound, combining the agentive stems I of the verbs ḥphrog and rlom.

According to the Tibetan grammatical theory of bdag & gžan ‘self and other’, which describes correctly the agent-orientation of stem I and the patient-orientation of stem III in nominal or embedded usage (cf. Zeisler 2004: 264f.), the compound should be translated as ‘robber and swaggerer’ (or ‘robber and oppressor’), due to the use of two times stem I. Since this does not make much sense in this context, the compound seems to denote the activities as such, ‘robbing and boasting’ (or ‘robbing and oppressing’), which I have tried to capture by a word play. It should not denote the objects of these activities, for which stem III is to be used. While I am somewhat sceptical whether stem I could be used to denote activities, my colleague Frank Müller-Witte, who studied the problems of bdag & gžan in some detail and who would argue for an even wider range of the opposition, has no objection against the use of stem I for actions — as long as the notion of agentship remains foregrounded (p.c.).

Nevertheless, I should add an observation made in this connection: the above-mentioned compound ḥphrogrlom ‘ravish and plunder’ would combine stem I (agent focus) with stem III (patient focus), apparently in order to express an activity from a holistic perspective, combining the two possible foci. The order of these foci does not seem to be fixed, as we can also observe a similar compound byabyed ‘doings, activity, fuss’ (JÄK, cf. also TVP v198, fol. 263v2) with the opposite order of stem III and stem I. In any case, a combination of stem I with stem
III would be the ideal form to express activities rather than the combination of two times stem I as in our text. As we can see in the similar compound zahthuŋ (note 55 below), the rules of bdag & gzan are not always applied strictly in compound formation. They nevertheless constitute an important thumb rule.

Not fitting at all into our view of the Tibetan world, the intended meaning of the compound hphrogrlom seems to be that the warriors are allowed to show off their booties or, even worse, that they are allowed to go on a raid (only the second interpretation is possible if one reads hphrogbcom). Ritual practice of violence is, however, not unheard of, and while we seem to have evidence mostly from the Indo-European antiquity (an extreme example is the Krypteia terror system against the Helotes in Sparta), this does not mean that other archaic societies did not have similar rites or institutions. Thomas Preiswerk (p.c.) points out that early Chinese rulers on the occasion of their enthronement went on raids against the ‘barbarous’ tribes, later this was replaced by extensive hunting parties with animals killed in extremely large numbers.

One may thus wonder whether the raid against the Loŋam tribe described in v197 to v207 (ll. 53-56) was not just such an act of ritual man hunting, rather than a simple act of revenge. The Loŋam are depicted here either as cowards or as comparatively defenceless people and the subsequent song (following v209 up to v213, ll. 57f.), quite apparently likens the raid to a hunting expedition. It may well be the case that the figure of Loŋam the regicide is a mere fiction, constructed not just to cover a break in the lineage (or rather the non-existence of such lineage), but to camouflage the, from the Buddhist perspective, absolute skandalon of men hunt at the very beginning, and as a foundation, of the lineage.

<55> zahthuŋ.

Like in the case of the above hphrogrlom the compound shows the combination of two agentive stems I of the verbs zal bzaḥ ‘eat’ and hthuŋ ‘drink’. One should thus likewise expect a translation as ‘eater and drinker’ or as referring to the activities of ‘eating and drinking’ directed towards the victuals. The corresponding CT compound referring to the objects of this activity predictably shows stem III (for hthuŋ, at least), at least in the dictionary entries: zabtung (TETT; I & III) or bzaḥbtuŋ (BRGY, TETT; III & III) ‘eating and drinking’, i.e., ‘what is to be eaten and to be drunk’, cf. also the non-compound form bzahbadan btuŋba ‘meat and drink, specially the quality and quantity of food’ (JÄK). The compound is also found in some modern varieties: in Ladakh with the meaning ‘food and drinks’ as /zathuŋ/ (Norman, in preparation, and own data: Upper and Lower Ladakh) ~ /zatuŋ/ (Hamid 1998, with the spelling bzaḥbtuŋ) ~ /zapthuŋ/ (Ramsay 1890, own data: Lower Ladakh and Gya-Sasoma), in Balti as /zapthuŋ/ with the meaning
‘food management, catering’ (Sprigg 2002), in Nubri as /saptuŋ/ and in Spiti with vowel assimilation as /siptuŋ/ both with the somewhat reduced meaning ‘food’ (CDTD).

While most versions correspond to a spelling zabtuŋ or bzaḥtuŋ with stem III for the verb ḥthuŋ, the first Ladakhi variant rather corresponds to the OT compound with the combination of two times stem I, apparently again against the rules of bdag & gžan. The forms /zapṭuŋ/ (possibly reflecting an OT pronunciation), /saptuŋ/, and /siptuŋ/ are instances of the dőrje-effect or leftward consonant migration, by which prefixes could be preserved as finals of preceding open syllables. Due to various sociolinguistic factors, such compounds are now in decline in Ladakh and are replaced by compounds without the migrated prefixes. While it cannot be precluded thus that the form /zathuŋ/ actually goes back to an earlier /zapṭuŋ/ (one would have otherwise expected also the occurrence of the form */zanthuŋ/ for zathuŋ, with preservation of the ḥ- prefix), the Ladakhi compound /zathuŋ/ as well as the formally identical OT compound zathuŋ could perhaps indicate that with respect to compound formation, the bdag & gžan ‘rules’ merely describe (strong) tendencies.

One reason could perhaps lie in the irregular behaviour of the verb ‘eat’. According to a regular weak paradigm one could expect the form za to represent stem I and bzaḥ stem III, but quite apparently, the verb does not behave regularly, so that we find the latter spelling also for stem I, e.g. in BRGY, while the data from the dialects suggests that the prefixed forms for stems I/III, and II are not based on linguistic facts, cf. CDTD sub za. This may have combined with the likewise somewhat irregular behaviour of the verb ‘drink’, which at least according to JĀK does not necessarily follow the paradigm with respect to stem II: we may find thuŋs in place of paradigmatic bṭuŋs. Thus already at an early time, but perhaps restricted to few varieties, the verb ḥṭuŋ might have either followed a paradigm of non-agentive verbs or underwent a levelling of stem forms (cf. Zeisler forthcoming chapter 3 § 3), in this case towards stem I. It is interesting to see, that the overwhelming majority of the modern varieties shows an aspirated form based on the regular stem I, thus /thuŋ/ in West and Central Tibetan, and variants of /nthuŋ/ in East Tibetan (CDTD), the exceptions being a few Western and Central Tibetan varieties: Ngari Purang, Dingri, Shigatse, and Lhasa with variants of /tūŋ/ bṭuŋ. If it was not for these exceptions and the above compounds, one could think that the prefixed written forms bṭuŋs (stem II) and bṭuŋ (stem III) had no base in the spoken language.

Given this data from the spoken languages it is quite obvious that the compound zathuŋ might equally have an AGENT and a PATIENT reading: ‘eater and drinker’ (‘eating and drinking as activities’) and ‘what is to be eaten and drunk’. The parallelism with the preceding nominal clause suggests an activity reading.
For the use of *geod* ‘cut’ in this collocation see note 73 below. The expression indicates that tallies might have been used as tokens for an oath.

Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 146) interpret the word as *ltotshay* ‘family, household’. They seem to overlook that the same interpretation should hold for clause v70 (l. 20), where Drigum’s corpse eventually gets into the ‘household’ or rather belly of the same spirit. From a Buddhist perspective it is certainly preferable if a person given as ransom is handed over to a household and is not devoured by a spirit. But by all that we know from the early Tibetan burial practises, animals were sacrificed as ‘ransom’ for the defunct, and hence we cannot preclude a similar human sacrifice in conformity with Central Asian practises.

Obviously a compound, the first element of which is a short form of the name Ńakhyi. The second seems to be the (imperial) title, rather than a name, since otherwise one would have expected the compound Ńa-Ša. Bacot & Toussaint do not translate the names and simply speak of ‘les deux frères’. Hill follows Zeisler (2004: 388, example 283), where it is suggested to read ša instead of lha. An emendation is, however, not really necessary. If it is Šakhyi who becomes the new lord (for doubts concerning this interpretation see note 64 below), he would be the country’s god, lha, or with some more probability, the lhasras ‘son of the gods’, as the emperor is usually addressed.

Cf. Panglung (1988: 324, n. 20). All translations (including unfortunately Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) opt for *gur* ‘tent’, which accordingly would be ‘pitched’ (*ḥbubs*). But this interpretation would be syntactically invalid (see note 61 below). Moreover, the pre-radical cannot simply be ignored. Even in the modern clusterless dialects of Western and Central Tibet and those that only lost the nasal pre-radicals, as the Leh dialect and the Shamskat varieties of Baltistan and Lower Ladakh, there would be a phonemic difference between /kur/ < *gur* and /gur/ < *mgur* as in Shamskat and Leh or between semi-aspirated /k’ut/ < *gur* and possibly pre-nasalised /ŋkur/ < *mgur* in Western and Central Tibetan.
The word \textit{mgur} has various meanings. The basic meaning seems to be ‘neck, throat’, from which the meanings ‘vocal chord, voice’, and further ‘air, melody, song’ might have been secondarily derived. For Tibetans, the meaning ‘neck, shoulder’ seems to be self-evident, cf., e.g. Panglung (1988: 325, n. 20). According to Gñaḥgoṇ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 22), the notion ‘neck’ must be understood in the sense of \textit{risked} ‘middle part of a mountain’ (cf. TETT; not a ‘cavern’ as Hill 2006a: 96, n. 40 translates). Similarly, Wang & Bsodnams Skyid 1992: 80, n. 147, suggest reading \textit{mgur} as \textit{rimgur} or \textit{rimgul}, which they define as \textit{rildebs} ‘mountain slope’, or ‘side’. Cf. also P.t.1068, l. 101 for a similar instance of \textit{mgur}:

\textit{Lhakhapo Gaṇṣrgyalgyi mgurna ḫtshalẓiṅ-mchisde}

‘[He, the elder yak-brother] was roaming on the slope(s) of Lhakhapo Gaṇṣrgyal (King of Glaciers).’

Since both forms \textit{mgur} and \textit{mgul} have the meaning ‘neck, throat’, they seem to be dialectal variants, and both forms might thus have originally also referred to the ‘neck’ or ‘shoulder’ of a mountain. Reading \textit{mgur} as ‘mountain slope’ (of Gyaṅṭo) would yield the necessary indication of where the funeral monument was built.

\textit{<60> Gyaṅṭo.}

Bacot & Toussaint (unfortunately also Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) translate ‘de pisé’. They do not understand that Gyaṅṭo or Gyaṅṭho is the name of a holy mountain in Rkoṅpo, one of the candidates for the descent from heaven of the primordial king, on which, according to certain traditions, at least, Drigum is buried: Lhari Gyaṅṭho (cf. Panglung 1988: 353, Karmay 1989: 536; who identified a mound at Miyul Skyimthiṅ with Drigum’s grave). Haarh translates the phrase \textit{Gyaṅṭo bla} as ‘with its upper part like Gyaṅṭo’, Hill as ‘high [as] Gyaṅṭo’ (transliteration adjusted), Macdonald quite cryptically as ‘en guise de ‘tente de l’âme’ (la montagne Lhari) Gyaṅṭo’ (transliteration adjusted). In all cases, at least one locational case marker is missing, either on \textit{bla} (to make it an adverb of ‘pitch’) or on Gyaṅṭo for the comparison. Neither Haarh nor Macdonald nor Hill think of Mt. Gyaṅṭo as the place where the funeral monument could have been built.

\textit{<61> Blahbubs.}

Quite apparently, this is an element of the mountain name, cf. Panglung (1988: 325). Since all translators interpret \textit{mgur} as \textit{gur} (cf. note 59 above) it is only con-
sistent that Bacot & Toussaint (with Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) and Hill furthermore understand the tent to ‘be pitched’, because, as Hill (2006a: 96, n. 40, transcription adapted) states: “the verb *hbubs means specifically ‘to pitch a tent’”. Haarh translates *hbubs with ‘piled up’. But stem II of the agentive-causative verb *hbubs ‘put (a roof), pitch (a tent)’ is *phub(s) < *b-pub (OTC also pub, cf. clause v201, l. 55 below).

The inagentive counterpart ‘be turned over, upside down’ does not seem to be well attested in CT and is thus not included in BRGY or BTSH. JAK and other word lists give its stem II as *bub or *ḥbub, without final -s. The inagentive verb is, however, well attested in the western and central dialects (CDTD). The Balti and Shamskat (plus Leh) Ladakhi form /bups/ ‘stumble, fall down, decline in status’ (cf. also CDTD) indicates that the final -s belongs to the root and that the spelling *hbubs of OTC, if referring to the resulting state of being ‘upside down’ could represent a linguistic fact. With respect to a mountain slope, the notion of being ‘upside down’ might perhaps be equivalent to being ‘concave’.

Since the phrase Gyaŋto Ḗlāhbubs is followed by a genitive marker and functions thus as modifier of the following noun mgur and since the slope in question is without doubt part of Mt. Gyaŋto, Ḗlāhbubs must be an attribute of either the mountain or the slope. The later solution is suggested by Karmay (1989: 536), who suggests that this would have been the south-west foot of Mt. Gyaŋto, at the base of which lies an ancient tomb, which may or may not be Drigum’s tomb.

While criticising Macdonald’s translation ‘tente de l’âme’, Karmay, nevertheless, suggests that the name were associated with a soul (bła) ritual. According to him, the verb *hbubs would not only denote something that is pitched or the act of pitching, but would also be used in the sense of ‘explain essential points’ as in the case of the expression khog*hbubs. The latter term basically denotes the ‘design of an outline (for a tent or house)’ and only secondarily the ‘setting up of parameters’ or ‘defining a context’ (cf. BRGY, TETT). However, if the name were an attribute of the slope, we would be in need of a further genitive marker after Gyaŋto.

As an attribute of the mountain, the compound could refer to its white peak that is pitched in or against the sky like a tent, cf. the description of Yarḥbroq G.yumthsho’s consort Mt. “Gangbzang” in note 18 above. However, as mentioned above, *hbubs can by no means mean ‘be pitched’. One possibility might be that the inagentive verb could have had the additional meaning ‘to span (itself) like a roof or tent (over sth.).’ Another possibility is to treat Mt. Gyaŋto as the agent of the transitive action (and the verb form as stem I of the agentive verb). A third, but perhaps less likely possibility could be that the compound is a ‘polar compound’, that is, formed of antonyms (bła in the sense of ‘protruding’ or ‘rising
high’, ḫbubs in the sense of being ‘concave’ or ‘reaching low’), and expresses thus an abstract concept of volume or massiveness (cf. Goldstein 1994: 16).

In any case, the interpretation as a compound should lead to the elimination of the verb ḫbubs and its clause (v184) from the annotation.

<62> baŋso.

Not necessarily a tomb, cf. note 84.

<63> gšegso.

Given the contrastive context, I would expect a present tense form, more specifically, the mere stem I, corresponding to the preceding clause v186 (cf. Zeisler 2004, part II, 3.4.6.2). The honorific verb gšegs, however, has only one stem, so that the play with the stems does not become visible.

<64> v190.

It is not entirely clear who the agent is. One could have expected a continuation of the contrasting between Ṇakhyi and Śakhyi. This would also be corroborated by the fact that in clauses v187 and v188, Śakhyi is said to take revenge and further by the fact that the honorific verb gšegs had been used for Śakhyi, which might indicate his higher status in relation to his brother, although not with necessity: while Nyakhi’s hosting of the funeral repast is expressed by the non-honorific verb gtoŋ, his being the prince of Rkongpo is expressed with the honorific copula lags. Linguistically, however, the omitted argument should by preference refer to the last mentioned ‘subject’. References to previous ‘subjects’ are not generally precluded, especially when two agents of different status or different importance for the narrative act upon each other (in the case of differing status, ‘subject’-hood can be discovered by lexical means, otherwise, it is mostly a matter of common sense).

In our case the last mentioned subject is particularly highlighted by the topic marker ni. It can be expected that by its special emphasis as well as its introductory character, the topic marker blocks a reference beyond the emphasised argument. From this it would follow that Nākhyi is the agent. One should compare the Tibetan clauses to similar English sentences, where the subject is continued with zero or the anaphoric pronoun he. If one says: A did x, B did y and then (he) did z, it would be quite clear that B is also the actor of z, even more so if we emphasise the contrast: A, for his part, did x, B, by contrast, did y, and (he) did z. Tibetan cross-clausal references function pretty much along the same lines (that is, they
follow the principles of communicative economy and clarity), except that anaphoric pronouns are used much less frequently than in English. The problem was noted already by Wylie (1963: 99), who opts for the solution “that there was no change of subject” (emphasis in the original). Against Macdonald’s (1971: 226) critique, his arguments are well-founded.

Only one line earlier, OTC shows a similar hesitation: Ñakhyi or both brothers are referred to in a compound as Ñalha, where lha, either by itself or as an abbreviation for lhasras ‘son of the gods’, is obviously the regal title. The compound could be read either as a karmadhāraya compound ‘Ña[kyi], who is like a deity’ or as a dvandva compound ‘Na[kyi] and the Deity’, and only the following numeral gnis ‘both’ indicates that the second meaning is intended. Unexpected as the title appears, it looks as if the name of the second brother was avoided, certainly not without a reason. Both lacunae indicate that there must have been a contradiction in the various traditions, which the compiler could not solve. The confusion continues through the later traditions, which also know of a third son Byakhri as further candidate for the throne, e.g. also in the Ladvags Rgyalrabs, while oral traditions from Ladakh name Ñakhri (Ñakhyi) as the first king of the Spurgyal lineage, and the king from whom the Ladakhi royal lineage as well as some minor lineages claim their descend. As Haarh (1969: 158f.) points out convincingly, the name Ñakhri is only an orthographic variant of Gñaḥkhri, the name of the primordial king. There are many other indications that the latter is but a mythical reduplication of Ñakhyi, which, from this perspective, appears to be the most likely candidate for being identical with the first king of the Spurgyal lineage, Spulde Guŋrgyal.

<65> v191.

Here and in the following, the omitted ‘subject’ may be well the future ruler and his army. But since it is the future ruler who is in the focus of interest, it may be justified to continue the sentences in the singular.

<66> yulyab.

Disregarding the order of the elements of a tatpurśa compound (see also n. 46 above), Hill translates this as ‘fatherland’. But the ‘land of the father’ father’s land is phahi yul, accordingly, the corresponding compound ‘fatherland’ is phayul, and the honorific form would be *yabyul.

Macdonald suggests a reading ‘seigneur et père du pays’, but this interpretation is grammatically not possible. yulyabgyi rje is formally a possessive phrase, the literal reading thus ‘lord of the land-patrons’. One could think that the honorific
form yab indicates some elevated status in the social hierarchy. yab can have the connotation of sheltering (TETT), which I tried to catch with the word patron (derived from the Latin word for father). As providing some protection should have been the prominent task of even a petty ruler, this could have licensed the use of yab for apparently second-rank persons.

On the other hand, the possessive phrase could also be analysed as a restrictive relative clause: the lord who is a patron for the country. I would think that yul(yab) here and dog(yab) in clauses v194 and v218 were parts of a translational compound, see note 68 below.

The reduplication functions as an intensifier, with respect to either duration or iteration. While to Hill (2006a: 97, n. 42), “the use of the genetive to connect two verbs seems odd”, I should argue that the morpheme {kyi} here corresponds to the connective morpheme {kyi}, which we can find in modern Lhasa Tibetan and which seems to be related to, if not identical with, the connective morpheme {kyin} of OT and CT. It can be used to form a sort of present participle as well as complex periphrastic expressions, here with the verb cha that apparently signals a future event (cf. the use of ḡgro). In non-finite as well as in the complex finite forms, the morpheme might indicate duration or iteration (cf. Zeisler 2004: 286f.).

The aspirated labial ph is often written as a non-aspirate p when combined with a subscripted letter (including vowel u). This has nothing to with phonology but rather with institutionalised laziness. Btsanlha paraphrases the verb accordingly as phyolphyollam | brospa (TETT), while Bacot & Toussaint (1940: 127, n. 5), Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 150), and Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 25) emend byolbyol. Haarh (1969: 453: 29 takes pyol as a derivation of ḡbyol. The meaning is thus either ‘run away’ or ‘turn aside’. Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan adds the nuance that the nomads sneak away like snakes, or flee the snakes, of the wilderness (phyiḥbrog dgongyi sbrul bros) and further suggests the alternative interpretation that while the nomads stay, their cattle has freed itself from the tethering rope and the corrals got emptied (phyiḥbroggde ḡdaŋthaglas phyugzog brospas lhasra stongs). Wang & Bsodnams Skyid further interpret ḡbroggdebs as ḡbroggnas ‘nomad’s abode’, but then it remains unclear who is fleeing. Perhaps they also think of the livestock? This interpretation would definitely play down the political dimension of the passage.
Hill’s translation as ‘father’s ears (of grain)’, once again, does not take into account the order of the elements. Besides, the notion of ‘ears’ or rather ‘pods’ (dogpa) belonging to the father is not very convincing. Equally, I am not really able to imagine what a more correct ‘pods’ ‘father’ could be. The only possibility remaining is to read dogyab as ‘father(s) of the earth’, as originally suggested by Bacot & Toussaint. This is corroborated by two parallel passages in Ms. 249 (P.t.1286) ll. 30-32 and l. 43 referring to ņagkhri btsanpo (the first):

$ || lhagnamgyi-steŋnas gšegspaḥ || Yablha Bdagdrug bžugspaḥi sras l gcn gsm gcun gsumna || Khiṃtı Bdunštʰgsdāṅ bdun || Khiṃtı Bdunštʰgskṣyı sras l Khiṅ ņagkhri btsanpo || sadogla yulyabkyı rje l dogyabkhyı chardu gšegssоł ||

‘Having come from above the sky of the gods, the son of Yablha Bdagdrug, who dwells aloft the heavenly space: Khiṃtı Bdunštʰgs, [the one] between (lit. at) three elder brothers [and] three younger brothers, [thus] seven with Khiṃtı Bdunštʰgs, [his] son: Khiṅ ņagkhri btsanpo, the lord who is the patron of the country in the earthly narrowness, [he] came like the rain as (lit. of/ which is) the patron of the (narrow) earth.’

Khriṃtı Bdunštʰgskṣyı sras || Lde ņagkhri btsanpo l sadogla yulyabkyı rje dogyabkhyı chardu gšegssоł ||

‘The son of Khriṃtı Bdunštʰgs: Lde ņagkhri btsanpo, the lord who is the patron of the country in the earthly narrowness, [he] came like the rain as (lit. of/ which is) the patron of the (narrow) earth.’

Haarh (1969: 312) assumes that there should be a difference between the two compounds yulyab and dogyab. But as Hummel (1994: 172, n. 34) points out, dog might be originally a Žaŋžuŋ word, meaning something like ‘domicile, abode’ (Wohnplatz, Aufenthaltsort), cf. also ZhEH, where dog is listed in the phrase na.slas dogla, paraphrased as sayi gžima ‘earthly residence’, with ne.slas meaning ‘earth, ground’ or ‘earth goddess (sadāŋ saŋ i lhamo, ZhNN). dog corresponds thus to yul in the sense of ‘inhabited land, village’. Most probably then, we deal here with a split up translational compound *yuldog ‘habitation’.

In the context of the song, one may, nevertheless, suspect a subtle contrast between yul and dog. The latter word may perhaps more specifically stand for the ground, the agricultural base for which the rain is even more essential than the ruler. Mountain deities are the forces who are responsible for the sending of the right amount of water at the right time, and for all the destruction too much or too
little water and water at the wrong time might cause. While this function is basically connected with the snowmelt, the picture here apparently implies that the mountain deities are also responsible for the right amount of precipitation. This could perhaps reflect the influence of Chinese ideologies where the ruler is responsible for a more general cosmic balance. One might thus read dogyab in the sense of a sabdag. But apart from this, I cannot follow Haarh’s involved argumentation, notably not with respect to the alleged abstract and concrete functions of the verb stems and the identification of dog ‘earth’ with stem I of the verb I: ḥdogs, II: btags, III: gdags, IV: thogs ‘bind, fasten’, and of bdag ‘owner’ with its stem II, whatever the underlying etymological relations might be. Note that the alleged agentive function of stem II, is, according to traditional Tibetan grammar, exactly the function of stem I, and this is also corroborated by and large by the usage of the stems in Tibetan texts.

One can observe, in the first parallel passage, a contrast between gnamlhab, the wide space of the heavenly realms and the sadog, the comparatively narrowness and crowdedness on earth, reflecting perhaps the contrast between the wide steppe as the original homeland of the ruler and the narrow valleys and side valleys in Central Tibet. In the compound dogyab, the first element is ambivalent as being derived from dogma ‘earth’ (or ultimately as being the Žaŋžu word dog ‘settlement’) and dogpo ‘narrow’. It might be this inherent connotation of narrowness why dogyab and not sabdag (and yulbdag) is used.

P.t.1038, ll. 13-17 has an interesting variant, where, according to my understanding, the middle brother of the Khri first stays in the six-fold Saga (Libra) constellation (Saga dog drugdu, cf. Macdonald 1971: 215; OTDO renders this as “sa (14) gdog”, despite the line break after ga, and despite the fact that this reading does not improve the interpretation). There he is met by a delegation of ministers, priests, and other domestics in search for a ruler:

gnamrimpa bcugsamgyi-stengna | Khri-barla Bduntshig | šes bgyi || gnamgi lhalas | Sag(a) dog drugdu || «ḥgreng ḥgonaggi (ḥ) rjemyedgi (ḥ) ḥgreng rñogchag blamyedkyi blar» | blonpo Lho-Rŋegs | bonpo Mtshe Gco | phyagtshampa Ša-Spug || «myirje» lhada bdud- | -du brgyiñas | yul Bodka g-yag drugdu byon Žes mchi ||

It is said that … [from] aloft the thirteenth level of the sky, the one to be called The Middle of the Seven, the In Between of the Khri, from the gods of the sky, [he descended] to the six ?spheres of the Saga (Libra) constellation; a «(as) lord for the upright, the black-headed, the ones without lord and as life-support for the bent, the maned ones, the ones without life-support»: when the ministers, Lho and Rŋeg, the priests Mtshe and Gco, and the domestics Ša and Spug requested among gods and demons «a lord for the
men», he came (down) to the six ??valleys (lit. precipices) of the land Bodka.
a At the end of the line, the *tsheg seems to be missing. It is also not resumed in the next line as in other instances. Uray (1966: 250) and Macdonald (1971: 217) translate saga dog drugdu as ‘(descended) to earth’ and ‘(il est venue) … sur la terre en six divisions’, implicitly reading sadog. However, with the rather involved wording (or perhaps misplaced lines) it is all but clear whether the verb byon operates also over this NP, and if not, what kind of verb had been omitted. It is also not self-evident that a supposed sadog drug is synonymous with the yul Bodka g.yag drug.

b **brgyis** appears to be an old spelling for stem II of the irregular verb I: bgyid, II: bgyis, III: bgyi, IV: gys. One could have thus expected the regular paradigm 2a, namely I: *brgyid, II: bgyis ~ rgyis, III: bgyi, IV: *rgyis. In the form brgyibah the verb appears in line 6, were Macdonald (p. 216) takes it as an equivalent for bgyi ‘to be called’. However, the preceding NP lha Kuspyi Serb is in the ergative and is thus the agent not the patient of the verb. Functionally, thus, brgyi represents stem I. There are two interpretations possible:

a) The deity Kuspyi Serb commands something, and the content of the speech follows immediately afterwards (verbal nouns of verba dicendi can have an introducing function). The content of the command would be that the first Tibetan ruler will be the master of all Musans, the one who rules over all that exists, i.e. over the whole world, and that he will be the Commander of all Commanders or the Phiao of all Phiaos (Musans thamcadgi bdagpo || srinpa kunla musng mdzadpa || Phyaug || Phyaly), see note 35 above as well as Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.4 for the name Phiao and its relation to the verb smra (*mrao) ‘speak’, for its transliteration see also note 80 below.

b) The deity Kuspyi Serb would be characterised as performing the act described by the verb brgyi, and it would be the master of all Musans (l. 7), and the one who rules over all that exists, i.e. over the whole world. Accordingly, the verb brgyi should be related to the performance of power.

Rendering the second occurrence of brgyis in l. 16 as brgyes, a form that is not attested elsewhere, Macdonald is free to assign the verb a different meaning. She suggests that the lord came down to earth when gods and demons were ‘fighting’ each other (p. 217). This is grammatically completely impossible. As soon as two partners of a mutual action are rendered collectively (with the comitative case joined to the first member), the whole collective expression becomes the sole argument, regularly in the absolutive (pattern 01). Even if this sole argument should be case-marked for special emphasis, it could only receive the ergative marker as ‘subject’ case marker (pattern 13), never the locative-purposive. Furthermore, the royal ideology concerning the descent from heaven does not know of a fight between gods and demons, but of an instable situation down on earth (the topos of a fight between a god and a demon seems to be restricted to the Gesar epic, while other topoi of the descent are shared by both mythologies). The six clans mentioned correspond to the delegation, which welcomed the first Tibetan king and which, according to different variants, may or may not have been in search of a ruler for the rulerless country. In this particular passage, the delegation appears to be searching for a ruler. The verb brgyis should thus be related with this quest, either expressing the search or the demand. Given the immediate reaction of the deity, and the context of the
or the demand. Given the immediate reaction of the deity, and the context of the first appearance of the verb, I expect it to express a speech act.

Haarh (1969: 307) takes *brgyis* = *bgyis* in its sense of ‘acted’: “Myi-rje (The Ruler of Men) acted as *lHa* and *bDud*, and the country appeared as the *Bod-ka-g’yag-drug*”. While grammatically possible, the translation does not really make sense, particularly if taken in the whole context, which Haarh has omitted (one may further ask whether the honorific verb *byon* ‘arrived’ could be used in the sense of *byu*ŋ ‘appeared’ with a non-human entity of no particular rank, here a country).

As far as Old Tibetan is concerned, one can find two more instances of the archaic verb form in the documents from Eastern Turkestan (Takeuchi 1997/1998, 82 und 141). In the sales contract 82 *rgyis* (r8) alternates with *bgyis* (r5), which Takeuchi (1995: 287) translates in both cases with ‘it is decided’. In the fragmentary letter 143 it appears as *b*rgyis*[pa*] (r3), where both ‘acted’ and ‘spoke’ might be possible. The archaic form appears occasionally also in early Classical Tibetan texts, where it seems to have the same functions as the ‘standard’ form *bgyid* etc. (Helga Uebach).

However, a simple, unspecific *verbum dicendi*, as represented by *byed* and *bgyid* in Classical Tibetan, would be in need of a content argument, namely the speech (or, in a *figura etymologica*, a noun representing the speech). The speech could either precede or follow the verb. In the latter case, the verb may appear as verbal noun in order to indicate the beginning of a direct speech. This content argument can only be dropped or replaced by a noun (as part of the proposition) in the case of more specific *verba dicendi*, such as ‘declare, appoint’ or ‘demand, ask for’. In 1038, l. 17 the content argument is replaced by the noun *mirje*, which might indicate that the verb *brgyi*, *brgyis* originally had a somewhat more specific meaning than the quite general *bgyid*. It is also possible that the passage had been taken out of its original context where not only the appropriate speech was given, but also a verb describing the arrival among the gods and demons. The original speech seems to have been partly extracted and topicalised. One would have further expected a verb for ‘to give’, so that the original could have been something like «ḥgreng ḥgonaggi rjemyedgi rje || dud rŋogchag blamyedkyi blar mirje sis(du)».

According to the suggested scenario, the deity is no longer residing in the upper-most heaven but still in a sphere above the earth, when the delegation to the gods and other spirits arrives. The descent seems to have involved several stellar constellations. The seven Khri or rather Dri are themselves a constellation (the Pleiades, see below n. 84). This would also be in accordance with other royal genealogies, where the future lord descends through several realms of heaven, and it would equally match the corresponding narremes of the Gesar epic, where a single representative of the men arrives at the court of the highest god to ask for one of his sons as the lord of the men.

In this context, *dog* might be a synonym to *rim* and refer to one of several planes in the heaven or in the whole cosmos. *sadog* could then be one of the lowest planes, the plane of earth. If, on the other hand, *dog drug* should be parallel to the enigmatic *g.yag drug*, one could think of horizontal segmentations, that is, provinces, instead. It would probably be no coincidence that the future ruler of the six *g.yag* of Bodka, whatever these *g.yag* might be, a ruler also over the six repre-
sentative clans, was originally residing in a six-fold realm. In that case, sadog should be translated as the provinces of the earth. This would also correspond to the alternative rendering of the enigmatic Bodka g.yag drug as Bodka gliṣ drug. A dogyab could thus be the patron of the provinces.

<69> buspur.

All translations take spur to mean ‘corpse’, but then cannot account for the preceding bu, which would yield a ‘corpse of the son’. Macdonald similarly thinks that the lines refer in part to the funeral rites. As for Hill’s translation, I am unable to understand the intended meaning of his “The seeds [of] the earth and corpse decay”. What are seeds of the earth (not to speak of seeds of the corpse)?

For Gdaṅgoṅ Dkonmchog Tshesbtan (1995: 23, n. 26) spur apparently refers to the ‘corpse’ of the grain. The grain would get rotten and (the ears) would get empty, hence the farmers would be without a good harvest (sabon rulte khogstongdu rpaste ronpahi lotog malegspa). The simile would perfectly match the loss of cattle suggested above (see n. 67). But the explanation likewise ignores the syllable bu, and it would also not account for the honorific character of spur, which could hardly refer to the grain. Hill (2006a: 97, n. 42) suggests that the compound might have something to do with agriculture and could perhaps denote ‘chaff’. This implies an emendation from spur to sbunpa or sburma, without again accounting for the element bu. Furthermore, how can ‘chaff’ decay without rain, and is it such a problem, if it does?

If we cannot avoid an emendation, then hbusbur ‘insects’ or ‘worms and beetles/ants’ may perhaps be more suitable (cf. also Wang & Bsodnams Skyid 1992: 80, n. 152 who interpret spur as an insect called black ant ‘sburnag zerbaḥi hbutshig’; their previous note they had joined bu with the preceding hon from sahön, paraphrasing the resulting honbu with nats ho ‘we’, which is clearly out of place). Note that hbu ‘insect, worm, maggot’ appears as bu in the compound srinbu ‘insect, worm, parasite’. These insects, like the human beings, will definitely have a problem, if the grain does not grow for lack of rain. The verse would then demonstrate that the future ruler, according to the ideal of the good ruler, and according to his cosmic role as a god, is taking care of all beings, even the smallest ones, not only of the mighty chiefs.

<70> khogkhog.

The verb form possibly belongs to an adjectival I: ḥkhog, II: ḥkhogs ‘be weak from age, decay, wither’ (cf. JÄK, BRGY ḥkhogs, TETT ḥkhog ~ ḥkhogs). The resultative stem II must have been overgeneralised. JÄK’s entry shows that the
mere root *khog* may appear in compound forms: *skyakhog* and *sŋokog* ‘having a complexion pale or blue from age’ (the latter compound with second syllable deaspiration). The same phonological process seems to apply in the case of reduplication and prefixation, cf. also BRGY *khoggas* ‘old’, where *khog* probably serves as intensifier. The interpretation as ‘rot, decompose’ (Haarh, Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan, Hill, see previous note 69) is thus not fully felicitous.

Bacot & Toussaint’s reading ‘err, wander’ is not attested in JÅK and BRY, it is listed, however, in TETT for the form *ḥkhogs*.

Hill (2006a: 97, n. 43, transcription adapted) states that

*phub* is the past tense of *ḥbubs* ‘to cover up, cover over.’ Haarh translates « The hundred male Loŋam took a hundred copper vessels, Put them over their heads, and sought death by precipitation. » (1969: 405). One could first make a grammatical objection to this interpretation, the Loŋam are in the absolutive and not the ergative case, and *ḥbubs* expects the ergative (though perhaps not when used reflexively). More importantly this interpretation makes little sense. In the face of the enemy the Loŋam subject themselves to an odd sort of suicide. It makes better sense that in recompense for the fate of Dridgum Brtsanpo they have the pots put over their heads, and then because of lake [sic.] of vision they fall to their deaths.

While I cannot preclude a causative interpretation, I should think that the reflexive interpretation makes a lot of sense. The Loŋams are depicted as ridiculous cowards who, instead of fighting, jump into death; and they are so coward that they cannot even bear the sight of where they are jumping. Alternatively, one could perhaps describe them, equally ridiculously, as trying to protect their heads with pots against the swords, but nevertheless jumping into death. A more compassionate interpretation might be that the Loŋam had neither weapons nor armours or were taken by surprise, and although they tried to protect themselves with mere household implements, they eventually ran into death. The last interpretation would probably better match the fate of their women (cf. note 72 below). Note that the verb *ḥbubs* does not simply mean ‘cover’, but rather to ‘set up a shelter (roof or tent)’. As for the grammatical argument: there are several reasons why an ergative marker can be omitted. Reflexivity could be one. The second is that the topic marker *ni* often (although not necessarily) leads to the drop of a case marker. Finally, the clause in question is embedded, so that the NP is linked with the following intransitive verb.
\<72\> \(\eta\)oggo.

BRGY paraphrases this verb as either non (sub \(\eta\)oggo) or \(h\)gro ‘go’ (=so\(\eta\)na; sub \(\eta\)ogna). non is the resultative and/ or potentialis form of gn\(\eta\)on ‘suppress’, with which it seems to be commonly confounded. BRGY defines non as spa \(h\)khumspahajspa ‘be discouraged’ or, as CDTD translates ‘to be timorous, cowardly’. TETT gives the inagentive meaning of non as ‘be oppressed, burdened’. Haarh suggests the meaning ‘precipitate oneself’, possibly because of the parallelism to the behaviour of their spouses, but in the accompanying note (Haarh 1969: 453, n. 28) he further attempts to construct a semantic link with d\(\eta\)o ‘shore, bank’ and \(\eta\)ogs ‘slope, shore’. Both words do not necessitate the connotation of a precipice. Particularly \(\eta\)ogs may have the additional meanings ‘port’, ‘fort’, ‘entrance’, or simply ‘side’ (cf. TETT).

Bacot & Toussaint and Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 154), followed by Hill, suggest the meaning ‘flee’. Fleeing is certainly the best solution for ‘discouraged’ or ‘coward’ people. I wonder, however, why then the ordinary word \(h\)bro ‘flee’ is not used, similarly, why not non for ‘be oppressed’ or perhaps ‘be overcome’. Could it not be that the word in question signals the common fate of women in war times? And could it not be that the word was lost because it actually was a taboo word? This interpretation would at least explain why the women were trying to protect their breasts with large iron pans. Cf. also the apparent transitive-causative counterpart \(s\)\(\eta\)og, explained as ‘search through, dig out’ in BRGY and other Tibetan dictionaries, but also as ‘criticise bluntly’ in DYGB, and as ‘vex, annoy’ in JÄK. The Lo\(\eta\)am women should then have been quite ‘embarrassed’, to say the least.

Macdonald’s suggestion that the Lo\(\eta\)am women had committed suicide (for \(\eta\)og!) by frapping (for \(b\)char!) their breasts with iron pans surpasses my imaginative capability. Similar unlikely is her idea (in that case at least supplied with a question mark) that the male Lo\(\eta\)am had killed themselves by frapping (for \(p\)up!) pots on their head, although this might more easily lead to the desired result. Note that the verb lce\(b\) does not simply mean ‘commit suicide (by whatever means)’ but basically ‘jump down (into a precipice, water, or fire)’ (cf. BRGY) with the common, but (for some speakers) not absolutely necessary connotation ‘in order to die’. It could not be used for cutting one’s throat, hanging oneself, or, for that matter, banging one’s head till death.
<73> mnaṅs u bchad.

Haarh translates this passage as ‘Dud were brought under yoke’, likening the expression to the collocation dbaṅsu gcod ‘subjugate’ (p. 454, n. 29). For the use of gcod see below. Hill (2006a: 98, n. 45) who rejects this interpretation and translates as ‘the cattle they took as wealth’, nevertheless adduces a passage from OL 0751, 38a2-4, where we find almost the same phrase mnaṅs bca dp a in the context of an enumeration of what able rulers and ministers do to their enemies. This would rather corroborate Haarh’s intuition, although with a slightly different undertone: ‘confiscate’.

Macdonald renders the whole phrase freely as ‘tue le bétail’. She probably follows Uray (1966: 254), who translates the passage as ‘the bent ones, being killed, were butchered.’ In his note 21, he explains mnaṅs as a past tense form of an unattested verb *noŋ or gnoŋ, which he takes as transitive-causative form of *noŋ, noŋs ‘die’. But his interpretation seems to be unlikely for several reasons. First of all, one might wonder why it should be mentioned explicitly that the animals were killed before being slaughtered or rather cut into pieces, and if so, why such an uncommon word should be used. Secondly the form mnaṅs, if representing a verb, at all, does not allow an interpretation in terms of anteriority (having or being X-ed), but rather points to a posterior event, aimed at (‘in order to X’). Thirdly, as Hill (2006a: 98, n. 45) rightly comments, Uray’s translation misses the parallelism with the preceding clause.

BRGY defines mnaṅspa as 1. nor loŋgspyod ‘wealth, property’ and 2. sriddam hjigrten ‘dominion or world’. The second meaning would support the interpretation ‘confiscated for the state’, the first meaning the interpretation as ‘confiscated as (his personal) wealth’. But one could also think of a combined interpretation ‘confiscated as state property’. Bacot & Toussaint’s translation ‘les animaux [furent] emmenés au royaume’ is as close or free a translation of this collocation as Hill’s ‘took as wealth’.

Apparently, the verb gcod ‘cut’ can be used in the sense of ‘single out, separate’ with respect to livestock and other items of wealth. Cf. also P.t.1042, 1. 54-56:

skugšen khagtsaŋ gnyislas | gcigis las gcig bcadde | g.yaprtar bgran || dkarmo dan | g.yaglas gcig bcadde | donpor | bgran || skugšen gciggi [!] dkorlas sna gcig bcaede || phugsnordu bgran ||
‘For/ From the two, the royal priest [and] the priest-in-charge, one [person] singled out one from the horses and denoted (lit. counted) it as propitious horse. From the white ones (ewes) and the yaks [he] singled out one [each] and denoted them as essential ones, one of the royal priests singled out one
specimen from the property (/ ??[he] singled out one specimen from the property of the royal priest) and denoted it as the ultimate riches.\(^c\)

\(^a\) *khagtsay*. Bellezza (2008: 455) suggests the reading ‘of individualised roles’.

\(^b\) *donpo*. Bellezza (ibid.) has ‘divine sheep’; the entries in TETT show that according to David Holler’s study on *tshehtar*, the words *donpo* and *donmo* are nowadays used for the ‘liberated’ sheep, set aside from consumption, another type of ‘sacrifice’.

\(^c\) *phugsnor*. According to Bellezza (ibid., n. 317) “the essential or vital wealth of a household, which is ritually enshrined in a special receptacle”; TETT (Ives Waldo) translates this as “the essential wealth of the goal, trump card, last resort”.

Lalou (1952) translates *gcd* almost everywhere as ‘choisir’ or ‘trier’. According to Bellezza (ibid., n. 315), the verb *gcd* is used among present-day nomads “to describe the separating of individual animals from the herd”.

However, it might be more appropriate to interpret the verb *gcd* in such cases as ‘decide upon’, corresponding to its use in the classical and modern, somewhat opaque collocation *tšag gcd* ‘decide’, lit. ‘cut a rope’. After reading Helga Uebach’s article on the replacement of tallies by paper documents (and unfortunately not when reading her draft version), where she points to the quite surprising fact that the earliest mentioning of ‘paper’ as *šog* comes a century after paper had started to be used in the administration (Uebach 2008: 64), it appears to me that the collocation *tšag gcd* derives from the phrase *thaṅ gcd* ‘cutting an unrolled document (in order to execute it)’ as we might find it at various points in P.t.1042:

\[
\text{mdadšídrgyalgyIs mṇaḥthāṅ bcd-de} \parallel \text{gtadu gnṛṃbhāṅ rṇams} \parallel \text{bdud gcdad} \quad 101ff.
\]

‘The rgyal [for] the funeral ceremony, having executed (lit. cut) a register of chattels\(^a\) [and having ?confirmed]\(^b\) all that was granted in order to be handed over, will (have to) execute\(^c\) the bdud.’\(^d\)

\(^a\) Lalou (1952: 353, n. 3 et passim), who has the disadvantage of being a pioneer, opts for ‘riches’ based on an entry in Desgodins with *mṇaḥthāṅ* ‘rich’. This does not seem to be a very safe base, however. All other dictionaries would give us the basic meaning ‘power, dominion, control’ for *mṇaḥthāṅ*. Again, this seems to be a secondary development, due to the loss of the meaning *tñaṅ* ‘scroll’. BRGY adds notions of ‘merit’ (*dgetshogs*), ‘accumulation (of merit?)’ (*bsagṛgyab*), and ‘inheritance, share, fate’ (*bgoskal; lasbskos*). GShS additionally lists ‘prosperity’. But in the case of meanings associated with wealth, this might well be a comparatively late development, based perhaps on the fact that power and richness often (if not always) go hand in hand. In this connection it might be quite telling that GShS gives *mṇaḥthāṅloṅsspypod* as ‘rich and powerful’ and not, as to be expected, the other way round.

\(^b\) Things to be used in the funeral are listed immediately after this passage (ll. 102-105), and this enumeration is opened with the words *tgaṅdu stsdpa ni* ‘what had been bestowed in order to give’, not with the word *mṇaḥthāṅ*. This indicates that we have to dif-
differentiate between the items to be sacrificed and their listing in a document. The enumeration is actually an inserted explanation, and the topic of making a list or document is resumed again in ll. 105-107, see below.

A similar collocation, *mṇah gsd* is listed with the meanings ‘name, nominate, appoint, declare as’, ‘praise’, and ‘congratulate’ in JĀK. Particularly the first meaning would indicate that the word *mṇah* did not only mean ‘power, might, control’, but possibly also something like an ‘authoritative utterance’ or ‘utterance from an authority’ as well as a ‘listing, register of items’. Since *mṇah* may further denote ‘acquisitions’ (TETT) or ‘belongings’ (JĀK), one could take *mṇah* with as a ‘register of possessions’. According to Helga Uebach, this last meaning would be corroborated by the usage of the word in Nelpa Paṇḍita’s chronic.

The verb *spadde* is to be added, cf. l. 110f. where we read *gtdu stsold- / -pahi rnams / spadde bdud bcadnas / Lalou reads this as ‘cacher’, which would imply several emendations as the verb for ‘hide’ is I *bed*, II: *sbis*, III: *sba*, IV: *sbon*. The verb *spad* is not attested in any dictionary, but in four documents it appears in connection with seals and signatures, cf. P.t.1083 v1, P.t.1089 r84, P.t.1111, l. 27, P.t.1120 r14; in the former three documents it appears in the very last line of the document. It may thus have the meaning ‘confirmed’ and could be related to the verb I/IV: *dpyod*, II/III *dpyad* ‘examine’, in which case, it might have shown the same ablaut pattern: I/IV: *spod*, II/III: *spad*. If, on the other hand, *spad* should be related to the verb *smra* ‘speak’, we should not expect an ablaut.

c *gcad*. Stem III and other future tense constructions can be used for habits. The choice of such constructions may emphasise the expectation that the habit is to continue in future, the choice of stem III, more particularly, may signal an obligation.

d The notion of *bdud* remains unclear in this context. It seems to be the name for another register.

rgyalgyis *thaŋ* bcadde khram / gcig bgyiste / gcig ni *zaḥblo* ngtad / khram gcig ni skyibslugla / gtag / (ll. 105-107)

‘The rgyal cut the document (*thaŋ*), made two tallies, one [of which] he handed over as the main (lit. great[er part of] the) document [to] the chief attendant, and the chief attendant fastened it to the main document. The other one [he =the rgyal, ?the chief attendant] fastened to the psychopomp sheep.’

I would think that a case marker is missing here, a genitive marker, a locational marker, or even an ergative marker after *zaḥblo*. The loss of a dative-locative marker could have been triggered by the following adverbial phrase. While the double absolutive is regular with the verb *sisal* (cf. note 12), to my knowledge there does not seem to be evidence for its use with other verbs of giving and the following clause has the expected construction with the dative-locative. I do not really think that the chief attendant could be the subject. The drop of the ergative marker would not be well motivated in a context where the actions of different persons are contrastively enumerated. But one might perhaps think of a setting where an attendant always continues and finishes the work of his superior, and thus his agency might be backgrounded.
The possible analysis as *dvandva* compound: ‘attendant and lord’ might be ruled out, since higher ranking persons should be mentioned first.

In this case, even Lalou (1952: 357), who otherwise prefers to read *thang* as ‘va-leur’, by translating *thang* *chenpo* as ‘grand registre’ refers to it as a document. It is quite apparent that the *thang* *chenpo* stands in relation to one of the two *khram*, apparently a *khramma* ‘tally mother’, although one might still argue that the *khram* serves as a symbol for the ‘values’ registered on it.

Further up, namely l. 53, just before the example for *gcod* = ‘single out’, given above, we find the following passage:

*rgyalgyis kyaŋ l myaṅthang bcad myaṅthangdu ḥdusso ḥtshal īl bza-y-l-ṇan rimpar plagste īl ḥodod bod īl*

‘The *rgyal* executed (lit. cut) a register of chattels (and) whatever\(^a\) was included (lit. had come together)\(^b\) in the declarative document/ register of chattels, [its] (moral) quality was read out\(^c\) one by one and the specific (ho) equivalent (/ payment) (dod) was announced.’\(^d\)

\(^a\) Literally, ‘whatever is desired’. Like -o c(h)og. lit. ‘whatever may be’, -o hts(h)al(d) serves as an all-inclusive totaliser. The definiteness marker or demonstrative pronoun -o, as in all other cases where it follows a verb, serves as a nominaliser.

\(^b\) For the meaning ‘inhere’, ‘be included’ or ‘subsumed’ cf. TETT and GShS. The focus seems to be on the result of the preceding act of registering, not on the act itself. Lalou takes *htshal* literally as meaning ‘commanded’, the subordinated clauses accordingly as a command: ‘Choisissez les *myaṅthang*! Rassemblez-vous auprès des *myaṅthang*!’ (transliteration adjusted). But it is not verisimilar that the people should be commanded to assemble at the riches only after having chosen from them (*bcad*; stem II with the function of anteriority).

\(^c\) Lalou reads *blangs* for *plags*. But this implies two emendations, which are not at all necessitated. That the verb *klog* ‘read’ has the ‘irregular’ stem II *blags* in Old Tibetan is meanwhile well known (de Jong 1973). Less known is perhaps the general assumption among historical linguists that the root of the verb, √ḷag, must have had an unvoiced lateral (cf. also Hahn 1999), which triggered the extraordinary unvoiced realisation of the regular prefix g- as k-. Since the b- prefix has an inherently unvoiced character, turning voiced root consonants into unvoiced ones (Zeisler 2004: 865, n. 335), there was no necessity to render it as p-, but this nevertheless happened, perhaps in order to discriminate the cluster with an unvoiced lateral from an ordinary combination with a voiced lateral. The best evidence for this are the Old Tibetan variant spellings *phlangs* and *plhags* as noted by de Jong (1973: 311, with further references).

\(^d\) Lalou renders this last phrase as ‘il appelle à l’aide’. While the compound *ḥodod* is usually given as ‘lamentation’ or ‘cry for help’, particularly in combination with the verb *ḥbod*, I do not think that this is intended here in a quasi-bureaucratic setting. If the *rgyal* really needed assistance in setting apart certain donations, he would certainly have had helpers. And in such case, he would also not have been in need to ‘cry out for help’ like in an emergency, but would just have given a command. I would further think that given
the grandeur of the burial, and the many things to be set apart for offering, the rgyal would just have been busy with this task, and would not have been able to even think about lamenting. As an officiant he would not typically have an emotional relation with the defunct. If there should have been professional lamenters at such a funeral, such people would certainly not have handled the sacrifices. I would thus prefer to analyse the compound as bohi dod ‘equivalent of that specific [item]’, much as dehi dus can be contracted into dedus ‘that time’. ho or hu is a comparatively infrequent demonstrative pronoun or definiteness marker (not so infrequent after clauses, where it seems to have a resumptive function, comparable, perhaps, to Skr. titi), surviving, however, in a few western varieties, often in combination with other pronouns, such as Ladakhi /ote/ hode ‘that very’.

While the exact meaning of myahθan is difficult to establish, it is clear from the context that neither a dominion nor a ruler’s power was cut into pieces. It also seems to be quite unlikely, semantically as well as contextually, that items of wealth were singled out and then accumulated as items of wealth. Similarly, if we disregard the totalising function of -o tshal, it remains questionable who should gather at the items of wealth, and for what particular purpose. On the other hand, there would be no problem if various items came together on, or simply were contained in, a document, a document, which had been cut or in any other way executed. While items (of wealth) were, in fact, singled out in the following lines (54-56), namely a horse, a sheep, a yak, and some inanimate objects (see above), here, something written down in a document was read out aloud (plags). This announcement apparently served to add value to the items given, by stating (or praising) their quality.

The word thag is apparently the same as than ‘plain (land)’, and we also find it in thanka, and in bkahθan ‘order’ or (bkah)θanyig ‘decree’. Corresponding to the notion of a ‘plain’, it seems to have designated any flat, unrolled document, whether of cloth (like a thanka), leather, paper, or even metal. While it may well be that the element thag replaced the word than, because the meaning of the latter had become opaque, the interchange of final -g and -γ is not unheard of (it is due to the same sound law that is described in notes 12 (c), 13, and 35) and a rope, thagpa is ultimately likewise an item that is rolled up for storage and unrolled for usage. It seems thus that in the early stages of the Tibetan administration, official documents were cut into (asymmetric?) parts for the purpose of verification or identification. They may or may not have constituted tallies in the technical sense. From this practice it would be easy to understand how the meaning ‘decide (upon)’ could develop. This derived meaning could easily be transferred to other collocations as in our present case.
Macdonald thinks that the song has something to do with the funeral rites, while Bacot & Toussaint and many Tibetan scholars (cf. Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan 1995: 23, n. 27) take the preceding Loṃam episode as an act of revenge, which is resumed by this song. Their interpretations of the following difficult words or passages are guided by this assumption. This assumption overlooks the fact that the corpse deposited (ḥtab) in clause v211 (l. 58) has the honorific form spur and thus refers to the emperor’s corpse, not to the slain enemies. The same holds if spu in clause v213 (l. 58) should be emended as spur.

The song may well refer to the assault upon the Loṃam. The initial boasting of the singer with his ability as a perfect hunter who does not need distance weapons, such as arrows, to reach the birds (or men?) and hares, but can kill all of them almost by hand (with the tip of the lance and the tip of the boot) should, nevertheless, be understood as a warning to the lesser lords.

According to Gñahgoñ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 27) roro would be simply a reduplication indicating the largeness of the cadaver, in his paraphrase expressed by the reduplication of the adjectival che: byaro chechena ‘in(to) the very large cadaver’. In his translation, Hill follows the idea of a reduplicated word for ‘corpse’, while neither Bacot & Toussaint nor Haarh translate the second syllable.

While I do not see how the largeness of the cadavers could contribute to the meaning of the song, I, furthermore, do not think that the text speaks of the corpses of the prey, but of the prey itself. Dan Martin in TETT mentions an entry in Btsanlha, which defines roro as an old expression for ‘all’: ‘thamscad cespaḥi brdarñi’. Most probably it is related to CT rere. There are a few other instances where the vowels e and o interchange diachronically or synchronically, the most obvious is perhaps che ‘be big’ with the nominal forms chenpo and chenmo, attested as /cho-/ or /chu-/ in various modern dialects (CDTD). Cf. also the alternation rjebo ~ rjobo ‘lord’, note 36 above. Other alternations occurring in OTC are found with the tribal name Lhe ~ Lho and with the general and minister Weṅker ~ Woṅker Žanše.

Not being an expert in hunting, I am somewhat surprised that lances were used in hunting birds, and not arrows or slingshots. It is of course possible that this ab-
surdity is part of the exaggeration as in the following clause, which is also not to be taken literally. Nevertheless, lances are quite suitable tools for fighting men.

<77> nig.

This might be a dialectal variant of the topic marker ni, as it is found in the Sham-skat dialects of Ladakh. Cf. also JÄK (sub ni), who cites the colloquial form nig. But whatever the main function, the word here apparently replaces an existential copula. Bacot & Toussaint translate this as ‘je les ai tués’, disregarding the locative case marker -na. The locational meaning of the marker is accounted for in Haarh’s translation as ‘plunged’ and ‘thrust’, but despite the view of traditional grammar that the ladon markers all had the same function and could interchange freely, the locative marker -na is typically used only for non-dynamic spatial relations, that is, for the localisation of an entity at a certain place, infrequently also for unbounded movements in a certain direction (such as leftwards), but not for any kind of bounded movement towards a specific location (this would be the function of the locative-dative la or the locative-purposive {tu}).

<78> goŋra.

The word seems to be related to goŋ ‘the above’ and goŋma ‘superior, first’. The ‘heel’ is riŋpa, from riŋ ‘what is behind’, so the tip might be ‘what comes first or above’. Bacot & al. translate freely as ‘coup de bottes’, Haarh gives ‘pointed blade’, reading ltim, instead of lham. Without further comment, he suggests (1969: 454, n. 31) a relation between the non-existing word ltn (!) and the component 🀃 in stari ‘axe’ and dgrasta, an axe with a semi-circular blade (Jim Valby in TETT). A closer look at the manuscript reveals that Haarh is mistaken. Both clusters lt- and lh- appear at the end of line 10 in the words deltär and lha. 🀃 upper vertical stroke of the ta merges with, or continues, the right vertical stroke of the superscript l-. The round hook of the ta typically starts from the bottom of this prolonged stroke (l. 10, l. 20), so that the bottom of the superscript is connected with the apex of the ta. In any case, the hook is placed more or less immediately below the superscript. In the case of lh, the head line of the ha is identical with the base line of the superscript l-, and from the left side of this base line starts first a short vertical stroke, to which is connected another short slanted stroke downwards to the right, to which finally a round hook like that of the ta is joined. The clusters thus cannot be easily confounded, and in our case, the distance between the round hook and the superscript is even more prominent. (See also epigraphic notes and illustrations 🀃 lham.)
Haarh further suggests that ra might be a mistake for ray. This would yield a nice parallel to the above rtse ray and corroborates my interpretation of goŋ or goŋra as ‘point, tip’. Nevertheless, one can never be sure that the lines are composed in strict parallelism, and it is also possible that the emphatic pronoun ray was added to rtse for the sake of the metre, where goŋra might be a disyllabic noun of its own right. Hill translates goŋra as ‘mass of a shoe’, taking goŋpo/bu ‘lump, mass, heap, clot’ as base. It is, however, difficult to imagine what a ‘lump’ of boots could have to do with a (dead) hare. Gñaḥgoṇ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 27) equates goŋra with yuba ‘bootleg’, which I am even less able to connect with the killing of a hare.

<79> brlah rduŋs.

I am not quite sure what Bacot & Toussaint actually meant with their ‘j’ai fustigé sur les cuisses’, since fustiger ‘flogging, denouncing’ is a transitive verb (the direct object typically being a person). The use of the preposition sur is all the more surprising as the Tibetan verb rduŋ apparently follows the ergative scheme 08, that is, brlah corresponds to a direct object. As it stands, the sentence is incomprehensible to educated French speakers. The next possible activity that Europeans could perform on(to) their thighs: ‘knee slapping’ would be expressed with the preposition sur, but with a different verb: taper sur les cuisses.

Haarh translates this clause as ‘the power of life is broken’, equating brlah with blə. The idea is taken up by Gñaḥgoṇ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 28) and Rgyaye Bkrabho (after Hill 2006a: 99, n. 48; rerenas brlarus kyang brduŋsšiŋ bcagnas, however, does not translate as “broke the “brla” bone and brduŋs-tree of each” but as ‘from each one [he] knocked and broke also the thighbone’; the connective morpheme {-ciŋ} (-šiŋ after final -s) can combine with all three temporal stems, cf. Zeisler 2004: 285, examples 163-166 for the use with stem II). The idea behind the supposed breaking of bones seems to be that a life principle, blə, resides in the bone or marrow (and due to the sound similarity, particularly in the brlarus). As Gñaḥgoṇ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan further explains, one wants to hinder a zombie (rolays) from rising up by breaking its legs.

The main problem with this and similar analyses is that the text does not speak of (uncounted) bones, but of a (possibly individual) limb (brlah), and that the verb rduŋ does not by itself have the meaning ‘break’ but ‘hit, beat (against)’. This may include harmless acts, such as knock a door or beat a drum, but also quite violent or at least more forceful acts, such as cudgel or drub, trash, and smash into pieces (JÅK). An interpretation as knock open cannot fully be ruled out, but in this case, there should be a breakable item. The thigh does not qualify.
The phrase *brla brduŋs* rather recalls the tradition concerning the ritual obligation to beat the corpse of Drigum with iron rods, cf. note 20 above.

The preceding discussion presupposes that the act of *brla brduŋs* goes together with the subsequent act of depositing the corpse. There is no necessity to do so. *brla brduŋs* might well be an act connected with the preceding ‘hunting’ expedition. Its significance might then be a quite different one. One may perhaps recall Arjuna beating his own thigh as a signal for Bhīma, and the latter then hitting (at) the thigh(s) of Duryodhana as an act of utterly foul play, leaving even the combatants in shame, cf. the nice summary of Mahābhārata 9.57 to 9.60 given by Smith (2009: 109-111 with n. 24 on p. 110), here once more shortened:

Kṛṣṇa replies that … [*i]f Bhīma fights according to dharma he will lose: he should therefore fight unfairly. Kṛṣṇa reminds Arjuna of Bhīma’s vow to break Duryodhana’s thigh; … Unless Bhīma resorts to unfair fighting, Dṛtarāśtra will remain king. Hearing Kṛṣṇa’s advice, Arjuna strikes his own thigh where Bhīma can see him; Bhīma understands the signal. … Bhīma rushes at Duryodhana … and *smashes his thighs with his club*. Duryodhana falls to the earth with a great crash; …

Balarāma cries out in dismay at Bhīma’s *unprecedented violation of the rules in striking below the navel*. …

At this the dying Duryodhana props himself up with his arms and bitterly accuses Kṛṣṇa of responsibility for the *unfair deaths* of himself and many others, … he has secured victory and the death of his enemies *only by resorting to adharma and trickery*. … [*T*]houghts of the unfair deaths of their enemies, *causes the Pāṇḍavas shame and grief*. …

[To this Kṛṣṇa answers:] “… As for Dṛtarāśtra’s son here, not even staffwielding Death could kill him fairly if he stood club in hand and free from weariness. You should not take it to heart that this king has been slain, for, when enemies become too numerous, they should be slain by deceit and stratagems. *This is the path formerly trodden by the gods to kill the demons; and a path trodden by the virtuous may be trodden by all.* We have achieved success. …” His words restore the Pāṇḍavas’ spirits, and they *rejoice* to see Duryodhana lying slain (all emphasis added).

The winner takes it all, including the morals and the gods, who are, by definition, on his side. The whole debate is much longer, which indicates how important the topic (the dilemma between morality and war) must have been for the authors as well as for the targeted audience. Given this importance, it is not unlikely that beating the thigh could have become emblematic in both a negative
and an affirmative sense, and that the corresponding narremes, if they were not themselves borrowed into the Mahābhārata, could have spread far beyond India.

The thigh beating of OTC appears in a song of triumph, where an assault is likened to a hunting expedition, and the slain enemies to timid hares. It is rather obvious that the Loṅgam were taken by surprise, and that the hunters did not behave like gentlemen towards the women. To my taste, this could well qualify as deceit and unfair behaviour, particularly as the Loṅgam had not given reason for an attack, not even according to the narrative of OTC I: Drigum had caused his death by his own folly, and Loṅgam the culprit, if he ever were a culprit (after all, P.t.1286 knows him as a rgyalphran, that is, a ruler in his own right), had already been murdered, quite perfidiously. The real offender would have had reason enough to invert his guilt into arrogant boasting.

<80> Ḫo/b de or Wode myed.

See epigraphic notes and illustrations Ḫo/b or wo. The graphical representation allows three quite different analyses:

(a) A final -b could have been added below the Ḫa, but offset somewhat to the right. This is represented here with a slash. With or without an offset, this is a common graphical device in OT manuscripts to save on space or to add forgotten letters, cf. also the names Phya/u ~ Phya/v and Mya/u ~ Mya/v = Miao, where the final semivowel or labial is conventionally added below the -y- subscript (typically transcribed as Phyva or Myva). Another case is found in RAMA, where gsol regularly appears as gso/l, regularly transliterated as gslo in the notes. One could thus read Ḫo/b ‘pit’ with Bacot & Toussaint and Haarh.

(b) Gñahgonj Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 21 and n. 28 on p. 23) and Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 37) read Ḫvο, that is radical Ḫa plus wazur. Given the value of the wazur as a rounded semivowel (u or o), this interpretation is rather unlikely.

(c) Following OTDO, Hill (2006a: 99, n. 49) suggests to read this combination as digraph ‘vwo’ (i.e. wo). While he does not give any reason for his choice, other instances of the digraph show, that his interpretation is well possible from the epigraphic side: the digraph can appear in a form that corresponds to a combination with a forgotten letter.
On the first sight, this last reading does not seem to make sense. Hill has no explanation for the meaning of the word wo or wode, except that he accepts a relation with the water spirit Ḥo(d)de Bedde Riŋmo, as set up by Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (see below). Neither Hill nor Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan give an explanation how the form Wode could be related to the form Ḥo(d)de. If it is not simply an error of the scribe (perhaps in a failed attempt to supplement the second part of the spirit’s name), it should be a dialectal variant, and, if not itself representing an older form with a labio-velar or labio-laryngeal initial, both forms should go back to an original [*γυode] or [*ɦυode] (cf. Hill 2006b).

Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan’s interpretation is in need of a reinterpretation of myed as mad ‘be true’ (via myad, which is given in BRGY and TETT as old form of mad). The water spirit would have been ‘true’, possibly in the sense of being reliable or loyal, and thus Spude Guṇrgyal himself (or, as a term of self-reference: ‘I myself’) is reliable or abiding, as well (klu Ḥode Riŋmo madla Spude Guṇrgyal khobohaŋ maddo |). This appears somewhat stretched, but it would at least account for the obvious parallel construction.

Keeping more closer to the text, one could perhaps interpret the phrase as Without Ḥode Spude is not or more literally ‘[If] Ḥode were not, [I], Spude were not [either]’, that is, Spude Guṇrgyal would not be standing here as the legal successor. A similar solution could, however, be arrived with ḥob ‘pit’: without the sacrifice no legitimate Spude Guṇrgyal. But since both readings presuppose an omitted marker -na for the condition clause, they are not the first choice, even though such omission is licensed in a song.

If the form Wode were correct and if it were due to dialect variation, one could also think that the parallelism of clauses v212 and v213 Wode myed Spude myed reflects a split compound *Wode-Spude, which stands for *Ḥolde-Spu(l)de, a combination of Ḥolde Guṇrgyal, the name of the dynastic mountain deity, and Spu(l)de Guṇrgyal, the name of the new lord (I owe this line of thought to Helga Uebach). In that case, of course, myed could not be identical with CT med, but only with CT mad. The meaning could then perhaps be Wode and Spude are true[ly existing] or both are [the] true [divine and earthly sovereigns].

In an alternative attempt, Gñaḥgoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 28) relates the word ḥvo or ḥo/b implicitly to yob ‘stirrup, step’ (the less frequent reading ‘ditch, pit’ seems to be ruled out by his choice of spelling), and thus indirectly to the foot or leg, since having no legs prevents the dead to rise again as a zombie (brla bcag ro sbas l yobste rkaŋpa medla rolaŋ med cespaste ‘The thigh was broken, the corpse hidden. As for yob: there is no leg and (thus) no rising of the corpse, such [is the meaning]’). The real significance would be that the Loṇams had been completely annihilated (Loṇampa rmegmeddu btaŋbahi don).
This interpretation can be ruled out, since spu cannot be corpse, or if emended to spur, the honorific form would refer to the corpse of Drigum not to that of the Loŋam.

The solution depends on how we should interpret spu, see the following note 81.

<81> spu de myed or Spude myed (=myad).

Given the context of the song, that is, the spur btab in the preceding clause v211, it is not fully impossible that spur ‘corpse’ was intended here instead of spu. But then, it is again Drigum’s corpse that is no longer, not that of the slain enemies. The verse might perhaps signal that with the closing of the last pit the funeral is over, and as a consequence, the corpse of Drigum has disappeared from the realm of the living. From this perspective, the verse might even signal — against later tradition — that after the appropriate rites, the corpse of Drigum disappeared like that of his predecessors. In that case, the ‘royal monument’ (baŋso) of clause v185 (l. 49) would have been merely a memorial platform or the like, and not a grave (cf. note 84 below). This interpretation would imply that the song is taken from a quite different tradition than the one that makes Drigum the first king to have a tomb.

If spu should refer to the clan name, and if the line would thus signify something like the famous Le roi est mort, vive le roi, this would imply that Drigum himself was a Spu, which is neither supported by the text nor by tradition. (Even if one takes Rulaskyes to be identical with Drigum, he would have been a Bkrags, while it was his wife who came from the Spu.) Haarh (1969, passim) is most probably right when he suggests that the transition from Drigum to Spude Gunjrgyal corresponds to a dynastic break or more precisely to the true beginning of the Spurgyal lineage (unlike Haarh, however, I do not think that the lineage is continued by the following ‘dynasties’).

A possible alternative, already hinted at in note 35 above, is that the clan name Spu as a self-designation signified nothing else than humanity (as defined by the ability to speak — one’s own language). If so, the word spu could certainly also be used simply with the meaning ‘man’. The whole phrase ḥob de myed | spu de myed | ‘that pit is no more, that man is no more’ could then simply signal that the funeral is ruled off. For Tibetans as well as for the Tuyuhun, the people of Greater Yangtong, and the Hephthalites, mourning ended, in fact, with the accomplished burial (Pelliot 1961: 3; Môlè 1970: 18; Pelliot 1963: 708; Enoki 1958: 50). Nevertheless, the wording under this interpretation sounds rude.

The word spu can also be associated with a large semantic field related to the meaning ‘high, exalted, supreme’ associated with words in the shape of spV and
Bacot & Toussaint, followed by Hill, mistake this as stem II of the verb ḥdzugs ‘put in, plant, establish’. Stem II, however regularly takes the form btsugs, only stem III, the gerundive, has the form gzug or gzugs. The gerundive can be used, e.g., in a purposive clause, where, since it involves a temporal movement towards an intended goal, it is typically followed by the locative-purposive marker {-tu}, less frequently by the dative-locative marker -la, or by zero, but not by the locative marker -na, which expresses a concrete and non-dynamic spatial relation. The gerundive may also appear, although rather infrequently, in the first part of a condition clause, indicating some sort of obligation. I do not fully understand the motivation for its use here, and in the original annotation I had, therefore, come to quite a different conclusion, treating the whole sequence as a noun phrase (hence the index number is missing).

The caseless form of the adverb ḥog ‘below’ could indicate that the whole passage is taken from a song. In this case, the locative -na may perhaps have the same introductory function as in the later epic tradition, where one will come across the standard phrase X mašesna Y ‘if you do not know X, it is/has the function of Y’ (cf. R.A. Stein 1959: 165). Disregarding the clause chaining at the end of the passage, the translation could be something like ‘If [you] were to set up a hearth below, [I] [already] brought the copper/iron ore down from above.’ I do not think that the continuation ‘and came as the lord’ would have belonged to the original song.

The conditional or hypothetical character is only reflected by Bacot & Toussaint: ‘Si j’ai établi mon foyer en bas, c’est que les vasques de cuivre furent précipitées d’en haut’. This translation expresses an inference: If I could establish my hearth below, then (only) because the copper basins were thrown down from
For the meaning ‘iron’ in the Žaṅţuṅ language, cf. ZhEH (and note 20 above). Haarh and Hill translate ‘copper stones fell from above’, notwithstanding the transitive-causative verb form. Bacot & Toussaint delegate the agency to some anonymous natural force, overlooking that the verb is followed by the lhagbcas morpheme {ste} which disfavours a subject switch. Unlike flowers that may fall or be sent down from the sky by an anonymous agency, the sending down of copper ore does not appear to be a common image in Tibetan literature. I do not know whether the falling of meteors was ever taken as an auspicious sign, but meteors are typically not denoted by the words zaṅsrdo or lcagsrdo, the common designation being skarrdo (BRGY), possibly also gnamlcags, see below.

The surface meaning seems to be that Spurgyal brought some metal down, in order to have a hearth or perhaps rather a tripod constructed (by whom so ever). sgyidbu and sgyedpo typically refer to the three hearth stones, while lcagssgyid would be the appropriate word for a tripod, which, as the name indicates, is made of iron, not of copper. Whether copper or iron, this would not be worth mentioning, if it were not intended as a simile. As the clause is continued with the statement that the agent is or becomes the lord, the ore from the heights could refer to the haughty rulers whom the new lord had subdued, and the hearth could stand for his new dominion.

If originally part of a song, it might have been an invitation to join the new ruler and to set up the hearth stones, assuring that enough metal for protective weapons has been gathered. The metal in question would be iron again (I do not think that such invitation could be based on a sufficient amount of copper for making household utensils). In this connection, one could think also of a more mythical act, as ascribed to Mukhari, the scion, of whom it is said that ‘he threw down thunderbolts (or meteoric iron) and the class of demons was complying’: gnamlcags phabste bdudrigs hjompa i (Ṣāṛrdza Bkraśis Rgyalmtshan Legsbsād rinpochehi gtermdzod, p. 225, as cited by Linnenborn 2004: 193, with n. 243; her translation suggests that Mukhari ‘subdued the group of bdud, by sounding thunder’; cf., however, Rangjung Yeshe in TETT, most probably based on ThDG, for the inagentive verb I/(III): hjom, II: žom, (IV: žoms) ‘go or sink down; subside or come under control’, which, given its inagentive meaning, should neither have a stem III nor a stem IV).
Alternatively or additionally, the simile might indicate that the new lord brought the wealth of Žaŋžuṅ from above, that is, from the west, down, that is, eastwards, to Central Tibet. This, the use of the mountain name Titse (see note 18), and the fact that zaṅs is used, here and possibly also above in clause v68 (l. 20, see note 20), in its Žaŋžuṅ-ian meaning ‘iron’, all this might perhaps indicate that we are dealing with mythologemes originally belonging to, or transmitted by, Žaŋžuṅ.

<84> Graŋmo Gnam Bseḥbrtsig.

The translations ‘Graŋmo Gnambsǹ was built’ (Haarh; transliteration adjusted) and ‘a cold bronze dome erected’ (Hill) overlook that the element -brtsig of the name does not correspond to stem II brtsigs (as used for past time reference or a resulting state), but to stem III, the future oriented gerundive ‘to be built’ of the verb rtsig. The same objection holds against Dotson’s (2009: 144, n. 415) suggestion to translate the parallel passage in P.t.1286 as ‘they built the tomb Graŋmo Gnamgser’ (transliteration adjusted). Hazod’s (2005: 223f, n. 10) statement that “in DTH Graŋmo Gnambse[h] is the name of the tomb of Spulde Guṅrgyal” (transliteration adjusted) must be likewise be based on the implicit reading brtsigs.

In the present passage, however, given the parallelism with the preceding sentence v224, a purposive reading ‘to be built’ seems not to be well-motivated. Bacoṭ & Toussaint (1940: 128, n. 4) erroneously take this phrase as the name of the Spulde Guṅrgyal’s successor, since the same name is found in Ms. 249 (P.t.1286) with a slightly different spelling as Graŋmo Gnam Gserbrtsig. The immediate successor is usually given as Ašolegs (with variants; cf. Haarh 1969: 47). In P.t.1286, TDD/-OTDO, ll. 48-50 we find:

Drigum btsanpo sras || Spude Guṅrgyal gnamla Dri ḫa bdun l sale ḫa
Legs drug bšosna || Spude Guṅrgyal groṣna || Graŋmo Gnam Gserbrtsig l Gserbrtsiggi sras || Tholeg btsanpo...

Graŋmo Gnam Gserbrtsig is thus certainly the name of Spude Guṅrgyal after his death and not the name of his son, which is given here as Tholeg btsanpo ([A]šol coming second), cf. TDD/-OTDO, ll. 50-51: 1. Tholeg btsanpo, 2. Šolegs btsanpo, 3. Goerulegs btsanpo, 4. Ḥbronjilegs btsanpo, 5. Thišoleg btsanpo, 6. Išoleg btsanpo, altogether six members of the Legs dynastical group. Haarh must have overlooked this passage, although it appears in a text that he had quite obviously studied well (it is no. 1 of his sources, Haarh 1969: 33).
Quite against his insights proposed in the accompanying note 415, Dotson (2009: 144, transliteration adjusted) translates these lines as

‘Spude Guṇrgyal Gnamla Dribdun was the son of Drigum btsanpo. When he united with Sale Legsdrug, Spude Guṇrgyal died, whereupon they [had the son] Graṇmo Gnam Gserbrtsig.’

Dotson mistakes Gnamla Dribdun as part of Spude Guṇrgyal’s name and accordingly Sale Legsdrug as the name of the latter’s wife. While he blames the author(s) of these lines as the culprit(s), it is his interpretation that, although possibly suggested by the use of the šad.s, violates Tibetan grammar as much as it does not suit the context.

If Spude Guṇrgyal were already the ‘subject’ or co-‘subject’ of bšos, his mentioning again as ‘subject’ of groŋs would be quite unexpected.

Furthermore, if, in this context, the verb bšo, bšos means ‘unite, mate, lie with, etc.’, we could expect some overt case marking indicating the relation with, most probably the comitative marker daŋ. If a symmetric relation is intended and husband and wife are thus to be interpreted as collective actors of the intransitive verb ‘unite (with each other)’, the comitative should follow the first member, here, the husband’s name, and since there is only one argument, the couple, this single argument would remain in the absolutive (our pattern 01).

If an asymmetric relation is intended, and thus only one of the couple is seen as the main actor, we could expect two different frames. If the verb described only female behaviour, the wife as the ‘subject’ should come first, followed by the husband in the comitative case (our pattern 05), cf. the example given in JÄK, notably for a female subject. Similarly also in the narrative of the supernatural conception of Ṛarlaskyes, where it is said that (in her dream) Drigum’s widow ‘had intercourse with someone looking like a son of the Klū: Klūḥi bu ḫdrabadan bšospa (Mkhaspa Ldeḥu, ed. 1987: 246). If the verb focused only on the male’s acting upon a female, one could perhaps, as with the corresponding Ladakhi verbs, expect ergative marking for the male and dative-locative marking for the female (our pattern 07, or with drop of the ergative marker: 03a). The beginning of the annals, P.t.1288, TDD/OTDO, ll. 15-16, however, shows that the verb bšo can be used neutrally with pattern 05 for both genders:

$ || denas lo drugnaḥ l btsanpo Khri Sroŋrtsan dguṇdu gšegso l btsanmo Muncaŋ Kṣogcodan dguṇlo gsum bšosso

‘Then, after (lit. in) six years, the imperial scion Khri Sroŋrtsan betook himself to heaven. [He] had performed marital duties with the imperial daughter
Munçaŋ Koŋco for three years’ (cf. Dotson 2009: 22: ‘had cohabited to’ and p. 82, quite freely: ‘had been married to’).

The verb bšo has also the meaning ‘engender, beget’ (ergative for the parent(s) and absolutive for the child, pattern 08, with drop of the ergative marker also pattern 02 or double absolutive, as underlying Bacot & Toussaint’s translation: ‘Les sept Gnam-la-dri engendrèrent les six Sa-le-legs’). Its stem II can lead to an impersonal reading or even to a secondary intransitive verb ‘be engendered, begotten’, as listed in JÄK and, in fact, as used in P.t.1286 with the meaning ‘be born’ in place of the original intransitive verb hcho, hchos. As an intransitive verb, it follows our pattern 03b, which we also find for the verb skye ‘be born’, here in P.t.1286 with locative-purposive marking on the LOCATION argument, the collective of husband and wife: (X-daŋ Y)-{tu} šospahi sras ‘the son born to (X and Y)’ and at least grammatically not ‘the son of X conceived with Y’ as Dotson (2009: 145f.) translates.

In the cited passage of P.t.1286, there is a conspicuous parallelism and contrast between the designations gnamlX-7 and sale Y-6, and an equally eye-catching parallelism and contrast between the phrases bšosna l X and groṣna l l Y, which are not accounted for in Dotson’s translation. For the latter contrast, cf. also R.A. Stein (1973: 423, ns. 41-44) where bšos ‘être vivant’ etc. is in various ways opposed to noŋs and groj(s) ‘mort’ etc. In this context, R.A. Stein (n. 41) also refers to our passage in OTC I.

The expression sale Legs drug quite obviously refers to the ‘dynasty’ of the six Legs on earth (for le instead of la, see also the variation between Ċarleskyes and Ċarlaskyes, note 39 above). legs might be the collective form of leg or lig, CT srid(pa) (ZhEH, ZhNN). The latter form appears in the names of Ŋaŋžuŋ rulers, where it may correspond to Skr. sat or sattva, perhaps in the sense of a ‘legitimate descent’ (the Tibetan word legs ‘good’ translates only one of the many aspects of these words; for the connotations of Tibetan srid with the notion of ‘procreation’ or with its legal precondition, the marriage, and its further political implications see R.A. Stein 1973). Less obviously, then, gnamlDri bdun should refer to the ‘dynasty’ of the seven Khri in the sky (cf. Bacot et al. 1940: 87, n. 5 and also Dotson 2009: 144, n. 415). Whether the form dri reflects an extremely early sound change affecting first the clusters with velar and alveolar trill, whether it is simply a mistake triggered by the preceding name of Drigum (note that in combination with the ‘middle of the seven of the Khri’ only the form Khri appears, ll. 31 (2x), 42, 43), whether it derives from a different tradition, or whether it results from a combination of all these factors cannot be said with certainty.
Note, however, that the element *tri* appears in the Žanžuŋ name for a celestial body *Triki* (ZhNN), possibly derived via metathesis from Skr. *Kr̥ttika*, the Tibetan *Smindrug*, the Pleiades, which, in European and Chinese tradition have seven elements, but in ancient India only six (Petri 1966; cf. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kṛttika). Similarly in Kashmiri as spoken in the Neelam Valley in Pakistan, the constellation, called Kretsa, consists of six stars (Khawaja Rehman, p.c.). But the number seems to be quite variable, Urdu speakers call the constellation *sāhelin̄ kā jhumkā* ‘the earring of the seven girl friends’ (Ruth Laila Schmidt, p.c.), and in Tibetan one finds the alternative name *madrugbu* (SCD, BRGY), which indicates that there are six mothers and one son, together seven elements. The difference in numbers may result from fluctuations in brightness of one of the stars (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Plejaden). The Pleiades are an important constellation in Indian and Tibetan astrology. They appear as one of the first entries in the lists of the 28 (or 27) lunar mansions (*rgyuskar*; Skr. *nakṣatra*; Petri 1966, cf. also BRGY sub *rgyuskar*). In the Ladakhi marriage songs they constitute one of the 18 ‘auspicious connections’ (*rtenＢｈｒｅｌＢｃｏＢｒｇｙａｔ*).

While Old and Classical Tibetan do not allow for the clusters *tr* and *thr* (the few such words are all obvious loans), the representation of the two clusters *tr* and *dr* in the Old Tibetan manuscripts is quite similar, the main difference being the way how the subscript is joined (actually, in OTC the only word with the cluster *tr* is the place name Maltro, ll. 192, 422, in later times also spelled *Malgro* < *Maldro*). A confusion of the two clusters *tr* and *dr* or a copy error would thus not be completely improbable.

The clusters of velar plus alveolar trill (*kr*, *khr*, *gr*) seem to have started changing into the corresponding retroflexes [ʈʂ, ʈʂʰ, ɖʐ] quite early, although most probably not in all dialects. It must have been the knowledge of this synchronic sound alternation that has led early scribes as well as later scholars to opt for a velar cluster instead of a dental cluster or a retroflex in loan words. This almost institutionalised case of hypercorrection is quite obvious in the spelling *Grugu* for the *Drugu* (Turks) or *Grigum* (var. *Khrigum*) for *Drigum*, less obvious perhaps in the spelling of *hgrul* ‘go, walk’, not attested with a velar cluster in Balti, and thus most probably borrowed from an Indian language, cf. Hindi *dulnā* ‘move’ and Kumaoni *dulno* ‘wander’ (Bielmeier 1985: 171). Even my non-scholarly Ladakhi friends would automatically opt for a velar cluster for retroflexes in words of unknown origin and for retroflex variants of words with dentals (e.g. Shamskat /thrup/ for /thup/ ‘be able’ would be spelled as *khrub*). An original *tri-*, alternatively spelled as *dri-*, could thus well be re-interpreted as either *gri* or *khri*-. For obvious reasons, *gri* ‘knife’ is not the preferred option when it comes to celestial bodies. (The name *Drigum* might accordingly be read as ‘one of the Pleiades that
vanished’, that is, did not return to the sky, referring perhaps to the star with the weakest brightness, which was once seen and then no longer.)

It should further be noted that according to the genealogy of P.t.1286, Khribdun not only the name for the first ‘dynasty’ on earth, but hidden also in the designation of the first king’s father (and six uncles): Khriḥi Bduntshigs, lit. ‘the Middle of the Seven of the Khri’, i.e. the fourth Khri. Arguably then, the designation Khribdun would have originally belonged to this mythical ancestral heavenly realm, where it would have referred to only one single generation (with seven, but perhaps only six members, as in the preceding generation or as corresponding to the number of the stars). Only later was the designation transferred to the allegedly first dynasty, referring then to seven (or eight, sometimes even nine) consecutive generations. This is another instance of transforming a horizontal or synchronous setting into a vertical or diachronous sequence.

The addition of a ‘middle one’ to a group of six brothers may be related to the addition of a ‘son’ to a group of six ‘mothers’. But the apparent oscillation between the numbers six and seven may also have to do with an odd feature of Žanžun numbers, namely the combination with a lower or higher number in ordinals and conjunctive numerals, interestingly with a break at the seventh element (cf. Haarh 1968: 18: drug ‘six’, snis and variants ‘seven’, gyad ‘eight’, but drug-snis ‘sixth’, sni-tse ‘seventh’, sni-gyad ‘eighth’). Another possible source for confusion could be the byaṅgyi skarma spun bdun ‘the Seven Brothers, stars of the north’, the seven stars of the Great Bear, also known as smi bdun or sme bdun (SCD). In any case, I should suggest to translate the passage as follows (cf. also Panglung 1988: 353 for a similar rendering of the second half):

‘The son of Drigum, the scion: Spude Guṅrgyal; at [the junction of two lineages:] the seven Dri in the sky [and] the six Legs on the earth; when engendered: Spude Guṅrgyal, when having died: Graṅmo Gnam Gserbrtsig. The son of Gserbrtsig: Tholeg, the scion …’

Admittedly, my interpretation might be in need of a radically different punctuation and the addition of a marker for the relation between as indicated below (all changes are marked by grey shading):

Drigum btsan po sras || Spude Guṅrgyal || gnam la Dri bdun sale Legs drug[na] || bṣos na | Spude Guṅrgyal || groṣ na | Graṅmo Gnam Gserbrtsig || Gserbrtsig gi sras || Tholeg btsan po…

For the interesting technique of enumerating three terms, by giving the middle term separately from the first and the last term, which are then grouped together
and, as a group, receive a locative marker, expressing the relation *between*, or perhaps more precisely the notion of *at [the junction of]*, compare l. 42 of the same text:

\[Yablha Bdagdrug bzugspha sras | gcn gsum gcun gsumna | Khrihi Bduntshigsdan\]

‘The son of the [heaven]-dweller, *Yablha Bdagdrug*, between (lit. at) three elder brothers [and] three younger brothers, seven with *Khrihi Bduntshig*.’

I would assume that in view of this parallelism (and the internal coherence) and as compared to the grammatical problems discussed above, the mispunctuation could be more easily explained by some kind of enjambment or other features of recitation, some ‘error’ in the transmission (in part resulting from a repeated faithful copying of a line-ending *shad*, although no longer motivated in a different layout), not yet fully developed punctuation conventions, or, in this case, a partial neglect by the scribe (e.g. the double *šad*s as appearing between father and son in the original text, do not seem to be well motivated either, further up in the manuscript *šad*s are repeatedly missing between the name of a person, just defined as son and the same name as fathering the next generation). The missing locative marker might be explained either by haplography (triggered by the following *bšosna*) or by a contraction in an originally metrical text. The author(s) or compiler(s) of OTC quite apparently came to a similar result: *bšosna ni | Spude Guñrgyal | groñsna ni | Grañmo Gnam Gserbrtsig* . With the emphasising, and here also contrasting, use of the topic marker *ni*, this passage can only be translated the way I did, or a bit more freely as ‘At birth: Spude Guñrgyal; at death: Grañmo Gnam Gserbrtsig’.

In later tradition, however, the first part of the name, *Grañmo*, is part of a place name. *Grañmo Grañchun* (as found, e.g. in Ĝnalal Nhima Ḥoqzer’s *Metog sñinpo* and Mkhaspas Ldeq; var. *Dragn Mo* Ḥan in *Bkaḥchems kakhroma* and *Bragn Mo Bragnchui* in *Bkaḥchems kakhroma*, cf. Linnenborn 2004: 178) denotes a mountain, where Drigum’s (second?) grave is to be found. According to the Ḥgya-Bod yigcha ngkaspa dgahbyed of Śrībūṭibrhadra, the grave was first built at the end of the valley Senmo in Rkoṅyul, but the corpse was transferred to Yarluṣ and was hidden (*sbas*) in a cave or on the top (*zomla*) of Mt. Grañmo Grañchun in Hconārgyas (= Hphyongrgyas). The grave or the corpse received the name Gnamla Gserthig (Panglung 1988: 324/235). According to Ḥazod (2005: 223f. n. 10), the corpse would have been transferred after the death rites, while the site on Gyaṅto Blahbubs would have been merely a memorial or “(grave)-throne”. The name of Drigum’s (real) grave would then have been *Grañmo Gnam Gser[h]ig*. Mt. Grañmo Grañchun would be found in the area of Dar(pa)ṭhanḍ/ Ni(ra)rathān (ibid. p.
223 with n. 10), possibly in the valley of Ḥphyoṅpo, perhaps near present-day Grongchung (ibid. p. 224).

One possibility to reconcile these conflicting traditions could be to see in Spude Guṇṛgyal’s posthumous name a reference to his own grave: ‘The one for whom [the tomb] Graṃmo Gnambseḥ (or Gnamgs) is/ was to be built’. This could indicate that Grigum as much as the ‘predecessors’ never existed (quite likely the main reason for the non-existence of their tombs), alternatively that Spulde Guṇṛgyal (or his successors) appropriated Drigum’s grave as a further step in cementing his (or their) legitimacy. A further possibility is that Drigum was a ruler of Rkoṅpo who died in an attempt to conquer neighbouring Myaṅro and was buried accordingly in his homeland Rkoṅpo. At some later time, Spude Guṇṛgyal or his descendants, who may or may not have been from Drigum’s clan, established themselves in Yarluṅs, but in order to gain legitimacy they built up a new tomb for Drigum their alleged ancestor and the even more ostensible ‘former ruler of Yarluṅs’.
It is interesting to note that in many Old Tibetan manuscripts, the *wazur*, that is, the voiced labial as a subscript is not yet clearly distinguishable from the ordinary letter. In particular, there is no difference in size. In the Old Tibetan manuscripts, the voiced labial itself may come in a square or triangular form. For the following discussion, I should like to distinguish these as *ba* vs. *va*. The square *ba* is found in inscriptions and ‘monumental’ or official writing. The triangular *va* is typical for (more) informal handwriting, as, e.g., in OTC. Ideally, its left point is situated in the middle between the headline and the base. This makes it a descendant of the Brāhmī or rather Gupta *va* (cf. Laufer 1898: 189f. for the subscribed *va* or *wazur*). In neglect handwriting, however, the left point might end up even be below the base of the right stroke (as evident in the second case of *lbo* last note).

Van Schaik (this volume), starting from the earlier attested inscriptions, argues that the square *ba* is the original form and “the collapsing of the two vertical lines into a triangle almost certainly developed from the exigencies of writing quickly with a pen on paper — as opposed to inscribing in stone”. It should be noted, however, that the *wazur* is never attested in a square form. If thus the square *ba* and the triangular letter *va* were in use simultaneously at the time of the introduction or standardisation of the script, the two forms should have had different phonetic values. In particular, while the square *ba* might have been ambiguous, representing either a stop [b] or a fricative [β] or [v], the triangular *va* should have had only the value of a fricative [β] or [v] or a semivowel [ɣ]. There would have been absolutely no need to compose the digraph *ḥba* or *ḥva*, in order to represent the value [β] or [v]. The fact that the digraph *ḥba* or *ḥva* was invented indicates that there was only one letter form available initially. The fact that the *wazur* is not attested in a square form, further indicates that the initial form for the representation of a voiced labial stop or fricative was the triangular letter *va*. Whatever the reasons for the choice of a square form in inscriptions and official writing, the subscribed letter, due to its low frequency, was ‘forgotten’ by this reform.
In this connection, I should like to draw the attention to a certain tendency in various manuscripts, e.g. OTC (P.t.1287), P.t.1134, and P.t.1285, to write the labial as a letter-in-line very loosely, often with rounded points and the left and right line not exactly meeting, whereas the labial as a letter-below-the-line is often more accurately rendered as a perfect triangle, often also with extremely sharp points. Like in the case of the modern wazur, the left point is then typically found at half height. The letters-below-the-line include the radical with superscript, the subscribed labial semi-vowel -u̯- as the predecessor of the wazur (cf. Laufer 1898: 307, 1899: 95-96 for its value as a rounded semi-vowel ū (or ů)), and any forgotten letter added below the main line, cf., e.g. P.t.1134, l. 100, where a missing pre-radical had been added below the šad. Writing a letter below the line, particularly ex post, involves an interruption in the flow of writing. This gives me the impression that the ideal form for informal handwriting was a sharply pointed triangular va based on the triangular va of certain Brāhmī types (Śumga, Kuṣāṇa, and Gupta), but turned counter-clockwise by 90°. Quick writing leads to a more trapezoid and often also more rounded form. This can also be seen with other letters, e.g. the -g- in the same word:

\[\text{b}s\text{ñ}g\text{a}s, \text{P.t.1134, l. 100} \quad \text{Gupta (Allahabad) ba and va}^* \quad \text{Kuṭila ba and va}^*\]

*http://zh.wikipedia.org/zh-tw/Template:Archaic_Brahmic_scripts

The Brāhmī va was originally a circle below a vertical stroke. The circle then developed into an isosceles triangle, with the base at the bottom, the vertical stroke being shortened and dropped only in few variants (cf. the Aśoka and Allahabad Gupta forms given in Faulmann 1880: 126; for the various Brāhmī variants, including a Gupta variant with a long stroke, see http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/3/36/Brahmi.png). Uray (1955: 102) speaks of the Kuṭila type with respect to the triangular va; but the Kuṭila va, like the Śarādā and the Nāgarī va has a round loop-like form (it resembles the Tibetan na). A remnant of the earlier Brāhmī va might be seen in the drop-like ba/va variant of some 8th or 9th century Central Asian documents of the Stein collection, represented in Francke 1912, plate IV, first two columns.

It would appear to me somewhat more logical if informal handwriting had a longer tradition in Tibet (most probably among merchants, but perhaps also among ritualists) than official writing. To my opinion, the various means of derivation for the ‘missing’ letters and the violations of a strictly phonetic ordering (Francke 1912: 269f., Róna-Tas 1985: 232, 255-260; for an English summary of the latter, see Zeisler 2007b: 29-32) show that the adaptation of an Indian script to
Tibetan phonetics was rather slow, and certainly not the work of a single person or a small committee (cf. also Zeisler 2005: 43 with n. 6). Nothing, however, speaks against a single person or a committee to decide upon a more monumental form of writing for inscriptions and other official purposes on the base of a different type of Indian alphabet.

In OTC, at least, one can note a subtle difference between a radical-below-the-line and a subscript semi-vowel. While there is usually no apparent difference in size, the subscript ideally lacks the vertical headline. I shall represent this variant with the symbol for a non-syllabic vowel: \(-u\). Unfortunately, the scribe(s) was (or were) not fully consistent, and thus we can find the syllable \(lyo\) for \(lbo\) (ll. 221 and 416) not only with a headless \(-{y}-\), but with a quite miniature one, as well (see note 12 and epigraphic notes and illustrations \(l.\) \(lbo\)). By contrast the subscribed semi-vowel may, from time to time appear in the full form with the headline, as in the case of \(rva\) in line 16, where, as a consequence, it was mistranscribed as radical letter (cf. note 15).

The other two occurrences of \(rya\) ‘horn’ in OTC, ll. 215 and 502, are represented more or less correctly as \(rava\) and \(rva\) in Bacot & al. (1940: 107 l. 11, 121 l. 8) and as ར་ in Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 46, 64) and as \(rwa\) (\(rva\)) in TDD/OTDO. The upper bar, however, is also found in one of two instances of \(Kyacu\) ll. 340, 341 (the latter with the bar) and in at least one of six instances of \(Mya/v\) ll. 335 (2x), 343, 345, 347, 393 (l. 343, clearly with an additional stroke at the head; in the two instances of l. 335, one could perhaps argue that a bar merged with the \(yabtags\)).

The fact that the subscribed semivowel may be represented as a slightly reduced, that is, bar-less \(va\), has not yet been brought to the attention of the public, as far as I know. Nor has anyone commented upon the fact that in OTC a derived (bar-less) \(-y\) could still interchange with a full \(va\) (with top bar). Uray (1955: 108), who obviously had no access to the OTC manuscript, points to an instance of a non-reduced semi-subscript \(-v\) in another Old Tibetan text, but does not mention the occurrence or absence of the top bar as a distinctive feature.
3. dud (addendum to note 32)

4. rlom (addendum to note 54)

5. lham (addendum to note 78)

6. ḥo/b or wo (addendum to note 80)

Apart from the word in question, the digraph appears in OTC five times for the name Wonyker ~ Wonyker Žanje (ll. 495, 496, 497 with o, ll. 512, 521 with e).

As the examples indicate, there are different ways of writing the digraph.

(a) The ḥ- superscript (?), bearing a diacritical hook, appears in a reduced form (the final stroke is shortened) and combines with a more or less full-fledged va or ba, the top bar of which merges with the shortened and horizontal final stroke of the ḥ-.

(b) A full-fledged radical ḥa (?) — without diacritic hook, the final stroke of which ideally points downwards (slant or slightly convex), combines with a more or
less reduced (bar-less) \( va \) (\(-y\)-). Particularly in the latter case, the digraph cannot be discriminated from a combination with a subjoined final labial.

(c) There is, however, also an intermediary form of neglect handwriting, where it becomes difficult to identify the stroke between the two letters as either the final stroke of the \( ha \) or the top bar of the \( va \) (or \( ba \)). It may perhaps be counted as a subtype of type \( b \).

The two styles \((a)\) and \((b)\) seem to reflect the ambiguous phonetic value of the digraph. In the case of \( wa \) ‘fox’ \(< \gamma^a\) or \([\bar{h}^a]\) and similar words, the first element should have been a radical and the second element a mere subscript, indicating the semivowel. When used to transcribe a foreign [va] or [Ba], the first element should have been a reduced superscript and the second element should have been the radical with the value of [ba] or [va]/[Ba]. In the latter case, the superscript \( h \)- would not have had any phonetic value of its own, but would have served to disambiguate the phonetic value of the radical.

Besides OTC, digraph \( wa \) is found in the Old Tibetan Annals, IOL Tib J 0750, ll. 122, 268, 277: \( way \) (in the latter two instances alternatively transcribed as \( hba\)); IOL Tib J 1368, l. 26: \( way \); IOL Tib J 1374, l. 1: \( way \); IOL Tib J 1383, l. 1: \( way \); P.t.1047, l. 16: \( wer \) (alternatively transcribed as \( hber \)), ll. 26, 65, 66, 79, 96, 107, 124, 126, 175, 231, 233, 247, 279, 338, 341, 395, 396: \( wi\) (alternatively transcribed as \( hbi\)), l. 225: \( wa \); P.t.1072 ll. 91, 95: \( wa \); P.t.1078bis, l. 1: \( weg \), ll. 1 (2x), 6, 20, 26, 30, 33 (2x), 37: \( way \); P.t.1089 r66: \( way \); P.t.1134, ll. 93, 94, 98: \( wa \); P.t.1092, r2, v1: \( wen \); P.t.1285, l. 126: \( war \); P.t.1297-1, l. 10: \( way \), ll. 2, 4: \( weg \), P.t.1297-4, l. 7: \( way \) (according to OTDO, l. ad3 should also have a \( wa \), which I am, however, unable to identify); P.t.1297-6, ll. 1.1, 1.2, 2.1 (2x), 2.3: \( way \). A few more instances of digraph \( wa \) can be found in the documents from Eastern Turkestan (Takeuchi 1997/1998), nos. 134v3 (\( Widas\)a of Li), 164.7 (\( Wines\)a of Li), 223.1 (\( Watas\) Mdo\( g\)dzigs), 542.v9, v11, v1(inv) (\( Ldak\)a Wa\( los\)va), 588r8 (\( rag\)\( wa\) gsas), 673.2 (\( pradawa\)).

Documentwise, type \((a)\) (mostly superscript \( h \) without hook) is most common \((12:2:3)\). However, due to the high number of occurrences of the digraph in P.t.1047 (21x type \((b)\), only one time without hook), type \((b)\) appears slightly more frequently than type \((a)\) \((22:24:7)\). In contrast to OTC, all documents use either style \((a)\) or style \((b/c)\). The labial might be a quadrangular \( ba \) (as in Takeuchi no. 164.7, 673.2, and IJT 0750) or, more commonly, a triangular \( va \). Takeuchi no. 164.7 corresponds to IJT 0750, where the upper bow of the superscript combines directly with a quadrangular \( ba \). Takeuchi no. 673.2 is a very interesting piece of monumental writing: the upper bow of the superscript \( h \)- embraces the letter \( ba \) on the left side and the top of this bow is almost flat but bears a diacritic hook. The right downward stroke or any connecting line to the letter \( ba \) is missing. In all
these cases, there is no question that we deal with a digraph. In the following, I present a few exemplary types from the Takeuchi documents:

It may be noted that Hill’s analysis of the letter wa as digraph h & wa is misleading in so far as the digraph in question, hba (or hva) in OT, lba in CT, consists of a superscripted letter h- or l- for the fricative value and a radical letter for the labial — if there had been already a letter ‘wa’, there would never have been the need to invent the digraph. An apostrophe is not a good representation for a consonant. It is somewhat unfortunate that Chinese scholars chose the symbol “v-” for the letter h-. If one follows this convention, the epigraphic transliteration of the digraph wa can only be vba. If one chooses the symbol h, one has both options: hba and hva, and it might be expedient to make use of these options in order to distinguish between the quadrangular and the triangular form of the radical.

ABBREVIATIONS

Languages

CT Classical Tibetan
OT Old Tibetan
Skr. Sanskrit

Linguistics

C Consonant
N Nasal
NP Noun Phrase (the nominal group, on which case marking operates)
V Vowel

Texts, dictionaries, or authors

BRGY BodRgya tshigmdzod chenmo, Zhang Yisun, 1993
BTSH Byatshig kungsal melon, Hri Šao Lis and Skalbzang Lhamo, 2002
CDTD Comparative dictionary of Tibetan dialects, Bielmeier, in preparation
DYGB Dagyig Gsarbsgrigs, Blomthun Bsamgtan, 1994
GShS Goldstein, Shelling, and Surkhang, 2001
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