FOR LOYCE OF THE WORLD: A NEW TRANSLATION OF PELLICOT TIBETAN 1287, THE OLD TIBETAN CHRONICLES, CHAPTER I

Bettina Zeisler*

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Buchuung text P1.1287, better known as the Old Tibetan Chronicle (OTC), was fully translated in 1940 by Bucoz & Toussaint, while the first chapter was re-translated 29 years later by Eric Haure in 1969 and then again 37 years later by Nathan W. Hill in 2006, when he was working on 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 Bucoz & Toussaint (Bucoz & al. 1940: 123-128) and Haure (1969: 402-406), I eventually decided not to provide yet another translation,* a translation, however,  

---

* The SFB-Sonderforschungsbereich (Collaborative Research Centre) 441 "Linguisitc Data Structures: On the Relation between Data and Theory in Linguistics" at the University Tübingen, supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, was established in 1999 and closed in 2008. Our project B11: "Semantic roles, case relations and cross-clausal reference in Tibetan" was part of the SFB from 2002 until the end (for further details see our page http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b11/indexengl.html). I should like to express my gratitude towards the anonymous German taxpayer who contributed to the achievements of the project.

† The first version was posted on the project's website as part of the annotation and as a separate document in December 2008, followed by an amendment in March 2009, see http://www.sfb441.uni-tuebingen.de/b11/OTC-translation.pdf.
which does not strive for originality or literary elegance, but is as faithful to the structure of the original as possible.

Hence I made so attempt to streamline the endless convolution chains of nonfinite 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 overhurried 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 rivaling clans of the most diverse tribal units. This constructivist aspect of all historiographic narration and compilation has typically been ignored, even among western Tibetologists, as if the debates of postmodernism had nothing to do with our field. While the fiction of nativeness and chronological order in traditional Tibetan historiography is hardly ever challenged, I am definitely missing a similar faithfulness towards the text, when it comes to 'translating' rather than narrating its content.

Semantic and grammatical negligence, however, easily leads to misconceptions and boasex, 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 as example from Richardson (1998a [1980]: 93/97), whose translation of Śīhavarmā's Bhaktadvīda gives the impression that the early Tibetans not only used to paint their faces (like the Haža 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 lada ni skala dmar yan dogs / 'Some were addicted to colouring their bodies red.' First of all, Richardson overlooks the homorific character of skra (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 dmar 'be low, decay' (dmar-), with regular omission of the final -h, thus the whole passage should be translated as 'Some feared that with respect to the emperor's person [t] 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 mightbe affected.

dogs, as an adjectival basically of verbal nature, could only mean 'be, become red' but never 'make red'. The contrast between intrasitive 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, 3, 44, 6, and 83), and that one can freely change, e.g., the causative meaning of the verb hlogs, brags, gtags, dogs 'fasten, fix, attach something', via a reflexive 'attach as.' 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 confused with hlogs, brags, gtags, dogs 'fasten, fix, attach as', 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 10th and 13th 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 prefixed or their choice of radicals would be arbitrary and irrelevant (see also note 48).

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 Choepel 1978: 72 (the original Tibetan statement can be found in Dgegdam Choephel, 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 such 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 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 sreb, e.g., can be found in Old Tibetan documents with the transitive (possible non-controlled) meaning 'reach out (for)', try, be able to reach somebody', following the standard ergative pattern for transitive verbs (ergative absolute, our pattern 08, cf. Takeschi 1995: 139, 149; nos. 0108 and 0308). In Classical Tibetan the meaning has shifted to an intransitive 'be able to arrive at', be able to still find the verb in early classical texts with ergative plus locational (laidon marking) (our pattern 07), as in TVP, or, as, e.g., in the biographies of Milarepa and Naroopa, varying between pattern 07 and the modern pattern 03a (absolute locational).2

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 seriously. Uray (1966: 50) already pointed out that the verb sreb, stsal, stsal, stsal, give (and stsal, 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, 107, Tib. 109, II, 130, 246, OTA II, Or 8212.187, II, 35, not mentioned by Uray are Or 8212.117, II, 486, 59-61 (3x) and


The first eleven patterns are common to all Tibetan language, including Old and Classical Tibetan (cf. also Zeisler 2006: 255, but without sigle).
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 constructing 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 criticism, 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. Disent, forcing one to reread the text 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 critiques of previous translations not as product of perniciousness, 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 Miller-Witte, where text, translation, and the annotated information are combined, has become invariable and is presently under reconstruction by Fabian Kliebahn. 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 realizations for each paragraph under http://www.xfb444.atschlingen.de/b1/b1 corpora.html#larkTrees.

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", etc. 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 to the notes to text passages further up or further down. Each clause is defined as containing not more than one single, possibly complex, verb. Clausees 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.xfb444. uni-tuebingen.de/b1/b1annotation.html#elements).

Line breaks will be indicated only approximately by the mark \", 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 Tibetan terms, 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 Skyd-Rig-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 Ladakh or East. 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 au and the quadrangular Tibetan bu — both having the double value of a voiced labial stop [b], or a bilabial [bə]
or labiodental [v] voiced fricative — and both will be differentiated from the semi-pony [q], the precursor of the [w]. 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, clause v1-v27 (OTC II. 1-6): Drigon’s naming

When Drigon, the son of the goddess Groganma Skyhbrjna: “How (lit. as what) shall [he be named]?” [and] from the words of the nurse: “The Golden Rock of Sky, c2 did it crumble to pieces c4 or not c6] Groganma, the Meadow of the skri, did it get burst by fire c8 or not c10. Lake Dwdne, the Pointed Lake, did it dry up c12 or not c14. c3 thus it was spoken c16.

‘The rock did not crumble c18. Nor did the lake dry up c20. Nor did the meadow get burst by fire c22, c23] so they answered (lit. said) c24. But the nurse Groganma, being aged c25, heard c26 it just the opposite way as due to her ears: ‘Not only did the rock crumble into pieces c27, but the meadow get burst by fire c28, and the lake dried up c29 as well’, having heard c30 it this way. She spoke c31. ‘Well then, in order to perform the rite in proper (appropriately) lit. to perform c35, water to perform c37 existence) in order to kill the spirit (lit. to kill c20, the water, to kill c22, the spirit) c4 name c5 him as Drigon, c25 name him as Drigon, and thus they named c25 him as Drigon, the son, but the name-giving was an error c30, c4 and it affected lit. entered c37 also his mind c5 (personality).

§ 2, clause v28-v75 (OTC II. 6-21): fight between Logam and Drigon

The divine son, not being comparable to the lit. not having the manner c4 of ordinary men c5, is named c6 as possessing c8 great gifts and magical powers, such as verily going to heaven c10 was unable to withhold c11, heat and pride and when, being full of violence c12, c8, being chaste c3, and chasing c4 everyone c5, he called upon c6, all (lit. nine) paternal bondsmen and relatives and all (lit. three) maternal bondsmen and relatives c9. ‘Dare you to fight c15, [his] as an enemy and stand up c30 against us as a yak c8? c10 it one by one, they said c6, “I shall not dare c36 when

When marshal Logam likewise said c46 “I shall not dare c46 [the emperor] did not accept c48 it and thereupon Logam prayed c46. “If you do not accept my such answer c50, if you then confer c52 to me the divine treasures, such as the self-stabbing spear, self-cutting sword, self-donning mant, and self-purifying shield, c11 the great magical treasures that you possess c50 then I shall dare c46, thus he prayed c46.

Then [the emperor] conferred c50 c52 to Logam c12 all the divine treasures.

Thereupon marshal Logam, on his part, went c50 c52 to his army c50 and marched c52 to Myanpo Tanpo. After the emperor likewise betook c50, c52 himself to Myanpo Tanpo, [they] arranged c52 the battle in the grove Myanpo Tanpo and then, as from the words of the marshal c52, it was prayed c50 to cut c52, the divine cord made of coral c52 the all-transcending divine cord (dbuhdyreg taggyag), c13 and as it was [further] c50 to also turn upside down c52 lit. to show with the opening downwards) the nine-stepped divine ladder (dzhtskas stengghug), c14 the emperor granted c52 these two [requests] accordingly.

Thereupon Logam fastened c50 c59, two hundred golden spear heads on his horns c15 of lit. upon a hardened ox c16 and loaded c50 [sacks of] ashes on [their] backs following which [Logam and the emperor] started to fight c50 among the oxen c17 so that the ashes got whirled c50 about [because the oxen (got) pushed against each other and the sacks got torn by the spear heads], and within that c20 Logam attacked c60 c72 [the emperor].

As for the emperor Drigon, the ancestral deity Ldebla Gungyag tried to pull him up c49 to heaven, but Logam drew out c50 c52 a monkey from [his own] ammit, who then cast c50 c52 Ldebla Gungyag into the womb of the placid Tshi, c18 when the latter betook himself to heaven c60 c60.

Since [he =Logam ‘the monkey’ had killed c50 c52 emperor Drigon likewise at this place, [he =Logam placed c50 the corpse into two juxtaposed vessels], with copper heads c50 with the (Chinese Ornament) c50 c20 and discarded c52 it in the middle of the Tsang river, c22.

At Chabugz Sertshans c22 c25 it went c25 to the stomach of the water spirit Hodle Bedde Rjinpno. Having, in turn, named c71 the two sons as Sakhiyi and Nakhlyi c22 c52 he =Logam banished c72 c75 them to the land of Rkog and separated c72 c75 them (redistributed their property).

§ 3, v74-v86 (OTC II. 21-26): the killing of Logam

Thereafter, two [loyal men], Rhulbi’zhugs of the Rhyamo clan c29 and Bstan- dbogrug of the Snamam clan c29 smeared c74 poison into the fur of the great dog of the domination: Hnullugyangs (7), and [into the fur] of the two [dogs] of Hjag;
Zulemahshaj 225 and Honriku (?), and when passing, the 'rock shelter' (or rocks and slates) <28> at (lit. of the narrow passage), [they] examined (lit. looked at), a bird's stomach. <25> For the signs, the signs were good, then, thus arriving by boat in the land of Mysaro Kampo, they infiltrated (lit. 'fastened', lit. 'strangled') the dogs with a trick, and while there was no poison in the dogs for now my marshal (led) them along, and as for the good dogs, Longam's hand passed them, and since our marshals had anticipated the dogs for poison, [his] Longam's hand got besmeared, and so [they] killed, 226, 227, 228 him, and took his life (lit. flesh) in revenge. <28>

§ 4, v17-v19 (OTC II. 26-28): the Riva-Rulakesyes fraternal war, Ḫarlesyes's birth and his inquiry about feather and lord

Thereafter, <27> the son of Bkrag, the divine son Rulakesyes, <28> a paternal cousin, fought, 229 with Ryha, <29> as a paternal cousin (i.e., in a fraternal war). <30>

Ryha cut off, 230 the Bkrag's lineage. [He] 'drove away', 231 the livestock. <32>

One consort <33> of Bkrag's fled, 232 and was able to rescuer herself in the land of her father and brother(s).

Carrying, 233 a child in her womb (lit. belly), [she] had gone away, and [thus it] was born (lit. appeared), 234, 235, 236 there.

As soon as the son was able to stand upright, 237 among the men of the Spu clan, <38> he said, 238 to his mother: 'If every man and every bird (i.e., human) 239 has, 240 a lord, where is, 241 my lord? 238 If every man and every bird (i.e., human) 239 has, 240 a father, where is, 241 my father?', 239, 241, 242 then, thus he said. 242 'Show me, 243 both of them, to me', 242 having spoken, 242 thus, from the words of the mother: 242 'Child little, don't talk big (lit. don't be big, with your mouth)!', 242 having spoken, 242 thus, from the words of the son of the Spu, Ḫarlesyes: 'If you do not show, 244 them (i.e., don't explain this) to me [I am going], 245 leaving you. 246 It was thus uttered by, 247 and [his] mother explained, 247 lit. right from the beginning, 246: 'As for your father, Ryha has killed, 248 him. As for your lord, Longam has killed, 248 him, placed, 249 in the midst of the Riva valley. At Chabug Setshapu [lit. went, 249 into the stomach of the water spirit Hode Rinno. As for the royal sons, the two brothers, having named, 250 them (lit. as Sahkiy and Ḫakhtiy, the Longam banished, 251 them) to the land of Rkong and separated, 252 them (lit. redistribu-
mother having spoken, thus, [he] laid down a solemn vow (lit. declared, a vow, declared, a high tone), <56> [he] made a commitme[nt (lit. made the promise, made the word) to act accordingly, and went, leading along, the daughter of the family Manbird ("Mamman).

[He] deposited, [the child] / [the daughter] in the belly <57> of the water spirit Hode Rimno as ransom for the corpse.

§ 6, v183-v226 (OTC B. 49.62): Spude Guugyal assumes power

Na[y]kiy and the [future] majesty ([is or [is] bussas]) both <58> took hold, [of] the corpse of the emperor.

Into the flank <59> of Mt. Gyango, <60> spanning [itself; aloft (the lofty tent-pitcher?)/ the massive (sulfof and concave); Blifisbba] <61> [they] build [tbis]; <62> a funeral monument, <62>.

As for the younger brother Nalkhiy, he hosts, [tbis] the funeral repast.

As for the elder brother Nalkhiy, he goes (<7ewn>, <7ew > <63> to take re-venge, [tbis] for the father.

As for Nalkhiy, he is (<?waw), <70> the White [Prince of] Ikong.

As for [the? Nalkhiy, he /He (7Nalkhiy] <60> departs (<7depa) <70> with an army [of] about three thousand three hundred [men].

[He] goes (<7ew) <71> <65> to his] castle (or enclosure) Pyi[nja.

"If there is, <72> so lord as (lit. of whom] is the patron (lit. father) of the country, [of the outer nomads and the vassals will, one by one, turn] run away (and leave). <73> <74>

As for his] the pass of the Menpa chain.

[He] passed through, <75> the long gorge of Timshar.

[He] came <76> to Bachos Guu[n]dan.

When [he] came, <77> to Myango Sampo, the hundred men [of the] Longam [clan], having sheltered, <71> their heads with pots, [nevertheless] run (<7lumped) <75> into death.

The hundred women [of the] Longam [clan], having pressed, <77> large iron pans against their breasts, were [nevertheless] never disgraced (<?we were scared [shamless] <79> <77>.

[He] overthrew <78> Myango Sampo.

The bipeds [he] took, <79> as prisoners, the quadrupeds [he] confiscated, <79> as [his] the state's livestock, <73> and went, <73> (back) to Bachos Guu[n]dan.

[He] sang <79>, the following song [of triumph], <74>

"Ibanii-Nepeulii. In every <75> bird (the man) <76> is; <sits> <70> the tip of the lance. In every hare <71> sits, the tip <78> of the boot. <77> The thigh has been hit; <78> The royal corpse has been disposed off. <79> Wode [the] Guugyal [is] the true [ruler/ deity] (The pit is no more). <80> Spude [the] Guugyal [is] the true [ruler] (The spu [the man] is no more). <81> <81> Thus sang (lit. spoke) <82> [he] again (back) to Pyi[n]ja Stagritse.

[He] went <72> there as the lord of the local patrons.

[Thus:] "[In] the country, the outer nomads and the vassals will not turn away. <73>

Because the water as the patron of the inhabited places has come, <73> seeds and ?insects will not decay. <73>

Such sang (lit. spoke), <73> [he] that song.

As if a hearth were to be established <74> below <82> [he] had brought down, <73> iron ore <82> from high above and came, <73> as th'eldor.

When he was engaged: <75> Spude Guugyal; when he died: <75> Gnaan Gnaan Boebrugir. <74> [He] came <74> as the lord for the slack-headed bipeds, and as the assistance for the maned quadrupeds.

NOTES TO THE TRANSLATION

<71> bsisapo.

The title or attribute is usually related to the adjective bsisapo ‘strong, mighty, powerful, violent’ and to a class of spirits, the bsom, which we taken to be ‘violent’ or ‘powerful’. Some traditions (particularly also those of Western Tibet) have sivasapu instead of bsisapo, some only for individual names. This alteration indicates that we deal here with a derivation from an open verb root, like in the case of bhamma ‘sacrament, act’, related to bham, bhas, bis, bsh ‘look at’ (see Frisch & Simon 1929; 120-121 and Simon 1977 for many more examples). The root in question is bshai. While the corresponding intransitive verb is *bhasa, II: *bsas ‘be born’ is reflected only in nominal derivations such as bsakla ‘son’, also is names as X-tsha ‘son of the X-clan’, tshabo ‘grandson, nephew’, or tshas woman in labour (tshas ‘garden’ might be equally related as a place where plants grow up), the agentive-causative counterpart is I/III bshais, II/IV: bsisas ‘bear, bring forth’. Note also bsakpa ‘labor pains’ (JAK), which clearly shows that this is, in fact, exclusively a female task.

The derivation bsas-o or bsas-d most probably refers to the product, the child, 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 forth-
coming, chapter 4, § 2.4.3, notes on smin-(drug), spum (mas)mad, (phu)poad, and spud. With the derivative morphemes -po and -mos a specific son or daughter would be singled out of the collective. Literally then, btsampa or btsanmo could be translated as 'immediate' or 'grandson' or 'daughter'. As second syllable in names, -tsampa most probably had exactly the same function as its intransitive sibling -tsa (and 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 princeses 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 empresses, the title btsanpo most probably only means that the person is accepted as an offspring of the heir-bearing mother (cf. Richardson 1998: 1988 according to whom Hodson's main problem in being accepted as btsanpo was that he was not a child of Ghan 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 presume 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 Uehberg (1997), according to whom a btsanmo was primarily a daughter of the ruling btsampa, a position she has since given up in favour of the view described (p.c.).

For more about the word, see Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.1.

The three verbs ril 'crumble', tshig 'burn,' and skam 'dry' appear to be present stems. They are here unexpectedly negated with ma rather than ni.

Acut et al. translate these passages with the passé composé (1940: 123), and Haahr 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 she were 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 (khu) as "odd".

Skam is clearly not a present stem, but quite evidently (as old) stem II of the adjective: skam, II: skams 'get, be dry'. The derived nominal adjective skampa '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 (resultant result of a past event), notably in the case of adjectives. The question how far away in the past the event took place is not crucial for the use of stem I, particularly not when used with the function of a present perfect. Stem I, by contrast, may denote the inchoative meaning of adjectives: get X (cf. Zeisler 2004: 450). Ril and tshig are verbs with no (apparent) stem alternation, although the form ril 'lam 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 ni (OT nth) help to locate the event or rather non-event on the time axis, mi 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 past state resulting from an event that necessarily took place or started before the speech act. As all three event apply 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 ἔφησαν ‘I stood/am standing’ = ‘I have stood up’, निपुणitt ‘I stare/am staring’ = ‘I have started staring’). With expressions such as sal sogn ‘I am tired’ (JAK) = ‘[I] have become tired’, Tibetan behaves rather like Ancient Greek (Zeiler 2004: 102; with further references for Ancient Greek, section II.3.5.3 for the perfect function of stem II in OF and CT, sections II.4.2.5, II.5.2.5, and III.3.8.2 for the perfect functions in the modern varieties).

<5> cho dgum, sri dgum.

It seems to be a common poetic or rhetorical means in Old Tibetan to divide a compound and duplicate the predication (R.A. Steit 1962: 216), cf. also the division of dnamshtng in clauses v176 and v177 (III.47f.), and of donshing in clauses v178 and v179 (I.48). A similar example, but without predication, is the division of phashten in clause v37 (III.8). Bacoτ & Toussaint translate the phrase as ‘pour tuer les humeurs et les Sri’. Haahr renders it as ‘because there is water-death, and there is Sri-death’. Similarly Wang & Bowmann Skjold (1992: 79, n. 127) interpret this phrase as the having died (liba) 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 verbal ‘kill’, and secondly, that it is stem III, the so-called future stem, which has a patient-oriented gerundive function with a strong obligation character, hence referring to the ‘(item) to be killed’ (cf. Zeiler 2004: 264).

Glahgnyon Dkonmchog Tsheshtram (1995: 21, n. 1) rejects the last interpretation (… don yingur dkyil pa yod khyung ‘it has been explained…’), but, not ‘I explain that this means…’ as rendered by Hill 2006: 90, n. 6) According to him, chuṣrti may be an old variant (bdarldng) of chabrsit ‘dominion, rulership’. If the meaning were thus not (a predicate) that the sovereignty would decay (bdar chabrsit lamdu chog rgyobral don medphy), the phrase should otherwise refer to hindrances and annihilation caused by evil spirits (belonging to chag-chod medphu don). Quite interestingly, in legal contexts, the verb (gsum) is, dgu, dgu, dgu ‘kill’ or at least its stem III can have a quite different meaning: ‘carry out, perform appropriately’ (Dositon forthcoming, p. 79, n. 10 with further references).

Although some doubts remain with respect to the equation of chuṣrti and chabrsit, not so much because of the missing final -l, 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 Glahgnyon Dkonmchog Tsheshtram’s first interpretation comes closest to the intended meaning. The phrase, however, is not a predication but rather a directive or wish. The name is given in view of a (mis)perceived impending crisis and should have empowered the ruler to steer through this crisis. Of course, this narrow 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 compounds in question should have been ‘Drigum. 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 undergro, 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.

<5> nagste.

Bacoτ & Toussaint translate this likewise as ‘ce fut une faute’, Haahr more freely as ‘was ominous’. Hill chose the possible meaning ‘regret’ but then, given the close connection between two events indicated by the bhagbras 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 nagst 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 (Khyuopp Bloprom Rgyal-ma, 81,4, as cited by Linnenborn 2004: 80 with n. 115, and Nang-pa Nima Rdo-rje, Me-tog bshang po, A 240; 3; 1. T. 116.2.2, as cited ibid. p. 81 with n. 118).

<5> mshis mshitsulte.

With Hill (2006a: 90, n. 8) I follow Bacoτ & 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 Haahr). The word tshul is normally a noun. The bhagbras 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 incoherent with the enumeration of super-human faculties. Therefore, the syllable my 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, tshud must function here as a verb, with the extremely rare case frame absolute – genitive (14b). Note the similar use of the genitive with the modal verb rigs ‘be suitable, proper, necessary’; miremsbeli nitrigsso ‘it is not right not to say [anything]’ (JAK sub rigs, rigya vb).

<8> bsan.

Bacot & Toussaint avoid an exact translation, Haarth and Hill take bsan as to be the agent, the former keeping the word untranslated, the latter taking it as a short form of bsanto. Wang & Bodnams Skyld (1992: 86, n. 129) interpret bsan as an adverb of manner: bsanadaksis ‘by intimidation’ (cf. TEIT); and possibly not “with imperial authority” as Hill 2006: 91, n. 10 renders this phrase). Glaðhjón Dkomshog (1995: 21, n. 4) suggests to read bsan and the following verb as a collocation with the meaning ‘compete with respect to bravery’ (dphrtsal byr). This is a possibility. I do not want to rule it 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 bsan as noun, either meaning ‘emperor’ or ‘force’. In all these cases (except Glaðhjón Dkomshog (1995)’s collocation), a case marker would be missing, either for marking the agent or to derive an adversative phrase.

bsan is certainly not related to the above root vbta but a non-derived adjective, and thus basically a verb ‘be mighty, powerful, vincible, strong, etc.’. It cannot refer to the ruler’s legitimising attribute bsanto, 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 l (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 inflences, since the morpheme of the last verb in the row extends over the preceding verb(s).

<9> yabbhugs phu dagdshad yunyshugs shm gsum.

Here, again, a compound or, perhaps more likely, two compounds: phubsun and matsuun ‘paternal’ and ‘maternal relative’, are split up (cf. also Hill 2006a: 91, n.11, who chooses an interpretation in terms of only one compound: phubsun). 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> drug-phod.

Cf. Bacot & Toussaint, who translate this clause as indirect speech: ‘s’il osait laisser le traiter en yak’. The word drug is not attested as verb or adjectival, but only as noun or postposition. Haarth’s translation ‘Are we equal in prudence to the Yak?’ (p. 402), based on the adjective drugpo ‘prudent’, does not really fit the context (are yaks really wise animals?). Nor does it fit the grammar of the verb phod, ‘come up to, be nearly equal in worth to’, which requires a locational (by- or down) case marker (cf. JAK). Wang & Bodnams Skyld 1992 34 emend g.yogda for g.yogda, 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 preposition should take the form g.yoggi-drangda or g.yogda-drang and should precede drugra rgyal-phod). Hill (2006a: 91, n. 12) suggests an similar inversion: “I wonder however if it could be odd syntax for g.yogda drug dge drug ra rgyal-phod?”. For the translation “prudence adjusted”. An alternative interpretation of drug as an archaic form of rag ‘be fit, suitable’ (for a possible alternative vr ~ hvr, cf. Spring 1970: 16-17, Hill 2005) is ruled out by the subsequent modal verb phod, ‘dare, be able’.

Dostor (2009: 114, n. 268) renders the whole passage not very literally as ‘who dares serve us 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 Bisan-po’s relationship with the yak may be described as one of ritual embers’. ‘This sentiment would also be “apparent” in the present case. A similar idea is followed by Hazen (2000: 219), who argues that the “condition of the sacred 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 Haarth’s willful interpretation, but not on a close reading of the text.
ralgyi.

According to Hill (2006a: 91, n. 14), this has to be 'head' as ralgyi. 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 Saldhyi and Nakhdyi 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 Shamsak Ladakhi irag ri-tru 'sword', were borrowed even into West Tibetan. In BRGY ub skadgsurtnoc, the 'New Language Instruction', we find the following remark:

hbrillog na Orchestra byagtsi gya lone dmar pa dpal in de sda dang hor dbang muedin byo dga’i zhes pa me la yhe byo zhes pa zosu ndu btar ba stobs /

'Some ancient spellings, inconvenient for writing and reading, were cast aside and a more conveniently reticible written language was imposed, for example the *dadrang was discarded and spellings such as mve (‘fire’) and yhe (‘go’) were simplified to me and byo.‘

In this clause, the RECIPIENT-argument, Logam, is omitted, but somewhat earlier, in clause v46 (l. 11), the RECIPIENT-argument is explicitly mentioned as bkogla to me, (the speaker is Logam), 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), overlooked the following passages much further down, ll. 260, 221f., 223, 229, 265f., 385f., and 415f. where, as elsewhere in the annals, the RECIPIENT-argument remains in the ab positive (our pattern 35).

khrungs kha ba fangs thanggugs / Rtsan-Bod khyim tseg / [1] / Zute glosa ngelbyi byang chub stobs /

'Then, the imperial scion Stenbtson bestowed Zute the 20,000 households of Rtsang-Bod as reward for this [his] loyalty.' (l. 200)

slaibo n / Lho-Rgegs stobsal /; gsalgyur na Lho-Rgegs stobsal / ‘As for the sla and the ‘belly fun’; Lho (mLho) and Rgegs were bestowed with. ... As for the grah and the ‘feather cloak’, Lho and Rgegs were bestowed with: (l. 221f., 223 Zute’s song of complaint)
for'. This solution is also suggested by Uray (1972: 21 n. 34, reading 'bat') without any explanation for this choice. While BRGG indicates that the spellings 'dho' and 'dho' are variants in the case of abo being a lunar constellation TETT also gives the meaning ‘right’ for abo; which does not seem to fit. See also the further discussion in the context of the song of Sudmarkar below.

Siberian tigers, generally having a flatter fur than other tigers, have considerably longer hair at the belly (http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tiger, last accessed XI/2010). This may not hold, however, for the Southern Tibetan (Mon) tigcr, but in general the hair at the belly, and particularly between the legs appears somewhat longer and perhaps softer, as judged from some photography. Since these should be some relation between the 'abo' 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 ‘right’ for abo would be correct, the compound might perhaps refer to the softest part of the fur, at the junctions of belly and thighs.

While gqub as a verb means ‘fill, stuff’, gqung, 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 of the whole body were handed over to the ruler. According to Wang & Boohum Skjold (1992: 83, n. 226), the meaning of the compound would be something like ‘false cloth’ (spurathalas); cf the entry for spurath in TETT, where it is described as a kind of winter cloak with long hems. Such a cloak could well correspond to the above definition of gqung alone. Uray (1972: 21 with n. 35) translates gqungsub as ‘payment’, taking gsub as an echo form of the verb gsub with the not too-common derived meaning ‘return, repay’ (as this is based on the meaning ‘food (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 textual insignia.

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

dlaugpin ni gsubola i thama ni q.yagis bskorlad / Zasu ni stsalag-krap 1

‘As for the [granaries of] Central Phynj, their environment (lit. rim) is surrounded with yaks/As for the head-feet [that is, a cap of cap worn only] by the ruler[1]; it [is] dappled of reddish grey and as for [its] brim, it is edged with [precious] fur; is surrounded? with yak [applications].’ As for Zasus, should he not be bestowed [something] ‘the ruler’s sat’? (II. 229)

1 Apparently an OT variant of CT gray, a kind of question marking auxiliary.

Bacot & al. (1940: 141) and Wang & Boohum Skjold (1992: 83, n. 234) take the phrase dlaugpin gsubola as a place name. According to the latter, Dba Phynj would refer to Phynja Stangme of the Central Hen (Obara Skjold 1992: 234), a quite problematic reading, since the division into homes can hardly have existed at the time of Gnammi Skommishan, to whom Zasus complains. They further interpret the word gsubola, which is usually found with the meaning ‘reddish grey’ or ‘dappled’ as baumed/ ‘granny’. This is most probably based on the word gsub ‘sheath’, but seems to be an ad hoc solution. A further problem with this interpretation is that the case marker is at the end of the first line cannot really be accounted for. The relation between the granaries and their envi-
Dorje Phugthams Stubzdon dbangblti mthabmar ' nagi lhagsa stsad la

"Among the subjects, [the men of the thousand districts of] Dorte, Phugthams, and Stubzdon were bestowed 'tiger tops' as insignia of bravery." (II. 385f.)

bhrungs ni Ido- Tog stsad la lhakho ni Lhe-Rgyeds stsad la Ithog ni Sa-Spungs stsad la

"As for the horns and 'intestines' [sinews] of the slain yak, Ldon and Ton were bestowed with. As for the flesh and skin," Lhe (i.e., Lho) and Rgyeds were bestowed with. As for the 'floating belly hair' (the belly hair like wings), Sa and Spung were bestowed with." (II. 41f., song of Sadmarkar)

8 Baczot & al. (1940: 156) translate this as 'la fibre du corse', 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 lau and the latter, like fibres, should be dregal. 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' (ra plus rdzens 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.

9 Cf. also R.A. Stein (1961: 25), Macdonald (1971: 266) and Uray (1972: 25). None of them remarks upon the uncommon form lbo. In a similar context, in the Tragedy of the Horse and Yak. TIB J 0751; II. 116 and 118, Thomas (1957: 27) likewise translates Igo and llo with 'skin'; and in this case there cannot be much doubt as this item is (to be) cut into pieces (drefu) (I). It seems, then, that lho is related to lhaa 'leather'. The Zhagyes word rko, however, is typically paraphrased as laa 'body' or gsum / outer form (cf. ZHEH and ZINN). While Hoffmann (1972: 197) points to the fact that rko is at least one time also equated with gsum, ZHIN also rgyalparam rhagmarl 'meat offering' also shows an association with laa (maqphan). Rko might well have been a dialectical variant of rko, and the compound lhakho could perhaps have been a translational compound, simply meaning 'meat'. That the skin was not given away to the Lho and Rgyeds would make sense if Ithog would refer to the far and not just to the hair of the yak as suggested in the translation by Hummel (1964: 169). If so, then perhaps the other compounds might be translational compounds, as well.

Baczot & Toussaint (Baczot & al. 1940: 156) translate lsho (I) as 'viande séche' in opposition to lhagpa, which they see as 'viande cuite' (p. 57) or, as they specify in their note 1, as 'viande frisée', but see below.

6 For the element 1hgo see also above. Log is most probably the clipped form of lhagpa '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 karmdrolrasa compound since it seems unlikely that the hair and the fur were given, if the skin (which is part of the fur) was already 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 kluus 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, log should be taken as being related to the verb glog 'split, break open, rend, tear'; and thus the translation should be 'parts of the belly'. Wang & Bodozams Skyd (1992: 87, n. 337) interpret loaging (written with wame) as glograsa '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 11o as 'intestines' in Tsenge's song 9 above. Most probably the bones are not the most valuable parts to share with the helpers of a hunt.

Baczot & al. (1940: 157) translate lshog as 'viande cuite' or 'frisée', but as Uray (1972: 144f.) already explained, they miss the parallelism of the causes. Sa and Spung are infrequently mentioned clan names (ibid. Spung, in addition, can be analysed as Spung-po, 'affixing, man of the Spa [clan]' (see note 54 below). Most probably it is identical with the form Spungs that we also find in the name of one of the most important ministers, Dungtso Spungpa Sowa or in the name of the Zhagyan chief Shisur Spunggya (for the not infrequent exchange of oral and nasal stops cf. Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.2 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 stsho, stsal, with the ordinary meaning 'give, confer to s.o. (hon; private setting)', following the standard frame of transfer verbs (99a), and stsho, stsal with the particular meaning of 'bestow s.o. insignia, rewards (official setting)' with double absolute 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 unspecified receivers, which are delexicalised, replaceable, and thus, as mentioned in the introduction, rather patient-like.

<13> dWongshglo yisngag.

The first element would suggest a reading as 'head-ribbon'. Laarh and Hill leave this and the following item untranslated. Baczot & Toussaint render it as 'courroux de chèv', Wang & Bodozams Skyd (1992: 80, n. 131), suggest the readings helmet (trnas) or damphag. Similarly, Gihaloq Dkomchog Tsheshtsan (1995: 22, n. 8) explains this as a helmet made out of leather and copper (khang zangla hyps-pa ruong), a support for the dgrulha (war-god) to which is added (a set of) helmet ribbons (smogshagdak bsa-pa damphag-drulha rten), or simply as a head ornament; hat is, an ornament for the crown of the head consisting of a helmet (dhrung yasngag damphag bsa-pa gisgyur nag).
As there is some evidence for an interchange of nasal and nasal stops, *dbuh* 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: 220-230; Zeiser forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.3 for some interesting nasal and nasal doublets, as well as Beekwitz 2006: 187 for similar sound changes in Chinese. If, also, we note 12 (c), 14, and 35). Other mythological narrations have Drigung accidentally cut the *dmu*thang, 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 not too late to assume, that the ribbon, which Drigung cuts according to the request of Lopam, is exactly the crucial connection to the heaven. Compare the quite parallel form *rumllbrag* *znyag* in Mkhadsa Ldkebu (ed. 1987: 234). Here, the item in question belongs to the magic tools given to the princetorial king before his descent to earth. Linneborn (2004: 320), overlooking the mostly quarto-syllabic structure of the items given (di-syllabic name plus dasyllabic attribute), renders this single NP with two individual NPs belonging to separate sentences: *rma* rope and 'good copper tools'. While such an interpretation might not be totally impossible in the enumeration of gifts, in our context *znyag* is clearly an attribute of *dmu*phren.

Jim Valley (TETT) lists the variant without intermediate -s- as a "fabulous numerical figure." Similarly BRYG 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 *bza*nyag, for which he gives the definition: *znyag* = *byrugdag* *rtseron*, taken from "Karmay, Treasury". As all these expressions would usually occur with the *dmu*thang, he (that is, Karmay) suggests a translation as 'the red cord of *dmu* (?) or 'a sharply pointed coral (?)'.

The word seems to be of *Zhang* origin. In TseH we find it in the form *znapag* 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 Norbaj in the Khams version published by Magret Causseman, *Fichte des Morgen*, Eugen Diederichs Verlag 1896, the fisher boy catches a fairy with a lasso made of gems; in the *jataka* of Prince Asadaha, we hear of a broom that looks like a coral, Else Lüders, *Buddhistische Mächten*, Eugen Diederichs Verlag 1961, Rohwolt 1991).

As for the element *za* alone, Dan Martin (TETT), referring to Btsanlha, gives the definition *rza*znapag *syir*pa *nca*pa 'bare or without defilement/ obstruction' (cf. also BRYG for *znapa*). This meaning also shows up in the compound *znapa*th 'unobstructed', 'penetrating', and 'transparent' (BRYG, TETT, cf.

also JAK sub *za*, where he refers to I.J. Schmidt's entry *zaphaldsa* '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 BRYG) might be quite suitable.

<14> *dhumkas* stendgzh.

The single elements would suggest a reading such as 'head-adder', qualified as having nine *sten* 'holders' or perhaps something equal to *rim* 'steps'. Bucat & Toussaint suggest the meaning 'gangerio' (part of the armour or helmet that covers the throat), anachronistically reading it as *skar* or *skas*. This is followed by Giabangton Dkonmchok Tsheserbyan (1995: 22, n. 9). Wang & Boonsams Skyld (1992: 80, n. 132) come to a similar conclusion, suggesting 'breath or life protection, armour' (*dbrugs*skyod l *sro*gskyod l *skrul* s *dmkasas*.

It might be simply a kind of auspicious insignia or ornament. Most probably again a reference to the *dmu*thang (the rope that allows ascent to heaven) or, in mythological duplication, a reference to a similar tool, which is likewise made useless by turning it upside down. Cf. again the parallel form *rmaska* srim*da* in Mkhadsa Ldkebu (ed. 1987: 234), listed among the gifts for the princetorial king immediately before the above *rumllbrag* *znyag*.

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

*dmu*thang gnamnas dranbas bzegsags bza* s

'in relation to the *dmu*thang 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)' (Serdita Balsis, Rgyaelpa, *Legsleg* srigsphug gormdo, p. 223, as cited by Linneborn 2004: 196 with n. 266).

Concerning the interpretation of the elements *dmu* as *dmu* Tucci (1955: 200) makes a similar suggestion for the word *dbrug* '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 *dmu*phren-thang and a *dmkasas* 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 Xibab tribes, the word *mewong*, 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 Mn. The word for the headgear, again, is considered to be related, via another tribal name, to a proto-Mongolic word for shaman (Mödl 1970: 68, n. 5).

See also epigraphic notes and illustrations 2: rva = rve. Bacot & al. (1940: 98, l. 1), Haarth (1969: 403), as well as the original TDD/O'DO version (cf. Inaede & al. 2007) represent the word as shib. Wong & Boosmann Skyd (1992: 38) as sbal. The latter suggest an interpretation as ‘joined one behind each other’ (p. 80, n. 133). Without any comment, Bacot & Toussaint as well as Haarth translate the word correctly as ‘horn’. In the newest version of OTEO (as accessed 1/2010), the word is given as ‘rva la’ (and all superscripted labials have been changed from ‘w’ to ‘v’).

The superscripted consonant looks somewhat like the superscripted v in stengdsh just one line above (l. 15) and in hshotse 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 la, enough to insert a syllable separating tsegh. The final right stroke of the apparent superscript as ends up exactly where one would expect a tsegh and the accurate eye can, in fact, perceive a tsegh at this point. The stroke apparently resulted from moving the pen too hastily from the base of the letter to the tsegh (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 garga in the same line). Hill (2009a: 92, n. 17) 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 v may go to Gáhaton Džoumnhog Tsheshbran (1995: 17). Unfortunately, the latter does not comment his decision.

Haarth analyses the additional locational argument (oxen) as the primary location and the locational argument (horn) as a manner adverb transiting this passage as ‘faster two hundred spearsheads 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).
formation their case marker is dropped, the best solution seems to be to take \textit{gnyan} 'among the oxen' as such compound, constituting a location adjunct, not an argument of the verb. The missing co-actor must then be Logjam 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 (there for the ashes). That 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 Logjam attacks the emperor in the resulting haze is also not really a contradiction to a previous statement that Logjam 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.

\textless 18\textgreater \textgreater 65.

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 \textit{agent} --- \textit{patient} cross-reference 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 Logjam pulled out the monkey from the bosom of god Ldebla Guurgyal 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 (\textit{pholha}) by putting a (dead) monkey on his right shoulder (cf. Linneborn 2004: 205-208), but this might have been a distortion of the original mythical relations due to different religious affiliations. Could not the \textit{pholha} Ldebla Guurgyal have manifested himself in the form of a monkey? In this case, Logjam 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 Guurgyal tried to pull him up to heaven, but Logjam drew the monkey (=Ldebla Guurgyal) from [Drigum’s] shoulder (lit. arm pit), and cast Ldebla Guurgyal (=the monkey) into the womb of the glacier Tisse.'

As even more annoying problem lies in the fact that according to the text, the duel took place near a Mt. Tisse in Myangro Şampo, the seat of the Lojam. This region has been identified with Naq (i.e. Nyang) in Rkongpo (north of the Rtsapto) and with the more western Myang (i.e. Naq), south of the Rtsapto, not far from Mt. Yarha Şampo. The latter identification has much more likelihood than the former, not only because of the shared place name element Şampo, but also because, according to the text, v197-v202 (ll. 53-54), Myangro Şampo is located only a few marathas from the castle Pyinba Stagrste in Yar, apparently on the same side of the Rtsapto. But even in this case, one wonders why Mt. Tisse, 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 Rkongpo where he is claimed to be burned. 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 \textit{there} (at Tisse) 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 Nyung-chu near Gyantse; while the pandit Nain Singh of the Indian Survey found a similar story current near the Dang-ga Gyu-mtsho, [...] but many indications point to the valley of the Rkong-po Nyung-chu.

One could think of several solutions. First of all, as place names are transferrable and multiple, Myangro Şampo is not necessarily identical with one of the historical Myang/Naq regions. Similarly, the not very telling appellations Tisse could apply to more than one mountain, as we can observe in the case of the mountains bearing the name element \textit{Kailash} or \textit{Mastag} 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 Yarlung Gyantse has Mt. Gyangrzan as her consort, “a crystal pillar piercing the sky” (http://www.angelfire.com/vt/OkarResearch/geography.html, last accessed X/2010). The name is close enough to Gyangrzan ‘Good Glacier’, as corresponding to Titite, and allows conflation: in fact, is one of the four holy mountains, Mt. Gyangrzan was replaced by Mt. Tise (http://www.emnet.de/hb_nyan.htm, last accessed X/2010). Near the lake, one can also find Mt. Yarlung Sampo (one of the alternative candidates for the descent of its first king, accordingly the dynasty’s soul mountain). As a glacier, this mountain could well have borne the name element Titite. 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 seriously, particularly since it occurs in connection with a deity. In much later times, the itinerary of Saktu Rsapa (ca. 1600-1645) mentions a Yampa Rizdrup, near Dulchhu 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 Yampa 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 Zanglung, we can find, according to the Catalogue of the Ancient Principalities, P1.1286, II. I.f., the White Moity (pyed-khar in P1.1286, var. pyed-dkar in Dphaybo Gsuglag) of Yampa in Rtsang, the ruler of which is described somewhat enigmatically as ‘the lord: [called] the Tocharian, from the rulers of Rtsang’ (rje Rtsangdral Yodkuru), while according to II. 9f., an obviously legitimate ruler Lopam Yidrhom (cha — tsho) (var. Lopam Rdzab rdro) would reign in Sampo of Yampa (var. Sagro Sampo; cf. R.A. Stein 1961: 9, n. 25, Haar 1969: 241).

* According to Bocot & 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 Tocharian appears also in the name of Gegrab Mibo’s father in the Geemuy. The presence of people in Western Tibet and Western Central Tibet with family ties to the Yampa region and Bactria is not at all surprising. The communication from the Upper Yampa into the area of the ancient Upper India (i.e. the Gokt river) seems to have been quite easy. From there, one could relatively easily reach Western Tibet via Parik 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 impressions if in an original version more
where her 'cows and oxen' still stay during the bathe, but since this would not have had the desired effect, it is quite clear that chubha ngagtsi cannot be a defining attribute. (The phrase is actually an ellipsis for something like chubha ngag tsali yod pole; similar ellipses have also been observed in Ladakhi, e.g., 'thase ngagtsi mendik/flowers in the garden' for 'thase ngagtsi yothani mendik/flowers that are in the garden'.) The apparent colour term dmaw could be equally misleading, as a tshog dmaw refers to a stallion ox (Jim Valley, TETT). dmaw could also be a term given to animals (ming dmaw, another designation of the water buffalo (BRGY). The phrase bstan dmaw, either for bstag dmaw (po) 'red, hot bull' or for bstan mig dmaw 'red-eyed cattle' = water buffaloes, reappears in Mkharsa Ldche, 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 buffaloes. It does not seem likely that the western tradition simply turned cattle into water buffaloes, due to some prestigious influence, since ordinary cattle is common to Western Tibet as much as to their neighbours and to Ata's homeland, hence the narrative should have its roots in the distribution area of water buffaloes. Unfortunately, I am not aware of whether water buffaloes 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 speacks of buffaloes and that these have been turned into ordinary cattle in the 'official' version speaks against a borrowing from these regions. Water buffaloes are also common in Nepal, Kashmir, and, of course, India, whence the narrative might have beon borrowed (possibly via the former two regions).

If we have to choose between the likelihood of an 'original' Zangdung-Indian tradition or of one of the Zangdung languages being originally spoken as far east as Yarlung, my preference would clearly be in favour of the borrowed narrative. Tales, and their segments (motifs or narratives), are even more mobile than nomastic populations. At least one thing should be clear: according to OTC, the event did not take place in Rkongpo, since Drigung's sons could not have been expelled from Rkongpo to Rkongpo.

The Western Tibetan narrative could be a mere projection from the early 8th century, when Tibet extended its rule up to Kabul. But if based on older local traditions, it might allow to link the Drigung episode with the mid 6th century (or earlier) Bhautta incursions into Kashmir, as reported in the Kashmirian chronicle Rujjutrum (1, 313; M.A. Stein 1900 (1961) 1, introduction, p. 78, 76; cf. also Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4, § 1.4.5). In that case, Drigung could by no means have been a ruler of Yarlung, but must have been a ruler in Zangdung. As OTC seems to hint at, Spute Gurgyyal might have first usurped the rule in Zangdung before extending his dominion to Central Tibet.

<193> glinggra.

As an euphemism and combined with dagyu 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.

<202> zasfin+ brgyag = zasfin- bsgyadhma, v68.1.20 and v114.1.33.

Wang & Boedians Skyd 1992:80, n. 136) suggest reading zasfin 'box' for bsgyadhma, the expression seems to be in 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 khyad chu. Hal 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 zasfin), or whether the whole body was encaissed in a giant mastraska, 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 khyad chu). Like other quantifiers, such as the totalisers khar or thagma, the collective marker dog, and the limiting quantifier rgyung, 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 mwa would also 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 hence measurable 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 load of a river. Nevertheless, I would have expected an inverted order, "brgyad mgags, 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 mwa in clause v114 (l. 33). The same objections would hold against a reading 'wide vessel', where the modifying element
rgyu, like in the case of the ‘wide lake, ocean’ rgyangtsa 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 brgyugma as a non-documented derived adjective ‘wide’ (actually, one would expect a derivation morpheme -po or -ma). One could perhaps think of brgyugma as designating a vessel ‘having hundred [units]’, and hence one could think of a zugskhyi ‘brgyugma ’a hundred-unit-vessel out of copper’. As a compound, however, this could only be “zugsbrgyug and not “zugsbrgyugma”, since derivative suffixes belonging to only one of the elements get clipped. In any case, “brgyugma ’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 derived adjectives, such as brgyugma ‘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., zugs rabthins ‘pot with for horns (i.e. handles)’ or the expression lcogthins below. This morpheme is superfluous and may well be dropped when the compound itself is an exo-centric or bahuertz compound, expressing that something or someone not explicitly mentioned is supplied with the entity mentioned by the compound the name Ros-kempchen (Little Red Rising 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 be something that can characterise a vessel. In correspondence with the expression rabthins, one could perhaps think of a vessel that has one hundred zugs, 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, lcogthins ‘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 zugsbrgyugma 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 (zugs), but the functional item (brgyug) poses some problems. 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’ (JAK), 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 (khasspro) 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:

zanbskyi grost spur berug lcagsgeszer btbas / (Dpalbo Gtsuglag, cited after Haahr 1969: 144, Littenborn 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 nare rje’i spu’la thargys kseg brgya thampa brdegsa chug zersal khlas bblogse / (Mkhaspa Mdo’chu, ed. 1987: 247)

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

ma nare stgyi bs yongbshi-grags pa dba’i bsgrugs btsug dbang mthogdreg dbang brgyogdreg mthogdreg phig brgyodbcu lebdus chug zernas (Dpalbo Gtsuglag, cited after Haahr 1969: 145)

‘The mother having said: “Together with the coming [lack of] a/the son of the ruling lineage let one hundred ‘magic’ sticks and eighty vermilion lines be driven into that corpse!”’...

1 Possibly erroneous for the above thargys ‘by series’; the error might have been triggered by the following mthogdreg. 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 Zangyan word for ‘iron’ or metal in general is zaps (ZHEH). A reading ‘iron’ instead of ‘copper’ would also make more sense in the context of clause 221 (II. 60f.), cf. note 83. However, the expression ‘having an iron-hundred’ is as ineluctable as ‘having a copper-hundred’, as it does no really specify what item we are dealing with. It is interesting that in the above mentioned examples
we either have iron nails with a numeral or hundred sticks without indication of the material. It would appear that the Chronicle fixed 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 Drigung 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 a inadequate recompense for a human sacrifice. Perhaps the authors of the later tradition chose the slightly variant spelling leq, because they could neither make sense if lcags-brgyu as equivalent to an original tshigs-brgyu 'having an iron hundred'.

In Ngagral Nima Hodzer's Metog shingpo we find the expression brgyals (var. rgyalsin with the apparent meaning melog 'mirror' (Linnenborn 2004: 204, n. 298). While the element -lugs might indicate the shape of the mirror (or might perhaps correspond to an old gnos-Tibeto-Burman word for 'stone', r-lugs, cf. Matossi 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 (OL TIB J 0750, II, 61, 110, 173) tshigs-lugs 'mirror' (here probably referring to documents; Dositon's 'fire raising [station]', 2009: 674, 691, 709, is more than improbable; -lugs cannot have the meaning of 'rise', at best it could be the potentialis form of the intransitive verb lugs '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 (brgya as a synonym to me- or zugs- '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 rgyugshug 'boze' and rgyugsha, an 'axe used in certain rituals, where rgyug might likewise refer to the metal parts. But in both cases, and particularly also in the case of the mirror, rgyu could also have the sense of 'Chinese', which could further refer to a certain type of ornament as in rgyals (lit. 'Chinese Iron') for rgyal-ma lcags (the 'Chinese Wall'), a kind of meander. If the original sense of our expression was something like a zangs-brgyals-cnas (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 haplography (or -graphy) and a reinterpretation of the element rgyu 'Chinese' as brgyu 'hundred'.

The problem with this last interpretation could be that the term rgyal-ma 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 K. Hütter (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 stupa (such as the arrival of a heir, p. 34), although the resulting mess might not have been very appealing (p. 5). As for the building of a stupa, it is stated in the Mahajaril-nibbana-sutta by Buddha himself that only four classes of persons deserve this honor: a perfectly enlightened Buddha, a pacceka-buddhas, a disciple of a Buddha, and i 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 stupa built in their memory (p. 46, 51).

Such conservation techniques would not have been necessary in Tibet, and most probably 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 mahapurasas and cakrasattva, 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 self-understood, was borrowed from Buddhist India.

<21> v67-v69.

The interpretation that the empty arguments actually refer to Lojam is corroborated by the parallel episode, clauses v113-v115 (II, 31-33), narrated by Nytse-skye's mother: there Lojam is the explicit agent of killing and, given the close connection between events indicated by the bhu-gcems morheme (ste), which does not without further contextual clues support a subject switch, he is also the implicit agent of the following two actions.

<22> Chabteng.

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 chabteng, a monastic summer picnic). Karmay (1989: 535, however, reading chabteng (!), 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 (brgyud) but not the *thugcas* 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. Logam as an actor is mentioned some lines before as the one who causes the death of Ldebla Gunggyal and Dirgam and indirectly also as the one who deposes Drigum’s corpse in the river. Except for Ldebha Gunggyal 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 (classes v72 and v73). The latter act can certainly be associated with the agency of Logam. If, thus, Logam 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 *khi*, surfacing in so many regal names. The latter element, although unanimously translated as ‘tirone’, seems to be related to the word *khi*ri-*lead’, and may thus correspond to the title of a ‘Duke’. Together with Byakhri, the ‘Bird-Leader’, known from later traditions, Sakhrin, the ‘Stag-Leader’, and Nakhrin, the ‘Fish-Leader’, represent the three realms of the world (Heaven, Middle-World, and Yonder-World, cf. also Haahr 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 Logam would have left them alive, if they had already been given such names (at birth or later). They would have been a constant threat to his usurpation.

The second possibility is, of course, that the contradictions; treating the slain foe as *cakravartha* (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, Logam does not attempt to cut off the progeny of Drigum. In the conflict between Rulukyes 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, Jwarlesyes, survives.

This is only one of several possible interpretations of a rather enigmatic passage. It is basically three options: g.yab or g.yalbyo could either refer to the dogs or to the people who sent the dogs. In both cases the word could be interpreted as g.yabu ‘relative’ (BRG) or perhaps rather ‘helper’ (cf. JAK, GSHs yado) or also a yupa ‘exector’ (JAK). However, the word order with the subject following the localised 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 Haahr’s translation ‘Shaking g.yabho they passed *hphagsphu brgyud* (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.yabho or a convert g.yalbmas, 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’, ‘executor’, or also ‘shaking’ 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.yabho could stand for g.yub ‘sigh’ (GSHs), g.yab ‘cover, shelter, overhang’ (cf. JAK sub yalbu), or simply for g.yabho ‘slaves’. 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.

All translations have ‘mace’ leaving 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 stemma 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 Suisu and Beishi as being practiced in prehistoric times (or up to the 7th century) in the ‘Women’s Dominion’ (Nüguo) or country of the ‘Cold Race’ (Suvuna
gotra) that apparently extended from Hunza through Ladakh into the Changthang and possibly up to Eastern Tibet, cf. Pelliot (1963: 694f.) as well as Rockhill (1891: 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 Chagpas, the ‘genealogy of the beer’, from the Ladakhi cycle of marriage songs; various birds are filled in search of the first grain; finally barley is found in the stomach of a pigeon and disseminated for the first time.

<26> v78 (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. Bactot & Toussaint put these words into the mouth of Logam ‘la caresse ma tue’, Haarth and Hill interpret them as part of the omen. Haarth, however, interprets the second occurrence of the word rnor as referring to Logam, whom then they have killed himself.

<27> langzi-korya.

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 Debgtier s Nyonpo, 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.e., 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 successors.

The sequential marker is interesting in itself, as the spatial notion of below is applied for a temporal apprehension of sequence. This is indicative of 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.

Bactot & 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 sort of Brkags, born into the family of divine sons’, assuming, according to Haarth (1969: 279f.) that ru/military division or horn’ can be taken to be identical with rui/lineage, family or ‘bone’. According to our discussions, he farther thought that finite verb is rather uncommon in Tibetan names, and in fact, one could have expected either a verbal noun ‘1Rul-skje-syapa or a compound: ‘Rul-skje-syapa. But the same objection should hold for the name Nalaskyes, 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 verb forms in names (a topic yet to be researched) is not necessarily a violation of Tibetangrammar.

R.A. Stein (1959: 302: n. 22) has aptly pointed to the possible epic dimension of this name. In fact, in later tradition, Rulaskyes, when born, bears all signs of a future Universal Ruler. This is a blind motive, since Rulaskyes does not become ruler himself (except in one minor tradition, the Bla-ba-tshes kags-pa-bzang, where (Hbrngri) Rulaskyes is Spade Gunggyal, cf. Linninborn 2000: 127f.), but remains in a subordinate position, at best becoming minister. Such epics traits are completely missing in OTG, and the only indication of a special status may be seen in Rulaskyes’ title ltha'i btsun ‘son of the gods’. This, 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 name concerning his ‘double’ (?). Nalaskyes bears traits of epic folklore: the refugee-herd 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 Nyarlakesyes does not become ruler himself and is usually not involved in the revenge. The motivation for integrating these names remains unclear, particularly in the later tradition. Only the author(s) of the Bka’chams kathoñna drew the obvious conclusion.

<26> Rhyä, Rhyä...

A Zhang-lan dynastic name and/or title (cf. also OTC II, 399-433: Līg Myin-rhya, the last ruler of Zhang, and Rhyelig, a ruler or official in Nimtab mentioned in M.Tagh. c. iii, 8019, 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 gya-pol, apparently going back to a form *gyapol. The form rgya, on the other hand, might represent the first step of a sound change attested in Zanokar, when the cluster rgy- turned into bl-/bl-, thus bljaslo rgyalpo ‘king’. An early attestation of this sound change might be found in the word sattars of the OT contracts, being, according to BRGY and TETT, an old form of rgyal-brags. This word, however, is not listed, but we can find rgyal-brags ‘bet’ (for the somewhat unexpected see of stem I for an activity instead of an agent, cf. the discussion in notes 54 and 55). In the contracts, the word sattars is used in the sense of ‘forfeiture or penalty [for breach of contract]’ (Takuchii 1995: 143). The element -brags could then be related to the inceptive verb brag, indicating here that the ‘state’ 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 Rulaksyes, a man of the Rhyamo clan is instrumental in the murder of Logum and thus loyal to Drigum. If Rhya and Rhyamo were related, this could indicate that Rhya as a vasal or ally of Drigum was of all not antagonistic to Drigum and secondly not identical and not even related to Logum. 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 to 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 Logum was merely built up as a scapegoat and has as much to do with the death of Drigur as the knife (geri) with the latter’s name. Logum’s name might well have been chosen retroactively to give the massacre of the Logum (and the usurpation of Logum’s throne) a semblance of legitimacy.

That the later Tibetan historical tradition fused the two narratives or rather suppressed the Rulaksyes-Rhya episode (in order to redefine Rulaksyes as Drigum’s son) is by no means an indication for its identity with the Drigum-Logum episode, as Hurli (1969: 156) suggests and many authors still think plausible (cf. Hazood 2006: 187; here identifying Rhya with Rgya, a well-known lineage from Myang-stod (with the plain of Grya-grong (SW of Sham-bu ...) as one of the main settlements of the lineage ...)).

<30> v67.

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 is if some linguistic accident had happened when mounting this passage. Macdonald suggests to interpret the compound phes-than simply as ‘clan’, but than it would be even less comprehensible why the sentence is formulated in such a complicated way.

<31> pho-lo.

Cf. illi (2006a: 93, n. 22). Dan Martin in TETT quotes Bsaṅba with the paraphrase rgyangdrag phnyug sug dam chos phags-pa (‘the robbing of all material wealth and livestock’). Most probably Wang & Boodham’s Skyid (1992: 80, n. 137) derived their definition khyin-mang gi dran-phyod phags-pa (‘by force and threat of law, 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 Buco & Toussaint (Buco & al. 1940: 125, n. A-4) and Gitelargon Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: p. 22, n. 13: tsho bskyed sugs dkon mchog b’gya-gu: ‘like the time specification (lit. entry relating to the time of a happening)’). In his note, however, Gitelargon Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan reads phes-tan, which he alternatively paraphrases as phes-tha ‘in the upper part of a valley’ (the note is misplaced before note 12 on dradmos 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 phes or pho-lo. BRGY, BTSII, and TETT list pho-lö only as an old word for ‘understand, perceive, be
aware'. ThDG, by contrast, lists this verb, for which he gives the stems I: *bphol, II: *phol; III: *phol; IV: *bphold, as "break through the difficulties of knowing", but in his Tibetan paraphrase, the word is also given as being synonymous to rrod and bhrigs, both meaning 'pierce' (it seems likely that the standard interpretation rrogs is due to an error in transmission for rrod). Haahr (1969: 453, n. 17) suggests a relation to dbol, *bhol, and *bdol and its stem IV *bhol have the meaning 'part, dress etc.' (JAK) or 'pluck, card (wool)' (BRGY). This can certainly be ruled out as can bhrig for 'soft' or 'cushion'. DYGJ gives a somewhat different meaning for bdol: '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: *bhol or *bphol, II: *phol (< *b-pol); III: dbol; IV: *piel, of which, strangely enough, only stem III would have survived. dbol is given in JAK with the meaning rrod 'pierce, perforate', in SCD as 'open the closure of a pond', similarly in ThDG (the synonymous collocation rdog rrod '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' (bpholer byedpar and 'pour out' (glo). If the interpretation of BRGY is correct, one would see here an old causative derivation from the verb I: *bphol. II: *phol < *b-pol, III: dbol; IV: *piel, of which, strangely enough, only stem III would have survived. dbol is given in JAK with the meaning rrod 'pierce, perforate', in SCD as 'open the closure of a pond', similarly in ThDG (the synonymous collocation rdog rrod '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' (bpholer byedpar and 'pour out' (glo). If the interpretation of BRGY is correct, one would see here an old causative derivation from the verb I: *bphol. II: *phol < *b-pol, III: dbol; IV: *piel, of which, strangely enough, only stem III would have survived. dbol is given in JAK with the meaning rrod 'pierce, perforate', in SCD as 'open the closure of a pond', similarly in ThDG (the synonymous collocation rdog rrod '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' (bpholer byedpar and 'pour out' (glo).

If the interpretation of BRGY is correct, one would see here an old causative derivation from the verb I: *bphol. II: *phol < *b-pol, III: dbol; IV: *piel, of which, strangely enough, only stem III would have survived. dbol is given in JAK with the meaning rrod 'pierce, perforate', in SCD as 'open the closure of a pond', similarly in ThDG (the synonymous collocation rdog rrod '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' (bpholer byedpar and 'pour out' (glo).

If the interpretation of BRGY is correct, one would see here an old causative derivation from the verb I: *bphol. II: *phol < *b-pol, III: dbol; IV: *piel, of which, strangely enough, only stem III would have survived. dbol is given in JAK with the meaning rrod 'pierce, perforate', in SCD as 'open the closure of a pond', similarly in ThDG (the synonymous collocation rdog rrod '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' (bpholer byedpar and 'pour out' (glo).

The analysis does not account for expressions such as dma zla 'five sorts of silk'; riugchena bta 'seven kinds of jewels'; sugs susb dhupa 'smoke of several kind of wood' as well as the compounds snathsogs, sma, snashtshad 'of every sort' etc. (cf. JAK sub sna, 5). When one is used in combination with numerals, one could perhaps describe it as a (kind of) classifier, but we have no proof that the word used in such contexts originally meant 'nose' or is even distantly related to the word for 'nose' (in the case of more monosyllables, often resulting from originally much longer word forms, it cannot be taken for granted that the look-alike always have a shared etymology), nor is there any proof that its application was originally restricted to animals.

In his review of Barot & al. (1940), R.A. Stein (1952: 12, n. 1) lists several misprints, and in this connection suggests to read the presented dud as duh. 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 certain overlap, cf. in the beginning of l. 29 the very similar letters da and ya in pha yodn gahi pha gare. While the lower stroke of the da in dud should be more slanted and more convex, and particularly somewhat longer, similar das, only minimally more prolonged or crooked, are found in l. 12 gebd os, phed, l. 15 gebd, l. 24 byagd (or byug?); the latter form is likewise not attested in the dictionary), khvb, l. 29 yod, l. 31 the first khvb, indicating that he 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 de-forms. Apart from this, a reading duh 'conch' would not really fit into the context. See also epigraphic notes and illustrations 3: dud.
<33> changpa.

Cf. Macdonald and Ghulmoh Quokshah Tshesbritan (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. skyed 'man, person' (lit. of birth), similarly bud-med 'girl, woman' < *bu-ndan 'low offspring'. Bacon & Trussart and Harer translate changpa as 'male child', however, as Hill (2006e: 93, n. 23) correctly comments, a child of Ikgrus would have no land of his or her father to return to. Moreover the changpa returns to the land of her father and brother (phunyigyiul), where the brother is referred to by a designation (nyigbo) that is only used in relation to women (cf. JAK sab nyibo). The term nyibo is still used in Ladakh with reference to a female's brother, irrespective of his relative age, while the compound minpingi 'sibling' is used by both genders with respect to both genders. See also Yamaguchi (1970: IG, n. 25), although otherwise rather crudely making Rhya a wife of Logam.

<33> Spus.

This is the collective form of the clan name Spus. For the collective suffix -s cf. Denwood (1986). Interesting examples for this suffix, appearing in the same syntactic context as the collective marker -deg, are found in RAMA D6: kyunsep sponpo spredpa niti, 'as for the arranged (lit. jointed, combined) collective of green-blue turquoise rocks' and El: nebuang sponpo ni springi [lit for ablative] mihob 'as for the collective of green-blue meadows, they are higher than the clouds'. The collective marker -deg is used in the same way in nangshel stag-pdag 'a collective of dense forests' (D7) and darzalbyi tuma tshabspadag 'a collective of wide (=sheltering) leaves of finest silk' (S6).

The Spa (var. Spua) clan seems to have been instrumental in installing the Spurgyal lineage (lit. 'king over from the Spa'), the first member of which would be Drigmam's 'successor' and 'son' Sakyi (or Nukhiy or Byakhi) under the regal name Spuda Gungygal (cf. clause v223, l. 61). The name must have been of very high prestige in order to be adopted by the Tsuoba elites who took over power in prehistoric Tibet. There might be an etymological relation either with the Sip(ya) and or the clan name Dmua/ Rına/ Rțna (see also belw. n. 35), which is also a designation for a certain class of deities (and demonised spirits). In the latter case, spua might have been a synonym for deve or tba (cf. Ziesler 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 'filis de qualité'), based on the CT noun 1) 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 he noun Spus is followed by dative-locative case marker: Spusla bregnas-tsam-nas.

<35> bya.

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

Of the other hand, there is some remote evidence for as early homophonous word *bya with the meaning 'speaker, man', ultimately related to the word for 'human, man' migi < *mi-gi < *mi-ni < *mi-na, the clan names Dmua/Rına, Rına (< *rına), Bra (var. Srba, Dbra, and Pra), Miao (Mnyaw, and Phiao (Phyaw); see note below for this transliteration), and the verb rma < *mrwa. The clan name Spus might equally belong to this set of derivations (for the various permutations that link these words: m < *ghi, *mr > *mr < *mr > m and similarly phir > sr > sr (br > shr), Ct. Ct > Cy., and the instability of the vowel, cf. Ziesler 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 > *N and 1 more general metathesis of Ct > Cy, Icf cf. Simos 1975 and somewhat less convincingly 1949: 10-15). The most obvious trace of aformer *bya 'human' might be found in the word bya-s pa 'one out of the collective of human offspring' > 'child'; which could be derived immediately or via an intermediate *byea 'human offspring'; *bya 'human plus filiation suffix -s plus collective suffix -s, the latter apparently leading to the loss of fusion of the filiation suffix.

Synchronically, for the compiler of the Chronicle and his source(s), the word most probably signified only 'bird', and 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 transnational compound myuwa 'man-man' (later reinterpreted as a karmadhatraya or descriptive compound 'man like a bird'), which was split up in accordance with the poetic convention, already mentioned in note 4 above.

It's obvious that as soon as the notion 'speaker, man' was lost, the compound myuwa 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.
<36> rjobo.

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 rjobo, and thus also rjbo, is etymologically related to, or merely a dialect variant of, rjbo 'lord, master' (cf. rebo for rere after clause v103 with note 75 for a similar alternation between e and o). Only the forms rjo- (-rje) and je- (-cco) appear to be attested in the phonetically conservative dialects. The historical chiefs of Ladakh, e.g., are commonly referred to as 'Chbo' (for cco < 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 rjbo. The form rjbo, however, appears in the online documents in 21 instances (Pt.4:1040: 3x, 1041: 1x, 1047: 1x, 1136: 2x, 1287: 4x), the form rjobo in 10 instances (Pt.4:1042: 3x, 1049: 2x, IOL. Tib J1 0740), and the form rjibo in a single instance (Pt.4:1285). Except for OTC, where we find an alternation between rjbo (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 rje- and the quite frequent use of jobo (20x) and rjbo (18x, but no rjbo) in the documents of Eastern Turkistan (Takeuchi 1998: incomplete or questionable forms were not counted).

<37> relhucaug.

To my opinion, it is necessary to distinguish between verbal adjectives that are monosyllabic and may have two stems (more frequently in OT than in CT, e.g., l. che, B. ches 'be big') and nominal adjectives that are always derived (whether by a derivational morpheme or via composition) and thus at least disyllabic. Like other verbs, a monosyllabic verbal adjective may occur as the second element of a compound. That we are dealing here with a compound is corroborated by the spelling -aug, 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 -chat. All translations interpret the phrase as a normal noun plus (nominal) adjective. In our discussions Nathan W. Hill suggested to read the combination chhunpho 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.
(Yar-) like the first and the last name by the way they are uniformed child was kept: inside a yak horn (g.yurgal), which again was placed in the leg of a boot (thunyok), and then the child (or the horn or the bootleg) was covered by a thick woolen face-cloth or blanket: g.yor.sam yur.gal khus ledu (g.yar does not mean ‘borrowed’ here, as Linnenborn 2004: 128 translates, but is a honorific word for ‘face, countenance’, serving also as a honorific, e.g., yur.mkhar \= skom.ka \= sk). While the last name inevitably calls into mind a much later Yumbra (or Yumnt, the middle name is also reminiscent of the above clause r95 (l. 28) Spusla hreg hreg yun.yun-yun, which could be interpreted alternatively as Spusla hreg hreg yun.yun-yun ‘as soon as Spusla hreg was able’. As Mikhasa Ledua’s Nar.la lagreg demonstrates, the name Standing-out-from-the-spur, would not be completely unlikely, but then, in the above context, one might wonder: able to do what? If Mikhasa Ledua did, in fact, intend a parallel between a Spusla hreg and a Nar.la lagreg, it would probably be better to read Yar as a clan name, as well. Yar. ledka ye could well mean something like ‘Born to the Yar’ or ‘Yar Dhagpo’.

What is definitely not possible is Baco & Toussaint’s translation ‘et de lui-même’ (Baco & al. 1940: 125, n. 6), which disregards that yur would be an already case-marked form of the pronoun yur ‘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 rup, and the corresponding compound for this translation would be *yup.ledka ye ‘Self-born’ or *yup.ledka ye ‘Born to/from oneself’. Incidentally, yur is a mirror-inverted rup, a fact that might have enhanced the misinterpretation.

Baco & Toussaint’s interpretation was largely followed by Haahr (1969: 156), who only corrected the pronominal reference: ‘Born from (or by) myself’. For Haahr, 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 defendant, from which the kings would derive their magical power. In this connection, he reinterprets Spusla bu ‘son of the corpse’, insinuating that the nouns spus, spur, and sput would all signify ‘corpse’, spus being thus “an otherwise unknown derivative” (p. 157). Such metaphorical contamination must be quite abnormal compared to the uninforming linguistic argument. Or else, it is not really intelligible why we still find Baco & Toussaint’s ungrammatical rendering and Haahr’s over-interpretation uncritically quoted as, e.g., in Linnenborn (2004: 135).

<41> gholod.

All translations have ‘wish’ or ‘what he wanted’. The verb ‘wish, want’ gholod, however, does not have any stem form gholod; and such stem form, which would represent the gerundial stem III ‘to be wished’, would also not make sense in the context. Wang & Boundmaids Skyld (1992: 80, n. 139) interpret the phrase as ‘having a personal interview’ (gdot 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 gholod (for gholoda) should not mean ‘beginning’ here, since the mother explains everything from the very beginning. For the short form gholo cf. TETT and JAK’s citations from Miibarspa.

<42> charlag ci ibres.

Baco & Toussaint translate this as ‘celui qui est abime dans le fleuve’. Haahr as ‘the destroyed man who is wrapped in the water’, Hill (who further renders tsod ‘shall search’ with ‘will find’) as ‘the filth of the destroyed water’. Ghalgoj Dkomchag Tshetsbat (1995: 22, n. 14) suggests the following interpretations: a waterlogged area after recession (chubuhuyi chu.khyi) (drops (thugpa), ice block’ (chabrum), waves (chabrum), or simply traces (rge). He further suggests that the word might be the same as ibres ‘magnitude, size, dimensions’. The only entry for ibres in BRGY is ibreskyi latshma, lit. ‘suitable or necessary for ibres’ with the definition rgamsho tshibs ‘waves of the ocean’. This is not really helpful.

Hanlin’s definition of the hapax legomenon ibres as ‘water course or canal’ (chubul kumnam yurba, TETT) is followed by Wang & Boundmaids Skyld (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 (charlag). No such flood is mentioned and I am not convinced that the compound charlag 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 rjes good. Furthermore, given the parallelism with mirdag in the preceding clause v.120, the compound charlag should refer to ‘one destroyed by water’, rather than to ‘destructive water’.

Haahr’s translation suggests a connection with the verb bhre, bres ‘spread’ (cloth, curtain, or net, wrap up (books or corpse’s);. The problem is that the verb seem to presuppose solid not liquid types of wrappings, and even if we allow for a figurative usage, the form ibres 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: *dbres (or *dbres), II: *dbres, III: dbres, I: *dbres. Furthermore, his translation does neither take into account the genitive nor the element rag 'destroyed'.

As Hill and perhaps also Gyaltsen 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 'remain' (which may or may not be filthy or dirty). The word dbres appears also in the compound dbretseg 'dirty filth' (JĀK, BRGY, TETT), which could perhaps indicate that dbres does not simply mean 'dirty', but a particular state, perhaps after being crushed or after having rotten.

<43> myth bris bya-gnyid dag nyidugs

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 chimera 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 Drigung's substitute and, in later tradition, the primordial king Gdäakhri, and even Rinchen Bzangpo (cf. Snellgrove & Skorupski 1980: 86). One might also count the apparent parallelism between men and birds in clauses v96-v99 (II: 28a) above as further evidence. Gdäakhri 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. Mktaspas Ldebu, ed. 1987: 226: lhes gdong/ dkyil bkhar khespa; and not: as Linnenborn 2004: 29 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 man lakṣaṇa of a mahāpurasya 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 mahāpurasya 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 (Bautz-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. Bautz-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 Gdäakhri bears his superhuman features especially in the context of the Buddhist tradition, which makes him an exiled Indian prince, exiled particularly because of his laksana.

If the bird eyes actually stood, pars pro toto, for an orginal 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. Sein 1959: 288, referring to Nebesky-Wojkowitz 1956: 102). Pehar was 'invited' to Basmyas as war god 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 treasures. 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 origina 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 downward for protective blinking, the former two aslan, the latter strictly vertically (Curzi 2001: 257, 263, Figs. 2b, 269). An owl, if one wants it 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> bgehs pa bgyig.

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 Mktaspas Ldebu (ed. 1987: 246), the phrase is replaced by
mig byamig'is naa bsunpa gi gis 'one who (has) closed the eyes from below like bird eyes', from the verb I: bsun (bsum), II: bsun (bsum), III: gsum, IV: tsan 'close, shut' with an equally transitive-agentic 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 created gpees 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 google), and they would even less mind that, when losing all potency of agency, one closes one's eyes for ever, according to an agentic transitive rendering. In Shamkot Ladakhi we may equally find: ho gyon sotema. khoi muk tsama! 'Having become eighty years, she-ergetic closed the eyes (for ever).' In this variety, the ergerative indicates agency and thus intention and control on the part of the 'subject'. Non-control would be indicated by the aesthetic /khoom kholu. 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 [a(n)control] or [extra(n)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 possible, 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> thonglig.

I do not want to preclude that this form is simply an error for thong, stem IV of giong '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 byo 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 Myilba.

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) taphrusa or determinative compounds and b) karmadhra as or descriptive comp-

pounds. In Tibetan, like in English, German, and many other languages, the modifying element of a taphrusa 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 possessessor construction and to the order of the German a-genitive. For instance: fatherland = father's land, in Tibetan phyog = pha'i ynl. 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 karmadhra compound, a poetical device, whereby the first element is likened to the second one, as in Skt. merkhdada 'the cloud that is the messenger' parasa-iho 'a man like a lion', or rjaden 'a king like a god' for which latter we have a Tibetan equivalent in rgyalshbu used as the translation for the Roman title Caesar (Kesar or Gyi-yar) and as a generic term for a certain type of protectice deities. A valuable description of (modern) Tibetan compound formation is found in Goldstein (1994: 13-22).

Bicot & Toussaint do not translate cho. Macdonald similarly neglecting this word, comes to the solution that the person in question is une fille à moitié osée. Haar leaves the whole expression untranslated, although elsewhere (Haar 1966: 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' (taphrusa & dvunva) or the 'family's men that are like birds' (taphrusa & karmadhra). The expected reading 'men-birds' family', that is: 'family of the men-birds' (however one analyses the latter compound), should have taken the form mvdvaya-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 karmadhra compound 'a human who is like a bird' would make more sense than the dvunva 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) [=1903] 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 [I]'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 *byamnyi-mego-slo*, 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 phonologic structure of their 'own' vocabulary even with respect to the complementary articulations (in this case *q*/*g* and *q*/*g*).

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 *chub-brag* 'lineage from the mother's side' and *chog-rgyas* 'lineage from the father's side' (JAK, the gender bias might not always hold), we would even have a clear minimal pair. Note also the relation with the verb I: *chos, II: *chhos possibly = *chos* 'be born' (a regular causative derivation would have led to the forms I: *chod-brag, II: *chos, III: *cho-brag, IV: *chos 'to engender'; we find the same derivation, but with stem I: *chos for the not unrelated meaning of production: make, prepare, construct', while the causative meaning 'engender' has survived only in the forms III: *chos, II: IV: *chos). Note further the possible relation with *chos* 'harma' as something that 'came into existence' or 'was able to be produced' (potentials 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 'spellings' to or the 'arbitrariness' or 'interchangeability' of certain graphemes can only be the very last step, when all alternative attempts for an explanation have failed.

<47> v157-v158.

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 Mi-kyu was sleeping. Implied in this analysis is an identity between bu-sno 'daughter' and ba-sno 'son' in clause v159. Later tradition clearly speaks of a girl, *bumo* (cf. Littenborn 2004: 164f.). There are several arguments speaking against this interpretation, and while each one might not be very strong, the summation perhaps gain a certain momentum.

The first argument is the different wording. I should think that the gender distinction between bu-sno 'daughter' and ba-sno '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. Littenborn's argument, 2004: 164, according to which the girl would represent the primordial allegedly birdlike female ancestor Mo-yan/mosan).

Secondly, while the verb *yur* or perhaps only the collocation *gyi-gur* 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 (ba) lies in a cradle, v159, while the girl (bumo) is led along (khrad) in v180 (I. 48). To my understanding, the verb *khrad*
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 (bkhas, lbayer). Finally, if buno and bu were identical, one would also not expect that the subject of clause vi159 bu kheljona dkaqpo skig would be explicitly mentioned. Likewise one would not expect the repeated use of bkaq in vi159 and vi162, if vi162 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' (vi159). 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 bkaq as an attributive copula (c is y) presumes that the evidential distinction between bkaq (observed or new knowledge) and yed (intimate or assimilated knowledge) as found in the modern Tibetan languages had already fully developed in 6th Tibetan, so that it could override the semantic distinction between the attributive copula (c is y) sin and the existential copula (at y there exists x) yod or bhaq (the use of bkaq as an existential copula is based on its full verb meaning sittell, 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 bungo 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 zigs 'a, one' to operate over a complex NP (indicated here by angle brackets and italics): 'il arrova près d'une <fille, née d'un homme et un oiseau, qui dormait> (Bacot & Toussaint), 'he came across a <daughter of Cho-myot-hya who was lying asleep> (Haahr). 'He went near to a <sleeping girl with a bird-man's-teeth> (Hill). However, the limiting quantifier zigs 'a, some', like other quantifiers demarcates the right end of an NP, here <cho Migyati buno-zig>. By no means can it operate on what follows subsequently. The following phrase yarba byedpa, however one wants to analyse it, thus cannot modify the preceding NP.

<cho Migyati buno-zig> may be an argument of a causative construction yarba byedpa 'lull, make sleep'. Similarly, both <cho Migyati bumo-zig> and <yrbar> could be arguments of a nominalised clause with the verb byed. But in the latter case, this nominalisation would specify the place where Njalotikeses ar-

rived ('when he came to <where a daughter of ... did X>'), and one would thus expect the nominaliser -su instead of -pa.

Yome takes the first NP (ending with buno'zig) as the CAUSEE argument of the causative construction yarba byed 'lull, make sleep'. Njalotikeses 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 Njalotikeses 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 yarba byedpa can thus only be understood as an apposition or as an insertion of 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 a item from a possibly larger set of such 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 rna nangpo, one would be talking casually about the colour of an already identified horse (or set of horses). In the case of nagpo 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 backgrounder 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: yerba byelpa sko Mnyiapka bamezeg. This would also have been the true counterpart for the translations of Bacot & Toussaint and Haarth.

<48> khuljo.

As Hill (2006a: 95, n. 30) already mentioned, khul`i'is taken to be the equivalent of khul. "to crib" by Gyalrong Doksmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22 n. 17) and Wang & Boddams Skyid (1992: 36 n. 142 on p. 80), but the latter word itself is classified as 'archaic' in TEPT. 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 realigned by the speakers as a syllable final, in which position it may survive also in the modern Central Tibetan dialects: dorje. 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 r to r may have been triggered by the 'loss' of the original pre-radical, but we also find in West Tibetan a certain interchangeability between r and r.

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

<49> lho npa khu npa.

While shtoro is attested as 'top-knot', lphprenmo appears as a baphus legomenon. Bacot & Toussaint, Hill, and van Schalk (2008) love the word untranslated, Haarth interprets it as 'braid', but his translation 'the top-knot of the hair should be bound like a braid' would require a locative-purpose marker: lphprenmo or an even more explicit equivalent for 'like'. Gyalrong Doksmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22 n. 19) suggests a reading phtramo 'fine thin'. While phtramo or phramo 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 (TEPT), citing Bstanha, equates shtoro with hortsrogs, which Jim Vally (TEPT) again describes as 'plaited hair bound up on or on the head in a spiral, plaited tuft of hair, toupee, luxuriant locks dressed neatly on the crown of the head'. Similarly, Ives Waldo (TEPT) paraphrases shtoro as 'hair bound like a gisurgo' (transliteration adjusted), the latter word also meaning turban (Jim Vally, TEPT). Only Rangjung Yeshe (TEPT) indicates a meaning for lphprenmo: lhprenmo 'be possessive of'. Perhaps this could be paraphrased as 'contain, hold sth. together'. In that case, a lphprenmo might be something that holds the hair tuft together, a ribbon or turban.

Otherwise, since shtoro somehow implies a plaited tuft (cf. also JAK for shtoroq and hortsrogs), and since this meaning perhaps might be related to shto'bu 'single, separate, scattered' (cf. also Jim Vally in TEPT, 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 plates. 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 Byunghag (Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 2, § 1.2.3), and was more generally found among the Iranian populations (cf. the Arsakids and Sasanian coins), particularly in Afghanistan (cf. the Jatakas of the 6th century Bhrasmanshi, north-eastern section, Fleet 1973: 12; this location would well correspond to the Byunghag, but 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).

<50> bcheg.

Cf. Bacot & Toussaint. Whatever the exact meaning of shtoro lphprenmo, there is no doubt that the hair or headress should have been bound up (bcheg), 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 Schalk (2008) suggests that the topknot should have been cut of; pointing to similar usages among the Scythians, the Xiongnu, and Huns, where the mourners cut off their plaits and lacated their faces. Nevertheless, if this were the intended meaning, the verb bcheg 'bind' would have been completely out of place. While one can argue about the meaning of the verb bcheg (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 Drigung’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 mchasar gyis bya.<

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, his rather apparent, yet often neglected fact has been observed independently by van Schaik 2008).

The ordinary CT frame for the verb būskua would be that the MEDIUM, that is, the colour etc., is in the absolute and the SUBSTRATE, that is the item adorned, takes a locational marker (our pattern 09a, cf. BGRY). 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. JAK; sub rgyangpa). Here, we find the dative-locative marker lu. 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 identifiability 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 vermillion’ vs. ‘smear vermillion 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 corresponds to a kind of self-deformation, the latter is clearly an act of adornment, cf. Sam van Schaik’s posting http://earlytibet.com/2007/10/05/ved-acad-men-lii/ (last accessed XI/2010), with photographs of coffins from the tombs in Guolimu, a village near Delingha in Qinghai Province (Ando), excavated by Xu Xinguo in 2002. The photographs show paintings of Hula (?) men and women, having their faces nicely decorated with red circles on the cheeks and the front.

Wang & Bsdarns Skyid (1992: 80, n. 143) and Glañggon Dkonmchog Tshesbrit or (1995: 22, n. 20) interpret this respectively as ‘having made lines upon the body’ (lungshes-thegla thigs bkha) and ‘beautifully ornamented’ (lia sa niserga rgya). The word is only attested as a verb in BTSH (glaṅs - būskua) and ThDG (UBIV: glaṅs, II: būskua), whereas BGRY (sub būskua) lists it as an adjective ‘adorned or beautiful’ (bgyanpa phams niserga). While BTSH defines the meaning as ‘adorn’ (rgyangpa don), ThDG gives the meaning as ‘to beautify, ornament’, paraphrasing it, however, as niserga ‘beautiful’ and rgyanpa ‘adorned’, thus ultimately as an adjective. Neither BTSH nor BGRY give an example for the usage.

According to the BGRY the word also takes the forms glaṅs and gūsku, the latter with the meanings: 1. būskua, 2. brangpa considered, 3. hjalupa ‘sneaking’, cf. TETT where the source for all three meanings is given as Bstanla. The verb gūsk on the other hand, of which one might perhaps think in connection with gūzub (as alternative form to glaṅs), has the meaning ‘lic’ in JAK (based on Schifner) and ‘skim off’ in DYGB, and does not lead to a meaningful result.

Bacot & Toussaint, Haahr, and van Schaik (2008) translate the verb as ‘lacerate’ on the base of the verb būskua; ‘cut, bew, carve, chip’, stem II of which, however, is būskga. Hills translates it as ‘lay down the body’ based on the verb būskag, the regular stem II of which is būsk not būskua. This comes as a surprise, since he refers to the above-mentioned entry in BGRY and the interpretations of Wang & Bsdarns Skyid and Glañggon Dkonmchog Tshesbritan.

Van Schaik suggests that the mourners follow Central Asian rites of scratching one’s face, attested, e.g. for Scythians, Xiongnu, Hepthaites, 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 mentioned 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 sem forms match, the general use of būskua; ‘cut, bew, carve, chip’ would indicate 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, Haahr, 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 Iranised tribes, more particularly also Scythians, on the Tibetan plateau (Roerich 1930, Pei 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 & Bodnams Skyid's interpretation, but more probably they think of the 80 vermilion lines that are to be driven into Drigung's corpse (in order to pay for the bird-eyed victim) as reported by Drapbo Gsalag (cf. the discussion in note 20). But note again the non-honorable form for las 'body' instead of skhu or spar. The action is thus to be performed by the addressee and his companions reflexively upon themselves.

<53> hrbbb

I follow Bacin & Toussaint, who translate 'assemble at', based on the verb hbbbb. Haarth 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 hbbbb, given as 'beat' in BRGY. BRGY gives an example for a locational marker on the second argument. Together with the classification as thal bngpa this would yield our pattern 07 (ergative & dative-locative). Only JAK 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 & Bodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 144) opt for the meaning 'beat', while Glauberg, Dknag chog Tshes rgyan (1965: 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.

Mikuspa Ldedu and Drapbo Gsalag 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 210 (l. 575) below, where the thigh is beaten this time, however, the verb rdbag 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.

<54b> lom.

See also epigraphic notes and illustrations 4. lom, Bacin & al. (1940: 99) and Haarth (1969: 405) read lom, Wang & Bodnams Skyid (1992: 37) bcom, which would yield the compound khr barg bchom 'wash and plumb' (TTET). Dan Martin and Brandon Dobson in their comments to Sam van Schai's posting suggest a reading chom; the latter had suggested lom (cf. http://earlybuddhism.com/2008/10/27/between-death-and-the-tomb/ last accessed XI/2010). The first reading, lom, can definitely be ruled out. The second reading, bcom, cannot be corroborated by the corresponding letters in the manuscript. The next candidate, letter chu, 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 el- of breq in line 21 or rdbag n 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 r-. The left part of the r- 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 r-. The straight bottom line of the r-, 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 r-. 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 r- subscript (as particularly visible in the edited photograph).

Al translations take the preceding khr barg as a verb. According to Bacin & Toussaint, a pot is taken away from the people — but then its content, the food is distributed to the people. According to Haarth it is the corpse that should be taken away from the people, while van Schaik (2008) wants to be taken away to the people' (emphasis added in both cases). All three translations play down the aggressive semantics of the verb khr barg 'rob, deprive'. Hill captures this notion of force by his translation 'expel [[1] the men', but none of the dictionaries give 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 _hphrog_ 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 _rrom_ were an independent verb, it would lack a suitable argument, even more since _hphrog_ 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 _hphrog_ and _rrom_ denote two independent actions, it is also difficult to understand how one could command a forceful dissimulation (hphrog) in the same breath as a boasting behavior (rrom), treated as intransitive verb in BRGY) or a sort of oppressing (rrom) the mind of the people.

I would think that Bucat & Tossaint’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 phrase v. 171 (l. 47) it is absolutely evident that _za_ (stem I) cannot be the command form ‘eat’: stem IV should be _za_ (some dictionaries give stem IV also as _za_ , but this might be an artificial form). _zathu_ should thus be taken as a compound, see also note 55 below. Expecting a parallel construction in the present clause, I would suggest reading _hphrogrrom_ as compound, combining the agentive stems I of the verbs _hphrog_ and _rrom_.

According to the Tibetan grammatical theory of _bdag_ & _gsum_ ‘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 swaggere’ (or ‘robber and oppresser’), 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 to try 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_ & _gsum_ 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 _hphrogrrom_ ‘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 _bya_byed_ ‘doings, activity, fuss’ (JAK; cf. also TVP v. 98, 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 _zathu_ (note 55 below), the rules of _bdag_ & _gsum_ are not always applied strictly in compound formation. They nevertheless constitute an important rule.

Not fitting at all into our view of the Tibetan world, the intended meaning of the compound _hphrogrrom_ 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 _hphrogrcom_). 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 _Knights_ 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 Longan tribe described in v. 37 to v. 207 (II. 53-56) was not just such an act of ritual man hunting, rather than a simple act of revenge. The Longan are depicted here either as cowards or as comparatively defenceless people and the subsequent song (following v. 209 up to v. 213, II. 57f.), quite apparently likens the raid to a hunting expedition. It may well be the case that the figure of _Longan the recouler_ 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 shambles of men hunt at the very beginning, and as a foundation, of the lineage.

<55> _zathu_.

Like in the case of the above _hphrogrrom_ the compound shows the combination of two agentive stems I of the verbs _za_ bshad_ ‘eat’ and _batshu_ ‘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 victual. The corresponding CT compound referring to the objects of this activity predictably shows stem III (for _snyon_, at least), at least in the dictionary entries: _zathu_ (TETT; I & III) or _lha_sbyin_ (BRGY, TETT, III & III) ‘eating and drinking’, i.e. ‘what is to be eaten and to be drunk’, cf. also the non-compound form _lha_sbyin_ ‘meat and drink, specially the quality and quantity of food’ (JAK). The compound is also found in some modern varieties: in Ladakh with the meaning ‘food and drinks’ as _izathu_ (Norman, in preparation, and own data: Upper and Lower Ladakh ~ izatpu_ (Hamid 1998, with the spelling _lebbrug_ ~ _izathu_ (Ramsay 1890), own data: Lower Ladakh and Gya-Saomon), in Balti as _izathu_ with the meaning
‘food management, catering’ (Sprigg 2002), in Nubri as /saptu/ and in Spiti with vowel assimilation as /saptu/ both with the somewhat reduced meaning ‘food’ (CDTD).

While most versions correspond to a spelling /zatbu/ or /khaZthug/ with stem III for the verb /lthu/, the first Ladakhi variant rather corresponds to the OT compound with the combination of two times stem I, apparently again against the rules of /deSg/ & /gu/. The forms /zaptu/ (possibly reflecting an OT pronunciation), /sapt/ and /saptu/ are instances of the dorje-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 /zatbu/ actually goes back to an earlier /zaptu/ (one would have otherwise expected also the occurrence of the form /t/ (from /zatbu/, with preservation of the /t/-prefix), the Ladakhi compound /zatbu/ as well as the formally identical OT compound /tathug/ could perhaps indicate that with respect to compound formation, the /deSg/ & /gu/ ‘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 /baS/ 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 BGY, while the data from the dialects suggests that the prefixed forms for stems 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 JAK does not necessarily follow the paradigm with respect to stem II: we may find /buS/ in place of paradigmatic /buns/. Thus already at an early time, but perhaps restricted to few varieties, the verb /lthu/ 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 aspired form based on the regular stem I, thus /thu/ in West and Central Tibetan, and variants of /mtu/ in East and Central Tibetan (CDTD), the exceptions being a few Western and Central Tibetan varieties: Ngari Purang-Dingri, Shigatse, and Lhasa with variants of /t/ (from /buns/). If it was not for these exceptions and the above compounds, one could think that the prefixed written forms /buns/ (stem II) and /bun/ (stem III) had no base in the spoken language.

Given this data from the spoken languages it is quite obvious that the compound /tathug/ 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’.

\[\text{\textit{mn\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}ts\textasciitilde{}k\textasciitilde{}h\textasciitilde{}h\textasciitilde{}d.}}\]

For the use of ge\textasciitilde{}d ‘cut’ in this collocation see note 73 below. The expression indicates that tallies might have been used as tokens for an oath.

\[\text{\textit{ltu.}}\]

Wang & Bsodnam Skyid (1992: 80, n. 146) interpret the word as /tots\textasciitilde{}h\textasciitilde{}u\textasciitilde{}/ ‘family, household’. They seem to overlook that the same interpretation should hold for clause 70 (1, 20), where Drigung’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 practices, animals were sacrificed as ‘ransom’ for the defunct, and hence we cannot preclude a similar human sacrifice in conformity with Central Asian practices.

\[\text{\textit{N\textasciitilde{}sh.}}\]

Obviously a compound, the first element of which is a loan form of the name N\textasciitilde{}sh\textasciitilde{}yi. The second seems to be the (imperial) title, rather than a name, since otherwise one would have expected the compound N\textasciitilde{}sh\textasciitilde{}-\textasciitilde{}\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}a. Becot & Toussaint do not translate the names and simply speak of ‘les deux fr\textasciitilde{}res’. Hill follows Zeisler (2004: 388, example 283), where it is suggested to read /sa/ instead of /ltu/. An emendation is not really necessary. If it is N\textasciitilde{}sh\textasciitilde{}yi who becomes the new lord (for doubt concerning this interpretation see note 64 below), he would be the country’s god, /ltu/, or with some more probability, the /bsras/ ‘son of the gods’, as the emperor is usually addressed.

\[\text{\textit{ng\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}}}\]

Cf. Pangling (1988: 324, n. 20). All translations (including unfortunately Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) opt for /\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m/ ‘stem’, which accordingly would be ‘pitched’ (\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m). 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-radical, as the Leh dialect and the Shamskhat varieties of Baltistan and Lower Ladakh, there would be a phonetic difference between /\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m/ & /\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m/ & /\textasciitilde{}g\textasciitilde{}\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}/ & /\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m/ & /\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m/ & /\textasciitilde{}s\textasciitilde{}t\textasciitilde{}m/.
as in Shamskat and Leh or between semi-aspirated /kʰ/ < gur and possibly prenasalized /kʰug/ < mgur in Western and Central Tibetan.

The word 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 Gyaldey Dkonmchod Tsheshrtan (1993: 23, n. 22), the notion 'neck' must be understood in the sense of rsked 'middle part of a mountain' (cf. TETT, not a 'cavern' as Hill 2006a: 96, n. 40 translates). Similarly, Wang & Beshants Skyid 1992: 89, n. 147, suggest reading mgur as rimgur or rimug, which they define as rldus 'mountain slope', or 'side'. Cf. also P.1.1068.1.101 for a similar instance of mgur:

Lhakhang Gagsrgyal mgar na bsho ring-mchisle

'[He, the elder yak-brother] was running on the slope(s) of Lhakhang Gagsrgyal (King of Glaciers).'

Since both forms mgur and 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 mgur as 'mountain slope' (cf. Gyantso) would yield the necessary indication of where the funeral monument was built.

<<0>> Gyantso.

Bacot & Toussaint (unfortunately also Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) translate 'de pise'. They do not understand that Gyantso or Gyantsho is the name of a holy mountain in Rkoyap, one of the candidates for the descent from heaven of the primordial king, on which, according to certain traditions, at least, Drigung is buried: Lhari Gyantso (cf. Panglung 1988: 353; Karmay 1989: 536; the latter identified a mound at Mysul Skyimthing as Drigung’s grave). Haahr translates the phrase Gyantso bla as 'with its upper part like Gyantso'. Hill as 'high [as] Gyantso' (transliteration adjusted); Macdonald quite cryptically as 'en guise de ‘tente de l’âme’ (la montagne Lhari) Gyantso' (transliteration adjusted). In all cases, at least one locational case marker is missing, either on bsl (to make it an adverb of 'pitch') or on Gyantso for the comparison. Neither Haahr nor Macdonald nor Hill think of Mt. Gyantso as the place where the funeral monument could have been built.
transitive action (and the verb form as stem 1 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 (hle in the sense of 'protruding' or 'rising high', bhuba 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 bhuba and its clause (v184) from the annotation.

<62> bapbo.
Not necessarily a tomb, cf. note 84.

<63> glegs so.
Given the contrastive context, I would expect a present tense form, more specifically, the mere stem 1, corresponding to the preceding clause v186 (cf. Zeisler 2004, part II, 3.4.6.2). The honorific verb glegs, 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 Nakhiy and Sekhi. This would also be corroborated by the fact that in clauses v187 and v188, Sekhiy is said to take revenge and further by the fact that the honorific verb glegs had been used for Sekhiy, which might indicate his higher status in relation to his brother, although not with necessity: while Nakhiy's hosting of the funeral repast is expressed by the non-honorific verb gteo, his being the prince of Rkongpo is expressed with the honorific copula lags. Linguistically, however, the omitted argument should be 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, subjecthood 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 emphasized argument. From this it would follow that Nakhiy 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, 3 did y and then (he) did z,

it would be quite clear that B is also the actor of z, even mon so if we emphasize 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 Macconnal's (1971: 229) critique, his arguments are well founded.

Only one line earlier, OTC shows a similar hesitation: Sekhiy or both brothers are referred to in a compound as Ṛkha, whereas Ḍha, either by itself or as an abbreviation for Ṛnasas 'son of the gods', is obviously the regal title. The compound could be read either as a karmadhatvay compound 'Ṣak[y]i, who is like a deity' or as a dvandva compound 'Na[k]i and the Deity', and only the following numeral ġiši '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 show of a third son Byakti as another candidate for the throne, e.g. also in the Ladung Ranalhul, while oral traditions from Ladakh name Nakhi (Nakhi) as the first king of the Spurgal lineage, and the king from whom the Ladakhi royal lineage as well as some minor lineages claim their descent. As Haath (1969: 185f) points out convincingly, the name Nakhi is only an orthographic variant of Gudshikhi, the name of the primordial king. There are many other indications that the latter is; it is a mythical reduplication of Nakhi, which, from this perspective, appears to be the most likely candidate for being identical with the first king of the Spurgal lineage, Spulde Gunphyal.

<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> yab√ab√.
Disregarding the order of the elements of a taparaya compound (see also n. 46 above), Hill translates this as 'fatherland'. But the 'land of the father', father's land is phul khuu, accordingly, the corresponding compound 'fatherland' is phulay, and the honorific form would be *phulay.
MacDonald suggests a reading ‘seigneur et père du pays’, but this interpretation is grammatically not possible. yulbasyi ti is formally a possessive phrase, the literal reading thus ‘lord of the land-patrons’. One could think that the honorific form yub indicates some elevated status in the social hierarchy, yab can have the connotation of sheltering (TTET), 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 yulbasyi here and dogyabas in clauses v194 and v218 were parts of a translational compound, see note 68 below.

<67> półporylsy-chabo.

The reduplication functions as an intensifier, with respect to either duration or iteration. While to Hill (2006a: 97, n. 42), “the use of the genitive to connect two verbs seems odd”. I should argue that the morpheme ‘yl’ here corresponds to the connective morpheme ‘yl’, which we can find in modern Lhasa Tibetan and which seems to be related to, if not identical with, the connective morpheme ‘yl’ 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 ela that apparently signals a future event (cf. the use of ‘ya’ in nonfinite 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-aspire p when combined with a subordinated letter (including vowel u). This has nothing to do with phonology but rather with institutionalised laziness. Bsinta phausphes the verb accordingly as phye¡phylam / bropu (TTET), while Bosc & Toussaint (1940: 127, n. 5), Wang & Bodnams Skyd (1992: 80, n. 150), and Gyalshing Dkonmchog Tsheshbrun (1995: 23, n. 25) emend byabphul, Haarth (1996: 453; 29 takes prol as a derivation of ‘byul’. The meaning is thus either ‘run away’ or ‘turn aside’. Gyalshing Dkonmchog Tsheshbrun adds the nuance that the nomads sneak away like snakes, or flee the snakes, of the wilderness (phye¡phryog dpngtis sbrol bros) and further suggests the alternative interpretation that while the nomads stay, their cattle has freed itself from the treasuring rope and the cairals got emptied (phye¡phrneg byegophrag phugphrog brosas bhaara stros). Wang & Bodnams Skyd further interpret byugbads as byugbads ‘nomads’ abode’, but then it remains unclear who is facing. 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’ (dogas) 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 Bosc & Toussaint. This is corroborated by two parallel passages in Ms. 249 (P.1286) B. 30-32 and i. 43 referring to Khi-rig-btsan-po (the first):

\[ s il \ \text{hunamgyi-stigmas gsegshu} \ \text{gshun-thubki-bstan-bali} \ \text{Yabha Blagsug}\n\[ \text{yongs-pa} \ \text{srus} \ \text{geg cru} \ \text{gshu} \ \text{gsumma} \ \text{Khi-rig Blamshig-dan bsdun} \ \text{Khi-rig Bhumshigskyi srus} \ \text{Khi-rig-btsan-po} \ ] sado-gla yul-yabshu tje \ dogyabshu chadub gsegshu \]

Having come from above the sky of the gods, the son of Yabha Blagsug, who dwells atop the heavenly space: Khi-rig Bhumshigds, [the one between lit. at three elder brothers (and) three younger brothers, (thus) seven with Khi-rig Bhumshigs, his son: Khi-rig-btsan-po, the lord who is the patron of the country in the earthy narrowness, [he] came like the rain as (lit. s l which is) the patron of the (narrow) earth.

\[ Khi-rig Bhumshigskyi srus \ \text{Lde Nagkri-btsan-po} \ ] sado-gla yul-yabshu tje dogyabshu chadub gsegshu

The son of Khi-rig Bhumshigs: Lde Nagkri-btsan-po, the lord who is the patron of the country in the earthy narrowness, [he] came like the rain as (lit. s l which is) the patron of the (narrow) earth.

Haarth (1969: 312) assumes that there should be a difference between the two compounds yulbas and dogyab. But as Hurnmel (1994: 172, n. 34) points out, dog might be originally a Yagzjud word, meaning something like ‘domestic, abode’ (Wohlfart, Aufenthaltsort), cf. also ZHE, where dog is listed in the phrase masla doga, paraphrased as savi glama ‘earthly residence’, with ne.las meaning ‘earth-ground’ or ‘earth goddess (sodag soh guma, ZhIN), 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 that 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 dogshab in the sense of a subdag. But apart from this, I cannot follow Harth’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 b: budog, II: b: nag, III: gdis, IV: thog ‘bird, fasten’, and of blog ‘owner’ with its stem II, whatever the underlying etymological relations might be. Note that the alleged agentic 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 gnamthab, the wide space of the heavenly realms and the subdag, the comparatively narrowness and crowedness 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 dogshab, the first element is ambivalent as being derived from dogma ‘earth’ (or ultimately as being the Zapha word dog ‘settlement’) and dogshab ‘narrow’. It might be this inherent connotation of narrowness why dogshab and not subdag (and yulshab) is used.

P.t.038, II. 13-17 has an interesting variant, when, according to my understanding, the middle brother of the Khri first stays in the six-fold Saga (Libra) constellation Saga dog drugs, cf. Macdonald 1971: 145: OTDO renders this as “sa (14) dallog”, despite the line break after ger, 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:

gnamringa btsugstang-pi stypa | Khri-bahra btagsbyor [1] / btsug byi il gnam- 
gi [1] bads | Saga (2) dog drugs il btsug byangbtsug [1], the genitive marker is out of place] tshemdegi [1] rgyad il btsug byangbtsug bka’ | bston po Lha-Rgags | bston Mtha’-dgon | phyagdrug Ss-par spungs il smgyur il btagsbyor bbad il de brgyas btsugs il yul Bloka gsaug drugs il byon zer mchil il}

‘It is said that ... [from] above the thirteenth level of the sky, the one to be called The Middle of the Seven, In-between the Khri, from the gods of the sky, [the descended] to the six (7) spheres of the Saga (Libra) constellation: il (as) lord for the upright, the black-headed, the ones without lord and as life-support for the bent, the named ones, the ones without life-support: when the ministers, Lha and Rgags, the priests Mtha’ and Geo, and the domestics Ss and Spungs requested among gods and demons a lord for the

gen-‘, he came (down) to the six (?) valleys (lit. precocities) [so] of the land Bloka.’

1 At the end of the line, the tshug seems to be missing. It is also not resumed in the next line as in other instances. Urgy (1996: 250) and Macdonald (1971: 217) translate saga dog drugs as ‘descended to earth’ and ‘ill est venu’ ... ou il est tenu en six divisions’, implicitly reading subdag. 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 subdag lug is synonymous with the yul Bloka gsaug drugs.

bgrigs appears to be an old spelling for stem II of the irregular verb b. byrigs, II: bgrigs, III: byrigs, IV: byrigs. One could have thus expected the regular paradigm 2a, namely I: b’byrigs, II: bgrigs = bgrigs, III: byrigs, IV: byrigs. In the form bgrigs the verb appears also in line 6, were Macdonald (p. 216) takes it as an equivalent for byrigs ‘to be called’. However, the preceding NP ‘b. byrigs Serkbas is in the ergative and is thus the agent not the patient of the verb. Functionally, thus, bgrigs represents stem I. There are two interpretations possible:

a) The deity Kusgy Serbik commands something, and the content of the speech follows immediately afterwards (verbal nouns of verb siems can have an introducing function). The content of the command would be the first Tibetan minor will be the master of all priests, 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 Physician of all Physicians (bssigs thams kyi blags bka’ rgyud ma mchad) il Phrulsky yig Phugs‘ kyi bka’, see note 35 above as also Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4. 2.4.4 for the name Phrulsky and its relation to the verb snya (bseroa ‘speak’, for its transliteration see also note 89 below).

b) The deity Kusgy Serbik would be characterised as performing the act described by the verb bgrigs, and he would be the master of all Physicians (7), and the one who rules over all that exists, i.e. over the whole world. Accordingly, the verb bgrigs should be related to the performance of power.

Rendering the second occurrence of bgrigs in lines 16 as bgrigs, aform that is not attested elsewhere, Macdonald is free to assign the verb a different meaning. She suggests that the two 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 entered collectively (with the conjunctive case joined to the first number), 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 05), never the locative-nominative. Furthermore, the royal ideology concerning the descent from heaven does not allow of a flight between gods and demons, but of an installate situation down on earth (the topic of a flight between a god and a demon seems to be restricted to the Gesar epic, while other topics of the descent are shared by both mythologists). The six clans mentioned correspond to the delegation that welcomed the first Tibetan king and that, according to different variants, may or may not have been in search of a ruler for the rulersless country. In this particular passage, the delegation appears to be searching for a ruler. The verb bgrigs should thus be related to this quest, either expressing the search or the de-
mind. 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.

Haarth (1969: 307) takes brgyis ’to appear’ in its sense of ‘acted’; “My-ja (The Ruler of Men) acted in the sun and the Moon, and the country appeared as the Bod-lha g.yug drug”. While grammatically possible, the translation does not make sense, particularly if taken in the whole context, which Haarth has omitted (one may further ask whether the honorific verb byan ‘arrived’ could be used in the sense of byas ‘appeared’ with a non-human entity of no particular rank, here a country). As far as Old Tibetan is concerned, one may find two more instances of the archaic verb form in the documents from Eastern Turkestan (Talkeuchi 1992:1998, 82 and 141). In the sales contract 82 rgo (88) alternates with brgyis (6), which Talkeuchi (1995: 287) translates in both cases with ‘it is decided’. In the fragmentary letter 143 it appears as brgyis/pjet (6), 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 byas’lag etc. (Helga Uebeck)

However, a simple, unspecific verb form dron, as represented by byas and qyis in Classical Tibetan, would be in need of a content argument, namely the speech (or, in a figural etymology, 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 be dropped or be replaced by a noun (as part of the proposition) in the case of more specific verbs dron, such as ‘declare, appoint’ or ‘demand, ask for’. In 1038, 11.7 the content argument is replaced by the noun mirje, which might indicate that the verb brgyis, brgyis originally had a somewhat more specific meaning than the quite general qyis. 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 }kgnye /byas, g.yig /byas, g.yug g.yug, blamyis, blam mirje, stod’.(d evacuation)

Reading g.yug for g.yug.

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 celestial constellations. The seven Khi or rather Dré are themselves a constellation (the Pleiades, see below n. 84). This would also be in accordance with other nyan geologanas, where the future lord descends through several realms of heaven, and it would equally match the corresponding narratives 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, dogdrag should be parallel to the enigmatic g.yug 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.yug of Bodka, whatever these g.yug might be, a ruler also over the six respective 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.yug drug as Bodka g.yug drug. A dogdrag could thus be the patron of the provinces.

<69> buspar.

All translations take spar 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 ‘The seeds of the earth (not to speak of seeds of the corpse?)’.

For Gyalshing Dkonmchog Tsheshtsab (1995: 23, n. 26) spar apparently refers to the ‘corpse’ of the grain. The grain would get eaten and the ears) would get empty, hence the farmers would be without a good harvest (sabur rulde khangspog bu gyarpopa ronpoche lung malingpo). 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 nature of spar, which could hardly refer to the grain. Hill (2006c: 97, n. 42) suggests that the compound might have something to do with agriculture and could perhaps denote ‘chaff’. This implies an emendation from spar to skampa or bsharma, 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 bsharbrin ‘insects’ or ‘worms and beetles/ants’ may perhaps be more suitable (cf. also Wang & Bodnamrs Skydld 1992: 80, n. 152 who interpret spar as an insect called black ant bshar brisal tshishal in their previous note they had joined bu with the preceding bron from s-logo, paraphrasing the resulting lungm with matho ‘we’, which is clearly out of place). Note that bsharu ‘insect, worm, maggot’ appears as bu it the compound skampa-bu ‘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> kholkglog.

The verb form possibly belongs to an adjectival form kholklog, i.e. kholklog ‘be weak from age, decay, wither’ (cf. JAK, BRGY kholklog, TETT bshar bshar – kholklog). The resulting stem II must have been overgeneralised. JAK’s entry shows that the
mere root *khog may appear in compound forms: skyahog and apohog 'having a complexion pale or blue from age' (the latter compounded with second syllable deaspiration). The same morphological process seems to apply in the case of reduplication and prefixation, cf. also BRGY *khoqgus 'old', where *khoq probably serves as intensifier. The interpretation as 'rot, decumose' (Haarth, Glauchg Dkonningq Tshesbtran, Hill, see previous note 69) is thus not fully felicitous.

Bacot & Toussaint's reading 'err, wander' is not attested in JAK and BRGY, it is listed, however, in TETT for the form *bhohog.

<71> pub.

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

phyab is the past tense of lhabs 'to cover up, cover over.' Haarth translates "The hundred male Longam took a hundred copper vessels. Put them over their heads, and sought death by precipitation." (969: 405). One could first make a grammatical objection to this interpretation, the Longam are in the absolutive and not the ergative case, and lhabs expects the ergative (though perhaps not when used reflexively). More importantly this interpretation makes little sense. In the face of the enemy the Longam subject themselves to an odd sort of suicide. It makes better sense that a recompense for the fate of Dridgam Brtsanpo they have the pots put over their heads, and then because of lake [sic.] 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 Longams 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 Longam had neither weapons nor armour or were taken by surprise, and although they tried to protect themselves with mere household implements, they eventually run into death. The last interpretation would probably better match the fate of their women (cf. note 72 below). Note that the verb lhabs 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> gogbo.

BRGY paraphrases this verb as either non (sub gopho) or lhas 'go' (cssogn; sub gogon), non is the resultative and or potentialis form of gom 'suppress,' with which it seems to be commonly confused. BRGY defines non as *ska dkhams-pa lung-tama 'be discouraged' or, as CTD translates, 'to be envious, cowardly.' TETT gives the intransitive meaning of non as 'be oppressed, burdened.' Haarth suggests the meaning 'precipitate oneself', possibly because of the parallelism to the behaviour of their spouses, but in the accompanying note (Haarth 1960: 453, n. 28) he further attempts to construct a semantic link with dph 'shore, bank' and goys 'slope, shore'. Both words do not necessitate the connotation of a precipice. Particularly goys may have the additional meanings 'port', fort', 'entrance', or simply 'side' (cf. TETT).

Bacot & Toussaint and Wang & Boodhams Skiyd (1992: 8, 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 bhro 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 counterpartstop gog, explained as 'search through, dig out' in BRGY and other Tibetan dictionaries, but also as 'criticise bluntly in DYGB, and as 'vex, annoy' in JAK. The Longam women should then have been quite 'embarrassed, to say the least.

MacDonald's suggestion that the Longam women had committed suicide (for gong!?) by frapping (for bkhut) their breasts with iron pans supposes my imaginative capability. Similar unlikely is her idea (in that case at least supplied with a question mark) that the male Longam had killed themselves by frapping (for padd) pots on their head, although this might more easily lead to the desired result. Note that the verb lcbg 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, bashing one's head till death.
<73> mnuŋsu bchad.

Haarth translates this passage as 'Dad were brought under yoke', likening the expression to the collocation dhansu ggod 'subjective' (p. 454, n. 29). For the use of ggod 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 mnuŋsu bchad in the context of an enumeration of what able rulers and despisers do to their enemies. This would rather corroborate Haarth's intuition, although with a slightly different undertone: 'confiscate'.

MacDonald renders the whole phrase freely as 'tue e bētilā'. She probably follows Uray (1966: 254), who translates the passage as the bent ones, being killed, were butchered. In his note 21, he explains mnuŋsu asa past tense form of an unclassified verb *nuy* or *suyg*, which he takes as transitive-causative form of *nuy, nugs* '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 mnuŋsu, 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 parallels the simplicity with the preceding clause.

BRGY defines mnuŋsu as 1. not lopspuyd 'wealth, property' and 2. sriddam hifjarun 'dominion or world'. The second meaning would support the interpretation 'confiscated for the state', the first meaning the interpretation as 'confiscated of (his personal) wealth'. But one could also think of a combined interpretation 'confiscated as state property'. Bacoet & Toussaint's translation 'les animaux [fruits] emmenés als royaume' is as close or free a translation of this collocation as Hill's 'took as wealth'.

Apparently, the verb ggod 'cut' can be used in the sense of 'single out, separate' with respect to livestock and other items of wealth. Cf. also P.1.1042, l. 54-56:

skūnglenn khtaḡḡn hąśla [grigīg] l chihḷ-lāṣ gméd bchade | ḡuŋȳtrar byγ̄m | ḡbarmōȳd | ḡoŋlãṣ gméd bchade | ḡɔŋp̣ɔr | ḡbyγ̄m | l skūnglenn grigīg | ġdōḳlaṣ sṣã gméd bchade | plungsōndu byγ̄m

'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 (eaves) 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 (! in [he] singled out one specimen from the property of the royal priest) and denoted it as the ultimate riches."

1 khaḡtṣay, Bellezza (2008: 455) suggests the reading of 'of individualised roles'.

2 donpo, Bellezza (ibid.) has 'divine sheep', the entries in TET show that according to David Rollert's study on tešṭhart, the words donpo and donno are nowadays used for the 'fertilised' sheep, set aside from consumption, another type of 'sacrifice'.

3 phuḡṣon. According to Bellezza (ibid., n. 317) 'the essential or vital wealth of a household, which is ritually enshrined in a special receptacle', TET (Ives Waldo) translates this as 'the essential wealth of the goal, trump card, last resort'.

Lalou (1952) translates ggod almost everywhere as 'choisé' or 'trié'. According to Bellezza (ibid., n. 315), the verb ggod 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 ggod in such cases as 'decide upon', corresponding to its use in the classical and modern, somewhat opaque collocation thag ggod 'decide', lit. 'cut a rope'. After reading Helga Ubach'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 bug occurs a century after paper had started to be used in the administration (Ubach 2008: 64), it appears to me that the collocation thag ggod serves from the phrase thag ggod 'cutting an unrolled document (in order to execute it)' as we might find it at various points in P.1.1042:

thaḡṣon hifjarun yaḡbãhαn bchad | ḡtadũ yaḡbãhαn yams | bchad ggod | ḡl. 101 | The royal [for the] funeral ceremony, having executed lit. cut, register of dhatteš [and having 'confirmed'] all that is granted is in order to be handed ever, will (have to) execute the bchad."

4 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 nupahθsɔmu '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 nupahθ. Again, this seems to hit a secondary development, due to the loss of the meaning tug 'scroll'. BRGY adds notions of 'merit' (eḡ-θhnḡ), 'accumulation of merit') (brouȳkara), and 'inheritance, share, fate' (bγ̄rõḳ, tlẽbḥon). OSSn additionally lists 'property'. 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 OSSn gives nupahθhɔŋ spɔd ęd 'nicl and powerful' and not, as to be expected, the other way round.

The things to be used in the funeral are listed immediately after this passage (l. 102-105), and this enumeration is opened with the words gŋaṣa imũla ni 'what had been bestowed in order to give', not with the word nupahθhɔŋ. This indicates that we have to
distinguish between the items to be sacrificed and their listing in a document. The enumeration is actually an inserted explanation, and the role of making a list or document is resumed again in II. 105-107, see below.

A similar collocation, maṇḍa gaṇita, is listed with the meanings ‘name, nominative, appositive, declension,’ ‘praise,’ and ‘congratulate’ in JAK. Particularly the first meaning would indicate that the word maṇḍa 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 maṇḍa may further denote ‘acquisitions’ (TEIT) or ‘belongings’ (JAK), one could take maṇḍhaṇa as a ‘register of possessions.’ According to Herle Urbač, this last meaning would be corroborated by the usage of the word in Nelpa Panjīta’s chronicle.

b The verb gaṇita is to be added, cf. I. 1109, where we read gaṇita stōda / gaṇita bhād bhād / stōda bhād bhād. The verb educates this as ‘catcher,’ which would imply several emendations as the verb for ‘hide’ is āribha, II: 1093; III: 1123, IV: 1098. The verb gaṇita is not attested in any dictionary, but in four documents it appears in connection with seals and signatures, cf. P.1183 v.1, P.1089 v.6, P.1111 v.1, P.1120 v.4. 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 eva-thājādha, II:49, eva-thājādha ‘examine,’ in which case, it might have shown the same ablativus pattern: I/IV: *spod. II/II: spod. II, on the other hand, spod should be related to the verb sōra ‘speak,’ we should not expect an ablative.

c gaṇita. 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 signify an obligation.

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

rgyud Phyag rhin khrab bral gyi phags pa legs bzhedu phyags ba phyag ston gyi skyid stobs ku gyi ston (II. 105-107)

The rgyud cut the document (than), made two tallies, one of which he handed over as the main (lit. great[er part of the] document [to] fastened to the main document [of] the chief attendant, and the chief attendant fastened it to the main document. The other one (he = the rgyud/ 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 five terms. The loss of a case-locative marker could have been triggered by the following adverbial phrase. While the double absolutive is regular with the verb stōda (cf. note 12), in 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 case-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 foregrounded.

The possible analysis as drongwa 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 than as ‘valour,’ by translating rgyud chenpo as ‘grand registre’ refers to it as a document. It is quite apparent that the rgyud chenpo stands in relation to one of the two khrab, apparently a khrabma ‘tally mother,’ although one might still argue that the khrab serves as a symbol for the ‘values’ registered on it. Further up, namely l. 53, just before the example for good = ‘simple out,’ given above we find the following passage:

ngul gyig kha’i mnyahthr la mnyahthr du hta’i bus la hta’i hun dngar pa’i la II bka’i brsd II

The rgyud, in turn, executed (lit. cut) a register of chartals (and) whatever was included (lit. had come together) in the declarative document/register of chartals, (its) (moral) quality was read out by one and the specific (for equivalent (i.e. payment) (dod) was announced.1d

e Literally, ‘whatever is desired.’ Like -o (bhikṣu, lit. ‘whatever may be’), -o (skul‘al dud) serves as an all-inclusive totaliser. The definiteness marker or demonstrative pronoun -a in all other cases where it follows a verb, serves as a nominaliser.

f For the meaning ‘inhere,’ ‘be included’ or ‘subsumed’ cf. TEIT and GSHS. The focus seems to be on the result of the preceding act of registering, not the act itself. Lalou takes hta’i literally as meaning ‘commanded’, the subordinated clauses accordingly as a command: Chosser les mnyahthr dharzam-voz auprè dés mnyahthr (translation adjusted). But it is not dissimilar that the people should be commanded to assemble at the riches only after having chosen from them (bead, stem III with the function of anteriority).

1 Lalou reads blo’s khrug for pungs. But this implies two emendations, which are not at all necessary. That the verb kha’ (read) has the irregular stem II kha’ in Old Tibetan is nevertheless well known (de Jong 1973). I only know, perhaps he general assumption among historical linguists that the root of the verb, vloq, must have had an unvoiced lateral (cf. also Holm 1999), which triggered the extraordinary unvoiced realisation of the irregular prefix s- as -s-. Since the b-prefix has an inherently unvoiced character, turning voiced root consonants into unvoiced ones (Zeisler 2004: 856 n. 335), there was no necessity to render it as -s-, 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 pungs and pungs as noted by de Jong (1977: 311, with further references).

1 Lalou renders this last phrase as ‘il appelle à l’aide’, While the compound bka’i bsdus is usually given as ‘tarnametion’ or ‘cry for help’, particularly in combination with the verb bka’i, I do not think that this is intended here in a quasi-bureaucratic setting. If the rgyud only 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 of ‘cry out for help’ like in an emergency, but would just have given a command. I would rather think that given
the grandeur of the burial, and the many things to be set apart for offering, the royal 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 analyze the compound as dehë duś ‘equivalent of that specific item’, rauch as dehë duś can be contracted into duśa ‘that time’, he or he 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. ita), surviving, however, in a few western varieties, often in combination with other pronouns, as such Ladhaki (the hosts) ‘that very’.

While the exact meaning of upalāthup 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 unlike, semantically as well as contextually, that items of wealth were singled out and then accumulated as items of wealth. Similarly, if we disregard the totalizing function of -o šalal, 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 (phage). This announcement apparently served to add value to the items given, by stating (or prasing) their quality.

The word rhag is apparently the same as rhag ‘plain (land)’, and we also find it in thangka, and bhalubhā ‘order’ or (bhalubhātiv) ‘decree’. Corresponding to the notion of a ‘plain’, it seems to have designated any flat, unrolled document, whether of cloth (like a thangka), leather, paper, or even metal. While it may well be that the element thag replaced the word thag, because the meaning of the latter had become opaque, the interchange of final -g and -g 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 or 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 funeral rites, while Baccot & Toussaint and many Tibetan scholars (cf. Gyalrong Dkonmchog Tshesbri 1995: 23 n. 27) take the preceding Longam episode as an act of revenge, which is resumed by this song. Their interpretations of the following difficult word or passages are guided by this assumption. This assumption overlooks the fact that the corpse deposited (htab) in clause v.211 l. 58 has the honorific form spar and thus refers to the emperor’s corpse, not to the slave enemies. The same holds for spu in clause v.213 l. 58 should be emended as spar.

The song may well refer to the assault upon the Longam. 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 bow) should, nevertheless, be understood as a warning to the lesser lords.

According to Gyalrong Dkonmchog Tshesbri 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: byar- 'shchen- 'in(to) the very large cadaver’. In his translation, Hill follows the idea of a reduplicated word for ‘corps’, while neither Baccot & Toussaint nor Hauth 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 corpse of the prey, but of the prey itself. Dan Martin in TET mentions an entry in Bstanba, which defines roro as an old expression for ‘all’ ‘thamscad brolpas brdari’. Most probably it is related to CT rero. 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 chepo and chemo, attested as cho- or cho- in various modern dialects (CDTD). CT also the alternation rybo - rybo ‘lord’, note 36 above. Other alternations occurring in OTC are found with the tribal name Lhe - Lho and with the general and minister Wojejr - Wojejr Za fertility.

Hya.

Not being an expert in hunting, I am somewhat surprised that lances were used in hunting birds, and not arrows or slingshoes. 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*, cf. Shamsikut *nık* as well as JAK (sub *su*) with the colloquial form *nig*. But here, the word appears in place of an existential verb: Bstan’ha apparently came to a similar understanding, equating the word with *budspa* ‘having sat (down)’ (TEIT, Dan Martin). As Rainer Kimmig (p.c.) recently pointed out to me, semantically empty relative clauses of the type *what (is) X, that (is) Y* are used in Vedic to modern Indrauyan simply to mark a theme or topic: as *for X, it is Y*. One could think of a similar device with embedded nominalisation based on a pre-Tibetan existential verb: *X *nig(pan) y ‘X existing, [at] it does Y*. In fact, there seems to be a proto-Tibeto-Burman verb *nig ‘exist, be present’, as we can find corresponding forms in Bodic (Mama Tshona *mći*¹), Northern Loloish (Northern and Southern Nusu *ni*¹ and *ni*²), Bumrish (Longchuan and Lianghe Aheang *ni*² and *na*³), and Qiangie (Guigiong *na*²), cf. STEDT database with the references given there, http://stedt.berkeley.edu/search/, last accessed XI/2010. Such verbal origin could explain why in contrast to the conjunction or focus marker *kyug*, case markers tend to be omitted before the topic marker *ni*. Case markers could have been reintroduced in the construction only after the original verbal value of the topic marker had been lost.

Bacot & Toussaint translate this as *je les ai tués*, disfiguring the locative case marker -na. The locational meaning of the marker is accounted for in Haahr’s translation as ‘plunged’ and ‘thrust’, but despite the view of traditional grammar that the *ladom* markers all had the same function and could interchange freely, the locative marker -na is typically used only for non-directional 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> goypa.

The word seems to be related to *goj* ‘the above’ and *goypa* ‘superior, first’. The ‘heel’ is *rigpa*, from *rig* ‘what is behind’, so the tip might be ‘what comes first or above’. Bacot & al. translate freely as ‘coup de bôtes’, Haahr gives ‘pointed blade’, reading *lam*, instead of *lham*. Without further comment, he suggests (1969: 454, n. 31) a relation between the non-existing word *bwa* (1) and the component *sia* in *sartu ‘axx* and *degrasx*, an axe with a semi-circular blade (Jim Valby in TEIT). A closer look at the manuscript reveals that Haahr is mistaken. Both clusters *lr- and *lh-* appear at the end of line 10 in the words *deltar* and *lha*. The upper vertical stroke of the *sa* merges with, or continues, the right vertical stroke of the superscript *l*. The round hook of the *tu* 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 *sa*. 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 *tu* is joined. The clusters thus cannot be easily confused, and in any case, the distance between the round hook and the superscript is even more prominent. (See also epigraphic notes and illustrations S. *lham*.)

Haahr further suggests that *ra* might be a mistake for *rug*. This would yield a nice parallel to the above *rse rug* and corroborates my interpretation of *goj* or *goypa* 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 *rug* was added to *rse* for the sake of the metre, where *goypa* might be a disyllabic noun of its own right. Hill translates *goypa* as ‘mass of a shee’, taking *goypa* ‘lump, mass, heap, clod’ as base. It is, however, difficult to imagine what a ‘lump’ of boils could have to do with a (dead) hare. Glaunyog Dökmochq Tsheshbrit (1995: 23; n. 25) equates *goypa* with *yuka ‘bootsleg’*, which Iam even less able to connect with the killing of a hare.

<79> brielh rdugs.

I am not sure what Bacot & Toussaint actually meant with their ‘*j’ai fusillé sur les cuisses*’, since fastiger ‘flogging, denouncing’ is a transitive verb (the direct object typically being a person). The use of the proposition *sur* is all the more surprising as the Tibetan verb *sug* apparently follows the negative scheme 6b, that is, *sug* corresponds to a direct object. As it stands, the sentence is incomprehensible to educated French speakers. The next possibility that Europeans could perform *sug* is their thighs: “knee slapping” would be expressed with the proposition *sur*, but with a different verb *suger sur les cuisses*.

Haahr translates this clause as ‘the power of life is broken’, equating *brielh* with *bla*. The idea is taken up by Glaunyog Dökmochq Tsheshbrit (1995: 23, n. 28) and Rayaye Bkrahs-ghi (after Hill 2006a: 99, n. 48; *beramas braran ykyug briedgug bcagpas*), however, does not translate as “broke the *bria* bone and briedugq-tree of each” but as ‘from each one/ one by one, [the] also knocked and broke the thighbone’ the connective morpheme (-*chig* -*tag* 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, bhū, resides in the bone or marrow (and due to the sound similarity, particularly in the balas). As Gáháqoq Ḍokhunqosh Teshbran further explains, one wants to hinder a zombie (rolayu) 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 (bhrlei), and that the verb rilay 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 drab, trash, and smash into pieces (IÁK). 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 bhrle bhrayu 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 bhrle bhrayu goes together with the subsequent act of depositing the corpse. There is no necessity to do so. bhrle bhrayu might well be an act connected with the preceding 'hunting' expedition. Its significance might then be quite a different one. One may perhaps recall Arjuna beating his own thigh as a signal for Bhima, and the latter then hiring a bull at the thigh(s) of Duryodhana as an act of utterly foul play, leaving even the combatants in shame. cf. the nice summary of Mahabharata 9.57 to 9.60 given by Smith (2009: 109-111 with n. 24 on p. 110), here once more shortened:

Krṣṇa replies that ... [If Bhima fIghts according to dharma he will lose; he should therefore fight unfairly]. Krṣṇa reminds Arjuna of Bhima's vow to break Duryodhana's thigh; ... Unless Bhima resorts to unfair fighting, Diṭtarṣa will remain king. Hearing Krṣṇa's advice, Arjuna strikes his own thigh where Bhima can see him; Bhima understands the signal. ... Bhima rushes at Duryodhana ... and smashes his thighs with his club. Duryodhana falls to the earth with a great crash; ...

Balarma cries out in dismay at Bhima's unprecedented violation of the rules in striking below the navel. ...

At this the dying Duryodhana propels himself up with his arms and bitterly accuses Krṣṇa of responsibility for the unfair deaths of himself and many others, ... he has secured victory and the deeds of his enemies only by resorting to adharma and trickery. ... [Thoughts of the unfair deaths of their enemies, causes the Pāṇḍavas shame and grief. ...]

[To this Krṣṇa answers] "... As for Diṭtarṣa's son here, not even stuffwielding 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 ad. 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 narratives, if they were not themselves borrowed into the Mahabharata, 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 Logam 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 Logam 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 Logam the culprit, if he ever were a culprit (after all, Pt.1.196 knows him as a rulgphran, that is, a ruler in his own right), had already been murdered, quite pitilessly. The real offender would have had reason enough to invert his guilt into arrogant boasting.

<80> bolb de or Wode myed.

See exographic notes and illustrations 6. bolb or wo. The graphical representation allows three quite different analyses:

a) A final -b could have been added below the bu, but offset somewhat to the right. This is represented here with a slash. With b 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 Phyaɪ - Phyaɪ and Myaɪ - Myoɪ - Mio, where the final semi-vowel or labial is conventionally added below the -y- subscript (typically transcribed as Phya or Mya). Another case is sound in RAMA, where gsoi regularly appears as gsoi regularly transcribed as gsto in the notes. One could thus read bolb 'pit' with Bacot & Tossaint and Haarh.
only with CT mad. The meaning could then perhaps be Vode and Spule are truly existing or both are [the] true [divine and earthly sovereigns].

In an alternative attempt, Giahtog Dkomkoch Tshesbtran (1995: 23, n. 28) relate the implicit form hboh to yoh 'stirrup, step' (the less frequent reading of hboh as '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 (bria bceg ro shas | yohse rkgupa medla roto g med ecsp caste). 'The thigh was broken, the corpse hidden. As for yoh, there is no leg and (thus) no rising of the corpse, such [is the meaning]'). The real significance would be that the Lopam had been completely annihilated (Lopam na wey medla laychupi 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 Drigung not that of the Lopam.

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

<81> spu de myed or Spule myed (omyad).

Given the context of the song, that is, the spur babc in the preceding clause v211, it is not fully impossible that spur 'corps e' was intended here instead of spu. But then, it is again Drigung'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 Drigung 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 Drigung disappeared like that of his predecessors. In that case, the 'royal monument' (bapas) 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 Drigung the first king to have i 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 Drigung himself was a Spu, which is neither supported by the text nor by tradition. (Even if one takes Rudaskyes to be identical with Drigung, he would have been a Bkargs, while it was his wife who came from the Spu.) Haarh (1959, passim) is most probably right when he suggests that the transition from Drigung to Spule Gurgyal 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 *holb de myed i *spu de *myed i ‘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 Tushun, the people of Greater Yangtong, and the Hepthalites, mourning ended, in fact, with the accomplished burial (Pelliot 1961: 3; Molé 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 *shV*, underlying, e.g., *spu* ‘hair, feather’, *spu* ‘reed’, *spu* and *spyi* ‘summit’. *sphu, sphu* ‘tower’ (< *spu* ‘tower’) as items that are proruding, cf. also *spu* ‘hero, proud’ for an exalted person (cf. Zeisler forthcoming, chapter 4 § 2.4.3). If we read the preceding clause v215 as a condition clause, the self-reference as *spu* could have constituted a word play: on the one hand, he speaker is a member of the *Spu* clan, but on the other, he thus claims the highest rank available among the clan leaders. For this possibility cf. also note 80 above. In a way, to close the vicious circle opened there, the interpretation of the word *spu* depends on how we read and how we interpret the grapheme *holb or wo*. If we read *Wode* as a name, we might do so with *Spnde*, and both names may then be related to the dynastic lineage. *myed* must then be read as *myed ‘be true’, that is, *Wode and Spnde are truly existing*, i.e., they are the legitimate celestial and earthly rulers.

For the meaning ‘iron’ in the Zang language, cf. ZhEH (and note 20 above). Haahr and Hill translate ‘copper stones fell from above’, notwithstanding the transitive-causative verb form. Bacoit & Toussaint delegate the agency to some anonymous natural force, overlooking that the verb is followed by the *thubchos* (paras) which disfavors 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 *zaspardo or kegardo*, the common designation being *zardro (BRGY)*, possibly also *gvmgDgugs*, see below.

The surface meaning seems to be that Sthrupgal brought some metal down, in order to have a hearth or perhaps rather a tripod constructed (by whom so ever). *sgyiDgo* and *sgyesDgo* typically refer to the three heath stones, while *lugsDgayal* 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 domain.

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 Mukhri, the scion, of whom it is said that 'he threw down thunderbolts (or meteoric iron) and the class of demons was complying': gnamgna nagmo pho brtse bzhug ho sman, p. 225; as cited by Lissenborn 2004: 192, with n. 243; her translation suggests that Mukhri ‘subdued the group of bhadra, by sounding thunder’; cf., however, Rangijs Yeche in TETT, most probably based on TdDG, for the intransitive verb brdo, II: zons, (IV: zoms) ‘go or sink down; subside or come under control’, which, given its intransitive 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 Zangdng from above, that is, from the west, dwe, that is, eastwards, to Central Tibet. This, the use of the mountain name Tittse (see note 18), and the fact that zays is used, here and possibly also above in clause v68 (I. 20, see note 20), in its Zangdng-iun meaning ‘iron’, all might perhaps indicate that we are dealing with mythologemes originally belonging to, or transmitted by, Zangdng.

<84> Grawmo Gnam Gsersetigs

The translation 'Grawmo Gnam Gsersetigs' was built (Haard; transliteration adjusted) and 'a cold bronze dome erected' (Hill) overlook that the element -btsig of the name does not correspond to stem II btsig (as used for past time reference or a resulting state), but to stem III, the future oriented gerundive ‘to be built’ of the verb btsig. The same objection holds against Donson’s (2009: 144, n. 415) suggestion to translate the parallel passage in P.t.126 as ‘they built the tomb Grawmo Gnam Gsersetigs’ (transliteration adjusted). Huzad’s (2005: 223, n. 10) statement that ‘in DTH Grawmo Gnam Gsersetigs is the name of the tomb of Spulde Guungyal’ (transliteration adjusted) must be likewise be based on the implicit reading btsigs.

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. Bocat & Toussaint (1940: 128, n. 4) erroneously phrase as his name the phrase of the name of Spulde Guungyal’s successor, since the same name is found in Ms. 249 (P.t.1266) with a slightly different spelling as Grawmo Gnam Gsersetigs. The immediate successor is usually given as Asoles (with variants; cf. Haard 1969: 47). In P.t.1286, TDD/OTDO, II. 48-50 we find:

<85> Drigun bsamspa sras // Spule Guungyal gsamla Dr. [1] bdam // sale [1]
Legs drug bsamspa // Spule Guungyal gsumgra // Grapmo Gnam Gsersetigs // Gsersetigs sras // Tholeg bsamspa...

Grapmo Gnam Gsersetigs is thus certainly the name of Spule Guungyal after his death and not the name of his son, which is given here as Tholeg bsamspa ([A]oles coming second), cf. TDD/OTDO, II. 50-51: 1. Tholeg bsamspa, 2. Solegs bsamspa, 3. Gourules bsamspa, 4. Hrojiags bsamspa, 5. Tholeg bsamspa, 6. Hleogs bsamspa, altogether six members of the Legs dynastical group: Haarr 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, Haarr 1969:33).

Quite against his insights proposed in the accompanying note 415, Donson (2009: 144, transliteration adjusted) translates these lines as ‘Spule Guungyal Gsamla Drubdun was the son of Drigun bsamspa. When he united with Sale Legsdrag, Spule Guungyal died, whereupon they [had the son] Grapmo Guungyal Gsersetigs’.

Donson mistakes Gsamen Drubdun as part of Spule Guungyal’s name and accordingly Sale Legsdrag 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 sād.a,s violates Tibetan grammar as much as it does not suit the context.

If Spule Guungyal were already the ‘subject’ or co-subject of bīos, his mentioning again as ‘subject’ of greg would be quite unexpected.

Furthermore, if, in this context, the verb bīos, bīos means ‘unite, mate, lie with, etc.’, we could expect some overt case marking indicating the relation with, most probably, the comitative marker da. 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 member 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 02, cf. the example given in JAK, notably for a female subject. Similarly also in the narrative of the supernatural conception of Sṛjālkṣyā, where it is said that (in her dream) Drigum’s widow had intercourse with someone looking like a son of the K‘u: Klu bshad pa bsamspa (Mkhasla Ldāču, ed. 1987: 246). If the verb focused only on the male’s acting upon a female, one could perhaps, as with the corresponding Ladakh 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, Pt.1288, TIB/DTO, II, 15-36, however, shows that the verb blo can be used neutrally with pattern 05 for both genders.

S II desas lo dragnag l besang Khi Khrogtsan dagspa glespo l besaman Muncaug Kopog dagspa gsum brolbo

"Then, after (lit. in) six years, the imperial scion Khi Khrogtsan betook himself to heaven. [He] had performed marital duties with the imperial daughter Muncaug Kopo for three years" (cf. Dotson 2009:22: 'had cohabited to' and p. 82, quite freely: 'had been married to').

The verb blo has also the meaning 'engendered, begot' (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 Baccot & Boussair's translation: 'Les sept Gnams-la-dri engendèrent les six Sa-la-legs'). Its stem II can lead to an impersonal reading or even to a secondary intransitive verb 'be engendered, begetten', as listed in JAK and, in fact, as used in Pt.1286 with the meaning 'be born' in place of the intransitive verb bcho, bchos. As an intransitive verb, it follows our pattern 03b, which we also find for the verb skye 'be born', here in Pt.1286 with locative-purposive marking on the location argument, the collective of husband and wife: 'X-dagy Y(mal) kopne sa xs, 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 Pt.1286, there is a conspicuous parallelism and contrast between the designations gmaunla X-7 and sale Y-6, and an equally eye-catching parallelism and contrast between the phrases blosanu X and gromsuu Y, which are not accounted for in Dotson's translation. For the latter contrast, cf. also R.A. Stein (1973:423, ms. 41-44) where blos "être vivant" etc. is in various ways opposed to grom and grom(s) 'moort etc. etc. In this context, R.A. Stein (n.41) also refers to our passage in OTC I.

The expression sale Legs drung quite obviously refers to the 'dynasty' of the six Legs on earth (for le instead of la, see also the variation between Narlaskyes and Narlaskyes, note 39 above). Legs might be the collective form of leg or leg, CT srid/ads (ZHEH, ZHNN). The latter form appears in the names of Zangpo rulers, where it may correspond to Skr. sa or satru, perhaps it is 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, gmaunla Dri ldan should refer to the 'dynasty' of the seven Khi in the sky (cf. Bacoct el. 1940: 87, n. 5 and also Dotson 2009: 144, n. 415). Whether the form drung reflects an extremely early sound change affecting first the clusters with velar and alveolar trill, whether it is a mistake triggered by the preceding name of Drigung (note in combination with the 'middle of the seven of the Khi' only the form Khi appears, ill. 31 (2), 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.

Now, however, that the element tri appears in the Zangpo name for a celestial body Briki (ZhNN), possibly derived via metaanalysis from Skr. Krititi, the Tibetan Zonmo, the Pleiades, which, in European and Chinese tradition have seven elements, but in ancient India only six (Petri 1966; cf. http://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krititi, last accessed XI/2010). Similarly in Kashmiri as spoken in the Neelam Valley in Pakistan, the constellation, called Kreis, consists of six stars (Khwaja Rehman, p.c.). But the number seems to be quite variable, Udu speakers call the constellation sdo sambhelan kha smamlha 'the earing of the seven girl friends' (Ruth Latha Schmidt, p.c.), and in Tibetan one finds the alternative name nudrogya (SCD BROY), 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/Pleiaden, las accessed XI/2010).

The Reiscnes are an important constellation in Indian and Tibetan astrology. They appear as one of the first entries in the list of the (or 27) lunar mansions (rgyugkar; Skr. nakaturo; Petri 1966, cf. also BROY sub rgyugkar). In the Ladakhi marriage songs they constitute one of the 18 auspicious connections) /internetel ebyg/or (riechbrella bcebyug).

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 Malro, ll. 192, 422, in later times also spelled Malpo < *Maluro). 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 (dr, khr, gr) seem to have started changing into the corresponding reflexes lge, yhi, qig 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 Grung for the Drugs (Turks) or Drugum (var. Khrigum) for Drigung, less obvious perhaps in the spelling bhrugl 'go, walk', not attested with a velar cluster in Balti, and thus probably borrowed from an Indian language, cf. Hindi dhitu 'move' and Kumaoni dhuja 'wander' (Bielmeier 1985: 171). Even my two-scholarly Ladakhi
friends would automatically opt for a verbal cluster for reflexives in words of unknown origin and for reflexive variants of words with dentals (e.g., Shamskat khrup for khrup ‘be able’ would be spelled as khrus). An original _tri_, alternatively spelled as _dri_, could thus well be re-interpreted as either _gri_ or _khris_. For obvious reasons, _gri_ ‘knife’ is not the preferred option when it comes to celestial bodies. (The name Drigung 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, Khri-bidan is 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): Khri-bi Bahuntsig, lit. ‘the Middle of the Seven of the Khri’, i.e. the fourth Khri. Arguably then, the designation Khri-bidan 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 Zangyud 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’, gyud ‘eight’, but drug-snis ‘sixth’, snis-tee ‘seventh’, snis-gyud ‘eighth’). Another possible source for confusion could be the bnyas-gyi skarma spungdan ‘the Seven Brothers, stars of the north’, the seven stars of the Great Bear, also known as snadrum or snedrum (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 Drigung, the scion: Spude Guungryal, at the junction of two lines, the seven Dri in the sky [and] the six Legs on the earth, when enraged: Spude Guungryal, when having died: Graung 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):

"Drigung bsumgpa sras / Spude Guungryal / gnamla Dri btsun / dale Legs drug / bno / Spude Guungryal / gsumna / Graung Gnam Gserbrtsig / Gserbrtsi sras / Tholeg bsumgpa..."

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 off], compare 1.42 of the same text:

"Yabthu Bdragdrag bsumgpa gsum / ge gsum gnyag gsumna / Khri-bi Blungs-ghigdu bdom / The son of the [heaven]-dweller, Yabthu Bdragdrag, between (lit. at) three elder brothers [and] three younger brothers, seven with Khri-bi Blungs-ghigdu..."

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 _sad_ although not longer motivated in a different layout), or yet fully developed punctuation conventions, or, in this case, a partial neglect by the scribe (e.g., the double _sad_ as appearing between father and son in the original text, do not seem to be well motivated either, further up in the manuscript _sad_ are repeatedly missing between the name of a person, just defined as son, and the same name, defined as fathering the next generation). The missing locative marker might be explained either by haplography (triggered by the following _bno/a_) or by a contraction in an originally metrical text. The author(s) or compiler(s) of OTC quite apparently came to a similar result: _bno/a_ ni / Spude Guungryal / gsumna ni / Graung Gnam Gserbrtsig. With the emphasis, 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 Guungryal; at death Graung Gnam Gserbrtsig.’

In later tradition, however, the first part of the name, _Graung_, is part of a place name Graung Grongchug (as found, e.g., in Ngagl Nima Mechee’s _Meng gsho po_ and Mchaspa Lctx’s _var_. Graung Glong in Bka’lchems kholoma and _Graung Grongchug_ in Bka’lchems kholoma, cf. Luminóbh 2004: 178) denotes a mountain, where Drigung’s (second?) grave is to be found. According to the _Rgya Bod sgyag_ mchaspa dgya’bzhed of Sèlphyunbr, the grave was first built at the end of the valley Senmo in Rkoyul, but the corpse was transferred to Yurups and was hidden (shas) in a cave or on the top (soms) of Mt. Graung Grongchug in
Hchoŋgps (= Hphyongps). The grave or the corpse received the name Gnamla Gserthig (Panglung 1988: 324/235). According to Hacod (2005: 223f. n. 10), the corpse would have been transferred after the death rites, while the site of Gyanto Blahjubs would have been a memorial or "(grave)-chorten". The name of Drigum's (real) grave would then have been Graṇṇo Graṇṇ Gserthig [f.] Mt. Graṇṇo Graṇṇjub would be found in the area of Dartga'byud/ Nā'iri[rathug] (ibid. p. 223 with n. 10), possibly in the valley of Hphyonpgs, perhaps near present-day Gronchung (ibid. p. 224).

One possibility to reconcile these conflicting traditions could be to see in Spudé Gungryal’s posthumous name a reference to his own grave: 'The one for whom [the tomb] Graṇṇo Gnambshe (or Graṇṇgsers) is to be built'. This could indicate that Gungryal as much as the ‘predecessors’ never existed (quite likely the main reason for the non-existence of their tombs), alternatively that Spudé Gungryal (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 Rkyongs who died in an attempt to conquer neighboring Myangpo and was buried accordingly in his homeland Rkyongs. At some later time, Spudé Gungryal or his descendants, who may or may not have been from Drigum’s clan, established themselves in Yarlung, 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 Yarlung’.

**Epigraphic notes and illustrations**

1. *lbu* (addendum to note 12)

   ![Image 1](attachment:A.png)

2. *avra - rva* (addendum to note 15)

   ![Image 2](attachment:B.png)

It is interesting to note that in many Old Tibetan manuscripts, the wazar, 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 *bu* vs. *va*. The square *bu* 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 *brahmi* or rather Gupta va (cf. Laufer 1899: 189f. for he subscribed *va or wazar*). In neglect handwriting, however, the left point might end up even below the base of the right stroke (as evident in the second case of the last note).

Vas Schairer (this volume), starting from the earlier attested inscriptions, argues that the square *ha* is the original form and “the collapsing of he 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 wazar is never attested in a square form. If thus the square letter *ha* and the triangular letter *va* were in use simultaneously at the time of the introduction or standardization of the script, the two forms should have had different phonetic values. In particular, while the square *ha* might have been ambiguous, representing either a stop [b] or a fricative [h] or [v], the triangular *va* should have had only the value of a fricative [h] or [v] or a semi-vowel [j]. There would have been no need to compose the digraph *lha* or *lva* in order to represent the value [b] or [v]. The fact that the digraph *lha* or *lva* was invented indicates that there was only one letter form available initially. The fact that the wazar 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 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 wazar, the left point is often found at half height. The letters-below-the-line include the radical with superscript, the substituted labial semi-vowel *g* as the predecessor of the wazar (cf. Laufer 1899: 307, 1899: 95-96 for its value as a rounded semi-vowel [g] or [g]), and any forgotten letter added below the main line, e.g., the word Bodlungs in P.t.1134, 1, 103, where a missing pre-radical had been added below the ladin. Writing a letter below the line, particularly in 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 brahmi types (Sūmi, Kusunq, 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:
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The Brāhmī ʋ as 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 a few variants (cf. the Aṇoka and Allahabad Gupta forms given in Paulmann 1880: 126; for the various Brāhmī variants, including a Gupta variant with a long stroke, see http://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/5/56/Brāhmī.png, last accessed 3/2010). Unny (1955: 102) speaks of the Kuṭāla type with respect to the triangular ʋ; but the Kuṭāla ʋ, like the Śārdi and the Nāgar ʋ has a round loop-like form (it resembles the Tibetan na). A remnant of the earlier Brāhmī ʋ might be seen in the drop-like ha/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: 209f.; Rona-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 baseline. I shall represent this variant with the symbol for a non-syllabic vowel: -u. Unfortunately, the scribes were not fully consistent, and thus we can find the syllabic lgo for lbo (ll. 221 and 416) not only with a headless -u, but with a quite miniature one, as well (see note 12 and epigraphic notes and illustrations 1. Ibo). By contrast the subscribed semi-vowel may, from time to time appear in the full form with the baseline, as in the case of rva in line 16, where, as a consequence, it was transcribed as radical letter (cf. note 15).

The other two occurrences of rva ‘horn’ in OTC, ll. 215 and 502, are represented more or less correctly as rva and rva in Bacoût & al. (1940: 107 l. 11, 121 l. 8), as  in Wang & Bsdnams Skyid (1992: 46, 64), and as rva (rva) in TDD/OTDD. The upper bar, however, is also found in one of two instances of Kyuus ll. 340, 341 (the latter with the bar) and in at least one of six instances of Myisu ll. 335 (2x), 343, 345, 347, 293 (l. 243, 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 subscript).

The fact that the subscribed semi-vowel may be represented as a slightly reduced, that is, bar-less ʋ, 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) -u could still interchange with a full ʋ with top bar. Unny (1955: 108), who obviously had no access to the OTC manuscript, points to an instance of a non-reduced semi-subscript -u 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. tham (addendum to note 38)

\[ \text{tham, l. 57} \]

\[ \text{tham, l. 59} \]

\[ \text{bar, l. 10} \]

\[ \text{bar, l. 20} \]

\[ \text{bar, l. 48} \]

6. kob or wa (addendum to note 39)

Apart from the word in question, the digraph appears in OTC five times for the name Wogker - Wogker Zagle (l. 495, 496, 497 with s, l. 512, 521 with e).

\[ \text{bokb, or wode, l. 58} \]

\[ \text{wofyj, l. 405} \]

\[ \text{wofy, l. 406} \]

\[ \text{wofy, l. 407} \]

\[ \text{wefy, l. 512} \]

\[ \text{wofy, l. 521} \]

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

(a) The \( b- \) superscript (\( ^{b} \)), even if bearing a diacritic hook, appears in a reduced form (the final stroke is shortened) and combines with a more or less full-fledged \( vu \) or \( ba \), the top bar of which merges with the shortened and horizontal final stroke of the \( b- \).

(b) A full-fledged radical \( ba \) (\( ^{b} \)), the final stroke of which ideally points downwards (slant or slightly convex), combines with a more or less reduced (bar-less) \( vu \) (\( ^{v} \)). 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 \( ba \) or the top bar of the \( vu \) (or \( ho \)). 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 \( vu \) "fox" < \( f[	ext{u}]a \) or \( [f\text{a}]a \) 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 \( b- \) 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 10750, l. 122, 268, 277: \( waj \) (in the latter two instances alternatively transcribed as \( lbaj \)). IOL Tib J 1368, l. 26: \( waj \); IOL Tib J 1374, l. 1: \( waj \); IOL Tib J 1383, l. 1: \( waj \); Pt.1047, l. 16: \( wer \) (alternatively transcribed as \( lsher \)), l. 26, 65, 66, 79, 96, 107, 124, 126, 175, 231, 233, 247, 279, 338, 341, 395, 396: \( weig \) (alternatively transcribed as \( lbig \)), l. 225: \( wi \); Pt.1072 ll. 91, 95: \( wu \); Pt.1078b ll. 1, 1: \( weig \), l. 1 (2x), 6, 20, 26, 30, 33 (2x), 37: \( weig \); Pt.1089 rbc: \( wu \); Pt.1134, ll. 93, 94, 98: \( wu \); Pt.1092, r2, v1: \( wu \); Pt.1235, l. 126: \( wu \); Pt.1297-1, l. 10: \( wu \), l. 2, 4: \( wu \); Pt.1297-4, l. 1, 7: \( waj \) (according to OTHO). I. ad3 should also have a \( we \), which I am, however, unable to identify; Pt.1297-6, ll. 1, 11, 12, 21 (2x), 23: \( wae \). A few more instances of digraph \( wu \) can be found in the documents from Eastern Turkestan (Takeuchi 1997/1998), nos. 134v3 (Wadasa of Li), 164.7 (Wiasa of Li), 223.1 (Waj Mdzoggs), 542.9, v1, v1(rev) (Lakza Wa-ba), 5818 (Ba-gwa gnas), 673.2 (prakara).

Documentwise, type (a) (mostly without hook) is most common (12 : 2 : 3). However, due to the high number of occurrences of the digraph in Pt.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). The labial might be a quadrangular \( ba \) (as in Takeuchi no. 164.7, 673.2, and JT 0750) or, more commonly, a triangular \( wa \). Takeuchi no. 164.7 corresponds to JT 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 \( b- \) 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:

\[ \text{134v3} \]

\[ \text{542.9, v1, v1(rev)} \]

\[ \text{5818} \]

\[ \text{673.2} \]

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, \( bh \) (or \( bva \) in OT, \( iba \) in CT, consists of a superscript letter \( b- \) or \( i- \) 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 "-" for the letter \( b- \). If one follows this convention, the epigraphic transliteration of the digraph \( wa \) can only be \( bva \). If one chooses the symbol \( b- \), one has both options: \( bha \) and \( bva \), 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
SkT  Sanskrit

Linguistics

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

Texts, dictionaries, or authors

BTSH  Byangshing lunggu mdog, Hir Sue Liss and Skalbray Yamo, 2002
CDTD  Comparative dictionary of Tibetan dialects. Biemler, in preparation
DYGK  Dzigig Gyangbrgyug. Blatonsthang Yambulang, 1994
GSHS  Goldstein, Stiefel, and Saklung, 2001
JAK  Jaksche, 1881 (1995)
OTC  Old Tibetan Chronicle
OTDO  Old Tibetan Documents Online: http://otdo.aau.nifs.ac.jp
RAMA  The story of Khana in Tibet, de Jong, 1989
SDO  Sarah Chandler Das, 1902
TDD  Tibetan Documents from Dakhisang, Inacella & al., 2007
TETT  Tibetan to English Translation Tool. Pelligrin, 2006-2009
TVP  Die tibetische Version des Papageienchronik. Hermann, 1983
THD  Thamu dyogspyur. Mkhinrodc Kgorje Dhangphug, 1989
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