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PREFACE

The existence of a Nam state came to light, in 1925, through mention of a king Hu-mar, whose daughter became consort of a Khotan ruler: see Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, vol. i, p. 130 and n. 5. In the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1928 (pp. 630-4) note was taken of a Nam, or Nam-pa, kingdom and language and a Nam-tig people, as cited in certain early Tibetan manuscripts which had been brought by Sir Aurel Stein from the now famous walled-up library in Ch’ien-fo-tung (a monastery settlement near Tun-huang/Sha-chou in western Kan-su) and which evidently contained folk-lore of the Koko-nor region of north-eastern ‘Tibet’. On the basis of certain names quoted along with Tibetan equivalents it was concluded that the folk-tales were versions of Nam originals; and the language was identified with that of the text here edited, of which a specimen had been published. The matter was carried somewhat further, with discussion and attempts at elucidation of the language, in an article contributed to the JRAS, for 1939 (pp. 193-216).

A connexion of the Nam kingdom with the Nan (Nam1)-shan range of mountains, which separate the Koko-nor region from the Chinese province of Kan-su, was naturally conjectured from the first; and confirmation may be sought in the name of a Sinified ‘Nam-Liang’ dynasty which at the end of the fourth century A.D. and during the early part of the fifth ruled the country from Hsi-ning to Lan-chou. The family name of the dynasty was T’u-fa, and its members are stated to have been of north-Asian, Sien-pi, extraction, akin to the Koko-nor T’u-yü-hun, with whose state it coexisted in a relation which is not perspicuous. On the Chinese side ‘Nam-Liang’ was evidently taken to mean ‘Southern (Nan) Liang’, as contrasting with the perhaps somewhat later Hou-Liang, ‘Later Liang’, Pei-Liang, ‘Northern Liang’, and Hsi-Liang, ‘Western Liang’, ruling over different parts of Kan-su. Thus the Nam-pa people may have been the people of the Nan-Liang state, and this may have owed its name to the Nan-shan mountains. But the Chinese nomenclature of outside cities and districts has frequently been found to be a deceptive covering of prior native designations: and it is conceivable that the Nan-shan itself was originally not ‘Southern mountain’, which
is not obviously appropriate, but 'Nam mountain' in a native sense. This is suggested by the familiarity of the word *gnam*, 'sky', and *gnam-pa* (in our present text *hnam-hldah*), 'sky-people', as denoting the inhabitants of *Gnam*, the higher Bon-po heaven. Thus the Nan-shan may have been at first the 'heaven mountains', and the Nan-Liang, properly the 'Nan(-shan)-Liang', may have set the fashion for the Chinese designations, Pei-Liang, Hsi-Liang, &c. One of the Tibetan manuscripts, which mentions a 'Nam-po' or 'Gnam-po' species of turquoise, also makes *gnam* 'sky' play a part in the mythical origin of the stone.

Identification of the language of the text as 'Nam' was based upon a limited number of name-forms, and objection may be raised as follows: Granted that in the text the expression *Mehi-klu-hcah* may, on the lines suggested *infra* (p. 255), carry a covert allusion to the Nam people as related to an eponymous Mye-kru, celebrated in the folk-lore manuscripts, does it not seem that these *Mehi-klu-hcah* are mentioned slightingly or even with hostility? Should not the text represent an external point of view, namely, that of the Hldyan associated with them, who could well be the Hjañ, i.e. the Tang-hsiang people, known from Tibetan history? In that case the language of the text might deserve to be named rather Hldyan, or Hjañ, than Nam. To this it may be replied that the name Hjañ, whether identical or not with *Liang* in *Nam-Liang*, &c., was probably dynastic, and that the country itself was known as Skyi. In fact, the folk-lore texts themselves give as Skyi, or *Skyi-mthin*, 'Skyi-plateau', the name of the 'far country' to which the daughter of Mye-kru escaped to become a bride in the local Gyim-po family, i.e. a racial ancestress. In all the tales it seems that the main theme is really the Skyi country legend and that the Nam occurrences are incidental, imported as accounts of that ancestry. Nevertheless, only a Nam original is mentioned, and it is therefore to be concluded that the Tibetan versions had only Nam originals, whether the legends were current only in a 'Nam' area, or whether between a 'Nam' and a 'Skyi', or Hjañ', language there was no real difference. Substantially, in fact, the latter was, no doubt, the case. The Skyi kingdom was separated from the Nan-shan districts only by the Rma-chu (Hoang-ho), which in early times did not constitute a barrier: the whole confused mass of the Ch’iang tribes of the region was swayed, as appears, by the 'Shao-t’ang' leaders to the north of it; and the subsequent detachment of a Skyi, or Tang-hsiang, state
may have been merely a reaction from the domination of the intrusive T'u-yü-hun people in the vicinity of the Koko-nor.

For the study of the oldest-known Tibetan the Nam language, as we may accordingly continue to designate it, should, being approximately contemporary, furnish a not superfluous control. In relation to Ch'iang or other Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Sino-Tibetan borderlands, none of them recorded until centuries later or until modern times, it may serve to measure development. The contents also of the few texts, Nam and Tibetan, should help in divining the obscure mentality, traditions, and social conditions of the peoples. While the Nam text is not here accompanied by a continuous translation, the pieces of folk-lore in the Tibetan manuscripts, of which an edition with translation has been prepared, may be forthwith utilizable.

Increased familiarity with the text, which was ready in 1941 for the press, has strengthened the impression of artifices of style, such as are noted on p. 157: it has also given occasion for amplification, and, it is hoped, improvement, of the Vocabulary.

The latter, in common with the chapter on Etymology, to which it largely refers, has necessarily a tentative character; but it may perhaps be found to contain, along with, no doubt, numerous over-speculative or erroneous items, a proportion of additional confirmations and also material for the correction of its own errors. A reader attracted to the study of the language and its problems may prefer, however, to make an independent approach by first looking through the Text as printed, unless he should choose rather the facsimile Plates.

For the sketch-map, designed for reference in connexion with the present work, a historically and ethnographically instructive original could, but for technical difficulties, have been found in one included in M. Grenard’s valuable Atlas, published (1898) in Mission Scientifique dans la Haute Asie, par J.-L. Dutreuil de Rhins. The Oxford University Press has graciously allowed the two compiled for Sir Charles Bell’s The Religion of Tibet to be used as a basis. The fine geographical maps published by the Royal Geographical Society and the Trigonometrical Survey Department of the Government of India are replete with here irrelevant names of native or foreign origin. Readers may appreciate a reference to Dr. Tafel’s map, accompanying his Meine Tibetreise, to the Chinese sketches for the Rgyal-ron statelets (see the cited publications of E. Colborne Baber and Dr. Haenisch), and to the Chinese
map of Kan-see published with an elaborate Index, by Dr. Filchner (infra, p. 25 and n. 4).

Certain inconstancies in the spelling of names, due to retention of general usage or of the use of quoted works, or to variation in the Tibetan writing itself, will, it is hoped, be excused as innocuous.

Grateful acknowledgement is due to the authorities of the India Office for continuous loan of the manuscript and permission of the publication, and to the now retired Librarian, Dr. H. N. Randle, and his assistants for constant help. For a liberal subvention towards the expense of printing, the Philological Society desires to record its cordial thanks to the Council of the British Academy. The skilled and rapid work of the Oxford University Press from the time when a commencement became possible has lightened the task of correcting the typographically rather complex proofs.

F. W. THOMAS

*September 1947*
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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Pp. vi, 27, 31, 333: In identifying the Hjan with the Tang-hsiang it was suggested (JRAS. 1928, p. 85) that the name, so far as it is applied to the Mo-so, was brought by that people from the north. In its occurrences in the Tibetan Chronicle and the associated texts M. Jacques Bacot (Documents de Touen-houang . . . , 1940–1946) refers it to the Mo-so. Reserving some here irrelevant comments upon this matter, we should first note that the form Hldyan (Chinese Liang), which alone is here requisite, was certainly applied to the T'ang-chang dynasty.

P. 8 n. 2: The Chinese account rendered by Dr. Haenisch (op. cit., p. 23) gives as boundaries of Khams, E. the Ya-lung river, W. the mountain ‘Noubou-grangra’, N. the northern boundary of the Hbri-chu (upper Yang-tse-chiang), S. the mountain ‘Gakra-gangri’. The ‘capital’ was Batang (Hbah-thain).

P. 28 and n. 4: Fussū-ch'ēng is given in Professor Herrmann's Atlas, map 32.


P. 74: Add to the list of languages the Kioutse (d’Orléans, nos. 27, 29) or Kiu-tzu, occasionally cited infra (see p. 459). Belonging, like the Mélam and Loutse/Lu-tzu, to the Me-kong valley (see map), it seems to have been extensively Tibetanized, but retains some clear Hsi-fan features. The Kiu may be the Hjus of Geografia Tibet, p. 42.

Pp. 89 n. 2, 90, Dge-di-tsha: The name of the small state (located in the map) is recorded in Tibetan writing (see Haenisch, op. cit., p. 98 n. 4) as Dge-bhes-rtsas. In the numerals cited infra (p. 90) 'awda, given by Haenisch as = 20, should, no doubt, be '14', '4' being 'da (Hör-pa hla): '20' would resemble Hör-pa naska', since '30', 'su-sk'a, and '40', 'wa-sk'a, correspond to Hör-pa sūskā, lēskā.

P. 154, Bo-lo-tse: The language of this people, the Polotseu of d'Ollone (p. 34), is warranted as Hsi-fan by a short list of numerals and other words reported by W. C. Haines Watson in the Journal of the China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. xxxvi (1905), p. 101 (‘Journey to Sungp'an').

P. 333: For the sorcerer's cock, or fowl, see also Tafel, op. cit., II, p. 236.

P. 430: In the Vocabulary insert ḡphyah, l. 298, and read ḡpus-ḡphyah in p. 428.
I. INTRODUCTION
A. GENERAL
GEOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The great country which on the maps is labelled 'Tibet' extends, from Rudok in the west to Ta-chien-lu = Dar-chen-do in the east, over about 22 degrees of longitude, and, from the Himalaya in the south to the Kuen-lun and Altyn-Tagh in the north, over about 11 degrees of latitude. Owing to the inverse curvature of the great mountain ranges on the north and south it presents a rather oval contour. Somewhat more visually it may be compared to a left hand placed flat with palm downwards upon a board pointing eastwards with a slight declivity in that direction. The wrist will then be the region where Kuen-lun, Karakoram, and western Himalaya approach each other in the Ladak countries; and the back of the hand, with, say, half the length of the fingers, may represent the great 'north plain', Byaṅ-thaṅ, which has its greatest general altitude in the north-west, where the Byaṅ-chen-mo (Changchenmo) attains to about 17,000 feet; the whole western border is at a great height, so that it, and especially the Kailāsa-Mānasā-sarovar area, is by the Tibetans designated Stod-ph-yogs, 'Upper Region', and the descents to the Low Country (Mar-yul) of Ladak are over passes reaching 19,000 feet.

The fingers will have to be more than four in number; they will have to be lengthened, to develop a curvature in a south-easterly direction, and to have branching ends. The curvature will be most pronounced in the prolongation of the little finger and forefinger, and least in the case of the longer middle finger. Hence there will seem to be, as it were, two groups: the prolongation of the little finger will, as the Nan-shan of the Chinese border, seem to wish to approach the prolongation of the middle finger, the great Bayan-kara\(^1\) range of mountains, and to allow the river which the Tibetans call Rma-chu, 'Peacock River',\(^2\) only a rather contracted exit into

---

\(^1\) Mongol bayaŋ, 'rich'; + kara, 'black' (Prejevalsky, ii, p. 181; Tafel, ii, p. 257 n., with a plea for the retention of the name).

\(^2\) The name, in Hsi-hsia ma-tuo (Laufer, No. 109), must have been obtained by the Tibetans from the Tang-hsiang people, concerning whom see infra (p. 28). The peacock bird (Tib. rma-bya), traditional ancestress of the Tang-hsiang (infra, pp. 28-9, 135), who bore the designation Rma as a national and regional surname (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i,
China, where it becomes the Hoang-ho; while the continuations of the forefinger will take a decidedly southern direction, until, in a braid of high ranges, they collide with the most easterly prolongations of the thumb, namely the Himalaya. Between the two groups, and receiving great tributaries from the southern flanks of the Bayankara, lies the course of that river which of all those descending from the Tibetan plateau into China has its sources farthest to the west, namely the Ḥbri-chu (Di-chu, Dre-chu, i.e. ‘Yak-cow River’) of the Tibetans, or, as it approaches China, the Chin-sha-chiang (‘Gold-sand River’) or, in China, the Yang-tse-chiang. The forefinger, which bounds the course of the upper Ḥbri-chu on the south, is a great area of snow mountains wherein is distinguished on the north the Tang-la, of which the western continuation is not definitely known, but which to the travellers coming from the north presents the most imposing spectacle that they have encountered. More to the south, and extending eastwards between the Tengri-Nor (Nam-tsho) lake and Lha-sa, is the Gñan-chen-Thañ-la, the Nyin-chen-Tangla of

The Chinese notion, reported by Rockhill (Diary, p. 113 n.), that rma means ‘yellow’ is an imagination based upon the Chinese Huang-ho, ‘Yellow River’. According to Huc and Gabet (i, p. 274) the water of the river begins to be yellow only after its entry into China; but Dr. Tafel (ii, p. 290, with an erroneous etymology) finds it ‘yellow-gray’ as high up as its knee.

It is, of course, conceivable that rma originally meant ‘river’ and that the connexion with ‘peacock’ is due to folk-etymology; but evidence is wanting, unless Loutse ré-mé should prove to be such.

1 For a general view of the ranges and their curvatures see M. Grenard’s discussion in Dutreuil de Rhins, La Haute Asie, iii, pp. 156 sqq.

2 The other spellings, Brius (Marco Polo), Polei-tchou (Huc and Gabet, ii, p. 119, evidently heard from a Chinaman), Di-chu (Prejevalsky, ii, pp. 221, 306), Drum’u (Rockhill, p. 196, n. 2), Bri-chu, all represent the Tibetan word Ḥbri, ‘yak-cow’, with its ancient (bri) or modern (dri, di) pronunciation: the ḃ’eh which Gill heard at Ba-thañ (The River of Golden Sand, ed. Baber, 1883, p. 44) is merely the modern E.-Tibetan pronunciation of Ḥbri: see p. 76. On the Mongol name, Murū (or Murūs)-uṣu, see Prejevalsky, Rockhill (whose objections in regard to Ḥbri are unavailing), locc. ctt., and Tafel, ii, p. 28 n.

3 See Huc and Gabet, ii, pp. 126–8; Rockhill, Diary, p. 215 (‘certainly the most imposing chain of mountains I have seen in Asia’). The name, which Rockhill gives (p. 214) as = Tib. grāns (‘cold’, ‘icy’), is given in the Dictionary of S. C. Das as Dān-la and by the Panchen whose itinerary is mentioned infra as Ldaṅ-la, in which ldāṅ is ambiguous and la = ‘mountain pass’ or, metonymously, ‘high mountain’.

4 Gñan-chen-Thañ-lha (the spelling of the Geografia Tibet, p. 2) means
maps, perhaps belonging in some way to the ‘Trans-Himalaya’. The gap between forefinger and thumb will be the valley of the Brahmaputra.

Crossing the Byan-than in an approximately west-to-east direction are numerous mountain ranges, which owing to the great general elevation of the plateau do not tower excessively;\(^1\) the Littledales, whose journey from Cercen and the Tokuz-Dawân was in a north-south direction and traversed the Byan-than farther to the west than the corresponding lines followed by other explorers, except Dutreuil de Rhins, found it always possible to discover a gap or a manageable pass. The broad depressions between the ranges are occupied not by rivers, but by chains of lakes, which, having no outlet, are saline; in the whole of the Byan-than, as far east as the main routes from Lha-sa to the north and north-west, the chief obstacle to travel is the scarcity of drinkable water. As the general level declines eastwards without a corresponding reduction in the heights of the great mountain ranges,\(^2\) the deepening depressions become the valleys of rivers, which in some cases, after descending from their parent glaciers, have over immense distances a quite moderate fall. The most familiar example of this is, of course, the Brahmaputra; but both the Hbri-chu and the Rma-chu traverse vast stretches of than country in this manner; and on a smaller scale some of the rivers embraced by the Hbri-chu and its southern barrier, the Tang-la—for instance the Dza-chu, or upper Me-kong—may exhibit the same feature; and certainly in the Koko-nor region the T'ao-river has a long than course from west to east between mountain ranges before making at Min-chou a right-angle bend which ultimately brings it through a deep trough to the Rma-chu, somewhat west of Lan-chou. The great Na(g)-chu, or Ya-lung river, which with its tributaries issues from the southern slopes of the Bayankara range and ultimately

\(^1\) ‘The further west the lower the mountains’ (Tafel, ii, p. 33).

\(^2\) ‘The valleys descend from W. to E. quicker than the mountain heights’ (Dutreuil de Rhins, ii, p. 180).
joins the Ḥbri-chu, now Chin-sha-chiang, on its left bank, has perhaps a more precipitous upper course.

There comes a point when the river either bends round the end of one of its mountain barriers or breaks through it,¹ or is confined by the approach of two ranges, and so enters a gorge from which it emerges with much diminished altitude. This characteristic, manifested in the west by the Indus, which after a long course through Ladak and Baltistan at a height of 10,500–8,000 feet accomplishes in the 60 miles of its gorge ending in Kohistan a fall of about 4,000 feet, and similarly by the Brahmaputra just prior to its emergence in Assam, may in the case of the Ḥbri-chu and Rma-chu be indicated by figures. The former, which, where crossed by the main route over the Tang-la northwards, has an elevation of 13,000 feet,² reaches the district of Jyekundo after a winding course through about 4 degrees of longitude and 1½ of latitude with a height of about 12,000 feet; thence through gorge country it traverses about 2 degrees of longitude and 3 of latitude to the vicinity of Ba-t'ang on the great route from Lha-sa to Pe-king, losing 4,000 feet of height.³ The Rma-chu, after its short uppermost course, passes through the two lakes, Charing-nor and Oring-nor,⁴ at an elevation of about 14,000 feet; with many windings at the foot of the great Amne Rma-chen⁵ range of

¹ Cf. Tafel, ii, p. 169 (the Ḥbri-chu).
² Rockhill, p. 380; Filchner, Om Mani Padme Hum, p. 168, 4,670 metres. Dr. Tafel's crossing, some distance north of Jyekundo, was at 3,650 metres (ii, p. 134).
³ Ba-t'ang (Ba-thaṅ) is about 8,200 ft. above sea-level (Rockhill, Diary, p. 393).
⁴ As the correct spelling of these names Rockhill gives (p. 173, n. 1) Ts'aring and Noring with Tibetan etymology accordingly. Grenard has (iii, p. 206) Kya-ring and Ngo-ring. Tafel follows (ii, p. 15, n. 2) Rockhill, stating, however, that the names are Mongol, and adding, however, a reference to a text which gives Tibetan etymologies partly identical with those of Rockhill but with spellings Ts'o-schdyara and Ts'o-ngora: he further cites Ś. C. Das's spelling of the name Ts'aring as Skya-reṅs. Ś. C. Das in his Dictionary states that Skya-reṅ is the name of a lake which is the source of the Yang-tse-chiang. No doubt the really correct spelling is that of the Geografia Tibet (p. 2), viz. Skya-reṅs and Sño-raṁs (reṅs ?).
⁵ In the name Amne, Amyé, Anyei (no doubt—Tib. 'a-ne) signifies, according to Prejevalsky (ii, p. 76), Rockhill (p. 94, Diary, p. 130) and the Vicomte d'Ollone (In Forbidden China, p. 256), 'ancestor'; and the two
mountains, in the course of which it passes through about 5
degrees of longitude and about 1½ degrees of latitude, it reaches its
knee in a wide than at about 11,200 feet; then, curving round the
Amne Rma-chen, it enters its gorge and in a sort of semicircle
through less than 3 degrees of latitude reaches Kuei-tê, south-east
of the Koko-nor (lat. c. 101°-50'), where it is flowing at 7,500 feet;
thence, with regular fall through about 2½ degrees of longitude, it
enters China proper at Lan-chou with a height of 5,400 feet.

The above particulars may enable us to appreciate the Tibetan
conception of their country as consisting of than, i.e. high plateaux,
or plains, and wide valleys of similar aspect, roñ, gorges or defiles
among mountains, with, of course, the sgan, the mountain ridges
themselves. Eastern and northern ‘Tibet’, Mdo-Khams, is
described as the country of the three Sgañs. The passes over the
mountains are la. But we may make mention of some further
useful expressions.

Where there are mountain slopes and higher parts of valleys
unsuitable for settlements, but allowing of nomadic pasturage,
those districts are known as hbrog, and the nomads, tent-
dwellers, are hbrog-pa (Dokpa). In many of the roñs of eastern
Tibet there are upper, barren, parts of the valleys, where the life
is thus quite different from that of not very distant settlements.
The word yog, a variant of hog, ‘below’, seems to have in general
a rather wider sense than roñ, denoting a valley without implying

first-named travellers give lists of the thirteen or fourteen so surnamed
mountains of north-eastern Tibet. A later writer, Dr. W. Filchner, adds
(Das Rätsel des Matschâ, p. 167 n.) that primarily the term denotes certain
‘mountain spirits’. In connecting Machen with the name of the river
Rma-chu the Vicomte d’Ollone is indubitably right; but, as pointed out
supra (p. 1, n. 2), Rma-chen means ‘Great Peacock’, and the Geografia Tibeta
gives the name of the range as Rma-chen-sbon-ra, ‘Great Peacock vast
region’, Prejevalsky’s Amnimanchenponra, which Rockhill (loc. cit.) found
‘horrible’. The Dictionary of S. C. Das clinches the matter by interpreting
the expression as: ‘name of the great genius of the gshi-bdag (ground-lord)
class, the lord of the peacocks, who resides in the snowy mountain of
Spom-ra of the province of Amdo.’

1 For a view see Tafel, ii, Plate LXVI.
2 Concerning the figures for Kuei-tê and Lan-chou see Rockhill, p. 376,
Diary, p. 387.
3 On than, roñ, sgañ, hbrog, see Sandberg, Tibet and the Tibetans,
pp. 13-20.
4 Geografia Tibeta, p. 41, adding three subsidiary ones. An old Bon-po
work (MS.) enumerates four.
5 See Rockhill (Druk-pa), pp. 189-90, Diary, p. 243, and, more generally,
Sandberg, pp. 15-17.
the features of a ‘gorge’ or ‘defile’. *Mdo* is the lower part of a valley where it opens out, and in its application to Amdo or Mdo-smad, denoting the Koko-nor region generally, the term seems to mean no more than ‘low country’. *Sods* are flat districts,\(^1\) where the high mountains end: we hear of the ‘Eighteen *Sods*’ of Mdo-Khams.

It is curious to note that the great difference in fertility between the northern and southern flanks of mountains in Tibet (see the remarks in Futterer, *Durch Asien*, i, p. 430, and Tafel, *Meine Tibetreise*, ii, p. 170) is represented by the Tibetans as a difference between ‘bright’ (*gdags*) and ‘shadowed’ (*sribs*) mountains and is commemorated in the names of two of the early legendary kings, *Gdags-* and *Sribs-khri*.

Naturally Tibet has *roṅ* districts in more than one direction, not indeed on the north, where the passages into Chinese Turkestan and the Lob-nor region, over the Kuen-lun and Altyn-tāgh, are for the most part arid and those few rivers which rise beyond the first ranges have a course over barren *thaṅs* and descend through treeless defiles into deserts of stony soil or sand. On the south, of course, there are many *roṅs*, and Sikkim derives its Tibetan name from being of that nature. But the *roṅ* country *par excellence* is in the east, where the many great rivers, taking approximately parallel courses from north to south, are separated by high, relatively narrow, *sganṅs*. As readers of Fathers Huc and Gabet’s famous work will realize, and as appears at least equally from the published itineraries, Chinese and Nepalese,\(^2\) of the grand route from Lha-sa to Pe-king, which, after a slightly northerly detour to Chamdo on the Dza-chu, follows approximately the 30th parallel of latitude, the journey via Ba-thāṅ\(^3\) and Li-thāṅ to Ta-chien-lu is one of perpetual ascents to passes and descents from the same.

---

1 *Gliṅ-khams.*
2 A Chinese itinerary was translated into Russian by Father Hyacinth Bichurin, whose work was rendered into French, with notes, by Klaproth (*Description du Tibet*, Paris, 1831, Chéng-tu to Lhasa, pp. 171–237): Rockhill’s translation, accompanied by other itineraries, appeared in the *JRAS.* 1891, pp. 27–69. The Nepalese itinerary was presented to B. H. Hodgson in 1843 and by him published in *Selections from the Records of Bengal*, No. IV, and again in *Miscellaneous Essays*, 1880, ii, pp. 167–90. Historically the most interesting itinerary, requiring, however, further elucidation, is that translated from the *T’ang Annals* by Bushell (*JRAS*. 1880, pp. 538–41)—from Hei-ning to Lha-sa and Tashilhunpo (?): it evidently belongs to the 8th century A.D.
3 *Geografia Tibeta*, pp. 44–5, Ḥbāḥ-[thāṅ].
Somewhat farther north, but south of the Tang-la, the routes followed by Rockhill in 1891, Captain Bower, and M. Bonvalot and Prince Henri d’Orléans tell the same tale; and the prior route of Rockhill (1889), which in a south-easterly direction from Jyekundo followed for awhile the line of the Hbri-chu, diverged to the Dza-chu and again to places on the upper Na(g)-chu or Ya-lung, and then headed direct to Ta-chien-lu, reckons its passes at the rate of at least one per day. A partly equivalent route was taken by Dr. Tafel in 1914.

It was observed by M. Grenard that, despite the general fall of the country towards the east, the mountain altitudes in eastern and north-eastern ‘Tibet’ are not appreciably less imposing than those of the west. Putting aside the fancy reported by Dr. Filchner, that in the Amne Rma-chen there are peaks comparable in height to Mt. Everest, we may note that the latest Government of India map of Tibet puts one part of that range on the 24,000-ft. level; the Nan-shan rises to 20,000 feet; and in the valley of the Chin-ch’uan river, which has a more or less north-to-south course rather to the east of Ta-chien-lu, Dr. Tafel records ranges to the east attaining to 5,000 metres, in two instances over 6,000, whereas the Tibetan side was content with somewhat over 4,000. It is clear that travelling in eastern Tibet is a much more toilsome matter than farther west; but, on the other hand, as has been recorded by both Rockhill and Dr. Tafel, the rohns are often well wooded, and even rather thickly populated, with permanent towns and villages at the crossing-places, sometimes having houses of several stories and towers climbing the steep declivities; whereas in the west the passes come at longer intervals and are more gradual. Prejevalsky, for instance, speaks (ii, p. 221, cf. p. 181) rather slightly of his traversing the Bayankara at

---

3 Op. cit., iii, pp. 180-1; also by Dr. Tafel, ii, pp. 196, 277.
4 *Om Mani Padme Hum*, p. 70.
5 ii, pp. 196, 200, 248, 277.
6 Rockhill, Index s.v. ‘Forests’; Tafel, ii, pp. 172, 188-9, 196, &c.

Similarly Gill and others.

7 Rockhill, pp.196, 239, 242, *Diary*, pp. 262, 297, 328; Tafel, ii, pp. 185, 241.
Odontala; and the chief difficulties are the fierce winds on the swampy *thans* and the impossibility of obtaining supplies of any kind, except in a few places where the crossing of an unfordable river, or some other special circumstance, has given birth to a permanent settlement.

All travellers from the north, however, from Fathers Huc and Gabet onwards, speak with respect of the Tang-la. And this is important; for it is certain that this is the northern boundary, both ethnical and political, of Tibet proper. In the centre and east of Tibet the highest general level seems to be that of the country immediately to the south of the Tang-la. To the Tibetans their country is the high country, culminating in the *Stod-phyogs*, the region of Mt. Ti-se (Kailása) and Lake Mánasa-sarovar. The area north-east of the Tang-la is regarded as a lowland, and either the whole of it, or at any rate the Koko-nor area, was in old times designated *Mdo-smad*, 'Low Mdo'; at present the terms used are *Amdo* and *Mdo-Khams*. The latter two names are somewhat loosely used. The term *Khams*, which, as we have seen, includes the valley of the Ḫbri-chu as far west as the Tang-La pass, is sometimes applied to the districts of eastern and even north-eastern Tibet in general; but it may be doubted whether the Tibetans ever think of the Koko-nor region or the Go-lok country to its south as *Khams*. It may be most convenient to restrict the term *Khams* to the country south of the Bayankara range, and to attribute the entire area to the north thereof, including the whole of the Rma-chu valley and the Koko-nor region, to *Amdo* (i.e. *Mdo*).²

¹ Huc and Gabet, ii, pp. 126–8; Rockhill, *Diary*, pp. 158, 214, 219 n.; see also infra, p. 13.

² The expression 'Mdo-Khams' is used in the *Geografia Tibet*, pp. 3, 41, and is given in S. C. Das’s *Dictionary*, s.v. *Mdo*. *Khams* does not seem to include any territory north of the Bayankara; and in the Koko-nor region the traders thence (Kham-pas, Rockhill, pp. 111, 188) are regarded as outsiders. Its westward extension is indicated by the Pan-chen’s itinerary (infra, p. 13). Dr. Tafel defines (ii, p. 29 n.) *Khams* as the country between Lha-sa and the districts under Sā-Ch’uan-Chinese rule; but, unless for Lha-sa we substitute 'Tibet proper’, that definition would be too comprehensive. Rockhill (pp. 61, 188) defines *Khams* as eastern Tibet. On the country and people see Sandberg, *Tibet and the Tibetans*, pp. 154–8.

According to the Pan-chen’s itinerary *Amdo* is a rather limited area, centring upon Tankar and Kum-bum; and this is partly in agreement with Rockhill, who states (p. 73) that 'the section of country within the Kan-su border inhabited by Tibetans is known to them as *Amdo*, hence the name they give to themselves, *Amdo-wa... To the west of the *Amdo-wa*, living
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Amdo, as so defined, being the main sphere of the present investigation, may be here briefly particularized.

The Bayankara range in the extreme east, where it reaches the north-western corner of the Chinese province of Ssū-ch’uan, is separated on its north by than country from the snowy Min-shan; from the Min-shan issues the Min river, which, flowing southwards by Sung-p’ān and the capital, Chêng-tu, of Ssū-ch’uan, ultimately reaches the Yang-tse-chiang. Along the northern front of the Min-shan flows, in a west–east direction, the upper T’ao river; and farther north, bounded on the west by the Rma-chu gorge (Rma-ron) and on the north by the subsequent west-to-east course of the same river, in the Koko-nor region, is mainly than country, having an elevation of from 12,000 to 13,000 feet, but crossed by some mountain ranges rising to 14,500 feet; through this country one or two rivers flow west into the Rma-ron, and a larger number descend northwards.¹ From this than country there is easy access, by way of the than districts about the knee of the Rma-chu, to the whole upper valley of that river; but also, at one point, at least, in the Rma-ron,² there is a crossing, whence a mountain route effects a much shorter approach to one or two points in that upper valley.

From the knee westwards the northern watershed of the Rma-chu is the Amne Rma-chen range of mountains, having a more or less north-west to south-east direction. At its western end it is separated by one or two parallel, but less considerable, ranges, Wahong-shan, Amne Bayan, &c., from the low country to the south and south-west of the Koko-nor; and these same ranges by their north-western projection, approaching the mountains of the south Koko-nor range, narrow the watershed between the Koko-nor region proper and the low-lying (9,000–10,000 ft.) districts (Baron, Jun, Taichinar, Hajjar, Gass, &c.) of the great salt-morass of the Tsaidam. These districts, lining the Tsaidam on the south, are backed by a succession of ranges, Burkhan Buddha range, Marco Polo range, Bokalik range, Chimen-tāgh, which separate them from the Tibetan plateau, Byaṅ-thaṅ, and ultimately effect in the steppe or the mountains round the Koko-nor, are the Panak’a or Panak’a sum, “the three Pana tribes”, who, save in their more complete independence, differ in nothing from their neighbours.¹

¹ On this country and the altitudes it will be sufficient to refer generally to Futterer, Durch Asien, i, pp. 329-441; d’Ollone, In Forbidden China (= Les derniers Barbares), pp. 225–81; Tafel, ii, pp. 275–321.

² See Filchner, Das Rätsel des Matschû, pp. 260–1, and route-map.
a junction with the high barren Altyn-tägh, the southern barrier of Chinese Turkestan and the Lob-nor region.

Concerning the Altyn-tägh, which bounds the Tsaidam on the north and north-west, we need note only that in the angle where it adjoins the Nan-shan is the most northerly part of the Tsaidam, the Sirtin district, whence an ancient route from the Tsaidam and Koko-nor areas crosses the mountains, descending by the valley of the Tang-ho to Nan-hu and Sha-chou (Tun-huang), in Chinese western Kan-su.

As a glance at the map will show, the great Nan-shan, extending with various subordinate partitions in a more or less south-easterly direction to Lan-chou on the Rma-chu (now Hoang-ho), has rivers flowing in long troughs in opposite directions, and at their highest points overlapping. The Su-lo-ho, flowing north-west, reaches western Kan-su, and, becoming the Bulungir, ends in the desert. The Pei-ta-ho and the Kan-chou river, taking at first opposite directions, descend eastwards to Su-chou and Kan-chou respectively, and after their union end, as the Etsin-gol, in the Gobi desert. Farther south the Charin-gol (P'ing-fan river) has a rather long valley, which reaches the Rma-chu not far west of Lan-chou. But historically the most important of the rivers is on the Tibetan side of the Nan-shan; this is the Ta-t'ung-ho, which in its highest reaches almost touches the sources of the Su-lo-ho, and which in a very long trough, dividing the Nan-shan from the North Koko-nor range of mountains, joins the Hoang-ho one or two days' journey west of Lan-chou; at no great distance from its mouth it has received, on its right bank, the Hsi-ning-ho, which has passed by the ancient town of Hsi-ning, to the east of the Koko-nor.

The Koko-nor itself, at an elevation of about 10,500 feet, has on its east the valley of the Hsi-ning river and other valleys with a north-west to south-east direction; it is embraced by the North and South Koko-nor ranges, which, however, leave on the shores of the lake, especially to its west, some rather extensive pasturage, famous in both ancient and modern times;¹ the combined prolongation of the two ranges constitutes the north-eastern boundary of the Tsaidam, and extends, more or less, to the above-mentioned Sirtin district.

¹ On this pasturage see Huc and Gabet, ii, p. 99; Prejevalsky, ii, pp. 144, 227; Tafel, ii, p. 81. A fuller description of the southern shore is to be seen in Futterer, op. cit. i, pp. 279 sqq.
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TOPOGRAPHY

For the purposes of this study (ethnographic, linguistic, and historical) not much needs to be premised in the way of topography; indeed most of the modern names on the maps are, as regards ancient times, uninformative or misleading. Mention has been made of Lha-sa, important as the capital of the great Tibetan Btsan-pos, no less than of their priestly successors; places on the grand route to Pe-king, namely the ancient Chamdo (Chab-mdo), on the upper Me-kong, then Ba-t'ang, near which the Hbri-chu is crossed, Li-t'ang, Ta-chien-lu, where is the Sino-Tibetan frontier, to which we may add Ya-chou, somewhat farther to the east, Kanzé¹ on the Ya-lung river, or Nhag-chu, perhaps the old capital of the 'Women's Kingdom'; Jyekundo not far from the beginning of the Hbri-chu gorge, a place not known to be ancient, but important as a junction of routes; farther west the Tang-la pass, leading to the crossing of the Hbri-chu and the great routes to the north. On the upper T'ao river are two places, Shin-se and T'ao-chou, which figure in the Sino-Tibetan wars;² and on the lower south-north course of the same river are some places, Min-chou³ and Ti-tao-chou⁴ and others, attested in far earlier times;⁵ on the Ta-hsia river, which reaches the Hoang-ho some distance west of the T'ao, is Ho-chou,⁶ originally Ga-cu,⁷ an early centre of Buddhism, now of Islam. East of the Koko-nor lake is Hsi-ning,⁸ in Tibetan Zi-li'n, a very ancient tribal centre and now the head-quarters of the Chinese local administration, subordinate to the Governor of the province of Hsin-chiang, the 'New Dominion', which includes the Koko-nor region, Kan-su, and Turkestan. Two short marches west of Hsi-ning is the Sino-Tibetan frontier town, Tankar,⁹ Tonkhor, Donkyr, Dungkor,

¹ According to Rockhill, p. 242, = Tibetan Dkan-mdzes.
² In the manuscript Chronicle, Zin-cu and Tebu-cu: for views of the modern places so named see Futterer, i, pp. 404-14 (Shin-se), 433 (T'ao-chou); Tafel, ii, Plates LXVII, LXIX (T'ao-chou).
³ Views in Futterer, i, Plate XXXIV, and p. 442.
⁴ Description in Tafel, i, p. 159.⁵ See infra, p. 41, and reff.
⁵ Part view in Tafel, i, Plate XXXVI.
⁶ JRAS. 1927, p. 552 (for Ga-lu read Ga- cu), Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 87.
⁷ Various forms of the name in Ritter, Geographie, iv, p. 217; Richthofen, i, p. 260; Rockhill, p. 109. Views in Futterer, i, pp. 259-69, ii, p. 61; Tafel, i, Plate XXXVIII.
Tang-keou-eul; and at about 20 miles south-west of Hsi-ning (Rockhill, p. 41) is Kum-bum, originally Hgo-boms, where is the famous group of Buddhist monasteries. Also near to Kum-bum was Tsoṅ-ka, Great and Little, known many centuries before it became, in A.D. 1355–7, the birthplace of the famous Buddhist reformer, Tsoṅ-kha-pa. When the history of the struggles between the Ch’iang, and later the Tibetans, and the Chinese becomes topographically clear, several other localities in this Koko-nor region will acquire definiteness. Specially to be noticed on the map is the subsidiary Great Wall, branching off south of Liang-chou in Kan-su, winding over the Nan-shan, crossing the Ta-t’ung-ho, and embracing Hsi-ning; after passing between Hsi-ning and Tankar it crosses the Hoang-ho and then curves round as far as the vicinity of Ho-chou.

In China proper two places, Sung-p’ān, originally Sung-ch’ou, on the Min river, and Mao-chou, in the north-west corner of Ssū-ch’uan, the old region of Shuh, have required mention. In Kan-su, east of Lan-chou and the line of the lower T’ao river, is the province of Lung-hsi, defined by the Lung mountains, which west of P’ing-liang stretch directly northwards towards Ning-hsia on the Hoang-ho; the Lung-hsi province, where are the head-waters of the Wei river, was the scene of most of the struggles between the Ch’iang and the Chinese during the centuries immediately preceding and following the beginning of the Christian era. From Lan-chou northwards, at the foot of the Nan-shan and passing successively through the ancient garrison towns of Liang-chou (Lem-cu, Wu-wei), Kan-chou (Chang-yih), Su-chou (Chiu-ch’uan),

1 See Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 87.
2 Views in Rockhill, p. 57, Diary, p. 26; Tafel, i, Plates XLVI-XLIX; Filchner, Kum-bum (1933), passim; Tsibikov, Buddhist Palomnik u sviatun Tibeta, pp. 23, 30, 36.
3 JRAS. 1927, p. 552: mentioned also in the Tibetan manuscript Chronicle and in the 8th century inscriptions of Lha-sa.
4 Highlands of Tibet and Surrounding Regions, Dehra Dun (1937?).
5 Here noted by Huc and Gabet, i, p. 293; Rockhill, Diary, p. 94; in the Ta-t’ung-ho valley by Prejevalsky, ii, p. 73; in the Hsi-ning valley by Rockhill, p. 97. The inner line which passes by P’ing-fan and crosses the Hoang-ho near Hsin-ch’êng (about 30 miles west of Lan-chou) has been noted by Rockhill, p. 42, Diary, p. 60; and a portion may be seen in a photograph by Futterer, ii, p. 39. In A.D. 822 the Chinese envoy Yuan-ting saw to the north-west of the Lung-ch’uan valley, where the Huang river joins the Hoang-ho, ‘the ancient fortifications of Koshu Han, of which there was still much remaining’ (Bushell, JRAS. 1880, p. 519).
6 Bushell, JRAS. 1880, p. 534 (63): view in d’Ollone, p. 212; Tafel, ii, Plate LXI.
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and Tun-huang–Sha-chou, ran the Great Wall, defending against the desert tribes the highway to the Lob-nor region and Central Asia.

The really important topographical features of eastern and north-eastern Tibet are what on the map are designated 'main caravan routes'; some of them are probably ancient, and with the aid of the reports of modern explorers and geographers they may be understood.

POLITICAL AND ETHNOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS OF TIBET

In this study we are primarily interested only in the north-eastern and eastern regions of Great Tibet. But, as the facts are not usually recognized, it is necessary to premise some general observations concerning the country as a whole.

That the northern boundary of Tibet proper is the Tang-la is recognized by all travellers from the north;¹ and the fact assumes for them a great practical importance, since it is only after passing the Tang-la that they meet with that determined official opposition which diverts them, either eastwards or westwards, from any further approach to Lha-sa. But we have more intimate evidence in the form of a diary² of a journey by the Pan-chen Blo-bzān Dpal-lidan Ye-šes, of Tashilhunpo,³ who in A.D. 1779 travelled from Lha-sa to Pe-king via the Koko-nor region, Kan-su, and Inner Mongolia. As far as Nag-chu-kha,⁴ the first settlement south of the Tang-la, he is in Tibet proper, Bodː from that point until he reaches the borders of the Koko-nor region he is in Khams; then comes Upper Mongolia, Stod-Sog, so designated by reason of the Mongol tribes, 'Banners',⁵ occupying parts of the country east, west, and south-west of the Koko-nor, also the Tsaidam; when he comes to Tankar and Kum-bum he is in Amdo; and at Hsi-ning, the head-quarters of the Chinese administration of north-eastern Tibet, he is in China, Rgya.

A glance at the map will show that far the greater area of 'Tibet' is north of the Tang-la. Lha-sa, the capital of Tibet

¹ See supra, p. 8. ² JASB. li (1882), pp. 43–52. ³ Tib. Bkra-sis-lhun-po, 'Blessedness (or Auspiciousness) in mass'. ⁴ Huc and Gabet's 'Na-Ptchu', 'the first Thibetian station' (ii, p. 131). Cf. Rockhill, Diary, pp. 233 sqq.; Filchner, Om Mani Padme Hum, pp. 198 sqq. ⁵ Concerning these see the accounts cited infra, p. 23 and n. 1.
proper, is still more decidedly southern, since the distance separating it from the Tang-la is about twice as great as its distance from the Himalaya passes. Before the foundation of Lha-sa, in the first half of the seventh century A.D., the capital was by many days’ journey still farther south, being at Yar-lun, a place almost on the border of Bhutan. In order to estimate the extent of the kingdom inherited by Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po, the first really historical Btsan-po, note may be taken of the following facts: The Kailāsa region, the above-mentioned Stod-phyogs, was not included, because it was the territory of another kingdom, Žan-žuṅ, which was acquired in the time of Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po himself,¹ and had an entirely non-Tibetan, though Tibeto-Burman, speech.² As for the ‘Low Country’ of Ladak and Baltistan, its conquest and Tibetanization probably do not date before the end of the seventh century A.D., and its earlier history is problematical. The Brahmaputra valley, on the other hand, must be reckoned among the ancestral territories; for it was from Nepal, which is approached by that route, that the king obtained the first of his two famous consorts, and it was through Nepal that the combined Chinese and Tibetan armies invaded northern India after the death of the great emperor Harsa in A.D. 646–7.³

Presumably the region of mountains and lakes north of the Brahmaputra, the district of Dok (Hbrog)-tho1 and, farther north, the district which for some unknown reason is called the Hor (Turk) Province, were also part of Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po’s kingdom. The inhabitants are Tibetans, and their speech is rather normal Tibetan. But how far north into the actual Byan-than Tibetan authority and Tibetan race extended among the very sparse nomad population is a matter in regard to which we have no light. North of the Tang-la must certainly have been the people mentioned by the Chinese T’ang Annals under the name Yang-t’ung,⁴

¹ The Tibetan manuscript Chronicle attributes the event to a year corresponding to circa A.D. 644. For a reference to the same occurrence see Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 54. The dynastic name of the Žan-žuṅ kings was Lig.
² See JRAS. 1933, pp. 405–10.
³ Of this event an account, translated from Chinese, was given by Pauthier in the Asiatic Journal for 1836 (July and August), reproduced by Prinsep in JASB. vi (1837), pp. 69 sqq., and subsequently in the Indian Antiquary, ix, p. 20: with much additional information the matter was treated by Lévi in the Journal Asiatique, ix. xv (1900), pp. 279 sqq.
⁴ See Bushell, p. 527 (9).
which seems to be only a representation of Byan-than. According to the Chinese\(^1\) this people occupied the plateau south of Khotan, being divided into Lesser and Greater. The latter are said to have had a country extending over 1,000 li\(^2\) from east to west, with the Tibetans on their east. They first communicated with the Chinese in A.D. 641, and in the *Annals* some account of their climate, their numbers (from 80,000 to 90,000 fighting men), and manners is given. What proves that they extended as far east as the Tang-la is that it was with their aid that Sroñ-ptsan Sgam-po made his first expedition to the north to attack the T'u-yü-hun of the Koko-nor region; but they cannot have reached much farther east, since we have, as will appear *infra*, to find room for the Pai-lan. It is extremely unlikely that the Yang-t'ung were in a strict sense Tibetans; but possibly they were Ch'iang. The name Byan-than, even if used by the people themselves, is quite indecisive, since both its elements, byan, 'north', and than, 'plain', were current among the Ch'iang peoples.

The eastern boundary of Tibet proper is, likewise, somewhat indefinite. South of the Brahmaputra perhaps the most easterly district which is definitely Tibetan is Dwags-po, where the language, the 'Tákpa' of Hodgson,\(^3\) is a clearly Tibetan dialect. Farther east and south-east the Tibetans recognize, in the south-eastern corner of their country, only semi-human cannibal beings, Blo-bkra\(^4\) and others, to whom they were wont to send criminals to be eaten.

As far south as Ba-t'ang, on the 30th parallel of latitude, it seems probable that the valley of the Hbri-chu was the frontier of Sroñ-ptsan Sgam-po's original kingdom. For, although the upper part of the next great river to the east, the Na(g)-chu or Ya-lung, is lined with states, Derge, Zog-chen, Hor-khog, &c.,\(^5\) having at

---

1. Bushell, p. 527 (9) and p. 520 (73).
2. The li varies between \(\frac{1}{3}\) and \(\frac{1}{6}\) of a mile, depending partly upon the time required by the route.
4. The Lo-tawa ("karpo and 'nakpo) of maps. 
5. In the *Geografia Tibet*, p. 47, the names of the states are given as Sde-dge, Rdzogs-chen, and Hor-khog, the last-named consisting of the five states Khan-gsar, Ma-zi, Brag-mgo, Be-ri, Tre-o. The places were visited by Rockhill (pp. 227-66) and Mrs. Rijnhart, *With the Tibetans in Tent and Field*, pp. 371 sqq., and later by Dr. Tafel (ii, pp. 168-96). Rockhill gives the names as Derge, Zochen, Horch Yok; the 'five Horba clans', Horsé-k'a-nga (pp. 44 n., 242), being given as Kangsar, Mazur, Bérim, Chuwo, and
present Tibetan population and speech, there is reason for believing that in the seventh century A.D. that was not the case. In regard to the lower valley of the same river, the Na(g)-ron or Chan-tui, Rockhill remarks (The Land of the Lamas, p. 345) that:

'The tribes inhabiting along the lower course of the Nya-ch'u are called Män-nya-k'a or "inhabitants of the lower Nya-ch'u" and are the Meniak of Hodgson, the Menia of Baber.'

We must take some exception to the philology of Rockhill's statement; for a Mi-ñag man is mentioned in Tibetan company in an eighth-century document from Chinese Turkestan, and the name is otherwise also known in the old literature (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 263, n. 1) and also in old Bon-po manuscripts. Thus the real name of the river is Ñag, and the modern Na is only an example of the dropping of final consonants, which is characteristic of all the Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Chinese frontier.

The Mi-ñag language, as represented by Hodgson's lists, has many Tibetan affinities and apparently not a few borrowings; but it has also definite features which associate it with another group. For applying to the people the term Ch'iang we have no authority, and, considering their rather southern habitat, it might seem venturesome to do so; they had, however, neighbours who certainly belonged to that ethnic group.

This is the place for reference to the tribes occupying the vicinity of a river still farther to the east, the Chin-ch'uan, the 'Gold River', which, flowing from north to south, becomes the Yü-t'ung and crosses the 30th parallel somewhat to the east of Chango. Concerning the name-forms see infra, pp. 81–5. The chief town of Khañ-gsar is Kanzé (Dkhañ-mdzes, Rockhill, p. 242 n. 1). For an older notice see Baber (p. 95).

The word Hor has nothing to do with Hor, 'Turk', and according to Baber (p. 95 n.) it is differently pronounced. Very possibly the original single kingdom (Rockhill, p. 253 n.) is the Hor-man of an old Tibetan manuscript. Concerning the pleasing physiognomy of the people and the state of education among them see Rockhill, pp. 243, 245–6, and cf. Hodgson, pp. 138–9.

1 Royal Geographical Society Supplementary Papers, i, p. 95. Baber here points out that the Menia country extends some distance east of the Yalong river.

2 Cf. the 'Ldon Me-ñag' of Francke's Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, pp. 65–6.

3 This is, in fact, the spelling of the Geografia Tibeta, pp. 45–6, and it is still heard, being used by Amundsen in his travel narrative (Geographical Journal, 1900, i. p. 621).

4 JASB. xxii (1853), pp. 143 sqq.
Ta-chien-lu; afterwards, as the T'ung-ho, it falls into the Min near Kia-ting. The country has a Tibetan name, Rgyal-mo-ron, 'Queen's (King's?) gorge', and it is the 'Gyárung' of Hodgson's vocabulary and the country of von Rosthorn's vocabularies (ZDMG. li (1897), pp. 524-33, with a sketch-map). Rockhill gives (op. cit., pp. 346-53) a Chinese administration list of the 'Thirty-three Yü-t'ung Hsi-fan tribes'. But more apposite are his lists of the 'Eighteen Kingdoms of Eastern Tibet', for which he had the authority of an official and of a Lama in Ta-chien-lu. In 1886 Baber had given (R. Geographical Society, Supplementary Papers, i, pp. 81-2) a list of the 'twelve Sifan tribes', which his sketch-map, even apart from the names, shows to be those of the Rgyal-ron. Parts of the country were traversed during the period 1903-7 by Mr. W. N. Fergusson, and again, in company with Lieutenant Brooke and Mr. Meares, in 1908 (see Fergusson, Adventure, &c.); but the fullest account of the country is given by Dr. Tafel in his Meine Tibetreise, vol. ii, pp. 212 sqq.

Concerning the names of these states we may refer to the discussion infra, pp. 81-5. It is remarked by Rockhill (p. 344) that one of the states, So-mo, is situated near Sung-p'án t'ing and is at present (1891) ruled by a woman; the So-mo district was visited by Lieutenant Brooke and his party (Fergusson, pp. 144 sqq., 173), and Dr. Tafel also had in 1914 an interview with the So-mo ruling lady. This peculiarity, which had previously been noted by Gill (The River of Golden Sand, p. 123) and which, we are told in the Later Han Annals,2 was not alien to Ch'i-ang ideas, has a

1 The spelling Rgyal-mo-ron is given by the Geografia Tibeta (pp. 41, 46) and it is, perhaps, correct, since the l would have been lost both in the Lha-sa pronunciation and in the local speech; but the suffix mo does not necessarily in such a compound denote femininity.

Dr. Tafel's rDyarong (ii, p. 229) follows a pronunciation, but the rendering (p. 223) 'extensive or Chinese valley' would not be inevitable.

The Gyärung of the Linguistic Survey volume (i. ii) and Dr. Laufer's Jyarun, Dr. Wolfenden Jyai-run, ignore the fact that the term is Tibetan.

It is, however, possible that the Rgyal(-ron) of the Geografia Tibeta is itself an etymologizing perversion of a non-Tibetan tribal name Byar, now pronounced Jyar: this is suggested by the numerous place-names, Gyarlung, Giyartang, Giyardo, Giyarsa, Gyarmu, recorded in the Manchu report translated by Dr. Haenisch in Sir Swen Hedin's Southern Tibet, ix, pp. 67 sqq. In that case it may go back to the old tribal name Byar, concerning which see infra, p. 34. At present it seems reasonable to keep the spelling of the Geografía.

considerable interest, because undoubtedly So-mo and, perhaps, all the states of the Rgyal-ron, were in earlier times part of the ‘Women’s Kingdom’, famous in the Sui and T’ang Annals and in Chinese popular knowledge as Nü-kuo.¹ For a summary of the Chinese information, including an account of the dimensions and situation of the territory, of the political history of the state and the manners of the people, a reference may be made to Dr. Bushell’s note in JRAS. 1880 (pp. 531–2) and to Rockhill, op. cit., pp. 339–41. The people were known to the Tibetans, who, however, are not informative, as Sum-pa,² and individual Sum-pas are mentioned; elsewhere we have given text and translation of a collection of sayings, ‘Sum-pa Mother’s sayings’, in Tibetan from an eighth-to-ninth-century manuscript.

The ‘Women’s Kingdom’ was of considerable extent. There were over 40,000 families, 10,000 warriors. The eastern frontier stretched in an approximately north–south direction from Mao-chou (in the Sung-p’an region) to Ya-chou, somewhat east of Ta-chien-lu.³ From east to west was 9 days’ journey, from north to south 20 days. The state included over 80 ‘cities’, large and small. The people were scattered in mountain valleys.

Upon this information we may incline to the belief that the kingdom extended westward as far as the upper Na(g)-chu, and that its capital, in ‘the Kang-yen valley, a narrow, precipitous gorge, around which flows the Jô river in a southerly direction’, was in fact Kanzé on the Na(g)-chu, which Rockhill visited (op. cit., pp. 239 sqq.)⁶ This kingdom must have been the northern neighbour of the Mi-nag.

It seems possible that this original westward extension of the ‘Women’s Kingdom’ may explain a peculiarity of Rockhill’s two lists in comparison with the other versions. Rockhill speaks of the ‘Eighteen tribes of the Nya-rong’; and in fact a number of the names in his versions are names of Hor-pa principalities of the

¹ This fact was ‘suspected’ by Mr. Edgar, The Marches of the Mantze, p. 64.
² Probably as Ldon–Sum-pa (in a Bon-po manuscript work), = the Gton-gsum-pa of Francke, Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, pp. 65–6. According to the Chinese Su-pi (= Sum-pa) was the queen’s family name.
³ It is interesting to read (Edgar, op. cit., p. 61) that ‘politically and ecclesiastically’ the boundary between Chinese dominion and semi-independent Tibet is here practically, though not theoretically, still along the same line.
⁴ Bushell, Je.
⁵ See also Tafel, ii, pp. 177 sqq., and view in Plate XXXVIII.
upper Ya-lung river, or Ňa(g)-chu. But most of the names in his lists belong, as do those of the other lists, to the districts of the Chin-ch’uan river, i.e. the Rgyal-ron; and Rockhill himself recognizes this, locating some of them on the Chin-ch’uan river and noting that So-mo is near to Sung-p’an. It seems possible that some reminiscence of the original ethnical situation may have been in the minds of Rockhill’s informants.

The people of the ‘Women’s Kingdom’ are definitely recognized by the Chinese Annals as Ch’iang;¹ and from the Tibetan side this is confirmed by the Geografia Tibetæ, which, after giving (p. 46) the names of the ‘Eighteen States’, remarks that ‘all these peoples, such as Mi-ňag, Rgyal-mo-ron (these also in Padma-thaň-yig, tr. Toussaint, pp. 298 sqq.) peoples and Mi-li, are not proper Tibetans’.²

Nevertheless they can hardly be regarded as typical Ch’iang; occupying permanent settlements in roň districts, partly well wooded and thickly populated,³ they represent a stage more developed than that of the true nomad Ch’iang of the high thaňs. And this was the case in early times, as we see from the Chinese descriptions, with the mention of the ‘80 cities’, and as appears from the tone of the ‘Sum-pa Mother’s sayings’.

The Rgyal-ron language is represented by the Gyärûng vocabulary of Hodgson and by those of von Rosthorn, who distinguishes several dialects,⁴ and Wolfenden. Dr. Tafel, who also notes various dialects of ‘Kin-tschuan’ speech, including one, that of ‘Krets-chiu’, which is markedly distinct (ii, pp. 248 n. 1, 263), informs us that, whereas the native language is never written (ii, p. 230),⁵ Tibetan proper is not ordinarily understood in the country, except by persons who have been in connexion with the local monasteries, Buddhist or Bon-po. He gives (pp. 230–40) some interesting items of the vocabulary and also communicates (pp. 232–3) six lines of a song, which he says is ‘half in Tibetan, half in Kin-tschuan language’. To this matter it will be necessary to recur, since the mixture is a topic of great importance in regard to the ‘Hsi-fan’ languages generally, and the actual proportion of half-to-half requires revision in the light of the translation which Dr. Tafel

¹ Bushell, pp. 473, 532; Rockhill, p. 340.
² The people of Dmar-khams (SW. of Ba-t’ang) also are described (p. 44) as ‘savage and coarse and in language resembling the Mi-ňag’.
⁴ See infra, pp. 71, 89.
⁵ Cf. Fergusson, op. cit., pp. 126, 255.
THE NAM LANGUAGE

The Rgyal-ron language has, as was remarked by Hodgson in 1853, and by von Rosthorn's editor, Professor Conrady, in 1897, a special feature, namely possession of syllabic, classificatory, prefixes, which is less prominent in other 'Hsi-fan' languages.¹

In the northern part of the Rgyal-ron Dr. Tafel takes note (ii, pp. 254, 256, 282) of the Chinese Musalman tea-traders,² who from that quarter penetrate far into the 'Go-lok' country; and he was aware of nomads, obviously Go-lok, bringing skins, wool, and other wares in the reverse direction. Since the upper valleys on the south of the Bayankara range and to the north of the states on the upper Ya-lung river and to the north and north-west of the Rgyal-ron are considered to be Go-lok country,³ those individuals may have come from that quarter. But the main habitat of these marauding tribes is north of the Bayankara, in the long valley of the upper Rma-chu, from the two lakes, Charing-nor and Oring-nor,⁴ as far as its knee and still farther east; also the country east of the gorge of the Rma-chu, as far as the south–north stretch of the T'ao river; and again a mountainous area north of the actual Koko-nor and another area to its south.⁵

The meaning of the term Go-lok⁶ is not definitely known; by Futterer, Filchner, and Tafel it is spelled Ngolok;⁷ if it was so heard by them, it may be, in fact, the Tibetan expression no-log, 'recalcitrant', 'rebel'.⁸ It is likely that this term is not a racial or national one, but is applied to the tribes simply with reference to their marauding and thievish practices, which have made them the terror of all travellers, both foreign and native, in north-eastern Tibet. Though nominally Buddhist and having Buddhist monasteries, including the great establishment of Bla-bran (Lhabrang),⁹ in their country, they wear their religion lightly, and pilgrim travellers, whether in small or in great companies, have reason to

¹ See infra, p. 96.  ² The Sharbas of Rockhill, pp. 54, 112. ³ Rockhill, pp. 188–9, 228, 232; Tafel, ii, pp. 170 and n. 3, 247, 253, 258, 291. ⁴ On these names see p. 4 n. 4. ⁵ See the map. ⁶ Huc and Gabet's Kolo (ii, p. 100). ⁷ The Geografia Tibetana seems to spell Mgo-log (p. 48). Elsewhere (p. 45) it uses the expression rkun-jag, 'thieves-robbers', the latter syllable being the 'Chakpa or Jagpa' of Hodgson, p. 123. ⁸ Tafel, ii, p. 291 n. 2. ⁹ Views in d'Ollone, pp. 282, 284, 286; Tafel, ii, Plates LXVI, LXXI; Tsibikov, p. 41; Kozlov-Filchner, Mongolei, Amdo und die tote Stadt Charachoto, pp. 197–213.
beware of them. The name accepted by them, in common with all Tibetans of the Koko-nor region is Panak'a, usually with the addition of sum, ‘three’, with reference to the triple division stated above.\(^1\) Rockhill (Diary, p. 112) interprets the name Pa-nag as meaning the ‘eight’ (pa = Chinese pa[r], ‘eight’) ‘Nag tribes’; but the explanation of Dr. Tafel,\(^2\) who restricts the term Go-lok to the tribes of the upper Rma-chu, is far preferable; he states (i, p. 177 n.) that all Koko-nor (nomad) Tibetans are called Banag, probably by reason of their ‘black tents’; and in fact the black tents (sbra-nag) of the Tibetans were proverbial even in the eighth century A.D. (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 273.) The Koko-nor Panag are described as ‘Tangutans’ in Prejevalsky’s Mongolia (trans., vol. ii, pp. 109–22) and also by Dr. Filchner in his Kumbum (1933, pp. 383, 390, 476 sqq.); for those east of the Rma-chu gorge we have good lights in Durch Asien, by Dr. Futterer, who traversed the country from Kuei-té to, and along, the T'ao river, and also the more lively narrative of the Vicomte d'Ollone (trans., In Forbidden China, pp. 240 sqq.); and an intimate picture of the Panag or Go-lok of the upper Rma-chu is to be seen in Dr. Filchner’s book of travel and adventure, Das Rätsel des Matschii (pp. 105 sqq.).

Geographically, as is apparent from the above sketch, there is no breach in their continuity, since, as we have seen, there is between the two southern divisions of them easy communication by way of the Rma-chu knee, and since south of the Koko-nor the Rma-chu is not in modern times, and was not in ancient times, a barrier.

It is not worth while to cite the names of particular settlements and tribes recorded by modern travellers or entered on the maps.\(^3\) The localities are not likely to be ancient; and the tribal divisions may have been continuously fluid, as they are stated to have been in early centuries. Possibly the Me-tsang tribe, placed on the map some distance to the south of the Rma-chu knee, and since south of the Koko-nor the Rma-chu is not in modern times, and was not in ancient times, a barrier.

1 Rockhill, p. 73, Diary, pp. 112–13, with a list of tribes, pp. 113–14.
2 i, pp. 177–8 n., and ii, pp. 291–2 with a list of the tribes on the upper Rma-chu.
3 See Filchner, Das Rätsel des Matschii and sketch-map; Tafel, ii, pp. 291–2; also the narratives of Futterer and d’Ollone.
These Panak’a Go-lok tribes seem to be the genuine descendants of the Ch’iang. In sociology, manners, and dress they appear to differ little from their predecessors, whom the Chinese Sui and T’ang Annals\(^1\) describe as in morals and customs the worst of savages; they were all fighting men and much given to robbing and plundering. They did not (in most places) till the soil. They got barley from neighbouring countries; from it they made a fermented drink. At present they include in their diet the tsamba (\textit{rtsam-pa}, parched barley meal) of the Tibetans; and tea, brought by the Chinese Sharba Musalmans from Sung-p’an and Ta-chien-lu, is to them as indispensable as it is to all Tibetans. In their armature they have progressed to guns and rifles;\(^2\) but the long spears depicted in the illustrations of all modern books of travel\(^3\) are perhaps similar to those mentioned in the Later Han Annals (infra, p. 39). The statement that against cold and privations they were hardened like beasts is well illustrated by the Vicomte d’Ollone’s lively narrative concerning his Go-lok escort (p. 261):

‘At early dawn there was a sudden lull in the storm. . . . We looked round for our Tibetans, meaning to order them to load the pack train, but there were no Tibetans to be seen. Had they deserted? But no, their yaks were there, and even their enormous lances, thrust vertically into the soil. Where were they?

‘At the foot of the lances we saw the snow moving, and on looking closely we noticed swellings in the dense white carpet. These swellings represented the Tibetans, who were sleeping the sleep of the just. They had no need of tents; unloosing their girdles, which had kilted their sheepskins up to their knees, they allowed the former to fall over their feet, turned their collars up over their ears, turned down the woolly borders of their caps, and with their naked bodies thus protected they reclined peacefully in the snow, leaving it to cover them with a warm counterpane. Rather too warm, if anything! When at our summons they awoke, their first care was to throw back their cloaks and bathe their bodies in the freezing wind.’

Naturally the conditions would be modified in the districts bordering on China and along the Rma-chu and other rivers where there were fixed settlements and some cultivation of ‘the five cereals’.

---

\(^1\) Rockhill, pp. 337–8.
\(^2\) Dr. Filchner mentions (\textit{Om Mani Padme Hum}, p. 145) their ‘modern weapons’.
The Panak'a occupy, as has been stated, extensive areas of Hbrog country, both on the north and on the south-west of the Koko-nor. Their western neighbours are the Mongols, whose settlements and encampments are found both on the north of the actual Tsaidam swamp, as far as the Sirtin district in the extreme north, and also to the south of it along the route to Charklik in Chinese Turkestan. Also on routes diverging westwards from Bokalik, where are ancient gold workings, and the Hajjar district, to the Tokuz-dawān and Cer-cen in Chinese Turkestan, the very sparse population is Mongol; moreover, immediately to the west, and also to the east, of the Koko-nor itself are Mongol settlements, and even as far down the Hoang-ho valley as the mouth of the Ta-t'ung-ho river there is an old Mongol population.¹

Ordinary Tibetan speech and mixed race are represented by the monasteries, on the one hand, and by towns, such as Tankar, and permanent villages to the south and south-west of the Koko-nor,² on the other; also, of course, by travelling and trading Tibetans, especially from Khams.³ Hsi-ning, which has a Chinese administration and partly Chinese or semi-Chinese population, and also Lusar and Kum-bum, through the attraction of the famous monastery, are very cosmopolitan.⁴ Hsi-ning, with its telegraph and its British missionary station, is not infrequently visited by European, including Russian, travellers and trade agents, also individual traders from Chinese Turkestan and even India; and there are, further, the official and trade connexions with Lan-chou, the provincial capital, and so with China in general. Then there are the compulsory ceremonial visits of Mongol and other chiefs from the Tsaidam and elsewhere, and visits in connexion with particular questions and disputes.⁵ The Chinese Amban’s travelling agents⁶ are also arriving from distant places with their reports. From the surrounding areas there are Mongol and Tibetan traders, bringing

¹ On these Mongols and their tribes (‘Banners’) and history see Huc and Gabet, ii, pp. 99-102; Prejevalsky, ii, pp. 148-52, 168-9; Rockhill, pp. 135-67, 171-2, 176, 180; Diary, pp. 156-60; Tafel, i, pp. 187-93, ii, pp. 68-70.
² Rockhill was convinced (p. 72) of the mixed descent of these T’u-fan, whose speech also contained ‘a large proportion of Chinese, Turkish, and Mongol words and expressions’.
³ Rockhill, pp. 111, 129. On the Khams in general see Sandberg, op. cit., pp. 154-8; Tafel, ii, pp. 143, sqq., and supra, p. 8 and n. 2.
⁴ See, for instance, Rockhill, pp. 40, 110-12, and Tafel, ii, p. 83.
⁵ See Rockhill, p. 54; Tafel, ii, p. 69.
⁶ On these t'ung-shih see Rockhill, pp. 52-3.
salt, skins, musk, Lha-sa incense-sticks, &c., while tea and some other Chinese articles come to Tankar and Hsi-ning through the Go-lok country, brought by Sharba Musalmans from Sung-p'an in Su-ch'uan.

The Turki-speaking Musalman Salars,¹ numerous in Hsi-ning, but congregated chiefly in the district of Ho-chou and farther west, at Hsun-hwa, on the Rma-chu, are said to have come from Turfan or Hami in Chinese Turkestan, during the fifteenth to sixteenth century, while a greater historical interest belongs to a tribe Tung-hou, reported in an eighteenth-century Chinese work and claiming descent from the Sha-t'o Turk tribe, which was transported by the Tibetans to Kan-chou after the conquest of Pei-t'ing in A.D. 790.²

Concerning the Chinese side of the Nan-shan and the line of the lower T'ao river it does not seem possible to venture upon any positive statement. In regard to the people of Kan-su Fathers Huc and Gabet, whose route was from Ning-hsia in a south-west direction to P'ing-fan, remark (English translation, i, p. 281) that:

'a very slight observation of the inhabitants of Kan-su will satisfy one that they are not of purely Chinese origin. The Tartaro-Thibetian element is manifestly predominant amongst them, and it displays itself with special emphasis in the character, manners and language of the country people.'

and they proceed to give particulars. These observations of the two Fathers, whose natural acuteness was reinforced by familiarity with Chinese and Mongol language and life, would be confirmed by the Chinese themselves, aware that, despite ages of Sinification, the population of Kan-su retains peculiarities of speech and habits. But the history of the province has been so complicated by invasions, immigrations, deportations, dynasties, and foreign dominations that the available information is a chaos. The actual topographical nomenclature, which might have been a help, is hidden beneath a network of Chinese official designations. In regard to the pre-Chinese period (down to 121 B.C.) one or two facts do emerge, but ethnographically and linguistically they are not sufficiently definite.

It is, however, undeniable that down to modern times the

¹ On the Salars see Geografia Tibet, p. 51; Prejevalsky, ii, p. 149; Rockhill, pp. 39-40, 323, Diary, pp. 62, 66, 76-83; Grenard, ii, pp. 455, 457; Tafel, i, pp. 161-5.
² Rockhill, pp. 44-5, 325; Bushell, p. 533 (57).
INTRODUCTION: GENERAL

eastern flanks of the Nan-shan and the line of the T'ao river retained many tribes or fragments of Ch'iang peoples, either settled as agriculturists, in Chinese territory or otherwise, or reckoned as independent. In The Land of the Lamas (pp. 323–6) Rockhill gives from an eighteenth-century Chinese text1 a list of 'Foreign Tribes of Kan-su', which includes many names of Hsi-ch’iang and Hsi-fan groups, some belonging to the districts of Su-chou, Kan-chou, and Liang-chou, others to Ho-chou and the line of the lower T'ao river, as well as tribes of the Hsi-ning and Koko-nor region. But the groups are too small and numerous, and the data concerning their history too few and dubious, to allow of any wide inference as to a continuous Ch’iang occupation of the districts where they are found; one or two are stated to have immigrated from the Koko-nor region, and some of them, not said to be of Hsi-ch’iang descent, may be merely Tibetan. Also it is not stated to what extent they were in speech still non-Chinese.

HISTORICAL SITUATION IN NORTH-EASTERN TIBET DURING THE SEVENTH TO EIGHTH CENTURY A.D.

In order to arrive at the conditions existing in Amdo during the seventh and eighth centuries A.D. it is necessary to peel off, so to speak, a number of accretions belonging to later times. First the existing Chinese administrations from Hsi-ning, whose travelling agents (t’ung-shih) were met by Rockhill even as far as the upper reaches of the Hbri-chu,2 where they were almost in contact with the authority of the Governor-General of Ssū-ch’uan. This administration is attended by a vast amount of the precise gazetteer information favoured by the Chinese. Rockhill himself made use of a gazetteer work3 relating to the Koko-nor region; and in Dr. Filchner’s map of the Chinese province Kan-su4 we find the whole area, including much of the Panak’a country, studded with names, largely, so far as that country, at least, is concerned, otherwise unknown, and all systematically transcribed from a Chinese map giving the administrative divisions. This Chinese rule is an inheritance from the Mongol dynasty, the Mongols under Cingiz Khan having, by the overthrow (A.D. 1226) of the Tangut empire (NE. Tibet and most of the Chinese province of Kan-su), brought all north-eastern Tibet under Mongol suzerainty. To this

1 Huang-ch’ing-chih-kung-t’u, Book V.
2 Pp. 162, 165.
3 Diary, p. 96 (Hsi-ning Fu hsüên chih).
4 Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der Expedizion Filchner, iii, Berlin, 1910.
conquest and the subsequent long domination of the successors of Cingiz Khan and Kublai Khan, followed by the invasion of Gusri Khan in A.D. 1636, must be attributed the fact that the map of the whole area is full of Mongol names; all the nor's (Koko-nor, 'Blue Lake', Dabasun-nor, 'Salt Lake', Tosun-nor, 'Butter Lake', Charing-nor, Oring-nor, &c.), all the ula's ('mountains'), most of the gols ('rivers, river-valleys'), some particular names, such as Bayankara, Murus-ussu (the Ḥbri-chu), the Barōn and Jūn, 'Right and Left', districts in the Tsaidam, Odontala ('Star-plain', =Tibetan Skar-ma-than) by the uppermost Rma-chu, &c., are due either to this domination or to the long ecclesiastical connexion between Mongolia, Kum-bum, and Lha-sa. The Pan-chen Dpal-ldan Ye-ses, as we have seen (p. 13), regards the whole of Amdo west of the Koko-nor as Stod-Sog, 'Upper Mongolia'. All such names and also the Mongol 'Banners' and settlements in the Tsaidam and the Koko-nor districts, and among the Panak'as and elsewhere farther south, have to be erased from the picture.

The pre-Mongol Tangut kingdom, of which the Chinese Annals give a very substantial account,\(^1\) was under a Ch'iang (Tang-hsiang) dynasty, and its language, the Hsi-hsia, was presumably a Ch'iang dialect; from A.D. 1035 to 1226 it cut off the Tibetans from all interference in Amdo and Kan-su. The Tibetan domination in Amdo may be said to have begun about A.D. 635, when the Btsan-po, Sron-btsan Sgam-po, having in his application for a Chinese princess as a consort received a rebuff, which he attributed to the T'u-yü-hun dynasty of the Koko-nor,

'thereupon, together with the Yangtung, led the united armies to attack the T'ukuhun. The T'ukuhun were unable to withstand him, and fled to the banks of the Ch'inghai [Koko-nor] to escape the edge of the sword. . . . He next led on his troops, attacked and defeated the Tanghsiang, the Pailan, and other Ch'iang tribes, and at the head of an army of over 200,000 men, encamped on the western border of Sungchou (Sung-p'an), whence he sent envoys to the emperor.'\(^2\)

After a temporary success at Sung-chou he sustained a defeat and retired.

This occurrence opened the long struggle between the Tibetans and the Chinese Empire, which empire was by all the peoples mentioned, as well as by the Tanguts in later times, acknowledged

---

1 See Bichurin, *Istoria Tibeta i Khukhunora*, ii, pp. 1-164.
2 Bushell, p. 444.
as suzerain. In Amdo during the remainder of the seventh century and the first part of the eighth the conflicts took place usually in the country between the Koko-nor and the Rma-chu;¹ and the peace of A.D. 730² between Chinese, Tibetans, Hjañ (Tang-hsiang), and Drug (Turks of Central Asia), was commemorated on the part of the Tibetans by a great Buddhist foundation, established near the frontier then fixed in the Byarro-thaii district, west of the Koko-nor.³ We may, therefore, understand that the Chinese were still maintaining their ancient administrative area within the above- (p. 12) mentioned branch of the Great Wall. Later the Tibetans advanced farther and farther into China, until in A.D. 763 they actually entered the capital, Hsi-ngan-fu, or Ch’ang-an, in Shen-hsi, far down the Wei river; during this second period most of the operations took place in the Tang-hsiang country and along the line of the T’ao river, and the treaty of A.D. 783 fixed the boundary on the border of Shen-hsi, far within Chinese territory.

The subsequent history of the Tibetan dominion in Amdo and the east does not greatly, except in regard to language and the Buddhist religion, concern us here. To the matter of language we shall return.

As regards Buddhism, the foundation in the Byarro-thaii may have been its first introduction into Amdo, at least as far as Tibetan Buddhism is concerned, but it seems possible that in Ho-chou there may have been an earlier establishment from the Chinese side. During the period of Tibetan rule there must have been a continuous increase in the number of Buddhist monasteries, which now are everywhere to be found. The Tangut kingdom was, from the eleventh century onwards, professedly Buddhist, and in its language, the Hsi-hsia, are many volumes and fragments of texts, recovered by Russian and British excavations⁴ at Khara-khoto on the Etsingol river in the Gobi desert; also some inscriptions and coin legends, published at an earlier date. In the Tangut home country (Tang-hsiang) there is, in addition to the great establishment of Lhabrang (Bla-bran), a monastery in the territory of the Co-ne tribe, celebrated for its somewhat independent edition

¹ This appears both from the T’ang Annals, as rendered by Bushell, and from the Tibetan manuscript Chronicle.
² Bushell, p. 466.
³ Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 104–9.
⁴ See Kozlov-Filchner, Mongolei, Amdo und die tote Stadt Chara-choto (Berlin, 1925), and Sir A. Stein, Innermost Asia, i, pp. 429 sqq.
Nevertheless, along all the Sino-Tibetan frontier from the ‘Women’s Kingdom’ northwards the Bon-po religion maintains itself in despite of orthodox disapproval; and in pre-Tibetan times this, in some early forms, was the religion of all Ch’iang peoples.

The T’u-yü-hun kingdom, which preceded the Tibetans and of which also the Chinese Annals furnish an extensive dynastic account, was an extraneous element, perhaps only a ruling race, in Amdo. The people were of what the Chinese name ‘Sien-pi’ stock, originated in north-eastern Asia and in language more akin to the Mongols than to the Turks. From A.D. 313, when they first invaded the Koko-nor region, until their final defeat and expulsion by the Tibetans in 663 they dominated that area during 350 years, having as their capital a place called Fussū ch’êng, 15 li west of the Koko-nor, and as their southern boundary the Rma-chu; during the latter part of the period their rule extended, under Chinese suzerainty, which they frequently resisted, to parts of Chinese Turkestan (the Shan-shan kingdom from about A.D. 445) and Kan-su (Sha-chou, Liang-chou). For our purpose their significance lies in the fact that the separate existence of the Tang-hsiang kingdom, south of the Rma-chu, was perhaps a reaction from their occupation of the Hsi-ning-Koko-nor district, which had previously been the centre of influence for all the tribes.

The Tang-hsiang kingdom, which, as we have seen, had the Rma-chu and the T’u-yü-hun on its north, is stated in the Sui Annals to have bordered to the east on Lin- and T’ao-chou, which would mean the line of the lower T’ao river. The T’ang Annals, which mention that since the period A.D. 535–581 the Tang-hsiang people had greatly spread and now bordered to the east on Sung-chou (Sung-p’an) and to the south on the Ch’un-sang, Mi-sang, and other Ch’iang tribes, may indicate an extension in a south-easterly

1 Geografia Tibet, p. 50. On Co-ne see Tafel, ii, pp. 296, 305 (Dschoni): a view of the village (Pschoni, Cho-nieh, on the T’ao river) in Futterer, op. cit. i, pp. 435–6, with description.

2 For notices see Rockhill, pp. 217–18, 275, Diary (Index); Tafel, ii, pp. 82, 185, 199, 229, 236, 240, 246; d’Ollone, p. 212; Futterer, i, p. 279; Edgar, p. 63; Fergusson, pp. 104, 200, 242, 249–50.


4 Bushell, loc. cit.

5 Bichurin, op. cit., i, pp. 237–58. See also Bushell, p. 528 (12); Rockhill, pp. 337–8.
direction, and may explain the statement concerning the 'Women's Kingdom' that it had the Tang-hsiang and Mao-chou on the east, whereas in fact the Tang-hsiang were mainly on its north. The statement that 'they live in secluded, rugged valleys, many of them three thousand li from any other tribe' would be hardly explicable, did we not assume that by that time they had spread to the uppermost Rma-chu valley; for their original western frontier must have been the Rma-chu gorge, since we have to find room for the Pailan. But perhaps all is made clear by the statement of the Sui Annals, that 'they comprise the T'ang-chang, Pai-lang, etc.' They had, in fact, absorbed their western neighbours, the Pailan, and might to the west constitute a barrier against the 'Yeh-Hu', of whom, however, nothing is known. From A.D. 629 'they gradually became subject' (to China), and their tribes were divided into chou and hsien, ruled by their own chiefs and subject to a governor-general, resident at Sung-chou. It was, as we have seen, not long after this that 'they were annexed by the T'ufan', i.e. by Sron-btsan Sgam-po and his successors, and the country afterwards became one of the main theatres of the Sino-Tibetan wars. It is from about A.D. 757 that the T'ang Annals begin to trace the fortunes of the leading, perhaps most eastern, clan, the To-pa, which through the weakening of the Tibetans from about the middle of the ninth century became powerful and ultimately founded the Tangut empire.

Some particulars of the Chinese description of the Tang-hsiang people have been extracted above (p. 22) for application to their Go-lok descendants. But ethnographically it may be of interest to add one or two further items, which may be for the most part applicable to all the free Ch'iang peoples of the period.

'A tribe is divided into little clans. A large one comprises a myriad horsemen, a small one several thousand....' They have no houses, but with the hair of their yak and the wool of their sheep they weave stuff out of which they make tents, whose location they change accordingly to the season of the year.... Their hair is matted, their faces filthy, and their feet bare. They live on roots and game. Men

1 Bushell, p. 531 (42); Rockhill, p. 340.  
2 Rockhill, p. 338.  
3 In the Sui Annals these numbers are stated, more moderately, as 5,000 and 1,000 respectively.  
4 'The most common, indeed the only industry of the Tangutsans is preparing yak (or more rarely sheep's) wool for cloth, out of which all their clothes are made' (Projevalsky, ii, p. 118; cf. Rockhill, who adds, p. 81, yak-hair cloth for tents and tanning of skins).
and women wear long skin gowns, or of coarse woollen stuff with a nappy surface. They have no written characters, but record the years by means of little reeds. Once every three years they assemble together and worship heaven by sacrificing oxen and sheep. A son may marry his deceased father's or uncle's wives (or wife); a younger brother his deceased brother's wife, but he may not marry a person of the same cognomen as himself. When an old person dies, the children and grandchildren do not weep, but, if a young person dies, they say it is a great wrong and they lament over him.  

It must be admitted that some points in the description recur in the Chinese accounts (Bushell, pp. 442, 527–8; Rockhill, pp. 335–8) of the T’u-yü-hun and the Tibetans and even in the early accounts of ancient peoples, Hsiung-nu, Sien-pi, &c. (Parker in The China Review, xx, pp. 1–2, 73–4), so that they may have been commonplaces in the Annalists’ conceptions of frontier barbarians. Disregard for age is attributed in these works to all the above-named peoples. For a less external view, permitting an insight into the Bon-po religion of this people, and also a glimpse of a more primitive stratum of belief and practice, as well as of their more general mentality, we must turn to the sole literary product known to have emanated from them, a text contained in an eighth-to-ninth century manuscript, in Tibetan language. Naturally it represents the comparatively civilized class of chieftains and priests, and in fact it belongs not to the Tang-hsiang definitely, but to the somewhat earlier period of the T’ang-chang, who had occupied the same country and were in the main, no doubt, the same people under another name.

Of these T’ang-chang the Chinese furnish a brief description and also a dynastic name, Lyang, and list, covering a period from about A.D. 400 to 550, after which the state was suppressed by the Chinese and became the district T’ang-chou; not long afterwards, as we have seen, the state reappeared, in an expanded form, as Tang-hsiang, with a dynastic name, in Tibetan Hjan, which may be identical with that of its predecessor. The interest of this  

1 On disregard for the old and on early retirement of kings see Bushell, p. 442; Rockhill, pp. 81, 143; Tafel, ii, p. 229 and n.; Fergusson, p. 319; Mrs. Rijnhart, p. 221.
2 Bichurin, op. cit., i, pp. 109–12.
3 The persistence of the syllable than in the names connected with this Skyi country, of which persistence another instance may be seen infra (p. 135), is due, no doubt, to the fact that the country predominantly consisted of high than: see supra, pp. 3, 9.
dynasty, apart from its definite dating and the literary connexions mentioned above, is that it was perhaps the first separate organization of Ch’iang tribes south of the Rma-chu. Like its successor, it had rather frequent connexions with the T’u-yü-hun.

The Pailan, who by the Chinese are located to the south-west of the T’u-yü-hun and to the west of the Tang-hsiang, must have occupied the mountainous country to the west of the Rma-chu gorge, which country is in the Pan-chen Dpal-lidan Ye-ses’ diary styled ‘Upper Mongolia’. Except that their western neighbours were the To-mi, or Tang-mi—unknown, unless they were the Yang-t’ung—and that they were called by the Tibetans ‘Ting-ling’, that they were divided into Black and White, that in customs they resembled the Tang-hsiang, the Chinese inform us only that in A.D. 561 their prince sent gifts to the Chinese court, and that in A.D. 624 they submitted to China and their country was made Wei-chou and K’ung-chou. The submission, probably in any case a mere formality, was of very brief duration, since before A.D. 650 the people were conquered by the Tibetans and thenceforward acted as the vanguard of the Tibetan invading armies. The interest of the Pailan resides in their name, which will be considered infra.

In order to discuss the Ch’iang of the actual Hsi-ning-Koko-nor area it is necessary to ascend through several centuries to the period preceding the irruption of the T’u-yü-hun people in A.D. 313. And, since until that time the Hsi-Ch’iang, ‘Western Ch’iang’, peoples of Amdo and the adjacent districts of China, may be regarded, if not as a whole, at least as a single mass, the account may go back as far as the really historical beginnings, about the end of the second century B.C. It will, however, be instructive to commence by taking note of the conditions indicated by the foundation of the above-mentioned Buddhist monastery in the territory immediately west of the Koko-nor itself.

The foundation, which was, as already mentioned, designed to commemorate a compact of permanent peace (A.D. 730) between the Chinese, the Tibetans, the Drug (the Turks of Central Asia), and the Hjañ (the Tang-hsiang)—the T’u-yü-hun, expelled in A.D. 663, passing unmentioned—was described as the monastery of the ‘De-ga G-yu-tshal’ (‘De Turquoise Forest’), the suffix ga

1 Bushell, p. 528 (3); Bichurin, i, pp. 113, 232.
2 Bushell, p. 541 (10).
3 Ibid., pp. 528 (13), 541 (10).
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(in De-ga) being used in Amdo to form adjectives of locality.\(^1\) The monastery was compared to ‘a flower blooming in the auspicious Dbyar-mo-thaṅ’ (‘Dbyar Steppe’); and here again we have the evidence of parallel expressions proving that Dbyar is a tribal name.\(^2\) On the particular occasion messages of prayer and congratulation upon the ‘face-warming’ of the foundation were received from

(a) the authorities of the realm of Mdo-gams;
(b) the Councillors of Bde;
(c) two great cities, Mkhar-tsan and Kva-cu, of Western Kan-su;
(d) the commandant of the ‘Thousand-district’ of Phyug-tsams;
(e) the Estate, or Territory, of Ḣbrom-khoṅ;

and the Bde councillors use the phrase ‘Hgreṅ people’, which from other evidences we know to have denoted not merely ‘upright man’ as opposed to prone beast, but also a particular people, whose country was accordingly named Hgreṅ-ro.\(^3\) That this name Hgreṅ is the native word represented by the Chinese k'iaŋ, ch’iang (originally kren), is a suggestion which we owe to Professor Pelliot.\(^4\)

It is possible that the text, which is fragmentary, opened with a message from the Tibetan Btsan-po himself. But in other respects the hierarchy of authorities is patent. First we have the (Tibetan) councillors of Mdo-gams, which is either Amdo or a whole, Mdo-smad, consisting of Amdo and Khams. Under Mdo-gams come the councillors of Bde, a division of the same, and known by several mentions both of the councillors and also of a place Bde-gam,\(^5\) no doubt their administrative centre. We then digress to two great cities of western Kan-su, which at the time were under Tibetan authority, exercised, as from other references also appears, through the Bde Council. Returning to Amdo, we come to the Tibetan official in command of the ‘Thousand-district’ Phyug-tsams, the term ‘Thousand-district’ which denotes probably an area of about 1,000 households, being well

---


\(^3\) Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 61–2, 87, 108–9, &c.

\(^4\) JRAS. 1928, p. 98.
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evidenced in Chinese Turkestan, both contemporary and prior. Nor does it seem doubtful that Phyug-tsams is the same as the capital of the T'u-yü-hun, Fussū ch'ēng, 15 li west of the Koko-nor, which had walls but was not lived in. It was, in fact, a ‘great mart’ and not different from the ‘great mart’ (khrom-chen-po) of the Dbyar-mo-thaṅ, mentioned in another document; the Chinese syllable represented by Fu was in early times sounded bhyuk. There cannot have been two ‘great marts’ in the than country adjoining the Koko-nor on the west.

The Dbyar-mo-thaṅ is rather famous; it is mentioned in one of the ancient inscriptions in Lha-sa, the Potala pillar inscription of c. A.D. 764, relating to the Sino-Tibetan wars. The G-yer-mo-thaṅ (‘a place in Kham’), Yar-mo-thaṅ and G-yar-mo-thaṅ (‘a district in the province of lower Amdo and Khams’) of S. C. Das’s Tibetan Dictionary are evidently the same place, which perhaps acquired literary notoriety through the treaty and the foundation of the monastery in question. The place is still known in Tibet by its old name, being mentioned, as G-yar-mo-thaṅ, in the Geografia Tibet of Mintshul Huthuktu (p. 55), where it is duly located on

1 The expression in its Tibetan form (ston-sde) was current in Tibet and Chinese Turkestan during the 8th century A.D. (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, pp. 283–4; ii, pp. 315–16). But an equivalent was also used by the Chinese in W. Kan-su (L. Giles, B.S.O.S. vi, pp. 831–2, vii, p. 850); and the T'u-yü-hun had officials over ‘Thousands’ (Bichurin, i, p. 97). An administrative division into ‘Thousands’ (kun, gun) is still found among the Salars in Amdo (Rockhill, Diary, pp. 62, 66, 76–7, 80–1; Tafel, i, p. 162). Perhaps the ‘Thousand-district’ was a district of approximately 1,000 families. Cf. the ancient Sanskrit term sahasra-pati? An official hierarchy of heads of 10, 100, and 1,000 families is, however, known to have existed among the ancient Hsiung-nu (see Parker in China Review, xx, p. 9) and even at present it exists in the Pamir, where the titles are, in Turki, Un-bāshī, yūz-bāshī, and min-bāshī (Orientalisches Archiv, ii, p. 29).


3 See Inventaire des MSS. tibétains de Touen-houang par Mdle Lalou, i, No. 16.

4 JRAS. 1910, pp. 1259, 1278 (l. 33).

5 The alternation by/gy (g-y), although perhaps a case of a more general alternation b/g, seen, for instance in gams/bams (pp. 241–2 infra), is to be discriminated from the modern Tibetan amalgamation of by and gy in j. It is ancient and probably dialectical or regional: an instance given in the Dictionary is g-yi = dbyi, ‘lynx’. Quite parallel to Dbyar/G-yar is the ancient Amdo tribal name Byim-po, which in the Tibetan manuscript Chronicle has two occurrences, in the first of which it is a correction of Gyim-po: the Tibetan manuscripts mentioned infra (pp. 130 sqq.) have Gyim-po. See infra, pp. 134–5.
the shore of the Mtsho Khri-sor Rgyal-mo, the Koko-nor, in the vicinity of the Mongol settlements. In one of the Tibetan manuscripts there is mention of a 'meadow G-ye-mo', which, by reason of the circumstances, must be the same place; and in the same connexion another of the manuscripts mentions a meadow Phug-dir(tir), which is perhaps related to Phyug-tsams.

Finally, the 'Turquoise Wood' (G-yu-tshal) also has an historical name. For the Byar-mo-than is, no doubt, the greater of the two 'Great and Little Yu (turquoise, jade) Valleys', often mentioned by the Later Han Annals as west of the Ching-hai, the 'Blue Lake', and head-quarters of the leading Ch'iang tribes. To the Ch'iang people the great lake was not the 'Blue Lake' (Mtsho-snön-po, Ch'ing-hai, Koko-nor) of the Tibetans, Chinese and Mongols, but the 'Turquoise Lake' (G-yu-mtsho).

The 'than of the Byar people' (Byar-mo-than) may help us to explain the name Pailan. On the south-eastern frontier of the 'Women's Kingdom', near to Ya-chou, was another Pailang tribe, whose name is spelled with the same Chinese characters, the first of the two being the word for 'white', now sounded pai and po. But a Chinese scholar, Wang Ching-ju, in editing and discussing three little songs in that people's speech, which, being included in the Later Han Annals, are the oldest known composition in Tibeto-Burman, adopts the transliteration Bair-lang; and, although a philological justification of this is not visible in Professor Karlgren's Analytical Dictionary or other familiar authorities, the double pronunciation in ordinary Chinese and the double form of the word (h(p)aku, biaku) in Japanese, suggest that in the history of the word there may have been confusion of synonyms. If the form Bair is justifiable, it would tend to justify also the reading of the same sign in the Koko-nor region as Byar, which better suits the Japanese biaku. But perhaps that is not necessary; for in the same region we have evidence of -ar becoming

---

1 The two are perhaps recognizable in Rockhill's account of his first journey, pp. 125–7 ('the valleys of the Buhagol and Dulangol').
3 One of the Tibetan manuscripts has G-yu-mtsho-snön-mo, 'Blue Turquoise Lake'.
4 Bushell, p. 531 (42).
6 Wylie, who translated the songs (op. cit., pp. 239–41), spells the name as Pih-lang.
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-e,\(^1\) and the Byar-mo-thaṅ may have been locally a Bye-mo-thaṅ = the G-ye-mo mentioned supra (p. 34).

By recognizing the Byar as the Pailan we escape the embarrassment caused by the fact that the latter, despite their services in the Tibetan campaigns, seem never to be mentioned in the manuscript Chronicle, which is largely a history of those campaigns. Byar, on the other hand, is several times mentioned in contexts relating to the Pailan region; and one place, Byar-liṅs-tshal, ‘Byar-liṅs Wood’, definitely assigned to its vicinity,\(^2\) may contain in its first two syllables an equivalent of the whole name.

It would not be at all in conflict with the facts with which we shall deal, if the Byar-mo-thaṅ should have been originally Pailan country. Perhaps we can also explain the name Ting-ling, which the Chinese so inexplicably give as the Tibetan designation of the Pailan. It is a well-established fact that in Central Asia the sign transliterated Ting might have had ordinarily the pronunciation Te or De, and the Byar-liṅs may have been De-liṅ by virtue of appertaining to the above-mentioned De or Bde.

The Tibetan records furnish also some slight further indication of the extent of the De or Bde district, which, being the centre of an authority covering, as does the present Chinese administration at Hsi-ning, places in Western Kan-su (Mkhar-tsan and Kva-cu), must have been spacious. As has been mentioned, the Tibetan Council of Bde-gams supervised also the administration of those parts of Western Kan-su which at the time were subject to Tibet. This appears not from a single reference, but from several,\(^3\) and it applies not only to the above-mentioned Mkhar-tsan and Kva-cu, but to other localities also. But the centre of administration, Bde-gams, which perhaps means ‘Bde posting-station’, and likewise ‘Bde-sum Wood’, though both are mentioned as having been places of ‘assemblies’, i.e., no doubt, the summer and winter conferences and musters of the Tibetan civil and military powers, have names topographically uninstructive. More significant, no doubt, is a reference to ‘Lyoi̇n-jeṅ in Bde’ in a document emanating from a T’u-yu-hun queen of Tibetan birth.\(^4\) From the context it is certain that the place was in T’u-yu-hun territory, and it seems highly probable that it was identical with Liung-ch’èng, which the

---

\(^1\) Concerning -ar/-e and concerning the equivalence of g-yar and byar see infra, p. 367, also pp. 243, 290.

\(^2\) Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 48.

\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 20, 25, 57-8, 78, 108, 319, 339.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. 10.
maps record under that name, or as Lang-chen, &c., on the Ta-t'ung-ho. It is eminently reasonable that the part of Amdo from which authority was exercised over Western Kan-su should have included the region of Hsi-ning and the Ta-t'ung river, whence Kan-su was reached by ancient routes.¹

When we have removed the historical accretions in the form of the modern Chinese administrations, the Mongols, the Tangut kingdom, the Tibetan rule and influence, and the T'u-yü-hun occupation, we come to the prior period of the Hsi-ch'iang, the 'Western Ch'iang'.

THE WESTERN CH'IANG (HSI-CH'IANG)

The most authentic account of the Western Ch'iang is that given in Book CXVII of the Later Han Annals (Hou Han Shu); after a series of notices of Ch'iang tribes of early periods the text makes mention of the first, eponymous, leader of the western Ch'iang, whom it places in the period 475–432 B.C., and then of his descendants and of tribal divisions; after which it embarks upon a history, from about 100 B.C., of the conflicts between the Ch'iang and the Chinese, continued to nearly the end of the second century A.D. Thereafter the Ch'iang are reckoned as subject to China, and for the period A.D. 170–312 we have only a few notices in the T'ang Annals. In A.D. 313 the Koko-nor Ch'iang were conquered, as we have seen, by the T'u-yü-hun. About the same time, more or less, and later there arose in Chinese territory,² and also in Amdo, one or two separate Ch'iang states and dynasties,

¹ See Rockhill, p. 41, n. 3, pp. 48–9. Fathers Huc and Gabet followed the route by the valley of the Charing-gol and P'ing-fan (i, p. 285), while Prejevalsky (ii, pp. 59 sqq.) and Futterer (i, pp. 244 sqq.) crossed that valley and then the valley of the Ta-t'ung-ho, making direct for the Koko-nor and Hsi-ning. Lieutenant Brooke crossed the mountains from Kan-chou direct to Hsi-ning (Fergusson, p. 51). The northern route to Sa-cu in W. Kan-su, descending via the valley of the Tang-ho, must have been that whereby in ancient times (Wylie, p. 433; De Groot, ii, pp. 197, 202–3) the Ch'iang communicated, through the 'Little Yüeh-chih', with the Hsiung-nu of the north: in modern times it has been followed not only by Mongol pilgrims, but also by explorers, Pandit A-K (see Hennessy, Report on the Explorations in Great Tibet and Mongolia, 1884, pp. 50–4), Messrs. Carey and Dalgleish (R. Geographical Society, Supplementary Papers, iii, pp. 46–8, Proceedings, 1887, pp. 731–52), the Littledales and Sir Sven Hedin.

² Cf. Franke, Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches, ii, p. 63 and Index.
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of which the Pailan, T‘ang-chang, and Tang-hsiang have been mentioned above.

The Book CXVII of the Later Han Annals was translated by Wylie in 1882 (Revue de l’Extrême-Orient, vol. i, pp. 423–78), with notes containing valuable identifications of places and dates. In 1926, as pp. 182–200 of Die Westlande Chinas in der vorchristlichen Zeit (Part II of Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens), appeared a translation by De Groot of the portion down to the Christian era, followed by extracts from the biographies of two Chinese generals, both contained in the Former Han Annals. De Groot, who, here as elsewhere, disapproves of his predecessor’s translation, has a systematic transcription of Chinese characters, stated to be based upon scholarly tradition, whereas Wylie used a transcription then normal in connexion with Mandarin Chinese; it is unlikely that either transcription would be regarded by Sinologists as adequately historical. The period is too early for certainty in regard to Chinese pronunciation (or pronunciations). Moreover, in cases of foreign names there are the complications arising from transmission, intentional modification, and other causes; certainty is obtained only when we have the names in some alphabetic writing. It seems proper to cite Wylie’s translation,¹ wherever it is in substantial agreement with that of his successor, and in quotations from the latter to reproduce the form presented by him.

According to the Later Han Annals, the original home of the Ch‘iang was on the Tz‘u-chih (De Groot Su-ki) river² and reached to the source of the (Hoang-)ho; it had an extension of 1,000 lǐ, and stretched southwards as far as Shuh (the western part of Ssū-ch‘uan) and the Han river. From another text De Groot quotes³ the statement that:

‘Where the (Huang-)ho river bends and then flows north-east, it cuts through the land of Sik-ki (Hsih-chih). This is accordingly “the bending of the Ho”... Then the Ho takes an eastward direction. From the bend it flows through the south of the province Si-hai, “the lake in the west” (Koko-nor)... and further east it flows on the north of the district of Ho-kuan,⁴ belonging to Lung-si.’

¹ With transcription modernized according to Giles’s Dictionary.
⁴ Ho-kuan was on the site of the [later] district of Chin-ch’ing, south of Lan-chou (Wylie, p. 425, n. 2).
From this citation it is, observes De Groot, ‘clear as daylight’ (sonnenklar) where on the map we must look for the land Tz‘u-chih, which his text explicitly identifies with Hsih-chih. Accordingly in Professor Herrmann’s *Historical and Commercial Atlas of China* (p. 10) we find the country so located. Of De Groot’s further suggestion that the Hoang-ho, in the part of its course wherewith the texts are concerned, was itself named Tz‘u-chih we are unable to add any confirmation. De Groot himself admits that subsequently (p. 194) there is mention of ‘the three rivers (Huang-ho, Hong and Su-ki)’; and in the *Annals* there are other references to a river ‘Su-ki’ (e.g. De Groot, p. 195, ‘left the Su-ki and the bending of the Huang-ho’, and cf. the translation of Wylie, who spells *Tsze-che*, pp. 443, 447, 449, 473) which do not accord with the suggestion. Su-ki might be a tributary of the Hoang-ho, no other perhaps than the She-chu of the latest map, the ‘meandering’ Sche-tsche of Dr. Futterer (*Durch Asien*, i, p. 350 and index), which flows into the Hoang-ho gorge somewhat north of the knee.

It may also perhaps be doubted whether there is really ancient authority for applying the name ‘Tsi-shi (Chi-shih) shan’ to the Amne Rma-chen range of mountains, as is sometimes done by the Chinese. But what is of importance for us here is the obvious identity of the Hsih-chih country with the land of the T‘ang-chang and Tang-hsiang and the fact that in the T‘ang *Annals* this identity is affirmed. The importance of the observation lies in the fact that it enables us to identify with the Tang-hsiang country the district Skyi, frequently mentioned in the Tibetan *Chronicle* as sphere of military struggles with the Chinese during the seventh and eighth centuries; thus we acquire the names of many places in the Tang-hsiang country and at the same time learn from this instance that on the Ch‘iang-Tibetan side of the mountains the nomenclature may have been more durable than was usual in China, where reshuffling and renaming seem to have been an administrative passion.

Although the ethnographical characteristics ascribed in the *Later Han Annals* compose much the same picture as the Sui and T‘ang *Annals* have given (*supra*, pp. 22, 29–30) in regard to the

1 Franke, *Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches*, i, p. 6; ii, p. 371; iii, pp. 3, 255.
2 Rockhill, p. 338; Bichurin, i, p. 238.
3 *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 48.
Go-lok and the Tang-hsiang, yet, since we have now reached the fountain head and are contemplating the Ch’iang people in general, it is not superfluous to reproduce it here.¹

‘Fixed settlements there are not, for they have to accommodate and direct themselves according to the districts where there is water, so that plants grow. The five cereals are indeed but little produced in the land, and consequently they make cattle rearing and herdmen’s life their business.

‘As for their manners and usages, the family system does not rest upon firm bases; sometimes the personal name of the father, sometimes the family name of the mother serves as name of the family. Relations who are more than twelve generations distant from one another can marry. If the father dies, the son marries his later mothers (i.e. the women married by his father after his mother); if an elder brother dies, then the younger ones marry their sisters-in-law (left behind by him). Consequently there are in the state no widows, and the families and groups multiply rapidly.

‘Princes and ministers are not there set up; Magistracies also there are not. But the most energetic separate from their families and become leaders, while the weaker constitute the people, dependants and underlings; they plunder and overpower each other mutually, and their power depends upon crude strength. For murder and manslaughter recompense is paid, but other restrictions and prohibitions there are not.

‘The weapons are, in the mountains and valleys, the long ones (lances, etc.), but on the plains the short (bows). The inhabitants cannot hold out for a long time, but seek to succeed by sudden incursions. Death in fighting counts as luck, death through sickness ill-luck.

‘Against cold and privation they are hardened like beasts; even their women in childbirth do not shelter themselves from wind and snow.²

‘Their character is firm and hard, brave and wild, and this in consequence of the element metal, corresponding to the west.’

The first organization of the Ch’iang³ is ascribed to a certain Wu-i-Yüan-chien (De Groot, Bu-ik-wan-kiëm), a fugitive from China,⁴ who after some adventures settled between the three

² An instance of this in Tafel, ii, p. 109, who states that on religious grounds the women avoid passing the period in the tent, where the cooking is done.
³ The following account is derived from Wylie, pp. 432 sqq., with references to De Groot, ii, pp. 194 sqq.
⁴ This trait seems to be normal in the Chinese accounts of the origins of foreign states.
rivers (Hoang-ho, Su-ki = Tzu-chih, and Hong = Huang). He was welcomed by the Ch’iang tribes and made their chief. He introduced among them agriculture and cattle-rearing, they having previously been only hunters. Thechieftaincy remained with his descendants.

The expression wu-i, bu-ik, is said to mean, in the Ch’iang language, ‘serf’, that having been Yuan-chien’s original status. If so, it may correspond to Tibetan g-yog, for which a variant b-yog would have analogies. If so, it is the earliest attested common noun in the language. The Hong = Huang river, which is stated to have been a tributary of the Hoang-ho, is evidently, in view of the subsequent history, the Ta-t’ung-ho, including perhaps also its affluent, the Hsi-ning river.

In the time of Yuan-chien’s great-grandson Jen (De Groot, Dsim) an uncle of the latter, by name Chiuang (De Groot, Gong), being alarmed by the power of the Chinese, left, along with his family and dependants, ‘the Tzu-chih and the bending of the Hoang-ho’ and fled westwards several thousand li, beyond all communication with the other Ch’iang. Afterwards the descendants of these, or of the Ch’iang generally, were divided into several tribes, which departed whither they would. One of these stocks was the ‘Yak’ tribe, being the Yüeh-sui Ch’iang, another the White Horse stock, the Ch’iang of Kuang-han, a third the ‘Mixed (or Three) Wolves’ Ch’iang, of Wu-tu. These particulars are evidently meant to mark off certain branches of the Ch’iang people, which had a separate history and a remote situation; these branches will be mentioned again infra.

Jen and his younger brother Wu remained in the Hong = Huang country, having respectively nine and seventeen sons, from whom descended as many tribes or clans. This was the beginning of the growth and prosperity of the Ch’iang.

Yen (De Groot, Gién), a son of Jen, c. 360–337 B.C., was extremely bold and heroic, and his descendants among the Ch’iang were called the Yen tribe. In the thirteenth generation

1 Cf. supra, p. 35, and infra, pp. 243, 290. 2 Wylie, p. 433 n. 2.
3 This is patent in the statement of the T’ang Annals reproduced by Bushell, op. cit., p. 519: see infra, p. 47 n 3.
4 Li-niu (De Groot, Li-gu): Yüeh-sui is stated (De Groot, ii, p. 21) to belong to the region of Ning-yüan in S. Ssü-ch’uan.
5 Pih-ma (De Groot, Pe’-ma).
6 Ts’an-lang (De Groot, Sam-long).
from Yüan-chien, during the period 48–32 B.C., came Shao-tang (De Groot, Sio-tong), who was in like manner bold and courageous, and his descendants bore accordingly the tribal (or clan) name Shao-tang.

We are not at present able to state the Ch’iang forms of the names Li-niu = Li-gu, Pai-ma = Pe’t-ma, Ts’an-lang = Sam-long, which are professedly Chinese, or to ascertain whether the latter are really translations, or only perversions, of the originals. And the same applies to two other tribes, Fèng-yang = Hong-jong and Lao-chieh = Lo-tsu, mentioned in connexion with events of the year 63 B.C.1 But a Seen-tsze = Shan-chieh, Sam-tsia, or Siêm-tsu, tribe, defeated in the period 48–32 B.C., may have a name identical with that of the Samsa, who occupy the southeastern corner2 of the Go-lok country, and Lo-tsu suggests a river name, which conceivably might be the Lo-tschu, a tributary of the Ta-hsia.3 Shao-tang = Sio-tong, which continually recurs in the struggles of the first to second centuries A.D., looks very like Zo-thañ, a place-name4 in the Koko-nor region, mentioned in the Tibetan Chronicle. The Yen = Giën tribe can now be more definitely located.

In the period 155–141 B.C.5 one Yen chief requested to be entrusted with the defence of the fortified western frontier of Lung-hsi; accordingly he was transferred with his people to the districts (Tí[k]-tao, Ngan(An)-ku, Lin-t’ao, Te(Ti)-tao, Ch’iang-tao), all which places were on the line of the lower T’ao river.6

In 111 B.C.7 we first hear of the Hsien-ling (Siën-liën) Ch’iang, whose name is, doubtless, preserved in that of Hsi-lin, or Hsi-ning,8 and who thenceforward play the leading role among the Ch’iang. Alarmed by the Chinese advance in Kan-su, which interposed a wedge between them and the Hsiung-nu, whom they had previously acknowledged as suzerains, they made an incursion

---

1 Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.
2 South of the Min-shan: see d’Ollone, pp. 226, 253; Tafel, ii, pp. 298–9 n.
3 Futterer, i, pp. 391, 398 (Lö-tsche): Tafel seems to identify his Lö-tschü (ii, pp. 299, 301) with the T’ao-ho.
4 Identified by Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kive occidentaux (p. 260 n. 1) with a T’u-yü-hun town, Sho-tun, taken by the Turks in 556 A.D.
5 Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.
6 See Wylie and De Groot, ibid., and De Groot, i, pp. 21, 41.
7 Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.
8 Tibetan Zi-liii. The Siën river (De Groot, ii, p. 207) may be the Ta-t’ung-ho, if not the Hsi-ning river (Hsi-he), its tributary, perhaps not yet distinguished therefrom.
into Chinese territory. After their defeat the Chinese instituted
the office of ‘Ch’iang-guarding Deputy-Protector’ for the general
surveillance of the Ch’iang, who thereupon abandoned the region
of the Huang = Hong-river (Ta-t’ung-ho) and settled on both
sides of the ‘Western Sea’ (Hsi-hai, the Koko-nor) and the Salt
Lake (Dabasun-nor). The Chinese thereupon built boundary
fortifications along the hills, perhaps on the line of the above-
mentioned branch of the Great Wall,¹ thereby marking off an
administration area, which they perhaps maintained down to the
period of the Tibetan wars, when it had the official name Shan-
chou.²

During the period 73–48 B.C.³ the Ch’iang recrossed the (Upper)
Huang = Hong river and occupied lands to the east of it; and
this perhaps accounts for the fact that at the time of the great
revolt in 63 B.C. Yen = Giên people of that area play, together
with another people named Han, a part in the strategy of the
Chinese generals. On that occasion,⁴ while the Chinese were
proposing to advance up the Hoang-ho from the Lan-chou region,
the Governor of Chiu-ch’uan (Su-chou) professed to apprehend
Han raids in his own district and proposed to make an expedition
over the mountains into Han and Yen territory; this he was
ultimately (61 B.C.) authorized to do, his troops being supplied in
part by the Governor of Tun-huang and the local (native) chief of
Chiu-ch’uan. From this it is evident that the Han territory was
farther north than that of the Yen; and confirmation is apparent
in the fact that the Han were expected to make an inroad upon
Tun-huang⁵ as well as Chiu-ch’uan, and in the further fact that
the Han people was the last to be reached by the army from the
Lan-chou region.

The Han are styled a Ch’iang people.⁶ We have no further
information concerning them;⁷ but it may be conjectured that
they were the original occupants of the Ta-t’ung-ho valley, and
that their name was originally the same as that of the river,
namely Hon, the two names having come to the Chinese at different
dates and in different ways. For in Tibetan times there was a

¹ Supra, p. 12 n. 5, infra, p. 47 n. 3.
² Bushell, p. 528 (17), p. 540 (1), gives Hsiningfu as the equivalent.
³ Wylie, p. 436; De Groot, ii, p. 199.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 209, 212.
⁶ Ibid., p. 212.
⁷ They were perhaps different from the Han tribe of Wylie, p. 469,
whose territory was elsewhere.
place named Ḥon-cani-do, in 'Skyi', the name of which should mean ‘Ḥon-city-land’ and should contain a tribal name Ḥon which certainly existed.¹ This place, whence authority was exercised over Ṣa-cu = Tun-huang, must have been in Bde and was possibly the Bde-gams mentioned supra. Since cani is found representing the Chinese ch'êng, ‘city’, ‘fortress’, this place may be identical with Hung-chêng, which the maps still record on the lower Ta-t'ung-ho.²

From the above consideration and from the circumstance that the Han tribe, which later also is mentioned in connexion with Ch'iang raids in the years A.D. 141–2,³ is pointedly distinguished from the Yen = Giën, it seems likely that, though Ch'iang, it did not belong to the Yen = Giën division, the descendants of Yen = Giën. In that division the leaders were the Hsien-ling = Siên-liën, who occupied the vicinity of the Koko-nor and in the second half of the first century B.C. became Shao-tang⁴ of the Great and Little Yü Valleys. Under that designation they are frequently mentioned in the Later Han Annals⁵ as the leaders in most of the conflicts with the Chinese during the first two centuries A.D. The usual theatre of the Ch'iang incursions was the Lung-hsi province and the vassal state of Chin-ch'ing;⁶ and since the Seen-ling tribe is mentioned as having made raids as far as Lin-t'ao,⁷ which was in the vicinity of Min-chou, at the bend of the T'ao river, it is clear that during this period the Hoang-ho did not constitute a barrier between the tribes to its north and those to its south.

In the succeeding periods other tribes, apparently belonging to Amdo, are occasionally named, and it is possible that, as time advanced, new units acquired some prominence; but other information concerning them is lacking, and the names in the Chinese transcription are insignificant. But in the northern and western, Tsaidam, part of the country there was a Ch'iang people unconnected with those with which we have been concerned and known

¹ Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 48, 301.
² See Filechner's map, h 8 (Hung-ku-tschöng, in which ku = 'ancient').
³ Wylie, p. 469.
⁴ Ibid., pp. 436–7; De Groot, ii, p. 199 (Sio-tong).
⁵ Wylie, pp. 440, 450, 462, 467, and under the names of the successive chiefs passim.
⁶ Represented by the present district and city of Chin, south of Lan-chou. Ibid., pp. 433 n. 2, 436 n 1 (Kin-ching), De Groot, i, p. 41 (Kin-tsh'ing).
⁷ Wylie, p. 439.
to the Chinese from early times. This people, mentioned in the
*Former Han Annals* by a name variously transcribed as *Jo-kiang*
(Wylie), *Ni-kiang* (F. W. K. Müller),¹ and *Dža-k’iong* (De Groot),²
disappears in later times almost completely; a contingent of it
served under the Chinese in the campaign of 63–62 B.C. On the
basis of precise statements in the *Annals* it is universally recognized
that the Jo-Ch’iang occupied the Tsaidam region and also the
southern slopes of the Altyn-tāgh and Kuen-lun mountains as far
west as the longitude of Khotan.³ But also north of the mountains
they were the people first met to the west outside the Yang
frontier gate, in the region of Tun-huang; hence it is probable that
the oasis of Nan-hu, about 80 miles west of Tun-huang, was in
their territory and that by the valley of the Tang-ho, which
debouches in the vicinity of Nan-hu, they communicated with the
Sirtin district in the extreme north of the Tsaidam area. Farther
west, at Charklik, also, in the Shan-shan kingdom, they were found
across the main route to Khotan. Thus both the route from the
Koko-nor to Tun-huang and that to Lob-nor passed through
Jo-Ch’iang land; and, as the Koko-nor route was the easiest means
of reaching Lop-nor from the Chinese capital, Ch’ang-an, it is
likely that many travellers took that way. Moreover, there was
local connexion with the Lob-nor state of Shan-shan, whence the
Jo-Ch’iang obtained cereals.⁴ In their territory also, in the Gass
district, are the Bokalik mountains, with the gold mines of Boka,⁵
which from Cer-cen in Chinese Turkestan, by the route over the
Tokuz-dawān and the ‘Valley of the Winds’—a route explored in
modern times by Prejevalsky, Carey, Hedin, and others—are still
visited by Turkestan people. At the end of the seventh century
A.D. the Tibetans established a post, Tshal-byi, somewhere
between Gass and Charklik, whence they controlled the Lob-nor
district; and thither in about A.D. 746 came refugee Buddhist
monks after a desperate journey over the mountains (Tokuz-

¹ Berlin Academy *Sitzungsberichte*, 1918, pp. 570 sqq.
² ii, p. 52.
³ This is proved by references in the *Former Han Annals*, giving accounts
of the states along the southern route in Chinese Turkestan (translated by
Wylie, *Journal of the Anthropological Institute*, x (1881), pp. 20–73, and
after him by De Groot, ii, pp. 52–69). Cf. maps collected by Professor
Herrmann in Hedin, *Southern Tibet*, vol. vii, map X. See also Müller,
loc. cit.
⁵ Visited in the 13th century by William Bouchier, of Paris (Sandberg,
The Exploration of Tibet, p. 21).
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dawān) from Khotan.¹ A Chinese authority informs us that T'u-yü-hun people were constantly reaching the Shan-shan kingdom by that route.²

The Jo-Ch'iang, however, are never mentioned, and, if they continued to exist, it must have been under another name. It seems possible to point to that name. We owe to Professor Pelliot³ the proof that the T'u-yü-hun people are stated in Chinese writings to be called also A-ch'ai,⁴ and the observation that the name is identical with that of the Ḥa-ža, mentioned in the Tibetan Chronicle and other documents belonging to the seventh and eighth centuries A.D., one of them being the above mentioned narrative by a T'u-yü-hun queen. It is, however, not at all likely that in addition to the name T'u-yü-hun and the variant form Tho-gon, independently attested in the Tun-huang region,⁵ the same people should have been known also as Ḥa-ža; and, furthermore, the Ḥa-ža are not infrequently mentioned at dates later than A.D. 663, when the T'u-yü-hun were expelled from Amdo.⁶ Moreover, one of the T'u-yü-hun kings, in the early part of the fifth century (417-) A.D. (Bichurin, i, p. 78) was named A-ch'ai⁷—long after the word was, according to Professor Pelliot, first known as a tribal name—and it is quite unlikely that he should have received the name of his own people, though the reverse process is familiar and exemplified in the case of T'u-yü-hun itself. Professor Pelliot holds that the name belonged originally to some mixed tribes in the north of Kan-su, which became included in the T'u-yü-hun dominion. It seems, however, much more appropriate to substitute for ‘mixed tribes in the north of Kan-su’ the name of Jo-Ch'iang, ǲi-k'iang, Dža-k'iong. Possibly the majority of the subjects of the T'u-yü-hun chiefs, whose power extended through Jo-Ch'iang territory to Sha-chou on the one hand and the Lob-nor state on the other, and who had entered the Koko-nor region only as an invading tribe, were of Jo-Ch'iang race, and in the Sha-chou

¹ See Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 119–25. The name Tšal-byi (‘Little Wood’?) was probably pre-Tibetan.
² See L. Giles, B.S.O.S., vi, p. 830.
⁴ 阿柴.
⁵ Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 367.
⁷ 阿豺 (or 獵). Professor Haloun has kindly furnished this spelling, as well as exact translations of the various ancient Chinese statements concerning the origin of the dynasty and the dynastic lists.
region, as well as in the Lob-nor kingdom, there were in the seventh to eighth centuries A.D., Ha-ža people, just as at the time of the beginning of the Christian era there were Jo-Ch’iang people. There is no reason to suppose that the latter ceased to exist; if not as Ha-ža people, under what alias did they survive?

The question is accordingly not exclusively one of identity in name. But on that ground also, if De Groot’s transcription dža (= ja) is correct—and he quotes the authority of Jen Ší-ku (Yen Shih-ku, A.D. 579–645), the commentator on the Former Han Annals—it would correspond to the second syllable of Ha-ža, as also to that of A-ch’ai in its original pronunciation. As regards the omission of the first syllable Ha, we may refer to Professor Pelliot’s remark concerning frequent Chinese transcriptions in which an initial a is suppressed.

If this explanation is correct, i.e. if the Ha-ža were primarily a Tsaidam people, being identical with the Jo-Ch’iang, this may help to account for the name of the Tsaidam district Hajjar and also for the fact that on a route from Charklik to the Tsaidam there is, on the Turkestan side of the mountains, a place named Hashak(lik), which name recurs farther in the mountains south of Khotan. For we know that there were scattered bodies of Jo-Ch’iang people, who would be Ha-ža, along the southern border of Chinese Turkestan.

Thus in regard to the history of the Ch’iang people in general the Jo-Ch’iang would have some importance. And this is emphasized by the fact that they become known to the Chinese at an early date and through not the same intermediaries as did the Koko-nor Ch’iang. They may have been neighbours of Chinese Turkestan from very early times.

With one exception, that of the oft discussed ‘Little Yüeh-chih’ of the northern parts of the Nan-shan, a small remnant of a Kan-su people which made a forced migration westwards about 170 B.C., we have now mentioned all the ancient populations of Amdo and Tsaidam and found them all to have been Ch’iang. After the expedition of 63–62 B.C., and the above-mentioned Shan-chieh =

1 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 17–18, 25–9, 35, 343.
3 See Müller, loc. cit. (p. 44).
4 Particulars of these, translated from the Later Han Annals, are given by Wylie, pp. 474–5. On their probable identity with the Hu frequently mentioned in conjunction with the Ch’iang (both ‘of Huang-chung’) see p. 47 n. 3.
Sam-tsia raid during the period 48–33 B.C.,\(^1\) there were several decades of peace with the Chinese, and the Chinese prestige in the region may have reached its zenith in the first decade A.D., during the time of the usurper Emperor Wang Mang, who

'caused his wishes to be made known in translation to the Ch'iang and commanded them to pay tribute jointly; thereby for the first time the country on the Western Lake (Koko-nor) was opened and changed into a frontier province, wherein were established five districts. Since then on the lakes of the borderland also the signal fire of a watch-house had the next in sight.'\(^2\)

The Chinese had previously established the above (pp. 12, 42) mentioned fortified frontier, crossing the Nan-shan south of Liang-chou and embracing the Hsi-ning district in a curve which almost reached Ho-chou; and this they afterwards maintained;\(^3\)

\(^1\) Wylie, pp. 436–7; De Groot, ii, p. 199.

\(^2\) De Groot, ii, p. 200; Wylie, p. 437.

\(^3\) Concerning the beginnings of these fortifications in 111 B.C. see Wylie, pp. 435–6; De Groot, ii, p. 197. The district within the fortifications was designated Huang-chung (Wylie, pp. 434–6 and passim), which the Chinese identify with Hsi-ning. It is the district of the Huang (De Groot, ii, pp. 194, &c., Hong) river, which is certainly the Ta-t'ung-ho, the name being retained in T'ang times (Bushell, p. 519) and still persisting (Rockhill, p. 42 n.): it may include the tributary Hsi-ning-ho, which, however, may be the Siên river of De Groot, ii, p. 207.

That the fortifications and Huang-chung (which De Groot, ii, p. 194, &c., fails to recognize) did during the first two centuries A.D. include the Hsi-ning district is proved by the frequent references in the *Later Han Annals* (Wylie, pp. 444, 446–50, 457–8, 466–8, 470–2) to the 'Keang and Hoo' (Ch'iang and Hu) of Huang-chung; for these resided within the frontier, and were sometimes led against the Ch'iang outside, e.g. in A.D. 96 (p. 447), when:

'She Ch'ung raised the Keang and Hoo of Huang-chung and marched beyond the fortresses to attack Me-t'ang in the Great and Little Yü Valleys.'

Similarly in A.D. 101 (p. 449), 135 (p. 466), 139 (p. 467). That the 'Ch'iang and Hu of Huang-chung' were the immediate neighbours of the 'Ch'iang of the Great and Little Yü Valleys' is evident both from the geographical situation and from the references to 'the roads by which the Ch'iang and Hu hold intercourse [with the Shao-tang tribes] at the barrier' (p. 400) and to the Shao-tang tribes 'enticing the Ch'iang and Hu' (p. 467): when the Ch'iang and Hu rebelled, as they sometimes did (e.g. in A.D. 86, p. 444), they began by going 'beyond the fortifications'—so also others and at other times (pp. 442, 448–9, 452, 462, 470).

The term Hu must have been used by the Annalist in its familiar signification of a Chinese-Turkestan people. It must denote the 'Little Yüeh-chih', since during the first two centuries A.D. no other Central-Asian people was resident in the Ta-t'ung-ho area or anywhere else in Amdo. In fact, the *Annals* speak (Wylie, p. 474) of 'the Getae [Yüeh-chih] barbarians of
also there was in Kan-su, to the south of the present Lan-chou, the vassal state of Chin-ch'ing (De Groot, Kin-tš'ing), founded in 60 B.C. and peopled with deported Ch'iang who had submitted; it was made the residence of a 'Protector of the Ch'iang'.

About the end of Wang Mang's reign 'the barbarians on all sides advanced into the empire'; and down to about A.D. 170 the Ch'iang border was the scene of almost incessant forays and punitive expeditions. It is unnecessary to retail the disjointed particulars of these occurrences; but an understanding of the Ch'iang problem may be facilitated by the following general observations:

1. A continuous leadership on the part of the Shao-tang people of the 'Great and Little Yü Valleys' is attested by the Later Han Annals, which largely follow the fortunes of a succession of chiefs belonging to that tribe.

2. During the first half of the period the usual scene of the Ch'iang incursions was the Lung-hsi province and especially the state of Chin-ch'ing, against which, as peopled by their tamed kinsfolk, the free Ch'iang may have maintained a special spite. Later some more northerly parts of Kan-su, such as Liang-chou, Kan-chou, and Su-chou, come more into play, and we may conceive that, as the south became more settled, the trouble moved northwards. In A.D. 87 intrusion from the west, i.e. over the Nan-shan, was apprehended in Kan-chou and Su-chou (p. 444). In A.D. 111 (p. 456) the Ch'iang were attacked in the Shan-tan mountains (near Kan-chou); in 120 and 121 (pp. 462-3) there were struggles in the Kan-chou region; in 141 (p. 469) a raid on Liang-chou, in which various tribes took part; in 162 (p. 472) Liang-chou, Kan-chou, and Su-chou were attacked; in 167 (p. 472) Liang-chou. We can understand therefore why the Han tribe of the Upper Ta-t'ung-ho, who seem also to have had settlements on the Kan-su side of the Nan-shan, and also the 'Ch'iang and Hu (i.e. Little Yüeh-chih) of Huang-chung', i.e. the lower Ta-t'ung-ho valley, frequently come in for mention, as do also, on the Chinese side, the governors of the three garrison cities and

Huang-chung and proceed to give an account of them, which, with much other information is fully expounded by Professor Haloun in ZDMG., 1937, Zur Üe-tši-Frage, esp. pp. 275 sqq.

1 De Groot, ii, p. 216.
3 Ibid., pp. 437, 440, 450-1, &c.
5 Ibid., pp. 447, 449, 450, 457, 468-9, 471.
the 'Too-leaou general'.

Nevertheless the T'ao river frontier continues to be prominent, and it seems likely that the main line of approach to Liang-chou was via the lower Hoang-ho valley and those of the P'ing-fan river or Charing-gol.

3. It is not to be understood that the districts under direct Chinese rule had during this period a Chinese population. It not infrequently happened that a tribe, or portion of a tribe, came in and submitted, becoming a 'patriotic adherent tribe', in which case it was sometimes deported elsewhere, even as far into the interior as 'the three Metropolitan Provinces'. The instances of the vassal state Chin-ch'ing and of the Yen = Giën tribesmen settled along the lower T'ao river are only typical. These tamed Ch'iang might then be employed in resisting or attacking the free tribes, and especially would this be the case with the 'Ch'iang and Hu of Huang-chung', i.e. of the frontier district enclosed by the branch of the Great Wall. But, on the other hand, the tribes settled within the empire were apt to revolt, in which case they sometimes migrated 'outside the fortifications'.

4. Another factor complicating the ethnographical situation is the deportations effected by the Chinese in their early conquests. Thus, when the districts of Wu-wei (Liang-chou) and Chiu-ch'uan (Su-chou) were founded, the previous Hun-sha population had been partly destroyed and partly removed, and people were transferred there to fill the gap; so also in districts south of the Hoang-ho: and in 108 B.C. Chiu-ch'uan received further accessions of the Te of Wu-tu. So again, when the Ch'iang abandoned

---

1 In A.D. 76 'the former Too-leaou General was again appointed Keang-assisting Deputy-Governor, and dwelt in Gan-o' (p. 442). This associates the 'Too-leaou General' with Liang-chou, since in A.D. 33 (p. 438) 'for the hordes in Leang-chou a Keang-guarding Deputy-Protector was appointed'. In A.D. 116 (p. 460), 122 (p. 463), 136 (p. 466), there are further mentions of the 'Too-leaou General'. The 'Too-leaou General' and garrison were first established in 86 B.C. and seem to have been made permanent about twenty years later (see Parker in The China Review, xxi, p. 262, n. 89).

Since the General appears to be the head of the Chinese military forces connected with Liang-chou and the southern parts of Kan-su, it seems that Too-leaou must be equivalent to the To-lebu of the 'To-lebu Three Tigers' (military officers) who during Tibetan times (JRAS, 1927, p. 550) commanded the region of Liang-chou. Too-leaou = To-lebu is therefore a place in the Liang-chou region and may accordingly be the Tolan, northwest of Liang-chou, on the grand route.


3 e.g. ibid., pp. 442, 444, 452, 462, 468, 470, 471-2.

4 De Groot, i, pp. 126, 146; ii, p. 49.

5 Ibid., ii, p. 198.
'Huang-chung', leaving the land west of the Hoang-ho 'empty', people were gradually removed there to occupy it.  

5. In the free areas also the Chinese punitive expeditions with their thousands of decapitations and captures of hundreds of thousands of cattle, though they do not raise the same ethnographical problems, wrought great devastation, concerning which it is worth while to quote from the summary wherewith the author of the Later Han Annals concludes this chapter of his work:  

'When the tribes were somewhat weakened, the imperial forces attacked them, and, they being still more weakened by the numbers of dead and wounded, the imperial troops followed up the pursuit. . . . The settlements were cut off from the mountains a hundred thousand feet high. And skinless bones were strewn on the tops of the loftiest precipices, beyond expression or calculation. There were no more than one or two in a hundred of the Jung able to skulk away among the grass and stones, and so evade the lances and arrows of the troops.'  

Sometimes a chief with the remnant of a tribe retired to remote regions; thus in A.D. 93.  

'Kuan Fan then sent troops beyond the fortresses, who attacked Me-t'ang (the Shaou-tang leader) in the Great and Little Yü Valleys, where they caught the chief, and took more than eight hundred captives, and collected several tens of thousands of bushels of wheat. After this the imperialists, meeting together from all sides, remained at the Great River (Hoang-ho), where they built a city, constructed large vessels, and erected a bridge over the river, wishing to carry over the troops to attack Me-t'ang. Me-t'ang then conducted his settlement to a distance along the windings of the Tz'u-chih river.'  

In A.D. 100:  

'Me-t'ang was reduced to a condition of weakness, the men of his tribe not amounting to a thousand in number. He made a distant journey to the head of the Tz'u-chih river, where he raised the Keang and took up his residence.'

---

1 Wylie, p. 436; De Groot, ii, p. 198. Later instances in Wylie, pp. 244, 439, 441, 448–9, 455, &c.  
2 Ibid., pp. 477–8.  
3 The 'height' of mountains being the length of an ascent.  
4 Sc. barbarians.  
5 Ibid., pp. 446–7.  
6 Sc. beyond the branch of the Great Wall.  
7 Mentioned again p. 448. Is this the Hung-chi Bridge, north-west of Ho-chou (Bushell, pp. 519 and 534 (72))?  
8 On the Tz'u-chih river see supra, pp. 37–8.  
9 Wylie, p. 449.
Apropos of an occurrence in the year A.D. 194, the *Annals* observe that:

'The descendants of Yüan-chien (the legendary first king) were divided into a hundred and fifty tribes. Nine of these lived about the head of the Tz‘u-chih river and westward and to the north of Shuh and Han (Ssu-ch‘uan). The number of persons is not stated by former historians. Only the Ts‘an-lang of Wu-tu had several thousand able-bodied troops. Fifty-two of the tribes dwindled away in numbers, till they were unable to maintain their integrity. They were divided and dispersed, attaching their settlements to other bodies. Some were utterly destroyed, leaving no posterity. Some were led away into distant lands.'

Despite all this the author admits that the Ch‘iang, who, he says,

'showed much heart in their national customs and in their martial bearing they were active and turbulent'

could not be rooted out; he ascribes this to the exhaustion of the troops and refers to the financial burdens of the empire. It seems likely that much of the Ch‘iang country was inaccessible to large bodies of troops, and that, as in the case of the Go-lok, a permanent control was impossible. The losses of the tribes, who were free from the checks upon growth of population at present operant in Tibet, namely, polyandry and Buddhist monachism, were quickly repaired. The Amdo states, Ch‘iang and T‘u-yü-hun, continued to be a trouble to the Chinese empire, and they passed on the struggle as an heritage to their Tibetan successors.

The unflattering picture which the Chinese give of the usages and morals of the Ch‘iang has already been mentioned. But possibly no society of human beings is without 'literature' of some kind. In the case of one tribe on the Ssu-ch‘uan frontier we hear of music and dances, and of poetry, whereof specimens, 'Songs of the Distant Barbarians', were sent to the Chinese court; in conversation

---

1 Ibid., p. 473.

2 The passage continues with a reference to the Chung tribe as the most powerful and to the respective numbers.

3 Ibid., p. 477.

4 According to Rockhill (pp. 80, 190) neither the Go-lok nor the nomads generally are polygamous. Baber states (p. 97) that 'polyandry prevails in the uplands'; so too Edgar, *The Marches of the Mantze*, p. 67. Both Edgar and Tafel (ii, p. 282) deny polyandry in the Rgyal-ron, while Rockhill restricts it in Tibet to agricultural districts (p. 211).
they were fond of comparisons. Probably, therefore, they had the interminable stories and antithetic verses and songs noted by the Abbé Huc, Rockhill, and Tafel among the Go-lok and other rude peoples of Tibet. The statement that 'their kings and marquises had some knowledge of literature' would, however, refer to a smattering of Chinese. In the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., when in Kan-su and Central China there were some dynasties of 'Tibetan', i.e. Ch‘iang, origin, these were, no doubt, completely Chinese in culture, and the princes had in some cases received a thorough indoctrination into the spirit and principles of Confucianism.

THE EARLY CH‘IANG, THE TE AND THE TIK

MENTION has been made of Ch‘iang tribes, the ‘Yak’ tribe, the ‘White Horse’ tribe, and the ‘Three (or mixed) Wolves’ tribe, which, though descended from the first king and his great-grandson Jén = Dsim, or the latter’s brother Chiung = Gong, could not be described as Amdo Ch‘iang. They had a separate existence and history, of which the Later Han Annals supply some particulars. The ‘Yak’ tribe of Yüeh-sui (Li-niu, De Groot Li-gü), inhabited the region south of Ya-chou, in Ssü-ch‘uan, and the ‘White Horse’ tribe of Kuang-han likewise belonged to Ssü-ch‘uan, being in the region of Ch‘êng-tu, the present capital of the province. These two are sometimes mentioned in connexion with risings in the

1 Wylie, pp. 238–9, 246. For a mention of ‘the hymns of the Ti-peoples’ see Franke, Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches, ii, p. 158. See also infra, p. 61.
2 Huc and Gabet., ii, p. 82; Rockhill, Diary, pp. 168–9; Tafel, ii, pp. 158–60 (Ge-sar legend).
4 On these Sinified or Confucianized barbarians see Franke, op. cit. ii, pp. 63, 89 (Fu kien), 94, &c. Professor Franke’s use of the term ‘Tibetans’ (pp. 60, 61, 63, 89, 183) or ‘Tangut or Tibetan’ (pp. 94, &c.) should not mislead. None of the persons or dynasties can have been Tibetan or Tangut in any ordinary acceptation: they will have been Ch‘iang. Before the 7th century A.D. perhaps no single ‘Tibetan’ had ever visited China; and the ‘Tangut’ people did not exist, except as Ch‘iang, before the 9th century at the earliest.

The ruling classes among the T‘u-yü-hun, who also are described by the Chinese (Bushell, pp. 527–8 (11); Rockhill, pp. 335–7; Bichurin, i, pp. 97–8) as uncivilized, had likewise, according to the T‘ang Annals, an adequate knowledge of (Chinese) literature.
6 Wylie, pp. 225–6, 243–4, 434, 466 (rebellion in A.D. 136), 471 and 474 (raid on Kuang-han), 473 (submission in A.D. 37); De Groot, ii, p. 195.
INTRODUCTION: GENERAL

districts to which they belonged. The Ts'an-lang of Wu-tu, occupying an isolated district in the southernmost part of Kan-su, south of the Wei river and the Pe-lung mountains which form its southern boundary, have this distinction, that in the T'ang Annals there is an account of a Te state, which under a Lyang dynasty existed from about A.D. 296 to about A.D. 506, when it became the district Tung-i-chou. These Te became known to the Chinese in 111 B.C., and from 108 B.C. various rebellions on their part are mentioned. The several tribes of barbarians mentioned as 'outside' the Shuh (Ssū-ch'uan) region, belonged perhaps to the area of what became later the 'Women's Kingdom'.

The Wu-tu state is not alone in receiving the appellation Te. The same term is applied in the Later Han Annals to the 'White Horse' Ch'iang of Kuang-han and also to the 'Yen-mang' and 'Tso-tu' of north-western Ssū-ch'uan, the former of these two belonging to the region of Mao on the Min river and the latter being to the south-west of that tribe. All these were of Te race.

'In these mountains (sc. the mountains adjacent to north-western Ssū-ch'uan) there were six tribes of Eastern Barbarians, seven tribes of Keang and nine tribes of Te. Each tribe had its territorial settlement.'

The two names, Te and Ch'iang, in conjunction or in alternation, carry us back to times far anterior to those which we have been considering and even to that of the first, legendary, Ch'iang ruler, Wu-i-Yüan-chien. In connexion with a repression of the Ch'iang during the period 1324-1265 B.C. the Later Han Annals quote from the Shih-ching the statement that

'Since then none of the To and Ch'iang has dared not to come here with tribute, and none has had the courage not to appear before the king.'

The Ch'iang are mentioned again in connexion with the period 1122-1116 B.C., after which neither they nor the Te seem in early

1 Wylie, pp. 434, 439 (rebellion in A.D. 36 and in A.D. 56), 453 (assembly in Pih-te, A.D. 108), 473 (several thousand able-bodied troops), 474 (submission of those outside the Kuang-han barrier, A.D. 108); De Groot, ii, p. 198 (risings, in 108 and 80 B.C., of the Te of Wu-tu), 201 (rising, in 86-73 B.C., of the Te of Wu-tu).
3 e.g. Wylie, pp. 225, 474.
5 Ibid., pp. 225-6.
6 Ibid., p. 242.
7 氏.
8 Ibid., p. 426; De Groot, ii, p. 187.
times to recur. They may, however, lurk under the more general designation of 'Jung of the West' (1150–1123 B.C., 1001–947 B.C.) and sometimes perhaps simply of 'Jung'.

More frequently we hear of the Ti[k]² (De Groot Tik, Terrien de Lacouperie Tek). At the close of the early Hia period (2205–1766 B.C.) one sovereign is said to have fled to the 'Jung and Tik',³ and the same conjunction recurs in 1154–1123 B.C., 1001–947 B.C., 878–827 B.C., 770–720 B.C., 635–627 B.C.⁴

The Tik are also frequently mentioned by themselves. But it seems that we must leave out of account the 'Red Tik' and 'White Tik', who belonged respectively to the west of Shan-hsi and farther south in Ho-nan and Kiang-su.⁵ For their position was the result of a deportation, since we are informed that:

'King Wên of Tsin (circa 635 B.C.) conquered the Džong and Tik and settled them on the [Chinese side of the] western (Huang-)ho between the Huan [Hun] and the Lo' [rivers].’⁶

The earliest situation of the Tik seems to have been in the region of the Ching and the Ch'i and Chü rivers, tributaries reaching the Wei river in the region north of the present Hsi-ngan-fu.⁷ Afterwards they advanced far to the east, at times even as far south as the Wei river. To the west of their original settlements were the Lung mountains, which in later times formed the eastern boundary of the Lung-hsi province. In connexion with a date 659–620 B.C.⁸ we are told that:

'Accordingly at that time there were to the west of the Lung mountains the Hun Džong of Miên-tšu⁹ and the Džong of Tik and of Huan.'

The Lung-hsi district was constituted in the period after 272 B.C.,¹⁰ down to which time the region west of the Lung mountains was apparently independent Tik country. A notice belonging to the period 770–720 B.C. states¹¹ that 'At the sources of the Wei were

¹ For the above particulars see Wylie, pp. 426–7; De Groot, ii, pp. 187–8.
² De Groot, i, p. 4.
³ De Groot, i, p. 4.
⁵ Ibid., i, pp. 19–32.
⁶ Ibid., p. 19. Further notices of the wars with these 'Red' and 'White' Tik, i, pp. 25–32.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 4–5, the Ch'i being a tributary of the Chü.
⁸ Ibid., p. 21.
⁹ Region of the present Min-chou.
¹⁰ Wylie, p. 432; De Groot, i, p. 34, ii, p. 193.
¹¹ Wylie, p. 429; De Groot, ii, p. 190.
Jung of Tik and Huan, of Kwei and Ki'; and so also at a later period, c. 400 B.C.¹ The Tik seem to have extended as far west as the lower T'ao river; for their name is still preserved in that of the district Ti(k)-tao, shown on the maps as bordering on that river; along with Te(Ti)-tao and Ch'iang-tao, as well as Lin-t'ao, it is mentioned² in connexion with the period 155–141 B.C., when a submitted Yen = Giën tribe was deported to those districts 'to defend the fortified (Western) frontier of Lung-hsi'. The direct Chinese administration of the frontier was not established until A.D. 124.³

In this way we find assembled on the line of the lower T'ao river the three designations Ch'iang, Te, and Tik; and from about 150 B.C. the districts coupled with their names are held for the Chinese by a subdivision of Yen = Giën. Concerning the names Jung and Tik De Groot states (i, p. 5) that the Chinese characters representing them

'appear both perhaps to belong to the oldest that the Chinese language possesses. The Džong (Jung) of the West are mentioned in the Yü-kung, a book of the Shu-king, in regard to which it is held that it originated in the time of Yü, the founder of the Hia dynasty, who is supposed to have lived in the XXIII century B.C. . . . The "Tik of the North" meet us in a book of the Shu-king which carries us back to the time of T'ang, and so to the XVIIIth Century B.C.'

De Groot speaks of Tik as, like Jung, a general name for the foreign peoples of the west and north; that, however, does not seem to accord either with the references cited above or with the numerous others collected in pp. 4–31 of his volume i. The statements concerning the original and later seats of the Tik, the coupling of their name with that of the Jung, the distinction of 'White' and 'Red', applied to some divisions of them, and finally the expression 'Jung of Tik', i.e. 'those Jung who were Tik', show that the name involved a racial discrimination. It seems likely that the 'White' and 'Red' Tik were finally subdued in the sixth century B.C.;⁴ and with the formation of the Lung-hsi district, after 272 B.C. (supra, p. 54), the remaining Tik also passed under Chinese control. But they were still a discriminable element of the

¹ Wylie, p. 433; De Groot, ii, p. 195.
² Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197; supra, p. 41.
³ Wylie, p. 464, 'In the autumn of 124 the region of Lung-si first extended to Teih-taou.'
⁴ De Groot, i, pp. 30–1.
population of the Ch'iang frontier; for at the time of the expedi-
tion against the Ch'iang in 63–B.C. the celebrated Chinese general
in command was apprehensive of the derision of the I (= Jung)
and Tik (De Groot, ii, p. 218):

'Consequently everywhere among the I and Tik prevails a spirit
of depreciation of our officials in the borderlands, and now the
Ch'iang give them the example of revolt.'

Concerning the Te De Groot writes as follows (ii, p. 183):

'Irrespective of the name Džong, Tik, and Hu, whereby . . . the
barbarians of the north and west are designated in general, these
Tibetans are in the ancient Chinese records throughout named Te
and K'iong.

'It cannot be decided whether these Te and K'iong are to be under-
stood as two actually different peoples. From the sources to be
treated below it appears only that the abodes of the Te lay more to
the south, those of the K'iong in the Kuku-nor region proper, and
even this is not saying much, since both peoples led a nomadic or
half-nomadic existence.'

The latter part of this statement is not quite borne out by the
notices in the Later Han Annals. The Wu-tu country was the
country of the 'Three (or mixed) Wolves' Ch'iang; yet in 108 B.C.
and 80 B.C. we hear of risings of the Te of Wu-tu,¹ and the dynasty
of the period A.D. 296–506 is called a Te dynasty (supra, pp. 52–3).
The 'White Horse' tribe of Kuang-han was, as we have seen, a
branch of the Ch'iang; yet along with the Tso-tu and Yen-mang
of the Ssū-ch'uan north-western border it is said to belong to the
Te race;² and in the mountains adjacent to Yen-mang there were
'six tribes of Eastern Barbarians, seven tribes of Keang, and nine
tribes of Te'.³ On the line of the lower T'ao river are Tik-tao,
Te-tao, and Ch'iang-tao. Moreover, it is likely that the Hong Te
mentioned in the report on the campaign of 63–B.C.⁴ are the Te
of the Hong river, the Ta-t'ung-ho, being none other than the Han
and Gičn, who figure in that occurrence. And the Te mentioned,
along with the (Little) Yüeh-chih and the Ch'iang, as the western
limit of the Right-hand Hsiung-nu king⁵ cannot have belonged to

⁴ De Groot, ii, p. 215: the Chinese characters rendered as Hong (i.e.
Huang) are not identical in the two cases, but homophonie: see Karlgren,
Nos. 104, 106.
⁵ De Groot, i, p. 58. Further particulars of Te peoples, largely settled
in Kan-su, are supplied by the Wei-lio (trans-Chavannes, T'oung-pao, 1905,
pp. 521–5) mentioning resemblances to, and mixture with, the Ch'iang.
the south. Furthermore, the above-mentioned T’u-yū-hun king A-ch’ai is stated\(^1\) to have annexed tribes of the Te and Ch’iang, who therefore cannot have been remote from the Koko-nor country.

As a solution of the problem we may venture upon the following suggestions:

\(a\) The original name of these Tibeto-Burman tribes at a very early date, when along the valley of the Wei and in the region of Shuh and Han (in the modern Ssū-ch’uan) they extended far into China, was Tik or Tek.

\(b\) A later, perhaps a dialectical, form of the same word\(^2\) was Te, which perhaps belonged to the Amdo country and the south.

\(c\) In regard to the Ch’iang we should take seriously the Chinese statement that they originated in Si-ki (Hsih-chih) or Skyi, the country east of the gorge of the Rma-chu; and we may suppose that they were an aggressive people who spread eastwards into districts originally occupied by their kinsmen, the Te, and became intermingled with them. They were, therefore, an active subdivision of the Te.

Now on the Tibetan side we have found the Ḫgren and their country Ḫgreṅ-ro, and these may be the Ch’iang and the Ch’iang country. We have also found a country De or Bde, probably including the valley of the Ta-t’ung-ho. Perhaps we may discover in the tribal designation Gyim/Byim (p. 35 n. 5, supra) an equivalent for the name of the early Ch’iang leader Jén/Dsim (p. 40), as we have, in fact, for Sik-ki, Hsih-chih. Persistence of the names on the Tibetan side accords with other evidence, and it is in itself credible, since the names belonged to the peoples themselves. Have we any trace of Tik?

We have seen that Ḫgreṅ = Ch’iang properly means ‘man’ as opposed to other animals, and the use of the word ‘man’ in a national or racial sense is a phenomenon very widely instanced among uncivilized peoples. What then of Tik? It would be a fair conjecture that that name also originally meant ‘man’. Hence it is a matter of interest that the earliest known specimen of a Te, or Ch’iang, dialect, or indeed of a Tibeto-Burman sentence, namely

\(^1\) Pei-shih, 96, 10 a–b, for which reference I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Haloun.

\(^2\) It may be left to conjecture whether the change Tik > Te took place among a part of the people themselves or among Chinese who had occasion to mention them.
the above (p. 51) mentioned 'Songs of the Distant Barbarians', the Tso-tu Te of the Ssū-ch’uan border, has a word t’iëk (see Karlgren’s Dictionary, no. 909) in the sense of ‘t(ribes)man’.

THE NAM-TIG

This is not the place for an inquiry into the early ethnical conditions in Kan-su and western Kan-su, concerning, which, however, we may remark that, while it is very unlikely a priori that the plains and the sand-deserts of Kan-su should have been occupied by Ch’iang tribes, people of high plateaux and great river gorges, it is both a priori and a posteriori improbable that the actual flanks of the Nan-shan on the Chinese side should have had any but a Ch’iang population. For, if there had been, in addition to the Little Yüeh-chih, of whom we do hear, any non-Ch’iang population in the Nan-shan, it is hardly possible that in the long course of events involving raids upon Su-chou, Kan-chou, and Liang-chou, and, as we have seen, a great Chinese expedition over the Nan-shan, it should never have been mentioned. Moreover, the evidently Ch’iang district Cog (Tsog, Tshog)-ro, the ‘Cog (Tsog) country’, which clearly belonged to the T’u-yü-hun territory and which in a list of Tibetan army districts is associated with the Koko-nor area (Phyug-tshams) and with the districts of the Rma (Hoang-ho) and Ka(Ska)-ba (Liang-chou), is probably the country of the Džok river, which De Groot identifies (i, p. 122; ii, p. 203) with the river of Kan-chou or that of Su-chou, flowing down from ‘the Ch’iang rocks’. It is further likely that Lok-tik, which in the Chinese campaign of 121 B.C. is associated with the Little Yüeh-chih and the Ch’i-lien mountains (south-east of Tun-huang), and which the Chinese identify (De Groot, i, p. 124) with a part of the Kan-chou district, is the country of the Lok tribe, which was originally connected with the Tun-huang region and part of which penetrated in 638 B.C. far into China. This being the case, it

1 See Wang Jinqru, Shishiah Studies (Academia Sinica Monographs, Series A, Nos. 8, 11, 13), i, pp. 17 sqq., esp. p. 29.

2 It may be noticed that the ‘Little Yüeh-chih’, when they first fled to the mountains, ‘took refuge with the K’iang’ (Franke, Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, vi, p. 85).

3 Re the above particulars see Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 279 and n. 5; ii, pp. 10–12.

4 五乐得.

becomes probable that the name Lok-tik means the 'Tik of the Lok tribe' and contains the ethnical name Tik.¹

As has been shown previously (JRAS. 1928, p. 633; 1939, p. 216), the speakers of the Nam language, which was the language of the Nam, or Nam-pa ('Nam people') kingdom, were called Nam-tig. A Nam state, with a king, is independently evidenced in Central Asia,² and it is natural to associate it with the Nan-shan. That the language was Tibeto-Burman and that the horizon of the people had for centre the districts of Koko-nor and Amo is certain from the particulars which have been published and which will be re-examined infra. Since we know that the ethnical name Tik existed on the line of the lower T'ao river and in the form Ti is still there preserved, and since it now appears that in the far north of the Nan-shan the same was contained in the tribal designation Lok-tik, it is not at all venturesome to suppose that on the Tibetan side of the Nan-shan, in the actual Koko-nor region, the same was contained in the name Nam-tig, which accordingly might be written Nam-Tig. But, in fact, the same syllable in tribal or local names exists there even in modern times. In the Geografía Tibeta of Min-tshul Huthuktu (p. 51) we read:

'Hence (i.e. from some places in the Koko-nor region and north of the Rma-chu (Hoang-ho)) to the east are found the races Tan-tig and Yan-tig [the latter mentioned also in Hor-chos-byun, trans. Huth, p. 227], where are Šel-gyi-yan-rdzön (fort or castle) and some other places and also a few monasteries.'

and in the next paragraph we learn that to the north-west of Tan-tig and Yan-tig is the great mountain Tsoṅ-la, avoiding which one arrives at the celebrated place Tsoṅ-kha and so proceeds to Kum-bum. The mountain may be the Lha-mo-shan or Lha-mo-ri of Rockhill (The Land of the Lamas, p. 94) or some part of the range which on the latest Indian Survey map is named Amaserigu. Also, the well-known place Kuei-tê on the Hoang-ho to the south of the Koko-nor has in Chinese spelling a second syllable anciently sounded tak.³

¹ The Chinese signs for Lok and Tik (Karlgren, Nos. 568, 573, 980) are not the same in the two cases: but their values approximate. Variations in the writing of foreign names, communicated through different channels and of unascertained meaning, seem to have been usual in China; and even the racial name Tik, which must have been well known, is often written (De Groot, i, p. 5) with a different homophone.

² Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 130, n. 5.

³ Karlgren, No. 981. The spelling Kuei-tê (Prejevalsky Quedae, Futterer Kuei-tê; Tafel Kue-de (map ⁰tê); Kozlov, Gui-Dui (with views, pp. 165,
It need not be stated that Tson-kha, birthplace of the fourteenth-century Buddhist reformer Tson-kha-pa, has not a modern name: indeed it may be said that by the suffix $ka^1$ (later $kha$) it both affirms its regional character and suggests that the name $Tson\tilde{n}$ was originally tribal. But a far higher antiquity, more or less contemporary with our Nam manuscript, is proved in respect of Tson-ka and Dan(Tan)-tig jointly by an eighth or ninth century manuscript, containing a Buddhist pilgrim’s letters of introduction; it states ($JRAS$. 1927, p. 552) that the pilgrim, after visiting a monastery in Ga-cu (Ho-chou), had arrived at the mountain Dan-tig-šan (= Chinese $shan$, ‘mountain’) and thence at a Tson-ka monastery. It is not likely that an independent Nam kingdom existed during the T’u-yü-hun domination (A.D. 313–63); and the few pieces of its folk-literature and legend which we have now acquired are in Tibetan script, and all but one in Tibetan language. But evidently there is no difficulty in the supposition that its people preserved the old racial designation $Tik$, which has survived down to the present or recent past.

The only doubt may be whether the syllable was used rather in its original sense of ‘man’, equivalent to the Tibetan $mi$ (in north-eastern Tibet $mi$, $rmi$, or $smi$); in regard to that we have no evidence.

Of the first syllable of Nam-Tig the most probable etymology is to regard it as representing the Chinese $nam$, ‘south’, in Nan-shan, ‘southern mountain’, an ancient name, used in the nomenclature of persons in Chinese Turkestan during the third to fourth century A.D.$^2$ Probably the compound Nam-Tig itself is also there attested, in the Prakrit form $Nama\tilde{t}g\tilde{a}$. The only other Chinese alternative is $nam$, ‘male’, ‘son’. In the Tibeto-Burman languages of the region we could cite only $gname$, $nam$, ‘sky’ (Tibetan also $nam$, ‘night’). Both these seem less appropriate.

175)) is adopted from Rockhill. The Chinese characters may be verified in Dr. Filchner’s $Wissenschaftliche\ Ergebnisse$, iii, Name-list, p. 21, where the form $Kui-tê$ is printed. $Kuei-tê$ is an old name, the place (concerning which see Rockhill, $Diary$, pp. 89 sqq.; Futterer, i, p. 318–19; Tafel, i, pp. 263 sqq.) having been the capital of a small Ch’iang state, ‘Dunczi’, with a dynasty Tai, which in A.D. 418 appeared with gifts at the Chinese (Wei) court (Bichurin, i, p. 113). At Kuei-tê the river is crossed by routes to Labrang and Lha-sa.

1 See supra, pp. 31–2 and n. 1.

2 See $Festgabe\ Hermann\ Jacobi$, ed. W. Kirfel (1928), p. 67.

3 $Kharo\tilde{t}sthi\ Inscriptions$, edited by Boyer, Ranson, and Senart (Index): see $JRAS$. 1939, p. 216, n. 2.
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The above considerations seem to authorize the conclusion that the Nam state, of which one ruler took to wife a Khotan princess¹ and concerning which our only other information is derived from manuscripts written in Sa-cu = Tun-huang, of Chinese Kan-su, was situated in the Nan-shan region and presumably on the Tibetan side of it. As will appear, its folk-lore envisaged the Koko-nor region and the Skyi = Tang-hsiang kingdom on its south, separated therefrom by the Rma-chu.

THE NAM, OR NAM-TIG, LANGUAGE, THE HSI-FAN AND THE CH'IANG

Nam, Ch'iang, Hsi-hsia

It may now, perhaps, be taken for granted that the Nam language, the language of the Nam-Tig people, which from a few examples of nomenclature we know to have been genetically akin to Tibetan, was a Ch'iang dialect. Unfortunately the only certified specimens of Ch'iang speech are the short 'Songs of Western Barbarians' (Pai-lan, Bari-lang) which have been mentioned supra (pp. 34, 51). The character and transmission of the songs are also not very satisfactory. The monosyllabic words in the four-syllable lines of the songs are in Chinese sentence-order; and, as the Tibeto-Burman order is different, and the sentiment is likewise unnatural, it is evident that the songs were conceived in Chinese and given to the Barbarians as what they might like to say, with substitution only of their own, as far as possible equivalent, words.

The pronunciation of the words, transmitted in Chinese characters, is exposed to all the uncertainties regarding Chinese pronunciation, or pronunciations, in the first century A.D.; and the etymological connexions with Hsi-hsia (12th–13th century) and Tibetan words are accordingly, in the great majority of cases, highly dubious. For these reasons the three little texts are in only very slight measure illuminating.

The Hsi-hsia language, employed in the Tangut kingdom, which was founded by the To-pa tribe of the Tang-hsiang, was presumably Ch'iang. Two circumstances render it practically useless for the study of early stages of Ch'iang speech. One of these circumstances is the transmission of most of the known words through Chinese characters, an obstacle which, however, by reason of date and of advanced precision on the part of the Chinese

¹ Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 130, n. 5.
linguists is less than in the case of the ‘Songs of the Barbarians’. In the very complicated and difficult Hsi-hsia writings there are indeed many Buddhist texts, wherein the meanings of large numbers of signs have been determined by comparison with versions of the same texts in other languages; and in a moderate number of cases the like result is obtained from interlinear translations in Chinese. Interlinear transcriptions in Tibetan writing supply sound-values of about 330 signs, whereof in about three-quarters of the number of cases the meaning also is known from Chinese translations;¹ and sound-values of many signs are known from their use in transliteration of Sanskrit religious formulae (dhāranis). But the study of the script has not yet (pending a publication of Sir G. L. M. Clauson’s researches) progressed to a stage where characters not so known can be read, i.e. understood in respect of sound or sense. Accordingly the available vocabulary consists of:

(a) signs whose meaning is known;

(b) signs whose sound is approximately known from Chinese or Tibetan transcription or from use in formulae;

(c) a moderate number of signs whereof both pronunciation and meaning are known.

This material, despite its deficiencies, might nevertheless be of great use but for a second circumstance, inherent in the language itself, which, if judged from a Tibetan point of view, is at a stage of very advanced phonetic degeneration. Scarcely any of its monosyllabic words are represented as commencing with conjunct consonants (there are some cases with $y$ or $v$ or $w$ as the second member) and few as ending in a consonant. Hence from a Tibetan standpoint it would be said that:

(a) all initial consonant groups have been simplified;

(b) all final consonants and consonant groups, except $ṅ$ (also representing $g$ and $m$), and, in a smaller number of instances, $n$, $m$, and $r$, have been discarded.

Nor is this merely a hypothetical judgement; for there are some groups, e.g. $tenuis + r$, $media + r$, which are attested throughout

¹ See N. Nevsky, A Brief Manual of the Si-Hia Characters with Tibetan Transcriptions (Research Review of the Osaka Asiatic Society, No. 4, 1926), and, as regards the dhāranis, the above (p. 58, n. 1) mentioned Shishih Studies of Wang Jinru. A plate with Chinese translations was given by Morisse in Mémoires présentées par divers savants of the Académie des Inscriptions xx, i, xi (1904), p. 362, and a plate with Tibetan transcription is printed as Plate CXXXIV in Sir A. Stein’s Innermost Asia.
the Tibeto-Burman sphere, and hence must have been primary in Hsi-hsia also. The effect of the degeneration of consonants, together with the serious degeneration of vowels and the consequent multiplication of homophones, is to render conjectural almost every restoration of earlier forms of the words. Thus at the present stage of our knowledge the Hsi-hsia vocables are for etymological purposes rather awaiting light from extraneous sources than able to contribute. To the matter of the consonantal Prefixes which the Tibetan transcriptions attribute to Hsi-hsia words we shall recur *infra* (p. 108).

The late Dr. Laufer, whose remarkable article in *T'oung-pao* greatly stimulated the modern study of Hsi-hsia and who by a mass of comparisons adduced from all known dialects of Tibeto-Burman convincingly demonstrated the etymological connexions (but not the historical developments, since most of the dialects have become known only in modern times) of so many Hsi-hsia words, expressed the opinion that the language was not 'fundamentally Tibetan', but was 'an independent and peculiar idiom in the great family of Tibeto-Burman languages, fundamentally evincing decided affinities with the Lo-lo and Mo-so group'. In view of the geographical and historical considerations which we have been following out both the negative and the positive parts of this statement would have *a priori* probability. A perusal of the available literature concerning Lo-lo and Mo-so, and of the grammars and vocabularies which it includes, will make it clear that the two groups are at approximately the same stage of phonetic degeneration as the Hsi-hsia itself; and there may be a common cause, namely an influence emanating from Chinese, which from very early times has been traversing similar developments. But can it be proved that the Hsi-hsia, the Lo-lo, and the Mo-so have behind them stages of development comparable to that of the earliest known Tibetan and do not derive rather from a still earlier stage of Tibeto-Burman, lacking the more complex formations of the Tibetan? It seems likely that this problem will be solved *ambulando* and that the consideration of the groups *tenuis* + *r*, &c., and of the final consonants will contribute to the solution. In the meanwhile what we have called the 'phonetic

---


2 As concerns the characteristic consonantal Prefixes of the Tibetan,
degeneration' of Lo-lo and Mo-so, like that of Hsi-hsia, greatly restricts the assistance which these can render in ascertaining the meanings of unknown words. It is chiefly in combining to establish a common vocabulary that they may be of use; thus, for instance, we may get a regional word mo or mon, meaning 'sun' or 'sky', which the Tibetan would never have supplied.

The next group of languages which may be closely related to the Nam are those of the peoples known to the Chinese as Hsi-fan, 'Western Fan', or Fan-min, 'Fan people', including T'u-fan, 'Agricultural Fan', and Fan-tzü and Man-tzü, who are mostly nomads. The term in general use among scholars is Hsi-fan.

'Hsi-fan' and 'Man-tzü'

For any further linguistic, or indeed ethnographical, use of the term Hsi-fan it is, however, necessary to obtain a more definite idea of its denotation. The matter has been carefully discussed by Sir Henry Yule, who quoted from Hodgson's essays¹ a passage mainly as follows:

'From Khokhonúr to Yúnnán, the conterminous frontier of China and Tibet is successively and continuously occupied (going from north to south) by the Sokpa above spoken of; by the Amdóans, who for the most part now speak Tibetan; by the Thóchú; by the Gyárúng, and by the Mányak. . . . The people of Sókyeul,² of Amdo, of Thóchú, of Gyárúng, and of Mányak . . . bear among the Chinese the common designation of Sifán or Western aliens; and the Tibetans frequently denominate them Gyárúngbo from the superior importance of the special tribe of Gyárúng, which reckons eighteen chiefs or banners. . . . The word Gyá, in the language of Tibet, is equivalent to that of Fan (alienus, barbaros) in the language of China; and as rúng means, in the former tongue, proper or special, Gyárúng signifies alien par excellence. . . . Others affirm that Gyárúng means wild, rude, primitive Gyás . . . and that the typical Gyás (Gyámi) are the Chinese, though the latter be usually designated specially black Gyás (Gyá-nak).'

Philologically Hodgson's statement, based upon Nepalese and Tibetan information, can no longer hold good. Rgya-nag, 'Black plain', is the common and ancient Tibetan designation of China;

Dr. Laufer allows (p. 103) to Hsi-hsia only four examples; but two would have been enough! On this matter see infra, p. 108.

¹ 1874, ii, pp. 66-7: see Yule's 'Geographical Introduction' to The River of Golden Sand, by Captain W. Gill, condensed by E. C. Baber (1883), pp. 125 sqq.

² = Sog-yul, 'Mongol country'.
and a Chinaman may be mentioned as Rgya simply or as Rgya-mi, ‘Rgya-man’, which is the name of Hodgson’s Gyāmi language. With this Rgya the term Gyārūng, which in Tibetan is Rgyal(or Rgyal-mo)-roñ, ‘King’s or Queen’s Gorge’, has nothing to do; and it is, moreover, inconceivable that the Tibetans ever applied the term Rgyal-roñ-po, ‘people of the Rgyal-roñ’, to the Mongols, Amdoans, &c.; furthermore, it is hardly the fact that the Chinese ever include the Mongols of Tibet under the designation Hsi-fan.¹ That Thöchü is really the name of the T’ao river and the town T’ao-chou situated on it Hodgson could not know; his unfortunate misconception that his ‘Hōrpa’ dialect had something to do with Turkish (Hor) people precluded his assigning in the above passage a place to the Hor-pa states.

But in remarking that the Chinese applied their term Hsi-fan to the Amdoans, ‘Thöchü’, ‘Gyārūng’, and ‘Mānyak’, peoples Hodgson was, no doubt, well informed. For Baber also, as Yule remarks (p. 126, n. 6), refers to the people of Tzü-ta-ti, on the lower T’ung river, perhaps included in the old Mi-ňag (Mānyak) country, as Sifan; and Baber also states² that

‘Sifan, convertible with Man-tzū, is a loose Chinese expression of no ethnological value, meaning nothing more than western barbarians; but in a more restricted sense it is used to designate a people (or peoples) which inhabits the valley of the Yalung and the upper T’ung [sc. the Chin-ch’uan or Gold River] from about the twenty-seventh parallel to the borders of Koko-nor. This people is subdivided into eighteen tribes [which he proceeds to name].’

This definition includes Hodgson’s Thöchú, Gyārūng, Mānyak, and also the Hor-pa states (mentioned among the ‘eighteen tribes’). Rockhill states (p. 72, n. 1) that on the Kan-su border the Chinese apply to the non-agricultural natives the terms Sheng Fan, ‘wild barbarians’, Hsi-Fan, ‘western barbarians’, more commonly Fan-tzū, ‘(sons of) barbarians’, or, in the case of the wildest tribes, Hei Fan-tzū, ‘black (sc. independent) barbarians’: he further notes (p. 241) that the Ssū-ch’uan people call all eastern Tibetans Man-tzū or Man-chia. The Vicomte d’Ollone says³ that ‘Under this very vague appellation [Si-Fan] the Chinese confound all the populations which we call Tibetan’. Similarly, the late

¹ Rockhill, p. 72, n. 2.
² R. Geographical Society’s Supplementary Papers, vol. i, p. 81.
³ In Forbidden China (English translation of Les Derniers Barbares), p. 180.
Professor Sir Reginald Johnston mentions (From Peking to Mandalay, pp. 268 sqq.) that 'by the Chinese many of the western tribes are more or less indiscriminately known as Man-tzü, Man-chia, Hsi-Fan and T'u Fan': he proceeds, however, to point out that the terms Fan and Man, which to the modern Chinese are ordinary words, meaning 'barbarians' or 'savages', were originally native, non-Chinese, designations of the peoples. In fact, the Man tribes and the 'Southern Man' (Nan-Man) are often mentioned in old Chinese literature, and sometimes identified with a southern people or peoples, called Miao-tzü.

But, of course, 'the Chinese' is itself a very vague expression, and we have indications of more precise Chinese conceptions of the import of the terms Man-tzü and Hsi-fan. Yule, following Richthofen, observes (p. 125) that:

'The Man-Tzü are regarded by the Chinese as the descendants of the ancient occupants of the province of Ssū-ch'uan, and Mr. Wylie has drawn attention1 to the numerous cave dwellings which are ascribed to them in the valley of the Min river. The name is applied to the tribes which occupy the high mountains on the west of the province up to about 32° lat. North of that parallel, beginning a little south of Sung-Pan-Ting, the extreme point of Captain Gill's excursion in this direction, are the Si-Fan ('western aliens'), who extend into the Koko-Nur basin. . . .'

'Both terms, Man-Tzü and Si-Fan, seem, however, to be used somewhat loosely or ambiguously.

'Thus, Man-Tzü is applied to some tribes which are not Tibetan, while it is also applied to people, like those on the Ta-Chien-Lu road, who are distinctly Tibetan.

'Thus, also, Si-Fan appears to be sometimes applied to the whole body of tribes, of different languages, who occupy the alpine country between Koko-Nur and the Lolo mountain country, and sometimes distinctively to a Tibetan-speaking race who form a large part of the occupants of that country on the north-east of Tibet, and in the Koko-Nur basin, the Tangutans of Colonel Prejevalsky. And in this sense it is used in Captain Gill's book.'

It is indeed remarkable that Gill, whose information was local (Ssū-ch'uan), does so clearly distinguish (op. cit., pp. 127, 133) between his Si-Fan, related doubtless to the 'nomades des hauts plateaux' (Sung-p'an region) of d'Ollone's vocabularies, and his Man-Tzü (pp. 111-12, 119, 122), whom he found near Li-fan-fu.
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(half-way between Ch'êng-t'u and Sung-p'an), and 'Outer Mantzû', farther west, of whom he tells us (pp. 111–12) that there is a high tower in each village, usually square, one octagonal, and that the possession of one was said to be a privilege enjoyed by the headman,¹ though he afterwards saw three or four in one village. The country to the west of Sung-p'an and Li-fan-fu is the Rgyal-ron-Gyärung territory, and it may be considered the centre of distribution of the towers. Perhaps we shall be able to prove definitely a connexion between the towers and a Man people. In general, it is clear that Gill in his use of the term Man-Tzii had in view mainly peoples of the Rgyal-ron-Ssû-ch'uan border: and the same appears to be actual Chinese usage in the Rgyal-ron itself (Tafel, ii, pp. 241, 247; cf. Gill, op. cit., p. 119, and Fergusson, infra, p. 68).

For further illustration of local employment of the term Mantzû we may cite the works of missionaries, The Marches of the Mantze, by J. H. Edgar, and Adventure, Sport and Travel on the Tibetan Steppes, by W. H. Fergusson. The former, whose scope comprises all the country as far west as Ba-t'ang (p. 7), states that 'The people inhabiting the marches (i.e. the Mantze) are of Tibetan descent and without exception speak the language of this people'² (p. 8): yet he recognizes the separate existence of the 'Chia Rung' (Rgyal-ron) states. Mr. Fergusson holds (pp. 247 sqq.) that the Mantze, by which term he means primarily the Rgyal-ron peoples, are 'different from the rest of the people of the west of China'; and he conceives for them an immigration from 'Gari, a place just north of Siklim, near Camba Dsung' (sc. Kam-ba-rdzon?). Elsewhere (Geographical Journal, 1908, pp. 594–7) he remarks concerning the Rgyal-ron peoples that:

¹ The towers are not dwelling-houses, but places for refuge and storage: the chief's abode is a castle (see Fergusson, p. 248, and views pp. 166, 194).
² This perhaps was not intended to be taken quite literally. As has been already seen (supra, p. 19), the population from Ba-t'ang westwards is not by the Tibetans regarded as racially Tibetan, and this judgement is extended to the people of Dmar-khams, SW. of Ba-thań and on the other side of the Hbri-chu. Ba-thań is named after a Hbah tribe (Rockhill, p. 218, n. 1), which may even have been a division of the Mi-ña, since the 'Mu-nia' people of Davies, Yûn-nan (Table of Tibeto-Burman Languages, p. 4), are by the Yûn-nan Tibetans designated Ba. Sir R. Johnston (p. 268) thought that the people of the country west of the T'ung river could be styled Tibetan only in a non-ethnical sense.

As regards speech Rockhill remarks (Diary, p. 355) that the Tibetan pronunciation of Ba-thań was nearly incomprehensible, whereas that of Li-thań was nearer to the Lha-san.
'They are not Tibetan, nor do they wish to be called such. Their features are different, and so is their language. They have mixed much with the Tibetans and have adopted many of their manners and customs, as well as their written language, which has been brought in by the lamas. In the spoken language many words have been borrowed from the same source, but the majority have no connection with Tibetan.'

We have seen already (p. 19) that on the Tibetan side also the Rgyal-ron peoples are regarded as distinct.

From the above it is apparent that in Ssü-ch’uan the Man-tzü, peoples on the west, are not confused with the Hsi-fan occupying the high steppe country more to the north. Indeed Mr. Fergusson says (p. 249) that:

‘There is no other Chinese term [than Man-tzū] to distinguish them (the Rgyal-ron people) from the Sifan, employed in reference to the ordinary Tibetan of Central and Northern Tibet.’

Historically it would seem that in applying the term Hsi-fan not to neighbours on the west, but only to nomad tribes from Sung-p’an northwards the Ssü-ch’uanese preserve an old tradition. For Hsi-fan is not a modern expression. As can be seen from Professor Franke’s Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches, iii, pp. 22–4, it dates back to the time of the Sung Annals and the Biography of Hsüan-tsang (7th century a.d.), at which period it denoted peoples of the Kan-su border: later also it specially applied to the region including Hsi-ning, Ho-chou, T'ao-chou, and Min-chou, in fact the old Ch’iang territory. In the texts it seems to have gone out of fashion owing to the prominence of the Tibetans, from the seventh century, in that area and to the new term T’u-fan employed in regard to them. It seems allowable to conjecture that it originated as a substitute for Hsi-ch’iang, when the Ch’iang ceased to appear as a definite mass in the borderlands: it could embrace also the remnants of intermingled Te and Tig peoples. It would be a curious fact if, as Professor Franke states, the term were now used (in literature) only of the people of the Rgyal-ron: and it seems more likely that it is, as von Rosthorn, cited by Franke, limits it, confined 'to certain tribes in the administrative area of Sung-p’an', i.e. to the Si-Fan of Gill, who would really be Go-lok. The modern wide use of the term by the Chinese to denote the Tibetans in general is mentioned by Professor Franke.

Practically a distinction between Hsi-fan and Tibetan holds
INTRODUCTION: GENERAL

good. Major Davies in his Yün-nan (pp. 384, 387) affirms its validity. The Tibetans, he says,

'call themselves Pè, or, as the sound might be better transliterated, Pö [sc. Bod] . . . . In western China, however, the Tibetans are more usually known by other names. In Ssū-ch'uan they call them Man-tzū, or, more politely, Man-chia, names which are also applied to the Lo-los of that province. In Yün-nan the most common name for a Tibetan is Ku-tsung.'

Hsi-fan is, he says, applied by the Chinese 'to certain tribes which inhabit the borderland between China and Tibet and may be accepted as a useful designation for those tribes'. Like Mr. Fergusson, he notes even a physical difference from Tibetans, though admitting that, if not indistinguishable from Tibetans, 'many of the Hsi-fan are at all events completely Tibetan in religion and customs'.

As is evident from the narratives of travellers, the differences of race and sociology are acutely realized by the border peoples. Even the Chinese, with their superior outlook, do not, it seems, apply to peoples of distinct characteristics, Lo-los, Mo-sos, &c., the term Hsi-fan; and, if they do sometimes speak of Lo-los as Man-tzū, it is conceivable that the Lo-los are in fact of Man origin; a partly Man origin of the Rgyal-ron tribes, also, as we see, called Man-tzū, is not improbable, since we have definite early notice of a Man people in the vicinity of Ya-chou and the 'Women's Kingdom'.

'Hsi-fan' languages: a Tibetan group

The following is a list of vocabularies, with particulars concerning languages and spellings:

Baber, E. Colborne, A Journey of Exploration in Western Ssū-ch'uan (R. Geographical Society’s Supplementary Papers, vol. i (1881), pp. 1–152).

Languages: pp. 73–8 Si-fan (properly Menia) of Tzū-ta-ti (on the T'ung river, far S. of Ta-chien-lu: map, p. 93), along with Lo-lo dialects. Spelling English.


1 On the origin of this term see Rockhill, p. 220, n. 2.
3 Bushell's 'Lonü Man', JRAS. 1880, p. 531 (42).
Davies, H. R., Yün-nan, the Link between India and the Yangtze (Cambridge, 1909), pp. 235-44 (4 Tables) = Vocabularies of Tibeto-Burman languages of Yün-nan and Western Su-ch’uan.

Languages cited: Ku-tsung (Yün-nan Tibetan), Lu-tzü, P‘rü-mi, Mu-nia, Li-so (or ‘su). Spelling English, but with ‘Continental’ vowels and aspires as k', t', &c.


Languages: Mosso, Lissou, Min-kia, Loutse, Chinese, Tibetan, Kham di Mou oua (Khamti). Spelling French, with aspires as kh, th, &c. ——, Le Thibet d’après la correspondance des missionnaires (2nd ed., Paris, 1885).

Language: Mélam, pp. 371-7, some words, &c., adduced (in part erroneously) as not derived from Tibetan. Spelling French.


Languages (only numerals 1-12, 20): Si-fan, A (from neighbourhood of Li-fan-fu) and B (from neighbourhood of Sung-p‘an), Outer Man-Tzü (W. of Li-fan-fu). Spelling English.

—-, quoted in Terrien de Lacouperie, The Languages of China before the Chinese (see infra). Some additional numerals and other words from the same languages.


Languages: Thöchü, Sókpa (really Mongol), Gyámi (Chinese), Gyährung, Hórpa, Tákpa, Mányak. Spelling precise according to system expounded, ibid., pp. 150-1.


Languages (pp. 392-7): Pa-U-rong, Muli(Njong), also dialects of Lo-lo and Mo-so, also Li-so. Spelling English, but with ‘Continental’ vowels and aspires as k’, t’, &c.


Language: Si-hia (with etymological, &c., discussions covering the whole range of Tibeto-Burman, Thai, &c.: some words of Ge-si-ts’a). Spelling according to system of Lepsius.


Language: Lo-lo. Spelling systematic, with aspires as k’, t’, &c.

Monbeig, Père. See Liétard.


Language: Si-hia (Tibetan transcriptions, also romanized, with Chinese renderings and citations of etymological correlates in Chinese, Tibeto-Burman, &c.). Spelling systematic.
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Languages (in addition to numerous dialects of Lo-lo, Mo-so, &c.):
Eight 'Sifan' dialects, viz. Nos. 35 Nameji, 36 Sifan (really Tse-kou Tibetan), 37 Peu, 38 Duampou, 39 Pé, 40 Pé, 41 Dzorgai, 42 Kortsé: with No. 38 are given some words of the Peu of Seutati, and with No. 40 some words reported as used by the nomads of the contiguous high plateaux; on pp. 222–4 supplements to Nos. 38, 40–2, including a few phrases. Spelling French (ordinary and with possible inconsistencies between different dialects, due to difference of recorders, see pp. 4–5).

Orléans, Prince Henri d', From Tonkin to India (English trans., London, 1898).

Languages (in addition to numerous dialects of S. China and the Sino-Tibetan borderlands in the SW.): Nos. 19 Lissou, 22 Pe Lissou, 24 Loutse (also Nos. 3, 7, 12, 15 Lolo, 23 Mosso). Spelling French.


Language: Tangut (pp. 136–8, 112–13, and notes by the translator, pp. 302–3). Spelling in transliteration from Russian original.


Languages: Amdowa and Panak’a Tibetan (pp. 362–7); Tibetan syllabary with pronunciation of Lhasa, Bat’ang, and the Tsarong (pp. 368–70). Spelling according to normal transcription of Tibetan (and Chinese).


Languages: Rgya-ron dialects, viz. Wmsfi (pp. 526–9), Pati (p. 530), Pawang (p. 530), Hanniu (pp. 530–1). Spelling according to system of Lepsius.


Language: Rgyal-ron dialects (occasional citations of words and phrases, in considerable total number). Spelling German.


Languages: Captain Gill’s short lists of additional words (numerals, &c.) from Sung-p’an Si-fan, Li-fan-fu Si-fan, and Outer Man-Tzü.

Wang Jinqu, Shishia Studies (Academia Sinica Monographs, Series A, Nos. 8, 11, 13, Pei-핑, 1931–).

i, pp. 17–53: three Baìrlarg songs (from the Later Han Annals).
ii, pp. 275–88: Shishia, Ch’iang and Minia (also Baber’s Menia) in the Ssu-ch’uan province.
ii, pp. 1–272, iii, pp. 1–396: Romanized Shishia words intercolumniated in Shishia version of the Buddhist Suvarnaprabhāsa-sūtra. Spelling for literary Tibetan and Chinese normal, for dialect words in Chinese transcription historico-phonetical, in other cases systematic or according to sources.


Language: Jyā-ruí (Prefixes, Grammar, Sentences, comparisons with Tibetan). Spelling according to system of Lepsius.
References may be facilitated by a list of the names in alphabetic order, as follows:

**Amdo** Tibetan (Rockhill).

**Bairlang** (Wang Jinqru), Ch'iang of Ssü-ch'üan border.

**Bat'ang** Tibetan (Rockhill).

**Duampou** (Ollone 38).

**Dzorgai Sifan** (Ollone 41).

**Ge-ši-ts'a** (Laufer) of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Gyámi** Chinese (Hodgson).

**Gyárung** (Hodgson) of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Hanniu** (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Hórpā** (Hodgson).

**Jyā-run** (Wolfenden) of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Kortšé Sifan** (Ollone 42).

**Ku-tsung** Tibetan (Davies).

**Li-su** (or 'su) (Davies) = Lissou.

Lissou (Orléans), also in Desgodins: = Li-su: also Pe Lissou.

Lit'ang Tibetan (Rockhill).

**Lo-lo** (Baber, Johnston, Lézard, Ollone, Orléans)—rarely cited.

**Loutse** (Orléans), also in Desgodins: = Lu-tzū.

**Lu-tzū** (Davies) = Loutse.

**Mán-yak** (Hodgson) of Mi-ņag.

**Mántze, Outer** (Gill) = Man-tzū; akin to Thóchú.

**Mélam** (Desgodins) of Tsa-ро́n valley, on Upper Salween R.

**Menia** of Tzū-ta-ti (Baber) = Mi-ņag.

**Minia** (Wang Jinqru) = Mi-ņag.

**Mo-so** (Bacot), also in Johnston—rarely cited.

**Mosso** (Orlhans), also Desgodins: = Mo-so.

**Muli(Njong)** (Johnston) = Ḫjañ of Mi-li (2° S. of Li-t'ang): akin to Mán-yak.

**Mu-nia** (Davies) = Mi-ņag.

**Nameji Sifan** (Ollone 35), near junction of Ya-lung and Yangtze.

**Outer Mantze** (Gill).

**Panak'ā** (Rockhill), Go-lok of Amdo.

**Pati** (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Pa-U-rong** (Johnston), Bowrong, Bawrang on lower Ya-lung (ņag) river: akin to Mán-yak.

**Pawang** (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Pe** (Ollone 39) = Bod (Tibetan), Mao-chou region.

**Pe** (Ollone 40) = Bod (Tibetan), Sung-p'än region.

Pe Lissou (Orléans).

**Peu** (Ollone 36), Bod of Tse-kou.

**Peu** (Ollone 37) = Bod of Ta-chien-lu region.

**Peu** of Seutati (Ollone 38) = Bod of Tzū-ta-ti.

**Prū-mi** (Davies), of Mi-li.

**Rgyal-ро́n** dialects (Rosthorn), of Rgyal-ро́n.

**Rgyal-ро́n** dialects (Tafel).

**Seutati**, Peu of (see Ollone 38) = Tzū-ta-ti.

**Shishia** (Wang Jinqru) = Hsi-hsia.

**Sifan of Tzū-ta-ti** (Baber) = Menia.

**Sifan** (Ollone 36 Tse-kou Sifan) = Monbeig.

**Sifan A & B** (Gill), also Terrien de Lacouperie: Tibetan.

**Si-hia** (Laufer) = Hsi-hsia.
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Si-hia (Nevsky) = Hsi-hsia.
Sökpa Mongol (Hodgson).
Täkpa (Hodgson) = Dwags-po Tibetan.
Tangut Tibetan (Prejevalsky).
Thochú (Hodgson), of T'ao-chou.
Tsarong Tibetan (Rockhill), of Upper Salween R.
Tse-kou Tibetan (Ollone 36).
Wassū (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-ron.

The spelling of these names and of the words cited from the several languages is adapted as explained infra (pp. 79-81).

Perhaps, however, some further light can be obtained from linguistic considerations. Is there a Hsi-fan group of languages? Hodgson, in his article 'Sifkn and Hórsók Vocabularies',1 clearly recognized that his Sökpa and Gyāmi, and perhaps also his Täkpa, were not Hsi-fan. Ignoring his misapprehension in regard to Hörpa, we have accordingly four Hsi-fan languages, namely Thochü (T'ao-chou), Hörpa, Gyärūng (Rgyal-ron), and Mányak (Mi-ñag), belonging to Hsi-fan country. Since they are all obviously connected with Tibetan, are they dialects of that language? The same question, of course, arises in regard to Baber's 'Sifan (properly Menia) of Tzü-ta-ti',2 evidently related to Mányak, and similarly to Major Davies's (loc. cit.) 'Mu-nia [sc. Menia] Hsi-fan' of the Mi-li country. We have, also, the 'Pa-U-Rong (Bawrang, Bourong) Hsi-fan' of Sir Reginald Johnston (op. cit., pp. 392-7). The vocabularies of the Rgyal-ron compiled by von Rosthorn3 must be associated with 'Gyärūng'; likewise the 'Jyā-ruñ' of the late Dr. Wolfenden's article,4 containing an orally communicated tale, with discussion and vocabulary. In the Vicomte d'Ollone's Langues des Peuples non-Chinois de la Chine we find vocabularies of as many as eight languages (Nos. 35-42) grouped as 'Sifan'. It is, however, explained (p. 20) that of these dialects one, No. 36, is nothing but Tibetan, as spoken in its district (Tse-kou-Tzū-ku in NW. Yün-nan), while No. 37 ('Peu' of Ta-chien-lu) does not seriously differ, and No. 40 ('Pe' of Sung-p'an district), despite its geographical remoteness, bears considerable resemblance to those two. This raises a question as to the 'Pe' (sc. Bod) of No. 39, and further as to the Tse-kou Tibetan of Prince Henri d'Orléans's From Tonkin to India (pp. 443-5) No. 25 (but this is = d'Ollone's No. 36) and the Ku-tsung Tibetan (Chung-tien in north Yün-nan) of

1 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1853, pp. 121-51 (see pp. 122-3).
3 ZDMG. li (1897), pp. 524 sqq.
4 T'oung-pao, xxxii (1936), pp. 167-204.
Major Davies. In their phonetical aspect the dialects recorded as Tibetan are not obviously less unlike ordinary Tibetan than the others or, indeed, than the distinctly non-Tibetan, though Tibeto-Burman, languages, Mo-so, Lo-lo, &c., of the same regions: for instance, the Tibetan word for 'rice', *hbras* (Lha-sa drel), is not more easily recognizable in Sung-p'an djei, Ta-chien-lu djei, Tse-kou dji, dre, than in Menia tch'e, Mu-nia chi, Pa-U-Rong bre, Muli tch'e, or than in Mo-so khia, chié, tcha, tchoua, Lo-lo ch'ö-so, chi-se, tche, tchêu, ndja, &c., Loutse ambo, Kioutse amtché, amsiet, Lissou dja-pou, tche-pou, &c., all derived from the same original: in regard to numerals, &c., the case is similar.

Practically, no doubt, the compilers of the vocabularies had good reason for applying to the persons interrogated the designations 'Tibetan', 'Hsi-fan', &c.: and in the actual language they would perceive indications not apparent in the mere list of words. But the philologist must find his own grounds for deciding whether a dialect is or is not Tibetan. The most obvious ground, appreciated, no doubt, by the compilers, is the general correspondence, despite any phonetical differences, of the vocabularies as a whole and of groups of words in them. The conclusiveness of this consideration can conveniently be verified in the case of the 'Yün-nan Tibetan or Ku-tsung' by reference to Major Davies's tables, where the select Yün-nan words are shown in a column side by side with their equivalents in 'written Tibetan' and in 'standard spoken Tibetan'. The etymological identity of the corresponding terms is in most cases patent; and even where the terms are different an etymological equivalent of the Ku-tsung word can often be found, as a synonym, in the Tibetan dictionaries. In regard to other dialects we have to make our own identifications; but, this done, we can state with confidence a posteriori that—

(a) in Prejevalsky's 'Tangut' vocabulary (*Mongolia*, ii, pp. 136–8), in which the translator, E. Delmar Morgan, identified (p. 303) a number of Tibetan words, nearly every word, in fact, is Tibetan;

(b) concerning the Tse-kou Tibetan (No. 25 of Prince Henri d'Orléans = No. 36 of the Vicomte d'Ollone = Monbeig, *BÉFd'E-O.*, ix, pp. 550–6), the Ta-chien-lu Tibetan (d'Ollone, No. 37) and the Sung-p'an Tibetan (d'Ollone, No. 40) a corresponding affirmation, in agreement with d'Ollone's own statement, can be made.
This is not the place for exhibiting the evidence in detail; but it shows that practically the whole vocabulary in these cases can be identified in the Tibetan dictionaries. Moreover, there are some specially Tibetan pronunciations, compound words, and occasional instances of purely Tibetan formatives. Matters of grammar and syntax scarcely appear in the vocabularies; but probably in this respect also there are few appreciable differences—thus ‘Tangut’ yut (Sung-p’an yu), ‘is’, rit, ‘yes’, mit, ‘no’, are Tibetan yod, ‘is’, red, ‘is so’, med, ‘is not so’, while, on the other hand, a ta, ‘is’, perhaps widely traceable in the vocabularies, must be sought in eastern Tibetan (Jyadé, ap. Rockhill, Diary, p. 270; cf. infra, p. 187).

Rockhill, however, goes much further, when he declares that ‘The “Sung-p’an Si-fan”, given in Lacouperie’s “Languages of China before the Chinese”, p. 97, is very good Tibetan very badly transcribed. The same may be said of nine-tenths of the words in the so-called Meniak vocabularies of Lacouperie, Hodgson and Baber and of Francis Garnier’s Mosso phrase, Voy. d’Expl. en Indo-Chine, I, p. 520, where Khe iché ma seu is only Kā-cha ma she, a common Tibetan expression for “I don’t understand”’ and (p. 361)

‘However this may be, the Mányak’a from the Chan-tui, like the people of Bat’ang, Ta-chien-lu, Kanzé, and Jyékundo, speak Tibetan; and the educated ones among them endeavour to pronounce as much like the Lh’asa people as they possibly can.’

This statement, which practically abolishes the Hsi-fan languages, ignores, as we shall see, important differences both of vocabulary and of phonology and morphology. Moreover, references to ‘bad transcription’ and imitation by the educated of Lha-sa pronunciation overlook an important fact. The words in the vocabularies are not transcribed, the dialects being never written, but recorded by the travellers, missionaries, and others from oral communication. They testify to phonetical developments on a large scale, which serve to establish the dialects as a group, not hitherto recognized, and represent a stage in Tibetan phonetics and processes which have operated extensively over the adjacent non-Tibetan languages. Rockhill himself, in his Peculiarities of the Amdoan Pronunciation (pp. 362–7), has given instances to which some of them apply, and in his Tibetan Syllabary with pronunciation

---

1 Land of the Lamas, p. 54, n. 1.
2 i.e. skad-cha-ma-ses.
3 = Nag-ron.
of Lh’asa, Bat’ang, and the Tsarong some of the developments can be seen stated as generalities.

The most important of these developments may be specified as follows:

1. The consonantal Prefixes of old Tibetan, namely
g, d, b, m, h, r, l, s
which in Lha-sa pronunciation have disappeared, though in some cases leaving effects, survive, excepting d, in the eastern Tibetan dialect of Khams, partly in modified forms. The ‘Tangut’ and Amdoan dialect, possibly derived from Khams, retains in general

g (in the forms k, kh (a spirant ?)), b (as p), m (sometimes), r, while h- is usually represented, as in Khams, by a nasal, and d, l, and s by the much favoured r.

In the other dialects here considered there is very general agreement with Lha-sa; but h- sometimes survives, in the form of a nasal. Such survival of h- as a nasal is a notable phenomenon, since it is exemplified also in ‘Hsi-fan’ languages, and, moreover, beyond, in the sphere of Mo-so, Lo-lo, &c.

2. The Lha-sa and central Tibetan, also Khams, pronunciation of

\[ \text{kr-, khr-, gr-} \] as \[ \text{tr-(t-), thr-(th-), dr-(d-)} \]
is not found in any of the dialects: instead of the dental they present a palatal (very possibly an earlier stage of the dental), which also appears in place of original dentals preceded by r, so that we find

\[ \text{kr-, khr-, gr-} \]
\[ \text{tr-, thr-, dr-, sr-} \] as \[ \text{cr-, chr-, jr-, sr-} \]
\[ \text{pr-, phr-, br-} \]
and in some dialects the r has then disappeared. These changes also were widespread in the non-Tibetan border languages. They perhaps indicate that originally the r itself was palatal.

3. In the combinations

\[ \text{ky-, khy-, gy-} \], where normally the Tibetan does not palatalize,\(^1\)

and

\[ \text{py-, phy-, by-} \], where ordinary Tibetan pronounces c-, ch-, j-
the dialects changed the guttural or labial to a palatal, giving cy-

\(^1\) But for Lha-sa Rockhill’s Syllabary, contrary to other authorities, affirms a palatalization. Rockhill is following E. Tibetan.
ch-y-, jy-, and the y was usually vocalized, so that the outcome was ci-, chi-, ji-, which might then undergo further changes, the palatal becoming guttural or dental. In Amdo there are also instances of rgy- > ry-.

4. After original palatal consonants and before the following vowel there was insertion of y, vocalized to i; and the consonant, having thus extruded its palatal element, often became guttural or dental. This change, like No. 3, is in accordance with Rockhill's syllabary for Ba-t'ang and the Tsa-rong. It must have been relatively late in some quarters, since it sometimes affects palatales originated under No. 2.

5. The combination my-, in ordinary Tibetan pronounced ny- (sometimes ŋ- or even ŋy-), appears in the dialects as mny-, mni-, ni-, sometimes eventuating in n-. This change, likewise a palatalization, since the stages will have been my-, mñy-, mny-, mni-may be partly fortuitous; for my- occurs rarely, except in the ancient alternative pronunciation of m, before i and e, as my-, e.g. in myig = mig, 'eye', mye = me, 'fire'. Examples are found sporadically, more in 'Hsi-fan' and the border languages than in Tibetan; but 'Tangut' has mni, 'man', and nik, 'eye'.

6. Of the final consonants of the old Tibetan, viz.

- g, gs, ŋ, ŋs, d, n, b, bs, m, ms, h, r, l, s
- the Lha-sa pronunciation suppresses d, l, s (the last-named after vowels and after consonants), modifying the preceding vowel in the case of d, l, and s, and also of n, which survives. Intact are - ŋ, - b (except for change to - p), - m (the most permanent of the finals), - r, while - h can to a certain extent be observed, and g is partly lost (though locally surviving), partly retained as a 'checked' consonant or as - k in certain combinations. A distinction between suppressed - g and suppressed - gs is observed. According to all indications the vowel modifications here mentioned preceded the loss of the consonant: they perhaps synchronized in origin with the change of final g, d, b, to k, t, p, which prevailed over the whole area.

'Tangut' retains all the finals, except - s after vowels and consonants (but it has even a trace of - gs, as - rk) and l, the mediae g, d, b becoming tenues. There is some evidence of vowel modification before - g (u > o), - ŋ (a > e, a > i, a > u, i > a, o > u), - d (a > e, e > i, o > u), - n (e > i), - r (u > i, u > a).
In the other dialects the weakness shown in the Lha-sa pronunciation is equalled in all points (one casual occurrence of -l appears), and in certain respects it is carried much farther. Particulars may be noted as follows:

(a) -g is nearly always lost even in the cases where in Lha-sa Tibetan it is maintained: -b likewise is practically always missing (see pp. 84 (Draya), 107).

(b) -n is mostly, -n frequently, and -m nearly always (as -m, -n, or -n) retained. Before -n the vowels a and u become o; before -n, a, u, and o are modified; before -m, a is usually, but not always, retained, while u becomes o.

(c) -r is sometimes lost, in which case a preceding a is sometimes retained, but sometimes appears as e or ò, which are also normal when the -r is retained. Before -l (lost) there is usually modification of the vowel.

7. As regards vowels it may be said that final a, e, and o are fairly well maintained, while i and u tend to become e and o or, especially when following a palatal or r, ò: wa in place of final o seems characteristic of Yün-nan dialects. Of internal vowels the most noticeable changes, in addition to those cited under No. 6, are those resulting from the combinations ia, ii, &c., due to the developments described under Nos. 3, 4, 5.

Of the so stated processes, whereby we can, it may be said, explain the phonetical aspect of the bulk of the words contained in the vocabularies, the most sweeping in their effects have been the palatalizations. It cannot be mere coincidence that similar processes are widely traceable also in the non-Tibetan border languages. Of the dialects in question the oldest and least transformed is the 'Tangut'-Amdoan, clearly related to its nearest neighbour, the speech of Khams: the others are more on the level of the central Tibetan. In virtue of the palatalizations all together constitute a group.

The group cannot be designated 'Eastern Tibetan'; for that title is already appropriated to the dialect of Khams, and elsewhere also in eastern Tibet proper there may be local varieties which might reasonably share it. From Amdo to Yün-nan the members of the group are all geographically situated in territory not originally Tibetan: as has been stated, and as all indications confirm, Tibet proper did not originally, and for the most part does not now, extend north or east of the Hibri-chu, and even Tse-kou, which is between the latter and the upper Me-kong, was
not originally Tibetan. Hence the dialects may reasonably be regarded as due to expansions and settlements, which as concerns Sung-p'ān and Yün-nan Tibetan must obviously be the case. Accordingly they may be designated 'Colonial Tibetan'; and, since in the west the dialects of the Ladak regions are likewise, no doubt, colonial, they may be distinguished as 'Eastern Colonial Tibetan'.

_Hsi-fan languages proper and Ch'iang: spellings, place-names, Tibetan admixtures_

In considering the remaining dialects we meet with two difficulties in addition to the paucity of the material contained in the vocabularies. The first difficulty is in making sure that the words recorded are actually current in the dialects. Inquiries concerning the local languages had usually to be made through intermediaries, who would ordinarily be either Tibetans or Chinese, of the locality or from outside. The Tibetan and Chinese languages being everywhere, to a greater or lesser extent, in use, and Tibetan being for the most part the language of education, writing, and literature, an interrogation might elicit not a native, but a Tibetan or Chinese term, especially if belonging to the currency of travel or some other sub-species of lingua franca or if no native equivalent existed. Fortunately most of the vocabularies were compiled by competent investigators with clear linguistic purpose; in some cases, indeed, they were supplied by missionaries familiar with the dialects. The minor embarrassment due to the fact that different systems of spelling have been used—Hodgson, for instance, having his own (carefully explained, pp. 150–1) method, Baber, Sir Reginald Johnston, and Major Davies following a usage in transcription of Chinese, von Rosthorn and Dr. Wolfenden employing the Standard Alphabet of Lepsius, the Vicomte d'Ollone's vocabularies having popular (and, as he states (pp. 4–5), not everywhere uniform) French spelling, M. Monbeig having an exact but partly independent method—may be treated on the following lines:

(a) All the spellings may for comparative purposes be accommodated to a common standard, which cannot, however, be that of a 'phonetic alphabet', the material, as supplied, not having an accuracy of that order.

(b) The dialects being all akin to Tibetan and any native writing of them being in Tibetan script, the words may be spelled with
consonants as if transliterated from Tibetan, i.e. with the letters and values employed in the usual transliteration of Tibetan words: by this means the attainable degree of exactness may be secured.

Thus aspiration may be represented by \( h \) (\( kh, ph, \) &c., not \( k', p', \) &c.); English \( ch \) and \( tch \) (with French \( tch \), German \( tsch, \) &c.) by \( c \); English \( j \) (with French \( dj \), German \( dsch, \) &c.) by \( j \); English \( dj \) is usually retained; English \( sh \) (with French \( ch, \) German \( sch, \) &c.) by \( s \) (except in any case where there may be ground for distinction of \( s \) from \( sh \)); French \( gu \) and \( j \) by \( g \) and \( z \); and so forth. The guttural and palatal nasals (\( n, \tilde{n}, \) the latter also in place of French \( gn^2 \)) and the remaining signs will cause no difficulty: between bilabial and labio-dental values of \( v \) and \( w \) distinction is impracticable.

(c) As regards vowels, the normal Tibetan values (with \( a \) as in Sanskrit) may be supplemented by \( \ddot{a}, \dddot{i}, \dot{o}, \) and by combinations \( ia, ie, \) &c., where these occur: thus French \( eu \) becomes \( \ddot{o}, \) and Baber's Menia \( u \) becomes \( a. \)

(d) Long vowels where recorded may be represented as \( \ddot{a}, \) &c. (also for Hodgson's \( \dot{a}, \) &c.), and hyphens inserted in disyllables, &c.

(e) With a view to compendiousness of citation the variant forms of the names of languages are retained with the spellings presented by the authors of the several vocabularies, except that \( \ddot{a}, \) &c., are substituted, as in (d), for original \( \dot{a}, \ddot{a}, \) &c., which in some cases are of not quite certain signification. Thus, whereas in the present work \( T'ao-chou, \) Hor-\( pa, \) Rgyal-\( ron, \) Mi-\( \ddot{n}ag, \) Mi-\( \ddot{l}i, \) &c., are adopted as correct forms of the names of the respective countries, &c., Hodgson's Thöchü, Hörpa, Gyarüng, Mānyak, &c., are used in citing words from his vocabularies, as an implicit reference to his article: similarly Rgya-\( ron \) refers to the Rgyal-\( ron \) vocabularies of von Rosthorn, and Jyä-\( ruñ \) to the article of Dr. Wolfenden (both relating to dialects different, at least in part, from Hodgson's Gyärung); also Menia indicates the Mi-\( \ddot{n}ag \) vocabulary of Baber, and Mu-\( nia \) that of Major Davies;

1 This does not apply to Chinese words.

2 Hodgson's initial \( gn, \) which is not explained, is retained, because in one case at least (\( chü-n̄gyō, \) 'fish') he uses \( ng \) for the initial, no less than for the final \( n. \) Nevertheless it seems likely that \( n \) is intended. Hodgson's \( ny, sy, \) and \( zy \) are replaced by \( n̄, s̄, z̄, \) in accordance with his explanations. His italic \( h \), indicating an abrupt tone, is neglected. In Thöchü and Hörpa words \( h, kh, gh \) are stated to have 'a harsh Arabic' (sc. spirantic) utterance; they are retained unaltered: in Prejevalsky's 'Tangut' the initial \( kh \) before consonants may have been similar.
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*Muli*(Njong) and *Pa-U-Rong*, so spelled, refer to Sir Reginald Johnston's vocabularies, and *Prü-mi* to that of Major Davies; *Loutse* indicates the vocabulary of Desgodins, *Loutse 24 and 26* those of Prince Henri d'Orléans, *Lu-tzü* that of Major Davies, * Mélam* a short list published by Desgodins, all four relating to dialects of the Tsa-roń. The vocabularies published by the Vicomte d'Ollone are conveniently cited by the numbers, 35 &c., assigned by him to them severally, whereof one, No. 36, *Tse-kou*, the Tzü-ku of Major Davies, is identical with that published for its author, M. Monbeig, in a stricter orthography, and also relates to the same dialect as does the No. 25 of Prince Henri d'Orléans.

A special case of the above stated difficulty is the spelling of place-names, of which all writers, and not only travellers, even when they know and actually mention the local forms, are apt to use a form extraneously or generally or otherwise current. The confusion wrought in Tibetan cartography by this cause has been noted by Rockhill (pp. 94–5, n.) and others. Its linguistic importance in the present connexion may be exemplified by the matter, in itself apposite, of Hodgson's 'eighteen chiefs or banners of Gyärūng', enumerated and discussed by Baber (pp. 93–6) as 'the eighteen Sifan tribes' and by Rockhill (pp. 344–6) as 'The Eighteen Tribes of the Nya-ron'. Baber's list was obtained in the Ta-chien-lu region: and with the aid of a Chinese map he located nearly all the tribes in his sketch-map. Rockhill's two, partly divergent, lists were supplied, one by the Secretary of the Cha-la (Cag-la, Ta-chien-lu state) chieftain, the other by a Lama resident during some years in Ta-chien-lu: both were, no doubt, in Tibetan script, which Rockhill has transliterated according to his system, adding in the former case the Lha-sa pronunciation and in the latter the items of Baber's list, which largely agrees with that of the Lama. To Rockhill we owe, further (pp. 347 sqq.), a Chinese administrative list of the 'Thirty-three Yü-t'ung Hsi-fan tribes', with geographical distribution, &c., including the eighteen: this, however, may here be disregarded.

The three lists do not exactly represent the 'eighteen chiefs or banners of the Gyärūng' (Rgyal-roń): they diverge by omissions, compensated by inclusion of the Hor-pa states and some others. To Rockhill, who, however, correctly locates many of the states in the country of the Chin-ch'uan ('Gold River', Rgyal-roń), the lists were given as applying to the Nya(Ñag)-roń, i.e. the Ya-lung river country. This error is not shared by the two missionary
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writers, Messrs. Edgar and Fergusson, who cite, with Chinese spellings for the most part, many of the 'Chia Rung' (Rgyal-ron) states, nor by von Rosthorn, who cites, likewise with Chinese spellings, many of the names. But it is shared by the military report and gazetteer work, in Manchu language, translated and annotated by Dr. Haenisch in volume ix (pp. 69 sqq.) of Sir Swen Hedin's *Southern Tibet*, where again a list and map are given. In Dr. Tafel's *Meine Tibetreise* (esp. ii, p. 224, nn. 1, 3) many of the states are named, partly with note, or use, of local pronunciations: a few also in Dr. Stötzner's *Ins unerforschte Tibet*.

But far more authentic and linguistically instructive is a list given by the author of the *Geografia Tibeta* (p. 46), whose people had during many centuries had intimate knowledge of the country and had constantly, no doubt, had occasion to write the names. The spellings are likely to have been traditional, and they may antedate all other available mentions of the names. Transliterating the latter in the author's order, together with the names of the Hor-pa and other states as recorded by him, and adding in parallel columns the corresponding items in (1) Rockhill's three versions, (2) Baber's list, (3) Dr. Tafel's narrative, we obtain a table as given on p. 83.

We need not consider the material discrepancies, due perhaps to lapse or absorption of some of the states;¹ but much linguistic instruction may be derived from the lists. That of the *Geografia Tibeta* preserves, no doubt, except perhaps in *Pa-sti* and the first vowel of Nos. 1 (*Lcog-* for *Lcag-* ) and 6 (*Lceg-* for *Lcog-* ), the correct spellings of the names. Rockhill's representation of the Lha-sa pronunciation diverges from orthodoxy in the second syllable of *Tro-jyab*, where general authority would demand *-kyap*: Rockhill has perhaps lapsed into 'that form of this official language spoken in eastern Tibet' (p. 263). The Lama is similarly influenced in regard to *-jyab* and to *Jya-* in his *Jya-kha*: also his vocalism (*Tru-* for *Tro-* , *-tse*, *-je*, for *-tsi*, *-zi*; *Me-* for *Smi-*; *Koń-ser* for *Khan-gsar*); *Leu-rgo* for *Lo-dgu*, and the *r*-Prefix (for *d*) in the last-named, are characteristic of E. Colonial Tibetan; the *e* of *-ten* and *Tsen-* is common to the latter and Lha-sa. Baber's spelling, based on oral communication, has further features of the E. Colonial, namely, (1) palatalization of consonant before *r* in *Chro-* , *Cra-* , *Djum-* , *Cran-go-* , *Dje-go,* (2) insertion of *i* after a palatal in *Djiu,*

¹ The *Geografia* remarks that 'but at present there are not more than thirteen'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geografia Tibetae</th>
<th>Rockhill I</th>
<th>Lha-sa pronunciation</th>
<th>Rockhill II</th>
<th>Baber</th>
<th>Dr. Tafel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. The Eighteen States of the Rgyal-roni</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lcag-la</td>
<td>Lcags-la (2)</td>
<td>Cag-la</td>
<td>Ja-la (15)</td>
<td>Djia-la (1)</td>
<td>Jag-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lba-si</td>
<td>Khro-skyab (3)</td>
<td>Tro-jyab</td>
<td>Tru-jyab (9)</td>
<td>Chro-siop (10)</td>
<td>Co-skiab (Kreciu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. So-mo</td>
<td>Po(So)-mo (13)</td>
<td>Po(So)-mo</td>
<td>Sa-ma (6)</td>
<td>So-muñ (7)</td>
<td>So-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Brdzun-ḥgag</td>
<td>ṉiḥ-ḥgag (15)</td>
<td>ṉiḥ-ga</td>
<td>Zun-ga (8)</td>
<td>Zur-ga (9)</td>
<td>Žuñ-kak or Ruñ-kañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lo-gtse</td>
<td>Lo-gtse (14)</td>
<td>Co-tse (7)</td>
<td>Djiu-tse(tzü) or Ciutse (8)</td>
<td>Cok-tsi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dam-ba</td>
<td>Hgo-ži (12)</td>
<td>Go-ži</td>
<td>Wo-je (3)</td>
<td>Wo-je or Go-je (4)</td>
<td>Wok-je (or o ṣe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pa-sti</td>
<td>Lo-dgu &amp; Ba-bam</td>
<td>Pa-ti Pa-wan (10)</td>
<td>Pa-wanorPa-un (12)</td>
<td>Ba-wan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ho-gzi</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ma-zi</td>
<td>Ma-zur (8)</td>
<td>Ma-zur</td>
<td>Ma-zer (18)</td>
<td>Ma-žu or Ma-že (14)</td>
<td>Ma-zar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Be-rim</td>
<td>Hbe-rim (10)</td>
<td>Be-rim</td>
<td>Pe-re (16)</td>
<td>Be-ri, Be-rin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Tre-o</td>
<td>Gri-hṭu (11)</td>
<td>Dri-tu</td>
<td>Dje-gu (or go)</td>
<td>Cu-wo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. The Five Hor-pa States (Hor-sde-kha-la or Ḥor-khog)**

| Khan-gsar | Khan-gsar (7) | Kaṅ-sar | Kon-ser (17) | Khun-ser (15) | Kuñ-sar (or o ser) |
| Ma-zi | Ma-zur (8) | Ma-zur | Ma-zer (18) | Ma-žu or Ma-že (14) | Ma-zar |
| Brag-mgo | Brag-mon (9) | Dra-mon | Crang-o (17) | Caṅ-gu |
| Be-rim | Hbe-rim (10) | Be-rim | Pe-re (16) | Be-ri, Be-rin |
| Tre-o | Gri-hṭu (11) | Dri-tu | Dje-gu (or go) | Cu-wo |

**III.**

| Hbah | Hbah (4) | Ba(Ba-thañ) | ... | ... | Ba-tañ |
| Li-thañ | Li-thañ (5) | Li-thañ | ... | ... | Li-tañ |
| Sde-dge | Sder-ṭi (6) | Der-ga | ... | ... | Der-gi |
| Mi-ḥi | Smi-li (16) | Mi-li | Me-li (14) | Me-li | De-ge or Der-ge |
| ... | ... | ... | Jye-dam (16) | Dje-dam | ... |
Ge-šie, (3) vocalization of post-consonantal y in -šiop, Djia-, Djie.- But Dr. Tafel, where he is not (in Ba-di, Ba-ti) recording a non-local form, affords clear evidence of (1) local survival of initial group khr- (Kreciu), br- (Bra-sdi), (2) final guttural (Jag-, -kak, Cok-, Wok-), m (Dami-, -wañ), n (Zuñ-, -dan, Tsan-), (3) non-insertion of i after palatal (Jag-, Cok-, Rge-ši-), (4) palatalization of guttural before y (Kretschiu), (5) loss of -n (Bra-sdi). Thus we have in the lists first-hand evidence of phonetical divergence between Lha-sa Tibetan, E. Colonial Tibetan, and local Hsi-fan. The survival of -b (Lha-sa -p) in E. Colonial -jyab (-šiop) can be observed also at Tse-kou (tson-diob, 'thunder', tsa-diob, 'root', jre-tob, 'sow rice' (hdab)); but it was not everywhere so, as we see from the official title, ku-tsha (= sku-tshab, Rockhill, p. 220, n. 1), in Der-ge and the Hor-pa country: the place Draya is Brag-gyab.

In No. 18, the Muping of Rockhill, Tafel, and others may be connected with the Sbrin-pa of Rockhill's first list: in the latter the phrase Nañ-chen-pa is possibly a pure error, being a Tibetan attempt to render the Chinese name (Ming-cheng) of the Ta-chien-lu state (No. 1): or was it intended as a claim to suzerainty over Muping (No. 18)? Rockhill I, Niñ-hgag, seems to be an error, being, according to von Rosthorn, the chief place in the Pati state.

From the mainly Chinese spellings used or noted by von Rosthorn (R) and Messrs. Edgar (E) and Fergusson (F) and from the Manchu spellings in Dr. Haenisch's work (H) but little can be gleaned. But, since these last go back at least to the times of the wars of A.D. 1746-75, they may be recorded in a note with initials as here indicated and with insertion of two spellings given by Captain Gill. The final b of Khro-skyab (No. 3) is preserved in the Chinese Chossfichiapu and Manchu Cosgiyab; the final g/ñ of

1 Tib. gnañ (or nañ?)-chen?
2 1. Chala (F), Ming-jeng (H) (Chinese Ming-cheng-ssü of Rockhill, Ming-tseng of Dr. Tafel); 2. Wassu (REF), Wasi (H); 3. Chossüchiapu (R), Chos Chia (E), Choesschia (F), Cosgiyab (H); (4) Somo (REFH), Su-mu (Gill); 5. Sungkang (R), Rtsung Kang (E), Rungkang (F), Sunggak and Zunggak (H), Ru-kan or Ju-kan (Gill); 6. Chok‘ochi (R), Choga Chi (E), Drukagi (F), Jokžai (H); 7. Tangpe (R), Damba (EFH); 8. Wojih (R), Okši (H, with note of Hog-żi in a Tibetan inscription and of modern pronunciation Wok-shi and Wo-ži); 9. —; 10. Pati (R), Badi (E), Bati (F), Burakdi (H); 11. Pawang (R), Bawang (EFH); 12. Keshetsa (R), Gaischchia (F), Gebbiza (H), Dr. Stötzner Gossettscha; 13-15. —; 16. Zanla (H); 17. Gigalung (H); 18. Muping (R), Muping (FH).

Dr. Haenisch's No. 1 Cucui is perhaps the town Su-ching (north of No. 10): he groups together under one head Nos. 4-6 and includes (as Kungsa and Mašu) two of the Hor-pa states and, further, the Yüko nomads.
**INTRODUCTION: GENERAL**

*Brdzun-hgag* in all; the initial Br. of *Brag-stiṅ* in Manchu *Burakdi* (= Dr. Tafel’s *Brasdi*). Mr. Fergusson’s variant, *Drukagi*, of *Lcog-rtse*, conceals, perhaps, some old local name: see his map.

The inclusion in the lists supplied to Rockhill and Baber of the Hor-pa states and some others may be due to the fact that the number ‘18’ was traditional, while in course of time some of the original constituents had lapsed or been absorbed, so that even the original designation ‘the 18 states of the Rgyal-ron’ had ceased to be understood and had been altered into the form reported by Rockhill, inconsistent and inappropriate though it is. This could not have occurred but for a feeling that all the states mentioned belonged somehow together, which is intelligible if all had been included in the old non-Tibetan ‘Women’s Kingdom’. The inclusion of Der-ge (Sde-dge), north of the Hor-pa states, has followed suit, perhaps with equally good reason. For the further inclusion of Smi-li (Mi-li) in Rockhill’s two lists and of Jye-dam (Chung-tien, Baber Tcia-tam), to the south of Mi-li, in that of the Lama, not the same reason could be alleged, since that state appertained perhaps to the old Mi-ñag country; but some excuse may be seen in the fact, recognized by the *Geografia Tibeta*, p. 46, and also linguistically apparent, that the Mi-li people, like the Mi-ñag, were ‘not real Tibetans’. The name-forms are significant in the same way as those of the Rgyal-ron: E. Colonial consonants in Crango, Cangu (Lha-sa Dra-)¹ and Dje-go (Lha-sa Dri-), vocalization of y in Djie-dam, and altered vowels, -aṅ > -oṅ, -uṅ, in Koṅ-ser, Khuṅ-sar, -i > -e in Ma-ze, Pe-re, Me-li. The g in *Dje-go = Tre-o* is reminiscent of the Khams pronunciation of *spreku*, &c., as *stre-gho* &c. Of Brag-mgo we have in Hodgson’s Tāngo, whence came the Hor-pa man whose dialect he has recorded, and in the *Dango* of the traveller Pandit A-K (Report, §§ 157–8) two further variants, representing a Lha-sa or central Tibetan, not local native, pronunciation.

But we have still to take account of the second difficulty, which consists in the presence of loan-words from Tibetan in the several dialects. It may be illustrated by the six lines of a song quoted by Dr. Tafel (ii, pp. 232–3). The song, which Dr. Tafel says is half in High Tibetan, half in Chin-ch’uan (Rgyal-ron) language, is given, with (approximate) translation as follows:

¹ Dr. Stötzer gives (p. 268) Kianggu, and for Ma-zi/Ma-zur ‘Matse (Mazzar)’, with loss of -r, as noted supra, p. 78.
rdyalsa (= rgyalsa) powrang Leui re
bdyardyal tshung dyen newsa ba
sgo di sgo tsa ne gui re
naschdien sdang mu nesgo dsche (= kri)
tschü sgor gari tachin tsen re
dschra sgor gari yalwa go.

'Firm stands the castle in L(e)u. Tigers from the darkest woods
lie as watch-dogs behind the great and behind the little gate,¹ and
all round, all round wind the mountain streams. As defence screen
rise all round the steepest crags.'

Here, Dr. Tafel informs us, yalwa is Tibetan yolwa, 'curtain',
'screen', and di = Tib. chen, 'great', tsa = 'small', dschra =
Tib. brag, 'precipice'. But, writing the lines as if transliterated
from Tibetan,

rgyal-sa-pho-brañ-Leñuñi-re
sgo-di-sgo-tsa-na(?)-khyi-re
nags-rgyañ(?)-stag-mo-ni-sgo(skyoñ ?)-byed
chu-sgor-ga-ri-rgyal-mtshan²-re
brag-sgor-ga-ri-yal-ba-go

we see that rgyal-sa, 'royal residence', pho-brañ, 'palace', sgo,
'gate', re, 'is', nags, 'forest', rgyañ, 'extensive', stag-mo, 'tigress',
sgo-byed(or skyoñ -), 'make a door (or guard)', chu, 'water', 'river',
sgor, 'at the gate', ri, 'mountain', rgyal-mtshan, 'banner', are
likewise Tibetan. The lack of a translation prevents an inter-
pretation of line 2. It is indeed evident that di, 'great', tsa,
'small', gui, 'dog', are related to Gyärung ka-hti (Rgya-ron
ko-ktie) 'great', Gyärung ka-hchai (Rgya-ron ko-ktie), 'small',
Gyärung khi (Rgya-ron khi), 'dog'; but these are only pro-
nunciations of the corresponding Tibetan words, chen (gcen),
chuñ (cùñ, gcùñ), and khyi, which in similar forms can be found in
neighbouring languages; they may indeed be genuine native
derivatives of the original words; but tchra for brag, which is
certainly not such, but is an Eastern Colonial pronunciation, casts
upon these also a suspicion of Tibetan origin, more especially as
they lack (perhaps excusably in poetry) the syllabic prefixes
characteristic of the Rgyal-ron. Possibly the only really local
form in the song is ga-ri, 'mountain' (Tib. ri), which has the
Prefix: and even the ri may be merely Tibetan, since for 'mountain'
we have a really native word, Gyärung ta-vet, Rgya-ron ta-wa.

¹ Not an imaginary trait: for an actual parallel see Fergusson, p. 194.
² Lha-sa pronunciation gyen-tshen.
These facts, according with the above quoted statement of Mr. Fergusson and partly with that of Rockhill, suggest that in the Rgyal-ron vocabularies there may be a large percentage of Tibetan loan-words, of different periods, accumulated during the many centuries of intimacy. The numeral system has been penetrated, and in one dialect (von Rosthorn's Hanniu), which behaves, as Conrady has remarked, like a Tibetan dialect, even the specially Tibetan bdun has been adopted (as dae = Yün-nan dai). Thus the Rgyal-ron dialects may in some points have, as Dr. Wolfenden suggested, a spurious appearance of antiquity: instances have been noted by Dr. Wolfenden where a Tibetan consonantal Prefix has through the insertion of a vowel acquired the semblance of a syllabic Prefix: a rather certain instance is Jyā-ruñ ki-tiak, '1', which is Tibetan gcig, with insertion of i after g and tiak < ciak < ciig, with E. Colonial Tibetan insertion of i after the palatal c in accordance with No. 4 supra (p. 77).

In Hodgson's vocabularies there is, as Rockhill states, not a little that may have been taken, early or late, from Tibetan; and in dealing with the phonetical and etymological history of the dialects we risk treating, as it were, Latin derivatives in English as basis for etymological comparison of the two languages. It is, for instance, not unlikely that—

Thöchü khak, Gyärung kūc-cēk, Mānyak da-kha, = Tib. khag, 'bitter';
Thöchü rkui, Hörpa ka-msyür, Gyärung kū-mchūr, Jyā-ruñ ke-msār, 'handsome' = Tib. khyur, 'entire';
Hörpa sgū-sgo, Gyärung kūc-cūr, Mānyak da-cū = Tib. skyur, 'sour';
Thöchü jäm = Tib. jham, 'sweet';
Gyärung ka-mnār, 'sweet' = Tib. mnār.

were originally obtained by borrowing. This large matter must, however, be reserved for treatment on an adequate scale.

1 For further references to comprehension or use of Tibetan speech in outside areas see Baber, p. 82; Johnston, pp. 222, 267-8; Tafel, ii, p. 230.
2 P. 531, following von Rosthorn's article.
3 JRAS, 1928, pp. 897-8, Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology, p. 141.
4 Borrowings from Chinese have been noted in the Rgyal-ron dialects by von Rosthorn and Wolfenden, and it seems that we may perhaps add the Gyärung words chidi, 'this', hadi, 'that', chidu, 'here', hadu, 'there', with Thöchü cho, 'here', hāto, 'there'; possibly also some interrogatives with ha- in Mānyak and Menia.
But it will not take long to discover in the dialects features which, being nowhere traceable in Tibetan, afford proof of independence and, in so far as they are common, serve to establish a group. The most obvious of these are—

(a) In the numerical system: the use of forms which may be generalized as a, snis/snis, ka/ga, for the numerals ‘1’, ‘7’, ‘10’, where Tibetan has everywhere gcig, bdun, and bcu, or their descendants. For ‘1’ a form ta/ti also is widespread. For ‘10’ and ‘100’ it is usual to say ‘one 10’, ‘one 100’: this idiom, unknown in Tibetan, is possibly of Chinese origin.

(b) Among pronouns: for ‘thou’, ‘you’, forms with a dental nasal, na, &c., are employed, while Tibetan has khyod, khyed, and derivatives therefrom; for ‘he’, ‘that’ we find tha, but in Tibetan kho, khoṅ, khoṅ-ta, de; there is also evidence for an interrogative tha (in Mānyak also a tha, ‘not’) and for a pa, ‘this’.

(c) As regards syllabic Prefixes: some of these, as in living use in the Rgyal-ron, but also observable in the other three dialects, were noted and discussed by Hodgson; subsequently, with wide references to similarities and analogies in other branches of Tibeto-Burman speech, the matter has been treated by Conrady,1 Wolfenden (Outlines . . . , passim), and others.

(d) In the general vocabulary: there are notable words, prom, ‘white’, mo, mon, ‘sky’, ‘sun’, na, ‘good’, not found in Tibetan; less essential are the words for ‘iron’, generalizable as sorm or somr (Mongol temur, Turkish timir), though absent from Tibetan, which has a lcags unevidenced in the four dialects. Attention would bring to light other non-Tibetan terms (e.g. tsha, ‘goat’, for Tib. ra) and preferences among terms which in Tibetan are synonyms.

On applying to all the dialects not already dismissed as Eastern Colonial Tibetan the criteria represented by the above particulars we obtain a result which may be exhibited in a table, the dialects being (in geographical arrangement, mainly from north to south):

(a) Amdo and Go-lok dialects: Thōchū (Hodgson), Dzorgai and Kortsè (d’Ollone, Nos. 41, 42), with d’Ollone No. 39 (region

1 Eine indo-chinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung, pp. 35 sqq.
of Sung-p'an) and the 'Outer Man-Tzü' of Gill (numerals and a few other words recorded by Terrien de Lacouperie, *Languages of China before the Chinese*, §§ 176–7).¹

(b) Hörpa (Hodgson).

(c) Rgyal-roṅ dialects: Gyārūṅ (Hodgson), Rgya-roṅ (von Rosthorn, 4 dialects, Wassū with Mup'ing and Wojih, Pati (a few words), Pawang (3 words), Hanniu (a few words)), Jyā-ruṅ (Wolfenden), Dge-śi-tsha.²

(d) Mi-ţiag country: Manyak (Hodgson), Menia (Baber), Mu-nia (Davies), with d'Ollone, No. 38 (region of Ya-chou).

(e) Pa-U-Rong Hsi-fan (Johnston).

(f) Mi-li State: Muli(Njong) (Johnston), Prü-mi (Davies).

(g) Tsa-roṅ (upper Salween river north of latitude 28°): Mélam

¹ Gill's 'Li-fan Man-Tzü' (§ 174) has E. Colonial Tibetan numerals: the 10 other words show some non-Tibetan admixture.

² By this term is indicated the dialect of the numerals recorded, along with a few other words, by Dr. Haenisch, op. cit., p. 71, where the dialect is not named. The designation may be justified on the ground that the dialect is evidently the one so named by Dr. Laufer, op. cit., p. 26, whose materials for 'Jykrun' and 'Gešits'a' were based, as he mentions (p. 10), upon his own 'collectanea made in the field'. Except a few words cited on pp. 14–15, 28–9, 36–7, of the article here referred to, those materials were perhaps never published; but evidently the dialect belongs to the Dge-śi-tsha state, whose name Laufer applied to it.

It is not obvious why Dr. Laufer affirms (p. 26) that Hodgson's 'Hörpa' is the Gešits'a, 'a peculiar Tibetan dialect spoken in the territory stretching from Dawo to Kanze in the north-western part of Sze-ch'uan'. The region so defined is, in fact, the Hor-pa country (see supra, p. 15 and n. 5); and the man minutely examined and described by Hodgson (pp. 138–9) was 'a Hörpa of Tāngo, west of Gyārūṅ towards Amdo'; Tāngo is the Hor-pa state Dango/Chango/Tchrango = Brag-mgo mentioned supra (pp. 83, 85). The place was visited and described by Pandit A–K (see Report on the Explorations of Great Tibet and Mongolia . . . by J. B. N. Hennessey, Dehra Dun, 1884, p. 62 Đango), Rockhill (pp. 260), and Tafel (ii, pp. 190 sqq., Tschanggu): it is mentioned by Stötzner (p. 268, Kianggu), who visited Dawo, as had been done previously, from Dge-śi-tsha, by Fergusson (pp. 205 sqq.); it is between Dawo and Kanzé.

Dge-śi-tsha (capital Dam-tung, see view in Fergusson, p. 194), the most westerly of the Rgyal-roṅ states, is separated from Dawo and Chango by a high mountain range (see maps in von Rosthorn, p. 525, Fergusson, Tafel, ii, p. 224, with note 3, and Stötzner). Its dialect may therefore approximate to that of the Hor-pa states, and this seems to be the fact: Dr. Laufer had, no doubt, reason for thinking that Hodgson's 'Hörpa' vocabulary holds good for it; but it does not follow that it does not hold good primarily for the far more extensive and important Hor-pa country; in fact, we may rather regard the Dge-śi-tsha as a dialect of Hor-pa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Tibetan)</th>
<th>'1' (gecg)</th>
<th>'7' (bdun)</th>
<th>'10' (bcu)</th>
<th>'11' (bcu-gecg)</th>
<th>'20' (ni-śu)</th>
<th>'100' (brgya)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amdo and Go-lök</td>
<td>a(-ri)</td>
<td>sta(-rē)</td>
<td>ha-dū(-rē)</td>
<td>a-tō</td>
<td>ni-śo</td>
<td>a-kṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thöchü</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>śtīe</td>
<td>a-diō</td>
<td>ni-śo</td>
<td>a-kṣō</td>
<td>a-kṣō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (Dzorgai)</td>
<td>eū</td>
<td>śtū</td>
<td>a-dūī</td>
<td>ni-śo</td>
<td>e-cōh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (Kortse)</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>a-skīé</td>
<td>a-dūō</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>ā(r-gu)</td>
<td>śne(r-gu)</td>
<td>kha(dr-gu)</td>
<td>khā-tyi</td>
<td>na-skā</td>
<td>rhyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Outer Man-Tzū'</td>
<td>rā</td>
<td>zne</td>
<td>sgā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hör-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-роn</td>
<td>ka-tī</td>
<td>kū-śnēs</td>
<td>sih</td>
<td>kin-nis-si</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyurung</td>
<td>t-rki</td>
<td>ko-śnēs</td>
<td>stytie or štie</td>
<td>ko-ne-štutie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-роn</td>
<td>ko-tie</td>
<td>ko-šnē</td>
<td>ša (for štia)</td>
<td>ko-ne-štutie</td>
<td>paryē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-роn (Pati)</td>
<td>ci</td>
<td>dačē</td>
<td>pcō</td>
<td></td>
<td>pria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-роn (Hanniu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyā-ruṅ</td>
<td>kitiak</td>
<td>ke-šnēs</td>
<td>šcī(ścīo, ōā)</td>
<td>ke-ne-šcīa</td>
<td>pōryā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dge-si-tsha</td>
<td>zi</td>
<td>zniē</td>
<td>zra</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-ŋag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mānyak</td>
<td>tā(-bī)</td>
<td>skwi(-bī)</td>
<td>cē(&lt; ti)-ci(-bī)</td>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menia</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>šan</td>
<td>chi(&lt; ti)-chi (&lt; thsa)</td>
<td>thsa-ta</td>
<td>na-tsa</td>
<td>tā-jia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-nia</td>
<td>dji</td>
<td>šō</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>thsa-ta</td>
<td>na-tsa</td>
<td>tā-jia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>té(-pi)</td>
<td>gmn(šin ?)(-pi)</td>
<td>si-ti(-pi)</td>
<td>gne(š̂in ?)-šō</td>
<td>hın</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-U-Rong</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>dun</td>
<td>ka(-den)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-li</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>hūn, hnyi</td>
<td>ka(-te)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muli(Njong)</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>hni</td>
<td>a(-ten)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsea-ṛoṅ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mélam</td>
<td>kig</td>
<td>šēnī</td>
<td>ti-tset</td>
<td>a-ṇi-ṭsēl</td>
<td>ki-śiā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutse 24</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>šēnī</td>
<td>ti-tset</td>
<td>a-ṇi-ṭsēl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lut-tzu</td>
<td>kie</td>
<td>šēnīd</td>
<td>tšel</td>
<td>chia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ti-(ku)</td>
<td>šē(-ku)</td>
<td>ho-u(-ku)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ti-(ku)</td>
<td>śē(-ku)</td>
<td>ho-tiē(-ku)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>ti-(ku)</td>
<td>śē(-ku)</td>
<td>ho-tiē(-ku)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tibetan)</td>
<td>'Thou' (khyod)</td>
<td>'He', 'That' (kho, khoi-ta)</td>
<td>'White' (dkar)</td>
<td>'Sky' (gnam-mkha')</td>
<td>'Sun' (ni-ma)</td>
<td>'Wind' (rlun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amdo and Go-lok</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thöchü</td>
<td>[kwä, kwê]</td>
<td>[kwän-thä-ca]</td>
<td>phyokh</td>
<td>mahto</td>
<td>mûn</td>
<td>mozyû ('air')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (Dzorgai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conša</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>mönn</td>
<td>muhuso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (Kortse)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>con</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>mönn</td>
<td>muhodze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mo-ta</td>
<td>me-si, mo-sa</td>
<td>mo-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Outer Man-Tsü'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hör-pa</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>[vja, vja]</td>
<td>phrû-phrû</td>
<td>[koh]</td>
<td>[gna]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-roń</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyärung</td>
<td>[sän-rë]</td>
<td>[gnä-pos, wa-tû]</td>
<td>ka-prom</td>
<td>tû-môn</td>
<td>[ki-ni]</td>
<td>[ta-li]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-roń (Wassû)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ko-pröm</td>
<td>te-mû</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-roń (Pati)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-roń (Hanniu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyä-ruń</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dge-si-tsha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-ňag</td>
<td>nô</td>
<td>thi</td>
<td>[dal-lû]</td>
<td>mah</td>
<td>[ni-ma]</td>
<td>mërda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mányak</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>[da-lu]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ni-ma]</td>
<td></td>
<td>mar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menia</td>
<td></td>
<td>phri</td>
<td>na-khañ-mo</td>
<td>[he-mi]</td>
<td></td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-nia</td>
<td>ña</td>
<td>[säm-ba]</td>
<td>moûkele</td>
<td>min-tsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>muh'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>phu-li-li</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ni-ru-ru]</td>
<td>[ru-ra]</td>
<td>[ri-ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-U-Rong</td>
<td>tr'ôn-mô</td>
<td>me-ni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nî]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mo-ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muli(Njong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prü-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsa-roń</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mélam</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>[aug]</td>
<td>hoñ</td>
<td>[nam-loñ]</td>
<td>[nam-loñ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutse 24</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>[koméiô]</td>
<td>hoñ</td>
<td>[nam]</td>
<td>[nam-loñ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, , 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ma-u</td>
<td>[nam]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-tzü</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nam]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[nam-boû]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yûn-nan</td>
<td>pu-lu-zu</td>
<td>na-ka-mû</td>
<td>[hi-mi]</td>
<td></td>
<td>mossa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Desgodins, a few words), Loutse (Desgodins), Loutse 24 and 26 (d'Orléans), Lu-tzü (Davies)—the Loutse = Lu-tzü people of the Tsa-ron.

(h) Yün-nan (d'Ollone, No. 35). This dialect, belonging to the region of the confluence of the Ya-lung river with the Yang-tse, is the southernmost (c. lat. 27°) of the dialects reported as 'Si-Fan'. The paucity of the available vocabulary does not prevent a recognition of some features as non-Tibetan.

Notes

1. Suffixes: The -ré appended in Thöchü to the numerals 1-10 may be = Tib. re, res, 'one by one', 'time', 'times'. The -r of 'Outer Man-Tzü' is, no doubt, as Yule has observed (p. 128), the same word. The additional -gu in 'Outer Man-Tzü', identified by Yule with the -kū of Hodgson's Gyämi and subsequently by Terrien de Lacouperie (§ 177) with the very common Chinese classificatory ko, similarly used with numerals, is proved to be Chinese by its very wide occurrence, being found also in Mo-so and as far south as No. 35 (Yün-nan). The -pi of No. 38 definitely associates the dialect with Mänjak (Mi-nag), whereto geographically, being of the region of Ya-chou, it is adjacent.

The -dū of Thöchü ha-dū, '10' = Go-lök a-diō, a-diū, a-dūo, which will also be identical with the -den, -te, -ten of Pa-U-Rong ka-den, Mi-li ka-te, a-ten, is perhaps a word having the same signification as the tham-pa, which Tibetan dialects in general append to '10', and sometimes to the higher decades and '100'.

2. 'Seven': The Thöchü and Go-lök forms with st-, st-, and šk- (but 'Outer Man-Tzü' šn-), and likewise the Mänjak škws (erroneously questioned by Baber, p. 102) may be derived from a stn-/škn-, resulting from the original sn-/šn, or possibly snw-/šnwh-, which accounts for the innumerable sn-, s-n- (but Kanauri stis), šn-, ſt-, s-r-, forms found all over the Tibeto-Burman field. The seũi, &c., of the Tsa-ron will be another derivate.

3. 'One 10', 'One 100': This locution, exemplified in the table by the forms with a-, &c., ta-, &c., and represented also by Hodgson's Gyämi i-shua, i-pë, can be found, further, in Lo-lo, Kioutse and Lissou-Li-so.

4. 'Ten': It is difficult to account for Gyärung shih, si, Rgya-ron (Pati) sii, except upon the supposition that they are borrowings of Chinese shih, earlier sib, found in many other languages. Rgya-ron štyê, Jyä-ron sci, scio, are, of course, = Tib. bcu>réc>šcu>šciu (insertion of i after palatal)>štìu, perhaps actually a loan-word, with Prefix acclimatized as in other cases. Hanniu pcö, like all the other Hanniu numerals, is clearly borrowed from Tibetan.

5. Hörpa and Dge-ši-tsha: A connexion between these would perhaps be more apparent if we had the Hörpa form of '11'. Evidently, however, the Dge-ši-tsha form owrê (10-1) may contain an etymological equivalent of Hörpa rä, '1'. The latter is used by Tibetans in dating, ston-sla-ra-ba, 'the first autumn month', &c.; but it seems to occur also in Kan-su Chinese of

---

1 Le Thibet d'après la correspondance des missionnaires, pp. 372-7.
the eighth to ninth century and may be related to Chinese ิร, ‘1’ (modern ิ), of the same provenance. The Dge-si-tsha ถ-เซ, ‘one 100’, with ze < jie < jia < (br)gya (cf. Mānyak ตี-จี, Menia ตา-จี), suggests that Hörpa หญา is, as suggested infra, borrowed from Amdo Tibetan.

Neglecting for the present matters of phonology and referring for some particulars to the notes appended to the table, we observe that

(a) Forms of า, ‘1’, are confined (except for Dge-si-tsha ถ in ถ-เซ) to the Amdo-Go-lok area, where they are also used to constitute the expression ‘one 100’. Forms of า/ี, ‘1’, occur in the number ‘11’, and to the south they entirely replace า, and occupy the whole field, except for some borrowing of Tibetan gcig in the Rgyal-roṅ (รกิ, ี, กิ), and in the Tsa-roṅ, where it is, doubtless, derived from the Tse-kou dialect of E. Colonial Tibetan: in Loutse 24 this กิ is used to form the expression ‘one 100’ (กิ-シア), which in the Mi-FLAG region and farther south is formed with า/ี.

(b) For ‘7’ forms derived from สนิ/สนิ are almost universal, invasion by Tibetan bdun being observable only in Pa-U-Rong and in the very much Tibetanized Hanniu dialect of the Rgyal-roṅ.

(c) Forms of า/ิน, ‘10’, predominate in the north (Amdo and Hor-pa country) and also in the far south (Pa-U-Rong and Mi-li): in the Hor-pa country and the south they are used also to form the decades, ‘20’, &c.: the -so, -sā employed in Amdo to form the decades can hardly be the -สุ of Tibetan นิ-สุ (<นิส-คู) and very possibly is Chinese (see the Gyāmi numerals in Hodgson’s vocabulary). With the exception stated the whole region from the Horpa country southwards uses for ‘10’, ‘11’, &c., and the decades etymological cognates of Tibetan ปุ.

Derivatives of prom, 'white', mo, mon, 'sky', 'sun', are found over the whole area; and of mog, 'wind', over most of it: with mo, mon, the ancient words gnam, 'sky', and (g)ȵi-ma, 'sun', are naturally concurrent. As regards na/ṇa, 'good', tsha, 'goat', somr/sorm, 'iron', and, further, ya, 'sheep', we may cite—

na/ṇa, 'good': Thōchū nā-i, Hörpa gāyē, gnor, Gyārung ka-snē.1

tsha, 'goat': Thōchū tsāh, Go-lok 39 sai, Hörpa chē, Gyārung kūs-so, Rgya-roṅ (Pati) ko-su, Jyā-ruṅ a-ke-sū, Mānyak tsāh, Menia chi, Mi-li (Prū-mi) che-da, Lu-tzū a-kie.

sormo, 'iron': Thōchū sormo, Go-lok 41 siémo, Hörpa cū, Gyārung sōm, Rgya-roṅ sōm, Mānyak sū, Menia sū, 38 sōn, Muli(Njong) sē, Prü-mi sēn, Loutse 24 siām.

ya, 'sheep': Rgya-roṅ (Pati) ko-yo (Wassū ke-yo, 'goat'), Jyā-ruṅ a-ke-yū, Menia yo (Mu-nia yū, 'goat'), Loutse 24 a-yau, 26 yāng, Yün-nan 35 yō, Hsi-hsia ye (Laufer, no. 68).

Hsi-fan languages: use of Prefixes

The matter of the Prefixes may be here merely adumbrated. The old consonantal Prefixes, which have survived only lexically, without discernible function, may be exemplified by a few occurrences of r-:

r- = Tib. r-:


brgyad, '8': Thōchū kh-rā(-rē), Hörpa rhéé, Gyārung oryēt, Rgya-roṅ varia(t), worio(t) (cf. the case of brgya, '100', supra, p. 90).

rna, 'ear': Gyārung ti-rnē, Rgya-roṅ t-rna.

rmaṅ, 'dream', &c.: Rgya-roṅ ko-rman, 'sleep' (Menia kho-me).

rtswa, 'grass': Mu-nia rju (Menia ndza).

r absent in Tibetan:

Tib. gor-ma, 'stone': Hörpa rgā-mē.

khyur, 'complete', &c.: Thōchū rkvi, 'handsome'.

ñan, mñan, sñan, 'listen': Gyārung ka-rnyou.

bya, 'bird', 'fowl': Menia rga, Mu-nia rja, 'chicken' (rja-gu, 'egg'), Mi-li (Prū-mi) ju, 'chicken' (ra-gu, 'egg'), 35 hro-pu, 'cock' hro-ma, 'hen' (hro-kō, 'egg').

mi, 'man': Gyārung ti-rmi, Rgya-roṅ t-rmi, Hsi-hsia rme.

1 Add Tākpa (līhū)-ni (((līhū)-ma-ni, 'bad').
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Tib. min, 'name'; Thöchū rmāh, Gyārūṅ ti-rmin, Rgya-roṅ k-rmien (Hörpa smen).

Similarly we find instances of g- (Thöchū kṣī(-ri), '3' = gsum, &c.), b- (Hörpa na-psē, 'tell' = bsad, &c.), m- (Hörpa ka-mthū, 'great' = mtho, 'high', &c.), h- (as nasal, Rgya-roṅ cī-mbō = hbar, 'blaze', &c.), and s- (Rgya-roṅ te-sni, 'heart' = sfin, &c.), both where present in Tibetan and where Tibetan has a different, or no, Prefix.

It appears that all the old Prefixes, except d (which indeed is given in Loutse 24 dgu, 26 daguen, Lu-tzū degu, '9', probably a loan of Tib. dgu—Thöchū has rgū(-rē)), exist in the dialects, partly as in Tibetan, partly with exchanges among the Prefixes, partly where absent from Tibetan. There is nothing surprising in this, alternation of Prefixes by interchange and by presence and absence being familiar within the limits of Tibetan itself. Some of the cases of Prefix absent from Tibetan and some local preferences may prove interesting. The general conclusion that the ancient Prefixes were a common heritage of the whole group stands fast.

The syllabic Prefixes in the dialects reveal by two circumstances the fact that they belong to a later stratum: (a) they are never found following, but always preceding the old Prefixes, where these are preserved, and (b) they are in particular conjunctions omissible, as can be observed in the case of Jyā-ruṅ, where Dr. Wolfenden has furnished a continuous narrative which exemplifies the fact. In function also they differ from the old Prefixes, serving to mark grammatic classes of words, such as nouns, adjectives, verbs, numerals. The different languages are not uniform in their choice of Prefixes or in their employment of them severally.

The available materials enable us to detect the following (vowel normalized as a):

- a-, ka-, ta-, da-, na-, wa-, ya, and, in the Rgyal-roṅ, sa- and (Hanniu) cī-, yi-,

and we may note occurrences in the languages severally.

Thöchū:

1. a- in Verbs (a-dz, 'eat', ā-thī, 'drink' = Tib. za, hthuṅ, &c.).
2. ta- in Verbs (ta-sēh, 'kill' = Tib. bsad, &c.).
3. da- in Verbs (da-gac, 'strike' = Menia na-ka, &c.).

Go-lök (41, 42, 39):

1. a- in 41 a-cl, 42 e-śi, 'month' (Rgya-roṅ ti-e-tsla, Tib. zla-ba).
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   (Thöchü styū, Jyä-ruṇ kā-mi-stē-a), kā-zye, ‘eat’ (Tib. za, 
   Li-Fan Man-Tzü gna-dze).


Hör-pa:

   (s)riṅ).

2. ta- in Verbs (ta-śē, ‘kill’ = Thöchü ta-sēh, &c.).

3. na- in Verbs (na-pśē, ‘tell’, &c.).

4. wa- in Verbs (wa-thi, ‘drink’, wa-nzūn, ‘sit’ = Thöchü ā-thi, 
   ā-jon, &c.).

Rgyal-ron (Gyärung, Rgya-ron, Jyä-ruṇ):

1. a- in Nouns (Rgya-ron ti-e-tsla, ‘month’ = Go-lok a-cl, e-śi, 
   a-sia, ‘flesh’ = Tib. śa, &c.).

2. ka- in Nouns (Gyärung ki-ni, ‘sun’ = Tib. nī-ma, &c.), 
   Adjectives (Gyärung ka-nak, ‘black’ = Tib. nag, &c.), 
   Verbs (Gyärung ka-rnyou, ‘hear’, &c.), and Numerals 
   (Gyärung ka-ti, ‘1’, ka-nēs, ‘2’, &c.).

   ga- in Rgya-ron ga-pa, go-mū, ‘father’, ‘mother’ (Gyärung 
   ta-pē, tō-mō), may be different.

   ru, kha, &c.), Adjectives (Rgya-ron te-sa-lo, ‘hot’ = Tib. 
   tsha, &c.), Verbs (Gyärung ta-zō, ‘eat’ = Tib. za, &c.).

4. da- in Verbs (Gyärung da-na-rgyūk, ‘run’ = Tib. rgyug, &c.).

5. na- in Verbs (Gyärung nā-sē, ‘kill’ = Thöchü ta-sēh, Hörpa 
   ta-śē, &c.).

6. ya- in Gyärung ya-cin (Rgya-ron na-chen), ye-yen, ‘go’, 
   ‘walk’.

7. sa- (Causative) in Verbs (Rgya-ron ta-sa-zo, ‘feed’, Jyä-ruṇ 
   sa-pkiab, ‘cover up’, &c.).

8. (Hanniu dialect) ni- (<na-?), ci-, yi-, me-, mö- in Verbs 
   (Rgya-ron ni-du, ‘bring’, ci-nthen, yi-nthen, ‘drink’ = 
   Tib. ḥṭhuṅ, me-ndū, ‘sit down’, mö-dru, ‘take off (clothes)’, 
   &c.).

Mi-ṇag (Mānyak, Menia, Mu-nia, 38):

1. a- (Mu-nia only) in Adjectives (a-ṇi, ‘few’ = Tib. ṇuṅ, a-bi, 
   ‘thin’ = Menia ṛa-bu, &c.).

---

1 We have here ventured to invert the meanings as given by Terrien de 
   Lacouperie, § 176.

3. **ta-** in Verbs (Mānyak ta-khi, ‘give’, &c.).


7. **wa-** in Mānyak wa-khi, ta-khi, ‘give’.

**Pa-U-Rong**:

**da-** in du-ka, ‘mouth’ (Tib. kha, Gyārūṅg ti-khe, &c.).

**Mi-li(Muli)(Njong), Prū-mi**:

1. **a-** in Prū-mi a-lu-lu, ‘small’ (cf. Mu-nia a-tzō-tzō = Tib. chuṅ, ‘small’, Lo-lo i-tzō, a-tio, &c.).

2. **na-** in Muli(Njong) ne-se, ‘kill’ (Gyārūṅg nā-sē, Mānyak na-sya, &c.).

**Tsa-roṅ (Mé-lam, Loutse, Lu-tzū)**:


2. **ka-** in Mélam ka-thin, ‘large’?


4. **da-** in Loutse 24, 26 de-gui, ‘dog’ = Tib. khyi.

In some of the above instances the word following the syllabic Prefix is probably a loan from Tibetan. Also, insertion of a vowel after one of the old consonantal Prefixes, whereby the semblance of a syllabic Prefix is created, is exemplified in—

Gyārūṅg sē-pri ‘ape’ (Tib. spreṅu), ko-rok, ‘ant’ (Tib. groṅ), Rgya-roṅ waria(t), woric(t) (Tib. brgyad, Khams vrgyad), Gyārūṅg paryē, ‘100’ (Tib. brgya), Mélam sela, ‘moon’, Loutse 24 sēñi, 26 sēñi, Lu-tzū seṅid, ‘7’ (snis), Loutse 26
daguen, '9' (Tib. dgu), sena, 'nose' (Tib. sna), sola, 'month' (26 sela, Tib. sla, zla), Lu-tzü sela, 'moon', a-beli, '4' (bli).

It seems likely that some of the coincidences of Rgyal-ron syllabic Prefixes with old consonantal Prefixes in Hsi-hsia (in Tibetan script), as noted by Dr. Wolfenden (JRAS. 1931, pp. 47–52), e.g. Hsi-hsia gnī, 'sun' (Tib. ŋi, gnī) = Gyārung ki-ni, &c., may really be of this nature. The question would then arise whether on the Rgyal-ron side the cause was an intellectual misunderstanding or a phonetic difficulty. It must, however, be admitted that some of the Rgyal-ron Prefixes, e.g. ka-, ta-, are of such extensive use as to render coincidences of the above kind inevitable.

The particulars elicited are by no means casual: on the contrary, some of them have an enormous extension in Tibeto-Burman generally. This is true, for instance, of the pronoun na, 'thou', and the numeral snis, ‘7’, concerning which it may be sufficient to refer to the Linguistic Survey of India, vol. i. ii, ‘Comparative Vocabularies’. For a, ‘1’, and ga/ka, ‘10’, we must look to the regions where China, Tibet, and Burma meet. The a seems to be found in Sing-pho (ai) and in the 'North Assam group' (Aka); but perhaps the most interesting recurrence is in the Min-kia of the Ta-li-fu region in Yün-nan, where the numerals are almost entirely Tibeto-Burman. For ‘1’ we there find a, but also i, the latter probably Chinese; but for ‘100’, ‘1,000’ ('one 100', 'one 1,000') the forms are a-pöl, a-khin, in which the second syllables are Chinese (pa(r) and ch'ien), while the a may be a survival from Tibeto-Burman antiquity.

The expressions ‘one 10’, ‘one 100’, seem nowhere to occur in Tibetan; but they may be discoverable in the Himālayan dialects, Thulung (Wolfenden, JRAS. 1935, p. 641), Simbu, Yākhā, Rāi.

It may be noticed that even in the Rgyal-ron we have both on its eastern extremity ('Outer Man-Tźu' a(r-gu), '1', kha(dr-gu), i.e. kha(r-gu), '10', khā-tyi, '11', &c.) and on the western (Dge-śi-tsha o-wre, '11', ś-mnē, '12', ś-su, '13', &c., ś-zē, 'one 100'), evidence for a, '1', and ga/ka (Thöchū ha), '10': and this suggests that the forms cognate to Tib. bcu, ‘10’, or Chinese shih, which dominate the remaining area, are intrusive.

As regards mon, 'sky', we may cite Mo-so mun, men, mö, mu, &c.

1 Conversely, the instances of an extra prefix d in Rgyal-ron words (drmi, 'man', drna, 'ear', &c.) cited by Laufer in T'oung-pao, xv (1914), p. 107 n., are nothing but the well-known syllabic prefix tả/te, &c., with the vowel lost (Rgya-ron trmi, trna, &c.).
INTRODUCTION: GENERAL

&c., Lo-lo m'o, mu, mii, Kioutse ga-mön, mu-lang; then Ka-chin la-mu and in Burma mow, mow-kong, mu-lang, moq, mo, &c.; while the rarer meaning, 'sun', is seen in Lo-lo mū-ni, &c., Li-su mū-tsa. In the case of prom, 'white', we have the r surviving (partly as l) in written Burmese phru, 'white', and, with the meaning 'silver', Sing-pho kūm-phron, Ka-chin kum-prōn, Nung kum-prā, Lo-lo phru, Aka Lo-lo and Lahu phu, Pyen plū; the r is lost in Mo-so phèn, phè, pha, pe, Lo-lo a-phyu, piu, &c., Li-su phu, phu-ca-ma, Lahu phu, Petsen pin, Loutse 24, 26 hong, Min-kia pö, pe, 'white', and Lo-lo piu, Li-su phu, 'silver'. There is loss of r with palatalization (prom > crom > ciom > tiom, kiom, in Lo-lo chon, a-tiu, a-thu, a-kiéu, tchuoh, tlo, &c.). Here again the partial survival of -m (as -n or -n) in languages which otherwise have lost their final consonants is noticeable.

The syllabic Prefixes also, especially a- in adjectives, are found to some extent in the Lo-lo and other border languages; and possibly they would be more evident in the living speech than in the vocabularies, whence they may be absent as 'omissible': and, of course, in some remoter Tibeto-Burman groups, e.g. the Mīrī-Daflā-Mishmi group, north of Assam, and in the Nāgā groups they are plentiful or abound.1 But nowhere in the Sino-Tibetan frontier languages could we hope to trace such a constellation as has been elicited above.

Hsi-fan languages: phonological derivation from early Ch'iang

It is perhaps, therefore, not venturesome to assume a concurrence in the conclusion that the languages under consideration constitute a distinct group. They extend northward continuously from just about latitude 28°2 to Amdo and the Koko-nor region, which is, as we have seen, the geographical area of the Hsi-fan languages proper. Therefore the group may reasonably be designated 'the Hsi-fan group'. But we know from definite Chinese information that the whole area, as far south at least as the Rgyal-roṅ, the 'Women's Country', was occupied by Ch'iang peoples, while concerning the Mi-ngag region, more to the south, we have no statement. The continuity of the linguistic evidence justifies us in contemplating the group as essentially a 'Ch'iang group'.

1 The ka- prefix used in Mishmi with the first four or six numerals and to a less extent in Nāgā dialects is reminiscent of the Rgyal-roṅ.
2 No. 35 is isolated farther south, circa lat. 27°.
In this conclusion we are confirmed by the evidence furnished by the Hsi-hsia, even in the present limits of the knowledge obtained of it. For that the Hsi-hsia, language of a Ch’iang dynasty and people, must have been largely or mainly Ch’iang could hardly be doubted; and in Hsi-hsia are found some of the above discussed marks of our Hsi-fan group, namely a, ‘1’ (Nevsky, No. 78, also lî, kli, gli, Nos. 1, 239, and gteh, ‘alone’, ‘7’, No. 300); ša, gśäh, ‘7’ (No. 56); kha, dgahāk, dgah, ‘10’ (No. 145); tha, ‘he’, ‘it’ (Nos. 71, 225); mo, ‘sky’, ‘sun’ (No. 7, Laufer, No. 34); dña’h, ‘good’ (Nevsky, No. 199); ye, ‘sheep’ (Laufer, No. 68); to which we may add ldi’h, lda, zla’h, lha (Nevsky, No. 93, from bldyi = Tib. bži), ‘4’ = Hörpa hla, Tākpa pli, Loutse a-bli, &c., and rme (Tib. mi, myi, Nevsky, No. 39), ‘man’, with r- Prefix, as in Gyarūng ti-ṛmi, Rgya-ron t-ṛmi.

It has been remarked that in some particulars, notably the preservation of ga/ka, ‘10’, and its employment in the formation of the decads, there is agreement between the northern and southern dialects, interrupted by the Rgyal-ron area, which is also the area of widest and still living activity of the syllabic Prefixes. In case it should eventually appear that from the ancient Ch’iang the syllabic Prefixes were absent, it may turn out that the Ch’iang population of the Rgyal-ron was superimposed upon another race which has contributed to the dialects the syllabic Prefixes. For such a substrate population we could conjecture no other name than Man, which is still applied by the Chinese to the Rgyal-ron people, supposed to represent the original native race of Ssū-ch’uan. In this connexion the apparently actual tradition of the Man-tzū people, that they were originally immigrants,1 may deserve consideration.

According to the etymologies propounded above the Hsi-fan languages show in many cases an advanced stage of phonetical degeneration, natural in view of their modern date. But a mass of the changes of consonants can be brought under the rubrics specified in connexion with the E. Colonial Tibetan, namely, (1) palatalization before r, and y, and (2) loss of finals.

As from brag, ‘rock’, we get in E. Colonial Tibetan jra(g) > cra(g) (Lhasa tra(g) > ca(g)) (Central Tibetan ta(g)), so from p(h)rom we get in the Hsi-fan languages—

(a) non-palatalized forms: (1) with retention of the r, Rgyal-ron

1 Fergusson, op. cit., pp. 247 sqq.
prom, Hörpa phrū, Mu-nia phri, (2) with \( r > y \) Thöchū phyo(\( kh \)), (3) with loss of \( r \), Pa-U-Rong phu-li-li;

(b) palatalized forms: (1) with retention of the \( r \), Muli(Njong) tr'on \(<\) cron, (2) with loss of \( r \), Go-lök con, (3) with \( c > s \), 38 šon, šam, (4) with \( s > h \) (probably not \( ph > h \)), Tsa-roñ hong.

From this palatalization the dentals \( t, d, \) &c., are not free either in E. Colonial Tibetan or in Hsi-fan, as we can see from E. Colonial (36 cru, 37 cu, 40 cuk) and Hsi-fan (Hörpa chō, Menia chu, Rgya-roñ ko-co, Mi-li (Prü-mi) chro, Mu-nia kho, Lu-tzū kru, &c.) forms of drug, '6'.

This palatalization has not spared the group sr-, as we can see in the case of sрин, 'long' = Tib. rin (but sрин, 'extend'): (a) non-palatalization in Gyiirfing ka-sri, 'long', 'tall'; (b) palatalization in Hörpa ka-ci (\(<\) cri \(<\) sri \(<\) sri), 'long', ce-ci (sрин-sрин), 'far', Mányak šā-śā, Menia ya-še, Mu-nia da-šō [Mo-so só, Lo-lo só, a-śō], 'long'. The instance illustrates also, in the Mányak, &c., forms, the modifications of vowels, especially i, which in both groups of languages are apt to occur after \( r \), e.g. in d'Ollone 36 crö, 37 cō, 38 tsē, 40 ce, 41 tueiß, Mélam širu, kio, <šru = Tib. gri, 'knife'.

As regards consonant before \( y \), we have seen in the case of brgya, '100':—

(a) non-palatalization in Hörpa rhyā, Rgyal-roñ paryē, pria, with elision, frequent in Amdo Tibetan, of \( g \) in the group rgy—cf. Hörpa rhiē, Rgyal-roñ oryēt, varia(t), &c. = Tib. brgyad, '8';

(b) palatalization in Thöchū and Go-lök a-kśi, a-kśō, &c., Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) ždie, Mányak tē-jē, Menia ta-jia, Tsa-roñ ki-sia, chia, &c.;

(c) probably rjia > ra in Pa-U-Rong ta-ra, and (r)šia > he in 35 hé (cf. 35 hé, 38 hię pi = brgyad, '8');

(d) in the degenerate Mu-nia and Yün-nan 35 a change \( s > h \), yielding hé, hin, '100'; cf. ho-u, ho, '10', hen, hé, '8'.

Here also we have in E. Colonial the palatalized forms 40 cia, '100', 37 dié, 40 dtié, '8'. With labials, by-, &c., the palatalization is in Tibetan, of course, normal—bya, 'bird', > ja, ca, in E. Colonial > jia > cia > šia.

The palatalizing process need not have been everywhere the same. In E. Colonial Tibetan the development, which is regular, is certainly as in pr > cr > c-, because the intermediate stage, cr-,
is normal in some dialects, the cause having been, no doubt, a palatal quality of the r. But in Hsi-fan the change might have been earlier and might, as suggested by Thöchü phyo(kh) \textless{} phrom, have been as pr- \textgreater{} py-, so that the r-palatalization would be a case of the y-palatalization, and, where it did not take place, the surviving form would be pr-, or py-, or p- (with loss of y, as in western Ladaki bi \textless{} byi). But this cannot have been, at any rate everywhere, the case in Hsi-fan, because we have exemplified palatalization with survival of the r, and the same is seen in the neighbouring border languages, e.g. in Mo-so jré, ‘mule’ = Tib. drehu.

What, however, is clear is that, once the stage p \textless{} pr is reached, there is no longer a basis for palatalization of a group pr-, since the pr- no longer exists: hence, if a palatalization has subsequently occurred, it must have operated upon loan-words containing that group.

The case of my- \textgreater{} mi-, or my- \textgreater{} mny-, ny- \textgreater{} mni-, ni-, may be exemplified by forms of Tib. mig, myig, ‘eye’, which illustrate also the fate of final g. In this word the -g is still pronounced both in Lha-sa Tibetan (mik) and in E. Colonial (mig), though normally -g is lost, in the former except in certain collocations, lak-pa, &c.: the survival may be due to the i vowel, since we find also Lha-sa šik (gzig), ‘panther’, and E. Colonial (Tse-kou) kig (gcig), ‘1’. In ‘Tangut’, which retains the -g, as -k, nik, ‘eye’, is not exceptional: in Mo-so, Lo-lo, &c., the -g is lost. From myig \textgreater{} miig \textgreater{} miag we get Gyärűng tai-myēk, Muli(Njong) mia (Li-su mia-sö), Menia mie, Mu-nia mie-lu, Pa-U-Rong, byu [Mo-so miō, mō, Lo-lo myet-sao, &c.]; from mnyig Rgya-ron (Hanniu) mnyi, Manyak mni [40 ñīhi, Lo-lo ni-ssa]; from mniag Rgya-ron te-mniak, te-mniok, &c., 38 nia, Mi-li (Prū-mi) nie, Loutse nie [Yün-nan (Ku-tsung) nie, Mo-so nya-lü, Lo-lo nie-sö, &c.]. Similarly from mi, myi, ‘man’, we get n-forms, Thöchü nāh, Go-lök née, no, 40 ņō, nie, Pa-U-Rong nyi [‘Tangut’ mni, Yün-nan (Ku-tsung) na]. It is noticeable that the mn-, n-, forms of these words are not found in E. Colonial Tibetan dialects, except where exposed to Hsi-fan influence.

These examples may serve to show what variety of phonetical form has in the Hsi-fan dialects, no less than in E. Colonial Tibetan and the neighbouring border languages, resulted from operation or non-operation of the palatalizing process and from vowel complication due to vocalization of y. Any further consideration of this matter, more especially as regards irregularities and loan-
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words, must perhaps be left to the study of the languages severally: is, for instance, Hörpa hyō, ‘house’, directly descended from the original khyim, or has it passed through the palatal stage of the adjacent Rgya-roṅ chiem, chom? Hörpa, a dialect exposed more than any other to influence from E. Colonial Tibetan, has palatalization in chēḥ, ‘road’ = Thōchū griḥ, Gyārūṅ tri, and in chō, ‘6’, <drug; and, on the other hand, the palatalization of ky-, khy- is universal in E. Colonial Tibetan (Amdo dcyil = dkyil, &c.), as also in the Rgyal-roṅ (Chyon = Khyūn, &c.); so that the answer is provisionally uncertain. What is here requisite is to attain, if possible, a conception of the phonological situation in the Hsi-fan language at as early a period as can be inferred from the common features of the modern dialects.

Early Hsi-fan phonology: comparison with Hsi-hsia

Here we may propound some deductions as follows:

1. In early Hsi-fan the palatalization of consonants followed by r had not taken place.

As regards pr- this follows from the forms of prom, ‘white’, as set out supra. Confirmatory examples of other groups are:

Tib. gru (Lha-sa tru, 40 juo), ‘boat’: Hörpa gra, Gyārūṅ brū, Mānyak gū.

Tib. greg-ma (Lha-sa tro-ma, Tse-kou cru-ma), ‘ant’: Thōchū tū-khrū, Hörpa skhrō, Gyārūṅ ko-rok [Mo-so cō, ca-i, Lo-lo bo-yo, bu-ma, &c.].

Tib. drug (Lha-sa truk, E. Colonial cru, cu, cuk), ‘6’: Thōchū khata(-re), Go-lok tōh, tüüü, ‘Outer Man-Tzū’ stu(r-gu), Gyārūṅ kū-tōk, Rgya-roṅ (Hanniu) ktrū, Mānyak trū-(bi), Pa-U-Rong tru, Mulī(Njong) thru.

-palatalization in Hörpa chō, Rgya-roṅ ko-co, Menia chu, Mu-nia kho, Mi-li (Prū-mi) chro, Loutse 24 kron, 26 ke-u, Lu-tzū kru [Mo-so khia, ca, &c., Lo-lo khu, &c.].

Tib. brag (Lha-sa tra, E. Colonial cra, ca), ‘rock’: Rgya-roṅ pra(k) (also in the place-name Bra-sdi, Burakdi), Loutse a-pra, perhaps Thōchū s-pyāḥ (cf. phyokh = prom).

-palatalization in the Hörpa (E. Colonial Tibetan ?) place-name Crango < Brag-mgo.

2. The palatalization of consonants before y, in Lha-sa of labials only, in E. Colonial of gutturals also, is a matter of some difficulty. Apparent examples of non-palatalization are:

Tib. bya (Lha-sa ca, E. Colonial śia, śiū, sū, żū, &c.), 'bird', 'fowl': Thōchū ma-ruwō (?), Gyārūng pyē-pyē, Rgya-roñ paï (-ku, 'cock', -mu, 'hen'—Dr. Tafel begu).

-palatalization in Hörpa gyō (?), Mānyak ĥā (?), Menia rga,1 Mu-nia rja (rja-gu, 'egg'), Mulī(Njong) ro (<rjo, cf. 35 hro-pu, 'cock', hro-ma, 'hen'), Mi-li (Prū-mi) ju ('chicken', ra-gu, 'egg').

The r- prefix in this word, *rbya, is interesting.

Tib. byi-ba (Lha-sa ci-wa, E. Colonial śiau, tsūi, śio, jeh), 'rat': Rgya-roñ puì, Jyā-ruñ pē-yī [Mo-so fu, Lo-lo vēh, hē, &c.].
Tib. khyim [Lha-sa and E. Colonial use khañ], 'house': Thōchū kih, 42 ēi, Loutse kiim, 24 kime.

-palatalization in Go-lok 41 tié, Hörpa hyō (?), Dge-si-tsha yo, Gyārūng chēm, Rgya-roñ ciem, Jyā-ruñ chom, Mulī(Njong) jih, Loutse 26 jīm. [Mo-so ji, jié, ghi, &c., Lo-lo he, hen, hié, ké, &c.].

To quote cognates of khyi, 'dog', is hardly decisive, there being in regard to that word much evidence of a v (khwi or khwyi): the same is possible in regard to bya, ‘bird’, Himālayan (Thulung) pwa, &c.—see Linguistic Survey of India, i. ii, 'Comparative Vocabularies'. The non-palatalized forms of khyim also might come from *khim.

Considering the widespread palatalization instanced in the cases of brgyad, ‘8’, and brgya, ‘100’, and its universality in E. Colonial Tibetan and in the Rgyal-roñ ('Jyā-ruñ', &c.), we are inclined to attribute it to early Hsi-fan in general, in the case of gutturals, at any rate, if not of labials.

3. Insertion of i after original palatals, unknown in Lha-sa Tibetan, but general in E. Colonial, often with change of the palatal to guttural or dental, had not taken place in early Hsi-fan.

Tib. bcu (Lha-sa cu, E. Colonial kiu, kio, co), '10': Jyā-ruñ sci (?) , Mānyak cē-ci(-bi) ('one 10'), Menia chi-chi, Mu-nia ho (<so ?), Loutse 24 ti-tse (1), 26 ti-eto (1) ('one 10'), Lu-tzū tsel, Yūn-nan 35 ho-u(-ku) (?)

-insertion of i in Rgya-roñ stiyie, Jyā-ruñ scio, scīā [Mo-so tse, tsō, &c., Lo-lo tse, tsō, cie, ci, &c.].

1 Menia rg- is r with guttural trill (Baber, p. 78).
It is, however, to be remarked that forms of bcu perhaps did not exist in early Hsi-fan, which had ga/ka: Gyärung sīḥ, Rgya-ron (Pati) sī, may be Chinese.


-insertion of i in 38 cēo, Mi-li (Prū-mi) cyō.

Tib. bṣad (Lha-sa sē, E. Colonial pset, sīe, &c.), ‘expound’, ‘tell’: Hörpa na-pē, Gyärung ta-cē(n), Mu-nia mo-sā (?)

-insertion of i in Jyā-ruṇi ušiat (also ušat), 38 sīe [Mo-so sō, sā-do, Lo-lo do-sī, sūo, do-chō, &c.].


-insertion of i in Rgya-ron sīe (‘tree’), Menia sīe (‘wood’), Pa-U-Rong and Mulī(Njong) hsiēh. [Mo-so sē, sō, &c., Lo-lo sī, sō, &c.].


The instances are in favour of posteriority of the insertion, which has sometimes (e.g. in ‘Tangut’ dziam-ba, ‘cheek’, < hjiamba < hgram-pa) affected even secondary palatals. In the Rgyal-ron it is perhaps even modern, since it is absent in the names of the ‘Eighteen States’, and it extends sometimes to non-palatals (Rgya-ron zie, ‘gold’, < ser, Jyā-ruṇi zia, ‘eat’, < za) no less than palatals (a-sīa, ‘flesh’, < sā, chia, ‘wine’, < chaṅ). In ‘Tangut’ it appears before u (liuk, ‘sheep’, < lug, rgiu, ‘9’, < dgu). In general, however, it is old enough to have become disguised in composite vowels, such as ō, eo, iō, uo, much complicating the vowel systems.

4. A casual change i > v was suggested by Laufer (p. 105) for Hsi-hsia. In Hsi-fan some occurrences of this, originally perhaps only before o or u, may be seen. Examples:

Tib. lña, ‘5’: Thöchū wā(-rē), Go-lok 41 uè, 42 rhoō, 39 uō, ‘Outer Man-Tzū’ wa(r-gu), Hörpa gwē: Dge-ši-tsha mña, Gyärung ku-ṅgno, Rgya-ron kō-mū ( < -mwo < -nwo < -nō), (Hanniu) ṅo, Jyā-ruṇi ko-mnō, 38 ḥan(-pi), Pa-U-Rong ṇa, Mulī(Njong) ṇo, (Prū-mi) ṇwa. [Mo-so ua, Lo-lo ṇwa, &c.].
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Tib. dṇul (Lha-sa ṅū, E. Colonial ṇöl, nu, ṇou, &c.), 'silver':
41 uon, 42 minu (meu), 39 u, Menia mue: Mu-nia nu, 38 on,
Muli(Njong) ŋou, (Prū-mi) ŋi, Loutse 24 ŋon, 26 nui, Lu-tzu
nul, 35 nnu. [Mo-so ŋu, ñō.]

5. Similarly casual, involving perhaps a change ŋ>ŋ, which
occurs in eighth-to-ninth-century Tibetan manuscripts from Kan-
su, are forms = Tib. ŋa, 'fish':

Tib. ŋa (Lha-sa ŋa, E. Colonial ŋa, ŋain), 'fish': Thöchū ižāh,
Go-lok 41 že, 42 ḡže, 39 že, Hörpa, hyā, Gyārūṅg chū-ŋyo,
Mānyak yū, Mu-nia zō, 38 ceĩi, Mi-li (Prū-mi) cō.

Cf. Hsi-hsia żu (Laufer, No. 5).

6. In regard to final consonants, it is necessary to exclude an -n
which in Thöchū, Hörpa, and the Rgyal-ron is found in verbs
(Thöchū ā-jon, Hörpa wa-ŋūn, 'sit', Gyārūṅg da-cín, ya-cin =
Hörpa ta-śin, wa-śin, 'go', &c.): this is probably a formative.
Thöchū has also other final consonants (nūk, 'ear', phyokh,
'white', aśpic, 'hunger', &c.), due to absorbed formatives or to
compounds.

Of -ś after consonants, otherwise wholly lost, the Go-lok has
curious survivals in 41 zierk, 42 ŋierk, 'tongue' = Tib. ljags, and
41 itierk (<iierk <iicags <cags <śags) = Tib. șańs, 'nose', where
-śs <-nś has ancient parallels in Kan-su Tibetan. The Go-lok
forms may be borrowed from Amdo Tibetan, where we find
'Tangut' khtsirk-ta = Tib. gzigs. After vowels -ś is lost, except in
the Rgyal-ron, where -nēs, '2', and -snēs, '7', are clearly native
words.

Of original -l there is no trace, and loss is evidenced in:

Tib. yul (Lha-sa yū), 'village', 'country': Thöchū vē-ḵāh,
Gyārūṅg vō-ḵyū, Mānyak ẖū.

Tib. bōsūl, 'path': Go-lok 41 jueu (= žūo?), 42 qevu, (qē-u?) and
in the above-cited forms of dṇul, 'silver', and sbrul, 'snake'.

Loss of -r, not infrequent in E. Colonial Tibetan and attested in
the Hör-pa-Rgyal-ron country by forms of place-names (Kungsa,
Kanze, &c. supra pp. 83, 85 n.), is seen in Go-lok 41 saē, 42 sō,
Menia sa = Tib. șar, '(sun)-rise', and in 39 se-u, Rgya-ron zie =
Tib. gser, 'gold' [Lo-lo ši, šō, &c.], and probably in forms of
dmar, 'red', and mar, 'below'. Several dialects preserve it in
Tibetan loan-words, and the Rgyal-ron perhaps in some others.

Of the nasals -m has everywhere, in prom, 'white', khyim,
'house', and in sam, som, '3', retained traces. Of -n and -n, the
former very, but not absolutely, persistent in E. Colonial Tibetan, there is no Hsi-fan survival, except in words with initial, or quasi-initial, *m* (Thöchü *min*, Gyårüng *ka-sman*, ‘ripe’, Hörpa *smen*, Rgya-roṅ *ti-rmiṅ*, *k-rmien*, Mányak *miṅ*, ‘name’, and forms of *mon*, ‘sky’). Loss of *-n* has been exemplified in the case of *sīṅ*, ‘tree’.

The three occlusives, *-g*, *-d*, *-b*, where preserved in Lha-sa or Amdo Tibetan, are all become *tenues*, *-k*, *-t*, *-p*: in Khams and Tse-kou they remain voiced. In Lha-sa we have *la*, but *lak-pa*, ‘hand’, and so forth, while E. Colonial Tibetan has in general *la-pa* in place of *lak-pa* (‘Tangut’ *lokhwa*). It is conceivable that the alternation *-g/-k*, &c., was originally due to Sandhi and that in some dialects, e.g. Lha-sa, *-k* was preserved, but *-g* lost.

In Hsi-fan widespread loss of *-g*, *-d*, *-b*, is attested by:


Tib. *chibs*, ‘horse’: Go-lok 41, 42, 39 (*h)iü, Rgya-roṅ (Hanniu) *chied*.

Also in many forms of *nag*, ‘black’, and those of *brgyad*, ‘8’, *bṣad*, ‘tell’, cited supra. Outside the Rgyal-roṅ the only traces of original *-g*, *-d*, *-b*, are seen in Thöchü *nyik*, ‘black’, *nyag-wō*, ‘crow’, and the Go-lok *nierk*, &c., quoted supra: these may, like Loutse 24 *šiot*, 26 *šiet*, Lu-tzû *cied*, ‘8’, be due to special causes, such as borrowing. In the Rgyal-roṅ there is a number of apparently unborrowed final *tenues* (*ta-yak*, ‘hand’ = Tib. *phyag*, *ta-vet*, ‘mountain’, &c.), pronounced for the most part with ‘checked’, or even imperceptible, utterance.

To the early Hsi-fan in general, therefore, we may attribute loss of (a) *-l*, *-s*, *-g*, *-d*, *-b* (that of *-r* may be later), (b) of *-ṇ* and *-n*, except after initial or quasi-initial *m*; but in the Rgyal-roṅ *-s* after vowels, and *-r*, *-g*, *-d*, *-b*, have been partly maintained.

7. Concerning vowels, which are likely to have undergone various local modifications, such as have been noted by Laufer (pp. 99–103, including several instances of *-a* > *-i*, *u* > *o*), or such
as are found in old Tibetan manuscripts from Kan-su (e.g. some cases of -ag, -ab, >-eg, -eb, and of e/i, -u/-o, alternations), or such as are frequent in E. Colonial Tibetan (e.g. -on, <-an, -un, -er < -ar, -e <-i), it is difficult to make general statements. But in certain respects the early Hsi-fan was probably free from infections which have greatly complicated the vocalism of later periods: it seems to have lacked

(a) the general Tibetan Umlaut of a, u, o before -d, -n, -l, -s;

(b) the complexes ia, ie, ii, io, iu, due to vocalization of post-consonantal y and to insertion of i after palatals, with the consequent developments.

In this way the vowel-system may have been appreciably nearer to that of written Tibetan. As individual particulars which have ancient analogues, we may mention (1) Thöchū rmāh, 'name', < rma < rmin (cf. 'Tangut' sañ for śiñ, 'wood', and confusion of sīan and sīn in the ancient manuscripts), and Gyārūng sman, 'ripe', < smin; (2) Rgya-roñ smou, 'medicine', ka-rnyou, 'hear', < sman, (s)ñan; (3) Thöchū pi, 'hog', Mānyak phwih, 'tooth', < phag, swa(so), Thöchū kṣi(-ri), Mānyak si(-bi), 'Outer Man-Tzū' kṣi(r-gu), Menia si, Pa-U-Rong zi < gsam, elsewhere only sōm, sam, &c., (cf. Hsi-hsia rni, &c., < rna, 'nose', &c. (Laufer, p. 99), and ni, nīḥ, Ṇe (Nevsky, No. 217), 'equal' < mīn).

In the numeral system there have been many mutual accommodations (Systemzwang) of vowels.

The phonetical inconsistencies in the individual Hsi-fan languages contrast with the appreciable regularity of E. Colonial Tibetan, e.g. in 'Tangut' and Tse-kou, where most of the vocabulary is consistently derivable from the literary Tibetan. This may reasonably be ascribed to penetration by Tibetan of different periods and localities. The general outcome of the above considerations represents a stage of Ch'iang somewhat anterior, if we may judge, to the Hsi-hsia. In the latter Dr. Laufer allows as Prefixes only the g-/k-, r-, m-, in g-ñum, k-ñum, 'sky', k-ñu, '5', rni, 'ear', m-lu, 'worm', 'snake' = Tib. gnam (or dguñ), lña, rna, sbrul: Nevsky has in Tibetan transcriptions many more, of which rme, 'man', seems to be a certain example. Of initial groups kr-, &c., Laufer has no examples, and Nevsky records only four obscure words, treḥ (No. 270), 'heaven', hṛtri (No. 201), 'change', bidra (No. 315), dbri (?), also ḍbhiḥ (No. 247), 'light': if in Hsi-hsia such an r had become y, as we might be led by the
instances, gye (No. 251), 'mountain' (<gri = Tib. ri), and hgye (No. 243), 'path' (cf. Thöchü grih, Gyärüng tri, Hörpa cēh) to think, then treh, 'heaven', may be nothing more than Chinese t'ien. Of palatalization before r, with loss of the r, there is a certain instance in chi (Nevsky, No. 101) <drug, '6' (cf. li, 'wind', ri, 'bone' = Tib. rlun, rus). Development of i after palatals is not apparent. The final consonants -ṅ, -n, -m, -r are exemplified by Laufer, -ṅ and -r also by Nevsky (Nos. 155, 187, 268; 55, 231, 279, 281, 333), though -ṅ is lost in li, 'wind' = Gyärüng ta-li, Tib. rlun. Thus not only -l and -s, but also -g, -d, -b had completely disappeared. It is true that Laufer does not admit loss of finals in Hsi-hsia and holds that, where lacking, they had never been present. But how is this to be reconciled with the variation -i/-a in Hsi-hsia equivalents of Tibetan a according as the latter occurs in an open or a closed syllable (ibid.)? How can we question the originality of the -g in Tibetan drug, '6' (Hsi-hsia chi), lag, 'hand' (Hsi-hsia la), phag, 'hog' (Hsi-hsia wo), nag, 'black', mig, 'eye' (Hsi-hsia mei), when, not to mention other Tibeto-Burman evidence, a language so remote as Burmese has khyok, lak, wak, nak, myak? or of -d in brgyad, '8', bsad, gsod, 'kill', represented in Burmese by rhac and sat? And how can we doubt losses of final consonants in Mo-so, Lo-lo, &c., languages known only in modern stages, when parallel losses, resulting very frequently in markedly similar forms, are historically demonstrated in the case of Tibetan, of E. Colonial Tibetan, and of Hsi-fan dialects?

Nam: some particular phonological particulars

The Nam language, older than the Hsi-hsia by about three to four centuries, is likely to have been exempt from some changes undergone by all the known Hsi-fan dialects. The hitherto certified specimens exemplify:

(a) consonantal Prefixes, d (dgu), r (rma, rbeg), l (lcogs, ldehu, ldon);

(b) initial consonants, ň (ñal), ts (tseñ), tsh (tshun), y (yab), ś and ž (ṣi = žin), z and ž (zu = žu), th (thiñ, thol);

(c) initial groups, sk (skeg), consonant+y ('pyi, bya, mye), consonant+r (kru, prom);

1 Perhaps also in chi, 'gall' (Laufer, No. 56) = Tib. mkhris.
(d) final consonants, g (cog, rbeg), ŋ (ltoṅ, thiṅ), n (tshun, žin), b (yab), m (prom), l (nal, thol), and group gs (lcogs);
(e) final vowel a (bya, rma), i (li), e (mye), u (zu), o (go, cho), or quasi-diphthong (tehi, ldehi, byeiku), and dialectical alternation a/e (rbag, rbeg);
(f) derivative byeiku from bya;
(g) formative te, lde, with tehi, ldehi, in which -hi seems to constitute an attribute.

We may also mention some contemporary non-Tibetan proper names of places (Bra-ma-than, Dra, Gro-pur, Zar-phur, Šo-ma-ra, Skyi-mthiṅ, Bum-liṅ, Byar-liṅs), persons (Myi-rama-bu Ldam-ṣad, Mun-žag-tsa, Rgyan-ňar), superhuman beings (Srad-po, Theg-leg, Pya-maṅs, Dre-da), and animals (Spur-bu, Thaṅ-prom, Skoṅ-theg-to), which are phonologically similar and which, being all connected with the Skyi, i.e. Tang-hsiang, country, are likely to exemplify the Ch’iang speech of their period (seventh to ninth century, A.D.).
B. A LITERARY WORK IN THE NAM LANGUAGE

Having now, it is hoped, ascertained the general situation and character of the Nam language and some of its general features, we may approach the consideration of a text which seems to be in that language. The proof that it is in fact a Nam text has been outlined elsewhere,¹ and it will be repeated with additional particulars infra (pp. 130 sqq.). The extraneous aids for the interpretation appear to be decidedly inadequate. The most promising of them is the Tibetan, of which the seventh-century pronunciation is known from its script, authoritatively and carefully designed, with the help of Indian teaching, to fit the language. To the kindred Nam language that script, which in the eighth century was in familiar use among officials and private persons in Tibet, is likely to have been applied with tolerable exactness; for we know that contemporaneously it was used with fair success to represent even Chinese, not to mention Central-Asian languages having alphabetic writing. The initial geographical remoteness of Tibet proper had given place to close political, administrative, and military connexions; and Buddhism in a Tibetan form commenced early in the eighth century to spread to Amdo. Hence the Tibetan scribes must have had constant practice in the writing of native personal names, which, however, they usually translated, and of topographical names, and of some common terms. There are also some few contemporary manuscript fragments in Tibetan, which, reproducing native folklore or religious compositions, may serve for orientation in regard to the interests, psychology, notions, and circumstances of the population.

In order to consider the problem somewhat systematically, it seems advisable to take up the several topics as they present themselves and accordingly to discuss in succession I. the manuscript and script, II. the orthography, III. the text, IV. the grammatical system, V. the etymology.

¹ JRAS. 1928, pp. 630–4; 1939, pp. 194–6.
I. THE MANUSCRIPT AND SCRIPT

The manuscript, of which particulars are given in the annexed note, was among the collection procured by Sir Aurel Stein in 1907 from the walled-up monastery library in Ch’ien-fo-tung (near to Sa-cu = Tun-huang), in western Kan-su. It is in the form of a roll of the yellow Chinese paper (of the somewhat thicker kind) there in use during its period, which the Chinese writing on its verso enables us to identify with the eighth to ninth century A.D. The roll, which is fragmentary at beginning and end, is composed of sections pasted together. Its existence as a roll prior to the Tibetan writing on the verso is proved, not only by the ductus of the script at the joinings, but also by the continuity of the Chinese text recto. That text is the Sad-dharma-pundarika, ‘Lotus of the Good Law’, of which a portion corresponding to pp. 30–3 of the Tai-sho edition, about one-fifteenth of the whole (pp. 62), survives. If the roll, in its original completeness, contained the whole of the Sad-dharma-pundarika on one face, its length must therefore have been about 216 feet, the surviving part being of c. 16 feet 7 inches: such an extent is perhaps unparalleled. We are not in any case at liberty to attribute to the Nam text dimensions of that order; for the Chinese text may have been continued on a part of the verso, leaving at the end a blank space, found sufficient for the Nam text; or the roll may have been fragmentary prior to its second use or may have been cut down for that use; or the Nam text may have occupied only a part of the blank space: for all which alternatives parallels could be adduced. Hence it is not possible to estimate what proportion of the whole Nam composition has been preserved: probably, however, the loss at the beginning is not very great and that at the end perhaps less.

The 398 lines of Nam writing extend for the most part across the whole width of the roll. In one case there is a short line (l. 61): and there is one instance (opposite II. 353–6) of omission repaired in the right-hand margin by writing in the lengthwise direction of

1 India Office Library MS., Stein Collection A, received in 1926: paper roll, width 10 in., length 16 ft. 7 in., composed of sections pasted together longitudinally; rather thick, yellowish paper; edges worn; fragmentary at beginning and end; discolorations in places affected by damp.

2 A ‘gigantic roll’ described by Dr. Hoernle in J.R.A.S. 1911, pp. 471–3, is of about 70 feet.
the roll. The average number of syllables per line is 13 or 14. At
the beginning, which is irregularly torn, the manuscript is much
abraded, so that ll. 1–4 of the script are almost entirely illegible;
while ll. 5–18 are in their left-hand half not much less obscure, and
to a diminishing extent ll. 19–65 are similarly affected. The last
six lines again, ll. 393–8, are obscure and also fragmentary. Both
edges are somewhat worn and in places torn; and there are dis-
colorations through moisture.

The Script

The script is Tibetan, of a squarish kind, with some few
peculiarities characteristic of the early period:¹ the hand is rather
course, the letters fairly large and wide-spaced. The words, nearly
always monosyllables, are separated by short vertical lines, |, in
place of the more usual (but by no means universal) points. At
the ends of clauses the vertical line tends to be somewhat length-
ened; and where a sentence (or verse) ends it is double, ||. More
emphatic punctuations |||, || : ||, || : || mark, as in other specimens
of Tibetan script, the terminations of paragraphs, chapters, and
topics.²

There are somewhat numerous corrections by the original
scribe, some obviously immediate, as when a first attempt is
either crossed out or enclosed in a circle, after which the intended
text proceeds, and others probably so, where a correction or
addition is made below the line, in which case the exact point of
intended insertion is not always evident. There are also many
corrections by a reviser, frequently in the form of inking over, and
there sometimes results a blur, intentional or otherwise. It is
perhaps noticeable that the corrections include cases of omission
or insertion of initial and final (after a) h, and final ñ, and of con-
fusion of ñ and g as finals;³ also of final h and r, u and o, initial rg
(rgy, rk) and rñ.

With exception of ṣ, all the single consonant signs of the

¹ The sign for h has at its right top a small curve with rightward facing
concavity; w is formed of this h superposed to a b; superscript i has fre-
quently the ‘inverted’ (rightward turned) form; the left limb of kh is short.
² For particulars see infra, p. 126.
³ Final h added ll. 8, 75, 137, 173, 228, 234, 258, 290, 302, 327, 367, 384;
crossed out l. 363. Initial h added ll. 70, 81, 178; crossed out, 106, 143, 174.
Final ñ added, ll. 326, 378. Final g added, l. 147; changed to ñ, l. 361.
Final h and r, ll. 17, 163, 246, 302. Initial rg(rgy, rk) and rñ, ll. 237, 239,
301, 343, 358. Final u and o, ll. 141, 302, 360, 381.
Tibetan alphabet proper occur in the text: accordingly we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ŋ} \ k, & \quad \text{ŋ} \ kh, & \quad \text{ŋ} \ g, & \quad \text{ŋ} \ n, \\
\text{č} \ c, & \quad \text{č} \ ch, & \quad \text{č} \ j, & \quad \text{ň} \ ť, \\
\text{ţ} \ t, & \quad \text{ţ} \ th, & \quad \text{ţ} \ d, & \quad \text{ţ} \ n, \\
\text{ţi} \ p, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ph, & \quad \text{ţi} \ b, & \quad \text{ţi} \ m, \\
\text{ţi} \ ts, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ťh, & \quad \text{ţi} \ dz, \\
\text{ţi} \ w, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ţ, & \quad \text{ţi} \ j, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ň, \\
\text{ţi} \ y, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ţ, & \quad \text{ţi} \ l, \\
\text{ţi} \ ŕ, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ř, & \quad \text{ţi} \ ňh
\end{align*}
\]

The absence of \text{ vara}, derived from Brāhmi \text{ a}, which in Central-Asian and Further-Indian alphabets, in India too at certain periods, was employed also as a basis for initial vowels and diphthongs in general, is not made good by any other means: accordingly words with initial vowels, in Tibetan itself not very common, appear to have been in Nam non-existent. The subscript \text{ h}, used in Tibetan either as a compendious way of writing postscript \text{ h} or to indicate vowel length (perhaps via the former alternative, \text{ a}, &c., being \text{ ah}, &c.), has in Nam probably only the former use and only with \text{ a}. The post-consonantal vowels, including the 'reversed' \text{ i}, are as in Tibetan. For final \text{ m}, the \text{ anusvāra}, \text{ m}, is sometimes used.

The special forms employed in Tibetan to represent Sanskrit sounds, viz. the cerebral consonants, the aspirated mediae, and some others, do not occur in the Nam text: the absence of the subscript \text{ h} as a mark of aspiration is noticeable, because in Tibetan transcriptions of Hsi-hsia words such an \text{ h} is frequent.

The proportionate frequency of occurrence of the several initial consonants constitutes in one or two points a marked divergence from the Tibetan. In Nam \text{ w}- (with \text{ hw}-) is common, while in Tibetan it is rare: \text{ ž} and \text{ z} are so rare that it is questionable whether in the Nam language itself, unmixed with Tibetan, they existed at all: the instances are noted infra (pp. 167–8). Absent, further, from the Nam text are:

(a) the Tibetan conjunct signs for \text{ sg}, \text{ lh}, \text{ sn}, \text{ cw}, \text{ lc}, \text{ lj}, \text{ ťw}, \text{ sd}, \text{ sn}, \text{ lb}, \text{ mr}, \text{ tšw}, \text{ žw}, \text{ zw}, \text{ zl}, \text{ lw}, \text{ ťw}, \text{ hr}, \text{ lh}, of which about one-half are in Tibetan itself quite rare;
(b) some Tibetan combinations of two written signs, viz. \( b+k \), \( b+rk \), \( b+g \), \( b+rgy \), \( b+sg \), \( b+sgy \), \( b+c \), \( b+n \), \( b+t \), \( b+rt \), \( b+lt \), \( b+st \), \( b+d \), \( b+ts \), \( b+rts \), \( dk \), \( d\dot{\text{n}} \), \( dp \), \( db \), \( mkh \), \( mch \), \( mj \), \( m\dot{n} \), \( md \), \( mn \), \( mtsh \), \( mdz \). \( M\dot{n} \) occurs only once, viz. in \( mn\text{ar} \) (1. 261). These are all, it will be seen, cases of the Prefixes \( b \), \( d \), \( m \).

These deficiencies, due mainly, no doubt, to lack of the corresponding conjunctions and combinations in the spoken language, are balanced by additional:

(a) conjuncts, \( skh \), \( ty \), \( dy \), \( thy \), \( \dot{r}z \), \( r\dot{s} \), \( rs \), \( sc \),
(b) combinations, \( gk \), \( gch \), \( grt \), \( gst \), \( gld \), \( gph \), \( bph \), \( gb(\text{gbl}) \), \( gm \), \( dd \)

(one occurrence, l. 95), \( s\dot{s} \), \( g-r \), \( g-w \),

Moreover, initial \( \dot{h} \) seems to occur before nearly all single consonants, conjuncts and combinations;\(^2\) and the great majority of words have usually this prefix, whose occurrence, however, is so capricious as to defy discrimination.

\(^1\) This occurs in old Tibetan manuscripts and documents, where also \( kh \) and other aspirates are frequently used after Prefixes.

II. ORTHOGRAPHY

Every language which has appeared in writing has in some degree an orthography, i.e. a normal written form; for a scribe who has once seen a word in a written form will not himself write the word without a consciousness of that visual appearance. On the other hand, no language has an orthography complete for all individual words that may appear in writing; because there must always occur expressions new absolutely or new as such to the scribe, for the writing of which the scribe depends upon a general rule or the general phonological values of his signs: thus a writer of English can extemporize a Preterite in -ed from any verb without having actually seen that Preterite and can write down according to his direct consciousness of the aural value of his signs, say, a foreign name which he has never seen, but only heard, and which may never have been written—an occurrence frequent with travellers in unliterate regions.

Some Central-Asian languages, e.g. the native language of the Shan-shan country and possibly the original native language of Khotan, may never, except as regards some proper names or casual terms, &c., have been written at all, written communications, if any, being exclusively in another medium. In other cases—and according to our information the T'u-yü-hun kingdom of the Koko-nor may be an example, the Chinese script having been in use—such writing as there is is in a foreign script.

It is unlikely that the Nam language during some eight centuries of close contact with China, and, for the most part, of Chinese domination, should never have been written at all: and, as we have seen, there were some instances of Chinese persons taking interest in languages of Ch'iang tribes, while, of course, there had been from early times an official department of interpreters.¹ But the writing of Nam can hardly have been more than casual and in the makeshift Chinese script; for 'literature' the people had perhaps only songs and recitations, and 'barbarians' taking to culture would find it in Chinese. The Tibetan alphabet cannot have been applied to the Nam language before the second half of the seventh century A.D.

The scribe who wrote the Nam text was no novice: he had an expert, flowing, and probably a rapid, hand. Though his facility

¹ See Terrien de Lacouperie, Languages of China before the Chinese, p. 17, and supra, pp. 51–2.
may have been in writing Tibetan, it is practically certain that the Nam language was not being written in Tibetan characters for the first time. For an orthography is proved by the existence of the Berlin fragment in the same script and language with the same spellings, and also by a number of corrections in the manuscript which can have no object other than that of giving a normal written form.

From some of the corrections it is, further, apparent that the manuscript reflects a written original, the errors being of a visual nature. But there are many errors which were probably aural: in many cases a character is written and then crossed out, the correct form following at once; sometimes the incorrect character is only partly formed; these are immediate rectifications, and their large number, which can be paralleled in the case of a Tibetan text from the same source, demands an explanation. There are several instances of underline additions, apparently immediate, of the second element of a reduplication; and there are also errors, probably aural, of other kinds. It is credible that the copy was made from dictation and thus included both misreadings, momentary and otherwise, by the dictator, and mishearings, also momentary and otherwise, by the scribe. In any case the copy was certainly read at a later date by a reviser, or at any rate by some person, who has by over-writing corrected or made clear many mistaken or obscure characters or parts of characters.

Assuming therefore an orthographic intention in the writing, we must proceed to investigate the amount and kinds of irregularities which it exhibits: since all writings show some margin of irregularity, and in certain old Tibetan manuscripts (infra, pp. 130 sqq.) the margin is rather wide. In the Nam text the

1 This applies certainly to the instances (supra, p. 113, n. 3) of confusion of $rg$-($rกาย$-) with $rh$.-.
2 This may frequently be the case with omissions due to anticipation of subsequent words.
3 Notably the confusions of -u and -o (supra, p. 113, n. 3).
4 In regard to Sogdian manuscripts, also from Ch'ien-fo-tung, which have a likewise capricious spelling, a similar suggestion was made by the late Dr. F. Rosenberg (Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'U.R.S.S., vii Série, Classe des Sciences Sociales, 1931, p. 629). The case is the same with the Chinese manuscripts in Tibetan script: see JRAS. 1929, pp. 39-40. The normal Tibetan literary manuscripts and the more or less contemporary lithic inscriptions of Lha-sa are much more correct and, except for archaisms, manifest few abnormalities.
predominant variations, immediately recognizable as such, are as follows:

1. Presence or absence of initial $h$: The great majority of the syllables in the manuscript have this prefix, which is found not only before single or conjunct consonants, clearly belonging to the root, but also before other Prefixes. This omnipresent phenomenon is so abundantly exhibited by the columns of the Vocabulary that it may be sufficient here to cite only a few cases selected among words having initial $k$ in the root:

- kehu-prom, 176, &c. = hkehu-prom, 177, &c.
- kya-wa-ne, 162 = hkyawana-ñe, 215, hkyawana-ñe, 339
- kyu-lدوn, 161 = hkyu-hدوn, 339
- kruhu-hpro, 321 = hkrudho-ro, 221, &c., hkrudu-hbro, 294, &c.
- rkabs, 272 = hrkabs, 271
- skyim-hse, 69, &c. = hskyim-se, 18.

Since the prefixed $h$ thus occurs, without dependence upon a preceding sound, both before initials of roots (here $k$, $ky$, $kr$) and before apparently Prefixed $r$ and $s$, it may be asked whether there are any situations from which it is excluded. To this inquiry we may reply that:

(a) $h$ is not found prefixed to $s\ddot{n}$, $sp$, $sb$, $sm$ ($s\ddot{n}$, $sg$, $sn$ do not occur), though it is to $st$, $sl$, $sr$, $sts$. It therefore seems likely that a labial tenuis or nasal after $s$- was inimical to its presence.

(b) $h$, though occurring freely before $g$, $gw$, $gy$, $gr$, $gl$, $rg$, $rgy$, does not occur before $gk$, $gc$, $g\ddot{n}$, $gt$, $gd$, $gn$, $gph$, $gb$, $gm$, $gts$, $gdz$, $g-y$, $g-r$, $g\acute{s}$, $gs$, i.e. in cases where the $g$ itself is obviously a Prefix. Since, however, it is found before $rgy$- in cases where this may be derived from $g-y$ (not $gy$) with the Prefix $r$, it seems that it was not the Prefixing of $g$ as a fact, but the consciousness of its Prefixal character, that precluded the addition of the $h$.

This leads to the further observation that:

(c) $h$ is found alternating with $g$:

For a list of words with $g$- Prefix, including cases of alternation with $h$- see pp. 163-4.
might, as concerns the verb *hyo/g-yo* be functional, as in Tibetan, cannot as regards the noun *g-raḫ* be other than orthographical or phonological. Other cases where no question of function arises are:

\[ \text{hmog-hce-rgyan, 52 = gmog-hce-rgyan, 55} \]
\[ \text{rgya (and hrgyaḥ)-hṇi-ke, 53, &c. = rgyaḥ-gūi-ke, 199} \]
\[ \text{ḥdim(dim)-ḥtshis (chis), 88, &c. = gdim-chis, 94} \]
\[ \text{ḥldag-khrī-khyag, 52 = gldag-hce-rgyan, 52} \]
\[ \text{ḥldag-nag, 129, &c. = gldag-nag, 136} \]
\[ \text{ḥldag-hṇag, 112, &c. = ḡldag-gnag (and nag), 129, &c.} \]
\[ \text{ḥrī-sta-mehi, 311, 312 = g-ri(g-rihi)-sta-mehi, 312, 313,} \]
\[ \text{ḥrīhi-sti-ḥyor-re, 300 = g-ri-sti-ḥyor-re 299} \]
\[ \text{ḥpha-hṇur-hṇur, 60 = gphaḥ-tṣa, 60} \]
\[ \text{ḥṣid-hṛihi, 62 = śid-g-ri, 34.} \]

In the last two instances, where *ḥpha/gphaḥ* = ‘father’, and *ḥrī/g-ṛi* = ‘mountain’, the impossibility of a difference of function is specially clear. The single occurrence of *gphaḥ* might, in its context, suggest that at the beginning of a line of verse, or of a sentence, the *g* has a preference: and in one or two other cases (*ḥldag/gldag, 136, ḡmog/gmog, 55*) some such explanation might apply. But it is impossible to carry it through; and, since dependence upon the sounds of the preceding word is likewise excluded, it appears that in these cases the scribes treated the choice of *ḥ*- or *g* as a matter of indifference. Since this must have been a consequence of the actual pronunciation, it seems to follow that the *ḥ*- was some guttural sound which might sometimes be heard as a *g*. The use of *ḥd, ḡb*, in transliteration of Chinese to represent the Chinese initial *n* and *m* suggests that the sound was a nasalization; and this may be confirmed by the fact that in one Tibetan manuscript from the same region *ḥgi* is written for *gi* after a nasal and there only. Furthermore, the sole trace in the Hsi-fan and other border languages of the ancient *ḥ*- is in the form of a nasal Prefixed to consonants.\(^2\) The fact that in the Nam manuscript the *ḥ* occurs before initial nasals as much as before other initials need not conflict with this interpretation.

\(d\) *ḥ*- does not occur before the Prefix *b*, a fact, however, of not much significance in view of the rarity of the latter.

---


2 See *supra*, p. 76; cf. *N’jeh = ḡbri(-chu)* and *Njong = ḡjaḥ* (pp. 2 n. 2, 72).
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(e) $h^-$ does not occur, or at least hardly ever, if ever, occurs,\(^1\) before certain very common words, viz. $dze$, probably a preposition or particle meaning ‘on’, ‘at’, \&c., $ge$, a particle, the sentence-ending particles $\dot{h}i$, $na$, $ra$, and the sentence-ending, or correlative, particle $ni$; and this consistent non-occurrence is a clear indication of purpose in the use of the $h^-$.

(f) The $h^-$ has in some cases been inserted or crossed out after being in the first instance omitted or written.\(^2\)

2. Alternation of tenuis and aspirate:

$k-kh$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$hkah-hrdza$</td>
<td>296, v. $hkha-hrdza$, 296.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hkab-hdro$</td>
<td>106, v. $hkha-b-hdro$, 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hko-r\tilde{n}o$</td>
<td>53, &amp;c., v. $hkho-hr\tilde{n}o$, 189, 267 (r\tilde{n}o).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hkog(gsom^o)$</td>
<td>23, v. $hkhog(gsom^o)$, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$kra\tilde{n}(\tilde{h}l\tilde{d}a\tilde{n}^o)$</td>
<td>124, &amp;c., v. $hkhra\tilde{n}(hlda\tilde{n}^o)$, 127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$kru-hrgya\tilde{n}$</td>
<td>388, v. $hkhru-rgya\tilde{n}$, 187.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hkru-hyog$</td>
<td>289, 324, v. $khru-hyog$, 321, 322 ($khruhu$).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$c-ch$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ca(\dot{h}c\tilde{a}h)-ya\tilde{n}$</td>
<td>235, &amp;c., v. $\dot{h}c\tilde{a}h-ya\tilde{n}$, 242.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ca\tilde{n}-sme$</td>
<td>262, v. $\dot{c}h\tilde{n}-rdzum$, 263.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ci(hdag^o)$</td>
<td>259, 261, v. $chi(hdag^o)$, 260, 261.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hce-hmu$</td>
<td>200 v. $\dot{h}c\tilde{e}-hmu$, 204.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$gceg(hso-hnah^o)$</td>
<td>234 v. $geg(hso-hnah^o)$, 111.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t-th$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ta(stor^o)$</td>
<td>145, v. $tha(stor^o)$, 149.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hta\tilde{n}-hrdzo$</td>
<td>218, v. $tha\tilde{n}(thta\tilde{n})-rdzo$, 130, 132, 220.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$htar-phy\tilde{n}$</td>
<td>374, v. $thar(thar)-phy\tilde{n}$, 348, 69 (pya\tilde{n}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$tor(htor)-hbro\tilde{n}$</td>
<td>216, &amp;c., v. $thor-hbro\tilde{n}$, 220.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$htye(sta-hldya\tilde{n}^o)$</td>
<td>8, v. $htye(sta\tilde{h}-hldya\tilde{n}^o)$, 20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p-ph$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$hpa\tilde{n}(hrihi^o)$</td>
<td>290, v. $h\tilde{p}ha\tilde{n}(hrihi^o)$, 302.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hpu-hkam$</td>
<td>83, v. $phu-hkam$, 130.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$pu-glo$</td>
<td>116, 135 (hlo), v. $phu-hklo$, 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hpu-hbos(hpos)$</td>
<td>140, 266, v. $phu-hbos$, 167.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hpuhi(rgyeb^o)$</td>
<td>282, v. $phuhi(rgyeb^o)$, 190.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hpeg(swah^o)$</td>
<td>360, v. $phyegeg(sw\tilde{a}^o)$, 176.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hpom$</td>
<td>347, v. $hphom$, 147.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The only exceptions are $hge$, 5, 8, 332. 
\(^2\) See supra, p. 113, n. 3.
INTRODUCTION: A NAM TEXT

por(htsa°), 291, v. phor(htsa°), 295.

hpshor(hnu-glañ°), 175, v. phor(nu-glañ°), 359.

pyañ(thar°), 69, v. phyañ(htar°), 348, 374 (htar).


pyi-hse, 88, v. phyi-hse, 89, 98.

— -ske, 143, v. phyi-ske, 79.


pyer(ldan°), 65, v. phyer(hldan°), 254.

prom/hprom, 65, 128, &c., v. phrom, hphrom, 171, 172.

ts-ts


htsur(hnah°), 391, v. htshur(hnah-hdíh°), 391.

htsog-hldañ, 95, v. tshog-hldañ, 95.

— -hram, 35, &c., v. htshog-hram, 90.

htsors(hldag-nag°), 134, v. htshors(hldag-nag°), 130.

— (hbroñ°), 219, v. tshor(hbroñ°), 220.

3. Alternation of tenuis and media:

\[k-g\]

kehuhkehu-prom, 176, 361, &c., v. gehu-prom, 362.


hkor-kla, 205, v. hgor-kla, 143.

hkyud(rdzo°), 220, v. hgyud(hrdzo°), 16.

hkri(hsi°), 81, v. hgri(hsi°), 38.

hkroms, 387, v. hgroms, 64.

hklo(hphu°), 40, v. glo(pu°), 116.

\[c-j\]

Apparently no occurrence.

\[t-d\]

htah(hkoh°), 328, v. hdah(hkho°), 329.

htor(gstor°), 143, v. hdor(stor°), 118, 142, &c.

htre(rgyed°), 248, v. htre(rgyed°), 87, &c.

hltan(rgyed-ma°), 93, v. hldañ(rgyed-ma°), 90, &c.

\[p-b\]


hpshor(htor°), 29, 64, &c., v. hbu(htor°), 33.

hpos(hpu°), 141, v. hpos(hphu°, hpu°, hpuhu°), 41, 266, 293, &c.

hpro(kruhu°), 321, v. hbro(hkruhu°, hkrú°), 221, &c.

\[ts-dz\]

htsañ(hdz°, htso°), 30, 62, 73, v. hdza(hdz°), 262.
4. Alternation of aspirate and media:

kh-g

ph-b

tsh-dz
No instance.

5. Alternations between the two groups

c  ch  j

   ts  tsh  dz

(to be expected in all old Tibetan writings) is seen in—

c-ts: hcog-hram, 87 = htsog-hram, 35, &c.

ch-tsh: hși-hkri-hchim, 38 = hși-hkri-htshim, 81; chis (gdim\(^\circ\)), 94 = tshis (dim\(^\circ\)), 95, 88 (hťhis)


joń(moń\(^\circ\)), 78, 118 (hjoń), &c. = hdzoń(moń\(^\circ\)), 64, &c.


hjo(hkehu-prom\(^\circ\)) = hdzоho(hkohu-prom\(^\circ\)), 361-2.

6. Alternation of j, dz, and z:


hјu(hраń-hche\(^\circ\)), 115 = hu( раń-hche\(^\circ\)), 117.

7. In a number of cases an r-Prefix seems to be capriciously present or absent (excluding cases where the r may be functional):

hgam(hthаń\(^\circ\)), 131, 221 = hrgam(hthаń\(^\circ\)), 133.

hgyeb-hkru-hбро, 221 = hrgyeb-hkru-hбро, 321, 323.

hбро-kyer, 144 = rbo(kyer\(^\circ\)), 136.

hбро-bon 238, &c.

hро-rbом 317 = hбом-rбо 111, &c.

hѕаń-hlad, 225, &c. = hrśаń-hlad, 226, &c.

hdzoń-hyo-hśid, 356 = hrdzoń-hyo-hśi, 194.

The clear cases are, however, relatively few and sporadic. The r-prefix may be in general either a fixed one or functional.

8. Alternations involving w:

dwań(hкеhu-hkah\(^\circ\)), 364 = рwаń(kehу-hkah\(^\circ\)), 178.

hбу-rbye-hće-rgyаń, 50 = hbu-rwyе-hće-rgyаń, 15.

hwań-hrśаń-hłamḥі, 224, 228 = hgwаń\(^\circ\), 229.
9. Miscellaneous alternations:

\[ \text{hstshah-} \text{hyer, 250 = hsc} \text{ah-} \text{hyer(g-} \text{yer), 166, 296.} \]
\[ \text{hnag(h} \text{ldag}^o, 112, \&c. = \text{nag(h} \text{ldag}^o, 129, \&c. = \text{gnag (h} \text{ldag}^o), 129.} \]
\[ \text{na-} \text{hgon, 358 = gnah-} \text{gon(h} \text{gon), 179, 367.} \]
\[ \text{hrgyo-} \text{hseg-} \text{gsegra, 330 = rbyo-gseg-gse[g]r[a], 330.} \]
\[ \text{hrtah-swah-hpeg, 360 = hrtah-swa-hphyegs, 176.} \]

10. Final consonants: The only at once recognizable case is that of presence and absence of \( h \) after vowels. It may be said that practically every word ending in \( a \) occurs in equal or greater frequency with \( -ah \). The fact that this addition of \( h \) does not take place after any vowel but \( a \) (the exceptions, \text{hdi}h, 43, \text{hsoh}, 75, \text{hkhoh}, 328, \text{h} \text{tseh}, 364, \text{gdeh}, 395, \text{being all questionable}) suggests that the practice has some relation to the Tibetan, likewise merely orthographical, use of the \( h \) in words like \text{mdah}, \&c., to preclude the reading \text{mad}, \&c.: but see infra, under 12. The irregularity in the use of this expedient extends to the Tibetan itself in old writings, where it creates difficulties. In both languages the \( h \) is sometimes retained (or used) before a suffix or final consonant, resulting in Tibetan forms such as \text{hda}h, and Nam forms such as \text{brahr}, \text{hna}h\text{d}. Apart from the question of a functional \( -r \) there seems to be a scriptural confusion of \( -h \) and \( -r \), visually quite easy, in ll. 17, 163, 302.

A few writings, \text{g-yaha}, 266, \text{hpha}h\text{hha}, 275, are provisionally mysterious: but see infra.

11. Non-functional vowel variation seems to be in the text very rare, except in one case, namely, the frequent variation between——

\[ i, u, e, o \]

and

\[ ihi, uhu, ehe, oho \]

Of this alternation full particulars have been given in the \textit{JRAS}. 1939, pp. 201 sqq., where it is shown that the longer forms are monosyllabic and that they represent a feature of pronunciation which in the Koko-nor region has been observed in modern times. It might be regarded as corresponding to one or other of the ‘tones’ of Chinese or Indo-Chinese languages; but it certainly is not employed as a means of discriminating homonyms.

In regard to this pronunciation and writing two somewhat curious observations present themselves——

In the first place, the pronunciation indicated has a singular
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resemblance to the Indian pandits’ pronunciation of the final -ah, -ih, -uh, &c., in Sanskrit.

Secondly, there does not seem to be any reason why the a-vowel should have been exempt: that is not the case with the modern Koko-nor pronunciation of Tibetan, as is proved by some of Prejevalsky’s instances, e.g. saa(zyuu) = Tib. sa(-gzi), ‘earth’, sha-a, ‘meat’, = Tib. sa, rta-a, ‘horse’ = Tib. rta. The question therefore arises whether all the Nam words in -ah should not rather be transliterated with -aha; and an affirmative answer is suggested by the above-noted g-yaha and hphahha, which may be explained simply as writings of ē in place of h.

This reasoning would not apply to Tibetan words with -ah because in the parallel Tibetan -ih, -uh, -eh, -oh there is no indication of a reduplicated i, u, e, o, except in the byoho and soho of two Amdo manuscripts.

Apparent variation between -e and -ehi and -e and -ehu in:
hrha-nta, 114, 191 = hrha-nta, 139, 380 (hwehi-hnta)
hrh-ht, 97 = hrh-re-hmo-cha-byi, 98
hke-hka, 152, 158 = hkehu-hka, 364
hke-prom, 176, 360, &c. = hkehu-prom, 177, 178, 360, &c.
hbe-hbah, 235 = hbehi-hbah, 110, 234.

and likewise some possible cases of -u/-o can be considered only after etymological investigation (infra, pp. 367–9).

It is evident that these numerous variations, which have been cited as patently orthographical and not significant, must add considerably to our embarrassment in confronting a language entirely unknown and moreover monosyllabic. A syllable ca, for instance, might present itself in variants such as caa, hca, hcah, cha, chah, hchah, ja, jah, hjah, tsa, tsah, htsa, htsah; and the possibilities must further be multiplied by the number of meanings which the syllable may have had in the language, no doubt rich, like all Tibeto-Burman dialects, in homophones. Much must be set down to the account of the scribes, persons used, no doubt, to writing Tibetan and in that language somewhat indifferent to certain distinctions, such as presence or absence of Prefix h and final h, tenuis and aspirate (frequently alternating in their verbs), the use of certain other Prefixes, final s after g and b, final d (the
drag) after n, r, l, and so forth. Hence we are not surprised to find that in certain contemporary Tibetan manuscripts (pp. 130 sqq.) from the same region parallel inconsistencies in comparable number can be observed.

There are, however, some qualifications which deserve mention. In the first place, the inconsistencies and laxities are, despite their number, not sufficient to preclude our speaking of a normal spelling, or orthography. This is evident from the circumstance that the reviser of the text has made frequent corrections of the spelling, paying attention to even such matters as initial and final h (supra, p. 113 n. 3): he, therefore, considered that in the particular passage such and such a form was the right one, unless indeed he was merely equating the copy with an original. Secondly, some words of enormous frequency, ge, re, dze, one or other of them occurring in nearly every line, never perhaps receive either the Prefixed h (as noted supra, pp. 120) or the suffixed h or any other modification. The words are ge, a particle; re, the verb ‘to be’, unemphatic; dze, a preposition, of Chinese origin; possibly some other words, e.g. na, when meaning ‘in’. These two circumstances prove that the initial or final h was not inserted without a purpose, upon a mere caprice: a like conclusion follows from the cases where g- and h- alternate without difference of function. The h- was not nothing; and, since it was not functional, it must have been phonetic; that being so, its irregularity can be explained by a proximate oral source of the text (supra, p. 117 n.), when the first scribe will have sometimes heard and sometimes failed to hear the acoustic equivalent of the sign, which indeed may not have been always enunciated in actual speech. This inference is reinforced by the vocalic variation, i, u, e, o/hi, uhu, ehe, oho, which shows a similar inconstancy and which is known to have been oral. The initial h, perhaps a guttural nasalization, had a nasal value in the oldest known Tibetan, e.g. in Be-rka-hdra = Bargandara¹ and Ga-hjag = Kanjak, and only with this value (e.g. in Kanjur = Bkah-hgyur, rdzum-chul = rdzu-hphrul) is it now sounded in central and north-eastern Tibet: cf. pp. 76, 119 supra.

¹ See ZDMG. xcii, pp. 609–10.
III. THE TEXT

In advance of any substantial knowledge of the language something may be affirmed concerning the text, both on internal and on external grounds.

In the first place, the punctuation, as described above and shown to be not casual, indicates sections of the text larger than a sentence. These occur as follows:

1, line 62 beginning with $\sim||:|:$ this, occurring after a short line and a blank of a line’s width, may be paralleled from Tibetan writings, where it is often only a scribe’s beginning upon the recto of a new folio. It may indicate only a resumption of work after a break: the previous sentence ends quite normally with $||$.

2, line 80, $||:$ the two dots seem to be a reviser’s insertion, and this circumstance somewhat emphasizes the break.

3, lines 110, 116, $||:$ perhaps casual, $=:||$, but in any case not very emphatic.


5, line 215, $||||$.

6, line 222, $|\cdot|.$

7, line 249, $||::||:$ evidently a major division.

8, line 253, $||::|:$ end of an epilogue or prelude?

9, line 325, $||||$.

10, lines 344, 352, 358, $||||$.

11, line 385, $\cdot||.$

All these punctuation marks are familiar in Tibetan manuscripts.

The punctuation with $||$, less emphatic, reveals the important fact that a large part of the text is in verse. This may be exemplified by a passage occupying ll. 89–93:

```
gdim | phyi | hse | ge | [90] | htshog | hram | hñad ||
gryed | ma | hldañ | ge | htsog | hram | hñah ||
rtæ | htsog | hram | [91] | ge | htañ | rwye | hтаñ ||
rtæ | sko | prom | re | hrtæg | hldañ | hkræñ ||
htsog | rpu | śe | chañ | [92] | pyi | hse | hthoñ ||
hkor | htañ | hkhæn | yañ | sfian | gyañ | gyañ ||
hñah | htañ | hkhæn | yañ | [93] | swa | tseg | tseg ||
```

Here the double line evidently divides verses of seven syllables each, and even its absence in the last line but one is perhaps due to the fact that the second $gyañ$ is an underline insertion.
A metre of seven syllables is common in Chinese writings, and the Rgyal-roṅ poem discussed above is in the same. The Hsi-hsia has it both in a sacred text, the translation of the Suvarṇa-prabhāsa sūtra (see the edition by Wang Jinqru in his Shishiah Studies, iii, e.g. pp. 110, 112, 152), and also elsewhere (see Nevsky, op. cit., p. xviii). In old Tibetan we find it used in the Buddhist Vimalaprabhā-paripṛcchā (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 190), as well as in crude verses concluding a letter (Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang, by F. W. Thomas and Sten Konow, pp. 124, 128). As regards later Tibetan, we may refer to Francke, Ladakhi Songs, i, pp. 35 (xiii), 62 (xxvi) and Frühlings- und Wintermythus der Kesarsage, i, p. 1, ii, pp. 17, 28, &c., and the Tibetan Chronicle (Rgyal-rabs-gsal-bahi-me-loṅ) in Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, pp. 22, 29. In the So-sor-thar-pa (Prātimokṣa-sūtra) edited by Satīścandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Calcutta, 1915) many such verses can be conveniently examined; perhaps even more accessible is Laufer’s edition of the Tibetan Citra-laksana (Leipzig, 1913), where the text is in the same metre. In the present instance (as also in Tibetan) the metre evidently has a caesura after the fourth syllable: the fact that in the first three verses the fourth syllable is the same (ge), and similarly in the last two, is a sufficient proof of this; but it is also shown by another outstanding feature of the text, namely the parallelism of expression seen throughout the passage and culminating in the last two lines and the reduplicated words (no doubt verbs) with which they end.

A verse of seven syllables with a caesura after the fourth would be a catalectic form of a verse of eight syllables, derived from one of four syllables, such as is common in Chinese. Hence it would not be surprising to meet with verses of eight syllables, and also verses of eleven or twelve, as common in Tibetan: and such seem in fact to occur; examples:

8 syllables:
htah : | ḥṣud | ḥdon | rgyag | dze | htor | ḥdo | ḥchuṅ |
   hta | ṣud | mehi | dze | hrtah | ḥjam | ge | hmehi || 185–6.

11 syllables:
   hbo | hroṅ | hrog | re | hlah | ḥkyaṅ | hras | re | ḥses | gśi | ḥdzuḥi |
rgyeb | ḥchi | hro | re | gdag | yaṅ | la | por | ḥses | ḥśi | ḥdzuḥi || 344–5.

1 There are a few intentional exceptions, e.g. in ll. 65, 67, where the fifth syllable is the tea of p. 188 infra.
It will be seen that metrically these verses are composed of 4+4, 4+4+3, and 4+4+4 syllables respectively. The verse of 9 syllables, likewise common in Tibetan, is seen in:

g-yog | ḡṣaṅ | ma | hpul | dze | hmar | ḡbab | ge | ḡrloho ||
ẖbu | rwyė | ḡce | ḡryaṅ | dze | ḡldyo | ḡtor | ge | ḡnus || 15–16.
ẖsehe | ḡldu | ḡru | re | dze | ḡphag | ḡbah | ge | ḡyor |
ẖcha | ḡgrah | nu | nar | dze | ḡkhab | ḡgro | ge | ḡkahi || 238–9.

In these, and in its other occurrences (e.g. 347–9), its caesura is evidently after the 5th syllable, which is perhaps noticeable, because the Tibetan verse of 9 syllables usually has its break after the 4th.

These metrical facts are of great importance, not only as shedding light upon the character of the text, but also for the understanding of the language. They determine the metrical values of syllables and make more definite the discrimination of the limits of the phrases, generally found to consist of two syllables, whose recurrence, as well as the recurrence of whole verses or halves of verses, is a prominent feature of the text; and they point the antitheses between pairs or groups of words or expressions, thus furnishing a clue to the meanings. Moreover, the gravitation of certain words to the caesura position is an invaluable guide to structure and syntax.

Naturally the recurrent words and phrases are themselves suggestive of the subject-matter. The frequency of the word ṛṭa, in that form or as ṛṭah, ḡṛṭa, ḡṛṭah, which prompted the original conjecture (JRAS. 1926, p. 505 n.) of a treatise on horses, is still a likely indication of a connexion with horses; for not only in normal Tibetan, but also in the dialects of the north-east, the word ṛṭa has that meaning and not prima facie any other. But this matter, and more especially when we consider other expressions, such as ḡso-hna, ḡtsog-hram, ḡldaṅ-ḥkhraṅ, recurrent in various
spellings, can be discussed profitably only under the head of etymology.

There are two breaks in the text which may be immediately instructive. The first of them occurs in line 180, where we find included a sentence of actual Tibetan:

de-nas-rabs-bgyis-gsaṅ-hldi-ḥlab

of which the meaning seems to be:

‘therefrom, or thereafter, race (races, descent, generations) was (were) made: this is said (as) secret’.

In this stage-direction, so to speak, a Tibetan editor, who for the word ‘this’ is betrayed into using the Nam form ḥldi in place of the correct ḡdi, indicates that the text had been communicated orally and that a part of it was in some way esoteric. The second is the very marked break noted as occurring in line 249. In accordance with usage we should be prepared to find at the end of a section a colophon; it may therefore be that the last word ḡkon (nī),¹ which occurs only in that place, may be simply the Chinese word chiün, ‘fasciculus’, ‘chapter’, which in the form kvon has been found so used (JRAS. 1927, p. 293; 1929, p. 61) in colophons of Chinese manuscripts, in Tibetan script, from Chinese Turkestan. Admixture of Chinese terms was to be anticipated in manuscripts written in Tun-huang. What then was the topic finished at line 249?

Among external indications we must cite first the fact that the manuscript was written, no doubt in Śa-cu, where it was preserved, upon the verso of a Chinese Buddhist text. This took place, probably, during the period of Tibetan predominance in Śa-cu, which period may be stated roughly as circa A.D. 730–850. It must have been monastic work, since only in a religious establishment would the Chinese manuscript have been available for use, and only in such a milieu would there have been the requisite literary interest; we know, moreover, that in the monasteries there was an extensive business of copying.² It is presumable therefore that the text had in some way a religious interest. That interest was certainly not Buddhist; for it would be impossible to find in any language a Buddhist text of like extent showing no discernible traces of Buddhist or Indian terminology—in fact the presence of Buddhist expressions in writings, from Śa-cu and elsewhere in

¹ The nī is a Particle (see infra, p. 177).
² Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 80.
Central Asia, representing unknown languages, has been the chief key to the understanding of those languages; in the present text an oft-repeated perusal has not brought to light a single item of Buddhism.

From the same library we have in Tibetan script a few non-Tibetan writings, namely:

(a) a small number of Chinese Buddhist texts and one or two documents in the same language;
(b) some parts of a medical work in a language which has been recognized as that of a district of the western part of Tibet, usually associated with the Himalayan district Gu-ge, but perhaps embracing the whole Kailāsa region.

In normal Tibetan there are:

(1) masses of manuscripts containing Buddhist texts or works connected with Buddhism;
(2) a Tibetan Chronicle;
(3) a few pieces relating to medicine or divination;
(4) a few pieces relating to business of government or monasteries;
(5) miscellaneous notices, letters, legal agreements, model letter-forms, and signatures.

But there are also some pieces marked in various degrees by linguistic features and style distinguishing them from everything hitherto familiar as Tibetan; they are connected with eastern and north-eastern Tibet, and their language and sentiment show no trace of Buddhism. They are popular literature, and two of them are folk-lore.

In these two, one of which is only a short fragment, there are references to the language of a Nam or Nam-pa kingdom, and in one of them the Nam people are called Nam-Tig. Two of the stories are introduced by, or contain, statements concerning their leading persons, to the effect that their names in the Nam-kingdom language are such and such, in Tibetan such and such. Since the narratives are in Tibetan, it is evident that the stories are derived from Nam originals, oral or otherwise; thus the stories are in substance literature of the Nam-Tig people, and the names given in Nam-pa form are evidence in regard to a Nam language. This evidence can most conveniently be considered here.

In the story of a man, or quasi-man—the story being a fable—
who with some of his family was devoured by a demon, the man’s name is given as:

In the language of the Nam-pa kingdom:

\textit{Ltoñ-tehi Mye-kru}

(with variants \textit{te} for \textit{tehi}, \textit{me} for \textit{mye} and \textit{ku}, \textit{kro} and \textit{bkru} (?) for \textit{kru});

In the language of Tibet:

\textit{Gloñ-myig-loñ, Bya-Gloñ-gi-lgo(mgo)-dañ-rje},

and the meaning (most names from Tibet and Central Asia had meanings) is ‘Blind Eye-blind’, ‘Blind Birds’ Head and Chief’. The word for ‘blind’ is found in Tibetan in the forms \textit{mdoñs, ldoñ, loñ}, all going back, no doubt, to \textit{ldoñ}; and \textit{gloñ}, for \textit{gldoñ}, has merely an additional, or a different, Prefix. The form of the expression ‘Blind, Eye-blind’ is characteristic of north-eastern Tibet, whence we have numerous parallels, such as \textit{yul-myi-yul}, ‘country, man-country’, \textit{yul-Rgya-yul}, ‘country, China-country’; and another will meet us below. Accordingly it appears that we have three Nam words, two of them, namely \textit{ltoñ} and \textit{kru} (or \textit{kro}), meaning ‘blind’, and the third meaning ‘eye’: the suffix \textit{te} in \textit{ltoñ-te} has a variant form \textit{tehi}. \textit{Ltoñ} is evidently related to the Tibetan \textit{ldoñ}; \textit{mye} or \textit{me} = Tibetan \textit{myig, mig}, is the most common form of the word for ‘eye’ in the Tibeto-Burman languages of the Tibeto-Chinese frontier and of China and Indo-China (Hsi-hsia \textit{mei}: cf. Laufer, \textit{T'oung-pao}, vol. xviii (1916), p. 50). \textit{Kru} or \textit{kro} is perhaps only a dialectical form corresponding to the Tibetan \textit{gloñ}, since loss of final nasals is one of the linguistic features of the region.

In the same story a daughter of Ltoñ-te Mye-kru has her name, originally \textit{Tseñ-gi-Rbag-žin}, changed into:

In the language of the Nam-pa kingdom: \textit{Bya-rma-byahi Rma-li, Byechu-rma-byechu-gi Thin-tshun} (of which two forms only the second recurs);

In the language of Tibet: \textit{Khab-yo-byahi-Hdab-bkra}.

The change of name takes place on the occasion of the girl’s escape from a fiend, which she effects by clinging to a bird. The bird is certainly a peacock, in which form the girl appears later in the story; in the version contained in the shorter manuscript she escapes by actually changing into a peacock and also reappears in that form. The expression \textit{Bya-rma-byahi} means ‘bird, peacock-bird’; it is parallel to the \textit{yul-myi-yul}, &c., noted above, and the
suffixal $\dot{hi}$ corresponds to the $\dot{hi}$ of tehi. The alternative form byehu-rma-byehu-gi is the same expression, modified only by substitution of the so-called ‘Diminutive’ form in -ehu, for -a, and the Genitive-Adjective suffix gi for the equivalent $\dot{hi}$. It can be shown that such diminutives and the actual form byehu were favoured in north-eastern Tibet. Thin is probably equivalent to Tibetan mthin, which in the form thin is found in a text from north-eastern Tibet, and which appears in several bird-names, mthin-ga, ‘a bird of deep blue colour’, mthin-ril, ‘a wild duck’, mthin-hril, ‘a certain bird’: note also mthin-khra, ‘a kind of silk-scarf with white spots on a blue ground’, containing the word khra, which also occurs in the name. It is possible that tshun means ‘feather’, since one of the Hsi-fan languages has tson in that sense;\(^1\) but not much weight can be attached to this, since in a modern dialect we should expect a more degenerate form: perhaps Tibetan tshon, ‘colour’, may call for consideration. It does not seem possible to say anything concerning rma-li. In the Tibetan name hdab-bkra means ‘mottled wing’, and khab-yo-bya in the context where it occurs ought to mean ‘household (khab)-managing (yo)-bird’. Thus the interpretation of this name fails to yield any sufficiently precise information in regard to the meanings of individual words.

In the same story figures the ‘mountain-ridge donkey’ (ri-khahi-bon-~), to whose neck the Nam-Tig people attach a ‘yak-heart’ bell and whom they set to guard sheep. His name is:

In the Nam-pa language: cho-pyi-cog-zu;
In the language of Tibet: span-hgi-bon-bu-stag-cun.

The Tibetan name means ‘Ass of the meadow, “Little Tiger”’. Here we have very good reason for understanding cog-zu as meaning ‘Ass of the meadow’; for in the divergent version of the story contained in the smaller manuscript the same, or another, ass is named zu-tsog-žu, a name evidently of the form previously described and meaning ‘Ass, meadow-ass’. It follows that cho-pyi means ‘Little Tiger’. Cho might be related to the kho of the Thöchü dialect, Gyāmi khu, Gyārūng kong, Chinese hu (Hodgson, JASB. xxii (1853), p. 144) and to the cho of certain Miao-tseu dialects, recorded by the Vicomte d'Ollone (op. cit., p. 64) as meaning ‘tiger’ and ‘panther’; and there are various forms in Tibeto-Burman dialects\(^2\) (see Hunter, The Non-Aryan Languages

---

1 d'Ollone, p. 70 (No. 38): in Hsi-hsia rtsi, rtsiñ, rtsi are given (Nevsky, No. 132) as meaning ‘colour’.

2 But some of these seem to point to an original initial kl-.
of India and High Asia, p. 160). In one of the two Tibetan manuscripts occurs a word cha, denoting some kind of forest animal, and this might mean the tiger, since the verb chchah has the sense of 'maul', 'mangle', and cho might be related to it as smo to rma, zo to za, lto to lta. For the moment there is little advantage in such conjectures, but it will appear infra (p. 252) that both the word for 'ass' and the expression 'little tiger' are represented in the text.

With the story of 'Blind, Eye-blind' the two manuscripts connect an account of the family of a person named:

In the language of the Nam-pa kingdom: Yab-ñal-ldehi (elsewhere lde)-thol-phrom;
In the language of the Tibetan kingdom: Yab-sten-rgan-gyi-ñer-ba,

and the one text states that he was in the country Skyi-mthin, while the other discusses the manner of his burial. The Tibetan means 'Having care (ñer-ba) of his exalted (sten) old (rgan) father'; from which we can see that the person was not an ordinary human being, but was connected with one of the upper (sten) worlds of the Bon cosmology: in fact, he himself goes at death 'to heaven' (dguñ-du). The Nam word ñal, if connected with Tibetan ñal, 'fatigue', could very well mean 'old'; and the suffix lde or ldehi is similar to the te or tehi already familiar to us. From the circumstances as detailed in the story we can see that the matter taken in charge was the burial of a father; hence we cannot be mistaken in assigning to lto1 the meaning 'bury', which meaning is not recorded in Tibetan dictionaries, but recurs several times in old Tibetan documents from Central Asia,1 possibly borrowed from people of the Koko-nor region, since the Tibetans themselves did not normally bury.2 Accordingly phrom will have the sense of ñer, 'take charge of', 'attend to' (infra, p. 137).

Of the other names mentioned in these stories we are not furnished with translations. But it may not be superfluous to point out that in type they correspond generally to those discussed above. Omitting the seven Gyim (Gyim-po, 'Gyim-man'),3 brothers we have:

(a) Wife of Lto1-te Mye-kru: Bžagste Ñar-hbyam.

2 See, however, infra, p. 148.
3 On Gyim as a tribe-name see supra, pp. 33, n. 5, 57.
(b) Daughters of the same:


Version B: \(^1\) Rbeg-ga-rbeg-śi (\(=\) Tsen-hgi-Rbag-zin) only mentioned in the fragment.

(c) Wives of Yab-ṇal-de-thol-phrom:

\(\text{Ldehu-zahi-ḥbrid-te Sman-skyol}\\n\text{Skeg-zahi-ḥbrid-te Yar-mo-btsun}\\n\) in which the te is once omitted.

Here we usually find the proper personal name preceded by a surname, which in two cases is a clan-name ‘Ldehu-woman-middle-[sister]’, ‘Skeg-woman-middle-[sister]’, in two, Bžagste and Tsen-hgi, is obscure, and in Rbeg-ga-rbeg has the form already exemplified in Glon-myig-loṅ (Lton-te-Mye-kru), Žu-tsog-žu, yul-myi-yul, &c. To this last group belongs also, in one of the two versions, the name of

(d) The fiend: Go-ya-go-phu (in the other version he is Dgu-lcogs), ‘the Go, the Ya-Go, the elder’ (if phu here, as usual, means ‘elder’: ya may be ‘sheep (ewe)’, cf. pp. 94, 343).

The persons in these stories are, as has been mentioned, not ordinary human beings. This applies in a high degree to the girl Rbeg-ga-rbeg-śi, or Tsen-hgi-Rba\[g\]-zin, who is transmuted into a peacock and flies away from G-ye-mo-thaṅ to the Skyi-mthīṅ country, where she becomes the wife of Gyim-po Ńag-cig [‘Number one’], the junior, but wise, son of Yab-ṇal-de Thol-phrom. Her character as a peacock suggests a bird-nature in the original status of herself and her family, and discloses a possibility that her father, ‘Blind Eye-blind’, ‘Blind Birds’ Head and Chief’, may have commenced his existence in fable as an owl. This possibility is confirmed by the name of the fiend in the form Go-ya-go, since go may well be \(=\) Tibetan go-bo (Mo-so hio ?), ‘vulture’; but she may have been a sheep, since the fiend’s first object in approaching the flock of sheep will have been, of course, the lambs. In any case the alternative version, in which the fiend is ‘the black fiend Dgu-lcogs from the fiend country Dgu-sul in Khar-tsan’, two places belonging to the Ša-cu region,\(^2\) shows that the original fable had assumed a less definite significance.

\(^1\) Evidently with dialectical difference.

\(^2\) Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 368–8 (\(\text{ṣul}\)), 28, 32, 34–5, &c.
An aetiological character in the story emerges when we consider that it is to the Skyi country that Tsen-hgi-Rba[g]-žin escapes, and in that country she becomes the peacock bride of Yab-nal-Ide-Thol-phrom’s son, Gyim-po Ng-cig. The story begins (in the larger manuscript):


In a country, man-country, Skyi-mthin: Skyi [country, high-country, Thaṅ-hundred].\(^1\) In the language of Tibet. . . .

The scribe, obsessed by the idea of the Skyi country, was going on to say ‘In the language of Skyi’; but he recollected immediately, crossed out the words ‘country, high-country, Thaṅ-hundred’ and proceeded ‘In the language of Tibet’, accidentally leaving in the (second) ‘Skyi’. Connexion of the Skyi country with the peacock is evident when we remember that Skyi is the country of the upper Hoang-ho, the Rma-chu, ‘Peacock-river’, and that Rma, ‘Peacock’, is a surname of persons from that region,\(^2\) and that the river in its great upper course winds round the towering Amne Ma-chin range of mountains, i.e. the Ane Rma-chen, ‘Aunt (or Grandmother, Grandfather, Ancestress, Ancestor) Great-Peacock’ range. In another story belonging to the larger manuscript one of the characters journeys to the ‘country, man-country, Skyi-mthin, a far country’, where he meets with ‘man, peacock-son (myi-rma-bu), Ldam-sad’; and in a different manuscript we have a long account of a certain Myi-rma-bu-Mchiṅ-rgyal, ‘Man, peacock-son, Mchiṅ-king’. It is therefore certain that the peacock was the legendary ancestor, or rather ancestress, of the Skyi people and its chiefs; and the story of Father Nal-Ide-Thol-phrom and his Gyim-po sons is the racial legend of the Skyi folk. Should we resist the temptation to identify this Gyim with Jèn (Wylie, pp. 433–4; De Groot, ii, pp. 195–6, Dsim), the great-grandson of the legendary first king of the Ch’iang? See supra, pp. 40, 57.

We should not fail to observe that in the story three different areas are envisaged. The first is the narrator’s own point of view,

\(^1\) ‘Plain-hundred’, if brga is = brgya, ‘hundred’: many parallels show that it must be a number; but it might be ga, ‘ten’, which is likely to have been the regional word = Hörpa sga, Muli ka-te, Pa-U-Rong ka-den, Hsihsia dgah, dgah, and which probably occurs as ga in the longer manuscript; on the word Thaṅ in the name see supra, p. 30, n. 3.

where, no doubt, since he does not suggest any other location, is the home of Lton-te Mye-kru and his family. The second is the place of the girl’s first hiding (and perhaps, therefore, not remote from her own original country), namely, the G-yer-mo-thañ, which we have already (pp. 33–4) found reason to identify with the ‘Great and Little Turquoise (Yü) Valleys’, west of the Koko-nor. The third is the country of Yab-nal-de-Thol-phrom, the Skyi country, which the girl reaches in her flight after traversing nine passes and crossing nine fords. Thus we have three regions: the narrator’s, i.e. the Nam, region; a proximate region, the G-yer-mo-thañ; and a remoter region, Skyi, which had its own language or dialect. The legend of the Skyi country, at any rate as retailed in the Nam country, recognized an ancestry from the first of these.

Have we now sufficient grounds for identifying with the Nam language that speech which is represented by our manuscript? The most obvious formal correspondence is in connexion with the suffix which appears in the forms te and tehi (Lton-te and tehi, hbrañ-te), ste (Bzagste), lde and ldehi (Nal-lde and ldehi), and which obviously is identical with the Tibetan Gerund suffix te, ste, de. In Tibetan, however, the suffix is not found employed as it is in these names, i.e. as a mere appendage to an attribute; and it certainly could not be followed, as here, by a Genitive or Adjective suffix hi—that this is the value of the hi is proved by the alternative use of hgi in Tsen-hgi Rba-ga, &c. Alternation of -e and -ehi without apparent difference of sense has been exemplified above (p. 124) in forms of the manuscript language, and it seems possible that we should find in the hi the Adjectival suffix i which Dr. Laufer attributed (T’oung-pao, xxii (1916), p. 106) to the Hsi-hsia language; and such a suffix might have also other uses. But in any case the language of the manuscript has many examples of a suffix te or hte attached to words which are unmistakable verbs (hdre, htre, hphom) and adjectives (htor, hram, hnam), on which matter see infra (pp. 188–90); the form ste also occurs.

It must be confessed that a te, de, ste, lde as a Gerund, though not in the above use, may, since it existed in two independent dialects, Tibetan and Nam, have been general in old Tibeto-Burman, and so may have extended to the language of the manuscript, even if not identifiable with Nam. This difficulty does not apply to the auxiliary verb phrom in thol-phrom, which in Tibetan might have been thol-byed or thol-mdzad, the two verbs byed, ‘do’, and mdzad, ‘make’, ‘do’, being from old times so
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employed with verbs, either to form Causatives or as mere stylistic equivalents of the simple verbs. In the Tibetan documents another verb hkhums (Preterite khums, and bkum; Future bgums) is frequently used in the expression gner-hkhums, ‘to carry out a task’, gner being a verb with the meaning ‘employ’ or ‘have in charge’. This verb hkhums, which is not found in the Tibetan dictionaries, is perhaps identical in root with hgum, ‘die’, bkum, ‘kill’, and may have meant ‘execute’ in both senses; but a more likely connexion is with hkhums, skum, ‘contract’ (limbs, &c.), whence the dictionary of S. C. Das gives ‘to practise’, ‘to impress on the mind’ (‘concentrate’), and thos-pa-hkhum, ‘comprehend what has been heard’. Phrom will then be a verb of the same character, possibly connected with phrom, khrom, ‘a mart’, often used by the Tibetans in Central Asia. The word, as prom, hprom, kproms, bprom, phrom, hphrom, is of frequent occurrence in the language of the manuscript, and is nowhere else recorded;¹ and this fact may perhaps be considered decisive of the whole matter.²

¹ Also the text has an auxiliary verb hkom, gkom, e.g. in yob-hkom, l. 166, ‘having accomplished a shaking’, which is clearly identical with the Tibetan hkhums; concerning prom and hkom see infra, pp. 199–200.

² Is it an accident that has combined the three syllables Nam-lдон-prom in the name of a place where in the year A.D. 702 the Tibetan government held their winter assembly of Mdo-smad (Tibetan MS. Chronicle)? The name might mean ‘Ldon-prom in Nam’, or ‘Nam-lдон mart’ (with prom = phrom, ‘mart’). But in any case the Nam country is probably indicated, and prom, even if = phrom, points to the north, since it is only in Central Asia that this form of khrom, ‘mart’, is known.

It seems highly probable that the collocation Nam-lдон is not, in fact, casual, and that the blindness (ldon) of Mye-kru owes its origin to a never-absent feature of Central-Asian folk-lore, namely, popular etymology. For the Ldon are famous in Tibetan literature as one of the six early tribes descended from the monkey patriarch of the Tibetan race, and also as having supplied generations of ministers to the Tibetan state (see S. C. Das’s Dictionary, s.v.). The Lдон Sum-pa, i.e. the Ldon of the Sum-pa division, have already (p. 18, n. 2) come to our knowledge; and in connexion with them the Tibetan history there cited makes mention also of the Lдон Mi-нag, as another of the four tribes of ‘inner dwarfs’. It looks as if the peoples of the Women’s Kingdom and of the Mi-наг country were regarded as subdivisions of a Lдон race. If that is so, we must include also the Nam people; for the same manuscript which speaks of the Lдон Sum-pa refers in the same connexion to the Nam-pa Ldon, the ‘Ldon of the Nam-pa division’, and these seem to be also the Nam-chen Ldon of the history (p. 65). Accordingly it appears that to the early Tibetans the Ch’iang tribes in general were Ldon. This being so, it is probable that the ‘blindness’ of the Nam patriarch Mye-kru, and perhaps his owl character and his whole story, embody merely a popular attempt to account for the racial or ethnic name Ldon, Gton.
But it seems also that the actual name *Mye-kru*, in the form *Mehi-klu*, and the word *klu*, with the meaning ‘blind’, occur in the manuscript.

*Mehi-klu-hcha*, certainly denoting some kind of living creatures, occurs in:

\[ hldyaăn-hpu-hbri-re-mehi-klu-hcha-ge-stor-htaň-htoni \] || 1.150,
which must mean (approximately):
‘the Mehi-klu-hcha, male and female (?) were scattered (or fled);'

and the same verse, with *hcah* for *hcha* and *yan-stor-hdor-hyon* for *ge-stor-htaň-htoni* recurs in l. 161. In l. 218 we have:

\[ hldyaăn-hpu-hbri-re-hmehi-klu-hcah-dze-htor-hkho-ge-hkhoi, \]
and the phrase *hldyaăn* . . . *hcah* is found again in l. 343. It is possible that *hcah* or *hcha* is a pluralizing suffix which occurs in other connexions; but more probably it means ‘harmful creatures’, see supra, pp. 132-3, *cha*, *hcah*, *hchah*, &c., and infra, p. 253. *Mehi*, according to what has been set out above, is a good equivalent for *mye*, *me*, ‘eye’; along with *klu* it is found in ll. 24-5:

\[ hgru-hsram-htam-ge-hšes-beg-stah \]
\[ klu-hrto-htsa-ge-hšes-hbeg-mehi \]
\[ klu-rto-htsah-ge-hrah-hyos-hlam. \]

*Hšes-hbeg* occurs elsewhere and seems to be a divinity, and *hrah-hyos* likewise recurs, meaning probably ‘place moved’, while *hlam* is certainly = Tibetan *lam*, ‘road’, ‘path’. The parallelism of *stah*, *mehi*, and *hlam*, along with the other antitheses, proves that the meaning of the second and third lines is:

‘They being blind [rocks], Hšes-beg was their eye:
They being blind [rocks], the place (itself) moving was their path.’

These coincidences inevitably suggest the possibility of a connexion between our Nam text (since we can now confidently refer to it as such) and the two Tibetan manuscripts, a connexion extending to the subject-matter; and this idea is encouraged by a rather striking parallelism.

The Tibetan interpolation at l. 180 of the Nam manuscript means, as we have seen,

‘therefrom, or thereafter, race (races, descent, generations) was (were) made: this is said (as) secret’.

In the longer Tibetan manuscript the first part ends:

‘Now in kinds, nine (= all) kinds (rigs, ‘races’), it is to be: in divisions, nine divisions, is to be division’;

and then, after some verses particularizing the changes, we have a colophon:

‘Chapter telling of the beginning (cho). The rest is to be spoken. Here a small extract is written.’

Thus both texts profess an oral source, and at a certain point both announce an oral continuation and state as its subject a matter of race or divided races (rabs, rigs).

The next, and longest, section in the Tibetan manuscript narrates the tragic story of the separation (dbye) of the horse and kiang (the wild ass) and the conflict with the yak, whose hostility is still a notorious theme. The horse is generally, of course, rta, the usual word not only in normal Tibetan but also in the frontier dialects of the east and north-east. The yak is g-yag (byag) or hbron, the yak-bull, whose malice is proverbial; in the text we are concerned with ‘Father Hbron-g-yag Skar-ba’ (his individual name). The Nam text likewise is evidently concerned with the horse (rta, rtah, hrtah, hrtak) and the yak (hbron), whose designations are of constant recurrence; and it would be easy to show that the main topic is the strife between the two and the quelling of the yak. Since this proof depends upon the interpretation of Nam words, it would be premature to dwell here upon the matter; it may suffice to cite two lines (185–6) of the text which are fairly clear:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{htah} & | \text{bsd} | \text{hdo} | \text{rgyag} | \text{dze} | \text{htor} | \text{hdo} | \text{hchuñ} | \\
\text{hta} & | \text{sd} | \text{mehi} | \text{dze} | \text{hrtañ} | \text{hjam} | \text{ge} | \text{hmehi} | \\
\end{align*}
\]

The meaning must be (roughly):

‘In comparison with (dze) that fierce-purposed [yak] the horse is in bigness small:

‘In comparison with that fierce-eyed [yak] the horse has a mild eye’

(the little fierce eye of the yak-bull being a familiar matter).\(^1\)

Another expression, of like frequency, in the Nam text is rgyed or rgyed-ma. If we disregard the initial r, or regard it as a Causative Prefix, we are at once conducted to the Tibetan verb hgye, ‘be

\(^1\) On the blackness, fierceness, and ‘fiery eyes’ of the yak see Huc and Gabet, ii, p. 120, and cf. Rockhill, Diary, pp. 193, 199, Tafel, i, p. 337, and Prejevalsky, ii, pp. 187–8, 194.
divided', 'to issue, proceed, spread, or branch from', and to its causative form \textit{hgyed}, 'scatter, disperse, set going', with Preterite \textit{bgyes}, Future \textit{bkye}. In connexion with Tibetan forms beginning with \textit{gy}, \textit{gr}, \textit{gl} there is always reason to anticipate alternatives with \textit{by}, \textit{br} or \textit{dr}, \textit{bl}, of which alternation we have here, in fact, an instance; for the more common form in Tibetan is \textit{hbye}, 'open, separate, resolve into', with Causative \textit{hbyed} (Preterite \textit{phye}, \textit{phyed}, \textit{physes}, Future \textit{dbye}), 'open, disunite, set at variance, divide', \textit{rigs-kyi-sgo-nas-dbye-na}, 'if classified according to the different species (\textit{rigs})'. This form \textit{hbyed} is, in fact, the one used (\textit{dbye}, Future or Prospective) in the Tibetan manuscript to denote the 'separation' of species. In the Nam we should, on the analogy of its \textit{glo}, 'mind' (ordinary Tibetan \textit{blo}, but in Central-Asian documents \textit{glo}), expect the \textit{g} form. Incontestably therefore we recognize in the Nam word \textit{rgyed} the meaning 'divide', 'separate'; and in regard to \textit{rgyed-ma} we scarcely need to cite the Tibetan \textit{hgyed-ma}, which the authors of S. C. Das's \textit{Tibetan Dictionary} have somewhere found denoting 'a goddess, one that brings on division, dissension, or disunion'.

We are now in a position to resume consideration of the 'colophon' occurring, as suggested \textit{supra} (p. 129) in ll. 248–9 of the text. The last sentence there reads:

\textit{hldi-rgyed-hrar-rgyed-htre-hte-ge-gse-hao-hkoni} (= \textit{hkon-ni}).

Here \textit{hldi} = Tibetan \textit{hdi}, 'this'; \textit{hrar} is Locative of \textit{krah} = Tibetan \textit{ra}, 'place', 'enclosure'; \textit{htre}, which elsewhere in connexion with \textit{rgyed} is \textit{hdre}, is a form of the Tibetan verb \textit{hdren}, 'draw', 'bring on', 'invite' (\textit{blo-hdren}, 'draw on the mind', 'persuade', 'induce'). The form \textit{hdre} with this meaning occurs in our texts from eastern and north-eastern Tibet; and the ordinary Tibetan \textit{hdre}, 'demon, or evil spirit', is perhaps the same word in the sense of a 'drawer'; \textit{hte} is the Participial-Adjectival suffix with which we are already familiar. \textit{Gse} (also \textit{hse}), since it occurs with the suffix \textit{htah}, is probably a verb; and since we have

\begin{align*}
gse-\textit{htah-hdam}, & 248, \\
\textit{hse-htah-hdam}, & 326,
\end{align*}

'\textit{gse-ta} was bound or condemned',

\footnote{S. C. Das's \textit{Dictionary}: \textit{de-dag-las-gyes-so}, 'they have proceeded from those (their ancestors)'. So also in the \textit{Rgyal-rabs} (ed. Francke, \textit{Antiquities of Indian Tibet}, ii, p. 21, l. 2) \textit{bzi-po-de-las-mi-rigs-phal-cher-gyes-so}, 'from those four the races of men in general branched out'.}
and gse-lad (and hlad), 240, 242, 244,  
‘requital of gse’,  
it means ‘injuring’, ‘harming’, ‘injury’, ‘harm’, and corresponds to Tibetan gtse/htshe, ‘cause mischief or danger to, damage, injure, persecute’. For hkon the meaning ‘chapter’ has been conjectured. The meaning of the passage therefore is:  
‘In this Place of Division injury [by] those inducing Division, so-Chapter.’  

cho-smos-pahi-lehu  
‘chapter telling of the beginning’,  
we might be tempted to equate só with cho in the sense of ‘beginning’; but, since the Nam text contains the word chos in that sense, that way seems provisionally to be closed, and we must leave the problem unresolved. Nothing supports the idea that só might be a number.  

In the Tibetan manuscript the (fragmentary) beginning is concerned with the period preceding the Age of Separation, division, dissension. It was a Golden Age, with blessedness concentrated on the top, and evil or curse shut outside. The change came with the action of the stars and planets, which commenced to ‘eat uphill1 (or with difficulty, against the grain) and drink anxiously’. If the Nam text was on similar lines, we might perhaps in its opening part, despite its fragmentary condition, find some traces of a world cataclysm. From ll. 24–5 we have already taken note of the verse which says:  
‘They being blind, the place (itself) moving was their path.’  
The phrase hrah-hyos, ‘place moved’, recurs as hrah-g-yos and  

1 G-yen-du, possibly a technical expression, because we are told that in October the yaks, having previously ‘fed their way up the mountain’, ‘of their own accord commence feeding downwards’ (Travels of a Pioneer of Commerce, by T. T. Cooper, p. 394).
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g-rah-hyos in l. 26, while in l. 27 we find g-rah-g-yo, and in l. 28 g-yo-hpud-hito. In g-yo we have evidently to do with the Tibetan verb g-yo, Preterite g-yos, ‘move’, ‘waver’, of which yo-ba, ‘crooked’, ‘perverted’, ‘deceitful’, may be a prefixless form; and other variations may be traced. But that in north-eastern Tibet the phrase was used with reference to earthquake or cataclysm\(^1\) is certain from another Tibetan manuscript, which tells of a girl queen of the Myaṅ country, who was keeping down the local fiend, so that:

‘When in the high-country was quaking (g-yos), in the Myaṅ high-country of Black Woods there was no quaking (g-yos).’

That a cataclysm is the subject of the opening part of the Nam text may shed light upon the verse (ll. 9, 19)

\[
\text{sta-re-hmo-ge-sta-hri-hldyaṅ}
\]

if that means something like

‘Where were the clouds (or heavens, \(h\text{mog}\) or \(h\text{mo}\)), there the mountains rose (or flew or ?)’,

which may suggest an original Tibeto-Burman source for the early Sanskrit legend that the mountains (Himālaya) at first had wings. It is a singular coincidence that the earth-movement was due to the swelling-up, as we shall see, of the above-mentioned (p. 138) divinity, Ḥśes-hbeg, in name resembling the serpent Śeṣa of Indian mythology, who ‘by moving his coils lays the mountains in ruins’.\(^2\) The end of the cataclysm is stated in the verse

\[
\text{hsah-yob-hkom-re-hraṅ-hraḥ-htsuhu ||, 166,}
\]

which patently means

‘The earth, having done quaking, returned to its own place.’

The character of the Nam text now begins, it may be hoped, to be discernible behind its machine-gun rapid-fire of strange monosyllables. It is the literature, folk-lore, and sacred legend of the Nam-Tig people. Like the narration in Tibetan language, to which it had a general, but apparently no close, correspondence, it began with a description of a primitive age of blessedness and harmony in the fields of heaven; and then, after describing the cosmic disaster which terminated that period, expounded the

\(^1\) On frequency of earthquakes in borderlands of east Tibet see Tafel, ii, pp. 195, 197; Johnston, p. 132; Gill, p. 218; Fergusson, p. 206.

\(^2\) See the Sanskrit \(H\text{arṣa-carītā}\), trans. Cowell and Thomas, p. 132.
unfortunate history of the divisions and strifes of species. If it was similar to the Tibetan texts which we have, it may have continued into human origins and have given the eponymous or aetiological legends of its own people and of others within their purview; in that case the legend of the Nam-Tig country would have been that of Mye-klu, while that of the Skyi country was, as we have seen, that of Yab-nal-lde-Thol-prom. Two other manuscripts from the same region use the doctrine of the Blessed Age and the successive periods of degeneration as a preface to disquisitions of a historical, and even a politico-religious, character. These may be affected by some indirect influence from the side of Buddhism. The Nam text, too, may contain some references to actualities. But, if it resembled the Tibetan account, which has one certain reference to Bon divinities, its notions will have been of the vaguer, more poetical and fanciful, kind, which may still be traced in certain Bon-po writings.

It ought not to be thought strange that from among tribes which the Chinese, even in T'ang times, could describe as the lowest savages, we should have literature of this nature. Narratives of a primitive Period of Bliss, or commencing with the gods or heaven and progressing into actual history or legend, are, in fact, the most widespread of all forms of early literature. After the most familiar examples, the Book of Genesis and the works of Hesiod, we may refer to the Sanskrit Purāṇas, which reflect some very ancient models. In the Tibeto-Burman sphere and among neighbouring peoples such narratives seem to have been a common type. For the Mo-so we may refer to the facsimile text printed, with translation, in Prince Henri d'Orléans' From Tonkin to India (pp. 448 sqq.) and to M. Jacques Bacot's work (Les Mo-so), pp. 18–20; for Lo-lo stories to M. Paul Vial (Les Lolos), pp. 6–12, H. Cordier in T'oung-pas, 1907, pp. 666–7, and M. A. Liétard's Au Yun-nan, Les Lo-lo-p'o, pp. 140–2. Concerning the 'independent Miao-tze' the Vicomte d'Ollone writes (trans., In Forbidden China, pp. 156–7):

‘One of the most curious customs of these people is that of profiting by all solemn occasions . . . to relate the traditions referring to the earliest ages of the world, the Creation, the Deluge and so forth. It is an interminable story, to which the crowd listens without fatigue; they will interrupt it in order to eat or sleep, and once more it is resumed, often to last for several days. . . . Their recitals vary from village to village. The most singular point about these traditions is the almost perfect identity, in spite of certain items of purely
local colour, of their account of the Deluge with that of the
Bible.'

As regards Burma, we have there 'the Lahu Narrative of
Creation' (Journal of the Burma Research Society, i, p. 65) and the
statement of the Rev. D. Gilmore (ibid. ii, p. 32) concerning the
Karens:
'the prevalence among them, when they first came in contact with
Christian missionaries, of a number of traditional legends more or
less resembling the narratives found in the early part of the book of
Genesis.'

In Tibet the Royal Chronicle (Me-loṅ), which remarks that
'Well known is the lineage of the gods according to Bon-po ideas',¹
has preserved in its early pages some little of this, though with
Buddhist admixture.

Whether the Nam narrative was of the same interminable
character² as those of the Miao-tze and the Finnish Kalevala is not
apparent. It has two distinctive features, or rather three.

The first of these features is the prominence of the idea of
division, or dissension, and the deploring of the resulting evils;
also the praise of combination or friendship. This idea seems to
have been prominent in the minds of the eastern and north-eastern
Tibetans;³ for in another of the Tibetan texts one of the evils of
the bad age is that
'father and son came to be in dissension (p(h)un-phye): elder
brother and younger brother came to be divided (p(h)ye)',
and this fact is not indifferent to us here; for the word phun-phye,
which is not given in the Tibetan dictionaries, obviously means
'heap, mass, aggregate (phun) divided (phye)', the second member
being the verb which we have found used of the division of species
and harmony; and this assures us that the Nam expression
puñ-te-gsar-ñar (204)
really does mean
'from being united (phun) new (Tib. gsar) strength (ñar)',
and that in
ḥkrug-ḥrdzo-ḥgyud-dze (18)
'upon the quarrelsome ḡrdzo (sc. yak) race'

¹ Prof. A. H. Francke's translation (Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii), p. 76.
² Cf. the remarks of Huc and Gabet (ii, p. 82) on 'interminable series of
tales and legends' among the 'Si-fan nomads'.
³ Likewise among the T'u-yū-hun it was illustrated by the story of
King A-ch'ai's sons and the arrows (Bichurin, i, p. 79).
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and in

\[ \text{ḥkrug-kyaṅ-hdom-re-hriē-hno-hdzar (371–2)} \]

'strife being bound down, foe and friend were united'

\[ \text{ḥkrug} \] really is = Tibetan \[ \text{ḥkhrug} \], 'commotion, quarrel, fight, row'. The material basis of this sentiment is likewise apposite for us, and we have already (p. 39) quoted a Chinese description of the constant and violent contentions within the Ch'iang tribes. The long history of the struggles related in the Annals shows with what success the dividing Chinese diplomacy played upon this weakness;¹ and we see here that the tribes, however incapable of counteracting, were conscious of it.

The second feature, which also will be a valuable aid in interpretation, is the large admixture of moral or practical reflection apparent in the text. Proverbial wisdom is, no doubt, current among all human groups; and from eastern Tibet we have a text containing 'Sum-pa Mother-sayings'. The Sum-pa sayings are not those of a savage, or even barbarous, folk; and from the Koko-nor peoples, after so many centuries of contact with, and, in a varying measure, absorption into, Chinese civilization, a common-sense tone is not surprising. In the Nam text ll. 120–3 contain six antithetical verses concerning \[ \text{ḥtsog-hram} \], which certainly means 'friendly association', and ll. 124–7 six similar verses concerning \[ \text{ḥldan-hkrañ} \], which is 'uprightness'. It is not convenient to attempt at this point a translation of these, or analogous, passages—in the Tibetan manuscripts there are similarly reflective sentiments and even, in the more systematic accounts of the world periods, rather sober historico-ethical reflections. As specimens of the earlier, more naïve, wisdom we may cite the two verses in ll. 60–1:

\[ \text{ḥkhu-tsa-ṣid-dze-hpha-hṇur-hṇur} \]
\[ \text{gphaḥ-tsa-gлом-dze-ḥkhu-hṇur-hṇur} \]

'When the uncle's family (i.e. the mother's side) is high, the father groans:

When the father's family is extravagant (or conceited), the uncle (the mother's people) groans',

and the three verses in ll. 158–60:

\[ \text{chos-ta-ṇan-re-hde-ta-rgyen-hlab-ta-hwen} | | \]
\[ \text{ḥnah-hchos-hre-ge-hldan-myi-ṣeg} | \]
\[ \text{spye-chos-hre-ge-gtsaṅ-myi-hrgan} | \]
\[ \text{ṣi-hchos-re-ge-hpu-myi-hldin} | | \]

¹ Cf. Johnston, p. 287.
'Beginnings being bad, prospering is uphill, speech vain.
Born (begun) in spring, the stick does not break (or burn);
Born in summer, the grain does not mature;
Born in winter, the bird does not fly.'

The third feature is the interest in animals, natural in folk-literature. The horse and the yak are the most prominent, the former being, of course, the mainstay of the lives of the galloping, fighting, marauding tribes, which still, as travellers' narratives attest, give their thievish attention primarily to horses. In a wild state the horse is said to exist still in the Kum desert, south-east of Lob-nor. His recourse to man occasioned his separation from his brother, the wild ass (*rkyan*, kiang), who is seen only afar, on the high *thais*. The wild yak, hunted with lasso and spear, is noted for his malignancy. His tame fellow, with the *dzö* (*mdzo*), the cross with the cow, and also other crossings, is the characteristic animal of Tibet. The traveller from the cosmopolitan Chinese direct administration area of Hsi-ning, where the camel is in use, finds himself, on passing the Tibetan frontier, at Tankar, in a yak-country; and it is possible that ethnical considerations enter into the folk-lore concerning this creature. The Nam-Tig people, though from early times they must have been familiar with the camel, which exists wild in the Altyn-tagh range, probably were, in their agricultural occupation of the fertile uplands of the Nan-shan, most concerned with the ass, who in the story appears, as we see (p. 132), bell-bearing as safeguarding the sheep. Perhaps the ass-country and the yak-country may have had some natural difference of sentiment. The sheep and the goat are common to all the districts. The camel, which is not mentioned in the Tibetan (fragmentary) version, is perhaps identifiable in the Nam text. The tiger and the bear (*dom, gre*) may be discovered in both.

Water, the matter of almost the greatest importance in north-eastern Tibet and in Tibet generally, is in the Tibetan manuscripts mentioned prominently in connexion with irrigation channels (*yan-ba* = *yur-ba*) and the fouling (*sbog*) of them, principally by

---

1 These two passages were presented, with etymologies, as provisional specimens in the article on the Nam language in *JRAS*. 1939 (see pp. 215-16), and so may, without assuming the conclusions to be reached *infra*, be adduced here. In the discussion of Grammar and Etymology many other such pointed or proverbial sayings will come to light.

2 So in the Tibetan manuscript. On slings or lassos in Tibet see Rockhill, *Diary*, p. 264; Bonvalot, ii, p. 5; Filechner, *Om Mani Padme Hum*, p. 156.

3 As regards Kan-su see d'Ollone, p. 292.
wild animals; we also read of clean descents (stëgs) to fords. And this helps in the interpretation of some phrases in the Nam text. The recurrent Tibetan expression is

yañ-ba-rab-tu-sbog (and sbogs)

‘the runnels were utterly fouled (or flooded)’,

sbog(s) being in normal Tibetan the Imperative of sbag, ‘pollute’; here it is a Preterite, and the root has the o-form. Sbag is properly, no doubt, a Transitive or Causative form of hbag, which is to ‘defile oneself’, ‘be polluted’. In the Nam text we have (l. 256) the verse

rgam-hgah-hkañ-hyañ-hrag-ma-hbog ||

in which hrag may correspond to Tibetan rags, ‘dam, mole, dyke’. Rgam may well be Tibetan sgam, ‘deep’, unless it should be skam, ‘dry’; this cannot be decided by other passages, because rgam, like so many other words, is a homonym. If hkañ = Tibetan gañ, ‘full’, which in itself is not improbable and which suits

htor-sñin-hkañ-ge, 168

‘great-heart-full’,

we get the rendering (cf. l. 283, hrag . . . hbog)

‘though the deep places were full, the dykes were not fouled’.

‘Hot’ and ‘cold’ are naturally prominent in the thoughts of an Amdo people. In the texts there are references to ‘the fire of action’, ‘the fire of speech’, ‘the fire of going’, and perhaps some other metaphorical ‘fires’; and ‘cold’ seems to occur with the sense of ‘dispirited’, ‘unenterprising’, ‘apprehensive’ (see p. 301); ‘hot become cold’ may refer to defeat or death, and it is said that

‘Invested with the great cold (sc. death), the evil are good’,

and

‘Invested with the great cold, evil and good are friends’.

The god or gods (tha = Tib. lha), of whom there is a mention (l. 241), seem to be distinct from the divine being Hšes-hbeg, who presided over the world-cataclysm, being the wings, eyes, and path of the flying mountains, &c., who again may belong to a stratum different from that of the ‘Hnam-people’, the upper sky (gnam) folk of the old Bon mythology.¹ Fiends (rñe) are located (l. 385) in dark subterranean hollows.

The social attitude of the text is distinctly aristocratic. The

¹ The evident suggestion (ll. 332, 344) that Hšes in this name = šes, ‘wise’, may be folk-etymology. Could this divinity be connected with the Se-bag of Tibetan Literary Texts, &c., i, p. 296, n. 3, or with the Beg-tse, patron of horses, mentioned ibid.?
ide, or influential people, are supposed to exercise supervision, and there were council, or tribal, meetings (hgru-ma). The yak, or 'black-back', whose rise was connected with the ruin of the 'High Town' and the ascendancy of the 'Low Town', seems to represent an antagonism of the commons (the mgo-nag, 'black-heads' of Tibetan and Chinese) to the chiefs or ruling classes; at times they are termed filth (kru = Tib. kru-ra, 'low people'), and they are approved only when duly submissive. The hkyénn, who are mentioned sometimes in connexion with the 'house-poor' (na-hpoṅ) or 'house-bondsmen' (na-hldom) and sometimes as 'runaways', may be praedial serfs. Women seem to be snubbed, which is not surprising, because, though free and influential among the nomads, as well as among other populations of Tibet, where there have been, or are, 'women's kingdoms', they are nevertheless not highly esteemed by the men. The expression 'a chief who is an inferior person, subject to a woman's words' (l. 84) may illustrate both aspects of the case.

The interest in tombs and 'father's tombs' (rman, hphah-rman), ll. 197–207 and elsewhere, may seem paradoxical in the case of a Ch'iang people, who might have been expected to follow one of the known Tibetan practices, such as exposure of the dead upon a mountain, which is usual in Amdo. But, as a matter of fact, the Tibetans, the Yang-t'ung and the Ch'iang of the Women's Kingdom practised burial, and the Tibetans worshipped ancestors at the tomb: the Tang-hsiang burned their dead. This, however, may have been only in the case of chiefs and leading persons and may have resulted from contact with China or Chinese Turkestan. The prominence of the topic in the Nam text is an example of the fundamental accord of its subject-matter with that of 'the Tibetan manuscripts', one of which is largely concerned with a dispute regarding entombment of a father. In Tibet the topic has maintained its interest down to modern times, as is evidenced by the amusing apologue recorded in Huc and Gabet's book (ii, pp. 83–4).

1 This is remarked by all travellers: see Rockhill, pp. 213, 230; Tafel, ii, pp. 125–6; Edgar, p. 66; Fergusson, pp. 256, 326 (Lo-lo women). The Vicomte d'Ollone compares (p. 236) the Go-lok women to the indomitable women of the Cimbr or the Teutons.

2 Authority for these statements in Bushell, pp. 443, 527(9), 531(42), and Rockhill, p. 339.

3 Cf. Rockhill, pp. 286–7, and, as regards Mongol usage, Huc and Gabet, i, pp. 77–80, and Prejevalsky, i, p. 82.
There are references to houses, in a town or village, with side-projecting roofs, which furnish a shelter for sheep, and in the case of a large one, with a ladder (perhaps the usual notched plank) for ascent; also to the supporting side-posts of the Tibetan tent. The chief economic interest was perhaps the milk-herds, with the sheep, goats, &c., coming next; but certainly there is reference to tillage and harvests. The Tibetan dog, usually an aggressive sentinel, is mentioned. The travelling animals, the sheep which, when their 'fire of going' is exhausted, 'bend down their heads',\(^1\) the yaks, which, when their 'stomach-fire (?)' gives out, ask to be 'hobbled' (?), or which, in the lower valleys, 'have their heads released', point to caravan journeys and help to prove that the *hdro-ño*, 'travel-buy-[people]', are the *hdron-po*, 'travelling traders', who figure in 'the Tibetan manuscripts' and other old texts, as well as in all modern narratives concerning the Hsi-fan countries and Tibet. We also may detect a reference to the well-attested practice of collecting medicinal herbs and drugs in the mountains. The making of yak-hair cloth for tents and 'a coarse kind of wollen stuff' for 'summer gowns and bags', beside which 'the Koko-nor Tibetans manufacture nothing' (Rockhill, p. 81), are not apparent in the text; but tanning of skins (for sheepskin gowns, &c.), wherein the same Tibetans are expert (ibid.), is certainly the subject of a direct reference and also of a metaphor;\(^2\) likewise the leather bellows, indispensable accompaniment of the Tibetan yak-dung (*argol*) fire.

The Ch‘iang man certainly wore a top-knot (*thor*, also mentioned metaphorically), possibly resembling the 'horn' of the independent Lo-los, who share with the Ch‘iang and the Go-lök so many features, including the long spears mentioned *supra* (pp. 22, 39). The Lo-los, however, claim to have entered their present territory, west and south of the lower T‘ung river, as immigrants from the east.

Does the text ever allow its attention to stray outside its own geographical horizon, so as to touch upon matters connected with the adjacent great world of China or with Chinese Turkestan? Certainly we have three trisyllabic expressions which are, no doubt, in some degree proper names, and which denote living beings, since of each of them it is said that they *stor-hdor-hyon*,

---


\(^2\) Cf. p. 251.
which must mean 'were (or will be) made to scatter'. These are: (1) kya-wa-ne, elsewhere hkya-wa-ñe and hkya-hwa-ñe (ll. 162, 215, 339); (2) hdragon-hwa-hrañ (ll. 162, 173); (3) the above-mentioned mehi-klu-hcak (ll. 150, 161, 218, 343). Considering that the mehi-klu-hcak have a fabular origin, it seems prudent to reserve a further consideration of any of the three.¹

But in the expression mon-rdzon (rjon) we have a reference of considerable importance. The phrase clearly means 'Mon-fort', and the reference is to the 'castles of the Mons'.² There can be no doubt that this is the sense of the phrase, which occurs in five places; and we have further confirmation in the expression rtsig-mon, once ses-hrtsig-mon, occurring three times in ll. 379–81. Rtsig-mon means 'Mon carpenter', rtsig, from rtsig, 'build', having this sense not only in ordinary Tibetan, but also in Hsi-hsia³ (rgi, rtsi).

From Rockhill's Land of the Lamas, p. 194, we learn that the Tibetans

'appear to be unable to build but the roughest kind of houses and only those where there is little woodwork. Ssù-ch'uanese carpenters and brick-makers do nearly all the building in eastern Tibet, and also fell the timber necessary for the work. I met large numbers of them on the road to Kanzé, travelling to remote localities, to build temples and bridges, to make plows and pack-saddles and do other kinds of labor in their respective trades.'

On p. 81 he states that 'all their ironware is made by itinerant Chinese smiths who visit their encampments', and in his Journal, p. 342, Rockhill states that Chinese carpenters 'travel all over Tibet'.⁴

We do not, however, need to prove that 'Mon'⁵ people may have been, as early as the eighth to ninth century A.D., within the pur-view of the Koko-nor tribes. For a contemporary Tibetan text, recounting the different species of barley, mentions various kinds as Chinese and various kinds as Mon; and in particularizing the species of cotton it speaks of China cotton as grown in 'China-plain' (Rgya-mo-thaň) and Mon cotton as grown in 'Mon-plain'

¹ See infra, pp. 253 sqq.
² We naturally think of the towers and forts mentioned supra, p. 71, n. 8.
³ See Nevsy, No. 77.
⁴ According to Dr. Tafel, ii, p. 155, carpenters and smiths in Tibet are Ssù-ch'uanese, never Tibetans. . . . In the Rgyal-roň the builders and carpenters belong to a particular tribe (p. 248 n.).
⁵ On -n/.-ń see infra, p. 362.
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(Mon-mo-thañ); and it has frequent references to buildings (rtsig), forts, &c., which upon the indication of the Nam text we may also set down to the Mons.

This is a matter which has very wide and ancient ethnographical connexions. According to the authors of Š. C. Das’s Tibetan Dictionary, Mon, corresponding to Sanskrit Kirāta, is a ‘general name for the different tribes living in the cis-Himalayan regions and who from remote antiquity have lived by hunting’, and Mon-yul, ‘Mon-country’, is ‘the sub-Himalayan regions extending from Kashmir to Assam’. But also Mon-Pa-gro, which should be Mon-Spa-gro, is ‘the town and province of Pa-ro, the seat of government of West Bhutan’, and Mon-rt-a-dwang,¹ Mon Rta-dbañ, is ‘a small principality on the eastern border of Bhutan, inhabited by a barbarous semi-Tibetan race engaged in trading operations between Tibet and Assam’. Rockhill states (JRAS. 1891, pp. 128–9, n. 3) that the Lissus, Mishmis, Lepchas, &c., of Nepal and Sikkim, &c., are known to the Tibetans as Mon.

This is not by any means the full range of the name. The late Professor A. H. Francke, in the narrative of his journey in the western Himalaya (Antiquities of Indian Tibet, vol. i) from the Sutlej valley to Ladak, found many ruins of villages, shrines, and cemeteries universally attributed to the Mons, whom he regards (p. 54) as the pre-Tibetan inhabitants of the country. In his A History of Western Tibet Chapter II is devoted to the Mons, of whom in every western Tibetan village are found one or more families; the people ‘are mostly musicians or carpenters, and are treated with little respect by the rest of the population. . . . Zangskar, I was told by the inhabitants, was once entirely in the hands of the Mons. The ruins of the old castles are still called “Mon-castles”’(Mon-mkhar) (pp. 19–20). Similarly in Antiquities, ii, p. 100, ‘Mons, joiners and carpenters by profession, also of low caste, though not quite so low as the Bhe-da’.

From Professor Francke’s Mons of Ladak and Dardistan the Mons adjacent to the Koko-nor region are separated by a thousand miles of geographical distance, not very seriously reduced, as regards difficulty of communication, by the thin line of cis-Himalayan Mons extending as far east as Assam; and there is

¹ The Geografia Tibetæ has (p. 37) Mon-rt-a-lwañ.
also, as concerns our present information, a time-interval of a thousand years. The latter interval is about halved by the Tibetan *Royal Chronicle*, which in its earlier portions preserves some items of old (Bon-po) tradition; it speaks (Francke, *Antiquities*, ii, p. 66) of four kinds of primitive ‘frontier dwarfs’, i.e. peoples outside the frontier of the author’s country; these are the Chinese *Rgya* of Gam-ṣan (‘the Gam mountains’), the Turks (*Hor*) of the Gyim-ṣan (‘the Altai mountains’?), the Mons of Ha-le, and the Spu-rgyal Tibetans. The corresponding four tribes of ‘interior dwarfs’, which also are named, belong to Tibet; they comprise the Žaṅ-zuṅ people, of the Kailāsa region; the Gtoṅ-gsum-pa or Toṅ-gsum-pa, perhaps = the Sum-pa mentioned above; the Ldoṅ Me-ṅag (also considered above); and the Se-Ha-ža. It is apparent that the primitive Mons are here, like the Mons of our text, not a part of the interior population, but an outside people, like the Chinese and the Turks.

The only people with a name resembling *Mon* who could have been within the purview of the Koko-nor tribes are those known to early Chinese history as the northern, or the western, *Man*. The former are mentioned in the *Shih-chi* (De Groot, op. cit. i, p. 2) as a people among whom dwelt the Jung and other tribes; and De Groot is of opinion that the two names are general designations of the northern peoples. The ‘*Man* of the west’ and the *I* of the north are stated to have been in 110 B.C. still not entirely under Chinese authority.¹ These western *Man* are elsewhere also associated with the *I*. Chang-Ch’ien, the celebrated emissary to the west, enjoyed, c. 140 B.C., the favour of the *Man* and the *I* (De Groot, op. cit. ii, p. 11); the people of the Man and the I were greedy for the riches and products of China (ibid. ii, p. 26); in connexion with the campaign against the Ch’iang in c. 62 B.C., it was said that prognostics threatened the *Man* and *I* with severe defeats (ibid. ii, p. 210). In the eighth century B.C. there were at the source of the Yung river, in middle Honan, and farther west, Jung of the Man races (ibid. ii, p. 191, Wylie, p. 429). About 500 B.C. the Man were completely subdued (ibid. ii, p. 192).

The *Man* of the Yung river were, no doubt, too far east to be within the contemplation of the Ch’iang tribes. But it is, at any rate, transparent that the term *Man* was used in an ethnographical, and not merely a political, sense; and it seems possible that some of those ‘further west’ may have been well known. In that case

¹ De Groot, i, p. 147.
we may venture the inquiry whether the *Ha-le-Mon* of the Tibetan *Chronicle* may have been ‘Mon of the Alashan’ and adjacent (Ning-hsia) region. It is likely that they may have been assimilated by the Chinese earlier than the Ch’iang of the western frontier, and had acquired handicrafts, which, like the modern Ssū-ch’uanese carpenters, &c., they practised also among the barbarians of the Tibetan mountains.

Possible relations of these Mons to the Man-peoples of southern China are matter for Sinologists; and the Mons of the cis-Himalaya, the western Himālayan countries, and Ladak are similarly outside our present scope. We can, however, see clearly that the Mon country to which, at the close of the eighth century A.D., the victorious Tibetans transported the people of Pei-t’ing, the people of Ge-sar (*JRAS*, 1931, p. 828; *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, i, pp. 273–4), is far more likely to have been some district in the part of China then under their control than remote regions in the west; and, in fact, the Ge-sar story is specially popular in eastern Tibet.1

The event decidedly recalls the history (p. 24) of the Sha-t’o Turks transported by the Tibetans to Kan-chou after the conquest of Pei-t’ing in A.D. 790. But certainly there were other Man peoples within their immediate horizon: the south-eastern boundary of the Ch’iang of the Women’s Kingdom approached Ya-chou, being separated from that place ‘by the Lonū Man and the Pailang tribe’ (Bushell, p. 531 (42)); and to the south of Ya-chou was the kingdom of the Nan-chao Man, including the town of Ning-yüan-fu in southernmost Ssū-ch’uan and Tali-fu in Yün-nan; which kingdom in the first half of the eighth century A.D. conquered the adjoining Man tribes and, becoming conterminous with the Tibetans, fought against and afterwards submitted to them (ibid., p. 531 (41)).

There may have been other Man tribes farther north and actually within the Rgyal-ron. For the ‘Kretschiu’, whose domain lies between the state of So-mo and Sung-p’an, are said (Tafel, ii, p. 248 n.) to have a dialect of the Rgyal-ron language unintelligible to the rest of the population and to differ in clothing and other matters from their neighbours, with whom they are constantly at strife. ‘Their country is a poor mountain region, greatly overpopulated in proportion to its productivity. Every year the inhabitants resort to the surrounding districts as manual workers,

---

1 See Rockhill, *Diary*, pp. 130, 165; Baber, op. cit., pp. 88–9; Tafel, ii, pp. 110, 158–9, 169, 246.
especially as masons and carpenters.' To their north are the Bo-lo-tse, by the Tibetans called ‘Kredyan’, who again differ, and of whom Dr. Tafel gives a description, holding that linguistically they appertain to the wild peoples of the Chinese border, and the Tibetan speech family.

The Ya-chou region is part of the area where are seen the towers, described and illustrated by many travellers, which we have already (p. 150) connected with the phrase ‘Mon-fort’. The towers are by tradition associated (like the excavated caves in the same regions) with the Man-tzū people, and that they are an ancient feature of the country cannot be doubted, since the Later Han Annals inform us (Wylie, pp. 241–2) that the barbarian inhabitants built houses of stone, the tallest being over 100 feet high.

A linguistic interest attaches to the possibility of a Man = Mon influence upon the people of the Rgyal-ron. From a Tibeto-Burman Mon language the Rgyal-ron and other Hsi-fan dialects may have derived the accretion of syllabic Prefixes which differentiates those dialects (see supra, pp. 95–7), but especially those of the Rgyal-ron, and the source of which is mysterious. In applying the term Mon to the Mishmis and other tribes situated north of Assam the Tibetans are not likely to be mistaken; and the Man of the Sino-Tibetan border in southern Saú-ch’uan and northern Yün-nan can hardly, if akin to those tribes, have failed to possess syllabic Prefixes in their language. One of the Rgyal-ron Prefixes, namely ka, prefixed to adjectives, is so, in fact, employed in Abor-Miri, Daflii, and Mishmi, as well as in Ka-chin and other groups of Tibeto-Burman (Linguistic Survey of India, iii. i, pp. 589, 619). A borrowing of the Prefixes would evade the paradox of a special preservation of them in the Rgyal-ron ages after others, regarded as analogous and not more ancient, had been reduced in the same dialects to vestigial consonants.

In the Nam text the ‘Mon-fort’ appears not merely by way of casual reference, but as a central feature. The passages

‘Heat being great, the Moñ-fort was lost’ (78, 139)
‘The horse yielding place, the Moñ-fort was lost’ (139)
‘The horse hgam being made, the Moñ-fort was lost’ (118)
‘Low Town becoming high, the Moñ-fort lost . . .’ (128)
‘Low Town becoming high, the black-back flourished’ (135)

give joint prominence to the successive stages of one event, namely, world-cataclysm and city-conflagration, flight of the chief-
tain to a settlement in the steppes and rise of the plebs of the Low Town. The antithesis of 'High Town' \(^{\text{mtho-mkhar}}\) and 'Low Town' \(^{\text{dmaḥ-mkhar}}\) appears in 'the Tibetan manuscripts', where we read also of building the 'upper town \(^{\text{rlan-mkhar}}\) aloft, aloft', the upper mansion \(^{\text{rla-khyim}}\) and courtyard \(^{\text{phyugs-ra}}\), and the upper path zig-zag \(^{\text{rla-lam-sgya-sgyo}}\), i.e. the winding ascent to the castle; and the situation persists in modern Tibet, where the monasteries, and, of course, the forts \(^{\text{rdzoñ}}\), commonly occupy elevations towering over the residential town. The heaven paradise \(^{\text{gnam}}\) was conceived on the same lines, having the 'castle eminent' \(^{\text{rdzan-stod}}\) at its summit and pastoral districts, with the stars for cattle, in the vales. The fabulistic beings, horse, yak, &c., of the Nam text formed a similarly constituted state. In one of the Tibetan manuscripts the horse's descent from the upper \(^{\text{gnam}}\), through the lower \(^{\text{dguñ}}\), heaven, the horse-yak tragedy, and the entry of the horse into the service of man are the chief theme. In both cases a secondary purpose of the tales, as parables, is partly explicit.

We may be interested to inquire how the Nam text and kindred Tibetan material came to be transmitted, in both cases, as we have seen, orally, to the Tibetan religious world in Şa-cu. It might not be an incredible supposition that in a place which during four or five centuries had been a literary centre, of whose many-sided activity we have now so abundant manuscript remains, there should have been an 'enlightened interest' in the folk-lore of the Nam-Tig people. But another extensive manuscript, already mentioned, which has a predominantly religious (Bon-po) character, may indicate that among the numerous shrines in Şa-cu there were some with Bon-po rather than Buddhist interests;\(^1\) and it may be remembered that Taoist literature is largely represented in the mass of the Chinese manuscripts. Hence it may be that the sacred lore of the Nam-Tig, which is at any rate faintly Bon-po, had a religious value in the minds of some community in Şa-cu.

As to the communicating medium we may detect an indication in the Nam text itself. After the Tibetan interpolation in l. 180 the text continues:

\[
\]

\(^1\) The divinity H̕eṣ-a-hbeg (supra, pp. 138, 142) may have been a Bon, if not pre-Bon, conception.
Here the first words may mean

‘the rbyo-man speaking of coming on the morrow (nañ, or “within”) secretly (gsan, or is nañ-gsan simply = Tibetan san-nañ, “morrow morning”?)’;

and the next phrase,

rbyo-hpro-hro-grtehe-hta-stel-re,

will mean

‘consenting to (stel-re) the fixing (grtehe-hta) of a place (hro) for continuing (hp(h)ro),’

since (1) stel may be = Tib. ster ‘grant’, e.g. in nañ-du-hgro-ster, ‘consent to come inside’; (2) grtehe-hta, with verb suffix ta, is perhaps connected with Hsi-hsia hrde, gdêh, ‘fix’, ‘establish’, ‘institute’, and will accordingly mean ‘fixing’, ‘determining’; (3) hpro = Tibetan hphro, meaning ‘going forward’, ‘continuing’, e.g. hphro-blans, ‘resumption of an unfinished work’, hphro-ma-chad-pa, ‘continuation not interrupted’. The remainder is:

‘talk (hlab-ta) gushing (gbohu-ste = Tib. hbo-ste, cf. pp. 230–2, 313) being stopped (hthogs-re = Tib. thogs-te, cf. p. 301), talk plan (“course”, “substance”? (as follows?).’

That a rbyo or rbyo-po is a person cannot be doubted; for we find the verse (ll. 102–3)

rbyo-sñañ-ge-sñañ-na-rgoñ-ru-ge-þru,

which must mean

‘if the heart (or affection) of a rbyo is a heart, then the horn (= end) of an egg is a horn’,

the ‘horns’ of an egg (Tib. sgoñ-ru) being its ‘ends’; and an egg in eastern Tibet is commonly compared to a head, as we may learn from the riddle reported by Dr. Tafel (Meine Tibetreise, ii, p. 337): ‘Even at birth it has a white head. What is that?’ (an egg). Elsewhere also (ll. 82, 102) the rbyo receives the same compliment. What rbyo may mean etymologically we are not yet in a position to suggest, the possibilities being too numerous and complex, and the other occurrences of the word furnishing no definite indications; but see p. 333. Substantially a ‘rbyo-man’ may conceivably have been a Bon-po, a ‘Bon-man’, in which case his functioning in the matter would need no further explanation.

1 Nevsky, No. 25.
2 In ll. 245–6 it is antithetical to hlad, ‘retaliate’.
3 On sñañ = sñañ or sñan see infra, p. 367.
The concluding phrase, *hlab-*ge-phaña, if it means, as suggested *infra* (pp. 241–2), 'as to the street (sc. the general course, in contrast to the previous “gushing”) of his talk’, may be helpful as explaining the apparent disconnectedness of the sections in the latter part of the text, selections, perhaps, giving only the salient passages in the speaker’s eloquence.

Stylistically the text is less naïve than might have been expected. Antithesis of word and phrase and parallelism of sentence, so characteristic of Tibetan folk-literature (*supra*, pp. 51–2), are frequently evident even upon mere inspection of the lines of verse as printed *infra*; see the passage quoted on p. 213. Towards the end of the manuscript occurs a series of more elaborate parallels, as in the two sentences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{štstg-mon-ge-htsah-hrahi-} & \quad \text{hda-hldahi-hne-ge-htsah-rgye-hrdz-a-na} \\
\text{hrtsg-mon-hkuñ-na} & \quad \text{hda-hldah-hkuñ-na} \\
\text{rstsig-mon-hsad-na} & \quad \text{hda-ldah-hsad-na} \\
\text{tsig-mon-we-ge-htsah-hpu-} & \quad \text{hda-hldah-hwehi-ge-htsah-rgye-hlo} \\
\text{hloho}
\end{align*}
\]

Intentional rhyme may be seen, e.g. in

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hs-tr-moñ-hdzoñ-re-htsa-hdzo-hkrom} & \quad \text{gstu-prom-hño-[r[e]-htsah-hpu-hdrom} \\
\text{and inversion of antithetic predicates (hrgom and hrgam) in} \\
\text{hrgom-hkkru-[r[e]-hto-na-hpehi-hrgam-re-hto} & \quad \text{(1. 169)}
\end{align*}
\]

Finally there are instances (see *infra*, pp. 269, 285, 304) of play upon words, e.g. on *ḥdro*, ‘go’, and *ḥdro*, ‘heat’, in

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hphe-hphu-mu-[r[e]-hdzu-ḥdro-hkus} & \quad \text{(1. 352)}
\end{align*}
\]

‘his blowings [boastings] being chill, the ass desired to go (heat),’

which pun recurs in ll. 170–1.

So far we have been guided partly by comparison with adequately comprehensible texts in a known language, the Tibetan, and partly by etymological considerations in connexion with Tibetan words. In this procedure, which may perhaps seem to have yielded some plausible results, it is presumed that the Nam language was at a stage comparable to that of the earliest Tibetan popular speech, especially as found in texts from the east and north-east. This presumption has been to some extent justified *supra* (pp. 109–110). But it does not follow that quite normally the similarly spelled words in the two languages can be provisionally
equated. As was so emphatically stated by B. H. Hodgson in his pioneer researches into Tibeto-Burman and other languages, and as appears prominently in the late Dr. Laufer's very learned and ingenious study of Hsi-hsia words, there is generally a core of root-form and root-meaning connecting the parallel expressions in the several languages; but this nucleus may be so disguised by the play of Prefixes and Suffixes, and, according to Dr. Laufer, by composition of synonyms into a single monosyllable and by other processes, as to be discoverable only by procedures of analysis which, applied to languages known only in modern forms, may be hazardous. The Nam words are at least contemporaneous with the Tibetan; nevertheless a too great resemblance between a Nam monosyllable and a Tibetan one may be even suggestive of non-connexion, more especially since in the very extensive vocabulary of Tibetan we are always in danger of overlooking unfamiliar homonyms and variant spellings; and deception is all the more likely because equivalents for Nam words may perhaps tend to occur among the obscurer, because provincial or obsolete, entries of the lexicon. It is therefore advisable to make citations, where possible, from the vocabulary of old texts or modern languages belonging to the region in question.

In some instances a suspicion, such as has been mentioned in JRAS. 1939, p. 212, in regard to the word rdzogs = Tibetan rdzogs, 'fulfilled', disappears upon reflection. The word seems to be a fairly complex form and accordingly open to such suspicion; but the r-Prefix is even more characteristic of the north-eastern dialects and of the Nam than of ordinary Tibetan; and the final s will be shown to be independently justified in both. Nevertheless the occurrence in the text of Tibetan words, either imported into the language or due to the scribe or editor, remains a possibility; but not on the same scale as in modern times, when, largely owing to Buddhist establishments and communications, the Tibetan language is nearly everywhere understood.

The help obtainable from the Tibetan texts to which reference has been made consists mainly in the light which they throw upon the environment and the interests of the people from whom the

---

2 There may also be in Tibetan many words originally borrowed from Ch'iang, either orally or through old Tibetan texts originated in the local monasteries.
3 See supra, p. 87, n. 1.
Nam composition emanated. We see that there was oral literature of the Purānic kind which has been mentioned, framed on the notion of an age of bliss and harmony of species, followed by a world-cataclysm leading to division and strife. There were fables relating probably to the origins of tribes, and in some cases continuations into actual historical matters. The enmities among animals, of which the most prominent, that between horse and yak, is a main subject in the Nam text and in one of the Tibetan texts, may also have partly an inter-tribal or inter-regional bearing. The predominance of the animal world is, in another way, a hindrance, since it restricts the information which might have been available concerning the livelihood and manners of human beings; probably also it greatly restricts the vocabulary.

In regard also to the form of the composition, mainly verse, and the style and turns of expression and some particular ideas, the Tibetan texts are somewhat helpful. They prepare us for interweaving of prose and verse and for the rhetorical devices of parallelism and antithesis, also for great curtness of statement; even in the Tibetan texts there may be a gap between the understanding of the words of a sentence and the apprehension of its meaning, the syntactical apparatus being inadequate. In respect of vocabulary the prima facie assistance of the Tibetan is meagre, and it is only here and there that we can pick out a more or less similar Tibetan word whose meaning fits a context; and, as in Tibetan itself, the frequency of homophones prevents any confident expectation that, when we next meet the word, it will have the same meaning. The inadequacy of other means of ascertaining the significations of the shifty monosyllables has been discussed supra; and we seem to be dependent in the main upon context, acquired familiarity, and lucky intuitions, confirable a posteriori, until a wide breach in the obscurity of the text shall have prepared us for a more rapid advance.

So far as the matter has at present proceeded it may be helpful to risk a tentative abstract of the content of the text, as follows:

**ABSTRACT OF TEXT**

*(Provisional and partly conjectural)*

I. Lines 1–247 (end of a Chapter, *hkon*).

1. Lines 1–166: (beginning fragmentary). The cosmic cataclysm and its effects.
Lines 1–16: Effects in the physical world, mountains uplifted, &c.; controlled by Hses-hbeg, ll. 7–8; opposition of *mor* and *hyañ* (evil and good), ll. 9–10.

Lines 16–19: Some effects among living creatures.

Lines 19–29: Continuation of 1–16.

Lines 29–49: Account of *hgru-hldan-hmah*; disunion among the horse’s friends, ll. 35–6; reflections upon evils and their consequences.

Lines 49–61: Disadvantages of greatness.

Lines 62–71: *Hgru-hldan-hmah*: discontent after the loss of the Moñ-castle; rejected helpers become opponents, and wish to retire to their own abodes; different creatures have their several appropriate dwelling-places.

Lines 71–80: Waning fortune brings feebleness, has moon-light in place of sunlight, and the fallen are replaced. The horse, when the *hgru-ma* is lost, takes to flight.

Lines 80–100: The horse’s family not displeased to be rid of a superior. The horse’s friends are disaffected; disunion arises and works against friendship; forgetfulness of harm from outside encourages cleavage within. The horse’s friends forget the horse’s merits.

Friendship is a thing that comes and goes. Disunion gradually works its way in, causing downfall of prosperity and finally of the feminine side.

Lines 100–164: Speech of the camel in the horse’s family concerning the evils of disunion (101–3), the advantage of taking counsel (104–6), the necessity of protecting the horse’s feminine household, like sheep from wolves (106–11), the importance of uprightness and the danger of delay and the reasons for urgency, the ruin of the family to follow the already accomplished loss of the Moñ-castle (111–19).

Verses concerning friendship (120–4), uprightness (124–7). The rise of the black-back (yak) and the necessity of assembling friends to suppress him (127–36). The occasion calls for action on the part of the males; when those in flight join together, the aggressors flee (137–40). Other reflections concerning flight (140–4). What happens in the case of flight in battle (144–9) and of stopping flight (149–52). Individual initiative; enmity and friendship dissolved by death; triumph and victorious return home.
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(152–8). Bad beginnings lead to failure (158–60). The classes of creatures which will be put to flight (160–4).

Lines 164–80: With the horse as watchman the Big Man is master of the land, which is protected against thieves, &c. Boundaries of the land ordained. The land returns after the earthquake to its proper position. The horse’s fugitive friends return.

Possession and deprival of the faculty of speech in the case of some classes of creatures.

Line 180: In Tibetan: ‘From then [kinds and] descents [of species] came: this is stated as secret.’

Lines 181–2: Statement concerning the speaker (rbyo-po)’s narrative.

Lines 182–end: Selections from an oral recitation.

Lines 182–4: Brief account of restoration of order.

Lines 184–222: Consideration of the danger from the yak;
• the danger on the side of the females, ll. 188–90; proposed abandonment of the city for another home, ll. 190–7; concerning burial and ancestral tombs, ll. 197–211; proposal to depart to the hgam in the than and, uniting together, to organize a chase of the yak, ll. 211–22.

Lines 222–49: Passionate appeal for an expedition of vengeance against the yak and the hcha.

End of Chapter.

II. Lines 249–53: Brief statement concerning the defeat of the yak and general satisfaction.


Lines 285–301: The social order, the wise, good, &c., in authority, the evil fled, the nobles in authority, the commons subservient, ll. 285–9; the Big Man and his subjects on the watch-mountain.

Lines 301–13: Classes of creatures, good and bad, on the mountain.

Lines 313–25: Reflections concerning relation of classes, supervision, and contact with inferiors.

Lines 325–44: General reflections upon what has taken place and concerning rgyo (329–36).


Lines 352–7: Summary concerning happy conditions restored.
Lines 358–68: Concerning profit (? kehu-prom) and friendship.

Lines 368–97: Future prosperity and agreement of friends and enemies: mention of braves and their deeds (377–8), the dead (enemies ?) (378), the ‘wise Moñ carpenters’ (379–81), females (381–2), makers of friendship (382–3), the ‘good lieges’ (383–4), the fiends in their dark cavities beneath the mountains sunk down again (384–5). Distinction of highland and lowland (385–7).

Final reflections (387–98).

(Fragmentary termination)

NOTE. The Berlin fragment, from Turfan, published by the late Professor A. H. Francke (Berlin Academy Sitzungsberichte, 1927, pp. 124 sqq.), facsimile with a for the most part acceptable transliteration, was attributed to an ‘unknown language’ and from the occurrence of some terms explicable from Tibetan regarded as of medical tenour. In the JRAS. of 1928 (pp. 633–4) it was pointed out that the language is in fact the ‘Nam’ of the present text: and subsequently (1939, pp. 196–8) the proof was reinforced, and Professor Francke’s etymologies, though favourably viewed, were found to be, by reason of some other expressions, inconclusive as to the character of the whole. Those other expressions seemed to point to an account of the decline of the Good Age, and it appears possible that the diseases identified by Francke are mentioned as operant in that decline: the MS. will then have contained a variant, no doubt widely different, ‘rhapsody’ on the theme of our text. This, however, though possibly provable, lacks present confirmation.
IV. THE LANGUAGE: GRAMMAR

In the investigation of the language it seems appropriate, since observations in detail may be illusory, to commence with its general morphological features. The script and punctuation enable us to ascertain both the forms of the words and the structure of the sentences, with which two matters we may accordingly begin.

A. WORD-FORMS

The words of the Nam language are, if we disregard one or two classes of apparent exceptions, all monosyllabic. They all begin with a consonant or a group of consonants. In the groups there are some consonants which by their alternating presence and absence are proved to be Prefixes analogous to those of the Tibetan language, the basic identity of a word with and without a Prefix being established by similarity of occurrence. The Prefixes so disclosed are $h$, $g$, $d$, $b$, $r$, $l$, $s$, and perhaps $m$, these being also the regular Prefixes known in Tibetan. Examples:

1. $h$-, which has been discussed supra, pp. 118–20, both in general and with regard to alternation with $g$-, need not be further exemplified, since, as occurring very widely and capriciously, it cannot be credited with a function.

2. $g$-, as alternating with $h$-, has been exemplified (p. 118–19) in $g$ñi, $g$dim, $g$ldag, $g$nag, $g$pha, $g$moq, $g$yo, $g$-ra$, g$-ri. We may here add:

- gkom, 222 (swa° re) = hkom, 175 (swa° re)
- gcig, 356 (ste-he-hdzu-ge) = cig, 194 (ste-gdzu-ge)
- gcii, 346 = hci/hcii, 205, 301, 348, 350
- gcog, 69
- gcheq, 111, 234 (gceg) = hceq, 250
- gñi, 80
- gñim, 12
- gtañ, 186 = htañ, 96
- gtoñ, 211 (hgo°) = htoñ, 212 (hko)
- gstor, 143 (°htor), 152 (°ta) = stor, 118, &c. (°hdor), 145, &c. (°ta)
- grtehe, 181 = hrtehu, 265 (?)
- gdah, 191 = hdah, 108
- gdag, 200, 204, 206 = hdag, 259, 260, 261
- gdes, 260
gdod, 186

gnah, 179, &c. (°goñ, °hgon) = na, 358 (°hgon, °hgon)
gbohu, 181 = hbo, 263
gblañ, 265
gtsañ, 165 (hsah°) = htsañ, 378 (hsah°)
gtsu, 214 = htsu, 193, 304, htsuhu, 166, 303 = htshu, 75, 76, 215, tshu, 206
gtsob, 351, 352
g-wah/hgwah, 224, 229 (°hrñañ) = hwa, 228 (°hrñañ) = hwañ, 224 (°hrñañ)
(g-we, 197, &c. = hwe, 85, &c., we, 114, &c.
g-wehi, 199, 263 = hwehi, 22, &c., 139, &c.
g-wehe, 201, &c. = hwehe, 348
(g-wer, 164, 301 = hwer, 19
gzu, 307, &c. (°hbyi) = gdzu, 305, &c. (°hbyi)
gzu, 353 (°hdro) = hdzu, 183, 352 (°hdro)
gzo, 165 = hdzoho, 362
g-yah, 287 (°hthañ) = hyah, 285, &c. (°hthañ)
g-yañ, 31 (°ra) = hyañ, 66, 226 (°hrañ)
g-yehi, 271, g-yehe, 166 = hgyehi, 209 (?)
g-yer, 167 (hscah°), 330 (hsah°) = yer, 141 (hsah°) = hyer, 267 (hsah°), 297 (hscah°)
g-yog, 15, 51, 200, 320
g-yog, 156 = hyog, 289, 324, &c.
g-rub, 261 = hrub, 108, 349
g-roñ, 71
glab, 180 = hlab, 180, &c.
glo, 116 (pu°) = hlo, 135 (pu°)
gsán, 30, 263, &c. = hsán, 81, 199, 255, &c.
gsí, 44, 244 (ses°, hses°) = hsi, 44, 245 (ses°, hses°)
gsím, 268
gše, 49 (°hdzro-hñañ) = hšehe, 369 (°rdzor-hñañ)
gség, 381 (°gšer) = hšeg, 330 (°gšegra)
gsóg, 7, 20 = hšog, 8, 20
gsah, 276, 333 = hsah, 165, 166, &c.
gsañ, 228 (°hrañ) = hsañ, 226 (°hrañ)
gsar, 204 = hsar, 255
gsas, 262 = hsas, 59, 116, &c.
gsau/gsus, 64, 99 (°slo) = hšus, 93 (°slo)
gše, 327 (°hko-hgyan) = hšehi, 325 (°hko-hgyan) = hšehe, 327 (°hkho-ho-hgyan)
There are also forms with gw- (hgweg), gy- (hgyud, hgyeb, gyim, &c.), gr- (gras, hgru, gre, hgro, &c.), gl- (gla, hglu, glehu, glog, &c.), in which the g is not a Prefix.

3. d-:

dgu, 75, 77, 225, &c. = dguhu, 236, 244
dgu, 127 = hgu, 126
ddyim, 95 (cpyi) = gdim, 88, &c. (cpyi, phyi) = dim, 95 = hdim, 88.

4. b-: For a list of b-forms in the Verb system see p. 194: and concerning the remaining three, bзir, bзer, bzod see infra.

5. m-: mнar, 261 (myag 39 &c. may not contain m-Prefix).

6. r-: List and discussion pp. 347-52.


8. s-: See pp. 354 sqq., list and discussion.

In the manipulation of the Prefixes and in the resultant word-forms there is a general resemblance to Tibetan. But a further examination elicits certain differences.

In the first place, d- and m- are so scantily represented that they can scarcely be said to exist in the Nam language. The former occurs in only three words, namely the somewhat frequent dgu, 'hot', usually antithetical to mu, 'cold', another dgu/hgu probably = '9' (Tib. dgu), and ddyim, a casual variant of dim/gdim/hdim. M- is apparent only in мнar (a single instance) and possibly in myag, 'spoiled', 'corrupted', the former being perhaps Locative of a мнah = Tib. мнah, 'power', &c., and the latter, also Tibetan, having an m- which need not be a Prefix. Since dgu, 'hot', also is found in 'the Tibetan manuscripts' and ddyim may be a scribal error, the four actual words may be merely Tibetan writings.

G frequently alternating with h-, reminds us of regular alternations, e.g. gcad/hchad in the Tibetan verb-system, where irregularities have ensued. In Nam the fluctuations extend to cases like гpha/hpha (Tib. pha), 'father', where there can be no question of functional difference, actual or original. Hence it must be that
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$g$- and $h$- were phonetically indistinguishable when prefixed to initial consonants, which implies that the $g$- had become a mere nasalization. Trace of an original difference may perhaps be seen in $hdzoh\text{o}/gzo$, ‘eat’, because a change $dz > z$ may have taken place, as in Tibetan, after $g$- (and $b$-), but not after $h$- (or $l$-); but in the case of $gdzu/gzu/hdzu/hsu/hju$, ‘ass’, even this trace is lost. There are also outside the verb-system instances of $g$- alternating with absence of Prefix, e.g. $gnag/nag$, ‘black’, $gnah/na$, ‘place’, $g-ra/ra$, ‘place’; but, since $h$- occurs with these words also, the case is not different from that of the alternation $g$-/h-.

In these circumstances the question of a functional $g$- in the verb-system becomes difficult: it may be considered *infra* (pp. 196–7).

$B$-, except in the tense-system (*infra*, p. 194), occurs only in the three words, $b\text{zir}$, ‘true’, ‘wise’ (?), $b\text{zer}$, ‘fort’ (?), $bzod$, ‘bear’ (verb), of which the first and third are $\ddot{a}v\text{a}v\varepsilon\upsilon\nu\mu\varepsilon\nu\alpha$, the second and third Tibetan: $b\text{zir}$ is possibly = Hsi-hsia $g\text{zir}$, ‘wise’ (Nevsky, No. 281). In view of the rarity of $z$ and $z$ in Nam it seems likely that all three are loan-words.

$R$, $l$, $s$, are discussed *infra*, pp. 347 sqq.

$L$, except in the combinations $ld$-, $ldy$- (pp. 317 sqq., 324 sqq.), where it is probably not a Prefix, has few examples, which seem, however, to be genuine. $R$- and $s$- are common, and instances are found both where the Tibetan has an equivalent, or at least some Prefix, and where it has not: and this raises a question as to a surviving functional value of the $r$- and $s$- in the two languages, where they seem to have become for the most part merely lexical. Cases like $rgu/hgu$, ‘steal’ (Tib. $rku$, $lku$), $rgyen =$ Tib. $g$-yen, ‘uphill’, $smyi/myi$, ‘man’ (Tib. $mi$, $myi$) do not seem explicable through the verb-system, but have parallels in the Hsi-fan dialects, e.g. in the case of a $rbya$, ‘bird’ (*supra*, p. 94). They may be due to particular analogies or to an incipient feeling of classification, observed, for instance, by Dr. Laufer (*Toung-pao*, xv (1914), pp. 108–9) in connexion with $m$- and with the $l$- of some Tibetan names for parts of the body. Of the syllabic Prefixes of Hsi-fan (*supra*, pp. 95–7) there is in Nam no trace.

The phonetical restrictions in the application of the Prefixes may best be shown in a table affording a comparison with Tibetan, Žañ-žuñ, and Hsi-hsia (in Tibetan transcription): see Appendix to this chapter, pp. 206–11 sqq.

Disregarding Prefixes, which probably were felt as distinct, even
when not clearly used as functional, the initial consonants and consonant groups in the Nam language are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without following consonant</strong></td>
<td><strong>With following consonant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>kw, ky, kr, kl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>khw, khy, khr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>gw, gy, gr, gl, gly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ŋy (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c, ch, j, ń</td>
<td>tw, ty, tr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>thw, thy, thr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>dw, dy, dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pw, py, pr, pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph</td>
<td>phy, phr, phl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>by, br, bl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>my (before a, i, and e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>tsw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td>dzw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ž (3 words only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z (a few words) confused</td>
<td>with dz (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>rw, rl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>lt, ld, ldy, (g)ly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ś</td>
<td>sw, sr, sl, sk, sky, skh, sc, ˢň, st, sp, spy, sby, sm, smy, sts, ˢś (partly with s-Prefix ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cases with a single consonant call for little comment. It has been remarked (p. 114) that the rarity of ž and z suggests that the sounds did not properly belong to the language. The only words with ž are

bźir, bźer, rźaň

of which bźir is possibly Hsi-hsia and bźer, ‘fort’ (‘mart’ ?, ‘magazine’ ?), is common in old Tibetan names, while rźaň may (but
see p. 352) be a casual variant of rṣaṅ, hrṣaṅ. In the Berlin manuscript we find also ēze (ll. 2, 3), perhaps a similar variant of je, which occurs (l. 10) in the same connexion. Nam z occurs in

hzāh, hzu, and gzu (with variants hju, gdzu, and hdzu), gzo, bzod, (g)bzāṅ (?)

Since none of these, except gzu (2) and hzu (2), has more than a single occurrence, and since gzo, bzod, and bzāṅ all exist as Tibetan words, it is likely a priori that, if not scribal errors, all the words are borrowed.\(^1\) H initial occurs, except as a Prefix, only in the particle hi.

The combinations of w, y, r, l with preceding tenuis (k, &c.), aspirate (kh, &c.), and media (g, &c.) are common to Tibetan, Nam, Žaṅ-žuṅ, and in part to old Burmese, and must be regarded as a feature of all early Tibeto-Burman speech (see supra, pp. 62–3). The Nam differs notably from Tibetan in presenting y after dental sounds, t, th, d, l (gl), being supported, as regards thy by Hsi-hsia, and as regards dy by Žaṅ-žuṅ. The combinations pw and dzw are peculiar to Nam:² pl and phl it shares with Žaṅ-žuṅ, the first of the two also with Central-Asian Tibetan (plaṅ) and some Hsi-fan dialects (rare).

In Tibetan the writing g-y serves to distinguish cases where the g is a Prefix from those, written gy, where the g belongs to the root; and the distinction is usually confirmed by the other evidence. The Nam follows the same procedure in connexion with w and r also, writing g-w and g-r where the g is a Prefix (infra, pp. 336–7). The usage has not been extended, as it might have been, to l;³ and so we find glab written where g-lab would certainly have been correct. It is therefore possible both in Nam and in Tibetan that some apparent roots commencing with gl may contain an originally Prefixed g; and this is certainly the case with Nam glaṅ, Tibetan glan, connected with the root lan, len. Analogously the b in br, bl, by, and possibly even a d in dr, dy, may in some cases once have been a Prefix; and this again is exemplified in Tibetan blaṅ, blaṅs. Similarly, in words commencing with sk, st, sp, sh, sm, sts, the s may once have been Prefixal; and in some words, e.g. spo (cf. hpho), stu, sdu (cf. hdu, hthu), that is certain.

¹ The Berlin fragment has, however, zor (ll. 2, 7), which again may be Tibetan. On hzu, gzu, see infra, pp. 251–2 sqq., and on z generally pp. 334–6 sqq.
² On w in Nam see pp. 336 sqq.
³ In Hsi-hsia (Nevsky, Nos. 239, 246) g-liḥ occurs (as a variant of gli, līḥ, li); also b-liḥ.
This is a matter which could be discussed only in detail and need be discussed only when and where, if anywhere, it assumes a significance: there are some adverbial words or formatives, Tibetan ste, sto, Nam sta, ste, sto, in which the s cannot have been a Prefix.\(^1\) We have noted supra certain combinations not to be found in Nam, whether represented, as in Tibetan, by a compound alphabetic sign, or otherwise.

The final consonants and consonant-groups are as in normal Tibetan, namely:

\[
g, \, \dot{n}, \, d, \, n, \, b, \, m, \, h, \, r, \, l, \, s \\
gs, \, n\dot{s}, \, bs, \, ms \text{ (with the addition of } rs)\]

and h sometimes (as in Tibetan manuscripts) precedes a final consonant. There is no occurrence of the drag, i.e. d in the combinations

\[
\text{nd, rd, ld.} \\
\]

In principle all the vowels, viz.

\[
a, \, i, \, u, \, e, \, o \\
\]

occur impartially after all consonants, except that (a) after the labials p, ph, b, m, and after k, kh, g, n, we seem always to have yi, never i, after m sometimes (mye) ye for e; (b) cu, ùu, wu, lu are, perhaps accidentally (since chu and ju occur), wanting; (c) zu, zo, zi, ze, also are wanting, which, in view of the rarity, and probable foreign origin, of the z and z, seems to have no significance: once or twice nye is written in place of ñe.

All the vowels occur as finals, in which position they very frequently have a prolonged or drawling pronunciation, indicated by writings of the type aha, ihi, &c., concerning which see supra, pp. 123–4. Once the lengthened pronunciation occurs in the interior of a word, rgyohon = rgyon (l. 336); and this fact may be not entirely negligible, since a contemporary Tibetan manuscript from the same region has once byohos in place of byos while another has so-ho for so; but, on the other hand, the rgyohon, for rgyon, is in a context which contains what is evidently the same verb in the forms rgyo and rgyoho.

Apparent diphthongs are classified and discussed in the above-cited article (pp. 201–6), where it is shown that chu and ohu are real and somewhat frequent.\(^2\) The case of ahi (rtahi, ḫpahi, pahi), uhi (hrahi ḫphuhi, ḫpuhi, kmuhi), ohi (hkohi), and perhaps also those of ehi (frequent), require further consideration with regard

---

\(^1\) See pp. 182–3, 185, 201.  
\(^2\) See infra, pp. 368–9.
to Syntax (pp. 176–7, 190–1). There is no real example of a diphthong in a word ending in a consonant.

Manifestly the above-noted morphological features place the Nam language upon the general level of the written, i.e. the old, Tibetan, and separate it definitely from the Hsi-hsia and from the modern Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Tibeto-Chinese border.

In the script there are numerous apparent disyllables, ending in o, hi, na, ni, ra, and occurring for the most part at the end of sentences. The cases belong evidently to the morphology of the sentence, and will be considered under that head. Numerous instances of -r appended to forms ending in vowels or h, e.g. hrar/hrah, rnor/rño, are likewise evidently syntactical.

B. MORPHOLOGY OF THE SENTENCE

That normally the verb is the last word in the sentence, as in Tibetan, is proved by the fact that most of the words with final s are found only at the end of a sentence or—what is usually equivalent—of a line or of both, and some of the residue also are restricted to an equivalent position. A full list will be given in connexion with the verb (infra, pp. 197–8), but, in order to carry the conviction with us, we may here note one or two cases where we have also in the text a corresponding s-less form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hldyan-hjo-hkromni, 389</td>
<td>v. hldyañ-hyu-hjo-cig-dze-htor-ge-hkroms, 387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hriñ-htho-hgyan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hlab-ma(me)-ñi, 67</td>
<td>v. hlab-me-ñis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ldyo-stor-hthu-re, 140</td>
<td>v. hjim-ta-hthusni, 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stor-ta-hthogni, 149</td>
<td>v. stor-ta-hthsors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thor-hbrón-tshor-na, 220</td>
<td>v. htor-hbrón-htsors, 219, hldagnag-hthshors, 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñes-hsi-brehe, 44</td>
<td>v. keñu-prom-hbres, 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hkoñu-hprom, 169</td>
<td>v. htor-htas-hproms, 121–2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These s-forms can be nothing else than s-Preterites, such as are common in Tibetan.

The words found at the ends of sentences or lines are in general, therefore, presumably verbs. But naturally there may sometimes be non-verbal predicates, e.g. Adjectives or Substantives, with omission, as in Latin and other languages, of the verb
'be'; and, furthermore, since the text is a verse composition, there may be inversions due to poetic style. Thus in

stor-moñ-hdzon, 139

we already know that moñ-hdzon means 'Moñ-fort (or castle)', and stor is a rather commonly occurring verb, certainly equivalent to Tibetan stor 'stray', 'be lost', and the sense is

'was lost the Moñ-castle'.

It was to be expected that an auxiliary should follow the verb to which it belongs; and this is to be seen in

hño-hkhob-hprom, 322 'face-cover-do', hño-stor-hprom ||, 128, 'friends-scatter-do', stor-rno, 141, 'scatter-can'.

In some of the above examples we see after the verb the syllables ni, na. These are Particles, the use of which will be considered infra.

That the subject should come first is, in view of the shortness of many of the sentences, an obvious consequence; and we have had it exemplified in gtsan-myi-hrgan (l. 160), 'the corn does not mature', and other sentences. Since we know further that sid means 'high', it appears from

hśid-hrihi-hthor-dze, 62

where hrihi must be = Tibetan ri 'mountain', that the Adjective may precede the Substantive: from hldi-rgyed-hrah, 'this place of division', it appears both that a Pronoun and that a qualifying word—Noun of Action and so forth—may precede the substantive to which it belongs. But in

wam-hśid-dze, 11

since dze is a very common particle, we have the hśid following wam, and in the frequent hrah-hldi, 'this place' (at the beginning of verses in ll. 225, &c.) and in the antithetical line (ll. 132–3)

hbri-hldi-hthan-re-hre-hldi-hyah

the Pronoun evidently follows its Noun. In ll. 57–60 there is a succession of verses beginning

-hce-rgye-dze

preceded by a varying monosyllable (a Noun). Since dze is familiar, hce-rgye must be an attribute, and it can hardly be anything but an equivalent of Tibetan dbye-che, 'extent-great', 'spacious', which in a contemporary text from north-eastern Tibet we find with a rather similar reiteration applied to certain mountain
regions. Here we see a composite attribute, ‘great (hce)-extent’ constructed on the lines of the Sanskrit Bahu-vrihis and following its Substantive. We may accordingly state that Pronouns and Adjectives may, as in Tibetan, Latin, &c., and perhaps with analogous variation of emphasis, either precede or follow their Substantive. That a simple Substantive in an attributive (Genitive) relation could follow the governing word is highly improbable and nowhere apparent. The contrary order is indicated by the above-noted phrase rgyed-ḥraḥ and many others, such as g-ri-ḥruḥu (l. 21), ‘mountain-horn’ (peak), hrdo-ḥgyud, ‘mdzo-race’, Moṅ-rdzoṇ, ‘Moṅ-castle’. Many other Case relations are similarly expressed merely by prefixing the subordinate term, e.g. ḡnah-ḥchos (l. 159), ‘spring-born’. An ‘Accusative’ of the Direct Object is not much required in Tibeto-Burman and other languages, which prefer a Passive form of expression and in which the verb is a sort of noun. But it can be clearly recognized as preceding the verb in:

su-me-ḥmeḥi, 114, ‘Who kindles a fire?’
ḥpu-ge-me-ḥmuḥi, 183, ‘The sons (?) cool the fire’

and derivatively in numerous compounds, such as:

and the same or other cases in:
gse-ḥlad, 240 &c., ‘requital of injury’
rne-ḥlad, 231, ‘requital of wrong’
ḥkhab-ḥgro, 233, &c., ‘home-going’.

So far we have not elicited anything concerning expressions of circumstance, time, place, condition, and reason, for which some provision must have been made in the structure of the sentence. And this gives prominence to the fact that in the verse of seven syllables the four syllables preceding the caesura constitute a separate section of the meaning of the sentence. If we take the following verses:

ṣi-ḥchos-re-ge-ḥpu-myī-lḥdin ||, 160
‘Winter-born, a bird does not fly’
ḥkhu-tsa-ṣid-dze-ḥpha-ḥṇur- ḡṇur ||, 60
‘When the uncle-people are high, the father groans’

¹ Thus ḡno-ḥkob-prom (l. 322), ḡno-ḥdaṅ-prom (l. 258) may be rendered ‘made a face-hiding’, ‘made a face-rest’.
rgam-hgah-hkañ-hyañ-hrag-ma-hbog ||, 256
‘Though the deep places were filled, the dykes were not fouled’

hjo-me-hdub-re-hla(b)-me-hñis ||, 70
‘When the hjo-fire sinks, the hlab-fire shines out’
thañ-rdzo-hkyud-na-hbros-hdru-hjar, 220
‘In the mdzo-race of the thañ-country the yak [is caught in the toils]’

we see that the last three syllables contain a complete proposition, while the first four introduce some circumstance of place or time or condition or specification. What gives importance to this observation is the fact that the monosyllables which occupy the fourth place in these verses, namely ge, dze, hyañ, re, na, occur with enormous frequency in the text, in that position. In the verses of eight and eleven syllables the case is similar, as is natural, since the former are the original of which the seven-syllable verse is a catalectic form and the latter have merely an additional clause of four syllables: an exception is noted infra, p. 188. In twelve-syllable verses we have three clauses of four syllables each: the eleven-syllable verse consists of 4+4+3. The nine-syllable verse has a different rhythm, and the Particles are apt to occur in the fifth place: examples on pp. 127–8.

These facts suffice to demonstrate a general or formal character in the four words and indicate that the groups ending with them are of the nature of subordinate clauses, such as in Tibetan are found ending in ciñ, te (de, ste), yañ, na, nas, la, las, and constituting Gerund-expressions. This is, doubtless, why, like the Gerund-clauses in the simple sentences of Tibetan, they occupy the first place, preceding the main sentence or at least the verb. The value and etymology of these several Particles, which we see to be in part identical with those of the Tibetan, will be considered infra. The clauses, for which we may give the general formula ‘A being B’, can be used to express not only attendant circumstances or conditions, but also mere note of time and place or other particulars: for example, ‘on a dark night’ may be expressed by ‘the night being dark’, and ‘vengeance upon the stupid mdzo’ by ‘the mdzo being stupid, vengeance’.

Here we must take note of a matter, which, if unobserved, would be a permanent obstacle to the interpretation of the text and the etymology of the language: it is as follows:—There are in the text many verses where in the caesura position a syllable is
missing. The cases, to which attention is called in the critical notes, occur as follows:

(a) Cases where the third syllable ends in \( r \):


(b) Other cases:

Lines 12, 14, 153, 193, 311–12, 319 (2).

The group (b) may be explained by a simple citation of one of the cases, ll. 193–4:

\[
\text{hnah-htsu-rpag-re-hnah-mo-hgam} || \\
\text{hnah-mo-hrpag-[re]-gso-nad-hgam} \\
\text{gso-nad-rpag-re-hkah-hgan-hjor.}
\]

No one would question that the parallelism in the three lines demands the insertion of \( re \) in the second of them. Quite similar are the cases in ll. 12 (insert \( ge \) or \( dze \)) and 14 (insert \( ge \)). The case of ll. 153–4 is slightly different, but has the advantage of illustrating also the group (a). We read:

\[
\text{myi-re-hti-ni-myi-[re]-hsi} || \\
\text{myi-rgye-mer(=} \text{mye-re})-hchos-hyo-hjo \\
\text{hti-rgye-mer-dze-hgye-hkrom-hkrom} ||
\]

In the first verse we are perhaps dealing with a different \( re = \) Tibetan \( re \), ‘each’, ‘a single’, and the meaning may perhaps be:

‘if each man singly stop, each man dies’, so that the bracketed \( re \) would be an appropriate insertion. In the second verse an alteration of \( myer \) to \( mye-re \) gives a required parallelism to the third, and also affords the valuable information that \( mye-re \) has approximately the same sense as \( mye-dze \).

Now in group (a) there are three other instances of \( myer \) in the same situation (ll. 365–6). They must be cured in the same way; and it follows that the word \( myer \), since it does not otherwise occur, does not exist. Of a different kind, but like effect, is the evidence when

1 Similarly, in l. 136 we have \( g-yar-re \) (written) in antithesis to \( g-yah-dze \).
we have the same phrase or verse recurring with the postulated modification, e.g.

\[ \text{rta-hgam-hphar-[re], 99 = rta-hgam-hphar-re, 110.} \]

These considerations enable us to dismiss from the vocabulary a number of syllables with final \( r \), many or most of which actually occur elsewhere without the \( r \).

The number of these \( (a) \) instances is perhaps less imposing in relation to the whole text than it seems; for a line of the manuscript will generally contain nearly 2 lines of verse. Nevertheless, such a frequency of a particular error demands some explanation. The error cannot be of a visual character, a miswriting by the copyist, more especially as it would not have so often escaped correction by the reviser. It follows, therefore, that from some points of view the difference between e.g. *myer* and *mye-re* was negligible. We have seen that a clause ending in *re* might sometimes be equivalent to a Locative case: hence, if on the analogy of Tibetan we assume a Nam Locative in *-r*, that may in a fair number of instances account for the indifference. But we require a disyllable. Remembering that the Tibetan *-r* Locative has also the forms *ru* (influenced by *-su?*) and *ra* and is probably nothing other than the ancient word *ra*, *ro*, 'place', it might be thought that the Nam Locative termination was really not *-r* but *-ra*. *Mye-ra* would more easily than *mye-re* be read as *myer*.\(^1\) Something could be urged in favour of this; and no doubt the *-r*-Locative is very old. But we could not assume that a Locative sense would always be appropriate; and we may prefer to connect the (*myer, &c., written in place of *mye-re &c.*) phenomenon with a proximate or ultimate oral transmission of the text and bring into the question the 'rapid pronunciation', which Prejevalsky (op. cit. ii, p. 112) noticed in the modern Tibetan ('Tangut') of the Koko-nor region. When there came to be a recopying from a manuscript, the dictator, scribe, and reviser might all alike be indifferent to the metre.

It now remains to give particulars of the sentence-ending Particles which sometimes lend an appearance of disyllabism to the last monosyllable in a sentence:

\( (a) \) -o, which occurs after a consonant in:

-Lidyoño, 318 (a doubtful reading)

\(^1\) On the cases where, on the contrary, this *ra* after a consonant is actually treated as non-syllabic see *infra*, p. 178.
after a vowel in:

hkruho, 316

and frequently perhaps in forms with o such as:

Ipyoho, 22, hyoho, 119, htoho, 140, 235, &c.

which last group is, however, dubious, since such forms occur in non-final positions, as equivalents of forms with o only, as hyo and hto.

(b) hi, which follows a consonant in:

(1) forms written as one word, viz.

hdzomhi, 134, hnahgbi ||, 137, hkañhi ||, 164, hpyedhi, 208, modhi, 212, hrdaghi ||, 214, hlamhi, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, htroñhi, 224, 243, stomhi, 255, hwadhi ||, 301, hlobbi, 378, hrlomhi | :, 385,

(2) forms written as two words, viz.


In both (1) and (2) the hi seems to be everywhere extra-metrical, though we may allow a doubt in the case of stomhi and hlobbi.

After a vowel there are numerous cases of -ihi, which may be left out of the question for the reason noted in regard to -oho; but parallelism of adjacent verses sometimes indicates the Suffixal character of the hi. With -ehi also there are numerous instances:


Here there is no question of extra-metric value of the hi, since all words ending in -ehi are monosyllabic. In some cases there may be doubt on the ground that alternate forms -e and -ehi are found also in non-final positions: of this mehi and hdehi (each of them, no doubt, a homonym) are examples. But most of the words occur only as finals and probably, therefore, contains sentence-ending hi.

With uhi we have:

hmuhhi, 183, hphuhi, 276, hpuhi ||, 282, hdzuhi ||, 345, 346, of which hphuhi and hpuhi occur also as non-finals (monosyllabic), the latter, however, last (with ge and re) in its clause (ll. 274, 329),
and so virtually final: similarly hruhi, 167. Probably all the words contain u+hi, and the hi will then be extra-metrical.

ahi is seen in hkhad-htohi (l. 324, extra-metrical hi), hkhahi || (l. 218, perhaps in a 12-syllable verse and with o+extra-metrical hi).  

ahi occurs only in

hkahi, 239, hpahi, 384,

where, if = hka+hi, the hi is extra-metrical; but rtahi (l. 174, but hrtah, l. 360), pahi (l. 262) and hpahi (l. 211) are found as non-final monosyllables.

What is the difference between the -o, which we see to have been rare, and the hi, unknown in Tibetan, which was common? Since in the passage, ll. 223-30, which is of a emotional character, a cry for vengeance, the hi ends every line of verse, it seems probable that, in contrast to the -o, which was a Particle of statement, hi was a Particle of emphasis or exclamation and suitable, therefore, for oratory and poetry. On non-final -hi see infra, pp. 191-2.

(c) ni is in Tibetan familiar as a Particle marking a discrimination of one topic from another: like the English 'as for', 'as to', it is therefore essentially antithetic, and so may introduce either the first or the last (a supplementary) member of a group of topics, or each one of them. In the old popular Tibetan it was very common, e.g. in

Sñag-na-ni-myi-slebs
hbros-na-ni-myi-thar
rgal-na-ni-myi-thub
‘Pursuing, cannot overtake;
Fleeing, cannot get away;
Contending, cannot overcome’

and

kha-hod-de-ni-dmar
so-ho-riñ-ni-dgar
‘As to his mouth-gleam, red;
‘As to his teeth, wide-apart’.

A similar meaning of the Nam ni as final is apparent in the series of sentences in ll. 149-56 ending in

htogni (2), 149, hton[n]ji, 150, 152, hkarni ||, 151, hgyañni, 153, hthusni, 156

1 -ahi non-final in the sentence is monosyllabic in hkohi (l. 170), like hkohu in ll. 171, 172, 173, 174, &c.
and internally in l. 153:

myi-re-ḥti-ni-myi-[re]-ḥṣi ||.

The other occurrences, viz.

kyāṇī, 192, rgyen[n]i, 198, ḡkon[n]i || œ œ ||, 249, ḡbogni, 283 can be seen to have the same character.

Where found at the end of Nam verse, this ni is always extra-

metrical.

(d) ra, although it may be merely the word ra, ‘place’, should be mentioned here, because in ll. 329–31:

ḥtoraḥpuḥuḥbos-dze-hrgyo-hṣeg-gṣegra-ge-rgyo-ḥto-stiṅ ||
ṛta-ḥsah-g-ye-dze-rbyo-gṣeg-gṣe[ṛ]-ge-rgyo-ḥto-stiṅ

the first of the two eleven-syllable verses presents gṣegra as one written word and with the value of a monosyllable; a circumstance which accounts for the writing gṣer for gṣegra in the second verse. In l. 270 also:

ḥwah-ḥldᵃṇra-ḥtsᵃṇra-na-ḥwa-ṛgya-ḥrko-ḥrkabs

we can, by reckoning ḡldᵃṇra and ḡtsᵃṇra as monosyllables and omitting the second ḡwah (ḥwa), which is absent in the parallel l. 272, arrive at a normal verse of seven syllables, as in the surrounding passage, or, retaining the ḡwa, a verse of eight syllables. This leaves us with l. 278:

ṛta-ḥwah-ḥldᵃṇra-ḥldah-ḥtag-ḥtos

and l. 302:

ḥmaṇ-ḥriḥi-ḥphaṅ-dze-dgah-ḥldonra-ḥnḥ-na

where, again, ḡldonra is a monosyllable. On ra(re)-ḥṅah see infra, p. 239. The facts appear to show that the writing of the ra as conjoined with the preceding monosyllable is not accidental, but indicates the pronunciations:

gṣegr, ḡldaṇr, ḡtaṣṇr, ḡldonr

without a final vowel:¹ and this may explain in l. 375 the writing ḡrora for what must be ḡroṅ-re or ḡroṅra. Also, it cannot be an accident that all the cases, except gṣegr, involve a final ŋ and that even as regards gṣegr we can point to confusion of final g and ŋ in contemporary Tibetan of north-eastern Tibet, so that gṣer in l. 331 may represent not gṣegr, but gṣenr.

We can hardly fail to connect this non-syllabic ra with the numerous class of contrary cases, discussed above, in which a

¹ In l. 133 ḡṭhaṇra, final, seems to be treated as a monosyllable.
written monosyllable ending in a possibly Locative r has disyllabic value.

(e) *na*: As has been mentioned, a syllable *na*, having obviously a syntactical value, occurs frequently in the *caesura* position in the verse. At end of sentences we find a *na* occurring in at least three ways, namely:

(i) *na* joined to the preceding monosyllable in ll. 77, 182 (*plāṇa* and *ḥḍubna*), 183, 221 (*ḥṭhaṇna*), 225, 231, 236, 237, 238, 244, 245, 246, 248, 253, 257, 258, 262, 280 (*ḥṭona*), 328, 329, 353, 354, 369

(ii) *na* separated from the preceding syllable by interpunctuation in ll. 113, 114, 174 (*ḥto-na* and *ḥpor-na*), 176–7 (*глаṇ-na*), 177, 220, 221, 241, 243, 252, 294, 296, 302, 304, 308–9 (*ḥpaṇ-na*) 359. That there is no difference between the cases (a) and (b) is evident from fluctuations such as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ḥto-na, 174, 294, = ḡtona, 280} \\
\text{ḥṛyaṇ-na, 296 = ḡṛyaṇṇa, 77} \\
\text{ma-ma-ḥna, 245 = mah-mahna, 238 = ma-maḥna, 245, 246 = ma-ḥman(a), 247}
\end{align*}
\]

but also quite as definitely from the fact that in all cases where the evidence of metre is available, and this is the great majority, the *na*, regardless of the difference in the writing, is extra-metrical. In *ma-ma-ḥna*, &c., indeed, the *na* is probably not the Particle, but merely the -n of the root *man*; see *infra*, p. 230.

There is, however, also a third class of cases, namely

(iii) *na* marked off from the preceding sentence by the punctuation, including one case where it is also marked off from the following sentence:

\[
\ldots \text{ḥkhehe} \parallel \text{na} \parallel \text{ḥnor} \ldots , 314.
\]

Not to lay too much stress upon this instance, we may refer to l. 178:

\[
\| \text{na-ḥḍyaṇ-hyaṇ-ḥyo-na-ḥḍyaṇ-ḥkah-ṛwaṇ.}
\]

Here the first *na* spoils the location of the *caesura* (after the second *na*) and brings to the seven-syllable verse an eighth syllable: more than this, it conflicts with two other verses, which commence with the phrase *ḥḍyaṇ-hyaṇ-ḥyo-na* (l. 179) and *ḥḍyaṇ-hyaṇḥ-hyo-doṇ* (l. 367) respectively. From this it appears that the *na* properly belongs neither to the preceding nor to the following verse, but serves as a link between them. This is presumably the same
function that it discharges in the interior of a sentence, when, in the *caesura* position, it joins the first three syllables of a seven-syllable verse to the last three. Accordingly the passage (ll. 124–7):  
htor-hṛta-rme-ge-hṛdaṅ-kraṅ-hkuṅ ||

na  
hṛdaṅ-kraṅ-ḥsad-na-hṛdaṅ-kraṅ-ḥśaḥ  
(with four further verses beginning with *ḥṛdaṅ-ḥkraṅ*) can be properly understood only if the connecting *na* is placed as here.

A fourth employment of *na* is:

(iv) *na* at the end of a paragraph or chapter,

ll. 222 | : |, 253 || • || (probably also l. 182, *plāṅna* |).

This usage, marking a conclusion, may well seem to conflict with the idea of connexion, which is the characteristic of the other usage.

When we take into consideration the Tibetan *na*, all difficulty vanishes. This *na*, in addition to its employment as a Locative suffix, is used

(a) at the end of subordinate clauses expressing circumstances, conditions, &c.;

(b) connecting sentences, and especially when the former of two is a verse or other piece forming a complete whole;

(c) at the end of paragraphs, statements, and whole documents, such as letters.

Moreover, this *na* is often, in the contemporary Tibetan manuscripts from north-eastern Tibet, placed at the beginning of the second sentence, separated by punctuation from the first. As an example with a prior verse we may quote:

rta-yul-ḥbrog-yin-kyāṅ-bden

g-yag-yul-ḥyāṅ-yin-kyāṅ-bden |

na | da-de-riṅ-saṅ-lṭa-na | rta-daṅ-g-yag-gṇis-saṅ-myi-ḥthab-ḥo

'Horse-country is the wilds—'tis true!

Yak-country is the north-plain—'tis true!

whereas this is so (*na*), now, looking to to-day and to-morrow, horse and yak should not strive as foes'.

Here the first *na*, marked off from both sentences and not included in the metre of what precedes, has the same meaning ('attendant circumstance' or 'condition') as the second, which in the prose passage is attached to its (subordinate) clause.
An example of the *na* attached to the following sentence only is:

\[ \text{sku-glud-du-bor} \mid : \mid \text{na-ḥbrog-srin} \ldots \text{ḥtshalde-mchis} \]

‘On *(na)* his casting away . . . as his body’s scapegoat, the fiend of the waste came accepting it.’

It may be added that these usages are not confined to cases with *na*, but are found also with the other subordinating Particles, *nas*, *ciṅ*, *ste*, *pas*, &c. The most convenient method of translation in such cases is to round off the prior sentence as a whole, and then commence a new one with ‘So’. On *doṅ* (Tib. *daṅ*) see Vocabulary.

The use of the *na* at the end of paragraphs, &c., now becomes intelligible. It implies vaguely that there is something still to come; and, when we find it in Tibetan at the end of a letter, we can understand it as analogous to English letter-endings such as ‘Hoping you are well’, when no main verb follows, the implied main statement being a general consent to further acquaintance or correspondence.

It is tempting to conceive of this *na*, local and conditional, as a form of the common word *gnah*, ‘place’, which in the Nam occurs both in this form and also as *na* and *ḥnah*. But an original pro-nominal sense, ‘that’, ‘there’, might account even better for the Tibetan *na-re*, meaning, no doubt, ‘so it is *(re)*’ and used, like Sanskrit *iti*, after quotations and also in the sense of ‘so say *(or said)*’.

**C. PARTS OF SPEECH**

I (a). Nouns, Suffixes, Reduplication

Naturally there are in the Nam language many Substantives, such as *pha*, ‘father’, *rta*, ‘horse’, *pu*, ‘bird’, *ri*, ‘mountain’, *phag*, ‘hog’, *lam*, ‘road’, *sku*, ‘body’, *no*, ‘face’, *mye*, *mehi*, ‘eye’, *roṅ*, ‘gorge’, *ḥla*, ‘moon’, *me*, ‘fire’, *smyi*, ‘man’, *na*, ‘spring’, *śi*, ‘winter’, which show no trace of a deverbal origin. And there are others, such as *ḥbroṅ*, ‘yak’, *gnah*, ‘place’, *ḥkhab*, ‘house’, *ḥdzoṅ*, ‘fort’, which, although originally they may in fact have been derived from Verbs or Adjectives, are, at any rate, not obviously or certainly so. But the Tibeto-Burman Verb is, as is well known, properly a noun of action, state, or occurrence, i.e. a name of a motion, state, &c., regarded as a thing; so that every verb-root can function as a Substantive. For use as a Substantive it requires no suffix; and, if it has one, e.g. *rgyed-ma*, ‘division’, the suffix is usually, in a compound, dropped, as in *rgyed-ḥrah*, ‘place of
division’. But naturally there is some demand for Suffixes, in order to convey particular nuances of meaning.

The most general and widespread Tibetan Suffix, *pa, ba*, does not seem to be recognizable in Nam, the only possible candidate being the *wa* in *gsom-wa, rgoñ-wa, hwi-wa*, of which expressions we have still (infra, pp. 336 sqq.) to determine the meaning. The Suffix, non-existent in Hsi-fan, is all the more unlikely to be found, inasmuch as its sphere is, at least in part, preoccupied by *ta*. The ‘Feminine’ form *ma* exists, as we have seen, in *rgyed-ma*, which is also guaranteed by some other forms in the Berlin fragment, *more-ma, yañ-ma, bri-ma, bra-ma, rme-ma*, &c., in which it seems certain that the *ma* is not the negative *ma*: this *ma* seems to give simply the sense of an Action-noun and is never a really ‘Feminine’ suffix.

The *po* and *mo* of the Tibetan are likewise, apparently, wanting. For, though we find the expressions, *rbyo-po, ‘rbyo-man’* (l. 181), and *hñah-mo, ‘home-woman’* (l. 193), it seems that they are compounds, in which *po* and *mo* retain their full meaning: cf. what Dr. Laufer wrote¹ concerning the Tibetan *btsan-po* (sometimes *-pho, ‘man’*).

Whether there was a Suffix *ka, ga* remains to be determined. Such a suffix, rare in ordinary Tibetan,² was certainly used in the Tibetan of the north-east.³

*Ta* is found copiously added to verb-roots and giving rise to nouns of action, such as *glo-ta, ‘intention’, ‘thought’, skye-ta, ‘life’, chos-ta, ‘beginning’, hlab-ta, ‘speaking’, g-ri-ta, ‘payment’. It is used of agents in l. 336;

klu-ḥtah-rgyohon-re-hšes-ta-ḥrgyon
‘if the blind perform rgyo, the knowing ones perform rgyo’
where *klu* and *hšes* are rather Adjectives than Verbs; and there are other like cases. We sometimes (ll. 7 hyed-ge-ta, 371, 372 hld-ge-ḥtah) find the Particle *ge* inserted between the Suffix and its word.

The *sta* in:

ḥño-sta, 85, rne-sta, 86, ḭbrad-sta, 306, Ḫmañ-sta, 311, hri (g-ri, g-riḥi)-sta, 311–12, slo-stah, 99

² But cf. *chad-ka*, ‘fine’ or ‘confiscation’, in the MS. *Chronicle* (now edited by M. Jacques Bacot, see pp. 25 (89), 57 (ll. 31–2)) lton-ka (and ‘ga) ‘groove’, ‘notch’, ‘depression’, dbyar-ka, sos-ka, ‘summer’, than-ka, ‘plain’, thad-ka, ‘direction’, &c. These, however, are substantives, and often they have by-forms with -kha and -ga, and may be compounds, formed with *kha* as second member.
³ Supra, pp. 32, n. 1, 60.
will be a form of ta, to be expected on the analogy of to/sto, te/sto in Nam and Tibetan: and hño-sta and rñe-sta seem to denote persons. On the s- see infra (p. 185, n.) and on sta = ‘there’ (p. 201). On ruye-HTAH, l. 91, and on hwa-sté-HTAH, ll. 71–2, with ste+ta see p. 187.

Since the expected da is not found in this use, we naturally ask whether among the occurrences of lda, ldah, hlda, hldah, there may be any of like character. There are numerous instances of hlda/ hlda/hda as a Suffix, viz.:

hrañ-hlda(hlda)-ñam-ge, 5, 6, 8, 37
hrañ-hlda-ge, 43
hmañ-hlda, 33
rkñ-hlda, 84
hkañ-hlda, 137
rke-hlda, 155
hban-hlda, 170
hsah-hlda, 164
g-yog-hlda, 200
hso-hlda, 201
šor-hlda, 203
gse-hlda, 240
hrde-hlda, 301
rpehi-hlda, 286
rñe(hrñe)-hlda, 303, 310
hpo-hlda, 358
hdzñ-hlda, 380, 382, 383.

Several of the words preceding the hlda, e.g.

hrañ (= Tib. rañ, ‘self’), hrañh (‘place’), hsah, ‘earth’

are certainly not Verbs, so that in those instances the Suffix must have a value different from that of the ta with Verbs and similar to that of ta with Adjectives. Some of the other words are provisionally (but see infra) not sufficiently determined in meaning to allow a certain decision. But as regards gse-hlda, in which gse is known as equivalent to Tibetan gtse ‘to injure’, we can take note of the verse

rñe-hlad-rpag-re-gse-hlda-hlad-ñlamhi, 239–40

which is immediately followed by gse-hlad, recurring again twice in l. 242. Gse-hlad means ‘requital of injury’, rñe-hlad probably ‘requital of wrong’: and gse-hlda-hlad, since it cannot differ much from gse-hlad, ought to mean ‘requital of injuring or injurers’.
The agential sense (‘injurers’) will probably be found to fit the case of *gse-hlda* and most of the other instances.

*to, hto, htoho* occur most commonly as Verb-suffix or Verb at the end of a sentence: we have:

- hsi-hrog-hpah-to, 17
- stor-htoho ||, 140
- bprom-hto, 168, 171 (hphrom), 172 (hphrom), 174 (prom), 359 (hprom-htoho), 360 (to)
- re-hto ||, 169, 382
- rmañ-dze-htoho, 235
- ḥnu-hto ||, 242
- hyah-hto, 294, 315 (htoho)
- hmañ-hto ||, 310
- rgo-htoho, 314–15
- hrbom-htoho ||, 317
- ḥkhad-htohi, 324

(Uncertain on account of confused text, g-yo-hpud-hto, 28).

Not really different are the cases where the sentence is subordinate and therefore followed by a Particle:

- gṣañ-re-ḥtad-to-dze, 30
- hrgom-ḥkhru1-ḥto-na, 169
- hldog-g-yah-to-dze, 317
- dguhu-mu-hto(to)-re, 236, 244: dgu-mu-hto[-]r[e], 225, 245.

The *re* in the last group of cases is one of the Particles which most commonly occupy the *caesura* position. As we shall see *infra*, it is really a Verb, meaning ‘be’ (in these cases a Gerund, ‘being’), for which reason it may itself admit the *hto* formation *re-hto*, as in ll. 169, 382, noted above. The cases with *hto-re* show, however, that the *hto*-forms are not really finite Verbs, but are predicative Participles or Adjectives with the Verb ‘be’ omitted.

After the *hto*-form may come an ‘auxiliary’ Verb or expression: the instances are:

- hrgu-hto-hrun (= Tibetan *run*, ‘ought’, ‘must’), 30, 32
- stor-to-hrun, 79–80, 138
- ḥdzohu-hto-hrun, 138
- ḥtshu-to-ḥphran, 215
- rgyo-hto-stin, 330, 331, 335, 336 (rgyoho)
- ḥko-hto-swad, 390

1 For *ḥkhru-re*. 
and in a subordinate sentence or phrase:

\[ \text{stor-hto-hruhi-ge}, 167 \]

The other cases are:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{klu-hto-hkyim}, & 37 \\
\text{hdam-to-hbu-hpor(hphor ?)}, & 68 \\
\text{stor-hto-rt-a-yañ-stor-to-hrun } & | \text{, } 79 \\
\text{hchihi-htoho-ge-hnan } & ||, 350.
\end{align*} \]

Here \text{klu-hto, hdam-to, hchihi-htoho,} clearly function as Substantives, 'the blind', 'the bound', &c.; and \text{stor-hto = stor-hto- &c., 'that having fled'}.

The \text{-sto} which we naturally expect is to be seen in

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{hswar-hldu-sto-dze}, & 28 \\
\text{hde-hyim-sto-rgyag}, & 29 \\
\text{hno-sto-ge-rdo-re}, & 84 \\
\text{hño-sto-ge-hśag-dze}, & 85 \\
\text{hbe-hbah-hnáh-sto}, & 235 \\
\text{tha-hnu-hrgyañ-sto-smyi-hnu-hto}, & 242 \\
\text{hkyan-hldon-hgyañ-sto}, & 292.
\end{align*} \]

In two cases \text{sto} comes at the end of a sentence, and the phrase is therefore, no doubt, a Verb:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{hrugu-hrgehi-sto } & ||, 58 \\
\text{hchir-htsah-sto}, & 233;
\end{align*} \]

and in one case:

\[ \text{sto-the-the-re}, 336 \]

it comes at the beginning of a sentence and is, doubtless, a quite different word.

It is fairly evident that \text{sto} is equivalent to \text{to} and both this and the Adjectival-Participial character of the \text{to} and \text{sto} are proved by the occurrence in contemporary Tibetan name-titles from north-eastern Tibet, such as:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Btsan-to-re, 'The powerful'} \\
\text{Snan-to-re, 'The distinguished'} \\
\text{Tshañ-to-re} \\
\text{Sgra-ya-sto, = Dgra-yas-to, 'Having foes without limit'} \\
\text{— -rgya-sto}
\end{align*} \]

\[ ^{1} \text{Cf. the doublets } te/sto, ta/sta, \text{ and Tibetan } te/ste. \text{ From observation of the occurrence, both in Tibetan and in Nam, it appears that } te \text{ and } sto \text{ derive their } s \text{ from the preceding (Preterite) verb-form: thus } hldu-sto, hhyms-sto, hrgchi-sto \text{ are merely scriptural substitutes for } hldus-to, hyims-to, hrgehis-to. \]

\[ ^{2} \text{Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 16.} \]
where, furthermore, we find also the re, which we have seen in
dgu-mu-to-re, &c.

In general therefore we see that the forms in -to, -sto, can act as
predicates and can then be followed by the word re, 'be'. This
means that they are Adjectives and Participles; and when we find
them as subjects, as in:

\[\text{hcih}-\text{htoho-ge-hnan} \parallel, 350\]
\[\text{hno-sto-ge-rdo-re}, \text{84}\]

they are Adjectives used as subjects: in fact, \text{hno-sto} probably
means 'friends' or 'allies', i.e. \text{hnos-to}, 'those on one's side (ños),
rather than \text{hno-sto}, 'those who lend countenance (ño, cf. Tib.
ño-tshab, a 'proxy', and so forth)'.

The forms do and ido may also be expected. The former may be
seen in:

\[\text{Idan-pyer-hgag-re-htsah-hya-hd} \parallel, 65\]
\[\text{hto-se-hgro-re-htsah-hya-hd} \parallel, 67\]
\[\text{rta-hso-hnah-ya-nhni-hrdzum-doh} \parallel, 80\]
\[\text{ldyn-glab-hd} \parallel, 180\]
of which the first perhaps means:

'those (htsah) who are prevented (hgag) from co-operating
(Idan-pyer) become rivals or enemies (hya = Tib. ya)'.

Somewhat different perhaps are:

\[\text{gsha-sna-dono} \ldots, 86\]
\[\text{htsog-hram-dono} \ldots\]

where we may suspect the meaning of an abstract 'in ... friendship', 'in comradeship', and:

\[\text{htor-hd-hchu} \text{, 185,}\]

which seems clearly to mean 'in greatness small'. The remaining
instance:

\[\text{hci-hd-dyan} \text{, 183, 353,}\]

may conceivably belong to either group. Probably, however, it
means 'started to depart' and so belongs to the group hrgu-
hto-hrun, &c.

A corresponding ido we may surely recognize in:

\[\text{dgu-hd-hd-dze, 74, 77, 78 (o\text{ge}), 114 (o\text{ge}), 139 (\text{ldo, o\text{ge})}, 309 (o\text{ge})}\]
\[\text{rne-hpo-hd-ge}, 177\]
\[\text{mehi-hgb-hd-ge}, 155\]
klu-hldo-sme-re, 342
hnu-hldo-hldyohe ||, 355
seg-sme-hldo, 375
hblri-slod-hldo-dze, 381

in several of which, e.g. dgu-hldo, ‘hotness’, klu-hldo, ‘blindness’, we seem to find the abstract sense: whereas in others, e.g.

mehi-hgab-hldo-ge = ‘having eyes hidden’

the Adjectival-Participial value may appear.

Like re, ‘be’, this Particpial or Verbal ta, to, survives in eastern and north-eastern Tibet down to the present time. Rockhill tells us (Journey through Mongolia and Tibet, p. 270) that:

‘The language spoken in Jyade (in Eastern Tibet) presents numerous peculiarities I have not met with elsewhere. To note only one—they use the particles lé and ta . . . to indicate the present tense . . . Rig-ta, “I see it”; Rig-mi-ta, “I (or you) do not see it.”’

And in the Vicomte d’Ollone’s Langues des peuples non-Chinois de la Chine, p. 224, we see the ta at work in a dialect (No. 41, Dzorgai) of the Go-loc peoples of the north:

Kan iu eu dzeta ‘I have a horse’
Kan iu nié dzeta ‘I have two horses’.

In rwye-htah, l. 91, htah, ‘is’, occurs, and in hwa-ste-htah, ll. 71–2, it is added to the Particpial form in ste.

A suffix tsa has been previously (JRAS. 1939, pp. 207, 216) seen in gpha-tsa, ‘father-people’, hku-tsa, ‘uncle-people’; and this is doubtless also to be seen in Tibetan bu-tsa, ‘child-people’, ‘children’. We are naturally inclined to see the same in

mor-tsah-khrom-re || hyaň-tsa-hcer ||, 388

since mor and hyaň are frequently antithetical and the parallelism with gpha-tsa v. hku-tsa is obvious: hyaň-tsa recurs in l. 63. The same appears in hyrog-htsa, ‘enemies’, l. 146, g-wah(g-yah ?)-htsa, l. 152, hkuwi-htsa, l. 259, hpan-tsa, l. 283. There are two interesting points in connexion with this Suffix. The first is that it may follow compounds:

klu-htro-htsa-ge, 24–5, ‘blind stones’ (?)
hthaň-le-tsa, 131, 220, ‘the [beings of the] than fields’ (?)
mye-hraň-htsa, 342, ‘look-outs’ (?)

compounds with -re:

gsu-prom-ôno[-r][e]-htsa-hpu-hdrom ||, 64–5
hstor-moň-ôdoň-re-htsa, 64
and even the inserted Particle ge:

śes-ṛtśiṃ-ṃ-ga-ḥṭṣaḥ, 379
trer-ga-ṃ-wa-ge-ḥṭṣaḥ, 381
ḥḍaḥ-ga-ṃ-ḥa-hwep-ga-ḥṭṣaḥ, 383.

This suits well with its being virtually a plural Suffix which can come after compounds and phrases. It is noticeable that the instances with re and ge all have the tsa, ṭṣaḥ, &c., as the fifth syllable in the verse, so that metrical convenience may have favoured the phraseology with re and ge.

We should expect to find such a tsa appearing sometimes in the form ca. But at present it does not seem possible to identify an instance in the Nam text. The Berlin fragment, which has one or two occurrences of tsa, viz.:

jig-maḥ-tsa-ge, 6
hṭhaṃ-gnaṃ-tsa-ge, 18
not to mention possible examples, such as
me-tsa, 14,
has very likely the expected ca in
ljeb-ca-ri-ri, gmu-me-doṅ-ca-ri-ri, 10–11.

In Tibetan the ca may be recognized in the cag (= ca-ge?, cf. yi = yi-ge) used to form the plural of Pronouns, such as ṅa-cag, ‘we’, which use is extended to pronominal words, e.g. in bdag-cag, ‘ourselves’; while an analogous or related form, cog, is still more widely employed, as in ḥbro-cog, ‘runaways’, yod-do-cog, ‘all existent things’, mthon-ṅo-cog, ‘all seen things’. It is intelligible that the convenient form ca, tsa may have penetrated into the Indian Prākrit of the Shan-shan kingdom, as was suggested in JRAS. 1939, pp. 207–8; cf. the Latin etc. in European languages.

The formative te/tehi/sti/stei/lde/ldehi has already (p. 136) been discussed and equated to the Tibetan Gerund-forming te/ste/de. This te/de seems to be clearly apparent in the Berlin fragment:

bri-ma-zor-de . . . , 2
bra-ma-gar-de . . . , 2
rme-ma-do-de . . . , 4
śaṅ-ma-de-de . . . , 5
rtoṅ-ma-de-de . . . , 5
kyo-ma-do-de . . . , 5
gce-yaṅ-phāṅ-de . . . , 6, &c.
and with *te* after *re*:
- klo-rňu-sňaň-re-te, 11
- klu-ne-sňaň-re-te, 13
- mug-tse-khyig-re-te, 17
- ḥtham-tse-re-te, 17

and after other Verbs:
- de-wa-yob-te, 16
- gya-rba-tsag-te, 20.

In the present text we can recognize the idiom quite well, e.g. in
- puň-te-gsar-ňar, 204 ('being massed together, new vigour')
- hphom-te-ḥdraň, 147 ('being conquered, led')
- hsas-te-khyaň, 116
- hjo(hdzo ?)-chi-te-re, 385

and with *ste*:
- ldyañ-ḥkañ-rwaň-ste, 178
- gnah-goň-myag-ste, 179–80
- ḥlab-ta-gbohu-ste-ge, 181–2
- na-ḥtsaň-ste-dze, 33–4
- hldyim-ste-hpuhi-ge, 274.

But, even putting aside
- hwa-ste-ḥtaň, 72
- hwa-ste-hge-dze, 73, 75

where we are not yet sure of *ste* as a suffix, we may apprehend a
difference in the employment of *te/stte*, in the two manuscripts. This difference may be best expressed as a tendency in our manu-
script for the *te/stte* to appear in the interior of a clause, instead of
at the end, and as belonging to the Subject and not to the
Predicate: that is to say, it serves to form a Participle-Adjective,
instead of a Gerund. This is seen, for instance, in the above
- hphom-te-ḥdraň, 147

and in
- hse-ḥte-hmun, 33
- hldya-ḥkañ-ḥte-ḥňor, 52
- ḥsōd-te-ṛmag-dze, 147

and it also appears from the fact that the phrases are sometimes
followed by *ge*, which always belongs to the Subject, as in
- hldyim-ḥste-hpuhi-ge, 274
- ḥrie-ḥrdam-ḥte-ṛge, 322
- ḥlab-ta-gbohu-ste-ge, 181–2
or by dze, which is normally a kind of preposition, e.g. in
na-htsah-ste-dze, 33
hwa-ste-hge-dze, 73, 75.
This is the employment which we have seen in
rgyed-hdre-hte-ge, 87, 24, ‘the division-inducers’,
and similar is the case of
htrog-hdre-hte-re, 326, 338, ‘there being (re, or re = ‘all’),
emnity (? deceit ?)-inducers’
so that finally we get the te attached to an Adjective:
trog-htor-hte-dze, 266, ‘upon great enmity’
and such an Adjective may become the main Predicate, as in
hla (lah)-hram-hte, 73, 76, ‘the moon [is] pleasant’.
The interest of this development in the use of the te, ste is the
fact that it is precisely the idiom which we have already (pp. 131,
136) traced in the personal names Ltori-te-Mye-kru, Bzagste-Nar-
byam; it emphasizes the connexion between the names and the
Nam dialect.
There do not seem to be any more syllabic formatives apparent
at first sight, excepting a Diminutive, hgu, on which see infra
(p. 258) and Case-suffixes, which will be mentioned below. But
this is clearly the place for considering the variant forms te and
tehi, lde and ldehi, which have been exhibited by the personal
names. The i is evidently regarded by the Tibetan translators of
the names as corresponding to their own Genitive- and Adjective-
forming Suffix hi; for, where their hi would not be phonologically
correct,1 they substitute their alternative gi, gyi: thus:
Byehu-rma-byehu-gi = bya-rma-byah i
Yab-sten-rgan-gyi = Yab-ñal-ldehi
Tsen-hgi-Rba-ga.
This is good evidence for a Genitive-Adjective value in the
Nam hi. Does it help to explain any of the variations between -e
and -ehi, such as we have exemplified supra (p. 124)?:
hrah-we-rtah = hrah-wehi-rt a
hbe-hbah = hbehi-hbah.
It might be, for instance, that hrah-we-rtah meant ‘place-make-
horse’ as a compound, while hr ah-wehi-rt a meant ‘place-making
horse’ with ‘place-making’ as an Adjective qualifying ‘horse’;
and similarly hbe-hbah might mean ‘sheep-oppression’ as a com-
 pound, while hbehi-hbah meant ‘oppression of sheep’, with hbehi

1 Occasionally elsewhere also, as in byehu-gi.
as a quasi-Genitive. And it would be convenient to discover in the Nam language a Genitive form. There are also cases where we apparently find these Gerund expressions with -de having the hi appendix when used apparently as Subjects. Thus in

\[\text{hstor-hdehi-hphyid} ||, 339, 341 \text{ (cf. ldañ-hdehi-hpyid} || ||, 343-4)\]

unless hde is there a different word (‘good fortune’), it might be that hstor-hdehi means ‘fugitives’, while hstor-hde might mean ‘fleeing’. But, if the language had had such a Genitive-Adjective suffix, we should have expected, though this and the analogous Tibetan texts are very terse and sparing in their use of Genitives otherwise indicated than by position, to find at any rate some instance of a Genitive suffix used after a word ending in a consonant; and of that we have not any clear example. Moreover, the cases with -ahi, uhi, ohi directly contradict the idea of a Genitive-Adjective suffix,¹ and the impression received is rather that the hi is a Particle of emphasis, identical, in fact, with the sentence-ending hi: the reason why we do not find it after consonants may be that in the interior of a sentence it would have added a syllable for which the verse had no place. It may very well have been used optionally in the interior of compounds, either to mark the separation of the parts or to emphasize one part, and for convenience, in cases like the above-mentioned hstor-hdehi, to mark off the phrase as a Subject. The objection to this is that the spelling mehi, where the probable meaning is ‘eye’, seems to be rather constant, while me, mye, prevails where ‘fire’ is probably meant; but possibly the hi may have been used in the language, without phonological origin, to make this very distinction. At the end of a sentence mehi can sometimes mean ‘is not’ (Tib. med).

It appears that before this enclitic hi a final a is usually converted into e. Hdzó-hdzehi, ll. 338, 339, htsø-htsahi, l. 342, are clearly identical with each other and with hdzó-hdza, l. 262, htsah, l. 29, htsch(i), l. 364, htsø-htsah, ll. 62, 73, 115: and the same change is to be seen in

\[\text{hyah-hnehi-hnahd}, 115-16 \text{ (Tib. ya-ña, ‘anguish’, ‘fright’)}\]
\[\text{hwí-hwéhi-htsag}, 173, ‘rats (or mice) collect’\]
\[\text{(cf. hwí-wa-rmañ, 201, ‘rats (or mice) are the tomb’)}\]

so that in some occurrences of spehi and hpehi, e.g. ll. 211, 370, we

¹ Ldehi-swa-rsañ, ll. 319, 320, from ide, seems exactly parallel to rtahi-swa-hldir, l. 174, from rta.
may question whether we have to do with *spe, *hpe, or with *spa, *hpa; see p. 282. The case of -a/-ehu (p. 368) seems analogous.

The possibility that -ehi is merely a lax representative of -ehe is suggested by the hrgehi-sto = hrges-to of p. 185, n. 1; it would then be parallel to -ohu = -oho (infra, p. 369). But against this we may note the occurrences of -ahi, -uhi, -ohi, and also of an -ehu similarly equivalent to -e (p. 368).

The only other morphological feature of Nam monosyllables is one found throughout the whole Tibeto-Burman area, namely reduplication. As concerns verbs a reference to this has, in regard to the Berlin fragment, already been made (*JRAS*, 1939, p. 198). In our text it is frequent, there being even sequences of verses such as

hbo-hkom-lďyan-dze-hldab-hde-hde ||

These verb-repetitions are true reduplications, without the vocalic variation which is found in some of the languages, e.g. Tibetan. But the latter type also seems to appear, as in Tibetan, in expressions, such as

gdim-hď zam-hď zim-re, 100
hď aň-plim-plam, 120.

These and others, e.g. hbo-hbon, ma-maňn, can function indistinguishably as Substantives, Adjectives (frequent in Hsi-fan, Lo-lo, Mo-so, etc.) and Verbs.

I (b). Declension

The apparent absence of any plural suffixes, such as the Tibetan *rnams, tsho, dag*, has already been noted (*JRAS*, 1939, p. 209): it is hardly likely that the hdag in the parallel phrases:

hyog-hprah-hdag-dze, 254
khkwi-htsa-hyog-hdag-ci
hsas-hď rah-hdag-chi,
&c., ll. 259–61

is equivalent to the Tibetan *dag*: the hdag must, in fact, be interpreted otherwise. Probably the language was content with the tsa, properly more equivalent to ‘&c.’, discussed on pp. 187–8.

The Genitive relation (or the direct relation between things) occurs, no doubt, in all its species (possession, part-whole, physical, psychological, legal, social, &c., connexion), being indicated merely by word-order, the Genitive word preceding. But the phrase is then indistinguishable, as in English, from a compound
word; and whether the connexion between the parts is then Genitival, Datival, Instrumental, Locative, depends simply upon the sense. Thus we have:

thañ-hrdzo-rgyud, 16, 220, ‘thañ-mdzo-race’ (2 Genitives)
g-ri-ĥruhu, 21, ‘mountain-horn (Peak)’ (Genitive of whole)
Moñ-hdzoñ, 64, &c., ‘Moñ castle’ (Genitive of description)
hjo-me, 67, &c., ‘hjo fire’ (Genitive of material)
ĥna-ĥlam, 68, ‘home way’ (Goal of motion)
meĥi-ra, 78, ‘eye-place’ (= Sentinel post)
mye-ĥrah, 342, ‘fire- or eye-place’ (Genitive of description)
hrgoñ-ru, 82, ‘egg’s horn’ (Genitive of whole)
hnaĥ-hchos, 159, ‘spring-born’ (Temporal)
hşan-ĥlad, 225, &c., ‘enmity requital’ (Genitive of description)
smyi-ĥnu, 241, ‘man(‘s) strength’ (Genitive of possession)
hldya-ĥkañ-hte, 51–2, ‘water-full’ (Genitive of material)
hpah-rmag, 205, ‘hero-army’ (Genitive of description)
rgyed-ĥrah, 87, &c., ‘division-place’ (Genitive of description).

Thus the ideas which we associate with the term Genitive have no explicit expression: how the phrase ‘This is yours’ would have been turned in the Nam language does not at present appear.

Is there a formative expressing Agent or Instrument? On the analogy of the Tibetan we should expect to find from vowel stems an Instrumental or Agential Case-ending -s, e.g. ńaś, ‘by me’, from ńa, ‘I’. This is likely to be an old formation. The fact that the corresponding kyis, &c., after consonant stems, fails to appear in Nam discourages the expectation of an s after vowels; and, as mentioned, supra (p. 170), the instances of words ending in a vowel followed by s occur almost always at the ends of sentences, and the words are, no doubt, verbs. The few possible examples are discussed infra (pp. 359–60) with negative conclusion. We must therefore hold that the Agential-Instrumental construction is evaded in Nam.

A Dative with Postposition la, as in Tibetan, is well established in the three successive sentence-endings ll. 69, 70:

hbehi-la-hgar, ‘a camp for the sheep’
hphag-la-gnah ‘a place for the hog’
hbyig-la-gnah ‘a place for the cow’.

The Tibetan Locative Postpositions ru, su, do not appear. But the r-Locative after vowels and the Locative with Postposition na are, as has been seen, frequent, the former very frequent; and there is
a third, doubtless of wider employment, namely dze. The partial equivalence of the three is shown by their alternations, e.g.

- myi-rgye-myer (mye-re or "ra), 153
- hti-rgye-mye-dze, 154
- sku-mag-hno-dze
- hdah-mag-hno-dze, 58
- twan-mag-hnor, 48
- hkyan-mag-hnor, 49
- htañ-hrdzo-hnor, 218–19, 132
- hthañ-le-tshah-dze, 219
- than-rdzo-hkyud-na, 220
- hkrug-hrdzo-hgyud-dze, 16
- hdza-ma-hne-na-rtag-ge-hdphah
- hke-ma-hnyehe-dze-htor-he-hdzo-hdseh
- hkehu-hkah-dwan-na-hldyan-hkah-dwan
- rgoñ-wa-myer-rbyo-rgyer-hldyan
- hldan-hkran-hsad-na-
- hldan-hkran-hgah
- hldan-hwhe-dze-hldan-slah-hkehe
- hldan-krañ-hwe-dze-hldan-slah-hkehe

In several of the above cases, however, and in many others, the word preceding the -r (= re), na, and dze is not a Substantive, but a Verb, and the sense also demands not local Locatives, but expressions of circumstance or condition, as set forth supra, pp. 173 sqq.; and this may be specially the case in regard to dze, which, as has been previously suggested (JRAS. 1939, p. 209), may be the Chinese word tsai, elsewhere also found spelt dze and dzehi (JRAS. 1926, p. 526; 1927, p. 306) and used in a local or temporal sense.¹ The fact that dze never has the h- Prefix favours the supposition that it is a foreign word. A strictly local sense seems to be conveyed by na in

- me-na-hldis, 58, 'bounds (?) in fire'
- me-na-hsams, 58, 'is tempered (?) in fire'.

II. THE VERB

Ordinarily the Tibetan Verb varies in three ways:

1. By alternation of Prefixes and associated modifications of initial consonants, e.g.

- sgyur/hgyur, spo/hpho, stu/sdu/hthu/hdu-, sñan/mñan/
- ñan, hgebs/hkhebs, bcug/hjug, btsugs/hdzugs/gdzugs,
- gdab/btab, gžag/bžag, hgum/dgum/bkum, bsdus/gtus,

¹ This dze, = Chinese tsai, seems to recur in Hui-hsia; see Wang Jinqru, op. cit., iii. p. 392, B, column 4.
and some of these alternations are lexical, that is, are stereotyped results of a process no longer active in the language, while others are functional, i.e. freely used with recognized significations. To the former class would belong perhaps the s of spo, stu, &c.; to the latter the variations between g-, usually Prospective (with its by-form d-), and b, usually Aoristic or Preterite. In later Tibetan the functional Prefixes also became lexical or merely graphic: and in early times also many particular, originally functional, forms, such as glan (vlen), bgyid, had become lexical.

(2) By addition of a final -s, constituting Preterites or Imperatives:

hthub/hthubs, skye/skyes, ḥcha/bcas, ḥbro/bros.

This formation was probably in early times far more prevalent than in the Classical Tibetan, and a lost -s is frequently evidenced by a preference for the Gerund suffix ste in place of te and the Imperative suffix sıg in place of cıg, or by n, a remainder of ňs < ns, in place of n.

(3) By vowel alternation, both where the original vowel is e or o:

ḥjog/bzag, ḥdren/drañ, rtog/brtags

and where the o, from a and e verbs, is (usually) a special characteristic of the Imperative, as in:

byed/byos, ḥgebs/khob(s), sṅeg/sṅog(s), ḥcha/chos, ḥdren/droñs.

In the Nam language antithesis of the type spo/kpho, stu/hdu, the s-form being transitive, is manifest in the recurrent expression stor-hdor, ‘to scatter in flight’, where, however, as in the corresponding Tibetan verbs, the actual relation of sense is the reverse. And the verb spo also occurs, probably with the meaning of the Tibetan spo, ‘change’. But that the s- had still a living function is not apparent.

On the other hand, there are some indications that the r-Prefix could be used to form Factitives or Causatives. Thus it is probable that

hrkom-hbroñ, 157, 331, &c.

means ‘slain yak’ (phaltum ‘die’, bkum ‘slain’). Again, the word rpaq/hrpaq, antithetic to ṣid, ‘high’, certainly means ‘low’ (Tib. dpag/dpoq, ‘measure’, especially of depth), ‘brought low’, as in
hnah-htsu-rpag-re-hnah-mo-hgam, 193
‘When the men of the homes (?) are brought low, the women of the homes are the village.’

But we have also:

hnah-hpag-hldir, 326, 328, ‘in this low home (?)’

But, although there are also other cases, hgam/rgam, mag/rmag, hgyeb/rgyeb), where the r-Prefix is apparent, and though it is exemplified in the common word rgyed, ‘division’ = Tibetan hgyed, and in the allied word rgye, ‘extent’ = Tibetan dbye, it does not appear that the supposed Factitive, or Causative, function can provisionally be demonstrated.1

The b-Prefix in verbs can be rapidly disposed of. It is quite clearly seen in bprom (ll. 168, 180), ‘made’, ‘did’, bphyag (l. 101), ‘saluted’, bsi (ll. 196, 198), ‘dead’ (?), bsog (l. 183), ‘collection’; while bbyam (l. 253), which might be similarly interpreted, is perhaps an error for hbyam, which recurs twice in the immediate context. The paucity of the examples, and the fact that the three other words with the Prefix b, viz. bžir, bzer, bzod, are probably (see supra, p. 166) foreign to the Nam language, which perhaps is also the case with phyag, suggest that the b-Preterite is borrowed from Tibetan.

The g-Prefix is more numerously exemplified (supra, pp. 163-5). Are there any signs of a Prospective function? This question is rendered more difficult by reason of the phonological, or scribal, fluctuation between g- and h- which has been discussed supra (pp. 163-5). There are, moreover, cases where the g- and h- forms of verbs are clearly equivalent: this applies to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>g Form</th>
<th>h Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gkom-re</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>hkom-re, 166, 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gcheeg</td>
<td>111, 234</td>
<td>hceeg, 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gcibi</td>
<td>346 = hci, hcihi, 205, 301, 348, 350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gcig</td>
<td>356 = hceig, 208, cig, 194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-yog (-rño)</td>
<td>156 = hyog (-rño), 289, 321-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-yo/g-yoho</td>
<td>142, 178-9 = hyo/hyoho, 118-19, 178-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g-yer(hsah°, hswah°, hscah°)</td>
<td>166-7, 330-1, 346 = yer/hyer (hsah°, hstsah°), 141, 250-1, 267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hgras</td>
<td>10, gras</td>
<td>300 = hras, 344² (but here the g is probably not a Prefix)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See, further, infra, p. 352.
2 g-we (wehi, wehe) perhaps never, and we/hwe/wehi/hwehi (wehe, hwehe) perhaps always, occur as posterior members of compounds.
and in other cases, where the alternation does not occur, a Prospective sense is not apparent. But it will be observed that in contexts which independently express a Prospective sense, e.g. in connexion with auxiliary verbs, such as 'be able', 'tend to', &c., a Prospective and a non-Prospective form would be equally appropriate; and this may account for \( g-yo/g-yog \) with \( r\)̆no, 'be able', \( gstor/stor-hdor \), 'put to flight', l. 142-3, and \( gstor/stor-ta-hтоn \), l. 152. It is also noticeable that in ll. 25-8, 34, 96, 98, the Preterite -s, \( hyos \), occurs five times, while the non-Preterite \( g-yo \) occurs twice,\(^1\) which fact is hardly accidental, though it must be admitted the \( g- \) is elsewhere sometimes found with Preterite in -s.\(^2\) In the above-discussed phrase:

\[
gtrehe-hта-stel, 181, \text{ 'granted a fixing'}
\]

the Prospective sense is appropriate; and in the near context appears the most persuasive example, if in the vicinity of several occurrences of \( hlб \) as Presents or Preterites the phrase:

\[
ldyaн-glаб-hдo ||, 180
\]

means 'will speak (or be spoken)'. On \( гzo \) in l. 165 (see p. 199).

Far less dubious, and in fact free from doubt, are the Preterites in -s, formed from both vowel and consonant stems. For the most part, as noted supra, p. 170, these at once proclaim their character by occurring at the ends of sentences: such are:

\((a)\) At end of line or sentence:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{\textbf{\textit{s-form}}} & \text{\textbf{Related \textit{s-less} verb-forms at end of sentence or clause}} \\
\hкroms, 387 & \hкrom(ni), 389 \\
\hgyаns, 241 & \hgyаn(na), 77 \\
\hgras, 10, (гras-re, 300) & \\
\hgrus, 293, 297 & \\
\hня, 70 & \hня, 67 \\
\hthogs, 145 & \hthog(ni), 149 \\
\hthus(ni), 156 & \hту-re, 140 \\
\gdes, 260 & \ \\
\hпрос, 122 & \hром, \textit{passim} \\
\htsors, 130 (htshors), 134, 219 & \tshor-na, 220 \\
\hбres, 176 & \brehe, 44 \\
\rdzogs, 157 & \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^1\) In l. 26 the -e of \( g-yos \) is crossed out. In l. 260 \( gdes \) is a Preterite.

\(^2\) \( гeus \), l. 99 = \( hrs\), l. 93; \( гras \), l. 262 = \( hrs\), ll. 59, 116, 260, \( gdes \), l. 260.
A special case is:

\[\text{htag-htos, } 278, 279\]

where the \( s \) is appended to the participial form in \( hto \).

The function of the \(-s\) in Tibetan is, as has been stated, Preterite or Aoristic (Perfective);\(^\text{2}\) and there does not seem to be difficulty in recognizing the same in Nam.

Is there any trace of vowel alternation corresponding to the Tibetan \( h\)bebs/\( ph\)ab, \( hjog/\)b\( z\)ag, or to \( hgebs/kho\)b(s), \( hcha/\)chos, \( mdzad/mdzod \), the latter being the specially Imperative \( o \), which, however, since many roots with \( a \) (e.g. \( rma/rm\)o, \( za/zo, lta/lto \)) have a by-form with \( o \), may originally have had a wider signification? It is obvious that the question of a functional \( o \) is thus, even in Tibetan, in particular instances a difficult one: in Nam there would be the additional difficulty that on the Tibeto-Chinese border \( a \) was often, at any rate before \( m \), rounded into \( o \): for

\(^1\) Some further \(-s\)-forms are noted, pp. 357–80.  
\(^2\) Also Imperative.
example, the word *tshams*, ‘border’, appears in names as *tshoms*, and *bam(s)*, ‘mansion’(?), appears as *bom(s)*, e.g. in *Hgo-bom*, the original name of *Kum-bum*; and this might well explain *hphom/hpom*, ‘vanquished’, in ll. 147, 347. In many occurrences of verb-forms with *o* we have not, or at any rate we cannot identify, related forms with *a* or *e*; and there is no reason to suspect an Imperative. The most probable instances of the Imperative *o* are:

(1) *htronhī*, ll. 224, 233, 243, which occurs in a speech apparently referring to the future and which may well be Imperative of *ḥdrañ*, ll. 147, 254: Tibetan has *trañ/drañ (hdren)*, with Imperative *dron/drons*.

(2) *ḥlobhī*, l. 378, which may well be in an aspiration (note the exclamatory *hi*) and be the Imperative (Tibetan *lobs*) of the *ḥlab/glab*, of ll. 180–2, &c. If so, the *ḥron/hthon*, which end the two next-following sentences, may likewise be Imperatives; the same may be the case as regards *ḥldon* (Imperative of *ḥldan*, ll. 187–9, 264, 273–4) in ll. 370–2.


The only other question in regard to the Verb is whether the *yon/hyon*, Auxiliary Verb in the recurrent phrase:

stor-ḥdor-hyon, 160, 161, 162

is a mark of future time, as in Tibetan are *hon* and *yon*. The reference seems to be to a future. If so, *ḥyoho* of:

stor-ḥdor-ḥyoho, 119

is equivalent to *ḥyono*, which is not unlikely by reason of *ḥrūḥi = ḥrūnhī* (see infra).

Other Tibetan auxiliaries, *yin*, *ḥgyur*, *ḥdug*, *mchi*, *ḥtshal* (‘should’, ‘ought’, ‘is supposed to’), *zin* (‘have’), are not apparent in Nam; but *ruñ* (‘be proper’, ‘ought’, ‘should’, ‘have to’) is clearly recognizable in:

*ḥrugu-hṭo-hrūn*, 30, 32
stor-to (*ḥto*)-hrūn, 80, 138
*ḥdzoḥu-hṭo-hrūn*, 138

and at the end of a clause in:

stor-ḥto-hṛuhi-ge, 167

where *ḥruhi = ḥrūnhī* is comparable to *ḥyoho = ḥyono* (supra).

The frequent *prom*, ‘do’, ‘perform’, &c. (possibly = Burmese *pru*, cf. Burm. *phru*, ‘white’ = *phrom*) has been several times
adduced (e.g. p. 137). As concerns the \textit{hhkum/dgum, \\&c.}, ‘execute’, ‘carry out’ (\textit{gner-hhkums, ‘carry out a task or commission’}) of \textit{Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents} (\textit{ii}, pp. 42, 79, \\&c. = \textit{JRAS.}, 1927, pp. 810, 838, \\&c., and \textit{supra}, pp. 137, 142), it seems possible that the same meaning is conveyed by \textit{hk}om in:

\textit{hsah-yob-hkom-re-hrañ-hrañ-htsu}hu, 166

‘The earth, having done (\textit{hkom}) quaking, came (back) to its own place,’

and the like is to be seen in ll. 136, (\textit{gtse-hkom}), 175 (\textit{swa-hkom}), 222 (\textit{swa-gkom}), 199 (\textit{rgyes-hkom}). In ll. 32 (\textit{hgru-ma-hkom}), 118 (\textit{hrtah-hgam-hkom}), the \textit{hk}om is not an auxiliary, but a Substantive Verb with (apparently) the signification ‘make’.

The verb \textit{re}, ‘is’, in dictionary Tibetan usually \textit{red} (‘Tangut’ \textit{rit}), but occurring also as \textit{re} (\textit{na-re, ‘so it is (said)’}, and in Personal names, \textit{Btsan-to-re, \\&c.}), has been instanced in the Rgyal-roñ \\textit{song} (pp. 85–6) and also as frequently used in the Nam text (see p. 174 sqq.) with the value of a Gerund, ‘being’: sometimes, e.g. in:

\textit{hc}he-hmu-gdag-re-gsañ-hkah-hrehi, 204

it concludes a sentence as the principal verb. \textit{Mod}, with the sense of ‘is really’, as in Tibetan, may be seen in:

\textit{hdyan-hto-hton-ge-hgo-gton-mod}, 210–11

‘those who surrender the \textit{hdyan-hto} really surrender the gate (or place)’.

A cognate of Tibetan \textit{yod}, ‘exist’, does not occur; but its negative, in Tibetan \textit{med}, ‘not exist’, has been exemplified (pp. 174–5 sqq.) in the form \textit{mye-re}, ‘not existing’: this also, as \textit{me-hi}, may end a sentence, e.g. in:

\textit{hman-sta-mehi || . . . hri-stah-mehi}, 311

‘the big is not there . . . the mountain is not there.’

Even the ordinary \textit{myi}, Tib. \textit{mi, myi}, ‘not’ can function in the same way, e.g. in:

\textit{hphu-hklo-hsad-dze-hnah-me-hmyi ||}, 40

‘if the \textit{hphu-hklo} is destroyed, ‘home-fire is none (or the place is fireless, \textit{me-hmyi}).’

perhaps also in \textit{phyi-hse-myi}, 1. 98.

The \textit{stor-hdor} type of Compound Verb appears also in \textit{hldan-phyer, phyer-cañ, hldim-chim, rgyer-hldyañ, rbyi-hldyihi, \\&c.}
III. Pronouns

Nam words for ‘I’, ‘thou’, ‘he’, and their plurals have not been found. We should expect ṇa (not kho-bo) = ‘I’ (Hsi-hsia ṇo—Laufer, No. 14), na perhaps (certainly not khyod) = ‘thou’; while for ‘he’, ‘they’, the Tibetan kho, khoṅ-ta is not at all likely, though kan exists in ‘Tangut’ and kwán-thá-cha, i.e. Tibetan khoṅ-ta, in Thöchü.: Hsi-hsia tha (Nevsky, Nos. 71, 225).

‘This’ is clearly the frequently recurring hldi, = Tibetan hdi, sometimes (ll. 107, 198) in the latter form or as hdiḥi (ll. 43 (?), 184, 391). We do not find the tha, ‘he’, ‘it’, of Hsi-hsia, since the tha which occurs has probably a different meaning.

‘There’, Tibetan da, would seem to be the ldāḥ of hraṅ-hldah-hnam-ge, ‘heavens (or celestials) themselves-there’ (i.e. the heavens, or celestials, proper); cf. Tibetan Ḥbon-da-rgyal, ‘the Ḥbon-there king’, Da-red, ‘There-being’ (= ‘of that ilk’).2 If the verse:

hldiḥi-su-hldoṅ-dze-hlda-hko-ge-hdzoṅ, 195

means:

‘What land he departs to, there is his castle’
then hlda may, like the Tibetan de, hdi, be followed by a Particle ko, giving the sense of ‘in that very place’.

The form sta, in eastern Tibetan sta-re, ‘that being so’ (not sta-re, ‘axe’), seems to be used correlative in:

sta-re-hmo(g)-ge-sta-hrdyāṅ, 19, cf. 9, 252

‘Where were the clouds, there the mountains flew (?)’
but not in:

hra (g-riḥi, g-ri)-stah (sta)-meḥi, 311–13
‘the mountain is not there’.

Su, to which we have just attributed a Relative sense, might then, like the Tibetan su, be also Interrogative in:

dgu-hldo-htor-ge-su-me-hmeḥi, 114
‘When the heat is great, who kindles a fire?’

perhaps also in:

su-ge-stor-ta-hthogs ||, 145
‘who stopped the flight?’

1 Prejevalsky, ii, p. 138; Hodgson, p. 144.
2 Similarly Mchiṅ-rgyal-hdi, ‘our Mchiṅ king’, in one of the Tibetan manuscripts.
The ci, chi of:

hkwi-htsa-hyog-hdag-ci-hrañ-hdom-gdes ||, 259-60
‘the elders with their staves affirmed their decisions’ (?)

and of the following lines may be the Tibetan Relative ci, ji.

It is possible that hji, which seems to occur (ji) in the Berlin fragment (ll. 10, 15, 16), may be the same Relative in ll. 78, 211.

One of the words hrañ, of frequent occurrence, must be = Tibetan rañ, ‘self’, e.g. in:

hrañ-hrañ, ‘own place’, 21, 166, 167

and in the above-mentioned  hrañ-hldah.

Re, beside being the verb ‘be’, evidently in bañ(hbañ)-hre (hrehe) in ll. 249-51, jo-re, &c., ll. 251-2, and perhaps in pra (hpra)-hre (hrehe), ll. 43, 267, means ‘each’, ‘every’ = Tibetan re (res, ‘turn’, ‘times’), and Hsi-hsia re, ‘many’, ‘all’. In l. 132 we have apparently hre = Tib. re, ‘hope’.

IV. Numerals

With the Tibetan names for the numerals 1–9, viz.:

gcig(cig), gnīs(nīs), gsom(sum, so), bzi(ze), lña(na), drug,
bdun(don), brgyad, dgu(go)

it would be simple to compare the Nam words:

gcig(cig), ḡnīs(hnī, ñi), gsom, bziř, lña(hña, &c.), trog, rgyed,
dgu(gu, ḡgo)

more especially as we leave out of consideration the Tibetan word for ‘7’, curiously reminiscent of the Indo-European septm and not found in Tibeto-Burman languages outside the specially Tibetan sphere. It is, however, quite unlikely that a form corresponding to Tibetan gcig, cig, almost equally confined to the Tibetan sphere, should have existed in Nam; and superficially the same applies also to bziř, which, moreover, is in Nam probably a foreign word. Furthermore, all the other Nam terms have demonstrably other meanings; and that they have also the numerical meanings, which in the abstract is quite possible, would require to be proved. Hence we might provisionally have no Nam words for the numerals 1–9.

In the eastern Tibeto-Burman dialects the most constant of the
numeral forms are those for 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, which we may generalize as:

ñi, som (sam, sum, so), ña, drug (truk), gu

It will be shown infra (pp. 234–5, 241) that forms corresponding to the first, second, third, and fifth of these, viz. sñi, hñi, (gñi), gsom, ña (Hsi-hsia, bñih, ñu, Nevsky, No. 87) do exist in the Nam text. For ‘1’ we might expect some equivalent of the a and tha of Hsi-hsia, both rather widespread, in various forms, in Hsi-fan and other Tibeto-Burman languages; but it seems certain that neither of them occurs.

What will have been the form of the word for ‘4’ will be suggested infra (pp. 324–6): possibly the borrowed word bžir, which occurs in the vicinity of a gsom, which may = ‘3’, has that sense.

‘Seven’ is also in Tibeto-Burman a highly variable form, where- of the numerous modifications have been discussed supra (pp. 90, 92–3 sqq.). In Nam we should, on the ground of vicinity to T’ao-chou and Mi-ñaq, expect some skwi, stwi, or the like. There is therefore just a possibility that the expression hkhwi-htsa, l. 259, if it should, as is probable, mean ‘old’ (Hsi-hsia wi/dwi/dwhi, Nevsky, No. 134), may be = ‘man of 70 years’.

In the forms hgu/dgu, ll. 126–7, we probably have the Nam word for ‘9’ (Tib. dgu), used according to a familiar Tibetan idiom in the sense of ‘all’: see p. 290.

The word for ‘10’ is likely to have been ga, which not only is given in Tibetan script (dgaḥ, dghaḥ) as the Hsi-hsia form (Nevsky, No. 145), but also occurs apparently in a Tibetan expression from the Nam region (supra, p. 135, n. 1). It will be = Hörpa sgā, ‘10’, &c. (see pp. 90, 93, &c.).

No expressions for ‘20’, &c., are apparent, and there is no clear reason for attaching the meaning ‘100’ to the hard-worked syllable rgya, or to any part of it, such as ya, attested by several languages. ‘Thousand’ should be something like (s)tom, (s)toñ, which both occur, the first, however, not meaning ‘thousand’, the second perhaps a loan-word from Tibetan with that sense (see infra, pp. 233–4). On myen = 10,000 see infra, p. 234; on a suffix -ke, used with numerals to indicate a group, pp. 241, 272.
V. PARTICLES

Forthwith apparent as a Particle is yan, hyan, in those cases where it occupies the caesura position, e.g. in:

stor-hto-rta-yañ-stor-to-ðrun | 79–80
rtá-ðso-hnah-yañ-gñi-ðrdzum-doho ||
hkor-htah-hkhen-yañ-sñoñ-gyañ-gyañ
hjah-htah-hkhen-yañ-swá-tseg-tseg || 92–3
sñoñ-ne-thehe-yañ-stor-dor-yon ||, 160

So also in:

hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re-mehi-klu-hcañ-yañ-stor-ðdor-ðyon ||, 161

and the two following lines: and frequently elsewhere, e.g. ll. 172, 255–6, 300, 306, 332.

In the first group of examples the concessive sense of the Tibetan yañ, ‘although’, ‘even’, seems to prevail, while elsewhere the alternative meaning, ‘also’, of the same may be more apt.

The equivalent form, kyañ, of the Tibetan seems attested by the parallelism in ll. 344–5:

hbo-hroñ-hrog-re-hlah-hkyañ-hras-re-hñes-gñi-[hðzùhi ?] ||
rgyeb-hchí-hro-re-gdag-yañ-la-por-hñes-hñi-hðzùhi ||

and the same may probably be seen elsewhere:

hðzàñ-hkhor-hkrug-hkyañ . . . , 18
hkhor-kyàñ-rwehi-re . . . , 98

The form gyañ of Tibetan may possibly occur in:

g-rah-ñag-hbo-gyañ . . . , 263.

Tsam, making a limit, ‘only so much’, &c., may perhaps be seen in:

gñi-brom-hnu-ge-hsor-htsam-bzod
‘supports only a finger (weight)’

see p. 342.

By far the most common Particle is ge, very rarely (ll. 5, 8) hge, which is found all over the text, both in its favourite caesura position, as in:

hnah-hchos-re-ge-hldañ-ñyì-ñeg, 159

and the two following verses, and also in other situations, e.g. in:

. . . hnah-hrañ-ge-ðwyin ||, 33
. . . hyos-htag-ge-hjoho ||, 34
. . . hkye-ge-ñmu ||, 39
hre-ge-rgyo-dze . . . , 48
A word occurring in these ways, and with this frequency, must be a very general formal element. The first passage quoted, where in the caesura position it follows re, which itself so often, at the end of a subordinate clause, occupies that position, suggests that it was merely a Particle of emphasis; while the next examples indicate that it served, like the Tibetan ni in some cases, merely to mark off the Subject or Object from the Predicate. Perhaps we may combine the two situations in the statement that ge can mark off any item of a sentence from its Predicate and also in a similar way mark off a whole subordinate clause from its main clause, becoming in the latter case almost an equivalent to re and ste or dze, the former two of which, however, it can follow, and the latter it can precede. Very possibly it conferred a slight emphasis, like the Greek γε.

But why may not ge be a sign of Plurality, possibly = Chinese (in Tibetan script) ke, kehi, 'all'? To this question it does not seem possible to give an immediate answer. But we may note that the ge can occur not only before the Postposition dze, as above, but also before the ta-formative, e.g. in:

\[\text{g-roṅ-hyed-ge-ta, 71}\]

\[\ldots \text{hlde-ge-htah-hldon, 370, 371, 372}.\]

The Particles o, hi, ni, na, doṅ, have been discussed in connexion with the morphology of the sentence (pp. 175-9).

The two negatives ma and myi probably agree in their employment with the Tibetan ma and mi/myi, concerning which it is usually said that ma is used (a) in prohibitions, (b) with past tenses, (c) with the present tenses of certain verbs signifying 'is', while mi is used with Present and Future tenses. But naturally there are refinements; and in general statements even with present tenses ma is apt to intrude.

The Nam text has ma prohibitive in ma-gzo, l. 165 (see p. 199). Inconsistency in general statements is seen in gtsaṅ-myi-hrgan, 'grain does not mature', &c., ll. 159–60, as compared with hldi-ma-hrtah and mo-ma-hθor, 'the horse does not leap', &c., ll. 63, 71, 144.
APPENDIX

Table showing phonetic restrictions upon the application of Prefixes in Tibetan (T), Tibetan manuscripts from Central Asia (T'), Nam (N), Hsi-hsia (H), and Žañ-žuñ (Ţ).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>g-</th>
<th>d-</th>
<th>b-</th>
<th>m-</th>
<th>h-</th>
<th>r-</th>
<th>l-</th>
<th>s-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TNHŽ</td>
<td>HŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>T'B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ň</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>ġ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>ġ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ň</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>TNHŽ</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>THŽ</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>THŽ</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts'h</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>THH</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
<td>TNŽ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T(?)N(?)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T(?)N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T(?)N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ņ</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ō</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ũ</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Š</td>
<td>T'NHŽ</td>
<td>T'NH</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ŝ</td>
<td>T(?)H(?)Ž</td>
<td>T(?)H(?)Ž</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is not necessary here to consider the original form, presumably syllabic, or the original employment, of any of the Prefixes, matters which have been discussed by Conrady in his celebrated work *Eine indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung* and by the late Dr. Wolfenden in his original and interesting *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology*. We can refer only to their actual employment as apparent in the four earliest sources named above, where none of the Prefixes is ever syllabic.

2. r-, l-, s-, are here reckoned as Prefixes, and in all the four languages they are somewhat abundantly represented. For this reason they are likely to be the original common patrimony; and this inference is confirmed by two circumstances: (a) they always
immediately precede the root and are often preceded by one member of the remaining group, \( g, d, b, m, h \); (b) by the Tibetan grammarians they are not regarded as Prefixes, but treated as part of the root, not functional at all; and this treatment was, no doubt, as early as the alphabet itself, since in the script the \( r, l, s \), are superfixed to the following consonant in a compound \( akṣara \), whereas those of the other group are prefixed as separate items. The Tibetans did not know that the \( s \)- of spo, the \( r \)- of \( rdun \), the \( l \)- of \( ljen \) were originally Prefixes: they speak only of the five, \( g, d, b, m, h \), ascribing to them functions, which they proceed to define.

3. The Žan-\( ūn \) manuscripts have no \( b, m, h \), and of \( g \)- they have only two occurrences (\( gdan, gsad \)), of \( b \)- likewise only two (\( dbem, dmo \)), all which occurrences, being found in a medical text, may well be borrowings. It is therefore probable that in Žan-\( ūn \), and in any other original Tibeto-Burman languages of the western regions of ‘Tibet’, the whole group \( g, d, b, m, h \) was lacking. This supports the suggestion of a difference of date between the two groups; but it does not follow that the members of the later group discharged the same functions as had originally been discharged by those of the earlier: the contrary is suggested by the case of the secondary (syllabic) Prefixes in Hsi-fan.

In the use of \( r, l, s \), Žan-\( ūn \) has the following combinations not allowed in Tibetan:

\[
\begin{align*}
rkh, rc, rch, rth, rp, rph, rh, lkh \\
skh, sth, sph
\end{align*}
\]

of which \( rkh \) recurs in Hsi-hsia, \( rp \) in Nam.

4. Taking together the other three languages, we find that \( m \) is practically confined to Tibetan, the single occurrence (\( mnar \)) in Nam being probably Tibetan, and the \( mkh \) (no meaning) and \( mkhee/mkhwe \), ‘play’, ‘sport’ (Nevsky, No. 73) of Hsi-hsia in Tibetan transcription being problematical.

In the Tibetan verbal system \( m \) is credited with a function, not temporal, or modal, but roughly definable as indicative of non-activity or state. Only a single instance is given (\( mnags \)); but from literature we might adduce some other cases of \( m \) in the verb-paradigm. It may be noted that in Tibetan \( m \), when prefixed to nasals \( n, ñ, n \), is often a substitute for \( b \), which is sometimes preserved in T'NH.

Functional Prefixes should be primarily indifferent to phonetical inconvenience. But in Tibetan the earliest grammarians, while stating functions for the Prefixes \( g, d, b, m, h \), have also announced phonetical restrictions upon the use of those Prefixes, which restric-

1 See *Les Šlokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa*, par Jacques Bacot, p. 60.
tions have been accepted in the common orthography. This inconsist-
sistency has been noted by Conrady (pp. 19, 28 sqq.) and Wolfenden
(pp. 12, 18, 40), both of whom have questioned the originality of the
restrictions, the former also remarking (p. 46) that phonetical in-
compatibility in the occurrence of two Prefixes, such that one can
precede those consonants which the other cannot, is a sign of identity
of function. It is, of course, obvious that such collocations as $gk$-, $gph$-, $gb$-, $bp$-, $bph$-, $bb$-, though in Nam they all actually occur, must
ultimately have been found intolerable and may have been avoided
even at a sacrifice of a consistent discrimination of the functions.
The resultant system, especially as seen in the four-stem Transitive
verb, is expounded in the native, and all the modern, grammars.

According to the system, while $g$-, $d$-, $b$-, all alike imply that the
verbal action is one which has an agent, $g$- and $d$- are used to form
Future tenses (i.e. they have a Prospective value) and $b$- forms Per-
fecTs (i.e. Preterites or Aorists):

Thus from $dul$ we have:

Present $h dul$, Preterite $btul$, Future $gdul$, Imperative $thul$.

But, when the root has a guttural initial, $g$- is excluded by the
phonetic rule, and $d$ is substituted, resulting in:

Present $h gel$, Preterite $bkal$, Future $dg al$, Imperative $khol$;
and when the initial is a labial, both $b$ and $g$ are excluded, and the
outcome is as in:

Present $h bul$, Preterite $phul$, Future $dbul$, Imperative $phul$,
the Preterite having the aspirate $ph$ in place of the inconvenient
combination $bp$-. There are, of course, various other schemes corre-
sponding to other forms of the root.

Forms of roots with initial $tenuis$ aspirata replacing their initial
media are, no doubt, very ancient, irrespective of Conrady’s theory
of their origin (from $s$ and media): and the simplest explanation of
the divergence in the Preterite of verbs with labial initial is to suppose
that in all the three above cases the Preterite had originally the
aspirate together with the $b$- Prefix, thus:

*$bthal$, *$bkhal$, *$bphul$

and that $bth$, $bkh$, became $bt$, $bk$, while $bph$, as was natural, simply
lost its $b$. The change of $bth > bt$, $bkh > bk$, may have been merely
phonetical. If it had been convenient to substitute for the $b$ of
*$bphul$, as for the $g$ of $gbul$, a $d$, the Preterite would perhaps have
become *$dpul$ in place of $phul$.

The thus posited combinations $bth$-, $gth$-, &c., might have dis-
appeared prior to the introduction of writing in Tibet. But in fact
they are to be found abundantly in the written documents and other
manuscripts of the seventh to ninth century A.D. As the $T$ entries
in the table show, the aspirate rule does not exist so far as these writings are concerned, although the occurrence of the tenuis discloses the fact that the transition bth-, gth-, &c., to bt-, gt-, was already effected; whether the matter is one of dialectical divergence or of period need not be considered. But it should be noted that in respect also of the Prefixes m- and h- the spelling of the documents and manuscripts is similarly disregardful of the aspirate rule. Nor is this all: from the table it may be seen, as noted above, that in the case of the Prefixes of the old group, r-, l-, s-, the Žan-žun spelling has no regard to the aspirate rule, which in the Tibetan grammar applies to these also; and in the Tibetan documents and in Hsi-hsia and Nam there is the same freedom. Whether the Tibetan changes of aspirate to tenuis in the combinations in question (bth-, gth-, rth-, lth-, sth-, &c.) was phonetical or, in whole or part, otherwise, depends upon etymologies and need not be considered here: nor need we consider the media retained in the Futures gdul, &c.; that characteristic of the Future may have antedated the use of the g-, b-, d-, group of Prefixes, since in cases where the aspirate is taken as belonging to the root, e.g. in:

Present hthub, Preterite btubs, Future gtub, Imperative hthub

we see that gth- becomes gt-, just as bth- becomes bt-.

But, secondly, the possibility that from roots with labial initial an inconvenient Preterite such as bphul could have been made workable by substitution of d- for b-, just as it was substituted in the Future for g- in ggun, &c., and in bgul, &c., was likewise realized in practice. For this d, as a substitute for b- in the Preterite of labials, is exemplified in the documents by dblaís (ʃblan) = Nam gblañ and dphrogs (ʃhphrog), of which the latter is not allowed by the phonetical rules. We even find drña, drgyal, written in place of rña, rkyal.

It appears therefore that in the verbal paradigm d- is a supplementary or substitute Prefix, due to phonetical convenience. Where it appears as an alternative (dgod/rgod, &c.) in the Present and is retained throughout the paradigm, the case is not necessarily otherwise, since it is recognized that such verb-stems, like those with g-, b-, m-, may be secondary generalizations. The d- need not be of purely phonetical origin or evoked from nowhere, if outside the verbal system it can be shown to be in some cases original. But we cannot rely upon instances such as dgu, ‘9’; and we must at least realize that in the eastern part of ‘Tibet’ the d- neither exists at present nor appears ever to have existed. Even in Khams it is regularly represented by a guttural (gh, Linguistic Survey of India, III. i, p. 137) while in ‘Tangut’ (rgiu, ‘9’, &c.) and ‘Amdoan’ (rka = dkah, &c.) r- appears. There seems to be no trace of the d- in the Rgyal-ron, 1

1 That the d- was from the first non-existent in Khams was considered possible by Jaeschke (Berlin Academy Monatsbericht, 1887, p. 165).
where the dominant Prefix is *sh* (§), or in any ‘Ch’iang’ dialect, and in ‘Eastern Tibetan’ it is absent, like the other Prefixes. It should not, indeed, be overlooked that in Tibetan transcriptions of Hsi-hsia there are not a few words with *d*- prefixed to *k* or *kh* or *g* or *b* or *m*, also two instances of *dn*- and one of *dtsh*-.. But in the present position of Hsi-hsia philology, when the meanings of many of the words in question are unknown, the spellings capricious, and when the value of the Prefixes in the Tibetan transcriptions is disputed, nothing can be ventured in regard to this matter. It will be seen that, except in the case of *dkh*-(aspirate!) and *dtsh*- (for *gtsh*-?), the spelling observes the Tibetan phonetical restrictions, a circumstance all the more suspicious as in *dmu*, ‘fire’, we have the Tibetan *dm*-, while *gmuḫ*, with the expected *gm*- (occurring also in Nam), is also recorded.

The Prefixes *d*- and *m*- may thus be regarded as foreign to three of the four ancient languages and confined to Tibetan—it is immaterial if in other (southern) Tibeto-Burman areas equivalents of them can be traced. Concerning *h*-, which is abundantly represented in Tibetan and Hsi-hsia and extraordinarily so in Nam, it may be sufficient to refer to the statement supra (p. 76), where it is shown that in the form of a nasal element this Prefix persists widely in the modern pronunciation of the eastern Tibet and the Tibeto-Chinese borderland. Conrady (p. 20) and Wolfenden (pp. 31–3) have suggested for it original functional values: or was it merely a phonetic feature?

In any case it must have been extremely ancient.

5. There are some further particulars in which the Tibetan phonetical restrictions are unoriginal:

(a) Tibetan *gẑ-, gz-, bẑ-, bz-* are derived from *gj-, gdz-, bj-, bdz-*, as is clear from the verb-paradigms such as:

*ḥjog/gf ḥag/bf ḥag*,
*ḥdzin/gzuñ/bzuñ*

and from other cases. In Hsi-hsia (Tibetan transcription) we actually find *gj-, gdz-, bj-, bdz-* in Nam *gdz-*: even in Tibetan we have *gjen* written for *gcen, chen*.

(b) Tibetan *gw-, gr-, gl-, bl-* were in some instances formed from roots with initial *w*, *r*, *l*, analogous to Tibetan *g-y-*: an instance is *gLan/blanś* from *glen*. The combinations *g-w-, g-r-,* occur in Nam and in Hsi-hsia, and the latter has even *g-l-* and *b-l-*.

(c) The form *mphro* occurring in a carefully written Tibetan text with the clearly intended sense of an abstract noun of action, ‘a going forward’, shows that the functional value of even *m-* could prevail against the phonetical objection to its being prefixed to a labial.

6. As to the temporal function of *g-, d-, b-, in the Tibetan verb paradigm doubt has been expressed by both Conrady (pp. 19, 28 sqq.)
and Wolfenden (pp. 49, 53). But such doubt must be regarded as applying to the original signification of those Prefixes, and not to their earliest attested usage; for not only are the Prefixes freely used to form Preterite (Aorist) and Future (Prospective) tenses, wherever phonetically legitimate, from verbs with initials of all classes, and from verbs with compound initials—producing forms such as brk-, bsk-, blk-, bst-, brd-, bsp- and even gst-, grt-, glt-,—in Hsi-hsia even grz,—but we can produce ancient texts where g/b (or d) forms of a single verb are used antithetically to mark a temporal contrast. This proves that a Tense value of the Prefixes was actual; but not that it was original—even the Indo-European Aorist and Perfect were not originally Tenses—and another element in the signification of g-, d-, b-, and also of m-, is, as we have seen, defined by the Tibetan grammarians.

7. In regard to r-, l-, s-, which for the etymologist, though not for the Tibetan grammarians, are Prefixes, the only question in connexion with the four languages is whether the Prefixes have in them become merely lexical or retain traces of a living function. In Tibetan the r- and l- have not hitherto been credited with a historically living function; but, as regards s-, the large number of forms such as stu, sdu, spo, &c., with Transitive sense and paired with Intransitives such as hthu, hdu, hpho, &c., has long been recognized as proving a Transitive function of the s-; and that function must have been active down to a time not long anterior to the historical period. Since r- and s- do not appear to have been phonetically ‘incompatible’ or mutually supplementary, their original functions were presumably different.
V. THE LANGUAGE: ETYMOLOGY

To describe the grammatical system of a language without knowing the meanings of the words may well seem to be a hazardous adventure. But the converse is equally true; and, as has been mentioned, the formal features, being of a general nature, are more likely to reveal themselves upon a first survey than the meanings of individual words. In the present case, moreover, we have the advantage that the language by its phonology declares itself to be not only a Tibeto-Burman dialect, but also one at approximately the same stage of development as the earliest known Tibetan. Hence there is a plausibility in the identification of prima facie similar features both of grammatical structure and of word-forms. A number of such ‘self-evident’ etymologies have been cited and used in the preceding discussions. But selected particulars may seem open to doubt until confirmed by a wider etymological knowledge of the language. To a certain extent a phonological ratio between two kindred languages may be established through syntactical equivalences elicited by a general survey: thus the postpositions na, la, te, the verb-suffix -s, and particles such as ni, yan, common to Tibetan and Nam, throw some light upon the developments of vowels and consonants in the latter, and so serve to control further etymologizing. But without independent ascertainment of meanings a comparison of forms is in a measure conjectural: and this is notably the case in regard to monosyllabic languages, where so commonly the monosyllables have each several significations.

Before discussing the further ways of investigating and verifying meanings it will be convenient to mention some principles which may lend useful guidance:

(1) Correspondence of Nam expressions to Tibetan has enhanced probability when:

(a) the expressions are known to have been more or less contemporary, which practically means that the Tibetan ones belong to the earliest records of the language;

(b) the expressions are attested in the same area of ‘Tibet’ and have therefore a chance of being ‘regional’. And this factor applies also to usages of modern dialects which are not evidenced in old Tibetan;
(c) the time-factor in (a) and the regional factor in (b) are combined, thereby increasing their force.

(2) Probability of equivalence increases somewhat with the complexity of the forms compared. Thus, it is far more likely that a Nam word *rdzogs* should be equivalent to a Tibetan word *rdzogs* than would be the case between *rog* and *rog*. In Tibeto-Burman, however, this argument is weakened by the frequency of homophones: thus, there were in Tibetan at least five different words *rgyan*. The general probability applies in particular to:

(a) phrases or compounds: thus, there is a greater likelihood of connexion between Nam *hldan-kraṅ*, proved by repetition to be a standing phrase, and Tibetan *draṅ-mkraṅ* from the same region and similarly established as a phrase, than there would have been between the members of the two compounds individually;

(b) words and phrases which by virtue of some relation of antithesis, &c., are in pairs or groups; thus, if a Nam word is identified with a Tibetan word meaning 'long', the probability of the conjecture is increased if there are on both sides related forms which can unite in the meaning 'short'. In the case of Nam this consideration (b) is rendered important by the antithetic style of the verses, which corresponds to what has been remarked elsewhere in the Tibetan area. For example in the passage (ll. 124-7):

```
 hldan-hkraṅ-hsad-na-hldan-hkraṅ-hśaḥ
 hldan-hkraṅ-hwe-dze-hldan-slaḥ-hkehe
 hldan-hkraṅ-hko-dze-stor-hldan-hphyar
 hldan-hkraṅ-spo-dze-stor-hgu-hbo ||
 hldan-hkraṅ-hnam-dze-stor-dgu-hdor ||
```

it is immediately evident that there is a relation of antithesis (of fact or logic) between the successive predicates *hsad, hwe, hko, spo, hnam*; and this is a factor which will assist or control the determination of their meanings.

Etymologies which have been established as certain furnish rules for judgement in similar cases: thus, if we know, as we may, that the Nam antithesis ḥbri(bri)/ḥbraḥ(brah) is identical with the Tibetan antithesis ḥbri(bri)/bra, then we anticipate that in other Nam words initial br will have retained its r (which would not be the case in Hsi-hsia, Hsi-fan in general, Lo-lo, Mo-so, or modern Central Tibetan) and that final i and a will have remained intact.

Phonological divergence in particular cases ceases to be a cause of difficulty, if we can show regional evidence for the change which it is proposed to allow. Thus, the Nam word ṛgyeb may be identical, as we have reason to suppose, with Tibetan ṛgyab, 'back', 'put back', &c., because in the Koko-nor region the changes -ab > -eb, -ag > -eg, are evidenced in early times. We here neglect the consideration that the e-form may be original, since even in Tibetan itself many a-forms are related to e-verbs (e.g. kḥab, kag, to ḥkhebs, ḥgegs).

Where such substitutions, e.g. of r as a Prefix for s, d, and sometimes m and b,¹ are characteristic of the Nam language in general, it is unnecessary to consider them except as indications of regional tendencies. But where in the Nam itself we have to account for something unexpected, it may be evidential to cite such phenomena of local and contemporary Tibetan, more especially when they occur in identical words; for instance, the Tibetan manuscripts have the, perhaps original, form ḥdren, 'lead', 'draw', instead of the normal ḥdren; they have r-less forms, ḥdzon, ḡyud, of rdzon, 'castle', ṛgyud, 'race'; occasional substitution of Ḣ for e (stigs, ṕis, cис); confusion (hraṅ for bran, dguṅ for dgun), loss (dgu for dguṅ), or mistaken addition (rgum for dgu) of final m, n, ṅ; confusion (by no means unexampled in ordinary Tibetan) of ś and s (bsen for bṣen), dr- and tr-, lṭ- and lṭ-, and so forth. Lḥ also is of doubtful origin in Tibetan. It would be superfluous here to cite many of these numerous peculiarities, which are being summarized elsewhere: they may be adduced singly where applicable.

Orthographical fluctuation in the Nam text has been discussed supra (pp. 117 sqq.), where an endeavour has been made to show that it is not unlimited. As between tenuis

¹ See pp. 347 sqq.
and tenuis aspirata it is extremely frequent: \(hk\), \(hc\), \(ht\), \(hp\), \(ht\), can always be written \(hk\), \(hc\), \(ht\), \(hp\), \(ht\), while the converse, and also confusion of tenuis and media, are rarer.

In this matter of orthography, where the facts are established from the Nam text itself, it is not necessary, but interesting, to mention that the Tibetan manuscripts exhibit substantially the same amount and varieties of fluctuation.

I. ANTI THESIS AND CONTEXT

Of the above considerations the one most immediately applicable is that of antithesis, whereof we may now proceed to adduce some instances:

1. \(Hbra; \ hbri; \ hyan ; \ mor; \ htham; \ mug; \ brah; \ gsa\).\(n; \ hre.\)

Attention has been previously (JRAS. 1939, p. 197) called to the fact that the Berlin fragment commences with four sentences as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{mor-ma-de-klo} \\
&\text{yan-ma-ji-de} \\
&\text{bri-ma-zor-de} \\
&\text{hra-ma-gar-de} 
\end{align*}
\]

and two others (successive) begin:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{mug-tse-khyig-re-te} \\
&\text{htham-tse-re-te} 
\end{align*}
\]

while in our manuscript we have successive verses beginning (ll. 225–8):

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{mor-hgu-hrdzor} \\
&\text{hyan-hrah-\(\)s\(a\)n-re} \\
&\text{mug-hgu-rdzor} \\
&\text{htham-rah-gsa\(n\)-re} \\
&\text{hbra-hgu-rdzor} \\
&\text{brah-hrah-gsa\(n\)-re} 
\end{align*}
\]

The former shows a general correspondence or antithesis among the four items \(mor, \ yan, \ bri, \ hbra\), and then a like relation between \(mug\) and \(htham\): the latter passage shows a correspondence between \(mor, \ mug, \ hbra\), and a correspondence between \(hyan, \ htham, \) and \(brah\), combined with an antithesis between the two groups.

In Tibetan \(hbra\) means ‘diminish’, ‘grow less’, while \(bra\) is ‘have or be in great plenty’, whence come bra-bo, ‘buckwheat’, and—since most Tibetan nouns in \(-s\) are really Aorist forms of
verb-roots—\textipa{\textipa{hbras}}, ‘rice’, \textipa{\textipa{hbras-bu}}, ‘fruit’. Accordingly we see why in Nam \textipa{\textipa{hbra}} and \textipa{\textipa{hbra}} can be contrasted; and at the same time we understand why a place in the Koko-nor region may have been named \textipa{\textipa{Bra-ma-tha\textsuperscript{n}}},\footnote{1} ‘Plain of Plenty’. It follows also that the three words \textipa{\textipa{hyan}}, \textipa{\textipa{htham}}, \textipa{\textipa{brah}} denote things approved, while \textipa{\textipa{mor}}, \textipa{\textipa{mug}}, \textipa{\textipa{hbri}} are things disliked. The three former are followed severally by the phrase \textipa{\textipa{hrah-gsan(hsan)-re}}, the latter by \textipa{\textipa{hgu-rdzor}} (\textipa{\textipa{hrdzor}}).

Provisionally we do not know the meanings of \textipa{\textipa{hyan}} and \textipa{\textipa{htham}} or of the phrase \textipa{\textipa{hrah-gsan-re}}, though the last may suggest Tib. \textipa{\textipa{ra-gsan}}, ‘place purified (or secret)’. The antithesis between \textipa{\textipa{hyan}} and \textipa{\textipa{mor}} is recurrent, being found also in ll. 9–10, 40–1, 286–7, 388, of which the last, the most convenient for citation, is,

\begin{align*}
\textipa{\textipa{mor-tsah-khrom-re}} & \| \textipa{\textipa{hya\textsuperscript{n}-tsa-hcer}} \|.
\end{align*}

In Tibetan \textipa{\textipa{g-ya\textsuperscript{n}}} signifies ‘happiness’, ‘good luck’, ‘blessing’, ‘prosperity’; but for its opposite, \textipa{\textipa{mor}}, we can adduce nothing nearer than \textipa{\textipa{dmod/rmod}}, ‘blame’, ‘reproach’, ‘curse’.\footnote{2} Tibetan \textipa{\textipa{mug}} is ‘gloom’, and the related \textipa{\textipa{rmugs}}, ‘fog’, ‘stupid’, ‘sluggish’, which occurs in Amdoan as \textipa{\textipa{rm\textsuperscript{ʊ}k}}ha (Prejevalsky, ii, p. 137), would well suit the expression \textipa{\textipa{mug-bu}}, ‘stupid children’ (?), in the Berlin fragment (l. 12). \textipa{\textipa{Htham}} will probably be connected with Tib. \textipa{\textipa{htham}} ‘unite’, \textipa{\textipa{hthams}}, ‘clasp in affection’, whence come the words \textipa{\textipa{thams-cad}}, \textipa{\textipa{tham-zin}}, ‘all’, ‘whole’; for this meaning prevails in the Tibetan manuscripts. Thus \textipa{\textipa{htham-hrah}} is the paradisial ‘place, or state, of union’ contrasted with the dissensions of the Evil Age. In the Berlin Fragment (l. 18) \textipa{\textipa{htham-gnam-tsa-ge}} means ‘the undivided celestial folk’.

It may be observed that in ll. 132–3,

\begin{align*}
\textipa{\textipa{hbri-hldi-htha\textsuperscript{n}-re-hre-hldi-hyah}},
\end{align*}

\textipa{\textipa{hbri}} occurs in antithesis to \textipa{\textipa{hre}}, which will be apt, if \textipa{\textipa{hre}} is equivalent to Tibetan \textipa{\textipa{re}}, ‘hope’. On \textipa{\textipa{Hbra}} as a local and tribal name see pp. 307–8, 319–20.

2. \textipa{\textipa{Hbri}}: \textipa{\textipa{hpu}}; \textipa{\textipa{hpo}}; \textipa{\textipa{hpho}}; \textipa{\textipa{hdzohu}}; \textipa{\textipa{hjohu}}; \textipa{\textipa{hjo}}.

In another group of passages \textipa{\textipa{hbri}} is antithetic to \textipa{\textipa{hpu}}:

\begin{align*}
\textipa{\textipa{hldya\textsuperscript{n}-hpu-hbri-re}}, & 150, 161, 218, 343. \\
\textipa{\textipa{hbri-h\textes\texteshe-hpu[-\{r\}e]}}, & 163. \\
\textipa{\textipa{bri-g\textes\texteshe-hpuhi-re}}, & 329.
\end{align*}

These must all belong together, especially in view of the adjacency

\footnote{1} Mentioned in the Tibetan MS. \textit{Chronicle}.
\footnote{2} But the Rgyal-ro\textsuperscript{n} language (Jyā-ru\textsuperscript{n}) has \textipa{m\textsuperscript{ʊ}r}, ‘night’, and \textipa{m\textsuperscript{ʊ}r}, ‘old’.
of lI. 161 and 163. A predominant meaning of pu in Tibeto-Burman is ‘man’, ‘male’ (Tib. po/pho), and, if hbrí/bri can mean ‘female’, we obtain the reasonable renderings:

‘the ḡldyan males being (weak) females’,
‘the wise (ḥšehe, gše) females being males’.

But Tibetan hbrí does denote a female, namely the yak-cow, and it appears in the name ḡbrí-chu, ‘Yak-cow river’, of the Yang-tse-chiang in its Tibetan course. In the Nam passages either the word denotes females in general or the reference is to females of the yak-species. The combination of meanings in Nam ḡbrí/bri confirms the identity of the word with the Tibetan forms.

Apart from explicit antithesis, hpu = ‘male’ is clear also in:

hpu-ḥbron-rkom-ge, 157, ‘the male yak-bull being killed’.

One other meaning of hpu, namely ‘bird’ (= Tib. bya, i.e. bwya,1 Hsi-hsia (Laufer, No. 32) wo-yao, Lepcha fo, and pu, wu, &c., in a considerable number of Tibeto-Burman dialects) has been mentioned elsewhere (JRAS. 1939, pp. 215–16): it is to be seen in:

śi-ḥchos-re-ge-hpu-myi-ldin ||, 160
‘Born in winter, a bird does not fly’.

But Tibetan phu, ‘elder brother’ (= Hsi-hsia phu/pho/phoh), bu, ‘child’, phu, ‘upper country’, phu (ḥbud), ‘blow the fire’, not to mention Hsi-hsia wu, ‘father’, &c., and the possibilities connected with bu, warn us to expect other significations of Nam hpu, which it is advisable to reserve for a separate consideration.

A form ḡpo/hpho, ‘male’, ‘heroic’, which in Tibetan is usual and gave rise to the masculine suffix po, seems clear in:

hpo-ḥldah-stor-[re]-ḥrah-ḥton-gsohū || dze-rñe-ge-ḥgo || 358
‘the heroic ones being lost, over the station-abandoning survivors the evil are head’.

The same must be recognized in:

hpo-ḥldi-nañ-re-ḥyah-ḥiehi-ḥnāḥd, 115–16
‘males being here within, fear (Tib. ya-ña p. 191) evaporates’
(because, as indicated in the following line, it is too late, the evil being already done: ḡnāḥd = ḡnād, p. 321)

hpho-ḥldir-hṣag-ge-so-ḥna-ḥstor, 117
‘males being here collected, the so-ḥna is lost’

1 Since, however, bya, bychu, has been given (supra, pp. 131–2) as a Nam word, it is possibly to be distinguished from pu, one of the two as meaning ‘fowl’; ‘bird’ and ‘fowl’ are often discriminated in Hsi-fan, &c. The distinction of the two forms in Nam may have been originally dialectical.
and hence also in:
rie-hpo-hldo-ge, 177, ‘enemies brave’
rie-hpo-hñe-ge, 361, ‘enemies brave, evil’
while in rbyo-po, l. 181, ‘rbyo-man’, the word approaches the later
Tibetan use as a suffix. Whether in hpo(po)-rbom, l. 317, the sense of
‘male’, ‘hero’, is present, or there is merely a miswriting of the
commoner hbo-bon is not certain. In hpu-hpos, l. 140, the usual
hpu(hphu)-hbos, ‘big man’, is obviously intended: on hbos see
infra (pp. 230-1).

Still another word plainly meaning ‘male’, namely hdzohu/
 hjohu, is contrasted with hibri in:
hibri-re-hrdyam-re-hkhah-hldah-hñahghí ||
hdzohu-ro-hldi-re-hjohu(hdzohu) || hwa-hkah
hdzehu-rje-hbro-re-hdzohu-hto-hrun, 137-8.
‘All the females being hrdyam, the speakers should have the
say (Tib. ṇag, “voice”, “speech”):
This being a place for males, males have to act and speak (?):
When a weak (Tib. gze-re) chief flees, one must be a man,’
and this is reinforced by:
hdzohu-hkru-hyog-re... hibri-hdzohu-kyim-re, 324-5.

Clearly this hdzohu, hjohu has nothing to do with rdzo = Tib.
mdzo, ‘the cross between a yak-bull and a cow’, which, moreover,
seems always to be spelled with r-. But it has also to be dis-
tinguished from a hjo/jo, meaning ‘chieftain’, and from another
hjo/hdzo/hdzoho, as well as from a gzo, all which must be discussed
infra (pp. 274-5, 334-5).

These groups of words illustrate rather noticeably the multiple
meanings which in monosyllabic languages are so commonly found
attached to single forms. But they also illustrate the opposite
feature, namely plurality of synonyms of common terms. What
is the difference between hpu, hpo(hpho), hdzo, all meaning ‘male’?
Moreover, we shall encounter (p. 238) another word, tsu, having
the same sense.

There seems to be no doubt as to the meanings. For hpu
external equivalents have been cited, while po/pho, is well known
in Tibetan. Hdzo is no less sure: it corresponds to Hsi-hsia bdzo
(Nevsky, No. 42 = Laufer, No. 45 tsu-ní, i.e. ni-tsu), Go-lok
tcho-mo, Mányak chhoh, Mu-nia ts’o, and many Lo-lo and Mo-so
forms assembled by Laufer. The tsu transcribed by Laufer from
Chinese may, if not intended for dzo, be a dialectical variant,
corresponding to the tsu of the Nam text.
It may be suggested that strictly dzo denotes 'man', i.e. male human being, while the wider antithesis 'male/female' is represented, as in Tibetan, by pho/mo. Phu in Tibetan properly means 'upper' in a local sense and so is used with the meaning 'elder', as antithetic to nu, 'younger': it is perhaps identical in origin with pho, which form is perhaps to be seen in Tib. la-po, 'high pass (or peak)', Nam la-po (infra, p. 269), and certainly in pho-bo, = phu-bo, 'elder brother'.

Hpu = bu, 'son', 'child', is supported by antithesis to hpha, 'father', in l. 183, and by connexion with mother in l. 184. It is also possible, as an alternative to 'man' in:

gsu-prom-hňo[-r][e]-htsah-hpu-hdrom, 64–5
'the friends to give them welcome (gsu-prom) were children and underlings (Tib. drum/druñ)'; but 'underling persons' may be meant.

3. ĕňo, ĕňoho; °sta, °sto; °khkog, °khob; °hdaň, wa-hdaň; rňe, hrňe; gšaň, hšaň; hšag; hwyir; hďzar; hďza; htrog; hram; mo-lañ; byu(r); hrub; skyaň.

ňo, and rňe are antithetic in ll. 85–6:
ĕňo-sto-ge-hšag-dze-rie-hwe-ge-hwyir||
ĕňo-sta-glom-dze-kraň-nur-ňur
rňe-sta-glaň-dze-hne-rieńi-rieńi

and this is a standing antithesis, as is shown by:

ĕňo-stor-HTOŇ-hrňe-hldaň-hkhyed, 119
ĕňo-stor-hkhyed-re-ŕrie-hldaň-hkhraň
so-hňañ-htstor-dze-ĕňo-stor-hprôm |
ĥthañ-hrgam-hkad-re-rňe-re-hño ||, 133
(cf. hrgyan-rień-re-ĕňoho ||, 320)
ĕňo-stor-hthor-bśi-ta-ston
rień-hldaň-hkhar-hmeye-hţah-rgyen

. . . ĕňoho-hjam-re-hldan
. . . rień-hdzam-re-hldan

staň-hro-hra-dze-hrıehe-ĥno-ge-hpom ||, 347

The same antithesis can be traced in ll. 56, 143–4.

But ĕňo is also antithetic to gšaň in:

gšaň-ra-gšaň-na-gšaň-tañ-hrtehu || 264–5
ĕňo-ra-hňon-kya-ĥňon-ta-gblaň

gšaň-ra-gšaň-ge-gšaň-hţag-hţos 278–80
ĕňo-ra-hňo-kya-ĥňo-htag-htona ||
gšaň-hraň-hţoň-kya-ĥňo-hjam-re-hldan, 273
and this is quite decisive. For gśaṅ, hśaṅ cannot mean anything but 'enmity', 'hate', as will be shown infra (p. 223).

In Tibetan ṅo means 'face', and it has many compounds and also derivative senses, e.g. 'person', 'public', &c. But the form of the suffix sto points, as has been explained supra (p. 185), to a word ending in s; and we have the likewise common word ṅos, 'side', so that ṅos-(s)to would mean 'those on one's side': cf. Tibetan ṅos-rgyud, 'personally', ṅos-zin, 'selfish', ṅos-loṅ, 'self-interested'. Rņe is attested regionally1 in the sense of 'fiend', and we see the appropriateness of the expression (ll. 119, 127) rņe-hldan, 'fiend (enemy)-rise', since in Tibetan ldaṅ, laṅ is the regular term for the 'rising', appearing, of a fiend. This gives us:

rņe-re-hņo,2 133 (hņo-ho, 320) = 'enemies are friends'.

hņo-ho-hjam . . . rņe-hdزam (= hjam) = 'friends mild . . . enemies [become] mild',

and since hśag can be = Tib. sags 'talk', and hwyir = Tib. hbyer, 'escape',

hņo-sto-ge-hśag-dze-rņe-hwe-ge-hwyir ||, 85 = 'while friends talk,3 those who do enmity escape'.

The passage:

hrņe-hņo-hdзar-dze, 372,

where ḍdзar can phonologically be = Tib. ḍjar, 'stick together' (see S. C. Das's Dictionary and infra, p. 248)—so that the sense will be:

'when foes and friends cohere':

brings in further expressions for 'friend' and 'enemy', with confirmation in regard to ḍdзar. For in l. 376 we have

ḥdзa-ḥtrog-ḥram-ḥdзar,

which conveys the same sense: hṛam, which might correspond to Tibetan ran, 'right', 'proper' (though another explanation is probable), certainly recurs in the Nam text with the signification 'agreeable' or the like, and ḍdзa is the inevitable Nam equivalent of Tib. mdзah, 'amicable', 'affection', 'friendship': while ḍtrog, whether connected with Tib. ḍdroг, 'wince', 'shudder' (dr and tr being in the manuscript practically interchangeable) or a form of the celebrated Central Asian word drug, can independently be shown (in ll. 146, 326, 338) to mean 'enmity' or 'enemy'.

---

1 In the Tibetan MSS.
2 In the Berlin fragment (l. 22) we find the phrase ṅo-re-ṛne.
3 Apparently antithetic to hņo-sto-ge-ṛdo-re, l. 84, 'when friends dare' (Tib. sdo, as on p. 296).
Nothing, of course, prevents the recognition of *hño* in the sense of 'face': and this sense is apparent in the expressions *hño-hkhog* (ll. 251, 341), which may be = Tib. *ño-lkog*, 'openly and secretly', and *hño-hkhob* = Tib. *ño-khob*, 'conceal face'; it is also conspicuous in the line:

hrta-wa-hdān-dze-hño-hdān-prom, 258
'the horses upon [their companions'] necks made a face-rest (*hño-hdān*);

for this action of horses in company is mentioned in one of the Tibetan texts, and *wa-hdān* may very possibly mean 'neck', being equivalent to Hsi-hsia o(wo, *ñoso*-diń (Laufer, No. 106) = Tib. o-ldon, ho-don, 'windpipe'.

With the original signification of Tib. *ños*, 'side', 'direction', we have:

mo-lañ-byu[r]-re-hldi-hdāh-ma-ge-hño-bro-hrub-re-myag-gre-skyān, 108-9
'the wretched lone females who are here, rushing in flight in (all) directions, need protection from the vile (?) bears'

(mo-lañ = Tib. mo-rañ, 'lone female'; byu[r] = Tib. byur, 'wretched'; bro = Tib. hbro(s), 'flee', *ño-bro* = Tib. *ños-sor*, 'flee into space (?)', 'disappear'; hrub = Tib. rub, 'rush in a body'; skyañ = Tib. skyoñ, bskyoñs, bskyañ, 'protect',—the last three recurrent in the Nam text).

The 'lone females' in the case are mares, and the danger to them from bears is illustrated by the incident related in Filchner, *Das Rätsel des Matschü*, pp. 85, 92.

Also the phrase *ḥrī-hño*, l. 299, will mean simply 'mountain side'.

4. ne; ṅe, ṅes, rñe; gṣaṅ, hṣaṅ; hṣaṅ-ma.

The occurrences of this group are somewhat akin to, and intermingled with, those of *ñoso/rñe*. For we find the above-cited:

rñe-sta-glañ-dze-hne-rñehi-rñehi, 86

and also

hlo-ge-blah-hldo-ge-na-rñe-ne, 154
hrñe-gsaṅ-hgre-dze-ñe-hkyeb-hkyeb, 16-17
hṣaḥ-yeṛ-hldān-dze-hṛne-hldān-ne, 141
hce-hmu-gdag-re-rniye (= rñe)-ne-hṇohu, 206

and we further find *rñe* associated with *ḥtrog* in:

trog hjo-rñe-dze, 201.
But the association within the group is constant: together we find ne and ñe/rñe in:

- rñe-ñe-ḥrmag-dze, 146
- rñe-ne-g-ri-dze, 301
- hce-ḥmu-gdag-re-rñe-ne-hreḥi, 200 (cf. l. 206, supra)
- trog-ḥjo-rñe-dze-pyi-rjes-ne-ḥcer, 201–2
- sñañ-ñe[-]ne-ḥldir, 328;

and there are parallel expressions:

- sñañ-ñe, 149 = sñañ-ñe, 229
- sñañ-ne, 66, 160.

It is apparent that between ñe and rñe there is no real difference, rñe having merely a Prefixed r, as in rmyi, ‘man’, and other cases: there may have been originally a difference to the extent that rñe may have been deverbal (see pp. 300–1).

In Tibetan ñes is the ordinary expression for ‘evil’, ‘misfortune’, ‘offence’, ‘crime’; and it also exists as a verb with corresponding senses. Probably it is an Aorist form of a ñe contained in ñen, ‘danger’, ‘enemy’, ‘pressure’, ‘drudgery’, ṅer, ‘affliction’, &c. In the Nam text the form ñes is in fact always a Predicate and may be Aoristic in:

- hkhar-ḥgyi-ñes, 192
- hke-hkah-ñes-re, 152–3, 158.


From this it follows that the antithetic word ne means ‘good’, so that:

- sñañ (sñañ)-ñe = ‘evil-hearted’
- sñañ-ne = ‘good-hearted’
- sñañ-ñe[-]ne-ḥldir = ‘in this case of evil-hearted and good-hearted’

and hce-ḥmu-gdag-re-rñe-ne-hreḥi, l. 200, means:

‘having taken on the great cold (sc. death), evil are good’.

The association with rñe, ‘fiend’, ‘enemy’, in ll. 86, 155, &c., is likewise highly apposite, e.g. in:

- hlo-ge-blah-hldo-ge-na-rñe-ne, 154–5

‘in the companies on high (sc. in heaven) fiends (enemies) are good (sc. no longer enemies)’.
In Tibetan *ne* does not exist with this signification. But the word may be identical with Thöchü *nääi*, Gyärüng *ka-sné*, which have many cognates in Tibeto-Burman (*Linguistic Survey of India*, r. ii, ‘Comparative Vocabularies’, pp. 196–7). In view of the Ch’iang sentiment mentioned *supra* (p. 30), it seems possible that the word is ultimately identical with Tib. *ne/nehu*, Nam *nehu*, ‘young’.

Here we may mention the proof that *gśaṅ/gśañ*, signifies, as noted above (p. 220), ‘enmity’, ‘hate’. This results from the expression *hśaṅ-hlad*, which in ll. 225–7 recurs as practically synonymous with *rūe-hlad* and *gse-hlad*, wherewith it is associated. This *gśaṅ/gśañ* is found as *śaṅ* in the Tibetan manuscripts, in the phrase *śaṅ-ḥthab*, ‘fight as foes’ (*supra*, p. 180). It is perhaps identical with the *ḥśaṅ-ma*, ‘filth’, which occurs in ll. 15, 51, and also in the Berlin fragment (I. 5): this also exists in Tibetan, as *gśaṅ-ba*, *bśaṅ-ba*, ‘ordure’; &c. It may be suspected, further, that a Tibetan expression for revenge, viz. *śa-lan*, was originally not ‘flesh’ (*śa*)- requital’, but an equivalent of the Nam *ḥśaṅ-hlad*.

The other occurrences of *ḥśaṅ/gśaṅ*, and especially those cited *supra* (p. 219), accord with the signification ‘enmity’, ‘hate’.

5. *klu*, *hklu*; *mehi-klu*; *šes*, *ḥses*; *ḥbeg*; *ḥse*, *gśe*; *ḥpah*; *sroṅ*.

*Klu* and *šes* are associated antithetically in:

*šes-hkeg-hhrko-hklu-hpah-hyunhu ||, 332
klu-ḥtah-rgyohon-re-hḥses-ta-hrgyon ||, 336

In the Nam language, as we have learned from the contemporary testimony of Tibetan translators of the same region (see *supra*, p. 131), the word *kru* signified ‘blind’; and in our text the actual name *Mye-kru*, wherein the word was given that meaning, is certainly reproduced in the form *mehi*(ḥmehi)-*klu*. Moreover, the same signification results from the antithesis in the line:

*klu-ḥtō-htsa-ge-ḥses-ḥbeg-mehe ||, 24–5
‘blind rocks, H̃ses-ḥbeg their eye’.

In Tibetan *šes* is ‘know’, ‘knowledge’, ‘intelligence’, ‘wisdom’; and this, rather than *ḥses*, ‘friendly’, ‘friend’, ‘relative’ (which, however, should represent the same root), is obviously what is required as antithetic to ‘blind’ (physical or mental). Moreover, in Hsi-hsia ‘wise’ is *sēe* (Chinese transcription; Laufer, No. 165; in Tibetan writing *gshe/gshe/ze*, ‘know’, ‘recognize’, *gshe*, ‘wisdom’, Nevsky, Nos. 10, 215), the *s* being perhaps due to confusion with
se/gseṅ, ‘pure’, ‘clear’ (Nevsky, No. 48) = Tib. sel/gsal, ‘purify’, ‘clear’: in Mo-so, ‘know’ is sse (J. Bacot, Les Mo-so, p. 50). The Tibetan ses is probably, like Ñes, &c., an Aorist form, of a prior se.

In the Nam text ses has occurrences (e.g. in ll. 36, 39, 44, 344–5, 379) independent of the antithesis to klu, but quite suitable for the signification ‘wise’; and of these an interesting one is ses-rtṣig-mon, l. 379, where the epithet is attached to the ‘Moṅ carpenter’, mentioned supra (p. 150). But we must note also the simpler form se/hse/gseṅ, already seen (p. 217) in the phrase bri-gseṅ, ‘wise female’, and elsewhere attached to rdzo (ll. 49, 369), ḣdgyaṅ, ‘the wild ass’ (l. 307), ḣse (l. 299), or contrasted with ḣpaḥ (= Tib. Ḥpaḥ, ‘hero’, ‘brave’) in ll. 36, 258. The practical equivalence of ses and ḣse/gseṅ, is specially apparent in ll. 342–3, where sron-ṇe-gseṅ-re (= sron-ṇe-ḥse-re[e], l. 339), ‘straightly knowing’, is antithetic to rṇe-ḥne-ḥses, ‘evilly know’.

In regard to the name of the divinity (p. 138) Ḥses-hbeg it will be observed that the first monosyllable of his name is clearly indicated as = ses, ‘wise’, by the relation to klu in the above-quoted ll. 24–5, and probably also in l. 5, klu-ga-hwaṅ . . . Ḥses-beg-hyaṅ.

6. nor, Ḥnor; Ḥdzaṅ; Ḥseṅye.

In Tibetan nor means ‘err’, ‘error’, and mdzaṅs ‘wise’, and the latter is often in the Tibetan manuscripts spelled Ḥdzaṅs. It is a fact, though of no significance here, that nor commonly means also ‘wealth’, ‘property’ (esp. ‘cattle’); and Ḥdzaṅs is stated to mean:

(a) ‘avaricious in the acquiring or hoarding of wealth’ and
(b) with nor, ‘spent’, ‘consumed’.

Ḥnor and Ḥdzaṅ, in the sense of ‘foolish’ and ‘wise’, are associated in:

g-rah-hsah-hkhehe || na || Ḥnor-ḥdzaṅ-rgo-htoho ||
go-hrah-ḥnor-[re-]ḥdzaṅ-hyaḥ-htoho ||, 314–15

‘In an enemy’s winning the land (or In winning an enemy land) fool and wise man are the gate:
If the gate-ward is a fool, the wise is antagonized.’
po-rbom-ḥnor-[re-]ḥldog-g-yah-to, 317.
‘If a big man, being a fool, is antagonized’,
and the same meaning of Ḥnor is apparent in l. 366, also in l. 163, where it is contrasted with Ḥseṅye, ‘wise’; and it can be seen in l. 192. Ḥdzaṅ, ‘wise’, is recognized in ll. 142, 318, from contrast
with mor, 'evil', and in ll. 18, 42, 44, 285, through other indications: in l. 269 it is associated with ne, 'good'.

These facts do not preclude the recognition of nor = 'wealth', 'property', in l. 151, or, possibly, of ʰḍzaⁿ, 'spent', 'paid', in ll. 232-4.

7. ʰsid, ḥsid; ᶜpag, ṛpag, ṣṛpag; ḥsi; ḥkhu`; ḥsi, ṣi, ṣbi; ṭbrom, ṭhkri, ṭhpo, ṭhwa, ṭrgo; ḥsi-kyeg.

Ṣid in Tibetan denotes a 'funeral ceremony', and ṣid-sa a 'burying-ground' and a 'fruitful field': the form ḡṣid also is known. A connexion with ṣi, 'die', which has in Tibeto-Burman numerous cognates, is apparent.

But in one of 'the Tibetan manuscripts' ṣid occurs in the sense of 'high', ṣid-rabs, 'high race' (= Tib. ya-rabs), being contrasted with ḡbraṅ-rabs, 'race of commons', and the term is used also in a local sense. Ṣi, too, occurs in the Locative form ṣir with the same signification.

Tibetan ḏpag means 'measure', ḏpas 'depth', and the latter is to be recognized also in ḏpag-bsam, 'thought', 'imagination': the root appears, further, in ḏpog/ḍpag/ḍpas, 'to measure, fix'.

In the Nam text, ll. 230-1, ḥsid and ḡṛpag are antithetic in application to ḥwa-bţer (a 'fort'): ḥwa-bţer-ḥsid-re-ḥṛtaḥ-ḥraṅ-glyāṅ ḥwa-bţer-ḥṛpag-re-ṛṇe-ḥld-ḥbyam ||.

When we find, further, the repeated phrase ṣid-g-ri ll. 34, 62 (ḥsid-hrihi), 'sid mountain', we can have no doubt that the meaning of ṣid, ḥsid is, as in Tibetan, 'high'; and we have no difficulty in recognizing the same in:

ḥwam-ḥsid, 11, 'high mansion'
ḥdoṅ-ḥyo-ḥsid, 356, where ḡdoṅ = 'castle'

while l. 194 ḡrdoṅ-ḥyo-ḥsi either has a miswriting for ḡsid or contains the shorter equivalent ḡsi. In ḡkhu-tsa-ṣid-re, l. 60, 'if the uncles are high', the height is social, as in Tib. ṣid-rabs, and in ḡbrad-sta-ḥsid-re, l. 306, 'clawings are high', the sense is that animals with claws have a superiority. The combination ṣid-ṛgyaṅ, 'high vast', is very aptly applied in ll. 151, 155 to ḡnom, 'enjoyment', and 'hope (?)'

Ḥṛpag, which would be the regular Nam equivalent of Tib. ḏpag, must in the passage quoted mean 'low' or 'brought low'. The same sense is clearly opposite where the epithet is attached to ḡkhar (Tib. mkhar, ḡkhar), 'city', 'citadel' (ll. 17, 128, 135, 192
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(hkar): see infra, p. 242), to ḡkaṅ-hcig,¹ 'house ruined' (l. 208), to ḡcaṅ, 'city' (l. 210), and also to the occupants of a dwelling-place, ḡnāh-htsu and omo (l. 193), gso-nad (l. 194), with whom we may associate the sky-people, ḡraṅ-hldah-hnam-hge, who in l. 6 have their bodies 'bowed low (downwards)', hrpag-hkhur-hskuhu (Tib. dgur/rgur/sgr (manuscripts also skur), 'bent', 'crookback'), and also the 'great yak' in l. 223. Ban in ll. 252–3 may be left aside pending a determination of its meaning; and there remain only rūe-hlad, 'requital of evil' (l. 239), and gse-lad, 'requital of harm', where the sense may be rather that of 'deep', or 'fixed'.

Since in dpag/rpag, the d/r is a Prefix, it is consistent to find a form hpag, with similar signification, attached to ḡnāh, 'home' (ll. 326, 328), khar (?) l. 377, and in:

hrsehi-hpag-slog-dze, 384–5, 'the peaks being become low again'.

We shall not be surprised to find in the Nam text the alternative sense, 'die', 'perish', of Tib. śi/śid: and this will be made manifest in regard to śid with hlduhu (p. 322), gldag (p. 317), so-na (p. 293), and rgoṅ-wa (p. 332); as concerns śi, ḡśi, gśi, we find, beside the ordinary use as a Predicate with or without an Auxiliary Verb (ll. 44, 47, 153, 344, 345), also the Preterite derivates bśi-ta, 'dead' (l. 196), bśi-re, 'having died' (l. 198), and the phrases gśi-brom (l. 72), 'nipped by death', ḡśi-hkri (ll. 38, 81), 'death couch', ḡśi-hpo (l. 47), 'pass away in death' (Tib. śi-hpho), ḡśi-hwa (l. 123), 'power (?) of death', śi-rgo (l. 120), 'gate of death', ḡśi-hrog (l. 17)?). In ḡśi-kyeg-mye (l. 102), applied to a defeated army, the meaning, 'death-congealed-fire', has an unmistakable side allusion to (ḡ)śi, 'winter' (l. 160), for which evidence has been proffered in JRAS. 1939, p. 215, and supra, pp. 145–6; for in one of the Tibetan manuscripts the expression dgun-cin-khyag combines with the same Verb (khyag, 'frozen', 'ice') the Tibetan equivalent, dgun, of ḡśi, 'winter'.

8. ḡyah, g-yah, g-yar; hmah, rmah, rmad, smad, hmad; ḡdad, ḡdahd.

The antithesis 'upper and lower', in various applications and with various derivative forms (ya, yar, yas, yan, ma, mar, mas, man), pervades in part the Tibetan use of the stems ya and ma. A form of ma with Prefix r is to be expected in the east and north-east (see pp. 94–5, 166 and cf. pp. 351–2); and from ma, 'not', a

¹ Cf. khaṅ ... bāigs in Tibetan Literary Texts, &c., ii, p. 149. 9.
form *rma* is actually found in one of the Tibetan manuscripts. An s-form, *smad*, has in ordinary Tibetan the meanings ‘lower’, ‘later’, ‘downwards’, ‘blame’, ‘contempt’, ‘to lower, abuse, degrade, dishonour’.

Correspondingly the Nam text contrasts *hyah* and *hmah*, *rmah* in

*hmah-*hldaň-*hyah*-dze, 112, ‘when low rises high’
*hyah-*rmah-*htsagna*, 257, ‘high and low are combined’
*hyah-*htaň-*rma[-]*r[e], 315, 318, ‘when high authority becomes low’.

The last example enables us to recognize the meaning of *hyah*(g-*yah*)-htaň, ‘[of] superior authority’, in the instances (ll. 285–8) where it recurs without a contrasted *hmah*; and similarly in the phrase *hyah*-hdad, ll. 304, 306 (hdahd), in which we may detect an equivalent of Tibetan *dad*, ‘devoted to’ (as in nor-dad, ‘devoted to wealth’, las-dad, ‘devoted to work’); the meaning is ‘having a feeling of superiority’, ‘self-confident’, and we can note in both instances the presence of the word *hpah*(kphaḥ) = Tib. *dpah*, ‘hero’, ‘brave’. In ll. 266–72 there is a series of parallel occurrences of *hyah*/g-*yah*, with either this sense or another to be mentioned *infra*; and the same is seen in ll. 72, *hyah*-hrgehe (‘high success’), and 136, 294.

In the expression *hkhur*-hrpag-g-*yar*-re, ll. 128, 136, the word *g-yar* has, as is evident from the antithesis to *hrpag* (‘when the low town becomes superior’), the same signification. It is the Locative or Adverbial form = Tib. *yar*, ‘on high’.

The form *hmad*/rmad/*smad*, may occur in ll. 36, 37, 39 (ses-hmad, ‘of low intelligence’?) and 202 (hrah-hmad); but in

smyi-hni-hşık-smyi-rmad-lđaň, 80
‘When a . . . man perishes, an inferior man rises’
hrje-smyi-rmad-ge-hmo-rkah-lđa, 84 (cf. 37)
‘chiefs who are inferior men, subject to a woman’s commands’
it is reinforced by a contrast in the actual context.

Several more words *ya*, g-*yah*, exist in Tibetan, and with two of these, reflected in the Nam text, we may proceed to deal. *Hya*, probably = ‘sheep’ (l. 45), will be mentioned *infra* (p. 343).

9. *hyah*, g-*yah*; *hyah*-htaň, g-*yah*-ta; g-*yah*-tsa.

Tibetan *ya* also means ‘an equal’, ‘a match’, and it is used with reference to things occurring in pairs, e.g. *kha-ya*, ‘partner’, *ḥṭab-ya*, ‘adversary’, *ya-po*, ‘rival’, ‘adversary’, *ya-bral*, ‘without
a partner’, ‘separate’, ya-med, ‘having no partner’, ‘single’. This meaning appears clearly in the Nam verse:

ldań-pyer-hgag-re-htsah-ḥyāh-hdo ||, 65
‘those prevented from co-operation become rivals (or adversaries)’

and in the parallel verse in l. 67; also in the above (p. 224) explained verse:

rgo-hraḥ-ḥnor-[re-]ḥdzań-ḥyāh-ḥtōho ||, 315.

Whether in ll. 266–72 ḥyāh, g-yaḥ has the sense of ‘paired with’ or that to be next discussed may be open to doubt. For ḥyāh-ḥtāḥ in ll. 222, 386, g-yaḥ-ta, l. 156, the general notion of ‘pair’ is probable; but whether hostility or combination is indicated, is not clear. On ḥyāh-ḥną, ‘fear’, see supra, p. 217.

The meaning of g-yaḥ in:

g-we-hku-rño-re-g-yah-hṭṣa-ne-ge-gstor-ta-hṭhon(hṭognā), 152

‘action-desire (ḥku)-capable, good adversaries stopped flight’

where g-yaḥ-tsa is a quasi-plural of g-yaḥ, seems to fit best under the signification ‘adversary’.

10. ḥyāh, g-yaḥ; rgyeb.

A third meaning of Tibetan g-ya, seen in g-yaṛ, ‘mouth’, ‘face and front’ (perhaps originally a Locative form), g-yaṛ-tsha = ṅo-tsha, ‘face-warmth’, i.e. ‘shame’, ‘bashfulness’, g-yaṛ-lam, ‘front path or side’, i.e. ‘presence’, is, as we see, ‘fronting’, perhaps the source of the second meaning (= ‘confront’). This sense must be seen in the Nam ḥyāh/g-yaḥ, where it is antithetic to rgyeb/hgyeb, as in:

rgyeb-hpłuḥi-ḥtón-re-ḥyāh-wa-ḥkāṅ, 190

hyāḥ-hkruḥu-hbro-re-hrgyeb-hkruho ||, 315–16

hṛgyeb-hkruḥu-hbro-re-g-yaḥ-ḥpaṅ-hwag, 323–4

hyāḥ-hklu(hkru)-hbro-re-hgyeb(hrgyeb)-hkrū-hbro-re-hyāḥ-

ḥtāḥ-hṭhan na | |, 221–2.

For rgyeb, whether with original e (replaced in Tibetan by an Ablaut a) or with secondary e as explained supra (p. 214), is certainly equivalent to Tib. rgyab, ‘back’ (of the body, &c.), ‘rear’ (cf. rgyab, ‘throw’, ‘fling’, &c.), but also ‘to set back’, ‘repulse’. This appears clearly also in:

ldań-rdze(rje)-ḥbro-re-hldañ-the-rgyebs ||, 138–9

‘when a supporting chief flees (Tib. ḫbros), the supporting followers retreat’.
There exists a curious ambiguity as to the meaning of the expression \textit{hkru-hbro}, which in ll. 221–2 ought to mean ‘flees into a corner (Tib. \textit{gru})’, while in the other two instances, supported also by l. 190, it seems rather to mean ‘has a foul (Tib. \textit{dkru}, ‘dirt’, ‘filth’) savour (Tib. \textit{bro}’) : see pp. 295–7. But this does not invalidate the assurance that in all the above cases \textit{hyah/g-ya\=h} = ‘front’ and \textit{rgyeb} = ‘rear’.

It may be noted that, by reason of the standing antithesis, the missing word in the passage:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{hbri-hldi-htha\=n-re-hre-hldi-hyah}
\textit{hldi-htha\=n-re-rgyeb-hldi-htha\=n-ra}, 132–3
\end{verbatim}

is, no doubt, a second \textit{hyah} : a more extended case of similar loss of a repeated word is to be seen in ll. 147–8; see p. 299. It is no objection that the added \textit{hyah} has the sense No. 3, while the preceding one has perhaps sense No. 1 (antithetic to \textit{hbri}) ; for, as we have seen, the monosyllabic languages (as also most natural use of language) are indifferent to such awkwardness, and perhaps the Nam speakers, possibly with etymological right, lumped all the senses of \textit{hyah/g-ya\=h} roughly together.

11. \textit{hna\=n}, \textit{na\=n}; \textit{hthah}; \textit{hgran}.

The common meaning of Tibetan \textit{na\=n} is ‘in’, ‘inside’, ‘within’; but there is also \textit{na\=n/na\=ns}, = ‘dawn’, ‘morning’, ‘to-morrow’, and we may add \textit{na\=ns}, ‘escaped’ (\textit{\=gno\=n}), and, for the sake of possible comparison with Nam, \textit{gna\=n/gna\=ns}, ‘grant’, and \textit{sna\=n}, ‘light’, ‘appearance’, ‘notion’, ‘shine’.

In the text the passages (ll. 225, 236, 244, 246), where we read:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{hra\=h-hldi-hna\=n-re}, ‘this place being inside’, or ‘being in this place’
\end{verbatim}

prove by their mere number that the word \textit{hna\=n} is = Tib. \textit{na\=n}, ‘inside’, &c. Hence it is practically certain that the meaning is the same in:

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{hldi-hga\=n-na\=n-re}, 104, ‘all these being inside’ or ‘being inside this house (Tib. \textit{kha\=n})’
\textit{hpo-hldi-na\=n-re}, 115, ‘these heroes (or males) being within’
\textit{gdzu-hbyi-hna\=n-re-hma\=n-hri-hwas}, 308, ‘the ass being within [it], the great mountain is non-existent’ (similarly in 305, 311).
\end{verbatim}

In l. 181 \textit{na\=n-\=gsa\=n} has been noted (p. 156) as possibly doubtful,
and \textit{nañ-pa-ḥsam} in l. 352 may be left for the present undetermined; as well as \textit{ḥnañ-ḥdro} in ll. 188–9 (see p. 285).

Antithesis to \textit{ḥṭḥah} can be seen in:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{ḥrtah-nañ-hwa[-r][e]-ḥṭṭah-ḥbro-ḥgran}, 354–5
  \item \textit{the horse being powerful (?)} within, his adversary (Tib. \textit{ḥgran}) was in flight to, or in, the \textit{ḥṭṭah}.
\end{itemize}

The identity of \textit{ḥṭṭah} with Tib. \textit{mtṭah}, ‘end’, ‘boundary’, ‘frontier’, is unmistakable; and perhaps the same will be found to be the case in l. 362, where \textit{ḥṭṭah-ḥrbyo} may prove to be a miswriting of \textit{ḥbro}: the manuscript shows, in fact, a correction, probably of \textit{ḥbro} into \textit{ḥbro}.

Another \textit{ṭha} will be mentioned \textit{infra} (p. 237).

12. \textit{ḥbom}, \textit{rbom}, \textit{hrbom}; \textit{ḥbo, bon, ḡbon, ḡbos, ḡpos}; \textit{rbo, ḡrbo}; \textit{ḡbōhu}; \textit{ma-man, ḡmañ; phañ; ḡrog; ḡkom; ḡji}.

In l. 238 of the text:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{gse-ḥbo-bon-re-ḥlad-mah-mahn}
  \item \textit{injury being ḡbo-bon, requital is mah-mahn}
\end{itemize}

we see an antithesis, repeated in ll. 243, 245, 246, 246–7, between two reduplications, \textit{ḥbo-bon} and \textit{mah-mahn}: and the first of the two can hardly be different in essence from \textit{ḥbom-rbo} in:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{ḥso-ḥnah-hyah-tse-gtaobom-rbo}
  \item \textit{ḥbom-rbo-phañ-dze-ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥnar-re-ḥbom-rbo-ḥldah ||, 111–12}
  \item \textit{ḥso-ḥnah-hyah-[ge-] ḡbah-ḥbom-rbo ||, 270.}
\end{itemize}

A form \textit{rbom/ḥrbom} occurs twice in l. 317 as a predicate of \textit{po}, ‘man’, ‘hero’.


It follows from the first quotation that \textit{ma-man} represents a \textit{man}, ‘great’, and means ‘vast’ or ‘larger’. This must be = Tib. \textit{mañ}, ‘much’, ‘many’, ‘great’, ‘be much’, &c., which in fact is sometimes found written \textit{man} (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 19. 8, 147: B1, 370. D). Indeed it is likely that \textit{mañ}, like \textit{boñ} and several other words, derives its \textit{n} from the circumstance that originally it was \textit{mañs <man-s}, a form existing in Tibetan, e.g. in \textit{mañs-tshig}, ‘plural number’.

\textit{Ḥmañ} itself is common in the text, and it obviously means
'great' when applied to 'mountain'; hmañ-hrihi, ll. 302, 308 ('hri), 308 (g-ri), followed by hmañ-sta-mehi . . . hri-stah-mehi, l. 311, 'great is not there . . . mountain is not there’. Not less clear is the meaning 'many' in:

hbrad-re-hpah-yañ-hmañ-ge-hrgam-hjihi ||, 305–6

'each clawing creature being brave, that many should form a community is unimportant (Tib. ḫji, "flea", "no matter", as in the Tib. manuscripts).'

Tibetan sbo is plainly connected with sbo, 'swell up', 'distend' (lto-ba-bsos, 'the belly is swollen'), and the above-mentioned sbo, 'the upper part of the belly': and this sbo is likewise an s-form of ḥbo, ḥbos, pho, dbo, 'to pour forth, swell up, rise, sprout (sa-ḥbo-
hdug, "the ground is verdant", "the ground swells, heaves")'. Hence it is evident that in the Nam text in the phrase:

g-raḥ-g-yo-rbo-ge, 'the earthquake rbo'

the word rbo signifies 'swells up', 'heaves', and is in meaning, as in form, an exact equivalent of Tib. dbo.

This root bo furnishes also another term of great importance in the text, namely bos/ḥbos (once, l. 141, spelled ḫpos) = Tib. ḥbos, Aorist of ḥbo, also 'boil', 'tumour'. This is applied in ll. 290, 291, 293 to g-ri, hrihi, 'mountain' ('a big mountain'); but its usual connexions are with smyi ('big man'), e.g. ll. 42, 43, [378], and especially with pu/ḥphu/ḥphu ('male', 'man'), in ll. 41, 167, 266, 293, 330; and several times (ll. 164, 213, 287, 294, 298) ḥbos alone is used to denote the 'big', the 'master', who is the sole undisguisedly human being figuring in the text.

The Verb ḥbo in the Tibetan sense of 'pour forth', 'spill out' has already (p. 156) been recognized in the expression:

ḥlab-ta-gbohü-ste, 'talk bubbling forth', 181; cf. g-raḥ-nag-
ḥbo-gyañ, p. 313 infra.

Probably also its meaning, 'sprout', accounts for ḥbo, 'forest', 'vegetation' (Hsi-hsia mo, Laufer, No. 85), which we shall find in ḥbo-hkom-hldyañ-dze, 12, 'the parched (Tib. skom, skam, &c.), woods flying high'

myag-ma-ḥtsar-dze-ḥbo-hram-ge-hsodtsa, 280–1

' on the not spoiled districts, or borders, the wood-groups were laid low'

(on ḥtsar and hsodtsa see pp. 234, 301)

ḥbo-hron-hrog-re, 344, 'the wooded gorges being torrents' (Tib. gрог).
On Ḋbo in l. 126 see infra, p. 289. The meaning of ĕldyān-ḥtah-ḥbo-kyer, l. 144, is not clear.

13. dgu, dguhu; mu, ḍmu, ḍmuhi; ḍḥrog, ḍlom; dgu, ḍgu; ḍṛgu, ḍgu.

It has already (JRAS. 1939, pp. 211-12) been stated that in the Tibetan manuscripts we have a word dgu, meaning ‘hot’. This fact, surprising in view of the circumstance that the Tibetan for ‘winter’ is dgun, becomes almost beyond belief when we remark that its opposite, mu, will have to mean ‘cold’. For in Hsi-hsia ‘fire’ is dmu/gmuh (Nevsky, No. 149), in Chinese transcription mo (Laufer, No. 36), while the Tibeto-Burman dialects in general are almost unanimous in denoting ‘fire’ by forms akin to this mo or to Tibetan me (Lolo mu-tu, &c., Mo-so mi, Rgya-roṅ Hsi-fan te-mi, &c., d’Ollone, Go-lok dialects, 41, 42, mo/mon, &c.). In Nam itself the word for ‘fire’ is me/sme/mye. The fact, however, is beyond all dispute, since the word occurs in the many times repeated sentence ‘To the fiend country of fire not hot (mye-myi-dgu), water not moist (chu-myi-rlan), I will carry you’. Moreover, the many Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Himalayas and elsewhere, which for ‘hot’ have words beginning with ku-, lend an aspect to the matter.

The antithesis declares itself prominently in the recurrent (ll. 225, 236, 244, 245) phrase:

dgu(dguhu)-mu-hṭo-re, ‘hot becoming cold’

where the implication is ‘living becoming dead’: and an analogous implication (cf. Tib. groṅ/gran, ‘cold’ and ‘die’) is to be seen in

mu-hṛog-hṭro(hdro)-re, 197, ‘cold being assisted by heat’

in reference perhaps to burning of the dead. Also in a verse already (p. 222) quoted ‘the great cold’, ḍce-mu, means, no doubt, death. But the antithesis is envisaged also in l. 309:

dgu-ḥldo-ḥṭor-ge . . .
ḥmu-ṭa-ṛno-ge . . .

Independently of antithesis dgu-ḥṭor, ‘great heat’, is seen in ll. 76, 77, and dgu-ḥldo, ‘heat’, in ll. 74, 77, 78, 139, 191; and in l. 114 there is connexion with ‘fire’ (me):

dgu-ḥldo-ḥṭor-ge-su-me-ḥmeḥi
‘with great heat, who kindles fire?’

mu, likewise, is connected with fire in the phrase me-ḥmuḥi, ‘chills the fire’, l. 183, and perhaps also in l. 268; in l. 39 ḍkye-ge-ḥmu (p. 320) the probable sense, indicated by antithesis to ḍdar,
'shiver', is 'the children are cold'. Another occurrence of *mu*, 'cold', is seen in l. 363, *mu-lom*, 'cold well'(?): in l. 9 it may signify 'sky' (Hsi-fan, &c., *mo*, *mon*). The cold is metaphorical, = 'fear', in l. 184: in ll. 104, 116, 352, in connexion with *kphu*, *pu-glo*, which contain the idea of 'blowing' (see pp. 284–5), it is again psychical, as is likewise sometimes the case with *me*, 'fire'.

The meaning 'all' seen in *stor-dgu*, l. 127, 'all losses or lost things' (see infra, p. 290), and perhaps also in l. 134, is helpful in two ways: firstly, it guarantees the Tibetan idiomatic use of 'nine' (*dgu*, *ru*), for 'all', which is found even in the Tibetan manuscripts, and thus supplies the Nam word for '9'; secondly, the *stor-hgu* of the preceding l. 126 seems to be the same expression, which shows that in the Nam word for '9' the Prefix *d/r* might be lacking, as in so many Tibeto-Burman dialects and sometimes in Tibetan itself (*go*, '90').

The same alternation justifies a recognition of two forms, *ru* and *hgu*, of the word for 'steal', 'thief' (Tib. *rkulku*, 'steal', *rkun*, 'thief', in the Tibetan manuscripts also *rgun*, Lo-lo *khu*, &c., Mo-so *kô*: *ru* is seen in *hrug-ma-gzo*, l. 165, 'thieves should not eat' (see pp. 199, 335) and in:

```
  rbyo-ḥcke-rgye-dze-hrug-hrgehi-sto ||, 57–8
```

'where poultry (error for *kbyor*, 'store'?) is very extensive, thieves rejoice' (on *hrgehi-sto* see p. 185 and n. 1)

and perhaps the same signification of *ru*/*hrug* in ll. 29, 30, 32;

*hgu* in:

```
  ḥnah-ḥpoń-hgor-re-hgu-ḥtor-ḥtsu, 113
```

'when the house-dependents are idle, big thieves come'

and in l. 331 *hgu-mor* can be 'wicked thieves'.

On *hgu* as a suffix see p. 258.

14. *stoń*, *htoń*; *ḥpoń*; *myen*; *stsar*; *ḥtsar*, *ḥtshar*.

Line 247, *gse-stoń-stsar-re-hlad-ḥton-myen* repeating an antithesis of *gse*, 'harm', and *hlad*, 'requital', requires an opposition between *stoń-stsar* and *ḥton-myen*, wherein, according to the context, the latter should denote a larger quantity. *Stoń-stsar* calls to mind Tib. *stoń*, 'thousand', and the particle *ṛṣa*, whereby *stoń* is usually linked to the following 'hundreds', &c., *ṛṣa* being perhaps = *ṛṭswa*, 'root', though we may suspect that it was once *ṛṭsar* or *ṛḷsar*, connected with *ḥtshar/tshar*, 'be finished, spent', 'up to the limit', and *tshar*, 'occasion', 'instance' (*tshar-gnīś, 'twice', &c.). However it may be as regards Tibetan *ṛṣa*, there is no difficulty
in connecting with this *htsar* the Nam *stsar* and attributing to it the sense of 'as much as' or 'only', though it might likewise be a Locative form of *rtsa*.

The word *htsar*, instanced p. 231, recurs, as *htshar*, in

\[ \text{hkaṅ-ḥeig-rpag-re-ḥtsar-hde-hpyedhi}, 208 \]

'when a house is laid low in ruin, the parish's prosperity is breached',

cf. khar (khaṅ ?)-hpag-cig-dze, l. 377, hldaṅ-ḥkhaṅ, 'wooden house' (sc. tomb), l. 198, and khaṅ-rul-sig, 'break down a ruined house' (*Tibetan Literary Texts*, &c., ii, p. 149. 8). With the meaning 'parish' (Sanskrit *simā*), derived from that of 'boundary', the Tibetan *tsbar* is frequent in the Central-Asian documents (ibid. i, p. 101, n. 5; ii, pp. 169 sqq.).

We are naturally reluctant to find in Narn *ston* the meaning 'thousand', since we should prefer *stom* or *tom*, as nearer to the original, widespread, Central-Asian *tom* (Mo-so tū, to, tu, Menia ta-to, Lo-lo ta-to, ti-tu, &c.); but that reluctance must yield before the fact that *ston-hpon* in l. 321 is very probably = *Tib. ston-dpon*, 'Thousand-[district]-officer', a prominent feature of Central-Asian administration (p. 33, n. 1). If *ston* was not the proper Narn form, it may have been due to borrowing from Tibetan (whence the s, absent in *htoṅ*) or to the Tibetan scribe or transmitter.

Proof that *ston* in the Nam passage means 'thousand' is given by the antithetic *myen*, for which Tibetan affords no explanation. This will be Chinese *wan* (Classical *mān*, Ancient *māwN*), Japanese *ban/man*; see Karlgren, No. 1295), 'myriad', preserved in Mo-so as *mō* and in Lo-lo, perhaps, as *[ta]-niai, &c. (ni- < my-).* Accordingly the translation of l. 247 in the Nam text is:

'harms being as many as a thousand, requital is [to be] a thousand myriad."

Elsewhere *htoṅ* has a quite different signification (= *Tib. gtoṅ*, 'give up', 'send', &c.); and *ston* in l. 51 seems to be = *Tib. ston*, 'empty'.

15. *gsom*; *sūi; hūi; hsam; h'sam; s'sam*

Nam *gsom* has a great chance of being = *Tib. gsum/sum*, 'three' (so-gecig, 'thirty-one', &c.); for in Tibeto-Burman the numeral 'three' is one of the most uniform, the dialects agreeing in something like *sum* (also *tum*), *som*, so, *sam* (cf. Hsi-hsia *gso, gsoh*, *gson*, *gswon*, Nevsky, No. 269), Chinese *sam, san*. The scribe
himself seems to intimate this; for in l. 117 he wrote Tibetan gsum, which was afterwards corrected to gsom.

Nevertheless, the clearest of the occurrences of gsom, namely in gsom-sii (l. 23) = Tib. som-ñi, ‘doubt’, presents a different sense; for in som-ñi (‘thought-two’) som belongs to the root sem, sems, bsam, bsams, Imperative soms, ‘think’, ‘thought’, ‘mind’, a root most widely spread in Tibeto-Burman (including Hsi-hsia sin, ‘heart’, = Tib. sems, Laufer No. 9, and Mo-so sin(-djre), šen(-djrö), šun(-dru), ‘think’) and shared with Chinese, sin, ‘heart’, ‘thought’, &c. (Classical som, Ancient, sīm, Karlgren, No. 801). The same signification recurs in:

»som-wa-hyo(g-yo), 178–9, ‘thought wavers’.

The meaning ‘three’, however, must be admitted in the expression khar-gsom, l. 117, ‘three towns’, where the scribe at first wrote gsum; for, though we cannot identify the towns, numerical phrases of the same type, ‘The Four Garrisons’ = Chinese Turkestan, ‘The Six Cities’ = Khotan, &c., were usual in Central Asia, and one of the Tibetan manuscripts has ‘The Twelve Cities’, ‘The Eight Snam’, &c. In htsa-gsom, l. 21, also we may find ‘the three roots or grasses or crops (Tib. rtsa or rtswa or btsa)’, analogous to the above (p. 39) cited ‘five cereals’ of the Chinese descriptions; and in l. 10 hlāh-gsom may be ‘the three passes (Tib. la)’. In ll. 89 (gsom-rgya ‘form a thought’, pp. 258–9), 198 (hdi-gsom, ‘this thought’), 206 (tshu-gsom, ‘the thought of coming’), we have again gsom, ‘think’.

But gsom-sñi, though not containing the numeral ‘three’, certainly reveals sñi as = ‘two’, Tibetan gñis/ñis, Hsi-hsia gñi/gñik (Nevsky, No. 75). This sñi does not otherwise occur in the Nam text, and it is possible that an s-less form is present in the expression rgya-hñi (gñi)-ke, concerning which see p. 272.

A cognate of gsom, ‘think’, is probably to be seen in hsam (Tib. bsam), ll. 185, 352, but not in hsam, l. 184, where me-hsam, ‘prepared fire’, antithetic to the above (p. 232) cited me-hmuhi, is probably for hśam (Tib. ŝom, gšom, bšam, bśams, ‘prepare’, ‘arrange’, &c). Sśam, l. 255, and hśam, l. 277, are problematical.

16. hti; hgye; hkröm-hkrom.

In ll. 12–13 and 154:

gñim-hti-hldyañ-[ge ? dze ?]-hgye-hkrom-hkrom, 12–13
hti-rgye-mye-dze-hgye-hkrom-hkrom ||, 154

hti and hgye seem to be contrasted. If hgye = Tib. hgye, ‘light’,
given as a synonym of hod, and perhaps, by reason of its rarity, an actual loan from Nam, it will harmonize with hkrom-hkrom, a reduplicated expression which may correspond to Tib. khrom-me, 'sparkling', 'glittering': in fact, the harmony may be etymologically very complete, if hgye, on the one hand, is connected with hgye, hgyed, 'scatter', 'diffuse', &c. (e.g. rays of light), and hkrom with hgrems, bkram, dgram, khroms, 'spread', 'scatter', 'display', khram, 'lively', 'brisk', both roots being otherwise also prominent in the text.

This being so, hti might well mean 'darkness', which will accord with Tib. gti-mug, 'gloom', 'ignorance', 'stupidity', and further with gniim, in the first verse cited, which will be = Tib. ñin, 'day' (cf. ñi/gñi, 'sun'). The two verses may then be rendered as follows:

'day-darkness rising, the light flickered, flickered', 12-13
'where extensive darkness is not, the light flickers, flickers', 154.

In l. 385:
hrñe-hrom-ge-hti-na-hrñe-ge-hrlomhi | : |
in the fiend-hollow darkness, let the fiends vaunt themselves will likewise fit.

Since Tibetan has a sti, hthi, meaning (a) 'take a rest', (b) 'honour', 'respect', and Hsi-hsia a sti meaning 'obey', 'possible' (Nevsky, No. 235), these also are conceivable in Nam; and the first may actually occur in:

myi-re-hti-ni-myi-[re-]hśi ||, 154
'when men severally stop (in flight), severally the men perish',
a passage curiously adjacent, however, to l. 154, with hti = 'light'. Concerning sku-hphu-hti, l. 104, and hgru-ma-hti, l. 27, see pp. 285, 309.

17. smyi, myi; tha; hnu; hśig; hṛgyaṅ.

The first two of these, where not identifiable with Tib. mi/myi, 'not', might very well be = Tib. mi/myi, 'man' (homo), more especially as this sometimes (Hsi-hsia rme (Nevsky, No. 39), Gyarūṅ ti-rmi, &c.; see p. 94) has a Prefix r. One instance of myi = 'man' (l. 154) has just been cited; but it may be doubted whether there are any more. In regard to smyi there can be no question that in htor-smyi-hbom-ge, l. 73 ('great smyi, big'), bos-smyi, ll. 42, 44 ('big smyi', 'master')—see the discussion of hbom supra—smyi signifies 'man'; and the same is apparent in:
rje-smyi-rmad-ge, 37, 84, 'chiefs who are inferior men' (on rmad see supra, p. 227)
smyi-hni-hśig[-g]e-smyi-rmad (smad?)-lдаn, 87
'when a Ḥni man perishes (Tib. Ḥjig, bźig, ǵźig, ńig), an inferior man rises'.

But it is in ll. 241-2:

smyi-hnu-mye-re-tha-hnu-hṛgyaṅ-sto-smyi-hnu-hṭo ||

that we find the most useful confirmation, the meaning being:

'if man's power (Tib. nus, "able", "ability", "power") is not, tha power coming in haste (Tib. ṡṛyaṅs) or being extended or extensive (ṛgyaṅ), man has power.'

Here tha must mean 'god'; and this may be the origin of Hsi-hsia ṭha, 'Buddha' (Nevsky, No. 105), Hsi-hsia Buddhism being late.

There is no temptation to derive tha = 'Buddha' from tha/thh, 'he', 'it' (Nevsky, Nos. 71, 225), or to regard it as a remnant of tathā-gata: it must correspond to Tibetan lha, 'god'. The problem of Tibetan ṭh has been mentioned supra (p. 214, cf. infra, p. 286).

In 'Tangut' 'god' is skha, 'boot' (Tib. lham) is kham; and we learn from Dr. Tafel (Meine Tibetreise, ii, p. 32, n. 3) that:

'In the whole of North-Tibet, among the Banag-kaksum of the Koko-nor region as in Amdo, Lhasa, which notoriously is compounded of Lha = "god" and sa = "land", "place", is not pronounced as usual with l and a following h, but like English th, followed by an h.'

If this was in Amdo an ancient pronunciation of lha, we understand the name of the city Tamo ('Goddess')-mēn, stated in the T'ang Annals (JRAS. 1880, pp. 463, 473) to have been built by the Tibetans in the Koko-nor region. Visible from Hsi-ning, and situated some eight or nine miles south of Lusar (Rockhill, The Land of the Lamas, p. 94, n. 1), are the three peaks of the 'Lh'a-mo-ri', which surely must be connected with the pass 'called in Tibetan Ta-mo-ri' (Rockhill Diary, p. 108), which 'leads [from Lusar] into a valley at the mouth of which is ... Shara-kūto'.

In ordinary Tibetan also the verb ṭtvūṅ, 'fall', has for Preterite lhuṅ.

18. (1) Ḥnah, ńnah, hna, na; (2) Ḥnah, hna, na; (3) Ḥnah, na;

1 Mentioned in connexion with Hung-chi (NW. of Ho-chou, with a bridge over the Hoang-ho), Bushell, p. 534 (72).

2 Similarly Dr. Tafel mentions (ii, p. 298) a 'Lhamo gomba' (monastery) in the T'ao-chou region, always known as Thamo or Tamo, the natives pronouncing every lḥ as English th or t, and speaking of Lha-sa, for instance, as T'asa.
It is clear in ll. 99, 101–2

rgyed-ma-glaṅ (102 hldan)-ge-hnah (102 ṇah)-htsog-hsah (102 ḍas)

that ṇah and ṇah are confused; and confusion of n and ṇ has been noted (p. 214) as occurring in Amdoan Tibetan. ḃnah is certainly = Tib. gnah, ‘place’; cf. l. 69 ḍphag-la-gnah, ‘a place for the hog’ &c., l. 391 ḃnah-ṭidī-ḥṭshur, ‘come to this place’, the Prefixes ḍ and ṇ alternating frequently, as we are already aware, in the text. ḃnah does not occur, though on the analogy of ḃsi-hsia ne, ‘king’, neh/neh = Tib. rje, and Gyāṛung ka-nēs, Tākpa nai, Mānyak nā(-bi), ‘two’, and various other instances in ḃsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman, we should be fully prepared for confusion of ṇ- also with n- and ṇ-.

In the case of ḃnah-ḥtsu/ḥnah-mo such confusion is specially clear; for ḃsi-fan (d’Ollone, Nos. 37 and 40, p. 79) na-mo, ‘woman’, is plainly = Tib. ṇa-ma, ‘housewife’, ‘mistress of a house’. That Nam ḃnah-mo is the same word is proved by the antithesis to ḃnah-ḥtsu in:

ḥnah-ḥtsu-ṛpag-re-ḥnah-mo-hgam || ḃnah-mo-ḥṛpag-[re-]-gso-nad-hgam

If the ḃnah-ḥtsu is brought low, the ḃnah-mo is the ḍgam;
if the ḃnah-mo is brought low, the gso-nad is the ḍgam;
if the gso-nad is brought low, (all talk is babble).

For in this connexion ḍtsu must be equivalent to ḃsi-hsia ni+tsu (i.e. ḍzu), bdzo, concerning which see supra (p. 218). The same word (= ḍir) may perhaps be detected in the title (chin(= khyim ?)-tsu), as given by the Chinese (Rockhill, The Land of the Lamas, p. 339), of the queen’s consort in the ‘Women’s Kingdom’.

We may infer that confusion between ḃnah and ḃnah was not merely phonetic, but due in part to coincidence of the ideas of ‘place’ and ‘home’. ḃnah/ṇa, which seems to be the more common, appears in:

ḥna-ḥlam-glo-hran, 68, ‘the home path is joyful’
na-hldom-hgor, 41, 143, 350, ‘if the house-servants are idle’
ḥnah-ḥpoṅ-hgor, 113, ‘if the house-poor (na-boṅ of the Tibetan manuscripts) are idle’

1 See infra, p. 360.
na-g-we-hkor, 205, ‘if there is idleness in home-making’

ḥphu-hklo-hsad-dze-hnah-me-hmyi ||, 40, ‘if the ḥphu-hklo (see infra, p. 284) is destroyed, house-fire there is not’.

In other instances (l. 56, 96, 280 (gnah)), though only ‘place’ is said, the idea may be that of home: elsewhere (ll. 191, 391, ḥnah; ll. 69, 70, 179, 367, gnah) ‘place’ suffices. Ḥnah is seen in:

ḥnah-hpag-hldir, 326, 328, ‘in this low place’

and together we find Ḥnah and na in:

ḥnah-na-hmañ-na-hmañ-hrgam-gre-na-hram ||, 307
‘though [their] home-places are many, the place they like is where many gre are in company’.

An entirely different Ḥnah = Hsi-hsia dnah (Nevsky, No. 159), ‘empty’, ‘sky’, occurs several times after re, ‘is’, forming an idiom with the meaning ‘absence of’, ‘there is absence of’, e.g. in:

mor-hldañ-re-ḥnah ||, 87, ‘there is no rising of evil’
ḥkyañ-hldoñ-re-ḥnah ||, 291, ‘there are no run-away ḥkyañ’
hrñ-ḥcañ-hram-dze-gše-hrdžro (i.e. hrdzo-re)-ḥnah ||, 49
hrño-hprañ-hram-dze-hšehe-rdzor (i.e. rdzo-re)-ḥnah, 368–9
‘where the power (or purpose)-violent are united, wise rdzo are not there’.

Tibetan has, further, na (a Postposition), ‘in’, &c., gnah(-ma) ‘old’, na, ‘meadow’, and na, ‘sickness’. Of these na, ‘in’, &c., as recurrent in the Nam text, has been considered supra (pp. 178 sqq.).

Gnah, ‘old’, is at present problematic. Na, ‘meadow’, is perhaps to be recognized in na-hṭsah-ste, ll. 33–4: see p. 275, cf. pp. 278, 281). Na, ‘sickness’, is to be seen in:

na-rog-hphar-ge-skye-ta-ram, 156–7
‘the black (? Tib. rog) sickness passed, life is agreeable’
ḥtṣog-hram-hnah-tṣe, 120 (see infra, pp. 291–2)
ḥṣas-hnah-ḥdag-chi-phyer-chañ-ḥson ||, 260–1
‘children who had sickness were, with support-hold, tended’
ḥldyo-hṭor-hmyi-na, 254 (see p. 328).

The phyer-chañ of the last passage will call for consideration later (pp. 283, 287). Ḥson will be = Tib. gson/gso, ‘tend’, ‘nurse’. Ḥsas, which in the preceding verse has the same form, shows in:

gsas-pahi-hdzo-ḥdza, 262, ‘children equal to braves (pa = ḥpah, Tib. dpah) or to their fathers (pha, ḥphah)’

the common ḥ/g alternation. The word is known in Tibetan as designation of a class of Bon divinities, and the meaning ‘children’
is established by the phrase \textit{pha-ma-gsas}, ‘father, grandfather, children’, in another text: it is, no doubt, Preterite, Tib. \textit{btsas}, of \textit{btsa}, ‘bring forth a child’\(^1\) (cf. \textit{btsa}, \textit{btsas}, \textit{rtsas}, ‘harvest’): as regards the initial cf. \textit{se/hse/gse} = Tib. \textit{gtse}, \textit{htshe}, and \textit{se/hse/rse} = Tib. \textit{rtse}.\(^2\) The verbal sense is clear in:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[] \textit{hsas-te-khyan-je(dze)-hsas-hkah-ge-hrwehi ||}, 116
\item[] ‘when the matron has given birth, talk of the birth is at an end’ (sc. it is too late, a sense in harmony with the context).
\end{enumerate}

‘Offspring’ is the meaning in:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[] \textit{hsas-hce-rgye-dze-hra\=n-hgam-hyim}, 59.
\item[] ‘with offspring very numerous one’s own mouthful (Tib. \textit{hgam/kkham}, “cram into the mouth”, \textit{bgam}, “gobble”, \textit{kham-gcig}, “morsel”, \textit{khams}, “appetite”) is diminished.’
\end{enumerate}

\textit{Khya\=n}, ‘matron’, is clearly recognizable in:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[] \textit{khyos-hkhyan-hyu-ge-mye-hpehi-hkhehi ||}, 212
\item[] ‘matrons united (cf. Tib. \textit{yug, yug-po, yugs}) with their husbands (Tib. \textit{khyo}) gain eye-sparkle (?)’
\end{enumerate}

A sentiment echoed in the Tibetan manuscripts by ‘a wife partnered by her husband smiles at every speech’. The sentiment is different in:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[] \textit{hmo[-]r[e]-hza\=h-re-hse-spye-khya\=n ||}, 190
\item[] ‘woman or wife, a matron is a summer of harm’
\end{enumerate}

and in l. 367 we hear of a \textit{hsan-khya\=n}, ‘hostile matron’. What is the precise signification of \textit{khya\=n} as distinguished from \textit{hmo}, ‘woman’, ‘female’ (see \textit{supra}, p. 221) and \textit{hza\=h}, Tib. \textit{bza\=h}, ‘wife’? Here we may be helped by Laufer’s (No. 153) \textit{Hsi-hsia cho\=n}, ‘mother’. We can see that the sense of ‘matron’, ‘mother’, well suits the passages, especially l. 116 and also, with reference to what in Sanskrit is called \textit{dohada}, l. 190. The word \textit{khya\=n} is not known in Tibetan, which, however, in its \textit{hkhyen}, \textit{hkhe\=ns}, ‘be filled up’, cf. \textit{hge\=ns}, \textit{bka\=n}, \textit{dga\=n}, \textit{ko\=n}, ‘fill’, \textit{gan}, ‘fill’, ‘full’, furnishes a good basis for an etymology.

We may now return to the \textit{gso-nad} of ll. 193–4. It might seem possible that the \textit{gso-nad}, who are left when the men and women of the place are laid low, are the ‘living sick’, Tib. \textit{gsan} ‘live’, ‘life’, \textit{n&d} ‘sickness’. The Tibetan has, in fact, the expression

\begin{enumerate}
\item[] \textit{hsa\=n-khya\=n}, ‘hostile matron’.
\end{enumerate}

\textit{Khyehu} (or \textit{bu})-\textit{btsas}, ‘a child (or son) was born’. The form \textit{tshas} occurs with the meaning ‘woman in child-birth’.

\textit{In Tibetan rtz, rds, r dz, are often pronounced as simply j, s, z, (Jaeschke, Tib. Grammar, § 7).}
nad-gso, ‘sickness-tending’; but the order of the syllables in the compound could not be inverted, and the gso is the word which means ‘feed’, ‘nourish’, ‘rear’, ‘cure’, e.g. in ḡud-ḥgro-gso-ba, ‘rear an animal’. In the Nam phrase:

nor-gso-ḥkañ-prom-re, 151, ‘having their fill of wealth and gso [as booty]’

we may understand gso as ‘livestock’, in which case nad will have nothing to do with ‘sickness’ and may be = Tib. gnad, ‘essence’, ‘pith’, in the sense of ‘last remainder’. The other occurrence of ḡnad (l. 46) is, however, obscure.

The liberal choice of significations presented by the syllables na and ḡa, with their various written forms, would not be fully stated without a mention of ḡnah, ‘spring’ in ḡnah-ḥchos-ḥre-ge, l. 159 (see JRAS. 1939, p. 215, cf. supra, p. 145) and ḡa in ḡa-ḥke, perhaps = ‘five’ (cf. ḡūi-ke, p. 272). No equivalent of Tib. ḡa, ‘I’, has come to light.

The above-quoted passage, concerning ‘house-man’, ‘housewife’, and cattle, is followed (l. 194–6) by:

ʰḥdзоn, ḡrdзоn; ḡkē, ḡkē, ḡkhe, ḡkhehe; ḡplaṅ, ḡplaṅ, ḡplaṅ; ḡドラ, ḡдра; ḡyo-ʰsĩ; ḡɡaṃ, ḡɡaṃ; ḡcaṅ; ḡṭhaṅ; ḡdah; ḡɡoṃ; ḡdro; ḡwe, ḡweh; ḡnɔr; ḡwam; ḡlda-ʰko; ḡldihi; ḡma; ḡṭharmye; ḡkim, ḡkỳim, ḡyım.

The above-quoted passage, concerning ‘house-man’, ‘housewife’, and cattle, is followed (l. 194–6) by:


After the discussion supra (pp. 150 sqq.) it may perhaps be assumed as certain that in the expression moṅ-ʰdзоn(ʰjoṅ) the word ḡdзоn = Tib. ḡdзоn, ‘castle’, which is also found (p. 214) written in Amdo as ḡdзоn. In the above lines both ḡdзоn, the usual Nam form, and ḡrdзоn occur.

Antithetic to ḡrdзоn, in the following parallel verse is ḡkē, with the addition plaṅ-ʰdromium, whereof the element plaṅ is known only from a Central-Asian Tibetan document (Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, 1, pp. 281, 285), which speaks of ‘a plaṅ of a market town’ (khrom-gyi-plaṅ): it is suggested that plaṅ is equivalent to sraṅ, ‘street’, and it may, in fact, be etymologically

1 Tākpa, however, has plaṅ, ‘sun’.
connected therewith. If *hke* is practically equivalent to *khrom*,
the antithesis of the market town to the citadel is satisfac-
tory. Such a word, moreover, will be acceptable as account-
ing for the syllable *ke*, *ge* in a number of place-names (*Hel-ke, Rañ-ke, Śud-ke, Mer-ke*) from north-eastern Tibet or the adjacent
regions.

*Hke* (l. 212, *hkhe*, ll. 251, 314, *hkhehe*) may be identified with the
Tibetan word *khe*, ‘profit’ (*khe-ūen*, ‘profit and loss’, *khe-pa*, in
Amdo = *tshon-pa*, ‘tradesman, dealer’), a word and notion which
can be shown to have been prominent in the thoughts of Tibetan-
using Central-Asians. Accordingly the *khe* of any city was its
bazaar or business quarter, its ‘Cheapside’.

The *hdra* of *plañ-hdra* will then be the ‘network’ (Tib. *dra*) of
‘streets’; for a metaphorical use of *dra* is known in Tibetan with
reference to a strategical network and also to fortifications (*groñ-
gi-dra-ba*, ‘fortification round a village’). The literal sense is seen
in l. 260 *hsas-hdrah-hdag-chi*, ‘children with nets’ (for catching
birds, &c., as in the Tibetan manuscripts).

The parallel expression *hyo-hśi*, attached to ‘castle’, can natur-
ally contain the word *hśi*, ‘high’, noted above: and, in fact, the
repetition of the verse in l. 356 has the alternative form *hśid*.
Since *hyo* is proved to exist in the text as equivalent to Tibetan
*g-yo*, ‘be unsteady’, ‘agitated’, *g-yo-byed*, ‘move’ or ‘quake’, also
‘cheat’, *yo*, ‘crooked’, ‘sloping’, ‘distorted’, ‘deceitful’, the *hyo-
hśid*, ‘high crooked’, can hardly help being ‘the high road zig-
zag’ (*rla-lam-sqya-sgyo*—probably connected with *g-yo/hyo*:
the common Tibetan form being *gya-gyu*) many times mentioned in
one of the Tibetan manuscripts together with the ‘high fort’ (*rlan-
mkhar*) and the ‘high mansion’ (*rla-khyim*). It is the zigzag ascent
into the citadel.

*Khe* as a Verb = ‘gain’, appears elsewhere in the text (see
p. 289), and *hyo* also may recur in the same sense of ‘crooked’.

It is now quite evident what is meant by ‘the Low Town
becoming high’ (*hkhar-hrpag-g-yar-re*, ll. 128, 136, see supra,
p. 227) and the ‘fort being made low’ (*hkhar-rpag-re*, l. 192). The
‘High Town’, the *mtho-mkhar* of one of the Tibetan manuscripts,
is the residence of the chiefs, while the Low Town (*dmah-mkhar*,
ibid.) is occupied by the commons, who will appear *infra* as *kru,*

---

1 In Kan-su and NE. Tibet some unexpected phonetical relations are
evidenced; thus, one of the Tibetan manuscripts has *plañ* = *raña*, ‘moist’,
and Mānyak has *phwih*, Menia *fu*, = *swa*, ‘tooth’.
'filth', sc. 'rabble', 'canaille'. In the text the elevation of the Low Town is clearly equated to the fall of the 'Mon-castle':

ḥkhar-hrpag-g-yar-[re-]stor-moṅ-hjoṅ-re, 128,

and to the rise of the hldag-nag, the villain of the situation:

ḥkhar-rpag-g-yar-re-hldag-[nag-]ḥgrom, 135–6.

It was through that event that importance came to the ḥgam. The fall of the Mon-castle caused the flight of the horse (ll. 79–80), the original chief, who is therefore described as 'making room', i.e. abandoning his place:

ḥrah-wei-ṛta-ge-stor-moṅ-ḥdzon ||, 139–40
(cf. l. 114). The connexion of the same event with excessive heat (world-conflagration) is likewise mentioned:

dgu-hldo-ḥtor-ge-stor-ḥmoṅ-joṅ, 78, 139 (ḥdzon),

and the horse's flight is related to the same in:

dgu-hldo-ḥtor-re-ḥra-wei-ṛtaḥ, 191.

The ḥgam seems actually to have come into being upon that occasion, and the horse's retreat thereto was synonymous with the loss of the caṅ (i.e. the ḥrdzon):

ḥṛtaḥ-ḥgam-ḥkom ('made') -re-stor-moṅ-hjoṅ
ṛtaḥ-ḥgam-ḥphar ('gone') -[re-]caṅ-stor-ḥdor-ḥyoho ||, 118–19.

The ḥgam is several times (ll. 131–2, 133 (ḥrgam), 221) mentioned as ḥṭhan-ḥgam, i.e. 'ḥgam in the high plains (Tib. thaṅ)', on which see p. 5. This must be the gam/gams, 'posting-station', discussed supra, as occurring in some names of localities such as Bde-gams, and probably identical with bam/bams/boms, found in other names (Ba-bams, Khri-boms, &c.) and actually preserved in the original designation of Kum-bum, viz. Ḥgo-boms. Essentially the horse's desertion of his place is his entry into the service of man (the ḥbos, 'big man', 'master', discussed supra, p. 231), which is a main feature in the text of one of the Tibetan manuscripts: and this fact helps us to realize the fundamental, but not obvious, unity of matter in the two compositions. What function the horse discharges in the Nam text will appear infra (p. 277).

1 It is not quite certain that the hldag-nag = ḥbron is conceived as an individual and not as a class, the 'common people': the latter might be suggested by the expression ḥbron-re-ge (l. 250), which should mean 'all the ḥbron'. Possibly the text fluctuates between the notions of group and typical (here also allegorical) individual.

2 On the alternation g/b see pp. 33, n. 5, 290.
It is only in this relation that a human being comes explicitly upon the scene.

In the text the word ḥgam occurs also, without reference to the particular ḥṭhaṅ-ḥgam, in the sense of 'home-community' or 'company', 'group'. This is seen in:

\[
\text{ldyaṅ-hjo-hjihi-re-mehi-ra-ḥgam ||, 78}
\]

'Where there is . . ., the eye's-horizon, or sentinel post (mehi-ra) is the ḥgam.'

\[
\text{rnam-skar-ḥkah-re-gdaḥ-ḥnah-ḥgam ||, 191}
\]

'Under threatening stars [any] available (gdaḥ) place is the ḥgam.'

The form with Prefix r, ḥrgam/ṛgam, has, no doubt, a verbal signification = 'form a community', 'take into a community', as we can realize by means of Tib. sgam, to which it exactly corresponds. In ordinary Tibetan this sgam is not known, though the parallel form sbam, sbams, sboms means 'place together', 'collect together'; but one of the manuscripts has it in:

\[
\text{nan-blo-rtul-gyis-ḥdzaṅs-rmon-po-la-myi-bsgam-ḥo}
\]

'By disciplining an inferior mind one does not rank with the sharp-witted.'

Of this verbal ṛgam one occurrence (l. 307) has been quoted supra (p. 231) in connexion with maṅ, and it is one of a group found in ll. 304–7; it may also be seen in:

\[
\text{rgyed-hsaṅ-ṛgam-caṅ-hldyo-ḥrje-ḥbro ||, 35–6}
\]

'A city (caṅ ?) with secret disunion (cf. ll. 16–17 ḥṛṅe-gsaṅ, 'secret enmity') taken in (ṛgam),' and similarly in ll. 169, 219, 286, 316. The first of these, l. 169, has an interest as bringing in another r/s form and also as illustrating the style of the text. In:

\[
\text{ḥrgom-ḥkhru[-][e]-ḥto-na-ḥrpeḥi-ḥrgam-re-ḥto}
\]

\[
\text{ḥdro-ḥbroṅ-prom-ge-ḥkohi-me-ḥṭul ||, 169, 170}
\]

'the ḥkhru being passed over (ḥrgom), the ḥrpeḥi were taken into the community:

the yak being made to go (ḥdro), his speech-fire was suppressed,'

the order of the words should have been ḥkhru-ḥrgom-re-ḥto and correspondingly ḥbroṅ-ḥdro-prom-ge, ḥrgom and ḥdro being the Predicates. In the first of the two cases the ḥrgom is placed in
front for the sake of antithesis to hrgam at the end of the verse: in
the second the hdro is placed first for the sake of antithesis to me,
‘fire’; and this, further, implies a pun on hdro, which also means
‘heat’, a pun which recurs in l. 352 (antithesis to mu, ‘cold’).
There are some further rhetorical points in the context.

Hrgom is an r/s form of hgom = Tib. hgom, ‘tread’, ‘pass over’,
gom-pa, ‘pace’, ‘step’, whence comes sgom, ‘practice’ and hence
‘meditate’.

The obvious identity of cañ, as noted above, with rdzoñ,
hdzóñ, is hardly less patent in:

hldañ-rgye-hdor-re-hwan-ta-ḥnen
hecáñ-rgye-rpag-re-hmo-ta-ḥpun ||, 209-11
‘Having thrown away the big stick (or prop, support, hldañ ?),
power is dangerous:

The big city laid low (talk or prayer or deliberation is vain ?).’
Fortunately, the explanation is simple: from occurrences in
identical words it can be shown (Tibetan Literary Texts and Docu-
ments, ii, pp. 28-9, 250) that both this cañ and also a form cag (an
alternation n/g being established for Amdoan Tibetan by stiñ =
ṣdīg, ḥṭhug = ḥṭhun, &c., in the manuscripts) are merely the well-
known Chinese word ch’eng (Ancient zijāng, Karlgren, No. 1204),
‘fortification’, ‘city’, an exact equivalent of hrdzoñ. Other
examples of cañ/hcañ/chan in the Nam text differ in signification.

The form hwam = bam, of which particulars have been given
above, and which may, in fact, be etymologically related to gam,
occurs in antithesis to hdzoñ in the last two lines of the passage
(ll. 194-6) quoted above (p. 241). For the meaning ‘mansion’ or
the like is clear in

hñor-ḥlah-hwam-ḥsid-dze, 11
‘On the high hwams in the hñor’

where hñor = ‘farm’ or ‘estate’. Hwam-wehi, in which we/wehi,
will have its very common signification ‘do’, ‘make’ (Hsi-hsia we,
Tib. hbyed, p. 337 infra), means ‘home-making’ (or ‘maker’).
Tswehu, perhaps = ḥtswe, l. 6, is unfortunately not known; but see
p. 269. In the preceding verse hlda-hko-ge-hdzoñ can mean ‘there
(Tib. da-ko, see p. 201) is their castle’. This leads to the recogni-
tion of an important antithesis in the first parts of the two lines:

hldihi-su-hldoñ-dze . . ., ‘to what (Tib. su) hldihi [they]
depart’

rmā-ḥsu-ḥdra-dze . . ., ‘in what-like (Tib. ḥdra) rmā’
and the sense emerges:

‘Whatever land they go to, there is their castle:’

‘By whatever river, home-making (makers) [is play?]’ see p. 269.

That hdi̱di means ‘land’ will be evidenced independently (pp. 329-30): rma is the name, local and general, of the Tibetan Hoang-ho (Rma-chu), and the meaning ‘By whatever Hoang-ho’ would be quite apt with people bordering on that great river; but we can learn from Dr. Laufer (No. 109) that the Hsi-hsia term for ‘river’ is mašuo, ‘that is, the River = Tibetan rma-chu, the Yellow River (Huang-ho)’.

In the two previous lines that which has ceased to exist on the high zigzag road up to the castle is the ste-gdzu-ge the ‘files of donkeys’ (on which see infra, p. 353), and what wanders free (lol) in the (burned) bazaar is the ḥthar-mye, ‘the fires let loose’ (= mye-thar of one of the Tibetan manuscripts).

This would be a suitable place for considering some other terms relating to dwellings: for various reasons most of these may conveniently be postponed. But gyim/kyim/hkyim has an analogy to hgam/hṛgam, which favours its treatment here. The form immediately calls to mind a Tibetan word for ‘house’, khyim, which has very numerous cognates throughout the whole Tibeto-Burman sphere (for particulars see the Linguistic Survey of India, i. ii, ‘Comparative Vocabularies’, pp. 102-3). The verification is at once evident in:

ḥsod-te-rmag-dze-rmañ-ra-gyim, 147-8

‘For an army brought low the tomb-enclosure is home’,

more especially as confusion of media and aspirate is not infrequent in the Tibetan manuscripts, and the alternation is also etymologically justified. Quite similar is:

hrañ-hldah-hnam-ge-klu-hto-hkyim, 37

‘the heaven-inhabitants proper [had to take] the blind [mountains] for home.’

But in the other occurrences:

hrañi-hdom-hkyim-re, 294, 297
hche-rgyo-hkyim-re, 323
hbri-hdzohu-kyim-re, 324
hyu-hstsah-kyim-re, 345, 350 (hkyim), 351 (hkyim),
kyim/hkyim is a Predicate, and we might not see the force of it, had we not learned from the case of hrgam that hkyim here means
taken as members of the house', so that *hrihi-hdom-hkhyim-re* means 'the mountain bears being included among the inhabitants', a meaning in full accord with the context.

This, however, is not the whole matter: for Tibetan has a word *hgyim*, 'circumference', which stands in normal relation to aspirated forms *hkhyim*, 'whirl' (as of water), *hkhyims*, 'be encircled with a halo', like the sun and moon: far from being secondary, the verbal idea of 'surrounding' is clearly the source of the notion of 'house', 'home', 'entourage': a situation highly characteristic of Tibeto-Burman speech, in which the roots so commonly denote not a material thing, but an idea of action or occurrence, a utility: see *infra*, p. 253.

20. *skyim, hskyim; se, hse; hgar; hdzar; thar, htar, hthar; pyaň, phyaň; hto, tho; hphah-hphah; gcog; hphag; hbehi, hbe, hbehe; hbyig; hbaň, hbar; hro; htsag; hbu; hruŋ, por, hpor; nu-glaň; hkuhu; neňu; wehi; hwehi; hkuhu; hned; htram; glah.*

In ll. 69, 70:

skyim-se-hdzar-dze-hbehi-la-hgar  
thar-pyaň-hjo-dze-hphag-la-gnah  
gcog-hlde-hldu-dze-hbyig-la-gnah

the expression *hphag-la-gnah*, which patently means 'a place for the hog' (Tib. *phag*, a word most widely represented in Tibeto-Burman languages), shows that the passage relates to the habitations of certain animals: and it calls to mind a passage in one of the Tibetan manuscripts, concerning the felicity of several species during the Age of Bliss: the sheep in the meadow, the horse in the moor, the goat and tiger (*cha ?*) in the woods, the *mdzo* in the farm, the hog in the shelter (*skyibs*), &c. Even the language is in part similar: for the word *dgar*, 'gathered (encamped) apart', cf. *sgar*, 'camp', is clearly reflected in the Nam *hgar*.

Elsewhere sheep are casually mentioned as *skyibs-lug*, 'sheep of the *skyibs*',¹ which in the Dictionary is defined as 'a place giving shelter (either in a rock, under a tree, roof or cavern)', e.g. *braq-skyibs*, 'a sheltering place under an overhanging rock or a projecting roof', *bkah-skyibs*, 'a covered terrace or small portico before a house', *char-skyib*, 'shelter from rain' (= *char-khyim* of one of the Tibetan manuscripts).

¹ The phrase occurs also in a document cited in *Inventaire des manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, by Mdlle Lalou, no. 239 (3).
Skyim-se will certainly be 'house-roof' = Tib. khaṅ-rtse, 'house-top'; for this se, = rtse, is found in the Tibetan manuscripts applied to both a mountain top and to a house-roof, and the same is seen in the Nam text, the se of a mountain being mentioned in ll. 14, 238–9, and the se of a house in hce-hse-rgye-re-hrkas-hthaṅ-hlde ||, 57

'If the roof is too large (high), a ladder is requisite.'

Hdzar clearly means 'stick together', 'cohere', being used of 'enemies and friends' (hrne-no, ḥdaṅ-ḥtrog) in ll. 372, 376 (supra, p. 220), and being equivalent to Tib. ḫjar, which latter form also (scarcely distinguishable in script) appears in l. 220. Hence skyim-se-ḥdzar means 'junction of roofs of (adjoining) houses', making in fact a skyibs. Here, therefore, we are thinking of houses in a town or village, as is also the case in l. 18 (ḥskyim-se).\(^1\)

With skyim-se-ḥdzar the thar-phaṅ of the following verse is again associated in:

ḥtar-phaṅ-ḥto-re-skyim-hse-ḥdzar ||, 374.

In this passage ḥto can be = ḥtho, 'high', tho, l. 132 (Tib. mtho), or tho, 'boundary', which occurs in l. 109;\(^2\) and we need not conceal a suspicion that in l. 69 also hjo is a miswriting (visually easy) of htho. The same ḥto = ḥtho is possible in l. 210, and practically certain in l. 296, where g-ri-ḥto is parallel to hriṅ-ḥrṅ, l. 293.

It is, at any rate, clear that thar(ḥtar)-phaṅ(phaṅ) is something connected with a dwelling; and the same is apparent in:

ḥweg-hwehe-hpah-hpah\(^3\)-dze-ḥthar-phaṅ-ge-ḥrub, 348–9

'The laughing spouses (? p. 343) rushed to the ḥthar-phaṅ.'

Phaṅ must denote something suspended or dangling (Tib. dpāṅ/ ḥpāṅ; ḥpāṅ, 'a hunter's nets', 'a lasso', dpāṅ-dar, 'a silk scarf attached to temple pillars or to flag-poles'). Ḫthar is more likely to be = Tib. mṭhar, Locative of mṭṇ, 'end', than ḥṭhar/ thar, 'get through', 'escape'. Ḫṭhar-phaṅ might then be 'boundary [partitions of] suspended [felt]', such as may be seen in Tibet; but we might think of the oft-illustrated\(^4\) roof-cords of  

---

\(^1\) Cf. the ‘terraced roofs [in Lhabrang] which meet over narrow alleys’ (d'Ollone, In Forbidden China, p. 284).

\(^2\) On ḥt = ḥth or th see p. 120.

\(^3\) ḥpah-hpah, 'laugh', otherwise unknown, is proved by the antithetic ḥṇu-hṇur, 'groan', of the preceding verse: it might perhaps be regarded as self-evident; but note the parallel khā-khe of Hörpa. On ḥweg-hwehe, see p. 343. Ḥrub, which occurs in ll. 108, 261 (g-ṛub) will be = Tib. ḕrub, 'rush in a body', ḕrub-te, 'altogether', W. Tibetan grub, 'all'.

\(^4\) Rockhill, pp. 75–6 (description), Diary, p. 132 (illustration); Futterer,
the nomad tents, which before being tethered pass over the tops of rods planted in the ground outside and so produce a quasi-wall. Probably, however, we are not here concerned with tents, but with houses more or less adjoining and with partitions such as we have indicated; and this is, in fact, involved in the juxtaposition of ḥtar-phyaṅ and skyim-hse-ḥdzar in l. 374; but in either case we can see that the junctions of adjoining roofs of a projecting kind would afford the requisite skyibs for the animals. The phag in his free, paradisial, condition would have, no doubt, a 'rock-shelter', while in later times he would have a sort of sty on the boundary (mthar) of the compound.

The gcog-hlde-hldu will be the meadow, since we know by direct testimony (supra, p. 132) that in Nam cog = Tib. span, 'meadow': cf. htañ(thañ)-hldu, l. 14.

From all this it follows that the ḥbehi, whose place is the skyim-se-ḥdzar, is the sheep (skyibs-lug), while the ḥbyig of the meadow (gcog = Tib. span) is the cow. But, in order to carry this through, we must steel ourselves in the face of some improbabilities. In Tibetan ba is the common word for the ox-species, and its Diminutive, behu, means 'calf'. In Hsi-hsia the word for 'sheep' is ye (Laufer, No. 68), and the form appears to have some support in other Tibeto-Burman languages (Mo-so io, iu, &c.): in fact, we have already found this word in Nam ḥya (supra, p. 227; cf. p. 343).

But, as is well known, a plurality of names for animals, representing distinctions of sex, age, &c., is usual in many languages. Hsi-hsia has a word (in Chinese 'transcription') mo, meaning 'sheep' (if not 'goat', Laufer, No. 173), and this might be really ba, of which our ḥbehi could be a 'Diminutive': in the Tibeto-Burman dialects there seem to be numerous forms, ma, mwa, nwa, which may go back to ba, a natural designation of 'baa'-sheep.

As regards ḥbyig, we note that Tibetan has, by the side of the generic ba and of glaṅ, ba-glaṅ, 'bull', for 'cow' ba-mo, ba-cu, and a number of forms, ḥjo and cognates, with which we shall have to deal infra (pp. 326–8). For cognates of Nam ḥbyig, signifying 'cow', we may note in the Tibeto-Burman sphere a surprisingly large number of forms such as:

į, pi, pį, pit, bik, bi, bį, bik, pui, pui, muk, mük, puk (Linguistic Survey of India, i. ii, pp. 170–1)

1 See the illustration in d'Ollone, In Forbidden China (Tibet), p. 216.
2 For Hsi-fan cognates see supra, p. 94.
which may go back to an original big (or bwig) and which accordingly relieve us of any scruple in regard to Nam hbyig.\(^1\)

The word hbyig does not recur; but hbehi is found in the phrases:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hro-hbehi-hbah-ge, 110} \\
\text{htsag-hro-hbehi-hbar, 234}
\end{align*}
\]

while the hbehi-hbah/hbe-hbah of ll. 234–5 show both that hbehi may be found as hbe and that the hbar of l. 234 is Locative of hbah (in fact -r = re is required by both sense and metrical practice). Hence it is practically certain that in:

\[
\text{hbehi-bah-hbu || hrug, 47}
\]

hbehi means 'sheep', and the same is likely in regard to hbehe (= hbe) in l. 46.

It can be shown that the phrase hro-hbehi-hbah signifies some oppressive occurrence; and, since hro may be = Hsi-hsia ro, 'wolf' (Laufer, No. 25), while hbah in Tibetan can mean 'seizure', 'distraint', 'carry off', it is highly likely that:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hro-hbehi-hbah-ge} &= \text{ 'wolves seizing, or oppressing, sheep'} \\
\text{htsag-hro-hbehi-hbar, 'when wolf-packs (htsag = "collected", htsogs, as elsewhere in the text) seize, or oppress, the sheep'}
\end{align*}
\]

In l. 47 (supra) hbu-hrug = Tib. mgo(= dbu, 'head') -rug, 'head bowed down'. The same hbu, 'head', in Hsi-hsia wu (Laufer, No. 103, where are given parallels in Mo-so, &c.), reappears in:

\[
\text{hdzam-hbron-hron-dze-Wm-to-Wu-hpo, 68}
\]

'in tame-yak gorges the tied (animals) have their heads released',

where por/hpor, applied to nu-glaň, 'young oxen', in ll. 175, 359 (phor) and with chi and hdro, 'set free to go', in ll. 183, 353, is = Tib. hbor, 'let go' (in the Tibetan manuscripts bor and por;\(^2\) cf. p. 319 infra).

There is no evidence that hwehi in any of its occurrences is identical with hbehi;

Usually it is the verb 'do' (g-we, see p. 337). In:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hkuhu-nehu-htshe-re-wehi-nehu-hrehe, 74} \\
\text{if the fresh hkuhu (Tib. khu, 'liquid', 'sap', 'broth'? ) harms (goes bad?), there is the fresh wehi'}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{1}\) It is curious that Chinese had an old word 'b yi (Karlgren, No. 713) = 'cow'.

\(^{2}\) por also Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains... by Mdlle Lalou, No. 67. 1.
it seems as if some liquid should be meant: and in:

\[ \text{hñed-ge-slug-dze-hwehi-hśni-hpo} \]

it perishes (hśni-hpo) in some connexion with the process of tanning (hñed). In case, then, it should mean ‘cream’, it would accord with the statement of Rockhill (p. 81) that the Koko-nor Tibetans, who are ‘expert tanners’, use cream for softening the skins: obviously the cream ‘perishes’ or vanishes.

A metaphorical use of the idea of tanning may be found in one of ‘the Tibetan manuscripts’, where a certain queen is described as pressing down the heads of the fiends and rendering them pliant (rřen, a form of Tib. mñe, mñed, ‘tan’, ‘rub’, mñen, ‘pliable’, ‘soft’, mñen-mñel, ‘make soft by tanning’). So in the Nam text the Hbra kingdom or folk were not shaken by the world-cataclysm by reason of three characteristics, whereof one is:

\[ \text{hñed-htram-htsah-glah-tah, 31} \]

‘having a glah stiff (htram = Tib. tram, as p. 285 infra) to tan or knead.’

They were a ‘tough subject’. This interpretation is notably confirmed by the word glah, for which elsewhere\(^1\) we have to recognize the common meaning of Tib. gla, viz. ‘wage’; for we have Hörpa gla, Mányak grah (Thöchü rāpi?), meaning ‘skin’, perhaps also Tib. gra, ‘awn’, ‘bristle’, gra-legs, ‘thick and glossy fur’.

21. gdzu, hdzu, gzu, hzu, hju, hjuku; hrañ-hche; hñlyañ, hlkyañ; hbyi; hkyud; hcañ, ca, hcha, cha; hдрab; hдрad; stor; hдор; meli (hmeñi)-klu (hklu)-hcañ (hcha); kya-wa-ne, hkyañ-hwañe, hkya-wa-ñe; hдрab-hwa(hwah)-hrañ; hkya, kya; hko; hpañ; hdom (hgu, hguñu); hkoñu-meñe; rma; gre; hldyo, hldyohn, ldyo; hkyu-hldon; rgyñ, sli; hiti; hrwad; hbañ-prom; klag; hdzur; hwi-hwa; hram.

An identity of gdzu, gzu, hju, hdzu, hzu easily understood by reason of the pervading equivalence of the Prefixes g and h in the Nam text and of the very frequent confusion of dz and j in Tibetan script and pronunciation, and (slightly) surprising only by reason of the intrusion of z, which, as explained supra (p. 168), is very rare in Nam, is proved by the following parallels:

\[ \text{ste-gdzu-ge-lol, 194 = ste-he-hju-ge-geig, 356} \]

\[ \text{hrañ-hche-hju-ge, 115 = rañ-hche-hzu, 117} \]

\[ \text{hdzu-hdro-hphor, 183 = gzu-hdro-hphor, 353} \]

\(^1\) e.g. in the glah-hlad, ‘return for wages’, &c., ll. 232-7, and perhaps gla-hdzo=Tib. gla-mi, ‘hireling’, ll. 29, 62, 73.
In li. 115, 117 the hju, hzu is called hrañ-hche, which must be = Tib. rañ, 'self'+gces, ches, 'dear', 'important', 'believe', and clearly means 'self-willed', more especially as li. 117 continues:

hrañ-hkah-khar-gsom, 'the three towns talking at will'.

In li. 307 the 'wise' hglyan ('capable' hlkyan in li. 188) are said to be of gzu-hbyi race (hkyud = Tib. rgyud, as in li. 220 and elsewhere: see pp. 214, 258); and this fact alone would be decisive, since the hlkyan must be = rkyan, the 'wild ass' of Tibet. The 'self-willed character of the ass, hju, hzu, accounts probably for the word gzu-lum, 'lums, 'obstinate', 'rash', &c., in Tibetan, which does not seem to have preserved any other trace of the noun.

No more is needed to prove that gdzu, hdzu, gzu, hzu, hju are the original Nam forms of the word zu certified as Nam, and as meaning 'ass', by the Tibetan translator mentioned above (p. 132), in the name cho-pyi-cog-zu, 'Ass of the Meadow, Little Tiger', and occurring elsewhere as zu-tsog-zu, 'Ass, Meadow Ass'. But we can also see that gdzu-hbyi, gzu-hbyi, since hbyi will appear elsewhere = Hsi-hsia dbhi/hbhi/hbih, 'small' (Nevsky, No. 125; see infra, p. 265), is the genuine original form of cho-pyi, 'Little Tiger', so that gdzu, in gdzu-hbyi, properly means not 'ass' but 'tiger'.

We have here, it seems, the explanation of the whole matter. For the Nam text actually has hjuhu (li. 312) with the signification 'tiger', or, at least, some clawing beast; and this is, perhaps, the Chinese hu (Ancient, 'xuo, Karlgren, No. 87), or ù (Ancient ngiu, Karlgren, No. 1284), having that meaning. The resemblance of the Chinese loan-word to the native Nam word, zu, žu, ju, or dzu, for 'ass', inspired the Nam people with the notion of a resemblance between the two creatures. And this resemblance is actually stated in the text:

hrañ-hche-hju-ge-hcañ-htso-htsah, 115

'self-willed asses are equal to hcañ (ravenous beasts).'

The kiang, or Wild Ass, though of ass race, is 'wise'.

It is, however, possible that the word represented by the Tibetan writer's cho is not the word for 'tiger', hjuhu, but this same hcañ, which also appears as cha, hcha: cf. za/zo, &c., p. 199. Line 71

1 The tu-brab of one of the Tibetan Manuscripts, denoting some unlucky cast in divination, is perhaps a 'clawing tiger'.

hrañ-hche-hju-ge-hcañ-htso-htsah, 307 = lkyan-hzu-hrño-re-hna(hnañ)-hdro-mo, 188
gdzu-hbyi-hnañ-re, 305, 308, 311.
speaks of ‘glaring’ ḥcha, and in ll. 235, 239, 240, 242, of the ca or ḥchaḥ as requiring suppression in company with the yak; but ll. 202, 203 speak of its ‘horns’ (ḥru).

The word ḥcaḥ/chaḥ, which is really nothing but the Tibetan verb ḥchaḥ, ‘snap at’, ‘mangle’, together with two other terms, namely ḥdrab and ḥbrad, used in the Nam designations of certain animals, invites attention to a feature of such nomenclature. As mentioned above, the Tibetan names of objects are often merely verb-roots expressing some action or occurrence, the connexion being a human interest or utility. Thus ḥcaḥ can be a common designation of all animals which ‘mawl’, ḥdrab of all animals which ‘snatch’ (ḥbrab), and ḥbrad of those which ‘scratch’. European language is not innocent of such anthropocentric expressions, careless of nature’s species: thus under the English word ‘game’ a large variety of independently existing creatures is lumped together. Another Nam example of the same will present itself later (p. 256).

In ll. 161–3 three classes of creatures are grouped together as destined to be driven in flight (stor-ḥdor-yon = Tib. stor, ‘be lost’, ‘go astray’, cf. ḥthor, ḅtor, ṛtor, ‘be strewn, dispersed, &c.’+dor/ ḥdor, ‘throw out’, ‘cast out’, ‘forsake’, +yon, on which see p. 199):

\[ \text{ḥldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re-mehi-ḥcaḥ-yañ-stor-ḥdor-ḥyon} \]
\[ \text{kyu-ldon-rño-re-kya-wa-ne-yañ-stor-ḥdor-ḥyon} || \]
\[ \text{ḥldyo-ḥdom-nag-re-ḥdrab-ḥwa-ḥrañ-yañ-stor-ḥdor-ḥyon. ||} \]

In ll. 339–40 and 343–4 the first two reappear:

\[ \text{ḥkyu-ḥldon-ḥrño[-r[e]-ḥkyaḥ-ḥwa-ñe[-r[e]-ḥstor-ḥdehi-ḥphyid ||, 339–40} \]
\[ \text{ḥldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re-mehi-ḥklu-ḥcaḥ} \]
\[ \text{sroñ-ñe-gše-re-ldañ-[ḥdehi]-ḥphyid ||||, 343–4.} \]

In ll. 214–15, 218, the ḥkya-wa-ñe, similarly described as kyul-ḥldon-ḥrño, are said ḥtshu-to-ḥphān (‘had better come’?); and the ḥmehi-klu-ḥcaḥ, likewise described as ḥldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re, have the great ḥkho for their ḥkho (‘ruler’?). In l. 150 the latter are again stated to have fled (stor-ḥtah-ḥtoni ||).

In connexion with the last group of passages we find mention of the ḥbrad:

\[ \text{ḥbehi-tyañ-rdehe-ge-hstsah-ḥbrad-hrdaghi ||, 213–14} \]
‘flocks (rde, see p. 270) of sheep and tyañ repel (Tib. rdeg, “smite”) the ḥstsah-ḥbrad’ (for the sense, cf. the ldyo-stor . . . of l. 140, infra).
and these \textit{hbrad} appear as ‘braves’ (\textit{hpah}) in:
\begin{align*}
\text{hbrad-re-hpah-ya\-\-n-hman-ge-hrgam-hjihi} & || \\
\text{hbrad-re-hpah-ge-hbrad-sta-h\textsc{\^}{s}id-re-hyah-h\textsc{\^}{d}ahd} & ||,
\end{align*}

Here immediately follow the \textit{hdom-hgu} and the \textit{gdzu-hbyi}; and with the \textit{hdom-hgu\textsc{u}} we find the \textit{hju\textsc{\^}u-hbrad} in:
\begin{align*}
\text{hdom-hgu\textsc{u}-rma[-]}r[e]-hri-sta\-\-h-mehi} & \\
\text{hju\textsc{\^}u-hbrad-rma[-]}r[e]-g-\text{ri-sta-mehi},
\end{align*}

In ll. 171–3 the \textit{hldyo-hdom-hnag} of ll. 162 are said to have talked (\textit{hkohu-\textsc{\^}phrom-hto}) and then apparently to have been deprived of the ‘fire of speech’ (\textit{hkohu-mehe}); and they are no longer identified with the \textit{hbrad-hwah-hra\textsc{\^}n}, who in ll. 172–3 severally (\textit{hra\textsc{\^}n}) talked:
\begin{align*}
\text{hbrad-hwah-hra\textsc{\^}n-re-hkohu-phrom-hto}
\end{align*}

and whose ‘fire of speech’ was then \textit{h\textsc{\^}rab}.\textsuperscript{1}

To complete the story it has to be mentioned that:
\begin{align*}
\text{ldyo-stor-h\textsc{\$}thu-re-hbrad-stor-htoho} ||, 140
\end{align*}

‘the \textit{ldyo} being assembled in flight, the \textit{hbrad} flee’.

The \textit{hju\textsc{\^}u-hbrad} of ll. 312–13 have already been identified as ‘clawing tigers’; and in ll. 305–6 they are, we see, curtly mentioned as the \textit{hbrad}, ‘the clawers’, and their \textit{hbrad-sta}, ‘clawings’, are noted. Their \textit{rma}, which in ll. 312–13 render the mountains useless (\textit{g-ri-sta-mehi}), are therefore the wounds (Tib. \textit{rma}) which they inflict. The \textit{hdom-hgu} associated with them in this are obviously the bears (Tib. \textit{dom}, ‘tawny bear’), the \textit{gre} who in ll. 304–5 occur with the \textit{hdom-hgu} as ‘mountain-community-bears’ (\textit{hri\textsc{\^}hi-hrgam-gre}, Tib. \textit{gre}, ‘bear’). We can see then that the \textit{hldyo-hdom-nag} associated in ll. 162 with the \textit{hbrad-wa-hra\textsc{\^}n}, and distinguished from them in ll. 171–3, are another kind of bear, the black (Tib. \textit{nag}) bear. Since, with unmistakable punning, the ‘fire of speech’ is stated in the case of the \textit{hbrad-hwah-hra\textsc{\^}n}, ll. 172–3, to have been ‘snatched away’ (\textit{h\textsc{\^}rab}), whereas in the case of the \textit{hldyo-hdom-hnag} it was \textit{hldyo}, it follows that the \textit{hldyo} in the second case means some kind of ‘taking’ or ‘deprival’.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1} Tibetan \textit{\^}hrad exists as a by-form of \textit{hbrad}, ‘claw’, ‘be wrathful’, while \textit{hbrab} is ‘snatch’, ‘beat’, &c. Initial \textit{gr}, \textit{dr}, \textit{br} are liable to confusion in even early Tibetan (\textit{hgron/\textsc{\^}h\textsc{\$}ron, hgrul/\textsc{\^}h\textsc{\$}ul, hgrim/\textsc{\^}h\textsc{\$}rim, h\textsc{\$}rid/h\textsc{\$}rid}); and in the \textit{Nam} there is perhaps some confusion of \textit{\textsc{\^}hrab} (cf. \textit{brab}, supra p. 253) and \textit{brad}.

\textsuperscript{2} Concerning the great Tibetan bear, regarded as semi-human and intensely dreaded—being the ‘abominable’ (which should be ‘carnivorous’, \textit{gean-g\textsc{\$}an}) ‘snow-men’ of Himalayan explorers—reference may be made to Prejevalsky, \textit{Mongolia}, ii, 249–51, and Rockhill, \textit{The Land of the Lamas}, pp.
The *hkya-hwa-ñe* are regularly, we see, described as *hkyu-hldoon-hrño*, which can reasonably be understood as ‘capable (hrño) of making off (Tib. hdoń) with speed’ (Tib. dkyu, dkyus, ‘run a race’, ‘swift’). They will then be fugitive creatures; and this furnishes an explanation of their name. For *kya* in its other occurrences in the text is very probably = Tib. skya, ‘crop’, while *hwa* will very likely mean ‘making’ (cf. hdrab-hwa, ‘snatch-making’ and see *infra*, p. 337), and *ñe* has, as we have seen (p. 222), the signification ‘injuring’, ‘bad’. Thus the *hkya-hwa-ñe* will be ‘crop-making-injury’ creatures, i.e. antelopes and other fugitive species which make war upon agriculture.

We come now to the *mehi-hklu-hcah*, described as *hldyan-hpu-hbri*. The description, in which *hpu-hbri* may, as shown *supra* (p. 217), but need not, mean ‘male and female’, involves the very difficult word *hldyan* and may therefore be left for a later consideration (pp. 331–3). But *mehi-hklu* we already know (p. 131) as the name (*Mye-kru*) of a legendary person, who, as well as one of his daughters, was devoured by the demon Dgu-locgs, in another version *Go-ya-go*. That name is stated to mean ‘Eye-blind’, and in the Nam text *mehi* and *hklu* have been shown (p. 223, cf. p. 282) to have the corresponding significations. The person, whose daughter became the peacock ancestress of the Skyi people, was perhaps the legendary progenitor of their Nam kinsfolk. His name, ‘Blind Birds’ Head and King’ (*supra*, p. 131), and the story of his daughter, suggest that he was originally a bird, namely an owl; and this suggestion is confirmed by the name of the fiend, *Go*, which may very well be = Tib. go (Mo-so hio), ‘vulture’. The enemy of the owl, in Indian legend the crow, may in old Tibet have been the vulture. In the passage:

\[hldyan-hpu-hbri-re-hmehi-klu-hcah-dze-htor-hkho-ge-hkhohi||, 218,\]

following a description of the great yak as *hkho*, which word seems elsewhere to mean ‘chief’ or ‘leader’ (*infra*, p. 263), it seems likely that the meaning is that over (dze) the *hmehi-klu-hcah*, ‘the great *hkho* (= hgo, vultures) are *hkho* (chiefs)’. As regards the syllable *hcah* added to *hmehi-klu*, it has previously (*JRAS*. 1939, p. 207) been suggested that it may be the pluralizing *tsa*, &c., found in other connexions (see p. 187). But, since that *hcah* has not 116–17, 150–1, &c. Rockhill tells us (pp. 171–2) that ‘Bears are very numerous around the Yellow River, where they do not keep to the hill-sides, but are frequently met with on the plains’.
been found in the text as *tsa*, &c., it is now more likely that it is merely another instance of the *hcah* which means ‘mangle’, ‘tear’.

The connexion of the *mehi-hklu-hcah* with the Nam country may explain why in ll. 343–4 it is said of him that:

\[\text{sron-né-gse-re-ldañ-hdehi-hpyid}\]

‘being straightly (or straightly and evilly, *né*) wise, he suffices as an ally (? *ldañ-hdehi-hpyid*),’

whereas in ll. 339–40 the fugitive *hkyah-hwa-né* ‘suffices as flying (*hstor-hdehi-hphyid*)’, i.e. all he wants (or all that we want) is that he should get away, from the crops.

The word *hldyo*, attached to the black bear in the recurrent phrase *hldyo-hdom-nag* and identical, or punningly identified, with a *hldyo* meaning ‘take’, ‘deprive’, or the like, cannot, one would suppose, have much to do with the *ldyo* of l. 140 (quoted *supra*):

‘the *ldyo* being assembled in flight, the *hdrab* flee’:

the *hldyo-hdom-nag* are themselves *hdrab* (l. 162). In fact, the text itself in ll. 383–4 distinguishes a *ldyo-roho*, ‘*ldyo*-district’, from a *hldyo-hro*, ‘*hldyo*-district’. But what if *ldyo* = ‘cattle’? We then get the sense:

‘when the fleeing cattle close together, the wolves, &c., flee’

which is a well-certified occurrence, stated also in the ll. 213–14 *hbehi-tyan* . . . quoted *supra* (p. 253). In another passage:

\[\text{hdom-hgu-htsułu-hyañ-hmañ-hldyo-hrgam, 303–4}\]

‘though the bears come, cattle in numbers (*hmañ-hldyo*) form a community’.

But, if *ldyo* does not essentially mean ‘cattle’, but rather ‘milk’, secondarily ‘all animals used for milking’, we not only obtain a term analogous to the above *hdrab* and *hbrad*, but also understand the ‘taking’ and ‘depriving’: the ‘fire of speech’ was ‘snatched away’ (*hdrab*) from the *hdrab-hwah-hrañ*, but ‘milked out’ (*hldyo*) from the *hldyo-hdom-hnag*. That *ldyo*, in the form *ldyohu*, has, in fact, the meaning ‘milk’ may appear, it is hoped, later (pp. 326–8): the metaphorical application of the notion of ‘milking’ can be seen again in:

\[\text{hnu[-]r[e]-hnah-rgyen-na-hnu-hldo-hldyoho ||, 355}\]

‘absence of weeping (Tib. *nü*, *nur*) being put in order (‘arranged’ Tib. *yeñ* or ‘being attended to’, ‘moving softly’, Tib. *g-yeñ*), weeping was milked away’,

\[\text{hnu-htsułu-hyañ-hmañ-hldyo-hrgam, 303-4}\]
where ʰnᵘ and ʰⁿᵃʰ are already known, as also the Abstract Suffix ʰld⁰; and ḥgyᵉⁿ, with the required sense of ‘putting in order’, recurs in the next following verse.

The above may help to explain what were the creatures, ṡli and ḥrwᵃᵈ, which in the two cases respectively ‘milked’ and ‘snatched away’ the fire of speech:

sylvania-ḥna⁰[v]-ḥko⁰u-mᵉⁿ-ḥld⁰y  ||||, 171–2
ḥrwᵃᵈ-ḥbaⁿ-ᵣᵽᵺᵽᵻᵽ-yaⁿ-ḥko⁰u-mᵉ-ḥdra翀, 172–3

so that the ʰld⁰y-ʰd[o]-ʰnᵃ⁰ and ʰdra翀-ʰwᵃ⁰-ʰrᵃⁿ have remained speechless. The ḥrwᵃᵈ, who is ʰbaⁿ-ᵽᵺᵽᵻᵽ, i.e. ‘made powerful or master (Tib. ḥdbaⁿ),’ can readily be identified with Tib. ṛbaⁿ, ‘a large species of eagle’, more especially since the next following verse reads:

klag-ḥrwᵃᵈ-ʰdᶻᵘʳ-[ᵽᵽᵻᵽ]-⼦-ḥwi-ḥwᵉⁱ-ʰtsᵃᵍ, 173

where klag, which appears also in Tib. klag-ᵽᵽᵻᵽ, ‘clamour’, ‘noise’, is the name (glag) of ‘a bird resembling an eagle . . .: carries away kids and lambs. This bird is numerous in Mongolia, central Tibet, and Kham. Probably the lammergeyer.’ ṛbaⁿ itself means ‘harsh-voiced’ and is name of ‘a large species of eagle’. Thus the verse means:

‘while the screaming eagle, or lammergeyer, is away (Tib. ḥdᶻᵘʳ, ḥzᵘʳ, &c., ‘turn aside’, ‘a corner’, &c.), the mice or rats (Tib. byⁱ-bᵃ+ḥⁱ, on which see p. 191) collect.’

The mice or rats (ḥwi-wᵃ) can be seen again in ll. 201, 273.

It is therefore fairly certain in advance that the ṡli, who ‘milked’ the fire of speech from the bears, are some animal species. They cannot be the Tibetan sʳⁱ, ‘a species of devil or vampire’, because that word seems to occur in the text in the form sʳⁱ and in a dissimilar context. In l. 46 they are imagined or dreamed of, perhaps in the dark, by the ḥbebe, who may be sheep (p. 249). In the present passage they are ḥᵗⁱ-ʰʳⁿᵒ, ‘capable of, or acquainted with darkness or stopping (ḥᵗⁱ)’: in ll. 288, 318, they are ‘wise’; and in the former of these they have authority when the ḥʳᵉʰⁱ are accordant or pleased (ḥʳᵉʰⁱ) in supervision, whereas in the latter they ldyᵉⁿ or ldyᵒᵇ (reading not quite certain) when the ḥˡᵈᵉʰⁱ are ʰᵐᵉʳ (‘bad’ or ‘stupid’) or ʰᵐᵒ in supervision. If they were marmots, they would be taking a just revenge upon the bears, which feed upon them, but there is no philological support for this; if they were tortoises, that might explain their power of resting (ḥᵗⁱ), and the name might be connected with Hsi-hsia ʰⁱⁿ
and the cognates adduced by Dr. Laufer (No. 133). But philological evidence is wanting: since, however, the field of search is circumscribed, it seems likely that a decisive etymology will one day be found (srin, sri-bu, ‘worm’, ‘maggot’, ‘insect’, ‘vermin’?)

The Dictionary knows sri as ‘a kind of wild animal’.

22. rta, hrta, rtah, hrtah; hbron; rgyag, hcaq-rgyag; rdzo; hkyud; hkrug; -hgu; hldag/gldag-nag/gnag; hko-nag; hko, kho, ko, kho, kkho, hhkho, hgho, hgo, rgo, rgor; rño (hko°, hhko°, hku°); hkus; htoñ, gtoñ (hgo°, hrah°); hkah-hgo; rab; hrak, ra (skułu°, mēhi°, rgo°); hbar; rwer; hnam; hthun; hpañ; hphañ (g-ri°, hrihi°).

That rta and hbron are the horse and yak-bull respectively, the hero and villain of the composition, requires no proof: the names are identical with the Tibetan forms. The rdzo, who is the friend of the hbron:

htañ-hrdzo-hño[-]r[e]-htor-hbron-htsors, 219–20
thañ-rdzo-hkyud-na-hbron-hdru-hjar, 220

must be the mdzo, the cross between the yak-bull and the cow. We see that he is placed in the thañ, or the upland plains, and is described as a hkyud, which word, in the form hgyud, recurs, in company with hkrug (= Tib. hkkhrug, ‘quarrel’, ‘quarrelsome’, as in ll. 18, 371) in:

hkrug-hrdzo-hgyud-dze-hrño-hyod-yod, 16

and is equivalent to Tib. rgyud, ‘race’ (see supra, pp. 214, 252).

In ll. 225–8 the rdzo receives successively the depreciatory epithets (see p. 215) mor-hgu, mug-hgu, hbrī-hgu, in which the syllable hgu, occurring also with hdom, ‘bear’, in the above-cited passages, ll. 303, 304, 312, is, of course, = the Tibetan ‘Diminutive’ Suffix seen in khyi-gu, ‘puppy’, &c. It is possible that in ll. 225–8 the term rdzo is being contemptuously applied to the hbron, who is there the real, or main, object of denunciation.

Have we in the text any equivalent of Tib. g-yag/byag, ‘yak’? The most persuasive passage is that quoted on p. 139, where the yak, who is certainly meant, is not named unless the word rgyag is a Nam form of g-yag/byag, which on the analogy of rbyo = bya, ‘bird’, rdza = mdzah, ‘friend’, it might easily be. But in that case we should expect a recurrence of the word in the text, which has so much to do with the yak. The actual recurrences of the word rgyag are, in fact, not encouraging. For in ll. 89 (p. 321) the phrase gsom-rgyag-hsor must mean ‘the forming a thought.
lapsed’ with the Verb *rgyag*, idiomatic in Tibetan, meaning ‘cast’, ‘strike’, ‘found’, ‘put’, ‘form’, &c., a synonym of *hdebs*. Hence *don-rgyag* in the passage quoted on p. 139 will mean ‘form or make a purpose’. Again, in:

\[ \text{hcag-rgyag-hris=}=\text{Tib. bris/ris)-dze-ĥño-sto-ge-rdo-re-cis-tsha-hbyihi}, 83-4 \]


*hcag-rgyag* seems to be an equivalent of Tib. *chag-rgyag*, ‘doubt’, sc. ‘hesitation’. Accordingly in the preceding passage:

\[ \text{hcag-rt-e-hyu-rgyag-dze-hldas, 82-3} \]

the meaning will not be ‘went over to the yak’, but:

‘making (*rgyag*) alliance with the *hcak* party, deserted’

the *hcak* being the frequently mentioned ravenous animals and *rte* a miswriting, or alternative of *rde, hrde* (p. 270), cf. *rto* for *rdo*, ‘stone’.

Then in:

\[ \text{smu-hdzu-rgyag-dze-hldain-rmai-hrwehi ||, 27} \]

‘under the stroke (*rgyag*) of brimstone (? = Tib. *mu-zi*), the tombs of wooden posts were destroyed’

and

\[ \text{hde-hyim-sto-rgyag-rgu-hmyil-myil, 29} \]

‘prosperity being made (*rgyag*) to diminish, thieves lurked, lurked’ (?)

the same Verb *rgyag* may be recognized.

In a number of passages, ll. 129 (*gnaq*), 130, 132, 134, 135, there is mention of a *hldag-nag*, in l. 136 *gldag-nag*. Line 130:

\[ \text{hthañ-rdzo-hño[-]-r[e]-hldag-nag-htshors} \]

in comparison with ll. 219–20 (quoted above) establishes his identity with the *hbron*: and everything else that is said of the *hldag-nag* confirms the identification; his rise was due to the rise of the ‘Low Town’ and the fall of the ‘Mon-castle’ (ll. 128–9, 135–6) and the horse’s departure, just as was that of the *hbron*. Hence *hldag-nag* can have nothing to do with Tib. *ldag*, ‘lick’, or *nag* with Tib. *ñag*, ‘voice’ (which occurs elsewhere, ll. 104, 276, 278, in the text). It is = Tib. *ltaq*, ‘the back part of the neck’, ‘the upper or back part of anything’, with confusion of *lt- and ld-*, as not uncommon in Tibetan and in this particular word, as well as in others, exemplified in one of the Tibetan manuscripts. Else-
where in the text (ll. 45, 52) the same word hldag/gldag occurs with the meaning ‘load’ (Tib. ltan, perhaps etymologically connected with ltag). Thus hldag-nag (Tib. nag, ‘black’, as in hdom-nag, ‘black-bear’) means ‘black-back’, a designation highly appropriate to the yak.

A similar explanation applies to the expression hko-nag in:

hpu-hbos-hyah-ge-hdro-hko-hnag, 266–7

‘With the big man in front (at the head) go the hko-nag’.

For hko-nag will be the famous expression ‘black-head’, denoting the ‘common people’, especially (and perhaps originally) of China, and occurring in the form mgo-nag in a Tibetan text (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 279, = JRAS. 1931, p. 819).1 Hgo, = mgo, also, occurs in the manuscripts.


(a) mgo, ‘head’, has been recognized in hko-nag: see also (e).

(b) go/ko, the Particle, has been recognized (p. 201) in hlda-hko, l. 195, and is possible in hbri-hko, ll. 156, 202, 203, and the parallel hwi-hkho, l. 336.

(c) hko = go, ‘place’, ‘room’, is evident in:

hko-wehi-htuhu, 100, ‘assembled, making room’ by reason Tib. go-byed, ‘making room’. See also (e).

(d) hko = sgo, ‘gate’, is apparent in:

rog-hji-rdañ-ge-hko-hton-modhi, 211–12.

It is, however, only a miswriting, since hgo-gtoñ occurs in the next preceding line: see (e). The hko of hko-htar, ll. 68, 371, 373, 386, 390, may be the same as in hko-hton.

1 Applied to Tibetan common people, it may be seen in a document quoted by Mdlle Lalou, Inventaire—, p. 6, No. 16, f. 34; also in the Lha-sa stone inscriptions (ed. Waddell, JRAS. 1910, p. 1276, A, l. 10, and p. 1277, B, l. 13). In the Rgyal-roñ it is still in use (see Tafel, ii, pp. 227, 229).
(e) \( hgo = sgo ? \), 'gate', is apparent, though go, 'place' is not impossible, in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rgyed-htso-dro-ho, 'rgyed comes to the htso'} & \quad 105-6 \\
\text{-hgo-hdro, 'gate'} & \quad 105-6 \\
\text{-hkab-hdro, 'house'} & \quad 105-6 \\
\end{align*}
\]

\( \text{ḥdyān-hto-htoñ-ge-hgo-gtoñ-mod, 210-11} \)

'the high wall (?) being surrendered, the gate or place is surrendered' (\( htoñ/gtoñ = \text{Tib. 'send', 'admit', 'give up'}, sgo-nas-gtoñ-ba, 'admit through the door')

\( \text{phye-hgo-hthun-re-hnam-Nzam-htar, 145-6} \)

'when there is a small (Tib. thun) open space, the tame-hearted makes his escape (Tib. hṭhar).'

In the phrase \( hgo-gtoñ \) the meaning of \( gtoñ \) is guaranteed by the parallel \( hrah-htoñ, 'place surrendering', in ll. 146 (with 'army'), 273 (with 'enemy'), 358, na-rom-htoñ, 'leave vacant place', l. 100; while in ll. 119, 190, the sense of 'let go', 'emit', appears:

\( \text{hrah-htoñ-gsohu-dze-riie-ge-hgo ||, 358} \)

'When place-abandoners survive, the bad (cowards ?) are the means' (or, with \( hgo = 'head', 'with place-abandoning survivors the bad are leaders').

It is, however, conceivable that in these passages \( hgo \) is not actually \( = \text{Tib. sgo, 'gate', but is go, 'place', used in some rather special sense, 'home', 'station', or the like. We may also regard as doubtful:} \)

\( \text{rab-hgo-cig-dze, 376, 'when the approach to the ford (rab) is destroyed (?)'.} \)

The same sense, 'gate' or 'place', is apparent in ll. 46 (\( hgo hpo \), 261 (\( g-rub-hgo ho \), 369 (\( hgo-hdzin \): \( hkvāñ-hgo \), l. 212, is obscure (reading uncertain).

In \( hkah-hgo \), l. 105, though it occurs in the vicinity of a \( hgo \), 'gate', the Tibetan \( kha-bsgo \), 'advice', which suits the context, is in favour of Tib. \( bsgo \).

\( Hgo \), 'vulture', may with probability be recognized in:

\( \text{hsas-hdrah-hdag-chi-hgo-.hsor-re-hyun, 260} \)

'children with (\( hdag \), "possessed of") nets (Tib. dra) spent their time (yun) hunting (Tib. bsor, byehu-šor, "hunt-birds") vultures'

because the sport of catching vultures by means of nets is known in Tibet (d'Orléans, \textit{From Tonkin to India}, p. 228).
(f) rgo = Tib. sgo, the most normal equivalent, is certain in:
\[ \begin{align*}
 g\text{-}rah\text{-}hsah\text{-}hkheh & \mid \text{na} \mid \text{hnor}\text{-}hdzan\text{-}rgo\text{-}htoho \mid \\
 rgo\text{-}rah\text{-}hnor\text{-}[re]\text{-}hdzan\text{-}hyah\text{-}htoho & \mid, \ 314\text{-}15
\end{align*} \]

'In winning an enemy land (or In an enemy's winning the land) fool and wise man are the gate.'

'If the gate-ward is a fool, the wise man is antagonized.'

For here the idiomatic use of hrah, ra, 'enclosed place', as in Tib. sgo\text{-}ra\text{-}ba, 'door-keeper', 'door-guard', is guaranteed by the sgo\text{-}ra, sku\text{-}ra, 'door-guard', 'own person', of the Tibetan manuscripts, while the Nam text has probably sku\text{hu}\text{-}ra (1. 6) in the Tibetan sense and also mehi\text{-}ra, ll. 78, 186, 369, 'eye-horizon', in the sense of 'sentinel'.

The same rgo is probable in:
\[ \begin{align*}
 \text{htsog\text{-}hram\text{-}hnah\text{-}tse\text{-}htor\text{-}\text{si}\text{-}rgo} & \mid \mid, \ 120
\end{align*} \]

'When htsog\text{-}hram sickens, it is a great gate of death'

\[ \begin{align*}
 \text{se\text{-}rgo\text{-}hdom\text{-}dze\text{-}hpaah\text{-}hrgam\text{-}hnam} & \mid, \ 258\text{-}9
\end{align*} \]

'When the wise have their doors shut, the community of heroes declines (Tib. ñams)'

and clearly also in the antithesis:

\[ \begin{align*}
 \text{rgor} &= \text{Tib. ñgor) \ldots hbar} (= \text{Tib. bar) \ldots rwer, 96\text{-}7}
\end{align*} \]

'at the beginning \ldots in the middle \ldots at the end (?)'.

(g) An entirely different hko must be seen in the recurrent expression hko\text{-}rño (ll. 53\text{-}6, 272, 342), hkkho\text{-}rño (ll. 189, 267). The second syllable, corresponding to Tib. rño, 'be able', supplied in early times a very common expression rño\text{-}thog, 'capable', 'competent', which we should be prepared to find reflected in hko(hkkho)\text{-}rño. In that case the hko(hkkho) might be connected with Tib. hkkho/mkho, 'think, or be, of use, necessary', hkkhos, 'value', 'importance', 'necessity', 'usefulness'.

Outside the compound hko(hkkho)\text{-}rño the word rño is found:

(i) several times as a Subject, obviously meaning 'ability' or 'power' (ll. 16, 49, 368);

(ii) several times by itself as a Predicate, meaning 'able' or 'wise' (ll. 179, 188, 360) ?;

(iii) frequently as an Auxiliary with Verbs, stor\text{o}, l. 141; hwa\text{o}, 'make', 'do' ?, ll. 116, 269, 335; ldo\text{o}, hldo\text{o}, 'go', 'depart', ll. 161, 214, 369; hkg\text{o}, l. 189; hyog\text{o}, g\text{-}yog\text{o}, 'serve', 'help', ll. 156, 289, 322.

These facts would favour in hko(hkkho)\text{-}rño a verbal meaning of the
\(\text{hk}(\text{hk})\); and the Verb \(\text{hkho}\) in the sense of 'be of use' would be suitable.

It cannot, however, be said that that meaning of \(\text{hk}(\text{hk})\)-\(\text{r}\) is everywhere satisfactory. In:

- \(\text{rbyo-} \text{hk}-\text{r}-\text{dze}, 53, \text{'under a capable } \text{rbyo}'\) (cf. 56)
- \(\text{hk}-\text{r}-\text{ge-hco}, 55, \text{'the capable are leaders'}\)
- \(\text{hk}-\text{r}-\text{hyah-ge}, 272, \text{'with the capable in the van'}\)

that meaning might suffice. And in:

- \(\text{hk}-\text{r}-\text{he-}c\text{-dze}, 53-4, 54-5,\)

we might understand \(\text{hk}-\text{r}\) as a Noun, 'ability' ('of great ability'), or take the \(\text{he}\) adverbially = 'greatly'. But in some of these cases we might prefer the signification 'leader' or 'master', e.g. in:

- \(\text{stor-} \text{hkho-} \text{hr}-\text{re}, 189, \text{'when the master is lost'},\)

and in:

- \(\text{hk}-\text{r}-\text{kl}\text{-re}, 342, \text{'when the leader is blind'},\)

the rendering 'capable' would be contradictory.

If this is so, we can still work with the Tibetan \(\text{hkh}/\text{mkh}\), provided that we adopt the signification 'chief person or thing', which sense may have given rise to the expression \(\text{kho-na}\), 'only', 'exactly', 'the very', occurring in the famous Buddhist term \(\text{de-kho-na}\), 'essence', 'reality'. A \(\text{kho}\) signifying 'chief' is required in:

- \(\text{hkhar-} \text{hr}-\text{g-} \text{yar-re-stor-moni-} \text{hj}\text{-re} \text{re-hmon-} \text{hj}\text{-re-} \text{ldag-gnag-hkho} \text{ho} ||, 128-9\)
  'Low Town having become high, Moïn-castle lost,
  In all (?) the Moïn-castle the black-back is chief.'

And this is confirmed by the repetition of the word in ll. 215-18:

- \(\text{h}\text{tor-} \text{hbro-} \text{hkho} \ldots \text{h}\text{tor-} \text{hkho-ge-} \text{hkho}\text{hi}\)
  'The great Yak is chief . . . the great is chief'

since, as we have seen, the great Yak is identical with the 'black-back'.

Perhaps this sense of \(\text{hkh}\) accounts also for \(\text{hri-} \text{hkh}\), ll. 291, 295, 'hill-top', more especially as in ll. 290-1, it is contrasted with \(\text{g-ri-} \text{hpa}\), 'hill-bosom' (side), recurring in ll. 302 (\(\text{hrihi-} \text{hpha}\)), 308.¹

¹ (Cf. Tib. \(\text{ri-kha}\), p. 132, supra.)
The Nam Language

Hku-rño in g-we-hku-rño, l. 152, has been interpreted above (p. 228) as a different expression, containing a Verb hku, ‘desire’: cf. hkus, l. 352.

(h) Still a further hkoho, for which Tibetan supplies no etymology, occurs in l. 101, where it is equivalent to the very common hkokho/hkkhoku, ‘speak’, ‘speech’. It has been suggested (JRAS. 1939, p. 206, n. 1) that this is Chinese k’ou, ‘mouth’, ‘speech’ and this is strongly supported by the phrase htab-hkkhoku-hkkhoku, ll. 292, 295 (p. 298), ‘answer-speaking-speaking’, i.e. conversing, in which htab will be = Chinese ta (Ancient tap, Karlgren, No. 954), which in Tibetan script occurs many times as tab.

(i) In case the phrase hkkoho-hko-bphyag, l. 101, should signify ‘saluted (Tib. phyag, “salutation”) with a view to speaking’, the same hko would be possible in:

\[hsehe-hkoho \ (327, \ hkho-ho-hgyan-re-hlab-hkho-hgyan) ||, 325\]

‘harms as cause were the cause of telling (sc. the narrative)’ and the hkkoho-htaeh, l. 328, or hkkho-hdaeh, l. 329, which were ‘restrained’, or ‘damned’ (hdam), like the hse-htaeh, ‘injurings’, l. 326, might be ‘causings’ or ‘causers’. This might bring in the well-known Chinese word ko, ‘cause’; but perhaps we can work with Tib. hgo, ‘beginning’, hgyan being obscure.


23. hri, g-ri, hrihi, g-rihi; mehi-, ḡdoñ-, ḡrañ-, ḡswañ-, g-ri; ḡri-hño, ḡkho, ḡpañ (kphañ), ḡruñ, ḡgru; hto, tho; spo; hsehe; sti; hti; hyor; g-yog; gras, hgras, hras; hrde, rdehe; hwad; hci; tho-rgyam; hkuñ; hbu-ruye(rbye); ḡsañ-ma; hmar-hbab; hron; ḡkad-, ḡdzm-hbrōñ, ḡbo, hron; la, hlañ; la-po; gdag; ḡdzu; (2) hron, g-ron; hyes; ḡze; hsw, ḡswu; g-ri-ta; ḡtañ = ḡthañ; mu-hro; ḡna-hlam; glo-hrañ; rgyen; hřgyañ.

That hri/g-ri, = Tib. ri, ‘mountain’, is evident. It is natural that in a country of great mountain ranges the word should be frequently mentioned and distinctions should be made: thus, one of the Tibetan texts speaks of gtshug (gtsug)-ri, ‘peaked mountains’, gyud = rgyud, ‘ridges’, ri-riñ-po, ‘long or high mountains’, of dbye-che, ‘wide expanses’, ḡprañ-rub, (probably) ‘precipice ledges’, ri-bzur-te-bzur, ‘mountains winding, winding’, and so forth.
In the Nam text we have had śid(hśid)-hrihi(g-ri) 'high mountains' (ll. 34, 62), hbos-hrihi(g-ri), 'big mountains' (ll. 290, 291, 293), mañ-hri (hrihi, g-ri) 'large mountains' (ll. 302, 308, 309): in l. 168 occurs hbyi-hri, which ought to mean 'small (see p. 252) mountains', and probably does so mean. In:

ḥdohn-hri-ḥldyaṅ-ge-spo-hpod-pod
ḥraṅ-hri-ḥldyaṅ-[ge-]ḥsehe-ḥwad-ḥwad, 13–14

the ḥdohn-hri are contrasted with the ḥraṅ-hri, and the spo, which cannot be different from Tib. spo, 'summit of a mountain', with the ḥsehe, which likewise = Tib. rtse, 'top', 'peak', 'summit of a mountain', 'house-roof', &c. The ḥraṅ-hri are evidently the 'self (i.e. by themselves, solitary, single) mountains', since ḥraṅ = 'self', Tib. raṅ, pervades the text. The ḥdohn-hri are probably not the 'trench, hole, pit, crater (Tib. don) mountains', but rather the 'face (Tib. gdoṅ/mdoṅs), i.e. contoured, mountains', since the Tibetans shared the universal tendency to see faces, heads, &c., in mountain ridges.

The mehi-g-ri-ḥtah contrasted with śid-g-ri-ḥtor in:

mehi-g-ri-ḥtah-dze-rtah-ḥtsoṅ-ḥram, 35

is, no doubt, the 'border of the fire-mountain',! volcanoes being known in northern Tibet: and the fact that the horse's original capital is placed near a (heavenly ?) fire-mountain may explain the references to 'great heat' (dgu-ḥtor, dgu-ḥldo, ll. 78, 139, 191) in connexion with the fall of the 'Moṅ-castle' and the earthquake.

As regards the parts of mountains, the hri-ḥkho; 'mountain-top' (Tib. ri-kha) and hrihi(g-ri, &c.)-ḥpaṅ(ḥphaṅ), 'mountain's bosom or lap', have been mentioned supra (p. 263). The 'mountain's-horn' (g-ri-hruhu, l. 21, hrihi-hruhu, l. 293, Tib. ru 'horn') is an expression perhaps not found in Tibetan, though an 'Ox-horn' (Glaṅ-rū) mountain is known.

The passage (ll. 299–301):

ḥse-ḥse-hdohn-ḥcaṅ-g-ri-sti-ḥyor-re
ḥri-hňo-hdzoṅ-g-yog-re-rgyaṅ-ge-hrihi-sti-ḥyor-re ///
hrim-hldoḥu-ḥsaṅ-hyaṅ-hri-hgru-gras-re-hri-ḥci-ḥwadhi ///

mentions the g-ri(hrihi)-sti-ḥyor, the hri-hňo, and the hri-hgru. The ḥyor must be = Tib. yor, seen in tho-yor, 'pyramid of stones heaped up as a votive pile, a cairn' (tho meaning

1 It could, however, be 'eye(sc. sentinel-post)-mountain', the htsah-ḥri of ll. 290, 295, the ḥswaṅ-g-ri of l. 296: see p. 278 and l. 186 ḥldyaṅ-g-ri . . . mehi-ḥraḥ.
boundary’, cf. *mtshams-tho*), i.e. the oft-illustrated *obo* (Tib. *lab-rtse*, for *la-rtse*) of modern travellers. It might seem to follow that *sti* is the top of a pass or the like; but the meaning ‘rest’, found in Tib. *sti/bsti/*hti (stia-bahi-gnas, ‘resting-place’) and in the *hti* of the Nam text, is, no doubt, right, since such *obo* points are inevitable resting-places. In contrast we have the *hri-hno-hdzon-g-yog*, i.e. ‘the castle (hdon) below (g-yog) on the mountain side or slope (hno = Tib. *nos*’), whose walls, perhaps (*hrgyan = Tib. rgyan, ‘wall’), or which, stretching (Tib. rgyan), act as a rest-obo’. Then the *hri-hgru*, ‘mountain corners’ (Tib. *gru*, ‘corner’, ‘angle’), i.e. projecting points (cf. *gru-bzi*, ‘square’), or else ‘recesses’, being alined (*gras = hgras*, l. 10, ‘aligned in battle’, hras, l. 344, Tib. hgras, ‘difference between two parties’, gra, ‘proper order or arrangement’, dgra, ‘enemy’), ‘keep watch’ (*hwad*) upon those who come (hci = Tib. *mchi*, ‘come’, ‘go’, = Hsi-hsia *ge*, *gech*, Nevsky, No. 144, see pp. 269, 332) ‘to or on the mountain’.

The watch (*hwad = Tib. *hbad*, *hbod*) on the mountain heights is extended in l. 109 to the *tho-rgyam*, ‘boundary slabs’: in l. 6 it is, it seems, used metaphorically of fires (*mye-hyan-hwad*); and in a line quoted supra (*hsehe-hwad-hzcad*) of the summits themselves; nor is it to be doubted that in *hwad-hldan-kra*n (l. 268), on which see infra (pp. 288–90), an ethical watchfulness is signified. All this is the less open to doubt as in one of the Tibetan texts, in a passage treating of a protective supervision of a country by certain divinities, the phrase *brag-hwod*, ‘watching on the rocks’, has actually taken, or preserved, the Nam *w* for *b*.

A further expression, important for other applications, is seen in the line:

*dgu-hldo-htor-ge-hmañ-g-rihi-hkuiñ ||, 309*

‘With great heat, the large mountain is hollowed out or caves in’ (Tib. *khun*, ‘hole’, ‘pit’, ‘cavity’, e.g. in *sna-khun*, ‘nostril’, *brag-khun*, ‘clef in a rock’).

For the compound *brag-khun* has had in the Hsi-fan languages a considerable vitality. In the Rgya-ron it is, quite regularly, *pra-khi*, ‘cave’; 3 and in the dialects collected by the Vicomte d’Ollone

---

1 *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 274: 11, 361. 1, &c.
2 See Prejevalsky, i, pp. 76, 283 (Yule); Rockhill, p. 126, *Diary*, pp. 92–3; d’Orléans, op. cit., p. 255; Futterer, i, pp. 354, 366, 390, 402, 421; d’Ollone, pp. 225–6; Tafel, ii, Pl. lxx; Filchner, *Om Mani Padme Hum*, frontispiece.
3 *pra-kha*, ‘precipice’. 
it is tchra-tcho (No. 36), tcha-kon (No. 40), haguen (No. 41, Go-lok), huékí (No. 42, Go-lok), tchra, tcha, being stated to mean 'rock' (= Tib. brag). The word hkuñ is also used of a ruined 'Mon-building' (hrtṣig-mön) in l. 380, and then, l. 382, of friendship (ḥdzah-hldah), or friends, become 'hollow'. This metaphor is applied, moreover (l. 124), to hldañ-krañ.

Also connected with mountains are the ḭbu-rwyè-hce-rgyāñ of the passage:

\[
g\text{-yog-hšañ-ma-hpul-dze-hmar-hbab-ge-hrloho} ||
\]
\[
ḥbu-rwyè-hce-rgyāñ-dze-hłdyo-hṭor-ge-ḥnus ||, 15–16
\]

a passage immediately following the verses concerning the ḭdon-ḥri and ḭrañ-ḥri: in ll. 50–1 the passage, with the lines inverted and with ḥrab for hrloho, rbye for rwyè, and ḥtòr-ṭe-nus for Ḡtòr-ge-ḥnus, is repeated. Rwyè-hce, ṛbye-hce, can at once be identified with the ḭbye-cē of a Tibetan text, the additional ṛgyañ forming with cē a recurrent phrase = 'of great extent': the Tibetan ḭbye = 'plain', 'expanse', 'extent'. Then ḭbu will be = Tib. phu, 'the upper part (opposite of mdah) of a sloping valley', 'the higher ground', being the phu-dañ-dañ, 'up-vales rising, rising', of the Tibetan manuscript. The form ḭbu (elsewhere meaning 'head', and etymologically connected, no doubt, with phu), does not create a difficulty, seeing that in the Tibetan manuscripts we find a fair number of cases (byi, dog, gañ, &c.) of media in place of aspirate and some (pho, phu, &c.) of the converse.

With this ḭbu are contrasted the g-yog (Tib. yog/hog), 'below', of the accompanying verse; for this word is applied to a large valley, and, as we have seen (pp. 5–6), a portion of north-eastern Tibet was designated 'the Eight Yogs'. The fact that in the verse the g-yog are 'brimming with filth (Tib. gian-balbkan-ba: in the Berlin fragment ṣañ-ma)', sc. mud, and that they have ḥmar-hbab, 'cascades', is due to the world-cataclysm. Ḫrloho, ḡldyo-ḥṭor, and ḡnus may be reserved: likewise the expressions g-ri-hkruhu-hbro, l. 313 = ḥri-ḥkruhu-ḥbroho, l. 294, gyañ-g-ri-hjim, ll. 313–14, ḡstsah-ḥrihi, ll. 290, 294 (ḥri) = ḡscah-ḥyev-ḥri, ll. 296–7.

In l. 296, ḡswah-g-ri-ḥto-na, ḥto is probably = Tib. mtho, 'high' (see supra, p. 248), while ḡswah has a relation to ḡstsah/hscah, to be discussed infra (pp. 276 sqq.).

G-ri-ta, in l. 157, is entirely different and means 'payment', 'price' = Tib. ri-ba.

The word ḡroñ so patently = Tib. roñ, 'defile', 'gorge', on
which see pp. 5–6, that it is unnecessary to discuss the matter. But in:

\[ \text{ḥbañ-re-hko-ḥtar-dze-hna-ḥlam-glo-ḥrañ ||} \]
\[ \text{ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-ḥroñ-dze-ḥdam-to-ḥbu-ḥpor, 67–8} \]

we have two phrases, \text{ḥbañ-re-hko-ḥtar} and \text{ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-ḥroñ}, which both recur several times (ll. 371, 373, 384, 386, 388, 390), and in ll. 373–4:

\[ \text{ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-ḥroñ-re-ḥbañ-hko-ḥtar-dze-ḥkad-ḥroñ-re-rgyen} \]

are accompanied by a third phase, \text{ḥkad-ḥroñ-re-rgyen}, itself recurring in ll. 373, 375, 376, 377. It is natural to connect the phrase ‘tame-yak gorge’ with the story contained in the text; but this would be an error, as appears from the following facts: From Š. C. Das’s \text{Tibetan Dictionary} (s.v. \text{khun-tshag}) we learn that the Tibetans have phrases, \text{khun-tshag} and \text{ri-tshag}, denoting respectively ‘yak of the valley’ and ‘hill-yak belonging to the higher elevations and hill-tops of Tibet’. A ‘tame-yak gorge’ is therefore a general term for a kind of valley, namely one opening out into spaces where the tame yak is employed. The statement ‘each ḥkad gorge is uphill or steep’ (rgyen, cf. Tib. \text{gyen-du}, ‘uphill’, \text{gyen-gzar-po}, ‘steep ascent’, &c.) connects with Tib. gad, ‘rock’, \text{gad-pa}, ‘a precipitous cliff of conglomerate such as often walls in the mountain rivers’, ‘a wide crack in a conglomerate rock’, \text{gad-skyibs}, ‘a rock cavern’, \text{gad-rgyal}, ‘the walls of conglomerate rock through which mountain-torrents have cut their way’, \text{gad-phug}, ‘a cavern or cleft in a conglomerate rock’. A place near to Ḥgru-gu monastery in Amdo, by name \text{Ka-dron} (i.e. Kad-roñ) is mentioned in the \text{Geografia Tibet,} p. 54.

The expression ‘each ḥkad gorge is uphill’ (rgyen sometimes takes on the sense of ‘difficult’) shows that the Nam author prefers the lower valleys; and this accords with the statement \text{hna-ḥlam-glo-ḥrañ}, ‘the home path (Tib. lam) is spirit-joyous (Tib. rañ)’. It may help in the interpretation of \text{ḥbañ-re-hko-ḥtar-dze}, when we shall have decided between the possible meanings of \text{ḥbañ}.

With \text{ḥroñ}, ‘gorge’, ‘valley’, quite unconnected is the \text{g-roñ} of:

\[ \text{ḥde-me-ḥtañ-g-roñ-hyed-ge-ta, 71} \]

‘fires of prosperity, diffusing g-roñ.’

\text{Hyed, elsewhere, ll. 53, 393, used of emitting fire (me/sme), in the second instance a metaphorical ‘fire of hate’ (ḥṣañ-sme), here diffuses g-roñ, which may accordingly be = Tib. groñ, ‘cold’; and}
this will suit the context, since the ‘fires’ in question are failing. It is, however, conceivable that g-ron here = Tib. groń, ‘die’, ‘death’; the fires are ‘expiring’. Though in this passage ‘cold’ is more apposite, the signification ‘death’ is acceptable in:

ses-ḥmad-ḥdzwe-he-re-hpah-hroń-hkes, 36
‘when the wisdom-low ḡdzwe, the brave gain death.’

But even here the meaning ‘the brave are chilled’ is supported by:

ses-ḥmad-ḥdzwe-dze-myag-mye-ḥtañ ||, 39
‘when the wisdom-low ḡdzwe, the power of fire is rotted.’

The decision depends upon the unascertained signification of ḡdzwe, which, if = ḥtswe, is again antithetic to ‘fire’ in:

... mog (cloud)-ḥtswe-re-mye-ḥyań-hwad ||, 6.

If this ḡtswe could be connected with Hsi-hsia ḡdzu, tsu, ‘rain’ (Nevsky, No. 92) and the cognates adduced by Laufer (No. 123), we should obtain the apposite sense:

‘though clouds rain, the fire also watches’

which would also give point to the two passages with ḡdzwe. But the paronomasia would demand a second ḡtswe/ḥdzwe, which, if it meant ‘play’, ‘sport’, might be = Tib. ṛṭse/ṛṭsed, and, since in eastern Tibet ṭshe and ṭshi are indistinguishable in pronunciation from ḷhye and ḷhyi (cf. p. 299 and Jaeschke Berlin Academy Monatsbericht, 1865, p. 443), might also be = Hsi-hsia mkhhe /mkhwe, ‘play’ (Nevsky, No. 73). The same signification would suit the ṭshehu of l. 196 (p. 245).

Clearly antithetic to ḡroń, ‘gorge’, is the ḡlaḥ of:

hbo-ḥroń-hrog-re-ḥlaḥ-ḥkyāń-hras-re-ḥṣes-ḥṣi-ḥdzuhi ||, 344–5
‘the wooded gorge being a torrent (Tib. grog), the passes (ḥlaḥ) also lined by the enemy (on hras, ḡras, see p. 266), the wise evades1 (?) death.’

This ḡlaḥ is evidently = Tib. la, ‘pass’, and it is so spelled in the following line:

rgyeb-ḥchi-ḥro-re-gdag-yan-la-por-ḥṣes-ḥṣi-ḥdzuhi ||, 345.
‘if there is a place for going back, though the high pass is conspicuous (gdags) or occupied, the wise evades death.’

Here la-po = Tib. la-po (i.e. ṭpho), ‘a pass over a lofty mountain; also a high peak’. On gdags, ‘bright’, as applied to mountains,

see p. 6: but here the word may be connected rather with bdog, ‘possess’, ‘acquire’, bdag, ‘owner’, ‘possessor’, which sense may be found in other occurrences (pp. 242, 357) of gdag/hdag in the Nam text. The same hlah, ‘pass’, is perhaps to be seen in:

hlah-gsom-hram . . . lgyoho-ge-htañ-mu-hro ||, 10–11.

The reading is partly obscured in the manuscript, and the meaning of lgyoho is unknown.

The passage, ll. 301–14, is concerned, as has already appeared, with animal species occupying the mountains. It begins:

hrtah-swa-g-we[-]r[e]-g-ri-hrde-hldah ||, 301

‘While the horse is doing swa, the mountain is possessed of hrde.’

This hrde is likely to be identical with rdehe of:

hbehi-tyañ-rdehe-ge, 213

where hbehi is a word found elsewhere signifying ‘sheep’. If rdehe = ‘flock’, ‘troop’, it will be, in sense as well as in form, = Tib. sde, ‘class’, ‘community’, ‘race’, ‘tribe’ (sde-brgyad, ‘eight classes [of demons]’, &c.), Hsi-hsia gde, gdeh (Nevsky, No. 45).

The passage continues:

rné-ne-g-ri-dze-hldim-hphu-hmañ, 301

where hldim-hphu (cf. line 310 hldim-hmañ-hto, ‘hldim were many’) is problematic, as are also the hgah-hldon (mist? avalanche?), who are associated with hldim (disappearances?):

hgah-hldon-hrañ-re-hmañ-g-ri-hpañna
dgu-hldo-htor-ge-hmañ-g-rihi-hkun ||
hmu-wa-rño-ge-hgah-hldon-hkyud ||
hgah-hldon-hrañ-re-hldim-hmañ-hto ||, 308–11

‘The hgah-hldon’ being free (? hrañ, by themselves) on the bosom (Tib. phañ, pañ) of the big mountain,

With great heat, the big mountain is hollowed out (Tib. khun, ‘cave’, &c.):

Able to cause cold is the hgah-hldon race.

When the hgah-hldon are free, there are many hldim (?)’

After the hgah-hldon come the kkhu:

hrie-hldah-hro[-]re-hmañ-hkhu-stañ ||, 303

‘there being hostile wolves (hro?), the great kkhu (? = Tib. spyañ-ku (and ⁰kkhu ‘wolf’) are at the top.’

Then come the bears (hdom and hgre(gre)), the gzu-hbyi, ‘little tigers’ = asses, and the hglyañ (= lkyañ, the kiang), who are of
ass race (gzu-ḥbyi-ḥkyud). With reference to these hostile creatures severally it is stated (ll. 310–13) that, if they are on the mountain (hri/g-ri/g-riḥi), the mountain is (practically) ‘not there (sta(stah)-mehi)’.

24.  gñim, gñi, hñi; hñi, hñis; hñi-htor, ḥtsa; sñi; rñi; mog, hmog, gmog; ṛgya-hñi-ke, ṛḥgyaḥ-hñi-hke (ḥkehe); ṛḥgyaḥ, ṛḥgyah; ḡkor; ke, ġke; ġjo, ġjoḥo, ḡdzhoḥo; ḡlab; ġla, laḥ; ḡtah; ḡtog, ḡḥog; ḡchos; ḡdub; skar; μu; rmu. Gñim, probably meaning ‘day’ (Tib. ʾin) and conjoined with ḡti, = ‘darkness’, has already (p. 236) been noted. And this renders it probable that in:

ṛta-ḥso-hnah-yañ-gñi-ḥrdzum-doho ||, 80
gñi = Tib. ʾini-ma (sometimes gñi, ‘the sun’: ‘the sun smiled’, ḡrdzum); for the next verse states that ‘when a good (?) man perishes, an inferior man rises’ (supra, p. 227), and in ll. 81–2:

ḥṣaṅ-re-ḥṣig-dze-hmog-re-hldon,
‘when all hostility perishes, every cloud (ḥmog)1 departs.’ That hmog/hmog/gmog means ‘cloud’ is indicated by antithesis to ‘fire’ (mye) in:

... ṛmg-ḥtswe-re-ṭmye-hyañ-ḥwad ||, 6
‘fire watches’; and that meaning is apposite in the other occurrences of the word (ll. 52, 54, 55): very possibly it is somehow connected with Tib. rmugs, ‘fog’, ‘stupid’, &c., ‘Tangut’ ṛmūkha, ‘cloud’, ṛmug, ‘(mental) gloom’ (ṭi-ḥmug, yid-ḥmug, &c.), ṛmūn, ‘darkness’; and then also with ṛmog, ‘dark-colour’, and further with ṛṃoṅ, ‘be obscured’, ‘puzzled’, ṛṃoṅs, ‘deluded’, ‘delusion’: as a translation of Sanskrit megha, ‘cloud’, it is probably to be seen in the name of the ‘retreat ʾNam-Kan-mog’ (mahā-megha), in the ʾa-cu region, mentioned in Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 365, 367; and perhaps Lo-lo ʿmor, is the same word.

Accordingly in:

ḥmog-hcė-ṛgyaṅ-ṛgya-ḥñi-ke-hkor-[re-]ḥṣid, 52–3
‘Clouds of great extent perish (ḥṣid)—when the ṛgya-ḥñi-ke hkor’

we suspect that ḡñi has to do with the sun, more especially as in l. 199 we find the spelling ṛḥgyaḥ-ṛñi-ke. This expression, with

1 Hence we may neglect the possibility that ṛgni-ṛdzum means ‘had their eyes closed’ (Tib. ḡdzum = ḡdzum, ‘smile’) in sleep (Tib. ʾgnid)? In l. 263 (p. 283) ṛdzum is an epithet of ‘fire’.
further variants, hrgyah, hke, hkehe, is to be seen also in ll. 291, 295, 319. The Verb hhkor can evidently be = Tib. hhkor, 'go round', 'return', which, in fact, appears elsewhere in the text.

But the expression rgya-hii-ke, being a whole, might have other explanations; and the syllable hii might, for instance, be connected with Tib. gnis, nis, 'two', which we have found in the form sii. We might then see in the ke a suffix, akin perhaps to Tib. ka in gnis-ka, gnii-ga, 'the two', gsum-ka, 'the three', lhna-ka, 'all five', &c., cf. p. 241. This would yield a quite natural compound, 'the two rgyas', and perhaps the same ke may be seen in na-hke, 'the five' (?), l. 54: see p. 203. The numerous meanings of rgya in Tibetan ('seal', 'mark'; 'animal of the deer class'; 'net', 'trap'; 'extent', 'size', 'plain country'; 'Chinaman'; 'useful'; 'steel-yard'; 'beard'), some of them requiring particular suffixes, cannot prevent our inclining to the meaning 'plain', 'extent', which in Tibetan is the most familiar and which suits the phrase hrgyah-hdihi-htron-re, 'travelling to this plain country', in l. 327, hgyah-hnah-tsur, l. 391. This idea of 'plane surface' takes in the Tibetan phrase ni-zlahi-rgya-dkar, 'white planes of sun and moon', the sense of 'large orb', 'disk', which accordingly is given in the dictionaries. Instead, therefore, of denoting the sun in some connexion the word rgya-hii-ke denotes the sun and moon.

Who (apparently some living creatures) are the hii-htor of l. 187 is obscure: they are likely to be the htor-hii-htsa-ge, over whom the Great Yak becomes lord in:

htor-hii-htsa-ge-htor-hbroñ-hkho, 215–16

and probably not the tor-sii of the than fields:


sii/rui occurs in the Tibetan texts with the meaning 'net', 'trap', which is probably the meaning in l. 219, since l. 220 speaks of 'being caught in the toils' (hdruc-hjar, see p. 369). Further, the Tibetan manuscripts refer to Sii mountains in the Skyi country.

But a Verb hii, probably connected with ni-ma, 'sun', and meaning 'shine', may be seen in:

hjo-me-hdub-re-hlab-ma-hii, 67

'When the hjo fire sinks, the hlab does not shine'

1 In the Tibetan Manuscript hdub seems to be Preterite of hdu (usually 'be fatigued') in this sense, which usually is expressed by nub.
which seems to be directly contradicted by:

\[ \text{hjo-me-\text{hdub-re-hlab (possibly hla)-me-hnis ||, 70} } \]

'When the \text{hjo} fire sinks, the \text{hlab(hla)} fire is ablaze'

which contradiction may, however, be due to mistaken omission of the vowel-mark \( (e) \) over the \text{ma} of l. 67.

There is a strong temptation to find in the antithesis \text{hjo/hlab} a contrast between 'sun' and 'moon'. And, in fact, in the same general context we find a clear reference to the moon: in l. 73, repeated with a slight variation in ll. 75–6, we read:

\[ \text{hw}\text{a-ste-hge-dze-hla(l. 75 lah)-hram-hte || } \]

'with exhausted (\text{hw}\text{a-ste, see p. 337}) good fortune the moon
(and not the sun) accords'

and the rendering is confirmed by a reference to fire in the same context:

\[ \text{hde-me-htah-g-roň-hyyed-ge-ta-hwa-ste-htah ||, 71–2} \]

'the fires of prosperity, making cold emissions, are exhausted',

and because in l. 75 it is said that:

\[ \text{hw}\text{a-ste-hgehe-dze-dgu-htor-hbyi} \]

'with exhausted good fortune the great heat [becomes] small'.

Thus for 'moon' we have \text{hla, lah}; and \text{la} is, in fact, the most widely attested Tibeto-Burman form with that signification. In Tibetan zla-ba, indeed, the \text{ba} may not be the common suffix, since there are in the various languages, as has been noted by Dr. Laufer (No. 12), forms such as Lo-lo sla-ba, hlo-bo, &c., which may not be loan-words from Tibetan. But nothing would justify a monosyllabic \text{hlab}, for \text{hla-ba}, in Nam or the related languages; and the \text{hlab} of the text could be explained only as a scriptural miswriting, not indeed unparalleled in the manuscript, of \text{b} in place of \text{h} in a form \text{hlah}. Even so, it would be difficult to discover either in Tibeto-Burman or in Chinese (\text{jih}, in old Tibetan script \text{žir}) an etymology for a \text{hjo, jo, = 'sun'}. We must therefore seek a different antithesis.

With the signification 'chieftain' (Tib. \text{jo/co/gtso, &c.}) \text{hjo} is evident in:

\[ \text{myi-rgye-mye[-]r[e]-hchos-hyo-hjo, 153–4} \]

'if there is no great man, the initiator is the chief'

where \text{hchos}, which in ll. 158–9 also means 'beginning' (+\text{hyo}, 'manage', 'carry on', see p. 132), is the same word as \text{cho} of one of the Tibetan manuscripts, meaning both 'beginning' and 'chief-
tain': it may be itself connected etymologically with ħjo. The same ħjo, 'chief', is seen in:

hyaŋ-tiği-ħjo-dze-hyaŋ-ge-hgroms, 63–4
'under the good as chiefs the good flourish (hkroms)'
trog-ħjo-rne-dze-pyi-rjes-ne-hcer, 201–2
'under an evil enemy chief a memorial looks terrible to the good'

hphah-ma-raæ-ge-htsaħ-ħjo-ħdzin, 73–4
'substitutes (sc. children) for father and mother hold the chieftainship'.

Whether this is the meaning of ħjo in ll. 372, 387, 389, we may for the present leave undetermined.

But an antithesis 'chieftain' (or 'leader')/‘speaking' (hlab), though in some possible context it might be found to work, could not bear repetition as in:

hbaŋ-hrehe-hkhehe-hbaŋ-hre-ħgehe-na
jo-re-ħgehe-hlab-re-ħge, 251–2
'Every hbaŋ a gain, every hbaŋ a joy,'
Every jo a joy, every hlab a joy'
sta-baŋ-ṛpag-re-ħyah-me-bbyam-re
jo-me-ḥbyam-re-hlab-me-hbyam-na \(\|_{\circ}\), 252–3.
'There, every baŋ being made low, front (or face) fire mild (or abundant),
jo-fire mild, hlab-fire mild'.


'When ħjo comes, hlab-words (or 'hearing, Tib. ńañ ?) correspond (?), is mark (or example) (?) of ḥldyaŋ-country'.
(The only authority for ńañ = 'words', beyond its appropriateness with hlab, being Hsi-hsia niaŋ (Laufer, No. 167)).

Another certain signification of ħjo/hdzo is 'eat', corresponding to Tib. za, zos, bzaŋ, bzos.1 A Nam example of this in the form, perhaps Imperative, gzo will be quoted infra (pp. 334–5): the following may be added:

r̥ne-ħpo-hldo-ge-hkkehú-prom-ħjo, 177
'the fiend (or enemy) braves ate the ḥkkehú-making'
hr̥ne-ħpo-ŋne-ge-hkkohu-prom-ḥdzoħo, 361–2
'the wicked fiend (or enemy) braves ate the speaking'.

Here the forms ħjo and hdzoħo, occurring in two different state-

1 On Nam z/dz see infra, pp. 334–5.
ments of the same incident, are clearly identical (cf. p. 335), the alternation \( j/dz \) being frequent in all Tibetan writing and scripturally easy. The rendering ‘ate’ is justified not only by the previously (pp. 254, 256) discussed references to ‘milking out’ and ‘snatching’ the fire (sc. power) of speech, but also by the use of the kindred form \( dzah \) in:

\[
\text{hba}-\text{hldah}-\text{hne-ge-}hke\text{-me}-hdzah ||, 170
\]

‘good authorities eat the fire of \( hke\text{hu} \)’

which occurs in the context of the references to the ‘milking out’ and ‘snatching’ the fire of speech. What \( hke\text{hu} \) is may be considered later.

These examples do, indeed, substantiate the expression \( hlab\text{-me}, 'fire of speech', and in antithesis thereto a 'fire of eating’ (\( hjo\text{-me} \)) would be possible. But between ‘eating’ and ‘speaking’ the antithesis is not sufficiently natural for frequent recurrence, and in the passage ll. 385–6 it is quite unsatisfactory. What is really required as a contrast to the ‘fire of speech’ is the ‘fire of action’; and this is available, if we understand \( hjo/jo \) as equivalent to Tibetan \( bzo \), ‘make’, ‘manufacture’, ‘work’, ‘craft’, ‘fashion’. It is possible that in the form \( hjo\text{ho} \) this is to be found in:

\[
\text{na}-\text{htsah-ste(=} \text{htsas-te)-dze-hldyo-hthor-ge-}hnus-dze-g-rah-hyos-htag-ge-hjoho ||, 33-4
\]

‘On the harvested fields . . . the earthquake acted as a mill (Tib. \( hthag \))’
mills for grinding or threshing corn, perhaps worked by a rope (Tib. \( thag \), ‘rope’, \( thag-bzo \), ‘rope making’), having been known in Amdo in the eighth century A.D. (Tib. Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 40).

If, then, we can understand the \( hjo/jo \) in \( hjo/jo\text{-me} \) as meaning ‘action’, ‘work’, we obtain an antithesis between ‘fire of action’ and ‘fire of speech’ which seems adequate in all the passages. The same contrast between action and speech may be seen in l. 137:

\[
\text{hbr}\text{-re-}hrdyam-re-\text{hkha}-hldah-\text{hnahghi}
\]

\[
\text{hdzohu-ro-}\text{hldi-re-hjo}\text{hu} || hwa-hkah
\]

‘When females are restrained (\( hr\text{dyam} \), p. 350), talkers have voice:

This being a place for males, action is the talk.’

The word \( h\text{ba}n/\text{ba}n \), recurring in some of the above passages, requires a more particular consideration, see provisionally p. 346. In the present connexion it seems appropriate to take note of one or two other terms related to the heavens.
Skar, 'star' = Tib. skar-ma, Hörpa sgrē, Tākpa, kar-ma, Mānyak krah, Mo-so kho, ki, kiū, kö, and various forms in Lo-lo, does not seem to present difficulty. The sole occurrence of skar, (l. 191) rīam-skar, 'threatening, or alarming star', has been quoted, supra p. 244. The word mun, l. 33, is likewise a ἀπαξ εἰρήνευον: though it would naturally be compared to Tib. mun, 'darkness', the passage is not sufficiently clear for a decision.

A mu = 'sky', as equivalent to the widely evidenced mo/mon, of Hsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman generally (see supra, pp. 88, 98–9, and for Hsi-hsia mo, Laufer, No. 34), would be acceptable in Nam. It seems not to exist in Tibetan: mu-saṅs, 'sky', may mean 'pure boundary' and contain the word mu, 'boundary', 'limit', 'margin', and rmu-thag, 'rmu-rope', 'a rope by which the ancient kings and queens of Tibet were reputed to ascend to heaven', contains a rmu which might have some other explanation. The Nam text has:

\[
\text{hmu-hṛṇu-skhrud-dze-mor-hṭaṅ-[hgras]}, \text{9–10}
\]

'On the hmu, put to flight (Tib. skrūd) in pain, the evil power was arrayed'

and there is an antithesis to 'earth' (see infra, p. 329) which renders it probable that mu = 'sky'. Probably the same hmu recurs in l. 11, hmu-hro.

Nam rmu, again, has only two instances, in both of which, however, an equivalence to Tib. mu, 'boundary', 'limit', is probable: the instances are:

\[
\text{hṣaḥ-chad-rmu[-]ṛ[e]-ḥkohu-prom-g-yehe}
\]

'the earth having its boundaries fixed (chad), speech was distributed (?)'

\[
\text{ḥbyi-hṛi-hgaṅ-ge-chi-hrmu-hṛhor | re, 167–8}
\]

'all the little hills having boundaries for their going released'.

Cf. l. 353:

\[
\text{gzu-hṛdro-hṛhor-[re]-ḥchi-hdo-ḥḍyaṅ}
\]

'the ass, being released to go (hṛdro-hṛhor), started to depart'.

25. swaḥ, hswaḥ, swa; ṣ-g-ṛi, ṣ-hṛam, ṣ-hṛiāṅ; hṣaḥ, gsah; ṣ-hldah, ṣ-ḥtsaḥ; ṣ-g-ye(r) (hyer); hṛtsaḥ, hscāh, hyer; ṣ-hldah, ṣ-hri (hṛihi); ḡtsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ; ḡtsa-pho; gtsaṅ, ḡtsaṅ; ḡnom; hṛgu; gzo; r[e]hi, ḡlehi, ḡle, ḡlehe; tho; ṣ-ṛgyam; ḡjim, ḡdzom; ḡrim-re-hldohu.

The form swaḥ/swa is used in a number of clauses of the type:

\[
\text{hṛtaḥ-swaḥ-g-we[-]ṛ[e]}, \text{164, 301 = rtah-hṣwaḥ-g-w[ehe], 298,}
\]
where the subject is the horse, and the verb is sometimes, as we see, \textit{g-we}, ‘make’, ‘do’, while elsewhere it is \textit{hkom/gkom} (ll. 175/222), \textit{hldi}[r] (l. 174), \textit{hphyegs/hpeg} (ll. 176, 360): \textit{mor}, not a verb, but probably = ‘bad’, occurs in l. 173, and in l. 359 has perhaps been lost through the defect in the manuscript. There can be no doubt that in all these cases \textit{swah/swa}, has the same meaning. It cannot be \textit{swa}, the most usual Tibeto-Burman equivalent of Tib. \textit{so}, ‘tooth’, which does, however, occur in the Nam text as \textit{swa}: that would not accord with the verbs \textit{g-we}, \textit{hkom}, ‘make’, ‘do’, ‘accomplish’. The same consideration excludes \textit{sa/swa}, ‘stag’, \textit{sa/swa}, ‘blood’, \textit{rtswa}, ‘grass’, \textit{tshwa}, ‘salt’; \textit{sbah/dbah/hbah/dbas/sbas}, ‘magician’; \textit{so}, ‘earth’, ‘place’ (in some connexions); and we can think only of \textit{so/gso/gson}, ‘live’, ‘nourish’, &c., \textit{sos(-ka)} ‘heat’, \textit{so}, ‘comfort’—all these being perhaps etymologically identical—and \textit{so}, ‘watch’, ‘spy’, with which \textit{so} in \textit{so-mtshams}, ‘boundary’, i.e. ‘watch-border’, and in \textit{so-kha}, ‘frontier guard and toll-station’, is similarly identical. In favour of the last is the fact that \textit{so-kha} is actually recorded (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 275, No. 9) in the form \textit{swa}. This meaning harmonizes, further, with the Predicate \textit{hram}, ‘agreeing’ or ‘united (in)’, l. 288, and with \textit{mor}, ‘bad (in)’, and \textit{hrsañ}, ‘stern’, or ‘violent’, which in ll. 318–21, in the same context with \textit{mor}, is applied to \textit{swah}.

It is therefore to be understood that the horse, after his retreat to the \textit{hgam}, was employed in the service of a man, viz. the \textit{hbos} (supra, p. 231), as ‘watch’, ‘guardian’, ‘police’: and this is, indeed, certain, being stated also in another form. In:

\begin{verbatim}
hrtañ-swah-g-we[-r][e]-hbos-hsah-hldah
hbos-hnom-hsah-gtsañ-hrgu-ma-gzo ||, 164–5
\end{verbatim}

‘The horse keeping guard, the master is (really) landowner’:

‘The crops of the land enjoyed by the master thieves do (or shall) not eat’.


\(^1\) Cf. l. 378, \textit{hsah-htsañ}?
Elsewhere the horse is said to be *hsah-g-yer*, ‘awake (Tib., &c., yer, “not asleep”, g-yer-po, “expert”, “wise”)\(^1\) on the land:

\[\text{rta-hsa-g-yer-dze, } 330 = \text{rta-hsah-g-yer-ge, } 346\]

which expression is elsewhere (ll. 141, 267) used in evidently the same sense, but without reference to the horse. This imports also another term, since in l. 250 the expression is *hstsah-hyer*, not really different (*ts* and *c* being constantly confused in manuscripts) from the *hsc ah-hyer* of l. 250 (applied to the horse) and ll. 296–7: in l. 298:

\[\text{rta-hswah-g-wehe-hbos-hstsah-hldah}\]

the *hbos* is no longer *hsah-hldah*, ‘landowner’, but *hstsah-owner*.

Unfortunately, *hstsah* also is ambiguous. Shall we understand that the *hbos* ‘has his watch(man)’ (Tib. *btsa, btsas, ‘watch’, ‘scrutinize’, a verb well known in Central Asia)\(^2\) or ‘has his harvest’ (Tib. *btsah-ma, rtsas-ma, btsas-ma*)? We clearly cannot understand ‘his offspring’ (Tib. *btsas*) or ‘his wages’ (Tib. *btsas*). It seems that the meaning ‘watch’ has strong support; for in ll. 290, 295, we have the *hstsah-hri* (*hrihi*), which must be equivalent to the *hswah-g-ri*, ‘watch mountain’ of l. 296 and the *htsa-pho* of l. 291 (see infra, p. 279), and at the same time proves that the *hstsah-hya-h-hthan* of l. 288 contains the same *hstsah*. Provisionally also it is probable that the same *hstsah* is to be seen in *hyu-hstsah-kym* (*hkyim*), ll. 345, 350, 351. A doubt remains in regard to *hstsah-hbrad-hrdag*, ll. 213–14, where ‘smite’ (Tib. *rdeg*) ‘harvest-snatchers’ is more likely.

Who then are the *hrlehi*, whose *hswah-hram*, ‘accord in watching’, is mentioned in l. 288, and who can scarcely be other than the *hldehi* of ll. 318–21, whose *hswah*, ‘watch’, may be *hmor*, ‘bad’ (l. 318), or *hrsahn*, ‘stern’, ‘violent’, ll. 319, 320, 321. These *hldehi* are, no doubt, the *hlde, hldehe of*:

\[\text{hlde-ge-hgru-ma-ramaň, } 77, \text{‘the hlde dreamed of hgru-ma’}\]
\[\text{hlde(hldehe)-ge-hthah-hldon, } 370, 371, 372, \text{‘let hlde (prosperities ?) return’}\]

A word *lde*, meaning (a) ‘treasury’, ‘storehouse’, (b) ‘warm oneself’, ‘be warmed’, appears in the dictionaries; and also *Lde*, ‘a

\(^{1}\) This *yer, g-yer*, perhaps preserved in Hörpa t\-ra-\-yen, ‘wake’, is probably an extension of *ye*, ‘alert’, in *ye-myig*, ‘alert-eye’ and *ye-\-kse*, ‘alert-knowledge’.

\(^{2}\) *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 223-13, 251. B 1, &c. One of the Tibetan MSS. has this word with the *r*- Prefix, *rtsas*. 
prefixed tribal title which some of the early kings of Tibet had assumed’. The late Professor A. H. Francke, who translates (Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, p. 80) ‘the Eight Lde (beauties, lde/rde/bde) of the earth’, expressed the opinion that lde, as found alternating with bde, in the names of late kings in western Tibet, was ‘only a dialectical form of the word Bde, ‘blessing, happiness’. While attached to the names of prehistoric rulers in Tibet, it was not neglected by their historical successors of the seventh to eighth centuries, Khri-lde Gtsug-btman, Khri-sroñ Lde-btman, &c., including Khri-lde Sroñ-btman, = Sroñ-btman Sgam-po, himself. It is, therefore, a very ancient designation, to be compared, perhaps, with Śrī, ‘beauty’, ‘prosperity’, in Indian names, and to analogous terms in other Oriental spheres: conceivably it is, in fact, connected with lde, ‘be warm, warmed’. The same word may with probability be seen in Hsi-hsia ldeh/ldeh/lde, ‘kingdom’, ‘futurity’, ‘power’, ‘ought’ (Nevsky, Nos. 11, 133) = lī (Laufer, No. 139), certified as meaning ‘rich and of high rank’ and occurring in an official title, weila.1

Accordingly, the lde who supervise may be the ‘powers’ generally. In l. 288 the rlehi associated, with the hyaṅ, ‘good’, mor, ‘bad’, ḥkru, ‘commons’, rta, ‘horse’, and in antithesis to the sli, are likely to be mortal, if not actually human, beings: and in ll. 318–21 the same is probably the case with the hldehi, who are stated to have appointed a ‘Thousand-[district-]commander’ (ston-hpon, on which see p. 234), unless the expression is metaphorical. But it is also said (l. 319) that the rgya-hni-hke are the ‘hldehi of stern watch’ (swah-rsāṅ), and in l. 295 they are said to meet (ḥdzom) on every ‘watch-height’, htsa-phor[e] (cf. la-po, p. 269): in accordance with what has been elicited above this can only mean that the supervisors of all things are the sun and moon. In the passage, l. 319, mention is made of their circling all round (krim-re-hldohu); and the expression ‘beneath the hrgya-hni-hke’ (hrgya-hni-hke-g-yog) reminds us of the Tibetan ǔi-hog, ‘below the sun’ or ‘sun below’, concerning which there is sometimes a doubt whether it means ‘western countries’ or ‘countries’ generally (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 21, n. 2). The outcome seems to be that the rlehi/hldehi/lde, are the ‘authorities’, ‘powers’, or ‘blessednesses’, and sometimes comprise mundane, sometimes superior, powers.

1 Perhaps the same lde may be seen in the lie of Menia ya-lie, ‘good’, am-lie, ‘bad’.
The expression tho-rgyam in:

tho-rgyam-ge-hwad-re, 109, ‘watching the boundaries’
must correspond to the repeated mtshams-tho-phyag-rgya-can, (or rgya-can), ‘boundary with a hand-mark (or seal)’, of Central-Asian Tibetan (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 129-40, 274, 361-5). But, since there is no special reason for identifying a rgyam with rgya (outside their equivalence in rgyam(lgyam)-tshwa = rgya°, ‘a kind of rock salt’), it is prudent to see in rgyam a connexion with g-yam, ‘slab of stone’, ‘roof-slate’, and gyam, ‘a shelter, recess in a rock’, and to think of a stone slab as a boundary mark. Who are the Hjim-li-li and Pa-la-la, who are in l. 109 to keep the watch, is not apparent.1 There may be some connexion with:

gyañ-g-ri-hjim-hño-hkhog-re-hphah ||, 313-14.

A different tho applied in l. 132 to the ‘black-back’ and in l. 374 (htho) to hpah-hwe, ‘brave deeds (doers)’ is, no doubt = Tib. mtho, ‘high’: and the same has been suspected (p. 248) in regard to hdyan-hto, l. 210, g-ri-hto, l. 296, phyañ-hto, l. 374.

In l. 42, where the horse is not in question:

hsah-htsah-hdzan-dze-hklom-ge-htul, ‘under wise hsah-htsah the hklom2 are restrained’
it seems that hsah-htsah, repeated in l. 44 as htsah-htsah, must be understood as hsah-htsah, ‘land-watching’. There is no difficulty in this; for—to overlook the confusion shown in the variation of the phrase—the s in stsah, like the b and r in the Tibetan equivalents, is a Prefix, and the b was originally, no doubt, attached only

1 Since in l. 156 mention is made of collection of hjim-ta serviceable for wounds:

rma-g-yog-rho-ge-hjim-ta-hthus
and since Tib. hjīn is ‘a mineral substance rubbed on old sores’ and hjim is ‘mud’, ‘clay’, it is likely that hjim here refers to the old and inveterate Ch’iang practice of collecting in the mountains herbs and mineral drugs, which are used and sold to the Chinese (see Rockhill, p. 132; Edgar, p. 65; Fergusson, p. 231 (photograph); Tafel, ii, pp. 248-9): a habit inherited by the Lamas (Huc and Gabet, ii, pp. 93-5). In Sanskrit also the Himālaya is traditionally the home of drugs. This may explain the phrase g-ri-hjim, ‘mountain medicaments’.


2 Perhaps some kind of superhuman creatures, since one of the Tibetan manuscripts speaks of a ‘klum god’ and a ‘klum fiend’.
to the Aoristic form btsas. There may well have been an original non-Aoristic form htsa, represented by the Nam htsah (perhaps also by Tib. tsha-kha, ‘target’). Without mention of hsah, ‘land’, we have in l. 268:

htsah-hdzan-hya-he-hwah-ne-hbrah ||

‘With wise supervisors above good work (?) flourishes’
(cf. p. 339).

Hsah = ‘land’, recurs in l. 314, and perhaps in l. 41. The form gsah is seen in l. 333 gsah-rkah, ‘steep land’, and in:

gsah-re-htsah-re-hrah-ge-hldohu-hjam-rño ||, 276-7

‘[in] the places, both lands (estates) and crops (Tib. btsa, ‘harvest’), were mild-minded groups (?)’.

Concerning hldohu, see pp. 322–3, and cf. hwah-hrño-hjam, p. 339.

26. hme, me, sme; mye; mehi, hmehi; rmc; gseq, hseq; hgyi; hcañ, cañ, chañ; sme, ordzum; se-, gse-, hrño-, cañ (hcañ); hpuhi, hphuhi; hphu-hklo, pu-glo (klo); hdram; hmu; rgyeb; hdro; hkus; hmar-mè; hkah; gte.

It is unnecessary to prove that me, hme (in l. 171 hmehe), already noted in so many instances, means ‘fire’ = Tib. me, &c., &c. But it may be added that it never appears to mean anything else, except in:

htsog-hram-hme-dze-htor-htas-hproms, 121–2

in which hme will be shown infra (p. 292) to signify ‘is not’, Mye, which in Tibetan orthography of the period would be the regular writing of me, is used in a number of clear instances (ll. 6, 39, 102, 195, 197 (hmye), 357) to signify likewise ‘fire’; and the only frequent examples to the contrary (ll. 129, 153, 241, 365, 366) are of the type smyi-hnu-mye-re, l. 241, already quoted as meaning ‘if man’s power is not’. The negative hme/mye occurs only as a verb, equivalent to Tib. med, ‘is not’, ‘is non-existent’: it is not used in the sense of ‘-less’, as is Tib. med in stobs-med, ‘strengthless’, and the like.

To the occurrences of mye, ‘is not’, we must add the instances (ll. 129, 153, 365, 366) where in accordance with what has been stated above (pp. 174 sqq.) myer, occupying the caesura position and functioning as a disyllable, has to be read as mye-re. There is no otherwise occurring myer.

The form mehi/hmehi, on the other hand, normally means ‘eye’, e.g. in the designation mehi(hmehi)-klu-hcañ, in mehi-ra,
The i in Hsi-hsia mei, 'eye', has been noted by Laufer (No. 53). In a number of cases, however, exemplified by:

\[ \text{dgu-ḥldo-ḥtor-ge-su-me-ḥmehi} \]
\[ \text{ḥrah-we-rtah-ge-so-ḥnah-ḥmehi} ||, \text{114–15} \]

'With great heat who kindles fire?'

'The horse giving place, the so-ḥnah is non-existent'

we see that, in combination with the sentence terminating hi, mehi can represent either me, 'fire', or me, 'is not'. The latter recurs in ll. 156, 311, 312, 313; the former, which is, as we see, a casual experiment ('fires fire'), does not seem to recur; but it is well paralleled by Ḥmuḥi in me-ḥmuḥi, 'cools fire' (l. 183).

It becomes therefore a question whether mehi, 'eye', does not similarly contain the enclitic hi discussed supra (pp. 190–2); and the answer seems to be that it does. Putting aside, as inconclusive, the cases (ll. 25, 185, 186) where the mehi/ḥmehi, is final in its clause, we find only compounds mehi-ra(ḥrah) ll. 78, 186, 369, ḡ-ri, l. 35, ḡspa, ḡspehi, ll. 151, 370, ḡcha, l. 352, ḡhpa, l. 272, ḡklu-ḥcha (ḥcaḥ), ll. 150, 161, 218, 343, and

\[ \text{mehi-ḥgab-ḥldo-ge, 155, 'with eyes covered up'} \].

There does not seem to be reason for distinguishing these from other cases, such as Ḥrah-hwehi (and Ḥwe)-ḥrtah, where we have supposed (pp. 190–2) the presence of an enclitic hi. What seems to be decisive here is the fact that there appears to be a certain instance of mye (i.e. me), 'eye', which form is in fact, that attributed in the Tibetan manuscripts (supra, p. 131) to the Nam language (Mye-kru). The instance is mye-hpehi, l. 212, which probably means 'eye-sparkle' or 'eye-ornament' (see p. 356) and to be not different from the mehi-spa, ḡspehi, of ll. 151, 370, and perhaps the hmehi-hpah of l. 272: in l. 211, re-mye-hpahi, the meaning 'fire' is not impossible. It must, however, be admitted that an independent instance of mehi conversely meaning 'fire' is not apparent, unless mehi-cha, l. 352, should happen to be = Tib. me-cha, 'flint'.

Sme usually occurs in relation to me, 'fire'. In ll. 282, 283–4 we have:

\[ \text{ḥseg-sme-ge-ḥrim-ḥdzom} \]

which seems to mean 'meeting lines' (sc. circles) of burning fires (sc. torches?)', with sme = 'fire' and ḥseg. The word ḥseg, again, raises difficulty. There is a phonological objection to its equivalence to Tib. sreg, 'burn', which meaning is most appropriate
Here and in 1.159. In 1.181 we have acquiesced (p. 155-6) in an equation to Tib. gsêgs, 'go', which in 1.330 might also suit gsêg/hêség; but, unless the compound gsêg-sme has some special sense, that will not serve in regard to hêség-sme here. This point must therefore be left obscure. Other occurrences of sme reinforce the notion of fire, thus:

dgu-hldo-htor-re-hra-we-rtah
rgyed-hrañ-sme-re-hkhar-hgyi-ñes |], 191-2
'The heat being great, the horse gave place:
Rgyed being itself a fire, the town's power (?) was destroyed'.
hrgyed-hsâñ-sme-hyed-re, 393, 'emitting a hate-fire of rgyed'.

An occurrence in 1.342 is affected by a doubtful reading in the verse (mye probably for rgyed).
Sme differs, perhaps, from me by containing a verbal notion, 'a blaze'. This appears clearly in:
gsas-pahi-hdzo-hdza-cañ-sme-hme-hkehi ||
g-rah-nag-hbo-gyañ-chañ-rdzum-me-g-wehi ||, 262-3
'children as good as their fathers (or as braves) gained an all-burning fire'

'. . . . made an all-smiling fire'.

Here the expressions cañ-sme, chañ-rdzum, correspond to the Tibetan cañ-rig, cañ-šes, 'all wise', 'all knowing'. We might connect cañ with cañ-s-po, 'clever', gcañ-po 'clever'; and this is, no doubt, correct, but not directly. It is probable that cañ = bcañ, 'comprising', 'comprehensive' (bcañ-rgya, 'extensive comprehension' or 'comprehensive extent'), which is really the aorist of the Verb hchañ, bcañ, bcañs, 'hold'. The Verb appears in close vicinity in:

hsas-hnah-hdag-chi-phyer-chañ-hson ||, 260-1
'children who had sickness were tended (hson = Tib. gson),
being supported-held (chañ).

The signification 'clever' appears in cases where cañ is not the first member of its compound, in:

rgyed-hsâñ-rgam-cañ, 36, 'disunity clever in secretly entering company' (p. 244)

and in 1.91 śe-chañ, 'clever in wisdom', 1.48 gse-hcañ, 'clever in harm', 1.49, hrñö-hcañ, 'clever in power', though here the sense

1 hgyi recurs in l. 346 with hyu, perhaps = Tib. yul, 'country', 'village'. Is it = Hsi-hsia hgi, 'strength' (Novsky, no. 118)? or is it connected with Tib. bgyid and so means 'business'? or = Chinese i (Jap. gi, Karlg., 204)?
of 'holding' would suffice. Very possibly the force of the word in
*do-ldo-hdzo-chai*, l. 76, *hpus-hphya-myi-cai*, l. 298, *hse-hse-hldon-
*hcain*, l. 299, is similar. On *cai*, 'city', ll. 118, 210, see supra, p. 245.

*Rme* is a quite different word. It is used only in the repeated
(ll. 124, 232, 337, 340, 342) phrase *htor-hrta-rme-ge*, always asso-
ciated with something undesirable, as in:

*htor-hrta-rme-ge-hso-hnah-stor ||*, 231–2

'the great horse being *rme*, the *hso-hnah* is lost'.

The restriction to the particular phrase excludes an understanding
of *rme* as = *me*, 'is non-existent'; but *rme* would be a regular
equivalent of Tib. *rne*, 'spot', 'blemish', physical or moral, which
in one of the Tibetan manuscripts and elsewhere is spelled *dme*
(*dmer-hgyur*, 'becomes spoiled', used of flesh corrupting);¹ and it
may express the loss of prestige to the horse due to his desertion
of his capital (unless it should be that, contrary to what we else-
where understand, the horse had been killed by the yak, as in the
Tibetan account, and had literally become carrion). We cannot
take the Nam *sme* (supra) for a divergent form of this *rme*; yet, on
the other hand, the Tibetan has a *sme* (in *sme-khab* = a particular
under-garment, and elsewhere), equivalent to its *rme*, *dme*.

The word for 'fire' with *s*-Prefix seems to occur in a Tibetan
document (*Tib. Literary Texts*, &c., ii, p. 397: A 4), but has not
elsewhere been found, unless Mānyak *sa-meh* is an instance.

In l. 40 we read:

*hp hu-hklo-hsad-dze-hnah-me-hmyi ||*

'if the *hphu-hklo* be destroyed, the place (or house ?) has no
fire'.

Here we must necessarily think of Tib. *hbud*, *phu*, *phus*, *dbu*,
'blow', *me-phu*, 'blow the fire', *hbud-hdun*, 'trumpet', also
'bellows', more especially as that *phu* occurs in the Central-Asian
Documents (vol. ii, p. 224). In fact, the *hphu-hklo* must signify
'bellows', modern Tibetan *sbud-pa*. An Amdoan form of this
implement is described by Rockhill in his *Diary* (p. 11), and others
are illustrated in a plate facing p. 96, and Filchner, *Das Rätsel* . . .,
Pl. 44, while in regard to Tibet generally reference may be made to
*S. C. Das's Dictionary*, s.v. *sbud-pa*. This being so, we can see
that the *aπαξ εφημευον hkl o* is simply the word *glo*, 'lungs', 'mind',
which is found in the Nam text (ll. 68, 93, 157), and that *hphu-hklo*
is literally 'blow-lungs': we can see, further, that the phrase

¹ In the Berlin fragment *rne-ma*, mentioned in (ll. 4–5) in company with
*sañ-ma*, 'filth' (supra, p. 223), will contain the same *rme*. 
hran-pu-glo, l. 116 = ran-pu-hlo, l. 135, means ‘himself his own bellows (sc. inspirer)’; possibly
tsig-moṅ-we-ge-ḥtsaḥ-hpu-hloho, 381
may mean
‘the Moṅ builders are the bellows’.

Phu, in the sense of ‘blowing’ must now be seen in:

hrno-re-hlo-ge-hkyi-hdzam-hphuhi, 275-6
‘in friendly troops the dogs mildly panted’
rgyeb-hphuhi-hṭon-re-ḥyah-wa-ḥkan, l. 190
‘if the rear emits a breath, the front is full of wa’ (cf. l. 282,
rgyeb-hpuhi-hpuhi).

And with this and the notion of ‘blowing’ a fire well agrees the
antithesis to ĥmu, ‘cold’, in:

ḥdram-ḥmu-ḥdno-ḥtor-sku-hp hu-ḥti, 103-4
‘the stiff (ḥdram¹ = Tib. tram, p. 251) cold gone (come ?), the
body-blowing (breath) stops’
ṛno-mu-rgyeb-re-hr an-pu-glo-re, 116-17
‘capacity covered up or kept back by cold (lack of spirit),
himself his own bellows’

(rgyeb = Tib. ḥgebs, ḥkheb, ḥkyebs; cf. ņe-ḥkye ṣ-ḥkye b, l. 17, ‘evil
spreads over, spreads over’; or = rgyeb, as supra, p. 228 ?)

hp hu-hph u-mu[-]-r[e]-ḥdzu-ḥdro-ḥkus, 352 (cf. l. 274, p. 331)
‘his blow, blow, being cold, the ass desired (Tib. ḥkhu) to go
(probably with a paronomasia on ḥro, ‘heat’, ‘longed for
(ḥkhu) heat’, which pun recurs in:
ḥdro-ḥбро́n-ḥre-ge-ḥkoḥi-ḥtul, 169, 170.
‘the yak being made to go, his fire of speech was quelled’)

and, again in connexion with the ass, in:

lkyaṅ-ḥzu-ḥṛṇo-re-ḥ[na]n-ḥdro-mo
. . . . . . . . . .
ḥso-ḥkog-ṛno || re-ḥnaṅ-ḥdro-ḥmo ||
stor-ḥkho-ḥṛṇo-re-ḥnaṅ-ḥdro-ḥṭar
ḥmo[-]-re-ḥbraṅ-ṛe-ḥsye-ḥkyaṅ ||, 188-90
‘The rkyang (ass) being capable, the female [horse] runs with-
in (or ‘has an inner heat’):
Capable of concealed ḥṣo (copulari), the female horse runs
within . . .

When her ruler is lost, the inner heat escapes;

¹ In l. 31 (and possibly here ?) the spelling is ḥtram.
Woman or wife, a matron is a summer (spye, pp. 145–6) of mischief.

To the metaphorical applications of the notion ‘fire’ must, it seems, be added those presented in the passage

hmar-me-hkah-ge-hrdzah-hgo-hpo ||
gte-me-hkah-ge-dam-rma-hbroñ ||
gci-me-hsi-ge-hbehi-bah-hbu || hrug ||, 46–7
‘When lamp (Tib. mar-me, ‘oil-fire’, ‘lamp’) fire is scarce (? = Tib. dkañ or kha), friends leave (hpho, ‘pass away’) the place (hgo);
‘When navel-fire (sc. appetite, Tib. lte) is exhausted, the yak begs to be tied (hobbled for the night);
‘When travel-fire (energy) declines (hdi), sheep and oxen have bowed heads’ (see p. 149)

27. hldan, ldan; *rgye, *rmañ, *rdze, *hkañ, *hphyar (hphyer, phyer, pyer), *pyi (phyi), *hkræ (krañ); ske, rke; hstañ; hduñ; hsad; hwe; hnar; hruehi; hko; spo; hnam; sla; hsañ; dgu, hgu.

In the sense of ‘wood’, ‘stick’, the word hldan, evidenced in l. 159, has cognates widely spread in Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman.1 Further occurrences in the Nam text may be recognized in:

rgön-hce-rgye-dze-hldan-rgyu-htam ||, 59–60
‘in a desert of great extent stick-material is a mere tale (? Tib. gtam)’;

cf. the reference in one of the Tibetan manuscripts to the single stick standing up in the than-plain. The ‘big-stick’ of government (hldan-rgye) has been noted (p. 245) in l. 209: and the hldan-rmañ, ‘wooden monument’ of l. 27, = hldan-hkhañ, ‘wooden house’ (cf. Tib. šiñ-khañ), may refer to the tomb with upstanding wooden posts described and illustrated in Sir Aurel Stein’s Innermost Asia (i, pp. 264–7, Illustrations Nos. 168–9).


Presumably the history is complex, some of the roots being originally d-roots, others l-roots, and variation of Prefixes also intervening, so that occasionally we find m- (mdoñs, ‘blind’), s-

1 For occurrences in dialects of Burmese see L. F. Taylor, Journal of the Burma Research Society, xi, pp. 89 sqq., Table II A, ‘firewood’.
(ldum-ra/sdum-ra, 'garden'), or g- (ldu-gu/gdu-gu, 'ring'). Lt-
has, beside the above-noted confusions with ld-, independent
contacts with lh-(ltun/lhun, 'fall'). The antiquity of ld- in Tibetan
has been illustrated in connexion with the word lde (pp. 278-9);
and from outside regions of the north-east and east we have early
eamples in proper names, such as Ldoñ, Mug-idem, Zaq-ldom.

In the Nam text the word hldi, 'this', = Tib. hdi, is several
times (ll. 107, 184, 198, 391 (?)) written in the Tibetan way; and,
on the other hand, the Tibetan hdi occurs in the sole Tibetan
sentence (l. 180) as hldi. Hence the Nam ld- may be credited with
all the connexions of Tib. d-.

One meaning of Tib. ldañ is 'side', seen in sgo-ldañ, 'each side
of the door', whence ldañ-du is found signifying 'near'; and we
can see that this is connected with lhan, 'together', seen in lhan-
skyes, 'born together' (as twins), lhan-byed, 'auxiliary', ldañ(s)
owing its n to an s which originally followed. The word lhan-byed,
in the form lhan-dpye, 'assistant', occurs in a Central-Asian docu-
ment. A Nam equivalent, ldañ-pyer, hldañ-hphyer (phyer), is to
be seen in:

ldañ-pyer-hgag-re-htsah-hyah-hdo ||, 65
'Those whose co-operation is refused become rivals (or
adversaries)'

hldañ-krañ-hko-dze-stor-hldañ-hphyar, 125-6
'when . . ., co-operation is lost'

hldañ-phyer-hbrah[-]r[e], 254
'while co-operation is abundant'.

Of this compound, hldañ-phyer, the second element, with e for a
on the lines explained supra (p. 214), is equivalent to Tib. hphyar/
phyar, 'lift up', 'hoist', (also 'blame', 'affront', 'disgrace', cf.
Latin tollere). Outside the compound it occurs in ll. 341–2 in the
three forms hphyar, pyar, hphyer,1 in ll. 254, 261 as phyer: in l. 239
it is contrasted (as in ll. 125–6, supra) with hstor, 'be lost'; and in
l. 343 ldañ likewise is contrasted with the stor of ll. 339, 340. It is
evident that in the compound ldañ means 'side', 'being at the
side', and hphyar, 'support'.

Ldañ singly, with the sense of 'at the side', 'auxiliary' is seen in :

ldañ-rdze(rje)-hbro-re-hldañ-the-rgyebs ||, 138–9
'when an allied chief flees, the allied lieges retreat'.

It is probable that in ll. 79, 143, the expression hldañ-phyi (pyi)

1 On -ar/-er see p. 353.
means ‘outside support’ (Tib. phyi). From the second of the two last-mentioned instances:

htor-se-stor-dze-hldan-pyi-ske ||, 143
‘when the great roof is lost, the outside support is slight (Tib. rke, “lean”, rked/sked, “waist”)’

we can see that the idea of ‘support’, ‘auxiliary’, is derived from that of ‘stick’, ‘pole’, ‘prop’, which in Tib. sgo-ldan, ‘door-side’, i.e. ‘door-post’, is still apparent. The ldan may denote, in fact, the sticks or poles, over which, in the case of the Amdoan tent, the roof-cords pass to the ground (supra, pp. 249–50).

We have not, however, reached the root of the matter, or the most common meaning of hldan in the Nam text, until we realize that hldan is another instance of object-denotation derived from quasi-abstract verbal notion. Like hbo, ‘forest’ or ‘vegetation’, properly ‘swelling’, ‘growth’, and hgreñ, ‘man’, properly the ‘upright standing’, hldan, ‘stick’, is a general notion of action, namely ‘rising erect’. This is the signification of Tib. ldañ/ldañs, lañ/lañs, and correspondingly is the frequent signification of Nam hldan/ldañ, as in:

htsog-hram-hdo-na-mor-hldan-re-hnañ ||, 86–7
‘where there is htsog-hram, there is no rising of evil’
htsog-hldan-hstañ, 94, ‘htsog rises to the top’
hmah-hldan-hyah-dze, 112, ‘when low rises high’
smyi-rmad-ldan, 80, ‘an inferior man rises’
stor-me-hkhyed-re-hldan-me-hkhyed ||, 123–4
‘if a lost fire sufficed, a rising fire suffices’
hsañ-yeñ-hldan-dze-rñe-hldan-ne, 141
‘when land-watch rises, hostility rising is good’.

The use of this Verb with rñe, which properly means ‘fiend’, is frequent (ll. 119, 141, 144, 197), and it is the more apposite because in Tibetan, as already (p. 220) remarked, ldan/lañ is used of the ‘rising’ of a fiend (from underground).

The same Verb forms part of an expression which in the text has marked importance. One passage reads:

hldan-hkrañ-hsad-na-hldan-hkrañ-hsañ
hldan-krañ-hwe-dze-hldan-slah-hkehe
hldan-krañ-hko-dze-stor-hldan-hphyar
hldan-krañ-spo-dze-stor-hgu-hbo ||
hldan-krañ-hnam-dze-stor-dgu-hdor ||, 124–7

1 Unless we prefer ‘the support turns its neck away’, with phyi-ske parallel to Tib. phyi-mig, ‘backward look’.
Hldan-hkrañ is one of a few compound nouns which directly recall equivalents in Tibetan. The Tibetan phrase, in the form drañ-mkrañ, is found, not indeed in the Dictionary, but two or three times in the contemporary manuscripts from north-eastern Tibet: it is composed of drañ, 'straight', 'honest', and mkrañ, hkrañs. 'hard', 'solid', and its meaning is 'honesty', 'uprightness'. Its non-occurrence in ordinary Tibetan combines with its provenance to suggest that it may be of Chinese origin, being one of a number of such phrases, concerning which see Franke, Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches, ii, p. 5: and this may explain why the Nam expression, while similar to the Tibetan and rhyming therewith, corresponds to it linguistically only in part. The second member, hkrañ, is, no doubt, cognate to the Tibetan mkrañ/hkrañs; but the first member, instead of meaning 'straight' (Tib. drañ), means 'standing upright' = Tib. ldan, unless indeed it envisages the particular denotation 'stick', 'pole', and so contains the metaphor 'stiff standing pole'.

The passage applies to hldan-hkrañ, in successive clauses with corresponding apodoses, the five Predicates or Verbs hsad, hwe, hko, spo, hnam, which are therefore in a measure antithetic. Being already acquainted with a portion of the Predicates and other words, we may venture upon a rendering of the whole, as follows:

'Uprightness being slain (hsad), uprightness is cut up (hśāh); Uprightness being done (hwe), upright friends (Tib. zla) are won (hkehe); Uprightness being by itself or enforced (?) hko, assistance is lost; Uprightness being changed (Tib. spo), all losses grow (hbo); Uprightness declining (Tib. ŋams), all losses are thrown away (hdor).'

Here hsad, 'slay', hwe, are words of frequent occurrence and quite certain etymology and meaning; hnam = Tib. ŋams recurs in l. 259 and is supported also by another hnam (l. 145) = Tib. ŋams, 'thought', 'mind', 'spirit' (on ŋ- see p. 360); spo, since Tib. spo, 'peak', is out of the question, can hardly help being = Tib. spo, ḥpho, 'change', 'be changed', 'pass away', cf. hśi- ḥpo, p. 226; hko is a form of diverse meanings, discussed supra (pp. 260–4).

As regards the apodoses, hśāh is applied in ll. 90, 99, as we shall see, to ḥtsog-hram and ḡnah-ḥtsog, and can well be = Tib. bśāh, used of the cutting up of a slain animal; hke, 'profit', 'gain', = Tib. khe (pp. 241–2), and hdor, 'throw away', = Tib. ḡdor, are
frequent in the text, while hbo, perhaps here doubtful, may be the hbo discussed supra (pp. 231–2); sla = Tib. zla, ‘friend’, calls for comment. The phrase stor-dgu is rendered ‘all losses’, literally ‘nine losses’, upon the supposition that this Tibetan idiom in the use of dgu, ‘nine’, found in our Tibetan manuscripts, was shared by the Nam; in the stor-hgu of the preceding verse there is no obvious alternative to the supposition of a writing of dgu as hgu, which may be defended on the two grounds, (a) that in l. 113 hgu-htor-htsu: na must be = l. 76 dgu-htor-tshun-re, and (b) that in the Hsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman dialects the Prefix-less form gu, ‘nine’, is far more common than those with Prefixes (d, r). On this matter see p. 233. Hsi-hsia has dgi/hghi, ‘9’ (Nevsky, No. 109).

The expression hldan-hkran occurs also in ll. 91, 111–12 (with hnr, ‘be strong’, or ‘be persistent’, or ‘attend to’, see p. 361), 113 (with hwehi, ‘come to an end’?), 127, 157 (with hwe: hkran erroneously omitted), 268 (with hwad, ‘be on the watch’). With the same essential signification kraṅ by itself is seen in:

hño-sta-glom-dze-kraṅ-nur-nur, 85
‘when friends are greedy, or conceited, the upright, or uprightness, groans’.

It may be remarked that etymologically hkraṅ/kraṅ = Tib. mkhraṅ/hkraṅ, can well be connected with Tib. hgreṅ, ‘stand’, sgren, ‘lift or rise up’ (sgren-sgren, ‘firm and well-fixed’), whence the expression hgreṅ-myi, ‘upright man’, as opposed to prone (dud) beast.

28. rgyed-ma, rgyed; *h dre, *h yo, *h rah; hgye, rgye, rgyes; nag; gcég, hcég, hgeg; hldøho; htsog, htsag; hnah-, nah-, htsog; ram, htsog-hram; hšah, hšas; phye; hnah; myag; hme; hpo; hreg; plim-plam; hso(so)-hnah (hna, na); hso-hldah; hdroho; myin; hṇad, hṇahd; hrgah, hrgan; hthaṅ; tseg; rmo.


1 On the alternation b/g see pp. 33, n. 5, 243.
In the Nam text hgye is found (ll. 12, 154) meaning ‘light’, in l. 209 (g-yehe, "hi", 166, 271) ‘is divided’. Rgye, ‘extent’, may be seen in hce-rgye (ll. 57–60) = Tib. dbye-che, ‘of great extent’, and equivalent to hce-rgyan, ll. 16, 50, 52, 55: in both the Nam phrases, however, hce may be the Noun, ‘greatness’, and rgye, rgyan, the Adjectives; as an Adjective, rgye is applied to ‘stick’ (hldan) and ‘city’ (can) in ll. 209–10, and probably to hlo in l. 383; to ‘man’ (myi) in l. 153; to ‘darkness’ (hti) in l. 154; in l. 280 to ‘house’ (hhkhab); in l. 54 it (rgyehe) is perhaps a Verb. In l. 326 it is probably a miswriting for rgyed (cf. l. 338). Once, viz. in hsa-nag-rgyes-hkom, l. 199, ‘when enemy voice (Tib. nag), or black (Tib. nag) enemy, has attained extension’, we find the form rgyes (= Tib. dbyes), which may be either Noun or Verb.

Rgyed = rgyed-ma is rather frequent, occurring in ll. 105, 106, 112 (rgyed-hldag-hnag, ‘the disunion black-back’), 192 (rgyed-hran-sme-re, ‘disunion being itself a fire’); and in compounds, rgyed-hdre (ll. 87, 94, 248), ‘disunion-inducing’, hrgyed-hyo (l. 338), ‘disunion-working’, rgyed-hrah (ll. 87, 216, 237, 243, 246, 248, 341, 342 (?), 392), ‘place of disunion’, the Suffix ma is absent, as it would quite ordinarily be in Tibetan.

As antithetic to hlda-n-kran, ‘uprightness’, rgyed is seen in:

rgyed-hldag-hnag-ge-hlda-n-hkra-n-hrwehi ||, 112–13
‘the disunion black-back put an end to uprightness’.

But more constant is the opposition to htsog-hram and allied expressions, as in:

rgyed-ma-hlda-n-ge-htsog-hram-hsah ||, 90
‘when disunion arises, htsog-hram is cut up’
rgyed-ma-glana-ge-hnag-htsog-hsah ||, 93
‘when disunion gains (?), hna-h-htsog is cut up’
rgyed-ma-hlda-n-ge-nah-htsog-hsas, 101–2 (where nah = hna of l. 93, and hsas is Aorist of hsah)

while in l. 94:

rgyed-hdre (read "hdro-hte, as in ll. 87, 248) -ge-htsog-hta-n-ma ||
‘the disunion-inducers permit not htsog’

and also in the two following verses, htsog suffices.

Htsog-hram, evidently one of the most important topics in the text, receives its most elaborate consideration in the passage:

htsog-hram-phye-dze-hsahn-plim-plam
htsog-hram-hnag-tse-htor-ri-rgo ||
htsog-hram-myag-dze-hrta-hwa-hlda-n
htsog-hram-hme-dze-ḥtor-ḥtas-ḥproms
htsog-hram-hpo-dze-ḥrta-rkwa-ḥdzam
htsog-hram-hreg-dze-ḥldyañ-ḥyu-hgañ-dze-ḥsi-ḥwa-ḥko,

Here the Predicates phye, 'divided', myag (Tib.) 'corrupted', hme, 'is not', hpo, 'changes' (Tib. Ḫpho), which may be taken as known, inform us that the remaining two must also be of an ominous character in relation to htsog-hram. Of the previously ascertained meanings of Ḫnah only one satisfies this condition; if we equate it to Tib. ṇa, 'be sick', on which see p. 239, we see that it leads on to the ṣi, 'die', of the apodosis. Ḫreg = Tib. Ḫeg, 'reach', 'touch', is not promising; but Ḫegs, Ḫbreng, Ḫregs, 'lopped off', 'amputate', would serve, and in regard to a lost (or perhaps later added) initial b we can think of Tib. ris, 'figure', 'design', which is in intimate relation to Ḫbri, bris, 'draw' (ris-su-ḥbri-ba, 'draw an outline'), and ras-su-dros (dra-ba), 'cut up into strips': cf. bris/ Ḫris (p. 259). Thus we arrive at a rendering as follows:

'Ḥtsog-hram being divided, hate is ṭlim-ṭlam (let loose ?); sick, a great door (rgo) of death;
" " " corrupted, horse's neck (a proverbial expression);
" " " non-existent (everything is tangled (?)): see p. 302);
" " " changed, the horse's rule was mild;
" " " broken, in all the Ḫldyañ-ḥyu death's power prevails (?)'.

Despite the obscurities not yet resolved, it will be seen that the signification of htsog-hram must be something like 'friendship'. And how can this fail to be the fact, when, as we are already aware, the enemy of htsog-hram, and of other combinations with htsog, is 'disunion', Ḫgyed-ма?

The constant, and therefore essential, factor in the expressions, namely htsog, is manifestly identical with Tib. 'assemblage', 'group', 'accumulation' (tshogs-kyi-gtso-bo or 'bdag = Sanskrit gana-pramukha, Gaṇeśa, &c.), being the Verb tshogs, 'assemble', 'unite', whence also btsags, 'accumulated', tshags-byed, 'save', tshags-lhod-po, 'loose cohesion'. Nam htsag occurs in l. 46, hya-htsag ||, 'sheep are collected', l. 117 Ḫpho-hldir-htsag, 'males here collected', l. 173 Ḫwi-hwehi-ḥtsag, 'rats or mice gather', l. 234 htsag-ḥro, 'collected wolves', l. 257 Ḫyah-rmah-ḥtsag, 'high and low united', also l. 282. Hence Ḫnah-ḥtsog and Ḫnah-ḥtsog, supra,
p. 291, denote respectively 'local unity' and 'home unity'. The element *hram* in *htsog-hram* evidently means 'agreeable' in l. 157: skye-ta-ram, 'life is agreeable'

and the same is applicable to 'the moon' in ll. 73, 76, while in other cases (ll. 49, 184, 288, 368, 376) 'company' or 'in agreement' are more apposite. The word accords well with Tib. *ram* in *rogs-ram*, 'assist', from *rogs* = *grogs*, 'friend', 'companion', and perhaps in *ra-mdah*, i.e. *ram-da*, 'friend', 'helper', and *ram-bu*, 'a roundel song'. Thus the notion in *htsog-hram* is 'harmonious cooperation', a thing constantly threatened by *rgyed-ma*, 'disunion'.

It may be noted that in the Berlin fragment, l. 21, *na-ram-reg* is likely to be equivalent to the Nam *htsog-hram* (= *nah-htsog)-hreg*, l. 122.

Antithetic likewise to *rgyed-ma* is *hso-hnah*, another main topic of the text, in:

rgyed-ma-hldan-ge-hso-hnah-hrgah, 107–8, 231
'disunion arising, *hso-hnah* grows old'

and this is also closely allied to *htsog-hram*:

*htsog-hram-mye[-]r[e]-so-na-hşid ||, 365–6

'if *htsog-hram* is non-existent, *so-na* perishes'. In Tibetan *so-nams* (cf. *so-tshis* (*tshigs*), 'house-keeping') means 'husbandry' or other 'business', being obviously = *gso/gson*, 'live', 'nurture', 'cure', + *snams, snom, bsnams*, 'seize', 'gain'. This *gso/so*, the Nam text has in *hso-hldah*, l. 201, the 'living'; and *hso-hnah* = 'life-place', 'home'. But, like other words of local signification, the expression takes on a personal sense and means 'family', e.g. in:

*hta*-hso-hnah-yaṅ-gni-hrdzum-doho ||, 80
'for the horse's family also the day smiled' (p. 271)

(sc. when the horse fled, the family was relieved of a master).

*rta-hgam-hpar-re-hso-hnah-hthāṅ ||, 289–90
'the horse having gone to the *hgam*, his family was the authority'.

*rta-hso-hnah-ge-na-rom-htoṅ, 100
'the horse's family made room (for the visiting camel)'.

In fact, however, the relief of the family, which consisted of females (l. 108 *mo-laṅ*), was illusory, since there were 'males here collected' (l. 117), and:

*hro-hbehi-hbah-ge-hso-hnah-gecheg || 110–11,
'With wolves oppressing the sheep, the family suffered a check.'
In l. 234 it is ‘collected wolves’, ‘wolf-pack’ (htsag-hro), and the family was practically in the grave (rmañ-dze, l. 235). Thus the ‘rise of disunion’ (ll. 107–8, 231), the flight (ll. 110, 114–15) and disrepute (ll. 231–2; rme, p. 284 supra) of the horse were ruinous to the family, and:

so-hnah-hsto-ndze-hño-stor-hprom ||, 127–8
‘family being lost, loss of friends results’.

Of the words closely attached to rgyed only rmag (rgyed-rmag, l. 149) remains for consideration (infra, pp. 300–1). With htsog-hram and htsog we have had the expressions hrta-hwa-hldan, htor-htas-hproms, hrra-rkwa-hdzam, hsah, hsas, phye, hnah, myag, hme, hpo, hreg, mye, hldan, of which the first three may be postponed, while the rest have been discussed. To be added are hdroho 1.37 (= Tib. hdro, hdro, ‘travel’, ‘depart’, a Verb occurring elsewhere also in the text), hnad, l. 90, myin, l. 97 (if a correct reading, equivalent, no doubt, to Tib. miñ, ‘a [mere] name’): hnad, which, as hñañd, is predicated in l. 116 of ‘fear’, may have appositely the meaning ‘evaporate’ and be akin to Tib. nad, ‘vapour’, ‘odour’. With hso-hnak have been found, ll. 108, 131, hrgah, ‘grow old’, = Tib. rga/rgan (used respectively of ‘speech’, hrgah, l. 169,1 and ‘corn’, hrgan, l. 160); l. 356 hósid, ‘perish’; l. 290, hthän, ‘be authority’; ll. 111, 234 gcég/getc, ‘suffer a check’; ll. 111, 270 hyah, ‘be in the ascendant’; l. 232, stor, ‘be lost’. In l. 103 we find ma-rán, ‘be not pleased’ = Tib. rañ, rañ; in l. 110 hldoho, which is ambiguous—conceivably it is related to Tib. bdo, ‘increase’. Gceg/getc, here antithetic to hldoho, is = Tib. hceg, hchags, bṣags, bṣag, sāg, ‘split’, ‘confess’, ‘be afraid’, gcog, bcag, chogs, ‘split’, ‘break’, cag/chag, ‘broken’, &c.; the form with ts which furnishes tshegs, ‘trouble’, ‘toil’, ‘difficulty’, may occur in l. 93, swa-tseg-tseg, where, however, a different explanation is possible. In the Central-Asian documents we find the forms tseg (ii, p. 412: 117) and tshegs (ii, p. 236: 87, a ‘check’ in the military sense). The Nam text has hceg in:

hbroñ-re-ge-rmo-hkum-hceg, 250
‘all the yaks were, in fulfilment of the vow or prayer (? Tib. smon ?), “checked”.’

29. hkhor, hkor; hyog, g-yog, hyogs; hkrn, hkrnuh, hkhru, hkhruh; hkr-yoq, ʰhbro, ʰhpo; hkhru-rgyän; hkyan; ʰrgyan, ʰhldon; khri; hski-hkri (hgrī); hnahn(ay)-ʰhpoñ, ʰhldom; hgor; kla;

1 But here probably rather = Tib. dgah, ‘joy’, ‘rejoice’. 
klag; gšim; hprah; hrgom; hrkah; hrdoho; hranab; hkyi; g-rah.

Tibetan hkhor, of which the central signification is that of 'circle', 'circling', whence also 'coming round', 'returning', has also very commonly the meaning 'entourage', 'courtiers', 'attendants', e.g. in ḥkhor-g-yog, 'attendants and servants', naṅ-hkhor, 'domestics'. The first of these meanings has been accepted (p. 272) in regard to hkor as applied in l. 53 to the rgya-hñi-ke, 'sun and moon'. In ll. 293, 294, 296 it is not clear whether the hyañ-hkah-ṛdza and hkyan-hldon 'form a circle' or 'turn back' (hkhor [-re]); and in l. 277 it is likewise uncertain whether the braves (hpah) 'return' or 'form groups or retinues' (hkor-re). But in l. 18, ḥdzaṅ-hkhor-hkrug, 'the retinue of wise persons was at strife', and in l. 98 the word hkhor clearly denotes a group of subordinates forming a retinue; and in:

ḥkor-ḥtah-ḥkhen-yaṅ-sñaṅ-gyaṅ-gyaṅ, 92
though recognizing one of one's own people, the heart dallies, dallies

the sense is approximately, or exactly, the same.

With ḥkhor, as in the above-cited Tibetan ḥkhor-g-yog, the Nam text associates ḥyogs in its:

ḥdzaṅ-ḥkhor-ḥkṛug-ḥkyan-ḥyogs-ḥldog, 18

where the ḥyogs or ḥkyan-ḥyogs are ḥldog. In the sense of 'below', associated with rgyah-gñi-ke and with 'castle' (ll. 200, 299, 320), g-yog has already been cited (pp. 267, 279); also in the thence derived sense of 'valley' (ll. 15, 51). In ḥkhri-tsa-ḥyog-ḥdag, l. 259, 'old men with staves or poles', an entirely different word, = Tib. ṭog-po, ṭog-siṅ, may be seen. The notion of 'servant' (Tib. g-yog) is to be recognized in ṭma-g-yog-ṛṇo, l. 156, 'capable of rendering service to the wounded' (cf. Tib. nad-g-yog, 'service at sick-bed'). The ḥyogs or ḥkyan-ḥyogs who in l. 18 are ḥldog, 'recalcitrant' (Tib. ṭdog, log), are accordingly 'servitors'.

The recurrent expression ḥkru-yog, ll. 289, 321 (ḥkru°), 322–3 (ḥṛkuḥu°), 324, contains a word which by reason of relative constancy of writing must be kept entirely apart from any gru or ḥgru. Even in ll. 187, 388, the rendering 'when the great ḥkhrum became expanded' is to be preferred. The ḥkru-ḥyog-ṛṇo, l. 289 = ḥkru-ḥyog-ṛṇo, l. 321 = ḥkru-ḥyog, l. 324, 'the ḥkru capable of service', must be the kṛhu-ḥthe-ḥprah, 'humble (Tib. phra) kṛhu lieges', of ll. 334–5, the ḥkhrumu-ḥyog-ḥṣud, 'dispersed (? Tib.
goud), \( \text{hkru} \) servitors', of ll. 322–3, and the \( \text{rkom-hkru-hsud} \), 'slain \( \text{hkru} \) dispersed', of l. 313. They must therefore be equivalent to the \( \text{kru-ra} \), = \( \text{dma\'ns-rigs} \), of the Tibetans, 'the vulgar, or the lowest class of people in the mystical [sc. yoga] language'. We cannot but surmise that they are properly 'the offscourings' (Tib. \( \text{hkhr} \), \( \text{khrud} \), 'wash', 'cleanse'). Accordingly we can understand:

\[
\text{hyah-lta\'n-sma[-r]e-hyah-hkruhu-hbro-re-hgyeb-hkruh} |, 315–16
\]

'when the higher authority becomes low, while the front \( \text{hkruhu-hbro} \), the rear is \( \text{hkru} \) (filth)'.

As a Predicate in the last usage, \( \text{hkru} \), \( \text{hkhu} \), has several recurrences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hrkom-hbro\'n-hkru[-r]e}, & 285, \text{'the slain yak being filth'}; \\
\text{hkhu-re-hkya\'n}, & 320, \text{'the hkyan being filth'}; \\
\text{hgu-mor-hkru[-r]e}, & 331, \text{'the wicked thieves? (?) being filth'};
\end{align*}
\]

while in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hrgom-hhkhu[-r]e-hto-na}, & 169, \text{'the canaille being passed over (hrgom, pp. 245, 323)'}; \\
\text{kkhu-hkha\'n-myi-hrdo\'h-rrnab-ma-hldah}, & 165 \text{'the canaille who do not submit to hardships (Tib. \text{dka\text{"a}-ba-dan-sdo} were not entitled to eat (Tib. \text{mnab})'};
\end{align*}
\]

the word is a Substantive.

These facts prohibit us from anywhere yielding to the temptation to render the frequent expression \( \text{hkru(hkruhu, kru)-hbro} \) (once \( \text{bpro} \), l. 321) by 'flies into a corner (gru)', although \( \text{hbro} \) (bro), = Tib. \( \text{hbro} \) (bros), 'flee', has a number of occurrences (ll. 36, 138, 139, 241). \( \text{Hyah-hkruhu-hbro} \) (ll. 315–16, 318, 325) means 'the front (sc. the superior) tastes as filth' (Anglicè 'is in bad odour'), \( \text{hgyeb-hkruhu-hbro} \) (ll. 297, 323) 'the rear (sc. inferior) tastes as filth', and \( \text{hri(g-ri)-hkrhu-h broho} \) (ll. 294, 313), 'the mountain tastes as filth', sc. when infested by savage animals. The verse:

\[
\text{hyah-hklu(hkru)-hbro-re-hgyeb4-hkru-hbro-re-hyah-hthana | |, 221–2}
\]

'The front tasting as filth, the rear tasting as filth, both are on a par'

\(^1\) \( \text{Hau}d \) occurs only in the two passages. Tib. \( \text{sud} \) = 'cough', 'choke', and \( \text{goud, boud} \), 'dyspepsia', 'be lost', 'dispersed', 'be crammed with food'. Perhaps \( \text{so} \), \( \text{boud} \), 'scratch', 'excoriate', also 'steal silently away', is intended: or cf. \( \text{boun} \) (\( \sqrt{\text{sun}} \)), 'dissolute'?

\(^2\) See p. 233.

\(^3\) Cf. Tib. \( \text{skyug-bro} \), 'nausea', 'disgust', 'shameful', 'impure', from \( \text{skyug} \), 'vomit'.

\(^4\) Sic.
follows the statement \(\text{hbro}^n\text{-hkru}^{}\text{-hbro-na}\) \(\|, 1. 221\), in regard to which the temptation is at first, by reason of the context, strong; and the Tibetan Dictionary of S. C. Das quotes from the Buddhist Bstan-hgyur a short sentence containing both \(\text{hbro}\) from \text{bro}, ‘taste’, and \(\text{bro}\) from \text{hbros}, ‘flee’. The same is possible in Nam; but \(\text{hkru}^{}\text{-hbro}\) is confined, in fact, to the single meaning.

\(\text{Hkya}^\text{n}\), mentioned above as possibly contained in the phrase \(\text{hkya}^\text{n}-\text{hyogs}\), where, however, it might be = Tib. \text{kyan}, ‘even’, ‘also’, and again in the statement ‘the \(\text{hkyan}\) being filth’, appears in antithesis to \(\text{hbos}\), ‘big man’, ‘master’, in:

\[
\text{hpu-hpos-stor-dze-hkya}^\text{n-stor-rno}\ \|, 141
\]

‘when the master man flees, the \(\text{hkyan}\) can flee’.

In ll. 273–4:

\[
\text{hwi-hwa-se-kyah-hkya}^\text{n-\text{hdzam-re-hldan}}\ \|
\]

‘to the crops mice-injured (se) the \(\text{hkyan}\) all tame returned’

the \(\text{hkyan}\) are alined with the \(\text{hnoho-hjam-re}\), ‘friends all tame’, of the previous verse, who returned to their enemy-abandoned (\(\text{g}^\text{san}^{}\text{-hra}^{}\text{-hto}^n\)) crops, and with the ‘enemies’ (\(\text{rne}\)), \(\text{twa}^\text{n}\) (?), ‘dogs’ (\(\text{hkyi}\)) and ‘goats’ (\(\text{g-ra}^\text{h}\)) ‘all tame’ or ‘tamed’, of the following verses. They are therefore not ‘friends’ or ‘enemies’ or ‘animals’; and, being contrasted with masters, they must be some class of clients, while, being agricultural, they must be some sort of tenants: they are therefore agricultural serfs. This accounts for the antithesis to \(\text{na-hldom}\) in:

\[
\text{na-hldom-hgor-kla-hkya}^\text{n-gstor[-\text{hdor}]}, 143
\]

‘if the \(\text{na-hldom}\) are very idle (Tib. \text{hgor}, ‘loiter’, \(+\text{kla},\text{‘unlimited’, as in ll. 205–6}, \text{the hkyan}\) are allowed to be lost’.

For the \(\text{na-hldom}\), who in ll. 41–2, 350, are again mentioned as ‘idle’ (\(\text{hgor}\)), must be domestic servants or slaves, just as the ‘idle’ (\(\text{hgor}\)) \(\text{hnah-hpo}^n\) of 1. 113 must be the \(\text{na-bon}\), ‘house or place poor (\(\text{hpho}^n\text{s}, \text{pho}^n\text{s}\)’, of one of the Tibetan manuscripts (see p. 238) on \(\text{hldom}\), ‘bound’, see infra, pp. 318–9 sqq.

The \(\text{hkyan}\) are again, as \(\text{hkya}^\text{n-hldon}\), contrasted with the \(\text{hbos}\) in:

\[
\text{mor-hkya}^\text{n-hldon-re-hbos-g-yah-htha}^\text{n} \|, 286–7
\]

‘the bad \(\text{hkya}^\text{n}\) being \(\text{hldon}\) (or the \(\text{hkya}^\text{n-hldon}\) being vile), the master is in the ascendant’

\[
\text{hkya}^\text{n-hldon-hkhor-[re-]hbos-brihi-brho}^u \|, 293
\]
'the hkyan-hldon returning (or in attendance), [to] the master (or master's) mountain peak'

hbos-g-ri-hpa{n}-dze-hkyan-hldon-re-hn{a}h ●, 290-1

'On the master's mountain-flank are no hkyan-hldon'
hkyan-hldon-hkh{	extcircled{r}}or-[re-]hbos-hyah-htona, 293-4

'the hkyan-hldon returning (or in attendance), the master is in the ascendant'.

Here hldon cannot mean 'face' ('hkyan-faced'), Tib. gdon/mdons, or 'blind', ldo{n}/lo{n}, or 'accompanying' = Tib. sdo{n}: it must be 'runaway', = Tib. hdon, 'depart' (in Imperative, 'Begone'), as elsewhere; and the situation, as well as the meaning of hkhor, is determined by:

r{	extcircled{n}}e-htab-hkohu-hkohu-ge-hkyan-hldon-hgya{n}-sto
hkyan-hldon-hkh{	extcircled{r}}or-[re-]hbos-hrihi-hrhu ||
htor-hpuhu-hbos-dze-hrim-ge-hgrus, 292-3

'while the fiends were answering back (p. 264), the runaway hkyan stopped:

the runaway hkyan turning back to the master's mountain peak,

under the great master did service all around'.

In ll. 308-11 there is a rather similar passage concerning certain hgah-hldon.

Reference to hkyan, 'serfs', must be seen also in ll. 48-9, where a fight of twa{n} is contrasted with a fight of hkyan. But in l. 372, hkrug-kya{n}-hldom-re, 'strife also being subdued', and consequently in the above-cited hkrug-hkyan-hyogs-hldog, l. 18; further in hhkor-kya{n}-rr{	extcircled{r}}hi, l. 98, 'the retinue also is ruined', and in hhla-hkyan-rras-re, l. 344, 'the passes also being alined', it seems probable that kya{n}, hhkyan = Tib. kya{n}, 'even', 'also'.

A quite different hkyan must be seen in:

hkyan-rgya{n}-hs{g}-dze-has-hkri-htshim, 81

'when the hkyan-rgya{n} is destroyed, the high or death (h{	extcircled{s}}i) couch (Tib. khri, 'chair', 'couch', 'bed') is a satisfaction'
hkyan-hrgya{n}-hyag-ge-hmu-klag-g{	extcircled{s}}im ||, 268

'with the hkyan-hrgya{n} in front, a cold season (Tib. gl{	extcircled{a}}gs, 'occasion') is agreeable (Tib. sim, tshim, or g{	extcircled{s}}im?)'.

Here the 'long or large (rgya{n}) hkyan' would be quite intelligible,

1 In this and the following passages hbos-hrihi(g-ri) perhaps means 'big mountain', as suggested supra, p. 231. In that case the hpu-hbos and hbos, 'big man', in the immediate context and in ll. 294, 298, is verbally associated with the 'big mountain'.

THE NAM LANGUAGE
if it were the k'ang of the Tibeto-Chinese border and of north China, a sort of dais, about 2 feet high, floored with tiles or mud and heated by a flue underneath: on this the people sit and sleep (Huc and Gabet, i, p. 287; Rockhill, The Land of the Lamas, pp. 6-7, Diary, p. 35). It seems possible that the word hkyan actually represents the Chinese term ts'uan, 'stove', since in the Tibetan manuscripts we find khyod written for tshod in gsum-tshod, 'winter-season' (cf. nin-tshod, mtshan-tshod, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 201). The same expression recurs in:

na-hldom-hgor-[re-]hkyan-hrgyañ-hdzud ||, 41-2

'if the house-servants are idle, the hkyan-hrgyañ is wasted or unsuccessful' (?)

but, though Tib. hdzud, zud, tshud, 'enter', 'put in', is identical with chud, which has these senses and also the meaning suggested (chud-gzon, 'zod, 'be wasted', 'consumed'), the rendering must be considered conjectural. The phrase hsi-hkri-hchim (sic), 'high or death chair or bed', recurs in l. 38 (hgrí); but Tib. hchim means 'be, or get, full', and the remainder of the verse is not clear. Khri = 'support', a meaning found also in Tibetan, is seen in l. 52 (p. 317).

In l. 114 (hrah-rtah-)hkyan is an error for the hgyan of l. 77.

30. rmag; mag-hno; hthuñ; htar; hmañ-byi; hdrag; hśod; ʼtsa; puñ; gsar; ſar; hpah; hci, hcihi, gcīhi, chi, hcī; hdah; hsams; hpom, ḫphom; ḥdrañ; ḫtog, ḫthog; ḫśi-kyeg; ḫyu-sad; ḫro-ta; tor, thor, ḫthor; tor-htas-proms; hīdas; ḫso-bos; ḫrīi; mo; myag; ḫdwa; lad, ḫlad.

The passage:

. . . mag-ḥnor-su-ge-stor-ta-ḥthogs ||
phye-ḥgo-ḥthuñ-re-ḥnam-ḥdzam-ḥtar
hrah-ḥtoñ-rmag-dze-hdrag-ḥtrog-ḥtsa ||
rña-ḥne-ḥrmag-dze-hmañ-byi-ḥldoñ
[hldoñ]-ḥyu-sad-ge-ḥphom-te-ḥdrañ
[ḥdrañ]-ge-ḥsad-na-hrañ-ṛgyañ-ḥśod
[ḥśod]-te-ṛmag-dze-ṛmañ-ṛa-gyim
spye-ḥtor-ḥdwa-dze-ṃyag-ṃyi-tor
[tor]-ḥtas-prom-dze-ṃyage-me-ḥtañ
ṛgyed-ṛmag-ṛne-ge-ṣtor-tha-ḥthogni
hrah-śiñ-ṛne-ge-ṣtor-ta-ḥthog-ni, 145-9

has suffered, as will be seen, from losses of repeated words, to the

1 On ḥky- and ḥsh- see p. 269.
detriment of the metre. The following discussion, however, does not greatly depend upon recognition of that circumstance. We may venture upon a rendering as follows:

'in . . . battle who stay flight?
If there is a little (ḥṭuḥ) open space, the tame-hearted make off (ḥṭar):
Against a post-relinquishing army the enemy are bold (Tib. ḫḍrag).
In an army of bad or good many weak ones (or big and little, ḫmaṅ-byi) flee;
Fleeing, with their country lost, they are dragged defeated;
Those dragged being annihilated, those of great self (ḥraṅ-ṛgyaṅ) are laid low (ḥṣod);
For an army laid low the tomb enclosure is home.

As to (ṇi) the evil army of disunion staying flight:
As to (ṇi) the evil-hearted enemy (ḥraḥ) staying flight:

The equation of rmag to Tib. dmag, 'army', is not open to objection; and the same is appropriate in regard to the only other instance of rmag:

puṅ-te-gsar-.Scale-hpah-rmag-ṛchih ||, 204–5
'In mass with new strength a hero army goes'

where puṅ = Tib. phuṅ, 'heap', 'bundle', ḥphuṅis, 'concourse', dpuṅ, 'host', 'army'; gsar = Tib. gsar, 'new'; ṅar = Tib. ṅar, 'strength', 'vigour' (infra, p. 361); ḫpah = Tib. ḫpaḥ, 'hero'; ḫchih (cf. l. 350, gcchih, l. 346; ḥchih, ll. 300, 345; ṛchih, ll. 168, 183, 345, 353, 385) = Tib. mchih, 'go', 'come': most of which words occur elsewhere also in the Nam text.

A practical equivalence of rmag to mag(-ḥnor) no longer calls for defence: the d/r in dmag/rmag is a Prefix, and we have suggested that strictly it implies an intervening verbal idea, so that, if mag originally meant 'array', dmag/rmag may have meant 'arrayed'. That mag-ḥno(r) means 'battle' is suggested by Tib. g-yul-ṅo, 'battle' (g-yul, 'fight', +ṅo, 'side', or ṅo, 'face'): as a fact, the equivalence, and at the same time the r-Locative in -ḥnor = -ḥno-dze, is established by:

sku-mag-ḥno-dze-me-na-hldis
ḥḍah-mag-ḥno-dze-me-na-ḥsams, 58

1 Cf. the cases of repeated words supplied underlined, as noted supra, pp. 117, 229.
'the body in battle leaps in fire;
'the arrow (Tib. \(mdah\), cf. p. 343: on \(hldah\) see p. 317) in battle[-time] is made ready (\(hsams\) in fire')

twa\-\(n\)-mag-\(hno\)[-]\(r[e]\) . . . \(hkya\-\(n\)-mag-\(hno\)[-]\(r[e]\), 48–9
'in a battle of twa\-\(n\) . . . in a battle of \(hkya\-\(n\)'
\(hdihi\)-mag-\(hno\)[-]\(r[e]\)-ma-\(hpu\)-mu-re, 184
'in this battle mother and children being cold (afraid ?)'

Even outside the compound mag-hno the form mag is seen in:
\(hsad\)-mag-hdehi-dze-\(h\-\(si\)-kyeg-mye\), 102
'in those whose army\(^1\) is defeated the fire (courage) is winter-clogged (\(h\-\(si\)-kyeg\), p. 226)'

where the \(hsad\), sad, of the passage ll. 145–9 recurs.

Of the other expressions in the passage many (\(phye\), hgo, \(knam\) = Tib. \(\tilde{n}\)ams, 'mind', &c., hrah-hto\(n\), hto\(g\), r\(\tilde{u}\)e, hne, hma\(n\), byi, hldon, \(hsad\), rgya\(n\), \(rama\), gyim, myag, stor, hrah (= Tib. dgra), \(s\-\(ni\)u\), have already been discussed: others, hthu\(n\) = Tib. thu\(n\), 'small'; h\(drag\) = Tib. drag, 'fierce', 'confident', &c.; h\(phom\) (l. 347 hpom) = Tib. h\(pham\)/pham, 'be defeated'; h\(dra\-\(n\)-re, 'at every pull') = Tib. h\(dren\), dra\(\tilde{n}\), dra\(\tilde{n}\), tra\(n\), dro\(\tilde{n}\) (dra\(\tilde{n}\)-dgu, 'every pull', in one of the Tibetan manuscripts), 'pull', 'drag', 'draw', 'lead', &c., may here be lightly passed over.
The phrase stor-ta-hthog(s), ll. 145, 149, contains a form h\(thog\) (l. 235 h\(tog\) = Tib. thogs, 'hold up', 'obstruct', connected, no doubt, with h\(dogs\), btags, gdags, thogs, 'bind', 'attach'; cf. p. 156. H\(yu\)-sad has been understood as = Tib. yul-brlag, 'country ruined', of an old text: on h\(yu\) = yul see p. 333. H\(sod\), which cannot be connected with Tib. sad/g\(sad\)/g\(sod\), 'comb' (a horse), 'brush', 'stroke', or with b\(sad\)/s\(od\)/b\(sod\), 'expound', 'state', may be = s\(od\), 'low', 'bottom', concerning which see p. 6: in l. 198 s\(odtsa\) is used of 'corpses' (hro-ta), in l. 281 (p. 231) of 'forests' (hbo-hram). The form s\(odtsa\), h\(sodtsa\), is peculiar both in itself and by reason of the fact that in both passages it functions as a monosyllable. Possibly it was intended as equivalent to h\(sod\)s, an s-Preterite of h\(sod\), which, however, would be hard to parallel, there being no other recognized s-Preterites from Verbs with final d.\(^2\) My\(age\)(= myag-ge)-me-h\(ta\)\(n\) can mean, here and in l. 39,

\(^1\) Or 'army fortune (h\(d\)c)' or 'army heat (l\(d\))', with a paronomasia.

\(^2\) Such Preterites in -\(ds\) were, however, posited by the late Dr. Wolfenden (Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology. p. 58(1), and JRAS. 1937, p. 648) as the source of the -\(s\) in d-verbs; and an actual instance may be seen in the word skyeds, 'interest' (?), occurring in a document (Tib. Literary Texts, &c., ii, p. 190): cf. h\(brad\)-sta. p. 359.
'the power (htaṅ = Tib. than, as elsewhere) of fire (perhaps here implying 'courage') is spoiled (Tib. myag').

In tor-ḥtas-prom (l. 148) ħtas cannot well be = Tib. ḡdas, ‘passed’, which in l. 85 is ḡdas: also tor cannot here be the frequent tor/ḥtor, ‘great’. The phrase must be the same as in ll. 121-2, where we are told that ‘if friendship is not, htor-ḥtas-ḥproms’: there, if we translate ‘the tuft (Tib. thor, e.g. of hair) has become tangled’, understanding ħtas as = Tib. hthas, ‘not straightforward’, ‘hard’, ‘solid’, s (originally Aoristic) form of tha, ‘hard’, ‘compact’,1 ‘bad’, we obtain a satisfactory sense and at the same time a relation to the proverb sdud-ka-nī-bal-nas-bchad (also glad-kyi-phud-ṇams), ‘the tie from the hair was burst’, of one of the Tibetan manuscripts (cf. thor-te, ‘the top point of the hair’, &c., gtsug-thor, ‘tor, thor-gtsug, ‘turban’, ‘head-tuft’, ‘top-knot’).2 Then in the preceding verse we shall have:

spye-ḥtor-hdwa-dze-myag-myi-tor

‘when the summer (spye, as in ll. 159, 190) -sheaf goes wrong (hdwa), the man-sheaf (coherence of the troops) gives way (myag, ‘corrupts’).

The word hdwa, known to the Tibetan dictionaries only in dwa-ba, name of ‘a plant yielding an acrid drug’, occurs in the Tibetan manuscript in the phrase dwa-bSES-myed, ‘a poor wretch (?) without friends’ (cf. Chinese to < d’uā, ‘ruin’, Karlgren, nos. 1008-9), which may indicate the general sense in the Nam passage.

In:

htar-ḥtas-prom-ḥrom-nehu-ḥso-bos, 257

‘in the vacancy (ḥrom = Tib. rum) of the tuft which has become tangled a new ḡso-bos’

we have evidently in ḡso-bos a synonym for thor; the expression will mean ‘top (ḥso = Tib. gtso, cf. ḡse = gtse)-swell’ (ḥbo, ḡbos, bos, see p. 231). Tibetan gtso has also the anticipated forms gco/co (Nam ḡco, l. 55); and this appears in co-to, ‘a tuft of hair on the head’.

It is unfortunate that in Tib. thor, ‘anything gathered into a point’, of which, as we see, the predominant sense is ‘top-knot’,

1 In the Tibetan manuscripts we find ziṅ-ta(= tha)-bahi-rna (for rña), ‘fields with thick mowing’.

2 Possibly the Nam people wore an elaborate top-knot, like the ‘horn’ of the modern Black (sc. Independent) Lo-los, who so much resemble them (figured in Fergusson, op. cit., p. 301, and D'Ollone, In Forbidden China, p. 90). See next page.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ṣid-g-ri-ārthor-dze, 34} & \quad \text{‘on the summit of a high mountain’}, \\
\text{ḥṣid-hrihi-hūtor-dze, 62}
\end{align*}
\]

But what is the signification of the quasi-proverbial phrase mo-ma-thor(hūtor), ll. 63, 71, 144, always corresponding to a ḫldi-ma-hṛtaḥ(ṛtaḥ), ‘the horse does not leap (gallop)’, in the following verse? The expression, which is linked by the word thor to the above tor/ārthor-ḥtas-prom/hproms, is further associated therewith by the application to friendship in:

hno-stor-hsan-stor-mo-ma-hūtor, 143–4
‘when friends are gone (Tib. soṅ, ‘go’) lost, the mo does or do not bunch’.

If the two phrases are equivalent, mo should mean ‘hair’: and this is in itself likely, because Hsi-hsia has ma (= Chinese mau, mao, Laufer, 92; Karlsgren, 602), which exists not only in the Nepal dialects cited by Laufer, and apparently elsewhere also in Tibeto-Burman, but actually in Hsi-fan, Mānyak mūṅ. This also accords with:

ḥyaṅ-hso-hṛṇi-dze-mo-ma-hūtor, 63
‘if the net or noose (Tib. rūṅ/sūṅ) is too large (Tib. yaṅs ?), the hair does not bunch’;

for the rūṅ, well-known in the sense of a trapper’s net, will be the sdud-ka, ‘tie’, of the above Tibetan sentence, and the dar-sna and o’sni, ‘silk tie’ of Tibetan Literary Texts, &c., ii, pp. 398, 440–1, and of thor-cog-dar-sna, ‘silk string of the spiral hair-plait’ (thor-cog and o’tshugs, S. C. Das’s Dictionary). But in l. 71 (p. 304) the meaning ‘sheep’ (‘ewe’?) or ‘goat’, attested in Hsi-hsia (Laufer, no. 173) is clearly more apposite, especially in view of the expression ḫṇaṅ-hya-ḥtsag, ll. 44–5 (see p. 343).

It seems probable that one same Predicate thor should be recognized in:

rūṅ-lad-thor-dze-ca-yaṅ-ḥtor, 235–6

In spite of the word ḫbro, ‘flee’, apparently alternative in l. 240 to
htor/thor, and the possibility of applying the idea of 'scattering' to r än(gse)-lad, 'requital of wrong (harm)', it does not seem reasonable to attribute to the Verb a meaning so opposed to the preceding, however justified in Tibetan. The meaning may be that the 'requital of evil (r än/gse-lad)' is exacted 'in a lump' and that the ca/hcah/hcah are taken in along with the other offenders.

The word lad/blad, will be a d-form corresponding to Tib. lan, 'turn', 'return', 'requital', lad-mo, 'imitation', 'mimic', slad (slan), 'after', 'back', slar, 'back'.

31. khrom, hkrom, hkhram, hgrom, hgroms; hcer; hpyi; hpraḥ; cig-dze; hldam.

Khrom is antithetic to hcer in:

mor-tsah-khrom-re || hyaṅ-tsa-hcer ||, 388

'when the evil khrom, the good hcer'

and the same antithesis takes the form of parallel in:

ru-ge-hkrom-dze-mo-ma-thor
hcha-ge-hcer-dze-hldi-ma-ṛtah ||, 70-1.

In Tibetan the Verb bcer/gcer, denotes a fixed stare or glare, and the Adverb cer-re/ce-re means 'with fixed stare'. In one of the Tibetan manuscripts it has been found applied to the stare of affright; but it might equally be used of a terrifying glare. In l. 202 of the Nam text phyi-rjes-ne-hcer seems to mean 'the good man is (in certain circumstances) afraid of a memorial'.

In the first passage quoted the good evidently stare with alarm at the evil, who khrom: in the second the horse refuses to leap at a ravenous animal (hcha) which glares.

The word khrom in the first passage must signify some kind of success; and, if we understand a 'spreading', the ru-ge-hkrom of the second passage can be adjusted as meaning 'with widespread horns (sheep do not flock together?)'. But a somewhat different notion is suggested by the phrase hgye-hkrom-hkrom, 'light flickers', discussed supra, p. 235-6, and there connected with the Tibetan hgrem, &c., 'spread', 'sprinkle', 'display', 'scatter'.

In view of certain traces of word-play in the Nam text it is not at all unlikely that in the verse:

'when the evil khrom ('spread' or 'glitter'), the good stare in fright'

both senses were envisaged.
The notion of 'prospering', 'flourishing', 'shining', can be seen also in:

\[ hkhram_1\text{-}re\text{-}hrda\text{-}ya\text{-}hrk\text{-}hpyi\text{-}hpraḫ ||, 332–3 \]

'though when prosperous (active, shining) wrathful (Tib. sdañ), when slain the hpyi\textsuperscript{2} (or "(creatures) after death") are of no account (hpraḥ, as elsewhere = Tib. phra, "small", or possibly Tib. ḥphra, "kick", "be kicked").'

\[ hkhar\text{-}rpag\text{-}g\text{-}yar\text{-}re\text{-}hldag\text{-}[nag\text{-}]hgrom, 135–6 \]

'When Low-town became high, the black-back flourished'

\[ hhta\text{-}swa\text{-}gkom\text{-}re\text{-}htor\text{-}hbroñ\text{-}hgrom, 222–3 \]

'while the horse was occupied with watching, the great yak flourished'

the last passage being followed by:

\[ htor\text{-}hbroñ\text{-}hgrom\text{-}re \ldots \{ 222–3 \]

\[ htor\text{-}hbroñ\text{-}hpaq\text{-}re \ldots \} \]

where there is an explicit antithesis of hgrom, 'flourished', to hpaq, 'brought low'.

The same meaning must be recognized in:

\[ hyañ\text{-}tsa\text{-}hjo\text{-}dze\text{-}hyañ\text{-}ge\text{-}hgroms \]

\[ tor\text{-}pu\text{-}hgru\text{-}ge\text{-}htor\text{-}moñ\text{-}hdzoñ\text{-}re\text{-}hhta\text{-}hdzo\text{-}hkrom, 63–4 \]

'when the good are chiefs, the good flourish: '

'... the Moñ-castle being lost, the men were scattered'

(the events indicated by the expressions 'the horse occupied in watching', 'Low-town become high', and 'Moñ-castle lost', being all one occurrence).

In:

\[ hldyañ\text{-}hyu\text{-}hjo\text{-}cig\text{-}dze\text{-}htor\text{-}ge\text{-}hkroms, 387 \]

\[ hldyañ\text{-}hjo\text{-}hkrom\text{-}ni, 390 \]

the sense of hkroms/hkrom is not clear.

The expression cig-dze, interpreted (p. 234) as cig, 'ruined' (= Tib. hjig/bžig/sig) and recurring as cig/gcig in ll. 194, 208, 356, 377+dze, may in l. 387 be the unanalysable term repeated in:

\[ cig\text{-}dze\text{-}htor[\text{-}re\text{-}]hl\text{ldam\text{-}re\text{-}hldan, 186–9, 192,} \]

where some official title or designation might be apposite. If the case were so, we could think only of Turkī cigšī, 'prefect', which appears in Chinese as ts'e-che (= še), in Central-Asian Tibetan Documents (ii, p. 49) as tshi-šī, and, probably, in one of 'the

1 Tib. khram is 'cunning', 'artful', 'lively', 'brisk', 'quick', as boys, kids, &c.

2 Perhaps Tib. dbyi, g-yi, 'lynx'.


Tibetan manuscripts' as *si-si-druṅ-po*, 'si-si official'. Possibly the line refers, as would be apposite in the context, to reports, &c., of such officials; but the phrase *hldam* (cf. Tib. *ldam-ltem*, 'dubious', &c.?)-*rc-hldan* is obscure.

In ll. 150, *hkyer-re-cig-dze*, 376, *rab-hgo-cig-dze*, the meaning 'ruined', 'overthrown', is clear.

32. *hgru*, *hgru-hldan-hmah/ma*; *hgru-ma*; *htor(tor)-hpu* (*hpuḥu*, *hphu*, *ḥbu*)-*hgru*.

Some of the most puzzling expressions in the text occur together in the lines:

*ḥṣid-hrīḥi-hṭhor-dze-hgru-hldan-hmah*
*ḥṭor-hphu-hgru-dze-gla-hṭso-hṭsah*, 62

of which the first recurs (*ḥṣid-g-ri-hṭor-dze . . .*) in ll. 34–5, and the second in ll. 29–30 (*hpu*, *ḥdzo*). Having acquiesced (p. 303) in the rendering of *ḥṣid-hrīḥi-hṭhor-dze* by 'on the top of a high hill', we come next to *hgru-hldan-hmah (ma)*. This expression, repeated in:

*hgru-hldan-hmah-dze-hṣom-ḥkhog, 21*
*hgru-hldan-hmah-ge-hṣes-ḥbeg-hrah ||, 22–3*
*hgru-hldan-ma-dze-hṛgū-hṭo-hrun ||, 30*

seems to denote some more than casual object. The element *hgru*, which, if = Tib. *gru*, should mean either (a) 'boat' or (b) 'angle', 'corner', 'edge' (*gru-bzi*, 'square', *gru-mo*, 'elbow', *gru-ma*, 'angle', 'corner', 'edge', *yul-gru*, 'locality' (country-corner)), may have the meaning (b) in:

*ḥldu-hṛo-hgru ||, 19*, 'the assembly-place (after the overthrow of the bžer, which was a building) a corner'
*ḥṛi-hgru-gras-re, 300*, 'the mountain corners (recesses ?) being aligned'.

But a different sense is apparent in:

*hgru-ḥṣram-ḥṭam-ge-hṣes-beg-ḥṣṭah ||, 24*

'the *hgru* firmly (*ḥṣram*) knit together are (were) Ḥṣes-beg's station'

which, however, is closely connected with *hgru-hldan-hmah* by the statement (ll. 22–3):

*hgru-hldan-hmah-ge-hṣes-ḥbeg-hrah ||*

'Hgru-hldan-hmah was (were) Ḥṣes-ḥbeg's place'.

Here we might understand *hgru*, 'corner', in the sense of 'corner (sc. projecting or recess in) rocks'; and we have already (p. 223) seen that Ḥṣes-ḥbeg was 'eye' and 'path' to the 'blind rocks'
Inasmuch as ʰldaⁿ is known as (a) 'stick', (b) 'rise', (c) 'side', and ʰmah should be either (a) 'low' or (b) 'not' or (c) a Suffix, the expression ʰgru-ʰldaⁿ-ʰmah might mean (a) 'promontories rise (rising) low', (b) 'side promontories', (c) 'promontories without trees', (d) 'promontories with low trees', (e) 'promontory risings'. None of these, however, seems to furnish a suitable abode for Ḥšes-ʰbeg; and, moreover, the statement in 1. 21 that in ʰgru-ʰldaⁿ-ʰmah the three grasses were spoiled (ṛtsa-gsom-ʰkhog) seems to point to a country rather than to such features. If we understand ʰgru-ʰldaⁿ-ʰmah as a proper name, we not only account for its recurrence, but recognize in its second syllable a characteristic of the names of places, imaginary or real, mentioned in the kindred literature. The Tibetan manuscripts mention:

- Rtsi-daⁿ, one of the 13 (mythological) countries,
- Ḥbum-daⁿ, one of the 13 (mythological) towns,
- Guñ-daⁿ, the (mythological) country of Guñ-tshun,
- Rji-luⁿ-daⁿ-ba, the (mythological) country of the Rji (= rdzi, 'storm-wind')? Phyar-phyur,
- Pyi-gtaⁿ-sum, a Ḥbrog country,
- Pyi-lđaⁿ, a certain locality,
- Dbye (Bye)-lḍaⁿ-sum, a Ḥbrog country = Dbye-mo.

It seems likely that in all these names we have one and the same syllable daⁿ, ldaⁿ, conventionally employed in the naming of imaginary places and preceded by a syllable which in some cases (Guñ and Rji) was used as name of the inhabitants, but in other cases (Rtsi, 'sap'?, Pyi, 'outer', Dbye, 'extent'? ) denoted something else. Accordingly Ḥgru-ʰldaⁿ-ʰmah might be 'country of rocks or rock-recesses', if it should not rather be 'country of the Ḥgru'.

The last-mentioned possibility, which might involve the supposition that the text regards the Ḥgru people as the people of the ʰgru, 'rocks' or 'mountain recesses', would not be foreign to the manner of this literature and would be in harmony with the bulk of the old Tibetan personal nomenclature, which prefixes names of countries, places, tribes, &c., as surnames to the individual designations of persons. We should, however, be inclined to pass it over, as an unnecessary complication, but for two circumstances. The first of the two is the fact that a Ḥgru people is mentioned, along with the Dbra, Ldoⁿ, and Lga, as one of 'four tribes' (Ṣ. C. Das's Dictionary). We may suspect that they figure in early Bon-po literature. Of the four the least legendary are the
The language Ldon, of whom some mention reaches historical times; the Lga attain a certain approximation to reality from the mention of a ‘Lgar-ma ancestor the Lga tribe’, which suggests that they may be the famous Mgar/Hgar. Here, however, the most significant are the Dbra, whose name is evidently connected with the word ḡbra discussed supra (pp. 215–6); for in ll. 30–2 a place ḡbra or ḡbra-hldah (p. 319) is mentioned immediately after ḡgru-hldan-ma, as not shaken by the cataclysm which ruined the latter. This greatly enhances the probability that ḡgru-hldan-ma is a place-name. The ḡgru might be connected with Gru, ‘a district of Tibet lying to the east and north of Dbus’ (central Tibet), and may have given a name to Gru-gu, a place near to Kad-roi, in Amdo (Geografia Tibet, p. 54), and to Gru-gu Rgya-ra, ‘a village in Khams’ (Ś. C. Das’s Dictionary). Upon this supposition the ḡgru people would be the people of the ḡgru (perhaps ‘rock’) country, and ḡgru-hldan-ḥmah would be their (fictitious) town.

The second circumstance is the repeated mention of the ḡtor-hpu(hbu, hphu)-ḥgru, which might mean the ‘great ḡgru men’, since ḡtor-hpu (ḥbu, hphu) has been found in the phrase ḡtor-hpu-hbos, meaning ‘the great big man or master’. This also we should be glad to avoid; and perhaps the rendering ‘great upland (ḥbu = Tib. phu, as in ḡbu-rwye-hce, ‘wide uplands’, ll. 15, 50) rocks or rock-recesses’ may better fit the occurrences:

- ḡtor-hpu-ḥgru-dze, 29 ‘in (not among) the ḡtor-hpu-ḥgru’
- ḡtor-hbu-ḥgru-dze, 33 ‘on (not among) the ḡtor-hpu-ḥgru’
- ḡtor-hphu-ḥgru-dze, 62 ‘on (not among) the ḡtor-hpu-ḥgru’
- tor-hpu-ḥgru-ge-ḥstor-mon-ḥdzon-re-ḥtsa-ḥdzo-ḥkrom, 64 ‘the tor-hpu-ḥgru having lost the Mon-castle . . .’

It is perhaps possible to acquiesce in this view.

There is, however, certainly another ḡgru, namely the Verb seen in the phrase hrim-ge-hgrus, ll. 293, 297, applied to some beings who perhaps ‘exerted themselves all round’ (hrim) the ‘big man’ (hpahu-hbos) or ‘on the watch mountain’ (ḥscah-ḥyer-ḥri). ḡgrus should be Preterite of Tib. ḡgru, ‘take pains’ (ḥgrus, ‘zeal’, ‘diligence’). But it may be suspected that the whole phrase hrim-ḥgrus is an old, or dialectical, form of Tib. rim-ḥgro, ‘ceremony’, ‘service’, ‘attendance upon’, ‘homage’, with an o/u alternation to be discussed below (p. 369), and that Tib. gros, ‘advice’, ‘counsel’, ‘heed’ (gros-pa, gros-mi, ‘counsellor’, ‘adviser’), is the same word.

At any rate ḡgru-ma, which is mentioned in the same context
as *htar-kpu-hgru*, must mean 'council'. The first mention of *hgru-ma*:

\[ g-ra\bar{h}-g-yo-rbo-ge-hgru-ma-hti \mid, 27 \]

'the earthquake swelling up, the *hgru-ma* stopped' cannot mean 'the rocks do not (ma) stand still', because a few lines later we read:

\[ hgru-h\bar{m}a-hkom-re-hrwad-h\bar{m}o\bar{n}-hldah, 32-3 \]

'\( hgru-ma \) being made, harsh noise (hrwad, see p. 257) was confused (?)' and in l. 77:

\[ h\bar{l}de-ge-hgru-ma-r\bar{m}a\bar{n}, \]

'the powers (authorities, nobles) dreamed, or conceived, of a *hgru-ma*'

and a few lines later:

\[ h\bar{n}o-stor-prom-re-hgru-ma-stor \mid \]

\[ stor-h\bar{t}o-\bar{r}ta-ya\bar{n}-stor-to-hrun \mid \bar{\varepsilon} \mid, 79-80 \]

'the friends having taken flight, the *hgru-ma* fled; [that] fled, the horse also had to flee'.

The *hgru-ma* was, accordingly, a sort of assembly, on the lines of the regular Tibetan *h\bar{d}un-ma* and the gatherings mentioned as occurring among the Ch'iang tribes and similarly among rude peoples everywhere. Whether the term was current or was invented by the text with reference to Hgru-hldâñ-hmah or the Verb *hgru* may be left doubtful. Some playings with words have been noted *supra* (pp. 269, 285, 304); and they seem to have been frequent in the old Bon-po writings, which in their cosmologies, historical statements, &c., freely mixed realities with fantasies.

The occurrence of different meanings of *hgru* in adjacent contexts does not attain the level of such a collocation as *ši-ši-ši-tcūmñi-šihi-ši* in a Chinese text written in Tibetan character: there the three first *ši*’s are, as is shown by the corresponding Chinese writing, all different words, differing also from *šihi*. But in the Nam text assonances of like nature, if less concentrated, are to be reckoned with.

33. *ya\bar{n}, hya\bar{n}, g-ya\bar{n}, gya\bar{n}, h\bar{g}ya\bar{n}, h\bar{g}ya\bar{n}s, rgya\bar{n}.*

That this should be a troublesome group of words was to be anticipated in view of the situation in Tibetan, where we find:

A: *ya\bar{n} — (1) ‘though’, ‘even’, ‘also’, ‘again’ (Sandhi variant of *kya\bar{n}, gya\bar{n})*, whence, in compounds, also
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'further' or 'higher', e.g. yañ-thog, 'highest story', yañ-dag, 'very real', yañ-ma, 'grandmother', yañ-slob, 'pupil's pupil'.

(2) 'light', e.g. in yañ-lci, 'light and heavy'.

(3) in the Tibetan manuscripts, yañ-ba, 'conduit' or 'watercourse'.

(4) in the Tibetan manuscripts 'evil' = rgyañ, antithetic of byin-che, 'blessing', 'bliss'.

B: yañs, 'wide', 'extensive'.

C: g-yañ = (1) 'luck', 'prosperity'.
(2) 'sheep' and 'goat', perhaps originally only a stuffed one, as an auspicious object.
(3) 'gulf', 'abyss'.

D: gyañ
(1) for kyañ, 'although', &c. (in the Tibetan manuscripts).
(2) 'clay stamped into moulds' for building, &c.

E: hgyañ, hgyañs, 'be delayed', 'tarry'.

F: rgyañ = (1) 'distance'.
(2) 'stretched'.
(3) 'wall'.
(4) in the Tibetan manuscripts—'evil'.
(5) in the Tibetan manuscripts = rkyañ, 'the wild ass'.

G: rgyañs(-te) = 'in haste'.

hgyañs, brgyañs, 'stretched', = rkyañ, brkyañs, rgyoñ, rkyoñ, 'stretch'.

It is fairly obvious that the forms with r-, except rkyañ, 'the wild ass' and rgyañ, 'evil', contain the general idea of stretching: whether in hgyañs, 'stretched', the r- has, or has not, been lost may be an open question. The rgyañ, 'evil', of the Tibetan manuscripts, is perhaps a perversion of g-yañ, 'luck', which is the more likely inasmuch as yañ occurs with the same sense.

Further, it is apparent that the r- forms are derivatives by means of the r/s Prefix, with an originally Active, Transitive, Causative, or Denominative function, from the Root seen in hgyañ, hgyañs, wherein, again, the idea of a 'stretch' is already present. But this hgyañ, also, is a derivative, as we can see, from yañs, 'wide', 'extensive'; and the g appears as a Prefix (the
Tibetan did not often confuse gy and g-y) in g-yañ, ‘gulf’, ‘abyss’, in which possibly the original conception was that of ‘yawning’. The yañ, ‘conduit’, which the Tibetan manuscripts use as equivalent to the usual yur, is also properly ‘the long’, as we can see from the reference to ‘quaffing water of the long-mouthed (kha-yañs)’, sc. of rivers and watercourses. We need not consider the other words, some of which seem to be connected with the ya of ya/ma ‘upper/lower’.

We see that the r-Prefix at the time when it had a living function could be applied to forms from y- roots already equipped with the g-Prefix wherein that Prefix was no longer recognized as such. In fact the s/r-Prefix is never applied to initial y without the intervention of the g; so that Tibet has no words with initial sy or ry. We cannot connect this with the fact that in Amdo rgy- is commonly pronounced ry, this phenomenon being of too limited a range in space, and having no appearance of antiquity.

In the Nam text we can distinguish:

(a) yañ = ‘also’, ‘even’, ‘though’, ll. 79, 80, 92 (2), 119, 123, 127, 160, 161, 162 (2), 173, 180, 236, 242, 306, 332, 345: this is always in the caesura position, or in an equivalent position, except in ll. 236, 345 (in the latter corresponding to hkyañ, l. 344), where it is attached to a single word.

hyañ = ‘also’, ‘even’, ‘although’, ll. 6, 24, 241, 249 (?), 255, 256, 300, 304; this also is in the caesura position, except in ll. 6, 24, 241, 249, exceptions similar to those in the case of yañ.

gyañ = ‘although’, l. 263, in the caesura position.

hyañ = ‘also’, ll. 18, 98, 344, 372: attached to a single word.

(b) hyañ = ‘good’ or ‘upper’, which latter is perhaps the original sense (√ya), ll. 5, 10, 41, 66, 226, 287, 290, 316, 355, 383, 388: this, as Substantive or Adjective, is usually first in the verse (or clause) and the Subject of its sentence: only in l. 5 is it Predicate; often it is antithetic to mor. In ll. 63–4 hyañ-so(hso) is of uncertain meaning.

g-yañ-ra, l. 31, is likely to be identical (‘good’ or ‘high’ place) with the hyañ-hrañ of ll. 66, 226.

(c) yañ, ‘conduit’, ‘watercourse’, l. 355 (Chinese yang ?).

(d) hyañ, ‘conduit’ ?, ll. 178, 179, 367, 391 (hlyañ-hyañ-hyo).

(e) ḡyañ, a Verb, perhaps always signifying ‘tarry’, ll. 7, 77, 200, 217, 292 (’sto), 296, 392: always concluding its sentence: in l. 114 ḡkyañ is written in error.
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hgyanś, Preterite of the same Verb, l. 241 (cf. also hgyan-sto, l. 292, = hgyanś-to).
gyan-gyan, l. 92, may be the same Verb.
hgyan, l. 153, is an error for hgyan, l. 158.
(f) gyan-g-ri, l. 313, is not clear.
(g) rgyan, ‘extent’, ‘extensive’, ll. 16, 52 (2), 55, 57, 147, 151, 152, 155: hkyan-rgyan, ll. 42, 81, 268.
rgyan, perhaps ‘far’, ‘completely’, l. 89.
rgyan, possibly ‘(long) wall’, l. 300.
(h) kyan, ? sense, l. 192.
(i) hkyan, error for hgyan, l. 114.
(j) hkyan-rgyan, ‘stove-bed’ (?), ll. 42, 81, 268.

The predominance of the form yan, ‘also’, &c., in comparison with the synonymous hyan, and its rarity in other senses, suggests that the h, which is also practically never joined to the other enclitics, ge, dze, na, ni, carried a slight increase of emphasis, and was not merely graphic.

34. Ra, rah, hrah, hrar, g-rah, hgraḥ.

For the most part there is no difficulty in equating these forms to Tib. ra, ‘limited or enclosed space or sphere’ or, according to its primary sense, ‘enclosure’, ‘fence’, ‘circle’: it is often used to form compounds, e.g. khrims-ra, ‘yard before a court of justice’, lcan-ra, ‘willow grove’, lug-ra, ‘sheepfold’, btson-ra, ‘prison’. It is only necessary to add the personal sense in sku-ra, ‘body enclosure’, ‘oneself’, sgo-ra, ‘door-enclosure’, ‘janitors’, of the Tibetan manuscripts.

In the Nam text we may distinguish:

1. -r or -ra as a Locative Suffix with Substantives (Tib. -r, -ra, -ru), scanned either as a syllable or as unsyllabic, even sometimes after -g or -n: see pp. 174, 178, where reference is made to the very numerous resulting confusions. The same use occurs after verb-forms in phrases, hgah-hldoṇra1-hnāḥ, l.302, ‘where are no fugitive hgah’, hrgyo-hṣeg-gṣegra, ll. 330, 331 (hrbyo° ‘gser), ‘where hrgyo comes’.

The form hrar, ll. 216, 237, 243, 246, 248, always a dissyllable, is the Locative of ra itself.

2. rah, hrah, g-rah, usually mean ‘place’, e.g. in g-rah-hyos,

1 Here perhaps intended for re: see p. 239.
'earthquake', ll. 8, 26, 27, 34, rgyed (hrgyed)-hra(h (hrar), 'place of disunion', ll. 216, 243, 341, &c. This meaning fits even g-rah-gsog-hner, ll. 7, 20: hrah-hrta(h, ll. 77, 114, seems to mean 'the horse (-chief) of the place'. As terminal member of a compound, this ra/rah/hra/hrah is found, further, with skah-, 'saddle', l. 45, hno-, 'friend' (ll. 264, 279, &c.), hce-, 'great' (ll. 49, 50, 56), sta(h)-hro-, 'high country' (l. 347), htham-, 'union' (l. 227), hphh-ma-, 'father and mother' (ll. 73-4), brac(h, 'increase', &c. (l. 228), rma(h, 'tomb' (l. 148), htsah-, 'harvest' (l. 277), hrah-, 'action' or 'government' (l. 353), hla(n/g-ya(n-, 'good' or 'upper' (ll. 31, 66, 226), hra-n-, 'own' (ll. 21, 166, 167), gsah-, 'land' (l. 277), gsa(n-, 'enemy' (ll. 263, 273, &c.). The same appears as first member of the compounds hrah-hlto(n (ll. 146, 273, 358), hrah-ue (we(hi, ll. 114, 139), 'give, or surrender, place'. The personal sense may be seen in mehi-hrah, ll. 78, 186, 369, mehi-spehi-hrah, l. 370, rgo-hrah, l. 315, sku(hu-ra (??), l. 7.

3. hrah/g-rah seems equivalent to Tib. dgra, 'enemy', in:

hra(h-sfiin-ñe-ge-stor-ta-hthog, 149, 'the evil-hearted enemy stopped flight'

g-rah-hsa(h-hkeche-na, 314, 'in winning an enemy land or in any enemy’s winning the land':

perhaps also in:

hra(h-ldah-ge-hdza(h ||, 43, 'the enemies there are friends’ (but see p. 334)

hra(h-hmad-hfie-nag, 202, 'low, evil-voiced enemies' (?)

g-rah-nag-hbo-nya(n, 262-3, 'though enemy-voice swelled’;

cf. hlab-ta-gbohun-st (pp. 158, 231) and hsa(n-nag-rgyes-hkom, pp. 320, 360.

hcha-hgra(h-nu, 239, 'strength of hostile ravenous beasts'

hbrou(h-hldah-hdzaam-re-hrah-rte-hdubna, 182 (354 "hra(h-hrta(re-hdub") 'the yak there being tamed, the enemy subsided’.

Here we might think of Tib. dgra-sde, 'enemy troop'; but elsewhere in the Nam text Tib. sde is represented by rdehe, l. 213, hrde, l. 301 (p. 270), while we find a grtehe in l. 181, apparently meaning 'fix', and in l. 265 gsa(n-ta-hrte(hu, 'stopped' (?) 'hostilities', where the same Verb may perhaps be seen. In l. 82, again, he(h-hra(h might be 'group of ravenous creatures' (p. 259), while in l. 260 we have taken (p. 343) gdes as Preterite of a gde, hrde (= Hsi-hsia gde(h/hrde, 'fix', 'make certain' (Nevsky, No. 25, but gde(h, No. 24,
A Hsi-hsia grdiḥ (No. 34) is given as meaning 'cultivate', 'devote oneself', and a grdeḥ (No. 91) as 'shallow', 'vulgar', 'light', 'weak', and a hrtri (No. 201) as 'change'.

4. g-raḥ in:

hsu-re || hru-ge-g-raḥ-hdzam-nag ||, 275

'with horns attending, the g-raḥ gave mild (or friendly) voice', since the previous line speaks of 'dogs mildly panting', must be some animal; being horned, it is, no doubt, the goat = Tib. ra.

5. hgraḥ in sta-hldyaṅ-hṭye(hṭye)-dze-hmo-ge-me-hgraḥ, l. 8, 20, 'the clouds (hmog) or heavens had fire hgraḥ', may be = Tib. sgra 'sound'. But ignorance of the meaning of hṭye (hṭye) precludes a decision.

The form ro, which in Tibetan frequently helps to constitute names of countries and districts, e.g. Cog-ro, Myan-ro, Spag-ro, and which implies a larger area than does ra, occurs in 'this place (hro)', l. 333, and in compounds with hgo-, 'gate' or 'head' (?)(ll. 212–13), ḥchi-, 'go' (l. 345), staṅ-, 'upper' (l. 347), ḥldu- (l. 19), hldyaṅ- (l. 386), hldyaṅ-paḥ- (ll. 271–2), ḥdyo- (ll. 383–4), ḥldyo- (l. 384), ḥldyoṅ- (l. 387), ḥpaḥ-ḥldaṅ- (l. 377), ḥpro- (l. 181), spo- (l. 381), mu- (l. 11).

35. ḥkaḥ, ḥkhāḥ.

Kha in Tibetan is properly 'mouth', 'face', 'surface', but also 'speech', 'word': there is another kha, usually employed, with the meanings 'occasion', 'time', 'place', as the second member of a compound, e.g. in ḥgro-khar, 'at the time of going', but also, in the same senses, with a preceding Genitive. There are further, kha, 'snow', and kha, 'bitter'. The first of all these is used as the prior number of a multitude of compounds, some with literal, others with metaphorical, meanings.

The signification 'mouth' is forthwith apparent in:

hyaṅ-ḥraḥ-ḥkaḥ-hldom-ge-ru-glaṅ-ge-ḥṭhuł-hi ||, 66–7

'mouth-tied in the proper, or upper, place, horned oxen are controlled';

cf. Tib. kha-sdom, 'to silence, gag'.

Ḥkaḥ, ḥkhāḥ, 'speech', is clear in:

ḥkaḥ-gsaṅ, 214, gsaṅ-ḥkaḥ, 204, ḥkhāḥ-gsaṅ, 329, 'secret speech'.

ḥkaḥ-ḥraṅ, 104, 'free to speak', ḥraṅ-ḥkaḥ, 117, 'free spoken'.

1 This is perhaps exemplified in rne-ḥldaṅ-ḥkhar, l. 197.
hkhah-hldah-hńahghi, 137, 'those entitled to speak should give voice'.
hwa-hkah, 137, 'doing and speaking' or 'talk of action'.
hsas-hkah-ge, 116, 'talk about the child'.
hkhah-hldan-hnore-tsa-chah || hkańhi ||, 163, 'talk rising foolish is the whole story (cha)' (?)
hkah-hgañ-hjor, 194, 'all talk is babble' (Tib. ca-co, 'babble',
co-re, cor-cor, 'sound of effervescence, klag-cor, 'clamour',
'noise', kha-bcol, 'prattle', col-chuñ, 'childish prattle', mu-
cor, 'rudeness in speech', 'nonsense').
the-then-hldi-bžir-hkah-hgän-htsur, 207, 'to this wise [Hsi-
hsia gźir (Nevsky No. 281) "wise"] folk-control all the talk
comes'.
rgyed-ma-hldan-ge-hkah-hcog-byin-ta, 104–5, 'when dis-
union rises, putting in a word (kha-cug (tsug) of the Tibetan
manuscripts) is a blessing (byin, l. 57).
hkah-hgo, 105 = Tib. kha-bsgo, 'giving directions' (or
possibly 'understanding (Tib. go) advice').
hkah-hkhab, 105, 106, 'concealing what is said'.
hkah-hpyah-hldan, 327, 'were repaid (Tib. ldon) with rebuke'
(Tib. ḡphyia, 'censure', cf. kha-phog, 'rebuke', ḡphyur-kha,
'blame', &c.)¹ ?
It is not so certain in:
hkah-hgro-ge-hkah, 239, 'home-going is to be talked of',
'is the moment for home-going'? 
ṛñam-skar-hkah-re-gdah-hnâ-hgm ||, 191, 'when there is
talk of, or it is a moment of, threatening stars, (any)
available place is home'.
hyań-hkah-rdza, 287, 290, = hkah-hrdza-hdze, 296, =
hkah-hrdza, 296
where ḡyań certainly = 'good' or 'superior' and hrdza appears
from its other occurrence, l. 382, to be a derivative from hdza,
'friend' and to mean 'in friendly union'. The ḡkah-rdza are con-
nected with stsâh, ll. 288, 290, and ḡswâh, l. 296, both of which have
been found (pp. 276–8) to denote 'watching' or 'supervision'. The
sense might be 'united in counsel'; but Tibetan has an expression
kha-rje, 'great lord', 'good luck', 'fortune', 'good', 'wealth',
which, since the meanings do not follow from kha+rje, might be a

¹ Or possibly 'paid command-impost (dpya)' (metaphorical). In the
Tibetan MS. Chronicle (British Museum portion, l. 18) appears the phrase
bkah-śo, 'special command-levy'.

LANGUAGE: ETYMOLOGY 315
perversion of a *kha-rdza*: the meaning ‘great lord’ might suit the Nam passages.

There remains the expression:

\[ \text{hke-hkah, 152, 153, hkeh}-\text{hkah, 158, hkehu-hkah, 364, kehu-hkah, 178} \]
\[ \text{(-dwan 364, rwa}-\text{n 178: cf. Tib. lab-dwa}s). \]

The word *hke*, &c., which appears also in the phrase *hke-prom*, l. 176, *keh}-\text{u-prom}, ll. 176, 360, 361, *hkehu-prom*, ll. 177, 178, 360, 362, 366, *gehu-prom*, l. 362, should not be different from the *hke* in *hke-}\text{plan-hdra}, ll. 195, 356, which has been found to mean ‘gain’, ‘profit’, and which, as a Verb, has been seen in ll. 36 (*hkes*, Preterite), 125 (*hkehe*), 251, 314 (*hkehe*), 212 (*hke(hi*)—the other instances, ll. 15, 41 (*hke(hi*) are not recalcitrant. The verse:

\[ \text{hke-hkah-}\text{n}-\text{es-re-ske-hbru}-\text{s-hgyaini, 152-3} \]
\[ \text{hkeh}-\text{e-hkah-}\text{n}-\text{es-re-ske-}\text{hbro-hgyan, 158} \]

should therefore mean:

‘if trade (or profit)-talk is faulty, the throat (Tib. *ske*), irritated or inflamed (Tib. *hbru, brus*, “probe”, “irritate”), itches (Tib. *g-yan*),

a sentiment in harmony with the context, which here enlarges upon bad beginnings. It will be seen that the *hbro* of l. 158, meaning ‘be sick’, confirms the interpretation of *hbru* in l. 152.

It must be admitted, however, that we have not solved all the difficulties connected with *hke/hkehu*. In the passage (ll. 165 sqq., cf. ll. 358 sqq.) concerning the distribution of the exercise and the fire of speech (*hko}\text{hu-prom, }\text{“me} we suddenly come upon the statement:

\[ \text{hban-hldah-hne-ge-hkehu-me-hdzah ||, 170} \]
‘good potentates eat the fire of *hkehu*’

and somewhat later:

\[ \text{rne-hpo-hldo-ge-hkehu-prom-hjo-na, 177} \]
\[ \text{hrne-hpo-hne-ge-hkohu-prom-hdzo}-\text{ho-na, 361-2} \]
‘the fiend braves (or evil fiend braves) ate the exercise of *hkehu* or *hkohu*’.

It is undeniable (see infra, p. 368) that a *hke, hkehu*, might exist as a form of *kha*, ‘mouth’, so that *hkehu-prom, }\text{“me}, would be synonymous with *hkohu (‘speech’)-prom, “me}; and in the above quoted ll. 152–3, 158, we might then translate *hke(hkehe)-hkah*, ‘mouth speech’, which would yield a good antithesis to *ske*, ‘throat’. But this would fail to do justice to the apparently pur-

positive alternative of *hkohu* and *hkehu* in ll. 165–80 and 358–65;
and we are, further, quite at a loss to interpret the pointed anti-
thesis of kehu(hkehu)-hkah and ldyañ(hldyañ)-hkah in ll. 177–8 and
364–5.

36. Words with initial ld.

Since it has already (p. 286) been seen that Nam ld- may corre-
spond to Tibetan d- and ld-, the l being, at any rate in some of the
instances of ld, a Prefix often found alternating in Tibetan itself
with other Prefixes attached to identical roots, and that it may
correspond to Tibetan l- and lh-, which in Tibetan also sometimes
alternate with ld-, we may here briefly deal with some recurrent
words in the Nam text which manifest this feature. We may pass
over:

(a) the Suffixes hldah(ldah, hlda, lda), hldo; (b) the Pronouns
hlda, hldi; (c) the words hldan/ldañ, hldhe/hldheh, hldon,
‘depart’, ‘flee’, = Tib. hdon, hlda (278) and hdañ (58, 59),
‘arrow’, = Tib. mdah = Hörpa lda. There remain:

(i) hldag/gldag = Tib. ltag (hdzur; ska; hbañ; khri; khyag).
This word, discussed supra (pp. 259–60) as occurring in the com-
 pound hldag/gldag-nag, ‘black-back’, has the sense of ‘load’ (Tib.
ltañ) in:

skañ-rañ-hdzur-dze-hldag-hbañ-hldon ||, 45
‘if the saddle (Tib. sga, but cf. ska-rags, “girdle”)—place is
awry (Tib. hdzur, bzur, gzur, “step aside”, “shy”, zur,
“corner” “aside”), the load goes rocking (?dbah, “wave”) or
“into a hole” (hbañ)

gldag-hce-rgyañ-na-hldag-khri-khyag-re-ñsid ||, 52
‘if the load is very large, the load support (khri) bending
(Tib. ıkhyog/khyog), it comes to grief’.

(ii) hldan, hldon = Tib. lan, lon, ‘retaliate’, ‘reply’, ldon, glon,
‘pay back’, ‘return’.

Hldan occurs in the phrases hldam(hdzam°, hjam°)-re-hldan in:
cig-dze-htor-hldam-re-hldan ||, 186–7, 187–8, 188–9
(meaning obscure, see pp. 305–6)
gsñ-rahñ-htnoñ-kyå-hñoñ-hjam-re-hldan, 273, cf. 274, 275
‘to enemy-abandoned crops friends returned mild’;
also in:

hrgyañ-hdi¡ñ-htron-re-hkah- hpyañ-hldan ||, 327–8
‘come to this plain (?) , are repaid with verbal reproof’ (Tib.
hphya, ‘reprove’, ? see supra, p. 315)
Hldon can be Imperative (Optative) of hldan in:
hlde(hldehe)-ge-htah-hldon, 370, 371, 372
‘let prosperities return’.

(1) hbo-hkom-ldyañ-dze-hldab-hde-hde ||, 12
‘On the dry (?) forests lifted high the foliage fluttered (?)’
(2) mu-hrog-htro(hdro)-re-rmañ-hldab-g-we, 197
‘cold (sc. the dead) helped by heat (or ‘when the black cold comes’?), tomb-foundation is made’
With this use of hldab cf. Tib. gur-hdebs, ‘pitch a tent’,
dgon-pa-hdebs, ‘found a monastery’.

The form hdab appears in:
mehi-hrah-hdab-na, 369
‘appointing, or stationing, sentinels’
on mehi-hrah see pp. 218–2, 313.

(iv) hldam, hldom, hltom, ldom, hdam, hdom, dam, hr dam, =
Tib. hdom, hdoms, gdams, dams, g dam, ‘exhort’, ‘demonstrate’,
cognates of this prolific root are to be seen in tham-ga, ‘seal’
(stamp), thams, ‘hold’, ‘stick fast’, the original and central idea
having been that of ‘bind’, ‘be made fast’: (ru-glañ; hthul; hdag).

Instances of hldam, ‘tamed’, have been given under (ii). Hldom,
‘bound’, is seen in na-hldom, ‘house slave’, ll. 41, 143, 350, gdims-
chis-ldom (l. 88 hltom)-re, ‘under the sway of transience’ (see infra,
p. 320), ll. 94, 95, and in:
še-rgo-hldom-dze, 258–9, ‘when the wise have their doors
fastened’
hkrug-kyan-hldom-re, 371–2, ‘strife also being quelled’
hpha-ma-sñañ-ne-ge-ru(bu)-lta-ge-sñañ-glañ-hgahi
hyañ-hrañ-hkah-ldom-ga-ru-glañ-ge-hthul-hi ||, 66–7
‘Affectionate father and mother, looking at a child, rejoice
(?) Tib. dgah) with affection increased (glañ, “returned”?)’
‘Mouth-bound (Tib. kha-sdom, “gag”, “silence”) in the
right (hyañ) place, horned oxen (Tib. glañ-ru, “bullock’s
horn”) are tamed (Tib. hdul, btul, dul, thul).’
The children are a 'tie'.

ḥrah-[hyos-]ḥldom, 9, 'the earth movement was stopped (?)'.

In ll. 298–9 q-rihi-ḥldom is perhaps only a variant of hriḥi-ḥdom ('bear') of l. 297.

Ḥdom, 'decision', appears in:

ḥkhwi-htsa-hyog-ḥdag-ci-ḥraṅ-ḥdom-gdes ||, 259–60
‘the old, equipped (ḥdag) with staves (Tib. yog-po), fixed their decisions’.

Ḥdam, 'bound', occurs perhaps in:

dzam-ḥbroṅ-ḥroṅ-dze-ḥdam-to-ḥbu-ḥpor, 68
‘in tame-yak gorges tied [animals] have their heads (Tib. dbu, Hsi-hsiawu) released (Tib. Ḥbor, "cast away", "let go", p. 250 supra).

Cf. ḥnu-glaṅ-ḥpor, ll. 175, 359 (phor), 'the young oxen are released', ḥdro-ḥpor, ll. 180, 353, 'released to go' (p. 250 supra). In the sense of 'checked' ḥdam is applied in l. 326 to hse-ḥtah, 'injuries', 'harms', and therefore also in ll. 328, 329, to ḥkhoḥ-ḥtah, ḥkhoḥdaḥ. In ll. 346, 351, ḥdam-sleg, partly obscure, may contain ḥdam in the sense of Tib. dam, 'vow', 'promise', 'bond'; on dam-ma ḥbroṅ, see p. 286. P[ḥ]yu-phyaḥdam, l. 204, is obscure, and in ḥpo-ḥdam-ḥtor, l. 393, the context is wanting.

In ḥrṇe-ḥrdam-ḥte, l. 322, 'fiends (enemies) bound, or quelled', ḥrdam regularly corresponds to a Tibetan s-form, sdam.

On ḥdom = Tib. ḥom, 'bear', see p. 254.

(v) ḥldar, ḥdar = Tib. ḥdar, 'be weary, faint', or ḥdar, 'quake, tremble', 'shiver', sdar-ma, 'timid', 'trembling': (ḥbraḥ-ḥldah; ḥyob; ḥkye; ḥyukhu).

A ḥldar with this sense might be recognized in:

ḥbroṅ-ḥlder-ḥdzam-re, 353, 'the yak being tame with trembling (or exhaustion)'

and that is not to be rejected. But in l. 182 the reading is:

ḥbroṅ-ḥldah-ḥdzam-re, 'the yak there (ḥldah = Tib. da, as in l. 195) being tame'.

The divergence of the two passages might be attributed to the easy scriptural confusion of r and ḥ.

In ll. 30–1, 31, 32, occurs the phrase:

ḥbraḥ(ḥbra)-ḥlder-ma-ḥyob

where an analogous doubt exists. Is the meaning 'Ḥbraḥ (p. 308) was not fluttered (Tib. g-yob) with quaking', or in Ḥbraḥ-ḥldaḥ
(hldar Locative of Suffix hldaṅ) there was no quaking’? Hdar, ‘tremble’, ‘shiver’, appears in:

\[ \text{rbyo-hphah-hdar-dze-hkye-ge-hmu |}, \text{ 38-9} \]

‘when the father rbyo (see pp. 332-3) shivers, the offspring
\[(hkye = \text{Hsi-hsia } hgyi (\text{Nevsky, No. 282}) = \text{Tib. skye, skyes, “be born”, “creature”, khye-bo, khyehu, “child” are cold’} \]

\[ \text{hrṇam-hdar-hyuhu, 368, “the district (Tib. yul? cf. p. 333) trembles with affright”. (But the parallel in l. 49 has nar.)} \]

(vi) hldas = Tib. hdaṅ, hdas, ‘pass’.

\[ \text{rbyo-ḥa-ge(ḥge)-ḥcaḥ-rtu-hyu-rgyag-dze-hldas, 82-3} \]

‘the rbyo . . . went over to the ḥcaḥ’ (p. 259).

(vii) hldi, hldis, hldin = Tib. ldin,1 ‘float’, ‘soar’.

\[ \text{hldi-ma-ḥrtaḥ, 63, 71 (rtah), 144, “the horse does not leap (gallop)”} \]

\[ \text{ḥtor-ḥrtaḥ-hldi[-]r[e], 337, “the great horse galloping”} \]

\[ \text{ṛtaḥi-swa-hldi[-]r[e], 174, “the horse galloping on guard”} \]

\[ \text{sku-mag-no-dze-me-na-hldis, 58, “the body in battle leaps ("is laid spread") in fire’ (hldis Aorist)} \]

\[ \text{ḥsi-ḥchos-re-ge-ḥpu-myi-hldin |}, 160, “born in winter, the bird does not fly’}. \]


\[ \text{ḥśaṅ-nag-rgyes-hkom-chim-hldim-ge-ḥphah-ṛmaṅ, 199} \]

‘when enemy voice (Tib. ṇag: see infra, p. 360, and supra, p. 313), or black (Tib. nag) enemy, has attained extension (rgyes), come and gone (impermanent) are fathers’ tombs’.

Tibetan ḥchim means ‘be full’, and with it is connected, no doubt, tshim, ‘be satisfied’: possibly the original notion was that of ‘full manifestation’. Considering the resemblance of m and s in the script and the rarity of roots in -s (mchis, ‘be there’, is Aorist of mchi, ‘come’), it seems likely, though chis might, like qdim, be Aorist or possibly Instrumental in -s (see infra, p. 359), that chim is the correct reading in:

\[ \text{gdim-chis-ldom-re-ḥtsog-hldaṅ-ḥstaṅ | |} \]

\[ \text{dim-tshis-ldom-re-tshog-hldaṅ-ḥduṅ | |}, 94-5 \]

‘Controlled by going and coming (impermanence), union rises high (Tib. steṅ, stan):’

1 On final n/ň see p. 362: in E. Colonial Tibetan the form is din.

Controlled by going and coming, union rising falls (Tib. ltuṅ) or is distressed (Tib. gduṅ).

ḥdim-ḥtshis-hltom (= ḡdom) - re-ḥtso[g]-ḥdaṅ-stañ
gdim-pyi-ḥse-ge-gsom-rgyag-hsor-doṅ-ḥtshog-mi-ḥldyim-rgyan


In this second passage:

ḥtshog-mi-ḥldyim-rgyan = ‘the fire of union disappears far’
ḥtshog-hram-ḥnad = ‘union evaporates (Tib. ḋad, cf. p. 217)’.

Hence gdim(ddyim, ll. 95-6)-phyi-ḥse-ge must mean ‘harm from outside (phyi), or subsequent (phyi) harm, being vanished (from thought = gsom-rgyag-hsor, cf. p. 258)’.

gdim-ḥdzam-ḥdzim-re-ḥko-wheli-ḥtuḥu ||, 100
‘the ḡdzam-ḥdzim (“bustle”? ; cf. Tib. zaṅ-zin, “miscellaneous objects”, “confused”) having subsided, they assembled, making room’.

What is the meaning of ḡldim in:

ṛfe-ne-g-ri-dze-ḥldim-ḥphu-ḥmaṅ, 301
‘evil and good on the mountain there are many ḡldim-ḥphu’ echoed in l. 310 by ḡldim-ḥmaṅ-ḥto ||, ‘there are many ḡldim’? They seem to be classes of creatures, real or imagined.


Hldu, ḡlduḥu:

ḥtaṅ-ḥldu-ḥldyaṅ-ge, 14, ‘the joined fields (risen) high’
ḥldu-ro-ḥgru, 19, ‘the assembly-place a corner (or rock)’
ḥswar-ḥldu-sto (= ḡldus-to)-dze, 28, ‘in a closing of fingers (Tib. sor)’, sc. in an instant.
ḥlduḥu-ce-rgyaṅ-na, 51, ‘if accumulation (store) is of great extent’
gcog-ḥldu-ḥldu-dze, 69-70, ‘on the joined warm (?) meadows’
ḥsehe-ḥldu-ḥru-re-dze, 238, ‘on all the peaks where the ḡse (“fiends”, or “tops”) meet’.

Hldun:

ḥrim-ḥdzm-ḥtaṅ-ḥldun ||, 284, ‘the joining (Tib. ḡdzm “meet”, “interlace”) [torches] gathered’
HTUHU (HTHUH), HTHU, HTHUS (AORIST):

Idyo-stor-hthu-re, 140, ‘when the idyo in flight gather’

Hjim-ta-HThusni, 156, ‘salves (p. 280 n.) were gathered’.

With spelling HTUHU an instance has been given supra (p. 321).


bos-smyi-hldog-ge-ses-gsi-hlduhu ||
htsah-htsah-ędzän-ge-ses-hsi-brehe, 43–4
‘when the master is a hldog man, the knowing man covets death:
‘when the harvest (or land, hsah)- overseer is wise, the knowing man fears death’.

Brehe may be a d-less form of Tib. bred, ‘fear’, ‘be dejected or ashamed’, and connected, moreover, with hbre, bres, ‘screen off’, ‘envelope’. Hbres, l. 176, is probably the Preterite of the same.

On hldog see infra (p. 323): htsah-htsah has been discussed on pp. 280–1.

(xi) hldug: (kyen):
the-kyen-hldug, 103.

The = ‘lieges’, ‘common people’: in regard to hldug, Tib. hldug/ldug/sdug have too many and contradictory meanings to furnish ground for inference. Kyen may be = Tib. skyen, ‘quick’, ‘rash’, ‘dexterous’: elsewhere the ‘lieges’ are styled hyañ, ‘good’ (l. 383), and sñañ-ne, ‘good-hearted’ (l. 160), but also kruhu, ‘canaille’ (l. 334).

(xii) hldo-, do-ldo, hldohu (hrim-hldohu):

Whether in seg-sme-hldo, l. 375, rñe-hpo-hldo, l. 177, hbrí-slo-dhldo, l. 381, the hldo is a Suffix is uncertain: on the analogy of hlo-ge-blah-hldoh, l. 154, mehi-hgab-hldo, l. 155, it should be so.

On l. 110 hldoho see supra, p. 294.

Do-ldo-ędzo-chán, l. 76, = [do]-hldo-ędzor-re, l. 77, = do-ldo-ędzo-ępěhi, l. 353, may contain in do-ldo an equivalent of Tib. ldo-ldo, ‘for a short time’ (sc. casually), perhaps derived from ldo, ‘the side of anything’, and meaning ‘bit by bit’. But ędzo/łdzor is uncertain: possibly ‘eat’, as in pp. 334–5. Hldoho occurs only in hldohu-hjam-ńno, l. 277, and hrim-hldoho, l. 300, hrim-re-hldoho, l. 319: it should not be = Tib. lo, ‘circle’, as suggested by the context, since in ll. 154, 275, that word, in the sense of ‘troop’, ‘company’, recurs as hlo. But it must have some kindred mean-
ing, since in l. 277 the reference is to groups of persons: it is perhaps = Tib. ldo, ‘side’, so that hrim-hldoḥu may mean ‘on all sides round’.


The appropriate sense is seen in:

hdzañ-hkhor-hkrug-hkyan-hyogs-hldoḥ, 18
‘retinue of wise men at strife, servants recalcitrant’
bos-smyi-hldoḥ-dze, l. 42, ‘when the master is a perverse person’; so also in 43–4
mor-gdag-hgomba-hdzañ-hldoḥ-stor, 141–2
‘when the wicked acquire mastery, the wise flee away’

perhaps also in:

hldah-hrgam-hstasag-hldoḥ-ḥpo-ḥrbom-ḥtoḥo || po-ḥrbom-ḥnor-[re]-hldoḥ-g-yaḥ-to-dze . . ., 316–17
‘when those in the community there are averse to unity (?), the chief is aggrandized’:

‘if, the aggrandized chief being foolish, the recalcitrant are in the ascendant . . .’

Not quite to be expected is the sentiment in:

hrpehi-hldah-hrgam-re-hldoḥ-ḥyaḥ-ḥthañ, 286
‘if the exemplary (?) are taken into the community, the recalcitrant are in the ascendant’

because in l. 169 we read:

hrgom-hkhrū-[r]e-[h]to-na-hrpehi-hrgam-re-ḥto
‘the canaille (hkhru) being passed over (hrgom), the exemplary were taken into the community’.

concerning which see pp. 244, 296–7. Rpehi would well correspond to Tib. dpe, ‘pattern’, ‘example’; cf. rpag = Tib. dpag. The word recurs, no doubt, in the mutilated passage:


(xiv) hldor, 357, is possibly = hldo-re, just as the rather frequent hldīr is always = hldi-re.

1 Hgom, which does not recur, will be = ḥkom (p. 200).
II. SOME PHONOLOGICAL PARTICULARS

1. ldy, &c.

So far we have been dealing with forms which, though not Tibetan, can be compared with Tibetan without going outside the phonological relations which can be shown to hold within the vocabulary of Tibetan itself. But there is one initial group of consonants, occurring in a number of puzzling words, some of them very frequent, which is unexampled in Tibetan and which, until somehow explained, precludes an interpretation of the text as a whole. This is the group ldy, with which we may associate the few occurrences of dy, ty, thy. These cannot correspond directly to anything in Tibetan, because Tibetan, not tolerating y after dentals, has no ldy-, dy-, ly-, ty-, thy.

It might be suggested that ldy- is a development from rgy-(lgy-), or rby-(lby-), with an l- due, perhaps, to contact with China: and we might point to actual instances of such change, e.g. Mo-so diager, ‘India’, evidently a borrowing of Tib. rgya-gar, to the rdyalsa = Tib. rgyal-sa, ‘seat of royalty’, in the Rgyal-ron song quoted by Dr. Tafel (supra, pp. 85-6), and to Dr. Tafel’s other spellings with rdy-,1 set down in the course of his travels in north-eastern and eastern Tibet. But such a suggestion is precluded by the frequency of rgy-, rby-, in the Nam itself.

Perhaps we may be helped by considering what was in early Tibeto-Burman languages the form of the word for ‘4’. The modern forms, collected in Linguistic Survey of India, volume i, Part II, ‘Comparative Vocabulary’, are far too numerous for citation; but the most common types may be indicated as follows:

(a) forms with initial l- only, such as lǐ, lē: these are found all over the Tibeto-Burman area, in Himālayan dialects, Lolo-Mo-so, Nāgā dialects, languages of Burma, &c.;

(b) forms with initial p- only, such as pǐ, pū, or py-, by-: these are not much less common and widespread than those with l-;

(c) forms with p+l or b+l or f+l, such as pli, bli, vli, pali, pili, buli, fali, fili (mili, &c.): these are similarly common and widespread;

(d) forms with p+r, b+r, or f+r, such as (ka)-prei, kam-brin, brè, brī, bruī, firi (marī, &c.): a less common variant of (c);

(e) forms with d: diā (Dīmāl, a Himālayan dialect), ka-di

1 [r]Dyalło, r Dyarong, &c. (see Index).
(Gyārūṅg, but ka-plis-si, '40', ko-plī (Rgya-roṅ), '4'), bi-di, bi-d'i, pedi, pa-dāi, mu-dai, &c. (Nāgā);

(f) forms with a sibilant, such as Tibetan bāzi, Śarpa śi, &c.: these are found only in the Tibetan group and are probably in all cases (including Thōchū gṣa(-re), '4', ghyi-so, '40') borrowed from Tibetan;

(g) forms with ld: ldi = '4', ldīh, lda, zlaḥ, lha, are attested in Tibetan script for Hsi-hsia (Nevsky, No. 93).

It will be observed that the p+l(r), b+l(r) are found in the same regions as p and l separately and that the l(r) never precedes the p(b). It seems to follow that the p(b)+l is an original combination and that the forms with p simply or l simply are degenerations of forms with p(b)l.

The forms with d are rare and scattered: it is to be noted that the Gyārūṅg, which for '4' has ka-di (Rgya-roṅ ko-plī), has at the same time for '40' the form with pl (ka-plis-si). In view of the Rgyal-roṅ forms and, further, of Tākpa bli and numerous equivalents in Himalayan dialects, and moreover of Loutse and Kioutse bli, the form with bl- may be said to dominate the whole eastern and southern border of Tibet, and it is perhaps represented also by the Lo-lo forms sli, &c., with s or sh for b, as in Rgya-roṅ sli, 'lungs', &c.

The only form approaching (and indeed by about four to five centuries surpassing) in antiquity the Hsi-hsia ldi are the Tibetan bāi and the Žuñ-žuñ pi (JRAS. 1933, p. 408).

Tibetan ẑ is constantly found in relation, as is natural, to j (c), e.g. in:

ẑiṅ, ẑes, particles alternating with cin (jiṅ), ces.
ghal, bžal, bżag, bżig, bżugs, zugs, žu, bžo, žo, connected with the
Verbs hjal, 'weigh', hjog, 'put', hjig, 'destroy', hjug, 'enter', hju, 'melt', hjo, 'milk'.
ghaṅ, gзоṅs, gžom = hjah, 'rainbow', ljоṅs, 'valley', hjoms, 'conquer'.

Since j is not found with the Prefixes g, b,1 while ẑ, which does occur with these, is not found with m, h, r, l, all of them common with j, the alternation shows the influence of a preceding consonant. The breathed sibilant ẑ follows the rule for its voiced correlate ž. Presumably ẑ and ž differ from c and j simply as being

1 Prejevalsky (trans. ii, p. 138) gives 'Tangut' bjeh = Tib. bži (apparently with English j).
spirants, i.e. by omission of stop-contact, which is natural, though not inevitable, after the contact required for \( g \) and \( b \): it may be noted that Hsi-hsia in Tibetan script has both \( gj \) and \( bj \), and Tibetan itself has \( gc \) and \( bc \). Conceivably the effort of making the change from voice \((g)\) to breath \((c)\) fortifies the utterance in making the second contact \((c)\).

The Tibetan sibilant in \( \\text{b}zi \) is therefore non-original in Tibetan itself. If accordingly we write it \( bji \), it cannot be derived from \( bdi \), but may represent a form \( bdyi \), since we see that \( dy \) does not survive in the language. Such a form may be akin to the Nāgā forms \( bi-di, bi-d'i, pe-di \), noted under \((e)\); but it disregards the \( l \), which, as is manifest under \((a), (c), (d), \) and \((g)\), is the sound most widely and numerously found in the Tibeto-Burman words for ‘\( 4 \)’. Therefore we must write \( bldyi \), possibly derived from a very early original \( ba-li \) or \( pa-li \), which became successively \( ba-lyi, ba-lde, bldyi, bldyi \), where it was not preserved, as it may have been in Lepcha \( fa-li \) and similar forms. The forms \( bli \) or \( bldyi \) will account for all the types \( li, pli, pre, pi \), as well as those with \( d \) (for \( ld \)), \( bi-di \), \&c., for those with \( ld \) (Hsi-hsia \( ld'i \)), and for the Tibetan \( bzi = bji = bldyi \).

It is accordingly among words with initial \( z \), so rare in Nam (or \( j \), in cases where there is no preceding \( g \)- or \( b- \)), that we should look for equivalents of the Nam initial \( ldy- \), \( dy- \). The commonest word, \( hldya\text{ñ} \), which by reason of an antithesis to \( hldyo\text{ñ} \) might seem to offer the best hold, occurs so variously as to suggest a complex derivation; and forms with \( yi \), e.g. \( ldyi \) can always be orthographical or other alternatives of those with \( i \), \( ldi \). Hence we may take the words in the order of convenience merely.

1. \( ldyo, ldyo, ldyoho; ldyo-hro \) (\( hbyohu; hnus; na-hsah-ste; htrog; hnus \)).

The verse:

\[
ldyo-stor-hthu-re-hdrab-stor-htho \|, 140
\]

has already (p. 254) been translated:

‘when the \( ldyo \) in flight collect together, the \( hdrab \) (ravenous animals) flee’

a rendering apposite in its context. Further, it has been suggested (pp. 254, 256) that in the phrase \( hko\text{ñu-mehe-hldyo} \|, ll. 171–2, \) which clearly signifies a deprival of the ‘fire’ (power) of speech, \( hldyo \), introduced by a paronomasia, really means ‘milked out’, the context containing references to ‘suppressing’ \((htul)\), ‘eating’,
(hdzah), and 'snatching away' (hdrab) the same 'fire'. The significations 'cow' and 'milk' are united in Tib. hjo, bžos, bzo, gzo, 'to milk', hjo-ma, 'milch-cow', Žo, 'milk'. As previously suggested, the root, when used as a designation of animals, does not properly denote merely cows, but includes all 'milkers', i.e. animals used for milk-supply: and this is the sense of Tib. bžon-ma, 'cow, ewe, or she-goat, that is yielding milk; a gen. term for such cattle'.

A Verb hldyoho (hldyo) is seen also in:

ḥnu[-]r[e]-ḥṇah-rγyen-na-ḥnu-hldo-hldyoho ||, 355
'absence of all weeping being arranged (rγyen), weeping was milked away' (p. 256).

In the sense of 'milch-cattle' the word recurs in:

ḥdom-hgu-ḥtshuḥu-ḥyaḥ-ḥmaṇ-hldyoh-ḥrgam, 303–4
'though bears come, many milch-cattle are in company' (ibid).

The meaning 'milk' may be traced in the ldyohu of:

ḥṣaṇ-ḥdzhah-hldyim-ḥyaṇ-ldyoḥu-ṛṣkṣ, 255
'though garbage-eating was sweet [sc. to the cattle], the milk was not poured out (Tib. ḷyo, ḷyo) [sc. dripped or poured away ?]'

The above may teach why a part of the country is distinguished from other parts as hldyo-hro, 'ranch-country (?)', in:

ḥdzm-ḥbroṇ-ḥron-dze-hldyo-hro-ḥpebi ||, 384
'in tame-yak gorges is an example (?) of “ranchland”'

and this, again, may explain the phrase:

ḥldyo-ḥdom-nag, 162, 171, 'the black bears of the ranch [-country]'.

The phrase hldyo-hṭor-ge-hṇus, ll. 16, 34, 50 (ṭor for hṭor-ge) : in:

ḥbu-rṭye-hce-ṛṣkṣ-dze-hldyo-ḥṭor-ge-hṇus ||, 15–16
'on the wide expanded uplands, the great ranch[-cattle] suckled (Tib. nu, nus)'

we have, however, to discover a misfortune of the cataclysm time: it might, indeed, be dripping udders (Tib. nu) or premature calving. In ll. 33–4 it is on the na-hṭṣah-ste = na-hṭsas-ste, perhaps the 'harvested meadows (Tib. na, bṭṣas: see p. 239)' that 'the ranch-cattle dripped or suckled'. By reason of uncertainty as to the meaning of hṭrog we cannot interpret:

ḥṭrog-hṭor-te-dze-hldyo-ge-nus, 40
(can ḷṭrog be = ḷbroγ, 'high pastures' (see p. 5)? In the Tibetan
manuscripts we find ye-ḥdrog written for ye-ḥbrog), nor is ḥldyo-
hrje-ḥbro in l. 36 clear. But ḥtrog, 'enemy', is possible.

If ḥldyo properly means 'milk', 'to milk', we should expect to
find some trace of it not only, as we do find, in Tibetan, but else-
where also in Tibeto-Burman. One Hsi-fan dialect (d'Ollone,
No. 35) has for 'milk' liō niu niu, in which the two last syllables
may be the Chinese for 'cow'. Conceivably there might be a
primitive relation between ḥldyo and Chinese zu (Ancient 'nǐṇiu,
Karlgren, No. 48).

2. ḥldya, ḥldyah: (stoṅ; ḥkhog; ḥnor; yaṅ, ḥyaṅ; sko).

This word occurs in:

ḥlduḥu-ce-rgyaṅ-na-stoṅ-ḥkhog-re-hldya-ḥkaṅ-hte-ḥnor, 51-2

'An accumulation (store, Tib. ḥdu-khaṅ?) of (too) great
extent, with empty (unfilled) interior (Tib. stoṅ, khog),
has its goods (ḥnor = Tib. nor, as in l. 50) filled with
ḥldya'.

Here the meaning 'water' would suit, since ordinarily the store-
place would be a pit (doṅ). In Hsi-fan we find Mānyak dyāḥ,
'water'; and this may also be Menia ḏj or ḏjui, Muli ḏjō, Pa-U-
Rong ḏji, Mo-so ḏji (Lo-lo, ji, yi-dié, i dia, dia dia ?), also it may
be Hsi-hsia tsee, dsee, jei (Laufer, No. 37). These, however, are
merely a beginning : we must add the whole army of forms, such as
ti, di, tūi, dūi, dwi, found in the western Himālaya and all over the
Tibeto-Burman world; among which forms the ti of Kanauri, &c.,
may be singled out, as found in a Žaṅ-žuṅ manuscript of the
ninth to tenth century A.D. (JRAS. 1933, p. 408). These may be
referred to an original form tya/dya (cf. the forms pū, by the side of
pya = Tib. bya, 'bird'), and possibly forms with a, such as chā,
may have retained the original final vowel. The many forms with
u, tūi, &c. (including Tib. cu/chu < *tyu), may point to a primary
twya, parallel to bwyə, 'bird' (cf. Tib. phywa, 'lot').

On the etymological side Nam ḥldya = 'water' may therefore

1 In l. 254 the metre warns us to read:

ḥldyo-ḥtor-hmyi-na || (instead of ḥḥmyi || na)

and the translation will be:

'the great herds were without sickness' (p. 239),
this being one of several particulars of a time of prosperity. Accordingly
the recurrent ḥldyo-ḥtor-ge-hnas (II. 16, 34, 40 (omit ḥtor)), which has the
contrary implication, must denote some illness of the herds, perhaps the
same which is indicated by the ḥdyohu-ma-ḥbyohu of l. 255. This confirms
the interpretation of ḥtrog-ḥtor-te-dze, which will be a variant of the ḥbu-
rnuye-hce-rgyaṅ-dze of ll. 15-16.
be defensible. As further evidence of the actuality, we may quote:

```
hyan-re-rgyen-na-yañ-hldyah-hldyah\(^1\)|, 355-6
'each conduit being in order, the conduits were water, water [sc. flowed continuously]' for \(hyan\), here necessarily a substantive, occurs (as noted p. 311), in the Tibetan manuscripts with the signification here adopted and no other seems apposite. The only other instance of \(hldyah\) occurs in the next line (following a reference to 'fires let loose', \(thar-mye\), where there is a question of 'allotment of work' (\(g-wehe-sko-hbab\), cf. Tib. \(las-sko\)): it may be noted that in a document from Central Asia (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 139-40), in connexion with a distribution of field-work, there is a reference to drying-up of the water (\(chab-skam\)).
```

If \(hldyah\) means 'water', 'water-flow', it will not be an accident that Tib. \(b\dot{\text{ja}}\dot{\text{h}}\), i.e. \(bjah < *bdyah\) or \(*bldyah\) (cf. \(b\dot{\text{zi}}\, '\text{4}'\)), means 'moist', 'wet'.

3. \(hldi\), \(hldyi\), \(hldyihi\), \(hldihi\): (\(hmu\); \(hr\nu\); \(skhrud\); \(hre\); \(rgyo\); \(hphu\); \(h\dot{\text{sig}}\); \(hldyeg\); \(hti\)).

It has been suggested supra (p. 276) that in:

```
\(hmu-hr\nu\)-skhrud-dze-mor-hta\(n\)-[hgras]|\n\(hldi-hrkah-hldya\(n\)-dze-hya\(n\)-hta\(n\)-hgras, 9-10
'On the \(hmu\), fleeing in pain (Tib. \(r\nu\), \(skru\)), the evil power was arrayed:

On the \(hldi\), risen steep (Tib. \(dka\(h\)), the good power was arrayed'
```

\(hmu\) should be the 'sky' (Hsi-hsia \(mu/mo\) (Laufer, No. 34); Hsi-fan, &c., \(mo/mon\), and \(hldi\) consequently 'earth'. The epithet \(rkah\), 'steep', is applied to \(gsah\), 'land', in l. 333 (infra, p. 338).

\(Ldi = 'earth',\) is, in fact, attested for Hsi-hsia (Nevsky, No. 189, Laufer, No. 40, \(le/lo\)). In the Nam text we find among the occurrences of \(hldi\) no further examples; all instances of \(hldi\), \(hldir\) (= \(hldi-re\), seeming to represent \(hldi\), 'this', or \(hldi\), 'fly'.

But \(hldihi\) in:

```
\(hldihi-su-hldo\(n\)| dze-hlda-hko-ge-hdzon, 195
'what \(hldihi\) one retires to, there is one's castle'
```

being antithetic to 'river' (\(rma\)) in the following line, should mean 'land'. On \(hlda-hko\ (da-ko) see supra, pp. 201, 245.

\(^1\) Cf. Lo-lo \(dia-dia\), above.
This *ldi* may be represented further by Mānyak *mali/mli* d'Ollone 38 *dia*, Mulī (Njong) *dja*, Mēlam *melī* ('country'), (Mo-so *mdie*, Lo-lo, *mi-dyi*, &c.?). In Tibetan there is a common word *gzi/gžis*, meaning 'ground', 'abode', 'estate', (*sa-gzi*, 'place', 'ground', 'locality', 'soil'), whence come common dialectical words for 'earth', Thōchū *zip* < *gzi-po*, Menia *za-pi*, d'Ollone 35 *sa-ze-diu* < *sa-gzi* ('Tangut' *sa-zu*), 41 and 42 *je-pu*: though it cannot correspond to Nam *hldi*, which would, no doubt, be *ldi* or *hdi*, it would, as we have seen, properly represent the inevitable alternative form, *hldyi*.

A *hldyi/hldyihi* is to be found, in fact, in the text. By way of conjecture only, since the instances probably represent different words, we may venture as follows:

In:

```
  hre-ge-rgyo-dze-hphu-hšig-hldyihi ||, 48
```

where *rgyo* recalls nothing, in its several recurrences, but Tib. *rgyo*, 'copulari', while *hre* has beside its very frequent signification 'is', 'being' (Tib. *re*) and that of 'hope' (Tib. *re*), also not infrequently the sense of Tib. *re*, 'each' (whence Hsi-hsia *re*, 'all'), *res*, 'times', 'turn', &c., whence *re-hlad*, 'retribution' (Il. 245, 247). *Hphu* (*hpū*) can mean 'male', and *hšig* always has the sense of Tib. *hjig*, *bžig*, *gžig*, 'destroy', 'decay', 'perish'. In this context *hldyihi*, no doubt a Verb, might well mean 'be assuaged', 'appeased', in which case it would correspond to Tib. *ži*, which has those meanings.

In connexion with the earthquake we find in l. 26 the phrase *hldyeg-hldyi-hti-dze*, where *hti* may mean 'darkness' (Tib. *gti*), as in l. 12. *Hldyeg* does not occur elsewhere; but, if *hldyi* should mean 'four', it could obviously denote only 'regions', 'quarters', and we should then have a good equivalent for the *li(lldi)-lei*, 'four quarters', frequently mentioned in a Buddhist Hsi-hsia text. The Tibetan for 'quarter' in this application is usually *phyogs* (Hsi-fan *chuo*, &c., Menia *cho*); but there is also a word *gžogs*, which might be akin to such a *hldyeg*.

In l. 375 *rbyi-hldyihi* is unfortunately obscure: see p. 350.

4. *hldyim* : (*hpǔhī, hphuhi*).

In one occurrence, namely in the phrase *htshog-me-hldyim-rgyaṅ*, l. 89, *hldyim* clearly belongs to the Verb *gdim/dim/hdim/"

---

1 On *hti* = 'stop' see pp. 174, 309.
2 Svāvana-prabhāsa (in Wang Jinqru Shishiah Studies, ii, e.g. p. 16, lower coll. 5, 6).
ddyim, 'disappear' (p. 321 supra), occurring in the immediate context: hence it is a mere way of writing ḡldim. The same interpretation is applicable in:

़ह्द्यिम-ह्स्ते-ह्पुहि-गे-र्ने-ह्द्जाम-रे-ह्ल्दन, 274

'their blowings ceased, the fiends (enemies) returned mild' where ḡ्पुहि = ḡ्पहुहि, said of dogs in the next but one line (p. 285), and of the ass in l. 354, and the s in ḡ्स्ते points to a form ḡ्द्यिम्स (Aorist).

A different ḡ्द्यिम must be seen in the above quoted:

ह्सा़्न-ह्द्जाह-ह्द्यिम-ह्यान, 255

which has been translated (p. 327) 'though garbage-eating was sweet'. The rendering implies an equivalence of ḡ्द्यिम to Tib. ḡ्सिम,1 'sweet', 'well-tasting', which phonetically may now be considered justified. In the Tibetan manuscripts we read 'A flesh-eater's sharp knife gives sweetness (ṡिम) at every cut'. But in the absence of further confirmation the matter remains conjectural: as regards ḡ्द्जाह see p. 334.

5. ḡ्द्यान, ḡ्द्योन, ḡ्द्यान, ḡ्द्यान, ḡ्द्यान; (़ह्रो; ḡ्ह्तो; ḡ्रोन; ḡ्ग्यर)

In the case of the two remaining words, of which the former is exceedingly troublesome, we have at least the support of an antithesis between them. In ll. 384-7, at the close of a discrimination of certain parts of the terrain, we read:

ह्जो(़्ह्द्जो)-चि-ते-रे-ह्लाब-ह्सा़्न-ह्यान-ह्ताह||ह्द्यान-ह्रो-ह्पेहि||

ह्द्जाम-ह्ब्रोन-ह्रोन || ह्बा़्न-ह्को-ह्तार-सिग-ड्जे-ह्द्योन-ह्रो-ह्पेहि||

Here, in company with phrases which have previously been found difficult, we find the ḡ्द्यान-ह्रो, 'ḥ्द्यान country', exemplified (ह्पेहि) in a certain way, the ḡ्द्योन-ह्रो, 'ḥ्द्योन-country', in another way, which brings in the 'tame-yak gorge', already seen to imply the lower levels. Concerning the word ह्रो(रो) in place-names see supra, p. 314. ḡ्द्योन probably has no other occurrence, ḡ्द्योन in l. 318 being a doubtful reading.

There are some indications connecting ḡ्द्यान with height:

ह्द्यान-ग-रि-ग्दो-रे-मेहि-ह्राह-ग्ता्न, 186

'[where] a ḡ्द्यान mountain is prominent (Tib. ḡोद), an eye-post should be set.'

ह्द्यान-ह्ग्हो-ह्द्जिन-रे-मेहि-ह्राह-ह्दाब ना, 369

'a ḡ्द्यान place or gate (ह्ग्हो) being held, an eye-post is put' although ḡ्द्यान might be not attribute of ग-रि and ह्ग्हो, but

1 For ḡ्सिम? Cf. ḡ्जिब, ḡ्जिब, 'relish'.

subject to the Verbs gdod (the phrase g-ri-ydod would then, however, be difficult) and hdzin. In the verse, repeated in ll. 9, 19:

sta-re-hmo (l. 9 ḥmo-ḥno)-ge-sta-ḥri-hldyaṅ
‘where were (had been) the heavens (clouds?), there the mountains hldyaṅ’

the signification ‘high’ or ‘rose’ becomes a certainty; and it is confirmed by the ḥldi-hrkaḥ-hldyaṅ-dze, ‘on the earth steep high or rising’, of l. 10, and then further by the repetition of the word as a Predicate in the antithetic verses of ll. 12–14.


ḥdyāṅ-hto-hṭon-ge-hgo-gton-mod, 210–11
‘when the high (Tib. mtbo) partition, or the partition boundary (Tib. tho), is surrendered, the gate or place is surrendered’.

The sense of ‘rising’ (from a seat, &c.), which Tib. bžeṅ conveys, may perhaps be recognized in:

ḥḍu-hdro-ḥphor-[re]-ḥchi-ḥdo-dyaṅa, 183, 353 (gzu, ḥdyāṅ)
‘the ass, set free to depart, started or rose (dyaṅ) to go (ḥchi)’
rgoṅ-wa-mye[-r[e]-rbyo-rgyer-hldyaṅ ||, 365
‘if there are no eggs (Tib. sgoṅ, sgoṅ-na, Mo-so gö, &c.), the rbyo rises abandoning (Tib. ḡgyer) it’

and the same is presumably the case in the hnu-glaṅ-ldyaṅ following in l. 366, and can also be harmonized with the ṛñe-ḥkhyam-hldyaṅ of ll. 229, 236.

The reference to eggs in l. 365, however, yields a more definite conception in hldyaṅ, that of ‘flying’, which would bring it into connexion, either as a synonym or as a linguistic or stylistic equivalent of ḥldiṅ, ‘fly’, which we have seen in l. 160 ḥpu-myi-hldiṅ, ‘the bird does not fly’ (pp. 145–6, 320). In that case rbyo should be a synonym of ḥpu, ‘bird’, and this will suit

rbyo-g-yer-ḥnor[-re]-rgoṅ-wa-śid ||, 366
‘if the bird is foolish in his alertness [sc. unwatchful] (cf. stṣaḥ-ḥyεr, swa-ḥmor, &c., pp. 276–8, and on ḡnor, ‘foolish’, pp. 224–5) the eggs perish’
and the further connexion of the *rbyo* with eggs in the proverb:

> rbyo-sñaṅ-ge-sñaṅ-na-rgoṅ-ru-ge-hru ||, 102-3 (cf. 1. 82)

‘if the heart of a *rbyo* is a heart, the horns (sc. ends) of an egg are horns’

the Tibetans speaking of the ends of an egg as ‘horns’. The strangeness of the *r*-Prefix to *bya*, ‘bird’, is almost a conclusive proof of the correctness of the interpretations; for, as shown supra (p. 94), several Hsi-fan languages have the *r*-Prefix in this word (e.g. Munia *rja*, ‘bird’, *rja-gu*, ‘egg’ = Tib. *bya*, *bya-sgoṅ*), and others also represent the final -o, perhaps a ‘Diminutive’ form = *byehu*. The difference between *hpu* and *rbyo* may be that between ‘bird’ and ‘fowl’, which occurs also elsewhere.

According to this the *rbyo-po* transmitter of the Nam text, whom we have conjectured (p. 156) to be some kind of Bon priest, will be a ‘bird (or cock)-man’, which is not improbable, because the sorcerer’s cock is well known in the Hsi-fan area (see *From Tonkin to India*, by Prince Henri d’Orléans, pp. 200, 263). *Rbyo*, however, must have a second sense in order to account for the references in ll. 53, 56, 57, and an antithesis to *hphon*, ‘poor’ (?) in 53, and to *rgu*, ‘thief’, in 1. 57 suggests that it may mean ‘rich’, ‘riches’, so that in this word again, we have a parable.

The signification ‘fly’ suits also the passage (ll. 12–15), where in the cataclysm the woods, mountains, fields, &c., soar (*hldyan*) through the sky. Moreover, it seems to afford a key to the phrase *hldyan-hpu-hbri-re* several times attached to the *Mehi-hklu-hcah*, whom we have supposed to have been originally an owl (pp. 134, 255). It will mean either ‘flying-bird (*pu*) -destroying’ or ‘flying males and females (*hbri*) or ‘flying bird-males being weak females’; see p. 217).

The word *hldyan* remains, however, the most puzzling in the whole text, and perhaps has several different senses. The obscure expression *hldyan-hkah* has been mentioned supra (p. 317). In regard to *hldyan-hyu* (ll. 122, 369, 372, 387) we can only mention the possibility that it means ‘high country’ (cf. the Tibetan *yul-mtho* = Tibet) and that it is virtually a Proper Name, being a designation of the land of the Ch’iang tribes, and that this is the explanation of the racial term, in Tibetan *Hjāṅ*, appearing in the name of the Tang-hsiang country and in the dynastic name, *Lyang* of the T’ang-chang kingdom therein.
2. Z

Nam $z =$ Tib. $z$ has been recognized in $hzah$, ‘wife’ (p. 240), $hzu$, $gzu$, ‘ass’ (p. 251–2), $bzod$, ‘bear’ (p. 166). But the great rarity of $z$ in Nam words and the fact that in Tibetan it is not very common and frequently alternates with $dz$ (e.g. in $hdzin/zin$, $gzu/nis$, $hdzur/zur$, $hdzar/bzar/gzar$, $hdzag/gzags/zags/gzag/zag$) suggests that some equivalents of Nam words with $dz$ may be found in Tibetan forms with $z$. We may here overlook the probability that Tibetan $z$ was originally derived from $dz$ under the same conditions as $i$ from $j$, i.e. when preceded by $g$ or $b$ (supra, pp. 325–6).

Tibetan $dz$ is also frequently confused with $j$, to such an extent indeed that Sanskrit $j$ is normally in the texts represented by $dz$ (as are $c$ and $ch$ by $ts$ and $tsh$). The substitution, very easy in the script, is perhaps not merely orthographical: being very widespread and not recent, it may point to an undiscriminated ‘phoneme’ or to dialectical variation. It cannot have been derived from Kashmir, the very country where the signs for $ts$, $tsh$, $dz$, were invented for the purpose of the discrimination.

1. $gdu$, $hdu$, $gzu$, $hzu$, $hju$, ‘ass’.

   This has been discussed supra (pp. 251–2, Tib. $gzu$-$lum$).


   $bos$-$smyi$-$hldog$-$dze$-$hra$h-l$hah$-$ge$-$hdzah$ ||, 42–3
   ‘under a master who is a perverse person, the people of the place are eaten [sc. by him] (or possibly “enemies there are friends”’, p. 313’)

   $hban$-$hldah$-$hne$-$ge$-$hkehu$-$me$-$hdzah$ ||, 171
   ‘good authorities eat the fire of profit (p. 316’)

   (In l. 172 we find ‘milk out the fire of speech’). Cf. $h$san-$hdzah$-$hldyim$-$hya$n, l. 255, ‘though garbage-feeding is sweet’ (supra, p. 327, 331).

   The form $hj$hah appears in:

   $hj$hah-$htah$-$hkhen$-$ya$n-$swa$-$tseg$-$tseg$ ||, 92–3
   ‘though familiar with (Tib. $mkhyen$), or quick at (Tib. $skyen$), eating, the teeth (Tib. so) are checked, checked’.

On $tseg$ see supra, p. 294. But the sense here might be ‘chatter’ (onomatopoeic): cf. Tib. $tseg$-$tseg$-$byed$, ‘rustle’ (like dry leaves, &c.).
gzo in:

hbos-hnom-hsah-gtsan-hrgu-ma-gzo ||, 164–5
‘crops of land enjoyed by the master thieves do (shall? see p. 199) not eat’.

On hrgu see p. 233.

The meaning ‘eat’ is suggested, by the above-cited hkehu-me-hdzah, for hjo, hdzo, in:

rie-hpo-hldo-ge-hkehu-prom-hjo-na, 177
hrule-hpo-hne-ge-hkohu-prom-hdzo ||, 361–2
‘enemy (fiend) braves eat the profit (speech, p. 316)-making’.

g-rah-hyos-htag-ge-hjo ho ||, 34
‘the earthquake acted as a mill’ (supra., p. 275).


hya\n-so-hdze-tse-hldi-ma-hrta\n||, 63
‘when the load is too big (Tib. ya\n?), the horse does not fly (gallop)’
spyi-hdze-ge-hkab ||, 110
‘the chief (Tib. spyi-bo) burden [sc. responsibility] is the family (Tib. khab)’.

5. hdzechu = Tib. gze-re, ‘weak’, ‘reduced’, bze, bze-re, ‘pain’ (endurance?), ze\d, ‘damaged’, ‘injured’?

hdzechu-rje-hbro-re-hdzohu-hto-hrun, 138
‘when a weak chief flees, one must be a man (hdzohu, pp. 218).

6. hdzon = Tib. zon, gzon ‘take care’, ‘keep watch over’, e.g. the tongue or feet (cf. dgra-zon, ‘military guard-post’) (sto, the-the).

sto-the-the-re-stor-hthah-hdzon, 336–7
‘the rope being pulled, pulled (Tib. the-re-then, “pull straight”, hthah, “pull (a rope, &c.)”), running away is guarded against’.

7. sla = Tib. zla, ‘friend’.

hlda\n-hkra\n-hwe-dze-hlda\n-slah-hkehe, 125
‘doing uprightness, one gains upright (or helping) friends’ (see p. 289)

   rta-hgam-hphar-re-hsus-slo-glo, 93
   rta-hgam-hphar-[re-]gsus-slo-stah, 99
   ‘the horse being gone to the hgam, intending to call (or expecting) a party to receive him... (those called (or who came forth) to receive him)’.

Hsus/gsus, Aorist of bsu, ‘advance to meet a visitor’, a common usage in Tibet and Central Asia. It will be noted that slo-stah = slos-ta, as in analogous cases.


   hnu-glañ-slog, 174, 359 (slug), ‘turned back the young oxen’.
   hrsehi-hpag-slog-dže-hrı́e-hrom-ge-htı-na-hrı́e-ge-hrlomhi:,
   384-5
   ‘the peaks (hrsehi also l. 208, = se, hse, Tib. rtse) having sunk down, in the darkness of the fiends’ gloomy (cavity) the fiends hanker (or are conceited, hrlom = Tib. rlom)’.

3. W

The w, which in the Tibetan alphabet has existed from the first, has not been in very frequent use. Words commencing with it are few, the best known being wa, ‘fox’; and, although, as a subscript letter, the sign is allowed to follow as many as sixteen of the other consonants, the words exhibiting that feature are not very numerous, some of them, e.g. śwa/śa, ‘stag’, śwa/śa, ‘blood’, showing alternative forms, and others being rather out-of-the-way terms. But some are fairly familiar, e.g. žwa, ‘cap’, grwa, ‘school’, phywa, ‘lot’, rtswa, zwa, ‘nettle’, ‘grass’, khua, ‘raven’, lwa, ‘blanket’—many of these, again, being often written without the w.

Nam, like Hsi-hsia, presents a relatively large percentage of w's, both initial (if we disregard the Prefix h) and subscript. It has, moreover, forms (g-waḥ, g-we, &c.) with Prefix g- written

1 But perhaps slo may rather be = Hsi-hsia sloḥ = ‘come forth’ (Nevsky, no. 103).

2 But being connected with hıęd (see p. 251) it may be related to Tib. ldug/blug/zług/bzług, ‘pour’, ‘cast metal’, &c.

3 e.g. śa, phya, ri-dags in the Tibetan Manuscripts.
separately, parallel to forms (g-ri, &c.) from r- roots and y- roots (g-yah, &c.): see p. 168. When h is prefixed (hgwah = g-wah = hwa), the subscript form is used: properly the h should not be prefixed to g, with which it commonly alternates; there do not seem to be parallel cases with y- and r-.

A. Initial w- in Nam, descended from b-, may be seen in:

1. we, hwe, hwehe, wehi, hwehi, g-we, g-wehe, g-wehi = Tib. byed, 'do', 'make' = Hsi-hsia we.

In the Tibetan byed the y may have been originally a phonetic accretion, as in mye, 'fire', &c., in the old orthography: this is suggested by the form bas, assumed by the Aorist byas, when used in the sense of 'done with', 'enough of that'.

It is not necessary to exemplify this word, which in cases like hdañ-hkrañ-hwe, 'doing uprightness', hrah-hwehi-hrtah, 'room-making horse', has been frequently mentioned. On the hi in hwehi, as being syntactical, see pp. 190-2.

2. hwas, hwa(s)-ste = Tib. bas, 'done for', 'done with', wa, hwa, hwah, g-wah, hwah, bzer, hrño, rkwa (g-roñ; hkah; gla; rko; glog).

In:

gdu-hbyi-hnañ-re-hmañ-hri-hwas ||, 308
'if "little tiger" (the ass) is in it, the great mountain is done for'

the phrase hmañ-hri-hwas is proved to have the meaning here given by hmañ-sta-mehi, 'greatness is not there' of l. 311, followed by:

gdu-hbyi-hnañ-re-hri-sta-hmeñi
'if "little tiger" is in it, the mountain is not there'

and further repetitions of hri(g-riñi, &c.)-sta-mehi. Hence it is clear that hwas = Tib. bas.

The same hwas, slightly disguised, is seen in the hwa-ste(= hwas-te) of:

hde-me-hthañ-g-roñ-hyed-ge-ta-hwa-ste-htah ||, 71-2
'fires of prosperity, with cooling (Tib. grañ ?), or dying (Tib. groñ ?),1 emissions, are done for'

an interpretation confirmed by:

hwa-ste-hge-dze-hla-hram-hte ||, 73
'with exhausted good fortune the moon consorts'

1 See pp. 289, 273.
repeated (with laḥ for ḥla) in ll. 75–6, where it is preceded by:

ḥwa-ste-ḥgeḥe-dze-dgu-ḥtor-ḥbyi
‘in exhausted good fortune the great heat diminishes’.

This being so, it is probable that the frequently recurring wa/ḥwa/hwah is the old Present stem of the same Verb; and, since these seem to incline to the signification of forcible action, it is also possible that Tib. Ḥbaḥ, ‘seizure’, ‘distrain (liability to)’ Ḥbaḥ-ḥgan (gan), ‘contractual obligation’, is of the same origin: but see p. 346. A more ordinary notion of ‘doing’, ‘making’, may be seen in:

gsom-wa-ḥyo, 178–9, ‘thought-making fluctuates’
mu-wa-rño, 309, ‘able to make cold’
ḥwad-ḥwah-rño, 335, ‘able to keep watch’
ḥkya-wa(ḥwa)-ñe(ḥñe), 162, 215, 339, ‘harming work upon crops’
ḥdram-ḥwa-hrañ, 162, 172, ‘delighting in making snatchings’.

A more definite note of action is seen in:
ḥbri-re-ḥrdyam-re-ḥkhah-ḥldañ-ḥṅaghi
ḥdzoḥu-ro-ḥldi-re-ḥjohu || ḥwa-ḥkah, 137
‘all females being restrained (?), let the speakers give voice’;
‘this being a place for males (p. 218), it is for males to act and speak’

where ḥwa-ḥkah perhaps corresponds to such phrases in Tibetan as ḥgro-kha, ‘time of going’ (p. 314).

Agricultural ‘work’ is indicated in:

gsaḥ-rkah-gla[-]r[e]-hwah-ḥrog-ḥldoñ
ḥwah-ḥrog-rño-ge-ḥkeg-rko-ḥwad, 333-4
‘If difficult or steep (rkah, see p. 329) land is hired, helpers in the work desert;
With capable helpers in the work the ḥkeg (checked ?) hoe (rko) is alert’

in which passage the use of gla, ‘wages’, as a Verb ‘hire’, is paralleled by a Central-Asian document (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 273. A. 3). The mixed expression ḥwah-ḡlaḥ-ḥṛṣaḥ-ḥgan, ll. 228–9 will also contain the notion of ‘wage of work’; while ḥwah-ḥraḥ, l. 353, may be merely ‘place (or room) for action’. Similarly in:

po-ṛbom-ḥnor-[re-]ḥldog-g-yaḥ-to-dze-ḥwa-ne-ḥphe, 317
'If the big man is a fool, then, becoming recalcitrant, good work (*hgwa-nehu*, l. 41) is weak (?)'\(^1\)

htsah-hdzan-hyah-ge-hwah-ne-hbrah ||

smyi-glog-g-yah-ge || hwah-hrño-hjam-ţma, 268-9

'With a wise supervisor in front, good work flourishes':

'With a lightning man in front, the work-capable are pleased (agreeable?)' cf. *ırlko-hjam-rño*, p. 322,

to which sentiment an interesting analogy may be seen in a passage of one of the Tibetan manuscripts:

'Work done by a believer in work: is like lightning (*glog*) even at night'.

But agriculture reappears in:

 hwah-hldanra-htsañra-na-hwa-rgya-hrko-hrkbäs, 270-1

'Work in woodland or cornland (?), work plain hoe . . .'

Possibly the notion of 'forcible action' or 'constraint' is to be recognized in:

hši-hwa-hko, 123, 'death-action (= death) is hko (supreme? sole?)'.

As hwah, g-wah, hw, hwah, the word with this signification appears repeatedly in the long passage (II. 223 sqq.) beginning:

htor-hbrón-hrpg-re-hwah-hršañ-hlamhī
g-wah-hršañ-hnar-[re-]hrkwā-hdzam-htronhī

'The great yak to be brought low, a journey of hostile action:
Hostile action accomplished, mild command to be led in'.

Here the word hršañ, which has occurred with ḥswa, 'surveillance' (l. 321), and in II. 225, 226 with *lad*, as equivalent to ḥsān-*hlad*, II. 226-7, should mean 'hostility' or 'hate'. Ḥrkwa, since in I. 122 we read ḥrta-rkwa-hdzam, 'the horse's rule (?) was mild', must have a sense akin to that of 'rule', 'command': see infra, pp. 343-4.

Another instance of the same sense may be seen in:

hwah-[h]t[b]-bzer ||, 18-19, 'violence brings down (Tib. *rtib*, 'break or pull down' *rdib*, 'crumble' (of a house, &c.), *ltib*, 'fall through') the fort'

where, however, the preceding word ḫbar is not clear. With hwah the word bzer, not given in the Tibetan dictionaries, but frequent

---

\(^1\) Ḥphe, perhaps identical with the *pheh* of the Berlin fragment (I. 3), is of uncertain meaning, though clearly antithetical to *hbrah*. Can it be a form of *hphe* (cf. ḥdre/hdren, &c.), 'throw away', and so with ḥphañ/phañe, 'loss', ḥpōns/仟phaön, 'poor', &c.?

in seventh-to-ninth century personal names and occurring in the Tibetan manuscript Chronicle as designation of some war-structure which was ‘built’ (dgra-bzer-brtsigs), is conjoined again in the expression hwa-bzer, l. 231, of the Nam text: since it is first hsid, ‘high’, and then hrpag, ‘brought low’, it is evidently here, also, a building, like hkhar, hbam, hkañ, and other objects to which these terms are applied. Thus it seems certain that hwa-bzer means ‘bzer of power or government or control’. The rarity of ɔ in Nam suggests that it is a loan-word from Tibetan, which itself may have acquired it by borrowing. In l. 177 we hkohu-prom-bzer.

The above include all the occurrences of wa, hwañ, hgwah, &c., except hwi-wa (hwa), ll. 201, 273, to be noted infra (p. 341), hyañ-wa-hkañ, l. 190, which all belong elsewhere.

The employment of wa with Verbs, as in gsom-wa, ‘thought-making’, śi-wa, ‘death-making (or power)’, hwad-hwañ-rño, ‘able to keep watch’, and at the same time with Nouns or Adjectives (hkya, hmu) may throw light upon the origin of the Tibetan Verb- and Noun-suffix ba (pa).


4. hwañ = Tib. hbag, ‘be defiled’:
   hrgyeb-hkruhu-hbro-re-g-yah-hpan-hwañ, 323–4
   ‘when the rear has a filth-taste (malodour ?), the lap in front is defiled’.

   mye-hyan-hwad, 6, ‘fire also is awake’
   hsehe-hwad-hwad, 14, ‘the peaks nodded, nodded’ (?)
   tho-rgyam-ge-hwad, 109, ‘watching [at] the boundary-slabs’
   rgyed-hdre-hte-ge-hcog-hdo-dze-hwad, 87–8, ‘the disunion-inducers keep watch on union’
   hri-hcì-hwadhi, 300–1, ‘watch those coming to (or moving on) the mountain’
   hwad-hldan-kran, 268, ‘uprightness keeps watch’,
   hkeg-rko-hwad, 334, ‘the stopped hoe wakes up’?
   hwad-hwah-rño, 335, ‘able to keep watch’.

Hbad may have a related sense in:
   hmor-hso-hbad-ge, 313.

The text contains no instance of wo or wu, while hbo is frequent,
and \textit{hbu} and \textit{hbo}\textsc{g} also occur: hence before \textit{o} and \textit{u} the change of \textit{b} to \textit{w} may not have taken place in \textit{Nam} itself.

6. \textit{hwar} $=$ Tib. \textit{hbar}, 'burn': (\textit{hdag}).

\textbf{hr\-\textit{o}-ta-\textit{sodtsa}-re-hwar-ta-rgyen(n)i, 198}

‘the corpses being laid low (?), burning is difficult’.

In l. 28, where an earthquake is in question, \textit{hwar} probably will have the same sense, though an apparent imperfection in the text renders it uncertain whether \textit{hdag-hpo\textsc{h}o}, which \textit{might} be $=$ Tib. \textit{mdag}, ‘embers’, is really the subject of the Verb. For other reasons \textit{hran-war-hpa\textsc{n}a-re, l. 101, hra\textit{n}-hwar-\textit{rde\textsc{r}}-\textit{hdi-na, l. 107, cha-ru-hwars} (perhaps Aorist) -\textit{ge, l. 203, must likewise be left obscure.}


\textit{kla}\textit{g-\textit{hrwad-hdzur-[re-]}h\textit{wi-hwehi-htsag}, 173}

‘if the harsh-voiced lammergeyer (or eagle) is away, the mice or rats gather’ (p. 257)

\textit{hso-hldah-hgor-re-h\textit{wi}-wa-r\textit{ma\textae{n}}, 201,}

‘if the living delay, mice or rats are the tomb’

\textit{h\textit{wi}-h\textit{wa-se-kyah-hkya\textit{n}a-hdzam-re-hldan ||, 273–4}

‘to their mice-injured crops the serfs returned tame’

(cf. the \textit{g\textsc{san}-hra\textit{n}-hto\textsc{n}-kya, ‘enemy-abandoned crops’ of the preceding verse).

8. \textit{h\textit{wyir} = Tib. \textit{hbyer}, ‘escape’: (\textit{h\textsc{sa}g})}:

\textbf{h\textit{no}-sto-ge-h\textit{sa}g-dze-r\text{\-}\textit{ne-hwe-ge-h\textit{wyir} ||, 85}

‘while friends talk (Tib. \textit{\textsc{sag}s}), enmity-doers escape’.

9. \textit{h\textit{wen} = Tib. \textit{dben}, ‘solitary’ (?)}:

\textit{hlab-ta-h\textit{wen}, 159, ‘speaking is empty ( )’}.  

A Hsi-\textit{hsia wen} is given as meaning ‘bad’ (Laufer, No. 17).

10. \textit{h\textit{wa\textae{n} = Tib. \textit{db\textae{n}}, ‘power’, &c. (or Chinese \textit{wang} ?)}

\textit{hlda\textsc{n}-rgye-h\textit{dor-re-h\textit{wa\textae{n}}-ta-h\textit{hen}, 209–10}

‘After throwing away the big stick (? strong support, \textit{hlda\textsc{n} ?)}, ruling is a risk’

\textit{ram (nam ?)-ge-hwa\textsc{n} || re-\textit{klu-ge-hwa\textsc{n} ||, 5}

‘... being in authority, the blind were in authority’.

11. \textit{we\textit{hi}/h\textit{weihi}, ‘cream’ (p. 251) ?}

In regard to alternation of \textit{w(h\textit{w})} and \textit{b(h\textit{b})} see p. 346.

B. \textsc{Post-consonantal w}: Here a distinction should be made according as the consonant seems, from the point of view of
actual Nam or Tibetan morphology, to be (a) not a Prefix, or (b) a Prefix. The Prefix having been felt as a separable element, the following sound might, or might not, have been exempted from being influenced by it.

(a) the consonant not a Prefix.


3. hswar/hsor = Tib. sor, ‘finger’ (htsam; bzod).

   hswar-hldu-sto(= hldus-to)-dze, 26, ‘in a closing of the fingers [sc. a moment]’.

   The form hsor in:

   gši-brom-hnu-ge-hsor-htsam-bzod, 72

   ‘those whose strength is cut away by death support [only] as much as a finger’

   may be a Tibetanism, since the htsam (Tib. tsam) and bzod also are āṃaṇὶ ὀψηλνὲβα: brom = Tib. hgrum, ‘pinch or nip off’, see pp. 366-7.

4. swehe = Tib. sbe, ‘wrestle’?; but we should expect rbe.

   g-wah-hram-myer-re-hldag-nag-swehe, 129-30

   ‘united action (power?) being non-existent, the black-back contended (raised contention?)’

   Tib. sbed, ‘hide’, is perhaps less apposite.

5. thwañ = Tib. thañ, ‘value’, ‘measure’ (dwañ, rwañ).

   The most certain instance, since ḡbañ-thwañ must be = Tib. dbañ-thañ, ‘might’, ‘luck’, ‘destiny’, is:

   ḡbar-ḥbañ-thwañ-byiñ ||, 97, ‘in the middle (= secondly) authority declines’ (echoed in ḡbar-thwañ, l. 98).

   Also in:

   gnah-ma-dwañ-dze-ḥkhab-rgye-ge-hthwañ ||, 280

   ‘over places not brilliant (? dwañs = dwañ ll. 364-5, rwañ l. 178) the great houses have authority’.

6. twañ = Tib. thoñ, ‘ram’? (mñar; nehe).

   twañ-mag-hnor, 48, ‘in a fight of rams’

   g-rub-ḥgoho-hdag-ci-twañ-mñar-hṣogna ||, 261-2

   ‘those who had their doors rushed (ḥrub, pp. 221, 343) divided the rams under control (mñar Locative of mñaḥ?)’
twañ-hdzam-nehe, 276, 'the rams tamely—' (The next two verses refer to the dogs and goats: nehe is conceivably onomatopoeic, meaning 'bleat').

7. hgweg-hwehe = Tib. sgeg-byed, 'charmer' [sc. 'wife'] or hgeg-bye, 'husband'? hgweg-hwehe-hphah-hphah-dze-hthar-phyan-ge-hrub||, 348-9

On hphah-hphah, 'laugh', see p. 248, n. 3.


hhkwii-htsa-hyog-hdag-ci-hrañ-hdom-gdes ||, 259-60
'elders with staves (Tib. yog-po) fixed (Hsi-hsia gdeh/hdeh, &c., "fix", "determine", Nevsky, No. 25) their decisions'.

(The previous verse speaks of the 'wise' (še) and 'brave' (hpah), and the two following verses of 'children' (hsas).)

9. rwa/hrwa = Tib. rwa, 'horn', cf. ru, 'horn' (hkār; hya; hpoګ; ḫdah; sbyim).

hrin-rwa-hkar-re-hyān-hya-hsats ||, 44-5
'the long-horn [sc. ram] being penned, the female sheep come together'

Here ḫkar, as in ll. 151, 204, is connected with Tib. skar/sgar/dgar, &c., 'pen cattle, &c.', 'set apart', 'make an encampment': ḫya, 'sheep', see supra, p. 94: ḫñaŋ = Chinese niang, 'woman'. sbyim-hce-rgye-dze-hdah-hpoګ ||, 59
'on a sbyim (? "target", Tib. hgyim, "circumference") which is large the horn [sc. bow, Tib. rwa-gžu] plants the arrow'

(Hdah = Tib. mdah, 'arrow', as in l. 58, pp. 300-1: hpoګ = Tib. hpoګ (in manuscript also pog), 'hit' (with an arrow, &c.).)

10. hrkwa/rkwa = Tib. bkāh, 'command' (rkāh).

hrta-rkwa-hdzam, 122, 'the horse's rule was mild', (cf. Tib. bkāh-drin, 'kind', 'kindness') g-wah-hrśaŋ-hnar[-r[e]-hrkwa-hdzam-htronbi, 224
'hospital force having been accomplished, mild rule is to be brought in'.

This case raises a question of some difficulty; for in l. 84:

hrje-smyi-rmad-ge-hmo-rkah-lda-dze
'under chiefs who are inferior men, subject to a woman's commands'
we have *rkah* equivalent to Tib. *bkah*. Can *rkwa* represent the same? In favour of a *rkwa* = Tib. *bkah* we may call attention to the several examples of the pre-consonantal Prefixes *b*, *d*, and *m* being represented in modern Amdoan by post-consonantal *u*: such are *hual* = *dpal*, *hue* = *dpe*, *kuar-tsal* = *bkah-hstsal*, *chum* = *byams*, *kuak* = *bkag*, *kuam* = *mkhan*, *huon* = *dpon* (Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, pp. 363–6). Again, it may be doubted whether there are in the Nam text any other examples of the *r*-Prefix corresponding to the *b*-Prefix in Tibetan, unless *rkom*/ *hrkom*, ll. 157, 285, &c., is such (it might possibly be for *dkum*, cf. *dgum*).

The difficulty is, however, unsubstantial. The word *bkah* declares itself by its form to be a Deverbal Derivative, presumably from a Verb *hkah*, connected with *kha*, ‘mouth’, ‘speech’, &c. Accordingly, it may have taken in Nam the *r*-Prefix; in Tibetan it is, in fact, found with this Prefix in the Aorist form *brkas*. Hence it is quite possible that the Nam may have had both a *rkah* and a *brkah*; and the latter, if it became *rkwa*, may have survived by the side of the former, possibly with a slightly different sense, ‘rule’ instead of ‘command’.


    ḥn̄or-ḥlah-ḥwam-ḥsid-dze-ḥrwaṅ-ḥkaṅ-ḥkaṅ ||, 11
    ‘on the estates, in the high mansions or settlements, the dwelling-places were in confusion (?)’

*Hkaṅ-hkaṅ* (onomatopoeic ?) recurs in l. 184.

The etymology of Tib. *braṅ* being unknown, the equation is uncertain (from *brwaṅ* ?). That Nam *hrw* should be descended from mere *br* does not seem possible in view of the many instances of *br* = Tib. *br*. On *rwan*/ *dwaṅ* see p. 342.


Concerning *tsweṅ*, *htswė*, *ḥdzwė*, see p. 269. *Kwa-ka* occurs in Mānyak with the meaning ‘night’, *khwa-khwa* in Menia = ‘old’. As a mere possibility it may be mentioned that *pwaṅ*, which in the text is associated with *sṅa*, a known variant of Tib. *gña*, ‘surety’, ‘witness’, may itself be = Tib. *dpaṅ*, which has the same significations.
(b) The consonant a Prefix:

1. **rwye** (l. 50 *rbye*)\(^1\) = Tib. *dbye* (a) 'extent', (β) 'divided':
   (a) See p. 267.
   (β) *rta-htsog-hram-ge-ḥtah-rwye-ḥtah* ||, 90–1
   'the horse's friendships are divided, broken'.
   On ḥtah in *rwye-ḥtah* see p. 267.

2. **hrwad** = Tib. *rbad* (a) 'harsh voice', (b) 'a kind of eagle':
   Concerning:
   
   *hrwad-ḥbaṅ-prom-yaṅ-hkoḥu-me-ḥdrab-na* ||
   *klag-ḥrwad-ḥdzur-[re-]-ḥwi-ḥwehi-ḥtsag*, 172–3, see p. 257.
   *ḥgru-ma-ḥkom-re-ḥrwad-ḥmoṅ-ḥldah*, 32–3

   Here a doubt as to reading (ḥmaṅ ?) creates some uncertainty: otherwise the meaning would be 'harsh voices or the harsh-voiced clamour multiplied' or 'was confused' (p. 309).

3. **rwe**, **rwer**, **hrwehi**: (rgor; ḡbar; ḡmo-cha).
   That this word means substantially 'end' is clear in:
   *rgor-ḥyos-ḥbom-ḥyiṅ-ḥbar-ḥbaṅ-ḥwaṅ-ḥyiṅ* ||
   *rwer-ḥmo-ḥcaḥ-ḥyiṅ-ḥtsog-ḥram-ḥmyiṅ*
   *rgor-ḥyos-ḥbar-ḥwaṅ-ḥkoḥ-ḥyaṅ-ḥwehi-ṛẹ-ḥmo-ḥcha-ḥyi-ḥna-
   ḡphyi-ḥse-ḥmyi*, 96–8
   'At the door (rgor) — sinks; in the middle (ḥbar, Tib. *bar*)
   luck or authority sinks;
   At the end (rwer) the women's part (ḥcaḥ/cha) sinks: friendship is a name:
   At the door —, in the middle power, retinue also being ended
   (rwehi),
   The women's part sinking, injury from outside is not (the
cause: it is disunion').

   It appears therefore that *rwe*, in itself meaning 'end', gives rise to
a Verb meaning 'puts an end to'. The etymology is not apparent; but the same signification may be seen in:

   *ḥldaṅ-ḥraṅ-ḥwehi* ||, 113, 'uprightness is at an end'
   *ḥldaṅ-ṛmaṅ-ḥwehi* ||, 27, 'the wooden tombs were destroyed'

   and possibly in *ḥraṅ-ḥraṅ-ḥwehi*, ll. 21–2; in *ḥwehi-ḥtsu-ṛẹ-ḥna*,
l. 214, the last word is of uncertain reading (= ḡrṇas, 'despised'?).

\(^1\) *Hbye* in l. 223, perhaps also in l. 131, seems to mean 'is divided'
(Intransitive Verb = Tib. *ḥbye*).
4. g-we, g-wehi, g-wehe:

These, being formed by aid of the living Prefix g to the Verb we (p. 337), require no discussion.

On g-wah = hwah, see p. 339.

5. rwyin in:

hnah-hrań-ge-rwyin ||, 33

is of uncertain meaning: perhaps connected with hbyin, hbyin, ‘sink’, ‘grow faint’.

A question as to the limits of fluctuation between w and b after Prefixes is raised by the certain case of rwyelrbye.

No notice need be taken of inconsistencies as between different words; in a language using Prefixes the conditions of occurrence of the same initial consonant in two different roots may be entirely different: it is therefore not at all disconcerting to find that in Nam hwar = Tib. hbar always has w, while hbar = Tib. bar has b. In the spelling of particular words the Nam text seems to be noticeably consistent in this respect: besides the above-mentioned rwyelrbye the only cases calling for examination are those of hbah and hban.

Hbah: in the phrase hro-hbehi-hbah, ‘wolf oppressing sheep’, the word hbah, which can hardly fail to be = Tib. hbah, ‘distraint’, has everywhere b. This fact casts doubt upon the suggested (p. 338) connexion between that word and the Verb we, ‘do’, along with hwa, ‘action’, ‘power’.

Hban: This, which is, beyond doubt, the regular equivalent in the Nam text of Tib. dban, ‘power’, has beside it a form hwan with analogous signification: perhaps its meaning is restricted to that of ‘rule’, ‘government’, and it has been suggested supra, p. 341, that it is really = Chinese wang.¹

Post-consonantal w, as both present and absent in rkwıı/rkahıı, has been discussed supra (pp. 343–4), where the possibility of a special explanation has been considered. But, furthermore, the thwan found (p. 342) to be equivalent to Tib. thanıı, ‘value’, ‘measure’, can hardly be different from the hthanıı of hldıı-hthanıı, ll. 132, 133, ‘of this measure’, or the repeated hyah (g-yah)-hthanıı, ll. 286–8, ‘in the ascendant’, ‘superior’, from the corresponding hthanıı of ll. 289, 290, or the hyah-hthanıı of ll. 315, 318. It does not seem possible to bring in Tib. thanıı, (1) ‘clear’, ‘serene’, (2) ‘tail’, (3) ‘enduring’,

¹ The word hbani/baın may have other senses also, one of which may be (e.g. in ll. 67, 249–51, 373, 386, 390) that of Tib. hbaınıı, ‘a subject’.
'strong', 'tight'. It is, therefore, likely that thwañ is the original form of which the w, lost in Tibetan, was *occasionally* preserved in Nam.

Hthañ, 'plain', 'steppe', = Tib. thañ, is never, in its frequent occurrences, spelled with the w.

4. **r-Prefix; r-final**

*r-Prefix*:

A complete distinction between Prefix and not-Prefix is not feasible. For, on the one hand, it is impossible to say what groups of initial consonants were existent or frequent in early periods of Tibeto-Burman, and, on the other hand, forms originally containing Prefixes may attain in course of time the value of roots, and with different Prefixes different secondary roots could develop from one original; and each such development may have had a different date and local range. The least unreliable indications of a Prefix still felt to be such are (a) variation, including that between presence and absence, of Prefix, and (b) analogy of similar cases. Of course, where the variation is in accordance with a grammatical system or the Prefix discharges a function, there is no doubt: thus, when blan(s) and glan alternate in a certain way, we may be sure that their connexion with the original len is not yet extinct.

In comparing Nam words having apparent Prefixes with Tibetan equivalents we have to reckon with variation on both sides: as regards Tibetan, even the dictionary attests an amount and range of variation of which the common orthography affords no conception: the double Prefix br- often, for example, alternates with bs-; and in the old manuscripts from Central Asia there are many more abnormalities, both orthographical and morphological. Hence we can never say that a Nam form containing a particular Prefix was not with that Prefix existent in Tibetan: we can say only that it has not been found. Subject to this proviso, the factual correspondence and divergences in respect of the r-Prefix may be classified as follows:

\[ r- = \text{Tib. } r- : \]

\[ rko/\text{hrko} = \text{Tib. } rko, \text{ 'dig', &c.} \]

\[ hrgah, hrgan = \text{Tib. } rga, rgan, \text{ 'old', 'grow old'.} \]

\[ rgu/\text{hrgu} = \text{Tib. } rku (rkun, lku, rgu, &c.), \text{ 'steal', 'thief'.} \]

\[ hrgod = \text{Tib. } rgod, \text{ 'wild'.} \]

\[ rgya/\text{rgyah/hrgyah} = \text{Tib. } rgya, \text{ 'plane surface'.} \]
hrgyu = Tib. rgyu, ‘material’.
rgyom/hrgyom/rgyoha/rgyom/rgyohon = Tib. rgyo/rgyon, ‘copulari’.
ṛṇam/hrṇam = Tib. ṛṇam, ‘threat’, ‘alarm’.
ṛṅu = Tib. ṛṅu, ‘pain’.
ṛṇe/hrṇe/hrṇehe = Tib. ṛṇe, ‘fiend’, ‘enemy’.
ṛṇo/hrṇo/hrṇoho = Tib. ṛṇo, ‘able’, ‘power’.
rjes = Tib. rjes, ‘trace’, ‘aftermark’.
rta(h), ṛṭaḥ = Tib. rta, ‘horse’.
rto/hrto = Tib. ṛdo, ‘stone’.
hrdag = Tib. rdeg, rdegs, ‘smite’, ‘thrust’.
ṛma = Tib. ṛma, ‘wound’.
mba = Tib. ṛma, ‘ask’ (l. 47?).
ṛmaṅ = Tib. ṛmaṅ, (a) ‘tomb’, (b) ‘dream’, ‘imagine’.
ḥṛmoḥo (‘shake’? l. 18?), ṛmone (‘dream’, ‘imagine’? l. 349) =
Tib. ṛmaṅ, ‘dream’, ‘imagine’, ṛmon, ‘be dazed, dizzy’?
ṛtsig/hrtsig = Tib. ṛtsig, ‘carpenter’.
ṛdzogs = Tib. ṛdzogs, ‘completed’.
ḥṛdzon(hdzon) = Tib. ṛdzon(hdzon), ‘castle’.
ḥrwad = Tib. ṛbad, ‘harsh-voiced’, ‘eagle’.
ḥrlom/glom = Tib. ṛlom, ‘conceit’, ‘covet’.
rse/hrse, se = Tib. ṛse/se, ‘summit’, ‘roof’.
ṣ = Tib. ṛ or ṛ:
ṛgade(l. 113) = Tib. ṛgaḍ/dgod/rgod, ‘laugh’ (?)
ṛ = Tib. ṛ or ṛs:
ṛkaḥ/hrkwa = Tib. ṛkaḥ, ṛkas, bkas, ‘command’.
ṛgo = Tib. ṛgo/ṛgo/sgo, ‘door’, ‘gate’.
ṛṇi/sṇi = Tib. ṛṇi/sṇi, ‘snare’, ‘noose’.
ṛke = Tib. ṛke/ske, ‘lean’.
ṛ = Tib. s (cf. ‘Tangut’ (ṛta-)ṛga, ‘saddle’, ṛkhiṅ, ‘heart’, =
sṇiṅ, Amdo ṛduk = ṛduṅ, &c.):
ḥṛkas = Tib. ṛkas, ‘ladder’, ‘staircase’.
ṛgam = Tib. ṛgam, ‘deep’.
ṛgam/hrgam = Tib. ṛgam, ‘take into company’.
ṛgon/hrgon = Tib. ṛgon-wa, ‘egg’.
ḥṛgom = Tib. ṛgom, ‘passed over’.
rdan/hrdan = Tib. sdn, ‘anger’, ‘enmity’.
hrdam = Tib. sdam, ‘bind’, ‘subdue’.
rde/hrde/rdehe = Tib. sde, ‘class’, ‘troop’.
rdorhrdo = Tib. sdo, ‘venture’.
hrpod (l. 250) = Tib. spod, ‘vow’?
rbo/hrbo, rbom/hrbom = Tib. sbo, sbom, ‘swell’, ‘grow big’.
romo (l. 250) = Tib. smon, ‘aspiration’, ‘vow’?

r = Tib. s or d:
rmah, hmah = Tib. ma, sma, dmah, ‘low’.

r = Tib. s or d or r:


rkañ/hrkañ = Tib. dkah, ‘steep’, ‘difficult’.
hrqañ = Tib. dqah, ‘delight’.
rgoñ = Tib. dgon, ‘wilderness’.

rbye/rwyê (cf. rgye, rgyes) = Tib. dbye, dbyes, ‘extension’, ‘extent’.

rmag/hrmag = Tib. dmag, ‘army’.

r = Tib. d, b, or g (cf. ‘Tangut’ rnit = gñid, Amdo rsum = gsum, rdä = bzla, &c.):
rkahn/hrkah = Tib. bkah, ‘word’, ‘command’.

Probably here the real Tib. equivalents are brkah and brkum.

r = Tib. m:

rnab = Tib. mnab, mnabs, ‘food’.
rdza, hrdzah (also hdza, hdzah) = Tib. mdzah, ‘friend’, ‘be friendly’.
rdzo = Tib. mdzo.

r = Tib. h or O:
rgyam = Tib. gyam (? rgyam (ḥgyam)-tshwa), ‘recess in a rock’.

hrgyeg = Tib. hgegs, ‘stop’, ‘obstruct’.
rgyen = Tib. yeṅ, ‘put in order’ (g-yeṅ, ‘move softly to and fro’).
rgyen = Tib. gyen, ‘uphill’.
rgyer = Tib. hgyer, ‘forsake’.
rñe/hrñe/rñye (ñe/hñe/ñes) = Tib. ñe, ñes, ‘be evil’, ‘evil’.
rbyo = Tib. bya, ‘bird’ (pp. 332–3).
rmu/hrmu = Tib. mu, ‘boundary’.
rdzar/hdzar = Tib. hjar, ‘cohere’, ‘meet’: or = rdza-re?
rdzum/hrdzum = Tib. hdzum, ‘smile’, ‘close eye’.
hrdzur(hdzur) = Tib. hdzur, ‘go, or be, aside’.

A special case is:
rlie, hlde/hldehe = Tib. lde, hde, bde, ‘fortune’, &c.

Of doubtful meaning and etymology are:
hrim (l. 213).
hri (l. 298), r̩i (l. 389) = Tib. r̩id, ¢ade’, r̩is, ‘worn out’?
rtre, hrtehu, grtehe (pp. 156, 313).
rders (l. 107); cf. Tib. bdar, rdar, ‘adjust’, ‘grind’, ‘sharpen’,
‘polish’, ‘examine closely’.
hrdyâh (l. 202).
hrdyam (l. 137) = Tib. hjoms/gjom, ‘subdue’?
ru (htsog-ru = Tib. tsog-pu, ‘sitting’, ‘crouching’?) or is
htsog-ru-še-chan, l. 91 = ‘united sons of a family’ (Tib.
spu/spun), strong in wisdom’?
ruyi (l. 375) = byi, hbyi, hbyi (Tib. dbyi, ‘wipe out’)?
rwyin (l. 33: see p. 346).
spu-rbu (l. 39), if it is = Tib. spur-bu, name of a certain deer
(in a manuscript), is merely an orthographic variation.
hrloho, ‘swirl’ (l. 15)? cf. Tib. mig-rlo ‘eyeing obliquely’.

It does not seem possible to consider any of the above from the
point of view of ‘sound change’. As has already been explained,
the Prefixes were originally functional; even when the functions
were become obsolescent, they remained to the linguistic sense
separable elements. The r- and s- Prefixes are, no doubt, very old.
But in the earliest known Tibetan the s was still partly functional,
as is shown by the frequency of Verbs of the type of spo, Transitive,
by the side of the type hpho, Intransitive. Nor can it be said that
even r had entirely ceased to be functional: such a form as brnaṅs
by the side of bsnan, as Aorist of the Verb mnon/non/snon, mani-
states an awareness of an alternation of r and s in a certain function.
Hence, when we find, and it is not very rarely, alternative forms where no consideration of function can be alleged, e.g. rñi/sñi, ‘snare’, rñil/sñil, ‘ear of corn’, rke/ske, ‘thin’, rked/sked, ‘waist’, rgyan/sgyan, ‘ornament’, rme/sme, ‘spot’, there is no ground for phonetical derivation of one form from the other. Both the r and the s belonged to the category of Prefixes available in the particular cases, and the choice was dictated by some fashion or tendency which need not have had invariably local limits. A striking instance is the Amdo form of the word for ‘horse’, which both in Nam and in Tibetan is rta, no doubt an original Tibeto-Burman form: by Prejevalsky, whose source was exclusively oral, the Amdo form is given as sta. Accordingly, in a country where the r-Prefix is notably prevalent and encroaching and where Tibetan st is most usually represented by rt, the r has been replaced by s in one of its oldest instances.

Consequently, when we find that Nam has no sg, sd, sb (except sbyim), and responds with rg, rd, rb, to Tibetan words beginning with sg, sd, sb, it does not certainly follow that there has been a change of s>r. The case may be one of alternative or of substitution. A proof of this may be seen in the fact that the Tibetan manuscripts have rman = sman, ‘medicine’, and brgo = sgo, ‘door’.

The same reasoning applies to r corresponding to Tibetan d, b, or m, all practically non-existent (b found only in a certain function) in Nam (pp. 166, 196). In the Tibetan manuscripts r is found replacing d in rgum = dgu, m in rñen = mnñen, and b replacing r in btsal = rtsal. Modern Amdoan has r for d in rka = dkah, rñō = dños, ryan = dbyaṅs; for b in rshyot = bskyod, rdā = bzla; for g in rtsaṅ = gtsaṅ, rsum = gsum, rdzuk = gzugs; beside the above-noted rt = st, and, further, rg = sg in rgom = sgom, rga = sga, rgo = sgo; rk = sk in rku = sku, rkad = skad; rn = sn in rna = sna; rn = sǹ in rnar = sñar; rm = sm in rmā = smras; rt = lṭ in rta = lṭa.

Absence of the r-Prefix of ordinary Tibetan is seen in the gyud (Nam gyud/kyud), ḍdzon (Nam ḍzon/hjoṅ/rdzon), of the Tibetan manuscripts. Nor can we be at all certain that the normal Tibetan form is the more original.

In cases where the Nam has r-Prefix lacking in ordinary Tibetan we may sometimes be able to cite a parallel without being able to furnish an explanation. Thus rmu, ‘boundary’ = Tib.  

1 So in Ladak (Jaeschke, Tib. Grammar, § 7).
mu, has beside it rma = ma, ‘not’, of the Tibetan manuscripts, and ti-rmi, ‘man’, ti-rming, ‘name’ (Tib. miṅ, myiṅ) of modern Gyārung: the form smyi may be compared to Hörpa smen, ‘name’. Rñe, ‘evil’ = Tib. ņes, is paralleled by the rņu = Tib. nu, ‘breast’, of the Tibetan manuscripts: cf. also the case of rbyo (p. 333).

The forms hršāṅ, ‘hostile’, and ržāṅ, ll. 54, 56, which must have some kindred meaning, are in themselves remarkable. The former is clearly connected with hšāṅ = Tib. šāṅ, ‘hate’, and in Tibetan might have been bšāṅ: in principle it is not different from rkaṅ, rkom, rpag, rmag. Ržāṅ, which does not recall anything in Nam, where the ẑ is practically non-existent, is curiously paralleled in one of the Tibetan manuscripts by a form ržen, ņen = Tib. mṅen, ‘make pliant’. This is not a scriptural accident, by reason of the parallels noted (p. 106) in certain Hsi-fan dialects (d’Ollone, p. 73): it looks as if in some circumstances ņ became j, whence ẑ. The particular word, ržāṅ, might accordingly be = Tib. gņan, ‘cruel’, ‘severe’, ‘wild’; but the final ņ is then a difficulty. Further curiosities in connexion with ņ are Tangut rkhiāṅ, ‘Argal sheep’ = Tib. gņan/rňan, and Tangut rkhiṅ, ‘heart’ = Tib. sńiṅ.

The instances of Nam r Prefixed to Verbs which in Tibetan are without it, e.g. rgyed, rdzum, rdzur, provoke the inquiry whether in Nam the r- may have retained some definite functional value. The question is most natural where the text exhibits forms with and without the r: such are hgam/hrgam (rgam), rgyeb/hgyeb, hrni(rni)/hi (ni), hrńe(rńe)/hńe (ńe), grteh(hrtehu, rte)/gde, hrpehi (rpehi)/kpehi, hrbo(rbo)/kbo(gbohu), hrmag(rmag)/mag, hrdzoṅ/ḥdzon, ḥrdza(rdza)/ḥdza, hrdzur/ḥdzur, one or two others (p. 350) being doubtful.

It is, no doubt, premature to enter into this question. In some cases (rgyeb/hgyeb, hrdzoṅ/ḥdzon, rmag/mag the latter only in mag-no) the alternation seems merely casual; in others the difference, if any existed, has been obscured (hrńi/kńi, hrńe/hńe, hrbo/ḥbo), or the connexion of the two forms is unproved. But in hgam/ḥrgam(rrgam) the difference = ‘community’/‘form a community’, is not only clear in the Nam text, but corresponds to the Tibetan gam/σgam; ḥdza/rdza also are not improbably = ‘friend’/‘make friends’; and hpag/hrpag may be partly distinguished as ‘low’/‘lay low’; ḥdzur/hrdzur perhaps as ‘be aside’/‘leave aside’. Hence it is possible that one function of the r- Prefix was that of forming Denominative Verbs, and that such a function was in Nam not yet extinct.
L- in \( hlkyan/\text{g}lyan \) = Tib. \( r\text{k}ya\text{n} \), ‘wild ass’, is not at all surprising on the Tibeto-Chinese border; cf. Central-Asian \( l\text{k}u \), \( \text{blkun} = r\text{k}u, \text{rkun} \), ‘steal’, ‘thief’.

R final:

In the *JRAS*. 1939, p. 215 and note, reference has been made to the possibility of a loss of final \( r \) in Nam \( spye = \text{Tib. dbyar} \), ‘summer’. Final \( ar/er \) is unmistakable in the \( \text{phyar(\text{pyar})/phyer (\text{pyer})} \) of the text, varying in such a way that an Ablaut relationship between the \( e/a \) is highly improbable; and it has been pointed out *supra* (pp. 33–4) that a place in the Koko-nor region mentioned in the eighth century A.D. as \( Dbyar-mo-tha\text{n} \) is known later as \( G\text{-yar-mo-tha}n, \text{Yar-mo-tha}n, \text{G-yer-mo-tha}n \). These cases seem evidence of occasional change of final \( ar \) to \( er \), which change is, also with loss of the \( -r \), in fact frequent in some modern E.-Tibetan dialects (*supra*, p. 78). On the other hand, a change of final \( -ir \) to \( -ar \), seen in Nam \( h\text{wyir} = \text{Tib. hbyer} \), ‘escape’, is paralleled by Hsi-hsia \( n\text{ir} \), ‘relative’, if equivalent, as suggested by Laufer (No. 122, p. 104), to Tib. \( gu\text{r}er \): the few other known Hsi-hsia words with final \( r \) (Nevsky, Nos. 55, 163, 231, 273, 279, 281) are of indeterminate etymology.

A parallel to \( spye/dbyar \) might perhaps be found in the Nam word \( ste \) in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{stehi-htam-hmog-dze, 54, ‘over the — clouds’} \\
\text{hrdzo\text{-}ho\text{-}hi\text{-}di\text{-}ste-gdzu-ge-cig, 194, 356} \\
\text{‘On the castle’s high zig-zag (ascent) the — asses ceased’}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, if \( ste \) were \( \text{Tib. sde} \), ‘class’, ‘group’, &c., the sense of \( stehi\text{-}htam(\text{htham}) \) would be ‘gathered in a mass’, and that of \( ste-gdzu \) would be ‘asses in troops’. Apposite as this would be, it is open to the serious objection that Tibetan \( sde \) is required as the equivalent of a different Nam word, namely, \( hr\text{de}/rde\text{he} \), which it fits, while in form supported by \( rd\text{a}n = \text{Tib. sda\text{n} \}, \text{‘anger’, and \( rdo = \text{Tib. sdo \}, \text{‘venture’. If, on the other hand, we bring in Tib. \( st\text{ar} \), ‘file on a string’, ‘fasten’, the ‘asses in file’ will be perhaps more appropriate than ‘asses in troops’, and the clouds ‘in close succession’ may not be seriously different from clouds ‘gathered in mass’. Moreover, the \( ste \) will furnish a good antithesis to the \( h\text{thar}\text{-}mye \), ‘fires let loose’ of the following line. It is, however, rather unfortunate that \( h\text{thar} \) also is an \( -ar \) word, and it seems preferable to take \( ste \) as a form of \( st\text{en}/\text{rten} \) (cf. \( h\text{dre}, h\text{dro} = h\text{dren}, h\text{dron} \), ‘hold on to’, ‘adhere to’, more especially as the corresponding
Intransitive *hthe/hthen*, whence *the*, ‘adherent’, ‘subject’, is used in the sense of ‘halting’ (see S. C. Das’s Dictionary).

5. **L-Prefix; l final**

Instances of *l* prefixed to roots with initial *d, dy* have been considered; other cases are rare. If we omit mis-writings, viz. *hltān*, l. 93 (for *hldān*), *hltāh*, l. 203 (for *hldāh*, see ll. 202–3), *hltom*, l. 88 (for *hldom*, see ll. 94, 95), there remain:

- *hlkyān*, 188 (written *hglyān*, l. 308) = Tib. *rkyañ*, *kiang* or ‘wild ass’.
- *lgyoho*, 11—meaning obscure.

Final *l* in place of *r* is seen in:


but *l* = Tib. *l* in:

- *htul/hthul* = Tib. *hdul, gdul, btul, thul*
- *hpul/hphul* = Tib. *phul*


The significance of so short a list is diminished by the fact that no other word in the text seems to invite comparison with a Tibetan word in *l*, except *høyu*, which in a number of occurrences (ll. 49, 123, 147, 305, 345–6, 350–1, 368–9, 372, 387) is possibly = Tib. *yul*, ‘country’, ‘district’, ‘village’.

6. **S initial; s final**

Before a vowel *s*, whether initial or preceded by a Prefix, corresponds regularly to Tibetan *s*; e.g.

- *su = Tib. su*, ‘who’.
The equivalence extends to cases where Nam wa = Tib. -o; e.g.
swa, 'tooth' = Tib. so.
swah/swa/hswah = Tib. so, 'watch', 'guard'.
hswar = Tib. sor, 'finger'.

Exceptionally s corresponds to Tib. š (cf. bsos/bšos, bsen/bšen, in the Tibetan manuscripts) and vice versa:

hsams, 58 = Tib. šom, gšom, bšoms, bšams, 'make ready'.
šon 156 = Tib. son/šon, 'arrive' (?).
S = Tib. ts, tsh in:
se/hse/rse/hrse = Tib. rtse, 'top', 'peak' (in the Tibetan manuscripts se).
se/hse/gse/gshe/gtse = Tib. gtse, htshe, 'injure'.
hsas/gsas = Tib. btsas, 'born', 'offspring', also gsas.

In general, however, the ts, tsh, survive as such. Where initial s is followed by a consonant, it is not feasible to distinguish generally between s-Prefix and s belonging to the root. Under the heads of (a) presence and (b) absence of s we may take note of factual equivalents to Tibetan as follows:

1. Before k, kh:

   (a) ska = Tib. sga, 'saddle'.
   skar = Tib. skar, 'star'.
   sku/skuhu = Tib. sku, 'body'.
   ske = Tib. ske, 'neck'.
   sko = Tib. sko, 'select', 'appoint'.
   skyan = Tib. skyon, bskyan, 'protect', (?).
   skyar = Tib. skyor, 'hold up' (?).
   skye = Tib. skye, 'be born', 'live'.
   skhrud (cf. skho in the Tibetan manuscripts) = Tib. skrud, 'retreat in fear'.

   (b) kya = Tib. skya, 'crop' (cf. Hsi-hsia khya = Tib. skya, 'magpie', Laufer, p. 104 (32)).
   kyen = Tib. skyen, 'swift' (?) or mkhyen, 'know'?).
   skyim(hkhyim/kyim/hkhyim/gyim) has no s in Tib. khyim, 'house', hgyim, 'circumference'.

2. Before t:

   (a) sta/stah/hstah = Tib. sta, a suffix.
   stan/hstan = Tib. stan, 'above'.
   sti/hti = Tib. sti, bsti, thi, 'rest', 'stop'.
   stin = Tib. stin, 'rebuke', or sdig, 'sin'? ( ).


ste/hste = Tib. ste, a suffix.
ste/sthe = Tib. sten/rten, ‘adhere to’, &c. (p. 353)?.
stel = Tib. ster, ‘grant’.
sto = Tib. sto, ‘rope’ (?)..
sto = Tib. sto, a suffix.
ston = Tib. ston, ‘empty’ (?)
ston = Tib. ston, ‘1,000’.
ston = Tib. ston, ‘show’ (?)
stom/hstom = Tib. ston, ‘harvest’.
stor/hstor/gstor = Tib. stor, ‘flee’, ‘be lost’.

3. Before p and b:
(a) spu-rbu = Tib. spu-rbu, a kind of bird or P.N. of a certain deer (?)
spo = Tib. spo, ‘peak’.
spo = Tib. spo, ‘change’.
spyi = Tib. spyi, ‘head’, ‘chief’.
spye = Tib. dbyar, ‘summer’, seems to be a by-form.
Spa/spehi in mehi-spa, l. 151 = mehi-spehi, l. 370, seems to be the same word (cf. p. 191), with the meaning ‘sparkle’ or ‘ornament’, which also suits spe in l. 86. Nevertheless, spehi in l. 379 seems equivalent to Tib. dpe, ‘example’.
(b) hpha, ll. 211, 384, hpehi, ll. 211, 386, 387, are plainly identical, and they appear to have the two meanings of spa and spehi. Cf. also spehi/hpehi, p. 282.
Sbyim = Tib. hgyim, ‘circumference’? Cf. hbyim, ll. 266, 363?

4. Before ts:
(a) htsag(htsag, htsog) = Tib. htsags, ‘collected’ (tshogs/htshogs).
(b) htsan/gtsan = Tib. stsañ, gtsañ, ‘corn’.
Stsah/htsah, ‘watch’, and stsar, show in Tibetan (htsah, tshar) no s form, but once r (rtsas).

5. Before ŋ:
(b) Possibly nor = Tib. nor (in manuscript snor), ‘farm’.

6. Before ŋ:
(a) sña/sniñ = Tib. sniñ, ‘heart’.
sña = Tib. sña/gña, ‘witness’?
snì = Tib. gñìs, ‘2’.
Sñìe (l. 217) is obscure.
7. Before \( m \):
   
   (a) \( \text{smu-hku} = \text{Tib. smi-gu/smyu-gu} \), ‘reed’.
   
   \( \text{Sme} \), ‘blaze’, \( \text{smyi} \), ‘man’, have normally in Tibetan no \( s \); but concerning \( \text{sme} \) see pp. 282–3. \( \text{Smu} \), l. 27, is quite obscure; but see p. 259.

8. Before \( r \):
   
   (a) \( \text{sram/hsram} = \text{Tib. sran} \), ‘hard’.

   \( \text{sri} = \text{Tib. sri} \), ‘demoness’.

   \( \text{hsre} = \text{Tib. sre} \), ‘soot’, &c.

   \( \text{sro} = \text{Tib. sro} \), ‘straight’.

9. Before \( l \):
   
   On \( sl < zl \) in \( slah \), \( slo \), \( slog \), see supra, pp. 335–6.

   \( \text{Slod} \) is perhaps = a \( \text{Tib. zlod} = \text{lhod/glod/lod} \), ‘to loose’.

   \( \text{Sli}, \text{hsli}, \text{sleg}, \text{slug} \) (p. 336 n. 2) are obscure.

10. Before \( 8 \):

   \( \text{ssam} \), a highly exceptional form, occurring in:

   \( \text{ssam-stom-hdag-dze-hsar-stomhi} \), 255

   ‘when the last (?) harvest has come to hand (? \( \text{hdag} \) = \( \text{Tib. bdog, bdag} \))’, a new harvest’.

   If \( \text{ssam} \) is to be credited with the conjectured meaning, it may be related to \( \text{Tib. sam/gsam} \), ‘lower’, ‘later’. \( \text{Hsam} \), l. 277, is apparently different.

   The cases where Tibetan \( s \) before consonants corresponds to Nam \( r \) before consonants, a frequent phenomenon in ‘Tangut’, have been noted under ‘\( r \)-Prefix’.

   \( s \) final, after consonants as well as after vowels, is almost confined to verb-forms, to which it imparts an Aoristic or Preterite sense. In Tibetan also, where the \( s \) is used, moreover, to form Imperatives, many nominal forms with final \( s \), both after vowels and after consonants, are plainly deverbal. Hence it is not certain that the Nam, where it lacks a final \( s \) present in Tibetan, has lost it. But the fact that its \( s \) is restricted to cases where it is functional indicates that in other circumstances a final \( s \) would have been lost; and such loss is sometimes suggested by particular factors, e.g. by the \( n \) (for \( n \)) in the Imperative form \( \text{htro} \), as in \( \text{Tib. drons/dron} \), from \( \text{hdren} \), and therefore also in \( \text{hlob} \) (Tib. \( \text{lobs} \)), Imperative of \( \text{hlab} \).

   After vowels the following Aorists or Preterites can be recognized:

   \( \text{gras, hgras, hras, htas} (= \text{hthas}) \), \( \text{hldas, hwas, hsas, hsa} \) (gsas)
After consonants we have:

- thogs, phyegs, rdzogs
- gyaṅs, haṅs
- rkabs, rgyebs
- kroms, groms, hroms, hams
- wars, rders (?), tsors, tshors.

In nearly all cases these are found (see pp. 170, 197–8) as Predicates at the end of verses, sentences, or clauses; and in many instances non-Aoristic forms, without the -s, occur. The verbal and Aoristic function is not, of course, impaired when the word is followed by one of the auxiliary verbs re, ‘be’, kom, prom, hyo, ‘do’ or ‘effect’, as in:

- spye-chos-re, ‘being begun in summer’,
- gyes-hkom, ‘effect extension’,
- Ṣatas-prom, ‘made hard or tangled’,
- hchos-hyo, ‘make beginning’;

or with a governing or accompanying verb or even noun, as in:

- gyaṅ-slo, ‘call for escort’,
- hbrus-hgyan, ‘itch with inflammation’,
- hlos-hlam, ‘movement path’,
- Ṣatas-kro, ‘tangled hate’;

or with a verbal or nominal suffix, as in:

- haṅs-te, ‘being born’,
- chos-ta, ‘beginnings’ or ‘things begun’.

In some cases the -s is disguised by being transferred in writing, as frequently in Tibetan, to a following suffix, ta, te, to, making sta, ste, sto, as in:

- Ṣatsah-ste (= htsahs-te), hwa-ste, gbhu-ste (= gbos-te)
- gyaṅ-sto, hrgyaṅ-sto, hrgehi-sto (= hrgehes-to), haṅh-sto,
  (= haṅhs-to), hldu-sto, hldyim-sto, Ṣatsah-sto (= htsahs-to),
  Ṣym-sto.

In ll. 278–9, Ṣtag-htos, the -s is attached to the Participle in -to, used as a main verb.

The possibility that the form Ṣodtsa is an attempt to attach the Aoristic s even to a root ending in d has been suggested supra.
Perhaps this, and not merely a feeling for euphony, accounts for the s in hbrad-sta, l. 306. In g-ri(hrī, &c.)-sta-mehi, hmañ-sta-mehi, ll. 311–13, the sta, which follows a nominal word, seems to be different, = sta, ‘there’.

We are now left with ñes (Aorist of ñe), ‘wise’; hbos (Aorist of ñbo, ‘swell’), ‘the big man’ or ‘master’; gsas/hsas (Aorist of btsah, ‘give birth’), ‘offspring’, ‘children’; hrkas (Tib. skas/skras), ‘ladder’, ‘staircase’; rjes (Tib. rjes), ‘aftermark’; hño(s) (evidenced by hño-sta/hño-sto), ‘friend’, ‘partisan’ (Tib. nös, ‘side’); hhyogs (one occurrence, usually hyo/g-yog) apparently = Tib. g-yog, ‘serve’, ‘servant’; and:

hño-sto-ge-rdo-re-cis-tsha-hbyihi, 84, ‘when friends venture . . .
gdim-chis(tshis ?)-ldom-re, 94, 95, ‘under the sway of disappearance and coming (transience)’
khysos-hkhyañ-ñyu-ge, 212, ‘wives united with husbands’
hgar-ñpu-ñches-hño-ñkhob-prom, 322, ‘the chief blacksmith having made a face-covering (blinkers)’
hpus-hphyah-ñmyi-cañ, 298 (obscure).

In most of the above-cited single words the -s may have been preserved by a consciousness of its functional, deverbal, character; and this applies even to hrkas and rjes, where the Tibetan also has the -s. For hrkas, perhaps connected with Tib. dkah, ‘steep’, occurs only in the phrase hrkas-hthañ, l. 57, which may be ‘putting (Tib. gtañ) a ladder or staircase’, unless Tib. skas-gdañ-bu (=skas, skas-ka, skas-tshañ, skras, skras-ka) contains a gdañ = gtañ, ‘stick’, and Nam hthañ is the same; in the phrase the -s might have been retained. Rjes is a derivative from rjed/brje/brjed, ‘change’, ‘exchange’, ‘forget’, ‘remind’; but the phrase in which it occurs, pyi-rjess-ne-ñcer, 201–2, ‘the good is afraid of a (funeral) memorial’,
might contain an Instrumental-Ablative after a verb of ‘fearing’, if such a Case existed in Nam. A consideration of this last possibility depends upon the words cis, chis, khyos, hches, hpus, in the five passages quoted. Cis (p. 259) and hpus, however, are obscure and therefore must be put aside; chis, even if it is not a mis-writing of the chim, hchim, htshm of ll. 38, 81, 199, can be Aorist of chi, ‘go’ (Tib. mchis), and not Instrumental in -s; and hches, though certainly connected with the hche, ‘great’, which elsewhere occurs, may still be = Tib. ches (not che) in its regular deverbal-adverbial
use. There remains, therefore, only khyos = Tib. khyo, ‘husband’, which is of uncertain derivation and may itself be deverbal, like skyes, ‘man’. Accordingly we find nothing to invalidate the negative conclusion (supra, p. 193) concerning the non-existence of a Nam Instrumental-Agential Case, which, had it existed, should have found some expression after words ending in consonants.

7. Nasals, initial and final

A. Initial m is usually unaffected in old Tibetan; but a change of my- to ny-(ñ-), regular in modern Tibetan and very widely evidenced in Hsi-fan and other languages of the Tibeto-Chinese areas, is to be seen in myul/ñul, ‘slink’, ‘rove’, ‘spy’, smyu-gu/ sñug-gu, ‘pen’, and in mye-cho/ñe-tsho of the Tibetan manuscripts. The change has not been found in Nam.

Initial ñ is not often replaced; for instance, the Tibeto-Burman equivalents of Tib. ña, ‘I’, and ña, ‘5’, commonly retain the guttural (Hodgson writes gn). The Nam text confuses ñah and hnah (supra, pp. 238–9), and in mag-no, ‘battle’, the no (dissimilation after g ?) is perhaps the same word as in Tib. g-yul-ño, ‘battle’. The cases of ña for na (assimilation ?), ll. 57, 199, 201, 206, 207 after -ñ in hbyiñ, rmañ, are interesting, because the like is exemplified in the Tibetan manuscripts.

ñ- is the most unstable, being usually in Tibeto-Burman languages represented by n: thus for Tib. gñen, ‘relative’, the Hsi-hsia nir (Laufer, No. 122); for sñiñ, ‘heart’, gñe/gne/ne (Nevsky, No. 100; Laufer, No. 105, niñ); for rje, ‘king’, ñeh/ne/neñ (Nevsky, No. 40); for mññam, ‘equal’, ñe/ñi/ñih (Nevsky, No. 217). The word for ‘2’, Tib. gñis, is Gyārung ka-nès, Rgya-ron (Pati) ko-nes, Tākpa nai, Mānyak nā-bi, ‘Tangut’ ni; cf. ‘Tangut’ nina, ‘sun’ (= Tib. ŋin). The Nam text varies ŋe with ne in ŋkya-wañe. The documents from Central Asia have nun-chad for ŋuñ-chad.

n- is not usually altered: in Thöchü nyik, Hörpa nya-nya, Golok 41 nierk, Muli nya, Pa-u-Rong nyi, all = Tib. nag, ‘black’, some confusion may have co-operated. The Central-Asian documents have ŋan-cher for nan-cher.

The above facts may tend to remove any a priori objections to the following abnormal equations between Nam and Tibetan initial nasals:


cf. l. 204,
puñ-te-gsar-ñar-hpah-rmag-ḥcihi ||
in a body with new vigour a hero-army goes’,

where ñar is written. Ñar/snar/bsnar, ‘lengthen’, ‘long and thin’, ‘continuous’, is less apt. In l. 112, hldan-hkrañ-hnar-re, the following may be preferable:
nar/ñner = Tib. gñer/gñar, ‘tend’, ‘provide for’, ‘procure’, in g-wah-hršañ-hnar[-re], 224, ‘procure fierce force’
glah-hlad-hnar[-re], 233, ‘procure return for wages’ (p. 251)
gse-hlad-hnar[-re], 243, ‘procure requital of injury’.

Here would belong also ḡcha-ḥgrañ-nu-nar-dze, l. 239, and the above-mentioned hldan-hkrañ-hnar-re. An equivalent of Tib. mnær, ‘sweet’, does not seem likely here.

Hner occurs only in

ghāñ-gśog-ñner[-re]-šes-ḥbeg-ḥśog ||, 7, 20
‘To provide wings for—Šes-ḥbeg was the wings’;

nen = Tib. ñen, ‘danger’ in

hldan-rgye-hdor-re-hwāñ-ta-ḥnen, 209–10
‘If the big stick (or ‘strong support’, hldañ) is thrown away, ruling is dangerous’;

nor = Tib. nor, ‘wealth’, ‘property’, ‘cattle’, in the Tibetan manuscripts snor, apparently ‘farm’ or ‘estate’. This may be recognized in

hńor-ḥlah-hwam-ḥśid-dze, 11, ‘in the high mansions on the farms or estates’. The same hńor, ‘wealth’, may be seen in ll. 50, 52 (p. 328).
Nor = ‘wealth’ occurs in l. 151; elsewhere nor, where not = no-re, is = Tib. nor ‘fool’.

In one or two places we find an abnormal initial ny, a combination otherwise unknown.1 In l. 206, rña-he-kñòhu, the rña is evidently a confusion of rña and rña, cf. rña-re-kñö, l. 133, rña-ne-kre}(h, l. 200. In ll. 362–3, where the readings are partly doubtful and we have in succession hñyóh (hñyehe ?), hñe, hñyehe, perhaps the same wordñe was intended. In l. 28 hgrañ-hñyir-hñyir ||, if hgrañ = Tib. grañ, ‘cold’, which is not unlikely, then hñyir-hñyir is probably = Tib. ñil-ñil, ‘trickle down’, with -r = -l, the converse of -l = -r in stel; cf. p. 354.

B. Nasals final: M in stóm, ‘harvest’, ll. 14, 255, 281 = Tib. ston, and gñim, ‘day’, l. 12 = Tib. ñin/gñin, is probably original, Tibetan having in several instances (e.g. ston, ‘thousand’) -n or -ñ in place of original -m.2

Confusion of final ñ and n is in Tibetan rather common, having perhaps its main root in the cases, such as drañ from hdrañ, bzuñ from hdzin, where ñ is for ñs < ns. To this type belongs the Nam Imperative htron (ll. 224, 233, pp. 199, 357) = Tib. dron/drons, from hdrañ, ‘lead’; and perhaps therefore rgon = Tib. dgon, ‘wilderness’, cf. Tib. dgon/dgonš/rgonš, ‘evening’ and šon/šon, p. 355. Stoñ-hpon, l. 321 = Tib. stoñ-dpon, ‘thousand-commander’, is perhaps a loan-word.

The loss, or non-accretion, of n in hdra/hitre, ‘draw’, ‘lead’, is not peculiar to Nam, being found in the Tibetan manuscripts (p. 214) and perhaps also in the common Tibetan word hdra, ‘demon’. Hdro, ‘go’, ‘travel’ = Tib. hdroñ, will be similar.

8. Other root consonants, initial and final

A. Tenuis and aspirate:

In the discussion of Orthography (pp. 116 sqq.) we have noted very numerous examples of variation between tenuis and aspirate. In most instances the tenuis is preceded by h; but the great general preponderance in the number of words with that prefix, and the fact that there are clear occurrences in its absence, render that circumstance insignificant.

The regular alternations of tenuis and aspirate in Tibetan verbal paradigms and the omnipresent phenomenon of such

---

1 Except in Khams, where Jäeschke notes (Berlin Academy Monatsbericht, 1865, p. 443) ñyen for ñen.

2 So also Chinese. On confusions in ‘the Tibetan manuscripts’ see p. 214.
alternation in the root-groups generally render it extremely difficult to affirm in a particular case that a Nam tenuis replaces an aspirate or vice versa: for example, ḥkhur, 'with back bent down', is not a phonetic equivalent of Tib. dgur/rγur/sγur, but an independent derivative of the root (perhaps gur) and possibly connected with ḥkhur, 'carry', and khur, 'load'. Within the limits of Tibetan such cases are not infrequent; for instance, we find paṅ and phaṅ both meaning 'lap'.

Some probable or certain cases are the following:¹

(a) Tenuis written for aspirate (common in the Tibetan manuscripts and documents):

 NEGLIGENCE OF ACCENT MARKS. (See Introduction, § 3.)

hkah (also ḥkhaḥ) = Tib. kha, 'mouth', 'speech'.
hkān (also ḥkhaṅ) = Tib. khaṅ, 'house'.
hkab (also ḥkhāb) = Tib. khab/khyab, 'home', 'family'.
hkar (also khar/hkhar) = Tib. khar/mkhar, 'city', 'citadel'.
hkuṅ = Tib. khuṅ, 'hallowed out', 'cave'.
hke (also ḥkhe) = Tib. khe, 'profit'.
hkor (also ḥkkor) = Tib. khor/hkhor (skor), 'surround', 'go round', &c.
hki = Tib. khyi, 'dog'.
kyu, ḥkkyu = Tib. ḥkhyu/dkyu, 'swift', 'race'.
hkye = Tib. khye, khyeṅ, 'child' (possibly, however, for skye).
hkri (also khri, ḥgri) = Tib. khri, 'seat', 'support'.
hec/hcīhi/gcī/gci = Tib. mchi, 'go'.
ce (also ḥce, ḥche) = Tib. che, 'great'.
htaṅ(than, hthaṅ) = Tib. than, 'plain'.
htham(htham) = Tib. htham, 'united'.
hlar(thar, hthar) = Tib. thar, 'released'.
haras = Tib. hthas, 'hard', 'tangled'.
hul(hthul) = Tib. thul, 'tame'.
hlo(htho) = Tib. mtho, 'high'.
hlar/hlor(hthor/thor) = Tib. thor, 'tuft', &c.
hpaṅ(phāṅ, ḥphaṅ) = Tib. paṅ/phāṅ, 'lap'.
hpu(hphu) = Tib. phu, 'blow'.
hphul(hphul) = Tib. phul, 'raised to the top'.
hphog(hphog) = Tib. hphog, 'hit'.
hphom(hphom) = Tib. hpham, 'be defeated'.

¹ In some of the following instances (pp. 363–5) the spelling in the manuscript fluctuates (supra, pp. 120–1).
pyaṅ (phyaṅ) = Tib. Ḥphyaṅ, Ḍpyaṅ, ‘dangle’.
pyar (pyer, phyer, Ḥphyer) = Tib. Ḥphyar, ‘lift’.
pyi (phyi) = Tib. phyi, ‘outside’, ‘later’.
ḥpraḥ (ḥphraḥ) = Tib. Ḥphra, ‘kick’ (?).
ḥpro, ll. 181 (p. 156), 245–6 = Tib. Ḥḥpro, ‘proceed’.
ṭsaṅ = Tib. ḍshaṅ, ‘complete’.
ḥtsu, tsur (ṭṭshu, ḍṭshur) = Tib. tshu, tshur, ‘hither’, ‘come hither’.
ḥtsors (ṭṭshor, ḍṭshors) = Tib. ḍṭshor, ‘chase’.

(b) Aspirate written for tenuis (common in the Tibetan manuscripts and documents):

skhrud = Tib. skrud, ‘put to flight’.
či (also ci) = Tib. ci, ‘who’, ‘which’.
gcheṅ (also ḍcheṅ, gceṅ) = Tib. tseg/ṭsṭheṅ, ‘trouble’, ‘hitch’.
thā (usually ta) = Tib. ta, a suffix.
ḥphu (also ḍpu) = Tib. pu, ‘man’, ‘elder’.
tṣa/tṣaṅ = tsa, a suffix.
tṣam (also ḍṭsam) = Tib. tṣam, ‘only’.

B. Media and tenuis (or aspirate):

(a) Tenuis for media (common in the Tibetan manuscripts):

ḥkaṅ (also ḍkaṅ) = Tib. gaṅ/ḍgaṅ, ‘full’, ‘complete’.
ḥkar (also ḍgar) = Tib. ḍgar/sgar/skar, ‘separate’, ‘pen’.
ḥko (also ḍgo) = Tib. go/mgo/ṛgo, ‘place’, ‘head’, ‘gate’.
ḥku (smyu-”) = Tib. gu(smyu”), ‘reed’.
ḥkor (also ḍgor) = Tib. ḍgor, ‘tarry’.
ḥkyud (also ḍgyud) = Tib. ḍgyud, ‘race’.
śka = Tib. sga, ‘saddle’.
ḥklo (also ḍlo, hlo) = Tib. glo, ‘lungs’.
ḥtor (usually ḍṭor) = Tib. ḍṭor, ‘cast away’.
ḥtre (usually ḍṭre) = Tib. ḍṭreṅ, ‘draw’.
ḥtrōṅ = Tib. ḍṭreṅ, ḍroṅ, traṅ, ‘draw’.
ṛto = Tib. ṛdo, ‘stone’.
ḥltaṅ (usually ḍḥṇaṅ) = Tib. ḍlaṅ, ‘rise’.
ḥlṭom (usually ḍḥṭom) = Tib. ḍṭom, ‘bind’, ‘subdue’.
poṛ/ḥpor (also phor) = Tib. ḍḥbor, ‘let go’ (manuscripts por).
ḥpro l. 321 (usually ḍḥbro) = Tib. ḍḥbro, ‘taste’.
ḥpos (usually ḍḥbos) = Tib. ḍḥbo, ‘swell’.

(b) Media for tenuis (or aspirate) (not rare in the Tibetan manuscripts):
The fluctuations of which the above are the most presentable examples might be recognized, especially those between *tenuis* and aspirate, in a good number of further instances which on the ground of some scruple, generally a possibility of grammatical alternation, are omitted. Hence a statistical interpretation is not feasible; nevertheless, a relative infrequency of the changes *tenuis* > aspirate and *tenuis* > *media*, as compared with their converses, is apparent; and it is natural to conclude that in the actual pronunciation there was a tendency to loss of aspiration on the part of aspirates and to loss of voice on the part of *media*. But it is not possible to adjust the facts into any of the usual phonological explanations. To a considerable extent there is a normal orthography, which accords with the etymology. If we assume that in the writing *hkahi* for *hkhah* the scribe followed his ear, when he did not remember the orthographic form, we may conclude either that in actual speech the *k* was aspirated or that the aspirate had lost its aspiration. But then how did he come to write as *tha* in *stor-tha-hthog*, l. 149, the suffix *ta*, with which he was perfectly familiar and which he gives in the *stor-ta-hthog* of the same line? Since a complete indifference in regard to *t/th* cannot be alleged, we are baffled, unless a writing from dictation, affected by casual pronunciations, should afford a clue.\(^1\)

Fortunately, however, we may disburden the Nam language of responsibility for the fluctuations. For in the Tibetan manuscripts, i.e. in a language which had been very copiously employed in writing, we find fluctuations of like character and amount, and not seldom affecting the same words.\(^2\) It may therefore be suspected, since the manuscripts were all, no doubt, written in Ša-cu, where they were found, that the actual scribes were not people of Tibet, but Central-Asians, imperfectly acquainted with the language, Tibetan or Nam, and liable to mishearing of words orally imparted to them. But, if that is the case, we must infer also that, as is not unlikely, private letters were often dictated to

---

1 See p. 117.

2 Concerning parallel caprice in Central-Asian texts in other languages see p. 117 n. 5.
scribes. For in a letter (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 238), of 4 lines only, from a Tibetan military officer we find:

(a) *tenuis* for aspirate in *mtoṅ = mthon*, *tos = thos*, *tsal = htsal*,

(b) aspirate for *tenuis* in *thah = ta*, *phar = par* (thrice),

(c) *tenuis* for media in *mtsad = mdzad* (twice), *rtsaṅ = rdzan*, *par = bar* (twice),

(d) media for *tenuis* in *gdaṅ = gtaṅ*, *gyaṅ = kyaṅ*,

and these occur in conjunction with correct writings, such as thugs, bde, bdag, khyams, kha, phyi, dag, rgyags, &c.

The normal Tibetan does not often confuse *tenuis* and aspirate, except where alternation is regular in the verbal paradigms and in root-forms. As regards Amdo, there is no serious evidence of a change of the type *t/th*; and, though the converse would account for 'Tangut' *tso, 'lake', tok, 'lightning', tūṅ, 'drink', tsiar, 'rain', ka, 'mouth', Thōchū pi, 'hog', kīh, 'house', kwā, 'thou', kwān, 'he' (Tib. mtsho, thog, hthuṅ, char, kha, phag, khyim, khyod, khoṅ), no clear conclusion follows from the meagre vocabularies at present available, even if we overlooked their modern date and were sure of their accuracy and interpretation. The case is similar in regard to *tenuis/media*. As concerns the ancient irregularities in the Tibetan and Nam writings, it seems necessary to acquiesce for the present in attributing the responsibility to the scribes.

C. The groups c, ch, j/ts, tsh, dz.

Confusion between these two groups, scripturally easy and in all old Tibetan writings quite frequent, is exemplified by:

hcog = htsog, 'collect'.
hscaḥ = htsah, 'watch' (Tib. btsa).
chis = tshis.
hjah = hdzah, 'eat' (Tib. za).
hjam = hdzam, 'mild' (Tib. hjam).
hjar = hdzar, 'adhere' (Tib. hjar).
hju = hdzu, gzu, &c., 'tiger', 'ass'.
hjo = hdzo, 'eat' (Tib. zo).
joṅ, hjoṅ = hdzoen, rdzoṅ, 'castle' (Tib. rdzoṅ, hdzoṅ).
rje = rdze, 'king' (Tib. rje, and manuscripts rdze).

Further serious matters in connexion with initial consonants hardly arise. If brom/hbrom, ll. 72 (pp. 226, 342), 297 = Tib. hgrum, 'pinch or nip off', and htrug, l. 40 = Tib. hbrog (see p. 327), they
belong to a class of cases where in Tibetan itself, especially before y, r, l, we find an alternation of b and g, sometimes (before r) of d also. The Tibetan manuscripts have hbrum for hgram, ‘border’, blo for glo, and elsewhere we find hārul/hgrul, hgrim/hbrim, hbye/hbye, &c.

D. Final consonants

Except the above noted, sporadic, instances of -l for -r (stel) and n for n, and the possible loss of final -s, there seems to be practically nothing that calls for notice. There are no apparent instances of -b for -g, as in the lhab, pyab = lhag, phyag, of the Tibetan manuscripts. If stīn in ll. 330–1, 335–6 were = Tib. sdig, ‘sin’ (but probably it is stīn, ‘rebuke’), it would correspond to the stīn of one of the Tibetan manuscripts, which present other instances also of confusion of final g, gs, with n, ns.

9. Vowels, medial and final

A. Medial

Apart from the normal ablauts, e/a, o/a, e/o/a, exhibited by Tibetan roots, there is little in respect of medial vowels that calls for note.

a for i in sīn (also sīn) = Tib. sīn, ‘heart’, is found also in the Tibetan manuscripts. Possibly it is due to confusion with sīn, ‘pleasant’; but it is exactly paralleled by ‘Tangut’ ṣān = Tib. śīn, ‘wood’, ‘tree’, &c.: see p. 108.

i for e in hwīr = Tib. hīer is paralleled by stīgs = stegs, cis = ces, &c., of the Tibetan manuscripts.

i for u in myīl = Tib. myul, ‘creep privily’, may be compared with ḡī = ḡu, ‘bow’, mu = mi, ‘man’, in the manuscripts, which have also u for i in mu, ‘man’, cf. the place-names Mi-ṅag/Menia/Mu-nia and Mi/Me/Mu-li.

e for a in rgyeb = Tib. rgyab, phyer/phyar = Tib. phyar, and perhaps therefore in spyē = Tib. dbyar, ste = Tib. star, and the name (Hīs-)hbeg (cf. the Bhaq(Rbeg) of the manuscripts), has been mentioned supra (p. 134), as perhaps dialectical; cf. tseb, bleg, šen, for tshab, blag, šan, in the Tibetan manuscript Chronicle.

o for a before -m, -ms, in hpo/m/hphom, ‘be defeated’, seems to have been regional, since it appears in several place-names ending in -tšoms = -mtshams, and -bons/-goms = -bams/-gams, belonging to NE. Tibet.

B. Final

The duplications of final vowels, resulting in -aha, -ihi, -uhu, -ehe, -oho, have been noticed in the chapter ‘Grammar’ (pp. 169); also the combinations with hi, resulting in -ahi, -uhi, -ehi, -ohi. There remain -ehu and -ohn, together with some other cases of -u.

-ehu, which in Tibetan is commonly used (a) to represent Chinese -ao, in its old pronunciation, and (b) in so-called diminutives, such as behu, ‘calf’, from ba, ‘ox’, appears also in some apparently non-diminutive words, e.g. khyehu, ‘child’, drehu, ‘mule’, lehu, ‘chapter’, nehu, ‘green meadow’ (nehu-than, ‘gsin): in the last group of cases it usually has a by-form (e.g. khye, dre, le, ne) with e only, a good example being the name of the famous king Khri-sron Ldehu (or Lde)-brtsan. The derivation of behu from ba-bo, in itself highly questionable, is rendered more so by the relation to -e. The forms seem to have been favoured in Amdo, the Tibetan manuscripts and documents having khyehu, glehu, sgyehu, chehu (also ‘hi), drehu, mdehu (= mda, ‘arrow’), idehu, behu, byehu (= bya, ‘bird’), nehu, snehu, tshehu, zehu, lehu (= la, ‘pass’). The forms in -ehu were, therefore, ancient and widespread, and their derivation and meaning is problematical.

In the Nam examples the relation to -e is permeating. We have:

- hkehu(kehu, gehu)-prom = hke-prom
- glehu = Tib. glehu/gle, ‘edges (?) of ploughlands’
- hrtehfu = grtehe/gde, ‘fix’ (?)
- nehu = Tib. nehe, ‘young’, ‘fresh’
- tswehu = htswe/hdze/hdzewhe
- hdzeheu = Tib. gze-re, ‘weak’.

The Nam, therefore, confirms the antiquity of the forms; but it does not enlighten us concerning their etymology.

On the possibility that some cases of -ehe = -e are derived from -ehe see supra, p. 192: on -a/-ehi (of. -a/-ehu) pp. 191–2.
-ohu occurs in:

hkohu (prom, me) = hhkohu = kohi (me) = hkohe.

hnohu (l. 206) = hno.

hjohu (l. 137) = hjo, ‘chief’, or hdzo, ‘man’.

htohu (l. 7) = hto?

hltdohu = ldo, hldo.

ldyohu = ldyo.

nohu (l. 41).

gbohu = hbo.

hbyohu = hbyo.

hdzohu = hdzo, ‘man’, or hdzo, ‘act’.

gsohu = gso, ‘live’.

Of these equations some are not beyond doubt; but the certain ones, hkohu, hnohu, ldyohu, hjohu (alternating with hdzohu), gbohu, gsohu, suffice to prove that the -ohu is indistinguishable in meaning from -o: it may, therefore, represent an occasional pronunciation of the normal variant -oho. Are there any other indications of a final -o inclining towards the pronunciation -u?

A certain instance is to be seen in the varied forms, both occurring more than once, of the name Mye-kru, kro, in one of the Tibetan manuscripts: and in ordinary Tibetan there are instances, such as phu/pho, ‘elder brother’. In the Nam text the variation between hbrus, and hbro in the repeated verse lines 152-3, 158 furnishes a good parallel: and the hdro (cf. Tib. dhu-bu, gu, gru-gu, ‘a clew or skein of thread’) of hdro-hjar, ‘caught in the toils’ (cf. p. 272), may be = dro, ‘net’, of one of the Tibetan manuscripts. The possibility that the Nam expression hrim-hgro corresponds to Tib. rim-hgro (supra, p. 308) is also apposite in this connexion. In Hsi-hsia -u = Tib. -o and -o = Tib. -u have been noted by Dr. Laufer (p. 101). The Nam word mu, when it seems to mean ‘sky’, corresponds to what in Hsi-hsia is mo and in Hsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman generally is usually mo or mon. In Hsi-fan ù < o is frequent or normal, e.g. in Rgya-roñ slu = Tib. glo, ‘lungs’.

The above discussions may serve to exemplify the methods and materials available for ascertaining the meanings and etymological relations of Nam words. In the case of a previously unknown language, where every word sheds obscurity upon its neighbours, a definite knowledge of some word-meanings is an early requisite. A monosyllabic language, abounding, like the Tibetan, in homophones and in unconnected meanings of other sorts, is especially elusive; and, in consequence of the play of consonantal Prefixes, the systematic variations of initial consonants, and ancient vowel-Ablauts, the seizable part of an individual monosyllable is reduced to very little. The popular Tibetan of the eighth- to ninth-century 'documents' and of the more or less contemporary texts of what we have cited as 'the Tibetan manuscripts' has, moreover, a Protean range of orthographic variation and frequent caprice in its employment. Only by observing the system of the morphological variations and becoming aware of habits shown in the orthographical fluctuations can we attain a conviction as to what is, or is not, possible in a particular case.

As students of even ordinary Tibetan, and certainly of old popular Tibetan, are aware, a fairly definite apprehension of word- or root-meanings is insufficient for the purpose of reaching, as we do in such languages as Greek, Latin, or Sanskrit, the meaning of the phrase or sentence: the syntactical indications are too lax and too few. It is by a sort of conjecture that the total meaning is conceived, and the verification is through familiarity with usage and comparison of parallels. The mentality of the Ch'iang peoples, whose history is known only from notices in Chinese Annals and biographies and from whom there has hitherto been a total lack of literary record, would be merely conjectural but for the existence of the fragmentary pieces to which we have been referring as 'the Tibetan manuscripts'. These, emanating from the same milieu, more or less, as the Nam text and partly concerned in a general way with the same subjects, do to some extent prepare us for comprehending the notions and interests involved in the text. Occasionally they furnish convincing evidence in detail: for instance, in the Nam expression smyi-glog we might, after making sure of smyi as = Tib. myi/mi, 'man', hesitate to recognize glog as = Tib. glog, 'lightning', and seek some other etymology and meaning, if we did not find in one of the manuscripts a proverb which explicitly compares a man of prompt activity to lightning, thus assuring the translation 'a lightning man'. The manuscripts
are, therefore, an essential part of the materials for the work of interpretation.

A fair number of the recurrent words and phrases in the text have been under consideration; and further meanings and etymologies, either consequent or comparable or not calling for longer examination, will be found in the Vocabulary. If a good proportion of all these ventures shall prove to have been successful, some serious inroads will have been made into the initial obscurity of the language and text. Apart from external points d'appui, which afford unmanipulated testimony, the most satisfactory verification should be found in continuous translation: in such languages as Nam or Tibetan a verse or a sentence might in some cases by aid of ingenuity be made to yield a reasonable sense, etymologically impeccable, but quite different from the original intent: the possibility of such illusion recedes pari passu with the increase in the extent of the passage in question. At present an attempt at a complete translation would be marred by numerous gaps and queries due to lack of comprehension, not to mention the fragmentariness of the text itself; and there might be a temptation to hazard renderings not based upon proof or mature conviction. The somewhat numerous versions of short passages or verses, taken along with the Abstract given supra (pp. 159 sqq.), may afford some conception of the matter and the modes of expression.

It could not have been intended to draw up any list of 'sound changes', or a lautlehre of the Nam language. An indispensable preliminary is the ascertainment of the meanings of the words, which, as factual matters, are established by use of all available sources of evidence. But it may be doubted whether an eventual lautlehre of Nam will ever be very extensive. The text is written in Tibetan script, which, as devised by Indian pandits of the seventh century A.D. for the representation of the Tibetan language, pronounced to them by a royal envoy dispatched for the purpose, is likely to have represented a contemporary pronunciation with a more than ordinary accuracy. In the use of that alphabet the Tibetan and Central-Asian scribes had had a vast experience, including some practice in writing foreign languages. The Lha-sa inscriptions and the more carefully written Central-Asian manuscripts are not remarkable for irregularities of spelling as distinguished from what later became archaisms of vocabulary or script. The common 'documents', with their multitude of different unlearned writers, present peculiarities both dialectical
and individual; and for some reason some of 'the Tibetan manuscripts’ are replete with abnormalities and inconsistencies, especially, it seems, in regard to distinction of *tenuis* and *tenuis aspirata* and, to a less extent, in regard to distinction of *tenuis* and *media*, while the vowels are more constant—the Sandhi of Particles is often abnormal. In this matter the Nam text is on the same general level as 'the Tibetan manuscripts’, and it probably exhibits no irregularity which cannot be exactly paralleled in the latter. If we regularize the orthography and ascribe the fluctuations to some rather general differences between what was orthodox and what, in the case of oral tradition of popular compositions, was actually heard, we shall find that, except in respect of the actual use of Prefixes, which were more restricted in number than in Tibetan, and in respect of the absence of initial vowels (whether with *h* or ‘) and the practical non-occurrence of *ž*, *z*, and *h*, the Nam phonology was notably similar, as was the word-morphology in general, to the Tibetan. Few of the phonetic deviations from Tibetan (in our present view almost entirely due to degeneration) which Dr. Laufer assembled on pp. 98–105 of his essay on Hsi-hsia can be paralleled in Nam. Accordingly the phonology of Nam may be treated to a great extent by mere reference to Tibetan.

It is possible that an excessive appearance of resemblance to Tibetan results from the predominance of the latter among the aids to investigation, the other known Tibeto-Burman languages being all inferior by many centuries in date and most of them recorded only in modern times, so that their forms may be degenerate in the same degree as the modern Lha-sa Tibetan. The resemblance of Nam to the early Tibetan is not such that even, perhaps, a single verse in the text would yield its meaning to a Tibetanist or Tibetan person either forthwith or through normal use of a Tibetan dictionary. The Grammar is simpler (though the verse parts of ‘the Tibetan manuscripts’ make some approximation), and the words are identifiable only when regard has been paid to principles of word-morphology in Tibetan and the alternatives which they involve. Nevertheless the resemblance turns out to be somewhat striking. In monosyllabic languages, indeed, correspondence of root-words, not obliterated, as so frequently in other forms of speech, by additions of suffixes, may be, when phonetic changes have been discounted, rather a general characteristic. As is apparent upon consultation of the Comparative Vocabu-
Laries in the *Linguistic Survey* volume, the original monosyllables are to a large extent recognizable in the corresponding terms, sometimes modified by mere phonetic change, sometimes incorporated in new monosyllables, sometimes fitted out with new, syllabic, prefixes, suffixes, and other exponents. But the Nam forms are appreciably on the same phonetic level as the Tibetan: they have more or less corresponding interchanges of initial consonants and Ablauts of vowels. It cannot be supposed that the other languages of the family, taken at the same level of date, would have revealed a like degree of affinity. Even in 'Tibet' the differences between the languages of the family are not a mere matter of chronology. This can be proved by inspection of the only other language of the group having records coeval with the Nam and the early Tibetan. This is the Žañ-ţuñ language of the Mānasa-sarovar-Kailāsa region, whereof some short specimens have been published in the *JRAS*. 1933, pp. 405–10. Very possibly it may turn out that the root-forms of Žañ-ţuñ are in a large measure shared by the Tibetan and the Nam. But the grammar and the actual words are, on the surface, entirely different, and the identification of the common elements will demand a study as intent as in the case of Nam.

The resemblance between Tibetan and Nam may call for a revision of our preliminary impression that in the early times of historical Tibet a great gap, geographical and linguistic, separated the Tibetan and Ch’iang peoples. We may have to group them together as Eastern instead of separating them as Southern and North-Eastern: the western Tibetan dialects, Ladāki, &c., are, no doubt, all derivative, consequent upon the conquests of Šroṅ-btsan Šgam-po and his successors. In this connexion it is interesting to note that the purest existing form of Tibetan proper, namely the ‘Tangut’ of the Koko-nor region, as exemplified in Prejevalsky’s vocabulary, is likewise colonial, being spoken in an originally Ch’iang area: allowance being made for a few phonological peculiarities, this dialect does not appear to differ seriously from the book language.
NOTE TO TEXT

The passages printed as prose betray frequently, but not at all points, a metrical intention, with verse varying (as elsewhere), irregular or miswritten. The punctuation being unreliable or inadequate, the beginnings of sentences after | (not after ||) are here indicated by an added mark (!). On extra-metrical -o, na, ni, ḥi, also doñ, at end of lines and on monosyllables with -r = -re, -r-re, or -ra see pp. 126-8, 173-81.
TEXT

[1] ... r(n?) ... [2] ... rka(h?) ... [3] ... (8 akṣaras) [1] hra .

1 hlda ... ] hses | beg. hr ... hran . [hlda] .

[4] ... (14 akṣaras)-[gñe ... gḍ(?)og] ... (10 akṣaras)

[5] [r]am1 | ge | hwañ || re | klu | ge | hwañ ||

hrañ | hlda | hnam | hge | hses | beg | hyañ |

[6] mog2 | htswe | re | mye | hyañ | hwañ ||

hrañ | hldañ | hnam | ge | hrapg | hkhur | hskuhu ||

[7] [skuhu ?] | na3 | hses | hbeg | [hldoho ?] | dze | hrño | htohu | re | hgyañ ||

g-rañ | gśog | hner4 | śes | [8] hbeg | hśog ||

sta | hldyañ | htye | dze | hmo | ge | me | ḥgrañ |

hrañ | hlda5 | hnam | hge6 | hrah7 [9] hyos.] | hldom | 10

sta | re | hmo | hno | ge | sta | hri | hldyañ ||

hmu | hriñu | skhrud8 | dze | mor | htañ | [10] [hgras] ||

hldi | hrkah | hldyañ | dze | hyañ | htañ | hgras9 |

hlañ | gsm | hram | [11][h?]lgyoho | ge | htañ | hmu | hro ||11

hñor | hlah | hwañ | hśid | dze | hrwañ | ḥkañ | [12] ḥkañ ||

hbo | hkom | ldyañ | dze | hldab | hde | hde ||

gñim | hti | hldyañ12 hgye | hkom | [13] hkom |

hkra | hrag | hldyañ | ge | hsreñi | hkyeb | hkyeb |

hdoñ | hri | hldyañ | ge | [14] spo13 | hpod | pod14 | 20

hrañ | hri | hldyañ15 ḥseñ | hwad | hwad |

htañ | hldu | hldyañ | ge | hstom | [15] hkom | hkeñi ||

g-yog | hśañ | ma | hpuñ | dze | hmar | hbab | ge | hrl16oño ||

hbu | rwye | [16] ḥce | rgyañ | dze | hldyo | ḥtor | ge | hnus ||

hkrug | hrdzö | hgyud | dze | hrño | hyod | yod17 |

[r]ne | [17] gsañ | hgre | dze | ņe19 | hkyeb | hkyeb |

hkhañ20 | hrapg | hñor | hlañ | hśi | hrog | hpañ | to | [18]

h21hskyim | se22 | hrmño | ||

hďzññ | hkkor | hkrug | hkyañ | hyogs | hldog | hbar23 |

hwññ | [19] [h]t[i]b . bjer ||

hďar | hti | hwer24 | hldu | hro25 hgru ||

1 dam ?
2 hśog ?
3 ra ?
4 Understand hner | re ? (metre). Cf. l. 20.
5 m here crossed out.
6 dze (?) here crossed out.
7 h below line.
8 skhud ? (a correction).
9 hbo | here crossed out.
10 -g here crossed out.
11 hrón ?
12 Insert ge or dze ? (metre).
13 lpo ?
14 pod added below line.
15 ge here omitted ? (metre).
16 inked over: correction from hroñ ?
17 yod added below line.
18 rdz here crossed out.
19 ņe added below line.
20 h a correction of r (crossed out?).
21 ra ?
22 Corrected to skhre ? (erasure and blur).
23 = ḥbah-re !
24 Read ḥwe-re ? (metre).
25 bjer | here crossed out.
10 sta | re | hmo | ge | sta | hri | hldyañ [20] 
stah | hldyañ | hthye1 | dze | hmo | ge | me | hgrañ | g-rañ | g'sog | hner2 | h'ses | hbeg | h'sog [21] 
hrgru | hldañ | hmah | dze | htsañ | gsom | hkhog |

5 ga | bzañ3 | g-ri | hruhu | hrañ | hrah | [22] [h]rwehi | 
smuñu | hku | hyob | ge | hmar | myi | ipyoho | 
hgru | hldañ | hmah | ge | h'ses | [23] hbeg | hrah | 
htsah | gsom | hkg | ge | h'ses | hbeg | hrah |
na | gsom | sñi | [24] hyañ |

15 hgru | h'sram | htam | ge | h'ses | beg | hstah | 
klu | hrtö | htsa | ge | h'ses [25] hbeg | mehi | 
klu | rto | htsah | ge | hrah | hyos | hlam | 
šes | hbeg | hrbo | dze | [26] hldyeg | hldiy | hti | dze | hrah | 
g-yos | ge | hsrar | 
g-rañ | hyos | ge | hsrar | [27] g-rañ | g-yo | rbo | ge | hglu4 | 
ma | hti |5

20 htor | hpu | hgru | dze | gla | hdzo [30] htsah | 
hrgru | hldañ | ma | dze | hrgu | hto | hrun |9 
gšañ | re | htad | to | dze | hbrañ | hldar [31] | ma10 | hyob | 
hñed11 | htram12 | htsah | glañ | tahl | hbra | 13hldar | ma | hyob | 
g-yañ | ra | [32] hrnab | hldah | htañ | hbra | hldar | ma | hyob |

25 hgru |(hto | hrun | || 
hrgru | hma | hkom | re | hrwad | [33] hmoñ | hldah | 
htor | hbu | ] | hgru | dze | hse | hte | hmun | 
hnah | hrañ | ge | rwyin | 
na | htsah | [34] ste | dze | hldyo | htor | ge | hns | dze |

30 g-rañ | hyos | htag | ge | hjoho | 
šid | g-ri | htor | [35] dze | hgru | hldañ | hmah | 
mehi | g-ri | htah | dze |14 rtah | htsog | hram |

1 hrbye? Cf. l. 8. 2 Read hner-re? Cf. l. 7. 
3 gbzañ? gañ | zañ? (corrected from "m). 4 hgru? 
5 hgru | h here crossed out. 6 hñiyir added below line. 
7 It may be suspected that of the words g-yo-hpud-hto-hdag the first two belong to the previous line of verse, and should precede hdag there. 
8 myil added below line. 9 Punctuation here completed by reviser. 
10 sa? 11 Underline correction from hyede 
12 Punctuation here due to reviser. 
13 Punctuation here confirmed by reviser.
1. hbu | rbye | hce | rgyaṅ | na | hldyö | tor | [51] hnus |
g-yog | hśaṅ | ma | hpul | dze | hmar | hbaḥ | ge | hrab ||
HDUHU | ce | rgyaṅ | na² | stōṅ | hkhog | re | hldya | [52] hkaṅ | hte |
hnor | l'gldag | hce | rgyaṅ | na | hldag | khrī | khyag | re | hśid ||
5. hḥog | hce | rgyaṅ | [53] rgya | ḍni | ke | hkor | hśid | rbyo | hko |
rō | dze | hphoṅ | ge | trāḥ | na | hce | ge | me | hyed | l'kho | [54]
rō | hce | dze | r'baḥ | na | ḍki | hko | r'kog | stēhi | htm | hḥog | dze |
rzāṅ | hba | ge | rgyehe | na | hko | rō | hce | [55] dze | hḥog | hco |
l'gḥog | hce | rgyaṅ | dze | hko | rno | ge | hco | l'gḥog | hce | hsa | dze |
10. hbaḥ | hrag | [56] hkyer | ḍnaḥ | hce | hraḥ | hbyiṅ | na | hrbyo |
hko | rō | rne | hno⁴ | rzaṅ | dze | na | ge | me | ⁵na | [57]⁶ hbyiṅ |
l'rgyaṅ | hce | ma⁷ | hbyin |
hce | hse⁸ | rgye | re | hrkas | hṭaṅ | hld | rbyo | hce | rgye | [58] dze | hṛgu | hṛghī | sto |
15. ṣku | mag | hno | dze | me | na | hldis |
hḍah | mag | hno | dze | me | na | hsams | [59] |
sbyim | hce | rgye | dze | hrwa | hḍah | hpoğ |
hsas | hce | rgye | dze | hraṅ | hgambar | hyim |
rğun [60] hce | rgye | dze | hldaṅ | hṛgyu | htm |
20. ḍkhu | ṭsa | śid | dze | ḍpha | ḍnur | ḍnur |
gphaṅ | ṭsa | glom | dze | ḍkhu | [61] ḍnur | ḍnur | [10] [62]
∽ | : | hśid | hrhiḥi | hthor¹¹ | dze | hgru | hldaṅ | hmah |
hṭor | hphu | hgru | dze | gla | htsaḥ |
ḥa | [63] yaṅ¹² | hso | hṛña | dze | mo | ma | hthor |
25. ḍhyaṅ | so | ḍdze | tse | ḍlidi | ma | hṛtaḥ |
hyaṅ | ṭsa | ḍjo | dze | [64] ḍhyaṅ | ge | hgrōms |
tor | hphu | hgru | ge | hstor | moṅ | hḍon | re | htsaḥ | hḍzo | hkm |
gsu | [65] prōm | ḍnōr | htsaḥ | hphu¹³ | hdm |
ldaṅ | pyer | hag | re | htsaḥ | hyaḥ | hdo |
30. ḍpha | ma | sñaṅ | [66] | ne | ge | bu | lta¹⁴ | ge | sñaṅ | glaṅ | hgaḥ |
ḥyaṅ | hraḥ | hkah | hldom | ge | ru¹⁵ | glaṅ | ge | [67] ḍthul | hi |

1. With these two verses cf. ll. 15–16.  
2. ce | rgyaṅ | na added below line.  
3. ṭa a correction (of ṭb?). Read ba?  
4. ce here crossed out. The h accidentally left in.  
5. ṛu here crossed out.  
6. ṭa here crossed out.  
7. Some sign here crossed out.  
8. Read hse | hce?  
9. This and the following verse seem to interrupt the series of expressions: an insertion?  
10. A short line. Before the next line there is a blank of about the width of a line.  
11. Correction of ḍphor?  
12. Read ḍhyaṅ: ḍ(ḥa) | yaṅ is merely the result of a line-ending.  
14. ru | lta (a correction of glaṅ) crossed out?  
15. ṛu here crossed out.
TEXT: LINES 68–82

1 Read me, as in l. 70?

2 ḫ below line.

3 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.

4 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.

5 hphor?

6 r inked over.

7 ḫ added below line.

8 b smudged or crossed out.

9 Something here crossed out.

10 h added below line. 11 ta added below line. 12 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.

13 heo?

14 ḫ added below line.

15 ḫ below line: hbyi correction of ḫgya?

16 ḫglu?

17 ḫglu?

18 Correction from ldah. 19 ḫchim? Cf. l. 38. 20 ḫ added below line.

hko | se | hgro | re | ḫtsa | ḫyah | ḫdo |

hjo | me | ḫdub | re | ḫlab | ma1 | ḫni |

hbaṉ2 | [68] re | hko | ḫtar | dze |3 ḫna | ḫlam | glo | ḫraṉ |4

hdzam | hbrōn | ḫroṅ | dze | ḫdam | to | ḫbu | ḫpor5 |

[69] skyim | se | ḫdzar | dze | ḫbehi | la | ḫgar6 |

thar | pyaṅ | ḫjo | dze | ḫphag | la | gnah |

gcog | [70] hlu | ḫldu | dze | ḫbyig | la | gnah |

hjo | me | ḫdub | re | ḫlab8 | me | ḫnīs |

ru | ge | ḫkrom | dze | [71] hmo | ma9 | ḫtor |

ḥcha | ge | ḫcer | dze | ḫldi | ma | ḫtah |

ḥde | me | ḫtah | g-raṅ | ḫyed | ge | ta10 | ḫwa [72] ste | ḫtah |11

gśi | brom | ḫnu | ge | ḫsor | ḫtsam | bzod |

ḥyah | ḫrgehe | ge | sram | pa | nar [73]

ḥwa | ste | ḫge | dze | ḫla | ḫram | ḫte |

ḥtor | ḫmyi | ḫbom | ge | gla | ḫtsā12 | ḫtsah |

ḥphah | [74] ma | rah | ge | ḫtsah | ḫjo | ḫdzin |

ḥkuhu | nehu | ḫtshe | re | wehi | nehu | ḫrehe |

dgu | ḫldo | ḫtor | [75] dze | ḫsoh13 | ḫsoh14 | ḫtsu |

ḥwa | ste | ḫrgehe | dze | dgu | ḫtor | ḫbyi15 |

ḥwa | ste | ḫge | dze | laḥ | [76] hram | ḫte | chaṅ | dgu | ḫtor |20 ḫtsu |

do | ldo | ḫdzo | chaṅ | dgu | ḫtor | ḫtshun | re | [77] ḫraḥ | ḫtah | ḫgyaṅna |

dgu | ḫldo | ḫtor | dze | ḫldo | ḫdzor | re | ḫlde | ge | ḫgru16 | ma |

rmaṅ | [78] na |

ldyaṅ | ḫjo | ḫjihi | re | mehi | ra | ḫgam |

dgu | ḫldo | ḫtor | ge | stor | ḫmoṅ | joṅ [79]

ḥldaṅ | phyi | ske | re | ḫño | stor | prom | re | ḫgru17 | ma |

ḥstor |

stor | ḫto | rta | yaṅ | stor | to | [80] ḫrun |

rta | ḫso | ḫnaḥ | yaṅ | ḫnī | ḫrdzum | doho |

ḥmyi | ḫni | ḫṣige | ḫmyi | rmad | ldaṅ18 | [81]

ḥkyaṅ | ḫgyaṅ | ḫṣig | dze | ḫśi | ḫkri | ḫtshim |

ḥsāṅ | ḫr | ḫṣig | dze | ḫmog20 | re | [82] ḫldōṅ |
rtah | htsog | hram | dze | hrgon | hru | ge | hru | re | rbyo | ha | ge² | hcah | 'rte | hyu [83] rgyag | dze | hldas | htsos | hpu | hkm | staŋ | rgyag | dze | hnam | hte | hšaŋ | hčag | rgyag | [84] hris | dze | hño | sto | ge | rdo | re | cis | tska | hbyihi | hrje | smyi | rmad | ge | hmo |
5 rkaŋ | lda | [85] dze | hño | sto | ge | hšag³ | dze | rie | hwe | ge | hwyir || hño | sta | glom | dze | kraŋ | ŋur | ŋur | [86] | rne | sta | glaŋ | dze | hne | rnehi | rnehi || gšaŋ | sñaŋ | do | na | rgyaŋ | na | spe |
10 htsog | hram | hdo | na | [87] mor | hldaŋ | re | hňaherent | hldi | rgyed | hrr | hcog | hram | hdo || rgyed | hdre⁴ | hte | ge | [88] hcog | hdo | dze | hwad | hdim | htshis | hltom | re | htsos | hldaŋ | staŋ | gdim | pyi | [89] hse | ge | gsom | rgyag | hšor | doŋ | htshog |
15 me | hldyim | rgyaŋ | ⁵gdim | phyi | hse | ge | [90] htshog | hram | hňad || rgyed | ma | hldaŋ | ge | htsog | hram | hšaŋ || rta | htsog | hram | [91] ge | htaŋ | rwye | htaħ || rta | sko | prom | re | hrtah | hldaŋ | hkran | ²⁰ htsog | rpu | še | chaŋ | [92] pyi | hse | hthoŋ || hkor | htaŋ | hkhchen | yaŋ | sñaŋ | gyaŋ | gyaŋ⁶ || hjah | htaŋ | hkhchen | yaŋ | [93] swa | tseg | tseg || rgyed | ma | hltan | ge || rta | ḡam | ḡgar | re | ḡsus | slo | glo |
25 rta | htsos | hna⁷ | [94] ge | htsog | hram | hduŋ || rgyed | htre⁸ | ge | htsog | htaŋ | ma || gdim | chis⁹ | ldom | [95] re | htsog | hldaŋ | hstain | dim | tshis | ldom | re | tshog | hldaŋ | hduŋ || ¹⁰ddyim | phyi | [96] hse | ge | htsog | htaŋ | ma | te | na | ge |
30 hbyiŋ | k'ya | htaŋ | ta | htor | rgor¹² | hyos | [97] hbon¹³ | byiŋ | hbar | hbaŋ | thwaŋ | byiŋ | rwer | hmo | hcah | byiŋ | htsog | hram | myiŋ | [98] rgor | hyos | hbar | thwaŋ | hkhos | kyaŋ | rwehi | re |
  hmo | cha | byi | na | phyi¹⁴ | hse | myi | [99]

¹ Correction below line from hltan. ³ Read hge in place of ha | ge.
² hše here crossed out. ⁴ htre? ⁵ d here crossed out. ⁶ The second gyaŋ added below the line. ⁷ m here crossed out.
¹¹ Erroneous punctuation (end of line). ¹² Correction, underline, from rgyor. ¹³ hthom? ¹⁴ bphyi? Correction from cha.
rgyed | ma | glaṅ | ge | hnaḥ | htsog | hśah ||
rtā | hgam | ḫphar² | gsus | slo | stah | [100]
gdim | hdzam | ḫdzim³ | re | hko | wehi | ḫtuḥu ||
rtā | hso | hnaḥ | ge | na | rom | ḫtoṇ | [101] re | ḫlaṅ | ḫjaṅ |
ḥkhoḥ | ḫko | bphyaṭ⁴ | ḫhkog | ḫraṅ | war | ḫpaṅ | re | 5
rgyed | ma | [102] hldaṅ | ⁵ ge⁶ | nāḥ | htsog | hśas |
hṣad | mag | ḫdehi | dze | hśi | kyeg | mye |
ṛbyo | sñaṅ | ge | [103] sñaṅ | na | rgoṅ | ru | ge | ḫru ||
the | kyen | hldug | ha | rta⁹ | hso | hna | ma | raṅ | ḫhdram | [104]
hmu | hdoṅ | htor | sku | ḫphu | hti | ḫldi | hgaṅ | naṅ | re | hnaṅ | 10
ḥtshab | ḫkāḥ | ḫraṅ | ḫrgyed | [105] ma | hldaṅ | ge | ḫkāḥ | ḫcog |
byin | ta¹⁰ | ḫrgyed | ḫtsō | ḫho | ḫkāḥ | ḫgo | ḫbyin | ta | ḫrgyed |
ḥgo | ḫdro | ḫkaṅ | ḫkhab | byin | [106] ta | ḫrgyed | ḫkab | ḫdro |
ḥkaṅ | ḫkhab¹¹ | byin | taḥ | ḫrgyed | ḫkhāb | ḫdro | ḫkho | ḫphyag¹² |
hkkohu | re | [107] ḫraṅ | ḫwar | rders | ḫdi | na | ḫna | ḫrom | ḫkob | 15
'ḥlaṅ | ḫjaṅ | ḫkhoṅ | ḫrgyed | ma | [108] hldaṅ | ge | ḫso | ḫnaḥ |
ḥrgaḥ | ḫmo | laṅ¹³ | byu | re | ḫldi | ḫdāḥ | ma | ge | ḫno | ḫro | ḫrub |
[109] re | myag | ge | skyaṅ | 'ḥjim | li | li | re | pa | la | la | ge | ḫtho |
ṛgyam | ge | ḫwad | re | [110] spyi | ḫdzē | ge | ḫkab | ||
rtā | hgam | ḫphar | re | ḫso | ḫnaḥ | hldōḥo ||
hro | ḫbehi | ḫbhāḥ | ge | [111] hso | ḫnaḥ | gcheṅ ||
hso | ḫnaḥ | ḫyaḥ | tse | ḫtah | ḫbom | ḫbo ||
ḥbom | ḫbo¹⁴ | ḫaṅ | dze | hldaṅ | [112] ḫkraṅ | ḫnar | re | ḫbom | ḫbo | hldaḥ ||
hmaḥ | hldaṅ | ḫyaḥ | dze | ḫrgyed | hldaṅ | ḫnaṅ | [113] ge |
hldaṅ | kṛaṅ | ḫrweḥi ||
hnaḥ | ḫpoṅ | ḫgor | re | ḫgu | htor | ḫtṣu : na | 25
gtse | ne | ḫgad | [114] re | hrah | rtah | ḫkyaṅ | na |
dgu | ḫldo | ḫtor | ge | su | me | ḫmehi |
ḥrah | we | ḫtah | ge | so | [115] hnaḥ | mehi ||
hraṅ | ḫche | ḫju¹⁵ | ge | ḫcaḥ | ḫtso | ḫtsaḥ |
ḥpo | ḫldi | naṅ | re | ḫyaḥ | ḫṅeḥi | [116] ḫnāḥd |
ḥsaṣ | te | ḫkyaṅ | je¹⁶ | ḫsaṣ | ḫkhaṅ | ge || ḫrweḥi ||¹⁸

¹ Sic (for ḫnaḥ? cf. l. 102).
² si here crossed out: read ḫphar-re? (cf. l. 110).
³ hjim|hjim? ḫdzam|ḥdzam?
⁴ Punctuation reinforced.
⁵ Correction from cha.
⁶ Read ḫraṅ in place of ḫa | ḫta.
⁷ Correction from ḫkhāb.
⁸ Or ḫna? (a correction).
⁹ Sic ( = ḫzu, l. 117).
¹⁰ ḫkāḥ . . . ta added below line.
¹¹ Cf. l. 101.
¹² ḫro added below line.
¹³ Read dzo.
¹⁴ Punctuation reinforced.
10 hrta | htsog | hram | yañ |
   hño | stor | ha^5 | htoñ | re | hrne | hldañ | hkhyed | [120]
   htsog | hram | phye | dze | hšañ | plim | plam^6 |
   htsog | hram | hnah | tse | htor | si | rgo^7 | [121]
15 hrta | htsog | hram | yañ |
   stor | me | hkhyyed | re | hldañ | [124] me | hkhyed |
   htor | h^9rta | rme | ge | hldañ | krañ | hkuñ | na |
   hldañ | hkráñ | hsad | na | hldañ [125] hkráñ | hšah |
   hldañ | krañ | hwe | dze | hldañ | slah | hkehe |
20 hldañ | krañ | hko | dze | stor | [126] hldañ | hphyar |
   hldañ | krañ | spo | dze | stor | hgu | hbo |
   hldañ | krañ | hnam | dze | stor | [127] dgu | hdoor^10 
   hldañ | htor | hno | stor | hkhyyed | re | hrne | hldañ | hkhráñ |
30 hthañ | phu | hkm | ge | rie | [131] hbye | hkwehe | ge |
   hthañ | rdzo | hñor^13 | hldag | nag | htshors |
   hthañ | le | htsa | ge | hthañ | [132] hgm | hkre |^15
   hthañ | rdzo | hñor^16 | hldag | nag | tho |

---

1 rño over h (a blur): possibly hño or hjo was intended.
2 Sic (= hju, l. 115).
3 A correction (of gsum?).
4 Punctuation reinforced.
5 Sic: omit ha.
6 plim-plam? Corrected below line from phyme | pyam.
7 rgi? A correction (of hltan?).
8 I here crossed out.
9 do a correction?
10 w here crossed out.
11 = g-yar-re or g-ya-re? Cf. l. 136.
12 hño-re?
13 = hño-re?
14 hldag | nag here crossed out.
15 he | here crossed out.
16 = hño-re?
Insert hyah (a regular antithesis to rgyeb)?

2 ni here crossed out: replaced by the ra (below line).

3 s below line.

4 I here crossed out (ḥ intended?).

5 re here crossed out.

6 Insert nag?

7 ḥum? Or is the dot over ḥu meant to indicate an error? Punctuation erroneous.

8 ḥ below line.

9 rto (a first correction of to ḥ) here crossed out. The to was then written.

10 te here crossed out.

11 dz written after te (crossed out).

12 Correction (of rūn ḥ).

13 ḥ here crossed out.

14 Insert here ḥrgyaṅ, as in l. 42.

15 Read ḥsaṅs?

16 ma: added below line.

17 Punctuation reinforced.

18 Some fragment of an aksara here crossed out.

hbri | ḡldi | ḡthaṅ | re | ḡre | ḡldi | [133] hyah |

1ḥldi | ḡthaṅ | re | rgyeb | ḡldi | ḡthaṅ | ra | ḡ |

ḥthaṅ | ḡrgam | ḡkad | re | rṅe | re | ḡno | [134]

dgu | sko | ḡldon | re | ḡkhog | ḡnoñ | ḡdzom hi |

re | ḡmoñ | ḡyog | re | ḡldag | nag | ḡtsors | [135] 5

hraṅ | pu | ḡlo | ge | gseñe | ḡldi | ḡthoñ | re | ḡldag | nag |

ḥkrag |

ḥkhar | ḡrpag | [136] | g-yar | re | ḡldag | ḡgrom |

gldag | nag | g-yah | dze | rgyad | kyer | rbo | dze |

getse | ḡkom | re | ḡsañ | [137] 10

hbri | re | ḡrdyam | re | ḡkhañ | ḡldah | ḡñahgхи |

ḥdzohu | ro | ḡldi | re | ḡjohu | ḡwa | ḡkañ | [138] 9

ḥdzehu | rje | ḡbro | re | ḡdzohu | ḡt9o | ḡrun |

stor | rje | ḡbro | re | stor | ḡto | ḡrun |

ldāñ | rdze | [139] ḡbro | re | ḡldāñ | the | rgyebs |

dgu | ḡdo | ḡtor | ge | stor | ḡmoñ | ḡt90džon |

hrañ | wehi | rta | ge | [140] stor | ḡmoñ | ḡdz11oñ |

ldyo | stor | ḡthu | re | ḡdram | stor | ḡtoho |

ḥañi | stor | ḡpehi |

hpul | [141] ḡpos | stor | dze | ḡkyañ | stor | ḡno12 |

ḥsah | yer | ḡldañ | dze | ḡriñe | ḡldañ | ne |

mor | [142] gdag | ḡgom | re | ḡdzañ | ḡldog | stor |

mor | gdag | ḡphar | re | stor | ḡdor | g-yoḥo | [143] 6

na | ḡldom | ḡgor | [13] kla | ḡkyañ14 | gstor |

ḥtor | se | stor | dze | ḡldañ | pyi | ske |

ḥno | stor | [144] ḡsañs | dze | mo | ma | ḡthor |

ḥriñe | ḡldañ | ḡñañ15 | dze | ḡldi | ma16 | ḡrtah | [17]

ḥldyañ | ḡtah | ḡbo18 | [145] kyey | mag | ḡnor | su | ge | stor | ta |

ḥthogs |

phye | ḡgo | ḡthuñ | re | ḡnam | ḡdzam | [146] ḡtar |
The passage rña-hṭaṅ (l. 149) was probably in verse: it may have been affected by omissions of duplicate, or quasi-duplicate, words. See pp. 299 sqq.

1 rñe | hne | hrmag | dze | hman | byi | hldo | hyu | sad | ge | hphom | te | hdraṅ | ge | hsd | na | hraṅ | rgyaṅ | hšod | te | rmag

2 na added below line.
3 g added below line.
4 sn (for st?) here crossed out.
5 Insert re?
6 Read mye-re or myer-re?
7 hṛño?
8 A syllable missing here or after hldāṅ? Kraṅ?
9 Underline correction from st.: cf. l. 153.
10 yaṅ here crossed out.
hḻdyo | hdom | nag | re | ẖdrab | hwa | hra̱n | yañ | [163] stor |
    | ẖdor | hyon ||
̱hbri | ẖšehe | hpur | hse | sri | ẖbodrag1 |
̱hḵha̱h | ẖldan | ẖnoro2 | tsa | [164] chah3 | ẖkañhi ||
hra̱h | swah | g-wer4 | ẖbos | ẖsah | ẖldah | ha5 |
̱hsah | [165] ẖnom | ẖsah6 | gtsañ | ẖṟgu | ma | gzo ||
ḵhṟu | ẖṟkah | myi | ẖṟdoẖo | ẖṟnab | ma | ẖldah |
̱ẖsah | chad | [166] rmur7 | ẖkohu | prom | g-yehe ||
̱ẖsah | yob | ẖkom | re | hrañ | hrañ | ẖtsu̱hu |
    | rta̱h | ẖscañ8 | [167] g-ye | dze | stor | hto | hruhi | ge | hrañ |
    | hrañ | ẖdehi ||
ẖtor | ḇphu | ẖbos | ge | ẖbyi | [168] ẖri | ẖgañ | ge ||
    | chi | ẖrmu | ẖphor || re | ẖkohu | ḇprom | hto |
    | ẖtor | s̱iñ | ẖkañ | ge | [169] ẖkohu | ẖprom || ẖrgañ | dze |
    | ẖrgom | ẖkhru̱r9 | hto | na | ẖṟpehi | ẖrgam | re | hto |
    | ẖdro | [170] ẖbroñ | prom | ge | ẖkohi | me | ẖtul ||
    | ẖbañ | ẖldah | ẖne | ge | ẖḵehu | me | ẖdzañ || [171] |
    | ẖldyo | ẖdom | ẖnag | re | ẖkohu | ẖphrom | hto | na |
    | sli | ẖti | ẖṟnor10 | ẖkohu | mehe | [172] ẖldyo ||
    | ẖḏrab | ẖwah | hrañ | hrañ | re | ẖkohu | phrom | hto | na |
    | ẖrwad | ẖbañ | prom | [173] yañ | ẖkohu | me | ẖḏrab | na |
    | klag | ẖrwad | ẖdzur11 | hwi | ẖwehi | ẖtsag |
    | rta | swah12 | mor13 | [174] ẖkohu | prom | hto | na |
    | tor | dro | ẖño | ge | ẖnu | glañ | slog |
    | rta̱h | swa | ẖḏdir14 | 15nu16 | [175] glañ | 17ẖḏdoñ18 ||
    | rta | swa | 18ẖkom | re | ẖnu | glañ | ẖpor | na | mu | ẖldi | hmo |
    | [176] na |
    | ẖrañ | swa | ẖphyega | na | kehu | prom | ẖbres || doñ |
    | nu | glañ | ẖrg̱yañ | ge | ẖke | prom20 | glañ | [177] na ||

1 rag ?: ẖ added below line: ẖbohg may have been intended?
2 Or read ẖner (correction of ẖnor)?
3 hrañ here crossed out, the double punctuation unintentionally left.
4 Read g-wer?
5 pu here crossed out: the ẖ unintentionally left.
6 Correction of apparent ẖnaha.
7 Read rmur? rmur is not found elsewhere. 8 ẖtsañ?
9 Read ẖkhru-re? ẖkhru is not found elsewhere.
10 Read ẖnu-re? ẖnor and ṟnor occur only in this way: cf. ll. 289, 322, 339.
11 Read ẖdzur-re?
12 ẖ below line.
13 Read mor-re
14 ẖ added below line.
15 Corrected from ẖnu.
16 ẖto here crossed out.
17 ẖdir here crossed out.
18 Read ẖḏdir-re or ẖḏir-re?
19 ẖ an addition.
20 prom an addition, below line.
htor | hdro | hño | ge | rie | hpo | hldo | ge | hkehu | prom | hjo | na |

hkohu | prom1 | bzer | na | kehu | [178] hkah | rwan || na ||

2hldyaŋ | hyaŋ | hyo | na | ldyaŋ | hkah | rwan |

ste | hkehu | prom | dze | gsom [179] wa | hyo ||

5 hnu | glaŋ | rño | dze | gsom | wa | g-yo ||

hldyaŋ | yaŋ | hyo | na | gnah | goŋ | myag | [180] 

ste | hkoŋu | bprom | yaŋ | ldyaŋ3 | glab | hdo ||

de | nas | rabs | bgyis | gsan | hldi | hlab | [181] |

rbyo | po | naŋ | gsaŋ | hšeg | hlab | dze | rbyo4 | hpro | hro | grtehe |

10 hta | stel | re | hlab | ta | gbohu [182] ste | ge | hthogs | re | hlab | ge | plaŋ | na |

hbroŋ | hldah | hdzam | re | hrah | rte5 | hdubna [183] |

hduz6 | hdro | hphor7 | hchi | hdo | dyah | na |

bsog | thom | thom | dze | hpu | ge | me | hmuhi | [184] |

15 hram | hkaŋ | hkaŋ | dze | hphage | me | hsam |

hdiiŋ | mag | hnor8 | ma9 | hpu | mu | re | [185] ma | hpaŋ | hsam ||

htah | hśud | hdon | rgyag | dze | htor | hdo | hchuŋ |

hta | šud | mehi | [186] dze | hrtah | hjam | ge | hmehi ||

hldyaŋ | g-ri | gdod10 | re | mehi | hrah | gtaŋ |

20 cig | dze | htor11 | [187] hldam | re | hldan ||12 |

htor | hkhru | rgyaŋ | re | hrtah | hpā | hphar |

hñi | htor | hldam13 | [188] re | hldan |

ha | 14 kyaŋ | huŋ | hrño | re | hña15 | hdro | mo |

25 cig | dze | tor | hldam | re [189] hldan ||

hño | hkgog | rño16 | re | hñaŋ | hdro | hmo ||

stor | hkgō | hrño | re | hñaŋ | hdro | [190] thar |

hmo17 | hzaŋ | re | hse | spye | khyaŋ |

rgyeb | hphuhi | hton | re | hyah | wa | hkaŋ | [191] |

18 ni18 | skar | hkaŋ | re | gdah | hnah | hgam ||

30 dgu | hldo | htor | re | hra | we | rtah | [192] |

rgyed | hraŋ | sme | re | hkar | hgyi | ňes ||

1 prom added below line.
2 h added below line.
3 ldyāŋ added below line.
4 rbyo added below line.
5 In l. 354 the manuscript has hṛtre.
6 In l. 352–3 ḥdu and gzü.
7 Read hpho-re or hphor-re? Cf. l. 353.
8 Read hno-re?
9 Correction of myyi?
10 d a correction (of r?).
11 Read hto-re?
12 Corrected from || or || reinforced?
13 kyaŋ here crossed out: read htkyaŋ?
14 Pasture erroneous.
15 Read hmo-re or hmo-re? Cf. l. 192.
16 jam?
cig | dze | htor | hldam | re | mor | re | hkar | rpag | re¹ |

kyañni | (193)

hñah | htsu | rpag | re | hñah | mo | hgam ||

hñah | mo | hr²pag | ³gso | nad | hgam |

(194) gso | nad | rpag | re | hkah | hgan | hjor |

hrdzon | hyo | hsi | dze | ste | gdzu | ge | cig⁴ | lol |

(195) hke | plan | hdrah | dze | hthar | mye | ge | lol |

hldihi | su | hldoñ | dze | hlda | hko | ge | hldzon | (196)

rma | hsu | hdra | dze | hwam | wehi | ge | tswelu |

hño | stor | hthor⁶ | bsi | ta | ston |

rñe | (197) hldañ | hkh₇ | hmye | htah | rgyen |

mu | hrog | htro | re | rmañ | hldab | g-we |

stor | thoñ | (198) bsi | re | hldañ | hkañ | g-we |

hro | ta | ṣodçe⁸ | re | hwar | ta | rgyen⁹ |

hdi | gsom | šud | (199) re | rmañ | na | g-wehi ||

hñan | nag | rgyes | hkom | chim | hldim | ge | hpah | rmañ | rgyah¹⁰ |

gni | ke | ge | (200) g-yog | hldañ | gse | ge | spehi | hdzañ | hgyañ |

¹hce | hmu | gdag | re | rñe | ne | hrehi | na | (201) rmañ | na | g-we | he |

hso | hldañ | ṣgor | re | hwi | wa | rmañ |

trog | hjo | rñe | dze | pyi | rjes | (202) ne¹¹ | hoer |

rmañ | bri | ko | ge | hch¹² | hru | hrdyan |

hran | hmad | hfe | nag | ge | hko | (203) hldañ | hse | hswad |

cha | hru | hwars | ge | hbrí | hko | ₁³htah |

šor¹⁴ | hlda | (204) hkar | re | pyu | phya | hdam |

ḥceh | hmu | ₁⁵gdag | re | gsañ | hkañ | hrehi |

puñ | te | gsar | ņar | (205) hpah | rmag | ḳchi |

gse | re | ḳrañ | klar | hdzoñ | skyar | hrehi |

na | g-we | hkor | (206) kla | gsañ | rmañ | re | rmañ | na | g-we ||

hec | hmu | gdag | re | rkiye | ne¹⁶ | hñohu |

tshu | gsom¹⁷ | (207) šud | re | rmañ | na | g-we | re | g-we |

the | then | hldi | ḳzir | hkañ | hgañ | htsur | (208)

¹⁸hkañ | ḳcie | rpag | re | ḳtshar | ḳde | hpypedhi |

rsehi | ḳrgod | ḳphyed | re | ḳphyu | (209) hldyañ | ḳgyehi ||

¹ rpag | re added below line: to be inserted here?
² Something here crossed out.
³ Insert re?
⁴ cig added below line, probably to replace lol: cf. l. 356.
⁵ Punctuation erroneous?
⁶ Read ḳhor-re or ḳthor-re?
⁷ Read ḳkkar-re or ḳkkha-re?
⁸ ṣodtsa?
⁹ = rgyen-ni.
¹⁰ rgyah added below line.
¹¹ rmañ here crossed out.
¹² cha added below line.
¹³ hdam here crossed out.
¹⁴ A correction (of rot?).
¹⁵ rkiye | no (ryye ?) inserted below line.
¹⁶ h here crossed out.
¹⁷ m below line.
¹⁸ g added below line.
hkho | hšan | hgor | hnom | ta | hprom | na |
hl다 | rgye | hдор | re | [210] hwañ | ta | hнен |
hcаñ | rgye | rpag | re | hmo | ta | hpun |
hδаñ | hто | hто | ge | hgo | [211] gтон | mod |
re | mye | hран | re | myi | hпен | hккhi² |
rog | hji | rдań | ge | [212] hko | hто | modhi |
khьос | hккьян | hyu | ge | mye | hпен | hккheн |
hквañ³ | hgo | [213] hро | ge | hbos | hdom | hриji |
hbeñi | tyañ | rdehe | ge | ʰhtsаñ | hbrad | [214] hrdаghi |
htаñ | gsañ | hраñ | re | hrwеñi | gtsu | ge | hрnаs⁵ |
kyu | hldоñ | hро | [215] re | hкya | wa | ņe | re | hтshу | to |
| hphans |
htor | hњi | htsа | ge | htor | hброň | [216] hкkhoñ |
hlдi | hrgyed | hраñ | htor | hброň | hкkhoñ |
hlдi | hrgyed | hраñ⁶ | tor | [217] hбро | ⁷ hгyañ |
htor | hброñ | hкkho | dze | htor | хкho | dze | ⁹ sне | ge |
| [218] hldyañ | hpu | hбрi | re | hmeñi | klu | hсаh | ¹⁰ dze | htor |
hkho | ge | hкkhoñ |
htаñ | [219] hrdzo | hњor¹¹ | htor | hброň | hтsors |
htаñ¹² | le | tshаñ | dze | tor | sњi | rgam | [220]
htаñ | le | tsа | ge | thor | hброñ | tshor | na |
thañ | rdzo | hkyud | na | hброñ | hдru | hjar |
| [221] hthañ | hgam | hrdзur | re | hброñ | hкrу | hбро | na |
hyаñ | hklu¹³ | hбро | re | hgyeb | [222] hкru | hбро | re | hyаñ |
| hтаñ | hthañ na | : |
hrta | swa | gkom | re | htor | hброñ | [223] hгром |
htor | hброñ | hгром | re | hton | hкоñ | hbye¹⁴ |
htor | hброñ | hrpag | re | [224] hwañ | hrзаñ | hlamhí |
g-wаñ | hrзаñ | hnar¹⁵ | hrkwa | hдzam | hтроñи |
| [225] dgu | hму | htor¹⁶ | hшаñ | hлад | hbyamnа |
| [226] hгу | hrdзor¹⁸ | hrзаñ | лad | hlamhí |
hyаñ | hраñ | hшаñ | re | hшаñ | hлад | hlamhí | [227]

¹ Read hго-re or hгор-re?
² Sic (for hккheн, as in l. 212)?
³ hкюаñ? Correction, below line, of hwañ.
⁴ mye here crossed out.
⁵ hнас? Correction of хкornas.
⁶ Read hраñ-re?
⁷ hко here crossed out.
⁸ Or khwo? (a correction).
⁹ hо here crossed out.
¹⁰ Punctuation erroneous.
¹¹ Read hњo-re.
¹² Correction, below line, of hphans.
¹³ Probably hкru.
¹⁴ hпеñ? hphyе?
¹⁵ Read hтo-re? Cf. l. 233.
¹⁶ hдлì added below line.
mug | hgu | rdzor₁ | ūśāṇ | hlād | ēlamḥī  | htham | rah | ēsāṇ | re | ūśāṇ | hlād | [228] ēlamḥī ||
ḥbri | hgu | rdzor² | hwa | hrśaṇ | ēlamḥī  |
braḥ | ḥraḥ | ēsāṇ | re | ēhwā̄³ | ēlah⁴ | [229] hrśaṇ | ēgam | ēlamḥī  |
śaṇ | ṅe | ḡdīr⁵ | ēgwāḥ | hrśaṇ | ēlamḥī  |
rīṇ | ḡkhyaṃ | ḡldyaṇ | dze | [230]⁶ rīṇ | ge | hlād | hi ||
hwa | bžer | hśid | re | hrṭaḥ | ḡuraṇ⁷ | ēlyaṇ |
hwa | bžer | [231] ḡṛpaṇ | re | rīṇ | hlād | ḡbyaṃma |
rgyed | ma | ḡldāṇ | ge | ḡso | ḡnaḥ | ḡṛgaḥ ||
ḥṭo | [232] ḡṛṭa | rme | ge | ḡso | ḡnaḥ | stōr ||
ḥḍzaṇ | ḡḷaḥ | ḡnaṇ | dze | rīṇ | hlād | ge | hlām ||
gāḥ⁸ | [233] ēlah | hlād | ēnaṇ⁹ | ḡkhbaḥ | ḡ10gro | ḡṭroṇ || 10
ḥḍzaṇ | gla | ḡnaṇ | dze | hchir | ḡṭṣaḥ¹¹ | stō | [234]  
ḥṭsag | ḡro | ḡbhēi | ḡbar | ḡso | ḡnaḥ | gceg |
ḥḍzaṇ | ḡglaḥ¹² | nag | ge | ḡbhēi | ḡbaḥ | [235] ḡṭog |
ḥbe | ḡbaḥ | ḡnaḥ | stō | ḡso | ḡnaḥ | rmaṇ | dze | ḡṭoḥo |
ṛṇe | ḡla | ḡnaṇ | dze | ca | [236] yāṇ | ḡṭo |
ṛṇaḥ | ḡdī | ḡrṣaḥ | ḡldi | nāṇ | re | ḡ | ēlah¹³ | hlād | ēlamḥna¹⁴ || [237]  
ḥḷdi | rgyed | ḡhra | ḡglā | hlād | ḡbyaṃma ||
rīṇ | ḡkhyaṃ | ḡldyaṇ | re | [16] rīṇ | ge | hlād | hi | [238] ||
gśe | ḡbo¹⁷ | bon | re | hlād | mah | mahan¹⁸ |
ḥześe | ḡldu | ḡru | re | dze | ḡḥphaṃ | ḡbaḥ | [239] ge | ḡyōr ||
ḥcha | ḡhraḥ | nu | nar¹⁹ | dze | [20] ḡkhbaḥ | ḡgro | ge | ḡkhaḥi ||
ṛṇe | ḡlaḥ | [240]²² ṛpaṇ | re | gśe | ḡḍaḥ | hlād | hlāmḥi  |
gśe | ḡlaḥ | ḡṭor | dze | ḡcḥaḥ | [241] ḡyaṇ | ḡbro | na ||
ḥṇo | ṛgam | ḡho | re | ṛmyi | ḡnu²³ | ṛgyāṃs |
ṛṇaḥ | ēḥyaṃ | ḡna | re | ṛthā | ḡnu | [242] ṛṛgyaṇ | stō | ṛmyi |
ḥnu | ḡṭo ||
gśe | ḡlaḥ | ḡṭor | dze | ḡcḥaḥ | ḡyaṇ | 25

1 Read rdzo-re ?  2 Read rdzo-re ?  3 ē added below line.  4 h added below line.  5 Read ḡldi-re ?  6 s here crossed out.  7 Read ḡraṇ.  8 gah perhaps a faulty anticipation of ēlah.  9 Read ēnaṇ-re ? Cf. l. 224.  10 b here crossed out.  11 A correction (of ḡṭṣhār).  12 ē added below line.  13 Read ēlah (for ḡ | ēlah).  14 n below line.  15 correct from n.  16 rgya here crossed out. Read ḡraḥ-re ?  17 Sic (for 1).  18 na added below line.  19 nu | nar, below line, correction of ḡḍu | ḡḍaḥ.  20 Punctuation reinforced.  21 k here crossed out.  22 ēlamḥi here crossed out.  23 nu underline correction (of di).
gse | hlad | [243] hnar1 | hkhab | gro | htroñhi ||
hlidi | hrgyed | hrar2 | gse | hbo | hbon | hlad | ma | mahna |
[244]
dguhu | mu | hto | re | hrah | hlidi | hnañ | re | gse | hlad |
hbyamna ||
gse | lad | [245] rpag | re | hpro | hbo | hbon |3 | re | hlad | ma | ma | hna |
dgu | hmu | htor4 | hpro | [246] hbo5 | hbon6 | hrah | hlidi |
hlañra | hlad | ma | mahna |
hlidi | hrgyed | hrar7 | hpro | hbo | [247] hbon | re | hlad | ma |
hman8 ||
gse | ston | stsar | re | hlad | htoñ | myen |
hcam | [248] hjam9 | htam | hldir10 | gse | htah | hdam | na ||
hlidi | rgyed | h11rar | rgyed | htre | hte | [249] ge | gse | hso |
hkon | : : ||
htsa12 | re | hldah | ge | hra | hyañ | phyir13 |14 | bañ | hrehe | [250]
hrpod | hbos | re15 | hbron | re | ge | rmo | h Kum | hceg |
hltah16 | htsah17 | hyer | ge | [251] hno | hkhog | hlt0 | ge |
hbañ | hrehe | hkehne | hbañ | hre | hgehe | na |
jo | re | h18gehe | [252] re | hlab | re | hge |
sta | re | mo | ge | sta | g-ri | hbañ |
sta | bañ | rpag | re | hyah19 | [253] me | bbyam | re |
jo | me | bbyam | re | hlab | me | hbyam | na || : |
hbañ | hldon | hrpag | [254] re | hldañ | phyer | hbrahr20 |
hldyo | htor | hmyi | na |
hyog | hprañ | hdag | dze | hdanañ | [255] re | hphrañ |
s âm | stom | hdag | dze | hsar | stomhi |
hšeñ | hdzah | hldyim | hyañ21 | [256] ldyohu | ma | hbyohu |
gram | hgañ | hkañ | hyañ | hrag | ma | hbag ||
htas | kro | hldon | [257] re | hyah | rmah | htsagna |
htor | htas | prom | hrom | nenh | hso | bos |

1 Read hnar-re ?
2 = hrah-re ? Cf. l. 246.
Sic: erroneous punctuation.
4 Read hto-re ?: cf. ll. 225, 236, 244.
5 h here crossed out and replaced by .
6 Insert re ?
7 rahr ?: h added below line. Cf. ll. 243, 248.
8 Sic (for mahna).
9 hjam marked for omission.
10 Read hldi-re ?
11 h a corrector’s addition: read hrah-re ? Cf. ll. 243, 246.
12 A correction of htsaa or htsao.
13 Correction from phyer.
14 m here crossed out.
16 re a correction of a badly written r.
15 rta added here below line (and then crossed out?).
17 ts of htsah inked over or added.
18 h inked over.
19 mye here crossed out.
20 Read hbrah-re ?
21 Underline correction of hyam: a yan also is here crossed out.
htab | [282] htsag | na | na | hldyañ | rgyeb | hpuhi | hpuhi |

| hseg | sme | ge | hrim | hdzom | [283] hpañ | tså | ge | hgal | hrag | re | hgañ | hag | hdañ | ta | hbgogni |

| 3 | 25 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 1 nest: LINES 280–96 |

hkañ | hrdza | hhkhor | hswah | g-ri | hto | na |

1 Correction (of kyañ).
2 m an insertion.
3 g below line: htsa | gna intended?
4 h inked over.
5 hbgogni?, the n an insertion.
6 Corrected, below line, from hklom.
7 Read hkruru?
8 Punctuation erroneous (end of line).
9 Corrected, below line, from hklom.
10 w here crossed out.
11 Read rdza-re? 322, 339.
12 h, h and th crossed out or corrected?
13 Some sign crossed out before ali.
14 Correction from hsrad.
15 h below line.
16 r (?) here crossed out.
17 Read rño-re; cf. ll. 171, 322, 339.
18 ts (or c) here crossed out.
19 Read po-re; cf. l. 295.
20 Read rdza-re? Cf. l. 287.
21 Read hkkhor-re?
22 Read hkkhor-re?
23 For hkeh? Cf. l. 53.
Read g-we-re. 1

Read rma-re? 16

Underline corrected from hbos.
gyañ [314] g-ri | hjim | hño | hkhog | re | ḫphaḥ |
g-raḥ | ḫsah | ḫkhehe || na || hnor | hdzañ | rgo | [315] htoḥo || rgo | hraḥ | hnor | hdzañ | hyañ | htoḥo || hyañ | htañ | rmar |
hyañ | [316] hkrhuḥ | hbro | re | ḫrgyeb | ḫkrhuḥ1 || ḫyaḥ | ḫldyañ |
5 ḫkyer | ge | ḫldāḥ | ḫrgam | ḫstsag | [317] ḫldog | ḫpo | ḫrbom |
htoḥo || po | ṛrbom | hnor | ḫldog | g-yaḥ | to | dze | ḫwa | ne | ḫphe |
[318] ḫyaḥ | htañ | rmar | hyañ | ḫkrhuḥ | hbro || ḫldehi | ḫswah |
hmor | ḫsli | ḫdañ | ḫdoño2 | [319] ḫrgya | ḫnī | ḫk | ḫldehi | ḫswah |
rṣañ | ḫrgyaḥ | ḫnī | ḫk | ḫrim | re | ḫldohu | ḫṛṛgyaḥ | [320] ḫnī |
10 ḫke | g-yog | re | ḫgyañ | ṛnē | re | ḫhnōho | ḫkrhu | re | ḫkyañ |
hldehi | swah | rṣañ | ḫn3 | [321] ḫstoń | ḫpoń | ḫprom | ge | ḫldehi |
hswa | ḫrṣañ | re | ḫrgyeb4 | ᕑ Datum: [322] ṛnor | ḫgar | ḫpu | ḫches | ḫnō | ḫkho | ḫprom | re | ḫnē | ḫdah | ḫrom | ḫte6 | ḫhe | ge | ḫkrhuṣ | [323] ḫyg | ḫṣud | re | ḫhe | ḫrgy | ḫkyim | re |
15 ḫrgyeb | ḫkrhuṣ | ḫbro | re | g-yah | [324] ḫpān | ḫwag |
ḥdzoḥu | ḫkru | ḫyog | re | ḫdzoḥu | ḫkḥad | ḫtōḥi |
ḥbri | ḫdzoḥu | ḫyim | [325] ḫre | ḫyḥa | ḫkrhuṣ | ḫbro || || ḫse7he | ḫkho | ḫgyan || ṛre | ḫlab | ḫko | ḫgyan || [326] ḫnāḥ | ḫpāg | ḫldir8 | ḫse | ḫṭah | ḫdām ||
20 ḫtṛog | ḫdṛē | ḫte | re | ḫṛgye9 | ḫyō | ḫṛna10 ṛna [327] ḫge | gśe |
ḥko | ḫgyan || ḫsehe | ḫko | ḫo | ḫgyan | ge11 | ḫrgyah | ḫdihi | ḫtron | ṛre |
ḥkḥaḥ12 | [328] ḫpyah | ḫldān || ḫnē | ḫsān | ḫldir | ḫkḥoḥ13 | ḫṭah14 | ḫdāmnā |
ḥnāḥ | ḫpāg | ḫldir15 | [329] ḫbri | gśe | ḫpūḥi | ṛre |
ḥkḥaḥ | ḫsān | ḫrān | ṛre | ḫkḥo | ḫdān | ḫdāmnā ||
25 ḫtṛ | ḫpūḥu | [330] ḫbos | dze | ḫṛgyo | ḫṣeg | ḫgṣega16 | ṛre | ḫrgy | ḫtō | ḫsō | ṛno | ḫṣe | ḫpe | ḫdō | ḫk | ḫkhe | ḫhe | ḫklu | ḫpraḥ | ḫyḥu || ḫkhrḥam | ṛre | ḫhrdān | ḫyañ | ḫkhrkm | [333] ḫpyi | ḫpraḥ ||

1 ho a correction (of ḫuḥo).
2 bo ? or a correction of bo ?
3 ḫa added below line.
4 ḫ a correction (of ḫn ?).
5 ḫnē added below line.
6 ḫnē ṛe crossed out.
7 ḫb here crossed out.
8 ḫnē kind of ḫhīdī-re or ḫldī-re: cf. l. 328, 337.
9 Sic for ḫrģyed: cf. l. 338.
10 ḫnē added below line.
11 ḫkḥaḥ here written below line.
12 ḫ added below line.
13 ḫkḥaḥ above this and below ge cf. l. 327.
14 ḫkḥaḥ above this and below ge cf. l. 327.
15 ḫtṛre or ḫdir-re? Cf. l. 326.
16 Sic (for ḫgṣer: see l. 331).
17 ḫuhr ṛe here crossed out.
18 ḫhr re here crossed out.
TEXT: LINES 334-49

hldi | hro | hgoñ | re | hkeg | hrko1 | hrko | hyuñ ||
gsah | rkah | [334] glar2 | hwah | hrog | hldoñ ||
hwah | hrog | rño | ge | hkeg | rko | hwad |
3kruñu | [335] hthe | hprah | dze | h4rog | ge | hro |
hwad | hwah | rño | ge | rgyoho | hto | stñ | [336] 5
rmañ | hwi | hkho | ge | rgyoho | hto | st5ñ |
ktu | htah | rgyohon | re | hñes | ta | hrgyon ||
sto | the | the | re | [337] stor | htah | hdzon |
htor | hrtah | hldir6 | hstor | ma | swañ ||
tor | hrtah | 7rme [338] ge | stor | hdzo | hdzeñi | 10
htrog | htrehe | hte | re | hrgyed | hyo | hrañ | ge | hstor | hdzo |
[339] hdzeñi |
sroñ | hñe | hñer8 | stor | hdeñi | hpyid |
hkyu | hldoñ | hrñor9 | hkyññ | hwa | [340] ñer10 | hstor | hdeñi |
hpyid ||
hñtor | hrtah | rme | ge | hstor | ma | ṭañ | phyer | ma | ṭswañ |
[341] rñe | hprom | hldir11 | hphyar | ma | ṭswañ ||
rgyed | hrañ | htor12 | pyar | ma | swañ |
hñtor | htah | [342] rme | ge | phyer | htso | ṭtseñi ||
ktu | hldo | sme | re | mye13 | hrañ | htsañ | ge |
hko | rño | klu | re | [343]14 | rñe | hñe | hñes |
hldyañ | ṭpu | ṭbri | re | meñi | ṭklu | ṭcañ |
5
sroñ | ñe | gñe | re | lñañ1 [344] [hdeñi]15 | hpyid || |
hbo | hroñ | hrog | re | ṭlañ | hkyañ | ṭras | re | ṭñes | gñi |
[345] [hduñi] ||
rgyeb | ṭchi | hro16 | re | gdog | yanñ | la | por17 | ṭñes | ṭsi | hduñi ||
hñyu | htsaññ | kyim | [346] re | ṭdam | sleg | glom ||
ṛtn | ṭsahññ | ṭg-yan | ge | ṭdam | sleg | gçiñi ||
hyu | ṭgyi | ka | [347] dze | ṭrímn | glehññ | ge | ṭñig ||
stañ | hroñ | hra | dze | ṭñeññ | ṭñññ | ge | ṭpom ||
gñaññ | ru [348] ṭnuñ | ṭnur | dze | ṭrímn | glehññ | ge | ṭciñ |
hgw19eg | ṭweñññ | ṭpahññ | ṭpahññ | dze | ṭthañ | phyanñ [349] ge | 30
hrb ||
sri | ge | gsen | hñe | ge | ṭchan | ṭjinm | ṭtsaññ | ge | ṭrmon ||
1 g here crossed out.  2 Read gla-ññ.  3 kluññ ñ stu here crossed out.
4 Something here crossed out.  5 t inked over.
6 Read hldñ-ññ: cf. l. 326, 328.  7 hldir here crossed out.
8 Read ṭhñ-ññ, as in l. 343.  9 Read hrñ-ññ.  10 Read ñe-ññ.
11 Read hñtor-ññ.  12 Read ṭhñor-ññ.  13 Or rgyn for rgynñ?
14 rgyñ, error for the following rññ, here crossed out.  15 ṭ
16 g here crossed out.  17 la | por added below line: cf. l. 349.
18 For ṭtsaññ. The first ṭñññ (for ṭñññ?) added below line.
19 w inked over.
1 por | ge | [350]² hyu | hstsah | hkyim | re | hcihi | htoho | ge | hnan ||
na | hldom³ | hgor [351] hšehe | hti | ge | hnan ||
hyu | hstsah | hkyim | re | hdam | sleg | gtsob | doñ |
gyañ | ru | [352] gtsob | re | mehi | cha | hrťe | ||
5 hphu | hphu⁴ | mur⁵ | hdzu | hdro | hkus |
nañ | pa | hšam | re | [353] hwañ | hrañ | hbyamna |
gzu | hdro | hphor⁶ | hchi | hdo | hdyan |
hbroñ | hldar | hdzam | re | do | ldo | hdzọ | hpehi⁷ | [354]
hrañ | hrtre | hdub⁸ |
htrah | hño | hti | ge | htañ | hldun | hbañna |
10 hrtah | nañ | hwar⁹ | [355] hthah | hbro | hgran |
hńur | hńañ | rgyeñ | na | hńu | hldo | hldyono ||
hyañ | re | rgyeñ | na | yañ [356] hldyah | hldyah ||
hdzoni | hyo | hśid | dze | ste | he | hdzu | ge | gcig |
hke | hplañ | hdra | dze | [357] thar | mye | ge | hlon ||
15 g-wehe | hldyah | hldor | g-wehe | sko | hbab | dze |
hram | yañ | phlañ | hńar¹⁰ [358] || ||
hpo | hldah | stor¹¹ | hrañ | htoñ | gsoñu | dze¹² | rñe | ge | hgo ||
na | hgo | na | hgon |
rtañ | swa | [359] . . . hköhu | hprom | htoho |
20 htor | hdro | hño | ge | hńu | glañ | slug | na |
nu | glañ | phor¹³ | [360] . . . mo¹⁴ | hña |
hrtah | swah | hpeñ¹⁵ | na | hkeñu | hprom | to | na | |
hńu | glañ | rio | ge | keñu [361] pr[om] | glañ | na | keñu |
| prom | pwañ¹⁶ |
htor | hdro | hño | ge | hrñe | hpo | hñe | ge | hköhu | prom |
| [362] hdzono | na | gehu | prom | pwañ |
25 hkeñu | prom | sña | hthah | hryo¹⁷ | htoho |
hdźa | ma | hńyoñ¹⁸ | re | [363] hke | ma | hńyoñ¹⁹ | hmu | lom |
ge | hbyim |

¹ hlaş here crossed out: cf. l. 345. Perhaps por-ge also was intended to be crossed out.
² hgon here crossed out.
³ Correction (of hldoh): hgom here crossed out.
⁴ The second [h]phu crossed out?
⁵ Read mu-re?
⁶ Read hpho-re or hphor-re? Cfi. l. 183.
⁷ do . . . hpehi in margin (to be inserted here?).
⁸ hńub?
⁹ Read hwar-re or hwa-re?
¹⁰ hńad? (inked over).
¹¹ Read stor-re or sto-re?
¹² rgye here crossed out.
¹³ Read phor-re or pho-re?
¹⁴ mu here crossed out.
¹⁵ áe correction from g.
¹⁶ hńyöhe? hńyöne?
¹⁷ hńyo? (inked over). Sña = sña-re?
¹⁸ hńyeñ? hńyeñ?
TEXT: LINES 364–78

hkohu || hbañ | kwa | kwa2 | ge | re | hnah |
hdza | ma | [364] hne | na | rta | ge | htom | hphah |
hke | ma | hnyehe3 | dze | htor | ge | hdzo | htseh |
hkehu | hkah | dwan [365] na | hldyañ | hkah | dwan ||
rgoñ | wa | myer4 | rbyo | rgyer | hldyañ ||
htsog | hram | myer6 | so | na | [366] hsid ||
rbyo | g.yer | hnor7 | rgoñ | wa | sid ||
hkehu | prom | myer8 | hnu | glañ | ldyañ ||
hldyañ | [367] hyañ9 | hyo | doñ | gnah10 | hgoñ | myag ||
hsañ | khyañ | dzwe | hyañ | hyo | doñ || 11hyañ12 | goñ | [368] 10
myag ||
gsehe | cañ | hldyañ | dze | hñam | hdar | hyuhu ||
hrno | hprañ | hram | dze | [369] hsehe | rdzor | hñah |
hldyañ | hgoho | hdzin13 | re | mehi | hrah | hdb na ||
hldyañ | yhu [370] hrno15 | dze | hle | ge | htañ | hldon |
mehi | spehi | hrah | je | hldhehe | ge | htañ | hldon | [371] 15
hdam | hbroñ | hroñ | re16hbañ | hko | htar | dze | 17hldhe | ge | htañ | hldon ||
hkrug | [372] kyañ | hldom | re | hrñe | hño | hdzar | dze |
hldhehe | ge | htañ | hldon ||
hldyañ | hyu | hjo18 | [373] [dze] | hkad | hroñ | re | hrgyen |
hdam | hbroñ | hroñ19 | re | hbañ | hko | htar | dze | hkad |
[374] [h]ron | re | rgyen |
htar | phyañ | hto | re | skyim | hse | hdzar ||
hpah | hwe | htho | hyah | pa- [375] . . hdzern20 | hphyo | hli |
g21-we |
seg | sme | hldo | rbyi | hldyihi | hkad | hron22 | rgyen |
[376] . . . rab | hgo | cig | dze | hkad | hron | re | rgyen ||
hda | htro | hram | hdzar | [377] . . hpag | cig | dze | hkad |
hrno | re | rgyen |||
hpah | hldañ | hroñ | dze | hse | ge | [378] httul | re | hse | ge |
hlobhi ||
hsañ | htsañ | dzen23 | rkom | hthul | na | rkom | ge | hron ||

1 Punctuation doubled by reviser. 2 h here crossed out.
3 he crossed out? Or inserted? 4 Read mye-re or myer-re?
5 Punctuation a correction. 6 Read mye-re or myer-re?
6 Read hnor-re? 8 Read mye-re or myer-re?
9 h added below line? 10 h added below line.
10 h added below line. 12 h added below line.
11 Omit hyo-doñ ||? (metre). 13 Or hdañ corrected to hdan?
14 Or hdañ corrected to hdan? 15 hjo?
15 hjo? 16 | here crossed out or reinforced.
17 A bad h here crossed out.
18 hñañ? 19 Something here crossed out.
20 hñor? hdzar?
21 y here crossed out. 22 hron? (Error for hron | re?). 23 h below line.
bos [379]—o[g] | dze[spe\(^1\)]hi | ge | hdza | na | spehi | ge | hthon |
śes | rtsig | moñ | ge | htsah [380] . . . . hrahi | hwehi | hrtah | ge | hrtsig | moñ | hkuñ | na |
rtsig | moñ | [381] hsad | na | tsig | moñ | we | ge | htsah | hpu\(^2\) | hloho | h bri | slod | hldo | dze | spo | ro [382] re | hto |
5 hdza | hldahi | hne | ge | tsa\(^3\) | hrgye | hrdza | na |
hdzah | hldah | hkuñ | na | hdza | ld [383] hsad | na | hdzah |
hldah | hwehi | ge | htsah | rgye | hlo \(^4\) |
hyañ | hthe | ge | hsad | dze | ldyo [384] roho | hpah\(^6\)i | hdzam | hbroñ | hroñ | dze | ldyo | hro | hpehi |
hrshehi\(^6\) | hpag | slog [385] dze | hrne\(^7\) | hrom | ge | hti | na |
hrne | ge | hrlomhi |
10 hdzo\(^8\) | chi | te | re | hlab | hñañ\(^9\) [386] hyah | htañ | hldynañ | hro\(^10\) | hpehi |
hdzam | hbroñ | hroñ | hbañ | hko | htar | [387] cig | dze | hldyoñ | hro | hpehi | \(^11\)
hldynañ | hyu | hjo | cig | dze | htor\(^12\) | ge | hkroms |
[388] mor | tsañ | khrom | re | hnyañ | tsa | hcer |
15 tor | kru | hrgyañ | re | hrtah | hpah | hphar [389] |
hlor | sñañ | rñi | re | rta | hldag | hsgag | hldynañ | hjo | hkromni |
hdzam | hbroñ | hroñ | [390] re | hbañ | hko | htar | ge | gdzu | hti | khyañ | hdag | ge | hko | hto | swad |
skyañ | hbe | [391] [hkyañ] | ge | hnah | hdiñ | htshur |
20 hldynañ | hyañ | hyo | ge | hgyañ | hnah | tsur | [392] |
hldyi | hi | rgiedy | hrañ | htor | hbroñ | hgynañ | doñ |
hroñ | ma | hño | re | htar\(^15\) | ma | hgañ [393] |
[hrgiedy | hñañ | sme | hyed | re | hbroñ | h[k(r)]hø | hbro | hpo | hdam | htor | -re-e-re | [394] | . . . . . . rñ—m-dañ . . . . . . . .
hlor\(^16\) | hbroñ | [395] | . . . . . . hguñ | ge | gdah | kum |
[396] | . . . . ge | gdah | hgam | [397] | . . . . rñu(?)—g | glañ |
[398] | . . . . bañ | dze | ? |

\(^1\) ?
\(^2\) Corrected from hpo.
\(^3\) tsa added below line.
\(^4\) Punctuation reinforced.
\(^5\) h below line. hi crossed out?
\(^6\) Correction of hshehi?
\(^7\) rdze here crossed out?
\(^8\) hjo?
\(^9\) htañ?
\(^10\) Punctuation due to reviser (correction of h ?).
\(^11\) Punctuation reinforced.
\(^12\) Correction from htor?
\(^13\) Punctuation reinforced.
\(^14\) Punctuation reinforced.
\(^15\) hldi?
VOCABULARY

(ALPHABETICAL ORDER of head-words according to the Tibetan system, the root-consonants, and their Prefixes in sequence (for details see Note),¹ and the five vowels, a, i, u, e, o, being in the usual succession. NUMERALS other than page-numbers (p., pp.) refer to lines of the MS., as shown in the Text, page-numbers to this volume.)

K

ka (a Suffix) (p. 182) 346 Ḥgyio.

kum, 395.

ke = Ḥke I, q.v. 199 ṭgya-h-ṇīo.

kehū = Ḥke II, Ḥkehu, gehū, q.v. 176, 360-1 -prom; 177 -ḥkāh (p. 316).

ko = Ḥko V, q.v. 202 ṭmaṇ-briö.

kwa-kwa 363.

kya I, 96 -ḥtaṇ-ta.

II = Tib. skya, crop (p. 355). See also kyaḥ. 263 ḡaṇo; 264, 279 Ḥnō; 273 ḡaṇ- -ḥraḥ-ḥtno (p. 317).

— -wa-ne = Ḥkyaḥ-ḥwa-ṇe, q.v 162 (pp. 253, 338).

kyan = Tib. kyan, also, even (pp. 204, 311-12) or = Ḥkyaṇ II. See also gyaṇ. 98; 192 -ni (pp. 318, 345).

kye, 273 ḡo (pp. 297, 341).

kyeḥ = kya II, crop. 273 seö (pp. 297, 341).

kyim = Ḥkym, home, taken home, q.v. 324, 345 -re (pp. 218, 246).

kyu = Ḥkū, speed, swift, q.v. 161 -Idon; 214 -ḥldon (pp. 253, 255).

kyeḥ = Tib. khyag, hkyag, freeze, be congealed, numbed. 102 ḡo (pp. 226, 301).

kyen = Tib. skyen, quick, dexterous. 103 theö (p. 322).

kyer = Tib. kyer, erect, or = Ḥkyer, q.v. 136 -rbo; 145 ḍboö.

kraṇ = Tib. kraṇ-ṇe, kroṇ, standing upright; mkhraṇ, Ḥkhraṇs, ḍкраṇ, robust, hard, solid (pp. 288-90). See also hldan-

-kraṇ/hkraṇ/hḥkraṇ. 85 -ṇur-

-ṇur (p. 290).

kru-hṛgyāṇ = ḧhhrūö. 388 (p. 312).

kruḥu = ḧkru, q.v. 321 -ḥpro = ḧbbo; 334 -ḥthe.

kro = Tib. khro, ḧhhrō, anger. 256 ḧtasö.

kla = Tib. klas, abundant, unlimited. 143 ḡgor; 206 ḧkrorö (pp. 238, 297).

klaq = Tib. glag, lammergeyer. 173 -ḥrwad (pp. 257, 341, 345).

II = Tib. glags, occasion, season. 268 ḡmūö (p. 298).

klar = glar, q.v.? 205 ḧhrāṇo.

klu = Tib. glob, Idon, İon, blind (pp. 131, 138, 223). See also mehl/hmehl-klu. 5 -ge; 342 -re (pp. 223, 341).

— -ḥtaṇ (a Suffix, pp. 182-3). 336 (p. 223).

— -ḥto (a Suffix, pp. 184-5). 37 (p. 246).

— -rto 25 | blind rock (pp. 138, 223).

— -ḥrto 24 | 223.

— -ḥldo (a Suffix, pp. 186-7), blindness. 342.

gkom, Prospective form of ḧkom II, q.v. (pp. 137, n. 1, 200, 368). 222 ḡswö (p. 305).

ḥkaṇ I = Tib. gaṇ, full, all. See

¹ Note. The resultant order of consonants is as follows:—

K (g-, h-, r-, hr-, hl-, s-, ḡs-); KH (h-, s-); G (d-, h-, r-, hr-, l-); N (m-, h-, r-, hr-); C (g-, h-, ḡs-); CH (g-, h-); J (h-, r-, hr-); N (g-, h-, hr-, s-); T (g-, h-, hr-, hl-, s-, ḡs, gr-, gs-); TH (h-); D (g-, d-, h-, r-, hr-, l, gl-, hl-); ḡ (g-, h-, hr-); P (b-, h-, r-, hr-, l, s-); PH (g-, b-, h-); B (g-, b-, h-, r-, hr-, s-); M (g-, h-, hr, s-); TS (g-, h-, hr, s-, ḡs-); TSH (h-); DZ (g-, h-, r-, hr-); W (g-, h-); Ĥ (b-, r-); Z (g-, b-, gb-, h-); ḧ (g-, ḡ-); ḥ (g-, ḡ-); L (h-); ṭ (g-, b-, h-, hr-, s-); ṭ (g-, b-, h-, r-, hr-).
also ḡaṅ. 52 ḡdiya°; 151 nor-
gso°; 168 sni°; 164 chah° (7); 190 wa° (1); 256 ḡaṅ°; 281 stom° (pp. 147, 173, 228, 241, 285, 328).

II = Tib. khaṅ. See also ḡkaṅ. 208 -hcig (p. 234).

ḥkaṅ-ḥkaṅ. onomatopoeic? 11 ḡrwaṅ°; 184 ḡram° (p. 344).

ḥkad I = Tib. ḡkhod, ḡkhad, build, settle. 73 -re. 133 -re.

II = Tib. gad, rock, precipice? 373, 375-7 (p. 268).

ḥkab = Tib. khab, house, family. See also ḡkhab. 106 -ḥdro; 281 ḡago; 364 ḡebo; 365 ḡdyaṅ° (pp. 174, 179, 200, 218, 252, 275, 315-16, 338).

II = Tib. ḡkab, steep, difficult, scarce. See also ḡkah. 46 me° (p. 286).

— ḡhab/ḥkhab, speech-concealing. 105 ḡhab; 106 ḡkhab (p. 315).

— ḡgaṅ, all talk. 194, 207 (p. 315).

— ḡgo = Tib. ḡha-bsgo, advice, or ḡkah-bsgo, exhortation. 105 (p. 315).

— ḡcog = Tib. ḡha-cug, counsel. 105 (p. 315).

— ḡldom, mouth-bound = Tib. ḡha-sdom, gag; cf. ḡkah-ḥdoms, instruction. 66 (p. 314).

— ḡhyaṅ, rebuke (Tib. ḡhyaṅ). 327-8 (p. 315).

— ḡraṅ, independent in speech; cf. ḡraṅ-ḥkaṅ. 104 (p. 314).

— ḡdza/ḥrdza, accordant in speech. See also ḡkhaṅ°. 287, 290, 296 (p. 315).

— ḡsaṅ, secret speech; cf. ḡsan-ḥkaṅ. 214 (p. 314).

ḥkāḥ = ḡkā I (?), q.v., + ḡi. 230 (p. 315).

ḥkāhe = ḡkā I. 295 ḡrgya-ḥni°.

ḥkar I = Tib. ḡkar, skar, gar, dgar, ḡgar, separate off, pen, encampment (pp. 247, 343). 45 ḡriṅ-
-rwa°; 204 ḡor-ḥlda° (p. 343).

II, for ḡkar? 192 ḡpag (p. 242).

ḥkarni = ḡkar I+ni; 204 (p. 343).

ḥku I, a Suffix = ḡgu, Tib. gu (p. 258). 22 ḡmuḥu-ḥku = ḡb. ḡmī-gu, ḡmīy-gu, ḡmīy-ma, ḡmīy-gu, ḡmīy, ḡmīy, ḡmīy.

II = Tib. ḡku, vie, contend, offend, &c. See also ḡkus; 152 ḡmo (pp. 228, 264).

ḥkuṅ, be hollowed out, or, metaphorically, cave in = Tib. ḡkuṅ, hole, pit (pp. 266-7). 124 ḡlaṅ-краṅ°; 309 g-ṛi ḡh; 380 ḡṛtsig-moṅ°; 382 ḡdzaṅ-ḥldaṅ° (pp. 180, 266, 270).

ḥkum? = ḡkom II (Tib. ḡkhum, &c.), q.v. 250 ḡmo (p. 294).

ḥkuṭu = Tib. ḡku, sap, broth. 74 ḡneu (p. 250).

ḥkus, Aorist of ḡku II. 352 ḡdro° (pp. 264, 285).

ḥke I a Suffix used with numerals (1) (pp. 241, 272). See also ḡkehe, ḡkahe. 54 ḡa°; 53, 199, 319, 320 ḡrgya-ḥni°, &c.

II = Tib. ḡhe, profit, get, khe-pa, trader, &c. (pp. 241-2, 289, 316-17, 383, 364).

— ḡkaḥ, trade-talk, 52. See also ḡku°, ḡkeho°, ḡkehe°, ḡheho° (pp. 316-17).

— ḡprom, profit-making. See ḡprom, ḡprom, &c., and also ḡku°, ḡkeho°, ḡheho°, 176.

— ḡplan-ḥdraḥ, bazar. 195, 356; ḡplan-ḥdra (pp. 241-2).

ḥkeg = Tib. kag, keg, kag-ma, kag-ma, mischief, hindrance, injury, accident; ḡkag, constipation; ḡkag, ḡkog, obstruction, prohibition; ḡkag, mischief, &c.; ḡkag-po, difficult, &c.; ḡkegs, ḡkegs, obstruct, debar, &c.; ḡgag, wadding, quinsy; ḡgags, obstructed; ḡgags, stoppage,
&c.; dgag, hinder, &c.; bgag, hinder, &c.; bgegs, hindrance, &c.; htag, htags, obstruction; htags, hinder, &c. See also htag, hrgye.

hkeg-hkro, rko 332, 333, 334 (pp. 338, 340).

hkehi = hke II (?)+hi. 15 hstom-hkom.

hkeh = hke II, kehu, q.v.

-hkah = hke II-hkah. 364.

-rom. 177-8, 362, 366 (pp. 274, 316, 335).

-me, profit-fire. 170 (pp. 274-5, 285, 316).

hkehe = hke I, q.v. 291 hrgya-hiiio.

hkes, Aorist form of hke II. 36 hpah-hrono (p. 269).

hko I a Particle = Tib. ko, go (with Pronouns) (pp. 201, 245, 260). 195 hlda (p. 245).

hkon,=Tib. goñ."upper"? 223 htono.

hkoni, written for hkon (Chinese chüan, chapter)+ni. 249 hso (p. 140).

hkob = Tib. khab, khebs, khhebs, hgebs, dgab, khab, cover. See also hkhob. 107 na-hromo.

hkom I = Tib. skam, skom, dry, thirst, &c. 12 hbo; 15 stom (pp. 231, 315).

hkohi = hkohu, II q.v.-me, speech-fire. 170 (pp. 275, 285).

hkohu I 363.

hkolo-bphyag. 101 hkoho, signal a desire to speak? See also hkho-bphyag (p. 264).

-wehi, room-making = Tib. gobyed. 100 (p. 260).

-se-hgro-re-htsa, those who have (others) placed above them? Or those who come to the top? See se-hgro (pp. 186, 264).

hkog I = Tib. hqog, bqog, qhog, snatch, pull out, uproot. See also hkhog I. 23 htsah-gsom; 54 rbah-na-hke?

II = Tib. lkg, secret; nó-lkg, open and secret. See also hkhog IV. 189 hso; 267 -hkho-rno (p. 285).

hkoni, written for hkon (Chinese chüan, chapter)+ni. 249 hso (p. 140).

hkohi = hkohu, II q.v.-me, speech-fire. 170 (pp. 275, 285).

hkohu I 363.

hkohi = hkohu II, q.v.-me, speech-fire. 170 (pp. 275, 285).

-Vocabulary-
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-hearted (a Suffix, pp. 182-3), one's own entourage. 92 (p. 239).

hkwañ (?) 212 -hgo.

hkweñe 131 hbyo³.

hkyawana-ñe = kya³/ hkyah³, q.v. 215, 339 ñer (pp. 253, 338).

hkyan I = Tib. kyan, even, also, etc. See also kya³, gya³, yañ. 344 hlah³ (?) (pp. 204, 311).

II serf ? (pp. 148, 297-8, 312). 18 hkrug³; 141, 143, 274, 287 mör (pp. 295, 297, 323).

III written for hgyan. 114-na.

-rgyan/hrgyan, stove-bed ? 42, 81, 268 (pp. 298-9).

-hldon, runaway serf ? 287, 291-3 (pp. 239, 297-8).

hkyah-hwa-ñe = kya³/ hkyah³, q.v. See also kya³, gya³, yañ.

hkyan I = Tib. kyan, even, also, etc. See also kya³, gya³, yañ. 344 hlah³ (?) (pp. 204, 311).

II serf ? (pp. 148, 297-8, 312). 18 hkrug³; 141, 143, 274, 287 mör (pp. 295, 297, 323).

III written for hgyan. 114-na.

-rgyan/hrgyan, stove-bed ? 42, 81, 268 (pp. 298-9).

-hldon, runaway serf ? 287, 291-3 (pp. 239, 297-8).

hkyah-hwa-ñe = kya³/ hkyah³, q.v. See also kya³, gya³, yañ.

hkyan I = Tib. kyan, even, also, etc. See also kya³, gya³, yañ. 344 hlah³ (?) (pp. 204, 311).

II serf ? (pp. 148, 297-8, 312). 18 hkrug³; 141, 143, 274, 287 mör (pp. 295, 297, 323).

hkye, offspring, child = Tib. skye,
hkruhu-hyog. See also hkru, khru. 322-3 ṭhsud.

hkruho, final = hkru+o. 316 (p. 228).


hkre, possibly = Tib. hkhrren, desire, envy (a Verb). 132 ḫthaṅ-ḥgam.

hkrom I = Tib. hgrem, dkram, bkram, khroms, spread, scatter (pp. 235-6, 304-5). 64 ḫdzo°; 70 ru-ge°; 389 ḫldyan-ḥjo° (pp. 157, 274, 303-5).

hkroms, Aorist form of hkrom I. Cf. ḫgroms. 387 ḫtor-ge° (p. 305).

hklu I = ḫkhrū I. 221 ḫbro (pp. 228, 296).

hklo = Tib. blo, glo, lungs, etc. See ḫlo. 40 ḫphu°, perhaps bellows = 135 pu-ḥlo (pp. 284-5).

hkrom, perhaps = Tib. klum, a species of divinity: or = glom, q.v.? 42 ge-ḥtul (p. 280, n. 2).

rkabs, a Verb; see also ḫrkabs. 272 rko°.

rkah I = Tib. dkah, steep, difficult. 2 (?): 165 (or is this II?); 333 gsah° (pp. 281, 396, 338).

rkah, 84 mo° (pp. 343-4). See also ḫrkah.

rke-hldah, perhaps = Tib. rke, lean, meagre. 156 ḫhradān.

rko = Tib. rko, hoe, dig. 272 -rkabs; 334 ḫkog°, ḫhwad (pp. 338, 340). See also ḫrko.

rkom killed = Tib. bkum, slain; gun, dead; hgum, dgum, die (pp. 195, 368), 157 ḫbron°; 378 (pp. 196, 217). See also ḫrkom.

rkwa = Tib. bkah, command: antithetical to ḫwah, g-wah (pp. 339, 343-4). See also ḫrkwa. 122 -ḥdzam (pp. 292, 343).

hrkabs = rkabs, q.v. 271 ḫrko° (p. 339).

hrkah = rkaḥ I, q.v. 10 ḫldi°; 165 -myi-hrdho (pp. 296, 329).

hrkas = Tib. skas, ladder, staircase (pp. 348, 359). 57 -ḥthaṅ (p. 248).

hrko = rko, q.v. 271 -hrkabs; 332 ḫrkeg°; 333 ḫkeg° ḫhrko-hyuṭu.

hrkom = rkom, q.v. 285 -hrbōn; 313 -hrku-ḥsud; 331 ḫkrur° ḫbro (p. 296).

hrkwa = rkwa, q.v. 224 -ḥdzam (p. 343).

hlkyan = Tib. rkyan, kiang, wild ass. 188 -ḥzu (pp. 252, 353-4). See also ḫglyan.

skah = Tib. sga, saddle; sga-lag, saddle-frame; ska-rags, girdle. 45 -raḥ (p. 317).

skar = Tib. skar, star, constellation (p. 276). 191 rnam° (pp. 244, 315).

sku = Tib. sku, body (p. 355). 58, 164 -ḥphu-ḥti (pp. 194, 285, 300, 320). See also ḫsku, ḫskuhu.

skul = sku, q.v. See also ḫskuhu. — na (ra?) (p. 312). Cf. Tib. sku-ra.

ske = Tib. ske, throat, neck (pp. 288 n., 316, 355). See also pyi°, phylo°. 153 -ḥbrus; 158 ḫbro (p. 316).

skeg, P.N (p. 134)—not in text.

sko = Tib. sko, select, appoint. 91 -prom; 134 (?): 357 ḫ-whel°; cf. Tib. las-su-sko?

skyān ward off = Tib. skyān, bskaṇ, protect, defend (p. 221). 109 myag-ḥre°; 390 (p. 221).

skyar = Tib. skyar, bs.kyar, prop up, or kyor, weak, unfortified, or ḫkyor (-ḥbyin), (capable of being) thrown down? 205 ḫdzon°.

skyim = ḫkim, q.v., but always in the sense of 'house'. See also ḫskym.

— se, house-roof. 69, 374 -ḥse (pp. 248-9).
skye = Tib. skye, be born, live, thrive.
— *ta a Suffix (pp. 182–3), life (pp. 239, 293).

\[\text{hsku} = \text{hsku}, \text{sku}, \text{sku}, \text{q.v.}\]

\[\text{hskylm-se} = \text{skyim}, 18-\text{hrmo} \text{ho.}\]

K

khab, conceal = Tib. bkb, cover, shelter; khebs, hkkhebs, cover; gab, hgebs, bgab, khob, cover, conceal. 106 hkkh, speech concealing (p. 315). See also hkker, hkhob.

khar = Tib. mkhar, castle, citadel. See also hkkhar. 117 -hsom (p. 252).

kho, a chief? = hkh, hkhkho (p. 263). 217 -sne = Tib. gne, court, or gnèn?; 241 -re (pp. 263, 356).

khyag = hkg, hkhkg, bent, crooked (hkg, &c., palanquin, sedan-chair). 52 hkhic (p. 317).

khyan, matron (p. 240). 116 hksas-te; 190, 367 (?), 390 (pp. 240, 285). See also hkhyan.

khri = hkr, q.v. 52 hldag (p. 317).

khru = hkr, q.v. See also hkkhru, hkkhru, hkkhur, hkkhrur. 165 -hkah-my-hrdoho; 321 -hkg (p. 296).

khrom = hkkrom I or II (p. 304). 388 mor-tsah; cf. hksas-ge-ghroms 64 (pp. 216, 304).

hkh = hka II, house, q.v. 198 hlda (p. 234).

hkhad = Tib. hkhad, hkhod, hgod, build, level, settle, &c.? 324 -htohi = -hto (Suffix) + hi.

hkkah = hkkh, q.v. 105 hkhah (p. 315).

II = hkkh, q.v. 280 -rgye.
— *hgro, go home. 233, 239, 243 gro (p. 315).

hkkh (hkkha) -hdro, come to house. 106 (p. 261).

hkh = Tib. hgam. hkh, &c. cram into one's mouth, gobble, &c. (p. 240). See also hkm II. 292 hrie.

hkhah = hkhah I, q.v. 116 hksas; 163 -hlda (pp. 240, 315).
— *hldah (Suffix, p. 183), speaker. 137 (p. 315).
— *hrdza = hkh, q.v. 296 (p. 315).
— *gsan = hkhah. 329 (p. 314).

hkh = hkkhar, q.v.
— *hgy, town's business (?) (p. 283 n.). 192 (p. 283).
— *rpag, or hpag (pp. 195, 225–6).
17 hkhah; 128 hpag; 135 rpag (pp. 227, 243, 263, 305).
II for hcca-re or hkkhar-re? 197 rke-hldanho.

hkh = hkkhi, q.v. 212.

hkkhu I maternal uncle = Tib. khu, 'a-khu, uncle.
— *tsa (Suffix, pp. 187–8) 60 (p. 145).
II Some species of animal, perhaps a kind of wolf. 303 (p. 270).

hkkur = Tib. dger, grug, sgr, skur, bent down, crookback (p. 226). 6 hpg.

hkkhn = Tib. mkhyen, know. 92 (2) (pp. 295, 334).

hkhehi, i.e. hkhe = hke, gain, profit, + hi. See also hkhehe, hkehi (pp. 242, 282). 212 mye-bpehi (p. 240).

hkhehe = hke II, hkhehi, q.v. 251, 314 hah (pp. 224, 262, 274).

hkho I chief (?) (pp. 262–3). See also kho. 217–18 htor and htor-htbroh; 209 -hna (pp. 255, 263).
II top (connected with I?) (p. 263). 295 -hko = Tib. ri-kha, hill-top. See also hklh-hkkho.
III desire, want, have to = hko V (pp. 262–3). 336 hwi, have to make? Cf. 156 rma-bri hko, have to destroy?; 295 hno or is this hko I?
— *hdah 329 meaning? (p. 264). See also hhhh-hhta, hko-hita, hldah.
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हक्हो-र्नो = ह्को-र्नो, q.v. 189 stor°; 267 ह्कोग° (pp. 263, 285).

— ह्फ्याङ = ह्को-फ्याङ, q.v. 106 (p. 264).

ह्क्रोग I = ह्कोग I, q.v. 21 ह्छसा-gsom° (pp. 203, 306).

II = Tib. क्रोग, interior? 51 stो° (p. 328).

III friend? 101 ह्ताव-ह्जान . . .°; 107 ह्ताव-ह्जान°; 134 -ह्नो° (?).

IV = ह्कोग II secret (p. 221). 251 ह्नो°; 314 ह्नो° (p. 280).

ह्क्रोब = ह्केब I and ह्काब, conceal. 322 ल्पो° (pp. 171, 359).

See also ह्क्रो.

ह्क्रो-ह्ता = ह्क्हो-ह्दा, q.v. 328 (p. 264).

ह्कोही = ह्क्रो 1+hi 218 (pp. 255, 263).

ह्कोहु = ह्कोहु II, q.v. 106 -re; 292 ह्ताब°; 296 ह्ताब° (pp. 264, 298).

ह्कोहो = ह्को I, 129, 216 (pp. 263, 272).

II = ह्कोहो II. 291 ह्री° (p. 328).

ह्कोर = ह्कोर 1, retinue, entourage, etc. 18 ह्ज्सा°; 98 (? (p. 295).

Return (?) (read ह्कोर-रे? ). 293, 294, 296 (pp. 297–8).

ह्क्ववि seven? (p. 203).

— ह्छसा, old, elder? (p. 343). 259 (pp. 319, 343).

ह्क्यान = ह्क्यान मात्र, q.v. 212 (p. 240).

ह्क्याम = Tib. ह्क्याम, row, wander. 229 र्ने°; 237 र्ने°.

ह्क्येड = Tib. ह्क्येड, sufficient. 119; 123 मे°; 124 मे°; 127 (p. 288).

ह्क्रान = क्रान, q.v. and ह्क्रान. 127 ह्दा° (pp. 288–9).

ह्क्राम = Tib. ह्क्राम, hrams, bkram, dgram, spread, or khram, artful, lively, brisk. 332 -re (p. 305 and n. 1).

ह्क्रु, probably = ह्क्रु, q.v. 320 -re (p. 296). See also ह्क्रुहु.

— ह्द्यान 187 = क्रु° 388 (p. 312).

ह्क्रुहु-ह्योग = ह्क्रु°,ह्क्रु°322.

ह्क्रुहु = ह्क्रु-ह्योग 169 (pp. 157, 244, 296, 323).

स्क्रुड = Tib. skrud, put to flight. 9 र्ने° (p. 329).

G

गाङ 232, probably erroneous: see critical note.

g (possibly erroneous in 265, 279), a particle (pp. 173, 189–90, 204–5). passim.

गेहु = केहु, ह्केहु, ह्के II, q.v. (pp. 316, 368). 362 -prom.

go, not in text, = ह्को, vulture (p. 134).

गोन = Tib. go, upper, superior. See also ह्गोन. 179 ग्नां° ोमयां; 367 ह्यां° ोमयां.

ग्यान I = Tib. याण, क्याण, ग्यान, also, even, though (pp. 204, 311). See also याण. 263 (pp. 283, 313).

II precipice? = Tib. ग्याण. 313 -g-ri (p. 312).

III ग्यान-ग्याण = Tib. ह्क्यान, daily (pp. 295, 312). 92 स्नां° (p. 295).

ग्यिम home = क्यिम, ह्क्यिम, &c. q.v. 148 र्माण-रा° (pp. 246–7).

ग्रास, Tib. gra, arrangement; gras, order, rank, &c.; ह्क्रास, difference between two parties; dgra, enemy. 300 -re. See also ह्क्रास, ह्रास (pp. 266, 269, 306).

ग्री = Tib. ह्रेण, bear (p. 254). See also ह्ग्रेण. 109 याम°; 305, 307 ह्ग्राम° (pp. 231, 239).

ग्रो = Tib. ह्रो, go. See also ह्ग्रो. 243 ह्काब°.

ग्रोन = Tib. ग्रोन, expend. 158 ग्री-ता°.

ग्ला = Tib. ग्ला, wages (p. 251). See also ह्ग्ला, ह्ग्लार, ह्ग्लाण, ह्ग्लाण. 233 ह्ज्सा° ोह्नाग.

— ह्त्सा/ह्द्जो = Tib. ह्सिं, hire-lin (p. 251 and n.).

ग्लान I increase, get (?) = Tib. len, bhān, or else glan, requite, return. 66 स्नां°; 86 र्ने-स्ता°; 99 ग्येड-मा°; 176 ह्के-प्रोम°; 361 ह्रो-प्रोम° (p. 318).

II = Tib. ग्लान, ox (p. 378). 66 र्ने°; 174–6, 359, 360, 366 र्नू°, र्नू°.

III? 397.
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glab = Tib. lab, speak. See also hlab, hlobhi. 180 -hdo, a Suffix, p. 186 (pp. 168, 197).
glah = gla, wages, q.v. See also hglia, hglia-. 31 -tañ (??); 228 ḡwah⁰ (p. 251).
-ḥliad wage requital. 233, 236 (pp. 251, 338). See also hglia°.
glar = gla-re (p. 338).
glehu = Tib. glehu, gle, edge of plough-land (p. 368). 347-8 ḡrim⁰.
glo = Tib. glo, lungs, side; blo, mind, heart. See also ḡklo, ḡlo. II. 68 -hrañ; 93; 116 pu° (pp. 238, 268, 285, 336).
-ṭa (a Suffix, pp. 182-3), purpose. 157 -rdzogs (p. 182).
glog = Tib. glog, lightning. 269 smyi⁰ (p. 339).
glom = Tib. rlom, conceit, covet. See also ḡrłomhi. 60 gpha-tsea⁰; 85 ḡño-sta⁰; 346 ḡdam-sleg⁰ (pp. 145, 290).
glyāñ probably a (Tun-huang) mispronunciation of rgyāñ, q.v.: cf. ḡglyāñ = hlkyan, Tib. rkyan. 230 ḡhrañ⁰; cf. 147 (p. 225).
-ṛu, long-horn = ox. 347, 351.
dgu I hot, heat (pp. 232-3). See also ḡdgu. 225, 245 -ḥmu-hṭo; 75-6 -ḥtor (pp. 232, 273, 338).
-ḥldo (a Suffix, pp. 186-7), hotness. 74, 77, 78, 114, 139, 191, 309 -ḥtor (pp. 201, 223, 243, 266, 270, 282-3).
II = Tib. dgu, nine, all. See also ḡgu II. (p. 203). 127 stor⁰; 134 -sko (pp. 233, 288, 290).
dguhū-ḥmu-ḥto = dgu I°. 236, 244 (p. 232).
ḥgā-ḥldoñ = ḡgah⁰, q.v. 308 (p. 270).
ḥgag = Tib. ḡag, keg, hinder. See ḡkeg. 65 -re (p. 228).
ḥgañ = ḡkañ I, full, all, q.v. 104 (or ḡkañ II, house ?); 123 ḡyu⁰; 168 ḡri⁰; 194, 207 ḡkañ⁰; 392 (??) (pp. 147, 229, 238, 315).
ḥgab-ḥldo (a Suffix, pp. 186-7), hidden, covered. See ḡkab. 155 mehi⁰ (p. 282).

ḥgam I = Tib. gam, gams, posting-station, settlement (p. 243). See also ḡragam, ḡrgam. 78 mehi-ra⁰; 93 -phar; 110 -ḥphar; 118 -ḥkóm; 131, 133, 221 ḡthañ⁰; 191 ḡdhañ-na⁰; 193 ḡñañ-mo⁰, gso-nad⁰; 229 -lam; 289 -ḥpar; 396 ḡdhañ⁰ (pp. 238, 243-4, 293, 315, 336).
II = Tib. ḡgam, ḡkham, ḡgam, cram into mouth, gobble; kham, morsel, &c. 59 ḡrañ⁰ (p. 240).

ḥgah I place (?). 256 ḡrag⁰ (pp. 147, 173).
II = I? 283 -ḥrag/rag.
-ḥldoñ, some creature, or phenomenon, on mountains. 302, 369-11 (p. 270).

ḥgahī = ḡgah (Tib. ḡgah, joy)+ hi. 66 (p. 318).

ḥgar I = ḡkar I, separate off, pen, q.v. 69 ḡbhehi-la⁰ (p. 247).
II -ḥpu = Tib. mgar, smith. 289, 322 (p. 359).

ḥgu I a Suffix (pp. 190, 258). 226 mor⁰; 227 ḡmug⁰; 228 ḡbrī⁰; 303 ḡdom⁰; 304 ḡdom⁰ (pp. 256, 327).
II = Tib. dgu, nine, all (pp. 203, 233, 290). See also dgu II. 126 stor⁰.
III = ḡru, ḡṛgu, thief, q.v. 113 -ḥtor; 331 -ḥmor (p. 233).

ḥguñ? 395.

ḥgulu = ḡgu I. 312 ḡdom⁰ (p. 254).

ḥge I = ge. 5, 8 ḡnam⁰; 332 (pp. 223, 341).
II = Tib. ḡge, happiness, welfare. See also ḡgehe, ḡrghe. 73, 75 ḡwa-ste⁰; 252 ḡlab-re⁰ (pp. 273-4, 337-8).

ḥgehe = ḡge II, q.v. 75 ḡwa-ste⁰; 251 ḡbañ-re⁰, jo-re⁰ (pp. 273-4, 338).

ḥgo I = ḡko IV (Tib. ṣgo, gate) or ḡko III (Tib. go, place). 46 -ḥpo; 105 -ḥdro; 145 phyē⁰; 210 -ḥtoñ; 212 -ḥtön (pp. 200, 260-1, 286, 332).
II = Tib. go, vulture. 260 -ḥsor (p. 261).
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III ḡkha-hgo = Tib. kha-bsgo, advice. 105 (pp. 261, 315).
IV? 212 ḡkwaṅ; 358 ṡhe-geø, naø? (p. 261).

ḥgon = goṅ, q.v. 333 ḡroø; 367 ḡnaṅø.

ḥgon = ḡgon? 358 naø.

ḥgom = ḡkom II, q.v. 142 gdagø (p. 323).

ḥgoṅo = ḡgo I. 261 ḡ-rubø; 369 ḡ-hdzin (pp. 261, 342).

ḥgor = ḡkor II, delay, &c., q.v. 42, 143, 350 na-hldomø; 113 ḡnaha-hpoṅø; 201 ḡso-hldahø; 209 ḡkho-hṣaṅø (pp. 233, 238, 297, 299, 341).

ḥgwa-nehu = ḡwa I, ḡwaḥ I, -ne good work, q.v. 41 (pp. 338–40).

ḥgwah-hṛṣaṅ = ḡwaḥ/ḡwaḥ/g-waḥø q.v. 229.

ḥgweg-hwehe = Tib. sgeg-byed, charmer, or ḡgeg-byed, husband. 348 (pp. 248, 243).

ḥgyan I = ḡyaṅ III, daily (pp. 311–12). 7, 77, 200, 296.

II confused with ḡuyaṅ, spread, increase, hasten? 217, 392 ḡtor-ḥbronø.

ḥgyaṅs Aorist form of ḡyaṅa. 241 ḡmyi-ḥnuø; 292 ḡyaṅa-sto = Ṣos-to (pp. 237, 298).

ḥgyan I = Tib. g-yan, itch. 153 (read ḡyaṅni); 158 (p. 316).

II See ḡko/ḥkoḥo-ḥgyan.

ḥgyaḥ = ḡya, ḡyaḥ, ḡryaḥ, plain, q.v. 391 -ḥnaḥ-tsur.

ḥgyi, business (Tib. bgyid, bgyis, byi, gyis, do: or Chin. i < ges, Karlgren, no. 204 ?). 192 ḡkharø (p. 283 n.).

— -ka (a Suffix ?) 346 ḡyuø.

ḥgyud = ḡkyud lineage, &c., q.v. 16 ḡrdzoø (p. 258).

ḥgye = Tib. ḡye, light (ḥgyed, scatter). 12, 154 ḡkrom-ḥkrom (pp. 235–6).

ḥgyed, a species of bird? 39 -ge-ḥbaṅ.

ḥgyeb = ḡyeb I, ḡrgye, back, q.v. 221 -ḥkru-ḥbro (p. 296).

ḥgyeth = ḡye+h. 209 ḡphyu-ḥlidaṅø.

ḥgraṅ = Tib. graṅ, cold. 28 -ḥṇyir-ḥṇyir (p. 362).

ḥgran = Tib. ḡgran, dgran, adversary, rival. 355 (p. 230).

ḥgraḥ I = Tib. dgra, enemy; ḡbras, arrangement in parties, alinement (whence also bkra, ḡhra, criss-cross, variegated). See also ḡras, ḡgras, ḡras. 239 ḡchaø (pp. 313–14).

II, possibly I, or ḡ = Tib. sgra, sound? 8 meø; 20 meø.

ḥgras = ḡras, ḡras, aligned, q.v. 10 ḡtaṅø (p. 266).

ḥgri = ḡkri, ḡhri, support, chair, bed, q.v. 38 ḡṣi (pp. 299, 317).

ḥgru I = Tib. gru, gru-ma, corner, angle; gru-mo, elbow; yul-gru, locality (pp. 266, 306), perhaps originally a recess in mountains. 19 ḡldu-hroø (?); 24 ḡhram-gtam; 300 ḡriø (pp. 138, 306, 321). Or rock? (p. 306).

II = Tib. ḡgru, an ancient tribe of Tibet, perhaps the people of Gru, a district of Tibet lying to the east and north of Dbus (cf. Gru-gu Rgya-ra in Khams). Perhaps named from ḡgru I. See ḡḥru-ḥdhaṅ-ḥmaḥ and ḡpu (ḥphu, ḡbu) -ḥgru (pp. 307–9).

III = Tib. ḡgru, ḡgrus, bestow pains, diligence; brtson-ḥgrus, industry, energy. See ḡgru-ma, ḡgrus.

— -ma (a Suffix, p. 182), council meeting (ḥgru III, or of ḡgru people, ḡgru II); cf. Tib. ḡdun-ma. See also ḡrim-ge-ḥgrus, ḡldu-hro-ḥgru (pp. 148, 308–9, 369). 27 ḡti; 32 ḡkom; 77 ḡraṅ; 79 ḡstor (pp. 278, 309, 346).

— (II) -ḥdhaṅ-ḥmaḥ, P.N. (of the city of the ḡgru people?) (pp. 306–7). 21, 22, 30 ma; 35, 62 (p. 306).

ḥgrus = Tib. ḡgrus, Aorist of ḡgru III (or possibly = Tib. ḡgs) (pp. 308, 369). 293 ḡrim-geø; 297 ḡrim-geø (p. 298).
hgre = gre, bear, q.v. 17 gesaň̂ 305
rgam° (p. 221).

hgro = gro, come, go, q.v. 67 hko̱-
seo 233 hhhab 239 hhhab° (pp. 186, 315).

hgron. flourishes ? But see hkhrom, hkmroms, khrom (pp. 236, 305). 136
hgron. flourishing? But see hkhrom, hkmroms, khrom (pp. 236, 305). 136

hglə, wages = gla, q.v. 237 -hlađ.

hglah = gla, glah, hgla, q.v. 232

hglu (a possible reading: see critical
note) = hgru, 77, 79 (pp. 278, 309).

hglyan 307 (p. 252), mispronunciation
of hlkyan, kiań, q.v.: cf. glyan.

rgad = Tib. rgad, rgod, laugh (p. 348). 113 gtse-ne0.

rgam I = Tib. sgam, deep (p. 147). 241 hno 7;
256 -hgah (pp. 147, 173). 113

rgu = Tib. rku, lku, rkun, rgun,
steal, thief. See also hgu 111, hrgu (pp. 233, 347). 29

rgo = Tib. sgo, door, gate. See also
hko IV, hgo I, rgor (pp. 262, 292, 348). 120 ši; 258 -hldom;
314 -htoho (pp. 224, 291-2, 318).

- hraň̂, gate-ward = Tib. sgo-ra
-ba 315 (pp. 228, 292).

rgon I = Tib. gdon, wilderness,
solitude (pp. 349, 362). 39
-spu-rbu; 59 -hce-rgye (p. 286).

II = Tib. sgoń̂, sgoń-na, egg (pp.
332-3, 348). See also hrgon.

- wa, egg (Tib. sgoń-na?) 365, 366 (p. 332).

- ru, horn (sc. end) of an egg (p. 333).
103 (pp. 156, 333). See also hrgon.

rgor, Locative of rgo, door (p. 262).
96, 98 -hyos (pp. 262, 345).

rgya = Tib. rgya, plain, extent,
country; rgya-dkar, large orb, disk. See also rgyah, hrgyah.
271 -hrko-hrkabs; 272 -rkoks (p. 339).

- hni-ke, the two orbs (sc. sun and
moon, Tib. ni-zlaň-rgya-dkar) (pp. 271-2). See also rgyah°, hrgyah°.
53, 319 hke (pp. 271-2).

rgyag = Tib. rgyag, throw, cast,
found, &c. (pp. 235, 348). 27

rgyam = Tib. rgyam, rock; g-
yam, slab of stone; gyaın, recess
in a rock (pp. 280, 349). 109
tho°; cf. Tib. tho-rdo (p. 280).

rgyag-ňii-ke = rgya-hni-ke, q.v. 199.

rgyeg extent, extended, cf. Tib. dbye
(p. 196, 286, 291). See also
rgyehe, rgyes, hrgye. 57 (2),
59 (2), 60 hce°; 153 myi°; 154
hti°; 209 hldan°; 210 hcań°;
280 hhhab°; 383 -hlo (pp. 171-
2, 245, 248, 273, 286, 341-3).

rgyen put in order? (cf. Tib. yen-
yen) (pp. 256, 327, 350). 355
hrur-hiań°, hyan-re0° (pp. 256,
327, 329).

rgyed, divide, cause division or dis-
sension, Tib. hgye, hgyed, dis-
tribute, &c.; hgyed-ma, dissen-
sion (pp. 139-40, 196, 290-3,
350). See also hrgyed. 105
-hsto-dro; -hgo-hdro; 106
-hkab/ -hkhab-hdro; 192 -hrań-
smes° (pp. 261, 283).
rgyed-ḥdre, division-inducing. 87; 94 ḥtre; 248 ḥtre (pp. 140, 291, 340).

-ḥḷdag-nāg, division black-back. 112 (p. 291).

-ṛmaṅ, division-army, 149.

-ма (a Suffix, p. 182) division. 90, 93, 99, 101, 104–5, 107, 231 (pp. 291, 293, 315).

-ḥraḥ, place of division. 87 ḥra, Locative; 216, 248 ḥra; 341, 342 (?), 392 (p. 140).

-ḥra. See ḥṛaḥ.

-ṛṣaṅ, secret division. 35 (pp. 244, 283).

rgyen = Tib. gyen, steep, uphill, difficult (pp. 145–6, 268, 350). See also ḥṛgyen. 158 ḥde-tā; 197 ḥmye-ḥtaḥ; 374–7 ḥkad-ḥroṅ-re (pp. 145, 268).

ṛgyeni = ḥgyen- ni. 198 (p. 341).

ṛgyeb I = Tib. ḥryab, back (Noun, Adverb, or Verb) (pp. 196, 228–9, 348). See also ḡṛgyeb.

ṛgyeb, ḡṛgyebs. 133 draw-back; 190 -ḥpuhi-ḥto; 282 -ḥpuhi-ḥpuḥi; 345 -ḥeḥi: Adverb (pp. 228–9, 269).

II, for ḥkṛyebs, fill, q.v., or = Tib. Ḹkhebs, Ḹkhebs, Ḹghebs, cover? 116 mu (p. 285).

ṛgyebs, Aorist of ḥrgyebs I, q.v. 139 'retrieves' (p. 228).

ṛgyehe = ḥgye, q.v. 54.

ṛgyer = Tib. ḥgyer, drop, abandon. 365 ḥiḥyaṇ (pp. 332, 350).

ṛgyes, Aorist of ḥrgyes, q.v. 199 ḥkom (p. 320).

ṛgyo = Tib. ḥgyo, copulate. See also ḡṛgyoho, ḡṛgyohon, ḡṛgyo, ḡṛgyon, ḡryo. 48, 323 ḥcheho; 330 -ḥto; 331 -ḥto (pp. 178, 348).

ṛgyoho = ḥgyo, q.v. 335, 336 -ḥto-stiḥ (p. 367).

ṛgyohon = ḥgyo, ḡṛgyoho. 336 (p. 223).

ḥṛgan ripe, cf. Tib. ḡran old. 160 ḡtsaṅ-myi (pp. 145–6.)

ḥṛgam = ḡram II, q.v. 133 ḡthaṅ; 169 ḡrpeḥi; 259 ḡpaḥ; 286 ḡpeḥi-ḥldaḥ; 304 ḡliyo; 305 -greḥ; 306 ḡmaṅ-ge; 307 ḡmaṅ; 316 ḡstṣag (pp. 231, 239, 244, 256, 262, 323).

ḥṛgu, steal, thief = ḡru, q.v. 30, 32 -ḥto-ḥrun; 58, 165 -ma-gzo (pp. 199, 233, 277, 335).

ḥṛgehi = ḡṛgehi, ḡe II, q.v. 58 -sto = ḡṛgehis-to (pp. 233, 349).

ḥṛgebe = ḡṛgehi, ḡe, II, q.v. 72 ḡyaḥ (p. 361).

ḥṛgoṅ-ḥru = ḡṛgoṅ-ru, q.v.

ḥṛgod. See ḡṛsehi. 208.

ḥṛgom, passed over, cf. Tib. ḡgom, tread, leap over, pass over; ḡgom, ḡgoms, ḡom, pace; ḡoms, skilled, practised, whence sgom, ḡsgom, contemplate (pp. 157, 245–5, 348). 169 (pp. 157, 244, 296, 323).

ḥṛgya-ḥni-ḥkaḥe = ḡṛgya-ḥni-ke, q.v. 295.

ḥṛgyaṅ-sto = ḡṛgyaṇs-to, being extended or hastening: see ḡṛgyaṇ. 242 ḡha-hnu (p. 237).

ḥṛgyaḥ = ḡṛgya plain, &c., q.v.? 327 -ḥdiḥi (p. 317).

ḥṛgyaḥ-ḥni-ḥke (ḥkehe) = ḡṛgya-ḥni-ke, q.v. 291, 319.

ḥṛgyu = Tib. ḡryu, material (pp. 286, 348). 60 ḡldaṇ (p. 286).

ḥṛgye I, error for ḡṛgyed, q.v. 326 -ḥyo.

II = ḡrye, q.v. 382 -ḥrdza, greatly friendly: cf. ḡrye-ḥło.


ḥṛgyed = ḡṛgyed, q.v. 393 -ḥšaṅ-sme.

-ḥyo. 326 ḡṛgye; 338.

-ḥṛaḥ, ḡṛar. 216 ḡraḥ, ḡr; 243 ḡr; 246 ḡṛar.

ḥṛgyen = ḡṛgyen, q.v. 373 ḡkad-ḥroṅ-re.

ḥṛgyeb = ḡṛgyeb I, back, &c., q.v.

-ḥkru (ḥkruḥu, ḡkruḥu)-ḥbro. 297, 321 ḡkruḥu-hpro; 323 ḡkruḥu (pp. 228–9).

-ḥkruḥo. 316 (p. 296).

ḥṛgyo = ḡṛgo, q.v. 330 -ḥṣeg (p. 178).
VOCABULARY

hṛgyon = rgyo, rgyoḥon, q.v. 336 (p. 223).

Igyoḥo? = Tib. g-yo, move, shake. Cf. g-yo, hyos; 11 (pp. 270, 354).

ña I used sometimes in place of the Postposition na (pp. 179–81, 193–4), when following -ṇ (p. 360). 56 ḥbỹiṅo; 56 reo (?); 199, 201, 206, 207 ṡmaṇo (?).

II = Tib. ingleton, five? (pp. 203, 241); 54 -hke (?).


ṉāṇ = Tib. ignment, bad, 158 chos-ta (pp. 145–6).

nāḥ, home, cf. Tib. nā-ma, house-mistress, and, as regards the ṇi, pp. 238, 360. See also ṣnaḥ I, na II, nāḥa I.

nār = Tib. ēar, strength, vigour (pp. 144, 300, 361). See also nar, ṣnār, ṣnar. 204 pa = Tib. ṭpa (pp. 300, 361).

ṅal (not in text) (p. 133).

ṅur = Tib. ēur, grunt, cf. ēu, ēud, weep, sob. See also ṣnur, ṣnū, ṣnū-ṅūr. 85 -ṅur (p. 290).

ṅor. See ṣnhr.

ṛnār (Locative) = Tib. mār, power, mastery. 261 (p. 342).

ṛṇa, error for ṣnaḥ: see critical note. 188 (p. 252).

ṛṇad = Tib. ignment, vapour, fragrance, evaporate (pp. 294, 321). See also ṣnṛṇad. 90 ṭḥog-ḥramō.

ṛṇaḥ I = nāḥ, q.v. (pp. 238–9). 56 -he; 307 -na; 326 -hpag; 328 -hpag (pp. 196, 239).

II = Hsi-hsia ṣṇaḥ, empty, sky = ṣna in mystical Buddhism (see Ś. C. Das’ Dictionary)? Generally in the phrase re-ṛṇaḥ, there is absence (void) of (p. 239). 49 ṭṛḍzo; for ṭḍzo-re; 37 ṭETO; 235 -sto = ṣnṛṇas-to; 291 reo; 369 ṭṛḍzo, for ṭḍzo-re; 363 reo (pp. 239, 288, 298).

ṛṇaḥ (I) = ṭo, house-wife 193 (pp. 196, 238).

ṛṇaḥgaṅ = ṭṇag+bi. See ṣāṅ I, ṭṇag I. 137 (pp. 218, 275, 315, 338).

ṛṇaḥd = ṭṇad, q.v. 116 ṭyāḥ-ṛṇeṅo (p. 217).

ṛṇar = ṭṇar, q.v.? 357 phlaṅ.

ṛṇas, error for ṣsaṅs (see critical note)? 144 ṭṛṇe-ḥdaṅo.

ṛṇu = Tib. ēu, weep, sob: see ṣnur.

— ṣnūr for ṣnūr-ṅūr. 348.

— -ḥdo (Suffix, pp. 186–7), weeping. 355 (p. 256).

ṛṇud = Tib. ēu, ēud, weep, sob. 41 -nohu.

ṛṇur = ēu, q.v. 60 ṭṇur; 61 -ṅur; 348 ṭṇu; 355 -ṅaḥ (pp. 145, 172, 256, 327).

ṛṇuraṅ, erroneous reading (for ṭṛṇa) in 230.

ṛṇe, error (for ṭṛṇye?). 364.

ṛṇeḥi. 115. See ṭyāḥ (pp. 191, 217).

ṛño I = Tib. ēo, face, etc.; ēo-ḳog, openly and secretly (pp. 220–1). 251 -ḥkhog-lto; 258 -ḥdaṇ; 314 -ḥkho; 322 -ḥkhob (pp. 171, 221, 280).

II friend, side = Tib. ēo, ēos, state, person, direction (pp. 220–1, 266). See also ṣnṛṇon, ṭṇoḥu, ṭṇoḥo, ṭṇor I. 56 ṭne; 133 ṭne-ṛe; 241 -ṛgam; 264–5, 279, 295 -ḥko; 299 hṛi; 347 ṭṛṇeḥo; 372 ṭṛṇe (pp. 219–21).

— (II) -stā = -s-ta, friend. 85 (pp. 290, 341).

— (II) -stō = -s-to, friend. 84, 85.

— (II) -stōr, friends fled or lost (pp. 219–20, 290). 79, 119, 127, 128, 143, 196, 257 (pp. 294, 303, 309).

— (I) -bro, flee into space. 108 (p. 221).

— (II) -ra, group (or place) of friends. 264, 265, 279.

ṛṇon = ṭṇo II. 265 -kyā.

— ṇa (Suffix, pp. 182–3) friendship. 265.

ṛṇoḥu = ṭṇo II. 206.
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\[\text{hr}n\text{u} = \text{Tib. r}\nu, \text{pain.} \quad 9 \quad \text{-skhrud (pp. 329, 348)}.

\[\text{hr}n\text{e} = \text{rie, q.v.} \quad 16 \quad \text{-g}sa\text{n; 119, 127, 141, 144 -h}l\text{da}n; \quad 292 \quad \text{-hkham; 322 -h}d\text{am; 361 -h}po; \quad 372 -\text{h}ho; \quad 385 \quad \text{-hrom (pp. 145, 220, 221, 274, 288, 316, 335)}.

\[\text{hr}n\text{e} = \text{hr}n\text{e} = \text{hr}n\text{e}; \quad 303 \quad \text{-h}ho (p. 270).

\[\text{hr}n\text{e} = \text{hr}n\text{e} = \text{hr}n\text{e}; \quad 131, \quad 347 -\text{h}ho.

\[\text{hr}n\text{o} = \text{ro}, \text{q.v.} \quad 16 \quad \text{-hyod; 49 -hca}n; \quad 188 -re; \quad 189 \text{h}ko^o; \quad 214 \text{h}ldo^o; \quad 269 \text{h}wa^o; \quad 368 \text{-hpra}n (pp. 239, 252, 253, 258, 263, 285, 339).

\[\text{hr}n\text{ho} = \text{hr}n\text{o}. \quad 302 \quad \text{-h}ni^o.

\[\text{hr}n\text{or} = \text{hr}n\text{or}. \quad 171 \quad \text{ht}i^o; \quad 339 \quad \text{h}ldo^o (pp. 257-8).

\[\text{ca} = \text{h}cah, \text{q.v.} \quad 235 -\text{ya}n (pp. 303-4).

\[\text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} (p. 219). \quad \text{See also}\ \text{ca}.

\[\text{ca} = \text{ch}en, \text{q.v.} \quad \text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} (pp. 221, 362).

\[\text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} (p. 283).

\[\text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} = \text{ca} (pp. 244, 283, 359).

\[\text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} (pp. 192, 202, 342).

\[\text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} = \text{cl} (pp. 234). \quad \text{See also}\ \text{cl}.
VOCABULARY

186 -htor; 188 -tor; 192 -htar (pp. 305, 331).

cis ? 84 -tsha (pp. 259, 359). Cf. gci, chI II, chis?

c = hce, q.v. 51 -rgyan (pp. 321, 328).

cog, not in text (pp. 132, 368). See gcog.

gci = Tib. mehi, go. See also gcihi, hci, hcihI. 47 -me (p. 286).

gcig = cig, q.v. 356 ste-he-hdzu-ge°.

gcihi = gci? 346 hdam-sleg°.

gceg = Tib. hcheg, tseg, tshugs, check, &c. (p. 294). See also hceg, tseg, gcseg. 234 hso- hnah°.

gcog meadow (p. 249), or possibly = Tib. lcog, roof. 69 -hide-hldu (pp. 247, 249, 321).

hcag = Tib. cag-ga, care; chag-rgyag, doubt.
— -rgyag, hesitation. 83 (p. 259).

hcOn I = cañ II, q.v. 48 gso°; 49 hri°; 299 hdlOn° (pp. 239, 265).

II = cañ III, q.v. 210 -rgye (p. 245).

hcam. 247 -hjam-htam.

hcañ = Tib. hchah, hchas, snap at, mangle (pp. 252–3). 82 -rte (?); 115 -htso-hsal; 240 -hyan (pp. 252–3, 259, 303, 320). See also ca-yañ, mehI (hmehI)-kIu-hcah.

hci = gci. 300 hri°; 348 hrim-glebu-ge° (?) (pp. 265–6, 340).

hcig = cig, q.v. 208 hkañ° (p. 234).

hcIhi = gci, q.v. 205 rmag°; 350 -htoho, a Suffix, pp. 184–6 (pp. 300, 361).

hce = Tib. che, chen, gchen, ched, ches, great. See also hche, hches. 53 na°; 54 hko-rno°; 57 rgyna°.
— -rgyan, of great extent. 16, 50, 52 (2), 55 (pp. 267, 291, 327).
— -rgye, of great extent. 57(2), 59 (2), 60 (pp. 286, 291).

-hmu, great cold = death. 200, 206 (pp. 222, 232).

-ra (hra, hrah), great place. 49, 50 hra; 56 hrah (p. 313).

hceg = gceg, q.v. 250 (p. 294).

cer = Tib. gcer, bcer, glare, stare; ce-re, cer-re, with fixed stare (p. 304). 71 hcha-ge°; 202 ne°; 388 hyan-tsa° (pp. 216, 222, 274, 304, 359).

hcO = Tib. jo, gtsO, jo-co, rjo, gtsO, cho, chief, lord. 55 (2) (p. 263).

hco I. See hkah-hcoh.

II = htsog, assemble, &c., q.v.
— -hram-hdo = htsog°, harmony. 87.

hscah = htsah, q.v. (p. 278). 166 -gyer; 296 -hyer.

Ch

cha I = Tib. cha, part, tidings, affair; khyim-cha, household prospects, &c. See also hca, hchah. 98 hmo° (p. 345).

II. See mehI°.

— -hru? See also hcha-hru. 203 -hwards.

cañ I = cañ I, q.v. 263 -rdzum (p. 283).

II = cañ II, hcañ I. 76 hdo°; 91 se° (pp. 283–4).

III = Tib. hchah, bcañs, hold, carry. 261 phrey° (pp. 239, 283).

chad = Tib. hchad, chod, gcod, bcad, gcod, cut, fix, decide. 165 -rmu (p. 276).


hil I = ci, q.v. 260, 281 hdo° (p. 239).

II = gci, go, q.v. See also hchi.

168 -hrmu; 385 -te, a Suffix (pp. 274, 276).

chim = Tib. hchim, htsaim, become full (e.g. the moon), satisfy, &c. See also hchim, htsaim, chis.

— -hdim, waxing-waning, impermanent? 199 (pp. 320–1).

chis, error for chim, q.v.? or = Tib. mchis, come! 94 gdim° (pp. 320–1, 359). See also tshis.

cho (not in text), tiger (p. 132).
chos = *Tib. hchos, bco, bcos, chos, make, arrange, originate, etc.; cho-rigs, lineage, etc. See also ḥchos. 159 -hreo (p. 145).
— -ta (a *Suffix, p. 182). 158 (pp. 145–6).

ghcheg = ggeg, ḥceg, q.v. 111 ḥso-.hnaḥø (p. 293).

ḥcha = ḥcaḥ, q.v. See also mēḥi-klu. 71 -ge-ḥceer; 239 -hgrah (?) (pp. 253, 304).

ḥchan 349-ḥjim.

ḥchaḥ = cha I. 97 ḥmoø (p. 345).
— -yañ 242 = caø, ḥcaḥø (pp. 303–4).

ḥchi = gci, chi II, go, q.v. 183 -ḥdo; 345 -ḥro; 353 -ḥdo (pp. 186, 269, 276, 329).

ḥchim = ḥtshim, cf. chim. 38 ḥși-.ḥgriø (p. 299).

ḥchir 233 -ḥtsah-sto.

ḥchuñ = *Tib. cuñ, gcuñ, chuñ, small. 185 ḥtør-ḥdoø (p. 139).

ḥche = ḥce, q.v., or *Tib. gcce, dear, important, 115 ḥrañø; 117 rañø (p. 252).
— -ḥmu, great cold, death = ḥceø; 204 (p. 200).
— -ṛgyo population. 323 (p. 246).

ḥches = ḥce, q.v. (pp. 359–60). 322 ḥgar-ḥpuø (p. 359).

ḥchos = chos, q.v. 153 -ḥyo; 159 ḥnaḥø; 160 šiø (pp. 145, 172, 174, 217, 263, 320).

J

je, error for dze. 116 (pp. 240, 315).
jo = *Tib. bzo, work? See also ḥjo, ḥjoø. 251 -re; 253 -me (pp. 274–5).
jon = ḥjoø, ḥdzøñ, q.v. 78 ḥmoø (p. 243).

ḥjan, see ḥlan. 101, 107.

ḥjam = *Tib. hjam, gentle, mild, pleasant. See also ḥdzam (pp. 297, 339). 186 -ge-hmebi, -htam; 269 ḥṛñoø; 273 ḥñoøø; 274 -ṛño (pp. 281, 317).

ḥjah = ḥdzah, eat, q.v. 92 -ḥtaḥ, a *Suffix, p. 182 (p. 334).

ḥjar = ḥdzar, stick, stick together, q.v. 220 ḥdruø (pp. 173, 366).

ḥji = *Tib. ḥji, ḥji, flea, no matter? See also ḥjìhi, ḥhrjìhi (p. 231).
(Or, per contra = *Tib. lje, ḥji, heavy?). 211 -rdañ (p. 260).


ḥjìhi = ḥji, q.v. 78 -re; 306 (pp. 244, 231).

ḥju, ass, cf. *Tib. gzù-lum, obstinate (p. 252). See also ḡdzu, ḡdzu, ḡzu, ḡzu, ḡjuñ. 115 ḥrañø-ḥceø (p. 252).

ḥjùñ, tiger = ḥju, q.v. 312 -ḥbrad (p. 254).

ḥjo I = *Tib. jo, &c. See ḡco. 63 ḡyañ-tseø; 78 ḡdyanø; 154 ḡchos-ḥyoø; 201 ḡtroø; 372 ḡdyan-ḥyuø; 385 -chi-te (?) (pp. 244). 387 ḡdyan-ḥyuø; 389 ḡdyanø (pp. 273–4, 305, 331).
— -ḥdzin, govern. 74 (p. 274).

II = jo, work, q.v. See also ḡjoø. 67, 70 -me-ḥdub (pp. 274, 335).

III = *Tib. za, zo, &c., eat. 177 (pp. 274, 335).

IV error (for ḥto) ? 69 thar-ṣyaø (pp. 247–8).

ḥjoñ = ḡdzøñ, fort, q.v. See also joñ. 118 ḡmoø; 129 ḡmoø (pp. 243, 263).

ḥjoø = ḡzo, man, q.v. 137 -ḥwa-ḥkañ (pp. 218, 338).

ḥjoø = ḡjo II, work. 34 (p. 275).

ḥjor = *Tib. cor, clamour, &c. 194 ḡkhañ-ḥgañø (pp. 238, 315).

ṛje = *Tib. rje, chieftain. 37 -ṣmyi-ṛmad; 138 ḡdzchuø (pp. 218, 228, 237). See also ḡrıje.

ṛjes = *Tib. rjes, trace? 201 pyiø (pp. 222, 274, 359).

ḥrıjìhi, r-form of ḡjìhi, ḡjìhi, q.v. 213 ḡbos-ḥdomø.

ḥrıje = rje, chieftain, q.v. 84 -ṣmyi-ṛmad (p. 227). 36 ḡdyoø. 36 (p. 244).
N

ṇe = Tib. ŋes, evil, &c. (pp. 221–2).
See also ŋene, ŋes, ōne, ōne, rēne, rēne, ḍrīne, ḍrīne, ḍkyah-hwa-ṇe.
17 -ḥkyeb-ḥkyeb; 149 sēn; 229 sēna; 343 -hēs (pp. 221–2, 256, 313).

ṇene = ŋe-ne? 328 sēna.

ṇer (ḥkyah-hwa-o) = ŋe-re. 340 (p. 253).

ṇes, Aorist form of ōe = Tib. ŋes.
153 -re; 158 -re; 192 (pp. 283, 316).

gūl = Tib. nū, gūn, sun. See also ḍhūl (pp. 271–2). 80 -ḥrdum; 199 ḍgyah-gūn-ke (pp. 186, 271, 293).

gūlm = Tib. nūn, gūn, day. 12 -htu (pp. 235–6, 362).

ḥuṇa I = Chin. ṇaṇ, female. 45 -hya (p. 343).
II, hear? 385 -hyaḥ-ḥtah (p. 331).

ḥūi I = Tib. ṅī, gūn, sun (pp. 272–3). See also ḍhūs. 67 ḍlab-ma (p. 272).
II = Tib. gūs, nū, woo (pp. 234–5). See also sūl. 140 -stor.

ḥūs, Aorist form of ḍhū I, q.v. 70 ḍlab-ma (pp. 173, 273, 358).

ṇe = ōe, q.v. 209 -nag; 343 sroō; 361 -ḥpo; 339 sroō (pp. 256, 274, 316).

ṝned = Tib. mūś, mūned, &c., tan, make pliable. 31 -ḥtram; 47 -ge-slug (p. 251).

ḥūo = Tib. ōo, buy, trade. 174, 177 ḍroo; 359, 361 droo, ḍroo.

ṝnul = Tib. rūnīd, brūnīd, ṛnīd, fade, grieve; ṛnīd, worn out, faded; cf.
ṇīn, old, ṛnīd, sleep. See also ḍhrūl. 389 sēna-ṛṇī-re.

ṇīe, r-form of ōe, evil. See also, ṛṇye, ḍhrīne (pp. 222, 360, 362).
146 -ḥne-hrmag; 149 rmag; 200 -ne; 201 ḍho; 229, 237 -ḥkhym; 301-ne; 341 -ḥprom;
343 -hē-ḥsēs; 358 -ge-hgo (pp. 221–2, 261, 274, 313, 321).
— ḍhlad, requital of evil (p. 223).

230, 231, 232, 235 la; 237, 239 (pp. 183, 303).

ṛṇeḥe = ōe, q.v. 297 -ḥbrom.

ḥhrūl = ōe, q.v. 63 ḍyan-ḥso; 298 ḍhos-stsah (p. 303).

ḥhrīne = ōe? 352 mehi-chā.

sēna I = Tib. sēna, heart. See also sēnī. 92 -gyan; 102–3 (? see II); 389 -ṛṇī (pp. 156, 295, 333–4).
— -ne, good heart (or II?). 65 ḍhpah-ma; 160 -ṭhe; 328 ŋene (pp. 222, 318).
— -ṇe, evil-heart. 229, 328 ŋene (pp. 222). See also sēnī.
II = Tib. sēna, agreeable, affectionate. 66-glaṇ; 102–3 (? see I) (p. 318).
— -do (a Suffix, p. 186), affection. 86.

sēnā, probably for sēna-re (metre), and possibly sēna = Tib. sēna,

sēnī I = Tib. gūs, two. See also ḍhū I
II (pp. 203, 235, 356). 23 gosom.
II = Tib. rūnī/sēnī, snare, trap.
219 (p. 272).

sēnīn = Tib. sēnīn, heart. See also sēnī I. 168 -ḥkan (p. 147).
— -ṇē, evil-heart = sēnā. 149 (p. 222).


T

ta, a Suffix, appended chiefly to words of Verbal, or at least Adjectival, sense. See also taḥ, ṭa I,
ḥṭah I, tha I, sta I, stāth I. (pp. 182–3, 187). See under
skyā-, glo-, ḍnōn-, chos-, ḍhmīm, ḍṭan-, stor-, ḍhāb-, ḍde-,
byin-, ḍmōn-, ḍwaṇ-, ḍwar-, g-yah-, hyed-ge,
ḥō-, ḍrom-, ḍ-ri-, ḍhab-, bsl-, ḍsēs-, ḍsō-ḥtī-ge.

ṭaḥ = ta. See byin-, ḍsān-,

ghā (1).

te, a Suffix, appended normally, with the sense of a Gerund, to Verbal
words. See also ḥte, ste I, ḥste I (pp. 136, 140, 188-90). See under chi-, ḥtaḥ-ma-, puṅ-, ḥphom-, ḥsod-, ḥsas-. to, a Suffix, appended to Verbal or other words, with the sense of ‘being’ or ‘becoming’, and constituting a Verb Finite (‘is’), an Infinitive or Participle. See also tor III, ḥto I, ḥtos, ḥtoḥo, ḥtoḥi, ḥtoḥu, ḥtor I, ḥtoni, sto I (pp. 184-6). See under ḥtad-, stor-, ḥdam-, ḥpā-, ḥprom-, ḥmu-, ḡ-yah-.

tor I great, perhaps derived in ancient times from an early form of Chinese ta. See also ḥtor II. 50 ḥldyo°; 219 -sīi; 174 -dro-. ḥ-no; 64 -hpu-hgru; 216 -hbroh; 219 -sīi; 337 -ḥrtah; 388 -kru (pp. 263, 272, 305, 308).

II = thor, ḥthor, q.v. 148 -ḥtas-prom (p. 302).

III written in place of to-re: cf. ḥtor I. 188 cig-dze° (p. 305).

twaḥ = Tib. thoḥ, ram? 48 -mag-. ḥ-no; 261, 275 (pp. 342-3).

tyaḥ 213 ḥhehi° ordhe (p. 253).

trog, enemy? (pp. 220-2). See also ḥtrog. 201 -hjo-rne; 266 -ḥtor (pp. 221, 222, 274).

gṭaḥ = Tib. gtoḥ, gtaḥ, btaḥ, send, let go, allow, &c. See also gtoḥ, ḥtoḥ, ḥthon, ḥthoḥ (p. 331).

gṭaḥ = Tib. gtah, pledge, hostage. See also gtar. 111 -ḥbom-rbo (p. 230).

gtar, written for gtah-re? 43.

gṭoḥ = gtḥ, ḥtoḥ, q.v. 211 hgo° (pp. 200, 261, 332).

ḥṭa I, a Suffix = ta, q.v. 181 grṭhe (p. 156, 197).

II = Tib. ḥla, now, &c. See also ḥṭah. 185 (p. 186).

ḥṭag = Tib. thag, ropc, ḥdogs, btags, glags. tie, &c. 34 ḥyo° (p. 275).

—ḥṭo (a Suffix, pp. 184-6). 278 ḥtos; 279 ḥtos, ḥto: 285.

ḥṭaṇ I = gtan, q.v. 94 ḥtsog°; 96 ḥtsog°. See also ḥṭaṇ III.

II = Tib. thaṇ, measure, power, 9 mor°; 10 ḥyaṇ°; 39 mye°; 149 me°; 315 ḥyaḥ°; 318 ḥyaḥ°. See also ḥṭaṇ II, ḥthaw, ḥṭhwaṇ (pp. 227, 276, 296, 301-2).

III = Tib. thaṇ, plateau, field. See also thaṇ, ḥṭaṇ I. 14 -ḥlhu; 218 -hrdz (pp. 258, 321).

IV? 11 -hmhu-hro; 96 kyo° ḥta (pp. 270, 329).

ḥṭad = Tib. gtad, gtd, btd, hand over, deliver, press, urge, gtd, steady, firm, 30 gṣaṇ-re°.

ḥṭab = Chinese ta (A. tap), answer. 293, 295 -hkhohu (pp. 264, 298).

ḥṭam I = Tib. ḥtham, ḥthams, thams, join, enlock, stick fast, thams-cad, all. See also ḥtham. 24 hsrma°; 54 steh° (pp. 138, 306, 353).

II = Tib. gtam, speech, story, 60 ḥldaṇ-gryn°; 248 ḥjam° (p. 286).

ḥṭaḥ I a Suffix = ta, q.v. See under klu-, ḥkor-, ḥkhoḥ-, ḥjah-, ḥṭor-, stor-, ḥlde-, ḥidehi-, ḥldyaṇ-, me-, ḥmye-, ḥdzoṃ-, ḥyah-, ḥwa-ste-, rwye-, ġ-ri-, ḥram-ge-, gse-, ḥse- (hrnab-hldah-?).

II = ḥta II? 185 (p. 186).


ḥṭar I = Tib. thar, be released, escape. See also ḥṭar I, ḥṭar I, ḥko-ḥtar. 146 ḥnam-hdzaṃ (pp. 261, 300).

II = Tib. mṭhaḥ, at the end; mṭhaḥ, extremity, border. See also ḥṭar II, ḥṭhar II. 374 -phyaṇ-ḥto; 392 -ma? (pp. 248-9).

ḥṭas = Tib. ḥṭas, hard, solid, stiff; brta, bṛtas, rtas, expand, widen, be abundant. 256 -kro.

—ḥṭom, become tangled? 121, 148, 257 ḥṭor° (pp. 292, 302).

ḥṭi I = Tib. gtis-mug, gloom, cf. gtibs, thib, thibs, &c.; dark, dense. 12 ḣnīm°; 26 ḥldye-ḥldyi°?; 154 -ṛgye; 385 hrom-ge° (pp. 174, 235-6).
II = Tib. sti, stis, bsti, bstis, stop, rest. See also sti. 19 -hwer; 27 hgru-ma°; 104 sku-hphu°; 153 myi-re°; 171 -hrivo; 351 hšehe° (?) ; 354 hšo°; 390 gđzu° (?) (pp. 174, 236, 257, 285, 309).

htib = Tib. rtib, rtbs, rtib, rtbs, break down; ltdib, rdib, collapse. 19 -bzer (pp. 339-40).

htuhu = hthu, assemble, q.v. 100 (pp. 260, 321).

htul = Tib. hdl, btl, thul, gdul, dul, brtul, &c., tame, discipline, conquer. See also hthul. 42 hklom-ge°; 170 hkohe-me°; 378 hše-ge° (pp. 244, 280, 285).

hte = te, Gerund-suffix, q.v. See under hša-, hšre-, hšog-, hšor-, hšri-hdre (and hšrhe)-, hšre-, rdam-, hšnam-, hšram-, hše-.

hto = I a Suffix and 'is'-Verb = to, q.v. See under klu, hko, hškru-re-, dguhú-mu-, hṛgam-re-, hrugu, ḥgyo, ḥgyo-ho, stor-, hnu, hrom-, hšrom-, hšpud, phrom-, hšphrom-, hšmaṅ, hšthu, hšdzho, hyah-, re-, g-ri-. See also htni, htoho, htor.

II? = Tib. mtho, high, or tho, boundary (pp. 248, 261, 332). 210 hdyañ°; 374 phyaṅ° (pp. 248, 280).

htog = htog, stop, q.v. 235 ḥbehi-hbaḥ° (pp. 250, 301).

hton = gtn, gtn, q.v. 100 naram°; 119 hno-stor°; 146 hraḥ°; 190 hphubio°; 210 ḥdyañ-hto°; 212 hko°; 247 hlad°; 273 ḥraḥ°; 328 ḥraḥ° (pp. 217, 228, 261, 285, 332).

hton = (Tib. mthon, 'high'). 223 (-hkoṇ).

II for hto-na. 280, 285 htag°.

htonl = hto + ni. 150 stor-hṭah°; 152 stor-ta°.

htom = 364 -hphah.

htohl = hto + hī. 324 hkhad°.

htohu = hto? (p. 369). 7 hṛño°.

htoho = hto, q.v. See under rgo-, hčihi-, stor-, ḥprom-, ḥrbom-, ḥṛyo-, rman-dze-, ḥyaḥ-.

ḥtor I written in place of hto-re (see pp. 172-5 and critical notes). See also tor. 96 htaṅ-ta° (?) ; 104 hdoṅ° (?) ; 186 cįg-dzoe°; 187 ḥāi° (?) ; 192 cįg-dzoe°; 225, 245 dgu-hmu°; 341 rgyed-hraḥ°; 393 ḥdam° (?) ; 394 (?) .

II = tor I great, q.v. Preceding hko 217, 218; ḥkhru-hṛgyaṅ 187; ḥni 215; sōṅ (sāṅ) 168; 389; hṛta (hṛtaḥ) 124, 231, 271, 340, 341 (hṭah); ḥdṛo-hño 177, 359, 361; ḥpu (ḥpuḥu, ḥpu, ḥbu) 29, 33, 62, 293, 329; ḥbrōṅ 215 (2), 216, 217, 219, 222, 223 (2), 392; smy 73; ḥṃ-ṛgo 120; ḥño 354. Following, as Attribute or Predicate, dgu 75, 76 (2); ḥgu 113; dgu-hḍo 74; 77, 78, 114, 139, 191, 309; ca-yaṅ 236 (?) ; hṛog (ḥṭrog) 40, 266; htaṅ-ta 96 (?) ; ṭdam 393 (?) ; ḥdoṅ 104 (?) ; ḥldyo 16, 34, 254; se (143); gse-hḷad 240 (?) .

— ge the great 364, 387.

— ḥdo (a Suffix, pp. 186-7) greatness. 185 (p. 139).

III = thor, ḥθor, bunch, top, &c., q.v. See also tor II. 121 -htas-hproms; 148 spye°; 236 ca-yaṅ° (?) ; 257 -htas-prom (pp. 292, 302).

ḥtos, Preterite form of hto I (p. 198). 278, 279 hṭag°.

ḥtye (conceivably = Chinese t’ien, heaven, sky) (p. 324). See also ḥṭye. 8 sta-hḍyaṅ°.

ḥtram = Tib. tram, hard, stiff. See also ḥḍram. 31 hṅed° (p. 251).

ḥtre = ḥdre, q.v. 94 rgyed°; 248 rgyed° (pp. 140, 291).

ḥtro = Tib. ḥdṛo, heat? or the frequent ḥdṛo = Tib. ḥdron, travel. 197 mu-hṛgog° (pp. 232, 318). See also ḥḍro.

ḥṭrog, enemy? (p. 220). See also ḥṛog. 40 -ḥtor; 146 ḥḍrag°; 326 -ḥdre; 338 -ḥḍṛṛhe; 376 ḥṛḍa° (pp. 320, 327).
VOCABULARY

ḥtroñ, Imperative (ḥdroñs) of Tib. ḥdron, travel, or ḥdren, drons, d.c., draw, lead. See also ḥtronhi. 233 ḥkhab-ḥgro (p. 343).

ḥtronhi = ḥtron, q.v., +hi. 224 ḥrkwa; 243 ḥkhab-ɡro (p. 343).

ḥtron = Tib. ḥdron, travel. 327 ḥrgyah-ḥdihi (p. 317).

ta horse = Tib. rta. See also rtaḥ, rtaḥi, ḫrta, ḫrtaḥ (pp. 139, 146, 258). With preceding ḥrah-wheli 139. With following sko-prom 91; ḫgam-ḥphar 93, 99, 110, 289; ḫdlag-ḥsag 389; ḫtsoɡ-ram 90; ḫwa-ḥldaŋ 278; yāṅ-stor 79; ḫsa-g-yer 330, 346; so (hso) -ḥnaḥ 80, 93, 100, 103; swa 173, 175, 358.

-ge the (?) horse. 364.

rtaḥ = rta, q.v. With preceding ḥrāḥ 114, ḥrāḥ(hra)-we 114, 191. With following ḫgam 118; ḫtsoɡ-ḥram 35, 82; ḫscaḥ-ɡ-yer 166; ḫswaḥ 298.

rtaḥi = rta(rtaḥ)+hi (?). 174-swa-ḥldir (p. 320).

rte 1? 82 ḥcaḥ (pp. 259, 320).

II = ḫrte, q.v. 182 ḥrah-ṛte-ḥdub (p. 313).

rto = Tib. ṛio stone (†). See also ḫrto. 25 klu (pp. 138, 223).

grtehe = ḫsi-ḥsia gdeḥ, ḡrde, ḡixe, ḡxe, d.c. (cf. Tib. ḫthēn, ḡixe, ḡxe; rṭen, ḡlot; bldn, true ?). See also ḫrtehu, ḫdse. 181-ḥta (pp. 156, 197 and mn.).

ṛhta = rta, ḫrtaḥ, horse, q.v. With preceding ḫtor 124, 232. With following ḫkwa-ḥdzam 122; ḫpā-ḥphar 187; ḫtsoɡ-ḥram 119, 123; wa-ḥldaŋ 258; ḫwa-ḥldaŋ 121.

ṛhtaḥ = rta, ḫrtaḥ, ḫrta, q.v. With preceding ḫtor 124, 232. With following ḫkwa-ḥdzam 122; ḫpā-ḥphar 187; ḫtsoɡ-ḥram 119, 123; wa-ḥldaŋ 258; ḫwa-ḥldaŋ 121.

ḥrtehu, ḫixe, stop; cf. ḫsi-ḥsia ḡrde, gdeḥ? See also ḫrtehe (pp. 156, 313-14). 265 ḡnān-tahō.

ḥrto = rto stone, q.v. 24 klu (pp. 138, 223).

ḥrtre = rte II. 354 ḥrah-ḥrtre-ḥdub.

ḥltān = ḡldaŋ, ldaŋ, rise, q.v. 93 ḡrgyed-ma (p. 291).

ḥltāh I. See ḫko-ḥltah. 203 ḫbri-ḥkō (or 250 ḡthsah-hyper (p. 278).

ḥlto, possibly = Tib. ḡtosah-ḥyey (p. 354).

ḥltom = ḫldom, subjue, q.v. 88 ḫdim-ḥtshis (p. 321).

sta, stah, I, a form of the Suffix ta, tah, q.v., which has attracted a -s belonging to its (preceding) word: cf. Tib. stel-te (pp. 182-3, 185 n. 1) and stō infra. 85 ḡhno; 86 ḫnio; 306 ḫbrad; (pp. 220-1, 359).

II = there, also Correlative. See also stah, ḫstah (p. 201). A, at beginning of clause. 8 ḫldyaŋ; 9 ḫri; 9, 19, 252 -re; 252 -g-ri, -baŋ (pp. 142, 274, 332). B, otherwise. 311 ḫmaŋ, ḫri; 312 ḫri-hi, ḫri, g-ri (pp. 201, 254, 337).

stān = Tib. stan, sten, top, high, up. See also ḫstān. 83 ḫkman (?); 88 ḡldaŋ; 303, 347 ḫro (pp. 270, 321).

stāh I = stā I, q.v. 99 slo (p. 336).

II = stā II, q.v. 20 ḫldyaŋ; 312 ḫri (p. 201).

stī = Tib. sti, bsti, thī, ṭhī, rest. 299 g-ri; 300 ḫṛi (pp. 265-6, 355). See also htl II.

stīn = Tib. stīn, bstīn, bstīnā, ṭhti, ṭhrke (p. 367). 330, 331 ḫgypo-hṭo; 335, 336 ḫgypo-hṭo (p. 178).

stē = te, hte, q.v., with s- as in stē and sto. See also stē (pp. 136, 188-90). 34 ḡthsahō; 72, 73, 75 (2) ḫwa; 182 gbohu (pp. 273, 275, 337, 338).
II = Tib. sten, bsten, range closely together. See also stehi, stehe (pp. 353-4). 178 -hkehu-prom; 180 -hkohe-bprom; 194 -gdzu (pp. 241-2, 251-2).

stehi = ste II q.v. 54 -htam (p. 333).

stehe = ste II q.v. 356 -hdzu (p. 333).

stel = Tib. ster, grant, &c. 181 grethe-tea (pp. 156, 354).

sto I = to, hto I, a Suffix q.v., with s-as in sta and ste (pp. 185-6). 28 hduo; 29 hyim; 58 hrgehi; 84, 85 hno; 233 htsah; 235 hnah; 242 hgyan; 292 hgyan (pp. 219-20, 233, 259, 321, 341).

II = Tib. sto, rope. 336 -the-the (pp. 185, 335).

stoin I = Tib. stoin, empty. 51 -hhkog (p. 328).

II = Tib. stoin, 1000 (pp. 203, 233-4). 247 geso.


stom = Tib. ston, autumn (harvest). See also hstom. 255 -hdag; 281 -hnah (p. 203, 362).

stor = Tib. stor, stray, flee, be lost; cf. htor, gtor, stor, scatter; dor, htor, cast away. See also dor, htor, hstor (pp. 171, 253). Applied to hkyan 141, 143; hkohe-broo 189; hno 79, 119, 127, 128, 143, 196, 258; rje 138; hni ("2") 140; hdehi (?) 339; ldyo 140; hldan-hphyar 125; hpo-hldan 358 (sto-re?); hpos 141; me (123); hmoi-hjor (hdozon) 78, 118, 128, 139, 140; hdozan 142; se 143; hso; hnah 122, 232.

— -ta (tha) (a Suffix, pp. 182-3). 145, 149, 150, 152, 337 htha.


— rno, able to flee (pp. 171, 297). 141 hkyan.

— thon, let or cause to flee. 197.

— hdehi-hpyid. 339 (p. 253).


— hdozo-hdzehi. 338.

— hgu (dgu), all things lost. 126-7 (pp. 233, 288-90).

— hpron, make flight. 128 hno (pp. 171, 294).

gstor = stor, hstor, q.v. 143 hkyan (p. 297).

— ta = stor-ta, q.v. 152 (p. 228).

hstah = stah, top, high, up, q.v. 95 hldan (p. 320).

hste = ste I q.v. 274 hldyim (p. 331).

hstom = ston, autumn (harvest). 14 -hnom.

hstor = stor, be lost, &c., q.v.

Applied to hgru-ma 79, hdei (?) 340, hmoi-hdzon 64, so-hna (hna) 117, 128.

— hta = stor-ta, q.v. 337 (p. 335).

— hdehi-hphyid 340 (p. 253).

— ma-swa(hsah) 337, 340 (p. 344).

— hdozo-hdzehi = stor, q.v. 338.

Th

tha I = ta, hta, a Suffix, q.v. 149 stor.

II = Hsi-hsia tha, Buddha, Tib. lha, god. 241 -hnu (p. 237).

than = htha, hta III, plateau, &c. (pp. 246-7). See also hthan. 220 -rdzo (pp. 173, 258).

thar I = htar, be let loose, q.v. See also hthar I. 190 hdro; 357 -mye (pp. 241, 285).

II = htar II, Tib. mthar, at end, q.v. See also hthar II. 69 -pyan (p. 248).

thun (not in text) = Tib. mthun, blue (p. 131).

the I = Tib. the, lieges, commons; the, thes, belong to. See also hthe, thehe. 103 -kyen; 139 hldan (pp. 228, 322).

II = Tib. then, hthen, draw, pull, control. See also then. 336 storo (p. 335).
then, control = the II, q.v. 207
theo (p. 315).

thehe = the I, lieges, q.v. 160
sian-neeo (p. 222).

tho I = Tib. theo, boundary. See also hto II. 109 -rgyam (pp. 280, 340).

II = Tib. mtho, high. See also hto II, htho, hjo IV. 132
hldag-nag.

thon = gtañ, gtoñ, htoñ, let go, &c., q.v. 197 stor.


thor = hthor, hthor, hthor, hthor, etc., q.v.

thrah. 53 hphon-ge.

thana I = than and htañ III,
plateau, &c., q.v. 130 -rdzo; 131 -hgam; 132 -rdzo; 133 -hrgam; 221 -hgam (pp. 243, 246-7, 259).

II = htañ II and thana, measure power, q.v. 132 hldi; 133 (2)
hid; 222 hyah-hthañ; 286 (2)
hyah; 287 g-yah; 288 hyah; 288 hdañ; 289 õgar-hpu; 290 hso-hnañ (pp. 171, 216, 228, 229, 293, 296, 323, 342).

--- (1) -phu-hkam. 130 hthañ.


III = gtañ, gtoñ, htañ I. 57
hikas (p. 248).

htam = htem I, q.v. 227 -rañ
place of union, or assemblage.

hthar I = thar I, be let loose, q.v. 195 -mye (p. 241).

II = thar II, at end, q.v. 348
-phyan (pp. 248, 343).

htho = htho, htho, htho, htho, etc., gather, assemble, &c. See also hthuñ, hdatun (pp. 321-2). 140
hldo-stor (pp. 254, 256, 326).

hthuñ = Tib. thuñ, small. 145 hgo (pp. 261, 300).

hthul = hthul, conquer, tame, &c., q.v. 67 ru-glañ-ge; 378 rkom (p. 318).

hthus, Aorist form of hthu, q.v. 156 hjim-ta (pp. 280, 322).

hthe = the I, thehe, lieges, &c., q.v. 335 kruñu; 383 hyan (p. 322).

htho = tho II, high, q.v. 374 hpañ-

hthog = hthog, hthog, btags, &c., fasten, impede; dog, narrow, danger, &c. (p. 301). See also hthogs. 149 stor-ta, stor-
tha (pp. 299-301, 313).

hthogni = hthog+ni, q.v. 149.

hthogs, Aorist form of hthog, q.v. 145 stor-ta; 182 hlab-ta (pp. 156, 299-301).

hthoñ = hthoñ, see. 92 pyi-
-hse; 135 gsehe-hldi (p. 321).

hthon I, error for htoni (152) or hthog-ni (149)? or = hthon II? 152 gstor-ta (p. 228).

II = Tib. hthon, come forth, &c., hdon, send forth, &c.? 152
gstor-ta (?) 379 spehi-ge (p. 228).

hthor = thor II, htor III, ter II, gather to a point, &c., q.v. 62
hiri; 63 mo-ma; 144 mo-ma (pp. 302-3).

hthwañ = hthwañ and htañ II, q.v. 280 hkhab-rgye-ge (p. 342).

hthy = hthy, q.v. 20 -hldyañ.

--- (I) -phu-hkam. 130 hthañ.


III = gtañ, gtoñ, htañ I. 57
hikas (p. 248).

htam = htem I, q.v. 227 -rañ
place of union, or assemblage.

D

dam = Tib. dam, bound, tight, bond, &c.; gdams, advice, &c.; hdam, choose; hdom, exhort, select; sdom, sdoms, bsdam, bsdoms,
II = Tib. sten, bsten, range closely together. See also stehi, stehe (pp. 353–4). 178 -hke Hughes; 180 -hku- 194 -gdzu (pp. 241–2, 251–2).

stehi = ste II q.v. 54 -htam (p. 353).

stehe = ste II q.v. 356 -hdzu (p. 353).

stel = Tib. ster, grant, &c. 181 grtehe-ta (pp. 156, 354).

sto I = to, hto I, a Suffix q.v., with s-as in sta and ste (pp. 185–6).


stom = Tib. ston, autumn (harvest). See also hstom. 255 -hdag; 281 -hkan (pp. 203, 362).

stor = Tib. stor, stray, flee, be lost; cf. hthor, gtor, btor, scatter; dor, htor, cast away. See also dor, htor, htor (pp. 171, 253). Applied to hkyan 141, 143; hku-brno 189; hno 79, 119, 127, 128, 143, 196, 258; rje 138; hni (‘2’) 140; hdehi (?) 339; ldyo 140; hrdan-hphyar 125; hpo-hldah 358 (sto-re?); hpos 141; me (123); hmoi-hjor (hdzon) 78, 118, 128, 139, 140; hdañ 142; se 143; hso-hnah 122, 232.

— ta (tha) (a Suffix, pp. 182–3). 145, 149, 150, 152, 337 htañ.


— rño, able to flee (pp. 171, 297). 141 hkyan.

— thoñ, let or cause to flee. 197.

— hdehi-hpyid. 339 (p. 253).


— hdo-hdzeñi. 338.

— hgu (dgu), all things lost. 126–7 (pp. 233, 288–90).

— hprrom, make flight. 128 hno (pp. 171, 294).

gstor = stor, hstor, q.v. 143 hkyan (p. 297).

— ta = stor-ta, q.v. 152 (p. 228).

hstañ = stañ, top, high, up, q.v. 95 hldah (p. 320).

hste = ste I q.v. 274 hldyim (p. 331).

hstom = stom, autumn (harvest). 14 -hkom.

hstor = stor, be lost, &c., q.v. Applied to hgru-ma 79, hdehi (?) 340, hmoi-hdzon 64, so- (hnah) 117, 128.

— htañ = stor-ta, q.v. 337 (p. 335).

— hdehi-hpyid 340 (p. 253).

— ma-swañ(hsan) 337, 340 (p. 344).

— hdo-hdeñi = stor, q.v. 338.

Th

tha I = ta, hta, a Suffix, q.v. 149 stor.

II = Hsi-hsia tha, Buddha, Tib. lha, god. 241 -hnu (p. 237).

thañ = hthañ, htañ III, plateau, &c. (pp. 246–7). See also hthañ. 220 -rdzo (pp. 173, 258).

thar I = htar, be let loose, q.v. See also hthar I. 190 hdro (p. 228).

— hthar II, Tib. mthar, at end, q.v. See also hthar II. 69 -pyañ (p. 248).

thin (not in text) = Tib. mthin, blue (p. 131).

the I = Tib. the, lieges, commons; the, thes, belong to. See also hthe, thehe. 103 -mye (p. 228, 322).

II = Tib. then, hthen, draw, pull, control. See also then. 336 sto (p. 335).
then, control = the II, q.v. 207
theo (p. 315).

thehe = the I, lieges, q.v. 160
siaň-neo (p. 222).

tho I = Tib. tho, boundary. See also hto II. 109 -rgyam
(pp. 280, 340).
II = Tib. mtho, high. See also hto II, htho, hjo IV. 132
hldag-nag.

thon = gtaň, gton, hton, let go, &c., q.v. 197 storö.


thor = htor II, great, q.v. 220 -hbroň.
II = Tib. thor, anything gathered to a single point; thor-cog (gtsug, tshugs), gtsug-tor (thor), spyi-tor (gtor), top-knot, turban; hthor-mtho, lofty peak. See also htor III, hthor
(pp. 149, 302-4). 71 hmo-maoö.
III = II ?235rane-ladö; 242 hchaň-yaňö (p. 303).

thol (not in text) (p. 133).

thwân = htaň II, Tib. thâň, measure, power, q.v.; dbaň-thaň, might, fate. See also hthwân
(pp. 346-7). 97 baňö; 98-hkhor (pp. 342, 345).

thrah. 53 phoň-geö.

htaň I = thâň and htaň III, plateau, &c., q.v. 130 -rdzo;
131 -hgam; 132 -rdzo; 133 -hrgam; 221 -hgam (pp. 243, 246-7, 259).
II = htaň II and thwaň, measure power, q.v. 132 hdiö; 133 (2) hldiö; 222 hyah-hthâňö; 286 (2) hyahö; 287 g-yahö; 288 hyahö;
288 hdoňaö; 289 hgaň-hpuö; 290 hso-hnaňö (pp. 171, 216, 228, 229, 293, 296, 323, 342).
(1) -phu-hkam. 130 htaňö.
(1) -le-tsa (htsa, tshah). 131, 219, 220 (p. 272).
III = gtaň, gton, hton I. 57 hkaňö (p. 248).

htaň = htaň I, q.v. 227 -raň place of union, or assemblage.

hthar I = thar I, be let loose, q.v. 195 -mye (p. 241).
II = thar II, at end, q.v. 348 -phyaň (pp. 248, 343).

hthu = Tib. hdu, sdu, hþhu, &c., gather, assemble, &c. See also hþhu, hildun (pp. 321-2). 140
ldyo-storö (pp. 254, 256, 326).

htuň = Tib. thuň, small. 145 hgoö (pp. 261, 300).

htul = hþul, conquer, tame, &c., q.v. 67 ru-glaň-geö; 378 rköö (p. 318).

hthus, Aorist form of hþhu, q.v. 156 hjiim-taö (pp. 280, 322).

hthe = the I, thehe, lieges, &c., q.v. 335 kruňö; 383 hyanö (p. 322).

hält = tho II, high, q.v. 374 hpaň-hweö (p. 280).

hthoq = Tib. thogs, bdogs, btags, &c., fasten, impede; dog, narrow, danger, &c. (p. 301). See also hthogs. 149 stor-taö, stor-thaö (pp. 299-301, 313).

hthogni = hthog+ni, q.v. 149.

hthogs, Aorist form of hthog, q.v. 145 stor-taö; 182 hlab-taö (pp. 156, 299-301).

htoň = Tib. mthoň, see. 92 pyi-hse; 135 gsehe-hlidö (p. 321).

hthon I, error for htoni (152) or hthog-ni (149)? or = hthon II? 152 gstor-taö (p. 228).
II = Tib. hthon, come forth, &c., hdon, send forth, &c.? 152 gstor-taö (p. 228).

hþhor = thor II, htor III, tor II, gather to a point, &c., q.v. 62 hriňö; 63 mo-maö; 144 mo-maö
(pp. 302-3).

hþwân = thwaň and htaň II, q.v. 280 hkhab-rgye-geö (p. 342).

hþye = htye, q.v. 20 -hliyaň.

D

dam = Tib. dam, bound, tight, bond, &c.; gdams, advice, &c.; hdam, choose; hdom, exhort, select;
sdom, sdoms, bsdoms, bsdoms,
VOCABULARY

&c., bind, fasten, obligation, vow, &c. See also Ḫdam, Ḫdom II, Ḫdom, Ḫdom, Ḫdom I. 46 -rma (p. 286).

dim = Tib. Ḫthim, thim, gtim, stim, be lost, dissolve, evaporate, be absorbed in. See also Ǧdim, Ǧdyim, Ḫldim, Ḫldyim. 95 -tshis (pp. 320–1, 359).

do I a Suffix (pp. 186–7). See also Ḫdo, Ḫdo, Ḫdo. 86 ʂnaņo.


dono I = Tib. Ḫdon, depart, begone. See also Ɂdo, Ɂdo, Ɂdo, Ḫdo. 89 ʰsoro; 392 ʰgyaņo (p. 321); 367 ʰyaņ-ʰyaņo.

II, extrametrical and accordingly different from I: very possibly therefore a Conjunction = Tib. Ḫoñ, a variant of Ɂañ, practically = whereupon 176 ʰbres; 351 ɡtsobə.

dor = Tib. Ḫdor, drive or throw away, always in the compound verb; stor-dor (Ɂdor), q.v. 80 ʰrdzum (pp. 271, 293).

doñ I = Tib. Ḫdoñ, depart, begone. See also Ḫdoñ I, Ɂdoñ, Ḫdoñ. 89 ʰsoro; 392 ʰgyaņo (p. 321); 367 ʰyaņ-ʰyaņo.

drag = Tib. Ḫdrag, vehement, fierce, powerful, eminent. See also Ḫdrag (p. 300). 163 ʂri-ʰbo (p. 216).

dro = Tib. Ḫdron, travel, go. See Ḫdro I (p. 294).

— -ño, travelling trader. 174 toro. See also Ḫdro-Ɂño.

droho = dro, q.v. 105 ʰtso (p. 261).

gdag I = Tib. Ḫdog, own, acquire, Ḫdog, master, self, perhaps kept distinct from gdags, Ḫtags, &c., fasten, affix, and from gdags, bright, daylight. See also Ḫdag.

142 ʰgom, ʰphar; 200, 204, 206 ʰce-ʰmu (pp. 221–2).

II = Tib. gdags, sunti? 345 -yaņ-la-po (pp. 269–70).

ɟdah = Tib. Ḫdah, be actual or possible. See also Ḫdaņ II. 191 -hnaḥ; 396 -kum (?), -ʰgaman. ?) 43 Ḫdah-ʰdi (pp. 244, 315).

ɟdim = dim, vanish, &c., q.v. 88 -pyi-ʰse; 89 -phyi-ʰse; 94 -chis or -tshis; 100 Ḫdzam-ʰdzim (pp. 320–1, 359).

ɟdes, Aorist form of Ḫrte, q.v. 260 Ḫdom (?) (pp. 319, 343).

ɟdod = Tib. Ḫdod, be prominent, emerge. 186 g-ri (p. 331).

ɟdyim (<bdyim?) = dim, Ḫgim, q.v. 95 -phyi-ʰse.

ɟdaņ = Ḫdaņ (?) 258 wa (p. 221).

ɟdad = Ḫdad, devoted to (p. 227). 304 ʰyaņo; 306 ʰyaņ-ʰdaņ (p. 254).

ɟdab = Ḫdab, Ḫdebs, Ḫtab, Ḫdag, put, &c. See also Ḫdab II. 369 mehi-Ɂra (pp. 318, 331).

ɟdam = dam, bind, &c., q.v. See also Ḫdam. 204 pyu-phya; 326 ʰse-ʰtaḥ; 328 ʰkho-ʰtaḥ; 329 ʰkho-ʰdaḥ; 345, 346, 351 -sle (pp. 140, 319).

— -to (a Suffix, pp. 184–6). 68 (pp. 250, 319).

ɟdaḥ I = Tib. mdah, arrow. See also Ḫdaḥ. 58, 59 - hôpog (pp. 300–1, 343).

II = Ḫdah, be actual or possible, q.v. 108 ʰdi (p. 294); 329 ʰkho ( ? see ʰkho-ʰtaḥ) (p. 221).


ɟdar = Tib. Ḫdar, skiver, tremble, &c. (pp. 319–20). See also Ḫdar. 19 -hti-hwe-re; 38, 368 hrəm (pp. 319–20).

ɟdi, this (Tib. Ḫdi). See also Ḫdi, Ḫdi, Ḫdi (p. 201). 107, 198.
**VOCABULARY**

\[\text{hdim} = \text{dim, gdim, } \& \text{c., vanish, q.v. 88 -htshis (pp. 320–1).}\]

\[\text{hdih} = \text{di, this, q.v. 43 gdah}.\]

\[\text{hdil} = \text{di, this, q.v. 184 -mag-}\]

\[\text{hnot; 327 hrygah}; 391 hnah}.\]

\[\text{hdu} = \text{Tib. gdun, be distressed, or itun, fall. 94, 95 (pp. 320–1).}\]

\[\text{hdb} = \text{Tib. dub, be fatigued, sink. 67 me}; 70 me; 182 hrah-rtc}; 354 hrah-hrte (pp. 173, 272–3).\]

\[\text{hde} = \text{Tib. bde, good fortune; ide, warm oneself? See also hdehi, hde I, hdehi, hdehe (pp. 278–9). 29 -hyim-sto; 208 htsbar (pp. 234, 259).}\]

\[\text{hdehi} = \text{hde I, q.v. 102 mag}; 339 stor}; 340 hstor (p. 301).\]

\[\text{hdo, a Suffix (pp. 184–6) = do, ldo, hldo, to, hto, q.v. 65, 67 hyah}; 86, 87 firm; 88 hrcog}; 180 glab}; 183, 353 hchi}; 183 htor (pp. 139, 186, 228, 276, 288, 332, 340).\]

\[\text{hdon} = \text{don I, depart, q.v. 104 hrmu (p. 285). 13 -hri (p. 265).}\]

\[\text{hdon} = \text{Tib. gdon, mdoins, face? q.v. 13 -hrii (p. 265).}\]

\[\text{hdon} = \text{Tib. don, purpose. 185 hshd}; (pp. 139, 186).}\]

\[\text{hdom I = Tib. dom, bear. See also hdom II. 162, 171 hldyo}; 294, 297 hrihi (pp. 246–7, 254, 327).}\]

\[\text{hdom II = Tib. dom, hdom, } \& \text{c., q.v. See dam and also ldom, hdom I (pp. 318–19). 213 hbos}; 260 hrau (pp. 202, 319).}\]

\[\text{hdono} = \text{hdo, 37 firm}.\]

\[\text{hdoro} = \text{lor, in stor-dor (hdor), q.v. 118, 127, 142, 161, 162, 163 stor}; 209 hldan-rgye (pp. 213, 245, 253, 289, 361).}\]

\[\text{hdwa} = \text{Tib. dwa, wretched. 148 spyre-htor (p. 302).}\]

\[\text{hdyan} = \text{ldyan, ldyan, high, fly, depart, q.v. 210 -htyo; But see also pyan (phyan). 353 hchi-hdo (pp. 200, 261, 276, 332).}\]

\[\text{hdr} = \text{Tib. hdra, like; ci-hdra, what-like? } \& \text{c. 196 hru (pp. 245–6; but see also hdra).}\]

\[\text{hdrag} = \text{drag, fierce, } \& \text{c., q.v. 146 -htrog (pp. 299–300).}\]

\[\text{hdayn} = \text{Tib. hdrn, drao, dro, } \& \text{c., lead, drag. 147 hphom-te (pp. 234–5, 254, 256, 326).}\]

\[\text{htral} = \text{htra, hard, stiff, q.v. 102 -hmu (p. 285).}\]

\[\text{htral = hdra I, net, q.v. 195 pltn; 260 -hdag (pp. 241–2).}\]

\[\text{hdu} = \text{Tib. dru-bu and } \& \text{gcu, clew, skein, or dro, net. 220 -hjar (pp. 173, 272, 369).}\]

\[\text{hder} = \text{induce = Tib. hderen, lead, } \& \text{c. (p. 262). See also hdehe, htre. 87 rgyed; 326 htrg (pp. 140, 340, 291).}\]

\[\text{hdehe} = \text{hder, q.v. 338 htrg}.\]

\[\text{hdro I = dro, travel, go, q.v. 105 hgo}; 106 hkgab, hkhb; 169 -hbon; 183 -hphor; 188–9 hna, hna (p. 266 -hko-hnag; 352 -hkus, 353 -hphor (pp. 157, 260, 276, 285, 332).}\]

\[\text{-hno = dro-no, travelling trader. 177, 359, 361.}\]

\[\text{htr} = \text{htro, heat, q.v. See also hdro I. 188–9 hna, hna (p. 252, 285).}\]

\[\text{hdom. 65 hptn (pp. 157, 187, 219).}\]

\[\text{rdan = Tib. sana, hate, anger? Cf. hrdan. 211 rog-hji (p. 290).}\]

\[\text{rdan = Tib. sdam, hsdam } \& \text{c. See dam. 322 hrtne (p. 319).}\]

\[\text{rdehe = Tib. sde, class, company,}
district. See also hrde. 213 ḡbeḥi-tyaṅ (pp. 253, 270, 353).

rders = Tib. bdar, rdar, examine closely, or sdar, timid? 107 ḡwār (p. 350).

rdo = Tib. sdo, venture. See also ḡrdoho. 84 ḡno-sto-ge (pp. 186, 259).

hrdāghī = ḡrdāg, Tib. rdegh, brdegh, smite, +hi. 214 ḡstäḥ-ḥbraḍ (p. 253).

hrdaṅ = rdaṅ, hate, anger, q.v. 155 ḡrko-ḥldah (a Suffix, p. 183). 301 ḡri- ḡrdyam = ḡrb, gzhou (? (p. 350). 137 ḡbri-re (pp. 218, 338).

lida, a Suffix = ḡlda, ḡlda, ḡldaḥ, q.v. 84 ḡrkaṅ (p. 183, cf. ḡhkāḥ- ḡhldah, p. 218).

ldaṅ, rise, stick, prop, support = Tib. ḡnān/ldān. See also ḡldaṅ (pp. 286–9). 80, 138 -rdzē; 343 ḡhe- ḡdehi (pp. 227, 228, 256, 287).

-hpyer, supporting. See also ḡldaṅ-hpyer. 65 (pp. 186, 228, 287).

ldaḥ = ldā, ḡlda I, II, ḡklaḥ, q.v. 43 ḡrāṅ (pp. 313, 334).

ldir = ḡdīr I, q.v. 328 ḡnāḥ-ḥpāṅ (pp. 196, 317).

ide (not in text) (pp. 136, 147–8, 188–92). See ḡlde, ḡldeḥi, ḡldehe.

ldeḥi (not in text) (pp. 133, 136, 188–92). See ḡldeḥi, ḡe. 

ldehu (not in text) (pp. 134, 368). See ḡde, ḡe.

ldo = ḡldō, ḡldōḥ, ḡldoḥu, ḡldoḥo, q.v. 76 ḡdū (pp. 186, 322). See also ḡdū (I) -ḥldo.

ldon = ḡdōn I, ḡdōn I, ḡdōn, ḡdōn, q.v. 161 ḡyu (p. 253). See also ḡyu, ḡkyu.

ldom = dam, ḡdom II, ḡdom I, bind, ḡe, q.v. 94, 95 ḡdm-chis (p. 320–1).

ldyāṅ = ḡldyāṅ, q.v. (pp. 331–3). 78 ḡjō; 178 ḡkāṅ; 180 -glab (pp. 179, 244).

ldyo = ḡldyo, q.v. See also ḡldyoḥu. 140 -stor; 383 -ro (pp. 256, 326–8, 331).

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.

ldyono (reading?) = ḡldyōn+o.
VOCABULARY

143 (pyi), -myi-seg 159 (pp. 145-6, 259, 286, 341, 345).

ḥldan-ra. 270 ḥwah⁰; 278 ḥwa⁰ (pp. 178, 339).

ḥldanḥ written for ḥldah or ḥldan.

ḥldan = Tib. lan, lon, ldon, glan, glon, retaliate, repay, return (Trans. and Intrans.) (pp. 317-18). See also ḥldon. 187, 188, 189 ḥldam-re⁰; 193 -re-mor-re⁰; 264 (2) ḥdzam-re⁰; 273 ḥjam-re⁰; 274 (2) ḥdzam-re⁰; 328 ḥpyah⁰; 377 ḥpah⁰ (pp. 297, 305, 317, 331).

ḥldab I = Tib. ḥdab, leaf, wing, etc. 12 -ḥd-e-ḥde (p. 318).
II = Tib. ḥdebs, ṭab, cast, put, found, cf. rdebs, sdebs. See also ḥldam. 197 ṭmaⁿ⁰ (p. 318).

ḥldam, tame, etc. = dam, ḥdam, ḥdom, ḥdon, q.v. 187 (2), 188-re (pp. 305, 317-18, 331).

ḥldah I, a Suffix (p. 183) = ḥda, ḥdaḥ, q.v. Cf. Tib. ḥdan; or derived from II? Appended to ḥko- 202; rke- 155; ḥkhah- 137; rṭe- 310; ḥṛne- 303; ḥṛde- 301; ḥrnav- 32; ḥrnav-ma- 165; ḥpo- 358; ṭṛpeḥi- 286; ḥbaṇ- 170; ḥbroň- 182; ḥbom-rbo- 112; ḥmaṇ- 33; htsa-re- 249; htsaḥ- 298; ḥdzah- 382, 383; g-yog- 200; ḥsah- 164.
II = ḥda II, Tib. da, there (p. 201). 6 ḥraḥ⁰; 316 -ḥrgaṃ (?) 182 ḥbroň⁰ (pp. 313, 319, 323).

ḥldar = ḥdar, shiver, tremble, q.v. 353 -ḥdam-re⁰; 30, 31, 32 ḥhrab⁰, or is ḥdar here Locative of ḥldah I, ḥldah I ? (pp. 319-20).

ḥldas = Tib. ḥlah, ḥdas, go beyond, past. 83 -ḥtsa (p. 320).

ḥldí I = Tib. ḥlī, this. See also ḥdl, ḥldīhí. 115 ḥpo⁰; 132 ḥhrī⁰, ḥre⁰; 133 ḥyḥaḥ⁰, ṭṛyeb⁰; 135 ṭeṣhe⁰; 137 ṭro⁰; 175 ḥu⁰; 225, 236, 244, 246 ḥraḥ⁰; 207 the-then⁰; 87, 216, 237, 243, 246, 248 -ṛgyed-ḥrār; 104 -ḥgaṇ; 108 -ḥdaḥ.

II = Tib. ḥdin, float, soar. See also ḥldin, ḥdis. 63, 71, 144 -ma-hṛtaḥ (p. 320).

ḥldin = ḥldi II. 160 ḥpu-myio (pp. 145-6, 217, 320).

ḥldim = dim, gdim, ddīyim, q.v. 199 ḥim⁰; 301 -ḥpuh; 310 -ḥmaṇ-ḥto (pp. 320-1).

ḥldiḥi = ḥldi III, land, q.v. 195 -su-ḥldoṇ (pp. 201, 245, 329-30).

ḥldir I. Locative of ḥldi, this, q.v. 117 -ḥtsag; 229 ṭṣaḥ-ṇe° (?) 248 ḥṭam⁰; 326 ḥḥaḥ-ḥpaq°; 328 ṭṣaḥ-ṇene° (?) 337 ḥṛtaḥ° (?) 341 ṭṛe-ḥprome (pp. 217, 222).

II = ḥldi-re, from ḥldi II, q.v. 174 ṭsah⁰; 229, 328, 337, 341 ? See under I (p. 320).

ḥldis, Aorist of ḥldi, q.v. 58 me-na° (pp. 320, 358).

ḥldu = Tib. ḡdu, ḡdus, sdu, sdus, ḡṭu, ḡṭus, etc., collect, etc. (pp. 321-2). 14 ṭaṇi° 19 -ḥro; 28 -ṣto; 70 ḡeog-ḥleq°; 238 ṭsebe⁰ (p. 247).

ḥldug = Tib. ḡdug, sit, remain? or sdug, dear, comely? or stug, wretched, afflicted? 103 ṭhekyen° (p. 322).

ḥldun = Tib. ḡdun, assemble. 284 ḡṛm-ḥḍom-ḥṭaḥ°; 334 ḡso-ḥṭi-ge-ḥṭaḥ° (pp. 282, 321).

ḥlduḥu = Tib. ḡdu, covet. 44 ṭṣi° 51 -ce-ṛγyaḥ; or is this ḡlduḥu = ḡlu, amass? (pp. 322, 328).

ḥle I = Tib. ḡle, bde, bdeḥu, happiness, high fortune, etc.; perhaps also ide, warn oneself. See also ḡle I, ḡlehi, ḡlehe, ḡreḥi (pp. 278-9). 77 -ge; 370, 371 -ge-ḥṭaḥ (p. 309).

II = Tib. ide, warn oneself? 70 ḡeog° (pp. 247, 249, 321).
III ? = I, be good or necessary. 57 ḡrkas-ḥṭaḥ° (p. 248).

ḥlehi = ḡle I, q.v. 318, 319, 320, 321 -ḥswaḥ, -swaḥ, -ḥswa (p. 318).
VOCABULARY

hldehe = hlide I, hldehi 370, 372
-ge-htah (pp. 278, 318).

hldo I, a Suffix = do I, hdo, ldo (pp. 186–7, 322–3). See also hldoch. 74, 77, 78, 114, 191, 309 dguo; 155 hgab; 177 hpo; 342 kluo; 355 hiuo; 375 ség-smoe; 381 slod (pp. 201, 222, 223, 256, 274, 282–3, 316, 327).

II, perhaps error for do-ldo (l. 76). 77 -hdzo[i-]k[e].

hllog = Tib. log/log, turn away, rebel, return (p. 323). 18 hyogs; 43, 44 smyi; 142 -stor (p. 323); 256 -hyah; 317 -hpo; 317 -g-yah (pp. 224, 295, 323, 334).

hlodon = don I, hodon I, ldon, depart, &c., q.v. 45 hbaht; 82 hmog-re; 134 sko; 175 nu-glan; 195 hldi-suo; 214 kuy; 253 hbaio; 256 krao; 287, 291–4 hkyan; 299 hse; 302, 303, 308, 310 (2), 311 hgaht; 334 hro; 339 hkyo (pp. 245, 270, 297, 298, 328, 338).

hlidon, probably Imperative of hdlan, return, repay, &c., q.v. 370 (2), 371 hide-ge-hilah; 370, 372 hdlehe-ge-hilah (pp. 278, 318).

hlodom I = dam, hdom II, ldom, bind, &c., q.v. 9 hrah-hyos; 41, 143, 350 na; 66 hkaht; 259 rgo; 372 hkrug-kyan (pp. 145, 297, 299, 318–19).

II = hdom I, bear? 299 g-rihio.

hlidoh, a Suffix = do I, hdo, ldo, hdlo I, q.v. 154 blah (p. 222).

hlidohu = Tib. lo, circle or troop? (pp. 322–3). See also hlo, hloho, hrolloho. 277 -hjam-rio; 300 hrim; 319 hrim-re (pp. 265, 281).

hlidoho? (p. 294). 110 hso-hnaha.

hlidor, probably for hldo I (Suffix) + re (metre). 357 hldiyah (p. 329).

hlidya, water. flow = Tib. hžah, moist. See also hldyah. 51 -hkan-hte (pp. 328–9).

hlidyañ = Tib. bžen, bžens, bžan, raise, erect. rise up, opposed to žoñ, lower, deepened; gžoñs, valley, and perhaps connected with ldn, fly, soar. In the Nam language meanings may provisionally be classified as follows: (pp. 331–3). See also hdyan, ldyan.

A. rise fly, depart. 9, 13, 14, 19 hri; 10 hldi-hrkah; 12 hti; 13 hrag; 14 htna-hldu; 38 -hdzañ; 43 pra-hrehe; 48, 368 gse-hcan, gse-he-cañ; 150, 161, 218, 243 hpu, but see also under C; 209 hpyu; 229, 237 rihe-hkyam; 365 rgyer; 282 na (?).


C. As Proper Name of a Hldyañ = Tib. Hjan, people of the high (sc. Tang-hsiang) country. 271-ma, -pah; 365 -hkah; 369 -hgo-hdzin. (Here should be considered, as either denoted or hinted at, the occurrences with -hyu (huyu), -hyan-htyo and -hro, cited under B, and those with -hpu under A).

D. doubtful. 316 hyan; 144 -htah.

hldyah = hldya, water, flow, q.v. 356 -hldyah; 357 -hdlo -[e] (p. 329).

hldyi, conceivably = Tib. bži, four. 26 hlyeg (p. 330).

hldyim I = dim, gdim, &c., evaporate, &c., q.v. 89 me; 274 -hte a Suffix, pp. 188–90 (pp. 321, 331).

II = Tib. žim, sweet? 255 hdsah (pp. 327, 331).

hldiyih I, conceivably = Tib. zi, be alloyed. 48 hphu-hseg; 375 ség-sme-hldo-rbyo (p. 330).

II = hldi I, this. 392 -rgyed-hrañ.

hldyeg, conceivably ‘quarter’ (of space) = Tib. gzos = phyogs. 26 -hlyi (p. 330).

hldyo = Tib. hjo, blos, hlo, gzo,
hldyon, low country apparently in the senses of cattle, milk out (extract) and cattle country (also hldyo-ro, equivalent to Tib. hbrog) (pp. 256–7, 326–8). See also ldyo, ldyo-ho, hldyo-ho. 16, 34, 50, 254 -htor, -tor; 36 -hrje; 162, 171 -hdom; 172 meho; 304 hman; 384 -bro (pp. 256–7, 267, 275, 326–7).

hldyon, low country = Tib. zoñ, g'oons, correlative to hldyana, q.v. 387 -ro (pp. 331–2).

hldyoho = ldyo, hldyo, q.v. 355 hnu-hldo (pp. 256, 327).

N

na I, a Postposition = Tib. na, appended to A: Nouns, &c., with the signification ‘in’; B: Subordinate clauses stating circumstances; C: Sentences, with signification as in B, but more general and vague (‘this being so’), as a Particle of transition or even of termination (cf. Sanskrit iti) (pp. 179–81, 194). A 58 (2) meo; 107, 154 (p. 194). B 50, 51, 52, 54, 86, 98, 103, 124, 147, 169, &c. C 77, 78, 114, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 182, 183, 209, 220, 221, 222, 225, 231, 236, 237, 241, 244, 245, 248, 251, 253, 254, 257, 258, 262, 280, 285, 294, 296, 302, 304, 309, 313, 328, 353, 360, 361, 369, 382, and possibly other instances.

II = Tib. gnas, place (pp. 237–8). See also hnah, gnah, and ná, hnah. 41, 143, 350 -hdom; 53 -hee; 56, 96 -ge; 86 -she; 100 -rom; 107 -hrom; 358 -hgo, -hgon (?); 365 so (pp. 238, 297, 299).

III = Tib. na, sickness? 156 -rog; 254 hmyio (pp. 239, 328). See also hnah II.

IV = Tib. na, meadow? or merely = na II? 33 -htsah (pp. 239, 275).

nag I = Tib. nag, speech, voice (p. 360). See also hnah I. 199 hšan: or nag, black (?); 202 hne (?); 262 g-raho (?); 276, 278 hdzam (pp. 283, 313, 314).

II = Tib. nag, black. See also gnah, hnah II. 129, 130, 132, 134, 135, 136 hldag (pp. 242, 259–60, 342).

III = Tib. rnaqs, cash? See also hnah III. 234 hglah.

nañ I = Tib. nañ, within (pp. 229–30). See also hnañ. 104, 115, 236 -re; 305 -hyu; 352 -pa; 354 -hwar (pp. 217, 252, 285).

II = Tib. nañ, to-morrow? 181 -gañ (pp. 156, 229–30).

nad = Tib. nad, disease. 193, 194 gso (p. 238).

nar, probably = Tib. ñar, strength, grim, strong, rather than nar, snar, long. 49 riam; 72 pa; 239 hgrah-nu (pp. 313, 361). See also hnar.

ni, a Particle used, A, after a part antithetically emphasized in a sentence; B, at end of a sentence to mark similarly the end or beginning of a topic: in use B always extra-metrical. See pp. 177–8, where the occurrences are cited. See also hni.

nu I, strength, ability = Tib. nus. See also hnu I. hnu (p. 237). 239 hgrah (p. 313).

II, probably = young, cf. Tib. nu, younger, opposite of phu. 359 -glañ. See also hnu II.

ne, good = Gyårung ka-sne, ñ. See also hne (pp. 221–3). 66, 160 sían; 113 gtse; 141 hringe, -hldan; 152 g-yah-hsa; 202 -heer; 206 nüye; 269 hwañ; 301 rüö; 317 hwa (pp. 221–2, 228, 270, 274, 318, 321, 338, 339, 359).

nehu = nu II, in sense of ‘new’, or = ne. 41 hgwao; 74 hkuñe, wehi; 257 -hso-bos; 258 hwam (pp. 250, 302).

nehe, perhaps onomatopoeic, ‘bleat’. 275 twañ-hdzam (p. 343).
NOHU. 41 hųd⁰.

NOR = Tib. nor, property, &c. (pp. 361–2). 151 -gso (pp. 224–5, 241). See also ᴥNOR II.

 Gnag = nag II, black, q.v. 129 hľdag⁰ (p. 263).

 Gnah, place = na II and ᴥnaha I, q.v. (pp. 237–9). 69, 70 lao; 179 -gon; 280 -ma-dwan; 281 hľdyań-ma⁰; 367 -hgon (pp. 193, 234, 342).

 ᴥna = na II, ᴥnaha I, gnah, q.v. 68 -hlam (p. 238).

 ᴥnag I = nag I, speech, &c., q.v. 104 -htshab, speech-deputy (p. 360).

 ᴥnag II = nag II, black, q.v. 112 hľdag⁰; 162, 171 hdpom⁰; 267 hko⁰ (pp. 253, 260, 263, 291, 327).

 ᴥnag III = nag III, cash, q.v.? 232, 233 hľglah⁰.

 ᴥnai = nan, within, q.v. 188 ᴥnia; 189 (2) -hdro; 225, 244, 305, 308, 311 -re (pp. 231–2, 252, 285, 337).

 -ra = ᴥnai, q.v., +re (p. 229).

 ᴥnad. 46 re-ma⁰.

 ᴥnan? = Tib. nan, pressure, urgency; gnon, press, suppress, or snon, hsnan, augment? 281 stom-hkań-ge⁰; 350 hčihi-hto-ho-ge⁰; 351 hšehe-hti-ge⁰ (p. 186).

 ᴥnam I = Tib. gnam, nam, sky. 5, 6, 8, 37 hrań-hldah (hlda)⁰ (p. 248).

 II = Tib. ġam, damaged, weakened, destroyed. 83 ġnam-h-te-hšah; 126 hldana-krań⁰; 259 ġpań-hrgam⁰ (pp. 262, 288–9, 361).

 III = Tib. ġams, thought, soul, spirit, courage. 145 -hdzam⁰ (pp. 261, 299–300, 361).

 ᴥnah I = na II, gnah, ᴥna, place, q.v., or confused with ᴥah, home, q.v. 33 -hrań (?) 40 -me; 99 -htsog; 113 -hpōn; 191 gdag⁰; 391 -hdihi, hgyah⁰ (pp. 233, 238–9, 244, 291–3, 284, 315, 346). See also so(hso)-ṛñah (ḥna, na).

 II = na III, sickness, q.v. 261 -hdag; 120 ᴥtsog-hram⁰ (pp. 239, 262, 283, 291–2).

 III spring (season) = Mo-so ſñoń? 159 -hčhos (pp. 145–6).

 ᴥnar = nar, strength, grim, &c., q.v. or possibly = Tib. gñer, provide, execute (?) (p. 361).

 ᴥnæ = na ᴥnor, property, &c.; gnon, be furnished, be covered (p. 238).

 ᴥnct. 72 gşi-brom⁰; 241–2 smyio, tha⁰ (pp. 237, 342).

 II = nu II, q.v. 174 (2), 175–6, 179, 359–60, 366 -glań.

 ᴥnus, Aorist of ᴥnu = Tib. nu suckle (or drip?). 16, 34 hľdyo-h-tor-ge⁰; 40 hľdyo-ge⁰ (pp. 275, 327, 328, n. 1).

 ᴥne = ne, good, q.v. 86 -rneńi; 146 ſne⁰; 155 ſne⁰; 170 ᴥbań-hldah⁰; 382 ᴥdza-hldahi⁰ (pp. 221–2, 275, 288, 316).

 ᴥnen = Tib. ſn, dangerous. 210 ᴥwań-te⁰ (p. 361).

 ᴥner = Tib. gñer, procure, seek for? 7, 20 gşo-g⁰ (p. 361).

 ᴥno = Tib. no in g-yul-no, battle front (no)? 58 (2) mag⁰ (pp. 194, 300–1). See also ᴥnor II.

 ᴥnoń, possibly = Tib. noń, grieve, or gnoń, be ashamed. 134 ᴥkḥo-g⁰.

 ᴥnom = Tib. nom, enjoyments, possessions, &c.; snom, grasp (p. 277). 151 ʃid-rygań⁰; 155 ᴥwań⁰; 165 -hsah; 209 hnom-te (p. 335).

 ᴥnor I = Tib. nor, err, foolish. 163 ᴥnor-[rje]; 314, 315 -hldan; 317 -hldag; 366 g-yr-e⁰ (pp. 224–5, 228, 262, 323, 332, 338–9).

 II, for ᴥno-r in mag-hnor; 48–9, 145, 184 (pp. 194; 299–301).

 ᴥnab = Tib. mnab, mnabs, food; ᴥnań, be hungry; brnäh, covet. 32 -hldah, a Suffix, p. 183? 165 -ma-hldah (p. 296).

 ᴥnas = Tib. ᴥn, despised? 214 ᴥrwehi-gtsu-ge⁰. (p. 345).
P

pa = Tib. dpah, brave, hero, &c. See also ṭpah I. 72 -nar; 109 -la-la; 352 raño (pp. 239, 280).

paḥ = pa? 271 ḫldyanō.

pañ = pa, or possibly ṭpha, father, + hi. 262 gsasō (pp. 239, 283).

pu-ɡlo (ḥlo), bellows. See also ṭhpun-ḥklo. 116 ḥraño; 135 raño ọhlo (pp. 284-5).

puṇ = Tib. phuṇ, heap; dpuṇ, host, &c. 204 -te, a Suffix, pp. 188-90 (pp. 144, 300).

po = Tib. pho, male, man (pp. 217-19). See also ṭpō I, ṭpho. 181 rbyo (pp. 155-6, 333).

— -rbom 317. See ṭphoō, ṭboō (pp. 224, 323, 338-9).

por I, perhaps = ṭphor, phor, ṭphor, release, q.v. 349 -ge. See critical note.

II, written for po (Tib. spo, pho, top) + re. See also ṭphor, phor, spo I. 291 ḫtsahō; 345 laō (p. 269).

pañ, conceivably = Tib. dpain, witness (p. 344). 361 ḫeṣu-ያ롬 (pp. 282, 233, 308).

pañ = Tib. dpān, ṭphān, something suspended, e.g. partitions. See also ṭphān. 69 tharō (pp. 247-8).

pyar = Tib. phyar, ṭphyar, lift, hoist, roof. See also pyar, phyar, ṭphyar (p. 287). 341 -ma-swañ (p. 353).

pyi = Tib. phyi, beyond, outside, subsequent; ṭphyi, be late. See also ṭphyī. 88, 92 ḫhse; 143 ḫldyanō; 201 -rjes (pp. 274, 288, 321, 359).


pyer = pyar, q.v. 65 ḫldanō (pp. 186, 228, 357).

pra. Cf. ṭpra, ṭpraḥ, ṭphrāḥ. 43 ḫrehe.

prom, Auxiliary Verb = perform, carry out, &c. (pp. 137, 199-200). See also ṭprom, ṭprom, ṭproms, ṭphrom, ṭphrom.


plan = Tib. plan/srañ, street, straight, and so ‘line’ (pp. 241-2). See also ṭplan, ṭphañ. 182 -na; 195 -ḥdrah (p. 155-6).

plim-plam, let loose? (p. 192). 120 ḫsānō (pp. 291-2).


ḥpā (read ṭpah) = pa, brave, &c. ? 187 ḫtāō.

ḥpag, low, cf. Tib. ṭpag, measure, depth (pp. 195-6, 226, 349). See also ṭpag, ṭrpag. 326, 328 ḫnāhō; 384 ḫṛṣehiō (pp. 226, 239).

ḥpañ I = Tib. ṭphëñ, ṭphañs, &c., throw. 283 -ṭsā-ge.

II = Tib. pañ, spañ, phañ, lap. See also ṭphāñ, ṭphañ. 290 ḫrīhōi (p. 291, 308 ḫg-ṛōi (p. 324 ḫ-gyāhō (pp. 228, 263, 275, 298, 340).

III = Tib. phāñs, ṭpañs, spañs, height? 290, 291, 308 (p. 340). See under II.

IV, conceivably = Tib. ṭpañ, witness. See also ṭpañ. 101 ḫrañ-warō.

ḥpañ I = pa, brave, hero, q.v. See also ṭpah. 36 -ḥron-ḥkes; 185 maō (p. 205 -ṛmag; 259 ḫrgam; 305, 306 ḫbrad-re; 374 ḫwe; 377 -ḥldan-ḥro; 388 ḫṛtahō (pp. 231, 239, 254, 262, 269, 280, 300).

II. See mehiō, ṭmehiō. 272 ṭmehiō.

ḥpahi, ṭpahi. See ṭpāhi. 211 myēō; 384 ḫdyo-rohō (pp. 282, 327, 331).

ḥpar = ṭphar, q.v. 289 ḫgamo (p. 293).
hpu I = man, male. See also hpur, hphu I, hbu II (pp. 216–17, 308). 29 htor° ohgru; 64 tor°; 65 hno-[e]-htsa°; 150 hldya°(?); 157 -hbro; 161, 218, 343 hldya°; 140 -hpos; 266 -hbo; 289, 322 hgar; 381 -hlo (see pu-glo) (pp. 138, 157, 187, 216–17, 219, 260, 297, 305, 308, 359).

II = bird. 160 -myi-hldin (pp. 145–6, 172, 217).

III, for hbu = Tib. bu, son, child. 183 -ge; 184 ma° (p. 301).

IV. 83 hts° ohkam.

hpud = Tib. phud, hphud, hbud, blow out, drive out? phud, an instant. 28 -hto. See critical note.


hpuhi = Tib. hphu, hbud, &c., blow (pp. 284–5). See also hphu II, hphuhi. 274 hldyim-ste°; 282 -hpuhi (p. 331).

hpur, for hpu I, q.v., +re (pp. 173–5). 163 hbr-hše° (pp. 216–17).

hpul, cf. Tib. phul, handful; phul-tu, at a climax; phul-byuñ, perfected. See also hphul. 15, 51 hš-ša°-ma° (p. 267).

hpus. 298 -hphy (p. 359).

hpég = hphyegs, q.v. 360 swa°.

hpehi, apparently = Tib. dpe, sample (exemplar), and confused with spa, ornament (pp. 282, 349). 211 myi°; 353 hdo°; 384, 386, 387 hro° (pp. 274, 331). See also spehi, hpehi, spa, spe, spehi.

hpó I = po, male, man, q.v. See also hpho. 115 -hldi; 177 -hldio, a Suffix, pp. 186–7; 358 -hldah, a Suffix, p. 183; 361 -hñe; 393 -hdam (? (pp. 217, 229, 274, 316, 335).

II = Tib. spo, hpho, change, alter, migrate. 46 hgo°; 48 hší°; 122 htsog-hram° (pp. 226, 251, 286, 292).

III, perhaps = Tib. pho, belly, in 317 hpo-hrbom: cf. po-rbom (hrbom), hbo-bon (hbon), hbm-rbo (pp. 224, 323). See also hpho, hphog.

hpog = Tib. hphog, hit (with a missile). See also hphog. 59 hda° (p. 343).

hpóñ I = Tib. phón, phóns, hphóns, poor, needy, &c. 113 hña° (pp. 233, 238, 297).

II, for Tib. dpon, master, chief, in 321 stó°? (p. 362).

hpod. perhaps = tremble. 14 spo° (p. 265).

hpom = Tib. pham, hpham, be defeated. See also hphom (p. 367). 347 hr-ne-hño-ge° (p. 219).

hpóto. 28 -hwar-hwar (p. 341).

hpó = por I, release, q.v. Tib. hbor, cast, abandon. See also phor II, hphor. 68 hbu°; 175 hrnu-gla° (pp. 250, 268, 319).

hpos = hbos, grown, big, q.v. 141 hpu° (pp. 231, 297).

hpyah = Tib. dpya, hphya, rebuke; dpya, tax (= phya, hphya?). 328 hka° (pp. 315, 317).

hpyi, perhaps = Tib. dbyi, g-yi, lynx. 333 hrkom° (p. 305).

hpyid = Tib. phyd, hphyd, suffice or wipe away. See also hphyd. 339 stor-hdei°; 344 ldáo-hdei°? (pp. 253, 256).

hpyed = Tib. hbyed, hbye, phye, dbye, be separated, divided, opened. See also hphyped, hbye. 208 htsb-hde° (p. 234).

hpára = Tib. pra, phra, prognostic? Cf. phra, minute? See also pra and hphrah. 267 -hra.

hpárán = Tib. hphrhán, narrow, ledge; sprán, beggar. 368 hrío° (p. 239).

hpárah = Tib. hphra, kick, or phra, small? See also pra, hphrah. 254 hyog° (?); 331 hrkom-hbro; 323 hklu°; 333 hrkom-hpyi°; 336 htho° (p. 305).

hpáro = Tib. hphro, spro, expand, progress, rejoice. 181 -hra; 245, 246 -hbo-hbon (p. 156).
hprom = prom, Auxiliary Verb, q.v. 128, 169, 209, 321, 322, 341, 359, 360.

hproms, Aorist of hprom, prom, q.v. 122 htas (pp. 281, 292).

hplaī = plaī, street, q.v. 356 -hdraḥ (p. 241).

rpaŋ, low or made low. See hpag and also hrpaŋ. Perhaps sometimes 'deep' or 'depth' (Tib. dpag) (pp. 225-6).

hplan = plan, street, q.v. 356.

hpraŋ = rpag, q.v. 17 hkaḥro; 128 hkaḥro; 193 hņaḥ-hṣu; 194 gso-nad; 208 hkaḥ-ḥcig; 210 hčaŋ-rge; 240 ṛne-hlaḍ; 245 gse-laḍ; 252 baṇ (pp. 183, 196, 234, 243, 245, 274, 305).

rpu. See p. 350. 91 htsoṅ.

rpehi = Tib. dpe, sample. See hpehi, hrpehi. 286 -hlaḍ, a ṣuffix, p. 183 (p. 323).

hrpaŋ = rpag, q.v. 17 hkaḥro; 128 hkaḥro; 193 hņaḥ-hṣu; 223 hbral; 231 hwa-bze; 253 hbaṇ-hlaḍ (pp. 225-7, 242-3, 263, 305, 309).

—ḥkhr, down-bowed. 6 (p. 226).

hrpehi = rpehi, q.v. 169 -hrgam (pp. 244, 323).

hrpod = Tib. spod, vow, or phod, cope with, or ḫbod, challenge, fight? 250 -ḥbos (p. 349).

lpyoḥo = Tib. ṭhyo, be agitated, wave? (p. 354). 22 ḥmar-myīo.

spa = Tib. spa, ornament. See also spehi, hpehi. 151 mehi (pp. 282, 356).

spu-rbu = Tib. spu-gu, some small bird, or spur, ḥphur, fly (p. 350). 39 ṭgoṅ.

spe fundamentally = spa, hpehi, spehi, hrpehi, ornament, exemplar, q.v. See also spehi (p. 356). 86 nao.

spehi = spo, q.v. (pp. 282, 356). 140 ḥni-stor; 200 -ḥdaṇ; 379 ge (p. 323).

spo I = Tib. spo, height, summit. 14 -ḥpod-pod; 381 -ro (?) (p. 265).

II = Tib. spo, ḥpho, change, migrate, pass away. See also

hpo II (p. 356). 126 ḥldan-kraṇ; 381 -ro (?) (pp. 288-9).

spyi = Tib. spyi, general, top, chief. 110 -ḥḍe (p. 335).

spye, summer = Tib. dbyar Mo-so jē? (p. 353). 159 -ḥṭor; 148 -ḥtor; 190 ḥṣe (pp. 145-6, 240, 285-6, 302).

Ph

phaṇ = ḥpaṇ II, lap, &c., q.v. 111 ḥbom-ṛbo (p. 230).

phu, conceivably = hpu IV, q.v. 130 -ḥkam.

phor I = pho-re. Cf. por II. 295 ḥtṣa-o.

II = por I, ḥpor, q.v. See also ḥphor. 359 nu-glai (p. 250).

phya = ḥphyah? 204 pyuo.

phyaṇ = pyaṇ, suspended, &c., q.v. 348 ḥṭam; 374 ḡtr (pp. 248, 343).

phyi = ṭyi, outside, subsequent, q.v. 79 ḥdaṇ; 89, 96, 98 ḡṣe (pp. 288, 321).

phyir, for phyir-re? = Tib. phyir, outside, back, or phyir-re? = Tib. ṭḥyir, eradicate? 249 ḥraḥyāṇo.

phye = Tib. ḥbyed, phye, &c., divided, opened. See also ḥpyed, ḥphyeḍ. 120 ḥtsoṅ-ṛbo; 145 ḡgo (pp. 291-2, 299-300).

phyer = pyar, phyar, lift, hoist, q.v. 254 ḥdaṇ; 261 ḡna; 340 -ma-svaṇ; 342 -ḥṣo-ḥṭsē (pp. 239, 283, 287, 353).

phrom = prom, Auxiliary Verb, q.v. See also ḥphrom. 172 ḥkiḥu (p. 254).

phlaṇ = plaṇ, ḥplaṇ, street, q.v. 357 -niṇ.

gphaḥ, father = Tib. pha. See also ḥphaḥ, ḥphaḥ. 60 -ṭa (p. 145).

bphyag, Aorist of ḥphyag, q.v. 101 ḥkho-ḥko (pp. 196, 264).

ḥpha = Tib. pha, father. See also ḥphaḥ, ḥphaḥ. 60 -ṣa (p. 318).
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**hphan** I = Tib. phag, pig. 69 -lag-nah (pp. 193, 247).

II cf. Tib. hphags, elevated, or phag, hidden part, interstice, or phag-rags, rampart? so-phag, brick-work. 238 -hba-ge.

**hphage.** See **hpha-ge.** 184.

**hphan =** hpañ II and III, q.v. See also phañ. 302 hrihi (pp. 178, 263).

**hphan =** Tib. phan, benefit. 215 ñushu-tø.

**hphah I =** phha, father, q.v. 38 rybo; 73 -ma; 199 -rmañ (pp. 274, 320).

II = pa, pā, hphem, I, brave, q.v.? 151 -hphog; 304 hyah-hdad; 314 ḡkhog-re (p. 280).

III = 275 ḡldañ(?)-gsom; 364 ḡtomo.

— **hphah,** laugh. 348 ḡweg-hweho (pp. 248, 343).

**hphahha, miswriting (of hphah?),** 275.

**hphar =** Tib. phar, beyond; phar, be elevated (go away). See also ḡpar. 93, 99, 110, 118 ḡgam; 142 mor-gdag; 157 na-rag; 187 ḡtṛa-hpae; 388 ḡtṛa-hpah (pp. 239, 243, 336).

**hphu I =** hpu I, man, male, q.v. 62 ḡtor; 48 -hseg (??) (pp. 308, 330).

II = Tib. phu, phus, ḡbud, ḡbu, blow (the fire, &c.). See also ḡpuhi, pu (ḥphu)-gro, ḡldim-ḥphu. 104 skuo; 301 ḡldim; 352 -ḥphu (pp. 157, 270, 285, 321).

— (I) **-ḥbos =** hpu (I), -ḥbos (hapus), q.v. 40, 167.

— (II) **-ḥklo, bellows = pu-glo, q.v. 40 (pp. 239, 284).**

**ḥphuḥi =** ḡphu II + hi. 190 -ḥtön; 276 ḡdzam (pp. 228, 285).

**ḥphul =** ḡphul, handyful, at a climax, q.v. 41 ḡnud-nohu.

**ḥphe =** Tib. ḡphen, throw away, or phe, weak? 317 ḡwa-ne (pp. 338-9).

**ḥpho =** po, ḡpo I, male, q.v. 117 -ḥdir-ḥtsag (p. 217).

**ḥphog =** ḡpog (Tib. ḡphog), hit with a missile, q.v. (p. 343). 151 ḡphah.

**ḥhom =** ḡhom (Tib. pham, hham), be defeated, q.v. 147 -te-hdrañ (pp. 299-300).

**ḥhor =** phor II, por I, ḡpor I, release, &c., q.v. 168 chi-hrму (p. 287, 344).

**ḥpyag =** Tib. phyag, hand; phyag-byed, salute, &c. See also ḡpyag. 106 -ḥkhoro.

**ḥpyar =** pyar, pyer, phyer, lift, hoist, q.v. 116 ḡldañ; 341 -ma; -hswañ (pp. 287, 344).

**ḥpyid =** ḡpyid, suffice, wipe away, q.v. 340 ḡstor-hdehio (p. 253).

**ḥpyu =** pyu? 208 -ḥlyañ.

**ḥpyeɡs =** ḡpeg, q.v. 176 swa.

**ḥpyed =** ḡpyed, be separated, opened, &c., q.v. See also phye. 208 rsehi-rgod.


**ḥphrah =** ḡprañ (Tib. kick?). 255 ḡdrañ-reo.

**ḥphrom.** Auxiliary Verb = prom, ḡprom, ḡproms, ḡprom, ḡrom, q.v. 171 ḡkhoñ.

**B**

**bañ =** Tib. ḡbañs, a subject or servant? See also ḡbañ I. 249 -hrehe; 252 -rpag (pp. 274).

**baḥ =** Tib. ba, cow? 47 ḡbehi (p. 286).

**beɡ, only in the Proper Name Ses (Hses)-beg (hbeq), possibly related to the ḡbeg, ḡbag, ḡaga of Tsen-hgi-rbag, &c., p. 134. See also ḡbeq. 24 ḡses; 5 ḡses (pp. 138, 224, 306-7).

**bon =** ḡbon, in ḡho-hbon, q.v. 238 ḡbo (p. 230).

**bos I =** ḡbos, grown, big, q.v. See also ḡbo I. ḡbom, ḡbo, ḡbom, ḡbro, ḡbrom. 42, 43 -smi; 378 -[smi]-ḥldog ? (pp. 322-3, 334).

**byl small = ‘Nam-pa’ pyi (p. 132) Hsi-hsia ḡbiñ, &c. See also
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See also ḥbaḥ I. 54 ržānô (p. 352).

Byān I = baṇ, subject, servant, q.v. 67, 251 -re, -re, -hre, -hrēhe; 67, 371. 373, 386, 390 -hko-htar, q.v.; 253 -hldon; 363 -kwa-kwa (?) (pp. 268, 274, 331, 346 n.).

II = Tib. dbaṇ, power, authority. 39 ḡyaid (?) -ge⁰; 170 -hldah, a Suffix, p. 183; 172 -prom; 252 g-riî (??); 354 ḡldumô (?) (pp. 257, 275, 316, 321, 345, 346).

— (II) -thwān = Tib. dbaṇ-thān, might, fortune, destiny. 97 -byiû (pp. 342, 347).

Ḥbāb = Tib. bab, ḡbab, dbab, fall, descend, alight; ḡbab-chu, river, torrent. 15 ḡmarô; 357 skôô (p. 267).

Ḥbaḥ I = ḡba, billows, &c., q.v. (also 'rocking' in 45): derived from II? 45 ḡldagô; 51 ḡmarô; 55 ḡrag-hkyer (p. 317).

II = Tib. ḡbaḥ, seizure, distrain (perhaps originally pressure, cf. ḡbaḥ-cha, less, sediment). 110 ḡro-ḥbeḥî; 234 ḡtsag-hro-ḥbeḥîô; 235 ḡbeô (pp. 293–4).

III? 239 ḡphagô; 270 -ḥbom-rbo (p. 230).

Ḩbar I = Tib. bâr, dbar, interval, between. 97, 98 (pp. 262, 342, 345).

II for ḡbâh (II)+re. 18 ḡyogs-bldogô; 234 ḡtsag-hro-ḥbeḥîô (pp. 250, 339).

Ḩbu I=Tib. dbu, head. 47 -hrug; 68 -hpọr (pp. 250, 268, 268, 319).

II = ḡpu I, ḡphu I, man, q.v. 33 ḡtorô ọhgru (p. 308).

III = Tib. phu, high part of valley. 15 -rwye; 50 -rhye (p. 267).

Ḩbe, sheep (p. 249). See also ḡbeḥî, ḡbehe. 235 -ḥbaḥ; 390 -ḥbaḥ? (pp. 293–4).

Ḥbeg = beg, q.v. 7, 8, 20, 23, 25 ḡsôô, sèsô (pp. 138, 224, 306–7).

Ḥbeḥî = ḡbe, ḡbehe, q.v. 47 -bâh; 69 -a-hgar; 110 -ḥbaḥ; 213 -tyaṇ; 234 -ḥbaḥ and -hbar (pp. 193, 247, 249, 250, 253, 286, 293).
hbehe = ḥbe, ḥbehi, q.v. 46 -ḥsli-
rmān (p. 257).

hbo I = Tib. bo, dbo, ḥbo, ḥbos,
expand as a bubble, spill over,
swell up, rise, grow; sbo, swell,
distend; sbo, upper part of belly;
pho, stomach; sbom, bulk (pp.
230–2). See also ḡbohu, rbo,
hrbo, ḥbon, ḥbom, ḥbos,
rbom, hrbom. 126 stor-ḥgu;
163 ḥsli-
rmān (p. 257).

hbo I = Tib. bo, dbo, ḥbo, ḥbos,
expand as a bubble, spill over,
swell up, rise, grow; sbo, swell,
distend; sbo, upper part of belly;
pho, stomach; sbom, bulk (pp.
230–2). See also ḡbohu, rbo,
hrbo, ḥbon, ḥbom, ḥbos,
rbom, hrbom. 126 stor-ḥgu;
163 ḥsli-
rmān (p. 257).

hbyi, small, become small = ḥsi-
hsia dbih, ḥbhi, ḥbiḥ (pp. 132,
252): perhaps = Tib. ḥbyi,
dbyi, wipe out. See also ṛbyi,
ḥḥbyihi. 50 ḥce-ḥraḥ; 75 ḥgu-
ḥtor; 167 ḥri; 305, 307, 308,
311 ḥdzu ḥgu (pp. 252, 265,
273, 276, 337, 338).

hbyig = cow (pp. 249–50). 70 -la-
ghaḥ (pp. 198, 247).

hbyiḥ = Tib. ḥbyiḥ, sink, grow
faint; byiḥ, depth, ḍec. See
also ḥyin. 56 ḥce-ḥraḥ; 57
me-ḥa; 96 na-ge (p. 345).

hbyiḥ = ḥbyiḥ, q.v. 84 cis-tsha (p.
359).

hbye, perhaps connected with ṛyim, q.v.
266 -ge-g-yah; 363 ḥmu-lom-
ge (p. 345).

hbyihi = ḥbyi, q.v. 46 -ḥsli-
rmān (p. 257).

hbyim = connected with ṛyim, q.v.
266 -ge-g-yah; 363 ḥmu-lom-
ge (p. 345).

hbyihi = ḥbyi, q.v. 46 -ḥsli-
rmān (p. 257).

hbra = braḥ, q.v. See also ḥbrah,
ḥbrahr.

— -ḥlda(r), probably name of a
place, real or mythical, 31, 32
(p. 319).

hbrad = Tib. ḥbrab, snatch (pp.
253–4). 213 ḥstāḥ; 305 -re;
306 -re, -sta, a Suffix, pp. 182–3,
359; 312 ḥjhuḥu (pp. 231,
253–4).

hbrah = ḥbraḥ, braḥ, be plentiful,
dec, q.v. 269 ḥwah-ne (p. 339).
See also ḥbrahr.

— -ḥlda(r), probably name of a
place, real or mythical, 31, 32
(p. 319).

hbrad = Tib. ḥbrab, snatch (pp.
253–4). 213 ḥstāḥ; 305 -re;
306 -re, -sta, a Suffix, pp. 182–3,
359; 312 ḥjhuḥu (pp. 231,
253–4).

hbrah = ḥbraḥ, braḥ, be plentiful,
dec, q.v. 269 ḥwah-ne (p. 339).
See also ḥbrahr.

— -ḥlda(r), probably name of a
place, real or mythical, 31, 32
(p. 319).

hbrahr for ḥbrahr-re (p. 123). 254
ḥldaḥ-phyr (p. 287).

ḥbri I = bri I, diminish, grow less
(destroy?), loss? q.v. 132 -ḥldi-
ḥtāḥ; 203 -ḥko; 228 -ḥgu, a
Suffix, pp. 190, 258 (pp. 171,
215–16, 246, 253).

II = bri II, female, q.v. 137 -re;
150, 161, 218, 343 ḥpu (71); 163
ḥsehe; 324 -ḥdzou hykym; 381
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slod-hldo (pp. 138, 216-18, 275, 338).

\[ \text{hbrus} = \text{Tib. hbru, brus, probe, irritate, inflame. 153 skeo (p. 316).} \]

\[ \text{hbres, Aorist of brehe, be alarmed, &c.} \]

\[ \text{hbro} I = \text{bro, flee, &c. q.v. 176 kehu-promo.} \]

\[ \text{hbron = Tib. hbron, wild yak (pp. 139, 258-9). See also hldag-nag.} \]

\[ \text{rbyo I = fowl (pp. 332-3). 38 -hphah: 365 -rgyer: 366 -g-yer (pp. 320, 332).} \]

\[ \text{II = rbyo-po, a priest, sorcerer or bon-po man, perhaps literally a fowl-man? (pp. 155-6, 332-3). See also hrbyo I. 53 -hko-rnio; 82 -ha-ge; 102 -sana; 181 -po (pp. 263, 320, 332-3).} \]

\[ \text{III, miswriting of rgyo, q.v. 330 -gsseg (p. 178).} \]

\[ \text{hrbo = rbo, swell up, &c. q.v. 25 Ses-hbeg.} \]

\[ \text{hrbom = rbom, bigness, become big, &c. q.v. 317 hpo (p. 323).} \]

\[ \text{hrbyo I = rbyo II, q.v. 56 -hkornio (p. 263).} \]

\[ \text{sbym, target, cf. Tib. hgyim? 59 -hce-rgye (p. 343).} \]

\[ \text{phyet, bye, rwyed. 53 -hce-rgya (pp. 290-2, 345).} \]

Ma

-\[ \text{ma, a Nominal Suffix (pp. 181-2), seen in rgyed-ma 101, 105, 107, 231, hgru-ma 27, 32, 77, 79, hdah-ma (?) 108.} \]

-\[ \text{ma = Tib. &c., ma, not (p. 205). 31, 32; 57, 63, 71, 94 (final after Verb htan); 96 (between Verb htan and Suffix te): 103. &c.} \]

-\[ \text{ma, mah. See mahn.} \]

-\[ \text{ma, mother. 65 hpha; 184 -hpu; 185 -hphah (?) (pp. 301, 318).} \]

-\[ \text{mag = Tib. dmag, army. See also rmag, hrmag. 102 hsad (p. 301).} \]

-\[ \text{hnno, battle, cf. Tib. g-yul-noo, battlefront. 48, 49, 58, 145, 184 (pp. 194, 299-301, 320).} \]

-\[ \text{mahn for man in reduplicated man-man. See also hman. 238 mah-mahn; 243, 246 ma-mah; 245 ma-ma-hna; 247 ma-hman (p. 230).} \]

-\[ \text{mu, cold, afraid (?). See also hmu, hmuhi. 116 -rgye; 184 -re; 175 -hkli (?) 197 -hrog-hтро;} \]
| mug | Tib. mug, gloom; rmugs, fog, stupid, &c. 227 -hgu, a Suffix, pp. 190, 258 (pp. 215–16). |
| me | fire (literal and metaphorical) = Tib. me. See also mye I, hmye, sme, mehe, hmehi II (pp. 281–6). 8, 20 -hrah; 40 hnah; 45 re, lect. ma for me?; 53 -hyed; 56 -na; 58 -na; 67 hjo, hlab; 70 hjo, hlab; 71 hde; 89 hshog; 114 -hmehi; 123 stor; 124 hlda; 149 htha; 170 hkeh, hkoh; 173 hko; 253 hyah, jo, hlab (pp. 172, 173, 194, 201, 232, 239, 244, 257, 268, 272, 273, 274, 275, 282, 284, 285, 286, 288, 300–1, 316, 320, 321, 337, 345). |
| mehi I, eye = Tib. mig, &c. See also hmehi I, mye III. 25 Hses-hbeg; 78 -ra; 151 -spa; 155 -hgb; 185 sud; 186, 369 -hrah; 370 -shehi-hrah; 35 -g-rhtha (?)(pp. 138, 139, 186–7, 223, 244, 265, 282, 318, 331). |
| mehe = me. 171 hko. |
| mo | Tib. mo, feminine, woman. See also hmo I (p. 182). 108 -lah; 188 hna(hna-hdra; 193 hnah (pp. 221, 238, 285). See also hmo II. |
| meh | sky, or mo-ge for mog (q.v.) + ge? 252 sta-reo (p. 201). |
| meh? | hair? 63, 144 -ma-hthor (p. 303). See also hmo III. |
| mog (? lect.) = gmog, hmog, cloud? 6 -htswe (pp. 269, 271). |
| Moñ | Proper name of a people, the Mons. See also Hmoñ (pp. 150–4). 379, 380, 381 hrtsg, rtsig, tsg (p. 285). |
| -hdoñ/hhñ, Mon fort. See also Hmoñ. 64 hstor; 118 stor; 128 stor; 139 stor; 140 stor (pp. 171, 187, 243, 305, 308). |
| mod | Tib. mod, be verily (p. 200). 211 hgo-gtoñ; 212 hko-htoñ (pp. 200, 260, 261, 332). |
| modhi | mod (q.v.) + hi. 212. |
| myag | Tib. myag, chew; myags, putrid (spoiled, vile). 39 -mye, -htha; 109 -gre; 148 -myi[-tor], myage-me-htha; 179 gnah, gno; 280 -ma-htsar; 367 gnah, gno; 368 hyahngno (pp. 221, 231, 269, 291–2, 302). |
| myi | Tib. mi, man (pp. 236–7). 148 -tor; 153 -re; -hsi, -rgye; 211 -hphehi (pp. 174, 236, 273). |
| myi II | = Tib. mi, not. See also hmyi, mye II. 98 phyih-se; 159 -seg; 160 -hrgan, -hdlin; 165 -hrdoho (pp. 145–6, 172, 200, 217, 296, 345). |
| myin | Tib. miñ, name (mere name). 97 htsog-hram (p. 345). |
| myil | Tib. myulñul, rove as a spy (pp. 354, 367). See also hmyil. 29 rgu-hmyil (p. 259). |
| mye | = me, fire, q.v. See also hmye. 6 -hya-hwad; 39 -htha; 102 hsi-kyeg; 195 hthar; 211 -hpa; 357 thar (pp. 241, 269, 271, 301, 340). |
| myer | 154 -dze; 241 -re (p. 237). |
| myen | Chinese wan (mín), myriad. 247 hlad-htno (p. 234). |
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**myer**
- written for mye II, is not, (q.v.), + re (pp. 174, 281). 129 -re; 153 myi-rgye⁰; 365 rgon-wa⁰, ḳtsog-hram⁰; 366 ḳhehu-prom⁰ (pp. 273, 293, 332, 342).

**ḥmog**
- cloud, cf. Tib. rmugs, fog, stupid; mug, gloom; mog, dark colours; Tangut; rmūkha, cloud. 55 -hce-rgyaḥ, -hec-hsaa (pp. 263, 271, 353). See also ṭmog, Ḷmog.

**ḥmana**
- larger, many = Tib. mañ, man (pp. 230–1). 33 (?) -hldāḥ, a Suffix, p. 183; 146 -byi; 301 ḳldm-hphu⁰; 302 -hṛiḥi; 303 -ḥkhu; 304 -ḥldyo, -rgam; 305 -nañ-hyu; 306 -ge-hrgam; 307 ḳhnā-na⁰, -hrgam; 308 -hṛi, -g-ri; 309 -g-riḥi; 310 ḳldim⁰; 311 -sto (pp. 200, 229, 231, 239, 254, 256, 266, 270, 300, 309, 321, 327, 337, 345).

**ḥmad**
- = Tib. smad, low, lower, reprove. See also ṭmad (pp. 226–7). 36, 39 ṭes⁰; 202 ṭhraḥ⁰ (pp. 269, 313).

**ḥman**
- in reduplicated form mañ, man, many. 247. See maḥn.

**ḥmah**
- = Tib. ma, dmaḥ, low, antithetic to ya. See also ṭmah, ḳgṛu (II) -ḥldān-ḥmaḥ (pp. 226–7). 112 -ḥldān-hyaḥ (pp. 227, 288).

**ḥmar**
- = Tib. mar, down, low. 15 ḳhab (cf. Tib. chu-ḥbab, hill torrent); 22 -myi-lpyoḥo; 51 -ḥbab (p. 267).

II = Tib. mar, butter, oil. 46 -me, lamp = Tib. mar-me (p. 286).

**ḥmu**
- = mu, cold, q.v. See also ḳmuḥi (pp. 232–3). 39 ḳhye-ge⁰; 104 ḳdram⁰; 200 ṭes⁰; 204 ḳche⁰; 206 ḳrce⁰; 225, 236, 245 dgu⁰/dguḥu⁰, hto/to; 268 -klag; 309 -wa-ṛuḥ; 363 -lom (?) (pp. 200, 232–3, 266, 270, 285, 298, 320, 338).


**ḥmun**
- = Tib. mun, darkness? (p. 276). 33 ḳse-hṭe⁰.

**ḥmuḥi**
- = ḳmu I, q.v. 183 me⁰, make cold (pp. 172, 232).

**ḥme**
- = me, fire, q.v. See also ṭmeḥi. 262 caṇ-smo (p. 283).

II meḥi II, is not. 121 ḳtsog-hram⁰ (pp. 281, 292).

**ḥmeḥi**
- = meḥi I, eye, q.v. 185 śud⁰; 186 ḳjam-ge⁰; 272 -ḥpah (p. 139).

II = ḳme, fire, q.v. 114 me⁰, light fire (pp. 172, 201, 232, 282).

— (I) -ḥlu-ḥcāḥ = meḥi⁰, q.v. 218 (pp. 138, 255).

**ḥmo**
- = mo, woman, q.v. 84 -rkah-lda; 97 -ḥcāḥ; 98 -cha; 189 ḳnañ-hdro⁰ (pp. 227, 285, 343, 345).

II = mo II, sky, q.v. (?). 8. 20 -ge-me-hraḥ; 9 -no-ge (? read mon-ge ?); 19 -ge (pp. 142, 201, 332).

III = mo III, hair? 71 -ma-thor (p. 303).

IV ? 210 -ta-ḥpun (p. 245).

V ? 175 mu-hldi⁰; 360.

**ḥmog**
- = ḳmog, cloud, q.v. 52 -hec-rgyaḥ; 54 stehi-ḥtam⁰; 81 -re-hldon (pp. 271, 353).

**ḥmogē**
- = written for ḳmog-ge or ḳmo-ge. 55 -hco.

**ḥmōn**
- = Moḥ, q.v. 78 -joḥ; 129 -ḥjoṇ (pp. 241, 263).

II. See re-ḥmoṇ. 134.

III. (ḥmaṇ ?)-ḥldān 33.

**ḥmor**
- = mor, bad, evil, q.v. 313 -ḥso; 318 ḳswaḥ⁰; 331 ḳgu⁰ (p. 296).

II. written for ḳmo (I) + re. 190 -bzaḥ-re (p. 240).

**ḥmyi**
- = myi II, not, q.v. 40 ḳnaḥme⁰; 254 ḳldyo-ḥtɔr⁰ (pp. 239, 284, 328 n.).

**ḥmyil**
- = myil, q.v. 29 -myil.

**ḥmye**
- = mye I, fire, q.v. 197 -ḥtah, a Suffix, pp. 122–3.

**ṛma**
- = Tib. rmas, ask. 47 dam⁰ (p. 286).

II = Tib. rma, wound. 156 -g-yog-ṛuḥ (p. 295).

III, river = ḳsī-hsia maṣuo, Tib.
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rma-chu. 196 -hsu-hdra (pp. 245–6).

rmag = Tib. dmag, army. See also mag, hrmag. 146 ḡraḥ-ḥtaņo; 147 ḡسود-ṭe; 149 ḡrgyed; 205 ḡphah (pp. 144, 246, 300, 361).


II = Tib. rmān, dream, rmoň, rmoňs, delusion, &c. 46 ḡśli; 77 ḡgur-ma (pp. 278, 309).

rmad = Tib. smad, low. See also hmah, rmah, hmad (pp. 226–7). 80, 84 ḡsýo (pp. 235, 288, 343).

rmah = ḡmah, rmah, q.v., low. 257 ḡyań (p. 227).

rmal I. written for rmah-re. 315, 318 ḡyań-htano (pp. 227, 296).

rmar I, written for rmah-re. 315, 318 ḡyań-ḥtań (pp. 227, 296).

II, written for rma (Tib. rma, wound, to wound) + re. ‘312 ḡdom-ḥgūḥo, ḡjuḥu-ḥbrad (p. 254).

rmur, written for rmu (= Tib. mu, boundary) + re (pp. 351–2). See also hmnu II, ḡrmu. 166 ḡshah-chad (p. 276).


rmr = Tib. smon, wish, aspire, pray? See also rmon? 250 -kum (p. 294).

rmon = rmo? or connected with rmān II, dream? 349 hjim-htsun-ge.

rmnyi (? lect.) = smyi, man, q.v.? 41 ḡyań.

hrmag = rmag, army, q.v. 146 ḡne-ne (pp. 222, 290–300).

hrnu = rnu, boundary, q.v. 168 chi (p. 276).

hrmono. 18 ḡskyim-se.

smu-hďdu, conceivably = Tib. mu-zī, brimstone, with -i/u as in p. 367. 27 -rgyag (p. 259).


sme, fire, blaze, me, mye I, ḡme I, ḡmēh II, ḡmye, q.v. (pp. 282–3, 357). 192 ḡrgyed-ḥrań; 202 ḡan; 282, 284, 375 ḡse; 342 klu-hldo—error for rme? 393 ḡrgyed-ḥsań (pp. 282–3).

smyi = Tib. mi, myi, man (pp. 236–7). See also myi, rmmyi, 37 -rmad; 42, 44 -hldog; 73 -ḥbom; 80 -nī; 84 -rmad; 241, 242 -ḥnu; 269 -glo (pp. 227, 237, 288, 322, 323, 334, 339, 343).

Ts

tsa, a Pluralizing or classifying Suffix, often in the combination re-tsa, signifying those who (whose, &c.) (pp. 187–8). See also tsaḥ, htsa I, htsaḥ, tsha, tshah. 60 ḡku, ḡphah; 63 ḡyań; 163 ḡno-re; 220ḥtań-le; 283 ḡpań; 388 ḡyań (pp. 145, 274, 304, 305, 315).

tsań = Tib. tsań, complete (p. 364). 136 ḡtsae-ḥkom-re.

tsaḥ = tsa, q.v. 388 mor (pp. 216, 304).

tsig = rtsig, ḡrtsig, carpenter, q.v. 381 -Moń.

tsu = Tib. tshu, tshur, hither, come hither. 284 -re (p. 364). See also gtshu, ḡtsu I, ḡtsuḥ, tsur, ḡtsur, ḡtsuḥ, ḡtshun, ḡtshur.

tsur = tsu, ḡtsu, ḡtsur, come, &c., q.v. 391 ḡyań-ḥnań.

tse, written for dze, q.v. 63 ḡjo; 111 ḡyań; 120 ḡnań (pp. 230, 262, 274, 291–2, 305).

tseg = ḡceg, ḡceg, ḡceg, q.v. (p. 294). 93 ḡswa o ḡtsae (p. 334).

tswu. 16 ḡswa? (pp. 269, 368). 196 ḡwam-whehi-ge (p. 241).

gtsań = Tib. stsań, corn, grain. See also ḡtsań. 159 -myihrjan; 165 ḡshah (pp. 145–6, 335).
**Gtse**. Prospective form of tsu, q.v. 214 ḡrneh r° (p. 345).

**Gtse** = Tib. gtse/ḥshe, cause mischief, injure (pp. 140–1). 113 -ne; 136 -ḥkom. See also **Gse**, ḥshe I, ḥsheh, ḥsheh II.

**Gtso**. Prospective form of ḡtshab, q.v. = Tib. ḡtshab, replace, be ruffled; ḡtshab, deputy? 351 ḡdam-sleg r°; 352 glyan-ru o.

** Hvtsa** = = Prospective form of ḡtshab, q.v. = Tib. ḡtshab, replace, be ruffled; ḡtshab, deputy? 351 ḡdam-sleg r°; 352 glyan-ru o.
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**Hvtsa**/ḥdzehi. 30, 62, 73, 115 (p. 252).

**Hvtsah**-sto, written for ḡtsahs-to. Aorist form of ḡtshah (III ?). 33 na o; 233 ḡchir o (p. 275).

**Hvtsar** = Tib. ḡtsar, ḡtsar, limit, parish. See also **Hvtsar**. 280 myag-ma o (p. 231).

**Hvtsu** = tsu, hither, come hither, q.v. See also **Hvtsu**u, ḡtsur, ḡtshu, ḡtshur. 113 ḡgu-ḥtor o; 304 ḡdom-ḥgu o (p. 233).

**Hvtsu**u = ḡtsu I, q.v. 166 ḡraň- ḡraň o; 303 ḡdom-ḥgu o (pp. 142. 200, 256, 327).

**Hvtsur** = tsu, ḡtsu I, q.v. 207 ḡkaň - ḡkaň o (p. 315).

**Hvtséh** 346. See **Hdzo**.

**Hvtséh** 342. See **Hvtsah** IV.

**Hvtsso** I? 83 ḡlasa o; 105 -dro- ḡo (p. 261).

— written in place of ḡtsog, q.v. 88.

— (II) -hna written for so/ḥso-hnah, q.v. 93.

— (III) -ḥtsah, perhaps = Tib. cha-cha, matched. See also **Hdzo**-ḥtsah/hdza. 62, 73 ghio o; 115 ḡchah o (p. 252).

— III -ḥtsahi, apparently = -ḥtsah + hi (pp. 191–2). 342 phyer o.

**Hvtsog** = Tib. ḡtshogs, bstsags, dhc. See **Hvtsag**, tshog, ḡtshog, ḡtso, ḡcoq II. 91 -rpu; 94, 96 -ḥtani-ma; 95 -ḥldana; 99 ḡnah o; 102 ḡnah o (pp. 292, 320–1).

— -ḥram, friendship, harmony. 35, 37, 82, 86, 90, 94, 97, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 363 (pp. 262, 281, 288, 291–3, 345).

**Hvtsón** = Tib. tshón, ḡtshón, ḡtoños. trade, barter, sell. 349 ḡhiom o.

**Hvtsors** = Tib. ḡsor, ḡchor, ḡchor, hunt, chase; ḡor, ḡchor, flee. See also **Htsor**, ḡtsors. 134 ḡldag-nag o; 219 ḡbroo o (pp. 258–9).

**Hvtswe** = tswehu, q.v.? ḡdzwe? (pp. 269, 368). 6 ḡgo o,? lect.? (p. 269).
rtsig = Tib. rtsig, build, mason. See also hrtsig, tsig (p. 150). 379, 380-Mon.  
hrtsig = rtsig, q.v. 380-Mon.  
stsah = htsah II, watch, q.v. (p. 278). See also hstsah I. 298 hbošö.  
stsar = Tib. tshar, occasion, instance, used with numerals. 247 stoňö (pp. 233–4).  
htshah I = stsah, htsah II, hscah, wukh, q.v. 260-hyer; 288-hri; 295-hldah, a Suffix, p. 183; 345, 350, 351 hyuo (pp. 246, 278, 280).  

Tsh  
tsha = tsa, Pluralizing Suffix, q.v. 50 hce-raö; 84 cisö (?) (pp. 259, 359).  
tsham = htsam, Tib. tsam, just so much, q.v. 50-hrog (p. 361).  
tphis, error for chim, q.v., or = Tib. mchis, come? See also hthis. 95 dimö (pp. 320, 359).  
tshu = tshu, tshu, gtsu, come hither, &c., q.v.? See also htsog. 90-hdimo (p. 321).  
tshog = htsog, collect, assemble, q.v. See also htsog. 95-hldan (pp. 320–1).  
tshor = htsor(s), hunt, chase. See also htsors. 220 hbroňö.  
htshab = Tib. htsab, tshab, replace, deputy. See gtso. 104 hnanö (p. 360).  
htshar = Tib. tshar, limit, parish. See also htsar. 208-hde (p. 234).  
htshim = Tib. tshim, satisfaction; hchims, get full. See also chim, hchim. 81 hši-hkriö (p. 298).  
htphis = tphis, q.v. 88-hdimö (p. 321).  
htshu = tshu, tshu, gtsu I, gtsu, q.v. 75-hsoh-hsohö; 76-dgu-htorö; 215-to, a Suffix, pp. 184–6.  
htshun = hts hu, &c., q.v., also Tib. tshun. 76 dgu-htorö.  
htshur = htsur, q.v. 391-hnaň-hdiňö.  
htshe = Tib. gtse, htshe, do harm. See also gtse. 74 hkuňu-neňö (p. 250).  
htshog = htsog, q.v. —-hram. 90 = htsogö, friendship, &c. (p. 321).  
htshors = htsors, tshor, hunt, &c., q.v. 130-hdag-nagö (p. 259).  

Dz  
dze I, a Clause-terminating Postposition, signifying place, time, or circumstance (pp. 193–4). 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20 and passim.  
II. For cig-dze see cig.  
dzen. 378. (Read dze-rie?).  
dzwe = hĎwe, htswe, hĎwehe (p. 269)? 367 hšaň-khyaňö (p. 240).  
gdzu, ass. See also gzü, hĎzu I, hju, hzu (pp. 251–3). 194-steö; 305, 308, 311-hbyi; 390-htí (pp. 229, 241, 251, 337, 353).  
hĎza I = Tib. mdzah, friend, friendship. See also hĎza I. 362-ma-hnyon; 363-ma-hne; 376-hød (p. 220).  
II. See hĎzo-hĎza (htsa, hĎzehi).  
II? = Tib. bżan, fine, good (large). 232–4-hglah/glah/gla.  
III? = 38-hďyaň-hrdzaňö.  
hĎzam = hĎzam, gentle, pleasant, mild. See also hjam (pp. 297, 339). 68, 371, 373, 386, 389-hbroňö; 353-hbroň-hldarö; 122-arkwaö; 145-hnamö; 182-hbroň-hldahö; 224-hrkwaö;
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264 gsān⁰; 264 hno⁰; 274 ḥkyan⁰, rne⁰; 275 twan⁰; 276 ḥkyi⁰; 276 g-rāh⁰-nag; 278 -nag (pp. 250, 261, 268, 285, 313, 314, 319, 331, 341, 343, 361).

— -hdzim = Tib. zaṅ-ziṅ, miscellaneous objects, confused (bustle)? (p. 192). 100 gdim⁰ (p. 321).

ḥdzāh I = ḥdza I, friend, &c., q.v. See also ḥrdza, ḥrdzāh. 379 spehi-ge⁰; 382, 383 -hldah, a Suffix, p. 183; 43 ḥrah-ldah-ge⁰ (?) (pp. 157, 313, 323, 334). II = Tib. za, eat. See also ḥjāh, ḡzo, ḥdzo-hter⁰ (p. 183); 170 ḥkehu-meo; 255 ḥBan⁰; 43 (?) (pp. 316, 327, 331, 334).

ḥdزار = ḥjar, stick, stick together, q.v. (pp. 220, 248). See also ḥrdzar. 69, 374 skyim-se(hse)⁰; 372 ḥrne-hno⁰; 376 ḥdza-htro⁰ (pp. 145, 220, 248).

ḥdżim = Tib. ḥdżim, seize, hold. 74 ḥjo⁰; 369 ḡooh⁰ (pp. 274, 331). See also ḥdżim. See ḥdżamo.

ḥdzu I = gdzu, ass, q.v. 183 ḥdro-ḥphor; 352 ḥdro-ḥkus (pp. 157, 285, 332).

II. See ṣmu-ḥdzu.

ḥdżud = Tib. chud, be wasted, consumed (also ḡjud, ḡdzud, insert). 42 ḥkyan-ḥrgyaḥ⁰ (p. 299).

ḥdżuḥi = ḥdzu, feign? (Tib. ḥdzu, rdzu, disguise oneself, pretend? Or ḡju, ḥdzu, catch at ?) +hi. 344, 345 ḡses-ḥsī⁰ (p. 269).

ḥdżur = Tib. ḥdżur, zur, go aside, a corner, side-note, &c. (p. 257). 45 skah-rah⁰; 173 klag-ḥrwad⁰ (?) (pp. 191, 257, 317, 343).

ḥdže = Tib. ze, zehu, cushion; ḡzed, carry, &c. 63 ḡyan-so⁰; 110 spyi⁰; 296 (?) (p. 335).

ḥdżeḥi. See ḥdžo-ḥtsaḥ.

ḥdžehu = Tib. gze-re, weak, &c. (pp. 335, 368). 138 -rje (pp. 218, 335).

ḥdžer (? lect. ?). 375.

ḥdzo I = ḡjo, chief, or ḥdzohu, man? 385 -chi-te; 64 -re-ḥtsa⁰ (pp. 305, 308).

II ? 76, 353 do-ldo⁰ (pp. 322-3).

ḥdżo-ḥtsaḥ 29; ḥdza 262; ḥdżehi 338 (2); ḡtseḥ 364 = ḡtsaḥ/ḥtsehi, q.v. (On the -eḥi see pp. 191–2. Possibly = Tib. cha-cho, matched: only in głahtso-ḥtsaḥ could the ḡtsa (29 ḡdzo) appositely signify ‘man’). (pp. 274, 283).

ḥdżoṇ = Tib. rdzoṇ, castle. See also ḥrdzoṇ, ḡjoṇ, joṇ (pp. 150–1, 171, 241). 64, 139, 140 Moṇ⁰; 194 -ḥyo-ḥsī; 195 ḡlda-ḥko-ge⁰; 205 -skyar-ḥreḥī; 299 ḡrī-ḥnō⁰; 356 -ḥyo-ḥsīd (pp. 201, 241, 243, 265-6, 305, 308, 329).

ḥdżon = Tib. zon, gzon, keep watch; ḡdra-zon, guard-post. 337 storḥtāḥ⁰ (p. 335).

ḥdżom = Tib. ḡdżom, meet (p. 279). 134 ḡkhog-ḥnoṇ⁰; 282, 284 ḡrīm⁰; 295 ḡsog-ge⁰ (pp. 282, 321, 329).

ḥdżohu, male, man. 137 -ro; 138 -ḥto-ḥrūn; 324 -ḥkrū-ḥyog, -ḥkḥad-ḥtō (pp. 199, 218, 246, 275, 338).

ḥdżoho = ḡjo, ḡzo, &c., Tib. za, zo, &c., eat (p. 334). 362 ḡköhu-prom⁰ (pp. 274, 316, 335).

ḥdżor, perhaps for ḡdzo II, as in 353 (cf. 76). 77 (do ?) ḡlūd⁰.

ḥdżwe = tsweḥu, ḥtswe? (pp. 269, 368). 39 ḡes-ḥmad⁰ (p. 269).

ḥdżweḥe = ḡdżwe, q.v. 36 ḡes-ḥmad⁰ (p. 269).

ṛdzar, written for rdza (= ḡdza I, friend, &c., q.v.), or ḡdzar, -re. See also ḡrdza, ḡrdzāh (p. 352). 287, 290 ḡyaṅ-ḥkḥah⁰ (pp. 315-16).

ṛdżum = Tib. ḡdżum, smile. See also ḡrdżum (p. 350). 263 -me (pp. 271 n., 283).

ṛdze = Tib. rje, rdze, chieftain (pp. 366). See also rje, ḡrje. 138 ḡdaṇ⁰ (pp. 228, 287).

ṛdzo = Tib. mḍzo, the cross between the yak-bull and the cow (pp. 258, 349). 132 ḡṭhāṇ⁰; 220 ḡtāṇ⁰ (pp. 173, 258).
rdzogs = Tib. rdzogs, complete, fulfil (pp. 213, 348). 157 glo-ta°.

rdzon I written for rdzo (q.v.) -re. See also hrdzor. 227 mug-hgu°; 228 hibri-hgu° (pp. 215-16).

II, written for hdzo, man, or hjo, chief.+ re. See also hrdzro. 369 hsehe° (p. 239).

hrdza = hdza I, friend. See also rdzar, hrdzah (pp. 315, 352). 296 hkhah°, hkhah°; 382 hrgyo°.

hrdzan = rdzum, q.v. 80 gii° (pp. 186, 271, 293).

hrdzur = hdzur, go aside, &c., q.v. (pp. 350, 352). 221 hthañ-hgam°.

hrdzo = rdzo, q.v. 16 hkrug°; 219 htañ° (p. 144).

hrdzon = hdzoñ, castle, q.v. (pp. 150, 348). 194-hyo-hsii (p. 241).

hrdzor = rdzor I (= rdzo + re), q.v. 226 mor-hgu° (pp. 215-16).

hrdzoñ, written for hrdzo (= hdzo I, man, or hjo, chief) + re. 49 gse° (p. 239).

W

wa I, make, do, or Auxiliary Verb.: cf. Tib. bas, done with, and see also hwa, hwañ, hwas, g-wañ, hgwå, hwå (pp. 337-40). 179 gsom°; 309 hmu° (pp. 182, 270, 338). See also kya (hky-a), wa-ñe, rgoñ-wa, hwí-wa.

II = Tib. bhañ, sediment? 190 hyañ° (pp. 228, 285).

wa-hdañ = Tib. o-ldoñ, hdo-ðoñ, windpipe. 258 (p. 221). See also hwa-hdañ.

war (p. 341). See also hwar. 101 hrañ°.

we = Tib. byed, Hai-baia we, make, do (pp. 190, n. 2, 337). See also weñ I, hwe, hwññ I, hwheñ, hwer, g-weñ, g-weñ, g-weñ, g-wør. 114 hrañ°; 191 hra°; 381 tsig-Moñ° (pp. 282, 283, 285).

weñ I = we, q.v. See also hweñ, hweññ. 100 hko°; 139 hrañ°; 196 hwam° (pp. 190, 243, 337).

II cream? See also hwñeñ II. 74 -nehu (pp. 250-1).

g-wañ = wa, hwa, &c., q.v. (pp. 337-40). 129 -ram; 224 -hrsanñ (pp. 342, 343, 361).

g-weñ = we, make, do, q.v. (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 152 -hku-rññ; 197 rmañ-hldañb°; 198 hldañ-hkhañ°; 201 rmañ-nañ°; 205 -hkor; 206, 207 rmañ-nañ-g-weñ-re-g-weñ; 375 hphyo-hli° (pp. 228, 239).

g-weññ = g-weñ, q.v. (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 199 rmañ-nañ°; 263 me° (p. 283).

g-weññ = g-weñ, q.v. (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 201 rmañ-nañ°; 298 hswhañ°; 357 -hlyañ, -sko.

g-wer, written for g-weñ, make, &c., q.v., + re. See also hwër (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 164 swañ°; 301 swañ° (pp. 270, 277).

hwa I = wa I, q.v. See also hwañ, g-wañ. 121 hsi°; 137 -hkah; 162 hdrañb°; 228 -hrsanñ; 230 -bzer; 269 -hrññ; 270 -rgya; 317 -ne; 339 hkyañ° (pp. 218, 253-5, 275, 292, 315, 338, 339).

— -ste, written for hwäs, q.v., + te (a Suffix, pp. 188-90). 71, 73, 75 (pp. 273, 337-8).

II -hldañ = wa-hdañ, q.v. See also hwañ-hldañ. 121, 278 (pp. 178, 221).

III. See hwí-hwañ, rat, mouse. 273 (pp. 297, 341).

hwag = Tib. hbag, be defiled. See also hboñ. 324 g-yañ-hpnañ° (pp. 228, 340).

hwañ = Tib. dbañ, power (pp. 341, 346 and n.). 5 ram (?) -ge°, klu-ge°; 210 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (pp. 245, 341, 361).

hwad = Tib. hbad, watch, hbad, call out, endeavour. See also hboñ (pp. 340-1). 6 mye-hyañ°; 14 hsehe-hwad-hwad;
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88 ḥcog-ḥdo-dze⁰; 109 tho-
rgam-ge⁰; 268 ḥldaṅ-kraṅ; 301 ḥrī-ḥcī-ḥwadhi; 334 ḥkeg-
ṛko⁰; 335 ḥwah-rno (pp. 265-

ḥwadhi = ḥwad, q.v., +ḥi. 301 (pp. 265, 340).

ḥwam, residence or village = Tib.
bams, boms, sbam, collect (p. 243). 11 -ḥśid; 155 -ḥnom-
son; 196 -wehi; 258 -neḥu (pp. 241, 245, 340, 361).

ḥwah = ḥwa I, q.v. 18 ḥbar⁰ (?); 172 ḥdраб⁰; 224 -hrśaṅ; 228
-glha; 269 -ne, -hrṅo; 270
ḥldaṅ⁰; 334 -ḥrog; 335
ḥwad⁰; 353 -hrāḥ (pp. 178, 254,
338, 339, 340).

ḥwar I = Tib. ḥbar, burn, blaze,


III? 107 ḥraṅ⁰. See also war (p. 341).

ḥwars, perhaps Aorist of ḥwar I. 203 cha-ḥru⁰.

ḥwas, Aorist of ḥwa I = Tib. bas,
done for, disposed of. See also ḥwa-ste (for ḥwas-te). 308
ḥmaṅ-ḥri⁰ (p. 337).

ḥwi I 386 ṛmaṅ⁰. Cf. ṛmaṅ-bri.

(II) -wa/ḥwa/hwehi = Tib. byi-
ba, mouse, rat. (On -eḥi see p. 191). 173 ḥwehi; 201 wa; 273 ḥwa (pp. 257, 297, 341).

ḥwe = we, wehi, do, make, ḍc., q.v. See also hwehi I, hwehe.
ḥwer. 85 ṛne⁰; 125 ḥldaṅ-
kraṅ⁰; 157 ḥldaṅ⁰; 374 ḥpaṅ⁰ (pp. 220, 288, 289, 335, 341).

ḥwen, vain ? = Tib. īben, solitary,
secret; īben-gtam, secret talk; Hsi-hsia wen, bad ? 159 ḥla-
ta⁰ (p. 341).

hwehi I = ḥwe, we, do, make, ḍc.,
q.v. 380 ṛbraṅ⁰; 383 ḥḍaṅ-
hlaṅ⁰.

II = wehi II? 47 -ḥśi-ḥpo (pp. 251, 341).

III ḥwi-hwehi. See ḥwi. 173 (pp. 257, 341).

ḥwehe = ḥwe I, ḍc., q.v. 348
ḥgwerg⁰ (pp. 248, 343).

ḥwer, written for ḥwe, q.v., + re. 19 ḥti⁰.

ḥwyir = Tib. ḥbyer, escape. 85 rṅe-
-ḥwe-ge⁰ (pp. 220, 341).

rw-. See under R.

Z

bżir = Hsi-hsia gźir, wise? (pp. 167–8, 315). 207 ḥldi⁰ (p. 315).
bżer = Tib. bżer, fort (?) (pp. 167–
8, 339–40). 19 ḥtib⁰; 177 ḥkoṅ-prom⁰; 230 ḥwa⁰ (pp. 225, 339).

rţaṁ, fierce, violent? (pp. 167–8,
352). 54 ṛba; 56 rṅe-ḥṅo⁰.

Z

gzu = gdzu, ḡduz, ass, q.v. See also ḡju, ḡzu (pp. 168, n. 1,
251–2). 307 ḡbyi; 353 -ḥdro-
-ḥphor (pp. 276, 332).

gzo = Tib. zos, Imperative, ḍc., of
za, eat (pp. 199, 334–5). 165 ḡru-ma⁰ (pp. 277, 335). See also ḡjo, ḡdзоbo.

bzod = Tib. bzod, bear, endure (p. 168). 72 ḡso-r-htsam⁰ (p. 342).

gbzaṅ (?) = Tib. bzaṅ, fine, large;
but see also ḡdzaṅ II. 21 ḡ-ri⁰ (p. 168).

ḥzaḥ = Tib. ḡbaḥ, woman, wife.
190 hmo[-r][e]⁰ (pp. 240, 285).

ḥzu = gzu, ḍc., ass, q.v. (p. 168).
188 ḡlkyaṅ⁰; 117 raṅ-ḥche⁰ (pp. 251–2, 285).

H

(For ḡ as Prefix see the Consonants
in general.)

ḥa I written for ḡ (with mistaken
punctuation). 61 -yaṅ for ḡyaṅ; 82 ḡbyo-ḥa-ge; 103 -rta for
hrta; 236 -glha for ḡglha; 320
-stoṅ for hstoṅ?

II miswriting for following ḡ. 119.
hi. Sentence-ending Particle, probably exclamatory (p. 177), following A: Consonants (with or without interpunct). List, p. 176. B: Vowels. List, with discussion of doubtful cases, pp. 176-7.

**Paragraph:**

hukah, written for ħkaḥ. 46 (p. 286).

hurañ, written forṁ ẖrañ. 230.

**VOCABULARY**

Yañ I = Tib. yañ, also, even, a Particle following the word, or sense, qualified and placed nearly always (exceptions, 345 gdag-yañ, 357 hram-yañ) at the end of its clause or and before a caesura point in a verse. See also ħyañ I (pp. 204, 311). 79, 80, 92, 119, 123, 160, 161, 162, 173, 180, 306, 332, 345, 357.

II = Tib. yañ (Chin. yang?), run- nel, watercourse = yur. See also ħyañ III (p. 311). 179 ħdíyañ⁰ oḥyo; 355 -ḥdíyaḥ-ḥdíyaḥ (p. 329).

III = I? See ca-yañ, ḥcaḥ-ḥyañ, ḥcaḥ-yañ.

Yuḥu = Tib. yul, village, district, country. See also ḥyuḥu I, ḥyu III (pp. 329, 333). 369 ħdíyañ⁰.

Yer = Tib. yer, g-yer, to be wide awake; g-yer-po, expert, wise. See also ḥyer, g-yer. 141 ḥṣah⁰ (p. 278).

Yod, possibly connected with Tib. g-yo, be unsteady, g-yob, shake, &c. 16 ḥṛño-hyod⁰. See also hyod (p. 258).

Yon, Auxiliary Verb with probably Future sense, as in Tib. ḥon, yon. See also g-yoho, hyon, ḥyoḥo (p. 199). 160 stor-dor⁰ (p. 253).

Yob = Tib. yab, g-yob, be pendu- lous, shake; g-yob, fan, curtain. See also hyob. 166 ḥṣah⁰ (pp. 142, 200).

G-yañ = Tib. gyañ(-ra), cattle- (yard)? or g-yañ = ḥyañ II, good, &c., q.v.? 31 -ra (p. 311).

G-yañ I = superior, cf. Tib. ya, antithetic to ma, lower (pp. 226-7). See also ḥyañ I. 136 gdag- -nag⁰; 152 -ḥtsa (?); 271 ḥtor- -ḥṛṭaḥ⁰; 287 -ḥṭaḥ (pp. 228, 297).

II = Tib. ya, match, adversary, rival (pp. 227-8). 156 -ta- -mehi; 317 ḥḍog⁰ oṭo; 152 -ḥtsa (?) (pp. 224, 323, 338-9). See also ḥyañ II.

III front, cf. Tib. g-yar, mouth, face, front (pp. 228-9). 323 -ḥpañ (p. 228).

G-yahe = g-yeḥi (be divided 1). 166 ḥkoḥu-prom⁰ (p. 276).

G-yer = yer, q.v. See also ḥyer. 167 ḥṣcaḥ⁰; 330 ḥṣah⁰; 346 ḥṣah⁰; 366 -ḥnor (pp. 278, 332).

G-yo = Tib. g-yo, move, waver. See also g-yos, hyos. 27 g-rah⁰; 28 -ḥpud-to (pp. 231, 309).

G-yog I = Tib. ḥog, yog, low, low ground, valley. See also hyog I (p. 266). 15, 51 -ḥṣaḥ- ma- -ḥpuł; 200 -ḥḷah a ḥ_suffix, p. 183; 299 ḥḍož⁰; 320 ḥṛγyaḥ-ḥṇi-ḥke⁰ (pp. 285-6, 267, 279).


G-yos (?), Aorist of g-yo, q.v. 26 ḥraḥ⁰ (p. 197 n.).

Hya, sheep (p. 94). 45 ḥṇaḥ⁰ (p. 343).

Ḥyañ I = yañ I, also, even, q.v. For list of occurrences see p. 311.

II good (antithetic to mor, bad) or superior (pp. 215-16, 311). 5 ḥṣes-beg⁰; 10 -ḥtañ; 41 -ṛṃyi; 63 -ṭsa; 64 -ge; 66, 226 -ḥraḥ; 287, 290 -ḥkaḥ-ṛdza; 383 -ḥṭhe; 388 -ṭsa (pp. 187, 216, 274, 304, 305, 315, 318, 329).
III = yañ II, runnel, &c., q.v. (p. 311). 178 ĥldyanô-hyô; 316 ĥdyañ (?); 355 ĥ-re-rgyeñ-na-yan; 367 ĥldyan-hyan-hyo, ĥyahñ-goñ; 391 ĥldyan-hyan-hyô (pp. 179, 329).

IV, ĥyan-hso = Tīb. yañs, large. 63 ĥrñi, ĥdze (pp. 303, 335).

Iī, ĥcâh-hyan, ĥcâh-yañ. 241 ĥbro; 242 ĥ-tho (pp. 303–4). See caô, ĥcâhô, ĥcâho.

hyah I = g-yañ I, superior, q.v. 72 ĥrgeñ; 111 ĥso-hnahô (?); 112 ĥmah-hldau; 133 ĥrêe-êliô (? hyah II); 257 ĥmah; 285, 286, 288 ĥthañ; 294 ĥ-hito, a Suffix, pp. 184–6; 315, 318 ĥ-htan; 304 ĥpdäd; 306 ĥ-hldad; 374 ĥthoô (?). See also hyah III (pp. 216, 227, 229, 230, 288, 296, 297, 298, 323, 361).

II = g-yañ II, match, adversary, rival. 65, 67 ĥ-hdo, p. 186; 222, 386 ĥ-htan, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 315 ĥ-htho; pp. 184–6 (pp. 228, 229, 274, 287, 296, 323, 331). III = g-yañ III, front, face, &c. 190 ĥ-wa-hkañ; 221 ĥ-kru-hbro; 252 ĥ-me; 325 ĥ-kru-hbro; 266–70, 272 ĥ-some—these to be placed under hyah I? (pp. 228, 260, 274, 281, 285, 298, 339).

hyah-hhehi = Tīb. yañ-ä, fear. 115 ĥñah (pp. 191, 217).

hyim = diminish. 59 ĥrñ-gehgoô (p. 240).

— ĥsto, written for hyism-to (a Suffix, pp. 184–6). 29 ĥdgoô (p. 259).

hyu I. 82 ĥcâh-reô (p. 320).

II. 212 ĥhyos-hkhyañô (p. 359).

III = yuhu, village, district, country, q.v. See also hyhu (p. 333). 123, 372, 387 ĥldyañô; 147 ĥ-sad; 305 nañ; 345, 350, 351 ĥstsañ; 346 ĥgyi-ka (pp. 246, 292, 305).

hyun = Tīb. yun, space of time. 260 ĥgo-hsoar-reô (p. 261).

hyhu I = yuhu, village, district, &c.; hyu III, q.v. 49 ĥriam-narô; 368 ĥriam-hdarô (p. 320).

II = I? 332 ĥklu-hpahô; 333 ĥrkôô (p. 223).

hyed = Tīb. ĥgeñ, ĥged, divide, scatter, &c. See also ĥgeñ (pp. 235–6, 291). 53 meô; 71 ĥ-gôñô; 393 smeô (pp. 273, 337).

hyer = yer, g-yer, awake, &c., q.v. 250 ĥtsahô; 267 ĥsahô; 297 ĥscaô (p. 278).

hyo I = Tīb. yo, g-yo, waver, shake, crooked, &c. See also g-yo, g-yos, hyos (p. 242). 178, 179, 367, 391 ĥyâñô/yañô/hyâñô; 179 gsom-wâô; 194 ĥ-siô; 356 ĥ-sid (pp. 179, 235, 241–2, 338, 353).

II = Tīb. yo, set in motion, manage (khab-yo). 154 ĥchosô; 326 ĥrgeñ(d)ô; 338 ĥrgyedô (pp. 273, 291).

hyog I = Tīb. g-yog, servant, subordinate. 134 ĥ-re-hmônô (?) ; 254 ĥ-pah-hdâg (?) ; 289, 321, 323, 324 ĥkruô/kruhuô/ khkruhuô (pp. 295–6).

II = Tīb. yog-pa, pole, stick. 259 ĥ-hdâg (pp. 192, 202, 343).

hyogs = hyog I, servant, &c. q.v. 18 ĥkyañô (p. 295).

hyod = yod, q.v. 16 -yod (p. 258).


hyob = yob, be pendulous, shake, q.v. 22 smułu-hkruô; 31–2 ĥbra-hdâr-maô (pp. 319–20).

hyoho = g-yoho, q.v. 119 stor-hdorô (pp. 199, 243).

hyor = Tīb. yor, g-yor, heap, a votive cairn (obo, lab-rtse) on a route. 239 hphag-hbah-geô; 299 g-ri-stôô; 300 ĥrihi-stôô (pp. 265–6).

hyos, Aorist of g-yo, shake, quake, q.v., and g-yos (pp. 196–7). 25 ĥrañô; 26, 34 ĥ-rahô; 96, 98 ĥgorô (pp. 138, 262, 335, 345).

R

-⟨r⟩ with equivalence to re, incorporated in the preceding monosyllable; A: after Vowels, pp.
173–5; B: after Consonants, pp. 178–9 (pp. 312–13).

ra = Tib. ra (enclosed or limited) place. See also raḥ, g-raḥ I, hrā I, ḥrā, ḥrāh I, ḥraḥ I, ḥraḥr (pp. 312–14), 7 skhu-ru ?; 31 g-yaño; 49 ḥeño; 78 mehīo; 148 rmān; 263, 265, 278 gṣānō; 264, 265 ḥhōo (pp. 244, 246).

rag = Tib. rags, dyke, embankment. See also ḥrag (p. 147). 283 ḥgahō.

raṅ I = Tib. raṅ, self. See also ḥraṅ I.

— -ṛche, self-willed (cf. Tib. raṅ-hdod). See also ḥraṅ (p. 252).

II = Tib. raṅ, raṅs, be pleased? See also ḥraṅ (p. 103). (p. 294).

rab = Tib. rab, ford? See also ḥrab. 376 -ḥgo (p. 261).

ram, harmony, concordant. See also ḥram (pp. 220, 277, 293). 5 ? lect.; 157 skye-taño (pp. 239, 293).

raḥ = ra, q.v. See also ḥraḥ, ḥraḥi. 45 skahō; 74 ḥpah-maño; 227 ḥthamō; 279 ḥnoo (pp. 274, 317).

ru = Tib. ru, horn. See also ḥru, ḥruḥu. 70 -ge-hkrom; 103 rgonō; 347, 351 gyaño (pp. 304–3, 333).

— -glaṅ, horned ox. 66 (p. 318).

re I = Tib. re, red, is, being, mostly at end of a Subordinate Clause, but sometimes with Suffix te or to (pp. 173–5, 200). See also ḥre I, ḥrehi, sta-re. 5, 6, 32, 36 and passim.

— -ṛto (a Suffix, pp. 184–6). 382.

II = Tib. re, each, every; res, times, requital (perhaps derived from I) (p. 202). See also ḥre II.

ḥrehe. 154 myiō; 251 joō; 252 ḥlabō; 250, 255, 276–7. (pp. 174, 236, 274).

III = Tib. re, hope. See also ḥre III. 211 -mye.

re-ma (for me ?) -ḥnad? 45.

re-ḥmōn 134 -ḥyog-re.

ro = Tib. -ro country, district, (large) place. See also roḥo, ḥro I (p. 314). 137 ḥdzhōuō; 381 spoō (pp. 218, 275, 338).

rog I = Tib. rogs, grogs, comrade, assistant. See also ḥrog. 211 -ḥji-rdaŋ (?) (p. 260).

II = Tib. rog, black? 156 naño (p. 239).

rom = Tib. rum, dark (space)? See also ḥrom (p. 368). 100 naño (p. 293).

roḥo = ro, q.v. 384 ḥdyoō (p. 327).

rwa = Tib. rwa, horn. See also ḥrwa. 45 ḥrīno (p. 343).

rwaṅ = Tib. dwaṅs, lustre, bright, force of language. See also dwaṅ. 178 ḥkahō (p. 179).

rwehi, end, be ended, be destroyed? See also rwer, ḥrwehi. 98 ḥkhor-kyano (p. 345).

rwer. Locative form of rwehi(ī). 97 (pp. 262, 345).

rwyin = Tib. ḥbyin, ḥbyin, sink; ḥbyin, space? 33 ḥnaḥ-hraŋ-geō (p. 346).

rwyē = Tib. ḥbyō, divide; ḥbye, expanse, &c. See also ḥbe, ḥbe. 15 ḥbuō; 91 -ḥtaḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182–3 (pp. 267, 327, 345).

ṛ-ṛaḥ I = ra, ḥra, ḥraḥ, ḥraḥ, place, q.v. 7, 20 ḥgō-hnro; 26, 34 ḥyos; 27 -g-yo (pp. 309, 312–13, 335, 361).

II = Tib. ḥgra, enemy. 262 -nag; 314 -ḥsah-hkhehe (pp. 224, 262, 283, 313).


ṛ-ṛi = Tib. ri, mountain. See also ḥ-ṛi, ḥri, ḥriḥi (pp. 264–71). 21 ḥrūḥu; 34 ṣiḍō; 35 mehīo; 186 ḥklyanō; 252-ḥḥān; 290 ḥbosō; 296 ḥswaḥo (?) (p. 299); -st; 301 ḥrade-hklaḥ, -dze; 308 ḥpaḥ; 312 -sta-mehi; 313 ḥkruḥu-hbro; 314 -ḥjim (pp. 201, 254, 265, 270, 280, 298, 303, 321, 331).

II = Tib. ri-ba, worth, price. 157 -ṭa, a Suffix, pp. 182–3 (p. 267).

ṛ-ṛiḥi = ḥ-ṛi I, q.v. 298 -ḥldom 309 -ḥkun; 312 -sta-mehi (pp. 201, 266, 270).
g-rub = *Tib.* grub, rub, rush in a body; rub-te, all. See also hrub (p. 221). 261 -hgo (p. 342).

g-ro̱n = *Tib.* grón/gran, cold, or groí, groíns, die. See also hron II. 71 -hyed (pp. 268–9, 273, 337).

hra I = ra, &c., place, q.v. See also hrah. 50 hce; 347 stañ-hro.

II = 249 -hyai.

hraq = rag, dyke, embankment, q.v. 13 hjra°; 55 -hkyer; 256 -ma-hbog; 283 hga° (pp. 147, 173).

hrañ I = rañ I, self, q.v. [3], 5, 6, 8, 37 -hlda/hldah; 59 -hgam; 21, 166, 167 -hrah; 33 hnah°; 101, 107 -war/hwar; 104 hkah° (?) 116, 135 -pu-glo/hlo; 117 -hkah; 147 -hrygan; 192 rgyed°; 205 -klar; 259 -hdom?; 308, 310, 311 hga-hldo° (pp. 142, 200, 202, 252, 270, 283, 314, 319, 343, 345–6).

II = rañ II, be pleased, q.v. 68 glo°; 214, 329 hkah/hkah-hsagn°; 308, 310, 311 hga-hldo° (?); 326, 338 hrgye/hrgyed-hyo° (pp. 268, 270, 314).

— (I) -hche, self-willed = rañ°, q.v. 115 (p. 252). See also ḡdrab-hwa-hrañ (II).

hrab = rab, ford, q.v. 51 hmar-hbah-ge°.

hram = ram, agreeable, harmony, &c., q.v. (p. 293). 10 hlah-gsom° (?); 35, 37, 82, 86, 87 hco°; 90, 94, 97, 119, 120–3, 365 htsog°; 49 hriñ-hcan°; 73, 76 hla/lah°; 129 g-wah°; 288 hswah°; 368 hriñ-hprar°; 376 hlda-htrog° (pp. 190, 220, 239, 262, 265, 270, 288, 291–3, 321, 342, 345).

II, group, company (hardly different from I). 184 -hkañ-hkañ (?); 281 hbo°; 357 -yañ-phlañ (p. 231).

hrañ I = ra, &c., place, q.v. 8, 25 -hyos; 21, 166, 167 hran°; 23 hshes-hbeg°; 26 -g-yos; 56 hce; 66, 226 hyañ°; 77 -hrtah; 114 -rtah, -we-rtah; 139 -weñi-rtah; 146, 273, 358 -hton; 186, 369 meñi°; 216 hrgyed°; 225, 236, 244, 246 -hldi; 228 brañ°; 277 gsah-re -htsah -re°; 315 rgo°; 341, 392 rgyed°; 342 mye°? rgyed°; 353 hwañ°; 370 meñi-speñi° (pp. 140–2, 228, 229, 243, 261, 262, 281, 282, 306, 313, 318, 319, 331).

II = g-rañ II, enemy, q.v. 43 -ldah (?); 149 -sñiñ-ñe; 182 -rte (?); 202 -hmad; 354 -hptrre (pp. 222, 313, 334).

hrañi = hrah+hi? 380.


hras = gras, hgras, aligned, q.v. (p. 266). 344 hlah-hkyañ° (p. 269).

hrañ = *Tib.* ri, mountain. See also ǵ-ri I. ǵ-riñi, ħriñi (pp. 264–71). 13 hdon°; 14 hrañ°; 19 hlyañ; 168 hbyi°; 294 -hkrhu-hbroho; 295 hstshañ; 297 hscañ-hyer°; 297 rçehe-hbrom°; 299 -hño; 300 -hgru; 300 -hcí; 308 -hwas; 311, 312 -stah-meñi (pp. 142, 200, 201, 229, 254, 265, 267, 270–1, 332, 337, 340).

hrañ = *Tib.* riñ, long. 44 -rwa (p. 243).

hrim = *Tib.* rim, order, succession, degree; rim-hgro, ceremony, attendance (p. 308). 282, 284 -hdzom; 293, 297 -ge-hgrus; 300 -hldoñ; 319 -re-hldoñ; 347, 348 -gleñu (pp. 265, 282, 298, 308, 321).

hrñi = ĥri, mountain, q.v. 62 hśid°; 290 hstshañ; 291 hbo°; 293 hbo°; 294, 297 -hdom; 300 -sti; 302 -hphañ; 305 -hrgam (pp. 171, 246, 267, 270–1, 297, 298, 303, 306).

hris = *Tib.* ḡbri, bris, diminish? cf. ris from ḡbri, write. 84 ḡcag-rgyag° (p. 259).

hru = ru, horn, q.v. See also ḡruñ. 82 ḡrño-hru-ge°; 103 rgoñ-ru-


**VOCABULARY**

-ge\(^0\); 202, 203 ḡcha\(^0\)/cha\(^0\) (?); 238 ḡsebe-hldu\(^0\); 276 ḡsu-re\(^0\) (pp. 156, 321, 333).

hrug = Tib. (mgo)-rug, (head) bowed down. 47 ḡbu\(^0\) (pp. 250, 286).

hrun = Tib. run, to be right, ought, have to, d.c. See also hrui (p. 199). 30, 32 ḡrgu-hto\(^0\); 80 stor-to\(^0\); 138 ḡdzo-huhto\(^0\), storhto\(^0\) (p. 335).

hrub = g-rub, rush in a body, q.v. 108 ḡn-o-bro\(^0\); 349 ḡthar-phyan-ge\(^0\) (pp. 221, 248, 343).

hrui = ḡrun, q.v.; +hi (p. 199). 167 storhto\(^0\).

hrugu = ru, hru, horn, q.v. 21 g-ri\(^0\); 293 ḡrihi\(^0\) (pp. 297, 298).

hre I = re I, is, being, q.v. 155 ḡido-rgyo\(^0\); 159 ḡn-hchhos\(^0\), spyenchos\(^0\) (p. 145).

II = re II, each, every, times, q.v. 48 -ge-rgyo; 251 ḡbañi; 267 ḡpra\(^0\) (?), (p. 330).

III = re III, hope, q.v. 132 -hldi; 155 ḡido\(^0\) (pp. 171, 216, 229).

hreg = Tib. ḡreg, bregs, regs, cut off, amputate. 122 ḡram\(^0\) (p. 293).

hrehi = re I, is, q.v., +hi. 200 ḡne-ne\(^0\); 204 ḡsan-ḥkah\(^0\); 205 ḡdzoñ-skyar\(^0\) (pp. 200, 222).

hrehe = re II, each, d.c., q.v. 43 pra\(^0\); 249 bañi; 251 ḡbañ (p. 274).

hro I = ro, country, place, d.c., q.v. 11 ḡmu\(^0\); 19 ḡldu\(^0\); 181 ḡpro\(^0\); 213 ḡgo\(^0\) (?); 272 ḡldyañ-pahn\(^0\); 333 -hgoñ; 345 ḡryeb-hchi\(^0\); 347 stañ\(^0\); 377 ḡpañ-hldan\(^0\); 384 ḡldyo\(^0\); 386 ḡldyan\(^0\); 387 ḡldyin\(^0\) (pp. 155–6, 269, 270, 274, 306, 331).

II, wolf? 110 -behi-ḥbañ; 234 ḡtsag\(^0\) ḡbehi-hbar; 335 hrog-ge\(^0\) (?). (p. 293). See also hror.


hrog I = rog I, comrade, assistant, q.v. 50 -hnor; 197 mu\(^0\); 334 ḡwah\(^0\); 335 -ge-hro (pp. 318, 338).

II = Tib. grog, a deep ravine with torrent. 344 ḡbo-ḥron\(^0\) (p. 231).

hrön I = Tib. rön, a deep gorge (p. 268). 68, 371, 373, 384, 386, 389 ḡdzam-ḥbrön\(^0\); 344 ḡbo\(^0\); 373–7 ḡkad\(^0\) (pp. 231, 250, 268, 269, 331).

II = g-ron II, Tib. grön, gröns, die; cf. grön, grañ, cold. 36 -ḥkes (p. 269).

hörn, Imperative form (p. 199), 'repose'? 378 rkom-ge\(^0\).

hörn (vacant) space = rom, q.v. 107 na\(^0\); 257 ḡtor . . .\(^0\); 385 -ge-ḥti (pp. 302, 336).

hör, written for hro II, wolf, q.v.; +re. 303, 310 ḡne-ḥrhe-ḥldah\(^0\) (p. 270).

hrwa, bow = rwa, horn, q.v.; cf. Tib. rwa-gzu, bow. 59 ḡdañ-ḥpog (p. 343).

hrwañ = Tib. brañ, dwelling-place. 11 -ḥkañ-ḥkañ (p. 344).

hrwad I = Tib. rbad, harsh noise (pp. 257, 309). 32 -ḥmañ-ḥldah (p. 345).

II = Tib. rbad, screaming eagle. 172 -ḥbañ-prom; 173 klag\(^0\) (pp. 257, 345).

hrwehi, end, be destroyed = rwehi, q.v. 22 ḡrañ-ḥrah\(^0\); 27 ḡldañ-ṛmañ\(^0\); 113 ḡldañ-krañ\(^0\); 214 -gtsu-ge (pp. 259, 291, 345).

hrlehi, authorities = hlude I, hldehi, hidehe, q.v. 288 -ḥswah-hram (pp. 278–9).

hrломхи = ḡrlom = glom, conceit, covet, q.v., +hi. 385 ḡne-ge\(^0\) (p. 336).

hrлбo, swirl? 15 ḡmar-ḥbañ-ge\(^0\) (p. 350).

---

**L**

la I, Postposition, to, for (Tib. la) (p. 193). 69 ḡbehi\(^0\), ḡphag\(^0\); 70 ḡbyig\(^0\) (pp. 193, 247–50).

II = Tib. la, a high pass. 345 -pol[-]-r[e] (p. 269).

la-la, a jingle, signifying something overt or large, antithetic to li-li, q.v. 109 pa\(^0\) (p. 280 and n. 1).
lañ = Tib. rañ in; mo-rañ, lone female (p. 221); but see mo I. 108 mo° (p. 221).

lad = Tib. lan, glan, reply, retribution. See also hlad (pp. 303–4). 225, 226 hršan°; 235 rña°; 244 gse° (pp. 141, 303, 304).

lambi = Tib. lam, road, path, journey, +hi. See also hlam. 229 hršan-hgam°, ḡwah-hršan°.

lah = hla, Tib. zla, moon, q.v. 75 -hram-hte (pp. 273, 337–8).


le = Tib. leb, flat? 219, 220 ḡthañ° (p. 272).

lom, well? (p. 233). 363 ḡmu°.

lol = Tib. rol, play? But see hlon. 194 ste-gdzu-ge°; 195 ḡthar-myge-ge° (p. 241).

hla = lah, moon, q.v. 73 -hram-hte (pp. 273, 337–8).

ḥlañ? 17 ḡnor°.


ḥlab = Tib. lab, speak. See also glab, hlobbi. 67, 70 -me; 159, 181 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 180 ḡnañ-hdi°; 181 ḡnañ-ḥseg°; 182 -ge-plañ-na; 252 -re, 253 -me; 325 -ḥko-ḥgyan; 385 -ḥnañ (pp. 145–6, 155–6, 173, 197, 199, 231, 264, 272–3, 274–5, 331, 341).

ḥlam = lam, road, journey, q.v. 25 ḡrañ-ḥyos°; 68 ḡma°; 232 rña-hlad-ge° (pp. 138, 238).

ḥlamna = ḡlam+na. 236 ḡlañ-hlad°.

ḥlamhi = ḡlam+ḥi. 224 ḡwañ-hršan°; 225, 226 ḡrañ-lad/hlad°; 226, 227 ḡnañ-hlad°; 228 ḡwa-hršan°; 229 ḡwañ-hršan°; 240 gse-hlda-hlad° (p. 183).

ḥli, wing? (p. 132). 375 ḡphyo°.

hlo I, group, company, perhaps = ḡlōhū (Tib. lo), q.v. (pp. 322–3). 154 -ge-blain-hlōd°; 275 ḡno-ge°; 383 ḡyu° (pp. 222, 285).

II. See pu-glo (hlo).

hlon = Tib. lon, arrive. But see lol. 357 ḡthar-myge-ge° (p. 241).

hlobhi = hlob, Imperative of hlab, q.v., +hi. 378 ḡse-ge° (p. 199).

hloho = hlo I or hlo II, q.v. 381 ḡpu° (p. 157).

Ś

śi I = Tib. śi, die. See also gši, bsī, ḡšī I (p. 226). 120 -rgo (pp. 226, 291–2).


śid I, high. See also ḡšid I (pp. 225–6). 34 -gri; 60 ḡku-tsa°; 151 ḡgyan-hnom (pp. 145, 172, 303).

II = śi, perish. See also ḡšid II = Tib. śid, funeral ceremony (p. 226). 366 ḡgoñ-wa° (p. 332).

śud = Tib. śud, bsud, rub, get scratched, galled. See also ḡšud, ḡšud (p. 296, n. 1). 185 -meñi; 198 ḡdi-gsom°; 207 tšu-gsom° (p. 139).

še, wise, wisdom, cf. Hsi-hsia gse, gše (pp. 223–4). See also şes, ḡše, ḡše, ḡšes. 91 -chañ; 258 -rgo-hldon (pp. 262, 318).

śeg = Tib. sreg, bsreg, bsregs, burn (irregular ś<sr due to some confusion). See also ḡšeg, ḡšeg. 159 ḡlañ-miy°; 283 -sme; 375 -sme (pp. 145–6).

šes, wise. Aorist form of še, q.v. See also ḡšes (pp. 223–4). 36, 39 -hmad; 44 -gši-ḥlduhan; 44
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-ḥṣi-brehe; 332 -ḥkeg-hrko; 379 -rtsig-Moň (pp. 223, 269, 322).

ṣod, lay low, cf. Tib. ṣod, low ground. See also ḡṣod (p. 301). 198 ḡro-ta-ṣodce/ṣodts (pp. 341, 358–9).

ṣodce/ṣodts. See ṣod.

ṣon = Tib. son/son, gone, come (p. 355). 156 ḡwam-ḥnom ρ.

ṣor = Tib. ṣor, flee, escape; bsor, chase. 203 -ḥlda, a Suffix, p. 183.

ḡṣaŋ, enmity, hate = Tib. ṣaṅ. See also ḡṣaṅ I (p. 223). 30 -re; 86 (for ḡṣaṅ) -ṣaṅ- -do; 263, 264, 278 -re; 263 -kṣa; 264 ḡhdzam; 265 -ne; 265 -taḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 273 ḡhraḥ-ḥtoṅ; 279 -ge (?) , -ḥtga-ḥtos (p. 317).

ḡṣi, Prospective form of ḡi, die, q.v. 44 -ḥlduḥi; 72 -brom-ḥnu; 344 ḡhdzuhi (p. 322).

ḡṣim = Tib. ḡṣin, agreeable, or sim, refresh, be well, happy. 268 ḡmu-klag (p. 298).

ḡse = ḡe, ses, ḡe, wise, wisdom, q.v. (pp. 223–4). 49 -ḥrdzro, q.v.; 329 ḡri (p. 329, 253, 256).

ḡseg = ḡeg, ḡseg, burn, q.v. 330 ḡrgyo-ḡseg-ḡseg; 331 ḡryo (for ḡgyo)-ḡseg-ḡseg (p. 178).

ḡser, written for ḡseg (p. 178). 331 see ḡseg.

ḡṣog = Tib. ḡog, ḡṣog, bsog, wing. See also ḡṣog I. 7, 20 -ḥner (p. 361).

bśl, Aorist form of ḡi, die, q.v. (p. 196). 196 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 198- -re.

ḥṣag = Tib. ḡṣaṅ, bsṅs, ẖṣaṅ, talk, expound. 85 ḡnho-sto-ge o (pp. 220, 341).

ḥṣaṅ I = ḡṣaṅ, enmity, hate, q.v. 81 -re-ḥṣig; 120 -phil-phil; 199 -nag; 209 ḡkho o; 225, 226, 227 ḡhd; 300 ḡrim-hlduḥo; 367 -ḥkyaṅ (?); 393 ḡme (pp. 192, 265, 271, 283, 291–2, 320).

II = Tib. ḡṣaṅ, ordure (p. 223). 15, 51 -ma-ḥpul; 255 -ḥdzaḥ (pp. 267, 327).

ḥṣam = Tib. ḡom, bsoms, bsam, bsams, prepare, arrange, etc. (p. 235). 277 ḡpah-ge o. See also ḡṣam, ḡṣams.

ḥṣah = Tib. bsah, bsas, slaughter, kill, cut up. See also bsas (p. 289). 83 ḡnam-ḥte o; 90 ḡtsog-ḥram o; 99 ḡnah-ḥtsog o; 125 ḡldaṅ-ḥkraŋ o (pp. 180, 288–9, 291).

ḥṣas, Aorist form of ḡṣah, q.v. 102 ḡnah-ḥtsog o (p. 291).

ḥṣi I = ḡi I, die, q.v. 17 -ḥro (?); 38 -ḥgri; 44 -brehe; 47 ḡci-me o; 47 ḡpo; 81 ḡkri; 102-kyeg (?); 123 -ḥwa; 153 ḡmi; 345 ḡhdzub (pp. 174, 226, 251, 286, 292, 298, 322, 339).

II = ḡi II, winter. 102 -kyeg (?) (see under I) (p. 301).

III = ḡid I, ḡsid, high (p. 226). 194 ḡrdzon-ḥyo o; cf. 356 ḡṣid (pp. 240–2).

ḥṣig = Tib. bsig, bsigs, hjig, destroy. 81 ḡkyaṅ-ṛgyaṅ o, ḡṣaṅ- -re o; 347 ḡrim-glehu-ge o (p. 298).

ḥṣiṅ 302 ḡryeg o.


II = ḡid II, perish (p. 226). 52 ḡhyaṅ-re o; 53 ḡnog-ḥce . . . o; 366 ḡso-na o (pp. 271, 293, 317).

ḥṣud = ḡud, q.v. See also ḡṣud. 185 -ḥdon (p. 139).

ḥṣe = ḡe, ḡse, wise, q.v. (pp. 223–4). 299 -ḥse; 307 ḡglyaṅ o (pp. 252, 265).

ḥṣeg I = ḡeg, ḡseg, burn, q.v. 48 ḡphu o; 282 -ḥme; 330 ḡrgyo o (p. 282).

II = Tib. ḡseg, bsṅs, go, come. 181 nak-γsaṅ o (pp. 155–6).

ḥṣehe = ḡe, wise, q.v. 163 ḡbr o; 351 -ḥti-ge; 369 -rdzo-[r]e (pp. 216–17, 224, 239).

ḥṣer, written for ḡe, wise, q.v., +re. 339 ḡro-ḥne o.

ḥṣes = ḡes, wise, q.v. (pp. 223–4).
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336 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3; 344, 345 -gši/hši-hdzuh (pp. 223, 269).
— -beg/hbeg, Proper Name of a divinity (pp. 138, 147 n., 224). 3, 5, 7, 20, 22-4.

-Vocabulary-

336 -ta, Suffix, pp. 182-3; 344, 345 -gši/hši-hdzuh (pp. 140, 285, 321).
344 -beg/hbeg, Proper Name of a divinity (pp. 138, 147 n., 224).


hsög I = gšog, wing, q.v. 8, 20 Sès/Hšès-hbeg (p. 361).
II separate (Tib. gšog, cleave)? 262 twaṅ-mńar (p. 342).

hsod = śod, lay low, q.v. (p. 301). 147 -te-rmag; 281 hbo-ṛam-ge-hsod-tsa (pp. 231, 300, 358-9).

-tsa. See hsod; cf. śodce.

rsaṅ, stern, or violent? See also hršaṅ (p. 277). 319, 320 swaḥ (p. 342).
hršaṅ/rrsaṅ, stern, violent? cf. hšaṅ (p. 277). 224 hwaḥ (p. 342); 225, 226 -lad; 228 hwaḥ; 229 hwaḥ-glaḥ, hgwah (p. 342); 319, 320 swaṁ-rsaṅ; 321 hswaḥ (pp. 339, 343, 361).

sśam, possibly 'last' = Tib. šam, lower, under, later (pp. 235, 357). 255 -stom (p. 357).

S

sad = Tib. gšod, bšad, sod, kill, destroy. See also ḡsad. 147 ḡyu (pp. 299-300).

su = Tib. su, who (Interrogative, Relative, &c.). See also ḡsu I, (p. 201). 114 -me-hmèbi; 145 -ge-stor-ta; 195 hdlīhi (pp. 172, 201, 232, 241, 245, 282, 299-300).

se I = Tib. rtse, see, top, house-top. See also hše II, ršeḥi, ḡhrseḥi (pp. 248-9, 348). 18 ḡskym (p. 342); 67 ḡko (p. 342); 69 skym (p. 342); 143 htor (pp. 248-9, 288).

[se-]ṛgro. Cf. Tib. ḡṛṣeṛ-hṛgro, chief, principal. 67 ḡko (p. 342).
II = gse, hše, injure, harm, q.v. 273 hwi-hwaḥ (pp. 297, 341).
so = Tib. gson, live, life; so-nams, husbandry. See also ḡso, ghsohu, ḡso ḡI.

-ḥnaḥ/na, life-place, home, family. See also ḡso, ḡtsos (pp. 293-4). 114, 117, 127, 365 (pp. 217, 282, 293-4).

swa I = Tib. so, swa, tooth. 93 -tseg-tseg (p. 334).
II = Tib. so, swa, look-out, guard, watch. See also swaḥ, hswaḥ, hswaḥ (pp. 355, 369). 174 -ḥdir; 175 -ḥkom; 176 -ḥphyegs; 222 -gkom; 301 -g-wer; 358 (p. 270).

swaṁ. See also hswaṁ, ḡsaṁ III. 337 ḡstot-mńar; 340 pyar-mńar (p. 264).
swaḥ = swa II, look-out, guard, &c., q.v. 164 -g-wer; 319, 320 -rsaṅ; 360 -hpeq (p. 277).

swehe = Tib. sbe, wrestle? 130 ḡldag-nag (p. 342).

sram = Tib. sran, hard, enduring. See also ḡsram. 72 -pa-nar (p. 361).

sri = Tib. sri, a kind of devil? a woman's temper? (p. 357). 163 ḡšœ; 349 -ge-gšen-ḡše.

sroñ = Tib. sroñ, sroñs, straight, straight-forward. 339 -hše; 343 -ne (p. 256).

slaḥ = Tib. ḡla, friend, helper. 125 ḡldan (pp. 288-9, 335).

sli name of some animal? See also ḡsli. 171 -ḥti-hṛṇo[-r]e (pp. 257, 357).

slug I = Tib. ḡlug, ḡzlug, pour? 47 ḡšed-ge (p. 251).
II 359 ḡnu-glaḥ (pp. 336, 368). 346, 351 ḡdam (pp. 336, 368). See slog.

sleg (p. 357). 346, 351 ḡdam (p. 357).

slo = Tib. ḡlo, summon, call; ḡžlos, challenge; ḡzlos, incantation, &c. 93 ḡšo; 99 -ṣṭaḥ = sloṅ-ta, with Suffix, pp. 182-3 (p. 336).

slog = Tib. zlug, ḡzlug, turn back, repel; slog, turn, invert (pp. 336, 368). 174 ḡnu-glaḥ; 384 ḡhrseḥi-hpeq (pp. 228, 336).

slod possibly = Tib. ḡlod, lod, glod, loose, relax (p. 357). 381 ḡbri.
slos Aorist form of slo, q.v.

gsāñ I = Tib. gsañ, sañ, secret (p. 156). 17 rīlo; 86 (see gśañ); 204 -hkañ; 329 ḡkañ; 181 -hseg (?); 206 -rmañ (?) (pp. 155–6, 186, 200, 221).

II? = Tib. sañ, sañs, bsañ, cleanse. See also ḡsañ II. 227 ḡtham-rah; 228 brañ-hrañ (pp. 215–16).

gsah = Tib. sañ, land. See also ḡsañ. 276 -re-ḥsañ-re; 333 -rkañ (pp. 281, 338).

gsar = Tib. gsar, new. See also ḡsar. 204 -nar (p. 361).

gsas = Tib. gsas, offspring; btsa, give birth; btsas, born. See also ḡsas (pp. 197, n. 2, 355). 262 -pahi-ḥḍo-ḥḍa (pp. 239, 283).

gsu = Tib. bsu, beus, meet, escort. See also ḡsus, ḡsus, ḡsu II. 64 -prom (pp. 157, 187, 219).

gsus Aorist form of gsu, q.v. See also ḡsus (p. 197 n. 2). 99 -slo (p. 336).

gse = Tib. gtse, htshe, btses, do mischief, injure. See also ḡsehe, ḡse I, ḡsehi, ḡsehe II (pp. 140–1, 183). 48 -hsaññ; 200 g-yog-ḥḷañ; 205 -re; 238, 243 -bho-bon/hbon; 240 -ḥlda-ḥlad; 242, 244 -ḥlad; 247 -stoñ-stsar; 248 -ḥṭañ, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 249 -ḥso-ḥkon; 327 -ḥko-ḥgyan (pp. 230, 303).

gsen, possibly (v. context) = Tib. bṣen-mo, a female evil spirit. 349 -ḥse.

ḡsehe = gse, injure, &c., q.v. 135 -ḥldi-ḥthon; 368 -cañ.

ḡso = Tib. gson, live, cf. gso, tend, cure. See also ḡsohu, ḡso I, ḡson. 151 nor; 193, 194 -nad (pp. 174, 238, 241).

ḡsom I = Tib. sens, mind, spirit; bsam, thought, &c.; som-nī, doubt. See also ḡsam I (pp. 236, 339). 23 -sni; 89 -rgbad; 178, 179 -wa-hyo; 198 ḡdi-osud; 206 ḡsho osud; 275 ḡḍañho (?), (pp. 235, 338).

II = Tib. gsum, three (?). 10 ḡlañ (?); 21 ḡtsañ (?); 23 ḡtsañ (?). (pp. 270, 308).

ḡsohu = gso, live, &c., q.v. 358 ḡrañ-ḥton (p. 261).

bsog = Tib. sog, sogs, gsog, bsog, bsag, bsags, collect, gather, &c. See also ḡṣag, ḡṣog. 183 -thom-thom.

ḥṣa = gsah, land, q.v. See also ḡṣañ. 55 mgoñ-hce; 330 ḡsāg-yrer (pp. 178, 278).

ḥṣag, gather together. See bsog, ḡṣog. 389 ḡḍag.

ḥṣañ I = gsan I, secret, q.v. 36 ṣrynd (pp. 244, 283).

II? = gsan II, cleanse, q.v. 226 ḡyañ-hrañ (pp. 239, 283).

III written for ḡṣwañ, q.v. 340 ḡstor-ma (pp. 270, 306).

ḥṣañs = Tib. soñ, go. 144 ḡño-stor (p. 303).

ḥṣad = sad, kill, destroy, q.v. 40 ḡphu-ḥkl; 102 -mag-hdehi; 124 ḡḍañ-ḥrañ; 147 ḡḍañ -ge; 381 ṛṣig-Ṃoñ; 383 ḡḍaṣa-lde; 340 ḡyañ-ḥthe-ge (pp. 289, 301).

ḥṣam I, think. See ḡsom (p. 235). 185 ma-ḥpañ; 350 nañ-pa.

II = Tib. bṣom, bṣoms, bsam, bsams, prepare, arrange (pp. 300–1, 355), cf. ḡsams. 184 ma (p. 36).

ḥṣams, Aorist form of ḡsam II, q.v. 58 me-na (pp. 194, 300–1).

ḥṣañ = gsah, land, q.v. 41 ḡyañ-ṛmy; 42 -ḥtsañ; 141 -yer; 164 -ḥḍañ, a Suffix, p. 183; 165 -gtsañ, -chad; 166 -yob-hkon; 267 -ḥyer; 314 -ḥkheñ; 346 ḡṣahg-yrer; 378 -ḥtsañ (pp. 142, 224, 262, 277, 278, 280, 288, 313, 335).

ḥṣar = gsar, new, q.v. 26 g-yos/ ḡyos-ge; 255 -stomhi (p. 357).

ḥṣas = gsas, offspring, q.v. (pp. 197, n. 2, 355). 59 -hce-rgbad; 116 -te-ḥyañ; 361 -ḥkheñ; 260 ḡḍrañ-ḥdag, ḡnañ-ḥdag (pp. 192, 239, 240, 261, 315).

ḥṣu I = su who? 196 ḡrañ (p. 246).
II = gsu, meet, escort, q.v. 276 -re (p. 314).

hsud, written for ḡṣud? (p. 296, n. 1). 313 ḡkrū; 323 ḡkhrūḥu-ḥyog (pp. 295–6).

hsus, Aorist form of gsu, ḡṣu II, q.v. (p. 197 n. 2). 93 -slo (p. 336).

ḥse I = gse, gsehe, injure, &c., q.v. See also ḡsehi, ḡsehe II (pp. 140–1). 33 -hše; 57 ḡœ; 89, 92, 96 pyi/phyi; 163 -sri; 190 -spye; 299 ḡšo; 326 -ṧah, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 349 gse (pp. 248).

-II = ḡse, top, house-top, q.v. 325 -ḳho-ḥgyan.

ḥsehe I = se I, top, &c., q.v. 14 -hwad-hwad (p. 265).

-II = ḡse I, injure, &c., q.v. 238 -ḥldu-ḥru; 327 -ḳho-ḥgyan (pp. 264, 321).

ḥso I = so, gso, live, &c., q.v. 201 -ḥldah, a Suffix, p. 183.

—hna/ḥnah, life-place, family, &c. See also so (pp. 293–4). 80, 100, 103, 108, 110, 111, 231, 232, 234, 235, 270, 290.

-II. See also so. 63 ḡyaṅ; 313 ḡmor (p. 303).

—(III) -bos, hair-tuft, cf. Tib. co-to? 257 neṅ (pp. 302–3).

ḥṣog = ḡṣag, bsog, collect, &c., q.v. 6 ? so read, -ḥtsw; 295 ḡno-ḥkho (p. 269, mog).

ḥson = Tib. gso, gson, tend, nurse. 261 phyer-ḥam (pp. 239, 283).

ḥṣoḥ-ḥṣoḥ = Tib. so-so, diverse, literally different places or bounds (so). 75 -ḥṭshu.

ḥṣor I = Tib. sor, finger. See also ḡṣwar. 72 -ḥtsam-bızod (p. 342).

-II = Tib. sı́, escape, hunt, &c., q.v. 89 gsom-ṛgyag; 260 -ḥgo (p. 261).

ḥṣwa = swa II, swah, look-out, guard, &c., q.v. See also ḡṣwaḥ. 321 -ḥrṣaṅ.

ḥṣwaṅ = swaṅ, q.v. See also ḡṣaṅ III. 340 phyer-ma; 341 ḡphyar-ma.

ḥṣwad = swad, q.v. 203 ḡko-ḥldah-ḥšo.

ḥṣwaḥ = swa II, swah, ḡswa, q.v. 288 -ḥram; 296 -ṛi; 298 -g-wehe; 318 -ḥmor (p. 267).

ḥṣwar = ḡṣor I, Tib. sor, finger, q.v. 28 -ḥldu-sto (pp. 321, 342, 355, 369).

ḥṣram = sram, hard, q.v. 24 ḡgru (p. 306).


ḥṣli = sli, q.v. (pp. 257, 357). 46 ḡbehe ṭmaṅ; 288, 318 -ḥdṣaṅ.

rṣeḥi = Tib. rtse, top, peak, &c. See also se I, ḡrṣeḥi (p. 348). 208 -ḥrgod.

 Helvetica

rṣeḥi = rṣehi, q.v. (p. 348). 384 -ḥpag (pp. 226, 336).
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Abbreviations: co. = country; di. = district; l. = language; m. = mountain; p. = people, tribes, &c.; q.v. = ‘which see’; re. = region; ri. = river; s. = ‘see’; s.a. = ‘see also’; st. = ‘state’; t. = ‘town’, ‘city’, &c.; w. = word(s).

* Titles of works in italic; those distinguished by an asterisk are meant where only the author’s name is cited.

A

A-K, Pandit, explorations, 36 n. 1, 85, 89 n. 2. S. HENNESSEY.

Abor, p., l., 154.

A-chai, I, a T’u-yü-hun king, 45 & n. 3, 57, 144 n. 3. II = Ha-za, 45-6.

A-la-shan, m., 153.

Altyn-tägh, m., 1, 6, 10, 44, 146.

Amaseriglu, m., 59.


Amne Bayan, m., 9.

Amne Rma-chen, m., 2 n., 4 n. 5, 5, 7, 9, 135.

Amnimachensbomra, m. = Amne Rma-chen, 4 n. 5.

AMUNDSEN, E., travels, 16 n. 3.


Baltistan, co., 14.


Baron, di. (Tsaidam), 9.

Ba-taⁿ, st. = ‘thaⁿ, 83.

Ba-t’ang, t. = Ba-thaⁿ, 6, 4 & n. 2, 11, 15, 19 n. 2, 67 & n. 2, 77-8; l., 75-7.

Ba-thaⁿ, st. (E. Tibet), 83.

Ba-ti, st. = Brag-stiⁿ, 83, 84 & n. 2.

Baw-nan, st. = Ba-bam, 83 n. 2.

Bawrang, t. or di. = Pa-U-Rong, q.v. 73.

Bayankara, m., 1-3, 7-9, 20, 26 (name).


Bde-gams, station in Bde, 32 n. 5, 35, 43, 243 (name).

Bde-sum-tshal (‘wood’), 35.

Beg-tse, a divinity, 147 n. 1.

Be-ri, st. (Rgyal-roṅ), 15 n. 5, 83.

S.a. Be-ri, Be-ri, Ḍbe-ri, Pe-re.

Bhutan, co., 14, 151.

BICHURIN, Iakinf, *Istoriya Tibet i Khukhunora, 6 n. 2, 26 n. 1, 28 nn. 3-5, 30 n. 2, 31 n. 1, 33 n. 1, 38 n. 2, 45, 52 n. 4, 53 n. 2, 60 n., 144 n. 3.

Bla-bran, monastery, 20 & n. 87, 27.

S.a. Lhabrang.


Blo-bzaṅ Dphah-ldan Ye-šes, itinera-ry, 2 n. 3, 8 n. 2, 15.

‘Blue Turquoise Lake’ = Koko-nor, q.v., 34 n. 3.

Bod, co. = Tibet, 13.

Boka, mines of, 44.

Bokalik, m., 9, 44.

Bo-lo-tse, p., 154.

Bon-po, sect, 18 n. 2, 28, 155-6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bonvalot, G., <em>Across Tibet</em></td>
<td>7, 146 n. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bournier, William, travels</td>
<td>44 n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bower, Hamilton, <em>Diary of a Journey across Tibet</em></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowrong, di. = Pa-U-Rong, q.v.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyer, Abbé, <em>Kharosthī Inscriptions edited by A. Boyer, E. J. Rapson and É. Senart</em></td>
<td>60 n. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brag-mon, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 83.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bra-chu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brius, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke, J.W., travels, 17, 36 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Btsan-la, st. (Rgyal-rob), 83. S.a. Tzan-la, Tsen-la, Zanla.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu-hagol, ri. (Tsaidam), 34 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulungir, ri. (Kan-su), 10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bum-liṅ, a place in Amdo, 110.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkhan Buddha, m., 9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese, 1, 168; w. 99, 109, 286 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushell, S. W., <em>The Early History of Tibet</em>, 6 n. 2, 12 nn. 5, 6, 14 n. 4, 15 n. 1, 18 n. 4, 148 n. 2, 153, &amp; in notes elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byea-glon-gi-loṇ-daṅ-rje, a person (mythical), 131.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byā-thaṅ, re., 1, 3, 9, 14, 15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byehu-rma-byehu-gi-Thin-tshun, a person (mythical), 131, 190.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bžagste-Nar-hbyam, a person (mythical), 133, 190.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C


Cer-cen, t., 23, 44.


Chakpa, robber tribes, 20 n. 7. S.a. Go-lok.

Cha-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 81.

Chamdo, t. = Chab-mdo, q.v., 6, 11.

Chang’an, -ngan, t. = Hsi-ngan-fu, q.v., 27, 44.

Changchenmo = Byaṅ°, q.v., 1.

Chango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 16 n.


Charing-nor (‘lake’) = Skya-reṅs-mtsho, q.v., 4, 20, 26 (name).

Charingol, ri. (Nan-shan), 10, 36 n. 1, 49.

Charklik, t. (Turkestan), 23, 44, 46.

Chavannes, E., *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux*, 41 n. 3.

Ch’eng-tu, t. (Ssū-ch’uān), 9, 52, 67.

Ch’i, ri. (China), 54 & n. 7.
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Ch'iang-tao, t. or di. (Kan-sa), 41, 55, 56.
Chia Rung, re. = Rgyal-ron, q.v., 67.
Ch'ien-fo-tung, t. (Sha-chou), 112, 117 n. 5, 129, 130.
Chi-lien, m. (Kan-su), 58.
Chimen-tāgh, m., 9.
Chin-ch'ing, t. (Kan-su), 37 n. 4, 43 & n. 6, 48–9. S.a. Kin-ch'ing, Kin-tş'ing.
Ching, ri., 54.
Ch'ing-hai (‘lake’) = Koko-nor, q.v., 26, 34.
Chin-sha-chiang, ri. = Middle Yangtze-chiang, 4.
Chi-shih (Skyi), m., 38 & n. 1. S.a. Tsi-shi.
Chiu-ch'uan, t. = Su-chou, q.v., 42.
Cho-ga-chi, st. = Lcog-rts'e, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Chok'ochi, st. = Lcog-rts'e, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Chos Chia, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Chos-chia, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Chos-schiapu, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Chü, ri. (China), 54 & n. 7.
Chung-tien, t. (Yün-nan), 73, 85.
Ch'un-sang, p., 128.
Chuo, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 15 n. 5.
Cingiz Khan, Mongol emperor, 26.
Ci-tzū, st. = Lcog-rts'e, q.v., 83.
Clauson, Sir G. L. M., 62.
Cog-ro, di., 58, 314. S.a. Tsog', Tshog'.
Cog-tsi, st. = Lcog-rts'e, q.v., 83–4.
Cok-tsi, st. = Lcog-rts'e, q.v., 83–4.
Co-ne, di. & p., 27, 28 & n. 1.
Cooper, T. T., *Travels of a pioneer of commerce*, 14 n. 1., 149 n. 1.
Cosgiyab, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Co-skiai, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 83.
Co-tse, st. = Lcog-rts'e, q.v., 83.
Cu-cui, st. (?), 84 n. 2.
Cu-wo, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 83.

D

Dabasun-nor (‘lake’), 26, 42 (name).
Dafla, l., 99, 154.
Dam-ba, st. (Rgyal-ron), 83, 84 n. 2. S.a. Tam-ba, Tangpa.
Dango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 85.
Dań-la, m. = Tang-la, q.v., 2 n. 3.
Dan-tig, p. = Tan-tig, 60.
Dar-chen-do, t. = Ta-chien-lu, 1.
Dardistan, co., 151 (Mons).
Das, Š. C., *Tibetan Dictionary*, 2 n. 3, 4 nn. 4, 5, 8 n. 2, 33, 137, 140, 151, 284, 297, 303, 307–8, 354, and elsewhere in notes.
Davies, H. R., *Yün-nan, the link between India and the Yangtze*, 67 n. 2, 69, 70, 73, 79, 81.
Dbye-dan-sum, t. (mythical), 307.
Dbye-mo, t. (mythical), 307.
De, re. = Bde, q.v., 35, 37.
De-ge, st. = Sde-dge, q.v., 83.
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Dergi, st. = Sde-dge, q.v., 83.

DESGODINS, Abbé, (1) Mots principaux des langues de certaines tribus ... (2) Le Thibet d'après la correspondance des missionnaires, 70, 81, 92 & nn. 1, 2.

Dge-śi-tsha, st. (Rgyal-ron), l., 83, 89 & n. 2; w., 90, 92–3, 104. S.a. Geśits’a, Rgo-śi-tsha, &c. (pp. 83–4).

Dgu-legs, a certain fiend, 130, 255.

Dgu-sul, a place in W. Kan-su, 134.

Di-chu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.

D'-mi, l., 324.

Dje-gu, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 82, 83, 85.


Dkari-mdzes, t. = Kanzé, q.v., 11 n. 1, 16 n.

Eastern Colonial Tibetan. S.Tibetan.


‘Eighteen Kingdoms’ of the Rgyal-ron, 17, 19.

‘Eight Snam’, 235.

‘Eight Yogs’, 267.

Dzorgai, p. (Go-lok); l., 72, 88; w., 90–1. S.a. Go-lok.

F

Fan-min (Chinese), Tibetan borderers, 64.


Fêng-yang, a Ch’iang tribe = Hong-jong, 41.
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‘Four Garrisons’ = Chinese Turkestan, 235.


Fussii ch66ng, t., 28 n. 4, 33.

S.a. *Phyug-tsams*.

FUTTERER, K., *Durch Asien*, 6, 9 n. 1, 10 n. 1, 11 nn. 2, 3, 9, 12 n. 5, 20, 38, 248 n. 4, 266 n. 2, elsewhere in notes pp. 21-60.

Gabet, Père, travels. S. Huc.

Ga-cu, t. = Ho-chou, q.v., 11 & n. 7, 60.

Gaishechia, st. = Dge-šī-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Gam-shan, m., 151.

Gan-‘e, t. or di., 49 n. 1.

Gari, t. or di., 67.

GARNTER, F., *Voyage d’Exploration en Indo-Chine*, 75.

Gass, t. & di. (Tsaidam), 44.

Gdags-khri, an early Tibetan king, 6.

Gdi-m-drug, a (mythical) di., 32 n. 1.

Gebazīra, st. = Dge-šī-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Geografia Tibeta of Mintshul Huthuktu, q.v.

Ge-sar, legend of, 153, 213 n. 1.


Gešitsa’s, st. = Dge-šī-tsha, q.v., 72; l., 89 & n. 2.


GILES, L., articles in B.S.O.S. vi & vii. 33 n. 1, 45 n. 1.

GILL, W., *The River of Golden Sand*, 2 n. 2, 7, 17, 64 n. 1, 66–8, 70, 84, 89 n. 1.

GILMORE, D., *The Karens*, 144.

Gi-še-tsha, st. = Dge-šī-tsha, q.v., 83.

Giyardo, Giyarlung, Giyarmu, Giyarsa, Giyartang, t. or di. (Rgyal-ron), 17 n. 1.

Glo-nyaig-loň, a mythical person = Lton-tehi-Mye-kru, q.v., 131.

Gnam-ka-Loň-sum, a mythical place, 32 n. 1.

Gñan-chen-Than-lha, m., 2–3, 2 n. 4.


Gobi desert, 10, 27.

Go-je, st. = Ho-gţi, q.v., 83.

‘Gold River’ = Chin-ch’uan, q.v., 16–17, 65, 81.


Gong, an early Ch’iang chief = Chiuq, q.v., 52.

Gossetscha, st. = Dge-šī-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Go-ya-go-phu, a certain fiend, 134, 255.

Go-zi, st. = Ho-gţi, q.v., 83.


Gropur, t. or di. (Skyi), 110.

Gru, di. (Tibet), 308.

Gru-gu, a place (Amdo), 308.

Gru-gu-rgya-ra, di. (Khams), 308.

Gton-sum-pa, p., 152.

Gu-ge, re. (W. Tibet), 130.

Guidui, t. & di. = Kuei-tê, q.v., 59 n. 3.

Guń-dań, a mythical place, 307.

Gusri Khan, a Mongol Emperor, 26.

Gyámi (Rgya-mi), l. (Chinese), 72–3; w., 92–3.

G-yar, p., 17 n. 1, 33 n. 5, 34–5, 35 n. 1.


Gyärüng, re. = Rgyal-ron, q.v.,
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17 n. 1, 64–5, 67, 81, 82–5; l., 19, 72–3, 80, 89, 98; w., 86–7, 90–1, 93–7, 100–9, 132, 223, 236, 352, 360, 369.

Gyarungbo, a Gyarung man, 64 (Rgyal-ron-po).

G-ye-mo-thaṅ = G-yarö, q.v., 34.

G-yer-mo-thaṅ = G-yarö, q.v., 136, 353.

Gyim-po, p., 33 n. 5, 57, 134–5.

S.a. Byim.

Gyim-tshan, m., 151.

G-yu-mtsho, ‘Turquoise Lake’ = Koko-nor, q.v., 34 & n. 3.

H

Haenisch, E. S. Hedin, Southern Tibet, vol. ix., 17 n. 1, 84 & n. 2, 89 n. 2.

Ha (Hwa)-hwa, st. (Rgyal-ron), 83.

Hajjar, di. (Tsaidam), 9, 23, 46.


Haloun, G., 45 n. 6, 48 n., 57 n. 1.

Hanniu, 1. (Rgyal-ron), 72, 87, 89; w., 87, 90, 92–3, 95–6, 101, 106, 107.

Ham, t. (Turkestan), 24.

Hann, co. (SsG-ch'uan), 51, 57.

Hann, ri. (China), 37.


Hanniu, l. (Rgyal-ron), 72, 87, 89; w., 87, 90, 92–3, 95–6, 101, 105, 107.

Harṣa, Indian Emperor, 14 & n. 3.

Hashakilr, t. (Turkestan), 46.


Hbä, p. & st. (Ba-thaṅ), 6 n. 6, 67 n. 2, 83.

Hbë-rim, st. (Hor-pa) = Be-ri, q.v., 83.


Hbrog, upland pasture, 5, 23.

Hbrog-pa, Hbrog (pastoral) people, 5.

Hbrom-koṅ, di. (Koko-nor), 32.

Hbum-daṅ, a mythical place, 307.

Hedin, Sven, travels, 36 n. 1, 369.

Southern Tibet, 44 & n. 3, 82. S.a. Haenisch.


Hel-ke, t., 242.


Herrmann, A., Historical and Commercial Atlas of China, 38, 40 n. 7, 44 n. 3.

Hgar, p. (Tibet), 308. S.a. Lga, Lgar, Mgar.

Hgo-boms, t. (= Kumbum?), 12 & n. 1, 199, 243.

Hgo-źi, st. = Ḥo-gźi, 33.

Hgrēn, p. (Amdo), 32, 57.

Hgrēn-ro, di. (Koko-nor), 32, 57.


Hgru, a legendary p. (Tibet), 307–8.

Hgru-gu, id., 268, 308.

Hgru-hdang-hmaḥ, a legendary t., 307–9.


Hldyaṅ, p. & dynasty = Ḥjaṅ (?), 333.


Hoernle, A. F. R., JRAS. 1911, p. 112.

Hog-gźi, st. = Ḥo-gźi, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Ho-kuan, di., 37 n. 4. S.a. Chin-ch'ing.

Ho-nan, re. (China), 54.
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Hong, ri. = Ta-t'ung-ho, q.v., 38, 40, 42, 47 n. 3, 56 & n. 4. S.a. Huang.

Hong-jong, a Ch'iang p., 41. S.a. Fêng-yang.

Hong Te, a Ch'iang p., 56 & n. 4. 

Hoo, p. = Hu, q.v.

Hor, re. (Byan-than), 14.

Hor in Hor-pa, q.v., 16 n., 65.

Hor = Turk, 152.

Hor-chyok = Hor-khog, q.v., 15 n. 5.

Hor-khog, the five Hor-pa stt., 15 & n. 5.

Hor-man, perhaps ancient name of the Hor-pa st., 16 n.

Hor-pa, stt., 65, 80; l., 65, 72-3, 80 n. 2, 89-99; w., 87, 89, 90-7, 100-1, 103-7, 109, 135, 248 n. 3, 251, 276, 278 n. 1, 317, 352, 360.

‘Horse, White’, Ch'iang tribe. S. 'White Horse'.

Horsek'anga = Hor-khog, q.v., 15 n. 5.

Hórsók = Hor-pa and Sog (Mongol), q.v., 73. S. Hodgson.


Hsi-ch'iang, ‘Western Ch'iang’, p., 25-6, 31, 36, 68.

Hsien-ling, an ancient Ch'iang tribe or group, 41 & n. 7, 43. S.a. Siên-liên, Hsi-ning.

Hsi-fan, p., 17, 25, 64-9, 77-8, 144; l., 19, 64, 73, 75-7, 88, 99, 100-5, 107-9, 119, 154, 168, 360, 369; w., 88, 102, 132, 203, 233, 238, 249 n. 2, 290, 328, 333, 352.

Hsi-hai, ‘Western Lake’ = Koko-nor, 42.

Hsih-chih, co. (Tang-hsiang), = Skyi, q.v., 38-9, 57.


I

I, p., 56, 152.

Indus, ri., 4 (gorge).

Itineraries (Lha-sa-China), 4, 5, 6 n. 2, 8 n. 2.

Ivanov, A., 63 n. 1 (Hsi-hsia vocabulary).

J


Jag-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 83-4.
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Ja-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 83.
Japanese, w., 34, 234.
Jë, ri. (E. Tibet), 18 n. 4, = Jo.
Jên, an early Ch'iang chief, 40, 52, 57, 135. S.a. Dsim.
Jên Ši-ku, commentator on the Former Han Annals = Yen Shih-ku, 46.
Jë, ri., 18 = Jë.
Jo-Ch'iang, p., 43-6, 43 n. 3 = Dža-k'iong, Ni-kiang. S.a. Ha-ža.
Johnston, R., *From Peking to Mandalay, 7 n. 8, 66 & n. 1, 67 n. 2, 70, 73, 79, 81, 87 n. 2, 142 n. 1, 145 n. 1.
Jok-žai, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Ju-kan, st. = Brdzun-hgag, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Jûn, di. (Tsaidam), 26 (name).
Jung, p. = Džung, 54-6, 152.
Jya-de, di. (E. Tibet), l., 75, 187.
Jya-kha, st. = Rgyal-kha, q.v., 82-3.
Jyê-rûn, co. = Rgyal-roñ, q.v., 17 n. 5; l., 72-3, 79 n. 1, 80, 89 & n. 2, 95; w., 87, 90, 92-4, 96, 103-5, 216 n. 2, 343. S.a. Gyärung, Rgya-roñ.
Jye-dam, di. (Chung-tien), 83-5.
Jyekundo, t. & di. (Tibet), 4, 7, 11; l., 75.

K

Ka-ba, di. (Liang-chou), 58 & n. 3.
Ka-chin, l., 154; w., 99.
Ka-dróñ (Kad-roñ), a place (Amdo), 268, 308.
Kailassa, & di., 1, 14, 130, 373.
Kam-ba-rdzon, t. (Thibet), 67.
Kanauri, l., w., 92, 328.
Kañ-sar, st. = Khañ-gsar, q.v., 83.
Kan-su, re., 10-13, 24-5, 28, 32, 36, 41, 45 n., 49 n., 58, 65, 242 n. 1; p., 24-5, 45, 53, 65; l. & w., 106 (Tibetan), 242 n. 1.
Kanzê, st. (Hor-pa), 11 n. 1, 16 n., 18, 75, 150; l., 75. S.a. Dkañ-mdzes.
Karokoram, m., 1.
Karen, p., 144 (creation legend).
Keang, p. = Ch’iang, q.v., 47 n. 3.
Keshets, st. = Dge-si-tsa, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Khab-yo-byahi-Hdab-bkra, a mythical person, 131.
Kharakhto, t. (ruins), 27 & n. 4.
Khri-boms, t., 243 (name).
Khri-šor, lake = Koko-nor, 34.
Khri-sroñ-Ldehu-brtsan, Tibetan king, 368 (name).
Khrom, t., 33.
Khus-sar, st. = Khañ-gsar, q.v., 83, 85.
Kiangu, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 85 n. 1.
Kiangsu, re. (China), 54.
Kiating, t. (China), 17.
Kin-ts’ing, id., 43 n. 6.
Kin-tschuan, ri. = Chin-ch’uan, q.v., l., 19.
Kioutse, l., w., 74, 92, 99, 325.
Klaproth, J., *Description du Tibet, 6 n. 2.
Koko-nor, lake & re., 8-13, 25-6 (name), 34 (name), 41, 58-9, 66, 99, 251; p., 20-1, 23, 26-8, 43, 45,
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56, 237, 251; 1, 123-4, 237, 373.
S.a. Amdo, Hsi-hai, Ching-hai, Turquoise Lake, Tangut, Tibetan.
Kolo, p. = Go-lok, q.v., 20 n. 6.
Konow, Sten, Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang, 127.
Kon-ser, st. = Khan-gsar, q.v., 82-5.
Kortse, p. (Go-lok), 1, 72, 88; w., 90-1.
Koshu Han, a Chinese official, 12 n. 5.
Kozlov, P. K., Mongolei, Amdo und die tote Stadt Charachoto, 20 n. 9, 27 n. 4, 59 n. 3.
Kre-ciu (tschiu), di. or st. = Khroskyab? 83-4, 153; 1., 19.
Kredyan, p. & 1., 154.
Kuang-han, t. & di. (China), 40, 52 & n. 6, 53 n. 1, 56.
Kublai Khan, a Mongol Emperor, 26.
Kue-de, st. = Kuei-tö, q.v., 59 n. 3.
Kuen-lun, m., 44.
Kum, desert (Lob-nor), 146.
K’ung-chou, di. (China), 31.
Kung-sa (sar), st. = Khan-gsar, q.v., 15 n. 5, 84 n. 2.
Kun-sar, id., 83.
Ku-tsun, p. (Tibetans of Yün-nan), 69; 1., 72-4; w., 102.
Kva-cu, t. = Kwa-chou (Kan-su), 32, 35.
Kya-ring-nor, lake = Skya-reüa, q.v., 4 n. 4.

L
La, pass (Tibet), 5.
Ladak, co., 1, 14, 151 (Mons); 1., 79; w., 102.
Lahu, p., 144 (legend); w., 99.
Lalou, Mdlle., Inventaire des MSS. tibétains de Touen-houang, 33 n. 3, 247, 250 n. 2, 260 n.
Lan-chou, t. (Kan-su), 3, 5, 10, 12, 23, 42, 48.

Lao-chieh, a Ch’üan tribe = Lotschü (tché), 41 & n. 3.
Leag-la, st. (Rgyal-ron), 82-3. S.a. Leags-la, Cag-la, Cha-la, Ja-la, Dja-la, Jag-la, Ming-jing, Ta-chien-lu.
Leags-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 83.
Ldañ-la, m. = Tang-la, q.v., 2 n. 3.
Ldehu-ža-hbriñ-te Sman-skyol, a legendary person, 134.
Ldoñ, an early Tibetan tribe, 307-8.
Ldoñ Moñag, p. (Miñag, q.v.), 16 n. 3, 152.
Ldoñ Sum-pa, p. (Sum-pa, q.v.), 18 n. 2. S.a. Gtonö.
Lehu, t. or st. (Rgyal-ron), 86.
Len-tsa, st. (Rgyal-ron), 14.
Lepcha, w., 217, 326.
Lévi, Sylvain, Tibetan invasion of India, 14 n. 3.
Lhabrang monastery = Bla-brañ, q.v., 20 & n. 8, 27, 60 & n., 243 n. 1.
Lha-mo-shan (ri), m., 54, 237.
Lha-sa, t., 11 (routes), 13-4, 26, 60 n (routes), 237 (name); 1., 33, 75 & n. 1, 78, 81, 84, 85, 86 n. 2, 104-5, 107, 117 n. 5, 372; w., 107.
Liébard, A., *Notes sur les dialectes Lo-lo, 70, 143.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Li-fan-fu, t. (Ssü-ch’uan)</td>
<td>66-7; 1. (Man-Tzü)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lig, dynasty (zähl-zhun)</td>
<td>14 n. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-gu, an early Ch’iang tribe</td>
<td>40 &amp; n. 4, 41, 52 &amp; n. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-niu, ‘Yak tribe’</td>
<td>Li-niu, p. = Li-gu, q.v., 40 &amp; n. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin-chou, di. (China)</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic Survey of India</td>
<td>98, 104, 209.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-niu, p. = Li-gu, q.v.</td>
<td>40 &amp; n. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin-t’ao, t. &amp; di. (Kan-su)</td>
<td>41, 43, 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissou, p. (l., 72)</td>
<td>w., 74, 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lissu, id.</td>
<td>151; l., 72.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-su, id.</td>
<td>1., 72; w., 99, 102.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-t’ang (tan, than)</td>
<td>6, 11, 83; l., 67 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littledales, St. G. R. and Mrs., travels</td>
<td>3, 36 n. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Little Tiger', a certain legendary ass = Cho-pyi-cog-zu, q.v., 132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liung-ch’kng, t. = Lyon-jen, q.v., 35.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo, ri. (China)</td>
<td>54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo-gu, st. = Ba-bam, q.v.</td>
<td>83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lok-Tik, p., 58-9, 59 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo’n-sum, a mythicall place, 32 n. 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonü Man, p., 153.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lo-tsu (tschu), tribe &amp; ri, 41 &amp; n. 3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutse, p.; l., 72, 81, 92; w., 2 n., 74, 90-1, 93-5, 97, 99, 100, 102-4, 106-7, 325. S. a. Lu-tzu.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lton-tehi-Mye-kru, a legendary person, 131, 133, 136-8, 143, 190 (name), 223, 255, 369 (name).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung, m. (Kan-su)</td>
<td>12, 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung-ch’uan valley (Amdo)</td>
<td>12 n. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung-hsi, di. (Kan-su)</td>
<td>12, 37, 41, 43, 55 &amp; n. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-tzu, p.; l., 72, 81, 92; w., 90-1, 94-5, 97-8, 101, 103-4, 106-7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M**

- **Mānasa-sarovar, lake**, 1, 8, 373.
- **Man-chia, p. = Min-chia, q.v., 65-6, 69.**
- **Manchu, l., 84.**
- **Mantzze, p. = Man-tzū, q.v., 67.**
- **Man-tzū, p. & l., 64-9, 154. S. a. Outer Man-tzū.**
- **Mānyak, co., 16, 64-5, 72, 75; l., 73, 75, 89; w., 87 & n. 4, 90-4, 101-5, 107-8, 218, 238, 242 n. 1, 251, 276, 284, 303, 328, 330, 344, 360. S. a. Mi-ñāg, Menia, Mu-nia, Minia.**
- **Mao, di. (Ssü-ch’uan), 53.**
- **Mao-chou, t. (Ssü-ch’uan), 18, 29.**
- **Marco Polo, 11 n. 8 (Sinju).**
- **Mar-khams, di., S. Dmarö.**
- **Mar-yul, co. = Ladak, 1.**
- **MASPERO, G., 119 n. 1.**
- **Ma-su, st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 84 n. 2.**
- **Matse, st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 85 n. 1.**
- **Mazar, st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 83.**
- **Ma-ze (zer), st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 83, 85.**
- **Ma-zi, st. (Hor-pa), 15 n. 5, 83. S. a. Ma-zar, òze, òzer, òzzar, òsu, òzu, òzur.**
- **Ma-zi (zur), st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 83, 15 n. 5.**
- **Mazzar, st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 85 n. 1.**
- **Mchín-rgyal, a Ch’iang king, 135.**
- **Mdo, lower part of valley, 6.**
- **Mdo-gams, a place in Amdo, 32.**
- **Mdo-Khams, re. = Amdo & Khams, 5, 8.**
- **Mdo-li, st. (Rgyal-ron), 83.**
- **Mdo-smad, re., perhaps embracing Amdo & Khams, q.v., 6, 8, 32, 137 n. 2.**
- **MEARES, C. H., travels, 17.**
- **Me-hi-klu-hcah, a class of beings, perhaps referring to the Nam people, 138.**
- **Me-kong, Upper, ri., 3, 11, 79 = Dza-chu, q.v.**
- **Mélam, l. (Tsa-ron), 81, 89; w., 91, 97, 101, 230.**
- **Me-li, st. = Mi-li, q.v., 82-5.**
- **Menia, p. = Mi-ñāg, q.v., 16 & nn. 1-3, 72; l., 16, 73, 75, 80, 89; w.,**
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74, 87 n. 4, 90-1, 93-6, 101-6, 108, 234, 242 n. 1, 279 n. 1, 328, 330, 339, 343-4.

Mer-ke, t. (Rgyal-ron), 242.
Me-t'ang, a Ch'iang chief, 50.
Me-tsang, a Ch'iang tribe, 21.
S.a. Mi-sang.
Mgar, a Tibetan clan, 308.
S.a. Hgar, Lga(r).
Mgo-log, p. = Go-lok, q.v., 20 n. 7.
Mi6n-tku, t. & di. = Min-chou, q.v., 64 & n. 9.
Mi-li, st., 19, 73, 90, 83, 85; l., 89-99.
Min, ri. (Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 17, 53, 66.
Mi̇n-tшу, t. & di. = Min-chou, q.v., 54 & n. 9.
Min, ri. (Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 17, 53, 66.
Mi̇n-tшу, t. & di. = Min-chou, q.v., 54 & n. 9.
Min, ri. (Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 17, 53, 66.
Mi̇n-tшу, t. & di. = Min-chou, q.v., 54 & n. 9.

MINTSHUL HUTHUKTU, *Geografia Tibet (q.v.), 33, 59.

Miri, l., 99, 154; w., 99 n. 1.
Mi̇sang, a Ch'iang tribe, 21, 28.
Mishmi, p. & l., 99, 154; w., 99 n. 1.
'Mixed Wolves', a Ch'iang tribe = Tsang-lang, q.v., 40 n. 6, 41, 51, 53 & n.
Mon (Moñ), p., 150 sqq., 243.
Monbeig, Pére, Tse-kou Tibetan, 1, 70, 74, 79, 81.
Mon-mo-thañ ('plateau'), 32 n. 2, 150.
Mon Rta-dbañ (lwan), Mon Spag-ro (Paro), Mon-yul, places near, or in, Bhutan, 151.

MORGAN, E. D., S. Prejevalsky, 74.
MORISSE, G., Hsi-hsia l., 62 n. 1.
Mo-so, p., 72; l., 63-4, 69, 72, 76, 101, 324; w., 74, 92, 98-9, 102-7, 218, 224, 232-4, 249, 250, 255, 324, 328, 330, 332.
Mosso = Mo-so, q.v.; l., 72.
Muli, st. = Mi-li, q.v.
Muli(Njong = Hjan), l., 72, 81, 89; w., 74, 90-4, 97, 101-6, 135, 328, 330, 360.
MÜLLER, F. W. K., Ñi-kiang, 44 & n. 3, 46 n. 3.
Mu-nia, p. = Mi-ñag, q.v., 67 n. 2; l., 72-3, 80, 89; w., 74, 90-1, 94, 101-7, 333.
Muping (p'ing), st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2; l., 89.
Murus-ussu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2, 26 (name).
Myañ, co. (Tibet), 142.
Myañ-ro, co., 314 (name).
Mye-kru, a legendary person. S. Lton-tehi?.
Myi-rma-bu-Ldam-Bad, a legendary person, 135.
Myi-rma-bu Mchiñ-rgyal, a T'ang-chang king, 135.

N

Nágā, l., 99, 324; w., 99 n. 1, 325.
Nāg-chu-ka, di. (Tibet), 13 & n. 4.
Nāg-cig, Gyim-po, a legendary person, 134-5.
Nam, co. & p., 130-3, 137 n. 2, 142-3, 146; l. & w., passim (S. Table of Contents). S.a. Nam-po, Nam-Tig, Nam-ldon-prom.
Nameji, l. (Hsi-fan), 72.
Nam Kan-mog, a temple (Sa-eu re.), 271.
Nam-ldon-prom, a place (Amdo ?) 137 n. 2.
Nam (Gnam)-mtsho = Tengri-nor, 2.
Nam-Tig, p. & l. (Tig of Nam), 59, 61, 132, 155.
Namtiñga, a person, 60.
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Nan-chao Man, p., 153.
Nañ-chen, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 83-4.
Nan-hu, t. & di. (Kan-su), 10, 44.
Nan-shan, m., 1, 7, 10, 12, 24-5, 46-8, 58-61.
Nepal, co., 14; l., 303.
Ngan ('An)-ku, di. (Kan-su), 41.
Ngo-ling, lake = Sño-raïns, q.v. 4 n. 4.
Ni-kiang, p. = Jo-ch'iang, q.v., 43-6, 43 n. 3.
Ning-hsia, t. (A-la-shan), 12, 24, 153.
Ning-yuan, t. (S. Ssü-ch'uan), 40 n. 4, 153.
N'jeh, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.
Noring-nor ('lake') = Sño-raïns, q.v., 4 n. 4.
Nü-kuo, st. = ‘Women’s kingdom’, q.v., 11, 18.
Nung, l.; w., 99.
Nyn-chen-tangle, m. = Gñan-chen-Than-lha, q.v., 2-3.

O

Odontala, a plain near the upper Rma-chu = Skar-ma-thañ, q.v., 26 (name).
Okši, st. = Ho-gzi, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Orazio della Penna, 11 n. 8.
Oring-nor ('lake') = Sño-raïns, q.v., 20, 26 (name).
ORLÉANS, Prince Henri d' , *From Tonkin to India*, 7, 71, 73-4, 81, 143, 261, 266 n. 2, 333.
Outer Man-tzu, p., 67; l., 70, 89; w., 90, 92, 96, 98, 103, 105, 108.
Ovis Ammoni (Hodgson), 3 n.

P

Pai-ma, ‘White Horse’ Ch'iang tribe, 40 & n. 5, 41, 52 & n. 6, 53.
S.a. P'e (Pih)-ma.
Pamir, w., 33 n. 1.
Pan-chen Blo-bzan Dpal-ldan Ye-ses, itinerary, 2 n. 3, 8 n. 2, 13.
PARKER, E. H., Hsiung-nu, &., 30, 33 n. 1, 49 n. 1.
Paro, t. = Spag-ro, q.v., 151 (name).
Pa-sti, st. = Brag-stin, q.v., 81, 83.
Pa-ti, id., 72, 83, 84 n. 2; l., 89; w., 90, 94, 105.
Pa-un, st. = Ba-bam, q.v., 83.
Pa-U-Rong, di., 72-3; l., 73, 81, 89; w., 74, 90-3, 97, 101-3, 105, 108, 135 n. 1, 328, 360.
PAUTHIER, J. P. G., Tibetan invasion of India, 14 n. 3.
Pa-wan (wang), st. = Ba-bam, q.v., 72, 83, 84 n. 2; l. 89.
Pe = Bod, p., 69, 72.
Pe (Bod of Sung-p’an), 1., 70, 73-4; w., 74.
‘Peacock River’, = Rma-chu, q.v., 1 & n. 2, 4 n. 5.
Pei-ta-ho ('river'), (Nan-shan), 10.
Pei-t'ing, t. (Turkestan), 24, 153.
Peking, routes from Lha-stt, 11.
Pelliot, P., 32, 45 & n. 2, 46 & n. 2.
Pel-lung, m. (Kan-su), 53.
P'e-ma, p. = Pai-ma, q.v.
P'e-re, st. = Be-ri, q.v., 83, 85.
Petsen, l., w., 99.
Peu (Bod) of Ta-chien-lu 72; l., 73-4.
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Phug-dir (tir), a place (Amdo), 34.
Phyug-tsams, di. (Amdo), 32-4, 53.
S.a. Fusst-ch'eng.
Pih-te, di. (Ssu-ch'uan), 53 n. 1.
Pih-ma, p. = Pai-ma, q.v., 40 n. 5.
P'ing-fan, t. (Amdo), 10, 12 n. 5, 36 n. 1, 49.
P'ing-liang, t. (Shen-hsi ?), 12.
Po, 1. = Pe, q.v., 69, 72.
Polei-tchou, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.
Po-mo, st. = So-mo, q.v., 83.
Prejevalsky, N., *Mongolia, the Tangut country (trans. E. D. Morgan), 1 n. 1, 2 n. 2, 3 n., 4 n. 5, 7, 44, 59 n. 3.
Prinsep, J., 14 n. 3.
Pri-mi, p. (Mi-li), 72; l., 81; w., 90, 94, 97, 101-6.
Pyen, 1.; w., 99.
Q Quedm, t. & di. = Kuei-t6, q.v., 59 n. 3.

'Queen's Gorge' (? King's), 17 & n. 1. S. Rgyal-roñ.

R Rab-brtan, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a.
Rap-ten, Rar-dan, Ra-ten.
Rái, l.; w., 98.
Rañ-ke, t., 242 (name).
Rapson, E. J., Kharosthi Inscriptions . . ., 60 n. 3.
Rap-ten, st. = Rab-brtan, q.v., 83.
Rar-dan, id., 83.
Ra-ten, id., 83.
Rbeg-ga-rbeg-si, a mythical person, 134.
Rdyarong, co. = Rgyal-roñ, q.v., 17 n. 1.
Rdzogs-chen, st. (Nag-roñ), 15 n. 5.
Rge-si-tsa, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 83-4.
Rgya, co. = China, 13, 131, 152.

Rgyal-kha, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a.
Djia-kha, Jya-kha.
Rgyal-(mo)-roñ, co. (18 States), 17 & n. 1, 18-20, 51 n. 4, 65, 67-8, 85, 99, 100; l., 19, 20, 72, 73, 85-7, 89-99, 95, 98, 154, 260 n. 1; w., 87 n., 90-1, 93, 100-1, 103, 105-7, 260 n. 1, 324 n. 1. S.a. Gyärung, Jyā-roñ, Rgya-roñ.
Rgya-roñ, co. = Rgyal-(mo)-roñ, q.v.; l., 72, 79 n. 1, 80, 89; w., 86, 92-8, 100-8, 232, 266, 325, 360, 369.
Richtofen, F. von., China, 11 n. 9.
Rijnhart, Mrs., *With the Tibetans in Tent & Field, 15 n. 5, 30 n. 1.
Ritter, C., Die Erdkunde, 11 n. 9.
Rji-lun-dañ-ba, t. or co. (legendary), 307.
Rma, surname, 1 n. 2.
Rma-chu, ri. = Hoang-ho in Tibet, 1 & n. 2 (name), 3, 9, 10, 20-2, 24, 26-8, 45 (altitude), 59, 61, 135, 246.
Rma-roñ = Rma-chu gorge, 9, 20, 29, 31, 57.
Rockhill, W. W., (1) *The Land of the Lamas, (2) Diary of a Journey through Mongolia & Tibet, (3) Tibet: a sketch from Chinese sources, 2 n., 2 & 3, 4 nn. 2-5, 5 nn. 3 & 6, 6 n. 2, 7, 8 n. 1 & 2, 16-20, 21, 52, 59, 65, 71, 75-6, 81-5, 87, 149-51, 187, 237-8, 251, 299, 344, 373, & passim in notes elsewhere.
Roñ (gorge) districts, 5-7.
Rosenberg, F., Sogdian MSS. (orthography), 117 n. 1.
Rtsi-dañ, a legendary place, 307.
Rtsung-kang, st. = Brdzun-hag, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Ru-dok, t. & di. (Tibet), 1.
Ru-kan, Rung-kang, Ruñ-kan, st. = Brdzun-hag, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2.
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S

Sa-ga Gdiñ-drug, a mythical place, 32 n. 1.
Salar, p. (Amdo), 24 & n. 1.
Sa-ma, st. = So-mo, q.v., 83.
Sam-long, p. = Ts‘an-lang, q.v., 40 n. 6, 41, 51, 53 & n. 1.
Sam-sa, a Go-lok tribe, 21, 41 & n. 2.
Sam-tsia, a Ch‘iang tribe, 21, 41.
Sa-bm-tsu.
SANDBERG, G., Tibet & the Tibetans, 5 nn. 3, 5, 8 n. 2.
SAT,CANDRA VIDYABHOSAPA, edited by, 127.
Scilin (*lingh), t. = Rsi-ning, q.v., 11 n. 8.
Sde-dge, st. (E. Tibet), 16 n. 5, 83.
S.a. De-ge, Der-ge, Der-gi, Sder-gi.
Sder-gi, id., 83.
Se-bag, a divinity, 147 n. 1.
Seen-tsze, a Ch‘iang tribe, 41. S.a. Shan-chieh.
Se-Ha-ja, p., 152.
Selìn, t. = Hsi-ning, q.v., 11 n. 8.
SENART, É., Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, 60 n. 3.
Seutati, Peu (Bod p.) of, 72. S.a. Tzu-ta-ti.
Sgaṅ districts, 5, 6.
Sha-chou, t. (Kan-su), 10, 28, 45. S.a. Sa-cu.
Shan-chieh, a Ch‘iang tribe = Seen-tsze, 41.
Shan-chou = Hsi-ning, q.v., 42 & n. 2.
Shan-hsi, re. (China), 54.
Shan-shan, co. (Lob-nor), 28, 44–5; 1., 116; w., 188.
Shan-tan, m. (Kan-chou), 48.
Sharakuto, t. (Amdo), 237.

Sharba, traders from Mer-ke (Ssū-ch‘uan), 20 n. 2, 22–4.
Sha-t‘o, a Turk tribe, 24, 153.
She-chu, Sche-tsche, ri., in Ch‘iang co., 38.
Shen-hsi, Ch‘ang-an in, 27.
Shi-shia = Hsi-hsia, q.v., 63 n. 1, 72.
Shuh, ancient division of Ssū-ch‘uan, 12, 37, 51, 53, 57.
Siṃ-tsu, a Ch‘iang tribe = Samsa? 41.
Siōn, ri. = Ta-t‘ung-ho? Hsi-ning-ho? 41 n. 7, 47 n. 3.
Siĕn-liĕn, Ch‘iang tribes = Hsi-ning, 41 n. 7, 43.
Si-hai = Hsi-hai, Koko-nor, q.v., 37.
Si-hia, l. = Hsi-hsia, q.v., 62 n. 1, 73.
Sikki, co. = Hsih-chih, Skyi, q.v., 37, 57.
Siklim, for Sikkim? 67.
Simbu, l.; w., 98.
Sing-pho, l.; w., 98–9.
Sining = Hsi-ning, q.v.
Sinju = Hsi-ning, q.v., 11 n. 8.
Sio-tong = Shao-tang, q.v., 41.
Sirtin, di. (Tsaidam), 10, 23, 44. ‘Six Cities’ = Khotan co., 235.
Ska-ba, di. (Liang-chou), 58 & n. 3.
Skar-ba, a certain Yak, 139 (acc. to Hue & Gabet (II, p. 158) Karba is a Tsaidam term for a young yak).
Skeg-zahi-hbriṅ-te Yar-mo-btsun, a mythical person, 184.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEX OF PROPER NAMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skyi-mthiṅ (plateau) co. = Skyi, 110, 133, 135.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sni-li, st. = Mi-li, q.v., 83, 85.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shri, m., 272.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shod, low-lying lands, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogdian MSS., orthography, 117 n. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sökpa, Mongol, l. 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokyeul = Sog-yul, Mongolia, 64. S.a. Stod-Sog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spag-ro, t. &amp; di. (Bhutan), 151 (Mon), 314.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sribs, shadowed side of m., 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sribs-khri, an early Tibetan king, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-ch’uan, re., 9, 12, 24-5, 33 n. 2, 40 n. 4, 51-3, 56, 58, 65-6, 68, 100, 153-4; p. 150. S.a. Shuh, Han.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stein, Sir A., Innermost Asia, 62 n. 1, 112, 286.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stod-phyogs, re. (Kailāsa), 1, 8, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stötznier, W., In’s unerforschte Tibet, 7 n. 8, 82, 84 n. 2, 85 n. 1, 89 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-ching, t. (Rgyal-ron), 84 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-chou, t. (Kan-su), 10, 12, 25, 42, 48-9, 58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šü-kde, t., 242 (name).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-ki, ri. = Tz’u-chih, q.v., 37-8, 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-lo-ho, ri. (Kan-su), 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su-mu, st. = So-mo, q.v., 84 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunggak, Sunggang, st. = Brdzun-hsgag, q.v., 84 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung-chou, old name of Sung-p’an, q.v., 12 n. 6, 26, 28-9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sung-p’an, t. (N. Su-ch’uan), 9, 12, 17-19, 22, 24, 26, 28, 66-8; l. 73. Su-pi, p. = Sum-pa, q.v., 18 n. 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T

| Tafel, A., *Meine Tibetreise, 1 n. 1, 2 n., 3 n. 1, 4 nn. 1, 2, 4, 5 n. 6, 5-9, 11 nn. 2, 4, 67, 71-2, 82-3, 85-6, 154, 156, 324, & passim in notes elsewhere. |
| Ta-hsia, ri. (Tang-hsiang co.), 11, 41. Taichinar, di. (Tsaidam), 9. |
| Ta-li-fu, t. (Yün-nan), 98, 153. |
| Tamba, st. = Dam-ba, q.v., 83. ‘Tame Yak’ gorge, 268. |
| Tamo = Lha-mo, 237 n. 2. S.a. Thamo. |
| Ta-mo-mén, t. (Amdo) = Lha-moº, 237. |
| Ta-mo-ri, a pass (Amdo), 237. |
| T’ang-chou, di., 30. |
| Tango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 85, 89. Tang-ho, ri. (Sha-chou re.), 10, 36 n. 1, 44. |
| Tang-keou-eul (Chinese) t. = Tankar, q.v., 12. |
| Tang-la, m. & pass, 2 & n. 6 (name), 8, 11, 13-15. |
| Tangpa, st. = Dam-ba, q.v., 84 n. 2. |
| Tan-tig, p. (Amdo), 59, 60. |
| T’ao, ri. (Tang-hsiang co.), 3, 9, 11-12, 20-1, 25, 27, 28 & n. 1, 41 n. 3, 43, 49, 55, 59, 65. |
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Tashilhunpo, t., 13 & n. 3.
Ta-t'ung-ho, ri. (Nan-shan), 10, 12 & n. 5, 36 & n. 1, 40 & n. 3, 42-3, 47 n. 3, 48, 56-7. S.a. Huang, Hong.
TAYLOR, L. F., 284 n. 1.
Te, p., 49, 53 & n. 1, 51, 52 n. 1 (‘Songs’), 56-7 (Wu-tu), 68.
Tehu-cu, t. = T'ao-chou, q.v., 11 n. 2.
Tek, p., S. Tik.
Tengri-nor (‘lake’) = Nam-mtsho, 2.
Te-tao, r. & di. (T'ao ri.), 55-6.
Than districts, 59.
Tho-gon, p. & dynasty = Tu-yü-hun, q.v., 45.
THOMAS, F. W., *Tibetan Literary Texts & Documents*, 1 n. 2, 14 n. 1, 27 n. 3, 32 n. 5, &c.
Thulung, l. w., 98, 104.
Tibet, co., 1-36 and passim.
Tibetan, l., 23, 85-7, 87 n. 1, 93, 117, 123, 127-8, 187, 206-11, 213, 240; w., 2 & nn. 2-4, 3 n., 4 nn. 4-5, 5 & n. 3, 6, 8 & n. 2, 11 n. 1, 13, 20 & n. 7, 32 nn. 1-2, 33 & nn. 1 & 5, 64-5, 87-8, 92, 131-4, 136-7, 139-42, 146-8, 155-6, 158 & n. 2, 199-201, 213, & ‘Nam Vocabulary’ passim.
Eastern Colonial, 78-9, 87, 100-2; w., 100-1, 103. S.a. particular dialects.
Kan-su, 108.
Ladaki, S. Ladak.
Yün-nan, l., 73-4, 78-9, 92; w., 87, 90-2, 94, 101-2, 369.
Tik (Tek), p., 54-9, 68; Red & White, 54-5.
Ti(k)-tao, t. (T'ao-chou re.), 56.
Ting-ling, p., 35.
Ti-se, m. = Kailása, 8.
Ti-tao-chou, t. & di. (T’ao-chou re.), 11, 41.
Tokuz-dawän, m. (Cer-cen re.), 23, 44.
Tolan, t. (Liang-chou di.), 49 n. 1.
Tolehu, a place = Tolan ?, 49 n. 1.
Tonkhor, t. = Tankar, q.v., 11.
To-pa, Tangut clan & dynasty, 29, 61.
Tosun-nor (‘lake’), 26 (name).
Tre-o, st. (Hor-pa), 15 n. 5, 83, 85. S.a. Cu-wo, Chuwo, Dze-go(gu), Dri-tu, Gri-htu.
Tro-jyab, Tru-jáb, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 82-3.
Tsaidam, re., 9, 10, 13, 23, 26, 43-4, 46.
Tsan-la, st. = Btsan-la, q.v., 83.
Tsa-ring-nor (‘lake’) = Skya-rein-mtsho, q.v., 4 n. 4.
Tse-kou, t. & di. (Yün-nan), l. 73-4, 81, 84; w., 74, 93, 108. S.a. Tsù-ku.
Tseñ-hgi-Rbag-ga (žin), a mythical person, 131, 134-6, 190 (name).
Tson-la, st. = Btsan-la, q.v., 82-3.
Tshal-byi, a place (Tsaidam re.), 44 & n. 6.
Tshog-ro, di. = Cog°, Tsog°, 58.
Tsi, dynasty (Kuei-té), 60 n.
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Tsi-shi, m., 38 & n. 1. S.a. Chi-shih.
Tsog-ro, di. = Cogö, Tshogö, 58.
Ts'o-nga-ra, lake = Sño-raña-mtsho, q.v., 4 n. 4.
Tson-ka, Great & Little (Amdo), 12, 60.
Tson-kha-pa, a Tibetan divine, 12, 59-60.
Tson-la, m. (Amdo), 59.
Ts'o-schdyara = Skya-reús-mtsho, q.v., 4 n. 4.
Tso-tu, a Ch'iang tribe, 53, 56, 58.
Tsze-she, m., ri. = Sche-tsche, Su-ki, Tsi-shi, q.v., 37 n. 2, 38.
T'u-fan (Chinese) = Kan-su Tibetans, 23 n. 2, 64, 68; 1. 64.
T'ung-ho ('river'), (Rgyal-ron re.), 17, 65, 67 n. 2.
T'ung-i-chou, t. & di. (Kan-su), 53.
Turfan, t. (Turkestan), 24.
Turk, p. 24, 153 (Sha-t'o, q.v.), 1. 24; w., 23 n. 2, 24, 33 n. 1, 88.
'Turquoise Lake' = Koko-nor, 34.
'Turquoise Valleys', 34. S.a. 'Yu Valleys, Great & Little'.
'Twelve Cities' (mythical), 235.
Tz'u-chih, ri. = Su-ki, Tsze-she, q.v., 37-8, 50 & n. 8, 51.

U, V

'Valley of the Winds' (Byañ-than re.), 44.

W

Wahong-shan, m. (Koko-nor re.), 9.
Wang Jinqru, Shishia Studies, 34 & n. 5, 58 n. 1, 62 n. 1, 127, 190 n. 1, 330 n. 2.
Wang Mang, Chinese emperor, 47-8.
Wa-se, Wassi, Wassu, st. = Lba-si, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2; 1., 73, 89; w., 90-1, 94.
Wei, ri. (Shen-hsi), 12, 27, 53-4, 57.
Wei-chou, di. (P'ai-lan co.), 31.
Wên, an early Chinese ruler, 54.
'Western Lake' = Koko-nor, q.v., 47.
'White Horse', a Ch'iang p. = Pai-ma, q.v., 40 & n. 5, 41, 52 & n. 6, 53.
Winds, S. 'Valley of the W.'
Woj-hih, Wok-je(še), Wok-shih, st. = Ho-gži, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2.
Wolfenden, S. N., (1) *Notes on the Jydrung Dialect of Eastern Tibet*, (2) *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology*, 17 n. 1, 19, 71, 80, 87 & nn. 3, 4, 88, 95, 98, 206, 208, 210-11, 301 n. 2.
'Wolves, Mixed', a Ch'iang p. = Ts'an-lang, q.v., 40 n. 6, 41, 51, 53 & n. 1.
'Women's Kingdom' = Sum-pa, Nü-kuo, q.v., 11, 18-19, 28-9, 53, 69, 85, 99, 137 n. 2, 153, 238.
Wo-ži, st. = Ho-gži, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Wu, an early Ch'iang chief, 40.
Wu-tu, st. (Ch'iang) in S. Kan-su, 40, 51, 53 & n. 1, 56. S.a. Te.
Wu-wei, t. = Liang-chou, q.v., 12, 49.
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Y

Yab-nil-ldehi-thol-phrom, a mythi-
cal person, 133-5, 143, 190 (name).
Yab-sten-rgan-gyi-ner-ba, id. 133,
190 (name).
Ya-chou, t. (Ssu-ch'uan), 11, 18, 34,
52, 69, 153-4.
‘Yak Tribe’ (Ch'iang) = Li-niu,
Ligu, 40 & n. 4, 41, 52 & n. 5.
‘Yak-cow river’ = Hbri-chu, q.v.
Yak-ha, l.; w., 98.
Ya-lang, ri. = Nag-chu, q.v., 3, 11,
15, 19, 20, 65, 81.
Yang-tse-chiang, ri., 2 = Hbri-chu,
q.v.
Yang-t'ung, p. (Byan-than), 14-15,
26, 31.
Ya-n-tig, p. (Amdo), 59.
Yar-lu, t. & di. (S. Tibet), 14.
Yar-mo-tha, ‘plateau’ = Byar, G-yar, Dbyar, q.v.
Yeh-hu, p. (Tibet), 29.
‘Yellow River’ = Rma-chu, q.v.,
246.
Yen, an early Ch’iang chief & p. =
Giên, 40-3, 49, 55.
Yen-mang, a Ch’iang p. (Ssu-
ch’uan), 53, 56.
Yen Shih-ku (Jen-ši-ku), a com-
mentator, 46.
Yog districts, 5-6.

‘Yü Valleys, Great & Little’, (Koko-
nor), 34, 43, 47 n. 3, 48, 50, 136.
S.a. ‘Turquoise Valleys’.
Yuan-ting, a Chinese envoy, 12 n. 5.
Yüeh-chih, Little, p., 46 & n. 4, 55.
Yüeh-sui, t. (Ssu-ch’uan), 40, 52.
Yü-ko nomads (E. Tibet), 84 n. 2.
Yule, H., 64 & n. 1, 65-6, 92.
Yung, ri. (Honan), 152.
Yün-nan, re., 64, 67 n. 2, 69, 73,
Ku-tsung; w., 104.
Yü-t’ung, ri. 16-17; tribes, 81.

Z

Zan-la, st. = Btsan-la, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Zanskar, re. (Ladak), 151, 153.
Žań-žu, st. (Kailása re.), 14 & n. 1,
152; l., 168, 206-11, 373; w., 328,
373.
Zar-phur, a place in Skyi, 110.
Zi-liń, t. = Hsi-niüng, q.v., 11, 41 n.
7.
Zin-cu, t. = Shin-se, q.v., 11 n. 2.
Zo-chen, Zog-chen, st. = Rdzogs-
chen, q.v., 15 & n. 5.
Žo-thań, Ch’iang chief & p. = Shao-
tang, q.v., 41.
Zun-ga, Zung-gak, Žuń-kak, Zur-
ga, st. = Brdzun-hgag, q.v., 83,
84 n. 2.
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Sketch Map
(Author’s Copyright) of
GREAT TIBET
(WITH ADJACENT REGIONS)
FOR ORIENTATION IN CONNEXION WITH
The Nam Language

KEY
Mountain Ranges as KOKOSHILI M.
Districts as KUMAON
Tribal or Linguistic areas as MISHMI
Towns (often with minor state areas) as Kathmandu
Rivers as Brahmaputra r.
Lakes as Syego r.
Main caravan routes as
Chinese frontier wall as

SPELLINGS
Tibetan and Chinese names in orthographic transcription, where ascertainet, e.g. Bum-chan (Bhutan), Dkam-mdzes (Kanze), Bhab-chan (Batang), Hbr-ri (Dre-chu), Hisi-
ning (Sining), No-lo (Golok), Phag-ri (Phari), Sbra-nag (Panaka-sum), Sde-dge (Derge), Skyd-gro (Kyirong),
Thak-lha (Tang-la): see ‘Index of Proper Names.’
Other names as reported or usual.

[Map of Great Tibet with key to features and spellings]