

PUBLICATIONS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL  
SOCIETY

---

XIV

NAM

AN ANCIENT LANGUAGE OF THE  
SINO-TIBETAN BORDERLAND

*Text, with Introduction, Vocabulary  
and linguistic studies*

*by*

F. W. THOMAS

*Price 35s. net*

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON

1948



PUBLICATIONS OF THE PHILOLOGICAL  
SOCIETY

---

XIV

N A M

AN ANCIENT LANGUAGE OF THE  
SINO-TIBETAN BORDERLAND

*Text, with Introduction, Vocabulary  
and linguistic studies*

*by*

F. W. THOMAS

*(With 10 Facsimile Plates  
and a Sketch Map)*

*Price 35s. net*

*Published for*

THE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY

*with the aid of a subvention from*

THE COUNCIL OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY

*by* GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON

1948

**PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN**

*To the memory of*  
BRIAN HOUGHTON HODGSON  
*founder of*  
*Himalayan and Tibetan linguistics*



## 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/Shachou in western Kansu) 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 (Nam)-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 'Nan-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 'Nan-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-hldaḥ*), '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-ḥcaḥ* 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-ḥcaḥ are mentioned slightingly or even with hostility? Should not the text represent an external point of view, namely, that of the Hldyañ 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 Hldyañ, 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 Rmachu (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-roñ 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*

## CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	pages v-viii
INTRODUCTION A, GENERAL . . . . .	1-110
Geographical considerations . . . . .	1-13
Political and ethnographical divisions of Tibet . . . . .	13-25
Historical situation in north-eastern Tibet during the seventh to eighth century A.D. . . . .	25-36
The Western Ch'iang (Hsi-ch'iang) . . . . .	36-52
The early Ch'iang, the Te and the Tik . . . . .	52-8
The Nam-Tig . . . . .	58-61
The Nam, or Nam-Tig, language, the Hsi-fan and the Ch'iang . . . . .	61-110
( <i>Nam, Ch'iang, Hsi-hsia, 61-4; 'Hsi-fan' and 'Man-tzü', 64-9; Hsi-fan languages: a Tibetan group, 69-79; Hsi-fan languages proper and Ch'iang: spellings, place-names, Tibetan admixtures, 79-87; Hsi-fan languages: criteria and list, 88-94; Hsi-fan languages: use of Prefixes, 94-9; Hsi-fan languages, phonological derivation from early Ch'iang, 99-103; early Hsi-fan phonology: comparison with Hsi-hsia, 103-9; Nam: some phonological particulars 109-10.</i> )	
INTRODUCTION B, A LITERARY WORK IN THE NAM LANGUAGE . . . . .	111-373
I. The manuscript and script . . . . .	111-15
II. Orthography . . . . .	116-25
III. The text . . . . .	126-62
IV. The language: grammar . . . . .	163-211
( <i>A, Word-forms, 163-70; B, Morphology of the sentence, 170-81; C, Parts of speech, 181-205; Appendix: Table showing phonetic restrictions upon the application of Prefixes in Tibetan, Tibetan manuscripts from Central Asia, Nam, Hsi-hsia and Žan-žun, 206-11.</i> )	
V. The language: etymology . . . . .	212-373
( <i>I, Antithesis and context, §§ 1-36, 215-323; II, Some phonological particulars: ldy, &amp;c., 324-33; z, 334-6; w, initial and post-consonantal, 336-47; r-Prefix; r-final, 347-54; l-Prefix; l-final, 354; s-initial; s-final, 354-60; nasals, initial and final, 360-2; other root-consonants, initial and final, 362-7; vowels, medial and final, 367-9.</i> )	
TEXT . . . . .	375-98

CONTENTS

VOCABULARY	.	.	.	.	.	399-451
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES	.	.	.	.	.	452-69
PLATES I-X	.	.	.	.	.	} at end
SKETCH-MAP	.	.	.	.	.	

## ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

- Pp. vi, 27, 31, 333: In identifying the Hjañ 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 Hldyañ (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-thañ).
- P. 28 and n. 4: Fussü-ch'êng is given in Professor Herrmann's *Atlas*, map 32.
- P. 31, Wei-chou: For a better-known Wei-chou, in the region of the Rgyal-roñ and Mao-chou, see Rockhill in *JRAS.* 1891, p. 193 n., Tafel, *op. cit.* ii, p. 223, Haenisch, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
- Pp. 59-60 n., Duñs: A place Stag-tshal in Duñs is mentioned in the *Tibetan Chronicle* (M. Bacot's edition, pp. 33, 44-6).
- P. 74: Add to the list of languages the Kioutse (d'Orléans, nos. 27, 29) or Kiu-tzū, occasionally cited *infra* (see p. 459). Belonging, like the Mélam and Loutse/Lu-tzū, 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 Tibeta*, p. 42.
- Pp. 89 n. 2, 90, *Dge-si-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-bśes-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 *naskā*, since '30', *śu-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 *hphyah*, l. 298, and read *hpus-hphyah* 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 Himālaya in the south to the Kuen-lun and Altyn-Tāgh 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 Himālaya 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-Mānasa-sarovar area, is by the Tibetans designated *Stod-phyogs*, '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*<sup>1</sup> range of mountains, and to allow the river which the Tibetans call *Rma-chu*, 'Peacock River',<sup>2</sup> only a rather contracted exit into

<sup>1</sup> Mongol *bayan*, 'rich', + *kara*, 'black' (Prejevalsky, ii, p. 181; Tafel, ii, p. 257 n., with a plea for the retention of the name).

<sup>2</sup> The name, in Hsi-hsia *ma-šuo* (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 Himālaya.<sup>1</sup> 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 Hbri-chu (Di-chu, Dre-chu, i.e. 'Yak-cow River') of the Tibetans,<sup>2</sup> 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 Hbri-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.<sup>3</sup> More to the south, and extending eastwards between the Tengri-Nor (Nam-tsho) lake and Lha-sa, is the Gñan-chen-Thañ-la,<sup>4</sup> the Nyin-chen-Tangla of

p. 279, n. 6, ii, p. 20), is commemorated also in the name of the great Amne-Machin (*Rma-chen*) range of mountains, round which the river flows.

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 *rè-mé* should prove to be such.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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), *Dréch'u* (Rockhill, p. 196, n. 2), *Bri-chu*, all represent the Tibetan word *hbri*, 'yak-cow', with its ancient (*bri*) or modern (*dri*, *di*) pronunciation: the *N'jeh* which Gill heard at Ba-thañ (*The River of Golden Sand*, ed. Baber, 1883, p. 44) is merely the modern E.-Tibetan pronunciation of *hbri*: see p. 76. On the Mongol name, *Muru* (or *Murus*)-*ussu*, see Prejevalsky, Rockhill (whose objections in regard to *hbri* are unavailing), locc. cit., and Tafel, ii, p. 28 n.

<sup>3</sup> 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 Ś. C. Das as *Dañ-la* and by the Panchen whose itinerary is mentioned *infra* as *Ldañ-la*, in which *ldañ* is ambiguous and *la* = 'mountain pass' or, metonymously, 'high mountain'.

<sup>4</sup> *Gñan-chen-Thañ-lha* (the spelling of the *Geografia Tibeta*, p. 2) means



maps, perhaps belonging in some way to the 'Trans-Himālaya'. The gap between forefinger and thumb will be the valley of the Brahmaputra.

Crossing the Byañ-thañ 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;<sup>1</sup> the Littledales, whose journey from Cer-cen and the Tokuz-Dawān was in a north-south direction and traversed the Byañ-thañ 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 Byañ-thañ, 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,<sup>2</sup> 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 *thañ* 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 *thañ* 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 Ña(g)-chu, or Ya-lung river, which with its tributaries issues from the southern slopes of the Bayankara range and ultimately

'Great Ovis Hodgsoni Steppe-god' (*lha* perhaps an error for *la*, 'pass'). That *gñan* means Ovis Ammoni is stated by Hodgson himself (*Miscellaneous Essays*, ii, p. 173), who translates 'Pass of (to and from) the plains of the Great Nyen or Ovis Ammon', with the (preferable) alternative 'Great Ammon pass of the plains'. According to the *Dictionary*, however, and to Sandberg (*Tibet and the Tibetans*, p. 297) *gñan*, *rñan*, is Ovis Hodgsoni (not Ammoni): Prejevalsky gives (ii, p. 137) the word, in its 'Tangut' form, *rkhiang*, as denoting the Argal.

<sup>1</sup> 'The further west the lower the mountains' (Tafel, ii, p. 33).

<sup>2</sup> 'The valleys descend from W. to E. quicker than the mountain heights' (Dutreuil de Rhins, ii, p. 180).

joins the H̄bri-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,<sup>1</sup> 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 H̄bri-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,<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> The Rma-chu, after its short uppermost course, passes through the two lakes, Charing-nor and Oring-nor,<sup>4</sup> at an elevation of about 14,000 feet; with many windings at the foot of the great Amne Rma-chen<sup>5</sup> range of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tafel, ii, p. 169 (the H̄bri-chu).

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> Ba-t'ang (Ba-thañ) is about 8,200 ft. above sea-level (Rockhill, *Diary*, p. 393).

<sup>4</sup> 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-reñs*. Ś. C. Das in his *Dictionary* states that *Skya-reñ* 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 Tibeta* (p. 2), viz. *Skya-reñs* and *Sño-rañs* (*reñs*?).

Grenard denies that the river actually passes through the two lakes, which he says are saline, and separates it by a range of hills. Possibly this question is not settled by Dr. Filchner's narrative (*Das Rätsel des Matschü*, pp. 95 sqq.) or by the modern maps.

<sup>5</sup> 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  $1\frac{1}{2}$  degrees of latitude, it reaches its knee in a wide *than* at about 11,200 feet;<sup>1</sup> 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  $2\frac{1}{2}$  degrees of longitude, it enters China proper at Lan-chou with a height of 5,400 feet.<sup>2</sup>

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, *ron*, gorges or defiles among mountains, with, of course, the *sgan*, the mountain ridges themselves.<sup>3</sup> Eastern and northern 'Tibet', Mdo-Khams, is described as the country of the three *Sgans*.<sup>4</sup> 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).<sup>5</sup> In many of the *rons* 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 *ron*, 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 Matschü*, 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-sbom-ra*, 'Great Peacock vast region', Prejevalsky's *Annimanchenponra*, which Rockhill (*loc. cit.*) found 'horrible'. The *Dictionary* of Ś. 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.'

<sup>1</sup> For a view see Tafel, ii, Plate LXVI.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the figures for Kuei-tê and Lan-chou see Rockhill, p. 376, *Diary*, p. 387.

<sup>3</sup> On *than*, *ron*, *sgan*, *hbrog*, see Sandberg, *Tibet and the Tibetans*, pp. 13–20.

<sup>4</sup> *Geografia Tibeta*, p. 41, adding three subsidiary ones. An old Bon-po work (MS.) enumerates four.

<sup>5</sup> 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 *roñ* 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 *thans* and descend through treeless defiles into deserts of stony soil or sand. On the south, of course, there are many *roñs*, and Sikkim derives its Tibetan name from being of that nature. But the *roñ* 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, *sgañs*. 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,<sup>2</sup> 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-thañ<sup>3</sup> and Li-thañ to Ta-chien-lu is one of perpetual ascents to passes and descents from the same.

<sup>1</sup> *Glin-khams*.

<sup>2</sup> A Chinese itinerary was translated into Russian by Father Hyacinth Bichurin, whose work was rendered into French, with notes, by Klapproth (*Description du Tibet*, Paris, 1831, Chêng-tu to Lhasa, pp. 171-237): Rock-hill'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 Hsi-ning to Lha-sa and Tashilhunpo (?): it evidently belongs to the 8th century A.D.

<sup>3</sup> *Geografia Tibeta*, pp. 44-5, Hbah[-thañ].

Somewhat farther north, but south of the Tang-la, the routes followed by Rockhill in 1891, Captain Bower,<sup>1</sup> and M. Bonvalot and Prince Henri d'Orléans<sup>2</sup> 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 H̄bri-chu, diverged to the Dza-chu and again to places on the upper Ña(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<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> 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<sup>5</sup> 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 *ron̄s* are often well wooded,<sup>6</sup> and even rather thickly populated,<sup>7</sup> with permanent towns and villages at the crossing-places, sometimes having houses of several stories and towers<sup>8</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Diary of a Journey across Tibet*, Calcutta and London, 1893-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Across Tibet*, 2 vols., London, 1891.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, iii, pp. 180-1; also by Dr. Tafel, ii, pp. 196, 277.

<sup>4</sup> *Om Mani Padme Hum*, p. 70. <sup>5</sup> ii, pp. 196, 200, 248, 277.

<sup>6</sup> Rockhill, Index s.v. 'Forests'; Tafel, ii, pp. 172, 188-9, 196, &c. Similarly Gill and others.

<sup>7</sup> Rockhill, pp. 196, 239, 242, *Diary*, pp. 262, 297, 328; Tafel, ii, pp. 185, 241.

<sup>8</sup> Gill, *The River of Golden Sand*, ii, p. 136; Rockhill, *Diary*, pp. 315, 323, 353, 365-6; Tafel, ii, pp. 175, 239, 243. The towers, a characteristic and perhaps ancient feature of the Hsi-fan countries, may be seen illustrated in Johnston, *From Peking to Mandalay*, p. 170; Fergusson, *Adventure, &c., on the Tibetan Steppes*, (facing) pp. 74, 194; d'Ollone, p. 208; Tafel, ii, Plates I, LV, LVII; Stötzner, *Ins unerforschte Tibet*, pp. 160, 181.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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 (Kailāsa) and Lake Mānasa-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 Hbri-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).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Huc and Gabet, ii, pp. 126-8; Rockhill, *Diary*, pp. 158, 214, 219 n.: see also *infra*, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup> The expression 'Mdo-Khams' is used in the *Geografia Tibeta*, pp. 3, 41, and is given in Ś. 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 Ssü-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

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 Ssü-ch'uan, is separated on its north by *thañ* country from the snowy Min-shan; from the Min-shan issues the Min river, which, flowing southwards by Sung-p'an and the capital, Chêng-tu, of Ssü-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-roñ*) and on the north by the subsequent west-to-east course of the same river, in the Koko-nor region, is mainly *thañ* 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-roñ, and a larger number descend northwards.<sup>1</sup> From this *thañ* country there is easy access, by way of the *thañ* 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-roñ,<sup>2</sup> 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, Byañ-thañ, and ultimately effect

in the steppe or the mountains round the Koko-nor, are the Panak'a or Panak'a sun, "the three Pana tribes", who, save in their more complete independence, differ in nothing from their neighbours.'

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> See Filchner, *Das Rätsel des Matschü*, pp. 260–1, and route-map.

a junction with the high barren Altyn-tāgh, the southern barrier of Chinese Turkestan and the Lob-nor region.

Concerning the Altyn-tāgh, 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;<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.



## 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, Kanzé<sup>1</sup> on the Ya-lung river, or Ña(g)-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;<sup>2</sup> and on the lower south-north course of the same river are some places, Min-chou<sup>3</sup> and Ti-tao-chou<sup>4</sup> and others, attested in far earlier times;<sup>5</sup> on the Ta-hsia river, which reaches the Hoang-ho some distance west of the T'ao, is Ho-chou,<sup>6</sup> originally Ga-cu,<sup>7</sup> an early centre of Buddhism, now of Islam. East of the Koko-nor lake is Hsi-ning,<sup>8</sup> in Tibetan Zi-liñ, 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,<sup>9</sup> Tonkhor, Donkyr, Dungkor,

<sup>1</sup> According to Rockhill, p. 242, = Tibetan *Dkañ-mdzes*.

<sup>2</sup> In the manuscript *Chronicle*, Zin-cu and Tehu-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).

<sup>3</sup> Views in Futterer, i, Plate XXXIV, and p. 442.

<sup>4</sup> Description in Tafel, i, p. 159.

<sup>5</sup> See *infra*, p. 41, and reff.

<sup>6</sup> Part view in Tafel, i, Plate XXXVI.

<sup>7</sup> *JRAS.* 1927, p. 552 (for *Ga-lu* read *Ga-cu*), *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 87.

<sup>8</sup> Views in Tafel, i, Plates XLV, XLVI, L. Rockhill gives (p. 49) other, European, forms of the name, *Sin-ju* (Marco-Polo), *Scilin*, *Scilingh*, *Silin*, &c. (Orazio de la Penna). Cf. Prejevalsky (Yule), ii, pp. 300-1.

<sup>9</sup> Various forms of the name in Ritter, *Geographie*, iv, p. 217; Riechthofen, 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,<sup>1</sup> where is the famous group of Buddhist monasteries.<sup>2</sup> Also near to Kum-bum was Tsoñ-ka, Great and Little, known many centuries before<sup>3</sup> it became, in A.D. 1355-7, the birthplace of the famous Buddhist reformer, Tsoñ-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<sup>4</sup> 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<sup>5</sup> it crosses the Hoang-ho and then curves round as far as the vicinity of Ho-chou.

In China proper two places, Sung-p'an, originally Sung-chou,<sup>6</sup> on the Min river, and Mao-chou, in the north-west corner of Ssü-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),

<sup>1</sup> See *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> Views in Rockhill, p. 57, *Diary*, p. 26; Tafel, i, Plates XLVI-XLIX; Filchner, *Kumbum* (1933), *passim*; Tsibikov, *Buddist Palomnik u sviatun Tibeta*, pp. 23, 30, 36.

<sup>3</sup> *JRAS.* 1927, p. 552: mentioned also in the Tibetan manuscript *Chronicle* and in the 8th century inscriptions of Lha-sa.

<sup>4</sup> *Highlands of Tibet and Surrounding Regions*, Dehra Dun (1937?).

<sup>5</sup> 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 Yüan-ting saw to the north-west of the Lung-ch'uan valley, where the Huang river joins the Hoang-ho, 'the ancient fortifications of Kosshu Han, of which there was still much remaining' (Bushell, *JRAS.* 1880, p. 519).

<sup>6</sup> Bushell, *JRAS.* 1880, p. 534 (63): view in d'Ollone, p. 212; Tafel, ii, Plate LXI.

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;<sup>1</sup> 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 diary<sup>2</sup> of a journey by the Pan-chen Blo-bzan Dpal-ldan Ye-sés, of Tashilhunpo,<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> the first settlement south of the Tang-la, he is in Tibet proper, *Bod*: 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',<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> See *supra*, p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *JASB.* li (1882), pp. 43-52.

<sup>3</sup> Tib. *Bkra-sis-lhun-po*, 'Blessedness (or Auspiciousness) in mass'.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> 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 Himālaya 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-luñ, a place almost on the border of Bhutan. In order to estimate the extent of the kingdom inherited by Sroñ-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, *Žaṅ-žuñ*, which was acquired in the time of Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po himself,<sup>1</sup> and had an entirely non-Tibetan, though Tibeto-Burman, speech.<sup>2</sup> 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 Harṣa in A.D. 646-7.<sup>3</sup>

Presumably the region of mountains and lakes north of the Brahmaputra, the district of Dok (Hbrog)-thol and, farther north, the district which for some unknown reason is called the Hor (Turk) Province, were also part of Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po's kingdom. The inhabitants are Tibetans, and their speech is rather normal Tibetan. But how far north into the actual *Byañ-thañ* 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*,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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 *Žaṅ-žuñ* kings was *Lig*.

<sup>2</sup> See *JRAS*. 1933, pp. 405-10.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> See Bushell, p. 527 (9).

which seems to be only a representation of *Byañ-thañ*. According to the Chinese<sup>1</sup> 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*<sup>2</sup> 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 Sron-btsan 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 *Byañ-thañ*, even if used by the people themselves, is quite indecisive, since both its elements, *byañ*, 'north', and *thañ*, '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,<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>4</sup> 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 Sron-btsan Sgam-po's original kingdom. For, although the upper part of the next great river to the east, the Ña(g)-chu or Ya-lung, is lined with states, Derge, Zog-chen, Hor-khog, &c.,<sup>5</sup> having at

<sup>1</sup> Bushell, p. 527 (9) and p. 520 (73).

<sup>2</sup> The *li* varies between  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{3}$  of a mile, depending partly upon the time required by the route.

<sup>3</sup> *JASB.* xxii (1853), pp. 142-51: the *Linguistic Survey of India*, i. ii, spells *Tákpa*.

<sup>4</sup> The Lo-tawa (°karpo and °nakpo) of maps.

<sup>5</sup> In the *Geografia Tibeta*, 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 *Khañ-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*, *Horchyok*; 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 Ña(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.’<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> Thus the real name of the river is Ñag,<sup>3</sup> and the modern Ña 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,<sup>4</sup> 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 (*Dkañ-mulzes*, 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.

<sup>1</sup> Royal Geographical Society *Supplementary Papers*, i, p. 95. Baber here points out that the Menia country extends some distance east of the Yalung river.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the ‘Ldon Me-ñag’ of Francke’s *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, ii, pp. 65–6.

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> *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-roñ*, 'Queen's (King's ?)<sup>1</sup> 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-roñ. 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'an 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*,<sup>2</sup> was not alien to Ch'iang ideas, has a

<sup>1</sup> The spelling *Rgyal-mo-roñ* 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 *rDyaronq* (ii, p. 229) follows a pronunciation, but the rendering (p. 223) 'extensive or Chinese valley' would not be inevitable.

The *Gyárung* of the *Linguistic Survey* volume (i. ii) and Dr. Laufer's *Jyaruñ*, Dr. Wolfenden *Jyá-rüñ*, ignore the fact that the term is Tibetan.

It is, however, possible that the *Rgyal(-roñ)* of the *Geografia Tibeta* is itself an etymologizing perversion of a non-Tibetan tribal name *Gyar*, now pronounced *Jyar*: this is suggested by the numerous place-names, *Giyarlung*, *Giyartang*, *Giyardo*, *Giyarsa*, *Giyarmu*, 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 *Geografia*.

<sup>2</sup> Wylie, *Revue de l'Extrême-Orient*, ii, p. 476. Dr. Tafel mentions (ii, p. 291) even a Go-lok tribal queen.

considerable interest, because undoubtedly So-mo and, perhaps, all the states of the Rgyal-roñ, 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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*,<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 Ña(g)-chu, and that its capital, in 'the Kang-yen valley, a narrow, precipitous gorge, around which flows the Jô<sup>4</sup> river in a southerly direction', was in fact Kanzé on the Ña(g)-chu, which Rockhill visited (*op. cit.*, pp. 239 sqq.)<sup>5</sup> This kingdom must have been the northern neighbour of the Mi-ñag.

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

<sup>1</sup> This fact was 'suspected' by Mr. Edgar, *The Marches of the Mantze*, p. 64.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Bushell, *Je*.

<sup>5</sup> See also Tafel, ii, pp. 177 sqq., and view in Plate XXXVIII.



upper Ya-lung river, or Ña(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-roñ; 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;<sup>1</sup> and from the Tibetan side this is confirmed by the *Geografia Tibeta*, which, after giving (p. 46) the names of the 'Eighteen States', remarks that 'all these peoples, such as Mi-ñag, Rgyal-mo-roñ (these also in *Padma-thaṅ-yig*, tr. Tous-saint, pp. 298 sqq.) peoples and Mi-li, are not proper Tibetans'.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless they can hardly be regarded as typical Ch'iang; occupying permanent settlements in roñ districts, partly well wooded and thickly populated,<sup>3</sup> they represent a stage more developed than that of the true nomad Ch'iang of the high *thaṅs*. 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-roñ language is represented by the Gyārūng vocabulary of Hodgson and by those of von Rosthorn, who distinguishes several dialects,<sup>4</sup> and Wolfenden. Dr. Tafel, who also notes various dialects of 'Kin-tschuan' speech, including one, that of 'Kretschiu', which is markedly distinct (ii, pp. 248 n. 1, 263), informs us that, whereas the native language is never written (ii, p. 230),<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> Bushell, pp. 473, 532; Rockhill, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> 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-ñag'.

<sup>3</sup> See Edgar, *The Marches of the Mantze*, pp. 7, 48, 64; Tafel, ii, p. 241. So generally in E. Tibet, Rockhill, p. 196; Gill, pp. 198-9, 227-8, &c.; Tafel, ii, pp. 172, 196-7, &c.

<sup>4</sup> See *infra*, pp. 71, 89.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Fergusson, *op. cit.*, pp. 126, 255.

communicates. The Rgyal-roñ 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.<sup>1</sup>

In the northern part of the Rgyal-roñ Dr. Tafel takes note (ii, pp. 254, 256, 282) of the Chinese Musalman tea-traders,<sup>2</sup> 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-roñ are considered to be Go-lok country,<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

The meaning of the term *Go-lok*<sup>6</sup> is not definitely known; by Futterer, Filchner, and Tafel it is spelled Ngolok;<sup>7</sup> if it was so heard by them, it may be, in fact, the Tibetan expression *ño-log*, 'recalcitrant', 'rebel'.<sup>8</sup> 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-brañ (Lhabrang),<sup>9</sup> in their country, they wear their religion lightly, and pilgrim travellers, whether in small or in great companies, have reason to

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 96.

<sup>2</sup> The Sharbas of Rockhill, pp. 54, 112.

<sup>3</sup> Rockhill, pp. 188-9, 228, 232; Tafel, ii, pp. 170 and n. 3, 247, 253, 258, 291.

<sup>4</sup> On these names see p. 4 n. 4.

<sup>5</sup> See the map.

<sup>6</sup> Huc and Gabet's *Kolo* (ii, p. 100).

<sup>7</sup> The *Geografia Tibeta* 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.

<sup>8</sup> Tafel, ii, p. 291 n. 2.

<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> 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-tê 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 Matschü* (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.<sup>3</sup> 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, may be the Mi-sang mentioned by the Chinese T'ang *Annals* as among the Ch'iang tribes on the southern border of the Tang-hsiang kingdom; and the Sam-sa tribe, near the knee of the Rma-chu, may be the Sam-tsia of ancient times (*infra*, p. 41).

<sup>1</sup> Rockhill, p. 73, *Diary*, pp. 112–13, with a list of tribes, pp. 113–14.

<sup>2</sup> i, pp. 177–8 n., and ii, pp. 291–2 with a list of the tribes on the upper Rma-chu.

<sup>3</sup> See Filchner, *Das Rätsel des Matschü* 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*<sup>1</sup> 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 (*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;<sup>2</sup> but the long spears depicted in the illustrations of all modern books of travel<sup>3</sup> 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'.

<sup>1</sup> Rockhill, pp. 337-8.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Filchner mentions (*Om Mani Padme Hum*, p. 145) their 'modern weapons'.

<sup>3</sup> Filchner, *Das Rätsel*, &c., pp. 200, 364; d'Ollone, pp. 232, 250, 268, 274.

The Panak'a occupy, as has been stated, extensive areas of H̄brog 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.<sup>1</sup>

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,<sup>2</sup> on the other; also, of course, by travelling and trading Tibetans, especially from Khams.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> The Chinese Amban's travelling agents<sup>6</sup> are also arriving from distant places with their reports. From the surrounding areas there are Mongol and Tibetan traders, bringing

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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'.

<sup>3</sup> Rockhill, pp. 111, 129. On the Kham-pas in general see Sandberg, op. cit., pp. 154-8; Tafel, ii, pp. 143, sqq., and *supra*, p. 8 and n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> See, for instance, Rockhill, pp. 40, 110-12, and Tafel, ii, p. 83.

<sup>5</sup> See Rockhill, p. 54; Tafel, ii, p. 69.

<sup>6</sup> On these *t'ung-shih*s 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 Ssü-ch'uan.

The Turkī-speaking Musalman Salars,<sup>1</sup> 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'ō Turk tribe, which was transported by the Tibetans to Kan-chou after the conquest of Pei-t'ing in A.D. 790.<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> On the Salars see *Geografia Tibeta*, 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.

<sup>2</sup> Rockhill, pp. 44-5, 325; Bushell, p. 533 (57).

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 text<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> where they were almost in contact with the authority of the Governor-General of Ssü-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 work<sup>3</sup> relating to the Koko-nor region; and in Dr. Filchner's map of the Chinese province Kan-su<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Huang-ch'ing-chih-kung-t'u*, Book V.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 162, 165.

<sup>3</sup> *Diary*, p. 96 (*Hsi-ning Fu hsin chih*).

<sup>4</sup> *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der Expedition 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 H̄bri-chu), the *Barōn* and *Jūn*, 'Right and Left', districts in the Tsaidam, *Odontala* ('Star-plain', = Tibetan *Skar-ma-thaṅ*) 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-Idan Ye-śes, 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,<sup>1</sup> 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.'<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> See Bichurin, *Istoria Tibeta i Khukhunora*, ii, pp. 1-164.

<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>1</sup> and the peace of A.D. 730<sup>2</sup> 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 Byar-mo-thañ district, west of the Koko-nor.<sup>3</sup> 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 Byar-mo-thañ 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 excavations<sup>4</sup> 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-brañ*), a monastery in the territory of the Co-ne tribe, celebrated for its somewhat independent edition

<sup>1</sup> This appears both from the T'ang *Annals*, as rendered by Bushell, and from the Tibetan manuscript *Chronicle*.

<sup>2</sup> Bushell, p. 466.

<sup>3</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 104-9.

<sup>4</sup> See Kozlov-Filchner, *Mongolei, Amdo und die tote Stadt Chara-choto* (Berlin, 1925), and Sir A. Stein, *Innermost Asia*, i, pp. 429 sqq.

of the Lamaist canon.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, along all the Sino-Tibetan frontier from the 'Women's Kingdom' northwards the Bon-po religion maintains itself in despite of orthodox disapproval;<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> 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 Fussü ch'êng,<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Geografia Tibeta*, 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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Bichurin, op. cit., i, pp. 74-99; cf. Bushell, pp. 527-8 (11); Rockhill, pp. 335-6.

<sup>4</sup> Bushell, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> 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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

'A tribe is divided into little clans. A large one comprises a myriad horsemen, a small one several thousand. . . .<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> Bushell, p. 531 (42); Rockhill, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> Rockhill, p. 338.

<sup>3</sup> In the Sui *Annals* these numbers are stated, more moderately, as 5,000 and 1,000 respectively.

<sup>4</sup> 'The most common, indeed the only industry of the Tangutans is preparing yak (or more rarely sheep's) wool for cloth, out of which all their clothes are made' (Prejevalsky, 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.<sup>1</sup>

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<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> with a dynastic name, in Tibetan *Hjan*, which may be identical with that of its predecessor. The interest of this

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Bichurin, op. cit., i, pp. 109-12.

<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>1</sup> 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-Idan Ye-sés' diary styled 'Upper Mongolia'. Except that their western neighbours were the To-mi, or Tang-mi<sup>2</sup>—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.<sup>3</sup> 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*

<sup>1</sup> Bushell, p. 528 (3); Bichurin, i, pp. 113, 232.

<sup>2</sup> Bushell, p. 541 (10).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 528 (13), 541 (10).

(in *De-ga*) being used in Amdo to form adjectives of locality.<sup>1</sup> The monastery was compared to 'a flower blooming in the auspicious *Ābyar-mo-thañ*' ('Dbyar Steppe'); and here again we have the evidence of parallel expressions proving that *Dbyar* is a tribal name.<sup>2</sup> 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, Mkhār-tsan and Kva-cu, of Western Kan-su ;
- (d) the commandant of the 'Thousand-district' of Phyug-tsams ;
- (e) the Estate, or Territory, of Ĥbrom-khoñ ;

and the Bde councillors use the phrase '*Ĥgreñ* 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 *Ĥgreñ-ro*.<sup>3</sup> That this name *Ĥgreñ* is the native word represented by the Chinese *k'iang*, *ch'iang* (originally *kren*), is a suggestion which we owe to Professor Pelliot.<sup>4</sup>

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-gams,<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Gnam-ka-Loñ-sum*, 'Loñ-sum in heaven', *sa-ga-Gdiñ-drug*, 'Gdiñ-drug on earth'.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Rgya-mo-thañ*, 'Chinese plain', *Mon-mo-thañ*, 'Mon plain'.

<sup>3</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 61-2, 87, 108-9, &c.

<sup>4</sup> *JRAS.* 1928, p. 98.

<sup>5</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, Bde, ii, pp. 10, 20; Councillors of, ii, pp. 20, 25, 99, 124, 319; Bde-gams, ii, pp. 22, 57-8, 78-9, 108, 338.

evidenced in Chinese Turkestan, both contemporary and prior.<sup>1</sup> Nor does it seem doubtful that Phyug-tsams is the same as the capital of the T'u-yü-hun, Fussü ch'êng, 15 li west of the Koko-nor, which had walls but was not lived in.<sup>2</sup> It was, in fact, a 'great mart' and not different from the 'great mart' (*khrom-chen-po*) of the Dbyar-mo-thañ, mentioned in another document;<sup>3</sup> the Chinese syllable represented by *Fu* was in early times sounded *bhyuk*. There cannot have been two 'great marts' in the *thañ* country adjoining the Koko-nor on the west.

The Dbyar-mo-thañ 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.<sup>4</sup> The G-yer-mo-thañ ('a place in Kham'), Yar-mo-thañ and G-yar-mo-thañ ('a district in the province of lower Amdo and Khams') of Ś. C. Das's *Tibetan Dictionary* are evidently the same place,<sup>5</sup> 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-thañ, in the *Geografia Tibeta* of Mintshul Huthuktu (p. 55), where it is duly located on

<sup>1</sup> 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, *Ūn-bāshī, yūz-bāshī, and min-bāshī* (*Orientalisches Archiv*, ii, p. 29).

<sup>2</sup> Rockhill, p. 336. On such uninhabited 'market-towns' see Forsyth, *Mission to Yarkund*, p. 32, and, in Ssü-ch'uan, Baber, op. cit., p. 10. Cf. Bichurin, p. 97.

<sup>3</sup> See *Inventaire des MSS. tibétains de Touen-houang* par Mdlle Lalou, i, No. 16.

<sup>4</sup> *JRAS.* 1910, pp. 1259, 1278 (l. 33).

<sup>5</sup> 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-thañ is, no doubt, the greater of the two 'Great and Little Yu (turquoise, jade) Valleys',<sup>1</sup> often mentioned by the *Later Han Annals*<sup>2</sup> 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-sñon-po*, *Ch'ing-hai*, *Koko-nor*) of the Tibetans, Chinese and Mongols, but the 'Turquoise Lake' (*G-yu-mtsho*).<sup>3</sup>

The 'thañ of the Byar people' (*Byar-mo-thañ*) 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,<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> in editing and discussing three little songs in that people's speech, which, being included in the *Later Han Annals*,<sup>6</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> The two are perhaps recognizable in Rockhill's account of his first journey, pp. 125-7 ('the valleys of the Buhagol and Dulangol').

<sup>2</sup> See Wylie, op. cit., pp. 445-51.

<sup>3</sup> One of the Tibetan manuscripts has *G-yu-mtsho-sñon-mo*, 'Blue Turquoise Lake'.

<sup>4</sup> Bushell, p. 531 (42).

<sup>5</sup> *Shishiah Studies* by Wang Jinqru (Academia Sinica Monographs, Series A, Nos. 8, 11, 13), i, pp. 17-30.

<sup>6</sup> Wylie, who translated the songs (op. cit., pp. 239-41), spells the name as *Pih-lang*.



-e,<sup>1</sup> and the Byar-mo-thañ may have been locally a Bye-mo-thañ = 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-liñs-tshal*, 'Byar-liñs Wood', definitely assigned to its vicinity,<sup>2</sup> 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-thañ 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-liñs* may have been *De-liñ* 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,<sup>3</sup> 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 uninformative. More significant, no doubt, is a reference to 'Lyon-jeñ in Bde' in a document emanating from a T'u-yü-hun queen of Tibetan birth.<sup>4</sup> From the context it is certain that the place was in T'u-yü-hun territory, and it seems highly probable that it was identical with Liung-ch'êng, which the

<sup>1</sup> Concerning *-ar/-e* and concerning the equivalence of *g-yar* and *byar* see *infra*, p. 367, also pp. 243, 290.

<sup>2</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 20, 25, 57-8, 78, 108, 319, 339.

<sup>4</sup> *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.<sup>1</sup>

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,<sup>2</sup> and also in Amdo, one or two separate Ch'iang states and dynasties,

<sup>1</sup> 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 Ša-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 Hennessey, *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.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Franke, *Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches*, ii, p. 63 and Index.

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,<sup>1</sup> 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) river<sup>2</sup> and reached to the source of the (Hoang-)ho; it had an extension of 1,000 *li*, and stretched southwards as far as Shuh (the western part of Ssü-ch'uan) and the Han river. From another text De Groot quotes<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> belonging to Lung-si.'

<sup>1</sup> With transcription modernized according to Giles's *Dictionary*.

<sup>2</sup> Wylie, pp. 424-5 (who, however, speaks of 'the Tsze-che mountain'); De Groot, ii, p. 184.

<sup>3</sup> Op. cit., p. 185, from the *Shui-ching-tsü-shih*, c. 2, foll. 11 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> The importance of the observation lies in the fact that it enables us to identify with the Tang-hsiang country the district Skyi,<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> Franke, *Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches*, i, p. 6; ii, p. 371; iii, pp. 3, 255.

<sup>2</sup> Rockhill, p. 338; Bichurin, i, p. 238.

<sup>3</sup> *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:<sup>1</sup>

'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.<sup>2</sup>

'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'iang<sup>3</sup> is ascribed to a certain Wu-i-Yüan-chien (De Groot, *Bu-ik-wan-kiēm*), a fugitive from China,<sup>4</sup> who after some adventures settled between the three

<sup>1</sup> De Groot, ii, pp. 185-6; cf. Wylie, pp. 425-6.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> The following account is derived from Wylie, pp. 432 sqq., with references to De Groot, ii, pp. 194 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> This trait seems to be normal in the Chinese accounts of the origins of foreign states.

rivers (Hoang-ho, Su-ki = Tz'u-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. The chieftaincy remained with his descendants.

The expression *wu-i*, *bu-ik*, is said to mean, in the Ch'iang language, 'serf', that having been Yüan-chien's original status. If so, it may correspond to Tibetan *g-yog*, for which a variant *b-yog* would have analogies.<sup>1</sup> If so, it is the earliest attested common noun in the language. The Hong = Huang river, which is stated<sup>2</sup> to have been a tributary of the Hoang-ho, is evidently, in view of the subsequent history, the Ta-t'ung-ho,<sup>3</sup> including perhaps also its affluent, the Hsi-ning river.

In the time of Yüan-chien's great-grandson Jên (De Groot, Dsim) an uncle of the latter, by name Chiung (De Groot, Gong), being alarmed by the power of the Chinese, left, along with his family and dependants, 'the Tz'u-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'<sup>4</sup> tribe, being the Yüeh-sui Ch'iang, another the White Horse<sup>5</sup> stock, the Ch'iang of Kuang-han, a third the 'Mixed (or Three) Wolves'<sup>6</sup> 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;<sup>7</sup> these branches will be mentioned again *infra*.

Jên 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, Giën), a son of Jên, 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

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 35, and *infra*, pp. 243, 290.

<sup>2</sup> Wylie, p. 433 n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> This is patent in the statement of the T'ang *Annals* reproduced by Bushell, *op. cit.*, p. 519: see *infra*, p. 47 n 3.

<sup>4</sup> *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.

<sup>5</sup> *Pih-ma* (De Groot, *Pe'-ma*).

<sup>6</sup> *Ts'an-lang* (De Groot, *Sam-long*).

<sup>7</sup> See Herrmann, *Atlas*, pp. 22-3.

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'-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, Fêng-yang = Hong-jong and Lao-chieh = Lo-tsu, mentioned in connexion with events of the year 63 B.C.<sup>1</sup> But a Seen-tsze = Shan-chieh, Sam-tsia, or Siëm-tsu, tribe, defeated in the period 48–32 B.C., may have a name identical with that of the Samsa, who occupy the south-eastern corner<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> Shao-tang = Sio-tong, which continually recurs in the struggles of the first to second centuries A.D., looks very like *Žo-than*, a place-name<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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 (Ti[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.<sup>6</sup>

In 111 B.C.<sup>7</sup> we first hear of the Hsien-ling (Siën-liën) Ch'iang, whose name is, doubtless, preserved in that of Hsi-lin, or Hsi-ning,<sup>8</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> South of the Min-shan: see d'Ollone, pp. 226, 253; Tafel, ii, pp. 298–9 n.

<sup>3</sup> Futterer, i, pp. 391, 398 (*Lö-tsche*): Tafel seems to identify his *Lö-tschü* (ii, pp. 299, 301) with the T'ao-ho.

<sup>4</sup> Identified by Chavannes, *Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux* (p. 260 n. 1) with a T'u-yü-hun town, Sho-tun, taken by the Turks in 556 A.D.

<sup>5</sup> Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.

<sup>6</sup> See Wylie and De Groot, *ibid.*, and De Groot, i, pp. 21, 41.

<sup>7</sup> Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.

<sup>8</sup> Tibetan *Zi-lin*. The *Siën* river (De Groot, ii, p. 207) may be the Ta-t'ung-ho, if not the Hsi-ning river (*Hsi-ho*), 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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

During the period 73–48 B.C.<sup>3</sup> 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 = Giën people of that area play, together with another people named *Han*, a part in the strategy of the Chinese generals. On that occasion,<sup>4</sup> 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-huang<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> We have no further information concerning them;<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Supra*, p. 12 n. 5, *infra*, p. 47 n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Bushell, p. 528 (17), p. 540 (1), gives Hsiningfu as the equivalent.

<sup>3</sup> Wylie, p. 436; De Groot, ii, p. 199.

<sup>4</sup> De Groot, ii, pp. 199, 202–16.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 209, 212.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 212.

<sup>7</sup> They were perhaps different from the Han tribe of Wylie, p. 469, whose territory was elsewhere.



place named *Hon-can-do*, in 'Skyi', the name of which should mean 'Hon-city-land' and should contain a tribal name *Hon* which certainly existed.<sup>1</sup> This place, whence authority was exercised over Śa-cu = Tun-huang, must have been in Bde and was possibly the Bde-gams mentioned *supra*. Since *can* is found representing the Chinese *ch'êng*, 'city', 'fortress', this place may be identical with Hung-ch'êng, which the maps still record on the lower Ta-t'ung-ho.<sup>2</sup>

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,<sup>3</sup> 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 = Siën-liën, who occupied the vicinity of the Koko-nor and in the second half of the first century B.C. became Shao-tang<sup>4</sup> of the Great and Little Yü Valleys. Under that designation they are frequently mentioned in the *Later Han Annals*<sup>5</sup> 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;<sup>6</sup> and since the Seen-ling tribe is mentioned as having made raids as far as Lin-t'ao,<sup>7</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 48, 301.

<sup>2</sup> See Filchner's map, h 8 (*Hung-ku-tschöng*, in which *ku* = 'ancient').

<sup>3</sup> Wylie, p. 469.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 436-7; De Groot, ii, p. 199 (*Sio-tong*).

<sup>5</sup> Wylie, pp. 440, 450, 462, 467, and under the names of the successive chiefs *passim*.

<sup>6</sup> 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-tš'ing*).

<sup>7</sup> 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), *Ñi-kiang* (F. W. K. Müller),<sup>1</sup> and *Dža-k'iong* (De Groot),<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> In their territory also, in the Gass district, are the Bokalik mountains, with the gold mines of Boka,<sup>5</sup> 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-

<sup>1</sup> Berlin Academy *Sitzungsberichte*, 1918, pp. 570 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> ii, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> Wylie, op. cit., 1881, p. 23; De Groot, ii, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> Visited in the 13th century by William Bouchier, of Paris (Sandberg, *The Exploration of Tibet*, p. 21).

dawān) from Khotan.<sup>1</sup> A Chinese authority informs us that T'u-yü-hun people were constantly reaching the Shan-shan kingdom by that route.<sup>2</sup>

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 Pelliot<sup>3</sup> the proof that the T'u-yü-hun people are stated in Chinese writings to be called also *A-ch'ai*,<sup>4</sup> and the observation that the name is identical with that of the *Ha-za*, 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,<sup>5</sup> the same people should have been known also as *Ha-za*; and, furthermore, the *Ha-za* are not infrequently mentioned at dates later than A.D. 663, when the T'u-yü-hun were expelled from Amdo.<sup>6</sup> 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'ai*<sup>7</sup>—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, Ñi-kiang, 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

<sup>1</sup> See *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 119–25. The name *Tshal-byi* ('Little Wood'?) was probably pre-Tibetan.

<sup>2</sup> See L. Giles, *B.S.O.S.*, vi, p. 830.

<sup>3</sup> *Journal Asiatique*, 1912, ii, p. 522; 1914, ii, p. 144; *T'oung-pao*, 1920–1, pp. 323–5.

<sup>4</sup> 阿柴. <sup>5</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 367.

<sup>6</sup> *Op. cit.*, i, p. 192, ii (Index).

<sup>7</sup> 阿豺 (or 豺). 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., *Hā-ža* people,<sup>1</sup> 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 *Hā-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 Jěn Śi-ku (Yen Shih-ku, A.D. 579–645), the commentator on the *Former Han Annals*—it would correspond to the second syllable of *Hā-ža*, as also to that of *A-ch'ai* in its original pronunciation. As regards the omission of the first syllable *Hā*, we may refer to Professor Pelliot's remark concerning frequent Chinese transcriptions in which an initial *a* is suppressed.<sup>2</sup>

If this explanation is correct, i.e. if the *Hā-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 *Hā-ža*, along the southern border of Chinese Turkestan.<sup>3</sup>

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'<sup>4</sup> 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 =

<sup>1</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 17–18, 25–9, 35, 343.

<sup>2</sup> *T'oung-pao*, 1920–1, pp. 324–5.

<sup>3</sup> See Müller, loc. cit. (p. 44).

<sup>4</sup> 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.,<sup>1</sup> 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.'<sup>2</sup>

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;<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Wylie, pp. 436–7; De Groot, ii, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> De Groot, ii, p. 200; Wylie, p. 437.

<sup>3</sup> 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'.<sup>1</sup>

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'<sup>2</sup> is attested by the *Later Han Annals*, which largely follow the fortunes of a succession of chiefs belonging to that tribe.<sup>3</sup>

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,<sup>4</sup> 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,<sup>5</sup> 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-tsi-Frage*, esp. pp. 275 sqq.

<sup>1</sup> De Groot, ii, p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> Wylie, pp. 445-51.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 437, 440, 450-1, &c.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 438-40, 445-8, 454, 467-8, 472.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 447, 449, 450, 457, 466-9, 471.

the 'Too-leaou general'.<sup>1</sup> 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',<sup>2</sup> 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'.<sup>3</sup>

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;<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> So again, when the Ch'iang abandoned

<sup>1</sup> In A.D. 76 'the former Too-leaou General was again appointed Keang-assisting Deputy-Governor, and dwelt in Gan-e' (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-lehu of the 'To-lehu Three Tigers' (military officers) who during Tibetan times (*JRAS.* 1927, p. 550) commanded the region of Liang-chou. Too-leaou = To-lehu is therefore a place in the Liang-chou region and may accordingly be the Tolan, north-west of Liang-chou, on the grand route.

<sup>2</sup> Instances in Wylie, pp. 443, 446, 449, 451, 463-4, 469, 470-1, 473-4.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. *ibid.*, pp. 442, 444, 452, 462, 468, 470, 471-2.

<sup>4</sup> De Groot, i, pp. 126, 146; ii, p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, ii, p. 198.

'Huang-chung', leaving the land west of the Hoang-ho 'empty', people were gradually removed there to occupy it.<sup>1</sup>

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: <sup>2</sup>

'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.<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>4</sup> 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:<sup>5</sup>

'Kuan Fan then sent troops beyond the fortresses,<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> 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.'<sup>8</sup>

In A.D. 100:<sup>9</sup>

'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.'

<sup>1</sup> Wylie, p. 436; De Groot, ii, p. 198. Later instances in Wylie, pp. 244, 439, 441, 448-9, 455, &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 477-8.

<sup>3</sup> The 'height' of mountains being the length of an ascent.

<sup>4</sup> Sc. barbarians.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 446-7.

<sup>6</sup> Sc. beyond the branch of the Great Wall.

<sup>7</sup> Mentioned again p. 448. Is this the Hung-chi Bridge, north-west of Ho-chou (Bushell, pp. 519 and 534 (72))?

<sup>8</sup> On the Tz'u-chih river see *supra*, pp. 37-8.

<sup>9</sup> Wylie, p. 449.



Apropos of an occurrence in the year A.D. 194, the *Annals* observe that<sup>1</sup>

'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 (Ssü-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.'<sup>2</sup>

Despite all this the author admits that the Ch'iang, who, he says<sup>3</sup>,

'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<sup>4</sup> 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 Ssü-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

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., p. 473.

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

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 477.

<sup>4</sup> 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-roñ, while Rockhill restricts it in Tibet to agricultural districts (p. 211).

they were fond of comparisons.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> The statement<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

#### 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 Jên = 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-gu*),<sup>5</sup> inhabited the region south of Ya-chou, in Ssü-ch'uan, and the 'White Horse' tribe of Kuang-han<sup>6</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> Huc and Gabet, ii, p. 82; Rockhill, *Diary*, pp. 168-9; Tafel, ii, pp. 158-60 (Ge-sar legend).

<sup>3</sup> Wylie, p. 242.

<sup>4</sup> 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 acceptance: 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.

<sup>5</sup> Wylie, pp. 434, 473; De Groot, ii, p. 195.

<sup>6</sup> 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.

districts to which they belonged. The Ts'an-lang of Wu-tu,<sup>1</sup> 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*<sup>2</sup> 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 (Ssü-ch'uan) region,<sup>3</sup> 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*<sup>4</sup> to the 'White Horse' Ch'iang of Kuang-han and also to the 'Yen-mang' and 'Tso-tu' of north-western Ssü-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.<sup>5</sup>

'In these mountains (sc. the mountains adjacent to north-western Ssü-ch'uan) there were six tribes of Eastern Barbarians, seven tribes of Keang and nine tribes of Te. Each tribe had its territorial settlement.'<sup>6</sup>

The two names, *Te*<sup>7</sup> 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*<sup>8</sup> quote from the *Shih-ching* the statement that

'Since then none of the Te 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

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> Bichurin, i, pp. 99-109.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 226, 243-4.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 242.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 426; De Groot, ii, p. 187.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Wylie, pp. 225, 474.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 225-6.

<sup>7</sup> 氏.

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'.<sup>1</sup>

More frequently we hear of the Ti[k]<sup>2</sup> (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',<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup> For their position was the result of a deportation, since we are informed that :

'King Wĕn 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].'<sup>6</sup>

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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> we are told that :

'Accordingly at that time there were to the west of the Lung mountains the Hun Džong of Miĕn-tšu<sup>9</sup> and the Džong of Tik and of Huan.'

The Lung-hsi district was constituted in the period after 272 B.C.,<sup>10</sup> 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. states<sup>11</sup> that 'At the sources of the Wei were

<sup>1</sup> For the above particulars see Wylie, pp. 426-7; De Groot, ii, pp. 187-8.

<sup>2</sup> 狄.

<sup>3</sup> De Groot, i, p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Wylie, pp. 427-30; De Groot, i, pp. 4 sqq., ii, pp. 187-92.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, i, pp. 19-32.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19. Further notices of the wars with these 'Red' and 'White' Tik, i, pp. 25-32.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 4-5, the Ch'i being a tributary of the Chü.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Region of the present Min-chou.

<sup>10</sup> Wylie, p. 432; De Groot, i, p. 34, ii, p. 193.

<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 mentioned<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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.;<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> Wylie, p. 433; De Groot, ii, p. 195.

<sup>2</sup> Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197; *supra*, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Wylie, p. 464, 'In the autumn of 124 the region of Lung-si first extended to Teih-taou.'

<sup>4</sup> De Groot, i, pp. 30-1.

population of the Ch'iang frontier; for at the time of the expedition 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 understood 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 Ssü-ch'uan north-western border it is said to belong to the Te race,<sup>2</sup> and in the mountains adjacent to Yen-mang there were 'six tribes of Eastern Barbarians, seven tribes of Keang, and nine tribes of Te'.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> are the Te of the Hong river, the Ta-t'ung-ho, being none other than the Han and Giën, 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 king<sup>5</sup> cannot have belonged to

<sup>1</sup> De Groot, ii, p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> Wylie, p. 226.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 242.

<sup>4</sup> De Groot, ii, p. 215: the Chinese characters rendered as *Hong* (i.e. *Huang*) are not identical in the two cases, but homophonic: see Karlgren, Nos. 104, 106.

<sup>5</sup> De Groot, i, p. 58. Further particulars of Te peoples, largely settled in Kan-su, are supplied by the *Wei-liao* (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-yü-hun king A-ch'ai is stated<sup>1</sup> 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 Ssü-ch'uan) they extended far into China, was *Tik* or *Tek*.

(b) A later, perhaps a dialectical, form of the same word<sup>2</sup> 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 Hgreñ and their country Hgreñ-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 Jên/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 Hgreñ = *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

<sup>1</sup> *Pei-shih*, 96, 10 a-b, for which reference I am indebted to the kindness of Professor Haloun.

<sup>2</sup> 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 Ssü-ch'uan border, has a word *t'iek* (see Karlgren's *Dictionary*, no. 909) in the sense of 't(ribes)man'.<sup>1</sup>

### 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,<sup>2</sup> 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),<sup>3</sup> 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*,<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> This being the case, it

<sup>1</sup> See Wang Jinqu, *Shishiah Studies* (Academia Sinica Monographs, Series A, Nos. 8, 11, 13), i, pp. 17 sqq., esp. p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> 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).

<sup>3</sup> *Re* the above particulars see *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, i, p. 279 and n. 5; ii, pp. 10-12.

<sup>4</sup> 魚樂得.

<sup>5</sup> Wylie, p. 430; De Groot, i, p. 19, ii, p. 191.



becomes probable that the name *Lok-tik* means the 'Tik of the Lok tribe' and contains the ethnical name *Tik*.<sup>1</sup>

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,<sup>2</sup> 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 Amdo 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 *Geografia 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 Yañ-tig [the latter mentioned also in *Hor-chos-byuñ*, trans. Huth, p. 227], where are Šel-gyi-yañ-rdzoñ (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 Yañ-tig is the great mountain Tsoñ-la, avoiding which one arrives at the celebrated place Tsoñ-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 *tək*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, i, p. 130, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Karlgren, No. 981. The spelling *Kuei-tê* (*Prejevalsky Quedae*, Futterer *Kuei-tö*; *Tafel Kue-de* (map <sup>o</sup>*te*); Kozlov, *Gui-Dui* (with views, pp. 165,

It need not be stated that Tsoñ-kha, birthplace of the fourteenth-century Buddhist reformer Tsoñ-kha-pa, has not a modern name: indeed it may be said that by the suffix *ka*<sup>1</sup> (later *kha*) it both affirms its regional character and suggests that the name *Tsoñ* was originally tribal. But a far higher antiquity, more or less contemporary with our Nam manuscript, is proved in respect of Tsoñ-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-śan (= Chinese *shan*, 'mountain') and thence at a Tsoñ-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.<sup>2</sup> Probably the compound *Nam-Tig* itself is also there attested, in the Prakrit form *Namtiḡa*.<sup>3</sup> The only other Chinese alternative is *nam*, 'male', 'son'. In the Tibeto-Burman languages of the region we could cite only *gnam*, *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-tō* 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 Tsi, 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.

<sup>1</sup> See *supra*, pp. 31-2 and n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See *Festgabe Hermann Jacobi*, ed. W. Kirfel (1926), p. 67.

<sup>3</sup> *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, edited by Boyer, Rapson, and Senart (Index): see *JRAS.* 1939, p. 216, n. 2.

The above considerations seem to authorize the conclusion that the Nam state, of which one ruler took to wife a Khotan princess<sup>1</sup> and concerning which our only other information is derived from manuscripts written in Śa-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'ANG

#### *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, Bair-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

<sup>1</sup> *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;<sup>1</sup> and sound-values of many signs are known from their use in transliteration of Sanskrit religious formulae (*dhāraṇīs*). 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

<sup>1</sup> 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 *dhāraṇīs*, the above (p. 58, n. 1) mentioned *Shishiah Studies* of Wang Jinqu. 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*<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> In the meanwhile what we have called the 'phonetic

<sup>1</sup> Vol. xvii (1916), pp. 1-126, *The Si-hia Language*, based upon a Chinese manual published, with interpretation, by Prof. A. Ivanov in the *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg*, 1909, pp. 1221-33. For a bibliography of Hsi-hsia studies see Laufer, pp. 4 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> 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-tzū and Man-tzū, who are mostly nomads. The term in general use among scholars is *Hsi-fan*.

'Hsi-fan' and 'Man-tzū'

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 essays<sup>1</sup> 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 Sókpa 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,<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> = *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.<sup>1</sup> That *Thöchū* 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 'Hórpa' 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, 'Thöchū', 'Gyārūng', and 'Mányak', peoples Hodgson was, no doubt, well informed. For Baber also, as Yule remarks (p. 126, n. 6), refers to the people of Tzū-ta-ti, on the lower T'ung river, perhaps included in the old Mi-ñag (Mányak) country, as Sifan; and Baber also states<sup>2</sup> 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 Thóchú, Gyárūng, Mányak, 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 says<sup>3</sup> that 'Under this very vague appellation [*Si-Fan*] the Chinese confound all the populations which we call Tibetan'. Similarly, the late

<sup>1</sup> Rockhill, p. 72, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> R. Geographical Society's *Supplementary Papers*, vol. i, p. 81.

<sup>3</sup> *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-tzū, Manchia, 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-tzū*.

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-tzū* and *Hsi-fan*. Yule, following Richthofen, observes (p. 125) that:

'The *Man-Tzū* are regarded by the Chinese as the descendants of the ancient occupants of the province of Ssū-ch'uan, and Mr. Wylie has drawn attention<sup>1</sup> 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-Tzū and Si-Fan, seem, however, to be used somewhat loosely or ambiguously.

'Thus, Man-Tzū 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-Tzū (pp. 111-12, 119, 122), whom he found near Li-fan-fu

<sup>1</sup> *Proceedings of the R. Geographical Society*, xiv, pp. 168 sqq. Cf. Baber, pp. 131 sqq.; Rockhill, *Diary*, p. 73; Johnston, pp. 46, 50.



(half-way between Ch'êng-t'u and Sung-p'an), and 'Outer Mantzū', 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,<sup>1</sup> 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-roñ-Gyārüng 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-Tzū had in view mainly peoples of the Rgyal-roñ-Ssü-ch'uan border: and the same appears to be actual Chinese usage in the Rgyal-roñ 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 *Mantzū* 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'<sup>2</sup> (p. 8): yet he recognizes the separate existence of the 'Chia Rung' (Rgyal-roñ) states. Mr. Fergusson holds (pp. 247 sqq.) that the Mantze, by which term he means primarily the Rgyal-roñ 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-rdzoñ?). Elsewhere (*Geographical Journal*, 1908, pp. 594-7) he remarks concerning the Rgyal-roñ peoples that:

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> 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-thañ and on the other side of the Hbri-chu. Ba-thañ is named after a Hbah tribe (Rockhill, p. 218, n. 1), which may even have been a division of the Mi-ñag, since the 'Mu-nia' people of Davies, *Yün-nan* (Table of Tibeto-Burman Languages, p. 4), are by the Yün-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-ethnic sense.

As regards speech Rockhill remarks (*Diary*, p. 355) that the Tibetan pronunciation of Ba-thañ was nearly incomprehensible, whereas that of Li-thañ 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-roñ peoples are regarded as distinct.

From the above it is apparent that in Ssü-ch'uan the Man-tzū, 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-roñ 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-roñ: 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

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

'call themselves *Pé*, 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 *Ssü-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*.'<sup>1</sup>

*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,<sup>2</sup> 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-roñ* 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'.<sup>3</sup>

### '*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 Ssü-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.

BACOT, JACQUES, *Les Mo-so. Ethnographie der Mo-so, leur religion, leur langue et leur écriture. Avec les documents historiques et géographiques relatifs à Li-kiang par Ed. Chavannes* (Leiden, 1913).

Language: *Mo-so* (full vocabulary of spoken language, pp. 29-55, and of written signs—mostly with transcription, pp. 62-117, Grammar, pp. 56-61). Spelling French, ordinary and with aspirates as *kh*, *th*, &c.

<sup>1</sup> On the origin of this term see Rockhill, p. 220, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Johnston, *op. cit.*, pp. 274, 277, 279.

<sup>3</sup> Bushell's 'Lonü Man', *JR.A.S.* 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 Ssü-ch'uan.
- Languages cited: *Ku-tsung* (Yün-nan Tibetan), *Lu-tzū*, *P'rü-mi*, *Mu-nia*, *Li-so* (or *\*su*). Spelling English, but with 'Continental' vowels and aspirates as *k'*, *t'*, &c.
- DESGODINS, L'ABBÉ, C. H., 'Mots principaux des langues de certaines tribus qui habitent les bords du Lan-tsan-kiang, du Loutse kiang et Irrawaddy' (*Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, Sér. VI, tome v (1873), pp. 144-7).
- Languages: *Mosso*, *Lissou*, *Min-kiä*, *Loutse*, Chinese, Tibetan, *Kham di Mou oua* (Khamti). Spelling French, with aspirates 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.
- GILL, CAPT. W., *The River of Golden Sand*, condensed edition by E. Colborne Baber, with Geographical Introduction by Sir Henry Yule (London, 1883).
- 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-Tzū* (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.
- HODGSON, B. H., 'Sifán and Hórsók Vocabularies with another special exposition in the wide range of Mongolidan affinities . . .' (*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, xxii (1853), pp. 121-51: reprinted in Hodgson's *Essays on the Languages . . . of Nepál and Tibet*, London, 1874, pp. 64 sqq.)
- Languages: *Thóchú*, *Sókpa* (really Mongol), *Gyámi* (Chinese), *Gyárung*, *Hórpa*, *Tákpa*, *Mányak*. Spelling precise according to system expounded, *ibid.*, pp. 150-1.
- JOHNSTON, SIR R., *From Peking to Mandalay* (London, 1908).
- 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 aspirates as *k'*, *t'*, &c.
- LAUFER, BERTHOLD, *The Si-hia Language, a Study in Indo-Chinese Philology* (T'oung-pao, II. xvii (1916), pp. 1-126).
- Language: *Si-hia* (with etymological, &c., discussions covering the whole range of Tibeto-Burman, Thai, &c.: some words of *Ge-ši-ts'a*). Spelling according to system of Lepsius.
- LIÉTARD, A., 'Notes sur les dialectes Lo-lo' (*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, ix (1909), pp. 549-58), with the Tse-kou Sifan (= Ollone 36) of Père Monbeig.
- Language: *Lo-lo*. Spelling systematic, with aspirates as *k'*, *t'*, &c.
- MONBEIG, PÈRE. See LIÉTARD.
- NEVSKY, N., *A Brief Manual of the Si-hia Characters with Tibetan Transcriptions* (Research Review of the Osaka Asiatic Society, Osaka, 1926).
- Language: *Si-hia* (Tibetan transcriptions, also romanized, with Chinese renderings and citations of etymological correlates in Chinese, Tibeto-Burman, &c.). Spelling systematic.
- OLLONE, VICOMTE D', *Langues des peuples non-Chinois de la Chine* (Mission d'Ollone. vol. vi, Paris, 1912).

- 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.
- PREJEVALSKY, N., *Mongolia, the Tangut Country . . .* (trans. by E. Delmar Morgan, 2 vols., London, 1876).
- Language: *Tangut* (pp. 136-8, 112-13, and notes by the translator, pp. 302-3). Spelling in transliteration from Russian original.
- ROCKHILL, W. W., *The Land of the Lamas* (London, 1891).
- 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).
- ROSTHORN, A. VON., 'Vokabularfragmente Ost-Tibetischer Dialekte' (*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, li (1897), pp. 524-31, with comment by A. Conrady, pp. 531-3).
- Languages: *Rgya-roñ* dialects, viz. *Wassü* (pp. 526-9), *Pati* (p. 530), *Pawang* (p. 530), *Hanniu* (pp. 530-1). Spelling according to system of Lepsius.
- TAFEL, ALBERT, *Meine Tibetreise* (2 vols. Stuttgart, 1914).
- Language: *Rgyal-roñ* dialects (occasional citations of words and phrases, in considerable total number). Spelling German.
- TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE, 'The languages of China before the Chinese' (*Transactions of the Philological Society*, London, 1887, pp. 394-538; pp. 468-71, 538, discussion of Hodgson's Gyárung; pp. 479-87, Lakas or Lolos, Liso (or 'su), Mo-so, Lu-tze, Melam; pp. 487-93 Si-fan and Tibetan).
- 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 JINQRU, *Shishia Studies* (Academia Sinica Monographs, Series A, Nos. 8, 11, 13, *Pei-ping*, 1931- ).
- i, pp. 17-53: three *Bairlang* songs (from the Later Han Annals).
  - ii, pp. 275-88: *Shishia*, *Ch'iang* and *Minia* (also Baber's *Menia*) in the Ssü-ch'uan province.
  - ii, pp. 1-272, iii, pp. 1-396: Romanized *Shishia* words intercolumniated in *Shishia* version of the Buddhist *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*. Spelling for literary Tibetan and Chinese normal, for dialect words in Chinese transcription historico-phonetical, in other cases systematic or according to sources.
- WOLFENDEN, S. N., *Notes on the Jyárung Dialect of Eastern Tibet* (T'oung-pao, II. xxxii (1936), pp. 167-204).
- Language: *Jyá-ruñ* (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'uan border.  
*Bat'ang* Tibetan (Rockhill).  
*Duampou* (Ollone 38).  
*Dzorgai* Sifan (Ollone 41).  
*Ge-ši-ts'a* (Laufer) of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Gyámi* Chinese (Hodgson).  
*Gyárúng* (Hodgson) of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Hanniu* (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Hórpa* (Hodgson).  
*Jyá-run* (Wolfenden) of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Kortsè* Sifan (Ollone 42).  
*Ku-tsung* Tibetan (Davies).  
*Li-so* (or *·su*) (Davies) = Lissou.  
*Lissou* (Orléans), also in Desgodins: = Li-su: also *Pe Lissou*.  
*Lit'ang* Tibetan (Rockhill).  
*Lo-lo* (Baber, Johnston, Liétard, Ollone, Orléans)—rarely cited.  
*Loutse* (Orléans), also in Desgodins: = Lu-tzŭ.  
*Lu-tzŭ* (Davies) = Loutse.  
*Mányak* (Hodgson) of Mi-ñag.  
*Mantze, Outer* (Gill) = Man-tzŭ; akin to Thóchú.  
*Mélam* (Desgodins) of Tsa-roñ valley, on Upper Salween R.  
*Menia* of Tzŭ-ta-ti (Baber) = Mi-ñag.  
*Minia* (Wang Jinqru) = Mi-ñag.  
*Mo-so* (Bacot), also in Johnston—rarely cited.  
*Mosso* (Orléans), also Desgodins: = Mo-so.  
*Muli(Njong)* (Johnston) = Hjañ of Mi-li (2° S. of Li-t'ang): akin to Mányak.  
*Mu-nia* (Davies) = Mi-ñag.  
*Nameji* Sifan (Ollone 35), near junction of Ya-lung and Yangtze.  
*Outer Mantze* (Gill).  
*Panak'a* (Rockhill), Go-lok of Amdo.  
*Pati* (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Pa-U-rong* (Johnston), Bowrong, Bawrang on lower Ya-lung (Ñag) river: akin to Mányak.  
*Pawang* (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Pé* (Ollone 39) = Bod (Tibetan), Mao-chou region.  
*Pé* (Ollone 40) = Bod (Tibetan), Sung-p'an 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 Tzŭ-ta-ti.  
*Prü-mi* (Davies), of Mi-li.  
*Rgya-roñ* dialects (Rosthorn), of Rgyal-roñ.  
*Rgyal-roñ* dialects (Tafel).  
*Seutati*, Peu of (see Ollone 38) = Tzŭ-ta-ti.  
*Shishia* (Wang Jinqru) = Hsi-hsia.  
*Sifan of Tzŭ-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.

*Si-hia* (Nevsky) = Hsi-hsia.

*Sókpa* Mongol (Hodgson).

*Tákpa* (Hodgson) = Dwags-po Tibetan.

*Tangut* Tibetan (Prejevalsky).

*Thóchú* (Hodgson), of T'ao-chou.

*Tsarong* Tibetan (Rockhill), of Upper Salween R.

*Tse-kou* Tibetan (Ollone 36).

*Wassü* (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roñ.

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 'Sifán and Hórsók Vocabularies',<sup>1</sup> clearly recognized that his Sókpa and Gyāmi, and perhaps also his Tákpa, were not Hsi-fan. Ignoring his misapprehension in regard to Hórpa, we have accordingly four Hsi-fan languages, namely Thóchū (T'ao-chou), Hórpa, Gyārūng (Rgyal-roñ), and Mānyak (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 Tzū-ta-ti',<sup>2</sup> evidently related to Mānyak, 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-roñ compiled by von Rosthorn<sup>3</sup> must be associated with 'Gyārūng'; likewise the 'Jyâ-run' of the late Dr. Wolfenden's article,<sup>4</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 1853, pp. 121–51 (see pp. 122–3).

<sup>2</sup> Op. cit., pp. 72–8.

<sup>3</sup> *ZDMG*. li (1897), pp. 524 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> *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 *dre*), is not more easily recognizable in Sung-p'an *djéé*, Ta-chien-lu *djei*, Tse-kou *djré, 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, tchéu, ndja, &c.*, Loutse *ambou*, 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<sup>1</sup> 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 tché ma seu* is only *Kä-cha ma she*,<sup>2</sup> a common Tibetan expression for “I don’t understand”’

and (p. 361)

‘However this may be, the Mänyak’a from the Chan-tui,<sup>3</sup> like the people of Bat’ang, Ta-chien-lu, Kanzé, and Jyé-kundo, 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*

<sup>1</sup> *Land of the Lamas*, p. 54, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. *skad-cha-ma-sés*.

<sup>3</sup> = Nag-roñ.

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

*kr*-, *khr*-, *gr*-  
*pr*-, *phr*-, *br*- } as *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

*kr*-, *khr*-, *gr*-  
*tr*-, *thr*-, *dr*-, *sr*- } as *cr*-, *chr*-, *jr*-, *sr*-  
*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

*ky*-, *khy*-, *gy*-, where normally the Tibetan does not palatalize,<sup>1</sup> and

*py*-, *phy*-, *by*-, where ordinary Tibetan pronounces *c*-, *ch*-, *j*- the dialects changed the guttural or labial to a palatal, giving *cy*-,

<sup>1</sup> But for Lha-sa Rockhill's *Syllabary*, contrary to other authorities, affirms a palatalization. Rockhill is following E. Tibetan.

*chy-*, *gy-*, 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 palatals originated under No. 2.

5. The combination *my-*, in ordinary Tibetan pronounced *ny-* (sometimes *ñ-* or even *ñy-*), 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*, *ṅ*, *ṅs*, *d*, *n*, *b*, *bs*, *m*, *ms*, *ḥ*, *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 *-ṅ*, *-b* (except for change to *-p*), *-m* (the most permanent of the finals), *-r*, while *-ḥ* 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 *tenuis*. There is some evidence of vowel modification before *-g* (*u* > *o*), *-ṅ* (*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) *-ñ* is mostly, *-n* frequently, and *-m* nearly always (as *-m*, *-ñ*, or *-n*) retained. Before *-ñ* 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 *ö*, 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*, *ö*: *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 Hbri-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'an 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'*,<sup>1</sup> &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 *ś* (except in any case where there may be ground for distinction of *ś* from *sh*) ; French *gu* and *j* by *g* and *ž* ; and so forth. The guttural and palatal nasals (*ñ*, *ñ̃*, the latter also in place of French *gn*<sup>2</sup>) 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 *ä*, *ü*, *ö*, and by combinations *ia*, *ie*, &c., where these occur : thus French *eu* becomes *ö*, and Baber's *Menia u* becomes *a*.

(d) Long vowels where recorded may be represented as *ā*, &c. (also for Hodgson's *á*, &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 *ā*, &c., are substituted, as in (d), for original *á*, *â*, &c., which in some cases are of not quite certain signification. Thus, whereas in the present work *T'ao-chou*, *Hor-pa*, *Rgyal-roñ*, *Mi-ñag*, *Mi-li*, &c., are adopted as correct forms of the names of the respective countries, &c., Hodgson's *Thöchū*, *Hörpa*, *Gyārūng*, *Mānyak*, &c., are used in citing words from his vocabularies, as an implicit reference to his article : similarly *Rgya-roñ* refers to the *Rgyal-roñ* vocabularies of von Rosthorn, and *Jyā-ruñ* to the article of Dr. Wolfenden (both relating to dialects different, at least in part, from Hodgson's *Gyārūng*) ; also *Menia* indicates the *Mi-ñag* vocabulary of Baber, and *Mu-nia* that of Major Davies ;

<sup>1</sup> This does not apply to Chinese words.

<sup>2</sup> Hodgson's initial *gn*, which is not explained, is retained, because in one case at least (*chú-nyō*, 'fish') he uses *ng* for the initial, no less than for the final *ñ*. Nevertheless it seems likely that *ñ* is intended. Hodgson's *ny-*, *sy-*, and *zy-* are replaced by *ñ̃-*, *ś-*, *ž-*, in accordance with his explanations. His italic *h*, indicating an abrupt tone, is neglected. In *Thöchū* 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.

*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-roñ. 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 Gyārūng', 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-rong'. 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 Gyārūng' (Rgyal-roñ): 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-roñ), the lists were given as applying to the Nya(Ñag)-roñ, i.e. the Ya-lung river country. This error is not shared by the two missionary

writers, Messrs. Edgar and Fergusson, who cite, with Chinese spellings for the most part, many of the 'Chia Rung' (Rgyal-roñ) 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;<sup>1</sup> 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-*; *Koñ-ser* for *Khañ-sar*); *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*,

<sup>1</sup> The *Geografia* remarks that 'but at present there are not more than thirteen'.



<i>Geografia Tibeta</i>	<i>Rockhill I</i>	<i>Lha-sa pronunciation</i>	<i>Rockhill II</i>	<i>Baber</i>	<i>Dr. Tafel</i>
<b>I. The Eighteen States of the Rgyal-roñ</b>					
1. Lcag-la	Lcags-la (2)	Cag-la	Ja-la (15)	Djia-la (1)	Jag-la
2. Lba-si	..	..	..	..	Wa-se
3. Khro-skyab	Khro-skyab (3)	Tro-jyab	Tru-jyab (9)	Chro-šiop (10)	Co-skiab (Kreciu ?)
4. So-mo	Po(So)-mo (13)	Po(So)-mo	Sa-ma (6)	So-muñ (7)	So-mo
5. Brdzun-hgag	Ñiñ-hgag (15)	Ñiñ-ga	Zun-ga (8)	Zur-ga (9)	Žuñ-kak or Ruñ-kañ
6. Lcog-rtse	Lcog-rtsi (14)	Cog-tai	Co-tse (7)	Djiu-tse(tzü) or Ciu-tzü (8)	Cok-tsi
7. Dam-ba	..	..	Tam-ba (5)	Tam-ba (6)	Dam-ba
8. Ho-gzi	Hgo-zi (12)	Go-zi	Wo-je (3)	Wo-je or Go-je (4)	Wok-je (or ° še)
9. Mdo-li	..	..	..	..	..
10. Pa-sti	Brag-stiñ (17)	Dra-tiñ	Tra-ti (11)	Cra-tiñ (13)	Bra-sdi (Ba-di, Ba-ti)
11. Ba-bam	Lo-dgu & Ba-bam (18)	Lo-gu & Ba-bam	Pa-ti Pa-wan (10) Leur-go (13) Gi-še-tsha (12)	Pa-wan or Pa-un (12)	Ba-wan
12. Dge-ši-tsha	..	..	..	Ge-šie (11)	Rge-ši-tsa
13. Ha (Hwa ?)-hwa	..	..	..	..	..
14. Len-tsa	..	..	..	..	..
15. Rab-brtan	..	..	Ra-ten } (4)	Rap-ten } (5)	Rar-dan
16. Btsan-la	..	..	Tsen-la } (4)	Tsen-la } (5)	Tsan-la
17. Rgyal-kha	..	..	Jya-kha (2)	Djia-kha (3)	..
18. Hgron-bu	(Nañ-chen-ba) Sbriñ-pa (1)	Driñ-pa	Drum-ba (1)	Djum-ba (2)	Muping
<b>II. The Five Hor-pa States (Hor-sde-kha-lña or Hor-khog)</b>					
1. Khañ-gsar	Khañ-gsar (7)	Kañ-sar	Kon-ser (17)	Khun-sar (15)	Kuñ-sar (or ° ser)
2. Ma-zi	Ma-zur (8)	Ma-zur	Ma-zer (18)	Ma-zu or Ma-ze (14)	Ma-zar
3. Brag-mgo	Brag-mon (9) (capital Cango)	Dra-mon	..	Cran-go (17)	Cañ-gu
4. Be-ri	Hbe-rim (10)	Be-rim	..	Pe-re (16)	Be-ri, Be-rin
5. Tre-o	Gri-htu (11) (capital Cuwo)	Dri-tu	..	Dje-gu (or go)	Cu-wo
<b>III.</b>					
Hbah	Hbah (4)	Ba(Ba-thañ)	..	..	Ba-tañ
Li-thañ	Li-thañ (5)	Li-thañ	..	..	Li-tañ
Sde-dge	Sder-gi (6)	Der-ge	..	De-ge or Der-ge	Der-gi
Mi-li	Smi-li (16)	Mi-li	Me-li (14)	Me-li	..
..	..	..	Jye-dam (16)	Djie-dam	..

*Ge-sie*, (3) vocalization of post-consonantal *y* in *-siop*, *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* (*Dam-*, *-wan*), *n* (*Žuñ-*, *-dan*, *Tsan-*), (3) non-insertion of *i* after palatal (*Jag-*, *Cok-*, *Rge-si-*), (4) palatalization of guttural before *y* (*Kretschiu*), (5) loss of *-ñ* (*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* (*-siop*) 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 Tachien-lu state (No. 1): or was it intended as a claim to suzerainty<sup>1</sup> over Muping (No. 18)? Rockhill I, *Ñin-ḥgag*, 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.<sup>2</sup> The final *b* of *Khro-skyab* (No. 3) is preserved in the Chinese *Chossüchiapu* and Manchu *Cosgiyab*; the final *g/ñ* of

<sup>1</sup> Tib. *gnañ* (or *nañ*?) *-chen* ?

<sup>2</sup> 1. Chala (F), Ming-jeng (H) (Chinese *Ming-cheng-ssü* of Rockhill, *Ming-tscheng* of Dr. Tafel); 2. Wassu (REF), Wassi (H); 3. Chossüchiapu (R), Chos Chia (E), Chosschia (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), Jokzai (H); 7. Tangpa (R), Damba (EFH); 8. Wojih (R), Oksi (H, with note of *Hog-gzi* in a Tibetan inscription and of modern pronunciation *Wok-shih* and *Wo-zi*); 9. —; 10. Pati (R), Badi (E), Bati (F), Burakdi (H); 11. Pawang (R), Bawang (EFH); 12. Keshetsa (R), Gaishechia (F), Gebśiza (H), Dr. Stötzner *Gosssetscha*; 13-15. —; 16. Zanla (H); 17. Giyalung (H); 18. Mup'ing (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 *Mabu*) two of the Hor-pa states and, further, the *Yüko* nomads.

*Brdzun-hgag* in all; the initial *Br-* of *Brag-stiñ* 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-roñ' 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-roñ: E. Colonial consonants in *Crango*, *Cangu* (Lha-sa *Dra-*)<sup>1</sup> and *Dje-go* (Lha-sa *Dri-*), vocalization of *y* in *Djie-dam*, and altered vowels, *-añ > -oñ, -uñ*, in *Koñ-ser*, *Khuñ-sar*, *-i > -e* in *Ma-ze*, *Pe-re*, *Me-li*. The *g* in *Dje-go* = *Tre-o* is reminiscent of the Khams pronunciation of *sprehu*, &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-roñ) language, is given, with (approximate) translation as follows:

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Stötzner 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 tschung dyen newsa ba  
 sgo di sgo tsa ne gui re  
 naschdien sdang mu nesgo dsche (= kri)  
 tschü sgor gari tschin 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,<sup>1</sup> 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-Leḥuḥi-re  
 sgo-di-sgo-tsa-na(?)-khyi-re  
 nags-rgyañ(?)-stag-mo-ni-sgo(skyoñ?)-byed  
 cñu-sgor-ga-ri-rgyal-mtshan<sup>2</sup>-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 interpretation of line 2. It is indeed evident that *di*, 'great', *tsa*, 'small', *gui*, 'dog', are related to Gyārūng *ka-ḥti* (Rgya-roñ *ko-ktie*) 'great', Gyārūng *ka-ḥchai* (Rgya-roñ *ko-keie*), 'small', Gyārūng *khi* (Rgya-roñ *khi*), 'dog'; but these are only pronunciations of the corresponding Tibetan words, *chen* (*gcen*), *chuñ* (*cuñ*, *gcuñ*), 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-roñ. 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, Gyārūng *ta-veṭ*, Rgya-roñ *ta-wa*.

<sup>1</sup> Not an imaginary trait: for an actual parallel see Fergusson, p. 194.

<sup>2</sup> Lha-sa pronunciation *gyen-tshen*.

These facts, according with the above quoted statement of Mr. Fergusson and partly with that of Rockhill,<sup>1</sup> suggest that in the Rgyal-roñ 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,<sup>2</sup> like a Tibetan dialect, even the specially Tibetan *bdun* has been adopted (as *dae*" = Yün-nan *dai*). Thus the Rgyal-roñ dialects may in some points have, as Dr. Wolfenden suggested, a spurious appearance of antiquity:<sup>3</sup> 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—

Thōchū *khak*, Gyārūng *kūc-cēk*, Mānyak *da-kha*, = Tib. *khag*, 'bitter';

Thōchū *rkwi*, Hōrpa *ka-msyūr*, Gyārūng *kū-mchūr*, Jyā-ruñ *ke-mšār*, 'handsome' = Tib. *khjur*, 'entire';

Hōrpa *sgū-sgo*, Gyārūng *kūc-cūr*, Mānyak *da-cū* = Tib. *skjur*, 'sour';

Thōchū *jam* = Tib. *hjam*, 'sweet';

Gyārūng *ka-mñar*, 'sweet' = Tib. *mñar*.

were originally obtained by borrowing.<sup>4</sup> This large matter must, however, be reserved for treatment on an adequate scale.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> P. 531, following von Rosthorn's article.

<sup>3</sup> *JRAS*, 1928, pp. 897-8, *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology*, p. 141.

<sup>4</sup> Borrowings from Chinese have been noted in the Rgyal-roñ dialects by von Rosthorn and Wolfenden, and it seems that we may perhaps add the Gyārūng words *chidi*, 'this', *hadi*, 'that', *chidu*, 'here', *hadu*, 'there', with Thōchū *cho*, 'here', *hāto*, 'there'; possibly also some interrogatives with *ha-* in Mānyak and Menia.

*Hsi-fan languages: criteria and list*

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*, *khoñ*, *khoñ-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-roñ, 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,<sup>1</sup> 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* unevicenced 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

<sup>1</sup> *Eine indo-chinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung*, pp. 35 sqq.

of Sung-p'an) and the 'Outer Man-Tzū' of Gill (numerals and a few other words recorded by Terrien de Lacouperie, *Languages of China before the Chinese*, §§ 176-7).<sup>1</sup>

- (b) *Hörpa* (Hodgson).
- (c) *Rgyal-roñ dialects*: Gyārūng (Hodgson), Rgya-roñ (von Rosthorn, 4 dialects, Wassū with Mup'ing and Wojih, Pati (a few words), Pawang (3 words), Hanniu (a few words)), Jyā-ruñ (Wolfenden), Dge-śi-tsha.<sup>2</sup>
- (d) *Mi-ñag country*: Mānyak (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-roñ* (upper Salween river north of latitude 28°): Mélam

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 'Jyāruñ' 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 Tángo, west of Gyárúng towards Amdo'; Tángo 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 *Dángo*), 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-roñ 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.

(Tibetan)	'1' (gcig)	'7' (bdun)	'10' (bcu)	'11' (bcu-gcig)	'20' (ñi-śu)	'100' (brgya)
<i>Amdo and Go-lok</i>						
Thöchü	a(-ri)	sta(-rē)	ha-dū(-rē)		gni-na-so	a-kśi
41 (Dzorgai)	a	śtie	a-diō	a-tō	niu-so	a-kśō
42 (Kortsè)	eū	śtū	a-dūi	a-ti	niu-so	a-kśō
39	é	skié	a-düō			e-cōh
'Outer Man-Tzū'	ā(r-gu)	śne(r-gu)	kha(dr-gu)	khā-tyi	ner (or ne)-sā	
<i>Hōr-pa</i>	rā	zne	sgā		na-skā	rhyā
<i>Rgyal-roñ</i>						
Gyārūng	ka-tī	kū-śnēs	sih		kin-nis-si	paryē
Rgya-roñ	t-rki	ko-śnēs	śtyie or śetie	śa (for śta)-tie	ko-ne-śtie	pria
(Wassū)						
Rgya-roñ (Pati)	ko-tie	ko-śne	śi			
Rgya-roñ	ci	dae <sup>?</sup>	pcō	cek-ci	nie-śe	
(Hanniu)						
Jyā-ruñ	kitiak	ke-śnes	ści(ściō, °ā)	ściō-tik	ke-ne-ściā	pōryā
Dge-śi-tsha	zi	zniē	zra	ōwrē	āwḍa	ō-zē
<i>Mi-ñag</i>						
Mānyak	tā(-bī)	skwi(-bī)	cē(< ti)-ci(-bi)		nā-cā(-bi)	tē-jē
Menia	ta	śan	chi(< ti)-chi (< thsa)	thsa-ta	na-tsa	ta-jia
			ho			hin
Mu-nia	dji	śō	śō(s'ō ?)(-pi)	si-ti(-pi)	gne(ñe ?)-śō	dio
38	té(-pi)	gnin(ñin ?)(-pi)	ka(-den)		ñā-ka	ta-ra
<i>Pa-U-Rong</i>	ta	dun				
<i>Mi-li</i>						
Muli(Njong)	ti	hnō, hnyi	ka(-te)	ka-ti	na-ha	śi
Prü-mi	di	hni	a(-ten)			
<i>Tsa-roñ</i>						
Mélam						
Loutse 24	kig	śeñi	ti-tsel	ti-tsel-kig	a-ñi-tsel	ki-śia
„ 26	ti	señi	ti-e-tsel		a-ñi-tsel	
Lu-tzū	kie	señid	tsel			chia
<i>Yün-nan</i>						
35	ti(-ku)	śe(-ku)	ho-u(-ku)	ho-tié(-ku)	ñi-hô(-ku)	tié-hé



(Tibetan)	'Thou' (khyod)	'He', 'That' (kho, khoñ-ta)	'White' (dkar)	'Sky' (gnam-mkhaḥ)	'Sun' (ñi-ma)	'Wind' (rluñ)
<i>Amdo and Go-lok</i> Thöchü 41 (Dzorgai) 42 (Kortsé) 39 'Outer Man-Tzü'	[kwā, kwē]	[kwāñ-thā-ca]	phyokh consa con	mahto mo mo mo-ta	mün mönn mönn me-si, mo-sa	mozyü ('air') muhuso muhodze mo-o
<i>Hör-pa</i> <i>Rgyal-roñ</i> Gyārüng Rgya-roñ (Wassü) Rgya-roñ (Pati) Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) Jyā-ruñ Dge-si-tsha	ni [sān-rē] no	[vjā, vja] [gnā-pos, wa-tū] [tenchie]	phrū-phrū ka-prom ko-pröm	[koh] tū-mön te-mū	[gna] [ki-ni] [ke-ni]	[ta-li]
<i>Mi-ñag</i> Mānyak Menia Mu-nia 38	nō na ña	thi tha	[dal-lū] [da-lu] phri šam-ba phu-li-li	mah na-khañ-mo moñkele [ñi-ru-ru]	[ñi-ma] [ni-ma] [he-mi] min-tsa [ru-ra]	mērda mar mu muh'i [ri-ru]
<i>Pa-U-Rong</i> <i>Mi-li</i> Muli(Njong) Prü-mi			tr'on-mö	me-ñi	[ñi]	mo-ho
<i>Tsa-roñ</i> Mélam Loutse 24 " 26 Lu-tzü	na na na	[aug] [koméio]	hoñ hoñ	[nam] [nam] mu	[nam-loñ] [nam-loñ] ma-u [nam]	[nam-boñ]
<i>Yün-nan</i> 35			pu-lu-zu	na-ka-mū	[hi-mi]	mossé

(Desgodins,<sup>1</sup> a few words), Loutse (Desgodins),<sup>2</sup> Loutse 24 and 26 (d'Orléans), Lu-tzū (Davies)—the Loutse = Lu-tzū people of the Tsa-roñ.

- (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 *-rē* appended in Thōchū to the numerals 1–10 may be = Tib. *re, res*, 'one by one', 'time', 'times'. The *-r* of 'Outer Man-Tzū' is, no doubt, as Yule has observed (p. 128), the same word. The additional *-gu* in 'Outer Man-Tzū', identified by Yule with the *-kū* of Hodgson's Gyāmi 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 Mānyak (Mi-ñag), whereto geographically, being of the region of Ya-chou, it is adjacent.

The *-dū* of Thōchū *ha-dū*, '10' = Go-lok *a-diö, a-düi, a-düö*, 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 decads and '100'.

2. 'Seven': The Thōchū and Go-lok forms with *st-, št-, and śk-* (but 'Outer Man-Tzū' *śn-*), and likewise the Mānyak *skwi* (erroneously questioned by Baber, p. 102) may be derived from a *stn-/skn-*, resulting from the original *sn-/śñ*, or possibly *snw-/śñw-*, which accounts for the innumerable *sn-, s-n-* (but Kanauri *stis*), *hn-, n-, sr-, s-r-*, forms found all over the Tibeto-Burman field. The *señi, &c.*, of the Tsa-roñ 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 Gyāmi *ī-shsa, ī-pē*, can be found, further, in Lo-lo, Kioutse and Lissou-Li-so.

4. 'Ten': It is difficult to account for Gyārūng *sih, si*, Rgya-roñ (Pati) *śi*, except upon the supposition that they are borrowings of Chinese *shih*, earlier *śib*, found in many other languages. Rgya-roñ *śtyie, Jyā-ruñ scī, scīo*, are, of course, = Tib. *bcu > ścu > ściu* (insertion of *i* after palatal) > *śtiu*, 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. *Hōrpa and Dge-śi-tsha*: A connexion between these would perhaps be more apparent if we had the Hōrpa form of '11'. Evidently, however, the *Dge-śi-tsha* form *ōwrē* (10–1) may contain an etymological equivalent of Hōrpa *rā*, '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

<sup>1</sup> *Le Thibet d'après la correspondance des missionnaires*, pp. 372–7.

<sup>2</sup> *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie de Paris*, v (1873), pp. 144 sqq.

the eighth to ninth century and may be related to Chinese *ir*, '1' (modern *i*), of the same provenance. The Dge-*śi-tsha* *ö-zě*, 'one 100', with *ze* < *jie* < *jia* < (br)gya (cf. Mānyak *tē-jē*, Menia *ta-jia*), suggests that Hōrpa *rhyā* 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 *a*, '1', are confined (except for Dge-*śi-tsha* *ö* in *ö-zě*) to the Amdo-Go-lok area, where they are also used to constitute the expression 'one 100'. Forms of *ta/ti*, '1', occur in the number '11', and to the south they entirely replace *a*, and occupy the whole field, except for some borrowing of Tibetan *gcig* in the Rgyal-roñ (*rki*, *cì*, *kitiak*) and in the Tsa-roñ, where it is, doubtless, derived from the Tse-kou dialect of E. Colonial Tibetan: in Loutse 24 this *kig* is used to form the expression 'one 100' (*ki-śia*), which in the Mi-ñag region and farther south is formed with *ta/ti*.

(b) For '7' forms derived from *snis/sñis* 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-roñ.

(c) Forms of *ga/ka*, '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 decads, '20', &c.: the *-so*, *-sā* employed in Amdo to form the decads can hardly be the *-śu* of Tibetan *ñi-śu* (< *ñis-cu*) and very possibly is Chinese (see the Gyāmi numerals in Hodgson's vocabulary). With the exception stated the whole region from the Hor-pa country southwards uses for '10', '11', &c., and the decads etymological cognates of Tibetan *bcu*.

(d) As regards the pronouns: *na*, 'thou', is almost universal, and its prevalence might be still more impressive, if forms for 'thou' were more frequent in the vocabularies. *Tha*, 'that', can be seen in Thōchū *thā*, 'that', *thā-ko*, *thāk-lar*, 'they', *thāk-ci*, *tha-kūk*, 'his', 'their', *thūzga*, *thaksi*, 'there' (Gyārūng has *t* in *tis-dūi*, 'then', Hōrpa *ta* in *tab-deu*, 'then'); Mānyak *thi*, 'he', *thiē*, 'his', *thūsū*, &c., 'thus', *thilē*, 'then', *thūngā pu*, 'there', &c.; Menia *tha*, 'he', *thi*, 'his', *thou*, 'they'; *tha* 'what?', in Thōchū *thi-sni*, 'when?', Gyārūng *this-dūi*, 'when?', *this-ti* (Rgya-roñ *this-tie*), 'how much?', *thū*, 'what?'; *pa*, 'this', in Thōchū *patino*, Gyārūng *pūz-dūi*, 'now', Thōchū *pa-śi*, Go-lok 41 *pös*, Hōrpa *pa-sni*, Gyārūng *pi-śñi*, Jyā-run *pe-śne*, Muli(Njong) *pu-ne* (?) 'to-day'.

(e) 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*)*ñi-ma*, 'sun', are naturally concurrent. As regards *na/ña*, 'good', *tsha*, 'goat', *somr/sorm*, 'iron', and, further, *ya*, 'sheep', we may cite—

*na/ña*, 'good': Thōchū *nā-i*, Hōrpa *gāyē*, *gnor*, Gyārūng *ka-snē*.<sup>1</sup>  
*tsha*, 'goat': Thōchū *tsāh*, Go-lok 39 *sai*, Hōrpa *chē*, Gyārūng *kūs-so*, Rgya-roñ (Pati) *ko-su*, Jyā-run *a-ke-sū*, Mānyak *tsāh*, Menia *chi*, Mi-li (Prü-mi) *che-da*, Lu-tzū *a-kie*.

*sormo*, 'iron': Thōchū *sormo*, Go-lok 41 *siēmo*, Hōrpa *cū*, Gyārūng *som*, Rgya-roñ *sōm*, Mānyak *si*, Menia *še*, Mu-nia *śu*, 38 *śon*, Muli(Njong) *še*, Prü-mi *śen*, Loutse 24 *śiam*.

*ya*, 'sheep': Rgya-roñ (Pati) *ko-yo* (Wassū *ke-yo*, 'goat'), Jyā-run *a-ke-yū*, Menia *yo* (Mu-nia *yü*, 'goat'), Loutse 24 *a-yau*, 26 *yang*, Yün-nan 35 *yo*, 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* :

Tib. *rgyug*, 'run': Gyārūng *da-na-rgyūk* (Hōrpa *ta-mgyo*, Mānyak *ta-ci-mo-yū*).

„ *brgyad*, '8': Thōchū *kh-rā(-rē)*, Hōrpa *rhiéé*, Gyārūng *oryēt*, Rgya-roñ *waria(t)*, *worio(t)* (cf. the case of *brgya*, '100', *supra*, p. 90).

„ *rna*, 'ear': Gyārūng *ti-rnē*, Rgya-roñ *t-rna*.

„ *rmañ*, 'dream', &c.: Rgya-roñ *ko-rman*, 'sleep' (Menia *kho-me*).

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

*r* absent in Tibetan :

Tib. *gor-ma*, 'stone': Hōrpa *rgā-mē*.

„ *khyur*, 'complete', &c.: Thōchū *rkwi*, 'handsome'.

„ *ñan*, *mñan*, *sñan*, 'listen': Gyārūng *ka-rnyou*.

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

„ *mi*, 'man': Gyārūng *ti-rmi*, Rgya-roñ *t-rmi*, Hsi-hsia *rme*.

<sup>1</sup> Add Tākpa (*lihū*)-*ni* ((*lihū*)-*ma-ni*, 'bad').

Tib. *miñ*, 'name'; Thöchü *rmāḥ*, Gyārūng *ti-rmiñ*, Rgya-roñ *k-rmien* (Hörpa *smen*).

Similarly we find instances of *g-* (Thöchü *kśi(-ri)*, '3' = *gsum*, &c.), *b-* (Hörpa *na-pśē*, 'tell' = *bsad*, &c.), *m-* (Hörpa *ka-mthū*, 'great' = *mtho*, 'high', &c.), *ḥ-* (as nasal, Rgya-roñ *ci-mbö* = *ḥbar*, 'blaze', &c.), and *s-* (Rgya-roñ *te-śni*, 'heart' = *sñiñ*, &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*—Thöchü 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-ruñ, 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-roñ, *sa-* and (Hanniu) *ci-*, *yi-*,

and we may note occurrences in the languages severally.

Thöchü:

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

Go-lok (41, 42, 39):

1. *a-* in 41 *a-cl*, 42 *e-śi*, 'month' (Rgya-roñ *ti-e-tsla*, Tib. *zla-ba*).

2. *ka-* 'Outer Man-Tzū' *kō-ā-dre*, 'hot', *kō-a-sti*, 'cold'<sup>1</sup> (Thōchū *styū*, Jyā-ruñ *kā-mi-stē-a*), *kā-zye*, 'eat' (Tib. *za*, Li-Fan Man-Tzū *gna-dze*).
3. *da-* in 42 *da-kō*, 'go' (41 *kō-sé*, Tib. *ḡgro*).

## Hōr-pa :

1. *ka-* in Adjectives (*ka-chi*, 'long' = Gyārūng *ka-sri*, Tib. (*s*)*riñ*).
2. *ta-* in Verbs (*ta-sē*, 'kill' = Thōchū *ta-sēh*, &c.).
3. *na-* in Verbs (*na-psē*, 'tell', &c.).
4. *wa-* in Verbs (*wa-thi*, 'drink', *wa-nzūn*, 'sit' = Thōchū *ā-thī*, *ā-jon*, &c.).

## Rgyal-roñ (Gyārūng, Rgya-roñ, Jyā-ruñ) :

1. *a-* in Nouns (Rgya-roñ *ti-e-tsla*, 'month' = Go-lok *a-cl*, *e-si*, *a-sia*, 'flesh' = Tib. *śa*, &c.).
2. *ka-* in Nouns (Gyārūng *ki-ni*, 'sun' = Tib. *ñi-ma*, &c.), Adjectives (Gyārūng *ka-nak*, 'black' = Tib. *nag*, &c.), Verbs (Gyārūng *ka-rnyou*, 'hear', &c.), and Numerals (Gyārūng *ka-ti*, '1', *ka-nēs*, '2', &c.).  
*ga-* in Rgya-roñ *ga-pa*, *go-mū*, 'father', 'mother' (Gyārūng *ta-pē*, *tō-mō*), may be different.
3. *ta-* in Nouns (Gyārūng *tā-rū*, 'horn', *ti-khe*, 'mouth' = Tib. *ru*, *kha*, &c.), Adjectives (Rgya-roñ *te-sa-lo*, 'hot' = Tib. *tsha*, &c.), Verbs (Gyārūng *ta-zō*, 'eat' = Tib. *za*, &c.).
4. *da-* in Verbs (Gyārūng *da-na-rgyūk*, 'run' = Tib. *rgyug*, &c.).
5. *na-* in Verbs (Gyārūng *nā-sē*, 'kill' = Thōchū *ta-sēh*, Hōrpa *ta-sē*, &c.).
6. *ya-* in Gyārūng *ya-cin* (Rgya-roñ *na-chen*), *ye-yen*, 'go', 'walk'.
7. *sa-* (Causative) in Verbs (Rgya-roñ *ta-sa-zo*, 'feed', Jyā-ruñ *sa-pkiab*, 'cover up', &c.).
8. (Hanniu dialect) *ni-* (<*na-*?), *ci-*, *yi-*, *me-*, *mō-* in Verbs (Rgya-roñ *ni-ndu*, 'bring', *ci-nthen*, *yi-nthen*, 'drink' = Tib. *ḡthuñ*, *me-ndü*, 'sit down', *mō-dru*, 'take off (clothes)', &c.).

## Mi-ñag (Mānyak, Menia, Mu-nia, 38) :

1. *a-* (Mu-nia only) in Adjectives (*a-ñi*, 'few' = Tib. *ñuñ*, *a-bi*, 'thin' = Menia *ya-bu*, &c.).

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

2. *ka-* in Verbs (Menia *kho-me*, 'sleep', Rgya-roñ *ko-rman*, *kho-cuo*, 'kill', *kho-tha-cuo*, 'do not kill').
3. *ta-* in Verbs (Mānyak *ta-khi*, 'give', &c.).
4. *da-* in Adjectives (Mānyak *dā-nā*, Menia *da-na*, 'black', *dallū*, Menia *da-lu*, 'white', Mu-nia *da-sō*, Menia *ya-sé*, Tib. (*s*)*riñ*, 'long', &c.) and Verbs (Mānyak *da-ñwā*, 'weep' = Tib. *ñu*, *da-ci*, 'lift' = Thōchū *ta-ci*, &c.).
5. *na-* in Verbs (Mānyak *nai-jeu*, 'sit' = Thōchū *ā-jon*, *gna-jeu*, 'eat' = Tib. *za*, Menia *na-ka*, 'beat', *na-tha-ka*, 'do not beat' = Thōchū *da-gac*, &c.).
6. *ya-* (Menia only) in Adjectives (*ya-nche*, 'fast', *ya-nche-ta*, 'clever' = Tib. *skyen*, *mkhyen*, *ya-sé*, 'long', &c.).
7. *wa-* in Mānyak *wa-khi*, *ta-khi*, 'give'.

## Pa-U-Rong :

*da-* in *du-ka*, 'mouth' (Tib. *kha*, Gyārūng *ti-khe*, &c.).

## Mi-li(Muli(Njong), Prū-mi) :

1. *a-* in Prū-mi *a-lu-lu*, 'small' (cf. Mu-nia *a-tzö-tzö* = Tib. *chuñ*, 'small', Lo-lo *i-tzö*, *a-tio*, &c.).
2. *na-* in Muli(Njong) *ne-se*, 'kill' (Gyārūng *nā-sē*, Mānyak *na-sya*, &c.).

## Tsa-roñ (Mé-lam, Loutse, Lu-tzū) :

1. *a-* in Nouns (Loutse *a-sa*, 'earth', *a-na*, 'ear', &c. = Tib. *sa*, *rna*, &c.), and Numerals (Loutse *a-ñi*, '2', *a-som*, '3' *a-bli*, '4', &c.).
2. *ka-* in Mélam *ka-thin*, 'large' ?
3. *ta-* in Nouns (Mélam *té-kru*, 'horn' = Hōrpa *k-rūm-bo*, Tib. *ru*, Loutse 24 *t-me*, 26 *t-mé*, 'fire' = Gyārūng *ti-mi*, Tib. *me*, &c.) and Adjectives (Mélam *te-ke*, 'difficult' = Tib. *kha*, *te-ñi*, 'little' = Mu-nia *a-ñi*, Tib. *ñuñ*).
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—

Gyārūng *sē-pri* 'ape' (Tib. *sprehu*), *ko-rok*, 'ant' (Tib. *grog*), Rgya-roñ *waria(t)*, *woric(t)* (Tib. *brgyad*, Khams *vrgyad*), Gyārūng *paryē*, '100' (Tib. *brgya*), Mélam *sela*, 'moon', Loutse 24 *señi*, 26 *señi*, Lu-tzū *señid*, '7' (*snis*), Loutse 26

*daguen*, '9' (Tib. *dgu*), *sena*, 'nose' (Tib. *sna*), *sola*, 'month' (26 *sela*, Tib. *sla*, *zla*), Lu-tzū *sela*, 'moon', *a-beli*, '4' (*bli*).

It seems likely that some of the coincidences of Rgyal-roñ 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 *gñi*, 'sun' (Tib. *ñi*, *gñi*) = Gyārūng *ki-ni*, &c., may really be of this nature. The question would then arise whether on the Rgyal-roñ side the cause was an intellectual misunderstanding or a phonetic difficulty.<sup>1</sup> It must, however, be admitted that some of the Rgyal-roñ 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-roñ we have both on its eastern extremity ('Outer Man-Tzū' *ā(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', *ō-mnë*, '12', *ō-su*, '13', &c., *ō-zë*, 'one 100'), evidence for *a*, '1', and *ga/ka* (Thōchū *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*,

<sup>1</sup> Conversely, the instances of an extra prefix *d* in Rgyal-roñ 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 *ta/te*, &c., with the vowel lost (Rgya-roñ *trmi*, *trna*, &c.).



&c., Lo-lo *m'o*, *mu*, *mü*, Kioutse *ga-mön*, *mu-lang*; then Ka-chin *la-mu* and in Burma *mow*, *mow-kong*, *mu-tang*, *mog*, *mo*, &c.; while the rarer meaning, 'sun', is seen in Lo-lo *mü-ñi*, &c., Li-su *mü-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-proñ*, Nung *kum-prā*, Lo-lo *phru*, Aka Lo-lo and Lahu *plu*, 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 *-ñ* 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 Miri-Daflā-Mishmi group, north of Assam, and in the Nāgā groups they are plentiful or abound.<sup>1</sup> 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°<sup>2</sup> 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-roñ, the 'Women's Country', was occupied by Ch'iang peoples, while concerning the Mi-ñag 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'.

<sup>1</sup> 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-roñ.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *li*, *kli*, *gli*, Nos. 1, 239, and *gteh*, 'alone', '7', No. 300); *śa*, *gśah*, '7' (No. 56); *kha*, *dghah*, *dgah*, '10' (No. 145); *tha*, 'he', 'it' (Nos. 71, 225); *mo*, 'sky', 'sun' (No. 7, Laufer, No. 34); *dñah*, 'good' (Nevsky, No. 199); *ye*, 'sheep' (Laufer, No. 68); to which we may add *ldih*, *lda*, *zlah*, *lha* (Nevsky, No. 93, from *bldyi* = Tib. *bzi*), '4' = Hōrpa *hla*, Tākpa *pli*, Loutse *a-bli*, &c., and *rme* (Tib. *mi*, *myi*, Nevsky, No. 39), 'man', with *r*-Prefix, as in Gyārūng *ti-rmi*, Rgya-roñ *t-rmi*.

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-roñ 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-roñ 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-roñ 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 *ʈa(g)*), so from *p(h)rom* we get in the Hsi-fan languages—

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

<sup>1</sup> Fergusson, op. cit., pp. 247 sqq.

*prom*, Hōrpa *phrū*, Mu-nia *phri*, (2) with  $r > y$  Thōchū *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-lok *con*, (3) with  $c > ś$ , 38 *son*, *śam*, (4) with  $ś > h$  (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 (Hōrpa *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 *sriñ*, 'long' = Tib. *riñ* (but *sriñ*, 'extend'): (a) non-palatalization in Gyārūng *ka-sri*, 'long', 'tall'; (b) palatalization in Hōrpa *ka-ci* (< *cri* < *śri* < *sri*), 'long', *ce-ci* (*sriñ-sriñ*), 'far', Mānyak *śā-śā*, Menia *ya-śe*, Mu-nia *da-śō* [Mo-so *śō*, Lo-lo *śō*, *a-śō*], 'long'. The instance illustrates also, in the Mānyak, &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 *crō*, 37 *cō*, 38 *tse*, 40 *ce*, 41 *tüeiś*, Mélam *śiru*, *kiō*, < *śru* = Tib. *grī*, 'knife'.

As regards consonant before  $y$ , we have seen in the case of *brgya*, '100'—

- (a) non-palatalization in Hōrpa *rhyā*, Rgyal-roñ *par̄yē*, *pria*, with elision, frequent in Amdo Tibetan, of  $g$  in the group *rgy*—cf. Hōrpa *rhiēē*, Rgyal-roñ *oryēt*, *waria(t)*, &c. = Tib. *brgyad*, '8';
- (b) palatalization in Thōchū and Go-lok *a-kśi*, *a-kśō*, &c., Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) *źdie*, Mānyak *tē-jē*, Menia *ta-jia*, Tsa-roñ *ki-śia*, *chia*, &c.;
- (c) probably *rjia* > *ra* in Pa-U-Rong *ta-ra*, and (*r*)*śia* > *he* in 35 *hé* (cf. 35 *hé*, 38 *hié pi* = *brgyad*, '8');
- (d) in the degenerate Mu-nia and Yün-nan 35 a change  $ś > h$ , 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* > *śia*.

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 Thōchū *phyo(kh) < phrom*, have been as *pr- > 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 < 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 < 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- > mi-*, or *my- > mny-*, *ny- > 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 *śik* (*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 > miig > miag* we get Gyārūng *tai-myēk*, Muli(Njong) *mia* (Li-su *mia-sö*), Menia *mie*, Mu-nia *mie-lu*, Pa-U-Rong, *byu* [Mo-so *miö*, *mö*, Lo-lo *myet-sao*, &c.]; from *mnyig* Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) *mnyi*, Mānyak *mni* [40 *ñihi*, Lo-lo *ni-ssa*]; from *mniag* Rgya-roñ *te-mniak*, *te-mniok*, &c., 38 *nia*, Mi-li (Prü-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, Thōchū *nāh*, Go-lok *néé*, no, 40 *ñö*, *nié*, 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-

words, must perhaps be left to the study of the languages severally : is, for instance, Hōrpa *hyō*, 'house', directly descended from the original *khyim*, or has it passed through the palatal stage of the adjacent Rgya-roñ *chiem*, *chom*? Hōrpa, a dialect exposed more than any other to influence from E. Colonial Tibetan, has palatalization in *chēh*, 'road' = Thōchū *grih*, Gyārūng *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-roñ (*Chyon* = *Khyun*, &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': Hōrpa *grā*, Gyārūng *brū*, Mānyak *gū*.

Tib. *grog-ma* (Lha-sa *tro-ma*, Tse-kou *cru-ma*), 'ant': Thōchū *tū-khrā*, Hōrpa *skhrō*, Gyārūng *ko-rok* [Mo-so *cö*, *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' *štu(r-gu)*, Gyārūng *kū-tōk*, Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) *ktrü*, Mānyak *trū(-bi)*, Pa-U-Rong *tru*, Muli(Njong) *thru*.

-palatalization in Hōrpa *chō*, Rgya-roñ *ko-co*, Menia *chu*, Mu-nia *kho*, Mi-li (Prü-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-roñ *pra(k)* (also in the place-name *Bra-sdi*, *Burakdi*), Loutse *a-pra*, perhaps Thōchū *s-pyāh* (cf. *phyokh* = *prom*).

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

Tib. *hbrug*, 'dragon', *sbrul*, 'snake' (Lha-sa *druk*, *dru*, E. Colonial *ju*, *jrö*, &c.): Thōchū *brigi*, 41, 42 *büyö*, 39 *buś*, Hōrpa *phri*, Gyārūng *kha-bri*, Jyā-ruñ *kha-uri*, Mānyak *brū*, Menia *bar*, 'snake' [Mo-so *zö*].

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*, *śiü*, *sü*, *zü*, &c.), 'bird', 'fowl': Thöchü *ma-rwō* (?), Gyārüng *pyē-pyē*, Rgya-roñ *pai* (-*ku*, 'cock', -*mu*, 'hen'—Dr. Tafel *begu*).

-palatalization in Hörpa *gyō* (?), Mānyak *hā* (?), Menia *rga*,<sup>1</sup> Mu-nia *rja* (*rja-gu*, 'egg'), Muli(Njong) *ro* (<*rjo*, cf. 35 *hro-pu*, 'cock', *hro-ma*, 'hen'), Mi-li (Prü-mi) *ju* ('chicken', *ra-gu*, 'egg').

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

Tib. *byi-ba* (Lha-sa *ci-wa*, E. Colonial *śiua*, *tsüi*, *śio*, *jeh*), 'rat': Rgya-roñ *pui*, Jyā-ruñ *pē-yī* [Mo-so *fu*, Lo-lo *véh*, *hè*, &c.].

Tib. *khyim* [Lha-sa and E. Colonial use *khañ*], 'house': Thöchü *kih*, 42 *ki*, Loutse *kiim*, 24 *kime*.

-palatalization in Go-lok 41 *tié*, Hörpa *hyō* (?), Dge-śi-tsha *yo*, Gyārüng *chēm*, Rgya-roñ *ciem*, Jyā-ruñ *chom*, Muli (Njong) *jih*, Loutse 26 *jim*. [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 *w* (*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-etse* (1) ('one 10'), Lu-tzū *tsel*, Yün-nan 35 *ho-u(-ku)* (?)

-insertion of *i* in Rgya-roñ *śtyie*, Jyā-ruñ *sciō*, *sciä* [Mo-so *tse*, *tsö*, &c., Lo-lo *tse*, *tsö*, *cie*, *ci*, &c.].

<sup>1</sup> 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*: Gyārūng *sih*, Rgya-roñ (Pati) *si*, may be Chinese.

Tib. *chu* (Lha-sa *chu*, E. Colonial *kiu*, *khié*, *chüo*, *csiu*, &c.), 'water': Go-lok 41 *cuo*, 42 *cu*, Gyārūng *ti-chī*, Rgya-roñ *te-chi*, Jyā-ruñ *tē-chī*, Menia *jo*, *jui* (?), Mu-nia *ndzö* (?), Pa-U-Rong *dji*, Muli(Njong) *jö* (? < *jiu*).

-insertion of *i* in 38 *cèo*, Mi-li (Prü-mi) *cyö*.

Tib. *bsad* (Lha-sa *še*, E. Colonial *pset*, *šie*, &c.), 'expound', 'tell': Hōrpa *na-psé*, Gyārūng *ta-cē(n)*, Mu-nia *mo-sa* (?)

-insertion of *i* in Jyā-ruñ *uśiat* (also *uśat*), 38 *śié* [Mo-so *śö*, *śa-do*, Lo-lo *do-śi*, *śuo*, *do-chö*, &c.].

Tib. *śiñ* (Lha-sa *śiñ*, E. Colonial *śañ*, *śi*, *śin*, *śiñ*, *śim*, &c.) 'tree', 'wood': Go-lok 39 *se*, Gyārūng *śi*, Rgya-roñ *śē* ('wood'), Mānyak *sā-poh* (= 36 *śim-pon*, 37 *śin-po*), 38 *saim-bu*, *sen*, Menia *śi*, Mi-li (Prü-mi) *śe*, Loutse *śiñ*.

-insertion of *i* in Rgya-roñ *śie* ('tree'), Menia *śie* ('wood'), Pa-U-Rong and Muli(Njong) *hsieh*. [Mo-so *śè*, *śö*, &c., Lo-lo *śi*, *śö*, &c.].

Tib. *śog*, *śog-bu* (Lha-sa *śu-gu*, E. Colonial *sio*, *śu-gu*, &c.), 'paper': Rgya-roñ *śou*, 38 *śo-u*, Menia *śo*.

The instances are in favour of posteriority of the insertion, which has sometimes (e.g. in 'Tangut' *dziam-ba*, 'cheek', < *h̄jiam-ba* < *h̄gram-pa*) affected even secondary palatals. In the Rgyal-roñ it is perhaps even modern, since it is absent in the names of the 'Eighteen States', and it extends sometimes to non-palatals (Rgya-roñ *zie*, 'gold', < *ser*, Jyā-ruñ *zia*, 'eat', < *za*) no less than palatals (*a-śia*, 'flesh', < *śa*, *chia*, 'wine', < *chan*). 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 *ö*, *eo*, *üo*, *uo*, much complicating the vowel systems.

4. A casual change *ñ* > *w* 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': Thōchū *wā(-rē)*, Go-lok 41 *uè*, 42 *rhoö*, 39 *uö*, 'Outer Man-Tzū' *wa(r-gu)*, Hōrpa *gwē*: Dge-śi-tsha *mña*, Gyārūng *ku-ñgnō*, Rgya-roñ *kō-mū* (< *-mwo* < *-ñwo* < *-ño*), (Hanniu) *ño*, Jyā-ruñ *ko-mñō*, 38 *ñan(-pi)*, Pa-U-Rong *ña*, Muli(Njong) *ño*, (Prü-mi) *ñwa*. [Mo-so *ua*, Lo-lo *ñwa*, &c.].

Tib. *dñul* (Lha-sa *nü*, E. Colonial *nöl*, *nu*, *nou*, &c.), 'silver':  
 41 *uon*, 42 *mivu* (*mvu*), 39 *u*, Menia *mwe*: Mu-nia *nu*, 38 *on*,  
 Muli(Njong) *ñou*, (Prü-mi) *ni*, Loutse 24 *non*, 26 *nui*, Lu-tzū  
*nul*, 35 *nnu*. [Mo-so *ñu*, *ñö*.]

5. Similarly casual, involving perhaps a change  $\tilde{n} > j$ , which occurs in eighth-to-ninth-century Tibetan manuscripts from Kan-su, are forms = Tib. *ña*, 'fish':

Tib. *ña* (Lha-sa *ña*, E. Colonial *ña*, *ñain*), 'fish': Thōchū *izāh*,  
 Go-lok 41 *že*, 42 *gže*, 39 *že*, Hōrpa, *hyā*, Gyārūng *chū-nyo*,  
 Mānyak *yū*, Mu-nia *zō*, 38 *ceñi*, Mi-li (Prü-mi) *cō*.

Cf. Hsi-hsia *žu* (Laufer, No. 5).

6. In regard to final consonants it is necessary to exclude an *-n* which in Thōchū, Hōrpa, and the Rgyal-roñ is found in verbs (Thōchū *ā-jon*, Hōrpa *wa-nzūn*, 'sit', Gyārūng *da-cin*, *ya-cin* = Hōrpa *ta-sin*, *wa-sin*, 'go', &c.): this is probably a formative. Thōchū has also other final consonants (*nūkh*, 'ear', *phyokh*, 'white', *aspic*, 'hunger', &c.), due to absorbed formatives or to compounds.

Of *-s* after consonants, otherwise wholly lost, the Go-lok has curious survivals in 41 *zierk*, 42 *zierk*, 'tongue' = Tib. *ljags*, and 41 *itierk* (< *icierk* < *iciags* < *cags* < *śags*) = Tib. *śaṅs*, 'nose', where *-gs* < *-ṅs* 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 *-s* is lost, except in the Rgyal-roñ, where *-nēs*, '2', and *-śnēs*, '7', are clearly native words.

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

Tib. *yul* (Lha-sa *yü*), 'village', 'country': Thōchū *wē-khā*,  
 Gyārūng *wō-khyū*, Mānyak *hū*.

Tib. *bśul*, 'path': Go-lok 41 *jueu* (= *züö* ?), 42 *guéu*, (*gé-u* ?) and in the above-cited forms of *dñul*, 'silver', and *sbrul*, 'snake'.

Loss of *-r*, not infrequent in E. Colonial Tibetan and attested in the Hōr-pa-Rgyal-roñ country by forms of place-names (*Kungsa*, *Kanzé*, &c. *supra* pp. 83, 85 n.), is seen in Go-lok 41 *saé*, 42 *sö*, Menia *śa* = Tib. *śar*, '(sun)-rise', and in 39 *se-u*, Rgya-roñ *zie* = Tib. *gser*, 'gold' [Lo-lo *śi*, *śö*, &c.], and probably in forms of *dmar*, 'red', and *mar*, 'below'. Several dialects preserve it in Tibetan loan-words, and the Rgyal-roñ perhaps in some others.

Of the nasals *-m* has everywhere, in *prom*, 'white', *khyim*, 'house', and in *sam*, *som*, '3', retained traces. Of *-ñ* 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* (Thōchū *min*, Gyārūng *ka-sman*, 'ripe', Hōrpa *smen*, Rgya-roñ *ti-rmin*, *k-rmien*, Mānyak *min*, 'name', and forms of *mon*, 'sky'). Loss of *-ñ* has been exemplified in the case of *śin*, '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. *phag* (Lha-sa *phak-pa*, E. Colonial *pa*, *pha*), 'hog': Thōchū *pi*, Go-lok 41 *pa*, 42 *pa*, 39 *pe*, Hōrpa *vāh*, Rgya-roñ *pa*, *phā*, *pa(k)*, Mānyak *wāh*, Mu-nia *va*, 38 *pa*, Loutse 24, 26 *ua* [Mo-so *bu*, Lo-lo *vi*, &c.].

Tib. *bsad*, *gsod* (Lha-sa *se*, E. Colonial *sé*, &c.), 'kill': Thōchū *ta-sēh*, Hōrpa *ta-sē*, Gyārūng *nā-sē* (Jyā-run *sia(t)*), Mānyak *na-sya*, Muli(Njong) *ne-se* [Mo-so *su*, Lo-lo *si*, *sié*, &c., Burmese *sat*].

Tib. *chibs*, 'horse': Go-lok 41, 42, 39 (*h*)*ii*, Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) *chie*.

Also in many forms of *nag*, 'black', and those of *brgyad*, '8', *bsad*, 'tell', cited *supra*. Outside the Rgyal-roñ the only traces of original *-g*, *-d*, *-b*, are seen in Thōchū *nyik*, 'black', *nyag-wō*, 'crow', and the Go-lok *nierk*, &c., quoted *supra*: these may, like Loutse 24 *śiot*, 26 *śiet*, Lu-tzū *cied*, '8', be due to special causes, such as borrowing. In the Rgyal-roñ there is a number of apparently unborrowed final *tenues* (*ta-yak*, 'hand' = Tib. *phyag*, *ta-vel*, '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 *-ñ* and *-n*, except after initial or quasi-initial *m*; but in the Rgyal-roñ *-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. *-oñ*, *-on*, *<-añ*, *-uñ*, *-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) Thōchū *rmāh*, 'name', *<рмаñ* *<rmiñ* (cf. 'Tangut' *sañ* for *siñ*, 'wood', and confusion of *sñan* and *sñiñ* in the ancient manuscripts), and Gyārūng *sman*, 'ripe', *<smiñ*; (2) Rgya-roñ *smou*, 'medicine', *ka-rnyou*, 'hear', *<smān*, *(s)ñān*; (3) Thōchū *pi*, 'hog', Mānyak *phwiñ*, 'tooth', *<phag*, *swa(so)*, Thōchū *kśi(-ri)*, Mānyak *si(-bi)*, 'Outer Man-Tzū' *kśi(r-gu)*, Menia *si*, Pa-U-Rong *zi* *<gsam*, elsewhere only *som*, *sam*, &c., (cf. Hsi-hsia *rni*, &c., *<rna*, 'nose', &c. (Laufer, p. 99), and *ni*, *niñ*, *ñe* (Nevsky, No. 217), 'equal' *<mñam*).

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, *treñ* (No. 270), 'heaven', *hrtri* (No. 201), 'change', *bldra* (No. 315), *dbri* (?), also *hbhiñ* (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. Thōchū *grih*, Gyārūng *tri*, Hōrpa *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. *rluñ*, *rus*).<sup>1</sup> Development of *i* after palatals is not apparent. The final consonants *-ñ*, *-n*, *-m*, *-r* are exemplified by Laufer, *-ñ* and *-r* also by Nevsky (Nos. 155, 187, 268; 55, 231, 279, 281, 333), though *-ñ* is lost in *li*, 'wind' = Gyārūng *ta-li*, Tib. *rluñ*. 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*, *ldoñ*);
- (b) initial consonants, *ñ* (*ñal*), *ts* (*tseñ*), *tsh* (*tshun*), *y* (*yab*), *ś* and *ž* (*śi* = *žin*), *z* and *ž* (*zu* = *žu*), *th* (*thiñ*, *thol*);
- (c) initial groups, *sk* (*skeg*), consonant + *y* (*pyi*, *bya*, *mye*), consonant + *r* (*kru*, *prom*);

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps also in *chi*, 'gall' (Laufer, No. 56) = Tib. *mkhris*.

- (d) final consonants, *g* (*cog*, *rbeg*), *ñ* (*ltoñ*, *thiñ*), *n* (*tshun*, *zin*), *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*, *ldehu*, *byehu*), and dialectical alternation *a/e* (*rbag*, *rbeg*);
- (f) derivative *byehu* 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-thañ*, *Dra*, *Gro-pur*, *Zar-phur*, *Śo-ma-ra*, *Skyi-mthiñ*, *Bum-liñ*, *Byar-liñs*), persons (*Myi-rma-bu Ldam-śad*, *Mun-žag-tsa*, *Rgyan-ñar*), superhuman beings (*Srad-po*, *Theg-leg*, *Pya-mañs*, *Dre-da*), and animals (*Spur-bu*, *Thañ-prom*, *Skog-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,<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> *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,<sup>1</sup> was among the collection procured by Sir Aurel Stein in 1907 from the walled-up monastery library in Ch'ien-fo-tung (near to Śa-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-puṇḍarīka*, '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-puṇḍarīka* 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 ll. 353-6) of omission repaired in the right-hand margin by writing in the lengthwise direction of

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> A 'gigantic roll' described by Dr. Hoernle in *JRAS.* 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 discolorations through moisture.

### THE SCRIPT

The script is Tibetan, of a squarish kind, with some few peculiarities characteristic of the early period:<sup>1</sup> the hand is rather coarse, 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 lengthened; 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.<sup>2</sup>

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 confusion of *ñ* and *g* as finals;<sup>3</sup> also of final *h* and *r*, *u* and *o*, initial *rgy*, *rk*) and *rñ*.

With exception of  $\mathfrak{U}$ ,<sup>1</sup> all the single consonant signs of the

<sup>1</sup> 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 frequently the 'inverted' (rightward turned) form; the left limb of *kh* is short.

<sup>2</sup> For particulars see *infra*, p. 126.

<sup>3</sup> 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 *rgy*(*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:

ཀ *k*, ཁ *kh*, ག *g*, ཅ *ñ*,  
 ཆ *c*, ཇ *ch*, ཉ *j*, ཏ *ñ*,  
 ཐ *t*, ད *th*, ན *d*, པ *n*,  
 བ *p*, མ *ph*, ག *b*, མ *m*,  
 ཚ *ts*, ཛ *tsh*, འ *dz*,  
 ཡ *w*, ལ *z*, ལ *z*, ལ *h*,  
 ལ *y*, ལ *r*, ལ *l*,  
 ལ *s*, ལ *s*, ལ *h*

The absence of ལ, derived from Brāhmī *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 *h*, used in Tibetan either as a compendious way of writing postscript *h* or to indicate vowel length (perhaps via the former alternative, *ā*, &c., being *ah*, &c.), has in Nam probably only the former use and only with *a*. The post-consonantal vowels, including the 'reversed' *i*, are as in Tibetan. For final *m*, the *anusvāra*, *ṃ*, 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 *h* as a mark of aspiration is noticeable, because in Tibetan transcriptions of Hsi-hsia words such an *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 *w*- (with *hw*-) is common, while in Tibetan it is rare: *z* and *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 *sg*, *lñ*, *sn*, *cw*, *lc*, *lj*, *ñw*, *sd*, *sn*, *lb*, *mr*, *tshw*, *zw*, *zw*, *zl*, *lw*, *św*, *hr*, *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+ñ*, *b+t*, *b+rt*, *b+lt*, *b+st*, *b+d*, *b+ts*, *b+rts*, *dk*, *dñ*, *dp*, *db*, *mkh*, *mch*, *mj*, *mñ*, *md*, *mn*, *mtsh*, *mdz*. *Mñ* occurs only once, viz. in *mñar* (l. 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*,<sup>1</sup> *ty*, *dy*, *thy*, *rž*, *rś*, *rs*, *sc*,  
 (b) combinations, *gk*, *gch*,<sup>1</sup> *grt*, *gst*, *gld*, *gph*, *bph*, *gb(gbl)*, *gm*, *dd*  
 (one occurrence, l. 95), *sś*, *g-r*, *g-w*,

Moreover, initial *h* seems to occur before nearly all single consonants, conjuncts and combinations;<sup>2</sup> and the great majority of words have usually this prefix, whose occurrence, however, is so capricious as to defy discrimination.

<sup>1</sup> This occurs in old Tibetan manuscripts and documents, where also *kh* and other aspirates are frequently used after Prefixes.

<sup>2</sup> See *infra*, pp. 118–20.

## 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 unilliterate 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> But there are many errors which were probably aural:<sup>2</sup> 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;<sup>3</sup> and there are also errors, probably aural, of other kinds.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> This applies certainly to the instances (*supra*, p. 113, n. 3) of confusion of *rg-(rgy-)* with *rñ-*.

<sup>2</sup> This may frequently be the case with omissions due to anticipation of subsequent words.

<sup>3</sup> Ll. 14, 16, 28, 29, 92.

<sup>4</sup> Notably the confusions of *-u* and *-o* (*supra*, p. 113, n. 3).

<sup>5</sup> 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 :

keḥu-prom, 176, &c. = ḥkeḥu-prom, 177, &c.

kya-wa-ne, 162 = ḥkya-wa-ñe, 215, ḥkya-ḥwa-ñe, 339

kyu-ldoñ, 161 = ḥkyu-ḥldoñ, 339

kruḥu-ḥpro, 321 = ḥkru-ḥbro, 221, &c., ḥkruḥu-ḥbro, 294, &c.

rkabs, 272 = ḥrkabs, 271

skyim-ḥse, 69, &c. = ḥskyim-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 *sñ*, *sp*, *sb*, *sm* (*sñ*, *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*, *gñ*, *gt*, *gd*, *gn*, *gph*, *gb*, *gm*, *gts*, *gdz*, *g-y*, *g-r*, *gś*, *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*- :<sup>1</sup> This alternation, which in cases such as :

ḥraḥ-ḥyos-ḥlam, 25, v. g-rah-g-yo-rbo, 27, ḥraḥ-g-yos-ge-ḥsar, 26

g-rah-ḥyos-ge-ḥsar, 26, v. g-yo-ḥpud-ḥto, 28

stor-ḥdor-ḥyoḥo, 119, v. stor-ḥdor-g-yoḥo, 142

<sup>1</sup> 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-rah* be other than orthographical or phonological. Other cases where no question of function arises are :

ḥmog-ḥce-rgyañ, 52 = gmog-ḥce-rgyañ, 55

gmog-ḥce-ḥsa, 55

rgya (and hrghyaḥ)-ḥñi-ke, 53, &c. = rgyaḥ-gñi-ke, 199

ḥdim(dim)-ḥtshis (chis), 88, &c. = gdim-chis, 94

ḥldag-khri-khyag, 52 = gldag-ḥce-rgyañ, 52

ḥldag-nag, 129, &c. = gldag-nag, 136

ḥldag-ḥnag, 112, &c. = ḥldag-gnag (and nag), 129, &c.

ḥri-sta-meḥi, 311, 312 = g-ri(g-riḥi)-sta-meḥi, 312, 313,

ḥriḥi-sti-ḥyor-re, 300 = g-ri-sti-ḥyor-re 299

ḥpha-ḥñur-ḥñur, 60 = gphaḥ-tsa, 60

ḥsid-ḥriḥi, 62 = síd-g-ri, 34.

In the last two instances, where *ḥpha/gphaḥ* = 'father', and *ḥri/g-ri* = '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, *ḥmog/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*, *ḥb*, in transliteration of Chinese to represent the Chinese initial *n* and *m*<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> See Maspero, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, xx. 2, pp. 32-3, and further instances, partly accordant, in *JRAS*. 1926, pp. 518-19, 1927, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> See *supra*, p. 76; cf. *N'jeh* = *Hbri(-chu)* and *Njong* = *Hjañ* (pp. 2 n. 2, 72).

(e) *h-* does not occur, or at least hardly ever, if ever, occurs,<sup>1</sup> before certain very common words, viz. *dze*, probably a preposition or particle meaning 'on', 'at', &c., *ge*, a particle, the sentence-ending particles *hi*, *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.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. Alternation of tenuis and aspirate :

### *k-kh*

ħkah-ħrdza, 296, v. ħkhaħ-ħrdza, 296.

ħkab-ħdro, 106, v. ħkhaħb-ħdro, 106.

ħko-rño, 53, &c., v. ħkho-ħrño, 189, 267 (rño).

ħkog(ġsom°), 23, v. ħkhog(ġsom°), 21.

krañ(ħldañ°), 124, &c., v. ħkrañ(ħldañ°), 127.

kru-ħrgyañ, 388, v. ħkhru-rgyañ, 187.

ħkru-ħyog, 289, 324, v. khru-ħyog, 321, 322 (ħkhruħu).

### *c-ch*

ca(ħcaħ)-yañ, 235, &c., v. ħcaħ-yañ, 242.

cañ-sme, 262, v. chañ-rdzum, 263.

ci(ħdag°), 259, 261, v. chi(ħdag°), 260, 261.

ħce-ħmu, 200 v. ħche-ħmu, 204.

ġceg(ħso-ħnaħ°), 234 v. ġcheg(ħso-ħnaħ°), 111.

### *t-th*

ta(stor°), 145, v. tha(stor°), 149.

ħtañ-ħrdzo, 218, v. thañ(ħthañ)-rdzo, 130, 132, 220.

ħtar-phyañ, 374, v. thar(ħthar)-phyañ, 348, 69 (pyañ).

tor(ħtor)-ħbroñ, 216, &c., v. thor-ħbroñ, 220.

— (ġ-ri°), 34, v. ħthor(ħriħi°), 62.

ħtor(ġse-ħlad°), 240, v. thor(rñe-lad°), 235.

ħtye(sta-ħldyañ°), 8, v. ħthye(staħ-ħldyañ°), 20.

### *p-ph*

ħpañ(ħriħi°), 290, v. ħphañ(ħriħi°), 302.

ħpu-ħkam, 83, v. phu-ħkam, 130.

pu-ġlo, 116, 135 (ħlo), v. ħphu-ħklo, 40.

ħpu-ħbos(ħpos), 140, 266, v. ħphu-ħbos, 167.

ħpuħi(rgyeb°), 282, v. ħphuħi(rgyeb°), 190.

ħpeg(swah°), 360, v. ħphyegs(swa°), 176.

ħpom, 347, v. ħphom, 147.

<sup>1</sup> The only exceptions are *ħge*, 5, 8, 332.

<sup>2</sup> See *supra*, p. 113, n. 3.

por(ḥtsaḥ°), 291, v. phor(ḥtsa°), 295.  
 ḥpor(ḥnu-glañ°), 175, v. phor(nu-glañ°), 359.  
 pyañ(thar°), 69, v. phyañ(hthar°), 348, 374 (htar).  
 pyar-ma-swañ, 341, v. ḥpyar-ma-ḥswañ, 341.  
 pyi-ḥse, 88, v. phyi-ḥse, 89, 98.  
 — -ske, 143, v. phyi-ske, 79.  
 ḥpyid, 339, 344, v. ḥphyid, 340.  
 pyer(ldañ°), 65, v. phyer(ḥldañ°), 254.  
 prom/ḥprom, 65, 128, &c., v. phrom, ḥphrom, 171, 172.  
*ts-tsh*  
 tsa/ḥtsa, (ḥthañ-le°), 131, 220, v. tshaḥ(ḥthañ-le°), 219.  
 tsur(ḥnaḥ°), 391, v. ḥtshur(ḥnaḥ-ḥdih°), 391.  
 ḥtsog-ḥldañ, 95, v. tshog-ḥldañ, 95.  
 — -ḥram, 35, &c., v. ḥtshog-ḥram, 90.  
 ḥtsors(ḥldag-nag°), 134, v. ḥtshors(ḥldag-nag°), 130.  
 — (ḥbron°), 219, v. tshor(ḥbron°), 220.

### 3. Alternation of tenuis and media :

#### *k-g*

keḥu(ḥkeḥu)-prom, 176, 361, &c., v. geḥu-prom, 362.  
 ḥko-ḥtoñ, 212, v. ḥgo-gtoñ, 210.  
 ḥkor-kla, 205, v. ḥgor-kla, 143.  
 ḥkyud(rdzo°), 220, v. ḥgyud(ḥrdzo°), 16.  
 ḥkri(ḥsí), 81, v. ḥgri(ḥsí°), 38.  
 ḥkroms, 387, v. ḥgroms, 64.  
 ḥklo(ḥphu°), 40, v. glo(pu°), 116.

#### *c-j*

Apparently no occurrence.

#### *t-d*

ḥtaḥ(ḥkhoh°), 328, v. ḥdaḥ(ḥkho°), 329.  
 ḥtor(gstor°), 143, v. ḥdor(stor°), 118, 142, &c.  
 ḥtre(rgyed°), 248, v. ḥdre(rgyed°), 87, &c.  
 ḥltañ(rgyed-ma°), 93, v. ḥldañ(rgyed-ma°), 90, &c.

#### *p-b*

ḥpañ-ḥko-ḥtar, 371, v. ḥbañ-ḥko-ḥtar, 373, 386, 390.  
 ḥpu/ḥpuḥu(ḥtor°), 29, 64, &c., v. ḥbu(ḥtor°), 33.  
 ḥpos(ḥpu°), 141, v. ḥbos(ḥphu°, ḥpu°, ḥpuḥu°), 41, 266,  
 293, &c.  
 ḥpro(kruḥu°), 321, v. ḥbro(ḥkruḥu°, ḥkru°), 221, &c.

#### *ts-dz*

ḥtsaḥ(ḥdzo°, ḥtso°), 30, 62, 73, v. ḥdza(ḥdzo°), 262.

ḥtseḥi/ḥtseḥ (ḥdzo°), 364, v. ḥdzeḥi(ḥdzo°), 338, 339.  
 ḥtso-ḥtseḥi, 342, v. ḥdzo-ḥdzeḥi, 288.  
 ——— -ḥtsaḥ, 62, 73, 115, v. ḥdzo-ḥtsaḥ, 29.

4. Alternation of aspirate and media :

*kh-g*

? khrom, 388, v. ḥgrom, 136, 223 (2).

*ph-b*

ḥtor-ḥphu-ḥgru-dze, 62, v. ḥtor-ḥbu-ḥgru-dze, 33.

*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*: ḥcog-ḥram, 87 = ḥtsog-ḥram, 35, &c.

*ch-tsh*: ḥśi-ḥgri-ḥchim, 38 = ḥśi-ḥkri-ḥtshim, 81; chis (gdim°),  
 94 = tshis (dim°), 95, 88 (*htshis*)

*j-dz*: ḥño-ḥdzam, 264 = ḥñoḥo-ḥjam 273.

joṅ(moṅ°), 78, 118 (ḥjoṅ), &c. = ḥdzoṅ(moṅ°), 64, &c.

rje-ḥbro-re, 138 = rdze-ḥbro-re, 138.

ḥjo(ḥkeḥu-prom°) = ḥdzoḥo(ḥkoḥu-prom°), 361-2.

6. Alternation of *j*, *dz*, and *z* :

gdzu-ḥbyi, 305, &c. = gzu-ḥbyi, 307.

ḥju(ḥraṅ-ḥche°), 115 = ḥzu(raṅ-ḥche°), 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) :

ḥgam(ḥthaṅ°), 131, 221 = ḥrgam(ḥthaṅ°), 133.

ḥgyeb-ḥkru-ḥbro, 221 = ḥrgyeb-ḥkru-ḥbro, 321, 323.

ḥbo-kyer, 144 = rbo(kyer°), 136.

ḥbo-bon 238, &c. } = ḥbom-rbo 111, &c.

ḥpo-rbom 317 }

ḥśaṅ-ḥlad, 225, &c. = ḥrśaṅ-ḥlad, 226, &c.

ḥdzoṅ-ḥyo-ḥśid, 356 = ḥrdzoṅ-ḥyo-ḥśi, 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* :

dwaṅ(ḥkeḥu-ḥkaḥ°), 364 = rwaṅ(keḥu-ḥkaḥ°), 178.

ḥbu-rbye-ḥce-rgyaṅ, 50 = ḥbu-rwye-ḥce-rgyaṅ, 15.

ḥwaḥ-ḥrśaṅ-ḥlamḥi, 224, 228 = ḥgwaḥ°, 229.



## 9. Miscellaneous alternations :

ḥtsaḥ-ḥyer, 250 = ḥscaḥ-ḥyer(g-yer), 166, 296.

ḥnag(ḥldag°), 112, &c. = nag(ḥldag°), 129, &c. = gnag(ḥldag°), 129.

na-ḥgoṅ, 358 = gnaḥ-goṅ(ḥgoṅ), 179, 367.

ḥrgyo-ḥséeg-gségra, 330 = rbyo-gséeg-gsé[g]r[a], 330.

ḥrtaḥ-swaḥ-ḥpeg, 360 = ḥrtaḥ-swa-ḥphyegs, 176.

10. Final consonants : The only at once recognizable case is that of presence and absence of *ḥ* after vowels. It may be said that practically every word ending in *a* occurs in equal or greater frequency with *-aḥ*. The fact that this addition of *ḥ* does not take place after any vowel but *a* (the exceptions, *ḥdih*, 43, *ḥsoḥ*, 75, *ḥkḥoh*, 328, *ḥtseh*, 364, *gdeḥ*, 395, being all questionable) suggests that the practice has some relation to the Tibetan, likewise merely orthographical, use of the *ḥ* in words like *mdaḥ*, &c., to preclude the reading *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 *ḥ* is sometimes retained (or used) before a suffix or final consonant, resulting in Tibetan forms such as *ḥdaḥs*, and Nam forms such as *braḥr*, *ḥnaḥd*. Apart from the question of a functional *-r* there seems to be a scriptural confusion of *-ḥ* and *-r*, visually quite easy, in ll. 17, 163, 302.

A few writings, *g-yaha*, 266, *ḥphahḥa*, 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

iḥi, uḥu, eḥe, oḥo

Of this alternation full particulars have been given in the *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

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. *śa*, *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 *h* 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 *byoḥo* and *soḥo* of two Amdo manuscripts.

Apparent variation between *-e* and *-ehi* and *-e* and *-ehu* in:

hraḥ-we-rtah, 114, 191 = hraḥ-wehi-rta, 139, 380 (hwehi-hrtah).

rwer-ḥmo-ḥchah-byiñ, 97 = rwehi-re-ḥmo-cha-byi, 98.

hke-ḥkah, 152, 158 = hkeḥu-ḥkah, 364.

hke-prom, 176, 360, &c. = hkeḥu-prom, 177, 178, 360, &c.

ḥbe-ḥbah, 235 = ḥbehi-ḥbah, 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 *caḥ*, *ḥca*, *ḥcaḥ*, *cha*, *chah*, *ḥchah*, *ja*, *jah*, *ḥjah*, *tsa*, *tsah*, *ḥtsa*, *ḥtsah*; 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/ihi*, *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* = *Bargandara*<sup>1</sup> 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*.

<sup>1</sup> 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.
- 4, lines 164, 172, 186, 365, 377,  $|||$ : as in line 116.
- 5, line 215,  $|| ||$ .
- 6, line 222,  $| : |$ .
- 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,  $| : |$ .

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 | hnad ||  
 rgyed | ma | hldañ | ge | htsog | hram | hśah ||  
 rta | htsog | hram | [91] ge | htaḥ | rwe | htaḥ ||  
 rta | sko | prom | re | hrtah | hldañ | hkrañ ||  
 htsog | rpu | śe | chañ | [92] pyi | hse | hthoñ ||  
 hkor | htaḥ | hkhen | yañ | sñañ | gyañ | gyañ |  
 hjah | htaḥ | hkhen | 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-roñ 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-baḥi-me-loñ*) in *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, ii, pp. 22, 29. In the *So-sor-thar-pa* (*Prātimokṣa-sūtra*) edited by Satīscandra Vidyābhūṣaṇa (Calcutta, 1915) many such verses can be conveniently examined; perhaps even more accessible is Laufer's edition of the Tibetan *Citra-lakṣaṇa* (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:<sup>1</sup> 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 surprizing 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:

ḥtaḥ | ḥśud | ḥdon | rgyag | dze | ḥtor | ḥdo | ḥchuñ |  
ḥta | śud | meḥi | dze | ḥrtaḥ | ḥjam | ge | ḥmeḥi || 185-6.

11 syllables:

ḥbo | ḥroñ | ḥrog | re | ḥlaḥ | ḥkyan | ḥras | re | ḥśes | gśi |  
ḥdzuḥi |  
rgyeb | ḥchi | ḥro | re | gdag | yañ | la | por | ḥśes | ḥśi |  
ḥdzuḥi || 344-5.

<sup>1</sup> There are a few intentional exceptions, e.g. in ll. 65, 67, where the fifth syllable is the *tsa* of p. 188 *infra*.

ḥbom | rbo | phaṅ | dze | ḥldaṅ | ḥkraṅ | ḥnar | re | ḥbom | rbo |  
ḥldaḥ ||.

ḥmaḥ | ḥldaṅ | ḥyaḥ | dze | rgyed | ḥldag | ḥnag | ge | ḥldaṅ |  
kraṅ | ḥrweḥi || 111-13.

12 syllables :

ḥdzam | ḥbroṅ | ḥroṅ | re | ḥpaṅ | ḥko | ḥtar | dze | ḥlde | ge |  
ḥtaḥ | ḥldon ||.

ḥkrug | kyaṅ | ḥldom | re | ḥrṅe | ḥṅo | ḥdzar | dze | ḥldeḥe |  
ge | ḥtaḥ | ḥldon || 371-2.

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 | ḥsaṅ | ma | ḥpul | dze | ḥmar | ḥbab | ge | ḥrloḥo ||  
ḥbu | rwe | ḥce | rgyaṅ | dze | ḥldyo | ḥtor | ge | ḥnus || 15-16.  
ḥseḥe | ḥldu | ḥru | re | dze | ḥphag | ḥbah | ge | ḥyor |  
ḥcha | ḥgraḥ | nu | nar | dze | ḥkhab | ḥgro | ge | ḥkaḥi || 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 *rta*, in that form or as *rtaḥ*, *ḥrta*, *ḥrtah*, 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 *rta* has that meaning and not *prima facie* any other. But this matter, and more especially when we consider other expressions, such as *ḥso-ḥna*, *ḥtsog-ḥram*, *ḥldaṅ-ḥkhrāṅ*, 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-gsañ-ḥldi-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 *ḥdi*, 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 *ḥkon* (*ni*),<sup>1</sup> which occurs only in that place, may be simply the Chinese word *chüan*, ‘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.<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> The *ni* is a Particle (see *infra*, p. 177).

<sup>2</sup> *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 Himālayan 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 :

*Ltoñ-tehi Mye-kru*

(with variants *te* for *tehi*, *me* for *mye* and *ku*, *kro* and *bkru* (?) for *kru*);

In the language of Tibet :

*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 *mdoñs*, *ldoñ*, *loñ*, all going back, no doubt, to *ldoñ*; and *gloñ*, for *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 *yul-myi-yul*, 'country, man-country', *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 *ltoñ* and *kru* (or *kro*), meaning 'blind', and the third meaning 'eye': the suffix *te* in *ltoñ-te* has a variant form *tehi*. *Ltoñ* is evidently related to the Tibetan *ldoñ*; *mye* or *me* = Tibetan *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 mei: cf. Laufer, *T'oung-pao*, vol. xviii (1916), p. 50). *Kru* or *kro* is perhaps only a dialectical form corresponding to the Tibetan *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 *Tseñ-gi-Rbag-žin*, changed into :

In the language of the Nam-pa kingdom: *Bya-rma-byahi Rma-li, Bychu-rma-byehu-gi Thiñ-tshun* (of which two forms only the second recurs);

In the language of Tibet: *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 *Bya-rma-byahi* means 'bird, peacock-bird'; it is parallel to the *yul-myi-yul*, &c., noted above, and the

suffixal *hi* corresponds to the *hi* of *tehi*. The alternative form *byeħu-rma-byeħu-gi* is the same expression, modified only by substitution of the so-called 'Diminutive' form in *-ħu*, for *-a*, and the Genitive-Adjective suffix *gi* for the equivalent *hi*. It can be shown that such diminutives and the actual form *byeħu* were favoured in north-eastern Tibet. *Thin* is probably equivalent to Tibetan *mthiñ*, which in the form *thiñ* is found in a text from north-eastern Tibet, and which appears in several bird-names, *mthiñ-ga*, 'a bird of deep blue colour', *mthiñ-ril*, 'a wild duck', *mthiñ-ħril*, 'a certain bird': note also *mthiñ-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;<sup>1</sup> 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 *ħdab-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-khaħi-boñ-bu*), 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-ħgi-boñ-bu-stag-cuñ*.

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-zu*, 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 *khoh* of the Thōchū 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<sup>2</sup> (see Hunter, *The Non-Aryan Languages*

<sup>1</sup> d'Ollone, p. 70 (No. 38): in Hsi-hsia *rtai*, *rtsiħ*, *rtsiñ* are given (Nevsky, No. 132) as meaning 'colour'.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *hchaḥ* 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-ldeḥi*  
(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 *Skyyi-mthiñ*, 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 *ldeḥi* is similar to the *te* or *teḥi* 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 *thol* the meaning 'bury', which meaning is not recorded in Tibetan dictionaries, but recurs several times in old Tibetan documents from Central Asia,<sup>1</sup> possibly borrowed from people of the Koko-nor region, since the Tibetans themselves did not normally bury.<sup>2</sup> 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'),<sup>3</sup> brothers we have:

(a) Wife of Ltoñ-te Mye-kru: *Bzagste Nar-ḥbyam*.

<sup>1</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 389: 83, 390: 84 (*btol*), 389: 82 (*gthol*).

<sup>2</sup> See, however, *infra*, p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> On *Gyim* as a tribe-name see *supra*, pp. 33, n. 5, 57.

## (b) Daughters of the same :

Version A : *Tseñ-ḥgi-Rba[g]-ga*, *Tseñ-ḥgi-Rbag-žin*, *Tseñ-ḥgi-Rba[g]-ga*.

Version B :<sup>1</sup> *Rbeg-ga-rbeg-śi* (= *Tseñ-ḥgi-Rbag-žin*) only mentioned in the fragment.

## (c) Wives of Yab-ñal-de-thol-phrom :

*Ldeḥu-zaḥi-ḥbrin-te Sman-skyol*

*Skeg-zaḥi-ḥbrin-te Yar-mo-btsun*

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 'Ldeḥu-woman-middle-[sister]', 'Skeg-woman-middle-[sister]', in two, *Bžagste* and *Tseñ-ḥgi*, is obscure, and in *Rbeg-ga-rbeg* has the form already exemplified in *Glon-myig-loñ* (*Ltoñ-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 *Tseñ-ḥgi-Rba[g]-žin*, who is transmuted into a peacock and flies away from G-yer-mo-thañ to the Skyi-mthiñ country, where she becomes the wife of Gyim-po Ńag-cig ['Number one'], the junior, but wise, son of Yab-ñal-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 Śa-cu region,<sup>2</sup> shows that the original fable had assumed a less definite significance.

<sup>1</sup> Evidently with dialectical difference.

<sup>2</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 366-8 (*°sul*), 28, 32, 34-5, &c.

An aetiological character in the story emerges when we consider that it is to the Skyi country that Tseñ-ḡgi-Rba[g]-zin escapes, and in that country she becomes the peacock bride of Yab-nal-lde-Thol-phrom's son, Gyim-po Ñag-cig. The story begins (in the larger manuscript):

Yul-myi-yul-Skyi-mthiñ-na | √ | Skyi-[yul-sten-yul-Thañ-brga-]rgyal Bod-kyi-skad-du-na

'In a country, man-country, Skyi-mthiñ : Skyi [country, high-country, Thañ-hundred].<sup>1</sup> 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, Thañ-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,<sup>2</sup> 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-mthiñ, a far country', where he meets with 'man, peacock-son (*myi-rma-bu*), Ldam-śad'; and in a different manuscript we have a long account of a certain *Myi-rma-bu-Mchiñ-rgyal*, 'Man, peacock-son, Mchiñ-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 Ñal-lde-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 Jên (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,

<sup>1</sup> '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 = Hórpa *sga*, Muli *ka-te*, Pa-U-Rong *ka-den*, Hsihsia *dgaḥ*, *dghaḥ*, and which probably occurs as *ga* in the longer manuscript; on the word *Thañ* in the name see *supra*, p. 30, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> As explained in *JRAS.* 1927, p. 40, and *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, i, p. 279, n. 6. Cf. *supra*, p. 1, n. 2.

where, no doubt, since he does not suggest any other location, is the home of Ltoñ-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-ñal-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* (*Ltoñ-te* and *tehi*, *hbrin-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

employed with verbs, either to form Causatives or as mere stylistic equivalents of the simple verbs. In the Tibetan documents another verb *ḥkhum*s (Preterite *khums*, and *bkum*; Future *bgums*) is frequently used in the expression *gñer-ḥkhum*s, 'to carry out a task', *gñer* being a verb with the meaning 'employ' or 'have in charge'. This verb *ḥkhum*s, which is not found in the Tibetan dictionaries, is perhaps identical in root with *ḥgum*, 'die', *bkum*, 'kill', and may have meant 'execute' in both senses; but a more likely connexion is with *ḥkhum*s, *skum*, 'contract' (limbs, &c.), whence the dictionary of Ś. C. Das gives 'to practise', 'to impress on the mind' ('concentrate'), and *thos-pa-ḥkhum*, '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*, *ḥprom*, *ḥproms*, *bprom*, *phrom*, *ḥphrom*, is of frequent occurrence in the language of the manuscript, and is nowhere else recorded,<sup>1</sup> and this fact may perhaps be considered decisive of the whole matter.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Also the text has an auxiliary verb *ḥkom*, *gkom*, e.g. in *yob-ḥkom*, l. 166, 'having accomplished a shaking', which is clearly identical with the Tibetan *ḥkhum*s; concerning *prom* and *ḥkom* see *infra*, pp. 199–200.

<sup>2</sup> Is it an accident that has combined the three syllables *Nam-ldoñ-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 'Ldoñ-prom in Nam', or 'Nam-ldoñ 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-ldoñ* is not, in fact, casual, and that the blindness (*ldoñ*) of Mye-kru owes its origin to a never-absent feature of Central-Asian folk-lore, namely, popular etymology. For the *Ldoñ* 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 Ś. C. Das's *Dictionary*, s.v.). The *Ldoñ Sum-pa*, i.e. the *Ldoñ* 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 *Ldoñ Mi-ñag*, as another of the four tribes of 'inner dwarfs'. It looks as if the peoples of the Women's Kingdom and of the *Mi-ñag* country were regarded as subdivisions of a *Ldoñ* race. If that is so, we must include also the Nam people; for the same manuscript which speaks of the *Ldoñ Sum-pa* refers in the same connexion to the *Nam-pa Ldoñ*, the 'Ldoñ of the Nam-pa division', and these seem to be also the *Nam-chen Ldoñ* of the history (p. 65). Accordingly it appears that to the early Tibetans the Ch'iang tribes in general were *Ldoñ*. 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 *Ldoñ*, *Gtoñ*.

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 :

hldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re-mehi-klu-ḥcha-ge-stor-ḥtaḥ-ḥtoni || l. 150,  
which must mean (approximately) :

'the Mehi-klu-hcha, male and female (?), were scattered (or fled)';

and the same verse, with *ḥcaḥ* for *ḥcha* and *yañ-stor-ḥdor-ḥyon* for *ge-stor-ḥtaḥ-ḥtoni* recurs in l. 161. In l. 218 we have :

hldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re-ḥmehi-klu-ḥcaḥ-dze-ḥtor-ḥkko-ge-  
ḥkhoḥi,

and the phrase *hldyañ . . . ḥcaḥ* is found again in l. 343. It is possible that *ḥcaḥ* or *ḥcha* is a pluralizing suffix which occurs in other connexions ; but more probably it means 'harmful creatures', see *supra*, pp. 132-3, *cha*, *ḥcaḥ*, *ḥchaḥ*, &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 :

ḥgru-ḥsram-ḥtam-ge-ḥśes-beg-staḥ  
klu-ḥrto-ḥtsa-ge-ḥśes-ḥbeg-mehi  
klu-rto-ḥtsaḥ-ge-ḥraḥ-ḥyos-ḥlam.

*Ḥśes-ḥbeg* occurs elsewhere and seems to be a divinity, and *ḥraḥ-ḥyos* likewise recurs, meaning probably 'place moved', while *ḥlam* is certainly = Tibetan *lam*, 'road', 'path'. The parallelism of *staḥ*, *mehi*, and *ḥlam*, along with the other antitheses, proves that the meaning of the second and third lines is :

'They being blind [rocks], *Ḥśes-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*, *hrtā*, *hrtah*) 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 :

hṭah | hṣud | ḥdon | rgyag | dze | ḥtor | ḥdo | ḥchuñ |  
hṭa | ṣud | meḥi | dze | hṛtaḥ | ḥjam | ge | ḥmeḥi ||

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).<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> 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',<sup>1</sup> and to its causative form *hgyed*, 'scatter, disperse, set going', with Preterite *bgyes*, Future *bkye*. In connexion with Tibetan forms beginning with *gy*, *gr*, *gl* there is always reason to anticipate alternatives with *by*, *br* or *dr*, *bl*, of which alternation we have here, in fact, an instance; for the more common form in Tibetan is *hbye*, 'open, separate, resolve into', with Causative *hbyed* (Preterite *phye*, *phyed*, *phyes*, Future *dbye*), 'open, disunite, set at variance, divide', *rigs-kyi-sgo-nas-dbye-na*, 'if classified according to the different species (*rigs*)'. This form *hbyed* is, in fact, the one used (*dbye*, Future or Prospective) in the Tibetan manuscript to denote the 'separation' of species. In the Nam we should, on the analogy of its *glo*, 'mind' (ordinary Tibetan *blo*, but in Central-Asian documents *glo*), expect the *g* form. Incontestably therefore we recognize in the Nam word *rgyed* the meaning 'divide', 'separate'; and in regard to *rgyed-ma* we scarcely need to cite the Tibetan *hgyed-ma*, which the authors of Ś. C. Das's *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 *supra* (p. 129) in ll. 248-9 of the text. The last sentence there reads:

hldi-rgyed-hrar-rgyed-htre-hte-ge-gse-hso-hkoni (= hkon-ni).

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

gse-htah-hdam, 248,

hse-htah-hdam, 326,

'*gse-ta* was bound or condemned',

<sup>1</sup> Ś. C. Das's *Dictionary*: *de-dag-las-gyes-so*, 'they have proceeded from those (their ancestors)'. So also in the *Rgyal-rabs* (ed. Francke, *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, ii, p. 21, l. 2) *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,

‘requit 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, *śo*-Chapter.’

What is *hśo*? The two other occurrences of the word throw no light upon its meaning. It is clearly not = Tibetan *śo*, ‘dice’, *śo*, ‘blast, blight, mildew’, *śo(-gam)*, ‘tax, toll’, *śo(-re)*, ‘defect, flaw, notch, gap’, *gśo/bśo*, ‘pour’, *žo*, ‘curds’, *žo*, a certain weight, *žo*, ‘spot, speck’, *bśos*, ‘victuals’, *so*, ‘attachment’, ‘desire’, *so* ‘tooth’, *so, bso*, ‘watchman’, ‘guard’, ‘spy’, *so-ga/sos-ka*, ‘summer’, *so/gso/bso*, ‘feed’, ‘nourish’, ‘cure’; and we have so far no reason for thinking of *bśo*, ‘pour’, ‘vomit’, ‘copulate’. Remembering that in the Tibetan manuscript the opening chapter is

*cho-smos-paḥi-leḥu*

‘chapter telling of the beginning’,

we might be tempted to equate *śo* 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 *śo* 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 uphill<sup>1</sup> (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

<sup>1</sup> *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).

*g-rah-hyos* in l. 26, while in l. 27 we find *g-rah-g-yo*, and in l. 28 *g-yo-hpud-hto*. 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<sup>1</sup> is certain from another Tibetan manuscript, which tells of a girl queen of the Myan country, who was keeping down the local fiend, so that:

'When in the high-country was quaking (*g-yos*), in the Myan 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)

sta-re-ḥmo-ge-sta-ḥri-ḥdyañ

if that means something like

'Where were the clouds (or heavens, *ḥmog* or *ḥmo*), 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, *Hśes-ḥbeg*, in name resembling the serpent Śeṣa of Indian mythology, who 'by moving his coils lays the mountains in ruins'.<sup>2</sup> The end of the cataclysm is stated in the verse

hsaḥ-yob-ḥkom-re-ḥrañ-ḥraḥ-ḥtsuḥu ||, 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

<sup>1</sup> On frequency of earthquakes in borderlands of east Tibet see Tafel, ii, pp. 195, 197; Johnston, p. 132; Gill, p. 218; Fergusson, p. 206.

<sup>2</sup> See the Sanskrit *Harṣa-carita*, 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-loñ*), which remarks that

'Well known is the lineage of the gods according to Bon-po ideas',<sup>1</sup> has preserved in its early pages some little of this, though with Buddhist admixture.

Whether the Nam narrative was of the same interminable character<sup>2</sup> 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,<sup>3</sup> 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)uñ-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 *phuñ-phye*, which is not given in the Tibetan dictionaries, obviously means 'heap, mass, aggregate (*phuñ*) 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 (*phuñ*) new (Tib. *gsar*) strength (*ñar*)',

and that in

*hkrug-hrdzo-hgyud-dze* (18)

'upon the quarrelsome *hrdzo* (sc. *yak*) race'

<sup>1</sup> Prof. A. H. Francke's translation (*Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, ii), p. 76.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the remarks of Huc and Gabet (ii, p. 82) on 'interminable series of tales and legends' among the 'Si-fan nomads'.

<sup>3</sup> Likewise among the T'u-yü-hun it was illustrated by the story of King A-ch'ai's sons and the arrows (Bichurin, i, p. 79).

and in

ḥkrug-kyañ-ḥldom-re-ḥrñe-ḥño-ḥdzar (371-2)

‘strife being bound down, foe and friend were united’

*ḥkrug* really is = Tibetan *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;<sup>1</sup> 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 *ḥtsog-ḥram*, which certainly means ‘friendly association’, and ll. 124-7 six similar verses concerning *ḥldañ-ḥkrañ*, 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:

ḥkhu-tsa-śid-dze-ḥpha-ḥñur-ḥñur

gphaḥ-tsa-glom-dze-ḥkhu-ḥñur-ḥñur

‘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:

chos-ta-ñan-re-ḥde-ta-rgyen-ḥlab-ta-ḥwen ||

ḥnaḥ-ḥchos-ḥre-ge-ḥldañ-myi-śeg |

spye-chos-ḥre-ge-gtsañ-myi-ḥrgan |

śi-ḥchos-re-ge-ḥpu-myi-ḥldin ||

<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup>

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 *thans*. The wild yak, hunted with lasso and spear,<sup>2</sup> is noted for his malignancy. His tame fellow, with the *dzo* (*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-tāgh range, probably were, in their agricultural occupation of the fertile uplands of the Nanshan, most concerned with the ass,<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> So in the Tibetan manuscript. On slings or lassos in Tibet see Rockhill, p. 120, *Diary*, p. 264 ; Bonvalot, ii, p. 5 ; Filchner, *Om Mani Padme Hum*, p. 156.

<sup>3</sup> As regards Kan-su see d'Ollone, p. 202.



wild animals; we also read of clean descents (*stegs*) 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-ḥgaḥ-ḥkañ-ḥyañ-ḥrag-ma-ḥbog ||

in which *ḥrag* 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 *ḥkañ* = Tibetan *gañ*, ‘full’, which in itself is not improbable and which suits

ḥtor-sñiñ-ḥkañ-ge, 168

‘great-heart-full’,

we get the rendering (cf. l. 283, *ḥrag* . . . *ḥbog*)

‘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 *Hśes-ḥbeg*, 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 ‘Ḥnam-people’, the upper sky (*gnam*) folk of the old Bon mythology.<sup>1</sup> Fiends (*rñe*) are located (l. 385) in dark subterranean hollows.

The social attitude of the text is distinctly aristocratic. The

<sup>1</sup> The evident suggestion (ll. 332, 344) that *Hśes* in this name = *śes*, ‘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.* ?

*lde*, 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 *hkyan*, who are mentioned sometimes in connexion with the 'house-poor' (*na-hpoñ*) 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,<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> This, however, may have been only in the case of chiefs and leading persons<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> 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 Cimbri or the Teutons.

<sup>2</sup> Authority for these statements in Bushell, pp. 443, 527(9), 531(42), and Rockhill, p. 339.

<sup>3</sup> 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',<sup>1</sup> 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;<sup>2</sup> 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-lok 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*,

<sup>1</sup> See p. 286, and cf. Cooper, *Travels of a Pioneer of Commerce*, pp. 238, 241.

<sup>2</sup> 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) *hḍrab-hwa-hrañ* (ll. 162, 173); (3) the above-mentioned *mehi-klu-hcaḥ* (ll. 150, 161, 218, 343). Considering that the *mehi-klu-hcaḥ* have a fabular origin, it seems prudent to reserve a further consideration of any of the three.<sup>1</sup>

But in the expression *moñ-rdzoñ* (*rjōn*) we have a reference of considerable importance. The phrase clearly means 'Moñ-fort', and the reference is to the 'castles of the Mons'.<sup>2</sup> 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-moñ*, once *śes-hṛtsig-moñ*, occurring three times in ll. 379–81. *Rtsig-moñ* means 'Moñ carpenter', *rtsig*, from *rtsig*, 'build', having this sense not only in ordinary Tibetan, but also in Hsi-hsia<sup>3</sup> (*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. Ssū-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'.<sup>4</sup>

We do not, however, need to prove that 'Mon'<sup>5</sup> people may have been, as early as the eighth to ninth century A.D., within the purview 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-thañ*) and Mon cotton as grown in 'Mon-plain'

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, pp. 253 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> We naturally think of the towers and forts mentioned *supra*, p. 71, n. 8.

<sup>3</sup> See Nevsky, No. 77.

<sup>4</sup> According to Dr. Tafel, ii, p. 155, carpenters and smiths in Tibet are Ssū-ch'uanese, never Tibetans. . . . In the Rgyal-roñ the builders and carpenters belong to a particular tribe (p. 248 n.).

<sup>5</sup> On *-n/-ñ* see *infra*, p. 362.

(*Mon-mo-than*); 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 Ś. 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-rta-dwang*,<sup>1</sup> *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 Himālaya (*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-Himālayan Mons extending as far east as Assam; and there is

<sup>1</sup> The *Geografia Tibeta* has (p. 37) *Mon-rta-lwan*.

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-śan ('the Gam mountains'), the Turks (*Hor*) of the Gyim-śan ('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-ñag (also considered above); and the Se-Ḥa-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.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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 Ssü-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-Himālaya, 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.<sup>1</sup> The event decidedly recalls the history (p. 24) of the Sha-t'ō 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 Lonü 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 Ssü-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-roñ. 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-roñ 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,

<sup>1</sup> 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 'Moñ-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-roñ. From a Tibeto-Burman Mon language the Rgyal-roñ 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-roñ, 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 Ssü-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-roñ Prefixes, namely *ka*, prefixed to adjectives, is so, in fact, employed in Abor-Miri, Daflā, and Mishmi, as well as in Kachin 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-roñ 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 'Moñ-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 . . .'
- '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' (*mtho-mkhar*) and 'Low Town' (*dmah-mkhar*) appears in 'the Tibetan manuscripts', where we read also of building the 'upper town (*rlan-mkhar*) aloft, aloft', the upper mansion (*rla-khyim*) and courtyard (*phyugs-ra*), and the upper path zig-zag (*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 (*rdzoñ*), commonly occupy elevations towering over the residential town. The heaven paradise (*gnam*) was conceived on the same lines, having the 'castle eminent' (*rdzañ-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 (*gnam*), through the lower (*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 Śa-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 Śa-cu there were some with Bon-po rather than Buddhist interests;<sup>1</sup> 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 Śa-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:

rbyo-po-nañ-gsañ-ḥseg-ḥlab-dze-rbyo-ḥpro-ḥro-grteḥe-ḥta-  
stel-re-ḥlab-ta-gboḥu-ste-ge-ḥthogs-re-ḥlab-ge-plañna.

<sup>1</sup> The divinity *Hśes-ḥbeg* (*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 (*gsañ*, or is *nañ-gsañ* simply = Tibetan *sañ-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 (*hpro(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*, *gdeh*, 'fix', 'establish', 'institute',<sup>1</sup> and will accordingly mean 'fixing', 'determining'; (3) *hpro* = Tibetan *hphro*, meaning 'going forward', 'continuing',<sup>2</sup> e.g. *hphro-blañs*, 'resumption of an unfinished work', *hphro-machad-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 *plañ* ("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-hru*,

which must mean

'if the heart (or affection)<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>1</sup> Nevsky, No. 25.

<sup>2</sup> In ll. 245-6 it is antithetical to *hlad*, 'retaliate'.

<sup>3</sup> On *sñañ* = *sñiñ* or *sñan* see *infra*, p. 367.

The concluding phrase, *hlab-ge-planna*, 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:

śes-rtsig-moñ-ge-ḥtsaḥ-ḥrahi-	hdza-ḥldaḥi-ḥne-ge-tsaḥ-rgye-
ḥwehi-ḥrtaḥ-ge	ḥrdza-na
ḥrtsig-moñ-ḥkuñ-na	ḥdzah-ḥldaḥ-ḥkuñ-na
rtsig-moñ-ḥsad-na	ḥdza-ldaḥ-ḥsad-na
tsig-moñ-we-ge-ḥtsaḥ-ḥpu-	ḥdzah-ḥldaḥ-ḥwehi-ge-ḥtsaḥ-
ḥloḥo	rgye-ḥlo

Intentional rhyme may be seen, e.g. in

ḥstor-moñ-ḥdzoñ-re-ḥtsa-ḥdzo-ḥkrom  
 gsu-prom-ḥño[-]r[e]-ḥtsaḥ-ḥpu-ḥdrom || (ll. 64–5)

and inversion of antithetic predicates (*hrgom* and *hrgam*) in

ḥrgom-ḥkhru[-]r[e]-ḥto-na-ḥpeḥi-ḥrgam-re-ḥto (l. 169)

Finally there are instances (see *infra*, pp. 269, 285, 304) of play upon words, e.g. on *ḥdro*, ‘go’, and *ḥdro*, ‘heat’, in

ḥphu-ḥphu-mu[-]r[e]-ḥdzu-ḥdro-ḥkus (l. 352)

‘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<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 132-6, 150-1.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> See *supra*, p. 87, n. 1.

Nam composition emanated. We see that there was oral literature of the Purāṇic 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, confirmable 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 up-lifted, &c.; controlled by H̄ses-ḥbeg, 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 *ḥgru-ḥldañ-ḥmah*; disunion among the horse's friends, ll. 35–6; reflections upon evils and their consequences.

Lines 49–61: Disadvantages of greatness.

Lines 62–71: *Ḥgru-ḥldañ-ḥmah*: 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 moonlight in place of sunlight, and the fallen are replaced. The horse, when the *ḥgru-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

(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 deprivation 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 253–85: Long description of the happy circumstances of restored peace.

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 344–52: Proverbial sayings concerning government.

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 *gñi*, *gdim*, *gldag*, *gnag*, *gpha*, *gmog*, *g-yo*, *g-raḥ*, *g-ri*. We may here add:

gkom, 222 (swa° °re) = ḥkom, 175 (swa° °re)

gcig, 356 (ste-ḥe-ḥdzu-ge) = cig, 194 (ste-gdzu-ge)

gciḥi, 346 = ḥci/ḥciḥi, 205, 301, 348, 350

gcog, 69

gcheg, 111, 234 (gceg) = ḥceg, 250

gñi, 80

gñim, 12

gtañ, 186 = ḥtañ, 96

gtoñ, 211 (ḥgo°) = ḥtoñ, 212 (ḥko)

gstor, 143 (°ḥtor), 152 (°ta) = stor, 118, &c. (°ḥdor), 145, &c.  
(°ta)

grteḥe, 181 = ḥrteḥu, 265 (?)

gdaḥ, 191 = ḥdaḥ, 108

gdag, 200, 204, 206 = ḥdag, 259, 260, 261

gdes, 260

- gdod, 186  
 gnaḥ, 179, &c. (°goñ, °ḡgoñ) = na, 358 (°ḡgon, °ḡgon)  
 gboḥu, 181 = ḡbo, 263  
 gblañ, 265  
 gtsañ, 165 (ḡsaḥ°) = ḡtsañ, 378 (ḡsaḥ°)  
 gtsu, 214 = ḡtsu, 193, 304, ḡtsuḥu, 166, 303 = ḡtshu, 75,  
 76, 215, tshu, 206  
 gtsob, 351, 352  
 g-waḥ/ḡgwah, 224, 229 (°ḡrśañ) = ḡwa, 228 (°ḡrśañ) =  
 ḡwaḥ, 224 (°ḡrśañ)
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| { | g-we, 197, &c. = ḡwe, 85, &c., we, 114, &c. |
|   | g-weḡi, 199, 263 = ḡweḡi, 22, &c., 139, &c. |
|   | g-weḡe, 201, &c. = ḡweḡe, 348               |
|   | g-wer, 164, 301 = ḡwer, 19                  |
- gzu, 307, &c. (°ḡbyi) = ḡdzu, 305, &c. (°ḡbyi)  
 gzu, 353 (°ḡdro) = ḡdzu, 183, 352 (°ḡdro)  
 gzo, 165 = ḡdzohu, 362  
 g-yah, 287 (°ḡthañ) = ḡyah, 285, &c. (°ḡthañ)  
 g-yañ, 31 (°ra) = ḡyañ, 66, 226 (°ḡrah)  
 g-yeḡi, 271, g-yeḡe, 166 = ḡyeḡi, 209 (?)  
 g-yer, 167 (ḡscaḥ°), 330 (ḡsaḥ°) = yer, 141 (ḡsaḥ°) = ḡyer,  
 267 (ḡsaḥ°), 297 (ḡscaḥ°)  
 g-yog, 15, 51, 200, 320  
 g-yog, 156 = ḡyog, 289, 324, &c.  
 g-rub, 261 = ḡrub, 108, 349  
 g-roñ, 71  
 glab, 180 = ḡlab, 180, &c.  
 glo, 116 (pu°) = ḡlo, 135 (pu°)  
 ḡśañ, 30, 263, &c. = ḡśañ, 81, 199, 255, &c.  
 ḡśi, 44, 244 (śes°, ḡśes°) = ḡśi, 44, 245 (śes°, ḡśes°)  
 ḡśim, 268  
 ḡśe, 49 (°ḡdzro-ḡñah) = ḡśeḡe, 369 (°rdzor-ḡñah)  
 ḡśeg, 381 (°ḡśer) = ḡśeg, 330 (°ḡśegra)  
 ḡśog, 7, 20 = ḡśog, 8, 20  
 ḡsaḥ, 276, 333 = ḡsaḥ, 165, 166, &c.  
 ḡsañ, 228 (°ḡrah) = ḡsañ, 226 (°ḡrah)  
 ḡsar, 204 = ḡsar, 255  
 ḡsas, 262 = ḡsas, 59, 116, &c.  
 ḡsu/gsus, 64, 99 (°slo) = ḡsus, 93 (°slo)  
 ḡse, 327 (°ḡko-ḡgyan) = ḡseḡi, 325 (°ḡko-ḡgyan) = ḡseḡe,  
 327 (°ḡkho-ḡo-ḡgyan)

gsen, 349

gso, 151, 193, 194

gsoḥu, 358 = ḥso, 201

gsom, 23, 178, 206, &c.

gsom, 10, 117, &c. (?)

There are also forms with *gw-* (*ḥgweg*), *gy-* (*ḥgyud*, *ḥgyeb*, *gyim*, &c.), *gr-* (*gras*, *ḥgru*, *gre*, *ḥgro*, &c.), *gl-* (*gla*, *ḥglu*, *gleḥu*, *glog*, &c.), in which the *g* is not a Prefix.

### 3. *d-*:

dgu, 75, 77, 225, &c. = dguḥu, 236, 244

dgu, 127 = ḥgu, 126

ddyim, 95 (°pyi) = gdim, 88, &c. (°pyi, °phyi) = dim, 95 = ḥdim, 88.

4. *b-*: For a list of *b*-forms in the Verb system see p. 194: and concerning the remaining three, *b̄zir*, *b̄zer*, *bzod* see *infra*.

5. *m-*: *m̄nar*, 261 (*myag* 39 &c. may not contain *m*-Prefix).

6. *r-*: List and discussion pp. 347–52.

7. *l-*: *lgyoḥo*, 11, *lpyoḥo*, 22. The numerous words with *ld-*, *ldy-*, may not contain *l*-Prefix: see pp. 317 sqq., 353–4.

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/ḥgu* probably = '9' (Tib. *dgu*), and *ddyim*, a casual variant of *dim/gdim/ḥdim*. *M-* is apparent only in *m̄nar* (a single instance) and possibly in *myag*, 'spoiled', 'corrupted', the former being perhaps Locative of a *m̄nah* = Tib. *m̄nah*, '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 *gpha/hpha* (Tib. *pha*), 'father', where there can be no question of functional difference, actual or original. Hence it must be that

*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 *hdzoḥo/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/hzu/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-rah/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, *bžir*, 'true', 'wise' (?), *bžer*, 'fort' (?), *bzod*, 'bear' (verb), of which the first and third are ἀπαξ ἐιρημένα, the second and third Tibetan: *bžir* is possibly = Hsi-hsia *gžir*, 'wise' (Nevsky, No. 281). In view of the rarity of *ž* 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, Žaň-žuň, 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:

I	II
<i>Without following consonant</i>	<i>With following consonant</i>
k	kw, ky, kr, kl
kh	khw, khy, khr
g	gw, gy, gr, gl, gly
ñ	ñy (?)
c, ch, j, ñ	
t	tw, ty, tr
th	thw, thy, thr
d	dw, dy, dr
n	
p	pw, py, pr, pl
ph	phy, phr, phl
b	by, br, bl
m	my (before <i>a</i> , <i>i</i> , and <i>e</i> )
ts	tsw
tsh	
dz	dzw
w	
ž (3 words only)	
z (a few words) confused with dz (?)	
h	
y	
r	rw, rl
l	lt, ld, ldy, (g)ly
ś	
s	sw, sr, sl, sk, sky, skh, sc, sñ, st, sp, spy, sby, sm, smy, sts, sś (partly with <i>s</i> -Prefix ?)
h (?)	

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

bžir, bžer, ržan

of which *bžir* is possibly Hsi-hsia and *bžer*, 'fort' ('mart'?, 'magazine'?), is common in old Tibetan names, while *ržan* may (but

see p. 352) be a casual variant of *rśaṅ*, *hrśaṅ*. In the Berlin manuscript we find also *že* (ll. 2, 3), perhaps a similar variant of *je*, which occurs (l. 10) in the same connexion. Nam *z* occurs in

*hzaḥ*, *hzu*, and *gzu* (with variants *hju*, *gdzu*, and *hdzu*), *gzo*, *bzod*, (*g*)*bzaṅ* (?)

Since none of these, except *gzu* (2) and *hzu* (2), has more than a single occurrence, and since *gzo*, *bzod*, and *bzaṅ* all exist as Tibetan words, it is likely *a priori* that, if not scribal errors, all the words are borrowed.<sup>1</sup> *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-žun*, 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-žun*. The combinations *pw* and *dzw* are peculiar to Nam:<sup>2</sup> *pl* and *phl* it shares with *Žaṅ-žun*, the first of the two also with Central-Asian Tibetan (*plan*) 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*;<sup>3</sup> 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*, *sb*, *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.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> On *w* in Nam see pp. 336 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> In Hsi-hsia (Nevsky, Nos. 239, 246) *g-liḥ* occurs (as a variant of *gli*, *liḥ*, *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.<sup>1</sup> 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, ñ, d, n, b, m, ḥ, r, l, s  
gs, ñs, bs, ms (with the addition of rs)

and *ḥ* sometimes (as in Tibetan manuscripts) precedes a final consonant. There is no occurrence of the *drag*, i.e. *d* in the combinations

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*, *ñ*, we seem always to have *yi*, never *i*, after *m* sometimes (*mye*) *ye* for *e*; (*b*) *cu*, *ñu*, *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 *aḥa*, *iḥi*, &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-ḥo* 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 *ehu* and *ohu* are real and somewhat frequent.<sup>2</sup> The case of *aḥi* (*rtahi*, *ḥpahi*, *pahi*), *uḥi* (*hruḥi* *ḥphuḥi*, *ḥpuḥi*, *ḥmuḥi*), *oḥi* (*ḥkōḥi*), and perhaps also those of *eḥi* (frequent), require further consideration with regard

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 182–3, 185, 201.

<sup>2</sup> 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/rno*, 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 :

hldyañ-hjo-hkromni, 389, v. hldyañ-hyu-hjo-cig-dze-htor-ge-hkroms, 387

hrno-htoḥu-re-ḡgyaṅ ||, 7, v. smyi-nu-ḡgyaṅs, 241

hlab-ma(me)-hñi, 67, v. hlab-me-hñis ||, 70

ldyo-stor-hthu-re, 140, v. ḡjim-ta-hthusni, 156

stor-ta-hthogni, 149, v. stor-ta-hthogs ||, 145

thor-hbron-tshor-na, 220, v. htor-hbron-htsors, 219, hldag-nag-htshors, 130

śes-hśi-breḡe, 44, v. keḡu-prom-hbres, 176

hkoḡu-hprom, 169, v. htor-htas-hproms, 121–2.

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-ḥdzoñ, 139

we already know that *moñ-ḥdzoñ* 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

ḥño-ḥkhob-ḥprom, 322 'face-cover-do', ḥño-stor-ḥprom ||,  
128, 'friends-scatter-do', stor-rño, 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 *gtsañ-myi-ḥrgan* (l. 160), 'the corn does not mature', and other sentences. Since we know further that *śid* means 'high', it appears from

ḥśid-ḥriḥi-ḥthor-dze, 62

where *ḥriḥi* must be = Tibetan *ri* 'mountain', that the Adjective may precede the Substantive: from *ḥldi-rgyed-ḥrah*, '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-ḥśid-dze, 11

since *dze* is a very common particle, we have the *ḥśid* following *wam*, and in the frequent *ḥrah-ḥldi*, 'this place' (at the beginning of verses in ll. 225, &c.) and in the antithetical line (ll. 132–3)

ḥbri-ḥldi-ḥthañ-re-ḥre-ḥldi-ḥyah

the Pronoun evidently follows its Noun. In ll. 57–60 there is a succession of verses beginning

-ḥce-rgye-dze

preceded by a varying monosyllable (a Noun). Since *dze* is familiar, *ḥce-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-vr̥his* 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-hrah* and many others, such as *g-ri-hruhu* (l. 21), 'mountain-horn' (peak), *hrdzo-hgyud*, 'mdzo-race', *Moñ-rdzoñ*, 'Moñ-castle'. Many other Case relations are similarly expressed merely by prefixing the subordinate term, e.g. *hnañ-hchos* (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.<sup>1</sup> But it can be clearly recognized as preceding the verb in :

su-me-hmeñi, 114, 'Who kindles a fire ?'

hpu-ge-me-hmuñi, 183, 'The sons (?) cool the fire'

and derivatively in numerous compounds, such as :

rgyed-hdre, 87, 'division-inducing', hwam-weñi, 196, 'mansion-making',

and the same or other cases in :

gse-hlad, 240 &c., 'requit of injury'

rñe-hlad, 231, 'requit of wrong'

hkhah-hgro, 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 :

śi-hchos-re-ge-hpu-myi-ldin ||, 160

'Winter-born, a bird does not fly'

hkhu-tsa-śid-dze-hpha-hñur- hñur ||, 60

'When the uncle-people are high, the father groans'

<sup>1</sup> Thus *hño-khob-prom* (l. 322), *hño-hdañ-prom* (l. 258) may be rendered 'made a face-hiding', 'made a face-rest'.

rgam-ḡgaḡ-ḡkaḡ-ḡyaḡ-ḡrag-ma-ḡbog ||, 256

‘Though the deep places were filled, the dykes were not fouled’

ḡjo-me-ḡdub-re-ḡla(b)-me-ḡñis ||, 70

‘When the *ḡjo*-fire sinks, the *ḡlab*-fire shines out’

ḡtaḡ-rdzo-ḡkyud-na-ḡbroḡ-ḡdru-ḡjar, 220

‘In the *mdzo*-race of the *ḡtaḡ*-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*, *ḡyaḡ*, *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 *ciḡ*, *te* (*de*, *ste*), *yaḡ*, *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*:

Lines 7, 20 42, 43 (?), 48, 49, 65, 86-7, 99, 128, 130, 132, 143, 153, 163, 164, 166, 169, 171, 173 (2), 174, 183, 184, 186-7 (?), 188-9 (?), 190, 196, 197, 209, 216-17 (?), 219, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 237, 242-3, 243, 245, 246, 248, 254, 257-8, 285, 287, 289, 290, 292-3, 293, 296, 301, 303, 310-11, 312 (2), 315, 315-16, 317, 318, 319, 322, 326, 328, 331, 333-4, 337, 339, 339-40 (2), 341, 352, 353, 354-5, 358, 359, 362 (?), 365 (2), 366 (2), 392 (?).

(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:

hñah-ḥtsu-rpag-re-hñah-mo-ḥgam ||  
 hñah-mo-ḥrpag-[re]-gso-nad-ḥgam  
 gso-nad-rpag-re-ḥkah-ḥgañ-ḥjor.

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:

myi-re-ḥti-ni-myi-[re]-ḥśi ||  
 myi-rgye-myer(= mye-re)-ḥchos-ḥyo-ḥjo  
 ḥti-rgye-mye-dze-ḥgye-ḥkrom-ḥkrom ||

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*.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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*.<sup>1</sup> 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:

ldyoño, 318 (a doubtful reading)

<sup>1</sup> 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 :

ħkruħo, 316

and frequently perhaps in forms with *o* such as :

lpyoħo, 22, ħyoħo, 119, ħtoħo, 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 *ħyo* and *ħto*.

(b) *ħi*, which follows a consonant in :

(1) forms written as one word, viz.

ħdzomħi, 134, ħñahghī ||, 137, ħkañħi ||, 164, ħpyedħi, 208, modħi, 212, ħrdagħi ||, 214, ħlamħi, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, ħtronħi, 224, 243, stomħi, 255, ħwadħi ||, 301, ħlobħi, 378, ħrlomħi | : |, 385,

(2) forms written as two words, viz.

ħthul-ħi, 67, ħlad-ħi, 230, 237.

In both (1) and (2) the *ħi* seems to be everywhere extra-metrical, though we may allow a doubt in the case of *stomħi* and *ħlobħi*.

After a vowel there are numerous cases of *-iħi*, which may be left out of the question for the reason noted in regard to *-oħo*; but parallelism of adjacent verses sometimes indicates the Suffixal character of the *ħi*. With *-eħi* also there are numerous instances :

ħkeħi ||, 15, 41, 202, ħrweħi ||, 22, 113, 198, meħi ||, 25, 115, 311, 312, 313, rñeħi, 86, ħmeħi, 114, 186, ħdeħi ||, 167, g-weħi ||, 199, 263, ħreħi ||, 204-5, ħgyeħi ||, 209, ħkheħi ||, 212, g-yeħi ||, 271, ħdzeħi, 338, 339, ħtseħi, 342, ħpeħi, 386, 387.

Here there is no question of extra-metric value of the *ħi*, since all words ending in *-eħi* are monosyllabic. In some cases there may be doubt on the ground that alternate forms *-e* and *-eħi* are found also in non-final positions : of this *meħi* and *ħdeħi* (each of them, no doubt, a homonym) are examples. But most of the words occur *only* as finals and probably, therefore, contains sentence-ending *ħi*.

With *uħi* we have :

ħmuħi, 183, ħphuħi, 276, ħpuħi ||, 282, ħdzuħi ||, 345, 346, of which *ħphuħi* and *ħpuħi* 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.

*ohi* is seen in *hkhad-htohi* (l. 324, extra-metrical *hi*), *hkhohi* || (l. 218, perhaps in a 12-syllable verse and with *o+extra-metrical hi*).<sup>1</sup>

*ahi* occurs only in

*hkaḥi*, 239, *ḥpaḥḥi*, 384,

where, if = *hka+hi*, the *hi* is extra-metrical; but *rtahi* (l. 174, but *hrtah*, l. 360), *paḥi* (l. 262) and *ḥpaḥi* (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 an 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  
ḥbros-na-ni-myi-thar  
rgal-na-ni-myi-thub  
‘Pursuing, cannot overtake;  
Fleeing, cannot get away;  
Contending, cannot overcome’

and

kha-ḥod-de-ni-dmar  
so-ḥo-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

ḥthogni (2), 149, ḥton[n]i, 150, 152, ḥkarni ||, 151, ḥgyaṅni, 153, ḥthusni, 156

<sup>1</sup> *-o*hi non-final in the sentence is monosyllabic in *hkoḥi* (l. 170), like *hkoḥu* in ll. 171, 172, 173, 174, &c.

and internally in l. 153 :

myi-re-ḥti-ni-myi-[re]-ḥsí ||.

The other occurrences, viz.

kyañni, 192, rgyen[n]i, 198, ḥkon[n]i || °° ||, 249, ḥbogni, 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 :

ḥtor-ḥpuḥu-ḥbos-dze-ḥrgyo-ḥséḡ-gségra-ge-rgyo-ḥto-stiñ ||  
rta-ḥsaḥ-g-yer-dze-rbyo-gséḡ-gsé[g]r[a]-ge-rgyo-ḥto-stiñ

the first of the two eleven-syllable verses presents *gségra* as one written word and with the value of a monosyllable ; a circumstance which accounts for the writing *gsér* for *gségra* in the second verse. In l. 270 also :

ḥwaḥ-ḥldañra-ḥtsañra-na-ḥwa-rgya-ḥrko-ḥrkabs

we can, by reckoning *ḥldañra* and *ḥtsañra* as monosyllables and omitting the second *ḥwaḥ* (*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 *ḥwa*, a verse of eight syllables. This leaves us with l. 278 :

rta-ḥwa-ḥldañra-ḥldaḥ-ḥtag-ḥtos

and l. 302 :

ḥmañ-ḥriḥi-ḥphañ-dze-dgaḥ-ḥldoñra-ḥñañ-na

where, again, *ḥldoñra* is a monosyllable. On *ra(re)-ḥñañ* 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 :

gségr, ḥldañr, ḥtsañr, ḥldoñr

without a final vowel :<sup>1</sup> and this may explain in l. 375 the writing *ḥror* for what must be *ḥroñ-re* or *ḥroñra*. Also, it cannot be an accident that all the cases, except *gségr*, involve a final *ñ* and that even as regards *gségr* we can point to confusion of final *g* and *ñ* in contemporary Tibetan of north-eastern Tibet, so that *gsér* in l. 331 may represent not *gségr*, but *gsénr*.

We can hardly fail to connect this non-syllabic *ra* with the numerous class of contrary cases, discussed above, in which a

<sup>1</sup> In l. 133 *ḥthañra*, 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 (*plañna* and *hdubna*), 183, 221 (*hthañna*), 225, 231, 236, 237, 238, 244, 245, 246, 248, 253, 257, 258, 262, 280 (*htona*), 328, 329, 353, 354, 369

(ii) *na* separated from the preceding syllable by interpunctuation in ll. 113, 114, 174 (*hto-na* and *hpor-na*), 176-7 (*glañ-na*), 177, 220, 221, 241, 243, 252, 294, 296, 302, 304, 308-9 (*hpañ-na*) 359. That there is no difference between the cases (a) and (b) is evident from fluctuations such as

hto-na, 174, 294, = htona, 280

hgyañ-na, 296 = hgyañna, 77

ma-ma-ḥna, 245 = maḥ-maḥna, 238 = ma-maḥna, 245, 246  
= ma-ḥman(a), 247

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:

... ḥkheḥe || na || ḥnor . . . , 314.

Not to lay too much stress upon this instance, we may refer to l. 178:

|| na-ḥldyañ-ḥyañ-ḥyo-na-ldyañ-ḥkaḥ-rwañ.

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 *ḥldyañ-ḥyañ-ḥyo-na* (l. 179) and *ḥldyañ-ḥyañ-ḥyo-doñ* (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) :

ḥtor-ḥrta-rme-ge-ḥldañ-krañ-ḥkuñ ||

na

ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥsad-na-ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥśah

(with four further verses beginning with *ḥldañ-(h)krañ*) 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, *planna* |).

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-kyañ-bden  
 g-yag-yul-byañ-yin-kyañ-bden |  
 na | da-de-riñ-sañ-lta-na | rta-dañ-g-yag-gñis-śañ-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 :

sku-glud-du-bor | : | na-ḥbrog-srin . . . 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*, *ciñ*, *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 *doñ* (Tib. *dañ*) 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 *gnaḥ*, ‘place’, which in the Nam occurs both in this form and also as *na* and *ḥnaḥ*. But an original pronominal 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’, *ño*, ‘face’, *mye*, *meḥi*, ‘eye’, *roñ*, ‘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 *ḥbroñ*, ‘yak’, *gnaḥ*, ‘place’, *ḥkhab*, ‘house’, *ḥdzoñ*, ‘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, *mor-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 wrote<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> was certainly used in the Tibetan of the north-east.<sup>3</sup>

*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-htah-rgyohon-re-hses-ta-hrgyon

'if the blind perform *rgyo*, the knowing ones perform *rgyo*'

where *klu* and *hses* are rather Adjectives than Verbs; and there are other like cases. We sometimes (ll. 7 *hyed-ge-ta*, 371, 372 *hlde-ge-htah*) find the Particle *ge* inserted between the Suffix and its word.

The *sta* in:

hño-sta, 85, rñe-sta, 86, hbrad-sta, 306, hmañ-sta, 311, hri  
(g-ri, g-rihi)-sta, 311-12, slo-stah, 99

<sup>1</sup> *T'oung-pao*, Sér. 2, vol. xv (1914), pp. 93, 102-3.

<sup>2</sup> 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)) *ltoñ-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.

<sup>3</sup> *Supra*, pp. 32, n. 1, 60.

will be a form of *ta*, to be expected on the analogy of *to/sto*, *te/ste* 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 *rwe-htaḥ*, l. 91, and on *hwa-ste-htaḥ*, 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*, *ldaḥ*, *hlda*, *hldaḥ*, there may be any of like character. There are numerous instances of *hlda/hldaḥ/ldaḥ* as a Suffix, viz.:

hrañ-hldaḥ (hlda)-hnam-ge, 5, 6, 8, 37

hraḥ-ldaḥ-ge, 43

hmañ-hldaḥ, 33

rkaḥ-lda, 84

hkaḥ-hldaḥ, 137

rke-hldaḥ, 155

hbañ-hldaḥ, 170

hsaḥ-hldaḥ, 164

g-yog-hldaḥ, 200

hso-hldaḥ, 201

śor-hlda, 203

gse-hlda, 240

hrde-hldaḥ, 301

rpeḥi-hldaḥ, 286

rñe(hrñe)-hldaḥ, 303, 310

hpo-hldaḥ, 358

hdzaḥ-hldaḥ, 380, 382, 383.

Several of the words preceding the *hldaḥ*, e.g.

*hrañ* (= Tib. *rañ*, 'self'), *hraḥ* ('place'), *hsaḥ*, '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-hlamḥi, 239–40

which is immediately followed by *gse-hlad*, recurring again twice in l. 242. *Gse-hlad* means 'requit of injury', *rñe-hlad* probably 'requit of wrong': and *gse-hlda-hlad*, since it cannot differ much from *gse-hlad*, ought to mean 'requit of injuring or injurers'.

The agential sense ('injurers') will probably be found to fit the case of *gse-ḥlda* and most of the other instances.

*to*, *ḥto*, *ḥtoḥo* occur most commonly as Verb-suffix or Verb at the end of a sentence: we have:

ḥsi-ḥrog-ḥpaḥ-to, 17

stor-ḥtoḥo ||, 140

bprom-ḥto, 168, 171 (ḥphrom), 172 (ḥphrom), 174 (prom),  
359 (ḥprom-ḥtoḥo), 360 (to)

re-ḥto ||, 169, 382

rmañ-dze-ḥtoḥo, 235

ḥnu-ḥto ||, 242

ḥyaḥ-ḥto, 294, 315 (ḥtoḥo)

ḥmañ-ḥto ||, 310

rgo-ḥtoḥo, 314-15

ḥrbom-ḥtoḥo ||, 317

ḥkhad-ḥtoḥi, 324

(Uncertain on account of confused text, *g-yo-ḥpud-ḥto*, 28).

Not really different are the cases where the sentence is subordinate and therefore followed by a Particle:

gśaṅ-re-ḥtad-to-dze, 30

ḥrgom-ḥkhrur<sup>1</sup>-ḥto-na, 169

ḥldog-g-yaḥ-to-dze, 317

dguḥu-mu-ḥto(to)-re, 236, 244: *dgu-mu-ḥto[-]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 *ḥto* formation *re-ḥto*, as in ll. 169, 382, noted above. The cases with *ḥto-re* show, however, that the- *ḥto*-forms are not really finite Verbs, but are predicative Participles or Adjectives with the Verb 'be' omitted.

After the *ḥto*-form may come an 'auxiliary' Verb or expression: the instances are:

ḥrgu-ḥto-ḥrun (= Tibetan *run*, 'ought', 'must'), 30, 32

stor-to-ḥrun, 79-80, 138

ḥdzohu-ḥto-ḥrun, 138

ḥtshu-to-ḥphan, 215

rgyo-ḥto-stiṅ, 330, 331, 335, 336 (rgyoḥo)

ḥko-ḥto-swad, 390

<sup>1</sup> For *ḥkhru-re*.

and in a subordinate sentence or phrase :

stor-ḥto-ḥruḥi-ge, 167

The other cases are :

klu-ḥto-ḥkyim, 37

ḥdam-to-ḥbu-ḥpor(ḥphor ?), 68

stor-ḥto-rta-yañ-stor-to-ḥrun | ∘ |, 79

ḥciḥi-ḥtoḥo-ge-ḥnan ||, 350.

Here *klu-ḥto*, *ḥdam-to*, *ḥciḥi-ḥtoḥo*, clearly function as Substantives, 'the blind', 'the bound', &c.; and *stor-ḥto* = *stor-ḥto*- &c., 'that having fled'.

The *-sto* which we naturally expect is to be seen in

ḥswar-ḥldu-sto-dze, 28

ḥde-ḥyim-sto-rgyag, 29

ḥño-sto-ge-rdo-re, 84

ḥño-sto-ge-ḥsag-dze, 85

ḥbe-ḥbah-ḥñah-sto, 235

tha-ḥnu-ḥrgyañ-sto-smyi-ḥnu-ḥto, 242

ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ-ḥgyañ-sto, 292.

In two cases *sto* comes at the end of a sentence, and the phrase is therefore, no doubt, a Verb :

ḥrgu-ḥrgeḥi-sto ||, 58

ḥchir-ḥtsah-sto, 233 ;

and in one case :

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 *sto* is equivalent to *to*<sup>1</sup> and both this and the Adjectival-Participial character of the *to* and *sto* are proved by the occurrence in contemporary Tibetan name-titles from north-eastern Tibet, such as :<sup>2</sup>

Btsan-to-re, 'The powerful'

Snañ-to-re, 'The distinguished'

Tshañ-to-re

Sgra-ya-sto, = Dgra-yas-to, 'Having foes without limit'

— -rgya-sto

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the doublets *te/ste*, *ta/sta*, and Tibetan *te/ste*. From observation of the occurrence, both in Tibetan and in Nam, it appears that *ste* and *sto* derive their *s* from the preceding (Preterite) verb-form: thus *ḥldu-sto*, *ḥyim-sto*, *ḥrgeḥi-sto* are merely scriptural substitutes for *ḥldus-to*, *ḥyims-to*, *ḥrgeḥis-to*.

<sup>2</sup> *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:

h̄cihi-htōho-ge-h̄nan ||, 350  
h̄no-sto-ge-rdo-re, 84

they are Adjectives used as subjects: in fact, *h̄no-sto* probably means 'friends' or 'allies', i.e. *h̄nos-to*, 'those on one's side (*nos*), rather than *h̄no-sto*, 'those who lend countenance (*no*, cf. Tib. *no-tshab*, a 'proxy', and so forth)'.

The forms *do* and *ido* may also be expected. The former may be seen in:

ldañ-pyer-h̄gag-re-h̄tsah-h̄yah-h̄do ||, 65  
h̄ko-se-h̄gro-re-h̄tsa-h̄yah-h̄do ||, 67  
rta-h̄so-h̄nah-yañ-gñi-h̄rdzum-doho ||, 80  
ldyañ-glab-h̄do ||, 180

of which the first perhaps means:

'those (*h̄tsah*) who are prevented (*h̄gag*) from co-operating (*ldañ-pyer*) become rivals or enemies (*hyah* = Tib. *ya*)'.

Somewhat different perhaps are:

ḡsañ-s̄ñañ-do-na . . . , 86  
h̄tsog-h̄ram-do-na . . .

where we may suspect the meaning of an abstract 'in . . . friendship', 'in comradeship', and:

h̄tor-h̄do-h̄chuñ, 185,

which seems clearly to mean 'in greatness small'. The remaining instance:

h̄chi-h̄do-dyañ, 183, 353,

may conceivably belong to either group. Probably, however, it means 'started to depart' and so belongs to the group *h̄rgu-h̄to-h̄run*, &c.

A corresponding *ldo* we may surely recognize in:

dgu-h̄ldo-h̄tor-dze, 74, 77, 78 (*°ge*), 114 (*°ge*), 139 (*°ldo*, *°ge*),  
309 (*°ge*)  
rñe-h̄po-h̄ldo-ge, 177  
mēhi-h̄gab-h̄ldo-ge, 155



klu-ḥldo-sme-re, 342

ḥñu-ḥldo-ḥldyoho ||, 355

ség-sme-ḥldo, 375

ḥbri-slod-ḥldo-dze, 381

in several of which, e.g. *dgu-ḥldo*, 'hotness', *klu-ḥldo*, 'blindness', we seem to find the abstract sense: whereas in others, e.g.

*meḥi-ḥgab-ḥldo-ge* = 'having eyes hidden'

the Adjectival-Participial value may appear.

Like *re*, 'be', this Participial 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-mé-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-lok peoples of the north:

Kan iu eu dzeta 'I have a horse'

Kan iu nié dzeta 'I have two horses'.

In *rwye-ḥtah*, l. 91, *ḥtah*, 'is', occurs, and in *ḥwa-ste-ḥtah*, ll. 71–2, it is added to the Participial form in *ste*.

A suffix *tsa* has been previously (*JRAS.* 1939, pp. 207, 216) seen in *gpha-tsa*, 'father-people', *ḥkhu-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-tsaḥ-khrom-re* || *ḥyañ-tsa-ḥcer* ||, 388

since *mor* and *ḥyañ* are frequently antithetical and the parallelism with *gpha-tsa* v. *ḥkhu-tsa* is obvious: *ḥyañ-tsa* recurs in l. 63. The same appears in *ḥtrog-ḥtsa*, 'enemies', l. 146, *g-wah(g-yah ?)-ḥtsa*, l. 152, *ḥkhwī-ḥtsa*, l. 259, *ḥpañ-tsa*, l. 283. There are two interesting points in connexion with this Suffix. The first is that it may follow compounds:

*klu-ḥrto-ḥtsa-ge*, 24–5, 'blind stones' (?)

*ḥthañ-le-tsa*, 131, 220, 'the [beings of the] *thañ* fields' (?)

*mye-ḥraḥ-ḥtsaḥ*, 342, 'look-outs' (?)

compounds with *-re*:

*gsu-prom-ḥño[-]r[e]-ḥtsaḥ-ḥpu-ḥdrom* ||, 64–5

*ḥstor-moñ-ḥdzoñ-re-ḥtsa*, 64

and even the inserted Particle *ge* :

śes-rtsig-moñ-ge-ḥtshah, 379

tsig-moñ-we-ge-ḥtshah, 381

ḥdzaḥ-ḥldaḥ-ḥweḥi-ge-ḥtsah, 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*, *ḥtsah*, &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

ḥtham-gnam-tsa-ge, 18

not to mention possible examples, such as

me-tsa, 14,

has very likely the expected *ca* in

ljeb-ca-ri-ri, gmū-me-doñ-ca-ri-ri, 10–11.

In Tibetan the *ca* may be recognized in the *cag* (= *ca-ge*?, cf. *yig* = *yi-ge*) used to form the plural of Pronouns, such as *ña-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', *mthoñ-ño-cog*, 'all seen things'. It is intelligible that the convenient form *ca*, *tsa* may have penetrated into the Indian Prākṛit of the Shan-shan kingdom, as was suggested in *JRAS*. 1939, pp. 207–8; cf. the Latin *etc.* in European languages.

The formative *te/teḥi/ste/steḥi/lde/ldeḥi* 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

śañ-ma-de-de . . . , 5

rtoñ-ma-de-de . . . , 5

kyo-ma-do-de . . . , 5

gce-yañ-phañ-de . . . , 6, &c.

and with *te* after *re* :

klo-rñu-sñañ-re-te, 11  
 klu-ne-sñañ-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

puñ-te-gsar-ñar, 204 ('being massed together, new vigour')  
 ḥphom-te-ḥdrañ, 147 ('being conquered, led')  
 ḥsas-te-khyañ, 116  
 ḥjo(ḥdzo ?)-chi-te-re, 385

and with *ste* :

ldyañ-ḥkaḥ-rwañ-ste, 178  
 gnaḥ-goñ-myag-ste, 179-80  
 ḥlab-ta-gboḥu-ste-ge, 181-2  
 na-ḥtsaḥ-ste-dze, 33-4  
 ḥldyim-ste-ḥpuḥi-ge, 274.

But, even putting aside

ḥwa-ste-ḥtaḥ, 72  
 ḥwa-ste-ḥge-dze, 73, 75

where we are not yet sure of *ste* as a suffix, we may apprehend a difference in the employment of *te/ste*, in the two manuscripts. This difference may be best expressed as a tendency in our manuscript for the *te/ste* 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

ḥphom-te-ḥdrañ, 147

and in

ḥse-ḥte-ḥmun, 33  
 ḥldya-ḥkañ-ḥte-ḥñor, 52  
 ḥsod-te-rmag-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

ḥldyim-ḥste-ḥpuḥi-ge, 274  
 ḥrñe-ḥrdam-ḥte-ḥe-ge, 322  
 ḥlab-ta-gboḥu-ste-ge, 181-2

or by *dze*, which is normally a kind of preposition, e.g. in

na-ḥtsaḥ-ste-dze, 33

ḥwa-ste-ḥge-dze, 73, 75.

This is the employment which we have seen in

rgyed-ḥdre-ḥte-ge, 87, 24, 'the division-inducers',

and similar is the case of

ḥtrog-ḥdre-ḥte-re, 326, 338, 'there being (*re*, or *re* = 'all'),  
enmity (? deceit?)-inducers'

so that finally we get the *te* attached to an Adjective:

trog-ḥtor-ḥte-dze, 266, 'upon great enmity'

and such an Adjective may become the main Predicate, as in

ḥla (laḥ)-ḥram-ḥte, 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 *Ltoñ-te-Mye-kru*, *Bzagste-Nar-ḥbyam*; 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, *ḥgu*, 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 *teḥi*, *lde* and *ldeḥi*, 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 *ḥi*; for, where their *ḥi* would not be phonologically correct,<sup>1</sup> they substitute their alternative *gi*, *gyi*: thus:

Byeḥu-rma-byeḥu-gi = bya-rma-byaḥi

Yab-sten-rgan-gyi = Yab-nal-ldeḥi

Tseñ-ḥgi-Rba-ga.

This is good evidence for a Genitive-Adjective value in the Nam *ḥi*. Does it help to explain any of the variations between *-e* and *-eḥi*, such as we have exemplified *supra* (p. 124)?:

ḥraḥ-we-rtaḥ = ḥraḥ-weḥi-rta

ḥbe-ḥbaḥ = ḥbeḥi-ḥbaḥ.

It might be, for instance, that *ḥraḥ-we-rtaḥ* meant 'place-make-horse' as a compound, while *ḥraḥ-weḥi-rta* meant 'place-making horse' with 'place-making' as an Adjective qualifying 'horse'; and similarly *ḥbe-ḥbaḥ* might mean 'sheep-oppression' as a compound, while *ḥbeḥi-ḥbaḥ* meant 'oppression of sheep', with *ḥbeḥi*

<sup>1</sup> Occasionally elsewhere also, as in *byeḥu-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

*hstor-hdehi-hphyid* ||, 339, 341 (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,<sup>1</sup> 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*. *Hdzo-hdzehi*, ll. 338, 339, *htso-htsehi*, l. 342, are clearly identical with each other and with *hdzo-hdza*, l. 262, *°htsah*, l. 29, *°htseh(i)*, l. 364, *htso-htsah*, ll. 62, 73, 115: and the same change is to be seen in

*hyañ-hñehi-hñañd*, 115-16 (Tib. *ya-ña*, 'anguish', 'fright')

*hwi-hwehi-htsag*, 173, 'rats (or mice) collect'

(cf. *hwi-wa-rmañ*, 201, 'rats (or mice) are the tomb')

so that in some occurrences of *spehi* and *hpehi*, e.g. ll. 211, 370, we

<sup>1</sup> *Ldehi-swa-rsañ*, ll. 319, 320, from *lde*, seems exactly parallel to *rtahi-swa-hldir*, l. 174, from *rtā*.

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 *-ehē* 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-ḥkom-ldyañ-dze-ḥldab-ḥde-ḥde ||  
gñim-ḥti-ḥldyañ-[dze]-ḥgye-ḥkrom-ḥkrom, 12-13.

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-ḥdzam-ḥdzim-re, 100  
ḥsañ-plim-plam, 120.

These and others, e.g. *hbo-hbon*, *ma-mahn*, 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 *ḥdag* in the parallel phrases:

hyog-ḥprah-ḥdag-dze, 254  
hkhwi-ḥtsa-ḥyog-ḥdag-ci  
ḥsas-ḥdraḥ-ḥdag-chi,  
&c., ll. 259-61

is equivalent to the Tibetan *dag*: the *ḥdag* 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, Dative, Instrumental, Locative, depends simply upon the sense. Thus we have:

- than-ḥrdzo-rgyud, 16, 220, 'than-mdzo-race' (2 Genitives)  
 g-ri-ḥruḥu, 21, 'mountain-horn (Peak)' (Genitive of whole)  
 Moñ-ḥdzoñ, 64, &c. 'Moñ castle' (Genitive of description)  
 ḥjo-me, 67, &c., 'ḥjo fire' (Genitive of material)  
 ḥna-ḥlam, 68, 'home way' (Goal of motion)  
 mehi-ra, 78, 'eye-place' (= Sentinel post)  
 mye-ḥraḥ, 342, 'fire- or eye-place' (Genitive of description)  
 ḥrgoñ-ru, 82, 'egg's horn' (Genitive of whole)  
 ḥnaḥ-ḥchos, 159, 'spring-born' (Temporal)  
 ḥsañ-ḥlad, 225, &c., 'enmity requital' (Genitive of description)  
 smyi-ḥnu, 241, 'man('s) strength' (Genitive of possession)  
 ḥldya-ḥkañ-ḥte, 51-2, 'water-full' (Genitive of material)  
 ḥpaḥ-rmag, 205, 'hero-army' (Genitive of description)  
 rgyed-ḥraḥ, 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. *ñas*, 'by me', from *ña*, '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:

- ḥbeḥi-la-ḥgar, 'a camp for the sheep'  
 ḥphag-la-gnaḥ 'a place for the hog'  
 ḥbyig-la-gnaḥ '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  
 ḥti-rgye-mye-dze, 154  
 sku-mag-ḥno-dze } 58  
 ḥdah-mag-ḥno-dze }  
 twañ-mag-ḥnor, 48  
 ḥkyañ-mag-ḥnor, 49  
 ḥtañ-ḥrdzo-ḥnor, 218-19, 132  
 ḥthañ-le-tshaḥ-dze, 219  
 thañ-rdzo-ḥkyud-na, 220  
 ḥkrug-ḥrdzo-ḥgyud-dze, 16  
 ḥdza-ma-ḥñe-na-rta-ge-ḥtom-ḥphaḥ  
 ḥke-ma-ḥñyeḥe-dze-ḥtor-ge-ḥdzo-ḥtseḥ ||  
 ḥkeḥu-ḥkaḥ-dwañ-na-ḥldyañ-ḥkaḥ-dwañ |||  
 rgoñ-wa-myer-rbyo-rgyer-ḥldyañ ||, 363-5  
 ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥsad-na-ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥśaḥ } 124-5.  
 ḥldañ-krañ-ḥwe-dze-ḥldañ-slaḥ-ḥkeḥe }

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 *dzeḥi* (*JRAS.* 1926, p. 526; 1927, p. 306) and used in a local or temporal sense.<sup>1</sup> The fact that *dze* never has the *ḥ*-Prefix favours the supposition that it is a foreign word. A strictly local sense seems to be conveyed by *na* in

me-na-ḥldis, 58, 'bounds (?) in fire'  
 me-na-ḥsams, 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, ḥgum/dgum/bkum, bsdus/gtus,

<sup>1</sup> This *dze*, = Chinese *tsai*, seems to recur in Hsi-hsia; see Wang Jinqu, *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* ( $\sqrt{len}$ ), *bgyid*, had become lexical.

(2) By addition of a final *-s*, constituting Preterites or Imperatives:

hthub/hthubs, skye/skyes, hcha/bcas, hbro/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 *sig* in place of *cig*, or by *ñ*, a remainder of  $\dot{n}s < ns$ , in place of *n*.

(3) By vowel alternation, both where the original vowel is *e* or *o*:

hjog/bžag, hdren/drañ, rtog/brtags

and where the *o*, from *a* and *e* verbs, is (usually) a special characteristic of the Imperative, as in:

byed/byos, hgebs/khob(s), sñeg/sñog(s), hcha/chos, hdren/droñs.

In the Nam language antithesis of the type *spo/hpho*, *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-hbron, 157, 331, &c.

means 'slain yak' ( $\sqrt{hgum}$  'die', *bkum* 'slain'). Again, the word *rpag/hrpag*, antithetic to *sid*, 'high', certainly means 'low' (Tib. *dpag/dpog*, 'measure', especially of depth), 'brought low', as in

hñah-htsu-rpag-re-hñah-mo-ḡgam, 193

'When the men of the homes (?) are brought low, the women of the homes are the village.'

But we have also :

hñah-ḡpag-ḡldir, 326, 328, 'in this low home (?)'

But, although there are also other cases, *ḡgam/rgam*, *mag/rmag*, *ḡgyeb/rgyeb*), where the *r*-Prefix is apparent, and though it is exemplified in the common word *rgyed*, 'division' = Tibetan *ḡgyed*, and in the allied word *rgye*, 'extent' = Tibetan *dbye*, it does not appear that the supposed Factitive, or Causative, function can provisionally be demonstrated.<sup>1</sup>

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', *bśi* (ll. 196, 198), 'dead' (?), *bsog* (l. 183), 'collection'; while *bbyam* (l. 253), which might be similarly interpreted, is perhaps an error for *ḡbyam*, 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*, *bžer*, *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 *ḡ*- which has been discussed *supra* (pp. 163-5). There are, moreover, cases where the *g*- and *ḡ*- forms of verbs are clearly equivalent: this applies to:

gkom-re, 222 = ḡkom-re, 166, 175

gcheg, 111, 234 (gceg) = ḡceg, 250

gcihi, 346 = ḡci, ḡcihi, 205, 301, 348, 350

gcig, 356 = ḡcig, 208, cig, 194

g-yog (-rño), 156 = ḡyog (-rño), 289, 321-2

g-yo/g-yoḡo, 142, 178-9 = ḡyo/ḡyoḡo, 118-19, 178-9

g-yer(hsah°, ḡswah°, ḡscaḡ°), 166-7, 330-1, 346 = yer/ḡyer  
(ḡsah°, ḡstsah°), 141, 250-1, 267

ḡgras, 10, gras, 300 = ḡras, 344<sup>2</sup> (but here the *g* is probably not a Prefix)

<sup>1</sup> See, further, *infra*, p. 352.

<sup>2</sup> *g-we* (*wehi*, *weḡe*) perhaps never, and *we/ḡwe/wehi/ḡwehi* (*weḡe*, *ḡweḡe*) 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-yog/hyog* with *rño*, 'be able', *gstor/stor-ħdor*, 'put to flight', ll. 142-3, and *gstor/stor-ta-ħton*, l. 152. It is also noticeable that in ll. 25-8, 34, 96, 98, the Preterite *-s*, *ħyos*, occurs five times, while the non-Preterite *g-yo* occurs twice,<sup>1</sup> which fact is hardly accidental, though it must be admitted the *g-* is elsewhere sometimes found with Preterite in *-s*.<sup>2</sup> In the above-discussed phrase:

grteħe-ħta-stel, 181, '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 *ħlab* as Presents or Preterites the phrase:

ldyañ-glab-ħdo ||, 180

means 'will speak (or be spoken)'. On *gzo* 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:

<i>s-form</i>	<i>Related s-less verb-forms at end of sentence or clause</i>
ħkroms, 387	ħkrom(ni), 389
ħgyańs, 241	ħgyań(na), 77
ħgras, 10, (gras-re, 300)	
ħgrus, 293, 297	
ħńis, 70	ħńi, 67
ħthogs, 145	ħthog(ni), 149
ħthus(ni), 156	ħthu-re, 140
gdes, 260	
ħproms, 122	ħprom, <i>passim</i>
ħtsors, 130 (ħtshors), 134, 219	tshor-na, 220
ħbres, 176	breħe, 44
rdzogs, 157	

<sup>1</sup> In l. 26 the *-s* of *g-yos* is crossed out. In l. 260 *gdes* is a Preterite.

<sup>2</sup> *gsus*, l. 99 = *ħsus*, l. 93; *gsas*, l. 262 = *ħsas*, ll. 59, 116, 260, *gdes*, l. 260.

ḡgroms, 64  
 rgyebs, 139  
 ḡsās, 102  
 ṅes, 192 (cf. 153, 158, °re)  
 ḡldis, 58

ḡsams, 58  
 ḡnus, 16, 34, 40  
 ḡwas, 308  
 ḡkus, 352  
 ḡkes, 36  
 rkabs, 271, 272

ḡgrom, 136, 223  
 rgyeb-re, 116  
 ḡsāh, 90, 99

ḡldi-ma-ḡrtaḡ (inversion), 63,  
 71, 144  
 ḡsam, 174

ḡku-rṅo, 152  
 ḡkeḡi, 15, 41, 262

(b) At end of a clause :

*s-form*

ḡthogs-re, 181, cf. under (a)  
 ḡwars-ge, 203  
 ḡsaṅs, 144  
 ṅes-re, 153, 158  
 ḡnus-dze, 34, cf. under (a)  
 swa-ḡphyegs-na, 176  
 ḡras-re, 344 (gras-re, 300)  
 rders-ḡdi-na, 107<sup>1</sup>

*Allied s-less form*

ḡwar-ḡwar, 29  
 swa-ḡpeg-na, 360

A special case is :

ḡtag-ḡtos, 278, 279

ḡtag-ḡto-na, 279, 280

where the *s* is appended to the participial form in *ḡto*.

The function of the *-s* in Tibetan is, as has been stated, Preterite or Aoristic (Perfective);<sup>2</sup> 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 *ḡbebs/phab*, *ḡjog/bḡag*, or to *ḡgebs/khob(s)*, *ḡcha/chos*, *mdzad/mdzod*, the latter being the specially Imperative *o*, which, however, since many roots with *a* (e.g. *rma/rmo*, *za/zo*, *lta/lto*) have a by-form with *o*, may originally have had a wider significance? 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

<sup>1</sup> Some further *-s*-forms are noted, pp. 357-60.

<sup>2</sup> 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) *htronhi*, ll. 224, 233, 243, which occurs in a speech apparently referring to the future and which may well be Imperative of *hdrañ*, ll. 147, 254: Tibetan has *trañ/drañ* (*hdren*), with Imperative *dron/drons*.

(2) *hlobhi*, l. 378, which may well be in an aspiration (note the exclamatory *hi*) and be the Imperative (Tibetan *lobs*) of the *hlab/glab*, of ll. 180-2, &c. If so, the *hron/hthon*, which end the two next-following sentences, may likewise be Imperatives; the same may be the case as regards *hldon* (Imperative of *hldan*, ll. 187-9, 264, 273-4) in ll. 370-2.

(3) *gzo*, l. 165, must mean 'shall eat', Imperative of the *hdzah* of ll. 170, 255: cf. Tibetan *za*, Imp. *zos*: note the Prohibitive *ma*.

The only other question in regard to the Verb is whether the *yon/hyon*, Auxiliary Verb in the recurrent phrase:

stor-ḥdor-ḥyon, 160, 161, 162

is a mark of future time, as in Tibetan are *hoñ* and *yoñ*. The reference seems to be to a future. If so, *hyoḥo* of:

stor-ḥdor-ḥyoḥo, 119

is equivalent to *hyono*, which is not unlikely by reason of *hruhi* = *hrunhi* (see *infra*).

Other Tibetan auxiliaries, *yin*, *hgyur*, *hdug*, *mchi*, *htshal* ('should', 'ought', 'is supposed to'), *zin* ('have'), are not apparent in Nam; but *ruñ* ('be proper', 'ought', 'should', 'have to') is clearly recognizable in:

hrgu-ḥto-ḥrun, 30, 32

stor-to (ḥto)-ḥrun, 80, 138

ḥdzohu-ḥto-ḥrun, 138

and at the end of a clause in:

stor-ḥto-ḥruhi-ge, 167

where *hruhi* = *hrunhi* is comparable to *hyoḥo* = *hyono* (*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 *ḥkhum/dgum*, &c., 'execute', 'carry out' (*gñer-ḥkhum*s, 'carry out a task or commission') of *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents* (ii, pp. 42, 79, &c. = *JRAS.*, 1927, pp. 810, 838, &c., and *supra*, pp. 137, 142), it seems possible that the same meaning is conveyed by *ḥkom* in :

ḥsaḥ-yob-ḥkom-re-ḥrañ-ḥraḥ-ḥtsuḥ, 166

'The earth, having done (*ḥkom*) quaking, came (back) to its own place,'

and the like is to be seen in ll. 136, (*gtse-ḥkom*), 175 (*swa-ḥkom*), 222 (*swa-gkom*), 199 (*rgyes-ḥkom*). In ll. 32 (*ḥgru-ma-ḥkom*), 118 (*ḥrtah-ḥgam-ḥkom*), the *ḥkom* is not an auxiliary, but a Substantive Verb with (apparently) the signification 'make'.

The verb *re*, 'is', in dictionary Tibetan usually *red* ('Tangut' *rit*), but occurring also as *re* (*na-re*, 'so it is (said)'), and in Personal names, *Btsan-to-re*, &c.), has been instanced in the Rgyal-roñ 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 :

ḥche-ḥmu-gdag-re-gsañ-ḥkaḥ-ḥrehi, 204

it concludes a sentence as the principal verb. *Mod*, with the sense of 'is really', as in Tibetan, may be seen in :

ḥdyañ-ḥto-ḥtoñ-ge-ḥgo-gtoñ-mod, 210-11

'those who surrender the *ḥdyañ-ḥto* really surrender the gate (or place).'

A cognate of Tibetan *yod*, 'exist', does not occur ; but its negative, in Tibetan *med*, 'not exist', has been exemplified (pp. 174-5 sqq.) in the form *mye-re*, 'not existing': this also, as *me + ḥi*, may end a sentence, e.g. in :

ḥmañ-sta-mehi || . . . ḥri-staḥ-mehi, 311

'the big is not there . . . the mountain is not there.'

Even the ordinary *myi*, Tib. *mi*, *myi*, 'not' can function in the same way, e.g. in :

ḥphu-ḥklo-ḥsad-dze-ḥnaḥ-me-ḥmyi ||, 40

'if the *ḥphu-ḥklo* is destroyed, 'home-fire is none (or the place is fireless, *me-ḥmyi*).'

perhaps also in *phyi-ḥse-myi*, l. 98.

The *stor-ḥdor* type of Compound Verb appears also in *ḥldañ-phyer*, *phyer-chañ*, *ḥldim-chim*, *rgyer-ḥldyañ*, *rbyi-ḥldyih*, &c.

## III. PRONOUNS

Nam words for 'I', 'thou', 'he', and their plurals have not been found. We should expect *na* (not *kho-bo*) = 'I' (Hsi-hsia *no*—Laufer, No. 14), *na* perhaps (certainly not *khyod*) = 'thou'; while for 'he', 'they', the Tibetan *kho*, *khoñ-ta* is not at all likely, though *kan* exists in 'Tangut' and *kwán-thá-cha*, i.e. Tibetan *khoñ-ta*, in Thōchū.<sup>1</sup>: 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 *hdihi* (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 *ldaḥ* of *hrañ-hldaḥ-hnam-ge*, 'heavens (or celestials) themselves-there' (i.e. the heavens, or celestials, proper); cf. Tibetan *Hbon-da-rgyal*, 'the Hbon-there king', *Da-red*, 'There-being' (= 'of that ilk').<sup>2</sup> If the verse:

*hldihi-su-hldoñ-dze-hlda-ḥko-ge-ḥdzoñ*, 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 correlatively in:

*sta-re-ḥmo(g)-ge-sta-ḥri-hldyañ*, 19, cf. 9, 252

'Where were the clouds, there the mountains flew (?)'

but not in:

*ḥri (g-rihi, g-ri)-staḥ (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-ḥtor-ge-su-me-ḥmeḥi*, 114

'When the heat is great, who kindles a fire?'

perhaps also in:

*su-ge-stor-ta-ḥthogs ||*, 145

'who stopped the flight?'

<sup>1</sup> Prejevalsky, ii, p. 138; Hodgson, p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Similarly *Mchiñ-rgyal-hdi*, 'our Mchiñ king', in one of the Tibetan manuscripts.

The *ci*, *chi* of:

ħkwī-ħtsa-ħyog-ħdag-ci-ħrañ-ħdom-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 *ħji*, 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 *ħrañ*, of frequent occurrence, must be = Tibetan *rañ*, 'self', e.g. in:

ħrañ-ħrah, 'own place', 21, 166, 167

and in the above-mentioned *ħrañ-ħldah*.

*Re*, beside being the verb 'be', evidently in *bañ(ħbañ)-ħre* (*ħreħe*) in ll. 249-51, *jo-re*, &c., ll. 251-2, and perhaps in *pra(ħpra)-ħre* (*ħreħe*), ll. 43, 267, means 'each', 'every' = Tibetan *re* (*res*, 'turn', 'times'), and Hsi-hsia *re*, 'many', 'all'.<sup>1</sup> In l. 132 we have apparently *ħre* = Tib. *re*, 'hope'.

#### IV. NUMERALS

With the Tibetan names for the numerals 1-9, viz.:

gcig(cig), gñis(ñis), gsum(sum, so), bži(žè), lña(ña), drug,  
 bdun(don), brgyad, dgu(go)

it would be simple to compare the Nam words:

gcig(cig), ħñis(ħñi, ñi), gsom, bžir, ña(ħña, &c.), trog, rgyed,  
 dgu(gu, ħgo)

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 *bžir*, 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

<sup>1</sup> Nevsky, No. 88.



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, whereof the numerous modifications have been discussed *supra* (pp. 90, 92–3 sqq.). In Nam we should, on the ground of vicinity to T'aochou and Mi-ñag, 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/dwiñ*, 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 (*dgañ*, *dghañ*) 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 = Hōrpa *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 *yañ*, *hyañ*, in those cases where it occupies the *caesura* position, e.g. in :

stor-ḥto-rta-yañ-stor-to-ḥrun   °	}	79–80
rta-ḥso-ḥnaḥ-yañ-gñi-ḥrdzum-dohō		
ḥkor-ḥtaḥ-ḥkhen-yañ-sñañ-gyañ-gyañ	}	92–3
ḥjaḥ-ḥtaḥ-ḥkhen-yañ-swa-tseg-tseg		
sñañ-ne-theḥe-yañ-stor-dor-yon   , 160		

So also in :

ḥldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re-meḥi-klu-ḥcaḥ-yañ-stor-ḥdor-ḥyon ||, 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 :

ḥbo-ḥron-ḥrog-re-ḥlah-ḥkyañ-ḥras-re-ḥśes-gśi-[ḥdzuḥi ?] ||  
rgyeb-ḥchi-ḥro-re-gdag-yañ-la-por-ḥśes-ḥśi-ḥdzuḥi ||

and the same may probably be seen elsewhere :

ḥdzañ-ḥkhor-ḥkrug-ḥkyañ . . . , 18  
ḥkhor-kyañ-rweḥi-re . . . , 98  
ḥkrug-kyañ-ḥldom-re . . . , 371–2.

The form *gyañ* of Tibetan may possibly occur in :

g-raḥ-ḥnag-ḥbo-gyañ . . . , 263.

*Tsam*, making a limit, ‘only so much’, &c., may perhaps be seen in :

gśi-brom-ḥnu-ge-ḥsor-ḥtsam-bzod  
‘supports only a finger (weight)’

see p. 342.

By far the most common Particle is *ge*, very rarely (ll. 5, 8) *ḥge*, which is found all over the text, both in its favourite *caesura* position, as in :

ḥnaḥ-ḥchos-re-ge-ḥldañ-myi-śeg, 159

and the two following verses, and also in other situations, e.g. in :

. . . ḥnaḥ-ḥrañ-ge-rwyin ||, 33  
. . . ḥyos-ḥtag-ge-ḥjoḥo ||, 34  
. . . ḥkye-ge-ḥmu ||, 39  
ḥre-ge-rgyo-dze . . . , 48

ru-ge-*hkrom-dze* . . . , 70

hjim-li-li-re-pa-la-la-ge-tho-rgyam-ge-*hwad-re-smyi-hdze-ge-hkab* ||, 109–10

hthañ-phu-*hkam-ge-rñe-hbye-hkwehe-ge-hthañ-hgam-hrñehe*, 130–1

hlo-ge-*blaḥ-hldo-ge-na-rñe-ne*, 154–5.

hlab-ta-*gboḥu-ste-ge-hthogs-re-hlab-ge-plañna*, 181–2.

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  $\gamma\epsilon$ .

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:

g-roñ-hyed-*ge-ta*, 71

. . . hld-*ge-hṭaḥ-hldon*, 370, 371, 372.

The Particles *o*, *hi*, *ni*, *na*, *doñ*, 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 *gtsañ-myi-hrgan*, ‘grain does not mature’, &c., ll. 159–60, as compared with *hldi-ma-hṛtaḥ* and *mo-ma-hṭhor*, ‘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 Žaň-zuň (Ž).

	g-	d-	b-	m-	h-	r-	l-	s-
k	N	TH	TH	T'	T'N	TNHŽ	TNŽ	TNŽ
kh	..	H	..	TH	TN	HŽ	Ž	T'NŽ
g	..	TNH	TH	T	TNH	TNHŽ	TN	TŽ
ň	..	TH	H	TN	N	TNHŽ	T	T
c	TNH	..	T	T'	T'N	Ž	T	N
ch	T'N	..	T'	T	TN	Ž	..	..
j	H	..	H	T	TN	TNHŽ	T	..
ň	TNH	..	T'	T	N	TNŽ	..	TNŽ
t	TNH	..	T	T'	T'N	TNHŽ	TNŽ	TNHŽ
th	T'	..	T'	T	TNH	Ž	..	Ž
d	TNHŽ	N	TH	T	TNH	TNHŽ	TNHŽ	TŽ
n	TNH	..	T'	T	N	TNHŽ	..	TŽ
p	..	T	N	..	T'N	NŽ	TNŽ	TNŽ
ph	N	T'	N	T'	TN	Ž	..	Ž
b	N	THŽ	N	..	TNH	TNŽ	TŽ	TNŽ
m	NH	THŽ	..	..	N	THNŽ	..	TNŽ
ts	TNH	..	T	T'	T'NH	TNHŽ	..	TNŽ
tsh	T'	H	T'H	T	TN	T'	..	Ž
dz	NH	..	H	T	TNH	TNHŽ	..	..
w	N	T(?)N(?)	..	..	N	T(?)N	..	..
ž	TH	..	TNH	..	..	N	..	..
z	TNH	..	TN	..	N	H	..	..
y	TNH	..	..	..	N	..	..	..
r	NH	..	T'H	..	N	..	..	..
l	T'N	..	T'H	..	N	..	..	..
š	TNH	..	TN	..	N	N	..	N
s	T'HNŽ	..	T'NH	..	N	N	..	..
h	..	..	..	..	..	Ž	T(?)H(?)Ž	..

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 *rduñ*, 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 *Žaṅ-žuṅ* 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 *Žaṅ-žuṅ*, 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-*, *Žaṅ-žuṅ* has the following combinations not allowed in Tibetan:

*rkh*, *rc*, *reh*, *rth*, *rp*, *rph*, *rh*, *lkh*  
*skh*, *sth*, *sph*

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 (*mñar*) in Nam being probably Tibetan, and the *mkhi* (no meaning) and *mkhhe/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 (*mñags*);<sup>1</sup> 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 *ñ*, *ṅ*, *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-

<sup>1</sup> See *Les Ślokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa*, par Jacques Bacot, p. 60.

tions have been accepted in the common orthography. This inconsistency 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 incompatibility 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 Perfects (i.e. Preterites or Aorists):

Thus from *dul* we have:

Present *hdul*, 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 *hgel*, Preterite *bkal*, Future *dgal*, Imperative *khol*;

and when the initial is a labial, both *b* and *g* are excluded, and the outcome is as in:

Present *hbul*, 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 corresponding 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 disappeared 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 disregarding 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 *Žaṅ-žuṅ* 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 *ggum*, &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 *dblans* ( $\sqrt{blan}$ ) = Nam *gblan* and *dphrogs* ( $\sqrt{hphrog}$ ), 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)<sup>1</sup> 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-roṅ,

<sup>1</sup> That the *d-* was from the first non-existent in Khams was considered possible by Jaeschke (Berlin Academy *Monatsbericht*, 1867, p. 165).

where the dominant Prefix is *sh* (*ś*), 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 *gmuh*, 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 *gž-*, *gz-*, *bž-*, *bz-*, are derived from *gj-*, *gdz-*, *bj-*, *bdz-*, as is clear from the verb-paradigms such as:

*hjog/gžag/bžag, 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/blans* from  $\sqrt{len}$ . 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 *h̄thu*, *h̄du*, *h̄pho*, &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*, *yañ*, 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 *rgyañ*. The general probability applies in particular to:
- (a) phrases or compounds: thus, there is a greater likelihood of connexion between Nam *hldañ-krañ*, proved by repetition to be a standing phrase, and Tibetan *drañ-mkhrañ* 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.<sup>1</sup> For example in the passage (ll. 124-7):

hldañ-hkrañ-ḥsad-na-hldañ-hkrañ-ḥśah  
 hldañ-krañ-ḥwe-dze-hldañ-slah-ḥkeḥe  
 hldañ-krañ-ḥko-dze-stor-hldañ-ḥphyar  
 hldañ-krañ-spo-dze-stor-hgu-hbo ||  
 hldañ-krañ-ḥnam-dze-stor-dgu-hdor |||

it is immediately evident that there is a relation of antithesis (of fact or logic) between the successive predicates *ḥsad*, *ḥwe*, *ḥko*, *spo*, *ḥnam*; and this is a factor which will assist or control the determination of their meanings.

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Francke, *Der Frühlingsmythus der Kesarsage* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne xv, Helsingfors, 1900), p. vi, *Buddhistische Volkslieder aus Ladakh* (Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin xxx), pp. 118, 121, *Ladakhi Songs*, i, Leh, 1899, p. 2. See also Rockhill, *Diary*, pp. 168-9.

- (3) 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 *hbri(bri)/hbrah(brah)* is identical with the Tibetan antithesis *hbri(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.
- (4) 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 *rgyeb* may be identical, as we have reason to suppose, with Tibetan *rgyab*, '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. *khab*, *kag*, to *hkhebs*, *hgegs*).

Where such substitutions, e.g. of *r* as a Prefix for *s*, *d*, and sometimes *m* and *b*,<sup>1</sup> 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 *hdre*, 'lead', 'draw', instead of the normal *hdren*; they have *r*-less forms, *hdzoñ*, *gyud*, of *rdzoñ*, 'castle', *rgyud*, 'race'; occasional substitution of *i* for *e* (*stigs*, *sis*, *cis*); confusion (*brañ* for *bran*, *dgum* for *dgun*), loss (*dgu* for *dguñ*), or mistaken addition (*rgum* for *dgu*) of final *m*, *n*, *ñ*; confusion (by no means unexampled in ordinary Tibetan) of *ś* and *s* (*bsen* for *bśen*), *dr-* and *tr-*, *lt-* and *ld-*, and so forth. *Lh* 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.

- (5) 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*

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 347 sqq.

and *tenuis aspirata* it is extremely frequent: *hkh, hch, hth, hph, htsh*, can *always* be written *hk, hc, ht, hp, hts*, 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. ANTITHESIS 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; hyaṅ; mor; htham; mug; hraḥ; gsaṅ; hre.*

Attention has been previously (*JRAS.* 1939, p. 197) called to the fact that the Berlin fragment commences with four sentences as follows:

mor-ma-de-klo . . .  
 yaṅ-ma-ji-de . . .  
 bri-ma-zor-de . . .  
 hbra-ma-gar-de . . .

and two others (successive) begin:

mug-tse-khyig-re-te . . .  
 htham-tse-re-te . . .

while in our manuscript we have successive verses beginning (ll. 225–8):

mor-ḥgu-ḥrdzor . . .  
 hyaṅ-hraḥ-hsaṅ-re . . .  
 mug-ḥgu-rdzor . . .  
 htham-raḥ-gsaṅ-re . . .  
 hbri-ḥgu-rdzor . . .  
 braḥ-hraḥ-gsaṅ-re . . .

The former shows a general correspondence or antithesis among the four items *mor, yaṅ, bri, hbra*, and then a like relation between *mug* and *htham*: the latter passage shows a correspondence between *mor, mug, hbri*, and a correspondence between *hyaṅ, htham, and braḥ*, combined with an antithesis between the two groups.

In Tibetan *hbri* 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—*ḥbras*, ‘rice’, *ḥbras-bu*, ‘fruit’. Accordingly we see why in Nam *ḥbri* and *ḥbra* can be contrasted; and at the same time we understand why a place in the Koko-nor region may have been named *Bra-ma-thaṅ*,<sup>1</sup> ‘Plain of Plenty’. It follows also that the three words *ḥyaṅ*, *ḥtham*, *braḥ* denote things approved, while *mor*, *mug*, *ḥbri* are things disliked. The three former are followed severally by the phrase *ḥrah-gsaṅ* (*ḥsaṅ*)-*re*, the latter by *ḥgu-rdzor* (*ḥrdzor*).

Provisionally we do not know the meanings of *ḥyaṅ* and *ḥtham* or of the phrase *ḥrah-gsaṅ-re*, though the last may suggest Tib. *ra-gsaṅ*, ‘place purified (or secret)’. The antithesis between *ḥyaṅ* and *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,

*mor-tsaḥ-khrom-re* || *ḥyaṅ-tsa-ḥcer* ||

In Tibetan *g-yaṅ* signifies ‘happiness’, ‘good luck’, ‘blessing’, ‘prosperity’; but for its opposite, *mor*, we can adduce nothing nearer than *dmod/rmod*, ‘blame’, ‘reproach’, ‘curse’.<sup>2</sup> Tibetan *mug* is ‘gloom’, and the related *rmugs*, ‘fog’, ‘stupid’, ‘sluggish’, which occurs in Amdoan as *rmūkha* (Prejevalsky, ii, p. 137), would well suit the expression *mug-bu*, ‘stupid children’ (?), in the Berlin fragment (l. 12). *Ḥtham* will probably be connected with Tib. *ḥtham* ‘unite’, *ḥthams*, ‘clasp in affection’, whence come the words *thams-cad*, *tham-zin*, ‘all’, ‘whole’; for this meaning prevails in the Tibetan manuscripts. Thus *ḥtham-ḥrah* is the paradisaical ‘place, or state, of union’ contrasted with the dissensions of the Evil Age. In the Berlin Fragment (l. 18) *ḥtham-gnam-tsa-ge* means ‘the undivided celestial folk’.

It may be observed that in ll. 132–3,

*ḥbri-ḥldi-ḥthaṅ-re-ḥre-ḥldi-ḥyaḥ*,

*ḥbri* occurs in antithesis to *ḥre*, which will be apt, if *ḥre* is equivalent to Tibetan *re*, ‘hope’. On *Ḥbra* as a local and tribal name see pp. 307–8, 319–20.

2. *Ḥbri*; *ḥpu*; *ḥpo*; *ḥpho*; *ḥdzohu*, *ḥjohu*; *ḥjo*.

In another group of passages *ḥbri* is antithetic to *ḥpu*:

*ḥldyaṅ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re*, 150, 161, 218, 343.

*ḥbri-ḥśeḥe-ḥpu[-]r[e]*, 163.

*bri-gśe-ḥpuḥi-re*, 329.

These must all belong together, especially in view of the adjacency

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned in the Tibetan MS. *Chronicle*.

<sup>2</sup> But the Rgyal-roṅ language (Jyā-ruṅ) has *mōr*, ‘night’, and *mōr*, ‘old’.

of ll. 161 and 163. A predominant meaning of *pu* in Tibeto-Burman is 'man', 'male' (Tib. *po/pho*), and, if *hbri/bri* can mean 'female', we obtain the reasonable renderings:

- 'the *hldyañ* males being (weak) females',
- 'the wise (*hšehe, gše*) females being males'.

But Tibetan *hbri* does denote a female, namely the yak-cow, and it appears in the name *Hbri-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 *hbri/bri* confirms the identity of the word with the Tibetan forms.

Apart from explicit antithesis, *hpu* = 'male' is clear also in:

*hpu-hbroñ-rkom-ge*, 157, 'the male yak-bull being killed'.

One other meaning of *hpu*, namely 'bird' (= Tib. *bya*, i.e. *bwya*,<sup>1</sup> 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:

*ši-hchos-re-ge-hpu-myi-lidin* ||, 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 (hbud)*, '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 *hpo/hpho*, 'male', 'heroic', which in Tibetan is usual and gave rise to the masculine suffix *po*, seems clear in:

*hpo-hldaḥ-stor-[re]-hraḥ-htoñ-gsoḥu* || *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-hldi-nañ-re-hyaḥ-hñehi-hñaḥd*, 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: *hñaḥd* = *hñad*, p. 321)

*hpho-hldir-htsag-ge-so-hna-ḥstor*, 117

'males being here collected, the *so-hna* is lost'

<sup>1</sup> 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 :

rñe-ḥpo-ḥldo-ge, 177, 'enemies brave'

rñe-ḥpo-ḥñe-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 *ḥpo(po)-rbom*, l. 317, the sense of 'male', 'hero', is present, or there is merely a miswriting of the commoner *ḥbo-bon* is not certain. In *ḥpu-ḥpos*, l. 140, the usual *ḥpu(ḥphu)-ḥbos*, 'big man', is obviously intended: on *ḥbos* see *infra* (pp. 230-1).

Still another word plainly meaning 'male', namely *ḥdzohu/hjohu*, is contrasted with *ḥbri* in :

ḥbri-re-ḥrdyam-re-ḥkhaḥ-ḥldaḥ-ḥñahḡhi ||  
ḥdzohu-ro-ḥldi-re-ḥjohu(ḥdzohu) || ḥwa-ḥkaḥ  
ḥdzeḥu-rje-ḥbro-re-ḥdzohu-ḥto-ḥrun, 137-8.

'All the females being *ḥrdyam*, the speakers should have the say (Tib. *ñag*, "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 :

ḥdzohu-ḥkru-ḥyog-re . . . ḥbri-ḥdzohu-kyim-re, 324-5.

Clearly this *ḥdzohu*, *ḥjohu* 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 distinguished from a *ḥjo/jo*, meaning 'chieftain', and from another *ḥjo/ḥdzo/ḥdzoho*, 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 *ḥpu*, *ḥpo(ḥpho)*, *ḥdzo*, 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 *ḥpu* external equivalents have been cited, while *po/pho*, is well known in Tibetan. *Ḥdzo* is no less sure: it corresponds to Hsi-hsia *bdzo* (Nevsky, No. 42 = Laufer, No. 45 *tsu-ni*, i.e. *ni-tsu*), Go-lok *tcho-mo*, Mānyak *chhoḡ*, 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-hño[-]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. *hño*, *hñoḥo*; °*sta*, °*sto*; °*hkhog*, °*hkhob*; °*hdañ*, *wa-hdañ*; *rñe*, *hrñe*; *gśañ*, *hśañ*; *hśag*; *hwyir*; *hdzar*; *hdza*; *htrog*; *hram*; *mo-lañ*; *byu(r)*; *hrub*; *skyañ*.

*ño*, and *rñe* are antithetic in ll. 85-6:

hño-sto-ge-hśag-dze-rñe-hwe-ge-hwyir ||  
hño-sta-glom-dze-krañ-nur-nur  
rñe-sta-glañ-dze-hne-rñehi-rñehi

and this is a standing antithesis, as is shown by:

hño-stor-hton-re-hrñe-hldañ-hkhyed, 119  
hño-stor-hkhyed-re-hrñe-hldañ-hkhran } 127-8  
so-hnah-hstor-dze-hño-stor-hprom || }  
hthañ-hrgam-hkad-re-rñe-re-hño ||, 133  
(cf. hrgyañ-rñe-re-hñoḥo ||, 320)

hño-stor-hthor-bśi-ta-ston } 196-7  
rñe-hldañ-hkhar-hmye-htaḥ-rgyen }  
... hñoḥo-hjam-re-hldan } 273-4  
... rñe-hdzam-re-hldan }

stañ-hro-hra-dze-hrñeḥe-hño-ge-hpom ||, 347  
hrñe-hño-hdzar-dze-hldeḥe-ge-htaḥ-hldon ||, 372.

The same antithesis can be traced in ll. 56, 143-4.

But *hño* is also antithetic to *gśañ* in:

gśañ-ra-gśañ-na-gśañ-taḥ-hrteḥu || } 264-5  
hño-ra-hñon-kya-hñon-ta-gblañ }  
gśañ-ra-gśañ-ge-gśañ-htag-htos } 278-80  
hño-rah-hño-kya-hño-htag-htona || }  
gśañ-hrah-hton-kya-hñoḥo-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 *no* 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 *nos*, 'side', so that *nos-(s)to* would mean 'those on one's side': cf. Tibetan *nos-rgyud*, 'personally', *nos-zin*, 'selfish', *nos-loṅ*, 'self-interested'. *Rñe* is attested regionally<sup>1</sup> in the sense of 'fiend', and we see the appropriateness of the expression (ll. 119, 127) *rñe-ḥldaṅ*, 'fiend (enemy)-rise', since in Tibetan *ldaṅ*, *laṅ* is the regular term for the 'rising', appearing, of a fiend. This gives us:

rñe-re-ḥño,<sup>2</sup> 133 (ḥñoḥo, 320) = 'enemies are friends'.

ḥñoḥo-hjam . . . rñe-ḥdzam (= hjam) = 'friends mild . . . enemies [become] mild',

and since *hśag* can be = Tib. *śags* 'talk', and *ḥwyir* = Tib. *ḥbyer*, 'escape',

ḥño-sto-ge-hśag-dze-rñe-ḥwe-ge-ḥwyir ||, 85 = 'while friends talk,<sup>3</sup> those who do enmity escape'.

The passage:

hrñe-ḥño-ḥdzar-dze, 372,

where *ḥdzar* can phonologically be = Tib. *hjar*, 'stick together' (see Ś. 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 *ḥdzar*. For in l. 376 we have

ḥdza-ḥtrog-ḥram-ḥdzar,

which conveys the same sense: *ḥram*, 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 *ḥdza* is the inevitable Nam equivalent of Tib. *mdzah*, 'amicable', 'affection', 'friendship': while *ḥtrog*, whether connected with Tib. *ḥdrog*, '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'.

<sup>1</sup> In the Tibetan MSS.

<sup>2</sup> In the Berlin fragment (l. 22) we find the phrase *no-re-rñe*.

<sup>3</sup> Apparently antithetic to *ḥño-sto-ge-rdo-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-hdañ-dze-hño-hdañ-prom*, 258

'the horses upon [their companions'] necks made a face-rest (*hño-hdañ*)';

for this action of horses in company is mentioned in one of the Tibetan texts, and *wa-hdañ* may very possibly mean 'neck', being equivalent to Hsi-hsia *o(wo, ño)-diñ* (Laufer, No. 106) = Tib. *o-ldoñ, ho-doñ*, 'windpipe'.

With the original signification of Tib. *ños*, 'side', 'direction', we have:

*mo-lañ-byu[r]-re-hldi-hdah-ma-ge-hño-bro-hrub-re-myag-gre-skyañ*, 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-śor*, '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 *hri-hño*, l. 299, will mean simply 'mountain side'.

4. *ne*; *ñe*, *ñes*, *rñe*; *gśañ*, *hśañ*; *hśañ-ma*.

The occurrences of this group are somewhat akin to, and intermingled with, those of *ño/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-gsañ-hgre-dze-ñe-hkyeb-hkyeb*, 16-17

*hsah-yer-hldañ-dze-hrñe-hldañ-ne*, 141

*hce-hmu-gdag-re-rñye (= rñe)-ne-hñoñu*, 206

and we further find *rñe* associated with *htrog* in:

*trog hjo-rñe-dze*, 201.

But the association within the group is constant : together we find *ne* and *ñe/rñe* in :

rñe-ḥne-ḥrmag-dze, 146

rñe-ne-g-ri-dze, 301

ḥce-ḥmu-gdag-re-rñe-ne-ḥreḥi, 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 :

sñiñ-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’, *ñer*, ‘affliction’, &c. In the Nam text the form *ñes* is in fact always a Predicate and may be Aoristic in :

ḥkhar-ḥgyi-ñes, 192

ḥke-ḥkaḥ-ñes-re, 152–3, 158.

That the most usual form, *rñe*, means ‘evil’, generally ‘offence’, is almost too clear to need demonstration. The simplest proof is the recurrent expression *rñe-ḥlad*, ‘requit of evil’, in ll. 230–9 : it is associated with occurrences of *gse-ḥlad*, ‘requit of injury’, in ll. 240–4.

From this it follows that the antithetic word *ne* means ‘good’, so that :

sñañ (sñiñ)-ñe = ‘evil-hearted’

sñañ-ne = ‘good-hearted’

sñañ-ñe[-]ne-ḥldir = ‘in this case of evil-hearted and good-hearted’

and *ḥce-ḥmu-gdag-re-rñe-ne-ḥreḥi*, 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 :

ḥlo-ge-blaḥ-ḥldo-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 Thōchū *nāi*, Gyārūng *ka-snē*, which have many cognates in Tibeto-Burman (*Linguistic Survey of India*, I. 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/hśaṅ*, signifies, as noted above (p. 220), 'enmity', 'hate'. This results from the expression *hśaṅ-ḥlad*, which in ll. 225-7 recurs as practically synonymous with *rñe-ḥlad* and *gse-ḥlad*, wherewith it is associated. This *gśaṅ/hśaṅ* 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 *hśaṅ-ma*, 'filth', which occurs in ll. 15, 51, and also in the Berlin fragment (l. 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*-requit), but an equivalent of the Nam *hśaṅ-ḥlad*.

The other occurrences of *hśaṅ/gśaṅ*, and especially those cited *supra* (p. 219), accord with the signification 'enmity', 'hate'.

5. *klu*, *ḥklu*; *mehi-klu*; *śes*, *hśes*; *°hbeg*; *śe*, *hśe*, *gśe*; *ḥpah*; *sroṅ*.

*Klu* and *śes* are associated antithetically in:

*śes-ḥkeg-ḥrko-ḥge-ḥklu-ḥpraḥ-ḥyuḥu* ||, 332

*klu-ḥtaḥ-rgyohon-re-hśes-ta-ḥrgyon* ||, 336

*ḥko-rño-klu-re-rñe-ḥñe-hśes*, 342-3.

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(hmehi)-klu*. Moreover, the same signification results from the antithesis in the line:

*klu-ḥrto-ḥtsa-ge-hśes-ḥbeg-mehi* ||, 24-5

'blind rocks, Hśes-ḥbeg their eye'.

In Tibetan *śes* is 'know', 'knowledge', 'intelligence', 'wisdom'; and this, rather than *bśes*, '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 *sie* (Chinese transcription; Laufer, No. 165; in Tibetan writing *gse/gseh/ze*, 'know', 'recognize', *gseh*, 'wisdom', Nevsky, Nos. 10, 215), the *s* being perhaps due to confusion with

*se/gseh*, '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 *še*.

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-rtsig-mon*, l. 379, where the epithet is attached to the 'Mon carpenter', mentioned *supra* (p. 150). But we must note also the simpler form *še/hše/gše*, already seen (p. 217) in the phrase *bri-gše*, 'wise female', and elsewhere attached to *rdzo* (ll. 49, 369), *hlgyañ*, 'the wild ass' (l. 307), *hse* (l. 299), or contrasted with *hpah* (= Tib. *dpah*, 'hero', 'brave') in ll. 36, 258. The practical equivalence of *ses* and *hše/gše*, is specially apparent in ll. 342–3, where *sroñ-ñe-gše-re* (= *sroñ-hñe-hše-r[e]*, l. 339), 'straightly knowing', is antithetic to *rñe-hñe-hšes*, 'evilly know'.

In regard to the name of the divinity (p. 138) *Hšes-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-ge-hwañ . . . hšes-beg-hyañ*.

6. *nor*, *hnor*; *hdzañ*; *hšehe*.

In Tibetan *nor* means 'err', 'error', and *mdzañs* 'wise', and the latter is often in the Tibetan manuscripts spelled *hdzañs*. It is a fact, though of no significance here, that *nor* commonly means also 'wealth', 'property' (esp. 'cattle'); and *hdzañs* is stated to mean:

- (a) 'avaricious in the acquiring or hoarding of wealth' and  
(b) with *nor*, 'spent', 'consumed'.

*Hnor* and *hdzañ*, in the sense of 'foolish' and 'wise', are associated in:

g-rah-hsañ-hkhehe || na || hnor-hdzañ-rgo-htocho ||  
rgo-hrah-hnor-[re-]hdzañ-hyah-htocho ||, 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-hnor-[re-]hldog-g-yah-to, 317.

'If a big man, being a fool, is antagonized',

and the same meaning of *hnor* is apparent in l. 366, also in l. 163, where it is contrasted with *hšehe*, 'wise'; and it can be seen in l. 192. *Hdzañ*, '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 *hdzañ*, 'spent', 'paid', in ll. 232-4.

7. *śid*, *hśid*; *hpag*, *rpag*, *hrpag*; *hśi*; *hkhur*; *hśi*, *śi*, *gśi*, *bśi*; °*brom*, °*hkri*, °*hpo*, °*hwa*, °*rgo*; *hśi-kyeg*.

*Śid* in Tibetan denotes a 'funeral ceremony', and *śid-sa* a 'burying-ground' and a 'fruitful field': the form *gśid* also is known. A connexion with *śi*, 'die', which has in Tibeto-Burman numerous cognates, is apparent.

But in one of 'the Tibetan manuscripts' *śid* occurs in the sense of 'high', *śid-rabs*, 'high race' (= Tib. *ya-rabs*), being contrasted with *hbrañ-rabs*, 'race of commons', and the term is used also in a local sense. *Śi*, too, occurs in the Locative form *śir* with the same signification.

Tibetan *dpag* means 'measure', *dpags* 'depth', and the latter is to be recognized also in *dpag-bsam*, 'thought', 'imagination': the root appears, further, in *dpog/dpag/dpags*, 'to measure, fix'.

In the Nam text, ll. 230-1, *hśid* and *hrpag* are antithetic in application to *hwa-bžer* (a 'fort'?):

*hwa-bžer-hśid-re-hrtañ-hrañ-glyañ*

*hwa-bžer-hrpag-re-rñe-ħlad-ħbyam* ||.

When we find, further, the repeated phrase *śid-g-ri* ll. 34, 62 (*hśid-hrihi*), 'śid mountain', we can have no doubt that the meaning of *śid*, *hśid* is, as in Tibetan, 'high'; and we have no difficulty in recognizing the same in:

*hwam-hśid*, ll, 'high mansion'

*hdzoñ-ħyo-hśid*, 356, where *hdzoñ* = 'castle'

while l. 194 *hrdzoñ-ħyo-hśi* either has a miswriting for *hśid* or contains the shorter equivalent *hśi*. In *hkhu-tsa-śid-re*, l. 60, 'if the uncles are high', the height is social, as in Tib. *śid-rabs*, and in *hbrad-sta-hśid-re*, l. 306, 'clawings are high', the sense is that animals with claws have a superiority. The combination *śid-rgyañ*, 'high vast', is very aptly applied in ll. 151, 155 to *ħnom*, 'enjoyment', and 'hope (?)'

*Hrpag*, which would be the regular Nam equivalent of Tib. *dpag*, must in the passage quoted mean 'low' or 'brought low'. The same sense is clearly apposite where the epithet is attached to *hkhār* (Tib. *mkhar*, *hkhār*), 'city', 'citadel' (ll. 17, 128, 135, 192

(*hkar*): see *infra*, p. 242), to *hkañ-ħcig*,<sup>1</sup> 'house ruined' (l. 208), to *hcañ*, 'city' (l. 210), and also to the occupants of a dwelling-place, *hñah-ħtsu* and *°mo* (l. 193), *gso-nad* (l. 194), with whom we may associate the sky-people, *ħrañ-ħldah-ħnam-ħge*, who in l. 6 have their bodies 'bowed low (downwards)', *ħrpag-ħkhur-ħskuhu* (Tib. *dgur/rgur/sgur* (manuscripts also *skur*), 'bent', 'crookback'), and also the 'great yak' in l. 223. *Bañ* in ll. 252-3 may be left aside pending a determination of its meaning; and there remain only *rñe-ħlad*, '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 *ħpag*, with similar signification, attached to *hñah*, 'home' (ll. 326, 328), *ħhar* (?) l. 377, and in:

*ħrseħi-ħpag-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 *ħlduhu* (p. 322), *gldag* (p. 317), *so-na* (p. 293), and *rgoñ-wa* (p. 332); as concerns *śi*, *ħśi*, *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 derivatives *bśi-ta*, 'dead' (l. 196), *bśi-re*, 'having died' (l. 198), and the phrases *gśi-brom* (l. 72), 'nipped by death', *ħśi-ħkri* (ll. 38, 81), 'death couch', *ħśi-ħpo* (l. 47), 'pass away in death' (Tib. *śi-ħpho*), *ħśi-ħwa* (l. 123), 'power (?) of death', *śi-rgo* (l. 120), 'gate of death', *ħśi-ħrog* (l. 17)(?). In *ħśi-kyeg-mye* (l. 102), applied to a defeated army, the meaning, 'death-congealed-fire', has an unmistakable side allusion to (*h*)*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-ciñ-khyags* combines with the same Verb (*khyag*, 'frozen', 'ice') the Tibetan equivalent, *dgun*, of *ħśi*, 'winter'.

8. *ħyah*, *g-yah*, *g-yar*; *ħmah*, *rmah*, *rmad*, *smad*, *ħmad*; *ħdad*, *ħdahd*.

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

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *khañ* . . . *bśigs* 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*, *rma*h in

*hmah*-*hldañ*-*hyah*-*dze*, 112, 'when low rises high'

*hyah*-*rma*h-*htsagna*, 257, 'high and low are combined'

*hyah*-*htañ*-*rma*[-*r*][*e*], 315, 318, 'when high authority becomes low'.

The last example enables us to recognize the meaning of *hyah*(*g-yah*)-*hthañ*, '[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 (*hdañd*), 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*(*hphah*) = 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 *hkhar*-*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*/*rma*d/*smad*, may occur in ll. 36, 37, 39 (*ses-hmad*, 'of low intelligence'?) and 202 (*hrah*-*hmad*); but in

*smyi*-*hni*-*hsige*-*smyi*-*rma*d-*ldañ*, 80

'When a . . . man perishes, an inferior man rises'

*hrje*-*smyi*-*rma*d-*ge*-*hmo*-*rka*h-*lda*, 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*-*hta*h, *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', *htha*b-*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:

ldañ-pyer-hgag-re-ḥtsah-hyah-ḥdo ||, 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-ḥrah-ḥnor-[re-]ḥdzañ-hyah-ḥtoḥo ||, 315.

Whether in ll. 266–72 *hyah*, *g-yah* has the sense of 'paired with' or that to be next discussed may be open to doubt. For *hyah-ḥtah* in ll. 222, 386, *g-yah-ta*, l. 156, the general notion of 'pair' is probable; but whether hostility or combination is indicated, is not clear. On *hyah-ḥña*, 'fear', see *supra*, p. 217.

The meaning of *g-yah* in:

g-we-ḥku-rño-re-g-yah-ḥtsa-ne-ge-gstor-ta-ḥthon(ḥthogna),  
152

'action-desire (*ḥku*)-capable, good adversaries stopped flight' where *g-yah-tsa* is a *quasi*-plural of *g-yah*, seems to fit best under the signification 'adversary'.

#### 10. *hyah*, *g-yah*; *rgyeb*.

A third meaning of Tibetan *g-ya*, seen in *g-yar*, 'mouth', 'face and front' (perhaps originally a Locative form), *g-yar-tsha* = *ño-tsha*, 'face-warmth', i.e. 'shame', 'bashfulness', *g-yar-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 *hyah/g-yah*, where it is antithetic to *rgyeb/hgyeb*, as in:

rgyeb-ḥphuḥi-ḥtoñ-re-hyah-wa-ḥkañ, 190

hyah-ḥkruḥu-ḥbro-re-ḥrgyeb-ḥkruḥo ||, 315–16

ḥrgyeb-ḥkruḥu-ḥbro-re-g-yah-ḥpañ-ḥwag, 323–4

hyah-ḥklu(ḥkru)-ḥbro-re-ḥgyeb(ḥrgyeb)-ḥkru-ḥbro-re-hyah-ḥtah-ḥthañ 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:

ldañ-rdze(rje)-ḥbro-re-ḥldañ-the-rgyeb ||, 138–9

'when a supporting chief flees (Tib. *ḥbros*), the supporting followers retreat'.

There exists a curious ambiguity as to the meaning of the expression *ḥkru-ḥbro*, which in ll. 221–2 ought to mean ‘flees into a corner (Tib. *gru*)’, while in the other two instances, supported also by l. 190, it seems rather to mean ‘has a foul (Tib. *dkru*, ‘dirt’, ‘filth’) savour (Tib. *bro*)’: see pp. 295–7. But this does not invalidate the assurance that in all the above cases *ḥyah/g-yah* = ‘front’ and *rgyeb* = ‘rear’.

It may be noted that, by reason of the standing antithesis, the missing word in the passage:

*ḥbri-ḥldi-ḥthañ-re-ḥre-ḥldi-ḥyah*  
*ḥldi-ḥthañ-re-rgyeb-ḥldi-ḥthañ-ra*, 132–3

is, no doubt, a second *ḥyah*: 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 *ḥyah* has the sense No. 3, while the preceding one has perhaps sense No. 1 (antithetic to *ḥbri*); 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 *ḥyah/g-yah* roughly together.

11. *ḥnañ, nañ; ḥthaḥ; ḥgran*.

The common meaning of Tibetan *nañ* is ‘in’, ‘inside’, ‘within’: but there is also *nañ/nañs*, = ‘dawn’, ‘morning’, ‘to-morrow’, and we may add *nañs*, ‘escaped’ ( $\sqrt{\text{gnoñ}}$ ), and, for the sake of possible comparison with Nam, *gnañ/gnañs*, ‘grant’, and *snañ*, ‘light’, ‘appearance’, ‘notion’, ‘shine’.

In the text the passages (ll. 225, 236, 244, 246), where we read:

*ḥrah-ḥldi-ḥnañ-re*, ‘this place being inside’, or ‘being in this place’

prove by their mere number that the word *ḥnañ* is = Tib. *nañ*, ‘inside’, &c. Hence it is practically certain that the meaning is the same in:

*ḥldi-ḥgañ-nañ-re*, 104, ‘all these being inside’ or ‘being inside this house (Tib. *khañ*)’

*ḥpo-ḥldi-nañ-re*, 115, ‘these heroes (or males) being within’  
*gdzu-ḥbyi-ḥnañ-re-ḥmañ-ḥri-ḥwas*, 308, ‘the ass being within [it], the great mountain is non-existent’ (similarly in 305, 311).

In l. 181 *nañ-gsañ* has been noted (p. 156) as possibly doubtful,

and *nañ-pa-ḥsam* in l. 352 may be left for the present undetermined; as well as *ḥnañ-ḥdro* in ll. 188–9 (see p. 285).

Antithesis to *ḥthaḥ* can be seen in:

*ḥrtaḥ-nañ-ḥwa[-]r[e]-ḥthaḥ-ḥbro-ḥgran*, 354–5

‘the horse being powerful (?) within, his adversary (Tib. *ḥgran*) was in flight to, or in, the *ḥthaḥ*’.

The identity of *ḥthaḥ* with Tib. *mthaḥ*, ‘end’, ‘boundary’, ‘frontier’, is unmistakable; and perhaps the same will be found to be the case in l. 362, where *ḥthaḥ-ḥrbyo* may prove to be a miswriting of *ḥbro*: the manuscript shows, in fact, a correction, probably of *ḥbyo* into *ḥbro*.

Another *tha* will be mentioned *infra* (p. 237).

12. *ḥbom*, *rbom*, *ḥrbom*; *ḥbo*, *bon*, *ḥbon*, *ḥbos*, *ḥpos*; *rbo*, *ḥrbo*; *gboḥu*; *ma-man*, *ḥmañ*; *phañ*; *ḥrog*; *ḥkom*; *ḥji*.

In l. 238 of the text:

*gse-ḥbo-bon-re-ḥlad-maḥ-maḥn*

‘injury being *ḥbo-bon*, requital is *maḥ-maḥn*’

we see an antithesis, repeated in ll. 243, 245, 246, 246–7, between two reduplications, *ḥbo-bon* and *maḥ-maḥn*: and the first of the two can hardly be different in essence from *ḥbom-rbo* in:

*ḥso-ḥnaḥ-ḥyah-tse-gtaḥ-ḥbom-rbo*

*ḥbom-rbo-phañ-dze-ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥnar-re-ḥbom-rbo-ḥldaḥ* ||,  
111–12

*ḥso-ḥnaḥ-ḥyah-[ge-]-ḥbaḥ-ḥbom-rbo* ||, 270.

A form *rbom/ḥrbom* occurs twice in l. 317 as a predicate of *po*, ‘man’, ‘hero’.

*Rbom* cannot be different from Tib. *sbom*, ‘big’, ‘bulky’, ‘size’, to which it phonologically corresponds; so that *po-rbom* means ‘big man’ and *ḥbom-rbo-phañ* means ‘big lap or bosom’ (Tib. *pañ/phañ*); cf. Tib. *sbo*, ‘the upper part of the belly’ and, perhaps, *boñ*, *boñs* (< *bons*), *buñs*, ‘size’, ‘bulk’.

It follows from the first quotation that *ma-man* represents a *man*, ‘great’, and means ‘vast’ or ‘larger’. This must be = Tib. *mañ*, ‘much’, ‘many’, ‘great’, ‘be much’, &c., which in fact is sometimes found written *man* (*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 19. 8, 147: B1, 370. D). Indeed it is likely that *mañ*, like *boñ* and several other words, derives its *ñ* from the circumstance that originally it was *mañs* < *man-s*, a form existing in Tibetan, e.g. in *mañs-tshig*, ‘plural number’.

*Hmañ* itself is common in the text, and it obviously means

'great' when applied to 'mountain'; *hman̄-hrihi*, ll. 302, 308 (<sup>o</sup>*hri*), 308 (*g-ri*), followed by *hman̄-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-hman̄-ge-hrgam-hjihi* ||, 305-6

'each clawing creature being brave, that many should form a community is unimportant (Tib. *hji*, "flea", "no matter", as in the Tib. manuscripts).'

Tibetan *sbo*m is plainly connected with *sbo*, 'swell up', 'distend' (*lto-ba-sbos*, 'the belly is swollen'), and the above-mentioned *sbo*, 'the upper part of the belly': and this *sbo* is likewise an *s*-form of *hbo*, *hbos*, *pho*, *dbo*, 'to pour forth, swell up, rise, sprout (*sa-hbo-hdug*, "the ground is verdant", "the ground swells, heaves")'. Hence it is evident that in the Nam text in the phrase:

*g-rah-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/hbos* (once, l. 141, spelled *hpos*) = Tib. *hbos*, Aorist of *hbo*, 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/hpuhu/hphu* ('male', 'man'), in ll. 41, 167, 266, 293, 330; and several times (ll. 164, 213, 287, 294, 298) *hbos* alone is used to denote the 'big', the 'master', who is the sole undisguisedly human being figuring in the text.

The Verb *hbo* in the Tibetan sense of 'pour forth', 'spill out' has already (p. 156) been recognized in the expression:

*hlab-ta-gbohu-ste*, 'talk bubbling forth', 181; cf. *g-rah-nag-hbo-gyañ*, p. 313 *infra*.

Probably also its meaning, 'sprout', accounts for *hbo*, 'forest', 'vegetation' (Hsi-hsia *mo*, Laufer, No. 85), which we shall find in

*hbo-hkom-hldyañ-dze*, 12, 'the parched (Tib. *skom*, *skam*, &c.), woods flying high'

*myag-ma-h̄tsar-dze-hbo-hram-ge-h̄sodtsa*, 280-1

'on the not spoiled districts, or borders, the wood-groups were laid low'

(on *h̄tsar* and *h̄sodtsa* see pp. 234, 301)

*hbo-hron-hrog-re*, 344, 'the wooded gorges being torrents' (Tib. *grog*).

On *hbo* in l. 126 see *infra*, p. 289. The meaning of *hldyañ-htañ-hbo-kyer*, l. 144, is not clear.

13. *dgu*, *dguḥu*; *mu*, *ḥmu*, *ḥmuḥi*; °*hrog*, °*lom*; *dgu*, *ḥgu*; *ḥrgu*, *ḥgu*.

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/gmuḥ* (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-roñ 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-rlañ*), I will carry you’. Moreover, the many Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Himālayas 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(dguḥu)-mu-ḥto-re*, ‘hot be[com]ing cold’

where the implication is ‘living becoming dead’ : and an analogous implication (cf. Tib. *gron/grañ*, ‘cold’ and ‘die’) is to be seen in

*mu-ḥrog-ḥtro(ḥdro)-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’, *ḥce-mu*, means, no doubt, death. But the antithesis is envisaged also in l. 309 :

*dgu-ḥldo-ḥtor-ge . . .*

*ḥmu-wa-rño-ge . . .*

Independently of antithesis *dgu-ḥtor*, ‘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-ḥtor-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 *ḥkye-ge-ḥmu* (p. 320) the probable sense, indicated by antithesis to *ḥdar*,

'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 *hphu*, *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*, *rgu*) 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, *rgu* and *hgu*, of the word for 'steal', 'thief' (Tib. *rku/lku*, 'steal', *rkun*, 'thief', in the Tibetan manuscripts also *rgun*, Lo-lo *khu*, &c., Mo-so *kö*): *rgu* is seen in *hrgu-ma-gzo*, l. 165, 'thieves should not eat' (see pp. 199, 335) and in:

rbyo-ḥce-rgye-dze-hrgu-hrgeḥi-sto ||, 57-8

'where poultry (error for *hbyor*, 'store'?) is very extensive,  
thieves rejoice' (on *hrgeḥi-sto* see p. 185 and n. 1)

and perhaps the same signification of *rgu/hrgu* in ll. 29, 30, 32; *hgu* in:

hnaḥ-hpoṅ-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. *stoṅ*, *ḥtoṅ*; °*hpoṅ*; *myen*; *stsar*; *ḥtsar*, *ḥtshar*.

Line 247, *gse-stoṅ-stsar-re-ḥlad-ḥtoṅ-myen* repeating an antithesis of *gse*, 'harm', and *ḥlad*, 'requital', requires an opposition between *stoṅ-stsar* and *ḥtoṅ-myen*, wherein, according to the context, the latter should denote a larger quantity. *Stoṅ-stsar* calls to mind Tib. *stoṅ*, 'thousand', and the particle *rtsa*, whereby *stoṅ* is usually linked to the following 'hundreds', &c., *rtsa* being perhaps = *rtswa*, 'root', though we may suspect that it was once *rtsar* or *stsar*, connected with *ḥtshar/tshar*, 'be finished, spent', 'up to the limit', and *tshar*, 'occasion', 'instance' (*tshar-gñis*, 'twice', &c.). However it may be as regards Tibetan *rtsa*, there is no difficulty

in connecting with this *ḥtshar* 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 *ḥtsar*, instanced p. 231, recurs, as *ḥtshar*, in

*ḥkañ-ḥeig-rpag-re-ḥtshar-ḥde-ḥpyedhi*, 208

'when a house is laid low in ruin, the parish's prosperity is breached',

cf. *khar* (*khañ*?)-*ḥpag-cig-dze*, l. 377, *ḥldañ-ḥkhañ*, 'wooden house' (sc. tomb), l. 198, and *khañ-rul-sig*, 'break down a ruined house' (*Tibetan Literary Texts*, &c., ii, p. 149. 8). With the meaning 'parish' (Sanskrit *sīmā*), derived from that of 'boundary', the Tibetan *tshar* is frequent in the Central-Asian documents (ibid. i, p. 101, n. 5; ii, pp. 169 sqq.).

We are naturally reluctant to find in Nam *stoñ* the meaning 'thousand', since we should prefer *stom* or *tom*, as nearer to the original, widespread, Central-Asian *tom* (Mo-so *tü*, *to*, *tu*, Menia *ta-to*, Lo-lo *ta-to*, *ti-tu*, &c.); but that reluctance must yield before the fact that *stoñ-ḥpoñ* in l. 321 is very probably = Tib. *stoñ-dpon*, 'Thousand-[district]-officer', a prominent feature of Central-Asian administration (p. 33, n. 1). If *stoñ* was not the proper Nam form, it may have been due to borrowing from Tibetan (whence the *s*, absent in *ḥtoñ*) or to the Tibetan scribe or transmitter.

Proof that *stoñ* 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 *mī<sup>w</sup>vn*', Japanese *ban/man*; see Karlgren, No. 1295), 'myriad', preserved in Mo-so as *mö* 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 *ḥtoñ* has a quite different signification (= Tib. *gtoñ*, 'give up', 'send', &c.); and *stoñ* in l. 51 seems to be = Tib. *stoñ*, 'empty'.

15. *gsom*; °*sñi*; *ḥñi*; *ḥsam*; *ḥśam*; *sśam*.

Nam *gsom* has a great chance of being = Tib. *gsum/sum*, 'three' (*so-gcig*, '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*, *gsoḥ*, *gsoñ*, *gswoñ*, 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-sñi* (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 *śin(-djre)*, *śen(-djro)*, *śun(-dru)*, 'think') and shared with Chinese, *sin*, 'heart', 'thought', &c. (Classical *svm*, Ancient, *sīam*, Karlgren, No. 801). The same signification recurs in:

*gsom-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 *h̄tsa-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 *h̄lah-gsom* may be 'the three passes (Tib. *la*)'. In ll. 89 (*gsom-rgyag* 'form a thought', pp. 258-9), 198 (*h̄di-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/gñih* (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-h̄ñi (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-h̄sam*, 'prepared fire', antithetic to the above (p. 232) cited *me-h̄muhi*, is probably for *h̄sam* (Tib. *śom*, *śóm*, *bśam*, *bśams*, 'prepare', 'arrange', &c). *Sśam*, l. 255, and *h̄sam*, l. 277, are problematical.

16. *hti*; *hgye*; *hkrom-hkrom*.

In ll. 12-13 and 154:

*gñim-hti-h̄ldyañ-[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 *hgrem*, *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 *gñim*, 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-ḥrom-ge-ḥti-na-ḥrñe-ge-ḥrlomḥi | : |

'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-ḥti-ni-myi-[re-]ḥśi ||, 154

'when men severally stop (in flight), severally the men perish', a passage curiously adjacent, however, to l. 154, with *hti* = 'light'. Concerning *sku-ḥphu-ḥti*, l. 104, and *hguru-ma-ḥti*, l. 27, see pp. 285, 309.

17. *smyi*, *myi*; *tha*; *ḥnu*; *ḥśig*; *ḥrgyañ*.

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), Gyārūng *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 *ḥtor-smyi-ḥbom-ge*, l. 73 ('great *smyi*, big'), *bos-smyi*, ll. 42, 44 ('big *smyi*', 'master')—see the discussion of *ḥbom* 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-ḥni-ḥsig[-g]e-smyi-rmad (smad?)-ldañ, 87

'when a *ḥni* man perishes (Tib. *ḥjig*, *bzig*, *gzig*, *sig*), an inferior man rises'.

But it is in ll. 241-2:

smyi-ḥnu-mye-re-tha-ḥnu-ḥrgyañ-sto-smyi-ḥnu-ḥto ||

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. *rgyañs*) or being extended or extensive (*rgyañ*), man has power.'

Here *tha* must mean 'god'; and this may be the origin of Hsi-hsia *tha*, 'Buddha' (Nevsky, No. 105), Hsi-hsia Buddhism being late. There is no temptation to derive *tha* = 'Buddha' from *tha/thah*, '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 *lh* 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')-*mên*, stated in the T'ang *Annals* (*JRAS.* 1880, pp. 463, 473<sup>1</sup>) 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 Luser (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 Luser] into a valley at the mouth of which is . . . Shara-kuto'.<sup>2</sup> In ordinary Tibetan also the verb *ltuñ*, 'fall', has for Preterite *lhuñ*.

18. (1) *ḥnah*, *gnah*, *ḥna*, *na*; (2) *ḥnah*, *ḥna*, *na*; (3) *ḥnah*, *na*;

<sup>1</sup> Mentioned in connexion with Hung-chi (NW. of Ho-chou, with a bridge over the Hoang-ho), Bushell, p. 534 (72).

<sup>2</sup> 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 *lh* as English *th* or *t*, and speaking of Lha-sa, for instance, as *T'asa*.

(1) *hñah*, *ñah*; (2) *hñah*; °*htsu*; °*mo*; *hmo*; *gso*, *hson*; °*nad*; *hsas*, *gsas*; *pa*; *hgam*; *khyañ*, *hkhyañ*; *khyos*; *hzah*.

It is clear in ll. 99, 101–2

rgyed-ma-glañ (102 hldañ)-ge-hñah (102 ñah)-htsog-hśah  
(102 hśas)

that *hñah* and *ñah* are confused; and confusion of *n* and *ñ* has been noted (p. 214) as occurring in Amdoan Tibetan. *Hñah* is certainly = Tib. *gnah*, 'place'; cf. l. 69 *hphag-la-gnah*, 'a place for the hog' &c., l. 391 *hñah-hdiñi-htshur*, 'come to this place', the Prefixes *g* and *h* alternating frequently, as we are already aware, in the text. *Hñah* does not occur, though on the analogy of Hsi-hsia *ne*, 'king', *neh/ñeh* = Tib. *rje*, and Gyārūng *ka-nēs*, Tākpa *nai*, Mānyak *nā(-bi)*, 'two', and various other instances in Hsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman, we should be fully prepared for confusion of *ñ*-also with *n*- and *ñ*-.<sup>1</sup>

In the case of *hñah-htsu/hñah-mo* such confusion is specially clear; for Hsi-fan (d'Ollone, Nos. 37 and 40, p. 79) *na-mo*, 'woman', is plainly = Tib. *ñā-ma*, 'housewife', 'mistress of a house'. That Nam *hñah-mo* is the same word is proved by the antithesis to *hñah-htsu* in:

hñah-htsu-rpag-re-hñah-mo-hgam ||  
hñah-mo-hrpag-[re-]-gso-nad-hgam  
gso-nad-rpag-re-hkah-hgañ-hjor, 193–4

'If the *hñah-htsu* is brought low, the *hñah-mo* is the *hgam*;  
if the *hñah-mo* is brought low, the *gso-nad* is the *hgam*;  
if the *gso-nad* is brought low, (all talk is babble).'

For in this connexion *htsu* must be equivalent to Hsi-hsia *ni + tsu* (i.e. *dzu*), *bdzo*, concerning which see *supra* (p. 218). The same word (= *vir*) 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 *hñah* and *hñah* was not merely phonetic, but due in part to coincidence of the ideas of 'place' and 'home'. *Hñah/na*, which seems to be the more common, appears in:

hna-hlam-glo-hran, 68, 'the home path is joyful'  
na-hldom-hgor, 41, 143, 350, 'if the house-servants are idle'  
hñah-hpoñ-hgor, 113, 'if the house-poor (*na-boñ* of the  
Tibetan manuscripts) are idle'

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 360.

na-g-we-ḥkor, 205, 'if there is idleness in home-making'  
 ḥphu-ḥklo-ḥsad-dze-ḥnaḥ-me-ḥmyi ||, 40, 'if the *ḥphu-ḥklo*  
 (see *infra*, p. 284) is destroyed, house-fire there is not'.

In other instances (ll. 56, 96, 280 (*gnaḥ*)), though only 'place' is said, the idea may be that of home: elsewhere (ll. 191, 391, *ḥnaḥ*; ll. 69, 70, 179, 367, *gnaḥ*) 'place' suffices. *Ḥnaḥ* is seen in:

ḥnaḥ-ḥpag-ḥldir, 326, 328, 'in this low place'

and together we find *ḥnaḥ* and *na* in:

ḥnaḥ-na-ḥmañ-na-ḥmañ-ḥrgam-gre-na-ḥram ||, 307

'though [their] home-places are many, the place they like is where many *gre* are in company'.

An entirely different *ḥnaḥ* = Hsi-hsia *dnaḥ* (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-ḥldañ-re-ḥnaḥ ||, 87, 'there is no rising of evil'

ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ-re-ḥnaḥ ||, 291, 'there are no run-away *ḥkyañ*'

ḥrño-ḥcañ-ḥram-dze-gsé-ḥrdzro (i.e. ḥrdzo-re)-ḥnaḥ ||, 49

ḥrño-ḥprañ-ḥram-dze-ḥšeḥe-rdzor (i.e. rdzo-re)-ḥnaḥ, 368-9

'where the power (*or* purpose)-violent are united, wise *rdzo* are not there'.

Tibetan has, further, *na* (a Postposition), 'in', &c., *gnaḥ(-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.). *Gnaḥ*, 'old', is at present problematic. *Na*, 'meadow', is perhaps to be recognized in *na-ḥtsaḥ-ste*, ll. 33-4: see p. 275, cf. pp. 278, 281). *Na*, 'sickness', is to be seen in:

na-rog-ḥphar-ge-skye-ta-ram, 156-7

'the black (? Tib. *rog*) sickness passed, life is agreeable'

ḥtsog-ḥram-ḥnaḥ-tse, 120 (see *infra*, pp. 291-2)

ḥsas-ḥnaḥ-ḥdag-chi-phyer-chañ-ḥson ||, 260-1

'children who had sickness were, with support-hold, tended'  
 ḥldyo-ḥtor-ḥmyi-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-paḥi-ḥdzo-ḥdza, 262, 'children equal to braves (*pa* = *ḥpaḥ*, Tib. *dpah*) or to their fathers (*pha*, *ḥphaḥ*)'

the common *h/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 *pha-mes-gsas*, 'father, grandfather, children', in another text: it is, no doubt, Preterite, Tib. *btsas*, of *btsa*, 'bring forth a child'<sup>1</sup> (cf. *btsa*, *btsas*, *rtsas*, 'harvest'): as regards the initial cf. *se/hse/gse* = Tib. *gtse*, *htshe*, and *se/hse/rse* = Tib. *rtse*.<sup>2</sup> The verbal sense is clear in:

*hsas-te-khyañ-je(dze)-hsas-ḥkhaḥ-ge-ḥrwehi* ||, 116

'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).

'Offspring' is the meaning in:

*hsas-ḥce-rgye-dze-hrañ-ḥgam-ḥyim*, 59.

'with offspring very numerous one's own mouthful (Tib. *ḥgam/ḥkham*, "cram into the mouth", *bgam*, "gobble", *kham-gcig*, "morsel", *kham*s, "appetite") is diminished.'

*Khyañ*, 'matron', is clearly recognizable in:

*khyos-ḥkhyañ-ḥyu-ge-mye-ḥpeḥi-ḥkheḥi* ||, 212

'matrons united (cf. Tib. *yug*, *yug-po*, *yugs*) with their husbands (Tib. *khyo*) gain eye-sparkle (?)'

a sentiment echoed in the Tibetan manuscripts by 'a wife parted by her husband smiles at every speech'. The sentiment is different in:

*hmo[-]r[e]-ḥzaḥ-re-ḥse-spye-khyañ* ||, 190

'woman or wife, a matron is a summer of harm'

and in l. 367 we hear of a *ḥśaṅ-khyañ*, 'hostile matron'. What is the precise signification of *khyañ* as distinguished from *hmo*, 'woman', 'female' (see *supra*, p. 221) and *ḥzaḥ*, Tib. *bzaḥ*, 'wife'? Here we may be helped by Laufer's (No. 153) Hsi-hsia *choñ*, '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 *dohaḍa*, l. 190. The word *khyañ* is not known in Tibetan, which, however, in its *ḥkhyeñ*, *ḥkheñs*, 'be filled up', cf. *ḥgeñs*, *bkañ*, *dgañ*, *khoñ*, 'fill', *gañ*, 'fill', 'full', furnishes a good basis for an etymology.

We may now return to the *gso-nad* of ll. 193-4. It might seem possible that the *gso-nad*, who are left when the men and women of the place are laid low, are the 'living sick', Tib. *gson* 'live', 'life', + *nad* 'sickness'. The Tibetan has, in fact, the expression

<sup>1</sup> *Khyeḥu* (or *bu*)-*btsas*, 'a child (or son) was born'. The form *tshas* occurs with the meaning 'woman in child-birth'.

<sup>2</sup> In Tibetan *rj*, *rts*, *rdz*, 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 *hdud-hgro-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 *ḥnad* (l. 46) is, however, obscure.

The liberal choice of significations presented by the syllables *na* and *ña*, with their various written forms, would not be fully stated without a mention of *ḥnaḥ*, 'spring' in *ḥnaḥ-ḥchos-ḥre-ge*, l. 159 (see *JRAS.* 1939, p. 215, cf. *supra*, p. 145) and *ña* in *ña-ḥke*, perhaps = 'five' (cf. *ḥñi-ke*, p. 272). No equivalent of Tib. *ña*, 'I', has come to light.

19. *hdzoñ, ḥrdzoñ; ḥke, khe, ḥkhe, ḥkheḥe; plañ, ḥplañ, phlañ; ḥdraḥ, ḥdra; ḥyo-ḥsí; ḥgam, ḥrgam; cañ; ḥthañ; gdaḥ; ḥrgom; ḥdro; we, weḥi; ḥñor; ḥwam; ḥlda-ḥko; ḥldiḥi; rma; ḥthar-mye; kyim, ḥkyim, gyim.*

The above-quoted passage, concerning 'house-man', 'house-wife', and cattle, is followed (ll. 194-6) by:

*ḥrdzoñ-ḥyo-ḥsí-dze-ste-gdzu-ge-cig*  
*ḥke-plañ(356 ḥplañ, 357 phlañ)-ḥdraḥ-dze-ḥthar-mye-*  
*ge-lol*  
*ḥldiḥi-su-ḥldoñ || dze-ḥlda-ḥko-ge-ḥdzoñ*  
*rma-ḥsu-ḥdra-dze-ḥwam-weḥi-ge-tsweḥu.*

After the discussion *supra* (pp. 150 sqq.) it may perhaps be assumed as certain that in the expression *moñ-ḥdzoñ(ḥjoñ)* the word *ḥdzoñ* = Tib. *rdzoñ*, 'castle', which is also found (p. 214) written in Amdo as *hdzoñ*. In the above lines both *ḥdzoñ*, the usual Nam form, and *ḥrdzoñ* occur.

Antithetic to *ḥrdzoñ*, in the following parallel verse is *ḥke*, with the addition *plañ-ḥdraḥ*, whereof the element *plañ* is known only<sup>1</sup> from a Central-Asian Tibetan document (*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, I, pp. 281, 285), which speaks of 'a *plañ* of a market town' (*khrom-gyi-plañ*): it is suggested that *plañ* is equivalent to *srañ*, 'street', and it may, in fact, be etymologically

<sup>1</sup> Tākpa, however, has *plāñ*, 'sun'.

connected therewith.<sup>1</sup> If *hke* is practically equivalent to *khrom*, the antithesis of the market town to the citadel is satisfactory. Such a word, moreover, will be acceptable as accounting for the syllable *ke*, *ge* in a number of place-names (*Hel-ke*, *Raṅ-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-ñen*, 'profit and loss', *khe-pa*, in Amdo = *tshoṅ-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 *plaṅ-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 (*gron-gi-dra-ba*, 'fortification round a village'). The literal sense is seen in l. 260 *hsas-hdraḥ-hdag-chi*, 'children with nets' (for catching birds, &c., as in the Tibetan manuscripts).

The parallel expression *hyo-hśi*, attached to 'castle', can naturally 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-sgya-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' (*hkar-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*,

<sup>1</sup> In Kan-su and NE. Tibet some unexpected phonetical relations are evidenced; thus, one of the Tibetan manuscripts has *plaṅ* = *rlaṅs*, 'moist', and Mānyak has *phwiḥ*, *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':

ħkhar-ħrpag-g-yar-[re]-stor-mon-ħjon-re, 128,

and to the rise of the *ħldag-nag*, the villain of the situation:<sup>1</sup>

ħkhar-rpag-g-yar-re-ħldag-[nag]-ħgrom, 135-6.

It was through that event that importance came to the *ħgam*. 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:

ħrah-weħi-rta-ge-stor-mon-ħdzoñ ||, 139-40

(cf. l. 114). The connexion of the same event with excessive heat (world-conflagration) is likewise mentioned:

dgu-ħldo-ħtor-ge-stor-ħmon-jon, 78, 139 (*ħdzoñ*),

and the horse's flight is related to the same in:

dgu-ħldo-ħtor-re-ħra-we-rtaħ, 191.

The *ħgam* seems actually to have come into being upon that occasion, and the horse's retreat thereto was synonymous with the loss of the *cañ* (i.e. the *ħrdzoñ*):

ħrtaħ-ħgam-ħkom ('made') -re-stor-mon-ħjon

rtaħ-ħgam-ħphar ('gone') -[re]-cañ-stor-ħdor-ħyoħo ||, 118-19.

The *ħgam* is several times (ll. 131-2, 133 (*ħrgam*), 221) mentioned as *ħthañ-ħgam*, i.e. '*ħgam* in the high plains (Tib. *thañ*)', 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. *Ĥgo-boms*.<sup>2</sup> Essentially the horse's desertion of his place is his entry into the service of man (the *ħbos*, '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).

<sup>1</sup> It is not quite certain that the *ħldag-nag* = *ħbron* is conceived as an individual and not as a class, the 'common people': the latter might be suggested by the expression *ħbron-re-ge* (l. 250), which should mean 'all the *ħbron*'. Possibly the text fluctuates between the notions of group and typical (here also allegorical) individual.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *hgam* occurs also, without reference to the particular *hthan-hgam*, in the sense of 'home-community' or 'company', 'group'. This is seen in:

ldyañ-hjo-hjihi-re-mehi-ra-hgam ||, 78

'Where there is . . ., the eye's-horizon, or sentinel post (*mehi-ra*) is the *hgam*.'

rñam-skar-hkañ-re-gdañ-hnañ-hgam ||, 191

'Under threatening stars [any] available (*gdañ*) place is the *hgam*.'

(the latter perhaps repeated in the fragmentary line 396) and in the above-quoted (p. 238) passage *hñah-tsu*, &c. The form with Prefix *r*, *hrgam/rgam*, 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:

ñan-blo-rtul-gyis-hdzañs-rnon-po-la-myi-bsgam-ḥo

'By disciplining an inferior mind one does not rank with the sharp-witted.'

Of this verbal *rgam* one occurrence (l. 307) has been quoted *supra* (p. 231) in connexion with *mañ*, and it is one of a group found in ll. 304-7; it may also be seen in:

rgyed-hsañ-rgam-cañ-hldyo-hrje-hbro ||, 35-6

'A city (*cañ*?) with secret disunion (cf. ll. 16-17 *hrñe-gsañ*, 'secret enmity') taken in (*rgam*),'

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:

hrgom-hkhru[-]r[e]-ḥto-na-hrpehi-hrgam-re-ḥto

ḥdro-hbroñ-prom-ge-hkōhi-me-ḥtul ||, 169, 170

'the *hkhru* being passed over (*hrgom*), the *hrpehi* 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 *hkhru-hrgom-re-ḥto* and correspondingly *hbroñ-ḥdro-prom-ge*, *hrgom* and *ḥdro* being the Predicates. In the first of the two cases the *hrgom* 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*, *hdroñ*, is hardly less patent in :

hldañ-rgye-hdor-re-hwañ-ta-hnen

hcañ-rgye-rpag-re-hmo-ta-hpun ||, 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 Documents*, ii, pp. 28-9, 250) that both this *cañ* and also a form *cag* (an alternation *ñ/g* being established for Amdoan Tibetan by *stiñ* = *sdi*, *hthug* = *hthuñ*, &c., in the manuscripts) are merely the well-known Chinese word *ch'êng* (Ancient *z'äng*, Karlgren, No. 1204), 'fortification', 'city', an exact equivalent of *hdroñ*. Other examples of *cañ/hcañ/chañ* 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 *hdroñ* 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-hlah-hwam-hsid-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 = *htswe*, l. 6, is unfortunately not known; but see p. 269. In the preceding verse *hlda-hko-ge-hdroñ* can mean 'there (Tib. *da-ko*, see p. 201) is their castle'. This leads to the recognition of an important antithesis in the first parts of the two lines :

hldihi-su-hldoñ-dze . . . , 'to what (Tib. *su*) *hldihi* [they] depart'

rma-hsu-hdra-dze . . . , 'in what-like (Tib. *hdra*) *rma*'

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 *hldihī* 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 *hthar-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/hrgam*, 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 :

*hšod-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-hldaḥ-ḥnam-ge-klu-hto-ḥkyim*, 37

‘the heaven-inhabitants proper [had to take] the blind [mountains] for home.’

But in the other occurrences :

*hrihi-ḥdom-ḥkyim-re*, 294, 297

*hche-rgyo-ḥkyim-re*, 323

*hbri-ḥdzohu-kyim-re*, 324

*hyu-hštsaḥ-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-hkyim-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*, *htar*; *pyañ*, *phyañ*; *hto*, *tho*; *hphah-hphah*; *gcog*; *hphag*; *hbehi*, *hbe*, *hbehe*; *hbyig*; *hbañ*, *hbar*; *hro*; *hstasag*; *hbu*; *hrug*, *por*, *hpor*; *nu-glañ*; *hkuhu*; *nehu*; *wehi*, *hwehi*; *hkuhu*; *hñed*; *htram*; *glañ*.

In ll. 69, 70:

*skyim-se-hdzar-dze-hbehi-la-hgar*  
*thar-pyañ-hjo-dze-hphag-la-gnañ*  
*gcog-hlde-hldu-dze-hbyig-la-gnañ*

the expression *hphag-la-gnañ*, 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*',<sup>1</sup> which in the *Dictionary* is defined as 'a place giving shelter (either in a rock, under a tree, roof or cavern)', e.g. *brag-skyibs*, 'a sheltering place under an overhanging rock or a projecting roof', *bkañ-skyibs*, 'a covered terrace or small portico before a house', *char-skyib*, 'shelter from rain' (= *char-khyim* of one of the Tibetan manuscripts).

<sup>1</sup> 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. *khañ-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-hthañ-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' (*hrñe-ño*, *hdza-htrog*) in ll. 372, 376 (*supra*, p. 220), and being equivalent to Tib. *hjar*, which latter form also (scarcely distinguishable in script) appears in l. 220. Hence *skyim-se-hdzar* 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 (*hskyim-se*).<sup>1</sup>

With *skyim-se-hdzar* the *thar-pyañ* of the following verse is again associated in:

htar-phyañ-hto-re-skyim-hse-hdzar ||, 374.

In this passage *hto* can be = *htho*, 'high', *tho*, l. 132 (Tib. *mtho*), or *tho*, 'boundary', which occurs in l. 109;<sup>2</sup> and we need not conceal a suspicion that in l. 69 also *hjo* is a miswriting (visually easy) of *htho*. The same *hto* = *htho* is possible in l. 210, and practically certain in l. 296, where *g-ri-hto* is parallel to *hrihi-hruku*, l. 293.

It is, at any rate, clear that *thar(htar)-pyañ(phyañ)* is something connected with a dwelling; and the same is apparent in:

hgweg-hwehe-hphah-hphah<sup>3</sup>-dze-hthar-phyañ-ge-hrub, 348–9

'The laughing spouses (? p. 343) rushed to the *hthar-phyañ*.'

*Phyañ* must denote something suspended or dangling (Tib. *dpyañ/hphyañ*; *dphyañ*, 'a hunter's nets', 'a lasso', *dpyañ-dar*, 'a silk scarf attached to temple pillars or to flag-poles'). *Hthar* is more likely to be = Tib. *mthar*, Locative of *mthah*, 'end', than *hthar/thar*, 'get through', 'escape'. *Hthar-phyañ* might then be 'boundary [partitions of] suspended [felt]', such as may be seen in Tibet; but we might think of the oft-illustrated<sup>4</sup> roof-cords of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the 'terraced roofs [in Lhabrang] which meet over narrow alleys' (d'Ollone, *In Forbidden China*, p. 284).

<sup>2</sup> On *ht* = *hth* or *th* see p. 120.

<sup>3</sup> *hphah-hphah*, 'laugh', otherwise unknown, is proved by the antithetic *hñu-hñur*, 'groan', of the preceding verse: it might perhaps be regarded as self-evident; but note the parallel *khá-khe* of Hōrpa. On *hgweg-hwehe*, see p. 343. *Hrub*, which occurs in ll. 108, 261 (*g-rub*) will be = Tib. *rub*, 'rush in a body', *rub-te*, 'altogether', W. Tibetan *grub*, 'all'.

<sup>4</sup> 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;<sup>1</sup> and this is, in fact, involved in the juxtaposition of *htar-phyañ* and *skylim-hse-hdzar* 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. *spanñ*, 'meadow': cf. *htañ(thañ)-hldu*, l. 14.

From all this it follows that the *hbehi*, whose place is the *skylim-se-hdzar*, is the sheep (*skyibs-lug*), while the *hbyig* of the meadow (*gcog* = Tib. *spanñ*) 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.):<sup>2</sup> in fact, we have already found this word in Nam *hya* (*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 *hbehi* 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 *hbyig*, we note that Tibetan has, by the side of the generic *ba* and of *glañ*, *ba-glañ*, 'bull', for 'cow' *ba-mo*, *ba-cu*, and a number of forms, *hjo* and cognates, with which we shall have to deal *infra* (pp. 326-8). For cognates of Nam *hbyig*, signifying 'cow', we may note in the Tibeto-Burman sphere a surprisingly large number of forms such as:

pi, pī, pit, pīt, bik, bi, bī, bik, pui, pūi, muk, mūk, puk  
(*Linguistic Survey of India*, I. ii, pp. 170-1)

i, pp. 281, 283, 336 (illustration); Filchner, *Om Mani Padme Hum*, pp. 145, 304 (illustrations).

<sup>1</sup> See the illustration in d'Ollone, *In Forbidden China* (Tibet), p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> For Hsi-fan cognates see *supra*, p. 94.

which may go back to an original *big* (or *twig*) and which accordingly relieve us of any scruple in regard to Nam *hbyig*.<sup>1</sup>

The word *hbyig* does not recur; but *hbehi* is found in the phrases:

hro-hbehi-hbah-ge, 110

htsag-hro-hbehi-hbar, 234

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:

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', 'distrain', 'carry off', it is highly likely that:

hro-hbehi-hbah-ge = 'wolves seizing, or oppressing, sheep'

htsag-hro-hbehi-hbar, 'when wolf-packs (*htsag* = "collected", *htshogs*, as elsewhere in the text) seize, or oppress, the sheep'

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:

hdzam-hbron-hron-dze-hdam-to-hbu-hpor, 68

'in tame-yak gorges the tied (animals) have their heads released'

where *por/hpor*, applied to *nu-glan*, '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*;<sup>2</sup> 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:

hkuhu-nehu-htshe-re-wehi-nehu-hrehe, 74

'if the fresh *hkuhu* (Tib. *khū*, 'liquid', 'sap', 'broth'?) harms (goes bad?), there is the fresh *wehi*'

<sup>1</sup> It is curious that Chinese had an old word 'b'yi (Karlgren, No. 713) = 'cow'.

<sup>2</sup> *por* also *Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains . . .* by Mdlle Lalou, No. 67. 1.



it seems as if some liquid should be meant : and in :

hñed-ge-slug-dze-ḥweḥi-ḥsí-ḥpo ||, 47-8

it perishes (*ḥsí-ḥpo*) 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 (*rñen*, 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 :

hñed-ḥtram-ḥtsaḥ-glaḥ-taḥ, 31

'having a *glaḥ* stiff (*ḥtram* = Tib. *tram*, as p. 285 *infra*) to tan or knead.'

They were a 'tough subject'. This interpretation is notably confirmed by the word *glaḥ*, for which elsewhere<sup>1</sup> we have to recognize the common meaning of Tib. *gla*, viz. 'wage'; for we have Hōrpa *gla*, Mānyak *graḥ* (Thōchū *rāpī* ?), meaning 'skin', perhaps also Tib. *gra*, 'awn', 'bristle', *gra-legs*, 'thick and glossy fur'.

21. *gdzu*, *ḥdzu*, *gzu*, *ḥzu*, *ḥju*, *ḥjuḥu*; *hrañ-ḥche*; *ḥglyaṅ*, *ḥlkyaṅ*; *ḥbyi*; *ḥkyud*; *ḥcaḥ*, *ca*, *ḥcha*, *cha*; *ḥdrab*; *ḥbrad*; *stor*; *ḥdor*; *mehi* (*ḥmehi*)-*klu* (*ḥklu*)-*ḥcaḥ* (*ḥcha*); *kya-wa-ne*, *ḥkyaḥ-ḥwa-ñe*, *ḥkya-wa-ñe*; *ḥdrab-ḥwa* (*ḥwaḥ*)-*hrañ*; *ḥkya*, *kya*; *ḥkcho*; *ḥpaḥ*; *ḥdom* (*ḥgu*, *ḥguḥu*); *ḥkoku-meḥe*; *rma*; *gre*; *ḥldyo*, *ḥldyoho*, *ldyo*; *ḥkyu-ḥldoṅ*; *rgyeṅ*; *sli*; *ḥti*; *ḥrwad*; *ḥbañ-prom*; *klaḡ*; *ḥdzur*; *ḥwi-ḥwa*; *ḥram*.

An identity of *gdzu*, *gzu*, *ḥju*, *ḥdzu*, *ḥzu* easily understood by reason of the pervading equivalence of the Prefixes *g* and *ḥ* 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 :

ste-gdzu-ge-lol, 194 = ste-ḥe-ḥju-ge-gciḡ, 356

hrañ-ḥche-ḥju-ge, 115 = rañ-ḥche-ḥzu, 117

ḥdzu-ḥdro-ḥphor, 183 = gzu-ḥdro-ḥphor, 353

<sup>1</sup> e.g. in the *glaḥ-ḥlad*, 'return for wages', &c., ll. 232-7, and perhaps *gla-ḥdzo* = Tib. *gla-mi*, 'hireling', ll. 29, 62, 73.

ḡglyañ (i.e. ḡlkyañ)-hṣe-ge-gzu-ḡbyi-ḡkyud, 307 = lkyañ-  
 ḡzu-ḡrño-re-ḡña(ḡnañ)-ḡdro-mo, 188  
 gdzu-ḡbyi-ḡnañ-re, 305, 308, 311.

In ll. 115, 117 the *ḡju*, *ḡzu* is called *ḡrañ-ḡche*, which must be = Tib. *rañ*, 'self' + *gces*, *ches*, 'dear', 'important', 'believe', and clearly means 'self-willed', more especially as l. 117 continues :

ḡrañ-ḡkaḡ-khar-gsom, 'the three towns talking at will'.

In l. 307 the 'wise' *ḡglyañ* ('capable' *ḡlkyañ* in l. 188) are said to be of *gzu-ḡbyi* race (*ḡkyud* = Tib. *rgyud*, as in l. 220 and elsewhere : see pp. 214, 258) ; and this fact alone would be decisive, since the *ḡlkyañ* must be = *rkyañ*, the 'wild ass' of Tibet. The 'self-willed' character of the ass, *ḡju*, *ḡzu*, 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*, *ḡdzu*, *gzu*, *ḡzu*, *ḡju* 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 *ḡu-tsog-ḡu*, 'Ass, Meadow Ass'. But we can also see that *gdzu-ḡbyi*, *gzu-ḡbyi*, since *ḡbyi* 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-ḡbyi*, properly means not 'ass' but 'tiger'.

We have here, it seems, the explanation of the whole matter. For the Nam text actually has *ḡjuḡhu* (l. 312) with the signification 'tiger', or, at least, some clawing beast ; and this is, perhaps, the Chinese *hu* (Ancient, 'ḡuo, Karlgren, No. 87), or *ü* (Ancient *ngiu*, Karlgren, No. 1284), having that meaning.<sup>1</sup> The resemblance of the Chinese loan-word to the native Nam word, *zu*, *ḡu*, *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 :

ḡrañ-ḡche-ḡju-ge-ḡcaḡ-ḡtso-ḡtsaḡ, 115  
 'self-willed asses are equal to *ḡcaḡ* (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', *ḡjuḡhu*, but this same *ḡcaḡ*, which also appears as *cha*, *ḡcha* : cf. *za/zo*, &c., p. 199. Line 71

<sup>1</sup> The *ḡu-brab* of one of the Tibetan Manuscripts, denoting some unlucky cast in divination, is perhaps a 'clawing tiger'.

speaks of 'glaring' *hcha*, and in ll. 235, 239, 240, 242, of the *ca* or *hchah* as requiring suppression in company with the yak; but ll. 202, 203 speak of its 'horns' (*hru*).

The word *hcah/cha*, which is really nothing but the Tibetan verb *hchah*, 'snap at', 'mangle', together with two other terms, namely *hdrab* and *hbrad*, 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 *hcah* can be a common designation of all animals which 'mawl', *hdrab* of all animals which 'snatch' (*hbrab*), and *hbrad* 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-hdor-yon* = Tib. *stor*, 'be lost', 'go astray', cf. *hthor*, *btor*, *gtor*, 'be strewn, dispersed, &c.' + *dor/hdor*, 'throw out', 'cast out', 'forsake', + *yon*, on which see p. 199):

*hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re-mehi-klu-hcah-yañ-stor-hdor-hyon*

*kyu-ldoñ-rño-re-kya-wa-ne-yañ-stor-hdor-hyon* ||

*hldyo-hdom-nag-re-hdrab-hwa-hrañ-yañ-stor-hdor-hyon*. ||

In ll. 339-40 and 343-4 the first two reappear:

*hkyu-hldoñ-hrño[-]r[e]-hkyah-hwa-ñe[-]r[e]-hstor-hdehi-hphyid* ||, 339-40

*hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re-mehi-hklu-hcah*

*sroñ-ñe-gse-re-ldañ-[hdehi]-hpyid* ||||, 343-4.

In ll. 214-15, 218, the *hkyaw-wa-ñe*, similarly described as *kyu-hldoñ-hrño*, are said *htshu-to-hphan* ('had better come' ?); and the *hmehi-klu-hcah*, likewise described as *hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re*, have the great *hkho* for their *hkho* ('ruler' ?). In l. 150 the latter are again stated to have fled (*stor-htah-htoni* ||).

In connexion with the last group of passages we find mention of the *hbrad*:

*hbehi-tyañ-rdehe-ge-hstsañ-hbrad-hrdaghi* ||, 213-14

'flocks (*rde*, see p. 270) of sheep and *tyañ* repel (Tib. *rdeg*, "smite") the *hstsañ-hbrad*' (for the sense, cf. the *ldyo-stor* . . . of l. 140, *infra*).

and these *hbrad* appear as 'braves' (*hpah*) in :

*hbrad-re-hpah-yañ-hmañ-ge-hrgam-hjihi* ||

*hbrad-re-hpah-ge-hbrad-sta-hsid-re-hyah-hdahd* ||, 305–6.

Here immediately follow the *hdom-hgu* and the *gdzu-hbyi*; and with the *hdom-hguhu* we find the *hjuhu-hbrad* in :

*hdom-hguhu-rma[-]r[e]-hri-stah-mehi*

*hjuhu-hbrad-rma[-]r[e]-g-ri-sta-mehi*, 312–13.

In ll. 171–3 the *hldyo-hdom-hnag* of l. 162 are said to have talked (*hkoñu-hphrom-hto*) and then apparently to have been deprived of the 'fire of speech' (*hkoñu-mehe*); and they are no longer identified with the *hdrab-hwah-hrañ*, who in ll. 172–3 severally (*hrañ*) talked :

*hdrab-hwah-hrañ-hrañ-re-hkoñu-phrom-hto*

and whose 'fire of speech' was then *hdrab*.<sup>1</sup>

To complete the story it has to be mentioned that :

*ldyo-stor-hthu-re-hdrab-stor-htoho* ||, 140

'the *ldyo* being assembled in flight, the *hdrab* flee'.

The *hjuhu-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 *hbrad*, 'the claws', and their *hbrad-sta*, 'clawings', are noted. Their *rma*, which in ll. 312–13 render the mountains useless (*g-ri-sta-mehi*), are therefore the wounds (Tib. *rma*) which they inflict. The *hdom-hgu* associated with them in this are obviously the bears (Tib. *dom*, 'tawny bear'), the *gre* who in ll. 304–5 occur with the *hdom-hgu* as 'mountain-community-bears' (*hrihi-hrgam-gre*, Tib. *gre*, 'bear'). We can see then that the *hldyo-hdom-nag* associated in l. 162 with the *hdrab-wa-hrañ*, and distinguished from them in ll. 171–3, are another kind of bear, the black (Tib. *nag*) bear. Since, with unmistakable punning, the 'fire of speech' is stated in the case of the *hdrab-hwah-hrañ*, ll. 172–3, to have been 'snatched away' (*hdrab*), whereas in the case of the *hldyo-hdom-hnag* it was *hldyo*, it follows that the *hldyo* in the second case means some kind of 'taking' or 'deprivation'.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tibetan *hbrad* exists as a by-form of *hbrad*, 'claw', 'be wrathful', while *hbrab* is 'snatch', 'beat', &c. Initial *gr*, *dr*, *br* are liable to confusion in even early Tibetan (*hgron/hdron*, *hgrul/hdrul*, *hgrim/hbrim*, *hdrid/hbrid*); and in the Nam there is perhaps some confusion of *hdrab* (cf. *brab*, *supra* p. 253) and *brad*.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the great Tibetan bear, regarded as semi-human and intensely dreaded—being the 'abominable' (which should be 'carnivorous', *gcan-gzan*) 'snow-men' of Himālayan explorers—reference may be made to Prejevalsky, *Mongolia*, ii, 249–51, and Rockhill, *The Land of the Lamas*, pp.

The *ḥkya-ḥwa-ñe* are regularly, we see, described as *ḥkyu-ḥldoñ-ḥrño*, which can reasonably be understood as ‘capable (*ḥrño*) of making off (Tib. *ḥdoñ*) 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 *ḥwa* will very likely mean ‘making’ (cf. *ḥdrab-ḥwa*, ‘snatch-making’ and see *infra*, p. 337), and *ñe* has, as we have seen (p. 222), the signification ‘injuring’, ‘bad’. Thus the *ḥkya-ḥwa-ñe* will be ‘crop-making-injury’ creatures, i.e. antelopes and other fugitive species which make war upon agriculture.

We come now to the *meḥi-ḥklu-ḥcaḥ*, described as *ḥldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri*. The description, in which *ḥpu-ḥbri* may, as shown *supra* (p. 217), but need not, mean ‘male and female’, involves the very difficult word *ḥldyañ* and may therefore be left for a later consideration (pp. 331–3). But *meḥi-ḥklu* 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-lcogs*, in another version *Go-ya-go*. That name is stated to mean ‘Eye-blind’, and in the Nam text *meḥi* and *ḥklu* 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:

*ḥldyañ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re-ḥmeḥi-klu-ḥcaḥ-dze-ḥtor-ḥkho-ge-ḥkhoḥi* ||, 218,

following a description of the great yak as *ḥkho*, which word seems elsewhere to mean ‘chief’ or ‘leader’ (*infra*, p. 263), it seems likely that the meaning is that over (*dze*) the *ḥmeḥi-klu-ḥcaḥ*, ‘the great *ḥkho* (= *ḥgo*, vultures) are *ḥkho* (chiefs)’. As regards the syllable *ḥcaḥ* added to *ḥmeḥi-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 *ḥcaḥ* 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 *hcaḥ* which means 'mangle', 'tear'.

The connexion of the *meḥi-hklu-hcaḥ* with the Nam country may explain why in ll. 343-4 it is said of him that:

sroñ-ñe-gse-re-ldañ-ḥdeḥi-ḥpyid

'being straightly (or straightly and evilly, *ñe*) wise, he suffices as an ally (? *ldañ-ḥdeḥi-ḥpyid*),'

whereas in ll. 339-40 the fugitive *hkyah-hwa-ñe* 'suffices as flying (*ḥstor-ḥdeḥi-ḥpyid*)', i.e. all he wants (or all that we want) is that he should get away, from the crops.

The word *ḥldyo*, attached to the black bear in the recurrent phrase *ḥldyo-ḥdom-nag* and identical, or punningly identified, with a *ḥldyo* 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 *ḥdrab* flee':

the *ḥldyo-ḥdom-nag* are themselves *ḥdrab* (l. 162). In fact, the text itself in ll. 383-4 distinguishes a *ldyo-roḥo*, 'ldyo-district', from a *ḥldyo-ḥro*, 'ḥldyo-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 *ḥbeḥi-tyañ* . . . quoted *supra* (p. 253). In another passage:

ḥdom-ḥgu-ḥtsuḥu-hyañ-ḥmañ-ḥldyo-ḥrgam, 303-4

'though the bears come, cattle in numbers (*ḥmañ-ḥldyo*) 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 *ḥdrab* and *ḥbrad*, but also understand the 'taking' and 'depriving': the 'fire of speech' was 'snatched away' (*ḥdrab*) from the *ḥdrab-hwah-ḥrañ*, but 'milked out' (*ḥldyo*) from the *ḥldyo-ḥdom-ḥnag*. That *ldyo*, in the form *ldyoḥu*, 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:

ḥñu[-]r[e]-ḥñah-rgyeñ-na-ḥñu-ḥldo-ḥldyoḥo ||, 355

'absence of weeping (Tib. *ñu*, *ñur*) being put in order ("arranged" Tib. *yeñ* or "being attended to", "moving softly", Tib. *g-yeñ*), weeping was milked away',

where *hñu* and *hñah* are already known, as also the Abstract Suffix *hldo*; and *rgyen*, with the required sense of 'putting in order', recurs in the next following verse.

The above may help to explain what were the creatures, *sli* and *hrwad*, which in the two cases respectively 'milked' and 'snatched away' the fire of speech:

sli-hti-hrño[-]r[e]-hkoḥu-mehe-hldyo |||, 171-2

hrwad-hbañ-prom-yañ-hkoḥu-me-hdrab, 172-3

so that the *hldyo-hdom-hnag* and *hdrab-hwah-hrañ* have remained speechless. The *hrwad*, who is *hbañ-prom*, i.e. 'made powerful or master (Tib. *dbañ*)', can readily be identified with Tib. *rbad*, 'a large species of eagle', more especially since the next following verse reads:

klag-hrwad-hdzur-[re]-hwi-hwehi-htsag, 173

where *klag*, which appears also in Tib. *klag-cor*, '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.' *Rbad* 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. *hdzur, zur*, &c., "turn aside", "a corner", &c.), the mice or rats (Tib. *byi-ba+hi*, on which see p. 191) collect.'

The mice or rats (*hwi-wa*) can be seen again in ll. 201, 273.

It is therefore fairly certain in advance that the *sli*, 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 *hbehe*, who may be sheep (p. 249). In the present passage they are *hti-hrño*, 'capable of, or acquainted with darkness or stopping (*hti*)': in ll. 288, 318, they are 'wise'; and in the former of these they have authority when the *hrlehi* are accordant or pleased (*hram*) in supervision, whereas in the latter they *ldyon* or *ldyob* (reading not quite certain) when the *hldehi* are *hmor* ('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 (*hti*), and the name might be connected with Hsi-hsia *lin*

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*, *srin-bu*, 'worm', 'maggot', 'insect', 'vermin'?) The *Dictionary* knows *sri* as 'a kind of wild animal'.

22. *rta*, *hṛta*, *rtah*, *hṛtah*; *hbroñ*; *rgyag*, *hcag-rgyag*; *rdzo*; *hkyud*; *hkrug*; *-hgu*; *hldag/gldag-nag/gnag*; *hko-nag*; *hko*, *hkoḥo*, *hkoḥu*, *kho*, *hkhō*, *hkhoh*, *hkhohu*, *hgo*, *rgo*, *rgor*; *rño* (*hko*<sup>o</sup>, *hkhō*<sup>o</sup>, *hku*<sup>o</sup>); *hkus*; *hton*, *gton* (*hgo*<sup>o</sup>, *hrah*<sup>o</sup>); *hkah-hgo*; *rab*; *hrah*, *ra* (*skuḥu*<sup>o</sup>, *mehi*<sup>o</sup>, *rgo*<sup>o</sup>); *hbar*; *rwer*; *hnam*; *hthuñ*; *hpañ*; *hphañ* (*g-ri*<sup>o</sup>, *hrihi*<sup>o</sup>).

That *rta* and *hbroñ* 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 *hbroñ*:

*htañ-hrdzo-hño*[-]r[e]-hṭor-hbroñ-hṭsors, 219-20

*thañ-rdzo-hkyud-na-hbroñ-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. *hkhrug*, '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*, *hbri-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 *hbroñ*, 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 l. 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:

hcag-rgyag-hris(=Tib. bris/ris)-dze-hño-sto-ge-rdo-re-cis-tsha-hbyihi, 83-4

'when, with *hcag-rgyag*-diminished, friends dare, deserters (?) (*hci*, *gei*, 'go', 'come', Tib. *mchi*, *mchis*), are few.

*hcag-rgyag* seems to be an equivalent of Tib. *chag-rgyag*, 'doubt', sc. 'hesitation'. Accordingly in the preceding passage:

hcah-rte-hyu-rgyag-dze-hldas, 82-3

the meaning will not be 'went over to the yak', but:

'making (*rgyag*) alliance with the *hcah* party, deserted'

the *hcah* being the frequently mentioned ravenous animals and *rte* a miswriting, or alternative of *rde*, *hrde* (p. 270), cf. *rto* for *rdo*, 'stone'. Then in:

smu-hdzu-rgyag-dze-hldañ-rmañ-hrwehi ||, 27

'under the stroke (*rgyag*) of brimstone (? = Tib. *mu-zi*), the tombs of wooden posts were destroyed'

and

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 (*gnag*), 130, 132, 134, 135, there is mention of a *hldag-nag*, in l. 136 *gldag-nag*. Line 130:

hthañ-rdzo-hño[-]r[e]-hldag-nag-htshors

in comparison with ll. 219-20 (quoted above) establishes his identity with the *hbroñ*: 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 'Moñ-castle' (ll. 128-9, 135-6) and the horse's departure, just as was that of the *hbroñ*. 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. *ltag*, '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. *ltañ*, 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 :

hpū-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).<sup>1</sup> *Hgo*, = *mgo*, also, occurs in the manuscripts.

It would be convenient if in the Nam text it were possible to disentangle the several equivalents of Tib. *mgo*, 'head'; *hgo*, 'origin', 'source', 'foremost'; *hgo*, 'stain', 'infect'; *sgo*, 'door', 'entrance', 'means'; *sgo/bsgo*, 'direct', 'command', 'stain with'; *dgo*, 'a species of antelope'; *bgo*, 'portion', 'share', 'division', 'retribution'; *bgo/gos*, 'clothe', 'clothing'; as well as *go*, 'place', 'space', 'way', 'rank', *go* 'understand', *go(-bo)*, 'vulture', *go (ko)*, a particle (on which see pp. 201, 245). The matter is likely to be increased in difficulty by confusion with any equivalents of Tib. *kho*, *-kho*, *ko*, *rko*, *sko*. But some progress has been made :

(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-htuḥu, 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-gton* 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*.

<sup>1</sup> Applied to Tibetan common people, it may be seen in a document quoted by Mdille 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:

rgyed-htso-dro-ho, 'rgyed comes to the htso'	} 105-6
,, -hgo-ḥdro, ' ,, ,, ,, gate'	
,, -ḥkab-ḥdro, ' ,, ,, ,, house')	

ḥdyañ-ḥto-ḥtoñ-ge-ḥgo-gtoñ-mod, 210-11

'the high wall (?) being surrendered, the gate or place is surrendered' (*ḥtoñ/gtoñ*, = Tib. 'send', 'admit', 'give up', *sgo-nas-gtoñ-ba*, 'admit through the door')

phye-ḥgo-ḥthuñ-re-ḥnam-ḥdzam-ḥtar, 145-6

'when there is a small (Tib. *thuñ*) open space, the tame-hearted makes his escape (Tib. *ḥthar*).'

In the phrase *hgo-gtoñ* the meaning of *gtoñ* is guaranteed by the parallel *ḥrah-ḥtoñ*, 'place surrendering', in ll. 146 (with 'army'), 273 (with 'enemy'), 358, *na-rom-ḥtoñ*, 'leave vacant place', l. 100; while in ll. 119, 190, the sense of 'let go', 'emit', appears:

ḥrah-ḥtoñ-gsoḥ-dze-rñe-ge-ḥgo ||, 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 = Tib. *sgo*, 'gate', but is *go*, 'place', used in some rather special sense, 'home', 'station', or the like. We may also regard as doubtful:

rab-ḥgo-cig-dze, 376, 'when the approach to the ford (*rab*) is destroyed (?)'.

The same sense, 'gate' or 'place', is apparent in ll. 46 (*hgo ḥpo*), 261 (*g-rub-ḥgoḥo*), 369 (*ḥgo-ḥdzin*): *ḥkvañ-ḥgo*, l. 212, is obscure (reading uncertain).

In *ḥkah-ḥgo*, 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:

ḥsas-ḥdraḥ-ḥdag-chi-ḥgo-ḥsor-re-ḥyun, 260

'children with (*ḥdag*, "possessed of") nets (Tib. *dra*) spent their time (*yun*) hunting (Tib. *bśor*, *byeḥu-śor*, "hunt-birds") vultures'

because the sport of catching vultures by means of nets is known in Tibet (d'Orléans, *From Tonkin to India*, p. 228).

(f) *rgo* = Tib. *sgo*, the most normal equivalent, is certain in :

*g-rah-hsah-hkhehe* || *na* || *hnor-hdzañ-rgo-htoho* ||  
*rgo-hrah-hnor-[re-]hdzañ-hyah-htoho* ||, 314-15

'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-ra-ba*, 'door-keeper', 'door-guard', is guaranteed by the *sgo-ra*, *sku-ra*, 'door-guard', 'own person', of the Tibetan manuscripts, while the Nam text has probably *skuhu-ra* (l. 6) in the Tibetan sense and also *mehi-ra*, ll. 78, 186, 369, 'eye-horizon', in the sense of 'sentinel'.

The same *rgo* is probable in :

*htsog-hram-hnah-tse-htor-si-rgo* |||, 120

'When *htsog-hram* sickens, it is a great gate of death'

*še-rgo-hldom-dze-hpah-hrgam-hnam* ||, 258-9

'When the wise have their doors shut, the community of heroes declines (Tib. *ñams*)'

and clearly also in the antithesis :

*rgor* (= Tib. *hgor*) . . . *hbar* (= Tib. *bar*) . . . *rwer*, 96-7

'at the beginning . . . in the middle . . . at the end (?).'

(g) An entirely different *hko* must be seen in the recurrent expression *hko-rño* (ll. 53-6, 272, 342), *hkho-rño* (ll. 189, 267). The second syllable, corresponding to Tib. *rño*, 'be able', supplied in early times a very common expression *rño-thog*, 'capable', 'competent', which we should be prepared to find reflected in *hko(hkko)-rño*. In that case the *hko(hkko)* might be connected with Tib. *hkho/mkho*, 'think, or be, of use, necessary', *hkhos*, 'value', 'importance', 'necessity', 'usefulness'.

Outside the compound *hko(hkko)-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*<sup>o</sup>, l. 141; *hwa*<sup>o</sup>, 'make', 'do' ?, ll. 116, 269, 335; *ldoñ*<sup>o</sup>, *hldoñ*<sup>o</sup>, 'go', 'depart', ll. 161, 214, 369; *hkog*<sup>o</sup>, l. 189; *hyog*<sup>o</sup>, *g-yog*<sup>o</sup>, 'serve', 'help', ll. 156, 289, 322.

These facts would favour in *hko(hkko)-rño* a verbal meaning of the

*hko(hkko)*; and the Verb *hkho* in the sense of 'be of use' would be suitable.

It cannot, however, be said that that meaning of *hko(hkko)-rño* is everywhere satisfactory. In :

rbyo-*hko-rño-dze*, 53, 'under a capable *rbyo*' (cf. 56)

*hko-rño-ge-ḥco*, 55, 'the capable are leaders'

*hko-rño-ḥyah-ge*, 272, 'with the capable in the van'

that meaning might suffice. And in :

*hko-rño-ḥce-dze*, 53-4, 54-5,

we might understand *hko-rño* as a Noun, 'ability' ('of great ability'), or take the *ḥce* adverbially = 'greatly'. But in some of these cases we might prefer the signification 'leader' or 'master', e.g. in :

*stor-hkko-ḥrño-re*, 189, 'when the master is lost',

and in :

*hko-rño-klu-re*, 342, 'when the leader is blind',

the rendering 'capable' would be contradictory.

If this is so, we can still work with the Tibetan *hkho/mkho*, provided that we adopt the signification 'chief person or thing', which sense may have given rise to the expression *kho-na*, 'only', 'exactly', 'the very', occurring in the famous Buddhist term *de-kho-na*, 'essence', 'reality'. A *kho* signifying 'chief' is required in :

*ḥkhar-ḥrpag-g-yar-re-stor-moñ-hjoñ-re*

*re-ḥmoñ-hjoñ-re-ḥldag-gnag-ḥkkoḥo* ||, 128-9

'Low Town having become high, Moñ-castle lost,

In all (?) the Moñ-castle the black-back is chief.'

And this is confirmed by the repetition of the word in ll. 215-18 :

*ḥtor-ḥbroñ-ḥkkoḥo . . . ḥtor-ḥkko-ge-ḥkkoḥi*

'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 *hkho* accounts also for *hri-hkko*, ll. 291, 295, 'hill-top', more especially as in ll. 290-1, it is contrasted with *g-ri-ḥpañ*, 'hill-bosom' (side), recurring in ll. 302 (*hriḥi-ḥphañ*), 308.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tib. *ri-kha*, p. 132, *supra*.

*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 *hkoḥo*, for which Tibetan supplies no etymology, occurs in l. 101, where it is equivalent to the very common *hkoḥu/hkḥoḥu*, '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 *ḥtab-hkḥoḥu-hkḥoḥu*, ll. 292, 295 (p. 298), 'answer-speaking-speaking', i.e. conversing, in which *ḥtab* will be = Chinese *ta* (Ancient *tap*, Karlgren, No. 954), which in Tibetan script occurs many times as *tab*.

(i) In case the phrase *hkoḥo-hko-bphyag*, l. 101, should signify 'saluted (Tib. *phyag*, "salutation") with a view to speaking', the same *hko* would be possible in:

*hseḥe-hkoḥo* (327, *hkhoho*)-*ḥgyan-re-ḥlab-hko-ḥgyan* ||, 325 'harms as cause were the cause of telling (sc. the narrative)' and the *hkhoh-ḥtah*, l. 328, or *hkhoh-ḥdah*, l. 329, which were 'restrained', or 'damned' (*ḥdam*), like the *hse-ḥtah*, '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. *ḥgo*, 'beginning', *ḥgyan* being obscure.

(j) Doubtful is *hko* in 67 (*hko-se-ḥgro*), 123 (*hśi-hwa-hko*, 'only', 'verily'?), 125 (*ḥldañ-krañ-hko*, 'only'?), 390 (*hko-ḥto-swad*); also *hkhoh* in 209 (*hkhoh-ḥsañ*, 'chief'?), 241 (*hño-rgam-kho-re*), 295 (*hño-hkhoh-ḥsog-ge*), 217 (*kho-sñe*). See *kho/hkhoh* in Vocabulary.

23. *hri*, *g-ri*, *hrihi*, *g-rihi*; *mehi*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥdoñ*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥrañ*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥswah*<sup>o</sup>, *g-ri*; *hri-hño*, *hkhoh*, *ḥpañ* (*ḥphañ*), *ḥruḥu*, *ḥgru*; *ḥto*, *tho*; *spo*; *hseḥe*; *sti*; *ḥti*; *ḥyor*; *g-yog*; *gras*, *ḥgras*, *ḥras*; *ḥrde*, *rdeḥe*; *ḥwad*; *ḥci*; *tho-rgyam*; *ḥkuñ*; *ḥbu-rwye* (*rbye*); *ḥsañ-ma*; *ḥmar-ḥbab*; *ḥroñ*; *ḥkad*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥdzam-ḥbroñ*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥbo*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥroñ*; *la*, *ḥlah*; *la-po*; *gdag*; *ḥdzu*; (2) *ḥroñ*, *g-roñ*; *ḥyed*; *ḥdze*, *ḥtswe*, *ḥtsweḥu*; *g-ri-ta*; *ḥtañ* = *ḥthañ*; *mu-ḥro*; *ḥna-ḥlam*; *ḥlo-ḥrañ*; *ḥrgyen*; *ḥrgyañ*.

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', *ḥphrañ-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:

*hdoñ-hri-hldyañ-ge-spo-hpod-pod*

*hrañ-hri-hldyañ-[ge-]hsehe-hwad-hwad*, 13-14

the *hdoñ-hri* are contrasted with the *hrañ-hri*, and the *spo*, which cannot be different from Tib. *spo*, 'summit of a mountain', with the *hsehe*, which likewise = Tib. *rtse*, 'top', 'peak', 'summit of a mountain', 'house-roof', &c. The *hrañ-hri* are evidently the 'self (i.e. by themselves, solitary, single) mountains', since *hrañ* = 'self', Tib. *rañ*, pervades the text. The *hdoñ-hri* are probably not the 'trench, hole, pit, crater (Tib. *doñ*) mountains', but rather the 'face (Tib. *gdoñ/mdoñs*), i.e. contoured, mountains', since the Tibetans shared the universal tendency to see faces, heads, &c., in mountain ridges.

The *mehi-g-ri-htah* contrasted with *śid-g-ri-htor* in:

*mehi-g-ri-htah-dze-rtah-htsog-hram*, 35

is, no doubt, the 'border of the fire-mountain',<sup>1</sup> 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-htor*, *dgu-hldo*, ll. 78, 139, 191) in connexion with the fall of the 'Moñ-castle' and the earthquake.

As regards the parts of mountains, the *hri-hkho*; 'mountain-top' (Tib. *ri-kha*) and *hrihi(g-ri, &c.)-hpañ(hphañ)*, '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' (*Glañ-ru*) mountain is known.

The passage (ll. 299-301):

*hse-hse-hldoñ-hcañ-g-ri-sti-hyor-re*

*hri-hño-hdzoñ-g-yog-re-rgyañ-ge-hrihi-sti-hyor-re* ||

*hrim-hldoñ-hsañ-hyañ-hri-hgru-gras-re-hri-hci-hwadhi* ||

mentions the *g-ri(hrihi)-sti-hyor*, the *hri-hño*, and the *hri-hgru*. The *hyor* must be = Tib. *yor*, seen in *tho-yor*, 'pyramid of stones heaped up as a votive pile, a cairn' (*tho* meaning

<sup>1</sup> It could, however, be 'eye(sc. sentinel-post)-mountain', the *hstsañ-hri* of ll. 290, 295, the *hswañ-g-ri* of l. 296: see p. 278 and l. 186 *hldyañ-g-ri* . . . *mehi-hrah*.

'boundary', cf. *mtshams-tho*),<sup>1</sup> i.e. the oft-illustrated *obo* (Tib. *lab-rtse*, for *la-rtse*?) of modern travellers.<sup>2</sup> 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/hthi* (*sti-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-hño-hdzoñ-g-yog*, i.e. 'the castle (*hdzoñ*) below (*g-yog*) on the mountain side or slope (*hño* = Tib. *ños*)', whose walls, perhaps (*hrgyañ* = Tib. *rgyañ*, 'wall'), or which, stretching (Tib. *rgyañ*), 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, 'alined 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 *gce*, *gceh*, 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-hyañ-hwad*); and in a line quoted *supra* (*hsehe-hwad-hwad*) of the summits themselves; nor is it to be doubted that in *hwad-hldañ-krañ* (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-hkuñ ||, 309

'With great heat, the large mountain is hollowed out or caves in' (Tib. *khuñ*, 'hole', 'pit', 'cavity', e.g. in *sna-khuñ*, 'nostril', *brag-khuñ*, 'cleft in a rock').

For the compound *brag-khuñ* has had in the Hsi-fan languages a considerable vitality. In the Rgya-roñ it is, quite regularly, *prakhī*, 'cave',<sup>3</sup> and in the dialects collected by the Vicomte d'Ollone

<sup>1</sup> *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 274: 11, 361. 1, &c.

<sup>2</sup> 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. LIX; Filchner, *Om Mani Padme Hum*, frontispiece.

<sup>3</sup> *pra-kha*, 'precipice'.



it is *tchra-tcho* (No. 36), *tcha-kon* (No. 40), *haguen* (No. 41, Go-lok), *huèki* (No. 42, Go-lok), *tchra*, *tcha*, being stated to mean 'rock' (= Tib. *brag*). The word *hkuñ* is also used of a ruined 'Mon-building' (*hrtsig-mon*) in l. 380, and then, l. 382, of friendship (*hdzah-hldah*), or friends, become 'hollow'. This metaphor is applied, moreover (l. 124), to *hldañ-krañ*.

Also connected with mountains are the *hbu-rwye-hce-rgyañ* of the passage :

*g-yog-hsañ-ma-hpul-dze-hmar-hbab-ge-hrloho* ||  
*hbu-rwye-hce-rgyañ-dze-hldyo-htor-ge-hnus* ||, 15-16

a passage immediately following the verses concerning the *hdon-hri* and *hrañ-hri*: in ll. 50-1 the passage, with the lines inverted and with *hrab* for *hrloho*, *rbye* for *rwye*, and *tor-hnus* for *htor-ge-hnus*, is repeated. *Rwye-hce*, *rbye-hce*, can at once be identified with the *dbye-che* of a Tibetan text, the additional *rgyañ* forming with *hce* a recurrent phrase = 'of great extent': the Tibetan *dbye* = 'plain', 'expanse', 'extent'. Then *hbu* 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 *hbu* (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 *hbu* 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. *gsañ-ba/bsañ-ba*: in the Berlin fragment *sañ-ma*)', sc. mud, and that they have *hmar-hbab*, 'cascades', is due to the world-cataclysm. *Hrloho*, *hldyo-htor*, and *hnus* may be reserved: likewise the expressions *g-ri-hkruhu-hbro*, l. 313 = *hri-hkruhu-hbroho*, l. 294, *gyañ-g-ri-hjim*, ll. 313-14, *hstsañ-hrihi*, ll. 290, 294 (*hri*) = *hscañ-hyer-hri*, ll. 296-7.

In l. 296, *hswah-g-ri-hto-na*, *hto* is probably = Tib. *mtho*, 'high' (see *supra*, p. 248), while *hswah* has a relation to *hstsañ/hscañ*, 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 *hron* so patently = Tib. *ron*, 'defile', 'gorge', on

which see pp. 5–6, that it is unnecessary to discuss the matter. But in:

hbañ-re-ḥko-ḥtar-dze-ḥna-ḥlam-glo-ḥrañ ||  
 ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-ḥroñ-dze-ḥdam-to-ḥbu-ḥpor, 67–8

we have two phrases, *hbañ-re-ḥko-ḥtar* and *ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-ḥroñ*, which both recur several times (ll. 371, 373, 384, 386, 388, 390), and in ll. 373–4:

ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-ḥroñ-re-ḥbañ-ḥko-ḥtar-dze-ḥkad-ḥroñ-re-rgyen are accompanied by a third phase, *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 Ś. C. Das’s *Tibetan Dictionary* (s.v. *khun-tshag*) we learn that the Tibetans have phrases, *khun-tshag* and *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. *gyen-du*, ‘uphill’, *gyen-gzar-po*, ‘steep ascent’, &c.) connects with Tib. *gad*, ‘rock’, *gad-pa*, ‘a precipitous cliff of conglomerate such as often walls in the mountain rivers’, ‘a wide crack in a conglomerate rock’, *gad-skyibs*, ‘a rock cavern’, *gad-rqyal*, ‘the walls of conglomerate rock through which mountain-torrents have cut their way’, *gad-phug*, ‘a cavern or cleft in a conglomerate rock’. A place near to Hgru-gu monastery in Amdo, by name *Ka-droñ* (i.e. *Kad-roñ*) is mentioned in the *Geografia Tibeta*, 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 *ḥna-ḥlam-glo-ḥrañ*, ‘the home path (Tib. *lam*) is spirit-joyous (Tib. *rañ*)’. It may help in the interpretation of *hbañ-re-ḥko-ḥtar-dze*, when we shall have decided between the possible meanings of *hbañ*.

With *ḥroñ*, ‘gorge’, ‘valley’, quite unconnected is the *g-roñ* of:

ḥde-me-ḥtaḥ-g-roñ-ḥyed-ge-ta, 71  
 ‘fires of prosperity, diffusing *g-roñ*.’

*Hyed*, elsewhere, ll. 53, 393, used of emitting fire (*me/sme*), in the second instance a metaphorical ‘fire of hate’ (*ḥśañ-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-roñ* here = Tib. *groñ*, 'die', 'death'; the fires are 'expiring'. Though in this passage 'cold' is more apposite, the signification 'death' is acceptable in:

śes-ḥmad-ḥdzwehe-re-ḥpaḥ-ḥroñ-ḥkes, 36

'when the wisdom-low *ḥdzwe*, the brave gain death.'

But even here the meaning 'the brave are chilled' is supported by:

śes-ḥmad-ḥdzwe-dze-mye-mye-ḥtañ ||, 39

'when the wisdom-low *ḥdzwe*, the power of fire is rotted.'

The decision depends upon the unascertained signification of *ḥdzwe*, which, if = *ḥtswe*, is again antithetic to 'fire' in:

. . . mog (cloud)-ḥtswe-re-mye-ḥyañ-ḥwad ||, 6.

If this *ḥtswe* could be connected with Hsi-hsia *ḥdzu*, *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 *ḥdzwe*. But the paronomasia would demand a second *ḥtswe/ḥdzwe*, which, if it meant 'play', 'sport', might be = Tib. *rtse/rtseḍ*, and, since in eastern Tibet *tshe* and *tshi* are indistinguishable in pronunciation from *khye* and *khyi* (cf. p. 299 and Jaeschke Berlin Academy *Monatsbericht*, 1865, p. 443), might also be = Hsi-hsia *mkkhe/mkhwe*, 'play' (Nevsky, No. 73). The same signification would suit the *tswehu* of l. 196 (p. 245).

Clearly antithetic to *ḥroñ*, 'gorge', is the *ḥlah* of:

ḥbo-ḥroñ-ḥrog-re-ḥlah-ḥkyañ-ḥras-re-ḥśes-ḥśi-ḥdzuḥi ||,  
344-5

'the wooded gorge being a torrent (Tib. *grog*), the passes (*ḥlah*) also lined by the enemy (on *ḥras*, *ḥgras*, see p. 266), the wise evades<sup>1</sup> (?) death.'

This *ḥlah* is evidently = Tib. *la*, 'pass', and it is so spelled in the following line:

rgyeb-ḥchi-ḥro-re-gdag-yañ-la-por-ḥśes-ḥśi-ḥdzuḥi ||, 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. °*pho*), 'a pass over a lofty mountain; also a high peak'. On *gdags*, 'bright', as applied to mountains,

<sup>1</sup> 'Feigns'? *Ḥdzu* = *rdzu*, 'be disguised', occurs in a document (*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 205: 38, A 2).

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 . . . lgyoĥo-ge-htañ-mu-hro ||*, 10-11.

The reading is partly obscured in the manuscript, and the meaning of *lgyoĥo* 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-hldaĥ ||*, 301

'While the horse is doing *swa*, the mountain is possessed of *hrde*.'

This *hrde* is likely to be identical with *rdeĥe* of:

*hbehi-tyañ-rdeĥe-ge*, 213

where *hbehi* is a word found elsewhere signifying 'sheep'. If *rdeĥe* = '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*, *gdeĥ* (Nevsky, No. 45). The passage continues:

*rñe-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-hldoñ* (mist? avalanche?), who are associated with *hldim* (disappearances?):

*hgah-hldoñ-hrañ-re-hmañ-g-ri-hpañna*

*dgu-hldo-htor-ge-hmañ-g-riĥi-ĥkuñ ||*

*hmu-wa-rño-ge-hgah-hldoñ-ĥkyud ||*

*hgah-hldoñ-hrañ-re-hldim-hmañ-hto ||*, 308-11

'The *hgah-hldoñ*' 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. *khuiñ*, 'cave', &c.):

Able to cause cold is the *hgah-hldoñ* race.

When the *hgah-hldoñ* are free, there are many *hldim* (?)'

After the *hgah-hldoñ* come the *ĥkhu*:

*hrñe-hldaĥ-hro[-]re-hmañ-ĥkhu-stañ ||*, 303

'there being hostile wolves (*hro*?), the great *ĥkhu* (? = Tib. *spyañ-ku* (and °*khui*) '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-hbyi-hkyud*). With reference to these hostile creatures severally it is stated (ll. 310–13) that, if they are on the mountain (*hri/g-ri/g-rihi*), the mountain is (practically) ‘not there (*sta(stah)-mehi*)’.

24. *gñim*, *gñi*, *hñi*; *hñi*, *hñis*; *hñi-htor*, °*htsa*; *sñi*; *rñi*; *mog*, *hmog*, *gmog*; *rgya-hñi-ke*, *hrgyah-hñi-hke* (*hkehe*); *hrgyah*, *hgyah*; *hkor*; *ke*, *hke*; *hjo*, *hjoħo*, *ħdzoho*; *hlab*; *hla*, *lah*; *htag*; *htog*, *htog*; *hchos*; *hdub*; *skar*; *mu*; *rmu*.

*Gñim*, probably meaning ‘day’ (Tib. *ñin*) and conjoined with *hti*, = ‘darkness’, has already (p. 236) been noted. And this renders it probable that in:

*rta-hso-hnaħ-yañ-gñi-ħrdzum-doħo* ||, 80

*gñi* = Tib. *ñi-ma* (sometimes *gñi*°, ‘the sun’: ‘the sun smiled’, *ħrdzum*); for the next verse states that ‘when a good (?) man perishes, an inferior man rises’ (*supra*, p. 227), and in ll. 81–2:

*hśañ-re-hśig-dze-hmog-re-ħldoñ*,

‘when all hostility perishes, every cloud (*hmog*)<sup>1</sup> departs.’

That *mog/hmog/gmog* means ‘cloud’ is indicated by antithesis to ‘fire’ (*mye*) in:

... *mog-ħtswe-re-mye-hyañ-ħwad* ||, 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’ *rmūkha*, ‘cloud’, *mug*, ‘(mental) gloom’ (*gti-mug*, *yid-mug*, &c.), *mun*, ‘darkness’; and then also with *mog*, ‘dark-colour’, and further with *rmoñ*, ‘be obscured’, ‘puzzled’, *rmoñs*, ‘deluded’, ‘delusion’: as a translation of Sanskrit *megha*, ‘cloud’, it is probably to be seen in the name of the ‘retreat Ñam-Kan-mog’ (*mahā-megha*), in the Śa-cu region, mentioned in *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 365, 367; and perhaps Lo-lo *mow*, is the same word.

Accordingly in:

*hmog-hce-rgyañ-rgya-hñi-ke-hkor-[re]-hśid*, 52–3

‘Clouds of great extent perish (*hśid*)—when the *rgya-hñi-ke hkor*’

we suspect that *hñi* has to do with the sun, more especially as in l. 199 we find the spelling *rgyah-gñi-ke*. This expression, with

<sup>1</sup> Hence we may neglect the possibility that *gñi-rdzum* means ‘had their eyes closed’ (Tib. *ħdzum* = *ħdzum*, ‘smile’) in sleep (Tib. *gñid*)? In l. 263 (p. 283) *rdzum* is an epithet of ‘fire’.

further variants, *hrgyah*, *hke*, *hkehe*, is to be seen also in ll. 291, 295, 319. The Verb *hkor* can evidently be = Tib. *hkhor*, 'go round', 'return', which, in fact, appears elsewhere in the text.

But the expression *rgya-hñi-ke*, being a whole, might have other explanations; and the syllable *hñi* might, for instance, be connected with Tib. *gñis*, *ñis*, 'two', which we have found in the form *sñi*. We might then see in the *ke* a suffix, akin perhaps to Tib. *ka* in *gñis-ka*, *gñi-ga*, 'the two', *gsum-ka*, 'the three', *lña-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 *ña-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'; 'steelyard'; '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-hdih-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 *ñi-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-hñi-ke* denotes the sun and moon.

Who (apparently some living creatures) are the *hñi-htor* of l. 187 is obscure: they are likely to be the *htor-hñi-htsa-ge*, over whom the Great Yak becomes lord in:

*htor-hñi-htsa-ge-htor-hbron-hkhoḥo*, 215-16

and probably not the *tor-sñi* of the *thañ* fields:

*hthañ-le-tshañ-dze-tor-sñi-rgam*, 219.

*sñi/rñi* 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' (*hdru-hjar*, see p. 369). Further, the Tibetan manuscripts refer to *Sñi* mountains in the Skyi country.

But a Verb *hñi*, probably connected with *ñi-ma*, 'sun', and meaning 'shine', may be seen in:

*hjo-me-hdub-re-hlab-ma-hñi*, 67

'When the *hjo* fire sinks,<sup>1</sup> the *hlab* does not shine'

<sup>1</sup> In the Tibetan Manuscript *bdub* seems to be Preterite of *hdub* (usually 'be fatigued') in this sense, which usually is expressed by *nub*.

which seems to be directly contradicted by :

hjo-me-ḥdub-re-ḥlab (*possibly* ḥla)-me-ḥñis ||, 70

‘When the *hjo* fire sinks, the *ḥlab*(*ḥla*) fire is ablaze’

which contradiction may, however, be due to mistaken omission of the vowel-mark (*e*) over the *ma* of l. 67.

There is a strong temptation to find in the antithesis *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 :

ḥwa-ste-ḥge-dze-ḥla(l. 75 *lah*)-ḥram-ḥte ||

‘with exhausted (*ḥwa-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 :

ḥde-me-ḥtaḥ-g-roṅ-ḥyed-ge-ta-ḥwa-ste-ḥtaḥ ||, 71–2

‘the fires of prosperity, making cold emissions, are exhausted’, and because in l. 75 it is said that :

ḥwa-ste-ḥgeḥe-dze-dgu-ḥtor-ḥbyi

‘with exhausted good fortune the great heat [becomes] small’.

Thus for ‘moon’ we have *ḥla*, *lah*; and *la* is, in fact, the most widely attested Tibeto-Burman form with that signification. In Tibetan *zla-ba*, indeed, the *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*, *ḥlo-bo*, &c., which may not be loan-words from Tibetan. But nothing would justify a monosyllabic *ḥlab*, for *ḥla-ba*, in Nam or the related languages; and the *ḥlab* of the text could be explained only as a scriptural miswriting, not indeed unparalleled in the manuscript, of *b* in place of *ḥ* in a form *ḥlah*. Even so, it would be difficult to discover either in Tibeto-Burman or in Chinese (*jih*, in old Tibetan script *ḥir*) an etymology for a *hjo*, *jo*, = ‘sun’. We must therefore seek a different antithesis.

With the signification ‘chieftain’ (Tib. *jo/co/gtso*, &c.) *hjo* is evident in :

myi-rgye-mye[-]r[e]-ḥchos-ḥyo-ḥjo, 153–4

‘if there is no great man, the initiator is the chief’

where *ḥchos*, which in ll. 158–9 also means ‘beginning’ (+*hyo*, ‘manage’, ‘carry on’, see p. 132), is the same word as *cho* of one of the Tibetan manuscripts, meaning both ‘beginning’ and ‘chief-

tain': it may be itself connected etymologically with *hjo*. The same *hjo*, 'chief', is seen in:

*hyañ-tsa-hjo-dze-hyañ-ge-hgroms*, 63-4

'under the good as chiefs the good flourish (*hkroms*)'

*trog-hjo-rñe-dze-pyi-rjes-ne-ħcer*, 201-2

'under an evil enemy chief a memorial looks terrible to the good'

*hphañ-ma-rañ-ge-ħtsaħ-hjo-ħdzin*, 73-4

'substitutes (sc. children) for father and mother hold the chieftainship'.

Whether this is the meaning of *hjo* in ll. 372, 387, 389, we may for the present leave undetermined.

But an antithesis 'chieftain' (or 'leader')/'speaking' (*ħlab*), though in some possible context it might be found to work, could not bear repetition as in:

*ħbañ-ħreħe-ħkheħe-ħbañ-ħre-ħgeħe-na*

*jo-re-ħgeħe-ħlab-re-ħge*, 251-2

'Every *ħbañ* a gain, every *ħbañ* a joy,

Every *jo* a joy, every *ħlab* a joy'

*sta-bañ-rpag-re-ħyah-me-bbyam-re*

*jo-me-ħbyam-re-ħlab-me-ħbyam-na || ° ||*, 252-3.

'There, every *bañ* being made low, front (or face) fire mild (or abundant),

*jo*-fire mild, *ħlab*-fire mild'.

*hjo(ħdzo?)-chi-te-re-ħlab-ħñañ-ħyah-ħtaħ-ħldyañ-ħro-ħpeħi||*, 385-6.

'When *hjo* comes, *ħlab*-words (or °hearing, Tib. *ñan*?) correspond (?), is mark (or example) (?) of *ħldyañ*-country'.

(The only authority for *ñañ* = 'words', beyond its appropriateness with *ħlab*, being Hsi-hsia *nian* (Laufer, No. 167)).

Another certain signification of *hjo/ħdzo* is 'eat', corresponding to Tib. *za*, *zos*, *bzah*, *bzos*.<sup>1</sup> A Nam example of this in the form, perhaps Imperative, *gzo* will be quoted *infra* (pp. 334-5): the following may be added:

*rñe-ħpo-ħldo-ge-ħkeħu-prom-hjo*, 177

'the fiend (or enemy) braves ate the *ħkeħu*-making'

*ħrñe-ħpo-ħñe-ge-ħkoħu-prom-ħdzoho*, 361-2

'the wicked fiend (or enemy) braves ate the speaking'.

Here the forms *hjo* and *ħdzoho*, occurring in two different state-

<sup>1</sup> 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 *ḥdzah* in:

*ḥbañ-ḥldaḥ-ḥne-ge-ḥkeḥu-me-ḥdzah* ||, 170

'good authorities eat the fire of *ḥkeḥu*'

which occurs in the context of the references to the 'milking out' and 'snatching' the fire of speech. What *ḥkeḥu* is may be considered later.

These examples do, indeed, substantiate the expression *ḥlab-me*, 'fire of speech', and in antithesis thereto a 'fire of eating' (*ḥjo-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 *ḥjo/jo* as equivalent to Tibetan *bzo*, 'make', 'manufacture', 'work', 'craft', 'fashion'. It is possible that in the form *ḥjoho* this is to be found in:

*na-ḥtsaḥ-ste(= ḥtsas-te)-dze-ḥldyo-ḥthor-ge-ḥnus-dze-g-rah-ḥyos-ḥtag-ge-ḥjoho* ||, 33-4

'On the harvested fields . . . the earthquake acted as a mill (Tib. *ḥthag*)'

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 *ḥjo/jo* in *ḥjo/jo-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:

*ḥbri-re-ḥrdyam-re-ḥkhaḥ-ḥldaḥ-ḥñaḥḡhi*

*ḥdzohu-ro-ḥldi-re-ḥjohu* || *ḥwa-ḥkaḥ*

'When females are restrained (*ḥrdyam*, p. 350), talkers have voice:

This being a place for males, action is the talk.'

The word *ḥbañ/bañ*, 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*, Hōrpa *sgrē*, Tākpa, *kar-ma*, Mānyak *krah*, Mo-so *khō*, *ki*, *kü*, *kō*, and various forms in Lo-lo, does not seem to present difficulty. The sole occurrence of *skar*, (l. 191) *rnam-skar*, 'threatening, or alarming star', has been quoted, *supra* p. 244. The word *mun*, l. 33, is likewise a ἀπαξ εἰρημένον: 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:

hmu-hrñu-skhrud-dze-mor-htañ-[hgras] ||, 9-10

'On the *hmu*, put to flight (Tib. *skrud*) 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:

hsah-chad-rmu[-]r[e]-hkoḥu-prom-g-yeḥe

'the earth having its boundaries fixed (*chad*), speech was distributed (?)'

hbyi-hri-hgañ-ge-chi-hrmu-hphor || re, 167-8

'all the little hills having boundaries for their going released'.

Cf. l. 353:

gzu-hdro-hphor-[re]-hchi-hdo-hdyañ

'the ass, being released to go (*hdro-hphor*), started to depart'.

25. *swah*, *hswah*, *swa*; °g-ri, °hram, °hrsañ; *hsah*, *gsah*; °hldah, °htsah; °g-yer (*hyer*); *hstsañ-*, *hscañ-*, *hyer*; °hldah, °hri (*hrihi*); *htsañ-htsañ*; *htsa-pho*; *gtsañ*, *htsañ*; *hnom*; *hrgu*; *gzo*; *rlehi*, *hldehi*, *hlde*, *hldeḥe*; *tho*; °rgyam; *hjim*, *hdzom*; *hrim-re-hldoḥu*.

The form *swah/swa* is used in a number of clauses of the type:

hrtah-swah-g-we[-]r[e], 164, 301 = rtañ-hswah-g-weḥe, 298,

where the subject is the horse, and the verb is sometimes, as we see, *g-we*, 'make', 'do', while elsewhere it is *hkom/gkom* (ll. 175/222), *hldi[r]* (l. 174), *hphyegs/hpeg* (ll. 176, 360): *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 *swah/swa*, has the same meaning. It cannot be *swa*, the most usual Tibeto-Burman equivalent of Tib. *so*, 'tooth', which does, however, occur in the Nam text as *swa*: that would not accord with the verbs *g-we*, *hkom*, 'make', 'do', 'accomplish'. The same consideration excludes *śa/śwa*, 'stag', *śa/śwa*, 'blood', *rtswa*, 'grass', *tshwa*, 'salt'; *sbaḥ/dbaḥ/hbaḥ/dbas/sbas*, 'magician'; *so*, 'earth', 'place' (in some connexions); and we can think only of *so/gso/gson*, 'live', 'nourish', &c., *sos(-ka)* 'heat', *so*, 'comfort'—all these being perhaps etymologically identical—and *so*, 'watch', 'spy', with which *so* in *so-mtshams*, 'boundary', i.e. 'watch-border', and in *so-kha*, 'frontier guard and toll-station', is similarly identical. In favour of the last is the fact that *so-kha* is actually recorded (*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, i, p. 275, No. 9) in the form *swa*. This meaning harmonizes, further, with the Predicate *hram*, 'agreeing' or 'united (in)', l. 288, and with *mor*, 'bad (in)', and *hṛsaṅ*, 'stern', or 'violent', which in ll. 318–21, in the same context with *mor*, is applied to *swah*.

It is therefore to be understood that the horse, after his retreat to the *hgam*, was employed in the service of a man, viz. the *hbos* (*supra*, p. 231), as 'watch', 'guardian', 'police': and this is, indeed, certain, being stated also in another form. In:

*hṛtaḥ-swah-g-we[-]r[e]-hbos-hsaḥ-hldaḥ*

*hbos-hnom-hsaḥ-gtsaṅ-hrgu-ma-gzo* ||, 164–5

'The horse keeping guard, the master is (really) landowner':

'The crops of the land enjoyed by the master thieves do (or shall) not eat'.

*hsaḥ* = Tib. *sa*, 'land'; *gtsaṅ* = Tib. *rtsaṅ*, 'crop', as in l. 159;<sup>1</sup> *hnom* = Tib. *nom*, 'enjoyments' ('In Amdo all articles, substances, properties (movables) are called *nom-pa*'), frequent in the phrase *gya-nom*, 'abundance', 'wealth and power'; *hrgu* = Tib. *rku/rkun* (in the Tibetan manuscripts also *rgun*), 'steal', 'thief', p. 233; *gzo* = Tib. *za*, *zos*, *bzos* (*zan-zos*), 'eat'.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. l. 378, *hsaḥ-hsaṅ* ?

Elsewhere the horse is said to be *ḥsaḥ-g-yer*, 'awake (Tib., &c., *yer*, "not asleep", *g-yer-po*, "expert", "wise")<sup>1</sup> on the land':

rta-ḥsa-g-yer-dze, 330 = rta-ḥsaḥ-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 *ḥstsah-ḥyer*, not really different (*ts* and *c* being constantly confused in manuscripts) from the *ḥscāḥ-ḥyer* of l. 250 (applied to the horse) and ll. 296-7: in l. 298:

rtaḥ-ḥswah-g-weḥe-ḥbos-ḥstsah-ḥldah

the *ḥbos* is no longer *ḥsaḥ-ḥldah*, 'landowner', but *ḥstsah-owner*'.

Unfortunately, *ḥstsah* also is ambiguous. Shall we understand that the *ḥbos* 'has his watch(man)' (Tib. *btsa*, *btsas*, 'watch', 'scrutinize', a verb well known in Central Asia)<sup>2</sup> 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 *ḥstsah-ḥri* (*ḥriḥi*), which must be equivalent to the *ḥswah-g-ri*, 'watch mountain' of l. 296 and the *ḥtsa-pho* of l. 291 (see *infra*, p. 279), and at the same time proves that the *ḥstsah-ḥyah-ḥthañ* of l. 288 contains the same *ḥstsah*. Provisionally also it is probable that the same *ḥstsah* is to be seen in *ḥyu-ḥstsah-kyim* (*ḥkyim*), ll. 345, 350, 351. A doubt remains in regard to *ḥstsah-ḥbrad-ḥrdag*, ll. 213-14, where 'smite' (Tib. *rdeg*) 'harvest-snatchers' is more likely.

Who then are the *ḥrleḥi*, whose *ḥswah-ḥram*, 'accord in watching', is mentioned in l. 288, and who can scarcely be other than the *ḥldeḥi* of ll. 318-21, whose *ḥswah*, 'watch', may be *ḥmor*, 'bad' (l. 318), or *ḥrsañ*, 'stern', 'violent', ll. 319, 320, 321. These *ḥldeḥi* are, no doubt, the *ḥlde*, *ḥldeḥe* of:

ḥlde-ge-ḥgru-ma-rmañ, 77, 'the *ḥlde* dreamed of *ḥgru-ma*'

ḥlde(ḥldeḥe)-ge-ḥtaḥ-ḥldon, 370, 371, 372, 'let *ḥlde* (prosperities?) return'.

A word *lde*, meaning (a) 'treasury', 'storehouse', (b) 'warm oneself', 'be warmed', appears in the dictionaries; and also *Lde*, 'a

<sup>1</sup> This *yer*, *g-yer*, perhaps preserved in Hōrpa *ta-ryen*, 'wake', is probably an extension of *ye*, 'alert', in *ye-myig*, 'alert-eye' and *ye-śes*, 'alert-knowledge'.

<sup>2</sup> *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-brtan, Khri-sroñ Lde-btsan, &c., including Khri-lde Sroñ-btsan, = Sroñ-btsan 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/ldih/ldi*, 'kingdom', 'futuraity', 'power', 'ought' (Nevsky, Nos. 11, 133) = *li* (Laufer, No. 139), certified as meaning 'rich and of high rank' and occurring in an official title, *wei li*.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, the *hlde* who supervise may be the 'powers' generally. In l. 288 the *rlehi* associated, with the *hyan*, 'good', *mor*, 'bad', *hkru*, '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-hpoñ*, on which see p. 234), unless the expression is metaphorical. But it is also said (l. 319) that the *rgya-hñi-hke* are the 'hldehi of stern watch' (*swah-rsañ*), and in l. 295 they are said to meet (*hdzom*) 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 (*hrim-re-hldohu*); and the expression 'beneath the *hrgyah-hñi-hke*' (*hrgyah-hñi-hke-g-yog*) reminds us of the Tibetan *ñi-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/hlde*, are the 'authorities', 'powers', or 'blessednesses', and sometimes comprise mundane, sometimes superior, powers.

<sup>1</sup> 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-ḥwad-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.<sup>1</sup> There may be some connexion with :

*gyañ-g-ri-hjim-ḥno-ḥkhog-re-ḥphaḥ* ||, 313-14.

A different *tho* applied in l. 132 to the 'black-back' and in l. 374 (*htho*) to *ḥpaḥ-ḥwe*, 'brave deeds (doers)' is, no doubt = Tib. *mtho*, 'high': and the same has been suspected (p. 248) in regard to *ḥdyañ-hto*, l. 210, *g-ri-ḥto*, l. 296, *phyañ-hto*, l. 374.

In l. 42, where the horse is not in question :

*ḥsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ-ḥdzañ-dze-ḥklom-ge-ḥtul*, 'under wise *ḥsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ* the *ḥklom*<sup>2</sup> are restrained'

it seems that *ḥsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ*, repeated in l. 44 as *ḥtsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ*, must be understood as *ḥsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ*, '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

<sup>1</sup> Since in l. 156 mention is made of collection of *hjim-ta* serviceable for wounds :

*rma-g-yog-rño-ge-hjim-ta-ḥthus*

and since Tib. *hjin* 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'.

*Hjim-li-li-pa-la-la* may conceivably mean 'drug-collectors professedly, really fighters', which would harmonize with the *no-ḥkhog-re-ḥphaḥ*, drug-collectors openly, secretly fighters of l. 314. The syllables *li-li*, perhaps suggesting something small or sly, appear in the Tibetan name (*phri-li-li*) of the lagomus and in *si-li-li* 'sound of rain'.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *htsha*, represented by the Nam *htsah* (perhaps also by Tib. *tsa-kha*, 'target'). Without mention of *hsah*, 'land', we have in l. 268:

ḥtsah-ḥdzañ-ḥyaḥ-ge-ḥwaḥ-ne-ḥbraḥ ||

'With wise supervisors above good work (?) flourishes'  
(cf. p. 339).

*Ḥsah* = '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-ḥtsah-re-ḥrah-ge-ḥldoḥu-ḥjam-rño ||, 276-7

'[in] the places, both lands (estates) and crops (Tib. *btsa*, 'harvest'), were mild-minded groups (?)'.

Concerning *ḥldoḥu*, see pp. 322-3, and cf. *ḥwah-ḥrño-ḥjam*, p. 339.

26. *ḥme*, *me*, *sme*; *mye*; *mehi*, *ḥmehi*; *rme*; *gseg*, *ḥseg*; *ḥgyi*; *ḥcañ*, *cañ*, *chañ*; °*sme*, °*rdzum*; *še-*, *gse-*, *ḥrño-*, *-cañ* (*ḥcañ*); *ḥpuḥi*, *ḥphuḥi*; *ḥphu-ḥklo*, *pu-glo* (*ḥlo*); *ḥdram*; *ḥmu*; *rgyeb*; *ḥdro*; *ḥkus*; *ḥmar-me*; *ḥkah*; *gte*.

It is unnecessary to prove that *me*, *ḥme* (in l. 171 *ḥmeḥe*), 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:

ḥtsog-ḥram-ḥme-dze-ḥtor-ḥtas-ḥproms, 121-2

in which *ḥme* 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 (*ḥmye*), 357) to signify likewise 'fire'; and the only frequent examples to the contrary (ll. 129, 153, 241, 365, 366) are of the type *smyi-ḥnu-mye-re*, l. 241, already quoted as meaning 'if man's power is not'. The negative *ḥme/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/ḥmehi*, on the other hand, normally means 'eye', e.g. in the designation *mehi(ḥmehi)-klu-ḥcaḥ*, in *mehi-ra*,

*mehi-spa*, &c. The *i* in *Hsi-hsia mei*, 'eye', has been noted by Laufer (No. 53). In a number of cases, however, exemplified by:

dgu-ḥldo-ḥtor-ge-su-me-ḥmehi

ḥrah-we-rtah-ge-so-ḥnah-mehi ||, 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 *ḥmuhi* in *me-ḥmuhi*, '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, °*g-ri*, l. 35, °*spa*, °*spehi*, ll. 151, 370, °*cha*, l. 352, °*hpa*, l. 272, °*klu-ḥcha (ḥcah)*, ll. 150, 161, 218, 343, and

*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-ḥwehi* (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-ḥpehi*, l. 212, which probably means 'eye-sparkle' or 'eye-ornament' (see p. 356) and to be not different from the *mehi-spa*, °*spehi*, of ll. 151, 370, and perhaps the *ḥmehi-ḥpah* of l. 272: in l. 211, *re-mye-ḥpah*, 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:

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 l. 159. In l. 181 we have acquiesced (p. 155–6) in an equation to Tib. *gśegs*, ‘go’, which in l. 330 *might* also suit *gśeg/ħśeg*; but, unless the compound *gśeg-sme* has some special sense, that will not serve in regard to *ħśeg-sme* here. This point must therefore be left obscure. Other occurrences of *sme* reinforce the notion of fire, thus:

dgu-ħldo-ħtor-re-ħra-we-rtah

rgyed-ħrañ-sme-re-ħkhar-ħgyi-ñes ||, 191–2

‘The heat being great, the horse gave place:

*Rgyed* being itself a fire, the town’s power (?)<sup>1</sup> was destroyed’.

ħrgyed-ħśañ-sme-ħyed-re, 393, ‘emitting a hate-fire of *rgyed*’.

An occurrence in l. 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-paħi-ħdzo-ħdza-cañ-sme-ħme-ħkeħi ||

g-rah-nag-ħbo-gyañ-chañ-rdzum-me-g-weħi ||, 262–3

‘children as good as their fathers (or as braves) gained an all-blazing fire’

‘. . . made an all-smiling fire’.

Here the expressions *cañ-sme*, *chañ-rdzum*, correspond to the Tibetan *cañ-rig*, *cañ-śes*, ‘all wise’, ‘all knowing’. We might connect *cañ* with *cañs-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 *ħchañ*, *bcañ*, *bcañs*, ‘hold’. The Verb appears in close vicinity in:

ħsas-ħnah-ħdag-chi-phyer-chañ-ħson ||, 260–1

‘children who had sickness were tended (*ħson* = Tib. *gson*), being supported-held (*chañ*).

The signification ‘clever’ appears in cases where *cañ* is not the first member of its compound, in:

rgyed-ħsañ-rgam-cañ, 36, ‘disunity clever in secretly entering company’ (p. 244)

and in l. 91 *śe-chañ*, ‘clever in wisdom’, l. 48 *gse-ħcañ*, ‘clever in harm’, l. 49, *ħrño-ħcañ*, ‘clever in power’, though here the sense

<sup>1</sup> *ħgyi* recurs in l. 346 with *ħyu*, perhaps = Tib. *yul*, ‘country’, ‘village’. Is it = Hsi-hsia *ħgi*, ‘strength’ (Nevsky, 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-ḥdzo-čan*, l. 76, *ḥpus-ḥphya-myi-cañ*, l. 298, *ḥse-ḥse-ḥldoñ-ḥcañ*, l. 299, is similar. On *cañ*, '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 *ḥtor-ḥrta-rme-ge*, always associated with something undesirable, as in :

*ḥtor-ḥrta-rme-ge-ḥso-ḥnah-stor* ||, 231-2

'the great horse being *rme*, the *ḥso-ḥnah* 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. *rme*, 'spot', 'blemish', physical or moral, which in one of the Tibetan manuscripts and elsewhere is spelled *dme* (*dmer-ḥgyur*, 'becomes spoiled', used of flesh corrupting);<sup>1</sup> 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 elsewhere 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 :

*ḥphu-ḥklo-ḥsad-dze-ḥnah-me-ḥmyi* ||

'if the *ḥphu-ḥklo* be destroyed, the place (or house ?) has no fire'.

Here we must necessarily think of Tib. *ḥbud*, *phu*, *phus*, *dbu*, 'blow', *me-phu*, 'blow the fire', *ḥbud-ḥduñ*, 'trumpet', also 'bellows', more especially as that *phu* occurs in the Central-Asian Documents (vol. ii, p. 224). In fact, the *ḥphu-ḥklo* 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 Ś. C. Das's *Dictionary*, s.v. *sbud-pa*. This being so, we can see that the ἀναξ εἰρημένον *ḥklo* is simply the word *glo*, 'lungs', 'mind', which is found in the Nam text (ll. 68, 93, 157), and that *ḥphu-ḥklo* is literally 'blow-lungs': we can see, further, that the phrase

<sup>1</sup> In the Berlin fragment *rme-ma*, mentioned in (ll. 4-5) in company with *ḥaṅ-ma*, 'filth' (*supra*, p. 223), will contain the same *rme*.

*hrañ-pu-glo*, l. 116 = *rañ-pu-ḥlo*, l. 135, means 'himself his own bellows (sc. inspirer)'; possibly

tsig-moñ-we-ge-ḥtsah-ḥpu-ḥloho, 381

may mean

'the Moñ builders are the bellows'.

*Phu*, in the sense of 'blowing' must now be seen in:

ḥno-re-ḥlo-ge-ḥkyi-ḥdzam-ḥphuḥi, 275-6

'in friendly troops the dogs mildly panted'

rgyeb-ḥphuḥi-ḥtoñ-re-ḥyah-wa-ḥkañ, l. 190

'if the rear emits a breath, the front is full of *wa*' (cf. l. 282, *rgyeb-ḥphuḥi-ḥphuḥi*).

And with this and the notion of 'blowing' a fire well agrees the antithesis to *ḥmu*, 'cold', in:

ḥdram-ḥmu-ḥdoñ-ḥtor-sku-ḥphu-ḥti, 103-4

'the stiff (*ḥdram*<sup>1</sup> = Tib. *tram*, p. 251) cold gone (come?), the body-blowing (breath) stops'

rño-mu-rgyeb-re-ḥrañ-pu-glo-re, 116-17

'capacity covered up or kept back by cold (lack of spirit), himself his own bellows'

(*rgyeb* = Tib. *ḥgebs*, *ḥkheb*, *ḥkhyeb*; cf. *ñe-ḥkyeb-ḥkyeb*, l. 17, 'evil spreads over, spreads over'; or = *rgyeb*, as *supra*, p. 228?)

ḥphu-ḥphu-mu[-]r[e]-ḥdzu-ḥdro-ḥkus, 352 (cf. l. 274, p. 331)

'his blow, blow, being cold, the ass desired (Tib. *ḥlchu*) to go (probably with a paronomasia on *dro*, 'heat', 'longed for (*ḥkhu*) heat', which pun recurs in:

ḥdro-ḥbroñ-prom-ge-ḥkōḥi-me-ḥtul, 169, 170.

'the yak being made to *go*, his *fire* of speech was quelled')

and, again in connexion with the ass, in:

lkyañ-ḥzu-ḥrño-re-ḥ[na]ñ-ḥdro-mo

ḥsó-ḥkog-rño || re-ḥnañ-ḥdro-ḥmo ||

stor-ḥkho-ḥrño-re-ḥnañ-ḥdro-thar

ḥmo[-]re-bzah-re-ḥse-spye-ḥkyañ ||, 188-90

'The *rkyang* (ass) being capable, the female [horse] runs within (or 'has an inner heat'):

Capable of concealed *ḥsó* (*copulari*), the female horse runs within . . .

When her ruler is lost, the inner heat escapes;

<sup>1</sup> 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-ḥkaḥ-ge-ḥrdzah-ḥgo-ḥpo ||  
gte-me-ḥkaḥ-ge-dam-rma-ḥbroñ ||  
gci-me-ḥśi-ge-ḥbeḥi-baḥ-ḥbu || ḥrug ||, 46–7

‘When lamp (Tib. *mar-me*, ‘oil-fire’, ‘lamp’) fire is scarce (? = Tib. *dkaḥ* or *kha*), friends leave (*ḥpho*, ‘pass away’) the place (*ḥgo*);

‘When navel-fire (sc. appetite, Tib. *lte*) is exhausted, the yak begs to be tied (hobbled for the night)’;

‘When travel-fire (energy) declines (*ḥśi*), sheep and oxen have bowed heads’ (see p. 149)

27. *ḥldañ*, *ldañ*; °*rgye*, °*rmañ*, °*rdze*, °*ḥkañ*, °*ḥphyar* (*ḥphyer*, *phyer*, *pyer*), °*pyi* (*phyi*), °*ḥkrañ* (*krañ*); *ske*, *rke*; *ḥstañ*; *ḥduñ*; *ḥsad*; *ḥwe*; *ḥnar*; *ḥrweḥi*; *ḥko*; *spo*; *ḥnam*; *sla*; *ḥśaḥ*; *dgu*, *ḥgu*.

In the sense of ‘wood’, ‘stick’, the word *ḥldañ*, evidenced in l. 159, has cognates widely spread in Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman.<sup>1</sup> Further occurrences in the Nam text may be recognized in:

rgoñ-ḥce-rgye-dze-ḥldañ-rgyu-ḥtam ||, 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 *thañ*-plain. The ‘big-stick’ of government (*ḥldañ-rgye*) has been noted (p. 245) in l. 209: and the *ḥldañ-rmañ*, ‘wooden monument’ of l. 27, = *ḥldañ-ḥkhañ*, ‘wooden house’ (cf. Tib. *śiñ-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).

Initial *ld-* is not rare in Tibetan. It is found alternating with *l-* (*ldañ/lañ*, ‘rise’, *ldoñ/loñ*, ‘blind’), *d-* (*ldum-po/dum-po*, ‘piece’, *ldab/ḥdab*, ‘fold’, *ldam/ḥdam*, ‘mud’, *ldig/dig*, ‘stammer’, &c.), *zl-* (*zlog/ldog/log*, ‘turn away’, *zlug/ldug/blug*, ‘pour’), *lh-* (*ldad/lhad*, ‘adulterate’, *ldug/lhug*, ‘pour’, *ldon/lhon/glon*, ‘give back’). 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-*

<sup>1</sup> 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-* (*ltuñ/lhuñ*, '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 examples in proper names, such as *Ldoñ*, *Mug-ldem*, *Žag-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 *ñ* to an *s* which originally followed. The word *lhan-byed*, in the form *lhan-dpye*, 'assistant', occurs in a Central-Asian document. 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*,<sup>1</sup> 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-rgyeb*s ||, 138–9

'when an allied chief flees, the allied lieges retreat'.

It is probable that in ll. 79, 143, the expression *hldañ-phyi* (*pyi*)

<sup>1</sup> On *-ar/-er* see p. 353.

means 'outside support' (Tib. *phyi*). From the second of the two last-mentioned instances:

ħtor-se-stor-dze-ħldañ-pyi-ske ||, 143

'when the great roof is lost, the outside support is slight (Tib. *rke*, "lean", *rked/sked*, "waist")'<sup>1</sup>

we can see that the idea of 'support', 'auxiliary', is derived from that of 'stick', 'pole', 'prop', which in Tib. *sgo-ldañ*, 'door-side', i.e. 'door-post', is still apparent. The *ldañ* 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 *ħldañ* in the Nam text, until we realize that *ħldañ* is another instance of object-denotation derived from quasi-abstract verbal notion. Like *ħbo*, 'forest' or 'vegetation', properly 'swelling', 'growth', and *ħgreñ*, 'man', properly the 'upright standing', *ħldañ*, '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 *ħldañ/ldañ*, as in:

ħtsog-ħram-ħdo-na-mor-ħldañ-re-ħñaħ ||, 86-7

'where there is *ħtsog-ħram*, there is no rising of evil'

ħtsog-ħldañ-ħstañ, 94, '*ħtsog* rises to the top'

ħmaħ-ħldañ-ħyaħ-dze, 112, 'when low rises high'

smyi-rmad-ldañ, 80, 'an inferior man rises'

stor-me-ħkhyed-re-ħldañ-me-ħkhyed ||, 123-4

'if a lost fire sufficed, a rising fire suffices'

ħsaħ-yer-ħldañ-dze-rñe-ħldañ-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, *ldañ/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:

ħldañ-ħkrañ-ħsad-na-ħldañ-ħkrañ-ħśaħ

ħldañ-krañ-ħwe-dze-ħldañ-slaħ-ħkeħe

ħldañ-krañ-ħko-dze-stor-ħldañ-ħphyar

ħldañ-krañ-spo-dze-stor-ħgu-ħbo ||

ħldañ-krañ-ħnam-dze-stor-dgu-ħdor |||, 124-7

<sup>1</sup> Unless we prefer 'the support turns its neck away', with *phyi-ske* parallel to Tib. *phyi-miq*, 'backward look'.

*Hldañ-ḥkrañ* is one of a few compound nouns which directly recall equivalents in Tibetan. The Tibetan phrase, in the form *drañ-mkhrañ*, 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 *mkhrañ*, *ḥkhrañs*, '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, *ḥkrañ*, is, no doubt, cognate to the Tibetan *mkhrañ/ḥkhrañs*; but the first member, instead of meaning 'straight' (Tib. *drañ*), means 'standing upright' = Tib. *ldañ*, unless indeed it envisages the particular denotation 'stick', 'pole', and so contains the metaphor 'stiff standing pole'.

The passage applies to *ḥldañ-ḥkrañ*, in successive clauses with corresponding apodoses, the five Predicates or Verbs *ḥsad*, *ḥwe*, *ḥko*, *spo*, *ḥnam*, 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 (*ḥsad*), uprightness is cut up (*ḥśaḥ*);
- Uprightness being done (*ḥwe*), upright friends (Tib. *zla*) are won (*ḥkeḥe*);
- Uprightness being by itself or enforced (? *ḥko*), assistance is lost;
- Uprightness being changed (Tib. *spo*), all losses grow (*ḥbo*);
- Uprightness declining (Tib. *ñams*), all losses are thrown away (*ḥdor*).'

Here *ḥsad*, 'slay', *ḥwe*, are words of frequent occurrence and quite certain etymology and meaning; *ḥnam* = Tib. *ñams* recurs in l. 259 and is supported also by another *ḥnam* (l. 145) = Tib. *ñams*, 'thought', 'mind', 'spirit' (on *ñ* > *n* - 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. *ḥśi-ḥpo*, p. 226; *ḥko* is a form of diverse meanings, discussed *supra* (pp. 260-4). As regards the apodoses, *ḥśaḥ* is applied in ll. 90, 99, as we shall see, to *ḥtsog-ḥram* and *ḥnaḥ-ḥtsog*, and can well be = Tib. *bsaḥ*, used of the cutting up of a slain animal; *ḥke*, 'profit', 'gain', = Tib. *khe* (pp. 241-2), and *ḥdor*, 'throw away', = Tib. *ḥdor*, 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 *dgiḥ/hgiḥ*, ‘9’ (Nevsky, No. 109).

The expression *hldañ-hkrañ* occurs also in ll. 91, 111–12 (with *hnar*, ‘be strong’, or ‘be persistent’, or ‘attend to’, see p. 361), 113 (with *hrweḥi*, ‘come to an end’?), 127, 157 (with *hwe*: *hkrañ* erroneously omitted), 268 (with *hwad*, ‘be on the watch’). With the same essential signification *krañ* by itself is seen in:

*hño-sta-glom-dze-krañ-nur-nur*, 85

‘when friends are greedy, or conceited, the upright, or uprightness, groans’.

It may be remarked that etymologically *hkrañ/krañ* = Tib. *mkhrañ/hkhrañ*, can well be connected with Tib. *hgreñ*, ‘stand’, *sgreñ*, ‘lift or rise up’ (*sgreñ-sgreñ*, ‘firm and well-fixed’), whence the expression *hgreñ-myi*, ‘upright man’, as opposed to prone (*dud*) beast.

28. *rgyed-ma*, *rgyed*; <sup>o</sup>*hdre*, <sup>o</sup>*hyo*, <sup>o</sup>*hrah*; *hgye*, *rgye*, *rgyes*; *nag*; *gceg*, *hceg*, *gcheg*; *hldoḥo*; *htsog*, *htsag*; *hnah-*, *ñah-*, <sup>o</sup>*htsog*; *ram*, *htsog-hram*; *hśah*, *hśas*; *phye*; *hnah*; *myag*; *hme*; *hpo*; *hreg*; *plim-plam*; *hso(so)-hnah* (*hna*, *na*); *hso-hldaḥ*; *hdroḥo*; *myiñ*; *hñad*, *hñahd*; *hrgah*, *hrgan*; *hthañ*; *tseg*; *rmo*.

That *rgyed-ma* means ‘division’, ‘disunion’, has been argued above (pp. 139–40 sqq.): it is formed by aid of the Suffix *ma*, from a Verb *hgye*, ‘be divided’, ‘be dispersed’, *hgyed*, ‘scatter’, ‘disperse’, both being used also with reference to rays of light; and *hgyed-ma* in Tibetan is a goddess of dissension. Ultimately the Verb is an alternative form of a *hbye*,<sup>1</sup> ‘be opened’, ‘be divided’, *hbyed*, ‘open’, ‘disunite’, &c., whence *dbye*, ‘distinction’, ‘species’, ‘extent’, *dbyen*, ‘dissension’, *dbyes*, ‘magnitude’, ‘dimensions’ = Nam *rgye*, *rgyes*, ‘extent’.

<sup>1</sup> 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-rgyañ*, ll. 16, 50, 52, 55: in both the Nam phrases, however, *hce* may be the Noun, 'greatness', and *rgye*, *rgyañ*, the Adjectives; as an Adjective, *rgye* is applied to 'stick' (*hldañ*) and 'city' (*cañ*) 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' (*hkhah*); 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 *hśaṅ-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-hrañ-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 *hldañ-krañ*, 'uprightness', *rgyed* is seen in :

*rgyed-hldag-hnag-ge-hldañ-hkrañ-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-hldañ-ge-htsog-hram-hśaḥ* ||, 90  
'when disunion arises, *htsog-hram* is cut up'  
*rgyed-ma-glañ-ge-hnaḥ-htsog-hśaḥ* ||, 93  
'when disunion gains (?), *hnaḥ-htsog* is cut up'  
*rgyed-ma-hldañ-ge-ñah-htsog-hśas*, 101–2 (where *ñah* =  
*hnaḥ* of l. 93, and *hśas* is Aorist of *hśaḥ*)

while in l. 94 :

*rgyed-htre* (read °*hdre-hte*, as in ll. 87, 248) -*ge-htsog-htañ-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-hśaṅ-plim-plam*  
*htsog-hram-hnaḥ-tse-htor-śi-rgo* ||  
*htsog-hram-myag-dze-hrta-hwa-hldañ*

ḥtsog-ḥram-ḥme-dze-ḥtor-ḥtas-ḥproms

ḥtsog-ḥram-ḥpo-dze-ḥrta-rkwa-ḥdzam

ḥtsog-ḥram-ḥreg-dze-ḥldyañ-ḥyu-ḥgañ-dze-ḥsí-ḥwa-ḥko,  
120-3.

Here the Predicates *phyé*, 'divided', *myag* (Tib.) 'corrupted', *ḥme*, 'is not', *ḥpo*, 'changes' (Tib. *ḥpho*), which may be taken as known, inform us that the remaining two must also be of an ominous character in relation to *ḥtsog-ḥram*. Of the previously ascertained meanings of *ḥnaḥ* only one satisfies this condition; if we equate it to Tib. *na*, 'be sick', on which see p. 239, we see that it leads on to the *sí*, 'die', of the apodosis. *Ḥreg* = Tib. *reg*, 'reach', 'touch', is not promising; but *regs*, *ḥbreg*, *bregs*, 'lop 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 *ḥbri*, *bris*, 'draw' (*ris-su-ḥbri-ba*, 'draw an outline'), and *ras-su-dros* (*dra-ba*), 'cut up into strips': cf. *bris/ḥris* (p. 259). Thus we arrive at a rendering as follows:

- 'Ḥtsog-ḥram being divided, hate is *plim-plam* (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 *ḥldyañ-ḥyu* death's power prevails (?)'.

Despite the obscurities not yet resolved, it will be seen that the signification of *ḥtsog-ḥram* must be something like 'friendship'. And how can this fail to be the fact, when, as we are already aware, the enemy of *ḥtsog-ḥram*, and of other combinations with *ḥtsog*, is 'disunion', *rgyed-ma*?

The constant, and therefore essential, factor in the expressions, namely *ḥtsog*, is manifestly identical with Tib. 'assemblage', 'group', 'accumulation' (*tshogs-kyi-gtso-bo* or *°bdag* = Sanskrit *gaṇa-pramukha*, *Gaṇeśa*, &c.), being the Verb *ḥtshogs*, 'assemble', 'unite', whence also *bstsags*, 'accumulated', *tshags-byed*, 'save', *tshags-lhod-po*, 'loose cohesion'. Nam *ḥtsag* occurs in l. 45, *ḥya-ḥtsag* ||, 'sheep are collected', l. 117 *ḥpho-ḥldir-ḥtsag*, 'males here collected', l. 173 *ḥwi-ḥweḥi-ḥtsag*, 'rats or mice gather', l. 234 *ḥtsag-ḥro*, 'collected wolves', l. 257 *ḥyah-rmah-ḥtsag*, 'high and low united', also l. 282. Hence *ḥnaḥ-ḥtsog* and *ṇaḥ-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 co-operation', 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-hldañ-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-hsid* ||, 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-hldañ*, 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:

*rta-hso-hnah-yañ-gñi-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-hthañ* ||, 289-90

'the horse having gone to the *hgam*, his family was the authority'.

*rta-hso-hnah-ge-na-rom-hton*, 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-lañ*), was illusory, since there were 'males here collected' (l. 117), and:

*hro-hbehi-hbah-ge-hso-hnah-gcheg* || 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-ḥnaḥ-hstor-dze-ḥño-stor-ḥprom ||, 127–8  
 'family being lost, loss of friends results'.

Of the words closely attached to *rgyed* only *rmaḡ* (*rgyed-rmaḡ*, l. 149) remains for consideration (*infra*, pp. 300–1). With *htsog-hram* and *htsog* we have had the expressions *ḥrta-hwa-ḥldañ*, *ḥtor-ḥtas-ḥproms*, *ḥrta-rkwa-ḥdzam*, *ḥśaḥ*, *ḥśas*, *ḥpye*, *ḥnaḥ*, *ḥmyaḡ*, *ḥme*, *ḥpo*, *ḥreg*, *ḥmye*, *ḥldañ*, of which the first three may be postponed, while the rest have been discussed. To be added are *ḥdroḥo* l. 37 (= Tib. *ḥdro*, *ḥdron*, 'travel', 'depart', a Verb occurring elsewhere also in the text), *ḥñad*, l. 90, *ḥmyiñ*, l. 97 (if a correct reading, equivalent, no doubt, to Tib. *miñ*, 'a [mere] name'): *ḥñad*, which, as *ḥñahd*, is predicated in l. 116 of 'fear', may have appositely the meaning 'evaporate' and be akin to Tib. *ñad*, 'vapour', 'odour'. With *ḥso-ḥnaḥ* have been found, ll. 108, 131, *ḥrgaḥ*, 'grow old', = Tib. *rga/rgan* (used respectively of 'speech', *ḥrgaḥ*, l. 169,<sup>1</sup> and 'corn', *ḥrgan*, l. 160); l. 356 *ḥśid*, 'perish'; l. 290, *ḥthañ*, 'be authority'; ll. 111, 234 *ḡcheḡ/ḡceg*, 'suffer a check'; ll. 111, 270 *ḥyaḥ*, 'be in the ascendant'; l. 232, *stor*, 'be lost'. In l. 103 we find *ma-rañ*, 'be not pleased' = Tib. *rañ*, *rañs*; in l. 110 *ḥldoḥo*, which is ambiguous—conceivably it is related to Tib. *bdo*, 'increase'. *ḡcheḡ/ḡceg*, here antithetic to *ḥldoḥo*, is = Tib. *ḥcheḡ*, *ḥchags*, *bśags*, *bśaḡ*, *śaḡ*, 'split', 'confess', 'be afraid', *ḡcog*, *bcag*, *chogs*, 'split', 'break', *cag/chag*, 'broken', &c.; the form with *ts* which furnishes *tsheḡs*, 'trouble', 'toil', 'difficulty', may occur in l. 93, *swa-tseḡ-tseḡ*, where, however, a different explanation is possible. In the Central-Asian documents we find the forms *tseḡ* (ii, p. 412 : 117) and *tsheḡs* (ii, p. 236 : 87, a 'check' in the military sense). The Nam text has *ḡceg* in:

ḥbroñ-re-ge-rmo-ḥkum-ḡceg, 250

'all the yaks were, in fulfilment of the vow or prayer (? Tib. *smoñ* ?), "checked".'

29. *ḥkhor*, *ḥkor*; *ḥyog*, *ḡ-yog*, *ḥyogs*; *ḥkru*, *ḥkruḥu*, *ḥkhru*, *ḥkhruḥu*; *ḥkru-yog*, °*ḥbro*, °*ḥpro*; *ḥkhru-rgyañ*; *ḥkyañ*; °*rgyañ*, °*ḥldoñ*; *khri*; *ḥśi-ḥkri* (*ḡgri*); *ḥnaḥ(na)-ḥpoñ*, °*ḥldom*; *ḡgor*; *kla*;

<sup>1</sup> But here probably rather = Tib. *dgaḥ*, 'joy', 'rejoice'.

*klag*; *gśim*; *hprah*; *hrgom*; *hrkah*; *hrdoho*; *hrnab*; *hkyi*; *g-rah*.

Tibetan *hkkhor*, 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 *hkkhor-g-yog*, 'attendants and servants', *nan-hkkhor*, '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-rdza* and *hkyañ-hldoñ* 'form a circle' or 'turn back' (*hkkhor* [-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, *hdzañ-hkkhor-hkrug*, 'the retinue of wise persons was at strife', and in l. 98 the word *hkkhor* clearly denotes a group of subordinates forming a retinue; and in:

*hkor-htah-hkhen-yañ-sñañ-gyañ-gyañ*, 92

'though recognizing one of one's own people, the heart dallies, dallies'

the sense is approximately, or exactly, the same.

With *hkkhor*, as in the above-cited Tibetan *hkkhor-g-yog*, the Nam text associates *hyogs* in its:

*hdzañ-hkkhor-hkrug-hkyañ-hyogs-hldog*, 18

where the *hyogs* or *hkyañ-hyogs* are *hldog*. 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 *hkhwi-tsa-hyog-hdag*, l. 259, 'old men with staves or poles', an entirely different word, = Tib. *yog-po*, *yog-siñ*, may be seen. The notion of 'servant' (Tib. *g-yog*) is to be recognized in *rma-g-yog-rño*, l. 156, 'capable of rendering service to the wounded' (cf. Tib. *nad-g-yog*, 'service at sick-bed'). The *hyogs* or *hkyañ-hyogs* who in l. 18 are *hldog*, 'recalcitrant' (Tib. *ldog*, *log*), are accordingly 'servitors'.

The recurrent expression *hkru-yog*, ll. 289, 321 (*khru*<sup>o</sup>), 322-3 (*hkhruhu*<sup>o</sup>), 324, contains a word which by reason of relative constancy of writing must be kept entirely apart from any *gru* or *hgru*. Even in ll. 187, 388, the rendering 'when the great *hkhru* became expanded' is to be preferred. The *hkru-hyog-rño*, l. 289 = *khru-hyog-rño*, l. 321 = *hkru-hyog*, l. 324, 'the *hkru* capable of service', must be the *kruhu-hthe-hprah*, 'humble (Tib. *phra*) *kruhu* lieges', of ll. 334-5, the *hkhruhu-hyog-hsud*, 'dispersed (? Tib.

*gsud*),<sup>1</sup> *hkruhu* servitors', of ll. 322-3, and the *rkom-hkru-hsud*, 'slain *hkru* dispersed', of l. 313. They must therefore be equivalent to the *kru-ra*, = *dmañs-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. *hkhru*, *khruḍ*, 'wash', 'cleanse'). Accordingly we can understand:

hyah-htañ-rma[-]r[e]-hyah-hkruhu-hbro-re-ḥrgyeb-hkruḥo ||,  
315-16

'when the higher authority becomes low, while the front *hkruhu-hbro*, the rear is *hkru* (filth)'.

As a Predicate in the last usage, *hkru*, *hkhru*, has several recurrences:

ḥrkom-hbroñ-hkru[-]r[e], 285, 'the slain yak being filth',

hkhru-re-hkyañ, 320, 'the *hkyañ* being filth'

hgu-mor-hkru[-]r[e], 331, 'the wicked thieves<sup>2</sup> (?) being filth'

while in:

ḥrgom-hkhru[-]r[e]-hto-na, 169, 'the canaille being passed over (*hrgom*, pp. 245, 323)'

khru-ḥrkaḥ-myi-ḥrdoḥo-ḥrnab-ma-ḥldaḥ, 165

'the canaille who do not submit to hardships (Tib. *dkah-badañ-sdo*) were not entitled to eat (Tib. *mnab*)'

the word is a Substantive.

These facts prohibit us from anywhere yielding to the temptation to render the frequent expression *hkru(hkruhu, kru)-hbro* (once °*hpro*, l. 321) by 'flies into a corner (*gru*)', although *hbro* (*bro*), = Tib. *hbroś/bros*, 'flee', has a number of occurrences (ll. 36, 138, 139, 241). *Hyah-hkruhu-hbro* (ll. 315-16, 318, 325) means 'the front (sc. the superior) tastes as filth' (Anglicè 'is in bad odour'),<sup>3</sup> *ḥrgyeb-hkru-hbro* (ll. 297, 323) 'the rear (sc. inferior) tastes as filth', and *ḥri(g-ri)-hkruhu-hbroḥo(hbro)* (ll. 294, 313), 'the mountain tastes as filth', sc. when infested by savage animals. The verse:

hyah-hklu(hkru)-hbro-re-ḥgyeb<sup>4</sup>-hkru-hbro-re-hyah-htaḥ-  
htaña | : |, 221-2

'The front tasting as filth, the rear tasting as filth, both are on a par'

<sup>1</sup> *Hsud* occurs only in the two passages. Tib. *sud* = 'cough', 'choke', and *gsud*, *bsud*, 'dyspepsia', 'be lost', 'dispersed', 'be crammed with food'. Perhaps *sud*, *bsud*, 'scratch', 'excoriate', also 'steal silently away', is intended: or cf. *bsun* (*sun*), 'dissolute'.

<sup>2</sup> See p. 233.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Tib. *skyug-bro*, 'nausea', 'disgust', 'shameful', 'impure', from *skyug*, 'vomit'.

<sup>4</sup> *Sic*.

follows the statement *hbron-hkru-hbro-na* ||, l. 221, in regard to which the temptation is at first, by reason of the context, strong; and the *Tibetan Dictionary* of Ś. C. Das quotes from the Buddhist *Bstan-hgyur* a short sentence containing both *hbros* from *bro*, 'taste', and *bros* from *hbros*, 'flee'. The same is possible in Nam; but *hkru-hbro* is confined, in fact, to the single meaning.

*Hkyañ*, mentioned above as possibly contained in the phrase *hkyañ-hyogs*, where, however, it might be = Tib. *kyañ*, 'even', 'also', and again in the statement 'the *hkyañ* being filth', appears in antithesis to *hbos*, 'big man', 'master', in:

hpū-hpos-stor-dze-hkyañ-stor-rño ||, 141

'when the master man flees, the *hkyañ* can flee'.

In ll. 273-4:

hwi-hwa-se-kyah-hkyañ-hdzam-re-hldan ||

'to the crops mice-injured (*se*) the *hkyañ* all tame returned'

the *hkyañ* are alined with the *hñoho-hjam-re*, 'friends all tame', of the previous verse, who returned to their enemy-abandoned (*gsaṅ-hrah-htoṅ*) crops, and with the 'enemies' (*rñe*), *twañ* (?), 'dogs' (*hkyi*) and 'goats' (*g-rah*) '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 *na-hldom* in:

na-hldom-hgor-kla-hkyañ-gstor[-hdor], 143

'if the *na-hldom* are very idle (Tib. *hgor*, 'loiter', + *kla*, 'unlimited', as in ll. 205-6), the *hkyañ* are allowed to be lost'.

For the *na-hldom*, who in ll. 41-2, 350, are again mentioned as 'idle' (*hgor*), must be domestic servants or slaves, just as the 'idle' (*hgor*) *hnaḥ-hpoṅ* of l. 113 must be the *na-boṅ*, 'house or place poor' (*hphoṅs*, *phoṅs*), of one of the Tibetan manuscripts (see p. 238): on *hldom*, 'bound', see *infra*, pp. 318-9 sqq.

The *hkyañ* are again, as *hkyañ-hldoṅ*, contrasted with the *hbos* in:

mor-hkyañ-hldoṅ-re-hbos-g-yah-hthañ ||, 286-7

'the bad *hkyañ* being *hldoṅ* (or the *hkyañ-hldoṅ* being vile), the master is in the ascendant'

hkyañ-hldoṅ-hkhor-[re-]hbos-hrihi-hruḥu ||, 293

'the *ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ* returning (or in attendance), [to] the master (or master's)<sup>1</sup> mountain peak'

*ḥbos-g-ri-ḥpañ-dze-ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ-re-ḥñaḥ* ||, 290-1

'On the master's mountain-flank are no *ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ*'

*ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ-ḥkhor-[re-]ḥbos-ḥyah-ḥtona*, 293-4

'the *ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ* returning (or in attendance), the master is in the ascendant'.

Here *ḥldoñ* cannot mean 'face' ('*ḥkyañ*-faced'), Tib. *gdoñ/mdoñs*, or 'blind', *ldoñ/loñ*, or 'accompanying' = Tib. *sdoñ*: it must be 'runaway', = Tib. *ḥdoñ*, 'depart' (in Imperative, 'Begone'), as elsewhere; and the situation, as well as the meaning of *ḥkhor*, is determined by:

*rñe-ḥtab-ḥkoḥu-ḥkhoḥu-ge-ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ-ḥgyañ-sto*

*ḥkyañ-ḥldoñ-ḥkhor-[re-]ḥbos-ḥriḥi-ḥruḥu* ||

*ḥtor-ḥpuḥu-ḥbos-dze-ḥrim-ge-ḥgrus*, 292-3

'while the fiends were answering back (p. 264), the runaway *ḥkyañ* stopped:

the runaway *ḥkyañ* 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 *ḥgah-ḥldoñ*.

Reference to *ḥkyañ*, 'serfs', must be seen also in ll. 48-9, where a fight of *twañ* is contrasted with a fight of *ḥkyañ*. But in l. 372, *ḥkrug-kyañ-ḥldom-re*, 'strife also being subdued', and consequently in the above-cited *ḥkrug-ḥkyañ-ḥyogs-ḥldog*, l. 18; further in *ḥkhor-kyañ-rweḥi*, l. 98, 'the retinue also is ruined', and in *ḥlah-ḥkyañ-ḥras-re*, l. 344, 'the passes also being alined', it seems probable that *kyañ*, *ḥkyañ* = Tib. *kyañ*, 'even', 'also'.

A quite different *ḥkyañ* must be seen in:

*ḥkyañ-rgyañ-ḥsig-dze-ḥsi-ḥkri-ḥtshim*, 81

'when the *ḥkyañ-rgyañ* is destroyed, the high or death (*ḥsí*) couch (Tib. *khri*, 'chair', 'couch', 'bed') is a satisfaction'

*ḥkyañ-ḥrgyañ-ḥyah-ge-ḥmu-ḥkag-gsim* ||, 268

'with the *ḥkyañ-ḥrgyañ* in front, a cold season (Tib. *glags*, 'occasion') is agreeable (Tib. *sim*, *tshim*, or *gśin*?)'.

Here the 'long or large (*rgyañ*) *ḥkyañ*' would be quite intelligible,

<sup>1</sup> In this and the following passages *ḥbos-ḥriḥi(g-ri)* perhaps means 'big mountain', as suggested *supra*, p. 231. In that case the *ḥpu-ḥbos* and *ḥbos*, 'big man', in the immediate context and in ll. 294, 298, is verbally associated with the 'big mountain'.



if it were the *k'ang* of the Tibeto-Chinese border and of north China, a sort of *daïs*, 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 *hkyañ* actually represents the Chinese term *ts'uan*, 'stove', since in the Tibetan manuscripts we find *khyod* written for *tshod*<sup>1</sup> in *dgun-tshod*, 'winter-season' (cf. *ñin-tshod*, *mtshan-tshod*, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, p. 201). The same expression recurs in:

na-ḥldom-ḥgor-[re-]hkyañ-ḥrgyañ-ḥdzud ||, 41-2

'if the house-servants are idle, the *hkyañ-ḥrgyañ* is wasted or unsuccessful' (?)

but, though Tib. *ḥdzud*, *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 *ḥsí-ḥkri-ḥchim* (sic), 'high or death chair or bed', recurs in l. 38 (*ḥgri*); but Tib. *ḥchim* 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 (*ḥrah-rtah*-)hkyañ is an error for the *ḥgyañ* of l. 77.

30. *rmag*; *mag-ḥno*; *ḥthun*; *ḥtar*; *ḥmañ-byi*; *ḥdrag*; *ḥsod*; °*tsa*; *puñ*; *gsar*; *ñar*; *ḥpaḥ*; *ḥci*, *ḥcihi*, *gcīhi*, *chi*, *ḥchi*; *ḥdah*; *ḥsams*; *ḥpom*, *ḥphom*; *ḥdrañ*; *ḥtog*, *ḥthog*; *ḥsí-kyeg*; *ḥyu-sad*; *ḥro-ta*; *tor*, *thor*, *ḥthor*; *tor-ḥtas-proms*; *ḥldas*; *ḥso-bos*; *ḥrñi*; *mo*; *myag*; *ḥdwa*; *lad*, *ḥlad*.

The passage:

. . . mag-ḥnor-su-ge-stor-ta-ḥthogs ||  
 phyē-ḥgo-ḥthun-re-ḥnam-ḥdzam-ḥtar  
 ḥrah-ḥtoñ-rmag-dze-ḥdrag-ḥtrog-ḥtsa ||  
 rñe-ḥne-ḥrmag-dze-ḥmañ-byi-ḥldoñ  
 [ḥldoñ]-ḥyu-sad-ge-ḥphom-te-ḥdrañ  
 [ḥdrañ]-ge-ḥsad-na-ḥrañ-rgyañ-ḥsod  
 [ḥsod]-te-rmag-dze-rmañ-ra-gyim  
 spye-ḥtor-ḥdwa-dze-myag-myi-tor  
 [tor]-ḥtas-prom-dze-myage-me-ḥtañ  
 rgyed-rmag-rñe-ge-stor-tha-ḥthogni  
 ḥrah-sñiñ-ñe-ge-stor-ta-ḥthog-ni, 145-9

has suffered, as will be seen, from losses of repeated words, to the

<sup>1</sup> On *khy-* and *tsh-* see p. 269.

detriment of the metre.<sup>1</sup> 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 (*hthun*) open space, the tame-hearted make off (*htar*) :

Against a post-relinquishing army the enemy are bold (Tib. *hdrag*).

In an army of bad or good many weak ones (*or* big and little, *hman-byi*) flee ;

Fleeing, with their country lost, they are dragged defeated ; Those dragged being annihilated, those of great self (*hran-rgyan*) are laid low (*hsod*) ;

For an army laid low the tomb enclosure is home.

· · · · ·  
· · · · ·

As to (*ni*) the evil army of disunion staying flight :

As to (*ni*) the evil-hearted enemy (*hrah*) 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* :

puñ-te-gsar-nar-hpaḥ-rmag-hcihi ||, 204–5

‘in mass with new strength a hero army goes’

where *puñ* = Tib. *phuñ*, ‘heap’, ‘bundle’, *hphuñs*, ‘concourse’, *dpuñ*, ‘host’, ‘army’ ; *gsar* = Tib. *gsar*, ‘new’ ; *nar* = Tib. *nar*, ‘strength’, ‘vigour’ (*infra*, p. 361) ; *hpaḥ* = Tib. *dpah*, ‘hero’ ; *hcihi* (cf. l. 350, *gcihi*, l. 346 ; *hci*, ll. 300, 345 ; *chi/hchi*, ll. 168, 183, 345, 353, 385) = Tib. *mchi*, ‘go’, ‘come’ : most of which words occur elsewhere also in the Nam text.

A practical equivalence of *rmag* to *mag(-hnor)* 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-hno(r)* means ‘battle’ is suggested by Tib. *g-yul-ño*, ‘battle’ (*g-yul*, ‘fight’, + *ños*, ‘side’, or *ño*, ‘face’) : as a fact, the equivalence, and at the same time the *r*-Locative in *-hnor* = *-hno-dze*, is established by :

sku-mag-hno-dze-me-na-hldis

hdaḥ-mag-hno-dze-me-na-hsams, 58

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the cases of repeated words supplied underline, 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'

twañ-mag-ḥno[-]r[e] . . . ḥkyañ-mag-ḥno[-]r[e], 48-9

'in a battle of *twañ* . . . in a battle of *ḥkyañ*'

ḥdiḥi-mag-ḥno[-]r[e]-ma-ḥpu-mu-re, 184

'in this battle mother and children being cold (afraid?)'

Even outside the compound *mag-ḥno* the form *mag* is seen in :

ḥsad-mag-ḥdehi-dze-ḥśi-kyeg-mye, 102

'in those whose army<sup>1</sup> is defeated the fire (courage) is winter-clogged (*ḥśi-kyeg*, p. 226)'

where the *ḥsad*, *sad*, of the passage ll. 145-9 recurs.

Of the other expressions in the passage many (*phye*, *ḥgo*, *ḥnam* = Tib. *ñams*, 'mind', &c., *ḥrah-ḥtoñ*, *ḥtrog*, *rñe*, *ḥne*, *ḥmañ*, *byi*, *ḥldoñ*, *ḥsad*, *rgyañ*, *rmañ*, *gyim*, *myag*, *stor*, *ḥrah* (= Tib. *dgra*), *sñiñ*, have already been discussed: others, *ḥthuñ* = Tib. *thuñ*, 'small'; *ḥdrag* = Tib. *drag*, 'fierce', 'confident', &c.; *ḥphom* (l. 347 *ḥpom*) = Tib. *ḥpham/pham*, 'be defeated'; *ḥdrañ* (ll. 254-5 *ḥdrañ-re*, 'at every pull') = Tib. *ḥdren*, *drañs*, *drañ*, *trañ*, *droñs*, *droñ* (*drañ-dgu*, 'every pull', in one of the Tibetan manuscripts), 'pull', 'drag', 'draw', 'lead', &c., may here be lightly passed over. The phrase *stor-ta-ḥthog(s)*, ll. 145, 149, contains a form *ḥthog* (l. 235 *ḥtog*) = Tib. *thogs*, 'hold up', 'obstruct', connected, no doubt, with *ḥdogs*, *btags*, *gdags*, *thogs*, 'bind', 'attach'; cf. p. 156. *Ḥyu-sad* has been understood as = Tib. *yul-brlag*, 'country ruined', of an old text: on *ḥyu* = *yul* see p. 333. *Ḥśod*, which cannot be connected with Tib. *śad/gśad/gśod*, 'comb' (a horse), 'brush', 'stroke', or with *bśad/śod/bśod*, 'expound', 'state', may be = *śod*, 'low', 'bottom', concerning which see p. 6: in l. 198 *śodtsa* is used of 'corpses' (*ḥro-ta*), in l. 281 (p. 231) of 'forests' (*ḥbo-ḥram*). The form *śodtsa*, *ḥśodtsa*, 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 *ḥśods*, an *s*-Preterite of *ḥśod*, which, however, would be hard to parallel, there being no other recognized *s*-Preterites from Verbs with final *d*.<sup>2</sup> *Myage* (= *myag-ge-me-ḥtañ*) can mean, here and in l. 39,

<sup>1</sup> Or 'army fortune (*ḥde*)' or 'army heat (*lde*)', with a paronomasia.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *skyed-s*, 'interest' (?), occurring in a document (*Tib. Literary Texts*, &c., ii, p. 190): cf. *ḥbrad-sta*, p. 359.

'the power (*htañ* = Tib. *thañ*, as elsewhere) of fire (perhaps here implying 'courage') is spoiled (Tib. *myag*)'.

In *tor-htas-prom* (l. 148) *htas* cannot well be = Tib. *hdas*, 'passed', which in l. 85 is *hldas*: also *tor* cannot here be the frequent *tor/htor*, 'great'. The phrase must be the same as in ll. 121-2, where we are told that 'if friendship is not, *htor-htas-hproms*': there, if we translate 'the tuft (Tib. *thor*, e.g. of hair) has become tangled', understanding *htas* as = Tib. *hthas*, 'not straightforward', 'hard', 'solid', *s* (originally Aoristic) form of *tha*, 'hard', 'compact',<sup>1</sup> 'bad', we obtain a satisfactory sense and at the same time a relation to the proverb *sdud-ka-ni-bal-nas-bchad* (also *glad-kyi-phud-ñams*), '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').<sup>2</sup> Then in the preceding verse we shall have:

spye-htor-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-bśes-myed*, 'a poor wretch (?) without friends' (cf. Chinese *to* < *d'uá*, 'ruin', Karlgren, nos. 1008-9), which may indicate the general sense in the Nam passage.

In:

htor-htas-prom-hrom-nehu-hso-bos, 257

'in the vacancy (*hrom* = Tib. *rum*) of the tuft which has become tangled a new *hso-bos*'

we have evidently in *hso-bos* a synonym for *thor*; the expression will mean 'top (*hso* = Tib. *gtso*, cf. *hse* = *gtse*)-swell' (*hbo*, *hbos*, *bos*, see p. 231). Tibetan *gtso* has also the anticipated forms *gco/co* (Nam *hco*, 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',

<sup>1</sup> In the Tibetan manuscripts we find *ziñ-ta* (= *tha*)-*bañi-rna* (for *rna*), 'fields with thick mowing'.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

'tuft', exists side by side with a *ħthor*, 'scatter', 'sprinkle', 'disperse', belonging, no doubt, to the group *stor*, *gtor*, *ħdor*, and perhaps the basis of *thor-bu*, 'single', 'separate', *thor-bu* and *°pa*, 'pimples', &c. Nevertheless the first *thor* must be recognized in Tib. *ħthor-mtho*, 'lofty peak', and consequently in the Nam:

śid-g-ri-ħtor-dze, 34  
 ħśid-ħriħi-ħthor-dze, 62 } 'on the summit of a high mountain'.

But what is the signification of the *quasi*-proverbial phrase *mo-ma-thor* (*ħthor*), ll. 63, 71, 144, always corresponding to a *ħldi-ma-ħrtah* (*rtah*), 'the horse does not leap (gallop)', in the following verse? The expression, which is linked by the word *thor* to the above *tor/ħtor-ħtas-prom/ħproms*, is further associated therewith by the application to friendship in:

ħno-stor-ħsañs-dze-mo-ma-ħthor, 143-4

'when friends are gone (Tib. *soñ*, '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; Karlgren, 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 *mūi*. This also accords with:

ħyañ-ħso-ħrñi-dze-mo-ma-ħthor, 63

'if the net or noose (Tib. *rñi/sñi*) is too large (Tib. *yañs* ?), the hair does not bunch';

for the *rñi*, 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 *°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 *°tshugs*, Ś. 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 *ħñañ-ħya-ħtsag*, ll. 44-5 (see p. 343).

It seems probable that one same Predicate *thor* should be recognized in:

rñe-lad-thor-dze-ca-yañ-ħtor, 235-6

gse-ħlad-ħtor-dze-ħcaħ-ħyañ-ħbro-na ||, 240.

gse-ħlad-thor-dze-ħcaħ-yañ-thor, 242.

In spite of the word *ħbro*, 'flee', apparently alternative in l. 240 to

*ħtor/thor*, and the possibility of applying the idea of 'scattering' to *rñe(gse)-lad*, 'requit 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 'requit of evil (*rñe/gse-lad*)' is exacted 'in a lump' and that the *ca/hcaħ/hchaħ* are taken in along with the other offenders.

The word *lad/hlad*, will be a *d*-form corresponding to Tib. *lan*, 'turn', 'return', 'requit', *lad-mo*, 'imitation', 'mimic', *slad* (*slan*), 'after', 'back', *slar*, 'back'.

31. *khrom*, *ħkrom*, *ħkhram*, *hgrom*, *hgroms*; *ħcer*; *ħpyi*; *ħpraħ*; *cig-dze*; *ħldam*.

*Khrom* is antithetic to *ħcer* in :

mor-tsaħ-khrom-re || ħyañ-tsa-ħcer ||, 388  
'when the evil *khrom*, the good *ħcer*'

and the same antithesis takes the form of parallel in :

ru-ge-ħkrom-dze-mo-ma-thor  
ħcha-ge-ħcer-dze-ħldi-ma-rtaħ ||, 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-ħcer* 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 (*ħcha*) which glares.

The word *khrom* in the first passage must signify some kind of success; and, if we understand a 'spreading', the *ru-ge-ħkrom* 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 *ħgye-ħkrom-ħkrom*, 'light flickers', discussed *supra*, p. 235-6, and there connected with the Tibetan *ħgrem*, &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:

ḥkhram<sup>1</sup>-re-ḥrdañ-yañ-ḥrkom-ḥpyi-ḥpraḥ ||, 332-3

'though when prosperous (active, shining) wrathful (Tib. *sdañ*), when slain the *ḥpyi*<sup>2</sup> (or "(creatures) after death") are of no account (*ḥpraḥ*, as elsewhere = Tib. *phra*, "small", or possibly Tib. *ḥphra*, "kick", "be kicked").'

ḥkhar-rpag-g-yar-re-ḥldag-[nag-]ḥgrom, 135-6

'When Low-town became high, the black-back flourished'

ḥrta-swa-gkom-re-ḥtor-ḥbroñ-ḥgrom, 222-3

'while the horse was occupied with watching, the great yak flourished'

the last passage being followed by:

ḥtor-ḥbroñ-ḥgrom-re . . . } 222-3  
ḥtor-ḥbroñ-ḥrpag-re . . . }

where there is an explicit antithesis of *ḥgrom*, 'flourished', to *ḥrpag*, 'brought low'.

The same meaning must be recognized in:

ḥyañ-tsa-ḥjo-dze-ḥyañ-ge-ḥgroms

tor-pu-ḥgru-ge-ḥstor-moñ-ḥdzoñ-re-ḥtsa-ḥdzo-ḥkrom, 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:

ḥldyañ-ḥyu-ḥjo-cig-dze-ḥtor-ge-ḥkroms, 387

ḥldyañ-ḥjo-ḥkrom-ni, 390

the sense of *ḥkroms/ḥkrom* is not clear.

The expression *cig-dze*, interpreted (p. 234) as *cig*, 'ruined' (= Tib. *ḥjig/bzig/sig*) and recurring as *cig/gcig* in ll. 194, 208, 356, 377) + *dze*, may in l. 387 be the unanalysable term repeated in:

*cig-dze-ḥtor[-re]-ḥldam-re-ḥldan*, 186-9, 192,

where some official title or designation might be apposite. If the case were so, we could think only of Turkī *cigši*, 'prefect', which appears in Chinese as *ts'e-che* (= *še*), in Central-Asian Tibetan Documents (ii, p. 49) as *tshi-si*, and, probably, in one of 'the

<sup>1</sup> Tib. *khram* is 'cunning', 'artful', 'lively', 'brisk', 'quick', as boys, kids, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Tib. *dbyi*, *g-yi*, 'lynx'.

Tibetan manuscripts' as *si-si-druñ-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-ldem*, 'dubious', &c. ?)-*re-hldan* is obscure.

In ll. 150, *hkyer-re-cig-dze*, 376, *rab-hgo-cig-dze*, the meaning 'ruined', 'overthrown', is clear.

32. *hgru*, *hgru-hldañ-hmah/ma*; *hgru-ma*; *htor(tor)-hpū* (*hpukū*, *hpū*, *hbu*)-*hgru*.

Some of the most puzzling expressions in the text occur together in the lines:

*hśid-hrihi-hthor-dze-hgru-hldañ-hmah*  
*htor-hpū-hgru-dze-gla-htso-htsaḥ*, 62

of which the first recurs (*śid-g-ri-htor-dze . . .*) in ll. 34–5, and the second in ll. 29–30 (*hpū*, *hdzo*). Having acquiesced (p. 303) in the rendering of *hśid-hrihi-hthor-dze* by 'on the top of a high hill', we come next to *hgru-hldañ-hmah* (*ma*). This expression, repeated in:

*hgru-hldañ-hmah-dze-htsa-gsom-hkhog*, 21  
*hgru-hldañ-hmah-ge-hśes-hbeg-hraḥ* ||, 22–3  
*hgru-hldañ-ma-dze-hrgu-hto-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:

*hldu-hro-hgru* ||, 19, 'the assembly-place (after the overthrow of the *bzer*, which was a building) a corner'  
*hri-hgru-gras-re*, 300, 'the mountain corners (recesses?) being alined'.

But a different sense is apparent in:

*hgru-hsram-htam-ge-hśes-beg-hstaḥ* ||, 24  
'the *hgru* firmly (*hsram*) knit together are (were) Hśes-beg's station'

which, however, is closely connected with *hgru-hldañ-hmah* by the statement (ll. 22–3):

*hgru-hldañ-hmah-ge-hśes-hbeg-hraḥ* ||  
'Hgru-hldan-hmah was (were) Hśes-hbeg'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 Hśes-hbeg was 'eye' and 'path' to the 'blind rocks'



(*klu-rto*). Inasmuch as *hldañ* 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-hldañ-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 *Hses-hbeg*; and, moreover, the statement in l. 21 that in *hgru-hldañ-hmah* the three grasses were spoiled (*rtsa-gsom-hkhog*) seems to point to a country rather than to such features. If we understand *hgru-hldañ-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-dañ, one of the 13 (mythological) countries,
- Hbum-dañ, one of the 13 (mythological) towns,
- Guñ-dañ, the (mythological) country of Guñ-tshun,
- Rji-luñ-dañ-ba, the (mythological) country of the Rji (= *rdzi*, 'storm-wind'?) Phyar-phyur,
- Pyi-gtañ-sum, a Hbrog country,
- Pyi-ldañ, a certain locality,
- Dbye (Bye)-ldañ-sum, a Hbrog country = Dbye-mo.

It seems likely that in all these names we have one and the same syllable *dañ*, *ldañ*, 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 *Hgru-hldañ-hmah* might be 'country of rocks or rock-recesses', if it should not rather be 'country of the Hgru'.

The last-mentioned possibility, which might involve the supposition that the text regards the Hgru 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 *Hgru* people is mentioned, along with the *Dbra*, *Ldoñ*, and *Lga*, as one of 'four tribes' (Ś. C. Das's *Dictionary*). We may suspect that they figure in early Bon-po literature. Of the four the least legendary are the

Ldoñ, 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 *ħbra* discussed *supra* (pp. 215-6); for in ll. 30-2 a place *Ĥbra* or *Ĥbra-ħldaħ* (p. 319) is mentioned immediately after *Ĥgru-ħldañ-ma*, as not shaken by the cataclysm which ruined the latter. This greatly enhances the probability that *Ĥgru-ħldañ-ma* is a place-name. The *Ĥgru* 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-roñ*, in *Amdo* (*Geografia Tibeta*, p. 54), and to *Gru-gu Rgya-ra*, 'a village in *Khams*' (Ś. C. Das's *Dictionary*). Upon this supposition the *Ĥgru* people would be the people of the *Ĥgru* (perhaps 'rock') country, and *Ĥgru-ħldañ-ħmaħ* would be their (fictitious) town.

The second circumstance is the repeated mention of the *ħtor-ħpu* (*ħbu*, *ħphu*)-*ħgru*, which might mean the 'great *Ĥgru* men', since *ħtor-ħpu* (*ħbu*, *ħphu*) has been found in the phrase *ħtor-ħpu-ħbos*, meaning 'the great big man or master'. This also we should be glad to avoid; and perhaps the rendering 'great upland (*ħbu* = Tib. *phu*, as in *ħbu-rwye-ħce*, 'wide uplands', ll. 15, 50) rocks or rock-recesses' may better fit the occurrences:

*ħtor-ħpu-ħgru-dze*, 29 'in (not among) the *ħtor-ħpu-ħgru*'  
*ħtor-ħbu-ħgru-dze*, 33 'on (not among) the *ħtor-ħpu-ħgru*'  
*ħtor-ħphu-ħgru-dze*, 62 'on (not among) the *ħtor-ħpu-ħgru*'  
*tor-ħpu-ħgru-ge-ħstor-mon-ħdzoñ-re-ħtsa-ħdzo-ħkrom*, 64  
 'the *tor-ħpu-ħgru* having lost the *Moñ*-castle . . .'

It is perhaps possible to acquiesce in this view.

There is, however, certainly another *ħgru*, namely the Verb seen in the phrase *ħrim-ge-ħgrus*, ll. 293, 297, applied to some beings who perhaps 'exerted themselves all round' (*ħrim*) the 'big man' (*ħpuħu-ħbos*) or 'on the watch mountain' (*ħscah-ħyer-ħri*). *Ĥgrus* should be Preterite of Tib. *ħgru*, 'take pains' (*ħgrus*, 'zeal', 'diligence'). But it may be suspected that the whole phrase *ħrim-ħgrus* is an old, or dialectical, form of Tib. *rim-ħgro*, '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 *ħgru-ma*, which is mentioned in the same context

as *ḥtor-ḥpu-ḥgru*, must mean 'council'. The first mention of *ḥgru-ma*:

g-rah-g-yo-rbo-ge-ḥgru-ma-ḥti ||, 27

'the earthquake swelling up, the *ḥgru-ma* stopped' cannot mean 'the rocks do not (*ma*) stand still', because a few lines later we read:

ḥgru-ḥma-ḥkom-re-ḥrwad-ḥmoñ-ḥldaḥ, 32-3

'*ḥgru-ma* being made, harsh noise (*ḥrwad*, see p. 257) was confused (?)'

and in l. 77:

ḥlde-ge-ḥgru-ma-rmañ,

'the powers (authorities, nobles) dreamed, or conceived, of a *ḥgru-ma*'

and a few lines later:

ḥño-stor-prom-re-ḥgru-ma-stor ||

stor-ḥto-rta-yañ-stor-to-ḥrun | ° |, 79-80

'the friends having taken flight, the *ḥgru-ma* fled; [that] fled, the horse also had to flee'.

The *ḥgru-ma* was, accordingly, a sort of assembly, on the lines of the regular Tibetan *ḥdun-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 *Ḥgru-ḥldañ-ḥmaḥ* or the Verb *ḥgru* 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 *ḥgru* in adjacent contexts does not attain the level of such a collocation as *śī-śī-śī-tcūmñi-śīhi-śī* in a Chinese text written in Tibetan character: there the three first *śī*'s are, as is shown by the corresponding Chinese writing, all different words, differing also from *śīhi*. But in the Nam text assonances of like nature, if less concentrated, are to be reckoned with.

33. *yañ*, *ḥyañ*, *g-yañ*, *gyañ*, *ḥgyañ*, *ḥgyañs*, *rgyañ*.

That this should be a troublesome group of words was to be anticipated in view of the situation in Tibetan, where we find:

A: *yañ* = (1) 'though', 'even', 'also', 'again' (*Sandhi* variant of *kyañ*, *gyañ*), whence, in compounds, also

'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(-le)* = 'in haste'.

*bgyañs*, *brgyañs*, 'stretched', = *rkyañ*, *brkyañs*, *rgyoyñ*, *rkyoyñ*, '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 *bgyañs*, '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.

*kyañ* = 'also', ll. 18, 98, 344, 372: attached to a single word.

(b) *hyañ* = 'good' or 'upper', which latter is perhaps the original sense ( $\sqrt{ya}$ ), 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-hrah* of ll. 66, 226.

(c) *yañ*, 'conduit', 'watercourse', l. 355 (Chinese *yang*?).

(d) *hyañ*, 'conduit'?, ll. 178, 179, 367, 391 (*hldyañ-hyañ-hyo*).

(e) *hgyañ*, a Verb, perhaps always signifying 'tarry', ll. 7, 77, 200, 217, 292 ( $^{\circ}sto$ ), 296, 392: always concluding its sentence: in l. 114 *hkyañ* is written in error.

*hgyaṅs*, Preterite of the same Verb, l. 241 (cf. also *hgyaṅ-sto*, l. 292, = *hgyaṅs-to*).

*gyaṅ-gyaṅ*, l. 92, may be the same Verb.

*hgyaṅ*, l. 153, is an error for *hgyan*, l. 158.

(f) *gyaṅ-g-ri*, l. 313, is not clear.

(g) *rgyaṅ*, 'extent', 'extensive', ll. 16, 52 (2), 55, 57, 147, 151, 152, 155: *hkyāṅ-rgyaṅ*, ll. 42, 81, 268.

*rgyaṅ*, perhaps 'far', 'completely', l. 89.

*rgyaṅ*, possibly '(long) wall', l. 300.

(h) *kyaṅ*, ? sense, l. 192.

(i) *hkyāṅ*, error for *hgyaṅ*, l. 114.

(j) *hkyāṅ-rgyaṅ*, 'stove-bed' (?), ll. 42, 81, 268.

(k) *hkyāṅ*, 'serf', ll. 49, 141, 143, 274, 287, 291, 292 (2), 293.

The predominance of the form *yaṅ*, 'also', &c., in comparison with the synonymous *hyaṅ*, 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*, *hrrar*, *g-rah*, *hgrah*.

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. *khriṃs-ra*, 'yard before a court of justice', *lcaṅ-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 *-ṅ*: see pp. 174, 178, where reference is made to the very numerous resulting confusions. The same use occurs after verb-forms in phrases, *hgaḥ-hldoṅra*<sup>1</sup>-*hṅaḥ*, l. 302, 'where are no fugitive *hgaḥ*', *hrgyo-hseg-gségra*, ll. 330, 331 (*hrbyo*° *gśer*), 'where *hrgyo* comes'.

The form *hrrar*, 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*,

<sup>1</sup> Here perhaps intended for *re*: see p. 230.

'earthquake', ll. 8, 26, 27, 34, *rgyed* (*hrgyed*)-*hrah* (*hrrar*), 'place of disunion', ll. 216, 243, 341, &c. This meaning fits even *g-rah-gsog-hner*, ll. 7, 20: *hrah-hrtah*, 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, *hño-*, 'friend' (ll. 264, 279, &c.), *hce-*, 'great' (ll. 49, 50, 56), *stan-hro-*, 'high country' (l. 347), *htham-*, 'union' (l. 227), *hphah-ma-*, 'father and mother' (ll. 73-4), *brah-*, 'increase', &c. (l. 228), *rmañ-*, 'tomb' (l. 148), *htsah-*, 'harvest' (l. 277), *hwah-*, 'action' or 'government' (l. 353), *hyañ/g-yañ-*, 'good' or 'upper' (ll. 31, 66, 226), *hrañ-*, 'own' (ll. 21, 166, 167), *gsah-*, 'land' (l. 277), *gsañ-*, 'enemy' (ll. 263, 273, &c.). The same appears as first member of the compounds *hrah-htoñ* (ll. 146, 273, 358), *hrah-we* (*wehi*, 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, *skuhu-ra* (?), l. 7.

3. *hrah/g-rah* seems equivalent to Tib. *dgra*, 'enemy', in:

*hrah-sñiñ-ñe-ge-stor-ta-hthog*, 149, 'the evil-hearted enemy stopped flight'

*g-rah-hsah-hkhehe-na*, 314, 'in winning an enemy land or in any enemy's winning the land';

perhaps also in:

*hrah-ldah-ge-hdzah* ||, 43, 'the enemies there are friends' (but see p. 334)

*hrah-hmad-hñe-nag*, 202, 'low, evil-voiced enemies' (?)

*g-rah-nag-hbo-gyañ*, 262-3, 'though enemy-voice swelled';  
cf. *hlab-ta-gbohu-ste* (pp. 158, 231) and *hśañ-nag-rgyes-hkom*, pp. 320, 360.

*hcha-hgrah-nu*, 239, 'strength of hostile ravenous beasts'

*hbroñ-hldah-hdzam-re-hrah-rte-hdubna*, 182 (354 °*hrah-hrtre-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 *gsañ-ta-hrtehu*, 'stopped' (?) 'hostilities', where the same Verb may perhaps be seen. In l. 82, again, *hcah-rte* 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 *gdeh/hrde*, 'fix', 'make certain' (Nevsky, No. 25, but *gdeh*, No. 24,

'rite', 'form', 'pattern')). 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-rah* in :

hsu-re || hru-ge-g-rah-hdzam-nag ||, 275

'with horns attending, the *g-rah* 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. *hgrah* in *sta-hldyañ-ḥtye(ḥthye)-dze-ḥmo-ge-me-hgrah*, ll. 8, 20, 'the clouds (*ḥmog*) or heavens had fire *hgrah*', may be = Tib. *sgra* 'sound'. But ignorance of the meaning of *ḥtye (ḥthye)* precludes a decision.

The form *ro*, which in Tibetan frequently helps to constitute names of countries and districts, e.g. *Cog-ro*, *Myañ-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), *stan-*, 'upper' (l. 347), *ḥldu-* (l. 19), *hldyañ-* (l. 386), *hldyañ-paḥ-* (ll. 271-2), *ldyo-* (ll. 383-4), *ḥldyo-* (l. 384), *ḥldyoñ-* (l. 387), *ḥpaḥ-hldañ-* (l. 377), *ḥpro-* (l. 181), *spo-* (l. 381), *mu-* (l. 11).

35. *ḥkah*, *ḥkhah*.

*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',<sup>1</sup> 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 :

ḥyañ-ḥraḥ-ḥkaḥ-hldom-ge-ru-glañ-ge-ḥthul-ḥi ||, 66-7

'mouth-tied in the proper, or upper, place, horned oxen are controlled';

cf. Tib. *kha-sdom*, 'to silence, gag'.

*Ḥkah*, *ḥkhah*, 'speech', is clear in :

ḥkaḥ-gsañ, 214, gsañ-ḥkaḥ, 204, ḥkhah-gsañ, 329, 'secret speech'.

ḥkaḥ-ḥrañ, 104, 'free to speak', ḥrañ-ḥkaḥ, 117, 'free spoken'.

<sup>1</sup> This is perhaps exemplified in *rñe-hldañ-ḥkhar*, l. 197.



ħkhaħ-ħldah-ħnahgħi, 137, 'those entitled to speak should give voice'.

ħwa-ħkaħ, 137, 'doing and speaking' or 'talk of action'.

ħsas-ħkhaħ-ge, 116, 'talk about the child'.

ħkhaħ-ħldañ-ħnore-tsa-chaħ || ħkañhi |||, 163, 'talk rising foolish is the whole story (*cha*)' (?)

ħkaħ-ħgañ-hjor, 194, 'all talk is babble' (Tib. *ca-co*, 'babble', *co-re*, *cor-cor*, 'sound of effervescence, *klaġ-cor*, 'clamour', 'noise', *kha-bcol*, 'prattle', *col-chuñ*, 'childish prattle', *mu-cor*, 'rudeness in speech', 'nonsense').

the-then-ħldi-bžir-ħkaħ-ħgañ-ħtsur, 207, 'to this wise [Hsihsia *gžir* (Nevsky No. 281) "wise"] folk-control all the talk comes'.

rgyed-ma-ħldai-ge-ħkaħ-ħcog-byin-ta, 104-5, 'when disunion rises, putting in a word (*kha-cug* (*tsug*) of the Tibetan manuscripts) is a blessing (*byin*, l. 57).

ħkaħ-ħgo, 105 = Tib. *kha-bsgo*, 'giving directions' (or possibly 'understanding (Tib. *go*) advice').

ħkaħ-ħkhab, 105, 106, 'concealing what is said'.

ħkaħ-ħpyaħ-ħldan, 327, 'were repaid (Tib. *ldon*) with rebuke' (Tib. *ħpħya*, 'censure', cf. *kha-phog*, 'rebuke', *ħpħyar-kha*, 'blame', &c.)<sup>1</sup> ?

It is not so certain in:

ħkhab-ħgro-ge-ħkaħi, 239, 'home-going is to be talked of', 'is the moment for home-going'?

ñam-skar-ħkaħ-re-gdah-ħnah-ħgam ||, 191, 'when there is talk of, or it is a moment of, threatening stars, (any) available place is home'.

ħyañ-ħkaħ-rdza, 287, 290, = ħkhaħ-ħrdza-ħdze, 296, = ħkaħ-ħrdza, 296

where *ħyañ* certainly = 'good' or 'superior' and *ħrdza* appears from its other occurrence, l. 382, to be a derivative from *ħdza*, 'friend' and to mean 'in friendly union'. The *ħkaħ-rdza* are connected with *stsaħ*, ll. 288, 290, and *ħswaħ*, 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

<sup>1</sup> Or possibly 'paid command-impost (*dpya*)' (metaphorical). In the Tibetan MS. Chronicle (British Museum portion, l. 18) appears the phrase *bkaħ-šo*, 'special command-levy'.

perversion of a *kha-rdza*: the meaning 'great lord' might suit the Nam passages.

There remains the expression:

hke-hkaḥ, 152, 153, hkeḥe-hkaḥ, 158, hkeḥu-hkaḥ, 364, keḥu-hkaḥ, 178 (-dwañ 364, rwañ 178: cf. Tib. lab-dwañs).

The word *hke*, &c., which appears also in the phrase *hke-prom*, l. 176, *keḥu-prom*, ll. 176, 360, 361, *hkeḥu-prom*, ll. 177, 178, 360, 362, 366, *geḥu-prom*, l. 362, should not be different from the *hke* in *hke-plañ-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 (*hkeḥe*), 251, 314 (*hkeḥe*), 212 (*hkeḥe(hi)*)—the other instances, ll. 15, 41 (*hke(hi)*) are not recalcitrant. The verse:

hke-hkaḥ-ñes-re-ske-hbrus-hgyanni, 152-3

hkeḥe-hkaḥ-ñes-re-ske-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 *hbrus* in l. 152.

It must be admitted, however, that we have not solved all the difficulties connected with *hke/hkeḥu*. In the passage (ll. 165 sqq., cf. ll. 358 sqq.) concerning the distribution of the exercise and the fire of speech (*hkoḥu-prom*, °*me*) we suddenly come upon the statement:

hbañ-hldaḥ-hne-ge-hkeḥu-me-hdzah ||, 170

'good potentates eat the fire of *hkeḥu*'

and somewhat later:

rñe-hpo-hldo-ge-hkeḥu-prom-hjo-na, 177

hrñe-hpo-hñe-ge-hkoḥu-prom-hdzoh-na, 361-2

'the fiend braves (or evil fiend braves) ate the exercise of *hkeḥu* or *hkoḥu*'.

It is undeniable (see *infra*, p. 368) that a *hke*, *hkeḥu*, might exist as a form of *kha*, 'mouth', so that *hkeḥu-prom*, °*me*, would be synonymous with *hkoḥu* ('speech')-*prom*, °*me*; and in the above quoted ll. 152-3, 158, we might then translate *hke(hkeḥe)-hkaḥ*, 'mouth speech', which would yield a good antithesis to *ske*, 'throat'. But this would fail to do justice to the apparently purposive alternative of *hkoḥu* and *hkeḥu* in ll. 165-80 and 358-65;

and we are, further, quite at a loss to interpret the pointed antithesis of *keḥu* (*hkeḥu*)-*ḥkaḥ* and *ldyañ* (*hldyañ*)-*ḥkaḥ* in ll. 177–8 and 364–5.

### 36. *Words with initial ld.*

Since it has already (p. 286) been seen that Nam *ld-* may correspond 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 *ḥldaḥ* (*ldaḥ*, *ḥlda*, *lda*), *ḥldo*; (b) the Pronouns *ḥlda*, *ḥldi*; (c) the words *ḥldañ*/*ldañ*, *ḥlde*/*ḥldehi*/*ḥldeḥe*, *ḥldoñ*, ‘depart’, ‘flee’, = Tib. *ḥdoñ*, *ḥldaḥ* (278) and *ḥdaḥ* (58, 59), ‘arrow’, = Tib. *mdaḥ* = Hōrpa *lda*. There remain :

(i) *ḥldag*/*gldag* = Tib. *ltag* (*ḥdzur*; *ska*; *ḥbaḥ*; *khri*; *khyag*). This word, discussed *supra* (pp. 259–60) as occurring in the compound *ḥldag*/*gldag*-*nag*, ‘black-back’, has the sense of ‘load’ (Tib. *ltañ*) in :

*skaḥ*-*raḥ*-*ḥdzur*-*dze*-*ḥldag*-*ḥbaḥ*-*ḥldoñ* ||, 45

‘if the saddle (Tib. *sga*, but cf. *ska-rags*, “girdle”)-place is awry (Tib. *ḥdzur*, *bzur*, *gzur*, “step aside”, “shy”, *zur*, “corner” “aside”), the load goes rocking (? *dbaḥ*, “wave”) or “into a hole” (*ḥbaḥ*)’

*gldag*-*ḥce*-*rgyañ*-*na*-*ḥldag*-*khri*-*khyag*-*re*-*ḥsid* ||, 52

‘if the load is very large, the load support (*khri*) bending (Tib. *ḥkhyog*/*khyog*), it comes to grief’.

(ii) *ḥldan*, *ḥldon* = Tib. *lan*, *lon*, ‘retaliate’, ‘reply’, *ldon*, *glon*, ‘pay back’, ‘return’.

*Ḥldan* occurs in the phrases *ḥldam* (*ḥdzam*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥjam*<sup>o</sup>)-*re*-*ḥldan* in :

*cig*-*dze*-*ḥtor*-*ḥldam*-*re*-*ḥldan* ||, 186–7, 187–8, 188–9

(meaning obscure, see pp. 305–6)

*gśaṅ*-*ḥraḥ*-*ḥtoñ*-*kya*-*ḥnoḥo*-*ḥjam*-*re*-*ḥldan*, 273, cf. 274, 275

‘to enemy-abandoned crops friends returned mild’;

also in :

*ḥrgyaḥ*-*ḥdiḥi*-*ḥtron*-*re*-*ḥkaḥ*-*ḥpyah*-*ḥldan* ||, 327–8

‘come to this plain (?), are repaid with verbal reproof’ (Tib.

*ḥphyā*, ‘reprove’, ? see *supra*, p. 315)

*Hldon* can be Imperative (Optative) of *hldan* in :

*hlde(hldehe)-ge-htah-hldon*, 370, 371, 372

'let prosperities return'.

(iii) *hldab*, *hdab* = (1) Tib. *hdab*, 'wing', 'leaf'; (2) Tib. *hdabs*, *btab*, *hldab*, *hdab*, *gdab*, 'cast', 'put', 'sow', 'found' :

(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-hdabs*, 'pitch a tent', *dgon-pa-hdabs*, '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*, *hrdam*, = Tib. *hdom*, *hdoms*, *gdams*, *dams*, *gdam*, 'exhort', 'demonstrate', 'select', *sdom*, *bsdoms*, *bsdams*, *bstams*, 'bind', 'fasten', 'stop', 'confirm', *sdom*, 'obligation', 'engagement', 'vow', *hdam*, 'choose', 'select', *gdam-ka*, 'choice', *gdams*, 'advise', &c., *dam*, 'bound', 'vow', 'promise', 'seal', 'firm', 'narrow', &c. Further 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, *gdim-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-kyañ-hldom-re*, 371-2, 'strife also being quelled'

*hpha-ma-sñañ-ne-ge-ru(bu)-lta-ge-sñañ-glañ-hgañi*

*hyañ-hrah-hkah-hldom-ge-ru-glañ-ge-hthul-ñi* ||, 66-7

'Affectionate father and mother, looking at a child, rejoice (? Tib. *dgañ*) 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'.

hrah-[hyos-]hldom, 9, 'the earth movement was stopped (?)'.

In ll. 298-9 *g-rihi-hldom* is perhaps only a variant of *hrihi-hldom* ('bear') of l. 297.

*Hdom*, 'decision', appears in:

hkhwi-htsa-hyog-hdag-ci-hrañ-hdom-gdes ||, 259-60

'the old, equipped (*hdag*) with staves (Tib. *yog-po*), fixed their decisions'.

*Hdam*, 'bound', occurs perhaps in:

hdzam-hbron-hron-dze-hdam-to-hbu-hpor, 68

'in tame-yak gorges tied [animals] have their heads (Tib. *dbu*, Hsi-hsia *wu*) released (Tib. *hbor*, "cast away", "let go", p. 250 *supra*).'

(Cf. *hnu-glañ-hpor*, ll. 175, 359 (*phor*), 'the young oxen are released', *hdro-hphor*, ll. 180, 353, 'released to go' (p. 250 *supra*). In the sense of 'checked' *hdam* is applied in l. 326 to *hse-htah*, 'injuries', 'harms', and therefore also in ll. 328, 329, to *hkhoh-htah*, *hkhoh-hdah*. In ll. 346, 351, *hdam-sleg*, partly obscure, may contain *hdam* in the sense of Tib. *dam*, 'vow', 'promise', 'bond'; on *dam-rma-hbron*, see p. 286. *P[h]yu-phya-hdam*, l. 204, is obscure, and in *hpo-hdam-htor*, l. 393, the context is wanting.

In *hrñe-hrdam-hte*, l. 322, 'fiends (enemies) bound, or quelled', *hrdam* regularly corresponds to a Tibetan *s*-form, *sdam*.

On *hdom* = Tib. *dom*, 'bear', see p. 254.

(v) *hldar*, *hdar* = Tib. *ldar*, 'be weary, faint', or *hdar*, 'quake, tremble', 'shiver', *sdar-ma*, 'timid', 'trembling': (*hbrah-hldah*; *hyob*; *hkye*; *hyuhu*).

A *hldar* with this sense might be recognized in:

hbron-hldar-hdzam-re, 353, 'the yak being tame with trembling (or exhaustion)'

and that is not to be rejected. But in l. 182 the reading is:

hbron-hldah-hdzam-re, 'the yak there (*hldah* = 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 *h*.

In ll. 30-1, 31, 32, occurs the phrase:

hbrah(hbra)-hldar-ma-hyob

where an analogous doubt exists. Is the meaning '*Hbrah* (p. 308) was not fluttered (Tib. *g-yob*) with quaking', or 'in *Hbrah-hldah*

(*hldar* Locative of Suffix *hldaḥ*) there was no quaking? *Hdar*, 'tremble', 'shiver', appears in:

*rbyo-hphaḥ-hdar-dze-hkye-ge-hmu* ||, 38-9

'when the father *rbyo* (see pp. 332-3) shivers, the offspring (*hkye* = Hsi-hsia *hgyi* (Nevsky, No. 282) = Tib. *skye, skyes*, "be born", "creature", *khye-bo, khyeku*, "child") are cold' *hrñam-hdar-hyuku*, 368, 'the district (Tib. *yul*? cf. p. 333) trembles with affright'. (But the parallel in l. 49 has *nar*.)

(vi) *hldas* = Tib. *hdaḥ, hdas*, 'pass'.

*rbyo-ḥa-ge(hge)-hcaḥ-rte-hyu-rgyag-dze-hldas*, 82-3  
'the *rbyo* . . . went over to the *hcaḥ*' (p. 259).

(vii) *hldi, hldis, hldin* = Tib. *ldin*,<sup>1</sup> 'float', 'soar'.

*hldi-ma-hṛtaḥ*, 63, 71 (*ṛtaḥ*), 144, 'the horse does not leap (gallop)'

*ḥtor-hṛtaḥ-hldi[-]r[e]*, 337, 'the great horse galloping'

*ṛtaḥi-swa-hldi[-]r[e]*, 174, 'the horse galloping on guard'

*sku-mag-no-dze-me-na-hldis*, 58, 'the body in battle leaps (? is laid spread)<sup>2</sup> in fire' (*hldis* Aorist)

*ḥsi-hchos-re-ge-hpu-myi-hldin* ||, 160, 'born in winter, the bird does not fly'.

(viii) *hldim, hldyim, gdim, ddyim, hdim, dim* = Tib. *hthim, thim, gtim, stim*, 'be lost, dissolved, absorbed', 'evaporate', 'vanish', 'steal away' (*chim, chis, tshim, tshis, hdzam-hdzim*).

*ḥsañ-nag-rgyes-hkom-chim-hldim-ge-hphaḥ-rmañ*, 199

'when enemy voice (Tib. *nag*: 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 *hchim* 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 *gdim*, be Aorist or possibly Instrumental in *-s* (see *infra*, p. 359), that *chim* is the correct reading in:

*gdim-chis-ldom-re-ḥtsog-hldañ-hstañ* ||

*dim-tshis-ldom-re-tshog-hldañ-hduñ* ||, 94-5

'Controlled by going and coming (impermanence), union rises high (Tib. *steñ, stan*):

<sup>1</sup> On final *n/n̄* see p. 362: in E. Colonial Tibetan the form is *din*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Tib. *hdiñ*, 'spread', *adiñs*, 'level eminence', 'tableland'.

Controlled by going and coming, union rising falls (Tib. *ltuñ*)  
or is distressed (Tib. *gdun*)’.

hdim-htshis-htom(= hldom)-re-htso[g]-hldañ-stañ  
gdim-pyi-hse-ge-gsom-rgyag-hsor-doñ-htshog-me-hldyim-  
rgyañ  
gdim-phyi-hse-ge-htshog-hram-hñad ||, 88–90.

In this second passage :

htshog-me-hldyim-rgyañ = ‘the fire of union disappears far’  
htshog-hram-hñad = ‘union evaporates (Tib. *ñad*, cf. p. 217)’.

Hence *gdim*(*ddyim*, ll. 95–6)-*phyi-hse-ge* must mean ‘harm from  
outside (*phyi*), or subsequent (*phyi*) harm, being vanished (from  
thought = *gsom-rgyag-hsor*, cf. p. 258)’.

gdim-hdzam-hdzim-re-hko-wehi-htuḥu ||, 100

‘the *hdzam-hdzim* (“bustle” ?; cf. Tib. *zan-zin*, “miscellaneous  
objects”, “confused”) having subsided, they assembled,  
making room’.

What is the meaning of *hldim* in :

rñe-ne-g-ri-dze-hldim-hphu-hmañ, 301

‘evil and good on the mountain there are many *hldim-hphu*’  
echoed in l. 310 by *hldim-hmañ-hto* ||, ‘there are many *hldim*’?  
They seem to be classes of creatures, real or imagined.

(ix) *hldu*, *hlduḥu*, *hldun*, *htuḥu*, *htu*, *htus*, = Tib. *hdu*, *hdus*,  
‘collect’, ‘unite’, *hdun*, ‘council’, ‘counsel’, ‘companion’, *gdu*,  
‘mingle’, *sdud*, *bstus*, *bsdus*, *sdus*, *bsdu*, ‘collect’, &c., *sdum*,  
‘agreement’, *stun*, ‘agree’, *htu*, *thu*, *btus*, *btu*, *htun*, ‘gather’,  
‘pick’: (*hswar*; *hdzom*; *hjim*).

*Hldu*, *hlduḥu* :

htañ-hldu-hldyañ-ge, 14, ‘the joined fields (risen) high’

hldu-ro-hgru, 19, ‘the assembly-place a corner (or rock)’

hswar-hldu-sto (= *hldus-to*)-dze, 28, ‘in a closing of fingers  
(Tib. *sor*)’, sc. in an instant.

hlduḥu-ce-rgyañ-na, 51, ‘if accumulation (store) is of great  
extent’

gcog-hlde-hldu-dze, 69–70, ‘on the joined warm (?) meadows’

hseḥe-hldu-hru-re-dze, 238, ‘on all the peaks where the *hse*  
 (“fiends”, or “tops”) meet’.

*Hldun* :

hrim-hdzom-htaḥ-hldun ||, 284, ‘the joining (Tib. *hdzom*  
 “meet”, “interlace”) [torches] gathered’

htor-hsó-hti-ge-htaḥ-hldun, 354, ‘great *hso*-parties meet’.

*Htuħu* (*ħthuhu*), *ħthu*, *ħthus* (Aorist):

*ldyo-stor-ħthu-re*, 140, 'when the *ldyo* in flight gather'  
*ħjim-ta-ħthusni*, 156, 'salves (p. 280 n.) were gathered'.

With spelling *ħtuħu* an instance has been given *supra* (p. 321).

(x) *ħlduhu* = Tib. *gdu*, 'covet', 'hanker after', *gduñ*, 'desire', 'burn', 'torment': (*breħe*).

*bos-smyi-ħldog-ge-śes-gśi-ħlduhu* ||

*ħtsaħ-ħtsaħ-ħdzañ-ge-śes-ħśi-breħe*, 43-4

'when the master is a *ħldog* man, the knowing man covets death:

'when the harvest (*or* land, *ħsaħ*)-overseer is wise, the knowing man fears death'.

*Breħe* may be a *d*-less form of Tib. *bred*, 'fear', 'be dejected or ashamed', and connected, moreover, with *ħbre*, *bres*, 'screen off', 'envelope'. *ħbres*, l. 176, is probably the Preterite of the same.

On *ħldog* see *infra* (p. 323): *ħtsaħ-ħtsaħ* has been discussed on pp. 280-1.

(xi) *ħldug*: (*kyen*):

*the-kyen-ħldug*, 103.

*The* = 'lieges', 'common people': in regard to *ħldug*, Tib. *ħdug/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 *ħyañ*, 'good' (l. 383), and *śñañ-ne*, 'good-hearted' (l. 160), but also *kruħu*, 'canaille' (l. 334).

(xii) *ħldo-*, *do-ldo*, *ħldoħu* (*ħrim-ħldoħu*):

Whether in *śeg-sme-ħldo*, l. 375, *rñe-ħpo-ħldo*, l. 177, *ħbri-slod-ħldo*, l. 381, the *ħldo* is a Suffix is uncertain: on the analogy of *ħlo-ge-blaħ-ħldoħ*, l. 154, *meħi-ħgab-ħldo*, l. 155, it should be so.

On l. 110 *ħldoħo* see *supra*, p. 294.

*Do-ldo-ħdzo-chañ*, l. 76, = [*do*]-*ħldo-ħdzor-re*, l. 77, = *do-ldo-ħdzo-ħpeħi*, 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 *ħdzo/ħdzor* is uncertain: possibly 'eat', as in pp. 334-5. *ħldoħu* occurs only in *ħldoħu-ħjam-rño*, l. 277, and *ħrim-ħldoħu*, l. 300, *ħrim-re-ħldoħu*, 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 *ħlo*. 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 *ħrim-ħldoħu* may mean 'on all sides round'.

(xiii) *ħldog* = Tib. *log/ldog*, 'turn back, away', 'rebel', 'be recalcitrant', 'perverted', 'wrong': (*ħrpeħi*).

The appropriate sense is seen in:

*ħdzañ-ħkhor-ħkrug-ħkyañ-ħyogs-ħldog*, 18

'retinue of wise men at strife, servants recalcitrant'

*bos-smyi-ħldog-dze*, l. 42, 'when the master is a perverse person'; so also in 43-4

*mor-gdag-ħgom<sup>1</sup>-re-ħdzañ-ħldog-stor*, 141-2

'when the wicked acquire mastery, the wise flee away'

perhaps also in:

*ħldaħ-ħrgam-ħstsag-ħldog-ħpo-ħrbom-ħtoħo* ||

*po-rbom-ħnor-[re-]ħldog-g-yah-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:

*rpeħi-ħldaħ-ħrgam-re-ħldog-ħyah-ħthañ*, 286

'if the exemplary (?) are taken into the community, the recalcitrant are in the ascendant'

because in l. 169 we read:

*ħrgom-ħkhru[-]r[e]-ħto-na-ħrpeħi-ħrgam-re-ħto*

'the canaille (*ħkhru*) being passed over (*ħrgom*), the exemplary were taken into the community'.

concerning which see pp. 244, 296-7. *Rpeħi* would well correspond to Tib. *dpe*, 'pattern', 'example'; cf. *rpag* = Tib. *dpag*. The word recurs, no doubt, in the mutilated passage:

*bos - [smyi - ħld]o[g - dz]e - [rpe]hi - ge - ħdzañ - na - speħi - ge || ħthon ||*, 378-9.

(xiv) *ħldor*, 357, is possibly = *ħldo-re*, just as the rather frequent *ħldir* is always = *ħldi-re*.

<sup>1</sup> *Ĥgom*, which does not recur, will be = *ħkom* (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-*,<sup>1</sup> 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 *lī*, *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 *pī*, *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 *pī*, *bī*, *vī*, *pālī*, *pīlī*, *būlī*, *fālī*, *fīlī* (*mīlī*, &c.): these are similarly common and widespread;
- (d) forms with *p+r*, *b+r*, or *f+r*, such as (*ka*)-*preī*, *kam-brin*, *brè*, *brī*, *brui*, *firi* (*marī*, &c.): a less common variant of (c);
- (e) forms with *d*: *diā* (D'imāl, a Himālayan dialect), *ka-dī*

<sup>1</sup> [*r*]Dyalbo, *r* Dyarong, &c. (see Index).

(Gyārūng, but *ka-plis-si*, '40', *ko-pli* (Rgya-roñ), '4'), *bi-di*, *bi-d'i*, *pedi*, *pa-dāi*, *mu-dai*, &c. (Nāgā);

- (f) forms with a sibilant, such as Tibetan *bzi*, Śarpa *śi*, &c.: these are found only in the Tibetan group and are probably in all cases (including Thōchū *gzha(-re)*, '4', *ghyi-so*, '40') borrowed from Tibetan;
- (g) forms with *ld*: *ldi* = '4', *ldih*, *lda*, *zlah*, *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 Gyārūng, which for '4' has *ka-dī* (Rgya-roñ *ko-pli*), has at the same time for '40' the form with *pl* (*ka-plis-si*). In view of the Rgyal-roñ forms and, further, of Tākpa *bli* and numerous equivalents in Himālayan 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-roñ *ślu*, 'lungs', &c.

The only form approaching (and indeed by about four to five centuries surpassing) in antiquity the Hsi-hsia *ldi* are the Tibetan *bzi* and the Žaň-žuň *pī* (JRAS. 1933, p. 408).

Tibetan *ž* is constantly found in relation, as is natural, to *j* (*c*), e.g. in:

*žin*, *žes*, particles alternating with *cin* (*jin*), *ces*.

*gžal*, *bžal*, *bžag*, *bžig*, *bžugs*, *žugs*, *žu*, *bžo*, *žo*, connected with the Verbs *hjal*, 'weigh', *hjog*, 'put', *hjig*, 'destroy', *hjug*, 'enter', *hju*, 'melt', *hjo*, 'milk'.

*gžah*, *gžoňs*, *gžom* = *hjah*, 'rainbow', *ljoňs*, 'valley', *hjoms*, 'conquer'.

Since *j* is not found with the Prefixes *g*, *b*,<sup>1</sup> while *ž*, 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 *ś* follows the rule for its voiced correlate *ž*. Presumably *ś* and *ž* differ from *c* and *j* simply as being

<sup>1</sup> Prejevalsky (trans. ii, p. 138) gives 'Tangut' *bjeħ* = Tib. *bzi* (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 *bzi* 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*, *pedi*, 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-ldyi*, *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 *ldi*), 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, *hldyan*, which by reason of an antithesis to *hldyoñ* 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. *hldyo*, *ldyo*, *hldyoho*; *hldyo-hro* (*hbyohu*; *hnus*; *na-htsah-ste*; *htrog*; *hnus*).

The verse:

*ldyo-stor-hthu-re-hdrab-stor-htoho* ||, 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 *hkoñu-mehe-hldyo* |||, ll. 171-2, which clearly signifies a deprivation 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*, *bzos*, *bzo*, *gzo*, 'to milk', *hjo-ma*, 'milch-cow', *zo*, '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. *bzon-ma*, 'cow, ewe, or she-goat, that is yielding milk ; a gen. term for such cattle'.

A Verb *hldyoho* (*hldyo*) is seen also in :

hñu[-]r[e]-hñah-rgyeñ-na-hñu-hldo-hldyoho ||, 355

'absence of all weeping being arranged (*rgyeñ*), weeping was milked away' (p. 256).

In the sense of 'milch-cattle' the word recurs in :

hdom-hgu-htshuñu-hyañ-hmañ-hldyo-hrgam, 303-4

'though bears come, many milch-cattle are in company' (*ibid.*).

The meaning 'milk' may be traced in the *ldyohu* of :

hśañ-hdzah-hldyim-hyañ-ldyohu-ma-hbyohu, 255

'though garbage-eating was sweet [sc. to the cattle], the milk was not poured out (Tib. *byo*, *hbyo*) [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 :

hdzam-hbroñ-hroñ-dze-hldyo-hro-hpehi ||, 384

'in tame-yak gorges is an example (?) of "ranchland"'

and this, again, may explain the phrase :

hldyo-hdom-nag, 162, 171, 'the black bears of the ranch [-country]'

The phrase *hldyo-htor-ge-hnus*, ll. 16, 34, 50 (*tor* for *htor-ge*) : in :

hbu-rwye-hce-rgyañ-dze-hldyo-htor-ge-hnus ||, 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-htsah-ste* = *na-htsas-te*, perhaps the 'harvested meadows (Tib. *na*, *btsas* : see p. 239)' that 'the ranch-cattle dripped or suckled'. By reason of uncertainty as to the meaning of *htrog* we cannot interpret :

htrog-htor-te-dze-hldyo-ge-nus, 40

(can *htrog* be = *hbrog*, 'high pastures' (see p. 5) ? In the Tibetan

manuscripts we find *ye-ḥdrog* written for *ye-ḥbrog*), nor is *ḥldyo-ḥrje-ḥbro* in l. 36 clear.<sup>1</sup> 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 elsewhere also in Tibeto-Burman. One Hsi-fan dialect (d'Ollone, No. 35) has for 'milk' *lio niu niu*, in which the two last syllables may be the Chinese for 'cow'. Conceivably there might be a primitive relation between *ldyo* and Chinese *zu* (Ancient 'ńziu, Karlgren, No. 48).

2. *ḥldya*, *ḥldyah*: (*stoñ*; *ḥkhog*; *ḥñor*; *yañ*, *ḥyañ*; *sko*).

This word occurs in:

*ḥlduḥu-ce-rgyañ-na-stoñ-ḥkhog-re-ḥldya-ḥkañ-ḥte-ḥñor*, 51-2  
 'An accumulation (store, Tib. *ḥdu-khañ*?) of (too) great extent, with empty (unfilled) interior (Tib. *stoñ*, *khog*), has its goods (*ḥñor* = Tib. *nor*, as in l. 50) filled with *ḥldya*'.

Here the meaning 'water' would suit, since ordinarily the store-place would be a pit (*doñ*). In Hsi-fan we find Mānyak *dyāḥ*, 'water'; and this may also be Menia *djo* or *dju*i, Muli *djō*, Pa-U-Rong *dji*, Mo-so *dji* (Lo-lo, *ji*, *yi-dié*, *i dia*, *dia dia*?), also it may be Hsi-hsia *tsei*, *dsei*, *jei* (Laufer, No. 37). These, however, are merely a beginning: we must add the whole army of forms, such as *tī*, *di*, *tūi*, *dūi*, *dwi*, found in the western Himālaya and all over the Tibeto-Burman world; among which forms the *tī* of Kanaurī, &c., may be singled out, as found in a *Žaṅ-zuñ* 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 *bwya*, 'bird' (cf. Tib. *phywa*, 'lot').

On the etymological side Nam *ḥldya* = 'water' may therefore

<sup>1</sup> In l. 254 the metre warns us to read:

*ḥldyo-ḥtor-ḥmyi-na* || (instead of *ḥmyi* || *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-ḥnūs* (ll. 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 *ldyohu-ma-ḥbyohu* of l. 255. This confirms the interpretation of *ḥtrog-ḥtor-te-dze*, which will be a variant of the *ḥbu-rwye-ḥce-rgyañ-dze* of ll. 15-16.

be defensible. As further evidence of the actuality, we may quote:

hyañ-re-rgyeñ-na-yañ-ḥldyah-ḥldyah<sup>1</sup> ||, 355-6

‘each conduit being in order, the conduits were water, water  
[sc. flowed continuously]’

for *hyañ*, 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 *ḥldyah* 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-ḥbab*, 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 *ḥldyah* means ‘water’, ‘water-flow’, it will not be an accident that Tib. *bzah*, i.e. *bjah* < \**bdyah* or \**bldyah* (cf. *bzi*, ‘4’), means ‘moist’, ‘wet’.

3. *ḥldi*, *ḥldyi*, *ḥldyihi*, *ḥldihi*: (*ḥmu*; *ḥrñu*; *skhrud*; *ḥre*; *rgyo*; *ḥphu*; *ḥsig*; *ḥldyeg*; *ḥti*).

It has been suggested *supra* (p. 276) that in:

*ḥmu-ḥrñu-skhrud-dze-mor-ḥtañ*-[*hgras*] ||

*ḥldi-ḥrkah-ḥldyañ-dze-hyañ-ḥtañ-hgras*, 9-10

‘On the *ḥmu*, fleeing in pain (Tib. *rñu*, *skrud*), the evil power was arrayed:

On the *ḥldi*, risen steep (Tib. *dkah*), the good power was arrayed’

*ḥmu* should be the ‘sky’ (Hsi-hsia *mu/mo* (Laufer, No. 34); Hsi-fan, &c., *mo/mon*), and *ḥldi* 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 *ḥldi* no further examples; all instances of *ḥldi*, *ḥldir* (= *ḥldi-re*), seeming to represent *ḥldi*, ‘this’, or *ḥldi*, ‘fly’. But *ḥldihi* in:

*ḥldihi-su-ḥldoñ* || *dze-ḥlda-ḥko-ge-ḥdzoñ*, 195

‘what *ḥldihi* one retires to, there is one’s castle’

being antithetic to ‘river’ (*rma*) in the following line, should mean ‘land’. On *ḥlda-ḥko* (*da-ko*) see *supra*, pp. 201, 245.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Lo-lo *dia-dia*, above.

This *ldi* may be represented further by Mānyak *mali/mli* d'Ollone 38 *dia*, Muli (Njong) *dja*, Mélam *meli* ('country'), (Mo-so *mdié*, Lo-lo, *mi-dyi*, &c.?). In Tibetan there is a common word *gzi/gzis*, 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-že-diu* < *sa-gzi* ('Tangut' *sa-žu*), 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/hldyihī* 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-hsig-hldyihī* ||, 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' (ll. 245, 247). *Hphu* (*hpu*) can mean 'male', and *hsig* always has the sense of Tib. *hjig*, *bzig*, *gzig*, 'destroy', 'decay', 'perish'. In this context *hldyihī*, no doubt a Verb, might well mean 'be assuaged', 'appeased', in which case it would correspond to Tib. *zi*, 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.<sup>1</sup> *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(ldi)-lei*, 'four quarters', frequently mentioned in a Buddhist Hsi-hsia text.<sup>2</sup> The Tibetan for 'quarter' in this application is usually *phyogs* (Hsi-fan *chuo*, &c., Menia *cho*); but there is also a word *gzogs*, which might be akin to such a *hldyeg*.

In l. 375 *rbyi-hldyihī* is unfortunately obscure: see p. 350.

4. *hldyim*: (*hpuhi*, *hphuhi*).

In one occurrence, namely in the phrase *htshog-me-hldyim-rgyañ*, l. 89, *hldyim* clearly belongs to the Verb *gdim/dim/hdim/*

<sup>1</sup> On *hti* = 'stop' see pp. 174, 309.

<sup>2</sup> *Suvarṇa-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 *hldim*. The same interpretation is applicable in:

*hldyim-hste-hpuhi-ge-rñe-hdzam-re-hldan*, 274

'their blowings ceased, the fiends (enemies) returned mild'

where *hpuhi* = *hphuhi*, said of dogs in the next but one line (p. 285), and of the ass in l. 354, and the *s* in *hste* points to a form *hldyims* (Aorist).

A different *hldyim* must be seen in the above quoted:

*hśañ-hdzah-hldyim-hyañ*, 255

which has been translated (p. 327) 'though garbage-eating was sweet'. The rendering implies an equivalence of *hldyim* to Tib. *zim*,<sup>1</sup> 'sweet', 'well-tasting', which phonetically may now be considered justified. In the Tibetan manuscripts we read 'A flesh-eater's sharp knife gives sweetness (*zim*) at every cut'. But in the absence of further confirmation the matter remains conjectural: as regards *hdzah* see p. 334.

5. *hldyañ, hldyoñ, ldyañ, hdyañ, dyañ*; (*°hro*; *°hto*; *rgoñ*; *rgyer*)

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:

*hjo(hdzo)-chi-te-re-hlab-hñañ-hyah-htaḥ || hldyañ-hro-hpehi ||*  
*hdzam-hbroñ-hroñ || hbañ-hko-htar-cig-dze-hldyoñ-hro-*  
*hpehi ||*

Here, in company with phrases which have previously been found difficult, we find the *hldyañ-hro*, 'hldyañ country', exemplified (*hpehi*) in a certain way, the *hldyoñ-hro*, 'hldyoñ-country', in another way, which brings in the 'tame-yak gorge', already seen to imply the lower levels. Concerning the word *hro(ro)* in place-names see *supra*, p. 314. *Hldyoñ* probably has no other occurrence, *ldyoño* in l. 318 being a doubtful reading.

There are some indications connecting *hldyañ* with height:

*hldyañ-g-ri-gdod-re-mehi-hrah-gtañ*, 186

'[where] a *hldyañ* mountain is prominent (Tib. *dod*), an eye-post should be set'

*hldyañ-hgoḥo-hdzin-re-mehi-hrah-hdab na*, 369

'a *hldyañ* place or gate (*hgoḥo*) being held, an eye-post is put' although *hldyañ* might be not attribute of *g-ri* and *hgoḥo*, but

<sup>1</sup> For *bzim*? Cf. *hjiḥ*, *bziḥ*, 'relish'.

subject to the Verbs *gdod* (the phrase *g-ri-gdod* would then, however, be difficult) and *h̄dzin*. In the verse, repeated in ll. 9, 19:

sta-re-hmo (l. 9 h̄mo-h̄no)-ge-sta-hri-h̄ldyañ

‘where were (had been) the heavens (clouds?), there the mountains *h̄ldyañ*’

the signification ‘high’ or ‘rose’ becomes a certainty; and it is confirmed by the *h̄ldi-h̄rkañ-h̄ldyañ-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.

An antithesis *h̄ldyañ/h̄ldyoñ*, ‘high’/‘low’, can find its reflection in Tibetan *b̄zeñ*, *b̄zeñs*, *b̄zañ*, ‘raise’, ‘erect’, in comparison with *zoñ*, ‘lower’, *zoñ-zoñ*, ‘deepened’, ‘excavated’, ‘hollow’, *ḡzoñs*, *l̄joñs*, ‘valley’, (*lj* not becoming *l̄z*), with which must be connected *sañ-soñs*, ‘high and low’, *ḡsoñ*, *b̄soñ*, ‘deep valley’, ‘ravine’. *B̄zeñs* is used, for instance, to denote the raised partitions dividing fields; an analogous meaning will well suit:

h̄dyañ-hto-htoñ-ge-h̄go-gtoñ-mod, 210–11

‘when the high (Tib. *mtho*) 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. *b̄zeñ* conveys, may perhaps be recognized in:

h̄dzu-h̄dro-h̄phor-[re]-h̄chi-h̄do-dyañna, 183, 353 (*gzu*, *h̄dyañ*)

‘the ass, set free to depart, started or rose (*dyañ*) to go (*h̄chi*)’  
rgoñ-wa-mye[-]r[e]-rbyo-rgyer-h̄ldyañ ||, 365

‘if there are no eggs (Tib. *sgoñ*, *sgoñ-ña*, Mo-so *gö*, &c.), the *rbyo* rises abandoning (Tib. *h̄gyer*) it’

and the same is presumably the case in the *h̄nu-glañ-ldyañ* following in l. 366, and can also be harmonized with the *rñe-h̄khyam-h̄ldyañ* of ll. 229, 236.

The reference to eggs in l. 365, however, yields a more definite conception in *h̄ldyañ*, that of ‘flying’, which would bring it into connexion, either as a synonym or as a linguistic or stylistic equivalent of *h̄ldiñ*, ‘fly’, which we have seen in l. 160 *h̄pu-myi-h̄ldiñ*, ‘the bird does not fly’ (pp. 145–6, 320). In that case *rbyo* should be a synonym of *h̄pu*, ‘bird’, and this will suit

rbyo-g-yer-h̄nor[-re]-rgoñ-wa-śid ||, 366

‘if the bird is foolish in his alertness [sc. unwatchful] (cf. *stsah-h̄yer*, *swa-h̄mor*, &c., pp. 276–8, and on *h̄nor*, ‘foolish’, pp. 224–5) the eggs perish’

and the further connexion of the *rbyo* with eggs in the proverb:

rbyo-sñañ-ge-sñañ-na-rgoñ-ru-ge-hru ||, 102-3 (cf. l. 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-sgoñ*), and others also represent the final *-o*, perhaps a 'Diminutive' form = *byəku*. 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 *hphoñ*, 'poor' (?) in 53, and to *rgu*, 'thief', in l. 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 (*hldyañ*) through the sky. Moreover, it seems to afford a key to the phrase *hldyañ-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 *hldyañ* remains, however, the most puzzling in the whole text, and perhaps has several different senses. The obscure expression *hldyañ-hkah* has been mentioned *supra* (p. 317). In regard to *hldyañ-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 *Hjañ*, 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*, *gzuñs*, *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 *ž* 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 indiscriminated '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. *gdzu*, *hdzu*, *gzu*, *hzu*, *hju*, 'ass'.

This has been discussed *supra* (pp. 251-2, Tib. *gzu-lum*).

2. *hdzah*, *hjah*, *gzo*, *hdzo*, *hjo* = Tib. *za*, *bzah*, *bzas*, *zos*, *bzos*, 'eat', 'food', *zan*, *gzan*, 'food', 'eat': (*hkhen*).

*bos-smyi-hldog-dze-hrah-ldah-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. *hsan-hdzah-hldyim-hyan*, l. 255, 'though garbage-feeding is sweet' (*supra*, p. 327, 331).

The form *hjah* appears in:

*hjah-htah-hkhen-yan-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 :

ħbos-ħnom-ħsah-gtsañ-ħrgu-ma-gzo ||, 164-5

'crops of land enjoyed by the master thieves do (shall ? see p. 199) not eat'.

On *ħrgu* see p. 233.

The meaning 'eat' is suggested, by the above-cited *ħkeħu-me-ħdzah*, for *ħjo*, *ħdzo*, in :

rñe-ħpo-ħldo-ge-ħkeħu-prom-ħjo-na, 177

ħrñe-ħpo-ħñe-ge-ħkoħu-prom-ħdzoho ||, 361-2

'enemy (fiend) braves eat the profit (speech, p. 316)-making'.

3. *ħjoho* = Tib. *bzo*, 'manufacture', 'trade', 'craft', 'make', *bzo*, *zo*, 'figure', 'fashion', 'art', *thag-bzo*, 'rope-making'.

g-rah-ħyos-htag-ge-ħjoho ||, 34

'the earthquake acted as a mill' (*supra*, p. 275).

4. *ħdze* = Tib. *ze*, *zeħu*, 'hump', 'cushion', *gzed*, 'carry', *mjed*, 'convey', 'bear', perhaps related to *ħdzed*, 'hold out' and *bzod*, 'endure', 'forgive': (*ħyañ*; *spyi*; *ħkab*).

ħyañ-so-ħdze-tse-ħldi-ma-ħrtah ||, 63

'when the load is too big (Tib. *yañs* ?), the horse does not fly (gallop)'

spyi-ħdze-ge-ħkab |||, 110

'the chief (Tib. *spyi-bo*) burden [sc. responsibility] is the family (Tib. *khab*)'.

5. *ħdzeħu* = Tib. *gze-re*, 'weak', 'reduced', *bze*, *bze-re*, 'pain' (endurance ?), *zed*, 'damaged', 'injured' ?

ħdzeħu-rje-ħbro-re-ħdzohu-ħto-ħrun, 138

'when a weak chief flees, one must be a man (*ħdzohu*, pp. 218).

6. *ħdzon* = 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-ħtah-ħdzon, 336-7

'the rope being pulled, pulled (Tib. *the-re-then*, "pull straight", *ħthen*, "pull (a rope, &c.)"), running away is guarded against'.

7. *sla* = Tib. *zla*, 'friend'.

ħldañ-ħkrañ-ħwe-dze-ħldañ-slah-ħkeħe, 125

'doing uprightness, one gains upright (or helping) friends' (see p. 289)

8. *slo, slos* = Tib. *zlo*, 'summon', 'call', *zlos*, 'a charm', *zla-ba, bzla-ba, bzlas*?<sup>1</sup> (*hsus, gsus*).

rtā-ḡgam-ḡphar-re-ḡsus-slo-glo, 93

rtā-ḡgam-ḡphar-[re-]ḡsus-slo-stāḡ, 99

'the horse being gone to the *ḡgam*, intending to call (*or* expecting) a party to receive him. . . . (those called (*or* who came forth) to receive him)'

*Ḥsus/gsus*, Aorist of *bsu*, 'advance to meet a visitor', a common usage in Tibet and Central Asia. It will be noted that *slo-stāḡ* = *slos-tā*, as in analogous cases.

9. *slug*, l. 47, is uncertain,<sup>2</sup> as also is *ḡdam-sleg*, ll. 346, 351. *slug*, l. 359 = *slog*, ll. 174, 384 = Tib. *zlog, bzlog*, 'turn back', 'repel', 'divert', *bzlog*, 'contrary', *slog*, 'turn', 'invert', 'return' (*g-yul-bzlog*, 'repel in battle', 'a victorious battle').

ḡnu-glaḡ-slog, 174, 359 (*slug*), 'turned back the young oxen'.  
ḡrseḡi-ḡpag-slog-dze-ḡrḡe-ḡrom-ge-ḡti-na-ḡrḡe-ge-ḡrlomḡi|:|,  
384-5

'the peaks (*ḡrseḡi* also l. 208, = *se, ḡse*, Tib. *rtse*) having sunk down, in the darkness of the fiends' gloomy (cavity) the fiends hanker (*or* are conceited, *ḡrlom* = 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. *ḡwa*, 'cap', *grwa*, 'school', *phywa*, 'lot', *rtswa, zwa*, 'nettle', 'grass', *khwa*, 'raven', *lwa*, 'blanket'—many of these,<sup>3</sup> 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 *ḡ*) and subscript. It has, moreover, forms (*g-waḡ, g-we, &c.*) with Prefix *g*- written

<sup>1</sup> But perhaps *slo* may rather be = Hsi-hsia *sloḡ* = 'come forth' (Nevsky, no. 103).

<sup>2</sup> But being connected with *ḡḡed* (see p. 251) it may be related to Tib. *ldug/blug/zlug/bzlug*, 'pour', 'cast metal', &c.

<sup>3</sup> 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*, *wəhi*, *hwehi*, *g-we*, *g-wehe*, *g-wəhi* = 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 *hldañ-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*, *hgwa*; °*bzer*, °*hrno*; *rkwa* (*g-roñ*; *hkah*; *gla*; *rko*; *glog*).

In:

gdzu-ḥbyi-ḥnañ-re-ḥmañ-ḥri-ḥwas ||, 308

'if "little tiger" (the ass) is in it, the great mountain is done for'

the phrase *ḥmañ-ḥri-ḥwas* is proved to have the meaning here given by *ḥmañ-sta-meḥi*, 'greatness is not there' of l. 311, followed by:

gdzu-ḥbyi-ḥnañ-re-ḥri-stah-meḥi

'if "little tiger" is in it, the mountain is not there'

and further repetitions of *ḥri(g-rihi)*, &c.)-*sta-meḥi*. Hence it is clear that *hwas* = Tib. *bas*.

The same *hwas*, slightly disguised, is seen in the *hwa-ste*(= *hwas-te*) of:

ḥde-me-ḥtaḥ-g-roñ-ḥyed-ge-ta-ḥwa-ste-ḥtaḥ ||, 71-2

'fires of prosperity, with cooling (Tib. *grañ* ?), or dying (Tib. *groñ* ?),<sup>1</sup> emissions, are done for'

an interpretation confirmed by:

ḥwa-ste-ḥge-dze-ḥla-ḥram-ḥte ||, 73

'with exhausted good fortune the moon consorts'

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 269, 273.

repeated (with *lah* for *hla*) in ll. 75–6, where it is preceded by :

hwa-ste-hgehe-dze-dgu-htor-hbyi

‘in exhausted good fortune the great heat diminishes’.

This being so, it is probable that the frequently recurring *wa/hwa/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. *hbaḥ*, ‘seizure’, ‘dstraint (liability to)’ *hbaḥ-gan* (*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-hyo, 178–9, ‘thought-making fluctuates’

hmu-wa-rño, 309, ‘able to make cold’

hwad-hwah-rño, 335, ‘able to keep watch’

hkya-wa(hwa)-ñe(hñe), 162, 215, 339, ‘harming work upon crops’

hdrab-hwa-hrañ, 162, 172, ‘delighting in making snatchings’.

A more definite note of action is seen in :

hbri-re-hrdyam-re-hkkaḥ-hldaḥ-hñaghi

hdzoḥu-ro-hldi-re-hjoḥu || hwa-hkaḥ, 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 *hwa-hkaḥ* perhaps corresponds to such phrases in Tibetan as *hgro-kha*, ‘time of going’ (p. 314).

Agricultural ‘work’ is indicated in :

gsaḥ-rkaḥ-gla[-]r[e]-hwah-hrog-hldoñ

hwah-hrog-rño-ge-hkeg-rko-hwad, 333–4

‘If difficult *or* steep (*rkaḥ*, see p. 329) land is hired, helpers in the work desert ;

With capable helpers in the work the *hkeg* (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 *hwah-glah-hrsañ-hgam*, ll. 228–9 will also contain the notion of ‘wage of work’ ; while *hwah-hraḥ*, l. 353, may be merely ‘place (*or* room) for action’. Similarly in :

po-rbom-hnor-[re-]hldog-g-yah-to-dze-hwa-ne-hphe, 317



‘If the big man is a fool, then, becoming recalcitrant, good work (*hgwa-nehu*, l. 41) is weak (?)’<sup>1</sup>

ḥtsah-ḥdzañ-ḥyah-ge-ḥwah-ne-ḥbraḥ ||  
smyi-glog-g-yah-ge || ḥwah-ḥrño-ḥjam-ḥma, 268–9

‘With a wise supervisor in front, good work flourishes’:

‘With a lightning man in front, the work-capable are pleased (agreeable?)’ cf. *ḥldoḥu-ḥjam-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:

ḥwah-ḥldañra-ḥtsañra-na-ḥwa-rgya-ḥrko-ḥrkabs, 270–1

‘Work in woodland or cornland (?),<sup>2</sup> work plain hoe . . .’

Possibly the notion of ‘forcible action’ or ‘constraint’ is to be recognized in:

ḥśi-ḥwa-ḥko, 123, ‘death-action (= death) is *ḥko* (supreme? sole?)’.

As *ḥwah*, *g-wah*, *ḥwa*, *ḥgwah*, the word with this signification appears repeatedly in the long passage (ll. 223 sqq.) beginning:

ḥtor-ḥbron-ḥrpag-re-ḥwah-ḥrśañ-ḥlamḥi  
g-wah-ḥrśañ-ḥnar-[re-]ḥrkwa-ḥdzam-ḥtronḥi

‘The great yak to be brought low, a journey of hostile action: Hostile action accomplished, mild command to be led in’.

Here the word *ḥrśañ*, which has occurred with *ḥswa*, ‘surveillance’ (l. 321), and in ll. 225, 226 with *lad*, as equivalent to *ḥśañ-ḥlad*, ll. 226–7, should mean ‘hostility’ or ‘hate’. *Ḥrkwa*, since in l. 122 we read *ḥrta-rkwa-ḥdzam*, ‘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:

ḥwah-[h]t[i]b-bḥer ||, 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 *ḥbar* is not clear. With *ḥwah* the word *bḥer*, not given in the Tibetan dictionaries, but frequent

<sup>1</sup> *Hphe*, perhaps identical with the *pheh* of the Berlin fragment (l. 3), is of uncertain meaning, though clearly antithetical to *ḥbraḥ*. Can it be a form of *ḥphen* (cf. *ḥdre/ḥdren*, &c.), ‘throw away’, and so with *ḥphañ/phañs*, ‘loss’, *phoñs/hphoñs*, ‘poor’, &c.?

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *gah-re-ḥtsah-re*, ‘lands and crops’, p. 281.

in seventh-to-ninth century personal names and occurring in the Tibetan manuscript *Chronicle* as designation of some war-structure which was 'built' (*dgra-bžer-brtsigs*), is conjoined again in the expression *hwa-bžer*, l. 231, of the Nam text: since it is first *hšid*, 'high', and then *hrpag*, 'brought low', it is evidently here, also, a building, like *hkhār*, *hbam*, *hkañ*, and other objects to which these terms are applied. Thus it seems certain that *hwa-bžer* means 'bžer of power or government or control'. The rarity of ž in Nam suggests that it is a loan-word from Tibetan, which itself may have acquired it by borrowing. In l. 177 we *hkoḥu-prom-bžer*.

The above include all the occurrences of *wa*, *hwaḥ*, *hgwaḥ*, &c., except *hwi-wa* (*hwa*), ll. 201, 273, to be noted *infra* (p. 341), *hyah-wa-hkañ*, l. 190, which all belong elsewhere.

The employment of *wa* with Verbs, as in *gsom-wa*, 'thought-making', *ši-hwa*, 'death-making (or power)', *hwad-hwaḥ-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*).

3. *hwam*, 'mansion', 'dwelling' = Tib. *bam/bams/boms*; (see pp. 225, 243).

4. *hwag* = Tib. *hbag*, 'be defiled':

*hrgyeb-hkruḥu-hbro-re-g-yaḥ-hpañ-hwag*, 323-4

'when the rear has a filth-taste (malodour?), the lap in front is defiled'.

5. *hwad* = Tib. *hbad*, 'watch', 'be alert, earnest', *hbod*, 'call', 'call to', 'invite'.

*mye-hyañ-hwad*, 6, 'fire also is awake'

*hšeḥe-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-hci-hwadhi*, 300-1, 'watch those coming to (or moving on) the mountain'

*hwad-hldañ-krañ*, 268, 'uprightness keeps watch',

*hkeg-rko-hwad*, 334, 'the stopped hoe wakes up'?

*hwad-hwaḥ-rño*, 335, 'able to keep watch'.

*Hbod* may have a related sense in:

*hmor-hso-hbod-ge*, 313.

The text contains no instance of *wo* or *wu*, while *hbo* is frequent,

and *hbu* and *hbog* also occur : hence before *o* and *u* the change of *b* to *w* may not have taken place in Nam itself.

6. *hwar* = Tib. *hbar*, 'burn' : (*hdag*).

*hro-ta-śodtsa-re-hwar-ta-rgyen*(n)i, 198

'the corpses being laid low (?), burning is difficult'.

In l. 28, where an earthquake is in question, *hwar* probably will have the same sense, though an apparent imperfection in the text renders it uncertain whether *hdag-hpoħo*, which *might* be = Tib. *mdag*, 'embers', is really the subject of the Verb. For other reasons *hrañ-war-hpañ-re*, l. 101, *hrañ-hwar-rders-hdi-na*, l. 107, *cha-ru-hwars* (perhaps Aorist) *-ge*, l. 203, must likewise be left obscure.

7. *hwi-hwa* (*wa*) = Tib. *byi-ba*, 'mouse', 'rat' :

*klag-hrwad-hdzur*.[re-]*hwi-hweħi-ħtsag*, 173

'if the harsh-voiced lammergeyer (or eagle) is away, the mice or rats gather' (p. 257)

*ħso-hldaħ-ħgor-re-hwi-wa-rmañ*, 201,

'if the living delay, mice or rats are the tomb'

*hwi-hwa-se-kyah-hkyañ-hdzam-re-hldan* ||, 273-4

'to their mice-injured crops the serfs returned tame'

(cf. the *gśañ-hrah-ħtoñ-kya*, 'enemy-abandoned crops' of the preceding verse).

8. *hwyr* = Tib. *hbyer*, 'escape' : (*ħśag*) :

*ħno-sto-ge-ħśag-dze-rñe-hwe-ge-hwyr* ||, 85

'while friends talk (Tib. *śags*), enmity-doers escape'.

9. *hwen* = Tib. *dben*, 'solitary' (?) :

*ħlab-ta-hwen*, 159, 'speaking is empty ( )'.

A Hsi-hsia *wen* is given as meaning 'bad' (Laufer, No. 17).

10. *hwañ* = Tib. *dbañ*, 'power', &c. (or Chinese *wang* ?)

*hldañ-rgye-ħdor-re-hwañ-ta-ħnen*, 209-10

'After throwing away the big stick (? strong support, *hldañ* ?), ruling is a risk'

*ram* (nam ?)-*ge-hwañ* || *re-klu-ge-hwañ* ||, 5

'... being in authority, the blind were in authority'.

11. *weiħi/hweiħi*, 'cream' (p. 251) ?

In regard to alternation of *w*(*hw*) and *b*(*hb*) see p. 346.

B. 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.

1. *swa* = Tib. *so/swa*, 'watch', 'guard', &c.:

See *supra*, pp. 276-7.

2. *swa/hswa/hswah/swah* = Tib. *so*, 'tooth':

See p. 334.

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:

*gsi-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 ἀπαξ εἰρημένα: *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 *hbañ-thwañ* must be = Tib. *dbañ-thañ*, 'might', 'luck', 'destiny', is:

*hbar-hbañ-thwañ-byiñ* ||, 97, 'in the middle (= secondly) authority declines' (echoed in *hbar-thwañ*, l. 98).

Also in:

*gnañ-ma-dwañ-dze-hkhab-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-hgoho-hdag-ci-twañ-mñar-hsogna* ||, 261-2

'those who had their doors rushed (*hrub*, pp. 221, 343) divided the rams under control (*mñar* Locative of *mñah* ?)'

twañ-ḥdzam-neḥe, 276, 'the rams tamely—' (The next two verses refer to the dogs and goats: *neḥe* is conceivably onomatopoeic, meaning 'bleat').

7. *ḡweg-ḡwehe* = Tib. *sgeg-byed*, 'charmer' [sc. 'wife'] or *ḡgeg-bye*, 'husband'?

*ḡweg-ḡwehe-ḡphah-ḡphah-dze-ḡthar-phyañ-ge-ḡrub* ||, 348–9  
On *ḡphah-ḡphah*, 'laugh', see p. 248, n. 3.

8. *ḡkhwi-ḡtsa* = 'elder', 'old'? = Hsi-hsia *dwi*, *dwiḡ*, *wi* (Nevsky, No. 134), Jyā-ruñ *kā-woi*, Menia *khwa-khwa*? (*gdes*).

*ḡkhwi-ḡtsa-ḡyog-ḡdag-ci-ḡrañ-ḡdom-gdes* ||, 259–60

'elders with staves (Tib. *yog-po*) fixed (Hsi-hsia *gdeḡ/hdeḡ*, &c., "fix", "determine", Nevsky, No. 25) their decisions'.

(The previous verse speaks of the 'wise' (*śe*) and 'brave' (*ḡpah*), and the two following verses of 'children' (*ḡsas*).

9. *rwa/hrwa* = Tib. *rwa*, 'horn', cf. *ru*, 'horn' (*ḡkar*; *ḡya*; *ḡpog*; *ḡdah*; *sbyim*).

*ḡriñ-rwa-ḡkar-re-ḡñañ-ḡya-ḡtsag* ||, 44–5

'the long-horn [sc. ram] being penned, the female sheep come together'

Here *ḡkar*, as in ll. 151, 204, is connected with Tib. *skar/sgar/dgar*, &c., 'pen cattle, &c.', 'set apart', 'make an encampment': *ḡya*, 'sheep', see *supra*, p. 94: *ḡñañ* = Chinese *niang*, 'woman'.

*sbyim-ḡce-rgye-dze-ḡrwa-ḡdah-ḡpog* ||, 59

'on a *sbyim* (? "target", Tib. *ḡgyim*, "circumference") which is large the horn [sc. bow, Tib. *rwa-gzu*] plants the arrow'

(*ḡdah* = Tib. *mdah*, 'arrow', as in l. 58, pp. 300–1: *ḡpog* = Tib. *ḡphog* (in manuscript also *pog*), 'hit' (with an arrow, &c.).)

10. *ḡrkwa/rkwa* = Tib. *bkaḡ*, 'command' (*rkaḡ*).

*ḡrta-rkwa-ḡdzam*, 122, 'the horse's rule was mild', (cf. Tib. *bkaḡ-drin*, 'kind', 'kindness')

*g-wah-ḡrśañ-ḡnar[-]r[e]-ḡrkwa-ḡdzam-ḡtronḡi*, 224

'hostile force having been accomplished, mild rule is to be brought in'.

This case raises a question of some difficulty; for in l. 84:

*ḡrje-smyi-rmad-ge-ḡmo-rkaḡ-lda-dze*

'under chiefs who are inferior men, subject to a woman's commands'

we have *rkaḥ* equivalent to Tib. *bkaḥ*. Can *rkwa* represent the same? In favour of a *rkwa* = Tib. *bkaḥ* 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* = *dpaḥ*, *hue* = *dpe*, *kuar-tsal* = *bkaḥ-ḥtsal*, *chuam* = *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 *bkaḥ* declares itself by its form to be a Deverbal Derivative, presumably from a Verb *ḥkhaḥ*, 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 *rkaḥ* and a *brkaḥ*; 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’.

11. *ḥrwañ* = Tib. *brañ*, ‘dwelling-place’ (*ḥkañ-ḥkañ*):

*ḥñor-ḥlah-ḥwam-ḥsid-dze-ḥrwañ-ḥkañ-ḥkañ* ||, 11

‘on the estates, in the high mansions or settlements, the dwelling-places were in confusion (?)’

*Ḥkañ-ḥkañ* (onomatopoeic?) recurs in l. 184.

The etymology of Tib. *brañ* being unknown, the equation is uncertain (from *brwañ*?). That Nam *ḥrw* should be descended from mere *br* does not seem possible in view of the many instances of *br* = Tib. *br*. On *rwañ/dwañ* see p. 342.

The remaining words *kwa-kwa*, l. 363, *ḥkwañ* (? reading), l. 212, *ḥkweḥe*, l. 131, *ḥdwa*, l. 148, *pwañ*, ll. 361, 362, *tsweḥu*, l. 196, *ḥtswe*, l. 6, *dzwe*, l. 367, *ḥdzwe*, ll. 36, 39, *swañ* (= Tib. *soñ*?), ll. 337, 340, 341, *swad*, ll. 203, 390, are of unascertained meaning. See, however, the Vocabulary.

Concerning *tsweḥu*, *ḥtswe*, *ḥdzwe*, 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 *pwañ*, which in the text is associated with *sñā*, a known variant of Tib. *gñā*, ‘surety’, ‘witness’, may itself be = Tib. *dpañ*, which has the same significations.

(b) The consonant a Prefix :

1. *rwe* (l. 50 *rbye*)<sup>1</sup> = Tib. *dbye* (a) 'extent', (β) 'divided' :

(a) See p. 267.

(β) *rta-ḥtsog-ḥram-ge-ḥtaḥ-rwe-ḥtaḥ* ||, 90-1  
'the horse's friendships are divided, broken'.

On *ḥtaḥ* in *rwe-ḥtaḥ* see p. 267.

2. *ḥrwad* = Tib. *rbad* (a) 'harsh voice', (b) 'a kind of eagle' :

Concerning :

*ḥrwad-ḥbañ-prom-yañ-ḥkoḥu-me-ḥdrab-na* ||

*klag-ḥrwad-ḥdzur-[re-]ḥwi-ḥweḥi-ḥtsag*, 172-3, see p. 257.

*ḥgru-ma-ḥkom-re-ḥrwad-ḥmoñ-ḥldaḥ*, 32-3

Here a doubt as to reading (*ḥmañ*?) creates some uncertainty : otherwise the meaning would be 'harsh voices or the harsh-voiced clamour multiplied' or 'was confused' (p. 309).

3. *rwe*, *rwer*, *ḥrweḥi* : (*rgor* ; *ḥbar* ; *ḥmo-cha*).

That this word means substantially 'end' is clear in :

*rgor-ḥyos-ḥbom-byiñ-ḥbar-ḥbañ-thwañ-byiñ* ||

*rwer-ḥmo-ḥchah-byiñ-ḥtsog-ḥram-myiñ*

*rgor-ḥyos-ḥbar-thwañ-ḥkhor-kyañ-rweḥi-re-ḥmo-cha-byi-na-phyi-ḥse-myi*, 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 (*ḥchah/cha*) sinks : friend-  
ship is a name :

At the door —, in the middle power, retinue also being ended  
(*rweḥi*),

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 :

*ḥldañ-krañ-ḥrweḥi* ||, 113, 'uprightness is at an end'

*ḥldañ-rmañ-ḥrweḥi* ||, 27, 'the wooden tombs were destroyed'

and possibly in *ḥrañ-ḥrah-ḥrweḥi*, ll. 21-2 ; in *ḥrweḥi-gtsu-ge-ḥrnas*, l. 214, the last word is of uncertain reading (= *brñas*, 'despised'?).

<sup>1</sup> *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 :

hnaḥ-hrañ-ge-rwyin ||, 33

is of uncertain meaning: perhaps connected with *hbyiñ*, *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 *rwyē/rbye*.

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 *rwyē/rbye* the only cases calling for examination are those of *hbaḥ* and *hbañ*.

*Hbaḥ*: in the phrase *hro-hbehi-hbaḥ*, 'wolf oppressing sheep', the word *hbaḥ*, which can hardly fail to be = Tib. *hbaḥ*, 'distrain', 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'.

*Hbañ*: This, which is, beyond doubt, the regular equivalent in the Nam text of Tib. *dbañ*, 'power', has beside it a form *hwañ* 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*.<sup>1</sup>

Post-consonantal *w*, as both present and absent in *rkwa/rkaḥ*, has been discussed *supra* (pp. 343-4), where the possibility of a special explanation has been considered. But, furthermore, the *thwañ* found (p. 342) to be equivalent to Tib. *thañ*, 'value', 'measure', can hardly be different from the *hthañ* of *hldi-hthañ*, ll. 132, 133, 'of this measure', or the repeated *hyah(g-yah)-hthañ*, ll. 286-8, 'in the ascendant', 'superior', from the corresponding *hthañ* of ll. 289, 290, or the *hyah-hthañ* of ll. 315, 318. It does not seem possible to bring in Tib. *thañ*, (1) 'clear', 'serene', (2) 'tail', (3) 'enduring',

<sup>1</sup> The word *hbañ/bañ* may have other senses also, one of which *may be* (e.g. in ll. 67, 249-51, 373, 386, 390) that of Tib. *hbañs*, '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 *blañ(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-* = Tib. *r-*:

*rko/hrko* = Tib. *rko*, ‘dig’, &c.

*hrgah, hrgan* = Tib. *rga, rgan*, ‘old’, ‘grow old’.

*rgu/hrgu* = Tib. *rku (rkun, lku, rgu, &c.)*, ‘steal’, ‘thief’.

*hrgod* = Tib. *rgod*, ‘wild’.

*rgya/rgyah/hrgyah* = Tib. *rgya*, ‘plane surface’.

*rgyag* = Tib. *rgyag*, 'form', 'found', 'put', &c.

*rgyañ/hrgyaṅs* = Tib. *rgyañ*, 'extent', 'extensive', 'far', 'hasten'.

*hrgyu* = Tib. *rgyu*, 'material'.

*rgyeb/hrgyeb*, *rgyeb*s = Tib. *rgyab*, 'back', 'throw back', &c.

*rgyo/hrgyo/rgyohō/rgyon/rgyohōn* = Tib. *rgyo/rgyon*, 'copulari'.

*rñam/hrñam* = Tib. *rñam*, 'threat', 'alarm'.

*hrñu* = Tib. *rñu*, 'pain'.

*rñe/hrñe/hrñeḥe* = Tib. *rñe*, 'fiend', 'enemy'.

*rño/hrño/hrñoḥo* = Tib. *rño*, 'able', 'power'.

*rje/hrje/rdze* = Tib. *rje*, 'chief', 'king'.

*rjes* = Tib. *rjes*, 'trace', 'aftermark'.

*rta(h)*, *hṛtaḥ* = Tib. *rta*, 'horse'.

*rto/hrto* = Tib. *rdo*, 'stone'.

*hrdag* = Tib. *rdeg*, *rdegs*, 'smite', 'thrust'.

*rma* = Tib. *rma*, 'wound'.

*rma* = Tib. *rma*, 'ask' (l. 47 ?).

*rmañ* = Tib. *rmañ*, (a) 'tomb', (b) 'dream', 'imagine'.

*hrmoḥo* ('shake' ? l. 18), *rmon* ('dream', 'imagine' ? l. 349) =

Tib. *rmañ*, 'dream', 'imagine', *rmoñ*, 'be dazed, dizzy' ?

*rtsig/hrtsig* = Tib. *rtsig*, 'carpenter'.

*rdzogs* = Tib. *rdzogs*, 'completed'.

*hrdzoñ(hdzoñ)* = Tib. *rdzoñ(hdzoñ)*, 'castle'.

*hrwad* = Tib. *rbad*, 'harsh-voiced', 'eagle'.

*hrlom/glom* = Tib. *rlom*, 'conceit', 'covet'.

*rse/hrse*, *se* = Tib. *rtse/se*, 'summit', 'roof'.

*r* = Tib. *r* or *d*:

*rgad* (l. 113) = Tib. *gad/dgod/rgod*, 'laugh' (?)

*r* = Tib. *r* or *s*:

*rkaḥ/hrkwa* = Tib. *bkaḥ*, *brkas*, *bskas*, 'command'.

*rgo* = Tib. *rgo/brgo/sgo*, 'door', 'gate'.

*rñi/sñi* = Tib. *rñi/sñi*, 'snare', 'noose'.

*rke* = Tib. *rke/ske*, 'lean'.

*r* = Tib. *s* (cf. 'Tangut' (*rta*-)*rga*, 'saddle', *rkhin*, 'heart', = *sñin*, Amdo *rduk* = *sdug*, &c.):

*hrkas* = Tib. *skas*, 'ladder', 'staircase'.

*rgam* = Tib. *sgam*, 'deep'.

*rgam/hrgam* = Tib. *sgam*, 'take into company'.

*rgoñ/hrgoñ* = Tib. *sgoñ-wa*, 'egg'.

*hrgom* = Tib. *bsgoms*, 'passed over'.

*rdan/hrdan* = Tib. *sdañ*, 'anger', 'enmity'.

*hrdam* = Tib. *sdam*, 'bind', 'subdue'.

*rde/hrde/rdehe* = Tib. *sde*, 'class', 'troop'.

*rdo/hrdo* = Tib. *sdo*, 'venture'.

*hrpod* (l. 250) = Tib. *spod*, 'vow'?

*rbo/hrbo, rbom/hrbom* = Tib. *sbo, sbom*, 'swell', 'grow big'.

*rmo* (l. 250) = Tib. *smon*, 'aspiration', 'vow'?

*r* = Tib. *s* or *d*:

*rpehi/hrpehi* (p. 323) = Tib. *dpe*, 'example', *spe* (p. 356, *hpehi*).

*rmah, hmah* = Tib. *ma, sma, dmah*, 'low'.

*rmad* (but? *smad*), *hmad* = Tib. *smad, (dmad)*, 'low', 'make low', &c.

*r* = Tib. *s* or *d* or *r*:

*rme* = Tib. *rme/dme/sme*, 'mark', 'blemish', 'spot'.

*r* = Tib. *d* (cf. 'Tangut' *rgiu*, '9', Amdo *rka* = *dkah, rnyö* = *dños*, &c., Nam *rwan, dwañ*, p. 344).

*rkah/hrkah* = Tib. *dkah*, 'steep', 'difficult'.

*hrgah* = Tib. *dgah*, 'delight'.

*hrge/hrgehe, hrgehi-sto* (cf. *hge, hgehe*) = Tib. *dge, dges*, 'happiness', &c., 'happy', &c.

*rgoñ* = Tib. *dgon*, 'wilderness'.

*rbye/rwye* (cf. *rgye, rgyes*) = Tib. *dbye, dbyes*, 'extension', 'extent'.

*rpag/hrpag* (cf. *hpag*) 'bring low' = Tib. *dpag, dpags*, 'measure', 'depth'.

*rmag/hrmag* = Tib. *dmag*, 'army'.

*r* = Tib. *d, b*, or *g* (cf. 'Tangut' *rnit* = *gñid*, Amdo *rsum* = *gsum, rdä* = *bzla*, &c.):

*rkah/hrkah* = Tib. *bkah*, 'word', 'command'.

*rkom/hrkom* = Tib. *bkum*, 'kill', *dgum*, 'die'.

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 (hgyam)-tshwa*), 'recess in a rock'.

*hrgyeg* = Tib. *hgegs*, 'stop', 'obstruct'.

*rgyeñ* = Tib *yeñ*, 'put in order' (*g-yeñ*, 'move softly to and fro').

*rgyed/hrgyed* = Tib. *hgyed*, 'distribute', 'emit', 'divide'.

*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:

*rle, hlde/hldehe* = Tib. *lde, hde, bde*, 'fortune', &c.

Of doubtful meaning and etymology are:

*hrjihi* (l. 213).

*hrñi* (l. 298), *rñi* (l. 389) = Tib. *rñid*, 'fade', *rñis*, 'worn out'?

*rtre, hrtehu, grtehe* (pp. 156, 313).

*rders* (l. 107); cf. Tib. *bdar, rdar*, 'adjust', 'grind', 'sharpen', 'polish', 'examine closely'.

*hrdyañ* (l. 202).

*hrdyam* (l. 137) = Tib. *hjoms/gzom*, 'subdue'?

*rpu* (*htsog-rpu* = Tib. *tsog-pu*, 'sitting', 'crouching'?) or is *htsog-rpu-še-chañ*, l. 91 = 'united sons of a family (Tib. *spu/spun*), strong in wisdom'?

*rbyi* (l. 375) = *byi, hbyi, hbyihi* (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 *brnañs* by the side of *bsnan*, as Aorist of the Verb *mnon/non/snon*, manifests 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*.<sup>1</sup> 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* = *mñen*, and *b* replacing *r* in *btsal* = *rtsal*. Modern Amdoan has *r* for *d* in *rka* = *dkah*, *rñö* = *dños*, *ryan* = *dbyañs*; for *b* in *rshyot* = *bskyod*, *rdä* = *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* = *sñ* in *rnar* = *sñar*; *rm* = *sm* in *rmä* = *smras*; *rt* = *lt* in *rta* = *lta*.

Absence of the *r*-Prefix of ordinary Tibetan is seen in the *gyud* (Nam *gyud/kyud*), *ḥdzoṅ* (Nam *ḥdzoṅ/hjoṅ/rdzoṅ*), 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.

<sup>1</sup> 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. *miñ*, *myiñ*) of modern Gyārūng: the form *smyi* may be compared to Hōrpa *smen*, 'name'. *Rñe*, 'evil' = Tib. *ñes*, is paralleled by the *rñu* = Tib. *nu*, 'breast', of the Tibetan manuscripts: cf. also the case of *rbyo* (p. 333).

The forms *ħrsañ*, 'hostile', and *rzañ*, ll. 54, 56, which must have some kindred meaning, are in themselves remarkable. The former is clearly connected with *ħsañ* = Tib. *sañ*, 'hate', and in Tibetan might have been *bsañ*: in principle it is not different from *rkaħ*, *rkom*, *rpag*, *rmag*. *Rzañ*, which does not recall anything in Nam, where the *ž* is practically non-existent, is curiously paralleled in one of the Tibetan manuscripts by a form *ržen*, *rñen* = Tib. *mñen*, '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 *ñ* became *j*, whence *ž*. The particular word, *rzañ*, might accordingly be = Tib. *gñan*, 'cruel', 'severe', 'wild'; but the final *ñ* is then a difficulty. Further curiosities in connexion with *ñ* are Tangut *rkhiañ*, 'Argal sheep' = Tib. *gñan/rñan*, and Tangut *rkhiañ*, 'heart' = Tib. *sñiñ*.

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 *ħgam/ħrgam* (*rgam*), *rgyeb/hgyeb*, *ħrñi(rñi)/ħñi* (*ñi*), *ħrñe(rñe)/ħñe* (*ñe*), *grteħ(ħrteħu, rte)/gde*, *ħrpeħi* (*rpeħi*)/*ħpeħi*, *ħrbo(rbo)/ħbo* (*gboħu*), *ħrmag(rmag)/mag*, *ħrdzoñ/ħdzoñ*, *ħrdza(rdza)/ħdza*, *ħrdzur/ħdzur*, one or two others (p. 350) being doubtful.

It is, no doubt, premature to enter into this question. In some cases (*rgyeb/hgyeb*, *ħrdzoñ/ħdzoñ*, *rmag/mag* the latter only in *mag-no*) the alternation seems merely casual; in others the difference, if any existed, has been obscured (*ħrñi/ħñi*, *ħrñe/ħñe*, *ħrbo/ħbo*), or the connexion of the two forms is unproved. But in *ħgam/ħrgam* (*rgam*) the difference = 'community'/'form a community', is not only clear in the Nam text, but corresponds to the Tibetan *gam/sgam*; *ħdza/rdza* also are not improbably = 'friend'/'make friends'; and *ħpag/ħrpag* may be partly distinguished as 'low'/'lay low'; *ħdzur/ħrdzur* 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 *hłkyañ/hglyañ* = Tib. *rkyañ*, 'wild ass', is not at all surprising on the Tibeto-Chinese border; cf. Central-Asian *lku*, *blkun* = *rku*, *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 *spyē* = Tib. *dbyar*, 'summer'. Final *ar/er* is unmistakable in the *phyar(pyar)/phyer(pyē)* 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-thañ* is known later as *G-yar-mo-thañ*, *Yar-mo-thañ*, *G-yer-mo-thañ*. 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 *-er* to *-ir*, seen in Nam *hwyir* = Tib. *hbyer*, 'escape', is paralleled by Hsi-hsia *nir*, 'relative', if equivalent, as suggested by Laufer (No. 122, p. 104), to Tib. *gñer*: 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 *spyē/dbyar* might perhaps be found in the Nam word *ste* in:

ste<sup>hi</sup>-htam-hmog-dze, 54, 'over the — clouds'

hrdzoñ-hyo-hśi-dze-ste-gdzu-ge-cig, 194, 356

'On the castle's high zig-zag (ascent) the — asses ceased'.

Here, if *ste* were = Tib. *sde*, 'class', 'group', &c., the sense of *ste<sup>hi</sup>-htam(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, *hrde/rdehe*, which it fits, while in form supported by *rdañ* = Tib. *sdañ*, 'anger', and *rdo* = Tib. *sdo*, 'venture'. If, on the other hand, we bring in Tib. *star*, '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 a mass'. Moreover, the *ste* will furnish a good antithesis to the *hthar-mye*, 'fires let loose' of the following line. It is, however, rather unfortunate that *hthar* also is an *-ar* word, and it seems preferable to take *ste* as a form of *sten/rten* (cf. *hdre*, *hdro* = *hdren*, *hbron*), 'hold on to', 'adhere to', more especially as the corresponding

Intransitive *ħthe/ħthen*, whence *the*, 'adherent', 'subject', is used in the sense of 'halting' (see Ś. 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. *ħltañ*, l. 93 (for *ħldañ*), *ħltaħ*, l. 203 (for *ħldaħ*, see ll. 202–3), *ħltom*, l. 88 (for *ħldom*, see ll. 94, 95), there remain:

*ħlkyañ*, 188 (written *ħglyañ*, l. 308) = Tib. *rkyañ*, *kiang* or 'wild ass'.

*lgyoħo*, 11—meaning obscure.

*ħlto*, 251, perhaps a mis-writing of *ħldo*, but possibly = Tib. *ltos(lta)*, 'look'.

*lpyoħo*, 22 = Tib. *ħpħyo*, 'be agitated', &c.

Final *l* in place of *r* is seen in:

*stel*, 181 = Tib. *ster* (cf. *dbyal* = *dbyar*, in the Tibetan manuscripts),

but *l* = Tib. *l* in:

*ħtul/ħthul* = Tib. *ħdul*, *gdul*, *btul*, *thul*

*ħpul/ħphul* = Tib. *phul*

*ħmyil*, perhaps = Tib. *myul/ñul*, 'rove as spy', &c.

*Lol*, l. 195 (*ħlon*, l. 357), might be = Tib. *rol*, 'play'.

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 *ħyu*, 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.

*sa/ħsaħ/gsaħ* = Tib. *sa*, 'earth'.

*so/gso/gsoħu* = Tib. *so*, 'live'.

*su* = Tib. *su*, 'who'.

*gsar* = Tib. *gsar*, 'new'.

*gsom* = Tib. *som*, 'think', and = *gsum*, *sum*, '3'.

*bsog*, 182, *ħsog*, 295, *ħsag*, 389 = Tib. *sog*, *gsog*, *bsag*, *bsog*, 'accumulate'.



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. *ś* (cf. *bsos/bśos*, *bsen/bśen*, in the Tibetan manuscripts) and vice versa:

*hsams*, 58 = Tib. *som*, *gśom*, *bśoms*, *bśams*, 'make ready'.

*śon* 156 = Tib. *son/śon*, 'arrive' (?).

S = Tib. *ts*, *tsh* in:

*se/hse/rse/hrse* = Tib. *rtse*, 'top', 'peak' (in the Tibetan manuscripts *se*).

*se/hse/gse/gsehe/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'.

*ske* = Tib. *ske*, 'select', 'appoint'.

*skyañ* = Tib. *skyoñ*, *bskyañ*, '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* (*hkyim/kyim/hkyim/gyim*) has no *s* in Tib. *khyim*, 'house', *hgyim*, 'circumference'.

2. Before *t*:

(a) *sta/stah/hstah* = Tib. *sta*, a suffix.

*stañ/hstañ* = Tib. *stan*, 'above'.

*sti/hti* = Tib. *sti*, *bsti*, *thi*, 'rest', 'stop'.

*stiñ* = Tib. *stiñ*, 'rebuke', or *sdig*, 'sin' (?).

*ste/hste* = Tib. *ste*, a suffix.

*ste/stehe* = 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) *hpaḥi*, ll. 211, 384, *hpeḥi*, ll. 211, 386, 387, are plainly identical, and they appear to have the two meanings of *spa* and *spehi*. Cf. also *spehi/hpeḥi*, p. 282.

*Sbyim* = Tib. *hgyim*, 'circumference'? Cf. *hbyim*, ll. 266, 363?

### 4. Before *ts*:

(a) *hstsag(htsag, htsog)* = Tib. *bstsags*, 'collected' (*tshogs/htshogs*).

(b) *htsaṅ/gtsaṅ* = Tib. *stsaṅ, gtsaṅ*, 'corn'.

*Stsaḥ/hstsaḥ*, 'watch', and *stsar*, show in Tibetan (*btsaḥ, tshar*) no *s* form, but once *r* (*rtsas*).

### 5. Before *ñ*:

(b) Possibly *ñor* = Tib. *nor* (in manuscript *snor*), 'farm'.

### 6. Before *ñ*:

(a) *sñaṅ/sñiṅ* = Tib. *sñiṅ*, 'heart'.

*sña* = Tib. *sña/gña*, 'witness'?

*sñi* = Tib. *gñis*, '2'.

*sñi/rñi* = Tib. *sñi/rñi*, 'noose', 'tie'.

*Sñe* (l. 217) is obscure.

7. Before *m* :

(a) *smuħu-ħku* = Tib. *smi-gu/smyu-gu*, 'reed'.

*Sme*, 'blaze', *smyi*, 'man', have normally in Tibetan no *s*; but concerning *sme* see pp. 282-3. *Smu*, l. 27, is quite obscure; but see p. 259.

8. Before *r* :

(a) *sram/ħsram* = Tib. *sran*, 'hard'.

*sri* = Tib. *sri*, 'demoness'.

*ħsre* = Tib. *sre*, 'soot', &c.

*sroñ* = Tib. *sroñ*, 'straight'.

9. Before *l* :

On *sl* < *zl* in *slah*, *slo*, *slog*, see *supra*, pp. 335-6.

*Slod* is perhaps = a Tib. *zlod* = *lhod/glod/lod*, 'to loose'.

*Sli*, *ħsli*, *sleg*, *slug* (p. 336 n. 2) are obscure.

10. Before *ś* :

*śsam*, a highly exceptional form, occurring in :

*śsam-stom-ħdag-dze-ħsar-stomħi*, 255

'when the last (?) harvest has come to hand (? *ħdag* = Tib. *bdog*, *bdag*), a new harvest'.

If *śsam* is to be credited with the conjectured meaning, it may be related to Tib. *śam/gśam*, 'lower', 'later'. *Ĥśam*, 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 *ñ* (for *n*) in the Imperative form *ħtroñ*, as in Tib. *dronś/droñ*, from *ħdren*, and therefore also in *ħlob* (Tib. *lobś*), Imperative of *ħlab*.

After vowels the following Aorists or Preterites can be recognized:

*gras*, *ħgras*, *ħras*, *ħtas* (= *ħthas*), *ħdas*, *ħwas*, *ħśas*, *ħsas*  
(*gsas*)

hñis, hldis, hris,  
 hkus, hgrus, hthus, hnus, hbrus, gsus, hsus  
 hkes, ñes, gdes, hbres, rgyes  
 g-yos, hyos, chos.

After consonants we have :

hthogs, hphyegs, rdzogs  
 hgyañs, hsañs  
 rkabs, rgyebs  
 hkroms, hgroms, hproms, hsams  
 hwars, rders (?), htsors, htshors.

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', *hkom*, *prom*, *hyo*, 'do' or 'effect', as in :

spye-chos-re, 'being begun in summer',  
 rgyes-hkom, 'effect extension',  
 htas-prom, 'made hard or tangled',  
 hchos-hyo, 'make beginning' ;

or with a governing or accompanying verb or even noun, as in :

gsus-slo, 'call for escort',  
 hbrus-hgyan, 'itch with inflammation',  
 hyos-hlam, 'movement path',  
 htas-kro, 'tangled hate' ;

or with a verbal or nominal suffix, as in :

hsas-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 :

htsaḥ-ste (= htsaḥs-te), hwa-ste, gboḥu-ste (= gbos-te)  
 hgyañ-sto, hrgyañ-sto, hrgeḥi-sto (= hrgeḥes-to), hñah-sto,  
 (= hñahs-to), hldu-sto, hldyim-sto, htsaḥ-sto (= htsaḥs-to),  
 hyim-sto.

In ll. 278–9, *htag-htos*, the *-s* is attached to the Participle in *-to*, used as a main verb.

The possibility that the form *hsodtsa* is an attempt to attach the Aoristic *s* even to a root ending in *d* has been suggested *supra*

(p. 301). Perhaps this, and not merely a feeling for euphony, accounts for the *s* in *hbrad-sta*, l. 306. In *g-ri(hri, &c.)-sta-meñi*, *hmañ-sta-meñi*, ll. 311–13, the *sta*, which follows a nominal word, seems to be different, = *sta*, ‘there’.

We are now left with *ses* (Aorist of *sé*), ‘wise’; *hbos* (Aorist of *hbo*, ‘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. *ños*, ‘side’); *hyogs* (one occurrence, usually *hyog/g-yog*) apparently = Tib. *g-yog*, ‘serve’, ‘servant’; and:

*hño-sto-ge-rdo-re-cis-tsha-hbyiñi*, 84, ‘when friends venture . . .

*gdim-chis(tshis ?)-ldom-re*, 94, 95, ‘under the sway of disappearance and coming (transience)’

*khyos-hkhyañ-hyu-ge*, 212, ‘wives united with husbands’

*hgar-hpu-hches-hño-hkhob-prom*, 322, ‘the chief blacksmith having made a face-covering (blinkers)’

*hpus-hphyah-myi-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-rjes-ne-hcer*, 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*, *htshim* 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 *hñah* (*supra*, pp. 238-9), and in *mag-no*, 'battle', the *no* (dis-similation 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 Hsihsia *nir* (Laufer, No. 122); for *sñiñ*, 'heart', *gñe/gne/ne* (Nevsky, No. 100; Laufer, No. 105, *niñ*); for *rje*, 'king', *ñeh/ne/neh* (Nevsky, No. 40); for *mñam*, 'equal', *ñe/ni/nih* (Nevsky, No. 217). The word for '2', Tib. *gñis*, is Gyārūng *ka-nēs*, Rgya-roñ (Pati) *ko-nes*, Tākpa *nai*, Mānyak *nā-bi*, 'Tangut' *ni*; cf. 'Tangut' *nina*, 'sun' (= Tib. *ñin*). The Nam text varies *ñe* with *ne* in *hkyawa-ñe*. The documents from Central Asia have *nuñ-chad* for *ñuñ-chad*.

*n-* is not usually altered: in Thōchū *nyik*, Hōrpa *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 *ñan-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:

*nag* = Tib. *ñag*, 'voice' in *hdzam-nag* (ll. 276, 278), 'mild voice', *hśañ-nag* (l. 199) and *g-rah-nag* (l. 262), 'enemy voice', *hnaq-htshab* (l. 102), 'voice-deputy', Tib. *ñagt-shab*.

*nam* = Tib. *ñams*, 'mind', 'spirit', in *hnam-ḥdzam-ḥtar*, ll. 145–6, 'the faint-hearted escapes'; cf. Tib. *ñam* (and *ñams*)-*chuñ*, 'feeble'.

*nam* = Tib. *ñams*, 'damaged', 'spoiled', 'degenerate', in *ḥldañ-krañ-hnam-dze*, l. 126, 'when uprightness degenerates', *ḥpaḥ-ḥrgam-hnam*, l. 259, 'the community of braves declines'; probably also in *hnam-ḥte-ḥśaḥ*, l. 83, 'having declined, was destroyed' (cf. ll. 124–5, *ḥsad . . . ḥśaḥ*).

*nar* = Tib. *ñar*, 'strength', 'vigour', in:

*ḥyaḥ-ḥrgeḥe-ge-sram-pa-nar*, 72

'those whose fortune is in the ascendant have firm hero-vigour';

cf. l. 204,

*puñ-te-gsar-ñar-ḥpaḥ-rmag-ḥcihi* ||

'in a body with new vigour a hero-army goes',

where *ñar* is written. *Nar/snar/bsnar*, 'lengthen', 'long and thin', 'continuous', is less apt. In l. 112, *ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥnar-re*, the following may be preferable:

*nar/hner* = Tib. *gñer/gñar*, 'tend', 'provide for', 'procure', in

*g-waḥ-ḥrśaṅ-ḥnar[-re]*, 224, 'procure fierce force'

*glaḥ-ḥlad-ḥnar[-re]*, 233, 'procure return for wages' (p. 251)

*gse-ḥlad-ḥnar[-re]*, 243, 'procure requital of injury'.

Here would belong also *ḥcha-ḥgrah-nu-nar-dze*, l. 239, and the above-mentioned *ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥnar-re*. An equivalent of Tib. *mñar*, 'sweet', does not seem likely here.

*Hner* occurs only in

*g-raḥ-gśog-ḥner[-re]-śes-ḥbeg-ḥśog* ||, 7, 20

'To provide wings for—Śes-ḥbeg was the wings';

*nen* = Tib. *ñen*, 'danger' in

*ḥldañ-rgye-ḥdor-re-ḥwañ-ta-ḥnen*, 209–10

'If the big stick (or 'strong support', *ḥldañ*) is thrown away, ruling is dangerous';

*ñor* = Tib. *nor*, 'wealth', 'property', 'cattle', in the Tibetan manuscripts *snor*, apparently 'farm' or 'estate'. This may be recognized in

*ḥñor-ḥlah-ḥwam-ḥśid-dze*, 11, 'in the high mansions on the farms or estates'.

The same *ḥñor*, '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.<sup>1</sup> In l. 206, *rnye-ne-hñohu*, the *rnye* is evidently a confusion of *rñe* and *rñe*, cf. *rñe-re-hño*, l. 133, *rñe-ne-hrehi*, l. 200. In ll. 362-3, where the readings are partly doubtful and we have in succession *hñyoh* (*hñyehe* ?), *hñe*, *hñyehe*, perhaps the same word *ñe* 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 *stom*, '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*.<sup>2</sup>

Confusion of final *ñ* and *n* is in Tibetan rather common, having perhaps its main root in the cases, such as *drañ* from *hdren*, *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/droñs*, from *hdren*, 'lead'; and perhaps therefore *rgoñ* = Tib. *dgon*, 'wilderness', cf. Tib. *dgon/dgoñs/rgoñs*, 'evening' and *son/soñ*, p. 355. *Stoñ-hpoñ*, l. 321 = Tib. *stoñ-dpon*, 'thousand-commander', is perhaps a loan-word.

The loss, or non-accretion, of *n* in *hdre/htre*, 'draw', 'lead', is not peculiar to Nam, being found in the Tibetan manuscripts (p. 214) and perhaps also in the common Tibetan word *hdre*, 'demon'. *Hdro*, 'go', 'travel' = Tib. *hdron*, 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

<sup>1</sup> Except in Khams, where Jaeschke notes (Berlin Academy *Monatsbericht*, 1865, p. 443) *nyen* for *ñen*.

<sup>2</sup> 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, *hkhur*, 'with back bent down', is not a phonetic equivalent of Tib. *dgur/rgur/sgur*, but an independent derivative of the root (perhaps *gur*) and possibly connected with *hkhur*, 'carry', and *khur*, 'load'. Within the limits of Tibetan such cases are not infrequent; for instance, we find *pañ* and *phañ* both meaning 'lap'.

Some probable or certain cases are the following:<sup>1</sup>

(a) *Tenuis* written for aspirate (common in the Tibetan manuscripts and documents):

*hkañ* (also *hkhah*) = Tib. *kha*, 'mouth', 'speech'.

*hkañ* (also *hkhahñ*) = Tib. *khañ*, 'house'.

*hkañ* (also *hkhah*) = Tib. *khab/khyab*, 'home', 'family'.

*hkar* (also *khar/hkhar*) = Tib. *khar/mkhar*, 'city', 'citadel'.

*hkuñ* = Tib. *khuñ*, 'hollowed out', 'cave'.

*hke* (also *hkhe*) = Tib. *khe*, 'profit'.

*hkor* (also *hkhor*) = Tib. *khor/hkhor (skor)*, 'surround', 'go round', &c.

*hkyi* = Tib. *khyi*, 'dog'.

*kyu, hkyu* = Tib. *hkhyyu/dkyu*, 'swift', 'race'.

*hkye* = Tib. *khye, khyeñu*, 'child' (possibly, however, for *skye*).

*hkri* (also *khri, hgri*) = Tib. *khri*, 'seat', 'support'.

*hçi/hçiñ/gçi/gçiñ* = Tib. *mchi*, 'go'.

*ce* (also *hce, hche*) = Tib. *che*, 'great'.

*htañ(thañ, hthañ)* = Tib. *thañ*, 'plain'.

*htañ(hthañ, thwañ)* = Tib. *thañ*, 'power', &c.

*htam(htham)* = Tib. *htham*, 'united'.

*htar(thar, hthar)* = Tib. *thar*, 'released'.

*htas* = Tib. *hthas*, 'hard', 'tangled'.

*htul(hthul)* = Tib. *thul*, 'tame'.

*hto(htho)* = Tib. *mtho*, 'high'.

*htor/tor(hthor/thor)* = Tib. *thor*, 'tuft', &c.

*hpañ(phañ, hphañ)* = Tib. *pañ/phañ*, 'lap'.

*hpu(hphu)* = Tib. *phu*, 'blow'.

*hpul(hphul)* = Tib. *phul*, 'raised to the top'.

*hpog(hphog)* = Tib. *hphog*, 'hit'.

*hpom(hphom)* = Tib. *hpham*, 'be defeated'.

<sup>1</sup> In some of the following instances (pp. 363-5) the spelling in the manuscript fluctuates (*supra*, pp. 120-1).

*pyañ*(*phyañ*) = Tib. *hphyañ*, *dpyañ*, 'dangle'.

*pyar*(*pyer*, *phyer*, *hphyer*) = Tib. *hphyar*, 'lift'.

*pyi*(*phyi*) = Tib. *phyi*, 'outside', 'later'.

*hprah*(*hphrah*) = Tib. *hphra*, 'kick' (?).

*hpro*, ll. 181 (p. 156), 245-6 = Tib. *hphro*, 'proceed'.

*tsañ* = Tib. *tshañ*, 'complete'.

*htsu*, *tsur* (*htshu*, *htshur*) = Tib. *tshu*, *tshur*, 'hither', 'come hither'.

*htsors*(*tshor*, *htshors*) = Tib. *htshor*, 'chase'.

(b) Aspirate written for *tenuis* (common in the Tibetan manuscripts and documents):

*skhrud* = Tib. *skrud*, 'put to flight'.

*chi* (also *ci*) = Tib. *ci*, 'who', 'which'.

*gcheg* (also *hceg*, *gceg*) = Tib. *tseg/tsheg*, 'trouble', 'hitch'.

*tha* (usually *ta*) = Tib. *ta*, a suffix.

*hphu* (also *hpu*) = Tib. *pu*, 'man', 'elder'.

*tsha/tshaḥ* = *tsa*, a suffix.

*tsham* (also *htsam*) = Tib. *tsam*, 'only'.

B. *Media* and *tenuis* (or aspirate):

(a) *Tenuis* for *media* (common in the Tibetan manuscripts):

*hkañ* (also *hgañ*) = Tib. *gañ/dgañ*, 'full', 'complete'.

*hkar* (also *hgar*) = Tib. *dgar/sgar/skar*, 'separate', 'pen'.

*hko* (also *hgo*) = Tib. *go/mgo/sgo*, 'place', 'head', 'gate'.

*hku*(*smuhu*<sup>o</sup>) = Tib. *gu*(*smyu*<sup>o</sup>), 'reed'.

*hkor* (also *hgor*) = Tib. *hgor*, 'tarry'.

*hkyud* (also *hgyud*) = Tib. *rgyud*, 'race'.

*ska* = Tib. *sga*, 'saddle'.

*hklo* (also *glo*, *hlo*) = Tib. *glo*, 'lungs'.

*htor* (usually *hdor*) = Tib. *hdor*, 'cast away'.

*htre* (usually *hdre*) = Tib. *hdren*, 'draw'.

*htroñ* = Tib. *hdreñ*, *droñ*, *trañ*, 'draw'.

*rte* = Tib. *sde*, 'flock', 'troop', &c. (p. 259) = *rde* (p. 270).

*rto* = Tib. *rdo*, 'stone'.

*hltañ* (usually *hldañ*) = Tib. *ldañ*, 'rise'.

*hltom* (usually *hldom*) = Tib. *ldom*, 'bind', 'subdue'.

*por/hpor* (also *phor*) = Tib. *hbor*, 'let go' (manuscripts *por*).

*hpro* l. 321 (usually *hbro*) = Tib. *hbro*, 'taste'.

*hpos* (usually *hbos*) = Tib. *hbo*, 'swell'.

(b) *Media* for *tenuis* (or aspirate) (not rare in the Tibetan manuscripts):

*gehu-prom* = *kehu* (*hkehu*)-°.

*hgri* (also *hkri*) = *khri* 'seat'.

*hdah* (*hkho*°) = *htah* (*hkhoh*°).

*hbu*(*htor*°) = *hpu* and *hphu* (*htor*°).

*hdzo-hdza* (and °*htsah*) = *htso-htsah*.

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 *hkah* 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> It may therefore be suspected, since the manuscripts were all, no doubt, written in Śa-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

<sup>1</sup> See p. 117.

<sup>2</sup> 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 *mtoñ* = *mthoñ*, *tos* = *thos*, *tsal* = *htshal*,
- (b) aspirate for *tenuis* in *thah* = *ta*, *phar* = *par* (thrice),
- (c) *tenuis* for *media* in *mtsad* = *mdzad* (twice), *rtsañ* = *rdzañ*, *par* = *bar* (twice),
- (d) *media* for *tenuis* in *gdañ* = *gtañ*, *gyañ* = *kyañ*,

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', *tūn*, 'drink', *tsiar*, 'rain', *ka*, 'mouth', Thōchū *pi*, 'hog', *kih*, 'house', *kwā*, 'thou', *kwān*, 'he' (Tib. *mtsho*, *thog*, *hthuñ*, *char*, *kha*, *phag*, *khyim*, *khyod*, *khoñ*), 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'.
- hscah* = *hstsaḥ*, '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*).
- jjoñ*, *hjoñ* = *hdzoñ*, *rdzoñ*, 'castle' (Tib. *rdzoñ*, *hdzoñ*).
- 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 *htrog*, 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 *hdrul/hgrul*, *hgrim/hbrim*, *hgye/hbye*, &c.

#### D. Final consonants

Except the above noted, sporadic, instances of *-l* for *-r* (*stel*) and *ñ* 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 *stiñ* in ll. 330–1, 335–6 were = Tib. *sdig*, 'sin' (but probably it is *stiñ*, 'rebuke'), it would correspond to the *stiñ* of one of the Tibetan manuscripts, which present other instances also of confusion of final *g*, *gs*, with *ñ*, *ñs*.

### 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 *sñan* (also *sñin*) = Tib. *sñin*, 'heart', is found also in the Tibetan manuscripts. Possibly it is due to confusion with *sñan*, 'pleasant'; but it is exactly paralleled by 'Tangut' *šan* = Tib. *šin*, 'wood', 'tree', &c.: see p. 108.

*i* for *e* in *hwyir* = Tib. *hbyer* is paralleled by *stigs* = *stegs*, *cis* = *ces*, &c., of the Tibetan manuscripts.

*i* for *u* in *myil* = Tib. *myul*, 'creep privily', may be compared with *gzi* = *gzu*, 'bow', *mu* = *mi*, 'man', in the manuscripts, which have also *u* for *i* in *mu*, 'man', cf. the place-names *Mi-ñag/Menia/Mu-nia* and *Mi/Me/Mu-li*.

*e* for *a* in *rgyeb* = Tib. *rgyab*, *phyer/phyar* = Tib. *phyar*, and perhaps therefore in *spye* = Tib. *dbyar*, *ste* = Tib. *star*, and the name (*Hses-*)*hbeg* (cf. the *Rbag(Rbeg)* of the manuscripts), has been mentioned *supra* (p. 134), as perhaps dialectical; cf. *tseb*, *bleg*, *sen*, for *tshab*, *blag*, *šan*, in the Tibetan manuscript *Chronicle*.

*o* for *a* before *-m*, *-ms*, in *hpom/hphom*, 'be defeated', seems to have been regional, since it appears in several place-names ending in *-tsoms* = *-mtshams*, and *-boms/-goms* = *-bams/-gams*, belonging to NE. Tibet.

o for u is seen in *gsom* = Tib. *gsum*, 'three', *rkom* = Tib. *bkum*, 'slain', *hkom/gkom* = Tib. *hkhums*, *hgums*, *bkum*, 'execute (a task)', *rom* = Tib. *rum*, 'darkness', 'dark hollow', *hklom* = Tib. *klum* (p. 280), *drom* = Tib. *drum/druñ* (p. 219), *lom* (p. 233) = Tib. *lums*, 'bath', Hsi-hsia *lom*, 'well' (Laufer, no. 114)? The word *slog/slug* occurs in the two forms (ll. 174, 359): the *slug* of l. 47 is evidently a different word. *Hkah-hcog* = *kha-tsug*, of the Tibetan manuscripts, and *trog/htrog*, 'enemy' (= Tib. *hdrug*s, 'agitate'?) may be further examples of the same.

## 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 *-ohu*, 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-thañ*, °*gsiñ*): 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-sroñ 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* (= *mdah*, 'arrow'), *ldehu*, *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'
- hrtehu* = *grtehe/gde*, 'fix' (?)
- nehu* = Tib. *nehe*, 'young', 'fresh'
- tswehu* = *htswe/hdzwe/hdzwehe*
- hdzehu* = 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 *-ehi* = *-e* are derived from *-ehe* see *supra*, p. 192: on *-a/-ehi* (cf. *-a/-ehu*) pp. 191-2.

*-oɦu* occurs in :

*ɦkokoɦu* (°*prom*, °*me*) = *ɦkkoɦu* = *ɦkokoɦi* (°*me*) = *ɦkkoɦo*.

*ɦnoɦu* (l. 206) = *ɦno*.

*ɦjokoɦu* (l. 137) = *ɦjo*, 'chief', or *ɦdzo*, 'man'.

*ɦtoɦu* (l. 7) = *ɦto* ?

*ɦldokoɦu* = *ldo*, *ɦldoh*.

*ldyokoɦu* = *ldyo*.

*noɦu* (l. 41).

*gboɦu* = *ɦbo*.

*ɦbyokoɦu* = *ɦbyo*.

*ɦdzokoɦu* = *ɦdzo*, 'man', or *ɦdzo*, 'act'.

*gsoɦu* = *gso*, 'live'.

Of these equations some are not beyond doubt; but the certain ones, *ɦkokoɦu*, *ɦnoɦu*, *ldyokoɦu*, *ɦjokoɦu* (alternating with *ɦdzokoɦu*), *gboɦu*, *gsoɦu*, suffice to prove that the *-oɦu* 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 *ɦbrus*, and *ɦbro* in the repeated verse lines 152-3, 158 furnishes a good parallel: and the *ɦdru* (cf. Tib. *dru-bu*, °*gu*, *gru-gu*, 'a clew or skein of thread') of *ɦdru-ɦjar*, 'caught in the toils' (cf. p. 272), may be = *dro*, 'net', of one of the Tibetan manuscripts. The possibility that the Nam expression *ɦrim-ɦgru* corresponds to Tib. *rim-ɦgro* (*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 *ũ < o* is frequent or normal, e.g. in Rgya-roñ *slu* = Tib. *glo*, 'lungs'.

The *-wa* = Tib. *-o* in *swa* (also Tib. *swa*), 'watch', and *swa*, 'tooth', and similarly in *swar* = Tib. *sor*, 'finger', *wa-ɦdañ/hwa-ɦldañ* = Hsi-hsia °*o-diñ*, Tib. °*o-ldoñ/ɦo-doñ*, 'neck', 'windpipe', is perhaps original, although in later times we find Gyārūng *wāki*, Tākpa *wa*, derived, no doubt, from Tib. *ɦog*, 'below', and in Yün-nan Tibetan *-wa* for *-o* is frequent.

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 *z*, *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 Žaṅ-žun 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 Žaṅ-žun 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 Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-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 (<sup>1</sup>). On extra-metrical *-o*, *na*, *ni*, *hi*, also *don*, 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] . . . rkah(?) . . . [3] . . . (8 *akṣaras*) [1 hra .  
l hlda . . . ] hśes | beg . hr . . hrañ . [hlda] . .

[4] . . (14 *akṣaras*)-[gñe . . gž(?)og] . . (10 *akṣaras*)

[5] [r]am<sup>1</sup> | ge | hwañ || re | klu | ge | hwañ ||

hrañ | hlda | hnam | hge | hśes | beg | hyañ |

5

[6] mog<sup>2</sup> | htswe | re | mye | hyañ | hwad ||

hrañ | hldaḥ | hnam | ge | hrpag | hkhur | hskuḥu ||

[7] [skuḥu ?] | na<sup>3</sup> | hśes | hbeg | [hldoḥo ?] | dze | hrño | htoḥu |  
re | hgyañ ||

g-rah | gśog | hner<sup>4</sup> | śes | [8] hbeg | hśog ||

sta | hldyañ | htye | dze | hmo | ge | me | hgrah |

10

hrañ | hlda<sup>5</sup> | hnam | hge<sup>6</sup> | hrah<sup>7</sup> [9] hyos.] | hldom |

sta | re | hmo | hno | ge | sta | hri | hldyañ ||

hmu | hrñu | skhrud<sup>8</sup> | dze | mor | htañ | [10] [hgras] ||

hldi | hrkah | hldyañ | dze | hyañ | htañ | hgras<sup>9</sup>  
hlah | gsom | hram | [11]<sup>10</sup> [h ?] lgyoḥo | ge | htañ | hmu | hro ||<sup>11</sup> 15

hñor | hlah | hwam | hśid | dze | hrwañ | hkañ | [12] hkañ ||

hbo | hkom | ldyañ | dze | hldab | hde | hde ||

gñim | hti | hldyañ<sup>12</sup> | hgye | hkrom | [13] hkrom |

hkra | hrag | hldyañ | ge | hsreḥi | hkyeb | hkyeb |

hdon | hri | hldyañ | ge | [14] spo<sup>13</sup> | hpod | pod<sup>14</sup> |

20

hrañ | hri | hldyañ<sup>15</sup> | hseḥe | hwad | hwad |

htañ | hldu | hldyañ | ge | hstom | [15] hkom | hkeḥi ||

g-yog | hśaṅ | ma | hpul | dze | hmar | hbab | ge | hrl<sup>16</sup>oḥo ||

hbu | rwe | [16] hce | rgyañ | dze | hldyo | htor | ge | hnus ||

hkrug | hrdzo | hgyud | dze | hrño | hyod | yod<sup>17</sup>

25

<sup>18</sup>hrñe | [17] gsaṅ | hgre | dze | ñe<sup>19</sup> | hkyeb | hkyeb |

hkhah<sup>20</sup> | hrpag | hñor | hlañ | hśi | hrog | hpaḥ | to | [18]

h.<sup>21</sup>hskyim | se<sup>22</sup> | hrmōḥo ||

hdzañ | hkhor | hkrug | hkyañ | hyogs | hldog | hbar<sup>23</sup> |

hwaḥ | [19] [h]t[i]b . bžer ||

hdar | hti | hwer<sup>24</sup> | hldu | hro<sup>25</sup> | hgru ||

<sup>1</sup> dam ?

<sup>2</sup> hśog ?

<sup>3</sup> ra ?

<sup>4</sup> Understand hner | re ? (metre!). Cf. l. 20.

<sup>5</sup> m here crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> dze (?) here crossed out.

<sup>7</sup> h below line.

<sup>8</sup> skhud ? (a correction).

<sup>9</sup> hbo | here crossed out.

<sup>10</sup> -g here crossed out.

<sup>11</sup> hroñ | ?

<sup>12</sup> Insert ge or dze ? (metre).

<sup>13</sup> lpo ?

<sup>14</sup> pod added below line.

<sup>15</sup> ge here omitted ? (metre).

<sup>16</sup> l inked over: correction from hroḥo ?

<sup>17</sup> yod added below line.

<sup>18</sup> rdz here crossed out.

<sup>19</sup> ñe added below line.

<sup>20</sup> h a correction of r (crossed out ?).

<sup>21</sup> ra ?

<sup>22</sup> Corrected to skhre ? (erasure and blur).

<sup>23</sup> = hbaḥ-re ?

<sup>24</sup> Read hwe-re ? (metre).

<sup>25</sup> bžer | here crossed out.

- sta | re | hmo | ge | sta | hri | hldyañ [20]  
 stah | hldyañ | hthye<sup>1</sup> | dze | hmo | ge | me | hgrah |  
 g-rah | gśog | hner<sup>2</sup> | hśes | hbeg | hśog [21]  
 hgru | hldañ | hmañ | dze | htsā | gsom | hkhog |  
 5 ga | bzañ<sup>3</sup> | g-ri | hrūhu | hrañ | hrah | [22] | h|rwehi |  
 smūhu | hku | hyob | ge | hmar | myi | lpyoĥo ||  
 hgru | hldañ | hmañ | ge | hśes | [23] | hbeg | hrah ||  
 htsah | gsom | hkog | ge | hśes | hbeg | hrah |  
 na | gsom | sñi | [24] | hyañ ||  
 10 hgru | hsrām | htam | ge | hśes | beg | hstah ||  
 klu | hrto | htsa | ge | hśes [25] | hbeg | mehi ||  
 klu | rto | htsah | ge | hrah | hyos | hlam ||  
 śes | hbeg | hrbo | dze | [26] | hldyeg | hldyi | hti | dze | hrah |  
 g-yos | ge | hsar ||  
 g-rah | hyos | ge | hsar | [27] | g-rah | g-yo | rbo | ge | hglu<sup>4</sup> |  
 ma | hti ||<sup>5</sup>  
 15 smu | hdzu | rgyag | dze | hldañ | rmañ | hrwehi ||  
 [28] | hdag | dze | hgrañ | hñyir | hñyir<sup>6</sup> ||  
 hswar | hldu | sto | dze | g-yo | hpud | hto | hdag<sup>7</sup> | hpoĥo |  
 [29] | hwar | hwar ||  
 hde | hyim | sto | rgyag | rgu | hmyil | myil<sup>8</sup> |  
 20 htor | hpū | hgru | dze | gla | hdzo [30] | htsah ||  
 hgru | hldañ | ma | dze | hrgu | hto | hrun ||<sup>9</sup>  
 gśañ | re | htad | to | dze | hbrañ | hldar [31] | ma<sup>10</sup> | hyob |  
 hñed | <sup>11</sup>htram<sup>12</sup> | htsah | glah | tah | hbra | <sup>13</sup>hldar | ma | hyob ||  
 g-yañ | ra | [32] | hrnab | hldañ | htañ | hbra | hldar | ma | hyob |  
 25 hrgu | hto | hrun ||  
 hgru | hma | hkom | re | hrwad | [33] | hmoñ | hldañ |  
 htor | hbu [ ] | hgru | dze | hse | hte | hmun |  
 hnañ | hrañ | ge | rwyin ||  
 na | htsah | [34] | ste | dze | hldyo | htor | ge | hnus | dze |  
 30 g-rah | hyos | htag | ge | hjoĥo ||  
 śid | g-ri | htor | [35] | dze | hgru | hldañ | hmañ ||  
 mehi | g-ri | htañ | dze | <sup>14</sup>rtañ | htsog | hram |

<sup>1</sup> hrbye ? Cf. l. 8.<sup>2</sup> Read hner-re ? Cf. l. 7.<sup>3</sup> gbzañ ? gañ | zañ ? (corrected from °m).<sup>4</sup> hgru ?<sup>5</sup> hgru | h here crossed out.<sup>6</sup> hñyir added below line.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> myil added below line.<sup>9</sup> Punctuation here completed by reviser.<sup>10</sup> sa ?<sup>11</sup> Underline correction from hyede<sup>12</sup> htras ?<sup>13</sup> Punctuation here due to reviser.<sup>14</sup> Punctuation here confirmed by reviser.

rgyed | [36] ḥsañ | rgam | cañ | ḥldyo | hrje | ḥbro ||  
 śes | ḥmad | ḥdzweḥe | re | ḥpah | ḥroñ || ḥkes  
 [37] ḥrañ | ḥldaḥ | ḥnam | ge | klu | ḥto | ḥkyim |  
 rje | smyi | rmad | ge | ḥtsog | ḥram | ḥdroḥo | [38]  
 ḥśi | ḥgri | ḥchim<sup>1</sup> | ge<sup>2</sup> || ḥldyañ | ḥrdzañ | ḥdzañ || 5  
 rbyo | ḥpah | ḥdar | [39] dze | ḥkye | ge | ḥmu ||  
 śes | ḥmad | ḥdzwe | dze | myag | mye | ḥtañ ||<sup>3</sup>  
 rgoñ | spu | rbu | dze | ḥgyaid<sup>4</sup> | ge<sup>5</sup> | ḥbañ [40]  
 ḥphu | ḥklo | ḥsad | dze | ḥnaḥ<sup>6</sup> | me | ḥmyi ||  
 ḥtrog | ḥtor | te | dze | ḥldyo | ge | ḥnus | 10  
 mor | ḥphu | [41] ḥbos | dze | ḥñud<sup>7</sup> | noḥu | ḥphul ||  
 ḥyañ | rmyi<sup>8</sup> | ḥsaḥ | dze | ḥgwa | neḥu | ḥkeḥi ||  
 na | ḥldom [42] ḥgor<sup>9</sup> | ḥkyañ | ḥrgyañ | ḥdzud ||  
 ḥsaḥ | ḥtsaḥ | ḥdzañ | dze | ḥklom | ge | ḥtul |  
 bos | smyi | [43] ḥldog | dze | ḥraḥ | ldaḥ | ge | ḥdzaḥ || 15  
 gdaḥ<sup>10</sup> | ḥdih<sup>11</sup> | gtar | pra | ḥreḥe | ḥldyañ ||  
 bos | [44] smyi | ḥldog | ge | śes | gśi | ḥlduḥu ||  
 ḥtsaḥ | ḥtsaḥ | ḥdzañ | ge | śes | ḥśi | breḥe |  
 ḥriñ | [45] rwa | ḥkar | re | ḥñañ | ḥya<sup>12</sup> ḥtsag ||  
 skah | raḥ | ḥdzur | dze | ḥldag | ḥbaḥ | ḥldoñ || 20  
 re | ma | [46] ḥnad | ge | ḥbeḥe | ḥsli | rmañ ||  
 ḥmar | me | ḥukaḥ<sup>13</sup> | ge | ḥrdzaḥ | ḥgo<sup>14</sup> | ḥpo ||  
 gte | me | ḥkaḥ | ge<sup>15</sup> | dam | [47] rma | ḥbroñ ||  
 gci | me | ḥśi | ge | ḥbeḥi | baḥ | ḥbu || ḥrug ||  
 ḥñed | ge | slug | dze | ḥweḥi | ḥśi | [48] ḥpo || 25  
 ḥre | ge | rgyo | dze | ḥphu | ḥśeg | ḥldyihi ||  
 twañ | mag | ḥnor<sup>16</sup> | gse | ḥc<sup>17</sup>añ | ḥldyañ | dze | [49] rñam | nar |  
 ḥyuḥu |  
 ḥkyañ | mag | ḥnor<sup>18</sup> | ḥrño | ḥcañ | ḥram | dze | gśe | ḥrdzro |  
 ḥñaḥ<sup>19</sup> ||<sup>20</sup>  
 ḥce | ra<sup>21</sup> [50] tsha | ge | ḥce | ḥra | ḥbyi | na | tsham | ḥrog | ḥñor |

<sup>1</sup> = ḥtshim, l. 81.

<sup>2</sup> ḥtsog | ḥram | ḥdo here crossed out. The punctuation || after ge is probably due to confusion.

<sup>3</sup> Punctuation reinforced by reviser.

<sup>4</sup> ḥgyed? Correction from ḥgyaid.

<sup>5</sup> Corrected below line to ḥge.

<sup>6</sup> ḥnaḥ below line, a correction of myag.

<sup>7</sup> ñu a correction of ja.

<sup>8</sup> pyi? rpyi? myi?

<sup>9</sup> Read ḥgor-re? (metre).

<sup>10</sup> g added below line.

<sup>11</sup> ḥida written? See scansion.

<sup>12</sup> ya? The ḥ a correction of la.

<sup>13</sup> Sic.

<sup>14</sup> ḥko?

<sup>15</sup> ge added below line.

<sup>16</sup> For ḥno-re? Cf. l. 58.

<sup>17</sup> c a correction (of rts or c, clumsily written?)

<sup>18</sup> For ḥno-re?

<sup>19</sup> Corrected from ḥñar or ḥñaḥ.

<sup>20</sup> Punctuation reinforced by reviser.

<sup>21</sup> || ḥce | ra inked over.

1ḥbu | rbye | ḥce | rgyañ | na | ḥldyo | tor | [51] ḥnus |  
 g-yog | ḥsañ | ma | ḥpul | dze | ḥmar | ḥbah | ge | ḥrab ||  
 ḥlduḥu | ce | rgyañ | na<sup>2</sup> | stoñ | ḥkhog | re | ḥldya [52] ḥkañ | ḥte |  
 ḥñor | 'gldag | ḥce | rgyañ | na | ḥldag | khri | khyag | re | ḥśid ||  
 5 ḥmog | ḥce | rgyañ | [53] rgya | ḥñi | ke | ḥkor | ḥśid || rbyo | ḥko |  
 rño | dze | ḥphoñ | ge | thrah || na | ḥce | ge | me | ḥyed | 'ḥko | [54]  
 rño | ḥce | dze | rb<sup>3</sup>ab | ña | ḥke | ḥkog || steḥi | ḥtam | ḥmog | dze |  
 rzañ | ḥba | ge | rgyeḥe | na | 'ḥko | rño | ḥce | [55] dze | ḥmoge | ḥco |  
 'gmog | ḥce | rgyañ | dze | ḥko | rño | ge | ḥco | 'gmog | ḥce | ḥsa | dze |  
 10 ḥbah | ḥrag | [56] ḥkyer || ḥñaḥ | ḥce | ḥrah | ḥbyiñ | ña | ḥrbyo |  
 ḥko | rño || rñe | ḥño<sup>4</sup>ḥ | rzañ | dze | na | ge | me |<sup>5</sup> ña | [57]<sup>6</sup> ḥbyiñ |  
 'rgyañ | ḥce | ma<sup>7</sup> | ḥbyin ||  
 ḥce | ḥse<sup>8</sup> | rgye | re | ḥrkas | ḥthañ | ḥlde ||  
 rbyo | ḥce | rgye | [58] dze [ ] ḥrgu | ḥrgeḥi | sto ||  
 15 <sup>9</sup>sku | mag | ḥno | dze | me | na | ḥldis |  
 ḥdah | mag | ḥno | dze | me | na | ḥsams [59] |  
 sbyim | ḥce | rgye | dze | ḥrwa | ḥdah | ḥpog ||  
 ḥsas | ḥce | rgye | dze | ḥrañ | ḥgam | ḥyim |  
 rgoñ [60] ḥce | rgye | dze | ḥldañ | ḥrgyu | ḥtam ||  
 20 ḥkhu | tsa | śid | dze | ḥpha | ḥñur | ḥñur ||  
 gphaḥ | tsa | glom | dze | ḥkhu | [61] ḥñur | ḥñur ||<sup>10</sup> [62]  
 ~ || : | ḥśid | ḥrihi | ḥthor<sup>11</sup> | dze | ḥgru | ḥldañ | ḥmaḥ |  
 ḥtor | ḥphu | ḥgru | dze | gla | ḥtso | ḥtsaḥ |  
 ḥa | [63] yañ<sup>12</sup> | ḥso | ḥrñi | dze | mo | ma | ḥthor |  
 25 ḥyañ | so | ḥdze | tse | ḥldi | ma | ḥrtaḥ ||  
 ḥyañ | tsa | ḥjo | dze | [64] ḥyañ | ge | ḥgroms |  
 tor | ḥpu | ḥgru | ge | ḥstor | moñ | ḥdzoñ | re | ḥtsa | ḥdzo | ḥkrom |  
 gsu | [65] prom | ḥñor | ḥtsaḥ | ḥpu<sup>13</sup> | ḥdrom ||  
 ldañ | pyer | ḥgag | re | ḥtsaḥ | ḥyaḥ | ḥdo ||  
 30 ḥpha | ma | sñañ | [66] | ne | ge | bu | lta<sup>14</sup> | ge | sñañ | glañ | ḥgaḥi |  
 ḥyañ | ḥrah | ḥkaḥ | ḥldom | ge | ru |<sup>15</sup> glañ | ge | [67] ḥthul | ḥi ||

<sup>1</sup> With these two verses cf. ll. 15-16.      <sup>2</sup> ce | rgyañ | na added below line.

<sup>3</sup> rñ a correction (of rb?). Read ba?

<sup>4</sup> ce here crossed out: the ḥ accidentally left in.

<sup>5</sup> b here crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> ḥ here crossed out.

<sup>7</sup> Some sign here crossed out.

<sup>8</sup> Read ḥse | ḥce?

<sup>9</sup> This and the following verse seem to interrupt the series of expressions: an insertion?

<sup>10</sup> A short line. Before the next line there is a blank of about the width of a line.

<sup>11</sup> Correction of ḥphor?

<sup>12</sup> Read ḥyañ: ḥ(a) | yañ is merely the result of a line-ending.

<sup>13</sup> Correction of ḡśi (crossed out). Ḥñor = ḥño-re.

<sup>14</sup> ru | lta (a correction of glañ) crossed out?

<sup>15</sup> s here crossed out.



hko | se | hgro | re | htsa | hyah | hdo ||  
 hjo | me | hdub | re | hlab | ma<sup>1</sup> | hñi |  
 hbañ<sup>2</sup> | [68] re | hko | htar | dze ||<sup>3</sup> hna | hlam | glo | hrañ ||<sup>4</sup>  
 hdzam | hbroñ | hroñ | dze | hdam | to | hbu | hpor<sup>5</sup> |  
 [69] skyim | se | hdzar | dze | hbehi | la | hgar<sup>6</sup> | 5  
 thar | pyañ | hjo | dze | hphag | la | gnah ||  
 gcog | [70] hlde | hldu | dze | h<sup>7</sup>byig | la | gnah ||  
 hjo | me | hdub | re | hlab<sup>8</sup> | me | hñis ||  
 ru | ge | hkrom | dze | [71] hmo | ma<sup>9</sup> | thor |  
 hcha | ge | hcer | dze | hldi | ma | rtañ || 10  
 hde | me | htañ | g-roñ | hyed | ge | ta<sup>10</sup> | hwa [72] ste | htañ ||<sup>11</sup>  
 gśi | brom | hnu | ge | hsor | htsam | bzod |  
 hyah | hrgehe | ge | sram | pa | nar [73]  
 hwa | ste | hge | dze | hla | hram | hte ||  
 htor | smyi | hbom | ge | gla | htso<sup>12</sup> | htsañ | 15  
 hphañ | [74] ma | rañ | ge | htsañ | hjo | hdzin |  
 hkuñu | neñu | htshe | re | wehi | neñu | hrehe |  
 dgu | hldo | htor | [75] dze | hsoh<sup>13</sup> | hsoh<sup>14</sup> | htshu |  
 hwa | ste | hgehe | dze | dgu | htor | hbyi<sup>15</sup> |  
 hwa | ste | hge | dze | lañ | [76] hram | hte | chañ | dgu | htor | 20  
 htshu ||  
 do | ldo | hdzo | chañ | dgu | htor | htshun | re | [77] hrañ |  
 hrtañ | hgyañna |  
 dgu | hldo | htor | dze | hldo | hdzor | re | hlde | ge | hgru<sup>16</sup> | ma |  
 rmañ | [78] na |  
 ldyañ | hjo | hjihi | re | mehi | ra | hgam ||  
 dgu | hldo | htor | ge | stor | hmoñ | joñ [79]  
 hldañ | phyi | ske | re || hño | stor | prom | re | hgru<sup>17</sup> | ma | 25  
 hstor ||  
 stor | hto | rta | yañ | stor | to | [80] hrun | ° |  
 rta | hso | hnañ | yañ | gñi | hrdzum | doho ||  
 smyi | hni | hśige | smyi | rmad | ldañ<sup>18</sup> | [81]  
 hkyañ | rgyañ | hśig | dze | hśi | hkri | htshim<sup>19</sup> |  
 hśañ | re | hśig | dze | hmog<sup>20</sup> | re | [82] hldoñ | 30

<sup>1</sup> Read me, as in l. 70?<sup>2</sup> ñ below line.<sup>3</sup> Punctuation reinforced by reviser.<sup>4</sup> Punctuation reinforced by reviser.<sup>5</sup> hphor? <sup>6</sup> r inked over.<sup>7</sup> h added below line.<sup>8</sup> b smudged or crossed out.<sup>9</sup> Something here crossed out.<sup>10</sup> h added below line. <sup>11</sup> ta added below line. <sup>12</sup> Punctuation reinforced by reviser.<sup>13</sup> hco?<sup>14</sup> h added below line.<sup>15</sup> h below line: hbyi correction of hgya?<sup>16</sup> hglu?<sup>17</sup> hglu?<sup>18</sup> Correction from ldañ.<sup>19</sup> hchim? Cf. l. 38.<sup>20</sup> h added below line.

rtah<sup>1</sup> | ḥtsog | ḥram | dze | ḥrgoñ | ḥru | ge | ḥru | re | rbyo | ḥa | ge<sup>2</sup> |  
 ḥcaḥ | 'rte | ḥyu | [83] rgyag | dze | ḥldas | ḥtso | ḥpu || ḥkam | stañ |  
 rgyag | dze | ḥnam | ḥte | ḥśaḥ | 'ḥcag | rgyag | [84] ḥris | dze | ḥño |  
 sto | ge | rdo | re | cis | tsha | ḥbyiḥi | 'ḥrje | smyi | rmad | ge | ḥmo |  
 5 rkaḥ | lda | [85] dze | ḥño | sto | ge | ḥśag<sup>3</sup> | dze | rñe | ḥwe | ge |  
 ḥwyir ||

ḥño | sta | glom | dze | krañ | ñur | ñur | [86]

rñe | sta | glañ | dze | ḥne | rñeḥi | rñeḥi |

gśañ | sñañ | do | na | rgyañ | na | spe |

10 ḥtsog | ḥram | ḥdo | na | [87] mor | ḥldañ | re | ḥñaḥ ||

ḥldi | rgyed | ḥrar | ḥcog | ḥram | ḥdo ||

rgyed | ḥdre<sup>4</sup> | ḥte | ge | [88] ḥcog | ḥdo | dze | ḥwad |

ḥdim | ḥtshis | ḥltom | re | ḥtso | ḥldañ | stañ |

gdim | pyi | [89] ḥse | ge | gsom | rgyag | ḥsor | doñ | ḥtshog |

15 me | ḥldyim | rgyañ |

<sup>5</sup>gdim | phyi | ḥse | ge | [90] ḥtshog | ḥram | ḥñad ||

rgyed | ma | ḥldañ | ge | ḥtsog | ḥram | ḥśaḥ ||

rta | ḥtsog | ḥram | [91] ge | ḥtaḥ | rwe | ḥtaḥ ||

rta | sko | prom | re | ḥrtaḥ | ḥldañ | ḥkrañ ||

20 ḥtsog | rpu | śe | chañ | [92] pyi | ḥse | ḥthoñ ||

ḥkor | ḥtaḥ | ḥkhen | yañ | sñañ | gyañ | gyañ<sup>6</sup> |

ḥjaḥ | ḥtaḥ | ḥkhen | yañ | [93] swa | tseg | tseg ||

rgyed | ma | ḥltañ | ge ||

rta | ḥgam | ḥphar | re | ḥsus | slo | glo |

25 rta | ḥtso | ḥna<sup>7</sup> | [94] ge | ḥtsog | ḥram | ḥduñ |

rgyed | ḥtre<sup>8</sup> | ge | ḥtsog | ḥtañ | ma ||

gdim | chis<sup>9</sup> | ldom | [95] re | ḥtsog | ḥldañ | ḥstañ ||

dim | tshis | ldom | re | tshog | ḥldañ | ḥduñ ||

<sup>10</sup>ddyim | phyi ||<sup>11</sup> [96] ḥse | ge | ḥtsog | ḥtañ | ma | te | na | ge |

30 ḥbyiñ | 'kya | ḥtañ | ta | ḥtor | 'rgor<sup>12</sup> | ḥyos | [97] ḥbom<sup>13</sup> | byiñ |

'ḥbar | ḥbañ | thwañ | byiñ || rwer | ḥmo | ḥchaḥ | byiñ | 'ḥtsog |

ḥram | myiñ | [98] 'rgor | ḥyos | ḥbar | thwañ | ḥkhor | kyañ |

rweḥi | re |

ḥmo | cha | byi | na | phyi<sup>14</sup> | ḥse | myi | [99]

<sup>1</sup> Correction below line from ḥlta.

<sup>2</sup> Read ḥge in place of ḥa | ge.

<sup>3</sup> s here crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> ḥtre ?

<sup>5</sup> d here crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> The second gyañ added below the line.

<sup>7</sup> m here crossed out.

<sup>8</sup> ḥtre ? (correction from ḥrta). Read ḥdre-ḥte-ge (metre).

<sup>9</sup> tshis ?

<sup>10</sup> Some commencement here crossed out.

<sup>11</sup> Erroneous punctuation (end of line).

<sup>12</sup> Correction, underline, from rgyor.

<sup>13</sup> ḥthom ?

<sup>14</sup> ḥphyi ? Correction from cha.

rgyed | ma | glañ | ge | hñah<sup>1</sup> | htsog | hśah ||  
 rta | hgam | hphar<sup>2</sup> | gsus | slo | stañ | [100]  
 gdim | hdzam | hdzim<sup>3</sup> | re | hko | wehi | htuhu ||  
 rta | hso | hñah | ge | na | rom | hton | [101] re | hlañ | hjañ |  
     hkoño | hko | bphyag<sup>4</sup> || hkhog | hrañ | war | hpañ | re | 5  
 rgyed | ma | [102] hldañ |<sup>5</sup> ge<sup>6</sup> | ñah | htsog | hśas |  
 hśad | mag | hdehi | dze | hśi | kyeg | mye |  
 rbyo | sñañ<sup>7</sup> | ge | [103]<sup>8</sup> sñañ | na | rgoñ | ru | ge | hru ||  
 the | kyen | hldug | ha | rta<sup>9</sup> | hso | hna | ma | rañ | h'dram | [104]  
 hmu | hdoñ | htor | sku | hphu | hti | hldi | hgañ | nañ | re | hñag | 10  
 htshab | hkañ | hrañ | 'rgyed | [105] ma | hldañ | ge |<sup>10</sup> hkañ | hcog |  
 byin | ta<sup>10</sup> | 'rgyed | htso | dro | ho | hkañ | hgo | byin | ta | 'rgyed |  
 hgo | hdro | hkañ | hkhab | byin | [106] ta | 'rgyed | hkab | hdro |  
 hkañ | khab<sup>11</sup> | byin | tañ | 'rgyed | hkhāb | hdro | hkho | hphyag<sup>12</sup> |  
 hkhohu | re | [107] hrañ | hwar | rders | hdi | na | na | hrom | hkob | 15  
 'hlañ | hjañ | hkhog | 'rgyed | ma | [108] hldañ | ge | hso | hñah |  
 hrgañ | 'mo | lañ<sup>13</sup> | byu | re | hldi | hdañ | ma | ge | hño | bro | hrub |  
 [109] re | myag | gre | skyañ | 'hjim | li | li | re | pa | la | la | ge | tho |  
 rgyam | ge | hwad | re | [110] spyi | hdze | ge | hkab ||  
     rta | hgam | hphar | re | hso | hñah | hldoño || 20  
     hro | hbehi | hbañ | ge | [111] hso | hñah | gcheg ||  
     hso | hñah | hyañ | tse | gtañ | hbom | rbo ||  
     hbom | rbo<sup>14</sup> | phañ | dze | hldañ | [112] hkrañ | hnar | re |  
     hbom | rbo | hldañ ||  
     hmañ | hldañ | hyañ | dze | rgyed | hldag | hñag | [113] ge |  
     hldañ | krañ | hrwehi ||  
     hñah | hpoñ | hgor | re | hgu | htor | htsu : na | 25  
     gtse | ne | rgad | [114] re | hrañ | rtañ | hkyañ | na |  
     dgu | hldo | htor | ge | su | me | hmehi |  
     hrañ | we | rtañ | ge | so | [115] hñah | mehī ||  
     hrañ | hche | hju<sup>15</sup> | ge | hcañ | htso | htsañ |  
     hpo | hldi | nañ | re | hyañ | hñehi | [116] hñahd | 30  
     hśas | te | khyañ | je<sup>16</sup> | hśas | hkhañ | ge ||<sup>17</sup> hrwehi ||<sup>18</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Sic (for hñah ? cf. l. 102).

<sup>2</sup> sl here crossed out: read hphar-re ? (cf. l. 110).

<sup>3</sup> hjim|hjim ? hdzam|hdzam ?

<sup>5</sup> Punctuation reinforced.

<sup>7</sup> Correction from cha.

<sup>9</sup> Read hrta in place of ha | rta.

<sup>11</sup> Corrected from hkhab.

<sup>13</sup> Or hña ? (a correction).

<sup>16</sup> Sic (= hzu, l. 117).

<sup>17</sup> Erroneous punctuation.

<sup>4</sup> hpro here crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> hna here crossed out.

<sup>8</sup> hcañ here crossed out.

<sup>10</sup> hkañ . . . ta added below line.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. l. 101.

<sup>14</sup> rbo added below line.

<sup>16</sup> Read dze.

<sup>18</sup> Punctuation reinforced.



ʰbri | ʰldi | ʰthañ | re | ʰre | ʰldi | [133] ʰyah |  
 ¹ʰldi | ʰthañ | re | rgyeb | ʰldi | ʰthañ | ra |<sup>2</sup>  
 ʰthañ | ʰrgam | ʰkad | re | rñe | re | ʰño || [134]  
 dgu | sko | ʰldoñ | re | ʰkhog | ʰnoñ | ʰdzom ʰi |  
 re | ʰmoñ | ʰyog | re | ʰldag | nag | ʰtsors<sup>3</sup> [135] 5  
 ʰrañ | pu | ʰlo | ge | gsehe | ʰldi | ʰthoñ | re | ʰldag | nag |  
 ʰkrag ||  
 ʰkhar |<sup>4</sup> rpag<sup>5</sup> || [136] | g-yar | re | ʰldag<sup>6</sup> | ʰgrom |  
 gldag | nag | g-yah | dze | rgyad | kyer | rbo | dze |  
 gtse | ʰkom | re | tsañ | [137]  
 ʰbri | re | ʰrdyam | re | ʰkhañ | ʰldah | ʰñañghī || 10  
 ʰdzohu | ro | ʰldi | re | ʰjohu<sup>7</sup> || ʰwa | ʰkah |<sup>8</sup> [138]  
 ʰdzeñu | rje | ʰbro | re | ʰdzohu | ʰt<sup>9</sup>o | ʰrun |  
 stor | rje | ʰbro | re | stor | ʰto | ʰrun |  
 ldañ | rdze [139] ʰbro | re | ʰldañ | the | rgyebs ||  
 dgu | ldo | ʰtor | ge | stor | moñ | ʰ<sup>10</sup>dzon | 15  
 ʰrah | weñi | rta | ge | [140] stor | moñ | ʰdz<sup>11</sup>on ||  
 ldyo | stor | ʰthu | re | ʰdrab | stor | ʰtoho ||  
 ʰñi | stor | speñi |  
 hpu | [141] ʰpos | stor | dze | ʰkyañ | stor | rño<sup>12</sup> ||  
 ʰsañ | yer | ʰldañ | dze | ʰrñe | ʰldañ | ne | 20  
 mor | [142] gdag | ʰgom | re | ʰdzañ | ʰldog | stor |  
 mor | gdag | ʰphar | re | stor | ʰdor | g-yoho | [143]  
 na | ʰldom | ʰgor |<sup>13</sup> kla | ʰkyañ<sup>14</sup> | gstor |  
 ʰtor | se | stor | dze | ʰldañ | pyi | ske ||  
 ʰño | stor [144] ʰsañs | dze | mo | ma | ʰthor | 25  
 ʰrñe | ʰldañ | ʰñas<sup>15</sup> | dze | ʰldi | ma<sup>16</sup> | ʰrtañ ||<sup>17</sup>  
 ʰldyañ | ʰtañ | ʰbo<sup>18</sup> | [145] kyer | mag | ʰnor | su | ge | stor | ta |  
 ʰthogs ||  
 phye | ʰgo | ʰthuñ | re | ʰnam | ʰdzam | [146] ʰtar |

<sup>1</sup> Insert ʰyah (a regular antithesis to rgyeb) ?

<sup>2</sup> ni here crossed out: replaced by the ra (below line).

<sup>3</sup> s below line.

<sup>4</sup> l here crossed out (lñ intended?).

<sup>5</sup> re here crossed out.

<sup>6</sup> Insert nag ?

<sup>7</sup> ʰum ? Or is the dot over ʰu meant to indicate an error? Punctuation erroneous.

<sup>8</sup> ʰ below line.

<sup>9</sup> rto (a first correction of to ?) here crossed out. The to was then written.

<sup>10</sup> to here crossed out.

<sup>11</sup> dz written after te (crossed out).

<sup>12</sup> Correction (of rñu ?).

<sup>13</sup> ʰ here crossed out.

<sup>14</sup> Insert here ʰrgyañ, as in l. 42.

<sup>15</sup> Read ʰsañs ?

<sup>16</sup> ma: added below line.

<sup>17</sup> Punctuation reinforced.

<sup>18</sup> Some fragment of an akṣara here crossed out.

hrah | hton | rmag | dze | hdrag | htrog | htša ||  
 1 rñe | hne | hrmag | dze | hmañ [147] byi | hldoñ | hyu | sad | ge |  
 hphom | te | hdrañ | ge | hśad | na<sup>2</sup> | hrañ | rgyañ | hśod | te | rmag<sup>3</sup>  
 [148] dze | rmañ | ra | gyim | spyē | htor | hdwa | dze | myag | myi<sup>4</sup>  
 5 tor | htas | prom | dze | myage | [149] me | htañ |  
 rgyed | rmag | rñe | ge | stor | tha | htogñi |  
 hrah | sñiñ | ñe | ge | stor | ta | htog | ni | [150]  
 hldyañ | hpū | hbri | re | mehi | klu | hcha | ge | stor | htañ | htoni ||  
 hkyer | re | cig | dze | [151] hphañ | hphog | ge | hkarni || nor | gso |  
 10 hkañ | prom | re | śid | rgyañ | hnom | re | mehi | spa [152] rgyañ |  
 ge | stor | ta | htoni || g-we | hku | rño | re | g-yah | htša | ne | ge |  
 gstor | ta | htton |  
 hke | [153] hkañ | ñes | re | ske | hbrus | hgyañ ni |  
 myi | re | hti | ni | myi<sup>5</sup> | hśi ||  
 15 myi | rgye | myer<sup>6</sup> | hchos | [154] hjo | hjo<sup>7</sup> |  
 hti | rgye | mye | dze | hgye | hkrom | hkrom ||  
 hlo | ge | blañ | hldoñ | ge | na | [155] rñe | ne |  
 mehi | hgab | hldo | ge | rke | hldañ | hrdañ |  
 śid | rgyañ | hre | ge | hwam | hnom | [156] śon |  
 20 rma | g-yog | rño | ge | hjim | ta | htthusni |  
 rmañ | bri | hko | ge | g-yah | ta | mehi |  
 na | rog | [157] hphar | ge | skye | ta | ram |  
 hpū | hbroñ | rkom | ge | glo | ta | rdzogs ||  
 hldañ | hwe | ge | g-ri | [158] ta | gron ||  
 25 hkehe | hkañ | ñes | re | ske<sup>8</sup> | hbro | hgyan ||  
 chos | ta | ñan | re | hde | ta | rgyen | [159] hlab | ta | hwen ||  
 hnañ | hchos | hre | ge | hldañ | myi | śeg |  
 spyē | chos | hre | ge | gtsañ [160] myi | hrgan |  
 śi | hchos | re | ge | hpū | myi | hldin ||  
 30 sñañ | ne | thehe | yañ | stor | dor | yon || [161]  
 hldyañ | hpū | hbri<sup>10</sup> | re | mehi | klu | hcañ | yañ | stor | hdor |  
 hyon |  
 kyu | ldoñ | rño | re | [162] kya | wa | ne | yañ | stor | hdor |  
 hyon ||

<sup>1</sup> The passage rñe-htañ (l. 149) was probably in verse: it may have been affected by omissions of duplicate, or quasi-duplicate, words. See pp. 299 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> na added below line.

<sup>3</sup> g added below line.

<sup>4</sup> sñ (for st?) here crossed out.

<sup>5</sup> Insert re?

<sup>6</sup> Read mye-re or myer-re?

<sup>7</sup> hrño?

<sup>8</sup> A syllable missing here or after hldañ? Krañ?

<sup>9</sup> Underline correction from ste: cf. l. 153.

<sup>10</sup> yañ here crossed out.

hldyo | hdom | nag | re | hdrab | hwa | hrañ | yañ | [163] stor |  
 hdor | hyon ||  
 hbri | hsehe | hpur | hse | sri | hbodrag<sup>1</sup> |  
 hkhañ | hldañ | hnore<sup>2</sup> | tsa [164] चाह<sup>3</sup> || hkañhi |||  
 hrtañ | swa | g-wer<sup>4</sup> || hbos | hsañ | hldañ | ha<sup>5</sup> |  
 hbos | [165] hnom | hsañ<sup>6</sup> | gtsañ | hrqu | ma | gzo || 5  
 khru | hrkañ | myi | hrdoho | hrnab | ma | hldañ |  
 hsañ | chad | [166] rmur<sup>7</sup> | hkoñu | prom | g-yehe ||  
 hsañ | yob | hkom | re | hrañ | hrañ | htsoñu ||  
 rtañ | hsañ<sup>8</sup> | [167] g-yer | dze | stor | hto | hrui | ge | hrañ |  
 hrañ | hdehi ||  
 htor | bhphu | hbos | ge | hbyi | [168] hri | hgañ | ge | 10  
 chi | hrnu | hphor || re | hkoñu | bprom | hto |  
 htor | snin | hkañ | ge | [169] hkoñu | hprom || hrgañ || dze |  
 hrgom | hkhrur<sup>9</sup> | hto | na | hrpehi | hrgam | re | hto |  
 hdro | [170] hbron | prom | ge | hkohi | me | htul ||  
 hbañ | hldañ | hne | ge | hkeñu | me | hdzañ || [171] 15  
 hldyo | hdom | hnag | re | hkoñu | hphrom | hto | na |  
 sli | hti | hrñor<sup>10</sup> | hkoñu | mehe | [172] hldyo |||  
 hdrab | hwañ | hrañ | hrañ | re | hkoñu | phrom | hto | na |  
 hrwad | hbañ | prom | [173] yañ | hkoñu | me | hdrab | na |  
 klag | hrwad | hdzur<sup>11</sup> | hwi | hwehi | htsag | 20  
 rta | swa<sup>12</sup> | mor<sup>13</sup> | [174] hkoñu | prom | hto | na |  
 tor | dro | hño | ge | hnu | glañ | slog |  
 rtañ | swa | hldir<sup>14</sup> | <sup>15</sup>nu<sup>16</sup> | [175] glañ | <sup>17</sup>hldon<sup>18</sup> ||  
 rta | swa | <sup>19</sup>hkom | re | hnu | glañ | hpor | na | mu | hldi | hmo |  
 [176] na |  
 hrtañ | swa | hphyegs | na | keñu | prom | hbres || don | 25  
 nu | glañ | hrgyañ | ge | hke | prom<sup>20</sup> | glañ | [177] na ||

<sup>1</sup> rag ? : h added below line: hbohg may have been intended?

<sup>2</sup> Or read hner (correction of hnor) ?

<sup>3</sup> htañ here crossed out, the double punctuation unintentionally left.

<sup>4</sup> Read g-we-re ?

<sup>5</sup> pu here crossed out: the h unintentionally left.

<sup>6</sup> Correction of apparent hmañ.

<sup>7</sup> Read rnu-re ? rinur is not found elsewhere.

<sup>8</sup> hstsah ?

<sup>9</sup> Read hkhru-re ? hkhrur is not found elsewhere.

<sup>10</sup> Read hrño-re ? hrñor and rñor occur only in this way: cf. ll. 289, 322, 339.

<sup>11</sup> Read hdzur-re ?

<sup>12</sup> h below line.

<sup>13</sup> Read mor-re

<sup>14</sup> h added below line.

<sup>15</sup> Corrected from hnu.

<sup>16</sup> Read hldir-re or hldi-re ?

<sup>17</sup> hto here crossed out.

<sup>18</sup> ñ an addition.

<sup>19</sup> hldir here crossed out.

<sup>20</sup> prom an addition, below line.

ʔtor | ʔdro | ʔño | ge | rne | ʔpo | ʔldo | ge | ʔkeʔu | prom | ʔjo |  
 na |  
 ʔkoʔu | prom<sup>1</sup> | bʔer | na | keʔu | [178] ʔkaʔ | rwañ || na |  
 2ʔldyañ | ʔyañ | ʔyo | na | ldyañ | ʔkaʔ | rwañ |  
 ste | ʔkeʔu | prom | dze | gsom [179] wa | ʔyo ||  
 5 ʔnu | glañ | rño | dze | gsom | wa | g-yo ||  
 ʔldyañ | yañ | ʔyo | na | gnaʔ | goñ | myag | [180]  
 ste | ʔkoʔu | bprom | yañ | ldyañ<sup>3</sup> | glab | ʔdo ||  
 de | nas | rabs | bgyis | gsañ | ʔldi | ʔlab | [181]  
 rbyo | po | nañ | gsañ | ʔség | ʔlab | dze | rbyo<sup>4</sup> | ʔpro | ʔro | grteʔe |  
 10 ʔta | stel | re | ʔlab | ta | gboʔu [182] ste | ge | ʔthogs | re | ʔlab |  
 ge | plañ | na |  
 ʔbroñ | ʔldaʔ | ʔdzam | re | ʔraʔ | rte<sup>5</sup> | ʔdubna [183]  
 ʔdzu<sup>6</sup> | ʔdro | ʔphor<sup>7</sup> | ʔchi | ʔdo | dyañ | na |  
 bsog | thom | thom | dze | ʔpu | ge | me | ʔmuʔi | [184]  
 15 ʔram | ʔkañ | ʔkañ | dze | ʔphage | me | ʔsam |  
 ʔdiʔi | mag | ʔnor<sup>8</sup> | ma<sup>9</sup> | ʔpu | mu | re | [185] ma | ʔpaʔ |  
 ʔsam ||  
 ʔtaʔ | ʔśud | ʔdon | rgyag | dze | ʔtor | ʔdo | ʔchuñ |  
 ʔta | śud | meʔi | [186] dze | ʔrtaʔ | ʔjam | ge | ʔmeʔi |||  
 ʔldyañ | g-ri | gdod<sup>10</sup> | re | meʔi | ʔraʔ | gtañ |  
 20 cig | dze | ʔtor<sup>11</sup> | [187] ʔldam | re | ʔldan ||<sup>12</sup>  
 ʔtor | ʔkhru | rgyañ | re | ʔrta | ʔpā | ʔphar |  
 ʔñi | ʔtor | ʔldam<sup>13</sup> | [188] re | ʔldan |  
 ʔa | <sup>14</sup>lkyañ | ʔzu | ʔrño | re | ʔña<sup>15</sup> | ʔdro | mo |  
 cig | dze | tor | ʔldam | re [189] ʔldan ||  
 25 ʔśo | ʔkog | rño ||<sup>16</sup> re | ʔñañ | ʔdro | ʔmo ||  
 stor | ʔkho | ʔrño | re | ʔñañ | ʔdro | [190] ʔtar |  
 ʔmor<sup>17</sup> | ʔzaʔ | re | ʔse | spye | khyañ ||  
 rgyeb | ʔphuʔi | ʔtoñ | re | ʔyah | wa | ʔkañ | [191]  
 rñam<sup>18</sup> | skar | ʔkaʔ | re | gdaʔ | ʔnaʔ | ʔgam ||  
 30 dgu | ʔldo | ʔtor | re | ʔra | we | rtaʔ | [192]  
 rgyed | ʔrañ | sme | re | ʔkhar | ʔgyi | ñes ||

<sup>1</sup> prom added below line.<sup>3</sup> ldyañ added below line.<sup>5</sup> In l. 354 the manuscript has ʔrtre.<sup>7</sup> Read ʔpho-re or ʔphor-re? Cf. l. 353.<sup>9</sup> Correction of myi?<sup>10</sup> d a correction (of r?).<sup>12</sup> Corrected from || or || reinforced?<sup>14</sup> kyañ here crossed out: read ʔlkyañ?<sup>16</sup> Punctuation erroneous.<sup>17</sup> Read ʔmo-re or ʔmor-re? Cf. l. 192.<sup>2</sup> ʔ added below line.<sup>4</sup> rbyo added below line.<sup>6</sup> In ll. 352-3 ʔdzu and gzu.<sup>8</sup> Read ʔno-re?<sup>11</sup> Read ʔto-re?<sup>13</sup> re here crossed out.<sup>15</sup> Read ʔñañ?<sup>18</sup> jam?



cig | dze | ḥtor | ḥdam | re | mor | re | ḥkar | rpag | re<sup>1</sup> |  
 kyañni | [193]  
 ḥñaḥ | ḥtsu | rpag | re | ḥñaḥ | mo | ḥgam ||  
 ḥñaḥ | mo | hr<sup>2</sup>pag | <sup>3</sup>gso | nad | ḥgam |  
 [194] gso | nad | rpag | re | ḥkaḥ | ḥgañ | ḥjor | 5  
 ḥrdzoñ | ḥyo | ḥsi | dze | ste | gdzu | ge | cig<sup>4</sup> | lol |  
 [195] ḥke | plañ | ḥdraḥ | dze | ḥthar | mye | ge | lol |  
 ḥldiḥi | su | ḥldoñ ||<sup>5</sup> dze | ḥlda | ḥko | ge | ḥdzoñ | [196]  
 rma | ḥsu | ḥdra | dze | ḥwam | weḥi | ge | tsweḥu |  
 ḥño | stor | ḥthor<sup>6</sup> | bsi | ta | ston | 10  
 rñe | [197] ḥldañ | ḥkhar<sup>7</sup> | ḥmye | ḥtaḥ | rgyen |  
 mu | ḥrog | ḥtro | re | rmañ | ḥldab | g-we |  
 stor | thoñ | [198] bsi | re | ḥldañ | ḥkhañ | g-we |  
 ḥro | ta | śodce<sup>8</sup> | re | ḥwar | ta | rgyeni<sup>9</sup> |  
 ḥdi | gsom | śud | [199] re | rmañ | ña | g-weḥi || 15  
 ḥsañ | nag | rgyes | ḥkom | chim | ḥldim | ge | ḥphaḥ | rmañ |<sup>1</sup>rgyaḥ<sup>10</sup> |  
 gñi | ke | ge | [200] g-yog | ḥldaḥ | gse | ge | speḥi | ḥdzañ | ḥgyañ |  
<sup>1</sup>ḥce | ḥmu | gdag | re | rñe | ne | ḥreḥi | na | [201] rmañ | ña | g-we | ḥe ||  
 ḥso | ḥldaḥ | ḥgor | re | ḥwi | wa | rmañ |  
 trog | ḥjo | rñe | dze | pyi | rjes | [202] ne<sup>11</sup> | ḥcer | 20  
 rmañ | bri | ko | ge | ḥcha<sup>12</sup> | ḥru | ḥrdyañ |  
 ḥraḥ | ḥmad | ḥñe | nag | ge | ḥko | [203] ḥldaḥ | ḥse | ḥswad |  
 cha | ḥru | ḥwars | ge | ḥbri | ḥko | <sup>13</sup>ḥltah |  
 śor<sup>14</sup> | ḥlda | [204] ḥkar | re | pyu | phyā | ḥdam |  
 ḥche | ḥmu | <sup>15</sup>gdag | re | gsañ | ḥkaḥ | ḥreḥi | 25  
 puñ | te | gsar | ñar | [205] ḥpaḥ | rmag | ḥciḥi ||  
 gse | re | ḥrañ | klar | ḥdzoñ | skyar | ḥreḥi ||  
 na | g-we | ḥkor | [206] kla | gsañ | rmañ | re | rmañ | ña | g-we ||  
 ḥce | ḥmu | gdag | re | rñe | ne<sup>16</sup> | ḥñoḥu |  
 tshu | gsom<sup>17</sup> [207] śud | re | rmañ | ña | g-we | re | g-we | 30  
 the | then | ḥldi | bñir | ḥkaḥ | ḥgañ | ḥtsur | [208]  
<sup>18</sup>ḥkañ | ḥcig | rpag | re | ḥtshar | ḥde | ḥpyedḥi |  
 rseḥi | ḥrgod | ḥphyed | re | ḥphyu | [209] ḥldyañ | ḥgyeḥi ||

<sup>1</sup> rpag | re added below line: to be inserted here?

<sup>2</sup> Something here crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> Insert re?

<sup>4</sup> cig added below line, probably to replace lol: cf. l. 356.

<sup>5</sup> Punctuation erroneous?

<sup>6</sup> Read ḥdor-re or ḥthor-re?

<sup>7</sup> Read ḥkhar-re or ḥkha-re?

<sup>8</sup> śodtsa?

<sup>9</sup> = rgyen-ni.

<sup>10</sup> rgyaḥ added below line.

<sup>11</sup> rmañ here crossed out.

<sup>12</sup> cha added below line.

<sup>13</sup> ḥdam here crossed out.

<sup>14</sup> A correction (of ror?).

<sup>15</sup> g added below line.

<sup>16</sup> rñe | ne (rñe?) inserted below line.

<sup>17</sup> m below line.

<sup>18</sup> ḥ here crossed out.

- hkho | hsañ | hgor<sup>1</sup> | hnom | ta | hprom | na |  
 hldañ | rgye | hdor | re | [210] hwañ | ta | hnen |  
 hcañ | rgye | rpag | re | hmo | ta | hpun ||  
 hdyañ | hto | htoñ | ge | hgo | [211] gtoñ | mod |  
 5 re | mye | hpañi | re | myi | hpeñi | hkhiñi<sup>2</sup> |  
 rog | hji | rdañ | ge | [212] hko | htoñ | modhi |  
 khyos | hkhyañ | hyu | ge | mye | hpeñi | hkheñi ||  
 hkvañ<sup>3</sup> | hgo | [213] hro | ge | hbos | hdom | hrjiñi ||  
 hbeñi | tyañ | rdehe | ge | <sup>4</sup>hstsañ | hbrad | [214] hrdagñi ||  
 10 hkañ | gsañ | hrañ | re | hrweñi | gtsu | ge | hras<sup>5</sup> |  
 kyu | hldoñ | hrño | [215] re | hkya | wa | ñe | re | htshu | to |  
 hphan || ||  
 htor | hñi | htsa | ge | htor | hbroñ | [216] hkhoño ||  
 hldi | hrgyed | hrañ | htor | hbroñ | hkhoño ||  
 hldi | hrgyed | hrar<sup>6</sup> | tor | [217] hbroñ | <sup>7</sup>hgyañ |  
 15 htor | hbroñ | hkho<sup>8</sup> | dze | htor | hkho | dze || kho<sup>9</sup> | sñe | ge |  
 [218] hldyañ | hpu | hbri | re | hmehi | klu | hcañ ||<sup>10</sup>dze | htor |  
 hkho | ge | hkhoñi ||  
 htañ | [219] hrdzo | hñor<sup>11</sup> | htor | hbroñ | htsors |  
 hthañ<sup>12</sup> | le | tshañ | dze | tor | sñi | rgam | [220]  
 20 hthañ | le | tsa | ge | thor | hbroñ | tshor | na |  
 thañ | rdzo | hkyud | na | hbroñ | hdru | hjar |  
 [221] hthañ | hgam | hrdzur | re | hbroñ | hkru | hbro | na ||  
 hyañ | hklu<sup>13</sup> | hbro | re | hgyeb | [222] hkru | hbro | re | hyañ |  
 htañ | hthañ na | : |  
 25 hrta | swa | gkom | re | htor | hbroñ | [223] hgrom ||  
 htor | hbroñ | hgrom | re | hton | hkoñ | hbye<sup>14</sup> ||  
 htor | hbroñ | hrpag | re | [224] hwañ | hrśañ | hlamñi |  
 g-wañ | hrśañ | hnar | <sup>15</sup>hrkwa | hdzam | htronñi | [225]  
 dgu | hmu | htor<sup>16</sup> | hśañ | hlad | hbyamna |  
 30 hrañ | hldi<sup>17</sup> | hnañ | re | hrśañ | lad | hlamñi |  
 mor | [226] hgu | hrdzor<sup>18</sup> | hrśañ | lad | hlamñi ||  
 hyañ | hrañ | hsañ | re | hśañ | hlad | hlamñi | [227]

<sup>1</sup> Read hgo-re or hgor-re ?<sup>2</sup> Sic (for hkheñi, as in l. 212 ?).<sup>3</sup> hkyañ ? Correction, below line, of hwañ.<sup>4</sup> mye here crossed out.<sup>5</sup> hnas ? Correction of hkornas.<sup>6</sup> Read hrañ-re ?<sup>7</sup> hko here crossed out.<sup>8</sup> ge here crossed out.<sup>9</sup> Or khwo ? (a correction).<sup>10</sup> Punctuation erroneous.<sup>11</sup> Read hño-re.<sup>12</sup> Correction, below line, of hpañi.<sup>13</sup> Probably hkru.<sup>14</sup> hpye ? hpye ?<sup>15</sup> Read hnar-re ? Cf. l. 233.<sup>16</sup> Read hto-re ? Cf. ll. 236, 244.<sup>17</sup> hldi added below line.<sup>18</sup> Read hrdzo-re ?

mug | hgu | rdzor<sup>1</sup> | hśaṅ | hład | hlamhi |  
 htham | rah | gsaṅ | re | hśaṅ | hład | [228] hlamhi ||  
 hbri | hgu | rdzor<sup>2</sup> | hwa | hrśaṅ | hlamhi |  
 brah | hraḥ | gsaṅ | re | hwaḥ<sup>3</sup> | glaḥ<sup>4</sup> | [229] hrśaṅ | hgam |  
 lamhi |  
 sñaṅ | ñe | hldir<sup>5</sup> | hgwaḥ | hrśaṅ | hlamhi | 5  
 rñe | hkhyam | hldyaṅ | dze | [230]<sup>6</sup> rñe | ge | hład | hi ||  
 hwa | bzer | hśid | re | hrtaḥ | huraṅ<sup>7</sup> | glyañ |  
 hwa | bzer | [231] hrpag | re | rñe | hład | hbyamna ||  
 rgyed | ma | hldaṅ | ge | hso | hnaḥ | hrğaḥ ||  
 htor | [232] hrta | rme | ge | hso | hnaḥ | stor || 10  
 hdzaṅ | hğlaḥ | hnag | dze | rñe | hład | ge | hlam |  
 gaḥ<sup>8</sup> | [233] glaḥ | hład | hnar<sup>9</sup> | hkhab | h<sup>10</sup>gro | htron ||  
 hdzaṅ | gla | hnag | dze | hchir | htśaḥ<sup>11</sup> | sto | [234]  
 htśag | hro | hbehi | hbar | hso | hnaḥ | gceg |  
 hdzaṅ | hğlaḥ<sup>12</sup> | nag | ge | hbehi | hbaḥ | [235] htog | 15  
 hbe | hbaḥ | hnaḥ | sto | hso | hnaḥ | rmaṅ | dze | htōḥo |  
 rñe | lad | thor | dze | ca | [236] yaṅ | htor |  
 dguḥu | hmu | to | re | hraḥ | hldi | naṅ | re | h | glaḥ<sup>13</sup> | hład |  
 hlamna<sup>14</sup> || [237]  
 hldi | rgyed | hrar |<sup>15</sup> hğla | hład | hbyamna ||  
 rñe | hkhyam | hldyaṅ | re ||<sup>16</sup> rñe | ge | hład | hi | [238] 20  
 gse | hbo<sup>17</sup> | bon | re | hład | maḥ | maḥna<sup>18</sup> |  
 hseḥe | hldu | hru | re | dze | hphag | hbaḥ | [239] ge | hyor ||  
 hcha | hğrah | nu | nar<sup>19</sup> | dze |<sup>20</sup> hkhab | hgro | ge | hkaḥi ||  
<sup>21</sup>rñe | hład | [240]<sup>22</sup> rpag | re | gse | hlda | hład | hlamhi |  
 gse | hład | htor | dze | hcaḥ | [241] hyaṅ | hbro | na || 25  
 hño | rgam | kho | re | smyi | hnu<sup>23</sup> | hgyaṅs |  
 smyi | hnu | mye | re | tha | hnu | [242] hrğyaṅ | sto | smyi |  
 hnu | htō ||  
 gse | hład | thor | dze | hchaḥ | yaṅ | thor |

<sup>1</sup> Read rdzo-re ?<sup>2</sup> Read rdzo-re ?<sup>3</sup> h added below line.<sup>4</sup> h added below line.<sup>5</sup> Read hldi-re ?<sup>6</sup> s here crossed out.<sup>7</sup> Read hraṅ.<sup>8</sup> gaḥ perhaps a faulty anticipation of glaḥ.<sup>9</sup> Read hnar-re ? Cf. l. 224.<sup>10</sup> b here crossed out.<sup>11</sup> A correction (of htśar).<sup>12</sup> h added below line.<sup>13</sup> Read hğlaḥ (for h | glaḥ).<sup>14</sup> n below line.<sup>15</sup> rgya here crossed out. Read hraḥ-re ?<sup>16</sup> Sic (for I).<sup>17</sup> Corrected from n.<sup>18</sup> na added below line.<sup>19</sup> nu | nar, below line, correction of hdzu | hdzaḥ.<sup>20</sup> Punctuation reinforced.<sup>21</sup> k here crossed out.<sup>22</sup> hlamhi here crossed out.<sup>23</sup> nu underline correction (of di).

gse | hład | [243] hnar<sup>1</sup> | hkhah | gro | htronhi ||  
 hldi | hrgyed | hrar<sup>2</sup> | gse | hbo | hbon | hład | ma | mahna |  
 [244]  
 dguhu | mu | hto | re | hraḥ | hldi | hnañ | re | gse | hład |  
 hbyamna ||  
 gse | lad | [245] rpag | re | hpro | hbo | hbon ||<sup>3</sup> re | hład | ma |  
 ma | hna |  
 5 dgu | hmu | htor<sup>4</sup> | hpro | [246] hbo<sup>5</sup> | hbon<sup>6</sup> | hraḥ | hldi |  
 . hnañra | hład | ma | mahna |  
 hldi | hrgyed | hrar<sup>7</sup> | hpro | hbo | [247] hbon | re | hład | ma |  
 hman<sup>8</sup> ||  
 gse | stoñ | stsar | re | hład | hton | myen |  
 hcām | [248] hjam<sup>9</sup> | htam | hldir<sup>10</sup> | gse | htaḥ | hdam | na ||  
 hldi | rgyed | h<sup>11</sup>rar | rgyed | htre | hte | [249] ge | gse | hso |  
 hkon || : : ||  
 10 htsa<sup>12</sup> | re | hldaḥ | ge | hra | hyañ | phyr<sup>13</sup> |<sup>14</sup> bañ | hreḥe | [250]  
 hrpod | hbos | re<sup>15</sup> | hbron | re | ge | rmo | hkum | hceg |  
 hltaḥ<sup>16</sup> | hstsah<sup>17</sup> | hyer | ge [251] hño | hkhog | hlto | ge |  
 hbañ | hreḥe | hkheḥe | hbañ | hre | hgeḥe | na |  
 jo | re | h<sup>18</sup>geḥe | [252] re | hlab | re | hge |  
 15 sta | re | mo | ge | sta | g-ri | hbañ |  
 sta | bañ | rpag | re | hyah<sup>19</sup> | [253] me | bbyam | re |  
 jo | me | hbyam | re | hlab | me | hbyam | na || : ||  
 hbañ | hldoñ | hrpag [254] re | hldañ | phyer | hbrahr<sup>20</sup> |  
 hldyo | htor | hmyi || na |  
 20 hyog | hpraḥ | hdag | dze | hdrañ | [255] re | hphraḥ |  
 ssām | stom | hdag | dze | hsar | stomhi |  
 hsañ | hdzah | hldyim | hyañ<sup>21</sup> | [256] ldyoḥu | ma | hbyoḥu |  
 rgam | hgah | hkañ | hyañ | hrag | ma | hbog ||  
 htas | kro | hldoñ [257] re | hyah | rmaḥ | htsagna |  
 25 htor | htas | prom | hrom | neḥu | hso | bos |

<sup>1</sup> Read hnar-re ?<sup>2</sup> = hraḥ-re ? Cf. l. 246.<sup>3</sup> Sic: erroneous punctuation.<sup>4</sup> Read hto-re ? : cf. ll. 225, 236, 244.<sup>5</sup> ñ here crossed out and replaced by | .<sup>6</sup> Insert re ?<sup>7</sup> rahr ? : h added below line. Cf. ll. 243, 248.<sup>8</sup> Sic (for mahna).<sup>9</sup> hjam marked for omission.<sup>10</sup> Read hldi-re ?<sup>11</sup> h a corrector's addition: read hraḥ-re ? Cf. ll. 243, 246.<sup>12</sup> A correction of htsa or htso.<sup>13</sup> Correction from phyer.<sup>14</sup> m here crossed out.<sup>15</sup> re a correction of a badly written r.<sup>16</sup> rta added here below line (and then crossed out?).<sup>17</sup> ts of hstsah inked over or added.<sup>18</sup> h inked over.<sup>19</sup> mye here crossed out.<sup>20</sup> Read hbrahr-re ?<sup>21</sup> Underline correction of hyañ: a yañ also is here crossed out.

hño | [258] stor | dze | hwam | nehu | hka<sup>1</sup>h<sup>1</sup>mna ||  
 hrta | wa | hdañ | dze | hño | hdañ | prom |  
 sé | rgo | [259] hldom | dze | hpañ | hrgam | hnam ||  
 hkhwi | ht<sup>2</sup>sa | hyog | hdag | ci | hrañ | [260] hdrom<sup>2</sup> | gdes ||  
 h<sup>3</sup>sas | hdrañ | hdag | chi | hgo | h<sup>3</sup>sor | re | hyun | 5  
 h<sup>3</sup>sas | [261] hnañ | hdag | chi | phyer | chañ | hson ||  
 g-rub | hgo<sup>4</sup>ho | hdag | ci | twañ | mñar | [262] h<sup>3</sup>sogna ||  
 gsas | pañ | hdzo | hdza | cañ | sme | hme | hkehi ||  
 g-rah | nag | [263] hbo | gyañ | chañ |<sup>3</sup>rdzum | me | g-wehi ||  
 gsañ | ra | gsañ | kya | [264] gsañ | hdzam | re | hldan | 10  
 hño | ra | hño | kya | hño | hdzam | re | hldan |  
 gsañ | [265] ra | gsañ<sup>4</sup> | ge | gsañ | tañ | hrtehu ||  
 hño | ra | hñon<sup>5</sup> | kya | hñon | ta | gb<sup>6</sup>lañ | [266]  
<sup>6</sup>trog | htor | hte | dze | hbyim | ge | g-yaha<sup>7</sup> |  
 hpu | hbos | hyañ | ge | hdro | [267] hko | hnag | 15  
 hsañ | hyer | hyañ | ge | hkog | hkho | rño ||  
 hpra | hre | <sup>8</sup>hyañ | (ge) [268] hwad<sup>9</sup> | hdañ | krañ ||  
 hkyañ | hrgyañ | hyañ | ge | hmu | klag | g<sup>10</sup>sim ||<sup>10</sup>  
 ht<sup>11</sup>sañ | [269] hdzañ | hyañ | ge | hwañ | ne | hbrañ ||  
 smyi | glog | g-yañ | ge ||<sup>11</sup> hwañ | hrño | hjam | hma | 20  
 [270] hso | hnañ | hyañ | ge | hbañ | hbom | rbo ||  
 hwañ | hldañra | ht<sup>12</sup>sañra | na | hwa | [271] rgya | hrko | hrkabs |  
 htor | hrtah | g-yañ | ge | hldyañ | ma | g-yehi ||  
 hldyañ | pañ | [272] hro | re | hmehi | hpañ | hyañ ||  
 hko | hrño | h<sup>12</sup>yañ | ge | rgya | rko | rkabs [273] 25  
 gsañ | hrañ | htoñ | kya | hño<sup>13</sup>ho | hjam | re | hldan |  
 hwi | hwa | se | kyañ | [274] hkyañ | hdzam | re | hldan ||  
 hldyim | hste | hpuhi | ge | rñe | hdzam | re | hldan | [275]  
 hldañha<sup>14</sup> | gsom | hphañha<sup>15</sup> | ge | twañ | hdzam | nehe ||  
 hño | re | hlo | ge | hkyi | [276] hdzam | hp<sup>16</sup>huhi | 30  
 hsu | re ||<sup>16</sup> hru | ge | g-rah | hdzam | nag ||  
 gsañ | re | [277] ht<sup>17</sup>sañ | re | hrañ | ge | hldoñ | hjam | rño ||  
 hkor | re | hpañ | ge | h<sup>18</sup>sam | [278] hdzam | nag ||  
 rta | hwa | hldañ | ra | hldañ | htag | htos |  
 gsañ | ra | [279] gsañ | ge<sup>17</sup> | gsañ | htag | htos | 35

<sup>1</sup> h added below line.<sup>2</sup> hdom ? A correction (of hgrom ?).<sup>3</sup> sme | g-wehi here crossed out.<sup>4</sup> n added below line.<sup>5</sup> For hño | na ?<sup>6</sup> h or s (?) here crossed out.<sup>7</sup> g-yarka ? Perhaps g-yañ was intended.<sup>8</sup> l here crossed out.<sup>9</sup> hrwad ?<sup>10</sup> Punctuation reinforced.<sup>11</sup> Sic.<sup>12</sup> w here crossed out.<sup>13</sup> ho crossed out ?<sup>14</sup> h added below line.<sup>15</sup> Sic.<sup>16</sup> Sic.<sup>17</sup> Sic (for kya ?).

hño | rah | hño | kya<sup>1</sup> | hño | htag | [280] hton(a) ||  
 gnaḥ | ma | dwañ | dze | ḥkhab | rgye | ge | ḥthwañ ||  
 myag | ma<sup>2</sup> | ḥtsar | dze | ḥbo | [281] hram | ge | ḥsod | tsa |  
 ḥldyañ | ma | gnaḥ | dze | stom | ḥkañ | ge | hnan |  
 5 [282] ḥtsag<sup>3</sup> na | na | ḥldyañ | rgyeb<sup>4</sup> | ḥpuḥi | ḥpuḥi ||  
 ḥség | sme | ge | ḥrim | ḥdzom [283] ḥpañ | tsa | ge |  
 ḥgaḥ | ḥrag | re | ḥgaḥ | rag | ḥdaḥ | ta | ḥbogni<sup>5</sup> |  
 ség | [284] sme | ge | ḥrim | ḥdzom | re | ḥrim | ḥdzom | ḥtaḥ |  
 ḥldun || tsu | re | [285] ḥldaḥ | ḥtag | ḥto(na) ||  
 10 ḥrkom<sup>6</sup> | ḥbroñ | ḥkrur<sup>7</sup> | ḥdzañ | ḥ<sup>8</sup>yaḥ ||<sup>9</sup> [286] ḥthañ ||  
<sup>10</sup>rpeḥi | ḥldaḥ | ḥrgam | re | ḥldog | ḥyaḥ | ḥthañ |  
 mor | [287] ḥkyañ | ḥldoñ | re | ḥbos<sup>11</sup> | g-yaḥ | ḥthañ<sup>12</sup> ||  
 ḥyañ | ḥkaḥ | rdzar<sup>13</sup> | [288] ḥstsah<sup>14</sup> | ḥyaḥ | ḥt(h)añ |  
 ḥrleḥi | ḥswaḥ | hram | re | <sup>15</sup>ḥsli | ḥdzañ | ḥthañ<sup>16</sup> [289]  
 15 ḥkru | ḥyog | rñor<sup>17</sup> | ḥgar | ḥpu | ḥthañ ||  
 rta | ḥgam | ḥpar | re | [290] ḥso | ḥnaḥ | ḥthañ ||  
 ḥyañ | <sup>18</sup>ḥkaḥ<sup>19</sup> | rdzar<sup>20</sup> | ḥ<sup>21</sup>stsah | ḥriḥi | ḥpañ ||  
 ḥbos | g-ri | [291] ḥpañ | <sup>22</sup>dze | ḥkyañ | ḥldoñ | re | ḥñaḥ ||  
 ḥbos | ḥriḥi | ḥkhoḥo | dze | ḥrgyaḥ | ḥñi | ḥkeḥe |  
 20 ḥtsah | por<sup>23</sup> | [292] dze | ḥrñe | ḥkham | ge | ḥrgyeg || dze |  
 ḥtab | ḥkhoḥu | ḥkhoḥu || ge | ḥkyañ | ḥldoñ | ḥgyañ | sto |  
 ḥkyañ | [293] ḥldoñ | ḥkhor<sup>24</sup> | ḥbos | ḥriḥi | ḥruḥu ||  
 ḥtor | ḥpuḥu | ḥbos | dze | ḥrim | ge | ḥgrus |  
 ḥkyañ | [294] ḥldoñ | ḥkhor<sup>25</sup> | ḥbos | ḥyaḥ | ḥto | na |  
 25 ḥriḥi | ḥdom | ḥkyim | re | ḥri | ḥkruḥu | ḥbroḥo ||  
 [295] ḥstsah | ḥri | ḥkho | dze<sup>26</sup> || ḥrgya | ḥñi | ḥkaḥe<sup>27</sup> |  
 ḥtsa | phor | dze | hño | ḥkho | ḥsog | ge | ḥdzom | dze |  
 ḥtab | [296] ḥkhoḥu | ḥkhoḥu | ge | ḥkhaḥḥ<sup>28</sup> | ḥrdza | ḥdze | ḥgyañ |  
 na |  
 30 ḥkaḥ | ḥrdza | ḥkhor | ḥswaḥ | g-ri | ḥto | na |

<sup>1</sup> Correction (of kyañ).<sup>2</sup> m an insertion.<sup>3</sup> g below line: ḥtsa | gna intended?<sup>4</sup> b inked over.<sup>5</sup> ḥbogni?, the n an insertion.<sup>6</sup> Corrected, below line, from ḥklom.<sup>7</sup> Read ḥkru-re?<sup>8</sup> w here crossed out.<sup>9</sup> Punctuation erroneous (end of line).<sup>10</sup> sp here crossed out.<sup>11</sup> Correction from ḥldog.<sup>12</sup> h, ḥ and th crossed out or corrected?<sup>13</sup> Read rdza-re? Cf. ll. 290, 296.<sup>14</sup> Correction from ḥsrad.<sup>15</sup> Some sign crossed out before sli.<sup>16</sup> ñ below line.<sup>17</sup> Read rño-re; cf. ll. 171, 322, 339.<sup>18</sup> ḥ here crossed out.<sup>19</sup> ḥ below line.<sup>20</sup> Read rdza-re? Cf. l. 287.<sup>21</sup> ts (or c) here crossed out.<sup>22</sup> r (?) here crossed out.<sup>23</sup> Read po-re; cf. l. 295.<sup>24</sup> Read ḥkhor-re?<sup>25</sup> Read ḥkhor-re?<sup>26</sup> dze crossed out?<sup>27</sup> For ḥkeḥ? Cf. l. 53.<sup>28</sup> Sic.

ḥscaḥ | [297] ḥyer | ḥri | dze | ḥrim | ge | ḥgrus ||  
 ḥriḥi | ḥdom | ḥkyim | re | ḥrgyeb | ḥkru | ḥbro |  
 rñeḥe | ḥbrom | ḥri | [298] dze | ḥrñi | ḥbos | stsaḥ<sup>1</sup> ||  
 rtah | ḥswaḥ | g-weḥe | ḥbos | ḥstsaḥ | ḥldaḥ ||  
 ḥpus<sup>2</sup> | ḥpḥyaḥ | myi | cañ | g-riḥi | [299] ḥldom | ḥkam | 5  
 ḥse | ḥse | ḥldon | ḥcañ | g-ri | sti | ḥyor | re |  
 ḥri | ḥño | ḥdzoñ | g-yog | re | [300] rgyaṅ | ge | ḥriḥi | sti |  
 ḥyor | re ||  
 ḥrim | ḥldoḥu | ḥsañ | ḥyañ | ḥri | ḥgru | gras | re | ḥri | ḥci  
 [301] ḥwad<sup>3</sup>ḥi ||  
 ḥrtah | swa | g-wer<sup>4</sup> | g-ri | ḥrde | ḥldaḥ ||  
<sup>5</sup>rñe | ne | g-ri | dze | ḥldim | ḥphu | ḥmañ | [302] 10  
 ḥmañ | ḥriḥi | ḥphañ | dze | ḥgaḥ<sup>6</sup> | ḥldoñra | ḥñah<sup>7</sup> | na |  
 ḥrgyeg | ḥsñi<sup>8</sup> | ḥrñoḥo<sup>9</sup> | ge | ḥgaḥ | [303] ḥldon | <sup>10</sup>ḥkyud ||  
 ḥrñe | ḥldaḥ | ḥror<sup>11</sup> || ḥmañ | ḥkhu | stañ ||  
 ḥdom | ḥgu | ḥtsuḥu [304] ḥyañ | ḥmañ | ḥldyo | ḥrgam |  
 ḥdom | ḥgu | ḥtsu | ge | ḥyaḥ | ḥdad | ḥphaḥ | na | 15  
 ḥmañ | rgam | [305] ḥgre | na | ḥriḥi | ḥrgam | gre | ḥe ||  
 gdzu | ḥbyi | ḥnañ | re | ḥmañ | nañ | ḥyu ||  
 ḥbrad | re | ḥpaḥ | [306] yañ | ḥmañ | ge | ḥrgam | ḥjiḥi ||  
 ḥbrad | re | ḥpaḥ | ge | ḥbrad | sta | ḥsid | re | ḥyaḥ | ḥdaḥd |  
 [307] ḥñah | na | ḥmañ | na | ḥmañ | ḥrgam | gre | na | ḥram || 20  
 ḥ<sup>12</sup>glyaṅ | ḥse | ge | gzu | ḥbyi | ḥkyud | [308]  
 gdzu | ḥbyi | ḥnañ | re | ḥmañ | ḥri | ḥwas ||  
 ḥgā | ḥldon | ḥrañ | re | ḥmañ | g-ri | ḥpañ | [309] na  
 dgu | ḥldo | ḥtor | ge | ḥmañ | g-riḥi | ḥkuñ ||  
 ḥmu | wa | rño | ge | ḥgaḥ | [310] | ḥldon | ḥkyud || 25  
 ḥgaḥ | ḥldon | ḥrañ | re | ḥldim | ḥmañ | ḥto ||  
 rñe | ḥldaḥ | ḥror<sup>13</sup> | [311] ḥmañ | sta | meḥi ||  
 gdzu | ḥbyi | ḥnañ | re | ḥri | staḥ | meḥi |  
 ḥgaḥ | ḥldon | ḥrañ | <sup>14</sup>[312] g-riḥi | sta | meḥi |  
 ḥdom | ḥguḥu | rmar<sup>15</sup> | ḥri | staḥ | meḥi | 30  
 ḥjuḥu | ḥbrad | rmar<sup>16</sup> | g-ri | sta | [313] meḥi |  
 na | g-ri | ḥkruḥu | ḥbro ||  
 ḥmor | ḥso | ḥbod<sup>17</sup> | ge | ḥrkom | ḥkru | ḥsud | na |

<sup>1</sup> stsaḥ added below line.<sup>2</sup> ḥphus ?<sup>3</sup> d added below line.<sup>4</sup> Read g-we-re.<sup>5</sup> rgya here crossed out.<sup>6</sup> ḥ below line.<sup>7</sup> ḥ below line (a correction of r).<sup>8</sup> ñ a correction of m.<sup>9</sup> Correction from ḥñoḥu.<sup>10</sup> ra | ḥñah || here crossed out, leaving ||.<sup>11</sup> Read ḥro-re: cf. l. 310.<sup>12</sup> j or rñ here crossed out.<sup>13</sup> Read ḥro-re: cf. l. 303.<sup>14</sup> Insert re: cf. l. 308.<sup>15</sup> Read rma-re ?<sup>16</sup> Read rma-re ?<sup>17</sup> Underline corrected from ḥbos.

gyañ | [314] g-ri | hjim | hño | hkhog | re | hpah |  
 g-rah | hsañ | hkhehe || na || hñor | hdzañ | rgo | [315] htoho ||  
 rgo | hrañ | hñor | hdzañ | hyah | htoho || hyah | htañ | rmar |  
 hyah | [316] hkruhu | hbro | re | hrgyeb | hkruho<sup>1</sup> || hyañ | hldyañ |  
 5 hkyer | ge | hldāh | hrgam | hstsag | [317] hldog | hpo | hrbom |  
 htoho || po | rbom | hñor | hldog | g-yah | to | dze | hwa | ne | hphe |  
 [318] <sup>1</sup>hyah | htañ | rmar | hyah | hkruhu | hbro || hldēhi | hswah |  
 hmor | hslī | hdzañ | ldyoño<sup>2</sup> | [319] <sup>1</sup>rgya | hñi | hke | hldēhi | swah |  
 rśañ || hrgyah | hñi | hke | hrim | re | hldoḥu | <sup>1</sup>hrgyah | [320] hñi |  
 10 hke | g-yog | re | hrgyañ | rñe | re | hñoḥo || hkhru | re | hkyañ |  
 hldēhi | swah | rśañ | ha<sup>3</sup> | [321] stoñ | hpoñ | hprom | ge | hldēhi |  
 hswa | hrśañ | re | hrgyeb<sup>4</sup> | kruhu | hpro || khru | hyog | [322]  
 rñor<sup>5</sup> | hgar | hpu | hches | hño | hkhob | hprom | re | hrñe | rdam |  
 hte<sup>6</sup> | he | ge | hkhruhu | [323] hyog | hsud | re | hche | rgyo | hkyim | re |  
 15 hrgyeb | hkruhu | hbro | re | g-yah | [324] hpañ | hwag |  
 hdzoḥu | hkru | hyog | re | hdzoḥu | hkhad | htohi |  
 hbri | hdzoḥu | kyim [325] re | hyah | hkruhu | hbro || ||  
 hse<sup>7</sup>he | hkoḥo | hgyan || re | hlab | hko | hgyan || [326]  
 hñah | hpag | hldir<sup>8</sup> | hse | htañ | hdam ||  
 20 htrog | hdre | hte | re | hrgye<sup>9</sup> | hyo | hrañ<sup>10</sup> na [327] ge | gse |  
 hko | hgyan ||  
 hsehe | hko | ḥo | hgyan | ge<sup>11</sup> | hrgyah | hdihi | htron | re |  
 hkah<sup>12</sup> | [328] hpyah | hldan ||  
 | ñene sñañ | hldir | hkhoh<sup>13</sup> | htañ<sup>14</sup> | hdamna |  
 hñah | hpag | ldir<sup>15</sup> | [329] bri | gśe | hpuhi | re |  
 hkhah | gsañ | hrañ | re | hkho | hdañ | hdamna ||  
 25 htor | hpuhu [330] hbos | dze | hrgyo | hśeg | gśegra<sup>16</sup> | ge |  
 rgyo | hto | stiñ ||  
 rta | hśā | g-yer | dze | rbyo<sup>17</sup> | [331] gśeg | gśer | ge | rgyo | hto |  
<sup>18</sup>stiñ |  
 hgu | hmor | hkrur<sup>19</sup> | hrkom | hbroñ | hprañ | [332]  
 śes | hkeg | hrko | hge | hklu | hprañ | hyuhu ||  
 hkham | re | hrdañ | yañ | hrkom | [333] hpyi | hprañ ||

<sup>1</sup> ḥo a correction (of huho).

<sup>3</sup> ha added below line.

<sup>6</sup> Read rño-re: cf. l. 289.

<sup>8</sup> Read hldi-re or hldir-re: cf. ll. 328, 337.

<sup>9</sup> Sic for rgyed: cf. l. 338.

<sup>11</sup> hkah here written below line.

<sup>13</sup> h added below line.

<sup>14</sup> hkah above this and below ge cf. l. 327.

<sup>15</sup> Read ldi-re or ldir-re? Cf. l. 326.

<sup>17</sup> For rgyo?

<sup>18</sup> rt here crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> bo? or a correction of bo?

<sup>4</sup> b a correction (of ñ?).

<sup>7</sup> hi here crossed out.

<sup>10</sup> ñ added below line.

<sup>12</sup> h below line.

<sup>16</sup> Sic (for gśer: see l. 331).

<sup>19</sup> Read hkru-re?



hldi | hro | hgoñ | re | hkeg | hrko<sup>1</sup> | hrko | hyuñu ||  
 gsah | rkañ | [334] glar<sup>2</sup> | hwah | hrog | hldoñ |  
 hwah | hrog | rño | ge | hkeg | rko | hwad |  
<sup>3</sup>kruñu | [335] hthe | hprañ | dze | h<sup>4</sup>rog | ge | hro |  
 hwad | hwah | rño | ge | rgyoño | hto | stiñ | [336] 5  
 rmañ | hwi | hkho | ge | rgyoño | hto | st<sup>5</sup>iñ |  
 klu | htañ | rgyoñon | re | hśes | ta | hrgyon ||  
 sto | the | the | re | [337] stor | htañ | hdzon |  
 htor | hrtañ | hldir<sup>6</sup> | hstor | ma | swañ ||  
 tor | hrtañ | <sup>7</sup>rme [338] ge | stor | hdzo | hdzeñi | 10  
 htrog | hdreñe | hte | re | hrgyed | hño | hrañ | ge | hstor | hdzo |  
 [339] hdzeñi |  
 sroñ | hñe | hśer<sup>8</sup> | stor | hdeñi | hpyid |  
 hkyu | hldoñ | hrñor<sup>9</sup> | hkyañ | hwa | [340] ñer<sup>10</sup> | hstor | hdeñi |  
 hpyid ||  
 htor | hrtañ | rme | ge | hstor | ma | hsañ | phyer | ma | hswañ |  
 [341] rñe | hprom | hldir<sup>11</sup> | hphyar | ma | hswañ | 15  
 rgyed | hrañ | htor<sup>12</sup> | pyar | ma | swañ |  
 htor | htañ | [342] rme | ge | phyer | htso | htseñi ||  
 klu | hldo | sme | re | mye<sup>13</sup> | hrañ | htñeñ | ge |  
 hko | rño | klu | re | [343]<sup>14</sup> | rñe | hñe | hśes |  
 hldyañ | hpu | hbri | re | meñi | hklu | hcañ | 20  
 sroñ | ñe | gśe | re | ldañ<sup>1</sup> [344] [hdeñi]<sup>15</sup> | hpyid || ||  
 hbo | hron | hrog | re | hlah | hkyañ | hras | re | hśes | gśi |  
 [345] [hdzuñi] ||  
 rgyeb | hchi | hro<sup>16</sup> | re | gdag | yañ | la | por<sup>17</sup> | hśes | hśi | hdzuñi ||  
 hyu | htsañ | kyim | [346] re | hdam | sleg | glom || 25  
 rta | hsañh<sup>18</sup> | g-yer | ge | hdam | sleg | gciñi ||  
 hyu | hgyi | ka | [347] dze | hrim | gleñu | ge | hśig ||  
 stañ | hro | hra | dze | hrñeñe | hño | ge | hpom ||  
 glyañ | ru [348] hñu | hñur | dze | hrim | gleñu | ge | hci |  
 hgw<sup>19</sup>eg | hweñe | hphañ | hphañ | dze | htñar | phyañ [349] ge |  
 hrub || 30  
 sri | ge | gsen | hse | ge | hchan | hjim | htsoñ | ge | rmon ||

<sup>1</sup> g here crossed out.      <sup>2</sup> Read gla-re ?      <sup>3</sup> kluñu ? slu here crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> Something here crossed out.      <sup>5</sup> t inked over.

<sup>6</sup> Read hldi-re: cf. ll. 326, 328.      <sup>7</sup> hldir here crossed out.

<sup>8</sup> Read hśe-re, as in l. 343.      <sup>9</sup> Read hrño-re.      <sup>10</sup> Read ñe-re.

<sup>11</sup> Read hldi-re ?      <sup>12</sup> Read hto-re ?      <sup>13</sup> Or rgye for rgyed ?

<sup>14</sup> rgye, error for the following rñe, here crossed out.      <sup>15</sup> ?

<sup>16</sup> g here crossed out.      <sup>17</sup> la | por added below line: cf. l. 349.

<sup>18</sup> For htsañ ? The first h(ã) (for ts ?) added below line.

<sup>19</sup> w inked over.

1por | ge | [350]<sup>2</sup> hyu | hstsah | hkyim | re | hcihi | htoho | ge |  
 hnan ||  
 na | hldom<sup>3</sup> | hgor [351] hsehe | hti | ge | hnan ||  
 hyu | hstsah | hkyim | re | hdam | sleg | gtsob | don |  
 glyañ | ru | [352] gtsob | re | mehi | cha | hrñe || ||  
 5 hphu | hphu<sup>4</sup> | mur<sup>5</sup> | hdzu | hdro | hkus |  
 nañ | pa | hsam | re | [353] hwah | hrañ | hbyamna |  
 gzu | hdro | hphor<sup>6</sup> | hchi | hdo | hdyañ |  
 hbron | hldar | hdzam | re | do | ldo | hdro | hpehi<sup>7</sup> | [354]  
 hrañ | hrtre | hdub<sup>8</sup> |  
 htor | hso | hti | ge | htañ | hldun | hbañna |  
 10 hrtah | nañ | hwar<sup>9</sup> | [355] hthah | hbro | hgran |  
 hnur | hñah | rgyeñ | na | hñu | hldo | hldyoño ||  
 hyañ | re | rgyeñ | na | yañ [356] hldyah | hldyah ||  
 hdzoñ | hyo | hsid | 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 | hñar<sup>10</sup> [358] || ||  
 hpo | hldah | stor<sup>11</sup> | hrañ | hton | gsohu || dze<sup>12</sup> | rñe | ge | hgo ||  
 na | hgo | na | hgon |  
 rta | swa | [359] . . . hkoñu | hprom | htoho |  
 20 htor | hdro | hño | ge | hnu | glañ | slug | na |  
 nu | glañ | phor<sup>13</sup> | [360] . . . mo<sup>14</sup> | hna |  
 hrtah | swah | hpeg<sup>15</sup> | na | hkehu | hprom | to || na |  
 hnu | glañ | rño | ge | kehu [361] pr[o]m | glañ | na | kehu |  
 prom | pwañ<sup>16</sup> |  
 htor | hdro | hño | ge | hrñe | hpo | hñe | ge | hkoñu | prom |  
 [362] hdzoño || na | gehu | prom | pwañ |  
 25 hkehu | prom | sñar | hthah | hrbyo<sup>17</sup> | htoho |  
 hdza | ma | hñyoñ<sup>18</sup> | re | [363] hke | ma | hñyoñ<sup>19</sup> | hmu | lom |  
 ge | hbyim |

<sup>1</sup> hlah here crossed out: cf. l. 345. Perhaps por-ge also was intended to be crossed out.

<sup>2</sup> hgon here crossed out.

<sup>3</sup> Correction (of hldoh): hgom here crossed out.

<sup>4</sup> The second [h]phu crossed out?

<sup>5</sup> Read mu-re?

<sup>6</sup> Read hpho-re or hphor-re? Cf. l. 183.

<sup>7</sup> do . . . hpehi in margin (to be inserted here?).

<sup>8</sup> hñub?

<sup>9</sup> Read hwar-re or hwa-re?

<sup>10</sup> hñad? (inked over).

<sup>11</sup> Read stor-re or sto-re?

<sup>12</sup> rgye here crossed out.

<sup>13</sup> Read phor-re or pho-re?

<sup>14</sup> mu here crossed out.

<sup>15</sup> Read hphyegs? Cf. l. 176.

<sup>16</sup> ñ correction from g.

<sup>17</sup> hbyo? (inked over). Sñar = sñar-re?

<sup>18</sup> hñyoñe? hñyoñe?

<sup>19</sup> hñyeñe? hñyeñe?

hkoḥu ||<sup>1</sup> hbañ | kwa | kwa<sup>2</sup> | ge | re | hnaḥ |  
 ḥdza | ma | [364] hñe | na | rta | ge | ḥtom | ḥpahaḥ |  
 ḥke | ma | hñyeḥe<sup>3</sup> dze | ḥtor | ge | ḥdzo | ḥtseh |  
 ḥkeḥu | ḥkaḥ | dwañ [365] na | ḥldyañ | ḥkaḥ | dwañ |||  
 rgoñ | wa | myer<sup>4</sup> | rbyo | rgyer | ḥldyañ ||<sup>5</sup> 5  
 ḥtsog | ḥram | myer<sup>6</sup> | so | na | [366] ḥsid ||  
 rbyo | g-yer | ḥnor<sup>7</sup> | rgoñ | wa | síd ||  
 ḥkeḥu | prom | myer<sup>8</sup> | ḥnu | glañ | ldyañ ||  
 ḥldyañ | [367] ḥyah<sup>9</sup>ñ | ḥyo | doñ | gnaḥ<sup>10</sup> | ḥgoñ | myag ||  
 ḥsañ | khyañ | dzwe | ḥyañ | ḥyo | doñ ||<sup>11</sup>ḥyahñ<sup>12</sup> | goñ | [368] 10  
 myag ||  
 gseḥe | cañ | ḥldyañ | dze | ḥrñam | ḥdar | ḥyuhu ||  
 ḥrño | ḥprañ | ḥram | dze | [369] ḥseḥe | rdzor | ḥnaḥ |  
 ḥldyañ | ḥgoḥo | ḥdzin<sup>13</sup> | re | meḥi | ḥraḥ | ḥdab na ||<sup>14</sup>  
 ḥldyañ | yuḥu [370] ḥrño<sup>15</sup> | dze | ḥlde | ge | ḥtaḥ | ḥldon |  
 meḥi | speḥi | ḥraḥ | je | ḥldeḥe | ge | ḥtaḥ | ḥldon | [371] 15  
 ḥdzam | ḥbron | ḥron | re<sup>16</sup>ḥbañ | ḥko | ḥtar | dze |<sup>17</sup>ḥlde | ge |  
 ḥtaḥ | ḥldon ||  
 ḥkrug | [372] kyañ | ḥldom | re | ḥrñe | ḥño | ḥdzar | dze |  
 ḥldeḥe | ge | ḥtaḥ | ḥldon ||  
 ḥldyañ | ḥyu | ḥjo<sup>18</sup> | [373] [dze] | ḥkad | ḥron | re | ḥrgyen |  
 ḥdzam | ḥbron | ḥron<sup>19</sup> | re | ḥbañ | ḥko | ḥtar | dze | ḥkad |  
 [374] [ḥ]ron | re | rgyen |  
 ḥtar | phyañ | ḥto | re | skyim | ḥse | ḥdzar || 20  
 ḥpahaḥ | ḥwe | ḥtho | ḥyah | pa- [375] . . ḥdzer<sup>20</sup> | ḥphyo | ḥli |  
 g<sup>21</sup>-we |  
 ség | sme | ḥldo | rbyi | ḥldyiḥi | ḥkad | ḥror<sup>22</sup> | rgyen |  
 [376] . . . rab | ḥgo | cig | dze | ḥkad | ḥron | re | rgyen ||  
 ḥdza | ḥtrog | ḥram | ḥdzar | [377] . . ḥpag | cig | dze | ḥkad |  
 ḥron | re | rgyen |||  
 ḥpahaḥ | ḥldañ | ḥro | dze | ḥse | ge | [378] ḥtul | re | ḥse | ge |  
 ḥlobḥi ||  
 ḥsaḥ | ḥtsañ | dzeñ<sup>23</sup> | rkom | ḥthul | na | rkom | ge | ḥron || 25

<sup>1</sup> Punctuation doubled by reviser.<sup>2</sup> ḥ here crossed out.<sup>3</sup> ḥe crossed out? Or inserted?<sup>4</sup> Read mye-re or myer-re ?<sup>5</sup> Punctuation a correction.<sup>6</sup> Read mye-re or myer-re ?<sup>7</sup> Read ḥnor-re ?<sup>8</sup> Read mye-re or myer-re ?<sup>9</sup> ḥ added below line ?<sup>10</sup> ḥ added below line.<sup>11</sup> Omit ḥyo-doñ || ? (metre).<sup>12</sup> ḥ added below line.<sup>13</sup> ḥjin ?<sup>14</sup> Or ḥdañ corrected to ḥdan ?<sup>15</sup> ḥjo ?<sup>16</sup> | here crossed out or reinforced.<sup>17</sup> A bad ḥ here crossed out.<sup>18</sup> ḥrño ?<sup>19</sup> Something here crossed out.<sup>20</sup> ḥrñer ? ḥdzar ?<sup>21</sup> y here crossed out.<sup>22</sup> ḥror ? (Error for ḥron | re ?).<sup>23</sup> ñ below line.

bos [379]—o[*g*] | *dze*[spe<sup>1</sup>]*hi* | *ge* | *hdza* | *na* | *spehi* || *ge* |  
*hthon* ||  
*ses* | *rtsig* | *moñ* | *ge* | *htsah* | [380] . . . . . *hrahi* | *hwehi* | *hrtah* |  
*ge* | *hrtsig* | *moñ* | *hkuñ* | *na* |  
*rtsig* | *moñ* | [381] *hsad* | *na* | *tsig* | *moñ* | *we* | *ge* | *htsah* | *hpu*<sup>2</sup> |  
*hloho* |  
*hbri* | *slod* | *hldo* | *dze* | *spo* | *ro* [382] *re* | *hto* ||  
5 *hdza* | *hlda*hi | *hne* | *ge* | *t*sa<sup>3</sup> | *hrgye* | *hrdza* | *na* |  
*hdzah* | *hlda*h | *hkuñ* | *na* | *hdza* | *ld* [383] *hsad* | *na* | *hdzah* |  
*hlda*h | *hwehi* | *ge* | *htsah* | *rgye* | *hlo* <sup>4</sup>  
*hyañ* | *hthe* | *ge* | *hsad* | *dze* | *ldyo* [384] *roho* | *hpahh*<sup>5</sup>*i* |  
*hdzam* | *hbroñ* | *hron* | *dze* | *hldyo* | *hro* | *hpehi* ||  
*hrsehi*<sup>6</sup> | *hpag* | *slog* [385] *dze* | *hrne*<sup>7</sup> | *hrom* | *ge* | *hti* | *na* |  
*hrne* | *ge* | *hrlomhi* | : |  
10 *hdzo*<sup>8</sup> | *chi* | *te* | *re* | *hlab* | *hñañ*<sup>9</sup> [386] *hyañ* | *htañ* | *hldyañ* |  
*hro*<sup>10</sup> | *hpehi* ||  
*hdzam* | *hbroñ* | *hron* || *hbañ* | *hko* | *htar* | [387] *cig* | *dze* |  
*hldyoñ* | *hro* | *hpehi* ||<sup>11</sup>  
*hldyañ* | *hyu* | *hjo* | *cig* | *dze* | *htor*<sup>12</sup> | *ge* | *hkroms* |  
[388] *mor* | *tsah* | *khrom* | *re* ||<sup>13</sup> *hyañ* | *t*sa | *hcer* ||  
15 *tor* | *kru* | *hrgyañ* | *re* | *hrtah* | *hpah* | *hphar* [389]  
*htor* | *sñañ* | *rñi* | *re* | *rta* | *hldag* | *hsag* | *hldyañ* | *hjo* | *hkromni* |  
<sup>14</sup>*hdzam* | *hbroñ* | *hron* | [390] *re* | *hbañ* | *hko* | *htar* | *ge* |  
*gdzu* | *hti* | *khyañ* | *hdag* | *ge* | *hko* | *hto* | *swad* |  
*skyañ* | *hbe* | [391] [*hkya*]*h* | *ge* | *hnañ* | *hdihi* | *htshur* ||  
20 *hldyañ* | *hyañ* | *hyo* | *ge* | *hgyah* | *hnañ* | *tsur* | [392]  
*hldyi* | *hi* | *rgyed* | *hrañ* | *htor* | *hbroñ* | *hgyañ* | *doñ* |  
*hron* | *ma* | *hño* | *re* | *htar*<sup>15</sup> | *ma* | *hgañ* [393]  
[*hrgyed* | *hśañ* | *sme* | *hyed* | *re* | *hbroñ* | *hk*[*ru*]*hu* | *hbro* ||  
*hpo* | *hdam* | *htor* | *-re-e-re*] [394] [. . . . . *rñ*—*m-dah* . . . . .  
*htor*<sup>16</sup>(?) *hbroñ*] [395] [. . . . . *hguñ* | *ge* | *gdañ* | *kum* ?]  
[396] [. . . *ge* | *gdañ* | *hgam*] [397] [. . . . . *rñu*(?)—*g* | *glañ*]  
[398] [. . . . . *bañ* | *dze* ?]. . .

1 ?

2 Corrected from *hpo*.3 *t*sa added below line.

4 Punctuation reinforced.

5 *h* below line. *hi* crossed out?6 Correction of *hsehi* ?7 *rdze* here crossed out?8 *hjo* ?9 *htañ* ?10 Punctuation due to reviser (correction of *h* ?).

11 Punctuation reinforced.

12 Correction from *htore* ?

13 Punctuation reinforced.

14 Punctuation reinforced.

15 *htañ* ?16 *hldi* ?

# VOCABULARY

(ALPHABETICAL ORDER of head-words according to the Tibetan system, the root-consonants, and their Prefixes in sequence (for details see Note),<sup>1</sup> 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 ḡyio°.

**kum**, 395.

**ke** = ḡke I, *q.v.* 199 ḡyāḡ-ḡñio°.

**keḡu** = ḡke II, ḡkeḡu, ḡeḡu, *q.v.* 176, 360-1 -prom; 177 -ḡkaḡ (p. 316).

**ko** = ḡko V, *q.v.* 202 rmañ-brio°.

**kwa-kwa** 363.

**kya** I, 96 -ḡtañ-ta.

II = *Tib.* skya, *crop* (p. 355). See also **kyāḡ**. 263 ḡsañ°; 264, 279 ḡño°; 265 ḡñon°; 273 ḡsañ-ḡrah-ḡtoñ° (p. 317).

— **-wa-ne** = ḡkyāḡ-ḡwa-ñe, *q.v.* 162 (pp. 253, 338).

**kyañ** = *Tib.* kyañ, *also, even* (pp. 204, 311-12) or = ḡkyañ II. See also **gyañ**. 98; 192 -ni; 372 (pp. 318, 345).

**kyañni**, 192. See **kyañ**.

**kyāḡ** = *kya* II, *crop*. 273 se° (pp. 297, 341).

**kyim** = ḡkyim, *home, taken home, q.v.* 324, 345 -re (pp. 218, 246).

**kyu** = ḡkyu, *speed, swift, q.v.* 161 -ldoñ; 214 -ḡldoñ (pp. 253, 255).

**kyeg** = *Tib.* khyag, ḡkhyags, *freeze, be congealed, numbed.* 102 ḡśio° (pp. 226, 301).

**kyen** = *Tib.* skyen, *quick, dexterous.* 103 the° (p. 322).

**kyer** = *Tib.* kyer, *erect, or = ḡkyer, q.v.* 136 -rbo; 145 ḡbo°.

**krañ** = *Tib.* krañ-ñe, kroñ, *stand-*

*ing upright; mkhrañ, ḡkhrañs, bkrañ, robust, hard, solid* (pp. 288-90). See also **ḡldañ-krañ/ḡkhrañ/ḡkhrañ**. 85 -ñur-ñur (p. 290).

**kru-ḡrgyañ** = ḡkhruo°. 388 (p. 312).

**kruḡu** = ḡkru, *q.v.* 321 -ḡpro = ḡbro; 334 -ḡthe.

**kro** = *Tib.* khro, ḡkhro, *anger.* 256 ḡtas°.

**kla** = *Tib.* klas, *abundant, unlimited.* 143 ḡgor°; 206 ḡkor° (pp. 238, 297).

**klag** I = *Tib.* glag, *lammergeyer.* 173 -ḡrwad (pp. 257, 341, 345).

II = *Tib.* glags, *occasion, season.* 268 ḡmu° (p. 298).

**klar** = glar, *q.v.*? 205 ḡrañ°.

**klu** = *Tib.* gloñ, ldoñ, loñ, *blind* (pp. 131, 138, 223). See also **mehi/ḡmehi-klu**. 5 -ḡe; 342 -re (pp. 223, 341).

— **-ḡtaḡ** (*a Suffix*, pp. 182-3). 336 (p. 223).

— **-ḡto** (*a Suffix*, pp. 184-5). 37 (p. 246).

— **-rto** 25 } *blind rock* (pp. 138, — **-ḡrto** 24 } 223).

— **-ḡldo** (*a Suffix*, pp. 186-7), *blindness.* 342.

**ḡkom**, *Prospective form of ḡkom* II, *q.v.* (pp. 137, n. 1, 200, 368). 222 swa° (p. 305).

**ḡkañ** I = *Tib.* gañ, *full, all.* See

<sup>1</sup> Note. The resultant order of consonants is as follows:—

K (g-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, ḡl-, s-, ḡs-); KH (ḡ-, s-); G (d-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, l-); Ñ (m-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-); C (g-, ḡ-, ḡs-); CH (g-, ḡ-); J (ḡ-, r-, ḡr-); Ñ̃ (g-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, s-); T (g-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, ḡl-, s-, ḡs-, ḡr-, ḡs-); TH (ḡ-); D (g-, d-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, l-, ḡl-, ḡl-); N (g-, ḡ-, ḡr-); P (b-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, l-, s-); PH (g-, b-, ḡ-); B (g-, b-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, s-); M (g-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, s-); TS (g-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-, s-, ḡs-); TSH (ḡ-); DZ (g-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-); W (g-, ḡ-); Ž (b-, r-); Z (g-, b-, ḡb-, ḡ-); H; Y (g-, ḡ-); R (g-, ḡ-); L (ḡ-); Š (g-, b-, ḡ-, ḡr-, s-); S (g-, b-, ḡ-, r-, ḡr-).

also **ḡgañ**. 52 ḡdya°; 151 nor-gso°; 168 sñiñ°; 164 chaḡ° (?); 190 wa° (?); 256 ḡgaḡ°; 281 stom° (pp. 147, 173, 228, 241, 285, 328).

II = *Tib.* khañ, *house*. See also **ḡkhañ**. 208 -ḡcig (p. 234).

**ḡkañ-ḡkañ**, *onomatopoeic* ? 11 ḡrwañ°; 184 ḡram° (p. 344).

**ḡkad** I = *Tib.* ḡkhod, ḡkhad, *build, settle*. ? 133 -re.

II = *Tib.* ḡad, *rock, precipice* ?

— **-ḡroñ** 373, 375–7 (p. 268).

**ḡkab** = *Tib.* khab, *house, family*. See also **ḡkhab**. 106 -ḡdro; 110 (p. 335).

**ḡkam** 83 -stañ; 130 ḡthañ-phu°; 299 g-riḡi-ḡldom°.

**ḡkaḡ** I = *Tib.* kha, *mouth, speech, occasion, or Tib.* bkaḡ, *word, command*. See also **ḡkhaḡ**. 117 ḡrañ°; 137 ḡwa°; 153 ḡke°; 158 ḡkeḡe°; 178 keḡu°, ldyañ°; 191 skar°; 204 ḡsañ°; 364 ḡkeḡu°; 365 ḡdyañ° (pp. 174, 179, 200, 218, 252, 275, 315–16, 338).

II = *Tib.* dkah, *steep, difficult, scarce*. See also **rkah**. 46 me° (p. 286).

— **-khab/ḡkhab**, *speech-concealing*. 105 -ḡkhab; 106 -khab (p. 315).

— **-ḡgañ**, *all talk*. 194, 207 (p. 315).

— **-ḡḡo** = *Tib.* kha-bsgo, *advice, or bkaḡ-bsgo, exhortation*. 105 (p. 315).

— **-ḡcog** = *Tib.* kha-cug, *counsel*. 105 (p. 315).

— **-ḡldom**, *mouth-bound* = *Tib.* kha-sdom, *gag; cf.* bkaḡ-ḡdoms, *instruction*. 66 (p. 314).

— **-ḡpyah**, *rebuke* (*Tib.* ḡphya). 327–8 (p. 315).

— **-ḡrañ**, *independent in speech; cf.* ḡrañ-ḡkah. 104 (p. 314).

— **-rdza/ḡrdza**, *accordant in speech*. See also **ḡkhaḡ**°. 287, 290, 296 (p. 315).

— **-ḡsañ**, *secret speech; cf.* ḡsañ-ḡkah. 214 (p. 314).

**ḡkahi** = ḡkaḡ I (?), *q.v.*, + ḡi. 239 (p. 315).

**ḡkaḡe** = ḡke I. 295 ḡrgya-ḡñi°.

**ḡkar** I = *Tib.* bkar, skar, gar, dgar, sgar, *separate off, pen, encampment* (pp. 247, 343). 45 ḡriñ-rwa°; 204 ḡor-ḡlda° (p. 343).

II, *for ḡkhar* ? 192 °rpag (p. 242).

**ḡkarni** = ḡkar I + ni; 204 (p. 343).

**ḡku** I, *a Suffix* = ḡgu, *Tib.* gu (p. 258). 22 smuḡu-ḡku = *Tib.* smi-gu, smyi-gu, smyig-ma, smyu-gu, smyug-ma, myu-gu, myug, *reed*.

II = *Tib.* ḡkhu, *vie, contend, offend, &c.* See also ḡkus; 152 °rño (pp. 228, 264).

**ḡkuñ**, *be hollowed out, or, metaphorically, cave in* = *Tib.* khuñ, *hole, pit* (pp. 266–7). 124 ḡldañ-krañ°; 309 g-riḡi°; 380 ḡrtsig-moñ°; 382 ḡdzah-ḡldaḡ° (pp. 180, 266, 270).

**ḡkum** ? = ḡkom II (*Tib.* ḡkhums, &c.), *q.v.* 250 rmo° (p. 294).

**ḡkuḡu** = *Tib.* khu, *sap, broth*. 74 °neḡu (p. 250).

**ḡkus**, *Aorist of ḡku* II. 352 ḡdro° (pp. 264, 285).

**ḡke** I *a Suffix used with numerals* (?) (pp. 241, 272). See also **ḡkeḡe**, **ḡkaḡe**. 54 ḡa°; 53, 199, 319, 320 ḡgyah-ḡñi°, &c.

II = *Tib.* khe, *profit, get, khe-pa, trader, &c.* (pp. 241–2, 289, 316–17, 363, 364).

— **-ḡkaḡ**, *trade-talk*, 52. See also **keḡu°**, **ḡkeḡu°**, **ḡkeḡe°**, **ḡeḡu°** (pp. 316–17).

— **-prom**, *profit-making*. See **prom**, **ḡprom**, &c., and also **keḡu°**, **ḡkeḡu°**, **ḡeḡu°**, 176.

— **-plañ-ḡdraḡ**, *bazar*. 195, 356; -ḡplañ-ḡdra (pp. 241–2).

**ḡkeḡ** = *Tib.* kag, keḡ, kag-ma, keḡ-ma, *mischievous, hindrance, injury, accident; dkag, constipation; bkag, bkog, obstruction, prohibition; skag, mischief, &c.; khag-po, difficult, &c.; kheḡs, ḡkheḡs, obstruct, debar, &c.; ḡag, wadding, quinsy; gags, obstructed; gegs, stoppage,*

- &c.; dgag, hinder, &c.; bgag, hinder, &c.; bgəgs, hindrance, &c.; hgag, hgags, obstruction; hgegs, hinder, &c. See also hgag, hrgeyeg.
- hkeg-hrko, rko** 332, 333, 334 (pp. 338, 340).
- hkehi** = hke II (?) + hi. 15 hstom-hkom<sup>o</sup>.
- hkehu** = hke II, kehu, q.v.
- **-hkaḥ** = hke II-hkaḥ. 364.
- **-prom**. 177-8, 362, 366 (pp. 274, 316, 335).
- **-me**, profit-fire. 170 (pp. 274-5, 285, 316).
- hkehe I** = hke I, q.v. 291 hrgyaḥ-hñi<sup>o</sup>.
- II = hke II, q.v. 125 slaḥ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 288-9, 335).
- (II) **-hkaḥ** = hke (II)<sup>o</sup>. 158 (p. 316).
- hkes**, Aorist form of hke II. 36 hpaḥ-hron<sup>o</sup> (p. 269).
- hko I** a Particle = Tib. ko, go (with Pronouns) (pp. 201, 245, 260). 195 hlda<sup>o</sup> (p. 245).
- II = Tib. mgo, hgo, head, chief, initiative (pp. 260-1). See also hgo.
- III = Tib. go, place, room. See also hgo.
- IV = Tib. sgo, gate. See also hgo, rgo.
- V ? = hkho III (Tib. hkho, be, or deem useful or necessary; dgos, necessary (pp. 262-3)) ? 125 hldaḥ-kraḥ<sup>o</sup>; 156 rmaḥ-bri<sup>o</sup>; 203 hbri<sup>o</sup> (pp. 287, 289).
- **-hgyan**, cause, fault ? See also hkoḥo. 325, 327 (p. 264).
- **-rño**, leader ? See also hkho<sup>o</sup> (pp. 262-3). 53-6, 272, 342.
- **-htar** (I ?), head-released, cf. hbu-hpor ? 68, 371, 373, 386, 390 (pp. 268, 331).
- **-hto** 390 (p. 264).
- **-htoḥ**, gate, or place, surrendering. See also hgo<sup>o</sup>. 212 (pp. 260-1).
- **-hltah/hldaḥ**. Cf. hkhoh-htah, hkho-hdaḥ (p. 264). 202, 203.
- **-hnag** (II), black-head, com-
- mons = Tib. mgo-nag. 266-7 (p. 260).
- hko-bphyag**. 101 hkoḥo<sup>o</sup>, signal a desire to speak ? See also hkho-bphyag (p. 264).
- **-wehi**, room-making = Tib. go-byed. 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).
- hkoḡ I** = Tib. hgog, bkog, khog, snatch, pull out, uproot. See also hkhog I. 23 ht sah-gsom<sup>o</sup>; 54 rbab-na-hke<sup>o</sup> ?
- II = Tib. lkog, secret; no-lkog, open and secret. See also hkhog IV. 189 hso<sup>o</sup>; 267 -hkhoh-rño (p. 285).
- hkoḥ**, = Tib. goḥ. 'upper' ? 223 hton<sup>o</sup>.
- hkon**, written for hkon (Chinese chüan, chapter) + ni. 249 hso<sup>o</sup> (p. 140).
- hkob** = Tib. khab, khebs, hkhrebs, hgebs, dgab, khob, cover. See also hkhob. 107 na-hrom<sup>o</sup>.
- hkom I** = Tib. skam, skom, dry, thirst, &c. 12 hbo<sup>o</sup>; 15 stom<sup>o</sup> (pp. 231, 315).
- II = Tib. hkhums, perform, or Auxiliary Verb (pp. 137 n. 1, 200, 368). See also gkom, hgom. 32 hgru-ma<sup>o</sup>; 118 hgam<sup>o</sup>; 136 gtse<sup>o</sup>; 166 yob<sup>o</sup>; 175 swa<sup>o</sup> (pp. 142, 243, 309, 345).
- hkoḥi** = hkoḥu, II q.v. -me, speech-fire. 170 (pp. 275, 285).
- hkoḥu I** 363.
- II speak (Chinese k'ou ?) (pp. 254, 256-7, 264). See also hkhohu.
- **-prom, phrom, &c.**, use speech. 166 phrom; 168 bprom; 169 hprom; 171 hphrom; 172 phrom; 174, 177, 180 bprom; 359 hprom; 361 prom (pp. 274, 276, 316, 335).
- **-me** speech-fire. See also hkoḥi<sup>o</sup>. 171 meḥe; 173 (pp. 257, 345).
- hkoḥo** = hkoḥu II, q.v. 101 -hko-bphyag (p. 264).
- **-hgyan** = hko<sup>o</sup>, q.v. 325, 327 (p. 264).

**ħkor** I = *Tib.* skor, ħkhor, khor, *go round, return, entourage* (pp. 271-2, 295). *See also ħkhor.* 53 [-re]; 277 -re (*or is this ħkor II?*) (p. 271).

II = *Tib.* ħgor, *delay, rest, be idle.* *See also ħgor.* 205 -kla (p. 239).

— **-ħtah** (*a Suffix*, pp. 182-3), *one's own entourage.* 92 (p. 239).

**ħkwañ** (?) 212 -ħgo.

**ħkweħe** 131 ħbye<sup>o</sup>.

**ħkya-wa-ñe** = *kya*<sup>o</sup>/ ħkyaħ<sup>o</sup>, *q.v.* 215, 339 ñer (pp. 253, 338).

**ħkyañ** I = *Tib.* kyañ, *even, also, &c.* *See also kyañ, gyañ, yañ.* 344 ħlah<sup>o</sup> (?) (pp. 204, 311).

II *serf?* (pp. 148, 297-8, 312). 18 ħkrug<sup>o</sup>; 141, 143, 274, 287 mor<sup>o</sup> (pp. 295, 297, 323).

III *written for ħgyañ.* 114 -na.

— **-rgyañ/ħrgyañ**, *stove-bed?* 42, 81, 268 (pp. 298-9).

— **-ħldoñ**, *runaway serf?* 287, 291-3 (pp. 239, 297-8).

**ħkyaħ-ħwa-ñe**, *a class of living creatures, crop-work-injure?* (p. 255), *possibly with political allusion.* 339. *See also kya*<sup>o</sup>/ ħkya<sup>o</sup>.

**ħkyi** = *Tib.* khyi, *dog.* 275 (pp. 285, 287).

**ħkyim**, *taken home, included in company* = *Tib.* khyim, *home; ħkhyim, whirl; ħkhyims, halo; ħgyim, circumference.* *See also kyim, skyim, ħskyim.* 37, 294, 297, 323, 350, 351 -re (pp. 246-7).

**ħkyu** = *Tib.* dkyu, dkyus, *run, race; ħkhyu, run away; ħgyu, move quickly; brgyugs, race.*

— **-ħldoñ**, *swift-fleeing.* 339 (pp. 253, 255). *See also kyu*<sup>o</sup>.

**ħkyud** = *Tib.* rgyud, *string, lineage, &c.; brgyud, id.; khyud, mkhyud, ħkhyud, hold, embrace, &c.* (pp. 252, 258). *See also ħgyud.* 220 rdzo<sup>o</sup>; 307 gzu-ħbyi<sup>o</sup>; 303 ħgaħ-ħldoñ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 173, 252, 258, 270).

**ħkye**, *offspring, child* = *Tib.* skye,

skyes, khye-bo, khyeħu (pp. 320, 368). 39 -ge-ħmu.

**ħkyeb** = *Tib.* khyab, *fill?* 13 ħsrchi<sup>o</sup> ħkyeb; 17 ñe<sup>o</sup> oħkyeb (p. 221).

**ħkyer** = *Tib.* ħkhyer, *carry away; chu-yis-ħkhyer, carried away by water.* 56 ħbah-ħrag<sup>o</sup>; 316 ħyañ-ħldyañ, *or is this* = *kyer, erect, q.v.?*

**ħkra** = *Tib.* bkra, khra, *criss-cross, variegated.*

— **-ħrag**, *cross dyke?* 13.

**ħkrağ** = *Tib.* skrag, *fear.* 135 ħldag-nag<sup>o</sup>.

**ħkrañ** = *krañ, robust, &c., q.v.* *See also ħkhrañ.* 91, 112, 124 ħldañ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 180, 288, 291).

**ħkri** = *Tib.* khri, *seat, chair, bed.* *See also khri, ħgri.* 81 ħsi<sup>o</sup> (pp. 298-9, 317).

**ħkru** = *Tib.* kru-ra, *the lowest class of the people; dkru, abomination, filth; ħkhru, ħkhrud, wash; khru, bkru, bkru* (pp. 148, 229, 295-7). *See also kru, kruħu, ħkruħu, ħkruho, ħkrur, khru, ħkhru, ħkhruħu, ħkhrur.* 313 -ħsud.

— **-ħbro**, *taste as filth.* *See also kruħu, ħkruħu, ħklu* (pp. 295-7). 221, 222, 297 (p. 228, 296).

— **-ħyog**, *vile servants.* *See also ħkruħu, khru.* 289, 324 (p. 218).

— **-re**, *being filth.* *See ħkrur, ħkhrur.*

**ħkrug**, *quarrel (Noun and Verb), revolt, be disturbed, agitated, quarrelsome* = *Tib.* dkrug, dkrugs, ħkhrug, ħkhrugs (*id.*), *cf. grug, break* (pp. 144-5, 258).

— **-ħrdzo**, *troublesome mdzo.* 16 (pp. 144, 258).

— **-ħkyañ**, *troublesome serf.* 18 (*or ħkrug a Verb?*); 371 (kyañ; *or ħkrug a Noun?*) (pp. 145, 295, 318, 323).

**ħkruħu** = ħkru, *q.v.*

— **-ħbro.** *See also ħkru*<sup>o</sup>. 313,



- 316, 318, 323, 325; 294 ḥbroḥo (pp. 228, 296).
- ḥkruḥu-ḥyog.** See also **ḥkru**, **khru**. 322-3 ḥsud.
- ḥkruḥo**, *final* = ḥkru+o. 316 (p. 228).
- ḥkrur** = ḥkru+re. Cf. ḥkhrur. 285, 331 (p. 206).
- ḥkre**, possibly = Tib. ḥkhren, *desire, envy (a Verb)*. 132 ḥthañ-ḥgam<sup>o</sup>.
- ḥkrom I** = Tib. ḥgrem, dkram, bkram, khroms, *spread, scatter* (pp. 235-6, 304-5). 64 ḥdzo<sup>o</sup>; 70 ru-ge<sup>o</sup>; 389 ḥldyañ-ḥjo<sup>o</sup> (pp. 157, 274, 303-5).
- II Cf. Tib. khrom-me, *glittering (from the root of I?)*. See also **khrom**, **ḥgrom**, **ḥgroms**. 12 ḥgye<sup>o</sup>; 154 ḥgye<sup>o</sup> (pp. 235-6, 304-5).
- ḥkroms**, *Aorist form of ḥkrom I*. Cf. ḥgroms. 387 ḥtor-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 305).
- ḥklu I** = ḥkhru I. 221 -ḥbro (pp. 228, 296).
- II = klu, *blind, q.v.* 332 (p. 223).
- ḥklo** = Tib. blo, glo, *lungs, &c.* See **glo**. 40 ḥphu<sup>o</sup>, *perhaps bellows* = 135 pu-ḥlo (pp. 284-5).
- ḥklom**, *perhaps* = Tib. klum, *a species of divinity: or* = glom, *q.v.*? 42 -ge-ḥtul (p. 280, n. 2).
- rkabs**, *a Verb: see also ḥrkabs*. 272 rko<sup>o</sup>.
- rkah I** = Tib. dkah, *steep, difficult*. 2 (?); 165 (*or is this II?*); 333 gsah<sup>o</sup> (pp. 281, 396, 338).
- II = Tib. bkah, *word, command*. 84 mo<sup>o</sup> (pp. 343-4). See also **ḥrkah**.
- rke-ḥldah**, *perhaps* = Tib. rke, *lean, meagre*. 155 ḥrdañ.
- rko** = Tib. rko, *hoe, dig*. 272 -rkabs; 334 ḥkeg<sup>o</sup>, ḥhwad (pp. 338, 340). See also **ḥrko**.
- rkom** *killed* = Tib. bkum, *slain; gum, dead; ḥgum, dgum, die* (pp. 195, 368). 157 ḥbroñ<sup>o</sup>; 378 (pp. 195, 217). See also **ḥrkom**.
- rkwa** = Tib. bkah, *command: antithetical to ḥwah, g-wah* (pp. 339, 343-4). See also **ḥrkwa**. 122 -ḥdzam (pp. 292, 343).
- ḥrkabs** = rkabs, *q.v.* 271 ḥrko<sup>o</sup> (p. 339).
- ḥrkaḥ** = rkaḥ I, *q.v.* 10 ḥldi<sup>o</sup>; 165 -myi-ḥrdoḥo (pp. 296, 329).
- ḥrkas** = Tib. skas, *ladder, staircase* (pp. 348, 359). 57 -ḥthañ (p. 248).
- ḥrko** = rko, *q.v.* 271 -ḥrkabs; 332 ḥrkeg<sup>o</sup>; 333 ḥkeg<sup>o</sup> ḥrko-ḥyuhū.
- ḥrkom** = rkom, *q.v.* 285 -ḥbroñ; 313 -ḥkru-ḥsud; 331 ḥkrur<sup>o</sup> ḥbroñ (p. 296).
- ḥrkwa** = rkwa, *q.v.* 224 -ḥdzam (p. 343).
- ḥlkyañ** = Tib. rkyañ, *kiang, wild ass*. 188 -ḥzu (pp. 252, 353-4). See also **ḥglyañ**.
- skah** = Tib. sga, *saddle; sga-lag, saddle-frame; ska-rags, girdle*. 45 -rah (p. 317).
- skar** = Tib. skar, *star, constellation* (p. 276). 191 rñam<sup>o</sup> (pp. 244, 315).
- sku** = Tib. sku, *body* (p. 355). 58, 164 -ḥphu-ḥti (pp. 194, 285, 300, 320). See also **skuḥu**, **ḥskuḥu**.
- skuḥu** = sku, *q.v.* See also **ḥskuḥu**. — -na (ra?) (p. 312). Cf. Tib. sku-ra.
- ske** = Tib. ske, *throat, neck* (pp. 288 n., 316, 355). See also **pyi<sup>o</sup>**, **phyi<sup>o</sup>**. 153 -ḥbrus; 158 -ḥbro (p. 316).
- skeg**, *P.N* (p. 134)—*not in text*.
- sko** = Tib. sko, *select, appoint*. 91 -prom; 134 (?); 357 g-weḥe<sup>o</sup>; cf. Tib. las-su-sko?
- skyañ** *ward off* = Tib. skyoñ, bskyañ, *protect, defend* (p. 221). 109 myag-gre<sup>o</sup>; 390 (p. 221).
- skyar** = Tib. skyor, bskyar, *prop up, or kyor, weak, unfortified, or dkyor (-ḥbyin), (capable of being) thrown down?* 205 ḥdzoñ<sup>o</sup>.
- skyim** = ḥkyim, *q.v.*, *but always in the sense of 'house'*. See also **ḥskyim**.
- -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).

**hskuḥu** = sku, skuḥu, *q.v.* 6 ḥkhur° (p. 226).

**hskyim-se** = skyim°. 18-ḥrmōho.

## Kh

**khab**, *conceal* = *Tib.* bkab, *cover, shelter*; khebs, ḥkhebs, *cover*; gab, ḥgebs, bgab, khob, *cover, conceal.* 106 ḥkaḥ°, *speech concealing* (p. 315). *See also* ḥkhab, ḥkhob.

**khar** = *Tib.* mkhar, *castle, citadel.* *See also* ḥkhar. 117 -gsom (p. 252).

**kho**, a *chief?* = ḥkho, ḥkhoḥo (p. 263). 217 -sñe = *Tib.* gñe, *court, or gñen?*; 241 -re (pp. 263, 356).

**khyag** = khyog, ḥkhyog, *bent, crooked* (khyogs, &c., *palanquin, sedan-chair*). 52 khri° (p. 317).

**khyañ**, *matron* (p. 240). 116 ḥsas-te°; 190, 367 (?), 390 (pp. 240, 285). *See also* ḥkhyañ.

**khri** = ḥkri, *q.v.* 52 ḥldag° (p. 317).

**khru** = ḥkru, *q.v.* *See also* ḥkhru, ḥkhruḥu, ḥkhrur. 165 -ḥrkaḥ-myi-ḥrdoḥo; 321 -ḥyog (p. 296).

**khrom** = ḥkrom I or II (p. 304). 388 mor-tsaḥ°; *cf.* ḥyañ-ge-ḥgroms 64 (pp. 216, 304).

**ḥkhañ** = ḥkañ II, *house, q.v.* 198 ḥldaḥ° (p. 234).

**ḥkhad** = *Tib.* ḥkhad, ḥkhod, ḥgod, *build, level, settle, &c.?* 324 -ḥtoḥi = -ḥto (*Suffix*) + ḥi.

**ḥkhab** I = khab, *q.v.* 105 ḥkaḥ° (p. 315).

II = ḥkab, *q.v.* 280 -rgye.

— **-ḥgro**, *go home.* 233, 239, 243 ḥgro (p. 315).

**ḥkhāb** (ḥkhaḥb)-ḥdro, *come to house.* 106 (p. 261).

**ḥkham** = *Tib.* ḥgam. ḥkham, &c.

*cram into one's mouth, gobble, &c.* (p. 240). *See also* ḥgam II. 292 ḥrnie°.

**ḥkhaḥ** = ḥkaḥ I, *q.v.* 116 ḥsas°; 163 -ḥldaḥ (pp. 240, 315).

— **-ḥldaḥ** (*Suffix*, p. 183), *speaker.* 137 (p. 315).

— **-ḥrdza** = ḥkaḥ°, *q.v.* 296 (p. 315).

— **-gsañ** = ḥkaḥ°. 329 (p. 314).

**ḥkhar** I = khar, *q.v.*

— **-ḥgyi**, *town's business* (?) (p. 283 n.). 192 (p. 283).

— **-rpag**, °ḥrpag (pp. 195, 225–6). 17 ḥkhaḥ?; 128 ḥrpag; 135 rpag (pp. 227, 243, 263, 305).

II *for* ḥkha-re *or* ḥkhar-re? 197 rnie-ḥldaḥ°.

**ḥkhiḥi** 211 = ḥkheḥi, *q.v.* 212.

**ḥkhu** 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).

**ḥkhu**r = *Tib.* dgur, rgur, sgur, skur, *bent down, crookback* (p. 226). 6 ḥrpag°.

**ḥkhen** = *Tib.* mkhyen, *know.* 92 (2) (pp. 295, 334).

**ḥkheḥi**, *i.e.* ḥkhe = ḥke II, *gain, profit, + ḥi.* *See also* ḥkheḥe, ḥkeḥi (pp. 242, 282). 212 mye-ḥpeḥi° (p. 240).

**ḥkheḥe** = ḥke II, ḥkheḥi, *q.v.* 251, 314 ḥsaḥ° (pp. 224, 262, 274).

**ḥkho** I *chief* (?) (pp. 262–3). *See also* kho. 217–18 ḥtor° and ḥtor-ḥbroḥ°; 209 -ḥsañ (pp. 255, 263).

II *top* (*connected with* I?) (p. 263). 295 -ḥko = *Tib.* ri-kha, *hill-top.* *See also* ḥriḥi-ḥkkoḥo.

III *desire, want, have to* = ḥko V (pp. 262–3). 336 ḥwi°, *have to make?* *Cf.* 156 rmañ-bri° ḥko, *have to destroy?*; 295 ḥño°? *or is this* ḥkho I?

— **-ḥdaḥ** 329 *meaning?* (p. 264). *See also* ḥkkoḥ-ḥtaḥ, ḥko-ḥltaḥ, ḥldaḥ.

**ḥkho-rño** = ḥko-rño, *q.v.* 189 stor°;  
267 ḥkog° (pp. 263, 285).  
— **-ḥphyaḡ** = ḥko-bphyaḡ, *q.v.*  
106 (p. 264).  
**ḥkhog** I = ḥkog I, *q.v.* 21 ḥtsā-  
-gsom° (pp. 203, 306).  
II = *Tib.* khog, *interior?* 51  
stoñ° (p. 328).  
III *friend?* 101 ḥlañ-ḥjañ . . .°;  
107 ḥlañ-ḥjañ°; 134 -ḥnoñ (?).  
IV = ḥkog II *secret* (p. 221). 251  
ḥño°; 314 ḥño° (p. 280).  
**ḥkhob** = ḥkhab I *and* ḥkab, *con-  
ceal.* 322 ḥño° (pp. 171, 359).  
*See also* ḥkob.  
**ḥkhoḥ-ḥtaḥ** = ḥkho-ḥdaḥ, *q.v.*  
328 (p. 264).  
**ḥkhoḥi** = ḥkho I + ḥi 218 (pp. 255,  
263).  
**ḥkhoḥu** = ḥkoḥu II, *q.v.* 106 -re;  
292 ḥtab°; 296 ḥtab° (pp. 264,  
298).  
**ḥkhoḥo** = ḥkho I, 129, 216  
(pp. 263, 272).  
II = ḥkho II. 291 ḥriḥi° (p. 263).  
**ḥkhor** = ḥkor I, *retinue, entourage,  
&c.* 18 ḥdzañ°; 98 (?) (p. 295).  
*Return (?) (read* ḥkhor-re?).  
293, 294, 296 (pp. 297-8).  
**ḥkhwi** *seven?* (p. 203).  
— **-ḥtsa**, *old, elder?* (p. 343). 259  
(pp. 319, 343).  
**ḥkhyañ** = khyañ *matron, q.v.* 212  
(p. 240).  
**ḥkhyam** = *Tib.* ḥkhyams, *rove,  
wander.* 229 rñe°; 237 rñe°.  
**ḥkhyed** = *Tib.* ḥkhyed, *suffice.* 119;  
123 me°; 124 me°; 127 (p. 288).  
**ḥkhrañ** = krañ, *q.v. and* ḥkrañ.  
127 ḥldañ° (pp. 288-9).  
**ḥkhram** = *Tib.* ḥgrem, ḥgrams,  
bkram, dgram, *spread, or  
khram, artful, lively, brisk.* 332  
-re (p. 305 and n. 1).  
**ḥkhru**, *probably* = ḥkru, *q.v.* 320  
-re (p. 296). *See also* ḥkhrur.  
— **-rgyañ** 187 = kru° 388 (p. 312).  
**ḥkhrūḥu-ḥyog** = ḥkru°, khru° 322.  
**ḥkhrur** = ḥkhrur-re 169 (pp. 157,  
244, 296, 323).  
**skhrud** = *Tib.* skrud, *put to flight.*  
9 rñu° (p. 329).

## G

**gaḥ** 232, *probably erroneous: see  
critical note.*  
**ge** (*possibly erroneous in* 265, 279), *a  
particle* (pp. 173, 189-90, 204-  
5). *passim.*  
**geḥu** = keḥu, ḥkeḥu, ḥke II, *q.v.*  
(pp. 316, 368). 362 -prom.  
**go**, *not in text, =* ḥgo, *vulture*  
(p. 134).  
**goñ** = *Tib.* goñ, *upper, superior.*  
*See also* ḥgoñ. 179 gnaḥ°  
omyag; 367 ḥyaḥñ° omyag.  
**gyaḥ** I = *Tib.* yañ, kyañ, gyañ,  
*also, even, though* (pp. 204,  
311). *See also* kyañ. 263  
(pp. 283, 313).  
II *precipice?* = *Tib.* g-yañ. 313  
-g-ri (p. 312).  
III gyañ-gyañ = *Tib.* ḥgyaḥ,  
*dally* (pp. 295, 312). 92 sñañ°  
(p. 295).  
**gyim** *home* = kyim, ḥkyim, &c.  
*q.v.* 148 rmañ-ra° (pp. 246-7).  
**gras**, *Tib.* gra, *arrangement; gras,  
order, rank, &c.;* ḥgras, *differ-  
ence between two parties; dgra,  
enemy.* 300 -re. *See also*  
**ḥgras**, ḥras (pp. 266, 269,  
306).  
**gre** = *Tib.* gre, *bear* (p. 254). *See  
also* ḥgre. 109 myag°; 305,  
307 ḥrgam° (pp. 231, 239).  
**gro** = *Tib.* ḥgro, *go.* *See also* ḥgro.  
243 khab°.  
**gron** = *Tib.* gron, *expend.* 158  
g-ri-ta°.  
**gla** = *Tib.* gla, *wages* (p. 251). *See  
also* glaḥ, glar, ḥgla, ḥglaḥ.  
233 ḥdzañ° oḥnag.  
— **-ḥtso/ḥdzo** = *Tib.* gla-mi, *hire-  
ling* (p. 251 and n.).  
**glañ** I *increase, get (?) =* *Tib.* len,  
blañ, *or else* glañ, *requite, return.*  
66 sñañ°; 86 rñe-sta°; 99  
rgyed-ma°; 176 ḥke-prom°;  
361 keḥu-prom° (p. 318).  
II = *Tib.* glañ, *ox* (p. 318). 66  
ru°; 174-6, 359, 360, 366 ḥnu°,  
nu°.  
III? 397.

**glab** = *Tib.* lab, *speak*. See also **hlab**, **hlobhi**. 180 -hdo, a *Suffix*, p. 186 (pp. 168, 197).

**glah** = gla, *wages, q.v.* See also **hgla**, **hglah**. 31 -tah (?); 228 **hwah**<sup>o</sup> (p. 251).

— **-hlad** *wage requital*. 233, 236 (pp. 251, 338). See also **hgla**<sup>o</sup>.

**glar** = gla-re. 334 (p. 338).

**glehu** = *Tib.* glehu, glo, *edge of plough-land* (p. 368). 347-8 **hrim**<sup>o</sup>.

**glo** = *Tib.* glo, *lungs, side; blo, mind, heart*. See also **hklo**, **hlo** II. 68 -hrañ; 93; 116 pu<sup>o</sup> (pp. 238, 268, 285, 336).

— **-ta** (a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3), *purpose*. 157 -rdzogs (p. 182).

**glog** = *Tib.* glog, *lightning*. 269 **smyi**<sup>o</sup> (p. 339).

**glom** = *Tib.* rlom, *conceit, covet*. See also **hrlomhi**. 60 **gpha-tsa**<sup>o</sup>; 85 **hño-sta**<sup>o</sup>; 346 **hdam-sleg**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 145, 290).

**glyañ** probably a (*Tun-huang*) *mispronunciation of rgyañ, q.v.*: cf. **hglyañ** = **hkyañ**, *Tib.* rkyañ. 230 **hrañ**<sup>o</sup>; cf. 147 (p. 225).

— **-ru**, *long-horn = ox*. 347, 351.

**dgu** I *hot, heat* (pp. 232-3). See also **dguhu**. 225, 245 -hmu-hto; 75-6 -htor (pp. 232, 273, 338).

— **-hldo** (a *Suffix*, pp. 186-7), *hotness*. 74, 77, 78, 114, 139, 191, 309 -htor (pp. 201, 232, 243, 266, 270, 282-3).

II = *Tib.* dgu, *nine, all*. See also **hgu** II (p. 203). 127 **stor**<sup>o</sup>; 134 -sko (pp. 233, 288, 290).

**dguhu-hmu-hto** = **dgu** I<sup>o</sup>. 236, 244 (p. 232).

**hgā-hldoñ** = **hgah**<sup>o</sup>, *q.v.* 308 (p. 270).

**hgag** = *Tib.* kag, **keg**, *hinder*. See **hkeg**. 65 -re (p. 228).

**hgañ** = **hkañ** I, *full, all, q.v.* 104 (or **hkañ** II, *house* ?); 123 **hyu**<sup>o</sup>; 168 **hri**<sup>o</sup>; 194, 207 **hkañ**<sup>o</sup>; 392 (?) (pp. 147, 229, 238, 315).

**hgab-hldo** (a *Suffix*, pp. 186-7), *hidden, covera.* See **khah**. 155 **mehi**<sup>o</sup> (p. 282).

**hgam** I = *Tib.* gam, **gams**, *posting-station, settlement* (p. 243). See also **rgam**, **hrgam**. 78 **mehi-ra**<sup>o</sup>; 93 -phar; 110 -hphar; 118 -hkom; 131, 133, 221 **hthañ**<sup>o</sup>; 191 **gdah-na**<sup>o</sup>; 193 **hñah-mo**<sup>o</sup>, **gso-nad**<sup>o</sup>; 229 -lam; 289 -hpar; 396 **gdah**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 238, 243-4, 293, 315, 336).

II = *Tib.* hgam, **hkham**, **bgam**, *cram into mouth, gobble; kham, morsel, &c.* 59 **hrañ**<sup>o</sup> (p. 240).

**hgah** I *place* (?). 256 **rgam**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 147, 173).

II = I? 283 -hrag/rag.

— **-hldoñ**, *some creature, or phenomenon, on mountains*. 302, 309-11 (p. 270).

**hgahi** = **hgah** (*Tib.* **dgah**, *joy*) + **hi**. 66 (p. 318).

**hgar** I = **hkar** I, *separate off, pen, q.v.* 69 **hbehi-la**<sup>o</sup> (p. 247).

II -hpu = *Tib.* mgar, *smith*. 289, 322 (p. 359).

**hgu** I a *Suffix* (pp. 190, 258). 226 **mor**<sup>o</sup>; 227 **mug**<sup>o</sup>; 228 **hbri**<sup>o</sup>; 303 **hdom**<sup>o</sup>; 304 **hdom**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 256, 327).

II = *Tib.* dgu, *nine, all* (pp. 203, 233, 290). See also **dgu** II. 126 **stor**<sup>o</sup>.

III = **rgu**, **hrgu**, *thief, q.v.* 113 -htor; 331 -hmor (p. 233).

**hgun**? 395.

**hguhu** = **hgu** I. 312 **hdom**<sup>o</sup> (p. 254).

**hge** I = **ge**. 5, 8 **hnam**<sup>o</sup>; 332 (pp. 223, 341).

II = *Tib.* dge, *happiness, welfare*. See also **hgehe**, **hrgehe**. 73, 75 **hwa-ste**<sup>o</sup>; 252 **hlab-re**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 273-4, 337-8).

**hgehe** = **hge** II, *q.v.* 75 **hwa-ste**<sup>o</sup>; 251 **hbañ-re**<sup>o</sup>, **jo-re**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 273-4, 338).

**hgo** I = **hko** IV (*Tib.* sgo, *gate*) or **hko** III (*Tib.* go, *place*). 46 -hpo; 105 -hdro; 145 **phye**<sup>o</sup>; 210 -gtoñ; 212 -htoñ (pp. 200, 260-1, 286, 332).

II = *Tib.* go, *vulture*. 260 -hsor (p. 261).

- III **hkaḥ-ḡgo** = *Tib.* kha-bsgo, *advice.* 105 (pp. 261, 315).
- IV? 212 **hkwān°**; 358 **rñe-ge°**, **na°**? (p. 261).
- ḡgoñ** = **goñ**, *q.v.* 333 **hro°**; 367 **gnah°**.
- ḡgoñ** = **ḡgoñ**? 358 **na°**.
- ḡgom** = **hkom** II, *q.v.* 142 **gdag°** (p. 323).
- ḡgoḥo** = **ḡgo** I. 261 **g-rub°**; 369 **-ḡdzin** (pp. 261, 342).
- ḡgor** = **hkor** II, *delay, &c., q.v.* 42, 143, 350 **na-hldom°**; 113 **hnah-hpoñ°**; 201 **hso-hldaḥ°**; 209 **hkho-hśaṅ°** (pp. 233, 238, 297, 299, 341).
- ḡgwa-nehu** = **hwa** I, **ḡwah** I, *-ne good work, q.v.* 41 (pp. 338-40).
- ḡgwaḥ-hrśaṅ** = **hwa/hwah/g-waḥ°** *q.v.* 229.
- ḡgweg-ḡweḡe** = *Tib.* sgeg-byed, *charmer, or ḡgeg-bye, husband.* 348 (pp. 248, 343).
- ḡgyañ** I = **gyañ** III, *dally* (pp. 311-12). 7, 77, 200, 296.
- II *confused with rgyañ, spread, increase, hasten?* 217, 392 **ḡtor-hbroñ°**.
- ḡgyañs** *Aorist form of ḡgyañ.* 241 **smyi-hnu°**; 292 **ḡgyañ-sto** = **°ns-to** (pp. 237, 298).
- ḡgyan** I = *Tib.* **g-yan**, *itch.* 153 (*read ḡgyanni*); 158 (p. 316).
- II See **hko/hkoḥo-ḡgyan**.
- ḡgyaḥ** = **rgya**, **rgyaḥ**, **hrgyaḥ**, *plain, q.v.* 391 **-hnah-tsur**.
- ḡgyi**, *business (Tib. bgyid, bgyis, byi, gyis, do: or Chin. i < gyi, Karlgren, no. 204 ?).* 192 **hkhar°** (p. 283 n.).
- **-ka** (*a Suffix?*) 346 **hyu°**.
- ḡgyud** = **hkyud** *lineage, &c., q.v.* 16 **hrdzo°** (p. 258).
- ḡgye** = *Tib.* **ḡgye**, *light (ḡgyed, scatter).* 12, 154 **-hkrom-hkrom** (pp. 235-6).
- ḡgyed**, *a species of bird?* 39 **-ge-hbañ**.
- ḡgyeb** = **rgyeb** I, **hrgyeb**, *back, q.v.* 221 **-hkru-hbro** (p. 296).
- ḡgyehl** = **ḡgye+hi**. 209 **hphyu-hldyañ°**.
- ḡgrañ** = *Tib.* **grañ**, *cold.* 28 **-hñyir-hñyir** (p. 362).
- ḡgran** = *Tib.* **ḡgran**, **dgran**, *adversary, rival.* 355 (p. 230).
- ḡgrah** I = *Tib.* **dgra**, *enemy; ḡgras, arrangement in parties, alineation (whence also bkra, khra, criss-cross, variegated).* See also **gras**, **ḡgras**, **ḡgras**. 239 **ḡcha°** (pp. 313-14).
- II, *possibly* = I, *or* = *Tib.* **sgra**, *sound?* 8 **me°**; 20 **me°**.
- ḡgras** = **gras**, **ḡgras**, *aligned, q.v.* 10 **ḡtañ°** (p. 266).
- ḡgri** = **hkri**, **khri**, *support, chair, bed, q.v.* 38 **ḡśi°** (pp. 299, 317).
- ḡgru** I = *Tib.* **gru**, **gru-ma**, *corner, angle; gru-mo, elbow; yul-gru, locality* (pp. 266, 306), *perhaps originally a recess in mountains.* 19 **hldu-hro°** (?); 24 **-ḡsram-gtam**; 300 **ḡri°** (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 ḡgru-hldañ-hmaḥ and ḡphu (ḡphu, ḡbu) -ḡgru* (pp. 307-9).
- III = *Tib.* **ḡgru**, **ḡgrus**, *bestow pains, diligence; brtson-ḡgrus, industry, energy. See ḡgru-ma, ḡgrus.*
- **-ma** (*a Suffix*, p. 182), *council meeting (ḡgru III, or of ḡgru people, ḡgru II); cf. Tib. ḡdun-ma. See also ḡrim-ge-ḡgrus, hldu-hro-ḡgru* (pp. 148, 308-9, 369). 27 **-ḡti**; 32 **-hkom**; 77 **-rmañ**; 79 **-ḡstor** (pp. 278, 309, 345).
- (II) **-hldañ-hmaḥ**, *P.N. (of the city of the ḡgru people?)* (pp. 306-7). 21, 22, 30 **ma**; 35, 62 (p. 306).
- ḡgrus** = *Tib.* **ḡgrus**, *Aorist of ḡgru III (or possibly = Tib. ḡgrus)* (pp. 308, 369). 293 **ḡrim-ge°**; 297 **ḡrim-ge°** (p. 298).

**hgre** = gre, bear, *q.v.* 17 gsañ; 305 rgam° (p. 221).

**hgro** = gro, come, go, *q.v.* 67 hko-se°; 233 hkhah°; 239 hkhah° (pp. 186, 315).

**hgrom** *flourish?* But see **hkhrom**, **hkroms**, **khrom** (pp. 236, 305). 136 hldag[-nag]; 222-3 htor-hbroñ (pp. 243, 305).

**hgroms**, *Aorist of hgrom.* 64 hyañ-ge° (pp. 274, 305).

**hgla**, wages = gla, *q.v.* 237 -hld.

**hglah** = gla, glah, hgla, *q.v.* 232 hđzañ°°hnag; 234 hđzañ°°nag.

**hglu** (*a possible reading: see critical note*) = hgru, 77, 79 (pp. 278, 309).

**hglyañ** 307 (p. 252), *mispronunciation of hlkyañ, kiang, q.v.: cf. glyañ.*

**rgad** = Tib. rgad, rgod, laugh (p. 348). 113 gtse-ne°.

**rgam** I = Tib. sgam, deep (p. 147). 241 hño (?); 256 -hgañ (pp. 147, 173).

II = Tib. bsgam, admit into company or settlement (gam, gams). Cf. sbam, bams, boms. See also **hrgam** (pp. 196, 244, 352). 36 rgyed-hsañ°; 241 hño° (?); 304 hmañ° (p. 283).

**rgu** = Tib. rku, lku, rkun, rgun, steal, thief. See also **hgu** III, **hrgu** (pp. 233, 347). 29 -hmyil-myil (p. 259).

**rgo** = Tib. sgo, door, gate. See also **hko** IV, **hgo** I, **rgor** (pp. 262, 292, 348). 120 ái°; 258 -hldom; 314 -htoho (pp. 224, 291-2, 318).

— **-hrah**, gate-ward = Tib. sgo-ra-ba 315 (pp. 228, 292).

**rgoñ** I = Tib. dgon, wilderness, solitude (pp. 349, 362). 39 -spu-rbu; 59 -hce-rgye (p. 286).

II = Tib. sgoñ, sgoñ-na, egg (pp. 332-3, 348). See also **hrgoñ**.

— **-wa**, egg (Tib. sgoñ-na?). 365, 366 (p. 332).

— **-ru**, horn (*sc. end*) of an egg (p. 333). 103 (pp. 156, 333). See also **hrgoñ**.

**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 -rko-rkabs (p. 339).

— **-hñi-ke**, *the two orbs (sc. sun and moon, Tib. ñi-zlahi-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 smu-hđzu°; 29 hyim-sto°; 83 rte-hyu°, hkam-stañ°; 89 gsom°; 185 hdon°? (pp. 139, 259, 320).

**rgyañ** = Tib. rgyañ, stretch, extent, extensive, wall, distance; rgyañs-te, arriving in haste. 51 hldu-hu-ce°; 86 -na-spe; 89 hldyim°; 152 mehi-spa°; 300 wall? (pp. 266, 291, 298, 300, 312, 321, 328). See also **hce°**, **hkyañ°**, **hrgyañ-sto**, **śid°**, **hrañ°**.

**rgyad**, error for rgyed? 136.

**rgyam** = Tib. rgyam, rock; gyam, slab of stone; gyam, recess in a rock (pp. 280, 349). 109 tho°; cf. Tib. tho-rdo (p. 280).

**rgyah-gñi-ke** = rgya-hñi-ke, *q.v.* 199.

**rgye** extent, extended, cf. Tib. dbye (pp. 196, 286, 291). See also **rgyehe**, **rgyes**, **hrgye**. 57 (2), 59 (2), 60 hce°; 153 myi°; 154 hti°; 209 hldañ°; 210 hcañ°; 280 hkhah°; 383 -hlo (pp. 171-2, 245, 248, 273, 286, 341-3).

**rgyen** put in order? (cf. Tib. yeñ-yeñ) (pp. 256, 327, 350). 355 hñur-hñah°, hyañ-re° (pp. 256, 327, 329).

**rgyed**, divide, cause division or dissension, Tib. hgye, hgyed, distribute, &c.; hgyed-ma, dissension (pp. 139-40, 196, 290-3, 350). See also **hrgyed**. 105 -hđso-dro, -hgo-hđro; 106 -hđkab/ -hđkhāb-hđro; 192 -hrañsme° (pp. 261, 283).

**rgyed-hdre**, *division-inducing*. 87; 94 htre; 248 htre (pp. 140, 291, 340).

— **-hldag-nag**, *division black-back*. 112 (p. 291).

— **-rmağ**, *division-army*, 149.

— **-ma** (*a Suffix*, p. 182) *division*. 90, 93, 99, 101, 104-5, 107, 231 (pp. 291, 293, 315).

— **-hrah**, *place of division*. 87 hrar, *Locative*; 216, 248 hrar; 341, 342 (?), 392 (p. 140).

— **-hrar**. See °hrah.

— **-gsañ**, *secret division*. 35 (pp. 244, 283).

**rgyen** = *Tib. gyen, steep, uphill, difficult* (pp. 145-6, 268, 350). See also **hrgyen**. 158 hde-ta°; 197 hmye-hta°; 374-7 hkad-hron-re° (pp. 145, 268).

**rgyeni** = rgyen+ni. 198 (p. 341).

**rgyeb I** = *Tib. rgyab, back (Noun, Adverb, or Verb)* (pp. 196, 228-9, 348). See also **hgyeb**, **hrgyeb**, **rgyeb**s. 133 draw-back; 190 -hphuhi-hton; 282 -hphuhi-hphuhi; 345 -hchi: *Adverb* (pp. 228-9, 269).

II, for hkyeb, *fill, q.v.*, or = *Tib. khebs, hkhebs, hgebs, cover?* 116 mu° (p. 285).

**rgyeb**s, *Aorist of rgyeb I, q.v.* 139 'retreats' (p. 228).

**rgyehe** = rgye, *q.v.* 54.

**rgyer** = *Tib. hgyer, drop, abandon*. 365 -hldyañ (pp. 332, 350).

**rgyes**, *Aorist of rgye, q.v.* 199 -hkom (p. 320).

**rgyo** = *Tib. rgyo, copulate*. See also **rgyoḥo**, **rgyoḥon**, **hrgyo**, **hrgyon**, **rbyo**. 48, 323 hche°; 330 -hto; 331 -hto (pp. 178, 348).

**rgyoḥo** = rgyo, *q.v.* 335, 336 -hto-stiñ (p. 367).

**rgyoḥon** = rgyo, rgyoḥo, 336 (p. 223).

**hrgan ripen**, *cf. Tib. rgan old*. 160 gtsañ-myi° (pp. 145-6.)

**hrgam** = rgam II, *q.v.* 133 hthañ°; 169 hrpehi°; 259 hpaḥ°; 286 rpehi-hldaḥ°; 304 hldyo°; 305

-grehe; 306 hmañ-ge°; 307 hmañ°; 316 -hštsag (pp. 231, 239, 244, 256, 262, 323).

**hrgu**, *steal, thief* = rgu, *q.v.* 30, 32 -hto-hrun; 58, 165 -ma-gzo (pp. 199, 233, 277, 335).

**hrgehi** = hrgehi, hge II, *q.v.* 58 -sto = hrgehis-to (pp. 233, 349).

**hrgehe** = hrgehi, hge, II, *q.v.* 72 hyah° (p. 361).

**hrgoñ-hru** = rgoñ-ru, *q.v.*

**hrgod**. See rsehi°. 208.

**hrgom**, *passed over, cf. Tib. hgom, tread, leap over, pass over*; bgom, bgoms, gom, *pace*; goms, *skilled, practised, whence sgom, bsgom, contemplate* (pp. 157, 244-5, 348). 169 (pp. 157, 244, 296, 323).

**hrgya-hñi-hkahe** = rgya-hñi-ke, *q.v.* 295.

**hrgyañ-sto** = hrgyañs-to, *being extended or hastening: see rgyañ*. 242 tha-hnu° (p. 237).

**hrgyah** = rgya *plain, &c.*, *q.v.*? 327 -hdihi (p. 317).

**hrgyah-hñi-hke (hkehe)** = rgya-hñi-ke, *q.v.* 291, 319.

**hrgyu** = *Tib. rgyu, material* (pp. 286, 348). 60 hldañ° (p. 286).

**hrgye I**, *error for hrgyed, q.v.* 326 -hyo.

II = rgye, *q.v.* 382 -hrdza, *greatly friendly: cf. rgye-ḥlo*.

**hrgyeg**, *stop, hinder, cf. Tib. hgegs, dgag, bkag, id., skyeg, keg, kag, misfortune. See also hgag, hkeg* (p. 349). 292; 302 -hšiñ.

**hrgyed** = rgyed, *q.v.* 393 -hšañ-sme.

— **-hyo**. 326 hrgye; 338.

— **-hrah, hrar**. 216 hrah, hrar; 243 hrar; 246 hrar.

**hrgyen** = rgyen, *q.v.* 373 hkad-hron-re°.

**hrgyeb** = rgyeb I, *back, &c.*, *q.v.*

— **-hkru (kruḥu, hkruḥu)-hbro**. 297, 321 kruḥu-hpro; 323 hkruḥu (pp. 228-9).

— **-hkruḥo**. 316 (p. 296).

**hrgyo** = rgyo, *q.v.* 330 -hšeg (p. 178).

**hrgyon** = rgyo, rgyoñon, *q.v.* 336 (p. 223).  
**lgyoho** ? = *Tib.* g-yo, *move, shake.*  
*Cf.* g-yo, hyos; 11 (pp. 270, 354).

## Ñ

**ña** I *used sometimes in place of the Postposition na* (pp. 179–81, 193–4), *when following -ñ* (p. 360). 56 hbyiñ°; 56 me° (?); 199, 201, 206, 207 rmañ° (?).  
 II = *Tib.* ña, *five*? (pp. 203, 241); 54 -hke (?).  
 III ? = ñah, *home, q.v.* 199, 201, 206–7 rmañ-ña, *tomb-home*? *cf.* hldañ-hkhañ. *But see* I. 102 -htsog.  
**ñan** = *Tib.* ñan, *bad*, 158 chos-ta° (pp. 145–6).  
**ñah**, *home, cf. Tib.* ña-ma, *house-mistress, and, as regards the ñ,* pp. 238, 360. *See also* hñah I, na II, hñah I.  
**ñar** = *Tib.* ñar, *strength, vigour* (pp. 144, 300, 361). *See also* nar, hñar, hnar. 204 pa° = *Tib.* dpah (pp. 300, 361).  
**ñal** (*not in text*) (p. 133).  
**ñur** = *Tib.* ñur, *grunt, cf. ñu, ñud, weep, sob. See also* hñur, hñu, hñu-hñur. 85 -ñur (p. 290).  
**ñor.** *See* hñor.  
**mñar** (*Locative*) = *Tib.* mñah, *power, mastery.* 261 (p. 342).  
**hña**, *error for hñan: see critical note.* 188 (p. 252).  
**hñad** = *Tib.* ñad, *vapour, fragrance, evaporate* (pp. 294, 321). *See also* hñahd. 90 htshog-hram°.  
**hñah** I = ñah, *q.v.* (pp. 238–9). 56 -hce; 307 -na; 326 -hpag; 328 -hpag (pp. 196, 239).  
 II = *Hsi-hsia* dñah, *empty, sky = ña in mystical Buddhism (see Ś. C. Das' Dictionary)? Generally in the phrase re-hñah, there is absence (void) of* (p. 239). 49 hrdzro°, *for* hrdzo-re°; 87 re°; 235 -sto = hñas-to; 291 re°; 369 rdzor°, *for* rdzo-re°; 363 re° (pp. 239, 288, 298).

**hñah** (I) -mo, *house-wife* } 193 (pp. — (I) -htsu, *house-man* } 196, 238).  
**hñahghi** = hñag+hi. *See* nag I, hñag I. 137 (pp. 218, 275, 315, 338).  
**hñahd** = hñad, *q.v.* 116 hyah-hñehi° (p. 217).  
**hñar** = ñar, *q.v.*? 357 phlañ°.  
**hñas**, *error for hñasñ* (*see critical note*)? 144 hrñe-hldañ°.  
**hñu** = *Tib.* ñu, *weep, sob: see* ñur. — -hñur *for* hñur-hñur. 348. — -hldo (*Suffix*, pp. 186–7), *weeping.* 355 (p. 256).  
**hñud** = *Tib.* ñu, ñud, *weep, sob.* 41 -nohu.  
**hñur** = ñur, *q.v.* 60 -hñur; 61 -hñur; 348 hñu°; 355 -hñah (pp. 145, 172, 256, 327).  
**hñurañ**, *erroneous reading (for hñrañ) in* 230.  
**hñe**, *error (for hñye?).* 364.  
**hñehi**. 115. *See* hyah (pp. 191, 217).  
**hño** I = *Tib.* ño, *face, &c.; no-lkog, openly and secretly* (pp. 220–1). 251 -hkhog-lto; 258 -hdañ; 314 -hkhog; 322 -hkhob (pp. 171, 221, 280).  
 II *friend, side = Tib.* ños, *side, state, person, direction* (pp. 220–1, 266). *See also* hñon, hñoñu, hñoño, hñor I. 56 rñe°; 133 rñe-re°; 241 -rgam; 264–5, 279, 295 -hkhō; 299 hrñe°; 347 hrñeñe°; 372 hrñe° (pp. 219–21).  
 — (II) -sta = -s-ta, *friend.* 85 (pp. 290, 341).  
 — (II) -sto = -s-to, *friend.* 84, 85.  
 — (II) -stor, *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.  
**hñon** = hño II. 265 -kya.  
 — -ta (*Suffix*, pp. 182–3) *friendship.* 265.  
**hñoñu** = hño II. 206.



**hñoḥo** = hño II. 273 -hjam; 320 rñe-re° (p. 317).

**hñor** I for hño-re. 65 -hṣaḥ; 130, 132, 219 (pp. 157, 187, 219, 258, 259).

II = *Tib. nor, property, wealth, cattle, farm* (pp. 225, 245, 361-2). 11 -hlah; 50, 52. *See also nor* (pp. 245, 328, 344, 361).

— III? 17 hñor-hlañ.

**hñyir-hñyir** = *Tib. ñil-ñil, trickle down*, 28 hgrañ° (p. 362).

**hñyeḥe**, probably = hño, hñyoñ (*see critical notes to ll. 361-4*) (p. 362). *See also hño*. 363, 364 hke-ma°.

**hñyoñ** = hño, *q.v.* (p. 362). 362 hḍza-ma°; 363 hke-ma°.

**rñab** (?rbab), possibly = hrñab, *q.v.* 54 -ña-hke.

**rñam** = *Tib. rñam, threaten, rage, dazzle, devastate. See also hrñam*. 49 -nar; 191 -skar (pp. 244, 315).

**rñe** *enemy* = *Tib. rñe, fiend* (pp. 219-22). *See also rñeḥi, hrñe, hrñeḥe*. 85 -hwe; 130 -hbye-hkweḥe; 155 -ne; 177 -hpo; 196 -hldañ; 274 -hḍzam; 320 hrgyañ° (pp. 220-2, 316, 335, 341).

— **-hldaḥ** (*Suffix*, p. 183) *hostile*. 310 -hro.

**rñeḥi** = rñe + ḥi or rñeḥe, *is enemy*. 86 -rñeḥi (p. 219).

**rño** = *Tib. rño, ability, competence* (pp. 262-4, 339). *See also rñor, hrño, hrñoḥo, hrñor*. 53-6 hko-; 116 -mu-rgyeb; 189 hkhoo°; 267 hkhoo°; 272, 342 hko°; 141 stor°; 152 hku°; 156 g-yog°; 161 ldoñ°; 179 glañ°; 189 hkog°; 277, 309 wa°; 334 hwah-hrog°; 335 hwaḥ°; 360 hñw glañ° (pp. 228, 253, 263, 270, 281, 297, 338, 340).

**rñor** = rño-re. 289 hyog°; 322 hyog°.

**rñye**, for rñe, *q.v.* 206 -ne (pp. 221, 362).

**hrñam** = rñam, *q.v.* 368 -hḍar (p. 320).

**hrñu** = *Tib. rñu, pain*. 9 -skhrud (pp. 329, 348).

**hrñe** = rñe, *q.v.* 16 -gsañ; 119, 127, 141, 144 -hldañ; 292 -hkham; 322 -hdam; 361 -hpo; 372 -hño; 385 -hrom (pp. 145, 220, 221, 274, 288, 316, 335).

— **-hldaḥ** = rñe°. 303 -hro (p. 270).

**hrñeḥe** = hrñe, rñe, rñeḥi. 131, 347 -hño.

**hrño** = rño, *q.v.* 16 -hyod; 49 -hcañ; 188 -re; 189 hkhoo°; 214 hldoñ°; 269 hwaḥ°; 368 -hprañ (pp. 239, 252, 253, 258, 263, 285, 339).

**hrñoḥo** = hrño. 302 hśiñ°.

**hrñor** = hrño-re. 171 hti°; 339 hldoñ° (pp. 257-8).

## C

**ca** = ḥcaḥ, *q.v.* 235 -yañ (pp. 303-4).

**cañ I** = *Tib. cañ in cañ-rig, cañ-śes, all-knowing or very knowing* (pp. 283-4). *See also chañ*.

II *Suffixed, 'disposed to' (?) = Tib. -can, possessing, &c. (Probably identical with I and with Tib. gcañ, clever; bcañs, comprehensive, &c.: see ibid.) See also hcañ, chañ*.

III = *Chinese ch'êng, city?* 118 (p. 243).

— (I) **-sme**, *all-blazing*. 262 -me (p. 283).

— (II). 36 rgam°; 118 hphar°; 298 hphya-myi°; 368 gseḥe° (pp. 244, 283, 359).

**ci**, probably a *Suffix* or = *Tib. ci in the sense of 'those who'*. *See also chi*. 259, 261 hḍag° (pp. 192, 202, 342).

**ciḡ** = *Tib. ḥjig, gzig, bzig, bśigs, destroy, do away with, perish* (p. 234). *See also gciḡ, ḥciḡ, ḥśiḡ*. 150 hkyer-re°; 194 ste-gḍzu-ge°; 376 rab-hgo°; 377 hpag°; 387 hko-htar° (?); 387 hjo° (?) (pp. 241, 305-6).

— **-dze**, *an official title?* (pp. 305-6).

186 -htor; 188 -tor; 192 -htor (pp. 305, 331).

**cis** ? 84 -tsha (pp. 259, 359). *Cf.* **gci**, **chi** II, **chis**?

**ce** = **hce**, *q.v.* 51 -rgyañ (pp. 321, 328).

**cog**, *not in text* (pp. 132, 368). *See* **gcog**.

**gci** = *Tib.* mchi, *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, tshegs, *check*, &c. (p. 294). *See also* **hceg**, **tseg**, **gcheg**. 234 hso-hnah°.

**gcog** meadow (p. 249), *or possibly* = *Tib.* lcog, *roof*. 69 -hldc-hldu (pp. 247, 249, 321).

**hceg** = *Tib.* cag-ga, *care*; chag-rgyag, *doubt*.

— **-rgyag**, *hesitation*. 83 (p. 259).

**hcañ** I = cañ II, *q.v.* 48 gse°; 49 hrno°; 299 hldoñ° (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-htsah; 240 -hyañ (pp. 252-3, 259, 303, 320). *See also* **ca-yañ**, **mehi** (**hmehi**)-**klu-hcañ**.

**hci** = *gci*. 300 hri°; 348 hrim-glehu-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, gcen, ched, ches, *great*. *See also* **hche**, **hches**. 53 na°; 54 hko-rno°; 57 rgyaño.

— **-rgyañ**, *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).

**hcer** = *Tib.* gcer, bcer, *glare*, *stare*; ce-re, cer-re, *with fixed stare* (p. 304). 71 hcha-ge°; 202 ne°; 388 hyañ-tsa° (pp. 216, 222, 274, 304, 359).

**hco** = *Tib.* jo, gtso, jo-co, rjo, gtso, cho, *chief*, *lord*. 55 (2) (p. 263).

**hcog** I. *See* **hkah-hcog**.  
II = *htsog*, *assemble*, &c., *q.v.*  
— **-hdo** (*a Suffix*, pp. 186-7) = *htsog*°, *union*. 88 (p. 340).  
— **-hram-hdo** = *htsog*°, *harmony*. 87.

**hcsah** = *htsah*, *q.v.* (p. 278). 166 -g-ye; 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 -hwars.

**chañ** I = cañ I, *q.v.* 263 -rdzum (p. 283).  
II = cañ II, **hcañ** I. 76 hdzo°; 91 še° (pp. 283-4).  
III = *Tib.* hchañ, bcañs, *hold*, *carry*. 261 phyer° (pp. 239, 283).

**chad** = *Tib.* hchad, chod, gead, bcad, gcod, *cut*, *fix*, *decide*. 165 -rmu (p. 276).

**chah** = *cha* I, *story*, *matter*? 164 -hkañhi (p. 315).

**chi** I = *ci*, *q.v.* 260, 261 hdag° (p. 239).  
II = *gci*, *go*, *q.v.* *See also* **hcihi**. 168 -hrmu; 385 -te, *a Suffix* (pp. 274, 276).

**chim** = *Tib.* hchim, htshim, *become full* (e.g. the moon), *satisfy*, &c. *See also* **hchim**, **htshim**, **chis**.

— **-hldim**, *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.* ḥchos, bco, bcos, chos, *make, arrange, originate, &c.*; cho-rigs, *lineage, &c.* See also ḥchos. 159 -hre (p. 145).

— **-ta** (*a Suffix*, p. 182). 158 (pp. 145-6).

**gčeg** = gceg, hceg, *q.v.* 111 ḥso-ḥnah° (p. 293).

**ḥcha** = ḥcaḥ, *q.v.* See also meḥi-klu°. 71 -ge-ḥcer; 239 -ḥgrah (?) (pp. 253, 304).

— **-hru** = cha°. 202 -ḥrdyañ.

**ḥchan** 349 -ḥjim.

**ḥchah** = cha I. 97 ḥmo° (p. 345).

— **-yañ** 242 = ca°, ḥcaḥ° (pp. 303-4).

**ḥchi** = gci, chi II, *go, q.v.* 183 -ḥdo; 345 -ḥro; 353 -ḥdo (pp. 186, 269, 276, 332).

**ḥchim** = ḥtshim, *cf.* chim. 38 ḥsí-ḥgri° (p. 299).

**ḥchir** 233 -ḥtsah-sto.

**ḥchuñ** = *Tib.* cuñ, geuñ, chuñ, *small.* 185 ḥtor-ḥdo° (p. 139).

**ḥche** = ḥce, *q.v.*, or *Tib.* gces, *dear, important,* 115 ḥrañ°; 117 rañ° (p. 252).

— **-hmu**, *great cold, death* = ḥce°; 204 (p. 200).

— **-rgyo** *copulation.* 323 (p. 246).

**ḥches** = ḥce, *q.v.* (pp. 359-60). 322 ḥgar-ḥpu° (p. 359).

**ḥchos** = chos, *q.v.* 153 -ḥyo; 159 ḥnah°; 160 sí° (pp. 145, 172, 174, 217, 273, 320).

## J

**je**, *error for dze.* 116 (pp. 240, 315).

**jo** = *Tib.* bzo, *work?* See also ḥjo, ḥjoḥo. 251 -re; 253 -me (pp. 274-5).

**joñ** = ḥjoñ, ḥdzoñ, *q.v.* 78 Ḥmoñ° (p. 243).

**ḥjañ**, see ḥlañ. 101, 107.

**ḥjam** = *Tib.* ḥjam, *gentle, mild, pleasant.* See also ḥdzam (pp. 297, 339). 186 -ge-ḥmeḥi, -ḥtam; 269 ḥrño°; 273 ḥñoḥo°; 274 -rño (pp. 281, 317).

**ḥjah** = ḥdzaḥ, *eat, q.v.* 92 -ḥtah, *a Suffix*, p. 182 (p. 334).

**ḥjar** = ḥdzar, *stick, stick together, q.v.* 220 ḥdru° (pp. 173, 366).

**ḥji** = *Tib.* ḥji, lji, *flea, no matter?* See also ḥjiḥi, ḥrjiḥi (p. 231). (*Or, per contra* = *Tib.* lei, lji, *heavy?*). 211 -rdañ (p. 260).

**ḥjim**, *possibly drug and herb collectors, cf. Tib.* ḥjiñ, ḥjim (p. 280, n. 1). 109 -li-li; 156 -ta, *a Suffix*, pp. 182-3; 314 g-ri°; 349 -ḥtsoñ (pp. 280, 322).

**ḥjiḥi** = ḥji, *q.v.* 78 -re; 306 (pp. 244, 231).

**ḥju**, *ass, cf. Tib.* gzu-lum, *obstinate* (p. 252). See also ḡdzu, ḥdzu, ḡzu, ḥzu, ḥjuḥu. 115 ḥrañ-ḥche° (p. 252).

**ḥjuḥu**, *tiger* = ḥju, *q.v.* 312 -ḥbrad (p. 254).

**ḥjo** I = *Tib.* jo, &c. See ḥco. 63 ḥyañ-tsa°; 78 ldyañ°; 154 ḥchos-ḥyo°; 201 trog°; 372 ḥldyañ-ḥyu°; 385 -chi-te (?); 387 ḥldyañ-ḥyu°; 389 ḥldyañ° (pp. 273-4, 305, 331).

— **-ḥdzin**, *govern.* 74 (p. 274).

II = jo, *work, q.v.* See also ḥjoḥo. 67, 70 -me-ḥdub (pp. 274, 335).

III = *Tib.* za, zo, &c., *eat.* 177 (pp. 274, 335).

IV *error (for ḥto)?* 69 thar-pyañ° (pp. 247-8).

**ḥjoñ** = ḥdzoñ, *fort, q.v.* See also joñ. 118 Moñ°; 129 Moñ° (pp. 243, 263).

**ḥjohu** = ḥdzo, *man, q.v.* 137 -ḥwa-hkaḥ (pp. 218, 338).

**ḥjoḥo** = ḥjo II, *work.* 34 (p. 275).

**ḥjor** = *Tib.* cor, *clamour, &c.* 194 ḥkaḥ-ḥgañ° (pp. 238, 315).

**rje** = *Tib.* rje, *chieftain.* 37 -smyi-rmad; 138 ḥdzču° (pp. 218, 228, 237). See also ḥrje.

**rjes** = *Tib.* rjes, *trace?* 201 pyi° (pp. 222, 274, 359).

**ḥrjiḥi**, *r-form of ḥji, ḥjiḥi, q.v.?* 213 ḥbos-ḥdom°.

**ḥrje** = rje, *chieftain, q.v.?* 84 -smyi-rmad (p. 227). 36 ḥldyo°? (p. 244).

## Ñ

- ñe** = *Tib. ñes, evil, &c.* (pp. 221-2).  
See also **ñene**, **ñes**, **hñe**, **rñe**,  
**rñehe**, **hrñe**, **hkyah-hwa-ñe**.  
17 -hkye-hkyeb; 149 sñiñ°;  
229 sñañ°; 343 -hśes (pp. 221-2,  
256, 313).
- ñene** = ñe-ne? 328 sñañ°.
- ñer** (hkyah-hwa°) = ñe-re. 340  
(p. 253).
- ñes**, *Aorist form of ñe = Tib. ñes.*  
153 -re; 158 -re; 192 (pp. 283,  
316).
- gñi** = *Tib. ñi, gñi, sun.* See also  
**hñi** (pp. 271-2). 80 -hrdzum;  
199 rgyah-gñi-ke (pp. 186, 271,  
293).
- gñim** = *Tib. ñin, gñin, day.* 12  
-hti (pp. 235-6, 362).
- hñañ** I = *Chin. ñañ, female.* 45  
-hya (p. 343).  
II, *hear?* 385 -hyah-htaḥ (p. 331).
- hñi** I *shine, cf. Tib. ñi, gñi, sun*  
(pp. 272-3). See also **hñis**. 67  
hlab-ma° (p. 272).  
II = *Tib. gñis, ñis, two* (pp. 234-  
5). See also **sñi**. 140 -stor.  
III? 187 -htor; 215 -htor?  
(p. 272).
- hñis**, *Aorist form of hñi I, q.v.* 70  
hlab-me° (pp. 173, 273, 358).
- hñe** = ñe, *q.v.* 209 -nag; 343 sroñ°;  
361 -hpo; 339 sroñ° (pp. 256,  
274, 316).
- hñed** = *Tib. mñe, mñed, &c., tan,*  
*make pliable.* 31 -htram; 47  
-ge-slug (p. 251).
- hño** = *Tib. ño, buy, trade.* 174, 177  
hdro°; 359, 361 dro°, hdro°.
- rñi** = *Tib. rñid, brñis, gñid, fade,*  
*grieve; rñis, worn out, faded; cf.*  
*rñiñ, old, gñid, sleep.* See also  
**hrñi**. 389 sñañ-rñi-re.
- rñe**, *r-form of ñe, evil.* See also,  
**rñye**, **hrñe** (pp. 222, 350, 362).  
146 -hne-hrmag; 149 rmag°;  
200 -ne; 201 hjo°; 229, 237  
-hkhayam; 301 -ne; 341 -hprom;  
343 -hñe-śes; 358 -ge-hgo (pp.  
221-2, 261, 274, 313, 321).  
— **-hlad**, *requit of evil* (p. 223).

230, 231, 232, 235 lad; 237, 239  
(pp. 183, 303).

- rñehe** = *rñe, q.v.* 297 -hbrom.
- hrñi** = *rñi, q.v.* 63 hyañ-hso°; 298  
hbos-stsaḥ (p. 303).
- hrñe** = *rñe?* 352 meḥi-cha°.
- sñañ** I = *Tib. sñiñ, heart.* See also  
**sñiñ**. 92 -gyañ; 102-3 (? see  
II); 389 -rñi (pp. 156, 295,  
333-4).  
— **-ne**, *good heart (or II?)*. 65  
hpha-ma°; 160 -thehe; 328  
ñene (pp. 222, 318).  
— **-ñe**, *evil-heart.* 229, 328 ñene  
(p. 222). See also **sñiñ**.  
II = *Tib. sñan, agreeable, affec-*  
*tionate.* 66 -glañ; 102-3 (? see I)  
(p. 318).  
— **-do** (*a Suffix*, p. 186), *affection.*  
86.
- sñar**, *probably for sña-re (metre),*  
*and possibly sña = Tib. sña,*  
*gña, witness* (p. 356). 362  
hkehu-prom°.
- sñi** I = *Tib. gñis, two.* See also **hñi**  
II (pp. 203, 235, 356). 23 gsom°.  
II = *Tib. rñi/sñi, snare, trap.*  
219 (p. 272).
- sñiñ** = *Tib. sñiñ, heart.* See also  
**sñañ** I. 168 -hkañ (p. 147).  
— **-ñe**, *evil-heart = sñañ°.* 149  
(p. 222).
- sñe**, *conceivably = Tib. gñe, woo,*  
*court* (p. 356). 217 kho°.

## T

- ta**, *a Suffix, appended chiefly to words*  
*of Verbal, or at least Adjectival,*  
*sense.* See also **taḥ**, **hta** I,  
**htaḥ** I, **tha** I, **sta** I, **staḥ** I.  
(pp. 182-3, 187). See under  
**skye-**, **glo-**, **hñon-**, **chos-**,  
**hjim**, **htañ-**, **stor-**, **hdab-**,  
**hde-**, **byin-**, **hmo-**, **hwañ-**,  
**hwar-**, **g-yah-**, **hyed-ge-**,  
**hro-**, **hrom-**, **g-ri-**, **hlab-**,  
**bśi-**, **hśes-**, **hśo-hti-ge-**.
- taḥ** = *ta.* See **byin-**, **gśañ-**,  
**glaḥ** (?).
- te**, *a Suffix, appended normally, with*  
*the sense of a Gerund, to Verbal*

words. See also **hte**, **ste I**, **hste I** (pp. 136, 140, 188-90). See under **chi-**, **htañ-ma-**, **puñ-**, **hphom-**, **hsod-**, **hsas-**.

**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**, **hto I**, **htos**, **htoho**, **htohi**, **htohu**, **htor I**, **htoni**, **sto I** (pp. 184-6). See under **htad-**, **stor-**, **hdam-**, **hpā-**, **hprom-**, **hmu-**, **g-yah-**.

**tor I** great, perhaps derived in ancient times from an early form of Chinese *ta*. See also **htor II**. 50 **hldyo**<sup>o</sup>; 219 **-sñi**; 174 **-dro-hño**; 64 **-hpu-hgru**; 216 **-hbroñ**; 219 **-sñi**; 337 **-hrtah**; 388 **-kru** (pp. 263, 272, 305, 308).

II = *thor*, **hthor**, *q.v.* 148 **-htas-prom** (p. 302).

III written in place of *to-re*: cf. **htor I**. 188 **cig-dze**<sup>o</sup> (p. 305).

**twañ** = *Tib. thoñ*, *ram*? 48 **-mag-hño**; 261, 275 (pp. 342-3).

**tyañ** 213 **hbehi**<sup>o</sup> *ordehe* (p. 253).

**trog**, *enemy*? (pp. 220-2). See also **htrog**. 201 **-hjo-rñe**; 266 **-htor** (pp. 221, 222, 274).

**gtañ** = *Tib. gtoñ*, **gtañ**, **btañ**, *send*, *let go*, *allow*, &c. See also **gtoñ**, **htoñ**, **thoñ**. 186 **mehi-ra**<sup>o</sup> (p. 331).

**gtaḥ** = *Tib. gtaḥ*, *pledge*, *hostage*. See also **gtar**. 111 **-hbom-rbo** (p. 230).

**gtar**, written for **gtaḥ-re**? 43.

**gtoñ** = **gtañ**, **htoñ**, *q.v.* 211 **hgo**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 200, 261, 332).

**hta I**, a Suffix = *ta*, *q.v.* 181 **grtehe**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 156, 197).

II = *Tib. da*, *now*, &c.? See also **htaḥ**. 185 (p. 186).

**htag** = *Tib. thag*, *rope*, *hdogs*, **btags**, **gdags**, *tie*, &c. 34 **hyos**<sup>o</sup> (p. 275).

— **-hto** (a Suffix, pp. 184-6). 278 **htos**: 279 **htos**, **hto**: 285.

**htañ I** = **gtañ**, *q.v.* 94 **htsog**<sup>o</sup>; 96 **htsog**<sup>o</sup>. See also **hthañ III**.

II = *Tib. thañ*, *measure*, *power*, 9 **mor**<sup>o</sup>; 10 **hyañ**<sup>o</sup>; 39 **mye**<sup>o</sup>; 149 **me**<sup>o</sup>; 315 **hyaḥ**<sup>o</sup>; 318 **hyaḥ**<sup>o</sup>. See also **hthañ II**, **thwañ**, **hthwañ** (pp. 227, 276, 296, 301-2).

III = *Tib. thañ*, *plateau*, *field*. See also **thañ**, **hthañ I**. 14 **-hldu**; 218 **-hrdzo** (pp. 258, 321).

IV? 11 **-hmu-hro**; 96 **kya**<sup>o</sup> **ta** (pp. 270, 329).

**htad** = *Tib. gtod*, **gtad**, **btad**, *hand over*, *deliver*, *press*, *urge*, **gtad**, *steady*, *firm*, 30 **gsañ-re**<sup>o</sup>.

**htab** = *Chinese ta* (*A. tap*), *answer*. 293, 295 **-hkhohu** (pp. 264, 298).

**htam I** = *Tib. htham*, **hthams**, *thams*, *join*, *enlock*, *stick fast*, *thams-cad*, *all*. See also **htham**. 24 **hsram**<sup>o</sup>; 54 **stehi**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 138, 306, 353).

II = *Tib. gtam*, *speech*, *story*, 60 **hldañ-rgyu**<sup>o</sup>; 248 **hjam**<sup>o</sup> (p. 286).

**htaḥ I** a Suffix = *ta*, *q.v.* See under **klu-**, **hkor-**, **hkhoh-**, **hjah-**, **htor-**, **stor-**, **hld-**, **hldehi-**, **hldyañ-**, **me-**, **hmye-**, **hdzom-**, **hyaḥ-**, **hwa-ste-**, **rwye-**, **g-ri-**, **hram-ge-**, **gse-**, **hse-** (**hrnab-hldaḥ** ?).

II = **hta II**? 185 (p. 186).

III error for *rta*, **hrtah**? 341 **htor**<sup>o</sup>; cf. 124, 232, 337, 340.

**htar I** = *Tib. thar*, *be released*, *escape*. See also **thar I**, **hthar I**, **hko-htar**. 146 **hnam-hdzam**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 261, 300).

II = *Tib. mthar*, *at the end*; **mthaḥ**, *extremity*, *border*. See also **thar II**, **hthar II**. 374 **-phyañ-hto**; 392 **-ma**? (pp. 248-9).

**htas** = *Tib. hthas*, *hard*, *solid*, *stiff*; **brta**, **brtas**, **rtas**, *expand*, *widen*, *be abundant*. 256 **-kro**.

— **-prom**, *become tangled*? 121, 148, 257 **htor**<sup>o</sup> (pp. 292, 302).

**hti I** = *Tib. gti-mug*, *gloom*, cf. **gtibs**, **thib**, **thibs**, &c.; *dark*, *dense*. 12 **gñim**<sup>o</sup>; 26 **hldyeg-hldyi**<sup>o</sup>?; 154 **-rgye**; 385 **hrom-ge**<sup>o</sup> (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 -hrño; 351 hsehe° (?); 354 hso°; 390 gdzu° (?). (pp. 174, 236, 257, 285, 309).

**htib** = *Tib.* rtib, brtibs, rtib, rtibs, *break down; ltib, rdib, collapse.* 19 -bzer (pp. 339-40).

**htuħu** = hthu, *assemble, q.v.* 100 (pp. 260, 321).

**htul** = *Tib.* hdul, btul, thul, gdul, dul, brtul, &c., *tame, discipline, conquer.* See also htul. 42 hklom-ge°; 170 hkoħi-me°; 378 hse-ge° (pp. 244, 280, 285).

**hte** = te, *Gerund-suffix, q.v.* See under hkañ-, htre-, trog-htor-, htrog-ħdre (and ħdreħe)-, ħdre-, rdam-, hnam-, hram-, hse-.

**hte-ħe** written for htħe = hte. 322.

**hto** I a *Suffix* under 'is'. Verb = to, *q.v.* See under klu-, hko-, hkhru-re-, dguħu-mu-, hrgam-re-, hrgu-, rgyo-, rgyoħo-, stor-, hnu-, prom-, bprom-, hpud-, phrom-, hphrom-, hmañ-, htshu-, ħdzoħu-, ħyah-, re-, ġ-ri-. See also htoni, htħo, htor.

II ? = *Tib.* mtho, *high, or tho, boundary* (pp. 248, 261, 332). 210 ħdyañ°; 374 phyañ° (pp. 248, 280).

**htog** = htħog, *stop, q.v.* 235 ħbeħi-ħbaħ° (pp. 250, 301).

**htoñ** = gtañ, gtoñ, *q.v.* 100 narom°; 119 hño-stor°; 146 hraħ°; 190 hphuħi°; 210 ħdyañ-hto°; 212 hko°; 247 ħlad°; 273 hraħ°; 358 hraħ° (pp. 217, 228, 261, 285, 332).

**hton** I = (*Tib.* mthon, 'high'). 223 (-ħkoñ).

II for hto-na. 280, 285 htħag°.

**htoni** = hto + ni. 150 stor-htħaħ°; 152 stor-ta°.

**htom** 364 -hphah.

**htoħi** = hto + ħi. 324 hkhad°.

**htoħu** = hto ? (p. 369). 7 hrño°.

**htħo** = hto, *q.v.* See under rgo-,

ħciħi-, stor-, ħprom-, ħrbom-, ħrbyo-, rmañ-dze-, ħyah-.

**htor** I written in place of hto-re (see pp. 172-5 and critical notes). See also tor. 96 htħañ-ta° (?); 104 ħdoñ° (?); 186 cig-dze°; 187 hñi° (?); 192 cig-dze°; 225, 245 dgu-ħmu°; 341 rgyed-hraħ°; 393 ħdam° (?); 394 (?).

II = tor I *great, q.v.* Preceding ħkho 217, 218; ħkhru-ħrgyañ 187; hñi 215; sñiñ (sñañ) 168; 389; ħrta (ħrtaħ) 124, 231, 271, 340, 341 (htħaħ); ħdro-ħño 177, 359, 361; ħpu (ħpuħu, ħphu, ħbu) 29, 33, 62, 293, 329; ħbroñ 215 (2), 216, 217, 219, 222, 223 (2), 392; smyi 73; ħsi-rgo 120; hso 354. Following, as Attribute or Predicate, dgu 75, 76 (2); ħgu 113; dgu-ħldo 74; 77, 78, 114, 139, 191, 309; ca-yañ 236 (?); trog (htrog) 40, 266; htħañ-ta 96 (?); ħdam 393 (?); ħdoñ 104 (?); ħldyo 16, 34, 254; se (143); gse-ħlad 240 (?).

— -ge the great 364, 387.

— -ħdo (a *Suffix*, pp. 186-7) *greatness.* 185 (p. 139).

III = thor, htħor, *bunch, top, &c., q.v.* See also tor II. 121 -htħas-ħproms; 148 spye°; 236 ca-yañ° (?); 257 -htħas-prom (pp. 292, 302).

**htos**, *Preterite form of hto* I (p. 198). 278, 279 htħag°.

**htye** (*conceivably* = Chinese t'ien, *heaven, sky*) (p. 324). See also htħye. 8 sta-ħldyañ°.

**httram** = *Tib.* tram, *hard, stiff.* See also ħdram. 31 hñed° (p. 251).

**htre** = ħdre, *q.v.* 94 rgyed°; 248 rgyed° (pp. 140, 291).

**htro** = *Tib.* ħdro, *heat? or the frequent ħdro = Tib.* ħdron, *travel.* 197 mu-ħrog° (pp. 232, 318). See also ħdro.

**htrog**, *enemy?* (p. 220). See also trog. 40 -htor; 146 ħdrag°; 326 -ħdre; 338 -ħdreħe; 376 ħrdza° (pp. 320, 327).

**htron**, *Imperative* (hdroṅs) of *Tib.* htron, *travel, or* hḍren, droṅs, &c., *draw, lead.* See also **htronḥi**. 233 hḥhab-hgro° (p. 343).  
**htronḥi** = htron, *q.v.*, +ḥi. 224 hrkwa°; 243 hḥhab-gro° (p. 343).  
**htron** = *Tib.* htron, *travel.* 327 hrgyah-hḍiḥi° (p. 317).  
**rta** *horse* = *Tib.* rta. See also **rtah**, **rtahḥi**, **hrta**, **hrtah** (pp. 139, 146, 258). *With preceding* hraḥ-weḥi 139. *With following* sko-prom 91; ḥgam-hphar 93, 99, 110, 289; ḥdag-hsag 389; ḥtsog-ram 90; ḥwa-hḍaṅ 278; yaṅ-stor 79; ḥsa-g-yer 330, 346; so (ḥso) -ḥnaḥ 80, 93, 100, 103; swa 173, 175, 358.  
 — **-ge** *the (?) horse.* 364.  
**rtah** = rta, *q.v.* *With preceding* hraḥ 114, hraḥ(hra)-we 114, 191. *With following* ḥgam 118; ḥtsog-hram 35, 82; ḥscaḥ-g-yer 166; ḥswah 298.  
**rtahḥi** = rta(rtah) + ḥi (?). 174 -swa-hḍdir (p. 320).  
**rte** I? 82 ḥcaḥ° (pp. 259, 320).  
 II = hrtre, *q.v.* 182 hraḥ-rte-hḍub (p. 313).  
**rto** = *Tib.* rdo *stone* (?). See also **hrto**. 25 klu° (pp. 138, 223).  
**grteḥe** = *Hsi-hsia* gdeḥ, hrde, *fix, &c.* (*cf.* *Tib.* ḥthen, *stop; rten, hold; bden, true?*). See also **hrteḥu**, **gdes**. 181 -ḥta (pp. 156, 197 and nn.).  
**hrta** = rta, rtah, *horse, q.v.* *With preceding* htor 124, 232. *With following* rkwa-hḍzam 122; ḥpā-hphar 187; ḥtsog-hram 119, 123; wa-hḍaṅ 258; ḥwa-hḍaṅ 121.  
**hrtah** = rta, rtah, hrta, *q.v.* *With preceding* tor, htor, 271, 337, 340; ḥldi-ma 63, 144; hraḥ 77; hraḥ-hweḥi 380. *With following* ḥgam 118; naṅ-hwar 354; ḥpah-hphar 388; ḥldāṅ-hkraṅ 91; hraṅ-glyaṅ 230; swa (swah) 176, 301, 360.

**hrteḥu** *fix, stop; cf. Hsi-hsia hrde, gdeḥ?* See also **grteḥe** (pp. 156, 313-14). 265 gsaṅ-taḥ°.  
**hrto** = rto *stone, q.v.* 24 klu° (pp. 138, 223).  
**hrtre** = rte II. 354 hraḥ-hrtre-hḍub.  
**hḍtaṅ** = ḥldāṅ, ḍdaṅ, *rise, q.v.* 93 rgyed-ma° (p. 291).  
**hḍtaḥ** I. See **ḥko-hḍtaḥ**. 203 ḥbri-ḥko°.  
 II *for hḍtaḥ?* 250 -ḥtsaḥ-hyer (p. 278).  
**hḍto**, *possibly* = *Tib.* ltos, *look (or = ḥldo, a Suffix?)* 251 ḥṅo-hḥkog° (p. 354).  
**hḍtom** = ḥldom, *subdue, q.v.* 88 ḥdim-hḥtshis° (p. 321).  
**sta**, **staḥ** I, *a form of the Suffix ta, taḥ, q.v., which has attracted a -s belonging to its (preceding) word: cf. Tib. -ste/-te* (pp. 182-3, 185 n. 1) and *sto infra.* 85 ḥṅo°; 86 rṅe°; 306 ḥbrad°; (pp. 220-1, 359).  
 II = *there, also Correlative.* See also **staḥ**, **ḥstaḥ** (p. 201). *A, at beginning of clause.* 8 -ḥḍyaṅ; 9 -ḥri; 9, 19, 252 -re; 252 -g-ri, -baṅ (pp. 142, 274, 332). *B, otherwise.* 311 ḥmaṅ°, ḥri°; 312 g-riḥi°, ḥri°, g-ri° (pp. 201, 254, 337).  
**staṅ** = *Tib.* stan, steṅ, *top, high, up.* See also **ḥstaṅ**. 83 ḥkam° (?); 88 ḥldāṅ°; 303, 347 -ḥro (pp. 270, 321).  
**staḥ** I = sta I, *q.v.* 99 slo° (p. 336).  
 II = sta II, *q.v.* 20 -ḥḍyaṅ; 312 ḥri° (p. 201).  
**sti** = *Tib.* sti, bsti, thi, ḥthi, *rest.* 299 g-ri°; 300 ḥriḥi° (pp. 265-6, 355). See also **ḥti** II.  
**stiṅ** = *Tib.* stiṅ, bstiṅ, bstiṅs, ḥthiṅ, *rebuke* (p. 367). 330, 331 rgyo-ḥto°; 335, 336 rgyoḥo-ḥto° (p. 178).  
**ste** I = te, ḥte, *q.v., with s- as in sta and sto.* See also **ḥste** (pp. 136, 188-90). 34 ḥtsaḥ°; 72, 73, 75 (2) ḥwa°; 182 gboḥu° (pp. 273, 275, 337, 338).

II = Tib. *sten, bsten, range closely together. See also stehi, stehe* (pp. 353-4). 178 -*hkehu-prom*; 180 -*hkohu-bprom*; 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*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 156, 354).

**sto** I = to, *hto* I, a *Suffix q.v., with s- as in sta and ste* (pp. 185-6). 28 *hldu*<sup>o</sup>; 29 *hyim*<sup>o</sup>; 58 *hrgehi*<sup>o</sup>; 84, 85 *hno*<sup>o</sup>; 233 *htsah*<sup>o</sup>; 235 *hnah*<sup>o</sup>; 242 *hrgyañ*<sup>o</sup>; 292 *hgyañ*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 219-20, 233, 259, 321, 341).

II = Tib. *sto, rope.* 336 -*the-the* (pp. 185, 335).

**stoñ** I = Tib. *stoñ, empty.* 51 -*hkhog* (p. 328).

II = Tib. *stoñ, 1000* (pp. 203, 233-4). 247 *gse*<sup>o</sup>.

— **-hpon** = Tib. *stoñ-dpon, commander of a Thousand-district?* 321 -*hprom* (pp. 233-4, 362).

**stom** = Tib. *ston, autumn (harvest).* See also **hstom**. 255 -*hdag*; 281 -*hkañ* (pp. 203, 362).

**stor** = Tib. *stor, stray, flee, be lost; cf. hthor, gtor, btor, scatter; dor, hdor, cast away. See also dor, hdor, hstor* (pp. 171, 253). Applied to *hkyañ* 141, 143; *hkho-hrno* 189; *hno* 79, 119, 127, 128, 143, 196, 258; *rje* 138; *hni* ('2'?) 140; *hdehi* (?) 339; *ldyo* 140; *hldañ-hphyar* 125; *hpo-hldañ* 358 (*sto-re*?); *hpos* 141; *me* (123); *hmoñ-hjoñ* (*hdzoñ*) 78, 118, 128, 139, 140; *hdzañ* 142; *se* 143; *hso-hnah* 122, 232.

— **-ta** (*tha*) (a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3). 145, 149, 150, 152, 337 *htañ*.

— **-to** (*hto*, a *Suffix*, pp. 184-5). 79, 167, 138, 140 *htoho*.

— **-rno**, *able to flee* (pp. 171, 297). 141 *hkyañ*<sup>o</sup>.

— **-thoñ**, *let or cause to flee.* 197.

— **-hdehi-hpyid**. 339 (p. 253).

**stor-hdor**, *let be lost* (p. 253). 118, 127, 142, 160, 161, 162, 163.

— **-hdzo-hdzehi**. 338.

— **-hgu** (*dgu*), *all things lost.* 126-7 (pp. 233, 288-90).

— **-hprom**, *make fight.* 128 *hno*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 171, 294).

**gstor** = stor, *hstor, q.v.* 143 *hkyañ*<sup>o</sup> (p. 297).

— **-ta** = stor-ta, *q.v.* 152 (p. 228).

**hstañ** = stañ, *top, high, up, q.v.* 95 *hldañ*<sup>o</sup> (p. 320).

**hste** = ste I *q.v.* 274 *hldyim*<sup>o</sup> (p. 331).

**hstom** = stom, *autumn (harvest).* 14 -*hkom*.

**hstor** = stor, *be lost, &c., q.v.* Applied to *hgru-ma* 79, *hdehi* (?) 340, *hmoñ-hdzoñ* 64, *so-hna* (*hnah*) 117, 128.

— **-htañ** = stor-ta, *q.v.* 337 (p. 335).

— **-hdehi-hpyid** 340 (p. 253).

— **-ma-swañ** (*hsañ*) 337, 340 (p. 344).

— **-hdzo-hdzehi** = stor<sup>o</sup>, *q.v.* 338.

## Th

**tha** I = ta, *hta, a Suffix, q.v.* 149 stor<sup>o</sup>.

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*<sup>o</sup>; 357 -*mye* (pp. 241, 285).

II = *htar* II, *Tib. mthar, at end, q.v.* See also **hthar** II. 69 -*pyañ* (p. 248).

**thiñ** (*not in text*) = *Tib. mthiñ, blue* (p. 131).

**the** I = *Tib. the, lies, commons; the, thes, belong to. See also hthe, thehe.* 103 -*kyen*; 139 *hldañ*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 228, 322).

II = *Tib. then, hthen, draw, pull, control. See also then.* 336 stor<sup>o</sup> (p. 335).



**then**, *control* = the II, *q.v.* 207  
the° (p. 315).

**thehe** = the I, *liesges*, *q.v.* 160  
sñañ-ne° (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°.

**thoñ** = gtañ, gtoñ, htoñ, *let go*, &c.  
*q.v.* 197 stor°.

**thom-thom**, *cf.* *Tib.* hthom,  
hthoms, *be confused, dizzy*,  
*grope*? 183 bsog°.

**thor** I = htor II, *great*, *q.v.* 220  
-hbroñ.

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-ma°.

III = II? 235 rñe-lad°; 242 hchañ-  
yañ° (p. 303).

**thol** (*not in text*) (p. 133).

**thwañ** = htañ II, *Tib.* thañ, *mea-*  
*sure, power, q.v.*; dbañ-thañ,  
*might, fate*. See also **hthwañ**  
(pp. 346-7). 97 bañ°; 98 -hkhor  
(pp. 342, 345).

**thrah**. 53 hphoñ-ge°.

**hthañ** I = thañ *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* thwañ, *measure*  
*power, q.v.* 132 hldi°; 133 (2)  
hldi°; 222 hyah-htañ°; 286 (2)  
hyah°; 287 g-yah°; 288 hyah°;  
288 hdzañ°; 289 hgar-hpu°;  
290 hso-hnah° (pp. 171, 216,  
228, 229, 293, 296, 323, 342).

— (I) -phu-hkam. 130 hthañ°.

— (I) -le-tsa (hṭsa, tshañ). 131,  
219, 220 (p. 272).

III = gtañ, gtoñ, htañ I. 57  
hrkas° (p. 248).

**htham** = htam I, *q.v.* 227 -rah  
*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  
-phyañ (pp. 248, 343).

**hthu** = *Tib.* hdu, sdu, hthu, &c.,  
*gather, assemble, &c.* See also  
**htuḥu**, **hldun** (pp. 321-2). 140  
ldyo-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, *liesges, &c.*,  
*q.v.* 335 kruḥu°; 383 hyañ°  
(p. 322).

**htho** = tho II, *high, q.v.* 374 hpañ-  
hwe° (p. 280).

**hthog** = *Tib.* thogs, hdogs, btags,  
&c., *fasten, impede; dog, nar-*  
*row, 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** = *Tib.* mthoñ, *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 speḥi-ge°  
(p. 228).

**hthor** = thor II, htor III, tor II,  
*gather to a point, &c., q.v.* 62  
hrihi°; 63 mo-ma°; 144 mo-ma°  
(pp. 302-3).

**hthwañ** = thwañ *and* htañ II, *q.v.*  
280 hkhah-rgye-ge° (p. 342).

**hthye** = htye, *q.v.* 20 -hldyañ.

## D

**dam** = *Tib.* dam, *bound, tight, bond*,  
&c.; gdams, *advice, &c.*; hdam,  
*choose*; hdom, *exhort, select*;  
sdom, sdoms, bsdoms, bsdoms,

II = *Tib.* sten, bsten, range closely together. See also **steḥi**, **steḥe** (pp. 353-4). 178 -ḥkeḥu-prom; 180 -ḥkoḥu-bprom; 194 -gdzu (pp. 241-2, 251-2).

**steḥi** = ste II *q.v.* 54 -ḥtam (p. 353).

**steḥe** = ste II *q.v.* 356 -ḥdzu (p. 353).

**stel** = *Tib.* ster, grant, &c. 181 grteḥe-ta° (pp. 156, 354).

**sto** I = to, ḥto I, a *Suffix q.v.*, with *s-* as in sta and ste (pp. 185-6). 28 ḥldu°; 29 ḥyim°; 58 ḥrgeḥi°; 84, 85 ḥño°; 233 ḥtsaḥ°; 235 ḥñaḥ°; 242 ḥrgyañ°; 292 ḥgyañ° (pp. 219-20, 233, 259, 321, 341).

II = *Tib.* sto, rope. 336 -the-the (pp. 185, 335).

**stoñ** I = *Tib.* stoñ, empty. 51 -ḥkhog (p. 328).

II = *Tib.* stoñ, 1000 (pp. 203, 233-4). 247 gse°.

— **-ḥpoñ** = *Tib.* stoñ-dpon, commander of a Thousand-district? 321 -ḥprom (pp. 233-4, 362).

**stom** = *Tib.* ston, autumn (harvest). See also **ḥstom**. 255 -ḥdag; 281 -ḥkañ (pp. 203, 362).

**stor** = *Tib.* stor, stray, flee, be lost; cf. ḥthor, gtor, btor, scatter; dor, ḥdor, cast away. See also **dor**, **ḥdor**, **ḥstor** (pp. 171, 253). Applied to ḥkyañ 141, 143; ḥkho-ḥrño 189; ḥño 79, 119, 127, 128, 143, 196, 258; rje 138; ḥñi ('2'?) 140; ḥdeḥi(?) 339; ldyo 140; ḥldañ-ḥphyar 125; ḥpo-ḥldaḥ 358 (sto-re?); ḥpos 141; me (123); ḥmoñ-ḥjoñ (ḥdzoñ) 78, 118, 128, 139, 140; ḥdzañ 142; se 143; ḥso-ḥnaḥ 122, 232.

— **-ta** (tha) (a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3). 145, 149, 150, 152, 337 ḥtaḥ.

— **-to** (ḥto, a *Suffix*, pp. 184-5). 79, 167, 138, 140 ḥtoḥo.

— **-rño**, able to flee (pp. 171, 297). 141 ḥkyañ°.

— **-thoñ**, let or cause to flee. 197.

— **-ḥdeḥi-ḥpyid**. 339 (p. 253).

**stor-ḥdor**, let be lost (p. 253). 118, 127, 142, 160, 161, 162, 163.

— **-ḥdzo-ḥdzeḥi**. 338.

— **-ḥgu** (dgu), all things lost. 126-7 (pp. 233, 288-90).

— **-ḥprom**, make flight. 128 ḥño° (pp. 171, 294).

**ḡstor** = stor, ḥstor, *q.v.* 143 ḥkyañ° (p. 297).

— **-ta** = stor-ta, *q.v.* 152 (p. 228).

**ḥstañ** = stañ, top, high, up, *q.v.* 95 ḥldañ° (p. 320).

**ḥste** = ste I *q.v.* 274 ḥldyim° (p. 331).

**ḥstom** = stom, autumn (harvest). 14 -ḥkom.

**ḥstor** = stor, be lost, &c., *q.v.* Applied to ḥgru-ma 79, ḥdeḥi (?) 340, ḥmoñ-ḥdzoñ 64, so-ḥna (ḥnaḥ) 117, 128.

— **-ḥtaḥ** = stor-ta, *q.v.* 337 (p. 335).

— **-ḥdeḥi-ḥpyid** 340 (p. 253).

— **-ma-swañ(ḥsañ)** 337, 340 (p. 344).

— **-ḥdzo-ḥdzeḥi** = stor°, *q.v.* 338.

## Th

**tha** I = ta, ḥta, a *Suffix*, *q.v.* 149 stor°.

II = Hsi-hsia tha, Buddha, *Tib.* lha, god. 241 -ḥnu (p. 237).

**thañ** = ḥthañ, ḥtañ III, plateau, &c. (pp. 246-7). See also **ḥthañ**. 220 -rdzo (pp. 173, 258).

**thar** I = ḥtar, be let loose, *q.v.* See also **ḥthar** I. 190 ḥdro°; 357 -mye (pp. 241, 285).

II = ḥtar II, *Tib.* mthar, at end, *q.v.* See also **ḥthar** II. 69 -pyañ (p. 248).

**thiñ** (not in text) = *Tib.* mthiñ, blue (p. 131).

**the** I = *Tib.* the, lieges, commons; the, thes, belong to. See also **ḥthe**, **theḥe**. 103 -kyen; 139 ḥldañ° (pp. 228, 322).

II = *Tib.* then, ḥthen, draw, pull, control. See also **then**. 336 sto° (p. 335).

**then**, *control* = the II, *q.v.* 207 the<sup>o</sup> (p. 315).

**thehe** = the I, *lieges*, *q.v.* 160 sñañ-ne<sup>o</sup> (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<sup>o</sup>.

**thoñ** = gtañ, gtoñ, htoñ, *let go*, &c. *q.v.* 197 stor<sup>o</sup>.

**thom-thom**, *cf.* *Tib.* hthom, hthoms, *be confused, dizzy, grope?* 183 bsog<sup>o</sup>.

**thor** I = htor II, *great*, *q.v.* 220 -hbroñ.

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-ma<sup>o</sup>.

III = II ? 235 rñe-lad<sup>o</sup>; 242 hchañ-yañ<sup>o</sup> (p. 303).

**thol** (*not in text*) (p. 133).

**thwañ** = htañ II, *Tib.* thañ, *measure, power, q.v.*; dbañ-thañ, *might, fate*. See also **hthwañ** (pp. 346-7). 97 bañ<sup>o</sup>; 98 -hkhor (pp. 342, 345).

**thrah**. 53 hphoñ-ge<sup>o</sup>.

**hthañ** I = thañ *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* thwañ, *measure power, q.v.* 132 hldi<sup>o</sup>; 133 (2) hldi<sup>o</sup>; 222 hyañ-htañ<sup>o</sup>; 286 (2) hyañ<sup>o</sup>; 287 g-yañ<sup>o</sup>; 288 hyañ<sup>o</sup>; 288 hdzan<sup>o</sup>; 289 hgar-hpu<sup>o</sup>; 290 hso-hnañ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 171, 216, 228, 229, 293, 296, 323, 342).

— (I) -**phu-hkam**. 130 hthañ<sup>o</sup>.

— (I) -**le-tsa** (h<sup>h</sup>tsa, tshah). 131, 219, 220 (p. 272).

III = gtañ, gtoñ, htañ I. 57 hrkas<sup>o</sup> (p. 248).

**htham** = htam I, *q.v.* 227 -rah *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 -phyañ (pp. 248, 343).

**hthu** = *Tib.* hdu, sdu, hthu, &c., *gather, assemble, &c.* See also **htuhu**, **hldun** (pp. 321-2). 140 ldyo-stor<sup>o</sup> (pp. 254, 256, 326).

**hthuñ** = *Tib.* thuñ, *small*. 145 hgo<sup>o</sup> (pp. 261, 300).

**hthul** = htul, *conquer, tame, &c., q.v.* 67 ru-glañ-ge<sup>o</sup>; 378 rkom<sup>o</sup> (p. 318).

**hthus**, *Aorist form of hthu, q.v.* 156 hjim-ta<sup>o</sup> (pp. 280, 322).

**hthe** = the I, thehe, *lieges, &c., q.v.* 335 kruhu<sup>o</sup>; 383 hyañ<sup>o</sup> (p. 322).

**htho** = tho II, *high, q.v.* 374 hpañ-hwe<sup>o</sup> (p. 280).

**hthog** = *Tib.* thogs, hdogs, btags, &c., *fasten, impede; dog, narrow, danger, &c.* (p. 301). See also **hthogs**. 149 stor-ta<sup>o</sup>, stor-tha<sup>o</sup> (pp. 299-301, 313).

**hthogni** = hthog + ni, *q.v.* 149.

**hthogs**, *Aorist form of hthog, q.v.* 145 stor-ta<sup>o</sup>; 182 hlab-ta<sup>o</sup> (pp. 156, 299-301).

**hthoñ** = *Tib.* mthoñ, *see.* 92 pyi-hse; 135 gsehe-hldi<sup>o</sup> (p. 321).

**hthon** I, *error for htoni* (152) *or* hthog-ni (149)? *or* = hthon II ? 152 gstor-ta<sup>o</sup> (p. 228).

II = *Tib.* hthon, *come forth, &c., hdon, send forth, &c.?* 152 gstor-ta<sup>o</sup> (?); 379 spehi-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 228).

**hthor** = thor II, htor III, tor II, *gather to a point, &c., q.v.* 62 hrihi<sup>o</sup>; 63 mo-ma<sup>o</sup>; 144 mo-ma<sup>o</sup> (pp. 302-3).

**hthwañ** = thwañ *and* htañ II, *q.v.* 280 hkhah-rgye-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 342).

**hthye** = htye, *q.v.* 20 -hldyañ.

## D

**dam** = *Tib.* dam, *bound, tight, bond, &c.*; gdams, *advice, &c.*; hdam, *choose*; hdom, *exhort, select*; sdom, sdoms, bsdoms, bsdoms,

- &c.*, bind, fasten, obligation, vow, &c. See also **ḥdam**, **ḥdom** II, **rdom**, **ldom**, **ḥldom** I. 46 -rma (p. 286).
- dim** = *Tib.* ḥthim, thim, gtim, stim, be lost, dissolve, evaporate, be absorbed in. See also **ḡdim**, **ddyim**, **ḥldim**, **ḥldyim**. 95 -tshis (pp. 320-1, 359).
- do** I a *Suffix* (pp. 186-7). See also **ḥdo**, **ldo**, **ḥldo**. 86 sñan°.
- II, cf. *Tib.* ldo, side; ldo-ldo, for a short time (occasionally?).
- **-ldo**. 76, 353 (p. 322).
- doḥo**, a *Suffix* = do I, q.v. 80 ḥrdzum° (pp. 271, 293).
- doñ** I = *Tib.* ḥdoñ, depart, begone. See also **ḥdoñ** I, **ldoñ**, **ḥldoñ**. 89 ḥsor°; 392 ḥgyan° (p. 321); 367 ḥyañ-ḥyo°.
- II, extrametrical and accordingly different from I: very possibly therefore a *Conjunction* = *Tib.* doñ, a variant of dañ, practically = whereupon 176 ḥbres; 351 gtsob°.
- dor** = *Tib.* ḥdor, drive or throw away, always in the compound verb; stor-dor (ḥdor), q.v. 160 -yon. See also **ḥdor** (p. 253).
- dwañ** = *Tib.* dwañs, lustre, bright, clean, force of language. 280 gnaḥ-ma°; 364-5 ḥkaḥ° (2) (p. 342). See also **rwañ**.
- dyañ**, perhaps not different from ḥldyañ, q.v. 183 ḥchi-ḥdo° (pp. 172, 332). See also **ḥdyañ**.
- drag** = *Tib.* drag, vehement, fierce, powerful, eminent. See also **ḥdrag** (p. 300). 163 sri-ḥbo° (p. 216).
- dro** = *Tib.* ḥdron, travel, go. See **ḥdro** I (p. 294).
- **-ño**, travelling trader. 174 tor°. See also **ḥdro-ḥño**.
- droḥo** = dro, q.v. 105 ḥtso° (p. 261).
- ḡdag** I = *Tib.* bdog, own, acquire, bdag, master, self, perhaps kept distinct from gdogs, btags, &c., fasten, affix, and from ḡdags, bright, daylight. See also **ḥdag**.
- 142 -ḡgom, -ḡphar; 200, 204, 206 ḥce-ḥmu° (pp. 221-2).
- II = *Tib.* gdags, sunlit? 345 -yañ-la-po (pp. 269-70).
- ḡdah** = *Tib.* gdaḥ, be actual or possible. See also **ḥdah** II. 191 -ḥnaḥ; 396 -kum (?), -ḡgam. ? 43 gdaḥ-ḥdih (pp. 244, 315).
- ḡdim** = dim, *vanish*, &c., q.v. 88 -pyi-ḥse; 89 -phyi-ḥse; 94 -chis or -tshis; 100 -ḥdzam-ḥdzim (pp. 320-1, 359).
- ḡdes**, *Aorist form of grteḥe*, q.v. 260 ḥdom (?)° (pp. 319, 343).
- ḡdod** = *Tib.* dod, be prominent, emerge. 186 g-ri° (p. 331).
- ddyim** (<bdyim?) = dim, ḡdim, q.v. 95 -phyi-ḥse.
- ḥdag** = ḡdag I, possess, acquire, q.v. 254 ḥpraḥ° (?); 255 stom°; 259 ḥyog°; 260 ḥdraḥ°; 261 ḥnaḥ°, ḥgoḥo°; 390 ḥhyañ° (pp. 192, 202, 239, 242, 261, 283, 342-3, 357).
- ḥdañ** = ḥldañ (?) 258 wa° (p. 221).
- ḥdad** = *Tib.* dad, devoted to (p. 227). 304 ḥyaḥ°; 306 ḥyaḥ-ḥdaḥḥd (p. 254).
- ḥdab** = *Tib.* ḥdebs, btab, ḡdab, put, &c. See also **ḥldab** II. 369 meḥi-ra° (pp. 318, 331).
- ḥdam** = dam, bind, &c., q.v. See also **rdam**, **ḥldam**. 204 pyu-ḡpha°; 326 ḥse-ḥtaḥ°; 328 ḥkkoḥ-ḥtaḥ°; 329 ḥkho-ḥdaḥ°; 346, 351 -sleg (pp. 140, 319).
- **-to** (a *Suffix*, pp. 184-6). 68 (pp. 250, 319).
- ḥdah** I = *Tib.* mdah, arrow. See also **ḥldah**. 58, 59 -ḥpog (pp. 300-1, 343).
- II = ḡdah, be actual or possible, q.v. 108 ḥdih°; 329 ḥkho° (? see **ḥkho-ḥltaḥ**) (p. 221).
- **-ta** (a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3). 283 ḡgaḥ-rag°.
- ḥdar** = *Tib.* ḥdar, shiver, tremble, &c. (pp. 319-20). See also **ḥldar**. 19 -ḥti-ḥwe-re; 38, 368 ḥrñam° (pp. 319-20).
- ḥdi**, this (*Tib.* ḥdi). See also **ḥdih**, **ḥldi**, **ḥldih** (p. 201). 107, 198.

**hdim** = dim, gdim, &c., *vanish*,  
q.v. 88 -htshis (pp. 320-1).

**hdiḥ** = hdi, *this*, q.v. 43 gdaḥ°.

**hdihi** = hdi, *this*, q.v. 184 -mag-  
hñor; 327 hrgyaḥ°; 391 hñah°.

**hduñ** = Tib. gduñ, *be distressed*, or  
ltuñ, *fall*. 94, 95 (pp. 320-1).

**hdub** = Tib. dub, *be fatigued*, *sink*.  
67 me°; 70 me°; 182 hraḥ-rte°;  
354 hraḥ-hrte° (pp. 173, 272-3).

**hde I** = Tib. bde, *good fortune*; lde,  
*warm oneself?* See also **hdeḥi**,  
**hld I**, **hldēḥi**, **hldēḥe** (pp.  
278-9). 29 -hyim-sto; 208  
htshar° (pp. 234, 259).

— **-ta** (*a Suffix*, pp. 182-3). 158  
-rgyen (p. 145).

II = Tib. ḥded, *follow*, *drive*,  
*pursue?* 12 hldab-hde-hde,  
*possibly onomatopoeic*; 167 hrañ-  
hraḥ° (p. 318).

**hdeḥi** = hde I, q.v. 102 mag°; 339  
stor°; 340 hstor° (p. 301).

**hdo**, *a Suffix* (pp. 184-6) = do, ldo,  
hldo, to, ḥto, q.v. 65, 67 hyaḥ°;  
86, 87 hram°; 88 ḥcog°; 180  
glab°; 183, 353 ḥchi°; 185 ḥtor°  
(pp. 139, 186, 228, 276, 288,  
332, 340).

**hdoñ I** = doñ I, *depart*, q.v. 104  
hmu° (p. 285).

II = Tib. gdoñ, mdoñs, *face?*  
13 -hri (p. 265).

**hdon** = Tib. don, *purpose*. 185  
ḥsúd° (pp. 139, 186).

**hdom I** = Tib. dom, *bear*. See also  
**hldom II**. 162, 171 hldyo°;  
294, 297 hriḥi° (pp. 246-7, 254,  
327).

II = Tib. dom, hdom, &c., q.v.  
See **dam** and also **ldom**,  
**hldom I** (pp. 318-19). 213  
ḥbos°; 260 hrañ° (? *lect.*)  
(pp. 202, 319).

— (I) **-hgu** (*a Suffix*, pp. 190, 258).  
303, 304, 312 hguḥu (pp. 254,  
327).

**hdoḥo** = hdo. 37 hram°.

**hdor** = dor, *in stor-dor* (hdor).  
q.v. 118, 127, 142, 161, 162,  
163 stor°; 209 hldañ-rgye°  
(pp. 213, 245, 253, 289, 361).

**hdwa** = Tib. dwa, *wretched*. 148  
spye-htor° (p. 302).

**hdyañ** = ldyañ, hldyañ, *high*, *fly*,  
*depart*, q.v. 210 -ḥto; *But see*  
also **pyañ** (**phyañ**). 353 ḥchi-  
hdo° (pp. 200, 261, 276, 332).

**hdra I** = Tib. ḥdra, *like*; ci-ḥdra,  
*what-like?* &c. 196 ḥsu° (pp.  
245-6; *but see also hdraḥ*).

II = Tib. dra, *net*. See also  
**hdraḥ**. 356 ḥplañ° (pp. 241-2).

**hdrag** = drag, *fierce*, &c., q.v. 146  
-ḥtrog (pp. 299-300).

**hdrañ** = Tib. ḥdren, drañ, droñ,  
&c., *lead*, *drag*. 147 ḥphom-te°;  
254 -re (pp. 300-2).

**hdrab** = Tib. ḥdrad, dbrad, ḥbrab,  
*snatch*, *scratch*. 140 -stor; 173  
me° (pp. 252 n., 254, 256,  
326).

— **-ḥwa-hrañ**, *a class of clawing*  
*creatures*. 162, 172 ḥwah (pp.  
254, 256).

**hdram** = htram, *hard*, *stiff*, q.v.  
102 -hmu (p. 285).

**hdraḥ** = ḥdra II, *net*, q.v. 195  
plañ°; 260 -ḥdag (pp. 241-2).

**hdru** = Tib. dru-bu and °gu, *clew*,  
*skein*, or dro, *net*. 220 -hjar  
(pp. 173, 272, 369).

**hdre** = *induce* = Tib. ḥdren, *lead*,  
&c. (p. 262). See also **hdreḥe**,  
**htre**. 87 rgyed°; 326 ḥtrog°  
(pp. 140, 340, 291).

**hdreḥe** = ḥdre, q.v. 338 ḥtrog°.

**hdro I** = dro, *travel*, *go*, q.v. 105  
ḥgo°; 106 ḥkab°, ḥkhāb°; 169  
-ḥbroñ; 183 -ḥphor; 188-9  
ḥña°, ḥñañ° (?); 266 -ḥko-  
ḥnag; 352 -ḥkus; 353 -ḥphor  
(pp. 157, 260, 276, 285, 332).

— **-hño** = dro-ño, *travelling trader*.  
177, 359, 361.

II = ḥtro, *heat*, q.v.? See also  
**hdro I**. 188-9 ḥña°, ḥñañ°?  
(pp. 252, 285).

**hdrom**. 65 ḥpu° (pp. 157, 187, 219).

**rdañ** = Tib. sdañ, *hate*, *anger?* Cf.  
hrdañ. 211 rog-hji° (p. 260).

**rdam** = Tib. sdam, bsdam &c.  
See **dam**. 322 hrñe° (p. 319).

**rdeḥe** = Tib. sde, *class*, *company*,

*district. See also hrde.* 213  
 hbehi-tyañ° (pp. 253, 270, 353).  
**rders** = *Tib.* bdar, rdar, *examine closely, or sdar, timid?* 107  
 hwar° (p. 350).  
**rdo** = *Tib.* sdo, *venture. See also hrdoho.* 84 hño-sto-ge° (pp. 186, 259).  
**hrdaghi** = *hrdag, Tib.* rdeg, brdeg, *smite, +hi.* 214 hstsah-hbrad° (p. 253).  
**hrdañ** = *rdañ, hate, anger, q.v.* 155 rke-hldañ°; 332 (p. 305).  
**hrde** = *rdehe, class, species, &c., q.v.*  
 — **-hldañ** (*a Suffix*, p. 183). 301 g-ri° (p. 270).  
**hrdoho** = *rdo, venture, q.v.* 165 hrkañ-myi° (p. 296).  
**hrdyañ.** 202 hcha-hru°.  
**hrdyam** = *Tib.* gžom? (p. 350). 137 hbri-re° (pp. 218, 338).  
**lda, a Suffix** = *ldañ, hlda, hldañ, q.v.* 84 rkañ° (p. 183, cf. hkhañ-hldañ, p. 218).  
**ldañ, rise, stick, prop, support** = *Tib.* lañ/ldañ. *See also hldañ* (pp. 286–9). 80, 138 -rdze; 343 -hdehi (pp. 227, 228, 256, 287).  
 — **-pyer, supporting. See also hldañ-phyer.** 65 (pp. 186, 228, 287).  
**ldañ** = *lda, hlda I, II, hldañ, q.v.* 43 hrañ° (pp. 313, 334).  
**ldir** = *hldir I, q.v.* 328 hnañ-hpag° (pp. 196, 317).  
**lde** (*not in text*) (pp. 136, 147–8, 188–92). *See hldañ, hldañ, hldañ.*  
**ldehi** (*not in text*) (pp. 133, 136, 188–92). *See hldañ, &c.*  
**ldehu** (*not in text*) (pp. 134, 368). *See lde, &c.*  
**ldo** = *hldo, hldoh, hldohu, hldoho, q.v.* 76 do°; 139 dgu°; 353 do° (pp. 186, 322). *See also dgu (I) -hldo.*  
**ldoñ** = *doñ I, hdoñ I, hldoñ, depart, &c., q.v.* 161 kyu° (p. 253). *See also kyu°, hkyu°.*  
**ldom** = *dam, hdom II, hldom I, bind, &c., q.v.* 94, 95 gdim-chis°. *dim-tshis°* (pp. 320–1).

**ldyañ** = *hldyañ, q.v.* (pp. 331–3). 78 hjo°; 178 -hkañ; 180 -glab (pp. 179, 244).

**ldyo** = *hldyo, q.v. See also ldyoñ.* 140 -stor; 383 -ro (pp. 256, 326–8, 331).

**ldyoñ** (*reading?*) = *ldyoñ + o.* ? = *dyañ, hdyañ, or hldyoñ?* 318 hslī-hdzañ°.

**ldyoñ** = *ldyo, hldyo, hldyoñ, q.v.* 256 -ma-hbyoñ (p. 327).

**gldag** = *hldag, back, load, q.v.* 52 -hce-rgyañ; 136 -nag (pp. 259–60, 317).

**hlda I, a Suffix** (p. 183). *See also lda, ldañ, hldañ. Possibly derived from hlda II.* 203 śor°; 240 gse°.

II = *Tib.* da, *there* (p. 201). 5 hrañ°; 8 hrañ°; 195 -hko (pp. 201, 241).

**hldag** = *Tib.* ltæg, *back of neck; ltañ, load* (pp. 259–60, 317). 45 -hbañ-hldoñ; 52 -khri; 389 -hsag (p. 317).

— **-nag (gnag), black-back** = *Yak.* 112, 129 gnag° and nag°; 130, 132, 134, 135 (pp. 259–60, 291). *See also gldag.*

**hldañ, rise, stick, prop, support** = *Tib.* lañ, ldañ, *rise; gdañ, rdañ, sdañ, peg, rack, rail* (pp. 286–9). *See also ldañ.*

A. *rise (general), as Verb with hkañ-* 163, *rgyed-ma* 90, 102, 105, 108, 231, *rñe-* 197, *hrñe-* 119, 141, 144, *hmañ-* 112, *mor-* 87, *htsog-* 88 (*htso*), 95, *hsa-* yer- 141. *In Compound Verb or nominal phrase hldañ-hphyar* 126, 254 (*phyer*), -*hgye*hi 209, -*krañ* (*hkrañ*) 91, 111, 112, 124 (3), 125 (2), 126 (2), 127 (2). *As attribute with -mø* 123, -*hrgya* 60 (?), -*rmañ* 27 (?), -*hkañ* 198 (?), -*sla*ñ 125, -*the* 139. *See also hgru-hldañ-hmañ and hwa(hwah)-hldañ.*

B. *As Noun* = *stick, post, &c.* -*rmañ* 27 (?), -*hrgyu* 60 (?), -*hkañ* 198 (?), -*phyi-ske* 79,

- 143 (pyi), -myi-ség 159 (pp. 145-6, 259, 286, 341, 345).
- hldañ-ra.** 270 hwaḥ°; 278 hwa° (pp. 178, 339).
- hldañh** written for hldaḥ or hldañ.
- hldan** = *Tib.* lan, lon, ldon, glan, glon, retaliate, repay, return (*Trans. and Intrans.*) (pp. 317-18). See also **hldon.** 187, 188, 189 hldam-re°; 193 -re-morre°; 264 (2) hdzam-re°; 273 hjam-re°; 274 (2) hdzam-re°; 328 hpyah°; 377 hpaḥ° (pp. 297, 305, 317, 331).
- hldab I** = *Tib.* hḍab, leaf, wing, &c. 12 -hde-hde (p. 318).
- II = *Tib.* hḍebs, btab, cast, put, found, cf. rdebs, sdebs. See also **hdab.** 197 rmañ° (p. 318).
- hldam**, tame, &c. = dam, ḥdam, ḥdom, ldom, q.v. 187 (2), 188 -re (pp. 305, 317-18, 331).
- hldaḥ I**, a Suffix (p. 183) = lda, ldaḥ, ḥlda, q.v. Cf. *Tib.* ldan; or derived from II? Appended to ḥko- 202; rke- 155; ḥkhaḥ- 137; rñe- 310; ḥrñe- 303; ḥrde- 301; ḥrnab- 32; ḥrnab-ma- 165; ḥpo- 358; rpeḥi- 286; ḥbañ- 170; ḥbroñ- 182; ḥbom-rbo- 112; ḥmañ- 33; ḥtsa-re- 249; ḥtsaḥ- 298; ḥdzah- 382, 383; g-yog- 200; ḥsaḥ- 164.
- II = ḥlda II, *Tib.* da, there (p. 201). 6 ḥrañ°; 316 -hrgam (?); 182 ḥbroñ° (pp. 313, 319, 323).
- III? = *Tib.* mdaḥ, arrow = hdaḥ I, q.v. 278, 285 -htag-ḥto.
- hldar** = ḥdar, shiver, tremble, q.v. 353 -hdzam-re; 30, 31, 32 ḥbraḥ°, or is hldar here Locative of ḥlda I, hldaḥ I? (pp. 319-20).
- hldas** = *Tib.* hḍaḥ, ḥdas, go beyond, pass. 83 -htso (p. 320).
- hldi I** = *Tib.* ḥdi, this. See also **hdi**, **hdiḥi.** 115 ḥpo°; 132 ḥbri°, ḥre°; 133 ḥyah°, rgyeb°; 135 gseḥe°; 137 ro°; 175 mu°; 225, 236, 244, 246 ḥrah°; 207 the-then°; 87, 216, 237, 243, 246, 248 -rgyed-ḥrar; 104 -ḥgañ; 108 -ḥdaḥ.
- II = *Tib.* ldin, float, soar. See also **hldin**, **hldis.** 63, 71, 144 -ma-ḥrtaḥ (p. 320).
- III = *Tib.* gzi, land, estate? 10 -ḥrkaḥ (p. 329).
- hldin** = hldi II. 160 ḥpu-myi° (pp. 145-6, 217, 320).
- hldim** = dim, gdim, ddyim, q.v. 199 chim°; 301 -ḥphu; 310 -ḥmañ-ḥto (pp. 320-1).
- hldiḥi** = hldi III, land, q.v. 195 -su-hldoñ (pp. 201, 245, 329-30).
- hldir I.** Locative of hldi, this, q.v. 117 -ḥtsag; 229 sñañ-ñe° (?); 248 ḥtam°; 326 ḥnaḥ-ḥpag°; 328 sñañ-ñene° (?); 337 ḥrtaḥ° (?); 341 rñe-ḥprom° (pp. 217, 222).
- II = hldi-re, from hldi II, q.v. 174 swa°; 229, 328, 337, 341? See under I (p. 320).
- hldis**, Aorist of hldi, q.v. 58 me-na° (pp. 320, 358).
- hldu** = *Tib.* ḥdu, ḥdus, sdu, sdus, ḥthu, ḥthus, &c., collect, &c. (pp. 321-2). 14 ḥtañ°; 19 -ḥro; 28 -sto; 70 gcog-ḥlde°; 238 hseḥe° (p. 247).
- hldug** = *Tib.* ḥdug, sit, remain? or sdug, dear, comely? or stug, wretched, afflicted? 103 the-kyen° (p. 322).
- hldun** = *Tib.* ḥdun, assemble. 284 ḥrim-ḥdzom-ḥtaḥ°; 354 ḥsō-ḥti-ge-ḥtaḥ° (pp. 282, 321).
- hlduḥu** = *Tib.* gdu, covet. 44 gśi°; 51 -ce-rgyan; or is this hlduḥu = hldu, amass? (pp. 322, 328).
- ḥlde I** = *Tib.* ḥde, bde, lde, ldeḥu, happiness, high fortune, &c.; perhaps also lde, warm oneself. See also **ḥde I**, **ḥldeḥi**, **ḥldeḥe**, **ḥrleḥi** (pp. 278-9). 77 -ge; 370, 371 -ge-ḥtaḥ (p. 309).
- II = *Tib.* lde, warm oneself? 70 gcog° (pp. 247, 249, 321).
- III? = I, be good or necessary. 57 ḥrkas-ḥthañ° (p. 248).
- ḥldeḥi** = ḥlde I, q.v. 318, 319, 320, 321 -ḥswaḥ, -swaḥ, -ḥswa (p. 318).

**hlidehe** = hlide I, hlidehi 370, 372 -ge-htaḥ (pp. 278, 318).

**hldo** I, a Suffix = do I, ḥdo, ldo (pp. 186-7, 322-3). See also **hldoh**. 74, 77, 78, 114, 191, 309 dgu°; 155 ḡgab°; 177 ḥpo°; 342 klu°; 355 ḥnu°; 375 ḡg-sme°; 381 slod° (pp. 201, 222, 232, 256, 274, 282-3, 316, 327).

II, perhaps error for do-ldo (l. 76). 77 -hdzo[-]r[e].

**hldog** = Tib. log/ldog, turn away, rebel, return (p. 323). 18 ḡyogs°; 43, 44 smyi°; 142 -stor (p. 323); 286 -hyah; 317 -hpo; 317 -g-yah° (pp. 224, 295, 323, 334).

**hldoñ** = doñ I, ḥdoñ I, ldoñ, depart, &c., q.v. 45 ḡbaḥ°; 82 ḡmog-re°; 134 sko°; 175 nu-ḡlañ°; 195 ḡldiḡi-su°; 214 kyu°; 253 ḡbañ°; 256 kro°; 287, 291-4 ḡkyañ°; 299 ḡse°; 302, 303, 308, 310 (2), 311 ḡgaḥ°; 334 ḡrog°; 339 ḡkyu° (pp. 245, 270, 297, 298, 329, 338).

**hldon**, probably Imperative of hldan, return, repay, &c., q.v. 370 (2), 371 hlide-ge-htaḥ°; 370, 372 hlidehe-ge-htaḥ° (pp. 278, 318).

**hldom** I = dam, ḥdom II, ldom, bind, &c., q.v. 9 ḡrah-ḡyos°; 41, 143, 350 na°; 66 ḡkaḥ°; 259 ḡgo°; 372 ḡkrug-kyañ° (pp. 145, 297, 299, 318-19).

II = ḡdom I, bear? 299 ḡ-riḡi°.

**hldoh**, a Suffix = do I, ḥdo, ldo, hldo I, q.v. 154 blaḥ° (p. 222).

**hldoḡu** = Tib. lo, circle or troop? (pp. 322-3). See also **hlo**, **hloḡo**, **ḡrloḡo**. 277 -ḡjam-rño; 300 ḡrim°; 319 ḡrim-re° (pp. 265, 281).

**hldoḡo**? (p. 294). 110 ḡso-ḡnah°.

**hldor**, probably for hldo I (Suffix) + re (metre). 357 ḡldyah° (p. 329).

**hldya**, water, flow = Tib. bzaḡ, moist. See also **hldyah**. 51 -ḡkañ-hte (pp. 328-9).

**hldyañ** = Tib. bzeñ, bzeḡs, bzañ, raise, erect. rise up, opposed to

zoñ, lower, deepened; ḡzoḡs, valley, and perhaps connected with ldiñ, fly, soar. In the Nam language meanings may provisionally be classified as follows: (pp. 331-3). See also **ḡdyañ**, **ldyañ**.

A. rise fly, depart. 9, 13, 14, 19 ḡri°; 10 ḡldi-ḡrkaḡ°; 12 ḡti°; 13 ḡrag°; 14 ḡtañ-ḡldu°; 38 -ḡdzañ; 43 pra-ḡreḡe°; 48, 368 ḡse-ḡcañ°, ḡseḡe-cañ°; 150, 161, 218, 243 ḡpu°, but see also under C; 209 ḡpḡyuo°; 229, 237 rñe-ḡkḡyam°; 365 ḡgyer°; 282 na° (?).

B. high or upper (cf. Tib. stod). 8 -ḡtye (?); 122, 369, 372, 387 -ḡyu, -ḡyuhḡ; 178, 179, 366, 391 -ḡyañ-ḡyo; 186 -ḡ-ri; 386 -ḡro.

C. As Proper Name of a ḡldyañ = Tib. ḡjañ, people of the high (sc. Tang-hsiang) country. 271 -ma, -paḡ; 365 -ḡkaḡ; 369 -ḡgo-ḡdzin. (Here should be considered, as either denoted or hinted at, the occurrences with -ḡyu (ḡyuhḡ), -ḡyañ-ḡyo and -ḡro, cited under B, and those with -ḡpu under A).

D. doubtful. 316 ḡyañ°; 144 -ḡtaḡ.

**hldyah** = hldya, water, flow, q.v. 356 -ḡldyah; 357 -ḡldo -r[e] (p. 329).

**hldyi**, conceivably = Tib. bzi, four. 26 ḡldyeg° (p. 330).

**hldyim** I = dim, ḡdim, &c., evaporate, &c., q.v. 89 me°; 274 -ḡste a Suffix, pp. 188-90 (pp. 321, 331).

II = Tib. zim, sweet? 255 ḡdzah° (pp. 327, 331).

**hldyihl** I, conceivably = Tib. zi, be allayed. 48 ḡpḡhu-ḡḡeg°; 375 ḡeg-sme-ḡldo-rḡyi° (p. 330).

II = ḡldi I, this. 392 -ḡgyed-ḡrah. **hldyeg**, conceivably 'quarter' (of space) = Tib. ḡzogs = ḡphyogs. 26 -ḡldyi (p. 330).

**hldyo** = Tib. ḡjo, bzos, ḡzo, ḡzo,



&c., cow, milk, to milk: used 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*, *ldyoḥu*, *hldyoḥo*. 16, 34, 50, 254 -*ḥtor*, -*tor*; 36 -*hrje*; 162, 171 -*ḥdom*; 172 *meḥo*; 304 *ḥmaṅo*; 384 -*hro* (pp. 256-7, 267, 275, 326-7).

*hldyoṅ*, low country = Tib. *zoṅ*, *gzoṅs*, correlative to *hldyaṅ*, *q.v.* 387 -*ro* (pp. 331-2).

*hldyoḥo* = *ldyo*, *hldyo*, *q.v.* 355 *ḥnu-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 *hnaḥ*, *gnaḥ*, and *ṅaḥ*, *ḥnaḥ*. 41, 143, 350 -*ḥldom*; 53 -*ḥce*; 56, 96 -*ge*; 86 -*spe*; 100 -*rom*; 107 -*ḥrom*; 358 -*ḥgo*, -*ḥgon* (?); 365 *soo* (pp. 238, 297, 299).

III = Tib. *na*, sickness? 156 -*rog*; 254 *ḥmyio* (pp. 239, 328). See also *hnaḥ* II.

IV = Tib. *na*, meadow? or merely = *na* II? 33 -*ḥtsaḥ* (pp. 239, 275).

**nag** I = Tib. *ṅag*, speech, voice (p. 360). See also *hṅag* I. 199 *ḥsaṅo*; or *nag*, black?; 202 *ḥṅe* (?); 262 *g-raḥo* (?); 276, 278 *ḥdzam* (pp. 283, 313, 314).

II = Tib. *nag*, *gnag*, black. See also *gnag*, *hṅag* II. 129, 130, 132, 134, 135, 136 *ḥdag*, *gldag* (pp. 242, 259-60, 342).

III = Tib. *rnags*, cash? See also *hṅag* III. 234 *ḥglaḥo*.

**naṅ** I = Tib. *naṅ*, within (pp. 229-30). See also *hnaṅ*. 104, 115, 236 -*re*; 305 -*ḥyu*; 352 -*pa*; 354 -*ḥwar* (pp. 217, 252, 285).

II = Tib. *naṅ*, to-morrow? 181 -*gsaṅ* (pp. 156, 229-30).

**nad** = Tib. *nad*, disease. 193, 194 *gso* (p. 238).

**nar**, probably = Tib. *ṅar*, strength, grim, strong, rather than *nar*, snar, long. 49 *ṅam*; 72 *pa*; 239 *ḥgraḥ-nu* (pp. 313, 361). See also *hṅar*.

**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. *nu*. See also *hnu* I, *hnus* (p. 237). 239 *ḥgraḥo* (p. 313).

II, probably = young, cf. Tib. *nu*, younger, opposite of *phu*. 359 -*glaṅ*. See also *hnu* II.

**ne**, good = Gyārūṅ *ka-snē*, &c. See also *hne* (pp. 221-3). 66, 160 *sṅaṅo*; 113 *gtse*; 141 *ḥrṅe-hldaṅo*; 152 *g-yah-ḥtsaṅo*; 202 -*ḥcer*; 206 *rṅye*; 269 *ḥwah*; 301 *rṅe*; 317 *ḥwa* (pp. 221-2, 228, 270, 274, 318, 321, 338, 339, 359).

**neḥu** = *nu* II, in sense of 'new', or = *ne*. 41 *ḥgwa*; 74 *ḥkuḥu*, *weḥi*; 257 -*ḥso-bos*; 258 *ḥwam* (pp. 250, 302).

**neḥe**, perhaps onomatopoeic, 'bleat'. 275 *twāṅ-hdzam* (p. 343).

**nohu.** 41 hñud<sup>o</sup>.

**nor** = *Tib. nor, property, &c.* (pp. 361-2). 151 -gso (pp. 224-5, 241). *See also hñor* II.

**gnag** = *nag* II, *black, q.v.* 129 hldag<sup>o</sup> (p. 263).

**gnaḥ**, *place* = *na* II and *hnaḥ* I, *q.v.* (pp. 237-9). 69, 70 la<sup>o</sup>; 179 -goñ; 280 -ma-dwañ; 281 hldyañ-ma<sup>o</sup>; 367 -ḡgoñ (pp. 193, 247, 342).

**hna** = *na* II, *hnaḥ* I, *gnaḥ, q.v.* 68 -hlam (p. 238).

**hñag** I = *nag* I, *speech, &c., q.v.* 104 -ḥtshab, *speech-deputy* (p. 360).

II = *nag* II, *black, q.v.* 112 hldag<sup>o</sup>; 162, 171 hdom<sup>o</sup>; 267 hko<sup>o</sup> (pp. 253, 260, 263, 291, 327).

III = *nag* III, *cash, q.v.?* 232, 233 ḡglaḥ<sup>o</sup>.

**hñañ** = *ñañ, within, q.v.* 188 hña; 189 (2) -ḡdro; 225, 244, 305, 308, 311 -re (pp. 231-2, 252, 285, 337).

— **-ra** = *hñañ, q.v., +re* (p. 229).

**hñad.** 46 re-ma<sup>o</sup>.

**hñan?** = *Tib. nan, pressure, urgency; gnon, press, suppress, or snon, bsnan, augment?* 281 stom-hkañ-ge<sup>o</sup>; 350 ḡcihi-ḥtoḡo-ge<sup>o</sup>; 351 ḡšeḡe-ḥti-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 186).

**hñam** I = *Tib. gnam, nam, sky.* 5, 6, 8, 37 ḡrañ-hldaḡ (hlda)<sup>o</sup> (p. 246).

II = *Tib. ñams, damaged, weakened, destroyed.* 83 hñam-ḥte-ḡśaḡ; 126 hldañ-krañ<sup>o</sup>; 259 ḡpaḡ-ḡrgam<sup>o</sup> (pp. 262, 288-9, 361).

III = *Tib. ñams, thought, soul, spirit, courage.* 145 -ḡdzam<sup>o</sup> (pp. 261, 299-300, 361).

**hñah** I = *na* II, *gnaḥ, hna, place, q.v., or confused with ñah, home, q.v.* 33 -ḡrañ (?); 40 -me; 99 -ḡtsog; 113 -ḡpoñ; 191 gdaḡ<sup>o</sup>; 391 -ḡdihi, ḡgyaḡ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 233, 238-9, 244, 291-3, 284, 315, 346). *See also so(ḡso)-hñah (hna, na).*

II = *na* III, *sickness, q.v.* 261 -ḡdag; 120 ḡtsog-ḡram<sup>o</sup> (pp. 239, 262, 283, 291-2).

III *spring (season) = Mo-so ñi?* 159 -ḡchos (pp. 145-6).

**hñar** = *nar, strength, grim, &c., q.v. or possibly = Tib. gñer, provide, execute (?)* (p. 361). 112 hldañ-ḡkrañ<sup>o</sup>; 224 g-waḡ-ḡrśaḡ<sup>o</sup>; 233 gḡaḡ-ḡlad<sup>o</sup>; 243 gse-ḡlad<sup>o</sup> (pp. 230, 343, 361).

**hñi** = *ni?* or *ne?* 80 smy<sup>o</sup> (p. 227).

**hñu** I = *nu* I *strength, ability, &c. q.v.* 72 ḡśi-brom<sup>o</sup>; 241-2 smy<sup>o</sup>, tha<sup>o</sup> (pp. 237, 342).

II = *nu* II, *q.v.* 174 (2), 175-6, 179, 359-60, 366 -glañ.

**hñus**, *Aorist of hñu = Tib. nu suckle (or drip?)*. 16, 34 hldyo-ḡtor-ge<sup>o</sup>; 40 hldyog<sup>o</sup> (pp. 275, 327, 328, n. 1).

**hñe** = *ne, good, q.v.* 86 -rñeḡi; 146 rñe<sup>o</sup>; 155 rñe<sup>o</sup>; 170 ḡbañ-ḡldaḡ<sup>o</sup>; 382 ḡdza-ḡldaḡi<sup>o</sup> (pp. 221-2, 275, 288, 316).

**hñen** = *Tib. ñen, dangerous.* 210 ḡwañ-ta<sup>o</sup> (p. 361).

**hñer** = *Tib. gñer, procure, seek for?* 7, 20 ḡśog<sup>o</sup> (p. 361).

**hño** = *Tib. ño in g-yul-ño, battle front (ño)?* 58 (2) mag<sup>o</sup> (pp. 194, 300-1). *See also hñor* II.

**hñoñ**, *possibly = Tib. noñ, grieve, or gñoñ, be ashamed.* 134 ḡkhog<sup>o</sup>.

**hñom** = *Tib. nom, enjoyments, possessions, &c.; snom, grasp* (p. 277). 151 śid-rgyañ<sup>o</sup>; 155 ḡwam<sup>o</sup>; 165 -ḡsaḡ; 209 ḡnom-ta (p. 335).

**hñor** I = *Tib. nor, err, foolish.* 163 hñor[-r]e; 314, 315 -ḡdzañ; 317 -ḡldog; 366 g-ye<sup>o</sup> (pp. 224-5, 228, 262, 323, 332, 338-9).

II, *for hño-re in mag-hñor;* 48-9, 145, 184 (pp. 194; 299-301).

**ḡrnab** = *Tib. mnab, mnabs, food; rñab, be hungry; brnab, covet.* 32 -ḡldaḡ, a *Suffix*, p. 183? 165 -ma-ḡldaḡ (p. 296).

**ḡrnas** = *Tib. brñas, despised?* 214 ḡrweḡi-gtsu-ge<sup>o</sup>. (p. 345).

## P

**pa** = *Tib.* dpañ, *brave, hero, &c.*

See also **hpañ** I. 72 -nar; 109 -la-la; 352 nañ° (pp. 239, 280).

**pañ** = pa? 271 hldyañ°.

**pañi** = pa, or possibly hpha, *father*, +hi. 262 gsas° (pp. 239, 283).

**pu-glo** (**hlo**), *bellows*. See also **hphuñ-hklo**. 116 hrañ°; 135 rañ° ohlo (pp. 284-5).

**puñ** = *Tib.* phuñ, *heap*; dpuñ, *host, &c.* 204 -te, a *Suffix*, pp. 188-90 (pp. 144, 300).

**po** = *Tib.* pho, *male, man* (pp. 217-19). See also **hpo** I, **hpho**. 181 rbyo° (pp. 155-6, 333).

— **-rbom** 317. See **hpo°**, **hbo°** (pp. 224, 323, 338-9).

**por** I, *perhaps* = hpor, phor, hphor, *release, q.v.* 349 -ge. See *critical note*.

II, *written for po* (*Tib.* spo, pho, *top*) + re. See also **hphor**, **phor**, **spo** I. 291 htasañ°; 345 la° (p. 269).

**pwañ**, *conceivably* = *Tib.* dpañ, *witness* (p. 344). 361 keñu-prom°; 362 geñu-prom°.

**pyañ** = *Tib.* dpyañ, hphyañ, *something suspended, e.g. partitions*. See also **phyañ**. 69 thar° (pp. 247-8).

**pyar** = *Tib.* phyar, hphyar, *lift, hoist, roof*. See also pyer, phyer, hphyar (p. 287). 341 -ma-swañ (p. 353).

**pyi** = *Tib.* phyi, *beyond, outside, subsequent*; hphyi, *be late*. See also **phyi**. 88, 92 -hse; 143 hldañ°; 201 -rjes (pp. 274, 288, 321, 359).

**pyu**. Cf. hphyu? 204 -phya-hdam.

**pyer** = pyar, *q.v.* 65 ldañ° (pp. 186, 228, 287, 353).

**pra**. Cf. hpra, hprañ, hphrañ. 43 -hrehe.

**prom**, *Auxiliary Verb* = *perform, carry out, &c.* (pp. 137, 199-200). See also **bprom**, **hprom**, **hproms**, **phrom**, **hphrom**.

*Appended to Verbs or Action-words*, hkañ 151, keñu (hkeñu, geñu, hke) 176, 177, 178, 360, 361, 362, 366, hkoñu 166, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 177, 180, 359, 361, sko 91, hkhob 322, hñom-ta 209, htas 122, 148, 257, stor 79, 128, hdro 170, gsu 65: also to rñe, *evil*, 341; hño-hdañ, 258, *face-rest*; stoñ-hpoñ, *an office*, 321.

**plañ** = *Tib.* plañ/srañ, *street, straight, and so 'line'* (pp. 241-2). See also **hplañ**, **phlañ**. 182 -na; 195 -hdrañ (p. 155-6).

**plim-plam**, *let loose?* (p. 192). 120 hśañ° (pp. 291-2).

**bprom**, *Aorist of prom, q.v.* (p. 196). 168, 180 hkoñu°.

**hpā** (*read hpañ?*) = pa, *brave, &c.*? 187 hrta°.

**hpağ**, *low*, cf. *Tib.* dpag, *measure, depth* (pp. 195-6, 226, 349). See also **rpag**, **hrpag**. 326, 328 hñah°; 384 hrseñi° (pp. 226, 239).

**hpañ** I = *Tib.* hphen, hphañs, *&c.*, *throw*. 283 -tsa-ge.

II = *Tib.* pañ, spañ, phañ, *lap*. See also **phañ**, **hphañ**. 290 hrihi° (?) 291, 308 g-ri° (?); 324 g-yah° (pp. 228, 263, 270, 298, 340).

III = *Tib.* phañs, dpañs, spañs, *height?* 290, 291, 308 (?). See under II.

IV, *conceivably* = *Tib.* dpañ, *witness*. See also **pwañ**. 101 hrañ-war°.

**hpañ** I = pa, *brave, hero, q.v.* See also **pañi**. 36 -hron-hkes; 185 ma° (?); 205 -rmag; 259 -hrgam; 305, 306 hbrad-re°; 374 -hwe; 377 -hldan-hro; 388 hrtañ° (pp. 231, 239, 254, 262, 269, 280, 300).

II. See **meñi°**, **hmeñi°**. 272 hmeñi°.

**hpañi**, **hpañhi**. See **hpeñi**. 211 mye°; 384 ldyo-roho° (pp. 282, 327, 331).

**hpar** = hphar, *q.v.* 289 hgam° (p. 293).

**hpu** I = *man, male*. See also **hpur**, **hphu** I, **hbu** II (pp. 216–17, 308). 29 htor<sup>o</sup> ohgru; 64 tor<sup>o</sup>; 65 hno[-r[e]-htsa<sup>o</sup>]; 150 hldyañ<sup>o</sup>(?); 157 -hbroñ; 161, 218, 343 hldyañ<sup>o</sup>; 140 -hpos; 266 -hbos; 289, 322 hgar<sup>o</sup>; 381 -hloho (? 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<sup>o</sup> (p. 301).

IV. 83 htso<sup>o</sup> ohkam.

**hpud** = *Tib. phud, hphud, hbud, blow out, drive out? phud, an instant*. 28 -hto. See *critical note*.

**hpuñ** ? cf. *Tib. sbun-gter, hollow, vain?* 210 hmo-ta<sup>o</sup> (p. 245).

**hpuhi** = *Tib. hphu, hbud, &c., blow* (pp. 284–5). See also **hphu** II, **hpuhi**. 274 hldyim-ste<sup>o</sup>; 282 -hpuhi (p. 331).

**hpur**, for **hpu** I, *q.v.*, + *re* (pp. 173–5). 163 hbri-hsehe<sup>o</sup> (pp. 216–17).

**hpul**, cf. *Tib. phul, handful; phul-tu, at a climax; phul-byuñ, perfected*. See also **hphul**. 15, 51 hsañ-ma<sup>o</sup> (p. 267).

**hpus**. 298 -hphya (p. 359).

**hpeg** = *hphyegs, q.v.* 360 swah<sup>o</sup>.

**hpehi**, apparently = *Tib. dpe, sample (exemplar), and confused with spa, ornament* (pp. 282, 349). 211 myi<sup>o</sup>; 353 hdzo<sup>o</sup>; 384, 386, 387 hro<sup>o</sup> (pp. 274, 331). See also **spehi**, **hrpehi**, **spa**, **spe**, **spehi**.

**hpo** I = *po, male, man, q.v.* See also **hpho**. 115 -hldi; 177 -hldo, 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<sup>o</sup>; 48 hsi<sup>o</sup>; 122 htsog-hram<sup>o</sup> (pp. 226, 251, 286, 292).

III, perhaps = *Tib. pho, belly, in*

317 hpo-hrbom: cf. *po-rbom* (hrbom), *hbo-bon* (hbon), *hbom-rbo* (pp. 224, 323).

IV. See **hpoho**.

**hpog** = *Tib. hphog, hit (with a missile)*. See also **hphog**. 59 hda<sup>o</sup> (p. 343).

**hpoñ** I = *Tib. phoñ, phoñs, hphoñs, poor, needy, &c.* 113 hna<sup>o</sup> (pp. 233, 238, 297).

II, for *Tib. dpon, master, chief, in* 321 stoñ<sup>o</sup>? (p. 362).

**hpod**. perhaps = *tremble*. 14 spo<sup>o</sup> (p. 265).

**hpom** = *Tib. pham, hpham, be defeated*. See also **hphom** (p. 367). 347 hrñehe-hño-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 219).

**hpoho**. 28 -hwar-hwar (p. 341).

**hpor** = *por I, release, q.v. Tib. hbor, cast, abandon*. See also **phor** II, **hphor**. 68 hbu<sup>o</sup>; 175 hnu-glañ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 250, 268, 319).

**hpos** = *hbos, grown, big, q.v.* 141 hpu<sup>o</sup> (pp. 231, 297).

**hpyah** = *Tib. dpya, hphya, rebuke; dpya, tax (= phya, hphya?)*. 328 hka<sup>o</sup> (pp. 315, 317).

**hpyi**, perhaps = *Tib. dbyi, g-yi, lynx*. 333 hrkom<sup>o</sup> (p. 305).

**hpyid** = *Tib. phyid, hphyid, suffice or wipe away*. See also **hphyid**. 339 stor-hdehi<sup>o</sup>; 344 ldañ-[hdehi]<sup>o</sup> (pp. 253, 256).

**hpyed** = *Tib. hbyed, hbye, phye, dbye, be separated, divided, opened*. See also **hphyed**, **hbye**. 208 htshar-hde<sup>o</sup> (p. 234).

**hptra** = *Tib. pra, phra, prognostic?* Cf. *phra, minute?* See also **pra** and **hphrah**. 267 -hre.

**hptrañ** = *Tib. hphrañ, narrow, ledge; sprañ, beggar*. 368 hrño<sup>o</sup> (p. 239).

**hprah** = *Tib. hphra, kick, or phra, small?* See also **pra**, **hphrah**. 254 hyog<sup>o</sup>(?); 331 hrkom-hbroñ<sup>o</sup>; 332 hklu<sup>o</sup>; 333 hrkom-hpyi<sup>o</sup>; 335 htse<sup>o</sup> (p. 305).

**hpro** = *Tib. hphro, spro, expand, progress, rejoice*. 181 -hro; 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).

**hplañ** = plañ, *street*, q.v. 356  
-hdrah (p. 241).

**rpag**, *low or made low*. See **hpag**  
*and also hrpag*. *Perhaps some-*  
*times 'deep' or 'depth' (Tib. dpag)*  
(pp. 225-6). 135 hkhar°; 192  
hkar°; 193 hñah-htsu°; 194  
gso-nad°; 208 hkañ-ħcigo°; 210  
hcañ-rgye°; 240 rñe-ħlad°; 245  
gse-lad°; 252 bañ° (pp. 183,  
196, 234, 238, 243, 245, 274,  
305).

**rpu**. See p. 350. 91 htsog°.

**rpehi** = *Tib. dpe, sample*. See  
**hpehi**, **hrpehi**. 286 -ħldaḥ, *a*  
*Suffix*, p. 183 (p. 323).

**hrpag** = rpag, q.v. 17 hkhaḥ°; 128  
hkhar°; 193 hñah-mo°; 223  
ħbroñ°; 231 ħwa-bzer°; 253  
ħbañ-ħldoñ° (pp. 225-7, 242-3,  
263, 305, 339, 340).

— **-ħkhur**, *down-bowed*. 6 (p. 226).

**hrpehi** = rpehi, q.v. 169 -ħrgam  
(pp. 244, 323).

**hrpod** = *Tib. spod, vow, or phod,*  
*cope with, or ħbod, bos, chal-*  
*lenge, fight?* 250 -ħbos (p. 349).

**lpyoḥo** = *Tib. ħphyo, be agitated,*  
*waver?* (p. 354). 22 ħmar-myi°.

**spa** = *Tib. spa, ornament*. See also  
**spehi**, **hpehi**. 151 mehi°  
(pp. 282, 356).

**spu-rbu** = *Tib. spu-gu, some small*  
*bird, or spur, ħphur, fly* (p. 350).  
39 rgoñ°.

**spe** *fundamentally* = spa, hpehi,  
spehi, hrpehi, *ornament, exem-*  
*plar, q.v.* See also **spehi**  
(p. 356). 86 na°.

**spehi** = spe, q.v. (pp. 282, 356).  
140 hñi-stor°; 200 -ħdzan; 379  
-ge (p. 323).

**spo** I = *Tib. spo, height, summit*.  
14 -ħpod-pod; 381 -ro (?)  
(p. 265).

II = *Tib. spo, ħpho, change,*  
*migrate, pass away*. See also

**hpo** II (p. 356). 126 ħldañ-  
-krañ°; 381 -ro (?) (pp. 288-9).

**spyi** = *Tib. spyi, general, top, chief*.  
110 -ħdze (p. 335).

**spye**, *summer* = *Tib. dbyar Mo-so*  
jë? (p. 353). 159 -chos; 148  
-ħtor; 190 ħse° (pp. 145-6, 240,  
285-6, 302).

## Ph

**phañ** = ħpañ II, *lap, &c.*, q.v. 111  
ħbom-rbo° (p. 230).

**phu**, *conceivably* = ħpu IV, q.v. 130  
-ħkam.

**phor** I = pho + re. Cf. por II. 295  
ħtsa°.

II = por I, ħpor, q.v. See also  
**ħphor**. 359 nu-glañ° (p. 250).

**phya** = ħphyah? 204 pyu°.

**phyañ** = pyañ, *suspended, &c.*, q.v.  
348 ħthar°; 374 ħtar° (pp. 248,  
343).

**phyi** = pyi, *outside, subsequent*, q.v.  
79 ħldañ°; 89, 96, 98 -ħse  
(pp. 288, 321).

**phyr**, *for phyr-re?* = *Tib. phyr,*  
*outside, back, or phyi-re?* =  
*Tib. ħphyi, eradicate?* 249 ħra-  
ħyañ°.

**phye** = *Tib. ħbyed, phye, &c.,*  
*divided, opened*. See also **ħpyed**,  
**ħphyed**. 120 htsog-ħram°; 145  
-ħgo (pp. 291-2, 299-300).

**phyer** = pyar, phyar, *lift, hoist*,  
q.v. 254 ldañ°; 261 -chañ; 340  
-ma-swañ; 342 -ħtso-ħtsehi  
(pp. 239, 283, 287, 353).

**phrom** = prom, *Auxiliary Verb*,  
q.v. See also **ħphrom**. 172  
ħkoḥu° (p. 254).

**phlañ** = plañ, hplañ, *street*, q.v. 357  
-ñar.

**gphaḥ**, *father* = *Tib. pha*. See also  
**ħpha**, **ħphaḥ**. 60 -tsa (p.  
145).

**bphyag**, *Aorist of ħphyag*, q.v. 101  
ħkoḥo-ħko° (pp. 196, 264).

**ħpha** = *Tib. pha, father*. See also  
**gphaḥ**, **ħphaḥ**. 60 -ñur-ñur;  
65 -ma; 184 -ge (pp. 145, 172,  
318).

**hphag** I = *Tib. phag, pig.* 69 -la-gnaḥ (pp. 193, 247).

II ? *cf. Tib. hphags, elevated, or phag, hidden part, interstice, or phag-rags, rampart?* so-phag, brick-work. 238 -hbaḥ-ge.

**hphage.** See **hpha-ge.** 184.

**hphañ** = hpañ II and III, *q.v.* See also **phañ.** 302 hriḥi° (pp. 178, 263).

**hphan** = *Tib. phan, benefit.* 215 htshu-to°.

**hphaḥ** I = hpha, *father, q.v.* 38 rbyo°; 73 -ma; 199 -rmañ (pp. 274, 320).

II = pa, hpā, hpaḥ I, *brave, q.v.?* 151 -hphog; 304 hyaḥ-ḥdad°; 314 hkhog-re° (p. 280).

III ? 275 hldañḥ(?) -gsom°; 364 htom°.

— **-hphaḥ,** *laugh.* 348 ḥgewe-ḥweḥe° (pp. 248, 343).

**hphaḥha,** *miswriting (of hphaḥ?),* 275.

**hphar** = *Tib. phar, beyond; hphar, be elevated (go away).* See also **hpar.** 93, 99, 110, 118 ḥgam°; 142 mor-gdag°; 157 na-rog°; 187 hṛta-hpāe; 388 hṛtaḥ-hpaḥ° (pp. 239, 243, 336).

**hphu** I = hpu I, *man, male, q.v.* 62 htor°; 48 -ḥséḡ (?) (pp. 308, 330).

II = *Tib. phu, phus, ḥbud, dbu, blow (the fire, &c.).* See also

**hpuḥi, pu (hpuḥ)-glo, ḥldim-hphu.** 104 sku°; 301 ḥldim°; 352 -hphu (pp. 157, 270, 285, 321).

— (I ?) **-ḥbos** = hpu (I), -ḥbos (hpos), *q.v.* 40, 167.

— (II) **-ḥklo,** *bellows* = pu-glo, *q.v.* 40 (pp. 239, 284).

**hphuḥi** = hphu II + ḥi. 190 -ḥtoñ; 276 ḥdzam° (pp. 228, 285).

**hphul** = hpul, *handful, at a climax, q.v.* 41 ḥñud-noḥu°.

**hphe** = *Tib. hphen, throw away, or phe, weak?* 317 ḥwa-ne° (pp. 338-9).

**hpho** = po, hpo I, *male, q.v.* 117 -ḥldir-ḥtsag (p. 217).

**hphog** = hpog (*Tib. hphog*), *hit with a missile, q.v.* (p. 343). 151 hphaḥ°.

**hphom** = hpom (*Tib. pham, hpham*), *be defeated, q.v.* 147 -te-ḥdrañ (pp. 299-300).

**hphor** = phor II, por I, ḥpor I, *release, &c., q.v.* 168 chi-hrmu°; 183, 353 ḥdro° (pp. 276, 319, 332).

**hphyag** = *Tib. phyag, hand; phyag-byed, salute, &c.* See also **bphyag.** 106 -ḥkkoḥu.

**hphyar** = pyar, pyer, phyer, *lift, hoist, q.v.* 126 hldañ°; 341 -ma-ḥswañ (pp. 287, 344).

**hphyid** = hpyid, *suffice, wipe away, q.v.* 340 ḥstor-ḥdeḥi° (p. 253).

**hphyu** = pyu ? 208 -ḥldyañ.

**hphyegs** = hpeg, *q.v.* 176 swa°.

**hphyed** = hpyed, *be separated, opened, &c., q.v.* See also **phye.** 208 rḥḥi-rgod°.

**hphyo,** *cf. lpyoḥ?* 375 -ḥli.

**hphrah** = hpraḥ (*Tib. = kick?*). 255 ḥdrañ-re°.

**hphrom.** *Auxiliary Verb* = prom, ḥprom, ḥproms, hprom, phrom, *q.v.* 171 ḥkkoḥu°.

## B

**bañ** = *Tib. hbañs, a subject or servant?* See also **hbañ** I. 249 -ḥreḥe; 252 -rpag (pp. 274).

**baḥ** = *Tib. ba, cow?* 47 ḥbeḥi° (p. 286).

**beg,** *only in the Proper Name Śes (Hśes)-beg (ḥbeg), possibly related to the rbeḡ, rbag, rba-ga of Tseñ-ḥgi-rbag, &c., p. 134.* See also **ḥbeg.** 24 Śes°; 5 Hśes° (pp. 138, 224, 306-7).

**bon** = ḥbon, *in hbo-ḥbon, q.v.* 238 ḥbo° (p. 230).

**bos** I = ḥbos, *grown, big, q.v.* See also **hbo** I, **ḥbom, rbo, rbom, ḥrbo, ḥrbom.** 42, 43 -smyi; 378 -[smyi-ḥldog ?] (pp. 322-3, 334).

**byl** *small* = 'Nam-pa' pyi (p. 132) Hsi-hsia ḥbiḥ, &c. See also

**hbyi** (pp. 252, 265). 98 hmo-cha°; 147 hmañ° (p. 300).

**byiñ** = hbyiñ, *sink, &c., q.v.* 97 hbom°, hmo-hchañ° (pp. 342, 345).

**byin** = *Tib. sbyin, gift, charity; byin, a blessing, a good. See also hbyin.*

— **-ta** (tañ, a *Suffix*, pp. 182–3). 105–6 (p. 315).

**byu-re**, for byur-re, *Tib. byur, ill luck, wretched, &c.* 108 mo-lañ° (p. 221).

**brañ** = *Tib. bra, plenty; hbras, rice; hbras-bu, fruit: also Proper Name (Dbra) of an ancient, legendary, tribe. See also hbra, hbrañ, hbrahr.* 228 -hrañ (pp. 215–16, 319–20).

**bri** I = *Tib. hbri, bri, dbri, diminish, grow less; phri, hphri, dpri, diminish, reduce. See also hbri* I (pp. 215–16). 156 rmañ°; 202 rmañ°.

II, *female, cf. Tib. hbri, yak-cow. See also hbri* II. 329 -gše (pp. 216–17).

**brehe** = *Tib. bred, be alarmed, dejected, ashamed. See also hbres.* 44 šes-ħsi° (p. 322).

**bro** = *Tib. hbros, flee, escape. See also hbro* I. 108 hño° (p. 221).

**brom** = *Tib. hgrum, pinch or nip off; grum-po, cripple? (p. 366). 72 ġsi° ohnu (p. 342). See also hbrom.*

**bla** = *Tib. bla, upper, highest, superior.* 154 -hldoh, a *Suffix*, pp. 186–7 (p. 222).

**gbohu**, from hbo I (*Tib. hbo, &c., overflow, swell, grow, q.v.* 181 hlab-ta° (pp. 156, 231, 313).

**gblañ**, from blañ = *Tib. len, blañ, get, receive (possibly confused with glañ* I, *q.v., from the same root).* 265 hñon-ta° (p. 219).

**bbyam**, *Aorist of hbyam (= Tib. hbyam, flow over, spread; byams, kindness), q.v.* 253 me° (p. 274).

**hba** = *Tib. dbağ, rba, billows; dbağ-rlabs-can-ma, hill torrent.*

*See also hbağ* I. 54 rzañ° (p. 352).

**hbañ** I = *bañ, subject, servant, q.v.* 67, 251 -re, -hre, -hrehe; 67, 371. 373, 386, 390 -hko-htar, *q.v.*; 253 -hldoñ; 363 -kwa-kwa (?) (pp. 268, 274, 331, 346 n.).

II = *Tib. dbağ, power, authority.* 39 hgyaid (?) -ge°; 170 -hldah, a *Suffix*, p. 183; 172 -prom; 252 g-ri° (?); 354 hldun° (?) (pp. 257, 275, 316, 321, 345, 346).

— (II) **-thwañ** = *Tib. dbağ-thağ, might, fortune, destiny.* 97 -byiñ (pp. 342, 347).

**hbab** = *Tib. bab, hbab, dbab, fall, descend, alight; hbab-chu, river, torrent.* 15 hmar°; 357 sko° (p. 267).

**hbağ** I = *hba, billows, &c., q.v. (also 'rocking' in 45): derived from II? 45 hldag°; 51 hmar°; 55 -hrag-hkyer (p. 317).*

II = *Tib. hbağ, seizure, restraint (perhaps originally pressure, cf. hbağ-cha, lees, sediment).* 110 hro-hbehi°; 234 htsag-hro-hbehi°; 235 hbe° (pp. 293–4).

III? 239 hphag°; 270 -hbom-rbo (p. 230).

**hbar** I = *Tib. bar, dbar, interval, between.* 97, 98 (pp. 262, 342, 345).

II for hbağ (II)+re. 18 hyogs-hldog°; 234 htsag-hro-hbehi° (pp. 250, 339).

**hbu** I = *Tib. dbu, head.* 47 -hrug; 68 -hpor (pp. 250, 268, 286, 319).

II = *hpu* I, *hphu* I, *man, q.v.* 33 htor° ohgru (p. 308).

III = *Tib. phu, high part of valley.* 15 -rwyē; 50 -rbye (p. 267).

**hbe**, *sheep* (p. 249). *See also hbehi, hbehe.* 235 -hbağ; 390 -hbağ? (pp. 293–4).

**hbeg** = *beg, q.v.* 7, 8, 20, 23, 25 hšes°, šes° (pp. 138, 224, 306–7).

**hbehi** = *hbe, hbehe, q.v.* 47 -bağ; 69 -la-hgar; 110 -hbağ; 213 -tyañ; 234 -hbağ and -hbar (pp. 193, 247, 249, 250, 253, 286, 293).

**hbehe** = hbe, hbehi, *q.v.* 46 -hslirman (p. 257).

**hbo** I = *Tib.* bo, dbo, hbo, hbos, *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 gbohu, rbo, hrbo, hbon, hbom, hbos, rbom, hrbom.* 126 stor-hgu°; 163 sri° (?); 263 g-rah-nag° (pp. 231, 283, 288-9, 313).

II *forest, wood, a specialization of I.* 12 -hkom; 280 -hram; 344 -hron (pp. 231, 318).

III ? = II ? 144 -kyer.

— **-bon (hbon)**, *big, reduplicated form of I.* *See also po(hpo)-rbom, hbom-rbo.* 238, 243, 245, 246 (p. 230).

**hboğ** = *Tib.* hbag, hbags, dbag, sbag, sbogs, *defile, be defiled, be submerged.* 256 hrag-ma°; 283 rag-hdah-ta° °ni (pp. 147, 173). *See also hwag.*

**hbod** = *Tib.* hbad, *watch, be alert, take care; hbod, call out, endeavour.* *See also hwad.* 313 hmor-hso° (p. 340).

**hbon.** *See hbo-hbon.*

**hbom**, *big, bigness.* *See hbo, hbon:* *also rbom, hrbom.* 73 smyi°; 97 -byiñ (pp. 236, 345).

— **-rbo** = hbo-hbon, *q.v.*, *grow big.* 111 (2), 112, 270 (pp. 230).

**hbos**, *etymologically Aorist of hbo I, swell up, grow: usually signifying big man, with or without the term hpu, hphu, &c., man* (p. 231). *See also bos, hpos.* 41 hphu°; 164 -hsah-hdah and -hnom-hsah; 167 hphu°; 213 -hdom; 250 hrpod°; 266 hpu°; 287 -g-yah-hthañ; 290 -g-ri; 291 -hrihi; 293 -hrihi, hpuhu°; 330 hpuhu° (pp. 260, 277, 278, 297, 298).

**hbyam** = *Tib.* hbyam, byams, *flow over, be widespread (abound); byams, kind.* 225, 231, 237, 244 hlad°; 253 hyah-me°, hlab-me°; 353 hwah-hrah° (p. 274).

**hbyi**, *small, become small* = *Hsi-hsia* dbih, hbhi, hbih (pp. 132, 252): *perhaps* = *Tib.* hbyi, dbyi, *wipe out.* *See also rbyi, hbyihi.* 50 hce-hra°; 75 dgu-htor°; 167 -hri; 305, 307, 308, 311 gdzu°/gzuo° (pp. 252, 265, 273, 276, 337, 338).

**hbyig** = *cow* (pp. 249-50). 70 -la-gnah (pp. 193, 247).

**hbyiñ** = *Tib.* hbyiñ, *sink, grow faint; byiñs, depth, &c.* *See also byiñ.* 56 hce-hrah°; 57 me-na°; 96 na-ge° (p. 345).

**hbyin** = byin, *blessing, &c., q.v.* 57 rgyañ-hce° (p. 312).

**hbyim** ? *connected with sbyim, q.v.* 266 -ge-g-yah; 363 hmu-lom-ge°.

**hbyihi** = hbyi, *q.v.* 84 cis-tsha° (p. 359).

**hbye**, *perhaps connected with hpyed, hpyhed, q.v.* 131 rñe°; 223 hton-hkoñ°.

**hbyoğu** = *Tib.* byo, hbyo, *pour out?* 256 ldyoğu-ma° (pp. 327, 331).

**hbra** = brah, *q.v.* *See also hbrah, hbrahr.*

— **-hlda(r)**, *probably name of a place, real or mythical,* 31, 32 (p. 319).

**hbrad** = *Tib.* hbrab, *snatch* (pp. 253-4). 213 hstsah°; 305 -re; 306 -re, -sta, *a Suffix,* pp. 182-3, 359; 312 hjuhu° (pp. 231, 253-4).

**hbrah** = hbra, brah, *be plentiful, &c., q.v.* 269 hwah-ne° (p. 339). *See also hbrahr.*

— **-hlda(r)** = hbra°, *q.v.* 30 (pp. 319-20).

**hbrahr** *for hbrah-re* (p. 123). 254 hldañ-phyer° (p. 287).

**hbri** I = bri I, *diminish, grow less (destroy?), loss? q.v.* 132 -hldi-hthañ; 203 -hko; 228 -hgu, *a Suffix,* pp. 190, 258 (pp. 171, 215-16, 246, 253).

II = bri II, *female, q.v.* 137 -re; 150, 161, 218, 343 hpu° (? I); 163 -hsehe; 324 -hdzohu-kyim; 381



-slod-ħldo (pp. 138, 216-18, 275, 338).

**ħbrus** = *Tib.* ħbru, brus, *probe, irritate, inflame.* 153 ske<sup>o</sup> (p. 316).

**ħbres**, *Aorist of breħe, be alarmed, &c. q.v.* 176 keħu-prom<sup>o</sup>.

**ħbro** I = bro, *flee, &c., q.v.* 36 ħldyo-ħrje<sup>o</sup>; 138 ħdzeħu-rje<sup>o</sup>; 139 ldañ-rdze<sup>o</sup>; 241 ħcaħ-ħyañ<sup>o</sup>; 355 ħtħaħ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 218, 228, 230, 244, 287, 335).

II = *Tib.* bro, *taste, have a taste, be felt as.* See also **ħbroħo**. 221, 222, 297, 313, 316, 318, 323, 325 ħkru<sup>o</sup>, ħkruħu<sup>o</sup>; 221 ħklu<sup>o</sup> = ħkru<sup>o</sup> (pp. 228-9, 296-7).

**ħbroñ** = *Tib.* ħbroñ, *wild yak* (pp. 139, 258-9). See also **ħldag-nag**. 68, 371, 373, 384, 386, 389 ħdzam<sup>o</sup>; 157 ħpu<sup>o</sup>; 170 ħdro<sup>o</sup> ħprom; 182 -ħldaħ; 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 222, 392, 394 (?) ħtor<sup>o</sup>/tor<sup>o</sup>/thor<sup>o</sup>; 220 -ħdru-ħjar; 221, 393 -ħkru-ħbro; 250 -re-ge; 285, 331 ħrkom<sup>o</sup>; 353 -ħldar-ħdzam (pp. 244, 250, 258, 263, 268, 272, 285, 294, 296, 305, 313, 319, 331).

**ħbrom** = brom, *pinch, or nip, off, q.v.* 297 rñeħe<sup>o</sup>.

**ħbroħo** = ħbro II, *taste = be felt as, q.v.* 294 ħkruħu<sup>o</sup> (pp. 246-7).

**rbab** (*lect.?*), *for rnab = ħrnab, q.v.?* 54 -ña-ħke.

**rbu**. See spu<sup>o</sup>. 39 (p. 350).

**rbo** = *Tib.* sbo, *swell up, &c.* See **ħbo** I, **ħrbo**, **ħbom**, **rbom**, **ħrbom**. 27 g-yo<sup>o</sup>; 136 kyer<sup>o</sup>; 111, 112, 270 ħbom<sup>o</sup> (pp. 230-1, 309).

**rbom**, *big, bigness, become big, &c.* See **ħbom**, **ħrbom**. 317 ħpo<sup>o</sup>. See also **ħpo** III (pp. 224, 323, 338-9).

**rbyi**, *perhaps = diminish: cf. byi, ħbyi, small, q.v.* 375 -ħldyiħi (pp. 330, 350).

**rbye**, *extent = Tib. dbye, from ħbyed. See also ħpyed,*

**ħpyed, ħbye, rwe.** 53 -ħce-rgyañ (pp. 290-2, 345).

**rbyo** I = *fowl* (pp. 332-3). 38 -ħphaħ; 365 -rgyer; 366 -g-yer (pp. 320, 332).

II = rbyo-po, *a priest, sorcerer or bon-po man, perhaps literally a fowl-man?* (pp. 155-6, 332-3). See also **ħrbyo** I. 53 -ħko-rño; 82 -ħa-ge; 102 -sñañ; 181 -po (pp. 263, 320, 332-3).

III, *miswriting of rgyo, q.v.* 330 -gšeg (p. 178).

**ħrbo** = rbo, *swell up, &c., q.v.* 25 Šes-ħbeg<sup>o</sup>.

**ħrbom** = rbom, *bigness, become big, &c., q.v.* 317 ħpo<sup>o</sup> (p. 323).

**ħrbyo** I = rbyo II, *q.v.* 56 -ħko-rño (p. 263).

II, *miswriting of ħbro, q.v.?* (*Cf.* 355) 362 -ħtoħo, *a Suffix*, pp. 184-6.

**sbyim**, *target, cf. Tib. ħgyim?* 59 -ħce-rgye (p. 343).

## M

**-ma**, *a Nominal Suffix* (pp. 181-2), *seen in* rgyed-ma 101, 105, 107, 231, ħgru-ma 27, 32, 77, 79, ħdaħ-ma (?) 108.

**ma** = *Tib. &c., ma, not* (p. 205). 31, 32; 57, 63, 71, 94 (*final after Verb ħtañ*); 96 (*between Verb ħtañ and Suffix te*); 103. &c.

**ma, maħ.** See **maħn**.

**ma**, *mother.* 65 ħpha<sup>o</sup>; 184 -ħpu; 185 -ħpaħ (?) (pp. 301, 318).

**mag** = *Tib. dmag, army. See also rmag, ħrmag.* 102 ħsad<sup>o</sup> (p. 301).

— **-ħno**, *battle, cf. Tib. g-yul-ño, battlefront.* 48, 49, 58, 145, 184 (pp. 194, 299-301, 320).

**maħn** *for man in reduplicated ma-man. See also ħman.* 238 maħ-maħn; 243, 246 ma-maħn; 245 ma-ma-ħna; 247 ma-ħman (p. 230).

**mu**, *cold, afraid (?)*. See also **ħmu**, **ħmuħi**. 116 -rgyeb; 184 -re; 175 -ħldi (?); 197 -ħrog-ħtro;

244 dguḥu° (pp. 232-3, 285, 301, 318).

**mug** = *Tib. mug, gloom; rmugs, fog, stupid, &c.* 227 -ḥgu, a *Suffix*, pp. 190, 258 (pp. 215-16).

**mur**, written for mu, *q.v.*, +re. 252 ḥphu-ḥphu° (pp. 157, 285).

**me**, fire (*literal and metaphorical*) = *Tib. me. See also mye I, ḥmye, sme, meḥe, ḥmehi II* (pp. 281-6). 8, 20 -ḥgrah; 40 ḥnaḥ°; 45 re°, *lect. ma for me?*; 53 -ḥyed; 56 -ña; 58 -na; 67 ḥjo°, ḥlab°; 70 ḥjo°, ḥlab°; 71 ḥdø°; 89 ḥtshog°; 114 -ḥmehi; 123 stor°; 124 ḥldañ°; 149 -ḥtañ; 170 ḥkeḥu°, ḥkoho°; 173 ḥkoḥu°; 253 ḥyah°, jo°, ḥlab° (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 ḥmehi I, mye III.* 25 Ḥses-ḥbeg°; 78 -ra; 151 -spa; 155 -ḥgab; 185 śud°; 186, 369 -ḥrah; 370 -speḥi-ḥrah; 35 -g-ri-ḥtaḥ (?) (pp. 138, 139, 186-7, 223, 244, 265, 282, 318, 331).

II = *ma, not, +ḥi at end of sentence, 'is not'.* 115 so-ḥnaḥ°; 156 g-yah-ta°; 311 ḥmañ-sta°, ḥri-staḥ°; 312 g-riḥi-sta°, ḥri-staḥ°; 313 g-ri-sta° (pp. 200, 201, 254, 282, 337).

— (I) -**klu-ḥcha/ḥcaḥ**, a *Proper Name.* 150, 161, 343 ḥklu. *See also ḥmehi°* (pp. 138, 253, 255).

**meḥe** = *me.* 171 ḥkoḥu°.

**mo I** = *Tib. mo, feminine, woman. See also ḥmo I* (p. 182). 108 -lañ; 188 ḥnañ (ḥña)-ḥdro°; 193 ḥñah° (pp. 221, 238, 285). *See also ḥmo II.*

II = *sky, or mo-ge for mog (q.v.) +ge?* 252 sta-re° (p. 201).

III? = *hair?* 63, 144 -ma-ḥthor (p. 303). *See also ḥmo III.*

**mog** (? *lect.*) = *gmog, ḥmog, cloud?* 6 -ḥtswe (pp. 269, 271).

**Moñ**, *Proper name of a people, the Mons. See also Ḥmoñ* (pp.

150-4). 379, 380, 381 ḥrtsig°, rtsig°, tsig° (p. 285).

-**ḥdzoñ/hjoñ**, *Mon fort. See also Ḥmoñ°.* 64 ḥstor°; 118 stor°; 128 stor°; 139 stor°; 140 stor° (pp. 171, 187, 243, 305, 308).

**mod** = *Tib. mod, be verily* (p. 200). 211 ḥgo-gtoñ°; 212 ḥko-ḥtoñ° (pp. 200, 260, 261, 332).

**modḥi** = *mod (q.v.) +ḥi.* 212.

**mor**, bad, evil (pp. 215-16). *See also ḥmor I.* 9 -ḥtañ; 40 -ḥphu-ḥbos; 87 -ḥldañ; 141 -gdag-ḥgom; 142 -gdag-ḥphar; 173 swah°; 225 -ḥgu, a *Suffix*, pp. 190, 258; 286 -ḥkyañ; 388 -tsah, a *Suffix*, pp. 187-8 (pp. 187, 239, 276, 297, 304, 323, 329, 340).

**myag** = *Tib. myag, chew; myags, putrid (spoiled, vile).* 39 -mye-ḥtañ; 109 -gre; 148 -myi[-tor], myage-me-ḥtañ; 179 gnah-gon°; 280 -ma-ḥtsar; 367 gnah-ḥgon°; 368 ḥyahñ-gon° (pp. 221, 231, 269, 291-2, 302).

**myi I** = *Tib. mi, man* (pp. 236-7). 148 -tor; 153 -re, -ḥsi, -rgye; 211 -ḥpeḥi (pp. 174, 236, 273).

II = *Tib. mi, not. See also ḥmyi, mye II.* 98 phyi-ḥse°; 159 -ség; 160 -ḥrgan, -ḥldin; 165 -ḥrdoḥo (pp. 145-6, 172, 200, 217, 296, 345).

**myiñ** = *Tib. miñ, name (mere name).* 97 ḥtsog-ḥram° (p. 345).

**myil** = *Tib. myul/ñul, rove as a spy* (pp. 354, 367). *See also ḥmyil.* 29 rgu-ḥmyil° (p. 259).

**mye I** = *me, fire, q.v. See also ḥmye.* 6 -ḥyañ-ḥwad; 39 -ḥtañ; 102 ḥsi-kyeg°; 195 ḥthar°; 211 -ḥpaḥi; 357 thar° (pp. 241, 269, 271, 301, 340).

II = *Tib. med, is not. See also myer.* 154 -dze; 241 -re (p. 237).

III for *mehi I, eye, q.v.* 212 -ḥpeḥi (p. 240).

**myen** = *Chinese wan (mān), myriad.* 247 ḥlad-ḥtoñ° (p. 234).

**myer**, written for *mye* II, is not, (*q.v.*), +re (pp. 174, 281). 129 -re; 153 *myi-rgye*<sup>o</sup>; 365 *rgoñ-wa*<sup>o</sup>, *htsog-ḥram*<sup>o</sup>; 366 *hkeḥu-prom*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 273, 293, 332, 342).

**gmog**, cloud, cf. *Tib.* *rmugs*, fog, stupid; *mug*, gloom; *mog*, dark colours; *Tangut*; *rmūkha*, cloud. 55 -*ḥce-rgyañ*, -*ḥce-ḥsa* (pp. 263, 271, 353). See also **mog**, **ḥmog**.

**ḥmañ**, larger, many = *Tib.* *mañ*, man (pp. 230-1). 33 (?) -*ḥldaḥ*, a Suffix, p. 183; 146 -*byi*; 301 *ḥldim-ḥphu*<sup>o</sup>; 302 -*ḥrihi*; 303 -*ḥkhu*; 304 -*ḥldyo*, -*rgam*; 305 -*nañ-hyu*; 306 -*ge-ḥrgam*; 307 *ḥnaḥ-na*<sup>o</sup>, -*ḥrgam*; 308 -*ḥri*, -*g-ri*; 309 -*g-rihi*; 310 *ḥldim*<sup>o</sup>; 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 **rmad** (pp. 226-7). 36, 39 *śes*<sup>o</sup>; 202 *ḥrah*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 269, 313).

**ḥman** in reduplicated form *ma-ḥman*, from man, many. 247. See **mahn**.

**ḥmaḥ** = *Tib.* *ma*, *dmaḥ*, low, anti-thetic to *ya*. See also **рмаḥ**, **ḥgru** (II) -*ḥldañ-ḥmaḥ* (pp. 226-7). 112 -*ḥldañ-hyaḥ* (pp. 227, 288).

**ḥmar** I = *Tib.* *mar*, down, low. 15 -*ḥbab* (cf. *Tib.* *chu-ḥbab*, hill torrent); 22 -*myi-lpyoḥo*; 51 -*ḥbah* (p. 267).

II = *Tib.* *mar*, butter, oil. 46 -*me*, lamp = *Tib.* *mar-me* (p. 286).

**ḥmu** I = *mu*, cold, *q.v.* See also **ḥmuḥi** (pp. 232-3). 39 *ḥkye-ge*<sup>o</sup>; 104 *ḥdram*<sup>o</sup>; 200 *ḥce*<sup>o</sup>; 204 *ḥche*<sup>o</sup>; 206 *ḥce*<sup>o</sup>: 225, 236, 245 *dgu*<sup>o</sup>/*dguḥu*<sup>o</sup>.<sup>o</sup>*ḥto/to*; 268 -*klag*; 309 -*wa-rño*; 363 -*lom*(?) (pp. 200, 232-3, 266, 270, 285, 298, 320, 338).

II, sky, cf. *Tib.* *mu*, limit, boundary, horizon. 9 -*ḥrñu-skhrud* (p. 276).

**ḥmun** = *Tib.* *mun*, darkness? (p. 276). 33 *ḥse-ḥte*<sup>o</sup>.

**ḥmuḥi** = *ḥmu* I, *q.v.* 183 *me*<sup>o</sup>, make cold (pp. 172, 232).

**ḥme** I = *me*, fire, *q.v.* See also **ḥmeḥi** II. 262 *cañ-sme*<sup>o</sup> (p. 283).

II *meḥi* II, is not. 121 *htsog-ḥram*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 281, 292).

**ḥmeḥi** I = *meḥi* I, eye, *q.v.* 185 *śud*<sup>o</sup>; 186 *ḥjam-ge*<sup>o</sup>; 272 -*ḥpaḥ* (p. 139).

II = *ḥme* I, fire, *q.v.* 114 *me*<sup>o</sup>, light fire (pp. 172, 201, 232, 282).

— (I) -**ḥklu-ḥcaḥ** = *meḥi*<sup>o</sup>, *q.v.* 218 (pp. 138, 255).

**ḥmo** I = *mo*, woman, *q.v.* 84 -*rkaḥ-lda*; 97 -*ḥchaḥ*; 98 -*cha*; 189 *ḥnañ-ḥdro*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 227, 285, 343, 345).

II = *mo* II, sky, *q.v.* (?). 8, 20 -*ge-me-ḥgraḥ*; 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-ḥldi*<sup>o</sup>; 360.

**ḥmog** = *gmog*, cloud, *q.v.* 52 -*ḥce-rgyañ*; 54 *stehi-ḥtam*<sup>o</sup>; 81 -*re-ḥldoñ* (pp. 271, 353).

**ḥmoge**, written for *ḥmog-ge* or *ḥmo-ge*. 55 -*ḥco*.

**Ḥmoñ** I = *Moñ*, *q.v.* 78 -*joñ*; 129 -*ḥjoñ* (pp. 241, 263).

II. See **re-ḥmoñ**. 134.

III. (*ḥmañ* ?) -*ḥldaḥ* 33.

**ḥmor** I = *mor*, bad, evil, *q.v.* 313 -*ḥso*; 318 *ḥswaḥ*<sup>o</sup>; 331 *ḥgu*<sup>o</sup> (p. 266).

II. written for *ḥmo* (I) +re. 190 -*bzaḥ-re* (p. 240).

**ḥmyi** = *myi* II, not, *q.v.* 40 *ḥnaḥ-me*<sup>o</sup>; 254 *ḥldyo-ḥtor*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 239, 284, 328 n.).

**ḥmyil** = *myil*, *q.v.* 29 -*myil*.

**ḥmye** = *mye* I, fire, *q.v.* 197 -*ḥtaḥ*, a Suffix, pp. 122-3.

**rma** I = *Tib.* *rmas*, ask. 47 *dam*<sup>o</sup> (p. 286).

II = *Tib.* *rma*, wound. 156 -*g-yog-rño* (p. 295).

III, river = *Hsi-hsia maśuo*, *Tib.*

rma-chu. 196 -hsu-ḥdra (pp. 245-6).

**rmag** = *Tib.* dmag, *army*. See also **mag**, **ḥrmag**. 146 ḥrah-ḥtoñ°; 147 ḥsod-te°; 149 rgyed°; 205 ḥpah° (pp. 144, 246, 300, 361).

**rmañ** I = *tomb-monument*, *Tib.* rmañ (p. 148). 27 ḥldañ°; 148 -ra-gyim; 156 -bri-ḥko; 197 -ḥldab; 199 -ña, ḥphah°; 201 -ña, ḥwi-wa°; 202 -bri-ko; 206 gsañ°, -ña; 207 -ña; 235 -dze; 336 -ḥwi-ḥkho (pp. 246, 259, 318, 320, 341, 345).

II = *Tib.* rmañ, *dream*, rmoñ, rmoñs, *delusion*, &c. 46 ḥsli°; 77 ḥgru-ma° (pp. 278, 309).

**rmad** = *Tib.* smad, *low*. See also **hmaḥ**, **rmaḥ**, **ḥmad** (pp. 226-7). 80, 84 smyi° (pp. 237, 288, 343).

**rmaḥ** = ḥmaḥ, rmad, *q.v.*, *low*. 257 ḥyah° (p. 227).

**rmar** I, *written for rmaḥ-re*. 315, 318 ḥyah-ḥtañ° (pp. 227, 296).

II, *written for rma* (*Tib.* rma, *wound, to wound*) + re. 312 ḥdom-ḥguḥu°, ḥjuḥu-ḥbrad° (p. 254).

**rmur**, *written for rmu* (= *Tib.* mu, *boundary*) + re (pp. 351-2). See also **ḥmu** II, **ḥrmu**. 166 ḥsaḥ-chacl° (p. 276).

**rme** = *Tib.* dme/rme/sme, *blemish* (p. 349). 124, 232, 337, 340, 342 ḥtor/tor-ḥrta/ḥrtaḥ° (p. 284).

**rmo** = *Tib.* smon, *wish, aspire, pray?* See also **rmon?** 250 -hkum (p. 294).

**rmon** = rmo? or *connected with rmañ* II, *dream?* 349 ḥjim-ḥtsoñ-ge°.

**rmyi** (? *lect.*) = smyi, *man*, *q.v.*? 41 ḥyañ°.

**ḥrmag** = rmag, *army*, *q.v.* 146 rñe-ne° (pp. 222, 299-300).

**ḥrmu** = rmu, *boundary*, *q.v.* 168 chi° (p. 276).

**ḥrmoho**. 18 ḥskyim-se°.

**smu-ḥdzu**, *conceivably* = *Tib.* mu-zi, *brimstone*, with -i/-u as in p. 367. 27 -rgyag (p. 259).

**smuḥu-ḥku** = *Tib.* smyig-ma, smyug-ma, smyu-gu, *reed* (p. 357). 22 -ḥyob.

**sme**, *fire, blaze*, me, mye I, ḥme I, ḥmeḥi II, ḥmye, *q.v.* (pp. 282-3, 357). 192 rgyed-ḥrañ°; 262 cañ°; 282, 284, 375 ḥség°; 342 klu-ḥldo°—*error for rme?* 393 ḥrgyed-ḥsañ° (pp. 282-3).

**smyi** = *Tib.* mi, myi, *man* (pp. 236-7). See also **myi**, **rmyi**, 37 -rmad; 42, 44 -ḥldog; 73 -ḥbom; 80 -ḥni; 84 -rmad; 241, 242 -ḥnu; 269 -glog (pp. 227, 237, 288, 322, 323, 334, 339, 343).

## Ts

**tša**, *a Pluralizing or classifying Suffix, often in the combination re-tša, signifying those who (whose, &c.)* (pp. 187-8). See also **tšaḥ**, **ḥtša** I, **ḥtšaḥ** I, **tša**, **tšaḥ**. 60 ḥkku°, ḥphah°; 63 ḥyañ°; 163 ḥno-re°?; 220 ḥthañ-le°; 283 ḥpañ°; 388 ḥyañ° (pp. 145, 274, 304, 305, 315).

**tšañ** = *Tib.* tšaḥ, *complete* (p. 364). 136 gtse-ḥkom-re°.

**tšaḥ** = tša, *q.v.* 388 mor° (pp. 216, 304).

**tšig** = rtsig, ḥrtsig, *carpenter*, *q.v.* 381 -Moñ.

**tšu** = *Tib.* tshu, *tshur, hither, come hither*. 284 -re (p. 364). See also **ḡtsu**, **ḥtsu** I, **ḥtsuḥu**, **tšur**, **ḥtsur**, **ḥtshu**, **ḥtshun**, **ḥtshur**.

**tšur** = tšu, ḥtsu, ḥtsur, *come, &c.*, *q.v.* 391 ḥgyah-ḥnaḥ°.

**tše**, *written for dze*, *q.v.* 63 ḥjo°; 111 ḥyah°; 120 ḥnaḥ° (pp. 230, 262, 274, 291-2, 305)°.

**tšeg** = gceg, gcheg, ḥceg, *q.v.* (p. 294). 93 swa° otšeg (p. 334).

**tšweḥu**. ? *cf.* ḥtšwe? (pp. 269, 368). 196 ḥwam-weḥi-ge° (p. 241).

**ḡtšañ** = *Tib.* stšaḥ, *corn, grain*. See also **ḥtšaḥ**. 159 -myi-ḥrgan; 165 ḥsaḥ° (pp. 145-6, 335).

**gtsu.** *Prospective form of tsu, q.v.* 214 hrwehi° (p. 345).

**gtse** = *Tib.* gtse/htshe, *cause mischief, injure* (pp. 140–1). 113 -ne; 136 -hkom. *See also gse, hse I, hsehi, hsehe II.*

**gtsob.** *Prospective form of htshab, q.v.* = *Tib.* htshab, *replace, be ruffled; tshab, deputy?* 351 hdam-sleg°; 352 glyañ-ru°.

**htsa I** = *tsa q.v.* 24 klu-hrto°; 67 hgro-re°; 64 hstor-Moñ-hdzon-re°; 131 hthan-le°; 146 htrog°; 152 g-yah°; 215 htor-hñi°; 259 hkhwi° (pp. 138, 186–7, 202, 223, 272, 305, 308, 343).

II. 249 -re.

**htsā,** *probably intended for htсах III, q.v.* 21 -gsom (p. 306).

**htsag** = *Tib.* tshogs, htshogs, btsags, *collect, assemble.* *See also htсog, tshog, htshog.* 45 hya°; 117 hpho-hldir°; 173 hwi-hwehi°; 234 -hro; 257 hyah-rmah°; 282 (?) (pp. 191, 127, 227, 257, 292, 341, 343).

**htsañ** = *gtsañ, corn, grain, q.v.* 270 -ra; 378 hсах° (?) (pp. 178, 339).

**htsam** = *Tib.* tsam, *just so much.* *See also tsham.* 72 hсор° (pp. 204, 342).

**htсах I** = *tса, htса I, q.v.* 25 klu-rto°; 31 hñed-htram°; 65 hgag-re°; 65 hño[-]r[e]°; 74 rah-ge°; 342 mye-hrah°; 379 rtsig-Moñ-ge°; 381 we-ge°; 383 hwehi-ge° (pp. 138, 157, 186, 187, 219, 223, 228, 251, 274, 287, 319).

II = *Tib.* btsa, btsas, *watch* (p. 278). *See also stсах, htсах I* 42 hсах°; 44 htсах°; 268 -hdzañ; 291 -po[-]r[e] (pp. 280, 281, 322, 339).

III = *Tib.* btsah-ma, btsas-ma, btsas, rtsas, *ripening of corn, harvest, probably identical with btsa, btsas, give birth to a child; btsas-ston, birth festivity* (pp. 278, 281). 277 gсах-re-htсах-re. *See also htсах II.*

IV. *See hdzo(htso)-htсах/*

**htsehi/hdzehi.** 30, 62, 73, 115 (p. 252).

**htсах-sto,** *written for htсахs-to. Aorist form of htсах (III?).* 33 na°; 233 hchir° (p. 275).

**htсар** = *Tib.* tshar, htshar, *limit, parish.* *See also htшhar.* 280 myag-ma° (p. 231).

**htsu I** = *tsu, hither, come hither, q.v.* *See also htсуһu, htсур, htшу, htшur.* 113 hgu-htor°; 304 hdom-hgu° (p. 233).

II, *man* (pp. 218, 238). 193 hñah° (p. 238).

**htсуһu** = *htsu I, q.v.* 166 hrañ-hrah°; 303 hdom-hgu° (pp. 142, 200, 256, 327).

**htсур** = *tsu, htсу I, q.v.* 207 hkah-hgañ° (p. 315).

**htseh** 364. *See hdzo.*

**htsehi** 342. *See htсах IV.*

**htso I?** 83 hldas°; 105 -dro-ho (p. 261).

— *written in place of htсog, q.v.* 88.

— (II) -hna *written for so/hso-hnah, q.v.* 93.

— (III) -htсах, *perhaps = Tib. cha-cho, matched. See also hdzo-htсах/hdza.* 62, 73 gla°; 115 hcah° (p. 252).

— III -htsehi, *apparently = -htсах+hi* (pp. 191–2). 342 phyer°.

**htсog** = *Tib.* htshogs, btsags, &c. *See htсag, tshog, htшog, htso, hcog II.* 91 -rpu; 94, 96 -htañ-ma; 95 -hldañ; 99 hñah°; 102 nah° (pp. 292, 320–1).

— **-hram, friendship, harmony.** 35, 37, 82, 86, 90, 94, 97, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 365 (pp. 262, 281, 288, 291–3, 345).

**htсоñ** = *Tib.* tshoñ, htshoñ, stsoñs, *trade, barter, sell.* 349 hjim°.

**htсors** = *Tib.* gсор, bсор, hchor, *hunt, chase; сор, hchor, flee.* *See also tшor, htшors.* 134 hldag-nag°; 219 hbroñ° (pp. 258–9).

**htсwe?** = *tsweһu, q.v.?* hdzwe? (pp. 269, 368). 6 mog°, ? *lect.?* (p. 269).

**rtsig** = *Tib. rtsig, build, mason.*  
See also **hrtzig**, **tsig** (p. 150).  
379, 380 -Moñ.

**hrtzig** = *rtsig, q.v.* 380 -Moñ.

**stsaḥ** = *ḥtsaḥ II, watch, q.v.* (p. 278). See also **ḥtsaḥ I**. 298 ḥbos°.

**stsar** = *Tib. tshar, occasion, instance, used with numerals.* 247 stoñ° (pp. 233-4).

**ḥtsaḥ I** = *stsaḥ, ḥtsaḥ II, ḥscaḥ, watch, q.v.* 250 -ḥyer; 288 -ḥyah-ḥthañ; 290 -ḥriḥi; 295 -ḥri; 298 -ḥldaḥ, a *Suffix*, p. 183; 345, 350, 351 ḥyu° (pp. 246, 278, 280).

II? = *ḥtsaḥ, III, harvest?* 213 -ḥbrad (p. 253).

## Tsh

**tsha** = *tša, Pluralizing Suffix, q.v.* 50 ḥce-ra°; 84 cis° (?) (pp. 259, 359).

**tsham** = *ḥtsam, Tib. tsam, just so much, q.v.* 50 -ḥrog (p. 361).

**tshaḥ** = *tsha, tša, q.v.* (p. 364). 219 ḥthañ-le° (p. 272).

**tshis**, *error for chim, q.v., or = Tib. mchis, come? See also ḥtshis.* 95 dim° (pp. 320, 359).

**tshu** = *tsu, ḥtsu, gtsu, come hither, &c., q.v.? See also ḥtshu, ḥtshun, ḥtshur.* 206 -gsom.

**tshog** = *ḥtsog, collect, assemble, q.v. See also ḥtshog.* 95 -ḥldañ (pp. 320-1).

**tshor** = *ḥtsor(s), hunt, chase. See also ḥtshors.* 220 ḥbroñ°.

**ḥtshab** = *Tib. ḥtshab, tshab, re-place, deputy. See gtsob.* 104 ḥnag° (p. 360).

**ḥtshar** = *Tib. tshar, limit, parish. See also ḥtsar.* 208 -ḥde (p. 234).

**ḥtshim** = *Tib. tshim, satisfaction; ḥchims, get full. See also chim, ḥchim.* 81 ḥśi-ḥkri° (p. 298).

**ḥtshis** = *tshis, q.v.* 88 ḥdim° (p. 321).

**ḥtshu** = *thsu, tsu, ḥtsu I, gtsu, q.v.* 75 ḥsoḥ-ḥsoḥ°; 76 dgu-

-ḥtor°; 215 -to, a *Suffix*, pp. 184-6.

**ḥtshun** = *ḥtshu, &c., q.v., also Tib. tshun.* 76 dgu-ḥtor°.

**ḥtshur** = *ḥtsur, q.v.* 391 ḥnah-ḥdiḥi°.

**ḥtshē** = *Tib. gtse, ḥtshe, do harm. See also gtse.* 74 ḥkuḥu-neḥu° (p. 250).

**ḥtshog** = *ḥtsog, q.v.*

— **-ḥram.** 90 = *ḥtsog°, friendship, &c.* (p. 321).

**ḥtshors** = *ḥtsors, tshor, hunt, &c., q.v.* 130 ḥldag-nag° (p. 259).

## Dz

**dze I**, a *Clause-terminating Post-position, signifying place, time, or circumstance* (pp. 193-4). 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20 and *passim*.

II. *For cig-dze see cig.*

**dzeñ.** 378. (*Read dze-rñe?*).

**dzwe** = *ḥdzwe, ḥtswe, ḥdzweḥe* (p. 269)? 367 ḥsañ-khyañ° (p. 240).

**gdzu**, *ass. See also gzu, ḥdzu I, ḥju, ḥzu* (pp. 251-3). 194 ste°; 305, 308, 311 -ḥbyi; 390 -ḥti (pp. 229, 241, 251, 337, 353).

**ḥdza I** = *Tib. mdzah, friend, friendship. See also ḥdzah I.* 362 -ma-ḥnyoñ; 363 -ma-ḥñe; 376 -ḥtrog (p. 220).

II. *See ḥdzo-ḥdza (ḥtsa, ḥdzeḥi).*

**ḥdzañ I** = *Tib. mdzañ, ḥdzañ, wise* (pp. 224-5). 18 -ḥkhor; 42 ḥsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ°; 44 ḥtsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ°; 142 -ḥldog-stor; 200 speḥi°; 269 ḥtsaḥ°; 285 -ḥyah-ḥthañ; 288, 318 ḥsli°; 314, 315 ḥnor° (pp. 224, 262, 280, 295, 322, 323, 339).

II? = *Tib. bzañ, fine, good (large).* 232-4 -ḥglaḥ/glaḥ/gla.

III? 38 ḥldyañ-ḥrdzañ°.

**ḥdzam** = *Tib. ḥjam, gentle, pleasant, mild. See also ḥjam* (pp. 297, 339). 68, 371, 373, 386, 389 -ḥbroñ; 353 ḥbroñ-ḥldar°; 122 rkwa°; 145 ḥnam°; 182 ḥbroñ-ḥldaḥ°; 224 ḥrkwa°;

264 gsañ°; 264 hño°; 274 hkyañ°, rñe°; 275 twañ°; 276 hkyi°; 276 g-rah°onag; 278 -nag (pp. 250, 261, 268, 285, 313, 314, 319, 331, 341, 343, 361).

— **-hđzim** = *Tib.* zañ-ziñ, *miscellaneous objects, confused (bustle)?* (p. 192). 100 gdim° (p. 321).

**hđzah** I = hđza I, *friend, &c., q.v.* See also **hrdza**, **hđzah**. 379 spehi-ge°; 382, 383 -hłdah, *a Suffix*, p. 183; 43 hrah-ldah-ge° (?) (pp. 157, 313, 323, 334).

II = *Tib.* za, *eat*. See also **hjah**, **gzo**, **hđzohö**, **hjo** III (p. 334). 170 hkehu-me°; 255 hsañ°; 43 (?) (pp. 316, 327, 331, 334).

**hđzar** = hjar, *stick, stick together, q.v.* (pp. 220, 248). See also **rdzar**. 69, 374 skyim-se(hse)°; 372 hrñe-hño°; 376 hđza-htrog° (pp. 145, 220, 248).

**hđzin** = *Tib.* hđzin, *seize, hold*. 74 hjo°; 369 hgohö° (pp. 274, 331).

**hđzim**. See **hđzam**°.

**hđzu** I = gdzu, *ass, q.v.* 183 -hđro-hphor; 352 -hđro-hkus (pp. 157, 285, 332).

II. See **smu-hđzu**.

**hđzud** = *Tib.* chud, *be wasted, consumed (also hjud, hđzud, insert)*. 42 hkyañ-hrgyañ° (p. 299).

**hđzuhi** = hđzu, *feign?* (*Tib.* hđzu, rdzu, *disguise oneself, pretend?* Or hju, hđzu, *catch at?*) + hi. 344, 345 hses-hsi° (p. 269).

**hđzur** = *Tib.* hđzur, *zur, go aside, a corner, side-note, &c.* (p. 257). 45 skah-rah°; 173 klag-hrwad° (?) (pp. 191, 257, 317, 343).

**hđze** = *Tib.* ze, zehu, *cushion; gzed, carry, &c.* 63 hyañ-so°; 110 spyi°; 296 (?) (p. 335).

**hđzehi**. See **hđzo-htsah**.

**hđzehu** = *Tib.* gze-re, *weak, &c.* (pp. 335, 368). 138 -rje (pp. 218, 335).

**hđzer** (? *lect.* ?). 375.

**hđzo** I = hjo, *chief, or hđzohu, man?* 385 -chi-te; 64 -re-htsa° (pp. 305, 308).

II ? 76, 353 do-ldo° (pp. 322-3).

**hđzo-htsah** 29; -hđza 262; -hđzehi 338 (2); -htseh 364 = htso-htsah/htsehi, *q.v.* (*On the -ehi see pp. 191-2. Possibly = Tib. cha-cho, matched: only in gla-htso-htsah could the htso (29 hđzo) appositely signify 'man'.*) (pp. 274, 283).

**hđzon** = *Tib.* rdzon, *castle*. See also **hrdzon**, **hjoñ**, **joñ** (pp. 150-1, 171, 241). 64, 139, 140 Moñ°; 194 -hyo-hsi; 195 hlda-hko-ge°; 205 -skyar-hrehi; 299 hri-hño°; 356 -hyo-hsid (pp. 201, 241, 243, 265-6, 305, 308, 329).

**hđzon** = *Tib.* zon, *gzon, keep watch; dgra-zon, guard-post*. 337 stor-hta° (p. 335).

**hđzom** = *Tib.* hđzom, *meet* (p. 279). 134 hkhog-hnoñ°; 282, 284 hrim°; 295 hsog-ge° (pp. 282, 321, 329).

**hđzohu**, *male, man*. 137 -ro; 138 -hto-hrun; 324 -hkru-hyog, -hkhad-hto (pp. 199, 218, 246, 275, 338).

**hđzohö** = hjo, gzo, &c., *Tib.* za, zo, &c., *eat* (p. 334). 362 hkoñu-prom° (pp. 274, 316, 335).

**hđzor**, *perhaps for hđzo II, as in 353 (cf. 76). 77 (do?) -hldo°.*

**hđzwe** = tsehu, htsewe? (pp. 269, 368). 39 ses-hmad° (p. 269).

**hđzwehe** = **hđzwe**, *q.v.* 36 ses-hmad° (p. 269).

**rdzar**, *written for rdza (= hđza I, friend, &c., q.v.), or hđzar, -re. See also hrdza, hđzah (p. 352). 287, 290 hyañ-hkah° (pp. 315-16).*

**rdzum** = *Tib.* hđzum, *smile*. See also **hrdzum** (p. 350). 263 -me (pp. 271 n., 283).

**rdze** = *Tib.* rje, rdze, *chieftain* (p. 366). See also **rje**, **hrje**. 138 ldañ° (pp. 228, 287).

**rdzo** = *Tib.* mdzo, *the cross between the yak-bull and the cow* (pp. 258, 349). 132 hthañ°; 220 thañ° (pp. 173, 258).

**rdzogs** = *Tib.* rdzogs, *complete, fulfil* (pp. 213, 348). 157 glo-ta°.

**rdzor** I *written for rdzo (q.v.) -re. See also hrdzor.* 227 mug-ḡgu°; 228 ḡbri-ḡgu° (pp. 215-16).

II, *written for ḡdzor, man, or ḡjo, chief, +re. See also hrdzro.* 369 ḡseḡe° (p. 239).

**ḡrdza** = ḡdzza I, *friend. See also rdzar, hrdzah* (pp. 315, 352). 296 ḡkḡah°, ḡkḡah°; 382 ḡrgye°.

**ḡrdzañ.** 38 ḡldyañ° °ḡdzzañ.

**ḡrdzah** = ḡrdza, *friend, q.v.* 46 -ḡgo-ḡpo (p. 286).

**ḡrdzum** = rdzum, *q.v.* 80 ḡñi° (pp. 186, 271, 293).

**ḡrdzur** = ḡdzur, *go aside, &c., q.v.* (pp. 350, 352). 221 ḡthañ-ḡgam°.

**ḡrdzo** = rdzo, *q.v.* 16 ḡkrug°; 219 ḡtañ° (p. 144).

**ḡrdzoñ** = ḡdzoñ, *castle, q.v.* (pp. 150, 348). 194 -ḡyo-ḡśi (p. 241).

**ḡrdzor** = rdzor I (= rdzo + re), *q.v.* 226 mor-ḡgu° (pp. 215-16).

**ḡrdzro,** *written for ḡrdzo (= ḡdzor I, man, or ḡjo, chief) + re.* 49 ḡse° (p. 239).

## W

**wa** I, *make, do, or Auxiliary Verb.: cf. Tib. bas, done with, and see also ḡwa, ḡwah, ḡwas, ḡwah, ḡgwa, ḡgwah* (pp. 337-40). 179 ḡsom°; 309 ḡmu° (pp. 182, 270, 338). *See also kya (ḡkya)-wa-ñe, ḡgoñ-wa, ḡwi-wa.*

II = *Tib. ḡbaḡ, sediment?* 190 ḡyah° (pp. 228, 285).

**wa-ḡdañ** = *Tib. o-ldoñ, ḡo-doñ, windpipe.* 258 (p. 221). *See also ḡwa-ḡdañ.*

**war** (p. 341). *See also ḡwar.* 101 ḡrañ°.

**we** = *Tib. byed, Hsi-ḡsia we, make, do* (pp. 196, n. 2, 337). *See also weḡi I, ḡwe, ḡweḡi I, ḡweḡe, ḡwer, ḡ-we, ḡ-weḡi, ḡ-weḡe, ḡ-wer.* 114 ḡrah°; 191 ḡra°;

381 tsig-Moñ° (pp. 282, 283, 285).

**weḡi** I = *we, q.v. See also ḡweḡi, ḡweḡe.* 100 ḡko°; 139 ḡrah°; 196 ḡwam° (pp. 190, 243, 337).

II *cream?* *See also ḡweḡi* II. 74 -neḡu (pp. 250-1).

**ḡ-wah** = *wa, ḡwa, &c., q.v.* (pp. 337-40). 129 -ḡram; 224 -ḡrsañ (pp. 342, 343, 361).

**ḡ-we** = *we, make, do, q.v.* (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 152 -ḡku-rño; 197 rmañ-ḡldab°; 198 ḡldañ-ḡkḡañ°; 201 rmañ-ḡna°; 205 -ḡkor; 206, 207 rmañ-ḡna-g-we-re-g-we; 375 ḡphyo-ḡhli°? (pp. 228, 239).

**ḡ-weḡi** = *g-we, q.v.* (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 199 rmañ-ḡna°; 263 me° (p. 283).

**ḡ-weḡe** = *g-we, q.v.* (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 201 rmañ-ḡna°; 298 ḡswah°; 357 -ḡldyaḡ, -sko.

**ḡ-wer,** *written for g-we, make, &c., q.v., +re. See also ḡwer* (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 164 swah°; 301 swa° (pp. 270, 277).

**ḡwa** I = *wa* I, *q.v. See also ḡwah, ḡ-wah.* 121 ḡśi°; 137 -ḡkḡah; 162 ḡdrab°; 228 -ḡrsañ; 230 -ḡzer; 269 -ḡrño; 270 -ḡrgya; 317 -ḡne; 339 ḡkyah° (pp. 218, 253-5, 275, 292, 315, 338, 339).

— **-ste,** *written for ḡwas, q.v., +te (a Suffix, pp. 188-90).* 71, 73, 75 (pp. 273, 337-8).

II -ḡldañ = *wa-ḡdañ, q.v. See also ḡwah-ḡldañ.* 121, 278 (pp. 178, 221).

III. *See ḡwi-ḡwa, rat, mouse.* 273 (pp. 297, 341).

**ḡwag** = *Tib. ḡbag, be defiled. See also ḡbog.* 324 ḡ-yah-ḡpañ° (pp. 228, 340).

**ḡwañ** = *Tib. dbañ, power* (pp. 341, 346 and n.). 5 ram (?) -ḡge°, klu-ḡge°; 210 -ḡta, *a Suffix,* pp. 182-3 (pp. 245, 341, 361).

**ḡwad** = *Tib. ḡbad, watch, ḡbod, call out, endeavour. See also ḡbod* (pp. 340-1). 6 mye-ḡhyañ°; 14 ḡseḡe-ḡwad-ḡwad;



88 ḥcog-ḥdo-dze°; 109 tho-rgyam-ge°; 268 -ḥldañ-krañ; 301 ḥri-ḥci-ḥwadḥi; 334 ḥkeg-rko°; 335 -ḥwah-rño (pp. 265-6, 269, 271, 338, 340).

**ḥwadḥi** = ḥwad, *q.v.*, + ḥi. 301 (pp. 265, 340).

**ḥwam**, *residence or village* = *Tib.* bams, boms, sbam, *collect* (p. 243). 11 -ḥsid; 155 -ḥnom-son; 196 -weḥi; 258 -neḥu (pp. 241, 245, 340, 361).

**ḥwah** = ḥwa I, *q.v.* 18 ḥbar° (?); 172 ḥdrab°; 224 -ḥrśañ; 228 -glaḥ; 269 -ne, -ḥrño; 270 -ḥldañra; 334 -ḥrog; 335 ḥwad°; 353 -ḥrah (pp. 178, 254, 338, 339, 340).

**ḥwar** I = *Tib.* ḥbar, *burn, blaze, bloom* (p. 341). 29 -ḥwar (?); 198 -ta, *a Suffix*, pp. 182-3.

II, *written for ḥwa I, do, &c.*, + re. 354 nañ° (p. 230).

III? 107 ḥrañ°. *See also war* (p. 341).

**ḥwars**, *perhaps Aorist of ḥwar* I. 203 cha-hru°.

**ḥwas**, *Aorist of ḥwa* I = *Tib.* bas, *done for, disposed of. See also ḥwa-ste* (for ḥwas-te). 308 ḥmañ-ḥri° (p. 337).

**ḥwi** I 386 rmañ°. *Cf. rmañ-bri.*

(II) -**wa/ḥwa/ḥweḥi** = *Tib.* byi-ba, *mouse, rat.* (*On -ehi see* p. 191). 173 ḥweḥi; 201 wa; 273 ḥwa (pp. 257, 297, 341).

**ḥwe** = we, weḥi, *do, make, &c.*, *q.v.* *See also ḥweḥi* I, **ḥweḥe**, **ḥwer**. 85 rñe°; 125 ḥldañ-krañ°; 157 ḥldañ°; 374 ḥpaḥ° (pp. 220, 288, 289, 335, 341).

**ḥwen**, *vain?* = *Tib.* dben, *solitary, secret; dben-gtam, secret talk; Hsi-hsia wen, bad?* 159 ḥlab-ta° (p. 341).

**ḥweḥi** I = ḥwe, we, *do, make, &c.*, *q.v.* 380 ḥraḥi°; 383 ḥdzah-ḥldaḥ°.

II = weḥi II? 47 -ḥśi-hpo (pp. 251, 341).

III ḥwi-ḥweḥi. *See ḥwi.* 173 (pp. 257, 341).

**ḥweḥe** = ḥwe I, *&c.*, *q.v.* 348 ḥgweg° (pp. 248, 343).

**ḥwer**, *written for ḥwe, q.v.*, + re. 19 ḥti°.

**ḥwyir** = *Tib.* ḥbyer, *escape.* 85 rñe-ḥwe-ge° (pp. 220, 341).

**rw-**. *See under R.*

## Z

**bžir** = *Hsi-hsia* gžir, *wise?* (pp. 167-8, 315). 207 ḥldi° (p. 315).

**bžer** = *Tib.* bžer, *fort?* (pp. 167-8, 339-40). 19 ḥtib°; 177 ḥkoku-prom°; 230 ḥwa° (pp. 225, 339).

**ržañ**, *fierce, violent?* (pp. 167-8, 352). 54 -ḥba; 56 rñe-ḥño°.

## Z

**gzu** = gdzu, ḥdzu I, *ass, q.v.* *See also ḥju, ḥzu* (pp. 168, n. 1, 251-2). 307 -ḥbyi; 353 -ḥdro-ḥphor (pp. 276, 332).

**gzo** = *Tib.* zos, *Imperative, &c.*, of za, *eat* (pp. 199, 334-5). 165 ḥrgu-ma° (pp. 277, 335). *See also ḥjo, ḥdzoḥo.*

**bzod** = *Tib.* bzod, *bear, endure* (p. 168). 72 ḥsor-ḥtsam° (p. 342).

**gbzañ** (?) = *Tib.* bzañ, *fine, large; but see also ḥdzañ* II. 21 g-ri° (p. 168).

**ḥzaḥ** = *Tib.* bzaḥ, *woman, wife.* 190 ḥmo[-]r[e]° (pp. 240, 285).

**ḥzu** = gzu, *&c.*, *ass, q.v.* (p. 168). 188 ḥlkyañ°; 117 rañ-ḥche° (pp. 251-2, 285).

## H

(*For ḥ as Prefix see the Consonants in general.*)

**ḥa** I *written for ḥ (with mistaken punctuation).* 61 -yañ for ḥyañ; 82 rbyo-ḥa-ge; 103 -rta for ḥrta; 236 -glaḥ for ḥglaḥ; 320 -stoñ for ḥstoñ?

II *miswriting for following ḥ.* 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.

**hukah,** written for **hkaḥ.** 46 (p. 286).

**hurañ,** written for **hrañ.** 230.

## Y

**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 hyañ I* (pp. 204, 311). 79, 80, 92, 119, 123, 160, 161, 162, 173, 180, 306, 332, 345, 357.

II = *Tib. yañ (Chin. yang?), runnel, watercourse = yur. See also hyañ III* (p. 311). 179 hldyañ<sup>o</sup> ohyo; 355 -hldyah-hldyah (p. 329).

III = I? See **ca-yañ, ḥcaḥ-yañ, ḥchaḥ-yañ.**

**yuḥu** = *Tib. yul, village, district, country. See also hyuḥu I, hyu III* (pp. 320, 333). 369 hldyañ<sup>o</sup>.

**yer** = *Tib. yer, g-yer, to be wide awake; g-yer-po, expert, wise. See also hyer, g-yer.* 141 ḥsaḥ<sup>o</sup> (p. 278).

**yod,** possibly connected with *Tib. g-yo, be unsteady, g-yob, shake, &c.* 16 hrño-hyod<sup>o</sup>. See also **hyod** (p. 258).

**yon,** *Auxiliary Verb with probably Future sense, as in Tib. hoñ, yoñ. See also g-yoho, hyon, hyoho* (p. 199). 160 stor-dor<sup>o</sup> (p. 253).

**yob** = *Tib. yab, g-yob, be pendulous, shake; g-yob, fan, curtain. See also hyob.* 166 ḥsaḥ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 142, 200).

**g-yañ** = *Tib. gyañ(-ra), cattle (yard)? or g-yañ = hyañ II, good, &c., q.v.?* 31 -ra (p. 311).

**g-yah** I = *superior, cf. Tib. ya,*

*antithetic to ma, lower* (pp. 226-7). See also **hyaḥ I.** 136 gldag-nag<sup>o</sup>; 152 -ḥtsa (?); 271 ḥtor-ḥrtaḥ<sup>o</sup>; 287 -ḥthañ (pp. 228, 297).

II = *Tib. ya, match, adversary, rival* (pp. 227-8). 156 -ta-mehi; 317 hldog<sup>o</sup> oto; 152 -ḥtsa (?) (pp. 224, 323, 338-9). See also **hyaḥ II.**

III *front, cf. Tib. g-yar, mouth, face, front* (pp. 228-9). 323 -ḥpañ (p. 228).

**g-yar** = *Tib. yar, Adverbial form of g-yah I* (p. 227). 128 ḥkhar-ḥrpag<sup>o</sup>; 136 ḥkhar-rpag<sup>o</sup> (pp. 242-3, 263, 305).

**g-yaha,** written for **g-yah,** 266.

**g-yehi** ? = **hyehi, q.v.** (*be divided, Tib. hgyed?*). See also **hyed.** 271 hldyañ-ma<sup>o</sup>.

**g-yehe** = **g-yehi** (*be divided?*). 166 ḥkoḥu-prom<sup>o</sup> (p. 276).

**g-yer** = **yer, q.v.** See also **hyer.** 167 ḥsaḥ<sup>o</sup>; 330 ḥsā<sup>o</sup>; 346 ḥsahḥ<sup>o</sup>; 366 -ḥnor (pp. 278, 332).

**g-yo** = *Tib. g-yo, move, waver. See also g-yos, hyos* (pp. 141-2). 27 g-raḥ<sup>o</sup>; 28 -ḥpud-to (pp. 231, 309).

**g-yog I** = *Tib. hog, yog, low, low ground, valley. See also hyog I* (p. 266). 15, 51 -ḥsañ-ma-ḥpul; 200 -hldaḥ a *Suffix,* p. 183; 299 ḥdzoñ<sup>o</sup>; 320 ḥrgyah-ḥñi-ḥke<sup>o</sup> (pp. 265-6, 267, 279).

**g-yoho** = **yon, hyoho, q.v.** (p. 199). 142 stor-ḥdor<sup>o</sup>.

**g-yos** (?), *Aorist of g-yo, q.v.* 26 ḥrah<sup>o</sup> (p. 197 n.).

**hya,** *sheep* (p. 94). 45 ḥñañ<sup>o</sup> (p. 343).

**hyañ 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 ḥses-beg<sup>o</sup>; 10 -ḥtañ; 41 -rmyi; 63 -tsa; 64 -ge; 66, 226 -ḥrah; 287, 290 -ḥkaḥ-rdza; 383 -ḥthe; 388 -tsa (pp. 187, 216, 274, 304, 305, 315, 318, 329).

III = yañ II, *runnel, &c., q.v.* (p. 311). 178 hldyañ<sup>o</sup> ohyo; 316 -hdyañ (?); 355 -re-rgyeñ-na-yañ-; 367 hldyañ-hyaññ-hyo, hyaññ-goñ; 391 hldyañ-hyañ-hyo (pp. 179, 329).

IV, hyañ-hso ? = *Tib. yañs, large.* 63 -hrñi, -hdze (pp. 303, 335).

V, hcañ-hyañ, hchah-yañ. 241 -hbro; 242 -thor (pp. 303-4). See ca<sup>o</sup>, hcañ<sup>o</sup>, hchah<sup>o</sup>.

**hyañ** I = g-yañ I, *superior, q.v.* 72 -hrgehe; 111 hso-hnañ<sup>o</sup> (?); 112 hmah-hldañ<sup>o</sup>; 133 hre-hldi<sup>o</sup> (? hyañ II); 257 -rmañ; 285, 286, 288 -hthañ; 294 -hto, a *Suffix*, pp. 184-6; 315, 318 -htañ; 304 -hdad; 306 -hdahd; 374 htho<sup>o</sup> (?). See also **hyañ** III (pp. 216, 227, 229, 230, 288, 296, 297, 298, 323, 361).

II = g-yañ II, *match, adversary, rival.* 65, 67 -hdo, p. 186; 222, 386 -htañ, a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3; 315 -htoho, pp. 184-6 (pp. 228, 229, 274, 287, 296, 323, 331).

III = g-yañ III, *front, face, &c.* 190 -wa-hkañ; 221 -hkru-hbro; 252 -me; 325 -hkruhu-hbro; 266-70, 272 -ge—these to be placed under hyañ I ? (pp. 228, 260, 274, 281, 285, 298, 339).

**hyañ-hñehi** = *Tib. ya-ña, fear.* 115 -hñahd (pp. 191, 217).

**hyim**, *diminish.* 59 hrañ-hgam<sup>o</sup> (p. 240).

— **-sto**, *written for hyims-to (a Suffix*, pp. 184-6). 29 hde<sup>o</sup> (p. 259).

**hyu** I. 82 hcañ-rte<sup>o</sup> (p. 320).

II. 212 khyos-hkhyañ<sup>o</sup> (p. 359).

III = yuñu, *village, district, country, q.v.* See also **hyuñu** (p. 333). 123, 372, 387 hldyañ<sup>o</sup>; 147 -sad; 305 nañ<sup>o</sup>; 345, 350, 351 -hstsah; 346 -hgyi-ka (pp. 246, 292, 305).

**hyun** = *Tib. yun, space of time.* 260 hgo-hsor-re<sup>o</sup> (p. 261).

**hyuñu** I = yuñu, *village, district, &c.; hyu* III, *q.v.* 49 rñam-nar<sup>o</sup>; 368 hrñam-hdar<sup>o</sup> (p. 320).

II = I ? 332 hklu-hprañ<sup>o</sup>; 333 hrko<sup>o</sup> (p. 223).

**hyed** = *Tib. hgye, hgyed, divide, scatter, &c.* See also **hgye** (pp. 235-6, 291). 53 me<sup>o</sup>; 71 g-roñ<sup>o</sup>; 393 sme<sup>o</sup> (pp. 273, 337).

**hyer** = *yer, g-yer, awake, &c., q.v.* 250 hstsah<sup>o</sup>; 267 hsañ<sup>o</sup>; 297 hscañ<sup>o</sup> (p. 278).

**hyo** I = *Tib. yo, g-yo, waver, shake, crooked, &c.* See also **g-yo, g-yos, hyos** (p. 242). 178, 179, 367, 391 hyañ<sup>o</sup>/yañ<sup>o</sup>/hyaññ<sup>o</sup>; 179 gsom-wa<sup>o</sup>; 194 -hñi; 356 -hñid (pp. 179, 235, 241-2, 338, 353).

II = *Tib. yo, set in motion, manage (khab-yo).* 154 hchos<sup>o</sup>; 326 hrgye(d)<sup>o</sup>; 338 hrgyed<sup>o</sup> (pp. 273, 291).

**hyog** I = *Tib. g-yog, servant, subordinate.* 134 re-hmoñ<sup>o</sup> (?); 254 -hprañ-hdag (?); 289, 321, 323, 324 hkru<sup>o</sup>/kruñu<sup>o</sup>/hkruhu<sup>o</sup> (pp. 295-6).

II = *Tib. yog-pa, pole, stick.* 259 -hdag (pp. 192, 202, 343).

**hyogs** = **hyog** I, *servant, &c. q.v.* 18 hkyañ<sup>o</sup> (p. 295).

**hyod** = *yod, q.v.* 16 -yod (p. 258).

**hyon** = *yon, q.v.* (p. 199). 161-3 stor-hdor<sup>o</sup> (p. 253).

**hyob** = *yob, be pendulous, shake, q.v.* 22 smuñu-hku<sup>o</sup>; 31-2 hbra-hldar-ma<sup>o</sup> (pp. 319-20).

**hyoñu** = *g-yoñu, q.v.* 119 stor-hdor<sup>o</sup> (pp. 199, 243).

**hyor** = *Tib. yor, g-yor, heap, a votive cairn (obo, lab-rtse) on a route.* 239 hphag-hbah-ge<sup>o</sup>; 299 g-ri-sti<sup>o</sup>; 300 hrñi-sti<sup>o</sup> (pp. 265-6).

**hyos**, *Aorist of g-yo, shake, quake, q.v., and g-yos* (pp. 196-7). 25 hrañ<sup>o</sup>; 26, 34 g-rañ<sup>o</sup>; 96, 98 rgor<sup>o</sup> (pp. 138, 262, 335, 345).

## R

-r } with equivalence to re, incorpor-  
-ra } ated in the preceding mono-  
syllable; A: after Vowels, pp.

- 173-5; B: *after Consonants*, pp. 178-9 (pp. 312-13).
- ra** = *Tib. ra* (enclosed or limited) place. See also **rah**, **g-rah** I, **hra** I, **hrā**, **hraḥ** I, **hrahi**, **hrar** (pp. 312-14). 7 skuḥu-ra?; 31 g-yañ°; 49 hce°; 78 mehi°; 148 rmañ°; 263, 265, 278 gsañ°; 264, 265 hño° (pp. 244, 246).
- rag** = *Tib. rags*, dyke, embankment. See also **hrag** (p. 147). 283 hgañ°.
- rañ** I = *Tib. rañ*, self. See also **hrañ** I.
- **-hche**, self-willed (cf. *Tib. rañ-ḥdod*). See also **hrañ** (p. 252).
- II = *Tib. rañ*, rañs, be pleased? See also **hrañ** II. 103ma° (p. 294).
- rab** = *Tib. rab*, ford? See also **hrab**. 376 -hgo (p. 261).
- ram**, harmony, concordant. See also **hram** (pp. 220, 277, 293). 5? lect.; 157 skye-ta° (pp. 239, 293).
- rah** = *ra*, q.v. See also **hraḥ**, **hrahi**. 45 skah°; 74 hphah-ma°; 227 htham°; 279 hño° (pp. 274, 317).
- ru** = *Tib. ru*, horn. See also **hru**, **hruḥu**. 70 -ge-hkrom; 103 rgoñ°; 347, 351 glyañ° (pp. 303-4, 333).
- **-glañ**, 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 **hre** I, **hrehi**, **sta-re**. 5, 6, 32, 36 and *passim*.
- **-hto** (a Suffix, pp. 184-6). 382.
- II = *Tib. re*, each, every; res, times, requital (perhaps derived from I) (p. 202). See also **hre** II, **hreḥe**. 154 myi°; 251 jo°; 252 hlab°; 250, 255, 276-7. (pp. 174, 236, 274).
- III = *Tib. re*, hope. See also **hre** III. 211 -mye.
- re-ma** (for me?) -ḥnad? 45.
- re-hmoñ** 134 -hyog-re.
- ro** = *Tib. -ro* country, district, (large) place. See also **roḥo**, **hro** I (p. 314). 137 ḥdzohu°; 381 spo° (pp. 218, 275, 338).
- rog** I = *Tib. rogs*, grogs, comrade, assistant. See also **hrog**. 211 -hji-rdañ (?) (p. 260).
- II = *Tib. rog*, black? 156 na° (p. 239).
- rom** = *Tib. rum*, dark (space)? See also **hrom** (p. 368). 100 na° (p. 293).
- roḥo** = *ro*, q.v. 384 ldyo° (p. 327).
- rwa** = *Tib. rwa*, horn. See also **hrwa**. 45 hriñ° (p. 343).
- rwañ** = *Tib. dwañs*, lustre, bright, force of language. See also **dwañ**. 178 hkaḥ° (p. 179).
- rwehi**, end, be ended, be destroyed? See also **rwer**, **hrwehi**. 98 hkhor-kyañ° (p. 345).
- rwer**. Locative form of *rwe(hi)*. 97 (pp. 262, 345).
- rwyin** = *Tib. hbyin*, hbyiñ, sink; dbyiñs, space? 33 hnaḥ-hrañ-ge° (p. 346).
- rweye** = *Tib. dbye*, divide; dbyes, expanse, &c. See also **hbye**, **rbye**. 15 hbu°; 91 -htaḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (pp. 267, 327, 345).
- g-rah** I = *ra*, rah, hra, hraḥ, place, q.v. 7, 20 -gsog-hner; 26, 34 -hyos; 27 -g-yo (pp. 309, 312-13, 335, 361).
- II = *Tib. dgra*, enemy. 262 -nag; 314 -hsaḥ-hkheḥe (pp. 224, 262, 283, 313).
- III = *Tib. ra*, goat? 276 -ḥdzam-nag (p. 314).
- g-ri** I = *Tib. ri*, mountain. See also **g-rihi**, **hri**, **hrihi** (pp. 264-71). 21 -hruḥu; 34 śid°; 35 mehi°; 186 ḥldyañ°; 252 -hbañ; 290 hbos°; 296 hswaḥ° (?); 299 -sti; 301 -hrde-hldaḥ, -dze; 308 -hpañ; 312 -sta-mehi; 313 -hkruḥu-hbro; 314 -hjim (pp. 201, 254, 265, 270, 280, 298, 303, 321, 331).
- II = *Tib. ri-ba*, worth, price. 157 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (p. 267).
- g-rihi** = *g-ri* I, q.v. 298 -ḥldom 309 -hkuñ; 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 -hgoḥo (p. 342).

**g-roñ** = *Tib.* groñ/grañ, *cold, or groñ, groñs, die.* See also **hroñ** 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 -hyañ.

**hrag** = rag, *dyke, embankment, q.v.* 13 hkra°; 55 -hkyer; 256 -ma-hbog; 283 hgah° (pp. 147, 173).

**hrañ** I = rañ I, *self, q.v.* [3], 5, 6, 8, 37 -hlda/hldah; 59 -hgam; 21, 166, 167 -hrah; 33 hnaḥ°; 101, 107 -war/hwar; 104 hkah°(?); 116, 135 -pu-glo/hlo; 117 -hkah; 147 -hrgyañ; 192 rgyed°; 205 -klar; 259 -hdom?; 308, 310, 311 hgah-hldoñ° (pp. 142, 200, 202, 252, 270, 283, 314, 319, 343, 345-6).

II = rañ II, *be pleased, q.v.* 68 glo°; 214, 329 hkah/hkrah-gsañ°; 308, 310, 311 hgah-hldoñ°(?); 326, 338 hrgye/hrgyed-hyo° (pp. 268, 270, 314).

— (I) -hche, *self-willed* = rañ°, *q.v.* 115 (p. 252). See also **hdrab-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 hcog°; 90, 94, 97, 119, 120-3, 365 htsog°; 49 hrño-hcañ°; 73, 76 hla/lah°; 129 g-wah°; 288 hswah°; 368 hrño-hprañ°; 376 hdza-hrog° (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).

**hrah** I = ra, &c., *place, q.v.* 8, 25 -hyos; 21, 166, 167 hrañ°; 23 hśes-hbeg°; 26 -g-yos; 56 hce°; 66, 226 hyañ°; 77 -hrtah; 114

-rtah, -we-rtah; 139 -wehi-rta; 146, 273, 358 -hṭoñ; 186, 369 mehi°; 216 hrgyed°; 225, 236, 244, 246 -hldi; 228 braḥ°; 277 gsaḥ-re -hṭsaḥ -re°; 315 rgo°; 341, 392 rgyed°; 342 mye°? rgye[d]°?; 353 hwaḥ°; 370 mehi-spehi° (pp. 140-2, 228, 229, 243, 261, 262, 281, 282, 306, 313, 318, 319, 331).

II = g-rah II, *enemy, q.v.* 43 -ldah(?); 149 -sñiñ-ñe; 182 -rte(?); 202 -hmad; 354 -hrtre (pp. 222, 313, 334).

**hrahi** = hrah + hi? 380.

**hrar**, *written for hrah, q.v., + re* (pp. 173-4). 216, 243, 246, 248 hrgyed°; 237 rgyed° (p. 140).

**hras** = gras, hgras, *aligned, q.v.* (p. 266). 344 hlah-hkyañ° (p. 269).

**hri** = *Tib.* ri, *mountain.* See also **g-ri** I, **g-rihi**, **hrihi** (pp. 264-71). 13 hdoñ°; 14 hrañ°; 19 -hldyañ; 168 hbyi°; 294 -hkruḥu-hbroḥo; 295 hṭsaḥ°; 297 hscāḥ-hyer°; 297 rñeḥe-hbrom°; 299 -hño; 300 -hgru; 300 -hcei; 308 -hwas; 311, 312 -staḥ-mehi (pp. 142, 200, 201, 229, 254, 265, 267, 270-1, 332, 337, 340).

**hriñ** = *Tib.* riñ, *long.* 44 -rwa (p. 343).

**hrim** = *Tib.* rim, *order, succession, degree; rim-hgro, ceremony, attendance* (p. 308). 282, 284 -hdzom; 293, 297 -ge-hgrus; 300 -hldoḥu; 319 -re-hldoḥu; 347, 348 -gleḥu (pp. 265, 282, 298, 308, 321).

**hrihi** = *hri, mountain, q.v.* 62 hśid°; 290 hṭsaḥ°; 291 hbos°; 293 hbos°; 294, 297 -hdom; 300 -sti; 302 -hphañ; 305 -hrgam (pp. 171, 246, 267, 270-1, 297, 298, 303, 306).

**hris** = *Tib.* hbri, bris, *diminish?* cf. ris from hbri, *write.* 84 hcag-rgyag° (p. 259).

**hru** = ru, *horn, q.v.* See also **hruḥu**. 82 hrgoñ-hru-ge°; 103 rgoñ-ru-

-ge°; 202, 203 hcha°/cha° (?); 238 hsehe-ħldu°; 276 ħsu-re° (pp. 156, 321, 333).

**ħrug** = *Tib.* (mgo)-rug, (*head*) bowed down. 47 ħbu° (pp. 250, 286).

**ħrun** = *Tib.* ruñ, *to be right, ought, have to, &c.* See also **ħruhi** (p. 199). 30, 32 ħrgu-ħto°; 80 stor-to°; 138 ħdzohu-ħto°, stor-ħto° (p. 335).

**ħrub** = g-rub, *rush in a body, q.v.* 108 ħño-bro°; 349 ħthar-phyañ-ge° (pp. 221, 248, 343).

**ħruhi** = ħrun, *q.v.*, + ħi (p. 199). 167 stor-ħto°.

**ħruhu** = ru, ħru, *horn, q.v.* 21 g-ri°; 293 ħrihi° (pp. 297, 298).

**ħre** I = re I, *is, being, q.v.* 155 śid-rgyañ°?; 159 ħnañ-ħchos°, spye-chos° (p. 145).

II = re II, *each, every, times, q.v.* 48 -ge-rgyo; 251 ħbañ°; 267 ħpra° (?) (p. 330).

III = re III, *hope, q.v.* 132 -ħldi; 155 śido°? (pp. 171, 216, 229).

**ħreg** = *Tib.* ħbreg, bregs, regs, *cut off, amputate.* 122 ħram° (p. 293).

**ħrehi** = re I, *is, q.v.*, + ħi. 200 rñe-ne°; 204 gsañ-ħkah°; 205 ħdzoñ-skyar° (pp. 200, 222).

**ħrehe** = re II, *each, &c., q.v.* 43 pra°; 249 bañ°; 251 ħbañ° (p. 274).

**ħro** I = ro, *country, place, &c., q.v.* 11 ħmu°; 19 ħldu°; 181 ħpro°; 213 ħgo° (?); 272 ħldyañ-paħ°; 333 -ħgoñ; 345 rgyeb-ħchi°; 347 stañ°; 377 ħpañ-ħldan°; 384 ħldyo°; 386 ħldyañ°; 387 ħldyoñ° (pp. 155-6, 269, 270, 274, 306, 331).

II, *wolf?* 110 -ħbehi-ħbah; 234 ħtsag° oħbehi-ħbar; 335 ħrog-ge° (?) (p. 293). See also **ħror**.

III = *Tib.* ro, *corpse?* 198 -ta, *a Suffix*, pp. 182-3 (p. 341).

**ħrog** I = rog I, *comrade, assistant, q.v.* 50 -ħñor; 197 mu°; 334 ħwah°; 335 -ge-ħro (pp. 318, 338).

II = *Tib.* grog, *a deep ravine with torrent.* 344 ħbo-ħroñ° (p. 231).

**ħroñ** I = *Tib.* roñ, *a deep gorge* (p. 268). 68, 371, 373, 384, 386, 389 ħdzam-ħbroñ°; 344 ħbo°; 373-7 ħkad° (pp. 231, 250, 268, 269, 331).

II = g-roñ II, *Tib.* groñ, groñs, *die; cf. groñ, grañ, cold.* 36 -ħkes (p. 269).

**ħron**, *Imperative form* (p. 199), 'repose'? 378 rkom-ge°.

**ħrom** (*vacant*) space = rom, *q.v.* 107 na°; 257 ħtor...°; 385 -ge-ħti (pp. 302, 336).

**ħror**, *written for ħro* II, *wolf, q.v.*, + re. 303, 310 rñe/ħrñe-ħldaħ° (p. 270).

**ħrwa**, *bow* = rwa, *horn, q.v.; cf. Tib.* rwa-gzu, *bow.* 59 -ħdah-ħpog (p. 343).

**ħrwañ** = *Tib.* brañ, *dwelling-place.* 11 -ħkañ-ħkañ (p. 344).

**ħrwad** I = *Tib.* rbad, *harsh noise* (pp. 257, 309). 32 -ħmañ-ħldaħ (p. 345).

II = *Tib.* rbad, *screaming eagle.* 172 -ħbañ-prom; 173 klag° (pp. 257, 345).

**ħrwehi**, *end, be destroyed* = rwehi, *q.v.* 22 ħrañ-ħraħ°; 27 ħldañ-rmañ°; 113 ħldañ-krañ°; 214 -gtsu-ge (pp. 259, 291, 345).

**ħrlehi**, *authorities* = ħlde I, ħldehi, ħldehe, *q.v.* 288 -ħswaħ-ħram (pp. 278-9).

**ħrlomhi** = ħrlom = glom, *conceit, covet, q.v.*, + ħi. 385 ħrñe-ge° (p. 336).

**ħrloho**, *swirl?* 15 ħmar-ħbah-ge° (p. 350).

## L

**la** I, *Postposition, to, for* (*Tib.* la) (p. 193). 69 ħbehi°, ħphag°; 70 ħbyig° (pp. 193, 247-50).

II = *Tib.* la, *a high pass.* 345 -po[-r[e] (p. 269).

**la-la**, *a jingle, signifying something overt or large, antithetic to li-li, q.v.* 109 pa° (p. 280 and n. 1).

**lañ** = *Tib.* rañ *in*; mo-rañ, *lone female* (p. 221); *but see mo* I. 108 mo<sup>o</sup> (p. 221).

**lad** = *Tib.* lan, glan, *reply, retribution*. *See also hład* (pp. 303-4). 225, 226 hrśaṅ<sup>o</sup>; 235 rñe<sup>o</sup>; 244 gse<sup>o</sup> (pp. 141, 303, 304).

**lamhi** = *Tib.* lam, road, path, *journey*, +hi. *See also hlam*. 229 hrśaṅ-hgam<sup>o</sup>, hgwaḥ-hrśaṅ<sup>o</sup>.

**lah** = hla, *Tib.* zla, moon, *q.v.* 75 -hram-hte (pp. 273, 337-8).

**li-li**, a jingle, *signifying something sly or small, antithetic to la-la*, *q.v.* (p. 280, n. 1). *Cf. Tib.* chi-li-li, si-li-li. 109 hjim<sup>o</sup>.

**le** = *Tib.* leb, flat? 219, 220 htħaṅ<sup>o</sup> (p. 272).

**lom**, well? (p. 233). 363 hmu<sup>o</sup>.

**lol** = *Tib.* rol, play? *But see hlon*. 194 ste-gdzu-ge<sup>o</sup>; 195 htħar-mye-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 241).

**hla** = lah, moon, *q.v.* 73 -hram-hte (pp. 273, 337-8).

**hlañ**? 17 hñor<sup>o</sup>.

— **-hjañ**, camel? *Cf. Hsi-hsia* lañ-nön *in Laufer*, 'The Si-hia Language,' pp. 20, 23-4. 101, 107.

**hład** = lad, *reply, retribution, q.v.* 225, 226, 227 hśaṅ<sup>o</sup>; 230, 237 rñe-ge<sup>o</sup>; 231, 232, 239 rñe<sup>o</sup>; 233, 236, 237 glaḥ/hgla<sup>o</sup>; 238, 243, 245, 246, 247 -maḥ-maḥna, -ma-maḥna, -ma-ma-ḥna, -ma-ḥman; 240 gse-hłda<sup>o</sup>; 240, 242 gse<sup>o</sup>; 247 -htoñ (pp. 141, 183, 230, 234, 303-4, 361).

**hlab** = *Tib.* lab, *speak*. *See also glab, hlobhi*. 67, 70 -me; 159, 181 -ta, a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3; 180 gsañ-hdi<sup>o</sup>; 181 gsañ-hśeg<sup>o</sup>; 182 -ge-plañ-na; 252 -re; 253 -me; 325 -hko-hgyan; 385 -hñañ (pp. 145-6, 155-6, 173, 197, 199, 231, 264, 272-3, 274-5, 331, 341).

**hlam** = lam, road, journey, *q.v.* 25 hraḥ-hyos<sup>o</sup>; 68 hna<sup>o</sup>; 232 rñe-hład-ge<sup>o</sup> (pp. 138, 238).

**hlamna** = hlam+na. 236 glaḥ-hład<sup>o</sup>.

**hlamhi** = hlam+hi. 224 hwah-hrśaṅ<sup>o</sup>; 225, 226 hrśaṅ-lad/hład<sup>o</sup>; 226, 227 hśaṅ-hład<sup>o</sup>; 228 hwa-hrśaṅ<sup>o</sup>; 229 hgwaḥ-hrśaṅ<sup>o</sup>; 240 gse-hłda-hład<sup>o</sup> (p. 183).

**hli**, wing? (p. 132). 375 hphyo<sup>o</sup>.

**hlo** I, group, company, *perhaps* = hldoḥu (*Tib.* lo), *q.v.* (pp. 322-3). 154 -ge-blah-hldo; 275 hño-re<sup>o</sup>; 383 rgye<sup>o</sup> (pp. 222, 285).

II. *See pu-glo (hlo)*.

**hlon** = *Tib.* lon, arrive. *But see lol*. 357 thar-mye-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 241).

**hlobhi** = hlob, *Imperative of hlab, q.v.*, +hi. 378 hse-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 199).

**hloho** = hlo I or hlo II, *q.v.* 381 hpu<sup>o</sup> (p. 157).

## Ś

**śi** I = *Tib.* śi, die. *See also gśi, bśi, hśi I (p. 226). 120 -rgo (pp. 226, 291-2).*

II, winter (p. 226) = *Mo-so* ś'ih? 160 -hchos (pp. 145-6, 172, 217, 320).

**śid** I, high. *See also hśid I (pp. 225-6). 34 -g-ri; 60 hkhu-tsa<sup>o</sup>; 151 -rgyañ-hnom (pp. 145, 172, 303).*

II = śi, *perish*. *See also hśid II = *Tib.* śid, *funeral ceremony* (p. 226). 366 rgoñ-wa<sup>o</sup> (p. 332).*

**śud** = *Tib.* śud, bśud, rub, get scratched, galled. *See also hśud, hśud* (p. 296, n. 1). 185 -meḥi; 198 hdi-gsom<sup>o</sup>; 207 tshu-gsom<sup>o</sup> (p. 139).

**śe**, wise, wisdom, *cf. Hsi-hsia* gse, gseḥ (pp. 223-4). *See also śes, gśe, hśe, hśeḥ, hśes*. 91 -chañ; 258 -rgo-hłdom (pp. 262, 318).

**śeg** = *Tib.* sreg, bsreg, bsregs, burn (*irregular ś < sr due to some confusion*). *See also gśeg, hśeg*. 159 hłdañ-myi<sup>o</sup>; 283 -sme; 375 -sme (pp. 145-6).

**śes**, wise, *Aorist form of śe, q.v.* *See also hśes* (pp. 223-4). 36, 39 -hmad; 44 -gśi-hłduḥu; 44

- h̄si-brehe; 332 -h̄keg-h̄rko; 379 -rtsig-Moñ (pp. 223, 269, 322).
- śod**, *lay low, cf. Tib. śod, low ground. See also h̄śod* (p. 301). 198 h̄ro-ta-śodce/śodts (pp. 341, 358–9).
- śodce/śodts**. *See śod*.
- śon** = *Tib. son/soñ, gone, come* (p. 355). 156 h̄wam-h̄nom<sup>o</sup>.
- śor** = *Tib. śor, flee, escape; bśor, chase*. 203 -h̄lda, a *Suffix*, p. 183.
- gśaṅ**, *enmity, hate = Tib. śaṅ. See also h̄śaṅ I* (p. 223). 30 -re; 86 (for gsaṅ?) -sñaṅ- -do; 263, 264, 278 -ra; 263 -kya; 264 -h̄dzam; 265 -na; 265 -tah, a *Suffix*, pp. 182–3; 273 -h̄raḥ- -h̄toṅ; 279 -ge (?), -h̄tag-h̄tos (p. 317).
- gśi**, *Prospective form of śi, die, q.v. 44 -h̄lduḥu; 72 -brom-h̄nu; 344 -h̄dzuḥi* (p. 322).
- gśim** = *Tib. gśin, agreeable, or sim, refresh, be well, happy*. 268 h̄mu-klag<sup>o</sup> (p. 298).
- gśe** = *śe, śes, h̄śe, wise, wisdom, q.v.* (pp. 223–4). 49 -h̄rdzro, *q.v.*; 329 bri<sup>o</sup>; 343 sroṅ-ñe<sup>o</sup> (pp. 239, 253, 256).
- gśeg** = *śeg, h̄śeg, burn, q.v.* 330 h̄rgyo-h̄śeg-gśegra; 331 rbyo (for rgyo)-gśeg-gśer (p. 178).
- gśer**, *written for gsegr* (p. 178). 331 *see gśeg*.
- gśog** = *Tib. śog, gśog, bśog, wing. See also h̄śog I*. 7, 20 -h̄ner (p. 361).
- bśi**, *Aorist form of śi, die, q.v.* (p. 196). 196 -ta, a *Suffix*, pp. 182–3; 198 -re.
- h̄śag** = *Tib. śaga, bśags, talk, expound*. 85 h̄ño-sto-ge<sup>o</sup> (pp. 220, 341).
- h̄śaṅ I** = *gśaṅ, enmity, hate, q.v.* 81 -re-h̄śig; 120 -plim-plam; 199 -nag; 209 h̄kho<sup>o</sup>; 225, 226, 227 -h̄lad; 300 h̄rim-h̄ldoḥu<sup>o</sup>; 367 -khyaṅ (?); 393 -sme (pp. 192, 265, 271, 283, 291–2, 320).
- II = *Tib. bśaṅ, ordure* (p. 223). 15, 51 -ma-h̄pul; 255 -h̄dzah (pp. 267, 327).
- h̄śam** = *Tib. śom, bśoms, bśam, bśams, prepare, arrange, &c.* (p. 235). 277 h̄paḥ-ge<sup>o</sup>. *See also h̄sam, h̄sams*.
- h̄śaḥ** = *Tib. bśaḥ, bśas, slaughter, kill, cut up. See also bśas* (p. 289). 83 h̄nam-h̄te<sup>o</sup>; 90 h̄tsog-h̄ram<sup>o</sup>; 99 h̄naḥ-h̄tsog<sup>o</sup>; 125 h̄ldaṅ-h̄kraṅ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 180, 288–9, 291).
- h̄śas**, *Aorist form of h̄śaḥ, q.v.* 102 naḥ-h̄tsog<sup>o</sup> (p. 291).
- h̄śi I** = *śi I, die, q.v.* 17 -h̄rog (?); 38 -h̄gri; 44 -brehe; 47 gci-me<sup>o</sup>; 47 -h̄po; 81 -h̄kri; 102 -kyeg (?); 123 -h̄wa; 153 myi<sup>o</sup>; 345 -h̄dzuḥi (pp. 174, 226, 251, 286, 292, 298, 322, 339).
- II = *śi II, winter*. 102 -kyeg (?) (*see under I*) (p. 301).
- III = *śid I, h̄śid, high* (p. 226). 194 h̄rdzoṅ-h̄yo<sup>o</sup>; *cf.* 356 -h̄śid (pp. 240–2).
- h̄śig** = *Tib. bśig, bśigs, h̄jig, destroy*. 81 h̄kyaṅ-rgyaṅ<sup>o</sup>, h̄śaṅ-re<sup>o</sup>; 347 h̄rim-gleḥu-ge<sup>o</sup> (p. 298).
- h̄śin** 302 h̄rgyeg<sup>o</sup>.
- h̄śid I** = *śid I, high* (pp. 225–6). II h̄wam<sup>o</sup>; 62 -h̄riḥi; 230 h̄wa-b̄zer<sup>o</sup>; 306 h̄brad-sta<sup>o</sup>; 356 h̄dzoṅ-h̄yo<sup>o</sup> (pp. 171, 225, 242, 245, 254, 303, 306, 344).
- II = *śid II, perish* (p. 226). 52 khyag-re<sup>o</sup>; 53 h̄mog-h̄ce . . .<sup>o</sup>; 366\*so-na<sup>o</sup> (pp. 271, 293, 317).
- h̄śud** = *śud, q.v. See also h̄sud*. 185 -h̄don (p. 139).
- h̄śe** = *śe, gśe, wise, q.v.* (pp. 223–4). 299 -h̄se; 307 h̄glyaṅ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 252, 265).
- h̄śeg I** = *śeg, gśeg, burn, q.v.* 48 h̄phu<sup>o</sup>; 282 -sme; 330 h̄rgyo<sup>o</sup> (p. 282).
- II = *Tib. gśegs, bśegs, go, come*. 181 naṅ-gsaṅ<sup>o</sup> (pp. 155–6).
- h̄śeḥe** = *h̄śe, wise, q.v.* 163 h̄bri<sup>o</sup>; 351 -h̄ti-ge; 369 -rdzo[-r[e] (pp. 216–17, 224, 239).
- h̄śer**, *written for h̄śe, wise, q.v., + re*. 339 sroṅ-h̄ñe<sup>o</sup>.
- h̄śes** = *śes, wise, q.v.* (pp. 223–4).



- 336 *-ta*, a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3; 344, 345 *-gśi/hśi-ḥdzuhi* (pp. 223, 269).
- **-beg/hbeg**, *Proper Name of a divinity* (pp. 138, 147 n., 224). 3, 5, 7, 20, 22-4.
- ḥso**, *perhaps = Tib. bso, copulari* (p. 141). 189 *-ḥkog*; 249 *-ḥkon*; 354 *-ḥti-ge* (pp. 140, 285, 321).
- ḥsog** I = *gsog, wing, q.v.* 8, 20 Śes/Hśes-*ḥbeg*<sup>o</sup> (p. 361).
- II *separate (Tib. gsog, cleave)?* 262 *twañ-mnar*<sup>o</sup> (p. 342).
- ḥsod** = *sod, lay low, q.v.* (p. 301). 147 *-te-rmag*; 281 *ḥbo-ḥram-ge-ḥsod-tsa* (pp. 231, 300, 358-9).
- **-tsa**. See **ḥsod**; cf. *sodce*.
- rśaṅ**, *stern, or violent? See also hrśaṅ* (p. 277). 319, 320 *swaḥ*<sup>o</sup>.
- hrśaṅ/rśaṅ**, *stern, violent? cf. ḥsaṅ* (p. 277). 224 *ḥwaḥ*<sup>o</sup>, *g-waḥ*<sup>o</sup>; 225, 226 *-lad*; 228 *ḥwa*<sup>o</sup>; 229 *ḥwaḥ-glah*<sup>o</sup>, *ḥgwaḥ*<sup>o</sup>; 319, 320 *swaḥ-rśaṅ*; 321 *ḥswa*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 339, 343, 361).
- sśam**, *possibly 'last' = Tib. śam, lower, under, later* (pp. 235, 357). 255 *-stom* (p. 357).

## S

- sad** = *Tib. gsod, bsad, sod, kill, destroy. See also ḥsad*. 147 *hyu*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 299-300).
- su** = *Tib. su, who (Interrogative, Relative, &c.). See also ḥsu I*, (p. 201). 114 *-me-ḥmeḥi*; 145 *-ge-stor-ta*; 195 *ḥldiḥi*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 172, 201, 232, 241, 245, 282, 299-300).
- se** I = *Tib. rtse, se, top, house-top. See also ḥse II, rseḥi, hrseḥi* (pp. 248-9, 348). 18 *ḥskyim*<sup>o</sup>; 67 *ḥko*<sup>o</sup> (?); 69 *skyim*<sup>o</sup>; 143 *ḥtor*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 248-9, 288).
- [se-]ḥgro**. Cf. *Tib. rtser-ḥgro, chief, principal*. 67 *ḥko*<sup>o</sup>.
- II = *gse, ḥse, injure, harm, q.v.* 273 *ḥwi-ḥwa*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 297, 341).
- so** = *Tib. gson, live, life; so-nams,*

- husbandry. See also gso, gsoḥu, ḥso I.*
- **-ḥnaḥ/na**, *life-place, home, family. See also ḥso<sup>o</sup>, htso<sup>o</sup>* (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, ḥswa, ḥswaḥ* (pp. 355, 369). 174 *-ḥldir*; 175 *-ḥkom*; 176 *-ḥphyegs*; 222 *-gkom*; 301 *-g-wer*; 358 (p. 270).
- swaṅ**. See also **ḥswaṅ, ḥsaṅ** III. 337 *ḥstor-ma*<sup>o</sup>; 340 *pyar-ma*<sup>o</sup>.
- swad**. See also **ḥswad**. 390 *ḥko-ḥto*<sup>o</sup> (p. 264).
- swaḥ** = *swa II, look-out, guard, &c., q.v.* 164 *-g-wer*; 319, 320 *-rśaṅ*; 360 *-ḥpeg* (p. 277).
- sweḥe** = *Tib. sbe, wrestle?* 130 *ḥldag-nag*<sup>o</sup> (p. 342).
- sram** = *Tib. sran, hard, enduring. See also ḥsram*. 72 *-pa-nar* (p. 361).
- sri** = *Tib. sri, a kind of devil? a woman's temper?* (p. 357). 163 *ḥse*<sup>o</sup>; 349 *-ge-gsen-ḥse*.
- sroṅ** = *Tib. sroṅ, sroṅs, straight, straight-forward*. 339 *-ḥñe*; 343 *-ñe* (p. 256).
- slaḥ** = *Tib. zla, friend, helper*. 125 *ḥldaṅ*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 288-9, 335).
- sli** *name of some animal? See also ḥsli*. 171 *-ḥti-ḥrno[-]r[e]* (pp. 257, 357).
- slug** I = *Tib. zlug, bzlug, pour?* 47 *ḥñed-ge*<sup>o</sup> (p. 251).
- II 359 *ḥnu-glaṅ*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 336, 368). See **slog**.
- sleg** (p. 357). 346, 351 *ḥdam*<sup>o</sup>.
- slo** = *Tib. zlo, summon, call; bzlos, challenge; zlos, incantation, &c.* 93 *ḥsus*<sup>o</sup>; 99 *-staḥ* = *slos-ta, with Suffix*, pp. 182-3 (p. 336).
- slog** = *Tib. zlog, bzlog, turn back, repel; slog, turn, invert* (pp. 336, 368). 174 *ḥnu-glaṅ*<sup>o</sup>; 384 *ḥrseḥi-ḥpag*<sup>o</sup> (pp. 226, 336).
- slod** *possibly = Tib. lhod, lod, glod, loose, relax* (p. 357). 381 *ḥbri*<sup>o</sup>.

**slos** *Aorist form of slo, q.v.*

**gsaṅ** I = *Tib. gsaṅ, saṅ, secret* (p. 156). 17 rñe°; 86 (see gsaṅ); 204 -hkaḥ; 329 hkhaḥ°; 181 -hseg (?); 206 -rmaṅ (?) (pp. 155-6, 186, 200, 221).

II ? = *Tib. saṅ, saṅs, bsaṅ, cleanse. See also hsaṅ* II. 227 htham-raḥ°; 228 braḥ-hraḥ° (pp. 215-16).

**gsaḥ** = *Tib. sa, land. See also hsaḥ*. 276 -re-ḥtsaḥ-re; 333 -rkaḥ (pp. 281, 338).

**gsar** = *Tib. gsar, new. See also ḥsar*. 204 -nar (p. 361).

**gsas** = *Tib. gsas, offspring; btsa, give birth; btsas, born. See also ḥsas* (pp. 197, n. 2, 355). 262 -paḥi-ḥdzo-ḥdza (pp. 239, 283).

**gsu** = *Tib. bsu, bsus, meet, escort. See also gsus, ḥsus, ḥsu* II. 64 -prom (pp. 157, 187, 219).

**gsus** *Aorist form of gsu, q.v. See also ḥsus* (p. 197 n. 2). 99 -slo (p. 336).

**gse** = *Tib. gtse, ḥtshe, btses, do mischief, injure. See also gseḥe, ḥse* I, *ḥseḥi, ḥseḥe* II (pp. 140-1, 183). 48 -hcaṅ; 200 g-yog-ḥldaḥ°; 205 -re; 238, 243 -ḥbo-bon/ḥbon; 240 -ḥlda-ḥlad, -ḥlad; 242, 244 -ḥlad; 247 -ston-stsar; 248 -ḥtaḥ, a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3; 249 -ḥsō-ḥkon; 327 -ḥko-ḥgyan (pp. 230, 303).

**gsen**, possibly (*v. context*) = *Tib. bsen-mo, a female evil spirit*. 349 -ḥsae.

**gseḥe** = *gse, injure, &c., q.v.* 135 -ḥldi-ḥthoṅ; 368 -caṅ.

**gso** = *Tib. gson, live, cf. gso, tend, cure. See also gsoḥu, ḥso* I, *ḥson*. 151 nor°; 193, 194 -nad (pp. 174, 238, 241).

**gsom** I = *Tib. sems, mind, spirit; bsam, thought, &c.; som-ñi, doubt. See also ḥsam* I (pp. 235, 338). 23 -sñi; 89 -rgyag; 178, 179 -wa-ḥyo; 198 ḥdi°ḥsud; 206 tshu° ḥsud; 275 ḥldaṅḥ° (?) (pp. 235, 338).

II = *Tib. gsum, three (?)* 10

ḥlah° (?); 21 ḥtsā° (?); 23 ḥtsaḥ° (?) (pp. 270, 306).

**gsoḥu** = *gso, live, &c., q.v.* 358 ḥraḥ-ḥtoṅ° (p. 261).

**bsog** = *Tib. sog, sogs, gsog, bsog, bsag, bsags, collect, gather, &c. See also ḥsag, ḥsog*. 183 -thom-thom.

**ḥsa** = *gsaḥ, land, q.v. See also ḥsaḥ*. 55 gmog-ḥce°; 330 ḥsā-g-yer (pp. 178, 278).

**ḥsag**, *gather together. See bsog, ḥsog*. 389 ḥldag°.

**ḥsaṅ** I = *gsaṅ* I, *secret, q.v.* 36 rgyed° (pp. 244, 283).

II ? = *gsaṅ* II, *cleanse, q.v.* 226 ḥyaṅ-hraḥ°.

III *written for ḥswaṅ, q.v.* 340 ḥstor-ma°.

**ḥsaṅs** = *Tib. soṅ, go*. 144 ḥno-stor° (p. 303).

**ḥsad** = *sad, kill, destroy, q.v.* 40 ḥphu-hklo°; 102 -mag-ḥdeḥi; 124 ḥldaṅ-kraṅ°; 147 ḥdraṅ-ge°; 381 rtsig-Moṅ°; 383 ḥdza-lda°, ḥyaṅ-ḥthe-ge° (pp. 289, 301).

**ḥsam** I, *think. See gsom* (p. 235). 185 ma-ḥpaḥ°; 352 naṅ-pa°.

II = *Tib. śom, bśom, bśoms, bśam, bśams, prepare, arrange* (pp. 300-1, 355), *cf. ḥsams*. 184 me°.

**ḥsams**, *Aorist form of ḥsam* II, *q.v.* 58 me-na° (pp. 194, 300-1).

**ḥsaḥ** = *gsaḥ, land, q.v.* 41 ḥyaṅ-rmyi°; 42 -ḥtsaḥ; 141 -yer; 164 -ḥldaḥ, a *Suffix*, p. 183; 165 -ḥtsaṅ, -chad; 166 -yob-ḥkom; 267 -ḥyer; 314 -ḥkheḥe; 346 ḥsaḥḥ-g-yer; 378 -ḥtsaṅ (pp. 142, 224, 262, 277, 278, 280, 288, 313, 335).

**ḥsar** = *gsar, new, q.v.* 26 g-yos/ḥyos-ge°; 255 -stomḥi (p. 357).

**ḥsas** = *gsas, offspring, q.v.* (pp. 197, n. 2, 355). 59 -ḥce-rgye; 116 -te-khyaṅ, -ḥkhaḥ; 260 -ḥdraḥ-ḥdag, -ḥnaḥ-ḥdag (pp. 192, 239, 240, 261, 315).

**ḥsu** I = *su who?* 196 rma° (p. 246).

- II = *gsu, meet, escort, q.v.* 276 -re (p. 314).
- hsud**, *written for h́sud?* (p. 296, n. 1). 313 h́kru°; 323 h́khruḥu-ḥyog° (pp. 295-6).
- hsus**, *Aorist form of gsu, hsu II, q.v.* (p. 197 n. 2). 93 -slo (p. 336).
- hse I** = *gse, gseḥe, injure. &c., q.v.* See also **hseḥi, hseḥe II** (pp. 140-1). 33 -hte; 57 h́ce°; 89, 92, 96 pyi°/phyi°; 163 -sri; 190 -spye; 299 h́se°; 326 -htaḥ, a *Suffix*, pp. 182-3; 349 gsen°; 377-8 -ge (pp. 240, 285, 321).
- II = *se I, top, house-top, q.v.* 374 skyim° (p. 248).
- hseḥi** = *hse I, q.v.* 325 -hkoḥo-ḥgyan.
- hseḥe I** = *se I, top, &c., q.v.* 14 -ḥwad-ḥwad (p. 265).
- II = *hse I, injure, &c., q.v.* 238 -ḥldu-hru; 327 -hko-ḥo-ḥgyan (pp. 264, 321).
- hso I** = *so, gso, live, &c., q.v.* 201 -ḥldaḥ, a *Suffix*, p. 183.
- **-hna/hnaḥ**, *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 h́yañ°; 313 h́mor° (p. 303).
- (III) **-bos**, *hair-tuft, cf. Tib. co-to?* 257 neḥu° (pp. 302-3).
- hsog** = *hsag, bsog, collect, &c., q.v.* 6? *so read*, -ḥtswe; 295 h́no-ḥkho° (p. 269, *mog*).
- hson** = *Tib. gso, gson, tend, nurse.* 261 phyer-chañ° (pp. 239, 283).
- hsoḥ-hsoḥ** = *Tib. so-so, diverse, literally different places or bounds (so).* 75 -ḥtshu.
- hsor I** = *Tib. sor, finger. See also h́swar.* 72 -ḥtsam-bzod (p. 342).
- II = *Tib. śor, escape, hunt, &c., q.v.* 89 gsom-rgyag°; 260 -ḥgo (p. 261).
- hswa** = *swa II, swaḥ, look-out, guard, &c., q.v.* See also **h́swaḥ**. 321 -h́rsañ.
- hswañ** = *swañ, q.v.* See also **h́swañ III**. 340 phyer-ma°; 341 h́phyar-ma°.
- hswad** = *swad, q.v.* 203 h́ko-ḥldaḥ-h́se°.
- hswaḥ** = *swa II, swaḥ, h́swa, q.v.* 288 -h́ram; 296 -g-ri; 298 -g-weḥe; 318 -h́mor (p. 267).
- h́swar** = *hsor I, Tib. sor, finger, q.v.* 28 -ḥldu-sto (pp. 321, 342, 355, 369).
- h́sram** = *sram, hard, q.v.* 24 h́gru° (p. 306).
- h́sreḥi**, *cf. Tib. sre-nag/mog, soot; sre, mix?* (p. 357). 13 -h́kyeb-h́kyeb.
- h́sli** = *sli, q.v.* (pp. 257, 357). 46 h́beḥe° ormañ°; 288, 318 -ḥdzañ.
- rseḥi** = *Tib. rtse, top, peak, &c.* See also **se I, h́rseḥi** (p. 348). 208 -h́rgod.
- h́rseḥi** = *rseḥi, q.v.* (p. 348). 384 -ḥpag (pp. 226, 336).

# INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

(Languages, Persons (Authors' names\* in CAPITALS), Peoples, Places)

*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 = Ḥa-ža, 45-6.  
A-la-shan, m., 153.  
Altyn-tāgh, m., 1, 6, 10, 44, 146.  
Amaserigu, m., 59.  
Amdo, re., 6, 8, 13, 25-7, 31-3, 36, 43, 45-7, 51, 57, 59, 64, 99, 268; s.a. Koko-nor re.; l., 75-8, 88-99, 107, 238, 245, 272; w., 101, 106, 237, 277, 284, 344, 349, 351, 368, s.a. Tangut, Go-lok, Dzorgai, Kortsè.  
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.  
AMUNDSSEN, E., travels, 16 n. 3.

## B

Ba, p. = Ḥbah, q.v., 67 n. 2.  
Ba-bam, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a. Ba-wan, Lo-dgu, Lo-gu, Pa-wan, Pa-wang.  
Ba-bams, st. = Ba-bam, 83.  
BABER, E. Colborne, travels and researches, 16 n. & n. 1, 17, 33 n. 2, 51 n. 4, 64 n. 1, 65 & n. 2, 66 n. 1, 69 (Report), 73, 75, 80-2, 85, 87 n. 1, 92, 104 n. 1, 153 n. 1.  
BACOT, Jacques, (1) \**Les Mo-so*; (2) *Les Ślokas Grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa*, 69, 143, 182 n. 2, 207, 224.  
Ba-di, st. = Brag-stiñ, q.v., 83, 84 & n. 2.

Bair-lang, p. = Pai-lan, q.v., 34, 61.  
Baltistan, co., 14.  
Ba-nag, p. = Panakha, q.v., 21.  
Baron, di. (Tsaidam), 9.  
Ba-taṅ, st. = 'taṅ, 83.  
Ba-t'ang, t. = Ba-thaṅ, 6, 4 & n. 2, 11, 15, 19 n. 2, 67 & n. 2, 77-8; l., 75-7.  
Ba-thaṅ, st. (E. Tibet), 83.  
Ba-ti, st. = Brag-stiñ, 83, 84 & n. 2.  
Ba-wan, st. = Ba-bam, 83, 84 n. 2.  
Bawrang, t. or di. = Pa-U-Rong, q.v. 73.  
Bayankara, m., 1-3, 7-9, 20, 26 (name).  
Bde, di.: (Amdo), 32, 35, 57. S.a. De, De-ga, Te.  
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-roñ), 15 n. 5, 83. S.a. Be-rim, Be-rin, Ḥbe-rim, Pe-re.  
Bhutan, co., 14, 151.  
BICHURIN, Iakinf, \**Istoriya Tibeta 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-brañ, monastery, 20 & n. 87, 27. S.a. Lhabrang.  
Blo-bkra, p., 15. S.a. Lo-tawa.  
Blo-bzañ Dpah-ldan Ye-śes, itinerary, 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.

BONVALOT, G., \**Across Tibet*, 7, 146 n. 2.  
 Bouchier, William, travels, 44 n. 5.  
 BOWER, Hamilton, \**Diary of a Journey across Tibet*, 7.  
 Bowtong, di. = Pa-U-Rong, q.v.  
 BOYER, Abbé, *Kharosthī Inscriptions edited by A. Boyer, E. J. Rapson and É. Senart*, 60 n. 3.  
 Brag-gyab, di. (E. Tibet), 84. S.a. Draya.  
 Brag-mgo, st. (Hor-pa), 15 n. 5, 83, 85, 89. S.a. Brag-mon, Cañ-gu, Cran-go, Dra-mon, Tāngo.  
 Brag-mon, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 83.  
 Brag-stiñ, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83-5. S.a. Ba-di, Ba-ti, Bra-sdi, Bura-kdi, Cra-tin, Dra-tiñ, Pati, Tra-ti.  
 Brahmputra, ri, 3, 4 (valley & gorge), 14.  
 Bra-sdi, st. = Brag-stiñ, q.v., 83-5.  
 Bra-ma-thañ ('plateau'), 110, 216.  
 Brdzun-hgag, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a. Ju-kan, Niñ-hgag, Ru-kan, Rtsung Kang, Runggang, Ruñ-kañ, Sunggak, Sunggang, Zunga, Zunggak, Žuñ-kak, Zur-ga.  
 Bri-chu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.  
 Brius, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.  
 Brooke, J.W., travels, 17, 36 n. 1.  
 Btsan-la, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a. Tsan-la, Tsen-la, Zanla.  
 Buhagol, ri. (Tsaidam), 34 n. 1.  
 Bu-ik-wan-kiēm, Ch'iang chief, 39. S.a. Wu-i-Yüan-chien.  
 Bulungir, ri. (Kan-su), 10.  
 Bum-liñ, a place in Amdo, 110.  
 Burakdi, st. = Brag-stiñ, q.v., 80 n. 2, 85.  
 Burkhan Buddha, m., 9.  
 Burmese, l., 168; w. 99, 109, 286 n. 1.  
 BUSHELL, S. W., \**The Early History of Tibet*, 6 n. 2, 12 nn. 5, 6, 14 n. 4, 15 n. 1, 18 n. 4, 148 n. 2, 153, & in notes elsewhere.  
 Bya-gloñ-gi-lgo-dañ-rje, a person (mythical), 131.  
 Byañ-chen-mo, a plateau, 1. S.a. Changchenmo.  
 Byañ-thañ, ro., 1, 3, 9, 14, 15.  
 Byar, p., 17 n. 1, 33 n. 5, 34, 35 & n. 1. S.a. G-yar, Pai-lan.

Byar-liñs-tshal ('wood'), 35, 110.  
 Bya-rma-byañ-Rma-li, a person (mythical), 131.  
 Byar-mo-thañ ('plateau'), 27, 35 & n. 1. S.a. Dbyar°, G-yar°, G-yer°, Bye°, G-ye°.  
 Byeñu-rma-byeñu-gi-Thiñ-tshun, a person (mythical), 131, 190.  
 Bye-mo-thañ = Byar°, q.v., 35 & n. 1.  
 Byim-po, p. 33 n. 5, 57. S.a. G-yim-po.  
 Bžagste-Nar-hbyam, a person (mythical), 133, 190.

## C

Cag-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 81, 83.  
 Camba Dsung = Kam-ba-rdzoñ, 67.  
 Cango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 83.  
 Cangu, st. = ,, 83, 85.  
 CAREY, A. D. & — DALGLEISH, travels, 36 n. 1, 44.  
 Cer-cen, t., 23, 44.  
 Chab-mdo, t., 11. S.a. Chamdo.  
 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 = Byañ°, q.v., 1.  
 Chango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 16 n.  
 Chang-yih, t. = Kan-chou, q.v., 12.  
 Chan-tui, di. = Ñag-roñ, q.v., 16.  
 Charing-nor ('lake') = Skya-reñs-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'êng-tu, t. (Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 52, 67.  
 Ch'i, ri. (China), 54 & n. 7.  
 Ch'iang, p., 15-16, 19, 21, 26, 28, 31-2, 34, 36 sqq., 36 n. 1, 39 sqq., 41-3, 49, 51-3, 55, 57-8, 152-3, 280 (drug-collecting), 309, 370, 373; l., 26, 61, 97, 100, 110, 116; w., 40, 137, 333. S.a. Hsi-ch'iang, Jo-ch'iang, Keang, Pai-lan, T'ang-chang, Tang-hsiang, Sum-pa.

- Ch'iang-tao, t. or di. (Kan-sa), 41, 55, 56.  
 Chia Rung, re. = Rgyal-roñ, q.v., 67.  
 Ch'ien-fo-tung, t. (Sha-chou), 112, 117 n. 5, 129, 130.  
 Chin-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-tš'ing.  
 Chin-ch'uan, ri., 7, 65, 81; l., 85-6. S.a. 'Gold River', Kin-tschuan.  
 Chinese, 112 (text), 116, 119, 130 (MSS.); l., 23 n. 2, 88; w., 2 & n., 33, 43, 64-5, 87 n. 4, 92-3, 125, 129, 132, 194, 234-5, 238, 245, 250 n. 1, 252, 264, 273, 283 n. 1, 289, 299, 303, 305, 309, 328, 343, 362 n. 2.  
 Ching, ri., 54.  
 Ch'ing-hai ('lake') = Koko-nor, q.v., 26, 34.  
 Chin-sha-chiang, ri. = Middle Yang-tse-chiang, 4.  
 Chi-shih (Skyi), m., 38 & n. 1. S.a. Tsi-shi.  
 Chiu-ch'uan, t. = Su-chou, q.v., 42.  
 Chiung, Ch'iang chief & p., 51 n. 1. S.a. Gong.  
 Cho-ga-chi, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Chok'ochi, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Cho-pyi-cog-zu, 'Little Tiger, Meadow-ass', 132.  
 Chos Chia, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Chosschia, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Chossüchiapu, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Chro-šiop, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 82-3.  
 Ch'ü, ri. (China), 54 & n. 7.  
 Chung-tien, t. (Yün-nan), 73, 85.  
 Ch'un-sang, p., 128.  
 Chuwo, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 15 n. 5.  
 Cingiz Khan, Mongol emperor, 26.  
 Ciu-tzū, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 83.  
 CLAUSON, Sir G. L. M., 62.  
 Cog-ro, di., 58, 314. S.a. Tsog°, Tshog°.  
 Cog-tsi, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 83-4.  
 Cok-tsi, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 83-4.  
 Co-ne, di. & p., 27, 28 & n. 1.  
 CONRADY, A., *Eine Indo-Chinesische Causativ - Denominativ - Bildung*, 20, 88 & n. 1., 206, 208, 210. S.a. ROSTHORN.  
 COOPER, T. T., *Travels of a pioneer of commerce*, 14 n. 1., 149 n. 1.  
 CORDIER, H., *The Lo-los*, p. 143.  
 Cosgiyab, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Co-skiab, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 83.  
 Co-tse, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 83.  
 COWELL, E. B. & F. W. THOMAS, *Harṣa-carita* (trans.), 142 n. 2.  
 Crango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 82-5.  
 Cra-tin, st. = Brag-stiñ, q.v., 82-3.  
 Cu-cui, st. (?), 84 n. 2.  
 Cu-wo, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 83.
- ## D
- Dabasun-nor ('lake'), 26, 42 (name).  
 Daflā, l., 99, 154.  
 DALGLEISH, —, travels, 36 n. 1. S.a. CAREY.  
 Dam-ba, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83, 84 n. 2. S.a. Tam-ba, Tangpa.  
 Dango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 85.  
 Dañ-la, m. = Tang-la, q.v., 2 n. 3.  
 Dan-tig, p. = Tan-tig, 60.  
 Dar-chen-do, t. = Ta-chien-lu, l.  
 Dardistan, co., 151 (Mons).  
 DAS, Ś. 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 Yangtse*, 67 n. 2, 69, 70, 73, 79, 81.  
 Dbra, p., 307-8. S.a. Hbra.  
 Dbyar, p., 32, 33 n. 5, 35 n. 1. S.a. Byar, Bye, G-yar, G-ye, Yar.  
 Dbyar-mo-thañ ('plateau'), 32-3, 353. S.a. Byar, &c.  
 Dbye-ldañ-sum, t. (mythical), 307.  
 Dbye-mo, t. (mythical), 307.  
 De, re. = Bde, q.v., 35, 37.  
 De-ga-G-yu-tshal ('wood'), 31.  
 De-ge, st. = Sde-dge, q.v., 83.  
 DE GROOT, J. J. M., \**Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens: I,*

*Die Hunnen der vorchristlichen Zeit*; II, *Die Westlande Chinas in der vorchristlichen Zeit*. 36 n. 1, 37 & nn. 2-3, 38, 40 & nn. 4-6, 44, 46, 53, 54, 55, 56, 135, 151, & elsewhere in notes pp. 36-59.

Derge, st. = Sde-dge, q.v., 15, 83-5.

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-si-tsha, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 1., 83, 89 & n. 2; w., 90, 92-3, 104. S.a. Gešits'a, Rge-si-tsa, &c. (pp. 83-4).

Dgu-lcogs, 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'imāl, 1., 324.

Dje-gu, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 82, 83, 85.

Djia-kha, st. = Rgyal-kha, q.v., 83-4.

Djia-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 83-4.

Djie-dam, st. = Jye-dam, q.v., 83, 85.

Djiu-tse, st. = Lcog-rtse, q.v., 82-3.

Djum-ba, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 82-3.

Dkañ-mdzes, t. = Kanzé, q.v., 11 n. 1, 16 n.

Dmar-khams, di. (E. Tibet), 19 n. 2, 67 n. 2.

Dok-pa, p. = Hbrog°, q.v., 5.

Dok-thol, re. = Hbrog°, 14.

Donkyr, t. = Tankar, q.v., 11.

Dra, di. (Skyi), 110.

Dra-mon, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 83.

Dra-tiñ, st. = Brag-stiñ, q.v., 83.

Draya, di. (E. Tibet) = Brag-gyab, q.v., 84.

Dre-chu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.

Driñ-pa, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 83.

Dri-tu, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 83.

Drug, p. = Turk, 27, 31.

Drug-pa, p. = Hbrog, q.v., 5 n. 6.

Drukagi, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 84 n. 2, 85.

Drum-ba, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 83.

Dsim, a Ch'iang chief, 40, 52, 57, 135 = Jên, q.v.

Duampou = Hgron-bu ? 1., 72.

Dulangol, ri. (Koko-nor re.), 34 n. 1.

Dunczi, st., 60 n. S.a. Kuei-tê.

Dungkor, t. = Tankar, q.v., 11.

DUTREUIL DE RHINS, J. L., *La Haute Asie*, 2 n. 1, 3 n. 2. See GRECARD.

Dwags-po, di. (South Tibet), 15; 1., See Tākpa.

Dza-chu, ri., upper Me-kong, q.v., 3, 7.

Dža-k'iong, p. = Jo-ch'iang, q.v., 43-6, 43 n. 3.

Džok, ri. (Kan-su), 58.

Džong, p. = Jung, q.v.

Dzorgai, p. (Go-lok); 1., 72, 88; w., 90-1. S.a. Go-lok.

## E

Eastern Colonial Tibetan. S. Tibetan.

EDGAR, J. H., *\*The Marches of the Mantze*, 18 nn. 1, 3, 28 n. 2, 51 n. 4, 67, 82, 84, 148 n. 1, 280 n. 1.

'Eighteen Kingdoms' of the Rgyal-roñ, 17, 19.

'Eight Snam', 235.

'Eight Yogs', 267.

Etsingol, ri. (Gobi desert), 10, 27.

## F

Fan-min (Chinese), Tibetan borderers, 64.

Fan-tzū = Fan-min, 64-5. S.a. Hei Fan-tzū.

Fêng-yang, a Ch'iang tribe = Hong-jong, 41.

FERGUSSON, W. N., *\*Adventures, &c., on the Tibetan Steppes*, 7 n. 8, 17, 19 n. 8, 28 n. 2, 36 n. 1, 67 & n. 1, 68, 82, 84-7, 280 n. 1, 302 n. 2, & elsewhere cited in notes.

FILCHNER, W. (1) *Das Rätsel des Matschü*, (2) *Om Mani Padme Hum*, (3) *Kumbum*, (4) *Wissenschaftliche Ergebnisse der Expedition Filchner nach China und Tibet, 1903-1905*. III *Band, Karte der Chinesischen Provinz Kan-su*, 4 nn. 2, 4, 5, 7 & n. 4, 12 n. 2, 20, 21, 25, 146 n. 2, 221, 249, 266 n. 2, 284 & elsewhere in notes pp. 20-60.

FORSYTH, T. D., *Mission to Yarkund*, 33 n. 2.  
 'Four Garrisons' = Chinese Turkestan, 235.

FRANKE, A. H. (1) *Antiquities of Indian Tibet*, (2) *History of Western Tibet*, (3) *Ladakhi Songs*, (4) *Frühlings und Wintermythus der Kesarsage*, (5) article in *Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, Buddhistische Volkslieder aus Ladakh*, 16 n. 2, 18 n. 2, 127, 140 n. 1, 144 n. 1, 151, 213 n. 1, 279.

FRANKE, O., *Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches*, 36 n. 2, 38 n. 1, 52 nn. 1, 4, 58 n. 2, 68, 289.

FUSSÜ CH'ENG, 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.

## G

Gabet, Père, travels. S. HUC.

Ga-cu, t. = Ho-chou, q.v., 11 & n. 7, 60.

Gaishechia, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Gam-shan, m., 151.

Gan-'e, t. or di., 49 n. 1.

Gari, t. or di., 67.

GARNIER, F., *Voyage d'Exploration en Indo-Chine*, 75.

Gass, t. & di. (Tsaidam), 44.

Gdags-khri, an early Tibetan king, 6.

Gdiñ-drug, a (mythical) di., 32 n. 1.

Geb'siza, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

*Geografia Tibeta* of MINTSHUL HUTHUKTU, q.v.

Ge-sar, legend of, 153, 213 n. 1.

Ge-sie, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 83-4.

Gešits'a, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 72; l., 89 & n. 2.

Giën, early Ch'iang chief & tribe, 40-3, 49, 55. S.a. Yen.

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-sé-tsha, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 83.

Giyardo, Giyarlung, Giyarmu, Giyarsa, Giyartang, t. or di. (Rgyal-roñ), 17 n. 1.

Gloñ-myig-loñ, a mythical person = Ltoñ-tehi-Mye-kru, q.v., 131.

Gnam-ka-Loñ-sum, a mythical place, 32 n. 1.

Gñan-chen-Thañ-lha, m., 2-3, 2 n. 4. S.a. Nyin-chen-Tangla.

Gobi desert, 10, 27.

Go-je, st. = Ho-g'zi, q.v., 83.

'Gold River' = Chin-ch'uan, q.v., 16-17, 65, 81.

Go-lok, p. 8, 17 n. 2, 20-2 (name), 24, 41, 51. S.a. Chakpa, Panakha; l., 88-99. S.a. Dzorgai, Kortsè; w., 92-4, 96, 101-7, 218, 232, 267, 360.

Gong, an early Ch'iang chief = Chiung, q.v., 52.

Gossetscha, st. = Dge-si-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Go-ya-go-phu, a certain fiend, 134, 255.

Go-zi, st. = Ho-g'zi, q.v., 83.

GRENARD, F., *\*La Haute Asie*, 2 n. 1, 4 n. 4, 7, 24 n. 1. S.a. DUTREUIL DE RHINS.

Gropur, t. or di. (Skyi), 110.

Gru, di. (Tibet), 308.

Gru-gu, a place (Amdo), 308.

Gru-gu-rgya-ra, di. (Khams), 308.

Gtoñ-sum-pa, p., 152.

Gu-ge, re. (W. Tibet), 130.

Guidui, t. & di. = Kuei-tê, q.v., 59 n. 3.

Guñ-dañ, a mythical place, 307.

Gusri Khan, a Mongol Emperor, 26.

Gyāmi (Rgya-mi), l. (Chinese), 72-3; w., 92-3.

G-yar, p., 17 n. 1, 33 n. 5, 34-5, 35 n. 1.

G-yar-mo-thañ ('plateau'), 33, 136, 353. S.a. Bye°, Byar°, Dbyar°, G-ya°, G-yer°, Yar°.

Gyārüng, re. = Rgyal-roñ, q.v.,



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.  
 Gyárungbo, a Gyárung man, 64 (Rgyal-roñ-po).  
 G-ye-mo-thañ = G-yar°, q.v., 34.  
 G-yer-mo-thañ = G-yar°, q.v., 136, 353.  
 Gyim-po, p., 33 n. 5, 57, 134-5. S.a. Byim.  
 Gyim-śan, 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-roñ), 83.  
 Hajjar, di. (Tsaidam), 9, 23, 46.  
 Ħa-le-Mon, p., Mons of A-la-shan? 152-3.  
 HALOUN, G., 45 n. 6, 48 n., 57 n. 1.  
 Hami, t. (Turkestan), 24.  
 Han, co. (Ssü-ch'uan), 51, 57.  
 Han, ri. (China), 37.  
 Han., p., 42 & n. 7, 43, 48. S.a. Hong-te.  
 Hanniu, l. (Rgyal-roñ), 72, 87, 89; w., 87, 90, 92-3, 95-6, 101, 105, 107.  
 Harṣa, Indian Emperor, 14 & n. 3.  
 Hashaklik, t. (Turkestan), 46.  
 Ħa-za, p., 45-6. S.a. Jo-ch'iang.  
 Ħbaḥ, p. & st. (Ba-thañ), 6 n. 6, 67 n. 2, 83.  
 Ħbe-rim, st. (Hor-pa) = Be-ri, q.v., 83.  
 Ħbra, a legendary p. (Tibet), 307-8, 319, 320. S.a. Dbra.  
 Ħbri-chu, ri. (Yang-tse-chiang in Tibet), 2-4, 7-8, 11 (gorge), 25-6, 67 n. 2, 217. S.a. Bri-chu, Brius, Chin-sha-chiang, Di-chu, Dre-chu, Njeh, Polei-tchou, Yak-cow river, Murus-ussu.  
 Ħbrog, upland pasturage, 5, 23.  
 Ħbrog-pa, Ħbrog (pastoral) people, 5.  
 Ħbrom-khoñ, di. (Koko-nor), 32.  
 Ħbum-dañ, a mythical place, 307.  
 HEDIN, Sven, travels, 36 n. 1, *Southern Tibet*, 44 & n. 3, 82. S.a. HAENISCH.  
 Ħei ('Black') Fan-tzū, p., 65. S.a. Fan-tzū.  
 Ħel-ke, t., 242.  
 HENNESSEY, J. B. N., *Report on the Explorations of . . . Pandit A-K*, 36 n. 1, 89 n. 2.  
 HERRMANN, A., *Historical and Commercial Atlas of China*, 38, 40 n. 7, 44 n. 3.  
 Ħgar, p. (Tibet), 308. S.a. Lga, Lgar, Mgar.  
 Ħgo-boms, t. (= Kumbum?), 12 & n. 1, 199, 243.  
 Ħgo-zi, st. = Ħo-gzi, 83.  
 Ħgreñ, p. (Amdo), 32, 57.  
 Ħgreñ-ro, di. (Koko-nor), 32, 57.  
 Ħgron-bu, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a. Djum-ba, Driñ-pa, Drum-ba, Duampou, Nañ-chen-ba, Muping, Sbrriñ-pa.  
 Ħgru, a legendary p. (Tibet), 307-8.  
 Ħgru-gu, id., 268, 308.  
 Ħgru-ħldañ-ħmaḥ, a legendary t., 307-9.  
 Ħjañ, p. & dynasty (Tang-hsiang), 27, 30-1, 333. S.a. Njong.  
 Ħldyañ, p. & dynasty = Ħjañ (?), 333.  
 Hoang-ho ('river'), 2 n., 37-8, 42-3, 49, 50, 67, 237 n. 1, 246 (bridge). S.a. Rma-chu, 'Yellow River', Huang-ho.  
 Ho-chou, t. (Kan-su), 11-12, 24, 27, 47, 50 n.7, 68, 237 n. 1. S.a. Ga-cu.  
 HODGSON, B. H., \**Sifán & Hórsók Vocabularies . . . (Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. xxiii (1853, pp. 121-51))*, 6 n. 2, 17, 19, 20 & n. 7, 64-5, 70, 73, 75, 79, 80 & n. 2, 81, 85, 87, 89 n. 2, 92-3, 132, 158, 201 n. 1, 360.  
 HOERNLE, A.F.R., *JRAS.* 1911, p. 112.  
 Ħog-gzi, st. = Ħo-gzi, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Ho-kuan, di., 37 n. 4. S.a. Chin-ch'ing.  
 Ho-nan, re. (China), 54.  
 Ħon-cañ-do, a place in Bde, 42-3. S.a. Hung-ch'êng.

- 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. (Byañ-thañ), 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-mañ, perhaps ancient name of the Hor-pa st., 16 n.
- Hor-pa, stt., 65, 84-5; 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.
- Hšes-beg (hšeg), a divinity, 138, 142, 147 & n. 1, 155 n. 1, 223-4, 306-7.
- 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., 37-8, 57.
- Hsi-hsia, l., 26-7, 61-3, 62 n. 1, 63 n. 1, 98-9, 103, 114, 127, 136, 168, 170, 206-11, 326, 372; w., 94, 98, 100, 131-2, 135, 158, 167, 168 n. 3, 194 n. 1, 201, 203, 217-18, 221, 223-4, 232, 234-6, 238-9, 240, 246, 249, 250, 252, 257-8, 266, 269, 270, 274, 276, 279, 282, 283 n. 1, 290, 303, 313-15, 320, 325-6, 328-9, 330, 336 & n. 1, 341, 343, 353, 355, 360, 369.
- Hsin-ch'êng, t. (Lan-chou re.), 12 n. 5.
- Hsin-chiang, re. 'New Dominion' = Kan-su & Turkestan, 11.
- Hsi-ngan-fu, t. (China), 27, 54.
- Hsi-ning, t. (Koko-nor), 10-13, 23-5, 36 & n. 1, 41, 47 n. 3, 68, 237. S.a. Zi-liñ, & for various European spellings p., 11 n. 8.
- Hsiung-nu, p., 30, 33 n. 1, 56.
- Hsun-hwa, t. or di. (Amdo), 24.
- Hu, p. = 'Little Yüeh-chih, 46 n. 4, 47 n. 3, 48-9, 56. S.a. Hoo.
- Huan, ri. (China), 54.
- Huang, ri. = Ta-t'ung-ho, q.v., 12 n. 5.
- Huang-chung, di. (Amdo), 47-50.
- Huang-ho ('river') = Hoang-ho, 38, 40, 42, 49, 246.
- HUC, Abbé, \**Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans La Tartarie, le Thibet et la Chine*, 2 n., 2 n. 2, 3, 8 & n. 1, 10 n. 1, 12 n. 5, 13 n. 4, 20 n. 6, 23 n. 1, 24, 36 n. 1, 52 & n. 2, 139 n. 1, 144 n. 2, 148 & n. 3, 280 n. 1, 299.
- Hung-ch'êng, t. (Amdo), 43 & n. 2.
- Hung-chi on the Rma-chu in Amdo, 53 n. 7 (bridge), 237 n. 1 (bridge).
- HUNTER, W. W., *The Non-Aryan Languages of India & High Asia*, 132.
- HUTH, G., *Hor-chos-byun* (trans.), 59.

## 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

JAESCHKE, H. A., *Tibetan Grammar*, & articles on Tibetan (Berlin Academy *Monatschrift*, 1867), 209 n. 1, 240 n. 2, 269, 351, 362 n. 1.

Jag-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 83-4.

- Jagpa, p. = Chakpa, 20 n. 7. S.a. Go-lok.
- Ja-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 83.
- Japanese, w., 34, 234.
- Jê, 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.
- Jô, ri., 18 = Jê.
- Jo-Ch'iang, p., 43-6, 43 n. 3 = Dža-k'iong, Ńi-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.
- Jün, di. (Tsaidam), 26 (name).
- Jung, p. = Džong, 54-6, 152.
- Jya-de, di. (E. Tibet), 1., 75, 187.
- Jya-kha, st. = Rgyal-kha, q.v., 82-3.
- Jyar, p. = Byar/G-yar, 17 n. 1.
- Jyā-ruñ, 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. Gyārūng, Rgya-roñ.
- Jye-dam, di. (Chung-tien), 83-5.
- Jyekundo, t. & di. (Tibet), 4, 7, 11; 1., 75.
- K**
- Ka-ba, di. (Liang-chou), 58 & n. 3.
- Ka-chin, l., 154; w., 99.
- Ka-droñ (Kad-roñ), a place (Amdo), 268, 308.
- Kailāsa, m. & di., 1, 14, 130, 373.
- Kam-ba-rdzoñ, t. (Thibet), 67.
- Kanauri, l., w., 92, 328.
- Kan-chou, t. & di. (Kan-su), 10 (ri.), 12, 24-5, 36 n. 1, 48, 58 (ri.), 153.
- Kang-yen valley in 'Women's Kingdom', 18.
- Kaň-sar, st. = Khaň-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.
- Kanzé, st. (Hor-pa), 11 n. 1, 16 n., 18, 75, 150; l., 75. S.a. Dkaň-mdzes.
- Karakoram, m., 1.
- Karen, p., 144 (creation legend).
- KARLGREN, B., \**Analytical Dictionary of Chinese*, 34, 56 n. 4, 59 nn. 1, 3, 234-5, 245, 250 n. 1, 264, 303, 328.
- Keang, p. = Ch'iang, q.v., 47 n. 3.
- Keshets, st. = Dge-ši-tsa, q.v., 84 n. 2.
- Khab-yo-byaňi-Hdab-bkra, a mythical person, 131.
- Khams, re. (E. Tibet), 8, 13, 23, 32-3, 78. S.a. Mdo-Khams; l., 76, 78, 84-5, 107, 209, 362 n. 1.
- Khaň-gsar, st. (Hor-pa), 15 n. 5, 83. S.a. Kaň-sar, Kon-ser, Khun-sar, Kuň-sar.
- Kharakhoto, t. (ruins), 27 & n. 4.
- Khar-tsan, t. & di. (Kan-su), 134. S.a. Mkhar°.
- Khotan, st., 15, 44, 61, 116; l., 116.
- Khri-boms, t., 243 (name).
- Khri-šor, lake = Koko-nor, 34.
- Khri-sroñ-Ldehu-brtsan, Tibetan king, 368 (name).
- Khrom, t., 33.
- Khro-skyab, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83-4. S.a. Coskiab Cosgiyab, Chos Chia, Chosschia, Chossüchiapu, Chro-šio, Tro-jyab, Tru-jyab.
- Khun-sar, st. = Khaň-gsar, q.v., 83, 85.
- Kianggu, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 85 n. 1.
- Kiangsu, re. (China), 54.
- Kiating, t. (China), 17.
- Kin-ch'ing, t. & di. = Chin-ch'ing, q.v., 43 n. 6.
- Kin-ts'ing, id., 43 n. 6.
- Kin-tschuan, ri. = Chin-ch'uan, q.v., 1., 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,

- 56, 237, 251; l., 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. = Khañ-gsar, q.v., 82-5.
- Kortsè, p. (Go-lok), l., 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; l., 19.
- Kredyan, p. & l., 154.
- Kuang-han, t. & di. (China), 40, 52 & n. 6, 53 n. 1, 56.
- Kublai Khan, a Mongol Emperor, 26.
- Kue-de, st. = Kuei-tê, q.v., 59 n. 3.
- Kuei-tê (tö), st. (Amdo), 5, 21, 59 & n. 3, 59 n. 3, 60. S.a. Gui-duit, Kue-de, Dunczi.
- Kuen-lun, m., 44.
- Kum, desert (Lob-nor), 146.
- Kumbum, monastery t. (Amdo), 8 n. 2, 12 & n. 2, 13, 23, 26, 59, 199, 243. S.a. Hgo-boms.
- K'ung-chou, di. (China), 31.
- Kung-sa (sar), st. = Khañ-gsar, q.v., 15 n. 5, 84 n. 2.
- Kuñ-sar, id., 83.
- Ku-tsung, p. (Tibetans of Yünnan), 69; l., 72-4; w., 102.
- Kva-cu, t. = Kwa-chou (Kan-su), 32, 35.
- Kya-ring-nor, lake = Skya-reñs, q.v., 4 n. 4.
- L**
- La, pass (Tibet), 5.
- Ladak, co., 1, 14, 151 (Mons); l., 79; w., 102.
- Lahu, p., 144 (legend); w., 99.
- LALOU, Mdle., *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.
- Lang-chen, t. (Amdo) = Lyon-jen, q.v., 36.
- Lao-chieh, a Ch'iang tribe = Lotschü (tsche), 41 & n. 3.
- LAUFER, B., *\*The Si-hia Language, a Study in Indo-Chinese Philology*, 17 n. 1, 63 n. 1, 64 n., 70, 89 n. 2, 98 n. 1, 107-8, 109 & n. 1, 131, 136, 158, 166, 182, 258, 269, 282, 353, 369, 372, & elsewhere in citations of Hsi-hsia w.
- Lba-si, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83. S.a. Wa-se, Wassi, Wassu.
- Lcag-la, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 82-3. S.a. Lcags-la, Cag-la, Cha-la, Ja-la, Djia-la, Jag-la, Ming-jing, Ta-chien-lu.
- Lcags-la, st. = Lcag-la, q.v., 83.
- Lcog-rtse, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 81, 83. S.a. Lcog-rtsi, Cog-tsi, Cok-tsi, Co-tse, Ciu-tzü, Chok'schi', Choga Chi, Jokzai, Djiu-tse (tzü).
- Ldañ-la, m. = Tang-la, q.v., 2 n. 3.
- Ldehu-zahi-hbrin-te Sman-skyol, a legendary person, 134.
- Ldoñ, an early Tibetan tribe, 307-8.
- Ldoñ Me-ñag, p. (Mi-ñag, q.v.), 16 n. 3, 152.
- Ldoñ Sum-pa, p. (Sum-pa, q.v.), 18 n. 2. S.a. Gtoño.
- Lèhu, t. or st. (Rgyal-roñ), 86.
- Lem-cu, t. & di. = Liang-chou, q.v., 12.
- Len-tsa, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 14.
- Lepcha, w., 217, 326.
- LÉVI, Sylvain, Tibetan invasion of India, 14 n. 3.
- Lga, Lgar-ma, a legendary Tibetan tribe, 307-8. S.a. Hgar, Mgar.
- 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); l., 33, 75 & n. 1, 78, 81, 84, 85, 86 n. 2, 104-5, 107, 117 n. 5, 372; w., 107.
- Liang-chou, t. & di. (Kan-su), 12, 25, 28, 47-8, 49 & n. 1, 58. S.a. Lem-cu, Wu-wei, Ka-ba.
- LIÉTARD, A., *\*Notes sur les dialectes Lo-lo*, 70, 143.

Li-fan-fu, t. (Ssü-ch'uan), 66-7; l. (Man-Tzū), 70, 89 n. 1; w., 96.  
 Lig, dynasty (Žañ-zuñ), 14 n. 1.  
 Li-gu, an early Ch'iang tribe, 40 & n. 4, 41, 52 & n. 5. S.a. Li-niu, 'Yak tribe'.  
 Lin-chou, di. (China), 28.  
*Linguistic Survey of India*, 98, 104, 209.  
 Li-niu, p. = Li-gu, q.v., 40 & n. 4.  
 Lin-t'ao, t. & di. (Kan-su), 41, 43, 53.  
 Lissou, p.; l., 72; w., 74, 92.  
 Lissu, id., 151; l., 72.  
 Li-su, id.; l., 72; w., 99, 102.  
 Li-t'ang (tañ, thañ), t. & di. (Tibet), 6, 11, 83; l., 67 n. 2.  
 Littledales, St. G. R. and Mrs., travels, 3, 36 n. 1.  
 'Little Tiger', a certain legendary ass = Cho-pyi-cog-zu, q.v., 132.  
 Liung-ch'êng, t. = Lyon-jeñ, q.v., 35.  
 Lo, ri. (China), 54.  
 Lob-nor, re., 44-6, 146. S.a. Kum desert, Shan-shan.  
 Lo-dgu, Lo-gu, st. = Ba-bam, q.v., 83.  
 Lok-Tik, p., 58-9, 59 n. 1.  
 Lo-lo, p., 66, 69, 302 n. 2; l., 63-4, 72, 75, 99, 109, 324; w., 73-4, 92, 99, 101, 103-7, 218, 232-4, 271, 273, 276, 325, 328, 330.  
 Loñ-sum, a mythical place, 32 n. 1.  
 Lonü Man, p., 153.  
 Lo-tava, p. = Blo-bkra, q.v., 15 n. 1.  
 Lo-tsu (tschu), tribe & ri., 41 & n. 3.  
 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-tzū.  
 Ltoñ-tehi-Mye-kru, a legendary person, 131, 133, 136-8, 143, 190 (name), 223, 255, 369 (name).  
 Lung, m. (Kan-su), 12, 54.  
 Lung-ch'uan valley (Amdo), 12 n. 5.  
 Lung-hsi, di. (Kan-su), 12, 37, 41, 43, 55 & n. 3.  
 Lu-tzū, p.; l., 72, 81, 92; w., 90-1, 94-5, 97-8, 101, 103-4, 106-7.  
 Lyang, dynasty (T'ang-chang), 30, 333. S.a. Hjañ.  
 Lyon-jeñ, t. (Amdo), 35. S.a. Lang-chen, Liung-ch'êng.

## M

Man, p., 66-7, 152, 154.  
 Mānasa-sarovar, lake, 1, 8, 373.  
 Man-chia, p. = Min-chia, q.v., 65-6, 69.  
 Manchu, l., 84.  
 Mantze, 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-ñag, 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. Dmaro.  
 Mar-yul, co. = Ladak, 1.  
 MASPERO, G., 119 n. 1.  
 Mašu, 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, °ze, °zer, °zzar, °šu, °zu, °zur.  
 Ma-zu (zur), st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 83, 15 n. 5.  
 Mazzar, st. = Ma-zi, q.v., 85 n. 1.  
 Mchiñ-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-roñ), 83.  
 Mdo-smad, re., perhaps embracing Amdo & Khams, q.v., 6, 8, 32, 137 n. 2.  
 MEARES, C. H., travels, 17.  
 Meñi-klu-hcañ, 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-roñ), 81, 89; w., 91, 97, 101, 230.  
 Me-li, st. = Mi-li, q.v., 82-5.  
 Menia, p. = Mi-ñag, q.v., 16 & nn. 1-3, 72; l., 16, 73, 75, 80, 89; w.,

- 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-roñ), 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.
- Miao-tseu, p., 144 (legends); w., 132.
- Miën-tšu, t. & di. = Min-chou, q.v., 54 & n. 9.
- Mi-li, st., 19, 73, 90, 83, 85; l., 89-99. S.a. Me-li, Mu-li, Smi-li.
- Min, ri. (Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 17, 53, 66.
- Mi-ñag, p., 16 & nn. 1-3, 18-19, 19 n. 2, 65, 67 n. 2, 80, 85, 99, 137 n. 2; l., 16, 89-99; w., 93. S.a. Mānyak, Menia, Minia, Munia, Ldoñ Me-ñag.
- Min-chou, t. & di. (T'ao ri.), 3, 11, 43, 68. S.a. Miën-tšu.
- Ming-jeng (cheng, tsheng), 84 n. 2. S.a. Lcag-la.
- Minia, l., 72. S.a. Mi-ñag.
- Min-kia (chia), p.; w., 98-9.
- Min-shan, m. (Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 41 n. 2.
- MINTSHUL HUTHUKTU, \**Geografia Tibeta*, q.v., 33, 59.
- Miri, l., 99, 154; w., 99 n. 1.
- Mi-sang, 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.
- Mkhar-tsan, t. & di. (Kan-su), 32, 35. S.a. Khar-tsan.
- Mon (Moñ), p., 150 sqq., 243.
- MONBEIG, Père, Tse-kou Tibetan, l., 70, 74, 79, 81.
- Mongol, p., 23 n. 1, 25-6, 34, 36, 65; l., 23 n. 2, 28; w., 2 n. 3, 26, 28, 33 n. 1, 88. S.a. Sökpa, Hørsök.
- Mongolia, co., Inner, 13; Upper, 13, 26, 31. S.a. Stod-sog, Sok-yeul.
- 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 = Hjañ), 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. Ltoñ-tehi°.
- Myi-rma-bu-Ldam-śad, a legendary person, 135.
- Myi-rma-bu Mchiñ-rgyal, a T'ang-chang king, 135.

## N

- Nägā, l., 99, 324; w., 99 n. 1, 325.
- Ñag-chu, ri. = Ya-lung, q.v., 3, 7, 11, 15, 18-19.
- Nag-chu-ka, di. (Tibet), 13 & n. 4.
- Ñag-cig, Gyim-po, a legendary person, 134-5.
- Ñag-roñ, di. (on Ñag-chu), 16 & n. 3. S.a. Nya-ron.
- 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-ldoñ-prom.
- Nameji, l. (Hsi-fan), 72.
- Ñam Kan-mog, a temple (Śa-cu re.), 271.
- Nam-ldoñ-prom, a place (Amdo?) 137 n. 2.
- Nam (Gnam)-mtsho = Tengri-nor, 2.
- Nam-Tig, p. & l. (Tig of Nam), 59, 61, 132, 155.
- Namtiga, a person, 60.

Nan-chao Man, p., 153.  
 Nan-chen, st. = Lcag-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.  
 Na-Ptchu, di. = Nag-chu-ka, q.v., 13 n. 4.  
 Nepal, co., 14; l., 303.  
 NEVSKY, N., \**A Brief Manual of the Si-Hia Characters with Tibetan Transcriptions*, 62 n. 1, 70, & *passim* in citations of Hsi-hsia w.  
 Ngan ('An)-ku, di. (Kan-su), 41.  
 Ngo-lok, p. = Go-log, q.v., 20.  
 Ngo-ring, lake = Sño-rañs, q.v. 4 n. 4.  
 Ñi-kiang, p. = Jo-ch'iang, q.v., 43-6, 43 n. 3.  
 Ñin-ga, Ñin-hgag, st. = Brdzun-hgag, q.v., 83-4.  
 Ning-hsia, t. (A-la-shan), 12, 24, 153.  
 Ning-yüan, t. (S. Ssü-ch'uan), 40 n. 4, 153.  
 N'jeh, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.  
 Njong, p. = Hjañ?; l. & w. S. Muli(Njong).  
 Noring-nor ('lake') = Sño-rañs, q.v., 4 n. 4.  
 Ño-log, p. = Go-lok, q.v., 20.  
 Nü-kuo, st. = 'Women's kingdom', q.v., 11, 18.  
 Nung, l.; w., 99.  
 Nya-rong, di. = Ñag-roñ, q.v., 81-5.  
 Nyin-chen-tangla, m. = Gñan-chen-Thañ-lha, q.v., 2-3.

## O

Odontala, a plain near the upper Rma-chu = Skar-ma-thañ, q.v., 26 (name).  
 Oksi, st. = Ho-gzi, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 OLLONE, Vicomte d', (1) *Les Derniers Barbares* (Engl. trans. *In Forbidden China*), (2)\* *Langues des peuples non-Chinois de la Chine*, 4 n. 5, 7 n. 8, 9 n. 1, 12 n. 6, 20 n. 9, 21 & n. 3, 22 & n. 3, 28 n. 2, 41 n. 2, 65 & n. 3, 66, 70, 73-4, 132, 143, 146 n. 3, 148 n. 1, 187, 248 n. 1, 249 n. 1, 302 n. 2, 328, 352.  
 Orazio della Penna, 11 n. 8.  
 Oring-nor ('lake') = Sño-rañs, 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-tzü, p., 67; l., 70, 89; w., 90, 92, 96, 98, 103, 105, 108.  
 Ovis Ammoni (Hodgson), 3 n.

## P

Pai-lan, p. 15, 26, 29, 31, 35, 61. S.a. Bair-lang, Byar, G-yar.  
 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.  
 Panag, Panak'a, p., 21, 26, 72. S.a. Go-lok.  
 Pan-chen Blo-bzañ Dpal-ldan Ye-sés, 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-stiñ, 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), l., 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-sa, 11.  
 Pe Lissou, l., p. 72. S.a. Lissou.  
 PÉLLIOT, P., 32, 45 & n. 2, 46 & n. 2.  
 Pe-lung, m. (Kan-su), 53.  
 P'e-ma, p. = Pai-ma, q.v.  
 Pe-re, st. = Be-ri, q.v., 83, 85.  
 Petsen, l., w., 99.  
 Peu (Bod) of Ta-chien-lu 72; l., 73-4.

Phug-dir (tir), a place (Amdo), 34.  
 Phyug-tsams, di. (Amdo), 32-4, 53.  
   S.a. Fussü-ch'êng.  
 Pih-te, di. (Ssü-ch'uan), 53 n. 1.  
 Pih-lang, p. = Pai-lan, q.v., 34 n. 6.  
 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.  
 Pö, l. = 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, 74, 80 n. 2, 139 n. 1,  
 175, 216, 351, & elsewhere in  
 notes.  
 PRINSEP, J., 14 n. 3.  
 Prü-mi, p. (Mi-li), 72; l., 81; w., 90,  
 94, 97, 101-6.  
 Pyen, l.; w., 99.  
 Pyi-gtañ-sum, Pyi-ldañ, t. (legend-  
 ary), 307.

Q

Quedae, t. & di. = Kuei-tê, 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.  
 Rāi, l.; w., 98.  
 Rañ-ke, t., 242 (name).  
 RAPSON, E. J., *Kharoṣṭhī Inscrip-  
 tions . . .*, 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. (Ñag-roñ), 15 n. 5.  
   S.a. Zo-chen, Zog-chen.  
 Rgc-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. Gyārūng,  
 Jyā-ruñ, Rgya-roñ.  
 Rgya-mo-thañ, 'China plain', 32 n.  
 2, 153.  
 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.  
 RICHTHOFEN, 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-luñ-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 nn. 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.  
 ROSTHORN, A. von., \**Vokabular-  
 fragmente Ost. Tibetischer Dia-  
 lekte*, 17, 19, 20, 68, 71, 80, 82, 84,  
 87 & n. 4. S.a. Rgya-roñ.  
 Rtsi-dañ, a legendary place, 307.  
 Rtsung-kang, st. = Brdzun-hgag,  
 q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Ru-dok, t. & di. (Tibet), 1.  
 Ru-kan, Rung-kang, Ruñ-kan, st.  
 = Brdzun-hgag, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2.



## S

- Śa-cu, t. = Sha-chou, q.v., 36 n. 1, 43, 61, 112, 129-30, 134, 155, 271.  
 S.a. Ch'ien-fo-tung, Nam-Kan-mog.  
 Sa-ga Gdñ-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. S.a. Siēm-tsu.  
 SANDBERG, G., *Tibet & the Tibetans*, 5 nn. 3, 5, 8 n. 2.  
 SATĪSCANDRA VIDYĀBHŪṢAṆA, *Sosor-thar-pa*, edited by, 127.  
 Sbrñn-pa, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 83-4.  
 Scilin (°lingh), t. = Hsi-ning, q.v., 11 n. 8.  
 Sde-dge, st. (E. Tibet), 15 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-Ḥa-za, p., 152.  
 Selin, t. = Hsi-ning, q.v., 11 n. 8.  
 SENART, É., *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*, 60 n. 3.  
 Seutati, Peu (Bod p.) of, 72. S.a. Tzū-ta-ti.  
 Sgañ districts, 5, 6.  
 Sha-chou, t. (Kan-su), 10, 28, 45. S.a. Śa-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; l., 116; w., 188.  
 Shan-tan, m. (Kan-chou), 48.  
 Shao-tang, a Ch'iang chief & dynasty, 41, 43, 47 n. 3, 48, 52. S.a. Sio-tong.  
 Sharakuto, t. (Amdo), 237.  
 Sharba, traders from Mer-ke (Ssü-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.  
 Sheng-fan (Chinese) = Tibetan of Kan-su border, 65.  
 Shen-hsi, Ch'ang-an in, 27.  
 Shin-se, t. (Ch'iang), 11 & n. 2. S.a. Zin-cu.  
 Shi-shia = Hsi-hsia, q.v., 63 n. 1, 72.  
 Shuh, ancient division of Ssü-ch'uan, 12, 37, 51, 53, 57.  
 Siēm-tsu, a Ch'iang tribe = Samsa? 41.  
 Siēn, ri. = Ta-t'ung-ho? Hsi-ning-ho? 41 n. 7, 47 n. 3.  
 Siēn-liēn, Ch'iang tribes = Hsi-ning, 41. n. 7, 43.  
 Sien-pi, p., 28, 30. S.a. T'u-yü-hun.  
 Si-fan, p. & l. = Hsi-fan, q.v., 17, 72-3, 81-5.  
 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 Huc & Gabet (II, p. 158) *Karba* is a Tsaidam term for a young yak).  
 Skar-ma-thañ, a plain near the Upper Rma-chu, 26. S.a. Odon-tala.  
 Skeg-zañi-hbrñn-te Yar-mo-btsun, a mythical person, 184.  
 Skya-reñs-mtsho ('lake'), 4 n. 4. S.a. Charing-nor.  
 Skyi, co. (Tang-hsiang), 38, 42, 57, 61, 110, 135-6, 143, 255, 272; l. 135-6. S.a. Hsih-chih.

Skyi-mthiñ (plateau) co. = Skyi,  
 110, 133, 135.  
 Smi-li, st. = Mi-li, q.v., 83, 85.  
 Sñi, m., 272.  
 Sño-rañs-mtsho ('lake'), 4 n. 4. S.a.  
 O-ring-nor.  
 Śod, low-lying lands, 6.  
 Sogdian MSS., orthography, 117  
 n. 5.  
 Sōkpa, Mongol, 1. 73.  
 Sokyeul = Sog-yul, Mongolia, 64.  
 S.a. Stod-Sog.  
 Śo-ma-ra, a place in Skyi, 110.  
 So-mo, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 17-9, 83,  
 84 n. 2, 153. S.a. Po-mo, Sa-ma,  
 So-muñ, Su-mu.  
 Spag-ro, t. & di. (Bhutan), 151  
 (Mon), 314.  
 Spañ-gi-boñ-bu, 'Meadow ass', 132.  
 S.a. Cho-pyi-cog-zu.  
 Sribs, shadowed side of m., 6.  
 Sribbs-khri, an early Tibetan king, 6.  
 Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po, Tibetan king,  
 14-15, 26, 29.  
 Ssü-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.  
 STEIN, Sir A., *Innermost Asia*, 62 n.  
 1, 112, 286.  
 Stod-phyogs, re. (Kailāsa), 1, 8, 14.  
 Stod-sog, re. 'Upper Mongolia',  
 (Amdo), 13, 26.  
 STÖTZNER, W., *In's unerforschte  
 Tibet*, 7 n. 8, 82, 84 n. 2, 85 n. 1,  
 89 n. 2.  
 Su-ching, t. (Rgyal-roñ), 84 n. 2.  
 Su-chou, t. (Kan-su), 10, 12, 25,  
 42, 48-9, 58.  
 Śud-ke, t., 242 (name).  
 Su-ki, ri. = Tz'u-chih, q.v., 37-8, 40.  
 Su-lo-ho, ri. (Kan-su), 10.  
 Sum-pa, p., 18 & n. 2, 19, 148, 152.  
 S.a. Ldoñ°, Nü-kuo.  
 Su-mu, st. = So-mo, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Sunggak, Sunggang, st. = Brdzun-  
 h̄gag, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Sung-chou, old name of Sung-p'an,  
 q.v., 12 n. 6, 26, 28-9.  
 Sung-p'an, t. (N. Ssü-ch'uan), 9, 12,  
 17-19, 22, 24, 26, 28, 66-8; 1. 73.  
 Su-pi. p. = Sum-pa, q.v., 18 n. 2.

## T

Ta-chien-lu, t. & st., 1, 6-7, 11,  
 17-18, 22, 66, 81; 1., 73, 75. S.a.  
 Dar-chen-do, Lcag-la.  
 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.  
 Tākpa, di. & p. = Dwags-po (S.  
 Tibet), 15; 1., 73; w., 100, 238,  
 241 n. 1, 276, 325, 360, 369.  
 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-mên, t. (Amdo) = Lha-mo°,  
 237.  
 Ta-mo-ri, a pass (Amdo), 237.  
 T'ang-chang, p. & dynasty, 29-31,  
 38.  
 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-hsiang, p. & co., 1 n. 2, 26,  
 28-31, 38, 61. S.a. T'ang-chang.  
 Tang-keou-eul (Chinese) t. = Tan-  
 kar, q.v., 12.  
 Tang-la, m. & pass, 2 & n. 6 (name),  
 8, 11, 13-15.  
 Tang-mi, p., 31. S.a. To-mi.  
 Tangpa, st. = Dam-ba, q.v., 84 n. 2.  
 Tangut, p. (Amdo), 26-7, 29 n. 4,  
 36, 52 n. 4, 61-2, 74, 76-8, 80 n. 2,  
 108, 175, 357; w., 75, 77-8, 102,  
 105-8, 237, 271, 325 n. 1, 330,  
 349, 352, 360, 368. S.a. Amdo,  
 Tibetan.  
 Tankar, t. (Amdo), 8 n. 2, 11-13,  
 23-4, 146. S.a. Tongkor, Don-  
 kyr, Dungkor, Tang-keou-eul.  
 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.  
 T'ao-chou, t., 11 & n. 2, 28, 65, 68,  
 80. S.a. Tēh-cu.

- 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.
- Tcia-tam, di. = Chung-tien, Jyadam, 85.
- 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.
- TERRIEN DE LACOUPERIE, A., \**The languages of China before the Chinese*, 54, 71, 75, 89, 92, 96 n. 1, 116 n. 1.
- Te-tao, r. & di. (T'ao ri.), 55-6.
- Thamo-gompa, S. Tamo, 257 n. 2.
- Thañ districts, 59.
- Thöchü, t. & di. = T'ao-chou, q.v., 64-5, 203; l., 73, 80 n. 2, 88; w., 87 & n. 4, 90-8, 101-4, 106-9, 132, 223, 251, 325, 330, 366, 369.
- Tho-gon, p. & dynasty = T'u-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, 78, 210. S.a. Khams.  
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.
- Tibeto-Burman, l., 158, 207, 238, 247, 324, 347; w., 27, 131-2, 223, 225, 232-5, 246-7, 249, 277, 286 & n. 1, 290, 303, 326, 328, 351, 360, 369.
- Tig, p. = Tik, q.v. S.a. Nam-tig, Tan-tig, Yañ-tig, Kuei-tê.
- 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. = Kailāsa, 8.
- Ti-tao-chou, t. & di. (T'ao-chou re.), 11, 41.
- Tokuz-dawān, m. (Cer-cen re.), 23, 44.
- Tolan, t. (Liang-chou di.), 49 n. 1.
- Tolehu, a place = Tolan?, 49 n. 1.
- To-mi, p. (Byañ-thañ), 31. S.a. Tang-mi.
- Toñ-gsum-pa, p. = Gtoñ-sum-pa, q.v., 152.
- Tonkhor, t. = Tankar, q.v., 11.  
'Too-leaou General', a Chinese commander, 49 & n. 1.
- 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-ryab, Tru-jab, st. = Khroskyab, q.v., 82-3.
- Tsaidam, re., 9, 10, 13, 23, 26, 43-4, 46.
- Tsan-la, st. = Btsan-la, q.v., 83.
- Ts'an-lang, a Ch'iang p., 40 n. 6, 41, 51, 53 & n. 1. S.a. Sam-long.
- Tsa-ring-nor ('lake') = Skya-reñs-mtsho, q.v., 4 n. 4.
- Tsa-roñ (Tsarong), di. (Upper Mekong re.), 81; l., 76-7, 89-93; w., 90-1, 93, 101. S.a. Loutse, Lutzü, Mélam.
- Tse-kou, t. & di. (Yün-nan), l. 73-4, 81, 84; w., 74, 93, 108. S.a. Tzüku.
- Tseñ-ḡgi-Rbag-ga (žin), a mythical person, 131, 134-6, 190 (name).
- Tsen-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-tê), 60 n.

TSIBIKOV, G. Ts., *Buddisk Palomnik u sviatun Tibeta*, 12 n. 2, 20 n. 9.

Tsi-shi, m., 38 & n. 1. S.a. Chi-shih.

Tsog-ro, di. = Cog°, Tshog°, 58.

Ts'o-ngara, lake = Sño-rañs-mtsho, q.v., 4 n. 4.

Tsoñ-ka, Great & Little (Amdo), 12, 60.

Tsoñ-kha-pa, a Tibetan divine, 12, 59-60.

Tsoñ-la, m. (Amdo), 59.

Ts'o-schdyara = Skya-reñs-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; l. 64.

T'ukuhun, p. = T'u-yü-hun, q.v., 26.

T'ung-ho ('river'), (Rgyal-roñ re.), 17, 65, 67 n. 2.

T'ung-i-chou, t. & di. (Kan-su), 53.

Tun-huang, t. (Turkestan), 10, 13, 42-4, 58, 61, 112. S.a. Ch'ien-fo-tung, Sha-chou.

Turfan, t. (Turkestan), 24.

Turk, p. 24, 153 (Sha-t'ö, q.v.), l. 24; w., 23 n. 2, 24, 33 n. 1, 88.

'Turquoise Lake' = Koko-nor, 34.

'Turquoise Valleys', 34. S.a. 'Yü Valleys, Great & Little'.

'Turquoise Wood', 31. S.a. G-yu-tshal.

T'u-yü-hun, p. (Amdo), 15, 26, 28, 31, 33 n. 1, 36, 41 n. 3, 44-5, 51-2, 52 n. 4; l., 28, 116.

'Twelve Cities' (mythical), 235.

Tz'u-chih, ri. = Su-ki, Tsze-she, q.v., 37-8, 50 & n. 8, 51.

Tzū-ku, t. & di. = Tse-kou, q.v., l., 81.

Tzū-ta-ti, di. (on T'ung ri.), 65. S.a. Seutati, l., 72-3.

## U, V

'Valley of the Winds' (Byañ-thañ re.), 44.

VIAL, P., *Les Lolos*, 143.

## W

WADDELL, L. A., *Ancient Historical Edicts at Lhasa*, 260 n.

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; l., 73, 89; w., 90-1, 94.

Wei, ri. (Shen-hsi), 12, 27, 53-4, 57.

Wei-chou, di. (Pai-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.'

Wo-jih, Wok-je(še), Wok-shih, st. = Ho-gzi, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2.

WOLFENDEN, S. N., (1) \**Notes on the Jyárung 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-zi, st. = Ho-gzi, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Wu, an early Ch'iang chief, 40.

Wu-i-Yüan-chien, an early Ch'iang chief, 39, 40. S.a. Bu-ik-wan-kiëm.

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.

WYLIE, A., \**Ethnography of the After Han Dynasty* (trans. from the Hou Han-shu), 17 n. 2, 34 n. 2, 36 n. 1, 37 nn. 2, 4, 38, 43, 44, 135, 154, & elsewhere in notes pp. 39-58.

## Y

- Yab-nal-ldehi-thol-phrom, a mythical person, 133-5, 143, 190 (name).  
 Yab-sten-rngan-gyi-ñer-ba, id. 133, 190 (name).  
 Ya-chou, t. (Ssü-ch'uan), 11, 18, 34, 52, 69, 153-4.  
 'Yak Tribe' (Ch'iang) = Li-niu, Li-gu, 40 & n. 4, 41, 52 & n. 5.  
 'Yak-cow river' = Hbri-chu, q.v.  
 Yākhā, l.; w., 98.  
 Ya-lung, ri. = Ñag-chu, q.v., 3, 11, 15, 19, 20, 65, 81.  
 Yang-tse-chiang, ri., 2 = Hbri-chu, q.v.  
 Yang-t'ung, p. (Byañ-thañ), 14-15, 26, 31.  
 Yañ-tig, p. (Amdo), 59.  
 Yar-luñ, t. & di. (S. Tibet), 14.  
 Yar-mo-thañ ('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. = Giën, 40-3, 49, 55.  
 Yen-mang, a Ch'iang p. (Ssü-ch'uan), 53, 56.  
 Yen Shih-ku (Jen-ši-ku), a commentator, 46.  
 Yog districts, 5-6.  
 'Yü Valleys, Great & Little', (Kokonor), 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. (Ssü-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, 153-4; l., 78-9, 87, 90-9. S.a. 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.  
 Žañ-žuñ, st. (Kailāsa re.), 14 & n. 1, 152; l., 168, 206-11, 373; w., 328, 373.  
 Zar-phur, a place in Skyi, 110.  
 Zi-liñ, t. = Hsi-ning, 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-thañ, Ch'iang chief & p. = Shao-tang, q.v., 41.  
 Zun-ga, Zung-gak, Žuñ-kak, Zur-ga, st. = Brdzun-ḡag, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2.

PRINTED IN  
GREAT BRITAIN  
AT THE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS  
OXFORD  
BY  
CHARLES BATEY  
PRINTER  
TO THE  
UNIVERSITY

5

5

10

10

15

15

20

20

25

25

30

30

35

35

40

40

45

45

Handwritten text in an Indic script, likely Grantha or Tamil, covering the main body of the page. The text is arranged in approximately 45 lines, with some lines being partially obscured by a tear or shadow at the top of the page.





45  
 45  
 50  
 55  
 60

65  
 70  
 75  
 80



85  
 85  
 90  
 90  
 95  
 95  
 100  
 100  
 105  
 105  
 110  
 110  
 115  
 115  
 120  
 120



125 125  
 125  
 125

130 130  
 130

135 135  
 135

140 140  
 140

145 145  
 145

150 150  
 150

155 155  
 155

160 160  
 160

165 165  
 165

170 170  
 170

175 175  
 175

Handwritten text in a South Indian script (likely Grantha or Tamil) with frequent use of 'su' and 'ka' characters. The text is organized into lines, with some lines containing numbers on both sides (e.g., 125 on both left and right). The script is dense and appears to be a form of Sanskrit or Prakrit.



165 *[Handwritten text]*  
 170 *[Handwritten text]*  
 175 *[Handwritten text]*  
 180 *[Handwritten text]*  
 185 *[Handwritten text]*  
 190 *[Handwritten text]*  
 195 *[Handwritten text]*  
 200 *[Handwritten text]*

165

170

175

180

185

190

195

200





205 205  
 210 210  
 215 215  
 220 220  
 225 225  
 230 230  
 235 235  
 240 240  
 245 245



250  
 255  
 260  
 265  
 270  
 275  
 280  
 285  
 290

250  
 255  
 260  
 265  
 270  
 275  
 280  
 285  
 290



295  
 300  
 305  
 310  
 315  
 320  
 325

295  
 300  
 305  
 310  
 315  
 320  
 325



॥ अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३३० अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३३५ अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३४० अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३४५ अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३५० अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३५५ अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ ३६० अथ भद्रं कर्णेभिः शृणुयान् भगवत्पाठं ॥  
 ॥ दक्षिणहस्तं पश्यन् पूर्वमुखी भवेत् ॥  
 ॥ शिरसाच्छिद्यं शिरो हस्तौ च भवेत् ॥







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 *Skya-reñs l.*
- Main caravan routes as - - - - -
- Chinese frontier wall as - - - - -

**SPELLINGS**

Tibetan and Chinese names in orthographic transcription, where ascertained, e.g. Bum-thañ (Bhutan), Dkañ-mdzes (Kanzé), Hbah-thañ (Batang), Hbri-chu (Dre-chu), Hsi-ning (Sining), No-log (Golok), Phag-ri (Phari), Sbra-nag (Panakha-sum), Sde-dge (Derge), Skyid-groñ (Kyirong), Thañ-lha (Tang-la): see 'Index of Proper Names.'

Other names as reported or usual.

