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PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*September 1947*
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ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

Pp. vi, 27, 31, 333: In identifying the Ḥjaṅ 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 Ḥldyaṅ (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 Ḥbri-čhu (upper Yang-tse-chiang), S. the mountain ‘Gakra-gangri’. The ‘capital’ was Batang (Ḥbah-thaṅ).

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


P. 74: Add to the list of languages the Kioutse (d’Orléans, nos. 27, 29) or Kiu-tzū, occasionally cited infra (see p. 459). Belonging, like the Mélam and Louštse/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 Ḥjus of Geografia Tibet, p. 42.

Pp. 89 n. 2, 90, Dge-ši-tshu: 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-bes-tshis. In the numerals cited infra (p. 90) 'aṇḍa, given by Haenisch as = 20, should, no doubt, be ‘14’, ‘4’ being ‘da (Ḥör-pa kha): ‘20’ would resemble Ḥör-pa naskā, since ‘30’,  sku-sk’a, and ‘40’, wa-sk’a, correspond to Ḥör-pa eṣskā, lēskā.

P. 154, Bo-lo-tse: The language of this people, the Polotseeu 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 Ḥphyah, l. 298, and read Ḥpus-ḥphyah in p. 428.
I. INTRODUCTION
A. GENERAL

GEOGRAPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The great country which on the maps is labelled 'Tibet' extends, from Rudok in the west to Ta-chien-lu = Dar-chen-do in the east, over about 22 degrees of longitude, and, from the Himalaya in the south to the Kuen-lun and Altyn-Tâgh in the north, over about 11 degrees of latitude. Owing to the inverse curvature of the great mountain ranges on the north and south it presents a rather oval contour. Somewhat more visually it may be compared to a left hand placed flat with palm downwards upon a board pointing eastwards with a slight declivity in that direction. The wrist will then be the region where Kuen-lun, Karakoram, and western Himalaya approach each other in the Ladak countries; and the back of the hand, with, say, half the length of the fingers, may represent the great 'north plain', Byaṅ-thañ, which has its greatest general altitude in the north-west, where the Byaṅ-chên-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-sarover 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\(^1\) range of mountains, and to allow the river which the Tibetans call Rma-chu, 'Peacock River',\(^2\) only a rather contracted exit into...

---

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

\(^2\) The name, in Hsi-hsia ma-šuo (Lauffer, 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-byas), 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. 1 Between the two groups, and receiving great tributaries from the southern flanks of the Bayankara, lies the course of that river which of all those descending from the Tibetan plateau into China has its sources farthest to the west, namely the Ḥbri-chu (Di-chu, Dre-chu, i.e. ‘Yak-cow River’) of the Tibetans, 2 or, as it approaches China, the Chin-sha-chiang (‘Gold-sand River’) or, in China, the Yang-tse-chiang. The forefinger, which bounds the course of the upper Ḥbri-chu on the south, is a great area of snow mountains wherein is distinguished on the north the Tang-la, of which the western continuation is not definitely known, but which to the travellers coming from the north presents the most imposing spectacle that they have encountered. 3 More to the south, and extending eastwards between the Tengri-Nor (Nam-tsho) lake and Lha-sa, is the Ğnan-chen-Thaaṅ-la, 4 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 Hue and Gabet (i, p. 274) the water of the river begins to be yellow only after its entry into China; but Dr. Tafel (ii, p. 290, with an erroneous etymology) finds it ‘yellow-gray’ as high up as its knee.

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

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

2 The other spellings, Brius (Marco Polo), Polei-chou (Hue and Gabet, ii, p. 119, evidently heard from a Chinaman), Di-chu (Prejevalsky, ii, pp. 221, 306), Dréch’s (Rockhill, p. 196, n. 2), Bri-chu, all represent the Tibetan word Ḥbri, ‘yak-cow’, with its ancient (bri) or modern (dri, di) pronunciation: the N’jeh which Gill heard at Ba-thaṅ (The River of Golden Sand, ed. Baber, 1883, p. 44) is merely the modern E.-Tibetan pronunciation of Ḥbri: see p. 76. On the Mongol name, Muru (or Murus)-usu, see Prejevalsky, Rockhill (whose objections in regard to Ḥbri are unavailing), locc. cit., and Tafel, ii, p. 28 n.

3 See Hue 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. graṅś (‘cold’, ‘icy’), is given in the Dictionary of S. C. Das as Daṅ-la and by the Panchen whose itinerary is mentioned infra as Ldaṅ-la, in which Ldaṅ is ambiguous and la = ‘mountain pass’ or, metonymously, ‘high mountain’.

4 Ğnan-chen-Thaṅ-lha (the spelling of the Geografia Tibet, p. 2) means
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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 Byaṅ-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;¹ the Littledales, whose journey from Cer-cen and the Tokuz-Dawān was in a north–south direction and traversed the Byaṅ-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 Byaṅ-thañ, as far east as the main routes from Lha-sa to the north and northwest, the chief obstacle to travel is the scarcity of drinkable water. As the general level declines eastwards without a corresponding reduction in the heights of the great mountain ranges,² the deepening depressions become the valleys of rivers, which in some cases, after descending from their parent glaciers, have over immense distances a quite moderate fall. The most familiar example of this is, of course, the Brahmaputra; but both the Ḥbri-chu and the Rma-chu traverse vast stretches of than country in this manner; and on a smaller scale some of the rivers embraced by the Ḥbri-chu and its southern barrier, the Tang-la—for instance the Dza-chu, or upper Me-kong—may exhibit the same feature; and certainly in the Koko-nor region the T'ao-river has a long than course from west to east between mountain ranges before making at Min-chou a right-angle bend which ultimately brings it through a deep trough to the Rma-chu, somewhat west of Lan-chou. The great Na(g)-chu, or Ya-lung river, which with its tributaries issues from the southern slopes of the Bayankara range and ultimately

¹ 'The further west the lower the mountains' (Tafel, ii, p. 33).
² 'The valleys descend from W. to E. quicker than the mountain heights' (Dutreuil de Rhins, ii, p. 180).
joins the Hbri-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, 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 Hbri-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, 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. The Rma-chu, after its short uppermost course, passes through the two lakes, Charing-nor and Oring-nor, at an elevation of about 14,000 feet; with many windings at the foot of the great Amne Rma-chen range of

1 Cf. Tafel, ii. p. 169 (the Hbri-chu).
2 Rockhill, p. 380; Filechner, Om Mani Padme Hum, p. 168, 4,670 metres. Dr. Tafel's crossing, some distance north of Jyekundo, was at 3,650 metres (ii. p. 134).
3 Ba-t'ang (Ba-thań) is about 8,200 ft. above sea-level (Rockhill, Diary, p. 393).
4 As the correct spelling of these names Rockhill gives (p. 173, n. 1) Ts'aring and Noring with Tibetan etymology accordingly. Grenard has (iii. p. 206) Kya-ring and Ngo-ring. Tafel follows (ii. p. 15, n. 2) Rockhill, stating, however, that the names are Mongol, and adding, however, a reference to a text which gives Tibetan etymologies partly identical with those of Rockhill but with spellings Ts'o-scho-yara and Ts'o-ngora: he further cites Ş. C. Das's spelling of the name Ts'aring as Skya-reňś. Ş. C. Das in his Dictionary states that Skya-reňś is the name of a lake which is the source of the Yang-ťse-chiang. No doubt the really correct spelling is that of the Geografia Tibetâ (p. 2), viz. Skya-reňś and Sińo-reňś (reňś ?).
5 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. Filechner's narrative (Das Rätel des Mateschü, pp. 95 sqq.) or by the modern maps.

In the name Amne, Amye, 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; 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\(^\circ\)), 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-chow with a height of 5,400 feet.  

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

Where there are mountain slopes and higher parts of valleys unsuitable for settlements, but allowing of nomadic pasturage, those districts are known as hbrog, and the nomads, tent-dwellers, are hbrog-pa (Dokpa). In many of the rohs 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 roh, 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. Filehner, adds (Das Rätsel des Matschû, 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 Tibet a gives the name of the range as Rma-chen-sbom-ra, 'Great Peacock vast region', Prejevalsky's Amnimanchenponra, which Rockhill (loc. cit.) found 'horrible'. The Dictionary of S. C. Das clinches the matter by interpreting the expression as: 'name of the great genius of the gshi-belay (ground-lord) class, the lord of the peacocks, who resides in the snowy mountain of Spom-ra of the province of Amdo.'

1 For a view see Tafel, ii, Plate LXVI.
2 Concerning the figures for Kuei-tê and Lan-chow see Rockhill, p. 376, *Diary*, p. 387.
4 *Geografia Tibet*, p. 41, adding three subsidiary ones. An old Bon-po work (MS.) enumerates four.
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’. Šods are flat districts,¹ where the high mountains end: we hear of the ‘Eighteen Šods’ 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’ (gdaqs) 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 Altn-tagh, are for the most part arid and those few rivers which rise beyond the first ranges have a course over barren thanṣ 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, sganṣ. As readers of Fathers Huc and Gabet’s famous work will realize, and as appears at least equally from the published itineraries, Chinese and Nepalese,² of the grand route from Lha-sa to Pe-king, which, after a slightly northerly detour to Chamdo on the Dza-chu, follows approximately the 30th parallel of latitude, the journey via Ba-than³ and Li-than to Ta-chien-lu is one of perpetual ascents to passes and descents from the same.

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

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

3 Op. cit., iii, pp. 180-1; also by Dr. Tafel, ii, pp. 196, 277.
4 Om Mani Padme Hum, p. 70.
5 ii, pp. 196, 200, 248, 277.
6 Rockhill, Index s.v. 'Foresta'; Tafel, ii, pp. 172, 188-9, 196, &c. Similarly Gill and others.
7 Rockhill, pp.196, 239, 242, Diary, pp. 262, 297, 328; Tafel, ii, pp. 185, 241.
8 Gill, The River of Golden Sand, ii, p. 138; 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; Ferguson, Adventure, &c., on the Tibetan Steppes, (facings) pp. 74, 194; d'Ollone, p. 208; Tafel, ii, Plates L, LV, LVII; Stötzner, Ins unerforschte Tibet, pp. 160, 181.
Odontala; and the chief difficulties are the fierce winds on the swampy thanś 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 Hue 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.¹ 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 Mānasā-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 Ūbri-chu as far west as the Tang-La pass, is sometimes applied to the districts of eastern and even north-eastern Tibet in general; but it may be doubted whether the Tibetans ever think of the Koko-nor region or the Go-lok country to its south as Khams. It may be most convenient to restrict the term Khams to the country south of the Bayankara range, and to attribute the entire area to the north thereof, including the whole of the Rma-chu valley and the Koko-nor region, to Amdo (i.e. Mdo).²

¹ Hue and Gabet, ii, pp. 126–8; Rockhill, Diary, pp. 158, 214, 219 n.: see also infra, p. 13.
² The expression 'Mdo-Khams' is used in the Geografia 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 Ssu-ch'uan-Chinese rule; but, unless for Lha-sa we substitute 'Tibet proper', that definition would be too comprehensive. Rockhill (pp. 61, 188) defines Khams as eastern Tibet. On the country and people see Sandberg, Tibet and the Tibetans, pp. 154–8.

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

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

From the knee westwards the northern watershed of the Rma-chu is the Amne Rma-chen range of mountains, having a more or less north-west to south-east direction. At its western end it is separated by one or two parallel, but less considerable, ranges, Wahong-shan, Amne Bayan, &c., from the low country to the south and south-west of the Koko-nor; and these same ranges by their north-western projection, approaching the mountains of the south Koko-nor range, narrow the watershed between the Koko-nor region proper and the low-lying (9,000–10,000 ft.) districts (Baron, Jun, Taichinar, Hajjar, Gass, &c.) of the great salt-morass of the Tsaidam. These districts, lining the Tsaidam on the south, are backed by a succession of ranges, Burkhan Buddha range, Marco Polo range, Bokalik range, Chimen-tagh, which separate them from the Tibetan plateau, Byaⁿ-thaⁿ, 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. 3

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

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

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

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

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

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

For the purposes of this study (ethnographic, linguistic, and historical) not much needs to be premised in the way of topography; indeed most of the modern names on the maps are, as regards ancient times, un instructive or misleading. Mention has been made of Lha-sa, important as the capital of the great Tibetan Btson-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, Kanzê on the Ya-lung river, or Na(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'a-o river are two places, Shin-se and T'ao-chou, which figure in the Sino-Tibetan wars, and on the lower south-north course of the same river are some places, Min-chou and Ti-tao-chou and others, attested in far earlier times; on the Ta-hsia river, which reaches the Hoang-ho some distance west of the T'a-o, is Ho-chou, originally Ga-cu, an early centre of Buddhism, now of Islam. East of the Koko-nor lake is Hsi-ning, in Tibetan Zi-lin, 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, Tonkhor, Donkyr, Dungkor,

1 According to Rockhill, p. 242, = Tibetan Dkars-mdzes.
2 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).
3 Views in Futterer, i, Plate XXXIV, and p. 442.
4 Description in Tafel, i, p. 159.
5 See infra, p. 41, and ref.
6 Part view in Tafel, i, Plate XXXVI.
7 JRAS. 1927, p. 552 (for Ga-lu read Ga-cu), Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 87.
8 Views in Tafel, i, Plates XLV, XLVI, L. Rockhill gives (p. 49) other, European, forms of the name, Sin-ju (Marco-Polo), Seilin, Selining, Silin, &c. (Oratio de la Penna). Cf. Prejevalsky (Yule), ii, pp. 300-1.
9 Various forms of the name in Ritter, Geographie, iv, p. 217; Richthofen, i, p. 260; Rockhill, p. 109. Views in Futterer, i, pp. 259-69, ii, p. 61; Tafel, i, Plate XXXVIII.
Tang-keou-eul; and at about 20 miles south-west of Hsi-ning (Rockhill, p. 41) is Kum-bum, originally Hgo-boms, where is the famous group of Buddhist monasteries. Also near to Kum-bum was Tsoñ-ka, Great and Little, known many centuries before 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 Chi-ang, and later the Tibetans, and the Chinese becomes topographically clear, several other localities in this Koko-nor region will acquire definiteness. Specially to be noticed on the map is the subsidiary Great Wall, branching off south of Liang-chou in Kan-su, winding over the Nan-shan, crossing the Ta-t'ung-ho, and embracing Hsi-ning; after passing between Hsi-ning and Tankar it crosses the Hoang-ho and then curves round as far as the vicinity of Ho-chou.

In China proper two places, Sung-p'an, originally Sung-chou, 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 Chi-ang and the Chinese during the centuries immediately preceding and following the beginning of the Christian era. From Lan-chou northwards, at the foot of the Nan-shan and passing successively through the ancient garrison towns of Liang-chou (Lem-cu, Wu-wei), Kan-chou (Chang-yih), Su-chou (Chiu-ch'uan),

1 See Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 87.
2 Views in Rockhill, p. 57, Diary, p. 26; Tafel, i, Plates XLVI–XLIX: Filehner, Kumbum (1933), passim; Tsibikov, Buddhist Pałomník u sviatun Tíbea, pp. 23, 30, 36.
3 J.R.A.S. 1927, p. 552: mentioned also in the Tibetan manuscript Chronicle and in the 8th century inscriptions of Lha-sa.
4 Highlands of Tibet and Surrounding Regions, Dehra Dun (1937 ?).
5 Here noted by Huc and Gabet, i, p. 293; Rockhill, Diary, p. 94; in the Ta-t'ung-ho valley by Prejevalsky, ii, p. 73; in the Hsi-ning valley by Rockhill, p. 97. The inner line which passes by P'ing-fan and crosses the Hoang-ho near Hsin-ch'êng (about 30 miles west of Lan-chou) has been noted by Rockhill, p. 42, Diary, p. 60; and a portion may be seen in a photograph by Futterer, ii, p. 39. In A.D. 822 the Chinese envoy Yuan-ting saw to the north-west of the Lung-ch'uan valley, where the Huang river joins the Hoang-ho, 'the ancient fortifications of Koshu Han, of which there was still much remaining' (Bushell, J.R.A.S. 1880, p. 519).
6 Bushell, J.R.A.S. 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;¹ and the fact assumes for them a great practical importance, since it is only after passing the Tang-la that they meet with that determined official opposition which diverts them, either eastwards or westwards, from any further approach to Lha-sa. But we have more intimate evidence in the form of a diary² of a journey by the Pan-chen Blo-bzaṅ Dpal-lidan Ye-ses, of Tashihunpo,³ who in A.D. 1779 travelled from Lha-sa to Pe-king via the Koko-nor region, Kan-su, and Inner Mongolia. As far as Nag-chu-kha,⁴ the first settlement south of the Tang-la, he is in Tibet proper, 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’,⁵ occupying parts of the country east, west, and south-west of the Koko-nor, also the Tsaidam; when he comes to Tankar and Kum-bum he is in Amdo; and at Hsi-ning, the head-quarters of the Chinese administration of north-eastern Tibet, he is in China, Rgya.

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

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

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 Sroṅ-bsan Sgam-po's kingdom. The inhabitants are Tibetans, and their speech is rather normal Tibetan. But how far north into the actual Byaṅ-thaṅ Tibetan authority and Tibetan race extended among the very sparse nomad population is a matter in regard to which we have no light. North of the Tang-la must certainly have been the people mentioned by the Chinese T'ang Annals under the name Yang-t'ung.⁴

¹ The Tibetan manuscript Chronicle attributes the event to a year corresponding to circa A.D. 644. For a reference to the same occurrence see Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 54. The dynastic name of the Žaṅ-juṅ kings was Lig.
² See JRAS. 1933, pp. 405-10.
³ Of this event an account, translated from Chinese, was given by Pauthier in the Asiatic Journal for 1836 (July and August), reproduced by Prinsep in JASB. vi (1837), pp. 69 sqq., and subsequently in the Indian Antiquary, ix, p. 20: with much additional information the matter was treated by Lévi in the Journal Asiatique, ix. xv (1900), pp. 279 sqq.
⁴ See Bushell, p. 527 (9).
which seems to be only a representation of Byaṅ-thaṅ. According to the Chinese1 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 li2 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 Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po made his first expedition to the north to attack the T'u-yū-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 Byaṅ-thaṅ, even if used by the people themselves, is quite indecisive, since both its elements, byaṅ, 'north', and thaṅ, '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 'Tākpa' of Hodgson,3 is a clearly Tibetan dialect. Farther east and south-east the Tibetans recognize, in the south-eastern corner of their country, only semi-human cannibal beings, Blo-bkra4 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 Sroṅ-btsan Sgam-po's original kingdom. For, although the upper part of the next great river to the east, the Na(g)-chu or Ya-lung, is lined with states, Derge, Zog-chen, Hor-khog, &c.,5 having at

1 Bushell, p. 527 (9) and p. 520 (73).
2 The li varies between \( \frac{1}{2} \) and \( \frac{3}{4} \) of a mile, depending partly upon the time required by the route.
4 The Lo-tawa (‘karpo and ‘nakpo) of maps.
5 In the Geografia Tibet, p. 47, the names of the states are given as Sde-dge, Rdzogs-chen, and Hor-khog, the last-named consisting of the five states Khān-gsar, Ma-si, 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, Horchok; 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)-roñ 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 Menia of Hodgson, the Menia of Baber.’

We must take some exception to the philology of Rockhill's statement; for a Mi-ña man is mentioned in Tibetan company in an eighth-century document from Chinese Turkestan, and the name is otherwise also known in the old literature (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 263, n. 1) and also in old Bon-po manuscripts. Thus the real name of the river is Ñag, and the modern 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-ña language, as represented by Hodgson's lists, has many Tibetan affinities and apparently not a few borrowings; but it has also definite features which associate it with another group. For applying to the people the term Ch'iang we have no authority, and, considering their rather southern habitat, it might seem venturesome to do so; they had, however, neighbours who certainly belonged to that ethnic group.

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

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

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

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

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

4 JASB. xxii (1853), pp. 143 sqq.
Ta-chien-lu; afterwards, as the T'ung-ho, it falls into the Min near Kia-ting. The country has a Tibetan name, Rgyal-mo-roñ, 'Queen's (King's ?)1 gorge', and it is the 'Gyárúng' 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,2 was not alien to Chi'iang ideas, has a

---

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

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

The Gyárung of the Linguistic Survey volume (i. ii) and Dr. Lauffer's Jyarun, Dr. Wolfenden Jyd-rûn, ignore the fact that the term is Tibetan.

It is, however, possible that the Rgyal(-roñ) of the Geografia Tibetana is itself an etymologizing perversion of a non-Tibetan tribal name Gyar, now pronounced Jyar: this is suggested by the numerous place-names, Gyarlung, Gyartang, Gyardo, Gypa, Gypa, recorded in the Macheu 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.

considerable interest, because undoubtedly So-mo and, perhaps, all the states of the Rgyal-ron, were in earlier times part of the 'Women's Kingdom', famous in the Sui and T'ang Annals and in Chinese popular knowledge as Nū-kuo. 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, 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. From east to west was 9 days' journey, from north to south 20 days. The state included over 80 'cities', large and small. The people were scattered in mountain valleys.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

¹ Bushell, pp. 473, 532; Rockhill, p. 340.
² The people of Dmar-khams (SW. of Ba-’ang) also are described
(p. 44) as ‘savage and coarse and in language resembling the Mi-na’.
So generally in E. Tibet, Rockhill, p. 196; Gill, pp. 198–9, 227–8, &c.;
Tafel, ii, pp. 172, 196–7, &c.
⁴ See infra, pp. 71, 89.
⁵ Cf. Fergusson, op. cit., pp. 126, 255.
communicates. The Rgyal-ron language has, as was remarked by Hodgson in 1853, and by von Rosthorn’s editor, Professor Conrady, in 1897, a special feature, namely possession of syllabic, classificatory, prefixes, which is less prominent in other ‘Hsi-fan’ languages.¹

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

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

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

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

It is not worth while to cite the names of particular settlements and tribes recorded by modern travellers or entered on the maps.³ The localities are not likely to be ancient; and the tribal divisions may have been continuously fluid, as they are stated to have been in early centuries. Possibly the Me-tsang tribe, placed on the map some distance to the south of the Rma-chu knee, 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).

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

‘At early dawn there was a sudden hush 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 reined peacefully in the snow, leaving it to cover them with a warm counterpane. Rather too warm, if anything! When at our summons they awoke, their first care was to throw back their cloaks and bathe their bodies in the freezing wind.’

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

---

\(^1\) Rockhill, pp. 337–8.

\(^2\) Dr. Filechner mentions (\textit{Om Mani Padme Hum}, p. 145) their ‘modern weapons’.

\(^3\) Filchner, \textit{Das Rätzel}, &c., pp. 200, 364; d’Ollone, pp. 232, 250, 268, 274.
The Panak’a occupy, as has been stated, extensive areas of Hbrog country, both on the north and on the south-west of the Koko-nor. Their western neighbours are the Mongols, whose settlements and encampments are found both on the north of the actual Tsaidam swamp, as far as the Sirtin district in the extreme north, and also to the south of it along the route to Charklik in Chinese Turkestan. Also on routes diverging westwards from Bokalik, where there are ancient gold workings, and the Hajjar district, to the Tokuz-dawān and Cer-cen in Chinese Turkestan, the very sparse population is Mongol; moreover, immediately to the west, and also to the east, of the Koko-nor itself are Mongol settlements, and even as far down the Hoang-ho valley as the mouth of the Ta-t’ung-ho river there is an old Mongol population.¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 Huang-ch'ing-chih-kung-t'u, Book V.  
2 Pp. 162, 165.  
3 Diary, p. 96 (Hsi-ning Fu hsin chih).  
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 Hbri-chu), the Barôn and Jûn, 'Right and Left', districts in the Tsaidam, Odontala ('Star-plain', =Tibetan Skar-ma-thañ) by the uppermost Rma-chu, &c., are due either to this domination or to the long ecclesiastical connexion between Mongolia, Kum-bum, and Lha-sa. The Pan-chen Dpal-ldan Ye-ses, as we have seen (p. 13), regards the whole of Amdo west of the Koko-nor as Stod-Sog, 'Upper Mongolia'. All such names and also the Mongol 'Banners' and settlements in the Tsaidam and the Koko-nor districts, and among the Panák'as and elsewhere farther south, have to be erased from the picture.

The pre-Mongol Tangut kingdom, of which the Chinese Annals give a very substantial account,1 was under a Ch'iâng (Tang-shiang) dynasty, and its language, the Hsi-hsia, was presumably a Ch'iâng 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, Sroñ-btsan Sgam-po, having in his application for a Chinese princess as a consort received a rebuff, which he attributed to the T'u-yû-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'iâng tribes, and at the head of an army of over 200,000 men, encamped on the western border of Sungchou (Sung-p'an), whence he sent envoys to the emperor.'2

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

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

---

1 See Bichurin, Istoria Tibet i Khukhumora, ii, pp. 1–164.
2 Bushell, p. 444.
as suzerain. In Amdo during the remainder of the seventh century and the first part of the eighth the conflicts took place usually in the country between the Koko-nor and the Rma-chu; and the peace of A.D. 730 between Chinese, Tibetans, Hjañ (Tang-hsiang), and Drug (Torks of Central Asia), was commemorated on the part of the Tibetans by a great Buddhist foundation, established near the frontier then fixed in the Byarmo-thañ district, west of the Koko-nor. We may, therefore, understand that the Chinese were still maintaining their ancient administrative area within the above-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 at Kharkhoto 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

---

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

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

The Tang-hsiang kingdom, 5 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 Tang 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 direction.

---

1 Geografía 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.

2 For notices see Rockhill, pp. 217–18, 275, Diary (Index); Tafel, ii, pp. 82, 185, 199, 220, 236, 240, 246; d’Ollone, p. 212; Futterer, i, p. 279; Edgar, p. 63; Fergusson, pp. 104, 200, 242, 249–50.


4 Bushell, loc. cit.

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

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

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

1 Bushell, p. 531 (42); Rockhill, p. 340.  
2 Rockhill, p. 338.  
3 In the Sui Annals these numbers are stated, more moderately, as 5,000 and 1,000 respectively.  
4 'The most common, indeed the only industry of the 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.¹

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-hsia-hung 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 furnish² 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-hsia-hung,³ with a dynastic name, in Tibetan Hjaṅ, which may be identical with that of its predecessor. The interest of this

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

The Pailan,¹ who by the Chinese are located to the south-west
of the T’u-yu-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-Ildan Ye-ses’ diary
styled ‘Upper Mongolia’. Except that their western neighbours
were the To-mi, or Tang-mi²—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.³ 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-yu-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-yu-hun, expelled in
A.D. 663, passing unmentioned—was described as the monastery
of the ‘De-ga G-yu-tshal’ (‘De Turquoise Forest’), the suffix ga

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

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

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

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, no doubt their administrative centre. We then digress to two great cities of western Kan-su, which at the time were under Tibetan authority, exercised, as from other references also appears, through the Bde Council. Returning to Amdo, we come to the Tibetan official in command of the ‘Thousand-district’ Phyug-tsams, the term ‘Thousand-district’ which denotes probably an area of about 1,000 households, being well

---

3 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 61–2, 87, 108–9, &c.
4 JRAS. 1928, p. 98.
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evidenced in Chinese Turkestan, both contemporary and prior. Nor does it seem doubtful that Phyug-tsams is the same as the capital of the T'u-yü-hun, Fussū ch'ēng, 15 li west of the Kokonor, which had walls but was not lived in. It was, in fact, a 'great mart' and not different from the 'great mart' (khrom-chen-po) of the Dbyar-mo-thaṅ, mentioned in another document; the Chinese syllable represented by Fu was in early times sounded bhyuk. There cannot have been two 'great marts' in the thaṅ country adjoining the Kokonor on the west.

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

---

1 The expression in its Tibetan form (*ston-sde*) was current in Tibet and Chinese Turkestan during the 8th century A.D. (*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, i, pp. 283–4; ii, pp. 315–16). But an equivalent was also used by the Chinese in W. Kan-su (L. Giles, *B.S.O.S.* vi, pp. 831–2, vii, p. 850); and the T'u-yü-hun had officials over 'Thousands' (Bichurin, *Geografia*, 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 Turkic, Ğn-baší, yüz-baší, and min-baší (*Orientalisches Archiv*, ii, p. 29).


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

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

5 The alternation *by*/*gy* (*g-yi*), 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’,\(^1\) often mentioned by the Later Han Annals\(^2\) 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-shon-po, Ch’ing-hai, Koko-nor) of the Tibetans, Chinese and Mongols, but the ‘Turquoise Lake’ (G-yu-mtsho).\(^3\)

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,\(^4\) 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,\(^5\) in editing and discussing three little songs in that people’s speech, which, being included in the Later Han Annals,\(^6\) are the oldest known composition in Tibeto-Burman, adopts the transliteration Bair-lang; and, although a philological justification of this is not visible in Professor Karlgren’s Analytical Dictionary or other familiar authorities, the double pronunciation in ordinary Chinese and the double form of the word (h(p)aku, biaku) in Japanese, suggest that in the history of the word there may have been confusion of synonyms. If the form Bair is justifiable, it would tend to justify also the reading of the same sign in the Koko-nor region as Byar, which better suits the Japanese biaku. But perhaps that is not necessary; for in the same region we have evidence of -ar becoming

---

\(^1\) The two are perhaps recognizable in Rockhill’s account of his first journey, pp. 125–7 (‘the valleys of the Buhagol and Dulangol’).


\(^3\) One of the Tibetan manuscripts has G-yu-mtsho-shon-mo, ‘Blue Turquoise Lake’.

\(^4\) Bushell, p. 531 (42).


\(^6\) Wylie, who translated the songs (op. cit., pp. 239–41), spells the name as Pih-lang.
-e, and the Byar-mo-thaṅ may have been locally a Bye-mo-thaṅ = the G-ye-mo mentioned supra (p. 34).

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

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

The Tibetan records furnish also some slight further indication of the extent of the De or Bde district, which, being the centre of an authority covering, as does the present Chinese administration at Hsi-nings, places in Western Kan-su (Mkhar-tsang 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, and it applies not only to the above-mentioned Mkhar-tsang and Kva-cu, but to other localities also. But the centre of administration, Bde-gams, which perhaps means 'Bde posting-station', and likewise 'Bde-sum Wood', though both are mentioned as having been places of 'assemblies', i.e., no doubt, the summer and winter conferences and musters of the Tibetan civil and military powers, have names topographically uninstructive. More significant, no doubt, is a reference to 'Lyon-jeṅ in Bde' in a document emanating from a T'u-yū-hun queen of Tibetan birth. From the context it is certain that the place was in T'u-yū-hun territory, and it seems highly probable that it was identical with Liung-ch'ęng, which the

---

1 Concerning -ar/-e and concerning the equivalence of g-yar and byar see infra, p. 367, also pp. 243, 290.
2 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 48.
4 Ibid., p. 10.
maps record under that name, or as Lang-chen, &c., on the Ta-t'ung-ho. It is eminently reasonable that the part of Amdo from which authority was exercised over Western Kan-su should have included the region of Hsi-ning and the Ta-t'ung river, whence Kan-su was reached by ancient routes.\footnote{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 Kokonor and Hsi-ning. Lieutenant Brooke crossed the mountains from Kan-chou direct to Hsi-ning (Fergusson, p. 51). The northern route to Sha-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-chi', with the Hsiang-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.}

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 Kokonor 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,\footnote{Cf. Franke, Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches, ii, p. 63 and Index.} and also in Amdo, one or two separate Ch'iang states and dynasties,
of which the Pailan, T'ang-chang, and Tang-hsiang have been mentioned above.

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

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

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

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

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

Although the ethnographical characteristics ascribed in the *Later Han Annals* compose much the same picture as the Sui and T'ang *Annals* have given (*supra*, pp. 22, 29-30) in regard to the

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

‘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.  

‘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 is ascribed to a certain Wu-i-Yüan-chien (De Groot, Bu-ik-wan-kiem), a fugitive from China, who after some adventures settled between the three

---

2 An instance of this in Tafel, ii, p. 109, who states that on religious grounds the women avoid passing the period in the tent, where the cooking is done.
3 The following account is derived from Wylie, pp. 432 sqq., with references to De Groot, ii, pp. 194 sqq.
4 This trait seems to be normal in the Chinese accounts of the origins of foreign states.
rivers (Hoang-ho, Su-ki = 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.\(^1\) If so, it is the earliest attested common noun in the language. The Hong = Huang river, which is stated\(^2\) to have been a tributary of the Hoang-ho, is evidently, in view of the subsequent history, the Ta-t’ung-ho,\(^3\) 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’\(^4\) tribe, being the Yüeh-sui Ch’iang, another the White Horse\(^5\) stock, the Ch’iang of Kuang-han, a third the ‘Mixed (or Three) Wolves’\(^6\) 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;\(^7\) 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, Giên), 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

\(^1\) Cf. supra, p. 35, and infra, pp. 243, 290.
\(^2\) Wylie, p. 433 n. 2.
\(^3\) This is patent in the statement of the T’ang Annals reproduced by Bushell, op. cit., p. 519: see infra, p. 47 n 3.
\(^4\) Li-niu (De Groot, Li-gu): Yüeh-sui is stated (De Groot, ii, p. 21) to belong to the region of Ning-yüan in S. Ssü-ch’uan.
\(^5\) Pih-ma (De Groot, Pe’-ma).
\(^6\) Tz’an-lang (De Groot, Sam-long).
\(^7\) 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, Te'lan-lang = Sam-lang, 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.¹ But a Seen-tsze = Shan-chieh, Sam-tsia, or Siêm-tsu, tribe, defeated in the period 48–32 B.C., may have a name identical with that of the Samsa, who occupy the southeastern corner² of the Go-lok country, and Lo-tsu suggests a river name, which conceivably might be the Lo-tschu, a tributary of the Ta-hsia.³ Shao-tang = Sio-tong, which continually recurs in the struggles of the first to second centuries A.D., looks very like Zo-than, a place-name⁴ in the Koko-nor region, mentioned in the Tibetan Chronicle. The Yen = Giën tribe can now be more definitely located.

In the period 155–141 B.C.⁵ one Yen chief requested to be entrusted with the defence of the fortified western frontier of Lung-hsi; accordingly he was transferred with his people to the districts (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.⁶

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

¹ Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.
² South of the Min-shan: see d'Ollone, pp. 226, 253; Tafel, ii, pp. 298-9 n.
³ Futterer, i, pp. 391, 398 (Lo-tschê): Tafel seems to identify his Lo-tschê (ii, pp. 299, 301) with the T'ai-ho.
⁴ Identified by Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiue occidentaux (p. 260 n. 1) with a T'ou-yû-hun town, Sho-tum, taken by the Turks in 556 A.D.
⁵ Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.
⁶ See Wylie and De Groot, ibid., and De Groot, i, pp. 21, 41.
⁷ Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197.
⁸ Tibetan Zi-lin. The Siên river (De Groot, ii, p. 207) may be the Ta-tung-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 thereafter abandoned the region of the Huang = Hong-river (Ta-t’ung-ho) and settled on both sides of the ‘Western Sea’ (Hsi-hai, the Koko-nor) and the Salt Lake (Dabasun-nor). The Chinese thereupon built boundary fortifications along the hills, perhaps on the line of the above-mentioned branch of the Great Wall,\(^1\) thereby marking off an administration area, which they perhaps maintained down to the period of the Tibetan wars, when it had the official name Shan-chou.\(^2\)

During the period 73–48 B.C.\(^3\) the Ch’iang recrossed the (Upper) Huang = Hong river and occupied lands to the east of it; and this perhaps accounts for the fact that at the time of the great revolt in 63 B.C. Yen = Giên people of that area play, together with another people named Han, a part in the strategy of the Chinese generals. On that occasion,\(^4\) while the Chinese were proposing to advance up the Hoang-ho from the Lan-chou region, the Governor of Chiu-ch’uan (Su-chou) professed to apprehend Han raids in his own district and proposed to make an expedition over the mountains into Han and Yen territory; this he was ultimately (61 B.C.) authorized to do, his troops being supplied in part by the Governor of Tun-huang and the local (native) chief of Chiu-ch’uan. From this it is evident that the Han territory was farther north than that of the Yen; and confirmation is apparent in the fact that the Han were expected to make an inroad upon Tun-huang\(^5\) as well as Chiu-ch’uan, and in the further fact that the Han people was the last to be reached by the army from the Lan-chou region.

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

\(^1\) Supra, p. 12 n. 5, infra, p. 47 n. 3.
\(^2\) Bushell, p. 528 (17), p. 540 (1), gives Hsiningfu as the equivalent.
\(^3\) Wylie, p. 436; De Groot, ii, p. 199.
\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 209, 212.
\(^6\) Ibid., p. 212.
\(^7\) They were perhaps different from the Han tribe of Wylie, p. 469, whose territory was elsewhere.
place named Hon-cañ-do, in 'Skyi', the name of which should mean 'Hon-city-land' and should contain a tribal name Hon which certainly existed. This place, whence authority was exercised over Sa-cu = Tun-huang, must have been in Bde and was possibly the Bde-gamgs mentioned supra. Since cañ 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.

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, is pointedly distinguished from the Yen = Giên, it seems likely that, though Ch'iang, it did not belong to the Yen = Giên division, the descendants of Yen = Giên. In that division the leaders were the Hsien-ling = Siên-liên, who occupied the vicinity of the Koko-nor and in the second half of the first century B.C. became Shao-tang of the Great and Little Yü Valleys. Under that designation they are frequently mentioned in the Later Han Annals 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; and since the Seeling tribe is mentioned as having made raids as far as Lin-t'ao, which was in the vicinity of Min-chou, at the bend of the T'ao river, it is clear that during this period the Hoang-ho did not constitute a barrier between the tribes to its north and those to its south.

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

1 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 48, 301.
2 See Filehner's map, h 8 (Hung-ku-tsêông, in which ku = 'ancient').
3 Wylie, p. 469.
5 Wylie, pp. 440, 450, 462, 467, and under the names of the successive chiefs paseim.
6 Represented by the present district and city of Chin, south of Lan-chou. Ibid., pp. 433 n. 2, 436 n 1 (Kin-ching), De Groot, i, p. 41 (Kin-tê'êng).
7 Wylie, p. 439.
to the Chinese from early times. This people, mentioned in the
Former Han Annals by a name variously transcribed as Jo-kiang
(Wylie), Ni-kiang (F. W. K. Müller), and Dža-k’iong (De Groot),
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 Altyntaagh and Kuen-lun mountains as far
west as the longitude of Khotan. 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
Sirtlin 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. In their territory also, in the Gass
district, are the Bokalik mountains, with the gold mines of Boka,
which from Cer-cen in Chinese Turkestan, by the route over the
Tokuz-dawân and the ‘Valley of the Winds’—a route explored in
modern times by Prejevalsky, Carey, Hedin, and others—are still
visited by Turkestan people. At the end of the seventh century
A.D. the Tibetans established a post, Tshal-byi, somewhere
between Gass and Charklik, whence they controlled the Lob-nor
district; and thither in about A.D. 746 came refugee Buddhist
monks after a desperate journey over the mountains (Tokuz-

1 Berlin Academy Sitzungsberichte, 1918, pp. 570 sqq.  
2 ii, p. 52.  
3 This is proved by references in the Former Han Annals, giving accounts
of the states along the southern route in Chinese Turkestan (translated by
Wylie, Journal of the Anthropological Institute, x (1881), pp. 20–73, and
after him by De Groot, ii, pp. 52–69). Cf. maps collected by Professor
Herrmann in Hedin, Southern Tibet, vol. vii, map X. See also Müller,
loc. cit.


5 Visited in the 13th century by William Bouchier, of Paris (Sandberg,
The Exploration of Tibet, p. 21).
dawān) from Khotan. A Chinese authority informs us that T’u-yű-hun people were constantly reaching the Shan-shan kingdom by that route.

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 the proof that the T’u-yű-hun people are stated in Chinese writings to be called also A-ch’ai, and the observation that the name is identical with that of the Ha-ža, mentioned in the Tibetan Chronicle and other documents belonging to the seventh and eighth centuries A.D., one of them being the above mentioned narrative by a T’u-yű-hun queen. It is, however, not at all likely that in addition to the name T’u-yű-hun and the variant form Tho-gon, independently attested in the Tun-huang region, the same people should have been known also as Ha-ža; and, furthermore, the Ha-ža are not infrequently mentioned at dates later than A.D. 663, when the T’u-yű-hun were expelled from Amdo. Moreover, one of the T’u-yű-hun kings, in the early part of the fifth century (417–) A.D. (Bichurin, i, p. 78) was named A-ch’ai—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-yű-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-yű-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, Nī-kiang, Dža-k’iong. Possibly the majority of the subjects of the T’u-yű-hun chiefs, whose power extended through Jo-Ch’iang territory to Sha-chou on the one hand and the Lob-nor state on the other, and who had entered the Koko-nor region only as an invading tribe, were of Jo-Ch’iang race, and in the Sha-chou

1 See Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 119–25. The name Tšal-byi (‘Little Wood?’) was probably pre-Tibetan.

2 See L. Giles, B.S.O.S., vi, p. 830.


4 阿柴. 5 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 367.


7 阿豺 (or 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., Ha-za people,\(^1\) just as at the time of the beginning of the Christian era there were Jo-Ch’iang people. There is no reason to suppose that the latter ceased to exist; if not as Ha-za 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 dza (= ja) is correct—and he quotes the authority of Jen Shi-ku (Yen Shih-ku, A.D. 579–645), the commentator on the Former Han Annals—it would correspond to the second syllable of Ha-za, as also to that of A-ch’ai in its original pronunciation. As regards the omission of the first syllable Ha, we may refer to Professor Pelliot’s remark concerning frequent Chinese transcriptions in which an initial a is suppressed.\(^2\)

If this explanation is correct, i.e. if the Ha-za 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 Hashakilik, which name recurs farther in the mountains south of Khotan. For we know that there were scattered bodies of Jo-Ch’iang people, who would be Ha-za, along the southern border of Chinese Turkestan.\(^3\)

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 Kokonor Ch’iang. They may have been neighbours of Chinese Turkestan from very early times.

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

---

\(^1\) Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 17–18, 25–9, 35, 343.


\(^3\) See Müller, loc. cit. (p. 44).

\(^4\) Particulars of these, translated from the Later Han Annals, are given by Wylie, pp. 474–5. On their probable identity with the Hu frequently mentioned in conjunction with the Ch’iang (both ‘of Huang-chung’) see p. 47 n. 3.
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Sam-tsia raid during the period 48–33 B.C., 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."

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;

1 Wylie, pp. 436–7; De Groot, ii, p. 199.
2 De Groot, ii, p. 200; Wylie, p. 437.
3 Concerning the beginnings of these fortifications in 111 B.C. see Wylie, pp. 435–6; De Groot, ii, p. 197. The district within the fortifications was designated Huang-chung (Wylie, pp. 434–6 and passim), which the Chinese identify with Hsi-ning. It is the district of the Huang (De Groot, ii, pp. 194, &c., Hong) river, which is certainly the Ta-t’ung-ho, the name being retained in T’ang times (Bushell, p. 519) and still persisting (Rockhill, p. 42 n.): it may include the tributary Hsi-ning-ho, which, however, may be the Sién river of De Groot, ii, p. 207.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1 De Groot, ii, p. 216.
2 Wylie, pp. 445–51.
3 Ibid., pp. 437, 440, 450–1, &c.
4 Ibid., pp. 438–40, 445–6, 454, 467–8, 472.
5 Ibid., pp. 447, 449, 450, 457, 466–9, 471.
the ‘Too-leaou general’. Nevertheless the T'ao river frontier continues to be prominent, and it seems likely that the main line of approach to Liang-chou was via the lower Hoang-ho valley and those of the P'ing-fan river or Charing-gol.

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

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

---

1 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-lehlu of the ‘To-lehlu Three Tigers’ (military officers) who during Tibetan times (JRAS, 1927, p. 559) commanded the region of Liang-chou. Too-leaou = To-lehlu is therefore a place in the Liang-chou region and may accordingly be the Tolan, north-west of Liang-chou, on the grand route.

3 c.g. ibid., pp. 442, 444, 452, 462, 466, 470, 471–2.
4 De Groot, i, pp. 126, 146; ii, p. 49.
5 Ibid., ii, p. 198.
'Huang-chung', leaving the land west of the Hoang-ho 'empty', people were gradually removed there to occupy it.\textsuperscript{1} 

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 \textit{Later Han Annals} concludes this chapter of his work:\textsuperscript{2}

'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.\textsuperscript{3} 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\textsuperscript{4} 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:\textsuperscript{5}

'Kuan Fan then sent troops beyond the fortresses,\textsuperscript{6} 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,\textsuperscript{7} 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.'\textsuperscript{8}

\textbf{In a.d. 100:}\textsuperscript{9}

'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.'

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

"The descendants of Yu-an-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 (Ssh-ch'uan). The number of persons is not stated by former historians. Only the Ta'an-lang of Wu-tu had several thousand able-bodied troops. Fifty-two of the tribes dwindled away in numbers, till they were unable to maintain their integrity. They were divided and dispersed, attaching their settlements to other bodies. Some were utterly destroyed, leaving no posterity. Some were led away into distant lands."

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

'showed much heart in their national customs and in their martial bearing they were active and turbulent'
could not be rooted out; he ascribes this to the exhaustion of the troops and refers to the financial burdens of the empire. It seems likely that much of the Ch'iang country was inaccessible to large bodies of troops, and that, as in the case of the Go-lok, a permanent control was impossible. The losses of the tribes, who were free from the checks upon growth of population at present operant in Tibet, namely, polyandry and Buddhist monachism, were quickly repaired. The Amdo states, Ch'iang and T'u-yu-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

---

1 Ibid., p. 473.
2 The passage continues with a reference to the Chung tribe as the most powerful and to the respective numbers.
3 Ibid., p. 477.
4 According to Rockhill (pp. 80, 190) neither the Go-lok nor the nomads generally are polygamous. Baber states (p. 97) that 'polyandry prevails in the uplands': so too Edgar, The Marches of the Mantsze, 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.\(^1\) 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.\(^2\) The statement\(^3\) 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.\(^4\)

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),\(^5\) inhabited the region south of Ya-chou, in Ssü-ch’uan, and the ‘White Horse’ tribe of Kuang-han\(^6\) likewise belonged to Ssü-ch’uan, being in the region of Ch’êng-tu, the present capital of the province. These two are sometimes mentioned in connexion with risings in the

---

\(^1\) Wylie, pp. 238–9, 246. For a mention of ‘the hymns of the Ti-peoples’ see Franke, Geschichte des Chinesischen Reiches, ii, p. 158. See also infra, p. 61.

\(^2\) Huc and Gabet, ii, p. 82; Rockhill, Diary, pp. 168–9; Tafel, ii, pp. 158–60 (Ge-sar legend).

\(^3\) Wylie, p. 242.

\(^4\) On these Sinified or Confucianized barbarians see Franke, op. cit. ii, pp. 63, 89 (Fu kien), 94, &c. Professor Franke’s use of the term ‘Tibetans’ (pp. 60, 61, 63, 89, 183) or ‘Tangut or Tibetan’ (pp. 94, &c.) should not mislead. None of the persons or dynasties 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.


\(^6\) Wylie, pp. 225–6, 243–4, 434, 466 (rebellion in A.D. 136), 471 and 474 (raid on Kuang-han), 473 (submission in A.D. 37); De Groot, ii, p. 195.
districts to which they belonged. The Ts'an-lang of Wu-tu, occupying an isolated district in the southernmost part of Kan-su, south of the Wei river and the Pe-lung mountains which form its southern boundary, have this distinction, that in the T'ang Annals there is an account of a Te state, which under a Lyang dynasty existed from about A.D. 296 to about A.D. 506, when it became the district Tung-i-chou. These Te became known to the Chinese in 111 B.C., and from 108 B.C. various rebellions on their part are mentioned. The several tribes of barbarians mentioned as 'outside' the Shuh (Ssū-ch'uan) region, belonged perhaps to the area of what became later the 'Women's Kingdom'.

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

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

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

'Since then none of the 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
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’.¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

¹ For the above particulars see Wylie, pp. 426–7; De Groot, ii, pp. 187–8.
² De Groot, i, p. 4.
⁴ Ibid., i, pp. 19–32.
⁵ Ibid., p. 19. Further notices of the wars with these ‘Red’ and ‘White’
Tik, i, pp. 25–32.
⁶ Ibid., pp. 4–5, the Ch’i being a tributary of the Chü.
⁷ Ibid., p. 21.
⁸ Region of the present Min-chou.
⁹ Wylie, p. 432; De Groot, i, p. 34, ii, p. 193.
¹⁰ 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. 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'i-ang-tao, as well as Lin-t'ao, it is mentioned 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.

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 Dzong (Jung) of the West are mentioned in the Yu-kung, a book of the Shu-king, in regard to which it is held that it originated in the time of Yu, 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.; and with the formation of the Lung-hsi district, after 272 B.C. (supra, p. 54), the remaining Tik also passed under Chinese control. But they were still a discriminable element of the

---

1 Wylie, p. 433; De Groot, ii, p. 195.
2 Wylie, p. 435; De Groot, ii, p. 197; supra, p. 41.
3 Wylie, p. 464, 'In the autumn of 124 the region of Lung-si first extended to Teih-taou.'
4 De Groot, i, pp. 30–1.
population of the Ch’iang frontier; for at the time of the 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 Diöng, 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,¹ and the dynasty of the period A.D. 296–506 is called a Te dynasty (supra, pp. 52–3). The ‘White Horse’ tribe of Kuang-han was, as we have seen, a branch of the Ch’iang; yet along with the Tsö-tu and Yen-mang of the Ssü-ch’uan north-western border it is said to belong to the Te race;² and in the mountains adjacent to Yen-mang there were ‘six tribes of Eastern Barbarians, seven tribes of Keang, and nine tribes of Te’.³

On the line of the lower T’ao river are Tik-tao, Te-tao, and Ch’iang-tao. Moreover, it is likely that the Hong Te mentioned in the report on the campaign of 63–B.C.⁴ are the Te of the Hong river, the Ta-t’ung-ho, being none other than the Han and Giên, who figure in that occurrence. And the Te mentioned, along with the (Little) Yüeh-chiah and the Ch’iang, as the western limit of the Right-hand Hsiung-nu king⁵ cannot have belonged to

¹ De Groot, ii, p. 198. ² Wylie, p. 226. ³ Ibid., p. 242. ⁴ De Groot, ii, p. 215: the Chinese characters rendered as Hong (i.e. Huang) are not identical in the two cases, but homophonetic: see Karlsgren, Nos. 104, 106. ⁵ De Groot, i, p. 58. Further particulars of Te peoples, largely settled in Kan-su, are supplied by the Wei-lö (trans-Chavannes, T’öung-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\(^1\) to have annexed tribes of the Te and Ch'iang, who therefore cannot have been remote from the Koko-nor country.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

THE NAM-TIG

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

1 See Wang Jinqru, Shishiah Studies (Academia Sinica Monographs, Series A, Nos. 8, 11, 13), i, pp. 17 sqq., esp. p. 29.
2 It may be noticed that the 'Little Yüeh-chih', when they first fled to the mountains, 'took refuge with the K'iang' (Franke, Ostasiatische Zeitschrift, vi, p. 85).
3 Re the above particulars see Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 279 and n. 5; ii, pp. 10–12.
4 魚樂 得.
becomes probable that the name *Lok-tik* means the 'Tik of the Lok tribe' and contains the ethnical name *Tik*.

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, 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 Tibetana of Min-tshul Huthuktu (p. 51) we read:

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

and in the next paragraph we learn that to the north-west of Tan-tig and Yan-tig is the great mountain Tsoṅ-la, avoiding which one arrives at the celebrated place Tsoṅ-kha and so proceeds to Kumbum. 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-té on the Hoang-ho to the south of the Koko-nor has in Chinese spelling a second syllable anciently sounded *tok*.

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

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

3 Karlgen, No. 981. The spelling Kuei-té (Projevalsky *Quedae*, Futterer Kuei-tö; Tafel Kue-de (map te); Kozlov, Gui-Dui (with views, pp. 165,
It need not be stated that Tson-kha, birthplace of the fourteenth-century Buddhist reformer Tson-kha-pa, has not a modern name; indeed it may be said that by the suffix ka¹ (later kha) it both affirms its regional character and suggests that the name Tson was originally tribal. But a far higher antiquity, more or less contemporary with our Nam manuscript, is proved in respect of Tson-kha 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-san (= Chinese shan, ‘mountain’) and thence at a Tson-kha monastery. It is not likely that an independent Nam kingdom existed during the T’u-yu-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 northeastern Tibet mi, rmi, or smi); in regard to that we have no evidence.

Of the first syllable of Nam-Tig the most probable etymology is to regard it as representing the Chinese nam, ‘south’, in Nan-shan, ‘southern mountain’, an ancient name, used in the nomenclature of persons in Chinese Turkestan during the third to fourth century a.d.² Probably the compound Nam-Tig itself is also there attested, in the Prakrit form Nāṃtiṇā.³ 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.

¹ See supra, pp. 31-2 and n. 1.
² See Festgabe Hermann Jacob, ed. W. Kirfel (1926), p. 67.
³ 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 and concerning which our only other information is derived from manuscripts written in Sa-cu = Tun-huang, of Chinese Kan-su, was situated in the Nan-shan region and presumably on the Tibetan side of it. As will appear, its folk-lore envisaged the Koko-nor region and the Skyi = Tang-hsiang kingdom on its south, separated therefrom by the Rma-chu.

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

Nam, Ch'iang, Hsi-hsia

It may now, perhaps, be taken for granted that the Nam language, the language of the Nam-Tig people, which from a few examples of nomenclature we know to have been genetically akin to Tibetan, was a Ch'iang dialect. Unfortunately the only certified specimens of Ch'iang speech are the short 'Songs of Western Barbarians' (Pai-lan, 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

1 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 130, n. 5.
linguists is less than in the case of the 'Songs of the Barbarians'. In the very complicated and difficult Hsi-hsia writings there are indeed many Buddhist texts, wherein the meanings of large numbers of signs have been determined by comparison with versions of the same texts in other languages; and in a moderate number of cases the like result is obtained from interlinear translations in Chinese. Interlinear transcriptions in Tibetan writing supply sound-values of about 330 signs, whereof in about three-quarters of the number of cases the meaning also is known from Chinese translations;¹ and sound-values of many signs are known from their use in transliteration of Sanskrit religious formulae (dhāranīs). 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 ū (also representing g and m), and, in a smaller number of instances, n, m, and r, have been discarded.

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

¹ See N. Nevsky, A Brief Manual of the Si-Hia Characters with Tibetan Transcriptions (Research Review of the Osaka Asiatic Society, No. 4, 1926), and, as regards the dhāranīs, the above (p. 58, n. 1) mentioned Shishih 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* 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*-i-r, &c., and of the final consonants will contribute to the solution.  

---


2 As concerns the characteristic consonantal Prefixes of the Tibetan,
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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 essays¹ a passage mainly as follows:

'From Khokhonůr to Yûnnán, the conterminous frontier of China and Tibet is successively and continuously occupied (going from north to south) by the Sôkpa above spoken of; by the Amdôans, who for the most part now speak Tibetan; by the Thóchú; by the Gyârûng, and by the Mányak.... The people of Sôkyeul,² of Amdo, of Thóchú, of Gyârûng, and of Mányak... bear among the Chinese the common designation of Sifán or Western aliens; and the Tibetans frequently denominate them Gyârûngbo from the superior importance of the special tribe of Gyârûng, 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 rûng means, in the former tongue, proper or special, Gyârûng signifies alien par excellence.... Others affirm that Gyârûng means wild, rude, primitive Gyás... and that the typical Gyás (Gyámi) are the Chinese, though the latter be usually designated specially black Gyás (Gyá-nak).

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

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

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

² = Sog-yul, 'Mongol country'.
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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 Gyāring, which in Tibetan is Rgyal(or Rgyal-mo)-ron, 'King's or Queen's Gorge', has nothing to do; and it is, moreover, inconceivable that the Tibetans ever applied the term Rgyal-ron-po, 'people of the Rgyal-ron', to the Mongols, Amdoans, &c.; furthermore, it is hardly the fact that the Chinese ever included the Mongols of Tibet under the designation Hsi-fan.¹ That Thöchü is really the name of the T'ao river and the town T'ao-chou situated on it Hodgson could not know; his unfortunate misconception that his 'Hörpa' dialect had something to do with Turkish (Hor) people precluded his assigning in the above passage a place to the Hor-pa states.

But in remarking that the Chinese applied their term Hsi-fan to the Amdoans, 'Thöchü', 'Gyāring', and 'Mānyak', peoples Hodgson was, no doubt, well informed. For Baber also, as Yule remarks (p. 126, n. 6), refers to the people of Tsū-ta-ti, on the lower T'ung river, perhaps included in the old Mi-ñag (Mānyak) country, as Sīfan; and Baber also states² that 'Sīfan, convertible with Man-tsū, 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 Thöchü, Gyāring, Mānyak, and also the Hor-pa states (mentioned among the 'eighteen tribes'). Rockhill states (p. 72, n. 1) that on the Kan-su border the Chinese apply to the non-agricultural natives the terms Sheng Fan, 'wild barbarians', Hsi-Fan, 'western barbarians', more commonly Fan-tsū, 'sons of) barbarians', or, in the case of the wildest tribes, Hei Fan-tsū, 'black (sc. independent) barbarians': he further notes (p. 241) that the Ssū-ch'uan people call all eastern Tibetans Man-tsū or Man-chia. The Vicomte d'Ollone says³ that 'Under this very vague appellation [Si-Fan] the Chinese confound all the populations which we call Tibetan'. Similarly, the late

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

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

'The Man-Tzü are regarded by the Chinese as the descendants of the ancient occupants of the province of Ssü-ch'uan, and Mr. Wylie has drawn attention\(^1\) 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-Fan-Ting, the extreme point of Captain Gill's excursion in this direction, are the Si-Fan ('western aliens'), who extend into the Koko-Nur basin.

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

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

'Thus, also, Si-Fan appears to be sometimes applied to the whole body of tribes, of different languages, who occupy the alpine country between Koko-Nur and the Lolo mountain country, and sometimes distinctively to a Tibetan-speaking race who form a large part of the occupants of that country on the north-east of Tibet, and in the Koko-Nur basin, the Tangutsans 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 (Ssü-ch'uan), does so clearly distinguish (op. cit., pp. 127, 133) between his Si-Fan, related doubtless to the 'nomades des hauts plateaux' (Sung-p'an region) of d'Ollone's vocabularies, and his Man-Tzü (pp. 111-12, 119, 122), whom he found near Li-fan-fu
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(half-way between Ch'eng-t'u and Sung-p'an), and 'Outer Man-
tzū', 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, though he afterwards saw three or four in one village.
The country to the west of Sung-p'an and Li-fan-fu is the Rgyal-
ron-Gyārāng 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-rön-Ssū-ch'üan border: and the
same appears to be actual Chinese usage in the Rgyal-rön 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 Man-
tzū 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' (p. 8): yet he recognizes the separate existence of
the 'Chia Rung' (Rgyal-rön) states. Mr. Fergusson holds
(pp. 247 sqq.) that the Mantze, by which term he means primarily
the Rgyal-rön 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-rdzo1?). Elsewhere (Geographical Journal, 1908,
p. 594-7) he remarks concerning the Rgyal-rön peoples that:

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

As regards speech Rockhill remarks (Diary, p. 355) that the Tibetan
pronunciation of Ba-tha̱n was nearly incomprehensible, whereas that of
Li-tha̱n was nearer to the Lha-san.
THE NAM LANGUAGE

'They are not Tibetan, nor do they wish to be called such. Their features are different, and so is their language. They have mixed much with the Tibetans and have adopted many of their manners and customs, as well as their written language, which has been brought in by the lamas. In the spoken language many words have been borrowed from the same source, but the majority have no connection with Tibetan.'

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

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

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

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

Practically a distinction between Hsi-fan and Tibetan holds
good. Major Davies in his Yün-nan (pp. 384, 387) affirms its validity. The Tibetans, he says,

'call themselves Pê, or, as the sound might be better transliterated, Pô [sc. Bod]. . . . In western China, however, the Tibetans are more usually known by other names. In Ssû-ch'uan they call them Man-tzû, 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-teung.'

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

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

'Hsi-fan' languages: a Tibetan group

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


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


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

Languages cited: Ku-teung (Yûn-nan Tibetan), Lu-tsû, P’rû-mi, Mu-nia, Li-so (or œu). Spelling English, but with ‘Continental’ vowels and aspirates as k’, t’, &c.


Languages: Mosso, Lisou, Min-kia, Loutse, Chinese, Tibetan, Kham di Mou oua (Khamti). Spelling French, with aspirates as kh, th, &c.


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


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

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


Languages: Thôchû, Sêkpa (really Mongol), Gyâmi (Chinese), Gyârûng, Hôrpa, Tákpa, Mányâk. Spelling precise according to system expounded, ibid., pp. 150-1.


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

LAUPER, 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-sî-ts’o). Spelling according to system of Lepsius.


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

MONBEIG, Père. See Liétard.


Language: Si-hia (Tibetan transcriptions, also romanized, with Chinese renderings and citations of etymological correlates in Chinese, Tibet-Burman, &c.). Spelling systematic.
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Languages (in addition to numerous dialects of Lo-lo, Mo-so, &c.): Eight 'Sifan' dialects, viz. Nos. 35 Namejï, 36 Sifan (really Tse-kou Tibetan), 37 Peu, 38 Duampou, 39 Pé, 40 Pé, 41 Dzorgai, 42 Kortse: 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, 1899).

Languages (in addition to numerous dialects of S. China and the Sino-Tibetan borderlands in the SW.): Nos. 19 Lissou, 22 Pe Lissou, 24 Loute (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.


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


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


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


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


i, pp. 17–53: three Bairlang songs (from the Later Han Annals).

ii, pp. 275–88: Shishia, Ch’tang and Minia (also Baber’s Minia) in the Sâ-ch’uan province.

ii, pp. 1–272, iii, pp. 1–396: Romanized Shishia words intercolumniated in Shishia version of the Buddhist Suvarnaprabhâsa-sûtra. Spelling for literary Tibetan and Chinese normal, for dialect words in Chinese transcription historic-phontetical, in other cases systematic or according to sources.


Language: Jyâl-runi (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 Jingru), Ch’iang of Ssū-ch’uan border.
Bat’ang Tibetan (Rockhill).
Duampou (Ollone 38).
Dzorgal Sifan (Ollone 41).
Ge-ši-ta’a (Lauffer) of Rgyal-roṅ.
Gyāmi Chinese (Hodgson).
Gyāring (Hodgson) of Rgyal-roṅ.
Hanniu (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roṅ.
Horpa (Hodgson).
Jyā-roṅ (Wolfenden) of Rgyal-roṅ.
Kortse Sifan (Ollone 42).
Ku-teung 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, Lístard, Ollone, Orléans)—rarely cited.
Loutse (Orléans), also in Desgodins: = Lu-tzū.
Lu-tzū (Davies) = Loutse.
Mánjak (Hodgson) of Mi-ñaɡ.
Mantze, Outer (Gill) = Man-tzū; akin to Thóchü.
Milam (Desgodins) of Tsa-roṅ valley, on Upper Salween R.
Mènia of Tzū-ta-ti (Baber) = Mi-ñaɡ.
Minia (Wang Jingru) = Mi-ñaɡ.
Mo-so (Bacot), also in Johnston—rarely cited.
Mosso (Orléans), also Desgodins: = Mo-so.
Muli (Njonaq) (Johnston) = Hjaṅ of Mi-lik (2° S. of Li-t’ang): akin to Mányak.
Mu-nia (Davies) = Mi-ñaɡ.
Naneji Sifan (Ollone 35), near junction of Ya-lung and Yangtze.
Outer Mantze (Gill).
Panak’a (Rockhill), Go-lok of Amdo.
Pati (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roṅ.
Pa-U-rong (Johnston), Bowrong, Bawrang on lower Ya-lung (Nag) river: akin to Mányak.
Pawang (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roṅ.
Pè (Ollone 39) = Bod (Tibetan), Mao-chou region.
Pè (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 Sutati (Ollone 38) = Bod of Tzū-ta-ti.
Prū-mi (Davies), of Mi-li.
Rgya-roṅ dialects (Rosthorn), of Rgyal-roṅ.
Rgyal-roṅ dialects (Tafel).
Sutati, Peu of (see Ollone 38) = Tzū-ta-ti.
Shishka (Wang Jingru) = Hsi-hsia.
Sifan of Tzū-ta-ti (Baber) = Menia.
Sifan (Ollone 36 Tse-kou Sifan) = Monbeig.
Sifan A & B (Gill), also Terrien de Lacouperie: Tibetan.
Si-hsia (Lauffer) = Hsi-hsia.
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Si-hia (Nevsky) = Hsi-hsia.
Sökpa Mongol (Hodgson).
Täkpa (Hodgson) = Dwags-po Tibetan.
Tangut Tibetan (Prejevalsky).
Thöchü (Hodgson), of T’a-o-chou.
Tsame Tibetan (Rockhill), of Upper Salween R.
Tse-kou Tibetan (Ollone 36).
Wassu (Rosthorn) of Rgyal-roln.

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 ‘Sifan and Hórsôk Vocabularies’,1 clearly recognized that his Sökpa and Gyāmi, and perhaps also his Täkpa, were not Hsi-fan. Ignoring his misapprehension in regard to Hörpa, we have accordingly four Hsi-fan languages, namely Thöchü (T’a-o-chou), Hörpa, Gyārūng (Rgyal-roln), and Mānyak (Mi-ňag), 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’,2 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-roln compiled by von Rosthorn3 must be associated with ‘Gyārūng’; likewise the ‘Jyā-roln’ of the late Dr. Wolfenden’s article,4 containing an orally communicated tale, with discussion and vocabulary. In the Vicomte d’Ollone’s Langues des Peuples non-Chinois de la Chine we find vocabularies of as many as eight languages (Nos. 35–42) grouped as ‘Sifan’. It is, however, explained (p. 20) that of these dialects one, No. 36, is nothing but Tibetan, as spoken in its district (Tse-kou-Tzū-ku in NW. Yün-nan), while No. 37 (‘Peu’ of Ta-chien-lu) does not seriously differ, and No. 40 (‘Pe’ of Sung-p’an district), despite its geographical remoteness, bears considerable resemblance to those two. This raises a question as to the ‘Pe’ (sc. Bod) of No. 39, and further as to the Tse-kou Tibetan of Prince Henri d’Orléans’s From Tonkin to India (pp. 443–5) No. 25 (but this is = d’Ollone’s No. 36) and the Ku-tsung Tibetan (Chung-tien in north Yün-nan) of

1 Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1853, pp. 121–51 (see pp. 122–3).
3 ZDMG. li (1897), pp. 524 sqq.
4 Toung-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 djéét, 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’ò-so, chi-se, tche, tchèu, ndja, &c., Loutse ambou, Kioutse amtché, amstiet, 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-tsun' 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-tsun 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, BÉFDR-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 formative elements. Matters of grammar and syntax scarcely appear in the vocabularies; but probably in this respect also there are few appreciable differences—thus ‘Tangut’ yuty (Sung-p’an yu), ‘is’, rít, ‘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 declares1 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 Ka-cha ma she,2 a common Tibetan expression for “I don’t understand”’.

and (p. 361)

‘However this may be, the Mányak’a from the Chan-tui,3 like the people of Bat’ang, Ta-chien-lu, Kanzé, and Jyékundo, speak Tibetan; and the educated ones among them endeavour to pronounce as much like the Lh’asa people as they possibly can.’

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

1 Land of the Lamas, p. 54, n. 1.
2 i.e. skad-cha-ma-šes.
3 = Nag-roň.
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,¹ and
   \[ py-, phy-, by-, \]
   where ordinary Tibetan pronounces \( c-, ch-, j- \)
   the dialects changed the guttural or labial to a palatal, giving \( cy- \),

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

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

5. The combination my-, in ordinary Tibetan pronounced ny- (sometimes n- or even ny-), appears in the dialects as mny-, mni-, ni-, sometimes eventuating in n-. This change, likewise a palatalization, since the stages will have been

my-, mny-, mni-

may be partly fortuitous; for my- occurs rarely, except in the ancient alternative pronunciation of m, before i and e, as my-, e.g. in myig = mig, ‘eye’, mye = me, ‘fire’. Examples are found sporadically, more in ‘Hsi-fan’ and the border languages than in ‘Tibetan’; but ‘Tangut’ has mni, ‘man’, and nik, ‘eye’.

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

g, gs, ŋ, ŋs, d, n, b, bs, m, ms, ŋ, 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 -n, -b (except for change to -p), -m (the most permanent of the finals), -r, while -n can to a certain extent be observed, and g is partly lost (though locally surviving), partly retained as a ‘checked’ consonant or as -k in certain combinations. A distinction between suppressed -g and suppressed -gs is observed. According to all indications the vowel modifications here mentioned preceded the loss of the consonant: they perhaps synchronized in origin with the change of final g, d, b, to k, t, p, which prevailed over the whole area.

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

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

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

(c) -r is sometimes lost, in which case a preceding a is sometimes retained, but sometimes appears as e or o, 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, õ; wa in place of final 0 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 \( k' \), \( p' \), &c.); English ch and tch (with French tch, German tech, &c.) by c; English \( j \) (with French dj, German dsch, &c.) by j; English dj is usually retained; English \( sh \) (with French ch, German sch, &c.) by \( s \) (except in any case where there may be ground for distinction of \( s \) from \( sh \)); French \( qu \) and \( j \) by \( g \) and \( z \); and so forth. The guttural and palatal nasals (\( n, \tilde{n} \), the latter also in place of French \( gn \)) 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 \( \bar{a}, \bar{u}, \bar{o}, \) and by combinations \( ia, ie, &c. \), where these occur: thus French \( eu \) becomes \( o \), and Baber’s Menia \( u \) becomes \( a \).

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

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

---

1 This does not apply to Chinese words.
2 Hodgson’s initial \( gn \), which is not explained, is retained, because in one case at least (chü-ngyö, ‘fish’) he uses \( ng \) for the initial, no less than for the final \( n \). Nevertheless it seems likely that \( n \) is intended. Hodgson’s \( ny-, sy-, \) and \( zy- \) are replaced by \( \bar{n}, \bar{y}, \bar{z} \), in accordance with his explanations. His italic \( h \), indicating an abrupt tone, is neglected. In Thöchû and Hörpa words \( h, kh, gh \) are stated to have ‘a harsh Arabic’ (sc. spirantie) utterance; they are retained unaltered: in Prejevalsky’s ‘Tangut’ the initial \( kâ \) 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-tzu** that of Major Davies, **Mëlam** a short list published by Desgodins, all four relating to dialects of the Tsa-roû. 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 Gyärüm', 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 Gyärüm' (Rgyal-roû): 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-roû), the lists were given as applying to the Nya(Nag)-roû, 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-ron) states, nor by von Rosthorn, who cites, likewise with Chinese spellings, many of the names. But it is shared by the military report and gazetteer work, in Manchu language, translated and annotated by Dr. Haenisch in volume ix (pp. 69 sqq.) of Sir Swen Hedin's Southern Tibet, where again a list and map are given. In Dr. Tafel's Meine Tibetreise (esp. ii, p. 224, nn. 1, 3) many of the states are named, partly with note, or use, of local pronunciations: a few also in Dr. Stötzner's Ins unerforschte Tibet.

But far more authentic and linguistically instructive is a list given by the author of the Geografia Tibet (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, and (3) Dr. Tafel's narrative, we obtain a table as given on p. 83.

We need not consider the material discrepancies, due perhaps to lapse or absorption of some of the states;¹ but much linguistic instruction may be derived from the lists. That of the Geografia Tibet preserva, no doubt, except perhaps in Pa-sti and the first vowel of Nos. 1 (Loog- for Lcog-) and 6 (Leeg- 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-; Kon-ser for Kha-ngsar); 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 Dju,

¹ The Geografía remarks that 'but at present there are not more than thirteen'.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geografia Tibetai</th>
<th>Rockhill I</th>
<th>Lha-sa pronunciation</th>
<th>Rockhill II</th>
<th>Baber</th>
<th>Dr. Tafel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. The Eighteen States of the Rgyal-ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Leag-la</td>
<td>Leags-la (2)</td>
<td>Cag-la</td>
<td>Ja-la (15)</td>
<td>Djia-la (1)</td>
<td>Jag-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lha-si</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tru-je (9)</td>
<td>Tru-je (9)</td>
<td>Chro-siop (10)</td>
<td>Wa-se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Khro-skyab</td>
<td>Khro-skyab (3)</td>
<td>Tro-je (9)</td>
<td>Tro-je (9)</td>
<td>Co-skiab (Kreeiu)</td>
<td>Co-skiab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. So-mo</td>
<td>Po-(So)-mo (13)</td>
<td>Po-(So)-mo (13)</td>
<td>Sa-mu (6)</td>
<td>So-mu (7)</td>
<td>So-mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Brdzun-hgag</td>
<td>Niñ-hgag (15)</td>
<td>Niñ-hgag (15)</td>
<td>Zun-ga (8)</td>
<td>Zur-ga (9)</td>
<td>Żuñ-kak or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dam-ba</td>
<td></td>
<td>Go-zi (3)</td>
<td>Tam-ba (5)</td>
<td>Dam-ba</td>
<td>Cok-tzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ho-gzi</td>
<td>Hgo-zi (12)</td>
<td>Wo-je (3)</td>
<td>Wo-je (3)</td>
<td>Wok-je (or ö-še)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pa-sti</td>
<td>Brag-stiñ (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Ba-bam</td>
<td>Lo-du &amp; Ba-bam (18)</td>
<td>Pa-ti Pa-wan (10)</td>
<td>Pa-wan (12)</td>
<td>Ba-wan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Ha (Hwa?)-hwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Len-tsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Rab-brtan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Btsan-la</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Rgyal-kha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Hgron-bu</td>
<td>(Nañ-chen-ba)</td>
<td>Driñ-pa (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The Five Hor-pa States (Hor-sde-kha-hna or Hor-khog)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Khañ-ghsar</td>
<td>Khañ-ghsar (7)</td>
<td>Kañ-sar (17)</td>
<td>Kon-ser (17)</td>
<td>Khun-sar (15)</td>
<td>Kuñ-sar (or ö ser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ma-zî</td>
<td>Ma-zî (8)</td>
<td>Ma-zu (18)</td>
<td>Ma-zu (18)</td>
<td>Ma-zar</td>
<td>Ma-zar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Be-ri</td>
<td>Hbe-rim (10)</td>
<td>Be-rim (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pe-re (16)</td>
<td>Be-ri, Be-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tre-o</td>
<td>Gri-hù (11) (capital Cuwo)</td>
<td>Dri-tu (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dje-gu (or go)</td>
<td>Cu-wo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hbañ</td>
<td>Hbañ (4)</td>
<td>Ba(Ba-thañ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li-thañ</td>
<td>Li-thañ (5)</td>
<td>Li-thañ (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ba-tañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sde-dge</td>
<td>Sder-gi (6)</td>
<td>Der-gu (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Li-tañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-li</td>
<td>Smi-li (16)</td>
<td>Mi-li (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Der-gu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Ge-šie, (3) vocalization of post-consonantal y in -šiop, Djia-, Djie-. But Dr. Tafel, where he is not (in Ba-di, Ba-ti) recording a non-local form, affords clear evidence of (1) local survival of initial group khr- (Krechin), br- (Bra-šdi), (2) final guttural (Jag-, -kak, Cok-, Wok-), m (Dam-, -wañ), n (Zuñ-, -dan, Tsan-), (3) non-insertion of i after palatal (Jag-, Cok-, Rge-ši-), (4) palatalization of guttural before y (Kretschiu), (5) loss of -n (Bra-šdi). Thus we have in the lists first-hand evidence of phonetical divergence between Lha-sa Tibetan, E. Colonial Tibetan, and local Hsi-fan. The survival of -b (Lha-sa -p) in E. Colonial -jyab (-šiop) can be observed also at Tse-kou (tson-diob, ‘thunder’, tsa-diob, ‘root’, jre-tob, ‘sow rice’ (ḥab)); but it was not everywhere so, as we see from the official title, ku-tsha (= sku-tshab, Rockhill, p. 220, n. 1), in Der-ge and the Hor-pa country: the place Draya is Brag-gyab.

In No. 18, the Muping of Rockhill, Tafel, and others may be connected with the Sbrin-pa of Rockhill’s first list: in the latter the phrase Nañ-chen-pa is possibly a pure error, being a Tibetan attempt to render the Chinese name (Ming-cheng) of the Ta-chien-lu state (No. 1): or was it intended as a claim to suzerainty¹ over Muping (No. 18)? Rockhill I, Niñ-hgag, seems to be an error, being, according to von Rosthorn, the chief place in the Pati state.

From the mainly Chinese spellings used or noted by von Rosthorn (R) and Messrs. Edgar (E) and Fergusson (F) and from the Manchu spellings in Dr. Haenisch’s work (H) but little can be gleaned. But, since these last go back at least to the times of the wars of A.D. 1746-75, they may be recorded in a note with initials as here indicated and with insertion of two spellings given by Captain Gill.² The final b of Khro-skyab (No. 3) is preserved in the Chinese Chosölchiapu and Manchu Cosgiyab; the final g/ŋ of

¹ Tib. gnañ (or nañ?)-chen?
² 1. Chala (F), Ming-jeng (H) (Chinese Ming-cheng-ssu of Rockhill, Ming-cheng of Dr. Tafel); 2. Wassu (REF), Wassi (H); 3. Chosölchiapu (R), Chos Chia (E), Choschia (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’očhi (R), Choga Chi (E), Drukagi (F), Jokzañ (H); 7. Tangpa (R), Damba (EFH); 8. Wojih (R), Okši (H, with note of Hög-zi in a Tibetan inscription and of modern pronunciation Wok-shiñ and Wo-ži); 9. —; 10. Pati (R), Badi (E), Bati (F), Burakdi (H); 11. Pawang (R), Bawang (EFH); 12. Keshetsa (R), Gaishechia (F), Gebêiza (H), Dr. Stötznerr Gosetscha; 13-15. —; 16. Zanla (H); 17. Gyalung (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. 4-8 and includes (as Kungsa and Mašu) two of the Hor-pa states and, further, the Yako nomads.
Brdzun-hqag in all; the initial Br- of Brag-stiṅ in Manchu Burakdi (= Dr. Tafel’s Brasā). Mr. Fergusson’s variant, Drukagi, of Leog-rtse, conceals, perhaps, some old local name: see his map.

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

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

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

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

Here, Dr. Tafel informs us, yalwa is Tibetan yolwa, ‘curtain’,
Tib. brag, ‘precipice’. But, writing the lines as if transliterated
from Tibetan,

rgyal-sa-pho-brañ-Leñühi-re
 . . .
sgo-di-sgo-tsa-na(?)-khyni-re
nags-rgyan(?)-stag-mo-ni-sgo(skyon ?)-byed
cin-sgor-ga-ri-rgyal-mtshan²-re
brag-sgor-ga-ri-yal-ba-go

we see that rgyal-sa, ‘royal residence’, pho-brañ, ‘palace’, sgo,
sgo-byed(or skyon-), ‘make a door (or guard)’, chu, ‘water’, ‘river’,
sgor, ‘at the gate’, ri, ‘mountain’, rgyal-mtshan, ‘banner’, are
likewise Tibetan. The lack of a translation prevents an inter-
pretation of line 2. It is indeed evident that di, ‘great’, tsa,
‘small’, gui, ‘dog’, are related to Gyārüm ka-hti (Rgya-roñ
Gyārüm khi (Rgya-roñ khi), ‘dog’; but these are only pro-
nunciations of the corresponding Tibetan words, chen (geon),
chuñ (cuiñ, gcuiñ), and khyni, 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, Gyārüm ta-ñvet, Rgya-roñ ta-ña.

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

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

Thöchü khak, Gyärüng kū-cēk, Mānyak da-kha, = Tib. khag, ‘bitter’;
Thöchü rkvi, Hörpa ka-mṣyûr, Gyärüng kū-mchûr, Jyā-ruṅ ke-mṣār, ‘handsome’ = Tib. khyur, ‘entire’;
Hörpa sqū-sgo, Gyärüng kūc-cûr, Mānyak da-cû = Tib. skyur, ‘sour’;
Thöchü jam = Tib. kjam, ‘sweet’;
Gyärüng ka-mṇar, ‘sweet’ = Tib. mṇar.

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

1 For further references to comprehension or use of Tibetan speech in outside areas see Baber, p. 82; Johnston, pp. 222, 267–8; Tafel, ii, p. 230.
2 P. 531, following von Rosthorn’s article.
3 JRAS, 1928, pp. 897–8, Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology, p. 141.
4 Borrowings from Chinese have been noted in the Rgyal-roṅ dialects by von Rosthorn and Wolfenden, and it seems that we may perhaps add the Gyärüng words chidi, ‘this’, hadi, ‘that’, chido, ‘here’, hadu, ‘there’, with Thöchü cho, ‘here’, hâto, ‘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/shis, 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 Manyak also a tha, ‘not’) and for a pa, ‘this’.

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

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

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

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

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

(b) *Hörpa* (Hodgson).

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

(d) *Mi-ṅag 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), Prū-mi (Davies).

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

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

\(^2\) By this term is indicated the dialect of the numerals recorded, along with a few other words, by Dr. Haenisch, op. cit., p. 71, where the dialect is not named. The designation may be justified on the ground that the dialect is evidently the one so named by Dr. Lauffer, op. cit., p. 26, whose materials for ‘Jyāruṅ’ and ‘Geṣīs’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 Lauffer applied to it.

It is not obvious why Dr. Lauffer affirms (p. 26) that Hodgson’s ‘Hörpa’ is the Geṣīs’a, ‘a peculiar Tibetan dialect spoken in the territory stretching from Dawo to Kanze in the north-western part of Sze-ch’uan’. The region so defined is, in fact, the Hor-pa country (see supra, p. 15 and n. 5); and the man minutely examined and described by Hodgson (pp. 138–9) was ‘a Hörpa of Tāngo, west of Gyārūṅ towards Amdo’; Tāngo is the Hor-pa state Dango/Chango/Tchrango = Brag-mgo mentioned *supra* (pp. 83, 85). The place was visited and described by Pandit A–K (see *Report on the Explorations of Great Tibet and Mongolia* . . . by J. B. N. Hennessey, Dehra Dun, 1884, p. 62 Düngo), 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 Ferguson (pp. 205 sqq.); it is between Dawo and Kanze.

Dge-śi-tsha (capital Dam-tung, see view in Ferguson, p. 194), the most westerly of the Rgyal-roṅ states, is separated from Dawo and Chango by a high mountain range (see maps in von Rosthorn, p. 525, Ferguson, 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. Lauffer had, no doubt, reason for thinking that Hodgson’s ‘Hörpa’ vocabulary holds good for it; but it does not follow that it does not hold good primarily for the far more extensive and important Hor-pa country; in fact, we may rather regard the Dge-śi-tsha as a dialect of Hor-pa.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Tibetan)</th>
<th>'1' (geg)</th>
<th>'7' (bdun)</th>
<th>'10' (bcu)</th>
<th>'11' (bcu-geg)</th>
<th>'20' (ni-su)</th>
<th>'100' (brgya)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amdo and Go-lok</td>
<td>a(-ri)</td>
<td>sta(-rê)</td>
<td>ha-dû(-rê)</td>
<td>a-tô</td>
<td>gni-na-so</td>
<td>a-kâi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thôchû</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>étie</td>
<td>a-diô</td>
<td>a-ti</td>
<td>niu-so</td>
<td>a-kâo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (Dzorgai)</td>
<td>eü</td>
<td>étü</td>
<td>a-dûi</td>
<td>niu-so</td>
<td>a-kâo</td>
<td>e-côh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>é</td>
<td>skié</td>
<td>a-dûô</td>
<td>a-ti</td>
<td>e-côh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Outer Man-Tzû'</td>
<td>a(r-gu)</td>
<td>âne(r-gu)</td>
<td>kha(dr-gu)</td>
<td>khâ-tyi</td>
<td>ner (or ne)-sâ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hôr-pa</td>
<td>râ</td>
<td>zne</td>
<td>sgâ</td>
<td>na-skâ</td>
<td>rhyâ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-ron</td>
<td>râ</td>
<td>zne</td>
<td>sgâ</td>
<td>na-skâ</td>
<td>rhyâ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyârûng</td>
<td>ka-ti</td>
<td>kû-ânésa</td>
<td>sîh</td>
<td>kin-nis-sî</td>
<td>paryê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-ron (Wassû)</td>
<td>t-riki</td>
<td>ko-ânésa</td>
<td>âtyie or setie</td>
<td>ko-ne-âtie</td>
<td>pria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-ron (Pati)</td>
<td>ko-tie</td>
<td>ko-âne</td>
<td>sî</td>
<td>cek-ci</td>
<td>nie-âe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-ron (Hanniu)</td>
<td>ci</td>
<td>daeô</td>
<td>pcô</td>
<td>nie-âe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyû-ruûn</td>
<td>kitiak</td>
<td>ke-ânes</td>
<td>âsc(âscô, âô)</td>
<td>cek-ci</td>
<td>nie-âe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dgo-ši-taha</td>
<td>zi</td>
<td>zniê</td>
<td>zra</td>
<td>cek-ci</td>
<td>nie-âe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-nâag</td>
<td>tâ-bi</td>
<td>skwi(-bi)</td>
<td>âc(-t-s)-c(-bi)</td>
<td>ke-ne-âsîâ</td>
<td>pöryâ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mânyak Menia</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ân</td>
<td>cht(-t-s)-cht(-t-s)</td>
<td>âwâ</td>
<td>0-2ê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-nia 38</td>
<td>dji</td>
<td>âô</td>
<td>ho</td>
<td>nâ-câ(-bi)</td>
<td>tê-jê</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-U-Rong Mi-li</td>
<td>tê(-pi)</td>
<td>gâm(ââm ?)(-pi)</td>
<td>nâ-tsa</td>
<td>tê-jê</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prû-mi Tsa-ron</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>tâ</td>
<td>si-ti(-pi)</td>
<td>nâ-tsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mêlam Loutse 24</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>hâm, hni-yi</td>
<td>gne(-ô)</td>
<td>nê-ka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-tzû 26</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>hni</td>
<td>nê-ka</td>
<td>nê-ka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yîn-nan 35</td>
<td>ti(-ku)</td>
<td>sh(-ku)</td>
<td>ti-tsel</td>
<td>nê-ô(-ku)</td>
<td>ti-ô(-ku)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ti-tsel-kig</td>
<td>a-ô-tsel-kig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a-ô-tsel-kig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tibetan)</td>
<td>'Thou'</td>
<td>'He', 'That'</td>
<td>'White'</td>
<td>'Sky'</td>
<td>'Sun'</td>
<td>'Wind'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amdo and Go-lök</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thöchü</td>
<td>kwâ, kwê</td>
<td>kwân-thâ-ca</td>
<td>phyokh</td>
<td>mahto</td>
<td>mûn</td>
<td>mozyû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 (Dzorgai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>consa</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>mônn</td>
<td>muhosu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 (Kortsê)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>con</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>mônn</td>
<td>muhodze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 'Outer Man-Tzû'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mo-ta</td>
<td>me-sê</td>
<td>mo-sâ</td>
<td>mo-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hör-pa</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>[vjâ, vjya]</td>
<td>phrû-phrû</td>
<td>[koh]</td>
<td>[gna]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgyal-ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyurûng (Wassû)</td>
<td>[sân-rê]</td>
<td>[gnû-pos, wa-tû]</td>
<td>ka-prom</td>
<td>tû-mûn</td>
<td>[ki-nî]</td>
<td>[ta-lî]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-ron (Pâtû)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>[tenchie]</td>
<td>ko-prûm</td>
<td>te-mû</td>
<td>[ke-nî]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rgya-ron (Hanniu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jyâ-ruñ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dge-si-tsha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miñag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mânyak</td>
<td>nô</td>
<td>thi</td>
<td>[dal-lû]</td>
<td>mah</td>
<td>[ni-ma]</td>
<td>mûrda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mu-nia</td>
<td>ha</td>
<td></td>
<td>phri</td>
<td>moûkele</td>
<td>[he-mi]</td>
<td>mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sam-ba</td>
<td>min-tsa</td>
<td>[ru-ra]</td>
<td>muh’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa-U-Rong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>phû-li-li</td>
<td>[û-ru-ru]</td>
<td>[ru-ra]</td>
<td>[ri-ru]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi-li</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muli(Njong)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tr‘on-mû</td>
<td>me-nî</td>
<td>[nî]</td>
<td>mo-ho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prû-mi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsea-ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mêlâm</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>[aug]</td>
<td>hoûû</td>
<td>[nam]</td>
<td>[nam-loûn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutse 24</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>[koméio]</td>
<td>hoûû</td>
<td>[nam]</td>
<td>[nam-loûn]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, 26</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td>hoûû</td>
<td>[nam]</td>
<td>ma-u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu-tzû</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[nam-boûn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yûn-nan 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pu-lu-zu</td>
<td>na-ka-mû</td>
<td>[hi-mî]</td>
<td>mossê</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Desgodins,¹ a few words), Loutse (Desgodins),² 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 Thöchū to the numerals 1–10 may be = Tib. re, res, ‘one by one’, ‘time’, ‘times’. The -r of ‘Outer Man-Trū’ is, no doubt, as Yule has observed (p. 123), 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 -pī of No. 38 definitely associates the dialect with Mānyak (Mi-nag), whereto geographically, being of the region of Ya-chou, it is adjacent.

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

2. ‘Seven’: The Thöchū and Go-lok forms with st-, st-, and šk- (but ‘Outer Man-Trū’ šn-), and likewise the Mānyak skwī (erroneously questioned by Baber, p. 102) may be derived from a stn-/skn-, resulting from the original mn-/-n, or possibly smw-/-mw-, which accounts for the innumerable mn-, n-, b-, s-, s-, 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 location, exemplified in the table by the forms with a-, &c., ta-, &c., and represented also by Hodgson’s Gyāmi r-sa, r-pē, can be found, further, in Lo-lo, Kioutse and Liou-Li-so.

4. ‘Ten’: It is difficult to account for Gyārung sih, si, Rgya-roñ (Pati) si, except upon the supposition that they are borrowings of Chinese shih, earlier sī, found in many other languages. Rgya-roñ sthyi, Jyā-ruñ sī, sīo, 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. Hanni pcō, like all the other Hanni numerals, is clearly borrowed from Tibetan.

5. Hörpa and Dge-śi-tsha: A connexion between these would perhaps be more apparent if we had the Hörpa form of ‘11’. Evidently, however, the Dge-śi-tsha form ówer (10–1) may contain an etymological equivalent of Hörpa 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

the eighth to ninth century and may be related to Chinese "1" (modern i), of the same provenance. The Dge-ši-tsha ô-żê, 'one 100', with ze < jie < jia < (brjgya (cf. Mányak tê-jê, Menia ta-jia), suggests that Hörpa rhyâ 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-ši-tsha ô in ô-żê) to the Amdo-Go-lök 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-roṅ (rki, ci, kitak) and in the Tsa-roṅ, 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/snîs are almost universal, invasion by Tibetan bdun being observable only in Pa-U-Rong and in the very much Tibetanized Hanniu dialect of the Rgyal-roṅ.

(c) Forms of 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 decades, '20', &c.: the -so, -sû employed in Amdo to form the decades can hardly be the -su of Tibetan ñi-śu (< nis-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 decades 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 Thôchû thâ, 'that', thâ-ko, thâk-lar, 'they', thâk-ci, thâ-kûk, 'his', 'their', thûûga, thaksî, 'there' (Gyårung has t in tis-dûi, 'then', Hörpa ta in tab-deu, 'then'); Mányak thi, 'he', thê, 'his', thûûû, &c., 'thurs', thîlê, 'then', thûûû pu, 'there', &c.; Menia tha, 'he', thi, 'his', thou, 'they'; tha 'what?', in Thôchû thi-sni, 'when?', Gyårung thiis-dûi, 'when?', this-ti (Rgya-roṅ this-tie), 'how much?', thû, 'what?'; pa, 'this', in Thôchû patino, Gyårung pûz-dûi, 'now', Thôchû pa-si, Go-lök 41 pûs, Hörpa pa-sni, Gyårung pi-šûi, Jyû-ruû pe-sûne, 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)nî-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': Thöchû nã-i, Hörpa gãyê, gnor, Gyãrûng ka-sné.¹
*tsha*, 'goat': Thöchû tsâh, Go-lok 39 sai, Hörpa chê, Gyãrûng kûs-so, Rgya-roñ (Pati) ko-su, Jyã-ruñ a-ke-sû, Mâyak tsâh, Menia chi, Mi-li (Prû-mi) che-da, Lu-tzû a-kie.
*sormo*, 'iron': Thöchû sormo, Go-lok 41 siêmo, Hörpa cû, Gyãrûng sôm, Rgya-roñ sôm, Mâyak ñî, Menia ñe, Mu-nia ñû, 38 sôn, Mul(Njong) ñê, Prû-mi ñen, Loutse 24 ñiam.
*ya*, 'sheep': Rgya-roñ (Pati) ko-yo (Wassû ke-yo, 'goat'), Jyã-ruñ a-ke-yû, Menia yo (Mu-nia ñû, 'goat'), Loutse 24 a-yau, 26 yang, Yûn-nan 35 yo, Hsi-hsia ye (Lauffer, no. 68).

**Hsi-fan languages: use of Prefixes**

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

*r* - = Tib. *r* -:


``
*brgyad*, '8': Thöchû kh-rû(-rê), Hörpa rhidê, Gyãrûng oryê, Rgya-roñ varia(t), worió(t) (cf. the case of brgya, '100', supra, p. 90).
``

``
*rna*, 'ear': Gyãrûng ti-ûnê, 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:


``
*khyur*, 'complete', &c.: Thöchû rkwei, 'handsome'.
``

``
*nûn, mûn, ñûn*, 'listen': Gyãrûng ka-rnyou.
``

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

``
*mû*, 'man': Gyãrûng ti-rûi, Rgya-roñ t-rûi, Hsi-hsia rme.
``

¹ Add Tâkpa (líhû)-ni ((líhû)-ma-ni, 'bad').
Tib. **miṅ**, ‘name’; Thöchü **rmāḥ**, Gyārūṅg **ti-rmiṅ**, Rgya-roṅ **k-rmiien** (Hörpa **smen**).

Similarly we find instances of **g**- (Thöchü **kēi(-ri)**, ‘3’ = **gsun**, &c.), **b**- (Hörpa **na-pĕ̀**, ‘tell’ = **bsad**, &c.), **m**- (Hörpa **ka-mthū**, ‘great’ = **mtho**, ‘high’, &c.), **ḥ**- (as nasal, Rgya-roṅ **ci-mbō = ḥbar**, ‘blaze’, &c.), and **s**- (Rgya-roṅ **te-šni**, ‘heart’ = **sṇiṅ**, &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-ruṅ, where Dr. Wolfenden has furnished a continuous narrative which exemplifies the fact. In function also they differ from the old Prefixes, serving to mark grammatical classes of words, such as nouns, adjectives, verbs, numerals. The different languages are not uniform in their choice of Prefixes or in their employment of them severally.

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

\[a-, ka-, ta-, da-, na-, wa-, ya,\] and, in the Rgyal-roṅ, **sa-** and (Hanniū) **ci-**, **yi-**,

and we may note occurrences in the languages severally.

Thöchū:


**Go-lok** (41, 42, 39):

1. **a-** in 41 **a-cl**, 42 **e-śi**, ‘month’ (Rgya-roṅ **ti-e-tsla**, Tib. **zla-ba**).
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Hōr-pa:

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

Rgyal-roñ (Gyārūṅ, Rgya-roñ, Jyā-ruñ):

1. a- in Nouns (Rgya-roñ ti-e-tsa, 'month' = Go-lok a-cl, e-ṣi, a-ṣia, 'flesh' = Tib. ša, &c.).  
2. ka- in Nouns (Gyārūṅ ki-ni, 'sun' = Tib. nī-ma, &c.), Adjectives (Gyārūṅ ka-nak, 'black' = Tib. nag, &c.), Verbs (Gyārūṅ ka-rnyou, 'hear', &c.), and Numerals (Gyārūṅ ka-tī, '1', ka-nēs, '2', &c.).

ga- in Rgya-roñ ga-pa, go-mū, 'father', 'mother' (Gyārūṅ ta-pē, tō-mō), may be different.

3. ta- in Nouns (Gyārūṅ tā-rū, 'horn', ti-khe, 'mouth' = Tib. ru, kha, &c.), Adjectives (Rgya-roñ te-sa-lo, 'hot' = Tib. tsha, &c.), Verbs (Gyārūṅ ta-zō, 'eat' = Tib. za, &c.).

4. da- in Verbs (Gyārūṅ da-na-rgyūk, 'run' = Tib. rgyug, &c.).  
5. na- in Verbs (Gyārūṅ nā-sē, 'kill' = Thōchū ta-sēh, Hōrpa ta-sē, &c.).

6. ya- in Gyārūṅ ya-cin (Rgya-roñ na-chun), 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. ḫthun, me-ndū, 'sit down', mō-dru, 'take off (clothes)', &c.).

Miñag (Manyak, Menia, Mu-nia, 38):

1. a- (Mnia only) in Adjectives (a-ni, 'few' = Tib. ūn, a-bi, 'thin' = Menia ya-bu, &c.).

1 We have here ventured to invert the meanings as given by Terrien de Lacouperie, § 176.
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3. *ta-* in Verbs (Mānyak ta-khi, 'give', &c.).


7. *wa-* in Mānyak wa-khi, ta-khi, 'give'.

Pa-U-Rong:

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

Mi-li (Muli (Njong), Prū-mi):

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

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

Tsa-roṅ (Mēlam, Loutse, Lu-tzū):

1. *a-* in Nouns (Loutse a-sa, 'earth', a-na, 'ear', &c. = Tib. sa, rna, &c.), and Numerals (Loutse a-ni, '2', a-som, '3' a-bli, '4', &c.).

2. *ka-* in Mēlam ka-thin, 'large'?


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

Gyārūṅg śe-pri 'ape' (Tib. spreṅ), ko-rok, 'ant' (Tib. greg), Rgya-roṅ waria(t), worie(t) (Tib. brgyad, Khams brgyad), Gyārūṅg paryé, '100' (Tib. brgya), Mēlam 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-tzû 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 gûi, 'sun' (Tib. ëi, gûi) = Gyärûng 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.¹ 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 con-
trary, 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 Yûn-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-pôl, a-khin, in which the second syllables
are Chinese (pa(r) and ch'i'en), 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 Himalayan dialects,
Thulung (Wolfenden, JRAS. 1935, p. 641), Simbu, Yâkhâ, Râi.

It may be noticed that even in the Rgyal-roñ we have both on
its eastern extremity ('Outer Man-Tzû' â(r-gu), '1', kha(dr-gu),
i.e. kha(r-gu), '10', khâ-tyi, '11', &c.) and on the western (Dge-ši-
tsha o-wre, '11', ô-mnê, '12', ô-su, '13', &c., ô-zê, 'one 100'),
evidence for a, '1', and ga/ka (Thôchû 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, mû, mu,

¹ 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.).
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&c., Lo-lo m'o, mu, mü, Kioutse ga-mōn, mu-lang; then Ka-chin la-mu and in Burma mov, mov-kong, mu-tang, moq, mo, &c.; while the rarer meaning, 'sun', is seen in Lo-lo mū-nī, &c., Li-su mū-tsa. In the case of prom, 'white', we have the r surviving (partly as l) in written Burmese phru, 'white', and, with the meaning 'silver', Sing-pho kūm-phro, Ka-chin kun-pro, Nung kum-prá, Lo-lo phru, Aka Lo-lo and Lahu phu, Pyen plū; the r is lost in Mo-so phèn, phè, pha, pe, Lo-lo a-phyu, piu, &c., Li-su phu, phu-ca-ma, Lahu phu, Petsen pin, Loutse 24, 26 hong, Min-kia pó, 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, tchuo, tlo, &c.). Here again the partial survival of -m (as -n or -n) in languages which otherwise have lost their final consonants is noticeable.

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

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

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

1 The ka- prefix used in Mishmi with the first four or six numerals and to a less extent in Nāgā dialects is reminiscent of the Rgyal-roṅ.
2 No. 35 is isolated farther south, circa lat. 27°.
In this conclusion we are confirmed by the evidence furnished by the Hsi-hsia, even in the present limits of the knowledge obtained of it. For that the Hsi-hsia, language of a Ch’iang dynasty and people, must have been largely or mainly Ch’iang could hardly be doubted; and in Hsi-hsia are found some of the above discussed marks of our Hsi-fan group, namely a, ‘1’ (Nevsky, No. 78, also li, kii, gli, Nos. 1, 239, and gleh, ‘alone’, ‘7’, No. 300); ša, gšah, ‘7’ (No. 56); kha, dgšah, dgah, ‘10’ (No. 145); tha, ‘he’, ‘it’ (Nos. 71, 225); mo, ‘sky’, ‘sun’ (No. 7, Laufer, No. 34); dušah, ‘good’ (Nevsky, No. 199); ye, ‘sheep’ (Laufer, No. 68); to which we may add ldiš, lda, zlaš, tha (Nevsky, No. 93, from bldyš = Tib. bṣi), ‘4’ = Hörpa hla, Takpa pli, Loutse a-bli, &c., and rmé (Tib. mi, myi, Nevsky, No. 39), ‘man’, with r- Prefix, as in Gyārung ti-rmi, Rgya-roṅ 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 decades, there is agreement between the northern and southern dialects, interrupted by the Rgyal-roṅ 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-roṅ 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-roṅ people, supposed to represent the original native race of Ssū-ch’uan. In this connexion the apparently actual tradition of the Man-tzū people, that they were originally immigrants,¹ may deserve consideration.

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

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

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

¹ Fergusson, op. cit., pp. 247 sqq.
prom, Hörpa phrü, Mu-nia phri, (2) with r > y Thöchü 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 > s, 38 ṣon, ṣam, (4) with s > h (probably not ph > h), Tsa-ron hong.

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

This palatalization has not spared the group sr-, as we can see in the case of sriṅ, ‘long’ = Tib. riṅ (but sriṅ, ‘extend’): (a) non-palatalization in Gyärūṅ ka-sri, ‘long’, ‘tall’; (b) palatalization in Hörpa ka-ci (< cṛi < śṛi < sṛi), ‘long’, ce-ci (sṛin-sṛiṅ), ‘far’, Mányak śā-śā, Menia ya-šé, Mu-nia da-śō [Mo-so šō, Lo-lo šō, a-śā], ‘long’. The instance illustrates also, in the Mányak, &c., forms, the modifications of vowels, especially i, which in both groups of languages are apt to occur after r, e.g. in d’Ollone 36 crō, 37 cō, 38 tsē, 40 ce, 41 tūeiś, Mélam śiru, kiō, < śru = Tib. gri, ‘knife’.

As regards consonant before y, we have seen in the case of brgya, ‘100’—

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

(b) palatalization in Thöchū and Go-lok a-kśī, a-kśō, &c., Rgya-roṅ (Hanniu) ždie, Mányak te-jé, Menia ta-jia, Tsa-ron ki-śia, chia, &c.;

(c) probably rjia > ra in Pa-U-Rong ta-ra, and (r)sia > he in 35 hé (cf. 35 hé, 38 hiē pi = brgyad, ‘8’);

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

Here also we have in E. Colonial the palatalized forms 40 cia, ‘100’, 37 diē, 40 dtiē, ‘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 Thöchü \textit{phyo(kh)} < \textit{phrom}, have been as \(pr- \rightarrow py-\), 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\text{-}, or } py\text{-, or } p\text{- (with loss of } y\text{, 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 \textit{jré}, ‘mule’ = Tib. \textit{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 \(pr\text{-}\), since the \(pr\text{-}\) no longer exists: hence, if a palatalization has subsequently occurred, it must have operated upon loan-words containing that group.

The case of \(my- \rightarrow mi\text{-}, or } my- \rightarrow mny\text{-}, ny- \rightarrow mni\text{-}, ni\text{-}, may be exemplified by forms of Tib. \textit{mig}, \textit{myig}, ‘eye’, which illustrate also the fate of final \(g\). In this word the \(-g\) is still pronounced both in Lha-sa Tibetan (\textit{mik}) and in E. Colonial (\textit{mig}), though normally \(-g\) is lost, in the former except in certain collocations, \textit{lak-pa}, \&c.: the survival may be due to the \(i\) vowel, since we find also Lha-sa \textit{šik} (\textit{gsig}), ‘panther’, and E. Colonial (Tse-kou) \textit{kiq} (\textit{gsig}), ‘1’. In ‘Tangut’, which retains the \(-g\), as \(-k\), \textit{nık}, ‘eye’, is not exceptional: in Mo-so, Lo-lo, \&c., the \(-g\) is lost. From \textit{myig} > \textit{miig} > \textit{miag} we get Gyārūṅ \textit{tai-myèk}, Muli(Njong) \textit{mia} (Li-su \textit{mia-sö}), Menia \textit{mie}, Mu-nia \textit{mie-lù}, Pa-U-Rong, \textit{byu} [Mo-so \textit{miö}, mö, Lo-lo \textit{myet-sao}, \&c.]; from \textit{mniig} Rgya-roñ (Hanniu) \textit{mnyi}, Mānyak \textit{mni} [40 \textit{nìhi}, Lo-lo \textit{nì-sú}], from \textit{mniag} Rgya-roñ \textit{te-mniak}, \textit{te-mniok}, \&c., 38 \textit{nìa}, Mi-li (Prū-m) \textit{nìe}, Loutse \textit{nìe} [Yün-nan (Ku-tsung) \textit{nìe}, Mo-so \textit{nya-lù}, Lo-lo \textit{nìe-sö}, \&c.]. Similarly from \textit{mi}, \textit{myi}, ‘man’, we get \(n\)-forms, Thöchü \textit{näh}, Go-lok \textit{nèé}, no, 40 \textit{nö}, \textit{nìé}, Pa-U-Rong \textit{nyi} [‘Tangut’ \textit{mni}, Yün-nan (Ku-tsung) \textit{na}]. It is noticeable that the \textit{mn}-, \textit{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, Hörpa hyū, 'house', directly descended from the original khyim, or has it passed through the palatal stage of the adjacent Rgya-roṅ chiem, chom? Hörpa, a dialect exposed more than any other to influence from E. Colonial Tibetan, has palatalization in chēh, 'road' = Thöchū griṅ, Gyārūṅ tri, and in chō, '6', <drug; and, on the other hand, the palatalization of ky-, khy- is universal in E. Colonial Tibetan (Amdo deyil = dkyil, &c.), as also in the Rgyal-roṅ (Chyon = Khyuṅ, &c.); so that the answer is provisionally uncertain. What is here requisite is to attain, if possible, a conception of the phonological situation in the Hsi-fan language at as early a period as can be inferred from the common features of the modern dialects.

Early Hsi-fan phonology: comparison with Hsi-hsia

Here we may propound some deductions as follows:

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

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

Tib. gru (Lha-sa tru, 40 juo), 'boat': Hörpa grā, Gyārūṅ brū, Mānyak gū.

Tib. grog-ma (Lha-sa tro-ma, Tse-kou cru-ma), 'ant': Thöchū tū-khrā, Hörpa skhrō, Gyārūṅ ko-rok [Mo-so cō, ca-i, Lo-lo bo-yo, bu-ma, &c.].

Tib. drug (Lha-sa truk, E. Colonial cru, cu, cuk), '6': Thöchū khata(-re), Go-luk tōh, tūsū, 'Outer Man-Tzū' stū(r-gu), Gyārūṅ kū-tōk, Rgya-roṅ (Hanniu) ktrū, Mānyak trū-(bī), Pa-U-Rong tru, Muli(Njong) thru.

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

Tib. brag (Lha-sa tra, E. Colonial era, ca), 'rock': Rgya-roṅ prā(k) (also in the place-name Bra-sdì, Burakdi), Loutse a-pra, perhaps Thöchū s-ṣyāḥ (cf. phyokh = prom).

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

Tib. hbrug, 'dragon', sbrul, 'snake' (Lha-sa druk, dru, E. Colonial ju, jrö, &c.): Thöchū brigi, 41, 42 biyō, 39 buś, Hörpa phri, Gyārūṅ kha-bri, Jyā-ruṅ kha-uri, Mānyak brū, Menia bar, 'snake' [Mo-so żo].
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:


The r- prefix in this word, *rya, is interesting. Tib. byi-ba (Lha-sa ci-xa, E. Colonial síua, tsii, šio, jeh), ‘rat’: Rgya-ron pui, Jyä-ruñ pê-yi [Mo-so fu, Lo-lo véh, hê, &c.].

Tib. khyim [Lha-sa and E. Colonial use khañ], ‘house’: Thöchû kib, 42 ki, Loutse kium, 24 kime.

-palatalization in Go-lok 41 tié, Hörpa hyö (?), Dge-si-tsha yo, Gyärung chêm, Rgya-ron ciem, Jyä-ruñ chom, Mûl (Njong) jih, Loutse 26 jím. [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 more evidence of a v (khwi or khwi) : the same is possible in regard to bya, ‘bird’, Himalayan (Thulung) pwa, &c.—see Linguistic Survey of India, 1. ii, ‘Comparative Vocabularies’. The non-palatalized forms of khyim also might come from *khim.

Considering the widespread palatalization instanced in the cases of bryaad, ‘8’, and brkeya, ‘100’, and its universality in E. Colonial Tibetan and in the Rgyal-ron (‘Jyä-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’: Jyä-ruñ sci (?), Mányak cê-ci(-bi) (‘one 10’), Menia chi-chi, Mû-nia ho (<so ?), Loutse 24 ti-tse (1), 26 ti-etsé (1) (‘one 10’), Lu-tzu tsel, Yûn-nan 35 ho-u(-ku) (?)

-insertion of i in Rgya-ron styie, Jyä-ruñ sci, seid [Mo-so tse, tsö, &c., Lo-lo tse, tsö, cie, ci, &c.].

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


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

Tib. bsad (Lha-sa še, E. Colonial pset, śie, &c.), ‘expound’, ‘tell’: Hörpa na-psê, Gyärung ta-cê(n), Mu-nia mo-sa (?)

-insertion of i in Jya-ruń uṣiat (also uṣat), 38 śie [Mo-so śō, śa-do, Lo-lo do-si, śuo, do-chō, &c.].


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


The instances are in favour of posteriority of the insertion, which has sometimes (e.g. in ‘Tangut’ dziam-ba, ‘cheek’, <hjiam-ba <hgram-pa) affected even secondary palatals. In the Rgyal-ron it is perhaps even modern, since it is absent in the names of the ‘Eighteen States’, and it extends sometimes to non-palatalats (Rgya-ron zie, ‘gold’, <ser, Jya-ruń zia, ‘eat’, <za) no less than palatalats (a-śia, ‘flesh’, <śa, chia, ‘wine’, <chań). 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 o, eo, ūo, uo, much complicating the vowel systems.

4. A casual change ū outnumber 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. lha, ‘5’: Thöchū wā(-rē), Go-lök 41 uē, 42 rhoō, 39 uō, ‘Outer Man-Tzu’ wa(r-gu), Hörpa guē: Dge-si-tshwa mna, Gyärung ku-ngnō, Rgya-ron kō-mū (<-mwo <-ńwo <-ńo), (Hanniu) ņo, Jya-ruń ko-mū, 38 ŋan(-pi), Pa-U-Rong ņa, Muli(Njong) ņo, (Prü-mi) ŋwa. [Mo-so ua, Lo-lo ŋwa, &c.].
Tib. dḥul (Lha-sa ṅū, E. Colonial ṇöl, nu, ṇou, &c.), ‘silver’:
41 uon, 42 mivu (mvu), 39 u, Menia mwe: Mu-nia nu, 38 on,
Muli(Njong) ṇou, (Prū-mi) ṇi, Loutse 24 ṇon, 26 nu, Lu-tzū
nu, 35 nnu. [Mo-so ṇu, ṇō.]

5. Similarly casual, involving perhaps a change ī > j, which
occurs in eighth-to-ninth-century Tibetan manuscripts from Kan-
su, are forms = Tib. iā, ‘fish’:
Tib. iā (Lha-sa Ṽa, E. Colonial iā, īain), ‘fish’: Thōchū īzhāh,
Go-lok 41 že, 42 gže, 39 že, Hōrpa, hyā, Gyārūng chū-nyo,
Mānyak yū, Mu-nia zō, 38 ceńi, Mi-li (Prū-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-roṅ are found in verbs
(Thōchū ā-jon, Hōrpa wa-nzūn, ‘sit’, Gyārūng da-cin, ya-cin =
Hōrpa ta-sin, wa-śin, ‘go’, &c.): this is probably a formative.
Thōchū has also other final consonants (nūkh, ‘ear’, phyokh,
‘white’, aśpic, ‘hunger’, &c.), due to absorbed formatives or to
compounds.

Of -s after consonants, otherwise wholly lost, the Go-lok has
curious survivals in 41 zīerk, 42 zīerk, ‘tongue’ = Tib. ljags, and
41 ūteṅk (< ićieṅk < ićiag < cags < sags) = Tib. saṅs, ‘nose’, where
-gs < -n has ancient parallels in Kan-su Tibetan. The Go-lok
forms may be borrowed from Amdo Tibetan, where we find
‘Tangut’ kḥitsirk-ta = Tib. gzigs. After vowels -s is lost, except in
the Rgyal-roṅ, where -nels, ‘2’, and -snels, ‘7’, are clearly native
words.

Of original -l there is no trace, and loss is evidenced in:
Tib. yul (Lha-sa yũ), ‘village’, ‘country’: Thōchū wē-khā,
Gyārūng wō-khyū, Mānyak hū.
Tib. bṣul, ‘path’: Go-lok 41 jueu (= zūo ?), 42 guēu, (gě-u ?) and

Loss of -r, not infrequent in E. Colonial Tibetan and attested in
the Hōr-pa-Rgyal-roṅ country by forms of place-names (Kungsa,
Kanzé, &c. supra pp. 83, 85 n.), is seen in Go-lok 41 sae, 42 sō,
Menia sā = Tib. sār, ‘(sun)-rise’, and in 39 se-u, Rgya-roṅ zie =
Tib. geer, ‘gold’ [Lo-lo sī, sō, &c.], and probably in forms of
dmar, ‘red’, and mar, ‘below’. Several dialects preserve it in
Tibetan loan-words, and the Rgyal-roṅ perhaps in some others.

Of the nasals -m has everywhere, in prom, ‘white’, khyim,
‘house’, and in sam, som, ‘3’, retained traces. Of -ā and -n, the
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former very, but not absolutely, persistent in E. Colonial Tibetan, there is no Hsi-fan survival, except in words with initial, or quasi-initial, m (Thöchü min, Gyärung ka-sman, ‘ripe’, Hörpa smen, Rgya-roṅ ti-rmiṅ, k-rmien, Mányak miṅ, ‘name’, and forms of mon, ‘sky’). Loss of -n has been exemplified in the case of śiṅ, ‘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’; Thöchü pi, Go-lok 41 pa, 42 pa, 39 pe, Hörpa vāh, Rgya-roṅ pa, phā, pa(k), Mányak vāh, Mu-nia va, 38 pa, Loutse 24, 26 ua [Mo-so bu, Lo-lo vi, &c.].

Tib. bsad, gsd (Lha-sa se, E. Colonial sé, &c.), ‘kill’; Thöchü ta-sēh, Hörpa ta-sē, Gyärung nā-sē (Jyā-ruṅ sia(t)), Mányak na-sya, Muli(Njong) ne-se [Mo-so su, Lo-lo si, siē, &c., Burmese sat].

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

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

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

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

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

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

In this way the vowel-system may have been appreciably nearer to that of written Tibetan. As individual particulars which have ancient analogues, we may mention (1) Thöchü rmah, 'name', < rman < rmiu (cf. 'Tangut' sah for ñiñ, 'wood', and confusion of sran and sñin in the ancient manuscripts), and Gyärung sman, 'ripe', < smin; (2) Rgya-ron smou, 'medicine', ka-rnyou, 'hear', < sman, (s)ñan; (3) Thöchü pi, 'hog', Mänyak phuñ, 'tooth', < phag, suca(su), Thöchü kṣi(-ri), Mänyak sì(-bi), 'Outer Man-Tszü' kṣi(r-gu), Menia si, Pa-U-Rong zi<gsam, elsewhere only som, sam, &c., (cf. Hsi-hsia rni, &c., < rna, 'nose', &c. (Lauffer, 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. Lauffer 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), lañ, rna, sbrul: Nevsky has in Tibetan transcriptions many more, of which rme, 'man', seems to be a certain example. Of initial groups kr-, &c., Lauffer has no examples, and Nevsky records only four obscure words, treh (No. 270), 'heaven', hrtri (No. 201), 'change', bldra (No. 315), dbri (?), also hbbiñ (No. 247), 'light': if in Hsi-hsia such an r had become y, as we might be led by the
instances, gye (No. 251), 'mountain' (<gri = Tib. ri), and hgye (No. 243), 'path' (cf. Thöchü grih, Gyärüng tri, Hörpa cêh) 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. rlüṅ, rus). Development of i after palatals is not apparent. The final consonants -ň, -n, -m, -r are exemplified by Laufer, -ň and -r also by Nevsky (Nos. 155, 187, 268; 55, 231, 279, 281, 333), though -ň is lost in li, 'wind' = Gyärüng ta-li, Tib. rlüṅ. 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 rhač 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, ldebu, ldoṅ);

(b) initial consonants, ň (ňal), ts (tsen), tsh (tshun), y (yab), ș and ž (şī = žin), z and ž (zu = žu), th (thiṅ, thöl);

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

1 Perhaps also in chi, 'gall' (Laufer, No. 56) = Tib. mkhriṣ.
(d) final consonants, $g$ (cog, rgeb), $n$ (lloñ, thiñ), $n$ (ts'hun, žin), $b$ (yab), $m$ (prom), $l$ (nal, thol), and group $gs$ (loogs);

(e) final vowel $a$ (bya, rma), $i$ (hi), $e$ (mye), $u$ (zu), $o$ (go, cho), or quasi-diphthong (tehi, ldehû, byehû), and dialectical alternation $a/e$ (rbag, rgeb);

(f) derivative byehû 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, Šo-ma-ra, Skyi-mthiñ, Bum-liñ, Byar-liñs), persons (Myi-rma-bu Ldam-sad, Mun-zag-tsa, Rgyan-nar), superhuman beings (Srañ-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,¹ and it will be repeated with additional particulars infra (pp. 130 sqq.). The extraneous aids for the interpretation appear to be decidedly inadequate. The most promising of them is the Tibetan, of which the seventh-century pronunciation is known from its script, authoritatively and carefully designed, with the help of Indian teaching, to fit the language. To the kindred Nam language that script, which in the eighth century was in familiar use among officials and private persons in Tibet, is likely to have been applied with tolerable exactness; for we know that contemporaneously it was used with fair success to represent even Chinese, not to mention Central-Asian languages having alphabetic writing. The initial geographical remoteness of Tibet proper had given place to close political, administrative, and military connexions; and Buddhism in a Tibetan form commenced early in the eighth century to spread to Amdo. Hence the Tibetan scribes must have had constant practice in the writing of native personal names, which, however, they usually translated, and of topographical names, and of some common terms. There are also some few contemporary manuscript fragments in Tibetan, which, reproducing native folklore or religious compositions, may serve for orientation in regard to the interests, psychology, notions, and circumstances of the population.

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE SCRIPT

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

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

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

¹ The sign for ḭ has at its right top a small curve with rightward facing
concavity; w is formed of this ḭ superposed to a b; superscript ṭ has fre-
quently the ‘inverted’ (rightward turned) form; the left limb of kh is short.
² For particulars see infra, p. 126.
³ Final Ḧ added ll. 8, 75, 137, 173, 228, 234, 258, 290, 302, 327, 367, 384;
crossed out l. 363. Initial ḭ added ll. 70, 81, 178; crossed out, 106, 143, 174.
Final Ӧ added, ll. 326, 378. Final Ӧ added, l. 147; changed to ӓ, l. 361.
Final Ḧ and r, ll. 17, 163, 246, 302. Initial ry(rgy, rk) and rӦ, 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:

\[ \eta k, \eta kh, \eta g, \eta n, \]
\[ \eta c, \eta ch, \eta j, \eta \ddot{n}, \]
\[ \eta t, \eta th, \eta d, \eta n, \]
\[ \eta p, \eta ph, \eta b, \eta m, \]
\[ \eta ts, \eta tsh, \eta dz, \]
\[ \eta w, \eta \ddot{z}, \eta z, \eta h, \]
\[ \eta y, \eta r, \eta l, \]
\[ \eta s, \eta s, \eta h. \]

The absence of \( \eta \), 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 \( \eta \), used in Tibetan either as a compendious way of writing postscript \( h \) or to indicate vowel length (perhaps via the former alternative, \( a \), &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, \( m \), is sometimes used.

The special forms employed in Tibetan to represent Sanskrit sounds, viz. the cerebral consonants, the aspirated mediae, and some others, do not occur in the Nam text: the absence of the subscript \( h \) 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: \( \ddot{z} \) 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 \( sg, lh, sh, cw, lc, lj, \ddot{nv}, sd, sn, lb, mr, tshw, \ddot{zw}, zw,zl, lw, \ddot{sw}, hr, lh \), of which about one-half are in Tibetan itself quite rare;
(b) some Tibetan combinations of two written signs, viz. \( b+k \), \( b+rk \), \( b+g \), \( b+rgy \), \( b+sq \), \( b+sgy \), \( b+c \), \( b+n \), \( b+t \), \( b+rt \), \( b+lt \), \( b+st \), \( b+d \), \( b+ts \), \( b+rts \), \( dk \), \( dn \), \( dp \), \( db \), \( mkh \), \( mch \), \( mj \), \( m_nh \), \( md \), \( mn \), \( mtsh \), \( mdz \). \( m_nh \) occurs only once, viz. in \( m_nh \_r \) (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, \( skh \), \( ty \), \( dy \), \( thy \), \( r\_z \), \( r\_s \), \( rs \), \( sc \),

(b) combinations, \( gk \), \( gch \), \( grt \), \( gsr \), \( gld \), \( gph \), \( bph \), \( gb(gbl) \), \( gm \), \( dd \)

(one occurrence, l. 95), \( ss \), \( g-r \), \( g-w \),

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

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

II. ORTHOGRAPHY

Every language which has appeared in writing has in some degree an orthography, i.e. a normal written form; for a scribe who has once seen a word in a written form will not himself write the word without a consciousness of that visual appearance. On the other hand, no language has an orthography complete for all individual words that may appear in writing; because there must always occur expressions new absolutely or new as such to the scribe, for the writing of which the scribe depends upon a general rule or the general phonological values of his signs: thus a writer of English can extemporize a Preterite in -ed from any verb without having actually seen that Preterite and can write down according to his direct consciousness of the aural value of his signs, say, a foreign name which he has never seen, but only heard, and which may never have been written—an occurrence frequent with travellers in 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. But the writing of Nam can hardly have been more than casual and in the makeshift Chinese script; for ‘literature’ the people had perhaps only songs and recitations, and ‘barbarians’ taking to culture would find it in Chinese. The Tibetan alphabet cannot have been applied to the Nam language before the second half of the seventh century A.D.

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

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

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

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

---

1 This applies certainly to the instances (supra, p. 113, n. 3) of confusion of *rg-* (ngh-) with rā-.
2 This may frequently be the case with omissions due to anticipation of subsequent words.
3 Ll. 14, 16, 28, 29, 92.
4 Notably the confusions of -u and -o (supra, p. 113, n. 3).
5 In regard to Sogdian manuscripts, also from Ch’ien-fo-tung, which have a likewise capricious spelling, a similar suggestion was made by the late Dr. F. Rosenberg (Bulletin de l’Académie des Sciences de l’U.R.S.S., vii Série, Classe des Sciences Sociales, 1931, p. 629). The case is the same with the Chinese manuscripts in Tibetan script: see JRAS. 1929, pp. 39-40. The normal Tibetan literary manuscripts and the more or less contemporary lithic inscriptions of Lha-sa are much more correct and, except for archaisms, manifest few abnormalities.
predominant variations, immediately recognizable as such, are as follows:

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

- kehu-prom, 176, &c. = ḥkehu-prom, 177, &c.
- kya-wa-ñe, 162 = ḥkyya-wa-ñe, 215, ḥkyya-ñwa-ñe, 339
- kyu-ldoñ, 161 = ḥkyu-ñldoñ, 339
- kruhu-hpro, 321 = ḥkru-ñbro, 221, &c., ḥkruhu-ñbro, 294, &c.
- rkabs, 272 = ḥrkabs, 271
- skyim-hse, 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 $st$, $sl$, $sr$, $st$.$s$. 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 $gk$, $gc$, $gñ$, $gt$, $gd$, $gn$, $gph$, $gb$, $gm$, $gts$, $gdz$, $gy$, $g-r$, $gñ$, $gs$, 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 $g-ñy$ (not $gý$) 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 $g$-:\footnote{For a list of words with $g$- Prefix, including cases of alternation with $h$- see pp. 163-4.} This alternation, which in cases such as:

- hrah-hyos-ñlam, 25, v. g-rañ-g-yo-rbo, 27, hrah-g-yos-ge-ñsar, 26
- g-rañ-hyos-ge-ñsar, 26, v. g-ño-ñpod-hto, 28
- stor-ñdor-hyho, 119, v. stor-ñdor-g-yoho, 142
might, as concerns the verb *ḥyo/*ɡ-yo be functional, as in Tibetan, cannot as regards the noun *g-raḥ* be other than orthographical or phonological. Other cases where no question of function arises are:

\[ \text{ḥmog-ḥce-rgyaṅ, 52 = gmog-ḥce-rgyaṅ, 55} \]
\[ \text{gmog-ḥce-hsa, 55} \]
\[ \text{rgya (and hrgyah)-ḥai-ke, 53, &c. = rgyaḥ-ṇī-ke, 199} \]
\[ ḥdim(dim)-ḥtshis (chis), 88, &c. = gdim-chis, 94 \]
\[ ḥldag-khri-khyag, 52 = gldag-ḥce-rgyaṅ, 52 \]
\[ ḥldag-nag, 129, &c. = gldag-nag, 136 \]
\[ ḥldag-ḥnag, 112, &c. = ḥldag-gnag (and nag), 129, &c. \]
\[ ḥri-sta-mehi, 311, 312 = g-ri(ɡ-riḥi)-sta-mehi, 312, 313 \]
\[ ḥriḥi-sti-hyor-re, 300 = g-ri-sti-hyor-re 299 \]
\[ ḥpha-hṅur-hṅur, 60 = gphaḥ-tsa, 60 \]
\[ ḥṣid-hriḥi, 62 = ʃid-ɡ-ri, 34. \]

In the last two instances, where *ḥpha/gphaḥ* = ‘father’, and *ḥri/gl-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/gl-dag, 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* 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. The fact that in the Nam manuscript the *ḥ* occurs before initial nasals as much as before other initials need not conflict with this interpretation.

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


2 See supra, p. 76; cf. *N’jeh = Ḥbri(-chu)* and *Njong = Ḥjaṅ* (pp. 2 n. 2, 72).
(e) *h*- does not occur, or at least hardly ever, if ever, occurs,¹ before certain very common words, viz. *dse*, 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.²

2. Alternation of tenuis and aspirate:

- **k-kh**
  - ḫkaḥ-hrdza, 296, v. ḫkaḥ-hrdza, 296.
  - ḫko-ṛṇo, 53, &c., v. ḫko-hṛṇo, 189, 267 (ṛṇo).
  - ḫraḥ(hlḍaṅ⁰), 124, &c., v. ḫhrāḥ(hlḍaṅ⁰), 127.

- **c-ch**
  - ciḥ(hdāṅ⁰), 259, 261, v. chiḥ(hdāṅ⁰), 260, 261.
  - ḫcē-hmu, 200 v. ḫcē-ḥmu, 204.
  - gceg(hso-hnah⁰), 234 v. gcheg(hso-hnah⁰), 111.

- **t-th**
  - ta(hstor⁰), 145, v. tha(hstor⁰), 149.
  - ḫṭaḥ-hrdzo, 218, v. ḫṭaḥ(hṭaḥ⁰)-rḍzo, 130, 132, 220.
  - ḫṭar-phyaṅ, 374, v. thar(hṭar⁰)-phyaṅ, 348, 69 (pyaṅ).
  - tor(hṭor⁰)-ḥbroṅ, 216, &c., v. thor(hbroṅ⁰), 220.
  - — (g-ṛi⁰), 34, v. ḫṭhor(hṛiḥ⁰), 62.
  - ḫṭor(gse-hlad⁰), 240, v. thor(rṛe-lad⁰), 235.
  - ḫṭye(sta-ḥldyaṅ⁰), 8, v. ḫṭhye(staḥ-ḥldyaṅ⁰), 20.

- **p-ph**
  - ḫphaḥ(hṛiḥ⁰), 290, v. ḫphaḥ(hṛiḥ⁰), 302.
  - pu-ḥlo, 116, 135 (hlo), v. ḫpuḥ-klo, 40.
  - ḫpuḥi(rgyeb⁰), 282, v. ḫpuḥi(rgyeb⁰), 190.
  - ḫpeɡ(swah⁰), 360, v. ḫpyeɡs(swah⁰), 176.
  - ḫpom, 347, v. ḫphom, 147.

¹ The only exceptions are *ḥye*, 5, 8, 332. ² See supra, p. 113, n. 3.
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por(htsaṅ⁰), 291, v. phor(htsaṅ⁰), 295.
hpör(hnu-glaṅ⁰), 175, v. phor(nu-glaṅ⁰), 359.
pyaṅ(thar⁰), 69, v. phyaṅ(htar⁰), 348, 374 (htar).
pyi-bse, 88, v. phyi-bse, 89, 98.
——-ske, 143, v. phyi-ske, 79.
pyer(ldaṅ⁰), 65, v. phyer(ldaṅ⁰), 254.
pron/hpron, 65, 128, &c., v. phrom, Ḫphrom, 171, 172.
ts-tsh
tsür(hnaṅ⁰), 391, v. ḥtshur(hnaṅ-ḥdiṅ⁰), 391.
ḥtso-gḥldaṅ, 95, v. Ḫtshog-ḥldaṅ, 95.
——-ḥram, 35, &c., v. Ḫtshog-ḥram, 90.
ḥtsors(hldag-nag⁰), 134, v. Ḫtshors(hldag-nag⁰), 130.
——-ḥbroṅ⁰), 219, v. Ḫtshor(ḥbroṅ⁰), 220.

3. Alternation of tenuis and media:

k-g
kehū(hkehū)-pron, 176, 361, &c., v. gehū-prom, 362.
hkor-kla, 205, v. Ḫgor-kla, 143.
hkyud(rdzō⁰), 220, v. Ḫgyud(rdzō⁰), 16.
hkri(hṣī), 81, v. Ḫgri(hṣī), 38.
hkroms, 387, v. Ḫgroms, 64.
hklo(hphu⁰), 40, v. glo(pu⁰), 116.
c-j
Apparently no occurrence.

t-d
ḥtah(hkhoh⁰), 328, v. Ḫdaḥ(hkhoh⁰), 329.
ḥtör(gstor⁰), 143, v. Ḫdör(gstor⁰), 118, 142, &c.
ḥṭre(rgyed⁰), 248, v. Ḫdre(rgyed⁰), 87, &c.
ḥltāṅ(rgyed-ma⁰), 93, v. Ḫldaṅ(rgyed-ma⁰), 90, &c.
p-b
ḥpu/hpuḥu(htor⁰), 29, 64, &c., v. Ḫbḥu(htor⁰), 33.
ḥpōs(hpu⁰), 141, v. Ḫbos(hphu⁰, Ḫpu⁰, hpuḥu⁰), 41, 266, 293, &c.
ḥpro(kruhū⁰), 321, v. Ḫbro(kruhū⁰, Ḫkru⁰), 221, &c.
ts-dz
ḥtsaṅ(hdzō⁰, Ḫtso⁰), 30, 62, 73, v. Ḫdza(hdzō⁰), 262.
htsehi/htsêh (hdzo°), 364, v. hdzehi(hdzo°), 338, 339.

4. Alternation of aspirate and media:

kh-<
ph-<
tsh-<
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: hcoeg-hram, 87 = htsog-hram, 35, &c.
ch-tsh: hsi-hgri-hchim, 38 = hsi-hkri-hhtshim, 81; chis (gdim°),
94 = tshis (dim°), 95, 88 (htshis)
jo(n)mo(n°), 78, 118 (hjo(n), &c. = hdzo(n)mo(n°), 64, &c.
hjo(hkehu-prom°) = hdzobo(hko hu-prom°), 361-2.

6. Alternation of j, dz, and z:

hju(hrau-hche°), 115 = hzu(rau-hche°), 117.

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

hgam(htha°n°), 131, 221 = hrgam(htha°n°), 133.
hgyeb-hkru-hbro, 221 = hrgyeb-hkru-hbro, 321, 323.
hbo-kyer, 144 = rbo(kyer°), 136.
hbo-bon 238, &c. = hbon-rbo 111, &c.
{hpo-rbom 317

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:

dwan(hkehu-hkah°), 364 = rwan(kehu-kkah°), 178.
hwah-hrsañ-hlamhi, 224, 228 = hwgwañ°, 229.
9. Miscellaneous alternations:

ḥṣṭṣah-hyer, 250 = ḍṣṭṣah-hyer(g-yer), 166, 296.
ḥnag(hldagʰ), 112, &c. = nag(hldagʰ), 129, &c. = gnag (hldagʰ), 129.
na-hgoṅ, 358 = gnah-goṅ(hgoṅ), 179, 367.
ḥṛgyo-hṣeg-gṣegra, 330 = rbyo-gṣeg-gṣeg[g][r][a], 330.
ḥṛtah-swah-hpeg, 360 = hṛtah-swa-hphyegs, 176.

10. Final consonants: The only at once recognizable case is that of presence and absence of ḍ after vowels. It may be said that practically every word ending in a occurs in equal or greater frequency with -adh. The fact that this addition of ḍ does not take place after any vowel but a (the exceptions, ḍdiḥ, 43, ḍsoḥ, 75, ḍkhoḥ, 328, ḍṣeth, 364, gdeḥ, 395, being all questionable) suggests that the practice has some relation to the Tibetan, likewise merely orthographical, use of the ḍ 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 ḍ is sometimes retained (or used) before a suffix or final consonant, resulting in Tibetan forms such as ḍdaḥs, and Nam forms such as brahr, ḍnahr. Apart from the question of a functional -r there seems to be a scriptural confusion of -h and -r, visually quite easy, in ll. 17, 163, 302.

A few writings, g-yaha, 266, ḍphaḥha, 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. soa(zyuu) = Tib. sa(-gzi), 'earth', 
sha-a, 'meat', = Tib. ša, 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 ḫphaḥha, which may be explained simply as writings of Ḫ in place of h.

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

Apparent variation between -e and -eḥi and -e and -eḥu in:
hrab-we-ṛtah, 114, 191 = ḥraba-wehṛ-ṛta, 139, 380 (ḫwehi-ṛṛṭaḥ).

rweṛ-hmo-ṛcaḥ-byiṅ, 97 = rwehṛ-re-hmo-ch-a-byi, 98.
ḥke-ḥkḥaḥ, 152, 158 = ḡkhehu-ḥkḥaḥ, 364.
ḥke-prom, 176, 360, &c. = ḡkhehu-prom, 177, 178, 360, &c.
hbe-ḥbaḥ, 235 = hbehi-ḥbaḥ, 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, ḍca, ḍcaḥ, cha, čaḥ, čcaḥ, ja, jah, ḍjah, tsa, tsaḥ, ḍtsaḥ, ḍtsaḥ; 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 Ḫ and final Ḫ, tenuis and aspirate (frequently alternating in their verbs), the use of certain other Prefixes, final s after g and h, 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 = Bargandara¹ and Ga-hjq = Kanjak, and only with this value (e.g. in Kanjur = Bkah-hgyur, rdzum-chul = rdzu-hyphrul) is it now sounded in central and north-eastern Tibet: cf. pp. 76, 119 supra.

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

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

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

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

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

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


5, line 215, || ||.

6, line 222, : |.

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:

\[
\begin{align*}
gdim & \mid \physi \mid \bse \mid \ge \mid \{90\} \mid \htshog \mid \hram \mid \hnad \mid \\
rgyed & \mid \ma \mid \hlda\n \mid \ge \mid \htsog \mid \hram \mid \hsah \mid \\
\rta & \mid \htsog \mid \hram \mid \{91\} \ge \mid \htah \mid \rwy \mid \htah \mid \\
\rta & \mid \sko \mid \prom \mid \re \mid \hrtah \mid \hlda\n \mid \hkra\n \mid \\
\htsog & \mid \rpu \mid \se \mid \cha\n \mid \{92\} \pyi \mid \bse \mid \htoh\n \mid \\
\hkor & \mid \htah \mid \hkhen \mid \ya\n \mid \sna\n \mid \gya\n \mid \gyn\n \mid \\
\hjah & \mid \htah \mid \hkhen \mid \ya\n \mid \{93\} \swa \mid \tseg \mid \tseg \mid
\end{align*}
\]

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 gyan\n is an underline insertion.
A metre of seven syllables is common in Chinese writings, and the Rgyal-roṅ poem discussed above is in the same. The Hsi-hsia has it both in a sacred text, the translation of the Svarna-prabhāsa sūtra (see the edition by Wang Jinqiu 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-paripṛechā (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, i, p. 190), as well as in crude verses concluding a letter (Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang, by F. W. Thomas and Sten Konow, pp. 124, 128). As regards later Tibetan, we may refer to Francke, Ladakhi Songs, i, pp. 35 (xiii), 62 (xxvi) and Frühlings- und Wintermythus der Kesarsage, i, p. 1, ii, pp. 17, 28, &c., and the Tibetan Chronicle (Rgyal-rabs-gsal-bahi-me-loṅ) in Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, pp. 22, 29. In the So-sor-thar-pa (Prātimokṣa-sūtra) edited by Satścandra Vidyābhūṣāṇa (Calcutta, 1915) many such verses can be conveniently examined; perhaps even more accessible is Laufer’s edition of the Tibetan Citra-lakṣāṇa (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:¹ the fact that in the first three verses the fourth syllable is the same (ge), and similarly in the last two, is a sufficient proof of this; but it is also shown by another outstanding feature of the text, namely the parallelism of expression seen throughout the passage and culminating in the last two lines and the reduplicated words (no doubt verbs) with which they end.

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

8 syllables:

htah : hšud | hdon | rgyag | dze | htor | hdo | hchuṅ |
hta | šud | mehi | dze | hrtah | hjam | ge | hmehi || 185–6.

11 syllables:

hbo | hroṅ | hrog | re | hlah | hkyan | hras | re | hšes | gši | hžuhi |
rgyeb | hchi | hro | re | gdag | yaṅ | la | por | hšes | hši | hžuhi || 344–5.

¹ There are a few intentional exceptions, e.g. in ll. 65, 67, where the fifth syllable is the tsa of p. 188 infra.
THE NAM LANGUAGE

⁠[Translation of a text from a historical source discussing the separation of syllables in the language used by the Nam people, emphasizing the metric structure and the usage of words like "gesar", "hrta", and "rpau". The text delves into the linguistic patterns and their usage in different contexts, highlighting the importance of these linguistic elements in understanding the language's structure and syntax.]

12 syllables:

hdzam | hbroñ | hron | re | hpåñ | hko | htar | dze | hld | ge | htañ | hldon |

hkrug | kyañ | hldom | re | hrne | hño | hdzar | dze | hldhe | ge | htañ | hldon |

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 | bsañ | ma | hpuñ | dze | hmar | bbab | ge | hlorho |

hbu | rwyæ | hce | rgyañ | dze | ldyo | htor | ge | hunu | 15-16.

hsehe | hldu | hru | re | dze | hphag | bbah | ge | hyor |

høha | hgrah | nu | nar | dze | hkhab | hgro | ge | bkañi | 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 rtäb, hrta, hrtäb, 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 hso-hna, htsog-hram, hldañ-hkhran, 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:

deh-nas-rabs-bgyis-gsan-hldi-hlab

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 hldi in place of the correct ḫdi, 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 ḫkon (ni),¹ which occurs only in that place, may be simply the Chinese word chüan, 'fasciculus', 'chapter', which in the form kyon has been found so used (JRAS. 1927, p. 293; 1929, p. 61) in colophons of Chinese manuscripts, in Tibetan script, from Chinese Turkestan. Admixture of Chinese terms was to be anticipated in manuscripts written in Tun-huang. What then was the topic finished at line 249?

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

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

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

(a) a small number of Chinese Buddhist texts and one or two documents in the same language;

(b) some parts of a medical work in a language which has been recognized as that of a district of the western part of Tibet, usually associated with the Himalayan district Gu-ge, but perhaps embracing the whole Kailāsa region.

In normal Tibetan there are:

(1) masses of manuscripts containing Buddhist texts or works connected with Buddhism;

(2) a Tibetan Chronicle;

(3) a few pieces relating to medicine or divination;

(4) a few pieces relating to business of government or monasteries;

(5) miscellaneous notices, letters, legal agreements, model letter-forms, and signatures.

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

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

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

In the language of the Nam-pa kingdom:

*Ltoñ-teñ Mye-kru*

(with variants *te* for *teñi*, *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 *teñi*. *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-zin*, changed into:

In the language of the Nam-pa kingdom: *Bya-rama-byahi Rma-li, Byežu-rama-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-rama-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 byêhu-rma-byêhu-gi is the same expression, modified only by substitution of the so-called ‘Diminutive’ form in -êhu, for -a, and the Genitive-Adjective suffix gi for the equivalent hi. It can be shown that such diminutives and the actual form byêhu were favoured in north-eastern Tibet. Thiān is probably equivalent to Tibetan mthiān, which in the form thiān is found in a text from north-eastern Tibet, and which appears in several bird-names, mthiān-ga, ‘a bird of deep blue colour’, mthiān-ril, ‘a wild duck’, mthiān-hri, ‘a certain bird’; note also mthiān-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 tsun means ‘feather’, since one of the Hsi-fan languages has tson in that sense;¹ but not much weight can be attached to this, since in a modern dialect we should expect a more degenerate form: perhaps Tibetan tshon, ‘colour’, may call for consideration. It does not seem possible to say anything concerning rma-li. In the Tibetan name ḭa-bkra means ‘mottled wing’, and ḷab-yo-byā 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-khākhi-boṅ-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-coq-zu;
In the language of Tibet: spaṅ-hgi-boṅ-bu-stag-cuṅ.

The Tibetan name means ‘Ass of the meadow, “Little Tiger”’. Here we have very good reason for understanding coq-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 ḷu-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 khoj of the Thōchū dialect, Gyāmi khu, Gyārung 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 dialects² (see Hunter, The Non-Aryan Languages

¹ d’Ollone, p. 70 (No. 38): in Hsi-hsia rtsi, rtiṅ, rtsiṅ are given (Nevsky, No. 132) as meaning ‘colour’.
² But some of these seem to point to an original initial kl-.
of India and High Asia, p. 160). In one of the two Tibetan manuscripts occurs a word cha, denoting some kind of forest animal, and this might mean the tiger, since the verb ḥchah 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-ṇal-ldehi (elsewhere lde)-thol-phrom;

In the language of the Tibetan kingdom: Yab-sten-rgyan-gyi-ṇer-ba,

and the one text states that he was in the country Skyi-mthiṅ, while the other discusses the manner of his burial. The Tibetan means ‘Having care (ṇer-ba) of his exalted (sten) old (rgyan) 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 ṇal, if connected with Tibetan ṇal, ‘fatigue’, could very well mean ‘old’; and the suffix lde or ldehi is similar to the te or tehi already familiar to us. From the circumstances as detailed in the story we can see that the matter taken in charge was the burial of a father; hence we cannot be mistaken in assigning to thol the meaning ‘bury’, which meaning is not recorded in Tibetan dictionaries, but recurs several times in old Tibetan documents from Central Asia,1 possibly borrowed from people of the Koko-nor region, since the Tibetans themselves did not normally bury.2 Accordingly phrom will have the sense of ṇer, ‘take charge of’, ‘attend to’ (infra, p. 137).

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

(a) Wife of Ltoṅ-te Mye-kru: Bzagste Ńar-hbyam.

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

Version A: Tseq-hgī-Rba[g]-ga, Tseq-hgī-Rba-gzin, Tseq-hgī-Rba[g]-ga.

Version B:1 Rbeg-ga-rbeg-si (= Tseq-hgī-Rba-gzin) only mentioned in the fragment.

(c) Wives of Yab-nal-de-thol-phrom:

Ldeh-zaḥi-hbriṅ-te Sman-skylol
Skg-zahi-hbriṅ-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 ‘Ldehu-woman-middle-[sister]’, ‘Skeg-woman-middle-[sister]’, in two, Bzagste and Tseq-hgī, is obscure, and in Rbeg-ga-rbeg has the form already exemplified in Glon-myig-loṅ (Ltoṅ-te-Mye-kru), Zu-tsoṅ-ṣu, 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-locgs), ‘the Go, the Ya-Go, the elder’ (if phi 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-si, or Tseq-hgī-Rba[g]-zīn, who is transmuted into a peacock and flies away from G-ye-r-mo-thaṅ to the Skyi-mthīṅ country, where she becomes the wife of Gyim-po Ng-cig [‘Number one’], the junior, but wise, son of Yab-nal-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-locgs from the fiend country Dgu-sul in Khar-tsan’, two places belonging to the Sa-cu region,2 shows that the original fable had assumed a less definite significance.

1 Evidently with dialectical difference.
2 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 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 Tsen-hgi-Rba[g]-zin escapes, and in that country she becomes the peacock bride of Yab-ña-lde-Thol-phrom’s son, Gyim-po Ngag-cig. The story begins (in the larger manuscript):

Yul-myi-yul-Skyi-mthi’in-na | ~ | Skyi-[yul-sten-yul-Thai-n-brga-]rgyal Bod-kyi-skad-du-na

‘In a country, man-country, Skyi-mthi’in: Skyi [country, high-country, Thaṅ-hundred].’ In the language of Tibet. . . .’

The scribe, obsessed by the idea of the Skyi country, was going on to say ‘In the language of Skyi’; but he recollected immediately, crossed out the words ‘country, high-country, Thaṅ-hundred’ and proceeded ‘In the language of Tibet’, accidentally leaving in the (second) ‘Skyi’. Connexion of the Skyi country with the peacock is evident when we remember that Skyi is the country of the upper Hoang-ho, the Rma-chu, ‘Peacock-river’, and that Rma, ‘Peacock’, is a surname of persons from that region, 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-mthi’in, 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-Mchiṅ-rgyal, ‘Man, peacock-son, Mchini-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 Na-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 Jēn (Wylie, pp. 433–4; De Groot, ii, pp. 195–6, Dsim), the great-grandson of the legendary first king of the Ch’iang? See supra, pp. 40, 57.

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

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

where, no doubt, since he does not suggest any other location, is the home of 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 (Yëi) 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, ḫbrin-te), ste (Zagste), Ide and Idehi (Nal-Ide and Idehi), 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 ḫi—that this is the value of the ḫi is proved by the alternative use of ḫgi in Tseñ-ţgī Rba-ga, &c. Alternation of -e and -eḥi 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 ḫi 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 bte attached to words which are unmistakable verbs (ḥdre, ḫtre, ḫphom) and adjectives (ḥtor, hram, ḫnam), on which matter see infra (pp. 188–90); the form ste also occurs.

It must be confessed that a te, de, ste, Ide 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 Tibet-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 \( \text{hkhum} \) (Preterite \( \text{khums} \), and \( \text{bkum} \); Future \( \text{bgum} \)) is frequently used in the expression \( \text{gnir-hkhums} \), ‘to carry out a task’, \( \text{gnir} \) being a verb with the meaning ‘employ’ or ‘have in charge’. This verb \( \text{hkhum} \), which is not found in the Tibetan dictionaries, is perhaps identical in root with \( \text{hgum} \), ‘die’, \( \text{bkum} \), ‘kill’, and may have meant ‘execute’ in both senses; but a more likely connexion is with \( \text{hkhum} \), \( \text{skum} \), ‘contract’ (limbs, &c.), whence the dictionary of \( \text{Ś. C. Das} \) gives ‘to practise’, ‘to impress on the mind’ (‘concentrate’), and \( \text{thos-pa-hkhum} \), ‘comprehend what has been heard’. \( \text{Phrom} \) will then be a verb of the same character, possibly connected with \( \text{phrom} \), \( \text{khrom} \), ‘a mart’, often used by the Tibetans in Central Asia. The word, as \( \text{prom} \), \( \text{hyprom} \), \( \text{hproms} \), \( \text{byprom} \), \( \text{phrom} \), \( \text{hprom} \), is of frequent occurrence in the language of the manuscript, and is nowhere else recorded; and this fact may perhaps be considered decisive of the whole matter.

---

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

3 Is it an accident that has combined the three syllables \( \text{Nam-ldoñ-prom} \) 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 \( \text{prom} = \text{phrom} \), ‘mart’). But in any case the Nam country is probably indicated, and \( \text{prom} \) even if \( \text{phrom} \), points to the north, since it is only in Central Asia that this form of \( \text{khrom} \), ‘mart’, is known.

It seems highly probable that the collocation \( \text{Nam-ldoñ} \) 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 \( \text{Ś. C. Das's Dictionary, s.v.} \)). 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-ñaq, as another of the four tribes of ‘inner dwarfs’. It looks as if the peoples of the Women’s Kingdom and of the Mi-ñaq 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-chan 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:

\[ \text{hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re-mehi-klu-hcha-ge-stor-hتاب-htoni} \mid 1.150, \]

which must mean (approximately):

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

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

\[ \text{hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re-hmehi-klu-hcah-dze-htor-hkho-ge-hkkhobi} \]

and the phrase *hldyañ ... hcah* is found again in l. 343. It is possible that *hcah* or *hcha* is a pluralizing suffix which occurs in other connexions; but more probably it means ‘harmful creatures’, see supra, pp. 132–3, *cha, hcah, hchaḥ, &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:

\[ \text{hrgru-hsrma-htam-ge-hšes-beg-staḥ} \]

\[ \text{klu-hrto-htsa-ge-hšes-hbeg-mehi} \]

\[ \text{klu-rto-htsah-ge-hraḥ-hyos-hlam} \]

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

‘They being blind [rocks], Hšes-beg was their eye:

They being blind [rocks], the place (itself) moving was their path.’

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

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

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

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 bbron, the yak-bull, whose malice is proverbial; in the text we are concerned with ‘Father Bbron-g-yag Skar-ba’ (his individual name). The Nam text likewise is evidently concerned with the horse (rta, rtah, hrtah, hrtah) and the yak (bbron), whose designations are of constant recurrence; and it would be easy to show that the main topic is the strife between the two and the quelling of the yak. Since this proof depends upon the interpretation of Nam words, it would be premature to dwell here upon the matter; it may suffice to cite two lines (185–6) of the text which are fairly clear:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{htah} & \mid \text{bsd} \mid \text{hdon} \mid \text{rgyag} \mid \text{dze} \mid \text{htor} \mid \text{hdo} \mid \text{hchun} \\
\text{hta} & \mid \text{sd} \mid \text{mehi} \mid \text{dze} \mid \text{hrtah} \mid \text{bjam} \mid \text{ge} \mid \text{bmehi} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The meaning must be (roughly):

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

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

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

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

\(^1\) On the blackness, fierceness, and ‘fiery eyes’ of the yak see Hue and Gabet, ii, p. 120, and cf. Rockhill, Diary, pp. 193, 199, Tafel, i, p. 337, and Prejevalsky, ii, pp. 187–8, 194.
divided', 'to issue, proceed, spread, or branch from', and to its causative form *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 *hgyed (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 *hgyed 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 Š. 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:


Here *hldi = Tibetan *hdi, 'this'; *hrar is Locative of *hraḥ = 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'; *hṭe is the Participial-Adjectival suffix with which we are already familiar. *Gse (also *ḥse), since it occurs with the suffix *ḥtaḥ, is probably a verb; and since we have

*gsa-ḥtaḥ-ḥdam, 248,
*ḥṣa-ḥtaḥ-ḥdam, 326,
'*gsa-ta ḝwas bound or condemned',

1 Š. C. Das's Dictionary: *de-dag-las-gyes-so, 'they have proceeded from those (their ancestors)'. So also in the Royal-rabs (ed. Francke, Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, p. 21, l. 2) ḫei-po-de-las-mi-*rigs-phal-cher-gyes-so', 'from those four the races of men in general branched out'.

and *gse-lad* (and *hIad*), 240, 242, 244, *requital of gse*,
to Tibetan *gse/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,
*šo*-Chapter.’

What is *bšo*? The two other occurrences of the word throw no
light upon its meaning. It is clearly not = Tibetan *šo*, ‘dice’, *šo*,
‘blast, blight, mildew’, *šo(-gamm)*, ‘tax, toll’, *šo(-re)*, ‘defect, flaw,
bšo*, ‘feed’, ‘nourish’, ‘cure’; and we have so far no reason for
thinking of *bšo*, ‘pour’, ‘vomit’, ‘copulate’. Remembering that in
the Tibetan manuscript the opening chapter is

*cho-smos-pahi-lehu*

‘chapter telling of the beginning’,

we might be tempted to equate *šo* with *cho* in the sense of ‘begin-
ning’; 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 *šo*
might be a number.

In the Tibetan manuscript the (fragmentary) beginning is con-
cerned 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’ (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 *hraḥ-hyos*, ‘place moved’, recurs as *hraḥ-g-yos* and

1 *G-yen-du*, possibly a technical expression, because we are told that in
October the yaks, having previously ‘fed their way up the mountain’, ‘of
their own accord commence feeding downwards’ (*Travels of a Pioneer of
Commerce*, by T. T. Cooper, p. 394).
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 is certain from another Tibetan manuscript, which tells of a girl queen of the Myañ country, who was keeping down the local fiend, so that:

'When in the high-country was quaking (g-yos), in the Myañ 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-hmo-ge-sta-hri-hldyañ

if that means something like

'Where were the clouds (or heavens, hmo or hmo), there the mountains rose (or flew or?)',

which may suggest an original Tibeto-Burman source for the early Sanskrit legend that the mountains (Himalaya) 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, Ḥses-hbeg, in name resembling the serpent Śesā of Indian mythology, who ‘by moving his coils lays the mountains in ruins’. The end of the cataclysm is stated in the verse

ḥṣah-yob-hkom-re-ḥrañ-ḥrah-htsu hu ||, 166,

which patently means

'The earth, having done quaking, returned to its own place.'

The character of the Nam text now begins, it may be hoped, to be discernible behind its machine-gun rapid-fire of strange monosyllables. It is the literature, folk-lore, and sacred legend of the Nam-Tig people. Like the narration in Tibetan language, to which it had a general, but apparently no close, correspondence, it began with a description of a primitive age of blessedness and harmony in the fields of heaven; and then, after describing the cosmic disaster which terminated that period, expounded the

---

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

2 See the Sanskrit Haṛṣa-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-ñal-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 Baco’t’s work (*Les Mo-so*), pp. 18–20; for Lo-lo stories to M. Paul Vial (*Les Lolas*), 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-lon), which remarks that

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

Whether the Nam narrative was of the same interminable character² as those of the Miao-tze and the Finnish Kalevala is not apparent. It has two distinctive features, or rather three.

The first of these features is the prominence of the idea of division, or dissension, and the deploring of the resulting evils; also the praise of combination or friendship. This idea seems to have been prominent in the minds of the eastern and north-eastern Tibetans;³ for in another of the Tibetan texts one of the evils of the bad age is that

'father and son came to be in dissension (p(h)uñ-phye); elder brother and younger brother came to be divided (p(h)yê)',

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

ह्ख्रुग-ह्र्द्जो-ह्ग्युद्द्जे (18)

'upon the quarrelsome ह्र्द्जो (sc. yak) race'

¹ Prof. A. H. Francke's translation (Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii), p. 76.
² Cf. the remarks of Huc and Gabet (ii, p. 82) on 'interminable series of tales and legends' among the 'Si-fan nomads'.
³ Likewise among the T'u-yü-hun it was illustrated by the story of King A-ch'ai's sons and the arrows (Bichurin, i, p. 79).
and in

\( \text{k} \text{k} \text{rug-k} \text{yan-} \text{h} \text{l} \text{dom-re-} \text{hr} \text{ne-} \text{h} \text{no-} \text{hd} \text{zar (371-2)} \)

'strife being bound down, foe and friend were united'

\( \text{k} \text{rug} \) really is = Tibetan \( \text{\text{k}k \text{rug}} \), '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'ian tribes. The long history of the struggles related in the \textit{Annals} shows with what success the dividing Chinese diplomacy played upon this weakness, and we see here that the tribes, however incapable of counteracting, were conscious of it.

The second feature, which also will be a valuable aid in interpretation, is the large admixture of moral or practical reflection apparent in the text. Proverbial wisdom is, no doubt, current among all human groups; and from eastern Tibet we have a text containing 'Sum-pa Mother-sayings'. The Sum-pa sayings are not those of a savage, or even barbarous, folk; and from the Koko-nor peoples, after so many centuries of contact with, and, in a varying measure, absorption into, Chinese civilization, a common-sense tone is not surprising. In the Nam text ll. 120–3 contain six antithetical verses concerning \( \text{h} \text{tsog-h} \text{ram} \), which certainly means 'friendly association', and ll. 124–7 six similar verses concerning \( \text{h} \text{lda} \text{n-} \text{hkra} \text{n} \), 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 historic-ethical reflections. As specimens of the earlier, more naive, wisdom we may cite the two verses in ll. 60–1:

\( \text{h} \text{khu-} \text{t} \text{sa-} \text{si} \text{d-} \text{d} \text{ze-h} \text{pha-} \text{n} \text{ur-} \text{n} \text{ur} \)

\( \text{g} \text{phah-} \text{t} \text{sa-} \text{glom-} \text{d} \text{ze-} \text{hkhu-} \text{n} \text{ur-} \text{n} \text{ur} \)

'When the uncle's family (i.e. the mother's side) is high, the father groans:

When the father's family is extravagant (or conceited), the uncle (the mother's people) groans',

and the three verses in ll. 158–60:

\( \text{chos-ta-} \text{\text{n}a} \text{n-re-} \text{\text{h}de-ta-} \text{rg} \text{yen-h} \text{lab-ta-} \text{h} \text{wen}\ |

\( \text{hnah-} \text{chos-hre-} \text{ge-} \text{h} \text{lda} \text{n-} \text{myi-} \text{\text{seg}}\ |

\( \text{s} \text{pye-} \text{chos-hre-} \text{ge-} \text{gt} \text{sa} \text{n-} \text{myi-} \text{\text{hr}gan}\ |

\( \text{\text{si-}h} \text{chos-re-} \text{ge-} \text{\text{h}pu-} \text{myi-} \text{\text{h}ldin}\ |

1 Cf. Johnston, p. 287.
Beginnings being bad, prospering is uphill, speech vain.
Born (begun) in spring, the stick does not break (or burn);
Born in summer, the grain does not mature;
Born in winter, the bird does not fly.\textsuperscript{1}

The third feature is the interest in animals, natural in folklore. 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 (rkyaṅ, kiang), who is seen only afar, on the high thans. The wild yak, hunted with lasso and spear,\textsuperscript{2} 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 Nan Shan, most concerned with the ass,\textsuperscript{3} 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 northeastern Tibet and in Tibet generally, is in the Tibetan manuscripts mentioned prominently in connexion with irrigation channels (yāñ-ba = yur-ba) and the fouling (sbog) of them, principally by

\textsuperscript{1} These two passages were presented, with etymologies, as provisional specimens in the article on the Nam language in J.R.A.S. 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.

\textsuperscript{2} So in the Tibetan manuscript. On slings or lassos in Tibet see Rockhill, p. 120, \textit{Diary}, p. 264; Bonvalot, ii, p. 5; Filchner, \textit{Om Mani Padme Hum}, p. 156.

\textsuperscript{3} As regards Kan-su see d'Ollone, p. 292.
wild animals; we also read of clean descents (stege) to fords. And this helps in the interpretation of some phrases in the Nam text. The recurrent Tibetan expression is

yañ-ba-rab-tu-sbog (and sbogs)

‘the runnels were utterly fouled (or flooded)’,

sbog(s) being in normal Tibetan the Imperative of sbag, ‘pollute’; here it is a Preterite, and the root has the o-form. Sbag is properly, no doubt, a Transitive or Causative form of hbag, which is to ‘defile oneself’, ‘be polluted’. In the Nam text we have (l. 256) the verse

rgam-hgah-hkañ-hyan-hrag-ma-hbog ||

in which hrag may correspond to Tibetan rags, ‘dam, mole, dyke’. Rgam may well be Tibetan sgam, ‘deep’, unless it should be skam, ‘dry’; this cannot be decided by other passages, because rgam, like so many other words, is a homonym. If hkañ = Tibetan gañ, ‘full’, which in itself is not improbable and which suits

htor-sñin-hkañ-ge, 168

‘great-heart-full’,

we get the rendering (cf. l. 283, hrag . . . hbog)

‘though the deep places were full, the dykes were not fouled’.

‘Hot’ and ‘cold’ are naturally prominent in the thoughts of an Amdo people. In the texts there are references to ‘the fire of action’, ‘the fire of speech’, ‘the fire of going’, and perhaps some other metaphorical ‘fires’; and ‘cold’ seems to occur with the sense of ‘dispirited’, ‘unenterprising’, ‘apprehensive’ (see p. 301); ‘hot become cold’ may refer to defeat or death, and it is said that

‘Invested with the great cold (sc. death), the evil are good’, and

‘Invested with the great cold, evil and good are friends’.

The god or gods (tha = Tib. lha), of whom there is a mention (l. 241), seem to be distinct from the divine being Hñes-hbeg, who presided over the world-cataclysm, being the wings, eyes, and path of the flying mountains, &c., who again may belong to a stratum different from that of the ‘Hnam-people’, the upper sky (gnam) folk of the old Bon mythology. 1 Fiends (rñe) are located (l. 385) in dark subterranean hollows.

The social attitude of the text is distinctly aristocratic. The

1 The evident suggestion (ll. 332, 344) that Hñes in this name = ñes, ‘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 (ḥgру-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 mго-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 ḥkyaṅ, who are mentioned sometimes in connexion with the 'house-poor' (na-hпоň) or 'house-bondsmen' (na-ḥldom) and sometimes as 'runaways', may be praedial serfs. Women seem to be snubbed, which is not surprising, because, though free and influential among the nomads, as well as among other populations of Tibet, where there have been, or are, 'women's kingdoms', they are nevertheless not highly esteemed by the men. The expression 'a chief who is an inferior person, subject to a woman's words' (l. 84) may illustrate both aspects of the case.

The interest in tombs and 'father's tombs' (ṛmaṅ, ḥphaḥ-ṛmaṅ), ll. 197–207 and elsewhere, may seem paradoxical in the case of a Ch'iang Tibetan 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'iăng of the Women's Kingdom practised burial, and the Tibetans worshipped ancestors at the tomb: the Tang-hsiang burned their dead. This, however, may have been only in the case of chiefs and leading persons and may have resulted from contact with China or Chinese Turkestan. The prominence of the topic in the Nam text is an example of the fundamental accord of its subject-matter with that of 'the Tibetan manuscripts', one of which is largely concerned with a dispute regarding entombment of a father. In Tibet the topic has maintained its interest down to modern times, as is evidenced by the amusing apologue recorded in Huc and Gabet's book (ii, pp. 83–4).

1 This is remarked by all travellers: see Rockhill, pp. 213, 230; Tafel, ii, pp. 125–6; Edgar, p. 66; Fergusson, pp. 256, 326 (Lo-lo women). The Vicomte d'Ollone compares (p. 236) the Go-lok women to the indomitable women of the Cimbr or the Teutons.

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

3 Cf. Rockhill, pp. 286–7, and, as regards Mongol usage, Huc and Gabet, i, pp. 77–80, and Prejevalsky, i, p. 82.
INTRODUCTION: A NAM TEXT

There are references to houses, in a town or village, with side-projecting roofs, which furnish a shelter for sheep, and in the case of a large one, with a ladder (perhaps the usual notched plank) for ascent; also to the supporting side-posts of the Tibetan tent. The chief economic interest was perhaps the milk-herds, with the sheep, goats, &c., coming next; but certainly there is reference to tillage and harvests. The Tibetan dog, usually an aggressive sentinel, is mentioned. The travelling animals, the sheep which, when their 'fire of going' is exhausted, 'bend down their heads',¹ the yaks, which, when their 'stomach-fire (?)' gives out, ask to be 'hobbled (?)', or which, in the lower valleys, 'have their heads released', point to caravan journeys and help to prove that the ho-ro-ño, 'travel-buy-[people]', are the ho-dron-po, 'travelling traders', who figure in 'the Tibetan manuscripts' and other old texts, as well as in all modern narratives concerning the Hsi-fan countries and Tibet. We also may detect a reference to the well-attested practice of collecting medicinal herbs and drugs in the mountains. The making of yak-hair cloth for tents and 'a coarse kind of wollen stuff' for 'summer gowns and bags', beside which 'the Koko-nor Tibetans manufacture nothing' (Rockhill, p. 81), are not apparent in the text; but tanning of skins (for sheepskin gowns, &c.), wherein the same Tibetans are expert (ibid.), is certainly the subject of a direct reference and also of a metaphor;² likewise the leather bellows, indispensable accompaniment of the Tibetan yak-dung (argol) fire.

The Ch'iang man certainly wore a top-knot (thor, also mentioned metaphorically), possibly resembling the 'horn' of the independent Lo-los, who share with the Ch'iang and the Go-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,

² Cf. p. 251.
which must mean ‘were (or will be) made to scatter’. These are: (1) kya-wa-ne, elsewhere hkyu-wa-ñe and hkyu-hwa-ñe (ll. 162, 215, 339); (2) ḫrab-hwa-ḥraḥ (ll. 162, 173); (3) the above-mentioned meḥi-klu-ḥcaḥ (ll. 150, 161, 218, 343). Considering that the meḥi-klu-ḥcaḥ have a fabular origin, it seems prudent to reserve a further consideration of any of the three.¹

But in the expression moṅ-rdoṅ (rjon) we have a reference of considerable importance. The phrase clearly means ‘Moṅ-fort’, and the reference is to the ‘castles of the Mons’.² There can be no doubt that this is the sense of the phrase, which occurs in five places; and we have further confirmation in the expression rtsi-gmoṅ, once šes-hrtsi-gmoṅ, occurring three times in ll. 379–81. Rtsi-gmoṅ means ‘Moṅ carpenter’, rtsi, from rtsi, ‘build’, having this sense not only in ordinary Tibetan, but also in Hsi-hsia³ (rgi, rtsi).

From Rockhill’s Land of the Lamas, p. 194, we learn that the Tibetans

‘appear to be unable to build but the roughest kind of houses and only those where there is little woodwork. Ssū-ch’uaneese carpenters and brick-makers do nearly all the building in eastern Tibet, and also fell the timber necessary for the work. I met large numbers of them on the road to Kanzé, travelling to remote localities, to build temples and bridges, to make plows and pack-saddles and do other kinds of labor in their respective trades.’

On p. 81 he states that ‘all their ironware is made by itinerant Chinese smiths who visit their encampments’, and in his Journal, p. 342, Rockhill states that Chinese carpenters ‘travel all over Tibet’.⁴

We do not, however, need to prove that ‘Mon’⁵ people may have been, as early as the eighth to ninth century A.D., within the 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-thaṅ) and Mon cotton as grown in ‘Mon-plain’

¹ See infra, pp. 253 sqq.
² We naturally think of the towers and forts mentioned supra, p. 71, n. 8.
³ See Nevsky, No. 77.
⁴ According to Dr. Tafel, ii, p. 155, carpenters and smiths in Tibet are Ssū-ch’uaneese, never Tibetans. . . . In the Rgyal-rong the builders and carpenters belong to a particular tribe (p. 248 n.).
⁵ On -n/-n see infra, p. 362.
(Mon-mo-thaṅ); 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 Kirūta, 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,¹ Mon Rta-dbaṅ, is 'a small principality on the eastern border of Bhutan, inhabited by a barbarous semi-Tibetan race engaged in trading operations between Tibet and Assam'. Rockhill states (JRAS. 1891, pp. 128–9, n. 3) that the Lissus, Mishmis, Lepchas, &c., of Nepal and Sikkim, &c., are known to the Tibetans as Mon.

This is not by any means the full range of the name. The late Professor A. H. Francke, in the narrative of his journey in the western Himalaya (Antiquities of Indian Tibet, vol. i) from the Sutlej valley to Ladak, found many ruins of villages, shrines, and cemeteries universally attributed to the Mons, whom he regards (p. 54) as the pre-Tibetan inhabitants of the country. In his A History of Western Tibet Chapter II is devoted to the Mons, of whom in every western Tibetan village are found one or more families; the people 'are mostly musicians or carpenters, and are treated with little respect by the rest of the population. . . . Zangskar, I was told by the inhabitants, was once entirely in the hands of the Mons. The ruins of the old castles are still called "Mon-castles" (Mon-mkhar) (pp. 19–20). Similarly in Antiquities, ii, p. 100, 'Mons, joiners and carpenters by profession, also of low caste, though not quite so low as the Bhe-da'.

From Professor Francke's Mons of Ladak and Dardistan the Mons adjacent to the Koko-nor region are separated by a thousand miles of geographical distance, not very seriously reduced, as regards difficulty of communication, by the thin line of cis-Himalayan Mons extending as far east as Assam; and there is

¹ The Geografía Tibet has (p. 37) Mon-rta-lwaṅ.
also, as concerns our present information, a time-interval of a thousand years. The latter interval is about halved by the Tibetan *Royal Chronicle*, which in its earlier portions preserves some items of old (Bon-po) tradition; it speaks (Francke, *Antiquities*, ii, p. 66) of four kinds of primitive ‘frontier dwarfs’, i.e. peoples outside the frontier of the author’s country; these are the Chinese *Rgya* of Gam-ṣan (‘the Gam mountains’), the Turks (*Hor*) of the Gyim-ṣan (‘the Altai mountains’?), the Mons of Ha-le, and the Spu-rgyal Tibetans. The corresponding four tribes of ‘interior dwarfs’, which also are named, belong to Tibet; they comprise the Žaṅ-зуũ people, of the Kailāsa region; the Gtoṅ-gsum-pa or Tōṅ-gsum-pa, perhaps = the Sum-pa mentioned above; the Ldoṅ Me-ṅag (also considered above); and the Se-Ha-ža. It is apparent that the primitive Mons are here, like the Mons of our text, not a part of the interior population, but an outside people, like the Chinese and the Turks.

The only people with a name resembling Mon who could have been within the purview of the Koko-nor tribes are those known to early Chinese history as the northern, or the western, Man. The former are mentioned in the *Shih-chi* (De Groot, op. cit. i, p. 2) as a people among whom dwelt the Jung and other tribes; and De Groot is of opinion that the two names are general designations of the northern peoples. The ‘Man of the west’ and the I of the north are stated to have been in 110 B.C. still not entirely under Chinese authority.1 These western Man are elsewhere also associated with the I. Chang-Ch’ien, the celebrated emissary to the west, enjoyed, c. 140 B.C., the favour of the Man and the I (De Groot, op. cit. ii, p. 11); the people of the Man and the I were greedy for the riches and products of China (ibid. ii, p. 26); in connexion with the campaign against the Ch’iang in c. 62 B.C., it was said that prognostics threatened the *Man* and *I* with severe defeats (ibid. ii, p. 210). In the eighth century B.C. there were at the source of the Yung river, in middle Honan, and farther west, Jung of the Man races (ibid. ii, p. 191, Wylie, p. 429). About 500 B.C. the Man were completely subdued (ibid. ii, p. 192).

The Man of the Yung river were, no doubt, too far east to be within the contemplation of the Ch’iang tribes. But it is, at any rate, transparent that the term *Man* was used in an ethnographical, and not merely a political, sense; and it seems possible that some of those ‘further west’ may have been well known. In that case

1 De Groot, i, p. 147.
we may venture the inquiry whether the *Ha-le-Mon* of the Tibetan *Chronicle* may have been 'Mon of the Alashan' and adjacent (Ning-hsia) region. It is likely that they may have been assimilated by the Chinese earlier than the Ch’iang of the western frontier, and had acquired handicrafts, which, like the modern 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 Himalayan countries, and Ladak are similarly outside our present scope. We can, however, see clearly that the Mon country to which, at the close of the eighth century A.D., the victorious Tibetans transported the people of Pei-t’ing, the people of Ge-sar (*JRAS*, 1931, p. 828; *Tibetan Texts and Documents*, i, pp. 273–4), is far more likely to have been some district in the part of China then under their control than remote regions in the west; and, in fact, the Ge-sar story is specially popular in eastern Tibet.¹ The event decidedly recalls the history (p. 24) of the Sha-t’o Turks transported by the Tibetans to Kan-chou after the conquest of Pei-t’ing in A.D. 790. But certainly there were other Man peoples within their immediate horizon: the south-eastern boundary of the Ch’iang of the Women’s Kingdom approached Ya-chou, being separated from that place ‘by the 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-ron. For the ‘Kretschiu’, whose domain lies between the state of So-mo and Sung-p’an, are said (Tafel, ii, p. 248 n.) to have a dialect of the Rgyal-ron language unintelligible to the rest of the population and to differ in clothing and other matters from their neighbours, with whom they are constantly at strife. ‘Their country is a poor mountain region, greatly overpopulated in proportion to its productivity. Every year the inhabitants resort to the surrounding districts as manual workers,
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-roṅ. From a Tibeto-Burman Mon language the Rgyal-roṅ 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-roṅ, 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 Ssū-ch'uán and northern Yün-nan can hardly, if akin to those tribes, have failed to possess syllabic Prefixes in their language. One of the Rgyal-roṅ Prefixes, namely ka, prefixed to adjectives, is so, in fact, employed in Abor-Miri, Dafla, and Mishmi, as well as in Ka-chin and other groups of Tibeto-Burman (Linguistic Survey of India, iii. i, pp. 589, 619). A borrowing of the Prefixes would evade the paradox of a special preservation of them in the Rgyal-roṅ 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 ḥgam being made, the Moñ-fort was lost' (118)
'Low Town becoming high, the Moñ-fort lost . . . .' (128)
'Low Town becoming high, the black-back flourished' (135)

give joint prominence to the successive stages of one event, namely, world-cataclysm and city-conflagration, flight of the chief-
tain to a settlement in the steppes and rise of the plebs of the Low Town. The antithesis of ‘High Town’ (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 (rdzoh), commonly occupy elevations towering over the residential town. The heaven paradise (gnam) was conceived on the same lines, having the ‘castle eminent’ (rdzan-stod) at its summit and pastoral districts, with the stars for cattle, in the vales. The fabulistic beings, horse, yak, &c., of the Nam text formed a similarly constituted state. In one of the Tibetan manuscripts the horse’s descent from the upper (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 Ša-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 Ša-cu there were some with Bon-po rather than Buddhist interests;¹ and it may be remembered that Taoist literature is largely represented in the mass of the Chinese manuscripts. Hence it may be that the sacred lore of the Nam-Tig, which is at any rate faintly Bon-po, had a religious value in the minds of some community in Ša-cu.

As to the communicating medium we may detect an indication in the Nam text itself. After the Tibetan interpolation in 1. 180 the text continues:


¹ The divinity Hǎes-hyeg (supra, pp. 138, 142) may have been a Bon, if not pre-Bon, conception.
Here the first words may mean
‘the rgyo-man speaking of coming on the morrow (naṃ, or “within”) secretly (gsaṅ, or is naṃ-gsaṅ simply = Tibetan saṅ-naṅ, “morrow morning”?)’;
and the next phrase,
rgyos-dpro-rgro-grtehe-hta-stel-re,
will mean
‘consenting to (stel-re) the fixing (grtehe-hta) of a place (hro) for continuing (hphro)’,
since (1) stel may be = Tib. ster ‘grant’, e.g. in naṃ-du-hgro-ster, ‘consent to come inside’; (2) grtehe-hta, with verb Suffix ta, is perhaps connected with Hsi-hsia hṛde, gḍeh, ‘fix’, ‘establish’, ‘institute’,1 and will accordingly mean ‘fixing’, ‘determining’; (3) ḥpro = Tibetan ḥphro, meaning ‘going forward’, ‘continuing’,2 e.g. ḥphro-blangs, ‘resumption of an unfinished work’, ḥphro-ma-chad-pa, ‘continuation not interrupted’. The remainder is:
‘talk (ḥlab-ta) gushing (ḥboḥu-ste = Tib. ḥbo-ste, cf. pp. 230–2, 313) being stopped (ḥthogs-re = Tib. thogs-te, cf. p. 301), talk plaṅ (“course”, “substance”?) (as follows?)’.
That a rgyo or rgyo-po is a person cannot be doubted; for we find the verse (ll. 102–3)
rgyos-snaṅ-ge-snaṅ-na-rgoṅ-ru-ge-hru,
which must mean
‘if the heart (or affection)3 of a rgyo is a heart, then the horn (= end) of an egg is a horn’,
the ‘horns’ of an egg (Tib. sgoṅ-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 rgyo receives the same compliment. What rgyo 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 ‘rgyo-man’ may conceivably have been a Bon-po, a ‘Bon-man’, in which case his functioning in the matter would need no further explanation.

1 Nevsky, No. 25.
2 In ll. 245–6 it is antithetical to ḥlaj, ‘retaliated’.
3 On snaṅ = sniṅ or sian see infra, p. 367.
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The concluding phrase, *hlab-ge-plañna*, 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:

\[
\text{šes-rtsig-moṅ-ge-htsah-ḥraḥi-} \\
\text{ḥweḥi-ḥrtaḥ-ge} \\
\text{hrtsig-moṅ-ḥkun-na} \\
\text{rtsig-moṅ-ḥsad-na} \\
\text{tsig-moṅ-we-ge-htsah-ḥpu-} \\
\text{ḥloḥo} \quad \text{ḥdza-ḥldahi-ḥne-ge-ḥsah-rgye-} \\
\text{ḥrdza-na} \\
\text{ḥdzaḥ-ḥldah-ḥkun-na} \\
\text{ḥdza-ḥdah-ḥsad-na} \\
\text{ḥdzhāḥ-ḥldah-ḥweḥi-ge-ḥtsah-} \\
\text{rgye-ḥlo}
\]

Intentional rhyme may be seen, e.g. in

\[
\text{ḥstor-moṅ-ḥdzoṅ-re-ḥtsa-ḥdzo-ḥkrom} \\
\text{gsu-prom-ḥnö[-]-r[e]-ḥtsah-ḥpu-ḥdrom} \quad \text{(l. 64–5)}
\]

and inversion of antithetic predicates (*ḥrgom* and *ḥrgam*) in

\[
\text{ḥrgom-ḥkhru[-]-r[e]-ḥto-na-ḥpeḥi-ḥrgam-re-ḥto} \quad \text{(l. 169)}
\]

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

\[
\text{ḥphu-ḥphu-mu[-]-r[e]-ḥdzu-ḥdro-ḥkus} \quad \text{(l. 352)}
\]

'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 northeast. This presumption has been to some extent justified *supra* (pp. 109–110). But it does not follow that quite normally the similarly spelled words in the two languages can be provisionally
equated. As was so emphatically stated by B. H. Hodgson in
his pioneer researches into Tibeto-Burman and other languages,
and as appears prominently in the late Dr. Laufer's very learned
and ingenious study of Hsi-hsia words, there is generally a core of
root-form and root-meaning connecting the parallel expressions
in the several languages; but this nucleus may be so disguised by
the play of Prefixes and Suffixes, and, according to Dr. Laufer, by
composition of synonyms into a single monosyllable and by other
processes, as to be discoverable only by procedures of analysis
which, applied to languages known only in modern forms, may be
hazardous. The Nam words are at least contemporaneous with the
Tibetan; nevertheless a too great resemblance between a Nam
monosyllable and a Tibetan one may be even suggestive of non-
connexion, more especially since in the very extensive vocabulary
of Tibetan we are always in danger of overlooking unfamiliar
homonyms and variant spellings; and deception is all the more
likely because equivalents for Nam words may perhaps tend to
occur among the obscurer, because provincial or obsolete, entries
of the lexicon. It is therefore advisable to make citations, where
possible, from the vocabulary of old texts or modern languages
belonging to the region in question.

In some instances a suspicion, such as has been mentioned in
*JRAS*, 1939, p. 212, in regard to the word *rdzogs* = Tibetan
*rdzogs*, 'fulfilled', disappears upon reflection. The word seems to
be a fairly complex form and accordingly open to such suspicion;
but the *r*-Prefix is even more characteristic of the north-eastern
dialects and of the Nam than of ordinary Tibetan; and the final *s*
will be shown to be independently justified in both. Nevertheless
the occurrence in the text of Tibetan words, either imported into
the language or due to the scribe or editor, remains a possibility;
but not on the same scale as in modern times, when, largely owing
to Buddhist establishments and communications, the Tibetan
language is nearly everywhere understood.

The help obtainable from the Tibetan texts to which reference
has been made consists mainly in the light which they throw upon
the environment and the interests of the people from whom the

2 There may also be in Tibetan many words originally borrowed from
Ch'iang, either orally or through old Tibetan texts originated in the local
monasteries.
3 See supra, p. 87, n. 1.
Nam composition emanated. We see that there was oral literature of the Purānic kind which has been mentioned, framed on the notion of an age of bliss and harmony of species, followed by a world-cataclysm leading to division and strife. There were fables relating probably to the origins of tribes, and in some cases continuations into actual historical matters. The enmities among animals, of which the most prominent, that between horse and yak, is a main subject in the Nam text and in one of the Tibetan texts, may also have partly an inter-tribal or inter-regional bearing. The predominance of the animal world is, in another way, a hindrance, since it restricts the information which might have been available concerning the livelihood and manners of human beings; probably also it greatly restricts the vocabulary.

In regard also to the form of the composition, mainly verse, and the style and turns of expression and some particular ideas, the Tibetan texts are somewhat helpful. They prepare us for interweaving of prose and verse and for the rhetorical devices of parallelism and antithesis, also for great curtness of statement; even in the Tibetan texts there may be a gap between the understanding of the words of a sentence and the apprehension of its meaning, the syntactical apparatus being inadequate. In respect of vocabulary the prima facie assistance of the Tibetan is meagre, and it is only here and there that we can pick out a more or less similar Tibetan word whose meaning fits a context; and, as in Tibetan itself, the frequency of homophones prevents any confident expectation that, when we next meet the word, it will have the same meaning. The inadequacy of other means of ascertaining the significations of the shifty monosyllables has been discussed supra; and we seem to be dependent in the main upon context, acquired familiarity, and lucky intuitions, 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, ṭkon).
1. **Lines 1–166**: (beginning fragmentary). The cosmic cataclysm and its effects.
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Lines 1–16: Effects in the physical world, mountains uplifted, &c.; controlled by Hšes-hbeg, ll. 7–8; opposition of mor and hyaň (evil and good), ll. 9–10.

Lines 16–19: Some effects among living creatures.

Lines 19–29: Continuation of 1–16.

Lines 29–49: Account of hgru-hldaň-hmah; disunion among the horse’s friends, ll. 35–6; reflections upon evils and their consequences.

Lines 49–61: Disadvantages of greatness.

Lines 62–71: Hgru-hldaň-hmah: discontent after the loss of the Moň-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 hgru-ma is lost, takes to flight.

Lines 80–100: The horse’s family not displeased to be rid of a superior. The horse’s friends are disaffected; disunion arises and works against friendship; forgetfulness of harm from outside encourages cleavage within. The horse’s friends forget the horse’s merits.

Friendship is a thing that comes and goes. Disunion gradually works its way in, causing downfall of prosperity and finally of the feminine side.

Lines 100–164: Speech of the camel in the horse’s family concerning the evils of disunion (101–3), the advantage of taking counsel (104–6), the necessity of protecting the horse’s feminine household, like sheep from wolves (106–11), the importance of uprightness and the danger of delay and the reasons for urgency, the ruin of the family to follow the already accomplished loss of the Moň-castle (111–19).

Verses concerning friendship (120–4), uprightness (124–7). The rise of the black-back (yak) and the necessity of assembling friends to suppress him (127–36). The occasion calls for action on the part of the males; when those in flight join together, the aggressors flee (137–40). Other reflections concerning flight (140–4). What happens in the case of flight in battle (144–9) and of stopping flight (149–52). Individual initiative; enmity and friendship dissolved by death; triumph and victorious return home.
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(152–8). Bad beginnings lead to failure (158–60). The classes of creatures which will be put to flight (160–4).

Lines 164–80: With the horse as watchman the Big Man is master of the land, which is protected against thieves; &c. Boundaries of the land ordained. The land returns after the earthquake to its proper position. The horse’s fugitive friends return.

Possession and deprival of the faculty of speech in the case of some classes of creatures.

Line 180: In Tibetan: ‘From then [kinds and] descents [of species] came: this is stated as secret.’

Lines 181–2: Statement concerning the speaker (rbyo-po)’s narrative.

Lines 182–end: Selections from an oral recitation.

Lines 182–4: Brief account of restoration of order.

Lines 184–222: Consideration of the danger from the yak; the danger on the side of the females, ll. 188–90; proposed abandonment of the city for another home, ll. 190–7; concerning burial and ancestral tombs, ll. 197–211; proposal to depart to the hgam in the thain and, uniting together, to organize a chase of the yak, ll. 211–22.

Lines 222–49: Passionate appeal for an expedition of vengeance against the yak and the hcha.

End of Chapter.

II. LINES 249–53: Brief statement concerning the defeat of the yak and general satisfaction.


Lines 285–301: The social order, the wise, good, &c., in authority, the evil fled, the nobles in authority, the commons subservient, ll. 285–9; the Big Man and his subjects on the watch-mountain.

Lines 301–13: Classes of creatures, good and bad, on the mountain.

Lines 313–25: Reflections concerning relation of classes, supervision, and contact with inferiors.

Lines 325–44: General reflections upon what has taken place and concerning rgyo (329–36).


Lines 352–7: Summary concerning happy conditions restored.
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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 Mon 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.
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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, ɡ, ɗ, ɓ, ɾ, ɭ, 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 ɡ-, need not be further exemplified, since, as occurring very widely and capriciously, it cannot be credited with a function.

2. ɡ-, as alternating with ʰ-, has been exemplified (p. 118–19) in ɡni, ɡdim, ɡldag, ɡnaq, ɡpha, ɡmoq, ɡ-yo, ɡ-raḥ, ɡ-ri. We may here add:

- gkom, 222 (swa ʰre) = ḥkom, 175 (swa ʰre)
- gcig, 356 (ste-ʰe-hdzu-ɡe) = cig, 194 (ste-gdzu-ɡe)
- gciḥi, 346 = ʰcɨ/ɦciḥi, 205, 301, 348, 350
- gcog, 69
- gcgeh, 111, 234 (gcgeh) = ʰcgeh, 250
- gni, 80
- gñim, 12
- gtañ, 186 = ḥtañ, 96
- gtoñ, 211 (hgo ʰ) = ḥtoñ, 212 (hko)
- gstor, 143 (ʰtor), 152 (ʰta) = stor, 118, &c. (ʰdor), 145, &c.
- (ʰta)
- grtehe, 181 = ḥrteḥu, 265 (?)
- gdaḥ, 191 = ḥdaḥ, 108
- gdag, 200, 204, 206 = ḥdag, 259, 260, 261
- gdes, 260
gdod, 186
gnah, 179, &c. (ʰgoŋ, ʰhgoŋ) = na, 358 (ʰhgon, ʰhgon)
gbohu, 181 = hbo, 263
gblaŋ, 265
gtsaŋ, 165 (hsah) = htsaŋ, 378 (hsah)
gtsu, 214 = htsu, 193, 304, htsuŋ, 166, 303 = htsu, 75, 76, 215, tahu, 206
gtsob, 351, 352
g-wah/hgwah, 224, 229 (ʰhršaŋ) = hwa, 228 (ʰhršaŋ) = hwa, 224 (ʰhršaŋ)
g-we, 197, &c. = hwe, 85, &c., we, 114, &c.
g-wehi, 199, 263 = hwehi, 22, &c., 139, &c.
g-wehe, 201, &c. = hwehe, 348
g-wer, 164, 301 = hwer, 19
gzu, 307, &c. (ʰhbyi) = gdu, 305, &c. (ʰhbyi)
gzu, 353 (ʰhdro) = hdu, 183, 352 (ʰhdro)
gzo, 165 = hzdobo, 362
g-yaŋ, 287 (ʰhthaŋ) = hyah, 285, &c. (ʰhthaŋ)
g-yaŋ, 31 (ʰra) = hyaŋ, 66, 226 (ʰhra)
g-yehi, 271, g-yehe, 166 = hgyehi, 209 (?)
g-yer, 167 (hscah), 330 (hsah) = yer, 141 (hsah) = hyer, 267 (hsah), 297 (hscah)
g-yog, 15, 51, 200, 320
g-yog, 156 = hyog, 289, 324, &c.
g-rub, 261 = hrub, 108, 349
g-roŋ, 71
glab, 180 = hlab, 180, &c.
glo, 116 (pu) = hlo, 135 (pu)
gsəŋ, 30, 263, &c. = ḥsəŋ, 81, 199, 255, &c.
gsi, 44, 244 (ses, ḥses) = hsi, 44, 245 (ses, ḥses)
gsím, 268
gsə, 49 (ʰhzro-ʰnəh) = ḥsəh, 369 (ʰrdzor-ʰnəh)
gseg, 381 (ʰgər) = hṣeg, 330 (ʰgəegra)
gsog, 7, 20 = hṣog, 8, 20
gsah, 276, 333 = hsah, 165, 166, &c.
gsəŋ, 228 (ʰhraŋ) = ḥsəŋ, 226 (ʰhraŋ)
gsar, 204 = hsar, 255
gsas, 262 = hsas, 59, 116, &c.
gsu/gsus, 64, 99 (ʰslo) = hsus, 93 (ʰslo)
gsə, 327 (ʰkho-ʰgyan) = hṣəh, 325 (ʰkho-ʰgyan) = ḥsəh, 327 (ʰkho-ʰo-ʰgyan)
gsen, 349
gsö, 151, 193, 194
gsöhu, 358 = ḭso, 201
gsom, 23, 178, 206, &c.
gsom, 10, 117, &c. (?)

There are also forms with gw- (hgweg), gy- (hgyud, hgyeb, gyim, &c.), gr- (gras, ḷgru, gre, ḷgro, &c.), gl- (gla, ḷglu, glehu, glog, &c.), in which the (`<)` is not a Prefix.

3. d-:
   dgu, 75, 77, 225, &c. = dguhu, 236, 244
dgu, 127 = ḭgu, 126
ddyim, 95 (`pyi`) = gdim, 88, &c. (`pyi`, `phyi`) = dim, 95 = ḷdim, 88.

4. b-: For a list of b-forms in the Verb system see p. 194: and concerning the remaining three, bʒir, bṣer, bsod see infra.

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

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


8. s-: See pp. 354 sqq., list and discussion.

In the manipulation of the Prefixes and in the resultant word-forms there is a general resemblance to Tibetan. But a further examination elicits certain differences.

In the first place, d- and m- are so scantily represented that they can scarcely be said to exist in the Nam language. The former occurs in only three words, namely the somewhat frequent dgu, ‘hot’, usually antithetical to mu, ‘cold’, another dgu/hgu probably = ‘9’ (Tib. dgu), and ddyim, a casual variant of dim/gdim/ ḷdim. M- is apparent only in mnar (a single instance) and possibly in myag, ‘spoiled’, ‘corrupted’, the former being perhaps Locative of a mṇaḥ = Tib. mṇaḥ, ‘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 ḷ-, 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 ḥdsoho/gado, '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/ḥdzu/ḥzu/ḥju, 'ass', even this trace is lost. There are also outside the verb-system instances of g- alternating with absence of Prefix, e.g. gnag/naog, 'black', gnaḥ/na, 'place', g-raḥ/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' (?), bzer, 'fort' (?), bzod, 'bear' (verb), of which the first and third are ḥnaḥ ʾeṣṣmēva, the second and third Tibetan: bžir is possibly = Hsi-hsia gžir, 'wise' (Nevsky, No. 281). In view of the rarity of ż 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-, ldγ- (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, lkhu), 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 ṭhya, '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, Ḫaṅ-ṇuṅ, and Hsi-hsia (in Tibetan transcription): see Appendix to this chapter, pp. 206–11 sqq.

Disregarding Prefixes, which probably were felt as distinct, even
when not clearly used as functional, the initial consonants and consonant groups in the Nam language are as follows:

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

The cases with a single consonant call for little comment. It has been remarked (p. 114) that the rarity of ź and z suggests that the sounds did not properly belong to the language. The only words with ź are

bźir, bžer, ržaň

of which bźir is possibly Hsi-hsia and bžer, ‘fort’ (‘mart’?, ‘magazine’?), is common in old Tibetan names, while ržaň may (but
see p. 352) be a casual variant of *rśaṅ, hṛśaṅ*. In the Berlin manuscript we find also *ze* (ll. 2, 3), perhaps a similar variant of *je*, which occurs (l. 10) in the same connexion. Nam *z* occurs in

*hzāṅ, hzu, and zgu (with variants kju, gdsu, and hdzu), gzo, bxod, (g)hzāṅ (?)*

Since none of these, except *zgu* (2) and *hzu* (2), has more than a single occurrence, and since *gzo, bxod,* and *hzāṅ* all exist as Tibetan words, it is likely *a priori* that, if not scribal errors, all the words are borrowed. ¹ *H* initial occurs, except as a Prefix, only in the particle *ḥi*.

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-ğuṅ, 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-ḥsia, and as regards *dy* by Žaṅ-ğuṅ. The combinations *pw* and *dzu* are peculiar to Nam:² *pl* and *phil* it shares with Žaṅ-ğuṅ, the first of the two also with Central-Asian Tibetan (*plṅāṅ*) and some Hsi-fan dialects (rare).

In Tibetan the writing *g-y* serves to distinguish cases where the *g* is a Prefix from those, written *gy*, where the *g* belongs to the root; and the distinction is usually confirmed by the other evidence. The Nam follows the same procedure in connexion with *w* and *r* also, writing *g-w* and *g-r* where the *g* is a Prefix (infra, pp. 336–7). The usage has not been extended, as it might have been, to *l*;³ and so we find *glab* written where *g-lab* would certainly have been correct. It is therefore possible both in Nam and in Tibetan that some apparent roots commencing with *gl* may contain an originally Prefixed *g*; and this is certainly the case with Nam *glāṅ, 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 *blāṅ, blāṅs*. 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. *ḥpho*), *stu, sdu* (cf. *ḥdu, ḥthu*), that is certain.

¹ The Berlin fragment has, however, *zor* (ll. 2, 7), which again may be Tibetan. On *hzu, zgu*, see infra, pp. 251–2 sqq., and on *z* generally pp. 334–6 sqq.

² On *w* in Nam see pp. 336 sqq.

³ In Hsi-ḥsia (Neváky, Nos. 239, 246) *g-liṅ* occurs (as a variant of *gli, liṅ, li*); also *b-liṅ.*
This is a matter which could be discussed only in detail and need be discussed only when and where, if anywhere, it assumes a significance: there are some adverbial words or formatives, Tibetan ste, sto, Nam sta, ste, sto, in which the s cannot have been a Prefix. ¹ We have noted supra certain combinations not to be found in Nam, whether represented, as in Tibetan, by a compound alphabetic sign, or otherwise.

The final consonants and consonant-groups are as in normal Tibetan, namely:

\[ g, \dot{n}, d, n, b, m, \dot{h}, r, l, s \]
\[ gs, \dot{n}s, bs, ms \text{ (with the addition of rs)} \]

and \( \dot{h} \) 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 \( k, kh, g, \dot{n} \), we seem always to have \( yi \), never \( i \), after \( m \) sometimes (mye) ye for \( e \); (b) cu, \( \dot{n}u, \dot{w}u, \dot{l}u \) are, perhaps accidentally (since chu and ju occur), wanting; (c) \( \dot{zh}, \dot{z}o, \dot{z}i, \dot{ze} \), also are wanting, which, in view of the rarity, and probable foreign origin, of the \( \dot{zh} \) and \( z \), seems to have no significance: once or twice \( \dot{nye} \) is written in place of \( \dot{nie} \).

All the vowels occur as finals, in which position they very frequently have a prolonged or drawing pronunciation, indicated by writings of the type aha, \( \ddot{i}hi \), &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 bychos in place of byos while another has so-bo for so; but, on the other hand, the rgyohon, for rgyon, is in a context which contains what is evidently the same verb in the forms rgyo and rgyoho.

Apparent diphthongs are classified and discussed in the above-cited article (pp. 201–6), where it is shown that chu and ohu are real and somewhat frequent.² The case of ahi (rtahi, hpahti, pahti), uhi (hruki hyphahi, hpuhi, hmuhi), ohi (hkohti), and perhaps also those of ehi (frequent), require further consideration with regard

¹ See pp. 182–3, 185, 201.
² See infra, pp. 368–9.
to Syntax (pp. 176-7, 190-1). There is no real example of a diphthong in a word ending in a consonant.

Manifestly the above-noted morphological features place the Nam language upon the general level of the written, i.e. the old, Tibetan, and separate it definitely from the Hsi-hsia and from the modern Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Tibeto-Chinese border.

In the script there are numerous apparent disyllables, ending in o, hi, na, ni, ra, and occurring for the most part at the end of sentences. The cases belong evidently to the morphology of the sentence, and will be considered under that head. Numerous instances of -r appended to forms ending in vowels or h, e.g. hrar/ hrah, rhor/rho, 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:

\[ \text{hlidy\=a\=n-hjo-hkromni, 389, v. hlidy\=a\=n-hyu-hjo-cig-dze-\text{htor-ge}-hkroms, 387} \]
\[ \text{hr\=o-hto\=hu-re-hgya\=n ||, 7, v. smyi-nu-hgya\=ns, 241} \]
\[ \text{hlab-ma(me)-h\=ni, 67, v. hlab-me-h\=nis ||, 70} \]
\[ \text{ldyo-stor-hthu-re, 140, v. hjim-ta-hthusni, 156} \]
\[ \text{stor-ta-hthogni, 149, v. stor-ta-hthogs ||, 145} \]
\[ \text{thor-hbro\=n-tshor-na, 220, v. htor-hbro\=n-htsors, 219, hldag-nag-h\=tshors, 130} \]
\[ \text{\=se-h\=si-\=bre\=he, 44, v. kehu-prom-h\=bres, 176} \]
\[ \text{hko\=hu-\=hprom, 169, v. htor-htas-\=hproms, 121-2.} \]

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 Substan-
tives, 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-moṅ-hdzoṅ, 139

we already know that moṅ-hdzoṅ means ‘Moṅ-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 Moṅ-castle’.

It was to be expected that an auxiliary should follow the verb to which it belongs; and this is to be seen in

ḥno-hkhob-hprom, 322 ‘face-cover-do’, ḥno-stor-ḥprom ||,


In some of the above examples we see after the verb the syllables ni, na. These are Particles, the use of which will be considered infra.

That the subject should come first is, in view of the shortness of many of the sentences, an obvious consequence; and we have had it exemplified in gtsan-myi-hrgan (l. 160), ‘the corn does not mature’, and other sentences. Since we know further that sid means ‘high’, it appears from

ḥṣid-hriḥi-ḥthor-dze, 62

where hriḥi must be = Tibetan ri ‘mountain’, that the Adjective may precede the Substantive: from hldi-rgyed-hraḥ, ‘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-ḥṣid-dze, 11

since dze is a very common particle, we have the ḥṣid following wam, and in the frequent hraḥ-hldi, ‘this place’ (at the beginning of verses in ll. 225, &c.) and in the antithetical line (ll. 132–3)

ḥbri-hldi-hthaṅ-re-hre-hldi-hyah

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-{	extit{vrihis}} and following its Substantive. We may accordingly state that Pronouns and Adjectives may, as in Tibetan, Latin, &c., and perhaps with analogous variation of emphasis, either precede or follow their Substantive. That a simple Substantive in an attributive (Genitive) relation could follow the governing word is highly improbable and nowhere apparent. The contrary order is indicated by the above-noted phrase rgyed-hraḥ and many others, such as g-ri-hruḥu (l. 21), ‘mountain-horn’ (peak), hrdzo-hgyud, ‘mdzo-race’, Mon-{	extit{rdzo}}, ‘Mon-castle’. Many other Case relations are similarly expressed merely by prefixing the subordinate term, e.g. hnah-{	extit{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. But it can be clearly recognized as preceding the verb in:

su-me-hmehi, 114, ‘Who kindles a fire?’
ḥpu-ge-me-hmuhi, 183, ‘The sons (?) cool the fire’

and derivatively in numerous compounds, such as:

and the same or other cases in:
gse-hlad, 240 &c., ‘requisite of injury’
rne-hlad, 231, ‘requisite of wrong’
hkhab-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-{	extit{hchos}}-re-ge-hpu-myī-ldin ||, 160
‘Winter-born, a bird does not fly’
hkhu-tsa-śid-dze-hpha-hīur- hīur ||,60
‘When the uncle-people are high, the father groans’

---

1 Thus hno-khob-prom (l. 322), hno-hdūn-prom (l. 258) may be rendered ‘made a face-hiding’, ‘made a face-rest’.
rgam-hgah-hkañ-hyañ-ḥrag-ma-ḥbog ||, 256
"Though the deep places were filled, the dykes were not fouled"

hjo-me-ḥdub-re-ḥla(b)-me-ḥnis ||, 70
"When the hjo-fire sinks, the ḥlab-fire shines out"
thañ-ṛdzø-ḥkyud-na-ḥbroñ-ḥbru-hjar, 220
"In the mdzo-race of the than-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, dse, ḡyañ, 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 cin, te (de, st), yañ, na, nas, la, las, and constituting Gerund-expressions. This is, doubtless, why, like the Gerund-clauses in the simple sentences of Tibetan, they occupy the first place, preceding the main sentence or at least the verb. The value and etymology of these several Particles, which we see to be in part identical with those of the Tibetan, will be considered infra. The clauses, for which we may give the general formula ‘A being B’, can be used to express not only attendant circumstances or conditions, but also mere note of time and place or other particulars: for example, ‘on a dark night’ may be expressed by ‘the night being dark’, and ‘vengeance upon the stupid mdzo’ by ‘the mdzo being stupid, vengeance’.

Here we must take note of a matter, which, if unobserved, would be a permanent obstacle to the interpretation of the text and the etymology of the language: it is as follows:—There are in the text many verses where in the caesura position a syllable is
missing. The cases, to which attention is called in the critical notes, occur as follows:

(a) Cases where the third syllable ends in r:


(b) Other cases:

Lines 12, 14, 153, 193, 311–12, 319 (2).

The group (b) may be explained by a simple citation of one of the cases, ll. 193–4:

\[ \text{hni\-ah-htsu-rpag-re-hni\-ah-mo-hgam} \]
\[ \text{hni\-ah-mo-hrpag-[re]-gso-nad-hgam} \]
\[ \text{gso-nad-rpag-re-hka\-hga\-njor}. \]

No one would question that the parallelism in the three lines demands the insertion of \textit{re} in the second of them. Quite similar are the cases in ll. 12 (insert \textit{ge} or \textit{dze}) and 14 (insert \textit{ge}). The case of ll. 153–4 is slightly different, but has the advantage of illustrating also the group (a). We read:

\[ \text{myi-re-hti-ni-myi-[re]-hsi} \]
\[ \text{myi-rgye-my\=e-[re]-hchos-hyo-hjo} \]
\[ \text{hti-rgye-my\=e-dze-hgye-hkrom-hkrom}. \]

In the first verse we are perhaps dealing with a different \textit{re} = Tibetan \textit{re}, ‘each’, ‘a single’, and the meaning may perhaps be:

‘if each man singly stop, each man dies’;

so that the bracketed \textit{re} would be an appropriate insertion. In the second verse an alteration of \textit{myer} to \textit{mye-re} gives a required parallelism to the third, and also affords the valuable information that \textit{mye-re} has approximately the same sense as \textit{mye-dze}.\footnote{Similarly, in l. 136 we have \textit{g-yar-re} (written) in antithesis to \textit{g-yah-dze}.} Now in group (a) there are three other instances of \textit{myer} in the same situation (ll. 365–6). They must be cured in the same way; and it follows that the word \textit{myer}, since it does not otherwise occur, does not exist. Of a different kind, but like effect, is the evidence when
we have the same phrase or verse recurring with the postulated modification, e.g.

\[ \text{rta-hgam-\text{-}hphar-[\text{re}], 99 = rta-hgam-hphar-re, 110.} \]

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 \( ra, ro \, \text{‘place’} \), it might be thought that the Nam Locative termination was really not \(-r\) but \(-ra\). Mye-ra would more easily than mye-re be read as myer.\(^1\) Something could be urged in favour of this; and no doubt the \(-r\)-Locative is very old. But we could not assume that a Locative sense would always be appropriate; and we may prefer to connect the (myer, &c., written in place of mye-re &c.) phenomenon with a proximate or ultimate oral transmission of the text and bring into the question the ‘rapid pronunciation’, which Prejevalsky (op. cit. ii, p. 112) noticed in the modern Tibetan (‘Tangut’) of the Koko-nor region. When there came to be a recopying from a manuscript, the dictator, scribe, and reviser might all alike be indifferent to the metre.

It now remains to give particulars of the sentence-ending Particles which sometimes lend an appearance of disyllabism to the last monosyllable in a sentence:

(a) \(-o\), which occurs after a consonant in:

\[ \text{ldyo\text{-}o, 318 (a doubtful reading)} \]

\(^1\) On the cases where, on the contrary, this \( ra \) after a consonant is actually treated as non-syllabic see infra, p. 178.
after a vowel in:

हक्रुहो, 316

and frequently perhaps in forms with o such as:

पुयोहो, 22, हयोहो, 119, हतोहो, 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 हयो and हतो.

(b) हः, which follows a consonant in:

(1) forms written as one word, viz.

ह्द्वो, 134, ह्नोङ्गी ||, 137, ह्काङ्टी ||, 164, ह्प्येद्वी, 208, 
मोद्वी, 212, ह्र्द्वोङ्गी ||, 214, ह्लांवी, 224, 225, 226, 227, 
228, 229, ह्त्रोङ्गी, 224, 243, स्तोङ्गी, 255, ह्वांवी ||, 301, 
ह्लोङ्गी, 378, ह्र्लोङ्गी | : |, 385,

(2) forms written as two words, viz.

ह्तुहः, 67, ह्लादःहि, 230, 237.

In both (1) and (2) the हः seems to be everywhere extra-metrical, though we may allow a doubt in the case of स्तोङ्गी and ह्लोङ्गी.

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

ह्केहि ||, 15, 41, 202, ह्र्वेहि ||, 22, 113, 198, मेहि ||, 25, 115, 
311, 312, 313, र्वेथि, 86, ह्मेहि, 114, 186, ह्देहि ||, 167, 
ग-वेहि ||, 199, 263, ह्रेर्वि ||, 204-5, ह्ग्येहि ||, 209, ह्क्लेहि ||, 
212, ग-ेहि ||, 271, ह्द्वेहि, 338, 339, ह्तेहि, 342, ह्पेरि, 
386, 387.

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

With उः we have:

ह्मुहि, 183, ह्पुहि, 276, ह्पुहि ||, 282, ह्द्वुहि ||, 345, 346,
of which ह्पुहि and ह्पुहि 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 ḥruḥi, 167. Probably all the words contain u+ḥi, and the ḥi will then be extra-metrical.

oḥi is seen in ḫkhaḥ-ḥtoḥi (l. 324, extra-metrical ḥi), ḫkhoḥi || (l. 218, perhaps in a 12-syllable verse and with o+extra-metrical ḥi).¹

ahi occurs only in

ḥkahi, 239, ḫpahi, 384,

where, if = ḫka+ḥi, the ḥi is extra-metrical; but ṛtaḥi (l. 174, but ṛtahi, l. 360), pahi (l. 262) and ḫpahi (l. 211) are found as non-final monosyllables.

What is the difference between the -o, which we see to have been rare, and the ḥi, unknown in Tibetan, which was common? Since in the passage, ll. 223–30, which is of an emotional character, a cry for vengeance, the ḥi ends every line of verse, it seems probable that, in contrast to the -o, which was a Particle of statement, ḥi was a Particle of emphasis or exclamation and suitable, therefore, for oratory and poetry. On non-final -ḥi 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

Sṅag-na-ni-myi-alebs
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-riṅ-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

bṭhogni (2), 149, ḫtobn[i]j, 150, 152, ḫkarni ||, 151, ḫgyanj, 153, ḫthusni, 156

¹ -oḥi non-final in the sentence is monosyllabic in ḫkōhi (l. 170), like ḫkōhu in ll. 171, 172, 173, 174, &c.
and internally in l. 153:
myi-re-ḥti-ni-myi-[re]-ḥši ||.
The other occurrences, viz.
kyañni, 192, rgyen[n]i, 198, ḡkon[n]i || ḡ||, 249, ḡbogni, 283 can be seen to have the same character.
Where found at the end of Nam verse, this ni is always extra-metrical.
(d) ra, although it may be merely the word ra, ‘place’, should be mentioned here, because in ll. 329–31:
hṭor-hpuḥu-hbos-dze-ḥrgyo-hšeg-gšegra-ge-ḥrgyo-hṭo-stiṅ ||
ṛta-ḥšah-g-yer-dze-ḥryo-gšeg-gše[g][a]-ge-ḥrgyo-hṭo-stiṅ
the first of the two eleven-syllable verses presents gšegra as one written word and with the value of a monosyllable; a circumstance which accounts for the writing gšer for gšegra in the second verse.
In l. 270 also:
ḥwaḥ-ḥldaṅra-ḥtsaṅra-na-ḥwa-ḥrgya-ḥrkọ-ḥrkabś we can, by reckoning ḡldaṅra and ḡtsaṅra as monosyllables and omitting the second ḡwaḥ (ḥwa), which is absent in the parallel l. 272, arrive at a normal verse of seven syllables, as in the surrounding passage, or, retaining the ḡwa, a verse of eight syllables. This leaves us with l. 278:
ṛta-ḥwa-ḥldaṅra-ḥldaḥ-ḥtag-ḥtos
and l. 302:
ẖmaṅ-ḥriḥi-ḥphaṅ-dze-ḥdoṅra-ẖnaḥ-na
where, again, ḡdoṅra is a monosyllable. On ra(re)-ẖnaḥ 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:
gšegr, ḡldaṅ, ḡtsaṅ, ḡdoṅr without a final vowel:1 and this may explain in l. 375 the writing ḡrōr for what must be ḡrōṅ-re or ḡrōṅra. Also, it cannot be an accident that all the cases, except gšegr, involve a final ṅ and that even as regards gšegr we can point to confusion of final g and ṅ in contemporary Tibetan of north-eastern Tibet, so that gšer in l. 331 may represent not gšegr, but gšehr.
We can hardly fail to connect this non-syllabic ra with the numerous class of contrary cases, discussed above, in which a

1 In l. 133 ḡthaṅra, final, seems to be treated as a monosyllable.
written monosyllable ending in a possibly Locative r has dis-
syllabic 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
(glañ-na and ḫubna), 183, 221 (ḥthāña), 225, 231, 236, 237, 238,
244, 245, 246, 248, 253, 257, 258, 262, 280 (ḥtona), 328, 329, 353,
354, 369

(ii) na separated from the preceding syllable by interpunctuation
in ll. 113, 114, 174 (ḥto-na and ḫpor-na), 176–7 (glañ-na), 177,
That there is no difference between the cases (a) and (b) is evident
from fluctuations such as

ḥto-na, 174, 294, ḥtona, 250
ḥgyañ-na, 296 ḫgyaña, 77
ma-maḥna, 245 = ma-maḥna, 238 = ma-maḥna, 245, 246
= ma-hman(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-maḥna, &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:

... ḫkhehe || na || ḫnor ..., 314.

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

|| na-ḥldyañ-hyañ-hyo-na-ḥdyañ-ḥkah-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 ḫldyañ-hyañ-hyo-na (l. 179) and ḫldyañ-hyañ-hyo-don
(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):

\[
\text{ḥtor-ḥrta-rme-ge-ḥldaŋ-краŋ-hkuŋ} ||
\]

\[
\text{ḥldaŋ-краŋ-ḥsad-na-ḥldaŋ-краŋ-ḥsāh}
\]

(with four further verses beginning with ḥldaŋ-(ḥ)краŋ) 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, *plaṅna* |).

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 manu-
scripts 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:

\[
\text{rta-yul-ḥbrog-yin-kyaṅ-bden}
\]

\[
\text{g-yag-yul-byaṅ-yin-kyaṅ-bden} |
\]

\[
\text{na | da-de-riṅ-saṅ-lta-na | rta-daṅ-g-yag-gnis-saṅ-myi-ḥthab- ho}
\]

‘Horse-country is the wilds—’tis true!

Yak-country is the north-plain—’tis true!

whereas this is so (*na*), now, looking to to-day and to-morrow,
horse and yak should not strive as foes’.

Here the first *na*, marked off from both sentences and not included
in the metre of what precedes, has the same meaning (‘attendant
circumstance’ or ‘condition’) as the second, which in the prose
passage is attached to its (subordinate) clause.
An example of the *na* attached to the following sentence only is:

\[\text{sku-glud-du-bor} \mid | \text{na-hbrog-srin} \ldots \text{htshalde-mchis}\]

'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 *gnah*, 'place', which in the Nam occurs both in this form and also as *na* and *hnah*. 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', *no*, 'face', *mye*, *mehi*, 'eye', *roñ*, 'gorge', *hla*, 'moon', *me*, 'fire', *smyi*, 'man', *na*, 'spring', *ši*, 'winter', which show no trace of a deverbal origin. And there are others, such as *hbron*, 'yak', *gnah*, 'place', *hkhab*, 'house', *hdzoñ*, '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-hrañ*, '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 vca in gsom-vca, rgoṅ-vca, hwi-vca, 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, yan-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 bka-ko, ‘home-woman’ (l. 193), it seems that they are compounds, in which po and mo retain their full meaning: cf. what Dr. Laufer wrote1 concerning the Tibetan btsan-po (sometimes -pho, ‘man’).

Whether there was a Suffix ka, ga remains to be determined. Such a suffix, rare in ordinary Tibetan,2 was certainly used in the Tibetan of the north-east.3

Ta is found copiously added to verb-roots and giving rise to nouns of action, such as glo-ta, ‘intention’, ‘thought’, skye-ta, ‘life’, chos-ta, ‘beginning’, bka-ta, ‘speaking’, g-ri-ta, ‘payment’. It is used of agents in l. 336;

klu-hka-rgyo-ho-re-bsa-ta-hgyon

‘if the blind perform rgyo, the knowing ones perform rgyo’

where klu and bsa are rather Adjectives than Verbs; and there are other like cases. We sometimes (l.l. 7 bkye-dg-a-ta, 371, 372 bde-dg-a-hka) find the Particle ge inserted between the Suffix and its word.

The sta in:

hna-sta, 85, rne-sta, 86, bhrad-sta, 306, bma-sta, 311, bri (g-ri, g-ri-bi)-sta, 311–12, slo-sta, 99

2 But cf. chad-ka, ‘fine’ or ‘confiscation’, in the MS. Chronicle (now edited by M. Jacques Bacot, see pp. 25 (89), 57 (l. 31–2)) ltoṅ-ka (and ‘ga) ‘groove’, ‘notch’, ‘depression’, dbyar-ka, sos-ka, ‘summer’, than-ka, ‘plain’, thad-ka, ‘direction’, &c. These, however, are substantives, and often they have by-forms with -kha and -ga, and may be compounds, formed with kha as second member.
3 Supra, pp. 32, n. 1, 60.
will be a form of ta, to be expected on the analogy of to/sto, te/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 ruye-htàh, l. 91, and on hwa-stê-htàh, ll. 71–2, with ste-+ta see p. 187.

Since the expected da is not found in this use, we naturally ask whether among the occurrences of lda, ldah, hlda, hldah, there may be any of like character. There are numerous instances of hlda/ hldah/lda as a Suffix, viz.:

hrañ-hldah (hlda)-ñam-ge, 5, 6, 8, 37
hrañ-hldah-ge, 43
hrañ-hldah, 38
rkañ-lda, 84
hkañ-hldah, 137
rke-hldah, 155
hbañ-hldah, 170
hsañ-hldah, 164
g-yog-hldah, 200
hsñ-hldah, 201
sor-hlda, 203
gse-hlda, 240
hrde-hldah, 301
rpeñi-hldah, 286
ruñ(hriñ)-hldah, 303, 310
hpñ-hldah, 358
hðdäh-hldah, 380, 382, 383.

Several of the words preceding the hldah, e.g.

hrañ (= Tib. rañ, ‘self’), hrañ (‘place’), hsañ, ‘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 gtsé ‘to injure’, we can take note of the verse

rñe-hlad-rpag-re-gse-hlda-hlad-ñamñi, 239–40

which is immediately followed by gse-hlad, recurring again twice in l. 242. Gse-hlad means ‘requital of injury’, rñe-hlad probably ‘requital of wrong’; and gse-hlda-hlad, since it cannot differ much from gse-hlad, ought to mean ‘requital of injuring or injurers’.
The agential sense (‘injurers’) will probably be found to fit the case of gse-hlda and most of the other instances.

To, hto, htoho occur most commonly as Verb-suffix or Verb at the end of a sentence: we have:

hši-hrog-hpara-to, 17
stor-htoho ||, 140
bšrom-hto, 168, 171 (bšrom), 172 (bšrom), 174 (prom),
    359 (bšrom-htoho), 360 (to)
re-hto ||, 169, 382
rmañ-dze-htoho, 235
hnu-hto ||, 242
hyah-hto, 294, 315 (htoho)
hmañ-hto ||, 310
rgo-htoho, 314–15
hrbom-htoho ||, 317
hkhad-htohi, 324

(Uncertain on account of confused text, g-yo-hpud-hto, 28).

Not really different are the cases where the sentence is subordinate and therefore followed by a Particle:

gšañ-re-hṭad-to-dze, 30
hrgom-hkhrur1-hto-na, 169
hldog-g-yah-to-dze, 317
dguḫu-mu-hto(to)-re, 236, 244: dgu-mu-hto[-]r[e], 225, 245.

The re in the last group of cases is one of the Particles which most commonly occupy the caesura position. As we shall see infra, it is really a Verb, meaning ‘be’ (in these cases a Gerund, ‘being’), for which reason it may itself admit the hto formation re-hto, as in ll. 169, 382, noted above. The cases with hto-re show, however, that the hto-forms are not really finite Verbs, but are predicative Participles or Adjectives with the Verb ‘be’ omitted.

After the hto-form may come an ‘auxiliary’ Verb or expression: the instances are:

hrugu-hto-hrub (＝ Tibetan ruṇ, ‘ought’, ‘must’), 30, 32
stor-to-hrub, 79–80, 138
hdzohu-hto-hrub, 138
htshu-to-hpban, 215
rgyo-hto-stiṇ, 330, 331, 335, 336 (rgyoḥo)
hko-hto-swad, 390

¹ For ḥkhru-re.
and in a subordinate sentence or phrase:
stor-hto-hruhi-ge, 167

The other cases are:
klu-hto-hkym, 37
hdam-to-hbu-hpor(hphor ?), 68
stor-hto-rta-yan-stor-to-brun | ◊ |, 79
hchihi-htho-ge-hnan ||, 350.

Here klu-hto, hdam-to, hchihi-htho, clearly function as Substantives, 'the blind', 'the bound', &c.; and stor-hto = stor-hto- &c., 'that having fled'.

The -sto which we naturally expect is to be seen in
hswar-hldu-sto-dze, 28
hde-hyim-sto-rgyag, 29
hno-sto-ge-rdo-re, 84
hno-sto-ge-hskyag-dze, 85
hbe-hbahi-hnañ-sto, 235
tha-hnu-hrgyañ-sto-smyi-hnu-hto, 242
hkyan-hldon-hgnyañ-sto, 292.

In two cases sto comes at the end of a sentence, and the phrase is therefore, no doubt, a Verb:
hrgu-hrgahi-sto ||, 58
hchir-htsah-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 to¹ 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:²
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

¹ Cf. the doublets te/sto, ta/sta, and Tibetan te/sto. From observation of the occurrence, both in Tibetan and in Nam, it appears that sto and deriv two s from the preceding (Preterite) verb-form: thus hldu-sto, hjiym-sto, hrgehi-sto are merely scriptural substitutes for hldus-to, hjims-to, hrgehi-to.

² Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 16.
where, furthermore, we find also the re, which we have seen in
dgu-mu-to-re, &c.

In general therefore we see that the forms in -to, -sto, can act as
predicates and can then be followed by the word re, 'be'. This
means that they are Adjectives and Participles; and when we find
them as subjects, as in:

\( \text{ḥcihi-ḥtoho-ge-ḥnan} \), 350
\( \text{ḥno-sto-ge-rdo-re} \), 84

they are Adjectives used as subjects: in fact, \( \text{ḥno-sto} \) probably
means 'friends' or 'allies', i.e. \( \text{ḥnos-to} \), 'those on one's side (nos),
rather than \( \text{ḥno-sto} \), 'those who lend countenance (ño, cf. Tib. ṇo-tshab, a 'proxy', and so forth).

The forms do and ldo may also be expected. The former may be
seen in:

\( \text{ldañ-pyer-hgag-re-ḥtsah-ḥyah-hdo} \), 65
\( \text{ḥko-se-hgro-re-ḥtsa-ḥyah-hdo} \), 67
\( \text{ṛta-ḥso-ḥnaḥ-yañ-gni-ḥrdzum-doho} \), 80
\( \text{ldyañ-glab-hdo} \), 180

of which the first perhaps means:

'those (ḥtsah) who are prevented (ḥgag) from co-operating
(ldañ-pyer) become rivals or enemies (ḥyah = Tib. ya)'.

Somewhat different perhaps are:

\( \text{gsañ-sñañ-do-na} \) . . . , 86
\( \text{ḥtsog-ḥram-do-na} \)

where we may suspect the meaning of an abstract 'in . . . friendship', 'in comradeship', and:

\( \text{ḥtor-hdo-ḥχuñ} \), 185,

which seems clearly to mean 'in greatness small'. The remaining
instance:

\( \text{ḥchi-ḥdo-dyañ} \), 183, 353,

may conceivably belong to either group. Probably, however, it
means 'started to depart' and so belongs to the group hrgbu-
ḥto-ḥrun, &c.

A corresponding ldo we may surely recognize in:

dgu-hldo-ḥtor-dze, 74, 77, 78 (ge), 114 (ge), 139 (ldo, ge),
309 (ge)
rñe-hpo-hldo-ge, 177
mehi-hgab-hldo-ge, 155
klu-hldo-sme-re, 342
hну-hldo-hldyoho ||, 355
šeg-sme-hldo, 375
hбрислод-hldo-dze, 381

in several of which, e.g. dgu-hldo, ‘hotness’, klu-hldo, ‘blindness’, we seem to find the abstract sense: whereas in others, e.g.

mэhi-hгаб-хldo-ge = ‘having eyes hidden’

the Adjectival-Participial value may appear.

Like ре, ‘be’, this Participial or Verbal тa, тo, 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 лe and тa . . . to indicate the present tense . . . Риг-та, “I see it”; Риг-мя-та, “I (or you) do not see it.”’

And in the Vicomte d’Оllone’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:

Кan iu eu dzeta ‘I have a horse’
Кan iu nié dzeta ‘I have two horses’.

In рwye-hтах, л. 91, hтах, ‘is’, occurs, and in hwа-stе-hтах, л. 71–2, it is added to the Participial form in stе.

A suffix тsa has been previously (JRAS. 1939, pp. 207, 216) seen in gpha-tsa, ‘father-people’, hкhu-tsa, ‘uncle-people’; and this is doubtless also to be seen in Tibetan бuti-tsa, ‘child-people’, ‘children’. We are naturally inclined to see the same in

mоr-tsа-khrom-re || hвaн-tsa-хceг ||, 388

since mоr and hвaн are frequently antithetical and the parallelism with gpha-tsa v. hкhu-tsa is obvious: hваn-tsa recurs in л. 63. The same appears in hтroг-hтsa, ‘enemies’, л. 146, g-wах(g-yah ?)-htsа, л. 152, hкhwi-htsа, л. 259, hвaн-tsa, л. 283. There are two interesting points in connexion with this Suffix. The first is that it may follow compounds:

klu-hрto-htsa-ge, 24–5, ‘blind stones’ (?)
hтhan-le-tsa, 131, 220, ‘the [beings of the] than fields’ (?)
myе-hrah-htsah, 342, ‘look-outs’ (?)

compounds with -re:

gsu-prom-hно-[r]е-htsа-hpu-hдrom ||, 64–5
hстор-моn-hдzoн-re-htsa, 64
and even the inserted Particle ge:

\[ \overline{\text{sés-} \text{rtsig-moň-} \text{ge-htshah, 379}} \]
\[ \text{tsig-moň-} \text{we-} \text{ge-htshah, 381} \]
\[ \text{hdzah-} \text{hldah-} \text{hwehi-} \text{ge-htsah, 383} \]

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, htsah, &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.:

\[ \text{jig-mah-tsa-ge, 6} \]
\[ \text{htham-gnam-tsa-ge, 18} \]

not to mention possible examples, such as

\[ \text{me-} \text{tsa, 14,} \]

has very likely the expected ca in

\[ \text{ljeb-} \text{ca-} \text{ri-ri, gnu-me-} \text{doň-ca-ri-ri, 10–11.} \]

In Tibetan the ca may be recognized in the cag (\(= \text{ca-} \text{ge?} \), cf. yig \(= \text{yi-} \text{ge} \)) used to form the plural of Pronouns, such as ēna-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 hbro-cog, 'runaways', yod-do-cog, 'all existent things', mthon-ño-cog, 'all seen things'. It is intelligible that the convenient form ca, tsa may have penetrated into the Indian Prākrit of the Shan-shan kingdom, as was suggested in JRAS. 1939, pp. 207–8; cf. the Latin etc. in European languages.

The formative te/tehi/ste/stehi/lde/ldehi has already (p. 136) been discussed and equated to the Tibetan Gerund-forming te/ste/de. This te/de seems to be clearly apparent in the Berlin fragment:

\[ \text{bri-ma-} \text{za-} \text{de} . . . , 2 \]
\[ \text{bra-ma-} \text{ga-} \text{rde} . . . , 2 \]
\[ \text{rme-ma-} \text{do-de} . . . , 4 \]
\[ \text{saň-ma-de-de} . . . , 5 \]
\[ \text{rtoň-ma-de-de} . . . , 5 \]
\[ \text{kyo-ma-} \text{do-de} . . . , 5 \]
\[ \text{gee-yaň-phaň-de} . . . , 6, \&c. \]
and with *te* after *re*:

- klo-ṙn-u-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

- puṅ-te-gsar-ṅar, 204 ('being massed together, new vigour')
- ḥphom-te-ḥdraṅ, 147 ('being conquered, led')
- ḥsas-te-khyaṅ, 116
- bjo(ḥdzo ?)-chi-te-re, 385

and with *ste*:

- ldyaṅ-hkhaḥ-rwāṅ-ste, 178
- gnāḥ-goṅ-myag-ste, 179–80
- ḥlab-ta-gboḥu-ste-ge, 181–2
- na-ḥtsah-ste-dze, 33–4
- ḥldyim-ste-hpuḥi-ge, 274.

But, even putting aside

- hwa-ste-ḥtah, 72
- hwa-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-ḥdraṅ, 147

and in

- ḥse-hṭe-hmun, 33
- ḥldya-hkāñ-hṭe-hṅor, 52
- ḥṣod-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-hste-hpuḥi-ge, 274
- hrṅe-hrdam-hṭe-he-ge, 322
- ḥlab-ta-gboḥu-ste-ge, 181–2
or by *dze*, which is normally a kind of preposition, e.g. in
na-ḥtsah-ste-*dze*, 33
ḥwa-ste-*hge-*dze*, 73, 75.
This is the employment which we have seen in
rgyed-hdre-hte-*ge*, 87, 24, *the division-inducers*,
and similar is the case of
ḥtrog-hdre-hte-re, 326, 338, *there being* (*re*, or *re* = *all*),
emnity (¿ deceit ?)-inducers*
so that finally we get *the* attached to an Adjective:
trog-htor-hte-*dze*, 266, *upon great emnity*
and such an Adjective may become the main Predicate, as in
ḥla (lah)-hra-m-hte, 73, 76, *the moon [is] pleasant*.
The interest of this development in the use of the *te, ste* is the
fact that it is precisely the idiom which we have already (pp. 131, 136) traced in the personal names *Ltn̄-te-Mye-kru, Bzags-te-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, ḡu, 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, ḡe and ḡeḥi, which have been exhibited by the personal
names. The *i* is evidently regarded by the Tibetan translators of
the names as corresponding to their own Genitive- and Adjective-
forming Suffix *hi*; for, where their *hi* would not be phonologically
correct,¹ they substitute their alternative *gi, gyi*: thus:
Byeḥu-rma-byehu-*gi* = bya-rma-byahi
Yab-sten-rgan-*gyi* = Yab-ḥal-idehi
Tseñ-ḥgi-Rba-ga.
This is good evidence for a Genitive-Adjective value in the
Nam *hi*. Does it help to explain any of the variations between *e*
and *-eḥi*, such as we have exemplified *supra* (p. 124) ?:
ḥrah-we-*rtaḥ* = ḡrah-wehī-*rta*
hbe-ḥbaḥ = ḡbehī-ḥbaḥ.
It might be, for instance, that *ḥrah-we-*rtaḥ* meant *place-make-
horse* as a compound, while *ḥrah-wehī-*rta* meant *place-making
horse* with *place-making* as an Adjective qualifying *horse*; and
similarly *hbe-ḥbaḥ* might mean *sheep-oppression* as a com-
pound, while *ḥbehī-ḥbaḥ* meant *oppression of sheep*, with *ḥbehī*
¹ Occasionally elsewhere also, as in byehu-*gi*.
as a quasi-Genitive. And it would be convenient to discover in the Nam language a Genitive form. There are also cases where we apparently find these Gerund expressions with -de having the hi appendix when used apparently as Subjects. Thus in

ḥstor-hdehi-hphyid ||, 339, 341 (cf. 1dañ-hdehi-hphyid || ||, 343-4)

unless ḡde is there a different word (‘good fortune’), it might be that hstor-hdehi means ‘fugitives’, while hstor-ḥde 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, uhí, ohi directly contradict the idea of a Genitive-Adjective suffix,1 and the impression received is rather that the hi is a Particle of emphasis, identical, in fact, with the sentence-ending hi: the reason why we do not find it after consonants may be that in the interior of a sentence it would have added a syllable for which the verse had no place. It may very well have been used optionally in the interior of compounds, either to mark the separation of the parts or to emphasize one part, and for convenience, in cases like the above-mentioned hstor-hdehi, to mark off the phrase as a Subject. The objection to this is that the spelling mehi, where the probable meaning is ‘eye’, seems to be rather constant, while me, mye, prevails where ‘fire’ is probably meant; but possibly the hi may have been used in the language, without phonological origin, to make this very distinction. At the end of a sentence mehi can sometimes mean ‘is not’ (Tib. med).

It appears that before this enclitic hi a final a is usually converted into e. Ḥdzo-hḍzehi, ll. 338, 339, Ḥtso-ḥtsehi, l. 342, are clearly identical with each other and with Ḥdzo-hḍza, l. 262, ʰḥtsah, l. 29, ʰḥtseh(i), l. 364, Ḥtso-ḥtsah, ll. 62, 73, 115: and the same change is to be seen in

ḥyah-hnehi-hn|h, 115-16 (Tib. ya-na, ‘anguish’, ‘fright’) ḡw|i-hwehi-ḥtsag, 173, ‘rats (or mice) collect’

(cf. hw|i-wa-rmañ, 201, ‘rats (or mice) are the tomb’)

so that in some occurrences of spehi and ḡpehi, e.g. ll. 211, 370, we

---

1 Ldehi-swa-rtañ, ll. 319, 320, from lde, seems exactly parallel to rtañ-swa-hldir, l. 174, from rta.
may question whether we have to do with spe, hpe, or with spa, hpa; see p. 282. The case of -a/-ehu (p. 368) seems analogous.

The possibility that -ahi is merely a lax representative of -ehu is suggested by the hrgehi-sto = hrges-to of p. 185, n. 1; it would then be parallel to -ohu = -oho (infra, p. 369). But against this we may note the occurrences of -ahi, -uhi, -ohi, and also of an -ehu similarly equivalent to -e (p. 368).

The only other morphological feature of Nam monosyllables is one found throughout the whole Tibeto-Burman area, namely reduplication. As concerns verbs a reference to this has, in regard to the Berlin fragment, already been made (JRAS, 1939, p. 198). In our text it is frequent, there being even sequences of verses such as

hbo-hkom-ldyan-dze-hldab-hde-hde ||

These verb-repetitions are true reduplications, without the vocalic variation which is found in some of the languages, e.g. Tibetan. But the latter type also seems to appear, as in Tibetan, in expressions, such as
gdim-hdzam-hdzim-re, 100
hsan-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 hdag in the parallel phrases:

hyog-hprah-hdag-dze, 254
hkhwih-tsa-hyog-hdag-ci
hsas-hdrah-hdag-chi,
&c., ll. 259–61

is equivalent to the Tibetan dag: the hdag must, in fact, be interpreted otherwise. Probably the language was content with the tsa, properly more equivalent to ' &c.', discussed on pp. 187–8.

The Genitive relation (or the direct relation between things) occurs, no doubt, in all its species (possession, part-whole, physical, psychological, legal, social, &c., connexion), being indicated merely by word-order, the Genitive word preceding. But the phrase is then indistinguishable, as in English, from a compound
word; and whether the connexion between the parts is then Genitival, Datival, Instrumental, Locative, depends simply upon the sense. Thus we have:

thañ-hrdzo-rgyud, 16, 220, ‘thañ-mdzo-race’ (2 Genitives)  
g-ri-hruh, 21, ‘mountain-horn (Peak)’ (Genitive of whole)  
moñ-hdzono, 64, &c. ‘Moñ castle’ (Genitive of description)  
ḥjo-me, 67, &c., ‘ḥjo fire’ (Genitive of material)  
ḥna-ḥlam, 68, ‘home way’ (Goal of motion)  
mebi-ra, 78, ‘eye-place’ (= Sentinel post)  
mye-ḥrāḥ, 342, ‘fire- or eye-place’ (Genitive of description)  
hrcon-ru, 82, ‘egg’s horn’ (Genitive of whole)  
ḥnḥ-hchos, 159, ‘spring-born’ (Temporal)  
ḥsān-ḥlad, 225, &c., ‘enmity requital’ (Genitive of description)  
ḥmyi-hnu, 241, ‘man’s strength’ (Genitive of possession)  
hldya-hkañ-hte, 51–2, ‘water-full’ (Genitive of material)  
hpah-rmag, 205, ‘hero-army’ (Genitive of description)  
rgyed-ḥrāḥ, 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. ṣas, ‘by me’, from ṣa, ‘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 II. 69, 70:  
ḥbehi-la-ḥgar, ‘a camp for the sheep’  
ḥphag-la-ghan ‘a place for the hog’  
ḥbyig-la-ghan ‘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.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{myi-rgye-myer(mye-re or \text{ra}), 153} \\
\text{hti-rgye-my-e-dze, 154} \\
\text{sku-mag-hno-dze} \\
\text{ḥdaḥ-mag-hno-dze} \quad 58 \\
\text{twaḥ-mag-hnor, 48} \\
\text{ḥkyaḥ-mag-hnor, 49} \\
\text{ḥtaḥ-ḥrdzo-hnor, 218–19, 132} \\
\text{ḥthaḥ-le-tshah-dze, 219} \\
\text{thaḥ-rdz-o-hkyud-na, 220} \\
\text{ḥkrug-ḥrdzo-ḥgyud-dze, 16} \\
\text{ḥdza-ma-ḥne-na-rta-ge-ḥtom-ḥphah} \\
\text{ḥke-ma-ḥnyeḥe-dze-ḥtor-ge-ḥdzo-ḥtseh ||} \\
\text{ḥkḥu-ḥkah-dwaḥ-na-ḥldyaḥ-ḥkah-dwaḥ |||} \\
\text{ṛgoḥ-va-myer-ṛbyo-ṛgyer-ḥldyaḥ |||, 363–5} \\
\text{ḥldaḥ-ḥкраḥ-ḥsad-na-ḥldaḥ-ḥкраḥ-ḥsāḥ} \quad 124–5. \\
\text{ḥldaḥ-краḥ-ḥwe-dze-ḥldaḥ-ṣlaḥ-ḥkeḥe}
\end{align*}
\]

In several of the above cases, however, and in many others, the word preceding the -r (= re), na, and dze is not a Substantive, but a Verb, and the sense also demands not local Locatives, but expressions of circumstance or condition, as set forth supra, pp. 173 sqq.; and this may be specially the case in regard to dze, which, as has been previously suggested (JRAS. 1939, p. 209), may be the Chinese word tsai, elsewhere also found spelt dze and dzehi (JRAS. 1926, p. 526; 1927, p. 306) and used in a local or temporal sense.\(^1\) The fact that dze never has the ḍ-Prefix favours the supposition that it is a foreign word. A strictly local sense seems to be conveyed by na in

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{me-na-ḥldis, 58, ‘bounds (?) in fire’} \\
\text{me-na-ḥṣams, 58, ‘is tempered (?) in fire’}
\end{align*}
\]

II. The Verb

Ordinarily the Tibetan Verb varies in three ways:

(1) By alternation of Prefixes and associated modifications of initial consonants, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
sgyur/hgyur, sspo/hpho, stu/sdu/hṭhu/hdu-, sṇan/mṇan/ ṇan, ḡgebs/hkhebs, bcug/hjug, btsugs/hdzugs/gdzugs, 
\text{gdab/btab, ḡzag/bzag, ḡum/dgum/bkum, bsdu/gtus,}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^1\) This dze, = Chinese tsai, seems to recur in Hsi-hsia; see Wang Jinqru, op. cit., iii, p. 392, B, column 4.
and some of these alternations are lexical, that is, are stereotyped results of a process no longer active in the language, while others are functional, i.e. freely used with recognized significations. To the former class would belong perhaps the s of spo, stu, &c.; to the latter the variations between g-, usually Prospective (with its by-form d-), and b, usually Aoristic or Preterite. In later Tibetan the functional Prefixes also became lexical or merely graphic: and in early times also many particular, originally functional, forms, such as glan (νlen), byid, had become lexical.

(2) By addition of a final -s, constituting Preterites or Imperatives:

hthub/hthubs, skye/skyles, 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 šig in place of cig, or by ſ, a remainder of ſu < ſuš, in place of ſu.

(3) By vowel alternation, both where the original vowel is e or o:

hjog/bžag, hdren/draň, 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), śneg/snog(s), hcha/chos, hdren/droňs.

In the Nam language antithesis of the type spo/hpho, stu/hďu, 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-hbroň, 157, 331, &c.

means 'slain yak' (hghum 'die', hkm 'slain'). Again, the word rpag/hrpag, antithetic to šid, 'high', certainly means 'low' (Tib. dpag/dpog, 'measure', especially of depth), 'brought low', as in
hnah-htsu-rpag-re-hnah-mo-hgam, 193
‘When the men of the homes (?) are brought low, the women of the homes are the village.’

But we have also:

hnah-hpag-hldir, 326, 328, ‘in this low home (?)’

But, although there are also other cases, hgam/rgam, mag/rmag, hgyeb/rgyeb), where the r-Prefix is apparent, and though it is exemplified in the common word rgved, ‘division’ = Tibetan hgyed, and in the allied word rgye, ‘extent’ = Tibetan dbye, it does not appear that the supposed Factitive, or Causative, function can provisionally be demonstrated.¹

The b-Prefix in verbs can be rapidly disposed of. It is quite clearly seen in bprom (ll. 168, 180), ‘made’, ‘did’, bphyag (l. 101), ‘saluted’, bsi (ll. 196, 198), ‘dead’ (?), bsog (l. 183), ‘collection’; while bbyam (l. 253), which might be similarly interpreted, is perhaps an error for hbyam, which recurs twice in the immediate context. The paucity of the examples, and the fact that the three other words with the Prefix b, viz. bžir, 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 numerous 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 b- which has been discussed supra (pp. 163–5). There are, moreover, cases where the g- and b- forms of verbs are clearly equivalent: this applies to:

gkom-re, 222 = hkom-re, 166, 175
gcheq, 111, 234 (goeg) = hcieq, 250
gcihi, 346 = hci, hicih, 205, 301, 348, 350
gcieq, 356 = hicieg, 208, cig, 194
g-yog (-rño), 156 = hyog (-rño), 289, 321–2
g-yo/g-yohio, 142, 178–9 = hyo/hyoho, 118–19, 178–9
g-yr(hsab°, hswah°, ḥsah°), 166–7, 330–1, 346 = yer/hyer
(hsah°, ḥstsah°), 141, 250–1, 267
hgras, 10, gras, 300 = hras, 344² (but here the g is probably not a Prefix)

¹ See, further, infra, p. 352.
² g-ve (wehi, wehe) perhaps never, and we/hwe/wehi/hwehi (wehe, hwehe) perhaps always, occur as posterior members of compounds.
and in other cases, where the alternation does not occur, a Prospective sense is not apparent. But it will be observed that in contexts which independently express a Prospective sense, e.g. in connexion with auxiliary verbs, such as ‘be able’, ‘tend to’, &c., a Prospective and a non-Prospective form would be equally appropriate; and this may account for g-yog/gyog with rño, ‘be able’, gstor/stor-hdor, ‘put to flight’, ll. 142–3, and gstor/stor-ta-hтоn, l. 152. It is also noticeable that in ll. 25–8, 34, 96, 98, the Preterite -s, hйос, occurs five times, while the non-Preterite g-yо occurs twice,¹ which fact is hardly accidental, though it must be admitted the g- is elsewhere sometimes found with Preterite in -s.² In the above-discussed phrase:

gtrehе-hта-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 hlab as Presents or Preterites the phrase:

ldyan-glab-hdo ||, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s-form</th>
<th>Related s-less verb-forms at end of sentence or clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hkrims, 387</td>
<td>hkrum(ni), 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hgyaňs, 241</td>
<td>hgyaň(na), 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hgras, 10, (gras-re, 300)</td>
<td>hни, 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hgrus, 293, 297</td>
<td>hthog(ni), 149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hни, 70</td>
<td>hthu-re, 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hthogs, 145</td>
<td>hпrom, passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hthus(ni), 156</td>
<td>tshor-na, 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gdes, 260</td>
<td>breхе, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hпroms, 122</td>
<td>rdzogs, 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>htsors, 130 (htshors), 134, 219</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hбres, 176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In l. 26 the -s of g-yоs is crossed out. In l. 260 gdes is a Preterite.
² гsus, l. 99 = hус, l. 93; гsas, l. 262 = hус, ll. 59, 116, 260, gdes, l. 260.
hgroms, 64  
rgyeb, 139  
häs, 102  
ñes, 192 (cf. 153, 158, êre)  
ḥldis, 58  
ḥsams, 58  
ḥnus, 16, 34, 40  
hwas, 308  
hkus, 352  
hkes, 36  
rkabs, 271, 272

(b) At end of a clause:

s-form

ḥthogs-re, 181, cf. under (a)  
hwars-ge, 203  
ḥsañs, 144  
ñes-re, 153, 158  
ḥnus-dże, 34, cf. under (a)  
swa-hphyegs-na, 176  
bras-re, 344 (gras-re, 300)  
rders-hdi-na, 107²

Allied s-less form

hwar-hwar, 29

A special case is:

ḥtag-ḥtos, 278, 279  
ḥtag-ḥto-na, 279, 280

where the s is appended to the participial form in ḥto.

The function of the s in Tibetan is, as has been stated, Preterite or Aoristic (Perfective);² and there does not seem to be difficulty in recognizing the same in Nam.

Is there any trace of vowel alternation corresponding to the Tibetan ḥbebs/phab, ḥjog/bṭag, or to ḥgebs/khob(s), ḥcha/chos, mdzad/mdzod, the latter being the specially Imperative o, which, however, since many roots with a (e.g. rma/rmo, za/zö, lta/lto) have a by-form with o, may originally have had a wider signification? It is obvious that the question of a functional o is thus, even in Tibetan, in particular instances a difficult one: in Nam there would be the additional difficulty that on the Tibeto-Chinese border a was often, at any rate before m, rounded into o: for

¹ Some further -s-forms are noted, pp. 357–60.  
² Also Imperative.
example, the word *tshams*, 'border', appears in names as *tshoms*, and *bam(s)*, 'mansion'(?), appears as *bom(s)*, e.g. in *Hgo-bom*, the original name of *Kum-bum*; and this might well explain *hpom/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) *htronхи*, ll. 224, 233, 243, which occurs in a speech apparently referring to the future and which may well be Imperative of *hdraиn*, ll. 147, 254: Tibetan has *traиn/draиn (hdren)*, with Imperative *droиn/droиs*.

(2) *hlobи*, 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 *hdzab* 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- hdor-hyon, 160, 161, 162

is a mark of future time, as in Tibetan are *hoиn* and *yon*. The reference seems to be to a future. If so, *hyoho* of:

stor- hdor-hyoho, 119

is equivalent to *hyono*, which is not unlikely by reason of *hruиhi = hrunhi* (see infra).

Other Tibetan auxiliaries, *yin, hgyur, hdug, mchi, hthal* ('should', 'ought', 'is supposed to'), *zin* ('have'), are not apparent in Nam; but *run* ('be proper', 'ought', 'should', 'have to') is clearly recognizable in:

*hrugu-htoo-hrun*, 30, 32
*stor-to (hto)-hrun*, 80, 138
*hdzohu-htoo-hrun*, 138

and at the end of a clause in:

*stor-hto-hruиhi-ge*, 167

where *hruиhi = hrunhi* is comparable to *hyoho = 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 *hkhum/dgum, &c., ‘execute’, ‘carry out’ (*gner-hkhums, ‘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 *hkom* in:

ḥṣah-yob-hkom-re-hrañ-hrañ-ḥtsuḥu, 166

‘The earth, having done (*hkom*) quaking, came (back) to its own place,

and the like is to be seen in ll. 136, (*gtse-hkom*), 175 (*sва-hkom*), 222 (*sва-gkom*), 199 (*rgyes-hkom*). In ll. 32 (*ḥgru-ma-hkom*), 118 (*ḥrtah-ḥgam-hkom*), the *hkom* 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-ron 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-hmu-gdag-re-gsăñ-hkăh-hrehi, 204

it concludes a sentence as the principal verb. *Mod*, with the sense of ‘is really’, as in Tibetan, may be seen in:

ḥdyan-hto-htŏn-ge-hgo-gtŏn-mod, 210–11

‘those who surrender the ḥdyan-hto 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-hi*, may end a sentence, e.g. in:

hmañ-sta-mehi || . . . hri-sta-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-hklo-ḥsad-dze-ňn̄ah-me-hmyi ||, 40

‘if the ḥphu-hklo is destroyed, ‘home-fire is none (or the place is fireless, me-hmyi).’

perhaps also in *phyi-hse-myi*, l. 98.

The *sŏr-hdor* type of Compound Verb appears also in *hldañ-phyer, phyer-chañ, hldim-chim, rgyer-hldyañ, rbyi-hldyihi*, &c.
III. Pronouns

Nam words for ‘I’, ‘thou’, ‘he’, and their plurals have not been found. We should expect *na* (not *kho-bo*) = ‘I’ (Hsi-hsia *no—Lauffer, No. 14), *na* perhaps (certainly not *khyod*) = ‘thou’; while for ‘he’, ‘they’, the Tibetan *kho, khoṅ-ta* is not at all likely, though *kan* exists in ‘Tangut’ and *kwăn-thă-cha*, i.e. Tibetan *khoṅ-ta*, in Thöchǔ.\(^1\): 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 *ḥdiḥi* (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 *ldhā* of *hraṅ-hldah-hnam-ge*, ‘heavens (or celestial) themselves-there’ (i.e. the heavens, or celestial, proper); cf. Tibetan *Hbon-da-rgyal*, ‘the Hbon-there king’, *Da-red*, ‘There-being’ (= ‘of that ilk’).\(^2\) If the verse:

* hdīhi-su-hldoṅ-dze-hlda-hko-ge-hdzoṅ, 195

means:

‘What land he departs to, there is his castle’

then *hlda* may, like the Tibetan *de, hdi*, be followed by a Particle *ko*, giving the sense of ‘in that very place’.

The form *sta*, in eastern Tibetan *sta-re*, ‘that being so’ (not *sta-re*, ‘axe’), seems to be used correlative in:

* sta-re-hmo(g)-ge-sta-hri-hldyaṅ, 19, cf. 9, 252

‘Where were the clouds, there the mountains flew (?)’

but not in:

* hri (g-rīḥi, 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-htor-ge-su-me-hmeḥi, 114

‘When the heat is great, who kindles a fire?’

perhaps also in:

* su-ge-stor-ta-ḥthogs ||, 145

‘who stopped the flight?’

---

1 Prejevalsky, ii, p. 138; Hodgson, p. 144.
2 Similarly *Mchiṅ-rgyal-hdi*, ‘our Mchiṅ king’, in one of the Tibetan manuscripts.
The ci, chi of:

\( \text{hkwi-htsa-hyog-hdag-ci-hrañ-hdom-gdes} \), 259-60

'the elders with their staves affirmed their decisions' (?)

and of the following lines may be the Tibetan Relative ci, ji.

It is possible that hjii, which seems to occur (ji) in the Berlin fragment (ll. 10, 15, 16), may be the same Relative in ll. 78, 211.

One of the words hrañ, of frequent occurrence, must be = Tibetan rañ, 'self', e.g. in:

hrañ-hrañ, 'own place', 21, 166, 167

and in the above-mentioned hrañ-hldah.

Re, beside being the verb 'be', evidently in bañ(hbañ)-hre (hrehe) in ll. 249-51, jo-re, &c., ll. 251-2, and perhaps in pra (hya)-hre (hrehe), ll. 43, 267, means 'each', 'every' = Tibetan re (res, 'turn', 'times'), and Hsi-hsia re, 'many', 'all'. 1 In l. 132 we have apparently hre = Tib. re, 'hope'.

IV. Numerals

With the Tibetan names for the numerals 1-9, viz.:

gcig(cig), gñis(ñis), gsom(sum, so), bži(że), lña(ña), drug, bdun(don), brgyad, dgu(go)

it would be simple to compare the Nam words:

gcig(cig), hñis(hñi, ŋi), gsom, bžir, ńa(hña, &c.), trog, rgyed, dgu(gu, hgo)

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

1 Nevsky, No. 88.
numeral forms are those for 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, which we may generalize as:

 ningún, som (sam, sum, so), na, 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. snī, būi, (gūi), gsm, na (Hsi-hsia, būi, ni, 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 būir, which occurs in the vicinity of a gsm, which may = ‘3’, has that sense. ‘Seven’ is also in Tibeto-Burman a highly variable form, where-of the numerous modifications have been discussed supra (pp. 90, 92–3 sqq.). In Nam we should, on the ground of vicinity to T'ao-chou and Mi-flag, expect some skwi, stwi, or the like. There is therefore just a possibility that the expression bkhwi-hsia, I. 259, if it should, as is probable, mean ‘old’ (Hsi-hsia wi/dwi/dwiḥ, 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 (dgah, dgah) 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 = Horpa gūa, ‘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 (st)om, (st)on, 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{stor-hto-rta-yañ-stor-to-hrun} & | \quad \circ \quad | \quad \{79-80 \\
\text{rta-hso-hnah-yañ-gni-hrdzum-doho} & | \quad \{92-3 \\
\text{hkor-htañ-hkhen-yañ-sñañ-gyañ-gyañ} & \\
\text{hjah-htañ-hkhen-yañ-swa-tseg-tseg} & | \quad \{92-3 \\
\text{sñañ-ne-thehe-yañ-stor-dor-yon} & | \quad 160
\end{align*}
\]

So also in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hldyañ-hpu-hbri-re-mehi-klu-hcañ-yañ-stor-hdor-hyon} & | | 161
\end{align*}
\]

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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hbo-hroñ-hrog-re-hlah-hkyañ-hras-re-hsies-gsi-[hdzuhi ?]} & | | \\
\text{rgyeb-hchi-hro-re-gdag-yañ-la-por-hsies-hsi-hdzuhi} & | |
\end{align*}
\]

and the same may probably be seen elsewhere:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hdzañ-hkhor-hkrug-hkyañ ...} & , 18 \\
\text{hkhor-kyan-rwehi-re ...} & , 98 \\
\text{hkrug-kyan-hldom-re ...} & , 371-2.
\end{align*}
\]

The form gyañ of Tibetan may possibly occur in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{g-rah-nag-hbo-gyañ ...} & , 263.
\end{align*}
\]

Tsam, making a limit, 'only so much', &c., may perhaps be seen in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{gsi-brom-hnu-ge-hsor-htsam-bzod} \\
\text{supports only a finger (weight)}
\end{align*}
\]

see p. 342.

By far the most common Particle is ge, very rarely (ll. 5, 8) hge, which is found all over the text, both in its favourite caesura position, as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hnah-hchos-re-ge-hldañ-myi-šeg,} & , 159
\end{align*}
\]

and the two following verses, and also in other situations, e.g. in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{... hnah-hrañ-ge-rwyin} & | | , 33 \\
\text{... byos-htag-ge-hjobo} & | | , 34 \\
\text{... hkye-ge-hmu} & | | , 39 \\
\text{bre-ge-rgyo-dze ...} & , 48
\end{align*}
\]
ru-ge-hkrom-dze ..., 70
bjim-li-li-re-pa-la-la-ge-tho-rgyam-ge-hwad-re-smyi-hdze-ge-
hka ||, 109–10
hthaṅ-phu-hkam-ge-rṅe-hbye-hkwehe-ge-hthaṅ-hgam-hṛṅehe,
130–1

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, becom-
ing in the latter case almost an equivalent to re and ste or dze, the
former two of which, however, it can follow, and the latter it can
precede. Very possibly it conferred a slight emphasis, like the
Greek γε.

But why may not ge be a sign of Plurality, possibly = Chinese
(in Tibetan script) ke, kehi, ‘all’? To this question it does not
seem possible to give an immediate answer. But we may note that
the ge can occur not only before the Postposition dze, as above,
but also before the la-formative, e.g. in:

  g-roṅ-hyed-ge-ta, 71
  ... ḡldo-ge-htaḥ-ḥldon, 370, 371, 372.

The Particles o, hi, ni, na, don, have been discussed in connexion
with the morphology of the sentence (pp. 175–9).

The two negatives ma and myi probably agree in their employ-
ment 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 gtsan-myi-hrgan, ‘grain
does not mature’, &c., ll. 159–60, as compared with ḡldi-ma-htaḥ
and mo-ma-hṭhor, ‘the horse does not leap’, &c., ll. 63, 71, 144.
### Table showing phonetic restrictions upon the application of Prefixes in Tibetan (T), Tibetan manuscripts from Central Asia (T'), Nam (N), Hsi-hsia (H), and Žañ-žuṅ (Ž)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>g-</th>
<th>d-</th>
<th>b-</th>
<th>m-</th>
<th>h-</th>
<th>r-</th>
<th>l-</th>
<th>s-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>T'N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsh</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>TNH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>T'</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ó</td>
<td>T'N</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>T'NH</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is not necessary here to consider the original form, presumably syllabic, or the original employment, of any of the Prefixes, matters which have been discussed by Conrady in his celebrated work *Eine indochinesische Causativ-Denominativ-Bildung* and by the late Dr. Wolfenden in his original and interesting *Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology*. We can refer only to their actual employment as apparent in the four earliest sources named above, where none of the Prefixes is ever syllabic.

2. r-, l-, s-, are here reckoned as Prefixes, and in all the four languages they are somewhat abundantly represented. For this reason they are likely to be the original common patrimony; and this inference is confirmed by two circumstances: (a) they always
immediately precede the root and are often preceded by one member of the remaining group, \( g \), \( d \), \( b \), \( m \), \( h \); (b) by the Tibetan grammarians they are not regarded as Prefixes, but treated as part of the root, not functional at all; and this treatment was, no doubt, as early as the alphabet itself, since in the script the \( r \), \( l \), \( s \), are prefixed to the following consonant in a compound \( aks\text{\textbar}ra \), whereas those of the other group are prefixed as separate items. The Tibetans did not know that the \( s \) of \( spo \), the \( r \) of \( rd\text{\textbar}n \), the \( l \) of \( lj\text{\textbar}n \) 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 \( Zh\text{\textbar}n\text{\textbar}zu\text{\textbar}n \) manuscripts have no \( b \), \( m \), \( h \), and of \( g \) they have only two occurrences \( (gd\text{\textbar}n, gs\text{\textbar}d) \), of \( b \) likewise only two \( (db\text{\textbar}m, d\text{\textbar}m) \), all which occurrences, being found in a medical text, may well be borrowings. It is therefore probable that in \( Zh\text{\textbar}n\text{\textbar}zu\text{\textbar}n \), 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 \( r \), \( l \), \( s \), \( Zh\text{\textbar}n\text{\textbar}zu\text{\textbar}n \) has the following combinations not allowed in Tibetan:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rk}h, \text{rc}, \text{r}ch, \text{r}th, \text{rp}, \text{rph}, \text{rh}, \text{lk}h \\
\text{sk}h, \text{sth}, \text{sp}h
\end{align*}
\]

of which \( \text{rk}h \) recurs in Hsi-hsia, \( \text{rp} \) in Nam.

4. Taking together the other three languages, we find that \( m \) is practically confined to Tibetan, the single occurrence \( (m\text{\textbar}har) \) in Nam being probably Tibetan, and the \( mk\text{i} \) (no meaning) and \( mkh\text{\bar{h}}e \) \( mkh\text{\bar{w}}e \), "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 nonactivity or state. Only a single instance is given \( (m\text{\textbar}hags) \); but from literature we might adduce some other cases of \( m \) in the verb-paradigm. It may be noted that in Tibetan \( m \), when prefixed to nasals \( n, \tilde{n}, n \), is often a substitute for \( b \), which is sometimes preserved in T\(N\)N.

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-

\textsuperscript{1} See Les \textit{Slokas grammaticaux} de \textit{Thonmi Sambhota} par Jacques Baco, p. 60.
tions have been accepted in the common orthography. This inco-
stistency has been noted by Conrady (pp. 19, 28 sqq.) and Wolfenden
(pp. 12, 18, 40), both of whom have questioned the originality of the
restrictions, the former also remarking (p. 46) that phonetical in-
compatibility in the occurrence of two Prefixes, such that one can
precede those consonants which the other cannot, is a sign of identity
of function. It is, of course, obvious that such collocations as gk-,
gph-, gb-, bp-, bph-, bb-, though in Nam they all actually occur, must
ultimately have been found intolerable and may have been avoided
even at a sacrifice of a consistent discrimination of the functions.
The resultant system, especially as seen in the four-stem Transitive
verb, is expounded in the native, and all the modern, grammars.

According to the system, while g-, d-, b-, all alike imply that the
verbal action is one which has an agent, g- and d- are used to form
Future tenses (i.e. they have a Prospective value) and b- forms Per-
fec ts (i.e. Preterites or Aorists):

Thus from dul we have:

Present ḥdul, 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 ḥgul, 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 ḫbul, Preterite phul, Future dbul, Imperative phul,
the Preterite having the aspirate ph in place of the inconvenient
combination bp-. There are, of course, various other schemes corre-
sponding to other forms of the root.

Forms of roots with initial tenuis aspirata replacing their initial
media are, no doubt, very ancient, irrespective of Conrady’s theory
of their origin (from s and media): and the simplest explanation of
the divergence in the Preterite of verbs with labial initial is to suppose
that in all the three above cases the Preterite had originally the
aspirate together with the b- Prefix, thus:

*bthal, *bhkal, *bphul

and that bth, bkh, became bt, bk, while bph, as was natural, simply
lost its b. The change of bth>b, bkh>b, 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 dphul in place of phul.

The thus posited combinations bth-, gth-, &c., might have dis-
appeared prior to the introduction of writing in Tibet. But in fact
they are to be found abundantly in the written documents and other
manuscripts of the seventh to ninth century A.D. As the T entries
in the table show, the aspirate rule does not exist so far as these writings are concerned, although the occurrence of the *tenuis* discloses the fact that the transition *bth-*, *gth-*, &c., to *bt-*, *gt-*, was already effected; whether the matter is one of dialectical divergence or of period need not be considered. But it should be noted that in respect also of the Prefixes *m-*, and *h-*, the spelling of the documents and manuscripts is similarly disregardful of the aspirate rule. Nor is this all: from the table it may be seen, as noted above, that in the case of the Prefixes of the old group, *r-*, *l-*, *s-*, the Žaň-žuň 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 *g dul*, &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 *ḥthub*, Preterite *btubs*, Future *gtub*, Imperative *ḥthub* 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 *dblais* (*ǰblan*) = Nam *gblan* and *dphogs* (*ǰbphrog*), of which the latter is not allowed by the phonetical rules. We even find *drīra, drgyal*, written in place of *rıra, 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 *dgyn*, '9'; and we must at least realize that in the eastern part of 'Tibet' the *d-* neither exists at present nor appears ever to have existed. Even in Khams it is regularly represented by a guttural (*gh*, *Linguistic Survey of India*, III. i, p. 137) while in 'Tangut' (*rgiu*, '9', &c.) and 'Amdoan' (*rka = dkah*, &c.) *r-* appears. There seems to be no trace of the *d-* in the Rgyal-ron,  

1 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 $h$ (§), 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 $dh$- 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 $dmn$-, 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 $g^{h}$-, $g^{r}$-, $b^{h}$-, $b^{r}$-, are derived from $gj$-, $gdz$-, $bj$-, $bdz$-, as is clear from the verb-paradigms such as:

\[ h jog/gz og/bz og, hdzin/gzu/n/bzu/n \]

and from other cases. In Hsi-hsia (Tibetan transcription) we actually find $gj_1$, $gdz_1$, $bj_1$, $bdz_1$, in Nam $gdz_1$: even in Tibetan we have $gjen$ written for $ geen$, $chen$.

(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 $jen$. 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-, bll-, bst-, bnd-, bap- and even gst-, grt-, glt-,—in Hsi-hsia even grz,—but we can produce ancient texts where g/b (or d) forms of a single verb are used antithetically to mark a temporal contrast. This proves that a Tense value of the Prefixes was actual; but not that it was original—even the Indo-European Aorist and Perfect were not originally Tenses—and another element in the signification of g-, d-, b-, and also of m-, is, as we have seen, defined by the Tibetan grammarians.

7. In regard to r-, l-, s-, which for the etymologist, though not for the Tibetan grammarians, are Prefixes, the only question in connexion with the four languages is whether the Prefixes have in them become merely lexical or retain traces of a living function. In Tibetan the r- and l- have not hitherto been credited with a historically living function; but, as regards s-, the large number of forms such as stu, sdu, spo, &c., with Transitive sense and paired with Intransitives such as hthu, hdu, hpho, &c., has long been recognized as proving a Transitive function of the s-; and that function must have been active down to a time not long anterior to the historical period. Since r- and s- do not appear to have been phonetically 'incompatible' or mutually supplementary, their original functions were presumably different.
V. THE LANGUAGE: ETYMOLOGY

To describe the grammatical system of a language without knowing the meanings of the words may well seem to be a hazardous adventure. But the converse is equally true; and, as has been mentioned, the formal features, being of a general nature, are more likely to reveal themselves upon a first survey than the meanings of individual words. In the present case, moreover, we have the advantage that the language by its phonology declares itself to be not only a Tibeto-Burman dialect, but also one at approximately the same stage of development as the earliest known Tibetan. Hence there is a plausibility in the identification of prima facie similar features both of grammatical structure and of word-forms. A number of such 'self-evident' etymologies have been cited and used in the preceding discussions. But selected particulars may seem open to doubt until confirmed by a wider etymological knowledge of the language. To a certain extent a phonological ratio between two kindred languages may be established through syntactical equivalences elicited by a general survey: thus the postpositions na, la, te, the verb-suffix -s, and particles such as ni, 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 *ridzogs* should be equivalent to a Tibetan word *ridzog* than would be the case between *rog* and *roq*. In Tibeto-Burman, however, this argument is weakened by the frequency of homophones: thus, there were in Tibetan at least five different words *nygañ*. 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-mkrañ* 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.¹ For example in the passage (ll. 124–7):

*hldañ-hkrañ-hsad-na-hldañ-hkrañ-hsah*
*hldañ-krañ-hwe-dze-hldañ-slah-hkehe*
*hldañ-krañ-hko-dze-stor-hldañ-hphyar*
*hldañ-krañ-spo-dze-stor-hgu-hbo ||*
*hldañ-krañ-hnam-dze-stor-dgu-hdor ||*

it is immediately evident that there is a relation of antithesis (of fact or logic) between the successive predicates *hsad*, *hwe*, *hko*, *spo*, *hnam*; and this is a factor which will assist or control the determination of their meanings.

(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 ēbrī/braḥ is identical with the Tibetan antithesis brī/braḥ, 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, 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 hāren; they have r-less forms, hdzoṅ, gyud, of rdzoṅ, 'castle', rgyud, 'race'; occasional substitution of i for e (stigs, sis, cis); confusion (braṅ for bran, dgum for dguṅ), loss (dgu for dguṅ), or mistaken addition (rgun for dgu) of final m, n, ā; confusion (by no means unexampled in ordinary Tibetan) of ē and s (bsen for bṣen), 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

1 See pp. 347 sqq.
and \textit{tenuis aspirata} it is extremely frequent: \textit{hkh}, \textit{hch}, \textit{hth}, \textit{hph}, \textit{htsh}, can always be written \textit{hk}, \textit{hc}, \textit{ht}, \textit{hp}, \textit{hts}, while the converse, and also confusion of \textit{tenuis} and \textit{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.

\textbf{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. \textit{Hbra}; \textit{h bri}; \textit{hya\~n}; \textit{mor}; \textit{ht ham}; \textit{mug}; \textit{h r a\~h}; \textit{gsa\~n}; \textit{hre}.

Attention has been previously (\textit{JRAS}. 1939, p. 197) called to the fact that the Berlin fragment commences with four sentences as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item mor-ma-de-klo \ldots
  \item ya\~n-ma-ji-de \ldots
  \item bri-ma-zor-de \ldots
  \item hbra-ma-gar-de \ldots
\end{itemize}

and two others (successive) begin:

\begin{itemize}
  \item mug-tse-khyig-re-te \ldots
  \item htham-tse-re-te \ldots
\end{itemize}

while in our manuscript we have successive verses beginning (ll. 225–8):

\begin{itemize}
  \item mor-hgu-\textit{hr dzor} \ldots
  \item \textit{hya\~n}-hra\~h-\textit{hsa\~n}-re \ldots
  \item mug-hgu-rdzor \ldots
  \item htham-rah-gsa\~n-re \ldots
  \item hbra-hgu-rdzor \ldots
  \item brah-hbra-gsa\~n-re \ldots
\end{itemize}

The former shows a general correspondence or antithesis among the four items \textit{mor}, \textit{ya\~n}, \textit{bri}, \textit{hbra}, and then a like relation between \textit{mug} and \textit{ht ham}: the latter passage shows a correspondence between \textit{mor}, \textit{mug}, \textit{h bri}, and a correspondence between \textit{hya\~n}, \textit{ht ham}, and \textit{brah}, combined with an antithesis between the two groups.

In Tibetan \textit{h bri} means ‘diminish’, ‘grow less’, while \textit{bra} is ‘have or be in great plenty’, whence come \textit{bra-bo}, ‘buckwheat’, and—since most Tibetan nouns in -\textit{s} are really Aorist forms of
verb-roots—ḥbras, ‘rice’, ḥbras-bu, ‘fruit’. Accordingly we see why in Nam ḥtri 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,1 ‘Plain of Plenty’. It follows also that the three words ḥyan, ḥtham, braḥ denote things approved, while mor, mug, ḥtri are things disliked. The three former are followed severally by the phrase ḥraḥ-gsaṅ(hsaṅ)-re, the latter by ḥgu-rdzor (ḥrdzor).

Provisionally we do not know the meanings of ḥyan and ḥtham or of the phrase ḥraḥ-gsaṅ-re, though the last may suggest Tib. ra-gsaṅ, ‘place purified (or secret)’. The antithesis between ḥyan 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-tsah-khrom-re || ḥyan-tsa-hecr ||

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’.2 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-ḥraḥ is the paradisial ‘place, or state, of union’ contrasted with the dissensions of the Evil Age. In the Berlin Fragment (l. 18) ḥtham-gnam-ṭsa-ge means ‘the undivided celestial folk’.

It may be observed that in ll. 132–3,

ḥtri-hldi-ḥthaṅ-re-hre-hldi-ḥyah,

ḥtri 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. Ḥtri; ḥpu; ḥpo; ḥpho; ḥdoḥu, ḥjoḥu; ḥjo.

In another group of passages ḥtri is antithetic to ḥpu:

hldyaṅ-ḥpu-ḥtri-re, 150, 161, 218, 343.
ḥtri-ḥshe-ḥpu[-]-r[e], 163.
bra-gshe-ḥpuhi-re, 329.

These must all belong together, especially in view of the adjacency

1 Mentioned in the Tibetan MS. Chronicle.
2 But the Rgyal-roṅ language (Jyā-rūṅ) 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 *hbru bri* can mean
'female', we obtain the reasonable renderings:

'the *hldyan* males being (weak) females',
'the wise (*hsehe, gê* females being males'.

But Tibetan *hbru* does denote a female, namely the yak-cow, and it
appears in the name *Hbru-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 *hbru/bri* confirms
the identity of the word with the Tibetan forms.

Apart from explicit antithesis, *hpu* = 'male' is clear also in:

*hpu-*hbron-rkom-ge, 157, 'the male yak-bull being killed'.

One other meaning of *hpu*, namely 'bird' (= Tib. *bya*, i.e.
*bye*),1 Hsi-hsia (Lauffer, 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:

si-*hchos-re-ge-hpu-myî-ldin||, 160
'Born in winter, a bird does not fly'.

But Tibetan *phu*, 'elder brother' (= Hsi-hsia *phu/pho/pho*), *bu*,
'child', *phu*, 'upper country', *phu* (*hbu*), '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-*hldah-stor-[re]-hrah-htoî-gsohû || dze-rî-ge-*hgo|| 358
'the heroic ones being lost, over the station-abandoning sur-
vivors the evil are head'.

The same must be recognized in:

*hpo-*hldi-naî-re-hyâh-hîehi-hhâh, 115-16
'males being here within, fear (Tib. *ya-ha* p. 191) evaporates'
(because, as indicated in the following line, it is too late,
the evil being already done: *hîhâ* = *hîad*, p. 321)

*hpho-*hldir-hsag-ge-so-îhna-liestor, 117
'males' being here collected, the so-îhna is lost'.

1 Since, however, *bya*, *byêh*u, 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 dis-
tinction of the two forms in Nam may have been originally dialectical.
and hence also in:

riebro-ḥ̪l̪do-ge, 177, 'enemies brave'
riebro-ḥ̪ne-ge, 361, 'enemies brave, evil'

while in rbyo-po, l. 181, 'rbyo-man', the word approaches the later Tibetan use as a suffix. Whether in hpo(po)-r̪bom, l. 317, the sense of 'male', 'hero', is present, or there is merely a miswriting of the commoner hbo-bon is not certain. In hpu-hpos, l. 140, the usual hpu(hphu)-hbos, 'big man', is obviously intended: on hbos see infra (pp. 230–1).

Still another word plainly meaning 'male', namely ḡ̪dz̪oḥu/hjoḥu, is contrasted with ḡ̪bri in:

 hbri-re-hrdyam-re-hkha-hldah-hnāhghī || ḡ̪dz̪oḥu-ro-hldi-re-hjoḥu(hdz̪oḥu) || hwaw-hkha
 ḡdz̪eḥu-re-bro-re-ḥdz̪oḥu-hto-hrun, 137–8.

'All the females being hrdyam, the speakers should have the 
say (Tib. ḡ̪ag, "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:

 ḡdz̪oḥu-ḥkru-hyog-re ... ḡ̪bri-ḥdz̪oḥu-kyim-re, 324–5.

Clearly this ḡdz̪oḥu, hjoḥu 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 hjo/jo, meaning 'chieftain', and from another hjo/hdzo/hdz̪oḥo, as well as from a gzo, all which must be discussed infra (pp. 274–5, 334–5).

These groups of words illustrate rather noticeably the multiple 
meanings which in monosyllabic languages are so commonly found 
attached to single forms. But they also illustrate the opposite 
feature, namely plurality of synonyms of common terms. What 
is the difference between hpu, ḡ̪po(hpho), ḡdz̪o, all meaning 'male'? 
Moreover, we shall encounter (p. 238) another word, tsu, having 
the same sense.

There seems to be no doubt as to the meanings. For hpu 
external equivalents have been cited, while po/pho, is well known 
in Tibetan. ḡdz̪o 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 chḥok, 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 dzø, 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 ḭpha, '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/druṅ)'; but 'underling persons' may be meant.

3. hño, hñoḥo; ṭa, ṭo; ḍkhog, ḍkhoaḥ; ḍdaḥ, wa-ḥdaḥ; rne, hrne;
gsāḥ, ḧsāḥ; ḧag; ḧwyir; ḧdzar; ḧdaḥ; ḧtroḥ; ḧram; mo-lanḥ;
byu(r); ḍrub; skyaḥ.

ńo, and rne are antithetic in ll. 85-6:
hño-sto-ge-hṣag-dze-rne-ḥwe-ge-ḥwyir ||
hño-sta-glom-dze-краḥ-нur-nur
rne-sta-glaṅ-dze-ḥne-rneḥi-rneḥi

and this is a standing antithesis, as is shown by:
hño-stor-hṭoṅ-re-hrne-hldaḥ-ḥkhyed, 119
hño-stor-hkhyed-re-hrne-hldaḥ-hkhranḥ
so-hnaḥ-hstor-dze-hño-stor-hprom || \{127-8
ḥtanḥ-hrgam-hkṣad-re-rne-re-hño ||, 133
(cf. brgyaṅ-rne-re-hñoḥo ||, 320)
hño-stor-hṭhor-bṣi-ta-ston
rne-hldaḥ-ḥkhar-hmye-hṭah-ṛgyen \} 196-7
... hñoḥo-hjam-re-hldan \} 273-4
... rne-ḥḍzam-re-hldan
staḥ-hroḥra-dze-hrneḥe-hño-ge-hprom ||, 347

The same antithesis can be traced in ll. 56, 143-4.

But hño is also antithetic to ḡsāḥ in:
gsāḥ-ra-gsāḥ-na-gsāḥ-tah-hṛteḥu \} 264-5
hño-ra-hṅon-kya-hṅon-ta-gblaṅ
gsāḥ-ra-gsāḥ-ge-gsāḥ-hṭag-ḥtos
hño-raḥ-hṅo-kya-hṅo-ḥṭag-hṭona \} 278-80
gsāḥ-ḥraḥ-hṭoṅ-kya-hṅoḥo-hjam-re-hldan, 273
and this is quite decisive. For gsain, hšaṅ cannot mean anything but 'enmity', 'hate', as will be shown infra (p. 223).

In Tibetan nö 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 regionally¹ in the sense of 'fiend', and we see the appropriateness of the expression (ll. 119, 127) rñe-hldaṅ, 'fiend (enemy)-rise', since in Tibetan ldaṅ, laṅ is the regular term for the 'rising', appearing, of a fiend. This gives us:

rñe-re-hño,² 133 (hño-ho, 320) = 'enemies are friends'.

hño-ho-hjam . . . rñe-hdzam (= hjam) = 'friends mild . . . enemies [become] mild',

and since hšag can be = Tib. sags 'talk', and hwyir = Tib. hbyer, 'escape',

hño·sto·ge-hšag·dze-rñe·hwe·ge-hwyir ||, 85 = 'while friends talk,² those who do enmity escape'.

The passage:

hṅie-hño-hdzar-dze, 372,

where hdzar can phonologically be = Tib. hjar, 'stick together' (see S. C. Das's Dictionary and infra, p. 248)—so that the sense will be:

'when foes and friends cohere':

brings in further expressions for 'friend' and 'enemy', with confirmation in regard to hdzar. For in l. 376 we have

ḥdza-hṭrog-ḥram-ḥdzar,

which conveys the same sense: ḡram, 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 ḡdza is the inevitable Nam equivalent of Tib. mdzab, 'amicable', 'affection', 'friendship': while hṭrog, whether connected with Tib. ḡdroṣ, 'wince', 'shudder' (dr and tr being in the manuscript practically interchangeable) or a form of the celebrated Central Asian word ḡrug, can independently be shown (in ll. 146, 326, 338) to mean 'enmity' or 'enemy'.

¹ In the Tibetan MSS.
² In the Berlin fragment (l. 22) we find the phrase nö-re-rñe.
³ Apparently antithetic to ḡño·sto·ge·rdo·re, l. 84, 'when friends dare' (Tib. sdo, as on p. 296).
Nothing, of course, prevents the recognition of ह्नो in the sense of 'face': and this sense is apparent in the expressions ह्नो-ह्क्होग (ll. 251, 341), which may be = Tib. नो-ल्कोग, 'openly and secretly', and ह्नो-ह्क्होब = Tib. नो-क्होब, 'conceal face'; it is also conspicuous in the line:

ह्र्ता-वा-ह्दान-द्जे-ह्नो-ह्दान-प्रोम, 258

'the horses upon [their companions'] necks made a face-rest (ह्नो-ह्दान)

for this action of horses in company is mentioned in one of the Tibetan texts, and वा-ह्दान may very possibly mean 'neck', being equivalent to Hsi-hsia o(wo, नो)-diṅ (Lauffer, No. 106) = Tib. o-ḍoṅ, ḥo-ḍoṅ, 'windpipe'.

With the original signification of Tib. नोस, 'side', 'direction', we have:

मो-लान-ब्यु[r]-्रे-ह्द्ल्दि-ह्दान-माग-ह्नो-ब्रो-ह्रुब-रे-म्याग्रे-स्क्यान, 108-9

'the wretched lone females who are here, rushing in flight in (all) directions, need protection from the vile (?) bears' (मो-लान = Tib. मो-रान, 'lone female'; ब्यु[r] = Tib. ब्युर, 'wretched'; ब्रो = Tib. ह्ब्रो(श), 'flee', नो-ब्रो = Tib. नो-सोर, 'flee into space (?)', 'disappear'; ह्रुब = Tib. रुब, 'rush in a body'; स्क्यान = Tib. स्क्योन, ब्स्क्यों, ब्स्क्यान, '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 Filechner, Das Rätsel des Matschû, pp. 85, 92.

Also the phrase ह्री-ह्नो, l. 299, will mean simply 'mountain side'.

4. नें; नेई, नेई, ने; ग्सान, ह्सान; ह्सान-मा.

The occurrences of this group are somewhat akin to, and intermingled with, those of नो/र्ने. For we find the above-cited:

र्ने-स्ता-ग्लान-द्जे-ह्ने-र्ने-हिः-र्ने-हिः, 86

and also

ह्लो-ग्ला-ह्दो-ग्ला-ना-र्ने-ने, 154
ह्री-ग्सान-ह्ग्रे-द्जे-ने-ह्क्ये-ह्क्ये, 16-17
ह्सान-येर-ह्दान-द्जे-ह्री-ह्दान-ने, 141
ह्से-ह्मु-ग्दाग-र्ने (सर्ने)-ने-ह्नोहु, 206

and we further find र्ने associated with ह्त्रोग in:

त्रोग ह्सो-र्ने-द्जे, 201.
But the association within the group is constant: together we find _ne_ and _rñe/nñe_ in:

- rñe-hne-hrmag-dze, 146
- rñe-ne-g-ri-dze, 301
- hce-hmu-gdag-re-rñe-ne-hrêhi, 200 (cf. l. 206, _supra_)
- trog-bjo-rñe-dze-pyi-rjes-ne-hcêr, 201-2
- sñañ-_nñe[-]ne-hldar, 328;

and there are parallel expressions:

- sñañ-_nñe, 149 = sñañ-nñe, 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:

- hkhar-hgyi-ñes, 192
- hke-hkah-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-hlad_, 'reiquital of evil', in ll. 230–9; it is associated with occurrences of _gsi-hlad_, 'requital of injury', in ll. 240–4.

From this it follows that the antithetic word _ne_ means 'good', so that:

- sñañ (sñañ)-nñe = 'evil-hearted'
- sñañ-ne = 'good-hearted'
- sñañ-nñe[-]ne-hldar = 'in this case of evil-hearted and good-hearted'

and _hce-hmu-gdag-re-rñe-ne-hrêhi_, l. 200, means:

'having taken on the great cold (sc. death), evil are good'.

The association with _rñe_, 'fiend', 'enemy', in ll. 86, 155, &c., is likewise highly apposite, e.g. in:

- hlo-ge-blah-hldo-ge-na-rné-ne, 154–5

' in the companies on high (sc. in heaven) fiends (enemies) are good (sc. no longer enemies)'.
In Tibetan ne does not exist with this signification. But the word may be identical with Thöchü nāi, Gyärung ka-snē, which have many cognates in Tibeto-Burman (Linguistic Survey of India, r. ii, ‘Comparative Vocabularies’, pp. 196–7). In view of the Ch’iang sentiment mentioned supra (p. 30), it seems possible that the word is ultimately identical with Tib. ne/nehu, Nam nehu, ‘young’.

Here we may mention the proof that gṣaṅ/hṣaṅ, signifies, as noted above (p. 220), ‘enmity’, ‘hate’. This results from the expression hṣaṅ-hlad, which in ll. 225–7 recurs as practically synonymous with rne-hlad and gse-hlad, wherewith it is associated. This gṣaṅ/hṣaṅ is found as saṅ in the Tibetan manuscripts, in the phrase saṅ-hṭhab, ‘fight as foes’ (supra, p. 180). It is perhaps identical with the hṣan-ma, ‘filth’, which occurs in ll. 15, 51, and also in the Berlin fragment (l. 5); this also exists in Tibetan, as gṣaṅ-ba, hṣaṅ-ba, ‘ordure’, &c. It may be suspected, further, that a Tibetan expression for revenge, viz. sa-lan, was originally not ‘flesh’ (ṣa)- requital, but an equivalent of the Nam hṣaṅ-hlād.

The other occurrences of hṣaṅ/gṣaṅ, and especially those cited supra (p. 219), accord with the signification ‘enmity’, ‘hate’.

5. klu, hklu; mehi-klu; ñes, hñes; ṣhbeq; se, hse, gse; hpaṅ; sron.

Klu and ñes are associated antithetically in:

| sesh-brge-hrko-hge-hklu-hprah-hyubu ||, 332 |
| klu-hṭab-rgyohon-re-hñes-ta-hṛgyon ||, 336 |
| hko-rṇo-klu-re-rne-hñe-hñes, 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-hṛto-hṣa-ge-hñes-hṛbeg-mehi ||, 24–5

‘blind rocks, Hñes-hṛbeg their eye’.

In Tibetan ñes is ‘know’, ‘knowledge’, ‘intelligence’, ‘wisdom’; and this, rather than bṣes, ‘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-hšia ‘wise’ is sie (Chinese transcription; Laufer, No. 165; in Tibetan writing gse/gšeh/ze, ‘know’, ‘recognize’, gšeh, ‘wisdom’, Nevsky, Nos. 10, 213), 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 see (J. Bacot, Les Mo-so, p. 50). The Tibetan šes is probably, like nes, &c., an Aorist form, of a prior se.

In the Nam text šes 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 šes-rtsig-moñ, l. 379, where the epithet is attached to the 'Moñ 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), hgyañ, 'the wild ass' (l. 307), hše (l. 299), or contrasted with ḫpañ (= Tib. dpah, 'hero', 'brave') in ll. 36, 258. The practical equivalence of šes and hše/gše is specially apparent in ll. 342–3, where sroñ-ñe-gše-re (= sroñ-ñe-hše-r[œ]), l. 339), 'straightly knowing', is antithetic to rieñe-hše-hšes, 'evilly know'.

In regard to the name of the divinity (p. 138) Ḫšes-hbeñ it will be observed that the first monosyllable of his name is clearly indicated as = šes, '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, ḫnor; hdzañ; ḫšehe.

In Tibetan nor means 'err', 'error', and ndzañs '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'.

Ḫnor and hdzañ, in the sense of 'foolish' and 'wise', are associated in:

g-rañ-hšañ-bkhehe || na || ḫnor-hdzañ-rgo-htoñ ||
rgo-hrañ-ḥnor-[re-]hdzañ-hyañ-htoñ ||, 314–15

'In an enemy's winning the land (or In winning an enemy land) fool and wise man are the gate:
If the gate-ward is a fool, the wise is antagonized.'
po-rbom-ḥnor-[re-]ḥldog-g-yah-to, 317.

'If a big man, being a fool, is antagonized',
and the same meaning of ḫnor is apparent in l. 366, also in l. 163, where it is contrasted with ḫšehe, 'wise'; and it can be seen in l. 192. Ḫdzañ, '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’.


7. ṣid, ḍṣid; ḷpag, ṛpag, ḷṛpag; ḍṣi; ḥkhur; ḍṣi, ṛi, ḍṣi, ḍsī; ḍbrom, ḍkri, ḍhp, ḍhwa, ḍrgo; ḍṣi-kyeg.

Ṣid in Tibetan denotes a ‘funeral ceremony’, and ūṣ-d-sa a ‘burying-ground’ and a ‘fruitful field’: the form gṣid also is known. A connexion with ṣi, ‘die’, which has in Tibeto-Burman numerous cognates, is apparent.

But in one of ‘the Tibetan manuscripts’ ḍṣid occurs in the sense of ‘high’, ḍṣid-rabs, ‘high race’ (= Tib. ya-rabs), being contrasted with ḷbraṅ-rabs, ‘race of commons’, and the term is used also in a local sense. ūṣi, too, occurs in the Locative form ṛir with the same signification.

Tibetan dpag means ‘measure’, dpags ‘depth’, and the latter is to be recognized also in dpag-ṣeam, ‘thought’, ‘imagination’: the root appears, further, in dpog/dpag/dpags, ‘to measure, fix’.

In the Nam text, ll. 230–1, ḍṣid and ḷṛpag are antithetic in application to ḷwa-bżer (a ‘fort’?):

ḥwa-bżer-ḥṣid-ṛehṛtah-ḥraṅ-glyaṅ
ḥwa-bżer-ḥṛpag-ṛe-ḥlḥad-ḥbyam ||.

When we find, further, the repeated phrase ḍṣid-g-ṛi ll. 34, 62 (ḥṣid-hṛiḥi), ‘ḥṣid mountain’, we can have no doubt that the meaning of ḍṣid, ḍṣid is, as in Tibetan, ‘high’; and we have no difficulty in recognizing the same in:

ḥwam-ḥṣid, 11, ‘high mansion’
ḥḍzoṅ-ḥyo-ḥṣid, 356, where ḍḍzoṅ = ‘castle’

while l. 194 ḍṛḍzoṅ-ḥyo-ḥṣi either has a miswriting for ḍṣid or contains the shorter equivalent ḍṣi. In ḍkhu-tṣa-ḥṣid-re, l. 60, ‘if the uncles are high’, the height is social, as in Tib. ḍṣid-rabs, and in ḍbrad-sta-ḥṣid-re, l. 306, ‘clawings are high’, the sense is that animals with claws have a superiority. The combination ḍṣid-ṛyaṅ, ‘high vast’, is very aptly applied in ll. 151, 155 to ḍnom, ‘enjoyment’, and ‘hope (?)’

Ḥṛpag, 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 ḍkhar (Tib. mkhar, ḍkhar), ‘city’, ‘citadel’ (ll. 17, 128, 135, 192)
(hkhar): see infra, p. 242), to ḍhkaṅ-hṣig,1 ‘house ruined’ (l. 208), to ḍcnaṅ, ‘city’ (l. 210), and also to the occupants of a dwelling-place, ḍhnaḥ-hṣtu and ḍmo (l. 193), ḍso-nad (l. 194), with whom we may associate the sky-people, ḍhraṅ-hldah-ḥnam-hge, who in l. 6 have their bodies ‘bowed low (downwards)’, ḍhrpag-hkhur-hṣkuṭu (Tib. ḍgur/ṛgur/sgrur (manuscripts also skur), ‘bent’, ‘crockback’), and also the ‘great yak’ in l. 223. Baṅ in ll. 252–3 may be left aside pending a determination of its meaning; and there remain only ṛṇe-hlād, ‘requital of evil’ (l. 239), and ḍse-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 ḍhpag, with similar signification, attached to ḍñaḥ, ‘home’ (l. 326, 328), ḍhkar (?) l. 377, and in :

ḥṛṣeṅi-ḥpag-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 ḍlduṭu (p. 322), gldag (p. 317), so-na (p. 293), and ṛgōn-wea (p. 332); as concerns śi, ḍśi, gśi, we find, beside the ordinary use as a Predicate with or without an Auxiliary Verb (ll. 44, 47, 153, 344, 345), also the Preterite derivates bśi-ta, ‘dead’ (l. 196), bśi-re, ‘having died’ (l. 198), and the phrases gśi-brom (l. 72), ‘nipped by death’, ḍśi-hkri (ll. 38, 81), ‘death couch’, ḍśi-hpo (l. 47), ‘pass away in death’ (Tib. śi-hpho), ḍśi-hwa (l. 123), ‘power (?) of death’, śi-rgo (l. 120), ‘gate of death’, ḍśi-hrōg (l. 17)(?) In ḍśi-kṣeṅ-mye (l. 102), applied to a defeated army, the meaning, ‘death-congealed-fire’, has an unmistakable side allusion to (b)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-cìn-khyags combines with the same Verb (khyag, ‘frozen’, ‘ice’) the Tibetan equivalent, ḍgun, of ḍśi, ‘winter’.

8. ḍhṇaḥ, ḍyāḥ, ḍ-yar; ḍmaḥ, ḍmaḥ, ḍmad, ḍmad, ḍmad; ḍdad, ḍdahd.

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 northeast (see pp. 94–5, 166 and cf. pp. 351–2); and from ma, ‘not’, a

1 Cf. ḍcnaṅ . . . bēigs 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 *hma*h, *rma*h in

*hma*h-*lidan-hyah-dze, 112, ‘when low rises high’
*hyah*-hma*h*-htsag*na, 257, ‘high and low are combined’
*hyah*-htan-*rma*[ ]-[r][e], 315, 318, ‘when high authority becomes low’.

The last example enables us to recognize the meaning of *hyah*(*ga*yah)-*htana*, ‘[of] superior authority’, in the instances (ll. 285–8) where it recurs without a contrasted *hma*h; and similarly in the phrase *hyah*-hdad, ll. 304, 306 (*hda*hd), 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 *hyah*(*hpha*h) = Tib. *dpah*, ‘hero’, ‘brave’. In ll. 266–72 there is a series of parallel occurrences of *hyah*/*ga*yah, with either this sense or another to be mentioned *infra*; and the same is seen in ll. 72, *hyah*-hrge*he* (‘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 *hma*d/*rma*d/*smad*, may occur in ll. 36, 37, 39 (*hse-*hma*d, ‘of low intelligence’?) and 202 (*hra*h-*hma*d); but in

*myi*-hni-*busge-smyi-*rma*d-*lidan*, 80
‘When a . . . man perishes, an inferior man rises’
*hrje-my*ni-*rma*d-*ge-*hmo-*rka*h-*l*da, 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. *Hyah*, probably = ‘sheep’ (l. 45), will be mentioned *infra* (p. 343).

9. *hyah*, *g-yah*; *hyah*-htah, *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’, *htah*-*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:

\[
\text{ldan-pyer-hgag-re-htsa-hyah-hdo} \mid \mid, \text{65}
\]
‘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:

\[
\text{rgo-hrah-hnor-[re-]hdza-hyah-htoho} \mid \mid, \text{315.}
\]

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-htah*
in ll. 222, 336, *g-yah-ta*, l. 156, the general notion of ‘pair’ is
probable; but whether hostility or combination is indicated, is not

The meaning of *g-yah* in:

\[
g-we-hku-rño-re-g-yah-htsa-ne-ge-gstor-ta-hthon(hthogna),
\]
152
‘action-desire (*hku*)-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 = no-
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:

\[
\text{rgyeb-hphuhi-htoñ-re-hyah-wa-hkañ, 190}
\]
\[
\text{hyah-hkruñu-hbro-re-hrgyeb-hkruño} \mid \mid, \text{315–16}
\]
\[
\text{hrgyeb-hkruñu-hbro-re-g-yah-hpan-hwag, 323–4}
\]
\[
\text{hyah-hklu(hkru)-hbro-re-hgyeb(hrgyeb)-hkru-hbro-re-hyah-
htah-hthañ na} \mid \mid, \text{221–2.}
\]

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’
This appears clearly also in:

\[
\text{ldan-rdze(rje)-hbro-re-hldan-the-rgyeb}, \mid \mid, \text{138–9}
\]
‘when a supporting chief flees (Tib. *hbro*), the supporting
followers retreat’. 
There exists a curious ambiguity as to the meaning of the expression *hkru-hbro*, 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 *hyah/g-yah* = ‘front’ and *rgye* = ‘rear’.

It may be noted that, by reason of the standing antithesis, the missing word in the passage:

\[ *hbri-hldi-htha*n-re-*hre-hldi-hya* \]

\[ hldi-htha*n-re-rgye-hldi-htha*n-ra, 132–3 \]

is, no doubt, a second *hyah*: a more extended case of similar loss of a repeated word is to be seen in ll. 147–8; see p. 299. It is no objection that the added *hyah* has the sense No. 3, while the preceding one has perhaps sense No. 1 (antithetic to *hbri*); for, as we have seen, the monosyllabic languages (as also most natural use of language) are indifferent to such awkwardness, and perhaps the Nam speakers, possibly with etymological right, lumped all the senses of *hyah/g-yah* roughly together.

11. *hna*ñ, *na*ñ; *hthah*; *hgran*.

The common meaning of Tibetan *na*ñ is ‘in’, ‘inside’, ‘within’; but there is also *na*ñ/*na*ñs, = ‘dawn’, ‘morning’, ‘to-morrow’, and we may add *na*ñs, ‘escaped’ (√*gno*ñ), and, for the sake of possible comparison with Nam, *gna*ñ/*gna*ñs, ‘grant’, and *sna*ñ, ‘light’, ‘appearance’, ‘notion’, ‘shine’.

In the text the passages (ll. 225, 236, 244, 246), where we read:

\[ *hrah-hldi-hna*ñ-re, ‘this place being inside’, or ‘being in this place’ \]

prove by their mere number that the word *hna*ñ is = Tib. *na*ñ, ‘inside’, &c. Hence it is practically certain that the meaning is the same in:

\[ hldi-hga*ñ-na*ñ-re, 104, ‘all these being inside’ or ‘being inside this house (Tib. *khan*)’ \]

\[ hpo-hldi-na*ñ-re, 115, ‘these heroes (or males) being within’ \]

\[ gdzu-hbyi-hna*ñ-re-hma*n-hri-hwas, 308, ‘the ass being within [it], the great mountain is non-existent’ (similarly in 305, 311). \]

In l. 181 *na*ñ-*gsa*ñ has been noted (p. 156) as possibly doubtful,
and naṅ-pa-hsam in l. 352 may be left for the present undetermined; as well as hnaṅ-hdro in ll. 188–9 (see p. 285).

Antithesis to hṭṭaḥ can be seen in:

ḥṛtaḥ-naṅ-hwa[-r][e]-ḥṭṭaḥ-hbro-hgran, 354–5
‘the horse being powerful (?) within, his adversary (Tib. hgran) was in flight to, or in, the ḥṭṭaḥ’.

The identity of ḥṭṭaḥ with Tib. mṭṭaḥ, ‘end’, ‘boundary’, ‘frontier’, is unmistakable; and perhaps the same will be found to be the case in l. 362, where ḥṭṭaḥ-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. ḡbom, ṛbom, ḡrbom; ḡbo, bon, ḡbon, ḡbos, ḡpos; ṛbo, ṛrbo; ḡboḥu; ma-man, ḡmaṅ; ḡpāṅ; ḡrog; ḡkom; ḡji.

In l. 238 of the text:

gse-ḥbō-bon-re-ḥlad-maḥ-maṅ
‘injury being ḡbō-bon, requital is maḥ-maṅ’

we see an antithesis, repeated in ll. 243, 245, 246, 246–7, between two reduplications, ḡbō-bon and maḥ-maṅ: and the first of the two can hardly be different in essence from ḡbom-rbo in:

ḥso-ḥnaḥ-ḥyaḥ-tse-gtaḥ-ḥbom-rbo
ḥbom-rbo-paṅ-dze-ḥldaṅ-ḥkraṅ-ḥnar-re-ḥbom-rbo-hldah ||
111–12
ḥso-ḥnaḥ-ḥyaḥ-[ge-]-ḥbah-ḥbom-rbo ||, 270.

A form ṛbom/hrbom 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 ḡbom-rbo-paṅ means ‘big lap or bosom’ (Tib. paṅ/paṅ); cf. Tib. sbo, ‘the upper part of the belly’ and, perhaps, boṅ, boṅs (< bons), buṅs, ‘size’, ‘bulk’.

It follows from the first quotation that ma-man represents a man, ‘great’, and means ‘vast’ or ‘larger’. This must be = Tib. maṅ, ‘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 maṅ, like boṅ and several other words, derives its ṅ from the circumstance that originally it was maṅ<man-s, a form existing in Tibetan, e.g. in maṅs-tahīg, ‘plural number’.

Hmaṅ itself is common in the text, and it obviously means
'great' when applied to 'mountain'; ḡmaṅ-ḥrīḥi, ll. 302, 308 ('ḥrī), 308 (g-ṛi), followed by ḡmaṅ-sta-mehi ... ḡṛi-staḥ-mehi, l. 311, 'great is not there ... mountain is not there'. Not less clear is the meaning 'many' in:

ḥbrad-re-hphaḥ-yaṅ-ḥmaṅ-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 sbom 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, ḡbos, pho, dbo, 'to pour forth, swell up, rise, sprout (sa-ḥbo-ḥdug, "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 boṣ/ḥbos (once, l. 141, spelled ḡpos) = Tib. ḡbos, Aorist of ḡbo, also 'boil', 'tumour'. This is applied in ll. 290, 291, 293 to g-ṛi, ḡṛiḥi, 'mountain' ('a big mountain'); but its usual connexions are with smyi ('big man'), e.g. ll. 42, 43, [378], and especially with pu/hpuḥu/hphu ('male', 'man'), in ll. 41, 167, 266, 293, 330; and several times (ll. 164, 213, 287, 294, 298) ḡbos 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:

ḥlab-ta-ghoḥu-ste, 'talk bubbling forth', 181; cf. g-rah-nag-ḥbo-ghyaṅ, p. 313 infra.

Probably also its meaning, 'sprout', accounts for ḡbo, 'forest', 'vegetation' (Hsi-hsia mo, Laufer, No. 85), which we shall find in ḡbo-hkom-hldyaṅ-dze, 12, 'the parched (Tib. skom, skam, &c.), woods flying high'

myag-ma-hṭsar-dze-ḥbo-hrham-ge-hṣodtsa, 280-1
'on the not spoiled districts, or borders, the wood-groups were laid low'

(on hṭsar and hṣodtsa see pp. 234, 301)

ḥbo-hrōṅ-hrog-re, 344, 'the wooded gorges being torrents' (Tib. grog).
On hło in l. 126 see infra, p. 289. The meaning of hldyaŋ-hthah-hbo-kyer, l. 144, is not clear.

13. dgu, dgu hu; mu, ḥmu, ḥmu hi; ḥro ṣ, ḥom; dgu, ḥgu; ḥrγu, 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 dmū/gmu h (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 mī, Rgya-roṅ Hsi-fan te-mī, &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-myidgū), water not moist (chu-myi-rlaṅ), I will carry you’. Moreover, the many Tibeto-Burman dialects of the Himalayas and elsewhere, which for ‘hot’ have words beginning with ku-, lend an aspect to the matter.

The antithesis declares itself prominently in the recurrent (ll. 225, 236, 244, 245) phrase:

dgu(dgu hu)-mu-ḥto-re, ‘hot be[com]ing cold’

where the implication is ‘living becoming dead’: and an analogous implication (cf. Tib. groṅ/graṅ, ‘cold’ and ‘die’) is to be seen in mu-hro ṣ-hṭro(hdro)-re, 197, ‘cold being assisted by heat’ in reference perhaps to burning of the dead. Also in a verse already (p. 222) quoted ‘the great cold’, hce-mu, means, no doubt, death. But the antithesis is envisaged also in l. 309:

dgu-hldo-hṭor-ge . . .

ḥmu-wa-rṅo-ge . . .

Independently of antithesis dgu-hṭor, ‘great heat’, is seen in ll. 76, 77, and dgu-hldo, ‘heat’, in ll. 74, 77, 78, 139, 191; and in l. 114 there is connexion with ‘fire’ (me):

dgu-hldo-hṭor-ge-su-me-ḥmehi

‘with great heat, who kindles fire?’

mu, likewise, is connected with fire in the phrase me-ḥmu hi, ‘chills the fire’, l. 183, and perhaps also in l. 268; in l. 39 ḥkγe-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-hce-rgye-dze-hrgu-hrgebi-sto ||, 57–8

'where poultry (error for hbyor, 'store' ?) is very extensive, thieves rejoice' (on hrgebi-sto see p. 185 and n. 1)

and perhaps the same signification of rgu/hrgu in ll. 29, 30, 32; hgu in:

hnah-hpoñ-hgor-re-hgu-htor-htsu, 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. stoñ, htoñ; hpoñ; myen; stsar; htsar, htshar.

Line 247, gse-stoñ-stsar-re-blad-htoñ-myen repeating an antithesis of gse, 'harm', and blad, 'reiquittal', requires an opposition between stoñ-stsar and htoñ-myen, wherein, according to the context, the latter should denote a larger quantity. Stoñ-stsar calls to mind Tib. stoñ, 'thousand', and the particle rtsa, whereby stoñ is usually linked to the following 'hundreds', &c., rtsa being perhaps = rtswa, 'root', though we may suspect that it was once risar or stsar, connected with htshar/htshar, 'be finished, spent', 'up to the limit', and tsar, 'occasion', 'instance' (tshar-gnis, 'twice', &c.). However it may be as regards Tibetan rtsa, there is no difficulty
in connecting with this \textit{htshar} the Nam \textit{stsar} and attributing to it the sense of ‘as much as’ or ‘only’, though it might likewise be a Locative form of \textit{rtsa}.

The word \textit{htsar}, instanced p. 231, recurs, as \textit{htshar}, in

\begin{quote}
\textit{ńka-n-heig-rpag-re-htshar-hde-hpyedhī}, 208
\end{quote}

‘when a house is laid low in ruin, the parish’s prosperity is breached’

\textit{cf. khar} (\textit{ńka?}-\textit{ḥpag-cig-dze}, l. 377, \textit{ḥlaṅ-ńkhaṅ}, ‘wooden house’ (sc. tomb), l. 198, and \textit{ńka-n-rul-ṣig}, ‘break down a ruined house’ (Tibetan Literary Texts, &c., ii, p. 149. 8). With the meaning ‘parish’ (Sanskrit \textit{simā}), derived from that of ‘boundary’, the Tibetan \textit{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 \textit{stōṅ} the meaning ‘thousand’, since we should prefer \textit{stom} or \textit{tom}, as nearer to the original, widespread, Central-Asian \textit{tom} (Mo-so \textit{tiū}, to, tu, Menia \textit{ta-to}, Lo-lo \textit{ta-to}, ti-tu, &c.); but that reluctance must yield before the fact that \textit{stōṅ-hpon} in l. 321 is very probably = Tib. \textit{stōṅ-dpon}, ‘Thousand-[district]-officer’, a prominent feature of Central-Asian administration (p. 33, n. 1). If \textit{stōṅ} was not the proper Nam form, it may have been due to borrowing from Tibetan (whence the \textit{s}, absent in \textit{ḥtoṅ}) or to the Tibetan scribe or transmitter.

Proof that \textit{stōṅ} in the Nam passage means ‘thousand’ is given by the antithetic \textit{myen}, for which Tibetan affords no explanation. This will be Chinese \textit{wan} (Classical \textit{mān}, Ancient \textit{myun’}, Japanese \textit{ban/man}; see Karlsgren, No. 1295), ‘myriad’, preserved in Mo-so as \textit{mō} and in Lo-lo, perhaps, as [\textit{ta}]-\textit{nīaś}, &c. (\textit{ni} < \textit{my}–). Accordingly the translation of l. 247 in the Nam text is:

\begin{quote}
‘harms being as many as a thousand, requital is [to be] a thousand myriad.’
\end{quote}

Elsewhere \textit{ḥtoṅ} has a quite different signification (= Tib. \textit{gtoṅ}, ‘give up’, ‘send’, &c.) and \textit{stōṅ} in l. 51 seems to be = Tib. \textit{stōṅ}, ‘empty’.


Nam \textit{gsom} has a great chance of being = Tib. \textit{gsom} /\textit{sum}, ‘three’ (so-\textit{gcig}, ‘thirty-one’, &c.); for in Tibeto-Burman the numeral ‘three’ is one of the most uniform, the dialects agreeing in something like \textit{sum} (also \textit{tum}), \textit{som}, so, \textit{sam} (cf. Hsi-hsia \textit{gsō}, \textit{gsōh}, \textit{gsōŋ}, \textit{gswōṅ}, Nevsky, No. 269), Chinese \textit{sam}, \textit{san}. The scribe
himself seems to intimate this; for in l. 117 he wrote Tibetan gsom, which was afterwards corrected to gsom.

Nevertheless, the clearest of the occurrences of gsom, namely in gsom-si (l. 23) = Tib. som-ši, ‘doubt’, presents a different sense; for in som-ši (‘thought-two’) som belongs to the root sem, sens, bsam, bsams, Imperative soms, ‘think’, ‘thought’, ‘mind’, a root most widely spread in Tibeto-Burman (including Hsi-hsia sin, ‘heart’, = Tib. sens, Laufer No. 9, and Mo-so śi̯in(-djre), šen(-djrō), šun(-dru), ‘think’) and shared with Chinese, sin, ‘heart’, ‘thought’, &c. (Classical som, Ancient, sio, 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 gsom; for, though we cannot identify the towns, numerical phrases of the same type, ‘The Four Garrisons’ = Chinese Turkestan, ‘The Six Cities’ = Khotan, &c., were usual in Central Asia, and one of the Tibetan manuscripts has ‘The Twelve Cities’, ‘The Eight Snam’, &c. In htsa-gsom, l. 21, also we may find ‘the three roots or grasses or crops (Tib. rtsa or rtwa or btsa)’, analogous to the above (p. 39) cited ‘five cereals’ of the Chinese descriptions; and in l. 10 hlab-gsom may be ‘the three passes (Tib. la)’. In ll. 89 (gsom-rgyag ‘form a thought’, pp. 258–9), 198 (ḥdi-gsom, ‘this thought’), 206 (tshu-gsom, ‘the thought of coming’), we have again gsom, ‘think’.

But gsom-si, though not containing the numeral ‘three’, certainly reveals si as = ‘two’, Tibetan gnis/nis, Hsi-hsia gni/gnī (Nevensky, No. 75). This si does not otherwise occur in the Nam text, and it is possible that an s-less form is present in the expression rgya-hnī (gnī)-ke, concerning which see p. 272.

A cognate of gsom, ‘think’, is probably to be seen in hsam (Tib. bsam), ll. 185, 352, but not in hsam, l. 184, where me-hsam, ‘prepared fire’, antithetic to the above (p. 232) cited me-hmu, is probably for hsam (Tib. som, gsom, bsam, bsams, ‘prepare’, ‘arrange’, &c). Ssam, l. 255, and hsam, l. 277, are problematical.

16. hti; ḥg ye; ḫkrom-ḥkrom.

In ll. 12–13 and 154:

gnim-hti-hldya-n[ge ? dze ?]hgye-ḥkrom-ḥkrom, 12–13
htí-rgye-mye-dze-hgye-ḥkrom-ḥkrom ||, 154

hti and ḥgye seem to be contrasted. If ḥgye = Tib. ḥgye, ‘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, hgyped, ‘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 gnim, in the first verse cited, which will be = Tib. uninsured, ‘day’ (cf. uninsured, ‘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:

hörne-hrom-ge-hti-na-hrrie-ge-hrlomhi | : |

‘in the fiend-hollow darkness, let the fiends vaunt themselves will likewise fit.

Since Tibetan has a sti, hti, meaning (a) ‘take a rest’, (b) ‘honour’, ‘respect’, and Hsi-hsia a sti meaning ‘obey’, ‘possible’ (Nevsky, No. 235), these also are conceivable in Nam; and the first may actually occur in:

myi-re-hti-ni-myi-[re-]hsí ||, 154  
‘when men severally stop (in flight), severally the men perish’, a passage curiously adjacent, however, to l. 154, with hti = ‘light’. Concerning sku-kphu-hti, l. 104, and hgru-ma-hti, l. 27, see pp. 285, 309.

17. smyi, myi; tha; hnu; hśig; hrγyan.

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), Gyärung ti-rmi, &c.; see p. 94) has a Prefix r. One instance of myi = ‘man’ (l. 154) has just been cited; but it may be doubted whether there are any more. In regard to smyi there can be no question that in htor-smyi-hbom-ge, l. 73 (‘great smyi, big’), bos-smyi, ll. 42, 44 (‘big smyi’, ‘master’) — see the discussion of hbom supra — smyi signifies ‘man’; and the same is apparent in:
rje-smyi-rmad-ge, 37, 84, ‘chiefs who are inferior men’ (on *rmad see supra, p. 227)
smyi-hni-hsîg[-g]-smyi-rmad (smad?)-ldan, 87
‘when a hni man perishes (Tib. hjig, bzig, gzig, sig), an inferior
man rises’.

But it is in ll. 241–2:

smyi-hnu-mye-re-tha-hnu-hrgyaṅ-sto-smyi-hnu-hto ||

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. rgyaṅs) or being
extended or extensive (rgyaṅ), 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/thaḥ,
‘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 lhā 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 under-
stand the name of the city Tamo (‘Goddess’)-mën, stated in the
T’ang Annals (JRAS. 1880, pp. 463, 473) to have been built by
the Tibetans in the Koko-nor region. Visible from Hsi-ning, and
situated some eight or nine miles south of Lusar (Rockhill, The
Land of the Lamas, p. 94, n. 1), are the three peaks of the ‘Lh’a-
mo-ri’, which surely must be connected with the pass ‘called in
Tibetan Ta-mo-ri’ (Rockhill Diary, p. 108), which ‘leads [from
Lusar] into a valley at the mouth of which is . . . Shara-kuto’.

In ordinary Tibetan also the verb lṭūṅ, ‘fall’, has for Preterite
lhuṅ.

18. (1) ḥnāḥ, gnāḥ, hna, na; (2) ḥnāḥ, ḫna, na; (3) ḥnāḥ, na;

1 Mentioned in connexion with Hung-chi (NW. of Ho-chou, with a
bridge over the Hoang-ho), Bushell, p. 534 (72).
2 Similarly Dr. Tafel mentions (ii, p. 298) a ‘Lhama gomba’ (monastery)
in the T’aö-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) ḷnah, nāh; (2) ḷnah; ohtsu; ‘mo; ḷmo; gso, ḷson; o nad; ḷsas, gsas; pa; ḷgam; khyaṅ, ḷkhyāṅ; khyos; ḷzhā.

It is clear in ll. 99, 101–2

rgyed-ma-glaṅ (102 ḷldaṅ)-ge-ḥnah (102 ḷnaḥ)-ḥtsog-ḥsāh
(102 ḷsas)

that ḷnah and ḷnaḥ are confused; and confusion of n and ḷ has been noted (p. 214) as occurring in Amdoan Tibetan. ḷnaḥ is certainly = Tib. gnah, ‘place’; cf. l. 69 ḷphag-la-gnah, ‘a place for the hog’ &c., l. 391 ḷnaḥ-hdiḥi-hṭshur, ‘come to this place’, the Prefixes g and ḷ alternating frequently, as we are already aware, in the text. ḷnaḥ does not occur, though on the analogy of Hsi-hsia ne, ‘king’, neh/ṇeh = Tib. rje, and Gyārūŋ ka-nēs, Tākpa nai, Mānṭak nā-bī, ‘two’, and various other instances in Hsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman, we should be fully prepared for confusion of n- also with n- and ḷ-.

In the case of ḷnaḥ-ḥtsu/ḥnah-mo such confusion is specially clear; for Hsi-fan (d’Ollone, Nos. 37 and 40, p. 79) na-mo, ‘woman’, is plainly = Tib. na-ma, ‘housewife’, ‘mistress of a house’. That Nam ḷnah-mo is the same word is proved by the antithesis to ḷnah-ḥtsu in:

ḥnah-ḥtsu-rpag-re-ḥnah-mo-hgam || ḷnah-mo-hrpag-[re-]-gso-nad-hgam
gso-nad-rpag-re-hkah-hgam-hjor, 193–4
‘If the ḷnah-ḥtsu is brought low, the ḷnah-mo is the ḷgam; if the ḷnah-mo is brought low, the gso-nad is the ḷgam; if the gso-nad is brought low, (all talk is babble).’

For in this connexion ḷtsu 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 ḷnah and ḷnaḥ was not merely phonetic, but due in part to coincidence of the ideas of ‘place’ and ‘home’. ḷnah/na, which seems to be the more common, appears in:

ḥna-hlam-glo-ḥran, 68, ‘the home path is joyful’
na-hldom-hgor, 41, 143, 350, ‘if the house-servants are idle’
ḥnah-hpoṅ-hgor, 113, ‘if the house-poor (na-boṅ of the Tibetan manuscripts) are idle’

1 See infra, p. 360.
na-g-we-hkor, 205, 'if there is idleness in home-making'
hp-hklo-hsad-dze-hnah-me-hmyi ||, 40, 'if the hp-hklo
(see infra, p. 284) is destroyed, house-fire there is not'.
In other instances (ll. 56, 96, 280 (gnah)), though only 'place' is
said, the idea may be that of home: elsewhere (ll. 191, 391, hnah;
ll. 69, 70, 179, 367, gnah) 'place' suffices. Hnah is seen in :
hnah-hpag-hldir, 326, 328, 'in this low place'
and together we find hnah and na in :

hnah-na-hman-na-hman-hrgam-gre-na-hram ||, 307
'though [their] home-places are many, the place they like is
where many gre are in company'.

An entirely different hnah = Hsi-hsia dnah (Nevsky, No. 159),
'empty', 'sky', occurs several times after re, 'is', forming an
idiom with the meaning 'absence of', 'there is absence of', e.g. in :
mor-hlda-n-re-hnah ||, 87, 'there is no rising of evil'
hkya-n-hldo-n-re-hnah ||, 291, 'there are no run-away hkyan'
hrno-hcan-hram-dze-gse-hrdrzo (i.e. hrdrzo-re)-hnah ||, 49
hrno-hpran-hram-dze-hsche-rdzor (i.e. rdzo-re)-hnah, 368-9
'where the power (or purpose)-violent are united, wise rdzo
are not there'.

Tibetan has, further, na (a Postposition), 'in', &c., gnah(-ma) 'old',
na, 'meadow', and na, 'sickness'. Of these na, 'in', &c., as
recurrent in the Nam text, has been considered supra (pp.178 sqq.).
Gnah, 'old', is at present problematic. Na, 'meadow', is perhaps
to be recognized in na-hsah-ste, ll. 33-4: see p. 275, cf. pp. 278,
281). Na, 'sickness', is to be seen in :

na-rog-hphar-ge-skye-ta-ram, 156-7
'the black (? Tib. rog) sickness passed, life is agreeable'
htsog-hram-hnah-tse, 120 (see infra, pp. 291-2)
hsas-hnah-hdag-chi-phyer-cha-n-hson ||, 260-1
'children who had sickness were, with support-hold, tended'
hdyo-htor-hmyi-na, 254 (see p. 328).
The phyur-chañ of the last passage will call for consideration later
(pp. 283, 287). Hson will be = Tib. gsson/gso, 'tend', 'nurse'.
Hssas, which in the preceding verse has the same form, shows in :
gsas-pahi-hdzo-hdza, 262, 'children equal to braves (pa =
hphah, Tib. dpah) or to their fathers (pha, hphah)'
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. *bsas*, of *btsa*, ‘bring forth a child’\(^1\) (cf. *btsa, btsas, rtas*, ‘harvest’): as regards the initial cf. *se/*hse/*gse* = Tib. *gtse, htshe*, and *se/*hse/*rse* = Tib. *rtse*.\(^2\) The verbal sense is clear in:

\[\text{hsas-te-khyañ-je(dze)-hsas-hkhah-ge-hrwehi}||, 116\]

‘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:

\[\text{hsas-hce-rgye-dze-hrañ-hgam-hyim}, 59.\]

‘with offspring very numerous one’s own mouthful (Tib. *hgam/hkham*, “cram into the mouth”, *bgam*, “gobble”, *kham-geig*, “morsel”, *khams*, “appetite”) is diminished.’

*Khyañ*, ‘matron’, is clearly recognizable in:

\[\text{khyos/hkhyan-hyu-ge-mye-hpehi-hkhehi}||, 212\]

‘matrons united (cf. Tib. *yuq, yug-po, yugs*) with their husbands (Tib. *khyo*) gain eye-sparkle (?)’

a sentiment echoed in the Tibetan manuscripts by ‘a wife partnered by her husband smiles at every speech’. The sentiment is different in:

\[\text{hmo[-]r[e]-hzah-re-hse-spye-khyañ}||, 190\]

‘woman or wife, a matron is a summer of harm’

and in l. 367 we hear of a *hšan-khyañ*, ‘hostile matron’. What is the precise signification of *khyañ* as distinguished from *hmo*, ‘woman’, ‘female’ (see supra, p. 221) and *hzah*, Tib. *bzañ*, ‘wife’? Here we may be helped by Lauffer’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 *kkhyen, kkheñ*, ‘be filled up’, cf. *heñs, bkañ, dgañ, khoñ*, ‘fill’, ‘gain’, ‘fill’, ‘full’, furnishes a good basis for an etymology.

We may now return to the *gsọ-nad* of ll. 193–4. It might seem possible that the *gsọ-nad*, who are left when the men and women of the place are laid low, are the ‘living sick’, Tib. *gsor* ‘live’, ‘life’, ‘+nad’ ‘sickness’. The Tibetan has, in fact, the expression

\(^{1}\) *Khyeñ* (or *bu*)-*bsas*, ‘a child (or son) was born’. The form *tēbas* occurs with the meaning ‘woman in child-birth’.

\(^{2}\) In Tibetan *j*, *rt*, *rdz*, are often pronounced as simply *j*, *s*, *z*, (Jaeschke, *Tib. Grammar*, § 7).
nand-gso, ‘sickness-tending’; but the order of the syllables in the compound could not be inverted, and the gso is the word which means ‘feed’, ‘nourish’, ‘rear’, ‘cure’, e.g. in ḡud-ḥgro-gso-ba, ‘rear an animal’. In the Nam phrase:

nor-gso-ḥkaṅ-prom-re, 151, ‘having their fill of wealth and gso [as booty]’

we may understand gso as ‘livestock’, in which case nad will have nothing to do with ‘sickness’ and may be = Tib. gnad, ‘essence’, ‘pith’, in the sense of ‘last remainder’. The other occurrence of ḡnad (l. 46) is, however, obscure.

The liberal choice of significations presented by the syllables na and ṇa, with their various written forms, would not be fully stated without a mention of ḡnaṅ, ‘spring’ in ḡnaṅ-hchos-hre-ge, l. 159 (see JRAS. 1939, p. 215, cf. supra, p. 145) and ṇa in ṇa-ḥke, perhaps = ‘five’ (cf. ḡūi-ke, p. 272). No equivalent of Tib. ṇa, ‘I’, has come to light.

19. ḡdzoṅ; ḡke, ḡhe, ḡhe, ḡhe, ḡhe; plaṅ, ḡplāṅ, ḡplāṅ; ḡdrah, ḡdra; ḡyo-ḥski; ḡgam, ḡrgam; caṅ; ḡthaṅ; ḡdaṅ; ḡrog; ḡdro; ḡwe, ḡweḥi; ḡnōr; ḡhwaṅ; ḡlda-ḥko; ḡldiḥi; ḡma; ḡtharmye; ḡkyim, ḡkyim, ḡyim.

The above-quoted passage, concerning ‘house-man’, ‘housewife’, and cattle, is followed (ll. 194–6) by:

ḥrdzoṅ-ḥyo-ḥsī-dze-ṛdzu-ge-cig
ḥke-plaṅ(356 ḡplaṅ, 357 plaṅ)-ḥdraḥ-dze-ṛthar-myge-loł
ḥldiḥi-su-ḥldoṅ || dze-ḥlda-ḥko-ge-ḥdzoṅ
ṛma-ḥsu-ḥdra-dze-ḥwam-ṛwehi-ge-ṛswehū.

After the discussion supra (pp. 150 sqq.) it may perhaps be assumed as certain that in the expression moṅ-ḥdzon(hjoṅ) the word ḡdzoṅ = Tib. rdzoṅ, ‘castle’, which is also found (p. 214) written in Amdo as ḡdzoṅ. In the above lines both ḡdzoṅ, the usual Nam form, and ḡrdzoṅ occur.

Antithetic to ḡrdzoṅ, in the following parallel verse is ḡke, with the addition plaṅ-ḥdrah, whereof the element plaṅ is known only1 from a Central-Asian Tibetan document (Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, 1, pp. 281, 285), which speaks of ‘a plaṅ of a market town’ (khrom-gyi-plaṅ): it is suggested that plaṅ is equivalent to sraṅ, ‘street’, and it may, in fact, be etymologically

1 Tākpa, however, has plaṅ, ‘sun’.
connected therewith.\(^1\) If ēke 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, Rañ-ke, Šud-ke, Mer-ke) from north-eastern Tibet or the adjacent regions.

Ēke (l. 212, ḥkhe, ll. 251, 314, ḥkhehe) may be identified with the Tibetan word khe, 'profit' (khe-nien, 'profit and loss', khe-pa, in Amdo = tshoñ-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 ēdra of plan-ēdra will then be the 'network' (Tib. dra) of 'streets'; for a metaphorical use of dra is known in Tibetan with reference to a strategic network and also to fortifications (groñgi-dra-ba, 'fortification round a village'). The literal sense is seen in l. 260 ḥsas-ēdraḥ-ēdaq-chi, 'children with nets' (for catching birds, &c., as in the Tibetan manuscripts).

The parallel expression hyo-ēśi, attached to 'castle', can naturally contain the word ēśi, 'high', noted above: and, in fact, the repetition of the verse in l. 356 has the alternative form ēśid. 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-ēśid, 'high crooked', can hardly help being 'the high road zigzag' (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' (rλa-mdkhars) and the 'high mansion' (rλa-khyims). 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' (hkar-ḥraḥ-g-yar-re, ll. 128, 136, see supra, p. 227) and the 'fort being made low' (hkar-rpaḥ-re, l. 192). The 'High Town', the mtho-mdkhar of one of the Tibetan manuscripts, is the residence of the chiefs, while the Low Town (dmah-mdkhar, ibid.) is occupied by the commons, who will appear infra as kru,

\(^1\) In Kan-su and NE. Tibet some unexpected phonetical relations are evidenced; thus, one of the Tibetan manuscripts has plan = rλais, 'moist', and Mānyak has phwiḥ, Menia fu, = swa, 'tooth'.
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‘filth’, sc. ‘rabble’, ‘canaille’. In the text the elevation of the Low Town is clearly equated to the fall of the ‘Moń-castle’:

ḥkhar-hrpag-g-yar-[re-]stor-moń-hjoń-re, 128,

and to the rise of the ḭldağ-nag, the villain of the situation:¹

ḥkhar-ṛpag-g-yar-re-ḥldağ-[nag-]ḥgrom, 135-6.

It was through that event that importance came to the ḭgam. The fall of the Moń-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:

ḥrḥa-ṛweh-ṛta-ges-to-ṛmoń-ṛḥḍoṇ ||, 139-40

(cf. l. 114). The connexion of the same event with excessive heat (world-conflagration) is likewise mentioned:

dgu-ḥldo-ḥtora-ges-ḥmoń-joṇ, 78, 139 (ḥḍzoṇ),

and the horse’s flight is related to the same in:

dgu-ḥldo-ḥtora-re-ḥra-ve-ṛtaḥ, 191.

The ḭgam seems actually to have come into being upon that occasion, and the horse’s retreat thereto was synonymous with the loss of the caṇ (i.e. the ḭrdzoṇ):

ḥṛtaḥ-ḥgamon-ḥkom (‘made’) -re-ṣtor-moń-hjoṇ
ṛtaḥ-hgam-ḥphar (‘gone’) -[re-]caṇ-stor-hdor-hyoḥo||, 118-19.

The ḭgam is several times (ll. 131-2, 133 (ḥṛgam), 221) mentioned as ḥthami-ḥgam, i.e. ‘ḥgam in the high plains (Tib. tham’), 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 bams/bams/boms, found in other names (Ba-bams, Khri-boms, &c.) and actually preserved in the original designation of Kum-bum, viz. Ḫgo-boms.² Essentially the horse’s desertion of his place is his entry into the service of man (the ḭbos, ‘big man’, ‘master’, discussed supra, p. 231), which is a main feature in the text of one of the Tibetan manuscripts: and this fact helps us to realize the fundamental, but not obvious, unity of matter in the two compositions. What function the horse discharges in the Nam text will appear infra (p. 277).

¹ It is not quite certain that the ḭldağ-nag = ḭbroṇ is conceived as an individual and not as a class, the ‘common people’: the latter might be suggested by the expression ḭbroṇ-re-ge (l. 250), which should mean ‘all the ḭbroṇ’. Possibly the text fluctuates between the notions of group and typical (here also allegorical) individual.
² On the alternation g/b see pp. 33, n. 5, 290.
It is only in this relation that a human being comes explicitly upon the scene.

In the text the word *ḥgam* occurs also, without reference to the particular *ḥṭan-ḥgam*, in the sense of ‘home-community’ or ‘company’, ‘group’. This is seen in:

ldyañ-hjo-hjihi-re-mehi-ra-ḥgam ||, 78
‘Where there is ... , the eye’s-horizon, or sentinel post (mehi-ra) is the ḥgam.’

rñam-skar-hkah-re-gdah-hnah-ḥgam ||, 191
‘Under threatening stars [any] available (gdah) place is the ḥgam.’

(the latter perhaps repeated in the fragmentary line 396) and in the above-quoted (p. 238) passage *ḥñah-tsun*, &c. The form with Prefix *r*, *ḥrgam/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-gysis-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-hṣañ-rgam-cañ-hldyo-hrje-ḥbro ||, 35–6
‘A city (cañ?) with secret disunion (cf. ll. 16–17 *ḥṛṇe-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:

ḥrgom-hkhr[u[-][r[e]-hto-na-hrpehi-hrgam-re-ḥto
ḥdro-ḥbroñ-prom-ge-hkhoñ-me-ḥtul ||, 169, 170
‘the ḥkhru being passed over (*ḥrgom*), the ḥrpehi were taken into the community:

the yak being made to go (*ḥdro*), his speech-fire was suppressed,’

the order of the words should have been *ḥkhru-ḥrgom-re-ḥto* and correspondingly *ḥbroñ-ḥdro-prom-ge, ḥrgom* and *ḥdro* being the Predicates. In the first of the two cases the *ḥrgom* is placed in
front for the sake of antithesis to ḡram at the end of the verse: in
the second the ḡdro is placed first for the sake of antithesis to me,
‘fire’; and this, further, implies a pun on ḡdro, 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 ḡgom = Tib. ḡgom, ‘tread’, ‘pass over’,
 الجمه-اء, ‘pace’, ‘step’, whence comes sgom, ‘practice’ and hence
‘meditate’.

The obvious identity of caṅ, as noted above, with rdzōṅ,
ḥdzōṅ, is hardly less patent in:

ḥldaṅ-rgye-ḥdor-re-ḥwaṅ-ta-hnen
ḥcaṅ-rgye-rpaṅ-re-ḥmo-ta-ḥpun ||, 209–11

‘Having thrown away the big stick (or prop, support, ḡldaṅ?),
power is dangerous:

The big city laid low (talk or prayer or deliberation is vain?).’
Fortunately, the explanation is simple: from occurrences in
identical words it can be shown (Tibetan Literary Texts and Docu-
ments, ii, pp. 28–9, 250) that both this caṅ and also a form cag (an
alternation n/g being established for Amdoan Tibetan by stīṅ =
ṣdg, ḡṭhug = ḡṭhuṅ, &c., in the manuscripts) are merely the well-
known Chinese word ch’eng (Ancient ężăng, Karlgren, No. 1204),
‘fortification’, ‘city’, an exact equivalent of ḡrdzōṅ. Other
examples of caṅ/ḥcaṅ/chaṅ in the Nam text differ in signification.

The form ḡwam = bām, of which particulars have been given
above, and which may, in fact, be etymologically related to gām,
occurs in antithesis to ḡdzōṅ 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

ḥnor-ḥlaṅ-ḥwam-ḥṣid-dze, 11

‘On the high ḡwams in the ḡnor’

where ḡnor = ‘farm’ or ‘estate’. ḡwam-ȩhī, in which ḡe/ȩhī,
will have its very common signification ‘do’, ‘make’ (Hsi-hsia ḡe,
Tib. ḡbyed, p. 337 infra), means ‘home-making’ (or ‘maker’).
tswe bu, perhaps = ḡtswe, l. 6, is unfortunately not known; but see
p. 269. In the preceding verse ḡlda-ḥko-ge-ḥdzōṅ can mean ‘there
(Tib. da-ko, see p. 201) is their castle’. This leads to the recog-
nition of an important antithesis in the first parts of the two lines:

ḥldiḥi-su-ḥldoṅ-dze . . ., ‘to what (Tib. ḡu) ḡldiḥi [they]
depart’
rmā-ḥsu-ḥdra-dze . . ., ‘in what-like (Tib. ḡdra) rmā’
and the sense emerges:

'Whatever land they go to, there is their castle:'

'By whatever river, home-making (makers) [is play?]’ see p. 269.

That hdlidiḥi 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 maṣuo, '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 Tibetoburman sphere (for particulars see the Linguistic Survey of India, i. ii. 'Comparative Vocabularies', pp. 102–3). The verification is at once evident in:

ḥṣod-te-rmag-dze-rmaṅ-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:

hran-hldab-hnam-ge-klu-hhko-hkyim, 37

'the heaven-inhabitants proper [had to take] the blind [mountains] for home.'

But in the other occurrences:

ḥriḥi-ḥdom-hkyim-re, 294, 297
hche-ngyo-hkyim-re, 323
ḥbri-ḥdzohu-kyim-re, 324
ḥyu-hstshab-kyim-re, 345, 350 (ḥkyim), 351 (ḥhkyim),
kyim/hkyim is a Predicate, and we might not see the force of it, had we not learned from the case of hrgam that ḍkyim here means
taken as members of the house’, so that hr'i-hd'o-m-hk'yi-m-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 hkh'yi-m, ‘whirl’ (as of water), hkh'yi-m, ‘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; ḫgar; ḫdzar; thar, htar, ḫtar; pyaṅ, phyaṅ; hto, tho; hphah-hphah; geog; hphag; ḫbehi, ḫbe, ḫbehe; ḫbyig; ḫba, ḫbar; hro; ḫsaṅ; ḫbu; hruŋ, ḫpor; nu-glaṅ; ḫkułu; nehu; wehi, hwehi; ḫkułu; ḫued; ḫtram; glaḥ.

In ll. 69, 70:

skyim-se-ḥdzar-dze-ḥbehi-la-ḥgar
thar-pyaṅ-hjo-dze-hphag-la-gnah
geog-ḥlde-ḥldu-dze-ḥbyig-la-gnah

the expression ḫphag-la-gnah, which patently means ‘a place for the hog’ (Tib. ḫphag, a word most widely represented in Tibeto-Burman languages), shows that the passage relates to the habitation 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 ḫgar, ‘gathered (encamped) apart’, cf. ḫgar, ‘camp’, is clearly reflected in the Nam ḫgar.

Elsewhere sheep are casually mentioned as skyibs-lug, ‘sheep of the skyibs’,\(^1\) which in the Dictionary is defined as ‘a place giving shelter (either in a rock, under a tree, roof or cavern)’, e.g. brag-skyibs, ‘a sheltering place under an overhanging rock or a projecting roof’, bha-h-skyibs, ‘a covered terrace or small portico before a house’, char-skyib, ‘shelter from rain’ (= char-kh'yi-m of one of the Tibetan manuscripts).

\(^1\) The phrase occurs also in a document cited in Inventaire des manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale, by Mdle Lalou, no. 239 (3).
Skyim-se will certainly be 'house-roof' = Tib. khaṅ-rtse, 'house-top'; for this se, = rtse, is found in the Tibetan manuscripts applied to both a mountain top and to a house-roof, and the same is seen in the Nam text, the se of a mountain being mentioned in ll. 14, 238–9, and the se of a house in

ḥce-hṣe-rgye-re-hrkas-hṭaṅ-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' (ḥrṇe-ḥo, ḥḍza-ḥtrog) in ll. 372, 376 (supra, p. 220), and being equivalent to Tib. ḥjar, which latter form also (scarce distinguishing in script) appears in l. 220. Hence skyim-se-ḥdzar means 'junction of roofs of (adjoining) houses', making in fact a skyibs. Here, therefore, we are thinking of houses in a town or village, as is also the case in l. 18 (ḥskyim-se).¹

With skyim-se-ḥdzar the thar-pyaṅ of the following verse is again associated in:

ḥṭar-phyaṅ-hṭo-re-skyim-hṣe-ḥdzar ||, 374.

In this passage hṭo can be = ḥṭo, 'high', thọ, l. 132 (Tib. mṭho), or thọ, 'boundary', which occurs in l. 109;² and we need not conceal a suspicion that in l. 69 also ḥjo is a miswriting (visually easy) of ḥṭo. The same hṭo = ḥṭo is possible in l. 210, and practically certain in l. 296, where g-ri-hṭo is parallel to ḥṛiḥi-hṛuḥu, l. 293.

It is, at any rate, clear that thar(ḥṭar)-pyaṅ(phyaṅ) is something connected with a dwelling; and the same is apparent in:

ḥgweg-hwhe-he-phah-hphah³-dże-hṭhar-phyaṅ-ge-hrub, 348–9

'The laughing spouses (? p. 343) rushed to the ḥṭhar-phyaṅ.'

Phyaṅ must denote something suspended or dangling (Tib. dpyaṅ/hphyaṅ; ḏphyaṅ, 'a hunter's nets', 'a lasso', ḏpyaṅ-dar, 'a silk scarf attached to temple pillars or to flag-poles'). Ḥṭhar is more likely to be = Tib. mṭhar, Locative of mṭab, 'end', than ḥṭar/ thar, 'get through', 'escape'. Ḥṭhar-phyaṅ might then be 'boundary [partitions of] suspended [felt]', such as may be seen in Tibet; but we might think of the oft-illustrated⁴ roof-cords of

---

¹ Cf. the 'terraced roofs [in Lhabrang] which meet over narrow alleys' (d'Ollone, In Forbidden China, p. 284).

² On ḥt = ḥṭh or th see p. 120.

³ ḥphah-hphah, 'laugh', otherwise unknown, is proved by the antithetic ḥṇu-ḥṇur, 'groan', of the preceding verse: it might perhaps be regarded as self-evident; but note the parallel khā-khe of Hörpa. On ḥgweg-hwhe, see p. 343. Ḥrub, which occurs in ll. 108, 261 (g-ṛub) will be = Tib. ṛub, 'rush in a body', ṛub-ṭe, 'altogether', W. Tibetan ᱣṛub, 'all'.

⁴ Rockhill, pp. 75–6 (description), Diāry, p. 132 (illustration); Futterer,
the nomad tents, which before being tethered pass over the tops of rods planted in the ground outside and so produce a quasi-wall. Probably, however, we are not here concerned with tents, but with houses more or less adjoining and with partitions such as we have indicated; and this is, in fact, involved in the juxtaposition of ḥtar-phyaḥ and skyim-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-hldc-hldu will be the meadow, since we know by direct testimony (supra, p. 132) that in Nam cog = Tib. spaḥ, ‘meadow’: cf. ḥtaḥ(thaḥ)-hldu, l. 14.

From all this it follows that the ḥbeḥi, whose place is the skyim-se-hdzar, is the sheep (skyibs-lug), while the ḥbyiq of the meadow (gcog = Tib. spaḥ) is the cow. But, in order to carry this through, we must steel ourselves in the face of some improbabilities. In Tibetan ba is the common word for the ox-species, and its Diminutive, behu, means ‘calf’. In Hsi-hsia the word for ‘sheep’ is ye (Laufer, No. 68), and the form appears to have some support in other Tibeto-Burman languages (Mo-so io, iu, &c.): in fact, we have already found this word in Nam 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 ḥbeḥi could be a ‘Diminutive’: in the Tibeto-Burman dialects there seem to be numerous forms, ma, mva, nca, which may go back to ba, a natural designation of ‘baa’-sheep.

As regards ḥbyiq, we note that Tibetan has, by the side of the generic ba and of glaḥ, ba-glaḥ, ‘bull’, for ‘cow’ ba-mo, ba-cu, and a number of forms, ḥjo and cognates, with which we shall have to deal infra (pp. 326–8). For cognates of Nam ḥbyiq, signifying ‘cow’, we may note in the Tibeto-Burman sphere a surprisingly large number of forms such as:

pi, pi, pit, pit, bik, bi, bi, bik, pui, pūi, muk, mûk, puck

(Linguistic Survey of India, i. ii, pp. 170–1)
i, pp. 281, 283, 336 (illustration); Filehne, Om Mani Padme Hum, pp. 145, 304 (illustrations).

1 See the illustration in d'Ollone, In Forbidden China (Tibet), p. 216.
2 For Hsi-fan cognates see supra, p. 94.
which may go back to an original big (or bwig) and which accordingly relieve us of any scruple in regard to Nam hbyig. ¹

The word hbyig does not recur; but hbehi is found in the phrases:

hra-hbehi-hbah-ge, 110
htseg-hra-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:

hra-hbah-ḥbu || 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 hra-hbehi-hbah signifies some oppressive occurrence: and, since hra may be = Hsi-hsia ro, ‘wolf’ (Lauffer, No. 25), while hbah in Tibetan can mean ‘seizure’, ‘distrain’, ‘carry off’, it is highly likely that:

hra-hbehi-hbah-ge = ‘wolves seizing, or oppressing, sheep’
htseg-hra-hbehi-hbar, ‘when wolf-packs (htseg = “collected”, htsogs, as elsewhere in the text) seize, or oppress, the sheep’.

In l. 47 (supra) ḫbu-hrug = Tib. mgo(= dbu, ‘head’) -rug, ‘head bowed down’. The same ḫbu, ‘head’, in Hsi-hsia ḥu (Lauffer, No. 103, where are given parallels in Mo-so, &c.), reappears in:

ḥdzam-ḥbroñ-hron-dze-ḥdam-to-ḥbu-ḥpor, 68
‘in tame-yak gorges the tied (animals) have their heads released’,

where ḫpor, applied to nu-glañ, ‘young oxen’, in ll. 175, 359 (phor) and with chi and ḥdro, ‘set free to go’, in ll. 183, 353, is = Tib. ḡbor, ‘let go’ (in the Tibetan manuscripts bor and ḫor;² cf. p. 319 infra).

There is no evidence that hwehi in any of its occurrences is identical with hbehi;

Usually it is the verb ‘do’ (g-ve, see p. 337). In:

ḥkułu-nehü-htshe-re-wehi-nehü-hrebe, 74
‘if the fresh ḥkułu (Tib. khu, ‘liquid’, ‘sap’, ‘broth’?) harms (goes bad ?), there is the fresh whet’

¹ It is curious that Chinese had an old word ‘b’yi (Karlsgren, No. 713) = ‘cow’.
² por also Inventaire des Manuscrits tibétains . . . by Mille Lalou, No. 67. 1.
it seems as if some liquid should be meant: and in:

hned-ge-slug-dze-hwehi-hsi-hpo ||, 47-8

it perishes (hsi-hpo) in some connexion with the process of tanning (hned). 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 (rnen, a form of Tib. mne, mned, ‘tan’, ‘rub’, mnen, ‘pliable’, ‘soft’, mnen-miel, ‘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:

hned-htram-htsah-glah-tab, 31

‘having a glah stiff (htram = Tib. tram, as p. 285 infra) to tan or knead.’

They were a ‘tough subject’. This interpretation is notably confirmed by the word glah, for which elsewhere1 we have to recognize the common meaning of Tib. gla, viz. ‘wage’; for we have Hörpa gla, Mänyak grah (Tóchhú rōpi ?), meaning ‘skin’, perhaps also Tib. gra, ‘awn’, ‘bristle’, gra-legs, ‘thick and glossy fur’.

21. gdzu, hdzu, gzü, hzu, hju, hjuñu; hrañ-hche; hgyan, hlkyan; hbyi; hkyud; hcañ, ca, hcha, cha; hðrab; hbrad; stor; hðor; meñi (hmeñi)-klu (hklu)-hcañ (hcha); kya-wa-ne, hkyañ-hwa-ñe, hkyañ-wa-ñe; hðrab-hwa(hwañ)-hrañ; khya, kya; kko; hpañ; hðom (hjü, ḍhguñu); hköñu-meñe; rma; gre; hldyo, hldyoho, ldyo; hkyu-hldnñ; rgyen; së; hti; hrwad; hbañ-prom; klag; hðzur; hwi-hwa; hram.

An identity of gdzu, gzü, hju, hdzu, hzu easily understood by reason of the pervading equivalence of the Prefixes g and h in the Nam text and of the very frequent confusion of dz and j in Tibetan script and pronunciation, and (slightly) surprising only by reason of the intrusion of z, which, as explained supra (p. 168), is very rare in Nam, is proved by the following parallels:

ste-gdzu-ge-lol, 194 = ste-he-hju-ge-geig, 356
hrañ-hche-hju-ge, 115 = rañ-hche-hzu, 117
hdzu-hdro-hphor, 183 = gzü-hdro-hphor, 353

1 e.g. in the glah-hlad, ‘return for wages’, &c., ll. 232-7, and perhaps gla-hdzos = Tib. gla-mi, ‘hireling’, ll. 29, 62, 73.
The Nam Language

**hgłyana** (i.e. **hlkyañ**-hse-ge-gzu-ḥbyi-hkyud, 307 = lkyañ-hzu-hrho-re-hña(hnañ)-ḥdro-mo, 188
gdu-ḥbyi-hnañ-re, 305, 308, 311.

In ll. 115, 117 the **hju**, **hzu** is called **hrañ-hche**, which must be = Tib. **rañ**, ‘self’;+**gces, ches, ‘dear’, ‘important’, ‘believe’, and clearly means ‘self-willed’, more especially as l. 117 continues:

**hrañ-hkah-khar-gsom**, ‘the three towns talking at will’.

In l. 307 the ‘wise’ **hgłyana** (‘capable’ **hlkyañ** in l. 188) are said to be of **gzu-ḥbyi** race (**hkyud** = Tib. **rgyud**, as in l. 220 and elsewhere: see pp. 214, 258); and this fact alone would be decisive, since the **hlkyañ** must be = **rkyañ**, the ‘wild ass’ of Tibet. The ‘self-willed character of the ass, **hju**, **hzu**, accounts probably for the word gzu-łum, ‘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 gduz, hduz, gzu, hzu, hju are the original Nam forms of the word zu certified as Nam, and as meaning ‘ass’, by the Tibetan translator mentioned above (p. 132), in the name cho-pyi-cog-zu, ‘Ass of the Meadow, Little Tiger’, and occurring elsewhere as zu-tsgog-zu, ‘Ass, Meadow Ass’. But we can also see that gdu-ḥbyi, gzu-ḥbyi, since Ḫbyi will appear elsewhere = Hsi-hsia dbhi/hbbe/hbhi, ‘small’ (Nevsky, No. 125; see infra, p. 265), is the genuine original form of cho-pyi, ‘Little Tiger’, so that gdu, in gdu-ḥbyi, properly means not ‘ass’ but ‘tiger’.

We have here, it seems, the explanation of the whole matter. For the Nam text actually has hjuhu (l. 312) with the signification ‘tiger’, or, at least, some clawing beast; and this is, perhaps, the Chinese *hu* (Ancient, ‘χου, Karlsgren, No. 87), or ü (Ancient *ngiu*, Karlsgren, No. 1284), having that meaning.1 The resemblance of the Chinese loan-word to the native Nam word, zu, žu, ju, or dzu, for ‘ass’, inspired the Nam people with the notion of a resemblance between the two creatures. And this resemblance is actually stated in the text:

hrañ-hche-hju-ge-hcañ-ḥtsañ, 115
‘self-willed asses are equal to hcañ (ravenous beasts).’

The kiang, or Wild Ass, though of ass race, is ‘wise’.

It is, however, possible that the word represented by the Tibetan writer’s cho is not the word for ‘tiger’, hjuhu, but this same hcañ, which also appears as cha, hcha: cf. za/zo, &c., p. 199. Line 71

---

1 The žu-brab of one of the Tibetan Manuscripts, denoting some unlucky cast in divination, is perhaps a ‘clawing tiger’.
speaks of ‘glaring’ ḡcha, and in ll. 235, 239, 240, 242, of the ca or ḡchas as requiring suppression in company with the yak; but ll. 202, 203 speak of its ‘horns’ (ḥru).

The word ḡcaḥ/cha, which is really nothing but the Tibetan verb ḡcaḥ, ‘snap at’, ‘mangle’, together with two other terms, namely ḡdraṇ and ḡbraṇ, 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 ḡcaḥ can be a common designation of all animals which ‘mawl’, ḡdraṇ of all animals which ‘snatch’ (ḥbraṇ), and ḡbraṇ 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 (stōr-ḥḍor-yon = Tib. stōr, ‘be lost’, ‘go astray’, cf. ḡthor, btor, gtor, ‘be strewn, dispersed, &c.’+dor/ ḡdor, ‘throw out’, ‘cast out’, ‘forsake’,+yon, on which see p. 199):

hdyan-lḥpu-ḥbri-re-mehi-klu-ḥcaḥ-yān-stor-ḥdor-hyon
kyu-lḥdoṅ-ṛno-re-kya-wa-ne-yān-stor-ḥdor-hyon ||
hdyo-ḥdom-nag-re-ḥdraṇ-hwa-hraṇ-yān-stor-ḥdor-hyon. ||

In ll. 339–40 and 343–4 the first two reappear:

hkyu-lḥdoṅ-ḥrṇo[-]ṛ[e]-ḥkyaḥ-hwa-ñe[-]ṛ[e]-ḥstor-ḥdehi-
hphyid ||, 339–40
hdyan-lḥpu-ḥbri-re-mehi-hklu-ḥcaḥ
srōṅ-ñe-gṣer-re-lḍan-[ḥdehi]-hphyid ||||, 343–4.

In ll. 214–15, 218, the ḡkya-wa-ñe, similarly described as ḡyul-ḥdoṅ-ḥrṇo, are said ḡṭshu-to-ḥphyan (‘had better come’?); and the ḡmehi-klu-ḥcaḥ, likewise described as ḡldyaḥ-ḥpu-ḥbri-re, have the great ḡkho for their ḡkho (‘ruler’?). In l. 150 the latter are again stated to have fled (stōr-ḥtāḥ-ḥtoni ||).

In connexion with the last group of passages we find mention of the ḡbraṇ:

hbehi-tyaṅ-rdeḥe-ge-hṣṭaḥ-ḥbraṇ-ḥrdaghi ||, 213–14
‘flocks (rde, see p. 270) of sheep and tyan repel (Tib. ḡdeg, “smite”) the hṣṭaḥ-ḥbraṇ’ (for the sense, cf. the lḥyos-stor . . . of l. 140, infra).
and these hbrad appear as ‘braves’ (hpah) in:

hbrad-re-hpah-yañ-hmañ-ge-hragm-hjiñh ||
hbrad-re-hpah-ge-hbrad-sta-hśid-re-hyä-hhdahd ||, 305-6.

Here immediately follow the hdom-hgu and the gdzu-hbyi; and with
the hdom-hguñ we find the hjuñu-hbrad in:

hdom-hguñ-rma[-]r[e]-hri-stah-mehi
hjüñu-hbrad-rma[-]r[e]-g-rista-mehi, 312-13.

In ll. 171-3 the hldyo-hdom-hñag of l. 162 are said to have talked
(hkoñu-hphrom-hto) and then apparently to have been deprived of
the ‘fire of speech’ (hkñu-méhe) ; 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.¹

To complete the story it has to be mentioned that:

ldyo-stor-hthus-re-hdrab-stor-htoño ||, 140
‘the ldyo being assembled in flight, the hdrab flee’.

The hjuñu-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 clawers’, and their hbrad-sta, ‘clawings’, are
noted. Their rma, which in ll. 312-13 render the mountains useless
(g-rista-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’ (hriñi-hragm-
gre, Tib. gre, ‘bear’). We can see then that the hldyo-hdom-nag
associated in l. 162 with the hbrab-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-
ñag it was hldyo, it follows that the hldyo in the second case means
some kind of ‘taking’ or ‘deprival’.²

¹ 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/hdral, hgrim/hbrim, hārid/hbrid); and in
the Nam there is perhaps some confusion of hārab (cf. brab, supra p. 253)
and brad.

² Concerning the great Tibetan bear, regarded as semi-human and in-
tensely dreaded—being the ‘abominable’ (which should be ‘carnivorous’,
geæn-geän) ‘snow-men’ of Himālayan explorers—reference may be made to
The *hkya-hwa-ñe* are regularly, we see, described as *ḥkyu-hldon-hrño*, which can reasonably be understood as ‘capable (hrño) of making off (Tib. ḥdon) with speed’ (Tib. ḏkyu, ḏkyus, ‘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 *hwai* will very likely mean ‘making’ (cf. ḥdraḥ-*hwai*, ‘snatch-making’ and see *infra*, p. 337), and *ñe* has, as we have seen (p. 222), the signification ‘injuring’, ‘bad’. Thus the *hkya-hwa-ñe* will be ‘crop-making-injury’ creatures, i.e. antelopes and other fugitive species which make war upon agriculture.

We come now to the *mehi-ḥklu-ḥcaḥ*, described as *ḥldyaḥ-ḥpu-hbri*. The description, in which *ḥpu-hbri* may, as shown *supra* (p. 217), but need not, mean ‘male and female’, involves the very difficult word *ḥldyaḥ* and may therefore be left for a later consideration (pp. 331–3). But *mehi-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 *mehi* 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:

*ḥldyaḥ-ḥpu-hbri-re-hmehi-klu-ḥcaḥ-dze-htor-ḥkho-geh-hkhoḥi ||, 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 *hmehi-klu-ḥcaḥ*, ‘the great *ḥkho* (= *ḥgo*), vultures) are *ḥkho* (chiefs)’. As regards the syllable *ḥcaḥ* added to *hmehi-klu*, it has previously (*JRAS*. 1939, p. 207) been suggested that it may be the pluralizing *tsa*, &c., found in other connexions (see p. 187). But, since that *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 hillsides, 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 *hec* which means ‘mangle’, ‘tear’.

The connexion of the *meb*-*hkl*-*hec* with the Nam country may explain why in ll. 343–4 it is said of him that:

sroñ-ñe-gsre-ldãn-*hec*-hpýid
‘being straightly (or straightly and evilly, øe) wise, he suffices as an ally (*ldãn-*hec*-hpýid),’

whereas in ll. 339–40 the fugitive *hkyab*-hwa-ñe ‘suffices as flying (*hstor-*hec*-hpýid),’ i.e. all he wants (or all that we want) is that he should get away, from the crops.

The word *ldyo*, attached to the black bear in the recurrent phrase *ldyo-*hdom-nag and identical, or punningly identified, with a *ldyo* 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 *hdrob* flee’:

the *ldyo-*hdom-nag are themselves *hdrob* (l. 162). In fact, the text itself in ll. 353–4 distinguishes a *ldyo-roho*, ‘*ldyo*-district’, from a *ldyo-*hro, ‘*ldyo*-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 *hec*-tyañ ... quoted supra (p. 253). In another passage:

*ldom-*hgu-htsuhu-hyañ-hmañ-*ldyo*-hrgam, 303–4

‘though the bears come, cattle in numbers (*hmañ-*ldyo)
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 *hdrob* and *hbrad*, but also understand the ‘taking’ and ‘depriving’: the ‘fire of speech’ was ‘snatched away’ (*hdrob*) from the *hdrob-*hwa-*hrañ*, but ‘milked out’ (*ldyo*) from the *ldyo-*hdom-*hnag*. That *ldyo*, in the form *ldyo*hu, 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:

*hnu[-r(e)-hna-hgye-na-hnu-*ldo-*ldyo*ho ||, 355
‘absence of weeping (Tib. *nu*, *nur*) being put in order
(“arranged” Tib. *yeṅ* or “being attended to”, “moving softly”, Tib. *g*-*yeṅ*), weeping was milked away’,
where ḍhī and ḍnāḥ are already known, as also the Abstract Suffix ḍldō; and ṛgyāṅ, 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 ḍhrvād, which in the two cases respectively ‘milked’ and ‘snatched away’ the fire of speech:

sli-ḥti-hrño[-r-e]-ḥkōhū-ṃeḥe-ḥldyo |||, 171–2
ḥrvido-ḥbaṅ-prm-yāṅ-hkōhū-me-hhrad, 172–3

so that the ḍldyo-ḥdom-ḥnag and ḍhrad-ḥwāḥ-ḥrāṅ have remained speechless. The ḍhrvād, who is ḍbaṅ-prm, i.e. ‘made powerful or master (Tib. ḍbaṅ)’, can readily be identified with Tib. ṛbaṅ, ‘a large species of eagle’, more especially since the next following verse reads:

klaṅ-ḥrvāṅ-ḥdzur-[re]-ḥwi-ḥweḥi-ḥtsag, 173

where klaṅ, which appears also in Tib. klaṅ-cor, ‘clamour’, ‘noise’, is the name (glaṅ) of ‘a bird resembling an eagle . . . : carries away kids and lambs. This bird is numerous in Mongolia, central Tibet, and Kham. Probably the lammergeyer.’ ṛbaṅ 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. ḍhzur, zūr, &c., “turn aside”, “a corner”, &c.), the mice or rats (Tib. byi-ba+hi, on which see p. 191) collect.’

The mice or rats (ḥwi-va) 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 ḍbeḥe, who may be sheep (p. 249). In the present passage they are ḍhti-hrño, ‘capable of, or acquainted with darkness or stopping (ḥti)’: in ll. 288, 318, they are ‘wise’; and in the former of these they have authority when the ḍrleṭi are accordant or pleased (ḥram) in supervision, whereas in the latter they ḍldyoṅ or ḍldyob (reading not quite certain) when the ḍrleṭi are ḍmor (‘bad’ or ‘stupid’) or ḍmo in supervision. If they were marmots, they would be taking a just revenge upon the bears, which feed upon them, but there is no philological support for this; if they were tortoises, that might explain their power of resting (ḥti), and the name might be connected with Hsi-hsia liṅ
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, hrta, rtaḥ, hṛtaḥ; hbron; rgyag, ḡcag-rgyag; rdzo; ḡkyud; ḡhrug; -ḥgu; ḡdgan/glidan-nag/gnag; ḡko-nag; ḡko, ḡkoḥo, ḡkoḥu, ḡko, ḡkho, ḡkhoḥ, ḡkhoḥu, ḡgo, ḡgo, ḡgor; ḡno (ḥko°, ḡkho°, ḡku°); ḡkus; ḡtoñ, gtoñ (ḡgo°, ḡrah°); ḡkaha-ḡgo; ḡraḥ; ḡraḥ, ra (skuḥu°, mehī°, ḡgo°); ḡbar; ḡwer; ḡnam; ḡtuñ; ḡpañ; ḡphañ (ḡ-ri°, ḡriḥi°).

That rta and ḡbron 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 ḡbron:

ḥtañ-ḥrdzo-ḥnio-[r[e]-ḥtor-ḥbron-ḥtsors, 219–20
thañ-ḥrdzo-ḥkyud-na-ḥbron-ḥdru-ḥjars, 220
must be the mdzo, the cross between the yak-bull and the cow. We see that he is placed in the than, or the upland plains, and is described as a ḡkyud, which word, in the form ḡyud, recurs, in company with ḡhrug (= Tib. ḡkhrug, ‘quarrel’, ‘quarrelsome’, as in ll. 18, 371) in:

ḥkrug-ḥrdzo-ḥgyud-dze-ḥrño-ḥyod-yod, 16

and is equivalent to Tib. ṛgyud, ‘race’ (see supra, pp. 214, 252).

In ll. 225–8 the rdzo receives successively the depreciatory epithets (see p. 215) mor-ḥgu, ṛrug-ḥgu, ḡbri-ḥgu, in which the syllable ḡgu, occurring also with ḡdom, ‘bear’, in the above-cited passages, ll. 303, 304, 312, is, of course, = the Tibetan ‘Diminutive’ Suffix seen in ḡyi-ḡu, ‘puppy’, &c. It is possible that in ll. 225–8 the term rdzo is being contemptuously applied to the ḡbron, who is there the real, or main, object of denunciation.

Have we in the text any equivalent of Tib. ṛyag/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 ṛyag is a Nam form of ṛyag/byag, which on the analogy of ṛbyo = 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 ṛyag are, in fact, not encouraging. For in l. 89 (p. 321) the phrase ḡsom-ṛyag-ḥsor 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-bris (= Tib. bris/ris)-dze-hño-sto-ge-rdo-re-cis-tsha-hbyihi, 83–4*

'when, with *hcag-rgyag*-diminished, friends dare, deserters (?) (HCI, GHC, '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-hýu-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-hldan-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 (*gmoag*), 130, 132, 134, 135, there is mention of a *hldag-nag*, in l. 136 *gldag-nag*. Line 130:

*hthañ-rdz-o-hño[-]-r[e]-hldag-nag-htáshors*

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 'Mañ-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. *naq*, '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 (l. 45, 52) the same word hldag/gldag occurs with the meaning ‘load’ (Tib. ltań, 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:
Lehpos-lehyā-ge-hdro-hko-ṇag, 266-7
‘With the big man in front (at the head) go the hko-nag’.

For hko-nag will be the famous expression ‘black-head’, denoting the ‘common people’, especially (and perhaps originally) of China, and occurring in the form mgo-nag in a Tibetan text (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 279, = JRAS. 1931, p. 819).\(^1\)

Hgo, = mgo, also, occurs in the manuscripts.


(a) mgo, ‘head’, has been recognized in hko-nag: see also (e).

(b) go/ko, the Particle, has been recognized (p. 201) in hlda-hko, l. 195, and is possible in hbrī-hko, ll. 156, 202, 203, and the parallel hwī-hkho, l. 336.

(c) hko = go, ‘place’, ‘room’, is evident in:
Lehpos-lehwī-ḥtūḥu, 100, ‘assembled, making room’
by reason Tib. go-byed, ‘making room’. See also (e).

(d) hko = sgo, ‘gate’, is apparent in:
Lehpos-leṣgij-ṛdaṇ-ge-hkο-ḥtōn-modhī, 211-12.
It is, however, only a miswriting, since hgo-gtoṅ occurs in the next preceding line: see (e). The hko of hko-hṭar, ll. 68, 371, 373, 386, 390, may be the same as in hko-hṭoṅ.

\(^1\) Applied to Tibetan common people, it may be seen in a document quoted by Mdlle Lalou, Inventaire—, p. 6, No. 16, f. 34; also in the Lha-sa stone inscriptions (ed. Waddell, JRAS. 1910, p. 1276, A, l. 10, and p. 1277, B, l. 13). In the Rgyal-ritoṅ it is still in use (see Tafel, ii, pp. 227, 229).
(e) ḡgo = sgo ?, ‘gate’, is apparent, though go, ‘place’ is not impossible, in:

rgyed-htso-dro-ho, ‘rgyed comes to the htso’
\[ \text{rgyed \text{-} hdro,} \quad \text{‘gate’} \]
\[ \text{hdro,} \quad \text{‘house’} \]

ḥdyau-hṭo-hṭo-ṅ-ḡo-gṭoṅ-mod, 210–11
‘the high wall (?) being surrendered, the gate or place is surrendered’ (ḥṭoṅ/gṭoṅ, = Tib. ‘send’, ‘admit’, ‘give up’, sgo-nas-gṭoṅ-ḥa, ‘admit through the door’)

phye-ḡo-hṭhuṅ-re-ḥnam-hḍẓam-hṭar, 145–6
‘when there is a small (Tib. thun) open space, the tame-hearted makes his escape (Tib. thar).’

In the phrase ḡo-gṭoṅ the meaning of gṭoṅ is guaranteed by the parallel ḥraḥ-hṭoṅ, ‘place surrendering’, in ll. 146 (with ‘army’), 273 (with ‘enemy’), 358, na-ṛom-hṭoṅ, ‘leave vacant place’, l. 100; while in ll. 119, 190, the sense of ‘let go’, ‘emit’, appears:

ḥraḥ-hṭoṅ-gṣoḥu-dze-rṇe-ḡo ||, 358
‘When place-abandoners survive, the bad (cowards?) are the means’ (or, with ḡo = ‘head’, ‘with place-abandoning survivors the bad are leaders’).

It is, however, conceivable that in these passages ḡo 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:

rāb-ḡo-cig-dze, 376, ‘when the approach to the ford (rāb) is destroyed (?).’

The same sense, ‘gate’ or ‘place’, is apparent in ll. 46 (ḡo ḡpo), 261 (g-rub-ḡoḥo), 369 (ḡo-ḥdzin): ḥkvaṅ-ḡo, l. 212, is obscure (reading uncertain).

In ḥkāh-ḡo, l. 105, though it occurs in the vicinity of a ḡo, ‘gate’, the Tibetan kha-bsgo, ‘advice’, which suits the context, is in favour of Tib. bsgo.

Ḡo, ‘vulture’, may with probability be recognized in:

ḥsas-ḥdraḥ-ḥdag-chi-ḡo-ḥsor-re-hyūn, 260
‘children with (ḥdag, “possessed of”) nets (Tib. dra) spent their time (yun) hunting (Tib. bsor, byeḥu-ṣor, “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:

\[ g\text{-}r\text{ah-}h\text{sah-}h\text{khebe} \ || \ na \ || \ h\text{nor-}h\text{dzan-}r\text{go-}h\text{t}h\text{o} \ || \ r\text{go-}h\text{rah-}h\text{nor-[re-]}h\text{dzan-}h\text{yah-}h\text{t}h\text{o} \ ||, \ 314-15 \]

'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 *hraḥ, ra*, 'enclosed place', as in Tib. *sغو-رَا-بَا*, 'door-keeper', 'door-guard', is guaranteed by the *sغو-رَا*, *sku-را*, 'door-guard', 'own person', of the Tibetan manuscripts, while the Nam text has probably *sغو-رَا* (l. 6) in the Tibetan sense and also *mех-را*, ll. 78, 186, 369, 'eye-horizon', in the sense of 'sentinel'.

The same *rgo* is probable in:

\[ h\text{tsog-}h\text{ram-}h\text{nah-}t\text{se-}h\text{tor-}h\text{i-}r\text{go} \ ||, \ 120 \]

'When *htsog-ḥram* sickens, it is a great gate of death'

\[ s\text{e-}r\text{go-}h\text{l\text{dom-}dze-}h\text{pah-}h\text{rgam-}h\text{nam} \ ||, \ 258-9 \]

'When the wise have their doors shut, the community of heroes declines (Tib. *nams*)'

and clearly also in the antithesis:

\[ r\text{gor} (= \text{Tib. *hgor*) ... } h\text{bar} (= \text{Tib. *bar*) ... } r\text{wer, 96-7} \]

'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(hkho)-rño*. In that case the *hko(hkho)* might be connected with Tib. *hkho/mkho*, 'think, or be, of use, necessary', *hkhos*, 'value', 'importance', 'necessity', 'usefulness'.

Outside the compound *hko(hkho)-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, *stog*, l. 141; *huvo*, 'make', 'do', ll. 116, 269, 335; *ldon*, *hldon*, 'go', 'depart', ll. 161, 214, 369; *hkog*, l. 189; *hyog*, *g-yog*, 'serve', 'help', ll. 156, 289, 322.

These facts would favour in *hko(hkho)-rño* a verbal meaning of the
hko(hkho); and the Verb hkho in the sense of 'be of use' would be suitable.

It cannot, however, be said that that meaning of hko(hkho)-rho is everywhere satisfactory. In:

rbyo-hko-rho-dze, 53, 'under a capable rbyo' (cf. 56)
hko-rho-ge-hco, 55, 'the capable are leaders'
hko-rho-hyab-ge, 272, 'with the capable in the van'

that meaning might suffice. And in:

hko-rho-hce-dze, 53-4, 54-5,

we might understand hko-rho as a Noun, 'ability' ('of great ability'), or take the hce adverbially = 'greatly'. But in some of these cases we might prefer the signification 'leader' or 'master', e.g. in:

stor-hkho-hrho-re, 189, 'when the master is lost',

and in:

hko-rho-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:

hkhar-hrpag-g-yar-re-stor-moñ-hjono-re
re-hmoñ-hjono-re-hldag-gnag-hkho ho ||, 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:

htor-hbroñ-hkho ho . . . htor-hkho-ge-hkho hi
'The great Yak is chief . . . the great is chief'

since, as we have seen, the great Yak is identical with the 'black-back'.

Perhaps this sense of hkho accounts also for hri-hkho, ll. 291, 295, 'hill-top', more especially as in ll. 290-1, it is contrasted with g-ri-hpan, 'hill-bosom' (side), recurring in ll. 302 (hrihi-kphañ), 308.1

1 Cf. Tib. ri-kha, p. 132, supra.
Hku-rho in g-we-hku-rho, l. 152, has been interpreted above (p. 228) as a different expression, containing a Verb hku, 'desire': cf. hkus, l. 352.

(h) Still a further hkoho, for which Tibetan supplies no etymology, occurs in l. 101, where it is equivalent to the very common hkohu/hkohu, 'speak', 'speech'. It has been suggested (JRAS. 1939, p. 206, n. 1) that this is Chinese k'ou, 'mouth', 'speech': and this is strongly supported by the phrase htab-hkohu-hkohu, ll. 292, 295 (p. 298), 'answer-speaking-speaking', i.e. conversing, in which htab will be = Chinese ta (Ancient tap, Karlgren, No. 954), which in Tibetan script occurs many times as tab.

(i) In case the phrase hkoho-hkho-bphyag, l. 101, should signify 'saluted (Tib. phyag, "salutation")' with a view to speaking', the same hkho would be possible in:

hsehe-hkoho (327, hkho-ho)-hgyan-re-hlab-hkho-hgyan ||, 325 'harms as cause were the cause of telling (sc. the narrative)'
and the hkhoh-hlab, l. 328, or hkho-hdal, l. 329, which were 'restrained', or 'damned' (hdam), like the hse-hlab, 'inj urings', l. 326, might be 'causings' or 'causers'. This might bring in the well-known Chinese word ko, 'cause': but perhaps we can work with Tib. hgo, 'beginning', hgyan being obscure.

(j) Doubtful is hko in 67 (hko-se-hgro), 123 (hsi-hwa-hko, 'only', 'verily' ?), 125 (hldan-kranh-hko, 'only'?), 390 (hko-hto-swad); also hkh in 209 (hkh-o-hsa-n, 'chief'), 241 (hno-rgam-hko-re), 295 (hno-hkho-hsog-ge), 217 (hko-sne). See hko/hkho in Vocabulary.

23. hri, g-ri, hrihi, g-rihi; mehi, hdo-, hro-, hswa-, g-ri; hri-ho, *hko, *hpa (hpa), *hru, u-hru, hgru, hto, tho; spo; hsehe; sti; thi; hyor; g-yog; gras; hgras; hras; hrde; hcad; hci; tho-rgyam; hku; hbu-rwe(rbye); hsa-n-ma; hmar; hbb; hro; hka; hdo; hdzam-hbrun; hbo; hro; la; hla; la-po; gda; hdu; (2) hro; gr-o; hyed; hde; htswe; tsweh; g-ri-ta; hta = hthn; mu-hro; hna-hlam; glo-hra-n; rgyen; hrgya-n.

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 (gtseg)-ri, 'peaked mountains', gyud = rgyud, 'ridges', ri-rin-po, 'long or high mountains', of dbyar-che, 'wide expanses', hphra-n-rub, (probably) 'precipice ledges', ri-bzur-te-bzur, 'mountains winding, winding', and so forth.
In the Nam text we have had śid(ḥsid)-ḥriḥi(g-ri) ‘high mountains’ (ll. 34, 62), ḥbos-ḥriḥi(g-ri), ‘big mountains’ (ll. 290, 291, 293), man-ḥri (ḥriḥi, g-ri) ‘large mountains’ (ll. 302, 308, 309); in l. 168 occurs ḥbyi-ḥri, which ought to mean ‘small (see p. 252) mountains’, and probably does so mean. In:

ḥdoṅ-ḥri-hldyaṅ-ge-spo-hpod-pod
hraṅ-ḥri-hldyaṅ-[ge-]hseḥe-hwad-hwad, 13–14

the ḥdoṅ-ḥri are contrasted with the ḥraṅ-ḥri, and the spo, which cannot be different from Tib. spo, ‘summit of a mountain’, with the hseḥe, which likewise = Tib. rtse, ‘top’, ‘peak’, ‘summit of a mountain’, ‘house-roof’, &c. The ḥraṅ-ḥri are evidently the ‘self (i.e. by themselves, solitary, single) mountains’, since ḥraṅ = ‘self’, Tib. raṅ, pervades the text. The ḥdoṅ-ḥri are probably not the ‘trench, hole, pit, crater (Tib. doṅ) mountains’, but rather the ‘face (Tib. gdoṅ/mdoṅs), i.e. contoured, mountains’, since the Tibetans shared the universal tendency to see faces, heads, &c., in mountain ridges.

The mebi-g-ri-ḥtah contrasted with śid-g-ri-ḥtor in:

mehi-g-ri-ḥtah-dze-rtah-ḥtsoṅ-ḥram, 35

is, no doubt, the ‘border of the fire-mountain’,¹ volcanoes being known in northern Tibet: and the fact that the horse’s original capital is placed near a (heavenly?) fire-mountain may explain the references to ‘great heat’ (dgu-ḥtor, dgu-hldo, ll. 78, 139, 191) in connexion with the fall of the ‘Moṅ-castle’ and the earthquake.

As regards the parts of mountains, the ḥriḥkho; ‘mountain-top’ (Tib. ri-kha) and ḥriḥi(g-ri, &c.)-ḥpāṅ(ḥpāṅ), ‘mountain’s bosom or lap’, have been mentioned supra (p. 263). The ‘mountain’s-horn’ (g-ri-hruṭu, l. 21, ḥriḥi-hruṭu, l. 293, Tib. ru ‘horn’) is an expression perhaps not found in Tibetan, though an ‘Ox-horn’ (Glaṅ-ru) mountain is known.

The passage (ll. 299–301):

ḥṣe-hṣe-hldoṅ-hcaṅ-g-ri-sti-hyor-re
ḥrī-hṇo-hdzoṅ-g-yog-re-rgyaṅ-ge-ḥriḥi-sti-hyor-re ||
ḥrim-hldoḥu-ḥṣan-hyaṅ-ḥrī-hgru-gras-re-ḥrī-hci-hwadḥi ||

mentions the g-ri(ḥriḥi)-sti-hyor, the ḥrī-hṇo, and the ḥrī-hgru. The hyor must be = Tib. yor, seen in tho-yor, ‘pyramid of stones heaped up as a votive pile, a cairn’ (tho meaning

¹ It could, however, be ‘eye(se. sentinel-post)-mountain’, the ḥataḥ-ḥri of ll. 290, 293, the hwaṅ-g-ri of l. 296: see p. 278 and l. 186 hldyaṅ-g-ri ... mehi-ḥrah.
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'boundary', cf. mtshams-tho), i.e. the oft-illustrated obo (Tib. lab-rtse, for la-rtse?) of modern travellers. It might seem to follow that sti is the top of a pass or the like; but the meaning 'rest', found in Tib. sti/bsti/hthi (sti-bahi-gnas, 'resting-place') and in the hiti of the Nam text, is, no doubt, right, since such obo points are inevitable resting-places. In contrast we have the hri-hno-hdzon-g-yog, i.e. 'the castle (hdzon) below (g-yog) on the mountain side or slope (hno = Tib. nos'), whose walls, perhaps (hrgya = Tib. rgya, 'wall'), or which, stretching (Tib. rgya), act as a rest-obos. Then the hri-hgru, 'mountain corners' (Tib. gru, 'corner', 'angle'), i.e. projecting points (cf. gru-bzi, 'square'), or else 'recesses', being aligned (gras = hgras, l. 10, 'aligned in battle', hras, l. 344, Tib. hgras, 'difference between two parties', gra, 'proper order or arrangement', dgra, 'enemy') keep watch (hweed) upon those who come (hci = Tib. mchi, 'come', 'go', = Hsi-hsia gee, gceh, Nevsky, No. 144, see pp. 269, 332) to or on the mountain.

The watch (hweed = Tib. hbad, hbod) on the mountain heights is extended in l. 109 to the tho-rgyam, 'boundary slabs': in l. 6 it is, it seems, used metaphorically of fires (mye-hyan-hweed); and in a line quoted supra (hsehe-hweed-hweed) of the summits themselves; nor is it to be doubted that in hweed-hlda-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-hweed, '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-ron it is, quite regularly, pra-khi, 'cave'; and in the dialects collected by the Vicomte d'Ollone

1 Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 274: 11, 361. 1, &c.
2 See Prejvalsky, 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'Ollonne, pp. 225–6; Tafel, ii, Pl. lix; Filehner, Om Mani Padme Hum, frontispiece.
3 pra-kha, 'precipice'.

it is tchra-tcho (No. 36), tcha-kon (No. 40), haguen (No. 41, Go-lok), huëki (No. 42, Go-lok), tchra, tcha, being stated to mean 'rock' (= Tib. brag). The word hkuṅ is also used of a ruined 'Moṅ-building' (ḥrtsig-moṅ) in l. 380, and then, l. 382, of friendship (ḥdzaḥ-hldah), or friends, become 'hollow'. This metaphor is applied, moreover (l. 124), to ḡlāṇ-kraṇ.

Also connected with mountains are the ḡbu-rwyé-hce-rgyāṅ of the passage:

\[
\text{ḡyog-ḥsāṅ-ma-hpul-dze-hmar-hbab-ge-ḥrloḥo} \parallel \text{ḡbu-rwyé-hce-rgyāṅ-dze-hldyo-hṭor-ge-hnus} \parallel, 15–16
\]

a passage immediately following the verses concerning the ḡdoṅ-hri and ḡraṅ-hri: in ll. 50–1 the passage, with the lines inverted and with ḡrab for ḡrloḥo, ḡrbye for rwyé, and ḡṭor-ge-hnus, is repeated. Rwyé-hce, ḡrbye-hce, can at once be identified with the ḡbye-che of a Tibetan text, the additional rgyāṅ forming with hce a recurrent phrase = 'of great extent': the Tibetan ḡbye = 'plain', 'expansive', 'extent'. Then ḡbu will be = Tib. ḡhu, 'the upper part (opposite of ḡdah) of a sloping valley', 'the higher ground', being the ḡu-ḍaṅ-ḍaṅ, 'up-vales rising, rising', of the Tibetan manuscript. The form ḡbu (elsewhere meaning 'head', and etymologically connected, no doubt, with ḡhu), does not create a difficulty, seeing that in the Tibetan manuscripts we find a fair number of cases (byi, dog, gaṅ, &c.) of media in place of aspirate and some (pho, ḡhu, &c.) of the converse.

With this ḡbu are contrasted the ḡ-yog (Tib. yag/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 ḡ-yog are 'brimming with filth (Tib. gsāṅ-ba/bṣāṅ-ba: in the Berlin fragment saṅ-ma)', so, mud, and that they have ḡmar-hbab, 'cascades', is due to the world-cataclysm. ḡrloḥo, hldyo-hṭor, and ḡnus may be reserved: likewise the expressions ḡ-rī-hkruṅu-hбро, l. 313 = ḡṛ-hkruṅu-hбро, l. 294, gyaṅ-g-ṛi-hjim, ll. 313–14, ḡtsaḥ-hriḥi, ll. 290, 294 (ḥri) = ḡscaḥ-hyer-hṛi, ll. 296–7.

In l. 296, ḡswaḥ-g-ṛi-hṭo-na, ḡṭo is probably = Tib. mṭo, 'high' (see supra, p. 248), while ḡswaḥ has a relation to ḡtsaḥ/ḥscaḥ, to be discussed infra (pp. 276 sqq.).

G-ṛi-ta, in l. 157, is entirely different and means 'payment', 'price' = Tib. ri-ba.

The word ḡroṅ so patently = Tib. roṅ, 'defile', 'gorge', on
which see pp. 5–6, that it is unnecessary to discuss the matter. But in:

\begin{align*}
  & \text{hbañ-re-hko-htar-dze-hna-hlam-glo-hrañ} \
  & \text{hdzam-hbroñ-hroñ-dze-hdam-to-hbu-hpor}, 67–8
\end{align*}

we have two phrases, \text{hbañ-re-hko-htar} and \text{hdzam-hbroñ-hroñ}, which both recur several times (ll. 371, 373, 384, 386, 388, 390), and in ll. 373–4:

\begin{align*}
  & \text{hdzam-hbroñ-hroñ-re-hbañ-hko-htar-dze-hkad-hroñ-re-rgyen}
\end{align*}

are accompanied by a third phase, \text{hkad-hroñ-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 S. C. Das’s \text{Tibetan Dictionary} (s.v. \text{khuñ-tshag}) we learn that the Tibetans have phrases, \text{khuñ-tshag} and \text{ri-tshag}, denoting respectively ‘yak of the valley’ and ‘hill-yak belonging to the higher elevations and hill-tops of Tibet’. A ‘tame-yak gorge’ is therefore a general term for a kind of valley, namely one opening out into spaces where the tame yak is employed. The statement ‘each \text{hkad} gorge is uphill or steep’ (\text{rgyen}, cf. Tib. \text{gyen-du}, ‘uphill’, \text{gyen-gzar-po}, ‘steep ascent’, &c.) connects with Tib. \text{gad}, ‘rock’, \text{gad-pa}, ‘a precipitous cliff of conglomerate such as often walls in the mountain rivers’, ‘a wide crack in a conglomerate rock’, \text{gad-skyibs}, ‘a rock cavern’, \text{gad-rgyal}, ‘the walls of conglomerate rock through which mountain-torrents have cut their way’, \text{gad-phug}, ‘a cavern or cleft in a conglomerate rock’. A place near to Hgru-gu monastery in Amdo, by name \text{Ka-droñ} (i.e. \text{Kad-roñ}) is mentioned in the \text{Geografia Tibet}a, p. 54.

The expression ‘each \text{hkad} gorge is uphill’ (\text{rgyen} sometimes takes on the sense of ‘difficult’) shows that the Nam author prefers the lower valleys; and this accords with the statement \text{hna-hlam-glo-hrañ}, ‘the home path (Tib. \text{lam}) is spirit-joyous (Tib. \text{rañ})’. It may help in the interpretation of \text{hbañ-re-hko-htar-dze}, when we shall have decided between the possible meanings of \text{hbañ}.

With \text{hroñ}, ‘gorge’, ‘valley’, quite unconnected is the \text{g-roñ} of:

\begin{align*}
  & \text{hde-me-htah-g-roñ-hyed-ge-ta}, 71 \\
  & \text{‘fires of prosperity, diffusing g-roñ’}
\end{align*}

\text{Hyed}, elsewhere, ll. 53, 393, used of emitting fire (\text{me/sme}), in the second instance a metaphorical ‘fire of hate’ (\text{hšañ-sme}), here diffuses \text{g-roñ}, which may accordingly be = Tib. \text{groñ}, ‘cold’; and
this will suit the context, since the 'fires' in question are failing.
It is, however, conceivable that *g-roṅ* here = Tib. *groṅ*, 'die',
'death'; the fires are 'expiring'. Though in this passage 'cold' is
more apposite, the signification 'death' is acceptable in:

śes-hmad-hdzwehe-re-ḥpaḥ-hroṅ-hkhes, 36
'when the wisdom-low ḥdzwe, the brave gain death.'

But even here the meaning 'the brave are chilled' is supported by:

śes-hmad-hdzwe-dze-myag-mye-ḥtaṅ ||, 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-hyaṅ-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/hdzwe*, which, if it
meant 'play', 'sport', might be = Tib. *rtse/rtsed*, and, since in
eastern Tibet *tshe* and *khyi* (cf. p. 299 and Jaeschke Berlin Academy
*Monatsbericht*, 1865, p. 443), might also be = Hsi-hsia *mkhhe*
/mkhwe, 'play' (Nevsky, No. 73). The same signification would
suit the *tswehku* of l. 196 (p. 245).

Clearly antithetic to *ḥroṅ*, 'gorge', is the *ḥlah* of:

hbo-ḥroṅ-brog-re-ḥlah-hkyaṅ-ḥras-re-hśes-hśi-ḥdzuḥi ||, 344-5

'the wooded gorge being a torrent (Tib. *grog*), the passes
(*ḥlah*) also lined by the enemy (on *ḥras*, *ḥbras*, see p. 266),
the wise evades\(^1\) (?) death.'

This *ḥlah* is evidently = Tib. *la*, 'pass', and it is so spelled in the
following line:

rgyeb-ḥchi-ḥro-re-gdag-yaṅ-la-por-hśes-hśi-ḥdzuḥi ||, 345.

'if there is a place for going back, though the high pass is
conspicious (*gdags*) or occupied, the wise evades death.'

Here *la-po* = Tib. *la-po* (i.e. *ṭho*), 'a pass over a lofty mountain;
also a high peak'. On *gdags*, 'bright', as applied to mountains,

\(^1\) '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 ... lgyoho-ge-htañ-mu-hro ||, 10–11.

The reading is partly obscured in the manuscript, and the meaning of lgyoho is unknown.

The passage, ll. 301–14, is concerned, as has already appeared, with animal species occupying the mountains. It begins:

hrtañ-swa-g-we[-]r[e]-g-ri-hrde-hldañ ||, 301

'While the horse is doing swa, the mountain is possessed of hrde.'

This hrde is likely to be identical with rdehe of:

hhbei-tyan-rdehe-ge, 213

where hhbei is a word found elsewhere signifying 'sheep'. If rdehe = 'flock', 'troop', it will be, in sense as well as in form, = Tib. sde, 'class', 'community', 'race', 'tribe' (sde-bryad, 'eight classes [of demons]', &c.), Hsi-hsia gde, gdeh (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-hpañña
dgu-hldo-htor-ge-hmañ-g-rihi-hkuñ ||
hmu-wa-riho-ge-hgah-hldoñ-hkyud ||

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. khuñ, '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 kkhu:

hrñe-hldah-hrof[-]re-hmañ-hkhu-stañ ||, 303

'there being hostile wolves (hro ?), the great kkhu (?) = Tib. spyañ-ku (and 'khu) 'wolf' are at the top.'

Then come the bears (hdom and hgre(gre)), the gzu-hbyi, 'little tigers' = asses, and the hgyañ (= 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 (bri/g-ri’/g-ri’i), the mountain is (practically) ‘not there (sta(sta’h)-mehi’.

24. gñim, gñi, ḡû; ḡû, ḡûs; ḡû-ʰtor, ḡtsa; sñi; rñi; mog, hmog, gmog; rgya-ʰni-ke, ḡryah-ʰni-hke (hkehe); ḡryah, ṭgyah; ḡkor; ke, ḡke; ḡjo, ḡjo’oh, ḡdzoho; ḡlab; ḡla, lâh; ḡtsg; ḡtog, ḡtshog; ḡchos; ḡdub; skar; mu; rmu.

Gñim, probably meaning ‘day’ (Tib. ʰni) and conjoined with ḡti, = ‘darkness’, has already (p. 236) been noted. And this renders it probable that in:

\[\text{rta-ʰso-ʰna’-ya’-gñi-ʰrdzum-ḍo} \text{ho} \parallel, 80\]

\[\text{gñi = Tib. ʰni-ma} \text{ (sometimes gñí’, ‘the sun’; ‘the sun smiled’, ḡrdzum)}; \text{ for the verse states that ‘when a good (?) man perishes, an inferior man rises’ (supra, p. 227), and in ll. 81–2:}\]

\[\text{ḥsa’-re-ʰšig-dze-ʰmog-re-ḥldoñ,}\]

‘when all hostility perishes, every cloud (hmog)\(^1\) departs.’

That \text{mog/hmog/gmog} means ‘cloud’ is indicated by antithesis to ‘fire’ (mye) in:

\[\ldots \text{mog-ʰtswe-re-myé-ʰya’-hwa’d} \parallel, 6\]

‘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’ ṭmûkha, ‘cloud’, mug, ‘(mental) gloom’ (gni-mug, yid-mug, &c.), mun, ‘darkness’; and then also with mog, ‘dark-colour’, and further with rmoṅ, ‘be obscured’, ‘puzzled’, rmoṅs, ‘deluded’, ‘delusion’; as a translation of Sanskrit megha, ‘cloud’, it is probably to be seen in the name of the retreat Ńam-Kan-mog’ (mahâ-megha), in the Ṣa-cu region, mentioned in Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, pp. 365, 367; and perhaps Lo-lo mow, is the same word.

Accordingly in:

\[\text{hmog-hce-rgya’-rgya-ʰni-ke-ʰkor-[re-]ḥśid, 52–3}\]

‘Clouds of great extent perish (ḥśid)—when the rgya-ʰni-ke ḡkor’

we suspect that ḡû has to do with the sun, more especially as in l. 199 we find the spelling rgya-ʰni-ke. This expression, with

\(^1\) Hence we may neglect the possibility that gñi-ʾrdzum means ‘had their eyes closed’ (Tib. ḡdzum = ḡdzum, ‘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-hni-ke,* being a whole, might have other explanations; and the syllable *hni* might, for instance, be connected with *Tib. gnis,* *nis,* ‘two’, which we have found in the form *snī.* We might then see in the *ke* a suffix, akin perhaps to *Tib. ka* in *gnis-ka,* *gni-ga,* ‘the two’, *gsum-ka,* ‘the three’, *lha-ka,* ‘all five’, &c., cf. p. 241. This would yield a quite natural compound, ‘the two *rgyas,*’ and perhaps the same *ke* may be seen in *na-hke,* ‘the five’ (?), l. 54: see p. 203. The numerous meanings of *rgya* in Tibetan (‘seal’, ‘mark’; ‘animal of the deer class’; ‘net’, ‘trap’; ‘extent’, ‘size’, ‘plain country’; ‘Chinaman’; ‘useful’; ‘steel-yard’; ‘beard’), some of them requiring particular suffixes, cannot prevent our inclining to the meaning ‘plain’, ‘extent’, which in Tibetan is the most familiar and which suits the phrase *hrgyah-hdihi-htron-re,* ‘travelling to this plain country’, in l. 327, *hgyah-hnah-tsur,* l. 391. This idea of ‘plane surface’ takes in the Tibetan phrase *nī-zlañ-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-hni-ke* denotes the sun and moon.

Who (apparently some living creatures) are the *hni-htor* of l. 187 is obscure: they are likely to be the *htor-hni-htsa-ge,* over whom the Great Yak becomes lord in:

*hitor-hni-htsa-ge-htor-hbroñ-hkhoño, 215-16* and probably not the *tor-sní* of the *thañ* fields:


*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’ (*hdro-ḥjar,* see p. 369). Further, the Tibetan manuscripts refer to *Snī* mountains in the Skyi country.

But a Verb *hní,* probably connected with *nī-ma,* ‘sun’, and meaning ‘shine’, may be seen in:

*ḥjo-me-hdub-re-ḥlab-ma-hñi,* 67

‘When the *ḥjo* fire sinks,’ the *ḥlab* does not shine’

---

1 In the Tibetan Manuscript *ḥdub* seems to be Preterite of *ḥdub* (usually ‘be fatigued’) in this sense, which usually is expressed by *nub.*
which seems to be directly contradicted by:

ḥjo-me-hdub-re-hlab (possibly ḡla)-me-hnīs ||, 70

‘When the ḡjo fire sinks, the hlab(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 ḡjo/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-hge-dze-ḥla(l. 75 ḡla)-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-hṭaḥ-g-roṅ-ḥyed-ge-ta-ḥwa-ste-hṭaḥ ||, 71–2

‘the fires of prosperity, making cold emissions, are exhausted’,

and because in l. 75 it is said that:

ḥwa-ste-hgeḥe-dze-dgu-ḥṭor-ḥbyi

‘with exhausted good fortune the great heat [becomes] small’.

Thus for ‘moon’ we have ḡla, laḥ; 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, hlo-bo, &c., which may not be loan-words from Tibetan. But nothing would justify a monosyllabic hlab, for ḡla-ba, in Nam or the related languages; and the hlab of the text could be explained only as a scriptural miswriting, not indeed unparalleled in the manuscript, of b in place of ḡ in a form ḡlaḥ. Even so, it would be difficult to discover either in Tibeto-Burman or in Chinese (jiḥ, in old Tibetan script žir) an etymology for a ḡjo, jo, = ‘sun’. We must therefore seek a different antithesis.

With the signification ‘chieftain’ (Tib. jo/co/gtso, &c.) ḡjo is evident in:

myi-rgye-mye[-r(e)-ḥchos-hyo-hjo, 153–4

‘if there is no great man, the initiator is the chief’

where ḡchos, which in ll. 158–9 also means ‘beginning’ (+ḥyo, ‘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:

\(\text{ḥyaṅ-tsa-hjo-dze-ḥyaṅ-ge-ḥgroms, 63–4}\)

'under the good as chiefs the good flourish (ḥkroms)'

\(\text{trog-hjo-rñe-dze-pyi-rjes-ne-ḥeer, 201–2}\)

'under an evil enemy chief a memorial looks terrible to the good'

\(\text{ḥphaḥ-ma-raḥ-ge-ḥtsah-hjo-ḥdzin, 73–4}\)

'substitutes (sc. children) for father and mother hold the chieftainship'.

Whether this is the meaning of hjo in l.l. 372, 387, 389, we may for the present leave undetermined.

But an antithesis 'chieftain' (or 'leader')/'speaking' (ḥlab), though in some possible context it might be found to work, could not bear repetition as in:

\(\text{ḥbañ-hrehe-ḥkhehe-ḥbañ-hre-ḥgehe-na}\)

\(\text{jo-re-ḥgehe-ḥlab-re-hge, 251–2}\)

'Every ḭbañ a gain, every ḭbañ a joy,

Every jo a joy, every ḡlab a joy'

\(\text{sta-bañ-rpag-re-ḥyaḥ-me-bbyam-re}\)

\(\text{jo-me-hbyam-re-ḥlab-me-hbyam-na || o ||, 252–3.}\)

'There, every bañ being made low, front (or face) fire mild (or abundant),

jo-fire mild, ḡlab-fire mild'.

\(\text{ḥjo(ḥdzo?)-chi-te-re-ḥlab-ḥñañ-ḥyaḥ-ḥṭah-ḥdyañ-ḥro-ḥpebi||, 385–6.}\)

'When ḭjo comes, ḡlab-words (or 'hearing, Tib. ṳan ?) correspond (?), is mark (or example) (?) of ḡldyañ-country'.

(The only authority for ṳan = 'words', beyond its appropriateness with ḡlab, being Hsi-hsia niañ (Laufer, No. 167)).

Another certain signification of ḭjo/ḥdzo is 'eat’, corresponding to Tib. za, zos, bzaḥ, bzos.\(^1\) A Nam example of this in the form, perhaps Imperative, gzo will be quoted infra (pp. 334–5): the following may be added:

\(\text{rñe-hpo-ḥldo-ge-ḥkeḥu-prom-hjo, 177}\)

'the fiend (or enemy) braves ate the ḡkeḥu-making'

\(\text{ḥrñe-hpo-hñe-ge-ḥkohu-prom-ḥdzho, 361–2}\)

'the wicked fiend (or enemy) braves ate the speaking'.

Here the forms ḭjo and ḡdzho, occurring in two different state-

\(^1\) On Nam z/dz see infra, pp. 334–5.
ments of the same incident, are clearly identical (cf. p. 335), the alternation j/dz being frequent in all Tibetan writing and scripturally easy. The rendering ‘ate’ is justified not only by the previously (pp. 254, 256) discussed references to ‘milking out’ and ‘snatching’ the fire (sc. power) of speech, but also by the use of the kindred form ḡdzah in:

Һbaň-ɣldah-bne-ɣkeňu-me-ɣdzah ||, 170
‘good authorities eat the fire of ɣkeňu’

which occurs in the context of the references to the ‘milking out’ and ‘snatching’ the fire of speech. What ɣkeňu is may be considered later.

These examples do, indeed, substantiate the expression ɦlab-me, ‘fire of speech’, and in antithesis thereto a ‘fire of eating’ (ɦjo-me) would be possible. But between ‘eating’ and ‘speaking’ the antithesis is not sufficiently natural for frequent recurrence, and in the passage II. 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 ɦjo/Jo as equivalent to Tibetan bzo, ‘make’, ‘manufacture’, ‘work’, ’craft’, ‘fashion’. It is possible that in the form ɦjoňo this is to be found in:

na-ɦtsaň-ste(= ɦtsas-te)-dze-ɦldyo-ɦthor-ge-ɦnus-dze-g-raň-ɦyoş-ɦtag-ge-ɦjoňo ||, 33–4

‘On the harvested fields . . . the earthquake acted as a mill
(Tib. ɦthag)’

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 ɦjo/Jo in ɦjo/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:

ɦbri-re-ɦrdyaň-rem-ɦkhaň-ɦldah-ɦnaňghĩ
ɦdzôňu-ro-ɦlidi-re-ɦjoňu || ɦwa-ɦkaň

‘When females are restrained (ɦrdyaň, p. 350), talkers have voice:

This being a place for males, action is the talk.’

The word ɦbaň/rimp, 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, Höarpa sgrê, Täkpa, kar-ma, Mânyak krah, Mo-so kho, ki, kû, kô, 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 ápâc eipêmuévoc: 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 Tibet-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-saûs, ‘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-ʰru-n-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]-hkoû-prom-g-yêhe
‘the earth having its boundaries fixed (chad), speech was distributed (?)’

ʰbyi-hri-hgäñ-ge-chi-ʰrmu-hphor || re, 167–8
‘all the little hills having boundaries for their going released’.

Cf. l. 353:

gzu-ʰdro-hphor-[re]-ʰchí-hdo-hdyân
‘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); htsah-, hscañ-, hyer; hldah, hri (hrîhî); htsah-htsah; htsa-pho; gtsañ, htsañ; hnom; hrgu; gzo; rîñi, hldehi, hlde, hldehe; tho; ‘rgyam; hjim, hdzom; hrîm-re-hldobu.

The form swah/swa is used in a number of clauses of the type:

ʰrtab-swah-g-we[-]r[e], 164, 301 = rtab-hswah-g-wehe, 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), hdi[r] (ll. 174), hphyegs/-hpyeg (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 ša/swa, ‘stag’, ša/swa, ‘blood’, rtswa, ‘grass’, tshwa, ‘salt’; sbah/dbah/hbah/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 hršaṅ, ‘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:

hṛtah-swah-g-we[-r[e]-hbos-hsah-hldah
hbos-hnom-hsah-gtsaṅ-hṛgu-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’.

hsah = Tib. sa, ‘land’; gtsaṅ = Tib. rtsaṅ, ‘crop’, as in l. 159;¹

¹ Cf. l. 378, ḥsah-htsoṅ ?
Elsewhere the horse is said to be *hsah-g-yer*, 'awake (Tib., &c., yer, "not asleep", g-yer-po, "expert", "wise")\(^1\) on the land':

\[ \text{rta-} \text{hsa-g-yr-dze, 330 = rta-} \text{hsa-g-yr-ge, 346} \]

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 *htsah-hyer*, not really different (ts and c being constantly confused in manuscripts) from the *hsah-hyer* of l. 250 (applied to the horse) and ll. 296–7: in l. 298:

\[ \text{rta-} \text{hswa-g-wehe-hbos-hsah-hldah} \]

the *hbos* is no longer *hsah-hldah*, 'landowner', but *htsah-owner*.

Unfortunately, *htsah* also is ambiguous. Shall we understand that the *hbos* 'has his watch(\man)\)' (Tib. *btsa, btsas*, 'watch', 'scrutinize', a verb well known in Central Asia)\(^2\) or 'has his harvest' (Tib. *btsa-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 *htsah-hri* (brihi), which must be equivalent to the *hsuah-g-ri*, 'watch mountain' of l. 296 and the *btsa-pho* of l. 291 (see infra, p. 279), and at the same time proves that the *htsah-hyah-hthał* of l. 288 contains the same *htsah*. Provisionally also it is probable that the same *htsah* is to be seen in *hyu-htsah-kyim* (hkyim), ll. 345, 350, 351. A doubt remains in regard to *htsah-hbrad-hrdaq*, ll. 213–14, where 'smite' (Tib. *rdeg*) 'harvest-snatchers' is more likely.

Who then are the *hrlehi*, whose *hsuah-hram*, 'accord in watching', is mentioned in l. 288, and who can scarcely be other than the *hldæhi* of ll. 318–21, whose *hsuah*, 'watch', may be *hnor*, 'bad' (l. 318), or *hræñ*, 'stern', 'violent', ll. 319, 320, 321. These *hldæhi* are, no doubt, the *hldæ, hldæhe* of:

\[ \text{hldæ-ge-hguru-ma-rmañ, 77, 'the hldæ dreamed of hgru-ma'} \]
\[ \text{hldæ(hldæhe)-ge-hthał-hldon, 370, 371, 372, 'let hldæ (} \text{pro} \text{} \text{perities ?) return'}. \]

A word *lde*, meaning (a) 'treasury', 'storehouse', (b) 'warm oneself', 'be warmed', appears in the dictionaries; and also *Lde*, 'a

---

1 This *yer, g-yer*, perhaps preserved in Hörpa *ta-ryen*, 'wake', is probably an extension of *ye, 'alert', in ye-nyig, 'alert-eye' and ye-les, 'alert-knowledge'.

2 *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 223-13, 251. B 1, &c. One of the Tibetan MSS. has this word with the *r*-Prefix, *rtsas*. 

---
prefixed tribal title which some of the early kings of Tibet had assumed'. The late Professor A. H. Francke, who translates (Antiquities of Indian Tibet, ii, p. 80) 'the Eight Lde (beauties, lde/rde/bde) of the earth', expressed the opinion that lde, as found alternating with bde, in the names of late kings in western Tibet, was 'only a dialectical form of the word Bde, 'blessing, happiness'. While attached to the names of prehistoric rulers in Tibet, it was not neglected by their historical successors of the seventh to eighth centuries, Khri-lde Gtsug-brtan, Khri-sroś Lde-btsan, &c., including Khri-lde Sroṅ-btsan, = Sroṅ-btsan Sgamp-po, himself. It is, therefore, a very ancient designation, to be compared, perhaps, with Šri, 'beauty', 'prosperity', in Indian names, and to analogous terms in other Oriental spheres: conceivably it is, in fact, connected with lde, 'be warm, warmed'. The same word may with probability be seen in Hsi-hsia ldeh/ldeh/ldeh, 'kingdom', 'futurity', 'power', 'ought' (Nevsky, Nos. 11, 133) = li (Lauffer, No. 139), certified as meaning 'rich and of high rank' and occurring in an official title, wei li.¹

Accordingly, the lde who supervise may be the 'powers' generally. In I. 288 the rle hi associated with the hyan, 'good', mor, 'bad', kru, '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 hdehi, who are stated to have appointed a 'Thousand-[district-]commander' (stoṅ-hpoṅ, on which see p. 234), unless the expression is metaphorical. But it is also said (l. 319) that the rgya-hni-hke are the 'hdehi of stern watch' (swaṅ-rsāṅ), and in l. 295 they are said to meet (ḥdson) 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 hrgya-hni-hke' (hrgya-hni-hke-g-yog) reminds us of the Tibetan ni-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 rle hi/hdehi/lde, are the 'authorities', 'powers', or 'blessednesses', and sometimes comprise mundane, sometimes superior, powers.

¹ Perhaps the same lde may be seen in the lie of Menia ya-lie, 'good', am-lie, 'bad'. 
The expression *tho-rgyam* in:

*tho-rgyam-ge-hwad-re*, 109, 'watching the boundaries' must correspond to the repeated *mtshams-tho-phyag-rgya-can*, (or *rgya-can*), 'boundary with a hand-mark (or seal)', of Central-Asian Tibetan (*Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, ii, pp. 129–40, 274, 361–5). But, since there is no special reason for identifying a *rgyam* with *rgya* (outside their equivalence in *rgyam(lgyam)-tshwa = rgya*, 'a kind of rock salt'), it is prudent to see in *rgyam* a connexion with *g-yam*, 'slab of stone', 'roof-slate', and *gyam*, 'a shelter, recess in a rock', and to think of a stone slab as a boundary mark. Who are the *Hjim-li-li* and *Pa-la-la*, who are in l. 109 to keep the watch, is not apparent.\(^1\) There may be some connexion with:

\[
\text{gya}_\text{n-g-ri-bhjim-hjo-\-hkhog-re-hpha\_h} \parallel, 313–14.
\]

A different *tho* applied in l. 132 to the 'black-back' and in l. 374 (*ḥtho*) to *ḥpha\_h-hwe*, 'brave deeds (doers)' is, no doubt = Tib. *mtхо, 'high*': and the same has been suspected (p. 248) in regard to *ḥdyan-hṭo*, l. 210, *g-ri-hṭo*, l. 296, *phya\_h-hṭo*, l. 374.

In l. 42, where the horse is not in question:

*ḥsah-htsah-ḥdza\_n-dze-hklom-ge-hṭul*, 'under wise *ḥsah-htsah* the *hklom*\(^2\) are restrained'

it seems that *ḥsah-htsah*, repeated in l. 44 as *ḥtsah-ḥtsah*, must be understood as *ḥsah-ḥtsah*, 'land-watching'. There is no difficulty in this; for—to overlook the confusion shown in the variation of the phrase—the *s* in *ḥtsah*, like the *b* and *r* in the Tibetan equivalents, is a Prefix, and the *b* was originally, no doubt, attached only

---

\(^1\) Since in l. 156 mention is made of collection of *ḥjim-ta* serviceable for wounds:

*rma-g-yog-rño-ge-bhjim-ta-ḥṭhus*

and since Tib. *ḥjön* is 'a mineral substance rubbed on old sores' and *ḥjim* is 'mud', 'clay', it is likely that *ḥjim* 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; Ferguson, 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-ḥjim*, 'mountain medicaments'.

*Ḥjim-li-li-pa-la-la* may conceivably mean 'drug-collectors professedly, really fighters', which would harmonize with the *no-hkhog-re-hphaḥ*, 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'.

\(^2\) Perhaps some kind of superhuman creatures, since one of the Tibetan manuscripts speaks of a 'klum god' and a 'klum fiend'.

to the Aoristic form *btsas*. There may well have been an original non-Aoristic form *htsha*, represented by the Nam *htsah* (perhaps also by Tib. *tsa-kha*, ‘target’). Without mention of *hsaḥ*, ‘land’, we have in l. 268:

htsah-hdzan-ḥyah-ge-hwah-ne-hbraḥ ||
‘With wise supervisors above good work (?) flourishes’
(cf. p. 339).

Hṣaḥ ‘land’, recurs in l. 314, and perhaps in l. 41. The form *gsaḥ* is seen in l. 333 *gsaḥ-rkah*, ‘steep land’, and in:

gsaḥ-re-hṣaḥ-re-ḥraḥ-ge-ḥldoḥu-ḥjam-rno ||, 276–7
[in] the places, both lands (estates) and crops (Tib. *btsa*, ‘harvest’), were mild-minded groups (?)’.


26. *hme*, me, sme; mye; mebi, hmebi; rme; gṣeg, ḥṣeg; ḡyi; ḡcaḥ, caṅ, chaṅ; *sme, rdzum; se*, gse-, ḡruo-, -caṅ (ḥcaṅ); ḡpuḥi, ḡpuḥi; ḡpuḥi-klo, pu-glo (blo); ḡdraṃ; ḡmu; ḡyeḥ; ḡdro; ḡkus; ḡmar-me; ḡkah; gte.

It is unnecessary to prove that *me, hme* (in l. 171 *hmehe*), already noted in so many instances, means ‘fire’ = Tib. *me*, &c., &c. But it may be added that it never appears to mean anything else, except in:

ḥtsoğ-hram-hme-dze-hṭor-ḥtas-hproms, 121–2

in which *hme* will be shown *infra* (p. 292) to signify ‘is not’, *Mye*, which in Tibetan orthography of the period would be the regular writing of *me*, is used in a number of clear instances (ll. 6, 39, 102, 195, 197 (*hmye*), 357) to signify likewise ‘fire’; and the only frequent examples to the contrary (ll. 129, 153, 241, 365, 366) are of the type *smyi-hnu-myre*, l. 241, already quoted as meaning ‘if man’s power is not’. The negative *hme/mye* occurs only as a verb, equivalent to Tib. *med*, ‘is not’, ‘is non-existent’: it is not used in the sense of ‘-less’, as is Tib. *med* in *stobs-med*, ‘strengthless’, and the like.

To the occurrences of *mye*, ‘is not’, we must add the instances (ll. 129, 153, 365, 366) where in accordance with what has been stated above (pp. 174 sqq.) *myer*, occupying the caesura position and functioning as a disyllable, has to be read as *mye-re*. There is no otherwise occurring *myer*.

The form *mehi/hmehi*, on the other hand, normally means ‘eye’, e.g. in the designation *mehi(hmehi)-klu-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-hldo-htrg-su-me-hmehi
hrhg-we-rthg-so-hnah-mehi ||, 114–15

'With great heat who kindles fire?'
'The horse giving place, the so-hnah 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 hmuhi in me-hmuhi, '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/hmehi, is final in its clause, we find only compounds mehi-rh(hnah) ll. 78, 186, 369, 6g-ri, l. 35, 6spa, 6spehi, ll. 151, 370, 6cha, l. 352, 6hpa, l. 272, 6klu-hcha (hcha), ll. 150, 161, 218, 343, and

mehi-hgab-hldo-ge, 155, 'with eyes covered up'.

There does not seem to be reason for distinguishing these from other cases, such as hrh-hwcihi (and hw)-hrthg, where we have supposed (pp. 190–2) the presence of an enclitic hi. What seems to be decisive here is the fact that there appears to be a certain instance of mye (i.e. me), 'eye', which form is in fact, that attributed in the Tibetan manuscripts (supra, p. 131) to the Nam language (Mye-kru). The instance is mye-hpehi, l. 212, which probably means 'eye-sparkle' or 'eye-ornament' (see p. 356) and to be not different from the mehi-spa, 6spehi, of ll. 151, 370, and perhaps the hmehi-hpah of l. 272: in l. 211, re-mye-hpahi, the meaning 'fire' is not impossible. It must, however, be admitted that an independent instance of mehi conversely meaning 'fire' is not apparent, unless mehi-cha, l. 352, should happen to be = Tib. me-cha, 'flint'.

Sme usually occurs in relation to me, 'fire'. In ll. 282, 283–4 we have:

hsseg-sme-ge-hrim-hdzom

which seems to mean 'meeting lines' (sc. circles) of burning fires (sc. torches?'), with sme = 'fire' and hsseg. The word hsseg, 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. gṣegs, ‘go’, which in l. 330 might also suit gṣeg/
hṣeg; but, unless the compound gṣeg-sme has some special sense,
that will not serve in regard to hṣeg-sme here. This point must
therefore be left obscure. Other occurrences of sme reinforce the
notion of fire, thus:
dgu-hldo-ḥtor-re-hra-we-ṛtaḥ
rgyed-hraṇ-sme-re-hkhar-hgyi-ṇes ||, 191-2
‘The heat being great, the horse gave place:
Rgyed being itself a fire, the town’s power (?) was destroyed’.
hṛgyed-hṣaṇ-sme-hyed-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-paḥi-hdzo-hdza-caṇ-sme-hme-ḥkehi ||
g-raḥ-nag-hbo-gyaḥ-chaṇ-rdzum-me-g-wehi ||, 262-3
‘children as good as their fathers (or as brave) gained an all-
blazing fire
‘... made an all-smiling fire’.

Here the expressions caṇ-sme, chaṇ-rdzum, correspond to the
Tibetan caṇ-rig, caṇ-ses, ‘all wise’, ‘all knowing’. We might
connect caṇ with caṇs-po, ‘clever’,.gcaṇ-po ‘clever’; and this is,
no doubt, correct, but not directly. It is probable that caṇ =
bcan, ‘comprising’, ‘comprehensive’ (bcan-rgya, ‘extensive com-
prehension’ or ‘comprehensive extent’), which is really the aorist
of the Verb ḥchaṇ, bcaṇ, bcaṇs, ‘hold’. The Verb appears in close
vicinity in:
ḥsaṣ-hnḥ-hdag-chi-phye-chi chaṇ-hson ||, 260-1
‘children who had sickness were tended (hson = Tib. gson),
being supported-held (chaṇ).

The signification ‘clever’ appears in cases where caṇ is not the
first member of its compound, in:
rgyed-hṣaṇ-rṣag-caṇ, 36, ‘disunity clever in secretly enter-
ing company’ (p. 244)
and in l. 91 ṣe-chaṇ, ‘clever in wisdom’, l. 48 gṣe-hcaṇ, ‘clever in
harm’, l. 49, hṛṇo-hcaṇ, ‘clever in power’, though here the sense

1 ḥgyi recurs in l. 346 with ḥyu, perhaps = Tib. yul, ‘country’, ‘village’.
Is it = Hsi-hsia ḥgi, ‘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-hdzo-cañ, l. 76, hpus-hphy-a-myi-cañ, l. 298, hse-hse-hldon-hecañ, 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 htor-hrta-rme-ge, always associated with something undesirable, as in:

htor-hrta-rme-ge-hso-hnah-stor ||, 231–2

‘the great horse being rme, the hso-hnah is lost’.

The restriction to the particular phrase excludes an understanding of rme as = me, ‘is non-existent’; but rme would be a regular equivalent of Tib. rme, ‘spot’, ‘blemish’, physical or moral, which in one of the Tibetan manuscripts and elsewhere is spelled dme (dmer-hgyur, ‘becomes spoiled’, used of flesh corrupting),¹ and it may express the loss of prestige to the horse due to his desertion of his capital (unless it should be that, contrary to what we 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 Mányak sa-meh is an instance.

In l. 40 we read:

hphu-hklo-hsad-dze-hnah-me-hmyi ||

‘if the hphu-hklo be destroyed, the place (or house?) has no fire’.

Here we must necessarily think of Tib. hbud, phu, phus, dbu, ‘blow’, me-phu, ‘blow the fire’, hbud-hduñ, ‘trumpet’, also ‘bellows’, more especially as that phu occurs in the Central-Asian Documents (vol. ii, p. 224). In fact, the hphu-hklo must signify ‘bellows’, modern Tibetan sbud-pa. An Amdoan form of this implement is described by Rockhill in his Diary (p. 11), and others are illustrated in a plate facing p. 96, and Filchner, Das Rätsel . . ., Pl. 44, while in regard to Tibet generally reference may be made to S. C. Das’s Dictionary, s.v. sbud-pa. This being so, we can see that the áraç cipnuéwóv hklo is simply the word glo, ‘lungs’, ‘mind’, which is found in the Nam text (ll. 68, 93, 157), and that hphu-hklo is literally ‘blow-lungs’: we can see, further, that the phrase

¹ In the Berlin fragment rme-ma, mentioned in (ll. 4–5) in company with ñañ-ma, ‘filth’ (supra, p. 223), will contain the same rme.
hра́н-пу-гло, l. 116 = ра́н-пу-гло, l. 135, means ‘himself his own bellows (sc. inspirer)’; possibly
tсиг-мо́н-ве-ге-гтах-гпу-гло́, 381
may mean
‘the Món builders are the bellows’.

Phu, in the sense of ‘blowing’ must now be seen in:
ъно-ре-гло-ге-хкы-гдзам-гпухи, 275–6
‘in friendly troops the dogs mildly panted’
гдэб-гпухи-гто́н-ре-гях-ва-гкай, l. 190
‘if the rear emits a breath, the front is full of уа’ (cf. l. 282,
гдэб-гпухи-гпухи).

And with this and the notion of ‘blowing’ a fire well agrees the
antithesis to гму, ‘cold’, in:
ъдрам-гму-гдо́н-гтор-ску-гпухи-гхти, 103–4
‘the stiff (ъдрамъ = Тиб. трамъ, p. 251) cold gone (come ?), the
body-blowing (breath) stops’
рно-му-гдэб-ре-гра́н-пу-гло-ре, 116–17
‘capacity covered up or kept back by cold (lack of spirit),
himself his own bellows’
(гдэб = Тиб. ггьес, хкеб, кхьеб; cf. те-гкы́еб-гкы́еб, l. 17, ‘evil
spreads over, spreads over’; or = гдэб, as supra, p. 228 ?)
гпух-гпух-му-[р]е-гдзу-гдро-гхкус, 352 (cf. l. 274, p. 331)
‘his blow, blow, being cold, the ass desired (Тиб. гкху) to go
(probably with a paronomasia on гро, ‘heat’, ‘longed for
(гкху) heat’), which pun recurs in:
‘the yak being made to go, his fire of speech was quelled’)

and, again in connexion with the ass, in:
ъкьан-гзу-грыо-ре-гнау-гдро-мо
ъсо-гког-грыо || г-гнау-гдро-гмо ||
stор-гкхо-грыо-гнау-гдро-гтар
гмо-[р]-гзы-гре-гсе-гпье-гкьан ||, 188–90
‘The rкянг (ass) being capable, the female [horse] runs with-
in (or ‘has an inner heat’):
Capable of concealed гсо (copulari), the female horse runs
within . . .

When her ruler is lost, the inner heat escapes;

1 In l. 31 (and possibly here ?) the spelling is гграм.
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

हमार-मे-हकाः-गे-हर्दजः-हगः-हपः
ग्ते-मे-हकाः-गे-दम-र्मा-हब्रौः
ग्वि-मे-हसी-गे-हबेहि-बहः-हबुः || ह्रुग ||, 46–7

‘When lamp (Tib. mar-me, ‘oil-fire’, ‘lamp’) fire is scarce († = Tib. डकाः or काः), friends leave (ह्फो, ‘pass away’) the place (ह्गो);

‘When navel-fire (sc. appetite, Tib. ल्टे) is exhausted, the yak begs to be tied (hobbled for the night’);

‘When travel-fire (energy) declines (हसी), sheep and oxen have bowed heads’ (see p. 149)

27. हल्दान, लदा; ग्र्यो, गर्मान, ग्ते, ग्वान, ग्ययार (ह्फ्ययर, प्यरे, प्यरे), ग्पी (प्यी), ग्व्रान (ग्रान); चेखे, र्के; हसा; ह्दूः; ह्सद; ह्वे; हनार; ह्रूवेभि; ह्को; खो; ह्नाम; स्ला; ह्सान; द्गु; ह्गु.

In the sense of ‘wood’, ‘stick’, the word हल्दान, evidenced in l. 159, has cognates widely spread in Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman.¹ Further occurrences in the Nam text may be recognized in:

र्गोङ-ह्ले-र्ग्यो-द्ग्रें-हल्दान-र्ग्यु-ह्तम ||, 59–60

‘in a desert of great extent stick-material is a mere tale († Tib. ग्तम’);

cf. the reference in one of the Tibetan manuscripts to the single stick standing up in the थान-plain. The ‘big-stick’ of government (हल्दान-र्ग्यो) has been noted (p. 245) in l. 209: and the हल्दान-र्मान, ‘wooden monument’ of l. 27, = हल्दान-ह्क्हान, ‘wooden house’ (cf. Tib. सिन-ह्कान), 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).


¹ For occurrences in dialects of Burmese see L. F. Taylor, Journal of the Burma Research Society, xi, pp. 89 sqq., Table II A, ‘firewood’. 
(ldum-ra/sdum-ra, 'garden'), or g- (ldu-gu/gdu-gu, 'ring'). Lithas, beside the above-noted confusions with ld-, independent contacts with lh-(ltni/lhun, 'fall'). The antiquity of ld- in Tibetan has been illustrated in connexion with the word lde (pp. 278-9); and from outside regions of the north-east and east we have early examples in proper names, such as Ldoṅ, Mug-Idem, žag-Idom.

In the Nam text the word ḥdi, 'this', = Tib. ḥdi, is several times (ll. 107, 184, 198, 391 (?)) written in the Tibetan way; and, on the other hand, the Tibetan ḥdi occurs in the sole Tibetan sentence (l. 180) as ḥdi. Hence the Nam ld- may be credited with all the connexions of Tib. ḥ-.

One meaning of Tib. ldan is 'side', seen in sgo-ladan, 'each side of the door', whence ldan-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', ldan(s) owing its ṅ 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, ldan-pyar, ḥdan-hphyer (phyer), is to be seen in:

ldan-pyar-hgag-re-ḥtsah-hyah-hdo ||, 65
'Those whose co-operation is refused become rivals (or adversaries)'

ḥdan-kraṅ-hko-dze-stor-ḥdan-hphyar, 125-6
'when . . . , co-operation is lost'

ḥdan-phyer-ḥbraḥ[-r[e], 254
'while co-operation is abundant'.

Of this compound, ḥdan-phyer, the second element, with e for a on the lines explained supra (p. 214), is equivalent to Tib. hphyar/phyer, 'lift up', 'hoist', (also 'blame', 'affront', 'disgrace', cf. Latin tollere). Outside the compound it occurs in ll. 341-2 in the three forms hphyar, pyar, hphyer,¹ in ll. 254, 261 as phyer: in ll. 239 it is contrasted (as in ll. 125-6, supra) with hstor, 'be lost'; and in ll. 343 ldan likewise is contrasted with the stor of ll. 339, 340. It is evident that in the compound ldan means 'side', 'being at the side', and hphyar, 'support'.

Ldāṅ singly, with the sense of 'at the side', 'auxiliary' is seen in:

ldan-rdze(rje)-ḥbro-re-ḥdan-the-rgyebs ||, 138-9
'when an allied chief flees, the allied lieges retreat'.

It is probable that in ll. 79, 143, the expression ḥdan-phyi (pyi)

¹ On -ar/-er see p. 353.
means 'outside support' (Tib. phyi). From the second of the two last-mentioned instances:

ḥtor-se-stor-dze-hldān-pyi-ske ||, 143

'when the great roof is lost, the outside support is slight (Tib. rke, "lean", rked/sked, "waist")'\(^1\)

we can see that the idea of 'support', 'auxiliary', is derived from that of 'stick', 'pole', 'prop', which in Tib. sgo-ldaṅ, 'door-side', i.e. 'door-post', is still apparent. The ldaṅ 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 hldān in the Nam text, until we realize that hldān is another instance of object-denotation derived from quasi-abstract verbal notion. Like ḭbo, 'forest' or 'vegetation', properly 'swelling', 'growth', and Ḫgreṅ, 'man', properly the 'upright standing', hldān, 'stick', is a general notion of action, namely 'rising erect'. This is the signification of Tib. ldn/ldan, lan/lanīs, and correspondingly is the frequent signification of Nam hldān/ldan, as in:

ḥtsog-hram-hdo-na-mor-hldān-re-hnāh ||, 86-7

'where there is ḭtsog-hram, there is no rising of evil'

ḥtsog-hldān-hstan, 94, 'ḥtsog rises to the top'

ḥmāh-hldān-hyah-dze, 112, 'when low rises high'

smyi-rmad-l painstaking, 80, 'an inferior man rises'

stor-me-hkhyyed-re-hldān-me-hkhyyed ||, 123-4

'if a lost fire sufficed, a rising fire suffices'

ḥṣah-ye-hlān-dze-rne-hldān-ne, 141

'when land-watch rises, hostility rising is good'.

The use of this Verb with ṛne, 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, ldn/laṅ 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:

ḥldān-ḥkraṅ-ḥsad-na-hldān-ḥkraṅ-hṣāḥ

ḥldān-ḥkraṅ-hwe-dze-hldān-slah-hkebe

ḥldān-ḥkraṅ-hko-dze-stor-hldān-ḥphyar

ḥldān-ḥkraṅ-spo-dze-stor-hgu-hbo ||

ḥldān-ḥkraṅ-hnam-dze-stor-dgu-ḥdor ||, 124-7

\(^1\) Unless we prefer 'the support turns its neck away', with phyi-ske parallel to Tib. phyi-mig, 'backward look'.

Hldaŋ-hkraṅ is one of a few compound nouns which directly recall equivalents in Tibetan. The Tibetan phrase, in the form draṅ-mkraṅ, is found, not indeed in the Dictionary, but two or three times in the contemporary manuscripts from north-eastern Tibet: it is composed of draṅ, ‘straight’, ‘honest’, and mkraṅ, hkraṅs. ‘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, hkraṅ, is, no doubt, cognate to the Tibetan mkraṅ/hkraṅs; but the first member, instead of meaning ‘straight’ (Tib. draṅ), means ‘standing upright’ = Tib. ldaṅ, unless indeed it envisages the particular denotation ‘stick’, ‘pole’, and so contains the metaphor ‘stiff standing pole’.

The passage applies to hldaṅ-hkraṅ, in successive clauses with corresponding apodes, the five Predicates or Verbs hsad, hwe, hko, spo, hnam, which are therefore in a measure antithetic. Being already acquainted with a portion of the Predicates and other words, we may venture upon a rendering of the whole, as follows:

‘Uprightness being slain (hsad), uprightness is cut up (hśah);
Uprightness being done (hwe), upright friends (Tib. zla) are won (hkehe);
Uprightness being by itself or enforced (? hko), assistance is lost;
Uprightness being changed (Tib. spo), all losses grow (hbo);
Uprightness declining (Tib. /XML/), all losses are thrown away (hdor).’

Here hsad, ‘slay’, hwe, are words of frequent occurrence and quite certain etymology and meaning; hnam = Tib. /XML/ recurs in l. 259 and is supported also by another hnam (l. 145) = Tib. /XML/, ‘thought’, ‘mind’, ‘spirit’ (on n- > n- see p. 360); spo, since Tib. spo, ‘peak’, is out of the question, can hardly help being = Tib. spo, hyho, ‘change’, ‘be changed’, ‘pass away’, cf. hśi-hypo, p. 226; hko is a form of diverse meanings, discussed supra (pp. 260–4). As regards the apodeses, hśah is applied in ll. 90, 99, as we shall see, to htsog-hram and hnah-htsog, and can well be = Tib. bśah, used of the cutting up of a slain animal; hke, ‘profit’, ‘gain’, = Tib. khe (pp. 241–2), and hdor, ‘throw away’, = Tib. hdor, 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-hstor-hsasu: na must be = l. 76 dgu-hstor-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 dgih/hgih, '9' (Nevsky, No. 109).

The expression hldan-hkrañ occurs also in ll. 91, 111–12 (with hnar, 'be strong', or 'be persistent', or 'attend to', see p. 361), 113 (with hwelh, '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:

hñ-o-sta-gлом-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. mkrañ/hkrañ, 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; 6hre, 6hýo, 6hrah; hgye, rgye, rgyes; naq; geq, heq, geq; hldo; htsog, htsag; hnah-, hnah-, 6htsog; ram, htsog-hram; hñah, hñas; phye; hñah; myag; hne; hpo; hreg; plim-plam; hso(so)-hnañ (hna, na); hso-hldah; hdroho; myin; 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,1 'be opened', 'be divided', hbyed, 'open', 'disunite', &c., whence dbye, 'distinction', 'species', 'extent', dbyen, 'dissension', dbyes, 'magnitude', 'dimensions' = Nam rgye, rgyes, 'extent'.

1 On the alternation b/g see pp. 33, n. 5, 243.
In the Nam text **hgye** is found (ll. 12, 154) meaning 'light', in l. 209 (g-yehe, 'hi', 166, 271) 'is divided'. **Rgye**, 'extent', may be seen in **hce-rgye** (l. 57-60) = Tib. **dbye-che**, 'of great extent', and equivalent to **hce-rgyan**, ll. 16, 50, 52, 55: in both the Nam phrases, however, **hce** may be the Noun, 'greatness', and **rgye**, **rgyan**, the Adjectives; as an Adjective, **rgye** is applied to 'stick' (**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' (**hkhab**); 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 **hśan-nag-rgyes-hkom**, l. 199, 'when enemy voice (Tib. **nąg**), 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-hdag-ńnag**, '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-hrañ** (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-hrañ**, 'uprightness', **rgyed** is seen in:

rgyed-hdag-ńnag-ge-hldañ-hkrañ-hrweñi ||, 112-13
' the disunion black-back put an end to uprightness'.

But more constant is the opposition to **htsoñ-hram** and allied expressions, as in:

rgyed-ma-hldañ-ge-htsoñ-hram-hśñ ||, 90  
'when disunion arises, **htsoñ-hram** is cut up'

rgyed-ma-glañ-ge-hnañ-htsoñ-hśñ ||, 93  
'when disunion gains (?), **hnañ-htsoñ** is cut up'

rgyed-ma-hldañ-ge-ńañ-htsoñ-hśñs, 101-2 (where **ńañ** = **hnañ** of l. 93, and **hśñs** is Aorist of **hśñ**)

while in l. 94:

rgyed-htre (read 'hdre-hte, as in ll. 87, 248) -ge-htsoñ-htañ-ma ||  
'the disunion-inducers permit not **htsoñ**'

and also in the two following verses, **htsoñ** suffices.

**Htsoñ-hram**, evidently one of the most important topics in the text, receives its most elaborate consideration in the passage:

**htsoñ-hram-phye-dze-hśañ-plim-plam**

**htsoñ-hram-hnañ-tse-hṭor-si-rgo ||**

**htsoñ-hram-myag-dze-hṛta-hwa-hldañ**
htsog-hram-hme-dze-htor-htas-hproms
htsog-hram-hpo-dze-hrta-rkwa-hdzam
htsog-hram-hreg-dze-hldyañ-hyu-hgañ-dze-hsi-hwa-hko,
120–3.

Here the Predicates phyé, ‘divided’, myag (Tib.) ‘corrupted’,
hme, ‘is not’, hpo, ‘changes’ (Tib. hpho), which may be taken as
known, inform us that the remaining two must also be of an
ominous character in relation to htsog-hram. Of the previously
ascertained meanings of hnah 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 ē, ‘die’, of the apodosis. Hreg = Tib. reg,
‘reach’, ‘touch’, is not promising; but regs, hreg, 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 hbrí, brís, ‘draw’ (ris-su-hbri-ba, ‘draw an
outline’), and ras-su-dros (dra-ba), ‘cut up into strips’: cf. brís/
brís (p. 259). Thus we arrive at a rendering as follows:

‘Htsog-hram 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 hldyañ-hyu death’s
power prevails (?).

Despite the obscurities not yet resolved, it will be seen that the
signification of htsog-hram must be something like ‘friendship’.

And how can this fail to be the fact, when, as we are already aware,
the enemy of htsog-hram, and of other combinations with htsog, is
‘disunion’, rgyed-ma ?

The constant, and therefore essential, factor in the expressions,
namely htsog, is manifestly identical with Tib. ‘assemblage’,
‘group’, ‘accumulation’ (tshogs-kyi-gtso-bo or bdag = Sanskrit
gana-pramukha, Gañesa, &c.), being the Verb tshogs, ‘assemble’,
‘unite’, whence also btsags, ‘accumulated’, tshags-byed, ‘save’,
tshags-lhos-po, ‘loose cohesion’. Nam htsag occurs in l. 45, hya-
htsag ||, ‘sheep are collected’, l. 117 hpho-hldir-htsag, ‘males here
collected’, l. 173 hwi-hwehí-htsag, ‘rats or mice gather’, l. 234
htsag-hro, ‘collected wolves’, l. 257 hyah-rmah-htsag, ‘high and
low united’, also l. 282. Hence hnah-htsog and nah-htsog, 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 (= ṅah-htsog)-hreg, l. 122.

Antithetic likewise to rgyed-ma is hso-hnah, another main topic of the text, in:

rgyed-ma-hldan-ge-hso-hnah-hrgab, 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-hṣid ||, 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, snon, bsnams, ‘seize’, ‘gain’. This gso/so, the Nam text has in hso-hldah, l. 201, the ‘living’; and hso-hnah = ‘life-place’, ‘home’. But, like other words of local signification, the expression takes on a personal sense and means ‘family’, e.g. in:

rta-hso-hnah-yañ-gñi-hrtzum-dogy ||, 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-hthān ||, 289–90
‘the horse having gone to the hgam, his family was the authority’.

rta-hso-hnah-ge-na-rom-bton, 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-lar), was illusory, since there were ‘males here collected’ (l. 117), and:

bro-hbehi-hbah-ge-hso-hnah-gche || 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 (*rmaṅ-dze*, l. 235). Thus the ‘rise of disunion’ (ll. 107–8, 231), the flight (ll. 110, 114–15) and disrepute (ll. 231–2; *reme*, p. 284 *supra*) of the horse were ruinous to the family, and:

\[
\text{so-hnāṅ-hstɔ́r-dze-hīṅo-stɔ́r-hprōm} \mid l. 127–8
\]

‘family being lost, loss of friends results’.

Of the words closely attached to *rgyed* only *rmag* (rgyed-rmag, l. 149) remains for consideration (*infra*, pp. 300–1). With *htsog-hram* and *htsoṅ* we have had the expressions *ḥrta-hwa-hldāṅ*, *ḥtor-htas-hproms*, *ḥrta-rkwa-hdzam*, *ḥsāṅ*, *ḥsas*, *phye*, *hnāṅ*, *myaṅ*, *hmey*, *hpo*, *hreṅ*, *mye*, *hldāṅ*, of which the first three may be postponed, while the rest have been discussed. To be added are *ḥdṛho* l. 37 (= Tib. *ḥdṛo*, *ḥdron*, ‘travel’, ‘depart’, a Verb occurring elsewhere also in the text), *ḥnāṅ*, l. 90, *myiṅ*, l. 97 (if a correct reading, equivalent, no doubt, to Tib. *miṅ*, ‘a [mere] name’): *ḥnāṅ*, which, as *ḥnāḥ*, is predicated in l. 116 of ‘fear’, may have appositely the meaning ‘evaporate’ and be akin to Tib. *nāṅ*, ‘vapour’, ‘odour’. With *ḥso-hnāḥ* have been found, ll. 108, 131, *ḥṛgaḥ*, ‘grow old’, = Tib. *rga*/*rgan* (used respectively of ‘speech’, *ḥṛgaḥ*, l. 169,\(^1\) and ‘corn’, *ḥṛgan*, l. 160); l. 356 *ḥṣid*, ‘perish’; l. 290, *ḥthaṅ*, ‘be authority’; ll. 111, 234 *gcheṅ/gceṅ*, ‘suffer a check’; ll. 111, 270 *hyaṅ*, ‘be in the ascendant’; l. 232, *stor*, ‘be lost’. In l. 103 we find *ma-raṅ*, ‘be not pleased’ = Tib. *raṅ*, *raṁs*; in l. 110 *ḥldoḥo*, which is ambiguous—conceivably it is related to Tib. *bdø*, ‘increase’. *Gcheṅ/gceṅ*, here antithetic to *ḥldoḥo*, is = Tib. *ḥcheṅ*, *ḥchags*, *bṣags*, *bṣag*, *sag*, ‘split’, ‘confess’, ‘be afraid’, *gcog*, *bcag*, *chogs*, ‘split’, ‘break’, *cag/chag*, ‘broken’, &c.; the form with *ts* which furnishes *tseṅs*, ‘trouble’, ‘toil’, ‘difficulty’, may occur in l. 93, *swa-tseg-tseg*, where, however, a different explanation is possible. In the Central-Asian documents we find the forms *tseg* (ii, p. 412: 117) and *tseṅs* (ii, p. 236: 87, a ‘check’ in the military sense). The Nam text has *ḥceṅ* in:

\[
\text{ḥbroṅ-re-ge-rmo-hkum-ḥceṅ}, 250
\]

‘all the yaks were, in fulfilment of the vow or prayer (? Tib. *smon* ?), “checked”.’

29. *ḥkhor*, *ḥkor*; *ḥyog*, *g-yog*, *ḥyogs*; *ḥkru*, *ḥkruṅ*, *ḥḥkru*, *ḥḥkruṅ*; *ḥkru-yog*, *ḥbro*, *ḥpro*; *ḥḥkru-ṛgaṅ*; *ḥkyaṅ*; *ṛgaṅ*, *ḥḥldoṅ*; *ḥkri*; *ḥsī-hkri* (*ḥgṛi*); *ḥnāṅ-ḥna*; *ḥpōṅ*, *ḥḥdol*; *ḥyor*; *kla*;

\(^1\) But here probably rather = Tib. *dgah*, ‘joy’, ‘rejoice’.
klag; gśim; hpraḥ; hrgom; hrkah; ḡrdoḥo; ḡrnab; ḡkyi;
g-rah.

Tibetan ḡkhor, 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 ḡkhor-g-yog, 'attendants and servants', naṅ-
ḡkhōr, 'domestics'. The first of these meanings has been accepted (p. 272) in regard to ḡkor as applied in l. 53 to the rgya-hūi-ke, 'sun
and moon'. In ll. 293, 294, 296 it is not clear whether the ḡyaṅ-
ḡkah-ṛdza and ḡkyaṅ-hldoṅ 'form a circle' or 'turn back' (ḡkhōr
[-r]); and in l. 277 it is likewise uncertain whether the braves
(hpraḥ) 'return' or 'form groups or retinues' (ḡkor-re). But in l. 18,
ḡdzaṅ-ḡkhōr-ḥkrug, 'the retinue of wise persons was at strife', and
in l. 98 the word ḡkhōr clearly denotes a group of subordinates
forming a retinue; and in:

ḡkhōr-hṭah-ḡkhen-yaṅ-sṅaṅ-gyaṅ-gyaṅ, 92
'though recognizing one of one's own people, the heart
dallies, dallies'

the sense is approximately, or exactly, the same.

With ḡkhōr, as in the above-cited Tibetan ḡkhōr-g-yog, the Nam
text associates ḡyogs in its:

ḡdzaṅ-ḡkhōr-ḥkrug-ḡkyaṅ-ḡyogs-ḥldog, 18

where the ḡyogs or ḡkyaṅ-ḡyogs are ḡldog. In the sense of 'below',
associated with rgyaṅ-ḡūi-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 ḡkhui-teṣa-ḥyogs-ḥdag, l. 259,
'old men with staves or poles', an entirely different word, = Tib.
yog-po, yog-šiṅ, 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 ḡyogs or ḡkyaṅ-ḡyogs who in l. 18 are ḡldog, 'recalcitrant' (Tib.
ldog, log), are accordingly 'servitors'.

The recurrent expression ḡkrū-yog, ll. 289, 321 (ḡkrū), 322-3
(ḡkhrūḥu'), 324, contains a word which by reason of relative
constancy of writing must be kept entirely apart from any gru or
ḡrū. Even in ll. 187, 388, the rendering 'when the great ḡkrū
became expanded' is to be preferred. The ḡkrū-ḥyogs-rño, l. 289
= ḡkrū-ḥyogs-rño, l. 321 = ḡkrū-yog, l. 324, 'the ḡkrū capable of
service', must be the kruḥu-ḥthe-hpraḥ, 'humble (Tib. phra) kruḥu
lieges', of ll. 334-5, the ḡkhrūḥu-ḥyogs-hṣud, 'dispersed (? Tib.
THE NAM LANGUAGE

gsud), hkrųhu servitors', of ll. 322–3, and the rkom-hkrų-hsud, 'slain hkrų dispersed', of l. 313. They must therefore be equivalent to the kru-ra, = dmość-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, hkrųd, 'wash', 'cleanse'). Accordingly we can understand:

byah-hťaun-rma[-]-ṛ[e]-hyah-hkrųhu-hbro-re-hrgyeb-hkruho ||
315–16

'when the higher authority becomes low, while the front hkrųhu-hbro, the rear is hkrų (filth)'.

As a Predicate in the last usage, hkrų, hkhru, has several recurrences:

hrom-hbroś-hkru[-]-ṛ[e], 285, 'the slain yak being filth',
hkhrū-re-hkyañ, 320, 'the hkvañ being filth'
hgu-mor-hkru[-]-ṛ[e], 331, 'the wicked thieves² (?) being filth'

while in:

hrgom-hkhrū[-]-ṛ[e]-hṭo-na, 169, 'the canaille being passed over (hrgom, pp. 245, 323)'
hkṛū-hrkah-myī-hrdōho-hrṇab-ma-hldā, 165
'the canaille who do not submit to hardships (Tib. dkaḥ-ba-
dān-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 hkrū(hkruhu, kru)-hbro (once ṣhbro, l. 321) by 'flies into a corner (gru)', although ḥbro (bro), = Tib. ḫbros/bros, 'flee', has a number of occurrences (ll. 36, 138, 139, 241). Ḥyah-hkṛuhu-hbro (ll. 315–16, 318, 325) means 'the front (sc. the superior) tastes as filth' (Anglicè 'is bad odour'),³ hrgyeb-hkṛu-hbro (ll. 297, 323) 'the rear (sc. inferior) tastes as filth', and hri(g-ṛi)-hkrųhu-hbroho(hbro) (ll. 294, 313), 'the mountain tastes as filth', sc. when infested by savage animals. The verse:

byah-hklu(hkṛu)-hbro-re-hgṛyebh|hkrų-hbro-re-hyah-hṭaḥ-
ḥṭhañma | |, 221–2

'The front tasting as filth, the rear tasting as filth, both are on a par'.

¹ Hsud occurs only in the two passages. Tib. suḍ = 'cough', 'choke', and gṣud, bṣud, 'dyspepsia', 'be lost', 'dispersed', 'be crammed with food'. Perhaps śuḍ, bṣud, 'scratch', 'excoriate', also 'steal silently away', is intended: or cf. bṣun (ṣun), 'dissolute'? See p. 233.
² Cf. Tib. skyug-bro, 'nausea', 'disgust', 'shameful', 'impure', from skyug, 'vomit'.
³ Sic.
follows the statement `hbroṅ-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 S. 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.

*Hkyaṅ*, mentioned above as possibly contained in the phrase *hkyaṅ-hyogs*, where, however, it might be = *Tib. kyaṅ*, ‘even’, ‘also’, and again in the statement ‘the *hkyaṅ* being filth’, appears in antithesis to *hbos*, ‘big man’, ‘master’, in:

```
  hpu-hpos-stor-dze-hkyaṅ-stor-rño ||, 141
   ‘when the master man flees, the *hkyaṅ* can flee’.
```

In ll. 273–4:

```
hwi-hwa-se-kyah-hkyaṅ-hdzam-re-hldan ||
   ‘to the crops mice-injured (se) the *hkyaṅ* all tame returned’
```

the *hkyaṅ* are aligned with the *hñoḥo-hjam-re*, ‘friends all tame’, of the previous verse, who returned to their enemy-abandoned (*gsan-hrah-htoṅ*) crops, and with the ‘enemies’ (*rñe*), *twaṅ* (?), ‘dogs’ (*hkyi*) and ‘goats’ (*g-raḥ* ) ‘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 servants. This accounts for the antithesis to *na-hldom* in:

```
  na-hldom-hgor-kla-hkyaṅ-gstor[-ḥdor], 143
    ‘if the *na-hldom* are very idle (*Tib. hgor*, ‘loiter’, +-kla, ‘unlimited’, as in ll. 205–6), the *hkyaṅ* 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 *hlod* ‘bound’, see *infra*, pp. 318–9 sqq.

The *hkyaṅ* are again, as *hkyaṅ-hldoṅ*, contrasted with the *hbos* in:

```
  mor-hkyaṅ-hldoṅ-re-hbos-g-yah-hthaṅ ||, 286–7
    ‘the bad *hkyaṅ* being *hldoṅ* (or the *hkyaṅ-hldoṅ* being vile),
     the master is in the ascendant’
```

```
hkyaṅ-hldoṅ-hkhor-[re-]*hbos-hriḥi-hruḥ ||, 293
```

'the ḡkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ returning (or in attendance), [to] the master
(or master’s)1 mountain peak'
ḥbos-g-ri-hpaṅ-dze-ḥkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ-re-hṅah ||, 290–1
‘On the master’s mountain-flank are no ḡkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ’
ḥkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ-hkhor-[re-]ḥbos-ḥyaṅ-[h]tona, 293–4
‘the ḡkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ returning (or in attendance), the master is
in the ascendant’.

Here ḡldōṅ cannot mean ‘face’ (‘ḥkyaṅ-faced’), Tib. gdoṅ/mdoṅs,
or ‘blind’, ḡdoṅ/loṅ, or ‘accompanying’ = Tib. sdoṅ: it must be
‘runaway’, = Tib. ḡdoṅ, ‘depart’ (in Imperative, ‘Begone’), as
elsewhere; and the situation, as well as the meaning of ḡkhor, is
determined by:

riṅ-ḥtab-hkhoṅ-hkhoṅ-ge-ḥkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ-ḥgyaṅ-sto
ḥkyaṅ-ḥldōṅ-hkhor-[re-]ḥbos-ḥriṅ-ḥruṅ ||
ḥṭor-ḥpuṅ-ḥbos-dze-ḥrim-ge-hṛgrus, 292–3
‘while the fiends were answering back (p. 264), the runaway
ḥkyaṅ stopped:
the runaway ḡkyaṅ 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
ḥgaṅ-ḥldōṅ.

Reference to ḡkyaṅ, ‘serfs’, must be seen also in ll. 48–9, where
a fight of twaṅ is contrasted with a fight of ḡkyaṅ. But in l. 372,
ḥḥrūg-ḥkyaṅ-ḥldom-re, ‘strife also being subdued’, and consequently
in the above-cited ḡhhrūg-ḥkyaṅ-ḥyaṅs-ḥldog, l. 18; further in
ḥḥkor-ḥkyaṅ-ṛueḥi, l. 98, ‘the retinue also is ruined’, and in ḡlaḥ- ḡkyaṅ-ḥras-re, l. 344, ‘the passes also being alined’, it seems
probable that ḡyaṅ, ḡkyan = Tib. kyaṅ, ‘even’, ‘also’.

A quite different ḡkyaṅ must be seen in:
ḥkyaṅ-rṛgaṅ-ḥṣig-dze-ḥṣi-ḥkri-ḥtshim, 81
‘when the ḡkyaṅ-rṛgaṅ is destroyed, the high or death (ḥṣi)
couch (Tib. ḡkri, ‘chair’, ‘couch’, ‘bed’) is a satisfaction’
ḥkyaṅ-ḥṛgaṅ-ḥyaṅ-ge-hmu-klaṅ-gṣim ||, 268
‘with the ḡkyaṅ-ḥṛgaṅ in front, a cold season (Tib. gḷags,
‘occasion’) is agreeable (Tib. sīm, tṣhim, or gṣin?)’.

Here the ‘long or large (ṛgaṅ) ḡkyaṅ’ would be quite intelligible,
if it were the k'ang of the Tibeto-Chinese border and of north China, a sort of dais, about 2 feet high, floored with tiles or mud and heated by a flue underneath: on this the people sit and sleep (Huc and Gabet, i, p. 287; Rockhill, The Land of the Lamas, pp. 6–7, Diary, p. 35). It seems possible that the word ḫkyaṅ actually represents the Chinese term ts'uan, 'stove', since in the Tibetan manuscripts we find khyod written for tshod¹ in dgun-tshod, 'winter-season' (cf. ņin-tshod, mtshan-tshod, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 201). The same expression recurs in:

na-ḥłdom-ḥgor-[re-]ḥkyaṅ-ḥrγyaṅ-ḥdzuṭ ||, 41–2

'if the house-servants are idle, the ḫkyaṅ-ḥrγyaṅ is wasted or unsuccessful' (?)

but, though Tib. ḥdzuṭ, ḥdud, 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 ḡsi-ḥkri-ḥchim (sic), 'high or death chair or bed', recurs in l. 38 (ḥgri); but Tib. ḡchim means 'be, or get, full', and the remainder of the verse is not clear. ḡkri = 'support', a meaning found also in Tibetan, is seen in l. 52 (p. 317).

In l. 114 (ḥrah-ṛṭah-.)ḥkyaṅ is an error for the ḡγyaṅ of l. 77.

30. rmag; mag-ḥno; ḡthuṅ; ḡtar; ḡmaṅ-byi; ḡdrag; ḡsod; ḡtsa; ḡnu; ḡsar; ḡnar; ḡphah; ḡci, ḡcihi, ḡcihi, ḡhi, ḡchhi; ḡdaḥ; ḡsams; ḡpom, ḡphom; ḡdraṅ; ḡtq; ḡtq; ḡsi-kyeg; ḡnu-sad; ḡro-ta; ḡor, ḡhor; ḡor-tas-proms; ḡdas; ḡso-bos; ḡrṇi; mo; myag; ḡdwā; ḡad; ḡlad.

The passage:


has suffered, as will be seen, from losses of repeated words, to the

¹ On ḡgy- and ḡsh- see p. 269.
detriment of the metre. The following discussion, however, does not greatly depend upon recognition of that circumstance. We may venture upon a rendering as follows:

‘in . . . battle who stay flight?
If there is a little (hthuṅ) open space, the tame-hearted make off (ṭar):
Against a post-relinquishing army the enemy are bold (Tib. ḭrag).
In an army of bad or good many weak ones (or big and little, ḡmaṅ-byi) flee;
Fleeing, with their country lost, they are dragged defeated;
Those dragged being annihilated, those of great self (hṛaṅ-ṛgyaṅ) are laid low (ḥsod);
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 (ḥraḥ) staying flight:

The equation of ṛmag to Tib. ḏmag, ‘army’, is not open to objection; and the same is appropriate in regard to the only other instance of ṛmag:

puṅ-te-gsar-ṅar-hpaḥ-ṛmag-hcihi ||, 204–5

‘in mass with new strength a hero army goes’


A practical equivalence of ṛmag to maγ(-ṅor) no longer calls for defence: the ḏ/r in ḏmag/ṛmag is a Prefix, and we have suggested that strictly it implies an intervening verbal idea, so that, if maγ originally meant ‘array’, ḏmag/ṛmag may have meant ‘arrayed’. That maγ-ṅo(r) means ‘battle’ is suggested by Tib. g-yul-ṅo, ‘battle’ (g-yul, ‘fight’, +ṅos, ‘side’, or ṅo, ‘face’): as a fact, the equivalence, and at the same time the r-Locative in -ṅor = -ṅo-dze, is established by:

sku-maγ-ṅo-dze-me-na-hldis
ḥḍaḥ-maγ-ṅo-dze-me-na-ḥsams, 58

1 Cf. the cases of repeated words supplied underlie, 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-hno[-r[e] . . . ḥkyan-mag-hno[-r[e], 48–9
'in a battle of twañ . . . in a battle of ḥkyan'
ḥdiḥi-mag-hno[-r[e]-ma-hpu-mu-re, 184
' in this battle mother and children being cold (afraid?)'

Even outside the compound mag-hno the form mag is seen in:
ḥsad-mag-ḥdehi-dze-ḥsi-kyeg-mye, 102
'in those whose army¹ is defeated the fire (courage) is winter-clogged (ḥsi-kyeg, p. 226)'

where the ḥsad, sad, of the passage ll. 145–9 recurs.

The phrase stor-ta-hṭhog(s), ll. 145, 149, contains a form hṭhog (l. 235 hṭog) = Tib. thogs, ‘hold up’, ‘obstruct’, connected, no doubt, with ḥdogs, ḥtoqs, ḡdogs, ḡtoqs, ‘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. Ḥsod, which cannot be connected with Tib. ṣad/qṣad/qṣod, ‘comb’ (a horse), ‘brush’, ‘stroke’, or with ḥsād/ṣād/ḥsād, ‘expound’, ‘state’, may be = ṣđ, ‘low’, ‘bottom’, concerning which see p. 6: in l. 198 ṣodṛsa is used of ‘corpses’ (ḥro-ta), in l. 281 (p. 231) of ‘forests’ (ḥbo-hram). The form ṣodṛṣa, ḥsodṛṣa, 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 ḥsāds, an s-Preterite of ḥsād, which, however, would be hard to parallel, there being no other recognized s-Preterites from Verbs with final d.² Myage(= myag-ge)-me-hṭan can mean, here and in l. 39,

¹ Or ‘army fortune (ḥde)’ or ‘army heat (ḥde)’, with a paronomasia.
² Such Preterites in -ds were, however, posited by the late Dr. Wolfenden (Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology. p. 58(1), and JRAS. 1937, p. 648) as the source of the -s in d-verbs; and an actual instance may be seen in the word skyeds, ‘interest’ (?), occurring in a document (Tib. Literary Texts, &c., ii, p. 190): cf. hbraṅ-sta. p. 359.
'the power (htaṅ = Tib. thaṅ, as elsewhere) of fire (perhaps here implying 'courage') is spoiled (Tib. myag').

In tor-ḥtas-prom (l. 148) ḡtas cannot well be = Tib. ḡdas, 'passed', which in l. 85 is ḡddas: also tor cannot here be the frequent tor/ḥtor, 'great'. The phrase must be the same as in ll. 121–2, where we are told that 'if friendship is not, ḡtor-ḥtas-hproms': there, if we translate 'the tuft (Tib. thor, e.g. of hair) has become tangled', understanding ḡtas as = Tib. ḡthas, 'not straightforward', 'hard', 'solid', s (originally Aoristic) form of tha, 'hard', 'compact',1 'bad', we obtain a satisfactory sense and at the same time a relation to the proverb sdud-ka-ni-bal-nas-bchod (also glad-kyi-phud-ūams), '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, ḡtor, thor-gtsug, 'turban', 'head-tuft', 'top-knot').2 Then in the preceding verse we shall have:

spye-ḥtor-ḥdwa-dze-myag-myi-tor
'when the summer (spye, as in ll. 159, 190) -sheaf goes wrong (ḥdwa), the man-sheaf (coherence of the troops) gives way (myag, 'corrupts').

The word ḡdwa, 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-bês-myed, 'a poor wretch (?) without friends' (cf. Chinese to < d'ūā, 'ruin', Karlsgren, nos. 1008–9), which may indicate the general sense in the Nam passage.

In:

ḥtor-ḥtas-prom-ḥrom-neḥu-ḥso-bos, 257
'in the vacancy (ḥrom = Tib. rum) of the tuft which has become tangled a new ḡso-bos'

we have evidently in ḡso-bos a synonym for thor; the expression will mean 'top (ḥso = Tib. gtso, cf. ḡse = gtse)-swell' (ḥbo, ḡbos, bos, see p. 231). Tibetan gtso has also the anticipated forms gco/co (Nam ḡco, l. 55); and this appears in co-to, 'a tuft of hair on the head'.

It is unfortunate that in Tib. thor, 'anything gathered into a point', of which, as we see, the predominant sense is 'top-knot',

1 In the Tibetan manuscripts we find ziṅ-ta(= tha)-baḥi-rna (for rña), 'fields with thick mowing'.

2 Possibly the Nam people wore an elaborate top-knot, like the 'horn' of the modern Black (sc. Independent) Lo-los, who so much resemble them (figured in Fergusson, op. cit., p. 301, and D'Ollone, In Forbidden China, p. 90). See next page.

ṣīd-g-ri-ḥṭor-dze, 34 ‘on the summit of a high mountain’.
ḥṣīd-hrihi-ḥṭhor-dze, 62

But what is the signification of the quasi-proverbial phrase mo-ma-thor(hṭhor), ll. 63, 71, 144, always corresponding to a ḥḍi-ma-ḥṛṭah(rṭah), ‘the horse does not leap (gallop)’, in the following verse? The expression, which is linked by the word thor to the above tor/ḥṭor-htas-prom/hproms, is further associated therewith by the application to friendship in:

ḥṇo-stor-ḥṣaṅs-dze-mo-ma-ḥṭhor, 143–4
‘when friends are gone (Tib. soṅ, ‘go’) lost, the mo does or do not bunch’.

If the two phrases are equivalent, mo should mean ‘hair’: and this is in itself likely, because Hsi-hsia has ma (= Chinese mau, mao, Laufer, 92; 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:

ḥyaṅ-ḥso-ḥrṇi-dze-mo-ma-ḥṭhor, 63
‘if the net or noose (Tib. ṛṇi/sṇi) is too large (Tib. yaṅs ?), the hair does not bunch’;

for the ṛṇi, 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 sṇi, ‘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 ḥṇaṅ-ḥyaṅ-hṭsag, ll. 44–5 (see p. 343).

It seems probable that one same Predicate thor should be recognized in:

rṇe-lad-thor-dze-ca-yāṅ-ḥṭor, 235–6

In spite of the word ḥbro, ‘flee’, apparently alternative in l. 240 to
HTOR/thor, and the possibility of applying the idea of ‘scattering’ to rūe(gse)-lad, ‘requital of wrong (harm)’, it does not seem reasonable to attribute to the Verb a meaning so opposed to the preceding, however justified in Tibetan. The meaning may be that the ‘requital of evil (rūe/gse-lad)’ is exacted ‘in a lump’ and that the ca/hcah/hchah are taken in along with the other offenders.


31. khrom, hchrom, ḥkhram, ḥgrom, ḥgroms; ḥcer; ḥpyi; ḥpraḥ; cig-dze; ḥldam.

Khrom is antithetic to ḥcer in:

mor-tsah-khrom-re || ḥyaṅ-tsa-ḥcer ||, 388
‘when the evil khrom, the good ḥcer’

and the same antithesis takes the form of parallel in:

ru-ge-ḥkrom-dze-mo-ma-thor
ḥchah-ge-ḥcer-dze-hldi-ma-rtah ||, 70-1.

In Tibetan the Verb becr/gcecr, 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-ḥcer 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 (ḥcha) which glares.

The word khrom in the first passage must signify some kind of success; and, if we understand a ‘spreading’, the ru-ge-ḥkrom 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 ḥgye-ḥkrom-hkrom, ‘light flickers’, discussed supra, p. 235-6, and there connected with the Tibetan ḥgrem, &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:

हक्रम1-re-हर्दान-यान-ह्रकोम-हप्यि-हप्रान ||, 332-3
'though when prosperous (active, shining) wrathful (Tib. 
स्तान)', when slain the हप्यि² (or "(creatures) after death") are 
of no account (हप्रान, as elsewhere = Tib. फ्रा, 'small', or 
possibly Tib. फ्रा, "kick", "be kicked").
हक्हर-र्पाग-ग-यार-हल्दाग-[नाग-]हग्रम, 135-6
'When Low-town became high, the black-back flourished'
हर्ता-स्वाग-कोम-रे-ह्तोर-ह्ब्रों-हग्रम, 222-3
'while the horse was occupied with watching, the great yak 
flourished'

the last passage being followed by:
ह्तोर-ह्ब्रों-हग्रम-रे . . . } 222-3
ह्तोर-ह्ब्रों-हर्पाग-रे . . . }

where there is an explicit antithesis of हग्रम, 'flourished', to 
हर्पाग, 'brought low'.

The same meaning must be recognized in:

ह्यान-त्सा-ह्जो-द्जे-ह्यान-ग-हग्रम
tor-pu-hgru-ge-hstor-moñ-hdzon-re-htsa-hdzon-hkrom, 63-4
'when the good are chiefs, the good flourish:
'... the Moñ-castle being lost, the men were scattered'

(the events indicated by the expressions 'the horse occupied in 
watching', 'Low-town become high', and 'Moñ-castle lost', being 
all one occurrence).

In:
ह्ल्द्यान-ह्यु-ह्जो-चिग-द्जे-ह्तोर-ग-ह्क्रमस, 387
ह्ल्द्यान-ह्जो-ह्क्रम-ग-नि, 390

the sense of हक्रम/ह्क्रम is not clear.

The expression chig-dże, interpreted (p. 234) as chig, 'ruined'
(= Tib. ह्जिग/ह्जिग/ह्जिग) and recurring as chig/gcig in ll. 194, 208, 356, 
377)+dże, may in l. 387 be the unanalysable term repeated in:

chig-dże-ह्तोर-[रे]-ह्ल्दाम-रे-ह्ल्दान, 186-9, 192,

where some official title or designation might be apposite. If the 
case were so, we could think only of Turki chigši, 'prefect', which 
appears in Chinese as ㄝ-e-che (= ㄝ), in Central-Asian Tibetan 
Documents (ii, p. 49) as tshi-ši, and, probably, in one of 'the 

1 Tib. हक्रम is 'cunning', 'artful', 'lively', 'brisk', 'quick', as boys, 
kids, &c.

2 Perhaps Tib. डोय, ग-गि, 'lynx'.
Tibetan manuscripts' as si-si-druṅ-po, 'si-si official'. Possibly the line refers, as would be apposite in the context, to reports, &c., of such officials; but the phrase ḥldam (cf. Tib. ldam-ldem, 'dubious', &c.?)-re-ḥldan is obscure.

In ll. 150, ḥkyer-re-cig-dze, 376, rab-hgo-cig-dze, the meaning 'ruined', 'overthrown', is clear.

32. hgru, hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ/ma; hgru-ma; ḥtor(tor)-ḥpu (ḥpuḥu, ḥphu, ḥbu)-hgru.

Some of the most puzzling expressions in the text occur together in the lines:

ḥṣid-ḥriḥi-ḥthor-dze-hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ
ḥtor-ḥphu-hgru-dze-gla-ḥtso-ḥtsaḥ, 62

of which the first recurs (ṣid-g-ri-ḥtor-dze . . . ) in ll. 34–5, and the second in ll. 29–30 (ḥpu, ḡdzo). Having acquiesced (p. 303) in the rendering of ḍṣid-ḥriḥi-ḥthor-dze by 'on the top of a high hill', we come next to hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ (ma). This expression, repeated in:

hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ-dze-ḥtṣa-gsom-ḥkḥog, 21
hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ-ge-ḥṣes-ḥbeg-ḥraḥ ||, 22–3
hgru-ḥldaṅ-ma-dze-hṛgu-ḥto-ḥrṇun ||, 30

seems to denote some more than a casual object. The element hgru, which, if = Tib. gru, should mean either (a) 'boat' or (b) 'angle', 'corner', 'edge' (gru-bṣi, 'square', gru-mo, 'elbow', gru-ma, 'angle', 'corner', 'edge', yul-gru, 'locality' (country-corner)), may have the meaning (b) in:

ḥldu-hro-hgru ||, 19, 'the assembly-place (after the overthrow of the bzer, which was a building) a corner'
ḥṛi-hgru-gras-re, 300, 'the mountain corners (recesses ?) being aligned'.

But a different sense is apparent in:

hgru-ḥṣram-ḥtam-ge-ḥṣes-beg-ḥstal ||, 24
'the hgru firmly (ḥṣram) knit together are (were) Ḥṣes-beg's station'

which, however, is closely connected with hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ by the statement (ll. 22–3):

hgru-ḥldaṅ-ḥmaḥ-ge-ḥṣes-ḥbeg-ḥraḥ ||
'Hgru-ḥldan-ḥmaḥ was (were) Ḥṣes-ḥbeg's place'.

Here we might understand hgru, 'corner', in the sense of 'corner (sc. projecting or recess in) rocks'; and we have already (p. 223) seen that Ḥṣes-ḥbeg was 'eye' and 'path' to the 'blind rocks'
Inasmuch as ḥdaṅ is known as (a) 'stick', (b) 'rise', (c) 'side', and ḡmaḥ should be either (a) 'low' or (b) 'not' or (c) a Suffix, the expression ḡru-ḥdaṅ-ḵmaḥ 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 Ḥes-ḥbeg; and, moreover, the statement in l. 21 that in ḡru-ḥdaṅ-ḵmaḥ the three grasses were spoiled (ṛtsa-gsom-ḥkhoṣ) seems to point to a country rather than to such features. If we understand ḡru-ḥdaṅ-ḵmaḥ 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-daṅ, one of the 13 (mythological) countries,
Hbum-daṅ, one of the 13 (mythological) towns,
Guṅ-daṅ, the (mythological) country of Guṅ-tshun,
Rji-lun-daṅ-ba, the (mythological) country of the Rji (= rdzi, 'storm-wind') Phyar-phyur,
Pyi-gtaṅ-sum, a Ḥbrog country,
Pyi-ldaṅ, a certain locality,
Dbye (Bye)-ldaṅ-sum, a Ḥbrog country = Dbye-mo.

It seems likely that in all these names we have one and the same syllable daṅ, ldaṅ, conventionally employed in the naming of imaginary places and preceded by a syllable which in some cases (Guṅ and Rji) was used as name of the inhabitants, but in other cases (Rtsi, 'sap', Pyi, 'outer', Dbye, 'extent') denoted something else. Accordingly ḡru-ḥdaṅ-ḵmaḥ might be 'country of rocks or rock-recesses', if it should not rather be 'country of the ḡru'.

The last-mentioned possibility, which might involve the supposition that the text regards the ḡru people as the people of the ḡru, '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 ḡru people is mentioned, along with the Dbra, Ldon, and Lga, as one of 'four tribes' (S. C. Das's Dictionary). We may suspect that they figure in early Bon-po literature. Of the four the least legendary are the
Ldoû, 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 ĕbra discussed supra (pp. 215–6); for in ll. 30–2 a place ĕbra or ĕbra-hldah (p. 319) is mentioned immediately after Ḥgru-hldan-ma, as not shaken by the cataclysm which ruined the latter. This greatly enhances the probability that Ḥgru-hldan-ma is a place-name. The Ḥgru 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-ron, in Amdo (Geografia Tibetana, p. 54), and to Gru-gu Rgya-ra, ‘a village in Khams’ (Ś. C. Das’s Dictionary). Upon this supposition the Ḥgru people would be the people of the Ḥgru (perhaps ‘rock’) country, and Ḥgru-hldan-hma at would be their (fictitious) town.

The second circumstance is the repeated mention of the htor-hpu(hbu, Ḥphu)-hgru, which might mean the ‘great Ḥgru men’, since htor-hpu (hbu, Ḥphu) has been found in the phrase htor-hpu-ḥbos, meaning ‘the great big man or master’. This also we should be glad to avoid; and perhaps the rendering ‘great upland (ḥbu = Tib. Ḥbu, as in Ḥbu-rwye-hce, ‘wide uplands’, ll. 15, 50) rocks or rock-recesses’ may better fit the occurrences:

htor-hpu-hgru-dze, 29 ‘in (not among) the htor-hpu-hgru’
htor-hbu-hgru-dze, 33 ‘on (not among) the htor-hpu-hgru’
htor-ḥphu-hgru-dze, 62 ‘on (not among) the htor-hpu-hgru’
tor-hpu-hgru-ge-hstor-moḥ-ḥdzon-re-htsa-ḥdzo-hkrom, 64 ‘the tor-hpu-hgru having lost the Mon-caste . . .’

It is perhaps possible to acquiesce in this view.

There is, however, certainly another Ḥgru, namely the Verb seen in the phrase Ḥrim-ge-hgrus, ll. 293, 297, applied to some beings who perhaps ‘exerted themselves all round’ (ḥrim) the ‘big man’ (ḥphu-ḥbos) or ‘on the watch mountain’ (ḥscah-ḥyer-hri). Ḥgrus should be Preterite of Tib. Ḥgru, ‘take pains’ (ḥgrus, ‘zeal’, ‘diligence’). But it may be suspected that the whole phrase Ḥrim-hgrus is an old, or dialectical, form of Tib. Ḥrim-ḥgro, ‘ceremony’, ‘service’, ‘attendance upon’, ‘homage’, with an o/u alternation to be discussed below (p. 369), and that Tib. Ḥros, ‘advice’, ‘counsel’, ‘heed’ (ḥros-pha, Ḥros-mi, ‘counsellor’, ‘adviser’), is the same word.

At any rate Ḥgru-ma, which is mentioned in the same context
as htor-hpu-hgru, must mean ‘council’. The first mention of hgru-ma:

g-rah-g-yo-rbo-ge-hgru-ma-hṭi ||, 27
‘the earthquake swelling up, the hgru-ma stopped’ cannot
mean ‘the rocks do not (ma) stand still’, because a few
lines later we read:
hgru-hma-hkom-re-hrwad-hmoṅ-ḥldah, 32-3
‘hgru-ma being made, harsh noise (hrwad, see p. 257) was
confused (?)’

and in l. 77:
ḥilde-ge-hgru-ma-rmaṅ,
‘the powers (authorities, nobles) dreamed, or conceived, of a
hgru-ma’

and a few lines later:
ḥño-stor-prom-re-hgru-ma-stor ||
stor-hto-rta-yaṅ-stor-to-hrun | § |, 79-80
‘the friends having taken flight, the hgru-ma fled; [that] fled,
the horse also had to flee’.

The hgru-ma was, accordingly, a sort of assembly, on the lines of
the regular Tibetan 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-ḥldaṅ-hmaḥ or the
Verb hgru may be left doubtful. Some playings with words have
been noted supra (pp. 269, 285, 304); and they seem to have been
frequent in the old Bon-po writings, which in their cosmologies,
historical statements, &c., freely mixed realities with fantasies.

The occurrence of different meanings of hgru in adjacent con-
texts does not attain the level of such a collocation as ši-ši-ši-
tcūmni-śihi-ši in a Chinese text written in Tibetan character:
there the three first ši’s are, as is shown by the corresponding
Chinese writing, all different words, differing also from śihi. But
in the Nam text assonances of like nature, if less concentrated, are
to be reckoned with.

33. yaṅ, ḥyaṅ, g-yay, gyaṅ, ḥgyaṅ, ḥgyaṅs, rgyaṅ.

That this should be a troublesome group of words was to be
anticipated in view of the situation in Tibetan, where we find:
A: yaṅ = (1) ‘though’, ‘even’, ‘also’, ‘again’ (Sandhi variant
of kyaṅ, gyaṅ), whence, in compounds, also
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'further' or 'higher', e.g. yañ-thog, 'highest story', yañ-dag, 'very real', yañ-ma, 'grandmother', yañ-slob, 'pupil's pupil'.

(2) 'light', e.g. in yañ-lci, 'light and heavy'.

(3) in the Tibetan manuscripts, yañ-ba, 'conduit' or 'watercourse'.

(4) in the Tibetan manuscripts 'evil' = rgyañ, antithetic of byin-che, 'blessing', 'bliss'.

B: yañs, 'wide', 'extensive'.

C: g-yañ = (1) 'luck', 'prosperity'.

(2) 'sheep' and 'goat', perhaps originally only a stuffed one, as an auspicious object.

(3) 'gulf', 'abyss'.

D: gyañ (1) for kyañ, 'although', &c. (in the Tibetan manuscripts).

(2) 'clay stamped into moulds' for building, &c.

E: hgyañ, hgyañs, 'be delayed', 'tarry'.

F: rgyañ = (1) 'distance'.

(2) 'stretched'.

(3) 'wall'.

(4) in the Tibetan manuscripts—'evil'.

(5) in the Tibetan manuscripts = rkyañ, 'the wild ass'.

G: rgyañs(-te) = 'in haste'.

hgyañs, brgyañs, 'stretched', = rkyañ, brkyañs, rgyon, rkyon, '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-yān,* ‘gulf’, ‘abyss’, in which possibly the original conception was that of ‘yawning’. The *yaḥ,* ‘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-yān*)’, 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 *rγy-* 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) *yaḥ* = ‘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 *hkyan,* l. 344), where it is attached to a single word.

*bhyan* = ‘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 *yaḥ.*

*gyan* = ‘although’, l. 263, in the caesura position.

*kyan* = ‘also’, ll. 18, 98, 344, 372: attached to a single word.

(b) *bhyan* = ‘good’ or ‘upper’, which latter is perhaps the original sense (*vyَا*), 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 *bhyan-so(hso)* is of uncertain meaning.

*g-yān-ra,* l. 31, is likely to be identical (‘good’ or ‘high’ place) with the *hyan-hyar* of ll. 66, 226.

(c) *yaḥ,* ‘conduit’, ‘watercourse’, l. 355 (Chinese *yang* ?).

(d) *hyan,* ‘conduit’, ll. 178, 179, 367, 391 (*hdiyan-hyan-hyo*).

(e) *hγyan,* a Verb, perhaps always signifying ‘tarry’, ll. 7, 77, 200, 217, 292 (*sto*), 296, 392: always concluding its sentence: in l. 114 *hkyan* is written in error.
hgyañs, Preterite of the same Verb, l. 241 (cf. also hgyañ-sto, l. 292, = hgyañs-to).

gyañ-gyañ, l. 92, may be the same Verb.
hgyañ, l. 153, is an error for hgyan, l. 158.

(f) gyañ-g-ri, l. 313, is not clear.

(g) rgyañ, ‘extent’, ‘extensive’, ll. 16, 52 (2), 55, 57, 147, 151, 152, 155: hkyañ-rgyañ, ll. 42, 81, 268.
rgyañ, perhaps ‘far’, ‘completely’, l. 89.
rgyañ, possibly ‘(long) wall’, l. 300.

(h) kyañ, ? sense, l. 192.

(i) hkyañ, error for hgyañ, l. 114.

(j) hkyañ-rgyañ, ‘stove-bed’ (?), ll. 42, 81, 268.


The predominance of the form yan, ‘also’, &c., in comparison with the synonymous hyan, and its rarity in other senses, suggests that the ʰ, which is also practically never joined to the other enclitics, ge, dze, na, ni, carried a slight increase of emphasis, and was not merely graphic.

34. Ra, rah, hräh, hrar, g-rah, hgrañ.

For the most part there is no difficulty in equating these forms to Tib. ra, ‘limited or enclosed space or sphere’ or, according to its primary sense, ‘enclosure’, ‘fence’, ‘circle’: it is often used to form compounds, e.g. khrims-ra, ‘yard before a court of justice’, lcân-ra, ‘willow grove’, lug-ra, ‘sheepfold’, btsön-ra, ‘prison’. It is only necessary to add the personal sense in sk ê-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 -ń: see pp. 174, 178, where reference is made to the very numerous resulting confusions. The same use occurs after verb-forms in phrases, ḥgah-ḥdoṅra1-hñaḥ, l. 302, ‘where are no fugitive ḥgah’, ḥrugs-ḥseg-ḥşehra, ll. 330, 331 (hrbyo⁰ ḡser), ‘where hrugo comes’.

The form hrar, ll. 216, 237, 243, 246, 248, always a disyllable, is the Locative of ra itself.

2. rah, hräh, g-rah, usually mean ‘place’, e.g. in g-rah-ḥyos,

¹ Here perhaps intended for re: see p. 239.
‘earthquake’, ll. 8, 26, 27, 34, rgyed (hrgyed)-hraḥ (hrar), ‘place of disunion’, ll. 216, 243, 341, &c. This meaning fits even g-raḥ-gṣog-hner, ll. 7, 20: hraḥ-hṛtaḥ, ll. 77, 114, seems to mean ‘the horse (-chief of the place’. As terminal member of a compound, this ra-raḥ/hraḥ/hraḥ is found, further, with skaḥ-, ‘saddle’, l. 45, hno-, ‘friend’ (ll. 264, 279, &c.), hce-, ‘great’ (ll. 49, 50, 56), staḥ-hro-, ‘high country’ (l. 347), hitham-, ‘union’ (l. 227), ḥphah-ma-, ‘father and mother’ (ll. 73–4), braḥ-, ‘increase’, &c. (l. 228), rmaḥ-, ‘tomb’ (l. 148), htsah-, ‘harvest’ (l. 277), hwah-, ‘action’ or ‘government’ (l. 353), ḥyaḥ/g-yaḥ-, ‘good’ or ‘upper’ (ll. 31, 66, 226), hraḥ-, ‘own’ (ll. 21, 166, 167), gsah-, ‘land’ (l. 277), ḡṣaḥ-, ‘enemy’ (ll. 263, 273, &c.). The same appears as first member of the compounds hraḥ-hṭoḥ (ll. 146, 273, 358), hraḥ-we (weḥi, ll. 114, 139), ‘give, or surrender, place’. The personal sense may be seen in meḥi-hraḥ, ll. 78, 186, 369, meḥi-spehi-hraḥ, l. 370, rgo-hraḥ, l. 315, skhu-ra (?) l. 7.

3. hraḥ/g-raḥ seems equivalent to Tib. dgra, ‘enemy’, in:
hraḥ-saḥ-ṇe-ge-stor-ta-hṭhog, 149, ‘the evil-hearted enemy stopped flight’
g-raḥ-hsaḥ-hkhehe-na, 314, ‘in winning an enemy land or in any enemy’s winning the land’;
perhaps also in:
hraḥ-lḥdah-ge-ḥdzah ||, 43, ‘the enemies there are friends’ (but see p. 334)
hraḥ-hmād-hne-nag, 202, ‘low, evil-voiced enemies’ (?)
g-raḥ-nag-hbo-ghan, 262–3, ‘though enemy-voice swelled’;
cf. hlab-ta-gbohu-ste (pp. 158, 231) and ḥṣaḥ-nag-rgyeh-hkom, pp. 320, 360.
ḥcha-hgraḥ-nu, 239, ‘strength of hostile ravenous beasts’
hbri-n-hdah-hdzam-re-hraḥ-rte-hdubna, 182 (354 ‘hraḥ-hṛtre-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 rdeḥe, l. 213, ḥrde, l. 301 (p. 270), while we find a gṛteḥe in l. 181, apparently meaning ‘fix’, and in l. 265 ḡṣaḥ-ta-hṛtehu, ‘stopped’ (?) ‘hostilities’, where the same Verb may perhaps be seen. In l. 82, again, ḥcaḥ-rte might be ‘group of ravenous creatures’ (p. 259), while in l. 260 we have taken (p. 343) gdes as Preterite of a gde, ḥrde (= Hsi-hsia gdeḥ/ḥrde, ‘fix’, ‘make certain’ (Nevsky, No. 25, but gdeḥ, No. 24,
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4. g-raḥ in:

ḥṣu-re || hru-ge-g-raḥ-ḥdzam-nag ||, 275

‘with horns attending, the g-raḥ gave mild (or friendly) voice’, since the previous line speaks of ‘dogs mildly panting’, must be some animal; being horned, it is, no doubt, the goat = Tib. ra.

5. ḡraḥ in sta-ḥldyaḥ-hanye(hṭye)-dze-hmo-ge-me-ḥgraḥ, ll. 8, 20, ‘the clouds (ḥmog) or heavens had fire ḡgraḥ’, may be = Tib. sgra ‘sound’. But ignorance of the meaning of ḡṭye (ḥṭye) precludes a decision.

The form ro, which in Tibetan frequently helps to constitute names of countries and districts, e.g. Cog-ro, Myan-ro, Spag-ro, and which implies a larger area than does ra, occurs in ‘this place (ḥro)’, l. 333, and in compounds with ḡgo-, ‘gate’ or ‘head’ (?) (ll. 212–13), ḡchi-, ‘go’ (l. 345), staν- ‘upper’ (l. 347), ḥldu- (l. 19), ḡldyaḥ- (l. 386), ḡldyaḥ-paḥ- (ll. 271–2), ḡldyo- (ll. 383–4), ḡldyo- (l. 384), ḡldyoḥ- (l. 387), ḡpaḥ-ḥldaḥ- (l. 377), ḡpro- (l. 181), spo- (l. 381), mu- (l. 11).

35. ḡkaḥ, ṭḥkaḥ.

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 ḡgro-khar, ‘at the time of going’, but also, in the same senses, with a preceding Genitive. There are further, kha, ‘snow’, and kha, ‘bitter’. The first of all these is used as the prior number of a multitude of compounds, some with literal, others with metaphorical, meanings.

The signification ‘mouth’ is forthwith apparent in:

ḥyaḥ-ḥrah-ḥkaḥ-ḥldom-ge-ru-ḥlaŋ-ge-ḥṭḥul-hi ||, 66–7

‘mouth-tied in the proper, or upper, place, horned oxen are controlled’;

cf. Tib. ḡhaḥ-sdom, ‘to silence, gag’.

Ḥkaḥ, ṭḥkaḥ, ‘speech’, is clear in:

ḥkaḥ-gsañ, 214, gsañ-ḥkaḥ, 204, ḡkaḥ-gsañ, 329, ‘secret speech’.


1 This is perhaps exemplified in ṛṅe-ḥldaḥ-ḥkhar, l. 197.
LINGUISTIC: ETYMOLOGY

ḥkhāh-hldāh-hnāgh, 137, 'those entitled to speak should give voice'.

ḥwā-ḥkah, 137, 'doing and speaking' or 'talk of action'.

ḥsas-ḥkah-ge, 116, 'talk about the child'.

ḥkhāh-hldān-hnora-tsah-ḥah || ḥkāḥi ||, 163, 'talk rising foolish is the whole story (cha)' (?)

ḥkah-hgaṅ-hjor, 194, 'all talk is babble' (Tib. ca-co, 'babble', co-re, cor-cor, 'sound of effervescence, klag-cor, 'clamour', 'noise', kha-bcol, 'prattle', col-chuṅ, 'childish prattle', mu-cor, 'rudeness in speech', 'nonsense').

the-then-hldi-bzhir-ḥkah-hgaṅ-htsur, 207, 'to this wise [Hsihsia gzhir (Nevsky No. 281) "wise"] folk-control all the talk comes'.

rgyed-ma-hldān-ge-ḥkah-hcog-byin-ta, 104–5, 'when disunion rises, putting in a word (kha-cug (tsug) of the Tibetan manuscripts) is a blessing (byin, l. 57).

ḥkah-hgo, 105 = Tib. kha-bsgo, 'giving directions' (or possibly 'understanding (Tib. go) advice').

ḥkah-ḥkhab, 105, 106, 'concealing what is said'.

ḥkah-hpyaḥ-hldan, 327, 'were repaid (Tib. ldon) with rebuke' (Tib. ḥphya, 'censure', cf. kha-phog, 'rebuке', ḥphyur-kha, 'blame', &c.).

It is not so certain in:

ḥkhāh-ḥgṛo-ge-ḥkahi, 239, 'home-going is to be talked of', 'is the moment for home-going'? ṛnām-skar-ḥkah-re-gdah-hnagh, 191, 'when there is talk of, or it is a moment of, threatening stars, (any) available place is home'.

ḥyaṅ-ḥkah-ṛda, 287, 290, = ḥkah-ḥrdza-ḥdze, 296, = ḥkah-ḥṛdza, 296

where ḥyaṅ certainly = 'good' or 'superior' and ḥṛdza appears from its other occurrence, l. 382, to be a derivative from ḥdza, 'friend' and to mean 'in friendly union'. The ḥkah-ṛdza are connected with ṕṣaḥ, l. 288, 290, and ḥswaḥ, l. 296, both of which have been found (pp. 276–8) to denote 'watching' or 'supervision'. The sense might be 'united in counsel'; but Tibetan has an expression kha-rje, 'great lord', 'good luck', 'fortune', 'good', 'wealth', which, since the meanings do not follow from kha+rje, might be a

1 Or possibly 'paid command-impost (dpya)' (metaphorical). In the Tibetan MS. Chronicle (British Museum portion, l. 18) appears the phrase ḫkah-śo, 'special command-levy'.
perversion of a kha-rdza: the meaning 'great lord' might suit the Nam passages.

There remains the expression:

hke-hkah, 152, 153, hkehe-hkah, 158, hkedu-hkah, 364, kehu-

The word hke, &c., which appears also in the phrase hke-prom,
I. 176, kehu-prom, II. 176, 360, 361, hkedu-prom, II. 177, 178, 360,
362, 366, gehu-prom, I. 362, should not be different from the
hke in hke-plañ-hdra, II. 195, 356, which has been found to mean
'gain', 'profit', and which, as a Verb, has been seen in II. 36 (hkes,
Preterite), 125 (hkehe), 251, 314 (hkehehe), 212 (hkhe(hi))—the other
instances, II. 15, 41 (hke(hi)) are not recalcitrant. The verse:

hke-hkah-ñes-re-ske-hbris-hgyainni, 152-3
hkehe-hkah-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 I. 158, mean-
ing 'be sick', confirms the interpretation of hbrus in I. 152.

It must be admitted, however, that we have not solved all the
difficulties connected with hke/hkedu. In the passage (II. 165 sqq.,
cf. II. 358 sqq.) concerning the distribution of the exercise and the
fire of speech (hkohu-prom, eme) we suddenly come upon the state-
ment:

hbañ-hldab-hne-ge-hkedu-me-hdzañ ||, 170
'good potentates eat the fire of hkedu'

and somewhat later:

rne-hpo-hldo-ge-hkedu-prom-hjo-na, 177
hne-hpo-hne-ge-hkohu-prom-hdzoho-na, 361-2
'the fiend braves (or evil fiend braves) ate the exercise of
hkedu or hkohu'.

It is undeniable (see infra, p. 368) that a hke, hkohu, might exist
as a form of kha, 'mouth', so that hkohu-prom, eme, would be
synonymous with hkohu ('speech')-prom, eme; and in the above
quoted ll. 152-3, 158, we might then translate hke(hkehe)-hkah,
'mouth speech', which would yield a good antithesis to ske,
'throat'. But this would fail to do justice to the apparently pur-
positive alternative of hkohu and hkedu in II. 165-80 and 358-65;
and we are, further, quite at a loss to interpret the pointed antithesis of kehu(hkehu)-hkah and ldyañ(hldyañ)-hkah in ll. 177-8 and 364-5.

36. Words with initial ld.

Since it has already (p. 286) been seen that Nam ld- may 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 hldah(ldah, hlda, lda), hldo; (b) the Pronouns hlda, hldi; (c) the words hldan/ldan, hde/hdehi/hdehe, hldon, ‘depart’, ‘flee’, = Tib. hdon, hldah (278) and hdañ (58, 59), ‘arrow’, = Tib. mdag = Hörpa lda. There remain:

(i) hldag/gldag = Tib. ltag (hdzur; ska; hbañ; khri; khjay). This word, discussed supra (pp. 259-60) as occurring in the compound hldag/gldag-nag, ‘black-back’, has the sense of ‘load’ (Tib. ltañ) in:

skañ-rhñ-hdzn-dze-hldag-hbañ-hldon ||, 45
‘if the saddle (Tib. sga, but cf. ska-rags, “girdle”)-place is awry (Tib. hdzur, bzur, gurz, “step aside”, “shy”, zur, “corner” “aside”), the load goes rocking (?dbañ, “wave”) or “into a hole” (hbañ).’

gldag-hce-rgyñ-na-hldag-khri-khyag-re-häid ||, 52
‘if the load is very large, the load support (khri) bending (Tib. khyog/khyog), it comes to grief’.


Hldan occurs in the phrases hldam(hdzam, hjam)-re-hldan in:
cig-dze-btor-hldam-re-hldan ||, 186-7, 187-8, 188-9
(meaning obscure, see pp. 305-6)
sañ-rahñ-hñon-kyä-hñohn-hjam-re-hldan, 273, cf. 274, 275
‘to enemy-abandoned crops friends returned mild’;
also in:
hrţgysñ-hdihn-htron-re-hkñh-hphysñ-hldan ||, 327-8
‘come to this plain (?)”, are repaid with verbal reproof’ (Tib. hphya, ‘reprove’, ? see supra, p. 315)
Hldon can be Imperative (Optative) of hldan in:

hlde(hlde-he)-ge-htah-hldon, 370, 371, 372
‘let prosperities return’.


(1) ḫbo-hkom-ldyañ-dze-hldob-hde-hde ||, 12
‘On the dry (?) forests lifted high the foliage fluttered (?)’

(2) mu-hroh-htho(hdro)-re-rmañ-hldob-g-we, 197
‘cold (sc. the dead) helped by heat (or ‘when the black cold comes’?), tomb-foundation is made’

With this use of hldob cf. Tib. gur-hdebs, ‘pitch a tent’, āgon-pa-hdebs, ‘found a monastery’.

The form hdb appears in:

mebi-hrañ-hdb-na, 369
‘appointing, or stationing, sentinels’

on mebi-hrañ see pp. 218–2, 313.

(iv) hldam, hldom, hlton, ldon, hdam, hdom, dam, hrdat, =

Instances of hldam, ‘tamed’, have been given under (ii). Hldom, ‘bound’, is seen in na-hldon, ‘house slave’, ll. 41, 143, 350, gdimchis-ldom (l. 88 hlton)-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’

ḥkrug-kyañ-hldom-re, 371–2, ‘strife also being quelled’

ḥpha-ma-sñañ-ne-ge-ru(bu)-ltag-ge-sñañ-glañ-hgahi
hynañ-hrañ-ḥkah-hldom-ge-ru-glañ-ge-hṭhul-hi ||, 66–7
‘Affectionate father and mother, looking at a child, rejoice (? Tib. ḏqah) with affection increased (glañ, “returned”?)’

‘Mouth-bound (Tib. ḵha-ṣdom, “gag”, “silence”) in the right (hyañ) place, horned oxen (Tib. glañ-ru, “bullock’s horn”) are tamed (Tib. ḥdul, btul, dul, thul).’
The children are a 'tie'.

hraḥ-[hyos]-ḥdom, 9, 'the earth movement was stopped (?)'.

In ll. 298–9 g-riḥi-ḥdom is perhaps only a variant of ḥriḥi-ḥdom ('bear') of l. 297.

Ḥdom, 'decision', appears in:

ḥkhwī-hṭsa-hyog-ḥdag-ci-hraḥ-ḥdom-gdes ||, 259–60
'the old, equipped (ḥdag) with staves (Tib. yog-po), fixed their decisions'.

Ḥdam, 'bound', occurs perhaps in:

ḥdzam-ḥbroṇḥbroṇ-dze-ḥdam-to-ḥbu-ḥpor, 68
'in tame-yak gorges tied [animals] have their heads (Tib. dbu, Hsi-hsia wu) released (Tib. ḫbor, "cast away"), "let go", p. 250 supra."

Cf. ḫnu-ghan-ḥpor, ll. 175, 359 (ḥphor), 'the young oxen are released', ḫdro-ḥphor, ll. 180, 353, 'released to go' (p. 250 supra). In the sense of 'checked' ḥdam is applied in l. 326 to ḫse-ḥtah, 'injuries', 'harm', and therefore also in ll. 328, 329, to ḫkhoḥ-ḥtah, ḫkhoḥ-ḥdah. In ll. 346, 351, ḥdam-sleq, partly obscure, may contain ḥdam in the sense of Tib. dam, 'vow', 'promise', 'bond'; on dam-rma ḫbroṇ, see p. 286. P[h]yu-phya-ḥdam, l. 204, is obscure, and in ḫpo-ḥdam-ḥtor, l. 393, the context is wanting.

In ḫrē-hrdam-hṭe, l. 322, 'fiends (enemies) bound, or quelled', ḥrdam regularly corresponds to a Tibetan s- form, sdam.

On ḥdom = Tib. dom, 'bear', see p. 254.

(v) ḥldar, ḥdar = Tib. ldar, 'be weary, faint', or ḥdar, 'quake, tremble', 'shiver', ṣdar-ma, 'timid', 'trembling': (ḥbraḥ-ḥdalah; ḥyob; ḫkye; ḫyuhu).

A ḥldar with this sense might be recognized in:

ḥbroṇ-ḥldar-ḥdzam-re, 353, 'the yak being tame with trembling (or exhaustion)'

and that is not to be rejected. But in l. 182 the reading is:

ḥbroṇ-ḥdalah-ḥdzam-re, 'the yak there (ḥdalah = 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 ḫ.

In ll. 30–1, 31, 32, occurs the phrase:

ḥbrah(hbra)-ḥdar-ma-ḥyob

where an analogous doubt exists. Is the meaning 'Ḥbraḥ (p. 308) was not fluttered (Tib. g-yob) with quaking', or 'in Ḥbrah-ḥdalah
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(hlédar Locative of Suffix hlídañ) there was no quaking’? Hdar, ‘tremble’, ‘shiver’, appears in:

rbyo-hÞphañ-hlédar-dze-hkya-ge-hmu ||, 38–9
‘when the father rbyo (see pp. 332–3) shivers, the offspring
(hkya = Hsi-hsia hgyi (Nevsky, No. 282) = Tib. skye, skyes,
‘be born’, ‘creature’, khye-bo, khye-hyu, ‘child’) are cold’
hrñam-hlédar-hyuñu, 368, ‘the district (Tib. yul? cf. p. 333)
trembles with affright’. (But the parallel in l. 49 has nar.)

(vi) hlídas = Tib. hðañ, hðas, ‘pass’.

rbyo-ha-ge(hge)-hcañ-rté-hyu-rgyag-dze-hlídas, 82–3
‘the rbyo . . . went over to the hcañ’ (p. 259).

(vii) hlídi, hldis, hldin = Tib. ldin,1 ‘float’, ‘soar’.

hlídi-ma-hráñ, 63, 71 (rtah), 144, ‘the horse does not leap
(gallop)’
htor-hráñ-hldi[−r[e], 337, ‘the great horse galloping’
rtahi-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)2 in fire’ (hldis Aorist)
hrsi-hçhos-re-ge-hpu-myì-hldin ||, 160, ‘born in winter, the
bird does not fly’.

(viii) hlídim, hldyim, gdìm, ddyim, hdim, dim = Tib. hthin,
thin, gtin, stin, ‘be lost, dissolved, absorbed’, ‘evaporate’,
‘vanish’, ‘steal away’ (chim, chis, tshin, tshis, hðzam-hdzim).

hrñan-nag-rgyes-hkom-chim-hldim-ge-hþphañ-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 hçhim means ‘be full’, and with it is connected, no doubt,
hthin, ‘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:

gdìm-chis-ldom-re-hþtsog-hldan-hståñ ||
diñ-tshis-ldom-re-tshog-hldan-hduñ ||, 94–5
‘Controlled by going and coming (impermanence), union
rises high (Tib. steñ, stan):’

1 On final n/ñ see p. 362: in E. Colonial Tibetan the form is din.
Controlled by going and coming, union rising falls (Tib. ltuṅ) or is distressed (Tib. gdun)'.

ḥdim-ḥtshis-ḥtom (= ḭdom)-re-ḥtso[g]-ḥdaṅ-staṅ
gdim-pyi-hse-ge-gsom-rgyag-ḥsor-doṅ-ḥtshog-me-ḥddyim-rgyaṅ
gdim-phyi-hse-ge-ḥtshog-ḥram-ḥnad ||, 88–90.

In this second passage:

ḥtshog-me-ḥddyim-rgyaṅ = ‘the fire of union disappears far’
ḥtshog-ḥram-ḥnad = ‘union evaporates (Tib. ḥnad, 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-ḥsor, cf. p. 258)’.

gdim-ḥdzam-ḥdzim-re-hko-wehi-ḥtuḥu ||, 100
‘the ḭdzam-ḥdzim (“bustle” ?; cf. Tib. zaṅ-ziṅ, “miscellaneous objects”, “confused”) having subsided, they assembled, making room’.

What is the meaning of ḭdim in:

rfī-ne-g-ri-dze-ḥdim-ḥphu-ḥmaṅ, 301
‘evil and good on the mountain there are many ḭdim-ḥphu’ echoed in l. 310 by ḭdim-ḥmaṅ-ḥto ||, ‘there are many ḭdim’?

They seem to be classes of creatures, real or imagined.


Ḥdu, ḥduḥu:

ḥtaṅ-ḥdu-ḥdyāṅ-ge, 14, ‘the joined fields (risen) high’
ḥdu-ro-hgru, 19, ‘the assembly-place a corner (or rock)’
ḥswar-ḥdu-sto (= ḥduṣ-to)-dze, 28, ‘in a closing of fingers (Tib. sor)’, sc. in an instant.
ḥduḥu-ce-rgyaṅ-na, 51, ‘if accumulation (store) is of great extent’
⟩cog-ḥlde-ḥdu-dze, 69–70, ‘on the joined warm (?) meadows’
ḥse-ḥdu-ḥru-re-dze, 238, ‘on all the peaks where the ḥse (“fiends”, or “tops”) meet’.

Ḥdun:

ḥrim-ḥdzom-ḥtah-ḥdun ||, 284, ‘the joining (Tib. ḏzom “meet”, “interlace”) [torches] gathered’
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Htuḥu (ḥtuḥu), ḥtuḥ, ḥthuṣ (Aorist):

ldyo-stor-ḥtuḥu-re, 140, ‘when the ldyo in flight gather’
hjim-ta-ḥthuṣni, 156, ‘salves (p. 280 n.) were gathered’.

With spelling ḫtuḥu an instance has been given supra (p. 321).

‘burn’, ‘torment’; (brehe).

bos-smyi-ḥldog-ge-ṣes-gši-hlduḥu || ḥtsah-ḥtsah-hdzaŋ-ge-ṣes-hši-brehe, 43-4
‘when the master is a ḥldog man, the knowing man covets death:
‘when the harvest (or land, ḫṣah)-overseer is wise, the knowing man fears death’.

Brehe may be a d-less form of Tib. bred, ‘fear’, ‘be dejected or ashamed’, and connected, moreover, with ḥbre, bres, ‘screen off’, ‘envelope’. Ḥbres, l. 176, is probably the Preterite of the same.

On ḥldog see infra (p. 323): ḥtsah-ḥtsah has been discussed on pp. 280-1.

(xi) ḥldug: (kyen):

the-kyen-ḥldug, 103.

The = ‘lieges’, ‘common people’: in regard to ḥldug, Tib. ḥdug/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 ḡyaŋ, ‘good’ (l. 383), and sñaŋ-ne, ‘good-hearted’ (l. 160), but also kruḥu, ‘canaille’ (l. 334).

(xii) ḥldo-, do-ldo, ḥldoḥu (ḥrim-ḥldoḥu):

Whether in seg-sme-ḥldo, l. 375, ṭhe-hpo-ḥldo, l. 177, ḫbri-slod-ḥldo, l. 381, the ḥldo is a Suffix is uncertain: on the analogy of hlo-ge-blah-ḥldoḥ, l. 154, mehi-hgab-ḥldo, l. 155, it should be so.

On l. 110 ḥldoḥo see supra, p. 294.

Do-ldo-ḥdzol-čaŋ, l. 76, = [do]-ḥldo-ḥdzor-re, l. 77, = do-ldo-ḥdzo-ḥpehi, 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 ḥdzo/ḥdzor is uncertain: possibly ‘eat’, as in pp. 334-5. ḥldoḥu occurs only in ḥldoḥu-hjam-rño, l. 277, and ḥrim-ḥldoḥu, l. 300, ḥrim-re-ḥldoḥu, l. 319: it should not be = Tib. lo, ‘circle’, as suggested by the context, since in ll. 154, 275, that word, in the sense of ‘troop’, ‘company’, recurs as hlo. But it must have some kindred mean-
ing, since in l. 277 the reference is to groups of persons: it is perhaps = Tib. ldo, ‘side’, so that hrin-hldohu may mean ‘on all sides round’.


The appropriate sense is seen in:

ḥdzan-hkhor-hkuro-hkyaḥ-hyogs-hldog, 18
‘retinue of wise men at strife, servants recalcitrant’
bos-smyi-hldog-dze, l. 42, ‘when the master is a perverse person’; so also in 43–4
mor-gdag-hgom услуг-ḥdzan-hldog-stor, 141–2
‘when the wicked acquire mastery, the wise flee avert’

perhaps also in:

ḥldah-hrgam-hbtsag-hldog-hpo-hrbom-htoho ||
po-rbom-hnor-[re-]hldog-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:

rpehi-hldah-hrgam-re-hldog-hyah-hthanaḥ, 286
‘if the exemplary (?) are taken into the community, the recalcitrant are in the ascendant’

because in l. 169 we read:

hrgom-hkhr[u-]r[e]-hto-na-hrpehi-hrgam-re-hto
‘the canaille (ḥkhru) being passed over (hrgom), the exemplary were taken into the community’.

concerning which see pp. 244, 296–7. Rpehi would well correspond to Tib. ḏpe, ‘pattern’, ‘example’; cf. ṛpag = Tib. ḏpag. The word recurs, no doubt, in the mutilated passage:

bos-[smyi-hld][g-dz][e-rpe]hi-geo-ḥdzah-na-spebi-ge ||
̣hton ||, 378–9.

(xiv) hldor, 357, is possibly = hldo-re, just as the rather frequent hldir is always = hldi-re.

1 Hgom, which does not recur, will be = ḥkom (p. 200).
II. SOME PHONOLOGICAL PARTICULARS

1. Idy, &c.

So far we have been dealing with forms which, though not Tibetan, can be compared with Tibetan without going outside the phonological relations which can be shown to hold within the vocabulary of Tibetan itself. But there is one initial group of consonants, occurring in a number of puzzling words, some of them very frequent, which is unexampled in Tibetan and which, until somehow explained, precludes an interpretation of the text as a whole. This is the group ldy, with which we may associate the few occurrences of dy, ty, thy. These cannot correspond directly to anything in Tibetan, because Tibetan, not tolerating y after dentals, has no ldy-, dy-, ly-, ty-, thy.

It might be suggested that ldy- is a development from rgy-(lgy-), or rby-(lby-), with an l- due, perhaps, to contact with China: and we might point to actual instances of such change, e.g. Mo-so diager, ‘India’, evidently a borrowing of Tib. rgya-gar, to the rdyalsa = Tib. rgyal-sa, ‘seat of royalty’, in the Rgyal-ron song quoted by Dr. Tafel (supra, pp. 85–6), and to Dr. Tafel’s other spellings with rdy-\(^1\) set down in the course of his travels in northeastern 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 lì, lë: 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 pli, pā, or py-, by-: these are not much less common and widespread than those with l-;

(c) forms with p+l or b+l or f+l, such as pli, bli, vli, pali, pili, buli, fali, fili (mili, &c.): these are similarly common and widespread;

(d) forms with p+r, b+r, or f+r, such as (ka)-prei, kam-brin, brè, brî, brui, firi (marî, &c.): a less common variant of (c);

(e) forms with d: diā (D'imāl, a Himālayan dialect), ka-di

\(^1\) [r]Dyallo, r Dyarong, &c. (see Index).
(Gyārūṅ, but ka-plis-si, ‘40’, ko-plī (Rgya-roṅ), ‘4’), bi-di, bi-dī, pedi, pa-dāi, mu-dai, &c. (Nāgā);

(f) forms with a sibilant, such as Tibetan bzi, Šarpa ši, &c.: these are found only in the Tibetan group and are probably in all cases (including Thöchü gzha(-re), ‘4’, ghyi-so, ‘40’) borrowed from Tibetan;

(g) forms with ld: ldi = ‘4’, ldīh, 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 Gyārūṅ, which for ‘4’ has ka-di (Rgya-roṅ ko-plī), has at the same time for ‘40’ the form with pl (ka-plis-si). In view of the Rgyal-roṅ forms and, further, of Tākpa bli and numerous equivalents in 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-roṅ slu, ‘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 Žuṅ-žuṅ pī (JRAS. 1933, p. 408).

Tibetan ž is constantly found in relation, as is natural, to j (c), e.g. in:

žiṅ, žes, particles alternating with cin (jiṅ), ces.


Since j is not found with the Prefixes g, b, 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 š follows the rule for its voiced correlate ž. Presumably ś and ž differ from c and j simply as being

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 \(b\dot{z}i\) is therefore non-original in Tibetan itself. If accordingly we write it \(b\dot{ji}\), it cannot be derived from \(bd\dot{i}\), but may represent a form \(bd\dot{yi}\), since we see that \(dy\) does not survive in the language. Such a form may be akin to the Nāgā forms \(bi-di\), \(bi-d\dot{i}\), \(pedi\), noted under (e); but it disregards the \(l\), which, as is manifest under (a), (c), (d), and (g), is the sound most widely and numerous found in the Tibeto-Burman words for ‘4’. Therefore we must write \(bldy\dot{i}\), possibly derived from a very early original \(ba-li\) or \(pa-li\), which became successively \(ba-ly\dot{i}\), \(ba-l\dot{dy}i\), \(bi-d\dot{yi}\), where it was not preserved, as it may have been in Lepcha \(fu-li\) and similar forms. The forms \(bi\) or \(bd\dot{yi}\) will account for all the types \(li\), \(pli\), \(pre\), \(pi\), as well as those with \(d\) (for \(ld\)), \(bi-di\), &c., for those with \(ld\) (Hsi-hsia \(ld\dot{i}\)), and for the Tibetan \(b\dot{z}i = b\dot{ji} = bldy\dot{i}\).

It is accordingly among words with initial \(\dot{z}\), 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 \(ld\dot{y}-\), \(dy\dot{-}\). The commonest word, \(hldyo\dot{n}\), which by reason of an antithesis to \(hldyo\dot{n}\) might seem to offer the best hold, occurs so variously as to suggest a complex derivation; and forms with \(yi\), e.g. \(ldy\dot{i}\) can always be orthographical or other alternatives of those with \(i\), \(ld\dot{i}\). Hence we may take the words in the order of convenience merely.

1. \(hldyo\), \(ldyo\), \(hldy\dot{o}\); \(hldyo-h\dot{r}o\) (\(hbyohu\); \(hnus\); \(na-h\dot{ts}ah-ste\); \(htrog\); \(hnus\)).

The verse:

\[ldyo-stor-h\dot{h}thu-re-hdra\dot{b}-stor-h\dot{t}ho\] 140

has already (p. 254) been translated:

‘when the \(ldyo\) in flight collect together, the \(hdra\dot{b}\) (ravenous animals) flee’

a rendering apposite in its context. Further, it has been suggested (pp. 254, 256) that in the phrase \(hko\dot{h}u-me\dot{he}-hldyo\) [I], ll. 171–2, which clearly signifies a deprival of the ‘fire’ (power) of speech, \(hldyo\), introduced by a paronomasia, really means ‘milked out’, the context containing references to ‘suppressing’ (\(htul\)), ‘eating’,
(bdzah), and ‘snatching away’ (hdrob) the same ‘fire’. The significations ‘cow’ and ‘milk’ are united in Tib. hjo, bžos, 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. bžon-ma, ‘cow, ewe, or she-goat, that is yielding milk; a gen. term for such cattle’.

A Verb hldyoho (hl dyso) is seen also in:

hnu-[r[e]-hnu-lhun-rgyen-na-hnu-ldo-hldyoho ||, 355
‘absence of all weeping being arranged (rgyen), weeping was milked away’ (p. 256).

In the sense of ‘milch-cattle’ the word recurs in:

ḥdom-hgu-htshuḥu-hyan-hmañ-hldyo-hrgam, 303–4
‘though bears come, many milch-cattle are in company’ (ibid).

The meaning ‘milk’ may be traced in the ldyo ho of:

ḥsan-bdzah-hldyim-hyan-hldyo-ma-hbyoḥu, 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:

ḥdzam-hbron-hron-dze-hldyo-hro-hpebi ||, 384
‘in tame-yak gorges is an example (?) of “ranchland”’

and this, again, may explain the phrase:

ḥldyo-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:

ḥbu-rwy-e-bce-rgyaṅ-dze-hldyo-ḥtor-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-sté = 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 ḥtrog we cannot interpret:

ḥtrog-ḥtor-te-dze-hldyo-ge-nus, 40
(can ḥtrog be = ḥbrog, ‘high pastures’ (see p. 5) ? In the Tibetan
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manuscripts we find ye-hdrog written for ye-hbrog), nor is hldyohrje-hbro in l. 36 clear. But htrog, 'enemy', is possible.

If hldyo 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 'nizju, Karlgren, No. 48).

2. hldya, hldyah: (stoin; hkhog; hnor; yan, hyan; sko).

This word occurs in:

hlduhu-ce-rgyan-na-stoin-hkhog-re-hldya-hkaun-hnte-hnor, 51-2

'An accumulation (store, Tib. hdu-khaun?) of (too) great extent, with empty (unfilled) interior (Tib. stoin, khog), has its goods (hnor = Tib. nor, as in l. 50) filled with hldya'.

Here the meaning 'water' would suit, since ordinarily the store-place would be a pit (don). In Hsi-fan we find Manyak dyab, 'water'; and this may also be Menia djo or dju, Muli djö, Pa-U-Rong dji, Mo-so dji (Lo-lo, ji, yi-die, i dia, dia dia?), also it may be Hsi-hsia tsei, dsei, jei (Lauffer, No. 37). These, however, are merely a beginning: we must add the whole army of forms, such as ti, di, tui, dui, dui, found in the western Himalaya and all over the Tibeto-Burman world; among which forms the ti of Kanauri, &c., may be singled out, as found in a Zaun-zuun manuscript of the ninth to tenth century A.D. (J.R.A.S. 1933, p. 408). These may be referred to an original form tya/uya (cf. the forms pû, by the side of pya = Tib. bya, 'bird'), and possibly forms with a, such as châ, may have retained the original final vowel. The many forms with u, tui, &c. (including Tib. cu/chu < *tyu), may point to a primary tuya, parallel to buya, 'bird' (cf. Tib. phywa, 'lot').

On the etymological side Nam hldya = 'water' may therefore

1 In l. 254 the metre warns us to read:

hldyo-htor-ñmyi-na || (instead of 'ñmyi || 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 hldyo-htor-ge-hmus (l. 16, 34, 40 (omit htor)), which has the contrary implication, must denote some illness of the herds, perhaps the same which is indicated by the ldyohu-ma-hbyohu of l. 255. This confirms the interpretation of htrog-htor-te-dze, which will be a variant of the hbuwye-hee-rgyani-dze of l. 15-16.
be defensible. As further evidence of the actuality, we may quote:

\[ \text{hyaṅ-re-rgyeṅ-na-yaṅ-hldyāh-hldyāḥ} ||, 355-6 \]

‘each conduit being in order, the conduits were water, water [sc. flowed continuously]’

for hyaṅ, 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 hldyāh 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-skö-hbab, cf. Tib. las-skö): 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 hldyāh means ‘water’, ‘water-flow’, it will not be an accident that Tib. bzhah, i.e. bjaḥ < *bdayah or *hldyah (cf. bži, ‘4’), means ‘moist’, ‘wet’.

3. hldi, hldiyi, hldyihi, hldihi: (hmu; hrīu; skhrud; hre; rgyo; hphu; hēig; hldyeq; hti).

It has been suggested supra (p. 276) that in:

\[ \text{hmu-hrīu-skhrud-dze-mor-htaṅ-[hgras]} || \]

\[ \text{hldi-hrkah-hldyaṅ-dze-hyaṅ-htaṅ-hgras, 9-10} \]

‘On the hmu, fleeing in pain (Tib. rīu, skrud), the evil power was arrayed:

On the hldi, risen steep (Tib. dkah), the good power was arrayed’

hmu should be the ‘sky’ (Hsi-hsia mu/mo (Laufer, No. 34); Hsi-fan, &c., mo/mom), and hldi consequently ‘earth’. The epithet rkah, ‘steep’, is applied to gsah, ‘land’, in l. 333 (infra, p. 338).

Ldi = ‘earth’, is, in fact, attested for Hsi-hsia (Nevsky, No. 189, Laufer, No. 40, le/lo). In the Nam text we find among the occurrences of hldi no further examples; all instances of hldi, hldir (= hldi-re), seeming to represent hldi, ‘this’, or hldi, ‘fly’.

But hldihi in:

\[ \text{hldihi-su-hldoṅ || dze-hlda-hko-ge-hdzoṅ, 195} \]

‘what hldihi one retires to, there is one’s castle’

being antithetie to ‘river’ (rma) in the following line, should mean ‘land’. On hlda-hko (da-ko) see supra, pp. 201, 245.

1 Cf. Lo-lo dia-dia, above.
This ḫdi may be represented further by Mányak 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/gžis, meaning 'ground', 'abode', 'estate', (sa-gzi, 'place', 'ground', 'locality', 'soil'), whence come common dialectical words for 'earth', Thöcū zip <gzi-po, Menia za-pi, d'Ollone 35 sa-że-di <sa-gzi ('Tangut' sa- żu), 41 and 42 je-pu: though it cannot correspond to Nam ḫdi, which would, no doubt, be ḫdi or ḫdi, it would, as we have seen, properly represent the inevitable alternative form, ḫdyi.

A ḫdyi/hldyi 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:

ẖre-ge-rgyo-dze-hphu-hṣig-ẖdyihi ||, 48

where rgyo recalls nothing, in its several recurrences, but Tib. rgyo, 'copulari', while ḫre 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-ḥlād, 'retribution' (ll. 245, 247). Hphu (hpun) can mean 'male', and hṣig always has the sense of Tib. hṣig, bṣig, gṣig, 'destroy', 'decay', 'perish'. In this context ḫdyihi, no doubt a Verb, might well mean 'be assuaged', 'appeased', in which case it would correspond to Tib. ḫi, which has those meanings.

In connexion with the earthquake we find in l. 26 the phrase ḫdyeg-ẖdyi-ḥti-dze, where ḫti may mean 'darkness' (Tib. gti), as in l. 12. ḫdyeg does not occur elsewhere; but, if ḫdyi should mean 'four', it could obviously denote only 'regions', 'quarters', and we should then have a good equivalent for the liddi-lei, 'four quarters', frequently mentioned in a Buddhist Hsi-hsia text. The Tibetan for 'quarter' in this application is usually phyogs (Hsi-fan chuo, &c., Menia cho); but there is also a word gṣogs, which might be akin to such a ḫdyeg.

In l. 375 rbyi-ẖdyihi is unfortunately obscure: see p. 350.

4. ḫdyim: (hpun, hphuhi). In one occurrence, namely in the phrase ḫtshog-mc-ḥdyim-rgyaṅ, l. 89, ḫdyim clearly belongs to the Verb gdim/dim/ḥdim/

1 On ḫi = 'stop' see pp. 174, 309.
2 Suvarṇa-prabhāsa (in Wang Jinqru Shishiah Studies, ii, e.g. p. 16, lower coll. 5. 6).
ddiyim, ‘disappear’ (p. 321 supra), occurring in the immediate context: hence it is a mere way of writing hldim. The same interpretation is applicable in:

ḥldyim-hste-hpuhi-ge-rie-ḥdzam-re-hldan, 274
‘their blowings ceased, the fiends (enemies) returned mild’
where ḥpuhi = ḥphuhi, 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 ḥldyims (Aorist).

A different ḥldyim must be seen in the above quoted:
ḥṣaṇ-ḥdzah-ḥldyim-ḥyaṇ, 255
which has been translated (p. 327) ‘though garbage-eating was sweet’. The rendering implies an equivalence of ḥldyim to Tib. ǧim,1 ‘sweet’, ‘well-tasting’, which phonetically may now be considered justified. In the Tibetan manuscripts we read ‘A flesh-eater’s sharp knife gives sweetness (ǧim) at every cut’. But in the absence of further confirmation the matter remains conjectural: as regards ḥdzah see p. 334.

5. ḥldyaṇ, ḥldyoṇ, ḥdyāṇ, ḥdyaṇ, ḥyaṇ; (ʰḥro; ʰḥto; ḍyoṇ; ḍgyer)

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:

ḥjo(hdzo)-chi-te-re-hlab-hñaṇ-hyah-ḥtah||ḥldyaṇ-hro-hpehi||
ḥdzam-ḥbroṇ-hroṇ || ḥbaṇ-ḥko-ḥtar-cig-dze-hldyoṇ-hro-

hpehi ||

Here, in company with phrases which have previously been found difficult, we find the ḥldyaṇ-hro, ‘ḥldyaṇ country’, exemplified (hpehi) in a certain way, the ḥldyoṇ-hro, ‘ḥldyoṇ-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. Ḥldyoṇ probably has no other occurrence, ḥldyoṇo in l. 318 being a doubtful reading.

There are some indications connecting ḥldyaṇ with height:
ḥldyaṇ-g-ri-gdod-re-mehi-hrah-gtaṇ, 186
‘[where] a ḥldyaṇ mountain is prominent (Tib. dod), an eye-post should be set’
ḥldyaṇ-hgoṇo-hdzin-re-mehi-hrah-ḥdab na, 369
‘a ḥldyaṇ place or gate (hgoṇo) being held, an eye-post is put’ although ḥldyaṇ might be not attribute of g-ri and hgoṇo, but

1 For ǧim? Cf. ḥjib, ḥṭib, ‘relish’.
subject to the Verbs gdod (the phrase g-ri-gdod would then, however, be difficult) and ḫdzin. In the verse, repeated in ll. 9, 19:

sta-re-hmo (l. 9 ḫmo-ḥno)-ge-sta-ḥri-ḥldyaṅ

‘where were (had been) the heavens (clouds?), there the mountains ḡldyaṅ’

the signification ‘high’ or ‘rose’ becomes a certainty; and it is confirmed by the ḡldī-ḥrkah-ḥldyaṅ-dse, ‘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.


ḥldyaṅ-ḥto-ḥtoṅ-ge-ḥgo-gtoṅ-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. ḏzeń conveys, may perhaps be recognized in:

ḥḍzu-ḥdro-ḥphor-[re-]ḥchi-ḥdo-dyaṅna, 183, 353 (gzu, ḡdyāṅ)

‘the ass, set free to depart, started or rose (dyaṅ) to go (ḥchi)’

rgon-wa-mye-[r][e]-ṛbyo-ṛgyer-ḥldyaṅ ||, 365

‘if there are no eggs (Tib. sgoṅ, sgoṅ-ḥa, Mo-so gō, &c.), the ṛbyo rises abandoning (Tib. ḡgyer) it’

and the same is presumably the case in the ḡnu-ḍaṅ-ḥldyaṅ following in l. 366, and can also be harmonized with the rṇe-ḥkhyam-ḥldyaṅ of ll. 229, 236.

The reference to eggs in l. 365, however, yields a more definite conception in ḡldyaṅ, that of ‘flying’, which would bring it into connexion, either as a synonym or as a linguistic or stylistic equivalent of ḡldīṅ, ‘fly’, which we have seen in l. 160 ḡpu-myī-ḥldīṅ, ‘the bird does not fly’ (pp. 145–6, 320). In that case ṛbyo should be a synonym of ḡpu, ‘bird’, and this will suit ṛbyo-g-yeṅ-ḥnor-[re]-rgoṅ-wa-śid ||, 366

‘if the bird is foolish in his alertness [sc. unwatchful] (cf. stṣaṅ-hyen, sva-hnor, &c., pp. 276–8, and on ḡnor, ‘foolish’, pp. 224–5) the eggs perish’
and the further connexion of the *rbyo* with eggs in the proverb:

*rbyo-sñaṅ-ge-sñaṅ-na-rгоṅ-ra-ge-bru ||, 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-sгоṅ*), and others also represent the final -o, perhaps a ‘Diminutive’ form = *byeṅu*. 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 *hphoṅ*, ‘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 (*hldyaṅ*) through the sky. Moreover, it seems to afford a key to the phrase *hldyaṅ-hpu-hbri-re* several times attached to the *Mehi-hktu-hcaḥ*, 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 *hldyaṅ* remains, however, the most puzzling in the whole text, and perhaps has several different senses. The obscure expression *hldyaṅ-hkaḥ* has been mentioned supra (p. 317). In regard to *hldyaṅ-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 *Hjan*, 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 ż from j, i.e. when preceded by g or b (supra, pp. 325–6).

Tibetan dz is also frequently confused with j, to such an extent indeed that Sanskrit j is normally in the texts represented by dz (as are c and ch by ts and tsh). The substitution, very easy in the script, is perhaps not merely orthographical: being very widespread and not recent, it may point to an undiscriminated 'phoneme' or to dialectical variation. It cannot have been derived from Kashmir, the very country where the signs for ts, tsh, dz, were invented for the purpose of the discrimination.

1. gdzu, hdzu, gzu, hzu, hju, 'ass'.

This has been discussed supra (pp. 251–2, Tib. guz-łum).

2. hdzah, hjàh, gzo, hdzo, hjo = Tib. za, bzañ, bzas, zos, bos, 'eat', 'food', zan, gzan, 'food', 'eat': (hkhên).

bos-smyi-hldog-dze-hrañ-hdah-ge-hdzañ ||, 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)'

hbañ-hldah-hne-ge-hkehñ-meg-hdzañ ||, 171

'good authorities eat the fire of profit (p. 316)'

(In l. 172 we find 'milk out the fire of speech'). Cf. hñañ-hdzañ-hldiyim-hyañ, l. 255, 'though garbage-feeding is sweet' (supra, p. 327, 331).

The form hjàh appears in:

hjàh-hťah-hkhen-yañ-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:
ḥbos-ḥnom-hsah-gtsañ-hrgu-ma-gzo ||, 164–5
‘crops of land enjoyed by the master thieves do (shall? see p. 199) not eat’.

On hrgu see p. 233.
The meaning ‘eat’ is suggested, by the above-cited ḡkehu-me-
ḥdzaḥ, for ḡjo, ḡdzo, in:
ḥrie-ḥpo-ḥldo-ge-ḥkehu-prom-ḥjo-na, 177
ḥrie-ḥpo-ḥñe-ge-ḥkoḥu-prom-ḥdзоḥo ||, 361–2
‘enemy (fiend) braves eat the profit (speech, p. 316)-making’.

g-rah-ḥyos-ḥtag-ge-ḥjoḥo ||, 34
‘the earthquake acted as a mill’ (supra, p. 275).

‘convey’, ‘bear’, perhaps related to ḡdzed, ‘hold out’ and bzoḍ,
‘endure’, ‘forgive’: (hyañ; spyi; ḡkab).
hyañ-so-ḥdze-tse-ḥldi-ma-ḥṛtaḥ ||, 63
‘when the load is too big (Tib. yañs ?), the horse does not fly
(gallop’
spyi-ḥdze-ge-ḥkab |||, 110
‘the chief (Tib. spyi-bo) burden [sc. responsibility] is the
family (Tib. ḡkab ’).

5. ḡdzeḥu = Tib. gze-re, ‘weak’, ‘reduced’, bze, bze-re, ‘pain’
(endurance ?), zed, ‘damaged’, ‘injured’?
ḥdzeḥu-rje-ḥbro-re-ḥdzoḥu-ḥto-ḥrum, 138
‘when a weak chief flees, one must be a man (ḥdzoḥu,
pp. 218).

6. ḡdzon = Tib. zon, gzon ‘take care’, ‘keep watch over’, e.g. the
tounge or feet (cf. dgra-zon, ‘military guard-post’) (sto, the-the).
sto-the-the-re-stor-ḥtaḥ-ḥdzon, 336–7
‘the rope being pulled, pulled (Tib. the-re-then, “pull straight”,
ḥthen, “pull (a rope, &c.)”), running away is guarded
against’.

7. sla = Tib. zla, ‘friend’.
ḥldañ-ḥkrañ-ḥwe-dże-ḥldañ-slañ-hkehe, 125
‘doing uprightness, one gains upright (or helping) friends’
(see p. 289)
THE NAM LANGUAGE


\[\text{rta-hgam-hphar-re-hsus-slo-glo, 93} \]

\[\text{rta-hgam-hphar-[re]-ggsus-slo-stah, 99} \]

‘the horse being gone to the hgam, intending to call (or expecting) a party to receive him... (those called (or who came forth) to receive him)’.

Hsus/gsus, Aorist of bsu, ‘advance to meet a visitor’, a common usage in Tibet and Central Asia. It will be noted that slo-stah = slo-ta, as in analogous cases.


\[\text{hnu-glan-slog, 174, 359 (slug), ‘turned back the young oxen’,} \]

\[\text{hres-hpag-slog-dze-hrine-hrom-ge-hhti-na-hrine-ge-hrlomhi;} \]

\[\text{384–5} \]

‘the peaks (hres) also l. 208, = se, hse, Tib. rtse) having sunk down, in the darkness of the fiends’ gloomy (cavity) the fiends hanker (or are concealed, hrloṃ = 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. *šwa/ša,* ‘stag’, *šwa/ša,* ‘blood’, showing alternative forms, and others being rather out-of-the-way terms. But some are fairly familiar, e.g. *šwa,* ‘cap’, *grwa,* ‘school’, *phywa,* ‘lot’, *rtswa, zwa,* ‘nettle’, ‘grass’, *khwa,* ‘raven’, *lwa,* ‘blanket’—many of these,\(^3\) again, being often written without the *w.*

Nam, like Hsi-hsia, presents a relatively large percentage of *w*’s, both initial (if we disregard the Prefix *h*) and subscript. It has, moreover, forms (g-*wak, g-*we,* &c.) with Prefix *g-* written

\[\text{1 But perhaps slo may rather be = Hsi-hsia sloḥ = ‘come forth’ (Nevsky, no. 103).} \]

\[\text{2 But being connected with hīned (see p. 251) it may be related to Tib. ldüg/blug/slug/blug, ‘pour’, ‘cast metal’, &c.} \]

\[\text{3 e.g. ša, phya, ri-dags in the Tibetan Manuscripts.} \]
separately, parallel to forms (g-ri, &c.) from r- roots and y- roots (g-yah, &c.): see p. 168. When ʰ is prefixed (ʰgwah = g-wah = ʰwa), the subscript form is used: properly the ʰ should not be prefixed to g, with which it commonly alternates; there do not seem to be parallel cases with y- and r-.

A. Initial w- in Nam, descended from b-, may be seen in:

1. we, hwe, hwehe, wehi, hwehi, g-we, g-wehe, g-wehi = Tib. byed, 'do', 'make' = Hsi-hsia we.

In the Tibetan byed the y may have been originally a phonetic accretion, as in mye, 'fire', &c., in the old orthography: this is suggested by the form bas, assumed by the Aorist byas, when used in the sense of 'done with', 'enough of that'.

It is not necessary to exemplify this word, which in cases like hldan-ʰkrañ-hwe, 'doing uprightness', ʰrah-ʰwehi-ʰrtañ, 'room-making horse', has been frequently mentioned. On the ʰ in hwehi, as being syntactical, see pp. 190-2.

2. hwas, hwa(s)-ste = Tib. bas, 'done for', 'done with', wa, hwa, ʰwah, g- wa, ʰgua; 'bzer, ʰhrino; rka (g-roñ; ḡkah; gla; rko; glog).

In:

gdzu-ʰbyi-hnañ-re-hmañ-hri-hwas ||, 308

'if "little tiger" (the ass) is in it, the great mountain is done for'

the phrase hmañ-hri-hwas is proved to have the meaning here given by hmañ-sta-mehi, 'greatness is not there' of l. 311, followed by:

gdzu-ʰbyi-hnañ-re-ʰri-stah-mehi

'if "little tiger" is in it, the mountain is not there'

and further repetitions of hri(g-rihi, &c.)-sta-mehi. Hence it is clear that hwas = Tib. bas.

The same hwas, slightly disguised, is seen in the hwa-st(e(= hwas-te) of:

ʰde-me-ʰtah-g-roñ-hyed-ge-ta-hwa-ste-ʰtah ||, 71-2

'fires of prosperity, with cooling (Tib. grañ ?), or dying (Tib. groñ ?), emissions, are done for'

an interpretation confirmed by:

hwa-st(e-hge-dze-ʰla-ʰram-hte ||, 73

'with exhausted good fortune the moon consorts'

1 See pp. 269, 273.
repeated (with lah for hla) in ll. 75–6, where it is preceded by:

\[ \text{hwā-ste-ṛge-he-dze-du-gu-hṭor-ṛbi} \]

'in exhausted good fortune the great heat diminishes'.

This being so, it is probable that the frequently recurring wa/hwa'h 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. ḭbaḥ, ‘seizure’, ‘distraint (liability to)’ ḭbaḥ-hgan (gan), ‘contractual obligation’, is of the same origin: but see p. 346. A more ordinary notion of ‘doing’, ‘making’, may be seen in:

\[ \text{gsom-wa-ḥyo, 178–9, ‘thought-making fluctuates’} \]
\[ \text{ḥmu-wa-ṛno, 309, ‘able to make cold’} \]
\[ \text{ḥwad-ḥwaḥ-ṛno, 335, ‘able to keep watch’} \]
\[ \text{ḥkya-wa(hwa)-ṛne(hne), 162, 215, 339, ‘harming work upon crops’} \]
\[ \text{ḥdṛab-hwa-hraṅ, 162, 172, ‘delighting in making snatchings’.} \]

A more definite note of action is seen in:

\[ \text{ḥbri-re-hṛdyam-re-hkḥaḥ-ḥldag-ḥnaghi} \]
\[ \text{ḥḍzoḥu-ro-hldi-re-hjoḥu || hwa-hkḥaḥ, 137} \]

‘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 ḡwa-hkḥaḥ perhaps corresponds to such phrases in Tibetan as ḡgro-kha, ‘time of going’ (p. 314).

Agricultural ‘work’ is indicated in:

\[ \text{gsaḥ-rkaḥ-gl[a][r[e][hwaḥ-hro-g-hdoḥ} \]
\[ \text{ḥwaḥ-hro-g-ṛno-ge-hkeg-rko-hwaḥ, 333–4} \]

‘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 ḡwaḥ-glaḥ-hṛṣaḥ-ḥgan, ll. 228–9 will also contain the notion of ‘wage of work’; while ḡwaḥ-hraḥ, l. 353, may be merely ‘place (or room) for action’. Similarly in:

\[ \text{po-rboṅ-hnor-[re-]ḥldog-g-yah-to-dze-hwa-ne-ḥphe, 317} \]
'If the big man is a fool, then, becoming recalcitrant, good
work (hgwa-nehu, l. 41) is weak (?)'¹
htsah-ḥdzaṅ-ḥyāh-ge-ḥwah-ne-ḥbrah ||
smyi-glog-g-yah-ge || ḥwah-hrṇo-ḥjam-hma, 268–9
'With a wise supervisor in front, good work flourishes':
'With a lightning man in front, the work-capable are pleased
(agreeable ?)' cf. hldohu-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-ḥldāṅra-ḥtsaṅra-na-ḥwa-rgya-ḥrko-ḥrkabs, 270–1
'Work in woodland or cornland (?),² work plain hoe . . . '
Possibly the notion of 'forcible action' or 'constraint' is to be
recognized in:
ḥṣl-ḥwa-hko, 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-ḥbroṅ-ḥrpag-re-ḥwah-ḥrṣaṅ-ḥlamḥi
g-wah-ḥrṣaṅ-hnar-[re-]ḥrkwa-ḥdzaṃ-hṭroṅḥi
'The great yak to be brought low, a journey of hostile action:
Hostile action accomplished, mild command to be led in'.

Here the word ḥrṣaṅ, which has occurred with ḥswa, 'surveillance'
(l. 321), and in ll. 225, 226 with ḥad, as equivalent to ḥṣaṅ-ḥlad,
ll. 226–7, should mean 'hostility' or 'hate'. Ḥrkwa, since in l. 122
we read ḥṛta-ṛkwa-ḥdžam, '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-[ḥ]ṭ[i]b-bžer ||, 18–19, 'violence brings down (Tib. rtib,
"break or pull down" ṛṭib, "crumble" (of a house, &c.),
lṭib, "fall through") the fort'
where, however, the preceding word ḥbar is not clear. With ḥwah
the word bžer, not given in the Tibetan dictionaries, but frequent

¹ Ḥphe, perhaps identical with the pheh of the Berlin fragment (l. 3), is
of uncertain meaning, though clearly antithetical to ḥbrah. Can it be a
form of ḥphem (cf. ḥdre/ḥdreṇ, &c.), 'throw away', and so with ḥphem/phem,
'losa', phons/phons, 'poor', &c.?
² Cf. gsah-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-bzer-brtsigs), is conjoined again in the expression hwa-bzer, l. 231, of the Nam text: since it is first h săd, ‘high’, and then hrpag, ‘brought low’, it is evidently here, also, a building, like hkhär, hbam, hkañ, and other objects to which these terms are applied. Thus it seems certain that hwa-bzer means ‘bzer of power or government or control’. The rarity of ḡ in Nam suggests that it is a loan-word from Tibetan, which itself may have acquired it by borrowing. In l. 177 we ḡkohu-prom-bzer.

The above include all the occurrences of wa, hwaḥ, ḡwah, &c., except ḡwi-wa (hwa), ll. 201, 273, to be noted infra (p. 341), ḡyah-wa-hkañ, l. 190, which all belong elsewhere.

The employment of wa with Verbs, as in gsom-wa, ‘thought-making’, ḡi-hwa, ‘death-making (or power)’, hwad-hwaḥ-ṛño, ‘able to keep watch’, and at the same time with Nouns or Adjectives (ḥkya, ḡmu) may throw light upon the origin of the Tibetan Verb and Noun-suffix ba (pa).


4. hwag = Tib. ḡbag, ‘be defiled’:
hrgyeḥ-hkruḥu-hbro-re-g-yah-hpañ-hwag, 323–4
‘when the rear has a filth-taste (malodour ?), the lap in front is defiled’.

mye-hyaḥ-hwad, 6, ‘fire also is awake’
hṣeḥe-hwad-hwad, 14, ‘the peaks nodded, nodded’ (?)
thor-rgyam-ge-hwad, 109, ‘watching [at] the boundary-slabs’
rgyed-hdrel-ge-me-g-hdzo-dze-hwad, 87–8, ‘the disunion-inducers keep watch on union’
hṛ-ḥci-hwadhi, 300–1, ‘watch those coming to (or moving on) the mountain’
hwad-hldañ-krañ, 268, ‘uprightness keeps watch’,
hkdeg-ṛko-hwad, 334, ‘the stopped hoe wakes up’?
hwad-hwaḥ-ṛño, 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 ḡbo is frequent,
and Ḟbu and Ḟbog also occur: hence before o and u the change of b to t may not have taken place in Nam itself.

6. Ḥwar = Tib. Ḥbar, ‘burn’: (ḥdag).

    Ḥro-ta-ṣodtsa-re-Ḥwar-ta-rgyen(n)i, 198
    ‘the corpses being laid low (?), burning is difficult’.

In l. 28, where an earthquake is in question, Ḥwar probably will have the same sense, though an apparent imperfection in the text renders it uncertain whether Ḥdag-hpoḥo, which might be = Tib. mdag, ‘embers’, is really the subject of the Verb. For other reasons Ḥraṇ-war-hpaṇ-re, l. 101, Ḥraṇ-Ḥwar-ṛders-hdi-na, l. 107, cha-ru-Ḥwars (perhaps Aorist) -ge, l. 203, must likewise be left obscure.

7. Ḥwi-Ḥwa (wa) = Tib. Ḥyi-ba, ‘mouse’, ‘rat’:

    Ḥklag-Ḥrwad-ḥdzur-[re-]Ḥwi-ḥwehi-ḥtsag, 173
    ‘if the harsh-voiced lammergeyer (or eagle) is away, the mice or rats gather’ (p. 257)

    Ḥso-ḥldah-ḥgor-re-Ḥwi-Ḥwa-ṛmaṇ, 201,
    ‘if the living delay, mice or rats are the tomb’

    Ḥwi-Ḥwa-se-ḥyaḥ-ḥkyaṇ-ḥdzam-re-ḥldan ||, 273-4
    ‘to their mice-injured crops the serfs returned tame’
    (cf. the ḡaṇ-Ḥraṇ-ḥtoṇ-kaṇa, ‘enemy-abandoned crops’ of the preceding verse).

8. Ḥwyir = Tib. Ḥbyer, ‘escape’: (ḥṣag):

    Ḥḥo-sto-ge-ḥṣag-dze-ṛne-ḥwe-ge-ḥwyir ||, 85
    ‘while friends talk (Tib. ṣags), enmity-doers escape’.

9. Ḥwen = Tib. Ḥben, ‘solitary’ (?):

    Ḥlab-ta-Ḥwen, 159, ‘speaking is empty ( )’.

A Hsi-ḥsia Ḥwen is given as meaning ‘bad’ (Laufer, No. 17).

10. Ḥwaṇ = Tib. Ḥbaṇ, ‘power’, &c. (or Chinese Ḑangled ?)

    Ḥldan-ṛgye-ḥdor-re-Ḥwaṇ-ṛa-hnen, 209-10
    ‘After throwing away the big stick ( ? strong support, Ḥldaṇ (?)), ruling is a risk’

    Ḥam (nam(?)-ge-Ḥwaṇ || re-klu-ge-Ḥwaṇ ||, 5
    ‘... being in authority, the blind were in authority’.

11. Ḥeiḥi/Ḥweḥi, ‘cream’ (p. 251) ?

    In regard to alternation of Ḥw(Ḥw) and Ḥb(Ḥb) 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 [se. a moment].’
   The form h sor in:
   gši-brom-hnu-ge-hsor-htsam-bzod, 72
   ‘those whose strength is cut away by death support [only] as much as a finger’
   may be a Tibetanism, since the htsam (Tib. t sam) and bzod also are ánač eīpméva: brom = Tib. hgrum, ‘pinch or nip off’, see pp. 366–7.

4. swehe = Tib. sbe, ‘wrestle’?; but we should expect rbe.
   g-wah-hram-myre-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. thwain = Tib. thañ, ‘value’, ‘measure’ (dwañ, rwañ).
   The most certain instance, since bhain-thwain must be = Tib. dbañ-thañ, ‘might’, ‘luck’, ‘destiny’, is:
   ḡbar-bhana-thwañ-byiñ ||, 97, ‘in the middle (= secondly) authority declines’ (echoed in ḡbar-thwañ, l. 98).
   Also in:
   gnañ-ma-dwañ-dze-ḥkhab-rgye-ge-ḥthwañ ||, 280
   ‘over places not brilliant (? dwañs = dwañ ll. 364–5, rwañ l. 178) the great houses have authority’.

6. twan = Tib. thoñ, ‘ram’? (mñar; nehe).
   twañ-mag-ḥnor, 48, ‘in a fight of rams’
   g-rub-ḥgoñ-hdag-ci-twañ-mñar-ḥsogna ||, 261–2
   ‘those who had their doors rushed (ḥrub, pp. 221, 343) divided the rams under control (mñar Locative of mñañ?)’
twañ-hdzam-neñe, 276, ‘the rams tamely—’ (The next two verses refer to the dogs and goats: neñe is conceivably onomatopoeic, meaning ‘bleat’).

7. hgweg-hwehe = Tib. sgeg-byed, ‘charmer’ [sc. ‘wife’] or hgeg-byê, ‘husband’?

hgweg-hwehe-hphah-hphah-dze-hthar-phyañ-ge-hrub||, 348-9

On hphah-hphah, ‘laugh’, see p. 248, n. 3.


hkhwi-htsa-hyog-hdag-ci-hrañ-hdom-gdes ||, 259–60
‘elders with staves (Tib. yoq-po) fixed (Hsi-hsia gdeh/hdeh, &c., “fix”, “determine”, Nevsky, No. 25) their decisions’.

(The previous verse speaks of the ‘wise’ (še) and ‘brave’ (hphâh), and the two following verses of ‘children’ (hsâs).)


hrañ-rwa-hkar-re-hñañ-hya-htsag ||, 44–5
‘the long-horn [sc. ram] being penned, the female sheep come together’

Here hkar, as in ll. 151, 204, is connected with Tib. skar/sgar/dgar, &c., ‘pen cattle, &c.’, ‘set apart’, ‘make an encampment’: hya, ‘sheep’, see supra, p. 94: hñañ = Chinese niang, ‘woman’.

sbyim-hce-rgye-dze-hrwa-hdah-hpog ||, 59
‘on a sbyim (?) “target”, Tib. hggyim, “circumference”) which is large the horn [sc. bow, Tib. rwa-gzû] plants the arrow’

(Hdah = Tib. mdah, ‘arrow’, as in ll. 58, pp. 300–1: hpog = Tib. hphog (in manuscript also pog), ‘hit’ (with an arrow, &c.).)

10. hrkwa/rkwa = Tib. bkah, ‘command’ (rkah).

hrtâ-rkwa-hdzam, 122, ‘the horse’s rule was mild’, (cf. Tib. bkah-drin, ‘kind’, ‘kindness’)
g-wah-hrâñ-hnâr[-lr[ê]-hrkwa-hdzam-htronhi, 224
‘hostile force having been accomplished, mild rule is to be brought in’.

This case raises a question of some difficulty; for in ll. 84:

hrje-smyi-rmad-ge-hmo-rkah-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 = dpal, hue = dpe, kuar-tsäl = bkaḥ-hṣtsal, chuam = byams, kuak = bkaq, kuam = mkhan, huon = dpom (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 dkom, cf. dgum).

The difficulty is, however, unsubstantial. The word bkaḥ declares itself by its form to be a Deverbal Derivative, presumably from a Verb ḫkhaḥ, connected with ḫa, '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 brkaṣ. 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. hrwaḥ = Tib. braṅ, 'dwelling-place' (hkaṅ-hkaṅ):

ḥnor-ḥlaḥ-hwaḥ-hṣid-dze-hrwaḥ-hkaṅ-hkaṅ ||, 11

'on the estates, in the high mansions or settlements, the

dwelling-places were in confusion (?)'

Hkaṅ-hkaṅ (onomatopoeic ?) recurs in l. 184.

The etymology of Tib. braṅ being unknown, the equation is uncertain (from brwaḥ ?). That Nam hrw should be descended from mere br does not seem possible in view of the many instances of br = Tib. br. On ruṇaḥ/dwaḥ see p. 342.

The remaining words kwa-kwa, l. 363, ḥkwaḥ (? reading), l. 212, ḥkweḥe, l. 131, ḥdwa, l. 148, puṇaḥ, ll. 361, 362, tsweḥu, l. 196, htswe, l. 6, dzwe, l. 367, ḥdzwe, ll. 36, 39, swaṇ (= Tib. soṇ ?), ll. 337, 340, 341, swad, ll. 203, 390, are of unascertained meaning. See, however, the Vocabulary.

Concerning tsweḥu, htswe, ḥdzwe, see p. 269. Kwa-ka occurs in Mānyak with the meaning 'night', khwea-khwea in Menia = 'old'. As a mere possibility it may be mentioned that puṇaḥ, which in the text is associated with sna, a known variant of Tib. gña, 'surety', 'witness', may itself be = Tib. dpaṇ, which has the same significations.
(b) The consonant a Prefix:

1. *rwyê* (l. 50 *rbye*)\(^1\) = Tib. *dbyê* (a) ‘extent’, (β) ‘divided’:
   (a) See p. 267.
   (β) *rta-hstog-hram-ge-hthaḥ-rwyê-hthaḥ||*, 90-1
   ‘the horse’s friendships are divided, broken’.

On *hthaḥ in rwyê-hthaḥ see p. 267.

2. *hrwad* = Tib. *rbd* (a) ‘harsh voice’, (b) ‘a kind of eagle’:
   Concerning:
   
   *hrwad-ḥbañ-prom-yañ-hkohu-me-ḥdraḥ-na||
klag-hrwad-ḥdzur-[re-]-hwī-hwehi-htsag, 172-3, see p. 257.
   *hgru-ma-ḥkom-re-hrwad-hmoñ-ḥldah*, 32-3

Here a doubt as to reading (*kmañ ?*) creates some uncertainty: otherwise the meaning would be ‘harsh voices or the harsh-voiced clamour multiplied’ or ‘was confused’ (p. 309).

3. *rwe, rwer, hrwehi:* (rgor; ḏbar; ḏmo-cha).

That this word means substantially ‘end’ is clear in:

   *rgor-hyos-ḥbom-byiñ-ḥbar-ḥbañ-thwañ-byiñ||
rwer-hmo-ḥchah-byiñ-htsog-hram-myin
   *rgor-hyos-ḥbar-thwañ-hkhor-kyan-rwehi-re-ḥmo-cha-byi-na-
   phyi-hse-myin*, 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: friendship is a name:

   At the door —, in the middle power, retinue also being ended
   (rwehi),

   The women’s part sinking, injury from outside is not (the cause: it is disunion)’.

It appears therefore that *rwe*, in itself meaning ‘end’, gives rise to a Verb meaning ‘puts an end to’. The etymology is not apparent; but the same signification may be seen in:

   *ḥldañ-krañ-hrwehi||*, 113, ‘uprightness is at an end’
   *ḥldañ-rmañ-hrwehi||*, 27, ‘the wooden tombs were destroyed’

and possibly in *hrañ-hrah-hrwehi*, ll. 21-2; in *hrwehi-gtsu-ge-hrnas*,
   l. 214, the last word is of uncertain reading (= *brnas*, ‘despised’?).

\(^1\) *Hbye* in l. 223, perhaps also in l. 131, seems to mean ‘is divided’

Intransitive Verb = Tib. *ḥbye*.)
4. *g-we*, *g-wehī*, *g-wehē*:

These, being formed by aid of the living Prefix *g* to the Verb *we* (p. 337), require no discussion.

On *g-waḥ* = *hwah*, see p. 339.

5. *rwyn* in:

*hnah-hraṅ-ge-rwyn ||*, 33

is of uncertain meaning: perhaps connected with *ḥbyin*, *ḥbyin*, ‘sink’, ‘grow faint’.

A question as to the limits of fluctuation between *w* and *b* after Prefixes is raised by the certain case of *rwye/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 discourting to find that in Nam *ḥwar* = Tib. *ḥbar* always has *w*, while *ḥbar* = 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 *rwye/rbye* the only cases calling for examination are those of *ḥbaḥ* and *ḥbaṅ*.

*Ḥbaḥ*: in the phrase *ḥro-hbeḥi-ḥbaḥ*, ‘wolf oppressing sheep’, the word *ḥbaḥ*, which can hardly fail to be = Tib. *ḥbaḥ*, ‘distrain’, has everywhere *b*. This fact casts doubt upon the suggested (p. 338) connexion between that word and the Verb *we*, ‘do’, along with *ḥwa*, ‘action’, ‘power’.

*Ḥbaṅ*: This, which is, beyond doubt, the regular equivalent in the Nam text of Tib. *dbaṅ*, ‘power’, has beside it a form *ḥwaṅ* 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 *wăng*.1

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 *thwaṅ* found (p. 342) to be equivalent to Tib. *thāṅ*, ‘value’, ‘measure’, can hardly be different from the *ḥthāṅ* of *ḥldi-hthaṅ*, ll. 132, 133, ‘of this measure’, or the repeated *ḥyaḥ* (g-yah)-*ḥthaṅ*, ll. 286–8, ‘in the ascendant’, ‘superior’, from the corresponding *ḥthaṅ* of ll. 289, 290, or the *ḥyaḥ-hthaṅ* of ll. 315, 318. It does not seem possible to bring in Tib. *thaṅ*, (1) ‘clear’, ‘serene’, (2) ‘tail’, (3) ‘enduring’,

1 The word *ḥbaṅ*/baṅ may have other senses also, one of which may be (e.g. in ll. 67, 249–51, 373, 386, 390) that of Tib. *ḥbaṅ*, ‘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 *blaṅ(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.
hrqañ, 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'.

hrgyu = Tib. rgyu, ‘material’.
rgyo/hrgyo/rgyoho/rgyon/rgyohon = Tib. rgyo/rgyon, ‘copularchi’.
riam/hrñam = Tib. riam, ‘threat’, ‘alarm’.
hrñu = Tib. riñu, ‘pain’.
rihe/hrhe/hrñhe = Tib. rihe, ‘fiend’, ‘enemy’.
hrñu/hrño/hrñoho = Tib. riño, ‘able’, ‘power’.
rijes = Tib. rjes, ‘trace’, ‘aftermark’.
rt(a), hrtañ = Tib. rta, ‘horse’.
rto/hrto = Tib. rdo, ‘stone’.
hrdag = Tib. rdeg, rdegs, ‘smite’, ‘thrust’.
rm = Tib. rma, ‘wound’.
rm = Tib. rma, ‘ask’ (l. 47 ?).
rmāñ = Tib. rmañ, (a) ‘tomb’, (b) ‘dream’, ‘imagine’.
hrmho (‘shake’? l. 18), rmōn (‘dream’, ‘imagine’? l. 349) =
Tib. rmañ, ‘dream’, ‘imagine’, rmoñ, ‘be dazed, dizzy’?
rtṣig/hrtsig = Tib. rtṣig, ‘carpenter’.
rdzogs = Tib. rdzogs, ‘completed’.
hrdzòñ(hdzuñ) = Tib. rdzòñ(hdzuñ), ‘castle’.
hrucad = Tib. rbad, ‘harsh-voiced’, ‘eagle’.
rese/hrse, se = Tib. rtse/se, ‘summit’, ‘roof’.

r = Tib. r or ð:
rgad (l. 113) = Tib. gad/dgod/rgod, ‘laugh’ (?)
r = Tib. r or s:
rkah/hrkwa = Tib. bkah, brkas, bskas, ‘command’.
rgo = Tib. rgo/rgyo/sgo, ‘door’, ‘gate’.
rk = Tib. rk/e/k, ‘lean’.

r = Tib. s (cf. ‘Tangut’ (rta)-rga, ‘saddle’, rkhñ, ‘heart’, =
snûñ, Amdo rduk = sduq, &c.):
hrkas = Tib. skas, ‘ladder’, ‘staircase’.
rgam = Tib. sgam, ‘deep’.
rgam/hrgam = Tib. sgam, ‘take into company’.
rgon/hrgon = Tib. sgon-wa, ‘egg’.
hrgom = Tib. bsgoms, ‘passed over’.
rdan/hrdan = Tib. sdn, 'anger', 'enmity'.
hrdam = Tib. sdam, 'bind', 'subdue'.
rd/e/hrd/e/rdhe = Tib. sde, 'class', 'troop'.
rd/o/hrdo = Tib. sdo, 'venture'.
hrpod (l. 250) = Tib. scep, 'vow'? 
rbo/hrbo, rbom/hrbom = Tib. sbo, sbom, 'swell', 'grow big'.
rmbo (l. 250) = Tib. smon, 'aspiration', 'vow'? 

r = Tib. s or d:

rpehi/hrpehi (p. 323) = Tib. dpe, 'example', spe (p. 356, hpehi).
rmah, hma = Tib. ma, sma, dnah, '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, rnyo = dnos, &c., Nam rwa, dwa, p. 344).

rkah/hrkah = Tib. dkah, 'steep', 'difficult'.
hrgh = Tib. dgh, 'delight'.
hrge/hrge = hrehi-sto (cf. hge, hge = Tib. dge, dges, 'happiness', &c., 'happy', &c.
rgon = Tib. dgon, 'wilderness'.
rbge/rgbge (cf. rgge, rgbge) = Tib. dbge, dbges, '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 = gnid, Amdo rsum = gsum, rd = bzla, &c.):

rkah/hrkah = Tib. bkah, 'word', 'command'.
rkom/hrkom = Tib. bkom, 'kill', dgu, 'die'.

Probably here the real Tib. equivalents are brkah and brkum.

r = Tib. m:

rnab = Tib. mnab, mnabs, 'food'.

rdza, hrdza (also hdza, hdza) = Tib. mdza, 'friend', 'be friendly'.

rdzo = Tib. mdzo.

r = Tib. h or O:

rgam = Tib. gyam (? rgyam (hgyam)-tshwa), 'recess in a rock'.

hrgeg = Tib. hgegs, 'stop', 'obstruct'.
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rgyen = Tib. yeṅ, ‘put in order’ (g-yeṅ, ‘move softly to and fro’).
rgyen = Tib. gyen, ‘uphill’.
rgyer = Tib. hgyer, ‘forsake’.
rñe/rhñe/rhye (rñe/hñe/nès) = Tib. īe, īes, ‘be evil’, ‘evil’.
bryo = Tib. bya, ‘bird’ (pp. 332–3).
rmu/hrmu = Tib. mu, ‘boundary’.
rdzar/hdzar = Tib. ḫjar, ‘cohere’, ‘meet’: or = rdza-re?
rdzum/hrdzum = Tib. ḫdzum, ‘smile’, ‘close eye’.
hrdzur(hdzur) = Tib. ḫdzur, ‘go, or be, aside’.

A special case is:
rel, hlde/hldehe = Tib. lde, hde, bde, ‘fortune’, &c.

Of doubtful meaning and etymology are:
hṛjhi (l. 213).
hṛi (l. 298), rűi (l. 389) = Tib. rūid, ‘fade’, rūis, ‘worn out’?
ṛte, ḫṛteḥu, ḫṛtehe (pp. 156, 313).
hrdyaṅ (l. 202).
hrdym (l. 137) = Tib. hjoms/gzom, ‘subdue’?
ṛpu (htsog-ṛpu = Tib. tṣog-pu, ‘sitting’, ‘crouching’?) or is htsog-ṛpu-še chaṅ, l. 91 = ‘united sons of a family’ (Tib. spu/spun), strong in wisdom’?
ṛbyi (l. 375) = byi, ḫbyi, ḫbyihi (Tib. dbyi, ‘wipe out’)?
ṛwyin (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.

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 became obsolete, 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 kypo, Intransitive. Nor can it be said that even r had entirely ceased to be functional: such a form as brnaṅs by the side of bsnan, as Aorist of the Verb monon/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. ṛṇī/sṇī, ‘snare’, ṛṇīl/sṇīl, ‘ear of corn’, ṛke/ske, ‘thin’, ṛked/sked, ‘waist’, ṛgyan/sṛgyan, ‘ornament’, ṛme/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 ṛta, no doubt an original Tibeto-Burman form: by Prejevalsky, whose source was exclusively oral, the Amdo form is given as sta. Accordingly, in a country where the ṛ-Prefix is notably prevalent and encroaching and where Tibetan st is most usually represented by rt, the ṛ 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 ṛ 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 ṛ is found replacing d in rgum = dgu, m in rṇen = mūnen, and b replacing ṛ in btsal = ṛtsal. Modern Amdoan has ṛ for d in rka = dkaḥ, ṛūd = dūos, ryaŋ = dbyaṅs; for b in rshyot = bskyod, rdū = bzla; for g in ṛtsaṅ = gtsaṅ, rsum = gsum, rdzuk = gzugs; beside the above-noted rt = st, and, further, ṛg = sg in rgom = sgom, rga = sga, rgo = sgo; rk = sk in rku = sku, rkad = skad; rn = sn in rna = sna; ṛn = sn in rmar = shar; rm = sm in rmā = smras; rt = lt in rta = lta.

Absence of the ṛ-Prefix of ordinary Tibetan is seen in the gyuḍ (Nam gyuḍ/kyud), ḍhdzoṅ (Nam ḍhdzoṅ/hjoṅ/rdoṅ), 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 ṛ-Prefix lacking in ordinary Tibetan we may sometimes be able to cite a parallel without being able to furnish an explanation. Thus ṛmu, ‘boundary’ = Tib.

1 So in Ladak (Jaeschke, Tib. Grammar, § 7).
mu, has beside it rma = ma, ‘not’, of the Tibetan manuscripts, and ti-rmı́, ‘man’, ti-rgnings, ‘name’ (Tib. miṅ, myiṅ) of modern Gyärung; the form smyi may be compared to Hörpa smen, ‘name’. Rüe, ‘evil’ = Tib. ņes, is paralleled by the rnu = Tib. nu, ‘breast’, of the Tibetan manuscripts: cf. also the case of rhyo (p. 333).

The forms hršan, ‘hostile’, and riṅan, ll. 54, 56, which must have some kindred meaning, are in themselves remarkable. The former is clearly connected with hšan = Tib. šan, ‘hate’, and in Tibetan might have been bšan: in principle it is not different from rkaḥ, rkom, rpaḥ, rmag. Riṅan, which does not recall anything in Nam, where the ẑ is practically non-existent, is curiously paralleled in one of the Tibetan manuscripts by a form ržen, rjn = Tib. mjen, ‘make pliant’. This is not a scriptural accident, by reason of the parallels noted (p. 106) in certain Hsi-fan dialects (d’Ollone, p. 73): it looks as if in some circumstances ņ became j, whence ẑ. The particular word, riṅan, might accordingly be = Tib. jnān, ‘cruel’, ‘severe’, ‘wild’; but the final ņ is then a difficulty. Further curiosities in connexion with ņ are Tangut rkhian, ‘Argal sheep’ = Tib. gṇan/rṇan, and Tangut rkʰiṅ, ‘heart’ = Tib. sniṅ.

The instances of Nam r prefixed to Verbs which in Tibetan are without it, e.g. rgyed, rdzum, rdzur, provoke the inquiry whether in Nam the r- may have retained some definite functional value. The question is most natural where the text exhibits forms with and without the r: such are hgam/hrgam (rgam), rgyeb/hgyeb, hrni(rni)/ḥi (nī), hrne(rne)/ḥne (ńe), grteḥ(ḥteḥu, rte)/gde, hrpeḥi (rpeḥi)/hpeḥi, hrbo(rbo)/hbogboḥu, hrmag(rmag)/mag, hrdoḥo/ḥdoḥ, hrda(rda)/ḥda, hrdzur/ḥdzur, one or two others (p. 350) being doubtful.

It is, no doubt, premature to enter into this question. In some cases (rgyeḥ/hgyeb, hrdzoḥ/ḥdoḥ, rmag/mag the latter only in mag-no) the alternation seems merely casual; in others the difference, if any existed, has been obscured (hrni/hnī, hrne/hne, hrbo/ḥbo), or the connexion of the two forms is unproven. But in hgam/ḥrgam(hgam) the difference = ‘community’/‘form a community’, is not only clear in the Nam text, but corresponds to the Tibetan gam/sgam; ḍa/rdza also are not improbably = ‘friend’/‘make friends’; and ḍpag/hrpag may be partly distinguished as ‘low’/‘lay low’; ḍuzur/ḥdzur 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.

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(phyar)/phyer (pyer) of the text, varying in such a way that an Ablaut relationship between the e/a is highly improbable; and it has been pointed out supra (pp. 33–4) that a place in the Koko-nor region mentioned in the eighth century A.D. as Dbyar-mo-thaṅ is known later as G-yar-mo-thaṅ, Yar-mo-thaṅ, G-ye-yer-mo-thaṅ. 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 ʰhwir = Tib. ḫbyer, ‘escape’, is paralleled by Hsi-hsia nir, ‘relative’, if equivalent, as suggested by Laufer (No. 122, p. 104), to Tib. qüer: 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:

stehi-ʰtam-ʰmog-dze, 54, ‘over the — clouds’
ʰṛdzon-ḥyo-ʰṣi-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 stehi-ʰtam(ʰtham) would be ‘gathered in a mass’, and that of stegdzu would be ‘asses in troops’. Appositive 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, ḡrde/rdehe, which it fits, while in form supported by rdaṅ = Tib. sdaṅ, ‘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/ṛten (cf. ḡdre, ḡdṛo = ḡдрен, ḡдрон), ‘hold on to’, ‘adhere to’, more especially as the corresponding
Intransitive *hthe/hthen*, whence *the*, ‘adherent’, ‘subject’, is used in the sense of ‘halting’ (see S. C. Das’s Dictionary).

5. **L- Prefix; l final**

Instances of *l* prefixed to roots with initial *d, dy* have been considered; other cases are rare. If we omit mis-writings, viz. *hltañ*, l. 93 (for *hldan*), *hltah*, l. 203 (for *hldah*, see ll. 202–3), *hltom*, l. 88 (for *hldom*, see ll. 94, 95), there remain:

- *hlikyan*, 188 (written *hgyyan*, l. 308) = Tib. *rkyan*, *kiang* or ‘wild ass’.
- *lgyoba*, 11—meaning obscure.

Final *l* in place of *r* is seen in:


but *l* = Tib. *l* in:

- *htul/hthul* = Tib. *hdtul, gdul, btul, thul*
- *hpyul/hphul* = Tib. *phul*


The significance of so short a list is diminished by the fact that no other word in the text seems to invite comparison with a Tibetan word in *l*, except *byu*, 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.

The equivalence extends to cases where Nam wa = Tib. -o; e.g.
swa, 'tooth' = Tib. so.
swaḥ/swaḥ = Tib. so, 'watch', 'guard'.
hswar = Tib. sor, 'finger'.

Exceptionally s corresponds to Tib. š (cf. bsos/bṣos, bsen/bṣen, in
the Tibetan manuscripts) and vice versa:
hsams, 58 = Tib. sōm, gśom, bśoms, bṣams, '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/gshe/gtse = Tib. gtse, htshe, 'injure'.
hsas/gzas = Tib. btsas, 'born', 'offspring', also gzas.

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/skuḥu = Tib. sku, 'body'.
ske = Tib. ske, 'neck'.
sko = Tib. sko, 'select', 'appoint'.
skyaḥ = Tib. skyoḥ, bskyaḥ, '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', Lauffer, 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/stab/hstab = Tib. sta, a suffix.
stab/hstab = Tib. stan, 'above'.
sti/hti = Tib. sti, bsti, thi, 'rest', 'stop'.
stiṅ = Tib. stiṅ, 'rebuke', or sdig, 'sin' (?).
ste/hs te = Tib. ste, a suffix.
ste/stehe = Tib. sten/ren, ‘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’ (?).
strom/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) hpehi, ll. 211, 384. hpehi, ll. 211, 386, 387, are plainly identical, and they appear to have the two meanings of spa and spehi. Cf. also spehi/hpehi, p. 282.
Sbyim = Tib. hgyim, ‘circumference’? Cf. hbyim, ll. 266, 363?

4. Before ts:

(a) htsog(htsog, htsog) = Tib. btsags, ‘collected’ (tshogs/htshogs).
(b) htsaṅ/gtsaṅ = Tib. stsaṅ, gtsaṅ, ‘corn’.
Stsaṅ/htsaṅ, ‘watch’, and stsar, show in Tibetan (htsaḥ, tshar) no s form, but once r (rtsas).

5. Before u:

(b) Possibly nor = Tib. nor (in manuscript snor), ‘farm’.

6. Before ū:

(a) sūn/sūn = Tib. sūn, ‘heart’.
sūn = Tib. sūn/gūa, ‘witness’?
sūn = Tib. gūis, ‘2’.
sūn/rūn = Tib. sūn/rūn, ‘noose’, ‘tie’.
Sūn (l. 217) is obscure.
7. Before \( m \):
   \( a \) smuhe-hku = Tib. smi-qu/smyu-qu, ‘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/hsram = Tib. sran, ‘hard’.
   sri = Tib. sri, ‘demoness’.
   hscr = Tib. sre, ‘soot’, &c.
   sron = Tib. sron, ‘straight’.

9. Before \( l \):
   On sl <zl in slaḥ, slo, slog, see supra, pp. 335–6.
   Slod is perhaps = a Tib. zlod = lhod/glod/lod, ‘to loose’.
   Sli, ḫli, sleq, slug (p. 336 n. 2) are obscure.

10. Before \( s \):
    ssam, a highly exceptional form, occurring in:
    ssam-stom-ḥdag-dze-ḥsar-stomhi, 255
    ‘when the last (?) harvest has come to hand (?) Ḫdag = Tib. bdag, bdag), a new harvest’.

    If ssam is to be credited with the conjectured meaning, it may be related to Tib. sam/gsam, ‘lower’, ‘later’. Ḫsam, l. 277, is apparently different.

    The cases where Tibetan \( s \) before consonants corresponds to Nam \( r \) before consonants, a frequent phenomenon in ‘Tangut’, have been noted under ‘r-Prefix’.

    \( s \) final, after consonants as well as after vowels, is almost confined to verb-forms, to which it imparts an Aoristic or Preterite sense. In Tibetan also, where the \( s \) is used, moreover, to form Imperatives, many nominal forms with final \( s \), both after vowels and after consonants, are plainly deverbal. Hence it is not certain that the Nam, where it lacks a final \( s \) present in Tibetan, has lost it. But the fact that its \( s \) is restricted to cases where it is functional indicates that in other circumstances a final \( s \) would have been lost; and such loss is sometimes suggested by particular factors, e.g. by the \( n \) (for \( n \)) in the Imperative form Ḫtron, as in Tib. droṅs/dron, from Ḫdren, and therefore also in Ḫlob (Tib. lobs), Imperative of Ḫlab.

    After vowels the following Aorists or Preterites can be recognized:
    gras, Ḫgras, Ḫras, Ḫtas ( = Ḫthas), Ḫldas, Ḫwas, Ḫsas, Ḫsas
    (gsas)
hñís, hldís, hris,  
hkús, hr Gus, ḫthus, ḫnus, ḫbrus, gsus, ḫsus  
hkes, ñes, gdes, ḫbres, rgyes  
g-yos, hyos, chos.

After consonants we have:

ḥthogs, ḥphyegs, rdzogs  
hgyaṅs, hsaṅs  
rkabs, rgyeb s  
hkroms, ḫgroms, ḫproms, ḫsams  
hwars, rdrs (?), ḫtsors, ḫtshors.

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’, ḫkom, prom, hyo,  
‘do’ or ‘effect’, as in:

spyé-chos-re, ‘being begun in summer’,  
rgyes-hkom, ‘effect extension’,  
ḥtas-prom, ‘made hard or tangled’,  
ḥchos-hyo, ‘make beginning’;

or with a governing or accompanying verb or even noun, as in:

gsus-slo, ‘call for escort’,  
ḥbrus-hgyan, ‘itch with inflammation’,  
hyos-ḥlam, ‘movement path’,  
ḥtas-kro, ‘tangled hate’;

or with a verbal or nominal suffix, as in:

ḥsas-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:

ḥtsah-ste (= ḫtsaḥs-te), hwa-ste, gboḥu-ste (= gbos-te)  
hgyaṅ-sto, ḫrgyaṅ-sto, ḫrgehi-sto (= ḫrgehes-to), ḫnah-sto,  
(= ḫnaḥs-to), hldu-sto, ḫldyim-sto, ḫtsah-sto (= ḫtsaḥs-to),  
hyim-sto.

In ll. 278–9, ḫtag-htos, the -s is attached to the Participle in -to, 
used as a main verb.

The possibility that the form ḫodṣea is an attempt to attach the 
Aoristic s even to a root ending in ḫ has been suggested supra
Perhaps this, and not merely a feeling for euphony, accounts for the $s$ in $hbrad-sta$, l. 306. In $g$-ri($hri$, &c.)-$sta$-$mehi$, $hmana$-$sta$-$mehi$, ll. 311–13, the $sta$, which follows a nominal word, seems to be different, $= sta$, ‘there’.

We are now left with $ses$ (Aorist of $se$), ‘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’; $hyo(s)$ (evidenced by $hno$-$sta$/hño-$sto$), ‘friend’, ‘partisan’ (Tib. $nos$, ‘side’); $hyogs$ (one occurrence, usually $hyog$/g-$yog$) apparently $= $Tib. $g$-$yog$, ‘serve’, ‘servant’; and:

$hño$-$sto$-$ge$-$rdo$-$re$-$cis$-$tsha$-$hbyihi$, 84, ‘when friends venture . . .
gdim-chis(tshis ?)-ldom-re, 94, 95, ‘under the sway of disappearance and coming (transience)’

khyos-h$khyan$-$hjyu$-$ge$, 212, ‘wives united with husbands’
hgar-hpu-$hches$-$hño$-$hkho$-$prom$, 322, ‘the chief blacksmith having made a face-covering (blinkers)’

$hpus$-$hpwhyah$-$miy$-$cañ$, 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 $hrkas$-$htan$, l. 57, which may be ‘putting (Tib. $gta$) a ladder or staircase’, unless Tib. $skas$-$gta$-$bu$ ($= skas$, $skas$-$ka$, $skas$-$tsha$, $skras$, $skras$-$ka$) contains a $gta = gta$, ‘stick’, and Nam $htan$ 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,

$pyi$-$rjes$-$ne$-$hec$, 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 $hc$, ‘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-(n̄-), 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/n̄ul, ‘slink’, ‘rove’, ‘spy’, smyu-gu/ s̄n̄ug-gu, ‘pen’, and in mye-cho/n̄e-ts̄ho of the Tibetan manuscripts. The change has not been found in Nam.

Initial n̄ is not often replaced; for instance, the Tibeto-Burman equivalents of Tib. n̄a, ‘I’, and l̄na, ‘5’, commonly retain the guttural (Hodgson writes gn). The Nam text confuses nah and hn̄ah (supra, pp. 238–9), and in mag-no, ‘battle’, the no (dissimilation after g?) is perhaps the same word as in Tib. g-yul-n̄o, ‘battle’. The cases of n̄a for na (assimilation?), ll. 57, 199, 201, 206, 207 after -n̄ in hbyin̄, rmañ, are interesting, because the like is exemplified in the Tibetan manuscripts.

n̄ 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 s̄n̄iñ, ‘heart’, gñe/gne/ne (Nevsy, No. 100; Laufer, No. 105, niñ); for rje, ‘king’, n̄eh/ne/n̄eh (Nevsky, No. 40); for m̄n̄am, ‘equal’, ni/ne/n̄ih (Nevsky, No. 217). The word for ‘2’, Tib. gñis, is Gyārūṅg ka-n̄es, Rgya-roñ (Pati ko-nes, Tâkpa nai, Mânyak nā-bi, ‘Tangut’ ni; cf. ‘Tangut’ nīna, ‘sun’ (= Tib. ſ̄n̄iñ). The Nam text varies ſ̄n̄e with ne in hkyaw-wa- ſ̄n̄e. The documents from Central Asia have nuñ-chad for ſ̄nuñ-chad.

n- is not usually altered: in Thôchû nyik, Hôrpa nya-nya, Go-lok 41 nierk, Muli nya, Pa-u-Rong nyi, all = Tib. nag, ‘black’, some confusion may have co-operated. The Central-Asian documents have ſ̄nañ-cher for ſ̄nañ-cher.

The above facts may tend to remove any a priori objections to the following abnormal equations between Nam and Tibetan initial nasals:

nam = Tib. ñams, 'mind', 'spirit', in hnam-hdzam-htar, ll. 145-6, 'the faint-heart escapes'; cf. Tib. nam (and ñams)-čuñ, 'feeble'.

nam = Tib. ñams, 'damaged', 'spoiled', 'degenerate', in hldañ-krañ-hnam-dze, l. 126, 'when uprightness degenerates', hpaḥ-hrgam-hnam, l. 259, 'the community of braves declines'; probably also in hnam-hte-hsah, l. 83, 'having declined, was destroyed' (cf. ll. 124-5, hsad ... hsah).

nar = Tib. ñar, 'strength', 'vigour', in:

hyah-hrgehe-ge-sram-pa-nar, 72
'those whose fortune is in the ascendant have firm hero-vigour';
cf. l. 204,
pun-te-gsar-ñar-hpaḥ-rmag-hehi ||
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, hldañ-hkrañ-hnar-re, the following may be preferable:
nar/hner = Tib. gñer/gñar, 'tend', 'provide for', 'procure', in
g-waḥ-hrśañ-hnar[-re], 224, 'procure fierce force'
glaḥ-hlad-hnar[-re], 233, 'procure return for wages' (p. 251)
gse-hlad-hnar[-re], 243, 'procure requital of injury'.

Here would belong also ḥcha-hgrah-nu-nar-dze, l. 239, and the above-mentioned hldañ-hkrañ-hnar-re. An equivalent of Tib. mnar, 'sweet', does not seem likely here.

Hner occurs only in
g-rah-gśog-hner[-re]-šes-hbeg-hsog ||, 7, 20
'To provide wings for—Šes-hbeg was the wings';

nen = Tib. ñeñ, 'danger' in
hldañ-rgye-hdor-re-hwañ-ta-hnen, 209-10
'If the big stick (or 'strong support', hldañ) 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
hnor-hlaḥ-hwam-hśid-dze, 11, 'in the high mansions on the farms or estates'.
The same hnor, '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 ʰy, a combination otherwise unknown. In l. 206, rhiye-nej-huolu, the rhiye is evidently a confusion of rûe and rûe, cf. rûe-re-hûo, l. 133, rûe-ne-hrehi, l. 200. In ll. 362–3, where the readings are partly doubtful and we have in succession hûyoh (hûyêhe ?), hûe, hûyêhe, perhaps the same word ñe was intended. In l. 28 hgrañhûyirhûyir ||, if hgrañ = Tib. grañ ‘cold’, which is not unlikely, then hûyirhûyir is probably = Tib. ñilñil ‘trickle down’, with -r = -l, the converse of -l = -r in stel; cf. p. 354.

B. Nasals final: M in ston, ‘harvest’, ll. 14, 255, 281 = Tib. ston, and qûim, ‘day’, l. 12 = Tib. ñûin/qûim, is probably original, Tibetan having in several instances (e.g. stûn, ‘thousand’) -n or -ñ in place of original -m. Confusion of final ñ and n is in Tibetan rather common, having perhaps its main root in the cases, such as drañ from hûren, bûñ from hûdzin, where ñ is for ññ < ns. To this type belongs the Nam Imperative htron (ll. 224, 233, pp. 199, 357) = Tib. dron/drons, from hûren, ‘lead’; and perhaps therefore rgon = Tib. dgon, ‘wilderness’, cf. Tib. dgon/dgons/rgons, ‘evening’ and sön/son, p. 355. Stonhpoon, l. 321 = Tib. ston-dpon, ‘thousand-commander’, is perhaps a loan-word. The loss, or non-accretion, of n in hûre/htre, ‘draw’, ‘lead’, is not peculiar to Nam, being found in the Tibetan manuscripts (p. 214) and perhaps also in the common Tibetan word hûre, ‘demon’. Hdro, ‘go’, ‘travel’ = Tib. hdro, will be similar.

8. Other root consonants, initial and final

A. Tenuis and aspirate:

In the discussion of Orthography (pp. 116 sqq.) we have noted very numerous examples of variation between tenuis and aspirate. In most instances the tenuis is preceded by h; but the great general preponderance in the number of words with that Prefix, and the fact that there are clear occurrences in its absence, render that circumstance insignificant.

The regular alternations of tenuis and aspirate in Tibetan verbal paradigms and the omnipresent phenomenon of such

1 Except in Khams, where Jaeschke notes (Berlin Academy Monatsbericht, 1865, p. 443) ñyen for ñen.

2 So also Chinese. On confusions in ‘the Tibetan manuscripts’ see p. 214.
alternation in the root-groups generally render it extremely
difficult to affirm in a particular case that a Nam *tenuis* replaces
an aspirate or vice versa: for example, *hkhar*, ‘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 *kkhur*, ‘carry’, and *khur*, ‘load’. Within the
limits of Tibetan such cases are not infrequent; for instance, we
find *paṅ* and *phaṅ* both meaning ‘lap’.

Some probable or certain cases are the following:¹

(a) *Tenuis* written for aspirate (common in the Tibetan manu-
scripts and documents):

*hkahi* (also *hkhab*) = Tib. *kha*, ‘mouth’, ‘speech’.
*hkaṅ* (also *kkhaṅ*) = Tib. *khaṅ*, ‘house’.
*hkab* (also *hkhab*) = Tib. *khab/khyab*, ‘home’, ‘family’.
*hkar* (also *khar/hkhar*) = Tib. *khar/mkhar*, ‘city’, ‘citadel’.
*hke* (also *hkhe*) = Tib. *khe*, ‘profit’.
*hkor* (also *hkhor*) = Tib. *khor/hkhor* (skor), ‘surround’, ‘go
round’, &c.

*hkyi* = Tib. *khyi*, ‘dog’.
*hkye* = Tib. *khye*, *khyehu*, ‘child’ (possibly, however, for
*skyey*).

*hkri* (also *khri*, *hgri*) = Tib. *khri*, ‘seat’, ‘support’.
*hcii/hcihi/gci/gcihi* = Tib. *mchi*, ‘go’.
*ce* (also *hce, hche*) = Tib. *che*, ‘great’.
*htam/htham* = Tib. *tham*, ‘united’.
*hto/htho* = Tib. *mtho*, ‘high’.
*hpu/hphu* = Tib. *phu*, ‘blow’.
*hpul/hphul* = Tib. *phul*, ‘raised to the top’.
*hpog/hphog* = Tib. *phog*, ‘hit’.
*hpom/hphom* = Tib. *pham*, ‘be defeated’.

¹ In some of the following instances (pp. 363–5) the spelling in the
manuscript fluctuates (*supra*, pp. 120–1).
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pyaṅ(phyaṅ) = Tib. hphyan, dpyaṅ, ‘dangle’.
pyar( pyer, phyer, hphyer) = Tib. hphyar, ‘lift’.
pyi(phyi) = Tib. phyi, ‘outside’, ‘later’.
hpra(hhpraḥ) = Tib. hpra, ‘kick’ (?).
hpro, ll. 181 (p. 156), 245–6 = Tib. hpro, ‘proceed’.
thaṅ = Tib. tshaṅ, ‘complete’.
htsu, tsur (htshu, htshur) = Tib. tshu, tshur, ‘hither’, ‘come hither’.
htsors(tshor, htsors) = Tib. htsor, ‘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’.
gcheq (also ḡceq, gceq) = Tib. tseg/tsheg, ‘trouble’, ‘hitch’.
tha (usually ta) = Tib. ta, a suffix.
hphu (also hpu) = Tib. pu, ‘man’, ‘elder’.
tsha/tshah = tsa, a suffix.
tsham (also htsam) = Tib. tsam, ‘only’.

B. Media and tenuis (or aspirate):

(a) Tenuis for media (common in the Tibetan manuscripts):
hkhaṅ (also hgaṅ) = Tib. gaṅ/dgaṅ, ‘full’, ‘complete’.
hkar (also hgar) = Tib. dgar/sgar/skar, ‘separate’, ‘pen’.
hku(smuḥu-²) = Tib. gu(smyu⁰), ‘reed’.
hkor (also hgor) = Tib. hgor, ‘tarry’.
hkyud (also hgyud) = Tib. rgyud, ‘race’.
ska = Tib. sga, ‘saddle’.
hklo (also glo, hlo) = Tib. glo, ‘lungs’.
hṭor (usually hdor) = Tib. hδor, ‘cast away’.
hṭre (usually ḡdre) = Tib. ḡδren, ‘draw’.
hṭroṅ = Tib. ḡδren, droṅ, traṅ, ‘draw’.
ṛto = Tib. rdo, ‘stone’.
ḥtlaṅ (usually ḡ disproportion) = Tib. lδan, ‘rise’.
ḥlom (usually ḡlom) = Tib. ldom, ‘bind’, ‘subdue’.
por/hpor (also phor) = Tib. ḡbor, ‘let go’ (manuscripts por).
hpro l. 321 (usually ḡbro) = Tib. ḡbro, ‘taste’.
ḥpos (usually ḡbos) = Tib. ḡbo, ‘swell’.

(b) Media for tenuis (or aspirate) (not rare in the Tibetan manuscripts):

gehù-prom = kehu (hkhehu).\(^2\)
hkri (also hkri) = khrì ‘seat’.
hkoh (hkho\(^2\)) = hkah (hkho\(^a\)).
hbuh (htor\(^a\)) = hpu and hphu (htor\(^a\)).
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.\(^1\)

Fortunately, however, we may disburden the Nam language of responsibility for the fluctuations. For in the Tibetan manuscripts, i.e. in a language which had been very copiously employed in writing, we find fluctuations of like character and amount, and not seldom affecting the same words.\(^2\) It may therefore be suspected, since the manuscripts were all, no doubt, written in Ša-cu, where they were found, that the actual scribes were not people of Tibet, but Central-Asians, imperfectly acquainted with the language, Tibetan or Nam, and liable to mishearing of words orally imparted to them. But, if that is the case, we must infer also that, as is not unlikely, private letters were often dictated to

---

\(^1\) See p. 117.

\(^2\) Concerning parallel caprice in Central-Asiаn texts in other languages see p. 117 n. 5.
scribes. For in a letter (Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents, ii, p. 238), of 4 lines only, from a Tibetan military officer we find:

(a) tenuis for aspirate in mtoṅ = mthon, tos = thos, tsal = htshal,

(b) aspirate for tenuis in thaṅ = ta, phar = par (thrice),

(c) tenuis for media in mtsad = mdzad (twice), rtsan = rdzan, par = bar (twice),

(d) media for tenuis in gdaṅ = gtaṅ, gyaṅ = kyaṅ,

and these occur in conjunction with correct writings, such as thugs, bde, bdag, khyams, kha, phyi, dag, rgyags, &c.

The normal Tibetan does not often confuse tenuis and aspirate, except where alternation is regular in the verbal paradigms and in root-forms. As regards Amdo, there is no serious evidence of a change of the type t/θ; and, though the converse would account for ‘Tangut’ tso, ‘lake’, tok, ‘lightning’, tūn, ‘drink’, tsiar, ‘rain’, ka, ‘mouth’, Thöchü pi, ‘hog’, kih, ‘house’, kvā, ‘thou’, kwān, ‘he’ (Tib. mtsho, thog, bthun, char, kha, phag, khyim, khyod, khoṅ), no clear conclusion follows from the meagre vocabularies at present available, even if we overlooked their modern date and were sure of their accuracy and interpretation. The case is similar in regard to tenuis/media. As concerns the ancient irregularities in the Tibetan and Nam writings, it seems necessary to acquiesce for the present in attributing the responsibility to the scribes.

C. The groups c, ch, j/ts, tsh, dz.

Confusion between these two groups, scripturally easy and in all old Tibetan writings quite frequent, is exemplified by:

hcog = htsog, ‘collect’.
hscaṅ = htsaṅ, ‘watch’ (Tib. btsa).
chis = tshis.
hjaṅ = hdzab, ‘eat’ (Tib. za).
hjam = hdzam, ‘mild’ (Tib. hjam).
hjar = hdzar, ‘adhere’ (Tib. hjar).
hju = hdzu, gzv, &c., ‘tiger’, ‘ass’.
hjo = hdzor, ‘eat’ (Tib. zo).
jon, hjon = hdzor, rdzor, ‘castle’ (Tib. rdzor, hdzor).
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 htroṅ, l. 40 = Tib. hbroṅ (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 \( h\text{brum} \) for \( h\text{gram} \), ‘border’, \( b\text{lo} \) for \( g\text{lo} \), and elsewhere we find \( h\text{drul}/h\text{grul}, h\text{grim}/h\text{brim}, h\text{gye}/h\text{bye}, \&c. \\

D. Final consonants

Except the above noted, sporadic, instances of \(-l\) for \(-r\) (stel) and \(n\) for \(n\), and the possible loss of final \(-s\), there seems to be practically nothing that calls for notice. There are no apparent instances of \(-b\) for \(-g\), as in the \( l\text{hab}, p\text{yab} = l\text{hag}, p\text{hyag} \), of the Tibetan manuscripts. If \( s\text{tin} \) in ll. 330–1, 335–6 were = Tib. \( s\text{di}g \), ‘sin’ (but probably it is \( s\text{tin} \), ‘rebuke’), it would correspond to the \( s\text{tin} \) of one of the Tibetan manuscripts, which present other instances also of confusion of final \( g, g\text{s} \), with \( n, n\text{s} \).

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 \( s\text{n\text{a}n} \) (also \( s\text{n\text{i}n} \)) = Tib. \( s\text{n\text{i}n} \), ‘heart’, is found also in the Tibetan manuscripts. Possibly it is due to confusion with \( s\text{n\text{a}n} \), ‘pleasant’; but it is exactly paralleled by ‘Tangut’ \( s\text{a}n \) = Tib. \( s\text{in} \), ‘wood’, ‘tree’, \&c.: see p. 108.

\( i \) for \( e \) in \( h\text{byir} \) = Tib. \( h\text{byer} \) is paralleled by \( s\text{tys} = s\text{tys} \), \( c\text{i} = c\text{s} \), \&c., of the Tibetan manuscripts.

\( i \) for \( u \) in \( m\text{yul} \) = Tib. \( m\text{yul} \), ‘creep privily’, may be compared with \( g\text{zi} = g\text{zu} \), ‘bow’, \( m\text{u} = m\text{i} \), ‘man’, in the manuscripts, which have also \( u \) for \( i \) in \( m\text{u} \), ‘man’, cf. the place-names \( M\text{i}-\text{\&a|Menia}/M\text{u}-\text{n\text{i}a} \) and \( M\text{i}/M\text{e}/M\text{u}-\text{li} \).

\( e \) for \( a \) in \( r\text{gyeb} \) = Tib. \( r\text{gyab}, p\text{hyer}/p\text{hyar} \) = Tib. \( p\text{hyar} \), and perhaps therefore in \( s\text{pye} \) = Tib. \( d\text{byar} \), \( s\text{te} \) = Tib. \( s\text{tar} \), and the name (\( H\text{\&es-}h\text{beg} \) (cf. the \( R\text{bag/R\text{beg}} \) of the manuscripts), has been mentioned \( s\text{upra} \) (p. 134), as perhaps dialectical; cf. \( t\text{seb}, b\text{leg}, s\text{en} \), for \( t\text{shab}, b\text{lag}, s\text{an} \), in the Tibetan manuscript \( C\text{hronicle} \).

\( o \) for \( a \) before \( -m, -m\text{s} \), in \( h\text{pom}/h\text{phom} \), ‘be defeated’, seems to have been regional, since it appears in several place-names ending in \(-t\text{oms} = -m\text{tshams} \), and \(-b\text{oms}/-g\text{oms} = -b\text{ams}/-g\text{ams} \), belonging to NE. Tibet.
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\( o \) for \( u \) is seen in \( gsom = \) Tib. \( gsun \), 'three', \( rkom = \) Tib. \( bkun \), 'slain', \( hkom/gkom = \) Tib. \( hkhums, hgums, bkun \), 'execute (a task)', \( rom = \) Tib. \( rum \), 'darkness', 'dark hollow', \( hklom = \) Tib. \( klun \) (p. 280), \( drom = \) Tib. \( dru\kern-.1667em n \) (p. 219), \( lom \) (p. 233) = Tib. \( lums \), 'bath', Hsi-hsia \( lom \), 'well' (Laufer, no. 114) ? The word \( s\kern-.1667em io\kern-.1667em g\kern-.1667em l\kern-.1667em u\kern-.1667em g \) occurs in the two forms (ll. 174, 359): the \( s\kern-.1667em i\kern-.1667em o\kern-.1667em g \) of l. 47 is evidently a different word. \( Hk\kern-.1667em ah\kern-.1667em -h\kern-.1667em o\kern-.1667em g \) = \( kha-ts\kern-.1667em u\kern-.1667em g \), of the Tibetan manuscripts, and \( t\kern-.1667em r\kern-.1667em o\kern-.1667em g/ht\kern-.1667em r\kern-.1667em o\kern-.1667em g \), 'enemy' (= Tib. \( h\kern-.1667em d\kern-.1667em r\kern-.1667em u\kern-.1667em s\kern-.1667em r\kern-.1667em u\kern-.1667em g, 'agitate' ?) may be further examples of the same.

B. Final

The duplications of final vowels, resulting in -\( a\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em a \), -\( i\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em i \), -\( u\kern-.1667em u \), -\( e\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em e \), -\( o\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em o \), have been noticed in the chapter 'Grammar' (pp. 169); also the combinations with \( hi \), resulting in -\( a\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em i \), -\( u\kern-.1667em i \), -\( e\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em i \), -\( o\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em i \). There remain -\( e\kern-.1667em hu \) and -\( o\kern-.1667em hu \), together with some other cases of -\( u \).

-\( e\kern-.1667em hu \), which in Tibetan is commonly used (a) to represent Chinese -\( a\kern-.1667em o \), in its old pronunciation, and (b) in so-called diminutives, such as be\( hu \), 'calf', from ba, 'ox', appears also in some apparently non-diminutive words, e.g. khy\( eu \), 'child', dre\( hu \), 'mule', le\( hu \), 'chapter', ne\( hu \), 'green meadow' (ne\( hu\kern-.1667em t\kern-.1667em a\kern-.1667em n, 'g\kern-.1667em si\kern-.1667em n') 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-sro\kern-.1667em n Lde\( hu \) (or Lde)-brtsan. The derivation of be\( hu \) 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 khy\( eu \), gle\( hu \), sqye\( hu \), che\( hu \) (also 6\( hi \)), dre\( hu \), mde\( hu \) (= md\kern-.1667em ah, 'arrow'), lde\( hu \), be\( hu \), bye\( hu \) (= bya, 'bird'), ne\( hu \), sne\( hu \), tse\( hu \), ze\( hu \), le\( hu \) (= la, 'pass'). The forms in -\( e\kern-.1667em hu \) were, therefore, ancient and widespread, and their derivation and meaning is problematical.

In the Nam examples the relation to -\( e \) is permeating. We have:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{hke}(\text{keu}, \text{geu})-\text{prom} = \text{hke}-\text{prom} \\
&\text{gle\kern-.1667em u} = \text{Tib. gle\kern-.1667em u}/\text{gle}, \ 'edges' (\?) \text{of ploughlands}' \\
&\text{hre\kern-.1667em u} = \text{grte\kern-.1667em e}/\text{gde}, \ 'fix' (\?) \\
&\text{ne\kern-.1667em u} = \text{Tib. ne\kern-.1667em h}, \ 'young', \ 'fresh' \\
&\text{tswe\kern-.1667em hu} = \text{htswe}/\text{htze}/\text{hdzwe} \\
&\text{hdz\kern-.1667em hu} = \text{Tib. gze-re}, \ 'weak'.
\end{align*}
\]

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 -\( e\kern-.1667em hi \) = -\( e \) are derived from -\( e\kern-.1667em he \) see supra, p. 192: on -\( a\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em i \) (cf. -\( a\kern-.1667em h\kern-.1667em u \)) pp. 191–2.
-\textit{o\-hu} occurs in:

\begin{align*}
\text{h\textit{k}ho\textit{u} (\textit{prom}, \textit{\text{"}me})} & = \text{h\textit{k}ho\textit{u} = h\textit{k}ho\textit{i} (\textit{\text{"}me})} = h\textit{k}ho\textit{ho}. \\
\text{hn\textit{o\-hu} (l. 206)} & = h\textit{n}o. \\
\text{hj\textit{o\-hu} (l. 137)} & = hj\textit{o}, \text{`chief', or \textit{hdzo}, \text{`man'.} \\
\text{ht\textit{o\-hu} (l. 7)} & = h\textit{to} ? \\
\text{hd\textit{d}\textit{o\-hu} = ld\textit{o}, h\textit{ld}\textit{d}\textit{o\-h}.} \\
\text{ldy\textit{o\-hu} = ld\textit{y}o.} \\
\text{n\textit{no\-hu} (l. 41).} \\
\text{gb\textit{o\-hu} = h\textit{bo}.} \\
\text{h\textit{byo\-hu} = h\textit{byo}.} \\
\text{hd\textit{z}o\textit{hu} = hd\textit{zo}, \text{`man', or \textit{hdzo}, \text{`act'.} \\
\text{gs\textit{o\-hu} = g\textit{so}, \text{`live'.}}}
\end{align*}

Of these equations some are not beyond doubt; but the certain ones, \textit{hk\textit{k}ho\textit{hu}, h\textit{n}o\textit{hu}, ldy\textit{o\-hu}, hj\textit{o\-hu} (alternating with hd\textit{z}o\textit{hu}), gb\textit{o\-hu}, gso\textit{hu}, suffice to prove that the -\textit{o\-hu} is indistinguishable in meaning from -\textit{o}: it may, therefore, represent an occasional pronunciation of the normal variant -\textit{ho}. Are there any other indications of a final -\textit{o} inclining towards the pronunciation -\textit{u}?

A certain instance is to be seen in the varied forms, both occurring more than once, of the name \textit{Mye-\textit{k}ru}, \textit{\text{"}k\textit{ro}}, in one of the Tibetan manuscripts; and in ordinary Tibetan there are instances, such as \textit{ph\textit{u}/ph\textit{ho}}, \text{`elder brother'}. In the Nam text the variation between \textit{h\textit{b}\textit{r}us}, and \textit{h\textit{b}\textit{r}o} in the repeated verse lines 152–3, 158 furnishes a good parallel: and the \textit{h\textit{d}\textit{ru}} (cf. Tib. \textit{dru\text{-}bu}, \textit{\text{"}gu}, \textit{gru\text{-}gu}, \text{`a clew or skein of thread'}) of \textit{h\textit{d}\textit{ru\text{-}h}j\text{ar}, `caught in the toils' (cf. p. 272), may be = \textit{\text{d}r\text{\text{"}o}}, \text{`net'}, of one of the Tibetan manuscripts. The possibility that the Nam expression \textit{hrim-h\textit{gr}u} corresponds to Tib. \textit{rim-h\textit{gro} (supra, p. 308)} is also apposite in this connexion. In Hsi-hsia -\textit{\text{"}u} = Tib. -\textit{\text{"}o} and -\textit{\text{"}o} = Tib. -\textit{\text{"}u} have been noted by Dr. Laufer (p. 101). The Nam word \textit{mu}, when it seems to mean \text{`sky'}, corresponds to what in Hsi-hsia is \textit{mo} and in Hsi-fan and Tibeto-Burman generally is usually \textit{mo} or \textit{mon}. In Hsi-fan \textit{\text{"}u <\text{"}o} is frequent or normal, e.g. in Rgya-ro\text{"}n \textit{\text{"}u} = Tib. \textit{\text{"}lo}, \text{`lungs'}.

The -\textit{\text{"}a} = Tib. -\textit{\text{"}o} in \textit{swa} (also Tib. \textit{swa}), \text{`watch'}, and \textit{swa}, \text{`tooth'}, and similarly in \textit{swar} = Tib. \textit{\text{"}o}, \text{`finger'}, \textit{wa-h\text{\text{"}a}n/\text{\text{"}a}n-h\text{\text{"}a}n} = Hsi-hsia \textit{\text{"}o\text{-}di\text{\text{"}i}}, Tib. \textit{\text{"}o\text{-}ld\text{\text{"}o}/\text{\text{"}o\text{-}do\text{\text{"}o}}, `neck', \text{`windpipe'}, is perhaps original, although in later times we find Gyärung \textit{w\text{"}a\text{\text{"}i}}, Tākpa \textit{wa}, derived, no doubt, from Tib. \textit{\text{"}o}, \text{`below'}, and in Yün-nan Tibetan -\textit{\text{"}a} for -\textit{\text{"}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 seizureable 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 ʒ, 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 Žaũ-žuũ language of the Mānasa-sarover-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 Žaũ-žuũ 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, Ladáki, &c., are, no doubt, all derivative, consequent upon the conquests of Sroñ-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 Prejevalskey’s vocabulary, is likewise colonial, being spoken in an originally Ch’iang area: allowance being made for a few phonological peculiarities, this dialect does not appear to differ seriously from the book language.
NOTE TO TEXT

The passages printed as prose betray frequently, but not at all points, a metrical intention, with verse varying (as elsewhere), irregular or miswritten. The punctuation being unreliable or inadequate, the beginnings of sentences after | (not after ||) are here indicated by an added mark (!). On extra-metrical -o, na, ni, hi, also don, at end of lines and on monosyllables with -r = -re, -r-re, or -ra see pp. 126-8, 173-81.
[1] ... r(n?) ... [2] ... rkah(?) ... [3] ... (8 akṣaras) [1 hra.
1 hlda] ... hšes | beg. hr ... hrañ. [hlda].
[4]. ... (14 akṣaras) [grie ... gž(?)-og]. ... (10 akṣaras)
[5] [r]am1 | ge | hwañ || re | klu | ge | hwañ ||
hrañ | hlda | hnam | hge | hšes | beg | hyañ |
[6] mog2 | htswe | re | mye | hyañ | hwañ ||
hrañ | hldañ | hnam | ge | hrapag | hkhur | hskuñu |
[7] [skuñu ?] | na3 | hšes | hbeg | [hldho ?] | dze | hrño | htoñu |
| re | hgyan ||
g-rañ | gšog | hner4 | šes | [8] hbeg | hšog ||
sta | hldyañ | htye | dze | hmo | ge | me | hgrah ||
hraññ | hlda5 | hnam | hge6 | hrañ7 | [9] hvos.] | hldom |
| sta | re | hmo | hno | ge | sta | hri | hldyañ ||
hmu | hrñu | skhrud8 | dze | mor | htañ | [10] [hgras] ||
hldi | hrkñah | hldyañ | dze | hyañ | htañ | hgras9 |
| hlañ | gsom | hran | [11]10 | h¿? | łyoyo | ge | htañ | hmu | hro |11 15
|hño | hlañ | hwam | hšid | dze | hrwañ | hkañ | [12] hkañ ||
| hbo | hkom | ldyan | dze | hldab | hde | hde ||
gñim | hti | hldyañ12 | hgye | hkrum | [13] hkrum |
hkr | hrqg | hldyañ | ge | hsrñi | hkyeb | hkyeb |
hóñ | hri | hldyañ | ge | [14] spo13 | hpod | pod14 |
hraññ | hri | hldyañ15 | hseñ | hwañ | hwañ |
| htaññ | hlduñ | hldyañ | ge | hstom | [15] hkom | hkeñi ||
g-yog | hšañ | ma | hpul | dze | hmar | hbañ | ge | hrl16ο | hnu |
| hbo | rwy | [16] hce | rgyañ | dze | hldyo | htor | ge | hnu | |
hkrug | hrdzo | hgyud | dze | hrño | hyod | yod17 |
| 18hrñe | [17] gsañ | hgre | dze | ñe19 | hkyeb | hkyeb |
hkrñah20 | hrapg | hñor | hlañ | hñi | hрог | hpañ | to | [18] h-21hskiyim | se22 | hromho ||
hdzañ | hkhör | hkrug | hkyañ | hyog | hldog | hbar23 |
wah | [19] [hññi]b | bžer ||
hdar | hti | hwer24 | hldu | hro25 hgru ||

1 dam?
2 hšog?
3 ra?
4 Understand hñer | re? (metre!). Cf. 1. 20.
5 m here crossed out.
6 dze (?) here crossed out.
7 h below line.
8 skhud? (a correction).
9 hbo | here crossed out.
10 g here crossed out.
11 hron? |
12 Insert ge or dze? (metre).
13 lpo?
14 pod added below line.
15 ge here omitted? (metre).
16 1 inked over: correction from hroho?
17 yod added below line.
18 rdz here crossed out.
19 ñe added below line.
20 h a correction of r (crossed out?).
21 ra?
22 Corrected to skhrñe? (erosion and blur).
23 = hbañ-re?
24 Read hwe-re? (metre).
25 bžer | here crossed out.
sta | re | hmo | ge | sta | hri | hldyana [20]
stah | hldyana | hthye | dze | hmo | ge | me | hgrah |
g-rah | gsog | hner | hes | hbeg | hsog [21]
hgru | hlda | mah | dze | htsa | gsm | hkg |
5 ga | bza | g-ri | hruh | hra | hrah | [22] [hrwethi |
smui | hku | hyob | ge | hmar | myi | lpyoho ||
hgru | hlda | mah | ge | hes | [23] hbeg | hrah ||
htsah | gsm | hkg | ge | hes | hbeg | hrah |
na | gsm | shi | [24] hyan |
10 hgru | hsr | tam | ge | hes | beg | hstah |
klu | hto | htsa | ge | hes | [25] hbeg | mehi |
klu | rto | htsah | ge | hrah | hyos | hlam |
hes | hbeg | hrbo | dze | [26] hldyeg | hldy | hti | dze | hrah |
g-yos | ge | hsar |
grah | hyos | ge | has | [27] g-rah | g-yo | rbo | ge | hglu |
ma | hti | [5]
15 smu | hdzu | rgyag | dze | hlda | rma | hreweh |
[28] hdag | dze | hgra | nyi | nyir |
hswar | hldu | sto | dze | g-yo | hpud | hto | hdag | hpo |
[29] hwar | hwar |
nde | hyim | sto | rgyag | rgu | hymil | myil |
20 htor | hpu | hgru | dze | g | hdzo | [30] htsah |
hgru | hlda | ma | dze | hgru | hto | hr | [6]
gsra | re | hta | to | dze | hbra | hldar [31] | ma | hyob |
g-yan | ra | [32] hnrab | hlda | hta | hbra | hldar | ma | hyob |
25 hgru | hto | hrub |
hgru | hma | hkom | re | hrwad | [33] hmo | hldah |
htr | hbu | [ ] hgru | dze | hse | hte | hmun |
hnha | hra | ge | rwyin |
na | htsah | [34] ste | dze | hldyo | htor | ge | hnu | dze |
30 g-rah | hyos | htag | ge | hjo |
Sid | g-ri | htor | [35] dze | hgru | hlda | mah |
mehi | g-ri | hta | dze | 14 rtah | htsog | hram |

1 hbye? Cfl. l. 8. 2 Read hner-re? Cfl. l. 7.
3 gba | ga | za? (corrected from 5m). 4 hgru ?
5 hgru | h here crossed out. 6 nyir added below line.
7 It may be suspected that the words g-yo-hpud-hto-hdag the first two belong to the previous line of verse, and should precede hdag there.
8 myil added below line. 9 Punctuation here completed by reviser.
9 sa? 11 Underline correction from hyede
10 12 htraz ?
13 Punctuation here due to reviser.
14 Punctuation here confirmed by reviser.
rgyed | [36] hsañ | rgam | cañ | hldyo | hrje | hbro |
ses | hmad | hdzwehe | re | hpañ | hroñ | hkes
[37] hran | hldah | hnam | ge | klu | hto | hkyim |
rje | smyi | rmad | ge | htsog | hram | hdroho | [38]
hsi | hgr | hchim \ 2 | ge \ 2 | hldyañ | hrdzañ | hdzañ |
rbro | hphah | hdar | [39] dze | hkye | ge | hmu |
ses | hmad | hdzwe | dze | myag | mye | htañ \ 3
rgoñ | spu | rbu | dze | hgyaid \ 4 | ge \ 5 | hbañ [40]
hphu | hkl | hsad | dze | hnañ \ 6 | me | hmyi |
htrg | htor | te | dze | hldyo | ge | hnu |
mor | hphu | [41] hbos | dze | h núña | nohu | hphul |
hyañ | rmyi \ 8 | hsñ | dze | hgw | neñu | hkeñi |
na | hldom [42] hgor \ 9 | hkyan | hrgyañ | hdzud |
hsañ | htsañ | hdzañ | dze | hklom | ge | htl |
bos | smyi | [43] hldog | dze | hrañ | ldah | ge | hdzah |
gdah \ 10 | hdhíñ \ 11 | gta | pra | hreñ | hldyañ |
bos [44] smyi | hldog | ge | ses | gñi | hludñu |
htsah | htsañ | hdzañ | ge | ses | hsi | breñ |
hriñ [45] rwa | hkar | re | hñañ | hya \ 12 | htsag |
skñ | rah | hdzur | dze | hldag | hbañ | hldñ |
re | ma | [46] hnan | ge | hbeñ | hsi | rmañ |
hmar | me | hukañ \ 13 | ge | hrdzah | hgo \ 14 | hpo |
gte | me | hkañ | ge \ 18 | dam | [47] rma | hbroñ |
gci | me | hsi | ge | hbeñ | bñ | hbu | hruñ |
hñed | ge | slug | dze | hweñ | hsi [48] hpo |
hre | ge | rgñ | dze | hphu | hsg | hldyiñ |
twañ | mag | hnor \ 16 | gse | hñaññañ | hldyañ | dze [49] rñam | nar |
huyu |
hkyan | mag | hnor \ 18 | hriñ | hcañ | hram | dze | gñe | hrdzo |
hñañ \ 19 ||
hec | ra \ 21 [50] tsha | ge | hce | hrañ | hbyi | na | tsham | hroñ | hñor

1 = htsaññ, l. 81.
2 htsog | hram | hdo hcañ crossed out. The punctuation || after ge is probably due to confusion.
3 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.
4 hgyed? Correction from hgyaid.
5 hñañ below line, a correction of myag.
6 hñañ below line, a correction of myag.
7 nú a correction of ja.
8 pyi? rpyi? miñ?
9 Read hgor-re? (metre).
10 g added below line.
11 hida written? See scansion.
12 ya? The h a correction of la.
13 Sic.
14 hko?
15 For hñor-re? Cf. l. 68.
16 Corrected from hñar or hñañ.
17 Corrected from hñañ or hñañ.
18 For hño-re?
19 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.
20 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.
21 || hce | ra inked over.
TEXT: LINES 51-67

1 ḫbu | rbye | ḥce | ṛgyaṅ | na | ḥldyo | tor | [51] ḥnus |
g-yog | ḥsaṅ | ma | ḥpul | dze | ḥmar | ḥbaṅ | ge | ḥrab |
ḥlduṅ | ce | ṛgyaṅ | na² | stoṅ | ḥkgog | re | ḥldya [52] ḥkaṅ | ḥte |
ḥnor | ḥldag | ḥce | ṛgyaṅ | na | ḥldag | ḥkri | ḥkyag | re | ḥśid |
5 ḥmog | ḥce | ṛgyaṅ | [53] ṛgya | ḥni | ke | ḥkor | ḥśid | ṛbyo | ḥko |
ṛno | dze | ḥphoṅ | ge | ṛhrāṅ | na | ḥce | ge | ḥme | ḥyed | ḥko | [54]
ṛno | ḥce | dze | ṛb²ab | na | ḥke | ḥkog | steḥi | ḥtam | ḥmog | dze |
rṇaṅ | ḥba | ge | ṛgyehe | na | ḥko | ḥno | ḥce | [55] dze | ḥmoge | ḥco |
ṭgmog | ḥce | ṛgyaṅ | dze | ḥko | ḥno | ge | ḥco | ḥmog | ḥce | ḥsa | dze |
10 ḥbaṅ | ḥrag | [56] ḥkyer | ḥnāṅ | ḥce | ḥraḥ | ḥbyiṅ | ṛna | ḥbyo |
ḥko | ḥno | ṛne | ḥno⁴ ḥ | ṛṇaṅ | dze | na | ge | me ḥna | [57] ḥbyiṅ |
ṛgyaṅ | ḥce | ma | ḥbyiṅ |
ḥce | ḥse⁵ | ṛgye | re | ḥrkas | ḥthaṅ | ḥlde |
rbyo | ḥce | ṛgye | [58] dze [ ] | ḥgru | ḥrgeh | sto |
9 ṛsku | mag | ḥno | dze | me | na | ḥldis |
ḥdah | mag | ḥno | dze | me | na | ḥsams [59] |
sbyim | ḥce | ṛgye | dze | ḥrwa | ḥdah | ḥpog |
ḥsas | ḥce | ṛgye | dze | ḥraṅ | ḥgam | ḥyim |
ṛgoṅ [60] ḥce | ṛgye | dze | ḥldaṅ | ḥgrgyu | ḥtam |
20 ḥkhu | tsa | ṛid | dze | ḥpha | ḥnur | ḥnur |
gphaḥ | tsa | ḥglom | dze | ḥkkhu | [61] ḥnur | ḥnur [¹⁰ [62]
~ | ḥṭid | ḥriṅi | ḥṭhor¹¹ | dze | ḥgru | ḥldaṅ | ḥmaḥ |
ḥtor | ḥphu | ḥgru | dze | ḥlaṅ | ḥtsaṅ |
ha | [63] ṛyaṅ¹² | ḥso | ḥraṅi | dze | ḥmo | ma | ḥṭhor |
25 ṛyaṅ | so | ḥdze | tse | ḥldi | ma | ḥrtaḥ |
ḥyaṅ | tsa | ḥjo | dze | [64] ṛyaṅ | ge | ḥgroms |
tor | ḥpu | ḥgru | ge | ḥstor | ṛmoṅ | ḥdzoṅ | re | ḥtsaṅ | ḥdzo | ḥkrom |
gsu | [65] ḥpom | ḥnor | ḥtsaṅ | ḥpu¹³ | ḥdom |
ḷdaṅ | ḥyen | ḥagag | re | ḥtsaṅ | ḥyaḥ | ḥdo |
³₀ ḥpha | ma | ṛṇaṅ | [66] | ne | ge | ḥbu | ḥta⁴ | ge | ṛṇaṅ | ḥγaṅ | ḥgahi |
ḥyaṅ | ḥraḥ | ḥkaṅ | ḥldom | ge | ru [¹⁵ ḥgaṅ | ge | [67] ḥṭhil | hi |

¹ With these two verses cf. II. 15-16. ² ce ṛgyaṅ na added below line.
³ ṛba a correction (of ṛba?). Read ba?
⁴ ce here crossed out: the h accidentally left in.
⁵ b here crossed out.
⁶ ṛb here crossed out.
⁷ Some sign here crossed out.
⁸ Read ḥce ḥce?
⁹ This and the following verse seem to interrupt the series of expressions:
an insertion?
¹⁰ A short line. Before the next line there is a blank of about the width of
a line.
¹¹ Correction of ḥṭhor?
¹² Read ḥyaṅ: ḥ(a) yaṅ is merely the result of a line-ending.
¹³ Correction of ḥai (crossed out). ḥnor = ḥño-re.
¹⁴ ṛu ḥta (a correction of ḥaṅ) crossed out?
¹⁵ ḥa here crossed out.
hko | se | hgro | re | htsa | ḥyaḥ | hdo ||
ḥjo | me | ḥdub | re | ḥlab | ma | ḥni |
ḥbaḥ | [68] re | hko | ḥtar | dze | hna | hlam | glo | hraḥ ||
ḥdzam | ḥbroṇ | hroṇ | dze | ḥdam | to | hbu | ḥpor ||
[69] skyim | se | ḥdzar | dze | ḫbehi | la | ḥgar ||
thar | pyaḥ | ḫjo | ḥge | ḥphag | la | gnah ||
gecog | [70] hldc | ḥldu | dze | ḥiḥbyig | la | gnah ||
ḥjo | me | ḥdub | re | ḥlab | me | ḥnis ||
ru | ge | ḥkrom | dze | [71] hmo | ma | ṭhor ||
ḥcha | ge | ḥeer | dze | ḥldi | ma | ṭraḥ ||
ḥde | me | ḥtaḥ | g-roḥ | ḥyed | ge | ṭa | ḥwa | [72] ste | ḥtaḥ ||
gśi | bröm | hnu | ge | ḥsor | ḥtsam | ḥzod |
ḥyaḥ | brgeḥe | ge | sram | pa | nar | [73] |
ḥwa | ste | ḥge | dze | ḥla | ḥram | ḥte ||
ḥtor | ṭmyi | ḥbom | ge | ḥla | htsaḥ ||
ḥphah | [74] ma | raḥ | ge | ḥtsaḥ | ḥjo | ḥdsin |
ḥkuhu | neh | ḥtshe | re | ḥwḥi | neh | ḥreḥe |
gdu | ḥldo | ḥtor | [75] dze | ḥsōh | ḥsōh | ḥśtū ||
ḥwa | ste | ḥgeḥe | dze | gdu | ḥtor | ḥbyi |
ḥwa | ste | ḥge | dze | lah | [76] hram | ḥte | chań | gdu | ḥtor ||
ḥński ||
dō | ḥdo | ḥdzo | chań | gdu | ḥtor | ḥshun | re | [77] hrah |
ḥṛtah | ḥgyaḥa

dgū | ḥldo | ḥtor | dze | ḥldo | ḥdzor | re | ḥldo | ge | ḥgru | ma |
ṛmań | [78] na |
lḍyan | ḥjo | ḥjihi | re | mehi | ra | ḥgam ||
gdu | ḥldo | ḥtor | ge | stor | hmon | joṇ | [79] |
ḥldań | phyi | ske | re | ḥno | stor | prom | re | ḥgru | ma |
ḥstor ||
stor | ḥto | rta | yań | stor | to | [80] hrun ||
rta | ḥso | ḥnaḥ | yań | gni | ḥrdzum | doḥo ||
ṣmyi | ḥni | ḥāgie | ḥmyi | ḥrma | ḥdań | [81] |
ḥkyań | ḥgyań | ḥšig | dze | ḥsī | ḥkri | ḥṭśim |
ḥṣań | re | ḥšig | dze | ḥmog | re | ḥ [82] hldoń |

1 Read me, as in l. 707
2 H added below line.
3 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.
4 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.
5 ṭhor?
6 r inked over.
7 H added below line.
8 b smudged or crossed out.
9 Something here crossed out.
10 ḥadded below line.
11 ta added below line.
12 Punctuation reinforced by reviser.
13 ḥco?
14 ḥ added below line.
15 H below line: ḥbyi correction of ḥgya?
16 ḥglu?
17 ḥglu?
18 Correction from ḥdań.
19 ḥehim? Cf. l. 38.
20 ḥ added below line.
rtah¹ | htsog | hram | dze | hrgoñ | hru | ge | hru | re | rbyo | ha | ge² |
hecñ | ḍte | hyu | [83] rgyag | dze | hidas | htsø | hpu | ḍhakam | stañ |
rgyag | dze | hnam | ḍte | hsañ | ḍheag | rgyag | [84] hris | dze | hno |
sto | ge | rdo | re | cis | tsha | ḍbyiñi | ḍhrje | smyi | rmad | ge | hmo |
5 rkañ | lda | [85] dze | hno | sto | ge | ḍsag³ | dze | rie | hwe | ge |
hwir ||
hno | sta | glom | dze | krañ | nur | ḋur | [86] |
ré | sta | glañ | dze | hne | rneñi | rneñi |
gsañ | sñañ | do | na | rgyañ | na | spe |
10 htsog | hram | hdo | na | [87] mor | ḍldañ | re | ḍñañ ||
hldi | rgyed | ḍhar | ḍcoñ | hram | hdo ||
rgyed | ḍhre⁴ | ḍte | ge | [88] ḍcoñ | ḍdo | dze | hwad |
ḥdim | ḍtshis | ḍltom | re | ḍtsø | ḍldañ | stañ |
gdim | pyi | [89] ḍse | ge | ḍsom | ḍrgyag | ḍsor | doñ | ḍthshog |
15 me | ḍldyim | ḍrgyañ |
⁵gdim | phyi | ḍse | ge | [90] ḍtshog | hram | ḍñañ |
rgyed | ma | ḍldañ | ge | ḍtsog | hram | ḍñañ |
ṛta | htsog | hram | [91] ge | ḍtah | ḍrye | ḍtah |
ṛta | ḍsko | ḍrom | re | ḍṛtañ | ḍldañ | ḍкраñ ||
20 htsog | ḍpu | ḍe | ḍchañ | [92] pyi | ḍse | ḍthoñ |
kɔr | ḍtah | ḍkhen | yañ | sñañ | ḍyañ | ḍyañ⁶ |
ḥjañ | ḍtah | ḍkhen | yañ | [93] swa | tseg | tseg ||
rgyed | ma | ḍltañ | ge ||
ṛta | ḍgm | ḍphar | re | ḍhus | sło | glo |
25 ḍtgañ | ḍtsø | ḍna⁷ | [94] ge | ḍtsg | hram | ḍduñ |
rgyed | ḍhre⁸ | ge | ḍtsg | ḍtah | ma ||
gdim | ḍhíñ | ḍdom | [95] re | ḍtsg | ḍldañ | ḍstañ ||
ḥdim | ḍtshis | ḍdom | re | ḍtshog | ḍldañ | ḍduñ ||
10 ḍdyim | phyi | [96] ḍse | ge | ḍtsog | ḍtah | ma | te | na | ge |
30 ḍbyiñ | ḍkya | ḍtah | ḍta | ḍtør | ḍgor¹² | ḍhys | [97] ḍbom¹³ | ḍbyiñ |
ḥbar | ḍbañ | ḍthwañ | ḍbyiñ | ḍwre | hmo | ḍchañ | ḍbyiñ | ḍtsog |
hram | ḍmyiñ | [98] ḍgor | ḍhys | ḍbar | ḍthwañ | ḍkhor | kyañ |
rwehi | re |
hmø | cha | byi | na | phyi¹⁴ | ḍse | myi | [99] |
rgyed | ma | glaṅ | ge | ḷṅaḥ¹ | htsog | ḷaḥ | ḷaḥ¹ | rta | ḷgam | ḷphar² | gsus | slo | stāh | [100]

hiên | ḷzoom | ḷdzim³ | re | hko | wehi | ḷtuḥu |

rta | ḷso | ḷaña | ge | na | rom | ḷtoṇ | [101] | re | ḷlaṅ | ḷjaṅ | ḷkho | ḷko | bphyag⁴ | ḷkho | ḷraṅ | wa | ḷpaṅ | re |

rgyed | ma | [102] | ḷldaṅ⁵ | ge⁶ | ḷañ | htsog | ḷsas |

ḥsæd | mag | ḷdehi | ḷi | ḷi | ḷkej | mye |

ṛbyo | śñaṅ⁷ | ge | [103]⁸ | śñaṅ | na | ḷgo | ru | ge | ḷru |

the | kyen | ḷḥdug | ḷa | rta⁹ | ḷso | ḷna | ma | ḷraṅ | ḷḥdram | [104]

ḥmu | ḷdoṭ | ḷtor | ḷsku | ḷḥphu | ḷći | ḷḥldi | ḷgnaḥ | ḷnaṅ | ḷre | ḷnag |

ḥṭshab | ḷkaḥ | ḷraṅ | ḷrgyed | [105] | ma | ḷldaṅ | ge⁰ | ḷkaḥ | ḷco |

byin | ḷa¹⁰ | ḷrgyed | ḷtsog | ḷdro | ḷho | ḷkaḥ | ḷgo | byin | ḷa | ḷrgyed |

ḥgo | ḷdro | ḷkaḥ | ḷkhab | byin | [106] | ḷa | ḷrgyed | ḷkab | ḷdro |

ḥkaḥ | ḷkhab¹¹ | byin | ḷaḥ | ḷrgyed | ḷkhāḥ | ḷdro | ḷkho | ḷphyaγ¹² |

ḥkhoḥu | ḷre | [107] | ḷraṅ | ḷwaṛ | ḷrders | ḷći | ḷna | ḷna | ḷhrom | ḷkob |

ḥlaṅ | ḷjaṅ | ḷkhog | ḷrgyed | ma | [108] | ḷldaṅ | ge | ḷso | ḷñaḥ |

ḥṛgaḥ | ḷmo | ḷlaṅ¹³ | ḷbyu | ḷre | ḷḥldi | ḷḥdah | ma | ge | ḷho | ḷbro | ḷḥrub |

[109] | ḷre | ḷmyag | ḷgre | ḷskyāṅ | ḷḥjim | ḷli | ḷre | ḷpa | ḷla | ḷla | ḷge | ḷtho |

ṛgyam | ge | ḷhwaḍ | ḷre | [110] | ḷspyi | ḷḥdze | ge | ḷkab |

ṛta | ḷḥgam | ḷphar | ḷre | ḷso | ḷñaḥ | ḷhldo |

ḥrö | ḷbehi | ḷbaḥ | ge | [111] | ḷso | ḷñaḥ | ḷgeh | ḷgeg |

ḥso | ḷñaḥ | ḷhyaḥ | ḷtse | ḷṭaḥ | ḷḥbom | ḷro |

ḥbom | ḷro⁴⁴ | ḷphaṅ | ḷdze | ḷldaṅ | [112] | ḷкраṅ | ḷnar | ḷre |

ḥbom | ḷro | ḷldaḥ |

ḥmaḥ | ḷldaṅ | ḷhyaḥ | ḷdze | ḷrgyed | ḷḥdag | ḷhag | [113] | ge |

ḥldaṅ | ḷкраṅ | ḷhruḥi |

ḥñaḥ | ḷḥpoh | ḷgor | ḷre | ḷḥu | ḷtor | ḷḥtsu : na |

gtse | ḷne | ḷrgad | [114] | ḷraḥ | ḷraḥ | ḷkaṅ | ḷna |

dgu | ḷldo | ḷtor | ḷge | ḷsu | ḷme | ḷmehi |

ḥraḥ | ḷwe | ḷraḥ | ḷge | ḷso | [115] | ḷñaḥ | ḷmehi |

ḥraḥ | ḷhe | ḷre | ḷhjo¹⁵ | ḷge | ḷhe | ḷtsog | ḷtsaḥ |

ḥpo | ḷhlī | ḷña | ḷre | ḷhyaḥ | ḷhehi | [116] | ḷñaḥd |

ḥsas | ḷte | ḷkyāṅ | ḷje¹⁶ | ḷsas | ḷkhah | ge | ḷrwehi |

¹ Sic (for ḷñaḥ ? cf. l. 102).
² sl here crossed out: ḷphar-re ? (cf. l. 110).
³ hjim|hjim ? ḷḥdzam|ḥdzam ?
⁴ Punctuation reinforced.
⁵ Correction from cha.
⁶ Read ḷraṭa in place of ḷa | ḷraṭa.
⁷ Corrected from ḷkhab.
⁸ Or ḷña ?, (a correction).
¹⁰ Sic (= ḷzu, l. 117).
¹¹ Erroneous punctuation.
¹² ḷpro here crossed out.
¹³ ḷna here crossed out.
¹⁴ ḷhaḥ here crossed out.
¹⁵ ḷkaḥ . . . ta added below line.
¹⁶ Cf. l. 101.
¹⁷ ḷsas here crossed out.
¹⁸ Punctuation reinforced.
rtah | hgam | hphar | cañ | stor | hdar | [119] hyoho ||
hrta | htsog | hram | yañ |
hño | stor | ha5 | htoñ | re | hrie | hldan | hkhyed | [120]
htsg | hram | myag | dze | hrañ | pm | plan6 |
htsg | hram | hnañ | tse | htor | si | rgo7 || [121]
htsg | hram | hme | dze | htor | htas | [122] hproms |
htsg | hram | hpo | dze | hpta | rkwa | hdzam |
htsg | hram | hreg | dze | hldyan8 | [123] hyu | hgañ | dze |
hsi | hwa | hko |

hrta | htsog | hram | yañ |
stor | me | hkhyed | re | hldan | [124] me | hkhyed ||
htor | h’rta | rme | ge | hldan | krañ | hkuñ || na |
hldan | hkrán | bsad | na | hldan [125] hkrán | bsah |
htsd | hran | hwe | dze | hldan | slah | hkehe |

hldan | hkrán | hko | dze | stor | [126] hldan | hphyar |
hldan | hkrán | spo | dze | stor | hgn | hbo ||
hldan | hram | hnam | dze | stor | [127] dgu | hdar10 ||

hrtañ | hldan | krañ | yañ |
hño | stor | hkhyed | re | hrie | hldan | hkran |
so | [128] hnañ | hstor | dze | hño | stor | hprom ||
hkhar | hprag | g-yar11 | stor | monñ | hjoñ | re || [129]
re | hmoñ | hjoñ | re | hldag | gnag | hkkhoñ |
g-wah | hram | myer | re | hldag | nag | [130] swehe |
h2thañ | rdzo | hñor12 | hldag | nag | htsors |

hthañ | phu | hkmam | ge | rrie | [131] hbye | hkwhehe | ge |
14hthañ | hgam | hriehe |
hthañ | le | htsa | ge | hthañ | [132] hgam | hkre15 |
hthañ | rdzo | hñor16 | hldag | nag | tho ||

1 rño over h (a blur): possibly hño or hjo was intended.
2 Sic = hju, l. 115.
3 A correction (of gsum?).
4 Punctuation reinforced.
5 Sic : omit ha.
6 pm-plam? Corrected below line from phyum | pyam.
7 rgi? 8 A correction (of hthañ?). 9 I here crossed out.
10 do a correction? 11 = g-yar-re or g-ya-re? Cf. l. 136.
12 w here crossed out.
13 = hño-re?
14 hldag | nag here crossed out.
15 he | here crossed out.
16 = hño-re?
TEXT: LINES 133-146

hbri | hldi | hthaṅ | re | bre | hldi | [133] hyah |
1 hldi | hthaṅ | re | rgyeb | hldi | hthaṅ | ra | 2
hthaṅ | brgam | hkad | re | rne | re | hno | [134]
dgu | sko | hldon | re | hkhog | hnoṅ | hdzom bi |
re | hmoṅ | hyog | re | hldag | nag | htsors 3 [135]
braṅ | pu | blo | ge | gsehe | hldi | hthoṅ | re | hldag | nag |
hkrag |
hkhar 4 rpag 5 || [136] g-yr | re | hldag 5 | hgrom |
hldag | nag | g-yah | dze | rgyad | kyer | rbo | dze |
gtse | hkom | re | tsaṅ | [137]
1 bhr | re | hrdyam | re | hkhah | hldaṅ | hnaṅghi ||
hdzobu | ro | hldi | re | hjohu 7 || hwa | hkaṅ 8 [138]
hdzehu | rje | hbro | re | hdzobu | htō | hrun |
stor | rje | hbro | re | stor | hto | hrun |
lāṅ | rdze [139] hbro | re | hldaṅ | the | rgyeb ||
dgu | ldo | htor | ge | stor | moṅ | h10 dzon |
hraḥ | wehi | rta | ge | [140] stor | moṅ | hdz 11 oṅ ||
dyo | stor | hthu | re | hdrab | stor | htoho ||
hni | stor | spehi |
hpū | [141] hpos | stor | dze | hkyan | stor | rno 12 ||
hsaṅ | yer | hldaṅ | dze | hrne | hldaṅ | ne |
mor | [142] gdag | bgom | re | hdaṅ | hldog | stor |
mor | gdag | hphar | re | stor | hδor | g-yoho | [143]
na | hldom | hgor | hkyan 14 | gstor |
htor | se | stor | dze | hldaṅ | pyi | ske |
hrī | stor [144] hsaṅs | dze | mo | ma | htor |
hwī | hldaṅ | hnaṅs 15 | dze | hldi | ma 16 | hrtah | 17
hldyāṅ | htaḥ | hbo 18 | [145] kyer | mag | hnor | su | ge | stor | ta |
hthogs |
phye | hgo | hthuṅ | re | hnam | hdzam | [146] htar |

1 Insert hyah (a regular antithesis to rgyeb)?
2 ni here crossed out: replaced by the ra (below line).
3 s below line.
4 1 here crossed out (h intended?).
5 re here crossed out.
6 Insert nag?
7 hong? Or is the dot over hu meant to indicate an error? Punctuation erroneous.
8 h below line.
9 rto (a first correction of to?) here crossed out. The to was then written.
10 to here crossed out.
11 dz written after to (crossed out).
12 Correction of rūṭa?.
13 h here crossed out.
14 Insert here brgyaṅ, as in l. 42.
15 Read hsaṅs?
16 ma: added below line.
17 Punctuation reinforced.
18 Some fragment of an akṣara here crossed out.
hrad | hrta | rma | dze | hdrag | htrog | htsa |
1rde | hne | hrmag | dze | hman [147] byi | hldon | hyu | sad | ge |
hphom | te | hdrai | ge | hsad | na | hra | rgya | hsod | te | rma [148] dze | rman | ra | gyim | sipy | htor | hawa | dze | myag | myi [4]
5tor | htas | prom | dze | myage [149] me | htaa |
rgyed | rma | re | ge | stor | tha | hthogni |
hra | sini | fe | ge | stor | ta | hthog | ni [150]
hlda | hpu | hbsi | re | mehi | klu | heha | ge | stor | hta | htoni |
hkyer | re | cig | dze | [151] hpha | hpho | ge | hkar | nor | gso |
10hka | prom | re | sid | rgya | hnom | re | mehi | spa [152] rgya |
ge | stor | ta | htoni | g-we | hku | rio | re | g-yah | htsa | ne | ge |
gstor | ta | hthon |
hek [153] hka | fes | re | ske | hbrus | hgya | ni |
myi | re | hti | ni | myi [5] | his |
15myi | rgye | myer | hchos | [154] hyo | hj [7] |
ht | rgye | mye | dze | hye | hkm | hkm | |
hlo | ge | blah | hldo | ge | na | [155] rie | ne |
mehi | hgb | hldo | ge | rke | hlda | hrdan |
sid | rgya | hre | ge | hwm | hnom | [156] son |
20rma | g-yog | rio | ge | hjim | ta | hthusi |
rman | bri | hko | ge | g-yah | ta | mehi |
na | rog | [157] hphar | ge | skye | ta | ram |
hpu | hbro | rkom | ge | glo | ta | rdo |
9hlda | hwe | ge | g-ri | [158] ta | gron |
25hke | hka | fes | re | ske | hbro | hgya |
chos | ta | nan | re | hde | ta | rgyen | [159] hlab | ta | hwen |
hna | hchos | hre | ge | hlda | myi | seg |
spy | chos | hre | ge | gtsa | [160] myi | hrga |
Psi | hchos | re | ge | hpu | myi | hldin |
30sna | ne | the | ya | stor | dor | yon | [161]
hlda | hpu | hbsi [10] re | mehi | klu | hea | ya | stor | hdro |
hyon |
kyu | ldo | rio | re | [162] kya | wa | ne | ya | stor | hdro |
hyon |

1 The passage rde-hta (l. 149) was probably in verse: it may have been affected by omissions of duplicate, or quasi-duplicate, words. See pp. 299 sqq.
2 na added below line.
3 g added below line.
4 sa (for st?) here crossed out.
5 Insert re?
6 Read mye-re or myer-re?
7 hrio?
8 A syllable missing here or after hlda? Krahn?
9 Underline correction from ste: cf. l. 153.
10 ya here crossed out.
hldyo | hdom | nag | re | hdarb | hwa | hrañ | yan | [163] stor |
   | hnor | hyon | hbo | hsebe | hpur | hse | sri | hbodrag |
   | hkhah | hldañ | hnore² | ts | [164] chañ³ | hkañhi |
   | hrtah | swah | g-wer⁴ | hbos | hsah | hldañ | ha² |
   | hbos | [165] hnom | hsah⁶ | gtsañ | hru | ma | gzo |
   | khru | hruk | myi | hrdbo | hrnab | ma | hldañ |
   | hsah | chad | [166] rmur⁷ | hkoñu | prom | g-yehe |
   | hsah | yob | hkom | re | hrañ | hrah | htsuñu |
   | rtah | hscañ⁸ | [167] g-yer | dze | stor | hto | hruñi | ge | hrañ |
   | hrah | hdehi |
   | htor | bphu | hbos | ge | hbyi | [168] hri | hgañ | ge |
   | chi | hrmu | hphor | re | hkoñu | bprom | hto |
   | htor | snñiñ | hkan | ge | [169] hkoñu | hprom | hrgah | dze |
   | hrgom | hkhur⁹ | hto | na | hpeñi | hram | re | hto |
   | hdro | [170] hbron | prom | ge | hkoñi | me | htuł |
   | hbañ | hldañ | hne | ge | hkeñu | me | hdzah | [171] |
   | hldyo | hdom | hnag | re | hkoñu | hphrom | hto | na |
   | sli | tti | hñor¹⁰ | hkoñu | meñe | [172] hldyo |
   | hdarb | hwañ | hrañ | hrañ | re | hkoñu | phrom | hto | na |
   | hrwad | hbañ | prom | [173] yañ | hkoñu | me | hdarb | na |
   | klag | hrwad | hdzur¹¹ | hwi | hweñi | htsag |
   | rtai | swah¹² | mor¹³ | [174] hkoñu | prom | hto | na |
   | tor | dro | hñó | ge | hnu | glañ | slog |
   | rtai | swa | hdir¹⁴ | [175] glañ | hldoñ¹⁵ | |
   | rtai | swa | ḫkom | re | hnu | glañ | hpor | na | mu | ṭñi | ḫño |
   | [176] na | hrtah | swa | hphyegs | na | keñu | prom | hbrès | doñ |
   | nu | glañ | hrgyañ | ge | hke | prom²⁰ | glañ | [177] na |

¹ ṭag?: ṭ added below line: ṭbog may have been intended?
² Or read ṭnor (correction of ṭnor)?
³ ṭñi here crossed out, the double punctuation unintentionally left.
⁴ Read ṭw-ṛ?
⁵ ṭun here crossed out: the ṭ unintentionally left.
⁶ Correction of apparent ṭnñañ.
⁷ Read ṭmu-ṛ? ṭmrn is not found elsewhere.
⁸ ṭñsañ?
⁹ ṭndñañ?
¹⁰ Read ṭnor and ṭnor occur only in this way: cf. il. 289, 322, 339.
¹¹ Read ṭndñ-ṛ?
¹² ṭ below line.
¹³ ṭ added below line.
¹⁴ ṭ added below line.
¹⁵ Read ṭñor or ṭñor?
¹⁶ ṭ an addition.
¹⁷ ṭ an addition.
¹⁸ ṭ an addition, below line.
¹⁹ ṭñor here crossed out.
²⁰ prom an addition, below line.
htor | hdro | hño | ge | rne | hpo | hldo | ge | hkehu | prom | hjo | na |
hkohu | prom | bzer | na | kehu | 178 hkañ | rwan | na |
2 hldyañ | hyañ | hyo | na | ldyañ | hkañ | rwan |
ste | hkehu | prom | dze | gsom | 179 wa | hyo |
5 hnu | glañ | rño | dze | gsom | wa | g-yo |
hldyañ | yañ | hyo | na | gnah | goñ | myag | 180 |
ste | hkoñu | bprom | yañ | ldyañ | glañ | hdo |
de | nas | rabs | bgis | gsañ | hldi | hlab | 181 |
rbyo | po | nañ | gsañ | hñeg | hlab | dze | rbyo | hpro | hro | grteñhe |
10 hta | stel | re | hlab | ta | gboñu | 182 ste | ge | hthogs | re | hlab |
ge | plañ | na |
bbroñ | hldañ | hdzam | re | hrañ | rte | ḥdubna | 183 |
hdzu | hdro | hphor | hchi | hdo | dyañ | na |
bsog | tham | thom | dze | hpu | ge | me | hmuñi | 184 |
hrañ | hkañ | hkañ | dze | hphage | me | ḥsam |
hdiñi | mag | ḥnor | ma | hpu | mu | re | 185 ma | ḥpañ |
ḥsam |
htable | ḥsud | ḥdon | ḥgyag | dze | ḥtor | ḥdo | ḥchuñ |
htañ | ḥsud | meñi | 186 dze | hrtañ | ḥjam | ge | ḥmeñi |
hdyañ | g-ri | gdod | re | meñi | hrañ | gñañ |
20 cig | dze | ḥtor | 187 hldam | re | hldan | 12 |
htor | hkhruñ | ḥgyañ | re | ḥrta | ḥpñ | hphar |
hñi | htor | hldam | 188 re | hldan |
ha | 14 ḥkyañ | ḥzuñ | ḥrño | re | ḥña | 15 ḥdro | mo |
cig | dze | tor | hldam | re | 189 hldan |
25 ḥso | ḥkog | ḥño | 16 re | ḥnañ | ḥdro | ḥmo |
stor | ḥkhoñ | ḥrño | re | ḥnañ | ḥdro | 190 thar |
hmorñ | ḥzñ | re | ḥseñ | ḥpyeñ | ḥkyañ |
rgeñ | hphuñ | htoñ | re | ḥyanñ | wañ | ḥkaññ | 191 |
ruñ | 18 ḥkar | re | ḥdaññ | ḥnññ | ḥganñ |
30 dguñ | ḥldoñ | ḥtor | re | ḥranñ | weñ | ḥtññ | 192 |
rgeñ | ḥraññ | smeñ | re | ḥkharññ | ḥgyiñ | ņñes |

1 prom added below line.
2 ḥ added below line.
3 ldyañ added below line.
4 ḥb added below line.
5 In l. 354 the manuscript has ḥrter.
6 In l. 352–3 ḥdzu and ḥgu.
7 Read ḥpho-re or ḥphor-re? Cf. l. 353.
8 Read ḥno-re?
9 Correction of myñ?
10 ḥ a correction (of ḥr?).
11 Read ḥto-re?
12 Corrected from || or || reinforced?
13 ḥyañ here crossed out: 190 ḥkyañ?
14 ḥnorre or ḥnorre?
15 Punctuation erroneous.
16 Read ḥmo-re or ḥmor-re? Cf. l. 192.
17 ḥñ?
18 ḥam?
cig | dze | ḥtor | ḥldam | re | mor | re | ḥkar | ṛpaŋ | re¹ | 
kyāṇi | [193]  
ḥṇāḥ | ḥtsu | ṛpaŋ | re | ḥṇāḥ | mo | ḥgam | |  
ḥṇāḥ | mo | hr²paŋ | gso | nad | ḥgam | | [194] gso | nad | ṛpaŋ | re | ḥkhaŋ | ḥgaṇ | ḥjor |  
ḥṛḍzaṅ | ḥyo | ḥśi | dze | ste | gdzu | ge | cig⁴ | lol | | [195] ḥke | plaṅ | ḥdraḥ | ḥze | ḥṭhar | mye | ge | lol | 
ḥḍiḥi | su | ḥḍiṅ | ḥḍa | ḥko | ge | ḥḍzoṅ | [196]  
rmā | ḥṣu | ḥdra | ḥze | ḥwam | ṛwbi | ge | tswelhu |  
ḥṇo | stor | ḥṭhor⁵ | ḥši | ṛa | ston |  
rṇe | [197] ḥldaṅ | ḥkhar⁷ | ḥmye | ḥṭaḥ | ṛgyen | 
mu | ḥrog | ḥtro | re | rmāṅ | ḥldaḥ | g-we | 
stor | thon⁶ | [198] ḥši | re | ḥldaṅ | ḥkhaṅ | g-we | 
ḥro | ta | šodce⁸ | re | ḥwar | ta | ṛgyen⁸ |  
ḥḍi | gsom | śud | [199] re | rmāṅ | ṛa | g-wei | |  
hṣāṅ | nag | ṛgyes | ḥkom | chim | ḥlḍim | ge | ḥpḥaḥ | rmāṅ¹ | ṛgyaḥ¹⁰ | 
gṇi | ke | ge | [200] ṛg-yog | ḥldaḥ | gse | ge | spehi | ḥḍaṅ | ḥgyaṅ | 
ḥcē | ḥmu | gdag | re | ṛne | ne | ḥṛheḥi | na | [201] rmāṅ | ṛa | ḥwe | ṛe | 
ḥso | ḥldaḥ | ḥgor | re | ḥwi | wa | rmāṅ | 
ṛmaṅ | bri | ko | ge | ḥcha¹² | ḥṛu | ṛṛdyaṅ | 
ḥrah | ḥmaṭ | ṛne | nag | ge | ḥko | [203] ḥldaḥ | ḥse | ḥswad | 
cha | ḥru | ḥwars | ge | ḥbri | ḥko | ṛ³ḥtaḥ | 
šor¹⁴ | ḥlda | [204] ḥkær | re | ḥpya | ḥdāṃ | 
ḥcē | ḥmu | ṛ⁵gdag | re | ḥsaṅ | ḥkhaḥ | ṛḥṛheḥi | 
puṅ | te | ḥsār | ṛaṅ | [205] ṛpḥaḥ | rmag | ṛheḥi | 
gse | re | ḥraṇ | ṛaṅ | ḥḍzoṅ | ḥskyar | ṛṛheḥi | |  
na | g-we | ḥkor | [206] kla | ḥsaṅ | ṛmaṅ | re | ḥmaṅ | ṛa | g-we | |  
ḥcē | ḥmu | gdag | re | ṛṇye | ne¹⁶ | ḥṇoḥu | 
tsḥu | gsom¹⁷ | [207] śud | re | ṛmaṅ | ṛa | g-we | re | g-we |  
the | then | ḥḍi | ḥzir | ḥkhaḥ | ḥgaṇ | ḥtsur | [208]  
ḥkhaṅ | ḥcig | ṛpaŋ | re | ṛḥṣhar | ḥde | ṛḥyedḥi | 
ṛṣeḥi | ḥṛgoḍ | ḥphyed | re | ḥphyu | [209] ḥldyaṅ | ḥgyeḥi | |  
¹ ṛpaŋ | re added below line: to be inserted here?  
² Something here crossed out.  
³ Insert re?  
⁴ cig added below line, probably to replace lol: cf. l. 356.  
⁵ Punctuation erroneous?  
⁶ Read ḥkhar-re or ḥkhā-re?  
⁷ Soṭsə?  
⁸ ṛo = ḥgyen-ni.  
⁹ ṛmaṅ here crossed out.  
¹⁰ ḥdam here crossed out.  
¹¹ g added below line.  
¹² A correction (of ror 1).  
¹³ ḥmaṅ here crossed out.  
¹⁴ ḥmaṅ here crossed out.  
¹⁵ ḥwe here crossed out.
hkho | hšaň | hgor | hnom | ta | hprom | na |
hldañ | rgye | ḥdor | re | [210] ḥwaň | ta | hnen |
ḥcaň | rgye | rpag | re | ḥmo | ta | ḥpun ||
ḥdyañ | ḥto | ḥtoň | ge | ḥgo | [211] gton | mod |
re | mye | ḥpāň | re | myi | ḥpehi | ḥkhihi |
rog | ḥji | rdaň | ge | [212] ḥko | ḥtoň | modhi |
khvos | ḥkhyaň | hyu | ge | mye | ḥpehi | ḥkhehi ||
ḥkvaň | ḥgo | [213] bro | ge | ḥbos | ḥdom | ḥrjihi |
ḥbehi | tyaň | rdeňe | ge | ḥstsah | ḥbrad | [214] ḥrdaghi ||
ḥkaň | gsaň | ḥraň | re | ḥrwehi | gtsu | ge | ḥrnas |
kyu | ḥldoň | ḥrño | [215] re | ḥkya | wa | ře | re | ḥtshu | to |
ḥpahan ||
ḥtor | ḥňi | ṭhsa | ge | ḥtor | ḥbroň | [216] ḥkhoho ||
hldi | ḥrgyed | ḥraň | ḥtor | ḥbroň | ḥkoho ||
hldi | ḥrgyed | ḥrare | tor | [217] ḥbroň | ḥgyaň |
ḥtor | ḥbroň | ḥkhoľ | dze | ḥtor | ḥkho | dze | kło | sňe | ge |
[218] ḥldyaň | ḥpu | ḥbri | re | ḥmehr | klu | ḥcaň | dze | ḥtor |
ḥkho | ge | ḥkhoňi |
ḥtaň | [219] ḥrdzo | ḥniň | ḥtor | ḥbroň | ḥtsors |
hṭhaň | le | ṭshah | dze | tor | sňi | ṭgam | [220] |
ḥthaň | le | ṭsa | ge | thor | ḥbroň | ḥshor | na |
thaň | rdoň | ḥkyud | na | ḥbroň | ḥdru | ḥjar |
[221] ḥthaň | ḥgam | ḥrdzur | re | ḥbroň | ḥkru | ḥbro | na |
ḥyaň | ḥklu | ḥbro | re | ḥgyeb | [222] ḥkru | ḥbro | re | ḥyaň |
ḥtaň | ḥthaň | na |
ḥraň | swa | ḥkom | re | ḥtor | ḥbroň | [223] ḥgrom ||
ḥtor | ḥbroň | ḥgrom | re | ḥton | ḥkon | ḥbyye |
ḥtor | ḥbroň | ḥpag | re | [224] ḥwaň | ḥršaň | ḥlamhi |
g-waň | ḥršaň | ḥnar | ḥkrkwa | ḥdzm | ḥtroňj | [225] |
dgu | ḥmu | ḥtor | ḥšaň | ḥlad | ḥbyamna |
hrap | ḥlidi | ḥnaň | re | ḥršaň | ḥlad | ḥlamhi |
mor | [226] ḥgu | ḥrdzor | ḥršaň | ḥlad | ḥlamhi ||
hyañ | ḥraň | ḥšaň | re | ḥšaň | ḥlad | ḥlamhi | [227] |

1 Read ḥgo-re or ḥgor-re?
2 Sic (for ḥkhehi, as in l. 212?).
3 ḥkyaň? Correction, below line, of ḥwaň.
4 mye here crossed out.
5 ḥnas? Correction of ḥkornas.
6 Read ḥraň-re?
7 ḥko here crossed out.
8 ge here crossed out.
9 Or khwo? (a correction).
10 Punctuation erroneous.
11 Read ḥno-re.
12 Probably ḥkru.
13 Correction, below line, of ḥpahan.
14 ḥpye? ḥphye?
15 Read ḥnar-re? Cf. l. 233.
16 Read ḥto-re? Cf. ll. 236, 244.
17 hldi added below line.
TEXT: LINES 228-42

mug | hgu | rdzo r | hšañ | hlad | hlamhi |
htam | räh | gsañ | re | hšañ | hlad | [228] hlamhi |
hrbi | hgu | rdzo r | hwa | hršañ | hlamhi |
brah | hråh | gsañ | re | hwa h | glah | [229] hršañ | hgam | lambi |
sñañ | ñé | hldir | hgwah | hršañ | hlamhi |
rñe | hkkham | hldyañ | dze | [230] rñe | ge | hlad | hi |
hwa | bzer | hšid | re | hrtah | hurañ | glyañ |
hwa | bzer | [231] hrpag | re | rñe | hlad | hbyamna |
rgyed | ma | hldañ | ge | hso | hnah | hrgah |
htor | [232] hrañ | rme | ge | hso | hnah | stor |
hdzañ | hglah | hnag | dze | rñe | hlad | ge | hlam |
gah | [233] glah | hlad | hnarn | hkkab | h10gro | htroñ |
hdzañ | gla | hnag | dze | hchir | htsañ | sto | [234] 
htsag | hro | hbehi | hbar | hso | hnah | geeg |
hdzañ | hglah | nag | ge | hbehi | hbañ | [235] htog |
he | hbañ | hnñ | sto | hso | hnah | rmañ | dze | htoho |
rñe | lad | thor | dze | ca | [236] yañ | htor |
dguñu | hmu | to | re | hrañ | hldí | nañ | re | h | glah | hlad |
| hlamna | [237] |
hldí | rgyed | hrar | hglà | hlad | hbyamna |
rñe | hkkham | hldyañ | re | rñe | ge | hlad | hi | [238] 
gse | hbo | bon | re | hlad | mah | mahna |
hsehe | hldu | hru | re | dze | hphag | hbañ | [239] ge | hyor |
hchá | hgrah | nui | nar | dze | hkkab | hgro | ge | hkañ |
hrañ | hlañ | [240] rpag | re | gse | hlda | hlad | hlamhi |
gse | hlad | htor | dze | hcañ | [241] hyañ | hbro | na |
hño | rgam | kho | re | smyi | hnu | hgyañ |
smyi | hnu | mye | re | tha | hnu | [242] hrgyañ | sto | smyi |
hnu | hto |
gse | hlad | thor | dze | hcañ | yañ | thor |

1 Read rdzo-re?  2 Read rdzo-re?  3 h added below line.
4 h added below line.  5 Read hldí-re?  6 s here crossed out.
7 Read hrar.  8 gah perhaps a faulty anticipation of glah.
9 Read hnarn-re? Cf. l. 224.  10 b here crossed out.
11 A correction (of htsañ).  12 h added below line.
13 Read hglah (for h | glah).  14 n below line.
15 rgya here crossed out. Read hråh-re?  16 Sic (for I).
17 Corrected from n.  18 na added below line.
19 nu | nar, below line, correction of hdzu | hdzah.
20 Punctuation reinforced.  21 k here crossed out.
21 hlamhi here crossed out.  22 nu underline correction (of di).
gse | hlad | [243] hnar | hkhab | gro | htroñhi
hlidi | hrgyed | hrar | gse | hbo | hbon | hlad | ma | mahna |
[244]
dguhu | mu | hto | re | hrah | hlidi | hnañ | re | gse | hlad
hbyamna

gse | lad | [245] rpag | re | hpro | hbo | hbon | re | hlad | ma
ma | hna

dgu | hmu | htor | hpro | [246] hbo | hbon | hrah | hlidi
hnañra | hlad | ma | mahna

hlidi | hrgyed | hrar | hpro | hbo | [247] hbon | re | hlad | ma
hman

gse | ston | stsar | re | hlad | htoñ | myen
hcam | [248] hjam | htag | hldír | gse | htañ | hdam | na
hlidi | rgyed | h1r | rgyed | htre | hte | [249] ge | gse | hso
hkon

10 htsa | re | hldah | ge | hra | hyan | phyin | 14 | bañ | hrehe | [250]
hrpod | hbos | re | hbroñ | re | ge | rmo | hkm | hoeg
hltah | htsañ | hyer | ge | [251] hno | hkhog | hto | ge
hbañ | hrehe | hkehe | hbañ | hre | hge | na
jo | re | h1ge | [252] re | hlab | re | hge

sta | re | mo | ge | sta | g-ri | hbañ

sta | bañ | rpag | re | hyah | [253] me | bbyam | re
jo | me | bbyam | re | hlab | me | bbyam | na |

hbañ | hldoñ | hrg | [254] re | hldañ | phyer | hbrañ
hlayo | htor | hmyi | na

20 hyog | hprah | hdag | dze | hdrañ | [255] re | hphrañ
ssam | stom | hdag | dze | hsr | stombi
hsan | hdañ | hldym | hyañ | [256] ldyoñ | ma | hbyoñ
rgam | hgañ | hkañ | hyañ | hrag | ma | hboñ
htas | kro | hldoñ | [257] re | hyah | rmah | htsagna

25 htor | htas | prom | hrom | neñu | hso | bos

1 Read hnar-re? 2 = hrah-re? Cf. l. 246.
3 Sic: erroneous punctuation. 4 Read hto-re?: cf. ll. 225, 236, 244.
4 ñ here crossed out and replaced by . 6 Insert re?
7 rañ?: h added below line. Cf. ll. 243, 248.
8 Sic (for mahna).
9 hcam marked for omission. 10 Read hldí-re?
11 h a corrector’s addition: read hrah-re? Cf. ll. 243, 246.
12 A correction of htsa or htsa.
13 Correction from phyer.
14 m here crossed out. 15 re a correction of a badly written r.
15 rta added here below line (and then crossed out?).
17 ts of htsañ inked over or added.
18 h inked over.
19 myo here crossed out. 20 Read hbrañ-re?
21 Underline correction of hyam: a yan also is here crossed out.
hño | [258] stor | dze | hwam | nebu | hkañ'mna ||
hrta | wa | hdañ | dze | hño | hdañ | prom ||
še | rgo | [259] hdom | dze | hpah | hrgam | hnam ||
hkhwi | htsa | hyog | hdag | ci | hrañ | [260] hdom² | gdes ||
hsas | hdrañ | hdag | chi | hgo | hsr | re | hyun |
hsas | [261] hnañ | hdag | chi | phyer | chan | hson ||
g-rub | hgoñho | hdag | ci | twañ | miñar | [262] hsoñga ||
gsas | pahi | hdzø | hdañ | cañ | sme | hme | hkeñi ||
g-rah | nag | [263] bbo | gyañ | chan |³ rzum | me | g-weñi ||
gsañ | ra | gsañ | kya | [264] gsañ | hdzam | re | hldan |
ño | ra | hño | kya | hño | hdzam | re | hldan |
gsañ | [265] ra | gsañna⁴ | ge | gsañ | tañ | hrtøbu ||
ño | ra | hñon⁵ | kya | hñon | ta | gblañ | [266] |
⁶trog | htor | hte | dze | hbyim | ge | g-yañ⁷ |
hpu | hboñ | hyañ | ge | hdro | [267] hko | ñag |
hsañ | hyer | hyañ | ge | hkög | hkoñ | riñ ||
hpra | hre | hñañ | (ge) | [268] hwad⁹ | hldañ | krañ ||
hkyañ | hrñgañ | hyañ | ge | hmu | klæg | gsim ||
htsañ | [269] hdañ | hyañ | ge | hwañ | ne | hbrañ ||
smiñ | glog | g-yañ | ge | [11] hwañ | hrñño | hjam | hma |
[270] bso | hnañ | hyañ | ge | hbañ | hboñ | rbo ||
hwañ | hldañra | htsañra | na | hwax | [271] rgya | hrko | hrkabs ||
htr | hrtañ | g-yañ | ge | hldyañ | ma | g-yern ||
hldyañ | pah | [272] hrñ | re | hmeñi | hpañ | hyañ ||
hko | hrñño | hñañ | ge | rgya | rko | rkabs [273] |
gsañ | hbrañ | htoñ | kya | hñoñho¹³ | hjam | re | hldan |
htiñ | hwax | se | kyax | [274] hkyañ | hdzam | re | hldan ||
hldyn | bste | hpuñi | ge | rne | hdzam | re | hldan | [275] |
hldañha¹⁴ | gsom | hphañha¹⁵ | ge | twañ | hdzam | neñe ||
hño | re | hlo | ge | hkyi | [276] hdzam | hphuñi |
hsu | re |¹⁶ hru | ge | g-rah | hdzam | nag ||
gsañ | re | [277] htsañ | re | hrañ | ge | hldøñu | hjam | riñò ||
hkor | re | hpañ | ge | hsañ | [278] hdzam | nag ||
rtax | hwax | hldañ | ra | hldañ | htag | htos |
gsañ | ra | [279] gsañ | ge¹⁷ | gsañ | htag | htos |

¹ h added below line. ² hdom? A correction (of hdom²). ³ n added below line. ⁴ For hño | na? ⁵ h or s (?) here crossed out. ⁶ h or s (?) here crossed out. ⁷ g-yarka? Perhaps g-yañ was intended. ⁸ l here crossed out. ⁹ hwad? ¹⁰ Punctuation reinforced. ¹¹ Sic. ¹² w here crossed out. ¹³ ho crossed out? ¹⁴ h added below line. ¹⁵ Sic. ¹⁶ Sic. ¹⁷ Sic (for kya?).
Correction (of kyaḥ).
2 m an insertion.
2 g below line: htsa | gna intended?
4 b inked over.
5 ḫbogni?; the n an insertion.
6 Corrected, below line, from ḫklom.
7 Read ḫkru-re?
8 Punctuation erroneous (end of line).
9 ḫtsa | ḫtsag, ḫtsa?
10 w here crossed out.
11 Correction from ḫldog.
12 ḫ ḫ and th crossed out or corrected?
13 Read ḫdza-re? Cf. ll. 290, 296.
14 Correction from ḫrad.
15 Some sign crossed out before ali.
16 ḫ below line.
17 ḫ h nd . ḫ hrdza re; cf. ll. 171, 322, 339.
18 ḫ below line.
19 ḫ below line.
20 Read ḫdza-re? Cf. l. 287.
21 ḫ below line.
22 ḫ (?) here crossed out.
23 ḫ below line.
24 Read ḫhkar-re?
25 ḫbogni?
26 dzo crossed out?
27 For ḫkeḥ? Cf. l. 53.

392 TEXT: LINES 280–96

ḥnō | raḥ | ḫnō | kyaḥ | ḫnō | ḫtag | [280] ḫton(a) ||
ghan | ma | dwaḥ | dze | ḫkhab | ḫge | ge | ḫthwān ||
myag | mi² | ḫtsar | dze | ḫbo | [281] hram | ge | ḫsod | ḫsa |
ḥldyaḥ | ma | ḫnāh | dze | stām | ḫkān | ge | ḫnān |
[282] ḫtsag² na | na | ḫldyaḥ | ḫryeḥ⁴ | ḫpuhi | ḫpuhi ||
ḥṣeg | sme | ge | ḫrim | ḫdzom [283] ḫpān | ḫsa | ge |
ḥgāḥ | ḫrag | re | ḫgāḥ | ḫrāg | ḫdāḥ | ḫ | ḫbogni⁵ |
ṣeg | [284] sme | ge | ḫrim | ḫdzom | re | ḫrim | ḫdzom | ḫtaḥ |
hldun | tsu | re | [285] hldah | ḫtag | ḫto (na) ||
10 ḫrkom⁶ | ḫbroṅ | ḫkrur⁷ | ḫdzaḥ | ḫṣyah | [286] ḫthaḥ ||
ṛpehi | ḫldah | ḫrgam | re | ḫldog | ḫyāḥ | ḫthaḥ |
mor | [287] ḫkyān | ḫldoḥ | re | ḫbos¹¹ | ḫ-yah | ḫthaḥ¹² ||
ḥyaḥ | ḫkāh | ḫdzar¹³ | [288] ḫstsah¹⁴ | ḫyāḥ | ḫh(a)naḥ |
hrlehi | ḫswaḥ | hram | re | ḫṣli | ḫdzān | ḫthaḥ¹⁵ [289] |
15 ḫkr | ḫyog | ḫnor¹⁷ | ḫgar | ḫpu | ḫthaḥ ||
rtā | ḫgam | ḫpar | re | [290] ḫso | ḫnaḥ | ḫthaḥ ||
ḥyaḥ | ḫṣkaḥ¹⁹ | ḫdzar²⁰ | [291] ḫpān | ḫdzaḥ | ḫkaḥ | ḫkhoḥo | ḫ | ḫryaḥ | ḫni | ḫkehe |
hbos | g-ri | [291] ḫpān | ḫdzaḥ | ḫkyaḥ | ḫldoḥ | re | ḫnaḥ ||
ḥbos | ḫrīḥ | ḫkhoḥo | ḫ | ḫryaḥ | ḫni | ḫkehe |
20 ḫtsaḥ | ḫ | ḫ | [292] dze | ḫreḥ | ḫkham | ge | ḫryeḥ | ḫ | ḫdze |
ḥtab | ḫkhoḥo | ḫkhoḥo | ge | ḫkyān | ḫldoḥ | ḫgyaḥ | ḫsta | ḫkyaḥ | ḫkhoḥo | [293] ḫldoḥ | ḫkhor²⁴ | ḫbos | ḫrīḥ | ḫruḥu |
ḥtor | ḫpuḥu | ḫbos | dze | ḫriṃ | ge | ḫgrus |
ḥxyaḥ | [294] ḫldoḥ | ḫkhor²⁵ | ḫbos | ḫyaḥ | ḫto | ḫna |
25 ḫrīḥ | ḫdom | ḫkyime | re | ḫri | ḫkrūḥu | ḫbroḥo |
[295] ḫtsaḥ | ḫri | ḫkho | dze²⁶ | ḫrya | ḫni | ḫkahe²⁷ |
ḥtsa | ḫḥor | dze | ḫno | ḫkho | ḫsog | ge | ḫdzom | dze |
ḥtab | [296] ḫkhoḥo | ḫkhoḥo | ge | ḫkhaḥ²⁸ | ḫrdza | ḫdze | ḫgyaḥ |
na |
30 ḫkaḥ | ḫrdza | ḫkhor | ḫswaḥ | g-ri | ḫto | ḫna |
hscah | [297] hyer | hri | dze | hrim | ge | hgrus ||
hrihi | hdom | hkyim | re | hrgyeb | hkrui | hbro ||
rihe | hbrrom | hri | [298] dze | hri'i | hbos | stshah | ||
rtab | hswah | g-webe | hbos | htsakah | hldaah | ||
hpus1 | hphpyaah | myi | cau | g-rihi | [299] hldom | hcam | 5
hsa | hse | hldon | hcau | g-ri | sti | hyor | re |
hr | hno | hdoii | g-yog | re | [300] rgyaah | ge | hrihi | sti |
hyor | re | ||
hrim | hldohu | hsa | hyaah | hri | hgru | gras | re | hri | hci |
[301] hwad2 | hi ||
hrtah | swa | g-were3 | g-ri | hrde | hldaah | ||
5rnie | ne | g-ri | dze | hldim | hphu | hmaan | [302] 10
hmaan | hrihi | hphah | dze | hgaah | hldoinra | hnaah | na |
hrgyeg | hsi}| hriohoh | ge | hgaah | [303] hldoii | 10hkyud ||
hrnie | hldah | hror4 | hmaan | hku | staai | ||
hdom | hgu | htsuhu | [304] hyan | hmaan | hldyo | hramg |
hdoum | hgu | htsu | ge | hyaah | hdad | hphah | na | 15
hmaan | rgam | [305] hgre | na | hrihi | hrgam | gre | he | |
gdzu | hbyi | hmaan | re | hmaan | naa | hyu | |
hbraad | re | hpaah | [306] yaan | hmaan | ge | hrgam | bjihi | |
hbraad | re | hpaah | ge | hbraad | sta | hsid | re | hyah | hdaah | |
[307] hnaah | na | hmaan | na | hmaan | hrgam | gre | na | hram | 20
h12lyanah | hse | ge | gzu | hbyi | hkyud | [308] |
gdzu | hbyi | hmaan | re | hmaan | hri | hwas | |
hgah | hldon | hrai | re | hmaan | g-ri | hpaan | [309] na |
gu | hldo | htor | ge | hmaan | g-rihi | hkuu | |
hmu | wa | rio | ge | hgaah | [310] | hldon | hkyud ||
hgaah | hldon | hraan | re | hldim | hmaan | hto | |
rie | hldah | hror5 | [311] hmaan | sta | mehi | |
gdzu | hbyi | hnaan | re | hri | stah | mehi | |
hgaah | hldon | hraan | [312] g-rihi | sta | mehi | |
hdom | hjuhu | rmar5 | [313] mehi | 30
hjuhu | hbraad | rmar5 | g-ri | sta | [313] mehi | na | g-ri | hkrhu | hbro ||
hmor | hso | hbdoh | ge | hrokum | hkrui | hsd | na | ||
1 stshah added below line. 2 bphus? 3 d added below line.
4 Read g-we-re. 5 rgya here crossed out. 6 h below line.
7 h below line (a correction of r). 8 ? h a correction of m.
9 Correction from hnoohu. 10 ra hnaah | here crossed out, leaving ||.
11 Read hro-re: cf. l. 310. 12 j or rh here crossed out.
15 Read rma-re? 16 Read rma-re? 17 Underline corrected from hbos.
gyaṃ | [314] g-ri | hjim | hūo | hkhog | re | hphab ||
g-rah | ḥṣah | ḥkkehe || na | ḥnor | ḥdzaṅ | rgo | [315] ḥtoho ||
grgo | ḥrah | ḥnor | ḥdzaṅ | ḥyah | ḥtoho || ḥyah | ḥtaṅ | rmar |
ḥyah | [316] ḥkruhu | ḥbro | re | ḥrgyeb | ḥkruho1 | ḥyaṅ | ḥldyaṅ |
5 ḥkyer | ge | ḥldāḥ | ḥrgam | ḥtsag | [317] ḥldog | ḥpo | ḥrbom |
ḥtoho | po | ḥrom | ḥnor | ḥdog | ḡ-yaḥ | to | ḍze | ḥwa | ne | ḥphe |
[318] ḥyah | ḥtaṅ | rmar | ḥyah | ḥkruhu | ḥbro | ḥldehi | ḥswah |
ḥmor | ḥali | ḥdzaṅ | ḥdyanō2 | [319] ḥrgya | ḥni | ḥke | ḥldehi | ḥswah |
ṛṣaṅ || ḥrgyah | ḥni | ḥke | ḥrim | re | ḥldohu | ḥrgyah | [320] ḥni |
10 ḥke | g-yog | re | ḥrgyaṅ | rīe | re | ḥño | ḥkhru | re | ḥkyaṅ |
ḥldehi | ḥswah | ḥṛṣaṅ | ḥa | [321] ṭoṅ | ḥpoṅ | ḥprom | ge | ḥldehi |
ḥswa | ḥṛṣaṅ | re | ḥrgyeb4 | ḥkruhu | ḥbro | ḥkru | ḥyog | [322] |
ṛṇor5 | ḥgar | ḥpu | ḥches | ḥño | ḥkhob | ḥprom | re | ḥni | ṛdman |
ḥte6 | ḥe | ge | ḥkhrhu | [323] ḥyog | ḥsud | re | ḥche | ḥgyo | ḥkyim | re |
15 ḥrgyeb | ḥkruhu | ḥbro | re | g-yaḥ | [324] ḥpaṅ | ḥwag |
ḥdzoḥu | ḥkru | ḥyog | re | ḥdzoḥu | ḥkhad | ḥtōhi |
ḥbri | ḥdzoḥu | ḥyim [325] | re | ḥyah | ḥkruhu | ḥbro | || |
ḥse7 ḥe | ḥkho | ḥgyan | re | ḥlab | ḥko | ḥgyan | [326] |
ḥniḥ | ḥpag | ḥdir8 | ḥse | ḥtaṅ | ḥdam |
20 ḥtrog | ḥdre | ḥte | re | ḥrgye9 | ḥyo | ḥraṅ10 na [327] | ge | ḡse |
ḥko | ḥgyan |
ḥsehe | ḥko | ḥo | ḥgyan | ge11 | ḥrgyah | ḥdiḥi | ḥtron | re |
ḥkah12 | [328] ḥpyah | ḥldan || |
ṛṇe ṣnaṅ | ḥdir | ḥkho13 | ḥtaṅ14 | ḥdamna |
ḥnah | ḥpag | ḥdir15 | [329] bri | ḡse | ḥpuḥi | re |
ḥkhaḥ | ḡsaṅ | ḥraṅ | re | ḥkho | ḥdaḥ | ḥdamna |
25 ḥtor | ḥpuḥu | [330] ḥbos | ḥze | ḥrgyo | ḥṣeg | ḡṣega16 | ge |
ṛgyo | ḥto | ṛsin ||
ṛta | ḥaṅ | g-ye | ḥze | ḥryo17 | [331] ḡseg | ḡser | ge | ḥrgyo | ḥto |
18 ṛsin |
ḥgu | ḥmor | ḥkru19 | ḥrkom | ḥbroṅ | ḥprab | [332] |
ṛse | ḥkge | ḥrk | ḥge | ḥklu | ḥprab | ḥyuḥu ||
ḥkhrum | re | ḥrdvaṅ | yaṅ | ḥrkom | [333] ḥpyi | ḥprab ||

1 bo a correction (of ḥuḥo).
2 ha added below line.
3 ḡun added below line.
4 bo ? or a correction of bo ?
5 Read ṛhro-re: cf. l. 289.
6 ḡne ?
7 ḡh here crossed out.
8 Read ḡldi-re or ḡdir-re: cf. ll. 328, 337.
9 Sic for ḡryed: cf. l. 338.
10 ḡni added below line.
11 ḥkah here written below line.
12 ḡha added below line.
13 ḡy below line.
14 ḡkaḥ above this and below ge cf. l. 327.
15 Read ḡdi-re or ḡdir-re ? Cf. l. 326.
16 Sic (for ḡser: see l. 331).
17 For ḡryo ?
18 ṛt here crossed out.
19 Read ḥkru-re ?
hldi | bro | hgoṇ | re | hkeg | hrko | hrko | hyuḥu
|gsah | rkaḥ | [334] glar | hwaḥ | hroq | hldoṅ
|hwah | hroq | rño | ge | hkeg | rko | hwad
|3kruḥu | [335] hthe | hprah | dze | hrog | ge | hro
|hwad | hwaḥ | rño | ge | rgyoḥo | hto | stiṅ | [336]
|rnaṅ | hwi | hkhō | ge | rgyoḥo | hto | stiṅ |
|klu | htaḥ | rgyoḥon | re | hśes | ta | hṛgyon |
|sto | the | the | re | [337] stor | htaḥ | hḍzon
|htor | hṛtaḥ | hldir | hstor | ma | swaṅ |
|tor | hṛtaḥ | 7rme | [338] ge | stor | hḍzo | hḍeḥi
|htrog | hḍreḥe | bte | re | hṛgyed | hyo | hraṅ | ge | hstor | hḍzo |
| [339] hḍeḥi
|sroṅ | hīṅ | hśer | stor | hḍeḥi | hpyid |
|hkyu | hldoṅ | hṛṇor | hkyah | hwa | [340] ūṇer | hstor | hḍeḥi |
|hpyid |
|htor | hṛtaḥ | rme | ge | hstor | ma | hśan | phyer | ma | hśwaṅ |
| [341] rne | ḫprom | hldir | ḫpyyar | ma | hśwaṅ |
|rgyed | ḫraḥ | htor | pyar | ma | swaṅ |
|htor | htaḥ | [342] rme | ge | phyer | htsaḥ | hṛṣeḥi |
|klu | hldo | sme | re | mye | ḫraḥ | htsaḥ | ge |
|hko | rño | klu | re | [343] | rne | hīṅ | hśes |
|hldyaṅ | ḫpu | ḫbri | re | mehi | ḫklu | ḫcaḥ |
|sroṅ | ḫe | ḫse | re | ldrā | [344] | hḍeḥi | hpyid |
|hbo | hroṅ | hrog | re | hlaḥ | hkyāṅ | hras | re | hśes | ḫsī |
|[345] hḍzuḥi |
|rgyeb | ḫci | ḫru | re | gdag | yan | la | por | hśes | hśi | hḍzuḥi |
|huy | ḫṭsaḥ | kyim | [346] re | ḫdam | sleg | glom |
|rtā | ḫṣaḥ | ḫy | ge | ḫdam | sleg | gciḥ |
|huy | ḫgyi | ka | [347] dze | ḫrim | gleḥu | ge | hāṅ |
|stāṅ | ḫro | ḫra | dze | ḫreihe | ḫno | ge | hpom |
|glyaṅ | ru | [348] hṇu | hṇur | dze | hṛim | gleḥu | ge | hci |
|hgw | ḫweḥe | ḫphaḥ | ḫphaḥ | dze | ḫthar | phyaṅ | [349] ge |
|hrub |
|sri | ge | gsen | hse | ge | ḫchan | ḫjim | ḫṭsoṅ | ge | rmon |

1 g here crossed out.  
2 Read gla-re?  
3 kluḥu? slu here crossed out.  
4 Something here crossed out.  
5 t inked over.  
6 Read hldi-re: cf. l. 326, 328.  
7 hdir here crossed out.  
8 Read hśe-re, as in l. 343.  
9 Read hrno-re.  
10 Read ūṇ-re.  
11 Read ḫdir-re?  
12 Read ḫto-re?  
13 Or rgye for rgyed?  
14 rgye, error for the following rne, here crossed out.  
15 g here crossed out.  
16 la | por added below line: cf. l. 349.  
17 For ḫṭṣaḥ? The first ḫ(ā) (for ṭa?) added below line.  
18 w inked over.
por | ge | [350] hyu | hstah | hkyim | re | hcihi | htoho | ge | hnan |
na | hldom2 | hgor [351] hšehe | hti | ge | hnan |
hyu | hstah | hkyim | re | hdam | sleg | gtsob | doñ |
glyañ | ru | [352] gtsob | re | mehi | cha | hrñe | ||
5 hphu | hphu4 | mur5 | hdzu | hdro | hkus |
nañ | pa | bsam | re | [353] hwañ | hrañ | hbyamna |
gzu | hdro | hphor6 | ñchi | ñdo | ñdyañ |
hbron | hldar | hdzam | re | do | ñdo | ñdzo | ñpehi7 | [354]
hrañ | hrtre | hdub8 |
htor | ñso | ñti | ge | htañ | hldun | hbañna |
10 hrtañ | nañ | hwar9 | [355] hthañ | ñbro | hgran |
hñur | hñah | rygeñ | na | hñu | hldo | hldyoso |
hyañ | re | rygeñ | na | yañ [356] hldyah | hldyah |
hdzon | hyo | hsid | dze | ste | he | hdzu | ge | geig |
hke | hplañ | hdra | dze | [357] thar | mye | ge | hlon |
15 g-weñe | hldyah | hldor | g-weñe | sko | hbañ | dze |
hram | yañ | phlañ | hñar10 [358] || |
hpo | hldañ | stor11 | hrañ | htoñ | gsoñu | dze12 | rñe | ge | hgo |
na | hgo | na | ñgon |
rtañ | swa | [359] . . . hkoñu | hprom | htoñ |
20 htor | ñdro | ñño | ge | hnu | glañ | slug | na |
nu | glañ | phor13 | [360] . . . mo14 | ñña |
hrtañ | swañ | hpøeg15 | na | hkeñu | hprom | to | na |
hnu | glañ | rño | ge | keñu [361] pr[o]m | glañ | na | keñu |
prom | pwañ16 |
htor | ñdro | ñño | ge | hrñe | hpo | hñe | ge | hkoñu | prom |
[362] hdzoho | na | gehu | prom | pwañ |
25 hkeñu | prom | sñar | hthañ | hbyoñ17 | htoño |
hdz | ma | ññoñ18 | re | [363] hke | ma | ññoñ19 | hmu | lom |
ge | hbyim |

1 hñañ here crossed out: cf. l. 345. Perhaps por-ge also was intended to be crossed out.
2 hgon here crossed out.
3 Correction (of hldoh): hgon here crossed out.
4 The second [h]phu crossed out?
5 Read mu-re?
6 Read hpho-re or hphor-re? Cf. l. 183.
7 do . . . ñpeñi in margin (to be inserted here?).
9 Read hwar-re or hw-a-re?
11 Read stor-re or sto-re?
12 Read phor-re or pho-re?
13 Read hphyegs? Cf. l. 176.
17 hbyoñ (inked over). Sñar = sña-re?
18 hñoñe? hñoñe?
TEXT: LINES 364-78

hko'hu || hba'ñ | kwa | kwa2 | ge | re | hna'h |
hdza | ma | [364] hne | na | rta | ge | hto'm | hphah |
hke | ma | hnyehe3 | dze | htor | ge | hdz0 | hteh |
hke'hu | hka'h | dwa'n[365] na | hldya'n | hka'h | dwa'n ||
rgo'n | wa | myer4 | rbyo | rgyer | hldya'n ||
htsog | hram | myer6 | so | na | [366] hsi'd |
rbyo | g-ye'r | hno'q3 | rgo'n | wa | si'd ||
hke'hu | prom | myer5 | hnu | gla'n | ldy'a'n ||
 hldya'n | [367] hya'h[5]| hyo | do'n | gnah10 | hgo'n | myag ||
hna'h | kha'ñ | dzwe | hya'n | hyo | do'n || 11 hya'h[12] | ge'on | [368] 10
myag ||
gsehe | ca'n | hldya'n | dze | hr'nam | hdar | hyu'bu ||
hr'no | hpra'n | hram | dze | [369] hsehe | rdozor | hna'h |
hldya'n | hgo'ho | hddzin13 | re | mehi | hra'h | hda'n na | 14
hldya'n | yhu[370] hr'no15 | dze | hld | ge | hta'h | hldon |
 mehi | spe'h | bra'h | je | hldhe'h | ge | hta'h | hldon | [371] 15
 hdzam | hbro'n | hro'n | re16 hba'n | hko | htar | dze | 17 hld | ge |
 hta'h | hldon ||
hkrug | [372] kya'n | hdom | re | hri'e | hno | hdzar | dze |
hldhe'h | ge | hta'h | hldon ||
hldya'n | hyu | hjo18 | [373] dze | hka'd | hro'n | re | hrgyen |
hdzam | hbro'n | hro'n19 | re | hba'n | hko | htar | dze | hka'd |
[374] hro'n | re | hrgyen |
 htar | phya'n | hto | re | skyim | hse | hdzar || 20
hpah | hwe | htho | hyah | pa- [375] hder20 | hphyo | hli |
g21-we |
sseg | sme | hldo | rbyi | hldyihi | hka'd | hro'r22 | hrgyen |
[376] . . . rab | hgo | cig | dze | hka'd | hro'n | re | hrgyen ||
hdza | htro'g | hram | hdzar | [377] . . hpa'g | cig | dze | hka'd |
hro'n | re | hrgyen ||
 hpa'h | hldan | hro | dze | hse | ge | [378] htu'l | re | hse | ge |
 hlobhi ||
hsah | htsa'n | dzen23 | rkom | hthul | na | rkom | ge | hron || 25

1 Punctuation doubled by reviser.
2 h here crossed out.
3 he crossed out? Or inserted.
4 Read mye-re or myer-re?
5 Punctuation a correction.
6 Read mye-re or myer-re?
7 Read hno-re? 8 Read mye-re or myer-re?
9 h added below line?
10 h added below line.
11 Omit hyo-don || (metre).
12 h added below line.
13 hji'n?
14 Or hda'n corrected to hda'n?
15 hjo?
16 hro'n? 19 Something here crossed out.
17 A bad h here crossed out.
18 hro'n? 22 hro'n? (Error for hro'n ?re?).
20 h added below line.
bos [379]—o[g] | dze[spel]hi | ge | ḡḍza | na | speḥi || ge | ḡthon ||

ses | rtsig | moṅ | ge | ḡtsah | [380] ... ... ... hraḥi | hweḥi | hṛtah |
ge | hṛtsig | moṅ | ḡkun | na |

rtṣig | moṅ | [381] ḡsad | na | tṣig | moṅ | we | ge | ḡtsah | ḡpu² | ḡloho |

ḥbri | slod | ḡdo | dze | spo | ro [382] re | hto ||

ḥḍza | ḡldahi | hne | ge | tsa³ | ḡṛgye | ḡrdza | na |

ḥḍzah | ḡldah | ḡkun | na | ḡḍza | ld [383] ḡsad | na | ḡḍzah |

ḥḍah | hweḥi | ge | ḡtsah | ḡṛgye | ḡlo |⁴

hyaṅ | ḡthe | ge | ḡsad | dze | ḡdyo [384] ḡroḥ | ḡpaḥhi⁵ | ḡ |

ḥḍzam | ḡbroṅ | ḡroṅ | dze | ḡḍyo | ḡro | ḡpeḥi ||

hrseḥi⁶ | ḡpag | sḥog [385] dze | ḡrṇe⁷ | ḡrom | ge | hti | na |

hrne | ge | ḡrlombi ; |

ḥḍzo⁸ | chi | te | re | ḡlāb | ḡṇaṅ⁹ [386] ḡyāḥ | ḡṭḥaḥ | ḡldyaṅ |

hrō¹⁰ ḡpeḥi ||

ḥḍzam | ḡbroṅ | ḡroṅ | ḡbaṅ | ḡkō | ḡṭar | [387] cįg | dze | ḡldyōṅ | ḡro | ḡpeḥi ||¹¹

ḥldyaṅ | ḡyu | ḡjo | cįg | dze | ḡtōr¹² | ge | ḡkṛmons |

[388] mor | tṣab | ḡkṛrom | re ||¹³ ḡyaṅ | tsa | ḡcer ||

tor | kru | ḡṛgyaṅ | re | ḡṛtah | ḡpāḥ | ḡphar [389]

ḥtōr | ṣṇaḥ | rṇi | re | ṅta | ḡldag | ḡṣag | ḡldyaṅ | ḡjo | ḡkṛromni |

¹⁴ḥḍzam | ḡbroṅ | ḡroṅ | [390] re | ḡbaṅ | ḡkō | ḡṭar | ge |

gdzu | hti | ḡhyaṅ | ḡdag | ge | ḡko | hto | swad |

skyāṅ | ḡbe | [391] ḡkyaḥ | ge | ḡnāḥ | ḡdiḥi | ḡṭshur ||

ḥldyaṅ | ḡyaṅ | ḡyo | ge | ḡgyaḥ | ḡnāḥ | ṭsr | [392]

ḥldyi | hi | ḡgyed | ḡraḥ | ḡtōr | ḡbroṅ | ḡyaṅ | ḡoṅ |

ḥroṅ | ma | ḡnō | re | ḡṭar¹⁵ | ma | ḡgaṅ [393]

[ḥṛgyed | ḡṣaṅ | ṣme | ḡyed | re | ḡbroṅ | ḡk[m]jhu | ḡbro || ḡpo | ḡdam | ḡtōr | re-e-re | [394] [ ... ṭn—m-daḥ ... ḡtōr¹⁶(? | ḡbroṅ | [395] [ ... ... ḡguṅ | ge | ḡdaḥ | ḡkum ?] |

[396] [ ... ge | ḡdaḥ | ḡgam | [397] [ ... ṭnu(? | —g | glaṅ | |

[398] [ ... baḥ | dze ? ...]

¹ ? 
⁴ Punctuation reinforced. 
⁵ ḡ below line. ḡhi crossed out? 
⁶ Correction of ḡseḥi? 
⁷ ḡdo here crossed out? 
⁸ ḡjo ? 
⁹ ḡṭaṅ? 
¹⁰ Punctuation due to reviser (correction of ḡ?). 
¹¹ Punctuation reinforced. 
¹² ḡtōr? 
¹³ Correction from ḡtōre? 
¹⁴ Punctuation reinforced. 
¹⁵ ḡtāṛ? 
¹⁶ ḡtōr
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(ALPHABETICAL ORDER of head-words according to the Tibetan system, the root-consonants, and their Prefixes in sequence (for details see Note), 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 bgyi'o.

kum, 395.

ke = ḥke I, q.v. 199 rgyaḥ-gāṇo.

kehū = ḥke II, ḥkehū, gehū, q.v. 176, 360-1 -prom; 177 -ḥkāḥ (p. 316).

ko = ḥko V, q.v. 202 rmaṅ-bri'o.

kwa-kwa 363.

kya I, 96 -ḥtān-ta.

II = Tib. skyā, crop (p. 355). See also kyā. 263 gṣaṅ; 264, 279 ḥbo'o; 265 ḥhon'o; 273 gṣaṅ-ḥraḥ-ḥtoṇ'i (p. 317).

— wa-ne = ḥkyāḥ-wa-ne, q.v. 162 (pp. 253, 338).

kyān = Tib. kyan, also, even (pp. 204, 311-12) or = ḥkyaṇ II. See also gyaṇ. 98; 192 -ni; 372 (pp. 318, 345).

kyāṇi, 192. See kyāṇ.

kyāḥ = kya II, crop. 273 so'o (pp. 297, 341).

kyim = ḥkyim, home, taken home, q.v. 324, 345 -re (pp. 218, 246).

kyu = ḥkyu, speed, swift, q.v. 161 -ldo'n; 214 ḥldo'n (pp. 253, 255).

kyeṅ = Tib. khyag, ḥkhyags, freeze, be congealed, numbed. 102 ḥsi'o (pp. 226, 301).

kyen = Tib. skyen, quick, dexterous. 103 tho'o (p. 322).

kyer = Tib. kyer, erect, or = ḥkyer, q.v. 136 -ro; 145 ḥbo'o.

kraṅ = Tib. kraṅ-ne, kroṅ, stand-

ing upright; mkhraṅ, ḥmkraṅs, bkraṅ, robust, hard, solid (pp. 288-90). See also ḥdāṅ-

kraṅ/hkraṅ/hkṛaṅ. 85 -dur-

-dur (p. 290).

kru-hṛgyaṅ = ḥkhru'o. 338 (p. 312).

kruḥu = ḥkru, q.v. 321 -hp'o = ḥbro; 334 -ḥthe.

kro = Tib. kro, ḥkro, anger. 256 ḥtas'o.

kla = Tib. klas, abundant, unlimited. 143 ḥgor'o; 206 ḥkor'o (pp. 238, 297).

klag I = Tib. lag, lammergeyer. 173 -hrwa'd (pp. 257, 341, 345).

II = Tib. glags, occasion, season. 268 ḥmuro (p. 298).

klar = glar, q.v. 205 ḥraṇ'o.

klu = Tib. gloṅ, ldo'n, loṅ, blind (pp. 131, 138, 223). See also me lhme-lku. 5 -ge; 342 -re (pp. 223, 341).

— ḥtān (a Suffix, pp. 182-3). 336 (p. 223).

— ḥto (a Suffix, pp. 184-5). 37 (p. 246).

— rto 25 | blind rock (pp. 138, 223).

— ḥrto 24 (p. 223).

— hdo (a Suffix, pp. 186-7), blindness. 342.

gkom, Prospective form of ḥkomm II, q.v. (pp. 137, n. 1, 200, 368). 222 swa'o (p. 305).

ḥkaṇ I = Tib. guṅ, full, all. See

Note. The resultant order of consonants is as follows:

K (g, h, r, hr, hlr, a, b, hsb); KH (h, s); G (d, h, r, hr, l); N (m, h, r, hr); C (g, h, hls); CH (g, h); J (h, r, hr); N (g, h, r, hr, s); T (g, h, r, hr, hls, gr, grs); TH (h); D (g, d, h, r, hr, l, gl, hls); N (g, h, hlr); P (b, h, r, hr, l, s); PH (g, h, h); B (g, b, h, r, hr, s); M (g, b, r, hr, s); TS (g, h, r, hr, s, hls); TSH (h); DZ (g, b, r, hr, hls); W (g, h); Ž (b, r); Z (g, b, gb, h); H; Ž (g, h); R (g, h); L (h); Š (g, b, h, hr, s); S (g, b, h, r, hr).
also ḥgaṯ. 52 ḥḍya⁰; 151 nor-
gso⁰; 168 niṅ⁰; 164 chaḥ⁰ (?); 190 wa⁰ (?); 256 ḥgaḥ⁰; 281 
stom⁰ (pp. 147, 173, 228, 241, 
285, 328).

II = Tib. khaṅ, house. See also ḥkhaṅ. 208 -bcig (p. 234).

ḥkaṅ-ḥkaṅ, onomatopoeic? 11 ḥrwaṅ⁰; 184 ḥram⁰ (p. 344).

ḥkai = Tib. ḥkod, ḥkhad, build, settle. 133 -re.

II = Tib. gad, rock, prescipice?

-ḥroṅ 373, 375-7 (p. 268).

ḥkab = Tib. khab, house, family. See also ḥkhаб. 106 -ḥdro; 110 
(p. 335).

ḥkam 83 -staṅ; 130 ḥṭaṅ-phin⁰; 299 g-riḥi-hḍom⁰.

ḥkai = Tib. kha, mouth, speech, occasion, or Tib. bkaḥ, word, 
command. See also ḥkhaḥ. 
117 ḥraṅ⁰; 137 ḥwa⁰; 153 ḥke⁰; 
158 ḥkeḥ⁰; 178 keḥ⁰, ḥḍya⁰; 191 
skar⁰; 204 ḡsaṅ⁰; 364 ḡkeḥ⁰; 365 ḥḍya⁰ (pp. 174, 
179, 200, 218, 252, 275, 315-16, 
338).

II = Tib. dkaḥ, steep, difficult, 
scarcely. See also rkaḥ. 46 me⁰ 
(p. 286).

-ḥkab/ḥkhab, speech-concealing. 
105 -ḥkhab; 106 -ḥkab (p. 315).

-ḥgaṅ, all talk. 194, 207 (p. 315).

-ḥgo = Tib. kha-bgo, advice, or 
bkaḥ-bgo, exhortation. 105 
(p. 315).

-ḥcoṅ = Tib. kha-eug, counsel. 
105 (p. 315).

-ḥldom, mouth-bound = Tib. 
kh-a-sdom, gag; cf. bkaḥ-hḍoms, 
instruction. 66 (p. 314).

-ḥpyaḥ, rebuke (Tib. ḥpyha). 
327-8 (p. 315).

-ḥraṅ, independent in speech; cf. 
ḥraṅ-ḥkaḥ. 104 (p. 314).

-ṛdza/ṛrdza, accordant in 
speech. See also ḥkhaḥ⁰. 287, 
290, 296 (p. 315).

-ṛsaṅ, secret speech; cf. ṣaṅ- 
-ḥkaḥ. 214 (p. 314).

ḥkahī = ḥkai I (?), q.e., + hi. 239 
(p. 315).

ḥkahe = ḥke I. 295 ḥṛgya-ḥnī⁰.

ḥkar I = Tib. bker, skar, gar, dgar, 
sgar, separate off, pen, encamp- 
ment (pp. 247, 343). 45 ḥrin-
-rwa⁰; 204 ḥor-hlda⁰ (p. 
343).

II, for ḥkar? 192 ṣrpag (p. 242).

ḥkarni = ḥkar I + ni; 204 (p. 343).

ḥku, a Suffix = ḥgu, Tib. gu 
(p. 258). 22 snuḥu-hku = 
Tib. smi-gu, smyi-gu, smyg-
ma, smyu-gu, smyu-ma, reed.

II = Tib. ḥku, vie, contend, 
offend, etc. See also ḥkus; 152 
češt (pp. 228, 264).

ḥkun = ḥkum II (Tib. ḥkums, 
dc.). q.e. 250 ṣrmo⁰ (p. 294).

ḥkuḥu = Tib. khu, sap, broth. 74 
češt (p. 250).

ḥkus, Aorist of ḥku II. 352 ḥdro⁰ 
(pp. 264, 285).

ḥke I a Suffix used with numerals (!) 
(pp. 241, 272). See also ḥkeho, 
ḥkahe. 54 ṣna⁰; 53, 199, 319, 
320 ṣṛyha-ḥnī⁰, etc.

II = Tib. kho, profit, get, kho-pa, 
trader, etc. (pp. 241-2, 289, 
316-17, 363, 364).

-ḥkaḥ, trade-talk, 52. See also 
keho, ḥkeho, ḥkeho, geho 
(pp. 316-17).

-ḥrmo, profit-making. See 
ḥrmo, ḥḥmr, etc., and also 
keho, ḥkeho, geho, 176.

-ḥriṅ-ḥdran, bazar. 195, 356; 
-ḥriṅ-ḥdora (pp. 241-2).

ḥkag = Tib. kag, keg, kag-ma, 
keg-ma, mischief, hindrance, 
injury, accident; dkag, con- 
stitution; bkag, bkog, obstruc- 
tion, prohibition; skag, mischief, 
etc.; khag-po, difficult, etc.; 
khags, ḥkhegs, obstruct, debar, 
etc.; gag, wadding, quiny; 
gags, obstructed; gegs, stoppage,
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dc.; dgag, hinder, dc.; bgag, hinder, dc.; bgegs, hindrance, dc.; hgag, hags, obstruction; hgegs, hinder, dc. See also hga, hryeg.

hkég-hrko, rko 332, 333, 334 (pp. 338, 340).
hkéhi = hke II (1)+hi. 15 hstom-hkom².
hkehu = hke II, kehu, q.v.
- -hkah = hke II-hkah. 364.
- -prom. 177-8, 362, 366 (pp. 274, 316, 335).
- -me, profit-fire. 170 (pp. 274-5, 285, 316).

hkéhe I = hke I, q.v. 291 hryah-hini².
II = hke II, q.v. 125 slah⁰ (pp. 288-9, 335).
(II) -hkah = hke (II)². 158 (p. 316).

hkés, Aorist form of hké II. 36 hphah-hron⁰ (p. 269).

hkó I a Particle = Tib. ko, go (with Pronouns) (pp. 201, 245, 260). 195 hlda⁰ (p. 245).
II = Tib. mgo, hgro, 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 hldan-krai⁰; 156 rma-br⁰; 203 hbr⁰ (pp. 287, 289).

- -hgyan, cause, fault? See also hkhó. 325, 327 (p. 264).

-rho, leader? See also hkhó (pp. 262-3). 53-6, 272, 342.

- -htar (1?), head-released, cf. hbu-hpor. 68, 371, 373, 386, 390 (pp. 268, 331).

- -hto 390 (p. 264).

- -hton, gate, or place, surrendering. See also hgo². 212 (pp. 260-1).


- -hnag (II), black-head, com-

mons = Tib. mgo-nag. 266-7 (p. 260).

hkó-bphyag. 101 hköñ, signal a desire to speak? See also hköñ-bphyag (p. 264).

- -weñi, 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).

hkog I = Tib. hgor, bkog, khog, snatch, pull out, uproot. See also hkkog I. 23 htsah-gsom⁰; 54 rbañ-hkor⁰?
II = Tib. lkog, secret; no-lkog, open and secret. See also hkkog IV. 189 hso⁰; 267 hkkho-rho (p. 285).

hkoñ = Tib. goñ, 'upper'? 223 hton⁰.

hkoní, written for hkon (Chinese chuán, chapter)+ni. 249 hso⁰ (p. 140).

hkob = Tib. khab, khebs, hkhébs, hgebs, dgb, khob, cover. See also hkkob. 107 na-hrom⁰.

hkóm I = Tib. skam, skom, dry, thirst, &c. 12 hbo⁰; 15 stoma (pp. 313, 315).

II = Tib. kholes, perform, or Auxiliary Verb (pp. 137. n. 1, 200, 368). See also gkom, hgom. 32 hgru-ma⁰; 118 hgam⁰; 136 gta⁰; 166 yob⁰; 175 swa⁰ (pp. 142, 243, 309, 345).

hkú = hköñ, II q.v. -me, speech-fire. 170 (pp. 275, 285).

hkóñ I 363.

II speak (Chinese k'ou?) (pp. 254, 256-7, 264). See also hkkóñu.

- -prom, phrom, &c., use speech. 166 phrom; 168 bprom; 169 hprom; 171 hphrom; 172 phrom; 174, 177, 180 bprom; 359 bprom; 361 prom (pp. 274, 276, 316, 335).

- -me speech-fire. See also hköñ. 171 meñe; 173 (pp. 257, 345). hköñ = hköñ II, q.v. 101 -hko-bphyag (p. 264).

- -hgyan = hkoñ, q.v. 325, 327 (p. 264).
VOCABULARY

hkor = Tib. skor, hkhor, khor, go round, return, entourage (pp. 271-2, 295). See also hkhor. 53 [-re]; 277 -re (or is this hkor II?) (p. 271).

II = Tib. hgor, delay, rest, be idle. See also hgor. 205 -kla (p. 239).

— ḫṭah (a Suffix, pp. 182-3), one’s own entourage. 92 (p. 239).

hḳwan = 212 -hgo.

hḳwehe = 131 ḥbyeō.

hḳya-wa-ñe = kyaō/ ḥkyahō, q.v. 215, 339 ñer (pp. 253, 338).

hḳyań I = Tib. kyań, even, also, &c. See also kyan, ḡyań, yań. 344 ḥlahō (1) (pp. 204, 311).

II serf ? (pp. 148, 297-8, 312), 18 ḥkrugō; 141, 143, 274, 287 morō (pp. 295, 297, 323).

III written for ḡyań. 114 -na.

— Ṛgyań/ṛgyań, stowe-bed. 42, 81, 268 (pp. 298-9).

— hldōn, runaway serf ? 287, 291-3 (pp. 239, 297-8).

hḳyah-hwa-ñe, a class of living creatures, crop-work-injure ? (p. 255), possibly with political allusion. 339. See also kyaō/ ḥkyāō.

hḳyi = Tib. khyi, dog. 275 (pp. 285, 287).

hḳyim, taken home, included in company = Tib. khyim, home; ḡkyim, whirl; ḡkyims, halo; ḡgyim, circumstance. See also kyim, skyim, ḡskyim. 37, 294, 297, 323, 350, 351 -re (pp. 246-7).

hḳyu = Tib. dkyu, dkyus, run, race; ḡkyu, run away; ḡyu, move quickly; ḡryus, race.

— hldōn, swift-fleeting. 339 (pp. 253, 255). See also kyōō.

hḳyud = Tib. rygyud, string, lineage, &c.; ḡryud, id.; ḡhyud, mkhyud, ḡhyud, hold, embrace, &c. (pp. 252, 258). See also ḡgyud. 220 rdzoō; 307 guz-hbyiō; 303 ḡaḥ-ḥldōnō (pp. 173, 252, 258, 270).

hḳye, offspring, child = Tib. skye, skyes, khye-bo, khyeḥu (pp. 320, 368). 39 -gu-hnu.

hḳyeō = Tib. ḡhyab, fill ? 13 ḡsrēčōō ḡkyeb; 17 祐ō ⁹ḥkyeb (p. 221).

hḳyer = Tib. ḡkyer, carry away; chu-yis-ḥkyer, carried away by water. 56 ḡbḥāb-ḥragō; 316 ḡyań-ḥlyyan, or is this = kyer, erect, q.v. ?

hḳra = Tib. ḡkra, ḡhra, criss-cross, variegated.


hḳrag = Tib. skrag, fear. 135 ḡldag-nagō.

hḳran = kran, robust, &c., q.v. See also ḡkhrań. 91, 112, 124 ḡldańō (pp. 180, 288, 291).

hḳri = Tib. khri, seat, chair, bed. See also khri, ḡhrī. 81 ḡsiō (pp. 298-9, 317).

hḳru = Tib. kru-ra, the lowest class of the people; dkr, abomination, filth; ḡkruru, ḡkrud, wasb; ḡkrus, ḡkrus, ḡkrus (pp. 148, 229, 295-7). See also kru, ḡkruru, ḡkruru, ḡkruru, ḡkrur, ḡkruru, ḡkruru, ḡkruru. 313 -hsud.

— ḡbro, taste as filth. See also kru, ḡkruru, ḡklu (pp. 295-7), 221, 222, 297 (p. 228, 296).

— ḡyog, vile servants. See also ḡkruru, ḡkru. 269, 324 (p. 218).

— ṛ , being filth. See ḡkrur, ḡkhur.

hḳrug, quarell (Noun and Verb), revolt, be disturbed, agitated, quarrelsome = Tib. ḡkrug, ḡkrugs, ḡkruru, ḡkrugs (id.). cf. ḡrug, break (pp. 144-5, 258).

— ḡrdzo, troublesome mdzo. 16 (pp. 144, 258).

— ḡkyāń, troublesome serf. 18 (or ḡkrurg a Verb ?) 371 (kyań; or ḡkrurg a Noun ?) (pp. 145, 295, 318, 323).

hḳruru = ḡkru, q.v.

— ḡbro. See also ḡkruō. 313,
316, 318, 323, 325; 294 ḫbroho (pp. 228, 296).

ह्क्रुहु-ह्योग. See also ह्क्रु, ह्क्रु. 322-3 ḥṣud.

ह्क्रुहो, final = ह्क्रु+०. 316 (p. 228).

ह्कर = ह्क्रु+०-re. Cf. ह्करु. 285, 331 (p. 206).

ह्क्रे, possibly = Tib. ह्क्रे, desire, envy (a Verb). 132 ḥṭañ-hgām.

ह्क्रोम I = Tib. ḫग्रम, ḫκ्रम, ḫκ्रम, spread, scatter (pp. 235-6, 304-5), 42 ḫḍzo; 70 ru-ṛgo; 389 ḫḍyān-hjo (pp. 157, 274, 303-5).

II Cf. Tib. ḫḵrom-me, glittering (from the root of 11). See also ḫḵrom, ḫghrom, ḫḥroms. 12 ḫgye; 154 ḫgye (pp. 234-6, 304-5).

ह्क्रोमs, Aorist form of ḫḵrom I. Cf. ḫghroms. 387 ḫṭor-go (p. 305).

ह्क्लु I = ह्क्रु I. 221 ḫbro (pp. 228, 296).

II = ḫlu, blind, q.v. 323 (pp. 223).

ह्क्लो = Tib. ḫlo, ḫlo, lungs, etc. See ḫlu. 40 ḫghu, perhaps bellows = 135 pu-ḥlu (pp. 284-5).

ह्क्लोम, perhaps = Tib. ḫklu, a species of divinity: or = ḫḷom, q.v. (2) -ṛgo-ḥṭul (p. 280, n. 2). 305.

रकबs, a Verb: see also ह्क्रकबs. 272 ᵃṭkō.

रकह I = Tib. ḫkah, steep, difficult. 2 (?); 165 (or is this ḥṭ?); 333 ḫsah (pp. 281, 306, 338).

II = Tib. ḫkāh, word, command. 84 mo (pp. 343-4). See also ह्रकह.

रेक-ह्दाह, perhaps = Tib. ḫke, lean, meagre. 155 ḫḥṛdāh.

र्को = Tib. ḫko, hoe, dig. 272 ᵃṭkāb; 334 ḫkeg, ḫwad (pp. 333, 340). See also ह्रको.

र्कोम killed = Tib. ḫḵṛm, slain; gum, dead; ḫgum, dgum, die (pp. 195, 368). 157 ḫbro; 378 (pp. 195, 217).

र्कव = Tib. ḫkva, command: anti-theoretical to ḫwah, g-wah (pp. 339, 343-4). See also ह्रकव. 122 -ḥḍam (pp. 292, 343).

ह्रकबs = ḫkabs, q.v. 271 ḫkō (p. 339).

ह्रकह = ḫkāh I, q.v. 10 ḫkō; 165 -ṛmi-ṛḥṛdō (pp. 296, 329).

ह्रकस = Tib. ḫkas, ladder, staircase (pp. 345, 359). 57 -ḥṭān (p. 248).

ह्रको = ḫko, q.v. 271 -ṛkabs; 332 ḫkeg; 333 ḫkeg ḫṛko-ḥyuhu.

ह्रकोम = ḫkōm, q.v. 285 ḫbro; 313 -ṛkru-ḥṣud; 331 ḫkṛu ḫbro (p. 296).

ह्रक्व = ḫkwā, q.v. 224 -ḥḍam (p. 343).

ह्रक्या = ḫkya, kyang, wild ass. 188 -ḥzu (pp. 252, 333-4). See also ḫclyān.

स्का = Tib. sga, saddle; sga-lag, saddle-frame; sga-rags, girdle. 45 -raḥ (p. 317).

स्कार = Tib. ḫkār, star, constellation (p. 276). 191 ḫram (pp. 244, 315).

स्कु = Tib. ḫku, body (p. 355). 58, 164 -ḥpnu-hti (pp. 194, 285, 300, 320). See also ḫsku, ḫsku.

स्कु = sku, q.v. See also ḫsku.

—-na (ra?) (p. 312). Cf. Tib. ḫku-ra.

स्के = Tib. ske, throat, neck (pp. 288 n. 316, 355). See also pyī, phyī. 153 -ḥbṛs; 158 -ḥbro (p. 316).

स्केक, P.N. (p. 134)—not in text.

स्को = Tib. sko, select, appoint. 91 -ṛm; 134 (?); 357 g-wēhe (?). Cf. Tib. las-su-sko?

स्क्या = Tib. ḫka, sky; ḫskya, protect, defend (p. 221). 109 myag-grē; 390 (p. 221).

स्क्यार = Tib. skyar, bskyar, prop up, or kyor, weak, unfortified, or dkyor (-ḥḥyn), (capable of being) thrown down 205 ḫḍzo (p. 258).

स्म = ḫyim, q.v., but always in the sense of 'house'. See also ḫṣyim.

—-se, house-roof. 69, 374 -ḥse (p. 248-9).
skye = Tib. skye, be born, live, thrive.
— -ta a Suffix (pp. 182–3), life (pp. 239, 293).
ḥskuḥu = sku, skuhu, q.v. 6 ḥkhur6 (p. 226).
ḥskvim-se = skyim6, 18-ḥrmho6.

Kh
khab, conceal = Tib. bkab, cover, shelter; khbebs, ḥkhbebs, cover; gab, ḥgabs, bgab, khob, cover, conceal. 106 ḥkah6, speech concealing (p. 315). See also ḥkhab, ḥkhob.
khar = Tib. mkhar, castle, citadel. See also ḥkhar. 117 -gson (p. 252).
 khyag = khyog, khyog, bent, crooked (khyogs, ãc., palanquin, sedan-chair). 52 khri6 (p. 317).
 khri = ḥkri, q.v. 52 ḥdag6 (p. 317).
 khru = ḥkru, q.v. See also ḥkhr, ḥkhrūḥu, ḥkhrur. 165 ḥrkah-mi6-ḥrdolo6; 321 -hyog (p. 296).
 khrom = ḥkrom I or II (p. 304). 388 mor-tṣaḥ6; cf. hyaṃ-ge-hgroms 64 (pp. 216, 304).
 ḥkhan = ḥka6 II, house, q.v. 198 ḥld6 (p. 234).
 ḥkad = Tib. ḥkhad, ḥkhod, ḥgod, build, level, settle, ãc.? 324 ḥtobi = ḥto (Suffix)+ḫi.
 ḥkhab I = khab, q.v. 105 ḥkah6 (p. 315).
 II = ḥkab, q.v. 280 -rye.
 — -ḥgr6, go home. 233, 239, 243 gro (p. 315).
 ḥkhāb (ḥkahb)-ḥdro, come to house. 106 (p. 261).
 ḥkham = Tib. ḥgam, ḥkhah, ãc. cram into one's mouth, gobble, etc. (p. 240). See also ḥgām II. 292 ḥr6 (p. 240).
 ḥkah = ḥka6 I, q.v. 116 ḥsas6; 163 ḥld6 (pp. 240, 315).
 — -ḥdā (Suffix, p. 183), speaker. 137 (p. 315).
 — -ḥrdza = ḥka6, q.v. 296 (p. 315).
 ḥkhar I = khar, q.v.
 — -hgyi, town's business (?) (p. 283 n.). 192 (p. 283).
 — -ṛpag, 6ḥrpag (pp. 195, 225–6). 17 ḥkah6; 128 ḥrpag; 135 ṛpag (pp. 227, 243, 263, 305).
 II for ḥkha-re or ḥkhar-re? 197 rie-ḥld6.
 ḥkhi6 211 = ḥkhebi, q.v. 212.
 ḥku 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).
 ḥkhen = Tib. mkhyen, know. 92 (2) (pp. 295, 334).
 ḥkhehi, i.e. ḥkhe = ḥke II, gain, profit, +ḫi. See also ḥkhe, ḥkebi (pp. 242, 282). 212 mye-ḥpebi6 (p. 240).
 ḥkhe = ḥke II, ḥkhehi, q.v. 251, 314 ḥsah6 (pp. 224, 262, 274).
 ḥkho I chief (?) (pp. 262–3). See also kхо. 217–18ḥtor6 and ḥtor-ḥbros6; 209 ḥṣa6 (pp. 255, 263).
 II top (connected with I?) (p. 263). 295 ḥkho = Tib. ri-kha, hill-top. See also rihi-ḥkho6.
 III desire, want, have to = ḥko V (pp. 262–3). 336 ḥw6, have to make? Cf. 156 ṭmaṅ-ḥri6 ḥko, have to destroy? 295 ḥno6? or is this ḥkho I?
 — -ḥdā 329 meaning? (p. 264). See also ḥkhoh-ḥṭah, ḥko-ḥṭah, ḥld6.
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gho 232, probably erroneous: see critical note.

gc (possibly erroneous in 265, 279), a particle (pp. 173, 189-90, 294-5). passim.

gcu = keh, hkehu, hke II, q.v. (pp. 316, 368). 362-prom.

go, not in text = hgo, vulture (p. 134).

gon = Tib. gon, upper, superior. See also bhon. 179 ganā. 179 myag; 367 hyna. 367 myag.

gyun I = Tib. ya, kya, gya, also, even, though (pp. 204, 311). See also kya. 263 (pp. 283, 313).

II precipes = Tib. g-ya. 313 -g-ri (p. 312).

III gya-gya = Tib. hgya, daily (pp. 295, 312). 92 sana (p. 295).

gyim home = kym, hkyim, etc. q.v. 148 rhāna. (pp. 246-7).

gras, Tib. gran, arrangement; gras, order, rank, etc.: hgras, difference between two parties; dgra, enemy. 300-re. See also hgras, hras (pp. 266, 269, 306).

gre = Tib. gre, bear (p. 254). See also hgre. 109 myag. 305, 307 hrag (pp. 231, 239).

gro = Tib. gro, go. See also hgro. 243 khab.

gron = Tib. gro, expend. 168 g-ri-tā.

gla = Tib. gla, wages (p. 251). See also glāh, glar, hgl, hglāh. 233 hda (pp. 311).

gho 232, probably erroneous: see critical note.

gc (possibly erroneous in 265, 279), a particle (pp. 173, 189-90, 294-5). passim.

gcu = keh, hkehu, hke II, q.v. (pp. 316, 368). 362-prom.

go, not in text = hgo, vulture (p. 134).

gon = Tib. gon, upper, superior. See also bhon. 179 ganā. 179 myag; 367 hyna. 367 myag.

gyun I = Tib. ya, kya, gya, also, even, though (pp. 204, 311). See also kya. 263 (pp. 283, 313).

II precipes = Tib. g-ya. 313 -g-ri (p. 312).

III gya-gya = Tib. hgya, daily (pp. 295, 312). 92 sana (p. 295).

gyim home = kym, hkyim, etc. q.v. 148 rhāna. (pp. 246-7).

gras, Tib. gran, arrangement; gras, order, rank, etc.: hgras, difference between two parties; dgra, enemy. 300-re. See also hgras, hras (pp. 266, 269, 306).

gre = Tib. gre, bear (p. 254). See also hgre. 109 myag. 305, 307 hrag (pp. 231, 239).

gro = Tib. gro, go. See also hgro. 243 khab.

gron = Tib. gro, expend. 168 g-ri-tā.

gla = Tib. gla, wages (p. 251). See also glāh, glar, hgl, hglāh. 233 hda (pp. 311).
glaβ = Tib. lab, speak. See also ḥlab, ḥlobhī. 180 -hdo, a Suffix, p. 186 (pp. 168, 197).

ghaθ = gla, wages, q.v. See also ḥgla, ḥglāḥ. 31 -ṭāḥ (1); 228 ḥwāḥ (p. 251).

-ḥlād wage requital. 233, 236 (pp. 251, 338). See also ḥglāθ.

ghlār = gla-re. 334 (p. 338).


ghlo = Tib. glo, lungs, side; blo, mind, heart. See also ḥkllo, ḥlō ΙΙ. 68 ḥrāθ; 93; 116 pu (pp. 238, 268, 285, 336).

-ṭa (a Suffix, pp. 182–3), purpose. 157 -rdzogs (p. 182).

ghlog = Tib. glog, lightning. 269 smyi (p. 333).

ghlom = Tib. rloṃ, conceit, covet. See also ḥrlombe. 60 ḥpha-tsa; 85 ḥno-sta; 346 ḥdam-sleg (pp. 145, 290).

ghlyān probably a (Tun-huang) mis- pronunciation of ṛgyān, q.v.: cf. ḥghlyān = ḥlkyān, Tib. rkyān. 230 ḥrāθ; cf. 147 (p. 225).

-ṛu, long-horn = ox. 347, 351.

dgu I hot, heat (pp. 232–3). See also dgūθu. 225, 245 ḥmu-hṭo; 75–6 ḥṭo (pp. 232, 273, 338).

-ḥlōda (a Suffix, pp. 186–7), hotness. 74, 77, 78, 114, 139, 191, 309 ḥṭo (pp. 201, 232, 243, 266, 270, 282–3).

II = Tib. dgu, nine, all. See also ḥgū II (p. 203). 127 stor (p. 134 -sko (pp. 233, 288, 290).

dguθu-hmu-hṭo = dgu Ṭo, 236, 244 (p. 232).

ḥgā-hlōdōn = ḥgah, q.v. 308 (p. 270).

ḥgāg = Tib. kag, keg, hinder. See ḥkėg. 65 –re (p. 228).

ḥgān = ḥkān Ι, full, all, q.v. 104 (or ḥkān II, house ?) 123 ḥyu; 168 ḥrī; 194, 207 ḥkāθ (p. 147, 229, 238, 315).

ḥgab-hlōda (a Suffix, pp. 186–7), hidden, covered. See ḥkab. 155 mebrero (p. 282).

ḥgam I = Tib. gam, gams, posting-station, settlement (p. 243). See also ḥrgam, ḥṛgam. 78 mebrero; 93 –phar; 110 –phar; 118 –khom; 131, 133, 221 ḥrāθ; 191 ḥgaθ-na; 193 ḥnāθ-mo, ḥsna-nad; 229 –lam; 289 –phar; 396 ḥdah (pp. 238, 243–4, 293, 315, 336).

II = Tib. ḥgm, ḥkham, bgam, cram into mouth, gobble; kharn, morsel, etc. 59 ḥrāθ (p. 240).

ḥgāh I place (?). 256 ḥgm (pp. 147, 173).

II = I 233 –hrag/rag.

-ḥldōn, some creature, or phenomenon, on mountains. 302, 309–11 (p. 270).

ḥghāθ = ḥgah (Tib. ḥgabh, joy)+hi. 66 (p. 318).

ḥgar I = ḥkar I, separate off, pen, q.v. 69 ḥbegi-la (p. 247).

IІ-ḥpu = Tib. ḥgar, smith. 289, 322 (p. 359).

ḥgu I a Suffix (pp. 190, 258). 226, mor; 227 ḥmu; 228 ḥhr; 303 ḥdmon; 304 ḥdmon (pp. 256, 327).

II = Tib. ḥgu, nine, all (pp. 203, 233, 290). See also ḥgu II. 126 stor (p. 290).

III = ḥgū, ḥrū, ḥṭīf, q.v. 113 –hṭo; 331 ḥmor (p. 233).

ḥguθu? 395.

ḥgūθu = ḥgū I. 312 ḥdmon (p. 254).

ḥge I = ge. 5, 8 ḥnam; 332 (pp. 223, 341).

II = Tib. ḥgū, happiness, welfare. See also ḥgēθe, ḥrgeθe. 73, 75 ḥwa-sto; 252 ḥlak-re (pp. 273–4, 337–8).

ḥgēθe = ḥge II, q.v. 75 ḥwa-sto; 251 ḥbaθ-re, jo-re (pp. 273–4, 338).

ḥgo I = ḥko IV (Tib. ṣgo, gate) or ḥko III (Tib. go, place). 46 –ho; 105 ḥdro; 145 ḥphye; 210 –gto; 212 –hto (pp. 200, 260–1, 286, 332).

II = Tib. go, vulture. 260 –ḥsor (p. 261).
VOCABULARY

III ḥkāh-ḥgo = Tib. kha-bago, advice. 105 (pp. 261, 315).

IV ? 212 ḥkwən; 358 rie-ge, na? (p. 261).

ḥgōn = goh, q.v. 333 ḥro; 367 gnah.

ḥgon = ḥgōn ? 358 na?

ḥgom = ḥkəm II, q.v. 142 gdag (p. 323).

ḥgobo = ḥgo I. 261 g-ruby; 369 ḥdzin (pp. 261, 342).

ḥgor = ḥkor II, delay, etc., q.v. 42, 143, 350 na-ḥkdom; 113 ḥmaḥ-ḥpo (pp. 293, 293, 297, 299, 341).

ḥgwə-nehu = ḥwə I, ḥwah I, -ne good work, q.v. 41 (pp. 338-40).

ḥgwah-ḥrəsan = ḥwə/ḥwah/g-wah (q.v. 229).

ḥgweg-ḥwebe = Tib. sgeg-byed, charmer, or ḥsg–bye, husband. 348 (pp. 248, 343).

ḥgyan I = gyən III, daily (pp. 311–12). 7, 77, 200, 296.

II confused with ḥgyan, spread, increase, hasten? 217, 392 ḥtor-ḥbrol (p. 283 n.).

ḥgyan I = Tib. g-yan, ünchen. 153 (read ḥgyān); 158 (p. 316).

II See ḥko/ḥkho-ḥgyan.

ḥgyah = ḥgya, ḥgyah, ḥgyah, plain, q.v. 391 ḥnab-tsrur.

ḥgyi, business (Tib. ḥgyid, byigis, byi, gys, do; or Chin. i < gyi, Karlgren, no. 204?). 192 ḥkhar (p. 283 n.).

— -ka (a Suffix) 346 ḥyu.

ḥgyud = ḥkud ṭsage, etc., q.v. 16 ḥrdo (p. 258).

ḥgye = Tib. ḥgye, light (ḥgyed, scatter). 12, 154 ḥkrom-ḥkrom (pp. 235-6).

ḥgyed, a species of bird? 39 ge-ḥbaḥ.

ḥgyeb = ḥgyeb I, ḥrgeeb, back, q.v. 221 ḥkru-ḥbro (p. 296).

ḥgyehi = ḥgye-ḥi. 209 ḥphyu-ḥlīyaḥ.

ḥgrant = Tib. grañ, cold. 28 ḥyir,-ḥyir (p. 362).

ḥgran = Tib. ḥgran, dgran, adversary, rival. 355 (p. 230).

ḥgrah I = Tib. ḥgra, enemy; ḥgras, arrangement in parties, alinement (whence also ḥkra, ḥhra, criss-cross, variegated). See also gras, ḥgras, ḥras. 239 ḥcha (pp. 312-14).

II, possibly = I, or = Tib. sgra, sound? 8 me?; 20 me?.

ḥgras = gras, ḥras, aligned, q.v. 10 ḥtañ (p. 266).

ḥgri = ḥkri, krī, support, chair, bed, q.v. 38 ḥē (pp. 299, 317).

ḥgru I = Tib. gru, gru-ma, corner, angle; gru-mo, elbow; yul-gru, locality (pp. 266, 306), perhaps originally a recess in mountains. 19 ḥdul-ḥro (?); 24 ḥram-gtam; 300 ḥro (pp. 138, 306, 321). Or rock? (p. 306).

II = Tib. ḥgru, an ancient tribe of Tibet, perhaps the people of Gr, a district of Tibet lying to the east and north of Dbus (cf. Gr-gu Rgya-ra in Khama). Perhaps named from ḥgru I. See ḥgru-ḥlān-ḥmah and ḥpu (ḥphu, ḥbu) -ḥgru (pp. 307-9).

III = Tib. ḥgru, ḥgrus, bestowed pains, diligence; brtsen-ḥgrus, industry, energy. See ḥgru-ма, ḥgrus.

— -ma (a Suffix, p. 182), council meeting (ḥgru III, or of ḥgru people, ḥgru II); cf. Tib. ḥdun-ma. See also ḥrim-ge-ḥgrus, ḥdul-ḥro-ḥgru (pp. 148, 308-9, 369). 27 ḥhti; 32 ḥkrom; 77 ḥmaḥ; 79 ḥstor (pp. 278, 309, 345).

— (II) -ḥlān-ḥmah, P.N. (of the city of the ḥgru people?) (pp. 306-7). 21, 22, 30 ma; 35, 62 (p. 306).

ḥgrus = Tib. ḥgrus, Aorist of ḥgru III (or possibly = Tib. ḥgres) (pp. 308, 369). 293 ḥrim-ge; 297 ḥrim-ge (p. 298).
VOCABULARY

ḥgre = gro, bear, q.v. 17 gsaṅ; 305 ḍgam (p. 221).

ḥgro = gro, come, go, q.v. 67 ḍko-.se; 233 ḍkhab; 239 ḍkhab (p. 186, 315).

ḥgrom flourish? But see ḍkhrom, ḍkhroms, khrom (p. 236, 305). 136 ḍdag[-nag]; 222-3 ḍtor-ḥbrono (pp. 243, 305).

ḥgroms, Aorist of ḍgrom. 64 ḍhyān-ge (p. 274, 305).

ḥgl, wages = gła, q.v. 237 -ḥlad.

ḥglah = gła, glaḥ, ḍgla, q.v. 232 ḍdzana:ānag; 234 ḍdzana:ānag.

ḥgl (a possible reading: see critical note) = ḍgru, 77, 79 (pp. 278, 309).

ḥglyan 307 (p. 252), mispronunciation of ḍklyan, khang, q.v.: cf. ḍlyan.

ṛgad = Tib. ṛgad, ṛgod, laugh (p. 348). 113 ḍse-neutral.

ṛgam I = Tib. ṛgam, deep (p. 147). 241 ḍhō (1); 256 -ḥgaḥ (pp. 147, 173).

II = Tib. ṛsgam, admit into company or settlement (gam, game). Cf. samb, bams, bona. See also ṛgmaṃ (pp. 196, 244, 352).

36 ṛgyed-ḥsam (241 ḍho (1); 304 ḍmaḥ (p. 283).

ṛgu = Tib. ṛku, ḍku, ṛkm, ṛgm, steal, thief. See also ṛg III, ṛggu (pp. 233, 347). 29 -ḥmyil-ṃyil (p. 259).

ṛgo = Tib. ṛgo, door, gate. See also ḍko IV, ḍgo I ṛgor (pp. 262, 292, 348). 120 ḍi; 258 -ḥldom; 314 -ḥtobs (pp. 224, 291-2, 318).

-ḥraḥ, gate-ward = Tib. ṛgo-ra-ḥa 315 (pp. 228, 292).

ṛgön I = Tib. ṛgon, wilderness, solitude (pp. 349, 362). 39 -spto-ṛbu; 59 -hec-ṛgve (p. 286).

II = ṛgön, ṛgön-ṭa, egg (pp. 332-3, 348). See also ṛgön.

-ṭa, egg (Tib. ṛgon-ṭa (?). 355, 366 (p. 332).

-ṛu, horn (sc. end) of an egg (p. 333). 103 (pp. 156, 333). See also ṛgön.

ṛgor, Locative of ṛgo, door (p. 262). 96, 98 -ḥyos (pp. 292, 345).

ṛga = Tib. ṛgya, plain, extent, country; ṛgya-ḍkar, large orb, disk. See also ṛgya, ṛgṛya. 271 -ḥko-ḥrkaḥ; 272 -ḥko-ṛkabs (p. 339).

-ḥu-ke, the two orbs (sc. sun and moon, Tib. ṛi-ziḥaḥ-ṛga-ḍkar) (pp. 271-2). See also ṛgya, ṛgṛya. 53, 319 ḍke (pp. 271-2).

ṛgyag = Tib. ṛgyag, throw, cast, found, etc. (pp. 235, 348). 27 ṛmu-ḥdu; 29 ṛhyim-što; 83 ṛte-ḥyu, ḍkam-staṇ; 89 ḍsom; 185 ḍdon (p. 139, 259, 320).

ṛgyaṅ = Tib. ṛgyaṅ, stretch, extent, extensive, wall, distance; ṛgaṅ-te, arriving in haste. 51 ḍhu halt-e; 86 -na-spe, 89 ḍhyim; 152 meh-sp; 200 wall (pp. 266, 291, 298, 300, 312, 321, 328). See also ḍhe, ḍkyan, ṛgṛya-ṃ-ṣto, ṛ Śd, ḍraṇa.

ṛgad, error for ṛgyed? 136.

ṛgam = Tib. ṛgyam, rock; ḍgam, slab of stone; ḍyam, recess in a rock (pp. 280, 349). 109 ḍtho; cf. Tib. ṛtho-ṛdo (p. 280).

ṛgyaṅ-ḥu-ke = ṛgya-ḥu-ke, q.v. 199.

ṛgye extent, extended, cf. Tib. ḍbye (pp. 196, 286, 291). See also ṛgye, ṛgyes, ṛgye. 57 (2), 59 (2), 60 ḍhe; 153 ḍmi; 154 ḍhi; 209 ḍdaḥ; 210 ḍhe; 280 ḍkhab; 383 -ḥlo (pp. 171-2, 245, 248, 273, 286, 341-3).

ṛgeṇ put in order? (cf. Tib. ḍyeh-ṛyen) (pp. 256, 327, 350). 355 ḍhur-ḥaḥ, ḍhyaṛ-ṛ (pp. 256, 327, 329).

ṛgyed, divide, cause division or dispersion, Tib. ḍgye, ḍgyed, distribute, etc.; ḍgyed-ṛma, dissemination (pp. 139-49, 196, 290-3, 350). See also ṛgṛyed. 105 ḍte-ṛdo, ḍho-ḥro; 106 ḍkab-ḥkhab-ḥdرو; 192 ḍhraṇ-ṃs (pp. 261, 283).
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rgyed-bdre, division-inducing. 87; 94 brte; 248 brte (pp. 140, 291, 340).

- hladag-nag, division black-back. 112 (p. 291).

- rmmag, division-army, 149.

- ma (a Suffix, p. 182) division. 90, 93, 99, 101, 104-5, 107, 231 (pp. 291, 293, 315).

- hraj, place of division. 87 hrar, Locative. 216, 248 hraj; 341, 342 (?), 392 (p. 140).

- hrar. See o hraj.

- gsa'n, secret division. 35 (pp. 244, 283).

rgyen = TIB. gyen, steep, uphill, difficult (pp. 145-6, 268, 350). See also hrgye. 153 hde-ta; 197 hmye-hthah; 374-7 hktad- hbroń-re9 (pp. 145, 268).

rgyen + ni. 198 (p. 341).

rgye I = TIB. rgyab, back (Noun, Adverb, or Verb) (pp. 196, 228-9, 348). See also hgyeb.

hrgye, rgyebs. 133 draw-back; 190 hpuhi-htoń; 282 hpuhi-hpuhi; 345 hchh chi. Adverb (pp. 228-9, 269).

II, for hgyeb, fill, q.v., or = TIB. khebs, khchibs, hgebs, cover? 116 mu9 (p. 285).

rgyebs, Aorist of rgyeb I, q.v. 139 'retreats' (p. 228).

rgye = rgye, q.v. 54.

rgyer = TIB. hgyer, drop, abandon. 365 hbyań (pp. 332, 350).

rgyes, Aorist of rgye, q.v. 199 -hkom (p. 320).

rgyo = TIB. rgyo, copulate. See also rgyo, hgyo, hrpyon, hrgy, hrpyon, rbyo. 48, 323 hchhe9; 330 -hsto; 331 hsto (pp. 178, 348).

rgyo, rgyo, q.v. 335, 336 -hsto- stiń (p. 367).

rgyon = rgyo, q.v. 336 (p. 223).

hrpan ripen, cf. TIB. rgar old. 160 gtsan-myi9 (pp. 145-6.)

hrpam = rgam II, q.v. 133 hthah9; 169 hpeń; 259 hpań; 286 rpeń-hldah9; 304 hldy9; 305

-hreń; 306 hmań-ge9; 307 hmań9; 316 htsag (pp. 231, 239, 244, 256, 262, 323).

hrgu, steal, thief = rgu, q.v. 30, 32 hto-hruń; 58, 165 magzo (pp. 199, 233, 277, 335).

hrgehi = hrgehi, hge II, q.v. 58 -sto = hrgehi-sto (pp. 233, 349).

hrgehe = hrgehi, hge, II, q.v. 72 hya9 (p. 361).

hrgoń-hru = rgoń-ru, q.v.

hrgod. See rsehi9. 208.

hrgorn, passed over, cf. TIB. hgor, tread, leap, pass over; bgom, bgoms, gom, pace; goms, skilled, practised, whence sgom, bgom, contemplate. (pp. 157, 244-5, 348). 169 (pp. 157, 244, 286, 323).

hrgya-hni-hkahe = rgya-hni-ke, q.v. 295.

hrgyań-sto = hrgyań-to, being extended or hastening: see rgań. 242 tha-hnu9 (p. 237).

hrgyah = rgya plain, dec., q.v. 327 ħdihi (p. 317).

hrgyah-hni-hke (hkehe) = rgya- hni-ke, q.v. 291, 319.

hrgyu = TIB. rgyu, material (pp. 286, 348). 60 hldań9 (p. 286).

hrgye I, error for hrgyed, q.v. 326 hyo.

II = rgye, q.v. 382 ħrdza, greatly friendly; cf. rgye-hlo.

hrgyeg, stop, hinder, cf. TIB. hgegs, dgag, bgag, id., skyeğ, keg, kas, misfortune. See also hag, ħkeg (p. 349). 292; 302 ħsăń.

hrgyed = rgyed, q.v. 393 ħsăń-sme.

- hyo. 326 hrge; 338.

- hrań, hrań. 216 hrań, hrań; 243 hrań; 246 hrań.

hrgyen = rgyen, q.v. 373 ħktad-hbroń-re9.

hrgyeb = rgyeb I, back, dec., q.v.

- ħkru (kruņu, khrūņu)-hbro. 297, 321 kruņu-hbro; 323 ħkruņu (pp. 228-9).

- ħkruņo. 316 (p. 296).

hrge = rgyo, q.v. 330 -hseg (p. 178).
\textbf{Vocabulary}

\textbf{hrgyon} = rgyo, rgyo\text{\textipa{\textligature{h}}}, q.v. 336 (p. 223).

\textbf{ig gyro} \textdagger = \textit{Tib. g-yo}, move, shake. Cf. g-yo, hyos; 11 (pp. 270, 354).

\textbf{N}

\textbf{\textit{na}} I used sometimes in place of the \textit{Postposition na} (pp. 179-81, 193-4), when following \textacute{\textit{n}} (p. 360). 56 ḡbyi\textipa{\textligature{h}}; 56 me\textipa{\textligature{h}} (?); 199, 201, 206, 207 ḡma\textipa{\textligature{h}} (?).

II = \textit{Tib. ġna, five?} (pp. 203, 241); 54 ġke (?).

III = ġňa, home, q.v. 199, 201, 206-7 ḡma-ńa, tomb-home? cf. ḡdla-ńkhań. \textit{But see I. 102 ġhtsoh.}

\textbf{\textit{n}an} = \textit{Tib. ġnan, bad, 158 chos-ta\textipa{\textligature{h}} (pp. 145-6).

\textbf{\textit{ň}a\text{\textipa{\textligature{h}}}, home, cf. \textit{Tib. \textit{ňa}}-ma, house-mistress, and, as regards the ġ, pp. 238, 360. \textit{See also ġňaňa I, na II, ġňaňa I.}}

\textbf{\textit{ňar}} = \textit{Tib. ġnar, strength, vigour (pp. 144, 300, 361). \textit{See also ġnar, ġňar. 204 pa\textipa{\textligature{\textcircled{2}}} = \textit{Tib. dp\text{\textipa{\textligature{h}}} (pp. 300, 361).}}

\textbf{\textit{ňal}} (not in text) (p. 133).

\textbf{\textit{ňur}} = \textit{Tib. ġnur, grunt, cf. ġnu, ġnd, weep, sob. \textit{See also ġňur, ġnu, ġnu-ňur. 85 ġnur (p. 290).}}

\textbf{\textit{ńor}. See ġnor.}

\textbf{mńar} (Locative) = \textit{Tib. mňa, power, mastery. 261 (p. 342).}

\textbf{\textit{ňna}, error for ġňaňa: see critical note. 188 (p. 252).}

\textbf{\textit{ňnad} = \textit{Tib. ġnad, vapour, fragrance, evaporate (pp. 294, 321). \textit{See also ġňaňhad. 90 ġhtshog-hraň.}}

\textbf{\textit{ňnaňa} I = ġnah, q.v. (pp. 238-9). 56 ġhe; 307 -na; 326 ġhpag; 328 ġhpag (pp. 196, 239).}

II = Hsi-hsi ġňaňa, empty, sky = ġna in mystical Buddhism (see S. C. Das' Dictionary)? Generally in the phrase re-ňnaňa, there is absence (void) of (p. 239). 49 ġhrđrzơ, for ġhhrđzơ-re; 87 re; 235 -sto = ġňas-to; 291 re; 369 rdźơ, for rdźơ-re; 363 re (pp. 239, 288, 298).

\textbf{\textit{ňňaň} (I) -mo, house-wife | 193 (pp.}

\textbf{— (I) ġnts, house-man | 196, 238).}

\textbf{\textit{ňňaňg}hi = ġňag-ńhi. \textit{See nag I, ġnag I. 137 (pp. 218, 275, 315, 338).}}

\textbf{\textit{ňňaňd} = ġnard, q.v. 116 ġňaň-ňhe\textipa{180} (p. 217).}

\textbf{\textit{ňnar} = ġnar, q.v.? 357 phlań.}

\textbf{\textit{ňnas}, error for ġnaňa (see critical note) | 144 ġhrńe-hlań.}

\textbf{\textit{ňn}u = \textit{Tib. ġnu, weep, sob: see ġnur. — ġňur for ġnur-ňnur. 348.}}

\textbf{— ġľdo (Suffix, pp. 186-7), weeping. 355 (p. 256).}

\textbf{\textit{ňnud} = \textit{Tib. ġnu, ġnd, weep, sob. 41 -nohu.}}

\textbf{\textit{ňnur} = ġnur, q.v. 60 ġňur; 61 ġńur; 348 ġńańc; 355 ġňaň (pp. 145, 172, 256, 327).}

\textbf{\textit{ňnuraň, erroneous reading (for ġraň) in 230.}}

\textbf{\textit{ňne}, error (for ġneť). 364.}

\textbf{\textit{ľńe}hi. 115. \textit{See ġyaň (pp. 191, 217).}}

\textbf{\textit{ňno} I = \textit{Tib. ġno, face, &c.; ġno-ľkog, \textit{openly and secretly}} (pp. 220-1). 251 ġhkgog-ńo; 258 ġľdań; 314 ġhkg; 322 ġhľb (pp. 171, 221, 280).}

II friend, side = \textit{Tib. ġnos, side, state, person, direction (pp. 220-1, 266). \textit{See also ġńon, ġńoňu, ġńob, ġńor I. 56 rńe; 133 ġhrńe-re; 241 -rńam; 264-5, 279, 295 ġhńo; 299 ġhrńe; 347 ġhrńe; 372 ġhrńe (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, 306).

— (I) -bro, flee into space. 108 (p. 221).

— (II) -ra, group (or place) of friends. 264, 265, 279.

\textbf{\textit{ňńon} = ġńo II. 265 -ňyan.}

— (I) -ta (Suffix, pp. 182-3) friendship. 265.

\textbf{\textit{ňńoňu} = ġńo II. 206.}
VOCABULARY

 håno = ñño II. 273 -ñjam; 320
 rie-re° (p. 317).

 hånor I for hån-o re. 65 -hstah; 130,
 132, 219 (pp. 157, 187, 219, 258,
 259).
 II = Tib. nor, property, wealth,
cattle, farm (pp. 225, 245, 361-
2). 11 -blät; 50, 52. See also
nor (pp. 245, 328, 344, 361).

 III? 17 hånor-blät.

 hånyir-hânyir = Tib. ñl-ñl, trickle
down, 28 hurtan° (p. 362).

 hånyeche, probably = håno, hånyon
(see critical notes to II. 361-4)
(p. 362). See also håno. 363,
364 håme°.

 hånyon = håno, q.v. (p. 362). 362
bdza-ma°; 363 háme-ma°.

 râb († râb), possibly = hârnab,
 q.v. 54 -ñâ-ñke.

 râm = Tib. riam, threaten, rage,
dazzle, devastate. See also
hrâm. 49 -ñar; 191 -ñkar
(pp. 244, 315).

 râne = Tib. râne, fiend (pp.
219-22). See also rânehi, hrâne,
hâneche. 85 -ñwe; 130 -ñâñwe,
ñâwe; 155 -ne; 177 -ñpo;
196 -ñlâñ ñdâ; 274 -ñdzâm; 320
hrâñan° (pp. 220-2, 316, 335,
341).

 -ñldâñ (Suffix, p. 183) hostile.

 rânehi = râne-ñi or rîñe, is enemy.
86 -ñreñi (p. 219).

 râno = Tib. râno, ability, competence
(pp. 262-4, 339). See also
rânor, hrôno, hrâno, hrânor.
53-6 hko°; 116 -muñryeb; 189
ñkho°; 267 -ñkho°; 272, 342
ñkho°; 141 stör°; 152 hku°; 156
g-yog°; 161 ñdoi°; 179 glân°;
189 ñkog°; 277, 309 wa°; 334
ñwâñ-ñrogo°; 335 ñwâñ°; 360
ñw glân° (pp. 228, 263, 263,

 rânor = râno-re. 289 ñyog°; 322
hyog°.

 râye, for râne, q.v. 206 -ne (pp. 221,
362).

 hrâm = râm, q.v. 368 -ñdar
(p. 320).

 hrânu = Tib. ruu, pain. 9 -skhruad
(pp. 329, 348).

 hrâne = râne, q.v. 16 -gnâñ; 119, 127,
141, 144 -ñldân; 292 -ñkhâm;
322 -ñdmâñ; 361 -ñpo; 372 -ñño;
385 -ñrom (pp. 145, 220, 221,
274, 288, 316, 335).

 -ñldâñ = râne°. 303 -ñro (p.
270).

 hrâneche = hrâne, râne, rêñe, 131,
347 -ñño.

 hrâno = râne, q.v. 16 -ñyo; 49
-ñcañ; 188 -ñre; 189 ñkho°; 214
ñldân°; 269 ñwâñ°; 368 -ñhrân
(pp. 239, 252, 253, 258, 263,
285, 339).

 hrâno = hrâno. 302 ñsiñ°.

 hrânor = hrâno-re. 171 ñti°; 339
ñldân° (pp. 257-8).

 C

 ca = ñcañ, q.v. 235 -ñan (pp. 303-
4).

 cañ I = Tib. cañ in cañ-rig, cañ-ñes,
all-knowing or very knowing
(pp. 283-4). See also chañ.

 II Suffixed, 'disposed to' (?) = Tib.
-ñcañ, possessing, ñc. (Probably
identical with I and with Tib.
cañ, clever; ñcañ, comprehensive,
ñc.: see ibid.) See also
ñcañ, chañ.

 III = Chinese ch'êng, city? 118
(p. 243).

 (I) -ñme, all-blasting. 262 -ñme
(p. 283).

 (II). 36 ñgam°; 118 ñpharin°; 298
ñphañ-myïj°; 368 ñseñ° (pp.
244, 283, 359).

 ci, probably a Suffix or = Tib. ci in
the sense of 'those who'. See also
çli. 259, 261 ñdâñ (pp. 192,
202, 342).

 çg = Tib. ñgig, gëgig, ñgig, ñsîg,
destroy, do away with, perish
(p. 234). See also ñçgig, ñçgig,
ñsîg.

 150 ñkyer-ñg°; 194 ste-
ñdzù-ñgo°; 376 ñbâñ-ñgo°; 377
ñpag°; 387 ñkho-ñtar° (?); 387
ñgo° (?) (pp. 241, 305-6).

 -ñze, an official title? (pp. 305-6).
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186 -ḥtor; 188 -tor; 192 -ḥtor (pp. 305, 331).

cis ? 84 -tsha (pp. 259, 350). Cf. gci, chi II, chis?

ce = ḥce, q.v. 51 -rgyaṅ (pp. 321, 328).
cog, not in text (pp. 132, 368). See gcog.

gci = Tib. mchi, go. See also gcibi, ḥci, ḥcibi. 47 -me (p. 286).
gcig = cig, q.v. 356 ste-ḥe-mdzu-ge⁰.
gcibi = gc? 346 ḥdam-sleg⁰.
gcèg = Tib. ḥcheq, tség, teqeqh, check, etc. (p. 294). See also ḥcèg, tseg, gcèg, 234 ḥso-ḥnah⁰.

gcog meadow (p. 249), or possibly = Tib. leog, roof. 69 -ḥlde-hldu (pp. 247, 249, 321).

hcpag = Tib. cag-ga, care; chag-rgyag, doubt.

-rgyag, hesitation. 83 (p. 259).

hcpaṅ I = caṅ II, q.v. 48 gse⁰; 49 ḥrīro⁰; 299 ḥldon⁰ (pp. 239, 265).

II = caṅ III, q.v. 210 -rgyey (p. 245).

hcpam. 247 -ḥjam-ḥtam.

hcpaṅ = Tib. ḥchaṅ, ḥchas, snap at, mangle (pp. 252–3). 82 -rte (?); 115 -ḥtsa-ḥtshaṅ; 240 -ḥyaṅ (pp. 252–3, 239, 265, 320). See also ca-yan, mehi (ḥmehi)-klu-hcāh.

hcī = gcī. 300 brī; 348 ḥrim-ge⁰ (?)(pp. 265–6, 340).

hcig = cig, q.v. 208 ḥkāṅ (p. 234).

hcibi = gcī, q.v. 205 rmaṅ⁰; 350 -ḥtoḥo, a Suffix, pp. 184–6 (pp. 300, 361).

cie = Tib. che, chen, geen, ched, ches, great. See also ḥche, ḥches. 53 na⁰; 54 ḥko-rūro⁰; 57 ḥgyaṅ⁰.

-rgyaṅ, 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, ḥraḥ), great place. 49, 50 hra; 56 ḥraḥ (p. 313).

hcpg = gcog, q.v. 250 (p. 294).

hcer = Tib. goer, beer, glare, stare; ce-re, cer-re, with fixed stare (p. 304). 71 ḥcha-gro⁰; 202 ne⁰; 388 ḥyaṅ-tsa⁰ (pp. 216, 222, 274, 304, 359).

hcp = Tib. jo, gto, jo-c, rjo, gto, cho, chief, lord. 55 (2) (p. 263).

hcp I. See ħkah-hcog.

II = ḥtsog, assemble, etc., q.v.

-ḥdo (a Suffix, pp. 186–7) = ḥtsog⁰, union. 88 (p. 340).

-ḥram-ḥdo = ḥtsog⁰, harmony. 87.

ḥscaṅ = ḥtsaṅ, q.v. (p. 278). 166 -g-yer; 296 -ḥyer.

Ch

cha I = Tib. cha, part, tidings, affair; khyim-cha, household prospects, etc. See also ḥca, ḥchah. 98 ḥmo⁰ (p. 345).

II. See mehi⁰.

-ḥru? See also ḥcha-ḥru. 203 -ḥwars.

chaṅ I = caṅ I, q.v. 263 -rdzum (p. 283).

II = caṅ II, ḥcaṅ I. 76 ḥdzog⁰; 91 se⁰ (pp. 283–4).

III = Tib. ḥchaṅ, bcha, hold, carry. 261 phyer⁰ (pp. 239, 283).

chad = Tib. ḥchad, chod, gcad, bcad, gcad, cut, fix, decide. 165 -rmu (p. 276).

chah = cha I, story, matter? 164 -ḥkaḥhi (p. 315).

chi I = ci, q.v. 260, 261 ḥdag⁰ (p. 239).

II = gcī, go, q.v. See also ḥchi. 168 -ḥrmu; 385 -te, a Suffix (pp. 274, 276).

chim = Tib. ḥhim, ḥtshim, become full (e.g. the moon), satisfy, etc. See also ħchim, ḥtshim, chis.

-ḥidim, waxing-waning, impermanent? 199 (pp. 320–1).

chis, error for chim, q.v. or = Tib. mchis, come? 94 gdim⁰ (pp. 320–1, 359). See also tshis.

cho (not in text), tiger (p. 132).
chōs = Tib. hchos, beo, becos, chos, make, arrange, originate, etc.; cho-rigs, lineage, etc. See also ʰhchos. 159 -hre (p. 145).
- ta (a Suffix, p. 182). 158 (pp. 145-6).

gcheq = geeg, hoeg, q.v. 111 ʰsο-ʰmah⁰ (p. 293).
ʰcha = ḥcaḥ, q.v. See also mehį-klu⁰. 71 -ge-ʰcer; 239 -ʰgраḥ (?) (pp. 253, 304).
- hru = cha⁰, 202 -hrdíyaň.
ʰchan 349 -hjim.
ʰchaḥ = cha I. 97 hmo⁰ (p. 345).
- yañ 242 = ca⁰, ḥmaḥ⁰ (pp. 303-4).
ʰchi = gci, chi II, go, q.v. 183 -hdo; 345 -bro; 353 -hdo (pp. 186, 269, 276, 332).
ʰchim = htshim, cf. chim. 38 ḥśi-ʰgri⁰ (p. 299).
ʰchir 233 -hsaľ-sto.
ʰchuň = Tib. cuň, geuň, chuň, small. 185 ḥtor-hdo⁰ (p. 139).
ʰche = hce, q.v., or Tib. gees, dear, important, 115 ḥraň⁰; 117 rañ⁰ (p. 252).
- hmu, great cold, death = ḥce⁰; 204 (p. 200).
- rgyo copulation. 323 (p. 246).
ʰches = hce, q.v. (pp. 359-60).
322 ḥgαr-hpu⁰ (p. 359).
ʰchos = chos, q.v. 153 -họy; 159 ḥmaḥ⁰; 160 śi⁰ (pp. 145, 172, 174, 217, 273, 320).

J

je, error for dze. 116 (pp. 240, 315).
jo = Tib. bzo, work? See also ḥjo, ḥjho. 251 -re; 253 -me (pp. 274-5).
joň = ḥjoň, ʰdzoň, q.v. 78 ḥmoň⁰ (p. 243).
ḫjan, see ḥlaň. 101, 107.
ḫjam = Tib. ḥjam, gentle, mild, pleasant. See also ḥḍzam (pp. 297, 339).
186 -ge-ʰmeňi, -htam; 299 ḥhrno⁰; 273 ḥhoň⁰; 274 -ńo (pp. 281, 317).
ʰjaň = ḥdzaň, eat, q.v. 92 -ṭaň, a Suffix, p. 182 (p. 334).

ʰjar = ḥdzar, stick, stick together, q.v. 220 ḥdru⁰ (pp. 173, 366).
ʰji = Tib. ḥjī, lij, flea, no matter? See also ḥjiš, ḥʒiši (p. 231).
(Or, per contra = Tib. lei, lij, heavy?) 211 -rdañ (p. 260).
ʰjim, possibly drug and herb collectors, cf. Tib. ḥjni, ḥjim (p. 280, n. 1). 109 -li-li; 156 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3; 314 g-ri⁰; 349 -htsoň (pp. 280, 322).
ʰjiši = ḥji, q.v. 78 -re; 306 (pp. 244, 231).
ʰju, ass, cf. Tib. gzų-lum, obstinate (p. 252). See also gzų, ḥdzų, gzų, ḥzu, ḥjuňu. 115 ḥraň-ḥče⁰ (p. 252).
ʰjuňu, tiger = ḥju, q.v. 312 -ḥbrad (p. 254).
ʰjo I = Tib. jo, etc. See ḫco. 63 ḥyaň-ʈsa⁰; 78 ḥdaň⁰; 154 ḥchos-ḥyọ⁰; 201 tros⁰; 372 ḥdyan-ḫyuo⁰; 385 -chi-te (?) 387 ḥdyan-ḫyu⁰; 389 ḥdyan⁰ (pp. 273-4, 305, 331).
- ḥdžin, govern. 74 (p. 274).
II = jo, work, q.v. See also ḥjoňo. 67, 70 -me-ḥdub (pp. 274, 335).
III = Tib. za, zo, etc., eat. 177 (pp. 274, 335).
IV error (for hto)? 69 thar-pyań⁰ (pp. 247-8).
ʰjoň = ḥdzoň, fort, q.v. See also joň. 118 Moň⁰; 129 Moň⁰ (pp. 243, 263).
ʰjoňu = ḥdzo, man, q.v. 137 -hwa-ňkaň (pp. 218, 338).
ʰjoňo = ḥjo II, work. 34 (p. 275).
ʰjor = Tib. cor, clamour, etc. 194 ḥkαḥ-ḫgaň⁰ (pp. 238, 315).
ʳje = Tib. rje, chieftain. 37 -śmyi-rmad; 138 ḥdzěńu⁰ (pp. 218, 228, 237). See also ḥrje.
ʳjes = Tib. rjes, trace? 201 pyi⁰ (pp. 222, 274, 359).
ʰrįji, r-form of hįįi, hįįi, q.v.? 213 hboś-hdumm⁰.
ʰrje = rje, chieftain, q.v.? 84 -śmyi-rmad (p. 227). 36 ḥdyo⁰? (p. 244).
ñé = Tib. ñes, evil, &c. (pp. 221-2). See also ñene, ñes, ḥñe, riche, rnéche, hrné, bhya-hwa-ñé. 17 -hkyeb-hkyeb; 149 sání; 229 sání; 343 -hñes (pp. 221-2, 256, 313).
ñene = ñe-ne? 328 sání. 340 (p. 253).
ñes, Aorist form of ñé = Tib. ñes. 153 -re; 158 re; 192 (pp. 283, 316).
ñii = Tib. ñi, ñi, sun. See also ḥñe (pp. 271-2). 90 -hrdzun; 199 rgyah-ñi-ke (pp. 186, 271, 293).
ñím = Tib. ñin, ñin, day. 12 -ñi (pp. 335-6, 362).
ñíñ = Chín. ñañ, female. 45 -hya (p. 343).
II, hear? 385 -hya-hñah (p. 331).
ñíñ I = shine, cf. Tib. ñi, ñi, sun (pp. 272-3). See also ñinis. 67 ĥlab-ma (p. 272).
II = Tib. ñüs, ñis, two (pp. 234-5). See also sání. 140 -stor.
ñinis, Aorist form of ñíñ I, q.v. 70 ĥlab-me (pp. 173, 273, 358).
ññe = ñe, q.v. 209 -nag; 343 sroño; 361 -hpö; 339 sroño (pp. 256, 274, 316).
ñned = Tib. mñe, mñed, &c, tan, make gñiable. 31 -hrñam; 47 -hrñam (p. 251).
ñño = Tib. ño, buy, trade. 174, 177 ĥdro; 359, 361 dро; 480.
ññi = Tib. ñión, brñis, gñid, fade, grievce; rñis, worn out, faded; cf. rñin, old, gñid, sleep. See also hrñin. 389 sñañ-rñi-re.
ññe, r-form of ñé, evil. See also, rnye, hrñé (pp. 222, 350, 362). 146 -hne-hrmag; 149 rmag; 200-ne; 201 hjö; 229, 237 -hñhyam; 301-ne; 341 -hprom; 343 -hñés-ès; 358 -ge-hño (pp. 221-2, 261, 274, 313, 321).
-ñlad, requital of evil (p. 223).

230, 231, 232, 235 lad; 237, 239 (pp. 183, 303).
ññche = ñe, q.v. 297 -hbnrom.
hrñi = rñi, q.v. 63 hyañ-hbso; 298 hbos-stañ (p. 303).
hrñé = rñé? 352 meñi-čaño.
sñañ I = Tib. sñañ, heart. See also sání. 92 -gyañ; 102-3 († see II); 389 -ñi (pp. 156, 295, 333-4).
-ñe, good heart (or II?). 65 ḥña-ma; 160 -hñe; 328 ñene (pp. 222, 318).
-ñe, evil-heart. 229, 328 ñene (p. 222). See also sñiniº (p. 222).
II = Tib. sñañ, agreeable, affectionate. 66 -glñañ; 102-3 († see I) (p. 318).
-ñdo (a Suffix, p. 186), affection. 86.
sñar, probably for sña-re (metre), and possibly sña = Tib. sña, gñin, witness (p. 356). 362 ḥkeñu-promº.
sñañ I = Tib. sñis, two. See also sñi (pp. 203, 235, 356). 26 -gsmo.
II = Tib. sñi/sañ, snare, trap. 219 (p. 272).
sñiñ = Tib. sñañ, heart. See also sñañ I. 168 -ññañ (p. 147).
-ñe, evil-heart = sñañº. 149 (p. 222).

T

ta, a Suffix, appended chiefly to words of Verbal, or at least Adjectival, sense. See also tañ, ĥta I, ŕña I, tña I, tña I, tña I (pp. 182-3, 187). See under skye-, glo-, hñon-, chos-, hjm, tñañ, stor-, ĥjab-, ĥe-, byün-, ġmo-, ĥwān-, ĥwār-, g-yañ-, hyed-ge-, hrom-, ġ-ri-, ĥlab-, bsī-, hñes-, hññ-ht-ge-.
tañ = ta. See byün-, gšañ-, glañ (†).
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-, ḡtan-ma-, pun-, ḡphom-, ḡsod-, ḡsas-.

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, ḡto I, ḡtos, ḡtōh, ḡtōhi, ḡtōhu, ḡtor I, ḡtoni, sto I (pp. 184–6). See under ḡtad-, stor-, ḡdam-, ḡpā-, ḡprom-, ḡmu-, ḡ-yah-.

tor I great, perhaps derived in ancient times from an early form of Chinese ta. See also ḡtor II. 50 ḡldyo; 219 -sā; 174 -dro- ḡnō; 64 ḡpū-hgru; 216 ḡbrō; 218 -sā; 337 -hrāta; 388 -kru (pp. 263, 272, 305, 308).

II = thor, hthor, q.v. 148 -ḥtas- -prom (p. 302).

III written in place of to-re: cf. ḡtor I. 188 cīg-dzo (p. 305).

twān = ḡib. thōn, ram? 48 ḡmāhō; 261, 275 (pp. 342–3).

tyaṅ 213 ḡbēhī ḡrdēhe (p. 253).

troṅ, enemy? (pp. 220–2). See also ḡtroṅ. 201 -hjo-rā; 266 -ḥtor (pp. 221, 222, 274).

gṭaṅ = ḡib. gtuṅ, gtaṅ, btaṅ, send, let go, allow, etc. See also gṭoṅ, ḡtōṅ, ḡthōṅ, ḡthōṅ. 186 mehī-rō (p. 331).

gṭaṅ = ḡib. gtaṅ, pledge, hostage. See also gṭar. 111 ḡbom-rbo (p. 230).

gṭar, written for gṭaṅ-re? 43.

gṭoṅ = gtaṅ, ḡthoṅ, q.v. 211 ḡgo (pp. 200, 266, 332).

ṛta I, a Suffix = ta, q.v. 181 grtehe (pp. 156, 197).

II = ḡib. da, now, etc.? See also ḡtah. 185 (p. 186).

ḥṭag = ḡib. thag, rope, ḡdogs, ḡbags, ḡdags, tie, etc. 34 ḡyos (p. 275).

-ḥto (a Suffix, pp. 184–6). 278 ḡtos; 279 ḡtos, ḡto; 285.

ḥṭaṅ I = gtaṅ, q.v. 94 ḡtos (p. 275).

See also ḡṭhaṅ III.

II = ḡib. thāṅ, measure, power, 9 mor; 10 ḡyaṅ; 39 ḡye; 149 ḡe; 315 ḡyaḥ; 318 ḡyaḥ. See also ḡṭhaṅ II, ḡthaṅ, ḡṭwaṅ (pp. 227, 276, 296, 301–2).

III = ḡib. thāṅ, plateau, field. See also thāṅ, ḡṭhaṅ I. 14 ḡlūd; 218 ḡrō (pp. 258, 321).

IV = 11 ḡmu-hro; 96 ḡya ḡta (pp. 270, 329).

ḥṭad = ḡib. gtd, gtd, ḡtd, hand over, deliver, press, urge, ḡtd, steady, firm, 30 ḡsāṅ-re (p. 286).

ḥṭab = Chinese ta (A), tap, answer. 293, 295 ḡhkoṅu (pp. 264, 298).

ḥṭam I = ḡib. ḡṭham, ḡṭhams, thams, join, enlock, stick fast, thams-cad, all. See also ḡṭham. 24 ḡṣrām; 54 stehi (pp. 138, 306, 353).

II = ḡib. ḡṭam, speech, story, 60 ḡdaṅ-ṛgyu; 248 ḡjām (p. 286).

ḥṭaṅ a Suffix = ta, q.v. See under klu-, ḡkor-, ḡkkoṅ-, ḡjaḥ-, ḡtor-, stor-, hle-, ḡdehi-, ḡḍynā-, me-, ḡmye-, ḡdzom-, ḡyaḥ-, ḡwa-ste-, ḡrwy-, ḡ-ri-, ḡram-ge-, ḡse-, ḡse- (ḥrnab-ḥldāḥ-?)

II = ḡta II? 185 (p. 186).


ḥṭar I = ḡib. thar, be released, escape. See also thar I, ḡṭhar I, ḡko-ḥtar. 146 ḡnām-ḥdaṁ (pp. 261, 300).

II = ḡib. mṭhar, at the end; mṭhaḥ, extremity, border. See also thar II, ḡṭhar II. 374 -ṛyaṅ-hṭo; 392 -ma? (pp. 248–9).

ḥtas = ḡib. ḡtas, harsh, solid, stiff; brta, brtas, rta, expand, widen, be abundant. 256 -kro.

-ḥṭaṅ, become tangled? 121, 148, 257 ḡṭor (pp. 292, 302).

ḥṭi I = ḡib. ḡti-mug, gloon, cf. ḡtibs, thib, thibs, etc.; dark, dense. 12 ḡnūm; 26 ḡldyog- ḡlādiṅ; 154 -ṛgye; 385 ḡbrom- ḡge (pp. 174, 235–6).
II = Tib. sti, stis, bsti, bstis, stop, rest. See also sti. 19 -hwer; 27 ḥgran-ma⁰; 104 sku-hnh⁰; 153 myi-re⁰; 171 -hrno; 351 ḥsehe⁰ (?) ; 354 ḥso⁰; 390 gdzu⁰ (?) (pp. 174, 236, 257, 285, 309).

ḥṭib = Tib. rtib, brtibs, rtib, rhib, break down; ltib, rdib, collapse. 19 -bzer (pp. 339-40).

ḥṭuḥu = ḥṭhu, assemble, q.v. 100 (pp. 260, 321).

ḥṭul = Tib. ḥdul, btul, thul, gdul, dul, bṛṭul, etc, tame, discipline, conquer. See also ḥṭul. 42 ḥklom-go⁰; 170 ḥkhoṭi-me⁰; 178 ḥse-go⁰ (pp. 244, 280, 285).

ḥṭe = te, Gerund-suffix, q.v. See under ḥkān-, ḥṭre-, ṭrog-, ḥṭor-, ṭṛrog-ḥdre (and ḥdṛhe), ḥdṛe, rdam-, ḥnṃ, ḥram-, ḥse-.

ḥṭe-he written for ḥṭebe = ḥṭe. 322.

ḥṭo I a Suffix and 'is' Verb = to, q.v. See under ḥkun-, ḥṭre-, ᴻḥkhr-ṛ-hu, ṭṛagam-re, ḥṛgu, ḥṛyo, ḥṛyoḥo, ṭṛor, ḥnṃ, ṭṛor, ḥbror, ḥbror, ṭṛor, ṭṛor, ḥbror, 薹h, ṭṛor, ṭṛor, ḥbror. See also ḥṭon, ḥṭeḥo, ḥṭor.

II = ḥṭe mtho, ḥh, or ḥtho, boundary (pp. 248, 261, 332). 210 ḥtyan⁰; 374 phyan⁰ (pp. 248, 280).

ḥṭog = ḥṭhog, stop, q.v. 235 ḥbehi-ḥbba⁰ (pp. 250, 301).

ḥṭon = ṭnano, ṭnano, q.v. 100 na-nom⁰; 119 ṭnano-stor⁰; 146 ḥran⁰; 190 ḥhpgo⁰; 210 ḥddaⁿ-ḥto⁰; 212 ḥkgo⁰; 247 ḥlao⁰; 273 ḥra⁰; 358 ḥralo⁰ (pp. 217, 228, 261, 285, 332).

ḥṭon I = (Tib. mthon, 'high'), 223 (-ḥkōn). 280, 325 ḥtag⁰.

ḥṭon I = ḥṭo-n. 280, 285 ḥtag⁰.

ḥṭoni = ḥṭo+ni. 150 stor-ḥtah⁰; 152 stor-ta⁰.

ḥṭom 364 -ḥphab.

ḥṭohi = ḥṭo+hi. 324 ḥkhad⁰.

ḥṭohu = ḥṭo (p. 369). 7 hrho⁰.

ḥṭoho = ḥṭo, q.v. See under ṭṛog-, ḥχi-, stor-, ḥpror-, ḥrbom-, ḥhrbo-, ṭram-dze-, ḥyah-.

ḥṭor I written in place of ḥṭo-re (see pp. 172-5 and critical notes). See also ṭor. 96 ḥta-n-ta⁰ (?) ; 104 ḥdo⁰ (?); 186 ṭrog-dzo⁰; 187 ḥni⁰ (?) ; 192 ṭrog-dzo⁰; 225, 424 ṭrog-hu⁰; 341 ṭrog-hra⁰; 393 ṭrdam⁰ (?) ; 394 (?) .

II = tor I great, q.v. Preceding ḥkho 217, 218; ḥkhrū-hṛgyaṅ 187; ḥnī 215; sān (sānā) 168; 289; ḥrta (ḥṛtaḥ) 124, 231, 271, 340, 341 (ḥṛtaḥ); ṭṛro-hṛṅa 177, 359, 361; ḥp (ḥpu, ḥpbτ, ḥbu) 29, 33, 62, 293, 329; ṭṛroḥ 215 (2), 216, 217, 219, 222, 223 (2), 392; ṭṛroḥ 73; ṭṛrog- 120; ḥso 354. Following, as Attribute or Predicate, ḥdu 75, 76 (2); ḥgu 113; ṭṛro-hdṛ 74; 77, 78, 114, 139, 191, 309; ca-an 236 (?) ; ṭrog (ḥṭrog) 40, 256; ṭraṅ-ta 96 (?) ; ṭrdam 393 (?) ; ṭṛōḥ 104 (?) ; ṭṛdya 16, 34, 254; sā (143); ṭṛro-hdād 240 (?) .

— ḥge the great 364, 387.

— ḥdo (a Suffix, pp. 186-7) greatness. 285 (p. 139).

III = thor, ṭhthor, bunch, top, etc., q.v. See also ṭor II. 212 ḥtas-ḥproms; 148 ṭyse⁰; 236 ṭyse-yaⁿ⁰ (?) ; 257 ṭbas-prom (pp. 292, 302).

ḥtos, Preterite form of ḥto I (p. 198). 278, 279 ḥtag⁰.

ḥtve (conceivably = Chinese 'tien, heaven, sky') (p. 324). See also ṭhtye. 8 sta-hldyaⁿ⁰.

ḥtram = Tib. tram, hard, stiff. See also ḥdram. 31 ḥnied⁰ (p. 251).

ḥṭre = ṭṛre, q.v. 94 ṭrye⁰; 248 ṭrye⁰ (pp. 140, 291).

ḥṭro = ṭṛro, heat? or the frequent ṭṛro = Tib. ṭhrd, travel. 197 mu-ḥṛro⁰ (pp. 232, 318). See also ṭhrd.

ḥṭrog, enemy? (p. 220). See also ṭrog. 40 -ḥtro; 146 ṭhrag⁰; 326 ṭhrd; 338 ṭhrdeḥ; 376 ṭhrda⁰ (pp. 320, 327).
**VOCABULARY**

ह्त्रोङ्, Imperative (hydrośa) of Tib. ह्द्रोङ्, travel, or द्रोङ्, द्रे, dræ, draen, lead. See also ह्त्रोङ्धि. 233 ह्खाब्ह्रोङ्धि (p. 343).

ह्त्रोङ्धि = ह्त्रोङ्, q.v., +़ि, 224 ह्रक्र्वः; 243 ह्खाब्ह्रोङ्धि (p. 343).

ह्त्रोङ् = Tib. ह्द्रोङ्, travel, 327 हर्ग्याब्ह्रोङ्धि (p. 317).

र्ता horse = Tib. rta. See also र्ताह, र्ताहि, ह्त्राह, ह्त्राहः (pp. 139, 146, 258). With preceding ह्राह-वेह़ि 139. With following श्को-प्रोङ् 91; ह्गाम-भ्पार 93, 99, 110, 289; ह्ह्प्राग-श्सग 389; ह्स्त्सग-राम 90; ह्या-ह्ल्दान 278; यान-ह्लान 79; ह्सा-ग्येर 330, 346; so (ह्शो) -ह्लान 80, 93, 100, 103; swa 173, 358.

-ऽे the (ि) horse. 364.

र्ताह = rta, q.v. With preceding ह्राह-वेह़ि 139, ह्राहः (ह्राह) -वेह़ि 114, 191. With following ह्गाम 118; ह्स्त्सग-राम 35, 82; ह्सङ्ग-ग्येर 166; ह्ह्प्राग 189.

र्ताहि = rta(र्ताह)+ि (ि), 174 -sylvania (p. 320).

र्ते I ? 82 ह्त्रेह (pp. 259, 320).

II = ह्त्रेह, q.v. 182 ह्ह्राहः-र्तेह (p. 313).

र्तो = Tib. rdo stone (ि). See also ह्त्रोङ्. 25 ह्ह्रोङ् (pp. 138, 223).

ग्त्शे = Hsi-hsia gdeh, hrde, fix, q.v. (cf. Tib. ल्थ्रेङ, stop; र्तेङ, hold; bdeu, true). See also ह्त्रेङ्ग, ग्देः. 181 -ह्तेः (pp. 156, 197 and mn.).

ह्त्रा = rta, rtah, horse, q.v. With preceding ह्तोङ् 124, 232. With following ह्क्र्वाङ् 122; ह्पाङ्-ह्पार 187; ह्स्ग्राम-ह्लान 119, 123; वा-ह्लान 258; ह्या-ह्लान 121.

ह्त्राह = rta, र्ताह, ह्त्राह, q.v. With preceding ह्तोङ्, ह्तोङ् 271, 337, 340; ह्द्लङ-मा 63, 144; ह्राह 77; ह्राह-वेह़ि 380. With following ह्गाम 118; नाङ्-्सा 354; ह्पाङ्-ह्पार 388; ह्लान-ह्लान 91; ह्राह-ह्राहः 230; swa (swa) 176, 301, 360.

ह्त्रेङ्ग फ़ि, स्पोङ्; cf. Hsi-hsia hrde, gdeh ? See also ग्त्शे (pp. 158, 313-14). 265 ह्ह्तेह (p. 343).

ह्त्रोङ् = rto stone, q.v. 24 ह्ह्रोङ् (pp. 138, 223).

ह्तर्ते = rta II. 354 ह्राह-ह्तर्ते-ह्दुह (p. 220).

ह्तलिङ् = ह्ह्दान, ह्लान, rise, q.v. 93 ह्ह्ग्र्व-मा (p. 291).

ह्तलाह I. See ह्ह्को-ह्तलाह. 203 ह्ह्रिङ्ग-ह्लोङ् (p. 278).

ह्लो, possibly = Tib. ल्तो, look (or = ह्ह्लो, a Suffixed !) 251 ह्होङ्-ह्ह्होङ् (p. 354).

ह्लों = ह्ह्दो, subdue, q.v. 88 ह्ह्दिङ्ग-ह्लोंस (p. 321).

स्टा, औङ्ग I, a form of the Suffixed ta, औङ्ग, q.v., which has attracted a -स ending to its (preceding) word: cf. Tib. -स्टे-ङ्ग (pp. 353-3, 185 n. 1) and स्टोङ्ग infra. 85 ह्होङ्; 86 ह्होङ्; 306 ह्ह्रद्द (p. 220-1, 359).

II = there, also Correlative. See also औङ्ग, ह्ह्तोङ् (p. 201). A, at beginning of clause. 8 -ह्द्वाङ्; 9 -ह्री; 9, 19, 252 -र्तोङ्; 252 -ग्री- -बाङ् (pp. 142, 274, 332). B, otherwise. 311 ह्होङ्, ह्री; 312 ह्ह्री, ह्री; ग्री (pp. 201, 254, 337).

स्टा = Tib. तान, stand, top, high, up. See also ह्ह्तोङ्. 83 ह्ह्काङ् (ि); 88 ह्ह्दानः; 303, 347 -ह्रो (pp. 270, 321).

स्टौङ् = stoa I, q.v. 99 ह्ह्तोङ् (p. 336).

II = stoa II, q.v. 20 ह्ह्रोङ् (p. 201).

स्टी = Tib. sti, bsti, thī, ठी, rest. 299 ग्री; 300 ह्री (pp. 265-6, 355). See also ह्ठी II.

स्टीनि = Tib. sti, bsti, bsthīn, ठीनि, rebuke (p. 367). 330, 331 ग्यो-ह्तोङ्; 335, 336 ग्यो-ह्तोङ् (p. 178).

स्टे = te, ह्ते, q.v., with s-as in sta and stö. See also ह्ह्षेट (pp. 136, 188-90). 34 ह्ह्ताँ (p. 72, 73, 75 (2) ह्हवः; 182 ग्यो-ह्तोङ् (pp. 273, 275, 337, 338).
II = Tib. sten, bstén, range closely together. See also stehi, stehe (pp. 353-4). 178 -hkehu-prom; 180 -hkoju-bprom; 194 -gdzu (pp. 241-2, 251-2).

stehi = ste II q.v. 54 -ḥtam (p. 353).

stehe = ste II q.v. 356 -ḥdzu (p. 353).

stel = Tib. ster, grant, ñc. 181 grtehe-taño (pp. 156, 354).

sto I = to, ḷto I, a Suffix q.v., with s-as in sta and ste (pp. 185-6). 28 ḥlduñ; 29 ḥyimñ; 58 ḥrgehiñ; 84, 85 ḷnoñ; 233 ḷtsañño; 235 ḷnñaññ; 242 ḷrgyaññ; 292 ḷrgyaññ (pp. 219-20, 233, 259, 321, 341).

II = Tib. stō, rope. 336 -the-the (pp. 185, 335).

ston I = Tib. stōn, empty. 51 -ḥhokog (p. 328).

II = Tib. stōn, 1000 (pp. 203, 233-4). 247 gseñño.


stom = Tib. stōn, autumn (harvest). See also ḷstom. 255 -ḥdag; 281 -ḥkaññ (pp. 203, 362).

stor = Tib. stor, stray, flee, be lost; cf. ḷthr, gtor, btor, scatter; dor, ḷdor, cast away. See also dor, ḷdor, ḷstor (pp. 171, 253). Applied to ḷkyaññ 141, 143; ḷhko-hrio 189; ḷño 79, 119, 127, 128, 143, 196, 258; rje 138; ḷhii (‘?') 140; ḷdehi (‘?') 339; ḷdýo 140; ḷidnañ-hphyar 125; ḷpo-ḥldañ 358 (sto-re?); ḷpos 141; me (123); ḷmon-hjiññ (ḥdzoñ) 78, 118, 128, 139, 140; ḷdiññ 142; se 143; ḷso-hnañ 122, 232.

-ṭa (tha) (a Suffix, pp. 182-3). 145, 149, 150, 152, 337 ḷṭañ.


-ṙño, able to flee (pp. 171, 297). 141 ḷkyañño.

-ṭhoññ, let or cause to flee. 197.

-ḥdehi-hphyid. 339 (p. 253).


-ḥdзо-ḥdžehiñ. 338.

-ḥğu (dgú), all things lost. 126-7 (pp. 233, 288-90).

-ḥprom, make flight. 128 ḷñoñ (pp. 171, 294).

gstor = stor, ḷstor, q.v. 143 ḷkyañño (p. 297).

-ṭa = stor-ta, q.v. 152 (p. 228).

ḥstaññ = staññ, top, high, up, q.v. 95 ḷdñañño (p. 320).

ḥste = ste I q.v. 274 ḷldyimño (p. 331).

ḥstom = stōn, autumn (harvest). 14 -ḥkom.

ḥstor = stor, be lost, ñc. q.v. Applied to ḷgru-ma 79, ḷdeññ (‘?) 340, ḷmon-ḥdzoññ 64, soñññña (ḥnañña) 117, 128.

-ḥtaññ = stor-ta, q.v. 337 (p. 335).

-ḥdeññ-hphyid 340 (p. 253).

-ма-swanañ (ḥsanañ) 337, 340 (p. 344).

-ḥdzo-ḥdžeññ = storq, q.v. 338.

Th

tha I = ta, ḷta, a Suffix, q.v. 149 storño.

II = Hsi-hsia tha, Buddha, Tib. lha, god. 241 -ḥnu (p. 237).

thaññ = ḷthaññ, ḷthaññ III, plateau, ñc. (pp. 246-7). See also ḷthaññ. 220 -rdzo (pp. 173, 258).

thar I = ḷtar, be let loose, q.v. See also ḷthar I. 190 ḷdroñño; 357 -mye (pp. 241, 285).

II = ḷthar II, Tib. mthar, at end, q.v. See also ḷthar II. 69 -pyañ (p. 248).

thin (not in text) = Tib. mthiññ, blue (p. 131).

the I = Tib. the, lieges, commons; the, thes, belong to. See also ḷthe, thehe. 103 -kyen; 139 ḷdñañño (pp. 228, 322).

II = Tib. then, ḷthen, draw, pull, control. See also then. 336 stoñño (p. 335).
then, control = the II, q.v. 207 theo (p. 315).

thehe = the I, lieges, q.v. 160 sna-neo (p. 222).

tho I = Tib. tho, boundary. See also hto II. 109 -rgyam (pp. 280, 340).

II = Tib. mtho, high. See also hto II, htho, hjo IV. 132 hldag-nag-o.

thon = gtan, gto, hto, let go, dce, q.v. 197 stor-o.

thom-thom, cf. Tib. hthom, hthoms, be confused, dizzy, gropes? 183 bso-

thor I = htor II, great, q.v. 220 -hbron.

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, htor (pp. 149, 302-4). 71 hmo-ma-o.

III = II + 235rhe-lad-o; 242 hcha-

thol (not in text) (p. 133).

thwan = htan II, Tib. than, measure, power, q.v.; dban-than, might, fate. See also thwan (pp. 346-7). 97 ba-o; 98-hkhor (pp. 342, 345).

thrā. 53 hpho-ge-o.

htan I = than and htan III, plateau, dce, q.v. 130 -rdzo; 131 -hgam; 132 -rdzo; 133 -hrgam; 221 -hgam (pp. 243, 246-7, 259).

II = htan II and thwan, measure power, q.v. 132 hldi-o; 133 (2) hldi-o; 222 hyah-hlah-o; 286 (2) hyah-o; 287 g-yah-o; 288 hyah-o; 288 hldza-o; 289 hgar-hpu-o; 290 ho-hla-o (pp. 171, 216, 228, 229, 293, 296, 323, 342).

—I (I) -phu-hkam. 130 htha-o.


III = gta, gto, hta I. 57 hkras-o (p. 248).

htam = htam I, q.v. 227 -ra place of union, or assemblage.

htar I = thar I, be let loose, q.v. 195 -mye (p. 241).

II = thar II, at end, q.v. 348 -phyon (pp. 248, 343).

htu = Tib. hud, sdu, hthu, dce; gather, assembly, dce. See also htu, hdu (pp. 321-2). 140 ldo-stor-o (pp. 254, 256, 326).

htunu = Tib. thu, small. 145 hge-o (pp. 261, 300).

htul = hul, conquer, tame, dce, q.v. 67 ru-glha-ge-o; 378 rko-mo-p (p. 318).

htus, Aorist form of htu, q.v. 156 hji-ma-o (pp. 280, 322).

hthe = the I, thehe, lieges, dce, q.v. 336 kru-o; 383 hya-o (p. 322).

htho = tho II, high, q.v. 374 hpa-

htog = Tib. thogs, hdogs, btags, dce, fasten, impede; dog, narrow, danger, dce. (p. 301). See also hthogs. 149 stor-ta-o, stor-

htogni = hthog-ni, q.v. 149.

htogs, Aorist form of hthog, q.v. 145 stor-ta-o; 182 hlab-ta-o (pp. 156, 299-301).

hto = Tib. mto, see. 92 pyi-

hton I, error for htoni (152) or hthog-ni (149)? or = hthon II. 152 gstor-ta-o (p. 228).

II = Tib. hthon, come forth, dce, hdon, send forth, dce.? 152 gstor-ta-o (1); 379 spehi-ge-o (p. 228).

hthor = thor II, htor III, tor II, gather to a point, dce, q.v. 62 hri-o; 63 mo-mo-o; 144 mo-ma-o (pp. 302-3).

htwana = thwana and hta II, q.v. 280 hkha-brya-ge-o (p. 342).

htye = hye, q.v. 20 -hldya-o.

D

dam = Tib. dam, bound, tight, bond, dce; gdama, advice, dce; hdam, choose; hdom, exhort, select; sdom, sdoms, bsdoms, bsdoms,
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dc., bind, fasten, obligation, vow, &c. See also ḫdam, ḫdom II, rdom, ldom, ḫdom I. 46 -rm (p. 286).

dim = Tib. ḫthim, thin, thin, stim, be lost, dissolve, evaporate, be absorbed in. See also gdim, ddiyim, ḫldim, ḫldiyim. 95 -tshis (pp. 320-1, 359).

do I a Suffix (pp. 186-7). See also ḫdo, Ido, ḫdo. 86 sīnārī.
II, cf. Tib. ldo, side; Ido-ldo, for a short time (occasionally ?).
— ldo. 76, 353 (p. 322).

doḥo, a Suffix = do I, q.v. 80 ḫrdizum (pp. 271, 293).

doņ I = Tib. ḫdɔn, depart, begone. See also ḫdoņ I, ldoņ, ḫldoņ. 89 ḫṣarī; 392 ḫgyaṇo (p. 321); 367 ḫyaṇ-ḥyaṇo.
II, extrametrical and accordingly different from I: very possibly therefore a Conjunction = Tib. doņ, a variant of dań, practically = whereupon 176 ḫbres; 351 ḫtsobūn.

dor = Tib. ḫdor, drive or throw away, always in the compound verb; stor-dor (ḥdor), q.v. 160 -yon. See also ḫdor (p. 253).

dwaņ = Tib. dwaņ, lustre, bright, clean, force of language. 280 gnaḥ-maņ (p. 342). See also ḫwaņ.

dyaņ, perhaps not different from ḫldyaņ, q.v. 183 ḫchi-ḥdoņ (p. 172, 332). See also ḫdyān.

drag = Tib. drag, vehement, fierce, powerful, eminent. See also ḫdרא (p. 300). 163 sīr-ḥbo (p. 216).

dro = Tib. ḫdron, travel, go. See ḫdro I (p. 294).
— ḫnō, travelling trader. 174 torō. See also ḫdro-ḥnō.

droņo = dro, q.v. 105 ḫtso (p. 261).

gdag I = Tib. bdog, own, acquire, bdag, master, self, perhaps kept distinct from gdags, bdags, &, often, fasten, afflict, and from gdags, bright, daylight. See also ḫdag.

142 ḫgom, ḫphar; 200, 204, 206 ḫce-ḥmu (pp. 221-2).
II = Tib. gdags, sunlit ! 345 -yaṇ-la-po (pp. 269-70).

gdah = Tib. gdāḥ, be actual or possible. See also ḫdāḥ II. 191 ḫnāḥ; 396 -kum (?), ḫgarm. 43 ḫdāḥ-ḥdīh (pp. 244, 315).

gdim = dim, vanish, &c., q.v. 88 ḫpyi-ḥse; 89 ḫphyi-ḥse; 94 ḫchi or ḫtsis; 100 ḫḥdian-ḥdīzim (pp. 320-1, 359).

gdes, Aorist form of gyate, q.v. 269 ḫdom (?) (pp. 319, 343).

gdod = Tib. dod, be prominent, emerge. 186 ḫg-ri (p. 331).

ddyim (< ḫdyim ?) = dim, gdim, q.v. 95 ḫphyi-ḥse.

ḥdag = gdag I, possess, acquire, q.v. 254 ḫḥraḥ (?) (p. 323); 255 ḫhram; 259 ḫyog; 260 ḫḥraḥ; 261 ḫnāḥ; ḫghoḥo; 390 ḫkyaṇ (p. 192, 202, 239, 242, 261, 283, 342-3, 357).

ḥdaņ = ḫdaņ (?) 258 ḫwaņ (p. 221).

ḥdad = Tib. ḫdag, devoted to (pp. 227), 304 ḫyaṇ; 306 ḫyaṇ-ḥdaḥd (p. 254).

ḥdab = Tib. ḫdebs, btab, gdab, put, &c. See also ḫldab II. 369 ḫmeḥi-ra (pp. 318, 331).

ḥdam = dam, bind, &c., q.v. See also rdam, ḫldam. 204 ḫpyu-ḥyā (p. 326); 326 ḫsē-ḥtah; 328 ḫkhoḥ-ḥtah; 329 ḫkho-ḥdah; 346, 351 -sle (pp. 140, 319).

— to (a Suffix, pp. 184-6). 68 (pp. 250, 319).

ḥdāḥ I = Tib. mdāḥ, arrow. See also ḫldāḥ. 58, 59 -hpog (pp. 300-1, 343).

II = gdah, be actual or possible, q.v. 108 ḫdiḥ (p. 329 ḫkhoḥ-ḥtah (p. 221).

— ta (a Suffix, pp. 182-3). 283 ḫtgah-ṛag (p. 261).

ḥdar = Tib. ḫdar, shiver, tremble, &c. (pp. 319-20). See also ḫldar. 19 -ḥti-ḥwe-re; 38, 368 ḫṛum (pp. 319-20).

ḥdi, ḫdi (Tib. ḫdi). See also ḫdiḥ, ḫlī, ḫldiḥi (p. 201). 107, 198.
\ हृदि = Tid. dwa, wretched. 148 
\ ह्या = spyne-
\ ह्री = स्त्री, q.v. 43 gdh.
\ ह्रिण = ह्री, this, q.v. 184 -mag-
\ ह्रो = 327 hravya; 391 ह्रा.
\ ह्रू = Tib. grun, be distressed, or 
\ ह्रू = fall. 94, 95 (pp. 320–1).
\ ह्रुब = Tib. dub, be fatigued, sink. 
\ ह्रु = 67 me; 70 me; 182 hrah-
\ ह्रु = hrah-htre (pp. 173, 272–3).
\ ह्रु = Tib. bde, good fortune; ide, 
\ ह्रु = warm oneself? See also 
\ ह्रु = 278–9). 29 hymim-sto; 208 
\ ह्रु = htrash (pp. 234, 259).

- ta (a Suffix, pp. 182–3). 158 
\ ह्रु = -rgyen (p. 145).

II = Tib. hced, follow, drive, 
\ ह्रु = pursue? 1 hldab-hde-hde, 
\ ह्रु = possibly onomatopoetic; 167 hra-
\ ह्रु = hrah (p. 318).

\ ह्रु = hde l, q.v. 102 mag; 339 
\ ह्रु = stor; 340 htor (p. 301).

\ ह्रु = a Suffix (pp. 184–6) = do, ldo, 
\ ह्रु = hldo, to, hto, q.v. 65, 67 hyah; 
\ ह्रु = 86, 87 hram; 88 hcoq; 180 
\ ह्रु = glah; 183, 353 hchi; 185 htor 
\ ह्रु = (pp. 139, 186, 228, 276, 288, 
\ ह्रु = 332, 340).

\ ह्रु = doñ l, depart, q.v. 104 
\ ह्रु = hmun (p. 285).

II = Tib. gdoñ, mdoñ, face? 
\ ह्रु = 13 hri (p. 265).

\ ह्रु = Tib. don, purpose. 185 
\ ह्रु = hsd (pp. 139, 186).

\ ह्रु = Tib. dom, bear. See also 
\ ह्रु = dam and also dom.

\ ह्रु = I (pp. 318–19). 213 
\ ह्रु = hbo; 260 ह्रान (lect.) 
\ ह्रु = (pp. 202, 232).

- (i) -hgu (a Suffix, pp. 190, 258).
\ ह्रु = 303, 304, 312 hguh (pp. 254, 
\ ह्रु = 257).

\ ह्रु = ह्रो. 37 hram.

\ ह्रु = dor, in stor-dor (hdor), 
\ ह्रु = q.v. 118, 127, 142, 161, 162, 
\ ह्रु = 163 stor; 209 ह्रा-rgye 
\ ह्रु = (pp. 213, 245, 253, 289, 361).

\ ह्रु = Tib. dwa, wretched. 148 
\ ह्रु = spyne-
\ ह्रु = स्त्री, q.v. 43 gdh.
\ ह्रु = ह्री, this, q.v. 184 -mag-
\ ह्रु = ह्रा.
\ ह्रु = Tib. grun, be distressed, or 
\ ह्रु = fall. 94, 95 (pp. 320–1).
\ ह्रु = Tib. dub, be fatigued, sink. 
\ ह्रु = 67 me; 70 me; 182 hrah-
\ ह्रु = hrah-htre (pp. 173, 272–3).
\ ह्रु = Tib. bde, good fortune; ide, 
\ ह्रु = warm oneself? See also 
\ ह्रु = 278–9). 29 hymim-sto; 208 
\ ह्रु = htrash (pp. 234, 259).

- ta (a Suffix, pp. 182–3). 158 
\ ह्रु = -rgyen (p. 145).

II = Tib. hced, follow, drive, 
\ ह्रु = pursue? 1 hldab-hde-hde, 
\ ह्रु = possibly onomatopoetic; 167 hra-
\ ह्रु = hrah (p. 318).

\ ह्रु = hde l, q.v. 102 mag; 339 
\ ह्रु = stor; 340 htor (p. 301).

\ ह्रु = a Suffix (pp. 184–6) = do, ldo, 
\ ह्रु = hldo, to, hto, q.v. 65, 67 hyah; 
\ ह्रु = 86, 87 hram; 88 hcoq; 180 
\ ह्रु = glah; 183, 353 hchi; 185 htor 
\ ह्रु = (pp. 139, 186, 228, 276, 288, 
\ ह्रु = 332, 340).

\ ह्रु = doñ l, depart, q.v. 104 
\ ह्रु = hmun (p. 285).

II = Tib. gdoñ, mdoñ, face? 
\ ह्रु = 13 hri (p. 265).

\ ह्रु = Tib. don, purpose. 185 
\ ह्रु = hsd (pp. 139, 186).

\ ह्रु = Tib. dom, bear. See also 
\ ह्रु = dam and also dom.

\ ह्रु = I (pp. 318–19). 213 
\ ह्रु = hbo; 260 ह्रान (lect.) 
\ ह्रु = (pp. 202, 232).

- (i) -hgu (a Suffix, pp. 190, 258).
\ ह्रु = 303, 304, 312 hguh (pp. 254, 
\ ह्रु = 257).

\ ह्रु = ह्रो. 37 hram.

\ ह्रु = dor, in stor-dor (hdor), 
\ ह्रु = q.v. 118, 127, 142, 161, 162, 
\ ह्रु = 163 stor; 209 ह्रा-rgye 
\ ह्रु = (pp. 213, 245, 253, 289, 361).
district. See also ḥrde. 213 ḥbehī-tyān (pp. 253, 270, 353).

rders = Tib. bdar, rdar, examine closely, or solder, timid? 107 ḥwār (p. 350).

rho = Tib. sīo, venture. See also ḥrdōho. 84 ḥuo-sto-gō (pp. 186, 259).

hrdāghī = ḥrdag, Tib. rdde, hrde, xmit, + hi. 214 ḥstsaḥ-ḥbrad (p. 253).

hrdan = rdān, hate, anger, q.v. 155 rke-ḥlaḥ (p. 305).

hrde = rdē, class, species, etc., q.v. -ḥlān (a Suffix, p. 183). 301 g-ri (p. 270).

hrdōho = rdō, venture, q.v. 165 ḥrkāh-miy (p. 296).

hrdānān. 202 ḥchā-hru." 


Ida, a Suffix = ḥlān, ḥlā, ḥlān, q.v. 84 ṭah (p. 183, cf. ḥkkab-ḥlān, p. 218).

Idan, rise, stick, prop, support = Tib. laḥ/laḥān. See also ḥldan (pp. 286-9). 80, 128 -rīzē; 343 -ḥdehi (pp. 227, 228, 256, 257).

-zyćer, supporting. See also ḥldan-zyzer. 65 (pp. 186, 228, 287).

Idān = Idā, Idā I, II, ḥlā, q.v. 43 ḥrān (pp. 313, 334).

Idir = ḥdir I, q.v. 328 ḥnāḥ-ḥpāq (pp. 196, 317).

Ide (not in text) (pp. 136, 147-8, 188-92). See hde, ḥdehi, ḥdehi.

Idehi (not in text) (pp. 133, 136, 188-92). See hdehi, etc.

Ideh (not in text) (pp. 134, 368). See Ide, etc.

Ido = ḥdō, ḥdōh, ḥdōhū, ḥdōho, q.v. 76 do (p. 139 dgr; 353 do (pp. 186, 322). See also dgu (1).

Idōn = don I, ḥdo, ḥdo, depārt, etc., q.v. 161 kyū (p. 253).

See also kyu, kkyu.

Idom = dam, ḥdom II, ḥdom I, bind, etc., q.v. 94, 95 gdim-chis, dim-tshis (pp. 320-1).

Idyn = ḥldyn, q.v. (pp. 331-3). 78 hjō; 178 -ḥkāh; 180 -glāb (pp. 179, 244).

Idyo = ḥldyo, q.v. See also Idyōhu. 140 -stor; 383 -ro (pp. 256, 326-8, 331).

Idyōnu (reading?) = ḥdnyon + o. ? = ḥny, ḥdnyan, or ḥndyōn? 318 ḥṣ-hnṭzān.

Idyōhu = ḥldyo, ḥldyo, ḥldyohu, q.v. 256 -ma-ḥbyoḥu (p. 327).

Gldag = ḥlāg, back, load, q.v. 32 ḥc-ṛya (p. 327); 136 -nag (pp. 259-60, 317).

Ida I, a Suffix (p. 183). See also Ida, Idā, ḥldān. Possibly derived from ḥlda II. 203 sō; 240 gse (p. 317).

II = Tib. da, there (p. 201). 5 ḥrān; 8 ḥraḥi; 195 -ḥko (pp. 201, 241).

ḥdag = Tib. ltag, back of neck; ṭān, load (pp. 259-60, 317). 45 ḥb-ḥdān; 52 -khri; 389 -ḥsag (p. 317).

-ṣag (ṣag), black-back = Yak. 112, 129 ḫng and ḫng (p. 317), 130, 132, 134, 135 (pp. 259-60, 291). See also ḥdag.

Ḥldān, rise, stick, prop, support = Tib. ḥnā, ḥnān, rise; ḡda, ḡda, ṭda, ṭeg, ṭack, ṭail (pp. 286-9).

See also ḥldān.


As attribute with ṭme 123, ḥgya 60 (?), ṭmaḥ 27 (?), ḥkhaṭ 198 (?), ṭlah 125, -ṭhe 139. See also ḥgry-ḥldān- ḥmmah and ḥwa(ḥwah)- ḥldān.

B. As Noun = stick, post, etc.; ṭmaḥ 27 (?), ḥgya 60 (?), ḥkhaṭ 198 (?), ḥhgy- ṭe 79,
VOCABULARY

143 (pyi), -myi-šeg 159 (pp. 145–6, 259, 286, 341, 345).

हल्दन-रा. 270 hwahe; 278 hwahe (pp. 178, 339).

हल्दनह written for हल्दाह or हल्दान.

हल्दान = Tib. lan, lon, lodon, glan, glon, rediate, repay, return (Trans. and Intrans.) (pp. 317–18). See also हल्दन. 187, 188, 189 हल्दन-re; 193 -re-mor-re; 264 (2) हल्दन-re; 273 हल्दन-re; 274 (2) हल्दन-re; 328 हल्दन-re; 377 हल्दन (pp. 297, 305, 317, 331).

हल्दाह I = Tib. हल्दाह, leaf, wing, &c. 12 -hde-bhe (p. 318).

II = Tib. हल्दाह, tab, cast, put, found, cf. rdebs, sdebs. See also हल्दाह. 197 मण (p. 318).

हल्दाम, tame, &c. = dam, हल्दाम, हल्दम, lodom, q.v. 187 (2), 188 -re (pp. 305, 317–18, 331).

हल्दाह I, a Suffix (p. 183) = lād, lādah, lāda, q.v. Cf. Tib. lādān; or derived from II? Appended to hko- 202; rke- 155; हकाह- 137; rne- 310; हर्ने- 303; हर्न- 301; हर्नब- 32; हर्नब-मा- 165; हपो- 358; रप- 286; हङाह- 170; ह्सर्न- 182; ह्सोम-र्न- 112; ह्सन- 33; ह्ससा-र्न- 249; ह्ससा-ह- 298; ह्सह- 382, 383; g-yog-200; हसह- 164.

II = हल्दाह II, Tib. da, there (p. 201). 6 हर्न-; 316 -hrag (7); 182 ह्सर्न- (pp. 313, 319, 323).

III = Tib. म्दाह, arrow = हल्दाह I, q.v. 278, 285 हतह-हो.

हल्दान = ह्सड, shicer, tremble, &c. q.v. 353 -ह्ससा-हर्न-; 30, 31, 32 ह्सह-ह, or is ह्सद हरे Locative of हल्दा I, हल्दा II (pp. 319–20).

हल्दास = Tib. हल्दाह, हल्दा, go beyond, pass. 83 ह्सो (p. 320).

हल्दी I = Tib. हळी, this. See also हळ, हळही. 115 हपो; 132 ह्सन, ह्रे; 133 ह्सह, ह्सह; 135 ह्सह; 137 ह्सर्न; 175 म्नो; 225, 236, 244, 246 ह्सह; 207 the-then; 87, 216, 237, 243, 246, 248 -rhged-hra; 104 -ह्सत; 108 हल्दाह.

II = Tib. क्ली, float, soar. See also ह्लद, ह्लदस. 63, 71, 144 -ह्सा-ह्ताह (p. 320).

III = Tib. क्ली, land, estate? 10 -क्ली (p. 329).

ह्लद = ह्लाह II. 160 ह्सन-ह्रेन (pp. 145–6, 217, 320).

ह्लदिह = ह्लाह III, land, q.v. 195 -ह्सल्द (pp. 201, 245, 329–30).

ह्लदिह I. Locative of ह्लाह, this, q.v. 117 ह्सतह; 229 शान-ह्स (7); 248 ह्सतह; 326 ह्सह-ह्सह (7); 328 शान-ह्स (7); 337 ह्सह (7); 341 र्न-ह्स (pp. 217, 222).

II = ह्लाह, from ह्लाह II, q.v. 174 स्वाह (229, 328, 337, 341? See under I (p. 320).

ह्लदिह I. Aorist of ह्लाह, q.v. 58 me-nah (pp. 320, 358).

ह्लदू = Tib. डूह, डूह, सुद, सुद, ह्सत, ह्सत, &c., collect, &c. (pp. 321–2). 14 ह्सतह; 19 ह्सो; 28 -सो; 70 -ह्सह (238)

ह्सह (p. 247).

ह्लदु = Tib. ह्सो, sit, remain? or sdug, dear, comely? or stug, wretched, afflicted? 103 the-

ह्से (p. 322).

ह्लदु = Tib. ह्स, assemble. 284 ह्स-ह्सह-ह्सह (7); 354 ह्स-ह्सह- г-ह्सह (p. 328, 321).

ह्सदु = Tib. गुद, gover. 44 ग्स (7)

51 -ह्सय; अर is this ह्सदु = ह्सद, anam? (pp. 322, 328).

ह्सद = Tib. ह्स, bde, lde, kde, happiness, high fortune, &c.; perhaps also lde, warm oneself. See also ह्सद I, ह्सदह, ह्सदह.

ह्सदह (pp. 278–9). 77 -ह्स; 370, 371 -ह्स (p. 309).

III = I, be good or necessary. 57 ह्सस-ह्स (p. 248).

ह्सदह I, q.v. 318, 319, 320, 321 -ह्सह, -ह्स, -ह्स (p. 318).
VOCABULARY

hldehe = ʰhldei, ʰhldhe 370, 372 -ge-ʰtaθ (pp. 278, 318).

hldo I, a Suffix = do I, ḥldo, ldo (pp. 186–7, 322–3). See also hldoθ (74, 77, 78, 114, 191, 309 ḫgvo; 155 ḡhagə; 177 ḫpo; 342 ḫkθ; 355 ḫhur; 375 ḫeθ-smeθ; 381 sl̥d (pp. 201, 222, 232, 256, 274, 282–3, 316, 327).

II, perhaps error for do-ldo (l. 78). 77 -hdoθ-θ [e].

hldog = Tib. log/lṭog, turn away, rebel, return (p. 323). 18 ḡyogə; 43, 44 smyiə; 142-stor (p. 323); 286 -hyah; 317 -hpo; 317 -g-yahə (pp. 224, 295, 323, 334).

hldon = doŋ I, ḥdoŋ I, ldoŋ, de- part, ḍec, q.v. 45 ḡbə; 82 ḫmog-reθ; 134 skoθ; 175 ḫuθ; 195 ḫldiθ; 214 ḫuθ; 253 ḫbaθ; 256 kroθ; 287, 291-4 ḫkyanə; 299 ḫseθ; 302, 303, 308, 310 (2), 311 ḫgə; 334 hroθ; 339 ḫkyuə (pp. 245, 270, 297, 298, 329, 338).

hldon, probably Imperative of hldan, return, repay, ḍec, q.v. 370 (2). 371 ḫlde-ge-ʰtaθ (370, 372 ḫlde-ge-ʰtaθ (pp. 278, 318).

hldom I = dam, ḥdom II, ḥdom, bind, ḍec, q.v. 9 ḫrath-hyoθ; 41, 143, 350 naθ; 66 ḫkahə; 259 ḫgə; 372 ḫkrug-kyaθ (pp. 145, 297, 299, 318–19).


hldoh, a Suffix = do I, ḥdo, ldo, hldo I, q.v. 154 bləθ (p. 222).

hldohu = Tib. lo, circle or troop? (pp. 322–3). See also hlo, hloθo, hroθo. 277 ḫjam-rθo; 300 ḫrimə; 319 ḫrim-reθ (pp. 265, 281).

hldoθ (p. 294). 110 ḫso-hŋə.

hldor, probably for hldo I (Suffix) + re (metre). 357 hldyə (p. 329).

dyə, water, flow = Tib. bṣaθ, moist. See also hldyə. 51 ḫkaθ-θe (pp. 328–9).

hldyən = Tib. bṣən, bṣənə, bṣaθ, raise, erect, rise up, opposed to zoθ, lower, deepened; gzoθ, valley, and perhaps connected with kliθ, fly, soar. "In the Nam language meanings may provisionally be classified as follows: (pp. 331–3). See also hdlən, hldyə.

A. rise fly, depart. 9, 13, 14, 19 hriθ; 10 ḫldi-ʰrkaθə; 12 htiθ; 13 ḫraθ; 14 ḫtan-ʰlduθ; 38 ḫdənə; 43 pra-ʰreθ; 48, 368 ḫse-ʰnəθ, ḫsehe-caθ (150, 161, 218, 243 hpuθ, but see also under C; 209 ḫphyuθ; 229, 237 ḫreθ-ʰkhyamθ; 365 ḫγyθerə; 282 naθ (?).


C. As Proper Name of a Hldyən = Tib. Hjaθ, people of the high (sc. Tang-hsiang) country. 271 -ma, -paθ; 365 -ḥkaθ; 369 -hgoθ-hdzin. (Here should be considered, as either denoted or hinted at, the occurrences with -hya (hyaθ), -hya-hyoθ and -hra, cited under B, and those with -hpu under A).

D. doubtful. 316 hyaθ; 144 ḫtaθ.

hldyə = hlaθ, water, flow, q.v. 356 -hldyə; 357 -hdləθ (p. 329).

hldyi, conceivably = Tib. bzu, four. 26 ḫhyə (p. 330).

hldyim I = dim, gdim, ḍec, evaporate, ḍec, q.v. 89 meθ; 274 -hste a Suffix, pp. 188–90 (pp. 321, 331).

II = Tib. žim, sweet? 255 ḫdzəθ (pp. 327, 331).

hldyiθ I, conceivably = Tib. ži, be allayed. 48 ḫhuθ-hṣəq (375 ḫg-sm-hldo-rgbayrθ (p. 330).

II = ḫldi I, this. 392 -rgyed-ḥraθ.

hldyəq, conceivably ‘quarter’ (of space) = Tib. gzogs = phyogs. 26 -ḥldyi (p. 330).

hldyo = Tib. hjo, bzos, hzo, gzo,
&c., cow, milk, to milk: used apparently in the senses of cattle, milk out (extract) and cattle country (also hldy-o-ro, equivalent to Tib. hbrog) (pp. 256-7, 326-8). See also ldyo, ldyohu, hldyoho. 16, 34, 50, 254 -htor, -tor; 36 -hrje; 162, 171 -hdorn; 172 meh2o; 304 ʰmaňo; 384 -bro (pp. 256-7, 267, 275, 326-7).

hldyň, low country = Tib. ʰon, ghson, correlative to hldyaň, q.v. 387 -ro (pp. 331-2).

hldyoho = ldyo, hldyo, q.v. 355 ʰnu-hldo (pp. 256, 327).

N

na I, a Postposition = Tib. na, appended to A: Nouns, &c., with the signification ‘in’; B: Subordinate clauses stating circumstances; C: Sentences, with signification as in B, but more general and vague (this being so), as a Particle of transition or even of termination (cf. Sanskrit iti) (pp. 179-81, 194). A 58 (2) me²; 107, 154 (p. 194). B 50, 51, 52, 54, 56, 98, 103, 124, 147, 169, dec. 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, 333, 360, 361, 369, 382, and possibly other instances.

II = Tib. gnas, place (pp. 237-8). See also ʰnah, ʰnah, and ʰnah, ʰnah. 41, 143, 350 -hdorn; 53 -he; 56, 96 -ge; 86 -spe; 100 -rom; 107 -hrom; 358 -hgo, -hgon (?) 365 so² (pp. 238, 297, 299).

III = Tib. na, sickness? 156 -rog; 254 hmyrio (pp. 259, 328). See also ʰnah II.

IV = Tib. na, meadow? or merely = na II? 33 -htsaň (pp. 239, 275).

nag I = Tib. ʰaň, speech, voice (p. 360). See also ʰnag I. 199 ʰnær²; or nag, block? 202 ʰne² (?); 262 ʰraň² (??); 276, 278 ʰdzam² (pp. 283, 313, 314).

II = Tib. nag, gnag, black. See also gnag, ᵇnag II. 129, 130, 132, 134, 135, 136 ʰldag², ʰgldag² (pp. 242, 259-60, 342).

III = Tib. mags, cash? See also ᵇnag III. 234 ʰglaň².

naň I = Tib. naň, within (pp. 229-30). See also ʰnaň. 104, 115, 236 -re; 305 -hyu; 352 -pa; 354 -hwar (pp. 217, 252, 285).

II = Tib. naň, to-morrow? 181 -gsaň (pp. 156, 229-30).

nad = Tib. nad, disease. 193, 194 gso² (p. 238).

nar, probably = Tib. ʰnr, strength, grim, strong, rather than nar, snar, long. 49 ᵇram²; 72 pa²; 239 ᵇgrah-nu² (pp. 313, 361). See also ᵇnhr.

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 ʰnip.

nu I, strength, ability = Tib. nus. See also ᵇnu I, ᵇnus (p. 237). 239 ᵇgrah² (p. 313).

II, probably = young, cf. Tib. nu, younger, opposite of phu. 359 -glaň. See also ᵇnu II.

ne, good = Gyařing ka-sm, &c. See also ᵇne (pp. 221-3). 66, 160 ʰmán²; 113 ʰtries²; 141 ʰrnie-hldaň²; 152 g-yah-htsa²; 202 -hcern; 206 ᵇrye²; 269 ᵇhwaň²; 301 ᵇrne²; 317 ᵇwaň (pp. 221-2, 228, 270, 274, 318, 321, 338, 339, 359).

nehu = nu II, in sense of 'new', or = ne. 41 ᵇgwâ²; 74 ᵇkhu², wehr²; 257 -bso-bos; 258 ᵇhwaň (pp. 250, 302).

nehe, perhaps onomatopoetic, 'bleat'. 275 twaň-hdzam² (p. 343).
no'bu. 41 háudé.

nor = Tib. nor, property, etc. (pp. 361-2). 151 -šso (pp. 224-5, 241). See also hnor II.

gnag = nag II, black, q.v. 129 hldagé (p. 263).

gnä'h, place = na II and hnah I, q.v. (pp. 237-9). 69, 70 laö; 179 -göö; 280 -ma-dwanä; 281 hldyan-maö; 367 -hgoö (pp. 193, 247, 342).

hna = na II, hnah I, gnah, q.v. 68 -hiam (p. 238).

gnag I = nag I, speech, etc., q.v. 104 -hšhah, speech-deputy (p. 360).

II = nag II, black, q.v. 112 hldagö; 162, 171 hdomö; 267 hkoö (pp. 253, 260, 263, 291, 327).

III = nag III, cash, q.v.? 232, 233 hglahö.

hnañ = nañ, within, q.v. 188 hña; 189 (2) -hdro; 225, 244, 305, 308, 311 -re (pp. 231–2, 252, 285, 337).

-ra = hñañ, g.v., -re (p. 229).

hndad. 46 re-maö.

hnan? = Tib. nan, pressure, urgency; gnun, press, suppress, or snun, augment? 281 stüm-hknñ-geö; 350 ḡcnñ-hť取得了-geö; 351 ḡšehe-hți-geö (p. 186).

hnnam I = Tib. nnam, nam, sky. 5, 6, 8, 37 ḡñañ-hldnah (hídaö) (p. 246).

II = Tib. ŋrams, damaged, weakened, destroyed. 83 ḡnram-ḥte-hšah; 126 ḡdkañ-krñaö; 259 ḡpah-ḥrgmö (pp. 262, 288–9, 361).

III = Tib. ŋams, thought, soul, spirit, courage. 145 -hdzamö (pp. 261, 299-300, 361).

hnhah I = na II, gnah, hña, place, q.v., or confused with nañ, home, q.v. 33 -hrñañ (?); 40 -me; 99 ḡtsog; 113 -hpun; 191 gdagö; 391 -hdi, ḡyagö (pp. 233, 228–9, 244, 291–3, 284, 315, 346). See also so(hso)-hnhah (hña, na).

II = na III, sickness, q.v. 261 -hdañ; 120 ḡtsog-ḥramö (pp. 230, 262, 283, 291–2).

III spring (season) = Mo-so ni? 159 -hčos (pp. 145–6).

hnar = nar, strength, grim, etc., q.v. or possibly = Tib. gner, provide, execute (?) (p. 361).

112 hkläñ-hkläñö; 224 g-wah-ħšañaö; 233 glab-hładö; 243 gse-hładö (pp. 250, 343, 361).

hrñi = ni? o re? 80 smyö (p. 227).

hrn I = nu I strength, ability, etc. q.v. 72 ḡši-bröö; 241–2 smyö, thñaö (pp. 237, 342).

II = nu II, q.v. 174 (2), 175–6, 179, 359–60, 366 -gañ.

hnus. Aorist of ḡnu = Tib. no suckle (or drip?). 16, 34 ḡldyö-ḥ₃tor-geö; 40 ḡldyögeö (pp. 275, 327, 328, n. 1).

hrne = ne, good, q.v. 86 -rheä; 146 -rheö; 155 -rheö; 170 ḡñañ-hldñhö; 382 ḡdza-hldñhö (pp. 221–2, 275, 288, 316).

hnên = Tib. ŋên, dangerous. 210 hwañ-taö (p. 361).

hrner = Tib. gner, procure, seek for? 7, 20 ḡsogö (p. 361).

hrno = Tib. no in g-yul-ńo, battle front (ńo)? 58 (2) magö (pp. 194, 300–1). See also hnor II.

hrnoñ, possibly = Tib. noñ, grieve, or gnun, be ashamed. 134 ḡkhogö.

hnnom = Tib. nom, enjoyments, possession, etc.; snun, grasp (p. 277). 151 śid-rgañaö; 155 ḡwañö; 165 -hsam; 209 ḡnomta (p. 335).

hnor = Tib. nor, err, foolish. 163 ḡnor(-rje); 314, 315 -hdaññ; 317 -hdog; 366 g-yeö (pp. 224–5, 228, 262, 323, 332, 338–9).

II, for hno-re in mag-ńnor; 48–9, 145, 184 (pp. 194, 299–301).

hrnab = Tib. mnab, mnabs, food; rñañ, be hungry; brnab, covet. 32 -hldññ, a Suffix, p. 183? 165 -ma-hldññ (p. 296).

Appended to Verbs or Action-words, ḫa'nā 151, ke'hu (ḵekhu, gehju, ḫe) 176, 177, 178, 360, 361, 362, 366, ḫko'hu 166, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174, 177, 180, 359, 361, sko 91, ḫkob 322, ḫnom-ta 209, ḫtas 122, 148, 257, stōr 79, 128, ḫdro 170, gsu 65: also to 'rē, evil, 341; ḫno-hdān, 258, face-rest; stōn-hpōn, an office, 321.

plan = Tib. plan/sraṇ, street, straight, and so 'line' (pp. 241-2). See also ḫplan, phlān. 182 -na; 195 -hpāh (p. 155-6).

plīm-plam, let loose? (p. 192). 120 ḫsaṭ (pp. 291-2).


hpā (read ḫpā?) = pa, brave, etc. ! 187 hrāṣa.

hpqā, low, cf. Tib. dpag, measure, depth (pp. 195-6, 226, 234). See also rpāq, hrpqā. 326, 328 ḫqāla; 384 ḫqāh (pp. 226, 239).

hpān I = Tib. bphēn, bphpās, etc., throw. 283 -tsa-ge.

II = Tib. pa'n, ṣpan, ṣpa'n, lap. See also pha'n, phpān. 290 ḫrīḥ (!!) 291, 308 g-ri (!!); 324 ḫ-yah (pp. 298, 263, 270, 298, 340).

III = Tib. bphās, ḫpās, ṭpās, height? 290, 291, 308 (?). See under II.

IV, conceivably = Tib. dpān, witness. See also pwan. 101 ḫrān-war.

hpāh I = pa, brave, hero, q.v. See also pāhī. 36 -hro'n-hkes; 185 ma (!!); 205 -rmag; 259 -hr̥gām; 305, 306 ḫbrad-re; 374 -hr̥; 377 -hdān-hro; 388 ḫrtaḥ (pp. 231, 239, 254, 262, 269, 280, 300).

II. See mehī, ḫmehī. 272 ḫmehī.

bpāli, bphāhī. See bphēī. 211 ṭmy (!!); 384 ldyo-rohọ (pp. 282, 327, 331).

hpār = bphar, q.v. 289 ḫgamo (p. 293).
VOCABULARY

\(\text{ḥpu} \ I = \text{man, male. See also } \text{ḥpur, ḥphu I, ḥbu II (pp. 216-17, 308).} \) 29 ḥtor\(^{\circ}\) ḥbgur; 64 tor\(^{\circ}\); 65 ḥnō-[h]e[?]htsah\(^{\circ}\); 150 ḥdyaṭ\(^{\circ}\); 157 ḥbrōn; 161, 218, 343 ḥdyaṭ\(^{\circ}\); 140 ḥbps; 266 ḥbos; 289, 322 ḥgar\(^{\circ}\); 381 ḥlobo \(^{\circ}\) [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 ḥbu = Tib. bu, son, child. 183 -ge; 184 ma\(^{\circ}\) (p. 301).

IV. 83 ḥso\(^{\circ}\) ḥkam.

\(\text{ḥpwd = Tib. phud, ḥphud, ḥbud, blow out, drive out? phud, an instant. 28 } \text{-ḥto. See critical note.} \)

\(\text{ḥpun} \ ? \) cf. Tib. sbun-gter, hollow, vain? 210 ḥmo-ta\(^{\circ}\) (p. 245).

\(\text{ḥpuḥ} = \text{Tib. ḥphu, ḥbud, etc., blow (pp. 284-5). See also } \text{ḥphu II, ḥpuḥi.} \) 274 ḥdyaṭ\(^{\circ}\) -ste\(^{\circ}\); 282 -ḥpuḥi (p. 331).

\(\text{ḥpur, for ḥpu I, q.v.} \) +re (pp. 173-5). 163 ḥbri-ḥšeḥ\(^{\circ}\) (pp. 216-17).

\(\text{ḥpul, cf. Tib. phul, handful; phul-tu, at a climax; phul-byun, perfected. See also } \text{ḥphul.} \) 15, 51 ḥṣan-ma\(^{\circ}\) (p. 267).

\(\text{ḥpus.} \) 298 ḥphya (p. 359).

\(\text{ḥpeg = ḥphyegs, q.v. 360 swalḥ\(^{\circ}\).} \)

\(\text{ḥpeḥi, apparently = Tib. dpe, sample (exemplar), and confused with spa, ornament (pp. 282, 349).} \) 211 myi\(^{\circ}\); 333 ḥdzw\(^{\circ}\); 384, 386, 387 ḥro\(^{\circ}\) (pp. 274, 331). See also ṣpeḥi, ḥpeḥi, spa, spe, speḥi.

\(\text{ḥpo I = po, male, man, q.v. See also } \text{ḥpho.} \) 115 -ḥlī; 177 -ḥlīdo, a Suffix, pp. 186-7; 358 -ḥlīdah, a Suffix, p. 183; 361 -ḥīe; 393 -ḥdam (? (pp. 217, 229, 274, 316, 335). \)

\(\text{II = Tib. spo, ḥpho, change, alter, migrate. 46 ḥgo\(^{\circ}\); 48 ḥṣi\(^{\circ}\); 122 ḥtṣog-hram\(^{\circ}\) (pp. 226, 251, 286, 292).} \)

\(\text{III, perhaps = Tib. pho, belly, in } \)

317 ḥpo-hrbom: cf. po-rbom (ḥrbom), ḥbo-bon (ḥbon), ḥbom-rbo (pp. 224, 323).

IV. See ḥpho.

\(\text{ḥpog = Tib. ḥphog, hit (with a missile). See also } \text{ḥphog.} \) 59 ḥdah\(^{\circ}\) (p. 343).

\(\text{ḥpōn I = Tib. phōn, phōnas, poor, needy, etc.} \) 113 ḥnāḥ\(^{\circ}\) (pp. 233, 238, 297).

II, for Tib. ḫpon, master, chief, in 321 stōṭ\(^{\circ}\) (p. 362).

\(\text{ḥpod. perhaps = tremble. 14 } \text{spo.} \)

\(\text{ḥpom = Tib. pham, ḥpham, be defeated. See also } \text{ḥphom.} \) (p. 367). 347 ḥrneḥe-ḥnō-ge\(^{\circ}\) (p. 219).

\(\text{ḥpho.} \) 28 ḥwār-ḥwār (p. 341).

\(\text{ḥpor = por I, release, q.v. Tib. ḥbor, cast, abandon. See also } \text{phor II, ḥphor.} \) 68 ḥbūr; 175 ḥnū-ghāḥ (pp. 250, 268, 319).

\(\text{ḥpos = ḥbos, grown, big, q.v.} \) 141 ḥpū (pp. 231, 297).

\(\text{ḥpyāḥ = Tib. ḥpya, ḥphya, rebuke; ḥpya, tax (= phya, ḥphya ?).} \) 328 ḥkāḥ (pp. 315, 317).

\(\text{ḥpyi, perhaps = Tib. ḥbyi, g-yi, } \text{lynx.} \) 333 ḥrkom\(^{\circ}\) (p. 305).

\(\text{ḥpyid = Tib. ḥpyid, ḥphyid, suffice or wipe away. See also } \text{ḥphiyd.} \) 339 stor-ḥdeḥi\(^{\circ}\); 344 ḥdān-ḥdehi\(^{\circ}\) (pp. 253, 256).

\(\text{ḥpyed = Tib. ḥpyed, ḥbye, phye, dybe, be separated, divided, opened. See also } \text{ḥphyped, ḥbye.} \) 208 ḥṭahar-ḥde\(^{\circ}\) (p. 234).

\(\text{ḥpra = Tib. pra, phra, prognostic ? Cf. phra, minute ? See also pra and } \text{ḥphrah.} \) 267 -ḥre.

\(\text{ḥprān = Tib. ḥphraḥ, narrow, ledge; ṣprān, beggar. 368 ḥrīṭ\(^{\circ}\) (p. 239).} \)

\(\text{ḥprah = Tib. ḥpha, kīch, or phra, small ? See also pra, ḥphrah.} \) 254 ḥyog\(^{\circ}\); 331 ḥrkom-ḥbroṭ\(^{\circ}\); 332 ḥklū; 333 ḥrkom-ḥpyi\(^{\circ}\); 335 ḥṭhe\(^{\circ}\) (p. 305).

\(\text{ḥpro = Tib. ḥphro, spo, expand, progress, rejoice. 181 -ḥro; 245, 246 -ḥbo-hbon (p. 156).} \)
hprom = prom, Auxiliary Verb, q.v. 128, 169, 209, 321, 322, 341, 359, 360.

hproms, Aorist of hprom, prom, q.v. 122 ḡtas (p. 281, 292).

hplaṅ = plañ, street, q.v. 356 -ḥdraṅ (p. 241).

ṛpaṅ, low or made low. See ṣpāṅ and also ṣrpaṅ. Perhaps sometimes ‘deep’ or ‘depth’ (Ṭib. ḡpaṅ) (pp. 225–6). 135 ḡkar; 192 ḡkar; 193 ḡnaḥ-ḥtsu; 194 gso-nad; 208 ḡkaṅ-ḥiṅg; 210 ḡnaṅ-rge; 240 ḡiṅ-ḥlād; 245 gse-lad; 252 ḡaṅ (p. 183, 196, 234, 238, 243, 245, 274, 305).

ṛpu. See p. 350. 91 ḡtsog (p. 332).

ṛpeṅ = ṭeb. dpe, sample. See ḡpeṅ, ḡṛpeṅ. 286 ḡḥlaṅ, a Suffix, p. 183 (p. 323).

ḥṛpaṅ = ṣrpaṅ, q.v. 17 ḡkaṅ (p. 332).

ḥṛpaṅ = ṣrpaṅ, q.v. 17 ḡkaṅ (p. 332).

ḥṛpaṅ = ṣrpaṅ, q.v. 17 ḡkaṅ (p. 332).

ḥṛpaṅ = ṣrpaṅ, q.v. 17 ḡkaṅ (p. 332).

—I ḡkhor, down-bowed. 6 (p. 226).

ḥṛpeṅ = ṣrpeṅ, q.v. 169 ḡṛgām (pp. 244, 233).

ḥṛpoḍ = ṭeb. spod, vow, or phod, cope with, or ḣbod, bos, challenge, fight? 250 ḡbod (p. 349).

lṣvyoḥo = ṭeb. ḡphyō, be agitated, wave? (p. 354). 22 ḡmar-may (p. 348).

ṣpa = ṭeb. spa, ornament. See also ṣpeṅ, ḡpeṅ. 151 meb (p. 356).

ṣpu-rбу = ṭeb. ḡpu-gu, some small bird, or ṣpur, ḡphur, fly (p. 350).

ṛgoṅ (p. 232).

spe = ṣpe, q.v. (pp. 282, 356). 140 ḡhi-stor; 200 ḡdzaṅ; 379 ḡe (p. 323).

spo I = ṭeb. spo, height, summit. 14 -ḥpod-pod; 381 -ṛo? (p. 265).

IIP = ṭeb. spo, ḡpho, change, migrate, pass away. See also ḡpaṅ, ḡṭhaṅ, q.v. 357 -ṭar (p. 356). 126 ḡlaṅ- kvp (p. 288–9).

ṣpyi = ṭeb. ṣpyi, general, top, chief. 110 ḡdze (p. 335).

ṣpye, summer = ṭeb. ḡbyar Mo-so jë? (p. 333). 159 -chos; 148 ḡtor; 190 ḡso (pp. 145–6, 240, 285–6, 302).

Ph

phañ = ṭbaṅ II, lap, &c., q.v. 111 ḡbom-ṛbo (p. 230).

phu, conceivably = ḡpu IV, q.v. 130 -ḥkam.

phor I = pho+re. Cf. por II. 295 ḡtsa (p. 333).

II = por I, ḡpor, q.v. See also ḡphor. 359 nu- znaleź (p. 250).

phya = ḡphyah (? 204 ḡpy (p. 353).

phyaṅ = ḡnya, suspended, &c., q.v. 348 ḡtaṅ; 374 ḡtar (pp. 248, 343).

phyaṅ = ḡnya, suspended, &c., q.v. 348 ḡtaṅ; 374 ḡtar (pp. 248, 343).

phyaṅ = ḡnya, suspended, &c., q.v. 348 ḡtaṅ; 374 ḡtar (pp. 248, 343).

phyaṅ = ḡnya, suspended, &c., q.v. 348 ḡtaṅ; 374 ḡtar (pp. 248, 343).

phye = ṭeb. ḡbyed, phye, &c., divided, opened. See also ḡpyed, ḡphyed. 120 ḡtsog-ṛram (p. 354). 145 ḡho (pp. 291–2, 299–300).

phye = ṭeb. ḡbyed, phye, &c., divided, opened. See also ḡpyed, ḡphyed. 120 ḡtsog-ṛram (p. 354). 145 ḡho (pp. 291–2, 299–300).

phyer = pyar, phyar, lift, hoist, q.v. 254 ḡlaṅ; 261 ḡhañ; 340 ḡma-swañ; 342 ḡtsa-ḥtsi (pp. 239, 283, 287, 353).

phrom = prom, Auxiliary Verb, q.v. See also ḡphrom. 172 ḡkoṅ (p. 254).

phlan = plañ, ḡplañ, street, q.v. 357 -ṭar (p. 356). 126 ḡlaṅ- kvp (p. 288–9).

ṭpaṅ, father = ṭeb. ḡpa. See also ḡpha, ḡṭhaṅ. 60 ḡa (p. 145).

ṭpyaṅ, Aorist of ḡpyaṅ, q.v. 101 ḡkoṅ-ḥko (pp. 196, 264).

ṭpha = ṭeb. ḡpha, father. See also ḡphāṅ, ḡṭhāṅ. 60 ḡu-ḥu (p. 356). 126 ḡlaṅ- kvp (p. 288–9).
VOCABULARY

ḥphag I = Tib. ḫag, pig. 69 -la-gnaḥ (pp. 193, 247).

II [cf. Tib. ḫhags, elevated, or phag, hidden part, interstice, or phag-rags, rampart? so-phag, brick-work. 238 -ḥbaḥ-ge.

ḥphage. See ḫpha-ge. 184.

ḥphan = ḫpaṇ II and III, q.v. See also phan. 302 ḫriḥi (pp. 178, 263).

ḥphan = Tib. phan, benefit. 215 ḫstu-tu².

ḥphah I = ḫpha, father, q.v. 38 ḫryo²; 73 -ma; 199 -ramaḥ (pp. 274, 320).

II = pa, ḫpaḥ, ḫphaḥ I, brave, q.v.² 151 ḫphoh; 304 ḫyaḥ-ḥdaṭu²; 314 ḫḥog-re² (p. 280).

III² 275 ḫdaṭu²-ğsom²; 364 ḫtom².

-ḥphah, laugh. 348 ḫweg-hweṭu² (pp. 248, 343).

ḥphahha, miswriting of ḫphah²). 275.

ḥphar = Tib. phar, beyond; ḫphar, be elevated (go away). See also ḫpar. 93, 99, 110, 118 ḫgamtu²; 142 mor-gdагu²; 157 na-rogu²; 187 ḫraḥ-ḥpaḥu²; 388 ḥrtah-ḥphahu² (pp. 239, 243, 326).

ḥphu I = ḫpu I, man, male, q.v. 62 ḫtőr²; 49 ḫṣeg (?I) (pp. 308, 330).

II = Tib. phu, phus, ḫbud, dbu, blow (the ḫire, &c.). See also ḫphuʿi, pu (ḥphuḥ)-glo, ḫlim-ḥphu. 104 ḫu²; 301 ḫlim-u²; 352 -ḥphu (pp. 157, 270, 285, 321).

- (I)² -ḥbos = ḫpu (I), ḫbos (hpos), q.v. 40, 167.

-(II)² -ḥklo, bellew = pu-glo, q.v. 40 (pp. 239, 284).

ḥphuhi = ḫphu I+hi. 190 -ḥtǒn; 276 ḫdžam² (pp. 228, 285).

ḥphul = ḫpul, handful, at a climax, q.v. 41 ḫud-nuḥu².

ḥphe = Tib. ḫphen, throw away, or phe, weak² 317 ḫwa-ne² (pp. 338-9).

ḥpho = po, ḫpo I, male, q.v. 117 -ḥdhr-htsag (p. 217).

ḥphog = ḫpog (Tib. ḫphog), hit with a missile, q.v. (p. 343). 151 ḫphaḥu².

ḥhom = ḫhom (Tib. pham, ḫamam), be defeated, q.v. 147 -te-ḥdṛu (pp. 299-300).

ḥhor = phor II, por I, ḫpor I, release, &c., q.v. 186  ḫhi-ḥmir²; 183, 353 ḫdrō² (pp. 276, 319, 332).

ḥphyag = Tib. phyag, hand; phyag-byed, salute, &c. See also ḫphyag. 106 ḫkhoḥu².

ḥphyar = pyar, pyer, phyer, lift, hoist, q.v. 126 ḫdau²; 341 -ma-ḥswu (pp. 287, 344).

ḥphyid = ḫpyid, suffice, wipe away, q.v. 340 ḫṣt-hdeḥi² (p. 253).

ḥpyu = pyu². 208 ḫhdyaḥ.

ḥphyegs = ḫpeg, q.v. 176 ḫswa².

ḥphyed = ḫpyed, be separated, opened, &c., q.v. See also ḫphye. 208 ḫṛṣ-ṛgo².

ḥphyo, cf. ḫpyoḥo² 375 ḫli.

ḥphraḥ = ḫprah (Tib. = kick²). 255 ḫdrān-re².

ḥphrom. Auxiliary Verb = prom, ḫprom, ḫprom, ḫprom, phrom, q.v. 171 ḫkhoḥu².

B

baṇ = Tib. ḫbaṇas, a subject or servant? See also ḫban I. 249 -ḥreḥe; 252 -ṛpag (pp. 274).

baḥ = Tib. ba, cow? 47 ḫbeḥi² (p. 286).

beg, only in the Proper Name ḩes (Hșes)-beg (ḥbeg), possibly related to the rbeg, rba-ga of Tseḥ-hgi-rhag, &c., p. 134. See also ḩbeg. 24 ḩes²; 5 ḩes² (pp. 138, 224, 306-7).

bon = ḫbon, in ḫbo-ḥbon, q.v. 238 ḫbo² (p. 230).

bos I = ḫbos, brown, big, q.v. See also ḫbo I. ḫbom, ḫbo, ḫbom, ḫbo, ḫbom. 42, 43 -ṣmyi; 378 -ṣmyi-hdlog?] (pp. 322-3, 334).

byi small = 'Nam-pa' pyi (p. 132) ḫsi-ḥșia ḫbiḥu, &c. See also
VOCABULARY

hbvi (pp. 252, 265). 98 ḥmo-
-cha²; 147 ḥmaḥo (p. 300).

byin = ḥbyin, sink, dc., q.v. 97
ḥbom⁰, ḥmö-hchah⁰ (pp. 342, 345).

byin = Tib. sbyin, gift, charity;
byin, a blessing, a good. See also
ḥbyin.

— ta (taḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182-3).
105-6 (p. 315).

byu-re, for byur-re, Tib. byur, ill
luck, wretched, dc. 108 mo-
-ḥa⁰ (p. 221).

bräh = Tib. bra, plenty; ḥbras,
rice; ḥbras-bu, fruit: also Proper Name (Dbra) of an ancient,
legendary, tribe. See also ḥbra,
ḥbraḥ, ḥbrahr. 228 -ḥraḥ
(pp. 215-16, 319-20).

bri I = Tib. ḥbri, bri, dbri,
diminish, grow less; phri, ḥḥpri,
dpri, diminish, reduce. See also
ḥbri I (pp. 215-16). 156
rmaḥ⁰; 292 rmaḥ⁰.

See also ḥbri II. 329 -gše
(pp. 216-17).

brehe = Tib. bred, be alarmed,
dejected, ashamed. See also
ḥbres. 44 ṣeṣ-hṣi⁰ (p. 322).

bro = Tib. ḥbros, flee, escape. See
also ḥbro I. 108 ḥho⁰ (p. 221).

brom = Tib. hgrum, pinch or nip
off; grum-po, cripple. (p. 366).
72 ṣiṣo-ḥnu (p. 342). See also
ḥbrom.

bla = Tib. bla, upper, highest,
superior. 154 ḥlṣḥo, a Suffix,
pp. 186-7 (p. 222).

gbaḥu, from ḥbo I (Tib. ḥbo, dc.,
overflow, swell, grow), q.v. 181
ḥḥa-ta⁰ (pp. 156, 231, 313).

gbaḥ, from bhān = Tib. len, bhān,
get, receive (possibly confused
with glaḥ I, q.v., from the same
root). 265 ḥḤon-ta⁰ (p. 219).

bbyam, Aorist of ḥbyam (= Tib.
ḥbyam, flow over, spread;
byams, kindness), q.v. 253 me⁰
(p. 274).

ḥba = Tib. dbah, rba, billows;
dbah-rlabs-can-ma, hill torrent.

See also ḥbaḥ I. 54 ṭḥañ⁰
(p. 352).

ḥbaḥ I = baḥ, subject, servant, q.v.
67, 251-re, ḥre, ḥrebe; 67, 371.
373, 386, 390 -ḥko-ḥtar, q.v.;
253 -ḥlṣḥo; 363 -kwa-kwa (†)
(pp. 268, 274, 331, 346 n.).

II = Tib. dbah, power, authority.
39 hgyaid (†)-go⁰; 170 ḥḥaḥ,
a Suffix, p. 183; 172 -prom; 252
g-ṛi⁰ (†); 354 ḥḥiḥu (†) (pp.
257, 275, 316, 321, 345, 346).

— (II) -ṭwaḥ = Tib. ḥbaḥ-thaḥ,
might, fortune, destiny. 97
-byin (pp. 342, 347).

ḥbab = Tib. bab, ḥbab, dbah, fall,
descend, alight; ḥbab-chu, river,
torrent. 15 ḥmar⁰; 357 sko⁰
(p. 267).

ḥbaḥ I = ḥba, billows, dc., q.v.
(also ‘rocking in 45): derived
from II ? 45 ḥlaḥg⁰; 51 ḥmar⁰;
55 -ḥrāg-ḥkyer (p. 317).

II = Tib. ḥbaḥ, seizure, distraint
(perhaps originally pressure, cf.
ḥbaḥ-cha, less, sediment). 110
ḥro-ḥbehi⁰; 234 ḥṣṣag-ḥro-
-ḥbehi⁰; 235 ḥbe⁰ (pp. 293-4).

III ? 239 ḥpḥag⁰; 270 -ḥbom-rbo
(p. 230).

ḥbar I = Tib. bar, dbar, interval,
between. 97, 98 (pp. 262, 342,
345).

II for ḥbaḥ (II)+re. 18 ḥyorgan-
ḥloog⁰; 234 ḥṣṣag-ḥro-ḥbehi⁰
(pp. 250, 339).

ḥbu I =Tib. ḏbu, head. 47-ḥrūg; 68
-hpor (pp. 250, 258, 286, 319).

II = ḥpū I, ḥpū I, man, q.v. 33
ḥtōr⁰ ḥgru (p. 308).

III = Tib. ḏhu, high part of valley.
15 -rwye; 50 -rbye (p. 267).

ḥbe, sheep (p. 249). See also ḥbehi.

ḥbehe. 235 -ḥbaḥ; 390 -ḥbaḥ ?
(pp. 293-4).

ḥbeg = beg, q.v. 7, 8, 20, 23, 25
ḥṣes⁰, ṣes⁰ (pp. 138, 224, 306-7).

ḥbehi = ḥbe, ḥbehe, q.v. 47-ḥbaḥ;
69 -la-ḥgar; 110 -ḥbaḥ; 213
-tyaḥ; 234 -ḥbaḥ and -ḥbar
(pp. 193, 247, 249, 250, 253,
286, 293).
hbehe = hbe, hbehi, q.v. 46 -hali-
rmnañ (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 gboñu, rbo,
hrobo, hbon, hbon, hboñ,
rbon, hrbon. 126 stor-hguo;
163 sriö (1); 263 g-rañ-nagö (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)-
rbon, hbom-rbo. 238, 243,
245, 246 (p. 230).

hboğ = Tib. hbag, hbags, dbag,
shag, sbogs, desfile, be defiled, be
submerged. 256 hrag-maö; 283
rag-hdah-taö ni (pp. 147, 173).
See also hwag.

hbad = Tib. hbad, watch, be alert,
take care; hbad, call out, en-
deavour. See also hwad. 313
hnom-hsoö (p. 340).

hbbon. See hbo-hbon.

hbom, big, bigness. See hbo, hbo-
bon: also rbom, hrbon. 73
smyö; 97 -byin (pp. 236, 345).

— rbo = hbo-hbon, q.v., grow big.
111 (2), 112, 270 (pp. 230).

hboñ, etymologically Aorist of hbo I,
swell up, grow: usually signify-
ing big man, with or without the
term hpu, hphu, etc., man
(pp. 231). See also bos, hpos.
41 hphuoö; 164 -hseah-hdah and
-hnom-hseah; 167 hphuoü; 213
-hdom; 250 hroñdö; 266 hpuö;
287 -g-yah-hthannah; 290 -g-ri; 291
-hrihi; 293 -hrihi, hpuñuo; 330
hpuñuoö (pp. 260, 277, 278, 297,
298).

hbyam = Tib. hbyam, byams, flow
over, be widespread (abound);
byams, kind. 225, 231, 237,
244 hlañö; 253 hyah-meö, hlab-
meö; 353 hwah-hrahö (p. 274).

hbyi, small, become small = Hsi-
hsia dibñ, hbbi, hbbih (pp. 132,
252): perhaps = Tib. hbyi,
dbiñ, wipe out. See also rbyi,

—hbyiñ, 50 hçe-hraö; 75 dgnu-
hñtorö; 167 -hri; 305, 307, 308,
311 gduñ-gxuö (pp. 252, 265,
273, 276, 337, 338),

hbyiñ = Tib. hbyiñ, sink, grow
faint; byiñs, depth, etc. See
also byiñ. 56 hçe-hrahö; 57
me-ñaö; 96 na-goö (p. 345).

hbyên = byin, blessing, etc, q.v.
57 rgyan-heoö (p. 312).

—hbyim connected with shyim, q.v.
266 -ge-g-yah; 363 hnu-lom-
geö.

hbyiñ = hbyi, q.v. 84 cis-tshaö
(p. 359).

hbye, perhaps connected with hpyed,
hpyed, q.v. 131 rñö; 223
hton-hkonö.

—hby Gwen = Tib. byo, hbyo, pour
out? 256 Idyohu-maö (pp. 327,
331).

hbra = brab, q.v. See also hbrañ,

— hbrañ.

— hlda(r), probably name of a
place, real or mythical, 31, 32
(p. 319).

hbrad = Tib. hbrab, snatch (pp.
253–4). 213 ñtsañö; 305 -re;
306 -re, sta, a Suffix, pp. 182–3,
359; 312 hjuñö (pp. 231,
253–4).

hbrañ = hbrañ, brañ, be plentiful,
dec., q.v. 269 hwah-neö (p. 339).
See also hbrañ.

— hlda(r) = hbrañ, q.v. 30 (pp.
319–20).

— hbrañ for hbrañ-re (p. 123). 254
hdañ-phyerö (p. 287).

— hbrañ = hbrañ, q.v. 132 -h-ñ
-thannah; 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 hpuö (11); 163
-hšebe; 324 -hdoñu-kyin; 381
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-slod-hido (pp. 138, 216-18, 275, 338).

ḥbrus = Tīb. ḥbru, brus, probe, irritate, inflame. 133 skō (p. 316).

ḥbres. Aorist of brehe, be alarmed, etc. q.v. 176 kebu-promō.

ḥbro I = bro, flee, etc., q.v. 36 hldyo-brje; 138 ḥḍzhēru-je; 139 ḥḍai-rdza; 24 ḥchab-ḥyarā; 345 ḥṭhaḥ (pp. 218, 228, 230, 244, 287, 335).

II = Tīb. bro, taste, have a taste, be felt as. See also ḥbroḥo. 221, 222, 297, 313, 316, 318, 323, 325 ḥkru, ḥkruḥu; 221 ḥklu = ḥkru (pp. 228-9, 296-7).

ḥbroṇ = Tīb. ḥbroṇ, wild yak (pp. 139, 258-9). See also ḥldag-nag. 68, 371, 373, 384, 386, 389 ḥḍuzam; 157 ḥppu, 170 ḥdho, ḥprome; 182 ḥldah; 215, 216, 217, 219, 220, 222, 392, 394 (?) ḥṭor/tor/ṭor/ṭhor; 220 ḥbr-ḥijar; 221, 393 ḥkru-ḥbro; 250 ḥre, ḥge; 285, 331 ḥkrom; 335 ḥdar-ḥḍam (pp. 244, 250, 258, 263, 268, 272, 283, 294, 296, 305, 313, 319, 331).

ḥbrom = brom, pinch, or nip, off, q.v. 97 ṛhebō.

ḥbroḥo = ḥbro II, taste = be felt as, q.v. 294 ḥkruḥu (pp. 246-7).

rbab (lect.), for rnb = ḥrnab, q.v. 54 ṛna-ḥke.

rbu. See ṛpu. 39 (p. 356).

rbo = Tīb. sbo, swell up, etc. See ḥbo I, ḥbro, ḥbom, ḥrom, ḥrom. 47 ḥv; 164 ḥyvr; 111, 112, 270 ḥbom (pp. 230-1, 309).

rbom, big, bigness, become big, etc. See ḥbom, ḥrom. 317 ḥpo, See also ḥpo III (pp. 224, 232, 338-9).

ṛbif, perhaps = diminish: cf. byi, ḥbyi, small, q.v. 375 ḥldyiḥi (pp. 330, 350).

ṛbye, extent = Tīb. ḥbye, from ḥbyed. See also ḥpyed, ḥpyed, ḥbye, ṛwye. 53 ḥce-ṛgyaḥ (pp. 290-2, 345).

ṛbyo I = foule (pp. 332-3). 38 ḥpāḥ; 365 ṛgryer; 366 ḥg-yer (pp. 320, 332).

II = ṛbyo-po, a priest, sorcerer or bon-po man, perhaps literally a foule-man? (pp. 155-6, 332-3). See also ḥṛbyo. 53 ḥko-ṛho; 82 ḥa-ge; 102 ḥsāḥ; 181 ḥpo (pp. 263, 320, 332-3).

III, miswriting of ṛgypo, q.v. 330 ṛgie (p. 178).

ṛḥbo = ṛbo, swell up, etc., q.v. 25 ṛs-ḥbge.

ṛhbom = ṛbom, bigness, become big, etc., q.v. 317 ṛpo (p. 323).

ṛḥbyo I = ṛbyo II, q.v. 56 ḥko-ṛho (p. 263).

II, miswriting of ṛbro, q.v.? (Cf. 355) 362 ḥṭoḥo, a Suffix, pp. 184-6.


M

-ma, a Nominal Suffix (pp. 181-2), seen in ṛgyed-ma 101, 105, 107, 231, ḥgru-ma 27, 32, 77, 79, ḥdaḥ-ma (?) 108.

ma = Tīb. etc., ma, not (p. 295), 31, 32; 57, 63, 71, 94 (final after Verb ḥṭaḥ); 96 (between Verb ḥṭaḥ and Suffix te): 103. etc.

ma, mah. See mahn.

ma, mother. 65 ḥpah; 184 ṛpu; 185 ḥpah (?) (pp. 301, 318).

mag = Tīb. ḡmag, army. See also ṛmag, ḥrmag. 102 ḥṣad (p. 301).

-ḥno, battle, cf. Tīb. ḡ-yul-ḥo, battlefront. 48, 49, 58, 145, 184 (pp. 194, 299-301, 320).

maḥn for man in reduplicated ma-ma. See also ḥman. 238 ma-ḥmān; 243, 246 ma-maḥn; 245 ma-ḥmana; 247 ma-ḥman (p. 230).

mu, cold, afraid (?). See also ḥmu, ḥmuḥi. 116 ṛgyeb; 184 ṛre; 175 ḥdi (?); 197 ḥrog-ḥtro;
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244 dguhū (pp. 252-3, 285, 301, 318).
mug = Tib. mug, gloom; rmugs, fog, stupid, &c. 227 -hgu, 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, ḫmye, sme, mehe, ḫmehe II (pp. 281-6). 8, 20 -hgrah; 40 ḫnah (apud; 45 re, lect. ma for me?; 53 -hyed; 56 -na; 58 -na; 67 ḫjo, ḫlah; 70 ḫjo, ḫlah; 71 ḫde; 89 ḫtsog; 114 -ḫmehe; 123 stor; 142 ḫdañ; 149 -ḥtañ; 170 ḫkeḥ, ḥkoḥ; 173 ḫkoḥ (apud; 253 ḫyah; jo, ḫlah (apud 284, 285, 286, 288, 300-1, 316, 320, 321, 337, 345).

mehi I, eye = Tib. mig, &c. See also ḫmehe I, mye III. 25 ḫses-ḫbeg; 78 -ra; 151 -spa; 155 -ḥgab; 185 sud; 186, 369 -ḥrah; 370 -shehi-ḥrah; 35 -gri-ḥtañ (apud 138, 139, 186-7, 223, 244, 265, 282, 318, 331).

II = ma, not, + hi at end of sentence, ‘is not’. 115 so-ḥnah; 156 g-yaḥ-ta; 311 ḫmañ-sta; ḥri-staḥ; 312 g-ri-sta; ḥri-staḥ; 313 g-ri-sta (pp. 200, 201, 254, 282, 337).

— (I) -klu-ḫcha/ḫcaḥ, a Proper Name. 150, 161, 343 ḫklu. See also ḫmehe (apud 138, 253, 265).

mehe = me. 171 ḫkoḥ (apud 284, 285).

mo I = Tib. mo, feminine, woman. See also hmo I (p. 182). 108 -lañ; 188 ḫnañ (ḫnañ)-ḥro (apud 221, 238, 285). See also hmo II.

II = sky, or mo-go for mog (q.v.) + ge? 252 sta-re (apud 201).

III? = hair? 63, 144 -ma-ḥthor (apud 303). See also hmo III.

mog (ī lect.) = gmog, hmog, cloud? 6 -ḥtswe (apud 269, 271).

Mon, Proper name of a people, the Mons. See also ḫmön (pp. 150-4). 379, 380, 381 ḫtsig (apud 285), rtsig (apud 285).

-ḫdzn/ẖjōn, Mon fort. See also ḫmön. 64 ḫstor; 118 stor; 128 stor; 139 stor; 140 stor (pp. 171, 187, 243, 305, 308).

mod = Tib. mod, be verily (p. 200). 211 ḫgo-ḵtn (apud 200, 260, 261, 332).

modiḥ = mod (q.v.) + hi. 212.

mor, bad, evil (pp. 215-16). See also ḫmor I. 9-ḥtañ; 40-ḥphu-ḥbos; 87 -ḥldañ; 141 -gdañ; 142 -gdañ-ḥphar; 173 swaḥ; 225 -ḥgu, a Suffix, pp. 190, 258, 286 -bkyañ; 388 -tsañ, a Suffix, pp. 187-8 (apud 187, 239, 276, 297, 304, 323, 329, 340).


myi I = Tib. mi, man (pp. 238-7). 148 -tor; 153 -re, -ši, -rye; 211 -ḫpehi (apud 174, 236, 273).

II = Tib. mi, not. See also ḫmyi, mye II. 98 phyi-ḫse; 159 -ṣeg; 160 -hran, -ḥdin; 165 -ḥrdbo (apud 145-6, 172, 200, 217, 296, 345).

myiñ = Tib. miñ, name (mere name). 97 ḫtsog-ḥram (apud 345).

myil = Tib. myil/hul, rove as a spy (pp. 354, 367). See also ḫmyil. 29 ḫgul-ḫmyil (apud 259).

mye I = me, fire, q.v. See also ḫmye. 6 -ḥyañ-ḥwad; 39 -ḥtañ; 102 ḫsa-kyeg; 195 ḫṭar; 211 -ḥpaḥi; 357 thar (apud 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 -ḫpehi (p. 240).

myen = Chinese wan (man), myriad. 247 ḫlad-ḥtoñ (apud 234).
myer, written for mye II, is not, (q.v.), + re (pp. 174, 281), 129
-re; 153 myi-rgyeṣ; 385 rgoṅ-
-waṣ, ḩtsog-hramō; 366 ḩkheh-
-promō (pp. 273, 293, 332,
342).

 gömōg, cloud, cf. Tib. rmarbs, fog,
stupid; mug, gloom; mog, dark
colour; Tangut; ṛmukha,
cloud. 55 -ḥce-ṛgyaṅ, -ḥce-ṛs
(sa (pp. 263, 271, 353). See
also mög, ṛmōg.

hman, larger, many = Tib. mañ,
man (pp. 230–1), 33 (?) -ḥldah, a
Suffix, p. 183; 146 -ḥyī; 301
ḥldim-hphuṣ; 302 ḩṛhī; 303
-ḥkhu; 304 -ḥldyo, ṛgam; 305
-ṇah-ḥyu; 306 -ge-ḥṛgama; 307
ḥaṅaḥ-nā, -ḥrge; 308 -ḥrī,
-ṛ-gi; 309 -g-ṛhī; 310 ḩldimō;
311 -stō (pp. 200, 229, 231, 239,
254, 256, 266, 270, 300, 309,
321, 327, 337, 345).

ḥmad = Tib. smad, low, lower,
reproive. See also rmad (pp.
226–7). 36, 39 ṛsā; 202 ḩrhaṣ
(pp. 269, 313).

hmān in reduplicated form ma-
hman, from man, many. 247.
See mahn.

hmah = Tib. ma, dmah, low, anti-
thetic to na. See also rmah,
ḥgru (II) -ḥldaṅ-hmahā (pp.
226–7). 112 -ḥldaṅ-ḥyaḥ (pp.
227, 288).

ḥmar I = Tib. mar, down, low. 15
-ḥbaf (cf. Tib. chu-hbaf, hill
torrent); 22 -myi-ḥpyoḥo; 51
-ḥbah (p. 267).
II = Tib. mar, butter, oil. 46 -me,
lamp = Tib. mar-me (p. 286).

hmū I = mu, cold, q.v. See also
hmūхи (p. 233–3). 39 ḍhye-
-geṣ; 104 ḩrdramō; 200 ḍceṣ; 204
ḥcheṣ; 206 ḍceṣ; 225, 236,
245 ḩgō/ ḩgūṃ-ṣoḥtο/to; 268
-klaḥ; 309 -wa-ṛho; 363 -lom (?)
(pp. 200, 232–3, 266, 270, 285,
298, 320, 338).
II, sky, cf. Tib. mu, limit, bound-
ary, horizon. 9 -ḥrnu-skhrud
(p. 276).

hmun = Tib. mun, darkness?
(p. 276). 33 ḍhe-ḥteṃ.

hmūḥi = hmū I, q.v. 183 -mō,
making cold (pp. 172, 232).

hmē I = me, fire, q.v. See also
hmēhi II. 262 ḩcan-smaṣ (p. 283).
II meḥi II, is not. 121 ḩtsog-
-hramō (pp. 281, 292).

hmēhi I = meḥi I, eye, q.v. 185
ṣudō; 186 ḩjam-geo; 272 -ḥpaḥ
(p. 139).
II = ḩme I, fire, q.v. 114 -mō,
light fire (pp. 172, 201, 232, 282).
—I) -klu-ḥcaḥ = meḥi, q.v. 218
(pp. 138, 255).

hmō I = mo, woman, q.v. 84 -rkaḥ-
-kla; 97 -ḥcaḥ; 98 -cha; 189
hmān-hcroṣ (pp. 227, 285, 343,
345).
II = mo II, sky, q.v. (?). 8, 20
-ge-ḥṛgama; 9 -no-ge (?) read
mon-ge (?); 19 -ge (pp. 142, 201,
332).
III = mo III, hair? 71 -ma-thor
(p. 303).

IV = 210 -ta-hpun (p. 245).
V = 175 mu-ḥldi; 360.

hmog = gömōg, cloud, q.v. 52 -ḥce-
ṛgyaṅ; 54 stheḥ-ḥtamō; 81 -re-
-ḥlde (pp. 271, 353).

hmogē, written for hmog-ge or
hmog-ge. 55 -ḥco.

Hmoṇ I = Mōṅ, q.v. 78 -joḥ; 129
-ḥjoḥ (pp. 241, 263).
II. See re-hmoṇ. 134.
III. (hmān ?)-ḥldah 33.

hmor I = mor, bad, evil, q.v. 313
-ḥso; 383 ḍswaḥ; 331 ḍguṣ
(p. 296).
II. written for ḍmo (I) + re. 190
-bzah-re (p. 240).

hmīy = myi II, not, q.v. 40 ḍnaḥ-
mēḥ; 254 ḍldey-ḥtorō (pp. 239,
248, 328 n.).

hmīyil, myil, q.v. 29 -myil.

hmīye = mye I, fire, q.v. 197 -ḥtah,
a Suffix, pp. 122–3.

rma I = Tib. rmas, ask. 47 damō
(p. 286).
II = Tib. rma, wound. 156 -g-
yoṛ-ṛho (p. 295).
III, river = Ḵsi-ḥsia maṣu, Tib.
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rmä-chu. 196 -ḥsu-ḥdra (pp. 245-6).
rmag = Tīb. dmag, army. See also mag, hrmag. 146 ḫrah-ḥṭon³; 147 ḫṣod-te³; 149 ḡryed³; 205 ḥpah⁴ (pp. 144, 246, 300, 361).
rmän 1 = tomb-monument, Tīb. rmañ (p. 148). 27 ḥklañ; 148 -ra-gyim; 156 -bri-kho; 197 -ḥlad; 199 -nā, ḥpah⁴; 201 -nā, ḡwi-wa³; 202 -bri-kho; 206 gsañ⁴, -nā; 207 -nā; 235 -dze; 336 -ḥwi-ḥkho (pp. 246, 259, 318, 320, 341, 345).
II = Tīb. rmañ, dream, rmoñ, rmoñs, delusion, &c. 46 ḡāli³; 77 ḡru-ma² (pp. 278, 309).
rmad = Tīb. smad, low. See also ḡmañ, rmäñ, ḡmäd (pp. 226-7). 50, 84 smyi² (pp. 237, 288, 343).
rmäñ = ḡmañ, rmad, q.v., low. 257 ḡyañ (p. 227).
rmär I, written for rmäñ-re. 315, 318 ḡyañ-ḥtañ (pp. 227, 296).
II, written for rmañ (Tīb. rmañ, wound, to wound) +re. 312 ḡdom-ḥguñ³, ḡjuñ-ḥbrañ³ (p. 254).
rmur, written for rmu (= Tīb. mu, boundary) +re (pp. 351-2). See also ḡmu II, ḡruñ. 166 ḡṣah-chad³ (p. 276).
rmö = Tīb. smon, wish, aspire, pray? See also rmon? 250 -ḥkum (p. 294).
rmön = rmo? or connected with rmäñ, rmän, dream? 349 ḡim-ḥtson-ge³.
rmöl (? lect.) = smyi, man, q.v.? 41 ḡyañ³. 
hrmag = rmag, army, q.v. 146 rie-re³ (pp. 222, 299-300).
hrmu = rmu, boundary, q.v. 168 chi³ (p. 276).
hrmó. 18 ḡṣyim-se³.
smu-ḥdzu, conceivably = Tīb. mu-zi, brimstone, with -i/u as in p. 367. 27 ḡrgag (p. 259).

smuñu-ḥku = Tīb. smyig-ma, smyug-ma, smyu-gu, red (p. 337). 22 -ḥyob.
smé, fire, blaze, me, mye I, ḡme I, ḡmye, q.v. (pp. 282-3, 357). 192 ḡryed-ḥrañ³; 262 cañ³; 282, 284, 375 ḡṣeg³; 342 klu-ḥlo³-error for rme? 393 ḡryed-ḥṣan³ (pp. 282-3).
smyi = Tīb. mi, myi, man (pp. 236-7). See also myi, rmyn, 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

tsa, a Pluralizing or classifying Suffix, often in the combination re-tsa, signifying those who (whose, &c.) (pp. 187-8). See also tsañ, ḡtsa I, ḡtsa II, ḡtsha I, ḡtsha II, ḡtsha.
60 ḡkhur³, ḡphay³; 63 ḡyañ³; 163 ḡno-re³; 220 ḡthañ-ko³; 283 ḡpañ³; 388 ḡyañ³ (pp. 145, 274, 304, 305, 315).
tsañ = Tīb. tshañ, complete (p. 364). 136 ḡtsa-ḥkom-re³.
stasya = tsa, q.v. 388 mor² (pp. 216, 304).

Tsiq = ṛtsig, ḡṛtsig, carpenter, q.v. 381 -Moñ.

tsu = Tīb. tshu, tshur, hither, come hither. 284 -re (p. 364). See also ḡtsu, ḡtsu I, ḡtsuñ, ḡtsuñ, ḡtsuñ, ḡtsuñ, ḡtsuñ.

tsur = tshu, ḡtsuñ, come, &c., q.v. 391 ḡhyañ-ḥbañ³.

tse, written for dze, q.v. 63 ḡjo³; 111 ḡyañ³; 120 ḡbañ³ (pp. 230, 262, 274, 291-2, 305)³.

tseñ = ḡjeg, ḡheeg, ḡṣeg, q.v. (p. 294). 93 swa² ḡtseg (p. 334).

Tswēhu.  ḡtfse? (pp. 269, 368).

219 hesa-ḥwej-ge³ (p. 241).

Gtssañ = Tīb. stsañ, corn, grain. See also ḡtsañ. 159 -myi-ḥrgan; 165 ḡṣañ³ (pp. 145-6, 335).
ghts, Prospective form of tsa, q.v. 214 hrwehö (p. 345).

gts = Tib. gtsö/htshe, cause mischiev, injure (pp. 140-1). 113 -ne; 136-hkom. See also gse, hse I, hsehi, hshe II.

ghtsob. Prospective form of htsahab, g.v. = Tib. htsab, replace, be ruffled; tshab, deputy? 351 ḡdam-sloe; 352 glya[hruo.

hts I = tsa q.v. 24 kl-[h]tro; 67 ḡgro-re; 64 ḡstor-Mo[i]-ḥdzo[n]-re; 131 ḡta[n]-le; 146 ḡtrog; 152 ḡ-g[a]-[h]troc; 215 ḡtrog-hni; 250 ḡkhiwö (pp. 138, 186-7, 202, 223, 272, 305, 308, 343).

II. 249-re.

htsa, probably intended for htsah III, g.v. 21-gsom (p. 306).

htsag = Tib. tshogs, ḡtshogs, btsags, collect, assemble. See also ḡtso[g, tshog, ḡtshog, 45 ḡna; 117 ḡpho-[h]lirö; 173 ḡwi-[h]wehi; 234 ḡrum; 257 ḡ[...]wö; 282 (?) (pp. 191, 127, 227, 257, 292, 341, 343).

htsah = gtsa[n], corn, grain, q.v. 270 -ra; 378 ḡṣahö (!) (pp. 178, 339).

htsam = Tib. tsem, just so much. See also tsham. 72 ḡṣorö (pp. 204, 342).

htsah I = tsa, htsa I, q.v. 25 kl-[h]ro; 31 ḡḥasd-htram; 65 ḡag-reö; 65 ḡwö-[r]eÖ; 74 ḡa[b]-geö; 342 my-ehraḥ; 379 ḡtisg-Mong-reö; 381 we-geö; 383 ḡwehi-geö (pp. 138, 157, 186, 187, 219, 223, 228, 251, 274, 287, 319).

II = Tib. btsa, btsas, watch (p. 278). See also htsah I, htsah II.

htsah II = tsa, htsa II, q.v. 44 ḡṣahö; 268 -ḥḍa[n]; 291 -pol[y]-[r]eÖ (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 ḡṣah-re-ḥtsah-re. See also htsah II.

IV. See ḡhdzo-[htso]-ḥtsah/ ḡhtshei/ḥdzechii. 30, 62, 73, 115 (p. 252).

ḥtsah-sto, written for htsahs-to. Aorist form of htsah (III). 33 naö; 233 ḡchirö (p. 275).

ḥtsar = Tib. tshar, ḡtsar, limit, parish. See also ḡtshar. 280 myag-maö (p. 231).

ḥtsu I = tsa, hither, come hither, q.v. See also ḡtsuhu, ḡtsur, ḡtshu, ḡtshur. 113 ḡgou-[h]torö; 304 ḡdom-[h]gouö (p. 233).

II, man (pp. 218, 238). 193 ḡna[ḥ (p. 238).

ḥtsuhu = ḡtsu I, q.v. 166 ḡra[n]-hraḥö; 303 ḡdom-[h]gouö (pp. 142, 200, 256, 327).

ḥtsur = tsa, ḡtsu I, q.v. 207 ḡka[n]-[h]na[ḥö (p. 315).

ḥtseh 364. See ḡhdzo.

ḥtsehi 342. See ḡtshuh IV.

ḥtsö I = 83 ḡlulasö; 105 -dro-ḥo (p. 261).

— written in place of ḡtsoö, q.v. 88.

—(II) ḡna written for ḡsoö/hnii[ḥaḥ, q.v. 93.

—(III) ḡtsah, perhaps = Tib. cha-cho, matched. See also ḡhdzo-ḥtseh/ḥdza. 62, 73 ḡlaö; 115 ḡṣahö (p. 232).

—(III) ḡhsehi, apparently = ḡṣah-ḥi (pp. 191-2). 342 phyerö.

ḥtso = Tib. ḡtshogs, btsags, &c. See ḡtsg, ḡtshog, ḡtshog, ḡhcou II. 91 -rup; 94, 96 ḡṣah-ma; 95-ḥḍan; 99 ḡṣahö; 102 ḡḥaö (pp. 292, 320-1).

—ḥram, friendship, harmony. 35, 37, 82, 86, 90, 94, 97, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 365 (pp. 262, 281, 288, 291-3, 345).

ḥtson = Tib. tshon, ḡtshon, stso[n, trade, barter, sell. 349 ḡjimö.

ḥtssors = Tib. ḡṣor, ḡṣor, ḡḥor, ḡhurt, chase; ḡṣor, ḡḥor, flee. See also ḡshor, ḡshors. 134 ḡldag-nagö; 219 ḡbroöö (pp. 258-9).

ḥtse ? = tsweḥu, q.v.? ḡdzwe? (pp. 269, 368). 6 ḡmögö, ḡlectö (p. 269).
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rtsig = Tib. rtsig, build, mason. See also hrtsg, tsi (p. 150). 379, 380 -Mon.

hrtsg = rtsig, q.v. 380 -Mon.

stsh = htsah II, watch, q.v. (p. 278). See also htsah I. 298 \hbox{\footnotesize i}.

sttar = Tib. tshar, occasion, instance, used with numerals. 247 sto\hbox{\footnotesize i} (pp. 233-4).

htsah I = stsh, htsah II, hseah, watch, q.v. 250 -hyer; 288 -hย-htsa\hbox{\footnotesize a}; 290 -hร-; 295 -hร; 298 -hldh, a Suffix, p. 183; 345, 350, 361 hу (p. 246, 278, 280).

II = htsah, III, harvest? 213 \hbox{\footnotesize hbrad} (p. 253).

Tsh

tsha = tsa, Pluralizing Suffix, q.v. 50 hсе-ra (p. 259, 359).

tsham = htsam, Tib. tsaum, just so much, q.v. 50 -hrog (p. 361).


tshis, error for chim, q.v., or = Tib. mehis, come? See also hthi (95 dimi (pp. 320, 359).

tshu = tsu, htsu, tshu, come hither, q.v.? See also htsu, htsun, htsur. 206 -sgom.

tshog = htsog, collect, assemble, q.v. See also htsog. 95 -hlla (pp. 320-1).

tshor = htsor(s), hunt, chase. See also htsors. 220 hbrн (p. 360).

htshab = Tib. htsab, tshab, replace, deputy. See gtsoh. 104 hna (p. 234).

htshar = Tib. tshar, limit, parish. See also htsar. 208 -hde (p. 234).

htshim = Tib. tshim, satisfaction; hchims, get full. See also chim, hchim. 81 hси-hkr (p. 298).

htshis = tshis, q.v. 88 hdim (p. 321).

htshu = tsu, tshu, htsu I, gtsu, q.v. 75 hso-hsoly; 76 dgu-

-htor; 215 -to, a Suffix, pp. 184-6.

htshun = htsuh, dc, q.v., also Tib. tshum. 76 dgu-htor.

htshur = htsur, q.v. 391 hna-hddi (p. 250).

htshe = Tib. tse, htshe, do harm. See also gtse. 74 hku-хн (p. 250).

htshog = htsog, q.v.

-hram. 90 = htsog, friendship, dc. (p. 321).

htshors = htsors, tshor, hunt; dc., q.v. 130 hldag nga (p. 250).

Dz

dze I, a Clause-terminating Postposition, signifying place, time, or circumstance (pp. 193-4). 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 20 and passim.

II. For cig-dze see cig.

dzen. 378. (Read dze-rhe?).

dzwe = hдзве, hзве, hдзве (p. 269)? 367 hза-hкya (p. 240).

gдzu, ass. See also гzu, 8dzu I, hnu, hzu (pp. 251-3). 194 ste (305, 308, 311 -hbyi; 390 -hti (pp. 229, 241, 251, 337, 353).

8dza I = Tib. mdza, friend, friendship. See also 8dza I. 362 -ma-hын; 363 -ma-hе; 376 -htrg (p. 220).


II = Tib. бза, fine, good (large). 232-4 -hglab/ghla/gla.

II = 38 hлдян-8дза (p. 297, 339). 68, 371, 373, 386, 389 -hbrн; 353 hbroн-hlar; 122 ркв; 145 hnam; 182 hbroн-hldh (224 ркв);
VOCABULARY

II? 76, 353 do-lōko (pp. 322-3).

ḥdzō-ḥtsaḥ 29; ḥdzā 262; ḥdzēḥ 338 (2); ḥtseḥ 364 = ḥtsaḥ-ḥtsaḥ, q.v. (On the -ebi see pp. 191-2. Possibly = Tib. cha-cho, matched: only in gla-ḥtsaḥ could the ḥtsa (29 ḥdzō) appositely signify ‘man’). (pp. 274, 283).

ḥdzōn = Tib. rdzōn, castle. See also ḥrdzoń, ḥjōn, jōn (pp. 150-1, 171, 241). 64, 139, 140 Moń; 194 -byo-bi; 195 ḥlda-hko-ge; 205 -skyar-hrebhi; 299 ḥri-ḥno; 356 -byo-biśid (pp. 201, 241, 243, 265-6, 305, 308, 329).

ḥdzon = Tib. zon, gzon, keep watch; dgra-zon, guard-post. 337 stor-hṭaḥ (p. 335).

ḥdzom = Tib. ḥdzom, meet (p. 279). 134 ḥkhoğ-hnoń; 282, 284 ḥrim; 295 ḥsog-ge (pp. 282, 321, 329).

ḥdzōh, male, man. 137 -ro; 138 -ḥto-hrum; 324 -ḥkru-ḥyog, ḥkhad-hto (pp. 199, 218, 246, 273, 338).

ḥdzō, male, man. 137 -ro; 138 -ḥto-hrum; 324 -ḥkru-ḥyog, ḥkhad-hto (pp. 199, 218, 246, 273, 338).

ḥdzōh, male, man. 137 -ro; 138 -ḥto-hrum; 324 -ḥkru-ḥyog, ḥkhad-hto (pp. 199, 218, 246, 273, 338).

ḥdzōh, male, man. 137 -ro; 138 -ḥto-hrum; 324 -ḥkru-ḥyog, ḥkhad-hto (pp. 199, 218, 246, 273, 338).

ḥdzor, perhaps for ḥdzō II. as in 333 (cf. 76). 77 (do ?) -ḥbdō.

ḥdzwe = tswehū, ḥtswe? (pp. 269, 368). 39 ṣes-hmad (p. 269). ḥdzwẽhe = ḥdzwe, q.v. 36 ṣes-hmad (p. 269).

rdzum = Tib. ḥdzum, smile. See also ḥrdzum (p. 350). 263 -me (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzam = Tib. ḥdzam, smile. See also ḥrdzam (p. 350).

rdzam = Tib. ḥdzam, smile. See also ḥrdzam (p. 350) (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzam = Tib. ḥdzam, smile. See also ḥrdzam (p. 350) (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzam = Tib. ḥdzam, smile. See also ḥrdzam (p. 350) (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).

rdzone = Tib. ḥdzone, weak, q.v. (pp. 335, 368). 138 ḥrdzam (pp. 271 n., 283).
rdzogs = Tib. rdzogs, complete, fulfill (pp. 213, 348). 157 glo-ta°.
rdzor I written for rdzo (q.v.) -re. See also hr dzor. 227 mug-hgu°; 228 ñbri-hgu° (pp. 215-16).

II, written for hdzo, man, or hjo, chief, +re. See also hr dzro. 369 ñshebe° (p. 239).

hr dzra = hdza I, friend. See also rdzar, hr dzah (pp. 315, 352). 296 ñkhañ°, ñkha°; 382 ñhgye°.

hrdzan. 38 hdlyan° 0hdzan.

hr dzah = hr dzra, friend, q.v. 46 -hgo-hpo (p. 286).

hrdzum = rdzum, q.v. 80 gn° (pp. 186, 271, 293).

hrdzur = hdzur, go aside, ñc., q.v. (pp. 350, 352). 221 ñthañ-hgam°.

hr dz o = rdzo, q.v. 16 ñkruq°; 219 ñtau° (p. 144).

hrdzon = hdzon, castle, q.v. (pp. 150, 348). 194-hyo-hsi (p. 241).

hrdzor = rdзор I (= rdzzo + re), q.v. 226 mor-hgu° (pp. 215-16).

hr dz ro, written for hr dzro (= hdzo I, man, or hjo, chief) + re. 49 gse° (p. 239).

W

wa I, make, do, or Auxiliary Verb.: cf. Tib. bas, done with, and see also ñwa, ñwah, ñwas, ñwah, ñgwañ, ñgwah, ñgwah (pp. 337-40). 179 gsum°; 309 ñmu° (pp. 182, 270, 338). See also kya (hkyã)-wa-fe, rgon-wa, ñhwi-wa.

II = Tib. ñbañ, sediment? 190 ñyah° (pp. 228, 285).

wa-ñdañ = Tib. o-ldoñ, h¿-doñ, windpipe. 258 (p. 221). See also ñwa-ñdañ.

war (p. 341). See also ñwar. 101 ñrä°.

we = Tib. byed, Hsi-hsia we, make, do (pp. 196, n. 2, 337). See also webi I, ñwe, ñweñi I, ñweñi, ñweñi, ñwer, ñw-e, ñw-ñi, ñw-ñe, ñw-ñer. 114 ñrä°; 191 ñra°; 381 tsig-Moñ° (pp. 282, 283, 285).

webi I = we, q.v. See also ñweñi, ñweñi. 100 ñkho°; 139 ñhrañ°; 196 ñwam° (pp. 190, 243, 337).

II cream? See also ñweñi II. 74 -nebu (pp. 250-1).

ñg-wah = wa, ñwa, ñc., q.v. (pp. 337-40). 129 -hran; 224 -hrsan (pp. 342, 343, 361).

ñg-we = we, make, do, q.v. (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 152 -hku-rñño; 197 ñmañ-hñab°; 198 ñldan-hkhañ°; 201 ñmañ-ñañ°; 205 -hzen; 206, 207 ñmañ-ñño-ñe-g-ñe-re-g-ñe; 375 ñhpun-ñi°? (pp. 228, 239).

ñg-ñweñi = g-we, q.v. (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 199 ñmañ-ñañ°; 263 me° (p. 283).

ñg-ñweñi = g-we, q.v. (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 201 ñmañ-ñañ°; 298 ñswah°; 357 -ñldan, ñko.

ñg-were, written for g-ñwe, make, ñc., q.v., +re. See also ñher (pp. 196, n. 2, 346). 164 ñswah°; 301 swa° (pp. 270, 277).

ñwa I = wa I, q.v. See also ñwah, ñwah. 121 hñi°; 137 -ñkñu; 162 ñdrñu°; 228 -ñrsan; 230 -ñzer; 269 -ñrño; 270 -ñgya; 317 -ne; 339 ñkñah° (pp. 218, 253-5, 275, 292, 315, 338, 339).

-ñste, written for ñwas, q.v., + te (a Suffix, pp. 188-90). 71, 73, 75 (pp. 273, 337-8).

II -ñldan = wa-ñdañ, q.v. See also ñwah-ñldan. 121, 278 (pp. 178, 221).

III. See ñhwi-ñwañ, rat, mouse. 273 (pp. 297, 341).

ñwag = Tib. ñbag, be defiled. See also ñbog. 324 ñg-yah-ñpañ° (pp. 228, 340).

ñwañ = Tib. ñbañ, power (pp. 341, 346 and n.). 5 ram (?) -ge°, klu-ge°; 210 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (pp. 245, 341, 361).

ñwad = Tib. ñbad, watch, ñbod, call out, endeavour. See also ñbod (pp. 340-1). 6 mye-ñhyan°; 14 ñshebe-ñwad-ñwad;
VOCABULARY

88 ȟcog-ȟdo-dze\(^{o}\); 109 tho-
-rgyam-ge\(^{o}\); 268 -h\(l\)d\(a\)n-kra\(f\); 301 ȟ\(r\)i-ȟ\(c\)i-hwad\(h\); 334 hkeg-
-\(r\)k\(o\); 335 -hw\(a\)h-\(r\)i\(o\) (pp. 265-

hwad\(h\)i = hwad, q.v., + hi. 301 (pp.
265, 340).

hwam, residence or village = Tib.
bams, boms, sbam. collect
(p. 243). 11 -\(h\)\(s\)\(\i\)\(d\); 155 -\(h\)nom-
-\(s\)\(\o\)\(n\); 196 -weh\(i\); 258 -neh\(\u\)
(pp. 241, 245, 340, 361).

hwah = hwa I, q.v. 18 h\(b\)\(a\)r\(\o\)
(?); 172 hydr\(a\)\(b\); 224 -hr\(a\)\(\u\)\(\i\)\(n\); 228
-gl\(a\)h; 269 -ne; -hr\(n\); 270
-h\(\i\)\(d\)\(n\)\(a\)\(\o\); 334 -brog; 335
hwad\(o\); 353 -hra\(h\) (pp. 178, 254,
338, 339, 340).

hwar I = Tib. hbar, burn, blaze,
bloom (p. 341). 29 -war (?); 198
-ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3.

II, written for hwa I, do, d\(c\), + re.
354 na\(n\)\(a\) (p. 230).

III ? 107 h\(n\)\(a\)\(n\). See also war
(p. 341).

hwars, perhaps Aorist of hwar I.
203 cha-h\(n\)\(a\)\(n\).

hwas, Aorist of hwa I = Tib. bas,
done for, disposed of. See also
hw\(a\)s-te (for hw\(a\)s-te). 308
h\(h\)\(m\)\(\a\)\(n\)-\(h\)\(r\)\(a\)\(n\) (p. 337).

hw\(i\) I 386 m\(n\)a\(n\). Cf. r\(m\)\(n\)-\(h\)\(r\)\(i\).

II -wa/hwa/h\(w\)h\(e\)h = Tib. byi-
ba, mouse, rat. (On -\(e\)h see
p. 191). 173 h\(w\)\(h\)\(i\); 201 wa;
273 hwa (pp. 257, 297, 341).

h\(w\)e = we, wehi, do, make, d\(c\),
q.v. See also h\(w\)\(e\)h I, h\(w\)\(h\)e,
h\(w\)er. 85 \(r\)\(h\)\(e\); 125 h\(d\)\(a\)\(n\)k-
\(r\)\(a\)\(n\); 157 h\(d\)\(a\)\(n\)\(e\); 374 h\(p\)h\(a\)
(pp. 220, 257, 289, 335, 341).

h\(w\)en, vain ? = Tib. d\(b\)en, solitary,
secret; d\(b\)en-g\(t\)am, secret talk;
H\(s\)i\(s\)\(h\)si\(a\)\(n\) wan, bad ? 159 h\(l\)a-
\(b\)\(a\)\(n\) (p. 341).

h\(w\)h\(e\)h I = h\(w\)e, we, do, make, d\(c\),
q.v. 380 h\(r\)\(h\)\(a\)\(n\); 383 h\(d\)za-
\(h\)-\(h\)\(l\)\(a\)\(h\).

II = wehi II ? 47 -\(h\)\(s\)\(i\)-\(h\)po (pp.
251, 341).

III h\(w\)i-h\(w\)h\(e\)h. See h\(w\)i. 173
(pp. 257, 341).

\(h\)\(w\)e\(h\)e = h\(w\)e I, d\(c\), q.v. 348
hweg\(o\) (pp. 248, 343).

h\(w\)er, written for h\(w\)e, q.v., + re.
19 \(h\)\(t\)\(i\).

h\(w\)y\(i\) = Tib. hyer, escape. 85 r\(h\)\(e\)
-h\(w\)e-ge\(o\) (pp. 220, 341).

r\(w\)-. See under R.

Z

b\(z\)\(i\)r = Hs\(i\)\(s\)\(h\)si\(a\) \(g\)\(z\)\(i\)r, wise ? (pp.
167-8, 315). 207 h\(l\)\(d\)\(i\)\(o\) (p. 315).

b\(z\)\(e\)r = Tib. b\(z\)\(e\)r, fort ? (pp. 167-
8, 339-40). 19 \(h\)t\(i\)\(o\); 177
h\(k\)\(o\)\(u\)-prom\(o\); 230 h\(w\)a\(o\) (pp.
225, 339).

r\(\z\)\(n\)\(a\), fierce, violent? (pp. 167-8,
352). 54 -h\(b\)a; 56 r\(h\)\(e\)-h\(u\)\(o\).

Z

g\(z\)\(u\) = gdzu, h\(d\)zu I, ass, q.v. See
also h\(j\)u, h\(z\)u (pp. 168, n. 1,
251-2). 307 -h\(b\)\(y\)i; 353 -h\(d\)\(r\)o-
h\(p\)hor (pp. 276, 332).

g\(z\)o = Tib. zo\(s\), Imperative, d\(c\), of
za, eat (pp. 199, 334-5). 165
h\(r\)\(g\)u-ma\(o\) (pp. 277, 335). See
also h\(j\)o, h\(d\)zh\(o\)h\(o\).

b\(z\)\(o\)d = Tib. bd\(z\)od, bear, endure
(p. 168). 72 h\(s\)\(o\)-h\(t\)\(s\)a\(m\) (p.
342).

g\(b\)\(z\)\(a\)n (? = Tib. b\(z\)\(a\)n, fine, large;
but see also h\(d\)z\(a\)n II. 21 g-r\(i\)
(p. 168).

h\(z\)\(z\)\(a\)h = Tib. b\(z\)\(a\)h, woman, wife.
190 h\(m\)o-[\(r\)\(h\)\(a\)]\(e\) (pp. 240, 285).

h\(z\)u = g\(z\)u, d\(c\), ass, q.v. (p. 168).
188 h\(l\)\(k\)ya\(n\)\(o\); 117 r\(a\)n-h\(h\)o\(e\)
(pp. 251-2, 285).

H

(For h as Prefix see the Consonants
in general.)

\(h\)\(a\) I written for h (with mistaken
punctuation). 61 -ya\(n\) for hya\(n\); 82
r\(h\)\(y\)o-ha-ge; 103 -\(r\)\(t\)a for
hr\(t\)a; 236 -gl\(a\)h for h\(g\)l\(a\)h; 320
-sto\(n\) for h\(s\)\(t\)o\(n\).

II minwriting for following h. 119.
hi. Sentence-ending Particle, probably exclamationary (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).

huraḥ, written for hrn. 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 hldyaḥo ohyo; 355 -hldyaḥ-hldyaḥ (p. 329).

III = I? See ca-yañ, ḡcaḥ-hyañ, hcaḥ-yañ.

yahu = Tib. yul, village, district, country. See also hyuḥu I, hyu III (pp. 320, 333). 369 hldyaḥo.

yer = Tib. yer, g-yer, to be wide awake; g-yer-po, expert, wise. See also hyer, g-yer. 141 ḡsaḥo (p. 278).

yod, possibly connected with Tib. g-yo, be unsteady, g-yob, shake, etc. 16 ḡriḥo-hyuo. See also hyod (p. 258).

yon, Auxiliary Verb with probably Future sense, as in Tib. ḡoń, yon. See also ḡ-yoḥo, hyon, hyoḥo (p. 199). 160 stor-dom (p. 253).

yob = Tib. yab, g-yob, be pendulous, shake; g-yob, fan, curtain. See also hyob. 166 ḡsaḥo (pp. 142, 200).

g-yañ = Tib. gyañ(-ra), cattle-yard? or g-yañ = hyañ II, good, etc., q.v.? 31 -ra (p. 311).

g-yañ I = superior, cf. Tib. ya,

antithetic to ma, lower (pp. 226-7). See also hyañ I. 136 ḡdagnag; 152 -htsa (?); 271 ḡtorn-hṛtaḥ; 287 -ḥṭanaḥ (pp. 228, 297).

II = Tib. ya, match, adversary, rival (pp. 227-8). 156 -ta-meḥi; 317 ḡdagnag o-to; 152 -htsa (?) (pp. 224, 323, 338-9). See also hyañ II.

III front, cf. Tib. g-yar, mouth, face, front (pp. 228-9). 323 -ḥpah (p. 228).

g-yaṛ = Tib. yar, Adverbial form of g-yañ I (p. 227). 128 ḡkhar-hṛpag; 136 ḡkhar-rpag (pp. 242-3, 263, 305).

g-yaḥa, written for g-yaḥ, 266.

ḡ-yeḥi = ḡgyeḥi, q.v. (be divided, Tib. hgyed ?). See also hyed. 271 ḡdyañ-мао.

ḡ-yehe = g-yeḥi (be divided?). 166 ḡkhoḥu-prom (p. 276).

ḡ-yer = yer, q.v. See also hyer. 167 ḡsaḥo; 330 ḡašo; 346 ḡsaḥo; 366 -ḥnor (pp. 278, 332).

g-yo = Tib. g-yo, move, waver. See also g-yos, hyos (pp. 141-2). 27 ḡraḥo; 28 -hpud-to (pp. 231, 309).

ḡ-yog I = Tib. ḡog, yog, low, low ground, valley. See also hyog I (p. 266). 15, 51 -ḥšaḥ-ma-hpul; 200 -ḥdaḥ a Suffix, p. 183; 299 ḡdzono; 320 ḡṛgyaḥ-ḥni-ḥke (pp. 265-6, 267, 279).

ḡ-yoḥo = yon, hyoḥo, q.v. (p. 199). 142 stor-ḥdor.

ḡ-yos (?), Aorist of g-jo, q.v. 26 ḡraḥo (p. 197 n.).

hya, sheep (p. 94). 45 ḡṣaḥo (p. 343).

hyañ I = yañ I, also, even, q.v. For list of occurrences see p. 311.

II good (anthetic to mor, bad) or superior (pp. 215-16, 311). 5 ḡṣes-beγ; 10 -ḥtañ; 41 ḡmrvi; 63 -ṭsa; 64 -ge; 66, 226 -ḥraḥ; 287, 290 -ḥkaḥ-ṛza; 383 -ḥṭe; 388 -ṭsa (pp. 187, 216, 274, 304, 305, 315, 318, 329).
III = yañ II, runnel, &c., q.v. (p. 311). 178 hudyañ⁰ cheyo; 316 -hdyan (†); 355 -re-ngyeñ-na-yañ-; 367 hudyañ-hyaññ-hyoy; hyaññ-goñ; 391 hidyañ-hyaññ-hyoy (pp. 179, 329).

IV, hyañ-hso † = Tib. yañis, large, 63 -hrñi, -hde (pp. 303, 335).

V, -hcañ-hyañ, -hcañ-yañ. 241 -hbro; 242 -thor (pp. 303-4). See ño, ño, ño.

hyañ I = g-yañ I, superior, q.v. 72 -hrgeñ; 111 hso-ñañ⁰ †; 112 hmañ-hidañ; 133 hre-hldi (†) hyañ II; 257 -rmañ; 285, 286, 288 -hthañ; 294 -bto, a Suffix, pp. 184-6; 315, 318 -htañ; 304 -hdañ; 306 -hdañ; 374 htho (†). 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 -htbo, pp. 184-6 (pp. 228, 229, 274, 287, 296, 323, 331).

III = g-yañ III, front, face, &c. 190-wa-hknñ; 221 -hkrñ-nbro; 252 -me; 325 -hkrñhnu-nbro; 266-70, 272 -go-these to be placed under hyañ I (pp. 228, 260, 274, 281, 285, 298, 339).

hyañ-hnñi = Tib. yañá, fear. 115 -hññ (pp. 191, 217).

hyim, diminish. 59 hññ-hgamo (p. 240).

-sto, written for hymns-to (a Suffix, pp. 184-6). 29 bdeq (p. 259).

hya I = 82 hññ-hññ (p. 320).

II, 212 khynos-hkhyañ⁰ (p. 359).

III = yññu, village, district, country, q.v. See also hyññu (p. 333). 123, 372, 387 hudyañ⁰; 147 -sad; 305 nañ⁰; 345, 350, 351 -htsañ; 346 -hgyi-ka (pp. 246, 292, 305).

hyun = Tib. yun, space of time. 260 hgo-ññor-req (p. 261).

hyññu = yññu, village, district, &c.; hyññu III, q.v. 49 rham-nar⁰; 368 hññuñ-hññu (p. 320).

II = I? 332 hññhu-hpññ₁⁰; 333 hññor (p. 223).

hyañ = Tib. hgye, hgyed, divide, scatter, &c. See also hgye (pp. 235-6, 291). 53 meñ; 71 g-roñor; 393 smañ (pp. 273, 337).

hyañ = yer, g-yan, awake, &c., q.v. 250 hññañ; 267 hññ (p. 278).

hya = Tib. yññ, g-yan, weaver, shake, crooked, &c. See also g-yañ, g-ynos, hyos (p. 242). 178, 179, 367, 391 hyññ/yññ/hyññ (†); 179 gswm-wañ; 194 -hññ; 356 -hññ (pp. 179, 235, 241-2, 338, 353).

II = Tib. yññ, set in motion, manage (kññ-yañ). 154 hñños; 326 hrñyeñ(d); 338 hrñyeñ (pp. 273, 291).

hyog = I = Tib. g-yog, servant, subordinate. 134 re-hmoñ (†); 254 -hpññ-hññ (†); 289, 321, 323, 324 hññor/kruññor⁰/kññuñor⁰ (p. 295-6).

II = Tib. ygn-pa, pole, stick. 259 -hññ (pp. 192, 202, 343).

hyogs = hyog I, servant, &c. q.v. 18 hññ (p. 295).

hyod = yod, q.v. 16-yd (pp. 258).

hyon = yon, q.v. (p. 199). 161-3 stor-hññor (p. 253).

hyob = yob, be pendulous, shake, q.v. 22 smññu-hññu; 31-2 hññuñ-hññor (pp. 319-20).

hyoho = g-yobo, q.v. 119 stor-hññor (pp. 199, 243).

hyor = Tib. yor, g-yor, heap, a vasive cairn (obo, lab-rte) on a route. 239 hññuñ-hññ (pp. 265-6).

hyos, Aorist of g-yo, shake, quake, q.v., and g-ynos (pp. 196-7). 25 hññor; 26, 34 g-rññor; 96, 98 rgor (pp. 138, 262, 335, 345).

R

-r with equivalence to re, incorporated in the preceding mono-syllable; A: after Vowels.
173-5: B: after Consonants, pp. 178-9 (pp. 312-13).
ra = Tib. ra (enclosed or limited) place. See also raḥ, g-raḥ I, ḥra I, ḥraḥ, ḥraḥ I, ḥraḥI, ḥraḥr (pp. 312-14), 7 skūṭu-ra 7; 31 g-yāh; 49 hēc; 78 mehī; 148 ṭenaḥ; 263, 265, 278 gīaḥ; 264, 265 ḥuṣ (pp. 244, 246).
rag = Tib. rags, dyke, embankment. See also ḥrag (p. 147). 283 ḥgaḥ.
raḥ I = Tib. raḥ, self. See also ḥraḥ I.
—ḥche, self-willed (cf. Tib. raḥ-ḥdo). See also ḥraḥ (p. 252).
II = Tib. raḥ, raḥs, be pleased? See also ḥraḥII. 103m (p.294).
rab = Tib. rab, ford? See also ḥrab. 376 ḥgo (p. 261).
ram, harmony, concordant. See also ḥram (pp. 220, 277, 293).
—raḥm, lect.; 157 skye-ta (pp. 239, 293).
raḥ = ra, q.v. See also ḥraḥ, ḥraḥI. 45 skah; 74 ḥphaḥ-ma; 227 ḥtham; 279 ḥuṣ (pp. 274, 317).
ru = Tib. ru, horn. See also hru, ḥruḥu. 70 -ge-hkrom; 103 ṭging; 347, 351 ḡyān (pp. 303-4, 333).
— ṭgaḥ, horned ox. 66 (p. 318).
re I = Tib. re, red, is, being, mostly at end of a Subordinate Clause, but sometimes with Suffix te or to (pp. 173-5, 200). See also ḥre I, ḥreḥI, sta-re. 5, 6, 32, 36 and passim.
—ḥto (a Suffix, pp. 184-6). 382.
II = Tib. re, each, every; res. times, requital (perhaps derived from I) (p. 202). See also ḥre II, ḥreḥhe. 154 myī; 251 jo; 252 ḥlab; 250, 255, 276-7. (pp. 174, 236, 274).
III = Tib. re, hope. See also ḥre III. 211 mye.
re-ma (for me?) -ḥnad? 45.
re-hmoν 134 -ḥyog-re.
ro = Tib. -ro country, district, (large) place. See also roho, ḥro I (p. 314). 137 ḥdzōḥu; 381 spo (pp. 218, 275, 338).
roɣ I = Tib. rogs, grogs, comrade, assistant. See also ḥrog. 211 -ḥi-ṛdaḥ (?) (p. 260).
II = Tib. rog, black? 156 na (p. 239).
rom = Tib. rum, dark (space)? See also ḥrom (p. 368). 100 na (p. 293).
roḥo = ro, q.v. 384 ḫido (p. 327).
rwa = Tib. rwa, horn. See also ḥrwa. 45 ḥrīn (p. 343).
rwaḥ = Tib. dwānaḥ, lustre, bright, force of language. See also dwān. 178 ḥkāḥ (p. 179).
rweḥi, end, be ended, be destroyed? See also rwer, ḥweḥi. 98 ḥkhor-kyaḥ (p. 345).
rwer. Locative form of rweḥi. 97 (pp. 262, 345).
rwyin = Tib. ḥyiyn, ḥyiyn, sink; ḡyiyn, space? 33 ḥnabcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyzah-skambil (p. 346).
rwyhe = Tib. ḡyhe, divide; ḡyhes, expanse, etc. See also ḥbye, ḥbye. 15 ḥbū; 91 ḥtāḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (pp. 267, 327, 345).
g-raḥ I = ra, raḥ, hra, ḥraḥ, ḥrāḥ, place, q.v. 7, 20 -giq-ḥner; 26, 34 ḫyos; 27 -g-yo (pp. 309, 312-13, 335, 361).
II = Tib. ḡnaḥ, enemy. 262-nag; 314 ḥṣah-ḥkhehe (pp. 224, 262, 283, 313).
g-ri I = Tib. ri, mountain. See also ḡ-rihi, ḥri, ḥrīhi (pp. 264-71). 21 -ḥrūḥu; 34 ṭid; 35 mehī; 186 ḥlīyaḥ; 252 ḥbaḥ; 296 ḥwāḥ (1); 299 -ṭi; 301 -ḥrde-ḥldah, -dze; 308 -ḥpaḥ; 312 -ṣta-meḥi; 313 ḥkrūḥ-ḥbro; 314 -ḥjim (pp. 201, 254, 265, 270, 280, 298, 303, 321, 331).
II = Tib. ri-ba, worth, price. 157 -ṭa, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (p. 267).
g-rihi = g-ri I, q.v. 298 -ḥldom 300 -ḥkuñ; 312 -ṣta-meḥi (pp. 201, 266, 270).
g-rub = Tib. grub, rub, rush in a body; rub-te, all. See also hrub
(p. 221), 261 -hgoabo (p. 342).

g-ron = Tib. gron/gran, cold, or cold; grohs, die. See also hrón
II. 71 -hyed (pp. 269–89, 273,
337).

hra I = ra, &c., place, q.v. See also hrab.
50 hec²; 347 staḥ-hroo².

II = 249 -hyan².

hrag = rag, dyke, embankment, q.v.
13 hka¹; 55 -hkyer; 256 -mah-
bog; 283 hgaḥ⁰ (pp. 147,
173).

hраn I = ra theat, q.v. [3], 5, 6, 8,
37 -hda/hldah; 59 -hgam; 21,
166, 167 -hraḥ; 33 hnaao; 101,
107 -war/hwar; 104 hlaao (1);
116, 135 -pu-glo/blo; 117 -hkaab;
147 -hraya; 192 rgyed⁰; 205 -klaa;
259 -hdrom; 308, 310,
311 hgaab-hldah⁰ (pp. 142, 200,
202, 252, 270, 283, 314, 319,
834, 345–6).

II = ra theat II, be pleased, q.v.
68 glo²; 214, 329 hkaah/hkhah-
gsaah²; 308, 310, 311 hgaab-
hldah⁰ (1); 326, 338 bhrgey/
hrgyed-hyo⁰ (pp. 268, 270, 314).

— (I) -heše, self-willed = raḥ⁰, q.v.
115 (pp. 262). See also ḡdraḥ-
hwa-hraha (II).

hrab = rab, ford, q.v. 51 ḡmar-
hbaah-gaoo².

hram = ram, agreeable, harmony,
&c., q.v. (p. 293). 10 ḡlaab-
gsom⁰ (?); 35, 37, 82, 86, 87
hoogo; 90, 94, 97, 119, 120–3,
365 htsog⁰; 49 hro-bhan⁰; 73,
76 hla/laah; 129 g-waaah⁰; 288
hsbwaah⁰; 368 hro-hpraah²; 376
hdaa-hbrog⁰ (pp. 190, 220, 239,
262, 265, 270, 288, 291–3, 321,
342, 345).

II, group, company (hardly differ-
ent from 1). 184 -hkaah-hkaah (?);
281 hbo⁰; 357 -yaḥ-phihaah (p.
231).

hraha I = ra, &c., place, q.v. 8, 25
-byos; 21, 166, 167 hraha³; 23
byos-hbrog²; 26 -g-yos; 56 hec²;
66, 226 hyaan²; 77 -hrtaah; 114

-rtah, -we-rtah; 139 -weh-rtah;
146, 273, 358 -btoon; 186, 369
mehi⁰; 216 hrgyaed⁰; 225, 236,
244, 246 -hldi; 228 hrnaao; 277
hsaah-re -btsaah -re⁰; 315 rgo⁰;
341, 392 rgyed⁰; 342 mye²⁰
rgyed[y²⁰?]; 353 hwaah⁰; 370
mebi-spebi⁰ (pp. 140–2, 228,
229, 243, 261, 262, 281, 282,
306, 313, 318, 319, 331).

II = g-raha II, enemy, q.v. 43
-ldaah (?); 149 -shun-še; 182
-rte (?); 202 -hrmaad; 354 -hrtre
(pp. 222, 313, 334).

hrahi = hraah + hi² = 380.

hраr, written for hraah, q.v. + re
(pp. 173–4). 216, 243, 246, 248
hrgyed⁰; 237 rgyed⁰ (p. 140).

hras = gus, ḡhras, aligned, q.v.
(p. 266). 344 ḡbaah-ḥkyan⁰
(p. 269).

hri = Tib. ri, mountain. See also
ghri I, g-rihi, ḡrihi (pp. 264–
71). 13 ḡdoon²; 14 hraao²; 19
-hidayan²; 168 ḡbyr²; 294
-hkruhu-hbrooh; 295 ḡṣaah⁰; 297 ḡṣaah-hyer⁰; 297 ḡnehe-
hbroom⁰; 299 -bho; 300 -ḥgru;
300 -hcei; 308 -ḥwas; 311, 312
-stah-mehi (pp. 142, 200, 201,
229, 254, 265, 267, 270-1, 323,
337, 340).

hrin = Tib. riḥ, long. 44 -rwa
(p. 343).

hrim = Tib. rim, order, succession,
degree; rim-hgro, ceremony, at-
tendance (p. 308). 282, 284
-hdzm; 293, 297 -ge-hgrus;
300 -hldobu; 319 -re-hldobu;
347, 348 -gelaḥu (pp. 265, 282,
298, 308, 321).

hrihi = hri, mountain, q.v. 62
ḥsid⁰; 290 ḡṣaah⁰; 291 ḡboos⁰;
293 ḡboos⁰; 294, 297 -hdzm; 300
-sti; 302 -ḥpaḥu; 305 -ḥgamaa
(pp. 171, 246, 267, 270-1, 297,
298, 303, 306).

hri = hri, hri, diminish? cf. ris from ḡhrri, write. 84 ḡag-
rgyaag⁰ (p. 259).

hru = ru, horn, q.v. See also ḡrubu.
82 ḡroon-hru-gaoo²; 103 rgoon-ru-
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-ge⁰; 202, 203 ḥeḥa⁰/cha⁰ (?); 238 ḥebeḥ-ḥkuṭį; 276 ḥsu-re⁰ (pp. 156, 321, 333).

ḥruq = Tib. (mgo)-rug, (head) bowed down. 47 ḥbu⁰ (pp. 250, 286).

ḥru = Tib. ruḥ, to be right, ought, have to, &c. See also ḥruḥi (p. 199). 30, 32 ḥrgu-ḥṭo⁰; 80 stor-to⁰; 138 ḥdzuḥu-ḥṭo⁰, stor-ḥto⁰ (p. 335).

ḥrub = g-rub, rush in a body, q.v. 108 ḥbo-bro⁰; 349 ḥθar-ṭhyaḥ-ge⁰ (pp. 221, 248, 343).

ḥruḥi = ḥru, q.v., +ḥi (p. 199). 167 stor-ḥto⁰.

ḥruḥu = ḥu, ḥu, ḥorn, q.v. 21 g-rém; 293 ḥriḥi⁰ (pp. 297, 298).

ḥre = re I, is, being, q.v. 155 ᵇid-raγyaḥ⁰; 159 ḥnaḥ-ḥčos⁰, spy-e-chos⁰ (p. 145).

II = re II, each, every, times, q.v. 48 -ge-ṛyṛo; 251 ḥbaṅ⁰; 267 ḥประจำ⁰ (p. 330).

III = re III, hope, q.v. 132 -ḥḍi; 155 ᵇid-⁰ (pp. 171, 216, 229).

ḥreğ = Tib. ḥbreg, bregs, regs, cut off, amputate. 122 ḥram⁰ (p. 293).

ḥrehi = re I, is, q.v., +ḥi. 200 ḥe-ne⁰; 204 ḥaγaḥ-ḥkaḥ⁰; 205 ḥđeṇ-ṣkyar⁰ (pp. 200, 222).

ḥrebe = re II, each, ḫe, q.v. 43 pra⁰; 249 ṣaṅ⁰; 251 ḥbaṅ⁰ (p. 274).

ḥro = ro, country, place, ḫe, q.v. II ḥmu⁰; 19 ḥdu⁰; 181 ḥpro⁰; 213 ḥgo⁰ (t); 272 ḥdyan-paḥ⁰; 333 ḥgoṭį; 345 ḥyeb-ḥchi⁰; 347 ᵇaṭa⁰; 377 ḥpaḥ-ḥ▌daŋ⁰; 384 ḥdyo⁰; 386 ḥdyay⁰; 387 ḥdiyaŋ⁰ (pp. 155-6, 269, 270, 274, 306, 331).

II, wolf. 110 ḥbhehi-ḥbaḥ; 234 ḥtsaq⁰ ḥbheḥi-hbar; 335 ḥrog-ge⁰ (t) (p. 293). See also ḥror. 335 ḥrog-ge⁰ (t) (p. 293). See also ḥror.

III = Tib. ro, corpse ? 198 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3 (p. 341).

ḥrog = roq I, comrades, assistant, q.v. 50 -ḥnor; 197 mu⁰; 334 ḥwah⁰; 335 -ge-hro (pp. 318, 338).

II = Tib. gro, a deep ravine with torrent. 344 ḥbo-hro⁰ (p. 231).

ḥroň = Tib. roň, a deep gorge (p. 268). 68, 371, 373, 384, 386, 389 ḥḍaḥ-ḥbron⁰; 344 ḥbo⁰; 373-7 ḥkaḏ⁰ (pp. 231, 250, 268, 269, 331).

II = g-roň II, Tib. groň, groňs, die; cf. groň, graň, cold. 36 ḥkes (p. 269).

ḥroň, Imperative form (p. 199), ′repose′ ! 378 ḥkem-ge⁰.

ḥrom (vacant) space = rom, q.v. 107 na⁰; 257 ḥṭor . . .⁰; 385 ṣe-ḥti (pp. 302, 336).

ḥror, written for hro II, wolf, q.v., +re. 303, 310 ḥe-ḥrne-ḥlaŋ (p. 270).

ḥrwa, bow = rwa, horn, q.v.; cf. Tib. rwa-gzu, bow. 59 ḥdaḥ-ḥpoq (p. 343).

ḥrwaŋ = Tib. braŋ, dwelling-place. 11 ḥkaŋ-ḥkaŋ (p. 344).

ḥrwađ = Tib. rbad, harsh noise (pp. 257, 309). 32 ḥmaŋ-ḥlaŋ (p. 345).

II = Tib. rbad, screaming eagle. 172 ḥbraŋ-prom; 173 klaŋ (pp. 257, 345).

ḥrwehi, end, be destroyed = rwehi, q.v. 22 ḥraŋ-ḥraḥ⁰; 27 ḥlaŋ-ḥmaŋ⁰; 113 ḥlaŋ-ḥraŋ⁰; 214 ḥtṣu-ge (pp. 259, 291, 345).

ḥrlehi, authorities = ḥle I, ḥleḥi, ḥlebe, q.v. 288 ḥswah-ḥram (pp. 278-9).

ḥrlomhi = ḥlom = glom, conceive, covet, q.v., +ḥi. 385 ḥriye-ge⁰ (p. 336).

ḥrlho, swirl ! 15 ḥmar-ḥbaḥ-ge⁰ (p. 350).

L

la I, Postposition, to, for (Tib. la) (p. 193). 69 ḥbehi⁰, ḥphaq⁰; 70 ḥbyig⁰ (pp. 193, 247-50).

II = Tib. la, a high pass. 345 -po[ˌrh[e] (p. 269).

la-la, a jingle, signifying something overt or large, antithetic to li-li, q.v. 109 pa⁰ (p. 280 and n. 1).
lañ = Tib. rañ in; mo-rañ, lone female (p. 221); but see mo I. 108 mo° (p. 221).

lad = Tib. lan, glan, reply, retribution. See also hlad (pp. 303–4). 225, 226 hrāsan°; 225 rūe°; 244 gse° (pp. 141, 303, 304).

lambä = Tib. lam, road, path, journey, + hi. See also hlam. 229 hrāsan-hgam°, hgwah-hrāsan°.

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. 100 hjjm°s.

e = Tib. leb, fat? 219, 220 hthañ° (p. 272).

lom, well? (p. 233). 363 hmu°.

lol = Tib. rol, play? But see hlod. 194 ste-gdzu-ge°; 195 htšar°-mye-ge° (p. 241).

hlod = lañ, moon, q.v. 73 -hram-hte (pp. 273, 337–8).


hlab = Tib. lab, speak. See also glab, hlobhi. 67, 70 -me; 159, 181-ta, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 180 gsañ-hdi°; 181 gsañ-hsge°; 182 -ge-plañ-na; 252 -re; 253 -me; 325 -hko-htagsan; 385 -hlsan (pp. 145–6, 155–6, 173, 197, 199, 231°, 234, 272–3, 274–5, 331, 341).

hlam = lam, road, journey, q.v. 25 hrāañ-hyos°; 68 hrna°; 232 rie°-hlad-ge° (pp. 138, 238).

hlamna = hlam-na. 236 ghah°-hlad°.


hlo I, group, company, perhaps = hlo-hu (Tib. lo), q.v. (pp. 322–3). 154 -ge-hlah-hlo°; 275 hno-re°; 383 rgye° (pp. 222, 285).

II. See pu-glo (hlo).

hlod = Tib. lon, arrive. But see lol. 357 thar-mye-ge° (p. 241).

hlobhi = hlob, Imperative of hlab, q.v. + hi. 378 hse-ge° (p. 199).

hloho = hlo I or hlo II, q.v. 381 bpu° (p. 157).

Ś

śi I = Tib. śi, die. See also gśi, bśi, hśi I (pp. 226). 120 -rgo (pp. 226, 291–2).

II, winter (p. 226) = Mo-so śi-h? 160 -hehos (pp. 145–6, 172, 217, 320).

śid I, high. See also hśid (pp. 225–6). 34 -g-ri; 60 hku-tsa°; 151 -rgyañ-hnom (pp. 145, 172, 303).

II = śi, perish. See also hśid II = Tib. śid, funeral ceremony (p. 226). 366 rgon-wa° (p. 332).

śud = Tib. śud, bṣud, rub, get scratched, galled. See also hśud, hśud (pp. 296, n. 1). 185 -meñ; 198 hdi-gsom°; 207 tshu-gsom° (p. 139).

śe, wise, wisdom, cf. Hsi-hsia gse, gseh (pp. 223–4). See also śes, gše, hše, hše, hše. 91 -chan; 258 -rgo-hdom (pp. 262, 318).

śeg = Tib. sreg, bsepg, bsreg, burn (irregular ś<s due to some confusion). See also gśeg, hśeg. 159 hldañ-mye°; 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-hldubu; 44
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-ḥsi-brehe; 332-hkeg-hrko; 379
-rtsg-Moñ (pp. 223, 269, 322).
śod, lay low, cf. Tib. śod, low ground.
See also ḫsod (p. 301). 198
hrō-ta-śodče/śodts (pp. 341,
358-9).
śodče/śodts. See śod.
śon = Tib. son/son, gone, come
(p. 355). 156 hwam-ḥnomp.
śor = Tib. sor, fleex, escape; bsor,
chase. 203-ḥlda, a Suffix, p. 183.
ḡšan, emnity, hate = Tib. šaṅ. See
also ḫšan I (p. 223). 30-re; 86
(for ḡšan?) -ṣaṅ- -do; 263,
264, 278 -na; 263 -kya; 264
-hdzam; 265 -na; 265 -tab, a
Suffix, pp. 182-3; 273 -hraḵ-
hton; 279 -ge (?), -htag-ḥtos
(p. 317).
ḡši, Prospective form of śi, die, q.v.
44 -ḥduṣu; 72 -brom-hnu; 344
-hdzuhu (p. 322).
ḡšim = Tib. ǧšim, agreeable, or sim,
refresh, be well, happy. 268
ḥmu-klagh (p. 298).
ḡše = ǧe, ǧes, ǧše, wise, wisdom,
q.v. (pp. 223-4). 49 -hrdzro,
q.v.; 329 brjoph; 343 sroň-ňe
(p. 239, 253, 256).
ḡšeg = ǧeg, ǧšeg, burn, q.v. 330
hrgyo-ġšeg-ġšegra; 378 ryo
(for rgyo)-ġšeg-ġšer (p. 178).
ḡšer, written for ǧšegh (p. 178). 331
see ǧšeg.
ḡšog = Tib. ǧšog, ǧšog, bšog, wing.
See also ḫšog I. 7, 20 -hner
(p. 361).
ǧši, Aorist form of śi, die, q.v.
(p. 196). 196 -ta, a Suffix,
pp. 182-3; 198-re.
ḥšag = Tib. ḡšag, bšag, talk, ex-
pound. 85 ḡhno-sto-ge (pp.
220, 341).
ḥšan I = ḡšan, emnity, hate, q.v. 81
-re-ḥšig; 120 -plam-plam; 199
-nag; 209 ḡhko; 225, 226, 227
-hlad; 300 ḡhrim-hdlou; 367
-khyaṅ (?); 393 -še (pp. 192,
265, 271, 283, 291-2, 320).
II = Tib. śaṅ, ordure (p. 223).
15, 51 -ma-hpul; 255 -ḥdzah
(pp. 267, 327).
ḥšam = Tib. šom, bšoms, bšam,
bšams, prepare, arrange, etc.
(p. 235). 277 ḡpah-ge. See also ḫšam, ḫšams.
ḥšah = Tib. ḥšah, ḥšas, slaughter,
kill, cut up. See also ḫšas
(p. 289). 83 ḡnamp-hṭe; 90
ḥṣog-ḥram; 99 ḡnab-ḥṣog; 125
ḥldam-ḫkraṅ (p. 180, 288-9, 291).
ḥšas, Aorist form of ḫšah, q.v. 102
ḥnab-ḥṣog (p. 291).
ḥši I = śi I, die, q.v. 17 -ḥroq (?);
38 -hrī; 44 -brehe; 47 ǧem-mep;
47 -ḥpo; 81 -ḥkri; 102 -kyeg (?);
123 -hwa; 153 myīr; 345
-hdzuihu (pp. 174, 226, 251, 286,
292, 298, 322, 339).
II = śi II, winter. 102 -kyeg (?)
(see under I) (p. 301).
III = śīd I, ḫšid, high (p. 226).
194 ḡhrdoṅ-ḥyo; cf. 356 -ḥšid
(pp. 240-2).
ḥšig = Tib. bšig, bšigs, hįg, de-
stroy. 81 ḡkyan-ṛgyaṅ, ḫšan-
re; 347 ḡhrm-gleḫu-ge (p.
298).
ḥšiṅ 302 ḡrįyegh.
ḥšid I = śīd I, high (pp. 225-6).
11 ḡwam; 62 -ḥriḥi; 230 ḡwa-
βzer; 306 ḡhrad-sta; 356
ḥrdoz-hyo (pp. 171, 225, 242,
II = śīd II, perish (p. 226). 52
khyag-re; 53 ḡmog-ḥce ..,o,
366 -so-nu (pp. 271, 293, 317).
ḥšud = śud, q.v. See also ḫšud.
185 -ḥdon (p. 139).
ḥše = ǧe, ǧše, wise, q.v. (pp. 223-4).
299 -še; 307 ḡlgyaṅ (pp. 252,
265).
ḥšeg I = seg, seg, burn, q.v. 48
ḥphur; 282 -še; 330 ḡṛgyo
(pp. 282).
II = Tib. ḡśegs, ḡšegs, go, come.
181 naň-ḡšaṁ (pp. 155-6).
ḥšėhe = ḡše, wise, q.v. 163 ḡhrbi;
351 -ṭi-ge; 369 -rdzo[..r]e
(pp. 216-17, 224, 239).
ḥšer, written for ḡše, wise, q.v., + re.
339 sroň-ḥneh.
ḥšes = ḡše, wise, q.v. (pp. 223-4).
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336 -ta, a Suffix, pp. 182-3; 344, 345 -gês/hês-hêsduh (pp. 223, 269).

-beg/hbeg, Proper Name of a deity (pp. 138, 147 n., 224).
3, 5, 7, 20, 22-4.

hês, perhaps = Tib. hês, copular (p. 141). 189 -hêkog; 249-hêkon; 354 -hêti-ge (pp. 140, 285, 321).

hêsog I = giog, wing, q.v. 8, 20

hês/hês-hês-hêsog (p. 361).

II separate (Tib. giog, cleave) ? 252 twân-mhar (p. 342).

hêsod = sôd, lay low, q.v. (p. 301). 147 -te-rmag; 281 hbo-hram-

ge-hêsod-tsa (pp. 231, 300, 358-9).

-tsa. See hêsod; cf. sôdece.

rşaân, stern, or violent? See also h(550,699),(659,711)(550,699),(659,711)

hês-(550,699),(659,711)

rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)

hês-rşaân, stern, violent? cf. hês-(550,699),(659,711)


II = gse, hsep, iënui, harm, q.v. 275 hwi-hwa (pp. 297, 341).

so = Tib. gson, live, life; so-nams,

husbandry. See also gso,

ghso, hso I.

- hnah/na, life-place, home, family. See also hso, htsog (pp. 293-4). 114, 117, 127, 365

(pp. 217, 252, 293-4).

swa I = Tib. so, swa, tooth. 93

-tseg-tseg (p. 334).

II = Tib. so, swa, look-out, guard, watch. See also swah, hswa,

hswa (pp. 355, 356). 174

-hdir; 175 -hkom; 176

-hphyog; 222 -gkom; 301

-g-zer; 358 (p. 270).

swa. See also hswa, hswa III.

337 hstora-ma; 340 pyarm-a.

swad. See also hswad. 390 hko-

hota (p. 264).

swa = swa II, look-out, guard, cf.,

q.v. 164 -g-zer; 319, 320 -rsha;

360 -hpeg (p. 277).

swohe = Tib. sbe, wrestle? 130

- hldag-nag (p. 342).

sram = Tib. sram, hard, enduring.

See also htsram. 72 -pa-nar

(p. 361).

sri = Tib. sri, a kind of devil? a

woman’s temper? (p. 357). 163

hso; 349 -ge-gsen-bha.

sron = Tib. sron, srowa, straight,

straight-forward. 339 -hso; 343

-he (p. 256).

slah = Tib. sla, friend, helper. 125

hldan (pp. 288-9, 335).

sli name of some animal? See also htsli.

171 hti-hော[r]k[ra] (pp. 257, 357).

slug I = Tib. slug, bzlug, pour? 47

hñad-ge (p. 251).

II 359 hnu-glañ (pp. 336, 368).

slo = Tib. zlo, summon, call; bzlos, challenge; zlos, incantation, cf.

hso; 99 -stah = slosta, with Suffix, pp. 182-3 (p. 336).

log = Tib. zlog, bzlog, turn back,

repel; slog, turn, invert (pp. 336,

368). 174 hnu-glañ; 384

hur-sli-hpaq (pp. 226, 336).

slo possibly = Tib. hod, lod, glod,

loose, relax (p. 357). 381 hbrj.
slos Aorist form of slo, q.v.
gsān I = Tib. gsān, saṅ, secret (p. 156). 17 rīa\(^\circ\); 86 (see gsān); 204 -ḥkah\(^\circ\); 329 ḥkāh\(^\circ\); 181 -hsein\(^?\); 206 -ṛmaṇ\(^?\) (pp. 155–6, 186, 200, 221).

II * = Tib. saṅ, saṅ, bsāṅ, cleanse. See also ḥsān II. 227 ḥtam-rah\(^\circ\); 228 braḥ-ḥrah\(^\circ\) (pp. 215–16).

gsā = Tib. sa, land. See also ḥsā. 276 -re-ḥtsāh-re; 333 -raham\(^\circ\) (pp. 281, 338).

gsār = Tib. gsār, new. See also ḥsār. 204 -nār (p. 361).

gsas = Tib. gsas, offbreeding; btas, give birth; btas, born. See also ḥsas (pp. 197, n. 2, 355). 282 -phā-hdo-hdza (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, htse, btes, do mischief, injure. See also gse, ḥse, ḥseh, ḥshe, ḥsheh II (pp. 140–1, 183). 48 -ḥcan; 200 g-yog-hkāh\(^\circ\); 205 -re; 238, 243 -hbon/hbon; 240 ḥlda-hlad, ḥlad; 242, 244 -hlad; 247 -stōn-stsar; 248 -ḥtaḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182–3; 249 -hso-hkon; 327 -hko-hgyan (pp. 230, 303).

gsen, possibly (v. context) = Tib. bsen-mo, a female evil spirit. 349 -ḥse.

gseh = gse, injure, ḥṣ, q.v. 135 -ḥdl-hthoḥ; 368 -caḥ.

gso = Tib. gso, live, cf. gso, tend, cure. See also gsoh, ḥso I, ḥson. 151 nōr\(^?\); 193, 194 -nad (pp. 174, 238, 241).

gsom I = Tib. sems, mind, spirit; bsam, thought, ḥṣ; som-ṇi, doubt. See also ḥsom I (pp. 235, 338). 23 -ṇi; 89 -rgyag; 178, 179-wa-hy; 198 hdl\(^\circ\)ṣud; 206 tshu\(^\circ\)ṣud; 275 ḥldaḥ\(^?\) (pp. 230, 338).

II = Tib. gaum, three (?). 10

hlah\(^\circ\) (?); 21 -ḥtshāḥ\(^?\) (?); 23 ḥtshāḥ\(^?\) (? (pp. 270, 306).

gsoh = gso, live, ḥṣ, q.v. 358 ḥraḥ-ḥton (p. 261).

bsog = Tib. sog, sog, gsoh, bsog, bsog, bsag, bsags, collect, gather, ḥṣ. See also ḥsāg, ḥsog. 183 -thom-thom.

ḥsā = gṣāh, land, q.v. See also ḥṣā. 55 gmog-ḥṣe\(^\circ\); 330 ḥṣā-g-yer (pp. 178, 278).

ḥṣāg, gather together. See bsog, ḥṣog. 359 ḥdāg\(^?\).

II = ḥṣā II, cleanse, q.v. 226 ḥyaḥ-ḥrah\(^?\).

III written for ḥswāḥ, q.v. 340 ḥstor-ma\(^\circ\).

ḥṣāns = Tib. soṭ, go, 144 ḥṣo-stor\(^?\) (p. 303).

ḥṣad = sad, kill, destroy, q.v. 40 ḥphu-hklo\(^?\); 102 -mag-ḥdeḥi; 124 ḥldaḥ-ḥкраḥ\(^?\); 147 ḥdraḥ -ge\(^\circ\); 381 ḥtsīg-Moḥ\(^?\); 383 ḥdza - MLA, ḥyaḥ-ḥthe-ge (pp. 289, 301).

ḥṣam I, think. See gsom (p. 235). 185 ma-ḥpaḥ\(^?\); 352 naḍ-pa\(^?\).

II = Tib. ṣom, bṣom, bṣoms, bṣam, bṣams, prepare, arrange (pp. 300–1, 355). cf. ḥṣams. 184 ḥṣa-ma\(^\circ\).

ḥṣams, Aorist form of ḥṣam II, q.v. 58 me-na\(^\circ\) (p. 194, 300–1).

ḥṣaḥ = ḥṣāh, land, q.v. 41 ḥyaḥ -rhnyi\(^?\); 42 ḥtsaḥ; 141 -yer; 164 ḥ ldaḥ, a Suffix, p. 183; 165 -ghtṣaḥ, ḥchad; 166 -yob-hkson; 267 -hyer; 314 -ḥkheḥe; 346 ḥṣaḥg-yer; 378 -ḥtsaḥ (pp. 142, 224, 262, 277, 278, 280, 288, 313, 335).

ḥṣar = ḣsar, new, q.v. 26 g-yos, ḥyos-ge (p. 337).

ḥṣas = gṣas, offbreeding, q.v. (pp. 197, n. 2, 355). 59 -ḥee-ṛgye; 116 te-khyan, ḥkhaḥ; 260 ḥdraḥ-hdāg, ḥmaḥ-hdāg (pp. 192, 239, 240, 261, 315).

ḥṣu I = su who? 196 ṭma\(^\circ\) (p. 246).
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II = gsu, meet, escort, q.v. 276
-re (p. 314).

ḥṣud, written for ḥṣud? (p. 296, n. 1). 313 ḥkru\(^2\); 323 ḥkhrulu-hyog\(^2\) (pp. 295-6).

ḥṣus, Aorist form of gsu, ḥṣu II, q.v. (p. 197 n. 2). 93 -alo (p. 336).

ḥṣe I = gse, gsehe, injure, etc., q.v. See also ḥṣeḥi, ḥṣehe II (pp. 140-1). 33 -ḥte; 57 ḥce\(^2\); 89, 92, 96 py\(^2\)/phy\(^2\); 163 -eri; 190 -spye; 290 ḥše\(^6\); 326 -ḥṭaḥ, a Suffix, pp. 182-3; 349 gsen\(^6\); 377-8 -ge (pp. 240, 285, 321).

II = se I, top, house-top, q.v. 374 skyim\(^6\) (p. 248).

ḥṣeḥi = ḥṣe I, q.v. 325 -ḥko-ḥgyan.

ḥṣehe I = se I, top, etc., q.v. 14 -ḥwad-ḥwad (p. 265).

II = ḥše I, injure, etc., q.v. 238 -ḥldu-ḥru; 327 -ḥko-ḥgyan (pp. 264, 321).

ḥṣo I = so, gso, live, etc., q.v. 201 -ḥdaḥ, a Suffix, p. 183.

-ḥna/ḥnah, life-place, family, etc. See also so\(^6\) (pp. 293-4). 80, 100, 103, 108, 110, 111, 231, 232, 234, 235, 270, 290.

II. See also so. 63 ḥna\(^6\); 313 ḥmor\(^6\) (p. 303).

(III) -bos, hair-tuft, cf. Tib. co-to? 257 neṭu\(^6\) (pp. 302-3).

ḥṣog = ḥṣag, ḥṣog, collect, etc., q.v. 6 ? so read, -ḥṭswė; 295 ḥnọ-ḥkho\(^6\) (p. 269, mog).

ḥṣon = Tib. gso, gson, tend, nurse. 261 phyer-chu\(^6\) (pp. 239, 283).

ḥṣoḥ-ḥṣoḥ = Tib. so-so, diverses, literally different places or bounds (so). 75 -ḥṭaḥu.

ḥṣor I = Tib. sor, finger. See also ḥṣwar. 72 -ḥtsam-bzod (p. 342).

II = Tib. sor, escape, hunt, etc., q.v. 89 gsom-rgya\(^2\); 260 -ḥgo (p. 261).

ḥṣwa = swa II, swaḥ, look-out, guard, etc., q.v. See also ḥṣwaḥ. 321 -ḥrān.

ḥṣwaḥ = swa, q.v. See also ḥṣaḥ III. 340 phyer-ma\(^6\); 341 ḥphyar-ma\(^6\).

ḥṣwad = swad, q.v. 203 ḥko-ḥldah-ḥṣe?.

ḥṣwaḥ = swa II, swaḥ, ḥswa, q.v. 288 -ḥram; 296 -g-ri; 298 -g-veḥe; 318 -ḥmor (p. 267).

ḥṣwar = ḥṭor I, Tib. sor, finger, q.v. 28 -ḥldu-sto (pp. 321, 342, 355, 396).

ḥṣram = šram, hard, q.v. 24 ḥgru\(^9\) (p. 306).


ḥṣli = sli, q.v. (pp. 257, 357). 46 ḥbeḥo-ermaṇṭ; 288, 318 ḥdzān.

ṛṣeḥi = Tib. rṣe, top, peak, etc. See also se I, ḥṛṣeḥi (p. 348). 208 -ḥrṣod.

ḥṛṣeḥi = rṣeḥi, q.v. (p. 348). 384 -ḥpag (pp. 226, 336).
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Abbreviations: co. = country; di. = district; l. = language; m. = mountain; p. = people, tribes, &c.; q.v. = 'which see'; re. = region; ri. = river; s. = 'see'; s.a. = 'see also'; st. = 'state'; t. = 'town', 'city', &c.; w. = word(s).
* Titles of works in italic; those distinguished by an asterisk are meant where only the author's name is cited.

A
A--K, Pandit, explorations, 36 n. 1, 85, 89 n. 2. S. HENNESSEY.
Abor, p., l. 154.
A-chai, 1, a T'u-yü-hun king, 45 & n. 3, 57, 144 n. 3. II = Ḥa-zā, 45-6.
A-la-shan, m., 153.
Altyn-tagh, m., 1, 6, 10, 44, 146.
Amaserig, m., 59.
Amne Bayan, m., 9.
Amne Rma-chen, m., 2 n., 4 n. 5, 5, 7, 9, 135.
Ammachensbonra, m. = Amne Rma-chen, 4 n. 5.
AMUNDESEN, E., travels, 16 n. 3.

B
Ba, p. = Ḥbār, q.v., 67 n. 2.
Ba-bams, st. = Ba-bam, 83.
Baker, 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.
Ba-di, st. = Brag-stiṅ, q.v., 83, 84 & n. 2.

Baltistan, co., 14.
Baron, di. (Tsa'dam), 9.
Ba-taṅ, st. = 'thaṅ, 83.
Ba-t'ang, t. = Ba-thāṅ, 6, 4 & n. 2, 11, 15, 19 n. 2, 67 & n. 2, 77-8; l., 75-7.
Ba-thāṅ, st. (E. Tibet), 83.
Ba-ti, st. = Brag-stiṅ, 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-gams, station in Bde, 32 n. 5, 35, 43, 243 (name).
Bde-sum-tshal ('wood'), 35.
Beg-tse, a divinity, 147 n. 1.
Bhutan, co., 14, 151.
Bichurin, Iakinf, *Istoriya Tibet i Khukhunora, 6 n. 2, 26 n. 1, 28 mm. 3-5, 30 n. 2, 31 n. 1, 33 n. 1, 38 n. 2, 45, 52 n. 4, 53 n. 2, 60 n., 144 n. 3.
Bla-bran, monastery, 20 & n. 87, 27. S.a. Lhabrang.
Blo-bzaṅ Dpah-lidan Ye-šes, itinera ry, 2 n. 3, 8 n. 2, 15.
'Blue Turquoise Lake' = Koko-nor, q.v., 34 n. 3.
Bod, co. = Tibet, 13.
Boka, mines of, 44.
Bokalik, m., 9, 44.
Bo-lo-tse, p., 154.
Bon-po, sect, 18 n. 2, 28, 155-6.
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BONVALOT, G. *Across Tibet, 7, 146 n. 2.
Bourchier, William, travels, 44 n. 5.
Bowrong, di. = Pa-U-Rong, q.v.
Boyer, Abbé, Kharoshthi Inscriptions edited by A. Boyer, E. J. Rapson and É. Senart, 60 n. 3.
Brag-mon, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 83.
Brahmaputra, ri, 3, 4 (valley & gorge), 14.
Bra-ma-thân (*plateau*), 110, 216.
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-roûn), 83. S.a. Tsent-la, Tsen-la, Zanla.
Buhagol, ri. (Tsaidam), 34 n. 1.
Bulungir, ri. (Kan-su), 10.
Bum-liûn, a place in Amdo, 110.
Burakdi, st. = Brag-stiû, q.v., 80 n. 2, 85.
Burkhan Buddha, m., 9.
Burmesse, 1, 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-gloû-ûi-gó-daûn-rje, a person (mythical), 131.
Byaûn-thân, re., 1, 3, 9, 14, 15.

Byar-liûs-tshal (*wood*), 35, 110.
Bya-yøa-byøahi-Rma-li, a person (mythical), 131.
Byøu-rma-byøu-gi-Thiûn-tshun, a person (mythical), 131, 190.
Bye-mo-thân = Byar, q.v., 35 & n. 1.
Bžagste-Nar-hbyøam, a person (mythical), 133, 190.

C

Cag-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 81, 83.
Camba Dsung = Kamb-a-rdzoûn, 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.
Chakpa, robber tribes, 20 n. 7. S.a. Go-løk.
Cha-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 81.
Chamdo, t. = Chab-môo, q.v., 6, 11.
Chang-'an, -ngan, t. = Hsï-ngan-fu, q.v., 27, 44.
Changchenmo = Byaûn, q.v., 1.
Chango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 16 n.
Charin-nor (*lake*) = Skyya-reismitsho, q.v., 4, 20, 26 (name).
Charinggol, ri. (Nan-shan), 10, 36 n. 1, 49.
Charkilik, t. (Turkestan), 23, 44, 46.
Chavannes, E., *Documents sur les Tou-kiûe occidentaux, 41 n. 3.
Ch'êng-tu, t. (Ssû-ch'uan), 9, 52, 67.
Chi, ri. (China), 54 & n. 7.
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Ch'iang-tao, t. or di. (Kan-sa), 41, 55, 56.
Chia Rung, re. = Rgyal-roh, q.v., 67.
Ch'len-fou-tung, t. (Sha-chou), 112, 117 n. 5, 129, 130.
Chi-ien, m. (Kan-su), 58.
Chimen-tägh, m., 9.
Chin-ch'ing, t. (Kan-su), 37 n. 4, 43 & n. 6, 48-9. S.a. Kin-ch'ing, Kin-tä'ing.
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-asha-chiang, ri. = Middle Yangtze-chiang, 4.
Chi-shih (Skyi), m., 38 & n. 1. S.a. Tsi-shi.
Chiu-ch'uan, t. = Su-chou, q.v., 42.
Cho-ga-chi, st. = Leog-rtse, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Chok'o-chi, st. = Leog-rtse, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Choe Chia, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Choshecha, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Choshtchaapu, st. = Khro-skyab, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Ch'u, 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. Cingön Khan, Mongol emperor, 26.
Ci-tzöö, st. = Leog-rtse, q.v., 83.
Clausen, Sir G. L. M., 62.
Cok-tsi, st. = Leog-rtse, q.v., 83-4.
Co-ne, di. & p., 27, 28 & n. 1.
Cooper, T. T., Travels of a pioneer of commerce, 14 n. 1., 149 n. 1.
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. = Leog-rtse, q.v., 83.
Crango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 82-5.
Cra-tin, st. = Brag-sstiö, q.v., 82-3.
Cu-cui, st. (?), 84 n. 2.
Cu-wö, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 83.

D
Dabasun-nor ('lake'), 26, 42 (name).
Daflá, l., 99, 154.
Dam-ba, st. (Rgyal-roh), 83, 84 n. 2. S.a. Tam-ba, Tangpa.
Dango, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 85.
Dan-la, m. = Tang-la, q.v., 2 n. 3.
Dan-tig, p. = Tan-tig, 60.
Dar-chu-doon, t. = Ta-chien-lu, 1.
Dardistan, co., 151 (Mons).
Das, S. C., Tibetan Dictionary, 2 n. 3, 4, 4, 5, 8 n. 2, 33, 137, 140, 151, 284, 297, 303, 307-8, 354, and elsewhere in notes.
Davies, H. R.,* Yün-nan, the link between India and the Yangtze, 67 n. 2, 69, 70, 73, 79, 81.
Dbye-ldan-sum, t. (mythical), 307.
Dbyé-mo, t. (mythical), 307.
De, re. = Bde, q.v., 35, 37.
De-go, st. = Sde-dge, q.v., 83.
De Groot, J. J. M., *Chinesische Urkunden zur Geschichte Asiens: I,
Die Hunnen der vorchristlichen Zeit; II, Die Westlands China 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 Tibet d'après la correspondance des missionnaires, 70, 81, 92 & nn. 1, 2.

Dge-si-tsha, st. (Rgyal-ro) l., 83, 89 & n. 2; w., 90, 92-3, 104. S.a. Gesits'a, Rgya-si-tsa, &c. (pp. 83-4).

Dgu-log, a certain fiend, 130, 255.

Dgu-sul, a place in W. Kan-su, 134.

Di-chu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.

Di-mal, l., 324.

Dje-gu, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 82, 83, 85.

Djia-xha, st. = Rgyal-kha, q.v., 83-4.

Djia-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 83-4.


Djiu-tse, st. = Leog-rte, q.v., 82-3.

Djiu-ma, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 82-3.

Dka'-mdzes, t. = Kanzé, q.v., 11 n. 1, 16 n.

Dmar-khams, di. (E. Tibet), 19 n. 2, 67 n. 2.


Donkyr, t. = Tankar, q.v., 11.

Dra, di. (Skyi), 110.

Dra-mon, st. = Brag-mgo, q.v., 83.

Dra-ti'u, st. = Brag-štun, q.v., 83.

Draya, di. (E. Tibet) = Brag-gyab, q.v., 84.

Dre-chu, ri. = Hbri-chu, q.v., 2 n. 2.

Dri-pa, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 83.

Dri-tu, st. = Tre-o, q.v., 83.


Drukagi, st. (Rgyal-ro), 84 n. 2, 85.

Drum-ba, st. = Hgron-bu, q.v., 83.

Dzim, a Ch'iang chief, 40, 52, 57, 135 = Jên, q.v.

Duampou = Hgron-bu, q.v., 1, 72.

Dulangol, ri. (Koko-nor re.), 34 n. 1.


Dungkor, t. = Tankar, q.v., 11.

Dutreuil de Rhins, J. L., La Haute Asie, 2 n. 1, 3 n. 2. See Grenard.

Dwags-po, di. (South Tibet), 15; l., See Tákpa.

Dza-chu, ri., upper Me-kong, q.v., 3, 7.

Dza-k'iong, p. = Jo-chi'ang, q.v., 43-6, 43 n. 3.

Džok, ri. (Kan-su), 58.

Džong, p. = Jung, q.v.

Dzorgei, p. (Go-lok); l., 72, 88; w., 90-1. S.a. Go-lok.

E

Eastern Colonial Tibetan. S. Tibetan.


Eighteen Kingdoms' of the Rgyal-ro, 17, 19.

Eight Snam', 235.

Eight Yogs', 267.

Etingsong, ri. (Gobi desert), 10, 27.

F

Fan-min (Chinese), Tibetan borderers, 64.


Feng-yang, a Ch'i'ang tribe = Hong-jong, 41.

Fergusson, W. N., *Adventures, etc., 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.
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‘Four Garrisons’ = Chinese Turkestan, 235.


Fussch ch'eng, t., 28 & n. 4, 33. S.a. Phug-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.

Gaishchha, st. = Dge-ši-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Gam-shan, m., 151.

Gan-tse, t. or di., 49 n. 1.

Gari, t. or di., 67.

GARNIER, F., *Voyage d’Exploration en Indo-Chine*, 75.

Gass, t. & di. (Tsaiddam), 44.

Gdags-khi, an early Tibetan king.

Gdnü-drug, a (mythical) di., 32 n. 1.

Gebšiža, st. = Dge-ši-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

*Geografia Tibetae* of Mintshul Huthuktu, q.v.

Ge-sar, legend of, 153, 213 n. 1.


Gebšita, st. = Dge-ši-tsha, q.v., 72; 1, 89 & n. 2.


Giles, L., articles in *B.S.O.S. vi & vii*. 33 n. 1, 45 n. 1.

Gilt, W., *The River of Golden Sand*, 2 n. 2, 7, 17, 64 n. 1, 66–8, 70, 84, 89 n. 1.

Gilmour, D., *The Karens*, 144.

Gi-ši-tsha, st. = Dge-ši-tsha, q.v., 83.

Giyardo, Giyarlung, Giyarmu, Giyarsa, Giyartang, t. or di. (Rgyal-ron), 17 n. 1.

Gloön-myig-loön, a mythical person = Ltoön-tehj-Mye-kru, q.v., 131.

Gnam-la-Loön-sum, a mythical place, 32 n. 1.


Gobi desert, 10, 27.

Go-je, st. = Ho-gdzi, q.v., 83.

‘Gold River’ = Chin-ch’uan, q.v., 16–17, 65, 81.


Gong, an early Ch’iang chief = Chiuang, q.v., 52.

Gossetscha, st. = Dge-ši-tsha, q.v., 84 n. 2.

Go-ya-go-phu, a certain fiend, 134, 255.

Go-ţi, st. = Ho-gdzi, q.v., 83.


Gropur, t. or di. (Skyi), 110.

Gru, di. (Tibet), 308.

Gru-gu, a place (Amdo), 308.

Gru-gu-rgya-ra, di. (Kham), 308.

Gtoön-sum-pa, p., 152.

Gu-ge, re. (W. Tibet), 130.

Guidui, t. & di. = Kuei-te, q.v., 59 n. 3.

Guö-daö, a mythical place, 307.

Gusri Khan, a Mongol Emperor, 26.

Gyä-mi (Rgya-mi), l. (Chinese), 72–3; w., 92–3.

G-yar, p., 17 n. 1, 33 n. 5, 34–5, 35 n. 1.


Gyåröng, re. = Rgyal-ron, q.v.,
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17 n. 1, 64–5, 67, 81, 82–5; l. 19, 72–3, 80, 89, 98; w., 86–7, 90–1, 93–7, 100–9, 132, 223, 236, 352, 360, 369.
Gyārungbo, a Gyārung man, 64 (Rgyal-ron-po).
G-ye-mo-thān = G-yar', q.v., 34.
Gyim-sang, m., 151.
G-yu-mtsho, 'Turquoise Lake' = Koko-nor, q.v., 34 & n. 3.

H

Haenisch, E. S. Hedin, Southern Tibet, vol. ix., 17 n. 1, 84 & n. 2, 89 n. 2.
Ha (Hwa-hwa), st. (Rgyal-ron), 83.
Hajjar, di. (Tsaidam), 9, 23, 46.
Haloun, G., 45 n. 6, 48 n., 57 n. 1.
Hami, t. (Turkestan), 24.
Han, co. (Ssū-ch'uan), 51, 57.
Han, ri. (China), 37.
Han, p., 42 & n. 7, 43, 48. S.a. Hong-te.
Hanniu, l. (Rgyal-ron), 72, 87, 89; w., 87, 90, 92–3, 95–6, 101, 105, 107.
Harṣa, Indian Emperor, 14 & n. 3.
Hashaklik, t. (Turkestan), 46.
Hbāh, p. & st. (Ba-thān), 6 n. 6, 67 n. 2, 83.
Hb-rim, st. (Hor-pa) = Be-ri, q.v., 83.
Hbrong, upland pastureage, 5, 23.
Hbrong-pa, Hbrong (pastoral) people, 5.
Hbrom-kho, di. (Koko-nor), 32.
Hbum-daṅ, a mythical place, 307.
Hedin, Sven, travels, 36 n. 1, Southern Tibet, 44 & n. 3, 82. S.a. Haenisch.
Hel-ke, t., 242.
Herrmann, A., Historical and Commercial Atlas of China, 38, 40 n. 7, 44 n. 3.
Hgar, p. (Tibet), 308. S.a. Lga, Lgar, Mgar.
Hgo-boms, t. (= Kumbum?), 12 & n. 1, 199, 243.
Hgo-źi, st. = Ho-źi, 83.
Hgreñ, p. (Amdo), 32, 57.
Hgreñ-ro, di. (Koko-nor), 32, 57.
Hgru, a legendary p. (Tibet), 307–8.
Hgru-gu, id., 268, 308.
Hgru-hdañ-hmañ, a legendary t., 307–9.
Hldyañ, p. & dynasty = Hjañ (?), 333.
Hoernle, A.F.R., JRAS. 1911, p. 112.
Hog-źi, st. = Ho-źi, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Ho-kuan, di., 37 n. 4. S.a. Chin-ch'ing.
Ho-nan, re. (China), 54.
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Hong, ri. = Ta-t'ung-ho, q.v., 38, 40, 42, 47 n. 3, 56 & n. 4. S.a. Huang.
Hong-jong, a Ch'i-ang p., 41. S.a. Feng-yang.
Hong Te, a Ch'i-ang p., 56 & n. 4.
Hoo, p. = Hu, q.v.
Hor, re. (Bya-'than), 14.
Hor in Hor-pa, q.v., 16 n., 65.
Hor = Turk, 152.
Hor-chyok = Hor-khog, q.v., 15 n. 5.
Hor-khog, the five Hor-pa att., 15 & n. 5.
Hormah, 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'i-ang tribe. S. 'White Horse'.
Horsek'anga = Hor-khog, q.v., 15 n. 5.
Horsok = Hor-pa and Sog (Mongol), q.v., 73. S. Hodgson.
Hess-beg (h heg), 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. Si'en-lien, Hsi-nin.
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.
Hsi-hchih, co. (Tang-hsiang), = Skyi, q.v., 37-8, 57.
Hsin-ch'eng, t. (Lan-chou re.), 12 n. 5.
Hsin-chiang, re. 'New Dominion' = Kan-su & Turkestan, 11.
Hsi-nga-fu, t. (China), 27, 54.
Hsiu-nu, p., 30, 33 n. 1, 56.
Hsun-hwa, t. or di. (Amdo), 24.
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'eng, t. (Amdo), 43 & n. 2.
Hung-chi on the Rma-chu in Amdo, 53 n. 7 (bridge), 237 n. 1 (bridge).

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 vocabu-
lar).
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Ja-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 83.
Japanese, w., 34, 234.
Jé, ri. (E. Tibet), 18 n. 4, = Jo.
Jén, an early Ch’iang chief, 40, 52, 57, 135. S.a. Dsim.
Jén. Si-kun, commentator on the Former Han Annals = Yen Shih-
ku, 46.
Jó, ri., 18 = Jé.
Jo-Ch’iang, p., 43–6, 43 n. 3 = Dža-k’iong, Ni-khiang. S.a. Ha-zi.
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-zi, st. = Leog-rtse, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Ju-kan, st. = Brdzum-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.
Jyæ-ruñ, co. = Rgyal-ron, q.v.,
17 n. 5; 1, 72–3, 79 n. 1, 80, 89 &
n. 2, 95; w., 87, 90, 92–4, 96, 103–
5, 216 n. 2, 343. S.a. Gyärung,
Rgya-roni.
Jye-kundo, 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.
Kailása, m. & di., 1, 14, 130, 373.
Kam-ba-rdzon, 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-yan valley in ‘Women’s King-
dom’, 18.
Kañ-sar, st. = Khan-gsar, q.v., 83.
Kan-su, re., 10–13, 24–5, 28, 32, 36,
41, 45 n., 49 n., 58, 65, 242 n. 1;
Kanzé, st. (Hor-pa), 11 n. 1, 16 n.,
18, 75, 150; 1, 75. S.a. Dkañ-
mrdes.
Kararakom, m., 1.
Karen, p., 144 (creation legend).
Karlgren, B., *Analytical Dic-
tionary 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-si-tsa, q.v., 84 n.
2.
Khab-yo-byah-Hdab-bkra, a myth-
ical person, 131.
Kham, re. (E. Tibet), 8, 13, 23,
32–3, 78. S.a. Mdo-Kham; l.,
76, 78, 84–5, 107, 209, 362 n. 1.
Khan-gsar, st. (Hor-pa), 15 n. 5, 83.
S.a. Kañ-sar, Kon-ser, Khun-sar,
Kuñ-sar.
Kharakhot, t. (ruins), 27 & n. 4.
Khar-tsian, t. & di. (Kan-su), 134.
S.a. Mkhär\footnote{Khar-tsian, t. & di. (Kan-su), 134. S.a. Mkhär.}
Khri-boms, t., 243 (name).
Khri-sor, lake = Kokor-nor, 34.
Khri-sron-ldông-brtsan, Tibetan
king, 368 (name).
Khor, t., 33.
Khiro-skyab, st. (Rgyal-roñ), 83–4.
S.a. Coskiab Cosgiyab, Chos
Chia, Chosshcia, Chosshchiuap,
Chro-siop, Tro-yiab, Tru-yiab.
Khun-sar, st. = Khan-gsar, q.v.,
83, 85.
Kiang, 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.,
l., 19.
Kioutse, l. w., 74, 92, 99, 325.
Klaproth, J., *Description du Tibet,
6 n. 2.
Koko-nor, lake & re., 8–13, 25–6
(name), 34 (name), 41, 58–9, 66,
99, 251; p., 20–1, 23, 26–8, 43, 45,
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

56, 237, 251; l., 123–4, 237, 373.
Kosow, Sten, Two Medieval Documents from Tun-huang, 127.
Kortse, p. (Go-lok), l., 72, 88; w., 90–1.
Koshu Han, a Chinese official, 12 n.
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.
Kuen-lun, m., 44.
Kum, desert (Lob-nor), 146.
K'un-chou, di. (China), 31.
Kung-sa (sar), st. = Khan-gsar, q.v., 15 n. 5, 84 n. 2.
Ku-n-sar, id., 83.
Ku-tsun, p. (Tibetans of Yün-nan), 69; l., 72–4; w., 102.
Kva-cu, t. = Kwa-chou (Kan-su), 32, 35.
Kya-ring-nor, lake = Skyar-rei's, q.v., 4 n. 4.
L
La, pass (Tibet), 5.
Ladak, co., 1, 14, 151 (Mons); l., 79; w., 102.
Lahi, p., 144 (legend); w., 99.
Lalou, Mlle., Inventaire des MSS. tibétains de Touen-houang, 33 n. 3, 247, 259 n. 2, 260 n.
Lan-chou, t. (Kan-su), 3, 5, 10, 12, 23, 42, 48.
Lang-chen, t. (Amo) = Lyo'n-jen, q.v., 36.
Lao-chieh, a Ch'iang tribe = Lotschû (tsche), 41 & n. 3.
Lha-si, st. (Rgyal-roh), 83. S.a. Wa-se, Wassi, Wassu.
Leag-la, st. (Rgyal-roh), 52–3. S.a. Leags-la, Cag-la, Cha-la, Ja-la, Dja-la, Jag-la, Ming-jing, Ta-chien-lu.
Leags-la, st. = Leag-la, q.v., 83.
Leog-rtse, st. (Rgyal-roh), 81, 83. S.a. Leog-rtsei, Cog-tsei, Cok-tsei, Co-tse, Ciu-tzû, Chok' sche, Choga Chi, Jok'i'ai, Djiu-tse (tzû).
Ldañ-la, m. = Tang-la, q.v., 2 n. 3.
Ldehu-zahi-hbri'-te Sman-skyl, a legendary person, 134.
Ldoñ, an early Tibetan tribe, 307–8.
Ldoñ Meñag, p. (Miñag, q.v.), 15 n. 3, 152.
Ldoñ Sum-pa, p. (Sum-pa, q.v.), 18 n. 2. S.a. Gtöö.
Lehü, t. or st. (Rgyal-roh), 86.
Leng-tsa, st. (Rgyal-roh), 14.
Lepcha, w., 217, 326.
Lévi, Sylvain, Tibetan invasion of India, 14 n. 3.
Lhabrang monastery = Bla-brañ, q.v., 20 & n. 8, 27, 60 & n., 243 n. 1.
Lha-mo-shan (ri), m., 54, 237.
Lha-sa, t., 11 (routes), 13–4, 26, 60 n (routes), 237 (name); l., 33, 75 & n. 1, 78, 81, 84, 85, 86 n. 2, 104–5, 107, 117 n. 5, 372; w., 107.
LIÉTARD, A., *Notes sur les dialectes Lo-lo, 70, 143.
Li-fan-fu, t. (Ssū-ch'uan), 66-7; l. (Man-Tzū), 70, 89 n. 1; w., 96.
Lig, dynasty (Zaṅ-žuṅ), 14 n. 1.
Li-gu, an early Ch'iăng tribe, 40 & n. 4, 41, 52 & n. 5. S.a. Li-ni, ‘Yak tribe’.
Lin-chou, di. (China), 28.
Linguistic Survey of India, 98, 104, 209.
Li-ni, 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.
Li-su, id., 151; l., 72.
Li-t'ang (taṅ, than), t. & di. (Tibet), 6, 11, 83; l., 67 n. 2.
Littleales, St. G. R. and Mrs., travels, 3, 36 n. 1.
Liung-ch'eng, t. = Lypo-jen, q.v., 35.
Lo, ri. (China), 54.
Lo-igu, Lo-gu, st. = Ba-bam, q.v., 83.
Lok-Tik, p., 58-9, 59 n. 1.
Lo-n-sum, a mythical place, 32 n. 1.
Lonū Man, p., 153.
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.
Ltoṅ-tehi-Mye-krnu, 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.
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

74, 87 n. 4, 90-1, 93-6, 101-6, 108, 234, 242 n. 1, 279 n. 1, 328, 330, 339, 343-4.
Mé-ke, t. (Rgyal-ron), 242.
Me-t'ang, a Ch'iang chief, 50.
Mgar, a Tibetan clan, 308. S.a.
Hgar, Lg2(r).
Mgo-log, p. = Go-lók, q.v., 20 n. 7.
Miao-tseu, p., 144 (legends); w., 132.
Mién-tsú, t. & di. = Min-chou, q.v., 54 & n. 9.
Min, r. (Ssú-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.
Ming-jeng (cheng, tscheng), 84 n. 2. S.a. Lc-ala.
Minia, l., 72. S.a. Mi-ñag.
Min-k'ia (chia), p.; w., 98-9.
Min-shan, m. (Ssú-ch'uan), 9, 41 n. 2.

Miri, l., 99, 154; w., 99 n. 1.
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Ts'u-ku, t. & di. = Tse-kou, q.v., l., 81.

U, V

'Valley of the Winds' (Bya-tha'ug re.), 44.
Vial, P., Les Lolas, 143.

W

Wahong-shan, m. (Koko-nor re.), 9.
Wang Jing-ju, Shishia Studies, 34 & n. 5, 58 n. 1, 62 n. 1, 127, 190 n. 1, 330 n. 2.
Wang Mang, Chinese emperor, 47-8.
Wu-se, Wassi, Wasso, st. = Lba-si, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2; l., 73, 89; w., 90-1, 94.
We, 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 Chi'ang p. = Pai-ma, q.v., 40 & n. 5, 41, 52 & n. 6, 53.
Winds, S. 'Valley of the W.'
Wo-jih, Wok-je(se), Wok-shih, st. = Ho-gi, q.v., 83, 84 n. 2.
Wolfenden, S. N., (1) *Notes on the Jyårgung Dialect of Eastern Tibet, (2) *Outlines of Tibet-Burman Linguistic Morphology, 17 n. 1, 19, 71, 80, 87 & mn. 3, 4, 88, 95, 98, 206, 208, 210-11, 301 n. 2.
'Wolves, Mixed', a Chi'ang p. = Ts'an-lang, q.v., 40 n. 6, 41, 51, 53 & n. 1.
'Women's Kingdom' = Sum-pa, Nû-kuo, q.v., 11, 18-19, 28-9, 53, 69, 85, 99, 137 n. 2, 153, 238.
Wo-zi, st. = Ho-gi, q.v., 84 n. 2.
Wu, an early Chi'ang chief, 40.
Wu-tu, st. (Ch'iang) in S. Kan-su, 40, 51, 53 & n. 1, 56. S.a. Te.
Wu-wei, t. = Liang-chou, q.v., 12, 49.
INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Y


Z

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 et
Lakes as Sagor-riba I.
Main caravan routes as ————
Chinese frontier wall as ————

SPELLINGS
Tibetan and Chinese names in orthographic transcription, where ascertainable, e.g. Bum-thain (Bhutan), Dkar-ldzès (Kambo), Drig-thain (Bumang), 'Brul-chu (Dro-chu), Hui-ning (Sining), No-log (Golek), Phug-ru (Phari), Sbras-tag (Panakha-sam), Sde-dge (Derge), Skyi-dgrol (Kyirong), Thag-lha (Tang-la); see ‘Index of Proper Names.’
Other names as reported or usual.
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