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

When Drigum btsanpo was still small in size, v1 [they] asked v3 the nurse Grožama Skyibrlingma ‘how (lit. as what) shall [he] be named?’ v2 [and] from the words of the nurse: ‘The Golden Rock of Skyi, <1> did it crumble to pieces or not? v4 v5 Did it dry up or not? v6 v7 Did the Meadow of the bri, the Meadow of the bri, did it get burnt by fire or not? v8 v9 Did the lake Damle, the Pointed Lake, did it dry up or not?’ v10 v11 v12 v13 <2> it was spoken thus. ‘The rock did not crumble. Nor did the lake dry up. Nor did the meadow get burnt by fire’, v14 v15 v16 so [they] answered (lit. said), v17 but the nurse Grožama, being aged, heard it just the opposite way as due to her ears: <3> ‘Not only did the rock crumble into pieces, but the meadow got burnt by fire, and the lake dried up, as well”, having heard it this way, [she] spoke: v24 ‘Well then, in order to kill the water spirit (lit. to kill the water, to kill the spirit) name [him] as Drigum btsanpo!”, and thus they named v25 [him] as Drigum btsanpo, but the name-giving was an error <5> and [it] affected (lit. entered) v27 also his mind (or personality).

§ 2 clause v28-v73 (OTC l. 6-21): fight between Lojam and Drigum

The divine son, not having the manner v28 of (ordinary) men, <6> [namely as] possessing great gifts and magical powers such as really going to heaven, v29 was unable to withhold heat and pride and when, being full of violence, v30 v31 v32 v33 v34 [everyone], [he] called upon v37 nine cousins [among] the paternal bondsmen and three cousins [among] the maternal bondsmen: ‘Dare you to fight us as an enemy and stand up against us, the yak?”, <8> one by one, they said ‘[I] shan’t dare”. When marshal Lojam likewise said v41 ‘[I] shan’t dare”, v42 v43 [the emperor] did not accept [it] and thereupon Lojam prayed ‘If, thus, you do not accept, if you bestow on me with the divine treasures, such as the self-stabbing spear, self-cutting sword, self-donning mail, and self-parrying shield, the great magical treasures which you possess, [I] shall dare.” v47 Thus [he] prayed. v48 Then [the emperor] bestowed [Lojam] with all the divine treasures. Thereupon marshal Lojam, on his part, went ahead to the castle Myaŋro Šampo. After the emperor likewise betook himself to Myaŋro Šampo, [they] arranged the battle in the grove Myaŋro Thalba and then, as from the words of the marshal it was prayed to cut the ?bright red ?divine ribbon (dbuḥṭBrej zayag), <10> and prayed to also turn upside down (lit. with the opening downwards) the nine-?stepped ?divine ladder (dbuḥṭskas stendguḥ), <11> [the emperor] granted these two [requests] accordingly. Thereupon Lojam fas-
tended, two hundred golden spear heads on the horns of (lit. upon) a hundred oxen and loaded ashes on [their] backs, following which Lojam attacked [the emperor]. As for the emperor Drigum [his ancestor deity] Ldebla Guṛgyal tried to pull him up to the heaven, but Lojam drew out a monkey from [his] armpit, who then cast Ldebla Guṛgyal into the womb of the glacier Titse, [where the latter] died (lit. betook himself [to the heaven]). Since [he=Lojam /?the monkey] had killed emperor Drigum likewise at this place, [he=?Lojam] placed the corpse into a juxtaposed (ly) sealed copper (vessel) and discarded it in the middle of the Rtsa river. At Chabğzug Sertsha [it] went into the stomach of the water spirit Ὅdde Bedde Riṅmo. Having, in turn, named the two sons as Šakhyi and Ñakhyi, [he=?Lojam] banished [them] to the land of Rko and separated [their property].

§ 3 v74-v86 (OTC l. 21-26): the killing of Lojam

Thereafter, two [loyal men], Rhulbžikhugs of Rhyamo and Btsanbžo guṛgyal of Snanam smeared poison into the fur of the great dog of the dominion: Ὅnzugsyargras (?), and of the two [dogs] of Ὅjan: Zulemahjan and Ὅonrku (?), and when, passing the rock shelter (?rocks and slates) at (lit. of) the narrow passage, [they] examined a [bird's] stomach for the signs: the signs were good, thus arriving in the land of Myāro Šampo, [they] infiltrated (?/fastened; lit. stringed) the dogs with a trick, and while there was poison in the dogs' fur, now my marshal(s) led [them] along, and as for the good dogs, Lojam’s hand patted them, and since our marshal(s) had anointed the dogs’ fur with poison, [his =Lojam’s] hand got besmeared, and [so] [they] killed [him] and took his life (lit. flesh) in revenge. <22>

§ 4 v87-v119 (OTC l. 21-35): the Rhya-Bkrags war and Darleskyes’ birth and his inquiry about father and lord

Thereafter, the son of Bkrags, the divine son Rulaskyes, a paternal cousin, fought with Rhya as a paternal cousin (i.e. they fought a fraternal war). Rhya cut off the Bkrags lineage. [He] confiscated (or drove away) the livestock. One consort of Bkrags fled and was able to rescue herself in the land of her father and brother. Carrying a child in her womb (lit. belly), [she] had gone, and [thus it] was born here. As soon as the son was able to stand upright among the man of the Spu clan, [he] said to his mother: ‘If every man and every bird has a lord, where is my lord? If every man and every bird has a father, where is my father?’, thus he said, ‘Show [them] to me!’, having spoken thus, from the words of the mother: ‘Child little, don’t talk big (lit. be big with your mouth)! Colt, little don’t talk strong (lit. be strong with your mouth)! <29> I don’t know [nothing]’, having spoken thus, from the words of the son of the Spu clan, Darleskyes: ‘If [you] do not show [them] (if you do not explain [this]) to me [I] am going to die.” <30> ‘As for your father, Rhya killed him.
As for your lord, marshal Loṇjam killed him, placed the corpse into a juxtaposed (ly) sealed copper (vessel), and discarded it in the middle of the Rtsaṅ river. At Chabgžug Sertshaṅ [it] went into the stomach of the water spirit Ṣode Rigm. As for the royal sons, the two brothers, having named them as Šakhyi and Ṣakhya, [he ?=Loṇjam] banished them to the land of Rkoṅ and separated (them) (or: redistributed [their property])."

§ 5 v120-v182 (OTC l. 36-49): ransom of Drigum's corpse

Thereafter, from the words of the son of the Spu clan, Darlaskyes: ‘The one destroyed by men (/the destroyed man) [i.e. Bkrags], his traces to follow, and the one destroyed by water [=Drigum], his remnants to search, I shall go’, saying this, he started off. In Bresnar [in] the land [of] Rkoṅ [he] met with the sons Šakhyi and Ṣakhyi, on the one hand. On the other hand, [he] met with the water spirit Ṣode Bedde Rigm. ‘By what that you wish in exchange for the corpse of the emperor may [I] ransom [it]?’, having said this, [the water spirit] spoke: ‘[I] do not desire anything else: [I] want one who has human eyes like bird eyes, one who closes (lit. covers) them from beneath’, but although the son of the Spu clan, Darlaskyes searched in the four directions, [he] did not find [one with] human eyes, [but] similar to the eyes of a bird, [one who] closes (lit. covers) them from beneath, then, [his] provisions finished, his boots having got holes, he came back to [his] mother and after telling her: ‘As for the one destroyed by men (/the destroyed man) [i.e. Bkrags], [I] was able to follow his traces, as well as for the one destroyed by water [=Drigum], [I] found [his] remnants. [I] met with the sons Šakhyi and Ṣakhyi, and when [I] also met with the water spirit Ṣode Rigm, [the spirit] said: ‘As ransom for the corpse [I] want [one with] human eyes, [but] similar to the eyes of a bird, one who closes (lit. covers) them from beneath’, and since [I] have not [yet] found [any such], [I] must set out again to search [this being]. Pack up [/?Give me] [some] provisions!’, he went off again. As [he] came to [a place] below Gyarphurphrun and went up to [the spot] where a daughter of the family <35> Manbird (/Menbirds), was working on a canal (/??where someone was trying to make a daughter of the family Menbirds asleep), and when, [realising that] [s/he] had, lying in a cradle/crib, a child who covers the eyes from below, similar to bird eyes, [he] asked the mother: ‘If [I] shall ransom [this one], what do [you] wish [in exchange]?’; ‘[I] do not wish anything else: Forever and ever, whenever the emperor, lord or wife dies, as for [one’s] tuft of fine plaits (lit. fine tuft), having tied it (up), having [one’s] face anointed with vermilion, having applied ornaments on [one’s] body, one assembles at the corpse of the emperor. For (/Towards) the people: swag and swaggering (phrogrlom). For (/Towards) the fare: eating and drinking! Shall you act like this or not?”, the mother having spoken thus, [he] laid down a solemn vow (lit. cut a vow, cut a high [one]) to act accordingly, and went leading along the daughter of the family Manbird. [He] deposited [the child /the daughter] in the belly of the water spirit Ṣode Rigm as ransom for the corpse.
§ 6 v183-v225 (OTC l. 49-62): Spude Guṣrgyal assumes power

Ñā[khyi] and the [future] lord (ilha or ilhasras) <44> took hold v183 of the corpse of the emperor. On top of (mount) Gyaṭo [in Rkoγ], <45> [they] built v185 a tomb like a ?neck (?)tent) <46> turned upside down. v184 As for the younger brother Ñakhyi, he hosts v186 the funeral repast. As for the elder brother Śakhyi, he goes (?went) v188 to take revenge v187 for the father. As for Ñakhyi, he is (/was) v189 the White [Prince] of Rkoγ. [He ?= Ñakhyi /As for φ ?= Śakhyi, he] <47> departs (/departed) v190 with an army [of] about three thousand three hundred [men]. [He] go(es) (/went) v191 to the castle Piŋba. ‘If there is v192 no lord over (lit of) the elders of the country, <48> the outer nomads and the vassals will one by one turn away (and leave). v193 <49> If the rain for the elder of the pike (?the sprout) <50> does not come v194 [in time], seeds and ?insects <51> will one by one decay”, v195 thus [he/?they] spoke. v196 [He] crossed v197 the pass of the Menpa chain. [He] passed through v198 the long gorge of Tiṅsra. [He] came v199 to Bachos Guṇḍạn. When [he] came v200 to Myañro Šampo, the hundred men [of the] Loṃjam [clan], having sheltered v201 <52> their heads with pots, [?nevertheless] jumped (?run) v202 into death. The hundred women [of the] Loṃjam [clan], having pressed v203 large iron pans against their breasts, were [nevertheless] ?disgraced (?were scared shitless). v204 <53> [He] overthrew v205 Myañro Šampo. The bipeds [he] took v206 as prisoners, the quadrupeds [he] confiscated v207 as [his/the state’s] livestock, <54> and went v208 [back] to Bachos Guṇḍạn. [He] sang v209 the following song: ‘ḥabahi-ṇepahiṇi. In every v55> bird the tip of the lance. <56> In every hare the tip <57> of the boot. [We] have beaten v210 the thigh (perhaps an euphemism for animal and/or human sacrifices?). [We] have disposed v211 of the corpse. The pit <58> is no more. v212 The [former] Spu is no more.” v213 <59> Thus [he] spoke. v214 [He] crossed v197 again (back) to [the castle] Piŋba Stagrtse. [He] went v216 [there] as the lord of the elders of the country. [Thus:] ‘[In] the country, the outer nomads and the vassals will not turn away. v217 Because the water for the elder of the pike (?the sprout) has come, v218 seeds and ?insects will not decay.” v219 Such sang (lit. spoke) v220 [he] that song. At the fundament of the hearth (?=the dominion) <60> [he] brought down (=?subdued) v221 copper ore (?=the competing rulers) from above <61> and came v222 as the lord. When he was engendered: v223 Spude Guṣrgyal, when he died: v224 Graqmo Gnam Bseḥbrtsig. <62> [He] came v225 as the lord for the black headed bipeds, and as assistance for the maned quadrupeds.

<1> mar. As a reference to a particular place, it is not unlikely that the Zhangzhungian meaning ‘golden’ had been intended and not the classical meaning ‘red’ for which the spelling would be dmar-. For the respective colour terms cf. also Zeisler to appear, §5.3.4.1.

<2> Contrary to all other translations, NWH insists on a present tense reading, explaining this as follows: ‘The three verbs riil ‘crumble,’ tshig ‘burn,’ and skams ‘dry’ appear to be present stems. They are here unexpectedly negated with ma rather than mi. Bacot et al. translate these passages with the passé composé (1940: 123), and Haarh with a present perfect (1969: 402). To me present makes better sense. If these events had taken place very far in the past the nurse would already know about them. Additionally, to ask about them in the past implies some expectation on part of the nurse that they are likely, whereas a present simply asks about their current condition’ (2006: 89f, n. 4). skams is clearly not a ‘present’ stem, but evidently stem II of the adjectival skam ‘get, be dry’, cf. the derived nominal adjectival skampo ‘dry’. Stem II can have a resultative or present perfect function (present result of a past event), especially in the case of adjectivals, while stem I seems to denote the inchoative meaning (cf. Zeisler 2004: 450). riil and tshig are verbs with no (apparent) stem alternation, although the form nii Jádam points to an inherent -d suffix as marker for
The phrase *rna logpar thosste* follows the model of *sku chuṣha* ‘small, little with respect of the body’ in clause v1 (see also Hahn 1985: 48, section 7.5 d) where he gives *gtisg/sgralblo zabpo* ‘deep with respect to the ground/voice/intellect’, and *rgyaṅ rigba* ‘be long with respect to the distance’.

*chu dgum, srin dgum*. It seems to be a common poetic or rhetorical means in Old Tibetan to divide up a compound and duplicate the predication, cf. the division of *dmaṇḍmtho* in clauses v176 and v177, and of *damṣṭhig* in clauses v178 and v178. A similar example, but without predication, is the division of *phatshan* in clause v35. Bacot et al. translate ‘pour tuer les humeurs et les Sri’ with a note ‘Démons s’attaquant spécialement aux enfants’ (1940: 123, n. 3). Haarh translates ‘because there is water-death, and there is sri-death’, but the verb stem III has a patient-oriented gerundive function with a strong obligational character (cf. Zeisler 2004: 264).

Bacot & et al. translate this likewise as ‘ce fut une faute’. Haarh more freely as ‘was ominous’. NWH chose the possible meaning ‘regret’, but then, given the close connection between two events indicated by the *lhagbcas* morpheme [ste], which does not easily support a ‘subject’ switch, the ‘subject’ of regretting should have been the ‘subject’ of entering Drigum’s mind in the following clause, which would not make much sense.

*myiṣi myiṣtshulte*. We follow Bacot & al., since it is more probable that the emperor, styled a descendant of the gods, is not like other human beings, than that he is (as suggested by Haarh). The word *tshul* is normally a noun. The *lhagbcas* morpheme [ste] may well combine with nouns, especially when introducing an enumeration, but in our case the resulting meaning ‘the human manner of man’ would be extremely infelicitous with the enumeration of super-human faculties. Therefore, the syllable *myi* must be interpreted as a negation morpheme and not as the word ‘man’ for the story to make sense. But because negation markers only combine with verbs, *tshul* must be a verb, with the highly irregular case frame *Abs Gen*. The genitive seems to be triggered by the nominal use, but it might perhaps also be a misspelt instrumental or it might reflect an ancient pattern as found in the Kenhat dialects of Ladakh, where agents, causes, media, and possessors receive the same case marking. But, of course, one also has to reckon with some mistake in mounting the text passages.

Given the fact that *btsan* is an adjectival, and thus basically a verb ‘be mighty, powerful, violent, strong, etc.’, and that the nominaliser -po of the imperial title is missing, one should take all three words as verbs, describing the behaviour of Drigum. The use of stem I in its non-finite function (actually a case of cross-clausal group inflection, since the morpheme of the last verb in the row extends over the preceding verb(s)), binds correlated or like events closer together and suspends the sequential order as suggested by the linear presentation, giving thus the impression of simultaneity (cf. Zeisler 2004: 355-357). Since Drigum is already the implicit subject/topic of the preceding clauses, there is also no need for an explicit mentioning, either under his name or under the Imperial title. NWH prefers to interpret the first of these three clauses as NP with *btsan* for *btsanpo* ‘emperor’. His original note runs as follows: ‘Haarh suggests three translations: 1. accused of contending, vying; 2. contending for, he chased; 3. fighting and hunting’ (1969: 402 n. 5 on pg. 453). He opts for the third in his translation. Wang and Bsodnams Skyid interpret it as ‘*btsan śekṣyis lgraṅbshdur byedbcug* [with imperial authority he made [them] contend and fight]’ (1988 [=1992]: 34 n. 129 on pg. 81). It is presumably on this authority that Jacques translates this phrase as ‘*et il poussait (ses sujets) à participer à des épreuves de force (avec lui).*’ I think it simpler to see *btsan* as the topic and *dran bdaḥ* as a description of his action or state at the time that he proposed to his subjects that they vie with him” (transliteration adjusted).
<8> drug. This word is not attested as verb or adjectival, but only as noun or postposition. But Haarth’s translation ‘Are we equal in prudence to the Yak?’ (p. 402), based on the adjective drug po ‘prudent’, does not really fit the context. Nor does it fit the grammar of the verb phod; ‘come up to, be nearly equal in worth to’ which requires a locational marker (cf. JÅK). Wang & Bsdnam Skyid 1992: 34 emendate g.yogdu for g.yagdu, which apparently is intended to yield the meaning ‘dare you to fight [us] in front of the servants (as witnesses)?’, but is completely against the syntax (g.yogdu drug should then precede dgrruru rgal-phod). NWH suggests a similar inversion: ‘I wonder however if it could be odd syntax for g.yagdu drug dgrruru rgal phoddam?’ (transliteration adjusted). An alternative possibility to interpret drug as an archaic form of rug ‘be fit, suitable’ (for a possible alternative rV ~ þdrV, cf. Spigg 1970: 16-17, Hill 2006) is ruled out by the following modal verb phod, ‘dare, be able’. Nevertheless, there might have been an etymologically related verb with an agentic semantics.

<9> Bacot & al. as well as Haarth translate the two speeches as one single direct speech, with gsol as a performative verb. (In the case of performative verbs, the utterance is identical with the event referred to, e.g. when saying ‘I promise ...’ a promise is given or when saying ‘I request that ...’ the act of requesting is performed.) However, at least in the case of the second speech, the verb gsol cannot be a performative verb and part of the speech, since it is given in a non-finite form gsol-nas, lit. ‘from (having) spoken’. The request itself is thus given as embedded proposition or indirect speech. It is also not so clear whether gsol can ever be used as performative verb or only as descriptive verb relating to third persons, particularly since the verb ã ‘ask, request (a person of high status)’ is commonly used as performative verb. NWH, thus, translates both parts correctly as indirect speech. From that it follows that the two verba dicendi form a close unit and the ablative morpheme nas of the second verb operates also on the first one, a case of cross-clausal group inflection.

<10> The first element would suggest a reading such as ‘?head-ribbon’. But as there is some evidence for an interchange of (prenasalised) oral and nasal labial stops, dbu might perhaps be taken as a dialectal variant of dnu, a particular ‘deity’ and the realm of the heaven (cf. Stein 1941: 226-230, Zeisler, to appear, §5.3.4.3 for some interesting oral and nasal doublets, as well as Beckwith 2006: 187 for similar sound changes in Chinese). Other mythological narrations have Drigum accidentally cut the dmuthag, a rope that allows the defunct to ascend to heaven, and thus he is the first king whose body remains on earth after death, and the first king to be buried. The latter motive recurs also in the present text. It seems thus not to be too far fetched to assume, that the ribbon, which Drigum cuts according to the request of Loñam, is exactly the crucial connection to the heaven.

<11> The single elements would suggest a reading such as ‘?head-?ladder’, qualified as having nine sten or ‘?holders’. Perhaps simply a kind of auspicious insignia or ornament. But perhaps again a reference to the dmuthag (the rope that allows ascend to heaven) or, in mythical duplication, a reference to a similar tool, which is likewise made useless by turning it upside down.

<12> rba. Bacot & al. (1940: 98, l. 1), Haarth (1969: 403), as well as TDD/OTDO represent the word as rbal, Wang & Bsdnam Skyid (1992: 35) as sбал. They suggest an interpretation as ‘joined one behind each other’ (p. 80, n. 133). Without any comment, Bacot & al. as well as Haarth translate the word correctly as ‘horn’. In fact, the superscribed consonant looks very much like the superscribed s- in stendgůr just one line above (l. 15) and in þtabste just one line below (l. 17). However at a closer look, one will realise that there is too much space between the initial cluster and the following la, enough to insert a syllable separating tsheg. The final right stroke of the apparent superscript sa ends up exactly where one would expect a tsheg and the accurate eye can, in fact, perceive a tsheg at this point. The stroke apparently resulted from moving the pen too hastily from the base of the letter to the tsheg (a similar line, although much weaker, can be seen in sger of the same line). Without mentioning, who pointed out all this to him, NWH summarises our discussions as “An examination of the facsimilies […] convinces me that the text has rwa la, though hastily written such that the r obscures and combines with the following tsheg.” (2006: 92, n. 16). The radical (or subscribed?) ba actually corresponds to the wazur, the subscribed va, in accordance with the expected spelling for the word ‘horn’. Apart from this, it is interesting to note that throughout the whole document the consonant in question does not yet have the small size of the subscribed wazur, but is a full-sized triangular ba without the horizontal bar on its top, cf. the other
two occurrences of rña ‘horn’ in the OTC: line 215 and 502 (the obviously derived character of the letter is reflected here in the representation as ‘ß’). These instances are represented more or less correctly as rava and rña in Bacot et al. (1940: 107 l. 11, 121 l. 8), as rwa (with wazur) in Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 46, 64) and in TDD/OTDO. The upper bar is, however, also found in one of two instances of kKla cu l. 340, 341 (the latter with the bar). Both the form of the radical ba and that of the radical or subscribed va are important epigraphic traits, which can help to date early documents. The fact that in OTC a derived (bar-less) ba could apparently still interchange with a full ba (with top bar), and that the derived letter is not reduced in size, has not yet been brought to the attention of the public, as far as we know (Uray, who obviously had no access to the OTC manuscript, only points to a case of non-reduction in size in another text, but does not mention the occurrence of the top bar; 1955: 108). As mentioned by NWH (2006: 92, note 16), the honour for first representing the text (almost) correctly as rwa (with wazur) might go to Gyaltshog Dkonmchog Tshesbtxtan (1995: 17). Unfortunately, the author does not comment his decision.

Haarh apparently analyses the additional locational argument (oxen) as the primary location and the locational argument (horn) as a manner adverb, translating this passage as ‘fastened two hundred spearheads like horns upon one hundred oxen’, which is somewhat against the grammar (one would have expected locative-purposive case marking in this case) as well as against the intended meaning (the expression would have made sense, only if the oxen were hornless).

The clause is somewhat difficult to analyse. The problem does not get easier in view of the possible variation in the frame. The whirling up of ashes in the following clause indicates that the oxen with their spears and their sacks of ashes must have got into close contact with each other. This seems to rule out some human agency for the fighting in the present clause. Bacot & al. followed by NWH, prefer thus an interpretation where the oxen fight against/among each other. NWH argues that the further context, where Lojam is said to attack among the haze, does not really support the idea that Lojam (and/or the emperor) should be the agent of the fighting, but he admits that his solution ‘may not be philologically justified.’ According to Haarh, the oxen simply fight. Seen from a technical side, it is not absolutely necessary that the oxen fight each other in order to get the sacks of ashes torn by their lances. The same could happen, if they simply get somewhat to close to each other by being driven together or in a stampede. This even more so, if the ashes were not loaded upon the oxen in sacks, but simply ‘put’ upon their back, as Haarh translates (however, the little quantity of ashes that can be deposited so, might not yield the necessary haze). One might think of an interpretation where the implicit agent Lojam drives the oxen ‘inside’, i.e., into the forest or — since this evidently goes against the documented meaning of the verb jthab — where the oxen ‘get driven’, ‘get entangled’, or ‘huddle together inside’, assuming an etymological relation (intransitive or inagentive vs. causative) between jthab and jdebs ‘drive’, lost in CT. In that case we should assume only a frame with the first argument in the absolutive. But then again, the absolutive of the noun nay ‘inside’ could not be accounted for. Since postpositions can be realised as compounds, by which transformation their case marker is dropped, the best solution seems to be to take gla.nay ‘among the oxen’ as such a compound, hence the missing co-actors must be Lojam and the emperor: It would be utterly infelicitous to state that the oxen fought among the oxen by using the full NP two times or by even dropping the first NP (cf. the corresponding sentences in English; nobody would ever assume that ‘they’ in a sentence like ‘they fought among the oxen’ refers to exactly the same oxen). Further more, the deletion of the agent argument is much better motivated when it continues a preceding agent, which by virtue of being human is also high on the animacy hierarchy, than an argument that is animate, but takes the role of a location. That the empty argument actually refers to two different previous agents should not be a hindrance. The fact that Lojam attacks the emperor in the resulting haze is also not really a contradiction to a previous statement that Lojam and the emperor fought, or perhaps rather started to fight, among the oxen. Nevertheless, there seems to be a passage lacking, describing how and why exactly the ashes got scattered.

While following the translation of Bacot et al., this seems to be also the linguistically most feasible interpretation. Fieldwork in Ladakh has shown that there is a strong preference to link up an empty argument with the P argument of the preceding clause. We do also have examples for an agent–patient cross-reference relation in contexts of employment and assistance. Nevertheless, from the perspective of the Tibetan prehistory and mythology, monkeys seem to have played an essential
This is only one of several possible interpretations of a rather enigmatic passage. There are basically three options: \textit{g.yalp} or \textit{g.yalpo} could either refer to the dogs or to the people who sent the dogs. In both cases the word could be interpreted as \textit{g.yalha} ‘relative’ (BRGY) or perhaps rather role for the self-definition of particular ethnic groups, assuming the role of totems or ancestor-deities (cf. Zeisler to appear, §5.3.4.2). One could therefore think that Loṣam pulled out the monkey from the bosom of god Ldebla Gurgyal as a representation of the latter’s soul or magical power, and that this deprivation caused the latter’s death. On the other hand, as the whole episode implicitly reflects a dynastic change and ultimately the installation of the Spurgyal lineage, and since the clan name Spu has some quite obvious etymological relations with the word for ‘monkey’, and one could likewise assume — against the Tibetan tradition — that Loṣam was actually associated with the Spu clan and thus could use the magical power of the monkey totem to overcome the Lde (deva) lineage.

\textit{za}s\textit{b}r\textit{gya}ha. Bacot & al., Haarh, and NWH translate this as ‘hundred copper vessels’, the former two omitting the adjective \textit{kh}a\textit{sp}r\textit{od}, the latter translating it as ‘closed’. However, according to the standard word order within noun phrases, the numeral would be misplaced before a further adjective. The numeral might have thus been part of a compound, but this solution does not seem to be well motivated here. In the light of the expression \textit{za}s\textit{b}r\textit{gya}a\textit{m}a in clause v115 below, where the corresponding derivation ‘hundredth’ would be even less motivated than the plain numeral, I would suggest the interpretation ‘sealed copper vessel(s)’. For an alternative reading \*’wide copper vessel’ one would expect an inverted order of the compound elements on the model of \textit{rg}ya\textit{nts}\textit{ho} ‘wide lake, i.e. ocean’. The notion ‘juxtaposed’ may refer either to a small set of vessels fitted into each other in a juxtaposed manner or to the position of the opening of the vessel with respect to the corpse (thus at the feet). In a less felicitous way, it might perhaps also indicate the juxtaposition of the seals.

The interpretation that the empty arguments in clauses v67 to v69 actually refer to Loṣam is corroborated by the parallel episode clauses v113 to v115, narrated by Ḍarleskye’s mother: there Loṣam is the explicit agent of killing and, given the close connection between events indicated by the lhagbcas morpheme \{ste\}, which does not support a subject switch, also the implicit agent of the following two actions.

I correctly interpret that Loṣam is the agent of the name giving (because this event is closely connected with the following two events in clauses v72 and v73, ), this may imply that according to this narrative, the names given are thought to be non-auspicious and were literally understood by the author or compiler as ‘Stag-Dog’ and ‘Fish-Dog’. This would further imply that it was not generally known that the element \textit{khi} is an East Tibetan variant of \textit{kh}ri, surfacing in so many regal names. The latter element, although unanimously translated as ‘throne’, seems to be related to the word \textit{ph}hr\textit{id} ‘lead’, and may thus correspond to the title of a ‘Duke’. Together with Byakhri, the ‘Bird-Leader’, known from later traditions, Šakhri, the ‘Stag-Leader’, and Nakhrri, the ‘Fish-Leader’, represent the three realms of the world (Heaven, Middle-World, and Yonder-World), cf. also Haarh (1969, passim). They would certainly not have received such prestigious names from their foe. On the other hand, it also seems to be somewhat unlikely that Loṣam would have left them alive, if they had already been given such names (at birth or later). They would have been a constant threat to his usurpation. Although we are here certainly not dealing with ‘real’ facts, it is noteworthy that according to the narrative, Loṣam does not attempt to cut off the progeny of Drigum. In the conflict between Rulaskyes and Ṛhya, narrated somewhat later, clauses v87 to v89, the winner, Ṛhya, is said to do exactly that, although eventually one son, Ḍarleskyes, survives. While, quite apparently, the Tibetan historical tradition has fused these two narratives into a single one, making Ḍarleskyes or rather his father Rulaskyes a posthumous son of Drigum, it is quite evident the two narratives do not, as Haarh (1969: 156) thought, represent the same historical event under different names.

A Zhangzhungian dynastic name and/or title (cf. also Lig Myirhya, the last ruler of Zhangzhung, and Rhyleig, a ruler or official in Ōnimobag). It seems to be related to the Tibetan place names Rgya and as a title it seems to be related to the Tibetan verb \textit{rgyal} ‘win’ and the corresponding title \textit{rgyalpo} ‘king’. Note that while final -\textit{l} is pronounced in all Ladakhi varieties, the Lower Ladakhi word for king is /gyapo/, apparently going back to a form *\textit{rgyapo}.

This is only one of several possible interpretations of a rather enigmatic passage. There are basically three options: \textit{g.yalp} or \textit{g.yalpo} could either refer to the dogs or to the people who sent the dogs. In both cases the word could be interpreted as \textit{g.yalha} ‘relative’ (BRGY) or perhaps rather
It remains somewhat questionable whether this literal meaning is, in fact, the intended meaning. While the translation tries to do justice to the text, it appears as if some linguistic accident had happened when mounting this passage.
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The name has the same structure as that of Rulaskyes. It might well be possible that one name is not
the same large mouth as well as a figurative meaning ‘a person that has to command over much’. Given the antonym
khadrag ‘laconic, sparing of words’, khache should also have the meaning ‘so who talks too much’. In may be noted, en passant, that the Tibetan name for ‘Kashmir’ or Muslims in general: Khache, is readily misunderstood as ‘loudmouth, braggart’ in Ladakh.

The name has the same structure as that of Rulaskyes. It might well be possible that one name is
the translation of the other and the two persons were actually identical. This is what the Tibetan
traditions suggests which know only of Rulaskyes, making him a posthumous son of Drigum. In
the version of Dpaḥo Gtsuglag, the name Rulaskyes is equated with Ḍarsospo (Haarh 1969: 145).
But as Haarh (1969) has shown quite clearly, these traditions had been manipulated from the very
beginning for political purposes. If one wants to translate Rulaskyes as ‘born from a horn’, one
might translate Ḍarleskies as ‘born from the strength/front side/stalk/corner’. ḡar is the
Zhangzhung word for ‘corner’, in Tibetan it might either refer to the ‘front side’, to the ‘stalk of
plants’ ḡarpa, or to ‘strength’, cf. ḡarpa and ḡarma. -le- as a variant of the dative-locative case
marker is likewise a Zhangzhung form (cf. Haarh 1968: 20). As the variants Ru-las-skyes (Debther
dmarlo, Haarh 1969: 143-146) and Rgyu-las-skies (Buston, Haarh 1969: 154) indicate, the dative-
locative marker in both names should be interpreted according to its ablative function (for which
see JÄK sub la IV). What is not possible is Bacot & al.’s translation ‘né de lui-même” (p. 125, n.
6) which disregards that ḡar is an already case-marked form of the pronoun ḡa ‘I’ and that the
noun does not refer to the third but to the first person.

gdod. Bacot & al., Haarh, and NWH all translate this as ‘wish’ or as ‘what he wanted’. The verb
‘wish, want’ ḡddod, however, does not have any stem form ḡddod; and such stem form, which would
represent the gerundival stem III ‘to be wished’, would also not make sense in the context. There is
no reason why ḡddod (for ḡddoma) should not mean ‘beginning’ here, since the mother explains
everything from the very beginning. For the short form ḡddod cf. JÄK’s citations from Milaraspa
and TETT.

hängebṣpa gchig. All translations have an intransitive rendering, disregarding the fact that the verbal
noun necessarily must refer to a human being not to the eyes themselves. The water spirit does not
wish ‘one that gets closed’ (a single eye) but ‘one who closes (the eyes)’. Apparently all translators
reject the idea that there should be an agent in the case of shutting the lid of an eye, although first
of all, the Tibetan text is not talking about ‘shutting’ or ‘closing’ the eye, but of covering the eye,
where, in other contexts, the linguistic agent could well be the lid. None of them would probably
mind that everybody blinks, actively or not, or, when losing all potency of agency, closes one’s
eyes for ever. Languages might differ considerably in which body-related events can have a human
subject or actor and how they are represented in a [acontrol] or [transitivity] paradigm. It would
be certainly an interesting research topic to study how Tibetan languages in general or a particular
Tibetan language treats body-related events. As a first step, one could try to follow the wording as
closely as possibly, and if one’s own or the goal language does not allow a transitive rendering,
one could perhaps refer to the third but to the first person.

btsalkyaṅ (...) maṅed. NWH (2006: 95, n. 27): ‘It is odd to see kyag directly after a verb’ (translit-
eration adjusted). This statement is, so to speak, oddly odd, as it is in sharp contrast with what we
find in the dictionaries, grammars, and morphological indexes (e.g. Jäschke 1881: 505b, 1865/83:
75, Bacot 1948: 15-18, Hahn 1985: 78, Nagano 1997: 139-140). Furthermore NWH seems to have
forgotten that he had used a similar phrase in his BA thesis (Hill, MS: 30) as an example for a
‘non-finite past [being] used to show contrast between one past action and another’: btsalkyaṅ
dyul mabrñasso ‘Although [he] searched [he] did not find [his] money’ (example [53], taken from
Hahn 1994: 70). All efforts of his team mate to convince him otherwise were to no avail: bṛṣlabṣkyay ma(s)lobs.

thagṣig. I do not want to preclude that this form is simply an error for thoṅ, stem IV of gtoṅ ‘give’.
Nevertheless, one should not prematurely rule out the possibility that the word ḡdogs might have
had a broader spectrum of meanings. In the present context it is also possible that the provisions will be ‘attached’ on some pack animal.

cho. For the correct analysis of possible compounds, it is necessary to recapitulate the structure of two important types of noun-noun compounds: a) tadpurusa or determinative compounds and b) karmadhāraya or descriptive compounds. In Tibetan, like in English, German, and many other languages, the modifying element of a tadpurusa compound always precedes the head. This order corresponds to the order of an ordinary Tibetan possessor construction and to the order of the German and English s-genitive. For instance: fatherland = father’s land, in Tibetan phayul = phaṭji yul. There is no indication that the order could have been different in Old Tibetan. The only type of compound, where the order is inverted, is found with the karmadhāraya compound, such as in Skr. meghaduta ‘the cloud that is the messenger’, puruṣasīnha ‘a man like a lion’, or rājadeva ‘a king like a god’ for which we have a Tibetan equivalent in rgyallha used as the translation for the Roman title Caesar/Kesar/G(y)esar and as a generic term for a certain type of protective deities.

Bacot & al. do not translate cho, Haarh leaves the whole expression untranslated, although elsewhere (Haarh 1969: 209), he suggests a translation ‘family-man-bird’. The three words cannot form a compound, or otherwise the translation should be something the ‘family’s men and birds’ (tadpurusa & dvandva) or the ‘family’s men that are like birds’ (tadpurusa & karmadhāraya). The expected reading ‘family of the men-birds’ (however we analyse the latter compound) should have taken the form myibya-cho in Tibetan. We, therefore, think that cho has to be treated like a designation or title which precedes a name ‘the family man-bird’. If man-bird thus functions as a name, the interpretation as karmadhāraya compound ‘a human who is like a bird’ would make more sense than the dvandva compound ‘men and birds’. We would also think that the hidden punchline is that an offspring of this family bears bird-like features just because of the family or clan name, whatever the rationale behind the name might have been, not because it is a family of, or descending from, birds and men.

NWH suggests the translation ‘bird-man head’ on the basis that in ‘Zhang (1985) the word co is defined as an archaic word for ‘head.’ It is because of this that I have the translation I have proposed, the difference in aspiration between co and cho being hardly relevant (cf. Hill, forthcoming [!] ‘aspiration’ [= Hill 2007])’ (Hill 2006: 95, n. 29). Apart from the fact that NWH inverted the order of the elements completely (the Tibetan equivalent to this translation would be something like byamyi-mgo/*co), I have quite some difficulties to conceive of this ‘bird-man head’: does the ‘bird-man’ have a human body and a bird’s head or is it the other way round? Or does NWH actually mean ‘a head with human and birdlike’ characteristics’?

In contrast to NWH, I do not think that the aspiration contrast is irrelevant. Even if it could be proved that the aspiration contrast was not phonemic with respect to the vocabulary inherited from *proto-Tibetan (whatever language this might have been), Old Tibetan had already incorporated a large number of words from other languages of various affiliations, among them obviously a number of words with non-aspirated initials. It is a common feature that loanwords tend to be assimilated according to the phonologic structure of the receiving language. The fact, that the loans preserved their non-aspiration might thus be indicative, first of all, that the assumptions concerning the phonologic structure of *proto-Tibetan might not be correct. On the other hand, one can also observe (e.g. in Baltistan and Ladakh with respect to the Urdu phoneme /q/) that speakers may get used to a foreign phoneme and begin to reinterpret and reorganise the phonological structure of their ‘own’ vocabulary even with respect to the complementary articulations (in this case /qʰ/ and /ɕ/). A third possibility is that loans may retain their phonetic features, by virtue of being loans. In that case the alternation between aspiration and non aspiration would at least have a pragmatic function, and it would certainly be semantically distinctive. In NWH’s own words: ‘In the period of Old Tibetan inscriptions aspiration had begun to be phonemic’ (Hill 2007: 489).

In the case of a somewhat questionable OT co ‘head’ and the much better attested OT cho ‘family, lineage’, surviving in the CT compounds chohbraj ‘lineage from the mother’s side’ and chorigs ‘lineage from the father’s side’ (JĀK) we would even have a clear minimal pair. Whether or not both words were ultimately of *proto-Tibetan origin, only one of them, or even none, should not make much difference synchronically. For the philologist, at least, the question of how these two apparently unrelated words are spelled should not be irrelevant. The recourse to ‘misspellings’ or
to the ‘arbitrariness’ or ‘interchangeability’ of certain graphemes can only be the last step, when all alternative attempts for an explanation have failed.

The context as well as the syntax of this and the following clauses is not very clear. Bacot & al., Haarh, and NWH all interpret the sentence in the sense that the daughter of cho nyibya was sleeping. Implied in this analysis is the identity between bumo ‘daughter, girl’ and bu ‘son, child’ in clause v159. There are several arguments speaking against this interpretation, and while each one might not be very strong, the sum might gain a certain weight.

The first argument is the different wording. I would think that the gender distinction between bumo ‘daughter’ and bu ‘son’ cannot be ignored, and that the text would, in fact, be utterly messed up, if an identity was intended. I would further think that in a society of warriors it is more likely that a male child had to be offered in recompense for an emperor’s body than a female one.

Secondly, the (male) child in question (bu) seems to lie in a sort of cradle, v159, while the girl (bumo) is led along (khrid), v180. To my understanding the verb khrid implies that an animal or person one leads along can move by its own. By contrast, a child in a cradle would rather be carried along.

Thirdly, if bumo and bu were identical, one would also not expect that the subject of clause v159 would be explicitly mentioned.

Further more, while the verb yur or perhaps only the collocation gñid yur may have the meaning ‘slumber’ or ‘sleep’, it seems somewhat strange that this should be combined with the agentive verb byed ‘do, make, perform’, which leads to an agentive reading, such as ‘tried to slumber’, ‘pretended to slumber’, or ‘caused so else to slumber’. Except perhaps for the causative reading (see further below), these interpretations do not seem to be applicable. A more modest function, namely to highlight the agentivity or responsibility, would make sense only in contexts where the ‘act’ of slumbering is somehow important for the plot, but it does not seem to be well-motivated in the case of a simple background information, rendered in the translations as ‘who was lying asleep’ (Haarh; similarly Bacot & al.) or ‘a sleeping girl’ (NWH).

With the necessary reservation that the text might have been utterly messed up, we would suggest to distinguish between the adult bumo who is doing some work, and her child (bu) lying in the ‘cradle’ near to her or even on her back. Ladakhi women traditionally carried their small children in baskets on their back while working on the fields. The only linguistic argument that might speak against our analysis is that the bumo as working on the yurba does not receive an ergative marker.

Whether or perhaps only the collocation gñid yur may have the meaning ‘slumber’ or ‘sleep’, it seems somewhat strange that this should be combined with the agentive verb byed ‘do, make, perform’, which leads to an agentive reading, such as ‘tried to slumber’, ‘pretended to slumber’, or ‘caused so else to slumber’. Except perhaps for the causative reading (see further below), these interpretations do not seem to be applicable. A more modest function, namely to highlight the agentivity or responsibility, would make sense only in contexts where the ‘act’ of slumbering is somehow important for the plot, but it does not seem to be well-motivated in the case of a simple background information, rendered in the translations as ‘who was lying asleep’ (Haarh; similarly Bacot & al.) or ‘a sleeping girl’ (NWH).

With the necessary reservation that the text might have been utterly messed up, we would suggest to distinguish between the adult bumo who is doing some work, and her child (bu) lying in the ‘cradle’ near to her or even on her back. Ladakhi women traditionally carried their small children in baskets on their back while working on the fields. The only linguistic argument that might speak against our analysis is that the bumo as working on the yurba does not receive an ergative marker. But this is not a very strong argument, since agent marking tends to be somewhat unpredictable. Nevertheless, I should point to the fact that this solution as well as that of the available translations are somewhat infelicitous with respect to the clause structure: Like other quantifiers, the limiting quantifier žig ‘a, some’ demarcates the right end of a noun phrase. The following phrase yurba byedpa, however one wants to analyse it, cannot be subordinated to, or cannot modify, the NP ending with bumozig. The nominaliser -pa, to which the postposition is joined, must therefore operate on the whole clause. I can see only two possible interpretations, both of which would need some emendation:

1. pa or the verbal noun refers to the actor of the embedded clause: ‘(goes towards) somebody who is causing a daughter of ... to sleep’. In that case, however, one would have expected a limiting quantifier inserted between the nominaliser and the postposition. On the other hand, as clause v137 shows, the limiting quantifier may be dropped, but perhaps only in cases where the context is clear, e.g. in the case of repetitions (but the omission could well be a mere mistake due to copying the same phrase again and again). All the same, I would think that the construction does not seem to be very well motivated, if neither the person who acts nor the person acted upon had been previously introduced. Somewhat further down, immediately after clause 165 , there is mention of the child’s mother. This would again be better motivated if the mother could be identified with the girl, that is introduced by her family relation, rather than with ‘the one who causes the girl to sleep’, since such person could be of either sex, and even if female, she could have been merely a servant.

2. pa or the verbal noun refers to the actor of the embedded clause: ‘(goes towards) the place where a daughter of ... is doing yurba’. Here we would have only one previously unknown argu-
ment and thus a much better motivated construction, but the main problem is that we have to emend byedsa for byedpa. While printed pa and sa cannot be confounded easily, some of the handwritten sa-s of OTC look somewhat like a pa with a small loop at the lower left edge (one could also misread them for a ma). While OTC has a clear pa, there remains a faint possibility that it might have been misinterpreted in the process of compiling. We are aware that our suggestions are based on the fiction of a more or less coherent narrative, but if this fiction is given up, our interpretation is at least as likely as the previous one.

Wang & Bsodnams Skyid approached this solution, defining ljo with the remark: «buphrug sgalpar khursnodkyi snyugsdel itabu [a vessel, like a reed basket, for carrying a child on the small of the back]» (1988 [=1992]: 36 n. 142 on p. 80) (transliteration adjusted). The underlying sound change, namely the leftward migration of the initial of a consonant cluster after open syllable, has been described under various labels mostly for the modern Tibetan varieties, but cf. also Hogan 1996 for Old Tibetan. The change from j to ž may have been triggered by the original pre-radical, but we also find in West Tibetan a certain interchangeability between /j/ and /ž/. Bacot & al. give the grammatically possible translation ‘sous un arbre de paradis’ emending khulo as khuljon. Haarh’s translation ‘it was the daughter of Khuljona’ is simply incorrect. If at all, the sentence could be interpreted as ‘the boy was Khuljona’ or ‘it was the boy Khuljona’. However, any translation of ždag as an attributive copula (x is y) is presuming that the evidential distinction as found in the modern Tibetan languages had already fully developed in Old Tibetan, so that it could override the distinction between the attributive and the existential copula (at y there exists x). To our present knowledge, such an assumption would be premature.

Note the non-honorific form. The action is thus to be performed by the addressee and his compatriots reflexively upon themselves.

bžags (gžags). The verb is only attested in ThDG, while BRGY mentions it as an adjective. Bacot & al. and Haarh translate as ‘lacerate’ on the base of the verb žhog₂ ‘cut, hew, carve, chip’, stem II of which, however, is bžog(s). NWH translates as ‘lay down the body’ based on the verb žhog₁, stem II of which is bžag not bžags. This comes as a surprise, since he refers to the above mentioned entry in BRGY, as well as to the interpretations of Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 143) and Gña Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 22, n. 20, as cited by NWH 2006: 96, n. 35) as ‘anoint’ or ‘beautifully ornament’. Bacot & al., Haarh, and NWH overlook, that according to the case marking, something should be ‘lacerated’ or ‘laid down’ on the body. And, of course, none of the translations renders stem II correctly as a form signalling anteriority and not a command. Given the fact that linguistic analysis as well as cultural comparison seem to point at a prehistoric presence of Iranian (Scythian) tribes on the Tibetan plateau or a close cultural exchange (Zeisler, to appear, §5.2.4.3; Walter ###, Belluzza 2008, ###), I wonder whether ‘applying an ornament on the body’ might not mean here ‘apply a tattoo’. Note again the non-honorific form for lugs ‘body’ instead of sku or spur. The action is thus to be performed by the addressee and his compatriots reflexively upon themselves.

I follow Bacot et al., who translate as ‘assemble at’, based on the verb žshog₁. Haarh translates ‘incision should be made into the corpse’. NWH as ‘pierce the corpse’, the latter without accounting for the locational case marker. Both translations are based on the verb žshog₂ given as ‘beat’ in BRGY. BRGY gives an example for a locational marker on the second argument. Together with the classification as thadadpa this would yield our pattern 07 (ergative & dative-locative). (We find pattern 07 also in Ladakhi for the verb rdug ‘beat’, but not necessarily in other varieties.) Only JÄK offers the meaning ‘pierce, inoculate, vaccinate, but this meaning would not fit with a pattern 07 (but it might yield our pattern 09a ergative & dative-locative & absolute if something is inserted into something). Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 144) opt for the meaning ‘beat’, while Gña Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan (1995: 23, n. 21, as cited by NWH 2006: 96, n. 36) suggests the reading ‘embalm’. This latter suggestion looks rather like a mere guess and again does not account for the locational marking. I have difficulties to understand why a corpse should be beaten (except perhaps to break the bones, but then this should be mentioned). This holds also for clause v210 below, where the thigh (bone) is beaten (this time, however, the verb
According to the Tibetan grammatical theory of *bdag* & *gzhon* ‘self and other’, which describes correctly the agent-orientation of stem I and the patient-orientation of stem III in nominal or embedded usage (cf. Zeisler 2004: 264f.), the compound should be translated as ‘robber and swag¬gerer’ (or ‘robber and oppressor’), but since this apparently does not make sense in this context, the compound seems to denote the activities as such, ‘robbing and boasting’ (or ‘robbing and oppressing’), which I have tried to capture by a word play. My colleague Frank Müller-Witte, who presently studies the problems of *bdag* & *gzhon* in some detail and who would argue for an even wider range of the opposition, has no objection against the use of stem I for actions — as long as the agentship remains foregrounded (p.c.). Nevertheless, I should add an observation made in this connection: the above-mentioned compound *phrog* *com* ‘ravish and plunder’ combines stem I (agent focus) with stem III (patient focus) in order to express an activity from a holistic perspec-
One reason could perhaps lie in the irregular behaviour of the verb ‘eat’. According to a regular
While most versions correspond to a spelling
Not fitting at all into our view of the Tibetan world, the intended meaning of the compound
<42> Like in the case of the above ‘eating and drinking’, i.e., ‘what is to be eaten and to be drunk’, cf. also
While it cannot be precluded thus that the form /zathu/ actually goes back to /zathu/ (one would have otherwise expected also the occurrence of the form */zanthu/), the Ladakhi compound /zathu/ as well as the formally identical OT compound /zathu/ could perhaps indicate that the rule of *bdag & *gzan is a very useful rule of thumb, but may have exceptions.
Not fitting at all into our view of the Tibetan world, the intended meaning of the compound
While most versions correspond to a spelling /zathu/ or /bzaḥtu/ with stem III for the verb /ṭhu/, the first Ladakhi variant rather corresponds to the OT compound with the combination of two times stem I, apparently against the rules of *bdag & *gzan. The forms /zathu/ (possibly reflecting an OT pronunciation), /suptu/, and /siptu/ are instances of left-ward consonant migration by which prefixes could be preserved as finals of preceding open syllables. Due to various sociolinguistic factors, such compounds are now in decline in Ladakh and are replaced by compounds without the migrated prefixes. While it cannot be precluded thus that the form /zathu/ actually goes back to /zathu/ (one would have otherwise expected also the occurrence of the form */zanthu/), the Ladakhi compound /zathu/ as well as the formally identical OT compound /zathu/ could perhaps indicate that the rule of *bdag & *gzan is a very useful rule of thumb, but may have exceptions.
While most versions correspond to a spelling /zathu/ or /bzaḥtu/ with stem III for the verb /ṭhu/, the first Ladakhi variant rather corresponds to the OT compound with the combination of two times stem I, apparently against the rules of *bdag & *gzan. The forms /zathu/ (possibly reflecting an OT pronunciation), /suptu/, and /siptu/ are instances of left-ward consonant migration by which prefixes could be preserved as finals of preceding open syllables. Due to various sociolinguistic factors, such compounds are now in decline in Ladakh and are replaced by compounds without the migrated prefixes. While it cannot be precluded thus that the form /zathu/ actually goes back to /zathu/ (one would have otherwise expected also the occurrence of the form */zanthu/), the Ladakhi compound /zathu/ as well as the formally identical OT compound /zathu/ could perhaps indicate that the rule of *bdag & *gzan is a very useful rule of thumb, but may have exceptions.
One reason could perhaps lie in the irregular behaviour of the verb ‘eat’. According to a regular
weak paradigm one could expect the form za to represent stem I and ḏaḥ stem III, but it seems that the verb does not behave regularly, so that we find the latter spelling also for stem I, e.g. in BRGY, while the data from the dialects suggests that the prefixed forms for stems I/III, and II are not based on linguistic facts, cf. CDTD sub za. This may have combined with the likewise somewhat irregular behaviour of the verb ‘drink’, which at least according to JÄK does not necessarily follow the paradigm with respect to stem II: as we apparently find ṭhu instead of the paradigmatic ṭhu. Thus it might be possible that already at an early time some varieties the verb /ṭhu/ either followed a paradigm of non-agentive verbs or already showed a levelling of stem forms (cf. Zeisler to appear §4.3), in this case towards stem I. It is interesting to see, that the overwhelming majority of the modern varieties shows an aspirated form based on the regular stem I, thus /ṭhu/ in West and Central Tibetan, and variants of /ṭhu/ in East Tibetan (CDTD), the exceptions being a few Western and Central Tibetan varieties: Ngari Purang, Dingri, Shigatse, and Lhasa with variants of /ṭu/. If it was not for these exceptions and the above compounds one could think
that the prefixed written forms *btugs* (stem II) and *btug* (stem II) had no base in the spoken language.

Given this data from the spoken languages it is quite obvious that the compound *zaṅthug* might equally have an agent and a patient reading: ‘eater and drinker’ (‘eating and drinking as activities’) and ‘what is to be eaten and drunk’. The parallelism with the preceding nominal clause, however suggests an agentic or activity reading.

Wang & Bsodnams Skyid (1992: 80, n. 146) suggest to interpret *lto* as *ltoštshag* ‘family, household’. They seem to overlook that the same interpretation should hold for clause v72, where Drigum’s corpse eventually gets into the Household’ or rather belly of the same spirit. From a Buddhist perspective it is certainly preferable if a person given as ransom is given into a household and not be devoured by a spirit. But by all that we know from the early burial practises, animals were sacrificed as ‘ransom’ for the defunct, and hence we cannot preclude a similar human sacrifice.

Obviously a compound, the first element of which is a short form of the name Ñakhyi. The second seems to be the (imperial) title, rather than a name, since otherwise one would have expected the compound Ña-Ña. Bacot & al. do not translate the names and simply speak of ‘les deux frères’. NWH follows Zeisler (2004: 388, example 283), where it is suggested to read *sā* instead of *lha*. An emendation is, however, not necessary. Šakhyi becomes the new lord, and as such he is the country’s god, *lha*, or with some more probability, he is the *thasras* ‘son of the gods’, as the emperor is usually addressed.

Bacot & al. (unfortunately followed by Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) did not understand that Gyaṅto or Gyaṅtho is the name of a holy mountain in Rkonpo, one of the candidates for the descent from heaven of the primordial king. Tradition has it that emperor Drigum is buried at Lhari Gyaṅtho (Kirkland 2003). Haarh translates this phrase as ‘with its upper part like Gyaṅto’, NWH as ‘pitched high [as] Gyaṅto’ (transliteration adjusted). In both cases at least one locational case marker is missing, either on *bla* to make it an adverb of ‘pitch’ or on Gyaṅto for the comparison. We think that *bla* should be understood as a postposition. As already mentioned, postpositions can be realised as compounds, by which transformation their case marker is dropped.

All translations opt for ‘tent’. Bacot & al. (unfortunately followed by Zeisler 2004: 388, example 283) and NWH furthermore understand the tent to ‘be pitched’ (NWH: ‘because the verb *bubs* means specifically ‘to pitch a tent’’). However, stem II of the agentive-causative verb *lubs* ‘put (a roof), pitch (a tent)’ is *phubs* (OTC *pub*, cf. clause v201 below) < *b-pub*. The inagentive counter part does not seem to be well attested in CT and is thus not included in BRGY or BTSH. JĀK and other word lists give stem II as *bub* or *phub*, with no final -s. The inagentive verb is, however, attested in the western and central dialects (CTDT). The Balti and Ladakhi form *bubs* indicates that the spelling variant *fabsu* of OTC represents a linguistic fact. Given the fact that the item in question is not ‘pitched’ but ‘upside down’, the reading ‘tent’ is as unlikely as the reading ‘throat, neck’. One could perhaps think of a construction where the main chamber below the earth is reached by a manhole, hence the picture of a ‘neck’ plus head turned upside down, but this remains speculation. NWH: ‘Gñaṅjok Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan offers the alternative explanation « mguldax mchuyste šarih riskedla godgospa ūdra [meaning ‘throat,’ it must here refer to a mountain cavern] » (1995: 20 n. 21 on p. 23 where it is given as n. 22)” (transliteration adjusted). Similarly Wang & Bsodnams Skyid 1992: 80, n. 147, suggest reading *mgur* as *rimgur/mgul*, which they define as rildebs ‘mountain slope’. This would neither explain the inversion nor a pitching.

It is not quite evident who the agent is. One would have expected a continuation of the contrasting of Ñakhyi and Šakhyi. Linguistically, however, the omitted argument should by preference refer to the last mentioned subject. Reference to previous subjects are not generally precluded, especially when two agents of different status or different importance for the narrative act upon each other (in the case of differing status, subjecthood can be discovered by lexical means, in the other case, it is a matter of common sense). In our case, however, the last mentioned subject is particularly highlighted by the topic marker *ni*. It can be expected that by its special emphasis as well as its introductory character, the topic marker blocks a reference beyond the emphasised argument. From this it would follow that Ñakhyi is the agent. One should compare the Tibetan clauses to similar English sentences, where the subject is continued with zero or the anaphoric pronoun he. If one says: *A did x, B did y and then (he) did z*, it would be quite clear that B is also the actor of z, even more so...
If we emphasise the contrast: A, for his part, did x, B, by contrast, did y, and (he) did z. Tibetan cross-clausal references function pretty much along the same lines (that is, they follow the principles of communicative economy and clarity), except that anaphoric pronouns are used much less frequently than in English.

According to various Ladakhi traditions it is Nakhrī (Nakhyi) who is to be identified with the first king of the Spurgyal lineage, and as Haarh (1969: 158f.) has pointed out convincingly, the name Nakhrī is identical to that of Gñaakhri, the primordial king. Only one line earlier, OTC shows a similar hesitation: The two brothers are referred to in a compound as Na and lha, where lha, either by itself or as an abbreviation for lhasras ‘son of the gods’, is obviously the royal title. The name of the second brother was apparently avoided, certainly not without a reason. Both lacunae indicate that there must have been a contradiction in the various traditions, which the compiler could not solve.

48 yulyab. We take the honorific form to indicate some higher status in the social hierarchy. Disregarding the order of the elements of a tadpurasya compound (see also n. 35 above), NWH translates this as ‘fatherland’. As the ‘land of the father’ is phaṭi yul, the corresponding compound ‘fatherland’ is phayul, the honorific form would then be yabyul.

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

50 dogyab. NWH’s translation as ‘father’s ear’, again does not take into account the order of the elements.

51 buspur. All translations take spur to mean ‘corpse’, but then cannot account for the preceding bu, which would yield a ‘corpse of the son’. NWH (2006: 97, n. 42) suggests that the compound might have something to do with agriculture and could perhaps denote ‘chaff’. This implies an emendation from sbun or sburma to spun, without again accounting for the element bu. Furthermore, how can the ‘chaff’ decay without rain, and is it such a problem, if it decays? If we cannot avoid an emendation, then ḛbusbur ‘insects’ or ‘worms and beetles/ants’ may perhaps be more suitable (cf. also Wang & Bsodnams Skyid 1992: 80, n. 152 who interpret spur as an insect called black ant ‘sburnaṣ zebaṭi ḛbutshig’. These insects, like the human beings, will have a problem, if the spikes do not get filled for lack of rain. The verse would then demonstrate that the future ruler, according to the ideal of the good ruler, and according to his cosmic role as a god, is taking care of all beings, even the smallest ones, not only of the mighty chiefs.

52 phub. NWH: ‘phub is the past tense of ḛhub ‘to cover up, cover over.’ Haarh translates « The hundred male Logam took a hundred copper vessels, Put them over their heads, and sought death by precipitation. » (1969: 405). One could first make a grammatical objection to this interpretation, the Loṣams are in the absolutive and not the ergative case, and ḛhub ‘expects the ergative (though perhaps not when used reflexively). More importantly this interpretation makes little sense. In the face of the enemy the Logam subject themselves to an odd sort of suicide. It makes better sense that in recompense for the fate of Dridgum Brtsanpo they have the pots put over their heads, and then because of lake of vision they fall to their deaths.’ While I cannot preclude a causative interpretation, I would think that the reflexive interpretation makes a lot of sense. The Loṣams are depicted as ridiculous cowards who, instead of fighting, jump into death; and they are even so coward that they cannot even bare the sight of where they are jumping to. Alternatively, one could perhaps describe them, equally ridiculously, as trying to protect their heads with pots against the swords, but nevertheless jumping into death. A more compassionate interpretation might perhaps be that the Loṣam had neither weapons nor armours and although they tried to protect themselves with mere household implements, they eventually run into death. The last interpretation would perhaps better match the fate of their women. Note that the verb ḛhub does not simply mean ‘cover’, but rather to set up a shelter (roof or tent). As for the grammatical argument: there are
several reasons why the ergative marker is omitted here. Reflexivity could be one. The second is that the topic marker ni often (although not necessarily) replaces case marking. Finally I would think that the clause in question is embedded, so that the NP is linked with the following intransitive verb.

`poggo. BRGY paraphrases this verb as either non (sub poggo) or ḥbro ‘go’ (＝sopna; sub pogna). non is the resumptive and/or potentialis form of gnon ‘suppress’, with which it seems to be commonly confused. BRGY defines it as spa ḥkhumspaṅ ḥumpa ‘be discouraged’ or, as CDTD translates ‘to be timorous, cowardly’. TETT gives the inagative meaning as be oppressed, burdened. Haarth, most probably because of the parallelism, suggests the meaning ‘precipitate oneself’. Bacot & al., followed by NWH suggest the meaning ‘flee’. Fleeing is certainly the best solution for ‘discouraged’ or ‘coward’ people. I wonder, however, why then the ordinary word self’. Bacot & al., followed by NWH suggest the meaning ‘flee’. Fleeing is certainly the best solution for ‘discouraged’ or ‘coward’ people. I wonder, however, why then the ordinary word ‘flee’ is not used. Similarly in the case of ‘be oppressed’ or perhaps ‘be overcome’. Could it be that the word signals the common fate of women in war times? And could it be that it was lost because it actually was a taboo word? That would at least explain why the women were protecting their breasts with the large iron pan. Cf. also the apparent transitive-causative counterpart sgyog, explained as ‘search through, dig out’ in BRGY and other Tibetan dictionaries, but also as ‘criticise bluntly’ in DYGB, and as ‘vex, annoy’ in JĀK. The women should then have been ‘embarrassed’, at least.

`mnaṣṣu bchal. Apparently, the verb gcod can be used in the sense of ‘single out, separate’ with respect to livestock and other items of wealth. Cf. also Pt 1042, l. 54–56: skuṣen khaṭṣsaṇ gnyis-la | geṣigis | chibs-|las gci gcadde | g.yaṛtar bγraγ | dkarmoṇaγ | g.yaγlas gcig gcadde | donpor | bγraγ | skuṣen geṣigis dkölas sna gcig gcadde | phugsnordu bγraγ | ‘From the two royal priests of the preceding day,’ one [priest] singled out one from the horses and denoted (lit. counted) it as propitious horse. From the white ones (ewes) and the yaks [he] singled out one [each] and denoted them as essential ones,’ the [other] royal priest singled out one specimen from the property and denoted it as the ultimate riches.’

a ḥkhaṭṣsaṇ for ḥkharṣsaṇ; according to Bellezza (2008: 455) two specific but unknown ritual roles.
b donpo; Bellezza (ibid.) has ‘divine sheep’; the entries in TETT show that according to David Holler’s study on tshethaṅ, the words donpo and donmo are nowadays used for the ‘liberated’ sheep set aside from consumption, another type of ‘sacrifice’.
c phugsnor; according to Bellezza ibid., n. 317 “the essential or vital wealth of a household, which is ritually enshrined in a special receptable”; TETT (Ives Waldo) translates as “the essential wealth of the goal, trump card, last resort”.

According to Bellezza (ibid., p. 455, n. 315), the verb gcod is used among present-day nomads “to describe the separating of individual animals from the herd”.

However, it might be more appropriate to interpret the verb gcod both cases as ‘decide upon’, corresponding to its use in the classical and modern, somewhat opaque collocation thag gcod ‘cut a rope’. After reading Helga Uebach’s article on the replacement of tallies by paper documents (and unfortunately not when reading her draft version), where she points to the quite surprising fact that the earliest mentioning of ‘paper’ as sγog comes a century after paper must have been introduced in the administration (Uebach 2008: 64), it appears to me that the collocation thag gcod must have been derived from the phrase thag gcod ‘cutting an unrolled document’ as we find it in Pt 1042, l. 105–106: rgyalγis thag bcadde kḥram | gnyis hγyste | ‘the rgyal cut the document (thag) and made two tallies’ and probably not ‘the rgyal decided upon the authority’ as translated in Uebach (2008: 58, n. 2). In the same document, namely l. 53, just before the example given above, we find the phrase rgyalγis kyaγ | ṁpaγhṭaγ bcad ṁpaγhṭaγ du ḥlusso ḥṣalal || ḥṣap]-γan rimpva plagste | ḥo dod bod || ‘It was requested [that] the rgyal cut the declarative’ and joined it again as a declarative document. (Alternatively: The rgyal requested [that] …) Right and wrong were read out one by one and the specific ( ḥo) equivalent/payment (dod) was announced.”

a The dictionaries would give us the meaning ‘power, dominion, control’ for ṁpaγhṭaγ. Again, this seems to be a secondary development, due to the loss of the meaning thag ‘scroll’. For the collocation ṁpaγh ḡsoṣ JĀK gives the following meanings: ‘name, nominate, appoint, declare as’, ‘praise’, and ‘congratulate’. Particularly the first meaning would indicate that the word ṁpaγh did not only
mean ‘power, might, control’, but possibly also something like an ‘authoritative utterance’ or ‘utterance from an authority’. It is clear from the context that neither a dominion nor a ruler’s power was cut into pieces and reassembled, but a kind of tally or ‘authoritative scroll’.

The word *thag* is apparently the same as *thag* ‘plain (land)’, and we also find it in *thagka*, and in *bka’thag* ‘order’ or (*bka’thag*’ig ‘decree’. Corresponding to the notion of ‘a plain’, it seems to have designated any flat, unrolled document whether of cloth (like a *thagka*), leather, or paper. While it may well be that the element *thag* replaced the word *thagyig*, because the meaning of the latter had become opaque, the interchange of final -g and -q is not unheard of, and a rope, *thagpa* is ultimately likewise an item that is rolled up for storage and unrolled for usage. Since in the early stages of the Tibetan administration official documents were always cut into tallies for the purpose of verification or identification, it is quite evident how the meaning ‘decide (upon)’ could develop. This derived meaning could easily be transferred to other collocations as in our present case(s).

Haarh translates this passage as “Dud were brought under yoke”, likening the expression to the collocation *dbags pa gcod* ‘subjugate’ (p. 454, n. 29), which might have likewise contained an administrative connotation. NWH who rejects this interpretation and translates as “the cattle they took as wealth”, nevertheless adduces a passage from OL 0751, 38a2-4, where we find almost the same phrase *mnaḥs bcad pa* in the context of an enumeration of what able rulers and ministers do to their enemies (Hill 2006: 98, n. 45). This would rather corroborate Haarh’s intuition, although perhaps with a slightly different undertone: ‘confiscate’.

Uray (1966: 254) translates the passage as “the bent ones, being killed, were butchered.” In his note 21, he explains *mnaḥs* as a past tense form of *nog* or *gnog*, which he takes as transitive-causative form of *nog, nog* ‘die’. But his interpretation seems to be unlikely for several reasons.

First of all, one might wonder why it should be mentioned explicitly that the animals were killed before being slaughtered or rather cut into pieces, and if so, why such an uncommon word should be used. Secondly the form *mnaḥs* does not allow an interpretation in terms of anteriority (having or being X-ed), but rather points to a posterior event, aimed at (‘in order to X’). Thirdly, as NWH (ibid.) rightly comments, Uray’s translation misses the parallelism with the preceding clause.

BRGY defines *mnaḥs*pa as 1. *nor lo*ṣspjod ‘wealth, property’ and 2. *sriddam* *ṭjiṅrten* ‘dominion or world’. The second meaning would support the interpretation ‘confiscated for the state’, the first meaning the interpretation as ‘confiscated as (his personal) wealth’. But one could also think of a combined interpretation ‘confiscated as state property’. Bacot et al.’s translation ‘les animaux [furent] emmenés au royaume’ is as close or free a translation of this collocation as NWH’s ‘took as wealth’.

***<55>*** (bya) roro. I do not think that the text speaks of the corpses of the prey, but of the prey itself. Dan Martin in TETT mentions an entry in Bshanglha, which defines this word as an old expression for ‘all’: ‘thamskud cespag brdarirtig’. Most probably it is related to CT *rere*. There are other cases where the vowels e and o interchange, the most obvious is perhaps *che* ‘be big’ with the nominal forms *chenpo* and *chenmo* which is attested in *lḥo*- or *lḥu*- in various dialects (CDTD).

***<56>*** nig. I should suggest to take it as a dialectal variant of the topic marker ni, as it is found in the Shamskat dialects of Ladakh. Cf. also JĀK (sub ni) who cites the colloquial form *nig*. Whatever the main function, the word apparently replaces a copula.

***<57>*** gygra. The word seems to be related to *gy* ‘the above’ and *gymga* ‘superior, first’. The ‘heel’ is *ritspa*, from *ritig* ‘what is behind’, so the tip might be ‘what comes first or above’. Bacot & al translate freely as ‘coup de bottes’, Haarh gives ‘pointed blade’, reading *liam*, instead of *lham*. Without further comment, he suggests (1969: 454, n. 31) a relation between the non-existing word *lham* (!) and the component *sta* in *stari* ‘axe’ and *dgrasta*, an axe with a semi-circular blade (Jim Valley in TETT). A closer look at the manuscript reveals that Haarh is mistaken. Both clusters *lt* and *lh* appear at the end of line 10 in the words *deltar* and *lha*. The upper vertical stroke of the *ta* is more or less a continuation of the right vertical stroke of the superscript *t*. The round hook of the *ta* either starts from the bottom of this stroke (l. 10, l. 20) or may start somewhere below, so that the upper vertical stroke is connected with its apex (l. 20). In any case the hook is placed more or less immediately below the superscript. In the case of *lh*, the head line of the *ha* is identical with the base line of the superscript *l*, and from the left side of this base line starts first a short vertical
stroke, to which is connected another short slanted stroke downwards to the right, to which finally a round hook like that of the ta is joined. The clusters thus cannot be easily confounded, and in our case the distance between the round hook and the superscript is even more prominent.

Haarh further suggests that ra might be a mistake for rap. This would yield a nice parallel to the above rtsa rap and corroborates my interpretation of gos or gorba as ‘point, tip’. Nevertheless, one can never be sure that the lines are composed in strict parallelism, and it is also possible that the emphatic pronoun rap was added to rtsa for the sake of the metre, where gorba might be a corresponding disyllabic noun. NWH translates gorba as ‘mass of a shoe’, taking gogpo/bo ‘lump, mass, heap, clot’ as base. It is, however, difficult to imagine what a ‘lump’ of boots could have to do with (a dead) hare.

<58> høb. The final -b is added below the ha, but offset to the right. This is a common graphical device in OT manuscripts, cf. also RAMA gsol, which is commonly transliterated as gso, despite the offset. A less misleading representation of the offset could be achieved with a diagonal slash: høb or gso. Biased by his then new insights in the structure of the letter wa (cf. Hill 2006b), NWH suggests the reading ‘vwode’ (hwode). It may be noted that his analysis of the letter wa as digraph jwa is misleading in so far as the digraph in question, jba (or jva) in OT, lba in CT, consists of a superscribed letter ha or la and a subscribed letter for the voiced stop consonant ba — if there had been already a letter ‘wa’, there would never have been the need to invent the digraph. As Úray 1955 points out, the OT letter ba, triangular in its shape, stems from the letter va in the Kujila form of the Brāhmī script, and it is found in Central Asian alphabets still in the place of the Indic va (between la and ść, p. 103). But since the opposition between ba and va had collapsed in many Indic scripts (cf. ibid p. 105), the Tibetan scribes could easily reanalyse it as a stop consonant ba and shift it its present position (between pba and ma). Contrary to Úray’s argument (p. 110), the letter for the voiced labial should have had only the value of a stop consonant when or before the digraph was invented, especially to indicate a fricative value. But if Úray is right and the letter had still two different values for the early scribes, depending on certain phonetical environments, namely as voiced fricative [v] or [β] and as stop consonant [b], the epigraphic transliteration of the digraph should follow Úray’s model: ‘va. The apostrophe, however, is not a good representation for a consonant. It is quite unfortunate that Chinese scholars chose the symbol v for the letter ‘a/ha. If one follows this convention, the epigraphic transliteration of the digraph wa can only be vba. If one chooses the symbol h, one has both options: hba and hva.

<59> Bacot & al. and many Tibetan scholars interpret the whole passage as an act of revenge. NWH: ‘Gihagoŋ Dkonmchog Tshesbrtan paraphrases, and remarks on these two lines « byaro chechena mdunγi rtsela btags | yoste ribongro chechena lhagyi yuba byas žespag ti Spulde Guggyagyaligis yakbyi dgraša lenpar Logampa tshar bcadpa de byaḍag ribon bsdagpa ni sper sbyar paṇo | The significance of ‘In the very large bird corpse is the point of a lance affixed. In the very large hare, i.e. rabbit corpse has been put the leg of a boot.’ is that Spulde Guggyal destroying the enemy of the father Logam is linked to the example of killing a bird and rabbit [ ] » (1995: 20 n. 26 on p. 23 where it is given as n. 27)’ (transliteration adjusted). This interpretation overlooks the fact that the corpse deposited has the honorific form spur and thus refers to the emperor’s corpse, not to the slain enemies. The song seems to signify something like the famous ‘Le roi est mort, vive le roi.’ The initial boasting of the singer with his ability as a perfect hunter who does not need arrows to reach the birds and hares, but can kill all of them almost by hand (with the tip of the lance and the tip of the boot) could perhaps be understood as a warning to the lesser lords.

<60> sgyedpaijoggzugsna. Bacot et al. followed by NWH mistake take the noun gzugs ‘form’ as stem II of the verb ‘ghzugs ‘put in, plant, establish’. Stem II, however regularly takes the form btsugs, only stem III, the gerundive, has the form gzug or gzugs. The gerundive can be used, e.g., in a purposive clause, but in this case it should either be followed by the locative-purposive marker {tu} or by zero. It cannot be combined with the locative marker na. A rendering ‘in order to set up below the hearth’ would be furthermore quite infelicitous without the specification of the item to be set up. The only possible candidate, the copper ore, is mentioned in the following clause, but one wonders, why this should be ‘set up’ or ‘founded’ below the hearth. Bacot & al. (followed by NWH) also take hog as an independent adverb, in which case it should have the form hogtu. Haarh
misreads the noun gzugs as gzugs 'spoke'. Given the fact that gzugs cannot be a verb in this context, I can only suggest reading ḥoggzugs as a compound ‘the lower form’ or ‘fundament’. I would have expected a genitive marker between sgyedpo and ḥoggzugs, but apparently this phrase is contracted to a more complex compound.

The intended meaning is somewhat opaque. Why should copper ore be placed at or below the hearth? In a literal sense, the purpose could perhaps be its melting. Given the fact that the clause is continued with the statement that the agent is or becomes the lord, I think that this clause contains a simile. The copper ore from the heights might refer to the haughty lords which the new king had subdued, that is, put under his hearth or even melted. The hearth could then stand for his dominion. Haarh and NWH translate ‘copper stones fell from above’, notwithstanding the transitive-causative verb form. Bacot & al. delegate the agency to some anonymous natural force or deity, overlooking that the verb is followed by the lhagbcas morpheme [ste] which disfavours a subject switch. Unlike flowers that fall or are sent down from the sky by an anonymous agency, the sending down of copper ore does not appear to be a common image in Tibetan literature. I do not know whether the falling down of meteors was ever taken as an auspicious sign, but meteors do not seem to be ever denoted by the words zapsrd or lcagsrdo, the common designation being skarrdo (cf. BRGY).

Graṃmo Gnam Bbseṅbṛtsig. Given the parallelism with the preceding sentence, the reading ‘to be built’ for the last element of this name seems not to be well-motivated. Bacot et al. (1940: 128, n. 4) take this as the name of the successor, since the same name is found in the Ms. 249 of the font Pelliot as Graṃmo Gnam Gserbṛtsig. The immediate successor is usually given as Ašolegs (with variants; cf. Haarh 1969: 47). The Ms 249, a genealogical list, is now classified as PT 1286. In l. 48-50 we find: Drigum btsanpoḥ sras || Spude Guṇṛgyal gnaml粑 Dri bdun | sale [!] Legs drug bšosna | Spude Guṇṛgyal gṛonna || Graṃmo Gnam Gserbṛtsig | Gserbṛtsiggi sras || Tholeg btsanpo... (TDD/OTDO) ‘The son of Drigum btsanpo: Spude Guṇṛgyal, [coming in-between] the seven Dri [in/of] the sky and the six Legs [on/of] the earth, when engendered: Spude Guṇṛgyal, when having died: Graṃmo Gnam Gserbṛtsig. The son of Gserbṛtsig: Tholeg btsanpo.’

Graṃmo Gnam Gserbṛtsig is thus the name of Spude Guṇṛgyal after his death and not the name of his son, which is given here as Tholeg btsanpo ([A]šolegs coming second), cf. TDD/OTDO, l. 50-51: 1. Tholeg btsanpo, 2. Šolegs btsanpo, 3. Gorulegs btsanpo, 4. Ḥbroẓilegs btsanpo, 5. Thišoleg btsanpo, 6. Išoleg btsanpo, altogether six members of the Legs dynastical group. While NWH decided not to take care for the historical context (see his ‘preamble’, 2006: 89), it is all the more astonishing that Haarh happened to overlook this passage of a text which he had quite obviously studied well (it is no. 1 of his sources, Haarh 1969: 33). The translations ‘Graṃmo Gnambsėḥ was built’ (Haarh) and ‘a cold bronze dome erected’ (NWH) overlook that the element -bṛtsig of the name does not correspond to stem II (typically used for past time reference or for a present, sometimes also future perfect), but to stem III the future oriented gerundive of the verb rtsig ‘build’.