

The Envoys of Phywa to Dmu (PT 126)

Nathan W. Hill

(Trinity College Dublin)

ew are the texts which offer a glimpse into Tibet's religious traditions as they existed before the adoption of Buddhism as the state religion in 762. With the exception of stone inscriptions¹ the earliest extant texts in the Tibetan language come from the library cave at Duhuang. Among those extant texts valuable for the study of the indigenous religion, which include descriptions of funerary rituals and Buddhist texts aimed at discouraging more ancient practices, mythological texts *per se* are quite rare. The *Envoy of Phywa to Dmu* (Pélliot Tibétain PT 126), a narrative describing the doings of gods in a mythical past, is consequently of paramount importance as evidence for the ancient Tibetan religion.²

For most of the twentieth century the difficulty of the texts and their physical availability significantly constrained the study of Old Tibetan texts. The research of scholars like Stein and Macdonald generally treated a number of Dunhuang texts at once, without providing detailed studies of individual texts. The increasing understanding of the Old Tibetan language and increasing availability of editions of the texts now allows for more systematic study; the text treated here is no exception to this pattern. The text is treated in passing in French³ and

¹ Iwao et al. 2009.

² I began to study this text in the summer of 2007 on the basis of Ishikawa 2001, while a student of Japanese at Middlebury College's summer school. In the autumn of 2011 a stay as visiting researcher at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München proved essential in improving my understanding of this text. I read the document in a weekly seminar together with Brandon Dotson, Gergely Orosz and Lewis Doney. Although for the sake of readability I do not acknowledge each suggestion of these three colleagues, to whatever extent this study is an improvement over previous treatments of the text can be credited to my colleagues in Munich. I would thank Hou Haoran for his help with reading Chu Junjie (1990). I read the first half of the text with a class at UC Berkeley in Autumn 2015. I was lucky to have Meghan Howard, my old classmate from Harvard, among the students, who kindly gave me a copy of Drikung (2012). I have worked on incorporating his ideas, both during that class in Berkeley and while reading through the complete text with Tsering Samdup back at SOAS in Autumn 2018. A project of such long gestation will doubtless be out-of-date already at its appearance, but I hope it will nonetheless be helpful to those interested in this text.

³ Stein 1961: 62, 64; Macdonald 1971: 305–06, 369–73.

brief passages are treated in English,⁴ but more recent detailed study of the document is only available in Japanese⁵ and Chinese⁶. Western Tibetology does not pay sufficient attention to Japanese and Chinese scholarship on Tibet. In Old Tibetan studies the bulk of scholarship is now produced in these languages. This study relies in particular on the two essays of Ishikawa,⁷ which provide a complete transliteration, translation and discussion of contents and the first complete translation of this text by Chu Junjie.⁸ I consult previous literature in a supplementary manner as appropriate. When a complete version of this study was already prepared, I gained access to Drikung,⁹ and have incorporated its findings as seemed appropriate.

1. A Historical Marriage of Two Clans?

Various previous authors understand this text to report the marriage of two clans.¹⁰ For the sake of clarity it is useful to separate this claim into two: (1) that Phywa and Dmu are clans, and (2) that the text describes a marriage. Doubtless the reason why some have considered the Phywa and Dmu two tribes is that the Dmu are listed as such in various traditional lists of the early Tibetan clans.¹¹ The Dmu are however not a historic ethnic group. Stein specifies that he knows “aucun exemple historique de l’emploi de ce mot, comme nom ethnique, alors que tous les autres noms de cette liste se retrouvent dans la nomenclature ethnique réelle [no historic example of the use of this word as an ethnic name, even though all of the other names in this list are found in actual ethnic nomenclature]”.¹² The Phywa are not even reported in the lists of prehistoric clans; there is no reason to understand them as a tribe.

To describe Phywa and Dmu as clans suggests that PT 126 should be, or at least intends itself to be, understood as historical. Yamaguchi is the scholar to construe this understanding in the most strictly historical terms.¹³ His interpretation has been taken for granted by others.¹⁴

⁴ Bellezza 2005: 11–12, 342; Uebach and Zeisler 2008: 325.

⁵ Yamaguchi 1983: 171–72, 211; 1985: 546–49; Ishikawa 2000; 2001.

⁶ Chu Junjie 1989, 1990.

⁷ Ishikawa 2000, 2001.

⁸ Chu Junjie 1990.

⁹ Drikung 2011.

¹⁰ Stein 1961: 62; Yamaguchi 1983: 166–99; Nagano 1994: 105; Ishikawa 2000; 2001.

¹¹ Stein 1961: 6, 8, 18.

¹² Stein 1961: 55.

¹³ Yamaguchi 1983: 166–99.

¹⁴ See for instance Nagano 1994.

But even Ishikawa, who specifically argues against an historical interpretation in favor of a mythological one, still speaks of the marriage of two clans.¹⁵ To describe the Dmu and the Phywa as clans is a mistake, which predisposes one to think of them historically.

The temptation to see an historical event behind the narrative of this text stems from a belief that mythological texts are relevant primary sources for historical research. The relationship between mythology and history has been the subject of debate since classical times; the understanding of myths as misrepresentations of historical facts, Euhemerism, has historically been a widespread school of mythic interpretation.¹⁶ Because a certain element of a myth can be established as historical only when there is corroborating non-mythological evidence, this method of interpretation is useless as an approach to historical research and useful for mythological explication only when corroborating historical evidence is available. In the case of this text there are no relevant historical texts and a euhemeristic approach is fruitless. A more valuable task than chasing after the historical origins of this myth is to approach the function of the myth at the time it was told. This text acknowledges itself as an etiological story; consequently, an etiological approach, although by no means the only or the best approach to mythic interpretation,¹⁷ will be the most revealing for this text.

The second component of the received interpretation, that this text describes a marriage, like the understanding of Phywa and Dmu as tribes, arose on account of later Tibetan texts. Stein discusses a version of such a story in the *Gzer-myig* referring to the ancestry of the founder of the Bon religion Ston-pa Gšen-rab.¹⁸ Yamaguchi treats another version appearing in the *Dar rgyas gsal-baḥi sgron-ma*.¹⁹ Karmay notes further marital intertwining among the Phywa and Dmu.²⁰ It is a mistake however to use these later sources as guides to understanding the text at hand. While the myth contained in this text is related to these stories and a full account of the history of the mythology of the relationship between the Phywa and Dmu would trace the development of the story from the version appearing in PT 126 to that known from later texts, it must be emphasized that there is no ground to assume that elements of similar stories found in later texts are at play in this early version of the story. There is no marriage in PT 126; marriage is never discussed by either party in the text.

There are structural parallels between the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu*

¹⁵ Ishikawa 2000.

¹⁶ Graf 1993: 16 et passim.

¹⁷ Graf 1993: 39–40.

¹⁸ Stein 1961: 56.

¹⁹ Yamaguchi 1983: 170–71.

²⁰ Karmay 1975: 576, n. 81.

and Tibetan marriage rituals. In the course of a Tibetan marriage, it is not uncommon for a group of envoys to discuss with the Bride's family the circumstances of her handing over. Reluctance to relinquish her is part of the formal procedure of these practices. For example, in the wedding protocols at Ruthog an "honest gentleman"²¹ brings a scarf to the family of the bride on behalf of the bridegroom's family. If this scarf is favorably received the gentlemen returns accompanied "by the boy's parents and some older relatives".²² This party formally requests the young lady's hand and negotiates the date of the ceremony. A group of people from the family of the groom or representing his family making a request to the bride's parents, presumably foremost to the bride's father, may remind one of the groups of Phywa envoys making a request of the lord of Dmu.

In Dingri the bride's party is expected to interrupt in an antagonistic manner the *mopön*, who sings wedding songs and acts as master of ceremonies representing the interests of the groom's party.²³ An antagonistic conversation between one person and a group, representing two separate families who are preparing to bind their fates, in some ways parallels the scenario for the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* (PT 126). There are however significant differences. Unlike the bride's party at a Dingri wedding, the envoys of Phywa are always polite and deferential toward the lord of Dmu. Also, the lord of Dmu and the envoys of Phywa are engaged in dialogue; questions are posed and answered. This is not a monologue with occasional interruptions as found in the case of Dingri wedding songs.

One may also note a possible specific ritual parallel between marriage ceremonies and the ritual preparations that begin toward the end of the extant version of the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu*. In Both in Dingri and Ruthog an arrow is prominently displayed within the course of the ceremony.²⁴ A particular parallel might be seen in the decorated arrow demanded by the lord of Dmu and that in Ruthog, where "the arrow is decorated with the cloths of five colours and other objects, such as *gzi*, turquoise, *mchoñ*, mirror, spindle, *sre-loñ* and yarn thread, etc. are placed in the priest's hand followed by the songs in praise of the arrow".²⁵ An interest in the ritual use of arrows is however probably more indicative of Tibetan folk religion in general than marriage per se.²⁶

²¹ Shastri 1994: 758.

²² Shastri 1994: 758.

²³ Aziz 1985: 127.

²⁴ Aziz 1985: 120; Shastri 1994: 757–59.

²⁵ Shastri 1994: 759.

²⁶ The word *phywa* occurs in Shastri's description of the Ruthog wedding: "when a girl gets married and is about to leave her home, her family members perform the

The two parties in the story are the lord of Dmu and the envoys of Phywa. A marriage between one lord, and several envoys, all of whom are probably male, seems unlikely in the extreme. One could understand that the envoys of Phywa are negotiating a marriage between some member of the Phywa clan and the lord of Dmu, but no evidence within the text suggests this. The envoys of Phywa explain quite clearly their two goals: one is to worship the god of Dmu (ll.113–14 et passim) and the second is to convince the lord of Dmu to descend to the earth on behalf of man (ll.111–12). No marriage occurs in or is implied by this text.

Marriage is one species of fictive kinship. In Ruthog, when a bride arrives at the family of the groom, a *lha-hdog* ceremony binds her to the deity of her new family.²⁷ This binding to a new family's gods is parallel to the envoy's first goal of worshiping Dmu's god. Although no marriage is performed, a bond of kinship is forged between the Phywa and Dmu. The creation of fictive kinship is made clear by the switch from the exclusive pronoun *ned* to the inclusive pronoun *ho-skol* at line 165 in the discourse of the lord of Dmu addressing the envoys of Phywa, and such explicit statements as "*khyed ho-skol-la dbyar myed-pas* [there is no difference between you and us]" (l.167). The total absence of any mention of a bride or groom in PT 126 makes it difficult to see it as a part of a wedding. The most one can conclude is that the ceremony reflected in PT 126 has certain structural parallels with some Tibetan wedding ceremonies. A more apt comparison of the envoys of Phywa in their role as go-between is with the figure Skar-ma Yol-lde who, in the *yo ga can* account of the first emperor in the *Mkhas pa ldehu chos hbyun*, serves as a go-between to negotiate on behalf of men for the descent of the first emperor.²⁸

2. The Land of Dmu

The understanding of PT 126 as describing a marriage is not universal. Uebach and Zeisler refer to the text as "a funerary rite".²⁹ Perhaps they follow here the suggestion of Ishikawa that the land of Dmu is the land

rite to invoke the deities, the rite to secure *phywa*, the rite to secure *gyang* and the rite to release the girl from the bonds of her family patron deity" (1994: 760). However, his usage suggests that it is *phywa* 'good fortune' as a common noun which is under discussion. Shastri presumably meant *g.yang* 'wellfare' and not *gyang* 'wall'.

²⁷ Shastri 1994: 760.

²⁸ Mkhas-pa-ldehu 1987, 2003: fol. 131b–32b.

²⁹ Uebach and Zeisler 2008: 325.

of the dead.³⁰ The lord of Dmu describes his lands at the text's beginning; there is no day and night; it is encircled by mountains; no birds fly above and no mice creep below (ll.105–07). The land of Dmu is south east of the land of Srin (l.122). It is guarded by various wild animals (ll.126–27) and armored horsemen (l. 133). The men of Dmu, perhaps just the lord himself, look good, sound good, and smell good (ll.123–24). The lands of Phywa and of men are known in Dmu, but are far away. Dmu can be reached by horseback from Phywa (l.138).

Ishikawa cites the lack of day or night, birds or mice, as indication that time does not pass in Dmu; the non-passage of time is what suggests to him the land of the dead.³¹ The failure of dawn to break or dusk to fall is also tied directly to death in the ritual narrative PT 1285.

// Ḥol dug khu ser ma / Ṃa-luñ lhen-moñ brgyaḥ / las / bskus-paḥḡ gan-du mchis / yab-kyI gan-du mchis / Ṃa-luñ lhen-moñ brgya žig phaḡi phyag-du phul / Ḥol rje Zin-brañ-gis / gsol-ba / sku-ru gsol / lañs-pa dug-du lañs / Ḥol dug khu ser sku ma gdiñs-su lañs / « ha na na yis nam / myi nañs / hu tshu tshu ḥis ñin myi nub » /

[She rubbed the putrid sappy Ḥol poison on one hundred Nya-luñ lhen-moñ and it went near, went near, went near to her father. She offered one hundred Nya-luñ lhen-moñ to her father. Ḥol-rje Zin-brañ ate it, ate it in his body. He took it, took the poison. He took the putrid sappy Ḥol poison into the depths of his body. [He cried] “Ha-na-na, the day won't dawn! Hu-tshu-tshu, the sun won't set”.] (PT 1285, ll. 107–10).³²

In contrast to Ishikawa's suggestion that Dmu yul is the land of death, Stein suggests that “le pays des *dmu* [...] semble bien être situé au Ciel, quelque part où le soleil ne se lève, ni ne se couche (c'est-à-dire où il est toujours ?) [the land of Dmu appears to be situated in the sky, where the sun never rises or sets (i.e. where it always is?).]”.³³ The word ‘Dmu’ is cognate with words for sky in various Tibeto-Burman languages.³⁴ Among the Rawang, the *Dmø* ‘spirits of the upper realm’.³⁵ These parallels suggest that the understanding of the Dmu as gods of the sky is very ancient. The interpretation of Dmu as the heavens is of course not inconsistent with its interpretation as the realm of the dead. A better reason than its strange meteorology to identify the

³⁰ Ishikawa 2000: 176–97.

³¹ Ishikawa 2000: 176–79.

³² See Lalou 1958: 184–85; Karmay 1998: 344 §20.

³³ Stein 1962: 64.

³⁴ Stein 1961: 63–64; Coblin 1987.

³⁵ LaPolla and Poa 2001: 13.

land of Dmu with heaven is the overall place of this tale in Tibetan mythology.

Remembering that the envoys' two goals are to worship the god of Dmu (ll.113–14 et passim) and to convince the lord of Dmu to descend to the earth on behalf of man (ll.111–12), it becomes clear that the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* (PT 126) is an etiological tale, which explains the origin of the *sku-bla* ceremony. This myth is a vignette from a cycle of mythological components which together narrate the Tibetan emperor's divine descent from heaven to earth. The narrative of divine descent is referred to directly or indirectly in a number of Tibetan texts, often signaled by a single phrase such as “*gnam-gyī lha-las myīhi rjer gśegs-pa//* [came down from the gods of heaven as lord of men]” (Inscription at the tomb of Khri Lde-sroñ-brtsan, circa 815)³⁶ or “*myīhi mgon-du sa-la gśegs-nas* [come to earth as lord of men]” (Fragmentary Tablet at Žwa-baḥi lha khañ).³⁷ The pervasiveness of references to this myth (cf. PT 1287, ll. 62–63, PT 1286, ll. 31–35, India Office Library IOL Tib J 0751, l. 1) makes clear that it is a keystone of the ideology of the Tibetan empire.³⁸

As an etiological myth, the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* (PT 126) is a companion piece to the first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287). The former describes how the lord of Dmu reluctantly agrees to descend to the earth in order to rule over men and explains the origin of the *sku-bla* ceremony; the latter describes how the Tibetan emperor lost the ability to travel bodily to heaven at will, and explains the origin of the funerary rites of the Tibetan emperor. Using the standard terminology of later Tibetan historiographical literature, the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* (PT 126) tells the story of the first emperor Gñah-khri btsan-po and the first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287) tells the story of the seventh emperor Gri-gum btsan-po. The first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287) accounts for the physical death of the emperor and the institution of royal funerals. The *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* (PT 126) accounts for the arrival of the emperor and the institution of the *sku-bla* ceremony. This parallel suggests that the *sku-bla* ceremony would have been used in a coronation rite.

A negotiation between representatives of the men of earth with a god imploring his descent to rule over man, broadly paralleling the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu*, is attested in a number of later Tibetan mythological texts. The *Ldeḥu chos byung* (dating to after 1261) cites a text called the *Yo ga (yi ge) lha gyes can*, in which three origin stories for the

³⁶ Li Fang Kuei and Coblin 1987: 241, 246.

³⁷ Li Fang Kuei and Coblin 1987: 274.

³⁸ See Hill 2013.

dynastic line are discussed.³⁹ The second of these, referred to as the secret Bon tradition (*gsaṅ ba bon lugs*), contains one such parallel story,⁴⁰ in which a group of Tibetans decide they need a ruler. They ask the god of the ribs (*rtsibs kyi lha*), Skar-ma yol-lde, for assistance. Skar-ma yol-lde, like the messengers of Phywa, asks the lord of Dmu to descend to the earth in order to rule mankind. After a prolonged negotiation, his relatives give him a number of magical accoutrements to take with him on his voyage. His father gives him a garment, seven bodyguards, an ox with white horns, and the following self-deploying military equipment: a self blowing conch-shell, self arming bow, self shooting arrow, self donning coat of mail, self shielding shield, and self spearing spear; he also gives his son a cook and two priests. The uncle gives a partly overlapping set of military items, which are, like in most post-dynastic texts, themselves called Dmu; they include the Dmu coat of mail, the Dmu helmet, the Dmu spear, the Dmu shield, the Dmu sword, the Dmu ladder, and the Dmu cord.⁴¹ The mother provides her son with self-deploying household items: a piece of turquoise, fire, water, a mill-stone, a pan, a plate, and a loom.

In the first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287), when Dri-gum-bstan-po challenges his horse groom Lo-ñam to combat, the servant insists that the emperor abandon a certain number of divine implements (*lhaḥi dkor*, l. 10) as a prerequisite for their combat; these are a spear, a sword, armor, and a shield, all of them self-deploying. When meeting Dri-gum-bstan-po in the field he further requests that the emperor cut his 'head braids' (*dbuḥ-ḥbreṅ* l. 14) and overturn his 'head ladder' (*dbuḥ-skas* l. 15). Aside from differences in order, the absence of the helmet, and replacing 'braids' with 'cord', the objects Lo-ñam demands are the same as the gifts from the uncle in the *Yo ga (yi ge) lha gyes can*. Although these accoutrements are nowhere referred to as Dmu in the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287) they are structurally identical. Lo-ñam insists that Dri-gum-bstan-po abandon these devices precisely because they are what make the emperor more than a man. Dri-gum-bstan-po's ability to return bodily (*mñon-bar dguṅ-du gśeḡs-pa*, PT 1287, ll. 6–7) to heaven is what caused his haughtiness in the first place. In his confrontation with Lo-ñam, it is precisely this feat which he is fatally unable to perform, having relieved himself of his divine implements. Thus, it is clear that these tools are what enabled his ability. The gifts given by the uncle of the first emperor in the one story end up in the hands of the regicide horse groom in the other.

Although the story of divine descent in the *Yo ga (yi ge) lha gyes can*,

39 These three versions are broadly parallel to three versions of the origin of the dynasty recounted in PT 1038 and in several post dynastic historiographical sources.

40 Karmay 1998 [1994]: 299–300.

41 Karmay 1998 [1994]: 300.

in which an intermediary convinces the lord of Dmu to descend to earth for the betterment of mankind, is cognate with the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* (PT 126), there is no straightforward parallel for the transfer of divine gifts to the lord of Dmu in the latter. Two possibilities present themselves. The first possibility is that such a transfer is made in the section of the text which is no longer extant. The text we have mostly concerns the desire of the envoys of Phywa to worship the *sku-bla* of Dmu, only one of their stated goals. This section may have been followed by a further section where the descent of the lord of Dmu to become the lord of men is discussed in equal detail. The other possibility is that the gifts which Dmu demands of the envoys of Phywa are cognate with the gifts he receives from his relatives in the *Yo ga (yi ge) lha gyes can*. The gifts which the lord of Dmu demands from the envoys, and which they seem to have come prepared with, are bamboo, a divine arrow, gold, a skin garment, grains, seeds, vegetables, roasted meat, milk, a divine sheep, a divine horse, a divine female yak, and a divine male yak. Notably absent are divine military technologies. The arrow and garment could parallel gifts of the father in the *Yo ga (yi ge) lha gyes can*. The predominance of animals and foodstuffs in the list of the *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* perhaps indicates that these gifts are not enticements for the lord of Dmu to come to earth as a lord, but rather are the material requisites for performing the *sku-bla* cult. The divine animals (sheep, horse, female and male yak) parallel almost exactly the psychopomp horse, sheep, male yak, and dzo of the funeral rites.⁴² Together with Ishikawa's observation that the land of Dmu mirrors the land of the dead⁴³ this suggests that the *sku-bla* rites, related to coronation, may have also paralleled the imperial funeral rites.

3. The Manuscript

The manuscript is held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France with the shelfmark PT 126. I have not consulted the manuscript in person, but have consulted the high-resolution colour scans of it, via the Artstor homepage. Subsequently high-resolution scans have also become available for free consultation at gallica.bnf.fr. The scroll contains two texts. The Buddhist sūtra *Hphrul-kyi byig śus phyi ma la bstan paḥi mdo* takes up the first 103 lines of the text. This text is written with a larger more formal hand. The *Envoys of Phywa to Dmu* takes up the final 64 lines of the scroll (ll.104–68) as it exists today. Both the beginning and end of the scroll are missing.

⁴² Orosz 2003: 26.

⁴³ Ishikawa 2000: 176–79.

There are two *svasti* symbols which divide the Envoys of Phywa to Dmu into two discreet sections. The first section covers lines 104–51. The second section begins in line 151 and continues to the end of the scroll (l.168). Both sections consist of dialogue. In the first section the interlocutors are named as the envoys of Phywa (*phywahi pho ña*), the lord of Dmu (*Dmu rje*), and in a short passage near the beginning there are also some water carriers (*chu chun*). The second section does not name the interlocutors as clearly.

The fact that both the first section and the second section look a bit like the beginnings of texts might incline one to believe that they are altogether separate texts. The first section begins with a ‘once upon a time’ formula and even gives the text a sort of title in the phrase *Dmu-dañ Phywa gñen-baḥi ḥtshé*. The second section seems like the beginning of a new text, in particular because it includes a letter opening formula (ll.151–52, *ža sñā-nas ... mchid gsol-pa*).⁴⁴ Nonetheless, the phraseology of the two sections of the text is very similar; in both parts a group of people discuss being allowed to see a god. The definitive reason that one has to analyze the first part and the second part as sections of the same text is because of parallel passages in the two sections.

ll.138–39

*de sku-bla myi mthar myi g.yo-baḥi lha yon-tsam ḥbul-du mchis-na /
lha žal mtho-ziñ phyag chud-pa tsam-du gci gñañ?*

Now we have come merely to offer a gift (to) the god, the unbridled unwavering *sku-bla*.

Grant that we see the face of the god and touch (?) his hands.

ll.164–65

*bdag-cag ñan-pa yang lha žal tsam mthoñ /
lha bkaḥ tsam ñan-ciñ mchis-na /
bkaḥ stsal-pa tsam-du ci gñañ?*

Even we vulgar fellows saw merely the face of the god,
and heard merely the voice of the god,
please grant an order.

The grammatical structure of the two passages is parallel. The envoys state a precondition which motivates their request, ending in *mchis-na*, and state their request, ending in *ci gñañ*. The request of the first passage ‘to see the face of the god’ has become the precondition of the second passage. This means that the envoys have seen the face of the god during the lapse in the dialogue (ll.150–51). This analysis is further confirmed by a grammatical change from *-du mchis* to *-ciñ mchis* in the

⁴⁴ See Takeuchi 1990: 183.

statement of the prerequisite of the request.

The two passages present a clear 'before' and 'after' scenario with respect to seeing the face of the god. It is therefore necessary that the second section be regarded as a continuation of the narrative of the first section. With it established that the two sections belong to one text it is generally not difficult to identify which passages in the second section are addressed by the envoys and which by the lord of Dmu.

4. Editorial Conventions

I use a modified version of the former Library of Congress transliteration system. I add various formatting to the transliterated text to facilitate comprehension of the text on its own without the aid of the translation. Word breaks are indicated, names capitalized, and sentence punctuation such as quotations marks, question and exclamation marks are added. These editorial interventions are uncommon in the editing of Tibetan texts, but are taken for granted in the editing of Greek or Latin texts, where they have proven their utility. Following another convention taken from the Classics, the notes are anchored to the original text itself and not the translation. In this way maximum aid is provided to the comprehension of the original text, and the translation is a stand-alone text free from interference that can be employed for those ignorant of Tibetan.

In his first study of this text Ishikawa divides the text into 16 sections, and provides a summary of each section.⁴⁵ I have followed these divisions in my text and translation. I adjust the notice of line breaks so that they do not interrupt words.

5. The Text

Opening

(104) \$ / / gnaḥ-daṅ-po / gḥe thog-ma / Dmu-daṅ Phywa gñen-baḥi
ḥtshe / Phywa-ḥi pho-ña Dmu-ḥi [tha]d-du mchis-paḥ [...] /

1 (II, 105–07)

(105) Dmu-ḥis bkaḥ stsal-pa /
“ñed-kyi Dmu yul ḥdi dag-na /
dgaḥ lha byed ni nam myi naṅs-la /
dro ñi ḥod-kyis (106) ni /
mun myi sros-paḥi sa yul ḥdi dag ni /

⁴⁵ Ishikawa 2000.

g.yaḥ mthaḥ ni gañs-kyis bskor /
 mthiñ mthaḥ ni dag-gyis (107) bskor-te /
 mtho-ste bya myi ldiñ-la /
 dmaḥ-ste byi myi zul baḥi gra gru ḥdi dag-na / /"

2 (II, 107–09)

chu chun [noñ] bu dag (108) sbron-du ḥoñs-paḥi mchid na-re /
 "pho-brañ khab sgo-na /
 bañ-ñe-buñ-ñe se-ru loñ-loñ /
 neḥu bun-bun-po /
 myi-cuñ po-ka (109) tsam-la /
 rta-cuñ lgo-ba tsam kha-cig gdaḥ-ḥo" skad-na / /

3 (II, 109–10)

"myi ni su-ḥi myi? /
 byon ni gañ-nas byon? /
 don no su-la (110) gñer? /
 drag-du rmed-pas /
 žib-du sprinś-śig!" / / / /

4 (II, 110–15)

pho-ñas lan btab-paḥ /
 "bdag-cag (111) ni Ḥphywa-ḥi ḥbañs /
 Phywa-ḥis bkaḥ stsald /
 "rje ni žu phud-nas /
 mgo nag ḥgreñ-la rje myed . (112) rje skos-la /
 rnog chags ḥdud-la khram thob-cig!" ces bkaḥ stsald-pa /
 ḥdebs-śiñ mchi-baḥi (113) śul ka-na / bab
 Dmu yul-du bab-ste /
 dgaḥ ni lha byed /
 dro ni gñen byed /
 yar ni lha mchod /
 mar ni [sri] (114) gnon-baḥi thad-kar bab-ste / /
 bdag-cag ñan-pa yañ lha-la ni yon ḥbul /
 Dmu rje-la ni bkod tsam (115) ḥbul-žin spyañ-ñar mchis / /-
 paḥi pho-ña lags". / / /

5. (II, 115–17)

Dmu rjes bkaḥ stsald /-paḥ / /
 (116) "myi khyod-cag-kyi bkaḥ mchid-la /
 g.yo-sgyus bñan-paḥi śo-ge dag rab-du che-bas /
 śul nor-par byon-ba (117) ḥdra /
 nor tshabs dag rab-du che-bas /
 śnar-gi śul gañ lags-pa de-kho zuñ-la slar gśegs-śig!" / /

6 (II, 117–25)

pho-ñas (118) lan btab-paḥ / /
 “Rtsaṅ smad mdo-nas tshur mchis-na /
 śul yaṅ nor /-te / /
 ri roṅ ni stsub /
 chu rdzab (119) ni che /
 myi-daṅ mjal-pa-las /
 skra ni ḥkham-pa
 dmyig ni ser-ba /
 skad ni ḥdzer-ba /
 rka lag ni khyor-ba (120) cig-daṅ mjal-te /
 “su-ḥi myi?” źes bdag-cag-la ḥdri-ḥo /
 bdag-cag-kyis kyaṅ / draṅ-por smras-te /
 “Dmu-ḥi yul-du (121) Phywa-ḥi pho-ñar mchi.” źes bgyis-na
 /
 kho-ḥi mchid-nas /
 “ḥo-na khyod-cag nor-par ḥoṅs-te /
 yul ḥdi ni (122) srin-gi yul-gis / /
 Dmuḥi yul ni śar lho-ḥi tshams-na yin-bas /
 de-ltar / soṅ!” skad-nas śul (123) bstan /-te /
 da-ltar Dmuḥi yul ḥdab-du ḥphebs-na /
 myi-daṅ mjal-na /
 myi mgon-po-bas legs (124)
 skad mdaṅs ni ḥbrug skad-pas che-la sñan /
 dri-gsuṅ ni spos-kyi dri-bas gdaḥ-ḥo. /
 da rje-ḥi spyar-ñar sku-bla-la (125) yon ḥbul /
 Dmu rje-la bkod tsam ḥbul-źiṅ źal mthoṅ-bar ci gnaṅ?” / / /
 /

7 (II, 125–29)

Dmu rjes (126) bkaḥ stsald-pa /
 “ñed-kyi yul ḥdi dag-na /
 sa ḥtshams-kyi stag ḥphreṅ khri skugs dag-na /
 gles-pa stag-daṅ (127) gzig / dom-daṅ dred las bstsoḡs-pa
 maṅ-por mchis-na /
 de kun gcig-daṅ yaṅ ma phrad-na /
 khyed-cag gnam-nas ḥoṅs-na (128) ni /
 phur-baḥi ḥdab śog myed-la /
 sa-las ḥdzul-te ḥoṅs-na ni
 byi-ba ma yin-na /
 khyed-cag-gi tshig-la zol maṅ-bas (129) slar gśeḡs-śig!” / / /
 /

8. (II, 129–32)

pho-ñas lan btab-pa /

“bdag-cag ñan-pa-la sgyu-dañ zol ma mch[is] /

(130) Dmu rje-ñi stag phrañ gzig phrañ-na /

gles-pa stag gzig-dañ yañ mjal /

dom-dañ dred-dañ yañ mjal /

(131) la-la ni btsas phul. /

myi-la ni yon phul-nas /

bdag-cag ñan-pa-la śul bstan-nas /

Dmu rje-ñi spyā-ñar mchis-pa (132) lags” / / / /

9. (II, 132–35)

Dmu rjes bkañ stsal-pa / /

“khyed-cag-gi tshig-la yon zol yod-pas /

ñed (133) Dmu-ñi gcan-pa gles-pa lcags-kyi myi rta źub

rluñ ltar ni phyo-la /

glog ltar ni myur-ba /

lcags-kyi ri-boñ-la lcags-kyi (134) khra bkye-ste /

ste len-du len-ba dag kyañ yod-na /

de kun gcig-dañ yañ ma phrad-na /

khyod-cag-kyi tshig yañ brdzun-dañ zol mchis-par / (135)

slar gśegs-śig” / / / /

10 (II, 135–39)

pho-ñas lan btab-pa / /

“bdag-cag ñan-pa-la rdzun-dañ zol ma mchis /

lcags-kyi myi (136) rta źub

lcags-kyi khra bkye-ba

glog ltar myur-ba-dañ yañ mjal-te /

lcags-kyi thur-ma-la /

lcags-kyi ri-boñ gtur-nas bsreg (137) śa bgyid-pa-dañ yañ mjal

/

mdzo-mo dkar-mo źig bśas-te /

mźug-ma ma bcad-pa-dañ yañ mjal-nas /

de kun-la yañ (138) Phywañi bkañ-rtags-dañ skyes rañs phul-

te /

rta / rgal-nas mchis-na /

da sku-bla myi mthur myi g.yo-bañi lha yon tsam ħbul-du

(139) mchis-na /

lha źal tsam mtho-źiñ phyag chud-pa tsam-du gci gñañ?” / /

/ /

11 (II, 139–50)

Dmu rjes bkañ stsal-paħ /

(140) "ho-na Phywa-ḥi pho-ña ñed-kyi sku-bla-la mchod gsol-
 du ḥoñs-na /
 mchod-paḥi rkyen ci yod? /
 Hjañ smyug mchod-la (141) /
 thañ-kar yug-gyis bsgron-ba lha mdaḥ yod-dam myed? /
 lha mdaḥ-ḥi rkyen Rgya dar ris phran yug-kyis (142) btags-pa
 yod-dam myed? /
 gser kha ma blañs-pa yod-dam myed? /
 g.yu-ḥi slag cen yod-dam myed? /
 sñon-mo (143) ḥbru bdun-la khal dgu yod-dam myed? /
 sñon-mo ḥdiñ diñ ḥbras-kyi khu khal dgu yod-dam myed? /
 mthud goñ (144) goñ-mo tsam mchis-saṃ ma mchis? /
 mar-gi sreg śa sreg-pa tsam mchis-sam ma mchis? /
 ^o-maḥi (145) gdar bre-kha tsam mchis-sam mchis? /
 lha lug ño mar mchis-sam mchis? /
 lha rta sñan kar mchis-sam (146) ma mchis? /
 lha ḥbri zal mo mchis-sam ma mchis? /
 lha g.yag śam-po mchis-sam ma mchis? /
 (147) Dmu rje-la yañ skyes rañs rdzogs-par mchis-sam? /
 Dmu blon-la yañ skyes rañs rdzogs-par mchis-na /
 (148) ḥdron-po dag kyañ dguñ mthaḥ skor skor ni /
 rgod-po mthaḥ zags-la /
 dog mthaḥ skor bskor ni mtshal-ba (149) thil rdol /
 myi ni chad rta ni ñal-na yañ /
 ra-maḥi ḥdab tsam-du gdab-du gñañ /
 sku-bla-la yañ yon ḥbul-du (150) gñañ-ño" / / /

12 (II, 150–51)

žu-ba nram ḥga sñan-du žus-te /
 bkaḥ gñan-pos luñ-du stsal-te gñañ-ba (151) /
 gtañ-rag spyi-bo gtsug-gyis ḥtshal-žiñ mchis-so / / /

13 (II, 151–59)

\$ / / sku-gñen phyogs-kyi (152) ža sña-nas / Mañ-žam ñid-kyis
 mchid gsol-pa / /
 "bdag-cag ñan-pa lta-śig mchis-pa /
 bus-ba ñan-pa (153) ḥga žig rkañ riñs-te skyes-na /
 khyed-kyi žam-ḥbriñ ḥdab-du /
 riñ-baḥi ni srab-mdaḥ ḥdzin-pa-ḥam /
 thuñ-baḥi (154) baḥi ni yob-cen-gi rten tsam-ḥam /
 mtshan-mo ni g.yañ-mo-ḥi mthaḥ skyoñ-ba tsam-du ḥbul-bar
 bsamñs-te (155) /
 rko-loñ nram ḥga tsam žus-na / yañ / rko-loñ-du ma brtsis-te
 /

bkaḥ chad-kyis ma bkum /
 (156) gśegs-su gnañ-ba glo-ba dgaḥ / /
 de-ḥi rjes-la myi-dañ ḥdra-baḥi gdan tshab-ḥam? /
 gsol-du ruñ-baḥi (157) bśos skyems ni ci yañ ma ḥbyor lags-
 na yañ /
 byeḥu tshañ-du rgyal gśegs-pa-dañ mtshuñs-te /
 gdugs (158) tshod ma khoñs-paḥi thog-du /
 grañ-mo źal-bu re re źig sku-la dmyigs-śiñ mchis-na /
 chuñs-kyis (159) bkaḥ myi ḥbab / bźes-pa tsam-du ci gnañ?"
 / / / /

14 (II, 159–62)

"bdag-cag ñan-pa mchis-pa (160) yañ deñ-gi gdugs-la /
 ḥdi ḥdra-baḥi bkaḥ luñ gñan-po g.yar-du stsal-pa yañ /
 g.yar tshod ma (161) mchis / /
 bdag-cag-kyi yab-khu dag kyañ ma rdzogs / /
 yab-khu dag-dañ bkaḥ gros bgyis-la (162)
 de-nas khyed-cag-la bkaḥ luñ dag sbyin gis" / / / /

15 (II, 162–65)

sku gñen ḥphrul-gi źa śna-nas / (163)

"deñ-gi gdugs-la gor-bu-ḥi źabs tshogs-la ma gzigs-te gdan
 gśegs-su gnañ-ba glo-ba (164) dgaḥ /
 bdag-cag ñan-pa yañ lha źal tsam mthoñ /
 lha bkaḥ tsam ñan-ciñ mchis-na /
 bkaḥ (165) stsal-pa tsam-du ci gnañ" / / / /

16 (II, 165–68)

"de lags khyed ḥo-skol mchis-pa yañ /
 phu ni stoñ sde /
 (166) mdaḥ ni rgya sde /
 rje gcig-gi ḥbañs-la
 yul cig-gi ni myi /
 sa cig-gi ḥbras /
 ri cig-gi (167) rdo /
 khyed ḥo-skol-la dbyar myed-pas /
 khyed-kyis [---b]-nas kyañ ceḥu-yag-dañ log-men dag ltos! /
 ruñ-źiñ (168) śis-par gyur-na /
 bdag-cag [---] bkaḥ-gros dag [b]gyis-la /
 khyed-la bkaḥ-luñ dag sbyin-gis /"

6. Apparatus

O: Old Tibetan Documents Online (accessed June 2007)

I: Ishikawa (2001)

C: Chu Junjie (1990)

B: Bellezza (2005)

D: Drikung (2011)

104 OIC: gže, D: gži

105 OCD: dag na /, I: dag na

105 OID: dgaḥ lha, C: lha

106 gañs, OIC: g.yaḥ, D: g.yaḥ

106 dag-gyis: Ishikawa has a footnote pointing out that Yamaguchi (1983: 171, 194) reads rog gyis.

107 OID: mtho ste, C: mthoñ ste

107 OIC: byi, D: byeḥu

107: OD: zul baḥi, IC: ḥzul baḥi

107: OID: noñ bu, C: nor bu

108 OID: sgo na, C: sgro na

108 OID: loñ loñ, C: loñ lo

108 OID: myi cuñ po, C: myi chuñ po

109 OID: rta cuñ, C: rta chuñ

110 OID: gñer /, C: gñer

110 OD: rmed pas, IC: smed pas

110 OID: sprinḥ śig, C: sprinḥ [i]b

110 OI: lan btab paḥ, C: lan bdab paḥ, D: lan btab pa

112 ID: rñog chags ḥdud, O: rñog chags dud, C: rjog chag ḥdud

112 OID: bkaḥ stsald pa, C: bkaḥ stsald ba

113 O: lha byed / dro, I: lha byed da re, C: lha byed bdro, D: lha byed / ḥdre

113 OC: sri, I: dri, D: omit

116 OD: myi khyod cag, IC: myi khyed cag (Either *khyod cag* or *khyed cag* are defensible readings. The second stroke of the o vowel is quite short and may be a result of ink filling a natural crevice in the paper. Note however that the word *khyod cag* does appear unambiguously at lines 121 and 134.)

116 OD: śo ge dag, CI: śo ge dañ

116 śul nor par byon ba, OD: śul ner bar byon ba, I: śul noñ par byon, C: omit

117 OI: nor tshabs, C: nor chabs, D: nor tshab

117 gśegs (the first g- is written below the line.)

119 OID: ḥkham pa, C: ḥkham pa dañ

119 OC: rka lag, ID: rkañ lag (Either reading is defensible.)

119 OD: khyor ba, IC: khyor ba /

- 121 OD: kho ʰi mchid, IC: kho ʰo mchid
 122 OID: yin bas, C: yin baḥ
 123 OI: myi dañ mjal na /, C: omit
 127 gnam-nas (nas is written below the line.)
 127 OCD: gnam nas, I: gnam nañ
 128 OID: ḥdzul te, C: ḥdzul te /
 132 OID: yod pas /, C: yod bas /
 133 OID: lcags kyi ri boñ, C: lcags kyi ri bo
 134 OD: khyod cag, IC: khyed cag
 134–35 ID: zol mchis par / slar, O: zol mchis pas / slar, C: zol mchis
 par / gir
 135 O śig / / / /, IC: śig //, D: śig
 136 OID: rta źub, C: da źub
 138 OID: phywaḥi, C: phywa ʰi
 138 OD: ḥbul du, IC: ḥbul du /
 139 OD: chud pa tsam, I: mchod pa tsam, C: bchud ba tsam
 139 IC: du gci gnañ, OD: du ci gnañ
 139 OICB: stsal-paḥ, D: stsal-pā
 141 OICD: bsgron ba, B: bsgron pa
 141 the first lha mdaḥ is written below the line
 141 the syllable ri is crossed out between rkyen and Rgya
 142 OICD: btags pa, B: btag pa
 143 OID: khal dgu, C: khal dñu
 143 OCD: ḥdiñ diñ, I: ḥdiñ ḥdiñ
 144 OICD: mar gi, B: mar gyi
 145 OID: bre kha tsam mchis sam mchis /, C: *omit* mchis sam mchis,
 B: mchis sam ma mchis
 145 OIC: lha lug ño mar mchis sam mchis, B: mchis sam ma mchis, D:
 lha lug ño mar mchis sam ma mchis
 145 OICD: sñan kar, B: sñan kar
 146 The ma of the first (?) ma mchis is written below the line
 146 OCD: zal mo mchis sam ma mchis, I: zal mo mchos sam ma
 mchis, B: zal mo mchis sam mchis
 147 OCD: skyes rañs, C: skyes rasañ (an obvious typo)
 148 OID: rgod po mthaḥ zags la /, C: *omit* mthaḥ
 150 OD: źu ba rnam ḥga, I: źu ba rnam bag, C: ñu ba rnam bag
 150 O: luñ du, ICD: luñ ñu.
 152 mchid, OICD: mchod. The reason why people read o, is because
 of a crease in the paper.
 153 I: ḥga źig rkañ, C: ḥga źig rgañ, O: ḥga[h] źig rkañ, D: ḥgaḥ źig
 rkañ
 153 OID: ḥdab du, C: bdab du
 153–54 OIC baḥi baḥi, D: baḥi
 154 OID tsam ḥam, D: tsam mam

154 OD: bsam̄s, I: bsams, C: bas

155 rko loñ, I: rko -- rnam, O: rko [--] [rnam?], C: rko [ba] rnam, D: rko rnam. Indeed, the *loñ* is difficult to read. However, the *na-ro* is quite clear and even the *la* and *ña* can be seen. One can compare this writing of *rko loñ* with the writing of the same word a few words later.

155 IC: ḥga tsam źus na /, O: ḥga[h] tsam źus na /, D ḥgaḥ tsam źus na

155 OD: bkum, IC: bgum

156 OID: gśegs su gñañ, C: [g]śe las gñañ

157 OID: skyems, C: skyesm (C is orthographically correct, but the reading of OI is clearly what is intended.)

157 OD: gdugs, IC: gdubs,

159 IC: gci gnam, OD: ci gñañ

159 OID: mchis, C: mchis /

161 OID: yab khu dag dañ bkaḥ gros, C: yab khu dag kaḥ gros

163 OD: gdugs la, IC: gsugs la,

163 OD: tshegs la ma gzig, IC: tshegs las gzig

165 OIC de lags khyed, D: de lags / khyed

165 OD: ḥo skol mchis, IC: ḥo skol ma mchis

167 OID: log men dag ltos, C: log men d[]śa ltos

C ends at line 167

168 OIC: gyur na /, D: gyur na

168 O: [b]gyis la, I: ?gyis la, D: gyis la

168 OD: sbyin gis /, I: sbyin gis //

7. Translation

Opening (II, 104)

The first long ago, the beginning of before last (*gže*), at the time of the befriending of Dmu and Phywa, the messenger of Phywa came before Dmu.

1 (II, 105–07)

(105) Dmu decreed:

“In these our lands of Dmu,
the god makes joy; dawn does not break (*nañs*).
These lands are a place where (106)
the sunlight [makes] warmth;
night does not fall.

The slate end is encircled by glaciers.

The end of the depths is perfectly (*dag gyis*) encircled.

(107) In these *gra gru*, above, the birds do not fly about (*ldiñ*)
and, below, the mice do not burrow”.

2 (II, 107–09)

The servants, water carriers, came to announce, saying:

“At the palace door
 The small yellow ripe crops ripple,
 The small meadows swirl.
 There are some small men, tall as a midriff,
 and some small horses, tall as goas (*lgo-ba*)”.

3 (II, 109–10)

[Dmu decreed]:

“As for these men, whose men are they?
 As for their coming, whence do they come?
 As for their goal (*don*), on whose behalf are they acting (*gñer*)?
 I question strictly, convey detailedly!”

4. (II, 110–15)

The messengers answered:

“We are the subjects of Phywa.
 Phywa decrees:
 “Request of the ruler, after having met him.
 The upright black headed (i.e men) have no lord; appoint a
 lord [for them]!
 For the maned (*rnog chag*) and bent (i.e. animals) draw up a
 ledger!”
 [We] fell in the path which sows (*hdebs*) and goes (*mchi*);
 [we] fell to the land of Dmu.
 Where the god makes joy,
 friendship [makes] warmth,
 above the gods are worshiped,
 below the demons conquered,
 to your presence (*thad-kar*) [we] fell.
 We vulgar fellows,
 come before [you] merely offering an oblation to the god
 and offering governance to the lord of Dmu, are messengers”.

5. (II, 115–17)

The lord of Dmu decrees:

“As for this speech of you men,
 because [your] falsehoods which are heaped with deceits are
 very great,
 it appears [you] have arrived mistaking (*noñ*) the way.
 Because [your] mistake (*nor*) is very great,
 whichever was [your] previous path, take that, and go back!”

6 (II, 117–25)

The messengers reply,

“When we came thither from Rtsañ-smad-mdo
we lost the way.

The mountains and valleys are rugged.

The rivers and marshes are vast.

We met with a man, but

one [whose] hair is brown

[whose] eyes are yellow

[whose] voice is husky

[whose] legs and arms are bent we met with.

[He] asked us “Whose men are you?”.

We answered him straight;

when [we] said “[we] go as messengers of Phywa to Dmu”,

He said: “In that case you have come mistakenly;

this [is] the land of Srin, but

since the land of Dmu is at the South East border

go that way!”. Having said this, he showed us the path.

When [we] came in that way to the vicinity of Dmu,

when we met a man,

he is more noble than a lord of men,

we heard the melody of his voice, greater than a dragon’s
voice (thunder),

his fragrance is [better] than the smell of incense.

Now, will you grant that we give an oblation to the *sku-bla*

in the presence of the lord,

offer an appointment to the lord of Dmu and regard his face?”

7. (II, 125–29)

Dmu decrees:

“In these lands of ours

in the *skugs* defiles of ten thousand tigers

the are many including *gles-pa* tigers and leopards, bears and
red bears.

If [you] have not met with one of them all

although you had come from the heavens

[you] have no wings of flight

although [you] had come scurrying across the earth

[you] are not mice.

Since there are many lies in your words, go back!”

8. (II, 129–32)

The messengers answer:

“We vulgar fellows have no deceit or lies.
 On the lord of Dmu’s tiger defile, on the leopard trail
 we met with the *gles-pa* tigers and leopards;
 we met with the bears and red bears.
 To the mountain passes we offered cairns.
 To men we offered presents,
 and [they] showed us vulgar fellows the way,
 and we arrived in the presence of the lord of Dmu”.

9. (II, 132–35) Dmu decrees:

“In your words there are still lies.
 The *gles-pa* scouts of our Dmu, the armored horsemen of iron,
 bound like the wind
 as fast as lightning.
 Falcons of iron set on hares of iron.
 There are also those carrying axes.
 If you have not met one of all these
 since your words are deceit and lies
 go back!”

10 (II, 135–39)

The messengers reply:

“We vulgar fellows have no deceit or lies.
 [We] have met with the armored horsemen of iron,
 the pouncing (*bkye*) falcons of iron,
 [both] as fast as lightning.
 We met with someone preparing roasted meat, who had
 skewered an iron hare upon an iron skewer.
 We met with someone who had slaughtered a white dzo, and
 had not cut the tail.
 To all of them [we] presented the seal of Phywa and perfect
 presents.
 Crossing over [on] horse, [we] came.
 Now we have come merely to offer a gift [to] the god, the
 unbridled unwavering *sku-bla*.
 Grant that we see the face of the god and touch (?) his hands”.

11 (II, 139–50)

The lord of Dmu decrees:

“Well, if you messengers of Phywa have come to offer an
 oblation to our *sku-bla*
 what do you have as an oblation?
 Do [you] offer Hjañ (Nanzhao 南詔) bamboo;
 do [you] have or not have a divine arrow fletched with

lammergeier feathers?
 As divine arrow, do you have or not one fastened with fabric
 of various Chinese silk designs?
 Do you have or not have unwrought gold?
 Do you have or not have a great garment of turquoise?
 Do you have or not nine loads of (*la*) seven greens and grains?
 Do you have or not nine loads of greens and *h̄din̄ din̄* rice?
 Is there or not a ball of *m̄thud*, the size of a grouse?
 Is there or not a buttered pheasant, the size of roasted meat?
 Is there or not *gd̄ar* of milk, in the amount of one *bre-kha*?
 Is there or not the divine red-faced sheep?
 Is there or not the divine white eared horse?
 Is there or not the divine speckled dri?
 Is there or not the divine white (?) yak?
 Are there perfectly sufficient presents for the lord of Dmu?
 If there are perfectly sufficient presents for the ministers of
 Dmu
 [You, my] guests,
 circling at the edge of the heavens,
 the vulture drops (to) the edge;
 circling at the edge of the earth;
 vermilion spreads (across) the base.
 [Your] men are tired; [your] horses are tired.
 I grant that you draw near to around the side of the enclosure
 I grant that you offer an oblation to the *sku-bla*".

12 (II, 150–51)

[The messengers] offered their various petitions to be heard; with an awesome edict [Dmu] granted their petition, and they offered thanksgiving with the crowns of their heads and approached.

13 (II, 151–59)

To the presence of the side of the relatives Mañ-žam offered this discourse.

"Regarding we vulgar fellows, [we] have come.
 If some bad boys are born with long legs
 in the retinue of your servants
 they think "shall [we] take the reigns which are long, or
 shall [they] merely the support of the stirrup which is short, or
 shall he be offered as guardian of the edge of sheep at night?"
 if [we] offered any annoyance
 [you] did not count it as annoyance
 the order was not executed
 we are happy that you have deigned to come.

After that, will you be a substitute place for those similar to men?
 Even though we were unable to procure [for you] any food and drink suitable to offer
 Equal to a king come to a small bird's nest
 in addition to not being able to fill the noon meal
 each cold cup watches over [your] body
 do not hand down a command because of something small
 please deign merely to accept [these gifts]" .

14 (II, 159–62)

[Dmu says]:

"We vulgar fellows also at noon today
 although this edict has been granted as a loan
 there are no terms for the loan
 Our paternal relatives have not yet assembled
 after having consulted with the paternal relatives
 [I] will grant you the commands" .

15 (II. 162–65)

The sacred relatives say:

"Today at noon without regarding the weary legs of the cushion,
 you deigned to go to the seat [we] were happy.
 Even we vulgar fellows saw merely the face of the god,
 and heard merely the voice of the god,
 please grant an order" .

16 (II 165–68)

[The response of Dmu.]

"You are we.
 Above a myriarchy
 Below, a hecatontarchy (reading *brgya* for *rgya*)
 As subjects of the one ruler
 men of one land
 grain of one earth
 stone of one mountain
 you are not distinguished from us
 After you have [---], look to the *ceḥu-yag* divination and the *log-men* divination.
 If the outcome is appropriate and auspicious
 we will deliberate
 and grant you an order" .

8. Commentary

104 gže: Bsam Gtan defines *gže-niñ* as 'the year before last'.⁴⁶ Since *na-niñ* is 'last year', *niñ* must mean 'year' and *gže* must mean 'before last'.

105–106 dro ñi ḥod-kyis ni / mun myi sros-paḥi sa yul ḥdi dag ni: The overall syntax suggests a translation "these lands are a place where hot sunlight does not warm the darkness", taking *ḥod* 'light' as the ergative agent of the transitive verb *sros* 'heat' whose patient is *mun* 'darkness'. Ishikawa translates this phrase along these lines as "暖かい日のために、日が暮れないところ [a place where because of the hot sun night does not fall]".⁴⁷ However, because adjectives follow their heads in Tibetan it is not possible to translate *dro ñi ḥod* as 'hot sunlight', which would be *ñi ḥod dro*.

The parallelism of the structure and the form of its repetition in the mouths of the envoys (ll.113–14) leads me to understand the passage as if it said *dgaḥ lhas byed ni nam myi nañs-la / dro ñi ḥod-kyis byed ni / mun myi sros-pa*, i.e. moving *lha* from the absolutive to the ergative and supplying a verb for *ḥod*. The parallel of *dgaḥ lha byed ni* (l.105) to *dro ñi ḥod-kyis ni* permits the conjecture that *lha* should be treated as though it were *lhas*. On the other hand, the parallel of *dro ñi ḥod-kyis ni* (l.105–06) to *dro ni gñen byed* (l.113) allows one to supply *byed* in *dro ñi ḥod-kyis ni* (l.105–06) amending to *dro ñi ḥod-kyis byed ni*.

There is a chiasmus formed by the phrase *yul ḥdi dag* 'these lands' and the two weather patterns. This figure can unfortunately not be captured in English. The wider meaning of this odd weather is discussed above.

106 gañs: Previous editors have read *g.ya*. Ishikawa translates this word as 岩山 'rocky mountain'⁴⁸ and Chu Junjie as 岩石 'boulder'⁴⁹. Both appear to understand *g.ya* as *g.yaḥ* 'slate'. That *gañs* is the correct reading can be confirmed by examining the way the 'ñs' is written in the word *hoñs* (e.g. l. 108).

107 gra gru: Ishikawa understands the quotation as ending with *myi zul ba*. he write: "gra gru を sgra 「音声」の反復表現とすれば、gra gru 'di na は「うんぬんしていた時」と解せず。[If *gra gru* is a reduplicated expression for *sgra* 'sound' *gra gru ḥdi na* can be understood as

⁴⁶ Bsam Gtan 1979.

⁴⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 151.

⁴⁸ Ishikawa 2001: 151.

⁴⁹ Chu Junjie 1990: 29.

‘when saying this and that’]’.⁵⁰ However, quotations generally ends with the converb *zes* or the terminative of the verbal noun,⁵¹ not the genitive as occurs here. In addition, the parallel ending in *hdi dag-na* of the opening and closing line of the lord of Dmu’s speech is clearly an intentional poetic device.

Nag dbaṅ tshul khirms defines *gra-gru* as “*rgya khyon-gyi miñ-ste* [expanse]” and offers an enigmatic quotation from the *Rgya bod yig tshañ*;⁵² citing the same passage Drikung defines *gra-gru* as “*sa-chahm yul-gru* [place, district]”⁵³. The phrase *gra-gru* also occurs in PT 1052 (recto, l. 137), in a context which is hard to make sense of. The parallelism of the structure *Dmu yul hdi dag-na* (l.1–5) ... *gra-gru hdi dag-na* (l.107) argues in favour of *gra-gru* meaning something akin to *yul* ‘land’. I am tempted to connect it to the word *grwa/gru* ‘corner’.

107 chu chun non bu: PT 1068 has an analogous tale in which the hero, Lheḥu btsan pa first meets with the *chab chun* ‘water carrier’ of Bya-za-thin-tsun. The water carrier then acts as go-between negotiating Lheḥu btsan pa’s entrance to the palace (ll.5–13). I leave *non-bu* untranslated.

107 dmaḥ-ste byi: This explicit association between ‘rats’ and the depths may provide an etymology for the pronoun *ma-byi* ‘the thing down there’ (e.g. *Rama A*, IOL Tib J 0737/1, l. 35). In classical Tibetan this becomes *ma-gi*. This explanation may appear weak since it would not account for *ya-byi* ‘thing up there’. However, one should note the variation in IOL Tib J 0738 between *ya byi* (folio 3, verso, l. 37) and *ya bya* (folio 3, verso, l. 91). One is entitled to speculate that an original opposition between *ya-bya* ‘bird above’ and *ma-byi* ‘rat below’ became grammaticalized as *ya-byi* and *ma-byi* and through subsequent sound change then *ya-gi* and *ma-gi*.⁵⁴

108 bañ-ñe-buñ-ñe se-ru loñ-loñ / neḥu bun-bun-po /: The key to understanding this phrase is the parallel construction. Both *se-ru* and *neḥu* are diminutives. This parallel ensures that what is before these two words is parallel and what is after these two words is also parallel. Thus, *bañ-ñe-buñ-ñe se-ru* is parallel to *neḥu* and *loñ-loñ* is parallel to *bun-bun-po*.

⁵⁰ Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 3.

⁵¹ See Schwieger 2006: 193–201.

⁵² Nag dbaṅ tshul khirms 1997.

⁵³ Drikung 2011.

⁵⁴ On the change of -b- to -g- between vowel see Hill 2011.

Although the dictionary of such expressions⁵⁵ does not include it, *bañ ñe buñ ñe* is an expressive reduplicated phrase.⁵⁶ The first syllable in such constructions is usually the root. A search of the dictionaries for *bañ* yields 'run'⁵⁷ and *bañ phyin* which Nag dbaṅ tshul krhims gives as 'messenger'.⁵⁸ One might suggest for *bañ ñe buñ ñe* the meaning 'hurriedly like a messenger'. Chu Junjie translates "馬羽風起雲湧 [horse-feathers (?) surging]".⁵⁹ Ishikawa prudently leaves the latter part of line 108 and the early part of line 109 untranslated.

Keeping in mind that *bañ-ñe-buñ-ñe se-ru* must be somehow parallel to *nehu* 'little meadow', leads one to identify *bañ ñe buñ ñe* with *phañ ñi phuñ ñi* which Zhang defines as "(1) *śiñ hbras lo tog sogs legs par smin paḥi rnam pa/ ... 2) lañ liñ ñam/ ḥbar ḥbur du g.yo tshul/* [1) well-ripened fruit, crops etc. ... 2) drifting, sinuous, swinging or uneven motion]".⁶⁰ I employ the translation 'ripe crops'.

The word *se-ru* would then need to modify the noun 'ripe crops'. Zhang gives *se-ru* as an archaic word for 'yellow',⁶¹ which one could also arrive at by removing the diminutive suffix *-u* to yield *ser* 'yellow'. In contrast, Chu Junjie offers the translation "好似犀牛抖擻, 青草拂动 [shaking like a rhinoceros, blowing through the grass]",⁶² apparently understanding *se ru* as *bse ru* 'rhinoceros'.

The parallel between *loñ-loñ* and *bun-bun-po* is more straightforward. Both are reduplicated adjectives meaning respectively 'billowing' and 'swirling', i.e. with obviously parallel meanings.

Drikung translates 'there is a yellowish man running to and from all in a hurry'.⁶³

108–109 myi-cuñ po-ka tsam-la / rta cuñ lgo-ba tsam kha-cig gdaḥ-ḥo » skad-na / /:

Chu Junjie translates the passage "有幾個木樁般大的小人, 黃羊般大的小馬跑過來啦! [There come several small men about the size of wooden peg and the small horse about the size of zeren!]"⁶⁴ Drikung translates 'he comes up only to the chest of a man equal to him in age,

⁵⁵ Mgon po dbaṅ rgyal 2004.

⁵⁶ Uray 1955: esp. 233–35; Zhang Liansheng 1985.

⁵⁷ See for example Jäschke 1881.

⁵⁸ Nag dbaṅ tshul krhims 1997: 528.

⁵⁹ Chu Junjie 1990: 29.

⁶⁰ Zhang Yisun 1985.

⁶¹ Zhang Yisun 1985.

⁶² Chu Junjie 1990: 29.

⁶³ Drikung 2011: 39.

⁶⁴ Chu Junjie 1990: 29.

and he is riding a small horse the size of a gazelle'.⁶⁵ Ishikawa prudently leaves the passage untranslated.

I was for a long time tempted to segment *myi cun-po ka tsam-la*, seeing *ka* as the word *kha* 'mouth'. One reason for this is the similarity with *myiñu chuñ ka ma che śig! rteñu cuñ kha ma drag* 'Little man don't be a big mouth, little colts don't have fierce mouths' in the first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287, l. 030); similar phrases also occur in divination texts. In addition, the chiasmus formed by *ka tsam* and *tsam kha* appears intentional. However, the parallelism with *rta-cuñ lgo-ba tsam* makes clear that *myi-cuñ po-ka tsam* is the correct segmentation. Drikung's identification of *po-ka* with *pho-kha* 'stomach, chest'⁶⁶ is accurate and his translation conveys the intended meaning well.

The dictionaries lack a word *lgo-ba*. In Old Tibetan texts it clearly refers to a part of a yak, e.g. *da g.yag śa ni lhu ru gśogs-śig g.yag lgo ni rasu dros-śig* [Now, cut off in slices the yak meat; cut in *ras* the yak *lgo*!]" (IOL Tib J 731 recto, l. 116), "*phyi mdañ dbañ-pa ñ g.yon lbags-gyi rtsib-mañ lgo-pa-dañ khrag phyed-dañ* [As for the distribution for the latter arrows, they receive the *lgo-pa* of the ribs of the skin on the right, half the blood, ...]" (IOL Tib J 1072, ll. 179–80). This meaning does not seem relevant here.

Chu Junjie identifies *lgo-ba* with the 黃羊 *zeren* (*procapra gutturosa*)⁶⁷ and Drikung identifies *lgo-ba* with *rgo-ba* 'goa (*procapra picticaudata*)'.⁶⁸

108 khab: A word for 'house', which appears to be used typically in the context of marriage. Compare: *khyod-kyi bo-mo yañ yid-dañ hñhad-pa žig-pas // khab-du bžes-su gnañ-ño* [Your daughter is pleasing, I consent to take her home.] (PT 981, Rama E, ll. 49–40), *Kha-gan-gyi khab-du // Mug-lden-ha-rod-par-gyi bu-mo //* [The daughter of Mug-lden-ha-rod-par to the house of the Qayan] (IOL Tib J 1368, *Annals of Ħaža principality*, l. 49), *Kim-šññ kong-co // btsan-poñi khab-du blañs-nas* [Princess Jincheng was taken to the home of the emperor] (Sino-Tibetan treaty inscription of 821–822, East face, l. 28).

109 no: The context suggests that *no* should be understood as a mistake for *ni*. Certainly, *ni* would be expected here whereas *no* would have no apparent significance. Unfortunately, the text quite clearly has *no*.

⁶⁵ Drikung 2011: 39.

⁶⁶ Drikung 2011: 38, n. 36.

⁶⁷ Chu Junjie 1990: 29.

⁶⁸ Drikung 2011: 34.

111 rje ni źu phud-nas: Ishikawa offers the translation “王をあえてお願いした後 [after being able to meet the king, to request of him.]”⁶⁹ and Chu Junjie has “向大王献上礼物后 [After presenting a gift to the King]”.⁷⁰ For *źu* ‘to ask, request’ there is no difficulty. However, the second word *phud* is difficult to interpret. Nag dbań tshul khirms writes that it is “*chań-gi miń-ste/ ji skad-dul gser skyems gtsań-ma phud-kyi mchod-pa ħdi* [a word for barely beer; thus it is said ‘this offering of *phud*, a pure libation]”.⁷¹ Deriving the noun from the verb *ħphud* ‘spare, save, set aside’, Jäschke offers “a thing set apart, used particularly of the first-fruits of the field, as a meat- or drink-offering, in various applications”.⁷² Although contextually it may make sense for the envoys to offer the lord of Dmu a libation or first fruits, here *phud* is a verb, so these definitions are not satisfactory. I do not have a solution to propose.

111 mgo-nag: The phrase *mgo-nag* as an epithet for human beings occurs in several Old Tibetan texts, usually tied directly or indirectly to the descent of a god to rule over men, cf. *Old Tibetan Annals* (IOL Tib J 0750, l. 306 [746–747]), *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287, ll. 62, 330, 343, and 448), *Prayers of the foundation of the De ga g.yu tshal monastery* (PT 16, ll. 33v3, 34v1 and IOL Tib J 0751, ll. 35v2), *The Decline of the Good Age* (IOL Tib J 733, l. 47), *Žol* inscription (South, l. 13, East, l. 14).⁷³

112 khram: Ishikawa writes “人間を管理する rje 「王」に対応する家畜を管理するものとして khram 「帳簿」. Khram は古代において木簡帳簿を指する場合もあった. *Khram* (register) is something which rules cattle like a *rje* (king) rules men. There were also situations in the ancient period where *khram* indicates wood slip register”.⁷⁴ There is however no need to see in this context a meaning other than ‘wood slip register’. By keeping track of yaks, a wood slip register does to them what a king does to men.

113 dro ni gńen byed: Ishikawa translates this phrase “今や婚姻をむすび [to contract a marriage now]”.⁷⁵ I do not see how *dro* can mean ‘now’. My objections to *gńen* as ‘marriage’ are discussed above. The line is parallel to the line *dro űi ħod-kyis* (ll.105–106), which puts *gńen*

⁶⁹ Ishikawa 2001: 151.

⁷⁰ Ishikawa 1990: 26.

⁷¹ Nag dbań tshul khirms 1997.

⁷² Jäschke 1881.

⁷³ For discussion of these passages consult Hill 2013.

⁷⁴ Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 4.

⁷⁵ Ishikawa 2001: 151.

‘friendship’ parallel to *ñi-ḥod* ‘sun light’. The possibility is worth considering that *gñen* is simply a mistake for *gñi* ‘sun’. However, the correct solution is probably more ingenious and respects the text as it is.

113 sri: Ishikawa reads this word as *(h)dri* which he amends to *(h)dre* ‘demon’.⁷⁶ This amendment is not necessary if the text is read *sri* ‘demon’.

115 spyan ñar: For *spyan sñar*.

114 bkod: The noun *bkod* is derived from the past stem of the verb *ḥgod*. Because the messengers have said they are looking for a lord of men, and the verb *ḥgod* can mean ‘rule, govern’,⁷⁷ I take this noun as ‘governance’; an etymological relationship with the verb *sko* ‘appoint’ (l.112) is not unlikely. Ishikawa instead suggests that since the main meaning of *ḥgod* is ‘put’ “この場合は置くべき物、すなわち「貢ぎ物」を意味するかと思われる [in this situation it is an object to be given, thus one can suppose it means ‘tribute’]”.⁷⁸

116 śo-ge: Ishikawa understands *śo-ge* as from *śog* ‘paper’ and compares both its meaning and morphology to *yi-ge* ‘letter’ from *yig* ‘id.’ His suggestion that “チャの使者はムへの謁見が許されていないので、彼らはムの臣下を介して、文書で問答したのであろう [because the messengers of Phywa have not received an audience with Dmu perhaps the questions and answers are being done in paper through one of Dmu’s subjects]”⁷⁹ is implausible. Instead, *śo-ge* should be seen as a variant of *śo-be* ‘falsehood’. For the alternation of *-b-* and *-g-* compare *ri-boñ* and *ri-goñ* ‘hare’.⁸⁰ Chu Junjie’s translation “你們這些人所說的話中有許多詭詐成份 [there are many deceits in these words you speak]”⁸¹ may tacitly accept this solution; Drikung explicitly identifies *śo-ge* with *śo-pe*, translating ‘lies’.⁸²

117 sñar-gi śul gañ lags-pa de-kho zuñ-la. I understand this as a relative correlative construction, with *gañ* as the relative and *de-kho* as the correlative. Ishikawa translates this passage as “前の道程がどうでご

⁷⁶ Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 5.

⁷⁷ Jäschke 1881.

⁷⁸ Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 6.

⁷⁹ Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 7.

⁸⁰ See Hill 2011.

⁸¹ Chu Junjie 1990: 30.

⁸² Drikung 2011: 39.

ざいまましても、必要な物を取ってお戻り下さい [Whatever the previous distance please take what you need and return]".⁸³ He appears to take *gañ* as an indefinite pronoun, and *de* as a semifinal converb. Ishikawa explicitly equates *kho* with *mkho* '需要 [demand]'⁸⁴ citing Yamaguchi⁸⁵. This proposal can be broken into two separate claims. First, that *kho* here is to be identified with *mkho* and second that *mkho* means 'demand'. Yamaguchi's argument in favor of 'demand' as opposed to 'institution, administration' is unconvincing.⁸⁶

118 Rtsaṅ smad mdo: Stein sees this as 'vallée basse du Fleuve [valley at the base of a river]'⁸⁷ but I think it refers to Tibet. Rtsaṅ is a region of central Tibet, the location of Tibet's second city Shigatse (Gzi ka rtse). The phrase *smad mdo* refers to the eastern region of Amdo. The Phywa are also connected to Rtsaṅ in PT 1060: "*Rtsaṅ stod Rtsaṅ-gyi dño mkhar-gyī nañ-naḥ / lha rtsaṅ la-ḥi byeḥu / rje rtsaṅ rjeḥi Phywaḥ / /* [inside a castle (at) the edge of the Rtsaṅ (river) in upper Rtsaṅ, is the Phywaḥ, lord of Rtsaṅ, a little Phywa⁸⁸ who is among the Rtsaṅ gods]" (1.74). In two other texts the name of the lord of Rtsaṅ suggests a relationship with the Phywa: *rtsaṅ rje pwa ḥa* (IOL Tib J 0734, folio 7, ll. 292, 294, 298), *rtsaṅ rje phwa sñun* (PT 1286, recto, ll. 186)

119 rka lag: Chu Junjie identifies *rka lag* with *rkañ lag*⁸⁹ and translates 手脚 'hand and feet'.⁹⁰ Ishikawa similarly translates 手足 'hands and feet'.⁹¹ Another instance of a missing *-ñ* in this text occurs at line 139, where *mthoñ* 'see' is written *mtho*.

122 srin: Ishikawa has the following note:

srin は 2 系統の神靈を指して言うように思われる。一つは、Dgri, ḥdri, ḥdre といった死の顕現あるいは怨霊を意味する語（注 5 参照）と類縁関係にある sri 語で指し示されるような、地中の死魔 (Hoffmann 1950, pp.161–62 参照) か、その類、もう一つはインドの羅刹である、ここでは後者の意味で用いら

⁸³ Ishikawa 2001: 151.

⁸⁴ Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 8.

⁸⁵ Yamaguchi 1983: 898–99, n. 114.

⁸⁶ See Uray 1972: 18–19, and Tucci 1956: 76, n. 1 and 90 and, n. 1.

⁸⁷ Stein 1961: 64.

⁸⁸ For *byeḥu* as the diminutive of Phywa see Stein 1985: 105 note 50; McKeown, trans. 2010: 150 note 50.

⁸⁹ Chu Junjie 1990: 38, 43, n. 3.

⁹⁰ Chu Junjie 1990: 30.

⁹¹ Ishikawa 2001.

れており、インドの説話にあるランカー島の羅刹などように、異界の恐るべき住人として登場しているように思われる。敦煌チベット古代ボン教文献は8C来～9C前半の敦厚チベット支配期にほぼ成立したとみられているが、もうすでにこの時期にはインド系の主教思想がチベット人の間に浸透しており、この種の文献にインドの神話が影響を与えるのは不思議ではない。

Srin seems to indicate two types of spirits. On the one hand it could be a subterranean death demon (Hoffmann 1950, pp.161–62) such as is indicated with the word *sri* in a similar relationship to words such as *gri*, *ḥdri*, and *ḥdre* which mean the manifestation of death or a vengeful spirit (note 5) or on the other hand it could be an Indian Rakṣasa, here used in the meaning of the latter as they appear as a fearsome inhabitant of another world like the Rakṣasas of Laṅka island in Indian mythology. Dunhuang Tibetan ancient Bon religious literature was mostly formed during the period of Tibetan rule in Dunhuang from the 8th century to the early half of the ninth century. Already at this time religious thought of Indian origin was permeating among Tibetans. It is not surprising that this kind of literature is influenced by Indian myth.⁹²

I do not see the need to necessarily infer an Indic influence behind *srin*.

122 tshams: For *mtshams* ‘border’.

123 ḥdab: For *ḥdabs* ‘vicinity’.

124 mdañs: For *gdañs* ‘melody’.

124 dri-gsuñ: For *dri-bsuñ* ‘fragrance’.

124 sku bla: The phrase *sku-bla-la yon ḥbul / Dmu rje-la bkod tsam ḥbul-ziñ* (ll.124–25) is parallel to *lha-la ni yon ḥbul / Dmu rje-la ni bkod tsam ḥbul-ziñ* (ll.114–15). This repetition of the envoys’ intentions, by identifying *sku-bla-la* and *lha-la*, disproves Walter’s contention that the *sku-bla* are not gods.⁹³

⁹² Ishikawa 2001: 152, 156, n. 9.

⁹³ Walter 2009: 99–100; see Hill 2010a.

126 stag ḥphreñ khri skugs: The context, *sa ḥtshams kyi ... dag-na* 'in the Xs of the border', dictates that this phrase taken altogether must refer to a place or type of place. Both Chu Junjie and Ishikawa treat it accordingly. Chu Junjie gives *stag ḥphreñ khri skugs* as the name of a 'red stūpa': "赤古塔 (虎關萬道彎) [the red stūpa (tiger-frontier-10,000-winding-path)]".⁹⁴ This suggestion is unmotivated. Ishikawa translates *stag ḥphreñ khri* phrase "虎の群れ万匹 [herd of 10,000 tigers]"⁹⁵ but because *khri* '10,000' follows *ḥphreñ* it must mean '10,000 *ḥphreñ* of tigers'.

The phrase *stag phrañ gzig phrañ-na* (1.130) in the Envoys' reply permits one to identify *stag ḥphreñ* with *stag phrañ*. This phrase also further confirms that *phrañ* is a type of place. More importantly it establishes that *stag phrañ* and *gzig phrañ* are lexical units. The dictionaries offer *ḥphreñ* 'row, rosary' and (*h*)*phrañ* 'narrow path, defile'. The two words, sharing a notion of something long and thin, are probably etymologically linked.

The identification of *ḥphreñ* with *ḥphrañ* permits the discovery of a further parallel; in the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287). The Chinese general Ḥwoñ-ker-žañ-śes opens his taunting letter to Mgar khri-ḥbrīñ btsan-brod, saying "*Bod-kyi dmag / / stag ḥphrañ g.yag ḥphrañ-du bgrañs-pa-ḥī grañs kyañ ṅa-la yod-do* [I have the number which reckons up the *stag ḥphrañ* and *g.yag ḥphrañ* of the Tibetan army]" (1.498). This context makes clear that *stag ḥphrañ* must refer to a type or unit of soldiers, at least in this context.

Ishikawa translates *skugs* as 潜伏地 'hiding place' and suggests that "skugs は skuñs 「隠蔽」の異綴りと考えた [*skugs* is an alternate spelling of *skuñs* 'hidden grove']".⁹⁶ This explanation can be objected to on phonetic and narrative grounds. Variation between 'g' and 'ñ' is not the sort of variation that one usually sees in Old Tibetan, such as differences of aspiration or choice of prefix. More importantly, the significance of these wild animals is precisely that they are easy to find.

126 dag: The plural suffix *-dag* Ishikawa probably correctly understand to indicate that there are several similar places, and not necessarily several places called *stag ḥphreñ khri skugs*.⁹⁷

126 gles-pa: In line 133 *gles-pa* modifies *gcan-pa* 'scout'. Although the syntax is strange, in line 126 *gles-pa* must be an adjective modifying

⁹⁴ Chu Junjie 1990: 30.

⁹⁵ Ishikawa 2001: 152.

⁹⁶ Ishikawa 2001: 152, 156, n. 12.

⁹⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 151.

one or more of the animals. Without additional context one might conjecture that it means ‘fierce, scary’ or the like. The syllable *gles* also occurs in PT 1283, l. 328, but this is probably a different word. Ishikawa translates *gles-pa stag* as “傭兵の虎 [mercenary tigers/tigers of mercenaries]⁹⁸ and suggests that *gles-pa* be understood as *glas-mi* 雇い人 ‘hired hand’.⁹⁹ Chu Junjie does not translate *gles-pa*.¹⁰⁰ Drikung uncom-
fortably agrees to the identification of *gles-pa* with *bor-ba* in the *Bod kyi bdra skad ming gzhi gsal ston gyi bstan bcos*; it is translated ‘wild’.¹⁰¹

130 phrañ: Ishikawa translates *phrañ* as 群れ ‘herd’ like he had *hphreñ* in line 126. He adds 潜伏地 ‘hiding place’ in brackets to repeat the *skugs* of line 126. Although he is correct to link *hphreñ* and *phrañ*, his reading relies on a strained interpretation of *skugs* and an ellipsis, and is consequently untenable. The word *phrañ* defined by Jäschke “foot-path along a narrow ledge on the side of a precipitous wall of rock”¹⁰² fits the grammar and narrative context perfectly. Whether or not the text intends *stag hphreñ* (l.126) and *stag phrañ* (l.130) to refer to the same thing or not is difficult to say. It is clear that the military meaning of *stag hphrañ* found in the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1297, l. 498) informs this passage, even if it is not directly called upon. Nonetheless, the lexical meaning of *phrañ* is satisfactory here. Karmay suggests that the “gorges full of tigers and leopards” are an example of “certain echoes of Ḥol-mo luñ-riñ”,¹⁰³ the mythical land which is ultimate origin of the Bon religion according to its own traditions.

132 yoñ zol: Chu Junjie¹⁰⁴ and Drikung¹⁰⁵ identify *yoñ* with *yañ*. Two passages from the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287) help to confirm this proposal: *mañ-ñuñ-gñ khar myi dor-ro* // ‘we should not verbally spar over number’ (l.501), *che-cuñ-gñ khar yoñ myi dor-ro* // ‘we should also not verbally spar over size’ (l.517). The syntax of the second passage requires that *yoñ* is an adverb, and the context precludes any interpretation except ‘also’. In addition, the use of *kyoñ* in place of *kyañ* just a few words previous (*Bod-kyi spu-rgyal ni ñi-ma-dañ hdrañ* // *Rgya rje ni zla-ba-dañ hdra-ste* // *rgyal-po ched-por hdrañ mod kyoñ*, the king of Tibet is like the sun, the lord of China is like the moon, both are similarly great kings. See l. 516. Also cf. PT 1285, verso, l. 92.) further argues in

⁹⁸ Ishikawa 2001: 152.

⁹⁹ Ishikawa 2001: 152, 156.

¹⁰⁰ Chu Junjie 1990: 30.

¹⁰¹ Drikung 2011: 38, n. 41.

¹⁰² Jäschke 1881.

¹⁰³ Karmay 1975: 576, n. 81.

¹⁰⁴ Chu Junjie 1990: 39, 43, n. 9.

¹⁰⁵ Drikung 2011: 35.

favour of seeing *yoñ* as equivalent to *yañ*. One should compare this use of *yoñ* with its function beginning discourses and meaning 'thus', pointed out by Stein.¹⁰⁶

134 ste len-du len-ba dag kyañ yod-na: My translation follows Ishikawa's translation 斧を手に手に携えるゆえ [because each carries an axe];¹⁰⁷ Drikung similarly has 'carry hatchets'.¹⁰⁸ It is unclear to me whether Ishikawa intends this phrase to modify *khra* 'falcons'; I do not think it does. Presumably 手に手に 'each' is Ishikawa's way to capture the reduplicated structure of *len-du len-ba*. In general, reduplicated verb phrases have an iterative or imperfective sense¹⁰⁹ which is the reason for my translation 'carrying'. This specific construction, with the terminative between the two stems of a reduplicated verb, however, deserves further study. Chu Junjie's translation "即便是抓取鷂子，也有抓取的辦法 [if a falcon is taken, there is also a way of taking]"¹¹⁰ is hard to make sense of. He omits *ste*, presumably understanding it to be a mistaken copying of *ste*, the immediately previous semifinal converb, which Ishikawa, Drikung, and I have translated as 'axe'. Chu Junjie's 即便 'if' translates the converb *-na*. There is no need for this translation however, because in Old Tibetan *-na* did not have an exclusively condition function. I am unable to follow what analysis of grammar can countenance Drikung's "iron rabbits that sport coats of iron spikes";¹¹¹ his emendation of *khra* 'falcon' to *gra* 'corner' is unmotivated.

136 gtur: A verb *gtur* is unknown to the dictionaries. Ishikawa suggests it is an alternate spelling of *gtul* いぶる 'to smoke'.¹¹² This equation faces phonetic and semantic obstacles. On the phonetic side, Ishikawa does not give parallel examples of *-r* varying with *-l* in Old Tibetan. On the semantic side the verb *gtul* is generally given as intransitive and associated with incense.¹¹³ Of course this does not preclude it being used transitively with animals but weighs against it. Even if the verb did mean 'smoke' it seems unlikely that one would first smoke meat and then roast it. Chu Junjie leaves *gtur* untranslated: "在火箸上架起

¹⁰⁶ Stein 1983: 160–61; see McKeown, trans. 2010: 16–18.

¹⁰⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹⁰⁸ Drikung 2011: 40.

¹⁰⁹ Uray 1955: 188–90.

¹¹⁰ Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

¹¹¹ Drikung 2011: 40.

¹¹² Ishikawa 2001: 153, 156, n. 14.

¹¹³ See for example Zhang Yisun 1985.

鐵（一般）的兔子做烤肉也見過 [We have also seen (someone) roasting a rabbit made of iron on a spit]".¹¹⁴ Drikung's solution 'over an iron grate'¹¹⁵ is forced; iron is not mentioned here again and the dictionary definition he cites from Zhang of *gtur* as 'pouring vessel such as a net bag' (*dra phad lta buhi dnos po hjug snod*) is quite distinct from a grate.¹¹⁶

The context indicates that *gtur* is something that one can do to a rabbit on a skewer before roasting it. The meaning 'stick, impale' suggests itself. The stem of the verb *gtur* is clearly shared with the noun *thur-ma* 'skewer' (l.136); 'to skewer' is thus an appropriate translation of *gtur*.

137 mżug-ma: Not only is this word unrecorded in the dictionaries but it should be a phonological impossibility. Ishikawa suggests it has the meaning of *gzug* "屠った家畜の身体の4分の1 [one quarter of a butchered animal]".¹¹⁷ This suggestion fits the context perfectly, however would be difficult to explain phonetically. A better solution is to understand *mżug-ma* as a variant of *mjug* 'tail', as is implicitly reflected in Chu Junjie's translation 尾巴 'tail';¹¹⁸ Drikung similarly identifies it with *gżug-ma* 'tail'.¹¹⁹ Not only do the semantics of this word fit the context, but variation between 'ż' and 'j' is well attested. Just as according to Conrady's law **hżug* > *hjug*¹²⁰ one would also expect **mżug* > *mjug*. Consequently, the word *mżug* here can be seen as an archaic retention.

138 rañs: Ishikawa leaves *rañs* 'whole, entire, all' untranslated.

138 rgal: Ishikawa adds 山を 'mountains'¹²¹ in brackets as the patient of *rgal* 'cross'. I think the text is deliberately vague. The messengers themselves have already mentioned the mountains and rivers they had to cross. They may well have crossed other ethereal boundaries.

139 sku bla myi mthur: Chu Junjie appears to translate this phrase 不倒 'un-inverted, upright'.¹²² Ishikawa translates as 錯乱せず 'without

¹¹⁴ Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

¹¹⁵ Drikung 2011: 40?

¹¹⁶ Zhang Yisun 1985.

¹¹⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 157, n. 16.

¹¹⁸ Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

¹¹⁹ Drikung 2011: 35, 40.

¹²⁰ See Hill 2014: 168.

¹²¹ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹²² Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

confusion'.¹²³ I do not understand the reasoning behind either translation. Bellezza regards *sku bla myi mthur* as the name of a deity, he writes:

In the Bon tradition, *Sku-bla myi-thur* (although the name is spelled slightly differently) is one of the many deities in the circle of the *yi-dam* *Ge-khod*. In the text *Ge khod kyi sman bskan yod* (New Collection of Bon *bkaḥ brten*, *Ge khod sgrub skor*, vol. 121 (*stod-cha*), nos. 1249–1252), no. 1251, lns. 5, 6, it reads: “We satisfy the desires of *Sku-bla mu-thur* from the blazing deity castle of the fiery mountain of the southwest by medicines.” (*lho nub me ri ḥbar baḥi gsas mkhar nas / sku bla mu thur thugs dam sman gyis bskan /*)¹²⁴

The equation of *myi mthur* with *mu-thur* is not compelling. The word *mthur* means ‘bridle’ and a translation of *myi mthur* as ‘unbridled’ poses no difficulty. Although Drikung accepts *mthur* as ‘bridle’ he translates *myi mthur* ‘neither turn toward another’,¹²⁵ which is forced.

139 mtho: Chu Junjie identifies *mtho* with *mthoñ*¹²⁶ and translates 瞻仰 ‘gaze upon’.¹²⁷ Ishikawa similarly translates 拝見 ‘see’¹²⁸ and Drikung ‘beholding’.¹²⁹ Another instance of a missing *-ñ* in this text occurs at line 119, where *rkañ* ‘foot, leg’ is written *rka*.

139 phyag chud-pa: In the dictionaries one finds *chud-pa* as ‘enter’,¹³⁰ a meaning which is inappropriate here. The verb must indicate something which the envoys can do to the hands of the gods. Chu Junjie translates this phrase 獻上供品 ‘present the gifts’¹³¹ and Ishikawa 供物を献上する ‘present an offering’.¹³² These seem preferable to Drikung’s ‘take our requests to heart’.¹³³

140 than-kar yug-gyis bsgron-ba lha mdaḥ yod-dam myed?: Chu Junjie translates “有没有嵌有雕尾条纹箭 [do you have a divine arrow

¹²³ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹²⁴ Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 496.

¹²⁵ Drikung 2011: 40.

¹²⁶ Chu Junjie 1990: 40, 43, n. 13.

¹²⁷ Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

¹²⁸ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹²⁹ Drikung 2011: 40.

¹³⁰ See for example Jäschke 1881.

¹³¹ Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

¹³² Ishikawa 2001: 53.

¹³³ Drikung 2011: 40.

fledged with eagle tail stripes?]"¹³⁴ Ishikawa offers “タンかで飾ったもの、すなわち神の矢はあるのか [do you have something adorned with *thañ-ka*, i.e. a divine arrow?]"¹³⁵ Bellezza translates “a divine arrow decorated by a perfect lammergeier feather”,¹³⁶ which suggests that he thinks *thañ-kar yug* means ‘perfect lammergeier feather’. The dictionaries give *thañ-dkar* as a type of eagle¹³⁷ and *yug* as ‘a piece of cloth’¹³⁸. Since one does not make cloth form lammergeier there appears to be no better strategy than to understand *yug* in this context as indicating ‘feather’.

A chiasmus is formed with the two place names Hjañ and Rgya and the two occurrences of the phrase *lha mdaḥ*.¹³⁹

142 gser kha ma blañs-pa: Ishikawa explains “kha [へり] を ma blañs-pa [削り取っていない] gser [金] [gold (*gser*) whose edge (*kha*) has not been worked away (*ma blañs-pa*)]”.¹⁴⁰ He cites Jäschke where *kha len pa* is defined as ‘to become sharp’ (尖る).¹⁴¹ Bellezza similarly translates ‘unworked gold’.¹⁴²

142–43 sñon-po ḥbru bdun: Bellezza translates ‘prized blue grain’¹⁴³ with a note that *ḥbru-bdun* “appears to denote a special type or quality of barley hence, the word ‘prized’”.¹⁴⁴ I do not see why *bdun* can not simply mean ‘seven’. Bellezza’s translation treats *sñon-po* as if it modified *ḥbru-bdun*, but it does not; adjectives in Tibetan follow the nouns they modify. Thus, *sñon-po* must be a *dvandva* compound ‘greens and seven grains’ or ‘seven greens and grains’. Chu Junjie translates “青緑七谷 [greens and seven grains]”¹⁴⁵ and Ishikawa similarly “青物七穀

¹³⁴ Chu Junjie 1990: 31.

¹³⁵ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹³⁶ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹³⁷ See for example Goldstein 2001.

¹³⁸ See for example Jäschke 1881.

¹³⁹ John Pickens draws my attention to the phrase *dar sna mdaḥ dar gser gyus brgyan* “the silk ribbon *mda’ dar* is decorated with gold and turquoise”. in the collected works of Nag dbañ dpal bzañ and further writes “that the first items on the list are exactly what are used to make a *mda’ dar* in some contemporary Nyingma communities: namely, the bamboo, fleched with a particular type of feather, decorated with silks, and [attached] with unworked gold and a piece of (large) turquoise” (*per litteras* 19 Nov. 2015).

¹⁴⁰ Ishikawa 2001: 153, 157, n. 18.

¹⁴¹ Jäschke 1881: 35.

¹⁴² Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁴³ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁴⁴ Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 499.

¹⁴⁵ Chu Junjie 1990: 31–32.

[greens and seven grains]"¹⁴⁶. Drikung omits *ñon-po* translating 'seven grains'.¹⁴⁷

143 khu: My translation omits this word. Bellezza has "liquid offering of blue grain beer".¹⁴⁸ It is hard to imagine measuring liquid in *khal*.

143 mthud goñ: Bellezza identifies with *thud* and translates "cheese-cake".¹⁴⁹ Chu Junjie agnostically translates "一类的东西 [something]".¹⁵⁰

144 goñ-mo: I offer 'grouse' on the basis of Jäschke's 'ptarmigan, white grouse',¹⁵¹ by which he presumably means the rock grouse (*lagopus muta*). It is probably also relying on Jäschke that Ishikawa offers 雷鳥 'rock grouse (*lagopus muta*)'.¹⁵² In contrast, Chu Junjie offers 雪雞 'snowcock'¹⁵³ and Bellezza 'pheasant'.¹⁵⁴ Compare the phrase *bya goñ-mo* 'goñ-mo bird' (PT 1285, recto, l. 142).

144 sreg: a bird, I translate 'pheasant' but Bellezza gives as 'partridge'. Bellezza's translation "Do you have or not meat roasted in butter as large as a partridge"¹⁵⁵ is not grammatically possible; following the syntax the translation must be 'do you have or not have a pheasant/partridge of butter as large as roast meat'.

A chiasmus is formed by the two birds and the two food stuffs. *thud goñ goñ-mo sreg śa sreg-pa*. There is an obvious pun between *sreg* 'pheasant' and *sreg* 'burn'.

144 ^o-ma: There appears to be no possibility other than 'milk' although this word is properly spelled *ho-ma*. Chu Junjie translates 乳汁 'milk';¹⁵⁶ Ishikawa translates バター 'butter'.¹⁵⁷

145 lha lug noñ mar: Bellezza identifies *mar* with *dmār* 'red' and translates 'with a red face', a suggestion which I accept. He adds a note:

¹⁴⁶ Ishikawa 2001.

¹⁴⁷ Drikung 2011: 40.

¹⁴⁸ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁴⁹ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁵⁰ Chu Junjie 1990: 32.

¹⁵¹ Jäschke 1881.

¹⁵² Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹⁵³ Chu Junjie 1990: 32.

¹⁵⁴ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁵⁵ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁵⁶ Chu Junjie 1990: 32.

¹⁵⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

“sheep with reddish faces are customarily offered to the *lha* and *btsan*, even by the contemporary ‘brog-pa of Upper Tibet. This type of sheep is called *lha-lug/btsan-lug dmar žal* or *dmar-rtsa*”.¹⁵⁸ Chu Junjie translates “真正的神羊 [true divine sheep]”,¹⁵⁹ which I fail to see the motivation for. Ishikawa prudently leaves *noñ mar* untranslated.¹⁶⁰

145 *lha rta sñan kar*: Bellezza reads the text *sñan dkar* ‘white ears’,¹⁶¹ a suggestion which I accept. Chu Junjie provides the translation “暴烈的神馬 [a violent divine horse]”,¹⁶² which I fail to see the motivation for. Ishikawa prudently leaves *sñan kar* untranslated.¹⁶³

146 *hbri zal-mo*: Bellezza notes that in “contemporary Upper Tibet, *hbri-zil-mo/hbri-zil-mo* designates female yaks with highly prized physical characteristics. Such yaks are offered to the *lha-mo* (white) and *klu-mo* (bluish) by the *hbrog-pa*”.¹⁶⁴ Presumably what he means is that nomads sacrifice certain white female yaks to goddesses (*lha-mo*) and these same nomads also offer certain bluish female yaks to the *nāginī*. Blue yaks seem rather extraordinary.

Jäschke defines *zal-mo* as “young cow, heifer”.¹⁶⁵ Goldstein gives *zal-po* as “multicolored (for animals)” and *zal-mo* as “female cattle with white fur along the back”.¹⁶⁶

146 *g.yag śam-po*: Bellezza suggests that this kind of yak is “related to *g.yag-žol-po*, the special type of male yak offered by the *hbrog-pa* to the indigenous deities. It must have long hair, especially under its belly”.¹⁶⁷ He does not specify how the *g.yag śam-po* is related to the *g.yag žol-po* any linguistic relationship is entirely opaque.

The name *śam-po* refers to a mountain in the Yarlung valley. Gyalbo et al. discuss the history of this region.¹⁶⁸ At Myaṅ-ro *śam po* the groom Lo-ñam fights and kills the emperor Dri-gum in the first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* (PT 1287, ll. 13, 24, 54, 55). It is common to identify a mountain god *Śam-po*, as the tutelary deity and *sku-bla* of the Tibetan emperor. However, I know of no Old Tibetan data which supports this

¹⁵⁸ Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 502.

¹⁵⁹ Chu Junjie 1990: 32.

¹⁶⁰ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹⁶¹ Bellezza 2005: 342.

¹⁶² Chu Junjie 1990: 32.

¹⁶³ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

¹⁶⁴ Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 503.

¹⁶⁵ Jäschke 1881.

¹⁶⁶ Goldstein 2001.

¹⁶⁷ Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 504.

¹⁶⁸ Gyalbo et al. 2000.

hypothesis. Chu Junjie notes that in the *Bkañ-thañ-sde-lña* Padmasambhava subdued the mountain deity Śam-po in the form of white yak, which further bolsters the association of the white yak with the mountain.¹⁶⁹ Drikung translates *śam-po* as 'shaggy' without elaboration.¹⁷⁰

148 ḥdron: Chu Junjie equates *ḥdron-po* with *ḥgron-po* 'guest'.¹⁷¹ Ishikawa and Drikung accept this equation but reports it as *mgron-po*.¹⁷²

148 zags: Note that the verb *ḥdzag*, *zags* is characteristic of the downward movement of liquids (drip, trickle). This choice of words probably anticipates the following *mtshal* 'vermillion' (= blood).

148–49 mtshal-ba thil rdol: Regarding *mtshal-ba* 'vermillion' Drikung notes *khrag la go zhing / 'dir lus kyi zungs khrag zad zad du phyin pa'i don* 'understand as blood, here the meaning is that the vital force of the body has become exhausted'.¹⁷³ In the first chapter of the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* PT 1287 (ll.46, 50) mourners attending the obsequies of the Tibetan emperor are expected to rub themselves with vermillion. Tsering Samdrup draws my attention to the fact that *thil* (for *mthil*) here puns on the meanings 'sole of the feet' and 'base'. Parallel to the vultures descending in exhaustion from circling the sky, the envoys have bloody feet from having circled the earth to the point of exhaustion.

149 chad: Ishikawa suggests *chad* is for *thañ-chad* 'tired'.¹⁷⁴

149 ra-ma: This word would appear to mean 'shegoat', and this is how Chu Junjie, Ishikawa, and Drikung understand it.¹⁷⁵ Chu Junjie points to a notice in the *Xintangshu* that the Tibetans worship a ram (羴羴) as a great god.¹⁷⁶ However, a shegoat is a non sequitur. Presumably if the *sku-bla* is a shegoat this would have already been mentioned. I prefer to understand the word as 'court'. However, although this meaning is well known for *ra* and *ra-ba*, I am unfamiliar with another instance in which *ra-ma* means 'court'.

¹⁶⁹ Chu Junjie 1990: 32, 34, n. 8.

¹⁷⁰ Drikung 2011: 41, n. 65.

¹⁷¹ Chu Junjie 1990: 41; 43, n. 16.

¹⁷² Ishikawa 2001: 153, 157, n. 19; Drikung 2011: 36.

¹⁷³ Drikung 2011: 38, n. 52.

¹⁷⁴ Ishikawa 2001: 153, 157, n. 20.

¹⁷⁵ Chu Junjie 1990: 32; Ishikawa 2001: 153; Drikung 2011: 41.

¹⁷⁶ Chu Junjie 1990: 32, 34, n. 9.

150 *žu-ba rnam ḡga sñan-du žus-te* /: I take *rnam ḡga* as a binome for *rnam ḡgaḡ*. Both *rnam* and *ḡgaḡ* mean ‘some’, ‘several’. Ishikawa in contrast reads *bag sñan-du žus-te* and offers the following note:

bag sñan du žus の *bag* が「心」を意味し、*sñan* が「聞き心地が良い」の意味であるから、「心地よく」の意味であろう。*bag sñan* と動詞過去形 *žus* 「お願いした」「申し上げた」の間にある助詞 *du* は *de-ñid* であり、*bag sñan* で *žus* の意味が限定されるから (Yamaguchi 1990 参照), *bag sñan du žus* は「心地よく申し上げた」の訳となる。

Because the *bag* of *bag sñan-du žus* means ‘heart’, and *sñan* means ‘the feeling of hearing is pleasant’, perhaps the meaning is ‘agreeably’. The morpheme *du* between *bag sñan* and the past stem verb *žus* ‘request, implore’ is a *de-ñid*. Because the meaning is limited to *bag sñan-ly žus* (cf. Yamaguchi 1990), *bag sñan-du žus* is translated ‘agreeably implored’.¹⁷⁷

Miller has convincingly rejected Yamaguchi’s account of *de-ñid*.¹⁷⁸

150 *luñ du stsal*: Ishikawa reads *luñ ñu stsal* but still understands it as *luñ du stal*. He describes this usage of *-du* as *de-ñid*,¹⁷⁹ but Miller has convincingly rejected Yamaguchi’s account of *de-ñid*.¹⁸⁰

151 *sku-gñen phyogs*: Ishikawa writes “この表現からすでにここでチャの使者は姻戚の一員とみなされていることがわかる [from this expression here one knows that the messengers of Phywa can already be seen to be members of the relatives by marriage]”.¹⁸¹ I object that there is no mention of marriage and it is not clear in any case who the bride would be. But whatever this change of nomenclature indicates it is Dmu’s agreement that initiates their change of status. It is allowing them to worship the *sku-bla* that makes them relatives.

151–52 *sku gñen phyogs-kyi ža sña-nas Mañ-žam ñid-kyis mchid gsol-pa*: The phraseology *A-ža sña-nas B-mchid gsol-pa* “to the presence of A the letter of B is hereby presented” is a formulaic start to a letter.¹⁸²

¹⁷⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 21.

¹⁷⁸ Miller 1993: 198–220.

¹⁷⁹ Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 22.

¹⁸⁰ Miller 1993: 198–220.

¹⁸¹ Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 23.

¹⁸² Takeuchi 1990: 183.

Takeuchi notes that it is odd for the ablative *-nas* to have the meaning 'to' rather than 'from' and attempts to account for this usage.¹⁸³

152 Mañ-žam: Ishikawa makes the following interesting observation:

“マンシャム *mañ žam* はケン *mkhan*、すなわち、それによって人物を知りうるような称号的名称の一つである (Richardson 1967, pp. 11–12, 14). 敦煌文献『年代記』『編年記』でマンシャムと呼ばれた人物は皆、宰相 (*blon chen*) 位にあるから、これは宰相に対するケンとして、よく使用されたのかもしれない。そうであれば、チャの使者たちの代表はチャの國の宰相ということになるうか。

Mañ žam' a *mkhan* is a title-like name by which a person can be known (Richardson 1967, 11–12, 14). Because in the Dunhuang documents the *Old Tibetan Annals* and *Old Tibetan Chronicle* all of the people called by the name *mañ žam* are at the rank of prime minister (*blon chen po*), this *mkhan* is probably used with respect to prime ministers. If so, the messengers of Phywa are represented as the prime ministers of the land of Phywa.¹⁸⁴

Chu Junjie identifies *mañ-žam* with *ma žaṅ* and translates 母舅亲 'mother and maternal uncle'.¹⁸⁵ This suggestion takes too many liberties with the text.

152 bdag-cag ṅan-pa lta śig mchis-pa: Ishikawa correctly translates “私たち卑しくございます者は [we are vulgar fellows]”¹⁸⁶ with *mchis* as 'be' rather than 'come'. Here *lta śig* is a variant form for *lta žig*, which as Uebach remarks “kommt nach Personalpronomina und Namen vor in dem Bedeuteung 'was - betrifft' [appears after personal pronouns and names with the meaning 'with regard to']”.¹⁸⁷ Uebach's comment regards the phrase *bdag-cag lta žig* / in lines 8–9 of the Rkoṅ-po inscription. She suggests comparison with PT 1032, but without giving reference to a line number. Unfortunately, I am currently unable to consult PT 1032. The phrase *bdag lta žig mchis pa* occurs in version A of the Rama story (IOL Tib J 737.1, l. 5).

¹⁸³ Takeuchi 1990: 183, n. 14.

¹⁸⁴ Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 24.

¹⁸⁵ Chu Junjie 1990: 32, 43, n. 17.

¹⁸⁶ Ishikawa 2001: 154.

¹⁸⁷ Uebach 1985: 69, n. 104.

Chu Junjie's version is “我等小人來看看 [we little fellows have come to take a look]”.¹⁸⁸ This version appears to understand *lta* as a noun, *śig* as an allomorph of *cig* ‘a, one’, and *mchis* as ‘come’. However, if *lta śig* is a noun phrase it would be governed by a verb, which it is not.

153 rkañ riñs: Uebach and Zeisler discuss *rkañ riñs* as an example of a compound word ending in *-riñs*.¹⁸⁹ They discuss this instance and a further attestation from the Ladakhi version of the Gesar epic. For this passage they translate “if [to us humble people] humble boys having long legs would be born, if [the legs] are long, would they be admitted in your retinue as holder of the stirrups, if [the legs] are short ...?”.¹⁹⁰ In the *Jo sras Ldeḥu chos ḥbyuñ* the *rkañ riñs* appear as the second in a list of five types of soldiers.¹⁹¹ Dotson translates *rkañ riñs* as ‘fleet-footed’.¹⁹² Chu Junjie reads *rgañ* but identifies this with *rkañ* ‘foot, leg’.¹⁹³

153 žam-ḥbriñ: Nag dbaṅ tshul khirms defines this word ‘*žabs-ḥbriñ ñam g.yog-po* [servant]’.¹⁹⁴ Ishikawa similarly translates it ‘侍從[chamberlain]’ citing Yamaguchi’s remark that *ža ḥbriñ pa* “文成公主に関する『編年紀』に (TLT, II, pp. 8–9)見れると“*žam riñ*” (ll. 12, 25) 同じく、今日 “*žabs ḥbriñ*” と記すもの [is seen in the *Annals of Hazha Principality* related to Wencheng Gongzhu (文成公主) (Thomas 1951, vol. II, pp. 8–9) as is “*žam riñ*” (ll.12, 25), what today is written “*žabs ḥbriñ*” i.e. chamberlain]”.¹⁹⁵

154 yob-cen-gi rten: Ishikawa suggests that this expression is “鐙を鞍から吊り下げる綱のことであろう [perhaps a kind of rope which suspends stirrups from a saddle]”.¹⁹⁶

154 g.yañ-mo: Zhang gives *g.yañ-mo* as ‘*lug* [sheep]’.¹⁹⁷ Ishikawa translates this term as “深淵 [abyss]”,¹⁹⁸ which is the meaning that Jäschke

¹⁸⁸ Chu Junjie 1990: 32.

¹⁸⁹ Uebach and Zeisler 2008: 325.

¹⁹⁰ Uebach and Zeisler 2008: 325.

¹⁹¹ Dotson 2006: 281–82.

¹⁹² Dotson 2006: 281.

¹⁹³ Chu Junjie 1990: 41, 43, n. 19.

¹⁹⁴ Nag dbaṅ tshul khirms 1997: 762.

¹⁹⁵ Yamaguchi 1983: 306.

¹⁹⁶ Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 26.

¹⁹⁷ Zhang Yisun 1985; see also Nag dbaṅ tshul khirms 1997: 859.

¹⁹⁸ Ishikawa 2001: 154.

gives for *g.yaṅ* and in particular *g.yaṅ-sa*.¹⁹⁹ According to Drikung:²⁰⁰ *g.yaṅ moḥi skyoṅ / brda dkros gser gyi me loṅ las / ḥjigs snaṅ skye baḥi miṅ la gsuṅ / ḥdir g.yaṅ ni / ka skad duḥaṅ de g.yaḥ nga gzar po žig ḥdug zer ba ltar / blo mi bde ba daṅ / blo dog pa la gsung pas / ḥdir mtshan moḥi bya raḥi mthah skyoṅ mkhan laḥo //* [The *Bdra dkros gser gyi me loṅ* says 'a word for giving rise to fear'. Here *g.yaṅ* is an expression for an escarpment (?), and similarly the mind is anxious and narrow. Here a border guard who is night watchman.] I do not think this is on the right track.

155 rko-loṅ: Ishikawa understands this as *rku* 'theft'.²⁰¹ It is preferable, following a suggestion of Drikung's,²⁰² to see *rko-loṅ* as equivalent to *ko-loṅ* 'annoyance, dissatisfaction'.²⁰³ Because native Tibetan words do not generally begin with unaspirated voiceless consonants,²⁰⁴ *rko-loṅ* is likely to be the etymologically original form of *ko-loṅ*.

155 bkum: On the use of the verb 'kill, execute' in the sense of 'carry out, execute' see Dotson²⁰⁵ and the citations he collects.

157–58 gdugs-tshod ma khoṅs-paḥi thog-du: Ishikawa²⁰⁶ leaves untranslated. Drikung translates 'not even being able to offer you lunch'²⁰⁷ following the identification of *gdug tshod* with *guṅ tshig* according to the *Brda gsar rñiṅ gi rnam gžag*.²⁰⁸ In the dictionaries this word appears as *guṅ tshigs*. By implication Drikung takes *ma khoṅs* as the negative imperative, to show impossibility of the verb *ḥgeṅ* 'fill', an analysis I accept. For more on the *potentialis* use of the imperative stem see Müller-Witte²⁰⁹ and Zeisler.²¹⁰ The word *gdugs-tshod* also occurs at PT 960, l. 68.²¹¹

158 graṅ-mo: Ishikawa²¹² follows Chu Junjie²¹³ in translating this word 墓室 'burial chamber'. Chu Junjie bases this interpretation on the following passage from the *Old Tibetan Chronicle* "*Spu-de Guṅ-rgyal groṅs-*

¹⁹⁹ Jäschke 1881.

²⁰⁰ Drikung 2011: 38, n. 54.

²⁰¹ Ishikawa 2001: 153, 157, n. 27.

²⁰² Drikung 2011: 38.

²⁰³ Das 1902.

²⁰⁴ See Hill 2007.

²⁰⁵ Dotson 2011: 85, n. 12.

²⁰⁶ Ishikawa 2001.

²⁰⁷ Drikung 2011: 41.

²⁰⁸ Drikung 2011: 39, n. 58.

²⁰⁹ Müller-Witte 2009: 241–48, 278–81, 309–12.

²¹⁰ Zeisler 2002, 2004: 845–74, 2017: 86–89, 99–102.

²¹¹ I thank Tshering Samdrup for pointing out this parallel to me.

²¹² Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 29.

²¹³ Chu Junjie 1990: 35, n. 13.

na ni grañ-mo gnam-bseḥ brtsig [When Spu-de Guñ-rgyal died they built *grañ-mo gnam-gseḥ*" (PT 1287, ll. 61–62). To further clarify this passage he cites the *Rgya bod yig tshañ chen mo* as reporting that when Gri gum btsan po was buried a golden thread fell down from the sky and penetrated into the grave, thus this grave is called "the thread in the sky" (*gnam la gser thig*). He claims that *grañ-ma* came metonymically to refer to all graves. Although the gloss of *gnam-gseḥ* as *gnam la gser thig*, looks like a late attempt to rationalize what had become an obscure term, the association of *grañ-mo* with *grañ-mo gnam-gseḥ* is an idea worth pursuing, albeit speculative.

Drikung translates 'cold beer',²¹⁴ which is sensible following the mention of the midday meal and preceding the mention of *zal-bu* 'small cups'. Nonetheless, his overall translation of *grañ-mo zal-bu re re zig sku-la dmyigs-siñ mchis-na* as 'we have but a sip of cold beer intended for you' is impossible, taking no account of the grammar and all of the words after *grañ-mo zal-bu*. Although the phrase overall may refer to the offering of a liquid beverage, I do not think that the funerary associations of both *grañ-mo* and *zal-bu* can be accidental. It is not altogether unambiguous that the envoys of Phywa are speaking at this point, but this interpretation appears most likely. If so, it is perhaps not unwarranted to speculate that they are offering Dmu rje a drink of mortality which is apt as preparation for his descent to the earth.

158 *zal-bu*: Stein pointed out that in the 尚書 Shangshu paraphrase (PT 986), Tibetan *zal-bu* is used to translate Chinese 祖 *zu* 'ancestral tablet'.²¹⁵ He remarks that all "les dictionnaires définissent *zal-bu* comme un petit récipient (bol, coupe). Ce sens ne convient pas ici. On verra (1.104) qu'il s'agit des ancêtres. Je pense à *zal-byañ*, « titre écrit sur une tablette »",²¹⁶ which McKeown translates "All the dictionaries define *zal-bu* as a small container (bowl, cup). This sense is not appropriate here. We will see (1.104) that it concerns the ancestors. I would compare *zal-byañ*, 'title written on a tablet.'"²¹⁷ Coblin is reluctant to relinquish the meaning of 'cup', he concludes that "this word for 'cup' [...] served as an honorific euphemism for the dead ancestors to whom the offering [sic] were made".²¹⁸ Coblin translates the phrase *gdun-rabs bdun tshun-cad-gyi zal-bu gsol* in the 尚書 Shangshu paraphrase (PT 986) as "he sacrificially fed the *zal-bu* from seven generations (earlier)

²¹⁴ Drikung 2011: 41.

²¹⁵ Stein 1983: 164; see McKeown, trans. 2010: 22.

²¹⁶ Stein 1983: 202, n. 97.

²¹⁷ McKeown 2010: 74, n. 97.

²¹⁸ Coblin 1991: 316.

downward".²¹⁹ This passage corresponds to the Chinese original 祀于周廟 "he sacrificed in the ancestral temple of Zhou". The Tibetan translation appears to follow the Chinese commentary 七世之祖 'seven generations of ancestors'. Nag dbaṅ tshul khriṃs, citing this same passage, explicitly keeps a meaning "*mes-pohi že-sa* [honorific term for ancestor]" distinct from "*phor-pa chuñ-ba* [small cup]".²²⁰ Ishikawa following Stein²²¹ and Chu Junjie²²² translates this word 位牌 'mortuary tablet'²²³. Drikung accepts the 'small cup' meaning, translating 'sip'.²²⁴ I am inclined to agree with Coblin that small cups are not necessarily incompatible with ancestor worship.

160 g.yar-du stsal: In contracts *g.yar-du ḥtshal* means 'take out a loan'.²²⁵ Ishikawa translates 幸運に 'luckily, fortunately',²²⁶ because he reads the text *g.yaṅ-du*.

160 g.yar tshod: Ishikawa conjectures that *g.yar tshod* is the honorific equivalent of *kha tshod* 'speech'.²²⁷ However, since *g.yar* means 'loan' and *tshod* means 'measure, estimate',²²⁸ I suspect the topic is the terms of the loan.

161 yab-khu: Ishikawa offers the following note of which I am skeptical:

ムの国が父系父権制社会ならば王が父系を代表するから、この箇所には *yab khu* 「父方」ではなく、*yam zhañ* 「母方」のような語が記されそうなものである。山口氏によれば、後代史材 *rLañ po ti bse ru* 『ラン・ポティセル』などにより、吐蕃（古代チベット統・王朝）のヤルルン王家誕生以前、父系相続のム部族と母権継のダン *sBrañ* 氏が通婚し、父系母権制の複合部族ダン・ム *sBrañ dMu* が成立し、それと、ヤルルン王家の出自部族であるチャ部族が通婚したため、ダン氏の母権がチャ部族に入っていたことがわかるという。（山口 1983: 151-99 参照）その

²¹⁹ Coblin 1991: 316.

²²⁰ Nag dbaṅ tshul khriṃs 1997: 766.

²²¹ Stein 1983: 202, n. 97 cited above.

²²² Chu Junjie 1989: 34, 1990: 35-36.

²²³ Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 29.

²²⁴ Drikung 2011: 41.

²²⁵ Takeuchi 1995: 49.

²²⁶ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

²²⁷ Ishikawa 2001: 153, 157, n. 31.

²²⁸ See Jaeschke 1881.

ような事情がこの神話に反映されたため、ム王は父系母権制の女王に設定されているのかもしれない。1.149 でムが自身を母山羊に喩えていることも、その証左になるであろう。

If the land of Dmu is a patriarchal society because the king represents the paternal line, at this place one would expect something like *yam zan* ‘maternal relatives’ rather than *yab khu* ‘paternal relatives’ to be recorded. According to Yamaguchi, in the later historical text the *Rlan po ti bse ru* before the birth of the Yar luñ dynasty of Tufan (the ruling dynasty of ancient Tibet) the patrilineal Dmu tribe and the matriarchal Sbrañ married forming the composite patrilineal and matriarchal Sbrañ Dmu tribe, and then married the Phywa tribe, the original tribe of the Yarluñ dynasty. Because of that one can understand that the matriarchy of the Sbrañ entered into the Phywa clan (cf. Yamaguchi 1983: 151–99). This kind of situation is reflected in this legend. The king of Dmu is probably set up by a patrilineal matriarchal queen. In line 149 Dmu compares himself to a mountain she-goat, perhaps this is evidence for this interpretation.²²⁹

161 ma rdzogs: The word *rdzogs* means ‘perfected, complete’. Ishikawa translates the phrase 満足しない ‘unsatisfied’,²³⁰ Chu Junjie as 沒到齊 ‘not yet assembled’,²³¹ and Drikung as ‘still living’.²³² I prefer Chu Junjie’s reading, but without good reason.

162 sku gñen hphrul: Bellezza regards *sku gñen hphrul* as a personal name.²³³ I see no reason for doing so; the phrase means ‘the sacred relatives’ and this is contextually a sensible way of referring to the envoys of Phywa, now that it has been agreed to allow the to worship the *sku-bla*. On *hphrul* see Stein.²³⁴

163 gor-bu-ḥi žabs tshegs-la ...: Bellezza translates “I am very happy that you came here today without caring about the difficulty faced by your horse”.²³⁵ I do not see where there is any mention of a horse. The other major problem is Bellezza ignores *gnañ-ba* ‘deign, agree’. These lines must be addressed by the envoys, and it is they who have come.

²²⁹ Ishikawa 2001: 153, 156–58, n. 32.

²³⁰ Ishikawa 2001: 153.

²³¹ Chu Junjie 1990: 33.

²³² Drikung 2011: 41, 39, n. 63.

²³³ Bellezza 2005: 11–12.

²³⁴ Stein 1981.

²³⁵ Bellezza 2005: 12.

The crux of the interpretation rests on *gor-bu* 'round thing' which I have tentatively take as 'cushion'. Drikung notes that the *Bdra yig blo gsar mgrin rgyan* identifies *gor-bu* as *stan zlum mam gru bzi* 'a round or square seat'²³⁶ and translates 'a square seat'.²³⁷

164 bdag-cag ñan-pa yañ lha źal tsam mthoñ / lha bkaḥ tsam ñan: Karmay notes that the similar phrase *lha źal blta* 'look at the god' occurs in *Ge khod bsañ baḥi dkar tshan* (a section of the *Ge khod gsañ ba drag chen*, beginning on p.74, l. 3).²³⁸ Unfortunately Karmay does not give enough bibliographic information on this text to enable its consultation.

Bellezza translates "I the humble one have seen the face of the god I am obeying the *lha-bkaḥ*. Please confer on me the *bkaḥ*".²³⁹ This translation has various problems. First, *bdag-cag* is the plural 'we' and not the singular 'I'.²⁴⁰ Aside from this, the translation simply makes little sense in context. If the envoys had already seen the face of the god, what would they be asking for? There is a clear parallel construction between 'see the god's face' (*lha źal tsam mthoñ*) and 'hear the god's word' (*lha bkaḥ tsam ñan*). Bellezza has missed this parallel construction. Chu Junjie translation is accurate, but also misses this parallel "亲睹神顔，若降神旨 [(if) we see the face of the god, if we surrender to god's command]".²⁴¹ My translation follows Ishikawa "私たち卑しき者も神のお顔の程を拝見し，神のお言葉ばかりを拝聴しておりますゆえ [even we vulgar fellows saw merely the face of the god, and heard merely the voice of the god]".²⁴²

166 rgya sde: Read as *brgya sde*.

167 la dbyar myed: Read as *las dbyer myed*. In Old Tibetan *-la* frequently occurs in contexts where one would expect *-las*.²⁴³

167 ceḥu-yag: Chu Junjie notes that "最早是石泰安先生指出了是漢文《周易》的譯音詞 (Stein, 1983, p. 178, 1985, p. 119). [Professor Stein was the first to point out that *ceḥu yag* is a phonetic transcription for Chinese 周易 *Zhouyi*, I-ching 'book of change' (Stein 1983: 178, 1985:

²³⁶ Drikung 2011: 39, n. 64.

²³⁷ Drikung 2011: 41.

²³⁸ Karmay 1998: 393, 401, l. 7, 409, l. 7.

²³⁹ Bellezza 2005: 12.

²⁴⁰ Hill 2010b: 557–59.

²⁴¹ Chu Junjie 1990: 33.

²⁴² Ishikawa 2001: 154.

²⁴³ Takeuchi 1995: 49; Zeisler 2006: 70, 77.

119)]".²⁴⁴ Stein mentions two epithets for this work *ḥdzañs-paḥi yi-ge Cihū-yag* in PT 987 (l.11) and *Cu-yag-gyi yi-ge* in IOL Tib J 748 without specifying a line number.²⁴⁵

167 log-men: a type of divination

Appendix: Two Further Fragments Related to PT 126

Gergely Orosz draws my attention to two additional Dunhuang documents that contain material related to the story told in PT 126. I provide a provisional translation for the first fragment. The second fragment is so small that it resists translation.

IOL Tib J 747r

Text

(v1) mñaḥ bdag Si-koñ-gyi źa ra sñar / dguñ tshig sa [tshigs] dañ-po-la bab-ste dguñ lhags cheb [che ba?] dañ

(v2) ḥbañs mañbo [mañ po] bde ba la bkod pa dañ / ri[x]n po cheḥi gdan khri-la bže[g]ñś [bšeñ śa] skyid-kyis rab-du ḥo[-]

(v3) [-]rgal (?) na / sk[u] gnen źiñ b[-]n ba-las sñ[u]n bžes sam ma bžes / mñaḥ bdag Si-koñ myi ź[---]

(v4) bdag-cag ñan-pa lta sa śig mchis [x] pa phyogsmñaḥ [phyogs mñaḥ] tañ [thañ] che-baḥi źa ḥbreñ [ḥbriñ] mthaḥ mar mchis

(v5) di+u [de] riñ ga gdogs [gdugs] la / phyog[s]s mñaḥ tañ [thañ] dag che / dbon źaṅ gdan ḥtshoms / sko [sku] bla gnye[g]n

(v6) riñ btod [bstod] par kam [thams?]-cad rgyad grags-nas thos / skyol [sku bla?] g[x]ñen-po-la ni yon ḥbol [ḥbul] / źaṅ-po rñams-la

(v7) na [ni] sri źu ḥtshal źal mthoñ-bar ci gñañ / źa sña nes [nas] / lha gñen-po gcig mchis-pa ni da[g] dgoñ nañ

(v8) sañ sa nas mchod kañ [gañ] lags / lha dguñ-du gśags [gśegs] kyañ lags / phyag źal mthoñ-baḥi skabs

[a line of Uighur script in thick black ink]

(v9) kyañ ma mchis / thu[g]gs-dañ myi bskol-ste / slar gśag [gśegs] mdzod / ched-po źa sñan [sña] nes [nas] / bdag-cag

²⁴⁴ Chu Junjie 1990: 33, 36, n. 15.

²⁴⁵ Stein 1983: 178

(v10) ñan-pa yañ/ lo lom nes [lam nas] bsams zla lam-nas ni dgoñs/
dbe [dpe] chen ni phyiñ ltar dril //

(v11) śul riñ ni źags ltar bsdogs-ste / spyān lam dumchis / phyogs
dbon źañ ni gdan ɦtshoms /

(v12) sku-bla gñen-po ni la riñ bstod-bar thos/ lha-la ni yon [s]phul
/ myi-la phyag ɦchal [ɦtshal] // (v13) źal mthoñ-bar ci g[ź]nañ/ ched-
po źa sña nas/ bdag-cag [tsha] mtshan źañ gan [gdan] tshoms su la

(v14) thos/ sko [sku]-bla gñen-po mchod gañ la[g]gs/ lha gñen-po
cig mchis

OL Tib J 747 verso

Translation

To the presence of the ruler Si-koñ: it being the coming of the first *dguñ tshigs*, the *dguñ lhags che-ba* and many subjects were gladdened, and you ascended your precious throne. Happiness... extremely...have you caught an illness from sku gñen and...? Ruler Si-koñ...

“Lowly men such as ourselves have come to be the last (lowliest) servants of your great majesty. On this day the great majesties shall arrange the carpet [as] nephew and uncle. It being proclaimed (everywhere in the 8 directions?) that the *sku bla gñen* was being praised, we heard of it. We offer gifts to the *sku bla gñen po*. We offer respects to the maternal relatives. Please grant that we may see the face [of the *sku bla*?].”

From the presence: “Why do you wish to offer this evening or tomorrow to whatever *lha gñen po* there is? The god has in fact gone away. It is not the time for viewing his face and hands. thugs dañ myi bskol ste [something like, don’t be angry?], but do go away”.

From the presence of the great one: “We lowly men have indeed thought about this on the road of months, pondered this on the road of years (?). We have rolled up the great book like [a roll of] felt. We have bound the long road like a lasso, and have come to the road of sight [i.e., within sight of our objective]. We shall arrange the carpet [as] nephew and uncle. We have heard the *sku bla gñen po* was praised from afar/ was ... / its sacred but defunct presence was praised. We offer gifts to the god, we offer obeisance to the men. Grant that we may see the face”.

From the presence of the great one: “Who has heard that we shall meet as nephew and uncle? Why offer to the *sku bla gñen po*? [Whatever] *lha gñen po* there is...

IOL Tib N 136 (M.I.iii.6)

A wood slip, 18.9cm x 1.9cm x 0.2cm

(r1) \$/:/ gsolpaḥ [gsol paḥ] sañ lags na / /[la] sku bla-la phyag
tsam yañ bśes

(r2)[-]n lam tsam yañ mdzad/ na lha bdag-du brdan gśegs-dañ
[tsham]

(v1) [---]m-du ci gñañ/ /

Bibliography

Aziz, Barbara N. 1985.

“On translating oral traditions: Ceremonial wedding poetry from Dingri”, in Aziz, Barbara N. and Kapstein, Matthew (eds.), *Soundings in Tibetan Civilization*, 115–32. New Delhi: Manohar.

Bellezza, John V. 2005.

Spirit-mediums, sacred mountains, and related Bon textual traditions in upper Tibet: calling down the gods. Leiden: Brill.

Bsam Gtan. 1979.

Dag yig gsar bsgrigs. Xining: Mtsho sñon mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.

Chu Junjie 褚俊傑. 1989.

“Tufan benjiao sang zang yigui yanjiu 吐蕃本教喪葬儀軌研究 [Study of funeral rites of Tibet’s Bon religion]”, in *Zhongguo zangxue* 中國藏學 [China Tibetology] 1989.3, 15–34.

Chu Junjie 褚俊傑. 1990.

“Tufan yuangu shizu “qia” “mu” yanjiu 吐蕃遠古氏族“恰”“穆”研究 [Study on Phywa and Dmu, two important clans in Ancient Tibet]”, in *Zangxue yanjiu luncong* 藏學研究論叢 [Collection of Tibetan Studies] 2, 1–47.

Coblin, W. South. 1987.

"A note on Tibetan mu", in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 10.1, 166–68.

Coblin, W. South. 1991.

"A Study of the Old Tibetan Shangshu Paraphrase", in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 111.2: 303–22, 111.3: 523–39.

Das, Sarat Chandra. 1902.

A Tibetan-English dictionary with Sanskrit synonyms. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.

Dotson, Brandon. 2006.

Administration and Law in the Tibetan Empire: The Section on Law and State and its Old Tibetan Antecedents. PhD Thesis. Oxford: Oxford University.

Dotson, Brandon. 2011.

"On the Old Tibetan term khrin in the legal and ritual lexicons", in Turin, Mark and Zeisler, Bettina (eds.), *Himalayan Languages and Linguistics: Studies in Phonology, Semantics, Morphology and Syntax*, 77–97. Leiden: Brill.

Dpaḥo gtsug lag ḥphreñ ba. 1985.

Dam paḥi chos kyi ḥkhor lo bsgyur ba rnams kyi byuñ ba gsal bar byed pa mkhas paḥi dgaḥ ston. Beijing. Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.

Drikung Kyabgon Chetsang. 2011.

A History of the Tibetan Empire: drawn from the Dunhuang manuscripts. Translated by Meghan Howard. Gainesville: Vajra Publications.

Goldstein, Melvyn. 2001.

The new Tibetan-English dictionary of modern Tibetan. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Graf, Fritz. 1993.

Greek mythology: an introduction. Thomas Marier, trans. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Gyalbo, Tsering, Hazod, Guntram and Sørensen, Per K.
Civilization at the Foot of Mount Shampo: The Royal House of lHa Bug-pa-can and the History of g.Ya'-bzang. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften and Tibetan Academy of Social Sciences.

Hill, Nathan W. 2006.
"The Old Tibetan Chronicle: Chapter 1", in *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 10, 89–101.

Hill, Nathan W. 2010a.
"Buddhism and Empire. By Michael Walter. pp. xxvii, 311. Leiden, Brill, 2009", in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland (Third Series)* 20.4, 559–62.

Hill, Nathan W. 2010b.
"Personal Pronouns in Old Tibetan", in *Journal Asiatique* 298.2, 549–71.

Hill, Nathan W. 2011.
"Alternances entre ḥ et b en tibétain ancien et dans les langues tibétaines modernes", in *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* 20, 115–22.

Hill, Nathan W. 2013.
"Come as lord of the black-headed", in Mayer, Robert, Walter, Michael and Cüppers, Cristoph (eds.), *Tibet after Empire: Culture, Society and Religion between 850–1000*, 169–80. Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute.

Hill, Nathan W. 2014.
"Tibeto-Burman *dz- > Tibetan z- and Related Proposals", in VanNess Simmons, Richard and van Auken, Newel Ann (eds.), *Studies in Chinese and Sino-Tibetan Linguistics: Dialect, Phonology, Transcription and Text (A Festschrift for W. S. Coblin)*, 167–78. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

Hoffmann, Helmut. 1950.
Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

Imaeda, Yoshiro et al. 2007.

Tibetan Documents from Dunhuang, Kept at the Bibliotheque nationale de France and the British Library. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Ishikawa, Iwao 石川巖. 2000.

“Kodai Chibetto ni okeru reishin saigi no monogatari 古代チベットにおける霊神祭儀の物語 [The tale of the Bla ritual in Ancient Tibet]”, in *Chūō daigaku Ajia-shi kenkyū* 中央大學アジア史研究 [*Chuo University Asian History Studies*] 26, 169–86.

Ishikawa, Iwao 石川巖. 2001.

“Kodai Chibetto ni okeru reishin saigi no monogatari honyaku hen 古代チベットにおける霊神祭儀の物語翻訳編 [Translation of the tale of Bla ritual in Ancient Tibet]”, in 東方 *Tōhō* [*The East*] 16, 145–58.

Jäschke, Heinrich A. 1881.

A Tibetan-English dictionary. London: Unger Brothers.

Karmay, Samten G. 1975.

“A gZer-mig Version of the Interview between Confucius and Phyva Keñ-tse lan-med”, in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 38.3, 562–80.

Karmay, Samten G. 1994.

“The Origin Myths of the First King of Tibet as Revealed in the Can Inga”, in Kværne, Per (ed.), *Tibetan Studies* vol. 1, 408–29. Oslo: The institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture.

Karmay, Samten G. 1998.

The arrow and the spindle: studies in history, myths, rituals and beliefs in Tibet. Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point.

Lalou, Marcelle. 1958.

“Fiefs, poisons et guérisseurs”, in *Journal Asiatique* 246, 157–201.

LaPolla, Randy J. and Dory Poa. 2001.
Rawang Texts. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Li Fang Kuei and Coblin, W. South. 1987.
A Study of the Old Tibetan Inscriptions. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.

Macdonald, Adriane. 1971.
“Une lecture des P.T. 1286, 1287, 1038, 1047, et 1290. Essai sur la formation et l’emploi des mythes politiques dans la religion royale de Sroñ-bcan sgam-po”, in Macdonald, Ariane (ed.), *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, 190–391. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.

Mgon po dbaṅ rgyal (ed.). 2004.
Gaṅs can paḥi zlos sgrahi tshig tshogs rnam par brgyan pa dbyig gi mdzod. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ.

Miller, Roy Andrew. 1993.
Prologomena to the First Two Tibetan Grammatical Treatises. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.

Mkhas pa ldeḥu. 1987.
Mkhas pa ldeḥus mdzad paḥi rgya Bod kyi chos ḥbyuñ rgyas pa. Lhasa: Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang.

Mkhas pa ldeḥu. 2003.
Mkhas pa ldeḥus mdzad paḥi rgya Bod kyi chos ḥbyuñ rgyas pa / Diwu zongjiao yuanliu 弟吳宗教源流[The arising of Buddhism according to Ldehu]. Lanzhou: Lanzhou daxue Chubanshe.

Müller-Witte, Frank. 2009.
Handlungsrichtung im Tibetischen. Die Verbalkategorien bdag und gzhan bei dPa' ris sangs rgyas und Dor zhi gdong drug und ihr Nutzen für das Verständnis tibetischer Texte. Inaugural-Dissertation. München: Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

Nagano, Sadako. 1994.

"A note on the Tibetan kinship terms khu and zhang", in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 17.2, 103–15.

Orosz, Gergely. 2003.

"Folk religion in the ritual manuscripts of ancient Tibet", in Kelényi, Béla (ed.), *Demons and Protectors. Folk Religion in Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhism*, 19–26. Budapest: Ferenc Hopp Museum of Eastern Asiatic Art.

Richardson, Hugh. E. 1967.

"Names and Titles in early Tibetan records", in *Bulletin of Tibetology* 4.1, 5–20.

Schwieger, Peter. 2006.

Handbuch zur Grammatik der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Shastri, Lobsang. 1994.

"The marriage customs of Ru-thog (Mnga'-ris)", in Kværne, Per (ed.), *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies FAGERNES 1992*, 755–67. Oslo: Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture.

Stein, Rolf. 1961.

Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines. Paris: Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études chinoises.

Stein, Rolf. 1981.

"Saint et Divin, un titre tibétain et chinois des rois tibétains", in *Journal Asiatique* 259.1-2, 231–75.

Stein, Rolf. 1983.

"Tibetica Antiqua I: Les deux vocabulaires des traductions indo-tibétaines et sino-tibétaines dans les manuscrits Touen-Houang", in *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* 72, 149–236.

Stein, Rolf. 2010.

Rolf Stein's Tibetica antiqua: with additional materials. Translated by Arthur Mckeown. Leiden: Brill.

Takeuchi, Tsuguhito. 1990.

"A Group of Old Tibetan Letters Written Under Kuei-I-Chün: A Preliminary Study for the Classification of Old Tibetan Letters", in *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 44.1–2, 175–90.

Takeuchi, Tsuguhito. 1995. *Old Tibetan Contracts From Central Asia*. Tokyo: Daizo Shuppan.

Thomas, Frederick W. 1951.

Tibetan literary texts and documents concerning Chinese Turkestan. London: Royal Asiatic Society.

Tucci, Giuseppe. 1956.

Preliminary Report on Two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal. Rome: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.

Uebach, Helga. 1985.

Ein Beitrag zur Dokumentation der Inschrift von rKoñ-po. Sankt Augustin: VGH Wissenschaftsverlag.

Uebach, Helga and Zeisler, Bettina. 2008.

"rJe-blas, pha-los and Other Compounds with Suffix -s in Old Tibetan Texts", in Huber, Brigitte, Volkart, Marianne and Widmer, Paul (eds.), *Chomolangma, Demawend und Kasbek. Festschrift für Roland Bielmeier zu seinem 65. Geburtstag, Band I: Chomolangma*, 309–34. Halle: International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies.

Uray, Géza. 1955.

"Duplication, Geminatio and Triplioatio in Tibetan", in *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 4, 177–219.

Uray, Géza. 1972.

"The Narrative of Legislation and Organization of the Mkhas-pa'i

dga'-ston: the origins of the traditions concerning sron-brcan sgam-po as first legislator and organizer of Tibet", in *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 26.1, 11–68.

Walter, Michael. 2009.

Buddhism and Empire: the political and religious culture of early Tibet. Leiden: Brill.

Yamaguchi, Zuihō 山口瑞鳳. 1983.

Toban ōkoku seiritsushi kenkyū 吐蕃王國成立史研究 [A Study on the Establishment of the T'u-fan Kingdom]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Yamaguchi, Zuihō. 1990.

"The grammatical function of *de-nyid*", in *Acta orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 44, 251–57.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2002.

"The development of temporal coding in Tibetan: some suggestions for a functional internal reconstruction. (1): Unexpected use of the 'imperative' stem in Old Tibetan and Themchen (Amdo Tibetan)", in Blezer, Hank (ed.), *Tibet, Past and Present. PIATS 2000: Tibetan studies: Proceedings of the ninth seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000*, 441–53. Leiden: Brill.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2004.

Relative Tense and Aspectual Values in Tibetan languages. A comparative study. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2006.

"The Tibetan understanding of karman: Some problems of Tibetan case marking", in Beckwith, Christopher I. (ed.), *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages II*, 57–101. Leiden: Brill.

Zeisler, Bettina. 2017.

"Hypothetical sound laws and sound potential meaning: Once again on the uncommon Tibetan verb paradigm *za, zos, zo* 'eat'", in *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic*

Reconstruction 14, 77–117.

Zhang Liansheng. 1985.

“The Phonetic Structure of ABCB Type Words in Modern Lhasa Tibetan”, in Aziz, Barbara N. and Kapstein, Matthew (eds.), *Soundings in Tibetan Civilization*, 20–36. New Delhi: Manohar.

Zhang Yisun 张怡荪. 1985.

Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo / Zang Han da Cidian 藏漢大辭典 [*Tibetan-Chinese Dictionary*]. Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang.

