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Few 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 inscriptions\(^1\) 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 Envoys 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 French\(^3\) 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, but more recent detailed study of the document is only available in Japanese and Chinese. 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, which provide a complete transliteration, translation and discussion of contents and the first complete translation of this text by Chu Junjie. 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, 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. 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. 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]”. 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. His interpretation has been taken for granted by others.

4 Bellezza 2005: 11–12, 342; Uebach and Zeisler 2008: 325.
8 Chu Junjie 1990.
9 Drikung 2011.
11 Stein 1961: 6, 8, 18.
12 Stein 1961: 55.
But even Ishikawa, who specifically argues against an historical interpretation in favor of a mythological one, still speaks of the marriage of two clans. 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. 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, 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. Yamaguchi treats another version appearing in the *Dar rgyas gsal-bahi sgron-ma*. Karmay notes further marital intertwining among the Phywa and Dmu. 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*.

---

16 Graf 1993: 16 et passim.
18 Stein 1961: 56.
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”\textsuperscript{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”.\textsuperscript{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 moprôn, who sings wedding songs and acts as master of ceremonies representing the interests of the groom’s party.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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, mchoṅ, mirror, spindle, sre-loṅ and yarn thread, etc. are placed in the priest’s hand followed by the songs in praise of the arrow”.\textsuperscript{25} An interest in the ritual use of arrows is however probably more indicative of Tibetan folk religion in general than marriage per se.\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{21} Shastri 1994: 758.
\textsuperscript{22} Shastri 1994: 758.
\textsuperscript{23} Aziz 1985: 127.
\textsuperscript{25} Shastri 1994: 759.
\textsuperscript{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-ḥdog 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 Ṇed 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 ldeḥu chos Ḫbyun, 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

---

29 Uebach and Zeisler 2008: 325.
of the dead. 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. The failure of dawn to break or dusk to fall is also tied directly to death in the ritual narrative PT 1285.

\[
\text{She rubbed the putrid sappy Hol poison on one hundred Nya-luľ lhen-moň and it went near, went near to her father. She offered one hundred Nya-luľ lhen-moň to her father. Hol-rje Zin-bran ate it, ate it in his body. He took it, took the poison. He took the putrid sappy Hol poison into the depths of his body. [He cried] “Ha-na-na, the day won’t dawn! Hu-tshu-tshu, the sun won’t set”.}\] (PT 1285, ll. 107–10).

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?).]”. The word ‘Dmu’ is cognate with words for sky in various Tibeto-Burman languages. Among the Rawang, the Dmvo ‘spirits of the upper realm’. 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 that its strange meteorology to identify the

---

31 Ishikawa 2000: 176–79.
33 Stein 1962: 64.
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-gyi lha-las myi hi rjer gsogs-pa*” [came down from the gods of heaven as lord of men]” (Inscription at the tomb of Khri Lde-sroṅ-brtsan, circa 815)36 or “*myi hi mgon-du sa-la gsogs-nas* [come to earth as lord of men]” (Fragmentary Tablet at Žwa-bahi lha khan).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 Gñaṅ-khrī 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 *Lde hu 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.
The second of these, referred to as the secret Bon tradition (gsaṅ ba bon lugs), contains one such parallel story, 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. 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-nam 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’ (dbuh-ḥbreñ l. 14) and overturn his ‘head ladder’ (dbuh-skas l. 15). Aside from differences in order, the absence of the helmet, and replacing ‘braids’ with ‘cord’, the objects Lo-nam 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-nam 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 (mṅon-bar ḏguñ-du ḏsėgs-pa, PT 1287, ll. 6–7) to heaven is what caused his haughtiness in the first place. In his confrontation with Lo-nam, 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,
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-khyi byig šus 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.

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 (phywaḥi pho ȵa), the lord of Dmu (Dmu ḭje), 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-daṅ Phywa gñen-bahi ḡtshe. The second section seems like the beginning of a new text, in particular because it includes a letter opening formula (ll.151–52, ḍa sña-nas ... mchid gsol-pa). 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 mṭharr myi g.yo-bahi lha yon-tsam ḍbul-du mchis-na /
lha ḍal mṭho-žin phyag chud-pa tsam-du gći gnaṅ?
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 ņan-pa yang lha ḍal tsam mṭhoṅ /
lha bkah tsam ņan-ciṅ mchis-na /
bkah stsal-pa tsam-du ci gnaṅ?
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 gnaṅ. 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 -ciṅ 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


1 (II, 105–07)

(105) Dmu-ḥi s bkaḥ stsal-pa /
“ḥn-d-kyi Dmu yul ḥdi dag-na /
dgah lha byed ni nam myi naḥs-la /
dro ni ḥod-kyis (106) ni /
mun myi sros-paḥi sa yul ḥdi dag ni /

Envoys of Phywa to Dmu

2 (II, 107–09)
chu chün [noṅ] bu dag (108) sbron-du Ḥoṅs-paṅi mchid na-re /
“pho-bran khab sgo-na /
baṅ-ne-buṅ-ñe se-ru loṅ-loṅ /
neḥu bun-bun-po /
myi-cuṅ po-ka (109) tsam-la /
ṛtā-cuṅ lgo-ba tsam kha-cig gdah-ḥo” skad-na / /

3 (II, 109–10)
“myi ni su-hi myi? /
byon ni gaṅ-nas byon? /
don no su-la (110) gñer? /
drag-du rmed-pas /
žiḥ-du sptiṅs-ṣig!” / / /

4 (II, 110–15)
pho-ṇas lan btab-paṅ /
“bdag-cag (111) ni Ṣphywa-ḥi Ḥbaṅs /
Phywa-ḥis bkaḥ stsald /
“rje ni Ḫu phud-nas /
mgo nag Ḥgreṅ-la rje myed . (112) rje skos-la /
rṅog chags Ḥdud-la khram thob-cig!” ces bkaḥ stsald-pa /
ḥdebs-śiṅ mchi-baṅi (113) 狝 ka-na / bab 
Dmu yul-du bab-ste /
ḍgaḥ ni Ḫa byed /
dro ni gñen byed /
yar ni Ḫa mchod /
mar ni [sṛi] (114) gnon-baṅi thad-kar bab-ste / / 
bdag-cag Ṣaṅ-paṅ yaṅ Ḫa-la ni yon Ḫbul /
Dmu rje-la ni Ḫkod tsam (115) Ḫbul-źniṅ spyāṅ-ṇar mchis / /- 
paṅi pho-ṇa lags”./ / /

5. (II, 115–17)
Dmu Ṣres bkaḥ stsald /-paṅ / / 
(116) “myi Ḫhod-cag-kyi bkaḥ mchid-la /
g.yo-sgyus bṣaṅ-paṅi Ṣo-ge dag rab-du che-bas /
śul nor-par byon-ba (117) Ḫdra /
nor tshabs dag rab-du che-bas /
ṣnar-gi śul gaṅ lags-pa de-kho zuṅ-la slar gṣegs-ṣig!” / /
6 (II, 117–25)

pho-ña (118) lan btab-paḥ / /
 "Rtsaṅ smad mdo-nas tshur mchis-na / šul yan 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 hdzer-ba /
 rka lag ni khyor-ba (120) cig-daṅ mjal-te /
 "su-hi myi?" žes bdag-cag-la ḥdri-ḥo /
 bdag-cag-kyis kyaṅ / draṅ-por smras-te /
 "Dmu-ḥi yul-ḍu (121) Phywa-ḥi pho-ña mchi." žes bgyis-na /
 kho-ḥi mchod-nas /
 "ḥo-na khyod-cag nor-par hoṅs-te /
yul ḥdi ni (122) srin-gi yul-gis / /
 Dmuḥi yul ni šar lho-ḥi tshams-na yin-bas /
de-ltar / soṅ!" skad-nas šul (123) bstan /-te /
da-ltar Dmuḥi yul ḥdab-du ḥphelbs-na /
 myi-daṅ mjal-na /
 myi mgon-po-bas legs (124)
 skad mdanś ni ḥbrug skad-pas che-la sñaṇ /
 dri-gsun ni spos-kyi dri-bas gdaḥ-ḥo. /
da rje-ḥi spya-ṅar sku-bla-la (125) yon ḥbul /
 Dmu rje-la bkod tsam ḥbul-ziṅ ḥaṅ mthoṅ-bar ci gnaṅ?" / / /

7 (II, 125–29)

Dmu rjes (126) bkah stsal-pa /
 "ṇed-kyi yul ḥdi dag-na /
 sa ḥtshams-kyi stag ḥphren khri skugs dag-na /
gles-pa stag-daṅ (127) gzig / dom-daṅ dred las btsogs-pa
 maṅ-por mchis-na /
de kun gcig-daṅ yaṅ ma phrad-na /
khyed-cag gnam-nas hoṅs-na (128) ni /
 phur-baḥi ḥdab s̥og myed-la /
sa-las ḥdzul-te hoṅs-na ni
byi-ba ma yin-na /
khyed-cag-gi tshig-la zol maṅ-bas (129) slar gṣegs-śig!" / / /
8. (II, 129–32)
pho-ñaś lan btab-pa /  
“bdag-cag ŋan-pa-la sgyu-daṅ zol ma mch[is] /  
(130) Dmu ḍje-ḥi stag phraṅ gzig phraṅ-na /  
gles-pa stag gzig-daṅ yaṅ mjal /  
dom-daṅ dred-daṅ yaṅ mjal /  
(131) la-la ni btsas phul. /  
myi-la ni yon phul-nas /  
bdag-cag ŋan-pa-la śul bstan-nas /  
Dmu ḍje-ḥi spya-ṅar mchis-pa (132) lags” / / /  

9. (II, 132–35)
Dmu ḍjes bkaḥ stsal-pa / /  
“khyed-cag-gi tshig-la yoṅ zol yod-pas /  
ṅed (133) Dmu-ḥi gcan-pa gles-pa lcags-kyi myi rta ḽub  
rluṅ ltar ni phyo-la /  
glog ltar ni myur-ba /  
lcags-kyi ri-boṅ-la lcags-kyi (134) khra bkye-ste /  
ste len-du len-ba dag kyaṅ yod-na /  
de kun gcig-daṅ yaṅ ma phrad-na /  
khyod-cag-kyi tshig yaṅ brdzun-daṅ zol mchis-par / (135)  
slar gšegs-šig!” / / /  

10 (II, 135–39)
pho-ñaś lan btab-pa / /  
“bdag-cag ŋan-pa-la rdzun-daṅ zol ma mchis /  
lcags-kyi myi (136) rta ḽub  
lcags-kyi khra bkye-ba  
glog ltar myur-ba-daṅ yaṅ mjal-te /  
lcags-kyi thur-ma-la /  
lcags-kyi ri-boṅ gtur-nas bsreg (137) ša bgyid-pa-daṅ yaṅ mjal /  
mdzo-mo dkar-mo žig bšas-te /  
mʒug-ma ma bcad-pa-daṅ yaṅ mjal-nas /  
de kun-la yaṅ (138) Phywaḥi bkaḥ-rtags-daṅ skyes raṅs phul-te /  
rt a / rgal-nas mchis-na /  
da sku-bla myi mthur myi g.yo-baḥi lha yon tsam ḡbul-du  
(139) mchis-na /  
lha žal tsam mtho-ziṅ phyag chud-pa tsam-du gci gnaṅ?” / /  
/ /  

11 (II, 139–50)
Dmu ḍjes bkaḥ stsal-paḥ /
(140) “hecya Phywa-hi pho-ña ned-kyi sku-bla-la mchod gsol-du ḡons-na /
mchod-pahi rkyen ci yod? /
Hjaṅ smyuṅ mchod-la (141) /
thaṅ-kar yug-gyis bṣgron-ba lha mdah yod-dam myed? /
lha mdah-hi rkyen Rgya dar ris phran yug-kyis (142) btags-pa yod-dam myed? /
gser kha ma blan-śa yod-dam myed? /
g.yu-ḥi slag cen yod-dam myed? /
sṅon-mo (143) ḡbra bdun-la khal dgu yod-dam myed? /
sṅon-mo ḡdiṅ diṅ hbras-kyi khu khal dgu yod-dam myed? /
mthud goṅ (144) goṅ-mo tsam mchis-sam ma mchis? /
mar-ɡi sreg ša sreg-pa tsam mchis-sam ma mchis? /
^o-mahi (145) gdar bre-kha tsam mchis-sam mchis? /
pha lug ṇo mar mchis-sam mchis? /
pha ṇa sṅan kar mchis-sam (146) ma mchis? /
pha g.yag ʂam-po mchis-sam ma mchis? /
(147) Dmu rje-la yaṅ skies raṅs rdzogs-par mchis-sam? /
Dmu blon-la yaṅ skies raṅs rdzogs-par mchis-na /
(148) ḡdraṅ-po dag kyaṅ dguṅ mthah skor skor ni /
rgod-po mthah zags-la /
dog mthah skor bskor ni mthshal-ba (149) ṇi ṇr dol /
myi ni Chad ṇa ni ṇal-na yaṅ /
ra-mahi ḡdab tsam-du gḍab-du gnaṅ /
sku-bla-la yaṅ yon ḡbul-du (150) gnaṅ-ňo” / / /

12 (II, 150–51)
žu-ba rnam ḡa sṅan-du žus-te /
bkaḥ gṇan-pos luṅ-du stsal-te gnaṅ-ba (151) /
gtaṅ-rag spyi-bo gtsug-gyis ḡtshal-žiṅ mchis-so / / /

13 (II, 151–59)
$ / / sku-gṇen phyogs-kyi (152) ža sṅa-nas / Maṅ-žam ſiṅ-kyis mchid gsol-pa / /
“bdag-cag ſaṅ-pa lta-ṣig mchis-pa /
bus-ba ſaṅ-pa (153) ḡa žiṅ rkaṅ riṅs-te skies-na /
khyed-kyi žam-ḥbraṅ ḡdab-du /
riṅ-bahi ni srab-mdah ḡdzin-pa-ḥam /
thuṅ-bahi (154) baṅi ni yob-cen-gi rten tsam-ḥam /
mtshan-mo ni g.yaṅ-mo-ḥi mthah skyoṅ-ba tsam-du ḡbul-bar bsams-te (155) /
 rake-loṅ rnam ḡa tsam žus-na / yaṅ / rake-loṅ-du ma brtsis-te /
bkaḥ chad-kyis ma bkum /
(156) gšegs-su gnañ-ba glo-ba dgaḥ / /

de-hi rjes-la myi-dan Ḧdra-bahi gdan tshab-ḥam? /
gsol-du ruṅ-bahi (157) bšos skyems ni ci yaṅ ma Ḫbyor lags-na yaṅ /
byeḥu tshaṅ-du rgyal gšegs-pa-dan mtshuṅs-te /
gdugs (158) tshod ma khoṅs-pahi thog-du /
graṅ-mo ṣal-bu re re Ḿig sku-la dmyigs-šiṅ mchis-na /
chuṅs-kyis (159) bkaḥ myi Ḫbab / bžes-pa tsam-du ci gnaṅ?”
/ / / /

14 (II, 159–62)
“bdag-cag ṭan-pa mchis-pa (160) yaṅ deṅ-gi gdugs-la /
ḥdi Ḧdra-bahi bkaḥ luṅ gṇan-po g.yar-du stsal-pa yaṅ /
g.yar tshod ma (161) mchis / /
bdag-cag-kyi yab-khu dag kyaṅ ma rdzogs / /
yab-khu dag-dan bkaḥ gros bgyis-la (162)
de-nas khyed-cag-la bkaḥ luṅ dag sbyin gis” / / / /

15 (II, 162–65)
sku gṇen Ḧphrül-gi Ḏa sña-nas / (163)
“deṅ-gi gdugs-la gor-bu-hi Ḿabs tshegs-la ma gzigs-te gdan
gšegs-su gnañ-ba glo-ba (164) dgaḥ /
bdag-cag ṭan-pa yaṅ lha Ḿal tsam mthoṅ /
lha bkaḥ tsam ṭan-ciṅ mchis-na /
bkaḥ (165) stsal-pa tsam-du ci gnaṅ” / / / /

16 (II, 165–68)
“de lags khyed Ḫo-skol mchis-pa yaṅ /
phu ni ston sde /
(166) mdah ni rgya sde /
rje gcig-gi Ḫbaṅs-la
yul cığ-gi ni myi /
sa cığ-gi Ḫbras /
ri cığ-gi (167) rdo /
khyed Ḫo-skol-la dbyar myed-pas /
khyed-kyis [---b]-nas kyaṅ cehu-yag-dan log-men dag lṭos!
ruṅ-ζiṅ (168) śis-par gyur-na /
bdag-cag [---] bkaḥ-gros dag [b]gyis-la /
khyed-la bkaḥ-luṅ 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: gzì
105 OCD: dag na /, I: dag na
105 OID: dga lha, C: lha
106 gaṅs, OIC: g.yah, D: g.yah
106 dag-gyis: Ishikawa has a footnote pointing out that Yamaguchi (1983: 171, 194) reads rog gyis.
107 OID: mtho ste, C: mthoṅ ste
107 OIC: byi, D: byeḥu
107: OD: zul bahi, IC: ḥzul bahi
107: OID: noṅ bu, C: nor bu
108 OID: sgo na, C: sgro na
108 OID: lon loṅ, C:ローン lo
108 OID: myi cuṅ po, C: myi chuṅ po
109 OID: rta cuṅ, C: rta chuṅ
110 OID: gñer /, C: gñer
110 OD: rmed pas, IC: smed pas
110 OID: spriṅs śig, C: spriṅs [ i]b
110 OI: lan btab paḥ, C: lan bdb paḥ, D: lan btab pa
112 ID: rṅog chags ḥdud, O: rṅog chags dud, C: rjug 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 ḥdṛe
113 OC: sri, I: dri, D: omit
116 OD: myi khyed 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: ṣo ge dag, CI: ṣo ge daṅ
116 śul nor par byon ba, OD: śul ner bar byon ba, I: śul noṅ 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 daṅ
119 OC: rka lag, ID: rkaṅ lag (Either reading is defensible.)
119 OD: khyor ba, IC: khyor ba /
121 OD: kho ḥi mchid, IC: kho ḥo mchid
122 OID: yin bas, C: yin baḥ
123 OI: myi daṇ mjal na /, C: omit
127 gnam-nas (nas is written below the line.)
127 ÓCD: gnam naṉ, I: gnam naṉ
128 OID: ḡdzul te, C: ḡdzul te /
132 OID: yod pas /, C: yod bas /
133 OID: lcags kyi rī boṅ, 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 žub, C: da žub
138 OID: phywaḥi, C: phywaḥi
138 OD: ḡbul du, IC: ḡbul du /
139 OD: chud pa tsam, I: mchod pa tsam, C: bchud ba tsam
139 IC: du gci gnaṅ, OD: du ci gnaṅ
139 OICB: stsal-paḥ, D: stsal-pā
141 OICD: bṣgron pa, B: bṣgron 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 dṅu, C: khal dṅu
143 OCD: ḡdniṅ dṅu, I: ḡdniṅ ḡdniṅ
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 Ṽo mar mchis sam mchis, B: mchis sam ma mchis, D: lha lug Ṽo 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 OICD: zal mo mchis sam ma mchis, I: zal mo mchos sam ma mchis, B: zal mo mchis sam mchis
147 OCD: skyes raṅs, C: skyes rasaṅ (an obvious typo)
148 OID: rgod po mthora zags la /, C: omit mthora
150 OD: žu ba rnam ḡa, I: żu ba rnam bag, C: ņu ba rnam bag
150 O: luṅ du, ICD: luṅ ḡu.
152 mchid, OICD: mchod. The reason why people read o, is because of a crease in the paper.
153 I: ḡa žig rkaṅ, C: ḡa žig rgaṅ, O: ḡa[ʔ] žig rkaṅ, D: ḡaḥ žig rkaṅ
153 OID: ḡdab du, C: bdab du
153–54 OIC baḥi baḥi, D: baḥi
154 OID tsam ḡam, D: tsam mam
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:
“\[In these our lands of Dmu, the god makes joy; dawn does not break (naṅs). These lands are a place where (106) the sunlight [makes] warmth; night does not fall. The slate end is encircled by glaciers. The end of the depths is perfectly (dag gyis) encircled. (107) In these gra gru, above, the birds do not fly about (ldiṅ) and, below, the mice do not burrow\].\]
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 (rñog chag) and bent (i.e. animals) draw up a ledger!”
   [We] fell in the path which sows (ḥdebs) 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 (non) 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 Rtsaṅ-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
there 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 lighting.
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 Ḫjaṅ (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 ḫdiṅ ḫdiṅ rice?
Is there or not a ball of mthud, the size of a grouse?
Is there or not a buttered pheasant, the size of roasted meat?
Is there or not gdar 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;
vermillion 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 Maṅ-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 cehu-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-niṅ as ‘the year before last’.46 Since na-niṅ is ‘last year’, niṅ must mean ‘year’ and gže must mean ‘before last’.

105–106 dro ē hōd-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 hōd ‘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 ē hōd as ‘hot sunlight’, which would be ē hōd dro.

The parallelism of the structure and the form of its repetition in the mouths of the envoys (l.l.113–14) leads me to understand the passage as if it said dgah lhas byed ni nam myi naṅs-la / dro ē hōd-kyis byed ni / mun myi sros-pa, i.e. moving lha from the absolutive to the ergative and supplying a verb for hōd. The parallel of dgah lha byed ni (l.105) to dro ē hōd-kyis ni permits the conjecture that lha should be treated as though it were lhas. On the other hand, the parallel of dro ē hōd-kyis ni (l.105–06) to dro ni gñen byed (l.113) allows one to supply byed in dro ē hōd-kyis ni (l.105–06) amending to dro ē hōd-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 gaṅs: 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.yah ‘slate’. That gaṅs is the correct reading can be confirmed by examining the way the ‘ṅs’ is written in the word hoṅs (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」と解せす. [If gra gru is a reduplicated expression for sgra ‘sound’ gra gru ḥāi na can be understood as

48 Ishikawa 2001: 151.
49 Chu Junjie 1990: 29.
‘when saying this and that’]. However, quotations generally ends with the converb žes or the terminative of the verbal noun, not the genitive as occurs here. In addition, the parallel ending in ḫdi dag-na of the opening and closing line of the lord of Dmu’s speech is clearly an intentional poetic device.

Nag dbaṅ tshul khrims defines gra-gru as “rgya khyon-gyi miṅ-ste [expans]” and offers an enigmatic quotation from the Rgya bod yig tshaṅ; citing the same passage Drikung defines gra-gru as “sa-chalim yul-gru [place, district]” 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 ḫdi dag-na (l.1–5) … gra-gru ḫdi 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 noṅ bu: PT 1068 has an analogous tale in which the hero, Lheṇu btsan pa first meets with the chab chun ‘water carrier’ of Bya-za-thin-tsun. The water carrier then acts as go-between negotiating Lheṇu btsan pa’s entrance to the palace (ll.5–13). I leave noṅ-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.

108 baṅ-ṇe-buṅ-ṇe se-ru lōṅ-loṅ / nehū bun-bun-po /: The key to understanding this phrase is the parallel construction. Both se-ru and nehū 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, baṅ-ṇe-buṅ-ṇe se-ru is parallel to nehū and lōṅ-loṅ is parallel to bun-bun-po.

---

50 Ishikawa 2001: 151, 156, n. 3.
52 Nag dbaṅ tshul khrims 1997.
53 Drikung 2011.
54 On the change of -b- to -g- between vowel see Hill 2011.
Although the dictionary of such expressions does not include it, $\text{baṅ ne buṅ ne}$ is an expressive reduplicated phrase. The first syllable in such constructions is usually the root. A search of the dictionaries for $\text{baṅ}$ yields ‘run’ and $\text{baṅ phyin}$ which Nag dban tshul khrims gives as ‘messenger’. One might suggest for $\text{baṅ ne buṅ ne}$ the meaning ‘hurriedly like a messenger’. Chu Junjie translates “馬羽風起雲湧 [horse-feathers (?) surging]”. Ishikawa prudently leaves the latter part of line 108 and the early part of line 109 untranslated.

Keeping in mind that $\text{baṅ-ne-buṅ-ne se-ru}$ must be somehow parallel to $\text{nehu ‘little meadow’}$, leads one to identify $\text{baṅ ne buṅ ne}$ with $\text{phaṅ ni phun ni}$ which Zhang defines as “1) $\text{sīṅ ḫbras lo tog sog slegs par smin paṅi}$ rnam pa/ ... 2) laṅ liṅ nam/ ḫbar ḫbur du ȝ yo tshul/ [1) well-ripened fruit, crops etc. ... 2) drifting, sinuous, swinging or uneven motion]”. 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’, which one could also arrive at by removing the diminutive suffix -u to yield ser ‘yellow’. In contrast, Chu Junjie offers the translation “好似犀牛抖擞, 青草拂动 [shaking like a rhinoceros, blowing through the grass]”, apparently understanding se ru as bse ru ‘rhinoceros’.

The parallel between loṅ-loṅ 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’.

108–109 myi-cuṅ po-ka tsam-la / rta cuṅ lgo-ba tsam kha-cig gdah-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]”. Drikung translates ‘he comes up only to the chest of a man equal to him in age,

---

57 See for example Jäschke 1881.
58 Nag dban tshul khrims 1997: 528.
60 Zhang Yisun 1985.
64 Chu Junjie 1990: 29.
Envoys of Phywa to Dmu

...and he is riding a small horse the size of a gazelle.\textsuperscript{65} Ishikawa prudently leaves the passage untranslated.

I was for a long time tempted to segment $\textit{myi }\text{cu}^{-}\textit{po} \text{ka } \textit{tsam-la}$, seeing \textit{ka} as the word \textit{kha} ‘mouth’. One reason for this is the similarly with $\textit{myi}^{-}\textit{hu }\text{chu}^{-}\textit{ka }\text{ma }\textit{che }\textit{sig}! \textit{rtehu }\textit{cu}^{-}\textit{n} \text{ka }\text{ma }\text{drag} ‘Little man don’t be a big mouth, little colts don’t have fierce mouths’ in the first chapter of the \textit{Old Tibetan Chronicle} (PT 1287, l. 030); similar phrases also occur in divination texts. In addition, the chiasmus formed by \textit{ka tsam} and \textit{tsam kha} appears intentional. However, the parallelism with $\textit{rta-cu}^{-}\textit{n} \textit{lgo}^{-}\textit{ba} \textit{tsam}$ makes clear that $\textit{myi-cu^{-}po} \text{ka} \textit{tsam}$ is the correct segmentation.

Drikung’s identification of \textit{po-ka} with \textit{pho-kha} ‘stomach, chest\textsuperscript{66} is accurate and his translation conveys the intended meaning well.

The dictionaries lack a word $\textit{lgo}^{-}\textit{ba}$. In Old Tibetan texts it clearly refers to a part of a yak, e.g. $\text{da }\text{g.yag }\text{sa }\text{n} \text{lu }\text{ru }\text{g.sogs-sig }\text{g.yag }\text{lgo }\text{n} \text{ri} \text{su }\text{dros-sig}$ [Now, cut off in slices the yak meat; cut in ras the yak \textit{lgo}!]

(IOL Tib J 731 recto, l. 116), “\textit{phyi }\text{ma}^{-}\text{dha}^{-}\text{pa }\text{n} \text{g.yon }\text{lbs}^{-}\text{g.yi} \text{rtsib-mahi }\textit{lgo-pa}^{-}\text{da}^{-}\text{han }\text{khra}^{-}\text{gphyed-dan} [As for the distribution for the latter arrows, they receive the \textit{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 \textit{lgo}^{-}\textit{ba} with the \textit{黄羊} \textit{zeren} (\textit{procapra gutturosa})\textsuperscript{67} and Drikung identifies \textit{lgo}^{-}\textit{ba} with \textit{rgo}^{-}\textit{ba} ‘goa (\textit{procapra picticaudata}).\textsuperscript{68}

\textbf{108 khab:} A word for ‘house’, which appears to be used typically in the context of marriage. Compare: $\textit{khyo}^{-}\text{d}$\textit{kyi bo-mo ya}^{-}\text{ni} \text{yid-dan} $\textit{hthad}$\textit{pa }\textit{zig-pas }\text{h}^{-}\text{m} \text{b}^{-}\text{zes-su} \text{gna}^{-}\text{no}$ [Your daughter is pleasing, I consent to take her home.] (PT 981, \textit{Rama E}, ll. 49–40), $\text{Kha}^{-}\text{gan-gyi }\text{h}^{-}\text{m} \text{b}^{-}\text{zes-gi}^{-}\text{u}^{-}\text{mo}$ [The daughter of Mug-Iden-ha-rod-par-gyi \text{bu-mo} [The daughter of Mug-Iden-ha-rod-par to the house of the Qayan] (IOL Tib J 1368, \textit{Annals of Haža principality}, l. 49), $\textit{Kim}$\textit{shên} \textit{kong-co }\text{h}^{-}\text{m} \text{b}^{-}\text{zes-nas}$ [Princess Jincheng was taken to the home of the emperor] (Sino-Tibetan treaty inscription of 821–822, East face, l. 28).

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

\textsuperscript{65} Drikung 2011: 39.

\textsuperscript{66} Drikung 2011: 38, n. 36.

\textsuperscript{67} Chu Junjie 1990: 29.

\textsuperscript{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 dbaṅ tshul khrims
writes that it is “chuṅ-gi miṅ-stel/ ji skad-du/ gser skyems gtsan-ma phud-
kyi mchod-pa ḫdi [a word for barely beer; thus it is said ‘this offering of
phud, a pure libation’].\(^71\) Deriving the noun from the verb ḫphud ‘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 pro-
pose.

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. \(\text{Old Tibetan Annals (IOL}
\text{Tib J 0750, l. 306 [746–747]), Old Tibetan Chronicle (PT 1287, ll. 62,}
\text{330, 343, and 448), Prayers of the foundation of the De ga g.yu tsal monas-
tery (PT 16, ll. 33v3, 34v1 and IOL Tib J 0751, ll. 35v2), The Decline of the}
\text{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 an-
cient period where khram indicates wood slip register”.\(^74\) There is how-
ever 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 gñen 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 gñen as ‘marriage’ are discussed above. The
line is parallel to the line dro ŋi Ḗod-kyis (ll.105–106), which puts gñen

\(^69\) Ishikawa 2001: 151.
\(^70\) Ishikawa 1990: 26.
\(^71\) Nag dbaṅ tshul khrims 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 ńi-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'. This amendment is not necessary if the text is read sri 'demon'.

115 spyan ńar: For spyan sńar.

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', I take this noun as 'government'; 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']".

116 sńo-ge: Ishikawa understands sńo-ge as from sńog 'paper' and compares both its meaning and morphology to yęi-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]" is implausible. Instead, sńo-ge should be seen as a variant of sńo-be 'falsehood'. For the alternation of -b- and -g- compare ri-boṅ and ri-goṅ 'hare'. 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]" may tacitly accept this solution; Drikung explicitly identifies sńo-ge with sńo-pe, translating 'lies'.

117 sńar-gi ฐุล 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.
ざいいましても、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].

He appears to take gaṅ as an indefinite pronoun, and de as a semifinal converb. Ishikawa explicitly equates kho with mkho'

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.

118 Rtsaṅ smad mdo: Stein sees this as ‘vallée basse du Fleuve [valley at the base of a river]’ 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 dno mkhar-gyi nan-nah / 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 Phywa who is among the Rtsaṅ gods]” (l.74). In two other texts the name of the lord of Rtsaṅ suggests a relationship with the Phywa: rtsaṅ rje phwa sñun (PT 1286, folio 7, ll. 292, 294, 298), rtsaṅ rje phwa sñun (PT 1286, recto, ll. 186)

119 rka lag: Chu Junjie identifies rka lag with rkaṅ lag and translates 手脚 ‘hand and feet’. Ishikawa similarly translates 手足 ‘hands and feet’. Another instance of a missing -ṅ in this text occurs at line 139, where mthoṅ ‘see’ is written mtho.

122 sрин: Ishikawa has the following note:

sрин は 2 系統の神霊を指して言うように思われる。一つは、Dgri, ḫdri, ḫdre 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.
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.
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, ḫḍri, and ḫḍre which mean the manifestation of death or a vengeful spirit (note 5) or on the other hand it could an Indian Rakṣasas, here used in the meaning of the latter as they appearing 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.  

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

122 tshams: For mtshams ‘border’.

123 ḫḍab: For ḫḍabs ‘vicinity’.

124 mdaṅs: For gdaṅs ‘melody’.

124 dri-gsuṅ: For dri-bsuṅ ‘fragrance’.

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

---

92 Ishikawa 2001: 152, 156, n. 9.
126 stag ḫphreṅ khrī skugs: The context, sa ḡtshams 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 ḫphreṅ khrī 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)]”. This suggestion is unmotivated. Ishikawa translates stag ḫphreṅ khrī phrase “虎の群れ万匹 [herd of 10,000 tigers]” but because khrī ‘10,000’ follows ḫphreṅ it must mean ‘10,000 ḫphreṅ of tigers’.

The phrase stag phraṅ gzig phraṅ-na (l.130) in the Envoys’ reply permits one to identify stag ḫphreṅ with stag phraṅ. This phrase also further confirms that phraṅ is a type of place. More importantly it establishes that stag phraṅ and gzig phraṅ are lexical units. The dictionaries offer ḫphreṅ ‘row, rosary’ and (h)phraṅ ‘narrow path, defile’. The two words, sharing a notion of something long and thin, are probably etymologically linked.

The identification of ḫphreṅ with ḫphraṅ permits the discovery of a further parallel; in the Old Tibetan Chronicle (PT 1287). The Chinese general ḡwoṅ-ker-źaṅ-ses opens his taunting letter to Mgar khrī-brĭṅ btsan-brod, saying “Bod-kyi dmag // stag ḫphraṅ g.yag ḫphraṅ-du bgraṅs pa-hi graṅs kyaṅ na-la yod-do [I have the number which reckons up the stag ḫphraṅ and g.yag ḫphraṅ of the Tibetan army]” (l.498). This context makes clear that stag ḫphraṅ must refer to a type or unit of soldiers, at least in this context.

Ishikawa translates skugs as 潛伏地 ‘hiding place’ and suggests that “skugs は skuṅs 「隠藪」の異綴りと考えた [skugs is an alternate spelling of skuṅs ‘hidden grove’].” This explanation can be objected to on phonetic and narrative grounds. Variation between ‘g’ and ‘ṅ’ 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 understands to indicate that there are several similar places, and not necessarily several places called stag ḫphreṅ khrī skugs.

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 “僱兵の虎 [mercenary tigers/tigers of mercenaries]” 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 uncomfortably 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 phraṅ: Ishikawa translates phraṅ as 群れ ‘herd’ like he had hphreṅ in line 126. He adds 潛伏地 ‘hiding place’ in brackets to repeat the skugs of line 126. Although he is correct to link hphreṅ and phraṅ, his reading relies on a strained interpretation of skugs and an ellipsis, and is consequently untenable. The word phraṅ 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 hphreṅ (l.126) and stag phraṅ (l.130) to refer to the same thing or not is difficult to say. It is clear that the military meaning of stag hphraṅ 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 phraṅ is satisfactory here. Karmay suggests that the “gorges full of tigers and leopards” are an example of “certain echoes of Ḥol-mo luṅ-riṅ”,103 the mythical land which is ultimate origin of the Bon religion according to its own traditions.

132 yoṅ zol: Chu Junjie104 and Drikung105 identify yoṅ with yaṅ. Two passages from the Old Tibetan Chronicle (PT 1287) help to confirm this proposal: maṅ-nuṅ-gī khar myi dor-ro // ‘we should not verbally spar over number’ (l.501), che-cuṅ-gī khar yoṅ myi dor-ro / / ‘we should also not verbally spar over size’ (l.517). The syntax of the second passage requires that yoṅ is an adverb, and the context precludes any interpretation except ‘also’. In addition, the use of kyoṅ in place of kyaṅ just a few words previous (Bod-kyi spu-rgyal nī ŭi-ma-daṅ ḡdraḥ / / ḡrya rje nī zla-ba-daṅ ḡdra-ste / / rgyal-po ched-por ḡdraḥ mod kyoṅ, 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.
105 Drikung 2011: 35.
favour of seeing yoṅ as equivalent to yaṅ. One should compare this use of yoṅ with its function beginning discourses and meaning ‘thus’, pointed out by Stein.106

134 ste len-du len-ba dag kyaṅ 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 ‘falcon’s; 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 con-
verb, 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 gram-
mar can countenance Drikung’s “iron rabbits that sport coats of iron spikes”;111 his emendation of khra ‘falcon’ to gra ‘corner’ is unmoti-
vated.

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

109 Uray 1955: 188–90.
111 Drikung 2011: 40.
113 See for example Zhang Yisun 1985.
We have also seen (someone) roasting a rabbit made of iron on a spit." Drikung’s solution ‘over an iron grate’ 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.

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 mžug-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]”. This suggestion fits the context perfectly, however would be difficult to explain phonetically. A better solution is to understand mžug-ma as a variant of mjug ‘tail’, as is implicitly reflected in Chu Junjie’s translation 尾巴 ‘tail’; Drikung similarly identifies it with gžug-ma ‘tail’. Not only do the semantics of this word fit the context, but variation between ‘ž’ and ‘j’ is well attested. Just as according to Conrady’s law *hžug > hjug one would also expect *mžug > mjug. Consequently, the word mžug here can be seen as an archaic retention.

138 raňs: Ishikawa leaves raňs ‘whole, entire, all’ untranslated.

138 rgal: Ishikawa adds 山を ‘mountains’ 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’. Ishikawa translates as 錯乱せず ‘without
confusion’. 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 bska’ yod* (New Collection of Bon *bkah 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 hbar ba’hī gsas mkhar nas / sku bla mu thur thugs dam sman gyis bska’n /.)

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’, which is forced.

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

139 *phyag chud-pa*: In the dictionaries one finds *chud-pa* as ‘enter’, 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 献上供品 ‘present the gifts’ and Ishikawa 供物を献上する ‘present an offering’. These seem preferable to Drikung’s ‘take our requests to heart’.

140 *thaṅ-kar yug-gyis bsgron-ba lha mda’h yod-dam myed?:* Chu Junjie translates “有没有嵌有雕尾条纹箭 [do you have a divine arrow...
fletched with eagle tail stripes?]. 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 than-ka, i.e. a divine arrow?]”. Bellezza translates “a divine arrow decorated by a perfect lammergeier feather”, which suggests that he thinks than-kar yug means ‘perfect lammergeier feather’. The dictionaries give than-dkar as a type of eagle and yug as ‘a piece of cloth’. 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 Ḥjaṅ and Rgya and the two occurrences of the phrase lha mdaḥ.

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

142–43 sṅon-po ḭbru bdun: Bellezza translates ‘prized blue grain’ with a note that ḭbru-bdun “appears to denote a special type or quality of barley hence, the word ‘prized’”. I do not see why bdun can not simply mean ‘seven’. Bellezza’s translation treats sṅon-po as if it modified ḭbru-bdun, but it does not; adjectives in Tibetan follow the nouns they modify. Thus, sṅon-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]” and Ishikawa similarly “青物七穀

---

137 See for example Goldstein 2001.
138 See for example Jäschke 1881.
139 See for example Jäschke 1881.
141 Jäschke 1881: 35.
142 Bellezza 2005: 342.
143 Bellezza 2005: 342.
144 Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 499.
[greens and seven grains]”. Drikung omits shon-po translating ‘seven grains’.  

143 khu: My translation omits this word. Bellezza has “liquid offering of blue grain beer”.  

143 mthud goṅ: Bellezza identifies with thud and translates “cheesecake”. Chu Junjie agnostically translates “一类的东西” [something]”.  

144 goṅ-mo: I offer ‘grouse’ on the basis of Jäschke’s ‘ptarmigan, white grouse’, 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)’. In contrast, Chu Junjie offers 雪雞 ‘snowcock’ and Bellezza ‘pheasant’. Compare the phrase bya goṅ-mo ‘goṅ-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” 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 goṅ goṅ-mo sreg ša sreg-pa. There is an obvious pun between sreg ‘pheasant’ and sreg ‘burn’.  

144 ṭo-ma: There appears to be no possibility other than ‘milk’ although this word is properly spelled ho-ma. Chu Junjie translates 乳汁 ‘milk’; Ishikawa translates パター ‘butter’.  

145 lha lug noṅ mar: Bellezza identifies mar with dmar ‘red’ and translates ‘with a red face’, a suggestion which I accept. He adds a note:

---
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“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 noṅ 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 ḥbri zal-mo: Bellezza notes that in “contemporary Upper Tibet, ḥbri-zil-mo/ḥbri-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 ḥbrog-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 ḥbrog-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-ṛo śam po the groom Lo-ṇam 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

159 Chu Junjie 1990: 32.
161 Bellezza 2005: 342.
162 Chu Junjie 1990: 32.
164 Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 503.
165 Jäschke 1881.
166 Goldstein 2001.
167 Bellezza 2005: 342, n. 504.
hypothesis. Chu Junjie notes that in the *Bkah-thaṅ-sde-liṅa* Padmasambhava subdued the mountain deity Šam-po in the form of white yak, which further bolsters the association of the white yak with the mountain.\(^{169}\) Drikung translates *šam-po* as ‘shaggy’ without elaboration.\(^{170}\)

**148 ḣdron:** 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 (l.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 *thaṅ-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 (羱羝) 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.


\(^{173}\) Drikung 2011: 38, n. 52.


\(^{176}\) Chu Junjie 1990: 32, 34, n. 9.
150 ū-ba rnam ḥga sñan-du ūs-te: I take rnam ḥga as a binome for rnam ḥgah. Both rnam and ḥgah mean ‘some’, several’. Ishikawa in contrast reads bag sñan-du ūs-te and offers the following note:

Because the bag of bag sñan-du ūs 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 ūs ‘request, implore’ is a de-ñid. Because the meaning is limited to bag sñan-ly ūs (cf. Yamaguchi 1990), bag sñan-du ūs is translated ‘agreeably implored’.  

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の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 see 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 ūa sña-nas Mañ-ştam ñid-kyis mched gsol-pa: The phraseology A-ţi sña-nas B-mched gsol-pa “to the presence of A the letter of B is hereby presented” is a formulaic start to a letter.182

---

179 Ishikawa 2001: 154, 157, n. 22.
180 Miller 1993: 198–220.
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 Maṅ-ţam: Ishikawa makes the following interesting observation:

“マンシャム maṅ źam 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の名称の一つである (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。そうであらば、チャの使者たちの代表はチャの国の宰相ということになるようか。

Maṅ źam’ 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 maṅ źam 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 maṅ-ţam with ma ʒaŋ and translates 母舅亲 ‘mother and maternal uncle’.185 This suggestion takes too many liberties with the text.

152 bdag-cag ŋan-pa lta ʒig 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 ʒig is a variant form for lta ʒiṅ, which as Uebach remarks “kommt nach Personalpronomen 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 ʒiṅ / in lines 8–9 of the Rkon-po inscription. She suggests comparision with PT 1032, but without giving reference to a line number. Unfortunately, I am currently unable to consult PT 1032. The phrase bdag lta ʒiṅ mchis pa occurs in version A of the Rama story (IOL Tib J 737.1, l. 5).

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, sig as an allomorph of cig ‘a, one’, and mchis as ‘come’. However, if lta sig is a noun phrase it would be governed by a verb, which it is not.

153 rkaṅ riṅs: Uebach and Zeisler discuss rkaṅ riṅs as an example of a compound word ending in -riṅs.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 Lde ḥu chos ḥbyuṅ the rkaṅ riṅs appear as the second in a list of five types of soldiers.191 Dotson translates rkaṅ riṅs as ‘fleefooted’.192 Chu Junjie reads rgaṅ but identifies this with rkaṅ ‘foot, leg’.

153 žam-ḥбриṅ: Nag dbaṅ tshul khrims defines this word ‘žabs-ḥбриṅ nam g.yog-po [servant]’.194 Ishikawa similarly translates it ‘侍従[chamberlain]’ citing Yamaguchi’s remark that ža ḡбриṅ pa “文成公主に関する『編年紀』に (TLT, II, pp. 8–9)見れると“žam riṅ” (ll. 12, 25) 同じく、今日 “žabs ḡбриṅ” 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 riṅ” (ll.12, 25), what today is written “žabs ḡбриṅ” 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.yaṅ-mo: Zhang gives g.yaṅ-mo as ‘lug [sheep]’.197 Ishikawa translates this term as “深淵 [abyss]”,198 which is the meaning that Jäschke

---
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gives for \( g\!.ya\) and in particular \( g\!.ya\)-sa\(^{199}\). According to Drikung\(^{200}\),

\[ g\!.ya\ mo\!hi\ skyo\! / brda dkros gser gyi me lo\!n las / \!hjigs sna\! skye ba\!hi m\!i\!n la gsu\!n / \!h\!d\!i\!r g\!.ya\!n ni / ka sk\!\!a\!d d\!u\!k\!a\!n de g\!.ya\!h nga\! g\!zar po \!\!zhig \!\!\!h\!d\!u\!g z\!er b\!\!a\!lt\!a\!r / \!blo\! mi \!\!b\!de ba\! d\!a\!n / \!\!blo\! d\!og pa la g\!sun\!g pas / \!\!h\!d\!i\!r\! m\!t\!sh\!an\! mo\!hi\! bya\! r\!\!a\!h\!i\! m\!t\!ha\!h\! skyo\!n\! n\!k\!h\!an la\!h\!o // [T\!he B\!dra\! d\!k\!r\!os g\!ser g\!yi me lo\!n says ‘a word for giving rise to fear’. Here \( g\!.ya\) 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 \textit{rko-lo\!n}: Ishikawa understands this as \( r\!k\!u \) ‘theft’\(^{201}\). It is preferable, following a suggestion of Drikung’s\(^{202}\), to see \( r\!k\!o\!-\!l\!o\!n \) as equivalent to \( k\!\!o\!-\!l\!o\!n \) ‘annoyance, dissatisfaction’\(^{203}\). Because native Tibetan words do not generally begin with unaspirated voiceless consonants,\(^{204}\) \( r\!k\!o\!-\!l\!o\!n \) is likely to be the etymologically original form of \( k\!\!o\!-\!l\!o\!n \).

155 \textit{bkum}: On the use of the verb ‘kill, execute’ in the sense of ‘carry out, execute’ see Dotson\(^{205}\) and the citations he collects.

157–58 \textit{gdugs-tshod ma kho\!n\!s-pa\!h\!i thog-du}: Ishikawa\(^{206}\) leaves untranslated. Drikung translates ‘not even being able to offer you lunch’\(^{207}\) following the identification of \( gdug t\!shod\) with \( gu\!n t\!shig\) according to the \( Brda gsar r\!\!i\!n\!i\!n gi r\!n\!am g\!\!z\!ag\).\(^{208}\) In the dictionaries this word appears as \( gu\!n t\!shigs\). By implication Drikung takes \( m\!a k\!ho\!n\!s\) as the negative imperative, to show impossibility of the verb \( h\!g\!e\!n \) ‘fill’, an analysis I accept. For more on the \textit{potentialis} use of the imperative stem see Müller-Witte\(^{209}\) and Zeisler.\(^{210}\) The word \( gdugs-tshod\) also occurs at PT 960, l. 68.\(^{211}\)

158 \textit{gra\!n-mo}: Ishikawa\(^{212}\) follows Chu Junjie\(^{213}\) in translating this word ‘burial chamber’. Chu Junjie bases this interpretation on the following passage from the \textit{Old Tibetan Chronicle} “\textit{Spu-de Gu\!n-rgyal gro\!n-}
na nī graṅ-mo gnam-bseḥ brtsig [When Spu-de Guṅ-rgyal died they built graṅ-mo gnam-gseḥ] (PT 1287, ll. 61–62). To further clarify this passage he cites the Rgya bod yig tshaṅ 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 graṅ-ma came metonymically to refers 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 graṅ-mo with graṅ-mo gnam-gseḥ is an idea worth pursuing, albeit speculative.

Drikung translates ‘cold beer’, which is sensible following the mention of the midday meal and preceding the mention of žal-bu ‘small cups’. Nonetheless, his overall translation of graṅ-mo žal-bu re re žig sku-la dmyiṅs-sin 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 graṅ-mo žal-bu. Although the phrase overall may refer to the offering of a liquid beverage, I do not think that the funerary associations of both graṅ-mo and žal-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 žal-bu: Stein pointed out that in the 尚書 Shangshu paraphrase (PT 986), Tibetan žal-bu is used to translate Chinese 祖 zu ‘ancestral tablet’. He remarks that all “les dictionnaires définissent žal-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 žal-byan, « titre écrit sur une tablette »”, which McKeown translates “All the dictionaries define žal-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 žal-byan, ‘title written on a tablet’.” 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”. Coblin translates the phrase gduṅ-rabs bdun tshun-cad-gyi žal-bu gsol in the 尚書 Shangshu paraphrase (PT 986) as “he sacrificially fed the žal-bu from seven generations (earlier)

---
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downward”. This passage corresponds to the Chinese original “he sacrificed in the ancestral temple of Zhou”. The Tibetan translation appears to follow the Chinese commentary 七星之祖 ‘seven generations of ancestors’. Naγ dbaṅ tshul khrims, citing this same passage, explicitly keeps a meaning “mes-poхи že-sa [honorable term for ancestor]” distinct from “phor-pa chuṅ-ba [small cup]”. Ishikawa following Stein and Chu Junjie translates this word 位牌 ‘mortuary tablet’. Drikung accepts the ‘small cup’ meaning, translating ‘sip’. 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 ḡtshal means ‘take out a loan’. Ishikawa translates 幸運に ‘luckily, fortunately’, 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’. However, since g.yar means ‘loan’ and tshod means ‘measure, estimate’, I suspect the topic is the terms of the loan.

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


221 Stein 1983: 202, n. 97 cited above.
224 Drikung 2011: 41.
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 žan* ‘maternal relatives’ rather than *yab khu* ‘paternal relatives’ to be recorded. According to Yamaguchi, in the later historical text the *Rlaṅ po ti bse ru* before the birth of the Yar luṅ dynasty of Tufan (the ruling dynasty of ancient Tibet) the patrilineal Dmu tribe and the matriarchal Sbraṅ married forming the composite patrilineal and matriarchal Sbraṅ Dmu tribe, and then married the Phywa tribe, the original tribe of the Yarluṅ dynasty. Because of that one can understand that the matriarchy of the Sbraṅ 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 滿足しない ‘unsatisfied’,230 Chu Junjie as 没到齊 ‘not yet assembled’,231 and Drikung as ‘still living’.232 I prefer Chu Junjie’s reading, but without good reason.

162 sku gñen ḭphrul: Bellezza regards *sku gñen ḭphrul* 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 ḭphrul 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 *gnaṅ-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.
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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 bźi ‘a round or square seat’ and translates ‘a square seat’.

164 bdag-cag ńan-pa yaṅ lha ẓal tsam mthon / lha bkaḥ tsam ńan: Karmay notes that the similar phrase lha ẓal bta ‘look at the god’ occurs in Ge khod bsan bahi dkar tshan (a section of the Ge khod gsaṅ ba drag chen, beginning on p.74, l. 3). 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”. This translation has various problems. First, bdag-cag is the plural ‘we’ and not the singular ‘I’. 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 ẓal tsam mthon) and ‘hear the god’s word’ (lha bkaḥ tsam ńan). Bellezza has missed this parallel construction. Chu Junjie translation is accurate, but also misses this parallel “若降神旨 [if we see the face of the god, if we surrender to god’s command]”. 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]”.

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.

237 Drikung 2011: 41.
238 Karmay 1998: 393, 401, l. 7, 409, l. 7.
239 Bellezza 2005: 12.
Stein mentions two epithets for this work ḫdzanṣ-pahi yi-ge Cilu-yag in PT 987 (l.11) and Cu-yag-gyi yi-ge in IOL Tib J 748 without specifying a line number.

167 log-men: a type of divination

Appendix: Two Further Fragments Related to PT 126

Gergely Orosz draws my attention to two addition 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 ža 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 che-ḥi gdan khri-la bže[g]ṅś [bšeñ ša] skyi-kyis rab-du ḥo[-]

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


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

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

(v7) na [ni] sri žu ḥṭshal žal mthon-bar ci gnañ / ža 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 gṣags [gṣegs] kyan lags / phyag žal mthon-bahi skabs

[a line of Uighur script in think black ink]


---

244 Chu Junjie 1990: 33, 36, n. 15.
245 Stein 1983: 178
(v10)ṅan-pa yaṅ / lo lom nes [lam nas] bsams zla lam-nas ni dgoṅs/ dbe [dpe] chen ni phyin ltar dril //

(v11)śul riṅ ni žags ltar bsdogs-ste / spyan lam dumchis / phyogs dbon žaṅ ni gdan ḥtshoms/


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

OL Tib J 747 verso
Translation
To the presence of the ruler Si-koṅ: it being the coming of the first dguṅ tshigs, the dguṅ lhags che-ba and many subjects were gladdened, and you ascended your precious throne. Happiness... extremely...have you caught an illness from sku gnen and...? Ruler Si-koṅ...

“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 daṅ 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...
Envoys of Phywa to Dmu

IOL Tib N 136 (M.I.iii.6)
A wood slip, 18.9cm x 1.9cm x 0.2cm

(r1) $/:/ gsolpaḥ [gsol paḥ] saṅ lags na / /[la] sku bla-la phyag tsam yaṅ bšes

(r2)[-]n lam tsam yaṅ mdzad/ na lha bdag-du brdan gšegs-dan [tsham]

(v1) [--]m-du ci gnaṅ/ /
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