
The present paper has emerged as a result of a relentless struggle of the author with diverse occurrences of the syllable *dku* in Old Tibetan documents. It attempts to understand and to bring together conflicting information that has arisen from the analysis of frequently confusing, sometimes even completely obscure, passages. As efforts made by other scholars, who previously endeavoured to resolve the puzzle of the OT *dku*, have revealed\(^1\), reducing its semantics to a common denominator — a single keyword — cannot be deemed an adequate approach. Moreover, when one additionally includes glosses from lexicographical works on Classical Tibetan in the corpus the situation around *dku* complicates intolerably. As a matter of fact, I was able to discern between thirteen (!) different and, to all appearances, mutually

---

\(^1\) Passages quoted from Old Tibetan texts have been checked against their scanned versions available online via IDP. For the manuscripts that have not been scanned yet, I have used the transliterations published by OTDO. Otherwise, the source for the transliteration is given in brackets. Canonical texts have been transliterated after ACIP. The Tibetan script is transliterated according to the principles put forward in Hahn 1996: 1. No special signs have been used for transliteration of Old Tibetan texts; this concerns letters as well as punctuation marks. Accordingly, the so called ‘reversed gi gu’ is transliterated as a regular gi gu. The Old Tibetan orthography is strictly followed. No distinction is made between a single and a double *tsheg*. Punctuation marks other than *tsheg* and *sad* (transliterated as a space and a slash respectively) are not accounted for. For the sake of readability I have used hyphens between syllables of Tibetan proper nouns in translations as well as in the discussion. All passages were rendered by the author as literally as possible in the hope, however, that their comprehension has not been hampered by the chosen method of translation.

\(^1\) Cf. the second part of the paper, where the results of earlier analyses are presented.
incompatible sememes attested in the available sources. Since it did not seem probable that a syllable of a rather uncommon morphology (stem consonant \( k \)- prefixed with \( d \)-) would represent such a high number of etymons an effort was made to relate some of them to each other using Old as well as Classical Tibetan sources. The results are presented in the following.

The paper consists of three sections. In the first part, all attested occurrences of the syllable \( dku \) (bound and unbound) in OT documents are listed accompanied by text linguistic analyses of the respective passages. For the sake of convenience, the examples are numbered and referred to by their numbers in the course of the analysis. Furthermore, additional fragments from other OT texts are quoted in order to help to understand the syntax of the clauses or the historical facts narrated therein. The second section contains a detailed enumeration of formations with the syllable \( dku \)- that have been encountered in various works, mainly on Old and Classical Tibetan but also sporadically modern spoken dialects. A summary and the first attempt to bring some of the sememes together is additionally provided at the end of the second section. The concluding section aims at combining information gathered from the first two sections in order to acquire a more thorough picture of the semantics of the lexemes involved and the possible ways of their derivations. In consequence, I was able to distinguish between two etymons from which all attested formations could be proven to have derived. To wit:

\[
\begin{align*}
dku^I & \text{ “to bend, to make crooked”;} \\
dku^II & \text{ “to rise, ascend, go beyond”}.
\end{align*}
\]

Table 4 at the end of the third section provides an overview of the OT lexical material that has been classified in accordance with the reconstructed etymons.

---

2 These, together with their derivatives, can be found in the second section of the present paper.
1. dku(·) and its derivatives in OT sources

\(\text{dku}^1 (\text{N})\)

(1)
\[
de \ 'i \ 'og \ du \ mthon \ myi \ 'briṅ \ / \ (69) \ po \ rgyal \ btsan \ nus \ byas \ te \ / \ / \ \text{dku}' \ ched \ po \ byas \ nas \ / \ / \ kho \ na \ 'i \ sriṅ \ mo \ mthon \ myi \ za \ yar \ steṅ \ / \ dag \ bskur \ / \ (70) \ te \ btaṅ \ ba \ las \ / \ / \ mo \ na \ dag \ 'thuṅs \ nas \ / \ / \ btsan \ nu \ bkum \ ba \ lags \ / \ / \ (PT \ 1287)
\]

“Thereafter, Mthon-myi-’briṅ-po-rgyal-btsan-nu, having served [as a councillor], did a great dku’. Then (nas), having sent his own sister Yar-steṅ, a lady from the Mthon-myi-[clan], a poison, [he] let [her drink it]. Upon that, after she had [unknowingly] drunk the poison, [one] killed Btsan-nu.”

We gather from this passage that doing a great dku’ brought death to Mthon-myi-’briṅ-po-rgyal-btsan-nu. It is not clear from the sentence whether poisoning should be understood as contained semantically in dku’ ched po or is it an independent action. One should notice, however, another occurrence of dku’ in connection with poison and poisoners, namely in (25).

(2)
\[
de \ 'i \ 'og \ du \ moṅ \ / \ (75) \ [kh]ri \ do \ re \ snaṅ \ tshab \ kyis \ byaste \ / \ / \ 'dzaṅs \ kyi \ tshad \ ni \ / \ rtsaṅ \ bod \ kyi \ jo \ bo \ mar \ mun \ brlags \ te \ / \ / \ (76) \ \text{dku}' \ ched \ po \ blod \ pa \ 'i \ tshe \ / \ / \ deṅ \ pho \ ŋa \ žig \ riṅs \ par \ 'oṅ \ ba \ sñaṁ \ gis \ / \ / \ pho \ ŋa \ 'i \ lan \ myur \ du \ / \ (77) \ bgyi \ 'tshal \ źes \ mchi \ nas \ / \ / \ (PT \ 1287)
\]

“Thereafter, Mon-[kh]ri-do-re-snaṅ-tshab served [as a councillor]; as regards the measure of [his] wisdom, at the time when, having conquered Mar-mun, the lord of Rtsaṅ and Bod, [he] was planning a great dku’, since [he] thought that a messenger went fast those days, [he] said ‘I wish the answer is quickly given to the messenger.’”

---

3 Apart from its occurrences in the passages quoted below, the syllable dku is also attested in dku yul (PT 1039: 15). However, as the comparison with other similar phrases has yielded, it is a variant reading either of dgu sul (PT 1060, PT 1285) or dgu śul (PT 1286) - both apparently proper names. I have made one exception as concerns the examples quoted and discussed below. To wit, I have included one example from Li yul luṅ bstan pa that is preserved only in the Tibetan Buddhist canon. The text has been edited and translated in Emmerick 1967. Another, earlier translation has been published in TLTD.1: 89-136. I decided to include the respective passage in the present paper for two reasons. First of all, it contains a hapax legomenon dku dar which resembles to a great extent two other OT compounds. Secondly, it is justified to date the composition of the text to the ninth or tenth century, i.e. to the period of the Old Tibetan language; for details see TLTD.1: 73-4 and Emmerick 1967: 1.
I cite additionally the following passages in order to elucidate the historical context of the above narration:

(2.1)

rgyal po ’di ’i riṅ la // khyuṅ po spuṅ sad kyis // (199) rtsaṅ bod kyi rjo bo mar mun mgo bchod de’ // rtsaṅ bod khyim nī gri // btsaṅ po ’i pyag du pulte / zu tse glo ba ņe ’o // (PT 1287)

“During the life of this king (i.e. Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan), Khyn-po-spun-sad, having cut off the head [of] Mar-mun, the lord of Rtsaṅ and Bod, [and] having offered 20,000 houses [of] Rtsaṅ and Bod to the btsaṅ po, was loyal.”

(22)

‘uṅ gi ‘og du // (201) btsaṅ po mched gñis la // moṅ sṅon po glo ba riṅs pa // zu tse glo ba ņe bas dku’ bel nas // btsaṅ po mched (202) gñis kyi sku la ma dar par // moṅ sṅon po bkum ste // zu tse glo ba ņe ’o // (PT 1287)

“Thereafter, the disloyalty of Moṅ-sṅon-po to both, btsaṅ po [Slon-mtshan and his] brother [Slon-kol], was dku bel by the loyal Zu-tse. Then, having killed Moṅ-sṅon-po so that [he] could not triumph over any of the brothers, Zu-tse was loyal.”

Since Moṅ-sṅon-po had been killed by Zu-tse (22), Zu-tse ascribed to himself the conquest of Mar-mun’s land (2.1) which had in reality been accomplished by Moṅ-khri-do-re-sñaṅ-tshab (2). By combining information from the above passages it occurs that, first, Moṅ-khri-do-re-sñaṅ-tshab and Moṅ-sṅon-po are one and the same person and, secondly, the dku’ ched po that Moṅ-khri-do-re-sñaṅ-tshab was planning in (2) was apparently to defeat the btsaṅ po (22). Once more (see above (1)) we see here a direct relationship between doing a great

---

4 This ‘improvement’ of the text to Zu-tse’s advantage has already been noticed by Dotson (forthcoming, p. 334 n. 20). We learn from PT 1287: 79-94 that Khyn-po-spun-sad-zu-tse followed Moṅ-khri-do-re-sñaṅ-tshab to the office of a councillor only indirectly. The succession order is given there as: Moṅ-khri-do-re-sñaṅ-tshab, Mgar-khri-sgra’-dzī-rmun, Myaṅ-maṅ-po-rje-žan-sñaṅ (death of Khri-slon-btsaṅ ~ Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan; enthronement of Khri-sron-brtsaṅ), Mgar-maṅ-žam-sum-sñaṅ, Khyn-po-spun-sad-zu-tse. Similarly, someone else’s success is ascribed to Zu-tse in the following passage: ziṅ po rje srid brlag pa ’i blo la’ // (203) gthogs te // zu tse glo ba ņe ’o // (PT 1287). “Belonging to the plan of destroying Ziṅ-po-rje[’s] dominion, Zu-tse was loyal.” As demonstrated below (see the comments to dku rgyal and dku rgyal pa), various persons are said to be involved in a plot against Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-pan-sum. Zu-tse, however, is not one of them. Neither did he participate in overthrowing Ziṅ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo, who is said to have been defeated by Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-pan-sum and Mñan’-dzī-zuṅ-nag-po (PT 1287: 119-134). No other Ziṅ-po-rje seems to be mentioned in the Old Tibetan Chronicles.
The semantic ‘capacity’ of the OT dku

The semantic ‘capacity’ of the OT dku and the death of the person responsible for that. Furthermore, it appears from (2) and (22) that planning a dku was synonymous with being disloyal (glo ba riṅs pa). The reading “disloyalty” for glo ba riṅs pa is explained below in the notes on *dku ’phel.

(3)

(4r146) ba brgo rpyi nas ni dku daṅ d(r?)in kyī nas / kyis ŋan kyī nas ma laṅs / (ITJ 734)
“As for bu brgo rpyi nas, [his] nas of ŋan is not good through nas of dku and drin.”

This passage is highly obscure. One can only state that dku is a noun and must be somehow semantically related to drin (or din?) even though the meaning of the latter term remains unknown in this context. The same text, however, draws a parallel between dku (also spelled as sku), ŋan, and bla/rla - all of which form the first constituents in compounds with the second element khaṅ/gaṅ (for details see Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. dku gaṅ).

(4)
mgrin bzaṅs (197) rgyal po ra ma na la / ‘khaṅ ste / / khyod ko bdag la mtho ’tsham mam / dku’ byed pa ’dra ste / bslu bslu nas / (198) bdag de ‘u (read: ’is?) bsad ches byas pa daṅ / / (ITJ 737; trslr. after de Jong 1989: 119, ms. A)
“Mgrin-bzaṅs, being angry at king Ra-ma-na, said: ‘You seem to mock me or do dku’; [you] were deceiving me. I have almost been killed.’

The same passage is rendered in the manuscript E as follows:

(4.1)
mgrin bzaṅ rgyal po la gsol pa / / bdag la ’tho (198) ’tsham ba ’dra / / bdag ni śi la thug ces gsol ba daṅ / / (PT 981)
“Mgrin-bzaṅ said to the king: ‘You seem to mock me. I was almost dead.’”

We can infer from (4) that slu denotes a more concrete action than mtho/’tho ’tsham and dku byed do (cf. the introductory function of ste

---

5 Cf. Thomas’ translation: “The son, Brgo-rpyi barley, being fetid or fragrant barley, fealty barley there is none.” (1957: 83).
6 Lit. “Being like someone who mocks me or does dku [...]”.
7 Both passages are translated also in De Jong 1989: 29.
in 'dra ste'), although all three share some semantic traits denoting actions that have negative effects on the person targeted. The story preceding the above sentences tells of an agreement between Mgrin-bzaṅ(s) and king Ra-ma-na to help each other. However, when Mgrin-bzaṅ(s) starts fighting, the king abstains from any reaction. In consequence, Mgrin-bzaṅ(s) reproaches the king for not helping him and accuses Ra-ma-na of failing to keep his word. We can presume a close semantic relationship between mtho 'tsham, dku' byed, and slu. The three are replaced in (4.1) by 'tho 'tsham.

(5)  
ma ŋes par srog srid la **dku** (29) daṅ / gnod pa byed pa žig yod na / su la bab [kyaṅ r]uṅ / dku' (30) ba daṅ / phe'u pa'i no khar myi dor bar / dku ba du gtogs pa // (31) bka gyod la gdags par gnaṅ ba daṅ / (Ţwa E; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 56-8)

“If there is a one doing **dku** and harm to [their] life or property without there being any offence [on their side], whoever it may be, it is allowed to charge (lit. bind to accusation) the one belonging to those doing **dku** without confronting [him] with (lit. throwing in the face of) those doing **dku** and phe'u pa.”

As the coordination in this passage demonstrates, **dku** must have shared some negative connotations with gnod pa, CT “damage, harm, injury” (J: 311b). The second part of the sentence informs us that unsubstantiated **dku** and gnod pa resulted in an accusation. Interestingly, both could apparently be done against one’s life or property.

**dku**II (V)

(6)  
gser gyi ni doṅ raḷ na (480) g.yu 'i ni mda' chig ma // ma 'phaṅs ni śa myi khuns / 'phaṅs na ni raḷ yaṅ stoṅs // re na ni gthaṅ du na / re **dku**' ni (481) mtshul du **dku**' // (PT 1287)

“In a golden quiver, [there is] a sole turquoise arrow. Had [one] not shoot [it], a stag shall not be killed. Had [one] shot [it], the quiver would indeed become empty. [Your] hopes are dashed. [They] are dashed as gthaṅ. [Your] hopes **dku**’. [They] **dku**’ to [your] nose.”

---

8 On the introductory function of the gerundial particle see Hahn 1996: 151-2, § 15.3, and Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. dgra zun.
The last two verses possess paralleling structures. On these grounds, one can assume that \textit{dku'}, like \textit{na}, is an intransitive verb with the subject \textit{re}, i.e. “hope(s), wish(es)”. For the proposed figurative reading of \textit{re na} as “dashed hopes” compare Southern Mustang “\textit{na} [...] with \textit{sempa} to be disappointed, to be sad, to feel hurt” (CDTD.V: 706). The rendering of the last two verses of the quotation is only tentative since the exact meanings of \textit{gthäñ} and \textit{mtshul} remain uncertain. This part of the song sung by \textit{btsan po ‘Dus-sron} seems to concern the dashed hopes of Mgar to dethrone the \textit{btsan po} and take over his position. The use of the verb \textit{na} would favour the reading \textit{gdañ Kyirong} “to recover (h.)”, Shigatse “to heal (h.)” (CDTD.V: 607), instead of the attested \textit{gthäñ}. The alternation \textit{th} ~ \textit{d} after the prefix \textit{g-}, however, is not a common one. Moreover, \textit{gdañ} belongs to the honorific register and would be incompatible with the discourse. Two other hypotheses are put forward without, however, drawing any final conclusions:

1. \textit{gthäñ du < *g}tad du “as a hold”, i.e. “[Your] hopes are dashed. [They] are dashed as a hold [for you].”
2. \textit{gthäñ du < *g}tan du “1always, continually, for ever; 2entirely, completely” (J: 205b): “[Your] hopes are dashed. [They] are dashed for ever.”

The first reading, which interprets \textit{gthäñ} as a noun, would form a better parallel to \textit{mtshul} of the next verse.

(7)
\begin{quote}
yul dbye mo yul drug na / dbye rje khar ba žig srin dbye srin yug mo’i mchid nas srin (8r326) yul mye myi \textit{dku} chu myi rlañ kyi yul du bkri žes na / (ITJ 734)
“In the land Dbye-mo-yul-drug, a demon Dbye-srin-yug-mo said [to] Khar-ba, the lord of Dbye: ‘[You] will be led to the land of demons, [to] the land where fire does not \textit{dku} [and] water does not evaporate.’”
\end{quote}

The phrase \textit{mye myi dku chu myi rlañ kyi yul} is repeated in ITJ 734 eleven times with \textit{dgu} and four times with \textit{dku}. In all these cases, it functions as a proper name of a land of demons (srin yul). Additionally, we find the variation \textit{srin yul mye myi rlañ chu myi rgum kyi yul} (6r239-40). This toponym appears to consist, in fact, of two clauses,

\footnote{9 The draft (2013) of the \textit{Comparative Dictionary of Tibetan Dialects} (CDTD) was put at author’s disposal in form of a pdf-file by late Prof. Bielmeier.}

\footnote{10 On problems with interpreting the latter verses see Denwood (1991: 135) and Dotson (forthcoming, p. 351 n. 20).}
mye myi dku and chu myi rlaṅ in which dku and rlaṅ are predicates negated with myi, hence: “fire that does not dku, water that does not rlaṅ”. I suggest to connect rlaṅ with CT rlaṅs “vapour, steam” (J: 537a) and laṅ “to rise, to get up; to arise” (J: 542b). As concerns the phrase *mye dku, one can cite hereto Jirel phō rncA “with me for a fire to hiss and send off sparks” (CDTD.V: 801, cited s.v. ‘phar although with a question mark).

**dku khyim**

(8)  
dku khyim sdaṅ ra / rma khyim phraṅ ra byad khyim (15) sre ga’i naṅdu ku ru ru sōg / ‘bod ‘bod / (PT 1039)

“[One] calls: ‘Go ku ru ruAdv to Sdaṅ-ra, the house of dku, [to] Phraṅ-ra, the house of rma, [to] Sre-ga, the house of byad!’”

dku khyim, rma khyim, byad khyim, and dug khyim (in l.7 of the same document) are analogously formed compounds. Therefore, we can presume a semantic relationship between dku-, rma-, byad-, and dug-. The latter two possess clearly negative connotations in OT texts. Furthermore, by analogy with the first constituents of the other compounds, we gather that dku- in dku khyim is a noun. The OT dku khyim attested in the above sentence should, in all probability, be treated separately from the CT dku khyim glossed in the second part of the paper under dku¹.

**dku gaṅ**

(9)  
khri bombs (95) dku’ gaṅ pub nas / btsan po sroṅ brtsan ston mo gsol bar byas te / / glo ba rins pa / mgar yul žuṅ (96) gis tshor nas / raṅ gi mgo bchod de gum mo / / (PT 1287)

“[He] built a dku’ gaṅ at Khri-boms. Thereafter, having arranged to hold (lit. give) a feast for btsan po Sroṅ-brtsan, the one who had been disloyal died having cut off his own head after [he] had been noticed by Mgar-yul-žuṅ.”

(10)  
(322) yul zuṅ khri bombs su mchis te / brtags na / / dku gaṅ pub par yul zuṅ gis tshor nas / / (PT 1287)

“When [Mgar]-yul-žuṅ, having gone to Khri-boms, examined [the place], he (lit. Yul-žuṅ) noticed that [one] had built a dku’ gaṅ [there].”
I propose to reconstruct *dku khaṅ* as *dku khaṅ phub*, lit. “to build a house/room of *dku*”\(^{11}\). Although no semantic relationship between *dku gaṅ* and *dku khyim* as discussed above could be discovered so far, their morphological parallelism is striking.

\[dku ‘gel\]

\[(11.0)\]
\[
stag skya bo ‘i yul / yul yel rab sde bži daṅ / (135) klum ya gsum / / ziṅ po rje khri paṅ sum gyis / ‘dus so’ / / (PT 1287)\]

“The land of [Ziṅ-po-rje]-stag-skya-bo, four districts [of] the land Yel-rab and Klum-ya-gsum, was joined by Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-paṅ-sum.”

\[(11)\]
\[
de ‘i *dku’ ‘gel* du mkhar (136) sdur bas bchod de / klum ya sum gyi smad / / mñan ‘dzi zuṅ gi bran du dñar to / / (PT 1287)\]

“Having split (lit. cut off) [the land of Ziṅ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo] with the castle Sdur-ba as its *dku’ ‘gel*, [Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-paṅ-sum] attached the lower part of Klum-ya-sum as serfs of Mñan-’dzi-zuṅ.”

In order to throw more light on the owner status of the castle Sdur-ba, the following additional passages are quoted:

\[(11.1)\]
\[
(118) / / mkhar pyiṅ ba stag rtse na ni rgyal stag bu sña gzigs bzung / / ņen kar rīṅ pa ni ziṅ po rje stag skya bo mchis / / (119) sdur ba ‘i yu sna na ni / / ziṅ po rje khri paṅs sum mchis / / (PT 1287)\]


\[(11.2)\]
\[
de nas gnam ri slon mtshan gyis pyag lcag gis / / (191) dras te / / myaṅ tseṅ sku ‘i bya dga’r / / mñan ‘dzi zuṅ gi mkhar sdur ba daṅ / bran khyim stoṅ lna bṛgya’ stsalto / (PT 1287)\]

“Thereafter, Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan, having decided (lit. cut with a stroke), gave as a reward to (lit. of) Myaṅ-tseṅ-sku the Mñan-’dzi-zuṅ’s castle Sdur-ba and one thousand five hundred households.”

\(^{11}\) For details see Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. *dku gaṅ*. 
First of all, one needs to notice that **sdur ba'i yu sna**, being the residence of Ziñ-po-rje-khri-pañ-sum (11.1), is not identical with Sdur-ba itself. The latter, taken chronologically, belonged to Mñan-'dzi-zuñ-nag-po (11.2) from whom it was handed over to Myañ-tsen-sku (11.2) by Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan as Myañ’s reward (**bya dga’**) for his participation in a revolt against Ziñ-po-rje-khri-pañ-sum (PT 1287: 133-4). Then, we learn that during the lifetime of Khri-sro-brtsan (i.e. Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan’s son), Myañ-mañ-po-rje-zañ-snañ was in possession of Sdur-ba (11.3); thus it remained in the hands of the Myañ clan.\(^{12}\) Now, going back to (11), we may state that, after defeating Ziñ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo, Sdur-ba fell to the lot of Mñan-'dzi-zuñ-nag-po. However, no mention is made in the OTC that the castle has ever belonged to Ziñ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo. On the contrary, from (11.1) we learn that the latter resided in old Ňen-kar. If that was the case, the question arises: to what or to whom does **de** at the very beginning of (11) refer? **de** is an anaphoric pronoun referring back to something that precedes it (cf. J: 255, CDTD: 3864) and as such cannot, by definition, refer to Mñan-'dzi-zuñ- who is mentioned first in the second part of the current sentence.\(^{13}\) In our case it could only be the land (**yuł**) of Ziñ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo or the person of Ziñ-po-rje-khri-pañ-sum — the only potential referents mentioned in (11.0). Since, as we already know, it was Mñan-'dzi-zuñ-nag-po who acquired the castle, **de** cannot refer to Ziñ-po-rje-khri-pañ-sum — Sdur-ba has never been in his possession. Thus, the only possibility left is that it refers to the subdued land; i.e. **de'i dku’ ‘gel du = lit. “as a dku’ ‘gel of [the land of Ziñ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo]”**.

Scholars who previously analysed the passage have proposed the

\(^{12}\) For a possible location of Sdur-ba and its assumed proximity to Yu-sna see Richardson 1998: 58.

\(^{13}\) Cf. also Denwood (1991: 135): “It is not certain however that **dku’ ‘gel refers to mÑan.” The analysis takes for granted that neither the discourse nor the grammar of the passage are distorted. However, as has already been established for other fragments of the text, this does not have to be the case.
following renditions for *dku*’ **gel:** “basse œuvre” (DTH: 134), “récompense” (Macdonald 1971: 234), “reward for rebellion” or “punishment for opposition” (Denwood 1991: 135), “prize” (Richardson 1998: 58), “lot for [one’s] intrigue” (Dotson, forthcoming, p. 275). These prove that, apart from Bacot’s translation which is hardly comprehensible to me, *dku*’ **gel** was interpreted as a near-synonym of *bya dga*.

Now, we shall juxtapose the first clause of the structure *dku*’ **gel** [**term**] *bchad* with some other similar phrases that contain the same verb, cf.:

(11.4)  
*bran gyi sa* (137) *ris kyi nañ du* // *myañ nam to re khru gru dañ* / *smon to re tseñ sku spad kyañ* // *’dzi zuñ gi bran du bchad do* // (PT 1287)  
“Within the territory of bondservants, one allotted also Myañ-nam-to-re-khu-gru and Smon-to-re-tseñ-sku, father and son, as bondservants of [Mñan]-’dzi-зуñ.”

(11.5)  
(56) *’greñ ni btson du bzuñ* // *dud ni mnañ su bchad nas* / *ba chos guñ dañ du gšegso* / (PT 1287)  
“[He] took men as captives [and] seized (lit. cut off) cattle as [his] property. Thereafter, [he] went to Ba-chos-guñ-dañ.”

I could trace two further clauses that attest to an additional, non-agentive, element in ergative, although they do not contain any complement in terminative:

(11.6)  
*bal mkhar dñul phrom gi sgo rtsig gis bcade* (126) *bžag pa la* (PT 1040)  
“Having cut off the door of Dñul-phrom (lit. “White silver”), the castle of Bal, by means of a wall, [he] left.”

(11.7)  
(19) *šul gis ni mdo bcad* (PT 1051)  
“[One] split the lower part of the valley with roads.”

However, our clause in (11) differs in one important detail from all quoted passages: it lacks a direct object. Assuming that the sentence is grammatically correct, we need to look for a potential object of the verb *bchad*. Since Ziñ-po-rje-khri-pañ-sum is the only possible subject (11.0), the land (*yul*) must be the object. Thus, by assembling information on the argument structure of *bc(h)ad* gained from (11.4) to
(11.7), we can now translate the clause de ‘i dku’ ’gel du mkhar sdur bas bchad as “[Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-paṅ-sum] split [the land of Ziṅ-po-rje-stag-skya-bo] with the Sdur-ba castle as [its] (i.e. the land’s) dku’ ’gel.”

**dku rgyal**

(12)
myaṅ tseṅ cuṅ dañ /pha spun po mu gseṅ gnis ni **dku** (read: dku rgyal) la / / (195) gthogs ste / dku rgyal pa ’i naṅ du yaṅ gthogs so / / (PT 1287)
“Both, Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ and [his] paternal cousin [Myaṅ]-mu-gseṅ, belonging to *dku rgyal, belonged to (lit. into the middle of) dku rgyal pa.”

I propose to reconstruct *dku rgyal, instead of the attested dku in line 194, on the basis of the structural similarity of the present sentence to the remaining ones. The sentences (13) and (14) contain the phrase dku’ rgyal la gthogs and in (17) we find the expression dku rgyal pa’i naṅ du yaṅ gthogs. These should be juxtaposed with the discussed dku la gthogs. Moreover, as explained in more detail below, neither Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ nor [Myaṅ]-mu-gseṅ belonged to any kind of dku (*dku la gthogs). They were relatives of Myaṅ-smon-to-re-tseṅ-skü who, among others, turned away from Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-paṅ-sum (PT 1287: 153-7).

(13)
dba’s dbyi tshab kyi tsha bo / / stag po rje myes snaṅ dañ / maṅ po (196) rje pu tshab gnis **dku’ rgyal** la gthogs so / / (PT 1287)
“Both grandsons of Dba’s-dbyi-tshab, [Dba’s]-stag-po-rje-myes-snaṅ and [Dba’s]-maṅ-po-rje-pu-tshab, belonged to dku’ rgyal.”

(14)
(196) tshes poṅ nag seṅ gi nu bo na gu **dku’ rgyal** la gthogs so’ / / (PT 1287)
“Na-gu, the younger brother of Tshes-poṅ-nag-seṅ, belonged to dku’ rgyal.”

(15)
blon stag sgra klu khoṅ / (32) gi bu tsha rgyud peld / **dku rgyal** gyi yi ge’ (33) lag na ’chaṅ ’chaṅ ba žig rabs chad (34) dam bkyon bab na yaṅ / dīṅul gyi yi ge (35) blar myi bzes par / blon stag sgra klu khoṅ / (36) daṅ / zla goṅ gi bu tsha rgyud gaṅ ne ba gcig (37) dīṅul gyi yi ge chen po g.yuṅ druṅ du stsal (38) par gnaṅ no / / (Zol N; trslr. after
Richardson 1985: 20)
“Even if the descendants of councilor Stag-sgra-klu-khoṅ, who hold in [their] hands the letter of dku rgyal, become extinct or bkyon falls [on them], it is granted that a great silver letter is given in perpetuity to the descendant of councilor Stag-sgra-klu-khoṅ and Zla-goṅ, who is [their] relative, so that the silver letter is not taken back to the authorities.”

None of the persons mentioned in connection with dku rgyal or dku rgyal pa (see below) is reported to have been engaged in fighting any kind of dku (cf. Table 1). The persons responsible for the fall of Ziṅ-po-rje-khrö-paṅ-sum are stated to have been either Dba’s-paṅs-to-redbyi-tshab, Myaṅ-smön-to-re-tseṅ-sku, Mnon-paṅ-sum-’drön-po, and Tshes-poṅ-nag-seṅ (PT 1287: 153-7) or the same but without the latter (ibid., ll.233-7). Those belonging to dku rgyal (Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ, Myaṅ-mu-gseṅ, [Dba’s]-tseṅ-po-rje-myes-snaṅ, [Dba’s]-paṅ-po-rje-pu-tshab, [Tshes-poṅ]-na-gu) are relatives of Myaṅ, Dba’s, and Tshes-poṅ.14 They neither were “victorious” (~rgyal) over a dku nor partici-

---

14 One could speculate why none of the descendants of Mnon-paṅ-sum-’drön-po is listed among dku rgyal pas. One of the reasons could be that certain Mnon-snang-grags revolted against the btsan po in 705/6 (ITJ 750: 151) and this could have brought disgrace on the whole line of Mnon, resulting in banishment and depriving the clan of its social position. This of course would once more support the hypothesis of a relatively late date of the composition of the OTC and of its anachronism; cf. hereto the above mentioned story of the defeat of Mar-mun. Although one could feel tempted to associate dku rgyal with the institution of comitatus as described by, e.g., Beckwith for some Central Asiatic societies (2009: 12ff.), one should emphasise once more that those who took part in the vow were not identical with those related to dku rgyal. The former group, however, does not seem to be referred to by any common name in the sources. Besides, there is no mention of any suicide after the death of Spu-rgyal-stag-bu (PT 1287: 163-4) nei-
pated in any kind of *dku*. In fact, none of the persons discussed in the present paragraph was ever mentioned in any connection with *dku* as analysed above, although one could say that Dba’s-paṅs-to-re-dbyi-tshab, Myaṅ-smon-to-re-tseṅ-sku, Mnon-paṅ-sum’drong-po, and Tshes-poṅ-nag-seṅ plotted against Ziṅ-po-rje-khri-paṅ-sum. One could thus draw a conclusion that *dku* as it occurs in (1) and (2) could be planned only against a rightful or, as it is sometimes expressed in OT sources, true ruler (*rje bden*, PT 1287: 149). The word *dku* was not used in any other case of protest or revolt, for instance, against a ruler that was perceived as cruel and unjust.

| Table 1 |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **bro stsal pa** | **bro la’ gthogs** | **bya dga’r stsal** | **dku la’ gthogs** | **dku rgyal la’ gthogs** | **dku rgyal pa** |
| (ll.173-4)       | (ll.177-8)       | (ll.191-4)       | (ll.194-5)       | (ll.195-6)       | (ll.195)        |
| Myaṅ-[smon-to-re]-tse[n?] -sku | Myaṅ-tseṅ-sku | Dba’s-dbyi-tshab | Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ | Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ | Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ |
| Dba’s-[phaṅs-to-re]-dbyi-tshab | Dba’s-myes-snaṅ | Dba’s-pu-tshab | Mu-gseṅ | Mu-gseṅ | Mu-gseṅ |
| Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ | Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ | Stag-po-rje-myes-snaṅ |
| Myaṅ-mu-gseṅ | Dba’s-myes-snaṅ |
| Stag-po-rje-myes-snaṅ |
| Dba’s-myes-snaṅ | Stag-po-rje-myes-snaṅ |
| Dba’s-pu-tshab | Dba’s-pu-tshab | Man-po-rje-pu-tshab | Na-gu |
| Tshes-poṅ-naṅ-gu | Tshes-poṅ-naṅ-gu |
| Mnon-[paṅ-sum]-’dron-po |
| Mnon-’dron-po |
| Tshes-poṅ-nag-seṅ |
| Tshes-poṅ-nag-seṅ |

From (15) it can be inferred that the affiliation to *dku rgyal*, confirmed by the possession of a letter, was hereditary and should be transferred to a close (lit. near) relative (*bu tsha rgyud gaṅ ńe ba*). From (12) – (14) we learn that paternal cousin (*pha spun po*), grandson (*tsha bo*), and younger brother (*nu bo*) could be considered close relatives.

(16) makes it clear that *dku* (here: *bku* *rgyal*) was not a closed group but could be accessed by those who contributed to the development ther after that of any other ruler. A ritual suicide, beside the burial with the ruler, was, according to Beckwith (ibid., p.150), the constitutional part of the comitatus institution. If that should be the case, we do not possess any textual evidence supporting the existence of comitatus in the Tibetan Empire.
of the state (government or religion), for instance, by clergymen (*dge sloṅ*).

Due to the negative connotations of *dku* mentioned here as well as in the notes on (2) and (22), it seems also highly improbable that *dku rgyal* should be understood as “best among *dku* (bas)” or “ruler of *dku*”. In these interpretations one would expect the negative connotations to have likewise been transferred to *dku rgyal*. This, however, cannot be corroborated by the textual evidence. On the contrary, *dku rgyal* appears to have denoted a social group of great esteem.

**dku rgyal pa**

(17)

*myaṅ tseṅ cuṅ daṅ / pha spun po mu gseṅ gṅis ni dku (read: dku rgyal) la / / (195) gthogs ste / dku rgyal pa 'i naṅ du yaṅ gthogs so / / (PT 1287)*

“Both, Myaṅ-tseṅ-cuṅ and [his] paternal cousin [Myaṅ]-mu-gseṅ, belonging to *dku rgyal*, belonged to (lit. into the middle of) *dku rgyal pa*.”

*dku rgyal pa* is a derivative of the compound *dku rgyal* by means of the affiliation particle -*pa*, i.e. lit. “the one belonging to *dku rgyal***.”

**dku rgyal gtsigs**

(18)

(1) // blon stag sgra klu khoṅ / (2) dku rgyal gtsigs gnaṅ (3) ba'ī mdo rdo riṅs la yig [du]**¹⁵** (4) bris pa' / / (Žol N; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 16)

“The text (*mdo*) of a *dku rgyal*-edict, that was issued (lit. granted) for councillor Stag-sgra-klu-khoṅ, has been written in script on the stone pillar.”

*dku rgyal gtsigs* was obviously an edict (*gtsigs*) issued by a ruler that confirmed the affiliation to *dku rgyal* (< *dku rgyal gyi gtsigs*). Thus, *dku rgyal* was an officially recognised group from the upper social class that could be granted silver (15) or golden (16) charter (*yi ge*).

Compare other edicts (*gtsigs*) issued likewise for groups of people according to OT sources:

---

kar po’i gtsigs (Rkoṅ 12; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 68) “edict of [Rkoṅ]-kar-po”
myaṅ gi gtsigs (Ţwa W 57; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 52) “edict of Myaṅ-[clan]”

*dku sgyu*

(19)
bod rgya gñis gaṅ gis snar ſes (69) pa la sdiug ciṅ ∥ lan du *dku sgyu* ci byas kyaṅ (70) gtsigs bsig pa la ma gtogs so ∥ (ST Treaty W; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 126)
“Even though Chinese or Tibetans, whichever of these two, committed a sin against the first offender (lit. one who is offending first) or resorted to a *dku sgyu* in reprisal, whatever it may be, [they] are not responsible for (lit. are not involved in) the violation of the edict.”

The meaning of the otherwise lexicographically not attested *dku sgyu* is supported by its synonym *dku lto*. Interestingly, the latter compound is scarcely documented in canonical texts. In fact, only one occurrence of this variant could be discovered so far.16 One finds, however, the form *rku lto* twice.17 The latter variant of the compound attests to folk etymologisation of its first member that must have taken place after *dku-* had ceased to be used and understood. The early date of the translations in which *dku lto* occurs further supports the hypothesis of the archaic character of *dku-*. Moreover, the fact that *dku-* has been replaced in some sources by a syllable of a highly negative meaning, i.e. *rku* “to steal, to rob” (J: 16a), suggests similar semantic connotations of *dku-*. The latter observation is confirmed by the occurrence of *dku sgyu* here in one context with *sdiug*.

*dku’ che*

(20)
spuṅ sad zu tse lte bu / tshor skyen la *dku’ che* (101) sñiṅ ’dzaṅs (PT

---

16 Cf. *Mdzanšs blun žes bya ba’i mdo* (H 347, mdo sde, sa 409v3).
17 In *Mdzanšs blun žes bya ba’i mdo* (H 347, mdo sde, sa 338r4) and *Thabs mkhas pa chen po saṅs rgyas drin lan bsab pa’i mdo* (H 361, mdo sde, a 159r1). All CT passages containing the relevant compound are translated in Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. *dku sgyu*. It may be assumed that *dku lto* has found its way into later lexicographical sources only because *Mdzanšs blun žes bya ba’i mdo* was scrutinised as one of the basic texts for Jäschke’s corpus.
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1287) 
“One like Spuñ-sad-zu-tse whose perception was keen and of great dku’ [bo], [and whose] heart was wise.”

Compare hereto dku’ bo che in (28). I understand la as a particle coordinating two attributes, skyen “keen” and dku’ che “of great dku’”. It should be emphasised that dku’ che, here an exocentric compound (lit. “having great dku’”), is an attribute of tshor “perception”. This is made clear by the particle la, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, by the lack of any coordinating marker between tshor skyen la dku’ che and sñiñ ’dzañs. As I argue in the third section of the paper, dku’ che is a compound < *dku bo che.

dku dar

(21) 
de nas mchis pa la rgya gar yul nas kyan rgyal po dharma aśoka’i blon po yaña žes bgyi ba la dku dar nas / blon po yaña spad spun rje khol ’khor yan chad rgyal po la mi dga’ ba bdun ston yul nas buyin stey / nub phyogs šar phyogs su yul tshol (trslr. after Emmerick 1967: 18, ll.4-8) “Then, as concerns (la) the one who has come, [he] did dku dar (lit. over) the councillor of king Dharmāśoka, the so-called Yaśa, even from the country of India. Therefore, seven thousand [people], up to councillor Yaśa, father and [his] children, [his retinue] of lords and subjects, who were unhappy about king [Sa-nu], having left (lit. gone out from) the country, searched for a [new] country in the east [and] west.”

Thus, we learn that dku dar could have negative consequences for those who were exposed to it (cf. the particle la). It obviously forced Yaśa to leave the country together with his subjects, although no direct contact or conflict between the councillor and Sa-nu seems to be alluded to.

Now, in order to elucidate the meaning and the valence of dar in the above passage some further sentences from OT sources should be cited:

(21.1) 
(5) // ’bal ldoñ tsab dañ / lañ (6) myes zigs / blon po chen pho (7) byed byed pa las / glo ba riñs (8) nas // / btsan pho yab khrí lde (9) gtsug risan gyi sku la darde (10) dguñ du gšegs so // / (11) btsan pho sras khrí sroñ lde brtsan (12) gyi sku la ni dard du ņe // (Ţol S; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 6) “Bal-ldoñ-tsab and Lañ-myes-zigs, upon acting as great council-
lors, became disloyal. Thereafter, [they] triumphed over the btsan pho, the father Khri-lde-gtsug-rtsan; [he] died. [They] were [also] close to triumph over the btsan po, the son Khri-sron-lde-brtsan.”

(22)
‘uṅ gi ’og du // (201) btsan po mched gñis la // moṅ sñon po glo ba riṅs pa / zu tse glo ba ņe bas dku’ bel nas // btsan po mched (202) gñis kyi sku la ma dar par // moṅ sñon po bkum ste // zu tse glo ba ņe ‘o // (PT 1287)
“Thereafter, the disloyalty of Moṅ-sñon-po to both, btsan po [Slon-mtshan and his] brother [Slon-kol], was dku bel by the loyal Zu-tse. Then, having killed Moṅ-sñon-po so that [he] could not triumph over any of the brothers, Zu-tse was loyal.”

dar seems to have been used to express domination over one’s own ruler by unauthorised claimants to the throne. The honorific register is marked in (21.1) and (22) by the usage of the expression btsan po GEN sku ALLAT, instead of the simple HUM ALLAT of the passage (21). This can be compared with the well known custom of using more elaborate phrases with regard to btsan pos, cf.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{btsan po} \text{GEN} & \quad \text{sku la} \quad \text{dar} \\
& \quad \text{sñan du} \quad \text{gsol} \\
& \quad \text{spyan} \quad \text{’dren} \\
& \quad \text{ža sña nas} \quad \text{’tshal, etc.} \\
& \quad \text{phyag du}
\end{align*}
\]

Their meanings do not differ from those of their equivalents in the normal register. Moreover, the juxtaposition of the above quoted passages and the following schematic representation of their argument structures proves that dku dar is nearly synonymous with dar and should in all probability be understood as a verbal synonymic compound; cf.:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dku dar:} & \\
\text{HUM ALLAT} & \quad \text{dku dar (21)} \\
\text{dar:} & \\
\text{HUM GEN} \text{sku ALLAT} & \quad \text{dar (21.1)} \\
\text{HUM GEN} \text{sku ALLAT} & \quad \text{dar (22)}
\end{align*}
\]

18 Cf. Tabo τατ “to become famous, to be popular”, Tholing, Ruthok, Gar, Gergey, Purang, Tshochen τατ “to be prevalent”, Southern Mustang τατ κα “to spread, to become famous”, Lhasa τατ “to be prevalent”, Gertse τατ “to be prevalent” (CDTD.V: 589).
Since *dar* is unanimously glossed as an ncA verb in modern dialects, the elements marked with ALLAT must be understood as its optional complements that do not belong to the argument structure of this verb. Thus, the question arises as to who/what is the subject in the above clauses. In (21.1) the only possible subjects of *dard* in both its occurrences are 'Bal-lడo- Bengals and La-n-eyes-zigs. Although the grammatical situation is slightly more complicated in (22), the context allows only one reading, i.e. Zu-tse killed Mo-n-snon-po in order to prevent him from doing *dar* to the btsan po. Thus, the final argument structure appears to have been:

HUM.1\textsubscript{ABS} HUM.2\textsubscript{ALLAT} *dar* ncA “HUM.1 is prevalent over HUM.2”

The absolutive case of the subject, although not documented in any of the above clauses, is reconstructed on the basis of the dialectal data cited above that attest to *dar* as an ncA verb. I assume that this construction, which we encounter only in connection with btsan pos, had in this very context the idiomatic meaning “to triumph (over)” and was used as a form of euphemism to avoid the highly unwelcome image of a rightful ruler being defeated and killed.

As opposed to (21.1) and (22), *(dku)* *dar* in (21) does not imply the death of Yaśa. He is not even banished but decides himself to leave the country. The context makes it clear that it must be Sa-nu, sent by a Chinese king to look for a country for himself, from whom Yaśa flees. However, if one decides to split *dku* *dar* and interpret *dku* as the subject of the verb *dar*, two problems arise. First of all, the highly marked structure of the intransitive clause *HUM\textsubscript{ALLAT} dku\textsubscript{ABS} dar* “dku spreads over HUM”\textsuperscript{19} needs an explanation which I would not be able to offer. Secondly, if *mchis pa* refers to Sa-nu or his arrival and *dku* should express a trait of his character or an action that forced Yaśa to flee, then locating *dku* that far away from *mchis pa* in the clause and separating these two with two other quite long complements ([rgya gar yul nas kyaṅ] [rgyal po dharma aśoka'i blon po yaśa žes bgyi ba la]) would be even more unusual. Thus, being unable to offer a reasonable solution to the above objections I maintain my assumption that *dku* *dar* is a verbal compound. This hypothesis is additionally supported by the existence of another verbal compound with *dku* as its first constituent, namely *dку ’phel* for which see below.

---

\textsuperscript{19} This reading was chosen by Emmerick, cf. his translation “his wiles extending” (1967: 19). Emmerick’s rendering of the respective sentence is based on an erroneous grammatical analysis and cannot be maintained.
*dku ’phel

(22) ‘uṅ gi ’og du // (201) btsan po mched gñis la // moṅ sñon po glo ba riṅs pa / zu tse glo ba ņe bas dku’ bel nas / / btsan po mched (202) gñis kyi sku ma dar par / / moṅ sñon po bkum ste / / zu tse glo ba ņe ’o / / (PT 1287)

“Thereafter, the disloyalty of Moṅ-sñon-po to both, btsan po [Slon-mtshan and his] brother [Slon-kol], was dku bel by the loyal Zu-tse. Then, having killed Moṅ-sñon-po so that [he] could not triumph over any of the brothers, Zu-tse was loyal.”

(23) (315) // ‘uṅ gi ’i ’og du // khuyṅ po spuṅ sad zu tses // myaṅ żaṅ snaṅ btsan po la glo ba riṅs pa // / zu tses dku’ bel te // / żaṅ snaṅ bkum ste / / zu tse (316) glo ba ņe ’o / / (PT 1287)

“Thereafter, Khyuṅ-po-spuṅ-sad-zu-tse, having dku’ bel the disloyalty [of] Myaṅ-jaṅ-snaṅ to the btsan po, killed Żaṅ-snaṅ. Zu-tse was loyal.”

(24) ‘uṅ gi ’og du // btsan po [khri?] sroṅ rtsan gyi riṅ la / (r2) myaṅ żaṅ snaṅ glo ba riṅs pa zu tses dku ’pel te // / btsan po’i sṅan du gsol te / żaṅ snaṅ bkum nas zu tse (r3) glo ba ņe’o / / (ITJ 1375)

“Thereafter, during the lifetime of btsan po Khri-sroṅ-rtsan, the disloyalty [of] Myaṅ-jaṅ-snaṅ was dku’ pel by Zu-tse. Having reported [it] to the btsan po, [Zu-tse] killed Żaṅ-snaṅ. Then, Zu-tse was loyal.”

One finds two variants of the respective formation in OT sources; namely, dku’ bel (22 & 23) and dku’ pel (24). Whereas the word internal b- of the former variant can be easily explained as resulting from voicing of a consonant between two vowels20, the second variant seems to be the lectio difficilior. The text of ITJ 1375, from which dku’ pel stems, contains neither spelling errors nor alternations between voiceless and voiced consonants. Thus, I argue that the formation should be reconstructed as *dku ’phel.21

Now, if we look for ’phel in dictionaries we find two highly interesting details. First of all, the verb, CT “vb.n. to spel ba, opp. to ’grib pa, 1to increase, augment, multiply, enlarge; 2to improve, to grow bet-

20 For further examples of word-internal voicing in OT compounds see Bialek (forthcoming a), chapter Compounding in Old Tibetan.

21 On a common deaspiration in second syllables of compounds see Bielmeier 1988a: 48 n. 19 for dialectal data and Bialek (forthcoming a), chapter Compounding in Old Tibetan, for OT examples.
The semantic ‘capacity’ of the OT dku ter” (J: 357a), is intransitive and non-controllable (CDTD.V: 810: ncA in all surveyed dialects). If we analyse the syntax of the above sentences, the following schemes emerge:

(22) \[\text{[HUM}_{\text{ALLAT}}] \quad X_{\text{ABS}} \quad \text{HUM}_{\text{ERG}} \quad \text{dku bel}\]
(23) \[\text{[HUM}_{\text{ERG}}] \quad X_{\text{ABS}} \quad \text{HUM}_{\text{ERG}} \quad \text{dku bel}\]
(24) \[X_{\text{ABS}} \quad \text{HUM}_{\text{ERG}} \quad \text{dku ‘pel}\]

Leaving aside the bracketed elements\(^{22}\), the remaining parts of the clauses are identical. Firstly, it appears that \(^\star\text{dku ‘phel}\), being diachronically either a verbal compound or an incorporation, shall be treated synchronically as a one word.\(^{23}\) Furthermore, we observe that the order of the arguments here is unusual; in unmarked transitive constructions, the word order is always \(S_{\text{ERG}}O_{\text{ABS}}V\). However, all three passages have the reverse order of arguments. In conclusion, I assert that all three clauses are in fact intransitive; the verb \(^\star\text{dku ‘phel}\), in accordance with the argument structure of \(‘phel\), requires one argument and that is a subject in absolutive. The remaining part, \(zu\ tse_{\text{ERG}}\) is an optional complement.\(^{24}\)

\(^{22}\) It is contended that the bracketed elements in (22) and (23) resulted from misunderstanding of the text by the scribe. Neither of them can properly be fitted in the argument structures of the respective clauses. Taken at its face value, (23) would contain two (identical!) agentive arguments whereas in (22) \(\text{btsan po mched gñis la}\) came into being most probably through a confusion of the original \(^\star\text{btsan po […]}\) \(\text{gyi riṃ la}\) (cf. (24)) with the phrase \(\text{btsan po mched gñis kyi sku la}\) occurring just one line below in the same sentence of (22). As the comparison of the three sentences demonstrates (see the schemes above), the other complements correspond closely to each other whereas the bracketed elements offer oddly (22 & 23) or are missing (24).

\(^{23}\) The only alternative would be to interpret \(‘phel\) as a ditransitive verb with two arguments in absolutive (\(\text{moi snon po / myan žaṅ snan}\) \[\text{btsan po la}\] \(\text{glo ba riṅs pa & dku}\)) and one in ergative (\(zu\ tse\) \[\text{glo ba riṅs ba}s\]). Although verbs with this argument structure did indeed exist in OT (e.g., verbs of giving), the order of the arguments in the above clauses \([\text{ABS - ERG - ABS}]\) would be highly untypical. Besides, neither the reconstructed \(‘phel\) nor \(^\star\text{bel}\) proposed, e.g. by Denwood (1991: 133), are attested as ditransitive verbs. \(^\star\text{bel}\) could not have been a verb of speaking, as hypothesised by Denwood (ibid.), since OT ditransitive verbs of speaking consistently display the argument structure \(X_{\text{ERG}} Y_{\text{ALLAT}} QUOT \text{SAID}\), i.e. \(‘X \text{SAID QUOT to Y}’\); cf., for instance: \(\text{bu spus (read: pus?) la ‘greṅ nus tsam nas / ma la QUOT (29) žes zer to / (PT 1287). “As soon as the boy was able to stand upright (lit. straighten up on [his] knees), [he] said to [his] mother: QUOT."\)

\(^{24}\) For an analogous intransitive structure with an ergative complement compare, e.g., (11.0) where the only legitimate argument of the INTR verb \(‘dus\ is \text{stag skya bo ‘i yul / yul yel rab sde bži daṅ / klum ya gsum in ABS}, whereas \(\text{ziṅ po rje khrī paṅ}\) \(\text{sum gyi}s\) has to be treated as an optional complement in ERG. Another example that contains the verb \(‘phel\), can be cited from PT 1290: (r1) \[\text{kyle legs ņes dbyar gyi yon}, \] \[\text{[skyes dgu rims kyi}s] \(\text{phyir žiṅ rgyas la ‘phel \(“\text{Truly! Gifts of good and bad dbyar increase and multiply through droves of nine [classes of] beings.”.\)\}

As concerns the subject of the verb *dku 'phel, I assume that the head of the subject arguments in all three clauses is glo ba riṅs pa and not moṅ sṅon po or myaṅ žan snaṅ. This assertion is supported by the following example where in a phrase of the structure ‘HUMAbs glo ba riṅs pa’ the latter part, i.e. glo ba riṅs pa, is clearly the head:

(24.1)
klu khoṅ gis / 'bal (15) daṅ / laṅ glo ba riṅs pa'i gtan (16) gtṣigs // btsan pho sras khri sroṅ (17) lde brtsan gyi sñaṅ dū gsold nas (Zol S; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 6-8)
“[Stag-sgra]-klu-khoṅ handed over to btsan pho, the son Khri-sroṅ-lde-brtsan, a proof (lit. a decree of surety) for the disloyalty [of] 'Bal and Laṅ.”

Translated literally the respective phrase would be “a proof of being disloyal [by] 'Bal and Laṅ” — only “disloyalty” can be proven and not ”'Bal and Laṅ”. Accordingly, it is assumed that in the examples (22) - (24) the phrase glo ba riṅs pa, understood as a verbal noun, is the head of the pertinent phrases. Thus, the preliminary translation could be proposed as “The disloyalty of Moṅ-sṅon-po/Myaṅ-žan-snaṅ was *dku phel by Zu-tse.”

Secondly, 'phel is listed as a synonym of dar, cf. D: 849b, s.v. 'phel ba. dar and 'phel are also glossed in CDTD.V with the meanings ”get spread” and “spread”, among others (cf. the English index). According to CDTD.V: 589, dar is likewise an ncA verb in modern dialects. Apart from that, rgya, CT “to be wide, extent” (J: 106a), is also documented as an ncA verb in modern spoken Tibetan (cf. CDTD.V: 272). Even more interesting is the following juxtaposition of meanings shared by the three in the modern dialects (Table 2, prepared after the English index in CDTD.V):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“to expand”</th>
<th>“to get spread”</th>
<th>“to increase”</th>
<th>“to spread”</th>
<th>“to swell”</th>
<th>“to thrive”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rgya</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>‘phel</td>
<td>rgya</td>
<td>rgya</td>
<td>rgya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dar</td>
<td>‘phel</td>
<td>‘phel</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>‘phel</td>
<td>‘phel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the following two examples demonstrate, the semantic proximity of these verbs can be observed already in OT: rgyas la ‘phel (PT 1290:

---

25 In addition, we can infer from the structure of (23) that it was the act of being disloyal that was directed against the btsan po (btsan po la) and not dku ‘pel made by Zu-tse "to btsan po". The semantics of ‘phel’s subjects encountered in OT documents is analysed in more detail in Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. dku ‘pel.
Curiously enough, we have now three OT formations consisting of the first member dku and whose second elements morphologically greatly resemble the near-synonym verbs just listed; to wit: dku rgyal, dku dar, and dku ‘pel/bel.

**dku ba**

(25)

*yab gnem (301) ri slon mtshan dug bon te bkoṅs so // sras sroṅ brtsan sku gзон ma phan te // gzod ma (302) dku’ ba daṅ / dug pa rnams rabs bchod do // (PT 1287)

“Having given a poison to the father Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan, [one] killed [him]. The son Srōṅ-brtsan of young body, not being ?effective?, destroyed first the lineages of dku ba’ and poisoners.”

(5)

*ma ņes par srog srid la dku (29) daṅ gnod pa byed pa žig yod na / su la bab [kyaṅ r]un / dku’ (30) ba daṅ / phe’u pa’i no khar myi dor ba(r?) / dku ba du gtogs pa // (31) bka’ gyod la gdags par gnaṅ ba daṅ / (Ţwâ E; trslr. after Richardson 1985: 56-8)

“If there is a one doing dku and harm to [their] life or property without there being any offence [on their side], whoever it may be, it is allowed to charge (lit. bind to accusation) the one belonging to those doing dku without confronting [him] with (lit. throwing in the face of) those doing dku and phe’u pa.”

From these we can infer that dku ba belonged to one semantic field with, on the one hand, dug pa “poisoner” (25), and, on the other hand, with phe’u pa (5). The meaning of the latter remains unknown although it may be stated that both, dku ba and phe’u pa, were somehow involved in judicial issues.27 (25) seems to suggest that dku ba were equally responsible for the death of Srōṅ-brtsan’s father as the poisoners were. (5) makes it clear that dku ba is derived from the lexeme dku as it occurs in (1), (2), and (5).

---

26 Compare hereto CT spel rgyas par byed pa “in Menge vermehren, allgemein machen, allgemein verbreiten” (Sch: 330b, s.v. spel ba).

27 I remain sceptical about the etymological relationship between phe’u pa and bel/pel in dku bel/pel that has been proposed by Denwood (1991: 133). First of all, the derivation by means of the -l suffix in examples cited by Denwood (rde’u ~ rdel, dre’u ~ drel, spre’u ~ spre), as well as in all the other cases known to me, is exclusively nominal. No verb has been reported so far as derived by means of the suffix. Besides, as has been argued above, the second member of the formation dku bel/’pel is interpreted in the present paper as going back to the verb *phel.
"dku ba"II

(26)
(a9) ša chañ dan / dku ba rnam pa lña bsruñ dgos so (Tu 7; trslr. after Taube 1980: 74)
“[One] should beware meat, beer, and five kinds of fetid foods.”

Obviously, this dku ba is not identical with dku baI above. Occurring together with ša and chañ, it clearly belongs to the semantic field of foods, and so can be connected with the etymon dkuII as presented in the second part of the paper. It shares, however, one characteristic with many of the OT usages of the syllable dku-, namely, it is negatively valued and denotes objects that should be avoided.

Although not identified as such by Taube, a cursory check of canonical sources at RKTS proves that the manuscript Tu 7 is a fragment of ’Phags pa byaṅ chub sens dpa’ spyan ras gzigs dbaṅ phyug phyag ston spyan ston dañ idan pa thogs pa mi mña’ ba’i thugs rje chen po’i sens rgya cher yoṅs su rdzogs pa žes bya' ba'i gzuṅs (H 654, rgyud, pa 392v3-454v5). The sentence in question occurs in fol.419v5-6 and differs from the one cited above with regard to the syllable bsruṅ which in Lhasa canon is replaced by sruṅ. Compare also the following passage from another canonical text:

(26.1)
ša dañ / chañ dañ / sgog pa la sogš pa dku ba’i zas rnamese kun tu span bar bya’o / / (’Phags pa mi g.yo ba žes bya’i gzuṅs, H 611, rgyud, pa 9v4; trslr. after ACIP)
“[One] should completely renounce meat, beer, garlic, and the like - foods that are fetid.”

"dku babs"

(27)
da myi rma bu mchiṅ rgyal ‘di dku (27) babs ni dgu bgyis (PT 1039)
“Now, this Myi-rma-bu-mchiṅ-rgyal being dku babs, did dgu.”

The translation is only tentative. A preliminary explanation of the phrase dku babs will first be offered in the third part of the present paper. The reading *dku bgyis instead of dgu bgyis, although theoretically supported by the existence of the analogously formed phrase dku byed (see (1, 4 & 5)), remains highly speculative.
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*dku bo*

(28)  
myi maṅ gi rje / yul che ‘i bdag (27) byed byed pa las / rgyal po btsan ba daṅ / blon po ’dzangs pa dku’ bo che rnams kyis / gchig (28) gis gchig brlag ste / ’baṅs su bkug na / (PT 1286)  
“The lord of many people, upon functioning as a master of a great land, subdued (lit. gathered as subjects) mighty rulers and wise ministers of great dku bo who were destroying each other.”

dku’ bo che “of great dku bo” can be juxtaposed with dku’ che “of great dku” as attested in (20). Both function as attributes describing powerful people. It is apparent that dku’- and dku’ bo were nouns that could be qualified with che. In this context, one should additionally mention the nominal phrase dku’ ched po in (1) and (2).

*dku zaṅs / dku chaṅ / dku lug*

(29)  
zaṅs dku zaṅs byad zaṅs ni btsugs dku chaṅ (18) hug pa chaṅ ni btsos / dku lug sdaṅ lug byad lug ni btsos (PT 1039)  
“As regards a kettle, a kettle of dku, a kettle of byad, [one] put [them] down. As regards beer of dku [and] beer of hug pa, [one] brewed [them]. As regards a sheep of dku, a sheep of sdaṅ, [and] a sheep of byad, [one] killed [them].”

By complementing the above clauses with other passages from the same text we acquire the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dku zaṅs</th>
<th>dku chaṅ</th>
<th>dku lug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>byad zaṅs</td>
<td>byad chaṅ</td>
<td>byad lug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hug pa chaṅ</td>
<td>sdaṅ chaṅ</td>
<td>sdaṅ lug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this it occurs that dku- belonged to one semantic field with byad- and sdaṅ-. The two latter morphemes possessed highly negative

---

28 hug pa does not seem to match the other formations. First of all, dku chaṅ, byad chaṅ, and sdaṅ chaṅ are clearly disyllabic formations, with the first constituent truncated in case of sdaṅ chaṅ. Thus, one would rather expect *‘ug chaṅ. Furthermore, hug pa, when mentioned in one context with chaṅ, calls to mind ‘ug pa “[adakh] also for yug po oats” (J: 499b) and ‘ug ri “kind of chang” (CDTD: 7574). I assume that, in consequence of folk etymologisation, the lexeme hug pa has replaced another less known one, that, however, better corresponded to the seman-
connotations in OT sources. Accordingly, the same might be assumed for dku- as used here.

\[ k\text{ho}ñ \text{dku} \]

(30)
(12) grogs la \textit{khoñ dku} myi byed de mo bzañ no (PT 1046b; trslr. after OTDO)
“Not doing \textit{khoñ dku} to a friend, the lot is good.”

(31)
(132) rogsla \textit{khoñ dku} ma che žig dañ mo bzaño (ITJ 740; trslr. after OTDO)
“Do not let [your] \textit{khoñ dku} to be great towards [your] friend! The lot is good.”

In order to throw more light on the second example I should quote two further sentences from the same text:

\[ \text{myi nad phyugs nad myi 'on} \text{gis sñi}ñ \text{lo mal} \]

(33) dru phob šig dañ mo bzaño (ITJ 740; trslr. after OTDO)
“Since the illness of a man [and] the illness of cattle do not come, throw sñiñ lo in [its] place! The lot is good.”

\[ \text{lha la phyag 'tshol cig} \]

(162) dañ mo bzaño (ITJ 740; trslr. after OTDO)
“Pay homage to deities! The lot is good.”

These prove that the sequence /cig/+dañ marks the imperative. This is made even more obvious by the verbs phob in (31.1) and 'tshol in (31.2) that immediately precede the sequence and that are V4 stems of 'bebs and 'tshal respectively. To sum up, the first part of (31) should likewise be interpreted as a kind of command.

\[ \text{tics of dku-, byad-, and sdañ-. It might have been *hur- for which compare hur pa}
\]

“calamities” (Bellezza 2008: 276); hur pa byed pa “to harm life, to kill” (LZB: 285);
hur po “quick, alert, dextrous (sic!), clever; hot, hasty, passionate” (D: 1329a);
\[ \text{phor} \text{duñ} \text{gdu} \text{attested in PT 1039: 31 could be a variant of the discussed compound.}
\]

The context, however, remains unclear to me and for this reason I have restrained from including the passage here.
From (30) and (31) it appears that khoṅ dku had strong negative connotations. It apparently denoted an attitude or an action that should not be undertaken towards one’s friend.

\[\text{naṅ dku}\]

(32) gtor pa tsam (127) gyi Ṉo myi la btab na / g.yon can naṅ dku che dgra phywa la btab na / dgra myi thubs (128) bud med ša dag rgyo ste mo ḇan (ITJ 740; trslr. after OTDO)

“If thrown the side of a gtor pa for a man, the fornicator is of great naṅ dku. If thrown for a dgra phywa, dgra is not thubs. Only shagging women; the lot is bad.”

Although the passage is to a great extent unintelligible to me, two things can be said about the compound naṅ dku. To wit, together with che, “of great naṅ dku”, it qualifies g.yon can “a fornicator” and as such it is bound to a bad lot. Apart from that, we observe its analogous morphology when compared with khoṅ dku: both end with the syllable -dku and their first constituents are near-synonyms. We learn also that not doing or not being of great khoṅ dku is positive while a great naṅ dku is a negative value. To sum up, it occurs that khoṅ dku and naṅ dku were synonymous expressions.

2. dku and its derivatives in later lexicographical sources

Presented below are the attested meanings of dku and its derivatives grouped according to the assumed semantic links.

\[\text{dku}\]

“kukṣi” (Mvy: 4030); “udaram; kukṣih; kaṭih” (Negi.1: 105a); “sübege; sta zur dpyi mgo; lto ba ’am gsus pa’i miṅ grants; belge; gsan gnas; dpyi mgo” (SR: 1: 56.2, 4, 6); “lus kyi dpyi mgo; lte ba nas dpyi mgo’i bar gyi cha šas; bud med kyi bu snod; pho ba’am gsus pa” (BTC: 60a); “dpyi mgo daṅ; pho ba’am gsus pa daṅ; bsam se’am bu snod bcas du mar ’jug ste” (DSM: 17a); “the side of one’s body” (Cs: 66b); “uterus, womb; hip bone; stomach” (Gs: 22b); “Seite, Hüfte; auch Bauch” (WTS: 3: 172b-3a); “side” > “royal side” > the surrounding of the king, the court” > “nobleman” (Róna-Tas 1955: 264 n. 39)

\[\text{dku ma}\]: “ventre” (Desg: 23a)

\[\text{dku skabs}\]: “gsus pa’i skabs mtshams te sta zur gyi thad” (BTC: 60a)

\[\text{dku skyob}\]: “ral gri; kaukṣeyakah” (Negi.1: 105a; kaukṣa “abdominal,
ventral”, MW: 315a; kaukṣeyaka “being in a sheath, a sword”, MW: 315a)
dku khyim: “sked pa nas dpyi ‘go’i bar zer” (BRTD: 140a)
dku rgyal: “prince” (DTH: 139); “side of the king, courtier” (Róna-Tas 1955: 264)
dku rgyal pa: “prince” (DTH: 139)
dku ici: “lus la phru gu chags rkyen gyis dpyi mgo’i thad nas tshor ba’i ici ŋams” (BTC: 60a)
dku mñe: “stan; ā sanam” (Negi.1: 105a); “(rñiñ) ā me; 2stan” (BTC: 60a); “āsana, a rug to sit upon; a seat” (D: 53a)
dku lto: “gsus lto” (BTC: 60a); “stomach, abdomen” (Gs: 22b)
dku do: “trika” (Negi.1: 105b)
dku mtsāms: “brother of whole blood; uterine brother” (R.1: 99b)
dku mtschuṅs: “sodaraḥ” (Negi.1: 105b); “Bez. leiblicher Geschwister” (WTS.3: 174a)

dkuII “mauvaise odeur” (Desg: 23a); “schlecht riechen, stinken” (WTS.3: 173a)
dku ba: “= dri ŋa ba; pūtiḥ” (Negi.1: 105b); “II+dri ma ŋan pa” (BTC: 60b); “sweet scent” (Cs: 66b); “stench; putrid smell” (D: 53a); “to smell” (Gs: 22b); “scharf” (Taube 1980: 147a); “offensive; [...] seems to refer mainly to a set of five malodorous plants (onions and the like) whose smell is regarded as offensive to the gods” (Denwood 1991: 132)
dku ma: “Geruch” (WTS.3: 174a)
dku dar: “having a bad odour” (TLTD.1: 100)
dri dku: “dri ma dku ba’i bsdus tshig” (BTC: 1325a)

dkuIII
dku ba: “I(tha mi dad pa) 1laŋ ba’am; 3(rñiñ) lhag pa daṅ. lus pa” (BTC: 60b); “lhag ste” (DSM: 17b); “lhag pa daṅ lus pa” (BYD: 15a); “2Rest” (WTS.3: 173b); “6arc. to be leftover” (Gs: 22b)
dku ste: “lhag ste” (DSM: 17b; cf. also s.v. dgu ste); “= lhag ste; de plus” (Desg: 23a); “= lhag ste, šeṣa; remaining; in excess” (D: 53a)
dku ‘gel: “lhag ’phro” (DSM: 17b)
dku rgyal: “exaltation” (Richardson 1952: 29); “ennoblement” (Richardson 1985: 17); “promotion” (ibid., p. 160); “level” (Heller 1994: 13)
dku rgyal gtsigs: “the edict for the ennoblement” (Richardson 1985: 17)

---

30 According to Mimaki (1992: 481), BDSN glosses dkug ste with lhag ste. dkug is obviously a misspelling for the original dku.
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**dku stabs:** “mrīṣu; sekūči” (SR.1: 56a); “supplément” (Desg: 23a)

*dku tshod:* “projet, intention” (Desg: 23b; s.v. dgu tshod)

*dku mtshan:* “prize” (J: 84b; s.v. dgu mtshan)

**dku IV**

**dku ba:** “(tha mi dad pa) 2’bab pa’am. lhuṅ ba” (BTC: 60b); “4mchi ma ’dzag pa” (DSM: 17a); “5to fall” (Gs: 22b); “3herabfallend, herabtropfend” (WTS.3: 174a)

**mchi ma dku ba:** “mig chu ’dzags pa” (GC: 276a); “1mchi ma ’dzag pa’i don te. 2 ŋu bro ba’i min ste” (DSM: 185a)

**mig chu dku ba:** “mig gi mchi ma ’dzag pa” (GC: 637b)

**dku V**

“2Betrug, Gaunerei” (WTS.3: 173a); “artifice, cunning” (Li 1955: 62); “ruse, trap” (Róna-Tas 1955: 263 n. 39); “intrigue” (Richardson 1985: 59 n. 4); “opposition, rebellion, disaffection, plotting, intrigue, treason” (Denwood 1991: 136)

**dku() po:** “g.yo sgyu’am g.yo sgyu can” (BYD: 15b)

**dku() ba1:** “intrigue” (Richardson 1985: 59 n. 4)

**dku ba2:** “g.yon can la ’o” (BTK: 117 n. 5); “instigateur” (DTH: 147); “opponent, rebel, plotter” (Denwood 1991: 136)

**dku ched po:** “lkog g.yo chen po” (BYD: 15)

**dku gaṅ:** “g.yo sgyu khram gsum” (BYD: 15b); “Hinterhalt” (WTS.3: 173a); “piège” (DTH: 148); “treason” (Denwood 1991: 135); “trap” (ibid., p. 136); “ambush” (Zeisler 2004: 312); “a house of treachery” (Dotson, forthcoming, p. 272)

**dku ’gel:** “bya dga’. dga’ rtags” (BDN: 30 n. 11); “récompense de la trahison” (Macdonald 1971: 234); “reward for rebellion, punishment for opposition” (Denwood 1991: 136); “prize” (Richardson 1998: 58); “lot for intrigue” (Dotson, forthcoming, p. 275)

**dku rgyal:** “lit. overcomer of intrigue” (Denwood 1991: 133); “aristocracy” (Dotson 2009b: 63); “aristocracy” (Dotson, forthcoming, p. 279); “best of the plotters” (ibid., p. 333 n. 16)

**dku rgyal pa:** “aristocracy” (Dotson, forthcoming, p. 279)

**dku sgyu:** “g.yo sgyu ž es pa ste gna’ rabs kyi brda rñiṅ” (BRTD: 140a); “craft, trick, stratagem (sic!)” (Li/Coblin 1987: 372); “deceitful stratagem or stratagem and deceit” (Denwood 1991: 136)

**dku lto:** “rdab dkrugs sam. dbyen sbyor phra ma” (BTC: 95a and BYD: 25a, s.v. rku rdo); “rdab ḏkrugs sam. dbyen sbyor phra ma” (DSM: 29b, s.v. rku lto); “contrivance, stratagem” (Cs: 66b); “List, Arglist, bes. wenn man unter gutem Schein Jemanden zu etwas bewegt was ihm Unglück bringt” (Jä: 9a); “malice, malicious arts” (LEU: 6)

**dku dar:** “harmed by opposition” (Denwood 1991: 132); “[his] wiles extending” (Emmerick 1967: 19)
*dku 'phel: “g.yo sgyu’i lkog mna’ ther ‘don byas pa’i don te” (DSM: 18a, s.vv. dku bel ba, dku ‘bel); “lkog g.yo ther ‘don” (BYD: 15a, s.v. dku ‘pel); “g.yo sgyu yis gnod pa dañ gzan ñes goñ ñu” (BYD: 15b, s.v. dku’ bel); “g.yo sgyu ther ‘don dañ dmar rjen du bton pa’i don no” (BTK: 113 n. 12, s.v. dku ‘bel); “g.yo sgyu ther ‘don byas pa” (BNY: 138 n. 15, s.v. dku ‘bel); “nuire par artifice, dénoncer” (DTH: 190, s.v. dku ‘bel); “outwit” (TLTD.3: 113b)
dku byed: “to use ruses” (de Jong 1989: 64)
dku blod: “to hatch a plot” (Denwood 1991: 135)


*dku VI
“grade inférieur” (DTH: 190); “comitatus” (Walter 2009: 65 n. 68)
dku rgyal: “(inner) comitatus” (Walter 2009: 63 n. 62)


*dku VII
“mna’ dañ dam tshig gam mthu stobs sam bka’ rgya sog kyi don la ’jug” (BDN: 43 n. 9); “di nas (PT 1287: 194 - JB) mna’ gaŋ la go’o” (BTK: 113 n. 6)
dku la gtogs: “mna’ ’brel du ŋuṣgs” (DSM: 18a, s.v. dku la thogs pa)
dku rgyal: “mna’ ‘brel” (DSM: 17b); “mna’ ‘brel” (BNY: 57 n. 1)
dku rgyal pa: “mna’ dañ dam tshig bṣag pa las rgyal ba sog kyi don” (BDN: 43 n. 10); “mna’ chiṇs bṣag nas rgyal skugs pa’am rgyan ’jog pa la’o” (BTK: 113 n. 7)
dku rgyal ba: “mna’ dañ dam tshig bṣag pa las rgyal ba sog kyi don” (BDN: 43 n. 10)
*dku ‘phel: “mna’ dañ dam tshig bṣag pa’i gsaṅ brtol pa’i don” (BDN: 43 n.13, s.v. dku ‘bel); “dku’ ni mna’ dañ dam tshig gi don dañ bel ni bkog pa’am ‘don pa’i don te. gsaṅ ba brtol ba’am gsaṅ ba’i ‘char jus ther ‘don byas pa’i don” (STK: 151 n. 12, s.v. dku ‘bel)


*dku VIII
“³Schlauheit” (WTS.3: 173a)
dku bo: “schlau” (WTS.3: 174a)


*dku IX
“Bez. eines hohen Privilegs, das mit einer erblichen Würde verbunden ist“ (WTS.3: 173a)
dku rgyal gtsigs: “Ernennungsurkunde zum dku rgyal” (WTS.3: 173b)


*dku X

dku ‘gel: “basse œuvre” (DTH: 134)
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*dku* \(^{XI}\)

*dku bo:* “mthu bo” (BDN: 6 n. 6)

*dku* \(^{XII}\)

*dku thabs su:* “\(^{1}\)zol gyis sam brdzu ba; \(^{2}\)lkog tu” (DSM: 29b, s.v. rku thabs su)

*dku bya:* “to keep secret, hide” (D: 76a, s.v. rku bya)

*dku ma chen po:* “хранящий свои мысли при себе, скрытный; one who keeps his thoughts to himself” (R.1: 99b)

*dku bśams:* “\(^{1}\)nang yo lkog gštom” (DSM: 30a, s.v. rku bśams)

*dku* \(^{XIII}\)

“dgu ste thams cad tshan ba’am rdzogs pa’i don no” (BTK: 80 n. 11)

Although it seems improbable that all the attested meanings of *dku* and its derivatives should be somehow related to each other, it is even more improbable that there existed so many etymons with the form *dku:* the onset *dk-* is not very common in Tibetan and points rather to a derivational character of the morpheme. We should now have a closer look at the semantic composition of single etymons in order to discover potential links between them. In seems, in fact, that only first three from the above listed lexemes are amply corroborated by the lexicographical sources. The remaining ones either came into being in consequence of some morphonological changes or, it can be proven that, they have evolved from the basic ones.

There should be no doubts about the existence of the lexeme *dku* \(^{I}\) with the main meanings “\(^{1}\)hip; \(^{2}\)side”. Interestingly though, *dku* in this meaning does not seem to be documented in OT sources.

The core meaning of *dku* \(^{II}\) could be proposed to have been “malodorous, unpleasantly smelling, stinky” from which *dku ba* has been derived to denote plants of disagreeable smell as attested in the example (26) above.

*dku* \(^{III}\) appears to have been a verbal stem the original meaning of which can be assumed to have been *“to rise, ascend, go beyond”*.\(^{31}\)

The meaning *“to rise”* could in fact be suggested for the verbal usage of *dku* in (6) and (7).\(^{32}\) Later, “to exceed, overflow; to be in excess” and further “to remain” might have developed from the basic mean-

---

31 The verb could have been related to the PTB stem *\(k\)u* “take up, lift, prop up”; cf. hereto Coblin 1986: 103 and STEDT (http://stedt.berkeley.edu/~stedt-cgi/rootcanal.pl/etymon/2351; 01.02.2015).

32 re dku’ ni mtskul du dku’ “[Your] hopes rise. [They] rise to [your] nose.”, as attested in (6) could be juxtaposed with the Eng. expression [success, fame, fortune] went to one’s head.
ings. Similar scope of meanings is covered by *lhag* that is glossed as a synonym of *dku*III; for *lhag* as a verb in modern Tibetan dialects see CDTD.V: 1359. The deverbal adjective *dku ba*, when used attributively in the sense of “going beyond; exceeding”, could have caused confusion with *dgu* in its meaning “*2many*” (J: 84a) that resulted in a folk etymology of *dgu tshod* (lit. “measure of going beyond, of exceeding”)34 and *dgu mtshan* (lit. “a token for going beyond, for exceeding”).35 The latter process explains also the occurrence of the etymon *dku*XIII glossed, among others, as *rdzogs pa* “perfect, complete, blameless” (J: 469b) - meanings that come closer to *dku ba* “exceeding” rather than to *dgu* “many”.

The next lexeme, *dku*IV, is attested, as a matter of fact, only in one particular collocation, namely in connection with tears. It is proposed to treat *dku*IV as a figurative usage of *dku*III with the semantic development along the following lines: “to rise” > “to flow out (spouting)”36 (about tears) > “(of fluids) to fall down (like tears)”.

The sememes listed under V to XI have resulted from various interpretations of the respective OT lexemes. All proposed meanings are in fact contextual. As it seems, there is no extant lexicographical tradition that would support the reconstructed meanings providing them with a direct link to similar lexemes attested in other than OT sources. Nevertheless, it does not mean that they are all ungrounded or incorrect. As I will try to demonstrate in the last section of the present paper, the meaning of *dku* as documented in OT texts has been preserved in some, at times morphologically distorted formations that are indeed found also in later lexicographical tradition. Furthermore, I will argue that the OT *dku* can be related historically to some of the above sememes.

*dku*XII provides interesting examples of folk etymology. Three out

---

33 One could put forward an hypothesis that would include the WT *sku* “body” (J: 21b) into one word family with the discussed *dku* as derived from the sense “to remain”. Compare the parallel semantic development in case of *lus* “to be remaining or left” (J: 550a) and *lus* “body” (J: 549b) as well as the meanings “1dead body, corpse, carcass; 2body; 3residue, remains, sediment” combined in one lexeme *ro* (cf. J: 535b). In this connection one could also quote Ger. *Leib* and Eng. *life*, both going back to the PIE *lip-* “to remain, persevere, continue, live” (Klein 1966: 887b-8a). A distinct connotation of the verb *dku* with its main meaning “to go beyond, to exceed” as compared with the ordinary *lus* might have contributed to the marked usage of *sku* in the honorific register.

34 In Desgodins’ dictionary, *dgu tshod* follows immediately after the lemma *dku st* and could, in fact, be a mere scribal error.

35 Compare hereto also *dgu ste* glossed with “*lhag ste žes pa’i don te*” (DSM: 103a) and the grammaticalisation of *dgu* as in *dgu* “*3(neg.+vb.+_) to do to excess*” (Gs: 219b).

36 This meaning is glossed by Jäschke under ‘*dzag pa* (463b), a lexeme that occurs as a synonym of *dku*IV in the above list.
of four formations listed therein are documented with rku- syllable instead of the correct *dku- and yet their semantics reveals the relationship with some of the OT lexemes. First of all, rku is documented with the meaning “to steal, to rob” unanimously already in OT texts (cf., for instance, the legal texts PT 1071 & PT 1072). I assume that it was notably the negative connotation of both rku and dku that brought them closer to each other in speakers’ daily usage and resulted in replacing the latter by the former. Moreover, dkuXIII appears to denote some kind of fraudulent action done in collusiveness. This might have provided the major stimulus for replacing the original *dku- (whose meaning had already sunk into oblivion and the lexeme had ceased to be used as an independent morpheme) with the attested rku- that denotes an action which is likewise usually done secretly, although the latter sense does not belong to the core definition of rku. One notices additionally the semantic similarity between dku ma chen po glossed with dku- and, for instance, rku bya.

On the origins of dkuXIII see the discussion of dkuIII above.

3. Semantic analysis of OT dku-.

As opposed to Róna-Tas who assumed the existence of two homophones in OT, dku and dku’ (1955: 263 n. 39), I do not recognise these as distinct on the basis of their orthography alone. Establishing whether there existed more than one lexeme with the form dku(’) in OT is the purpose of the present section. However, as the juxtaposition below clearly demonstrates, the difference between dku and dku’ was purely orthographic and could occur even within one text:

\[
\begin{align*}
dku &\ gän (PT 1287: 322) \sim dku’ &\ gän (PT 1287: 95) \\
dku &\ rgyal (Żol N 32) \sim dku’ &\ rgyal (PT 1287: 196) \\
dku &\ ba (Żwa E 30) \sim dku’ &\ ba (Żwa E 29-30) \\
dku &\ [...] byed (Żwa W 28-9) \sim dku’ &\ byed (IT] 737: 197) \\
dku &\ ’pel (IT] 1375: r2) \sim dku’ &\ bel (PT 1287: 201, 315)
\end{align*}
\]

On these grounds, I shall refrain from distinguishing between the orthographical variants dku and dku’ in the following analysis. Furthermore, the above juxtaposition indicates clearly that other criteria have to be offered in order to clarify the semantics and etymology of the morpheme dku as attested in OT sources.

In the Table 3 below, I have grouped together all OT occurrences of the syllable dku- according to its place in a clause (NP, predicate) and the connotations of the particular phrase in which it appears (positive, negative, uncertain/neutral); the numbers given in brackets refer to the examples from the first part of the present paper.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku 'gel (11)</td>
<td>dku 'phel (22), (23), (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku rgyal (12), (13), (14), (15), (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku rgyal pa (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku rgyal gtsigs (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku che (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>dku dar (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku (1), (2), (4), (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku khym (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku gañ (9), (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku sgyu (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku bā (25), (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku bā² (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku zahn / chan / lug (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khoñ dku (30), (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāñ dku (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain / Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku (3)</td>
<td>dku (6), (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku bo (28)</td>
<td>dku babs (27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Starting with the most numerous group (i.e. negative-NP), I shall subsequently juxtapose its members with other lexemes and phrases with which they co-occur in OT sources and that have additionally been scrutinised in the notes of the first section. This approach shall provide us with a better understanding of the semantic field of the syllable dku-.

Thus, we learn that a (great) dku could be done (1) or planned (2) but had always negative consequences for the agent. Planning a dku (2) could involve overthrowing a btsan po (22) and was equivalent to being disloyal (2 & 22). Furthermore, according to (4), doing a dku was understood as closely related to mtho / 'tho 'tsham (CT tho 'tsham “to scorn, scoff, jeer, sneer at, vex, insult, mock”, J: 236b) and slu, CT “to entice, allure, ensnare, beguile, seduce” (J: 586b). The context of (4) allows us to assume that doing a dku was intended as a kind of offence towards the person targeted. In (5) dku is coordinated with gnod pa, CT “damage, harm, injury” (J: 311b); unsubstantiated doing

---

37 I was able to trace one more instance of dku byed in a canonical source, cf.: blo s ’dus byas thams cad gso gbog rdzun pa (4) bslu ba’i chos can dku byed pa / byis pa ’drid par yan dag par ji lta ba bžin du rab tu šes te / de sмон pas kyañ sens can thams cad la siñiñ rje mnon du ‘gyur ro / / (Sans rgyas phal po che žes bya ba śin tu rgyas pa chen po’i mdo, H 94, phal chen, ga 134v3-4; trslr. after ACIP) “The mind, that does dku everything that is compounded, phenomena that are empty, false, [and] deceptive, knowing how to search into in order to cheat the child, actualises the compassion towards all sentient beings even more than before.” In Cleary’s translation: “By means of the awareness [...], they know in truth that all that is conditional is void, unreal, delusive, deceptive, fooling the ignorant. They become all the more compassionate toward beings [...].” (1993: 737).
of any of these was liable to criminal charges.\textsuperscript{38} \textit{dku} and \textit{gnod pa} could be undertaken either against one’s life or property (5). From (8) and, more generally, from PT 1039, we gather that there existed a close semantic relationship between \textit{dku}-, \textit{rma}-, \textit{byad}-, and \textit{dug}- occur together with \textit{dku} also in other contexts, for which see below. Building a \textit{dku gaṅ}, if uncovered, brought death to the respective person (9 & 10). Furthermore, (9) describes someone who built a \textit{dku gaṅ} as being disloyal (\textit{glo ba riṅs pa}) - a connection we have already seen alluded to in (2) and (22). In (19), \textit{dku sgyu} is coordinated with \textit{sdig}, CT “sin, moral evil as a power; offence, trespass” (J: 293a). (25) establishes a link between \textit{dku ba}, lit. “a one doing a \textit{dku}”, and \textit{dug pa} “poisoner”. \textit{dku ba} and \textit{dug pa} denoted persons that were responsible for the death of Gnam-ri-slon-mtshan and for this very reason had to be killed together with their families. The same close relationship between \textit{dku} and \textit{dug} was already noticed in (1) where poisoning might be deemed to have resulted from making a \textit{dku} (\textit{byas nas}). In (5) \textit{dku ba} occurs together with \textit{phe’u pa}; the meaning of the latter term, however, remains unknown. The same passage connects \textit{dku ba} with \textit{dku} as it is attested in (1, 2 & 5). The juxtaposition of various compounds from PT 1039, some of which appear in (29), provides additional lexemes from the semantic field of \textit{dku}, namely \textit{byad}-, *\textit{hur}-, and \textit{sdaṅ}-, The connection between \textit{dku}- and \textit{byad}- has already been established in (8). As demonstrated previously, \textit{khoṅ dku} (30 & 31) is a synonym of \textit{naṅ dku} (32). Both seem to have had strong negative connotations that can be assumed to have been transferred from \textit{dku} to the compounds since \textit{khoṅ-} and \textit{naṅ-} have neutral meanings.

To conclude this part of the exposition, \textit{dku} seems to have belonged to one semantic field with the following lexemes (listed alphabetically): \textit{sgyu}, \textit{dug}, \textit{sdaṅ}-, \textit{sdig}, \textit{gnod pa}, \textit{byad}, \textit{rma}-, *\textit{hur}-. Additionally, \textit{dku byed} can be deemed nearly synonymic or closely related to \textit{sdig byed}, mtho/’tho ’tsham, and \textit{slu}.

As can be easily observed, none of the basic etymons (I, II, III) listed in the second section seems to match the just sketched semantic field of the OT \textit{dku}. However, lexemes and phrases recorded under \textit{dku}\textsuperscript{XII} demonstrate a striking similarity to the semantics of our \textit{dku}. There we find \textit{dku/rku} explained by terms such as: zol “= bslu ba khram pa, cunning, false” (D: 1098b); \textit{rdzu} “to give a deceptive representation” (J: 468b); \textit{lkog} “secrecy” (J: 18b); \textit{ṅan g.yo} “= khram pa or phram, hypocrisy” (D: 350a), “Betrug, böse List, Trügerisches” (WTS.15: 13a).\textsuperscript{39} From these, \textit{slu} has already occurred in connection

\textsuperscript{38} From (19) it occurs that \textit{dku sgyu} was justified when done in reprisal.

\textsuperscript{39} It is also worth mentioning in this context that, according to later Bon sources, Gña’-khrī-btsan-po was confronted with the following evils and obstacles: \textit{rku} (sic!), \textit{sdaṅ}, \textit{dgra}, \textit{g.yag}, \textit{dug}, \textit{byad stems}, \textit{sri}, and \textit{gdon} (Haarh 1969: 320-1). Three of
with the OT dku whereas g.yo may be juxtaposed with the OT compound dku sgyu. In addition, I have found in canonical texts another compound, which, as far as I could ascertain, has not been glossed in any lexicographical work. To wit, the following passage contains the word dku gsain that implies the notion of “secrecy” as encountered in the lexemes listed under dku XII:

(33)

de’i tshe rgyal po sdig pa can des blon po lña brgya zig bkug nas dku (6) gsain gcig tu byas te / gsain la btags nas / blon po de dag la ’di skad ces bsgo’o / / (Thabs mkhas pa chen po sans rgyas drin lan bsab pa’i mdo, H 361, mdo sde, a 296r5-6; trslr. after ACIP)

“At that time, king Sdиг-pa-can gathered five hundred ministers. Thereafter, having done dku gsain into one, initiated [them] into the secret (lit. bound to the secret)40 [and] said to them.”

Two important conclusions may thus be drawn. First of all, the identity of dku and rku as proposed for the lexemes glossed under dku XII is herewith confirmed.41 Secondly, it appears that the core meaning of dku that recurs in Old as well as Classical Tibetan sources was centred around the notion of **“trickery, deceit”**.

Now, as concerns potential cognates of OT dku, in WT we observe some regularity within word families one member of which has the onset dк- and the other ’kh-., cf.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dKyu “to run a race” (J: 11b)</th>
<th>~ ‘kHyu “to run” (J: 60a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dkri “to wind, to wind up” (J: 11b)</td>
<td>~ ’khri “to wind, roll” (J: 61b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dKrug “to stir, stir up, agitate” (J: 12a)</td>
<td>~ ’khrug “to be disturbed” (J: 62a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dKrog “to stir, churn; “to rouse, scare up; “to wag” (J: 12a)</td>
<td>~ ’khrog “to roar, rush, buzz, hum” (J: 63b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dKrol “ein Instrument spielen, mu-</td>
<td>~ ’khrol “to sound, resound” (J: 63b)42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the terms occur in the above list of words belonging to one semantic field with the OT dku, namely sdaṅ, dug, and byad stems (~ byad).

40 I understand gsain la btags, lit. “bound to a secret”, by analogy with dam la ’dogs, lit. “to bind to an oath”. It is worth noticing that it is the same text in which the compound rku lto ~ dku lto is found; see above the notes on dku sgyu.

41 As I tried to demonstrate in Bialek, forthcoming a (see s.v. dku rgyal), in the process of folk etymologisation dku has also happened to be replaced in OT by the syllable sku.

42 As regards dkrol ~ ’khrol, Jäschke gives both meanings under ’khrol (63b) and mentions dkrol as V2 and V3 of ’khrol - a highly improbable and, in fact, unattested conjugation pattern. I assume that the conjugation came into being as a result of combining two distinct verbs, i.e. TR dkrol and INTR ’khrol. The meaning “to release, set free” for the cognate ’grol and sgrol might have been the original from which **“to release a sound” > “to make a sound” developed as a consequence of semantic specialisation. At the same time a re-organisation of the verbs within the word family took place for ’khrol is attested dialectally as a TR verb with the
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With the exception of the first example for which not enough evidence is available\(^{43}\) in remaining cases the \(dk\)-verbs seem to be transitive (and controllable) equivalents of the respective intransitive (and non-controllable) \(’kh\)-verbs.\(^{44}\) Thus, following some previous authors\(^{45}\) I propose to relate \(dku\) to the verb \(’khu\) glossed, among others, as: “log pa” (BDSN, after Mimaki 1992: 482), “\(’ze\) sda\(n\) ba’\(a\)m log pa” (Lca\(n\) skya 2006: 266), “to offend, insult (= S[ans]kr[it] \(droh\)a injury)” (J: 55b), “to vie with, contend; also wrathfully rebelling” (D: 187a), \(^{1}\)vi. to hate; \(^{2}\)va. to oppose, to turn against; \(^{3}\)arc. stingy; \(^{4}\)arc. va. to cause to turn back; \(^{5}\)like, as good as” (Gs: 158b), \(^{6}\)\(’druh\)ya; \(\text{dhroksyati}\); \(\text{droha} - \text{grogs po la } ’\text{khu ba}\) (cf. \(n\a’i/kho\(n\) \(dku\) above); \(\text{drohi} - \text{grogs la } ’\text{khu ba}\); \(\text{drugdha}; \text{abhidrugdha}; \text{druh}\)” (Negi.1: 428a), Tabo ncA “to take interest in, to get absorbed in” (CDTD.V: 109). In addition, its \(v\)2 stem, \(’khus\), is attested with the meanings “\(’no\) ldog pa’am \(’no\) rngol byas pa’i don la ’jug ste” (DSM: 70a) and “\(’va\). to hide” (Gs: 159b).

The diversity of meanings glossed for \(’khu(s)\) proves that, on the one hand, there existed considerable uncertainty with regard to the semantics of the stem and, on the other hand, the stem has most probably a long history of semantic development. It is attested in the following OT passages:

---

\(^{43}\)\(dkyu\) is attested in Nurla as a cA verb, cf. CDTD.V: 7. There is no evidence, however, for its counterpart, \(’khyu\). It is possible that the latter form has been replaced by \(’khyug “to run” which occurs in modern dialects as an ncA verb, cf. CDTD.V: 132.

\(^{44}\)The existence of the verb pair \(dkrum\) Nurla cEA “to cut off (leaves of a tree)”, Leh cEA “to cut (hair), to trim (trees, bushes)”, Tabo cEA “to trim, to lop”, Dzongkha “to break” (CDTD.V: 10) and \(’grum\) “to pinch or nip off, to cut off, to prune, lop, clip” (J: 100a) as well as the reduplicated formations \(khrum \ khrum “fragments; barded fragments” (D: 169b), “\(groh\) zerst"uckelt” (WTS.8: 103a), \(khrum \ khrum \ byed/brdwa “to pound in a mortar” (D: 173a) and the noun \(khrums “Ass, von Raubthieren zerrissenes Wild” (Sch: 65b) would point to another triple: \(dkrum \sim *khrum \sim ’grum\). In Bialek (forthcoming a) I have reconstructed another series: TR \(dkyel \sim TR (but nc?) \ ’khyel \sim INTR \ ’gyel \sim TR sgyel\) (see s.v. \(dkyel \ mkh\as\)). Furthermore, in the notes on (37) below, the pair INTR \(’khrun\) and TR \(sgrun\) is mentioned. I am not aware of any deverbal derivation of nouns by means of the prefix \(d\)- as assumed by Denwood (1991: 136) and Dotson (forthcoming, p. 351 n. 19).


\(^{46}\)Skt. \(droh\)a is glossed with “injury, mischief, harm, perfidy, treachery, wrong, offence” (MW: 502c) and the verbal root \(\sqrt{druh}\) with “to hurt, seek to harm, be hostile to; to bear malice or hatred; to be a foe or rival” (MW: 502b).
(34) 'uṅ nas ’dzi zuṅ ma raṅs ste / / ziṅ po rje khri paṅ sum la ltas nas / / nag po 'khus te / (134) skya bo bsad / dre ’u rgal (read: sgal) te bse’ sga bchag go / / (PT 1287)


(35) ‘uṅ nas / myaṅ dba’s gnis ziṅ po rje las ’khus te / / btsan po spu rgyal (154) la glo ba ſe bar byas nas / mna’ mtho’ yaṅ cher bchad do / / (PT 1287)

“Thereafter, both, Myaṅ and Dba’s, having ’khus from (las) Ziṅ-po-rje-[khri-paṅ-sum], acted loyally for btsan po Spu-rgyal. Hence, [they] set greatly (?) also the time for a vow.”

(36) (299) / / btsan po sroṅ brtsan sgam po ’i riṅ la / / yab ’baṅs ni ’khus / yum ’baṅs ni log / / (PT 1287)

“During the lifetime of btsan po Sroṅ-brtsan-sgam-po, subjects of [his] father did ’khus, subjects of [his] mother turned away.”

(12.3) ‘uṅ nas żaṅ snaṅ gi bran / pa tshab gyim po ’khus te / (314) żaṅ snaṅ brlag go / / (PT 1287)

“Afterwards, Pa-tshab-gyim-po, the subject of żaṅ-snaṅ, ing ’khus, overthrown żaṅ-snaṅ.”47

By combining information from the above passages we acquire the following argument structure of ’khu:

HUM.1.Abs HUM.2.del ’khu “HUM.1 does ’khu from HUM.2”

From (36) we can infer that ’khu was semantically closely related to log, CT “1 to return, to go back; 2 to come back, to come again; 3 to turn round, to be turned upside down, to tumble down” (J: 553a).

To sum up the preceding discussion, I propose to reconstruct the etymological meaning of the INTR ’khu as “to bend, to curve; to be crooked” and dku as its transitive counterpart “to bend; to make

47 One more occurrence of ’khus is attested in PT 1288: 9. The passage, however, is incomplete and cannot be exploited for the needs of the present discussion.
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crooked”. As suggested above, their subsequent development is assumed to have been rather complicated and multidirectional.

To start with, the reconstructed meaning of ‘khu’ is still traceable in its OT attestations: “to bend” > “to turn (away from)” wherefrom the meaning “to turn against” and subsequently “to oppose; to rebel” might have developed. The dialectally attested “to take interest in, to get absorbed in” goes back to the original “to bend” in the figurative sense of “to bend (one’s mind) to sth.; to incline (towards sth.)”.

dku as a verb, a transitive equivalent of ‘khu’, does not seem to be attested in this form in any of the sources available to me. Furthermore, all meanings discussed so far in this section of the paper point to it as a nominal stem. Later lexicographical sources, however, evidence the existence of another verb of similar morphology and a meaning that corresponds exactly to the reconstructed meaning of dku, i.e. dgu “to bend, to make crooked” (J: 84b), “dbyibs gug pa” (GC: 145b, s.v. dgu pa), “biegen” (WTS.11: 312b). According to CDTD.V: 196, it is most commonly used as a cEA verb in collocation with the noun mgo “head” to express “to bow, to bend one’s head”. Apart from that, it is attested with the following meanings: Trang tse “to bend down, to bow”, Man-Merak c “to bow”, Nangchen ncA “to

Further cognates with the aspirated initial are assumed to include khud “coat-lap, or any cloth serving in an emergency as a vessel” (J: 41b; < “a fold (in a cloth)”, cf. the etymology of Eng. lap: “[t]he word originally denoted a fold or flap of a garment (compare with lapel), later specifically one that could be used as a pocket or pouch, or the front of a skirt when held up to carry something”, http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/lap?searchDictCode=all; 10.02.2015) as well as its derivatives khud pa “eine Tasche, ein Beutel” (Sch: 45a) and khud ma “die Seite, Ecke” (Sch: 45a). Compare also Gurung kiu “bent over” (Glover 1977: 130a); ku- in Kanauri kutā (?) “bent, crooked” (Bailey 1911: 336b); Lepcha gū “vb. to have end suspended downwards, to project downwards as roof, to hang down as bamboo, to impend” (MG: 54a; < “to be crooked (downwards)”; maybe also in kūr-gū “the breast, the chest”, MG: 21b); Tangut kiu “crooked, hollow” (http://stedt.berkeley.edu/~stedt-cgi/rootcanal.pl?gnis=t=crooked; 12.02.2015).

Goldstein cites another verb of similar semantics that has obviously undergone an analogous development, cf. ‘gugs “va. to interest, to attract, to turn on (usu[ally] follows a word for “mind” such as sens) mi maŋ po’i sens ‘gugs thub pa’i zlos gar Plays that are able to interest many people” (238a). Compare hereto also the etymology of Eng. to incline: “fr[om] L[atin] inclināre, ‘to cause to lean, to bend, bow, incline’” (Klein 1966: 782b).

Worth noticing is that the only example provided in WTS (from Baidārya sion po of Sde srid sangs rgyas rgya mtsho, 2: 336,5) attests, contrary to its given meaning, to a nominal usage of the lexeme dgu ba, cf. dgu ba mdun yin “eine Senke ist vorne” (ibid.).

This phrase is documented exclusively for WAT dialects and the verb dgu, in general, is glossed only for WAT, WIT, and Kham (Northern and Eastern) dialects.

---

48 Further cognates with the aspirated initial are assumed to include khud “coat-lap, or any cloth serving in an emergency as a vessel” (J: 41b; < “a fold (in a cloth)”, cf. the etymology of Eng. lap: “[t]he word originally denoted a fold or flap of a garment (compare with lapel), later specifically one that could be used as a pocket or pouch, or the front of a skirt when held up to carry something”, http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/lap?searchDictCode=all; 10.02.2015) as well as its derivatives khud pa “eine Tasche, ein Beutel” (Sch: 45a) and khud ma “die Seite, Ecke” (Sch: 45a). Compare also Gurung kiu “bent over” (Glover 1977: 130a); ku- in Kanauri kutā (?) “bent, crooked” (Bailey 1911: 336b); Lepcha gū “vb. to have end suspended downwards, to project downwards as roof, to hang down as bamboo, to impend” (MG: 54a; < “to be crooked (downwards)”; maybe also in kūr-gū “the breast, the chest”, MG: 21b); Tangut kiu “crooked, hollow” (http://stedt.berkeley.edu/~stedt-cgi/rootcanal.pl?gnis=t=crooked; 12.02.2015).

49 Goldstein cites another verb of similar semantics that has obviously undergone an analogous development, cf. ‘gugs “va. to interest, to attract, to turn on (usu[ally] follows a word for “mind” such as sens) mi maŋ po’i sens ‘gugs thub pa’i zlos gar Plays that are able to interest many people” (238a). Compare hereto also the etymology of Eng. to incline: “fr[om] L[atin] inclināre, ‘to cause to lean, to bend, bow, incline’” (Klein 1966: 782b).

50 Worth noticing is that the only example provided in WTS (from Baidārya sion po of Sde srid sangs rgyas rgya mtsho, 2: 336,5) attests, contrary to its given meaning, to a nominal usage of the lexeme dgu ba, cf. dgu ba mdun yin “eine Senke ist vorne” (ibid.).

51 This phrase is documented exclusively for WAT dialects and the verb dgu, in general, is glossed only for WAT, WIT, and Kham (Northern and Eastern) dialects.
bend”, Bathang TBL “to lower (the head); with kʰātsọ? (< kha rtsod? - JB) to make a row, to make a racket; with dzuʃa? (< ? - JB) to fight”, Dartsedo cA “to bow” (ibid.). Additionally, one finds dgu po glossed as “gebogen, vorwärts geneigt, gebückt” (Sch: 84a) and in Ladakhi “crooked, stooped” (LEU: 47).

It is assumed that the form dgu has replaced the original *dku under the influence of the following factors:

— Lexicalisation of the examined dku as a noun;
— Co-existence of other homophones of dku (see below);
— Blending of two distinct although historically related verbs *dku and *’gu (on *’gu see below);
— Semantic similarity to ’gugs (V2 bkug, V3 dgug, V4 khug) “1to bend, to make crooked; 2to gather; 3to call, to summon, to send for; 4to draw back; to cause to return, to convey back” (J: 93b-94a).  

The replacement of the syllable dku by dgu in consequence of folk etymologisation has already been mentioned above and will be addressed once more further below. However, in case of the reconstructed word family dku ~ ’khu there exist certain lexemes that could point to yet another member of the family with the voiced stem consonant g--; compare namely: gus TaboncAD “to be devoted” (CDTD.V: 164); gus pa “respect, reverence, devotion; respectful, devout” (J: 70a); ‘gus Ndzorge ngu “slope of the roof” (CDTD: 1663); rodus Balti “slope” (CDTD: 1752); gud “1slope, declivity; 3loss, damage” (J: 69b); rgud “to decline, to sink, to get weak, frail” (J: 104); mgu in: mgu ya “ring” (CDTD: 1558; < “mgu ya yo?”), gser mgu “gold ring” (CDTD: 9082), mgu lcags/zans “meuble ou ustensile de ménage (?)”

52 In fact, it is more probable that the meanings glossed by Jäschke for ’gugs have resulted from a blend of two verbs dku ~ dgu, perhaps also *’gu, and ’gugs. I assume that his first and fourth meanings belonged originally to the stem dku ~ dgu. The identification of the stems might have additionally been facilitated by the existence of another group of lexemes that, on the one hand, morphologically resemble dku ~ dgu and ’khu group but, on the other hand, share more semantic traits with ’gugs, cf.: khu gu “an address” (Cs: 8b; < “a call, summons”); khu byug “cuckoo” (J: 40b); ku “clamour” (J: 3b). Hereto belong probably also kwa ye and its clipped form kye as well as OT khu in phrases khu(s) ’debs and khu grags. It is highly probable that this word family is of onomatopoetic origin and developed from imitating sounds made, e.g., by cuckoos. An analogical replacement of the OT dkyel with a voiceless stem consonant by the CT dgyel with a voiced stem consonant has been hypothesised in Bialek, forthcoming as, s.v. dkyel mkhas. The change is supposed to have taken place under the influence of two further cognates with voiced stem consonants, i.e. ’gyel and sgyel.
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(Desg: 194b). The barely attested sgu, “bent” (D: 321b), and sgu can “kyog kyog sge sgu can” (GC: 183b), although most probably of later date, could also be included here. All these might have contributed to the hypothesised change *dku > dgu.

Hence, it seems probable that there existed originally two stems *khu and *gu with meanings closely resembling Eng. to bend. The reconstructed verb *dku was derived from *khu by means of the prefix d-. Only the latter hypothesis can explain the existence of the OT noun dku. dgu as a V3 < TR *’gu (V4 *gus) seems to be attested in brag dbye chu dgu yas (PT 1134: 289) “cleft rocks, curved rivers” where it parallels dbye, V3 < ’byed. The question whether there did ever exist a TR verb *’gu (V3 dgu, V4 *gus) must remain unanswered for the moment being.

The above exposition, that has thrown more light on the semantics of the whole word family, was necessary for a better understanding of the reconstructed semantic development of dku. To wit, an hypothesis is put forward according to which the OT noun dku was derived from the V1 stem of the TR verb *dku “to bend” by means of conversion to denote the act of bending, crooking. It subsequently acquired a figurative meaning **“trickery” > “harmful deed; harm, injustice”;

53 By analogy with the above mentioned collocation sens ‘gugs, one could also venture the hypothesis that the CT mgu “to rejoice, to be glad, joyful, content” (J: 90a) came into being by a similar semantic change MIND *gu **as for mind to bend” > mgu “to be satisfied” (CDTD.V: 211); cf. yid mgu “dankbar” (WTS.12: 349a) and Tabo ncA “with sem to be satisfied” (CDTD.V: 211). Another semantic development of analogous course could have taken place in case of dgye “to bend, to be curving or crooked” (J: 88a) and dgyes “to rejoice, to be glad; to please, to be pleased, to choose” (J: 88a).

54 Since the most commonly applied transitive marker is and was the prefix s- (see, e.g., Bielmeier 1988b: 18f.) one could hypothesise that d- derived controllable verbs from non-controllable ones. This would account for the semantic difference between dkyu and ’khyu as well as between dkyel and ’khyel tackled above.

55 The passage is discussed in more detail in Bialek, forthcoming b.

56 The postulated pair INTR *khu vs. TR *gu disagrees with Bielmeier’s pattern of morphonological alternation (1988b: 19f.) according to which TR verbs possess aspirated voiceless whereas INTR, voiced initials.

57 As a cursory view of the verbs with the onset dk- shows, their conjugation allows only for the suffix -s in V2 and V4. No other stem changes are attested.

58 One can mention here once more the example grogs la ’khu ba given by Negi for droha and drohi (1: 428a, s.v. ’khu ba) and juxtapose it with the OT grogs la khoi dku myi byed in (30). The meaning “harm, injustice” can also be reconstructed for dgu- in CT dgu mig < *dku mig. According to Lin (2005: 106 n. 411), dgu mig and dur mig are technical terms in one of Tibetan divination systems. Both express negative results of a divination (ibid., pp. 60 and 107 n. 414). The negative connotation of dgu- can additionally be inferred from the morphological parallelism between dgu mig and dur mig. To wit, the morpheme dur- invariably represents in religious literature the lexeme dur “tomb, grave” (J: 253b), or one of its derivatives, and is thus connected to the notions of death and dying.
compare hereto the English idiomatic expression *to bend the rules* and the Middle English *crook* “deceit, guile, trickery” - a sense that has disappeared by the 17th century (http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/crook?searchDictCode=all; 09.02.2015).

To summarise the results of our analysis, the following renderings of the ‘negative-NPs’ from the Table 3 are proposed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dku</th>
<th>“1trickery; 2harm; injustice”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dku khyim</td>
<td>“house of harm”; ~ rma- ~ byad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku gai</td>
<td>“trickery-room” &gt; “ambush”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku sgyu</td>
<td>“trickery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku ba</td>
<td>“trickster”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dku zaṅs</td>
<td>“a kettle of harm”; ~ byad- ~ *hur- ~ sdaṅ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khoṅ dku</td>
<td>lit. “a harm of the interior” &gt; “injustice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naṅ dku</td>
<td>“id.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reconstructed primary meaning *“a bending”* allows us to subsume another lexeme under the same etymon. To wit, I propose to

59 The figurative extension of the meaning “bent, crooked” towards “false; deceitful” is attested in many languages, cf. Eng. *crooked*, Ger. *krumm* in *krumme Geschäfte*, Pol. *krzywda < krzywy* (Boryś 2005: 268a). The latter term possessed in Old Polish also the meanings “false; untrue; deceitful” (ibid.) that are not known anymore in modern language. It is likewise worth considering whether the root *rku* “to steal, to rob” (J: 16a) could not be included in this word family as well. Although the issue needs a far more detailed study and the inclusion of the TB material, that I would not be able to provide here, alternation between the prefixes *d*- and *r*- is attested, e.g., in *dkan ~ rkan* (CDTD: 96) or *gdaṅ ~ rdaṅ* (J: 265a). The primary meaning could be proposed to have been *“to let sth. disappear in a fold”; compare hereto Ger. *entwenden*. However, it is likewise possible that, at some point, *dku* *“to bend”* and *rku* “to steal” happened to be confused on account of their phonetic convergence (cf. WAT and EAT pronunciation of *d*- and *r*- in CDTD) and/or obsolescence of *dku* in its original meaning. The problem of an hypothetical relationship between the examined word family and CT *dkyus* *“untruth, falsehood, lie”* (J: 11b) and *’khyu* *“bent; not straight”* (D: 195b) must remain unaddressed here. The latter two terms could be further related to a group of lexemes with palatalised stem consonants, cf.: *gcu cEA* “to twist, to screw” (CDTD.V: 343); *gcu/lcu ba* “screw” (J: 144b; < *“screwing one”*); *gcud “crookedness, crooked”* (CDTD: 2321); *gcud/lcu* “to turn, turn round, twist, twine, plait, braid” (J: 144b); *mchu* “lip; 2beak or bill of birds” (J: 165b; < *“crooked one”; the meaning “lip” seems to be secondary, compare a similar semantic development in Ger. *Schnabel* and Pol. *dziub*); *’chu* "1to be twisted, distorted, pf. *’chus; 2curvature, crookedness, distortion; 3crooked, wry”* (J: 170a); *’chus* “vi. to get twisted, to get sprained” (Gs: 385b).

It cannot be excluded that *dku* *“trickery”, when used in connection with glo ba rīṅs pa to describe actions undertaken against a btsan po, acquired a special meaning of “treachery”. However, a conclusive proof is missing and the passages examined in the first section do not allow for a more concrete definition of its semantics.

60 For khoṅ dku and naṅ dku compare, for instance, khoṅ khro “wrath, anger” (J: 44b) and naṅ dbugs “the inner breath (according to Tibetan medicine)” (Gs: 607a).
include in the discussed word family also lexemes listed under *dkuI in
the second section. The semantic development is assumed to have
proceeded along the following lines: *“a bending” > “hip”62 > “side
of one’s body”. The meaning “belly” might have occurred as a result
of generalisation from “a round (i.e. bent) part of one’s body”. It is
tempting to quote in this connection another occurrence of *dgu in OT:

(37)
lha ri gyaṅ dor gšegs na / [ri rab lhun po yaṅ (33) *dgu’ dud dud / śiṅ
sdoṅ po yaṅ bai thāṅ than / chab lu ma yaṅ dīo sil sil / gor pha boṅ la
stsoṅs pa yaṅ (34) mniṅs khruṅ khruṅ gis], pyaṅ ’tshal lo / / (PT 1286)
“When [he] came to Lha-ri-gyaṅ-do, Mount Meru bending [its] slope,
tree-trunks stretching out [their] feet, river-springs tinkling [on
their] banks, stones, rocks and the like dissolving [into] soft-
ness63, paid homage [to him].”

As can be inferred from the translation, I assume that *dgu’ stands
here for the original *dku in its figurative meaning “slope; shoulder
(of a mountain)” derived from “side”. This would make the only so
far identified occurrence of this meaning of *dku in OT sources.

The last lexeme listed in the Table 3 among the NPs with negative
connotations is *dku baII. I have already proposed to relate it to *dku II
of the second section. It is obvious that this lexeme must be kept distinct
from the reconstructed verb *dku “to bend”. I will return to *dku baII
and its etymology once more further below.

The negative-Predicate division of the Table 3 contains only one
member, i.e. *dku dar. As I have already argued in the first section of
the paper, there are reasons for analysing this compound together
with two other OT formations, *dku rgyal and *’phel. The closer
examination of the OT occurrences of the verb dar has proven that it
possessed highly negative connotations when used with a HUM com-
plement. These connotations have been transferred to the compound
*dku dar found in a similar context.

Now, I shall discuss the three compounds which have already
been brought together. In the first section of the paper, I attempted to
prove that dar, rgya, and ’phel are, first, near-synonymic ncA verbs,

(Klein 1966: 731b) and “[z]u Wörtern für ‘sich biegen, beugen’ auf einer Grundla-
ge (i[ndo]g[ermanisch]) *keu- mit verschiedenen Auslauten” (Kluge: 429a, s.v.
Hüfte).

63 For this tentative rendering of the phrase mniṅs khruṅ khruṅ compare mniṅ Balti
“soft, softness” (CDTD: 3076) and sgruṅ Kargil cEA “to mix in, to dissolve”,
Tshangra cEA “to dissolve, to melt”, Sapi, Khalatse, Nurla cEA “to dissolve”, Leh
cEA “to mix in”, Themchen cEA “to dissolve” (CDTD.V: 305). I assume that khruṅ
is a V2 stem of an otherwise unattested INTR equivalent of sgruṅ.
and, secondly, all form compounds with *dku* as their first constituent. The resulting formations are attested in our sources as *dku dar*, *dku rgyal*, and *dku bel*/*pel* respectively. The common semantic denominator of the simple verbs could be proposed as “to spread, to expand, to increase” (see Table 2). It can now be juxtaposed with the reconstructed meaning of *dku* III *”to rise, ascend, go beyond” (see the second section above). Although not strictly synonymic with *dar*, *rgya*, and *’phel*, *dku* shared with them the notion of “exceeding given proportions/frames” as well as its grammatical features (see the examples (6 & 7)). It follows that *dku dar*, *dku rgyal*, and *dku ’pel* can be interpreted as verbal compounds formed from constituents that are closely related to each other with respect to their semantics. We know that verbs of similar meanings could be combined in WT by means of the converbial particle /ciṅ/.64 Thus, the underlying structures of the compounds can be reconstructed as: *dku žiṅ dar*, *dku žiṅ rgyas*, and *dku žiṅ ’phel* respectively.

As concerns the semantics of the compounds, we observe some differences in their meanings and usage. First of all, *dku dar* and *dku ’phel* are clearly verbs whereas *dku rgyal* is a noun. As demonstrated above, *dar* took human beings as its subjects in OT whereas the subjects of *’phel* seem to have been more differentiated. In the latter case, a clear semantic analogy between the examined subject *glö ba riṅs pa* and *gsan* could be drawn.65 Both denote things that are supposed to remain secret but nevertheless have been revealed. Here, the most adequate rendering of the verb *dku ’phel* would be “to come to light, to be disclosed/revealed”, a narrowing of the original “to spread, diffuse”. To sum up, I propose the following understanding of the semantics and the argument structures of the compounds *dku dar* and *dku ’phel*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUM.1ABS HUM.2ALLAT</th>
<th><em>dku dar</em>; lit. “HUM.1 spreads while it exceeds over HUM.2” &gt; “HUM.1 prevails over HUM.2”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XABS HUM.ERG. <em>dku ’phel</em></td>
<td>lit. “X spreads while it exceeds through HUM” &gt; “X is revealed by HUM”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, with regard to *dku rgyal*, as I have demonstrated in Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. *dku rgyal*, its second syllable should be reconstructed as *-rgyas*. The change from *-rgyas* to *rgyal* is assumed to

---

64 Cf. Hahn 1996: 154, § 15.6c.
65 For details see Bialek, forthcoming a, s.v. *dku ’pel*.
66 Compare hereto also the analogous expression *lhag par ’phel ba* glossed with “increases exceedingly” (IW). *lhag* has already been identified in the present paper as a near synonym of *dku*. 
The semantic ‘capacity’ of the OT dku

have been one of folk etymologisation. Thus, the compound could be rendered literally as “spread while exceeding”, i.e. “famous, exceeding (ones)”, which is assumed to have undergone lexicalisation to “nobility”, since we already know that it denoted a social group formed firstly by descendants of persons who had made a significant contribution to the rise of the Tibetan Empire. A member of this very group was called *dku rgyas pa, i.e. “a nobleman”, whereas *dku rgyas gtsigs denoted a letter that confirmed the affiliation to the nobility.

An additional hypothesis could be put forward concerning dku II as discussed in the second section. To wit, I connect it tentatively to the same verb dku “to rise, ascend, go beyond” > dku ba (VA) “rising (as of (bad) smell)” > “odorous” > “(unpleasantly) smelling”.

Another lexeme from the division positive-NP, i.e. dku che, could be related to the already mentioned dku “trickery; 2harm; 3injustice”. First of all, I propose to reconstruct its underlying structure as *dku bo che - a phrase attested, as a matter of fact, in (28). dku bo is assumed to have been a further derivative of the noun dku: “trickery” > dku bo “deceitfulness” (abstract formation?) > “cunning”. Thus, dku che could be rendered as an adjective “cunning; shrewd”, lit. “of great cunning”, as in (28): “mighty rulers and wise ministers, who were shrewd”, or in (20): “whose perception was keen and shrewd”. This line of argumentation would also shift dku bo from uncertain-NP division in the Table 3 to the division positive-NP. At the same time, we observe a development towards a more positive connotation within the word-family of dku “to bend, to make crooked”.

With regard to dku ’gel, the last member of the positive-NP divi-

67 For further examples of folk etymologisation in OT see Bialek, forthcoming a, chapter Compounding in Old Tibetan.
69 Compare hereto an evidently analogous semantic development of khram “lying, deceiving” (Gs: 141b), Western Drokpas “lie” (CDTD: 913) but Balti “cunning (noun), cleverness” (CDTD: 914) and khram pa “a liar” (J: 49b), “g.yo sgyu can” (BTC: 275b; cf. also the dialectal meanings glossed in CDTD: 916).
sion to be discussed here, it is another formation related to the verb *dku “to rise, ascend, go beyond” according to DSM. The latter work defines the compound namely as *lhag ’phro (17b), “sm. *lhag ’phros” (Gs: 1181a); *lhag ’phros “surplus, remnant, remainder, leftover” (Gs: 1181a). As I am arguing in Bialek forthcoming a, s.v. *dku ’gel, the OT noun ’gel can be translated as “a charge” in the sense of “a responsibility or duty assigned to someone” (http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/charge; 11.02.2015), cf. ’gel “1 to load, to lay on a burden; to commission, to charge with, to make, appoint, constitute; 2 to put, to place on or over” (J: 94b-5a); compare hereto Ger. *Auftrag. I hypothesise that ’gel in *dku ’gel is identical with the just mentioned OT noun ’gel. Assuming that *dku- goes back to the verbal stem *dku, the only possible analysis of the compound would be *dku ba’i ’gel “’gel that exceeds, goes beyond”. In accordance with the conclusions drawn in the first section of the present paper, where it was suggested that the castle Sdur-ba was given to Mñan-’dzi-zuṅ additionally, I propose to interpret *dku ’gel as **”a supplement, addition”, i.e. an extra assigned to someone. It seems that a metonymic change has taken place in case of ’gel from **”a responsibility assigned to someone” to **”a thing for which one is responsible, a thing in one’s custody”.

Having discovered a close semantic relationship between the verb *dku “to rise, ascend, go beyond” on the one hand, and *dar, rgya, and ’phel on the other, I would like to propose an interpretation of the formation *dku babs based on the parallelism between *dku and *dar. To wit, in lexicographical works one finds the formation *dar bab glossed with “a person in the prime of life” (J: 251; < *dar la bab pa) or *dar babs “= *dar la babs pa youthful” (D: 621a). Accordingly, the following tentative reconstruction can be put forward: *dku la babs, lit. “having fallen on [the time of] being exceeding/excellent”.

The only lexeme listed in the Table 3 which I am unable to explain is *dku as occurring in (3). Any interpretation of this and other parallel passages remains speculative due to the unstable orthography and a seemingly distorted grammar of the text.

The following Table 4 recapitulates the preceding analyses of the OT *dkus and presents the examined lexical material in a systematic way.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ety-</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Derivative</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>OT Example</th>
<th>Lexicographical sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1a bending, crooking</td>
<td>dku</td>
<td>1hip; 2side; 3slope</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>dku²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2trickery, deceit</td>
<td>dku</td>
<td>trickery</td>
<td>(1) (2) (4) (5)</td>
<td>dku⁵ - dku¹²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku gaṅ</td>
<td>ambush</td>
<td>(9) (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku sgyu</td>
<td>trickery</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku che</td>
<td>shrewd</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku ba</td>
<td>trickster</td>
<td>(5) (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku bo</td>
<td>cunning (N)</td>
<td>(28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3harm; injustice</td>
<td>dku khyim</td>
<td>house of injustice</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku chaṅ</td>
<td>beer of injustice</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku zaṅs</td>
<td>kettle of injustice</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku lug</td>
<td>sheep of injustice</td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>khoṅ dku</td>
<td>harm, injustice</td>
<td>(30) (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>naṅ dku</td>
<td>harm, injustice</td>
<td>(32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1to rise</td>
<td>dku</td>
<td>to rise</td>
<td>(6) (7)</td>
<td>dku¹³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku ba</td>
<td>malodorous</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>dku¹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2to exceed</td>
<td>dku ‘gel</td>
<td>addition</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*dku rgyas</td>
<td>nobility</td>
<td>(12) (13) (14) (15) (16)</td>
<td>dku¹³ / dku¹³³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*dku rgyas pa</td>
<td>nobleman</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*dku rgyas gtsigs</td>
<td>nobility edict</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku dar</td>
<td>to prevail</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*dku ’phel</td>
<td>to be revealed</td>
<td>(22) (23) (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dku babs</td>
<td>youthful</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations

* form or meaning reconstructed by the author
? urgently? Translation uncertain
ABS absolutive
ACIP Asian Classics Input Project (see Internet sources)
The semantic ‘capacity’ of the OT dku

MW Monier-Williams, 2002 (see References)
N noun
nc non-controllable verb
O object
OT Old Tibetan
OTC Old Tibetan Chronicles
OTDO Old Tibetan Documents Online (see Internet sources)
PIE Proto-Indo-European
PT Pelliot Tibétain
PTB Proto-Tibeto-Burman
QUOT quotation
R Rerich, J.N., 1983-93 (see References)
Rkoṅ Rkoṅ-po inscription
RKTS Resources for Kanjur & Tanjur Studies (see Internet sources)
s subject
Sch Schmidt, 1841 (see References)
Skt. Sanskrit
SR Sumatiratna, 1959 (see References)
ST Treaty W Sino-Tibetan Treaty inscription, West side
STEDT Sino-Tibetan Etymological Dictionary and Thesaurus (see Internet sources)
TB Tibeto-Burman
TLTD Thomas, 1935-55 (see References)
TP T‘oung Pao
TR transitive
trsIr. transliteration
V verb
VA verbal adjective
WAT Western Archaic Tibetan
WIT Western Innovative Tibetan
WT Written Tibetan
WTS Wörterbuch der tibetischen Schriftsprache (see References)
Zol N Zol inscription, North side
Zwa E Zwa‘i-lha-khaṅ inscription, East side
Zwa W Zwa‘i-lha-khaṅ inscription, West side
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