A new study of the Kubyaukgyi (Myazedi) inscription

Marc Miyake

September 10, 2018

This paper is a new analysis of the 'Rosetta Stone' for the decipherment of the extinct Pyu language once spoken in what is now Upper Burma. The two pillars collectively known as the Kubyaukgyi (a.k.a. Myazedi) inscription from c. 1112 CE have two copies of the same text in four languages: Old Burmese, Old Mon, Pali, and Pyu. I present a critical edition of the text based on newly taken photographs using RTI (Reflectance Transformation Imaging) technology. I provide English glosses and translations of all versions of the text. I also include notes on the phonology and syntax of the Pyu text and a glossary of all words in the Pyu text including their equivalents in the other three languages of the inscription.

Unlike previous Western scholarship on the Kubyaukgyi, this paper incorporates the findings of earlier Japanese studies of the Kubyaukgyi inscription. It also takes into account recent developments in Mon and Pyu language studies.

1 Introduction: previous studies of the Kubyakugyi inscription

The extinct Trans-Himalayan (a.k.a. Sino-Tibetan) language Pyu was spoken in what is now Upper Burma during the first millennium and early second millennium CE. For an overview of current knowledge about Pyu civilization, see Stargardt [1990] and Arlo Griffiths and Wheatley [2017].

The Pyu language is known only from written sources of two types: inscriptional texts in the Pyu script and a limited number of transcriptions in Middle Chinese. The corpus of inscriptions is available online at Griffiths et al. [2018]. Arlo Griffiths and Wheatley [2017] provides an inventory of the former and provides a few examples of the latter; a detailed examination of the Chinese material is forthcoming.

The most studied and most famous of all Pyu texts is the ဂူပြောက်ကြီး Kubyaukgyi inscription (hereafter simply "Kubyaukgyi"), also known as the မြစေတီ Myazedi 'Emerald Pagoda' or ရာဇကုမာရ် Yazakumar inscription. The first two names refer to where the inscription was found; the third name to the prince mentioned in it. The "inscription" actually consists of a total of eight inscriptions: four on each side of two pillars conventionally known as A and B. The text on the two pillars is nearly identical. The text on each side of each pillar is in a different language: Old Burmese (OB), Pali, Old Mon (OM), and Pyu.

The two pillars were found in မြင်းကပါ Myinkaba south of Pagan by Dr. Emil Forchhammer in 1886-87. The smaller A pillar was near the Myazedi pagoda which was built in modern times; it has now been relocated to the Pagan Museum. The larger B pillar was in four pieces: two by the Myazedi pagoda and two at the neighboring Kubyaukgyi temple. These pieces have been reassembled into a single restored pillar now standing on the grounds of the Myazedi pagoda. Bits of the B pillar are missing, so its texts are incomplete; nonetheless, "what remains [is], however, beautifully clear" Duroiselle [1919a].

The top parts of the OB and Pali text were partly transliterated in Forchhammer [1892] on the basis of rubbings made before the bottom piece of the B pillar was fully excavated. That first OB transliteration was marred by modernized spellings. Tun Nyein was the first to translate the OB text into English in Nyein [1899]; a first translation of the Pali translation into French was published a few years later in Beylié [1907].

The OM text was unexamined until Blagden [1909] which was the first decipherment of any text in OM. In addition to transliterating and translating the A version of the OM text into English with extensive line-by-line commentary, Blagden also included the first complete transliteration of the Burmese text and a transliteration of the Pali lines missing from Forchhammer [1892]. Blagden [1910a] provided corrigenda for the OB readings of this pioneering effort and a reading of the B version of the OM text.

Those two articles were then followed by Blagden [1911] on both versions of the Pyu text. Blagden's third article is the foundation of Pyu linguistics; no one had ever studied the Pyu language before, and all other work on the Pyu section of the Kubyaukgyi has been heavily indebted to Blagden's second breakthrough in Southeast Asian decipherment. Prior to Blagden, what he referred to as "the fourth text of the Myazedi inscriptions" had "variously been conjectured to be in some old form either of Assamese, Tibetan, Cambojan, or Shan."

Instead of taking a top-down approach with an *a priori* hypothesis about the language of the text, Blagden adopted an agnostic bottom-up approach "to study the text itself, in both copies, compare it with the parallel versions [in other languages] and endeavour to analyse it as far as possible." He began by matching names and Indic loanwords in the various versions to identify the characters of the mystery script, and proceeded to read and gloss other words on the basis of his interpretation of the script and of the other texts. He made no attempt to be comprehensive by claiming he understood every word of the mystery language. Instead he built solid cases for twenty-six words, noting that some of them were similar to OB and, in one, case, OM. He concluded that

> we have before us a specimen of a language of Burma, not some distant and foreign tongue. Moreover, the language must have been in some kind of contact with Talaing [i.e., OM]: the Talaing loanword and the peculiar letter *ḅ* necessitate that inference. [...] I think the language of our text may with much probability be ascribed to the neighborhood of Prome, and it is not an extravagant conjecture to suggest that it may have been the language of the Pyu (or Pru) tribe which is said to have inhabited that region at an earlier period. [...] What is quite certain is that the language of our text (though assuredly not a mere dialect of Burmese) is either a Tibeto-Burman one or has been deeply modified by some member of the Tibeto-Burman family. (pp. 381-382)

All subsequent scholars have adopted Blagden's identification of the language as Tibeto-Burman and his use of the term Pyu for it (albeit with reservations in some cases).

Blagden's first paper on Pyu ended with a transliteration of the Pyu text of column A supplemented with variants from column B with English translations interspersed. Throughout this paper

and all his works, Blagden maintained a rare degree of honesty about his limitations; at the very end and in Blagden [1912] he printed yet more corrigenda for his 1909 and 1910 papers on the other texts of the Kubyaukgyi inscription.

Cœdès [1911] hailed blagden1911 as "sur ce texte qui était resté jusqu'ici rebelle à tout essai d'interprétation [...] un déchiffrement complet et très satisfaisant", His only quibble concerned Blagden's interpretation of the date in the Pyu text; he proposed that the Pyu used akṣaras as numeral symbols.

Blagden [1914] was a defense of a "much more literal" interpretation of OB spelling as "practically phonetic". Although scholars now take transliterations of OB for granted, in Blagden's day even a noted Orientalist such as his critic R. F. St. Andrew St. John could fall into the trap of anachronistically projecting modern Burmese pronunciation onto OB spellings: e.g., rejecting the evidence for a medial /l/ no longer present in modern Burmese.

The most extensive single work on the Kubyaukgyi inscription is the first part of the first volume of *Epigraphia Birmanica* which covered all four sides of both pillars. An article was devoted to each language of the inscription. Each article contained transcriptions and side-by-side photographs of both the A and B versions of each text followed by a new English translation.

Duroiselle [1919a] took up more than sixty percent of that issue; it contained extensive notes on its Burmese transliteration system and on individual words from a comparative perspective. Although Duroiselle justified OB medial /l/ at length, he oddly excluded it from his section on transliteration. His "Index of Burmese words explained" was unfortunately not accompanied by a comprehensive glossary like those of the Mon and Pyu articles in that issue.

Duroiselle used the inscription "to rectify the chronological errors of the Burmese chronicle *Mahāyāzawin* မဟာရာဇဝင် and Sir Arthur Phayre in respect of four of the most important reigns of that period of Burmese history." The Pali inscription states that Kyanzittha's reign began 1,628 years after the *parinibbāna* of the Buddha and that he died 28 years later. Adding those figures to 544 BCE, the traditional Burmese date for that event, Duroiselle calculated that Kyanzittha became king in 1084 CE and died in 1112 CE.

Although the inscription has often been assigned the date 1112 CE, none of its faces mention when it was written, and neither Duroiselle nor Blagden dated it.

Blagden [1910b] "hesitate[d] to put a date" to the Kubyaukgyi inscription, though he did not agree with Fleet, who thought the inscription "is not a synchronous one; that is, that it was framed and engraved, not when the acts registered by it were performed, but a considerable time afterwards" (Blagden and Fleet [1910]).

Blagden [1910b] hypothesized that

> a recent expansion of Burmese rule had brought neighbouring alien races under its sway, and that the prince who performed the act of piety recorded in these inscriptions was anxious that it should be commemorated in a manner which would be understood by all the more important sections of the population comprised in the Burmese empire. But would anyone, after a lapse of many years, have thought it worth his while to draft and set up in four different languages a statement of the fact that a long deceased prince had made a votive offering on behalf of a long deceased king? I do not think so: surely the principle of *cui bono* applies strongly to such a case of this.

He concluded that the Kubyaukgyi inscription "must be dated somewhere about the time of Kyanzittha's death" without providing a precise year.

Duroiselle [1919b], the section on the Pali text, was far briefer than the section on the OB text that preceded it. It did not even have a title; all it had beyond the bare bones of transcriptions, photographs, and an annotated translation was the text reorganized in metrical form.

The remaining two sections of *Epigraphia Birmanica* were Blagden's refinements of his earlier work on the OM and Pyu texts of the Kubyaukgyi. Both Blagden [1919a] and Blagden [1919b] contained lexicons of all OM and Pyu words other than names in those texts. His OM lexicon had only one error; he interpreted what is now read as a single word *raṁpo'·* 'portion' (Jenny/McCormick); as two words, *raṁ* 'to help' and *po'·* 'for'. Although *raṁ* is an actual Old Mon word, *po'·* is not.

Blagden [1919b] was to be Blagden's swan song on Pyu:

> So far as appears at present, the prospects of Pyu epigraphy are not very promising, and unless much additional material is discovered in the future, it does not seem likely that any great progress will ever be made in the study of this obsolete language.

Although Blagden moved on to other OM texts beginning with part 2 of *Epigraphia Birmanica*, he never touched Pyu again.

There was a quarter-century void in Kubyaukgyi studies that ended with Shafer [1943] which built upon Blagden's work on the Pyu faces of the Kubyaukgyi and other Pyu texts (reprinted in Blagden [1917], and Blagden's reading of PYU001 quoted in

Shafer's article had ten sections. Three overlapped with what Blagden had already published: (1) epigraphy, (8) a transcription with the first word-for-word translation as well as a more natural translation, and (9) a Pyu-English vocabulary. Beckwith [2002] reprinted entries for non-Indic, non-Mon words with certain meanings from Shafer's vocabulary with minor changes and the suggestion that Pyu *aṁ* "represents a vowel different from $[a]$" which "was perhaps closer to $[e]$". The other sections of Shafer's article examined the Pyu text from a linguistic perspective for the first time.

(2) compared Pyu grammatical words with the corresponding words in OB, OM, and Pali.

(3) was a survey of the Indic loans in all three non-Pali texts of the Kubyaukgyi and the Pyu urn. Shafer concluded that there were three strata of Indic loans in Pyu, an older and a newer layer preserving final *a* and a third layer without stem-final *a* via OB or OM. He drew a line between what he called Old Pyu and New Pyu on the basis of the different strata of Indic loans and grammatical differences between the Kubyaukgyi and the older urn texts described in (7).

(4) provided eight sets of sound correspondences between Pyu and other Trans-Himalayan languages: primarily Written Burmese, "Old Bodish" (i.e., Classical Tibetan, not Old Tibetan), and "Lucei" (i.e., Lushai, a.k.a. Mizo).

(5) was a brief discussion of prefixes with a focus on numerals.

(6) was a slightly less brief comparison of Pyu and Karenic vocabulary.

(7) was a survey of Pyu grammar with notes on parts of speech and a list of differences between Kubyaukgyi and pre-Kubyaukgyi Pyu.

(10) was a summary of the above including a list of Indic-to-Pyu sound conversion laws.

The Kubyaukgyi caught the interest of scholars again a decade after the Second World War.

Nishida [1955] contained tables of the OB characters and rhymes and a list of OB consonant clusters attested in the Kubyaukgyi and an annotated word-for-word translation of the OB text into Japanese. Nishida [1956] presented sound correspondences between the rhymes of the OB

of Kubyaukgyi and those of Proto-Tibeto-Burman and Written Burmese with references to Written Tibetan and modern Burmese dialects. Nishida then provided an inventory of OB phonemes including retroflex consonants (!) based on his analysis and a classification of OB suffixes.

Both Tun [1958] and Tha Myat [1958] provided Burmese transliterations of the Pyu text and English translations of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi. Than Tun also gave a word-for-word English translation whereas Tha Myat wrote the first Pyu-Burmese glossary of words in the text. Tha Myat [1958] was reprinted as part of Tha Myat [1963] without the glossary.

Luce [1961] \commentmarc{which I haven't seen} contained a transliteration and English translation of the Mon text of the Kubyaukgyi; Bauer [1990] drew upon it as a source of data for the Old Mon prefix *s-*.

Luce and Shin [1969-1970] placed the Kubyaukgyi into historical context, explaining why it has the four languages that it does and why Kyanzittha, a Burmese king, wrote so much in Mon rather than his native language:

> For the 11th century, we have to imagine the present proportion of Burmese and Mons reversed: a small minority of conquering Burmans, large numbers of native Mons; among the Burmans, only a few literates, mostly in Kyaukse and the capital; among the Mons, an old evolved literature, worthy vehicle for the arts, Buddhism and government. The first necessity for a united Burma was a common written language. The only possible alternative then to Mon was, not Burmese, but Pyu. Pyu, though venerable, was now archaic, and its peculiar script a curiosity. In numbers, too, and range, the Pyu were doubtless far inferior to the Mon. In seeking to impose the Mon written language on the peoples of Burma, Kyanzittha had reason enough: but other considerations, I suspect, may have influenced his choice. Like many another conqueror in history, the victor of the Mons was vanquished by their culture.

Luce went further than Blagden by stating a specific date for the erection of the Kubyaukgyi: "It was doubtless built in or about 1113 A.D., shortly after Kyanzittha's death."

Aung-Thwin [2005] challenged Luce's views, denouncing them as part of what Aung-Thwin called the "Mon Paradigm". In Aung-Thwin's alternative paradigm, written OB preceded written OM in Burma, the OB on the Kubyaukgyi was not one of the very earliest, much less the first, attestation of that language, and Kyanzittha's choice of OM for his inscriptions was an idiosyncratic aberration without long-term consequences. Aung-Thwin regarded the OM on the Kubyaukgyi erected after Kyanzittha's death as a last gasp of the language "as a medium for $[Burmese]$ royal communication".

On the issue of chronology, Aung-Thwin noted that the name Kyanzittha did not actually appear in the Kubyaukgyi and suggested that

> if another calculating era, such as that used in Thailand was intended, or if the date was meant to represent a yet-to-be-completed year, then the reign of this king must be changed accordingly and calculated with 543 BC (hence, to 1083 AD). Since the inscriptions also state that the king had ruled for twenty-eight years, it means the original of the two Kubyaukgyi stones had to have been inscribed thereafter, dating the Kubyaukgyi to 1111, *not* 1112, as conventionally given. The second stone with its newer-looking script could, of course have been inscribed much later than either date, an issue not yet discussed in Burma Studies.

It is not clear which pillar has the "newer-looking script". The question of which pillar came first has also not yet been discussed in Burma studies. Blagden [1909] and Duroiselle [1919a] both regarded the texts on the B pillar as "replicas" of those of the A pillar, but neither stated their reasoning.

Sawada (2002) contained color photographs, word-for-word English glosses, and Japanese translations of all four sides of Kubyaukgyi pillar A. It also contained photographs of all four sides of the other pillar, but only its OB text had English glosses and a Japanese translation.

Kato [2005] translated the Pyu text of the A pillar into Japanese with word-by-word glosses. His interpretation of the Pyu script incorporated several novel features, the most noteworthy being his equation of *ḅ*, *d...ṃ*, and *g...ṃ* with implosives [ɓ ɗ ɠ]. He then compared Pyu with Karen which also has implosives. He stated that *visarga* in Pyu corresponded to Haudricourt's Proto-Karen tone 2, whereas the absence of *visarga* almost always corresponded to Haudricourt's Proto-Karen tones 1 and 3. However, Katō's correspondences were dependent upon his idiosyncratic, unexplained reconstructions of Pyu phonology and semantics.

Krech [2012] was even bolder than Katō while also lacking in substantive argumentation. Krech declared his article to be "the outset of a methodological theory of how to reconstruct ancient languages" (p. 121). But in fact he spent more time criticizing his predecessors than proposing a testable theory.

Unlike previous scholars who looked at the Kubyaukgyi Pyu text with reference to other Pyu inscriptions, Krech viewed that text as an isolated example of what he called "Myazedi Pyu", regarding other Pyu texts as potentially being in other languages without demonstrating any differences between them and the Kubyaukgyi. Solely on the basis of the Kubyaukgyi text, Krech declared that

> Myazedi Pyu seems to have been either (i) a Yipho-Naxi-Burmese language with some important contact influence from Kuki-Chin or (ii) it was originally a Kuki-Chin language that has been deeply modified by some member of the Yipho-Naxi-Burmese group (most notably Mranma).

Krech did not provide any evidence that would justify either of these classifications of "Myazedi Pyu". Given Krech's statement that "the narrower we can identify the genetic affiliation of a certain language the less arbitrary the lexical identifications will tend to be," it is likely that his glosses for the Myazedi are rooted in his assumptions about the position of Pyu in the Trans-Himalayan family. However, like Katō, Krech did not explain how he arrived at his glosses. Moreover, Katō and Krech even supplied conflicting glosses for words whose meanings eluded most of their predecessors: e.g.,

ḅa doṃ (line 1)

Blagden: (no gloss)

Shafer: (no gloss)

Tha Myat: '*nibbāna*' from Pali *pada* which actually means 'foot' or, by extension, 'unit' (e.g., of verse) but not *nibbāna* itself.

Than Tun: (no gloss)

Katō: 'believe' + 'great'

Krech: 'Buddhist.teachings'

In contrast with Katō and Krech, Yabu [2006] was on firmer ground in two senses; he dealt with the far better understood OB text of the Kubyaukgyi, and he did so without resorting to groundless speculations. He translated the OB text into both word-for-word and natural Japanese

and supplied transcriptions into both the Latin and modern Burmese scripts. Like Nishida, he used the OB text primarily as a source of OB-WB sound correspondences, though he also provided notes on grammatical morphemes and expressions now extinct in modern Burmese.

Jenny and McCormick (2014), a handbook article on OM, contained word-for-word and natural English translations of the OM text of the Myazedi as a sample of the language.

Jenny [2015] glossed OM, OB, and Pyu versions of a single line of the Kubyaukgyi to compare what he viewed as permissive causatives in the three languages.

Apart from the two 21st century translations mentioned above, there has been no work on the OM text of the Kubyaukgyi since Blagden, and there has never been an in-depth study of the Pali text. This is perhaps understandable since there are older and longer OM texts, and the Pali text is but a drop in the vast sea of Pali literature, whereas the OB text is one of the earliest in the language, and the Pyu text is one of the very few in that language with counterparts in other languages and is therefore a major key to the decipherment of Pyu.

2 Objectives of the present study

My study differs from its predecessors in several ways.

First, our readings are based on Reflectance Transformation Imaging (RTI) images made in 2014 and 2016. Unlike photographs or rubbings, RTI images can be viewed with simulated lighting using a number of filters to bring out details and exclude noise for more accurate readings. My study is the first to incorporate Arlo Griffiths' identification of subscript final consonants in the B version of the text.

Second, I have compiled the first five-way glossary of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi. Although I claim no expertise in OB, OM, and Pali, I have synthesized the work of my predecessors and colleagues to use those languages to decipher Pyu. Whenever possible, I have explictly matched Pyu words with their counterparts in the other languages.

3 The text of the Kubyaukgyi inscription (A = PYU 7 and B = PYU 8)

3.1 Conventions

We use the following conventions in our edition of the text.

Abbreviations not in Leipzig conventions:

- AOR aorist

- ATTR attributive

- DES desiderative

- EMPH emphatic

- HON honorific

- LN locative noun

- PN personal or place name

- PPP past passive participle

- RLS realis

- so subordinator

- TMP temporal

- XCM exclamatory marker

  uncertain reading

- ( ) editorial restoration of lost text

- ⟨ ⟩ editorial addition of omitted text

- 《 》 scribal insertion

- { } scribal deletion

- ? illegible akṣara

- C illegible consonant element of an akṣara

- + lost akṣara

- ◊ punctuation space

- Z intonation marker

3.2 The Old Burmese text of A (PYU 7)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths, Julian K. Wheatley, and Marc Miyake

1. ‖ śrī ‖ namo buddhāya ‖ purhā skhaṅ· sāsanā °anhac· ta-
   glory reverence Buddha.DAT.SG Buddha lord religion year one

   Glory! Reverence to the Buddha! One thousand six hundred and

2. c· thoṅ· khrok[·] ryā nhac· chāy[·] het· nhac· lon·
   one thousand six hundred two ten eight year elapse

   twenty-eight years of Lord Buddha's religion

3. liy·brī rakā ‖ °īy· °arimaddanapur· maññ· su praññ·
   PFV SO this PN name ATTR city

   having elapsed, in this city named Arimaddanapura,

4. nhik· °ā ‖ śrī tribhuvanāditya dhamma-rāj· maññ· su ma-
   LOC ? HON PN dharma-king named ATTR king

   there was a king named Śrī Tribhuvanāditya

5. ṅ· phlac· °e°a· || thiv· maṅ· °e°a· pāy· mayā ta-
   king be RLS   that king GEN HON wife one

   Dhammarāja. That king's wife

6. c· yok· su kā trilokavaṭaṁsakā devī
   one person that TOP PN   queen

   was named Queen

7. maññ· °e°a· || thiv· pāy· mayā sā tamuleh· rā[ja]-
   name RLS   that HON wife son as.for   PN

   Trilokavaṭaṁsakā. As for that queen's son, he

8. kumār· maññ· °e°a· || thiv· maṅ· kā kyon· suṁ rvoh·
   PN   name RLS   that king TOP slave three village

   was named Rājakumāra. That king gave the queen

9. teh· pāy· mayā °ā piy· °e°a· || thiv· pāy· ma-
   EMPH HON wife DAT give RLS   that HON wife

   three slave villages. That queen

10. yā syī· kha rakā || thiv· pāy· mayā tan·chā   nhaṅ'· thi-
    wife die PST SO   that HON wife ornament and   that

    died, and the king gave that queen's ornaments

11. v· kyon· suṁ rvoh· su nhaṅ'· teh· thiv· pāy· mayā
    that slave three village that and   EMPH that HON wife

    and those three villages of slaves again

12. sā °a sā rājakumār· maññ· so   °ā maṅ· piy· tuṁ
    son DAT son PN   name NMLZ DAT king give do.again

    to the queen's son named Rājākumāra.

13. °e°a· || thuiv· maṅ· °anhac· nhac· chāy· het· nhac· maṅ· mū   bri   ru-
    RLS   that king year   two ten   eight year king reign complete so

    That king reigned twenty-eight years.

14. y'[·] °e°a· || siy· [kha]mū nā su   rhov· nhik· teh· || thuiv· rājaku-
    SO RLS   die about.to ill ATTR time EMPH   that PN

    When he was ill and about to die, the queen's son

15. mār· maññ· su   pay· mayā sā mimī keiv· muy· so   maṅ·
    PN   name ATTR HON wife son self ACC raise ATTR king

    named Rājakumāra remembered the favors of

16. grī   klaññjo °ok·mi   rakā ‖ rhuy· °ati su   purhā   skhaṅ· °a
    great favor   remember so   gold all ATTR Buddha lord   image

    the great king who raised him. He made a pure gold image

17. chaṅ· plu   ruy' °e°a· nhap·liy· su   rhov· teh·   °iy· si-
    image make so   RLS offer   ATTR time EMPH this man-

    of Lord Buddha, and when he offered it, he

18. °a·   min' °e°a· ‖ °iy· rhuy· purhā   kā ṅa skhaṅa °aphei°a· °ati°a· ky-
    -ner speak RLS   this gold Buddha TOP my lord   for   I   slave

    spoke thus: "As for this gold Buddha, I, [your] servant, have made"

19. on·   plo°a· su.teh· ‖ kyon· su[ṁ] rvoh·   °atui°a· kyo-
    servant make NMLZ   slave three village slave

    it for my lord. As for the three villages

20. n·   ṅa skhaṅ· piy· su   saññ· kā °iya rhuya pur[h]ā °ā °atui°a· kyo-
    slave my lord   give NMLZ TOP   TOP this gold   Buddha DAT slave

    of slaves my lord gave [me], I give [those] slaves to this

21. n·   piy· ye°a· ‖ thiv· rhov· teh·   maṅ· nhac[·]klui°a· rakā koṅ·
    slave give RLS   that time EMPH king pleased   so   good

    gold Buddha. At that very moment, the king was pleased, and

22. lheṅ'·teh[·] koṅ· lheṅ'·teh· min'· ruy'· °e°a· saṅgrī
    would.be   good would.be speak so   RLS   master

    said, "That would be good! That would be good!" The lord

23. mahāther· ‖ saṅgrī muggaliputtati[ssa]tther· ‖ saṅgrī su-
    PN   master PN   master PN

    Mahāthera, the lord Muggaliputtatissatthera, the lord Su-

24. medhapaṇḍit· ‖ saṅgrī brahmapāl· ‖ saṅgrī brahmadi-
    PN   master PN   master PN

    medhapaṇḍita, the lord Brahmapāla, the lord Brahmade-

25. v· ‖ saṅgri son[·] ‖ saṅgrī saṅghasena vara-paṇḍi-
    PN   master PN   master PN   best-pun-

    va, the lord Sona, the lord Saṅghasena Varapaṇḍi-

26. t· ‖ thuiv· skhaṅ· tui°a· °amhok·teh· maṅ· [r]iy· son· °e°a·
    dit that lord PL   presence   king water pour RLS

    ta, in the presence of those lords, the king poured water.

27. ‖ thiv· brī   rakā thuiv· rājakumār· maññ· su   pay· mayā °asā
    that complete so   that PN   name ATTR HON wife son

    After that was finished, the queen's son named Rājakumāra

28. thiv· rhuy· purhā   thāpanā ruy'· °e°a· °iy· rhuy· °athot· mū so
    that gold Buddha enshrine so   RLS this gold spire do ATTR

    enshrined the gold Buddha and made a cave-pagoda with

29. kū   plo°a· °e°a· ‖ plo°a· brī   rakā °iy· kū   purhā lhot·
    cave-pagoda make RLS   make complete so this cave-pagoda Buddha dedicate

    this gold sire. Having made that, when he dedicated

30. su   rhov· nhik· teh· ‖ sak·munalon· tac· rvoh· ‖ rapā-
    ATTR time LOC EMPH PN   one village PN

    this cave-pagoda and its Buddha, he brought the one village of Sakmunalor,

31. y· tac· rvoh· ‖ hen·buiv· tac· rvoh(·) ‖ °iy· kyon·
    PN one village PN   one village   this slave

    the one village of Rapāy, the one village of Henbuiv - these

32. suṁ rvoh· yo   ruy'· °e°a· ‖ thuiv· rājakumār· maññ· su   pay·
    three village bring so RLS   that PN   name ATTR HON

    three villages of slaves. The queen's son named Rājakumāra

33. mayā°a· sā °iya kū   purhā °ā riy· son· ruy'· °e°a· °iy'· sei-
    wife   son this cave-pagoda Buddha DAT water pour so RLS   this way

    poured water for this cave-pagoda and its Buddha, and

34. °a· min'· °e°a· ‖ °iy· ṅā °amho°a· kā sarvvaññutaññā-
    way speak RLS   this my deed   TOP omni-

    spoke thus: "May this deed of mine be the cause

35. ṇ·   prajññā ra °am'· sū   °akroṅ· phlac· ciy'· teh· ‖ ṅa
    science wisdom get FUT ATTR cause be   CAUS EMPH my

    of my obtaining omniscience and wisdom in the future. After

36. noṅ· °ā ṅa sā laññ·goṅ· ‖ ṅa mliy·   laññ·goṅ· ‖ ṅa °achu-
    after DAT my son be.it   my grandson be.it   my relatives

    me, be it my son, be it my grandson, be it

37. y·   laññ·goṅ· ‖ sū   tac·thū laññ·goṅ· ‖ °iy· purhā
    relatives be.it   person other be.it   this Buddha

    my relative, be it another person, if they

38. °ā   ṅā lhū   kha su   kyon· °anhip·°acaka teh·   mū mu-
    DAT I   offer PST ATTR slave   ill.treatment   EMPH do   if

    poorly treat the slaves that I offered to this Buddha,

39. kā ‖ °arimittiryā purhā   skhaṅ· °aphu   ra ciy· ‖ = ‖
    if   PN   Buddha lord   not.behold get CAUS

    may they not get to behold the Lord Buddha!"

3.3 The Old Mon text of A (PYU 7)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths and Marc Miyake

1. ‖ śrī   ‖ namo   buddhāya   ‖ śrī   ‖ sās·   kyek   buddha tirley·
   glory   reverence Buddha.DAT.SG   glory   religion sacred.being Buddha my.lord

   Glory! Reverence to the Buddha! Glory!

2. kuli °ār· moy· lṅim·   turov· klaṁ   bār· cvas· diññcām· cnām·
   last go one   thousand six   hundred two ten   eight   year

   When the religion of the Lord Buddha had lasted for 1628 years

3. tuy·   ‖ ḍe[y·] [ḍu]ṅ· (°a)rimaddanapur· vo°a· smiṅ· śri ⁻tribhuvanādi-
   finish in   city   PN   this   king   HON PN

   in the city of Arimaddanapura [Pagan], Śrī Tribhuvanādi-

4. tya dhammarāj·   das· ‖ gna.kyek· smiṅ· goḥh· moy(·) tri-
   PN dharma-king be   queen   king that   one   PN

   -tyadhammarāja became (king). One of the king's queens was

5. lokavaṭaṁsakā devī   °imo°a· ‖ kon·   gna.kyek· goḥ-
   PN   squeen name   child queen   that

   named Trilokavaṭaṁsakādevī. The son of that queen was

6. h·   rājakumār· °imo°a· ‖ smiṅ· goḥh· kil· ḍik· pi   tvā-
   that PN   name   king that   give slave three vil-

   named Rājakumāra. The king gave three villages of slaves

7. ññ·   ku gna.kyek goḥh· ‖ kāl·   gna.kyek· goḥh· cuti
   -lage OBL queen   that   time queen   that   die

   to the queen. When the queen died,

8. °ār· ‖ ’°ut· kiryā   gna.kyek· goḥ ku ḍik· pi   tvāññ· goḥ
   go   all   apparel queen   that OBL slave three village that

   all the queen's possessions and all three of the villages of slaves,

9. smiṅ· tun· kil· ku kon· gna.kyek· ma °imo°a· rājaku-
   king return give OBL child queen   REL name   PN

   the king gave to the son of the queen, who was named

10. mār· goḥ ‖ smiṅ· goḥḥ· kmin· bar cvas· diññcām· cnām· tuy·
    PN that king that reign two ten eight   year finish

    Rājakumāra. The king reigned for 28 years,

11. [kā]l· smiṅ· goḥ ’jey· ññan· scuti ‖ kaun· gna.kyek ma °i-
    time king that sick near IRR.die child queen   REL name

    and when he became sick, approaching death, the queen’s son named

12. mo°a· rājakumār· goḥ [m]ir·nas· guṇ· ma smiṅ· °iññcim·
    name PN   this remember virtue REL king feed

    Rājakumāra remembered the virtues that the king did for (lit. fed)

13. jirku kin[d]aṁ kyek· thar· moy· °ār· tu[ḅ]ok· smiṅ· mu-
    body build sacred.thing gold one go offer   king inform

    him. He cast a golden Buddha image and went to offer it to the king, telling

14. nas· rov· vo°a· ‖ kyek· thar· vo°a· °ey· ḍik· pa raṁ-
    inform manner this sacred.thing gold this 1SG make portion

    him, ”This golden Buddha image I have made on your behalf,

15. po°a· tirla ḍik· pi tvāññ· ma tirla kil· ku °ey· goḥḥ·
    portion lord slave three village REL lord give OBL 1SG that

    my Lord. Those three villages of slaves which you gave me,

16. °ey· ḍik· kil· ku kyek· vo°a· tirla °anumodanā da°a·
    1SG slave give OBL sacred.thing this lord approve   FOC

    I give to this image. May you approve, my Lord.”

17. ‖ kāl· goḥ smiṅ· sḍik· gap.pumas· thic· °ā thic· °ā smiṅ· p·
    time that king pleased pleased   good go good go king do

    Then the king was pleased and saying, ”well done, well done,” gave his

18. sādhukār· ‖ kāl· goḥḥ· tirla poy· mhā[the]r· ‖ ticā-
    approval   time that lord 1PL senior.monk lord

    approval. Then [in the presence] of our lord, the Senior Monk, the lord

19. r· muggaliputtat(i)ssatther· ‖ ticār· sumedhapaṇḍit· ‖ ti-
    lord PN   lord PN   lord

    Mugaliputtatissathera, the lord Sumedhapaṇḍita, the

20. [cā]r brahmapāl· ‖ ticār· brahmadiv· ‖ ticār· son·
    lord PN   lord PN   lord PN

    lord Brahmapāla, the lord Brahmadeva, the lord Son,

21. ‖ ticār· saṅghasena vara-paṇḍit· ‖ kinta   tirla
      lord PN   best-pundit   before lord

    and the lord Saṅghasena, best of pundits, before these lords,

22. ta goḥ smiṅ· cut· ḍek· han· ti   ‖ blaḥ goḥ kon· gna.kye-
    PL that king put water LOC soil end that child queen

    the king poured water on the water. After that, the son of the queen,

23. k·   ma °imo°a· rājakumār· goḥ ket· kyek·   thar· goḥ
    queen REL name PN   that take sacred.thing gold that

    queen, who was named Rājakumāra, took the gold image

24. thāpanā kandaṁ guoh·   cloṅ· thar· [v]o°a· ‖ kāl· busac· kye-
    enshrine build   cave-pagoda spire gold this   time dedicate sacred.thing

    and enshrined it, building this cave-pagoda with the golden spire. When he dedicated this
    image,

25. k·   guoh·   vo°a· kon· gna.kyek goḥ ket· sak·muna- e
    sacred.thing cave-pagoda this child queen   that take PN

    and cave, the queen's son brought from the villages of

26. lor· moy· tvāññ· ‖ rahay· moy· tvāññ· ‖ ññaḥh· (gir°u-)
    PN   one village PN   one village PN

    Sakmunalor, Rapāy, and Ñaḥ Gir

27. y· moy· tvāññ· ‖ °a'ut· ḍik· pi   tvāññ· goḥ cut· ḍe(k· ku)
    PN one village all   slave three village that put water OBL

    'Uy, all the slaves of the three villages, and poured water for

28. kyek·   thar· ma māpanā hin· goḥ   vo°a· rādhanā rov·   (vo°a)
    sacred.thing gold REL enshrine for cave-pagoda this pray   manner this

    the gold image that he had enshrined for this cave, [and] prayed thus:

    māpanā is an error for *thāpanā* in B influenced by the preceding *ma*.

29. ‖ sinraṅ· °e°a· vo°a· °or· dap· het· ku gvo°a·   sarvvaññ(uta)-
      deed   1SG this OPT be   cause OBL attainment omniscience

    "May this deed of mine be a cause for the attainment of omniscience!

30. ññāṇ·   ‖ kon· °ey· laḥ ‖ cov·   °ey· laḥ ‖ ku(lo)
    omniscience   child 1SG or   grandchild 1SG or   kinsman

    Be it my child or my grandchild or my kinsman

31. °ey· laḥ || ññaḥ   c'eṅ· laḥ || yal· pa X °upadrov· ku ḍ(i)-
    1SG or   person other or   if do   violence OBL ser-

    or [any] other person, if he do violence to the slaves

32. k·   ma °ey· kil· ku kyek·   vo°a· yaṅ· ññir·ññāc· kye-
    vant REL 1SG give OBL sacred.thing this EMPH sight   ho-

    whom I am giving to this very image, may he

33. k· trey·   mettey· laḥ   °or· ḍeh· go°a· || 0 ||
    -ly sacred.being PN   PROH OPT he   get

    not get sight of holy Metteya!

3.4 The Pali text of A (PYU 7)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths and Marc Miyake

   Stanzas are numbered with Roman numerals in parentheses: e.g., *jina-sā(2)sanasmiṁ* indicates that line 2 begins in the middle of that word after *sā*.

1. || śrī || (I) buddhādikaṁ   vatthu-varaṁ   namitvā puññaṁ
      glory   buddha.beginning.M.ACC.SG object-excellent.PN bow.ABS merit.ACC.SG
    kataṁ   yaṁ   jina-sā
    do.PPP.N.ACC.SG REL.N.ACC.SG conqueror-

    Glory! After bowing to the Buddha and the other excellent objects, I shall

2. sanasmiṁ   °anādikaṁ   rājakumāra-nāma-dheyyena vakkhā-
    dispensation.N.LOC.SG perpetual?.3SG.N.ACC PN-name-assigning.M.INS.SG speak

    speak of the perpetual ... in the name of Rājakumāra in the Conqueror's dispen-

3. mi   sunātha me   taṁ || (II) nibbānā   loka-nāthassa   °aṭha-vī-
    .FUT.1SG hear.IMP.2PL 1SG.ACC 3SG.N.ACC   nirvana.ABL.SG world-lord.GEN.SG eight-

    sation. Listen to me! A thousand six hundred twenty-

4. sādhike   gate   sahasse   pana vassānaṁ cha-sate
    twenty.plus.LOC.SG go.PPP.N.LOC.SG thousand.LOC.SG and   year.GEN.PL six-hundred.LOC.SG
    cāpare   ta-
    and.later.LOC.SG thus

    eight years having thus passed since the nirvana of the lord of the

5. thā || (III) °arimaddana-nāmasmi pure   °āsi   maha-bbalo
    thus   PN-name.LOC.SG   city.LOC.SG be.AOR.3SG great-power.M.NOM.SG
    rājā
    king.NOM.SG

    word, in a city named Arimaddana was a great and mighty King

6. tibhuvanādicco °udiccādicca-vaṁsa-jo   ‖ (IV) tassāse-
    PN.NOM.SG   exalted.sun-race-born.M.NOM.SG   3SG.M.DAT.be.AOR.3SG.one

    Tribhuvanādiya, born of the exalted solar race. He had

7. kā   piyā   devi   sā   tilokavaṭaṁsikā hi-
    .F.NOM.SG beloved.F.NOM.SG queen.NOM.SG 3SG.F.NOM PN.NOM.SG   desiring.

    a beloved queen Trilokakvaṭaṁsikā, desirous

8. tesī   kusalā   sabba-kiccesu pana rājino   ‖ (V)
    others'.welfare.M.NOM.SG skillful.F.NOM.SG. all-work.LOC.PL and king.GEN.SG
    ta-
    3SG.F.DAT

    of others' welfare, and skillful in all the affairs of the king.

9. ssāseko   suto   rājakumāro nāma   nāma-
    .be.AOR.3SG.one.M.NOM.SG son.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG   name.NOM.SG by.

10. to   °amacco   rāja-kiccesu   byāvato   satimā
    name minister.NOM.SG king-work.LOC.PL zealous.M.NOM.SG prudent.M.NOM.SG

11. vidū   ‖ (VI) °adā   gāma-ttayaṁ   tassā   deviyā   so
    wise.M.NOM.SG   give.AOR.3SG village-triad.ACC.SG F.DAT.SG queen.DAT.SG 3SG.M.NOM
    ma-
    king.

12. hīpati pasanno   sabbadā dāsa-paribhogena   bhuññjituṁ
    NOM.SG devoted.M.NOM.SG always   slave-material.for.enjoyment.INST.SG enjoy.INF

13. ‖ (VII) °aniccatā-vasaṁ   tassā   gatāya   pana deviyā   rā-
    non.continuity-authority.NOM.SG 3SG.F.GEN goPPP.DAT.SG and queen.GEN.SG king

14. ja   rājakumārassa °adā   gāma-ttaya   puna ‖ (VIII) °aṭha-vīsa-
    .NOM.SG PN.DAT.SG   give.AOR.3SG village-triad.ACC.SG again   eight-twen-

15. ti-vassāni   rajjaṁ   dhammena   kāriya māranantika-rogassa
    -ty-year.NOM.PL kingdom.ACC.SG righteousness.INS.SG do.ABS death.end-illness.GEN.SG

16. vasaṁ   patte   narādhipe   ‖ (IX) saranto
    control.ACC.SG reach.PPP.LOC.SG man.ruler.LOC.SG   remember.PRS.PTCP.M.NOM.SG.
    dhamma-rājassa   mahantaṁ   gu-
    righteous-king.GEN.SG great.M.ACC.SG vir

17. ṇa-saññcayaṁ   kāretvā   satthuno   bimbaṁ   sabbasovaṇṇa-
    -tue-quantity.ACC.SG do.CAUS.ABS teacher.GEN.SG image.ACC.SG all-gold

18. yaṁ   subhaṁ   ‖ (X) gahetvā taṁ   mahantena   sakkārena
    .N.ACC.SG beautiful.N.ACC.SG   take.ABS M.SG.ACC great.M.INS.SG reverence.INS.SG
    sumānaso
    joyful.M.NOM.SG

19. °upasaṅkamma rājānaṁ °āha cintitam attano || (XI) bhāgaṁ
    approach.ABS king.DAT.PL say.PRF.3SG thought.ACC.SG self.GEN.SG part.ACC.SG
    katvā-
    do

20. n-idaṁ satthu-bimbaṁ sovaṇṇayaṁ subhaṁ °akāsiṁ
    .ABS-this.N.ACC.SG teacher-image.N.ACC.SG gold.N.ACC.SG beautiful.N.ACC.SG make.AOR.1SG
    vo va-
    2PL.DAT excellent

21. raṁ puññaṁ sāmi tumhe numodatha || (XII) gāma-ttayaṁ
    .N.ACC.SG merit.ACC.SG lord.VOC.SG 2PL.NOM rejoice.IMP.2PL village-triad.NOM.SG
    pi vo
    also 2PL.INS

22. sāmi pubbe dinnan tu me °ahaṁ °imasseva
    lord.VOC.SG in.the.past give.PPP.N.NOM.SG now 1SG.DAT 1SG.NOM this.DAT.SG.only
    munindassa demi ta-
    sage.chief.GEN.SG give.PRS.1SG 3SG

23. ññ cānumodatha || (XIII) °evaṁ vutte mahīpālo roge-
    N.ACC and.rejoice.IMP.2PL say.PPP.LOC.SG king.NOM.SG illness

24. nātura-mānaso sādhu sādhū ti vatvāna
    .INS.SG.afflicted-mind.havingM.NOM.SG good good QUOT say.ABS
    tuṭha-hattho
    pleased.PPP-delightedPPP.M.NOM.SG

25. pamodito || (XIV) dayāparo mahāthero
    rejoiced.PPP.M.NOM.SG compassion.supreme.M.NOM.SG great-thera.NOM.SG
    thero muggali-
    thera.NOM.SG PN

26. puttako sumedhatta sumedho ti laddha-nāmo ca
    PN.NOM.SG wise.self.M.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG QUOT obtain.PPP-name.NOM.SG and
    paṇḍito ||
    pandit.NOM.SG ||

27. (XV) brahmapālo tathā brahmadevo sampanna-sīlavā sono
    .PN.NOM.SG thus PN.NOM.SG succeed.PPP-virtuous.M.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG

28. bahu-ssuto saṁghasenavho vara-paṇḍito || (XVI) °etesaṁ pa-
    much-learned.M.NOM.SG PN.NOM.SG excellent-pundit.NOM.SG this.3PL.GEN and

29. na bhikkhūnaṁ sammukhā so su-mānaso jalaṁ
    and monk.GEN.PL in.front 3SG.M.NOM good-minded.M.NOM.SG water.ACC.SG
    pātesi katvāna sa-
    fall.CAUS.AOR.3SG do.ABS witness

30. kkhin tu   vasudhā-talaṁ   ‖ (XVII) tato so   taṁ
.ACC.SG now earth-surface.ACC.SG   then 3SG.M.NOM 3SG.N.ACC
mahāmacco   bimbaṁ   sova-
great-minster.NOM.SG image.ACC.SG gold

31. ṇṇayaṁ subhaṁ   patiṭhāpiya   kāresi   guhaṁ
.N.ACC.SG beautiful.N.ACC.SG establish.CAUS.ABS do.AOR.3SG cave.ACC.SG
kaññcana-thūpikaṁ ‖
gold-spired.F.ACC.SG

32. (XVIII) katvāna maṅgalaṁ   buddha-patimāya   guhāya   ca °akāsevaṁ
         do.ABS ceremony.ACC.SG buddha-image.DAT.SG cave.DAT.SG and doAOR.3SG.thus
paṇī-
aspiration

33. dhānaṁ nibbinno   bhava-saṅkate   ‖ (XIX) karontena   mayā
.ACC.SG weary.PPP.NOM.SG existence-created.LOC.SG   do.PRS.PTCP.INS.SG 1SG.INS
°etaṁ   yaṁ   pu-
this.N.ACC.SG REL.N.ACC.SG merit

34. ññaṁ taṁ   samācitaṁ   hotu
.ACC.SG 3SG.N.ACC accumulate.PST.PASS.PTCP.N.ACC.SG be.IMP.3SG
sabbaññuta-ññāṇa-pativedhā-
omniscience-wisdom-attainment

35. ya   paccayo   ‖ (XX) yattakā   tu mayā dāsā
.DAT.SG cause.NOM.SG   however.manyM.NOM.SG but 1SG.INS slave.NOM.PL
gāma-ttaya-nivā-
village-triad-dwelling

36. sino   dinnā   guhāya   sovaṇṇa-patimāya mahesi-
.M.ACC.PL give.PPP.M.NOM.PL cave.DAT.SG gold-image.DAT.SG great.sage

37. no   ‖ (XXI) putto   me   vā paputto   vā °añño   vā pana
.GEN.SG   son.NOM.SG 1SG.GEN or grandson.NOM.SG or other.NOM.SG or and
ññā-
kinsman

38. tako   yo   koci   pāpa-saṁkappo   naro   °assaddha–
.NOM.SG REL.M.NOM.SG whoever.M.NOM.SG evil-thought.M.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG unbelieving-

39. mānaso   ‖ (XXII) kareyyupadduvaṁ   tesaṁ   dāsānaṁ   so
mind.M.NOM.SG   do.OPT.3SG.oppression.ACC.SG M.DAT.PL slave.DAT.PL 3SG.M.NOM
narādhamo
man.vilest

40. metteyya-dipadindassa   dassanaṁ   nāthigacchatū
metteyya-two.foot.lord.GEN.SG sight.ACC.SG not.attain.IMP.3SG QUOT

not attain the sight of Metteya, lord of bipeds!

41. ti   ‖ 0 ‖
    QUOT

3.5 The Pyu text of A (PYU 7)

1. 1 ‖ siri   ‖ dathagaṃda ḅadoṃ ḅaṁḥ ḅiṁḥ pduṃ sgu.daṃḥ.ḅa.tva 1000 [600]
   1 glory tathagāta   nirvāṇa HON RLS enter? TMP   1000 600

   Glory! Since the Tathāgata ... nirvāṇa, one thousand six hundred

2. 20 hraṁ °o   sniḥ ḅiṁḥ tvaṃṁḥ tha-daṃṁ // yaṁ tiṁ priḥ rimadhanarbu °o   rmi
   20 eight POSS year RLS elapse PFV   this LOC city PN   NMLZ be.name
   ḅiṁḥ si //
   RLS COP

   twenty-eight years have elapsed. This was in the city named Arimaddanapura.

3. sri tribhuvaṃnadiṃṁtya dhama-raja   °o   rmi   ḅiṁḥ si // °o   doṃḥ ḍaZ ḅaṁḥ
   HON PN   dhamma-king NMLZ be.name RLS   COP   POSS ?   or   HON
   °o   rvaṃḥ ma-
   POSS ruler? wife

   There was a righteous king named Śrī Tribhuvanāditya. His beloved, or the ruler's

4. yaḥ triḍogavaṃdasagadeṃviṃ ḅiṁḥ si °o rmi //   pau °o   saḥ rajaguma ḅiṁḥ
   wife PN   queen RLS be NMLZ name   that POSS son   PN   RLS

   wife, was named Queen Trilokavaṭaṁsakā. Her son was named

5. si °o   rmi // °o   vaṁ traḥ kra   hoḥ ḅiṁḥ paṃḥ toḥZ // pau ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ ḅiṁḥ
   be POSS name   POSS LN slave village three RLS   give PFV   that HON wife   RLS
   hi ta-daṃṁ
   die PRF

   Rājakumāra. To her [the king] gave three villages of slaves. That queen died.

6. ma[ya]ḥ °o   dra   traḥ kra   hoḥ ḅiṁḥ paṃḥ tḅaḥ ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ °o   saḥ
   wife   POSS personal.item slave village three RLS   give again HON wife   POSS son
   rajaguma °o   vaṁ //
   PN   POSS LN

   [The king] gave [his] wife's personal items and the three villages of slaves again to the queen's son Rājakumāra.

7. pau ḅaṁḥ tdaṃḥ sniḥ rpu   hraṁ biṁḥ ta   daṃṁ // ḅiṁḥ sriḥ ḅiṁḥ hniṁḥ hḍiṁḥ
   that HON king YEAR twenty eight RLS place PRF   RLS reign RLS sick NMLZ
   hi °o   mtu   duṃ
   die POSS vicinity LOC

   That king was in place [i.e., ruled] for twenty-eight years. Having reigned, having become sick, [he] was near

8. roḥ   // pau ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ °o   saḥ rajaguma ḅiṁḥ si °o   rmi   // °o diṁṁ
   RLS.COP   that HON wife POSS son PN   RLS be NMLZ name *3 acc*

   death. The queen's son was named Rājakumāra.

9. ḅiṁḥ mtau ma pau tdaṁḥ to   °o kḍeḥtroḥ diṁṁ ḅiṁḥ   mdauṁ.haḥ.ḍaḥ
   RLS raise REL that king righteous POSS favors   RLS   remember PFV
   daṁṁ //   pau ḅaṁḥ
         that HON

   [He] remembered the favors of the righteous king who raised him. He

10. ḅudha °o chaḥ.bo bradima tha   [tlu]   ḅiṁḥ se   kyaḥ // pau ḅaṁḥ ḅudha biṁḥ
    buddha POSS likeness image   golden entirely RLS make CAUS   that HON   buddha RLS
    tuḥ
    offer

    caused a pure gold image in the likeness of Buddha to be made. He offered the Buddha

11. P

    thmuḥ   ḍoḥ yaṁ na   ḅi[ṁḥ] tdiṁḥ toḥZ // yaṁ ḅaṁḥ ḅudha tha   ḅaṁḥ
    presence LOC this manner RLS   speak PFV   this HON buddha golden HON
    raḥ.saḥ   ḅiṁḥ
    on.behalf.of RLS

    into [the royal] presence and spoke thus: "I made this golden Buddha

12. se   ma   ḅuḥ ḅaṁḥ °o vaṁ paṁḥ ce choḥZ // yaṁ traḥ kra   hoḥ ḅiṁḥ paṁḥ
    make NMLZ do HON POSS LN give IRR XCM   this slave village three RLS give

    on behalf of [my] lord, and I shall give it to him!" [The king] gave [him] the three villages

13. ma   ḅuḥ // yaṁ ḅaṁḥ hra   tha   °o vaṁ paṁḥ cheZ // pau ḍoḥ ḅaṁḥ tdaṁḥ
    NMLZ do   this HON sacred.image golden POSS LN give IRR   that in HON king
    ḅiṁḥ kiṁ-
    RLS pleased

    of slaves, [and he] would give [them] to this golden Buddha image. At that point the king
    was

14. -pha   daṁṁ ḅiṁḥ ṅa   ha   pra choḥ ha   pra choḥ ḅiṁḥ si // pau °o   doṁḥ traḥ
    pleased PRF RLS exclaim good do XCM good do XCM RLS be   that POSS after ?
    ḅaṁḥ
    HON

    pleased and exclaimed, "Well done! Well done!" After that the ? lord

15. mahaṭhe / traḥ ḅaṁḥ mugaṁḍubudadisaṭhe / traḥ ḅaṁḥ 《su》medhabadiṁṁ
    PN   ?   HON PN   ?   HON PN

    Mahāthera, the ? lord Muggaliputtatissatthera, the ? lord Sumedhapaṇḍita,

16. / traḥ ḅaṁḥ vrahmaba / traḥ ḅaṁḥ vradaṃyoḥ / tra[ḥ] ḅaṁḥ su / traḥ ḅaṁḥ
    ?   HON PN   ?   HON PN   ?   HON PN   ?   HON

    the ? lord Brahmapāla, the ? lord Brahmadeva, the ? lord Sona, the ? lord

17. sagaṃsi vaṃrabadiṃṃ //   pau traḥ ḅaṁḥ sagha tvo °o   hṅa.diṁ duṃ tdaṃḥ
    PN   that ? HON saṅgha PL   POSS presence LOC   king

    Saṅghasena Varapaṇḍita - in the presence of the ? Saṅgha, the joyful

18. tu   ḅaṁḥ ḅiṁḥ cha toḥ tduṃ // pau ḅiṁḥ ta-daṃṁ mayaḥ °o   sa[ḥ] raja-
    joyful HON RLS pour PFV water   that RLS PRF   wife POSS son PN

    king poured water. That having been done, his wife's son, whose

19. guma ḅiṁḥ si °o   rmi ma   [//] ḅiṁḥ stabana [b]udha tha   ḅi(ṁ)ḥ se
    PN   RLS be POSS name NMLZ   RLS enshrine buddha golden RLS   make
    goṃ   °o sto tha   ḅi(ṁḥ)
    cave-pagoda POSS spire golden RLS

    name was Rājakumāra, enshrined the golden Buddha, made a golden spire of a cave-pagoda,
    and

20. ta-daṃṁ // pau goṃ   °o hḍ[ī]   ḅiṁḥ saṁḥ   [r]oḥ // [sa]manarḍo[ḥ]
    PRF   that cave-pagoda POSS dedication RLS pronounce when   PN
    kra   taṁ / rabai kra   [ta]ṁ [/ j]i[ṁ]-
    village one PN   village one   PN

    put [things in place]. He performed the dedication for that cave-pagoda. The one village of
    Sakmunalor, the one village of Rapāy, the one

21. vuḥ kra   taṁ // yaṁ traḥ kra   hoḥ diṃṁ ḅiṁḥ diṃṁ   daṃṁ // yaṁ ḅaṁḥ
    PN village one   this slave village three ACC RLS assemble PRF   this HON
    mayaḥ (°o   saḥ)
    wife POSS son

    village of Jiṁvuḥ - he assembled these three slave villages. This son of the queen,

22. rajaguma yaṁ goṃ   ḅu[dha] °o   vaṁ tduṃ ḅiṁḥ chai ta-daṃṁ // yaṁ na
    PN   this cave-pagoda buddha POSS LN water RLS pour PRF   this manner
    ḅiṁḥ diṃṁ ch[o] (// yaṁ)
    RLS pray QUOT   this

    Rājakumāra, poured water for this cave-pagoda Buddha. [He] prayed thus, "May this

23. ma gaṁḥ pra ḅuḥ saveññudeñña breñña ḅiṁḥ.ḅiṁḥ paṁḥ che naḥ tiṁ pḍaṁḥ paZ
    REL I   do do omniscience wisdom myself   give IRR cause LOC base   may.be
    //

    which I do be the basis for a cause to give myself omniscience and wisdom!

24. yaṁ tra   tiṁ mtu   knaṁḥ duṃ gi saḥ ḍa / gi pli   la gi sruḥ ḍaZ
    this slave LOC regards FUT   LOC my son or   my grandchild or   my kinsman
    mra.ja.hṅa ḍa   yaṁ
    or   other.person or   this

    In regards to these slaves in the future, whether it be my son or my grandchild or my kinsman
    or another person, suppose someone

25. (ḅu)[dha] °o   vaṁ gamḥ hḍiṁḥ   toḥ ma   diṁṁ / ga hñiṁ.chi ga bro.pdaṃ ma
    buddha   POSS LN   I   dedicate PFV NMLZ ACC   if violence if violence REL
    taḥ   ṅuḥ   ḅuḥ //
    be.evil? be.unbelieving? do //

    performs violence or evil and unbelieving oppression upon those whom I have dedicated to
    this Buddha.

26. yaṁ bamḥ ḅudha   °arimedeyaṃ damṁ ḅaḥ kdiṃ.kchiṁḥ tiṁ tmu   ma paṁḥ che
    this HON buddha PN   PRF   not get.sight.of LOC presence ? give IRR
    choḥ //Z
    xcm

    May [they] not get the sight of this Buddha Āriyametteyya and be permitted in [his] pres-
    ence!”

3.6 The Old Burmese text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Marc Miyake

1. || śra || namo buddhā /// rhā skhaṅa sāsanā tac· thoṅ· khrok· ryā

2. n(h)ac· chāy[·] he /// n· līy· brī rakā || °īy· °arimaddanapur· ma

3. /// vanādityadhammarāj· maññ· su maṅ· phlac· °e

4. /// (y)ā tac· yok· su kā trilokavaṭaṁ

5. /// thuiv· pay· mayā sā kā rājakumā

6. /// k[y]on· suṁ rvoh· pay· mayā °ā

7. /// (rakā) || pay· mayā (ta)

8. /// su nhaṅ’· pa[y·] /// (°a) [s]ā rājakumā

9. /// tu[ṁ] °e °a || thuiv· maṅ· °anhac· nhac· chāy·

10. /// °e°a· || sīy· kha mū nā su rhov· nhik· Ce

11. /// r· maññ· su pay· mayā°a· sā ◊ mi mī

12. /// kla ññjo °ok· mi rakā || r[h](u)[y]· °a

13. /// [ṅ](·) [p]lu ru /// °e°a· nhap· līy· su rhov· ///

14. /// ya /// na ◊ [°e °a] ‖ °iy· rhuy· purhā k[ā]

15. °aphei°a· °atei°a(·) /// y /// pl[o]°a· su teh· | ///

16. n· suṁ rvoh· °athui°a· kyon(·) ṅa skhaṅ· piy· su saññ· kā ///

17. rhuy· pu rhā °ā °a ◊ tui°a· kyon(·) /// y· ye°a· ‖ thiv· rhov·

18. ◊ h· maṅ· nhac· klui°a· rakā koṅ· lh(e)ṅ’·teh· koṅ· ///

19. teh· min’· ru ◊ y’· °e°a· ‖ sa (ṅg)r(ī) mahāther· ‖ sa ṅgrī ///

20. liputtatissatther· ‖ sa ṅgrī sume ///paṇḍit· ‖ sa ṅgrī brahma ///

21. l· ‖ sa ṅgrī brahmadiv· ‖ sa ṅgri so /// ‖ sa ṅgrī saṅghasena varapaṇḍi-

22. t· ‖ thuiv· skhaṅ· ◊ tui°a· °am(ho) /// ha maṅ· riy· son· °e°a· ‖

23. thuiv· brī rakā thuiv· rājak /// y· mayā°a· °a sā thuiv· rhuy·

24. pu rhā thāpanā /// [°e°a·] /// hu /// s[o] kū plo°a· ◊ °e°a·

25. plo°a· bri ra(k) /// (°i)y· kū pu ◊ rhā lho(t·) /// · ///

26. sakmunalon· [t](ac)· rvoh· ‖ rapāy· (t) /// ‖ hen· buiv· ta

27. c· rvoh· ‖ °iy· [ky]on· [p/s]lī rvoh(·) yo ruy’· °e°a· ‖ thiv·

28. rājaku(mā)[r]· (mañ ñ)· su pay· mayā°a· sā °iy· kū pu rhā °ā riy·

29. son ruy’ · °e°a· °iy’· sei°a· min’· °e°a· ‖ °iy· ṅā °amho°a·

30. kā sarvvaññutaññāṇ· praññjā ra °ap’· sū °akroṅ· phlac· ◊ ciy’·

31. teh· ‖ noṅ· °ā ṅa sā lañ ñ· goṅ· ‖ ṅa mliy· lañ ñ· goṅa

32. ‖ ṅa °achuy· lañ ñ· goṅ· ‖ sū tac· thū lañ ñ· goṅ· ‖ °iy· pu rhā °ā ṅā

33. lhū kha su kyon· °anhip·°acak· teh· mū mu kā ‖ °arimittiryā pu

34. rhā skhaṅ· °a phū ra ◊ ciy ‖ 0 ‖

3.7 The Old Mon text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Marc Miyake

1. [r]/// u(d)[dh]

2. ddha tirley· kuli °a /// moya lṅima ///

3. ḅār· cvas· diññcām· cnām· tuy· ‖ ḍe /// ḍu

4. °arimaddanapur· vo°a· smiṅ· śrītribhu ///

5. mmarāj· das· || gna kyek· smiṅ· goḥ[h](·) ///

6. lokavaṭaṁsakā de ◊ vi °imo ///

7. kyek· goḥh· rājakumār· °imo ///

8. g(o)ḥh· kil· ḍik· pi tvāññ· ku gna Ce ///

9. g(o)ḥh· || kāl· gna kyek· goḥh· cu(t)

10. °a°ut· kiryā gna kyek· goḥ ku ḍik· pi ///

11. goḥh· smiṅ· tun· keil· ku kon· gna ///

12. ma °imo°a· rāja[ku]mār· goḥh· || smi ///

13. kmin· ḅār cvas· diññcām· cnām· tuy· (k) ///

14. goḥ 'jey· ññan· scuti || kon· ///

15. ma °imo°a· rāja ◊ kumār· go ///

16. r·nas· guṇ· ma smiṅ· °iññcim· jirk ///

17. kyak· thar· moy· °ār· tu(ḅ)ok· smi

18. ṅ· munas· rov· vo°a· || kyek· thar· vo°a· °e

19. y· ḍik· pa raṁpo°a· tirla ḍi(k·) pi tvāññ· ma

20. tirla keil· ku °ey· goḥ /// °ey· ḍik·

21. kil· ku kyek· vo°a· tirla °anu

22. modanā da || kāl· goḥ smiṅ· (sḍ)ik· gap puma

23. s· thic· °ā thic· °ā smiṅ· pa sādhu(k)ār· || kāl·

24. goḥ tirla ◊ poy· mhāthe /// | ticār·

25. muggaliputtatissatther· || ◊ ticā /// [su]medhapa

26. ṇḍit· || ticār brah///pāl· || (ti) /// r· brahma

27. /// [va || ti]cār(·) son(·) || t(i)cā /// (ṅgha)sena-

28. [var]paṇḍit· || kinta tir[l]a (t)a goḥ smiṅ·

29. cut· ḍek· han· ti || blaḥ (go) /// (ko)n·

30. gna kyek· ma °imo°a· rājaku /// (go)ḥ

31. ket· kyek· thar· goḥh· thāpa?ā ka /// guo

32. h· cloṅ· thar· vo°a· || kāl· busac·

33. kyek· goh· vo°a· kon· gna kyek g(o)ḥ

34. ket· sak·munalon· moy· tvāññ· /// pā

35. y· moy· tvāññaḥh· gir°uy· moy·

36. tvāññ· ‖ ’ut· ḍik· pi tvāññ· goḥ cu

37. t· ḍek· ku kyek· thar· ma thāpanā

38. hin· guoḥ vo°a· rādhanā rov· vo

39. °· ‖ sinraṅ· °ey· vo°a· °or· das· he

40. t· ku gvo°a· sarvvaññutaññāṇ· |[‖] ko

41. n· °ey· laḥ ‖ cov· °e°a· laḥ ‖ kulo

42. °ey· laḥ ‖ ññaḥ c’eṅ· laḥ ‖ yal· pa °u-

43. padrov· ku ḍik· ma °ey· kil· ku

44. kyek· vo°a· yaṅ· ññir·ññāc· kye-

45. k· trey· mettey· laḥ °or· ḍeh·

46. go°a· ‖ 0 ‖

3.8 The Pali text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Marc Miyake

1. ‖ śrī ‖ buddhādikaṁ vatthuvaraṁ nametvā puññaṁ kataṁ yaṁ jina ///

2. kaṁ rājakumāranāmadhayyena vakkhāmi suṇ ///

3. nibbānā lokanāthassa °aṭhavīsā ◊ dhike gaCe /// sse pana

4. vassānaṁ chasate cāpare tathā ‖ 0 ‖ °arimadda /// smi pure °āsi

5. mahabbalo rājā tibhuvanādicco °udiccā /// va ◊ ṅsajo

6. tassāsekā piyā devi sā tilokava /// kā hitesī

7. kusalā sabbakiccesu pana rā[j]i[n]o ‖ /// ‖ (t) /// sāseko su

8. to rāja ◊ ku ◊ māro nāma nāmato °amacco rājakiccesu

9. byāvato satimā vidū ‖ 0 ‖ °adā gāmattayaṁ tassā de

10. ◊ viyā so mahīpati pasanno savvadā [dā]saparibhogena

11. bhuñjituṁ ‖ 0 ‖ °aniccatāvasaṁ tassā ga(t)āya pana deviyā

12. rāja rājakumārassa °adā gāmattayaṁ puna || 0 || °aṭhavīsati

13. vassāni rajjaṁ dhammena kāriya mā ◊ rananti(k)arogassa vasaṁ pa

14. tte narādhipe || 0 || saranto dhammarājassa (ma)hantaṁ guṇasañca

15. yaṁ kāretvā satthuno bi ◊ mbaṁ sabbasova[ṇṇa]yaṁ subhaṁ || 0 || ga

16. hetvā taṁ ◊ mahantena sakkārena sumānas[o] °upasaṅkamma

17. rājānaṁ °āha cintitam attano || 0 || bhāgaṁ katvānidaṁ satthu

18. bimbaṁ sovaṇṇayaṁ su ◊ bhaṁ °akāsiṁ vo varaṁ puññaṁ sā ◊ mi

19. tumhe numodatha || gāmattayaṁ pi vo sāmi pubbe dinna

20. n tu me °ahaṁ °imasseva munindassa demi tañ ñ cānumodatha || 0

21. || ◊ °evaṁ vutte mahīpālo rogenāturamānaso sādhu sā

22. ti vatvāna tu ◊ ṭhahattho pamodito || 0 || dayāparo pa

23. hāthero hero ◊ muggaliputtako sumedhattā su

24. medho ti laddhanāmo ca ◊ paṇḍito || 0 || brahmapā

25. lo tathā brahmadevo sampannasīlavā sono bahu

26. ssuto saṅghasennavho varapaṇḍito || 0 || °etesaṁ

27. pana bhikkhūnaṁ saṁmukhā so sumānaso (ja)laṁ pātesi katvā

28. na sakkhin tu vasudhātalaṁ || 0 || tat(o) so taṁ mahāmacco

29. bim /// sovaṇ(ṇ)ayaṁ subhaṁ pati /// i /// (kāresi gu)

30. [ha] (ka) /// [vā na] maṅgalaṁ buddhapa ///

31. timāya gu ◊ hāya ca °akāsevaṁ paṇī ◊ dhānaṁ

32. nibbinno bhavasaṅkate || 0 || karontena mayā °etaṁ

33. yaṁ puññaṁ taṁ samācitaṁ hotu sabbaññutaññāṇaṁ

34. pahivedhāya paccay[o] || 0 || yattakā tu mayā

35. dāsā gāmattayanivāsino dinnā gu ◊ hāya sova

36. /// patimāya mahesino || 0 || putto me vā pa

37. /// tt(o) vā °añño vā pana ññātako yo koci

38. pasaṅkappo naro °assaddhamānaso || 0 || ka[r]e

39. yyapadduvaṁ tesaṁ dāsānaṁ so narādhamo mittiyyadi

40. pa ◊ dinda ◊ ssa dassanaṁ nādhigacchatū ti ‖ 0 ‖

At the end of line 40 is the beginning of a barely visible text in Old Burmese that continues for two more lines. A reading of this text is forthcoming. This Old Burmese text is clearly not part of the original inscription, as it is not in the same hand as any of the other faces in Mon-Burmese script.

3.9 The Pyu text of B (PYU 8)

Reading by Arlo Griffiths, Julian K. Wheatley, and Marc Miyake

1. 1 ‖ siri ‖ dathagaṃda ḅa doṃ ḅaṁḥ ḅiṁḥ pduṃ sguṃ daṃḥ ḅa tva 1000 [600]

2. 20 hra[t]·ṁ °o sni[ṅ]·ḥ ḅiṁḥ tvaṅ·ṃṁḥ tha daṅ·ṃṁ yaṁ tiṁ priṅ·ḥ rimadham·narbu °o miṅ· ḅiṁḥ si // sri tribhu-

3. vaṃnadit·ṃṁtya dham·maraja °o rmiṅ· ḅiṁḥ si // °o doṅ·ṃḥ ḍaZ ḅaṁḥ °o rvaṅ·ṃḥ mayaḥ triḍo-

4. gavadasaga deṃviṃ ḅiṁḥ si °o rmi // pau °o saḥ rajaguma biṁḥ

5. si °o rmi // °o vaṁ traḥ kra nhoḥ ḅiṁḥ paṁḥ toḥZ // pau ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ biṁḥ

6. hi ta-daṃṁ // ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ °o tra traḥ kra hoḥ ḅiṁḥ paṁḥ [t]ḅaḥ ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ

7. [°o saḥ rajaguma °o vaṁ] // pau ◊ ḅiṁḥ tdaṃḥ sniḥ rpu hraṁ ḅiṁḥ ta-daṃṁ // 0 //

8. ḅiṁḥ sriḥ ḅiṁḥ hniṁḥḥḍiṁḥ hi °o mtu duṃ roḥZ // pau ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ °o saḥ

9. rajaguma ḅiṁḥ si °o rmi // °o diṃṁ ḅiṁḥ mtau ma pau tdaṃḥ to °o kḍeḥtroḥ

10. diṃṁ ḅiṁḥ mdauṃ.haḥ.ḍaḥ daṃṁ // pau ḅaṁḥ ḅudha °o chaḥ.bo bradima tha [tlu] ḅiṁḥ se

11. kyaḥ // pau ḅaṁḥ budha ḅiṁḥ tuḥ thmuḥ ḍoḥ yaṁ naṁ ḅiṁḥ tdiṃḥ toḥZ // yaṁ

12. ḅudha tha ḅaṁḥ raḥ.saḥ biṁḥ se ma ḅuḥ ḅaṁḥ °o vaṁ paṁḥ che choḥZ // yaṁ traḥ

13. k[ra] nhoḥ ḅiṁḥ paṁḥ ma ḅuḥ // yaṁ ḅaṁḥ hra tha °o vaṁ paṁḥ cheZ // pau ḍoḥ ḅaṁḥ

14. tdaṃḥ ḅiṁḥ kiṁ pa daṃṁ ḅiṁḥ ṅa ha pra choḥ ha choḥ ḅiṁḥ si // pau °o

15. doṃḥ traḥ ḅaṁḥ mhaṭhe / traḥ ḅaṁḥ mugaṃtubudiṁsaṭhe / traḥ ḅaṁḥ

16. saumedhaḅadiṃṁ / traḥ ḅaṁḥ vrahmaba / traḥ ḅaṁḥ vrahmadaṃyoḥ / tra ḅaṁḥ

17. su / traḥ ḅaṁḥ sagaṃsirvaṃrabadiṃṁ / pau traḥ ḅaṁḥ sagha tvo °o hṅa.

18. diṁ duṃ tdaṃḥ tu ḅaṁḥ ḅiṁḥ cha toḥ tduṃ // pau ḅiṁḥ ta-daṃṁ mayaḥ °o saḥ

19. rajaguma ḅiṁḥ si °o rmi maZ // ḅiṁḥ staḅana ḅudha tha ḅiṁḥ se goṃ

20. °o stau tha ḅiṁḥ ta-daṃṁ // pau goṃ °o hḍī ḅiṁḥ saṁḥ ma roḥ // samana-

21. rḍoṁṃḥ kra taṁ // rabai kra taṁ / jiṁvuḥ kra taṁ / yaṁ traḥ kra hoḥ diṁṃ ḅiṁḥ

22. diṃṃ daṃṃ // yaṁ ḅaṁḥ mayaḥ °o saḥ rajaguma yaṁ goṃ ḅaṁḥ ḅudha

23. °o vaṁ tduṃ ḅiṁḥ chai ta-daṃṃ // yaṁ na ḅiṁḥ diṃṃ cho // yaṁ ma gaṁḥ pra ḅuḥ

24. saveñudeña b(r)e[ña] (ḅ)i(ṁḥ.ḅ)i(ṁḥ paṁḥ) ch(e) naḥ [t](i)ṁ pḍa(ṁ)ḥ [pa] (//)

25. ya(ṁ) [t]r[a] ? + + + + + + + [sa]ḥ ḍa / gi pḍi ḍa / gi (s)ruḥ

26. ḍa / mra.ja.[h]ṅa [ḍa /] ya(ṁ) ḅudha °o vaṁ gaṁḥ hḍiṁḥ toḥ

27. ma diṃṃ / ga hñiṁ ci ga bro.pdaṃ ma taḥ ṅuḥ ḅuḥ // yaṁ baṁḥ

28. ḅudha °arimedeyaṃ daṃṃ ḅaḥ kdiṃ.kchiṁḥ tiṁ tmu ma paṁḥ

29. che choḥZ ◊ ‖ @

4 Phonology of the Pyu text

The phonology of the Kubyaukgyi text has characteristics distinguishing it from the phonology of all other Pyu texts in our corpus other than 39 whose Pyu and Old Mon texts refer to the year 441 = 1078 CE.

Shafer (1943: 316) was the first to suggest that the Kubyaukgyi text was in Late Pyu whereas earlier Pyu texts were in Old Pyu. Shafer differentiated between the two stages of Pyu on the basis of two criteria:

- Late Pyu had grammatical differences from Old Pyu
- Late Pyu had borrowings from Old Mon and Old Burmese absent from Old Pyu

Shafer (1943: 357) also speculated that "If we had more common lexical comparisons from the two periods, some phonetic change might perhaps be observed."

One phonetic change that has been observed in Miyake (forthcoming) is the fortition of Old Pyu *l to a Late Pyu retroflex ḍ, possibly via a retroflex ḷ in an intermediate stage Miyake called Middle Pyu. Retroflex ḍ is unique to the three Late Pyu texts (7, 8, 39), and retroflex ḷ is unique to 37, which Miyake tentatively regards as the only Middle Pyu text. 'Middle Pyu' is a shaky category since

- 37 cannot be dated; it may be contemporary with Old Pyu or New Pyu
- 37 is the only Pyu text found near modern Nay Pyi Taw, so its retroflex ḷ may reflect an unique dialectal development rather than an intermediate stage between Old and New Pyu
- ḷ only appears in three distinct akṣaras in 37: ḷo, ḷiṁ, and pḷaṁḥ. Out of these three akṣaras, only pḷaṁḥ resembles a word with a meaning found in another text: Old Pyu plaṁḥ (16.1b, 2b, 2C) > New Pyu pḍaṁḥ (7.23, 8.24) 'base'. However, there is no guarantee that pḷaṁḥ in 37 also means 'base'; it may be an unrelated word with a spelling other than plaṁḥ elsewhere in the corpus.

l is still present in two Late Pyu akṣaras, tlu '?' (7.10 and 8.10) and pli 'grandson' (7.24) corresponding to pḍi 'id.' (8.25).

tlu is unique to 7 and 8. It may be an archaic spelling for /t.ḍu/ from an earlier †tlu not attested elsewhere in the corpus. It may also be a loanword postdating the fortition of l.

pli 'grandson' (7.24) is not a loanword. Although its spelling is identical to that of Old Pyu pli 'grandson' (16.4A), it may represent /p.ḍi/.

A more speculative phonetic change also observed in Miyake (forthcoming) is the fortition of Old Pyu *hl to a Late Pyu retroflex hḍ. hl is unique to Old Pyu, and hḍ is unique to Late Pyu. However, none of the three hḍ-words have clear ancestors in Old Pyu. There is no Old Pyu hli or hlī corresponding to Late Pyu hḍī 'dedication formula', and Old Pyu hliṁḥ '?' (16.3d and elsewhere) may or may not be the same word as either of the two Late Pyu hḍiṁḥ, 'to dedicate to' (7.25, 8.26) and '?' (7.7, 8.8).

The Late Pyu of the Kubyaukgyi inscription has the following initials:

Preinitials

	/k./		
			/r./
/s./	/t./	/n./	
	/p./	/m./	

Periods in phonological reconstructions separate preinitial consonants from initial consonants.

Simple initials

	/°/?	/h/									
	/k/			/g/		g-ṃ /ɣ/	hṅ /ŋ̊/	ṅ /ŋ/			
	/c/	ch / cʰ/		j /ɟ/		y-ṃ / ʝ/	hñ /ɲ̊/	(ñ /ɲ/)		/y /j/	
				ḍ /ɖ/	hḍ /D/				hr /ɽ̥/	/r/	dr /R/
/s/	/t/	th /tʰ/		/d/		d-ṃ /ð/	hn /n̥/	/n/		/l/	
	/p/	ph /pʰ/	ɓ /ɓ/	/b/		v-ṃ /v/	hm /m̥/	/m/		v /w/	

Complex initials

	/k./	/t./	/n./	/p./	/m./	/r./	/s./
/g/							sg-ṃ /s.g/
/c/	kch /k.c/						
/ḍ/	kḍ /k.ḍ/			pḍ /p.ḍ/			
/t/					/m.t/		/s.t/
/d/	kd-ṃ /k.d/	td-ṃ /t.d/		pd-ṃ /t.d/	md-ṃ /m.d/		
/n/	/k.n/						/s.n/
/p/						rb /r.p/	
/ɓ/		tḅ /t.ɓ/					
/v/		tv-ṃ /t.b/				rv-ṃ /r.b/	
/m/		tm, thm /t.m/				/r.m/	
/j/	ky /k.j/						
/r/	/k.r/	/t.r/		/p.r/	/m.r/		/s.r/
/l/		/t.l/		/p.l/			
/w/		tv /t.w/					
/h/			/n.h/		/m.h/		

Aspiration is nonphonemic after preinitials. This may be a Late Pyu innovation.

Polysyllabic medial consonants

		/h/		g /k/	g-ṃ, gh /g/			
					j, y-ṃ /ipaɟ/		ñ/ɲ/	y /j/
				ḍ /ɖ/				/r/, rḍ /r.ḍ/, rb /r.p/, rv-ṃ /r.b/
/s/	t(y) /t(.y)/	/ṭh, th /tʰ/		d /t/	dh, d-ṃ /d/		/n/	
			ḅ /ɓ/	b /p/	bh, v-ṃ /b/	hm /m̥/	/m/	v /w/

Voiceless stops lenite to voiced in intervocalic position in close juncture.

Voiced stops lenite to fricatives in intervocalic position in close juncture.

Pre-initials

	/k./		
			/r./
/s./	/t./	/n./	
	/p./	/m./	

There are seven vowels: /a ä i ï u e o/.

/ä/ is a low front vowel spelled *aṁ*.

/ï/ is a nonfront, nonlow vowel spelled *iṁ*.

A has no subscript consonant symbols for codas, and B only has a few such symbols. Hence it is often not possible to tell whether written open syllables in fact represented open syllables. There are two types of potential unwritten codas: voiceless sonorant codas and all other codas. I phonologize the first type as /(C)h/ and the second type as /(C)/: e.g.,

- *kyaḥ* /k.jah/ may have been /k.jaŋ̊/, /k.jaĵ/, etc. as well as /k.jah/

- *hḍī* /Di(C)/ may have been /Dik/, /Diŋ/, etc. as well as /Di/.

I do not reconstruct (C) if a syllable in a word appears as an open syllable in texts with subscript consonants or if it corresponds to an open syllable in another language.

The only codas that can be confirmed from spellings in B are -ṅ·ḥ /ŋ̊/, -ṅ· /ŋ/, -t· /t/, -m· /m/, -ḥ /h/. Others are supplied on the basis of the Kan Wet Khaung Mound inscription (PYU 16).

It is possible that /h/ and voiceless sonorant codas conditioned tones by the Late Pyu period, but that is impossible to determine from spellings alone. Hence I phonemicize Late Pyu with codas in lieu of tones.

5 Grammar of the Pyu text: a few preliminary notes

The Kubyaukgyi inscription is invaluable for the reconstruction of Pyu grammar because it is the only multilingual text which is largely intact and contains coherent prose. The Kan Wet Khaung Mound inscription (PYU 16) is largely intact, but its Pyu content consists of glosses, not connected sentences. Conversely, the various texts of the Myittha inscription (PYU 39) are all heavily damaged to some degree; there is almost no Sanskrit text left. Both sides of the Pyu-Chinese Tharaba Gate inscription (PYU 11) are worn to the point of near-total illegibility.

The writing conventions of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi inscription both help and hinder the reconstruction of its grammar. On the one hand, daṇḍa (Sanskrit: 'stick') punctuation marks break up the text. Double daṇḍas appear roughly where full stops would be expected, and single daṇḍas appear roughly where commas would be expected. For instance, the first sentence of the Old Burmese text (7.1-3) ends in double daṇḍas, and a similarly long stretch of Pyu text (A1/B1-A2/B2) also ends in double daṇḍas.

The reconstruction of the grammar of the Pyu text of the Kubyaukgyi inscription is dependent upon the correct identification of morphemes. I can tentatively classify what appear to be free morphemes as 'words', but I am unable to be certain whether grammatical morphemes are bound affixes or clitics. Hence I use the deliberately vague term 'marker' for grammatical morphemes. I use periods to join sequences of syllables which may constitute a phrase (i.e., a sequence of words) or a polysyllabic word of one or more morphemes.

I assume that Indic nouns in the other three texts of the Kubyaukgyi correspond to nouns in Pyu: e.g., the Pali noun rājakumāra 'Rajakumara' and its Old Burmese and Old Mon equivalent rājakumār· correspond to a Pyu noun rajaguma. The phonetic resemblance of such polysyllabic sequences cannot be due to chance. As i eres no guarantee that a borrowed word will retain its original part of speech. Nonetheless a retention of noun status is the norm in contact situations, and we have no positional evidence to suggest that these Indic loans were verbs.

The identification of non-Indic Pyu nouns in the Kubyaukgyi on the basis of correlations with other texts and potential Trans-Himalayan cognates is less secure than equating obvious Indic loans. Once again, there is no guarantee that a Pyu word has the same part of speech as its equivalent in other texts. The possibility of a Pyu word being inherited from Proto-Trans-Himalayan or some lower-level proto-language does not improve the odds of stability in any way. Still, the positional evidence indicates that these non-Indic words were nouns.

What exactly is this positional evidence? If Pyu had a strict word order, I could expect Pyu nouns to appear only in certain slots. And if Pyu were inflecting, I could expect Pyu nouns to have certain affixes. Unfortunately, Pyu seems to be almost entirely lacking in inflectional morphology apart from the first person pronoun *gaṁḥ* /gäj̊/ which has a genitive form *gi* /gi/.

6 Glossary of the Pyu text

Entries appear in an alphabetic order based on that of Burmese with the addition of *ḅ* after *b*:

k	kh	g	gh	ṅ		
c	ch	j	jh	ñ		
ṭ	ṭh	ḍ	ḍh	ṇ		
t	th	d	dh	n		
p	ph	b	ḅ	bh	m	
y	r	l	v			
s	h	°				
a	i	u	e	ai	o	au
ṃ	ṁ	ḥ				

I do not include Z in the forms in my lexicon since I do not regard it as an inherent part of any word.

I choose spellings of Indic loanwords closest to their sources for main entries to faciliate lookup by users familiar with Indic languages. Similarly, I choose maximally conservative spellings of

non-Indic Pyu words for main entries to facilitate lookup by users familiar with Trans-Himalayan languages. I favor A spellings and/or more frequent spellings if I have no way to determine whether a spelling is more conservative. Nonfavored spellings have stub entries with cross-references to main entries.

I combine variant spellings into single entries. If multiple spellings are of equal frequency, I assign stub entries to spellings that appear incomplete or damaged. Otherwise I assign stub entries to arbitrarily chosen spellings. Variant spellings are listed in parentheses following their citation: e.g., B14 (*kiṁ pa*) in the entry for *kiṁ pha*.

Forms in slashes are phonological reconstructions. Spaces separate syllables and do not necessarily correspond to morphemic boundaries.

Citations from the two versions of the Kubyaukgyi inscription are in the format A or B plus line number. Each attestation in A is followed by a slash and its counterpart in B: e.g., A13/B14 indicates that a word in A13 corresponds to a word in B14. If a word appears in only one version, a hyphen indicates its absence in the other: e.g.,

A24/B-

A-/B6

This format allows users to easily compare words in the same contexts in both versions.

Numbers followed by x in parentheses indicate multiple attestations of a pairing: e.g., A8/B9 (×2) indicates two instances of a word in A8 corresponding to two instances of a word in B9. A8/B9 (×2) does not mean that there are only two instances of a word in A8 and B9; the word in question (°*o*) in fact appears three times in both A8 and B9, but the third instances in A8 and B9 are in different pairings: A8/B8 and A9/B9.

Non-Kubyaukgyi citations are in the format PYU inventory number + period + line number. Letters following the line number (A, b, C, d) specify the four faces of 16.

The Pali text only loosely corresponds to the Pyu text. I have tended to cite Pali equivalents only when they correspond to Pyu words lacking equivalents in OB and OM.

All readings are regularized for ease of comparison unless indicated otherwise: e.g., I write "first two syllables of *kdiṃ kchiṁḥ tiṁ*" at the beginning of Tha Myat's gloss even though Tha Myat himself read those syllables as *diṃ chiṁḥ* or textitdiṃ kchi.

I do not provide other scholars' readings unless they are relevant for a phonological discussion. Those other readings are preceded by abbreviations from the apparatus: e.g., Tm *diṃ chiṁḥ* is Tha Myat's reading of *kdiṃ kchiṁḥ*.

Other scholars' glosses are direct quotations despite the absence of double quotation marks. I have made small, nonsubstantive changes in capitalization and punctuation for stylistic consistency with the rest of this article: e.g., double quotes for glosses have been converted to single quotes for glosses, and punctuation has been placed outside single quotes. I have also added 'to' or 'to be' whenever they are absent from glosses of verbs.

All Blagden glosses are from Blagden [1919b] except for those followed by (1911) in parentheses; the latter are from Blagden [1911] whenever they differ from those of Blagden [1919b].

I include line numbers in glosses when scholars provide different glosses for the same entry in different contexts.

I have translated Tha Myat and Katō's glosses into English following their glosses which are respectively in Burmese and Japanese.

I reproduce Tha Myat's idiosyncratic Burmese spellings with redundant creaky and high tone marking verbatim: e.g., ၍ and ညှင်းခဲး instead of standard ၍ and ညှင်းခဲ. Although Burmese has no infinitives, I translate the suffixes လွှန်သသည် and မိန့်၏ in Tha Myat's glosses of verbs as 'to'

for consistency with other glosses of verbs.

Glosses extracted from idiomatic translations are included and marked with (IT) if there is no word-for-word gloss or if they substantially differ from word-for-word glosses.

To avoid repetition, I omit authors' unanimous glosses of foreign words and names: e.g., Sanskrit and Pali *tathāgata* for Pyu *dathagaṃda*.

In the notes, I use the term HL (hapax legomenon) to refer to words which are unique to the A and/or B versions of the Kubyaukgyi inscription. Although strictly speaking a word that appears in both versions is not a hapax legomenon, two attestations in two versions of the same text are not the same thing as two attestations in two completely different texts.

kiṁ.pha /k.pa(C)/
A13/B14 (*kiṁ.pa*)
OB: *nhac[·]klui°a·*
OM: *sḍik·, gap·pumas·*
Pali:
Gloss: to be pleased
Blagden: to be delighted (1911 IT), to be pleased
Shafer: to delight + cause (?)
Than Tun: to be pleased
Tha Myat: first two syllables of Tm *riṁ pa ḍaṃṁ*, analyzed as *riṁ* ရယ် 'to laugh' + *pa ḍaṃṁ* ပြုံး 'to smile'
Katō: 🄌🄌🄌 'to love'; 🄌🄌🄌 'was pleased, and ...' (IT)
Krech: to be pleased + grammatical morpheme
Notes: HL. The variation in spelling may reflect an earlier /kï pa/ pronounced in the 12th century as /k.pa/ with nonphonemic aspiration: [kʰpa] (cf. Khmer /kp/ [kʰp]) or as [xpʰa] (cf. the secondary aspiration after a fricative in Sanskrit *sth* from Proto-Indo-European *st-).

kḍeḥ.troḥ /k.ḍe(C)h t.ro(C)h/
A9/B9
OB: *klaññjo* 'favor'
OM: *guṇ·* 'virtue'
Gloss: favors
Blagden: benefits
Shafer: on + favor
Than Tun: no gloss + benefits
Tha Myat: ကျေးဇူး 'benefits'
Katō: 🄌 'favor'
Krech: favor
Notes: former homophone of Shafer's *kleḥ* 'to repose' on urns

kdiṃ.kchiṁḥ /k.dï(C) k.cï(C)h/
A26/B28
OB: *°aphu ra* 'not.behold get'
OM: *ññir·ññāc· ... go°a·* 'get sight'
Pali: *dassanaṁ athigacchatū* 'sight.ACC.SG attain.IMP.3SG'
Gloss: to get the sight of
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: sight + to obtain, get, attain
Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: first two syllables of Tm *diṃ chiṁḥ tiṁ* or *diṃ kchi ti* မြင်ခြင်း 'sight', ဖူးမြင်ခြင်း 'beholding with admiration', a borrowing from Sanskrit *dṛṣṭi* 'sight'

Katō: (□□ causative) + □□ 'to meet'

Krech: sight

Jenny: sight (?) + to get

Notes: HL. This expression is probably not an object-verb sequence 'sight get' since it is negated by a preceding *ḅaḥ*. I would expect a verb to be negated ('not get-sight') rather than its object ('get not-sight'). *kdiṃ kchiṁḥ* may be a disyllabic verb. Its alliteration suggests that it may be a partly reduplicative expression. A verb with a specific meaning like 'to get the sight of' is likely to be a HL in a small corpus, whereas a verb with a more generic meaning like 'to get' should be a common verb that is not an HL. *kchiṁḥ* is probably not 'to get' or 'to meet' because it is an HL. *kdiṃ*, on the other hand, occurs 14 times in the corpus, suggesting that it is a common verb like 'to meet' possibly followed by a rare synonym chosen for alliteration. But it is unclear whether the other instances of *kdiṃ* are of the same word.

knaṁḥ /k.nät/ /k.näh/

A24/B-

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: future

Blagden: future time (?)

Shafer: to press?, to oppress?

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: first syllable of Tm *kuṁḥ dūṃ* ကုံအုံ 'will be sufficient'

Katō: □□□□ 'to plan'

Krech: village

Notes: /t/ on basis of 16.1b *knat·ṁḥ*

kyaḥ /k.ja(C)h/

A10/B11

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: causative

Gloss: causative marker

Blagden: to cause

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: to cause

Tha Myat: ကာ 'while ...-ing'; ၍ 'after ...-ing'; လျက် 'while ...-ing'

Katō: (□□ exclamation)

Krech: emphatic

kra /k.ra(C)/

A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B13, A20/B21 (×2), A21/B21 (×2)

OB: *rvoh·*

OM: *tvāññ·*

Gloss: village

Blagden: village

Shafer: village

Than Tun: village

Tha Myat: ရွာ 'village'
Katō: ⟨⟩ 'village'
Krech: village
ga /ga(C)/
A25 (×2), B27 (×2)
OB: no equivalent
OM: *yal·*
Gloss: if
Blagden: possibly a particle meaning 'if'
Shafer: if (?)
Than Tun: if ('it' for the second instance is a typo for 'if')
Tha Myat: ကား 'as for'
Katō: ⟨⟩⟨⟩ 'if'
Krech: first instance: grammatical morpheme; second instance: second syllable of *chi ga* 'to be afraid'
gaṁḥ /gä̤j̊/
A23/B23, A25/B26
OB: *ṅā*
OM: *°ey·*
Gloss: I or royal 'we'
Blagden: I
Shafer: I
Than Tun: I
Tha Myat: ငါ 'I'
Katō: A23: ⟨⟩ 'virtue'; A25: first syllable of *gaṁḥ hḍiṁḥ* ⟨⟩⟨⟩⟨⟩ 'offering'
Krech: A23: second syllable of *ma gaṁḥ* 'deed'; A25: anterior event marker
gi /gi/
A24/B-, A24/B25 (×2)
OB: *ṅa*
OM: *°ey·*
Gloss: my or royal 'our'
Blagden: my
Shafer: my
Than Tun: my
Tha Myat: ငါ၏ 'my', ငါ့ 'my'
Katō: ⟨⟩⟨⟩ 'my'
Krech: first person pronoun
goṃ /ɣo/
A19/B19, A20/B20, A22/B22
OB: *kū*
OM: *guoh· goḥ*
Pali: *guhā*
Gloss: cave-pagoda
ṅa /ŋa(C)/
A14, B14
OB: *min'·* 'to speak'

OM: *p· sādhukār·* 'to express approval'
Gloss: to exclaim
Blagden: to exclaim (?)
Shafer: to exclaim
Than Tun: no gloss; to exclaim (IT)
Tha Myat: လျက် 'while ...-ing', ၍ 'after ...-ing', ကာ။ 'while ...-ing'
Katō: ⬚⬚ 'to exclaim'
Krech: to utter
ṅuḥ /ŋu(C)h/
A25/B27
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: °*assaddhamānaso*?
Gloss: to be unbelieving?
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: no gloss
Than Tun: to exclaim
Tha Myat: ရယ်ပြီးလျက် 'while laughing and smiling'
Katō: no gloss
Krech: to be skilled in
ce /ce(C)/
A12/B12, A13/B13, A23/B24, A26/B29 (*che* in all instances except for A12)
OB: A12/B12: no equivalent, A13/B13: *ye°a·*?, A23/B24: °*am'·*, A23/B24, A26/B29: *ciy'·*?
OM: A12/B12, A13/B13: no equivalent, A23/B24, A26/B29: °*or· .*
Gloss: irrealis marker
Blagden: probably a particle, or a verbal auxiliary to the verb /textitpaṁḥ; cf. Early Burmese /textitciy·?
Shafer: present time
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: ကြိယာထောက်ပစ္စည်း 'verb support particle'
Krech: to let
Jenny: A26/B29: present
Notes: Yabu: *masu yō ni*
cha
See *chai*.
chaḥ.bo /cʰa(C)h bo(C)/
A10/B10
OB: °*achaṅ·*
OM: *kyek·* 'sacred thing'
Gloss: form, likeness
Blagden: likeness (?) + a image, representation, likeness (?)
Shafer: likeness + form
Than Tun: likeness + image
Tha Myat: အဆင်း 'appearance' + ပုံ 'form', သဏ္ဌာန် 'form'
Krech: likeness + form
Katō: ⬚ 'form'

Notes: Following Katō, I regard *chaḥ.bo* as a single word. It may consist of two morphemes and may even be a compound of two free morphemes, but there is no independent evidence confirming either possibility, so I tentatively treat it as a single unit describing how 'Buddha' relates to 'image'. *chaḥ.bo* may also be forming a synonym compound with the Sanskrit loan *bradima* 'image'.

Both syllables of *chaḥ.bo* are HL.

If *bo* is a morpheme and if its *b* is the result of voicing in close juncture, its base form may be /po(C)/ with or without a final consonant that was not written in the Kubyaukgyi. However, no akṣara like *po* is in the corpus.

Blagden's division into two morphemes may be rooted in his comparison of *chaḥ* to Old Burmese °*achaṅ·* and his more tentative comparison of *bo* to Burmese *puṁ*. These comparisons are plausible but cannot be confirmed because the only extant spelling lacks subscript consonant symbols and the expected Pyu forms with final consonants (†*chaṅ·ḥ* and †*bom·*) are absent from the corpus.

It is not clear whether Shafer, Than Tun, and Krech had independent grounds for agreeing with Blagden's division.

che
See *ce*.
chai /cʰaj/
A18 (*cha*)/B18 (*cha*), A22/B23
OB: *son·*
OM: *cut·*
Gloss: to pour
Blagden: A18: to pour; A22: to pour out
Shafer: A18: to pour; A22: *cha* to pour + *i* out
Than Tun: to pour
Tha Myat: A18: ချသည် 'to drop (v.t.)'; A22: ချ၏ 'pour.RLS'
Katō: A18: ☐☐ 'to pour'; A22: *cha* ☐☐'to pour' + *y* (☐☐ benefactive)
Krech: to drop
cho /cʰo(C)/
A22/B23
OB: no equivalent or *min'·* 'to speak'?
OM: *rādhanā* 'to pray'
Gloss: quotative marker or second syllable of *diṃṁ.cho*, a verb of speaking?
Blagden: possibily a variant of *choḥ*
Shafer: aspiration
Than Tun: to pour
Tha Myat: second syllable of *diṃṁ cho* မိန့်ဆိုၐ၏ 'command.say.RLS'
Katō: (☐☐ exclamation)
Krech: grammatical morpheme
Notes: cf. Written Burmese *chui* 'to speak'
choḥ /cʰo(C)h/
A12/B12, A14/B14 (×2), A26/B29
OB: *lheṅ'·teh·*, no equivalent elsewhere
OM: A14/B14 °*ā*, no equivalent elsewhere
Gloss: exclamatory marker
Blagden: apparently a final particle
Shafer: exclamatory particle

Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: relative marker ေသာ
Katō: (🮲🮳 exclamation)
Krech: grammatical morpheme
Jenny: A26/B29: optative?

jiṁvuḥ /ɟï wuh/
A20/B21
OB: *hen·buiv·*
OM: *ññaḥh· gir°uy·*
Pali: absent
Gloss: name of a village
Notes: The Pyu, OB, and OM names are exonyms for an unknown original.

ḍa
See *la*.

ḍoḥ /ɖo(C)h/
A11/B11, A13/B13
OB: no equivalent
OM: A11/B11: no equivalent; A13/B13: *kāl·* 'time'
Gloss: locative-temporal marker
Blagden: it seems to be a postposition 'in', 'on'
Shafer: into, to, upon
Than Tun: in
Tha Myat: အခါ 'time'
Katō: 🮲🮳🮲🮳🮲 'while'
Krech: time
Notes: cf. OB *rhov·* 'time'

ta /ta/
A2 (*tha*)/B2 (*tha*), A5/B6, A7/B7, A18/B18, A20/B20, A22/B23
OB: A2/B2: *brī*; A5/B6: *kha*; A7/B7, A18/B18: *bri*; A20/B20 *plo°a· °e°a·*; A22/B23: *°e°a·*
OM: OM: A2/B2, A7/B7: *tuy·*; elsewhere no equivalent
Gloss: to place; first syllable of perfective marker *ta-daṃṁ*
Blagden: first syllable of a verb or auxiliary *tha daṅ·ṃṁ* indicating the past; probably the original meaning was 'to end', 'to finish'
Shafer: A2: perfect?; elsewhere: perfect
Than Tun: A2: first syllable of 'to end'
Tha Myat: A2/B2: first syllable of *tha daṅ·ṃṁ* ထိုအခါ 'that time'; elsewhere: first syllable of *ta daṅ·ṃṁ* ထိုအချိန် 'that time', ထိုနောက် 'after that', ရကား 'because'.
Katō: 🮲🮳🮲 'to end'
Krech: grammatical morpheme
Notes: Unaware of the subscript consonant *ṅ·* in B2, Tha Myat derived *tha daṅ·ṃṁ* from Pali *tadā* 'at that time'. I reject his etymology for three reasons. First, Pali *t* would not be borrowed as Pyu *th*. Second, the Pyu front vowel *aṁ* /ä/ does not appear in Indic loans. Third, a Pali open syllable would not be borrowed with a final *ṅ·*. Although *th* may be a sandhi variant of *t* after the *ḥ* of the preceding *tvaṅ·ṃṁḥ*, the other two objections cannot be explained away. The objection involving the vowel *aṁ* applies to the more common spelling *ta daṃṁ*, and the objection involving the coda *ṅ·* may apply to *ta daṃṁ* if that spelling represents /ta ðäŋ/.

An object of *ta* may have been accidentally omitted from A20/B20. This object may have been *goṃ* 'cave-pagoda' corresponding to OB *kū* 'cave-pagoda'.

taṁ /täk/
A20/B21, A20/B21, A21/B21
OB: *tac·*
OM: *moy·*
Gloss: one
Blagden: one
Shafer: one
Than Tun: one
Tha Myat: တစ် 'one'
Katō: 〼 'one'
Krech: one

taḥ /ta(C)h/
A25/B27
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *pāpasaṁkappo*
Gloss: to have evil thoughts?
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: no gloss
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: (အဟန့်)တား '(stopping) to stop', ဆီး 'to obstruct', ကာ(ကွယ်) 'to shield', မြစ် 'to prohibit', တား ဆီး 'to obstruct', တား မြစ် 'to prohibit'
Katō: 〼〼〼 'to rise'
Krech: to know

tiṁ /tï/
A2/B2, A23/B24, A24/B-, A26/B28
OB: A2/B2: *nhik· °ā*; elsewhere no equivalent
OM: A2/B2: *ḍe[y·]*; elsewhere no equivalent
Gloss: locative marker
Blagden: apparently a particle of relation, corresponding sometimes to our preposition 'in'
Shafer: (prep.) in, for, on (a certain day)
Than Tun: in
Tha Myat: A2/B2, A23/B24, A24/B-: တိုင်း 'country'; A26/B28: third syllable of *kdiṃ kchiṁḥ tiṁ* မြင်ခြင်း 'sight', ဖူးမြင်ခြင်းၬ 'beholding with admiration', a borrowing from Sanskrit *dṛṣṭi* 'sight'
Katō: A2: 〼〼 'at'; A23: no gloss; A24: 〼〼 'to'; A26: 〼〼〼〼〼 'located in'
Krech: locative
Jenny: A26/B28: locative

tu /tu(C)/
A18/B18
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *sumānaso*
Gloss: joyful
Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: well pleased?
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: second syllable of *tdaṃḥ tu ḅaṃḥ* မြတ်သောမင်းကြီး 'great noble king'
Katō: ⬚⬚⬚ 'was happy'
Krech: great
Notes: Shafer 333; Tha Myat *tat·daboṅ·* 'Duttabaung'
tuḥ /tuh/
A10/B11
OB: *nhap·liy·* 'to offer'
OM: *tu(ḅ)ok·* 'to offer'
Gloss: to bring
Blagden: to bring
Shafer: to bring
Than Tun: to bring
Tha Myat: အပ်နံ့သည် 'to deliver', အပ်သည် 'to deliver'
Katō: ⬚⬚⬚ 'to insert'
Krech: to offer/behold
to /to(C)/
A9/B9
OB: *grī* 'great'
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *dhamma-*
Gloss: righteous
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: great (?), just (?)
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: (လေးစားမှုစကား)တော်ဟု ယာယီယူဆပါ၏့ '(honorific) temporarily assumed to be *tau* 'royal' '
Katō: ⬚⬚⬚ 'eminent'
Krech: great
Notes: The postnominal position suggests this word is an adjective modifying *tdaṃḥ* 'king'.
toḥ /to(C)h/
A5/B5, A11/B11, A18/B18, A25/B26
OB: A25/B26: *kha*; elsewhere *°e°a·*
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: perfective marker?
Blagden: a particle used after verbs; cf. Early Burmese *tuṁ*
Shafer: terminal particle denoting end of one subjec and change in the narration to another
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: ကြိယာထောက်ပစ္စည်း 'verb support particle'
Katō: A5, A11, A18: (⬚⬚ predication); A25: (⬚⬚? honorific?)
Krech: grammatical morpheme
tdaṃḥ /t.däʌʌ/
A7/B7, A9/B9, A13/B14, A17/B18
OB: *maṅ·*
OM: *smiṅ·*

Gloss: king
Blagden: king
Shafer: king
Than Tun: king
Tha Myat: မင်း 'king'
Katō: ⯑ 'king'
Krech: lord

tdiṃḥ /t.dï(C)h/
A11/B11
OB: *min'·* 'to speak'
OM: *munas·* 'to inform'
Gloss: to speak
Blagden: to say, to speak
Shafer: to speak
Than Tun: to say
Tha Myat: မိန့်၏ 'to command', ဆို၏ 'to say', မိန့်ဆို၏ 'to command'
Katō: ⯑⯑ 'to say'
Krech: directive-say
Notes: Does Krech's gloss imply that *mtu* is an inflected form?

tduṃ /t.du(C)/
A18/B18, A22/B23
OB: *riy·*
OM: *ḍek·*
Gloss: water
Blagden: water
Shafer: water
Than Tun: water
Tha Myat: no gloss
Katō: ⯑ 'water'
Krech: water

tḅaḥ /t.ɓa(C)h/
A6/B6
OB: *tuṁ*
OM: *tun·* 'to return'
Gloss: postverbal marker of repeated action
Blagden: apparently an auxiliary going with *paṁḥ*
Shafer: again
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: recurring action suffix တုံ
Katō: ⯑⯑ 'again'
Krech: grammatical morpheme

tmu /t.mu/
A26/B28
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: presence?

Blagden: presence (?)
Shafer: presence (?)
Than Tun: presence (?)
Tha Myat: တမှ 'as for'
Katō: ⯑ 'world'
Krech: directive-goal marker
Jenny: presence
tra
See *traḥ* and *dra*.
traḥ[1] /t.ra(C)h/
A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B12, A21/B21, A24 (*tra*)/B25 (*tra*)
OB: *kyon·*
OM: *ḍik·*
Gloss: slave
Blagden: slave
Shafer: slave
Than Tun: slave
Tha Myat: ကျွန် 'slave'
Katō: ⯑⯑ 'slave'
Krech: serf
Notes: Tha Myat regards *traḥ*[1] and *traḥ*[2] as the same word.
traḥ[2] /t.ra(C)h/
A14/B15, A15/B15 (×2), A16/B16 (×3), A16/B17, A17/B17
OB: *saṅgrī* 'master'
OM: *ticār·* 'lord'
Gloss: slave or lotus or dharma?
Blagden: first syllable of *traḥ baṁḥ*, a title applied to ecclesiastics, lord. *traḥ* may be 'slave' as a humilific first person pronoun or be related to Burmese *tarāḥ* 'law'
Shafer: scholar (?), teacher (?)
Than Tun: first syllable of *traḥ baṁḥ* 'lord'
Tha Myat: တပည့်သား 'disciple', ဘုရား၏တပည့်သား(သံဃာ) 'disciple of Buddha (sangha)'
Katō: ⯑ 'master'
Krech: first syllable of *traḥ baṁḥ* 'a kind of dignitary'
Notes: slave HON as title? servants of Buddha? cf Skt dāsa or lotus? HON rules out homophone slave? (recycle deleted material from 016 draft no longer needed for section on traḥ 'lotus'))
Tha Myat regards *traḥ*[1] and *traḥ*[2] as the same word.
tribhuvaṃnadit·ṁṁtya /t.ri bu va na dït t.ja/
A3 (*tribhuvaṃnadiṃṁtya*), B2
OB: *tribhuvanāditya*
OM: *tribhuvanāditya*
Pali: *tibhuvanādicco*
Gloss: Tribhuvanāditya
triḍogavaṃdasaga /t.ri ḍo ka va ta(C) sa ka/
A4/B3 (*triḍogavadasaga*)
OB: *trilokavaṭaṁsakā*

OM: *trilokavaṭaṁsakā*
Pali: *tilokavaṭaṁsikā*
Gloss: Trilokavaṭaṁsakā
tlu /t.lu(C)/
A10/B10
OB: °*ati* 'all'
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: entirely
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: all, entirely, only of
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: ထုသည် 'to sculpt', ထုလုပ်သည် 'to sculpt and make', ပြုလုပ်သည် 'to make'
Katō: 🟥🟥🟥 'genuine'
Krech: plural/all
tva /t.wa/
A1/B1
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: temporal marker
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: no gloss
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: second syllable of *ḅa tva* ရောက်ရှိ◌ 'after reaching'
Katō: 🟥🟥🟥 'to count'
Krech: third syllable of '1628'
Notes: Also in 16 which enables me to guess it's a temporal marker.
tvaṅ·ṃṁḥ /t.bäṅ̊/
A2 (*tvaṃṁḥ*)/B2
OB: *lon·*
OM: *tuy·*
Gloss: to elapse
Blagden: to elapse, to pass
Shafer: to elapse (of time)
Than Tun: to elapse
Tha Myat: လွန်သည် 'to exceed'
Katō: 🟥🟥🟥 'to pass'
Krech: to elapse
tvaṃṁḥ
See *tvaṅ·ṃṁḥ*.
tvo /t.wo(C)/
A17/B17
OB: plural marker *tui°a·*
OM: plural marker *ta*
Pali: genitive plural marker *-naṁ*
Gloss: plural marker
Blagden: probably a particle indicating the plural; cf. Early Burmese *tui*?

Shafer: mendicant monks (?), beggars (?)

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: plural marker တို့

Katō: final syllable of *sagha tvo* 𑌏𑌏 'monks'

Krech: plural/all

tha[1] /tʰa(C)/

A10/B10, A11/B12, A13/B13, A19/B19, A19/B20

OB: *rhuy·*

OM: *thar·*

Gloss: golden

Blagden: gold, golden

Shafer: golden

Than Tun: gold

Tha Myat: ရွှေ 'gold'

Katō: 𑌏 'gold'

Krech: gold

Notes: /(C)/ is likely to have been /r/.

tha[2]

See *ta*.

thmuḥ /t.mu(C)h/

A11/B11

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: presence?

Blagden: presence (?)

Shafer: presence (?)

Than Tun: presence (?)

Tha Myat: ထံမှောက် 'in the presence of'

Katō: 𑌏 'life'

Krech: directive-goal

daṅ·ṃṁ /däŋ/

A2/B2, A5/B6, A7/B7, A9/B10, A14/B14, A18/B18, A20/B20, A21/B22, A22/B23, A26/B28 (*daṃṁ* in all instances except B2)

OB: A2/B2, A5/B6, A9/B10, A14/B14, A18/B18: *rakā*; A7/B7, A21/B22, A22/B23: *ruy'[·]* °*e°a·*; A20/B20: °*e°a·*; A26/B28: no equivalent

OM: A2/B2, A7/B7: *tuy·*; elsewhere no equivalent

Gloss: A26/B28: grammatical marker?; elsewhere perfective?

Blagden: probably = *tha daṅ·ṃṁ*

Shafer: prioritive

Than Tun: to end

Tha Myat: A9/B10: second syllable of *ḍaḥ daṃṁ* ထိုအခါ၌ 'at that time', ရကား 'because'; A26/B28: second syllable of *daṃṁ ḅaḥ* ထံပါး 'beside'; elsewhere second syllable of *ta daṅ·ṃṁ* ထိုအချိန် 'that time', ထိုနောက် 'after that', ရကား 'because'.

Katō: 𑌏𑌏𑌏 ... 'and ...'; A26: ?

Krech: A26: first syllable of *daṃṁ ḅaḥ* 'deva'; elsewhere: grammatical morpheme

Jenny: A26/B28: first syllable of *daṃṁ ḅaḥ* 'excellent (?)'

See *ḍaḥ* for commentary on Tha Myat's interpretation of *daṃṁ* in A9/B10.

daṃṁ
See *daṅ·ṃṁ*.

dathagaṃda /ta t^h a ga ta/
A1/B1
OB: *purhā*
OM: *buddha*
Pali: *buddha-* 'buddha-'
Gloss: Tathāgata

diṃṁ[1] /dï(C)/
A8/B9, A9/B10, A21/B21, A25/B27
OB: A25/B27: °*ā*; no equivalent elsewhere
OM: A25/B27: *ku*; no equivalent elsewhere
Gloss: accusative marker
Blagden: A8: °*o diṃṁ* no gloss; A9, A25: no gloss
Shafer: A8, A9, A21, A25: passive?
Than Tun: A8: myself; A9, A21, A25: no gloss
Tha Myat: A8/B9: °*o diṃṁ* မိမိကို 'myself.ACC'; A9/B10 ပေးပြိ 'give and', ယူပြိ 'take and', ပြုခဲ့ပြိ 'did and'; A21/B21: first syllable of *diṃṁ ḅiṁḥ diṃṁ daṃṁ* ယူပြီးပေးပြိ 'take and give and', ယူရွေ၏ 'take and'; A25/B27: ပြုခဲ 'done'
Katō: A8, A9, A21 (first instance): first syllable of *diṃṁ ḅiṁḥ* (⬜⬜ honorific); A25: ⬜⬜ also
Krech: A8, A9, A21 (first instance), A25: serf

diṃṁ[2] /ðï(C)/
A21/B22
OB: *yo* 'to bring'
OM: *ket·* 'to take'
Gloss: to bring, take, or assemble?
Blagden: it may mean 'to assemble', 'to bring together'
Shafer: to assemble? to put or take out?
Than Tun: to assemble
Tha Myat: third syllable of *diṃṁ ḅiṁḥ diṃṁ daṃṁ* ယူပြီးပေးပြိ 'take and give and', ယူရွေ၏ 'take and'
Katō: ⬜⬜⬜ 'to collect'
Krech: to call

diṃṁ[3] /ðï(C)/
A22/B23
OB: *min'·* 'to speak'
OM: *rādhanā* 'to pray'
Gloss: to pray?
Blagden: to pray
Shafer: assemble? put or take out?
Than Tun: to pray
Tha Myat: A22/B23: first syllable of *diṃṁ cho* မိန့်ဆိုၜ၏ 'to command'
Katō: ⬜⬜ 'to say'
Krech: to say

duṃ /du/

A7/B8, A17/B18, A24/B-

OB: *nhik·*; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: locative-temporal marker

Blagden: apparently a particle of relation. It seems to correspond roughly with our preposition 'in'.

Shafer: down? down onto?

Than Tun: A7: unto; A17: third syllable of *hṅa diṁ duṃ* which appears to mean 'in the presence (of)'; A24: in

Tha Myat: A7: လျ "; A17: locative markers တွ, ၌, မှာ, ဝယ်; A24: second syllable of *knaṁḥ duṃ* ကံအဲ့ 'will be sufficient'

Katō: A7: 𐂁𐂁𐂁𐂁 'like'; A17: (𐂁𐂁?) topic; A24: 𐂁𐂁 'if'

Krech: A7, A17: that; A24: plural/all

deṃviṃ /de vi/

A4/B4

OB: *devī*

OM: *devī*

Pali: *devi*

Gloss: queen

doṅ·ṃḥ /doṅ̊/

A3 (*doṃḥ*)

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: *piyā*

Gloss: to love or beloved?

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: benevolent, compassionate

Than Tun: second syllable of *°o doṃḥ* 'thereupon'

Tha Myat: first syllable of *doṅ·ṃḥ ḍaZ ḅaṁḥ* မြတ်သောမင်းကြီး 'great noble king'

Katō: 𐂁𐂁𐂁 'eminent'

Krech: time

Notes: Tha Myat *tat·daboṅ·* 'Duttabaung'. Katō has the same gloss for *doṃ*.

doṃḥ /do(C)h/

A14/B15

OB: no question

OM: *kāl·* 'time'

Gloss: a time noun; after?

Blagden: possibly a variant of *duṃ*; *pau °o doṃḥ* seems to mean 'thereupon'

Shafer: benevolent, compassionate

Than Tun: thereupon

Tha Myat: third syllable of *pau °o doṃḥ* ထိုအခါ 'at that time'

Katō: 𐂁𐂁𐂁 'eminent'

Krech: time

Notes: Katō has the same gloss for *doṃ*.

doṃ /do/

A1/B1

OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *-bānā*
Gloss: to blow?
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: no gloss
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: second syllable of □**aḍ** 'nirvana'
Katō: 𑀿𑀿𑀿 'eminent'
Krech: second syllable of *ḅa doṃ* 'Buddhist teachings'
Notes: Tha Myat was the first to identify *doṃ* as the second syllable of 'nirvana'. However, he regarded *ḅa doṃ* as a borrowing of Pali *pado* 'foot.NOM.SG' rather than as a calque of Sanskrit *nir·vāṇa-*/Pali *nib·bāna-*, both 'out-blow'.

Katō has the same gloss for *doṅ·ṃḥ*.

doṃḥ
See *doṅ·ṃḥ*.
dra /t.ra/
A6/B6 (*tra*)
OB: *tan·chā* 'ornaments'
OM: *kiryā* 'personal items'
Gloss: personal items
Blagden: goods, ornaments
Shafer: goods, ornaments
Than Tun: °*o dra* goods
Tha Myat: ပိုင်ဆိုင်သောပစ္စည်း 'things that are possessed', ကုန်စည် 'goods', စီးပွားဥစ္စာ 'property', ငွေ 'silver', တန်းဆာ *(sic)* 'ornament'
Katō: 𑀿𑀿 'property'
Krech: valuable(s)
dham·maraja /dam ma ra ɟa/
A3 (*dhamaraja*)/B3
OB: *dhammarāj·*
OM: *dhammarāj·*
Pali: *dhammarājassa*
Gloss: righteous king
na /na(C)/
A11/B11 (*naṁ*), A22/B23
OB: *si°a·*
OM: *rov·*
Gloss: manner
Blagden: manner; *yaṁ na* seems to mean 'thus', 'as follows'
Shafer: manner; (postpos.) like (?)
Than Tun: second syllable of *yaṁ na* 'thus'
Tha Myat: နည်းနာ 'manner'
Katō: 𑀿𑀿 'method'
Krech: second syllable of *yaṁ na* this manner

Notes: The anusvāra of *naṁ* in B11 may be an accidental carryover from the anusvāra of the preceding *yaṁ*. The word is spelled *na* in all three other instances. The accidental addition of a single anusvāra is more likely than the accidental omission of an anusvāra in three out of four spellings. *yaṁ na* also appears in 93, but *yaṁ naṁ* is a HL in B11, so *yaṁ na* is likely to be the correct spelling.

Tha Myat: < Pali *naya* improbable; prob neither cognate or loan; Pyu cognate of naññ should be *niṅ; WB -ññ absent in Pyu

naṁ

See *na*.

naḥ /na(C)h/

A23/B24

OB: no equivalent

OM: *het·*

Gloss: cause

Blagden: Somewhere in the phrase beginning with this word the idea of 'cause' must be expressed.

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: နည်းနာ 'manner'

Katō: no gloss

Krech: manner

nhoḥ /n.hoṃ/

A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B13, A21/B21 (*hoḥ* in all instances except A5, B5, and B13)

OB: *suṁ*

OM: *pi*

Gloss: three

Blagden: three

Shafer: three

Than Tun: three

Tha Myat: သုံး 'three'

Katō: 🗌 'three'

Krech: three

pa /pa(C)/

A23/B24

OB: *phlac· ciy'· teh·*

OM: *°or· dap·*

Pali: *hotu*

Gloss: irrealis copula: may ... be!

Blagden: no gloss

Shafer: cause (?)

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: polite marker ပါ

Katō: no gloss

Krech: emphatic

paṁḥ /päh/

A5/B5, A6/B6, A12/B12, A12/B13, A13/B13, A23/B24, A26/B28

OB: *piy·*
OM: *kil·*
Gloss: to give
Blagden: to give; perhaps also in A23, A26, though there the meaning is not so certain.
Shafer: to give, permit
Than Tun: to give
Tha Myat: ပုံသည် 'to help', ပေးသည် 'to give'
Katō: ⬚⬚⬚ 'to give'
Krech: to give
Jenny: A26/B28: lit. 'to give', postverbal permissive causative
pau /po/
A4/B4, A5/B5, A7/B7, A8/B8, A8/B9, A9/B10, A10/B11, A13/B13, A14/B14, A17/B17, A18/B18, A20/B20
OB: *thiv·*
OM: *goḥ   goḥh·*
Gloss: that
Blagden: that, the
Shafer: that (?), the (?), then (?)
Than Tun: that
Tha Myat: ထို့ 'that'
Katō: ⬚⬚ 'that'
Notes: I reject Blagden's comparisons with OB *thuiv·* and *thiv·* and modern Burmese *thui* 'that' since I read this word with *p* and not *ḍh* as he did.
pḍaṁḥ /p.ḍä(C)h/
A23/B24
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: basis
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: attainment (?), piercing (?)
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: ကူညီ 'to help'
Katō: no gloss
Krech: may
pḍi
See *pli*.
pduṃ.sguṃ.daṃḥ.ḅa /p.du(C) s.gu(C) da(C)h ɓa(C)/
A1/B1
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: no equivalent
Gloss: a phrase containing a verb taking 'nirvāṇa' as an object followed by some sort of time expression like 'since'
Blagden: possibly 'to achieve' or 'to enter' (*parinirvāṇa*), or 'to be established' (of the Buddhist religion) + the meaning is undetermined but will depend on that of *pduṃ* + no gloss
Shafer: to go + rest (n.)?, religion (?) + perfect (adj.)?

Than Tun: *pduṃ sgu daṃḥ* 'to enter (parinirvāṇa)'

Tha Myat: ပြုသည် 'to do' + *sgu daṃḥ* သုဂတ " < Pali *sugata* = ဘုရား ကောင်းစွာကြွသွားတတ်ခြင်း 'the Buddha having gone well' + first syllable of *ḅa tva* ရောက်၍ 'after reaching'

Katō: *pduṃ sgu* ⬚⬚⬚⬚ 'to enter nirvana' + (⬚⬚ restrictive) + ⬚⬚⬚⬚ 'to profess faith'

Krech: Buddhist teachings + Buddhist church + first and second syllables of '1628'

pra /p.rat/

A14/B14 (×2), A23/B23

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: to do

Blagden: to do, done, deed (?)

Shafer: good

Than Tun: A14: done; A23: to do

Tha Myat: ပြု 'to do'

Katō: A14: ⬚⬚⬚⬚⬚ 'splendid', A23: ⬚⬚ 'to make'

Krech: good

priṅ·ḥ /p.riṅ̇/

A2 (*priḥ*)/B2

OB: *praññ·*

OM: *ḍuṅ·*

Gloss: city

Blagden: city

Shafer: city

Than Tun: city

Tha Myat: ပြည် 'city', မြို့တော် 'royal city'

Katō: ⬚ 'town'

Krech: country

pli /p.ḍi/

A24/B25 (*pḍi*)

OB: *mliy·*

OM: *cov·*

Gloss: grandchild

Blagden: grandchild

Shafer: grandson

Than Tun: child, grandson (IT)

Tha Myat: မြေး 'grandchild'

Katō: ⬚ 'grandchild'

Krech: grandchild

baṁḥ

See *ḅaṁḥ*.

biṁḥ

See *ḅiṁḥ*.

budha /bu(C) da/

A10/B10, A10/B11 (*budha*), A11/B12, A19 (*[b]udha*)/B19, A22/B22, A-/B26, A26/B28 (in all instances spelled *ḅ* except B11 and A19)

OB: *purhā*

OM: *kyek·* 'sacred thing'
Gloss: Buddha
bradima /p.ra ti ma/
A10/B10
OB: *°achaṅ·*
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: image
Notes: Cf. *chaḥ.bo.*
breña /p.re ɲa/
A23/B24
OB: *prajññā*
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *ññāṇa-*
Gloss: wisdom
Notes:
bro.pdaṃ /p.ro(C) p.da(C)/
A25/B27
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *upadduvaṁ (sic)* for *upaddavaṁ*
Gloss: oppression?
Blagden: meaning undetermined, but possibly the phrase which it begins contains the idea of 'violence', 'harm' + no gloss
Shafer: mind (?) + unbelieving (?), believing (?)
Than Tun: harm (?) + no gloss
Tha Myat: ဖျို 'to destroy' + ပြု 'to do' = *bro pdaṃ* ဖြိုဖျက်အနက် 'to destroy'
Katō: 𐩠𐩠𐩠𐩠 'to smash to pieces' + 𐩠𐩠𐩠 'level (adj.)"
Krech: to make + Buddhist teachings
Notes:
ḅa /ɓa/
A1/B1
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Pali: *nib-*
Gloss: bound (and unstressed?) negative marker
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: no gloss
Than Tun: no gloss
Tha Myat: first syllable of *ḅa tva* ရောက်၍ 'after reaching'
Katō: 𐩠𐩠𐩠𐩠 'to profess faith'
Krech: first syllable of *ḅa doṃ* 'Buddhist teachings'; second syllable of '1628'
Notes: no gloss
ḅaḥ /ɓah/
A26/B28
OB: negative prefix *°a-*
OM: prohibitive marker *laḥ*

Gloss: free negative marker

Blagden: possibly an optative negative 'may not'

Shafer: no gloss

Than Tun: may not

Tha Myat: second syllable of *daṃṁ ḅaḥ* ထံပါး 'beside'

Katō: (偬偬 obligative)

Krech: second syllable of *daṃṁ ḅaḥ* 'deva'

Jenny: second syllable of *daṃṁ ḅaḥ* 'excellent (?)'

Notes:

ḅaṁḥ /ɓäj̊/

A1/B1, A3/B3, A5/B5, A6/B6, -/B6, A7/B7 (erroneously spelled *ḅiṁḥ*), A8/B8, A9/B10, A10/B11, A11/B12, A11/B-, A11/B12, A12/B12, A13 (*baṁḥ*)/B13 (×2), A14/B15, A15/B15 (×2), A16/B16 (×3), A16/B17, A17/B17 (*baṁḥ*), A18/B18, A21/B22, A-/B22, A26 (*baṁḥ*)/B27 (*baṁḥ*)

OB: A3/B3, A5/B5, -/B6, A6/B6: *pāy·*; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: honorific marker; lord

Blagden: honorific particle or title

Shafer: honorific

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: မြတ်သော 'noble', မြတ်နိုးဖွယ် 'for the purpose of cherishing', ကြည်ညိုဖွည် 'for the purpose of respect', ဗယ် 'dear'?, အဗယ် 'dear'

Katō: 偬偬偬 'eminent person'

Krech:

Notes: cognate to OB *pāy·*?

ḅiṁḥ /ɓïɳ̊/

A1/B1, A2/B2, A2/B2, A3/B3, A4/B4, A4/B4 (*biṁḥ*), A5/B5, A5/B5 (*biṁḥ*), A6/B6, A-/B7 (error for textit*baṁḥ*), A7 (*biṁḥ*)/B7, A7/B8 (×2), A8/B9, A9/B9, A9/B10, A10/B10, A10/B11, A11/B11, A11 (*biṁḥ*)/B12 (*biṁḥ*), A12/B13, A13/B14, A14/B14 (×2), A18/B18 (×2), A19/B19 (×3), A19/B20, A20/B20, A21/B21, A22/B23 (×2)

OB: A3/B3, A4/B4, A5/B5 (first), A6/B6, A11/B11, A18/B18 (first), A19/B19 (first and third), A22/B23 (second): *°e°a·*; no equivalent elsewhere, A9/B10, A13/A14: *rakā*; A7/B7, A10/B10, A14/B14 (×2), A21/B21, A22/B23: *ruy'· °e°a·*; no equivalent elsewhere

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: realis marker (suggested by Julian K. Wheatley; p.c.)

Blagden: particle preceding verbs

Shafer: did

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: ပြီး(သည္)) ", ပြီးဗြိ '

Katō: (偬偬 honorific)

Krech: affirmative

Notes:

biṁḥ.biṁḥ /ɓï ɓï/

A23/B24

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: myself
Blagden: perhaps meaning 'for myself'
Shafer: no gloss + did
Than Tun: myself
Tha Myat: မ္မိ 'oneself'
Katō: (⬚⬚ ⬚⬚ reduplicated honorific)
Krech:
Notes:

ḅudha
See *budha*.

ḅuḥ /ɓu(C)h/
A12/B12, A13/B13, A23/B23, A25/B27
OB: A23/B23: /textit°amho°a· 'deed'; no equivalent elsewhere
OM: A23/B23: *sinraṅ·* 'deed'; A25/B27 *pa* 'to do'; no equivalent elsewhere
Gloss: to do
Blagden: to do (?)
Shafer: A12, A13: lord; A23, A25: (optative) may
Than Tun: A12, A13: second syllable of *ma ḅuḥ* 'my lord'; A23, A25: to do
Tha Myat: ပ္ "
Katō: ⬚⬚⬚ 'offering'
Krech: goal marker
Notes: *pra ḅuḥ*, lit. 'do do', cannot be a noun 'deed' since it is preceded by a subject *gaṁḥ* 'I' rather than a possessor *gi* 'my'.

ma[1] /ma(C)/
A9/B9, A23/B23
OB: A9/B9: *so*; A23/B23: no equivalent
OM: A9/B9: *ma*; A23/B23: no equivalent
Gloss: relative marker
Blagden: apparently a particle
Shafer: relative pronoun
Than Tun: A9, A23: no gloss
Tha Myat: negative marker မ(ပဌ္ဌိ‌ေသဓစကၢး) (prohibitive word)
Katō: A9: copula; A23: ⬚⬚ 'to perform'
Krech: A9: relative marker; A23: first syllable of *ma gaṁḥ* 'deed'
Notes: Loan from OM?

ma[2] /ma(C)/
A12/B12, A13/B13, A19/B19, A-/B20, A25/B27
OB: A12/B12: *su.teh·*; A13/B13: no equivalent; A19/B19, A-/B20, A25/B27: *su*
OM: A19/B19, A25/B27: *ma*; no equivalent elsewhere
Gloss: nominalizer
Blagden: apparently a particle
Shafer: relative pronoun
Than Tun: A9, A19, A25: no gloss, A12, A13: first syllable of *ma ḅuḥ* 'my lord'
Tha Myat: negative marker မ(ပဌ္ဌိ‌ေသဓစကၢး) (prohibitive word)
Katō: A9, A19, A25: copula; A12, A13: ⬚⬚ 'to perform'
Krech: A9, A12, A13, A19, A25: relative marker

Notes: Related to *ma*[1]?

ma[3] /ma(C)/

A26/B28

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: a verb?

Blagden: apparently a particle

Shafer: not

Than Tun: no gloss

Tha Myat: negative marker မ(ပဌ်သေစကား:) (prohibitive word)

Katō: (☐☐ prohibitive)

Krech: negative marker

Jenny: negative marker

Notes: Context rules out *ma*[3] being relativizer *ma*[1] or nominalizer *ma*[2].

ma[3] may be a verb forming a compound with *paṁḥ* 'to give': 'to permit'?

Although it is tempting to interpret *ma*[3] as a negative marker like Written Burmese *ma*, it seems that initial *m became *ḅ* before vowels in Pyu, and the retention of initial *m* in this word but not in other Pyu negatives (*ḅa* and *ḅa*) would need to be explained.

mayaḥ /ma jah/

A3/B3, A5/B5, A6/B6, A8/B8, A18/B18, A21/B22

OB: *mayaḥ* 'queen'

OM: *gna.kyek·* 'queen'

Gloss: wife

Blagden: wife, consort

Shafer: queen

Than Tun: wife

Tha Myat: မယာ: 'wife'

Krech: wife

Katō: ☐ 'wife'

Notes: If *rvaṅ·ṁḥ mayaḥ* is a compound 'ruler-wife', its abbreviation Pyu *mayaḥ* 'wife' may have been borrowed into OB as 'queen'.

On the other hand, if initial *m became *ḅ* before vowels in Pyu, and the initial *m* of this word would need to be explained. Perhaps this word is a borrowing from OB postdating the shift of *m to *ḅ*.

mahaṭhe /ma ha tʰe(C)/

A15/B15 *mhaṭhe*

OB: *mahāther·*

OM: *mhā[the]r·*

Pali: *mahāthero*

Gloss: Mahāthera

Notes:

miṅ·

See *rmiṅ·*.

mugaṃḍubudadisaṭhe /mu ga ḍu pu ta ti sa tʰe(C)/

A15/B15 (*mugaṃtubudiṁsaṭhe*)

OB: *muggaliputtatissatther·*

OM: *muggaliputtatissatther·*
Pali: *muggaliputtako*
Gloss: Muggaliputtatissatthera
Notes:
mugaṃḍubudadisaṭhe
See *mugaṃḍubudadisaṭhe*.
mtu /m.tu/
A7/B8, A24/B-
OB: A7/B8: *rhov·* 'time'; A24/B-: no equivalent
OM: A7/B8: *[kā]l·* 'time'; A24/B-: no equivalent
Gloss: vicinity
Blagden: part of *°o mtu duṃ* 'nigh unto' and *tiṁ mtu* 'as for'
Shafer: death (?)
Than Tun: A7: nigh; A24: second syllable of *tiṁ mtu* 'as for'
Tha Myat: မေတာ "
Katō: A7: □□ 'to be destroyed'; A24: □□□□ 'to be destroyed'
Krech: A7: durative-live, A24: three
Notes: Does Krech's gloss imply that *mtu* is an inflected form?
mtau /m.to/
A9/B9
OB: *muy·* 'to raise (a child)'
OM: *°iññcim·* 'to feed'
Gloss: to raise (a child)
Blagden: perhaps 'to nourish', 'to foster'
Shafer: to nourish
Than Tun: to nourish
Tha Myat: no gloss
Katō: □□□□ 'to remember'
Krech: durative-support
Notes: Does Krech's gloss imply that *mtu* is an inflected form?
mdauṃ.haḥ.ḍaḥ /m.do(C) ha(C)h ḍa(C)h/
A9/B10
OB: *°ok·mi*
OM: *mirnas·*
Gloss: to remember
Blagden: to remember or perhaps 'to nourish', 'to foster' + no gloss + no gloss
Shafer: to remember, recall + no gloss + no gloss
Than Tun: to remember + no gloss + no gloss
Tha Myat: *mdauṃ haḥ* အောက်မေ့သည် 'to remember', သတိရသည် 'to remember' + first syllable
of *ḍaḥ daṃṁ* ထိုအခါ၌ 'at that time', ရကား 'because'
Katō: □□ 'to nourish' + □□ 'him' + (□□? emphatic?)
Krech: DUR-think-of + grammatical morpheme + grammatical morpheme
Notes: Tha Myat regards *ḍaḥ daṃṁ* as a loan from Pali *dadā* or *dadaṃ*. But those are feminine and neuter nominative singular forms of an adjective 'giving, to be given', not an adverb 'at that time'. The etymology is also improbable on phonetic grounds: Pali *d* would not be borrowed as *ḍ*, and the Pyu front vowel *aṁ* /ä/ is absent from Indic loans.

mra.ja.ṅa /m.ra(C) ɟa(C) ŋa(C)/
A24/B26
OB: *sū tac·thū*
OM: *ññaḥ c'eṅ·*
Gloss: other person
Blagden: the phrase *mra ja hṅa* must mean 'any other person' or 'a stranger', or the like
Shafer: *mra* other (?) + *ja* any (?) + *hṅa* 'person'
Than Tun: any other person
Tha Myat: မြလူ 'stranger', သူစိမ်း 'unfamiliar person', သူတစ်ထူး 'another person'
Katō: *mra* ⬚ 'person' + *ja hṅa* ⬚ 'other'
Krech: *mra ja* 'other' + *hṅa* 'person'
Notes: /m.ra(C)/ may end in a final stop that prevents the lenition of /ɟ/ to *y-ṃ* [ɟ].

If /m.ra(C) ends in a sonorant, the *j* spelling may be etymological: cf. the spelling of /ɟ/ as *j* in *rajaguma* /raɟakuma(C)/.

Tha Myat reads *ja hṅa* as *ja hna* which he regards as a loan from Indic *jana-*. Tha Myat does not specify whether *jana-* is Sanskrit or Pali; it could be either. This derivation is not possible because Indic *n* would not be borrowed as *hṅ*.

mhaṭhe
See *mahaṭhe*.

yaṅ /jä/
A2/B2, A11/B11 (×2), A12/B12, A13/B13, A21/B21, A21/B22, A22/B22, A22/B23, A-/B23, A24/B25, A24/B26, A26/B27
OB: °*iy· °īy·*
OM: *vo°a·*
Gloss: this
Blagden: this, that (1911), the (1919)
Shafer: this
Than Tun: A2: this; A4: no gloss; အကြင် 'that', ဤ 'this', ယင်း 'that'
Tha Myat: အကြင် 'that', ဤ 'this', ယင်း 'this, that'
Krech: this
Katō: A2: ⬚⬚ 'here', ⬚⬚ 'this'

raḥ.saḥ /ra(C)h sa(C)h/
A11/B12
OB: °*aphei°a·* 'for'
OM: *raṁpo'·* 'portion'
Gloss: on behalf of
Blagden: on behalf of
Shafer: thy (?) + on behalf of (?)
Than Tun: on behalf of
Tha Myat: ရစား '?', အဖို့ 'for the sake of', အစား 'instead of', ကိုယ်စား 'on behalf of', အတွက် 'for the sake of', အကျိုးငှာ 'for the benefit of'
Krech: no gloss + *saḥ* son
Katō: ⬚ 'king' + ⬚⬚ 'son'
Notes: Krech *sa* son

rajaguma /ra ɟa ku ma(C)/
A4/B4, A6/B7, A8/B9, A18/B19, A22/B22

OB: *rājakumār·*
OM: *rājakumār·*
Pali: *rājakumāra-*
Gloss: Rājakumāra
Notes: The *j* spelling may be etymological. The expected spelling of an intervocalic /ɹ/ is †*y-ṃ*. The word almost certainly ends in /r/ like its OB and OM equivalents.

rabai /rapaj/
A20/B21
OB: *ra pāy·*
OM: *rapāy·* (*rahay·* in A may be a sequence of *pa* plus a short *ā* resembling *ha*.)
Pali: absent
Gloss: Rapāy

rimadham·narbu /ri ma dam na r.pu/
A2 *rimadhanarbu*/B2
OB: *°arimaddanapur·*
OM: *°arimaddanapur·*
Pali: *°arimaddana-nāmasmi pure* 'in the city named Arimaddana'
Gloss: Arimaddanapura
Notes: 'Enemy-crushing-city', the Pali name for Pagan.

roḥ /ro(C)h/
A8/B8, A20/B20
OB: *rhov·* 'time'
OM: *[kā]l·* 'time'
Gloss: realis copula
Blagden: apparently a particle, perhaps meaning 'when'
Shafer: no gloss
Than Tun: when
Tha Myat: အချိန်ကာလ 'time'
Katō: (🄰🄰 predication)
Krech: time
Notes: Cf. OB *rhov·* 'time', WB vivid narrative marker *ro*

rpu /r.pu/
A7/B7
OB: *nhac· chāy·*
OM: *ḅār cvas·*
Gloss: twenty
Blagden: twenty
Shafer: twenty
Than Tun: twenty
Tha Myat: ၂၀ 'twenty'
Katō: 🄰🄰 'twenty'
Krech: twenty
Notes: Katō: *năsu*, Krech: *tsav*

rmi
See *rmiṅ·*.

rmiṅ· /r.miŋ/

A2/B2 (*miṅ·*), A3/B3, A4/B4, A5/B5, A8/89, A19/B19 (*rmi* in all instances except B2 and B3)

OB: *maññ·* 'to be named'

OM: *°imo°a·* 'name; to be named'

Gloss: to be named

Blagden: second syllable of *°o rmiṅ·* 'name, called, named'

Shafer: name

Than Tun: second syllable of *°o rmiṅ·* 'called'

Tha Myat: အမည် ဟု ခေါ် သည် 'to be named'

Katō: ⍰ 'name'

Krech: name

Notes:

rvaṅ·ṃḥ /r.baŋ̊/

A3 (*rvaṃḥ*)/B3

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Gloss: ruler?

Blagden: *°o rvaṃḥ* 'queen'; possibly two words *°o* and *rvaṃḥ*

Shafer: clever

Than Tun: queen

Tha Myat: မိဖုရား 'queen'

Katō: ⍰⍰⍰⍰ 'beloved'

Krech: *°o rvaṃḥ* 'king'

Notes: *rvaṅ·ṃḥ mayaḥ* may be a compound 'ruler-wife' that is elsewhere abbreviated as *mayaḥ* 'wife'.

la /ɖa/

A3/B3, A24/B25 (×2), A24/B26 (×2) (*ḍa* in all instances except for the second instance in A24)

OB: *laññ·goṅ·*

OM: *laḥ*

Gloss: or

Blagden: A3: apparently means 'was'; A24: 'be it' or 'either ... or'; cf. Early Burmese *lañ·*?

Shafer: A3: and (?); A24: either ... or ...

Than Tun: A3: was; A24: be it

Tha Myat: A3/B3: second syllable of *doṅ·ṃḥ ḍaZ ḅaṃḥ* မြတ်သောမင်းကြီး 'great noble king'; elsewhere: လည်း "

Katō: A3: ⍰⍰⍰ 'and'; A24: ⍰⍰⍰ 'be (imperative)'

Krech: A3: to pass/leave; A24: alternative marker

vaṃrabadiṃṅ /va ra pa(C) dï(C)/

A17 (*vaṃrabadiṃṅ*

OB: *varapaṇḍit·*

OM: *varapaṇḍit·*

Pali: *varapaṇḍito*

Gloss: Varapaṇḍita

vaṅ /ba/ or /va/

A5/B5, A6/B7, A12/B12, A13/B13, A22/B23, A25/B26

A12/B12 nada

OB: *°ā* except in A12/B12 where there is no equivalent

OM: *ku* except in A12/B12 where there is no equivalent
Gloss: locative noun?
Blagden: °*o vaṁ* to, to her (A5)
Shafer: dative (of 3d pers. pron.)
Than Tun: A5: °*o vaṁ* to her; A6, A22, A25: °*o vaṁ* to; A12, A13: °*o vaṁ* no gloss
Krech: °*ovaṁ* king
Katō: � 'sake'
vradaṃyoḥ
See *vrahmadaṃyoḥ*.
vrahmaba /p.ra m̥a pa(C)/
A16/B16
OB: *brahmapāl·*
OM: *brahmapāl·*
Gloss: Brahmapāla
vrahmadaṃyoḥ /p.ra m̥a da joh/
A16 (*vradaṃyoḥ*/B16
OB: *brahmadiv·*
OM: *brahmadiv·*
Pali: *brahmadevo*
Gloss: Brahmadeva
saṁḥ /sä(C)h/
A20/B20
OB: *lhot·* 'to dedicate'
OM: *busac·* 'to dedicate'
Gloss: to make
Blagden: to pronounce, to declare (?)
Shafer: to pronounce (a dedication)
Than Tun: to pronounce
Tha Myat: (ဝိဘတ်စကား)နှိုက်(၌) ”
Katō: 〔various〕'to declare'
Krech: to make
Notes: Cognate to *se*?
saḥ /sah/
A4/B4, A6/B7, A8/B8, A11/B12, A18/B18, A-/B22, A24/B25
OB: *saḥ*
OM: *kon·*
Gloss: son
Blagden: child, son
Shafer: son
Than Tun: child
Tha Myat: သား ”
Katō: 〔various〕 'son'
Krech: son
sagaṃsirva /sa ga si r.wa/
A17 (*sagaṃsi*/B17
OB: *saṅghasena*

OM: *saṅghasena*
Pali: *saṁghasenavho*
Gloss: Saṅghasena
sagha /sa ga/
A17/B17
OB: *skhaṅ·* 'lord'
OM: *tirla* 'lord'
Pali: *bhikkhu-* 'monk'
Gloss: saṅgha
samanarḍoṁṁḥ /sa(C) ma na r.ḍo(C)h/
A20 (*[sa]manarḍo[ḥ]*), B20
OB: *sak·munalon·*
OM: *sak·munalor·*, *sak·munalon·*
Pali: absent
Gloss: Sakmunalor
Notes: Luce 1985 I: 39 on "Sak village of Munalon"
saveñudeña /sa we ɲu te ɲa(C)/
A23/B24
OB: *sarvvaññutaññāṇ·*
OM: *sarvvaññutaññāṇ·*
Pali: *sabbaññutā   sabbaññūtā*
Gloss: omniscience
Notes: Sanskrit: *sarvajñātā*
si /si(C)/
A2/B2, A3/B3, A4/B4, A5/B5, A8/B9, A14/B14, A19/B19
OB: A3/B3: *phlac·*; no equivalent elsewhere
OM: A3/B3: *das·*; no equivalent elsewhere
Gloss: to be
Blagden: the root meaning is apparently 'to be', though in A14 it is difficult to see how that meaning can be appropriate
Shafer: to speak, to say, to call (by name)
Than Tun: to be
Tha Myat: realis verb suffix သည်
Katō: 𑀲𑀸 'to call'
Krech: to exist
Notes: Contra Tha Myat, unlikely to be equivalent of the Burmese realis verb suffix သည် since it is of much lower frequency than that ubiquituous marker. If Pyu does have an equivalent of သည်, it is more likely to be *ḅiṁḥ*.
siri /si ri/
A1/B1
OB: *śrī*
OM: *śrī*
Pali: *śrī*
Gloss: opening phrase 'glory!'

Notes: Only the Pyu text contains Pali *siri*; all others including the Pali contain Sanskrit *śrī*. *siri* is not a Pyu localization of Sanskrit *śrī* since Pyu permits the consonant sequence *sr*. The Pyu version of Sanskrit *śrī* is *sri* as in A3/B2.

su /su(C)/
A16/B17
OB: *son[·]*
OM: *son·*
Gloss: Sona

sumedhabadiṃṁ /su me da pa(C) tï(C)/
A15, B16 (*saumedhabadiṃṁ*)
OB: *sumedhapaṇḍit·*
OM: *sumedhapaṇḍit·*
Pali: *sumedhatta sumedho ti laddha-nāmo ca paṇḍito* 'a pundit, wise of self and having acquired the name Sumedha'
Gloss: Sumedhapaṇḍita

se /se/
A10/B10, A12/B12, A19/B19
OB: A10/B10: *plu*; A12/B12: *plo°a·*; A19/B19: *mū*
OM: A10/B10: *kin[d]aṁ*; A12/B12: *pa*; A19/B19: *kandaṁ*
Gloss: to make
Blagden: to make
Shafer: to make
Than Tun: to make
Tha Myat: causative marker ၏
Katō: ⬜⬜ 'to make'
Krech: to make

saumedhabadiṃṁ
See *sumedhabadiṃṁ*.

stabana /s.ta pa na/
A19/B19 (*staḅana*)
OB: *thāpanā*
OM: *thāpanā*
Gloss: to enshrine
Blagden: to enshrine, to set up (a sacred image)
Shafer: to enshrine
Than Tun: to enshrine
Tha Myat: ထားြခင်း 'placement'
Katō: ⬜⬜⬜⬜ 'to dedicate to something religious'
Krech: to enshrine
Notes: An interesting case of an Indic noun borrowed as a verb.

staḅana
See *stabana*.

stau /s.to(C)/
A19/B20
OB: *°athot·*
OM: *cloṅ·*

Pali: *thūpika-* 'spired'
Gloss: spire
Blagden: spire of a pagoda
Shafer: spire
Than Tun: spire of pagoda
Tha Myat: သျူပ 'stupa'
Katō: ⯑⯑ 'pointed stupa'
Krech: spire/stupa
Notes: Blagden, Than Tun: < stupa
sni[ṅ]·ḥ /s.niṅ̊/
A2/B2, A7/B7 (*sniḥ* in all instances except for B2)
OB: °*anhac·*
OM: *cnām·*
Pali: *vassānaṁ*
Gloss: year
Blagden: year
Shafer: year
Than Tun: year
Tha Myat: နှစ်ကာလ 'a year's time', နှစ် 'year', ခုနှစ် 'a year'
Katō: ⯑ 'year'
Krech: year
sniḥ
See *sni[ṅ]·ḥ*.
sri /s.ri/
A3/B2
OB: *śrī*
OM: *śrī*
Pali: absent
Gloss: glory!
Notes: < Skt śrī
sriḥ /s.ri(C)h/
A7/B8
OB: *mū*
OM: *kmin·*
Gloss: to reign
Blagden: to reign (?)
Shafer: to reign (?)
Than Tun: to reign
Tha Myat: Skt *śrī* 'royal prosperity, regal splendor'
Katō: ⯑⯑ 'to be ill'
Krech: ruler
Notes: Krech has a noun preceded by AFF.
sruḥ /s.ru(C)h/
A24/B25
OB: °*achuy*
OM: *kulo*

Gloss: kinsman
Blagden: kinsman, relative
Shafer: kinsman
Than Tun: kinsman
Tha Myat: ဆွေ 'friend', ဆွေမျိုး 'relatives', အဆွေအမျိုး 'close friends and relatives'
Katō: 🯄🯄 'relatives'
Krech: relative
ha /hak/
A14/B14 (×2)
OB: *koṅ·*
OM: *thic·*
Gloss: good, well
Blagden: good, well (?)
Shafer: deed (?)
Than Tun: well
Tha Myat: ကောင်း 'well'
Katō: 🯄🯄 'that'
Krech: grammatical morpheme
hi /hi/
A5/B6, A7/B8
OB: A5/B6: *syī·*; A7/B8: *siy·*
OM: A5/B6: *cuti*, A7/B8: *scuti* 'will die'
Gloss: to die
Blagden: to die
Shafer: to die
Than Tun: to die
Tha Myat: သေသည် 'to die'
Katō: 🯄🯄 'to die'
Krech: to die
hoḥ
See *nhoḥ*.
hṅa.diṁ /ŋ̊a(C) dï(C)/
A17/B17
OB: °*amhok·* 'presence'
OM: *kinta* 'before'
Pali: *saṁmukhā* 'in front'
Gloss: presence
Blagden: first two syllables of *hṅa.diṁ duṃ* which appears to mean 'in the presence of'
Shafer: persons
Than Tun: A17: first two syllables of *hṅa.diṁ duṃ* which appears to mean 'in the presence (of)'
Tha Myat: A17/B17: first syllable of *hṅa.diṁ* အမှောက် 'presence' (?), မျက်မှောက် 'under one's nose (figuratively)'
Katō: *hṅa* 🯄 'front' + *diṁ* 🯄🯄 'near'
Krech: *hṅa* 'presence' + locative *diṁ*
Also see *mra.ja.hṅa*.
hñiṁ.chi /ɲ̊ï(C) cʰi(C)/

A25/B27
OB: °*anhip*·°*acaka*
OM: °*upadrov*· 'harm'
Gloss: violence
Blagden: violence (? cf. Early Burmese °*anhip*·?) + violence (?); cf. Early Burmese °*acak*·?
Shafer: heart (?), thought (?) + evil (?)
Than Tun: violence
Tha Myat: ညှဉ်းဆဲး 'to torture, treat badly'
Katō: 𑄧𑄧𑄧𑄧 'to oppress' + 𑄧𑄧𑄧𑄧𑄧 'to receive damage'
Krech: to oppress + first syllable of *chi ga* 'to be afraid'

hḍimḥ [1] /ɲï(C)h Dï(C)h/
A7/B8
OB: no equivalent
OM: no equivalent
Gloss: nominalizer
Blagden: no gloss
Shafer: to destine (?)
Than Tun: second syllable of 'to be sick'
Tha Myat: လှုသည် 'to donate', ပေးသည် 'to give'
Katō: 𑄧𑄧𑄧𑄧 'like'
Krech: grammatical morpheme

hḍimḥ [2] /Dï(C)h/
A25/B26
OB: *lhū* 'to offer'
OM: *ku* 'to give'
Gloss: to dedicate
Blagden: to dedicate to, to make a gift to pious uses (cf. Early Burmese *lhū*?)
Shafer: to destine (?), to dedicate (?)
Than Tun: to dedicate to
Tha Myat: လှုသည် 'to donate', ပေးသည် 'to give'
Katō: A7: 𑄧𑄧𑄧𑄧 'like'; A25: second syllable of *gaṁḥ hḍiṁḥ* 𑄧𑄧𑄧 'offering'
Krech: A7: grammatical morpheme; A25 : to give/offer to
Notes: Probably cognate to *hḍī*, either 'to dedicate' or 'dedication'.

hḍī /Di(C)/
A20/B20
OB: *lhot*· 'to dedicate'
OM: *busac*· 'to dedicate'
Gloss: to dedicate or dedication
Blagden: dedication formula (?)
Shafer: dedication formula
Than Tun: dedication
Tha Myat: လွတ် 'to be free from', လှုသည် 'to donate'
Katō: 𑄧𑄧𑄧𑄧 'to joyfully give one's assets to charity'
Krech: donation

Notes: *goṃ °o hḍī* may either be a noun compound 'cave-pagoda dedication' with *°o* nominalizing a verb *hḍī* or a noun + possessed noun sequence 'dedication of the cave-pagoda'. In either case, *hḍī* is probably cognate to *hḍiṁh* 'to dedicate'.

hniṁḥ /ŋ̈ï(C)h/
A7/B8
OB: *nā*
OM: *'jey·*
Gloss: to be sick
Blagden: to be sick (cf. Early Burmese *nā*?) + ?
Shafer: to be sick (?)
Than Tun: first syllable of *hniṁḥ hḍiṁḥ* 'to be sick'
Tha Myat: နာမကျန်း 'to be sick and not healthy', နာဖျာ: 'to be sick with fever'
Katō: ⯑⯑⯑'to wither'
Krech: to be near

hra /r̥a(C)/
A13/B13
OB: *pur[h]ā* 'Buddha'
OM: *kyek·* 'sacred thing'
Gloss: sacred image
Blagden: sacred image (?)
Shafer: Buddha (? cf. Old Burmese *puhrā*)
Than Tun: sacred image
Tha Myat: ဘုရား: 'Buddha'
Katō: ⯑ 'Buddha'
Krech: no gloss
Notes: Tha Myat regards this word as a loan of a Sanskrit *hri* 'Buddha', but there is no such word.

hra[t]·ṁ /r̥ät/
A2/B2, A7/B7 (*hraṁ* in all instances except B2)
OB: *het·*
OM: *diññcām·*
Pali: *°aṭha-*
Gloss: eight
Blagden: eight
Shafer: eight
Than Tun: eight
Tha Myat: ရှစ် 'eight'
Katō: ⯑ 'eight'
Krech: seventh syllable of '1628'

hraṁ
See *hra[t]·ṁ*.

°arimedeyaṃ /°a ri me de ɟa/
A26/B28
OB: *°arimittiryā*
OM: *trey· mettey·*, lit. 'sacred being Metteyya'
Pali: *metteyya-dipadindassa* 'Metteyya, lord of bipeds'

Gloss: Āriyametteyya

°o /°o/

A2/B2 (×2), A3/B3 (×3), A4/B4 (×2), A5/B5 (×2), A6/B6, A6/B7 (×2), A7/B8, A8/B8, A8/B9 (×2), A9/B9, A10/B10, A12/B12, A13/B13, A14/B14, A17/B17, A18/B18, A19/B19, A19/B20, A20/B20, A-/B22, A22/B23, A25/B26

OB: no equivalent

OM: no equivalent

Pali: no equivalent

Gloss: marker of possessed nouns; nominalizer; third person pronoun before accusative marker

diṃṁ

Blagden: a particle used (1) to connect numerals with a noun, A2; (2) after words in the genitive relation, A4, A6-A10, A18-A21; (3) in certain other combinations not falling clearly under these heads, A3, A14, A17; (4) first syllable of *°o rmiṅ·* 'name, called, named'

Shafer: third person pronoun

Than Tun: first syllable of *°o rmiṅ·* 'called'; otherwise no gloss

Tha Myat: ထန်းများကို နာမ်နှင့်စကားဆက် 'connects numbers to nouns and words'; A4, A6-A10, A18-A21 သာမိကာရက – ပိုင်ဆိုင်သောပစ္စည်း စကားအဖြစ် 'the possessive case - being a word of things that are possessed'; A3, A14, A17: genitive marker ၏

Katō: ⬚⬚ 'his', ⬚⬚⬚ 'her', ⬚⬚ 'of that', ⬚⬚⬚ 'their', (⬚⬚⬚) nominalizer, (⬚⬚⬚) adverbializer

Krech: A2: plural; A2-A6, A8-A10, A14, A17-A21: third person pronoun; A7: negative; A5, A6, A12, A13, A22, A25: first syllable of *°o vaṁ*

7 Conclusion

The Kubyaukgyi inscription is only the beginning of my studies of Late Pyu. I also plan to examine the other two Late Pyu inscriptions which are also multilingual: the Sino-Pyu bilingual Tharaba Gate inscription (PYU 11) and the quadrilingual Myittha inscription in Mon, Pali, Pyu, and Sanskrit (PYU 39). Sein Win's (2016) reading of PYU 11 has unusual characteristics and needs careful reexamination, and both it and PYU 39 need to be studied from a grammatical perspective.

8 Apparatus

There is no agreement on how to represent Pyu in Roman letters. To facilitate comparisons, all readings have been converted as much as possible into the Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions system (hereafter, 'the Corpus system') used in this study.

Different romanization systems often make readings look more divergent than they actually are. Differences are of two types: systematic and nonsystematic.

I list all nontrivial systematic correspondences between transliteration systems at the top of each language section. Trivial correspondences such as *w* for the *v* of the Corpus system are not noted. The anusvāra that some scholars write as *ṃ* is consistently represented as *ṁ* following the Corpus system to avoid confusion with the Corpus system letter *ṃ* which represents a subscript dot.

Some systems use symbols which are typographically difficult to reproduce: e.g., Blagden [1919b]'s three vertically stacked circles for *ṁḥ* after *i*. I always convert such symbols into their Corpus system equivalents.

I ignore differences in hyphenation, spacing, and the use of brackets and parentheses around otherwise identical text.

I also ignore different ways of handling an identically read akṣara broken across two lines: e.g., Duroiselle [1919a] sometimes writes the entire akṣara on the first line (e.g., *si°a·* in OB A17-A18) but sometimes splits it across lines (e.g., *kyon·* in OB A19-A20).

If a reading matches the Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions reading (hereafter, 'the Corpus reading') after correspondence rules are applied, it is treated as identical to the Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions reading, and only a romanization in the Corpus system is given. For instance, Krech [2012]'s ' before vowels corresponds to *ṃ* after vowels in the Corpus system. Hence Krech [2012]'s *d'oḥ* in Pyu A3 is equivalent to the Corpus reading *doṃḥ*, and both are combined in a single listing for *doṃḥ*.

If two or more non-Corpus readings match each other after correspondence rules are applied, they are combined in a single listing with their shared reading converted into the Corpus system: e.g., Shafer [1943]'s *plà:* and Krech [2012] read *plaṃḥ* in OM A23. Both readings are equivalent to *plaṁḥ* in the Corpus system, and are written as *plaṁḥ* here despite their different forms in the original publications. The Corpus system regularization *plaṁḥ* contrasts with the Corpus reading *pḍaṁḥ*.

If a reading does not match any other reading even after correspondence rules are applied, that reading may contain elements absent from the Corpus system. Often parts of these sui generis readings cannot be converted into the Corpus system: e.g., Krech [2012]'s Pyu *av* has no equivalent in the Corpus system which lacks a means to write codas that are not represented by subscript consonants in the Pyu script. Hence Krech's transliteration *av* is left as without a dot to distinguish it from the vowel-subscript consonant sequence *av·*.

All Burmese script transliterations of OB, OM, Pali, and Pyu are converted into the Corpus system. ည is consistently transliterated as *ññña* regardless of whether it corresponds to a single or a double /ɲ/ in any given word in any given language. ဉ = *ñña* is not in any Burmese script transliteration of the Kubyaukgyi inscription.

Conversely, ဌ is consistently transliterated as *ṭha* regardless of whether it corresponds to a single or a double stop in any given word in any given language. ဋ္ဌ = *ṭṭha* is not in any Burmese script transliteration of the Kubyaukgyi inscription.

The distribution of ည ဉ ဌ ဋ္ဌ in Burmese script transliterations reflects the distribution of their 12th century Mon-Burmese script equivalents in the Kubyaukgyi inscription: ည ဌ are present and ဉ ဋ္ဌ are absent. Consequently the Corpus readings have *ññ ṭh* but not *ñ ṭṭh*. These readings reflect what is on stone and not what was necessarily on people's lips: e.g., Mon *ññaḥ* 'person' was phonemically /ɲah/ with a single /ɲ/ even though it was written with *ññ*.

8.1 Old Burmese

The majority of differences between readings involve the perceived presence or absence of the °asat·.

F: Forchhammer 1892; A1-A29 only in Burmese script; F . : C '· and C °a·, F *e : C °e°a·, F *dhuiv·* : C *thuiv·*, F *prov·*. : C *plo°a·*

Bl₀₉: Blagden 1909; A only in Burmese script

Bl₁₀: Blagden 1910 lists a few corrections of Bl₀₉ in Burmese script.

D: Duroiselle 1919; D ' : C '· and C °a·, D *e'* : C °e°a·, D *ie* : C *ei*, D *ñ* : C *ññ*

N: Nishida 1955; only sporadic notes on B; N *'* : C *'·* and C *°a·*, N *e'* : C *°e°a·*, N *å* : C *o*, N *ö* : *ui*, N *ü* : *ei*, N *ñ* : C *ññ*;

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006; Sa *N* : C *ññ*, Sa *@a_tV@'* : *tui°a·*, Sa *thVw'* : C *thuiv·*

Y: Yabu 2006; Y *ie* : C *ei*; Y distinguishes between *'·* and *°a·* in Burmese transliteration but not in Roman transliteration. Y's use of *'·* and *°a·* in Burmese transliteration matches C precisely, so I ignore the ambiguous use of *'* for both *'·* and *°a·* in Roman transliteration.

Y consistently has ꩠ = *ññ* in Burmese transliteration and *ñ* in Roman transliteration corresponding to C *ññ*.

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (Griffiths, Wheatley, and Miyake's reading; accessed ??? 2018)

A1 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *śrī*, N *srī*

A1 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *buddhāya*, N *buddhaya*

A1 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *skhaṅ·*, FN *sakhaṅ·*

A2 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *ryā*, F *rā*

A3 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *°īy·*, F *°iy·*

A3 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *°arimaddanapur·*, F *°arimaddhanapura*

A4 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *nhik·*, FN *nhuik·*

A4 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *dhammarāj·*, F *dhammarāja*

A5 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *phlac·*, F *phrac·*

A5 FDNSaYC *ta*, Bl$_{09}$ *tha*; Bl$_{09}$ ∞ *tha* may be a typo for ∞ *ta*.

A7 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *mañ·*, N *man·*; N's *n·* may be a typo since *n·* and *ñ·* look nothing alike, and he read *ñ·* in the same word elsewhere: e.g., A8.

A7 FBl$_{09}$DNSaYC *ta mu*; Bl$_{09}$ speculates the original text (that was the basis of the inscription?) had *tamū*.

A8 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *kumār·*, F *kumāra*

A10 Bl$_{09}$C *syī·*, FDSaY *sīy·*, N *siy·*; an unusual combination of *°asat·* atop *sī* atop subscript *y*. Bl$_{09}$ regards this as an error for *siy·*.

A10 Bl$_{09}$DNYC *kha*, F *khe*, Sa *kha·*

A10 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *hnaṅ'·*, F *hnaṅ·*

A11 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *hnaṅ'·*, F *hnaṅ·*

A12 Bl$_{09}$DNYC *sā °a· sā*, F *sā ra so*, Sa *sā'(·) sā*

A12 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *rājakumār·*, F *rājakumāra*

A12 FBl$_{09}$DNSaYC *so*; Bl$_{09}$ suggests an alternate reading *po* for *so*.

A13 Bl$_{09}$DNC *bri ru*, F *pri ru*, Sa *bri rū*, Y *brī rū*

A14 Bl$_{09}$DC *y'a °e°a· || siy·*, F *y·. *e. siy·*, N *ye'· siy*, Y *y'a °e°a· siy·*, Sa *y'· °e'· || siy·*; the line begins with an unusual combination of *y* atop subscript *°a* without an *°asat·*. There is no space for an *°asat·* beneath the descender of the *°e* on the line above. Bl$_{09}$ thinks *y'· °e°a· || siy·* was intended.

A14 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *nā*, F *rā*

A14 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *rhov·*, F *nhoṅ·*

A14 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *nhik·*, F *nhuik·*, N *nhok·*; N's *o* may be a typo for *ö* which is *ui* in the C transliteration system. There is no *o* in N's transliteration system. N's equivalent of *o* in the C transliteration system is *å*, not *o*.

A14 FBl$_{09}$DNSaC *rājaku-*, Y *rāj·ku-*

A15 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *-mār·*, F *-māra*

A15 FBl$_{09}$DNYC *pay·*, Sa *pāy·*

A15 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *mimī*, F *mimi*; Bl$_{09}$ thinks this may have been *mimi* in the original text.

A15 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *keiv·*, F *ṅa kiv·*

A16 F has a dash before *grī* presumably indicating lost text.

A16 Bl$_{09}$C *kla ññjo*, F *kra ñjo*, DSa *kla ñjo*, N *klañ jo*; Y's Burmese transliteration has *kla ññjo*, but his romanized transliteration has *klañjo*.

A16 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *skhaṅ·*, FN *sakhaṅ·*

A17 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *ruy· °e°a·*, F *ruy·. *e.*, N *ruye'·*

A17 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *nhap· liy· su rhov·*, F lost

A17 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *°iy·*, N *°īy·*

A18 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *°a· min'·*, F *v· min·*.

A18 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *°iy·*, N *°īy·*

A18 YC *skhaṅa*, Bl$_{09}$DSa *skhaṅ·*, FN *sakhaṅ·*; there is no space for an *°asat* beneath the subscript *h* of the line above.

A18 Bl$_{09}$NSaYC *°aphei°a·*, F *°apheiv·.*, D *°aphei'·*

A18 Bl$_{09}$NSaYC *°ati°a·*, F *°athiv·.*, Bl$_{10}$ *°abhi°a·*, D *°ati'·*

A18 DNSaYC *kyon·*, FBl$_{09}$ *kyvon·*

A19 DNSaYC *kyon· suṁ rvoh·*, FBl$_{09}$ *kyvon· suṁ rvoh·*

A19 Bl$_{09}$NSaYC *°atui°a·*, F *°athiv·.*, *°atui'·*

A20 Bl$_{09}$DSaC *skhaṅ·*, FN *sakhaṅ·*, Y *skhaṅa*

A20 Bl$_{09}$YC *saññ·*, FDNSa *sañ·*

A20 FBl$_{09}$Bl$_{10}$DYC *°iya rhuya*, NSa *°iy· rhuy·*; Bl$_{09}$ thinks *°iy· rhuy·* was intended. N *°iy·* is curious, as his OB vowel list does not include a vowel *ī*. Is N's *i* a typo for *ī*, or was *i* accidentally omitted from his OB vowel list?

A20 Bl$_{09}$NSaYC *°atui°a·*, F *°atuiv·.*, D *°atui'·*

A21 Bl$_{09}$NSaYC *ye°a·*, F *yev·.*, D *ye'·*

A21 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *thiv·*, F *dhiv·*

A21 NSaYC *klui°a·*, F *kriv·.*, Bl$_{09}$ *phlui°a·*, D *klui'·*

A22 Bl$_{09}$SaYC *ruy'· °e°a·*, F *ruy·. *e.*, D *ruy'· °e'*, N *ruye'·*

A23 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *mahāther·*, F *mahādher·*

A23 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *grī*, N *gri*

A23 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *muggaliputtatissatther·*, F *muggaliputtatissathther·*, N *muggaliputtatissātther·*

A25 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *son·*, F *serā*

A26 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *t·*, N *ta*

A26 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *skhaṅ·*, FN *sakhaṅ·*

A26 Bl$_{09}$NSaYC *tui°a·*, F *thuiv·.*, D *tui'·*

A27 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *thiv·*, F *dhiv·*

A27 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *brī*, F *bri*

A27 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *thuiv·*, F *dhuiv·*

A27 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *rājakumār·*, F *rājakumāra*

A27 FBl$_{09}$DNSaYC *ma yā °a*, Sa *ma yā°a·*; Bl$_{09}$ suggests an alternate reading *ma yā°a·*. N's text of A has a correction *mayā'·* on the basis of B, as explained in endnote 84.

A28 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *thiv·*, F *dhiv·*

A28 Bl$_{09}$DSaYC *thāpanā*, F *dhāpanā*, N *thāpaṭhnā*

A28 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *ruy'·*, F *ruy·*

A28 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *°iy·*, N *°īy·*

A28 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *°athot·*, F *°adhok·*

A29 FBl$_{09}$DSaYC *°iy·*, N *°īy·*

A29 Bl$_{09}$DNSaYC *brī*, F *prī*

A30 Bl₀₉DSaYC *nhik·*, N *nhuik·*

A31 Bl₀₉DSaYC *hen· buiv·*, N *hen· bov·*; Bl₀₉ cites an unpublished reading *mon· dhuiv·* by Taw Sein Ko. N's *o* may be a typo for *ö*. See note on A14 N *nhok·*.

A31 DSaYC *rvoh· || °iy·*, Bl₀₉ *rvobh· || °iy·*, N *rvoh· || °īy·*; Bl₀₉ သ် *bh·* may be a typo for ဟ် *h·*.

A32 Bl₁₀DSaYC *yo*, Bl₀₉N *yā*

A33 YC *°iya kū*, Bl₀₉DSa *°iy· kū*, N *°īy· kū*; there is no space for an *°asat* beneath the *ru* of the line above.

A33 Bl₀₉DSaYC *°iy· sei°a·*, N *°īy· sei'·*

A34 Bl₀₉DSaYC *min'·*, N *min·*

A34 Bl₀₉DSaYC *°iy·*, N *°īy·*

A34 Bl₁₀DSaYC *ṅā*, Bl₀₉N *rā*

A34 YC *sarvvañutañā-*, D *sarvvaññutañā-*, N *sarvvañutaña-*, Sa *sarbbañutañā-*; Bl₀₉ writes the word in Burmese as သရ်ဝ္ဉုတညာ, noting that he intends ရ်ဝ to form a single akṣara with a superscript *r* and without an *°asat·*. It is not clear whether he would transliterate ည in intervocalic position as *ñ* or as *ññ*, so I do not know if he intended *sarvvañutañā-* or *sarvvaññutaññā-*. Bl₁₀ does not comment on this word.

A35 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀SaYC *prajññā*, DN *prajñā*

A35 Bl₁₀DSaYC *sū*, Bl₀₉ *narū*, N *narā*

A35 DSaYC *ciy'·*, Bl₀₉N *ciy·*

A35 Bl₀₉DSaYC *ṅa*, N omit

A36 DSaYC *°achuy·*, Bl₀₉ *°achvay·*, Bl₁₀ *°achay·*; Bl₀₉ suggests a second possible reading *°achviy·*. N finds this word difficult to read and supplies *°achuy·* from B32.

A37 Bl₀₉DSaYC *thū*, N *tū*

A37 Bl₀₉DSaYC *°iy·*, N *°īy·*

A38 N has *°ā* at the end of this line instead of at the start of A39.

A38 Bl₀₉Bl₁₀DNYC *°acaka*, Sa *°acak·*; Bl₀₉ thinks *°acak·* was intended.

A39 SaYC *°arimittiryā*, Bl₀₉DN *°arimittiyā*; C reads a stroke above *y* as superscript *r*. This stroke is connected to the subscript *y* of the line above.

A39 Bl₀₉DSaYC *skhaṅ·*, N *sakhaṅ·*

A39 C *°aphu*, Bl₀₉Bl₁₀DNSaY *°aphū*; Bl₀₉ suggests an alternate reading *°achu*.

A39 Bl₀₉DNSaYC *ciy·*, Sa *siy·*; did Sa accidentally transliterate စ as *s* with the modern Burmese pronunication of စ in mind?

B1 DSaYC *|| śra || namo*; N cannot make out this part of the text and guesses that *śrī* might have been there.

B1 SaC *buddhā*, D *buddhāya*; D sees the first stroke of ya. Y has *buddhā* in Burmese transliteration but *buddhāa* in Roman transliteration.

B1 Bl₁₀ speculates that there was a second *śrī ||* after *buddhāya ||*. It is not clear whether Bl₁₀ is citing *buddhāya ||* from A or, like D, is seeing a *ya ||* that SaYC do not see.

B1 C *skhaṅā*, DSaY *skhaṅ·*

B2 SaC *n(h)ac·*, D omit, Y *(nhac·)*

B2 DYC *brī*, Sa *prī*

B2 SaDC *ma*; Y has *ma* in Burmese transliteration but *m* in Roman transliteration.

B7 D sees *||* amidst the damage on the left.

B8 C *(°a)*, DSaY omit

B9 DYC omit, Sa *piy'·*

B9 DSaC *maṅ·*; Y has *maṅ·* in Burmese transliteration but *man·* in Roman transliteration.

B10 DSaC *sīy·*; Y has *sīy·* in Burmese transliteration but *sīv·* in Roman transliteration.

B10 DSaC *mū*, Y has *mū* in Burmese transliteration but *mu* in Roman transliteration.

B10 YC *Ce*, DSa *e*; only the dependent vowel symbol *e* is visible at the right edge of the line. The consonant symbol that it is attached to is on the lost left side of B11. DS may have intended *e* to be the dependent vowel symbol, but they also use *e* to transliterate ေ = C °*e*.

B11 DNYC *pay·*, Sa *pāy·*

B12 C *kla ññjo*; Y has *kla ññjo* in Burmese transliteration but *klañio* in Roman transliteration.

B12 YC *r[h](u)[y]·°a*, DSa *rhuy·*

B13 C *[ṅ](·) [p]lu ru*, DSaY omit

B14 YC *ya /// na ◊ [°e °a]*, DS omit

B14 DYC ‖, Sa omit

B15 DC *°atei°a(·)*, Sa *°ati°a·*, Y *°atei*

B15 C *y*, D *yā*, SaY omit

B15 C |, DY ‖, Sa omit

B16 DSaYC *ṅa*, Bl₁₀ illegible

B16 Bl₁₀ sees a mark of unknown function beneath *piy·*.

B17 DSaYC *thiv·*, Bl₁₀N *thuiv·*

B17 C *rhov·*, DSaY *rvov·*

B18 YC *klui°a·*, D *klui'·*, Sa *klV°a·*

B18 DSaC *lh(e)ṅ'·*, Y *lh ṅ'·*

B18 DYC *e*, Sa omit

B19 DSaC *°e°a·*; Y includes this in his Burmese transliteration but omits it from his Roman transliteration.

B20 DSaC *brahma*, Y *prahma*

B22 SaC *°am(ho)*, D *°am*, Y *°ame*; only the *e*-shaped left side of *o* is visible.

B22 C *ha*, DSaY *h*

B23 DSaC *rājak*, Y *rājaku*

B24 C *hu*, DSaY omit

B24 DSaYC *s[o]*; although Y has *(e) sā* in Roman transliteration, his Burmese transliteration $\left(ေ◌\right)သာ$ makes it clear that *(e) sā* represents a *so* with a supplied first half of *o* rather than *(°e) sā* = $\left(ေ\right)$ သာ.

B25 DSaC *ra (k) /// (°i)y·*, Y *ra (kaa i)y·*

B25 C *lho(t·)*, DSaY *lho*

B25 C /// · ///, DYSa ///

B26 DSaYC *rvoh·*, Bl₁₀N *rvo*

B26 DSaC *(t)*, Y omit

B26 DYC *hen·buiv·*, Sa *hen·bVv·*

B27 C *[p/s]lī*, DSaY *(suṁ)*; D sees *[p/s]lī* but expects *suṁ* on the basis of A.

B28 C *rājaku(mā)[r]· (maññ)·*, DSa *rājakumā*, Y *rājakumār·*

B29 SaC *seī°a·*, D *sīe'·*, Y *sīe°a·*

B30 C *sarvvaññutaññāṇ·*, D *sarwwaññutanāṇ·*, Sa *sarbbañutañāṇ·*; Y has *sarvvarññuta ññāṇ·* in Burmese transliteration but *sarvvarñuta ñāṇ·* in Roman transliteration.

B30 SaC *praññjā*, DNSa *prañjā*; Y has *praññjā* in Burmese transliteration but *prañja* in Roman transliteration.

B30 DC *ap'·*, SaY *am'·*; D regards *ap'·* as an error for *am'·*.

B31 DYC *noṅ·*, Sa *ṅa noṅ'*; Sa has read the left half of *o* twice, first as *ṅa*, and then as the left half of *o*.

B31 C *lañ ñ· goṅa*, DSaY *lañgoṅ·*

B31 DYC *ciy·*, Sa *siy·*; Sa seems to have transliterated ဝ according to its modern Burmese pronunciation *s*.

8.2 Old Mon

Bl_{09}: Blagden 1909; A only; Bl_{09} *a-ut* : C *°a°ut·*, Bl_{09} *ñ* : C *ññ*, Bl_{09} *te°a·* : C *vo°a·*, Bl_{09} *titar·* : C *ticār·*; Bl_{09} proposes *ticār·* and *tivār·* as alternate readings. Bl_{09} does not contrast this word in A18 with the similar words in A19-A21, so presumably his remarks about the instance in A18 also apply to all further instances. Bl_{09} does not distinguish between independent vowel symbols and combinations of C *°a* with dependent vowel symbols: e.g., it is unclear whether Bl_{09} *-u* is equivalent to C *°u* (= ⟨⟩) or C *'u* (= ⟨⟩) in a subscript position. I retain Bl_{09}'s vocalic notation and list all cases of ambiguity other than *a-ut*.

Bl_{10}: Blagden 1910; corrections to Bl_{09} and first reading of B; Bl_{10} *ñ* : C *ññ*; Bl_{09} *titar·* : C *ticār·*; Bl_{10} is "still in doubt" about *titar·* but considers *ticār·* to be more probable than *tivār·*. Bl_{10} regards the word read by C as C *vo°a·* as ambiguous between *te°a·* and *vo°a·* in both versions of the Mon text of the Kubyaukgyi, but consistently reads *vo°a·* on the basis of the Shwezigon inscription.

Bl_{12}: Blagden 1912; further corrections to Bl_{09}; Bl_{12} *ñ* : C *ññ*

Bl_{19}: Blagden 1919; A with notes on differences between A and B; Bl_{09} *a-ut* : C *°a°ut·*, Bl_{19} *ñ* : C *ññ*; Bl_{19} reads *ticār·* like C but also proposes *titar·* as a less probable reading and *tivār·* as the least probable reading. Bl_{19} does not distinguish between independent vowel symbols and combinations of C *°a* with dependent vowel symbols: e.g., it is unclear whether Bl_{19} *-u* is equivalent to C *°u* (= ⟨⟩) or C *'u* (= ⟨⟩) in a subscript position. I retain Bl_{19}'s vocalic notation and list all cases of ambiguity other than *a-ut*.

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006; A only; Sa *N* : C *ññ*; Question marks reproduced verbatim.

J: Jenny and McCormick 2014; A1 to the middle of A27 only; J *ʔut* : C *°a°ut·*; J *ñ* : C *ññ*

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (Arlo Griffiths' reading; accessed ??? 2018)

A1 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *tirley·*, Bl_{09} *tīley·*

A2 $Bl_{12}Bl_{19}$SaJC *diññcām·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}$ *dijhām·*

A4 C *e*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ omit; this *e* is repeated at the start of the next line as the left side of *o*.

A8 $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaC *°a'ut*, J *°ut*

A8 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *kiryā*, Bl_{09} *kīyā*

A8 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *ḍik·*, Bl_{09} *ḍika*; the text of Bl_{09} states there is no virāma in *ḍika*, though the transcript in Bl_{09} has *ḍik·* with a virāma.

A10 $Bl_{12}Bl_{19}$SaJC *diññcām·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}$ *dijhām·*

A11 SaJC *'jey·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$ *°ajey·*; $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}$ state that *j* is subscript but transliterate as *°ajey·* rather than as *'jey·*.

A11 C *kaun·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ *kon·*

A12 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *mir·nas·*, Bl_{09} *mibas·*; Bl_{09} provides less likely readings *mivas·*, *mibas·ṁ*, *mivas·ṁ*.

A12 $Bl_{12}Bl_{19}$SaJC *°iññcim·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}$ *°ijhim·*

A13 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *jirku*, Bl_{09} *jïku*

A13 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *kindaṁ*, Bl_{09} *kinnaṁ*; Bl_{09} also provides a less probable reading *kinnuṁ*.

A14 $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaC *°ey· ḍik· pa*, J *°ey· pa*

A14 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *pa raṁ-*, Bl_{09} *par·*

A15 Bl_{10}SaJC *po°a·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$ *pā°a·*; Bl_{10} sees a space where the *ā*-shaped right half of *o* should be and thinks that half was either worn away or accidentally omitted. Bl_{19} thinks *po°a·* in B may have been what was intended for A as well.

A15 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *tirla ḍik·*, Bl_{09} *tīla ḍik·*

A15 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *tirla kil·*, Bl_{09} *tīla kil·*

A16 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *tirla*, Bl_{09} *tīla*

A16 $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaC *da°a·*, J *da*

A17 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *gappumas·*, Bl_{09} *garœ̄ ma°a·*; Bl_{09} rœ̄ is a transliteration influenced by /rɨ/, the modern Khmer pronunciation of *r̥*. Bl_{09} cites "friends" who read the first two akṣaras as *gapyu*. Bl_{09} acknowledges the possibility that the third akṣara is *mas·*.

A17 $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$SaC *thic· °ā thic· °ā*, J *thic· °ār· thic· °ār·*

A17 C *p·*, $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ *pa*, Bl_{09} *saṁ*

A18 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *tirla*, Bl_{09} *tīla*

A19 Bl_{19}CSa *muggaliputtatissatther·*, Bl_{09} *muggaliputtatissa t-her·*, J *muggaliputtatissather·*; Bl_{09} *t-h* is a ◌ *t* with a subscript *h*, not ∞ *th*.

A21 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *tirla*, Bl_{09} *tīla*

A24 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *kandaṁ*, Bl_{09} *kannaṁ*

A24 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJC *busac·*, Bl_{09} *būsac·*

A25 C *e*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ omit; this *e* is repeated at the start of the next line as the left side of *o*.

A26 $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaC *lor·*, J *lon·*

A26 C *rahay·*, $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ *rapāy·*; Bl_{09} sees *rahay·* but reads *rapāy·* on the basis of OB. Compare with *rapāy·* in B34 which has a tall *ā*: i.e., ◌ी.

A26 C omit, Bl_{09} *gin· up·*, Bl_{10} *gir-uy·* or *gin-uy·*, Bl_{19} *gir-uy·*, Sa ????, J *girʔuy·*; Bl_{09} acknowledges *gir·* as a possible reading. Bl_{10} acknowledges *gin·* as a possible reading.

A27 C *p· I*, $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ *y·*, Bl_{09} *p·*; a stroke connecting the *p·* and I-like parts of *y·* is missing. Bl_{09} regards the I-like stroke as the beginning of an ◌ *m* accidentally written before the left half ◌ of *o*. He does not regard the stroke as a single daṇḍa since a double daṇḍa is consistently used as the sole punctuation mark in this text. $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaJ ignore this stroke.

A27 SaC *°a'ut*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$ *°a-ut*, J *°ut*

A27 $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$C *cut· ḍek· ku*, Sa *cut· ḍe?? ??*; J reading ends right before this phrase.

A28 SaC *māpanā*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$ *thāpanā*; Bl_{09} acknowledges that the first consonant looks like *mā* but believes it is still distinct from *m* and is an incomplete *th*. Bl_{19} also regards that consonant as an incomplete *th*.

A28 $Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$C *vo°a· rādhanā rov· vo°a·*, Bl_{09} *te°a· rādhanā rov· te°a·*, Sa *vo°a· rādhanā rov· ????*

A29 $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$SaC *sinraṅ·*; Bl_{09} regards *pinraṅ·* as a possible reading.

A29 C *dap·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{10}Bl_{19}$Sa *das·*

A29 $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$C *sarvvaññutaññāṇ·*, Sa *sarvvaññ???ññāṇ·*

A30 $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$C *kulo*, Sa *kul?*

A31 SaC *c°eṅ·*, $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$ *c-eṅ·*

A31 Bl_{19}SaC *pa*, Bl_{09} *par·*; after this akṣara there is a vertical stroke with a curve on the bottom matching the curve of the following *°u*; perhaps the scribe thought of the *pa* and then the *°u* of the following word *°upadrov·* before starting over and writing *°u* properly.

A31 $Bl_{09}Bl_{19}$C *ḍi*, Sa *??*

B1 C *u(d)[dh]*, Bl_{10} *Bu[d]dh*

B2 C °*a /// moya lṅima*, Bl$_{10}$ *ā[r] moy lṅim·*; the virāmas of the last two akṣaras have been lost to damage.

B3 Bl$_{12}$C *diññcām·*, Bl$_{10}$ *dijhām·*

B3 C *ḍu*, Bl$_{10}$ omit

B13 Bl$_{12}$C *diññcām·*, Bl$_{10}$ *dijhām·*

B15 C *go ///*, Bl$_{10}$ *goḥ*; Bl$_{19}$ speculates that B originally had *goḥh·*.

B16 Bl$_{12}$C °*iññcim·*, Bl$_{10}$ *ijhim·*

B16 C omit, Bl$_{10}$ *k[i]nda[ṁ]*

B17 C *kyak·*, Bl$_{10}$ *kyek·*; the *e* of *kyek·* is presumably at the end of the previous line but is not visible in the RTI. Hence *kyek·* looks like *kyak·*. The *e* may still have been visible in Bl$_{10}$'s time.

B24 C *mhāthe /// |*, Bl$_{10}$ *mhāther· (||)*

B26 C *brah /// pāl·*, Bl$_{10}$ *brahmapāl·*

B27 C */// [va || ti]cār(·)*, Bl$_{10}$ *d[i]v· || titar·*; the left and top of B27 seems to have been considerably damaged since Bl$_{10}$'s time.

B30 Bl$_{19}$ speculates that B originally had *goḥh·*.

B35 C *tvāññaḥh· gir°uy·*, Bl$_{10}$Bl$_{19}$ *tvāññ· hegir-uy·*

B36 C *'ut·*, Bl$_{10}$Bl$_{19}$ *ut*

B42 C *c°eṅ·*, Bl$_{10}$ *c-eṅ·*

8.3 Pali

F: Forchhammer 1892; A1-31 only in Burmese script

Ts: Taw Sein Ko's transcript as printed in Blagden 1909; only A6-A8 in part on p. 1050, A15-16 in part on p. 1033; A19-21 in part on p. 1038, A30-A40 on p. 1022

Bd: Mrs. Bode's corrections and emendations for Ts as printed in Blagden 1911; with the exception of one emendation, it is not clear if she is providing readings or emendations, so I provide all other forms that she supplied whenever they differ from C.

D: Duroiselle 1919; periods indicating lost text reproduced as is

Tm: Tha Myat 1958a; in Burmese script

L: Luce 1980; B33-B43 only

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006; A only

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (Arlo Griffiths' reading; accessed ??? 2018)

A1 DSaC *yaṁ*, F *ti*

A2 C °*anādikaṁ*, FDSa °*anārikaṁ*

A3 FC °*aṭhavī-*, DSa °*aṭṭhavī-*

A4 C *cāpare*, F *sāsane*, DSa *vā pare*

A5 DSaC *mahabbalo*, F *mahapbalo*

A7 TsDSaC *tilokavaṭaṁsikā*, F *tilokavaṭasikā*, Bd *tilokāvataṁsikā*

A11 DSaC *tassā*, F *tassa*

A12 FC *bhuññjituṁ*, DSa *bhuñjituṁ*

A14 FC °*aṭhavīsati*, DSa °*aṭṭhavīsati*

A15 FTsDSaC *māranantikarogassa*, Bd *māraṇantikarogassa*

A16 DSaC *narādhipe*, FTs *narādhīpe*

A16 DSaC *mahantaṁ*, F *mahanta*

A17 FC *saññcayaṁ*, DSa *sañcayaṁ*

A18 FSaC *sumānaso*, D *sumānaso* ||; D's metrically arranged edition has a || absent from his other edition.

A20 DSaC °*akāsiṁ*, FTs °*akāsi*

A20 TsDSaC *vo*, F *te*

A20 FDSaC *varaṁ*, Ts *varam*

A23 FC *ññ cā*, TsDSaC *ñ cā*

A24 FC *tuṭhahattho*, TsDSaC *tuṭṭhahattho*

A25 TsDSaC || *dayāparo*, F | °*aparāparo*

A26 TsDSaC *paṇḍito* ||, F *paṇḍito*

A29 FTsDSaC *sakkhin*, Bd *sakkhiṁ*

A31 C *patiṭhāpiya kāresi*, BdDSa *patiṭṭhāpiya kāresi*, F *pati*, Ts *patitthāpiya kāresi*

A32 TsDSaC *patimāya*, Bd *paṭimāya*

A32 TsDSaC *nibbinno bhavasaṅkate*, Bd *nibbiṇṇo bhavasaṅkhate*

A33 BdDSaC *karontena*, Ts *karentena*

A34 C *sabbaññutaññāṇapativedhāya*, Ts *sabbaññutañāṇaṁ pativedhāya*, DSa *sabbaññutañāṇa-pativedhāya*

A35 DSaC *yattakā*, Ts *yatthakā*

A36 TsDSaC *patimāya*, Bd *paṭimāya*

A38 DSaC °*assaddha*, Ts °*asaddha*

A39 TsDSaC *upadduvaṁ*, Bd *upaddavaṁ*

A40 DSaC *metteyyadipadindassa*, Ts *metteyyadipadinnassa*, Bd *metteyyadīpadinnassa*

A40 DSaC *nāthigacchatū*, Ts *nādhigacchatū*

B2 C *suṇ*, D *suṇā*

B3 C °*aṭhavīsā* ◊ *dhike*, D °*aṭṭhavīsā* ◊ *dhike*

B4 C *cāpare*, D *vā pare*

B7 C *(t) /// sā*, D */// sā*

B10 C *pasanno*, D *pasano*

B10 C *savvadā*, D *sabbadā*

B10 C *[dā]saparibhogena*, D *..saparibhogena*

B11 C *ga(t)āya*, D *ga?āya*

B12 C °*aṭhavīsati*, D °*aṭṭhavīsati*

B13 C *(k)arogassa*, D *..rogassa*

B14 C *(ma)hantaṁ*, D *..hantaṁ*

B20 C *taññ*, D *tañ*

B22 C *tu* ◊ *ṭhahattho*, D *tuṭṭhahattho*

B22 C *pa*, D *ma*

B23 C *hero*, D *thero*

B27 C *(ja)laṁ*, D *..laṁ*

B28 C *tat(o)*, D *tate*; despite differences in transliteration; both C and D see the same thing: the left side of *o* resembling *e* and a damaged right side.

B29 C *subhaṁ*, D *.ubha*

B29 C *i*, D omit

B29 C *(kāresi gu)*, D omit

B30 C *[ha] (ka) /// [vā na]*, D omit

B33 DC *puññaṁ*, L *puñaṁ*

B33 DC *samācitaṁ*, L *sasācitaṁ*

B33 C *sabbaññutaññāṇaṁ*, D *sabbaññutañāṇaṁ*, L *sabbañutañāṇaṁ*

B34 LC *pahivedhāya*, D *pativedhāya*

B37 DC °*añño*, L °*año*

B37 C *ññātako*, DL *ñātako*

B38 LC *[pā]pasaṅkappo*, D . . *pasaṅkappo*

B39 C *yyapadduvaṁ*, D textityyupadduvaṁ, L *yyapaḍḍuvaṁ*

B39 DC *narādhamo*, L *narādhamo* or *nanādhamo*

B39 LC *mittiyyadi*, D *mittiyadi* d

MYSTERY LINES TO BE SUPPLIED???:

B40 C , D omit

B41 C , D omit

B42 C , D omit

8.4 Pyu

All readings of Pyu generally ignore Z except for the Pyu script versions of Tt and Sw, Sf's commentary, and the transliterations of Kr and C. Only instances where Tt and Sw lack a Z present in C are noted.

Bl$_{09}$: Blagden 1909; only two readings of Pyu words that differ from those of Bl$_{11}$

Bl$_{11}$: Blagden 1911; A with notes on B; Bl$_{11}$ °*u* : C °*o*, Bl$_{11}$ *ū* : C *u* (but the reverse is not always true, as some C *u* correspond to Bl$_{11}$ *u*), Bl$_{11}$ °*o* 'village' : C *kra*, Bl$_{11}$ *ḍhau* : C *pau*, Bl$_{11}$ *būḥ* : C *ḅuḥ*, Bl$_{11}$ *mī* : C *rmi*

Bl$_{19}$: Blagden 1919; A with notes on B; same equivalences as Bl$_{11}$ except B *mi* : C *rmi* . The *ra*-like daṇḍa | is not distinguished from the simple vertical line daṇḍa /; both are transliterated as | : C /.

Sf: Shafer 1943; A with notes on B; same equivalences as Bl$_{11}$; Sf *l* represents a phoneme /l/ rather than an Indic character textitl. Sf believes the Pyu used a non-*l* character (Bl$_{11}$ and Bl$_{19}$'s *ḷ*) to write an /l/-like phoneme. *Z* is absent from transliteration but present in the commentary unless noted.

Tt: Than Tun 1958; A only; same equivalences as Bl$_{19}$, except that *ḅ* is *b* and 'village' is *ro*. Although Tt distinguishes between *b* and *ḅ* in the Pyu script, Tt's Burmese and Roman transliteration systems have no *ḅ*.

Tm: Tha Myat 1958a; same equivalences as Tt, except Tt *ḍho* : C *pau* and Tm *ḷe* : C *ḍa* (but not in B3).

Sa: Sawada 2002-2006, A only; same equivalences as Bl$_{11}$ except Sa *mi* : C *rmi* and Sa *rh* : C *hr*. Question marks reproduced verbatim.

Ka: Katō 2005; A only in phonemic notation without punctuation; Ka ˜ : C *ṁ* (only exceptions in which Ka *ʔ* : C *ṁ* or Ka *˜ʔ* : C *ṁ* are noted), Ka *ʔə* : C °*o*, Ka *ʔo* 'village' : C *kra*, Ka *ɟ* : C *g-ṁ*, Ka *tăɗa:* : C *tdaṃḥ*, Ka *ɗ* : C *d-ṃ*, Ka *ɗaʔ* : C *daṃṁ*, Ka *du* : C *pau*, Ka *ɓ* : C *ḅ*, Ka *ɓuda* : C *ḅudha*, *mǎya:* : C *mayaḥ*, Ka *mi* : C *rmi*, Ka *ʔy* : C *y-ṃ*, Ka *yã* : C *yaṁ*, Ka *rajagəma* : C *rajaguma*, Ka *ʔw* : C *v-ṃ*

Kr: Krech 2012; A with notes on B; Kr '- : C -*ṃ*, Kr *ṃ* : C *ṁ*, *ʔa* : C °*o*, Bl$_{11}$ *ḍhau* : C *pau*, Ka *ḅav dha* : C *ḅudha*, Ka *ḅavḥ* : C *ḅuḥ*, Ka *mi* : C *rmi*

Sw: Sein Win 2016; B only as an eyecopy and in Burmese transliteration; Sw °*u* : C °*o*, Sw *kra* : C *ro*, Sw *ññ* : C *ñ*, Sw *b* : C *ḅ*, Sw *būḥ* : C *ḅuḥ*, Sw *būdha* : C *ḅudha*, Sw *rmi* : C *mi*; Sw *ḷe* : C *ḍa* (but not in B3); *Z* is absent from transliteration but present in the eyecopy unless noted.

C: Corpus of Pyu Inscriptions (accessed ??? 2018)

A1 KrC *1*, Bl_{19}Sa *//*, Bl_{11}SfKa omit, TtTm */*

A1 Bl_{11}C *|| siri ||*, Bl_{19}TtTmSa *// siri //*, SfKa *siri*, Kr *rara siri rara*; Ka does not include punctuation in his phonemic rendering of A, but it is clear that unlike Kr, he does not regard the daṇḍas as akṣaras.

A1 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaC *pdu*, Tm *pḷū*, Ka *pădum̐*, Kr *pdavṃ*

A1 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmC *sgu*, SaKr *sgum̐*, Ka *săgə*

A1 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaC *tva*, Kr *tav*

A1 Bl_{19}SfSaC *1000*, Bl_{11} *cū*, Tt *thū*, Tm *?*, Ka *?*, Kr *thav*; Tm reproduces the Pyu sign as is in his Burmese transliteration.

A1 Bl_{19}SfSaC *600*, Bl_{11} *jha*, Tt *trurā*, Tm *?*, Ka *?*, Kr *sāv*; Tm reproduces the Pyu sign as is in his Burmese transliteration.

A2 Bl_{19}SfSaC *20*, Bl_{11} *°e*, Tt *nsū*, Tm *?*, Ka *?*, Kr *tha*; Tm reproduces the Pyu sign as is in his Burmese transliteration.

A2 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *hram̐*, Ka *hraʔ*

A2 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *sniḥ*, Ka *săniḥ*

A2 Bl_{11}SfTtTmKrC *tvaṃm̐ḥ*, Bl_{19}Sa *tvaṃḥ*, Ka *tvam̐ḥ*

A2 Bl_{11}SfTtTmSaKrC *tha daṃm̐*, Ka *tha daṃʔ*; Bl_{19} has *tha da* in the transcription of the text but *tha dam̐* in his glossary where it is equated with *ta daṃḥ* (sic).

A2 C *rimadhanarbu*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSa *rimadhanabū*, Ka *rimadhanabu*, Kr *rimadhana Rbav*

A3 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmC *tribhuvaṃnadiṃm̐tya*, Sa *tribhuvanadiṃm̐tya*, Ka *tribə-vaṃnadīṃʔtəya*, Kr *tribhuvaṃnadim̐tya*; the function of the hyphen in Ka is unknown.

A3 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *dhamaraja*, Ka *damaraja*

A3 Bl_{19}SfSaKaKrC *doṃḥ*, Tt *doṃ*; Tm has *doṃḥ* in the transcription of the text but *doṃ* in the glossary.

A3 C *ḍaZ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$Sa *ḍa*, SfKa *la*, Tt *ḷa*, Tm *da*, Kr *laZ*; Bl_{19} proposes *ḷa* as an alternative reading.

A3 C *rvaṃḥ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTmSa *voṃḥ*, Tt *voḥ*, Ka *veṃḥ*, Kr *vaṃm̐ḥ*; Bl_{19} is uncertain about the vowel.

A4 C *triḍogavaṃdasaga*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$TtTmSa *trilogavaṃdasaga*, SfKaKr *trilogavaṃdasaga*

A4 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTmKaKrC *deṃvim̐*, Sa *deṃvi*; Tt has *deṃvim̐* in Burmese transliteration and *deviṃ* in romanization; his Pyu eye-copy has subscript dots under each akṣara.

A5 C *nhoḥ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaKr *hoḥ*

A5 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTmSaKrC *ta daṃm̐*, Tt *taṃ daṃm̐*, Ka *ta daṃʔ*; Bl_{19} has *ta daṃm̐* in the transcription of the text but *ta dam̐* in the glossary.

A6 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaC *mayaḥ °o*, Kr *(ḅam̐ḥ mayaḥ) ʔa*; Kr sees a blur on A and supplies two words on the basis of B6.

A6 TmKrC *dra*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaKa *tra*

A6 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaC *tḅaḥ*, Tm *tūḥ*, Ka *tăḅaḥ*, Kr *tvav*

A7 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *sniḥ*, Ka *săniḥ*

A7 C *rpu*, Bl_{11} *ṣū* or *dū*, Bl_{19}SfSa *tpū* or *npū*, TtTm *nsū*, Ka *năsu*, Kr *tsav*

A7 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *hram̐*, Ka *hraʔ*

A7 C *bim̐ḥ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfSaKaKr *ḅim̐ḥ*; TmTt have *ḅim̐ḥ* in their Pyu eye-copies but *bim̐ḥ* in transliteration.

A7 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaC *//*, Kr *// ○ //*; K's phonemic transcription excludes punctuation.

A7 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTmKaKrC *ḅim̐ḥ hnim̐ḥ*, Tt *ḅim̐ḥ hniḥ*, Sa *ḅiḥ hniḥ*

A7 C *hḍiṁḥ*, Bl₁₁TtTm *hḷiṁḥ*, SfKaKr *hliṁḥ*, Sa *hḷiḥ*; Bl₁₉ has *hḷiḥ* in the transcription of the text but *hḷiṁḥ* in the glossary.

A7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *mtu*, Ka *mătu*

A7 KaC *duṃ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSa *dūṃ*, TtTm *ḷūṃ*, Kr *davṃ*; Tt has *ḷū* in romanization but *ḷūṃ* in Burmese transliteration; his Pyu eye-copy has a subscript dot.

A9 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKrC *mtau*, Tm *mto*, Ka *mătu*

A9 Bl₁₁SfKaC *to*, Bl₁₉TtTmSa *toṃ*, Kr *tho*; Bl₁₁ thinks what appears to be *toṃ* has an accidental subscript mark.

A9 C *kḍeḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Sa *ḷoḥ*, Sf *loḥ*, TtTm *kḷeḥ*, KaKr *kleḥ*

A9 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSaKaKrC *troḥ*, TtTm *jroḥ*

A9 Bl₁₁SfTtKrC *mdauṃ*, Bl₁₉Sa *mdau*, Tm *mdo*, Ka *măduṃ*

A9 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSaC *ḍaḥ*, SfKa *laḥ*, Kr *daḥ*; Bl₁₉ proposes alternate readings *laḥ* and *leḥ*.

A9 Bl₁₁SfTtTmKrC *daṃṁ*; Sa *da??*, Ka *daṃ?*; Bl₁₉ has *da* in the transcription of the text but *daṃṁ* in the glossary.

A10 C *tlu*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *tū*, Ka *tu*, Kr *tav*; Bl₁₁ proposes an alternate reading *tkha*.

A10 TmC *biṁḥ tuḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSa *ḅiṁḥ tuḥ*, Ka *ḅiṁḥ təḥ*, Kr *biṁḥ bhuḥ*; Tt has *ḅiṁḥ* in his Pyu eye-copy, though the Burmese and Roman transliterations have *biṁḥ*.

A11 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC *thmuḥ*, Ka *thămuḥ*, Kr *thmavḥ*

A11 C *ḍoḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtSa *ḷoḥ*, SfKaKr *loḥ*, Tm *ḷo*

A11 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *tdiṁḥ*, Ka *tădīṁḥ*

A11 TtTmC *raḥ saḥ biṁḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfSaKa *raḥ saḥ ḅiṁḥ*, Kr *raḥ sa ḅiṁḥ*

A12 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmKaKrC *ḅaṁḥ*, Sa *ḅaṁḥ?*

A12 C *ce*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmKaKrSa *che*

A13 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaC *yaṁ ḅaṁḥ*, Kr *yaṁ baṁḥ*

A13 C *ḍoḥ ḅaṁḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSa *ḷoḥ ḅaṁḥ*, SfKa *loḥ ḅaṁḥ*, Kr *loḥ baṁḥ*

A13 C *kiṁ*, Bl₁₁ *riḥ*, Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *riṁ*, Ka *kviṁ*, Kr *k[r]iṁ* or *kviṁ*; Bl₁₉ sees *riḥ* as a possibility but favors *riṁ* on the basis of B14.

A14 C *pha*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKa *pa*; Kr *ḍha*; Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ see *pha* but read *pa* after B14.

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKaKrC *daṃṁ*, Tm *ḍaṃṁ*

A14 KaC *ṅa*, Bl₁₁SfTtTmSaKr *ṅu*; Bl₁₉ has *nu* in the transcription of the text but *ṅu* in the glossary.

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC *ha pra choḥ ha pra choḥ*, Ka *hă pra choḥ hă pra choḥ*, Kr ha pra cho ha pra cho

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKaKrC *choḥ ḅiṁḥ*; Bl₁₁ sees *choṁḥ ḅiṁḥ* but reads *choḥ ḅiṁḥ* after B14. Bl₁₉ sees *choṁḥ* as a possibility for the first akṣara.

A14 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtSaKaKrC *doṁḥ*, Tm *ḷoṁḥ*

A15 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKRC *mahaṭhe*, Ka *mahathe*; Ka may be seeing retroflex *ṭh* but is phonemically interpeting it as dental /th/.

A15 C *mugaṃḍubudadisaṭhe*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TtTmSa *mūgaṃḷubūdadisaṭhe*, Sf *mūgaṃlubūdadisaṭhe*, Ka *mugaṃləḅudadisathe*, Kr *mav gaṃ (tu ḅav) da diṁ sa ṭhe* with (tu ḅav) supplied on the basis of B.

A15 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaC *sumedhabadiṁṁ*, Ka *sumedabadiṃ?*, Kr *sav me dha ba diṇṁ*; both Tm and C acknowledge *su* was inserted.

A15 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSaKrC *vrahmaba*, Ka *vărahmaba*

A16 C *vradaṃyoḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTtTmSa *vrademyoḥ*, Ka *vărahmademyoḥ*, Kr *vra (dai) yoḥ*; Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ have doubts about *e*.

A16 KaC *su*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSa *sū*, Kr *sav*

A17 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaKrC *sagaṃsi*, Bl_{09} *sagasi*; given that Bl_{09} omitted the visarga in his transliteration of *hivūḥ* (A20) believing it to be a tonal mark, the absence of an anusvāra in *sagasi* may mean that Bl_{09} did not see an anusvāra or that he did see it but ignored it as a tonal mark.

A17 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *vaṃrabadiṃṁ*, Ka *vaṃrabadiṃ?*

A17 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaC *sagha*, Kr *saṃ gha*

A17 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaC *tvo*, Kr *tov*

A17 KaC *hṅa*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaKrC *hṅu*, Tm *h?*; Tm writes the Pyu subscript character beneath a Burmese *h*.

A17 KaC *duṃ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSa *dūṃ*, Kr *davṃ*

A18 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *tu*, Ka *tu?*

A18 C *tduṃ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSa *tdūṃ*, Ka *tăduṃ*, Kr *tdavṃ*

A18 Bl_{11}SfTtTmKaKrC *ta daṃṁ*, Sa *ta daṃ?*; Bl_{19} has *tada* in the transcription of the text but *tadaṃṁ* in the glossary.

A19 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTmSaKaKrC *ma*, Tt omit

A19 Bl_{19}SfTtTmSaKaC ||; Bl_{11}Kr see a blur

A19 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *stabana*, Ka *sătabana*

A19 C *[b]udha*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$TtSa *gūdha*, Sf *ḅūdha*, Tm *(bu)dha*, Ka *ḅuda*, Kr *bhav dha*

A19 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaKrC *stau*, Tm *sto*, Ka *sătu*

A19 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$TtTmSaC *tha ḅi(ṃḥ)*, SfKa *tha ḅiṁḥ*, Kr *tha ḅi*; Tt has *ḅi* in the Pyu script but has *ḅi* in his Burmese or Roman transliterations. Sf and Ka have supplied the anusvāra and visarga from B20 without comment.

A20 C *hḍī*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$TtSa *hḷau*, SfKr *hlau*, Tm *hḷo*, Ka *hlu*

A20 TmKrC *roḥ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaKa *toḥ*; Bl_{19} proposes *roḥ* as an alternate reading supported by B20.

A20 C *samanarḍoḥ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$ *samanaḷōṁ*, TtTmKr *samanaḷoṁ*, SfKa *samanaloḥ*, Sa *samanaḷo°oṁ*; Bl_{19} acknowledges the superscript hook that C reads as *r* but regards it as casting doubt on the vowel of the final akṣara. The macron in $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$ seems to symbolize that hook rather than vowel length.

A20 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtKrC *rabai*, Tm *rab?*, Sa *raba°i*, Ka *rabay*; Tm writes the Pyu vowel character atop a Burmese *b*. K's phonemic transcription is probably equivalent to the transliteration *rabai* rather than *rabay·*.

A20 KaC *jiṁvuḥ*, Bl_{09} *hivūḥ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSa *jiṁvūḥ*, Bl_{09} *hiṁvūḥ*; Bl_{09} does not include the visarga in his transliteration but states that although it is present in the word, he has omitted it because he believes it to be a tonal mark; Kr regards this word as damaged and supplies the reading *jiṁvavḥ* from B21.

A21 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$TmSaKrC (°o saḥ), SfTtKa *°o saḥ*; SfTtKa have supplied these words from B22 without comment.

A22 C *tduṃ*, $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSa *tdūṃ*, Ka *tăduṃ*, Kr *tdavṃ*

A22 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtSaKrC *chai*, Tm *ch?*, Ka *chay*; Tm writes the Pyu vowel character atop a Burmese *ch*. K's phonemic transcription is probably equivalent to the transliteration *chai* rather than *chay·*.

A22 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaC *choḥ*; Kr sees a blur.

A22 $Bl_{11}Bl_{19}$SaKrC (// yaṁ), SfTt // *yaṁ*, Tm *(yaṁ)*, Ka *yaṁ*; SfTtKa have supplied *yaṁ* from B23 without comment. Sf places this word at the start of A23. K's phonemic transcription excludes punctuation.

A23 C *saveñudeña*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSaKa *saveñodeñe*, Kr *sa ve ño de ña*; Tt has *savehodeñe* in romanization, but this is probably a typo for *saveñodeñe* which is in Burmese transliteration.

A23 KrC *breña*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSaKa *breñe*

A23 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaKrC *naḥ*; Bl$_{19}$ sees *nuḥ* as a possibility.

A23 C *pḍaṁḥ*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$TtTmSa *pḷaṁḥ*, SfKr *plaṁḥ*, Ka *pălaṁḥ*; Tt has *pṭaṁḥ* in romanization, but this is probably a typo for *pḷaṁḥ* which is in Burmese transliteration.

A23 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$KrC *paZ*, SfTtTmSaKa *pa*; Bl$_{11}$ observes Z and considers the possibility of reading it and *pa* together as an akṣara *pi* or *pau*. Bl$_{19}$ also observes Z and thinks it casts doubt on the vowel of *pa*.

A24 C *tra*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSaKaKr *traḥ*; there is a blank space after *tra* roughly corresponding to where a visarga could have been.

A24 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSaKrC *mtu*, Ka *mătuʔ*

A24 C *knaṁḥ*, Bl$_{11}$ *kuṁṁḥ*, Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSa *kuṁḥ*, Ka *kəṁḥ*, Kr *(kra)ṁḥ*; this is the only instance of a double anusvāra in Bl$_{11}$. Bl$_{11}$ also sees *kuṁḥ* with a single anusvāra as a possibility.

A24 KaC *duṃ*, Bl$_{11}$ *dū*, Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSa *dūṃ*, Kr *davṃ*; Bl$_{11}$ also sees *dūṃ* as a possibility.

A24 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SaC *gi saḥ ḍa*, SfKr *gi saḥ la*, Tt *gi saḥ ḷa*, Tm *gi saḥ ḷe*, Ka *gĭ saḥ la*; Bl$_{19}$ thinks *ḍa* throughout this line could also be read as *ḷa* or *ḷe*. Kr sees a dot to the top right of *la* but doubts it is part of the script, as it is absent from B25.

A24 SfKrC *gi pli la*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$Sa *gi pḷi ḍa*, Tt *gi pḷi ḷa*, Tm *gi pḷi ḷe*, Ka *gĭ păli la*

A24 C *gi sruḥ ḍaZ*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$Sa *gi sruḥ ḍa*, Sf *gi sruḥ la*, Tt *gi sruḥ ḷaZ*, Tm *gi srūḥ ḷe*, Ka *gĭ sruḥ la*, Kr *gi srūḥ laZ*; Kr sees *gi sruḥ laZ* as a possibility.

A24 KaC *hṅa*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtSa *hṅu*, Tm *hna*, Kr *hlu*; Tm transliterates the Pyu subscript character as a character resembling Mon subscript ◌ *na* with a hook. My romanization of his transliteration is based on Tm's glossary in which this akṣara is transliterated as *hna*.

A24 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SaC *ḍa yaṁ*, SfKaKr *la yaṁ*, Tt *ḷa yaṁ*, Tm *ḷe yaṁ*

A25 TmC *-dha*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$KrS omit, SfTtKa *ḅudha*

Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$S supply *ḅūdha*, Tm supplies *ḅū*, and Kr supplies *ḅav dha* on the basis of B26.

A25 C *hḍiṁḥ*, Bl$_{11}$TtTm *hḷiṁḥ*, SfKaKr *hliṁḥ*, Sa *hḷiḥ*; Bl$_{19}$ has *hiiḥ* (sic) in the transcription of the text but *hḷiṁḥ* in the glossary.

A25 Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmKrC *hñiṁ*, Bl$_{11}$ *jhiṁ*, Sa *hñi*, Ka *hñiʔ*; Bl$_{11}$ suggests *hñiṁ* as an alternative reading. Bl$_{19}$ has doubts about his reading.

A25 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtSaKrC *pdaṃ*, Tm *pḷaṃ*, Ka *pădaṃ*

A25 KaC *ṅuḥ*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSa *ṅūḥ*, Kr *javḥ*

A26 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmKaKrC °*arimedeyaṃ*, Sa °*arimedeya*

A26 Bl$_{11}$SfTtTmKaKrC *daṃṁ*, Sa *daṃʔ*; Bl$_{19}$ has *daṁ* in the transcription of the text but *daṃṁ* in the glossary.

A26 C *kdiṃ*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTmKr *diṃ*, Sa *diṃʔ*, Ka *kădiṃ*; Tt has *diṁṃ* in Burmese and Roman transliteration but his Pyu eyecopy has no *ṁṃ*.

A26 C *kchiṁḥ*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtSaKr *chiṁḥ*, Ka *kăchīḥ*; Tm has *chiṁḥ* in the transliteration of the text but the glossary lists *chiṁḥ* followed by *kchi* in parentheses.

A26 Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtSaKaKrC *tiṁ*; Tm has *tiṁ* in the transliteration of the text but the glossary lists *tiṁ* followed by *ti* in parentheses.

A26 C *tmu*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTtTmSa *tmū*, Ka *tămu*, Kr *tmav*

A26 C *choḥ //Z*, Bl$_{11}$Bl$_{19}$SfTmSa *choḥ //*, Tt *choḥ Z //*, Ka *choḥ*, Kr *choḥZ //*; Z is located over a blank space in T's eyecopy. Ka does not include punctuation in his phonemic transcription.

B1 SfTmC *dathagaṃda*, Sw *dathagada*

B1 C *pduṃ*, Tm *pḻūṃ*, Sw *pa*

B1 KrC *sguṃ*, Tm *sgu*, Sw *sga*

B1 TmC *daṃḥ*, Sw *naḥ*

B1 C *1000*, TmSw *thū*

B1 C *600*; Tm regards this numeral symbol as equivalent to *trū rā*. Sw regards this numeral symbol as equivalent to *krū rā*.

B2 C *20*, Kr *sāvu*; neither Tm nor Sw transliterate this numeral symbol; they merely reproduce it as is.

B2 C *hra[t]·ṁ*, TmSw *hraṁ*

B2 C *sni[ṅ]·ḥ*, TmSw *sniḥ*

B2 C *tvaṅ·ṃṁḥ*, Tm *tvaṃṁḥ* Sw *tvaṁḥ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B2 C *daṅ·ṃṁ*, Tm *daṃṁ*, Sw *daṁ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B2 C *priṅ·ḥ*, TmSw *priḥ*

B2 C *rimadham·narbu*, SfTmSw *rimadhanabū*

B2 C *miṅ·*, TmSw *mi*

B2 C *tribhuvaṃnadit·ṃṁtya*, Sf *tri?uvaṃnadiṁtya* TmSw *tribhuvaṃnadiṁṃtya*

B3 C *rmiṅ·*, TmSw *mi*

B3 C *doṅ·ṃḥ*, TmSw *doṃḥ*

B3 C *ḍaZ*, Sf *laZ*, TmSw *da*

B3 C *rvaṅ·ṃḥ*, SfTmSw *voḥ*, Kr *vaṃṁḥ*; Sf thinks this looks like *nvaṃḥ* or *lvaṃḥ* but rejects those readings since *n* and *l* should not be superscripts. C reads that superscript character as *r*.

B3 C *triḍogavadasaga*, Bl₁₁SfTm *trilogavadasaga*, Bl₁₉ *trilogavadasaga*; Sw *triḷogavadasa*; Sw includes the final akṣara in this word in his eyecopy but does not transliterate it.

B4 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmC *demviṃ*, Sw *dempaṃ*

B5 C *nhoḥ*, TmSw *hoḥ*

B6 C *tra*, TmSw *dra*

B6 C *[t]ḅaḥ*, TmSw *tūḥ*

B7 Bl₁₁Bl₁₉C *ḅiṁḥ*, TmSw *baṁḥ*; Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ regard *ḅiṁḥ* as an error for *ḅaṁḥ*. It is unclear whether TmSw have silently corrected this error or do not see an *i*.

B7 C *rpu*, TmSw *nsū*

B7 TmC *// 0 //*, Sw *// //*

B8 TmC *hniṁḥ*, Sw *huiḥ*

B8 C *hḍiṁḥ*, TmSw *hḷiṁḥ*

B8 C *duṃ*, Tm *ḻūṃ*, Sw *ḻū*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B8 C *rohZ*, SfTmSw *roḥ*

B9 TmC *diṃṁ*, Sw *diṃṁ*; Sw has *ṁ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B9 C *mtau*, Tm *mto*, Sw *mthau*

B9 C *tdaṃḥ*, TmSw *tdaḥ*

B9 SwC *to*, Tm *toṃ*

B9 C *kḍeḥ*, Tm *kḷeḥ*, Sw *teḥ*

B9 C *troḥ*, Sw *jroḥ*

B10 TmC *diṃṁ*, Sw *diṃ*; Sw has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B10 C *mdauṃ*, Tm *mdoṃ*, Sw *pdo*

B10 TmC *chaḥ*, Sw *cha*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B10 C *tlu*, SfTmSw *tū*

B11 C *budha*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTmSw *būdha*; Tm and Sw have *ḅ* in their eyecopies but not their translit-
erations.

B11 C *thmuḥ*, TmSw *thmūḥ*

B11 C *ḍoḥ*, TmSw *ḷoḥ*

B11 TmC *yaṁ*, Sw *laṁ*

B11 C *naṁ*, TmSw *na*

B11 C *toḥZ*, TmSw *toḥ*; Sw has Z in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B12 TmC *ma*, Sw *dha*

B12 C *choḥZ*, TmSw *choḥ*; Sw has Z in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B13 C *k[ra]*, Bl₁₁ omit, TmSw *ro*

B13 C *nhoḥ*, TmSw *hoḥ*

B13 C *ḍoḥ*, TmSw *ḷoḥ*

B14 C *kiṁ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉Tm *riṁ*, Sw *ri*; Sw has *ṁ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B14 C *daṃṁ*, TmSw *ḍaṃṁ*

B14 C *ṅa*, TmSw *ṅu*

B14 TmC *choḥ*, Sw *cho*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B15 C *doṃḥ*, TmSw *ḷoḥ*

B15 SfC *mhaṭhe*, Sw *mṭhaṭhe*; Tm has *mnaṭhe* in his reading but *mhaṭhe* in his glossary.

B15 C *mugaṃtubudiṁsaṭhe*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉TmSw *mūgaṃlubūdiṁsaṭhe*, Sf *mūgaṃlubūdiṁsaṭhe*, Kr
mav gaṃ tu ḅav diṁ sa ṭhe

B16 C *saumedhabadiṃṁ*, Tm *somedhabadiṃṁ*, Sw *saumedhabadiṃṁ*

B16 TmC *traḥ*, Sw *tra*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his transliteration.

B16 SfTmC *vrahmaba*, Sw *prahmabaṁḥ*

B16 C *vrahmadaṃyoḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉SfTm *vrahmadeṃyoḥ*, Kr *vrahmad[ai]yoḥ* Sw *prahmadeṃy-
oṃḥ*; Bl₁₁ and Bl₁₉ have doubts about *e*.

B17 C *su*, SfTmSw *sū*

B17 C *sagaṃsirvaṃrabadiṃṁ*, Sf *sagusivaṃrabadiṃṁ*, TmSw *sagaṃsivaṃrabadiṃṁ*

B17 TmSwC *sagha*, Sf *s(e)gha*

B17 C *hṅa*, TmSw *hX*; TmSw *X* represents a non-Burmese character which does not match the
Pyu eyecopy. In Tm's glossary, this akṣara is transliterated in Burmese as *hna*.

B18 C *duṃ*, Tm *dūṃ*, Sw *dū*; Sw has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his Burmese transliteration.

B18 C *tduṃ*, TmSw *tdūṃ*

B19 TmSwC *se*; Kr *so*

B20 SwC *stau*, Tm *sto*

B20 C *hḍī*, Tm *hḷo*, Sw *hḷau*

B20 C *ma*, TmSw omit

B20 C *samanarḍoṃṁḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ *samanaḷōḥ*, Sf *samanalōḥ*, TmSw *samanaḷauṃ*

B21 C *jiṁvuḥ*, Bl₁₁Bl₁₉ *jiṁvūḥ* or *jiḥvūḥ*, Tm *hiṁbūḥ*, Kr *jiṁvavḥ*, Sw *tibūḥ*

B23 C *tduṃ*, TmSw *tdūṃ*

B23 SwC *diṃṁ*, Tm *diṁ*; Tm has *ṃ* in his eyecopy but not his Burmese transliteration.

B23 C *ḅuḥ*, Tm *bū*, Sw *būḥ*; Tm has *ḥ* in his eyecopy but not his Burmese transliteration.

B24 C *saveñudeña*, Sf *..veñodeñe*, TmSw *saveññodeññe*; Sf could not read the first akṣara.

B24 C *b(r)e[ña]*, TmSw *breññe*, Kr *bre*; Kr could not read the second akṣara.

B24 TmSwC *(ḅ)i(ṁḥ ḅ)i(ṁḥ paṁḥ) ch(e) naḥ*; Kr could not read these akṣaras.

B24 C *pḍa(ṁ)ḥ*, TmSw *pḷaṁḥ*

B24 C *(//)*, TmSw *(yaṁ)*

B25 C *ya(ṁ)*, TmSw omit; Kr could not read this akṣara.
B25 C *[t]r[a]*, TmSw *traḥ*; Kr could not read this akṣara.
B25 TmSwC *[sa]ḥ*; Kr could not read this akṣara.
B25 C *pḍi*, Tm *pli*, Sw *pḷi*
B25 C *(s)ruḥ*, Tm *[srū]*, Kr *srūḥ* or *sruḥ*, Sw *(srūḥ)*
B26 C *ju*, TmSw *ja*
B26 C *[h]ṅu*, TmSw *na*, Kr regards this akṣara as "destroyed".
B27 C *hñiṁ*, TmSw *hññiṁ*
B27 C *ci*, SfTmSw *chi*
B27 SfC *pḍaṃ*, Tm *pḍaṃ*, Sw *pḷaṃ*
B27 C *ṅuḥ*, SfTm *ṅūḥ*, Sw *vūḥ*
B28 C *kdiṃ*, SfTmSw *diṃ*; Sf sees *kdiṃ* but thinks preinitial *k* is unlikely.
B28 C *kchiṁḥ*, Sf *chiṁḥ*, TmSw *chi*; Sf sees *kchiṁḥ* but thinks preinitial *k* is unlikely.
B28 C *tmu*, SfTmSw *tmū*
B29 TmSwC ‖ @, Bl$_{11}$ ‖ followed by "some more puncutation marks to indicate the end of the text", Bl$_{19}$ ‖, Kr *ra ra* @

References

Bob Hudson. Marc Miyake. Arlo Griffiths and Julian Wheatley. Studies in pyu epigraphy and pyu language, i: state of the field, edition and analysis of the kan wet khaung gon inscription, and inventory of the corpus. *Bulletin de l'Ecole franÃ§aise d'ExtrÃªme-Orient*, 2017.

Michael Aung-Thwin. *The Mists of Rāmañña: the legend that was lower Burma*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, 2005.

Christian Bauer. Numismatics, dialectology, and the periodization of old mon. *Mon-Khmer Studies*, 16-17:155–176., 1990.

Christopher I. Beckwith. *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages: proceedings of the 9th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000*, chapter A glossary of Pyu, pages 159–161. Brill's Tibetan studies library. Brill, Leiden, 2002.

Louis de Beylié. *Prome et Samara: voyage archéologique en Birmanie et en Mésopotamie*. Publications de la Société française des fouilles archéologiques. Ernest Leroux, Paris, 1907.

C. O. Blagden. The talaing inscription of the myazedi pagoda at pagan, with a few remarks on the other versions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 1017–1052, 1909.

C. O. Blagden. Two corrected readings in the myazedi (talaing) inscription. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 486–487, April 1912.

C. O. Blagden. The myazedi inscriptions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 1063–1069, October 1914.

C. O. Blagden. The "pyu" inscriptions. *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, 7(1):37–44, 1917.

C.O. Blagden. A further note on the inscriptions of the myazedi pagoda, pagan, and other inscriptions throwing light on them. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 797–812, 1910a.

C.O. Blagden. The early use of the buddhist era in burma. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 850–856, 1910b.

C.O. Blagden. A preliminary study of the fourth text of the myazedi inscriptions. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 365–388, 1911.

C.O. Blagden. The mon or talaing face of the myazedi inscription at pagan. *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1):53–58, 1919a.

C.O. Blagden. The pyu face of the myazedi inscription at pagan. *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1): 59–68, 1919b.

C.O. Blagden and J.F. Fleet. The revised buddhist era in burma. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, pages 474–481, 1910.

George Cœdès. Review of c.o. blagden: "a preliminary study of the fourth text of the myazedi inscriptions". *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient*, 11(1):435–436, 1911.

Charles Duroiselle. The burmese face of the myazedi inscription at pagan. *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1):1–46, 1919a.

CharlesE Duroiselle. (transliteration of the pali face of the myazedi). *Epigraphia Birmanica*, 1(1): 47–52, 1919b.

Emil Forchhammer. *Inscriptions of Pagan, Pinya and Ava, deciphered from the ink impressions found among the papers of the late Dr. E. Forchhammer*. The Superintendent, Government Printing, Rangoon, 1892.

Arlo Griffiths, Marc Miyake, , and Julian K. Wheatley. Corpus of pyu inscriptions, 2018. URL `http://hisoma.huma-num.fr/exist/apps/pyu/index2.html`. Accessed June 2018.

Matthias Jenny. The far west of southeast asia: 'give' and 'get' in the languages of myanmar. In N.J. Enfield and Bernard Comrie, editors, *Languages of mainland Southeast Asia: the state of the art*, Pacific Linguistics 649, pages 155–208. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 2015.

Atsuhiko Kato. Pyū-go to karen-kei shogengo no ruijisei, 2005. URL `http://www.sfs.osaka-u.ac.jp/user/burmese/Pyu`$_K$`aren.pdf`.

Uwe Krech. *Medieval Tibeto-Burman languages*, volume 4 of *Brill's Tibetan studies library*, chapter A preliminary reassessment of the Pyu faces of the Myazedi inscriptions at Pagan, pages 121–169. Brill, Leiden, 2012.

G.H. Luce. Myinkaba kubyauk-gyi temple of rājakumār (1113 a.d.), and the old mon writings on its walls. *Bulletin of the Burma Historical Commission*, 2:277–416, 1961.

G.H. Luce and Ba Shin. *Old Burma–early Pagán*. Number 25 in Artibus Asiae, Supplementum. Published for Artibus Asiae and the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University [by] J.J. Augustin, Locust Valley, N.Y., 1969-1970.

Tatsuo Nishida. Myazedi hibun ni okeru chūko biruma-go no kenkyū (studies in the ancient burmese language through the myazedi inscriptions) (1). *Palaeologia*, IV(1):17–32, March 1955.

Tatsuo Nishida. Myazedi hibun ni okeru chūko biruma-go no kenkyū (studies in the ancient burmese language through the myazedi inscriptions) (2). *Palaeologia*, V(1):22–40, March 1956.

Tun Nyein. *Inscriptions of Pagan, Pinya and Ava: translation with notes*. The Superintendent, Government Printing, Rangoon, 1899.

Robert Shafer. Further analysis of the pyu inscriptions. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, 7(4): 313–366, 1943.

Janice Stargardt. *The ancient Pyu of Burma, vol. 1: Early Pyu cities in a man-made landscape*. PACSEA in association with the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, Cambridge, 1990.

U Tha Myat. *Mracetī pyū krokcā*. Pr. Democracy Publishing, Rangoon, 1958.

U Tha Myat. *Pyu reader*. U Hla Din, Rangoon, 1963.

Than Tun. *A course on Pyu inscriptions*. Burma Historical Commission, Rangoon, 1958.

Shirō Yabu. *Old Burmese (OB) of Myazedi inscription in OB materials*. Osaka University of Foreign Studies, Osaka, 2006.