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This book makes accessible for the first time in English a series of articles that Siegbert Hummel wrote on the theme of Zhang-zhung, notably on its language, but also on the related question of the geographical location and size of this country, which came to be known as the stronghold of the Bon religion.

Studies on Bon and on Zhang-zhung have multiplied in recent years thanks to the increased availability of Bon texts and scholars, almost giving rise to a separate discipline within the field of Tibetological research, but this has not always been the case in the past.

It may thus be useful to provide a brief outline of the history and development of studies in this field in order to put this book into context, and understand its relevance. For a more detailed overview the reader is referred to Per Kværne’s excellent article “The Bon Religion of Tibet: A Survey of Research”, in The Buddhist Forum 3, London 1994.

The term Bon has been used ambiguously in the past, being sometimes referred to a rather vague “pre-Buddhist religion” of Tibet mainly centred around the cult of the royal tombs, sometimes to an even older popular religion that pre-dated both Bon and Buddhism, and sometimes to a “plagiarised” form of Buddhism which has continued to exist down to the present.

The confusion over what Bon actually meant was increased
by the fact that Bon texts, handed down to us in Tibetan translations, were stated to be originally written in the language of Zhang-zhung, but almost nothing remained of this original language, apart from the book titles and a few Zhang-zhung terms in the texts. This gave rise to a still ongoing dispute about whether this was a real language, or just a fabrication aimed at strengthening the claim made by the Bonpos (the followers of Bon) that this was a religion in its own right, as opposed to a plagiarised form of Buddhism, as the Buddhists maintained. This book definitely aims at providing a clear answer to this question.

The origin of Bon too, said to have anciently come to Zhang-zhung from sTag-gzig (cf. Tajik?)—to this day an unidentified country to the west of Tibet, possibly Persia—was far from clear.

In this confused scenario of contrasting opinions, the first comprehensive study of Bon that managed to throw some light on the subject by providing an organic translation of the few Bon texts available at the time appeared as late as 1950, with H. Hoffmann’s *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion*, a work that in many respects still constitutes a milestone, despite the fact that some of the theories it contains are no longer tenable (notably the view that Bon was a perverted, negative form of Buddhism).

Studies on the Bon religion received new impetus from the mid-Sixties onwards, when some knowledgeable Tibetan scholars of Bon found their way to safety in the West, fleeing from Chinese-occupied Tibet after 1959, and bringing with them precious Bon texts previously unknown. During these years, the importance of the work done by David Snellgrove and Samten Karmay can hardly be overestimated. Even then, however, most of the studies tended to focus on the doctrinal aspects of Bon, rather than on its language.

The main linguistic research that was available before the present book was constituted by Erik Haarb’s *The Zhang-zhung*
Language, published in 1968, which Hummel uses as a basis for the studies presented here, together with some bilingual texts that became available in India in the second half of the Sixties. Apart from Haarh, it was mainly Rolf Stein who on several occasions provided new contributions on the controversial issue of the Zhang-zhung language, always supporting the thesis that Zhang-zhung was essentially a mystification. Finally, new light on Bon and Zhang-zhung has been cast in recent years by the studies of A.M. Blondeau, A. Macdonald, S.G. Karmay, P. Kværne, and M. Brauen, mainly concerning the doctrinal and iconographic issues of Bon. Many original Bon texts have been published in Tibetan by the Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre in Dolanji.

The theory that has now found fairly general acceptance among Tibetologists, and which has been propounded mainly by David Snellgrove, is that the term Bon should be used to designate an unorthodox, early form of Buddhism that reached Tibet by way of Central Asia, prior to what the Tibetans call the “first propagation” of the Buddhist doctrine in Tibet in the 8th century. When Bon subsequently spread into Central Tibet it was not recognised for what it was, and came into conflict with the Buddhism of direct Indian provenance that in the meantime had become established there.

By contrast the location of sTag-gzig remains mysterious, and the name has even taken on the mythical connotation of a promised holy land, similar to the Shambhala of the Buddhist world.

The studies presented in this volume bring a host of new, almost provocative ideas into the debate, particularly with regard to the origin of the language and to the actual size and geographical position of the kingdom of Zhang-zhung. The author makes no pretensions to have fully resolved the issue of understanding the Zhang-zhung language—the material available is still far too scanty to allow firm conclusions—but
he indicates a totally new direction for future research, and provides sound and sensible arguments for his contentions.

These articles, published in various journals from 1976 to 1996, no doubt represent some of the most outstanding contributions Hummel has given to Tibetan studies in the last decades. It is therefore all the more astonishing that his work is hardly mentioned in the recent literature on this subject, a fact partially attributable to the long isolation from which Hummel has suffered in his own country, but perhaps also an indication of how limited the understanding of German is nowadays among Tibetologists.

This book is thus meant to fill a gap, in the hope that making its material available to a wider English-speaking circle of readers may also help Professor Hummel emerge from the oblivion to which he has been relegated for too many years, and finally give him the long-due recognition he has amply earned himself.

Guido Vogliotti

**Note:** Being a collection of articles that appeared in various journals over a span of several years, this book inevitably contains a number of repetitions. Whilst some editing has been done to alleviate that problem in the most obvious cases, a more radical approach would have meant rearranging or even rewriting large portions of the text, which was not the intended purpose of this publication, and would have implied a danger of losing track of the chronological development in Hummel’s theory. It has therefore been decided to leave the text as far as possible in its original form, amending it only where this was deemed strictly necessary.

The bibliography has been split into two sections; the first one containing the texts utilised by the author and referred to in
the text, the second one including further references on the topics of Zhang-zhung and Bon which were either not available or not cited by the author, but which the reader may nevertheless find useful for further reading. Together they provide a fairly comprehensive overview of the literature existing on the subject at this point in time. Various indexes have been added at the end of the volume to help trace the information, particularly the words in the various languages discussed.
Introduction

With the stream of Tibetan refugees who fled their country after the Chinese occupation of Tibet, a number of followers of the Bon religion (Bonpos) managed to reach Europe. With them they brought books written in an as yet undecoded language, of which only isolated fragments had come to light until then: these books would soon turn out to constitute the central body of holy scriptures of the Bon religion. Previously, some fragmentary remains of an ancient language, which was later to be compared with the language of Zhang-zhung, had attracted the interest of some scholars, particularly Frederick William Thomas, but no decisive success had been forthcoming. What was manifestly the religious language of Bon was called language of Zhang-zhung by the Tibetans.

The term Zhang-zhung served to indicate a confederacy of several tribes, all of related Tibetan stock, stretching from north-eastern Tibet across the plains of Byang-thang down to western and south-western Tibet. Its religious and political centre 'Ol-mo-lung-ring, with the residence Khyung-lung and the castle dNgul-mkhar, was situated close to Mount Kailāsa, while the Tibetan ruling power-to-be was still concentrated in rKong-po, before it reached a consolidated state in the Yar-lung (Yar-klungs) valley in southern Tibet following clashes with the populations of Zhang-zhung. A memory of these events still
echoes in the story of the fight of the Tibetan king Gri-gum-btsan-po against Lo-ngam, a foreign prince representing the people of Zhang-zhung who had penetrated from the northeast. The reference to the political centre of Zhang-zhung as sTag-gzig, which indicates regions of Asia Minor bordering on western Tibet, is demonstrably a later idea of the Bonpos, a fact which however implies, not without reason, far-reaching effects on the country of Zhang-zhung. This is confirmed for instance by an investigation of the problem concerning the script, or even the grammar, of the Na-khi living in the Sino-Tibetan frontier area, who were the target of a missionary activity on the part of the Bonpos. My views on the geographical position of sTag-gzig and Zhang-zhung and on the history and diffusion of the Bon religion, as well as on the conquest of Zhang-zhung by the Tibetans, found a recent confirmation in the interesting description from Tibetan Bon sources provided by N. Nyima Dagkar (see Bibliography).

The language of Zhang-zhung was initially believed by some Tibetologists to be purely fictitious, created by the scholarly supporters of the Bon religion as a medium for their holy scriptures to be used in lieu of Tibetan. This is no doubt a wrong conclusion, contradicted by any serious investigation of the language that, for simplicity’s sake, we call Zhang-zhung, for this language clearly went through an evolutionary process of its own, particularly as far as phonetics are concerned. There is also evidence of dialectical criteria, determined by the period but also by the geographical location, which equally rule out the possibility that we are dealing with a product of fiction. Furthermore, Zhang-zhung was used as lingua franca in Tibet, a fact attested inter alia by the personal names of the Tibetan royal dynasty. For these reasons, Tibetology remains a lame discipline without a knowledge of the Zhang-zhung language.

A question that remained open was the one concerning the real origin of the Zhang-zhung language. In this respect, in the early phases of serious research on this subject, an undue
importance was placed on the role played by western regions like Zangs-dkar and Gu-ge, or to the connections with dialects of the western Himalaya, for instance the Bhotia tongues of the Almora district, with the result that the origin of Zhang-zhung was actually sought in those regions. It is of course understandable that the regions on the western fringe of Zhang-zhung were linguistically influenced by the neighbouring countries to the north-east of India, but this still does not answer the questions about the origin of Zhang-zhung.

A striking peculiarity is constituted by some correspondences of Zhang-zhung with the old Chinese vocabulary (up to c. 600 A.D.) redacted by Bernhard Karlgren. Similarly, the use of grammatical particles, like the genitive particle in its various applications, is paralleled in Chinese.

The totally new thesis I brought into the debate about the origin of the Zhang-zhung language, supporting an eastern Tibetan provenance against current thinking, is made in my view absolutely certain by the comparison with Tibetan in the first place, but even more by the correspondences with the north-eastern Tibetan languages of Si-hia and Mi-nyag (marginally also with those of the Lo-lo, Ch’iang, and Na-khi), and more distantly with Dafla and Hruso. In passing, it should be noted that the Na-khi and Lo-lo lived in the immediate vicinity of Si-hia and Mi-nyag before they moved to their present settlements in north-eastern Tibet.

The overall picture brings into focus a Proto-Altaic substratum, to which I duly refer at appropriate stages of my research in the following pages. Leaving aside the philological aspects, I find it interesting that both Rolf Stein and Giuseppe Tucci came to the conclusion that the region of Yang-T’ung, mentioned in the Chinese T’ang annals, refers to the Tibetan high plains of Byang-thang, which to the east, as Zhang-zhung, border on China.
The country of Zhang-zhung probably consisted of a confederacy of several western, northern, and north-eastern Tibetan tribes, all of related ethnic stock, that was already in existence before the rise of the Central Tibetan monarchy. According to the Bon tradition, it also embraced sTag-[g]zig (rTag-gzigs), a name designating the area to the west of Mt. Kailāsa, hence the core of this kingdom, 'Ol-mo-lung-ring, also called 'Ol-gling, with the capital city Khyung-lung and its castle dNgul [mNgul]-mkhar. This is confirmed by the geographical mandala that Nyima-grags-pa (*1853) appended to his Tibetan Žang Žung Dictionary, a bilingual work strongly influenced by the cosmological ideas of the Bonpos (see p.24). Thus the name sTag-gzig does not just refer to Persia or to the regions on the fringe of western Tibet, and I see no reason to locate 'Ol-mo-lung-ring, as Haarh does (p. 9), in the western part of western Tibet.

Since the time of Srong-btsan-sgam-po—who was married inter alia to Li-thig-dman, a Zhang-zhung princess—Zhang-zhung had a vassalage relationship with the Central Tibetan royal house, and in the 8th century, during the reign of Khri-srong-lde-btsan, whose sister Sad-mar-kar was unhappily married to the Zhang-zhung king, Zhang-zhung was finally annexed by Tibet.
Among the foreign religious influences that reached these classical regions of the systematised Bon religion, mainly from the western neighbours, it is very likely that Buddhism too had a role of some consequence prior to the 8th century. This hypothesis could possibly be borne out by some Sanskrit words contained in the Zhang-zhung text of the above mentioned bilingual, since they are purposely used in lieu of their Tibetan equivalents: see Haarh, op. cit., p. 13, but also ba-ni for padma, bho-dha for sanss-rgyas, dhaki for mkha'-'gro, ki-la for phur-bu, pan-ti [tri] for mkhas-pa, pra-dznya (Skr. prajñā) for shes-rab, sam-pad for phun-tshogs, sidhi [siti] for dngos-grub, swa-ti for lha-mo, and ta-thā-ga-ta for de-bzhin-gshegs-pa.

Until fairly recently, the language of Zhang-zhung was usually believed to be a pious fiction created by the followers of Bon, but the publication of the above mentioned bilingual should conclusively dispel any doubts about the existence of a Zhang-zhung idiom. A text found in the vicinity of Tun Huang and edited by F.W. Thomas also shows a degree of affinity with the Zhang-zhung language of the bilingual published by Nyi-ma-grags-pa. With the help of some examples I will now show how capital the knowledge of Zhang-zhung, and therefore the publication of the bilingual, can be for the understanding of archaic Tibetan words, even duly recognising the fact that the scope of this text is far too limited to allow a satisfactory reconstruction of the Zhang-zhung language.

Concerning the name of the semi-legendary organiser of the Bon religion, gShen-rab-mi-bo, no convincing explanation has been provided till now for the syllable rab. According to Nyima-grags-pa (pp. 16, line 3 and 18, line 10), gshen-rab has a Zhang-zhung equivalent in the word dmu-ra, more rarely gyer-ngod (p. 12, line 3), and dmu [mu] is several times attested as the Zhang-zhung equivalent of Tib. gnam, [nam]-mkha', and dbyings (p. 15, line 2), that is 'sky', 'the heavens', clearly also with the meaning 'heavenly, of the sky'; cp. also mu-tsug (p. 9,
line 7) for \textit{d}mu-thag = ‘sky-cord’ and the heavenly \textit{d}mu of the Tibetan pantheon. In this connection, it is also important to consider the Zhang-zhung equivalent (p. 16, line 3) for \textit{s}angs-rgyas: \textit{mu-sangs} as ‘sky’ in the sense of the heavenly space or of ‘celestial’; compare also the holy Bon language of Mu-sangs-[s]tag-[g]zig. Thus we also find \textit{sangs} (p. 9, line 3) as a Zhang-zhung word with the meaning of \textit{gsal} (‘clear’). The brightness (\textit{sangs}) and the wideness of the space (\textit{mu}) are the two most significant individual constituents of the Bon faith. Possibly the controversial \textit{rab} in gShen-rab-mi-bo initially represented the old Zhang-zhung syllable \textit{ra} (= \textit{rab} or \textit{rgya}s). gShen-rab actually seems to be the preferred spelling in Bon, as opposed to gShen-rabs. The fact that g.Yung-drung-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po\textsuperscript{9} records the form gShen-rab-mchog seems to support Hoffmann’s translation of the syllable \textit{rab}, and possibly a Tibetan interpretation of \textit{ra}.

A further interesting Zhang-zhung equivalent for the Tibetologist is \textit{d}ung-ra for \textit{rgya-mtsho} (p. 9, line 4 of the bilingual): compare the already mentioned holy lake of the Bonpos, Dang-ra[b]-g.yu-mtsho in the northern Tibetan lake plateau. Thus various place names in the region of former Zhang-zhung are probably Zhang-zhung words which cannot be understood with the help of Tibetan. Perhaps also \textit{mar} (Tib. gser = ‘gold’) in Mar-yul belongs to this category; cp. Suvarṇagotra and Suvarṇabhūmi as western and south-western regions of Zhang-zhung.

As an explanation of the term ‘Bon’, the bilingual (p. 9, lines 7, 9, 10 and p. 11, line 1) gives the equivalent \textit{gyer}, which also exists in Tibetan and means something like ‘muttering, singing recitation’ (Mong. ungsiqu); see also \textit{gyer-ngod} (p. 12, line 3) for gshen-rab and \textit{gyer-wang} (p. 14, line 10) for bon-sku (sku similar to the \textit{kāya} in dharmakāya). We will come back to the elucidation of Bon given by W. Simon,\textsuperscript{10} as opposed to the one provided by H. Hoffmann. The following equivalents are also
worthy of notice: sa-trig (p. 17, line 5) for shes-rab (= Skr. prajñā). Thus Sa-trig-er-sangs (= dByings-kyi-yum-chen-mo) is identical with Prajñāpāramitā; moreover compare the ancient word sad for lha (p. 7, line 9) and wer for rgyal (p. 16, line 9), for instance as Wer-ma in the Tibetan pantheon and as 2Yu-1ma in that of the Na-khi. Also Gu-ra-pa, the name of a family from which the founder of Sa-skya acquired land in the 11th century, is a Zhang-zhung word.11

The close connection of Zhang-zhung with the mythical bird khyung is apparent, and is confirmed by the Zhang-zhung equivalents for garuda (Tib. [bya-]khyung) rendered as dmu-zag (‘celestial bird’) and zhung-zag (‘zhung bird’) (Bil., p. 8, line 8; p. 9, line 4; p. 15, line 5).

A typical term of the Bon religion is g.yung-drung. Based on p. 12, line 7, p. 14, line 8 and others of the bilingual, drung-mu is the corresponding Zhang-zhung term. Thus g.yung most likely corresponds to mu or dbyings, that is the wide (rgyas) celestial Bon sphere (see also p. 18 line 9: drung-mu-gyer for g.yung-drung-bon), albeit mostly in a metaphorical, spiritual sense (cp. Skr. dharmadhātu). A comparison is also made between dbyings (= mu) as the heavenly residence of the gods, and g.yung-drung dbyings as the (changeless = 'gyur-med) sphere of their being (Snellgrove, 1967, The Nine Ways of Bon, pp. 206 ff.). Based on the meaning ofongs and g.yung-drung, drung thus probably equates with mu-sangs. The Bon formula Oṃ ma-tri-mu-ye-sa-le- ’du, corresponding to the Buddhist Oṃ ma-ṇi-pad-me-hūṃ, would then contain the mu-sangs = g.yung-drung in the form mu-ye-sa (= gsal). In the doctrines of the Jōnang school g.yung-drung still had the meaning of ‘true being’.12 We will discuss further on the particles ye and le.

This shows how vital the bilingual is for the understanding of capital Bon concepts, even if a better knowledge of Zhang-zhung would probably lead to some corrections and adjustments, especially since the author Nyi-ma-grags-pa is not always sure
and often seems to be guessing, makes spelling errors and even incurs some plain blunders (e.g. p. 7 line 6). In any case, the value of the bilingual is remarkable, also in consideration of the fact that there cannot be many people left with a knowledge of Zhang-zhung. On the basis of the material now at hand, I believe an interpretation of the numerous compounds would be premature in most of the cases for the time being.

The relationship between the Zhang-zhung idiom and Tibetan is clearly recognisable. In some cases—like for instance the possessive particle *ci* and the homophonous genitive particle, but also where, unlike in the present Tibetan equivalent, prefixes and suffixes have been preserved—old linguistic remains seem to survive, whereas when Tibetan words are used in Zhang-zhung with their pronunciation the original Zhang-zhung element seems to have been overlaid (see p. 13).

The scarcity of particles, especially in declension, which is striking compared to Tibetan and is not always determined by metrics in the bilingual, is reminiscent of Chinese. The particles for the dative, ablative, locative and terminative cases are certainly less numerous than those for the genitive. Probably before the contamination with Tibetan took place only the genitive particle *ci* existed, and perhaps another particle with an instrumental function, used in a similar way as Chinese *i* (ʼ in the power of...) and for which *rtsal* (of Tibetan derivation) is used in the bilingual. It is also singular that the use of the particle *ci*, variously employed in Zhang-zhung for the genitive, possessive, or with an emphasising function, is in all respects comparable with the *ggo* of the Na-khi and with Chinese *chih* 之. Equally reminiscent of Chinese is the use of *tse* (also *ze* and *se*) when added to a word or used to form a diminutive (cf. Haarh, p. 16), which corresponds to Chinese *tzu* 𡽅 (cp. also Na-khi *zwō* = 'baby' and *zo* = 'young boy'): *hri-tse* = Tib. *khye'u* and *bu-tsha*; *klung-se* = Tib. *gzhon-nu*; *yog-ze [se] = Tib. *rgan-mo*; *shang-se [ze] = Tib. *rgan-po*. 
Some correspondences between the Zhang-zhung and Chinese vocabulary also seem to indicate that these terms represent the oldest part of the vocabulary, and that similarities with archaic Chinese persisted up to c. 600 A.D. I have based myself on Karlgren’s *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, Paris 1923 (shortened K): lgyum (Tib. lam) = K 411 luo; bteg (Tib. rgyab, rgyob) = K 902 d’êu = Tib. gtor; rbad (Tib. gcod) = K 1067 dz’iwät; ma-mung (Tib. ma-mo) = K 612 mung = Tib. rmong, etc. (see the word-lists).

With regard to the grammar we could perhaps add that the strengthening of a statement is obtained by adding ra = rgyas and rab, or as in Tibetan by repeating the word: kir-kar = ‘very light’, dub-dub = ‘particularly venomous’ (cp. Tib. nyon-mongs); rab (Haarh p. 15) also seems to be present in ha-ra and ne-ra (Tib. me-long = ‘mirror’; me-rab?), cp. also dang-ra = rgyamtsho. Ho (Tib. ka = ‘all this, that which is’, cp. Haarh p. 22: da-ba-ho) is still attested in Tibetan; see S. Hummel (1969a) ‘The sMe-ba-dgu, the Magic Square of the Tibetans”, pp. 145-146: srid-pa-ho. Paṇṭi-ta (Haarh p. 22) is plainly an equivalent for Skr. paṇḍita, like has-ti (Haarh p. 15) for hastin. The ta in bha-ta (Haarh p. 22) could represent the pronunciation of phrag in ‘bum-phrag. Ya (Haarh p. 23) is the Tibetan “article” ba following nga and ra and after vocals. Moreover the bilingual offers the clearly later Tibetan form ba in a word of Tibetan origin (ngar-ba). For particles that only appear once or twice, the inclusion in the grammar is in my opinion questionable. In Haarh, p. 14 (terminative), ni and ti in tur-ni and tag-ti can hardly be considered terminative particles. Nor do I believe that ni and ti (Haarh p. 20) are genuine genitive particles. I am not sure whether a genitive form like dmu-ri was not simply formed by analogy from dmu-ra; similarly, stig-pi for stig-pa’i or lig-mi (Tib. srid-pa’i) for lig-ma’i etc. Once again, the limited scope of the bilingual does not provide any conclusive evidence. The same reservations should be applied to the verb morphology,
especially since the text is too short and moreover not in a narrative style. *Rkyel* (Tib. sko) has a perfect form *rkyes*; *dod* (Tib. skye) can be found with the same pronunciation for *skye* and *bskyed*; *rbad* corresponds to *bcad* and *chod*, as equivalent also *sod* (Tib. gsod) and warrants the assumption that the present tense can also be homophonous *rbad*. *Zin* (Tib. 'dzin) becomes *zi* in the perfect (Tib. bzung), provided the reading in the bilingual is to be trusted.

In any case, we can imagine that in the huge territory of Zhang-zhung several dialects must have coexisted, some of them differing widely. Of these dialects there would appear to have been eight major ones and twenty-four less significant. We already mentioned the text edited by F.W. Thomas (see footnote 6) which seems to confirm this. In the preface to the bilingual Nyi-ma-grags-pa stresses the fact that he is dealing with Zhang-zhung-smar, as still known in Zangs-dkar, Gu-ge, around the Khyung-lung, the Dang-ra, and the gNam-mtsho. In one of the titles mentioned by H. Hoffmann in his article "Zur Literatur der Bon-po" (Hoffmann, 1940, p. 185) *Zang-zhung-smad [-kyi-skad] is used in lieu of Zhang-zhung-smar. However, it is doubtful whether *smar* can in all cases be correctly understood as *smad*. In Tibetan texts *smar [smra]* and *dmar* can be found for *mar* as a more specific name or to indicate a particular area of the Zhang-zhung confederation. At any rate we know of the existence of Zhang-zhung-stod and Zhang-zhung-smad, but Zhang-zhung-smad lies in the east, between Tibet and Sum-pa (cf. G. Tucci, 1956, *Preliminary Report*, p. 83). Therefore I assume that Žaň-Žuň-smar (Nyi-ma-grags-pa’s transliteration) corresponds to Suvarṇagotra, and not to Zhang-zhung-smad. In Chinese Si-Li, which Tucci (*op.cit.*, p. 102) like Pelliot identifies with Suvarṇagotra, the syllable *li* could correspond to Zhang-zhung *rig* (Tib. zhung, yul), and *si* to Tib. *gser* (Tucci-Pelliot) (Zhang-zhung: *mar* = ‘gold’); cp.: Mar-yul. This mixture of Zhang-zhung and Tibetan is by no means surprising. It
appears that Zhang-zhung was used at court well into the 8th century. As we will see further on (Chapter 6), the name Sadmar-kar, the sister of the Tibetan king Khri-srong-lde-btsan or Srong-btsan-sgam-po, is doubtless a Zhang-zhung word (sad = lha, mar = gser, kar = 'od). But also the names of the Tibetan mythological kings should be revisited accordingly (see Chapter 5). Khri seems to be the Zhang-zhung word for sens, also attested as mu-khri (Haarh p. 29a) and present in this form in the name of the second king in the line of the khri. Equally, A-sho-legs and De-sho-legs in the group of the legs (= leg [lig] = srid?) are certainly Zhang-zhung names (see the word-lists). As Haarh already demonstrated (Haarh 1969, The Yar-luri Dynasty, p. 118), the group of the legs is an alien element in the royal genealogy (cp. also Sad-na-legs, Mu-ne and Mu-tig). Concerning Mu-khri compare also the original form Nya-khri (‘chthonian being’) for Nyag-khri and later gNya’-khri.

On the question of the Zhang-zhung dialects we can only resort to speculation. Perhaps the so-called g.Yung-drung-lha language and that of Mu-sangs-ta-zig were dialects. The bilingual makes it virtually certain that the book titles in these languages, as well as the one quoted by Hoffmann (1940, “Zur Literatur der Bon-po”, p. 182), cannot be a translation of the corresponding Tibetan titles. The links of Zhang-zhung with the dialects of the western Himālaya and with the Bhotia languages of the Almora district and of Nepal cannot be used, in my opinion, to reach any conclusion about the origin of Zhang-zhung or its geographical location. Admittedly, together with certain analogies with the languages of the eastern Himālaya (Hruso, Dafla, Tōtō and Dhimal), they give us an indication of the area it covered.15 But I am convinced that the correspondences between the Zhang-zhung language and those of Si-hia and Mi-nyag are much more worthy of attention; compare for instance skod (Tib. so) = Si-hia ko; mu (Tib. nam-mkha’) = Si-hia mo; zangs (Tib. lcags) = Si-hia shang; le (Tib. rlung) = Si-hia lō; tsa [-mo] (Tib. nya) = Mi-nyag zō.16
The geographical area covered by the Zhang-zhung confederacy, which comprised north-eastern Tibet, and above all the ethnic links with the Ch’iang, should naturally induce us to shift the focus of our linguistic comparisons towards the northern border regions of the Sino-Tibetan settlements, rather than to the western Himalaya. This would also solve some problems raised by Stein (1951, “Mi-ñag et Si-hia”), for example the fact that in Tibetan texts mu (in the form rmu [dmu, smu]) appears to be a typical indicator of the Zhang-zhung religion, as a more specific term for the country of Zhang-zhung, but at the same time rmu is also used to indicate the Mo-so (or Nakh) who once populated north-eastern Tibet, and were beyond doubt akin to the Ch’iang. The Ch’iang in turn call themselves rma [rme, rmi]. In fact, rme means ‘man’ and ‘tribe’ in the Si-hia language. Probably no connection exists between the meaning of Zhang-zhung-smar [smra and dmar] and rmu [rma, rme] or rmu [dmu, smu], even if these ancient words are occasionally mixed up or used one for the other by the Tibetans. It is, however, possible that an identity exists between rmu or rma [rme, rmi] = ‘man’ and dmu [mu, rmu] = ‘sky’ in Zhang-zhung, or mu [ma] used by the Ch’iang and mo in Si-hia. This view is supported by an investigation of the origination myths and of the lists of divine ancestors of northern Mi-nyag, located around the Kūke-noor, which was anciently part of the reign of Si-hia, annihilated in the 14th century. These legends are reminiscent of the myths of ’O[d]-de[lde]-spu[r]-rgyal as ancestor of the Central Tibetan royal family, equally of north-eastern Tibetan provenance.

Most of the religious compounds in the bilingual featuring two or more syllables give us a certain uneasiness, a feeling that we are dealing with artificial constructions. No doubt these are relatively recent creations of the so-called bsgyur-Bon, introduced when the systematised Bon religion—which was chiefly linked to the semi-legendary gShen-rab-mi-bo and had reached the regions of Mi-nyag, Sum-pa, and southern Turkestan through
the northern and eastern provinces of Zhang-zhung—was undergoing a process of adaptation. Thus their earliest date of origin could be the first half of the 8th century, although probably most of them should be assigned to the time when Zhang-zhung texts were being translated into Tibetan, with traces of plagiarism operated by Bonpos and Buddhists alike during the reign of king Khri-srong-lde-btsan, before the persecution of the Bon religion. This period, mainly owing to the annexation of the Zhang-zhung kingdom to the Central Tibetan monarchy, would also have witnessed the contamination of Zhang-zhung by Tibetan, a process possibly already triggered by the political events of the 7th century.¹⁸

The uneasiness I mentioned above concerning these terms is enhanced by an often dubious Tibetan translation, even though the Tibetan counterparts are to be taken as simple equivalents in meaning, rather than literal translations. But, as I already said, we are probably not yet in a position to draw any final conclusions.

The vocabulary published by Haarh is largely in agreement with mine, for which reason I decided not to publish either the vocabulary or the grammar I had prepared. However, it seems to me that some equivalents in the bilingual are open to doubt, especially when they are attested less than three times. Various compounds could be taken apart even further than has been done. The problem of twin numbers, for which Hoffmann (1967b, “Ţań-Ţuň: the Holy Language of the Tibetan Bon-po”, pp. 378-379) offers a metric explanation (Haarh sees in them sometimes ordinal and conjunctive numerals, p. 18) is still confusing and unresolved. For instance on p. 13, line 7 the bilingual gives *ne-sum* (two-three) for Tib. *gsun* = 3, *bing* and *bing-nga* for 4 (line 4), and *nga-drug* for Tib. *drug* = 6 (line 8). In *cu-tig-ka-tu* (p. 13, line 1) I see the Tibetan *bcu-gcig-kun-tu* (see also Part 4 of this chapter). A satisfactory explanation will not be forthcoming without further supporting evidence from Zhang-zhung texts.
The often multiple meanings of homophonous words could indicate that Zhang-zhung was a tonal language, like that of the Ch’iang.\(^{19}\)

In the following list I propose some additions to the vocabulary. I have included words (marked with an asterisk) which Haarh also listed because in Snellgrove’s glossary to his book *The Nine Ways of Bon* they are classified as not attested in our Tibetan dictionaries.

### Zhang-zhung

**Ku-hrang** (this could be the origin of the term *Kulan*)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rkur} \, [\text{skyur}] & \quad \text{‘gyur, sgyur} \\
\text{khag} & \quad \text{kha} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(corresponding to the older Tibetan form *khag* for *kha*; cf. W. Simon, 1930, *Tibetisch-chinesische Wortgleichungen*, p. 13)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{khyil} & \quad \text{rdzing} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(cp. Tibetan *khyil* = ‘confluence’)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sgyib} & \quad \text{mid} \, (\text{throat}) \\
\text{ju} & \quad \text{gzungs, rdzu} \\
\end{align*}
\]

( perhaps in *ju-thig*; cp. also *ju-zhag* in Snellgrove, 1967, *op.cit.*, p. 256 footnote 4, doubtless to be connected with the Ju-thig oracle in the Ge-sar epic)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ting} & \quad \text{chu, lcam, g.yu, sngo} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(cp. Tib. *lding* and *mthing*)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{the-[tha-]wer} & \quad \text{pho-mtshan} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(cp. *wer* = ‘arrow’. According to R. Nebesky-Wojkowitz, 1956, *Oracles and Demons of Tibet*, p. 334, the *wer-ma*, being in the class of the *dgra-lha*, are also protectors of the arrows, in which they reside. The arrow is also a male symbol, see S. Hummel, 1959, “Eurasiatische Traditionen in der tibetischen Bon-Religion”, p. 171, with reference to the mirror = lotus = Zhang-zhung *ne-ra* = *me-long* and *pad-ma*. In the *Lexicon of Archaic Terms*, p. 119: *wer-ma sgra-bla dang* *wer-ro rgyal-po* *wer-mi rgyal-mo dang* *weg-zhi skar-ma* *wer-ya rgyal-ba dang* *wer-ru mda* ’ste ’phul-rtseg sogs-med) (weg = *wer[?]*)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ldem} & \quad \text{shing} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(cp. Tib. *ldem* = ‘upright, tumulus’)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pad-ma} & \quad \text{mo-mtshan} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(cp. the note to *the-[tha-]wer*)
(in the pantheon the ma-mo are usually of dark complexion. On the ma-mo see E. Neumeier, 1966, Mātarāḥ und Ma-mo: Studien zur Mythologie des Lamaismus)

ma-mung* → ma-mo
mang-thun* → sha
mu → (sky)

(² műn = 'sky' in Na-khi is doubtless related; cf. S. Hummel, 1960, "Die Bedeutung der Na-khi für die Erforschung der tibetischen Kultur", with bibliographic references. Mu-ye seems to have a more transcendent meaning; ye is often used, like ra (= rab), as a sort of honorific particle. For mu = 'ether' (element), 'sky vault' (space) and in the locative we often find mu-la. Probably the la [le] in mu-la was originally a locative or an emphatic particle like 'la in the language of the Na-khi)

mu → ngan
mung (see also ma-mung) → nag
rtso → steng
zhi → gzhi, bzhin, zlum
ya → 'du
ra-tra → sрин-po
(lig is found in the names of the rulers of Zhang-zhung)
shim* → dkar

(shim-phod in Snellgrove, 1967, p. 310, should probably be spos-dkar)
shin

(probably connected with Chinese shen 神; cf. Part 2 of this chapter, p. 31: sha-shin)
sri-zham → 'ja'-tshon
(cp. zham-ze. Possibly the magic powers of the sri demons?)
u-dug* → mi-snyan
e-ma → ngo-mtshar

(exclamation of surprise)
The following list contains examples of Tibetan words rendered phonetically in the Zhang-zhung of Nyi-ma-grags-pa’s bilingual. They are probably loan-words from Central Tibetan. Conversely, compare old Zhang-zhung forms like gyang, dmig, and rlug for Tib. yang, mig, and lug.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhang-zhung</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Zhang-zhung</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kha</td>
<td>= mkha’</td>
<td>nam</td>
<td>= rnams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu</td>
<td>= dgu</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>= gnyis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nga</td>
<td>= lnga</td>
<td>mig</td>
<td>= dmigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu</td>
<td>= bcu</td>
<td>wang</td>
<td>= dbang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyi</td>
<td>= nyid</td>
<td>zhin</td>
<td>= bzhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ta</td>
<td>= phrag?)</td>
<td>yag</td>
<td>= g.yag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tan</td>
<td>= ldan</td>
<td>yug</td>
<td>= mgyogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tog</td>
<td>= rto gs</td>
<td>sum</td>
<td>= gsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>= bde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following words are spelt irregularly:

| ga          | = ’gag  | cod         | = spyod |
| gam         | = kham s| ji          | = ’jig |
| gyad        | = bgrgyad | thah        | = mthar, thabs, thams |
| cu          | = bcud  | yo          | = yongs |

Some Zhang-zhung words that filtered into the Tibetan Bon language can be found in the Lexicon of Archaic Terms by g.Yung-drung-rgyal-mtshan-dpal-bzang-po (early 19th century, Delhi 1966). Words missing in the bilingual are marked with a “+” sign. Words with a question mark indicate that the Zhang-zhung origin is not certain. “Bil.” indicates forms attested in the bilingual. The words defined in the Lexicon as Zhang-zhung-skad-brda most likely belong to Zhang-zhung-smar, owing to the many correspondences with the bilingual.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhang-zhung</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ka-sha</td>
<td>ma-chags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-sang</td>
<td>kun-gsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-sangs (Bil. kha-sang)</td>
<td>kun-snang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kan +</td>
<td>dkyil-'dzub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam +</td>
<td>sog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kyer-shud (Bil. gyer-shud)</td>
<td>the-tshom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klung-se</td>
<td>gzhon-nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khir-zhi</td>
<td>'od-zer (mDzod-phug: chags, Bil. gsal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ga-ci</td>
<td>'gag-pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu-ra</td>
<td>yon-tan, 'khor[-ba] (Bil. 'du-byas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lgyam</td>
<td>rgyas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nyi-ri</td>
<td>nyi-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-ki</td>
<td>'dod-pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta-gu</td>
<td>'dod-rgu [dgu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti-pra-lgyam +</td>
<td>phra-rgyas, dug-lnga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ting-zhi</td>
<td>g.yu, g.yu'i (?) , dngul [-gyi?] (mDzod-phug; stong-pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha-tse</td>
<td>chen-po</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha-tshan</td>
<td>mang-tshig + (Bil. thams-cad; mDzod-phug: mtshan-nyid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha-tshon</td>
<td>mthar-thug (mDzod-phug: thams-cad)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha-ri +</td>
<td>thar-pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha-le +</td>
<td>chu-gtsan-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dum-pa-tshal +</strong></td>
<td>(name of a locality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>na-nam</strong></td>
<td><em>sa-'og</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ne-ra</strong></td>
<td><em>pad-ma</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pra-phud</strong> (as in the bilingual; Haarh suspects an error for <em>pra-phung</em>)</td>
<td><em>sku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>pra-mo-ha</strong></td>
<td><em>shig, phra-mo + (mDzod-phug: pra-mo = shig)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dpon-gsas (s. also gsas)</strong></td>
<td><em>slob-dpon (Bil. stong-rgyud, with a question mark in Haarh; read: ston-rgyud)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>rbad</strong></td>
<td><em>chod</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>mar[-zhi]</strong></td>
<td><em>gser [-gyi]</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dmu as deities +, e.g. the dmu-zhang</strong></td>
<td><em>g.yen-khams-dmu + (Bil. garuda)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>rme’u, in the term:</strong></td>
<td><em>rme’u-tshang-rus + (see S. Hummel, 1969a, “The sMe-ba-dgu”; Haarh: ‘horoscope’?)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>smar-ro</strong></td>
<td><em>bzang-po</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wang-ya</strong></td>
<td><em>dbang-ldan</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wer (in all compounds, as already illustrated on the example of the [tha]-wer from the Lexicon of Archaic Terms)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zhing-ri</strong></td>
<td><em>zlum-po</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zhin</strong></td>
<td><em>'dzin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zhung-zhang and ting-zhung +</strong></td>
<td><em>khyung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zur-rlung</strong></td>
<td><em>dbang-po</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zla-ri</strong></td>
<td><em>zla-ba</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'ol-mo</strong></td>
<td>(name of a locality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ra</strong></td>
<td><em>mang</em> (in tshang-ra as tshang-mang = khang-mang and mi-mang)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-tsa (= rāja) +</td>
<td>rgyal-po</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra-tra</td>
<td>log-lta + (Bil. srin-po; cp. the demons looking backward on the Christian mediaeval paintings (?). See also R. Nebesky-Wojkowitz, 1956, <em>Oracles and Demons of Tibet</em>, p. 335: dGra-lha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-ram</td>
<td>stag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-sad-ne-ber (Bil. la-sad-ne-bar; missing in Haarh)</td>
<td>stag-la-me-'bar (well-known Bon deity, cf S, Hummel, 1969b, &quot;Die Maske in Tibet&quot;, p. 187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sha-ya</td>
<td>bshags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sha-'bal</td>
<td>sta-re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shambha-la</td>
<td>rtag-gzigs-'ol-mo-gling (the promised land of the Bonpos); cp. Sham-po-lha-rtse in the innermost circle of the Zhangzhung mandala on map 1 of Nyi-ma-grags-pa (see p. 24). This would agree with the Shambhala 'i-lam-yig [ed. A. Grünwedel, 1915, <em>Der Weg nach Šambhala</em>, p. 70 fol. 42a] if we assume that there, as far as the location of Shambhala between the Kailāsa and the river Sītā is concerned, Sītā originally meant the Indus in the source used by the author; cf. Swami Pranavānanda (1949) <em>Kailās-Mānasarōvar</em>, p. 15: Sītā = Indus in the Gangs-ri dkar-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Material towards a Dictionary of the Zhang-zhung Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shi-shin (mDzod-phug, s. Part 2: shi-shen)</td>
<td>[mu-la-] dran-pa (Bil. dran-pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she-skya</td>
<td>thugs-rje-che</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she-thun</td>
<td>snyin (mDzod-phug: yid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se-to</td>
<td>khang-pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gsas (in gar-gsas, thor-gsas, bdar-gsas, dpon-gsas, dbal-gsas; moreover: gsas-khang, gsas-mda', gsas-gzhi)</td>
<td>(a term indicating, inter alia, certain divine beings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-ra</td>
<td>ye-shes (mDzod-phug: gsal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-tan (Bil. ha-dan)</td>
<td>theg-chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-'dran+</td>
<td>rab-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-'dran-rwang + (rwang = ri)</td>
<td>ri-rab-lhun-po (Kailāśa, in the mDzod-phug)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-ti-mu-wer + (cp. Bil.: a-ti, mu, wer)</td>
<td>sangs-rgyas-mkha'-rgyal (a Bon divinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-zhin+</td>
<td>bstan-'dzin (Bil. zhin = 'dzin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-sang+</td>
<td>dbyangs, skad (Bil. sang = dbyangs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag</td>
<td>srin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag-kyo</td>
<td>gtsang-dag (the inhabitants of gTsang, in Central Tibet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag-khar+</td>
<td>kha-gsal (Bil. khi-khar = 'od-zer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag-tsir (Bil. ag-rtser)</td>
<td>ngag-'khyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag-she</td>
<td>smra (mDzod-phug: kha-khyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag-sho</td>
<td>ngag+ (Bil. kha; mDzod-phug: sgra, zhal-ngad)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are a few more words of the Bon lexicon in Zhang-zhung which are not mentioned here, for their Zhang-zhung origin is not clearly stated or unmistakeably recognisable, especially since the degree of mutual compenetration of Zhang-zhung and Tibetan remains to be clarified.

| ang-wer + | rnam-rgyal |
| ar-sangs + | smra |
| u-pa + | man-ngag |
| u-mig | dmus-long |
| u-mun + | blo-rmongs |
| u-tra-seg + | gsang-rgyud-srog (reincarnation sequence, soul?; cf. mDzod-phug: seg-ri = sems) |
| u-tsug | gso-ba |
| u-ya (Bil. u-ye; cf. also Snellgrove, 1967, p. 312) | gsang-ba |
| u-yug + | blo-gros (mDzod-phug: blo-can), dus + (Bil. grags, ’brug; cp. also un-zhi) Zhang-zhung: un |
| un-ting | sgra-dbyangs |
| un-sing | grags-snyan |
| un-zhi | grags, dungs (mDzod-phug: un = dungs) |
| ur-mo + | gnam-lcags |
| e-na-ya ? + | sha-ba-gla-ba |
| e-ma-ho + (Bil. e-ma) | (exclamation of surprise: ngo-mtshar-gyi-sgra) |
| o-lo ? + | ngo-mtshar |
| og | mdud |
| ong-do ? + | ’phang |
| od | glang |
| om | song |
| os-ko | ma-le’i-gshang[s] |
It may be possible to interpret some words under a, u, e, and o, which perhaps derive from the Zhang-zhung language, on the basis of other sources. Their meaning is not intelligible for the time being, and therefore they have not been included here. As an addition to the vocabulary of Zhang-zhung, the following two entries are taken from P. Kværne (1969) *Bon-po Studies: The A Khrid System of Meditation*, p. 125: chang-stang = ‘fire’, li-sig = ‘wind’.

* * *

To illustrate the use of particles in Zhang-zhung I have selected some textual examples from Nyi-ma-grag-pa’s bilingual. As in the bilingual, the second line contains the Tibetan translation. The reference to page and line number of the bilingual is given in brackets.

1. *stig-pi ni-nam zur-rlung khir*
   *dbus-kyi mi-rnams dbang-po gsal* (18/1)

2. *tha-gi nyi lo gu-dun*
   *mthar-gyi snyom 'jug-dgu* (12/4)

3. *kha-mu khir-zhi pra-dznya tha-tse tan*
   *rig-pa gsal-ba'i shes-rab chen-po ldan* (20/4)

4. *dang-ra phyings-la tsa-mo yug*
   *rgya-mtsho klong-la nya-mo mgyogs* (18/8)

5. *skye-lig tha-tsan kir-kar-na*
   *snang-srid thams-cad gsal-ba-la* (10/1)
   *(kir-kar is an example of strengthening by reduplication with vocal change)*

6. *wer-sung ku-trig bran-du rgyes*
   *rgyal-'gong the 'u-rang g.yog-tu bskos* (9/1)

7. *rnil-rwang ting-nam khud-du 'rug*
   *gangs-ri chu-rnams lung-par 'bab* (18/5)
As Haarh demonstrated, the construction corresponds to that of Tibetan. Regarding the use of the particle ci the following can be said:

— ci can indicate the characteristic proper to something: e.g.
**ha-ra khi-khar ci** (Bil. p. 15, line 6) = ye-shes 'od-zer can.

— *ci* can underline the preceding part of the sentence, at the same time leading to the one that follows, that is to the characteristic of the previous one:

*i-tsam-spre-ci* *tsog mu-dum* (Bil. p. 7, line 5) = 'dzam-bu-gling-ni sog-pa'i dbyibs.

— *ci* = "leading to" ("tie"):

*sra-min ci pra-mo* (Bil. p. 13, line 3) = *sro-ma dang* (suffixed) shig.

— *ci* = "adhere":

*mu-la-ci* (Bil. p. 17, line 5) = *dbyings-la-'byor*.

— *ci* = as a noun-forming suffix: (with the meaning of English -ness, -ship, -ous, -ty, -cy, etc.)

*dzwan-ci* (Bil. p. 17, line 1) = *rdzu-'phrul* (-ous)

(*ci* [zhi] is thus often rendered by *nyid* in Tibetan).

— *ci* = as a pure genitive particle: see example No. 16 above.


**The Zhang-zhung alphabet (Zhang-zhung-smar yig-che)**
For the *ke* in the last line Nyi-ma-grags-pa has *ki*. Thus the bilingual offers no example of *'greng-bu*, whereas *gi-gu* is attested twice. I suspect a clerical error in the Tibetan equivalent, and therefore I assume, on the basis of the usual form *gi-gu* and *'greng-bu* take in the Tibetan cursive writing, that *ki* must be a misreading for *ke*. It will only be possible to finally resolve this doubt when words written in this script come to light. A history of the origin and development of the Zhang-zhung alphabet (*sTag-gzigs → sPung-yig → Zhang-zhung-yig-rgan → sMar* etc.) is provided by S.G. Karmay (1972, *op.cit.*, p. 28). The Bon script is supposed to have been in existence before Srong-btsan-sgam-po’s time.

The land of Zhang-zhung according to Nyi-ma-grags-pa

(Map on p. 24)

Explanation: the two maps in Nyi-ma-grags-pa’s bilingual are to be combined according to the relevant compass roses. Map 1
(see next page) contains Zhang-zhung-phug-pa-rtag-gzigs-'ol-gling-gi-skor as the core of Zhang-zhung with the Ri-g.yung-drung-dgu-brstegs (Kailāsa) at the centre. Adjoining to the south and east, if we turn map 1 clockwise by 90 deg. in accordance with the compass rose, is the intermediate region of Zhang-zhung-bar-pa'i-skor providing a bridge to India and Tibet. The note on the right-hand side of map 1 (Zhang-zhung-sgo-pa'i-skor), with an arrow pointing outwards, merely indicates that sGo-pa'i-skor is to be found on the next map (map 2), where its area is outlined, stretching from Bar-pa'i-skor in a north-easterly direction. In my opinion, the failure to recognise the ethnic affinity of at least the culture-carrying class of Zhang-zhung with the Ch’iang usually sets the colonisation of western Tibet by Tibetan peoples at too late a date.

If one compares the subdivision and the relative position of the most significant dialects of Zhang-zhung described on p. 6 of the bilingual with the information the author provides in the foreword, it appears likely—since Nyi-ma-grags-pa (born in 1853) is reporting a situation referring to a recent past—that the dialect of Zhang-zhung-smar supplanted the others.
Map 1 - Zhang-zhung bar-pa’i skor
Part 2 - Notes on the mDzod-phug

Compared with the text of the mDzod-phug, Nyi-ma-grags-pa's bilingual text, equally in verse, is no doubt more homogeneous, that is less disturbed by spelling variants and therefore also easier to elaborate, but in no way more reliable. Some spelling variants in the mDzod-phug are attested so many times that perhaps they should not be regarded as errors at all. They could in fact have dialectical explanations. Haarh too believes that variant forms in Nyi-ma-grags-pa's text could be due to dialectical influences or phonetic variants, which could be explained by the different periods in which his sources were committed to writing. Nevertheless, many variants could just be plain errors. Clearly, a received spelling can only be established once sufficient comparative material is available. Therefore, what lexicon we currently have should be taken with caution.

The words contained in Dran-pa-nam-mkha’’s commentary give a much more reliable feeling. Variant readings subsequently added in brackets in the printed Zhang-zhung text are explained by the fact that bsTan-'dzin-nam-dag utilised two manuscripts for his edition.

One can certainly gain the impression that a Zhang-zhung text was used for the translation into Tibetan. This text is often more detailed and richer in content, whereas the Tibetan translation is at times considerably abridged.

The Zhang-zhung text itself must have been written by different authors, just like the translation. In his foreword, bsTan-'dzin-nam-dag names two of the translators, and mentions the fact that the original text of the mDzod-phug was transmitted by various teachers. This also becomes apparent in the vocabulary used and in the spelling of various terms. In the translation this is confirmed by the mixture of passages accurately trans-
lated followed by other parts where a freer translation is not very useful for our purpose. Certain failures to distinguish between terms with almost the same pronunciation might be explained by the fact that by the time the text was written the literary Zhang-zhung language had already gone out of current use. Some words might possibly belong to an older stratum compared to Nyi-ma-grags-pa’s bilingual: for instance khod for kho, 'khir for khir, gti for ti, bsngal for sngal at least suggest this possibility. In any case, we are not yet in a position to reach any firm conclusion.

Despite some differences, the bilingual texts of Nyi-ma-grags-pa, of the mDzod-phug, and of Dran-pa-nam-mkha’ basically reflect the same dialect, namely that of Zhang-zhung-smar. This is confirmed by the fact that nearly all the words used by Nyima-grags-pa also appear in the mDzod-phug and in Dran-pa-nam-mkha’. The annotation “Bil.” in the following selection from the mDzod-phug vocabulary refers to the meaning of the relevant word in Nyi-ma-grags-pa’s bilingual edited by Haarh.

A curious feature is the syllable ti- prefixed to many words. The explanation offered by Haarh, namely that in many cases it means tig (= ‘one’), is certainly a valid one. Probably this syllable corresponds to a ‘one’ sometimes dialectically prefixed to some words, very short and hardly audible; often it may also have an emphatic meaning. To what extent this syllable may have a purely metrical function can only be ascertained when bilingual texts not in verse become available. I believe the likely explanation for the ti- in the following examples is that it is the only way not to disrupt the metrics: ti-gu-nam-lu-gyer-!nu-gu~~g // ne sum-cu-tse-ti-sum-gyin.

In this regard, at least as far as the emphatic meaning is concerned, it appears we should include other “prefixes”, like for instance yo (in yo-yongs), yi and ya (in yi[y a]-yong); see my remarks on reduplication in the first part of this article. That the syllable ti- as prefix must not by any means always belong to
the word that follows is demonstrated by the cases where it is dropped before the same word.

Among the most puzzling particles in Zhang-zhung are *ni* and the suffix -*ti*. In my grammatical notes (Part 1) I have not considered *ni* as a true genitive particle (Haarh, pp. 20-21). Perhaps it should be understood as a later replacement of the old particle *ci*, constantly oscillating between an emphasising function and a genitive meaning, by the Tibetan emphatic particle *ni*. Thus also in Zhang-zhung no distinction should be made between a genitive *ni* and one with an emphasising function, for they cannot be considered as two distinct particles.

In agreement with Haarh (pp. 14 and 20) I consider *ti* to be a particle expressing a close relationship, something with the meaning of "for what concerns", and not as a purely genitive or terminative particle. It is doubtless related to (or possibly even identical with) gerundive *ti* (Haarh, p. 23) and strongly reminiscent of the Chinese genitive *chih* (其); cf also Gabelentz, *Chinesische Grammatik*, p. 234.

Finally, I would like to point out that parts of the commentary to the *mDzod-phug*, believed to be a work of gShen-rab\(^29\) and contained in the Bon *bKa’-gyur*, later discovered as a *gter-ma* by Gyer-mi-nyi-’od in 1108, are also contained in Nyi-magrags-pa’s bilingual. As legend has it, the translation of the *mDzod-phug* was already undertaken during the reign of Grgum-btsan-po by Zhang-zhung-stong-rgyung-mthu-chen and Bon-sha-ri-dbu-chen. Dran-pa-nam-mkha’ lived in the 8th century.

Alternative forms are provided in square brackets (e.g.: *lig-mun* [leg-mu] = *lig-mun* and *leg-mu*; *lo-re*[s] = *lo-re* and *lores*; *shang-ze* [se] = *shang-ze* and *shang-se*). The English meaning is added in round brackets when the Tibetan word corresponding to the Zhang-zhung has more than one meaning. Unfortunately, also the *mDzod-phug* and its commentary do not provide any useful information as to the verb morphology.
Zhang-zhung—Tibetan word correspondences

In the vocabulary of the mdzod-phug, which I have studied and which I originally intended to publish separately, the following comparisons seem remarkable to me, and worthy of a preliminary publication (the Zhang-zhung word is given on the left, the corresponding Tibetan term on the right). “K” refers to Karlsgren’s Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese, “Bil.” to Nyi-ma-grags-pa’s bilingual.

ken = bskyed, yar (K 312: ken = ‘root, origin’).

keng [khon]-dur (Bil. kon-dur) = kha-gting (cp. K 315: keng = ‘limit’).30

[t]/kra = sgra (Bil. grags-pa).

rko[-kun] = gzugs[-khams] (Bil. lus).


skos (Bil. skod) = so (‘tooth’) (Si-hia ko).

khi-khar = kun-gsal (Bil. ’od-zer).

khi[r] = ’char (‘east, to rise’; Bil. gsal, ’od, zer), shar; [mu-] khir = gsal.

khod-rtsal-dhra-ci = stobs-kyi-rnam-pa (concerning khod = stobs see the demons Khod-de-ring-mo and Ge-khod in S.G. Karmay, 1972, p. 354. For Khod-de-ring-mo also the Tibetan equivalent ’O [’Od]-de [lde]-ring-mo is attested. ’O [’Od]-de [lde] indicates a divine character [see S. Hummel, 1974-1975, “Der Osiris-Mythos in Tibet”, p. 24]).

ga-ga = rgod-pa (cp. K 183: k’uâ = rgod = ‘mare’?).

gu-na = sgo-nor (about this term see R.B. Ekvall, 1968, Fields on the Hoof, p. 21: sgo-phugs).


gyer = gshen (Bil. bon); see the discussion in R.A. Stein (1971) “La langue žań-žuñ du bon organisé”, pp. 238-242.
gyer-rgyung-spungs (a name for gShen-rab-mi-bo).

**gyer-mu** = [d]gyer (bon), smon-lam (this is in line with the interpretation of the term bon given by W. Simon: bon = ‘to invoke’; see Part 1 footnote 10. Thus both meanings of bon have to be mentioned: 1) ‘muttering, singing recitation’ [see H. Hoffmann, 1967a, Symbolik, p. 68; cf. also A. Macdonald, 1971, “Une lecture des Pelliot Tibétain”, p. 292, footnote 375], 2) smon-lam).

gyer-’od [ngod] (Bil. gyer-ngod) = gshen-rab.

’gu (Bil. gu) = kun (literally: ‘nine’, cp. the meaning of Tibetan dgu.

See also the section “Numerals” further on in this chapter: gu-dun).

rgi (before consonants) = **rngams** (cp. also nge in ting-nges = chu-rngams).

rngim (before vocals) = **rngams**.

ci-ci: double genitive, turns the two preceding words into genitives.

ti = **chu** (the ti in Ti-tse [se] [= Kailāsa] is translated with ‘water’ [tse = rtse?]. The form Ting-tse is also attested. Could it not rather mean the blueness of the sky [ting] ? But see also ti [-tse] among the demon classes as gnyen [gnyan]).

ti-tse = gnyen-mo (demons; probably a euphemism for gnyan).

ting-zhi = stong-pa, chu (‘the void’ ; cp. ting = ‘blue, blueness of the sky’ ; Bil. ting-zhi = ‘turquoise’ ; cp. Chin. ch‘ing 青 and 清).

dang-ra (K 973: d’ang = ‘pond, tank’) = (Bil. rgya-mtsho).

dud-mur (Bil. du-mur) = byol-song (cp. mur = ‘og = ‘under’ ; du[d] = Tib. dud-‘gro).

drung-mu = rin-chen (cf. Part 1, footnote 12: g.yung-drung = maṇi), shin-tu.

dre = ’dre (demons, clearly the Zhang-zhung word for gnod-sbyin).

ni-du[d] (Bil. ni-dud) = gti-mug (cf. K 659: ni = ‘stop, dirty’).

spung-se = gcod-byed (perhaps here we should look for the meaning of spungs-so as a name for gShen-rab-mi-bo; usually translated as ston-pa).

phya (Bil. phya) [phyo-sangs] = yang, mkha’ (cf. my notes to musangs and nam-mkha’ in Part 1, also concerning ‘clear, wide, immensely clear’. Bil. phya-sangs = gsal, phya-sang = yangs-pa).

phyo* = ’byam[s] (‘boundless, empty’; cf. Snellgrove, op.cit., p. 302: phyo-ma = ‘void’).
mang-wer = mo-gdon (Bil. skya-lDan is certainly wrong; cp. also the

mu-tsug = skye-ba (Bil. bkra-shis, dmu-thag = ‘sky cord’; Cf. S.
Hummel, 1963a, “Das Motiv der Nabelschnur in Tibet”, about

dmu[-kha] = nam-mkha’ (ether as element) (Si-hia: mo = nam-
mkha’; Ch’i:ang: mu[ma]; Na-khi: ʰmuan).

tsa[-mo] = nya (attested in Bil., but see also Mi-nyag: ʑō).

tse-shan (Bil. tse-swe) = rna (cp. K 11: ʰnz i = rna).

zangs = lcags (attested in Bil., but see also Si-hia: shang).

yo [yi, ya]-yong[s] = yongs.

le = rlung (attested in Bil., but see also Si-hia: lō).

sha-shin [shan, shen, shi-shan, shi-shen, she-shen] (Bil. shi-shin)
= [rnam]-shes, shes-pa (cp. also K 868: ʰdz ien = ‘soul’; Si-hia:
siē; K 801: siēm = Chin. ʰhsin. Perhaps also 男神 (shen) could be
related. This could possibly also offer an explanation for g Shen-
rab [Shen-ra]?; see also S.C. Das, 1881, “The Bon (Pon) Reli-
gion”, p. 195, footnote 5, and one of the Bonpo “vehicles” (theg-

shan, see sha-shin, rarely mig-shan = rnam-shes.

seg-ri (K 780: siek = ‘to breathe’) = sems, dbugs (Bil. dbugs).

ha-ra = gsal (Bil. ye-shes); ha-ra-wang = ye-shes-sku (this could
offer a possibility for a tentative interpretation of the controver-
sial name Pe-har [dkar], also known as Zhang-zhung-gi-srung-
ma: pe = srog [see Bil.], ha-ra = gsal [dkar?]. Another name for
Pe-har is Srog-bdag-dkar-po; see my book review, 1971c, of M.
Hermanns, Schamanen, Pseudoschamanen, Erlöser und

a’-dran-rbang[-mar] = [gser-gyi]ri-rab (cf. Lexicon of Archaic
Terms: a’-dran-rwang = ri-rab-lhun-po).

u-dug[mung]-glang-ra[klang, brlang] (Bil. glang-u-dug)* = sgra-
mi-snyan (cf. Snellgrove, 1967, p. 312: u-dug = ‘unpleasant’).

u-yug = blo-can (Lexicon of Archaic Terms: blo-gros).
The vocabulary of the *mDzod-phug* is particularly rich in mythological terms, as can also be seen from the list of demons and divinities, for the work is a fundamental cosmological and metaphysical treaty of the Bonpos, whereas the *Zang-Zhung Dictionary* only contains a short compilation of various cosmogonic and cosmological concepts, as well as some metaphysical ones, taken from fundamental Bon scriptures, among them the *mDzod-phug*.

Some Bon deities and classes of demons from the *mDzod-phug*


**Kyeł-sad-gyer-lgyum** = *Srid-pa ‘i-lha-mo*, see also: *lig-rkye-ber-zhi.*

**rkya [skyā]** (Tib. *rje*) = general term for *rgyal-po, btsan* (Bil. *btsan*); the two groups are related (cf. S. Hummel. 1968-1969, “Bon-Ikonographisches”, p. 862 with bibliographic references), *gnyan* (see also *ti[-tse]*; according to Hoffmann, 1967a, *Symbolik*, p. 71, they are subordinate to the power of the *btsan*).

**rKyel-sang-lig-rgyung** = *Sangs-po ‘bum-khri* (the highest Bon deity in our world age; cf. Hoffmann, 1967a, *Symbolik*, p. 91).

**ge** = possibly a general term for *bdud* (see also Bil.; cf. Hoffmann, 1950, *Quellen*, p. 140); Dran-pa-nam-mkha’ gives the reading *rge = bgegs.* Compare the *ge-khod* living on the Kailäsa = Sumeru.

**lgyu-la-dm** (tra?) = *brag-srin* (see [ru-]tra; cf. S. Hummel, 1968-1969, *op.cit*).


**ti[-tse]** = *gnyen[-mo], gnyan* = ‘those from Kailäsa = Sumeru’ (?). About these demons see Hoffmann (1950) *Quellen*, p. 159. Gnyen could possibly be a euphemism for *gnyan*. Ti-tse[se] is also the Kailäsa = Sumeru, and according to S.G. Karmay (1972) *op.cit.*, p. XXIX, the deity of this mountain.
ting-mur = klu (cp. Bil. mur-ti[ng]).

tra[ng]-wer [ber] (Bil. tra, see also ku-tra) = gdon, [b]gegs (the two groups are related); they give life to the ro-langs (cf. Hoffmann, 1967a, Symbolik, p. 77). Lexicon of Archaic Terms: tra-wer = the 'u-rang.
dre = 'dre (see also under ku-tra).
dre-ge = gnod-sbyin (a collective term for 'dre and bgegs? According to Hoffmann, 'dre, like bgegs and gdon, is possibly a general term for demons, which could apply to gnod-sbyin as well. Dre-ge = gnod-sbyin, often with the meaning of yakṣa. Concerning the yakṣa, see also ye[yi]-mu). According to Sum-pa-mkhan-po, the gnod-sbyin with the bdud, srin-po, klu, btsan, lha, dmu, 'dre and 'gong-po are nine brothers.
ber [wer]-zhi = rgyal-po (see also rkyä).
rba = bdud (see also under ge).
ma-ma = a general term for sman-mo (see also ya[r]-me; cf. E. Neumaier, 1966, Mātarah und Ma-mo).
ma-mung = ma-mo (cf. Bil. and E. Neumaier, 1966, op.cit.).
mi-sngum = ma-mo (see also ma-mung).
mu-ti = klu (see mu[r]-zang[s]). Bil. mur-ting.
mu-zhi = lto-phye-che (see re- 'dab, a serpent being; compare the subterranean sri).
mu-rlab (Bil. rlab-rtse) = mkha'-lding (garuda); see also ting-zhung, [d]mu-tsha[r], dmu-zhag, zhung-zhag.
mu-sad = a general term for gnod-sbyin (see also dre[-ge], mu = ngan).
mu[r]-zang[s] (Bil. mur-ti[ng], zangs, ting-zangs) = klu.
dmu-zhag = garuda, dri-za (gandharva, see also Lexicon of Archaic Terms).
tsa-med = srin[-mo] (cf. S. Hoffmann, 1967a, Symbolik, p. 77: brag-srin-mo; see also lgyu-la-dra); compare the dgra-lha of Zhangzhung: Mu-tsa-med (Symbolik, p. 73).

zhung-zhag = khyung (garuda).
y[ar]-me = sman.
y[ej]-mu = yakṣa.

[ru-]tra = srin[-po] (see also Bil.), sri (see also tsa-med; the two groups are often mixed up due to their subterranean nature). Concerning the sri, see also S. Beyer (1973) The Cult of Tārā, p. 299.

re-'dab[-sri], re-hrab (Bil. re-hab) = lto-phye (sri demons in form of snakes, see mu-zhi), sri.

Li[khi]-mu = Ku-ma (a ḍākinī).

Lig-rkye-ber-zhi = Srid-pa’i-rgyal-po = Sangs-po’bum-khrī (compare his female partner Srid-pa’i-rgyal-mo (Srid-rgyal-ma) or Srid-pa’i-lha-mo; Hoffmann, 1967a, Symbolik, p. 94, and supra, under kyel-sad-gyer-lgyum).

shu (Bil. shu-nig) = bgegs (see also tra[nj]-wer; bgegs is no true Tibetan equivalent for shu).

Sad-mu = lHa-mo (see Hummel, 1963b, “Probleme der lHa-mo”, p. 143: sad = lha).

Sla-zhi-khang-mu = Sa-yi-bdag-mo (sla-zhi = sa’i [yj]).

slas-sad = sa-bla (= sa-bdag).


ag = sha-za (s rin).

Concerning the klu, bgegs, gnyan, the’u-rang, gdon, bdud, ma-mo, dmu, sman, sri and srin see also R. Nebesky-Wojkowitz (1956) Oracles and Demons of Tibet, Index. About the gnyan in particular see S. Hummel (1971b) “The Motif of the Crystal Mountain in the Tibetan Gesar Epic”. The bull (yak) is not the only mountain god and ancestor lord in Tibet; the sheep (argali) can have the same function, for instance in connection with the famous mountain gNyan-chen-thang-la; cf also rGyal-rabs gsal-ba’i me-long, Ch. 8: ...skyid-shod stag-gi-ri la snyan (= gnyan) ’gro-ba gzigs-pas (“... in sKyid-shod, on the moun-

*Numerals*

The rules governing the formation of compound numbers are not clear yet (see my notes in Part 1). The numbers one to six are always associated with the next higher number, perhaps as an indication of rounding up. The numbers seven and eight carry the suffix tse [se, tshe], possibly with the same meaning (cf. Haarh, pp. 16 f.: tse). Three and eight (in the bilingual also six) sometimes have the previous number prefixed. Nine (gu-dun) also has the meaning of ‘much’ or ‘unlimitedly large’; this is probably the reason for the form dun-gu (gu = kun). Possibly, in ancient times only the numbers from one to nine existed. Nine (dun) is thus identical with gu (‘all’ = kun, but also dgu?), and it became the holy number of Bon (the nine celestial spheres, the nine-storeyed palace of the queen of the realm of the eastern women, the nine “vehicles” of the doctrine and practice [Tib. theg-pa] etc.). See also A.H. Francke (1923) Tibetische Hochzeitslieder, pp. 20 f.

The number nine takes a special relevance in China as well. The Lo-Shu diagram, which is at the basis of the ancient Chinese philosophy and religion, is an imago mundi made up of nine fields. Accordingly, China was divided into nine provinces, and the old feudal land order was based, at least theoretically, on the system of nine. The cosmic temple Ming-T’ang is also composed of nine elements (cf. the nine celestial regions of Bon) and the fundamental principles of being are expressed in nine
astral figures; cf. S. Hummel (1969a) "The sMe-ba-dgu, the Magic Square of the Tibetans", with bibliographic references on China, particularly Schuyler Cammann's works.

1 - (cardinal and ordinal): ti-ne [ni], ti, ti-tig, ti-tog, tu-tog.
2 - ne-sum, nes (Bil. ni [ne], ne-sum = 3; according to Haarh (p. 18), ne-sum is an ordinal or conjunctive form for 2).
3 - sum-pi [pa], su[m], ne-sum (sum-pi [pa], also Tib. gsum-pa = 'third, triple'; Haarh: ne-sum = 2).
4 - bi[ng]-nga, bi (Bil. bing and bing-nga = 4), pi-nga, zhi ('gi-zhi = number of 4; zhi = Tib. bzhi)
5 - nga-[drug] (Bil. nga-drug is also 6; according to Haarh an ordinal or conjunctive form for 5).
6 - drug-snis, dug-mun, nga-drug (cf. Bil.).
7 - sni[s]-tse [se] (sni-tse is according to Haarh an ordinal and conjunctive number), rnil-se.
8 - gya[d]-tse [tshe], sni[s]-gyad, sni[s]-tse-gyad (Bil. gyad and sni-gyad = 8; according to Haarh ordinal and conjunctive form for 8).
9 - dun-gu, gu[-dun] (Bil. gu-dug, gu-dun = 9; according to Haarh, gu-dun is ordinal and conjunctive form for 9).
10 - cu-se [tsa], chu, ju, cus; cu-mo = bcu-pa (= 'consisting of 10, including 10').
11 - cu-tse-ti (Bil. cu-ti).
12 - cus-ne-sum (Bil. cu-nis).
21 - tsu [tse]-ti-ne (tse = Tib. rtsa in rtsa[-gcig]?), chu-tig (?)
22 - ne-cu-ne-sum.
30 - sum-pa'i-ju-tse (Bil. sum-cu).
33 - ne-sum-cu-tse (Bil. rtse)-ti (Bil. tel)-sum.
51 - nga-drug-ci (= cu)-tog (cp. ti [tu]-tog = 1).
100 - *rag (Bil. ra), rang (archaic Chinese pāk).
1000 - stang, tang, stam, sto[ng] (Bil. stong), du-tog (otherwise = sto[ng] = ‘empty’), ta.
100000 - *'ba, 'bab (Bil. ba-ta), pu (= Tib. 'hum).

* * * * *

List of variant readings in the vocabulary of the mDzod-phug
(based on the two Dol-po manuscripts used by the editor)

ko-nam : rko-nam
klang : brlang
klung-tsang : klung-tse (Bil. klung-rtse)
rko-bun : rko-phung (see Bil.)
rko-sangs (see Bil.) : rko-pa
rkyel (Tib. srid) : rgyal
lke : skye
skyug : snyug
khi-khar (see Bil.) : khi-kan
khi-ri : kha-ri
gyi-gyin : gyun-min
gyer-'od : gyer-ngod [dod]
gro-bun : gos-bun
lgyum : lkung
ngag-tse : ngog-ge
ci-glang (see Bil.) : ci-klung
cu-slig : cu-sdig
chu-ra : ma-ra (chu-ra-mur : ma-ra-mung)
ja-ris : ci-ris
ju (Tib. gtor) : hrung
rje : rnge
nya-zhi : nyang-zhi
nyu-nar : rku-nar
nye-lo : nye-lod, re-long
ta-gu : ta-cu
ti-kun : ti-cu
ti-ga : de-tig
tur-phrum : tur-phrom [phram]
tha-tsan (see Bil.) : tho-tstor
tha-tse : the-tse (Bil. chen-po), the-tshu
tha-tshar : tha-thar
tha-yud : tha-rud
tha-shan : la-shan
thang-zhi-tsog (see Bil.: thang; see tsog) : tha-tsi (see tha-tse)
da-yud (see Bil.) : dad [dis]-dzul
dan [-ci] : ta [-ri]
du-cog : gu-tshogs
du-mun : du-min
dus-khrun : dub-phyung
de-cu : de-chu (Tib. rgyu-mthun)
[de-] tog (Tib. mdog) : de-ga
de-phran : de-dran
dog-zom : hi-zog
dho-ye : hro-ye
ni-mung [mun] : ni-tud
pu-tsun : na-cud
phya-nga (see Bil.) : phung-ngo
phyog : phyo
\textquote{ba’-ra} : bha-ra
rbing : rang
ma-sangs (Tib. don-rtogs) : ye-sangs (Bil. ye-sangs = stong-zhing)
mang-tsa : ma-tsa
mi-som : mi-sos
mu-har : mu-khar
dmu-tor : dmu-ting
dmu-pun : dmu-bun [sun]
dmu-tsha (garuḍa) : mu-tshar
rma-lig : mi-ga
tsa-ge : tsa-ka
tsog (Tib. phyogs) : pogs
dzun : dzu
wi-som : tso-som
zhim-tse : zhim-ri
zhung : nung
za-ra-kham : za-zi-kham
rwa-tshar : ca-tshar
re-long : nye-lo
li-mu : khi-mu
lig : ltag
lig-rkyel : lig-rgyal
lig [leg]-mu[n] : li-yu
shin-rtsa : shin-tse
shi-ting : shing
sang-rgyung (Tib. 'gro-ba'i-lam) : sa [snga]-rgyu (see Bil.: snga = bsngal; rgyung = lam)
se-tan : se-stad
hrun : rgyun
lhag : lha
Part 3 - Lexical Correspondences from the mDzod-phug and the Žang Žung Dictionary

In this third part I will deal with some variants in spelling and meaning I obtained by comparing the mDzod-phug and Nyima-grags-pa’s Žang Žung Dictionary edited by E. Haarh. A small number of these differences may be attributable to spelling mistakes, but it will only be possible to ascertain this when more bilingual texts become available. Particularly relevant are the meanings which mutually complete each other, for they clearly show that the Zhang-zhung language is no artificial creation, with the only exception of some terms, mainly deriving from the systematised Bon religion.

This statement is also supported by folios 2, 3, 6 and 7 of the title pages (Tib. mgo’i mchod-brjod dang gleng-gzhi) of the two-volume work g. Yung-drung-bon-gyi bstan-’byung (History of Bon), published in Dolanji by dPal-ldan-tshul-khrims in 1972. These contain, in addition to the Tibetan text, the relevant translation in Zhang-zhung-smar, sometimes in a free style, but always faithfully conveying the meaning. To complete the lexicon provided by Haarh, I will add the following terms:

- khol = Tib. ji-lta (cp. Haarh: ti-khol = ’khor-ba)
- gu-dun = Tib. dgu (= ’very, absolutely’)
- gu-dun-hrun = Tib. phyag-tshal (Haarh: zhabs-la-’dud)
- glang = Tib. gsung (Haarh: sgra)
- mu-ci = Tib. mtha’-yas (Haarh: mu-med)
- ne-ting = Tib. sgron-ma (cp. ne = Tib. me)
- ba-zhu = Tib. zhabs
- ma-tsa = Tib. dge-mtshan (Haarh: mtshan-ma)
- smar-zhi = Tib. mdzes (Haarh: bzang-po)
- lig = Tib. skye-dgu (Haarh: srid-pa)
- she-rkya = Tib. bka’-drin (Haarh: thugs-rje)
- sangs = Tib. ji-snyed (Haarh: stong)
In the following word-list, Zhang-zhung (on the left) and Tibetan (on the right) are compared. Variants are given in square brackets. In round brackets are the readings or the Tibetan meanings taken from the bilingual edited by Haarh (H.). Compare also the list of deities and demons in Part 2 of this chapter.

**ku-shin** (= kun-shin) = *'du-shes* (H. kun-shes)

**keng** [khon]-dur (H. kon-dur) = *kha-gting*

**kyo-chu** (H. kyo = gtsang) = *khrus*

[ti]-*kra = sgra* (H. grags-pa)

**klung-tsang** [tse] (H. klung-rtse) = *tshig-rtsub*

**rku** [nyu (H. snyu)]-nar-dzun [jü]-ci = *mi-bsnyel-ba-yi-gzungs*

**rke-ri** (H. *lke-ri*) = *lce*

**rko[-kun] = gzugs [-khams] (H. *lus*)

**rko[-kung] (= rko-phung [pun, bun]) = gzugs* (cp. H. rko-phung = gzugs, phung-po)

**rko-phung** = [rgya-che-] *khams, lus* (H. rko-phung = phung-po, gzugs), *dhang-thang*

**rko-dzan** (H. rko-dza) = *gzugs*

**[rkyas-dur-] da-dod = [rje’i-, rgyal-po’i-] sprul-pa** (H. da-dod = sprul-sku)

**rkyal** (cp. skyel) = *skos* (‘fateful existence’; H. rkyal = ‘to exist’);

*skyel [-skya] = rkos (= skos) [-rje] (H. skyel = ’byung-ba = ‘existence’)*

**skur** (H. skyur) = *’gyur*

**skos** (H. skod) = *so* (‘tooth’)

**skya** [rkyas, rkye]-lig (H. skye-lig) = *snang-srid*

**skye** = *don* (H. skye = rkyen)

**khi-kar = kun-gsal** (H. ‘od-zer)

**khir = shar, ’char** (‘east, rise’; H. khir = gsal, ‘od, zer)

[mu-]**khir = gsal**

**khir-zhi = chags** (H. gsal-byed)

**khu** (H. khu-ne) = *khams*

**khod-spyod** (H. kho-spyod) = *lhun-grub*

**khod-rtsal = mi-’jigs-stobs** (H. stobs [-chen, ldan])

**khyo** (= kyo) = *dag* (‘pure’; H. kyo = gtsang)
khri = gru, bang-rim (H. gru); 'khrigs
khri-kar (H. khi-kar) = 'od-zer-can
khri-tsa [tsan] = thugs-nyid, sems[-nyid], sems-dpa', bdag-don (H.
  khri-tsan = sems-can; khri-tsa = thugs-nyid)
khri-tsar = rnam-shes (H. sems)
khrī-tsu [tshug] = tshe, sems (H. sems)
khrī-tse (H. khri-tsa) = thugs-nyid and the meanings of khri-tsa
khri-seg = srog (cp. H. seg = dbug)

ga-ga = kun-dga’, rgod-pa (H. dga’, rgod)
gag = 'gag-pa (H. ga-ci) = 'gag-pa (= gag-pa'i?)
gi (H. 'gi) = grangs
gu-nam = nang (H. nam = nang)
gu-mun = med-khams (cp. [gu-] mun = nag, H. gu-mun = mun-pa)
gung [kung] = kun (H. mdzod = ‘store’)
gyag = gshin, shi, stong [-pa] (‘empty’ = ‘desolate’) (H. shi = ‘dead’),
  mi-rtag; gyag[s]-ti = g.yas (gyog-ti = g.yon)
gyi-mig (H. gyim-mig) = g.yo-ba
gyim (H. gyil) = 'khyil; cp. also gyin (H. gyim) = g.yo
'gi-gar = 'phrul, gzh'a'-tshon (both with the property of surprising),
  gang (H. grangs-med)
'gir-cu (H. 'gir-chu) = bye-brag
rgya (H. rkya [skya]) = rje
rgyu = lam (H. lgyu = lam), rgyu-ba
rgyu-gang (rgyu-gang) = gang-po
rgyu-'od (rgyu-yod) = thabs-chen
lgu (H. lgyu) = lam
lge (H. lke-ri) = lce
lgyu = rgyud (‘continuity’; H. lgyu-zhi = rgyun-zhugs); see also lgu

nge-re [ngo-ra, ngog, nga-ro, nga-ra] (H. ngar = ‘side, corner’) =
  ngos (‘surface, side’); ngo-ra is also byad (‘aspect’)
ngo-ra-de-shin (H. nges-de-shin) = rang[-gis]-rig
sngo-se (H. sngog-se) = mkhon-'dzin
sngal-chal[fr] (cp. H. chal = yal) = sems-nad
bsngal-zhug (H. sngal-zhug) = nyon-mongs

ci (H. ci = sgra)-klung [glang] (H. ci-glang) = tshig
ci = dod (H. 'byor-ba), chags
cu [cug]-no (H. cug [tsug]-no) = 'dod-chags

cu-slig (see also ju-lig) = cho-'phrul

[b]cud = bcud (cp. cu[d] = shel = bcud-bstan; H. cu-shel = bcud-bstan-pa)

cod = 'dzoms, spyod (H. spyod)

cod = de-bzhin (cp. H. de-cod-gyin = yod-pa-yin)

ja-ris-ju-phyi (H. ca-ris-cu-phyi) = so-so[r]-yang-dag (cp. ja-tsug = rims-su)

jar (H. dzwar and 'dzar) = gza'

ju ['ju] = 'byung (H. bshos =‘brought forth’), 'bab (e.g. of rivers)

ju-lig [slis, slig] (H. ju-slig) = rdzu-'phrul, lhun-rdzogs (H. rdzu-'phrul)

ljon-lji (H. lji = thog = ‘above’)-gra-ner (H. gra-jil = ser-ba) = thog (‘lightning’) -dang-ser; about ljön cp. Tib. ljön = ‘land of the gods (paradise)’

nyi-'khor (H. nyi-khir) = nyi-zer

nye [nyi]-lo = snyom-par, mnyam [nyid], rnam-par-stong, bsam-gtan, ting-'dzin (H. nye-lo = mnyam-ngid, ting-'dzin, dgongs; nye-lo = snyom-'dzug)

ta-kyon (H. to-kyon) = 'gyod

ta-gu = lta-bu (H. 'dod-dgu)

ta-cod = las-spyod (H. cod = spyod)

ta-phyi (H. ting-phyi = phyi)-nu-ning (cp. nu-nig = nang) = phyi-nang

ta-lang (H. ta-la) = blang-dor, rtog[s]-pa

ta-han (H. ha-dan) = theg-chen

ti (ting) = chu (H. ting = chu)

ti-ka [ga] = don-dam, bden (H. ti-ga = bden; ti-ka = don-dam)

[tii-]kung = 'gegs (H. kung = 'gag)

ti-ga = don-dam (H. ti-ga = bden); bde-chen (H. bde-chen)

[tii-]ci (cp. H. ti-ci = kun) = gang (‘full’)

ti-par = bar[-du], 'phar (H. ti-par = 'phar)

ti-pra (H. ti-sra) = phra-rab, phra-rgyas (H. ti-pra = phra-ma)

ti-phung (H. ting-phung) = phung-po

ti-tson (H. ting-tson) = tshor-ba

tig-ti = mtshan-nyid (H. yang-dag), rig-pa
tig-zhi (H. tig-tig) = zhung-sa

ting = rlan (cp. H. ting = chu)

ting-mur (H. mur-ting) = klu; cp. mu[r]-zang[s] and dud-mur

ting-zhi = stong-pa (‘the void’; cp. H. ting = ‘blue, blueness of the sky’, but also chu = ‘water’, and moreover ting-zhi = ‘turquoise’) 

ting-sho = chu (H. chu-bo), chu-rgyun

teyi (H. ti-ci) = bsgyur

teshe [shan] (H. ti-shin) = rnam-shes, shes-rab

gti (H. du-ti) = dmyal-ba

stang-ri (H. stong-ri) = 'du-byed

tra[ng]-wer [ber] (H. tra, in ku-tra = 'dre-gdon) = gdon (‘demons’) 

tha = mtha’ (H. mthar)

tha-ci = mthar-phyin (cp. H. tha-cu = rgya-che)

tha-tsu (H. thad-tsur) = bden

tha-tse (H. tse = chen, chung) = rgya-chen (H. chen-po), rgya-chung

tha-tshan (H. tha-tshan) = thams-cad, mthar-thug

thang-gung (gung = mdzod, kun) = thams-cad (cp. H. rkyan-thang = thams-cad)

thad-tsud (H. thad-tsur) = bden-pa

[da-]dod [drod, 'dod] = skye-ba, chags-pa, skye-mched, sprul-pa;

de-bzhin, rang-bzhin (H. dod = skye, bskyed; da-dod = de-dag, 
de-bzhin, sprul-sku; da-drod = rang-bzhin)

da-zhing (H. zhing = bzhin) = de-bzhin

di-khor (H. ti-khor) = 'khor-ba

du-tog = mthun-par (H. stong-pa)

du-pur (H. du-bur) = spong

du-phud (cp. H. phud, in pra-phud) = 'khor-lo

dud[-mur] (H. du-mur) = byol-song (cp. mur = 'og; dud in Tib. 
dud- 'gro)

dum (H. mu-dum) = dbyibs

[dul-]pang (H. phang) = khu-rlangs

[de-]rkyam (H. tig-rkyam) = dran-pa

de-cu = rang-bzhin, rang-du, rgyu[d], rgyu-mthun (H. rgyu-mthun)

de-lud (H. de-lod) = lhun-grub (H. also has de-lhod)

dod = sprul (H. skye)

drin-ci = nye-bar (H. nyer-bzham)
dhang[-ra] (H. ra-tse = rna-ba) = rta[-rna]
dhe-tur = khyab (‘comprehensive’; H. bdal), rgya-che
dhod = chags (cp. H. dod = bskyed)
dhro-tor (H. dho-tar) = bag-med
'dod (H. dod) = skye

nam[-lu, lug] (H. nam-lu) = gnas, yul
nam-ran = dpyod (H. spyod)
ni-mun /num, nub/ (cp. H. ni[ng] = ‘region’ and Tib. mun = ‘dark’;
H. ni-nub = ‘west’) = nub
nu-ci = khyab (‘comprehensive’; H. mu-med)
nu-ning (cp. nig in nu-nig = nang)-ha-tan (H. ha-tan = ye-nyid) =
nang-stong
ne = drod (H. me)
ne-khri (H. khri-tse) = 'bras-bu

pu-tsam (H. sbu-tsam) = gtsug
pu-ri-ka-la (H. su-ri-ka-la) = kun-gzhi-ma-g.yos
spung (H. spungs) = sdud (H. spungs)
pra-min (H. sra-min) = sro-ma
pra-tse (H. sran-tse) = sor-tshig[s]
spre-ling = 'dzam-gling (cp. H. spre-ling = mtsho-gling; spre-gling
 = gling)

ba-ning (H. ba-ni) = pad-ma
bag = phyé (‘open’; H. bag = rgyas)
bi-lgyam (cp. H. bi-ni = rnam-par, lgyam = rgyas) = mgon-rtogs
bo (H. bho)-la = ri-bong
bri[ng]-nam (H. bring-ma) = bang-rim
sbu-gung = snod (H. mdzod)
bha-ra = 'phro-ba (cp. H. bha-gi = mgon-par)

ma-ni (cp. H. ma-ning = ming) = ming
ma-ning (H. ma-nig) = mi-'gags, bskyed (H. ma-ning = ming)
ma-mig = mu-med (H. dmigs-med = ‘independent’)
ma-min = ma-nges, mi-ldan (H. ‘negation’)
mang (H. mang-thun) = sha
mi-som (H. mi-sol) = ma-spangs, ma-chags, med
mu = mthar, stong (‘empty’); (H. mkha’, gnam, dbyings)
mu-khyu[ng] (H. khyu = bsgyur) = [khams-gsum-]’khor-ba (H. mu-khyung = nam-mkha’), 'gyur-ba-med-pa
mu-ur (H. mu-un) = gnam-’brug (‘thunder’)
mung-khor = ’khor (H. rdza-mkhan)
mur = ’og (cp. H. kan-mur = steng-’og)
mu[r]zang (H. mur-ting, zangs) = klu (cp. mur = ’og and zangs = klu)
dmu-tig (H. dmu-tog) = rtogs; conversely, [d]mu-tog [tor] (H. rmu-tog) = phrag-tog
dmu-har (H. mu-har-rtser) = stong-pa-nyid, thams-cad-stong-pa
smar = smin, bzang (H. bzang, bkra)
tska [khri] (= Skr. cakra; H. rtsa-krad) = ’khor-lo, srid-pa
ts[ar]-rang] (H. rtsa [-rang]) = khru
tse[je] (H. tse-swe) = rna-ba (‘antelope’)
rtse = dbal (‘point’) (cp. H. rtse-ze = rna-ba = gna’-ba)
tshu (H. tsu) = khru

dza (H. ’dzar) = gza’
dza-nam-da-dod = rdzu-’phrul-ladan (cp. H. dzwan-ci = rdzu-’phrul;
da-dod = sprul-sku)
dzag (H. zag) = zag-pa
dzad-min = dpag-med (H. btang-snyoms, zad-med)
dzan-kyi-da-dod (H. dzwan-ci; da-dod) = rdzu-’phrul (ci = kyi =
Tib. genitive; dzan = dzwan = dza)
dzan-slig (H. ju-slig) = rdzu-’phrul
[phu-ci-]dzam (H. ci-dzam) = [’dzin-]chags
dze (H. tse) = tshe

wag (H. ’dzar-wag = gza’-skar) = skar
wang[s] = Skr. kāya (H. sku)
wang = bcud (cp. H. wang-ya = dbang-ldan)
wi-som = log-par-g.yem (H. shyor-log)
weg[ti] (H. wi-to) = gzhu-’dom
wer-som (H. wir-som) = chags (H. ’dod-log), ’khrig[s]-chags

zhim-tse (H. shin-tsa) = dri
zhim-zhal (H. zhil-zhal) = tshor-ba; gzhal; mDzod-phug: zhil-zhal = ’jam (differences in word tone?)
zhu-klung (cp. H. zhu) = sgra (cp. H. klung = tshig)
zhor = chag (from chag-pa), zhig (= 'jig; cp. H. zhur = 'jig)
za-slig (H. ju-slig) = sprul
zad-tra (H. zad-dra) = sa-bon
zu-zus = 'du-byed (cp. H. zu = 'du)
zur-klung [pang] (H. zur-klung) = dbang-po
'u-glung (H. 'u-glang) = sgra
'ur-glang (H. ['u-]glang) = rgyang-grags
ya-yong (H. yang-yong) = yongs-su
yar-rni = mi-'am-ci (cp. H. ni-yar = mi-min)
yu-cog (H. yu-tsog) = ro ('taste')
[t]i-[yud (H. du-yud) = yid; cp. yud-shin = rnam-shes
ye in mu-ye, possibly emphatic, Tib. rgyas (?)
ye-dmigs (H. dmig = mig) = ye-shes-gsal-mthong
yo-yongs (H. yi-yong) = yongs
rang-sher = ri-bdag (H. rwang-sher = ri-dwags); cp. ri-rwang = ri-rgyal (H. ri-rab)
rig-tig = zhing-dang-sa (cp. H. tig-tig = zhing)
rul-drod [trod] (H. da-drod) = rang-bzhin; in the mDzod-phug moreover: dbus
re-'dab [hrab] (H. re-hab) = lto-phye
rlab-ce = rgyags-pa (cp. H. rlab-rtse = 'tshe-ba)
re-lus (H. lhe-lus) = le-lo
la-shug (H. la-shu) = dpag-med
li-[ta] = rdzi ('wind'; cp. H. li = rlung)
leg [lig]-zhur (H. leg = srid) = srid-pa, 'jig-chags
lo-sun (H. lo-sngun) = blo-rmug
lo-snga = sngon, ye-yod, gang-ste, dmigs-med (H. dmigs-med)
lod (H. la-lod) = lo
sha-bhar (H. sha-'bhal) = sta-re
sha = shar (= 'char) 'to shine' (H. 'to rise, east')

shang-ze [se] = rga-ba (H. rgan-po [mo]), rgas-pa
shi-khon (H. she-khon) = phy[a-b]skos
shi-shen = dran-pa ('to remember', also sha-shan; H. shi-shin)
shin-rtsa [tse] (H. shin-tsa) = dri ('fragrance, smell'); cp. also: shim-shim (H. shi-shim)
she-thun = yid (H. snying, thugs; literally: shes-rten)
she-tse (H. she-tsu; tse = tsu) = rnam-shes (H. bsod-nams, phyatshe)
sel = gsal (H. bstan = 'explained, shown')

sa-cis = lcam-drul (H. ming-po)
sad-min (H. sad-man) = lha-ma-min (sad in the mDzod-phug is also = bla) 32
se-tan = grong (cp. H. se-dad = khyim)
se-sto [sad-do, sad-sto] (H. se-to) = khang
[rko-]seg = gzugs, lus (H. dbug[s])
[ni-]som = [mi-]sbyor (cp. H. wi-som = sbyor-log)
slas = gnas (H. sa)
sli (= sla-ri?) (H. sla and zla-ri) = zla
slig-tso = mgon-rdzogs, kun-rdzogs, sprul [-ba] (cp. H. ju-slig = rdzu-'phrul)

ha (H. ha-tan) = ye-nyid
ha [he] -pi (= pa 'i?) (H. has-pi = dga'-ba'i) = nyams-dga'-ba'i
ha-ra = gsal (H. ye-shes); cp. ha-ra-wang = ye-shes-sku
hab (H. has) = glang
hrang = tsan-ses (H. rta); cp. kulan (= ku-hrang!)
hr[i]-tsa = ming-po (H. khye'u), gcen-po
hr[i]-tsa-med (shortened hri) = lcam-drul (H. tsa-med = bu-mo)
hri [tri] -shen (H. tri-shen) = shes-rab (tri = yid, shen = [rnam-] shes)

lhag = 'phyo (H. lding)
lhe-lung (H. lhe-lus) = le-lo
ag-tse[r] (H. ag-rtser; cp. tse = slu?) = ngag ['tshal] (H. ngag-‘khyal)
ag[-sho] (H. a-sho) = sgra (H. ag-sho = kha), zhal-ngad, ngad-ka;
    sha-za (cf. Lexicon of Archaic Terms: ag = srin)
i-seng (H. e-sing), [i-] seng-nge (H. sing-nge) = snying-rje
u-dug [mun]-glang-ra [klang, brlang] (H. glang-u-dug) = sgra-mi-
    snyan (cf. Snellgrove, 1967, The Nine Ways of Bon, p. 312: u-
    dug = ‘unpleasant’)
e-pod (H. em-sod) = yid-'ong

A few more correspondences were listed in Part 2.

*   *   *

The following categorisation of variants is tentative. As I men-
tioned at the beginning, we are not yet in a position to decide
on the subject of spelling errors. The left-hand column con-
tains the reading from the mDzod-phug, the right-hand one that
by Haarh, op. cit. Concerning dialectical differences within
Zhang-zhung-smar and phonetic variants in general, see my
introductory remarks to Part 2.

1. Vocal change (see also 7b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'khor</th>
<th>khir</th>
<th>(in the mDzod-phug: klung klang, also in Haarh glung glang nyi nye, also in Haarh tsa tse)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tig</td>
<td>-tog</td>
<td>Haarh glung glang nyi nye, also in Haarh tsa tse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te-</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td>Haarh glung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tor</td>
<td>-tar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stang</td>
<td>stong (also stang)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>man</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weg</td>
<td>wi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wer</td>
<td>wir</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za</td>
<td>ju (Tib. rju)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo</td>
<td>yi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lud</td>
<td>lod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-seng</td>
<td>e-sing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) Root consonant change (see also 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kung</td>
<td>phung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khon</td>
<td>kon</td>
<td>(in the mDzod-phug: ka ga, also in Haarh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu</td>
<td>chu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cug-no</td>
<td>tsug-no</td>
<td>gung kung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cog</td>
<td>tsog</td>
<td>tse ze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jar</td>
<td>'dzar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu</td>
<td>su</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pung</td>
<td>phung</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pur</td>
<td>bur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pod</td>
<td>sod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pra</td>
<td>sra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tshu</td>
<td>tsu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dzag</td>
<td>zag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrab ['dab]</td>
<td>hab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Loss of prefix by root consonant change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jar</td>
<td>'dzar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu</td>
<td>sbu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sad-]sto</td>
<td>[sad-]do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Loss of prefixed b-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bsngal</td>
<td>sngal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Addition of prefixed ' -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gi</td>
<td>'gi (Tib. grangs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dod</td>
<td>dod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dza (Tib. gza')</td>
<td>'dzar (s. also 3: jar = 'dzar)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. 'Prefigurative' r before ts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tsa</td>
<td>rtsa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tse[r]</td>
<td>rtser (in ag-tser [rtser])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rtsa</td>
<td>tsa (cp. shin-rtsa, H: shin-rtsa)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsa</td>
<td>rtsa (in rtsa[-rang] = khru)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Mixed-up prefixes

a) l / r change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rgyu</td>
<td>lgyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rke</td>
<td>lke, lge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


b) r / s change:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rkya</td>
<td>skye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rkyal</td>
<td>skyel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rkye</td>
<td>skye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Change of suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gyin</td>
<td>gyim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ning</td>
<td>nig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsud</td>
<td>tsur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhim</td>
<td>zhil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>som</td>
<td>sol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hab</td>
<td>has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ur</td>
<td>un</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Loss of suffix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>kun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>khod</td>
<td>kho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gag</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sngo</td>
<td>sngog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cu</td>
<td>cug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ti</td>
<td>ting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tha</td>
<td>thad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dud</td>
<td>du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ning</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsa</td>
<td>tsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsu</td>
<td>tsur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dzan</td>
<td>dza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ya</td>
<td>yang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lang</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[\begin{align*}
lu & \quad \text{lug} \\
shim & \quad \text{shi} \\
shug & \quad \text{shu} \\
ha & \quad \text{has} \\
ag & \quad \text{a}
\end{align*}\]

10. Loss of final s

\[\begin{align*}
\text{spung} & \quad \text{spungs} \\
\text{yongs} & \quad \text{yong}
\end{align*}\]

11. Parasitical y

\[\begin{align*}
\text{lg] [rgyu]} & \quad \text{lgyu}
\end{align*}\]

12. Loss of wa-sur

\[\begin{align*}
\text{rang} & \quad \text{rwang} \\
& \quad \text{cp. the old Chin. examples (Chin. w without Tib. correspondent) in W. Simon, 1930, \textit{Tibetisch-chinesische Wortgleichungen}, pp. 59 ff.}
\end{align*}\]

13. Varia

\[\begin{align*}
a) \text{different words with same meaning} \\
\text{ngo-ra} & \quad \text{nges} \\
\text{ta-} & \quad \text{ting-} \\
\text{de-} & \quad \text{tig-} \\
\text{za} & \quad \text{ju} \\
\text{lung} & \quad \text{lhus}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
b) \text{spelling based on pronunciation} \\
\text{nyu} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{snyu (in n}yu\text{-nar; H: snyu-nar} = \text{mi-bsnyel)} \\
\text{gti} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{ti} \\
\text{sad-sto} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{se-to}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
c) \text{so-called urbanity} \\
\text{bo} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{bho} \\
\text{lud} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{lhod (in de-lud; H: de-lod [lhod])} \\
\text{rle} & \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{lhe (in rle [lhe] -lus} = \text{le-lo)}
\end{align*}
d) dialectical differences

dhro  
dho  
dzun  
ju (s. also 2 and 9?)  
zhim  
shin  
sun  
sngun

To complete the grammatical notes in Part 1 and 2 I would like to mention the double genitive ci-ci, which in the mDzod-phug puts into the genitive the two preceding terms.

*   *   *   *

The following list includes words from Dran-pa-nam-mkha’i’s commentary to the mDzod-phug (see Part 2) which are included in the Žang Žung Dictionary (Bil., column 1) but differ in spelling or in meaning from their corresponding terms in Haarh (H, column 2), and sometimes in the mDzod-phug (column 3). Column 4 gives the Tibetan equivalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rky a</td>
<td>rka</td>
<td>mkhal-ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lkye</td>
<td>lke-ri</td>
<td>lke-ri</td>
<td>lce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kha-tham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kha-chod (mDzod-phug: ‘thibs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rked (mDzod-phug: ‘char, shar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rgya</td>
<td>skya</td>
<td></td>
<td>btsan (mDzod-phug: rje) = demons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gnyi</td>
<td>nyi</td>
<td></td>
<td>nyi-ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>ting</td>
<td></td>
<td>g.yu (mDzod-phug: chu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>du-ti</td>
<td></td>
<td>dmyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>khrag (as liquid, Bil. chu, mDzod-phug: rlan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhawg-ra</td>
<td>dang-ra</td>
<td>mtsho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du[-sa]</td>
<td>(du-dmyal)</td>
<td>dro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dud-mur</td>
<td>du-mur = byol-song</td>
<td>dud-'gro (mDzod phug: byol-song)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phang</td>
<td>gzha', ['dza']-tshon (Bil. rlangs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bri</td>
<td>pring</td>
<td>yi-dwags</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mang</td>
<td>mang = dkar, mang-tun = sha</td>
<td>sha, zan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rdzwa-ci</td>
<td>dzwan-ci</td>
<td>rdzu-'phrul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weg</td>
<td>wer-zhi</td>
<td>wag</td>
<td>skar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwi</td>
<td>wer</td>
<td>mda'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zhu</td>
<td>'og (mDzod-phug: 'jigs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zad-drung</td>
<td>'bru (Bil. drung-zad = za-ma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zli [sli]</td>
<td>zla-ri</td>
<td>zla-ba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yag</td>
<td>yag-gyad</td>
<td>g-yag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yo-ze</td>
<td>yo-se [yog-ze] = rgan-mo</td>
<td>bu-mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra</td>
<td>(ra = 'red')</td>
<td>nub (mDzod-phug: 'dra)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra</td>
<td>ra-tse</td>
<td>rna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lin</td>
<td></td>
<td>long [-ka], rlung (mDzod-phug: li =rlung)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shang-be</td>
<td>(shang = g.ya)</td>
<td>spang-g.ya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shang-mo</td>
<td>shang-ze</td>
<td>rgan-mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shang-ze</td>
<td></td>
<td>rgan-po (mDzod phug: rga-ba, rgas-ba)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shin-sbo</td>
<td>shin-thun</td>
<td>mchin-pa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shim</td>
<td>(cp. shim-phod = spos-dkar)</td>
<td>dri (mDzod-phug: dkar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shu</td>
<td>shu-nig</td>
<td>bgeggs (demons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>she-thing</td>
<td>dkar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>se-lto</th>
<th>se-to = khang</th>
<th>se-sto, sad-do [sto] = khang</th>
<th>rdzong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>seg</th>
<th>seg = dbugs, seg-ri = dbugs</th>
<th>seg-ri = sens, dbugs</th>
<th>yid (idea of so-called breath-soul?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hrangs-sti</th>
<th>hrang- ti</th>
<th>hrang-cang-shes</th>
<th>rta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hri-tsa-med</th>
<th>hri-tsa = khye' u, tsa-med = bu-mo</th>
<th>hri-tsa-med = lcam-dral</th>
<th>pho-mo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hrun</th>
<th></th>
<th>stod (Bil. 'dud; mDzod-phug: 'dus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th></th>
<th>lcang, lho (cp. i-dzam-spre = 'Dzam-bu-ling)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*   *   *

Phonetic (categories as above):

1. **dwi**  
   H. wer  
   zli (contracted from zla-ri?)  H. zla-ri

2. **bri**  
   H. phring  
   zli [sli]  H. zla-ri

6. **rdzwa**  
   H. dzwan

7b. **rgya**  
   H. skya

8. **weg**  
   H. wer  
   mDzod-phug: wag

9. **dud**  
   H. du  
   ti  
   H. ting  
   bri  
   H. phring

10. **hrangs**  
    H. hrang  
    mDzod-phug: hrang

11. **rkya**  
    H. rka  
    lkye  
    H. lke  
    mDzod-phug: lke

12. **dwang**  
    H. dang
The analysis of the Zhang-zhung language reveals in my opinion an affinity of its basic elements with the languages of the regions surrounding the origination centre of the Tibetan tribes. Therefore it belongs to an early wave of colonisation of Tibet which came from the north-east. According to the rKong-po inscription (H. Richardson, 1972, “The rKong-po Inscription”, p. 30), Lo-ngam was a Zhang-zhung prince contemporary with the Tibetan mythological king Gri-gum-btsan-po. The duel with his Tibetan opponent also took place in rKong-po, where Gri-gum held sway, and where the Tibetan tribes had initially settled in the course of their migration from the north-east. Only later was the move to the Yar-klungs valley undertaken, with the subsequent relocation of the events concerning Gri-gum (sPu-de-gung-rgyal).
Part 4

In the first three parts of this chapter I occasionally highlighted some peculiarities in the formation of numerals in Zhang-zhung, at the same time noting the elusive character of their rules. Whilst Tibetan, with which the Zhang-zhung idiom is related, possesses a consistent system of numerals, in Zhang-zhung various systems seem to be fused together. Thus for instance each of the numbers from 1 to 6 takes with it the next higher number, adding it to its own, e.g. \( \text{nga-drug} = 5 \), where \text{nga} corresponds to Tib. \text{lnga} (5), and \text{drug} to Tib. \text{drug} (6). This system ends with the number six. Of the numbers that follow, some contradict this rule by adding the preceding number as a prefix. Thus for eight we have the term \( \text{sni[s]-gyad} \) (\( \text{gyad} = \text{Tib. brgyad} = 8 \)). This peculiarity is inconsistently attested, with some reservations, for 3 (\( \text{sum-pi} \)) and 6 (\( \text{drug-snis} \)) as well. These numbers constitute a variant of the normal form for 2 (\( \text{ne-sum} \)), and for 6 (\( \text{nga-drug} \)), which we know as 5. A completely different rule is shown by the suffix \( \text{tse [se, tshe]} \). So for 7 we have \( \text{sni[s]-tse [se]} \), and for 8 \( \text{gya[d]-tse [tshe]} \), which normally takes the form \( \text{snis-gyad} \).

Finally, in parallel to this, there are also purely Tibetan constructions, when for 4, instead of the usual \( \text{bi[ng] [pi]-nga, zhi} \) is used (Tib. \text{bzhi}), which is no doubt related with Chinese \text{hsi}, archaic Chinese \text{sid} (B. Karlgren, 1923, Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese, p. 809). Conversely, \( \text{pi [bi]} = 4 \) probably relates to a western Himalayan tongue (e.g. Newāri and Bunān: \text{pi}). It is also interesting that the number 10 is \( \text{cu-se [tsa]} \) in Zhang-zhung, where \text{cu} reflects Tibetan \text{bcu} (10), whilst \( \text{se [tsa]} \) corresponds in the Na-khi language to ‘ts’ā for 10.\(^{34} \) In the Lo-lo language we have \( \text{ts’e}\(^3 \) for 10. For 1 (Zhang-zhung \text{ti[g]}), the Na-khi have ‘\text{ddü} (but the Tibetans \text{gcig}) and the Lo-
As further evidence for an origin of Zhang-zhung in the Sino-Tibetan area, I would also add the prefix *ta- [ti-, to-]* used to form verbal nouns in Zhang-zhung. It is the Chinese *t′a* and Tibetan *da*. For the diminutive *tse [ze, se]* in Zhang-zhung, the Lo-lo have *zo*. According to J.-H. Scharf the prefixes *ta-, ti-, to-* belong to the oldest linguistic heritage of mankind, and would thus represent so-called lambdacisms (lallation). We find the same prefixes, *inter alia*, in Old Canarian (*ti-* with the meaning of an article); compare also *ta* in Etruscan as a demonstrative pronoun and definite article (possibly also *dt* with a demonstrative function). The -*ta* used for noun forming is also to be found as a suffix in Etruscan and in Mongolian.

As we have seen, there is no consistent system for building numerals in Zhang-zhung. According to M. Wandruszka (Salzburg), each language is "a conglomerate of systems, system elements, system fragments, of old language remains and new language additions" which, "in the contradictory process of their formation are influenced by a variety of imponderable, heterogeneous factors". There is no other explanation for such different methods of construction, as for instance for the numeral 8, or for the contrasting forms of the numbers 3 and 6. This clearly betrays the application of completely different symbolic systems, a fact also borne out in European languages. Thus in Latin we have both *duodecentum* and *nonaginta octo* for 98, and in the French decimal system there are evident traces of an older vigesimal system (Wandruszka, *op.cit.*).

Zhang-zhung in particular is, as I demonstrated in the previous three parts of this chapter, an historically mixed object owing to its relationship with the languages of Sum-pa, Mi-nyag and Si-hia, of the Ch’iang and of the Na-khi, but also with ancient Chinese and above all with Tibetan, as evidenced by the numerous lexical correspondences. This fact is also apparent in the formation of numerals. For this reason, it would be unreasonable to look for logical connections within such a heteroge-
neous system, or to try and ascertain anomalies along the course of its development.

Bearing in mind that languages are polysystems, the remains of kindred languages in Zhang-zhung give us valuable indications as to the origination point and subsequent migrations of a primitive settlement in the area of the huge Zhang-zhung confederation. Something similar is true of the Etruscan language, if we take for instance its genitive, an archaic form of which points to Ural-Altaic connections, whereas an Anatolian and an Indo-European form give us an insight into the more recent prehistory of this people. The rapid disappearance of Etruscan is also reminiscent of the fate of the Zhang-zhung language. Probably both languages were spoken by a foreign element of the population which actually carried the culture, but was numerically insignificant. The same situation existed in the Meroitic language, spoken by a foreign ethnic minority.

However, the polymorphism of the Zhang-zhung numerals could be attributable to quite different reasons. It might also—or additionally—be due to a mixture of different dialects, the existence of which I have tried to substantiate in the present work. Even so-called “regiolects”, “sociolects”, or “technolects” might have been at work in the process of formation of this asystematic polysystem. But this is a question to which at present no satisfactory answer can be given.

Notes:


2. Nyi-ma-grags-pa, *Tibetan Žang Žung Dictionary* (sGra-yi don sdebsnang-gsal sgron-mesGra-yi don sdeb snang-gsal sgron-me), Lahore Press, Jama Masjid, Delhi-6, 1965 [1966], henceforth referred to as “the bilingual” or (Bil.) in this chapter. The work is divided into two parts, pp. 1-22 containing the Zhang-zhung Tibetan word-list with an introduction on the Zhang-zhung language by Nyi-ma-grags-pa, and pp. 23-64 containing a chronological table (*bstan-rtsis*) of the Bonpo edited by bsTan-'dzin-rnam-dag (subsequently published in English by P. Kverne, 1971, “A Chronological Table of the Bon po. The *bstan reis* of Ni ma bstan 'jin”). The spelling Shang-shung can also be found in Tibetan.
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4. This view is also supported by D.L. Snellgrove (1987) Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, p. 391: “It is not only conceivable, but by the nature of the case almost certain, that a knowledge of Buddhism, however rudimentary, would have been transmitted to the people of Zhang-zhung long before Buddhism was ever heard of in central Tibet.” See also H. Hoffmann (1967a) Symbolik der tibetischen Religionen und des Schamanismus, p. 85 (reviewed by the present writer in Tribus 17 [1967], pp. 194-195 and in Kairos 10/2 [1968], pp. 137-140). - D.L. Snellgrove (1967) The Nine Ways of Bon, p. 15.


7. See S. Hummel (1968-1969) “Bon-Ikonographisches im Linden-Museum, Stuttgart”, p. 862. For more information on the sky-cord see S. Hummel (1963a) “Das Motiv der Nabelschnur in Tibet”, pp. 572 ff. Concerning a chthonian layer in the Bon religion see S. Hummel (1968-1969) op.cit. - The celestial component in the Bon religion probably came to the fore under sPu-de-gung-rgyal (dur-Bon meant to exorcise the up-to-then dominant chthonian forces; the later svastika religion [g.yung-drung-Bon] of gShen-rab-mi-bo; the Tibetan king genetically linked to the lha, and his likely chthonian provenance still echoed in the epithet btsan). Ethnological implications are not to be dismissed out of hand (consider for instance the construction of forts, burial mounds, horse-breeding: Long-ngam’s victory). On these subjects see S. Hummel, passim, and the material in E. Haarh (1969) The Yar-lun Dynasty, Ch. 5.

8. R.B. Ekvall (1964) Religious Observances in Tibet, gives the form rabs as orally established, whereas Snellgrove (1967, op.cit., p. 14) and Hoffmann (1967a, Symbolik, p. 85), give rab. The map of Tibet in the bilingual (map 2) seems to suggest that ra equals rgya. On this map, to the north of lake Dang-ra there is a much smaller Dang-chung (see also W. Filchner, 1937, Kartenwerk der erdmagnetischen Forschungsexpedition nach Zentral-Asien 1926-1928, Teil II, sheet VI); concerning dang, compare also Chinese tang = ‘lake’. On the importance of photism in the Tibetan religious thought and in Lamaism see G. Tucci (1970) Die Religionen Tibets, pp. 80 ff.; ‘void’ = stong-pa-nyid = gsal = ‘light’, Tib. ’od-gsal, sangs. According to
the A-khrid meditation teachings (ed. by P. Kvárne, 1969, Bon-po Studies: The A Khrid System of Meditation, pp. 52 ff., 85, 87) the luminous sky is always identified with the void, where the sun of wisdom shines. It is likely that Manichaean influences are at the basis of this conception. The Bonpo A-khrid system forms part of the rDzogs-chen doctrine. The latter seems to have developed independently both in Bon and in Lamaism from a common root, under conditions of mutual exchange (cf. P. Kvárne, 1972, “Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet”, pp. 38 ff.; G. Tucci, 1958, Minor Buddhist Texts, II, p. 106). In “Some Glosses upon the Guhyasamāja” (Tucci, 1935) Tucci points out the fact that in the photism which is part of Mahāyāna Buddhism the luminous elements in the cosmic evolution and the identification of mystical knowledge with light (\'od-gsal-kyi ye-shes) are paralleled in Manichaean ideas.


12. G. Tucci (1970) Die Religionen Tibets, p. 85; [-le-] 'du = Tib. [-la]-’dā?. Ma-tri possibly refers to the “Great Mother of Space” (dByings-kyi-yum-chen-mo). Mu-ye-sa = g.yung-drung, also as a state of enlightenment. Probably mu-ye-sa (g.yung-drung) should correspond to the ma-ṇi and ma-tri (mātri), the lotus in omma-ṇi-pad-me hūn. Thus in the mDzod-phug (T. Namdak, 1966, mDzod-phug: Basic Verses and Commentary by Dran-pa-nam-mkha) for drung-mu one also finds the Tibetan equivalent rin-chen. Regarding drung compare also Tib. drungs; g.yung-drung = Skr. sanātana.

13. On the meaning of Chinese ṇ cf. also G.v.d. Gabelentz (1881) Chinesische Grammatik, pp. 177 ff., §§ 421, 422. See also Haarh (1968) op.cit., p. 30: ci “belong to, adhere to”. The expression “Anknüpfungspartikel” used by E. Haenisch (1940, Lehrgang der chinesischen Schriftsprache) should render the meaning of the particle also in Zhang-zhung.

14. On p. 39 in Haarh under the entry ye delete 2:7/2, 15/7, 20/7; under 19/2 the reading should probably be yi, and consequently the ye on p. 20 under item 2 should be deleted.

15. Concerning the affinities of Zhang-zhung with the languages of the western and eastern Himālaya see H. Hoffmann (1967b) “Zhān-żuń:
the Holy Language of the Tibetan Bon-po”. Zhang-zhung words still survive in the basin of the Dri-chu in southern Dolpo (personal communication from C. Jest, 4-4-1971).


17. My views on the eastern-Tibetan origin of the Tibetan tribes, and hence of their language, seem to be shared by D.L. Snellgrove: “…it would seem certain that the various waves of people who occupied Tibet, speaking early styles of Tibetan, came from the east, pressing ever further westward. They certainly penetrated at an early period deep into the Himalayan Range to the south, as is proved by the survival of ancient oral traditions, still intoned largely incomprehendingly by the priests of the people now usually referred to as Gurungs and Tamangs, who live mainly on the southern side of the main range almost the whole length of present-day Nepal. Is it therefore conceivable that those early Tibetan speakers did not also press westward up to the main river valley of the Tsangpo (Brahmaputra) and so reach the land of Zhang-zhung? It is also significant that Tibetan dialects are still spoken far to the west of the boundaries of modern Tibet, not only throughout Ladakh, but also in Gilgit and Baltistan, now controlled by the Pakistan Government.” (D.L. Snellgrove, 1987, Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, p. 392.)

18. P. Kværne (1972, “Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet”) believes that the process of merging of the pre-Buddhist religion with Buddhist, sometimes Śāivite traditions, took place in the area of Zhang-zhung around the 8th century and independently of the Buddhist developments in Central Tibet. This process continued in the following centuries across all of Tibet by means of plagiarism and also of scholarly elaboration.
19. See D.C. Graham (1958) *The Customs and Religion of the Ch‘iang*, pp. 8 ff. - In my “Die Bedeutung der Na-khi für die Erforschung der tibetischen Kultur” (Hummel 1960), p. 308, I have set the presence of the Ch‘iang in the Kuke-noor region and in A-mdo around 2000 B.C., and the beginning of a southward migration of the Miao (akin to the Ch‘iang), possibly in connection with the arrival of ox-breeders from the Eurasian steppe-belt, at the close of the 3rd century. Another possible explanation for this movement of people is offered by the so-called Pontic Migration, the last offshoots of which reached the Kuke-noor area before the middle of the 1st century B.C. The presence of the Ch‘iang (which the Chinese believe to be descendents of the Miao) in this region would then have to be fixed accordingly. By and large, this would be in agreement with the annals of the Han period. Concerning the Indo-European influences in Tibet see M. Walter and C.I. Beckwith (1997) “Some Indo-European Elements in Early Tibetan Culture”.

20. There is doubtless an identity between Sham-po-lha-rtse and the holy mountain of the gods Yar-lha [la]-sham-po, also Sham-po[-la], on which the ancient Tibetan kings descended on earth, whereas, as Haarh demonstrated (Haarh, 1969, *The Yar-luñ Dynasty*, p. 273), the mountain Rol-pa’i-rtse would correspond to the Sumeru. Sham-po is the name of Yar-lha. The castle of the first legendary king is called Sham-po[-dgu-brtsegs] or Sham-bu-rtse-dgu.

21. Concerning sog-pa’i-dbyibs see Snellgrove (1967) *op.cit.*, plate XX: lhö-gling according to the Bon view.


23. About the palaces of the thirty-three Bon gods see Snellgrove (1967) *op.cit.*, plate XXI: dpag-bsam-shing.


26. Perhaps this could also explain la, lu, le for the dative and allative case, as well as tsa, tsu, tse for Tibetan nyid and ldan.

27. In “La langue žan-žuñ du bon organisé” (R.A. Stein, 1971, which was not available to me at the time of writing), Prof. Stein suspects that the Zhang-zhung bilinguals could have been forged fairly late by the Bonpos utilising both Tibetan and original words of the language spoken in the Zhang-zhung area. This would also explain the different constructions, especially the compounds and the errors: cp. slas-’dzwa for Tib. sa-ya (one million), where Tib. sa, which does not mean ‘earth’ in this case, is expressed by slas (= ‘earth’). This theory, based on some factual evidence, is intriguing but not necessarily convincing. Another explanation could be that, by the time the bilinguals were written, a certain degree of compenetration with Tibetan had already taken place, and the conditions for the formation of certain terms in the native language were no longer there, which would explain the errors (for instance slas in slas-’dzwa as ‘dust’ in forming the term for ‘one million’ by analogy with sa = ‘earth’ as a misunderstood Tibetan word).

28. The prefix ta- (Haarh, 1968, p. 23) I rather believe to be cognate with Tib. da. Anyway, connections of the prefix ti- with the prefixed t’- in the Na-khi language are equally possible.


30. Compare also the examples in Karlgren (1923) Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese (shortened K) in Part 1 of this chapter:

tal (Tib. lcags): K 862 t’iet = ‘iron’.
bteg (Tib. rgyab, rgyob): K 902 dêu [d’eg] = ‘to throw’ (Tib.gtor).
rbad (Tib. gcod): K 198 dz’iwa[d]t] = ‘to cut’.

31. For instance, keng [khon]-dur = keng-dur, khon-dur; gnas[-pa] = gnas, gnas-pa; pa’i = pa, pa’i.

32. Interesting in the mDzod-phug is sad-khri; cf. Part 1 of this chapter. Compare also the remarks about khri in the ancient Tibetan royal
names (Mu-khri, Nya-khri, see in particular Chapter 5, p. 103). Regarding the particle *ni* (see Parts 1 and 2) and especially the similarity of *ni* and *ci*, I would like to draw attention to the formation of the genitive through *-ni* in Manchu and in some Tungus dialects (cf. B. Laufer, 1901b, "Zur Entstehung des Genitivs der altaischen Sprachen": the genitive suffix *-ni* as an originally pronominal affix). For more details see S. Hummel (1995b) *Die meroitische Sprache II*, pp. 39-42 (the particle *-ni* [-in, *-n*] in Meroitic). The Chinese particle *chih* (之), in some respects similar to *ci*, also has, *inter alia*, a pronominal and genitive meaning. The particle *ni* in Zhang-zhung could certainly have a very ancient origin, and not be a later loan from Tibetan as I was formerly inclined to believe. This, however, does not rule out the possibility that it may also be cognate with Tibetan *ni*. The fact that Laufer (1901b, *op. cit.*) attributes the same pronominal origin to the Mongolian genitive suffix *-ni* is reminiscent of the Etruscan genitive suffix *-in*, homophonous with the personal pronoun (neutre) 3rd person, although we should not forget that Mongolian *-in* is considered the basis for the personal pronoun 3rd person. In my review of Laufer’s *Kleinere Schriften* (ed. by H. Walravens, see Hummel, 1977) I mentioned a number of Altaic and especially Mongolian parallels with Etruscan to which the reader is referred. Interesting in the Na-khi language is also the absence of flection; the genitive (also expressing possession) is however rendered by ²*nnü* (or also ²*ggô*). Whilst the genitive *ci* in Zhang-zhung suggests a relationship with Chinese, *ni* forms part of the same complex to which belong the Tungusic and Altaic languages. A similar situation exists in Etruscan, where the genitives reflect the prehistorical period and in which the suffix *-l* comes from Asia Minor, *-n* from Altaic, and *-s* from Indo-European.


34. Further correspondences with Tibetan are constituted by the Na-khi numerals 2, 3, 9, and 1000, while 5 and 7 have Chinese parallels.

35. Personal communication, 7-7-1980.


Hypothesen, Modell und Realität”. Scharf believes the tonal systems to have originated from a loss of final sound.

In some previous publications dealing with the decipherment of the Zhang-zhung language I expressed the view that at least the upper strata of the populations anciently living in this confederation—stretching from the Küke-noor across the Byang-thang right up to western Tibet—were of Tibetan-related stock. If true, this fact should still be traceable in the language that, carried by the ruling class, became the classical language of the Bon religion.¹

Recent linguistic research makes much of the close ties of Zhang-zhung with the languages of the north-western Himalaya. Whilst it is undeniable that a linguistic comparison reveals certain affinities in this respect, I have tried, in contrast to this approach, to turn attention to the idioms of the north-eastern Tibetan border provinces. As a result, some strikingly ancient linguistic remains have come to light in the Zhang-zhung language, which point to archaic Chinese (as Karlgren has tried to reconstruct)² and to the languages of Si-hia / Mi-nyag and of the Lo-lo and Mo-so or Na-khi. We know that the Na-khi originally inhabited the north-eastern Tibetan borderlands, right up to southern Nan-shan and to the upper course of the Wei-ho, a fact that explains the close relationship of all these languages, while the Lo-lo, Na-khi and Mo-so are nowadays to be found in the south-western areas of Sino-Tibetan population. Also
the Ch’iang, the Hor-pa and the A-mdo dialects provide useful comparative material (see Table on p.76). It is precisely on these linguistic remains that we should concentrate, rather than on the affinities with the north-western Himalayan tongues. The latter similarities are easily accounted for by the proximity of the former Zhang-zhung confederation, after it became consolidated in western Tibet, above all in Mar-yul, Gu-ge and Purangs, and particularly in the central region around the Kailāsa, before it was annexed by the central Tibetan monarchy in the 8th century, or perhaps even in the 7th century, if we lend credence to a different tradition (according to the Zhang-zhung snyan-rgyud as a result of treason).

In the following pages I have drawn up a preliminary list of Zhang-zhung words which to a large extent find an equivalent in archaic Chinese, in the languages of Si-hia and Mi-nyag, of the Lo-lo, Mo-so and Ch’iang. Affinities of the Zhang-zhung language with an [Ural-]Altaic substratum can also be identified. Thus we have for instance:

1. The peculiar formation of numerals in Sumerian, Egyptian and old Canarian.
2. The prefix a- as in Sumerian -a, -e as nominal particle: cp. the prefix a- as article and demonstrative in old Canarian.
3. The prefix ta-, probably as definite article, as in old Canarian -ta, -tu, -to (definite article, demonstrative, nominal particle) Mong. -ta [as lta, mta] (nominative particle -l, -m, with -ta), Etruscan -ta (definite article, nominal particle). Prefixes can turn into suffixes maintaining the same meaning, like Canarian ta- to -ta-.
5. The suffix -to (see Table) as nominative particle has old Canarian and Basque parallels (-te).
6. The genitive particle ni (see Table), Etr. in, old Canarian -n, -en, Mong. -in (connected with the personal pronoun for
the 3rd person, cp. Sumerian -ne, -ni, Arabic -in also dative and ablative as in Etruscan, old Egyptian -n). See also S. Hummel (1988a) "Einige Notizen zum uralaltaischen Substrat im Altkanarischen und im Etruskischen als Beitrag zur linguistischen Neolith-Anthropologie Eurasiosaharaniens", op.cit., p. 54, footnote 2.

7. For the dative-terminative particle la we have Sumerian -ra, -re, -ri, Basque -ra (Canarian for building the possessive, e.g. i = ‘you’, ire = ‘your’); la is also ablative in Etruscan and old Canarian (-ra), Tib. -ru.

8. For ta- as collective noun (see Table) we have Sumerian -da (= ‘all’ = gu, Sum. = gu).

To the lexical examples given for the [Ural-]Altaic substratum (Hummel, 1988a, “Einige Notizen...”, op.cit.) and to the probably pseudo-Mediterranean roots gl, gr, kr, belonging to the Ural-Altaic substratum, we could add Sumerian kurkur (‘circle’) and the word for ‘dog’, Zhang-zhung ku[-ra], Chin. kou, Na-khi ʔk’ö, Canarian cuna, Greek κύων, Lat. canis. Other comparisons between Sumerian/Canarian and Zhang-zhung could be for instance Sumerian lilū = Zhang-zhung li (‘wind’, Sum. lil = ‘air’); Sumerian tag = Zhang-zhung bteg (‘to throw’); Sumerian ša = Zhang-zhung she (‘heart’); Sumerian ka = Zhang-zhung khag (Tib. kha = ‘mouth’); Sumerian bad (‘to open’) = Zhang-zhung rbad (Tib. gcod = ‘to cut up, tear apart’); Sumerian zu (‘knowing’), šan (‘wise’) = Zhang-zhung shen (‘to know’); Sumerian ag (‘give orders’) = Zhang-zhung ag (‘to speak’, Tib. ngag); Canarian guaire = Zhang-zhung wer (‘ruler’). The [Ural-]Altaic substratum can also throw light on the formation of Mongolian (Hummel, 1988a, “Einige Notizen...”, op.cit., p. 54, footnotes 1 and 2): for zla (= Zhang-zhung ‘moon’) we have Mong. sara, Canarian sel; for Sumerian dingir (‘sky, god’), Mong. tengri; for Canarian era (‘man, hero’), Mong. ere.
An origin of Zhang-zhung in the north-eastern border regions populated by Sino-Tibetan racial types is also suggested by the use of the word *mu* (= ‘sky’), which in the Tibetan texts has become a typical indicator of the religion of Zhang-zhung, and which in the form *rmu, dmu, smu*, provides a more specific term for Zhang-zhung; *rmu* is also used to indicate the Mo-so or the Na-khi, who in ancient times populated these territories. The Ch’iang instead call themselves *rma, rme, rmi*. In the Si-hia language *rme* means ‘man’ or ‘tribe’. There seems to be a connection in Zhang-zhung between *rmu, rma, rme* and *rmi* (= ‘man’) on the one side and *dmu, mu, rmu* (= ‘sky’; Ch’iang: *mu, ma*; Si-hia: *mo*) on the other, taking into account the origin myths and the lineages of the divine ancestors (*mu, dmu, rmu*) in Mi-nyag, which used to be a part of Si-hia located around the Küke-noor (see footnote 1).

The legend narrating the extinction of an essentially chthonian religion at the time of king Gri-gum-btsan-po through the semi-legendary organiser of the Bon religion, gShen-rab-mi-bo, who clearly belonged to the upper class of Zhang-zhung,betrays the acceptance of celestial beliefs, typical of the region we surmise to be at the source of the Zhang-zhung culture, and which in the Bon religion are still coupled with an evident photism (see footnote 3). This new religion is styled *g.yung-drung* Bon, and in the Zhang-zhung language *g.yung* corresponds to *mu*, whereas *drung* (= *sangs*, Tib. *gsal*) means ‘clear, light’ (see Chapter 1, p. 4).

For what concerns Si-hia, the people of this kingdom—finally constituted around 1032 in the region to the north of the Küke-noor—are known as Tang-hsiang or T’o-pa or under the Mongol name Tangg’ut. They belong to the Tibetan family and their language, part of the Tibeto-Burman group, features a copious literature, since 1037 even with its own script, similar to Chinese. This state was then annihilated as early as 1227, after the conquest of the capital Ning-hia by Ginggis Khan.
The stage of development of the old Chinese language used in the comparison is according to Karlgren (*op.cit.*, = K) that of the mid-1st century A.D. However, the words I selected are attested as early as c. 200 A.D. in the form listed here. The immigration of a social class carrying this state organisation, its culture and its literary language into central and western Tibet would have to be set at this point in time. There are no indications whatsoever that this migration produced a culturally significant ethnogeny through a contact with an ethnically different substratum in the western and southern border regions. Rather, we can postulate a relatively sparse Tibetan settlement—which antedated this migration but was of related ethnic stock—for most of the areas embraced by this growing confederation, except for the outlying regions to the south-west.

Assuming that the various dialects that can be identified within the literature of Zhang-zhung originated in the area occupied by the new confederation, and hence were not already used by the various groups that arrived within the stream of the migration, the migration itself must have taken place at a relatively early point in time. This view is also supported by linguistic elements of southern and western Himalayan origin (see footnote 3) which were at work in the formation of the distinctive idiom of the literary language of Zhang-zhung, as long as we are prepared to consider this process as fully achieved by about the 6th century.

A confirmation of my belief about the origin of the primary elements of the Zhang-zhung language is offered, in my view, by a statement in the *Deb-gter bsdzongs* (sic) -damar (MS B.M. Or. 6751), according to which Lo-ngam was a Zhang-zhung prince. He would then have been the leader of a group which, from the original confederation of tribes that set out from north-eastern Tibet heading west, took a south-western route and came into clash with the Tibetans, defeating their prince Gri-gum-btsan-po. As Richardson demonstrated, and as we can still evince
from the Bon tradition, this battle took place in rKong-po, which
was then ruled by Gri-gum. Only later would this event have
been moved to Yar-lung (Yar-klungs), in conjunction with the
relocation of the centre of the Tibetan power to southern Ti-
bet. We did mention Gri-gum in connection with a change in
the religious ideas of his time.

Finally, there is a curious statement in the bKa’-g DAMS-pa
chos-bu-chos (Stein, 1961, op.cit.) about a legendary king of
China-Zhang-zhung (rgya-nag zhang-zhung rgyal-po). This
might be a reminiscence of the ancient origin of Zhang-zhung
in the Chinese borderlands. Also, Zhang-zhung is mentioned
together with the eastern Tibetan tribes ‘A-zha (Küke-noor re-
gion), iDong (= Mi-nyag) and gTong [sTong] (= Sum-pa) (Stein,
1951, op.cit., pp. 252 ff.). Considering the close ties it had with
certain ethnic groups, Zhang-zhung might have been located
near the rMa-chen-spom-ra (A-mdo chos-’byung, Stein, 1961,
op.cit., pp. 28 and 31). Not completely clear is the identifica-
tion of Yang-T’ung ( 羊同 ) in the T’ang Annals, where men-
tion is made of a Greater and Lesser Yang-T’ung. Stein be-
lieves it could correspond to the region of the Zhang-zhung
confederation. In his mKhas-pa’i dga’-ston, dPa’-bo gtsug-
lag ’phreng-ba mentions an Upper and a Lower Zhang-zhung.
According to Tucci, the latter could correspond to Lesser Yang-
T’ung, thus representing the eastern part of Zhang-zhung, bor-
dering on China, which was subjugated by the Chinese in the
7th century, whereas the central and western regions were cap-
tured by the Tibetans in the 7th (8th) century. Remarkable is
above all the fact that the Chinese use Yang-T’ung to indicate a
population akin to the Ch’iang and settled in their vicinity with
which they had clashes ever since the Han period. If the same
name is used for Zhang-zhung or at least for a part of it, one
could reasonably argue that it might also indicate the core of
Zhang-zhung in the eastern Tibetan border province. We can-
not further debate the question of the identification of Yang-
T’ung here, but it seems at any rate certain that the Chinese believe Zhang-zhung to have been originally their frontier region.\textsuperscript{12}

The culture, and above all the religion of Zhang-zhung, is in any case permeated with ideas which are also characteristic of other tribes settled in the area around Si-hia, Mi-nyag, and adjoining regions. These ideas are very ancient and too deeply rooted in this culture, in some cases too specific, like for instance \textit{mu} (Tib. \textit{nam-mkha’}), to have only been taken up at a late stage from a population that was moving across on its way from western Tibet towards the north-east. If we are prepared to accept an origin of the Zhang-zhung confederation in eastern Tibet, then we should also look for the basic elements of its language in the form of a substratum in the same area.\textsuperscript{13} Just as for instance old Canarian came to be classified as part of a Mediterranean system owing to an overlay of Proto-Berber and later Berber elements, notwithstanding the fact that it belongs to the old Ural-Altaic languages, by the same token the language of Zhang-zhung cannot be considered western Tibetan. Here too we are dealing with later accessions, in this case from the regions of the Indian Himalaya.\textsuperscript{14}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zhang-zhung</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
<th>Archaic Chinese</th>
<th>Si-hia</th>
<th>Lo-lo</th>
<th>Na-khi</th>
<th>Ch’iang and others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘dog’</td>
<td>khyi</td>
<td>kou</td>
<td>k‘ü</td>
<td>k‘t</td>
<td>k‘ö</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘depth’</td>
<td>kha-gting</td>
<td>K315: keng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘bottom’, e.g. of a lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>(‘border’); keng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(‘chasm’, modern Chinese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to come out, to wash’</td>
<td>bskyed</td>
<td>K312: ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(‘root’); ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(‘root’, modern Chinese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘tooth’</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7’khu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘mouth’</td>
<td>kha</td>
<td>K79: k’ey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to sing’, muttering or in</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7‘gkyil’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘gu = ‘to meditate’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘way’</td>
<td>lam</td>
<td>K411: luoy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7’lu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(‘way, on the way’); lu (‘way’, modern Chinese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘to travel’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘iron’</td>
<td>lcags</td>
<td>K862: t’ied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T’ieh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(modern Chinese)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ti[ng]</strong> ('water, green')</td>
<td><strong>chu</strong> ('water, green = sngo) [ljang]</td>
<td>**K114: ts'ieng ch'ing ('green', modern Chinese)</td>
<td><strong>Tib-Burm. ti, t'i ('water')</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miao: de ('water')</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tig</strong> ('one')</td>
<td>gcig</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bteg</strong> ('to throw')</td>
<td>rgyab, rgyob</td>
<td><strong>K902: d'eu, d'ey</strong></td>
<td><strong>de'</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miao: nd'</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dang[-ra] ('lake')</strong></td>
<td>[rgya-]mtsho</td>
<td><strong>K973: d'äng</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ni</strong> ('man')</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td><strong>ni'</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ni, ne ('two')</strong></td>
<td>gnyis</td>
<td><strong>ni'</strong></td>
<td><strong>'nyi</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hor-pa: ne</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ni[-dud] (meaning of ni?) ('darkness, stupid')</strong></td>
<td>gti-mug</td>
<td><strong>K659: ni ('dirty')</strong></td>
<td><strong>nyi ('mean, despicable')</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>snis</strong> ('seven')</td>
<td>bdun</td>
<td><strong>K168: dz'iwäd[t]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bing &lt; bi-nga (cf. Hummel, 1988a, op.cit.)</strong></td>
<td>bzhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>rbad</strong> ('to cut')</td>
<td>gcod</td>
<td><strong>K168: dz'iwäd[t]</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>'bä</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-mung ('demonesses')</td>
<td>ma-mo</td>
<td>K612: mung (Tib. rmong = 'dark')</td>
<td>3mung [-1]ts'u('demon')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mung ('black')</td>
<td>nag</td>
<td>mung ('white')</td>
<td>2mung('grey')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mang[-wer] ('whitish')</td>
<td>skya[-ldan]</td>
<td>mang ('white')</td>
<td>2mung('grey')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ming[-ni] ('not to be')</td>
<td>med-khams</td>
<td>ming ('impenetrable, stupid', 'low, small')</td>
<td>1mueng ('low')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu, dmu ('sky')</td>
<td>nam-mkha' (in Tib. Bon: dmu-skas, dmu-thag)</td>
<td>mo Mi-nyag: mu</td>
<td>2mian[g] Mo-so: mu, mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mur ('snake')</td>
<td>sbrul</td>
<td>mru</td>
<td>Ch’iang: mu, mo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gyarong: mu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts'a ('man in: tsa-med = bu-med = 'not man' = 'woman')</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>ndzu, tsu</td>
<td>1ts'o Miao: tsi, tsu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts'a ('fish')</td>
<td>nya</td>
<td>zö (Mi-nyag)</td>
<td>Mo-so: dzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tse[-rtse] ('ear' in: tse-shan, tse-swe, rtse-ze = 'antelope')</td>
<td>rna</td>
<td>K11: nzi</td>
<td>2hā'-dsu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguor</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>(tiger)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Tibetan</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>(wind)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monguor and literary Tibetan</td>
<td>zangs-dmar</td>
<td>zangs</td>
<td>(iron)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1580</td>
<td>d'ung</td>
<td>le (Mi-nyag: le, lo: lo)</td>
<td>(soul)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shu</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>(to know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1580. 2p.</td>
<td>sieng</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>(to breathe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1580. 2p.</td>
<td>wu-tsuj</td>
<td>lo2, li2</td>
<td>(also Tine-Bum: g-lliy se')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1580. 2p.</td>
<td>diien</td>
<td>siek</td>
<td>(soul)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K868</td>
<td>diien</td>
<td>sie</td>
<td>(to know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibe-Burn.</td>
<td>shan</td>
<td>snying-shes-pa</td>
<td>, in Tib. Bon in gShen-rab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibe-Burn.</td>
<td>sail</td>
<td>dbugs</td>
<td>(soul)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibe-Burn.</td>
<td>saw</td>
<td>shi</td>
<td>(to know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: sei</td>
<td>shui-lo</td>
<td>gShen-rab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: sher</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>shen</td>
<td>(psyche)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: le</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>gShe-n, shin</td>
<td>(to know, psyche)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: lo</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>(god)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K1580. 2p.</td>
<td>g-lliy</td>
<td>se'</td>
<td>(to know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: lo</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>(god)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: sei</td>
<td>shui-lo</td>
<td>gShen-rab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: sher</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>gShe-n, shin</td>
<td>(to know, psyche)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: le</td>
<td>she</td>
<td>gShe-n, shin</td>
<td>(to know, psyche)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang: lo</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>li</td>
<td>(god)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Perhaps the old word for iron, Tib. = 'copper'.
- Monguor and literary Tibetan: copper = zangs-dmar.
| slas (‘earth’) | sa | li, le, lo | Tib-Burm. mliy | ʰlū | Ch’iang: xle  
Miao: la |
|----------------|-----|------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|
| hrang (‘horse’) | rta | rie, xre, ring[-lo] | Tib-Burm. [s-]rang | Mo-so: hrang | Ch’iang: ru  
Hor-pa: rhi  
Miao: h[r]eng |

Some particles are also interesting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-gu (terminative)</th>
<th>tu, du, ru, su</th>
<th>ʰk’ō</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ci (genitive. Used as in Chinese. The genitive particle ni belongs instead to an Ural-Altaic substratum, like prefix ti- for noun forming). F.W. Thomas, 1933, “The Žań-žuń Language”, surmises that the syllable -ga could be a genitive too (adjectival). It would thus correspond to ’ggō in Nakhí. | kyi, gyi | chih (之)  
Pre-classic for genitive also ch‘i (其) | dyi’ |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-ce, -se, -ze (diminutive)</th>
<th>bu, 'u, [gu, nu, ngu, ru, lu]</th>
<th>tzu (modern Chinese)</th>
<th>zo⁴</th>
<th>²zo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ta- (collective)</td>
<td>gcig-tu, thams-cad etc.</td>
<td>t'a (modern Chinese)</td>
<td>ta’h-o⁴</td>
<td>²dta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-to (nominative particle)</td>
<td>pa, ba, po</td>
<td>t'ou (modern Chinese)</td>
<td>du³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsa, -tsu, -tse, -ze, -se (status)</td>
<td>pa, nyid, ldan, can, bcas-pa</td>
<td>chih (modern Chinese)</td>
<td>dzo³</td>
<td>²dzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>za (locative, used besides na; na as in Tibetan)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>tsai (modern Chinese)</td>
<td>dzö[-bo⁴]</td>
<td>²zä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ya ('so being', present and participle perfect); with verbs</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>yeh (modern Chinese)</td>
<td>ya⁴</td>
<td>Mo-so: ya ('so being', present and participle perfect) Na-khi: ²wiia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lo (used to express characteristics from verbs)</td>
<td>(auxiliary, participle, gerund)</td>
<td></td>
<td>lu⁴</td>
<td>²lo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The superscribed numbers prefixed to the Na-khi words indicate the tone, in accordance with the system used by J.F. Rock (1963-1972). A 'Na-khi-English Encyclopedic Dictionary. To the same purpose are the superscribed numbers affixed to Lo-lo words, as used by A. Liétard (1912) “Vocabulaire Français—Lo-lo, dialecte A-hi”.**
**Notes:**

* This article was originally published, without the author’s corrections, in *The Journal of the Tibet Society*, vol. 6, Bloomington 1983, pp. 3-16, with the title “Der Ursprung der Sprache von Zhang-Zhung”.


Róna-Tas (1966) *Tibeto-Mongolica*. - P.K. Benedict (1972) *Sino-Tibetan*. - S. Hummel (1988a) "Einige Notizen zum uralaltaisichen Substrat im Altkanarischen und im Etruskischen als Beitrag zur linguistischen Neolith-Anthropologie Eurasiosaharaniens": there, on p. 56 footnote 2, add to zalag = 'shine': Tib. zil ['gloss']. Prof. Pfiffig informed me (personal communication, 29-5-88) that he would now also include the title zila₇, zilac, zilᵽ, understood as 'praetor', and translate it as 'Highness'. As to the languages and dialects of the western Himalaya (Haarh, 1968, *op.cit.*, pp. 24 ff.), see also M. Hermanns (1954) *The Indo-Tibetans*, pp. 130 ff.: a movement of Mongoloid people along the southern slopes of the Himalaya as far as Punjab. Words like for instance those for 'dog', 'horse', 'iron', and 'water' (see Table) in the old languages of Zhang-zhung, Si-hia and Mi-nyag, in old Chinese and in the languages of the Lo-lo, Na-khi, Mo-so, Ch'iang etc. cannot derive from western Himalayan languages despite the correspondences, since there was no sufficiently early contact between East and West. The point of origin lies without doubt in the Sino-Tibetan region. - J.F. Rock (1963-1972) *A 'Nækhi-English Encyclopedic Dictionary*, vol. I. - S. Hummel, works cited in footnote 1 above.

4. An interesting comparison can be made between the form of numerals in Zhang-zhung and in Sumerian, in which the suffix -kam is added to a numeral to form an ordinal number. According to Deimel (1939) *Šumerische Grammatik*, p. 120, this suffix means something like "whole, complete". The same idea is clearly at the basis of the peculiar form ordinal numbers take in Zhang-zhung, for which no parallel exists in central and east Asia, and where the next higher number is added to a number to indicate that it is complete (e.g. bing [4]-nga [5], 'fourth'). Traces of this peculiar system have been preserved in Old Canarian, where 9 (altamorawa) is built from 10 (morawa) and alta ('bordering on').


6. E. Haarh (1969) *The Yar-lun Dynasty*, pp. 117 ff. The origin of the word for Bon (Zhang-zhung gyer) is also interesting. According to
In the previous chapter I tried to determine the geographical position of the original nucleus of this confederation, that later developed into a wide country extending across the northern Tibetan Byang-thang as far as western Tibet, and across rKong-po into what was later to become the core region of 'Ol-mo-lung-ring, around the Kailāsa.¹ I located this original nucleus in the regions of Si-hia and Mi-nyag, near the rMa-chen-spom-ra, an area close to north-eastern Tibet. To support this thesis I could also produce—from the languages of Si-hia, Mi-nyag, of the Lo-lo, Na-khi (Mo-so) and Ch’iang—a large number of lexical correspondences with words and grammatical particles of the Zhang-zhung language. The original stock of Zhang-zhung, the holy language of the Tibetan Bon religion with numerous equivalents in the most significant religious terms, clearly seemed to be constituted by a Proto-Altaic substratum.²

Here I would like to supplement the numerous word correspondences I presented in the previous chapters with some interesting and striking peculiarities of the languages of Si-hia, and also of the Lo-lo and Na-khi (Mo-so) which, oddly enough, also crop up in Zhang-zhung.³ They no doubt constitute a further important indication as to the area where this as yet not fully decoded language originated. Thus for instance the Tibetan initial m is replaced by n in Zhang-zhung, certain word
this text the Bon religion sparked off in the original region of Zhang-zhung. It then developed in the later core land around 'Ol-mo-lung-rings under Indian and western Asiatic influence. The chronological setting of gShen-rab-mi-bo in the time of Gri-gum-btsan-po is also attested in the Deb-ther dmar-po (fol. 10b-11a), according to which gShen-rab was active under Gri-gum’s successor (see also T.V. Wylie, 1963, “O-lde-spu-rgyal and the Introduction of Bon to Tibet”). The fact that, according to the gZer-mig (fol. 69a ff.), gShen-rab on his way to Tibet crossed the border between Tibet and sTag-gzig is no positive evidence that he came from Persia (Iran), for sTag-gzig (Bon tradition: rTag-gzigs) included the core territory of Zhang-zhung, and not just regions of western Tibet or to the west of it (Iran); cf. Nyi-ma-grags-pa (1965 [1966]) Tibetan Žang Žung Dictionary, maps (see pp. 24-25 ). - Khyung-trul-jigme-namkhai-dorje (1966) Lexicon of Archaic Terms, p. 61: rtag-gzigs 'ol-mo-gling de rtag-par bde. Also, mu-cho in Mu-cho-ldem-drug (gShen-rab’s successor) is not linked with Sogdian möžaγ (Hoffmann) but it is a Zhang-zhung term (cho = rabs = ‘family, provenance’, as opposed to Mi-cho = Mi-rabs).


13. Regarding the westward expansion of Zhang-zhung starting from north-eastern Tibet and the setting up in western Tibet of originally north-eastern Tibetan settlements in connection with this westward drift, see also Kun Chang (1960) “On Zhang Zhung”. On the east-to-west transmission of place-names one should also note the term rMu, used in eastern Tibet for lJang and in western Tibet for the area around 'Ol-mo-lung-ring[s] (see R.A. Stein, 1942, “Notes d’étymologie tibétaine”).

In the previous chapter I tried to determine the geographical position of the original nucleus of this confederation, that later developed into a wide country extending across the northern Tibetan Byang-thang as far as western Tibet, and across rKong-po into what was later to become the core region of ’Ol-mo-lung-ring, around the Kailasa. I located this original nucleus in the regions of Si-hia and Mi-nyag, near the rMa-chen-spom-ra, an area close to north-eastern Tibet. To support this thesis I could also produce—from the languages of Si-hia, Mi-nyag, of the Lo-lo, Na-khi (Mo-so) and Ch’iang—a large number of lexical correspondences with words and grammatical particles of the Zhang-zhung language. The original stock of Zhang-zhung, the holy language of the Tibetan Bon religion with numerous equivalents in the most significant religious terms, clearly seemed to be constituted by a Proto-Altaic substratum.

Here I would like to supplement the numerous word correspondences I presented in the previous chapters with some interesting and striking peculiarities of the languages of Si-hia, and also of the Lo-lo and Na-khi (Mo-so) which, oddly enough, also crop up in Zhang-zhung. They no doubt constitute a further important indication as to the area where this as yet not fully decoded language originated. Thus for instance the Tibetan initial $m$ is replaced by $n$ in Zhang-zhung, certain word
endings present in Tibetan are dropped, and various vocals change.

I. Change of initial \(m\) to \(n\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(m)- (Tib.)</th>
<th>(n)- (ZhZh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. \(mi = 'man'\) | \(ni = 'man'\) | Na-khi ‘nyi = ‘male’  
Hruso \(ni[-na]\)  
Tib. \(ni\) (A-mdo dialect)  
Here I must highlight the kinship of the languages around the original area of Zhang-zhung. For Tib. mig (‘eye’) the Na-khi have ‘niu, the Lo-lo nye’, the Hruso \(ni-na\).
| 2. \(ming = 'name'\) | \(ning = 'name'\) | This word is missing in Na-khi, where Chinese \(ming\) (in the form ‘mi) has been adopted instead.  
| 3. \(ming = 'brother'\) | \(ning = 'brother'\) | Lo-lo \(ni^4 [-k'ye^3]\)  
Si-hia \(ning\) (?)  
| 4. \(mu = 'border'\) | \(nu = 'border'\) |  
| 5. \(mug\) (in \([gti-]\)  
\(mug = 'mental disorder'\) | \([ni-]nung\) | Na-khi \(2nung\)  
Lo-lo \(ne^3 = 'mad'\)  
| 6. \(me = 'fire'\) | \(ne = 'fire'\) | Conversely, the languages of the western Himalaya, which until now have been considered the closest relatives of Zhang-zhung (e.g. Newāri, Pahri, Tinān, Bunān and Almora dialects), have \(me, mai,\) and \(mi\); but Daflā and Hruso have \(ni\) and \(nyi\).  
| 7. \(me[-long] = 'mirror'\) | \(ne[-ra] = 'mirror'\) |
II. The Tibetan finals *g, l, s* are usually dropped in Zhang-zhung.\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Tib. -(g)</th>
<th>ZhZh -</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *gag, ’gag = ‘to stop’* | *ga* | *Na-khi ‘\(k'o\) = ‘to perish’*  
| *ngogs = ‘to cause damage’ (also II, 3)* | *sngo = ‘malevolent’* | *Na-khi ‘\(ngu\) = ‘disease’*  
| *’jig = ‘to destroy’* | *ji* | *Na-khi ‘\(dschi\) = ‘to tyrannise’*  
| *phrag (for cardinal numbers)* | *pra (rare)* |  
| *chags = ‘to hang onto, love’* | *cog →* | *cu (III, 2), Na-khi ‘\(dsu\) = ‘love each other, unite’*  
| *lug = ‘sheep’* | *lu* | *Lo-lo ‘\(djo\) = ‘to love’*  
| *rig = ‘to know’* | *ri* | *Na-khi ‘\(l\)ü*  
| *shug (= Zhang-zhung!)* | *shu = ‘reason for existence’* | *Na-khi ‘\(shu\)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Tib. -(l)</th>
<th>ZhZh -</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *bsngal = ‘exhausted’* | *snga* | *Na-khi ‘\(nga\)*  
| *’bral = ‘separated from’* | *pra* |  
| *’khrul = ‘illusion’* | *khru* |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Tib. -(s)</th>
<th>ZhZh -</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *khams = ‘region, area’* | *gam* | *Lo-lo -k’\(a\) (suffix for localities)*  
| *myogs = ‘fast’* | *yug* | *Na-khi ‘\(gyu\)*  
| *grags = ‘reputation’ (II, 1)* | *kra* |  
| *sgrogs = ‘to announce’* | *grag* |  
| *ngogs (II, 1)* | *sngo* | *Na-khi ‘\(ngu\)*  
| *rngams = ‘splendid’* | *rngim (III, 1)* | *Na-khi ‘\(ng\)\(a\)*  

---

\(^5\) For more information on Tibetan finals, see the text on pages 89 and 11.
In Si-hia, according to Laufer (op.cit.), the absence of these Tibetan finals is typical, for instance lag - la (hand), lug - lo (sheep), phag - wo (pig), nas - na (corn), dbus - wu (centre), lus - lu (body), dngul - ngo (silver).

III. Vocal changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Tib.: a</th>
<th>ZhZh: i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rgyan = ‘distinction, allotment, fate’</td>
<td>gyin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rngams (cf. II, 3)</td>
<td>rngi[m]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**New Material on the Language of Zhang-zhung**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>changes</strong> = ‘bound, binding’</th>
<th><strong>ci</strong></th>
<th><strong>Na-khi</strong> 'ch'i = ‘bound’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'char' = ‘to appear’</td>
<td><strong>khir</strong> = ‘to appear’</td>
<td><strong>Na-khi</strong> 'khi = ‘to originate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dag</strong> = ‘really’</td>
<td><strong>tag, ta; tig, ti</strong></td>
<td><strong>Na-khi</strong> 'd'a (II, 1) Si-hia <strong>do</strong> = ‘real’ (III, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dran</strong> = ‘to remember’</td>
<td><strong>drin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nang</strong> = ‘the inside’</td>
<td><strong>[nu-]nig</strong></td>
<td><strong>Na-khi</strong> 'nnü = ‘inner being’ Lo-lo <strong>ni</strong> = ‘heart’ Si-hia <strong>ning</strong> = ‘heart’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tshang[s]</strong> = ‘pure, clear’</td>
<td><strong>ching</strong> (from Chin. ch'ing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>yang</strong> (emphatic) = ‘also, again’</td>
<td><strong>gyang = emphatic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In Si-hia (Laufer, op.cit. pp. 99 ff.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tib.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Si-hia:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>rna</strong> = ‘ear’</td>
<td><strong>rni</strong> [Lo-lo no'[-pa'] (III, 2)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sna</strong> = ‘nose’</td>
<td><strong>ni</strong> [Lo-lo no'[-bo'] (III, 2)] <strong>Na-khi</strong> 'nyi Mo-so gni, Hruso ni[-sü]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>zla</strong> = ‘moon’</td>
<td><strong>li</strong> [Lo-lo hlo'[-bo'] (III, 2)] <strong>Na-khi</strong> 'lä</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>yang</strong> = ‘light, bright’</td>
<td><strong>ying = ‘star’</strong> [Lo-lo hlo' = ‘bright, light’] (y &gt; 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sha</strong> = ‘meat’</td>
<td><strong>chi</strong> <strong>Na-khi</strong> 'shi, Lo-lo shi²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Tib.: a** | **ZhZh: u, o** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>khang</strong> = ‘room’ (e.g. in a house)</td>
<td><strong>[di-]kong</strong> <strong>Na-khi</strong> 'gko = ‘the inside’ Lo-lo <strong>ku’</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>khams</strong> = ‘element’</td>
<td><strong>khu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ngar</strong> = ‘front’</td>
<td><strong>ngur</strong> <strong>Na-khi</strong> 'gko = ‘at the front’ Lo-lo <strong>ko’</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Finally, I would like to mention one Zhang-zhung particle which I know with the same meaning also in Si-hia. It is the suffix -ni, which is not identical to the Tibetan isolating particle. In Si-hia this suffix roughly corresponds to the Tibetan nominal particle pa. Thus tsu-ni means ‘man’ in Si-hia. In Zhang-zhung we can find for instance lung-ni for lung (Tib. glo-ba = ‘lung’), or shin-ni for shin (Tib. mchin-pa = ‘liver’) without any manifestly different application in the sentence. For a full discussion of ni as a nominal particle see Hummel (1992a), p. 30 and (1995b) Chapter 3: ni = nominal particle.

The comparisons I presented reveal a certain regularity. The striking correspondences with equivalents in the languages of the Lo-lo and Na-khi clearly point to north-eastern Tibet as the original point from which the Zhang-zhung language spread to become the holy language of the Tibetan Bon religion. It should be borne in mind that the Lo-lo and Na-khi, before migrating into their present settlements, lived in north-eastern Tibet, the Na-khi in close proximity of Si-hia and Mi-nyag.
I would also like to draw attention to a further few word comparisons, not included in the phonological lists, which do not match the Tibetan or are completely different from it. They too suggest a kinship of Zhang-zhung (ZhZh) with the language of Si-hia (SH) and with the related languages of Mi-nyag (MN), of the Na-khi (NK) and of the Mo-so (MS), as well as those of the Ch’iang (Ch) and Lo-lo (LL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZhZh</th>
<th>SH</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>LL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ku[-ra]</td>
<td>k ‘ü</td>
<td>2k ’ö</td>
<td>k ’i†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skod</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>2khü</td>
<td>cho²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bteg</td>
<td>nðü = ‘to drive out’</td>
<td>LL de³ = ‘to drive out’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mang[-wer]</td>
<td>mang = ‘white’</td>
<td>2mùng = ‘grey, whitish’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mu, dmu</td>
<td>mo</td>
<td>mùan[g]</td>
<td>mū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsal-mo</td>
<td>tsu</td>
<td>ts’o</td>
<td>ts’a³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zangs</td>
<td>shang</td>
<td>ts’ang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la</td>
<td>la, lo</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la’, lo²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>lō, lo</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>hlö³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sad</td>
<td>se = ‘shaman’ (Tib. lha), ‘priest’ (Tib. bla)</td>
<td>2sā (a divine epithet)</td>
<td>LL sa⁴ = ‘divine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she</td>
<td>sie = ‘wise’</td>
<td>sse = ‘wise’</td>
<td>LL se¹ = ‘wise’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In Lepcha fia-]tsu = ‘male’ (animals), e.g. luk = ‘sheep’>luk-tsu = ‘ram’ (origin of the Lepchas in eastern Himalaya)
This article was originally published in *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 56, Copenhagen 1995, pp. 162-168, with the title “Neues Material zur Sprache von Zhang-Zhung”.

1. The examples I gave in the previous chapters and also in this one are just an initial selection. I have often expressed the view that gShen-rab-mi-bo came to Tibet with the Zhang-zhung invasion that moved in from the north-eastern Tibetan-Chinese border region. gShen-rab is also known by the name of dMu-rab. In the Zhang-zhung language *dmu [mu, smu]* means ‘sky’. By *dmu [smu]* in the Tibetan mythology certain heavenly beings are also meant, to which the progenitor of man belongs. Furthermore, *dmu [smu]* is a Tibetan term for Zhang-zhung (sMu Zhang-zhung), probably with reference to the legendary origin of its inhabitants. Thus gShen-rab, in the form dMu-rab, would be the “noble of the clan of dMu”, which could refer both to his heavenly and earthly origin.


3. In the tables that follow Zhang-zhung is shortened ZhZh.
4. With the Hruso (pronounced Hrūsčö) and the Daflā in the Assam-
Himālaya we reach the southernmost extremity of the north-to-south
linguistic historical migration. Concerning Hruso see J. Schubert
Roter Fluss und blaue Berge, pp. 90 ff.
5. B. Laufer (1916) "The Si-hia language", pp. 103 ff. - As far as Zhang-
zhung is concerned see Chapter 1, p. 52. The presence in Zhang-
zhung of identical words with different meanings warrants the
suspicion that it may have been a tonal language.
6. See S. Hummel (1992b) "Die Nāga in der Ikonographie der Na-khi
und in der Überlieferung der tibetischen Bon-Religion", with further
references. - Concerning the former settlements of the Lo-lo see above
all E. Freiherr von Eickstedt (1944) Rassendynamik von Ostantien,
China und Japan, Tai und Kmer von der Urzeit bis heute, pp. 162 ff.
- H. Mueller (1912) "Beiträge zur Ethnographie der Lo-Lo",
particularly regarding the Lo-lo script. According to the map included
in this article, in Mueller’s time the centre of the various Lo-lo groups
scattered in Szü-Ch’uan and Yün-Nan bordered to the west on the
territory of the Mo-so. About the Lo-lo language see especially A.
Liétard, (1909) "Notions de grammaire Lo-lo". - Ibid. (1912)
"Vocabulaire Français—Lo-lo, dialecte A-hi". Ibid. (1913) Au Yun-
nan. Les Lo-lo-p’o. Une tribu des aborigènes de la Chine meridionale.
Concerning the Na-khi, now settled in western Yün-Nan, see J.F.
the script of the Na-khi see S. Hummel (1989a) "Die Schrift der Na-
khī", and (1993a) "Noch einmal die Schrift der Na-khi". About the
Mo-so, akin to the Na-khi and bordering on their territory to the
east, see J. Bacot (1913) Les Mo-so, with dictionary and grammar.
Concerning the Ch’iang, akin to the Tibetans and settled in western
Szü-Ch’uan, in addition to my works cited in footnote 2, I would
like to mention the word for ‘deity’ (Tib. lha) in Zhang-zhung: sad,
in Ch’iang: sei2, in Lo-lo: sa4.
7. About the Ch’iang see R.A. Stein (1957) "Les K’iang des marches
sino-tibétaines". - D. C. Graham, (1958) The Customs and Religion
of the Ch’iang, (with Ch’iang texts on pp. 87-96). - Mi-nyag bordered
to the north-west on Szü-Ch’uan, to the south and west on Si-hia.
Parts of Mi-nyag were annexed to the kingdom of Si-hia (1032 -
1226).
The term *gshen*, designating in Tibetan a specific category of Bon priests, has often been the subject of tentative interpretations. In *ye-gshen*, the *ye* only has an emphatic value; according to the Bon tradition this form was used to indicate higher, divine *gshen*. The most satisfactory explanation thus far seemed to be the one put forward by H. Hoffmann, who saw in *gshen* an old Tibetan word for 'shaman', even though he was aware that this interpretation does not satisfy the totality of cases.\(^1\) F.W. Thomas and J.v. Manen\(^2\) interpreted it as a derivative of *shan* (Old Tibetan *shen* = 'butcher'). Along similar lines, G. Tucci connected *gshen* with *gshed*, 'butcher'.\(^3\) Conversely, A.H. Francke had already realised that the *gshen*, based on their activity as described in the *gZer-myig*, might be saviours or teachers. Most of the Nine Ways (Tib. *theg-pa*), the practices that a Bon-po has to go through in order to attain his state of perfection, are qualified by *gshen*, for instance *snang-gshen* (the method of exorcism) or *srid-gshen* (the teachings about the after-death state in the *bar-do*). As in these cases, the use of *gshen* in *gshen-sras* (Buddhist: *dgra-bcom-pa* = Skr. *arhat*) for the Bon deity gShen-lha-’od-dkar in Sambhogakāya cannot be explained in a shamanistic sense. This interpretation remains dubious above all for the understanding of the name of the semi-legendary organiser of the Bon religion, gShen-rab-mi-bo, whose biogra-
On the other hand, we know from the language of Zhang-zhung that the term shen [shin] is equivalent to Tibetan [rnam-] shes and shes-pa, particularly as ‘to know’, but also with the meaning of ‘soul’. The dropping of prefixes, like the g in gshen, is not unusual in Zhang-zhung. According to dge-bshes Chos-kyi-grags-pa, Tibetan rnam-shes is rendered in Chinese as 神識 (shen-shih), and shen in Chinese, like the shen in Zhang-zhung, also means ‘soul’, including its derivatives as ‘to recognise’ and ‘to know’. I have often hinted at the correlation of the Zhang-zhung language with Old Chinese and with the languages of Si-hia and Mi-nyag in the previous chapters. On the basis of our current knowledge, the term gshen becomes meaningful in all the above mentioned occurrences with the help of the Zhang-zhung language. The fact that the five gshen emanated from gShen-rab-mi-bo are also called ye-shes-kyi lha, viz. “divinities of knowledge or wisdom” is in line with the definition of gshen we have identified.

Turning now to the meaning of gShen-rab-mi-bo in particular, we should again refer to the Zhang-zhung language, in which the syllable ra or rab equals Tibetan rgya[s]. As I could show in the previous chapters, the Zhang-zhung lexicon provides valuable help towards the understanding of many supposed Tibetan terms from the sphere of the Bon religion. For instance, there is a Dang-ra in the Tibetan lake region, where ra[b] corresponds to Tibetan rgya and dang (Chinese tang) to Tibetan mtsho.

Accordingly, a meaningful interpretation of gShen-rab would then be Shes-rgya or Shes-rab. The western Tibetan region of Mar-yul offers another example of how useful the Zhang-zhung lexicon can be. In Zhang-zhung mar corresponds to Tibetan gser. We are therefore dealing with Suvarṇagotra (Suvarṇabhūmi), the Chinese Si-li. Si in turn is the Tibetan gser (Zhang-
zhung *mar* and *li* the Zhang-zhung word *rig* (Tib. *yul*). This mixture of Zhang-zhung and Tibetan, as also in Shes-rab, was by no means unusual until well into the 8th century A.D., when Zhang-zhung was still used as *lingua franca* in Tibet. Even many of the names of the old Tibetan kings only acquire a meaning with the help of Zhang-zhung, if we consider that *khri*, for instance, equals the Tibetan *sems*, and *mu* [*dmu, rmu*] in Mu-khri indicates the heavenly region (Tib. *nam-mkha*). We know that Gri-gum-btsan-po was avenged by one of his sons, Bya-khri. Gri-gum’s sons Bya-khri (bird), Sha-khri (carnal beings, mammals), and Nya-khri (fish) correspond to the three regions of the Bon cosmology, *steng-lha*, *bar-btsan* and *g.yog-klu*. Finally, we should also mention here the first mythological king of Tibet, gNya’-khri-btsan-po known as a *sa-bdag* according to A.H. Francke. gNya’-khri could be a late aetiological spelling for Nya-khri. The usual translation of *khri* as ‘chair’ or ‘throne’ does not seem convincing.

We can therefore state that *gshen*, also in gShen-rab-mi-bo, cannot possibly be an old Tibetan word for ‘shaman’ which has then undergone certain mutations of meaning in the organised Bon. On the contrary, the term comes from the language of Zhang-zhung, and corresponds to Tibetan [*rnam-*] *shes* or *shes-pa* in its different applications.

With this interpretation, also two statements about gShen-rab-mi-bo which H. Hoffmann (*op.cit.*, pp. 348 ff.) quotes from the gZer-myig acquire a new meaning in keeping with the concepts of the Bon religion. He is described as “*gshen-rab cig gda*” (I 27 a4), which Hoffmann translates as “he is an excellent gShen”. With the help of Zhang-zhung however, we can translate “he is a *shes-rab*”, a frequently used appellation in the Bon religion for important spiritual personalities, among whom he is the highest. In II 282 b3 it is said that gShen-rab-mi-bo dwells after his death in “*gshen-grub-pa’i dbyings*”, which Hoffmann translates “in the sphere (*dbyings*) of the perfect
gShen”. Our reading “(he dwells) in the ye-shes-kyi dbyings”, i.e. in the sphere of Sambhogakāya, is also supported by a note in the Lexicon of Archaic Terms according to which gShen-rab-mi-bo is a gshen-rab sems-dpa’, that is a “dhyāni” bodhisattva (ye-shes sems-dpa’).13 We have therefore obtained the following equivalents: gshen = shes[-pa] and ye-shes or gshen-rab = ye-shes or shes-rab [rgya].

Notes:

* This article was originally published in Ural-Altaiische Jahrbücher NF 9, Wiesbaden 1990-[1993], pp. 236-238 with the same title. An English translation by G. Vogliotti (unchecked and without indication of the translator) appeared in Bulletin of Tibetology 1992/3, Gangtok 1993, pp. 5-8.


4. See Chapter 1, Part 2, p. 31.


7. According to R.A. Stein (1971) “La langue žan-žuñ du bon organisé”, the Tun-Huang texts also give the reading Dang-ko for Manasarovar. Concerning the examples demonstrating the links of Zhang-zhung with the languages of eastern Tibet and adjoining regions (see Chapter 1), Stein also mentions mur (‘snake’) > Dwags-po dialect: murui; le (‘wind’) > Ch’iang: le, Si-hia: xli, la (‘tiger’), > Mo-so la, Lo-lo la’.


25. The domains of the *sa-bdag* and of the *klu* (*nāga*) are sometimes confused, corresponding to the old Tibetan *se* (*bse*). For instance a *chu-bdag* can be found among the *sa-bdag* (B. Laufer, 1900, *Ein Sühngedicht der Bon-po*, pp. 32 and 46), whereas the *klu* are also said to be spirits of the land, of the mountains and rocks (A. Schiefner, 1881, *Über das Bonpo-Sūtra*: "*Das weiße Nāga-Hunderttausend*", p. 27. Concerning the *klu* as *sa-bdag* see also P. Kværne (1980) “A Preliminary Study of Chapt. VI of the *gZer-mig*”, p. 186, and S. Hummel (1964) “Profane und religiöse Gegenstände aus Tibet und der lamaistischen Umwelt”, p. 61. Doubts about the reading *gnya' (= 'neck') are already to be found in the *Blon-po-bka'i thang-yig* (7a, 2 ff.), where the form *nya* is attested, with the meaning of ‘full moon at the time of birth’.

10. See Chapter 5.
In chapter 4, discussing the term *gshen* in the Tibetan Bon religion I noted, with reference to the first of the mythological kings, *gNyā'-khri* (= ‘neck-throne’)-btsan-po, that *gnya'-khri* is clearly a later aetiological form for *nya-khri*. Its meaning ‘fish-(being)’ agrees with the certainly older tradition according to which the king belongs to the demonic *sa-bdag* (= ‘lords of the earth’), among which also the *klu* (Skr. *nāga*) can be found as *chu-bdag* (= ‘lords of the waters’). The distinction between the lords of the earth and those of the waters is a vague one, as is also the case with the ancient Tibetan *bse* [se]. Thus, we can also find the *klu* as spirits of the land, of mountains, and of rocks. Being a *sa-bdag*, the king belongs to the chthonian region (*'og [g.yog]-klu*) of the trichotomic Bon cosmology. This ancient classification is already attested in the *Blon-po-bka'i thang-yig* (7a, 2 ff.), where the form *nya* is used.

Concerning the term *khri*, I already remarked, in connection with *gshen*, that this is by no means the Tibetan word for ‘throne’ or ‘seat’: like *gshen*, it is a Zhang-zhung word. Based on the Zhang-zhung lexicon currently available, its meaning is clearly that of Tibetan *sems* (= ‘being’). Therefore, king *Gri-gum-btsan-po*’s sons, Bya-khri, Sha-khri, and Nya-khri, are to be translated as Bird(-being), Flesh(-being) and Fish(-being). This in turn fits in with the three regions of the trichotomic world-view, that is
Bya-khri for the *steng-lha*, the upper (*steng*) region of the gods (*lha*); Sha-khri for the *bar-btsan*, the middle (*bar*) region of the mammals (*sha* = ‘flesh’) where the ghosts of the *btsan* fly in the air; and Nya-khri (like before him Nya[gNya’]-khri-btsan-po) for the 'og-klu, the lower ('og') domain of the *klu*. In this way, we can safely discard the unconvincing translation Bird-throne, Flesh-throne, and Fish-throne. The king’s sons are assigned cosmological functions which determine their nature (*khri*). Bya-khri finally takes the place, with the name sPu-de-gung-rgyal, of the murdered Gri-gum, who rather seems to be a foreign element in the list of mythological kings and is either assigned to the *khri* group for ease of reference, or completely omitted by some historians. Just as Nya[gNya’]-khri represents the lower region of the cosmos, Bya-khri stands for the upper one, whereas the following group of kings called *legs* represents the middle region. Hence the three groups of kings mirror the trichotomic world-view.

In the same way as the royal sequences of *nya*, *bya* and *legs* reflect this tripartition, each representative of one of the three regions is accompanied by representatives of the other two, as in the case of Bya-khri with his two brothers, and as confirmed by the kings following Nya-khri in the group of the *khri* up to Gri-gum. These are Mu-khri, Ding-khri, So-khri, Me-khri, gDag-khri, and Srib[s]-khri. The Tibetan language alone will not suffice for a correct elucidation of these names. Once again we have to resort to Zhang-zhung, the old classical language of Bon. The fact that both Tibetan and Zhang-zhung words are used together, within the same name, should not come as a surprise, for the Zhang-zhung language remained in use as *lingua franca* across the whole of Tibet well into the 8th century.

Nya-khri is followed by king Mu-khri, representing the upper region (*steng-lha*). *Mu* corresponds to Tibetan *nam-mkha’*, the sky. Ding-khri indicates the sphere of the Tibetan *bar-snang*; *ding[-mu]*, or also *ting[-mu]*, is in Zhang-zhung the intermediate
region between the earth and the sky (mu). Whilst the Tibetan cosmology generally distinguishes a celestial, an earthly, and a chthonian sphere, in the more recent Bon ideas, perhaps under a stronger Chinese influence, the region between sky and earth (bar-snang, Zhang-zhung ding [ting]-mu) assumes a special relevance. The particular importance attributed to this region between the sky and the earth (nam-mkha’ and sa-gzhi) already transpires in the more recent gZer-myig. The chthonian domain of the earth is represented by So (= Tib. sa)-khri. Furthermore, the royal genealogy of the khri contains the cosmic polarity constituted by gDag-khri (= ‘light being’) and Srib[s]-khri (= ‘darkness being’). According to the Bon cosmology, the principles of light and darkness emanated from the pure light of divine wisdom (gsal-ba ye-shes). In this context, the pure light and the polarity of light and darkness are always to be regarded as cosmic principles. Possibly, one could see in Me-khri (= ‘fire-being’) the gsal-ba ye-shes of the Bon cosmology, which corresponds to the Manichaean region of pure light. For the time being this remains speculation, even though the type of sequence of the khri would seem to support this idea.

The group of the legs designating the middle region includes six kings: A-sho, De-sho, Thi-sho, Gu-ru[g], Brong-rje and Thong-sho. Again, we have to resort to the Zhang-zhung language to disclose their meaning. Legs, also leg or lig, corresponds to Tibetan srid and has, like khri, the meaning of ‘being’, albeit as a representation of the potentiality achieved in the bar-btsan. Some of the Tibetan sources do in fact assign the kings of the legs group to the earthly sphere (sa ‘i-legs), which is in accordance with the meaning of legs.

The syllable sho contained in four of these names, based on the other attested occurrences in our limited and fragmentary knowledge of Zhang-zhung, seems to mean something like “become manifest through movement and action”. The animals ass (gu-rug), wild yak (’brong) and ram (thong) lead us into
the Tibetan environment. The divine ancestors (yab-lha) of the Tibetans appear as mountain deities in form of animals, like gNyan-chen-thang-lha as a ram, or the progenitor of the dynasty on the mountain Yar-lha-sham-po as a yak.⁷

The royal lines IV (lde) and V (btsan) are clearly later additions, probably meant to reach the number of 27 generations corresponding to the 27 nakṣatra (Petech, 1939, op.cit., p. 29).

The function of the Zhang-zhung language as a Tibetan lingua franca also explains the names of the sons and successors of the Tibetan king Khri-srong-lde-btsan, whose sister Sad-mar-kar (a Zhang-zhung name: sad = lha, mar = gser, kar = 'od) was married to the king of Zhang-zhung. Their two sons and future kings bear Zhang-zhung names deriving from the Bon mythology. Sad-na-legs is thus "he with the divine nature", and Mu-ne-btsan-po is connected with space (mu-ne = Tib. nam-mkha').⁸

Groups I to III of the Tibetan mythological kings

Group I (nya)

[g]Nya-khri-btsan-po
Mu-khri (sky)
Ding-khri (middle region)
So-khri (underworld)
Me-khri (sky = pure light)
gDag-khri (middle region)
Srib[s]-khri (underworld)

Group II (steng)

[Gri-gum-btsan-po]
Bya-khri⁹ [brothers: Nya-khri and Sha-khri]

Group III (sa'i-legs)¹⁰

A-sho-legs (a = ngag = speech)
De-sho-legs (de = bde = earthly comfort)
Thi-sho-legs  (thi, see footnote 6)
Gu-ru-legs  (with various variants)
'Brong-rje-legs
Thong-sho-legs

Notes:

*  This article was originally published in *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, NF 12, Wiesbaden 1994, pp. 240-244, with the title "khri und legs in den mythologischen Königslisten der Tibeter".
1. Chapter 4, p. 99 - According to legend, when the king arrived he was carried on a throne supported by the porters’ necks.
2. L. Petech (1939) *A Study of the Chronicles of Ladakh*, p. 25 with bibliographic references (A.H. Francke, B. Laufer, A. Schiefner); concerning the legend see H. Hoffmann (1950) *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion*, p. 146. - The fish are also called klu-nya (B. Laufer, 1898, *Klu Bum Bsdus Pai Sniin Po*, p. 78).
3. See Chapter 4, p. 99.
4. For the Chinese ideas on this subject see J. Bredon and I. Mitrophanow (1937) *Das Mondjahr*, p. 345. - Among the Na-khi the older trichotomy features underworld yak, lion, and garuda, the newer one lion (‘ssì), dragon (‘mber), and garuda (‘t’khyu): cf. S. Hummel (1960) "Die Bedeutung der Na-khi für die Erforschung der tibetischen Kultur", p. 311, note 4.
zhung we find i-thi[-ya]: [i-] thi = Tib. gsang (ya = participle). This could refer to the three levels: De-sho = physical world, A-sho = speech and Thi-sho = esoteric spiritual world; cf. the Buddha’s body (= sku, sangha), the book (= gsung, dharma), and the stūpa (= thugs, Buddha) in Buddhism.

7. M. Hermanns (1965) *Das National-Epos der Tibeter. gLing König Ge sar*, pp. 52 ff. - Another interpretation could be 'brong-rje-legs (Lord of the yak [hunting and breeding]) and thong-sho-legs (thong = ‘plough, agriculture’) as primordial cultural heroes. Difficulties are presented by the various readings gu-ru [rub, rug, rum, go-ru, mgo-ro, gong-ru]; gu-rug = ‘foal’ (of an ass). The text is corrupt, gu-ru could perhaps mean ‘spiritual teaching’.

8. The best and most comprehensive work dealing with the Tibetan royal dynasties remains E. Haarh (1969) *The Yar-lun Dynasty*. There, see p. 139 concerning so (Tib. sa) “as an inferior stratum in relation to Sa” in the trichotomy of Mu-khri, Ding-khri (= bar-btsan) and So-khri. - Khri with the meaning of “from his nature”, “for what concerns his being”, “as the” also makes sense in the names of the kings in group V up to Khri-srong-lde-btsan. Usually, khri is associated with strong or with lde (= ‘divine’); concerning lde see also G. Tucci (1971c) *Opera Minora*, II, p. 576.

9. Concerning Bya-khri and sPu-de-gung-rgyal or 'O-lde-spu-rgyal (Bon tradition: 'O-lde-gung-rgyal) see T.V. Wylie (1963) “'O-lde-spu-rgyal and the Introduction of Bon to Tibet”. - S. Hummel (1974-1975) “Der Osiris-Mythos in Tibet”. - Our table reflects a later trichotomic fusion of the Buddhist tradition showing gNya’-khri-btsan-po as the first Tibetan king with the Bon tradition where 'O-lde-gung-rgyal starts the royal genealogy. The episode of Gri-gum with Lo-ngam and Bya-khri seems to preserve the memory of a dispute at the beginning of the Tibetan dynasty. According to the Deb-ter-bsdzongs (sic!)-dmar, Lo-ngam was a Zhang-zhung prince who had penetrated into the Tibetan territory and defeated Gri-gum, and with whom the Tibetan king had to confront himself (cf. Chapter 2). Lo-ngam, who defeated Gri-gum, should probably be read Lo-snga (= Zhang-zhung with the meaning of ‘independent lord, prince’). - See also S. Hummel (1974-1975) “Der Osiris-Mythos in Tibet”.

10. Variants of the names can be found in Haarh (1969) op.cit. (Index). The royal lists in Haarh and Petech (1939, op.cit.) show how widely the names in group III (legs) can vary. I have only chosen those names for which a sensible explanation can be given on the basis of our current knowledge.
The country of Zhang-zhung, probably formed by a confederacy of tribes racially akin to the Tibetans, extended from the north-eastern to the western Tibetan borderlands, including Mar-yul, Gu-ge and Pu-rangs to the west and the plains of Byang-thang to the north. The core of this vast territory, 'Ol-mo-lung-ring[s] (also called 'Ol-gling), with its centre Khyung-lung and the castle dNgul-mkhar, was situated to the west of Mount Kailāsa. Since the time of Srong-btsan-sgam-po, one of whose wives is believed to have been a Zhang-zhung princess, this kingdom had at least a vassalage relationship with the central Tibetan royal court, and by the 8th century latest, under king Khri-srong-lde-btsan, it was annexed by Tibet. Khri-srong-lde-btsan’s sister, Sad-mar-kar, was unhappily married to the king of Zhang-zhung, Lig-mi [myi]-rhya. We know nothing of the queen’s fate (and of her rival’s, another wife of Lig-mi-rhya’s born in Zhang-zhung) after the Tibetans seized the country. The precise dates of these historical events remain controversial. Probably the final annexation only took place, according to Tucci, under Khri-srong-lde-btsan (755-[780,797,799]). Oddly enough, Tucci believed Sad-mar-kar to be a daughter of the Tibetan king. Lig-snya-shur, who organised a rebellion in 644, during the reign of Srong-btsan-sgam-po ([569,620,628]-649), would then be a predecessor of Lig-mi-rhya. Under his rule,
Zhang-zhung would have been reduced to a vassal state by Srong-btsan-sgam-po. On the other hand, H.E. Richardson places the events concerning Sad-mar-kar (considered a sister of the Tibetan king) and the final annexation to Tibet in Srong-btsan-sgam-po’s time, a view also shared by Kun Chang.

A study of the Zhang-zhung language, which is no fabrication, as the discovery of bilingual texts demonstrates (see Chapter 1), will set the origin of the tribes making up the confederation, especially those akin to the Ch’iang, in north-eastern Tibet, where the district bordering on China, known in Chinese as Yang T’ung, was conquered by the Chinese in the 7th century A.D. These hypotheses are corroborated by an analysis of the Zhang-zhung language, and notably by the existence of a Proto-Altaic substratum, which bears evidence to the relationship of Zhang-zhung with a number of languages of the Sino-Tibetan border provinces, a fact particularly apparent in the sphere of religious ideas. It is thus probably in this original nucleus of Zhang-zhung that the celestial component in the Tibetan Bon religion sparked off. Its character later evolved in central 'Olmo-lung-ring, incorporating chthonian as well as Indian and western Asiatic influences—a process in which the legendary organiser gShen-rab-mi-bo, probably belonging to the Zhang-zhung stratum, played a role of some consequence.

The erstwhile importance of the large Zhang-zhung confederation—both as a political factor and in connection with the Bon religion, which soon gained the support of the Tibetan royal house—is demonstrated by the use of the Zhang-zhung language as a lingua franca across the Tibetan cultural world, even after the annexation, and especially at the royal court. Thus many names and terms dating from the time of the Tibetan monarchy cannot be understood with the help of Tibetan alone. Most of the names in the sequence of mythological kings are Zhang-zhung words, like the name of the Tibetan princess and later queen in Khyung-lung, Sad-mar-kar, who secretly sent her
songs to her brother—a fact which eventually contributed to the violent annexation of Zhang-zhung by Tibet.\(^4\)

These songs cannot be satisfactorily translated without a knowledge of Zhang-zhung, as can be evinced from the valuable full translations made by J. Bacot-F.W. Thomas-Ch. Toussaint, and by G. Uray in particular, and from the partial ones provided by A. Macdonald, D.L. Snellgrove / H.E. Richardson, and R.A. Stein.\(^5\) It is in this light that the following new tentative translation should be regarded, without any claim to have fully resolved all the uncertain and controversial passages.

**Song 1**

\[yul\text{-}gyi \text{ ni } skal \text{ pog\text{-}pa}\]

The land that has fallen to my lot,

\[Khyung\text{-}lung^6 \text{ ni } rngul\text{-}mkhar^7 \text{ zhig}\]

Is a mouldy castle in Khyung\text{-}lung.

\[mu\text{-}su \text{ ni } gshan\text{ na\text{-}re}\]

Others say “a heavenly place,”\(^8\)

\[phyi \text{ bltas ni } ngam\text{-}dang \text{ brag}\]

Seen from without all gorge and boulders,

\[nang \text{ bltas ni } gser\text{-}dang \text{ dbyig}\]

But seen from within all gold and precious stones”.

\[bdagi \text{ ni g.yar snga\text{-}ru}\]

But when I look at it (have it before me),

\[mchis\text{-}su \text{ ni ma } tho\text{-}'am\]

It can’t be good to live in there.\(^9\)

\[skya\text{-}mo \text{ ni } bseng\text{-}bseng\text{-}mo\]

Gloomy it is, for all its glitter.\(^10\)
bran-gyi ni skal pog-pa
The servant that has fallen to my lot,

Gu-ge ni rkang-pran₁¹ zhig
Is a serf coming from Gu-ge.

'khol-du ni ma tho-'am
Being forced to serve, this cannot be good,

Gu-ge ni bdris-shing sdang
He who knows a man from Gu-ge, (he knows) he hates (the Tibetans).

zas-kyi ni skal pog-pa
The food that has fallen to my lot,

nya-dang ni gro mchis-te
Is fish and wheat.

'tshal-du ni ma tho-'am
This cannot be a good food (not appropriate).

nya-gro ni bcha'-zhing kha
Fish (and) wheat are bitter.

pyugs-kyi ni skal pog-pa
The animals that have fallen to my lot,

sha₁²-dang ni rkyang mchis-te
Are wild deer and wild asses (kyang)₁³.

'tsho-ru ni ma tho-'am
To take them to pasture is not appropriate for me.

sha-rkyang ni btsa'-zhing rgod
Deer and asses are too wild to look after.

Queen Sad-mar-kar, dejected by her jealousy of her reportedly unfaithful husband Lig-mi-rhya₁⁴ and tormented by the longing for her Tibetan homeland, cannot bear any longer the inhos-
pitable conditions in her new, foreign environment. Full of scorn and disillusionment, she reports this to her brother. How faithful her description of the facts is we do not know.

The site of Khyung-lung on the left bank of the river Sutlej is in any case a starkly eroded and barren landscape in a volcanic region characterised by hot springs (see fig. 104 in S. Hedin, Transhimalaja, vol. 3, Leipzig 1912). The hot spring and the rugged, rocky slopes leading up to the ruins of the old fortress can be seen in S. Pranavānanda, Kailās-Mānasaroṣvar, Calcutta 1949 (2nd ed.), figs. 71-72; Ibid., Exploration in Tibet, Calcutta 1950, fig. 34. The Bon monastery visible on a nearby hill was founded in 1936.

Song 2

\[ kye \text{ byang-} \text{'brog ni ya-bi-na}^{15} \]
Watch out! Up in the northern wilderness

\[ Pho-ma 'i ni \text{'brong gchig-pa}^{16} \]
(There is) in (the region of) Pho-ma a strange wild yak.

\[ byang- \text{'brog ni \text{'brong dgum-na} \]
The hunting (killing) of the wild yak in (this) northern wilderness (is as follows):

\[ pu-(=\text{phu-})\text{ nas ni khus 'debs-pa} \]
They (the huntsmen) from the upper valley shout out loud,

\[ l\text{Dong-Thong ni 'phan-gyis thob} \]
(Namely) the lDong (and) Thong. (Also) they must wave their sashes.\(^{17}\)

\[ mda'-nas ni g.yab 'dor-ba \]
(But) those below must give signals.

\[ s\text{Kyi 'i ni Sha-dang sPug} \]
They are the (clans) Sha and sPug of sKyi.\(^{18}\)
dbus-nas ni dpor 'phen-ba
(But) those in the middle shoot between (= dbar)\(^1\) the two,
Yar-kyi ni lHo-dang rNgags
They are the (clans) lHo and rNgags of Yar.\(^2\)
pu-nas ni khus btab-ching
With the shouts from the upper valley
mda'-nas ni g.yab bor-nas
(And) the signals from the lower valley,
de'i ni bar-bar-du
Between these two
Pho-ma'i ni 'brong bkum-zhing
The wild yak of Pho-ma is killed.
thur-thur ni Phying-ba'i bcud
Exhausted is the life-force of Phying-ba.\(^2\)
ru-rgyus ni lDong-Tong (= thong) scald
The horn and the sinews have been given to the lDong and
the Thong,
sha-lko\(^2\) ni lHo-rNgags scald
The flesh with the skin to the lHo and the rNgags,
lbo-shog ni Sha-sPug scald
The hide with the fur (?) to the Sha and the sPug.\(^2\)

In this song Sad-mar-kar recalls the history of the conquests
when the Tibetan state was being set up, concealed in the meta-
phor of hunting the wild yak, and urges the Tibetan king to
attack Zhang-zhung in the same way and to overthrow Lig-mi-
rhya, which in the end is successfully achieved through the com-
plete annexation of Zhang-zhung by the Tibetans. The upheav-
als against the Tibetan régime in the years 644 and 677 are
narrated in BThT (op.cit., p. 155 note 3). Thus Zhang-zhung
was annihilated by treason.
Song 3

*mchil-pa'i ni ru srubs-la*
When the pointed ends of the fishing hook have been moved *(srub)* to and fro (when the hook has been cast)

*stagi ni sha btags-shing*
And the flesh*24* of the tiger [-fish]*25* is caught (and the fish has bitten),

*gyas-su ni ma yo-shig*
Then do not turn to the right (don’t look away)

*yon-du ni ma rdal-chig*
(And) do not turn to the left.

*yas-su ni yo-ba-na*
(If you) have turned to the right,

*bya ni gre-bo-chung*
(Then there is) the *so*-bird, the little demon.*26*

*yon-du ni rdal-ba-na*
If you turn to the left,

*sram-bu ni gong-te dngul*
(Then there is) the silver-top [fish]-otter.

*mar-gyi ni chang-chang-la*
If diving down (like) a fury

*gyur-gyis ni ma bsnubs-na*
And winding himself he cannot overcome (the fish),*27*

*pyi ni gnangs-slad-na*
How could he (the fish) ever (tomorrow, the next day and thereafter)

*sram-gyis ni 'tshal-ta-re*
Be eaten by the [fish]-otter.
The targeted fish must be attacked,

Targeted and attacked, right on sighting him.

The shimmering one on the angling line (the fish) must be held tight.

For what concerns holding tight the shimmering one, the wounds deriving from holding tight the shimmering one

(Caused by the hook on the head) with

The two crystal eyes

Both (gnyis-ka) (are) like a human head.

The instructions on fishing given by Sad-mar-kar, just like the dead fish, are a figure of speech for the strategy to be adopted in the fight she invokes against the king of Zhang-zhung and for Lig-mi-rhya, lying on the ground wounded to death and vanquished by the Tibetans. The song is a variant on the content of Song 2, which was about hunting the wild yak. Song 3 is about the rapidity of the action and about the defensive measures to be taken against the assailants. The dead fish represents the overthrown king of Zhang-zhung. Song 1 was more concerned with the tactical aspects.

Song 4

(When on the way) one comes forward (nearer and nearer),
Yar-pa ni dgung-dang nye
(There is) Yar-pa, quite close to the sky,

dgung-skar ni si-li-li
(Where) the starlight flickers down from the heavenly vault.32

je nye ni je nye-na
If one (then) comes nearer and nearer,

Gla-skar ni brag-dang nye
(Thus) Gla-skar lies there on the rock

brag-skar ni si-li-li
And the stars (now) flicker by the rocks.

sNgur-ba ni chab-dang nye
sNgur-ba (then) lies close to the river,

gyur-sram ni pyo-la-la
Where the lively (gyur) [fish]-otter splashes.33

Nyen-kar ni dog-dang nye
(The castle) Nyen-kar is next to an inhabited place.34

'bras drug ni si-li-li
Rustling (fields) of six (different) corns (are there).

Mal-tro ni Klum-dang nye
Mal-tro lies close to Klum.

sKyi-bser ni spu-ru-ru
There a cold wind blows (spu-ru-ru) from sKyi.

je nye ni je nye-na
As we come nearer and nearer (to our destination),

ra nye35 ni shug-pa thu
Not far from the fences juniper is picked.

Yar-gyi ni bye-ma-la
On the sand of Yar,
ltan-ltan ni ’gros-mo ’di
These footprints (of people) running together!

sKyi’i ni pur thib-su
At night in the upper sKyi valley

za-dur36 ni btab kyang rung
It is then time to take the chopsticks (have a rest).

In this fourth song Sad-mar-kar comes back to consider-ations about her lost former status, melancholically recalling old familiar wanderings in her Tibetan homeland in the days of her youth. As in the first song, she wants to prompt the spirits to free her from her humiliating state of abandon and to take her back home.

Notes:

* This article was originally published in Acta Orientalia, vol. 55, Copenhagen 1994, pp. 161-173, with the title “Die Lieder der unglücklichen Königin Sad-mar-kar”.


S.G. Karmay (1972, The Treasury of Good Sayings: A Tibetan History of Bon, p. 78) gives the form Li-tig-dman for Li-thig-dman (Li = Lig, tig = thig). Lig = Tib. srid-pa, tig = Tib. rig[pa], [dman (Tib.) = ‘woman’]: Skr. cakravidyā. Queen Li-thig-dman is thus the rig-ma (Tib. also for mudrā as female principle), the female aspect of the king as cakravartin (srid-pa’i rgyal-po).

More difficult is the interpretation of Lig-snya-shur (the predecessor of Lig-mi-rhya; Karmay, 1972, op.cit.: rgya). Possibly lig (Tib. srid-pa), snya = dznya (Lexicon also for snya: pradznya) [j > z (s)], shu[r] = Tib. gnas. The Srid-pa is Ye-shes-gnas (cp. also
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2. For details see Chapter 2, with full references to my linguistic researches. - I cannot expand here on the various forms of the place names and personal names given in this introduction, like Gu-ge, Pu-rangs, 'Ol-mo-lung-ring, gShen-rab-mi-bo etc.; see the references quoted. - The north-eastern Tibetan origin of the tribes making up the Zhang-zhung confederation also explains the name Zhang-zhung-gi-srung-ma given to Pe-har in the Lamaist pantheon. Originally, Pe-har was the protector deity (srung-ma) of the Jang and of Mi-nyag (see S. Hummel, 1962, "Pe-Har").


4. sad = Tib. lha = 'divine'; mar = Tib. gser = 'gold'; kar = Tib. 'od = 'light'.


6. Khyung Trul Jigme Namkhai Dorje (1966) Tibetan Lexicon of Archaic Terms: khyung = bya-rgyal (= 'king of birds'), often identified with the Indian garuda. According to H. Hoffmann (1967) Symbolik der tibetischen Religionen und des Schamanismus, p. 78 (reviewed by the present writer in Kairos, 10,2, Salzburg 1968, pp. 137-140, and in Tribus, 17, Stuttgart 1968, pp. 194-195), in the Bon religion the sacred bird is connected with the sun and the light; it is the protector
of holy sites. Concerning the importance of photism in Bon see Chapter 2.

7. **rngul** = 'mouldy' (Tibetan Lexicon of Archaic Terms, op.cit.). S-R, op.cit., p. 60, read **dngul-mkhar** = 'silver castle'. - M reads **rdul** = 'dust, dusty'.

8. **mu** = Zhang-zhung: 'heavenly' (certainly by analogy to the meaning of the bird **khyung**, see footnote 6); **su** = Zhang-zhung, Tib. **gzhi**. U interprets **mu-su** as hapax legomenon. M and BThT translate **mu-su** as 'tout autour' (= S-R: 'all around'). **Mu-su** is here used by Zhang-zhung people in their language to indicate the castle. **Mu** and **khyung** are often identical in Zhang-zhung (as **mu-khyung** = 'sky').

9. U: "isn't it scorn?".

10. BThT read **gseng** = 'brittle' for **bseng**; S-R: "[how sad I am and] lonely" (for **bseng**); M reads **bsen-mo** (a female demon); U: "(it is) gray (and) empty". - Desgodins-Renou-Fage (1899) *Dictionnaire Thibétain-Latin-Français par les missionnaires catholiques du Tibet*: **bseng**, 'propre, fin'. S.C. Das (1902) *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* (new edition), Calcutta 1951: **bseng = dwangs** = 'sparkling, pure, clean, glittering'. In adjectives **mo** is not necessarily feminine. Following Desgodins-Renou-Fage and S.C. Das, in line 8, with **bseng**, the queen takes a stance to what people say, that is lines 4 and 5.

11. **rkang** (not translated by M and U) = '(according to) the provenance'. **Pran** = Tib. **bran**; shift of the radical consonant in Zhang-zhung (**b** : **p**) (see Chapter 1, Part 3, p. 50). **Pran** or **bran** does not mean 'slave' (M, op.cit., p. 234, note 168 and C. Bell, 1928, *The People of Tibet*, p. 157 and 171). **Pran** or **bran** roughly corresponds to the Etruscan **lautni**, before the concession of citizenship (90 B.C.) to serfs belonging to the family (cf. A.J. Pfiffig, 1969, *Die etruskische Sprache*, p. 193). 'Khol' is closer to the meaning of slave. - Since for Zhang-zhung also the form **rJe-gu-ge-rkang-pran** is attested, in our case **pran** [**phran, bran**] indicates a member of the honorary nobility, who in Gu-ge was subject to the prince of Zhang-zhung and did the office of a sort of chamberlain of Sad-mar-kar's (cf. also M, p. 265). According to **dge-shes Chos-kyi-grags-pa** (1957) brTsams-pa'i brda-dag ming-tshig gsal-ba (Tibetan-Tibetan Dictionary), **phran** corresponds to Chin. **少** (schau') = 'inferior rank'.

12. **sha** = **sha-ba**. Concerning **sha**, the Proto-Altaic substratum reveals a widespread correspondence between 'animal' (for breeding or hunting) and 'meat'. See S. Hummel (1992a) *Die meroitische Sprache*
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und das protoaltaische Sprachsubstrat als Medium zu ihrer Deutung, p. 63: for instance Na-khi and Lo-lo: 'šhi = 'meat'; Mongolian šar, sar = 'ox'; Akkadian širu = 'meat'.


14. Concerning Lig-mi-rhya: Zhang-zhung lig = Tib. srid = 'world, existence, life'; mi is a genitive in lig-mi (Zhang-zhung, e.g. lig-mi sngum = srid-pa'i yum); rhya = Tib. rgyal = 'king'; see Hummel (1992a), op. cit., p. 58; ibid., p. 27, on Tib. -k (e.g. after numbers to indicate a collective noun) = Zhang-zhung -ha. The king's title corresponds to cakravartin.

15. bi = genitive (Zhang-zhung), cf. also mi (b : m).


17. Cf. the comment in U, p. 23, which is to be preferred to those of BThT and M.

18. U, p. 16, identifies sKyi with sKyid[-chu]. However, it could also refer to sKyi in the province of gTsang. All the clans mentioned here (lDong, Thong, Sha, sPug, lHo, and rNgegs) are part of the retinue of the Tibetan family from which comes Sad-mar-kar.

19. Concerning the vocal and consonant changes (o : a, p : b) see Chapter 1 Part 3, pp. 49-50.

20. Yar = Yar-lungs [klungs], the original region of the Tibetan royal family. The 'Phyongs-rgyas-chu, whose upper valley is known as Phying-ba, is a tributary of the Yar-klungs-chu (see also footnote 21).

21. Sad-mar-kar recalls here the conquest of the valley of Phying ['Phying]-ba [pa]. After the Tibetan conquest the ancient residence of the Tibetan kings, Phying-ba ['Phying-pa]-stag-rtse, was built here, according to tradition as early as the time of sPu-de-gung-rgyal (cf. Chapter 5). Before the seat of the Tibetan court was moved to Central Tibet in Phying-ba, its centre was in rKong-po (see my footnote 2 for further references). Phying means 'centre, central' in Zhang-zhung. Cf. also E. Haarh (1969) The Yar-Lun Dynasty, passim. - An illustration of the fortress 'Phying-ba-stag-rtse can be seen in A. Ferrari (1958) mK'yen-brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet, p. 52, fig. 29.

23. Concerning the meaning of lbo and shog: U reads dbo instead of lbo, in Jäschke’s Dictionary = “the belly-side of fur”. Shog = ‘feathers’, perhaps referring here to the long hair on the yak’s belly.

24. Regarding sha see footnote 12.

25. Concerning this type of fish I can only refer to Uray’s excellent comment with relevant sources (p. 27).

26. So-bird, according to U (p. 28) an unidentified species, like the gre demons, to which this bird belongs, unless this is a form of popular superstition. The *Tibetan Lexicon of Archaic Terms* equates so-[nam]-bya with seg-[ile]; according to S.C. Das seg-bya is the “name of an aquatic bird, prob. snipe (*Rtsil*)” (Das 1902, p. 1274). - Gre-bo-chung has perhaps the meaning of ‘the little devil’. Desgodins-Renou-Fage, *op. cit.*, “gre-bo forsan pro ‘dre?’”. ‘dre’ is a general term for any being believed to be a demon. Therefore the Chinese translation of ‘dre-bo in Chos-kyi-grags-pa (1957) *brTsams-pa* i *brda-dag ming-tshig gsal-ba* (*Tibetan-Tibetan Dictionary*), is important. Here for ‘dre-bo we find Chinese Kuei³-Mei⁴ (鬼魅) = ‘ghostly’ and Hen³-Hsiung¹ (很凶) = ‘ominous’. Hence ‘gre-bo does not refer to any particular class of demons. No doubt here a member of the species *Grallatores* (wading birds, stilts) is meant, some of which feed on fish and, due to their nocturnal noises, attract superstitious religious ideas.

27. These two lines are of difficult interpretation for BThT and U, who leave them for the most part untranslated. The [fish]-otter, with its characteristically clumsy manoeuvres (*gyur*), is like drunk (*chang-chang-la, strengthening through repetition*). - *Mar*: inflected form of the terminative with case particle: mar-*gyi*.

28. Sa’i-shel: “like the crystal lying on the ground”.

29. My translation is tentative. U finds the text has “too many *hapax legomena*” and leaves it untranslated.

30. Same as BThT. The unusual position of the genitive *gyi* after the particle *ni* is no doubt dictated by the verse metre.


32. The light is as if it dripped down upon the earth (*si-li-li*).

33. *Phyo-la-la*. St takes it as an onomatopoeia. No help is offered by the dictionaries. The same applies for *spu-ru-ru*. 
34. *Dog* is missing in Jäschke, Das, and Desgodins-Renou-Fage. In Zhangzhung *dog* means ‘residence, resting place’. It is a common word in the Proto-Altaiic substratum, see S. Hummel (1992a) *Die meroitische Sprache und das protoaltaiische Sprachsubstrat als Medium zu ihrer Deutung*, p. 44: Tib. 'dug = 'live in'; Mong. *deg* (root word for locative prepositions); Burushaski *tik = 'earth, ground’*; Basque *tegi = 'residence’*; Etruscan *tecum = 'land’*; Meroitic *dik* [Baric *dik, dege*] = ‘place, site’; in the Indo-European substratum: Greek *ΘΑΚΟΣ = 'place’* (S. Hummel, 1994a, “Meroitische Miszellen” 1. ‘Meroitische Äquivalente im indogermanischen Substrat’).

35. BThT interpret *ra-nye* as a place name.

36. Here I follow Uray’s suggestion to read *za-thur = ‘chopsticks’* (according to Jäschke) for *za-dur*.
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Entries in the Indexes are arranged in the Western alphabetical order, including Na-khi, Si-hia and Lo-lo words. Only the Tibetan Index is arranged in the Tibetan alphabetical order. No Zhang-zhung index has been provided, considering that the Zhang-zhung entries in the lists and tables of the text are always arranged alphabetically in the Tibetan order and therefore can easily be traced.

General

A-khrid teachings 62
Almora 8, 88
Bon cosmology 103-105
Bunān 57, 88
Canarian 58, 70-71, 83
Ch’iang 9, 10, 23, 58, 64, 70ff, 80, 83, 87, 93, 95, 110
Basque 70-71, 123
Berber 75
Daflā 8, 88, 95
Dhimal 8
demons 32-34
dgra-lha 11, 12, 16, 34
dharmadhātu 4
dharmakāya 3
Dwags-po 77, 78, 100
Egyptian 70-71
Etruscan 58-59, 66, 70-71, 83, 123
garuda (Tib. khyung) 4, 15, 33, 107, 119
Ge-sar epic 11
Hruso 8, 88, 95
Ju-thig oracle 11
Lo-lo 57, 69-70, 83, 87-88, 92, 95
Lo-Shu diagrams 35
Manichaean ideas 62, 105
Meroitic 59, 66, 107, 123
Mongolian 58, 62, 66, 70-71, 121
Mo-so 9, 69-70, 72, 83, 87, 93
Newāri 57, 88
Pahri 88
photism 61-62
Pontic Migration 64
Proto-Altaic (Ural-Altaic) 59, 66, 70-71, 75, 80, 87, 107, 110, 120, 123
sheep 34-35
Sumerian 70-71, 83
Tangg‘ut 72
Tinān 88
Ţōţō 8
wer-ma 4, 11
yak (bull) 34, 106, 108
yakṣas 33-34

Geographical names

A-mdo 64, 70, 88
‘A-zha 74, 94
Bon-ri 84
Byang-thang 69, 87, 94, 107
Dang-chung 61
Dang-ko 100
Dang-ra 3, 7, 61
Dar-tse-mdō 63
dNgul [mNgul]-mkhar 1, 109
Dolpo 63
gNam-mtsho 7
gNyan-chen-thang-la 34
gTsang 17
Gu-ge 7, 70, 109, 112, 120
Indus 16
Iran 60, 84
Kailāsa 1, 16, 23, 30, 70, 87, 109
Khyung-lung 1, 7, 65, 109-113
Kūke-noor 9, 64, 69, 72, 94
Mar-yul 3, 7, 70, 98
Ming-T’ang 35
Mi-nyag 8, 9, 58, 63, 72, 75, 87, 92-94, 119
Mu-sangs-[s]tag-[g]zig 8
Nan-shan 69
Ning-hia 72
Nyag-chu 63
‘Ol-mo-lung-ring 1, 16-17, 60, 64, 84-85, 87, 109-110
Pho-ma 113-114, 121
Phying-ba 114
Phying-ba-stag-rtse 121
‘Phyongs-rgyas-chu 121
Pu-rangs 70, 109
Ri-g.yung-drung-dgu-rtseg (Kailāsa) 22-23, 32
Ri-rab-lhun-po (Kailāsa) 17, 31
rKong-po 56, 74, 84, 87, 121
rMa-chen-spom-ra 74, 87
Rol-pa’i-rtse 64
Shambhala 16-17
Sham-bu-rtse-dgu 64
Sham-po-lha-rtse 16, 64
Si-hia 8-9, 58, 63, 72, 75, 87, 92, 93
Si-Li 7, 98
Sitā 16
sKyi 113, 117, 118, 121
sTag-gi-ri 34
sTag-[g]zig (rTag-gzigs) 1, 16, 22, 60, 64, 84
Sumeru 32, 64
Sum-pa 7, 9, 58, 74, 84, 94
Sutlej 113
Suvaraṇabhūmi 3, 98
Suvarṇagotra 3, 7, 98
Sūz-Ch’uan 95
Tang-hsiang (T’o-pa) 72
Ti-se (Ti-tse) (Kailāsa) 30, 32, 64
Tun Huang 2
Turkestan 9
Wei-ho 69
Yang-T’ung 74, 84, 94, 110
Yar-lha [la]-sham-po 64-65, 106
Yar-lung (Yar-klungs) 56, 74, 121
Yün-Nan 95
Zhang-zhung-smad 7
Zhang-zhung-smar 7, 27
Zhang-zhung-stod 7
Zangs-dkar 7

**Personal names, including deities**

A-sho-legs 8, 105ff
Bon-sha-ri-dbu-chen 28
’Brong-rje 105, 107
Bya-khri 99, 103, 106, 108
dByings-kyi-yum-chen-mo 4, 62
De-sho-legs 8, 105ff
Ding-khri 104, 106, 108
dMu-rab (epithet of gShen-rab) 94
gDag-khri 104-106
Ge-khod 29, 32
Ginggis Khan 72
gNya’-khri-btsan-po (Nya-khri) 8, 99, 103ff
gNyan-chen-thang-lha 106
gShen-lha-’od-dkar 97
gShen-rab-mi-bo 2, 9, 28, 30, 61, 65, 72, 84, 94ff, 110
Gu-ra-pa 4, 62
Gu-ru[g] 105, 107
Gyer-mi-nyi-’od 28
Khri-de-ring-mo 29
Khri-srong-lde-btsan 1, 8, 10, 60, 106, 108-109
Li-thig-dman 1, 118
Lig-mi-rhya 109, 112, 114, 116, 119ff
Lig-snya-shur 109, 118-119
Lo-nam 56, 61, 73, 108
Mang-snya-u-wer 31, 33
Me-khri 104-106
Mi-cho (Mi-rabs) 84
Mi-tshe-ring (rGan-po-dkar-po) 32
Mu-cho-lde-drug 84
Mu-khri 8, 66, 99, 104, 106, 108
Mu-ne 8, 106
Mu-rtse-mad 34
Nya-khri (son of Gri-gum) 8, 66, 99
’O[d]-de [lde]-ring-mo 29
’O[d]-de [lde]-spur[r]-rgyal 9, 84, 108
Pe-har (Pe-dkar) 31, 119
Prajñāparamitā 4
rJe-ring-dkar 32
Sad-mar-kar 1, 8, 106ff
Sad-na-legs 8, 106
Sangs-po-’bum-khri 32, 34
Sangs-rgyas-mkha’-rgyal 17, 34
Sa-trig-er-sangs 4
Sa-yi-bdag-mo 34
Sha-khri 99, 103, 106, 107
So-khri 104, 108
sPu-de-gung-rgyal 56, 61, 65, 104, 108, 121
Srib[s]-khri 104-106
Srid-pa’i-rgyal-mo (Srid-pa’i-lha-mo) 32, 34
Srog-bdag-dkar-po 31
Strong-btsan-sgam-po 1, 8, 22, 60, 109-110
Stag-la-me-’bar 16
Thi-sho 105, 107-108
Thong-sho 105, 107
Ye-shes’byung-gnas 119
Zhang-zhung-gi-srung-ma 31
Zhang-zhung-ston-rgyung-mthchen 28
**Lo-lo Index**

`ba` (a`- ba`) - ‘father’ 92
`cho` - ‘tooth’ 93
`de` - ‘to throw, to beat’ 93
`djo` - ‘to love’ 89
`dschu` - ‘to originate’ 92
`du` - (nominative particle) 81
`dyi` - (genitive particle) 80
`dz` - (to express a state) 81
`dzö` - ‘to unite’ 90
`dzol` - [bo] - (locative particle) 92
`hlo` - ‘bright’ 91
`hlo[-boy]` - ‘moon’ 91
`hlo[-hov]` - ‘wind, bright’ 93
`ju` - ‘sheep’ 89
`k’a` - (place-name suffix) 89
`k’i` - ‘dog’ 76, 93
`ko` - ‘front’ 91
`kös` - ‘to stop’ 89
`ku` - ‘room, inside’ 91
`la` (lo, lö, li) - ‘tiger’ 79, 93, 100
`la` - ‘earth’ 94
`lu` - (particle expressing characteristics from verbs) 81
`mu` - ‘sky’ 78, 93
`ne` - ‘mad’ 88
`ni` - ‘heart’ 91
`nö` - ‘two’ 77
`ni[-k’ye]` - ‘brother’ 88
`no` - [bo] - ‘nose’ 91
`no[-pa]` - ‘ear’ 91
`[no-] ko` - ‘behind’ 92
`nye` - ‘eye’ 88
`p’i` - ‘to congregate’ 90
`s`a` (se`) - ‘to know’ 79
`s`a` - ‘divine, deity’ 93
`s`e` - ‘to know, wise’ (sa`) 93
`shi[-ni]` - ‘meat’ 91, 121
`sö` - ‘to extinguish’ 90
`sö` - ‘god’ 79, 95
`ta` [-ho] - (collective particle) 81
`ti (t’i)` - ‘water’ (Tib.-Burm.) (Lo-lo: vi`-dy`) 77
`t’i` - ‘one’ 58, 77
`ts’a` - ‘man’ 78, 93
`ts’e` - ‘ten’ 57
`ve` - ‘pig’ 92
`wo` - ‘noble’ (wuo`) 79
`ya` - ‘so being’ 81
`zo` - ‘boy’
`zo` - (diminutive particle) 58, 81

**Na-khi Index**

`bä` - ‘to cut’ 77
`bpö` - ‘to chant, recite, pray’ 62
`bu` - ‘to congregate; pig; importance, power’ 90, 92
`ch’i` - ‘to weigh; suspended, bound’ 91
`d’a` - ‘really’ 91
`ddü` - ‘one (numeral); height, size’ 77, 77
`dschi` - ‘to tyrannise’ 89
`dsu` - ‘to love, unite’ 89
`dta` - (collective particle) 81
`dto` - ‘to unite’ 90
`dzi` - (status particle) 81
`dzu` - ‘status particle’ 92
`ggö` - (genitive particle) 5, 80
`gko` - ‘inside, at the front’ 91
`gkyi [-’gu]` - ‘to sing’ (muttering meditation) 76
`gyu` - ‘fast’ 89
`hä-` - ‘moon’ (literary) 91
`hä’-dsu - ‘ear’ (colloquial) 78
`k’o` - ‘to perish’ 89
`k’ö` - ‘dog’ 71, 76, 93
`k’ö` - (terminative particle) 80
\`{ki}hi - ‘to beget’ 91
\`{khi} - ‘tooth’ 76, 93
\`la - ‘tiger’ 79, 93
\`ll\`u - ‘earth’ 80, 94
\`lo - (particle expressing characteristics from verbs) 81
\`lu - ‘to travel’ 76
\`l\`u - ‘to know’ 89
\`m\`ber - ‘dragon’ 78, 107
\`m\`ian[g] - ‘sky, heaven’ 12, 31, 78, 93
\`mu\`eng - ‘low’ 78
\`mung - ‘grey’ 78, 93
\`mung [-\`{t}s\'{u}] - a sort of demon 78
\`nd\`u - ‘to throw, to drive out’ 77, 93
\`nga - ‘exhausted’ 89
\`ng\`\'{a} - ‘sword; beautiful’ 89
\`ng\`u - ‘disease; behind’ 89, 92
\`ni\`u - ‘eye’ (\`{m}i\`iu) 88
\`\`n\`\'{n} - ‘you’ 66
\`\`nn\`\'{\`u} - ‘inner being’ 91
\`\`n\`ung - ‘mental disorder’ 88
\`\`ny\`i - ‘two, male’ 77, 88
\`\`ny\`i - ‘despicable’ 77
\`\`ny\`i - ‘nose’ 91
\`\`p\'{u} - ‘father’ 92
\`\`s\`a - ‘divine’ 93
\`\`sh\`i - ‘meat’ 91, 107, 121
\`\`sh\`i - ‘to know’ 79
\`\`Sh\`i-\`{l}o - (= gShen-rab) 79
\`\`sh\`u - ‘iron’ 78, 89
\`\`s\`\'{s}\`aw - ‘to breathe’ 79
\`\`ssi - ‘lion’ (\`{s}\`si-\`{n}\`gg\`u) 107
\`\`ss\`u - ‘to confess’ 90
\`\`t\`\'{a}ng - ‘depth, bottom (of a lake)’ 77
\`\`t\`\'{k}hyu - ‘garuda’ (Tib. kh\`yung) 107
\`\`ts\'{\`a} - ‘ten’ (\`{t}s\`{\`e}r) 57
\`\`ts\`{a}ng - ‘iron’ 93
\`\`ts\'{\`o} - ‘man’ 78, 93
\`\`ts\'{u} - ‘to congregate’ 90
\`\`w\`\'{u}a - ‘so being’ (pres. and participle perfect) 81
\`\`w\`\'{u}a [-\`{m}a] - ‘king’ 79
\`\`yi - ‘right-hand’ 90
\`\`yu-\`{m}a - ‘ruler’ 4, 79
\`\`y\`u - ‘sheep’ 89
\`\`z\`\'{\`a} - (locative particle) 81
\`\`zo - (diminutive particle) 5, 81
\`\`zo - ‘boy, son’ (\`{z}o) 5
\`\`zw\`\'{\`o}-\`{z}w\`\'{\`o} - ‘little boy’ 5

\textbf{Si-h\`ia Index}

\textit{chi} - ‘meat’ 91, 107
\textit{do} - ‘real’ 91
\textit{ds\`ing}, \textit{ts\`ing} - ‘law’ 90
\textit{ko} - ‘tooth’ 8, 29, 76, 93
\textit{k\`{\`u}} - ‘dog’ 76, 93
\textit{la} - ‘hand’ 90
\textit{la, lo} - ‘tiger’ (\`{x}li) 79, 93, 100
\textit{le} - ‘earth’ 80, 94
\textit{li (le, lo)} - ‘moon’ 91
\textit{lo} - ‘sheep’ 90
\textit{l\`{o} (lo)} - ‘wind’ 8, 31, 79, 93
\textit{lu} - ‘body’ 90
\textit{m\`ang} - ‘white’ 78, 93
\textit{m\`ing} - ‘low’ 78
\textit{m\`o} - ‘sky’ 8, 9, 31, 78, 93
\textit{m\`ru} - ‘snake’ 78
\textit{na} - ‘corn’ 90
\textit{nd\`zu}, \textit{ts\`u} - ‘man’ (tsu-ni) 78
\textit{ngo} - ‘behind’ 92
\textit{ngo} - ‘silver’ 90
\textit{ni} - ‘nose’ 91
\textit{ning} - ‘heart, brother’ 88, 91
\textit{rie} - ‘horse’ 80
\textit{ring [-lo]} - ‘horse’ 80, 94
\textit{r\`me} - ‘man, tribe’ 9
\textit{r\`ni} - ‘ear’ 91
se - ‘shaman’ 93
shang - ‘iron’ 8, 31, 93
sie - ‘wise’ 31, 79, 93
tsu-ni - ‘man’ 92, 93
wo - ‘pig’ 90, 92
wu - ‘centre’ 90
wu - ‘father’ 92
wu [-tsu] - ‘cow’ 79, 92
xre - ‘horse’ 80
ying - ‘star’ 91
zö (Mi-nyag) - ‘fish’ 78

**Tibetan Index**

**ka**

ka 6
ku-hrang 48
kun 30, 42
kun-dga’ 42
kun-snang 14
kun-rdzogs 48
kun-gzhi-ma-g.yos 45
kun-shes 41
kun-gsal 14, 29, 41
kyi (gyi) 80
klu 12, 33, 44, 46, 101, 103-104
dkar 12, 54
dkyil-’dzub 14
bka’-drin 40
bkra 46
bkra-shis 31
rkang 120
rked 53
rko-phung 41
rkos 41
skad 17
skar 46, 54
sku 15, 108
sko (perf. skye) 7
skos 41

**skya[-ldan] 31, 78**

**skyed**

**skyé-dgu** 40
**skyé-mched** 44
**skyé-ba** 31, 44, 45
**bskyed** 7, 29, 44, 45, 76

**kha**

kha 11, 17, 49, 76
kha-khyer 17
kha-chod 53
kha-gting 29, 41, 76
kha-gsal 17
khang[-pa] 17, 48, 91
khang-mang 15
khams 4, 13, 41, 89, 91
[khams-gsum-] ’khor-ba 46
khi-khar 17
kuu-rlangs 44
khyab 45
khyi 76
khyim 48
khyung 4, 15, 33, 34
khye ’u 5, 48
khrag 53
khrag 46
khrus 41, 46
mkha’ 13, 30, 45
mkha’-’gro 2
mkha’-lting 33
mkhal-ma 53
mkhon-’dzin 42
’khor[-ba] 14, 40, 44, 46
’khor-lo 44, 46
’khyil 11
’khri[s][-chags] 42, 46
’khrul 89

**ga**

gang-ste 47
gang[-po] 42, 43
Indexes 159

gu-rug 105, 108
gegs (bgegs) 33, 34, 54
gyer 3, 30
ggrags 18, 89
ggrags-snyan 18
ggrags-pa 29
ggrags/-med] 42, 50
ggru 42
gre-bo 122
grong 48
glang 18, 48
glo-ba 92
dgu 13, 30, 40
dge-mtshan 40
dgongs 43
mgvogs 13
'gag (gag) 13, 43, 89
'gag-pa 14, 42
'gegs 43
'gong-po 33
'gyur (sgyur) 11, 41
'gyur-ba-med-pa 46
'gyod 43
'gro-ba'i-lam 39
rga-ba 48, 54
rgan-po 5, 48, 54
rgan-mo 5, 48, 54
rgas-pa 48
rgod-pa 29, 42
rgya-che 44, 45
rgya-chen 44
rgya-mtsho 3, 6, 30, 77
rgyas-pa 47
rgyang-grags 47
rgyan 90
rgyab (rgyob) 6, 65, 77, 92
rgyal 4, 29, 79, 121
rgyal-po 16, 29, 32, 33
rgyas] 14, 47, 98
rgyu-mthun 38, 44
rgyu-ba 42
rgyu[d] 42, 44
rgyun-zhugs 42
lgang 54
lgyu-la-dra 34
sgo-nor 29
sgo-phugs 29
sgra 17, 29, 41, 47, 49
sgra-dbyangs 18
sgra-mi-snyan 31, 49
sgrogs 89
sgron-ma 40
brgyad 13, 57
bsgyur 44
ngag 17, 49, 106
ngag-'khya] 17, 49
ngad-ka 49
ngan 12
ngar-ba 6, 91
ngo-mtshar 12, 18
ngogs 89
ngos 42
dngul 14
dngos-grub 2
mngon-rto gs 45
mngon-par 45
mngon-rdzogs 48
rngems 30, 89, 90
rngrul 120
lnge 13, 57
sngo 11, 77
sngon 47
bsngal 89
can 81
gcig[-tu] 57, 77, 81
gcen-po 48
gcod 6, 65, 77
gcod-byed 30
bcas-pa 81
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bcu 13, 57
bcu-geig-kun-tu 10
bcud 13, 43, 46
lcags 8, 31, 65, 76, 79
lcang 55
lcam 11
lcam-dral 48
lce 41, 42, 50, 53

cha
chag 47
chags[-paj 14, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 89, 90, 92
changes 91
chu 11, 30, 43, 44, 53, 77
chu-rgyun 44
chu-rngams 30
chu-bdag 101, 103
chu-gtsan-ma 14
chen-po 14
cho-'phrul 43
chod 7, 15
mchin-pa 54, 92
'char 29, 41, 47, 53, 91

ja
ji-lta 40
ji-snyed 40
ju-po 14
ju-bo-rdo 14
'ja'-tshon 12
'jam 46
'jig[s] 13, 47, 54, 89
'jig-chags 47
rju 49
rje 29, 32, 42, 53
ljon 43

nya
nya 8, 31, 78

nyams-dga 'ba'i 48
nyi-ma 14, 53, 107
nyi-zer 43
nyid 13, 21, 65, 81
nye-bar 44
nyer-bzhag 44
nyon-mongs 6, 42
gyan 30, 32, 34
gnyis 13, 77
gnyen 30
nnyam[-ngid] 43
snying 48, 79
snying-rje 49
snyin 17
snyom-par 43
snyom- 'dzug 43

ta
tu (du) 80
ting-'dzin 43
gti-mug 30, 77, 88
gtor 6, 37, 65
rta[-rna] 45, 55, 80
rtog[s][-pa] 13, 43, 46, 90
lta-bu 43
lto-phye[-che] 33, 34, 47
sta-re 16, 47
stag 16, 79
stang 92
steng 12, 104
steng- 'og 46
sieng-lha 99, 104
stong-rgyud (ston-rgyud) 15
stong-pa 14, 30, 42, 44, 44, 45, 92
stong-pa-nyid 44, 61
stod 55
stobs-kyi-rnam-pa 29
bstan[-pa] 48
bstan-'dzin 17
thabs (thams) 13
thabs-chen 42
thams-cad 14, 44, 81
thams-cad-stong-pa 46
thar-pa 14
thugs 48, 108
thugs-rje-che 17
thugs-nyid 42
the-tshom 14
the-g-chen 17, 43
theg-pa 35, 97
the'u-rang 12, 32, 33
thog-dang-ser 43
thong 105, 108
mtha [-yas] 40, 44
mthar 13, 44, 45
mthar-thug 14, 44
mthar-phyin 44
mthing 11
mthun-par 44
'thibs 53
dro 54
drod 45
dhang-thang 41
gdon 33, 44
bdag[-don] 42, 92
bdud 32, 33
bdun 77
bde 13, 106
bde-chen 43
bden[-pa] 43, 44
mda' 54
mdud 18
mdud 38
'du 12, 47
'du-byas 14
'du-byed 44, 47
'du-shes 41
'dud 55
'dus 55, 90
'dod-dgu 14
'dod-rgu 14
'dod-chags 43
'dod-pa 14
'dod-log 46
'dra 54
'dre 30, 32, 33
ldan 13, 65, 81
lding 48
lde 108
ldem 11
sdud 45
na 81
nag 12, 78
nang 42, 91
nang-stong 45
nam-mkha' 2, 8, 30, 31, 46, 75, 78, 82, 104, 105
ni 28
nub 45, 54
gnam 2, 45
gnam-lcags 18
gnam-'brug 46
gna'-ba 46
gnas 45, 48, 118
gnod-sbyin 30, 33
rnam[-ba] 31, 45, 46, 54, 78, 91
rnam-rgyal 18
rnam-shes 31, 42, 44, 47, 48, 98
rnams 13, 90
sna 91
snang-srid 41
snod 45

pha

pha 92
phag 92
phung-po 41, 47
phun-tshogs 2
phur-bu 2
pho-mo 55
pho-mtshan 11
phya-[b]skos 48
phya-tshe 48
phyag-tshal 40
phyi-nang 43

phye 45
phyogs 38, 90
phra-rgyas 14, 43
phra-ma 43
phra-mo 15
phra-rab 43
phrag 13, 89
phrag-tog 46
'phang 18
'phar 43
'phyo 48
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ON ZHANG-ZHUNG

The country of Zhang-zhung, the stronghold of the ancient Bon religion, is generally believed to have been situated at the western end of Tibet, in the region around Mount Kailūsa. Religious Bon texts handed down to us in Tibetan translations mention the fact that these texts were originally written in the language of Zhang-zhung, but due to the scarcity of material in this language, many scholars tended to dismiss this as a fabrication of the Bonpos.

In this book Professor Hummel revisits the whole issue of Zhang-zhung, concentrating particularly on its language, but also on the actual size and geographical position of this kingdom.

The studies presented here bring a host of new, almost provocative ideas, suggesting that Zhang-zhung was a vast confederacy of states stretching all the way from western to north-eastern Tibet, and that its language was in fact no artificial product, tracing its origins to the eastern Tibetan regions of Si-hia and Mi-nyag. With the help of Zhang-zhung, the author even sheds new light on the meaning of the old Tibetan kings’ names.

Without any pretentions to have fully resolved the issue of understanding the Zhang-zhung language, the author opens up new perspectives for future research.

Siegbert Hummel was born in Rodewisch, Germany, in 1908. After completing his studies as a commercial clerk, in 1926 he began the study of theology and philosophy, then art history and oriental disciplines (Egyptology, Tibetology, Sinology, Japanese and Mongolian studies) at the universities of Tübingen, Rostock, Leipzig and Munich.

After obtaining his doctorate in 1944 with Prof. Erkes in Leipzig (Sinology), he was first keeper of the Asian section and subsequently director of the Museum für Völkerkunde in Leipzig from 1947 until his dismissal in 1955 (due to political reasons).

Since 1955 Prof. Hummel has been living in retirement in a small village in Vogtland (Saxony). A special mention must be made of his complete description of the Tibetan collections of the Linden Museum of Ethnology in Stuttgart.