

TIBETAN AND BUDDHIST STUDIES

COMMEMORATING
THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE BIRTH OF
ALEXANDER
CSOMA DE KŐRÖS

Edited by
LOUIS LIGETI

Volume 1



AKADÉMIAI KIADÓ, BUDAPEST 1984

Adiutores:
GÉZA BETHLENFALVY
et
ALICE EGYED

ISBN 963 05 3573 4 (Volumes 1, 2)
ISBN 963 05 3902 0 (Volume 1)

© Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1984

Printed in Hungary



Élet után rajz. Schöffl.

Ny. Walzel A. F. Pesten.

CONTENTS

CHRISTOPHER I. BECKWITH (Bloomington), A Hitherto Unnoticed Yüan-Period Collection Attributed to 'Phagspa	9
GÉZA BETHLENFALVY (Budapest), The <i>Śatagāthā</i> Attributed to Vararuci . .	17
SH. BIRA (Ulan-Bator), Some Extracts from Sh. Damdin's Manuscript Copy of the <i>Hu-lan deb-ther</i>	59
ANNE-MARIE BLONDEAU (Paris), Le «découvreur» du <i>Maṇi bka'-'hum</i> était-il bon-po?	77
G. M. BONGARD-LEVIN (Moscow), A New Fragment of the Sanskrit <i>Sumukhadhāraṇī</i>	125
KUN CHANG and BETTY SHEFTS CHANG (Berkeley), The Spoken Tibetan Verb <i>KAP</i>	131
E. CSETRI (Cluj-Napoca), Csoma de Kőrös's Life Before His Oriental Journey	143
K. CZEGLÉDY (Budapest), The Foundation of the Turfan Uyghur Kingdom	159
ILDIKÓ ECSEDY (Budapest), Nanchao: an Archaic State Between China and Tibet	165
ALICE EGYED (Budapest), Notes on the Origin of Tibetan Religious Music	191
HELMUT EIMER (Bonn), Zur Stellung des Narthang-Druckes in der Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur	199
R. E. EMMERICK (Hamburg), Tibetan Lexical Notes	207
JUDIT FEHÉR (Budapest), Buddhapālita's <i>Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti</i> — Arrival and Spread of <i>Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika</i> Literature in Tibet	211
MARY FERENCZY (Budapest), The Formation of Tangut Statehood as Seen by Chinese Historiographers	241
MICHAEL HAHN (Bonn), Zu den Quellen einiger Strophen aus Sa skya Paṇḍitas <i>Subhāṣitaratnanidhi</i>	251
ZOLTÁN HORVÁTH (Budapest), Structure and Content of the <i>Chad-ma rigs-pa'i gter</i> , an Epistemological Treatise of Saskya Paṇḍita	267

YOSHIRO IMAEDA (Paris), Memento chronologique (<i>hstan-rtsis</i>) du calendrier bhoutanais	303
G. KARA (Budapest), A Sbra-nag Glossary in Grum-Gržimajlo's Travels	321
L. S. KAWAMURA (Calgary), Thus Have I Said — A Preliminary Study of the Tantra	363
E. I. KYCHANOV (Leningrad), From the History of the Tangut Translation of the Buddhist Canon	377

A HITHERTO UNNOTICED YÜAN-PERIOD COLLECTION ATTRIBUTED TO 'PHAGSPA*

BY

CHRISTOPHER I. BECKWITH (Bloomington)

Recently Luciano Petech, János Szerb, and others have published excellent studies on the history of the Tibetans at the court of the Mongol Great Khans, and have made clear the importance of Tibetan historical sources for the history of the Mongol Empire period in East Asia.¹ Although it is well known that Chinese sources are indispensable for the study of the Great Khanate, so far a number of valuable works have remained largely unused by Tibetologists and Sinologists, who seem therefore to be unaware of them. In particular, texts dealing with the religious sphere of activity at the Mongol court are still little studied, due perhaps to the prevailing misconception that the Mongols were not then seriously interested in religion, or did not favor one faith over the others, while supposedly religion was not an important factor in Mongol–Yüan history.² This serious misunderstanding, with the resulting lack of scholarly attention, has contributed to the current abysmal state of knowledge about Tibetan Tantric Buddhism among the Mongols during the Mongol Imperial period, and also among the Chinese from the Yüan Dynasty to the present day.

* I would like to thank Dr. János Szerb for his assistance in identifying the names of two works and of several historical personages mentioned in this paper.

¹ L. Petech, «Sang-ko, a Tibetan Statesman in Yüan China», *AOH* 34, 1980, pp. 193–208; id., «The Mongol Census in Tibet», in: M. Aris, et al., ed., *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*, Warminster 1980, pp. 233–238; J. Szerb, «Glosses on the Oeuvre of Bla-ma 'Phags-pa: II. Some Notes on the Events of the Years 1251–1254», *AOH* 34, 1980, pp. 263–285. See also Herbert Franke, «Tibetans in Yüan China», in: John D. Langlois, Jr., ed., *China under Mongol Rule*, Princeton 1981, pp. 296–328, an interesting and useful article, despite a few mistakes arising no doubt from Franke's unfamiliarity with Tibetan. (One error, concerning the origin of the Chinese name *T'u-fan*, «Tibet», should be noted. Franke states that the name derives from the Tibetan ethnonym *Bod*, but this equation was definitively disproven already in 1915 by Paul Pelliot: *Journal Asiatique*, 1915, pp. 18–20.) The only article so far devoted to surveying Tibetan sources on Chinese history is Josef Kolmaš's «Tibetan sources», in: Donald Leslie, et al., ed., *Essays on the Sources for Chinese History*, Canberra 1973, pp. 129–140, but this work hardly scratches the surface of the subject.

² It is very strange that such ideas could have arisen, in view of the unanimous opinion of the foreign accounts, most notably Marco Polo's and Rashīd al-Dīn's, that the Mongol Great Khans were completely swayed by the pronouncements and deeds of the «idolaters», or Buddhists, at their court. There are of course some excellent recent studies, notably K. Sagaster, *Die Weisse Geschichte*, Wiesbaden 1976, which may eventually be successful in changing the current opinion.

The Mongol court in China was, Tibetologists now believe, the center of great Tibetan Buddhist missionary activity, dominated by the Sakyas sect. It has usually been assumed that the only people at all influenced by this activity were the Mongols themselves. However, the fact must be considered that an enormous amount of time and effort was expended by the Mongol government on the production of Buddhist literature in Chinese. For example, in addition to the translation of various Buddhist canonical texts from Tibetan into Chinese,³ and perhaps even the composition of Buddhist texts in Chinese by Tibetans,⁴ a comparative catalogue of the Chinese and Tibetan canons was produced under Khubilai's patronage.⁵ Some of these texts are now preserved in the Chinese and Japanese editions of the *Tripitaka*. All of this rather orthodox material has been fairly easily available, if not quite well known, in Western Tibetological circles.

Twenty years ago, a previously unknown collection, called the *Tach'eng yao tao mi chi*, or «Secret Collection of Works on the Quintessential Path of the Mahâyâna» was brought to light and published.⁶ The publisher's preface makes several points. It states that although the mantra part of yoga came to China in the T'ang dynasty and passed from there to Japan, at the same time the siddha part of yoga came to Tibet and was only transmitted to China later, in the Yüan dynasty. According to the preface this collection, attributed to 'Phagspa, became a basic teaching text of the esoteric school in China, and from the Yüan through the Ming and Manchu-Ch'ing dynasties down to the present day it has been revered as a «sacred classic of the esoteric school». In other words, Tantric Buddhism—once introduced by 'Phagspa and his compatriots—did not die out in China.⁷ In fact, it continues to exist among Chinese, at least in Taiwan, where religious sects of all kinds openly flourish.⁸ A recent issue of a popular illustrated magazine from Taiwan includes a story about a young couple being married in one of this esoteric sect's temples. The

³ A rapid check produced these items: *Taishô Tripitaka* Nos. 925, 926, 976, 1417, 1645 (the famous 彰所知論 *Chang so chih lun*, a translation of 'Phagspa's *Ses-hya rab-gsal*), 1688, 1904, and 1905.

⁴ Some of the works in the *Ta-ch'eng yao tao mi chi* may be examples of this.

⁵ This is the 至元法寶勘同總錄 *Chih yüan fa pao k'an t'ung tsung lu*, in the *Taishô Tripitaka Index (Shôwa hôhô sômokuroku)* Vol. 2, No. 25, pp. 179a–238b. This extremely valuable work was later studied by the famous eighteenth century Mongol scholar Gung Gombojab, who included his Tibetan translation of it—abridged in part, but with occasional notes—in his *Rgyanag chos'byun*. So far, the only edition of the *Rgyanag chos'byun* that I have seen is the mimeographed version published by Namgyal Dorje Dalama, *The Penetration and the Spread of Buddhism in China*. Berkeley 1969, which was based on the publisher's copy of «the Lhasa print.»

⁶ Taipei. 自由出版社印行 *Tzu yu ch'u pan she yin hang*, 1962. The paperbound first version was in two volumes. The third printing, 1981, was in one hardbound volume.

⁷ The preface (pages 1–9 in the third printing) is by 蕭天石 Hsiao T'ien-shih.

⁸ The fact that such a book could be printed three times within twenty years testifies to this.

ceremony included the exchange of 哈達 *ho-ta*, or *khabtags*, and the text of the article mentions the Chinese sect's distant Tibetan origins.⁹ However, both the school and its texts have remained, apparently, quite unknown outside China.

The *Ta ch'eng yao tao mi chi* includes, according to my calculations, at least 28 texts. Since this number includes collections of works, the total number of separate texts is actually higher. By far the most important category of text is that devoted to 道果 *tao-kuo*, or *lam'bras*, teachings, which are especially favored by the Saskya sect. These five texts, totalling 238 pages, have commentaries, and include works authored or transmitted by Saskya Paṇḍita, the Imperial Preceptor 'Phagspa, and others. Among the other texts are several devoted to mantric utterances; a number of texts concerning 修習自在 *hsiu-hsi tzu-tsai* (*bhāvanākrama*); a «Prayer to the Eighty-five Mahāsiddhas» by a Master Vajrāsana; a versified hymn praising the travels of a certain master known as Wu-sheng *shang-shih* or Wu-hsien chin-kang *shang-shih*, in which some of the places in Central Asia and Tibet which he visited are mentioned; a short work on the iconometrics of stupas; a poetic work apparently dedicated to the praises of Padmasambhava; a work on new *mahāmudrā* translation(s); and a collection of short texts on *mahāmudrā*.

With the assistance of Dr. János Szerb, I have been able to positively identify two of the three or four works which are supposed to have been authored by 'Phagspa. These are firstly, the text 觀師要門 *Kuan shih yao men*, a short text included in work No. 3, «Virūpa's Volume on *lam'bras*». It is a translation of the *Blama'i rnal'byor*, text No. 27 in Volume 6 of the *Saskya bkā'bum*. The second identified text is one entitled 彌勒菩薩求修 *Mi le p'u sa ch'iu hsiu*, which is a translation of the *Byamspa'i sgrub-thabs*, text No. 142 in Volume 7 of the *Saskya bkā'bum*.

In addition to the contents of some of the works in this collection, what may be of especial interest to Tibetologists are the incipits and colophons. Quite often the transmission lineage of a text is given, and some familiar names — such as «Lama Marpa, Mila Raspa, Lama Ras-chuñ»¹⁰ etc. — may be recognized. Anyone wishing to study Tibetan historical phonology might also be interested in the numerous transcriptions of Tibetan and Sanskritic words and names scattered throughout the book.

My rather cursory examination of the contents of the *Ta ch'eng yao tao mi chi* leads me to the conclusion that 'Phagspa himself did not compile the collection.

◦ 家庭月刊 *Chia-t'ing yueh-k'an*, [Families; Published by TTV Weekly Magazines, P. O. Box 36-450, Taipei, Taiwan, R.O.C.] Vol. 23, August, 1976, pp. 16-19. For the rules I have followed in romanizing Tibetan, please see my article, «The Introduction of Greek Medicine into Tibet in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries»; *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 99, 1979, pp. 297-313, Note 2.

¹⁰ *Ta ch'eng yao tao mi chi*, p. 407.

However, numerous works of Yüan-period Saskyapa provenience are included in it, and one may therefore safely assume that most — if not all — of the texts date from that period.

A list of all of the texts included in the *Tach'eng yao tao mi chi* follows below, with all characters given in their standard forms. A high percentage of the names that I have attempted to interpret (in either English or Tibetan) are somewhat conjectural, but I thought that perhaps an imperfect attempt would be better than none at all.

Contents of the *Ta ch'eng yao tao mi chi*

1. 道果延暉集 *Tao kuo yen hui chi*, pp. 1–38. «Compiled and translated by the Dhâraṇi-holding Śramaṇa 莎南屹囉 *So-nan ch'i-lo* [*Bsod-nams grags].» A *lam'bras* text.

2. 依吉祥上樂輪方便智慧雙運道玄義卷 *I chi hsiang shang lo lun fang pien chih hui shuang yün tao hsüan i*, pp. 39–86. «Recorded by the 祐國寶塔弘覺國師 Yu kuo pao t'a hung chüeh *kuo shih* [National Preceptor], the Śramaṇa 慧信 Hui-hsin.»

3. 密哩斡巴上師道果卷 *Mi-li-wo-pa shang shih tao kuo chüan*, pp. 87–169. A collection (the title may be rendered «Virüpa's Volume on *lam'bras* [the Path and the Fruit]») consisting of various texts authored or transmitted by Saskya Paṇḍita and 'Phagspa, as follows:

a. 引上中下三機儀 *Yin shang chung hsia san chi i*, pp. 87–93. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named 幘 T'ung [= (Kun-dgā) Rgyal-mtshan].»

b. 授修習勅軌 *Shou hsiu hsi ch'ih kuei*, pp. 93–99. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, Master 普喜幘 P'u hsi t'ung [Kun-dgā rgyal-mtshan].»

c. 攝受承不絕授灌記文 *She shou ch'eng pu chüeh shou kuan chi wen*, pp. 99–104. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgā) rgyal-mtshan]»

d. 五緣生道 *Wu yüan sheng tao*, pp. 104–111. «Transmitted by the Great Saskya Paṇḍita, the Master P'u-hsi-t'ung [= (Kun-dgā) rgyal-mtshan].»

e. 大金剛乘修師觀門 *Ta chin kang ch'eng hsiu shih kuan men*, pp. 111–125. «Transmitted by the Great Saskya Paṇḍita, the 上師 *shang shih* ['Superior Master', = *lama*] 着哩哲斡 Cho li che wo [Chos-rjeba, i. e., Saskya Paṇḍita¹¹].»

f. 觀師要門 *Kuan shih yao men*, pp. 125–128. «Compiled by the 帝師 *Ti shih* [Imperial Preceptor] of the Great Yüan, 發思巴 *Pa-ssu-pa* ('Phagspa). Translated by the Dhâraṇi-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.» This is a translation of

¹¹ Saskya Paṇḍita is called 綽理哲瓦 *Cho li che wa* (*Chos-rjeba) in 念常 *Nien Ch'ang*, 佛相歷代通載 *Fo tsu li tai t'ung tsai* (Taishō No. 2036) p. 725c.

'Phagpa's short work, the *Blama'i rnal'byor*, No. 27 in Volume 6 of the *Saskya Bkã'bum*.

g. 含藏因續記文 *Han ts'ang yin hsü chi wen*, pp. 129–132. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan]. Translated by the Dhârañi-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.»

h. 座等略文 *Tso teng lüeh wen*, pp. 132–144. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan].» The Final title is different. It reads 辨死相文 *Pan ssu hsiang wen*.

i. (No title), pp. 144–156. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan].»

j. 說道時受灌儀 *Shuo tao shih shou kuan i (?)*, pp. 156–158. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan].» No initial title is given.

k. 四量記文 *Ssu liang chi wen*, pp. 158–167. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan].» No concluding title is given.

l. 除影瓶法 *Ch'u ying p'ing fa (?)*, pp. 167–168. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan].» No initial title is given.

m. 截截除影法 *Chieh chieh ch'u ying fa*, pp. 168–169. «Transmitted by the Great Yogin, the Master named T'ung [= (Kun-dgã) rgyal-mtshan].» The conclusion includes the title as 截截除影法儀 *Chieh chieh ch'u ying fa i*.

4. 解釋道果語錄金剛句記 *Chieh shih tao kuo yü lu chin kang chü chi*, pp. 171–200. «Translated by Śramaṇa 慧忠 Huei-chung of the 北山大清涼寺 *Pei shan ta ch'ing liang ssu*, transmitted by 中國大乘玄密帝師 *Chung kuo ta ch'eng hsüan mi ti shih* [The Great Vehicle Esoteric Imperial Preceptor of China], collected by the Master of the Law of Tibet and China, 禪巴 Ch'an-pa.» A *lam'bras* commentary.

5. 解釋道果逐難記 *Chieh shih tao kuo chu nan chi*, pp. 201–239. «Transmitted and translated by the Śramaṇa 寶昌 Pao-ch'ang of the 甘泉大覺圓寂寺 *Kan ch'üan tao chüeh yüan chi ssu*.» A commentary on the preceding text. The translator says of his work, «(I) Pao-ch'ang, relying on two Tibetan texts, have translated (them) into the (present) Chinese text, thus collating them together in one place.» The third item in the commentary (p. 201) reveals that «the Great Ch'an-pa» was a pupil of the Master of the Law 嘛 K'ang, who is identified as 嘛薩悉結瓦 *K'ang sa hsi chieh wa*, another name for 極喜真心師 *Chi hsi chen hsin* [= Kun-dgã sñiñpo?].

6. 大乘密藏現證本續摩尼樹卷 *Ta ch'eng mi ts'ang hsien cheng pen hsü mo ni shu chüan*, pp. 241–291. «Composed by the Superior Master [*blama*], the

大薩思嘉知宗巴 *Ta sa ssu chia chih tsung pa* (Great Saskya *Rjebtsunpa [= Gragspa rgyal-mtshan?]), translated by the Dhâraṇî-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.»

7. 五方佛真言 *Wu fang fo chen yen*, pp. 293–300. Anonymous. The title may be translated «The True Word (about) the Buddhas of the Five Directions.» Mostly mantric utterances, but it includes one diagram (p. 296).

8. 阿彌陀佛臨終要 *A mi t'o fo lin chung yao*, pp. 301–303. «Translated by the Dhâraṇî-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.» The colophon gives the lineage of the masters who transmitted the text, beginning with the Bodhisattva Mañ'uśrî and ending with the transmission from Saskya Paṇḍita to the master Ssu na li t'an wo [= Snar-thaṅba?].

9. 修習自在密哩呷巴讚嘆 *Hsiu hsi tzu tsai mi li wa pa tsan t'an*, pp. 304–305 (or 306?). The colophon says, «The *Hsiu hsi tzu tsai mi li wa pa* [*Virûpa's Bhâvanâkrama] was collected at Saskya at the request of (?) the 洛穆呷貢^兒葛_二合監藏班藏布 *Lo tsa wa Kung erh-ko* (the two [characters are read] together) *chien ts'ang pan ts'ang* [also read *tsang*] *pu* (= Locchâva Kun-dgâ rgyal-mtshan dpal-bzaṅpo [1310–1358; he was an Imperial Preceptor, according to G. N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals* (Calcutta, 1949; 1949; repr. Delhi, 1979) pp. 213–214]).»

10. 彌勒菩薩求修 *Mi le p'u sa ch'iu hsiu*, pp. 307–309. «Compiled by 慈思巴辣麻 *Pa ssu pa la ma* ['Phagspa Lama].» This text is a translation of 'Phagspa's work, the *Byamspa'i sgrub-thabs*, No. 142 in Volume 7 of the *Saskya Bkâ'bum*.

11. 上師二十五位滿吒藥 *Shang shih erh shih wu wei man cha la*, pp. 310–313. Anonymous. Mantric utterances.

12. 修習自在擁護要門 *Hsiu hsi tzu tsai yung hu yao men*, pp. 313–315. The colophon states, «The *Hsiu hsi tzu tsai yung hu yao men* was compiled by the Most Clearly Manifest 'Phagspa.»

13. 修習自在攝受記 *Hsiu hsi tzu tsai she shou chi*, pp. 316–317. Anonymous.

14. 成就八十五師禱祝 *Ch'eng chiu pa shih wu shih tao chu*, pp. 319–329. «Composed by Master 金剛座 *Chin kang tso* [= Vajrâsana].» The title may be translated «Prayer (to) the Eighty-five Mahâsiddhas.»

15. 無生上師出現感應功德頌 *Wu sheng shang shih ch'u hsien kan ying kung te sung*, pp. 331–334. «Summarized on the basis of the Indic [梵 *fan* (occasionally = 'Tibetan')] text by the practicing monk of *Ma t'i shan*, the 座主 *tso chu* [= 'meditation master?'] 穆巴 *Tsa pa* [or *Tsan pa*].» The work referred to is mentioned in the colophon as the 行記 *Hsing chi* («Travel Account») of the Superior Master 無先金剛 *Wu hsien chin kang*. The present work is a versified

hymn praising the travels of the Master, and mentions some of the places he visited in Central Asia.

16. 苦樂爲道要門 *K'u le wei tao yao men*, pp. 335–336. Anonymous. The colophon gives the transmission lineage, which ends with the transmission from 看纏_囉 二合思巴孺奴 *K'an ch'an ch'i-lo (erh ho) ssu pa ju nu* [*Mkhan-chen gragspa g'zonnū] to 看纏_囉 莎南_囉 *K'an ch'an so nan ch'i lo* [*Mkhan-chen Bsod-nams grags] to 法尊_囉 莎南_囉 監藏 *Fa tsun so nan chien ts'ang* [= Venerator of the Dharma Bsod-nams rgyal-mtshan].

17. 北俱盧州延壽儀 *Pei chü lu chou yen shou i*, pp. 337–339. Anonymous.

18. 護菩提要門 *Hu p'u t'i yao men* (?), pp. 341–342. Anonymous. The title is taken from the incipit; the concluding title is 護持菩提要門 *Hu ch'ih p'u t'i yao men*.

19. 菩提心戒儀 *P'u t'i hsin chieh i*, pp. 343–348. «Recorded by the Superior Master 公葛朋 *Kung ko p'eng* [*Kun-dgã phuñ (?)], translated by the Dhâraṇī-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.»

20. 服石要門 *Fu shih yao men*, pp. 349–352. Anonymous. The second line begins: 蓮花上師 *Lien hua shang shih*. . . [«The Superior Master Padma. . .»].

21. 大菩提塔樣尺寸法 *Ta p'u t'i t'a yang ch'ih ts'un fa*, pp. 353–357. The colophon states that the work was compiled by 卜_思端_端 «*Pu ssu-tuan* (the two [characters are read] together) [*Buston(?)]» and was written [書 *shu* (calligraphed?)] by 唎_纏南_加 二合 *Ling-ch'an nan chia-le* (erh-ho). On the iconometrics of stūpas.

22. 聖像內置總持略軌 *Sheng hsiang nei chih tsung ch'ih lüeh kuei*, pp. 359–363. «Transmitted by the Superior Master of India, the 勝諸冤敵節怛哩巴 *Sheng chu yüan ti chieh ta li pa*, translated by the Dhâraṇī-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.»

23. 略勝住法儀 *Lüeh sheng chu fa i*, pp. 365–368. «Transmitted by the Imperial Preceptor of the Great Yüan, *Pa ssu pa* [Phagspa], translated by the Dhâraṇī-holding Śramaṇa *Bsod-nams grags.»

24. (No title), pp. 369–373. Anonymous. The second line is an invocation to «the most esoteric [etc.] Superior Master 化身蓮花 *Hua shen lien hua* [*Sprul-sku padma, i. e., Padmasambhava].»

25. 新譯大手印不共義配教要門 *Hsin i ta shou yin pu kung i p'ei chia yao men*, pp. 375–393. «Compiled by the great 巴彌怛銘得哩_師 *Pa mi ta ming te li wo shih* [Master Paṇḍita Maitrīpâ], transmitted by 果海密嚴寺玄照國師沙門慧賢 *Kuo hai mi yen ssu hsüan chao kuo shih sha men hui hsien* [the National Preceptor Hsüan chao, the Śramaṇa Hui hsien of *Kuo hai mi yen ssu*], translated by the Śramaṇa 慧幢 *Hui t'ung* of *Kuo hai mi yen ssu*.»

26. 十種真性: *Shih chung chen hsing*, pp. 393–394. Anonymous. The title may be translated «The Ten Kinds of True Natures».

27. 新譯大手印頓入要門 *Hsin i ta shou yin tun ju yao men*, pp. 395–396. «Transmitted by *Kuo hai mi yen ssu hsüan chao kuo shih sha men hui hsien* [the National Preceptor Hsüan Chao, the Śramaṇa Hui hsien of *Kuo hai mi yen ssu*], translated by the Śramaṇa Hui t'ung of *Kuo hai mi yen ssu*.»

28. (No title), pp. 397–437. Anonymous. Although no title or authorship information is given at this point in the text, it is obvious that the remainder of the book consists wholly of a collection of very short anonymous texts dealing with mahāmudrâ. Since in numerous cases there is no title, or there is some question about the correct title, or it is uncertain if one may identify a section as a separate text or section of text, I have not included a list here. I hope that others more enlightened than I will work on this material, correct my mistakes, and make this interesting book more accessible to the scholarly world.

THE ŚĀTAGĀTHĀ ATTRIBUTED TO VARARUCI

BY

GÉZA BETHLENFALVY (Budapest)

By translating 234 stanzas of Sa-skya Paṇḍita's *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, Alexander Csoma de Kőrös opened up a path which is marked by several new translations, researches and by growing and widening interest. Already L. W. Campbell (who translated the whole *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* into German) published another Tibetan collection of wise sayings, the *Šes-rab sdoñ-bu* attributed to Nāgārjuna. More attention to the other *nīti*-collections preserved in the Tanjur was paid only in the last decades. The *Cāṇakya-rājanīti-śāstram* and Masūrākṣa's *Nītiśāstram* were published and translated by Sunitikumar Pathak in 1958 and 1961 respectively. The *Nītiśāstra-janapoṣanabindu* attributed to Nāgārjuna was published by Ts. Damdinsuren in 1964 together with Tibetan and Mongol commentaries (which were earlier studied by Vladimirtsov). In the last 10 years the works of Sunitikumar Pathak, Michael Hahn, N. Bolsohova and T. Malanova contributed much to the exploration of the Tibetan *nīti* texts. But the greatest impulse was given by the extensive researches and comprehensive works of Ludvik Sternbach which made the Indian *subhāṣita* literature accessible.

Of the eight *nīti* texts preserved in the Tanjur only three remained unedited till now. The present paper contains the text and an English translation of the collection entitled *Śatagāthā* which, according to the colophon, was written by M̄chog-sred (= Mvy. Vararuci), and translated into Tibetan by dge-sloñ Čhos-kyi šes-rab and the paṇḍit Vinayacandra.

There are several persons in Indian history known under the name Vararuci. One is the famous grammarian, author of the *Vārttika* commentary of Pāṇini's grammar. This author is also known under the name Kātyāyana and lived in the 1st–2nd century B. C. One of the Kātyāyanas was a minister of the Nandas in Magadha in the 4th century B. C. Another Vararuci was a grammarian of Pāli. (His grammar is also included in the Tanjur and belongs to the 4th century AD.) He may be the same person who is mentioned among the «nine gems» in the court of Vikramāditya, a contemporary of Kālidāsa. Sum-pa-mkhan-po refers to a Vararuci, a friend of Nāgārjuna and Mahāpadma. This may be the Vararuci who composed the hymns praising Mahākāla, 14 of which have been translated into Tibetan, and included in the *Tanjur*. Tārānātha also relates stories about a brahman Vararuci. These references do not help much in identifying the author of our *Śataka*.

Sanskrit *Subhāṣitasamgrahas* have preserved many verses attributed to Vararuci (I collected 45 of them) and also a small collection entitled *Nītiratnam* is attributed in some of the Mss to Vararuci — but, curiously enough, none of the Sanskrit stanzas agree with any of the Tibetan verses. In this view the question of authorship has to be left open.

The Tibetan translators, however, can be dated: they belong to the Post-Atīśa period (*phyi-dar*), and are contemporaries of Śākya-blo-gros of 'Brog, which means the 11–12th century.

The most interesting feature of the *Śatagāthā* is that almost all its verses can be traced in other Tibetan translations, too, and by collating the various versions some light may be thrown on the methods of translating Sanskrit texts into Tibetan, and on the development of the Tibetan language in that period.

In the present paper some material has been collected and put together for further investigation. I am sure that many more parallels exist, both in Sanskrit and Tibetan, and a clear picture for a solution of the literary problems will emerge only after much more extensive material will be made available, something on the scale of the *Mahāsubhāṣitasamgraha*. This work attempts to contribute a little bit to that great task.

ABBREVIATIONS

Brgya: Nāgārjuna (Klu-sgrub), *Lugs-kyi bstan-bčos šes-rab brgya-pa*

C: Cāṅakya, *Ča-na-ka'i rgyal-po'i lugs-kyi bstan-bčos* as edited by Sunitikumar Pathak, *Cāṅakya-rajānītīśāstram: Visva Bharati Annals VIII*, Santiniketan 1959.

D: Derge Tanjur

Gso: Nāgārjuna, *Lugs-kyi bstan-bčos skye-bo gso-ba'i thig-pa*, as edited by Ts. Damdinsuren, *Rasiyan-udusul-un Mongyol-Töbed tayilburi: Corpus Scriptorum Mongolorum VII*, Ulaanbaatar 1964.

IS: O. Böhtlingk, *Indische Sprüche I–III*, St. Petersburg 1863–1865; 2nd edition 1870–73. Serial numbers refer to the second edition, the number of the first edition is given in brackets, so that Schiefner's notes can be found.

M: *Ma-su-rā-kṣā'i lugs-kyi bstan-bčos* as edited by Sunitikumar Pathak, *Visva Bharati Annals X*, Santiniketan 1961.

MSS: L. Sternbach, *Mahā-Subhāṣita-Samgraha*, Delhi 1974 —

N: Narthang Tanjur

P: Peking Tanjur (Japanese reprint)

Pathak INT: Sunitikumar Pathak, *Indian Nītiśāstras in Tibet*, Delhi 1974.

R: Ravigupta (Ñi-ma sbas-pa), *Chigs-su bčad-pa'i mjad*

Sdoñ: Nāgārjuna, *Lugs-kyi bstan-bčos šes-rab sdoñ-bu* as edited by W. L. Campbell, *She-rab dong-bu*, Calcutta 1919. If quoted from the Tanjur the edition is mentioned, e.g. Sdoñ (D)

SRBh: *Subhāṣita-ratna-bhāndāgāra*, ed. by Nārāyan Rām Āchārya, Kāvya-tīrtha, Bombay 1952.

Sternbach CA: L. Sternbach, *The Spreading of Cāṅakya's Aphorisms over «Greater India»*, Calcutta 1969.

Sternbach KK: L. Sternbach, *The Kāvya-portions in the Kathā-literature*, Delhi I. 1971, II. 1976.
 Subh: *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, Sa-skya paṇḍita, *Legs-par bṣad-pa rin-po-ṅhe'i gter* as in the Ms. published
 by L. Ligeti, *Le Subhāṣitaratnanidhi mongol*, Budapest 1948.
 V: Vararuci (Mṅhog-sred), *Chigs-su bṅad-pa brgya-pa*

THE TEXT, TRANSLATION AND NOTES

|| *rgya-gar-skad-du* | *Ṣa-ta-gā-thā* | *bod-skad-du* | *Chigs-su bṅad-pa brgya-pa* |
dkon-mṅhog-gsum-la phyag-'chal-lo |

In the language of India: Hundred verses. In the language of Tibet: Hundred verses. I prostrate before the Three Precious Ones.

- (1) | *rig-pa gžon-pa'i*¹ *dus-na slob*² |
 | *ba ni dgun*³-*gyi dus-su gsos* |
 | *žiñ ni ser-dañ-ldan-la rmos* |
 | *'di gsum 'bras-bu smin-pa'i*⁴ *rgyu* |

Acquire knowledge during youth,
 nourish the cow in winter-time,
 plough the field in autumn, [or «in winter», or «when it is wet»]
 these three cause fruit to ripen.

1. Cf. Gso 19: *gžon-pa'i dus-su rig-pa bslab* | *bžo 'dod ba ni dgun-nas gso* | *drod-gser-ldan dus sa-bon gdab* |
'di gsum 'bras-bu smin-pa'i rgyu || Transl. of (bc): «If you want milk, feed the cow in winter; sow the seed
 when there is warmth and moisture»

¹N -*nu*'i ²N,P *slobs* ³D *rgun* ⁴N,P -*ba*'i

The meaning of *ser-dañ-ldan* is not clear. We find *ser-čan* explained as «*žiñ sa gser yod-pa*», which would give «wet, drenched». In another dictionary we find among the names of autumn: *ston-ka'i miñ. gser-ldan-ma ni*, which comes from Sanskrit *hemant*, meaning both «winter» and «gold». According to Das (p. 1311) *gser-ldan* «*hemavat*»: n. of the capital of Indra, *gser-ldan-ma* «*hemavatī*» possessing gold; n. of wife of Krishna; and *gser-čan* «*kañcī*», the golden city. p. 1272: *ser-čan* «rancid» does not fit well. If we compare this line with Gso 19 (c), we have to state that this line has been changed, though we cannot establish whether the change was made in Tibetan or in the Sanskrit original. However a real parallel order of lines would be: V, Gso(a) — V(b) — Gso(c) — V, Gso(d).

- (2) | *mkhas-pas rig-pa rnam-kun-tu*¹ |
 | *lañ-cho*² *yol-kyañ*³ *bslab bya-ste*⁴ |
 | *gal-te 'dir 'bras ma smin*⁵-*yañ* |
 | *skye-ba gžan-du rñed-par*⁶ *sla* |

The wise man should strive to acquire right knowledge⁷
 even when his youth is over.

Though the fruit may not ripen here [in this life],
it will be easy to obtain it in another birth [life].

2. Cf. Sdoñ 133: (the same translation) and Subh 7 (adaptation). Cf. also Subh 306, 438.

¹D -du ²N -mcho, Sdoñ na-chod «age» ³N,P -yañ ⁴Sdoñ -par bya ⁵Sdoñ mi ster- «does not give, present» ⁶Sdoñ -pa ⁷Campbell: «all sciences»

The differences between V and Sdoñ are negligible. V has changed the translation of Sdoñ only slightly, mostly making it clearer. The Subh version is certainly based on the canonic verse but it is much more artistic.

(3) | yon-tan-dag-la 'bad bya-yi |
| 'gyiñ-chul bstan-pas¹ či-žig bya² |
| 'o-ma med-pa'i ba-dag ni |³
| dril-bu btags⁴-kyañ ñor⁵ mi 'gyur⁶ |

Why should he, who strives for virtues,
learn the way of arrogance.
The cow, which does not have milk,
will not be bought although a bell has been tied on it.

3. Cf. Sdoñ 139, Gso 20. Skr cf. SRBh 81/12: *guṇeṣu kriyatām yatnaḥ kimūtopaiḥ prayojanam | vikriyante na ghaṇṭābhiraḡvāḥ kśīravivarjitāḥ |*

¹Sdoñ, Gso dgos-pa ²Sdoñ, Gso yod ³Sdoñ | ba ni 'o-ma-med-pa-la | Gso 'o-ma-med-par gyur-ba'i ba |
⁴N btags ⁵Sdoñ ño ⁶Gso 'dod

Sdoñ agrees with Skr closely. *bstan* is worse than *dgos* while the word order of line (c) has been improved by V.

(4) | yon-tan-ldan-pa yon-tan-la dga'-žin¹ |
| yon-tan-med-pa yon-tan-la² mi dga'³ |
| nags-kyi buñ-ba mcho-yi⁴ padmar dga' |⁵
| sbal-pa lhan-čig gnas-kyañ de-lta min |

While he, who is virtuous is delighted by virtue,
A [man] without virtue is not delighted by virtues.
The forest-bee is delighted by the lotus of the lake,
the frog, although living together [with the lotus in the lake], is not.

4. Cf. Sdoñ 150. Cf. also V 84, Subh 115, 8, 76, 91. Skr cf. IS 5149 (856), SRBh 82/35: *guṇini guṇajñō ramate nāguṇaśīlasya guṇini paritoṣaḥ || alireti vanātkamalaṃ na dardurastannivaso'pi ||*

¹Sdoñ -yi ²Sdoñ -gyis ³Sdoñ mgu ⁴N -yis ⁵Sdoñ buñ-ba nags-nas pad-mar 'oñ-' gyur-gyis «The bee comes from the forest to the lotus»

Tib agrees almost exactly with Skr. Line (c) of V contains a slight change: it may be explained from Tib as its language is more simple; but the bee — lake metaphor is also known from Skr. Subh 115 is certainly based on this stanza. Related motives occur in Subh 8 (cd), 76, 91 (ab).

- (5) | *yon-tan-ldan-la phyug-po dkon*¹ |
 | *phyug-po-la yañ yon-tan dkon* |

Among virtuous men riches are rare,
 Among rich men virtue is rare

5. Cf. R 77: *yon-tan-ldan-la phyug-po dkon* | *phyug-po phal-čher yon-tan med* | *me-tog rna-rgyan rab-mjes-kyañ* | *li-ši'i me-tog dri rab-žim* || Translation of (cd): «Though flowers are very nice ornaments of the ear, the flower of clove has [only] very sweet smell». Cf. also Subh 239 (a): *nor-ldan blun-po'i nañ-na mañ* |

¹N *kon*

This stanza is probably incomplete. A fuller version occurs in R. The connection of lines (ab) with (cd) is loose there also. Subh 239 (a) contains a similar idea.

- (6) | *yul-ljoñs dpag-tu med mod-kyi* |
 | *rin-po-čhe-dag skye-ba dkon* |
 | *'gro-ba dpag-tu med mod-kyi* |
 | *pha-ma rñed-pa šin-tu dkon* |

Though [the size of] a country is immeasurable,
 the appearance of precious stones is rare.
 Though [the number] of living beings is immeasurable,
 to obtain parents [human rebirth] is very rare.

6. Cf. R 90: *'gro-ba šin-tu grañs-med-kyañ* | *sems-čan yon-tan-ldan-pa dkon* | *yul-ljoñs dpag-tu med mod-kyi* | *rin-po-čhe-dag 'byuñ-ba dkon* |

The sequence of lines is changed in Var, bringing the explaining example first. The «rare» thing is not virtue but lucky rebirth, a frequent topic in Buddhism (Cf. V 2).

- (7) | *dam-pa riñ-na gnas-gyur-kyañ* |
 | *pho-ña yon-tan-ñid*¹ *byed-de* |
 | *ke-ta-ka-yi dri-yis ni*² |
 | *buñ-ba rañ-bžin 'oñ-ba bžin*³ |

Even if a good man lives far away,
 [his] virtue will serve as a messenger,
 just as, led by the sweet odour of the ketaka,
 the bees come to it of their own accord.⁴

7. Cf. Sdoñ 138, Subh 8. Cf. also Subh 37, 42. Cf. Skr I S 2128 (843), SRBh 81/1: *guṇāḥ kurvanti dūtatvaṃ dūre'pi vasatām satām* | *ketakī gandhamāghrāya svayamāyanti śatpadāḥ* |. Cf. also Bethlenfalvy, G, *On the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, Delhi 1980, in: *Papers on the Literature of Northern Buddhism* pp. 30–33.

¹Sdoñ *yon-tan pho-ñā-ñid* ²Sdoñ *hsams-nas* ³Sdoñ *bun-ba rañ-ñid 'oñ-bar gyur*

Sdoñ translates Skr almost word by word, changing (ab) according to Tibetan syntax. The slight changes in V look independent from Skr. Subh 8 is a quite close variation, 42 and 37 contain only similar ideas.

- (8) | *rgyal-po yon-tan-ldan-pa gñis* |
| *mñam-žin 'dra-ba¹ ma yin-te* |²
| *rgyal-po rañ-gi yul-na 'khur³* |
| *yon-tan-ldan-pa kun-tu⁴ 'khur³* |

A king and a good man, these two,
though equal, are not similar. [P,N.: can not compete.]
The king is revered in his own country,
the good man is revered everywhere.

8. Cf. Sdoñ 135, 227, Subh 43, Marian H Duncan, *Love Songs and Proverbs of Tibet* 612; Skr from Sternbach CA 202: *vidvatvaṃ ca nṛpatvaṃ ca naiṃ tulyaṃ kadācana | svadeśe pūjyate rājā vidvān sarvatra pūjyate |*

¹N,P *'gran-pa* ²Sdoñ 135 *rgyal-po dan ni yon-tan-ldan | de gñis 'dra-ba ma yin-te* | Sdoñ 227: *rig-par-ldan dan rgyal-po ni | gañ-du 'aṅ mñam-pa ma yin-te* | ³Sdoñ 135, 227 *bkur*. According to dictionaries only the verb *'khur* with the meaning «to carry a burden» has a Pf. *bkur*; *bkur* «to play reverence, homage» does not have a form *'khur*. Here, however, only the translation «is revered» seems to be correct. ⁴D *du* ⁵Sdoñ 227 *rig-ldan kun-tu bkur-bar 'gyur*

None of the Tib versions is an exact translation. Sdoñ 227 is nearest in wording to Skr, V 8 is similar to Sdoñ 135. V (c) is a slightly extended variant compared with the other ones.

- (9) | *dus ni¹ yun-thuñ rig-pa'i rnam-pa mañ* |
| *gañ-žig gčes-pa² de ni bsten-par-gyis³* |

Time is short, the branches of knowledge are many.
You must concentrate on whichever [branch] is most important.

9. Cf. Sdoñ 140, Skr IS 85/243, SRBh 173/879, MSS 1216 and 1220. *anantapāraṃ kila śabdaśāstram svalpaṃ tathāyur bahavaśca vighnāḥ | yat sārabhūtaṃ tadupāsaniyaṃ haṃsair-yathā kṣīramivāmbu-madhyāi* | (Pañc. Kathāmukha) Cf. also the motif of *haṃsa* in Subh 20 in another context.

¹N *-kyi* ²N *čes-pa* ³Sdoñ *bya*

Sdoñ 140 has two lines between V (ab): | *che-yi chad-kyañ ji-cam mi šes-pas* | *nañ-pa čhu-la 'o-ma len-pa bžin* | Taking Skr into consideration it is clear that V was extracted from Sdoñ.

- (10) | *yul¹ ni šin-tu dus² riñ gnas-kyañ*
| *nes-pa kho-nar 'gro-bar 'gyur* |
| *'bral-la khyad-par či-žig³ yod-na*
| *'gro-ba⁴ rañ-ñid spoñ mi byed* |

- (11) | *dbaṅ⁵ med 'bral-las yid-la yoṅs-su*
 gduṅ-ba mtha'-yas skyed-par byed |
 | *'di-dag raṅ-gis spaṅs-na⁶ ži-ba'i*
 bde-ba mtha'-yas 'byuṅ-bar⁷ 'gyur |

Even if you stay in a country for a very long time
 it is an absolute certainty that you will go away.

Whatsoever may be the form of separation
 the going itself cannot be avoided.

Being separated against your will
 endless pain will be born for the mind.

But if you abandon these things of your own will
 endless joy of peace will appear.

10–11. Cf. Sdoṅ 101–102

¹P *yun* ²Sdoṅ *yun-* ³D *gčig-žig* ⁴N *-bar* ⁵N *dpag-* ⁶Sdoṅ *spyāṅs-na ni* ⁷Sdoṅ *'thob-par* — Campbell omits *-kyaṅ* and *-na* from lines (a) and (c) to form 7 syllable lines and added the last syllables to 102 (a) (c).

Differences are insignificant. In fact 10–11 should be understood as one stanza with four 15 syllable lines.

- (12) | *dam-pa-min-daṅ lhan-čig gnas-gyur-kyaṅ |*
 | *čhu daṅ padma bžin-du 'dres¹ mi 'gyur |*
 | *dam-pa thag-riṅ-dag-na² gnas-gyur-kyaṅ |*
 | *zla-ba ku-mu-da-ltar dga'-bar byed |*

If somebody lives together with a bad man
 — like the padma lives with the [muddy] water — the two will not mix.
 But good people, even if they live very far from each other,
 — like the moon and the padma — they make each other happy.

12. Cf. Sdoṅ 192. Similar verses V 7, 24, 84; Subh 122, particularly the second part. Cf. Skr from SRBh 58/175 *saha vasatāmapyasatāṃ jalaruḥajalavadbhavatyasamśleṣaḥ || dūre'pi satāṃ vasatāṃ prītiḥ kumudenduvadbhavati |* (From Vallabhadeva)

¹N *'dres* ²Sdoṅ *-tu*

The Tib translation agrees exactly with Skr. Subh 122 contains a similar idea but the words are consciously changed by Sa-skye paṅḍita.

- (13) | *'du-'ji kun-tu¹ spaṅ-bar hya² |*
 | *dam-pa-dag-daṅ grogs-par brcom³ |*
 | *nad-kyi 'jigs-pa⁴ med-pa ni⁵ |*
 | *ñin gčig ⁶ lo brgya-bas-kyaṅ mčhog⁷ |*

Give up carousals completely
and cultivate friendship with good men.
One day without fear of sickness
is better than a hundred years.

13. Cf. Sdoñ 43 (three lines) and 187 (two lines). Contamination pattern of the lines:

V	Sdoñ 43	Sdoñ 187	
(a)	—	(a)	the only common line in all three verses is V(b)
(b)	(b)	(c)	
(c)	(a)	—	
(d)	(d)	—	

Cf. also C4/15(ab)

¹D -du ²Sdoñ 187 -gyis ³D <brcon>, Sdoñ 187 dre-bar-gyis ⁴D nad-kyis 'jig-pa ⁵Sdoñ 43 ma byuñ-žin
⁶P žig ⁷Sdoñ 43 mčhog yin

V is extracted from the two verses of Sdoñ.

(14) | 'dod-pa kun-tu¹ spañ-bar bya² |
| gal-te de spoñ³ ma⁴ nus-na |
| thar-pa dag-la 'dod-par-gyis |
| de-ñid de-yi sman yin-no |

Abandon desire completely.
But if you are not able to abandon it,
cultivate desire for the passionless state of Nirvāṇa —
this is the remedy.

14. Cf. Sdoñ 188

¹D -du ²Sdoñ -gyis ³Sdoñ spoñ-bar ⁴P mi

In Sdoñ also follows the previous stanza. A clear borrowing.

(15) | skar-ma čhen-po mañ-du šar-gyur-čič |
| sa-yi rgyan-gyur zla-ba šar-na-yañ |
| gañ-che¹ ñi-ma nub-na mchan-mor 'gyur² |
| ñi-ma ma-gtogs šar-nub phyogs mi phyed³ |

Although many big stars shine
and although the moon, the earth's ornament, also shines,
when the sun goes down it will be night.
Without the sun, dawn and nightfall would not alternate.

15. Cf. Sdoñ 141. Cf. also Subh 209 (cd). Cf. Skr IS 1245 (468), SRBh 209/9, MSS 6871: *udyantu nāma subahūni mahāmahāmsi candro'pyalam bhuvanamaṇḍalamāṇḍanāya | sūryāḍte na tadudeti na cāstameti yenoditena dinamastamitena rātriḥ ||* (Attributed to Ānandhavarmana, 9th cent.)

¹Sdoñ -du ²P gyur ³Sdoñ miñ mi 'dogs. Campbell translates the last line: «Except for the sun there is no meaning attached (to the terms) 'east' and 'west'».

Here V(c) is nearer to Skr, where clearly day and night alternate, although in V a translation «Directions East — West alternate» could also be accepted.

- (16) | gañ-žig šar-nub¹ gyur-na-yañ² |
 | ñi-ma med-na gzi-čan med |³
 | ñi-ma šar-ba mčhog yin-gyi |
 | gžan-dag šar-ba či-žig dgos |⁴

But even if morning and evening existed
 without the sun there is no brightness.
 As the shining of the sun is the best
 no other shining is needed.

16. Cf. Sdoñ 142. and partly Subh 58(cd), 209(cd). Cf. Skr IS. 4739 (2132): (b) *astam yānti prakāśena tārakā hi vivasvataḥ* «... the stars vanish due to the light of the Bright one»

¹D Sdoñ *šar-bar* (transl: But even if morning came... , Campbell's transl: On whatever it shines...)

²Sdoñ ni ³Sdoñ (b) *mun-pa med-čin gzi-čan byed* ⁴Sdoñ (d) *gžan-rnams šar-bas či-žig bya*

Sdoñ now clearly says «sunrise» while V may be still understood as «directions». V is a borrowing from Sdoñ.

- (17) | me-tog-gi ni¹ mgo-lčogs² bžin³ |
 | dam-pa'i gro-ba⁴ gñis yin-te |
 | 'jig-rten kun-gyi spyi bkur-ba'am⁵ |
 | nags-ñid-du ni⁶ deñs-par bya⁷ |

Like that of a bunch of flowers,
 the destiny of a good man is of two kinds:
 Either he is revered at the top of the whole world [~as a head ornament],
 or he vanishes in some forest.

17. Cf. Sdoñ 26, where lines (a) and (b) are changed. Cf. also C3/9 and partly Subh 343 (ab). Skr Cf. IS 1845 (708), Sternbach CA 52: *kusumastabakasyeva dvayī vṛttirnamasvinaḥ | mürdhni vā sarva-lokasya śīryate vana eva vā ||* (from the *Garuḍapurāna*)

¹Sdoñ -dag-gi ²Jä: 91 «little shoots, sprouts»; Sumatiratna: *mgo-lčog*: — *mgo-ča* — *mgo-rgyan*. ³C -ltar ⁴C *chul ni* ⁵Sdoñ *kun-gyis spyir bkur-ba'am*, N,P *spyi-bkur-'am* C *kun-gyis bkur-ba'am* ⁶P *na* ⁷C -pa'o

Exact translation of Skr. The translation of line (c) is particularly witty. Skr may be translated both as: «he is on the head ~ on the top of the whole world». This is rendered in Tib with two words having similarly two meanings: *spyi* ~ *spyi-bo* «head, top» and *bkur* which means both «to honour, esteem» and to «carry». (Jä 334 and 14)

- (18) | mi-srun¹ skye-bo khuñs²-nas byuñ-ba-yi³ |
 | chig ñan⁴-sbrul-gyis skye-bo dam-pa zin |

| *sbrul*⁵ *de ži-bar byed-pa'i gñen-por yañ* |
| *šes-rab bzod-pa'i sman*⁶-*dag bsten-par bya*⁷ |

The good men are grasped by the snake «Evil words»
which appears from the pit «Wicked man».

You should stick to the medicines «Understanding» and «Perseverance»
as to the antidote which appeases this snake.

18. Cf. Sdoñ 207. For *mi-srun* cf. Sdoñ 248–49.

¹N,P *bsrun*, ²D *khuñs* «originate», ³Sdoñ *mi-srun skye-bo'i sa-khuñ-las byuñ-ba'i*, ⁴N *chigs-ñan*, Sdoñ *chig-gi*, ⁵Sdoñ *dug*, ⁶D *smad-*, ⁷Sdoñ *btuñ-bar-bya*
V has improved the metaphor slightly.

(19) | *brtan-rnams*¹ *sdug-bsñal myoñ-gyur-kyañ* |
| *yid ni žum-par*² *mi byed-de* |
| *zla-ba sgra-gčan khar žugs-nas*³ |
| *'čhar-bar či-ga mi byed-dam* |

The spirit of a steadfast man, even perceiving misery,
will not be cast down.

Did not the moon appear [again]
after entering Rahu's mouth?

19. Cf. Sdoñ 7, C 4/8. Cf. also Subh 48 or 132. Skr from S. Pathak C — *Garuḍa-purāṇa* 111.24: *dhīrāḥ kaṣṭamanuprāptā na bhavanti viśādināḥ | praviśya vadanam rāhoḥ kim nodeti punaḥ śasī ||*

¹Sdoñ *bsñan-*, ²Sdoñ *gduñ-bar*, ³N,P *-kyañ*

V, Sdoñ and C are based on the same Sanskrit text, Subh 48 is a close version with special differences, 132 has some similar ideas in lines (ab).

(20) | *sems-čan-rnams-la gañ-gi sems* |
| *sñiñ-rjes brlan-par gyur-pa-dag* |
| *thar dañ ye-šes de-yin-gyi* |
| *ral-pa*¹ *thal-ba*² *čhos-gos min* |

For that soul, which is full
of compassion towards all beings,
which is liberated and which has perfect wisdom,
hair mixed with ashes is not a monk's robe.

20. Cf. Sdoñ 125: Here one finds two lines before our stanza: *gañ-žig yid-kyi gos-med-na | ras-kyi čhos-gos či-la phan* |

¹P *ra-la-pa*, ²Sdoñ *thal-ba ral-pa*

The differences are insignificant.

- (21) | *nags-sreg¹-pa-yi me-la ni* |
 | *rluñ lañs² grogs-su 'gyur-ba yin* |
 | *de-ñid-med-par gsod-byed-pa'i³* |
 | *ñam-čhuñ-ba-la bšes-yod min* |

The fire which burns the forest
 finds in an equally strong wind a friend.

If it is not [equally strong but stronger], the fire will be extinguished,
 as the weak have no friends.

21. Cf. Sdoñ 41. Cf. also Subh 113, 396, R 132 (cd). Skr cf. IS 5927(2716), Sternbach KK 255, SRBh 155/120: *vanāni dahato vahneḥ sakhā bhavati mārutaḥ* | *sa eva dīpanāśāya kṛṣe kasyāsti sauhrdam* ||
¹P,N *bsreg*, ²Sdoñ *-gis*, ³Sdoñ (c): *de-ñid mar-me 'jig-byed-pas*, ⁴N *ñams-čhuñ-ba-las šes*
 Sdoñ is an exact translation of Skr, V «improved» without consulting Skr (c!). R shows that the idea became popular in Tibet, too.

- (22) | *gžan-gyis¹ gžan-du² bsgrags-nas³ ni* |
 | *med-pa'añ yon-tan-čan-du 'gyur* |
 | *rañ-ñid yon-tan smra-byed-na⁴* |
 | *brgya-byin yin-yañ bcun⁵ mi 'gyur* |

If others say it among themselves
 a man without virtue may become virtuous.
 But even Indra will not become honourable
 if he speaks about his own virtues.

22. Cf. Sdoñ 156. Skr cf. IS 3933 (4508): *paraproktaguṇo yastu nirguṇo 'pi guṇī bhavet* | *indro 'pi laghutām yāti svayam prakhyāpitairguṇaiḥ* ||
¹N *gyi*, ²Sdoñ *-dag*, ³N,P *na*, ⁴Sdoñ *yon-tan rañ-ñid sgrags-pa ni*, ⁵N,P *brcon*
sgrags is nearer to *prakhyāpita* than *smra-byed*, though *-byed* may reflect a causative.

- (23) | *gañ-žig rigs¹-ldan kheñs-pa dañ* |
 | *nor-yod ser-sna-ldan-pa-dag* |
 | *de ni lha-yis smod-'dor-te²* |
 | *čhu-las me ni byuñ-dañ mchuñs* |

Those who are of noble birth but proud,
 those who have much wealth but are avaricious,
 all these are cursed and abandoned by the gods.
 This is similar to the fire which appears from water.

23. The parallel is not clear. No exact analogy could be found.
¹N,P *rig-*, ²N *-ste*

- (24) | *gañ-žig yid-dañ rjes¹ mthun-pa² |*
 | *riñ-na gnas-kyañ ñe-ba yin³ |*
 | *gañ-žig yid-dañ mi mthun-pa⁴ |*
 | *gam-na⁵ gnas-kyañ riñ-ba⁶ yin |*

Those whose hearts agree
 though living far apart are near.
 People disagreeing in heart
 though living near to each other are far apart.

24. Cf. Sdoñ 191, C 8/37. Cf. also Subh 122, V 7: Skr IS 2908 (1231), Pathak C: *dūrastho'pi samīpastho yo vai manasi vartate | hṛdaye yo na vartate samīpastho'pi dūrataḥ ||*

¹N *rjas*, ²C *mthun gyur-pa*, ³C *gram-na 'dug*, ⁴Sdoñ *yid-la brtan mi gnas C yid-du mi 'oñ-gi*, ⁵Sdoñ *druñ-na C 'gram-na*, ⁶C *thag-riñ*

The wording of Sdoñ is nearest to Skr. C is also close and has used Sdoñ. The use of *mthun-pa* by V is better from a Tibetan point of view but does not agree with Skr. *vartate*.

- (25) | *gžan-gyi 'byor-ba¹ dam-pa mthoñ-nas ni |*
 | *gañ-žig sems-'khrug-pa² ni skye-'gyur-ba³ |*
 | *don-de čuñ-zad rñed-par mi 'gyur-gyi |*
 | *'gro des⁴ rañ-gi bsod-nams 'joms⁵-par byed |*

If seeing other people's richness and excellence
 somebody's mind is troubled,
 it will not be of the slightest use
 and he will lose his own merit.

25. Cf. Sdoñ 211. Sdoñ 203 is also related. Skr cf. IS 4994 (2259) (From the Mbh, Virāṭaparvan): *ya ārṣuḥ parivitteṣu rūpe vīrye kulānvaye | sukhasaubhāgyasatkāre tasya vyādhiranantakaḥ ||*

¹Sdoñ *-pa*, ²D *'khrugs-pa*, ³Sdoñ *-bas*, ⁴Sdoñ *de*, ⁵Sdoñ *'joms-*

Skr is only similar, the Tibetan texts agree with each other exactly.

- (26) | *čhags-pa-dañ 'dra'i dri-ma 'gro-na med |*
 | *phrag-dog-dañ 'dra'i gnod-pa gžan yod min |*
 | *sloñ-ba 'dra'i mja'-bo yod min-te |*
 | *gtoñ-ba-dañ mñam gñen ni 'gro-na med |*

No filth like greed exists,
 there is no evil like envy,
 there is no friend like alms [-giving]
 no relative like generosity.

26. Cf. Sdoñ 104. Cf. also Sdoñ 137.

As the wording is changed considerably the whole text of Sdoñ 104 is given: 'gro-ba'i dri-ma čhags-pa 'dra-ba med || gžan-la gnod-pa phrag-dog 'dra-ba med || mja'-bo sloñs-mo-pa 'dra yod min-te || gtoñ-dañ mñam-pa'i gñen-bšes gañ-yañ med |. Sdoñ 137 line (d) agrees exactly with V (d).

V was probably compiled from both the stanzas.

- (27) | bkres-pa-dañ 'dra'i lus-kyi zug-gzer¹ med |
| sems-las-dañ mchuñs lus-kyi skem-byed med |
| yon-tan lta-bu'i rgyan ni yod min-la |
| bzod-pa-dañ mñam lus-kyi go-čha med |

There is no nagging pain of the body like hunger,
there is no body-drying illness-demon like brain work,
no ornament similar to virtue exists,
there is no armour of the body like perseverance.

27. ¹gzug-gzar «pain, illness, ache». N gzar

- (28) | skye-bo ser-sna-čan-la nor yod čičig bya |
| g-yo-sgyu phrag-dog-čan-gyi šes-kyis čičig bya |
| pha-rol gnod¹-byed yon-tan mañ-ldan čičig bya |
| phoñs-dus rgyab-kyis² phyogs-pa'i mja'-bos čičig bya |

If an avaricious person has wealth, what is the use?
If a cunning, envious person has wisdom, what is the use?
If a person doing harm to others has many virtues, what is the use?
What is the use of a friend, who turns his back at the time of poverty?

28. ¹N,P gnon «supress», ²N,P -tu

- (29) | rnam-pa kun-tu rañ-phan spyad-bya-yi |
| 'khor mañ nañ-du smras-pas čičig bya |
| skye-bo thams-čad yoñs-su mgu 'gyur-ba |
| de 'dra'i thabs ni gañ-na'an yod ma yin |

What is the use of consulting many different attendants
for somebody, who is looking for his own benefit in every respect?
There is no way, whatsoever,
to make all living beings completely happy.

29. Some common motifs occur in Subh 305. Lines (ab) may belong to verse 28 and (cd) to 30.

- (30) | *gnas-skabs dañ ni mthun-par bya* |
 | *bden dañ brjun¹ dañ byams-sdañ²-dag³* |
 | *bdag-gžan nus⁴-dañ sbyar-nas spyod* |
 | *gañ yin de šes mjañs-pa yin* |

He who can adjust [himself] to time and opportunity
 to truth and lies, to compassion and anger,
 and succeeds in harmonising [these things] with his own and other people's
 capability,
 — he is [indeed] a wise and learned man.

30. ¹D *bstun*, ²N *ldañ*, ³D *dañ* ⁴N,D *dus-*

- (31) | *ji-srid 'cho-bar¹ bsad²-kyañ ni* |
 | *dgra-bo zad-par mi 'gyur-gyi* |
 | *rañ-gi khro-bo³-ñid bsad-na* |
 | *des ni dgra-rnams kun bsad yin⁴* |

Though you may kill as long as your life lasts,
 [the number of] enemies will not be exhausted.
 If you kill your own anger,
 by this all [your] enemies will be killed.

31. Cf. Sdoñ 208. The meaning of Subh 424 is the same but the wording is changed: *gal-te dgra kun brlag-'dod-na* | *bsad-pas dgra kun ga-la 'jad* | *rañ-gi khro-ba gčig bčom-pa* | *dgra kun gčig čhar bsad-pa yin* ||

¹D *'du-ba P 'che-bar*, ²Sdoñ *gsed*, ³D *-ba-*, ⁴Sdoñ *dgra-bo ñid gsod yin*

The style of V is better than that of Sdoñ. Sa-skya pañđita has, of course, made further improvements.

- (32) | *mi-srun¹ skye-bo gdul-bar bya* |
 | *yon-tan-čan-dag² kun-tu³ bkur⁴* |
 | *drañ-po'i spyod-pas dkor-mjod dgañ* |
 | *rañ-gi yul-'khor bskyañ-bar bya* |

Tame those who are rough,
 revere those who are virtuous,
 fill the treasury by truthful activity,
 [and thus] defend your own country and people.

32. Cf. Sdoñ I

¹P *bsrun* N *sun*, ²Sdoñ N *ni*, ³D *-du*, ⁴Sdoñ *bkur-bar-bya*

- (33) | *ji-srid las¹ ni mthoñ-ba dañ* |
 | *ji-srid rkañ-pa brtan²-pa dañ* |
 | *ji-srid šes-rab ma ñams-pa* |
 | *de-srid rañ-gi phan-pa gyis* |

As long as you see the karma,
 as long as your leg is firm,
 as long as your intellect is not weakened,
 so long work for your own benefit.

33. Cf. Sdoñ 38. Cf. also Sdoñ 218. Here a Buddhist variant can be found, e.g. (cd): *ji-srid blo ni bya-ba'i rjes 'jug-pa* | *'di ni dam-čhos ñan-pa'i dus yin-no* ||

¹Sdoñ lam, ²Sdoñ bstan

The change of *lam* to *las* may be a conscious one.

- (34) | *rgyal-po byi-bo byed-pa-dañ* |
 | *de-yi blon-po¹ mi mkhas-pas* |
 | *nor bsags-pa lta ga-la-ste²* |
 | *'bad-pa čhen-pos srog sruñs³-šig* |

If the king commits rape,
 and his minister is not wise,
 and collects wealth: where [you see such a situation,]
 you can save your life only with great endeavour.

34. ¹N,P *blun-po*, ²N,P *-te*, ³N,P *bsruñs*

- (35) | *gañ-na žal-ta¹ byed-pa mañ* |
 | *kun-kyañ² mkhas-par ña-rgyal čhe³* |
 | *thams-čad⁴ gco-bo byed 'dod-pa* |
 | *de-yi chogs ni⁵ 'jig-par 'gyur* |

Where there are [too] many people giving orders,
 and everybody is [too] arrogant, [pretending] to be wise,
 and everybody wants to be a lord,
 such a community will perish [soon].

35. Cf. Sdoñ 53. Skr cf. Sternbach CA No. 230: *sarve yatra vinetāraḥ sarve paṇḍitamāniḥ* | *sarve prabhūtvamicchanti tadvr̥ṇdamavasīdati* ||

¹N *te*, ²Sdoñ *thams-čad*, ³Sdoñ *che*, ⁴Sdoñ *kun-kyañ*, ⁵Sdoñ *chogs-rnams*

Interestingly V comes nearer to Skr, Sdoñ 's translation was a bit rough.

- (36) | *gañ-na¹ byi-bas² mjod-pa byed* |
 | *byi-las mar ni sruñ³-ba dañ* |
 | *bya-roḡ phyag-chañ⁴ byed-pa-yi* |
 | *de-yi dños de⁵ smos či dgos* |

Where the rat is the storekeeper,
 the cat is guarding the butter,
 the crow is the cook,
 for what use is — tell me — such a state? •

36. Cf. Sdoñ 52.

¹Sdoñ -gi, ²N,P byis-pas, ³N bsruiṣ, P Sdoñ bsruiṣ, ⁴Sdoñ khva-yis phyag-chad, ⁵Sdoñ dños de-la ni
 In Sdoñ this stanza stands before the previous stanza of V.

- (37) | *kun-dga'-ra-ba'i phreñ-rgyud¹-bžin²* |
 | *me-tog rgyas-pa btu-bya-yi³* |
 | *ji-ltar sol⁴-ba-mkhan bžin-du⁵* |
 | *rca-nas bčad⁶-par mi bya'o* |

Do as the garland binder of the pleasure-garden,
 who plucks the excess of the flowers;
 and do not as the charcoal-burner,
 who cuts [the trees] with the roots.

37. Cf. Sdoñ 8, C/3. Skr cf. Sternbach CA 131, from Mbh. *puṣpaṃ puṣpaṃ vicinvīta mūlaccheda na kārayet | mālākāra ivārāme na yathāñgārakārah ||*

¹N,P brgyud, ²Sdoñ, C bžin, ³C me-tog me-tog cam btu-yi, ⁴Sdoñ so-, ⁵C sol-ba mkhan ni či bžin-du ⁶C gdon-

Though C obviously knew the previous translations, which are not very accurate, it improves the translation, specially in the first two lines.

- (38) | *grog-mkhar sa dañ¹ sbrañ-rci dañ* |
 | *zla-ba ches-pa yar-gyi ño²* |
 | *rgyal-po'i nor dañ spran-po'i³ nor* |
 | *čuñ-zad čuñ-zad bsags-pas⁴ 'phel* |

The earth of an ant hill, the honey, and
 the face of the moon in the first part of the month,
 the wealth of the king, and the wealth of the beggar
 increase by being collected little by little.

38. Cf. Sdoñ 29, C 6/3. Cf. also M 4/2 which has similar contents: *mig sman sbyañ-na brañ snañ bžin | grog-ma-yis ni bsags-pa ltar | de-bžin-du ni mkhas-pa-yis | bsegs-pa řuñ-ñu sbyor-bar bya ||*, and also

Subh 323: *bcva-ba mañ phyir rgyal-po'i mjod | ha-čan mi bsdu ñuñ-ñus kheñs | grog-mkhar sbrañ-rci yar-ño-yis | zla-ba ñuñ-ñu ñuñ-ñus kheñs ||*. Skr cf. Sternbach CA 200 and Pathak C: *vālmīkaṃ madhujālaṃ ca śuklapakṣe ca candramāḥ | bhikṣādravyaṃ nrpadravyaṃ stokam stokena vardhate ||*

¹Sdoñ, C *dañ ni*, ²C *yañ-po-yi ni zla-ba dañ* |, ³N *spañ-ba'i*, P *sbañ-ba'i*, C *sbrañ-ma'i*, ⁴C *cam-gyis*
A very popular stanza, V and C are near to each other. The change in Subh is delicate.

- (39) | *ti-ti-ra ni zil-pa¹-yi* |
| *thigs-pa cam²-gyis srog 'jin byed* |
| *bslañs-pas thob-par mi 'gyur-na³* |
| *brgya-byin-la-yañ mi sloñ-ño⁴* |

The titira bird is able to uphold its life
with just one dew drop.

If it does not achieve its aim by asking,
it would not beg even Indra.

39. Cf. Sdoñ 49. Cf. also Subh 282, coming from Pañcatantra. The text is not completely clear. Cf. the Skr stanza: IS 6386(2948): *śatorvikramamajñātvā vajramārabhate hi yaḥ | sa parābhavamāpnoti samudraṣṭītibhādyathā ||* Cf. Sternbach KK p. 153.

¹Sdoñ -*ba*, ²N *rcam*, ³Sdoñ (bc): *thigs-pas srogs-pas srog ni 'jin byed-kyañ* | *bslañs-na gtugs-pa'i 'jigs-pa-yis* |. Campbell translates (c) «For it fears to be placed under an obligation by begging» ⁴N,P *bslañ-ño* (fut)

- (40) | *rma-bya so-ga'i cha-bas¹ gduñs-kyañ ni²* |
| *mkha' dkyil čhar-gyi rgyun-la re bla-yi³* |
| *rjiñ-bu rñog-ma-čan-gyi čhu dman-la⁴* |
| *dregs-pas bstod-pa'i mgrin-pa ma 'dud-čig⁵* |

The peacock, though tormented by the heat of the hot season,
placing its hope in the rain stream coming from the middle of the sky,
does not bend her neck, which is pride being praised,
to the mean water of a muddy pond.

40. Cf. Sdoñ 48. Cf. also Subh 13 (cd). For Skr cf. *Pañcatantra*, Pūrn. P. I, 317.

¹Sdoñ -*pas*, ²Sdoñ *gduñs-gyur kyañ*, ³N,P Sdoñ (but not the Derge print of Sdoñ) *re sla-yi*, ⁴D, Sdoñ (D), *gdud*, Sdoñ *btud*

This stanza occurs in the same tale of the *Pañcatantra* as stanza 49 of Sdoñ.

- (41) | *stobs-ldan señ-ge ri-dags-ša za khrag 'thuñ-yañ* |
| *lo gčig khyu-dkor-la ni 'khrig-pa lan čig¹ spyod* |
| *boñ-bu rñul cam za-ba'añ 'dod-pa rtag-tu spyod* |
| *de-gñis gañ-gi rgyas bskyed khyed-kyis² ña-la smros* |

Although the powerful lion eats meat and drinks the blood of wild animals,
to enrich the herd he copulates only once in a year.
The donkey, although he eats only some dust, always satisfies his lust.
But, tell me, what kind of progeny do these two procreate?

41. ¹N *gčig*, ²N,P *khyod-kyis*

(42) | *nags-kyi glañ-po rcva-lo za-yañ stobs-dañ-ldan* |
| *sbrul-ni zas-su rluñ zar-gyur-kyañ sbeg-pa¹ med* |
| *drañ-sroñ rca-ba 'bras-bu cam-gyis dus 'da' byed* |
| *de-bas khrel-'jem čhog-šes kho-nar² 'byor-ba'i mčhog* |

Though the forest elephant eats grass and leaves of trees, he is powerful.
The snake eats wind as food, and is not weak (~lean).
The saint passes his time by eating some roots and fruit.
Thus, alone modesty and contentment are the best attainments.

42. Cf. Sdoñ 115. Cf. also Subh 264 (c), for snakes living on air. Skr cf. Sternbach KK 215, 232, IS 6903 (3199) (from Bhartṛhari, and Pañc.): *sarpāḥ pibanti pavanam na ca durbalāste | suṣkaistrṇairvanagajā balino bhavanti | kandaiḥ phalair munivarā ganayanti kālam | sontoṣa eva puruṣasya param nidhānam ||*
¹D *sbegs*, N,P, Sdoñ *rbeg*, Schiefner corrects it *sbeg*, ²N,P *-na*

(43) | *gañ-žig yi-ge mčhog-gis brgyan-pa'i kha ni gañ yin-pa* |
| *de-ni yid-'oñ padma rab-gsar rgyas-pa lta-bur mjes* |
| *yi-ge med-par gyur-ba'i kha ni gañ yin-pa* |
| *de-ni kha min sa-yi bu-ga-dag-dañ mchuñs* |

A mouth, which is adorned with the best aksharas
is as charming as a delightful very fresh lotus flower.
A mouth which became akshara-less,
is not a mouth, but is similar to a hole in the earth.

43. Cf. Gso 18: *yon-tan-med-pa'i kha-ñid ni | sa-yi bu-ga-dag-dañ mčhuñs | yon-tan rab-kyis brgyan-pa-yi | kha ni padma yid-oñ ldan ||*

V probably comes from Gso. The meaning is only slightly changed (by changing *yon-tan* to *yi-ge* «akṣara», which seems to give a more coherent parallel). While changing the stanza, more syllables were added in V, now (ab) have 13 and (cd) 11 syllables.

(44) | *boñ-bu phyugs-la¹ nor-bu mu-tig² či* |
| *dud-'gro phag-la kha-zas žim-po či* |
| *loñ-la snañ dañ 'on-pa-dag-la glu³* |
| *glen-pa-dag-la⁴ chos-kyis či-žig bya* |

What [is the use of] a precious stone or pearl for a donkey-beast?
 What [is the use of] delicious food for a wild boar?
 What [can] a blind man do with brightness, a deaf man with a song,
 or a fool with religion?

44. Cf. Sdoñ 219. Cf. also Subh 244 (and 447–448).
¹P *phyug-la*, ²Sdoñ *me-tog phreñ-ba* ³N. *slu* ⁴Sdoñ *-rnams-la*
 Subh 244 is closely related.

(45) | *ka-tan-tra šes*¹ *sgra-mkhan dañ* |
 | *gčes-sgrub*² *šes-pa'i sman-pa dañ* |
 | *dbyug-pa thog-pa'i*³ *ral-ka-ba*⁴ |
 | *de gsum 'jig-rten bžad-gad-sa'o* |

The grammarian who knows the Kātantra,
 the physician who knows how to take care [or: to cause pain?],
 the long haired ascetic [?] who carries a stick:
 these three are the objects of ridicule of the world.

45. Cf. Subh 259: *nor-med zas gos mčhog 'dod dañ* | *gžan-la sloñ-žin ña-rgyal che* | *bstan-bčos mi šes rcod-*
par 'dod | *gsum-po 'gro-ba'i bžad-gad gnas* |
¹D *šes* ²Another meaning appears if we suppose a corruption for *gces* (pf. of '*che-ba*'); This is supported
 by Subh. ³N,P *dbyig-pa thogs-pa'i* ⁴D *ral-ka-bas*

From V it is not clear whether only the (wrongly judging) world or the author, too, ridicule the three
 «buffoons». Sa-skya pañdita clearly condemns the mentioned types.

(46) | *bdag-la byin zer dman-pa'i chig* |
 | *mi sbyin zer-ba dman-pas dman* |
 | *'di khyer zer-ba mčhog-gi chig* |
 | *mi 'khyer-ba zer*¹ *de-bas mčhog* |

To say «Give me» — this is the word of the vile man.
 To say «I give not» — this is more vile than vileness.
 To say «Take this» — this is the word of a better man.
 To say «I do not take» [?] — this is still better than that.

46. ¹D *mi khyer zer-ba*
 Translation not sure.

(47) | *gnod spañs phan-pa bsten-pa-yi* |
 | *sbyor-ba*¹ *gañ-yañ ruñ-ba-yis* |
 | *lus-ni šin-tu bsruñ*² *bya-yi*³ |
 | *nor-la sred-pas čičig bya* |

What is the use of abandoning evil if you adhere to profiteering,
are capable of any kind of connection,
are always concerned about your body,
and desire wealth?

47. ¹N -ba missing, ²N *bsruṅs* ³N,P -yis

(48) | 'byor-pa¹ yod-kyañ gtoñ-med-na |
| ñe-bar 'cho-bas či-žig bya² |
| kim-šu-ka-yi³ 'bras-bu ni |
| čhags-kyañ⁴ kha-bas⁵ či byar yod |

If there are possessions but there is no giving away,
what is the use of life itself?

What is the use of the fruit of the *kiṃśuka*
which grows big but is bitter?

48. Cf. Sdoñ 204.

¹N -ba ²Sdoñ či-byar yod ³Sdoñ kim-pa-ka-yi ⁴Sdoñ(D) čhag-kyañ ⁵Sdoñ ltogs-la «for the hungry»

The fruit of the *kimpāka* tree has bad taste, the flower of the *kiṃśuka* is beautiful but odorless and useless (no fruit). V has mixed up the two words.

(49) | 'dod-pas gduṅs-la khrel¹ med ño-cha med |
| bkres-pas gduṅs-na stobs med mdaṅs-kyañ med |
| nad-kyis gduṅs-na gñid med bde-ba² med |
| lam-gyis dub-na 'jigs dañ brcon-pa med³ |

[Those who] suffer from love are without modesty and shameless,
[those who] suffer from hunger are powerless and look not well,
[those who] suffer from illness are sleepless and unhappy,
[those who] are fatigued from their journey are afraid [~fearless ?] and
unable to make any effort.

49. Cf. C VIII/35. Skr. cf. MSS 2959, from C: *arthaturāṅām na suhr̥ṇ na bandhuh̥ | kāmāturāṅām na bhayam na lajjā | kṣudhaturāṅām na balaṃ na tejah̥ | rogaturāṅām na sukham na nidrā* || Analyzed in Pathak INT, p. 52-53.

¹C 'jigs ²C bde-ba'añ

The last line of V is missing in C and in Skr; The first line of C is: *nor-gyis gduṅs-la gñen med bṣes-kyañ med* | which agrees with Skr (a). Other Skr versions have *vidyā* instead of *roga*, and the lines are not always in the same order. S.K. Pathak feels that *khrel* is a better translation for *bhayam* in this stanza than 'jigs.

(50) | *grog-s-po nor-la brkam-pa spañ* |
 | *chuñ-ma log-g-yem che-ba spañ¹* |
 | *rgyal-po čhos-min spyod-pa spañ* |
 | *blun-po rab gtum² dbyen smra spañ* |

Abandon the friend who has a passionate desire for wealth,
 abandon the wife who is given up to adultery,
 abandon the king who acts unlawfully,
 abandon the fool who is ferocious and speaks to create discord.

50. Cf. Sdoñ 4 (ab). Cf. also Sdoñ 3, Subh. 167, C II/5

¹Sdoñ 4 (ab): *grog-s-po nor dad che-ba spoñs* | *čhuñ-ma log-'gyem dad che spoñs* | ²N *gsum*

V 50 and 51 are both related to Sdoñ 4 (here the first two lines agree closely) and to 3 (general kind of agreement). The contamination may have had another source, too. Similar ideas had many expressions.

(51) | *yul ñan 'cho-ba ñan-pa spañ* |
 | *bešnes-gñen¹ ñan-pa spañ-bar bya* |
 | *bkur dka' gso-dpyad² mi mkhas-pa³* |
 | *del-ta-bu'i sman-pa spañ⁴* |

Abandon an evil country and evil livelihood,
 abandon an evil friend,
 abandon a doctor
 who does not know the healing treatment and whom it is difficult to esteem.

51. Cf. Sdoñ 4 (cd) = V (cd); For V (ab) cf. Sdoñ 3. Cf. also C II/5 (ab): *yul ni 'cho-ba med-pa dañ* | *'cho-yañ 'cho-ba yod-pa dor* — which is compared by S.K. Pathak to *Garuḍapurāṇa* 4.109.5: *tyajeddeśam-asadvṛttam vāsam sopadravam tyajet* |

¹N, P *šes* ²N, P *spyad* ³N, P *šes-pa*, Sdoñ *gso mi mkhas-pa-yi* ⁴Sdoñ *spoñs*

(52) | *phan¹ dañ mi phan dpyod-pa'i² blo med-č'iñ* |
 | *thos dañ bsam dañ bsgom-pa rnam spañ-ste³* |
 | *lto-ba 'geñs-pa⁴ cam žig gcor⁵ 'jin-pa⁶* |
 | *skyes-bu de blo⁷ phyugs-dañ⁸ khyad ci yod* |

That person who does not have intellectual ability to discriminate useful and
 useless matters,
 who abandons the correct way of listening, imagination and contemplation,
 who considers it most important to fill up his belly,
 does the intellect of such a person differ from that of a cattle?

52. Cf. Sdoñ 130, C VIII/18. Skr. cf. MSS 4099: *ahitahitavicārasunyabuddheḥ śrutisamayairbahubhirbahiskṛtasya | udarabharaṇamatrukevalacchoḥ puruṣapaśośca paśośca ko viśeṣaḥ ||* — Analyzed in Pathak INT pp. 49–50.

¹Sdoñ *rigs dañ mi rigs* ²P. *spyod-pa'i* ³Sdoñ: *thos dañ sdom-pa mañ-po-rnams spañs-nas*, C: *blo dañ thos-pa mañ-po dañ bral-ba* ⁴N 'goñs-pa ⁵Sdoñ 'ba' ⁶C *lto-ba 'grañs-pa 'ba' žig don gñer-ba* ⁷C *bsam* ⁸C -*las*, Sdoñ *skyes-bu phyug dañ phyugs-la*

According to S.K. Pathak *phan dañ mi phan* is better but *rnam spañs* is not appropriate. C is a more expressive translation than the earlier ones. — The idea of this stanza is a very popular one both in Skr literature (Cf. e.g. IS 7164 (3290) or MSS 5700) and in Tibetan (Cf. e.g. Subh 68, 83, 2, 297, 309).

(53) | *čhu-yi bum-pa phyed bkañ-ba* |
| *rab-tu 'bad-pas bzuñ-byas-te* |
| *spyi-bor bdag-gis khur-ba bžin* |
| *skye-bo ñan-pa bkur-na khro* |

Similarly to a bottle only half full of water
which is held up with great effort
and carried on one's own head,
the mean person, if esteemed, will be agitated.

53. Cf. Sdoñ 190: *'bad-pa-yis ni bzuñ-ba-yis | bum-pa-yi ni čhu phyed bžin | spyi-bo-la ni bkur byas-na | skye-bo ñan-pa khro-bar byed* |. Skr. cf. IS 2384 (4065): *jalarekhā khalapṛitirardhavāriḡhaṭastathā | śirasā dhāryamāno'pi khalah khalakhalāyate ||* Cf. also Subh 307–308.

The two translations differ from each other in the wording but the meaning is almost the same. On the other hand, it seems, V changed the text without consulting the Skr original. (They may have had another source.)

(54) | *rañ-bžin ñan-pa'i mi-rnams¹ dañ* |
| *srañ-gi mchan-ñid šin-tu² mchuñs* |
| *čuñ-zad cam-gyis mtho 'gyur-la³* |
| *čuñ-zad cam-gyis dma'-bar 'gyur* |

People having mean nature,
and the weight scale pointer are very similar;
they will be elevated by a tiny bit
and lowered by a tiny bit.

54. Cf. Sdoñ 175. Skr cf. IS ?(3299): *stokenonnatimāyāti stokenāyātyadhogatim | aho susadṛṣi vṛttistulākoteḡ khalasya ca ||* Cf. also Subh 121.

¹Sdoñ -*dag* ²-*dag-dañ* ³-*žin*

Tib translation has changed the lines and the position of *vṛtti*, but follows Sdoñ without any significant change. This and the previous stanza stand after each other in Sdoñ, too.

- (55) | *can-dan gla-rci ga-bur-gyis byugs-kyañ* |
 | *sgog-skya'i dri ni rañ-bžin¹ mi 'dor-ltar* |
 | *legs-pa'i² gžuñ-lugs bzañ-po³ rab bslabs-kyañ⁴* |
 | *rañ-bžin ñan-pa'i mchan-ñid 'dor mi srid* |

Though rubbed with sandal wood, musk or camphor,
 the smell of garlic will not lose its nature;
 although the best laws of proper behaviour will be taught to them,
 the characteristics of people with a bad nature cannot disappear.

55. Cf. Sdoñ 176

¹Sdoñ *rañ-bžin dri ña* ²Sdoñ *rig-pa'i* ³Sdoñ *mañ-po* ⁴D *bslab-kyañ*
 No significant difference

- (56) | *ji-ltar rigs-pas¹ brgyan-gyur-kyañ* |
 | *skye-bo ñan-pa yoñs-su spañ* |
 | *sbrul gdug² nor-bus brgyan-gyur-kyañ* |
 | *či-ste 'jigs-pa mi skyed-dam³* |

Be somebody adorned with [high] birth [~intellect?]
 but is of evil nature, keep away from him.
 Does a poisonous snake adorned with a precious stone
 not still generate fear?

56. Cf. C V/16: *gal-te rig-pas brgyan gyur-na'añ* | *skye-bo ñan-pa spañ byas-te* | *sbrul ni nor-bu brgyan-pa yañ* | *'di ni 'jigs-pa mi skyed-dam* || Skr cf. IS 2850 (1180): *durjanañ parihartavyo vidyayālamkr̥to'pi san* | *mañiñā bhūsitāḥ sarpaḥ kimasau na bhayaṃkaraḥ* || Cf. also Subh 165.

¹N,P *rig-pas* ²N *gdugs*, ³N,P *bskyed-dam*

Despite all the changes it is clear that C used the V text. Sometimes V's version is better.

- (57) | *ñan-pa ji-ltar¹ ñam-chuñ-ba* |
 | *de-srid bar-du rañ-bžin bzañ* |
 | *ston-ka-yi ni čhu-bo-dag²* |
 | *skyes-bu³ kun-gyis rgal-bar⁴ sla⁵* |

As long as a mean person is weak and small,
 his nature will be good.
 [Similarly,] the rivers of autumn
 are easy to ford for everyone.

57.Cf. Sdoñ 51. Cf. also Subh 147

¹Sdoñ *ji-srid*, ²Sdoñ *čhu-bo'i čhu* ³Sdoñ *skye-bo* ⁴Sdoñ *bgrod-pa*, N,P *brgal-par* ⁵D *bla*
 No significant difference. Subh takes just one motif.

- (58) | *yoñ-tan chul spyod rañ-bžin gsal-ba-yis* |
 | *skye-bo ñan-pa bčos-su ga-la ruñ* |
 | *cha žiñ drod¹ čhe rcub-pas bsgrubs-pa-yi²* |
 | *bad-kan-nad bžin rab-tu³ 'phel-bar 'gyur* |

How would it be possible to cure a mean person
 by the brightness of behaviour of a person who practices the way of virtue?
 It is like the mucous disease, which grows véry much
 if the fever is treated by strong, high heat.

58. Cf. Sdoñ 87. Cf also Subh 337

¹N *cha ži 'drod* ²Sdoñ *-yis* ³Sdoñ *šin-tu*

- (59) | *mi-srun¹ skye-bo ma gus bran* |
 | *ma dul rta dañ čhuñ-ma ñan* |
 | *brduñs-na mñen-par² 'gyur-ba-ste* |
 | *'di-dag legs-bya'i snod ma yin* |

If you beat a savage man, a disrespectful servant,
 an untamed horse and a bad wife,
 they may become pliable
 but they will not become baskets of proper deeds.

59. Cf. Sdoñ 246: *skye-bo ñan dañ gser dañ rña* | *mi bsrún rta dañ bud-med gos* | *brduñs-na dul-pa ñid gyur-gyi* | *de dag legs byas snod ma yin* |

¹N,P *bsrun* ²N,P *gñen-par*

It seems V used another source, too. (Skr or Tib ?)

- (60) | *rgya-mchor čhar phab¹ don-med-do* |
 | *'grañs-la zas² byin don-med-do* |
 | *phyug-la nor byin don-med-do* |
 | *dman-la legs-byas don-med-do* |

The fall of rain into the ocean is useless,
 to give food to the fully fed is useless,
 to give money to the rich is useless,
 to do good to mean people is useless.

60. Skr Cf. IS 6258/2890/: *vrthā vr̥ṣṭhiḥ samudreṣu vr̥thā tr̥ptasya bhojanam* | *vr̥thā dānaṃ samṛddhasya vr̥thā śūre vibhūṣaṇam* | SRBh 253/26 has in (d) *vr̥thā dīpo divāpi ca* | V comes from a third version. Schiefer's proposition: *śūra* < *śūdra* is not convincing.

¹P,N *bab* ²N *zan*

(61) | *dam-pa'i bu-yi gdoñ-la padma yod* |
 | *smad-'choñ-bu-yi glad-nas¹ dug-lo skyes* |
 | *ji-lta² ji-ltar log-par spyod-par byed* |
 | *de-lta de-ltar go-'phañ 'da'-bar 'gyur* |

There is a padma on the head of a virtuous person's son,
 there is a poisonous leaf born on the head of a prostitute's son.
 As far as he does contrary deeds
 so far will his position change.

61. Cf. Sdoñ 177: *dam-pa'i bu-la gdoñ-na pad-ma med* | *smad-choñ-bu-la glad-nas rva ma skyes* | *ji-lta ji-ltar log-par byed-gyur-pa* | *de-lta de-ltar nal-bu'i mchan-ñid yin* | For *dug-lo* cf. Sdoñ 34.

¹N,P *slad-nas* ²P *ji-ltar*

V has changed a few words and the meaning of the whole stanza. No Skr has been found, but it seems, the change was carried out in Tibetan.

(62) | *sprin-gyi grib-ma skye-bo ñan-dañ mja'* |
 | *rje-bo ñan ñan ñan bdag-po dman-la brten* |
 | *zil-pa'i čhu ñan rcva-las¹ 'bar-ba'i me* |
 | *drug-po 'di-dag² čhu-yi čhu-bur mčhuñs* |

The shade of a cloud, the friendship with an evil person,
 the reliance on an evil lord or on a mean master,
 the moisture of the dew, and the flames which come from a grass-fire:
 these six are similar to bubbles in the water.

62. Cf. C VIII/21: *sprin-gyi grib-ma rcva-yi me* | *blun-po-la brten skams-pa'i čhu* | *smad-'choñ čhags ñan mi-srun mja'* | *drug-pa 'di-dag čhu-bur mčhuñs* | — Skr. has many variants, cf. MSS 2411–2415; IS 515 (194), 514 (3554); etc. Pathak quotes the text from the *Garuḍapurāṇa*: *abhraçchāyū tṛṇādaḡnirñicaseva pathe jalam* | *veśyārāḡaḡ khaleprītiḡ ṣaḡete budbudopamāḡ* | Here *pathe* may be amended with *sthale* and *khaleprītiḡ* with *kumitrāḡ* on the basis of other Cāṇakya texts (MSS 2414). Cf. also Subh. 220

¹N,P *rca-las* ²D *de-dag*

The changes of V cannot be explained by the other known Skr texts. C is a close translation. But it is supposed that C was translated later than V. This stanza must be studied further.

(63) | *ša-skam ñan ni bud-med rgan* |
 | *čhañ gsar žo ni čhags¹ ma-thag* |
 | *ñin-phyed gñid ñan nam-phyed zas²* |
 | *'di drug³ 'phral-du srog 'phrog-pa'o⁴* |

Dry meat, an old woman,
 new chang, just curdled curds,
 sleeping at noon, eating at midnight:
 these six take your life immediately.

63. Cf. C VII/17 (agreement). Cf. also Sdoñ 54: *ñin-par 'khrig dañ ñin ñal dañ | čhañ sar žo ni gžon-nu 'thuñ | ša skam bud-med rgan ñal-te | 'di drug lus-kyi stobs 'phrog-pa'o* | For Skr. cf. C: *śuṣkaṃ māṃsaṃ striyo vṛddhā madyaṃ ca taruṇaṃ dadhi | prabhāte maithunaṃ nidrā sadyaḥ prāṇaharāṇi ṣaṭ* || Other texts (IS 6498 (3005), SRBh 162/395, Sterbach CA 210, etc.) have *bālārka* instead of *madyaṃ ca*.

¹P. *čhag*, D *'čhag* ²C *nañ-bar 'khrig-spyod ñin gñid log* | ³C *drug-po* ⁴C *'phrog-pa'o*

Here V is surely independent of Sdoñ and either is an original translation or is based on C (which is supposedly a later translation). The line V (c) cannot be found in Skr versions, may be an euphemism.

(64) | *mar gsar*¹ *'bras-čhan 'o-mar-bčas* |
 | *ša gsar bud-med gžon-nu dañ* |
 | *šič-gi grib-ma čhu dron khrus* |
 | *'di drug 'phral-du stobs skyed-do* |

Fresh butter, cooked rice with milk,
 fresh meat, a young woman, and
 the shadow of a tree, taking a bath in warm water:
 these six immediately give strength.

64. Cf. C VII/18: *čhañ rñič ša dañ mar rñič dañ | bud-med gžon dañ 'o-ma 'thuñ | čhu chan dañ ni šič-grib dañ | 'phral-du srog-na stor-byed yin* || Skr. Cf. IS 6790 (3149), SRBh 162/396, C is near to *Garuḍapurāṇa* I. 114/31: *sadyaḥ pakkaghrītaṃ drākṣā bālā strī kṣīrabhojanam | uṣṇodakam tarucchāyā sadyaḥ prāṇakarāṇi ṣaṭ* || C starts: *sadyo māṃsaṃ . . .*

¹N,P *sar*

No exact Skr source established. Origin of changes unclear.

(65) | *sdug-pa-dañ*¹ *bral rañ mis brñas-pa dañ* |
 | *bu-lon mañ-ziñ ñan-pa-dag-la*² *brten*³ |
 | *dbul-por gyur-nas*⁴ *mja'-bos*⁵ *riñ-du spanś*⁶ |
 | *'di lña me-med-par ni bsreg-pa'o*⁷ |

To be separated from the beloved one, to be despised by one's own people,
 to have many debts, to be dependent on mean people,
 to be forsaken afar by friends when one has become poor:
 these five burn without fire.

65. Cf. Sdoñ 58, C VIII/9. Skr cf. SRBh 389/479, C: *kāntāviyogaḥ svajanāpamānaḥ kanyā viśilā svajanasya sevā | duridrabhāvāt pravimuktamītraṃ vināgninā pañca dahanti tīvram* ||

¹C *čhuñ-ma-dañ* ²C *bu-lon lhag-ma skye-bo nan-la* ³Sdoñ *sten* ⁴C *gyur-pa*, Sdoñ *mthoñ-nas* ⁵P *mja'*-
'os ⁶Sdoñ *spañs-pa-ste*, C *skye-bo rgyab-kyis phyogs* ⁷Sdoñ *me ma yin-pas lus sreg de lña'o*, C *lña-po me*
med-par yañ šin-du bsreg |

No clear conclusions can be drawn.

- (66) | *bogs-med choñ dañ stobs-dañ-dag-la*¹ *'che*² |
| *sloñ-žin 'gyiñ-la nor-med 'dod-la dga'* |
| *na-čhuñ sdug-la chig-rcub smra-byed-pa*³ |
| *'di lña*⁴ *log-par spyod-pa'i skyes-bu'o*⁵ |

Those who trade without profit, who cause mischief to powerful people,
who despise the moneyless while begging, who delight in lust
and those who speak abusing words to beautiful virgins:
these are the five types of wrong-doers.

66. Cf. Sdoñ 47.

¹Sdoñ *'khor-ldan-dag-la* ²N *che* ³Sdoñ *bud-med gžon-la chig-rcub smra-ba-ste* ⁴Sdoñ *skyes-bu* ⁵Sdoñ
-pa'i de lña'o |

- (67) | *gañ-žig čhos ni sbyin-byed dañ* |
| *mi-'jigs sbyin dañ kha-zas sbyin* |
| *lus-skyed-pa dañ gdams-dag sbyin* |
| *'di lña phan-'dogs byed-pa'o* |

He, who presents the gift of religion,
who gives freedom from fear, the food-giver,
the procreator of the body and the advice-giver:
these five are the benefit makers.

67. Cf. Sdoñ 237: *skyed-par byed dañ legs slob dañ* | *gañ-žig rig-pa ster-ba dañ* | *zas ster-pa dañ mi-'jigs*
sbyin | *lña-po 'di-dag pha-ru bšad* |. Skr cf. IS 2328 (4057), Sternbach CA 66: *janitā copanētā ca yastu*
vidyām prayacchati | *annadātā bhayatrāta pañcaite pitarah smṛtāḥ* |

V seems to have another source, too.

- (68) | *rab-tu hyuñ-nas slar-log dañ* |
| *bud-med khyo gsum mthoñ-ba dañ* |
| *če-spyañ rñi-las*¹ *šor-ba-ste* |
| *'di gsum g-yon-čan šes-par bya* |

He, who after having been ordained, disavowes,
a woman who has experienced three husbands,

a jackal which escaped from a trap:
these three know how to deceive.

68. Cf. Mas V/11 for wife with more husbands
¹P,N *sñi-las*

(69) | *sman-pa*¹ *kha-zas*² *ma žu dañ* |
| *rgyal-po brjun-du smra-ba dañ* |
| *rigs-ldan sdig-pa spyod-pa-ste* |
| *'di gsum šin-tu mi-rigs-pa'o* |

A doctor who cannot digest food,
a king, who speaks lies,
a man of good family, who commits moral sins:
these three are very unbecoming.

69. Cf. Sdoñ 93.
¹N,P *-dañ* ²Sdoñ *zas ni*

(70) | *gžan-las chol-žin zas žim 'dod* |
| *sloñ-mos 'cho-žin kheñs-pa che* |
| *bstan-bčos mi šes*¹ *rcod-par 'dod* |
| *'di gsum 'jig-rten bžad-gad rgyu* |

He who wants sweet food while begging from others,
he who is haughty while living on alms,
he who seeks disputes not knowing the śāstras:
these three are objects of laughter for all the world

70. Cf. Sdoñ 40, Subh. 259, especially (cd). Skr cf. IS 4000 (1743): *pallavagrāhi pāṇḍityaṃ ca maithunam | bhojanaṃ ca paradhīnaṃ tisraḥ puṃsāṃ vidambanāḥ ||*

¹Sdoñ *šes med* ²Sdoñ *khyod-kyis de gsum*

Tib translation seems to go back to other related text. V (d) is nearer than Sdoñ. Subh is near to V, too.

(71) | *rgyal-po smra-ba lan-čig dañ* |
| *bu-mo gtoñ-ba lan-čig dañ* |
| *'phags-pa mthoñ-ba lan-čig-ste*¹ |
| *'di gsum 'jig-rten lan re-ba* |

The king speaks only once,
the daughter is married off only once,
a saint can be seen only once:
these three are only once in the world.

71. Cf. Skr SRBh 377/18, Sternbach CA 219, IS 6650 (3087): *sakṛjjalpanti rājānaḥ sakṛjjalpanti sādhuvaḥ*
| *sakṛtkanyāḥ pradīyante trīṇyetaṇi sakṛtsakṛt* |

¹D lan *čig-te*, P lan *gčig-ste*

Only difference is *mthoñ-ba* in line (b) (translating *jalpanti*).

(72) | *dka'-thub lus-ni cho¹-ba dañ* |
| *mjes-ma gčig-pur ñal-ba dañ* |
| *dpa'-bo rma-mchan med-pa-ste* |
| *'di gsum yid mi-čhes-pa'i rgyu* |

That an ascetic's body should be fat,
that a pretty woman should sleep by herself,
and that a hero should be without wound-scars:
these three are things, the mind does not credit.

[Transl. by S.Ch. Das]

72. Cf. S. Ch. Das, *Dict.*, p. 50

¹D. 'cho, Das: *che*

(73) | *rgyal-po byi-gyem byed-pa dañ* |
| *bram-ze gžan-la 'che-ba dañ* |
| *dge-sloñ¹ rced-'jo byed-pa-ste* |
| *'di gsum 'jig-rten smad-pa'i gnas* |

A king who commits adultery,
a brahmin, who causes mischief to others,
a Buddhist monk who causes public amusement:
these three are objects of disgrace in the world.

73. ¹N,P *dge-sbyor*

(74) | *mkhas-pa ña-rgyal med-pa dañ* |
| *dpa'-bo ñe-bar ži-ba dañ* |
| *phyug-po gtoñ-ba'i sgo phye-ba* |
| *'di gsum 'jig-rten bstod-pa'i gnas* |

A wise man without pride,
a hero who is very calm,
a rich man who has opened the door of giving alms:
these three are objects of the world's praise.

74. Skr cf. IS 2755 (1133) from the *Hitopadeśa*: *dānaṃ priyavāksahitaṃ jñānamagarvaṃ kṣamānviṭaṃ śauryaṃ | tyāgasahitaṃ ca vittaṃ durlabhametaccaturbhadrām ||* — Tib has changed the verse or is based on a partly differing original.

- (75) | *brce-ldan*¹ *phan-'dogs ñoms-pa med* |
 | *gdug-čan 'che-bas ñoms-pa-med* |
 | *byis-pa 'dod-pas mi ñoms-te* |
 | *'di gsum 'jig-rten ñoms med-pa'o* |

A compassionate man never tires of doing good,
 a vicious man never tires of causing mischief,
 a little child never tires of wishing:
 these three can never be satisfied in the world.

75. Cf. Sdoñ 111, C II/29, Subh 29 and Skr versions corresponding to them: IS 3547 (1520), C, Sternbach CA 79, etc. Though these verses are related to V, no real agreement can be seen except the sixth (!) line of Sdoñ: *byis-pa 'dod-pas ñoms-pa med*.

¹D *brcer-ldan*

- (76) | *nor-phyir yid ni*¹ *gduñs-pa-dañ* |
 | *khyim-na čhuñ-ma*² *log-par*³ *spyod* |
 | *bslus dañ brñas-pa byas-pa-rnams* |
 | *blo-dañ-ldan-pas smra mi bya* |

People, whose mind is harrassed because of money,
 whose wife is behaving wrongly at home,
 who have been deceived, and who have made debts,
 if they are wise, will not speak of these things.

76. Cf. C II/15: *nor-rlag yid-kyi gduñ-ba dañ | khyim-na ñes-pa spyod-pa dañ | rkus dañ brñas thabs spyod-pa-dag | blo-dañ-ldan-pas sgrog mi bya* |. Skr cf. C, IS 583 (213), MSS 2920: *arthanāśaṃ manastāpaṃ gr̥he duścaritāni ca | vañcanaṃ cāpamānaṃ ca matimān na prakāśayet ||*

¹D *mi* ²N,P *chuñ-ma* ³P *logs-par*

The two texts differ considerably, V made several changes or used another Skr text, which, however, could not be traced.

- (77) | *mkha'-la skar-mkhan-dag-gis rcis byas-na* |
 | *zla-ba dañ-ni skar-ma'i lam-rnams šes* |
 | *khyim-na čhuñ-ma log-g-yem byed-pa-dañ*¹ |
 | *sna-chogs ñan-spyod*² *de-ni mthoñ ma gyur* |

When the astrologers reckon in the sky,
 the paths of the moon and the stars become known.
 But if [his] wife commits adultery in the house,
 and all sort of wrong actions — these are never seen.

77. Cf. Sdoñ 71.

¹Sdoñ (D): *khyim-na mi dañ khyim-thab log-pa-dag* ²Sdoñ *spyod-pa*

(78) | *de-ñid šes-na slob-dpon či* |
 | *nad-dañ bral-la sman-pa¹ čī²* |
 | *ču-bo rgal-la³ gru-pa či* |
 | *čhags-bral mjes-mas⁴ čī-žig bya* |

Knowing the truth (tattwa), why do you need a teacher?
 Having recovered from an illness, why do you need a doctor?
 Having crossed the river, what need of a ferry?
 Having no attachment, what need of a beautiful girl?

78. Cf. Sdoñ 50

¹N,P, *-pas* ²Sdoñ *nad sos sman-pa ga-la dgos* ³N,P, *brgal-la*, Sdoñ *brgal-nas* ⁴Sdoñ *byad-mas*

(79) | *lha dañ bram-ze dam-pa-dag* |
 | *bden-pa-yis ni dga'-bar 'gyur* |
 | *mkhas-pa chig-zab smra-bas dga'* |
 | *phal-pa zas dañ skom-gyis dga'* |

The gods and the holy brahmins
 are delighted by the truth,
 the wise man is delighted by uttering profound words,
 the common people are delighted by food and drink.

79. No exact parallel, Cf. (ab) Subh 225 (d)

(80) | *ri-bo kun-na¹ rin-čhen² med* |
 | *nags-chal kun-na can-dan med³* |
 | *ñā-rnams⁴ kun-la mu-tig med* |
 | *dam-pa kun-la⁵ yod ma yin* |

There is no precious stone in every hill,
 there is no sandal tree in every forest,
 there is no pearl in every shell fish,
 there is no good man everywhere.

80. Cf Sdoñ 148, C. VIII 39: *nor ni ri-brag kun-na med | mu-tig glañ-po'i rcal-la med | nags-chal kun-na can-dan med | dam-pa kun-na yod ma yin* ||. Skr cf. C, Sternbach CA 212, SRBh 157/183, IS 6523 (3021): *śaile śaile na māñikyaṃ mauktikaṃ na gaje gaje | sādhave nahi sarvatra candanaṃ na vane vane* || Cf. also Subh 454, (for line V (b) which is missing in Sdoñ).

¹Sdoñ, D -la ²Sdoñ *can-dan* ³Sdoñ line V (b) missing. Instead Sdoñ adds a line (c): *yañ-dag don-gyi gtam smra-ba'i* ⁴Sdoñ *glañ-po* ⁵Sdoñ *mkhas-pa'añ kun-na*

The translation of C is exact, except for *rcal* and the change in the last lines. Sdoñ made several changes. Interestingly, V is nearer to Skr than Sdoñ, the translator used the original or another translation, it cannot be explained from Sdoñ.

(81) | *ñañ-pa čhu-skyar*¹ *chogs nañ*² *mjes ma yin* |
 | *čañ-šes boñ-bu'i chogs nañ mjes ma yin* |
 | *señ-ge wa-yi chogs nañ mjes ma yin* |
 | *mkhas-pa blun-po'i chogs nañ mjes ma yin* |

A haṃsa does not look well among cranes,
 an excellent horse does not look well among asses,
 a lion does not look well in a flock of jackals,
 wise men do not look well in the company of fools.

81. Cf. Sdoñ 152, C VIII 63 (another translation): *khva-yi chogs nañ ñañ-pa mjes ma yin | wa'i chogs nañ señ-ge mjes ma yin | boñ-bu'i khyu-na rta mčhog mjes ma yin | skyes-bu blun nañ mkhas-pa mjes ma yin* |. Skr cf. SRBh 176/964, C: *haṃsa na bhāti balibhojanavrndamadhye gomāyumaṇḍalagato na vibhāti simhaḥ | jātyā na bhāti turagaḥ kharayūthamadhye vidvāna bhāti puruṣeṣu nirakṣareṣu* ||. Cf. also one line in Subh 116.

¹Sdoñ *khra-yi* (hawk) ²N,P -na (in every line)

The Tib of C is the exact translation. *čhu-skyar* instead of *khra* is an improvement in V but clearly made without consulting the Skr version.

(82) | *khu-byug chul ni sgra-sñan yin* |
 | *mkhas-pa'i chul ni rig-pa yin* |
 | *bud-med chul ni khrel-yod*¹ *yin* |
 | *dka'-thub chul-ni bzod-pa yin*² |

The distinction of the kokila is sweet voice,
 the distinction of the wise man is learning,
 the distinction of a woman is modesty,
 the distinction of an ascetic is patience.

82. Cf. Sdoñ 162. Skr cf. SRBh 231/380, Sternbach CA 55, IS 1919 (741): *kokilānāṃ svaro rūpaṃ nārīrūpaṃ pativratam | vidyā rūpaṃ kurūpānāṃ kṣamā rūpaṃ tapasvinām* ||

¹Sdoñ *ñon-moñs* ²The lines in Sdoñ are changed: (b)-(a)-(d)-(c).

The translation is not exact, though *rūpaṃ* may be translated with *chul*. In this case V is nearer to Skr both in the order of lines (only (b) and (c) lines are changed) and in translating *pativratam* with *khrel-yod*.

(83) | *mthu-čhen bčos-su¹ mi ruñ-la* |
 | *bzod-pa byar-yañ či-žig yod* |
 | *ži-ba dul-bar² spyod-pa-la* |
 | *bzod-pa bya-ba³ či-žig dgos* |

[If a deed] cannot be accomplished by magic power,
 what is the use of ascetic perseverance?
 And why should he persevere in asceticism
 who practices tranquillity with discipline.

83. Cf. Sdoñ 209.

¹N *bčosu* ²Sdoñ *dul-ba ži-ba'i* ³Sdoñ *byar yañ*

(84) | *phan-med gñen ni² gžan yin-te* |
 | *pha-rol yin-yañ gañ phan gñen* |
 | *lhan-čig skyes-pa'i nad-sogs² dañ³* |
 | *gañs-čan ri-bo'i⁴ sman bžin-no* |

A useless relative is a stranger, —
 he who, though an outsider, is useful, is a relative.
 Just as hereditary illness, —
 and the medicine from the snow hills.

84. Cf. Sdoñ 189, C I/11: *phan-byed gžan yin-na-yañ gñen* | *gñen-yañ phan-med gžan yin-te* | *phan-byed dgon-pa'i sman-dañ ni* | *phan-med lus-skyed nad-dañ mčhuñs* |, Skr cf. C, Sternbach CA 125, IS 3988 (1736): *paro'pi hitavānbandhurbandhurapyahitaḥ parah* | *ahito dehajo vyādhirhitamāraṇyamaṣadham* ||. Cf. also Subh 210 (ab).

¹Sdoñ *yañ* ²D *nags-sogs* ³Sdoñ *byuñ-ba'i lus-sogs nad* ⁴Sdoñ *phan-byed dgon-pa'i*

Contains an exact translation, V is secondary to Sdoñ, which is a bit nearer to the original. V has a better Tibetan style.

(85) | *mthu-čhe-ba-dañ 'groggs gyur-na* |
 | *mthon-po ñid-du su mi 'gyur* |
 | *me-tog phreñ-dañ¹ 'brel-ba-yis* |
 | *srad-bu² mgo-la' čhiñ-bar³ byed* |

By becoming a friend of a very powerful man
 who will not reach the top?
 By connection with a flower garland
 a thread will be bound on the head.

85. Cf. Sdoñ 94. Skr cf. SRBh 81/2, IS 2120 (841): *guṇavajjanasamsargādyāti svalpo'pi gauravam | puṣpamālāprasāṅgena sūtram śirasi dhāryate ||*. Cf. also Subh 236 (ab)

¹Sdoñ *-bar* ²Sdoñ *skud-pa* ³Sdoñ *'dogs-par*

No significant difference in the two translations, *dañ* is a bit more simple than *-bar*.

(86) | *drañ-žin¹ bden-par smra-ba-la² |*
| *slu-byed mkhas-pa yin-nam či |*
| *pañ-par brten-te ñal-ba'i mi³ |*
| *gsod-pa de či dpa'-bo'am |*

Would it be wise to deceive
a man who speaks the truth by his honest nature?
To kill a man who is sleeping held on your bosom,
is such a thing a heroic deed?

86. Cf. Sdoñ 90. Cf. also Subh 263.

¹D *rañ-bžin* ²Sdoñ *bden-la žugs-par gyur-pa-la* ³Sdoñ *spa-bar* [D, P *pañ-par*] *brten-te ñal-ba-dañ |*

(87) | *gžon-nu'i dus-na pha-ma'i dbañ-gyur žin¹ |*
| *lañ-cho'i dus-na bud-med dbañ-gyur-te |*
| *rgan-po'i dus-na bu'i dbañ-gyur-pas |*
| *blun-po nam-yañ rañ-dbañ yod ma yin |*

In childhood, being subjected by his parents,
in youth, being subjected by women,
in old age being subjected by his son,
the fool never is in his own power.

87. Cf. Skr IS 4067 (1774): *pitā rakṣati kaumāre bhartā rakṣati yauvane | rakṣanti sthāvire putrā na strī svātantryamarhati ||*

¹D *-žin*

The same stanza could not be found in Skr, here only the structure is the same, the main point has been changed, in accordance with religious ideas: the brahmanic view changed into Buddhist ones. Another Sanskrit original may have existed.

(88) | *ji-srid¹ 'dod čhen² ma-gyur-ba |*
| *de-srid yon-tan de-ñid³ yin |*
| *'dod čhen 'di-la⁴ žugs gyur-na |*
| *yon-tan bcun-par ga-la 'gyur |*

As long as affection does not grow great
it is a virtue.

If the affection grows [too] great
how could it be a revered virtue?

88. Cf. Sdoñ 220

¹D *ji-ltar* ²D *čhags* ³Sdoñ *čhe-ñid* ⁴Sdoñ *ñid-la*

(89) | *skye-bo phal-čher rañ-gi ni* |
| *chad-mas gžan-dag 'jal-bar byed* |
| *drañ-sroñ-gyis ni yi-dags mthoñ* |
| *'di ni dka'-thub-pa žes zer* |

People usually judge others
by their own standards.
When a r̥ṣi sees a preta
he says, «Here is an ascetic».

89. —

(90) | *skye-bo ñan-pas sun-phyuñ-na* |
| *dam-pa-la yañ yid mi čhes¹* |
| *byis-pa 'o-mas kha chig-na* |
| *žo-la'añ² phu-yis 'debs-ših 'thuñ* |

If somebody has been insulted by a wicked man,
he will not believe a good man either.
If a child's mouth gets burned by milk,
it will drink even curd only after blowing on it.

90. Cf. Sdoñ 180. Cf. also Subh 296

¹Sdoñ *rton* ²N *žo-la*

(91) | *zo-čhun bzor ni sbyar-gyur-na* |
| *bud-med-kyi yañ dbaṅ-du 'gyur* |
| *dañ-po brcams-pa¹ gañ yin-pa* |
| *de-ni ño-mchar čhe-ba yin* |

If a water-mill is constructed and it already works,
even a woman is able to manage it.
But to construct the first one, this indeed
is a great wonder.

91. Cf. Sdoñ 222: *dañ-po'i rcom-pa gañ yin-pa* | *'di-ltar ño-mchar che-ba yin* | *zo-čhun bzo sbyar gyur-pa ni* | *bud-med-kyi yañ dbaṅ-du 'gyur* |

¹N,P *rcom-pa*

V has changed the order of lines, giving first the example and than the general statement.

(92) | *gañ-žig čhen-po'i spyir bkur-ba¹* |
| *de-ñid dman-pas rca² sñam-sems* |
| *mkhas-pas phyag-byas mčhod-rten ni* |
| *khva-yis³ stan-du byed-pa yin* |

Whatever the great man carries on his head,
the same thing is looked upon as grass by a mean person.
The stūpa, to which the saints pay respect,
is used by the crow as a perch.

92. Cf. Sdoñ 153. Cf also Subh 241 (ab): *čhen-pornams-kyis mčhod bya-ba* | *dman-pa-rnams-kyis brñas-par 'gyur* |

¹Sdoñ *spyi-bos bkur* ²Sdoñ, *rca*, N *cva* ³Sdoñ *khva-dag*

(93) | *ke-ta-ka-yi 'bras-bu ni* |
| *čhu-rnams dañ-bar byed mod-kyi* |
| *de-yi miñ cam brjod-pa-yis¹* |
| *čhu rdul dañ-bar mi-byed-do* |

The fruit of the ketaka
is a purifier of water.
But by only uttering its name
no drop of water will become clean.

93. Cf. Sdoñ 168. Skr. Cf. IS 4369 (1931): *phalaṃ katakavr̥kṣasya padyapyambuprasādakaṃ* | *na nāmagrahaṇādeva tasya vāri prasīdati* | Cf also Subh 12 (water-purifying jewel).

¹Sdoñ *smras-pa-yi*

Exact translations.

(94) | *dam-pa dañ-por¹ khas-'če² mi-byed-la* |
| *gal-te dka'-bas khas ni blaṅs gyur-na* |
| *rdo-la ri-mo bris-pa ji-lta-bar³* |
| *khas blaṅs de-ni ñes-par sgrub-par byed⁴* |

The good man, at first, does not make promises,
if however, after hard consideration, he promises something,
it is like a picture being drawn on stone:
he will certainly carry out his promise.

94. Cf. Sdoñ 11. Cf also Sdoñ 243, which has a Skr parallel: Sternbach CA 68: *jalalekheva nīcānām yatkr̥tam̐ tanna dr̥ṣyate | atyalpamapi sādḥūnām śilālekheva tiṣṭhati ||*

¹Sdoñ *mañ-po* ²Sdoñ *khas-čhes N khas-čhe* ³Sdoñ *lta-bur ni* ⁴Sdoñ *ši-yañ gžan-đu byed-par mi 'gyur-ro*

Sdoñ 243, which is an almost exact translation of the Skr stanza quoted, may have been the source of Sdoñ 11 and V as well. In this case we have to suppose that already some stanzas of Sdoñ were compiled in Tibetan.

(95) | *dman-pas gañ che nor ni čuñ-zad rñed* |
| *'gro-ba gžan-la¹ brñas-pa'i ña-rgyal-ldan* |
| *dam-pa nor-gyi 'byor-ba thob-gyur-k'yañ* |
| *sā-lu smin-pa bžin-du² šin-tu 'dud³* |

When a mean person gets a little bit of wealth,
he shows pride in despising other beings.
A good man, even gaining the riches of wealth,
like the ripe salu rice, always bends respectfully.

95. Cf. Sdoñ 44.

¹Sdoñ *thams-čad* ²Sdoñ *lta-bur* ³N,P *dud*

(96) | *šes-rab-dañ 'dra'i¹ mig med-de* |
| *rmoñs-pa-dañ mñam mun-pa med* |
| *nad-dañ 'dra-ba'i dgra med-de²* |
| *'čhi-bdag-dañ³ mñam 'jigs-pa med* |

There is no eye comparable to knowledge,
there is no darkness similar to stupidity,
there is no enemy comparable to illness,
there is no fear like that of Yama (the Lord of Death).

96. Cf. Sdoñ 105. Skr cf. SRBh 162/406, 96/1, 167/624; IS 3231 (1374) (ab) *na ca vidyāsamo bandhurna ca vyādhisamo ripuḥ* |, IS 3680 (4452) (a) *nāsti vidyāsamaṃ cakṣur* IS 3670 (4446) (ab) *nāsti kāmasamo vyādhirnāsti mohasamo ripuḥ* |; Sternbach CA 113. Cf. also Sdoñ 104, V 26.

¹Sdoñ *mñam* ²Sdoñ *nad 'dra-ba-yi dgra-bo med* | ³Sdoñ *'čhi-ba-dañ*

V is slightly improved (*'čhi-ba > 'čhi-bdag*). No exact original could be found, but it seems, the number of variants in Skr is so high that a «Buddhistic» version, similar to the Tibetan, might have existed, too.

(97) | *de-bas šin-tu mi bzad-pa'i¹* |
| *'čhi-ba ñes-par 'byuñ-'gyur-gyi²* |
| *'dod-pa-rnams-łas³ sems-zlog-la⁴* |
| *dam-pa'i čhos-la dga'-bar-gyis* |

That is why, as the absolutely irresistible
 death certainly will come,
 you should give up desires,
 and find delight in the holy religion (saddharma).

97. Cf. Sdoñ 106

¹Sdoñ -*zad-pa*¹i ²N,P -*gyis* ³D Sdoñ -*la* ⁴N,P *bzlog*

A continuation of the previous stanza. The last line of V 96 (Sdoñ 105) could be added to the first three lines in order to bring together the two verses.

(98) | *yon-tan-čan-la*¹ *rig-pa*² *yon-tan* 'gyur |
 | *yon-tan-med-la*³ *de-ñid skyon-du* 'gyur |
 | *čhu-bo*¹i *čhu ni šin-tu dri-med-pa*⁴'añ⁴ |
 | *rgya-mchor phyin-na btuñ-du mi ruñ* 'gyur |

In a virtuous man, knowledge will become virtue.
 In a man without virtue the same will become a fault.
 The water of a river is indeed free from impurity,
 but when it arrives at the ocean, it will become unfit for drinking.

98. Cf. Sdoñ 149, C. VIII/64. Skr cf. SRBh 82/40, IS 2120(841): *guṇā guṇajñeṣu guṇā bhavanti te nirguṇaṃ prāpya bhavanti doṣāḥ | susvādutoyāḥ prabhavanti nadyaḥ samudramāsadya bhavantyapeyāḥ* || Analysed in my paper *On the Subhāṣitaratnanidhi in Papers on the Literature of Northern Buddhism*, Delhi University 1979, pp. 33–35. Cf. also Subh 142: *skye-bo dam-pa ṅan-pa-dañ | grogs-na ṅan-pa*¹'i *šan-du* 'gyur | *Gaṅ-ga*¹'i *čhu ni rab žim-pa* | *rgya-mchor sleb-nas ba-chvar* 'gyur |

¹N -*ldan-la*, C *šes-na* Sdoñ *šes-la* ²C *yon-tan* Sdoñ *de-ñid* ³C -*na* ⁴Sdoñ *skyon-med-pa*¹'añ C *žim-pa-dag*

C is the most exact translation, Sdoñ and V have slight changes. The version of Subh shows the poetic qualities of Sa-skya paṇḍita, and his effort to make his poems sound like original Indian verses. «Sanskritization»

(99) | *bye-brag phyed-pa*¹'i *blo-ldan yañ* |
 | *bya-ba gros-kyis bsgrub-par bya* |
 | *de-la ñes-dmigs mi* 'byuñ-*ste* |
 | *byuñ-na*¹'añ *de-yis*¹ *slar spon byed*² |

A wise person, who can discriminate,
 should carry out his actions only after consultations.
 By doing so reproach will not arise,
 and if it does he can refute it.

99. Cf. Sdoñ 5. Cf. also Subh 304: *blo-dañ bya-ba čuñ-zad kyañ* | *rgyun-du gros-kyis sgrub-par bya* | *grub-par-gyur-na smos či dgos* | *ma-grub-na yañ mjes-pa'i rgyu* | and Subh 372 (ab).

¹D yi ²Sdoñ, two last lines: *'grub 'gyur kho-nar ma zad-kyi* | *ma grub-na yañ mjes-pa yin* | «It is nice not only if you are successful [in the matter] but also if you are not able to complete it».

Sdoñ and V seem to go back to two Skr versions, which I could not find, though the stanza sounds very «Pañcatantra» like. Subh has used the Sdoñ version.

(100) | *brtan-žin 'jam-la chig ñuñ gañ yin-pa* |
| *de-la mi-yis² šin-tu bag bya-ste* |
| *ñi-ma sprin stug³ nañ-nas byuñ-ba-yi* |
| *'od-zer šin-tu cha-bar 'gyur-ba bžin* |

People will always pay attention
to those who are firm but polite, and of few words,
just as to the very hot rays of the sun
when they come out from behind dense clouds.

100. Cf. Sdoñ 6. Cf. also related contents in Sdoñ 95.

¹Sdoñ *bstan-žin* ²*mis ni* ³*bug* «crack, hole»

V seems to be a bit better in style. These two stanzas follow each other in Sdoñ, too.

(101) | *na-chod gžon-yañ¹ ñe-bar ži-la dga'* |
| *m khas-par gyur-kyañ šes-pa'i ña-rgyal med* |
| *gzi-brjid čhe-yañ bzod-čič des-pa-yis²* |
| *dgra-las rgyal-byed de-ni rñed-par dka'³* |

To enjoy calmness — though still young,
not to be proud of one's knowledge — though a learned man,
to show perseverance — though celebrated,
to be victorious over the enemy by good nature, these things are difficult to
find.

101. Cf. Sdoñ 91.

¹Sdoñ *gžon-yañ rgan-pa'i* ²D *ñes-pa-yi*, Sdoñ *des-pa'i ñañ* ³Sdoñ *ji mthor phyin yañ ña-rgyal dregs-pa med*

The relation of V and Sdoñ is not clear, V contains a motif missing in Sdoñ (the last five syllables) and seems to be less well constructed.

(102) | *phyug-po kla-klo-rnams-la'añ yod* |
| *dpa'-bo dud-'gro-rnams-la'añ yod* |
| *sna-chogs don-ldan¹ gtam smra-ba'i* |
| *dam-pa-dag ni šin-tu dkon* |

There are rich people among the barbarians, too,
 there are heroes among the beasts, too,
 but such excellent people are very rare,
 whose talking conveys the substance of all things.

102. Cf. Sdoñ 147, Gso 16: *phyug-po kla-klo-la yañ yod | dpa'-bo 'dud-gro-la yañ yod | don-dañ ldan-pa'i chig smra-ba | 'jig-rten 'di-na šin-tu dkon | D,P (c): don-dañ mthun-pa'i gtam smra-ba |* Cf. also Subh 239: *nor-ldan blun-po'i nañ-na mañ | dpa'-bo gčan-zan khrod-na mod | legs-bšad mkhas-pa'i khrod 'byin-pa | dam-pa 'jig-rten 'di-na dkon |*

¹Sdoñ -gyi

V tried to put more meaning in the third line. The adaptation of Sa-skya pañḍita offers us a clear insight into the way of thinking and aims of this great poet.

(103) | *'byor-pa g-yo-žin lañ-cho myur-du¹ 'jig |*
 | *srog ni gšin-rje'i so-yi bar-na gnas² |*
 | *'dir bde don-gñer pha-rol yal-bar 'dod |*
 | *de-ni g-yañ-sa'i mthar gnas loñ-ba bžin |*

Acquisitions are unsteady, youth perishes quickly.

Life is an existence between the teeth of the Lord of Death.

Joy, desire, the wish to defeat others:

all these here are similar to the acts of a blind man who lives on the brink of a precipice.

103. Cf. Sdoñ 214 (ab). Sdoñ (cd) differ: *'on-kyañ 'jig-rten pha-rol sgrub-la lhod | kye-ma mi-yi spyod-pa ño-mchar che |*

¹Sdoñ *yud-kyis* ²Sdoñ *so gcigs* [D *gčig*] *gnas-dañ mchuñs |*

(104) | *gañ-žig ñon-moñs nad bčas-pa |*
 | *de sman dam-čhos mi bsten-par |*
 | *yul-la bag-yañs¹ spyod-pa ni |*
 | *srid-pa'i lam-nas² 'byuñ mi 'gyur |*

If somebody, being in misery and ill,

does not keep to the medicine of the holy doctrine,

but practices attachment to wordly affairs,

such a person will not be set free from transmigratory existence.

104. N,P -kyañ ²N,P -las

(105) | *gal-te 'gro-ba 'di-dag-gis*¹ |
 | *'čhi-bdag spyi-bor gnas mthoñ-na* |
 | *zas-kyañ yid-du*² *mi 'oñ-na* |
 | *bya-ba gžan-lta čičig smos*³ |

If these people see
 the Lord of Death seated on their heads
 even food will not please them
 not to mention other similar things.

105. Cf. Sdoñ 216. Cf. also Subh 432: *skye-bo kun-gyi druñ stod-pa'i* | *'čhi-bdag gal-te mñon-sum mthoñ* |
bya-ba gžan-dag lta čiči smos | *za-ba dran-pa'i nus-pa med* |

¹Sdoñ *kun-gyis* ²Sdoñ *-yi gar* ³D *ji-žig smos* P *smros* Sdoñ *smos čiči dgos*
 The changes in Subh are clearly conscious ones.

(106) | *bya-ba*¹ *zin-nam ma-zin žes*² |
 | *'čhi-bdag skyod-par*³ *mi 'gyur-bas* |
 | *sañ-gi bya-ba de-riñ ñi*⁴ |
 | *phyi-dro'i bya-ba sñā-dro'o*⁵ |

Whether our work be finished or not,
 the Lord of Death will not go away.
 That's why we must do tomorrow's work today,
 the evening's work in the morning.

106. Cf. Sdoñ 217. Cf. Also Subh. 433: *khyod-kyi bya-ba zin-nam žes* | *'čhi-bdag sdod-par mi 'gyur-gyi* |
ñes-par bya dgos yod na ni | *de-riñ-ñid-du brtan-la gyis* | Also related Subh 434.

¹Sdoñ *'dus byas* ²Sdoñ *-čes* ³P, Sdoñ *sdod-par* D *bstod-par* ⁴N,P *-ste*, Sdoñ *bya* ⁵N *gro'o*, Sdoñ *bya*
 V 103, 105, 106 are in the same order as Sdoñ (214, 216, 217), — V 104 has no parallel. Even the
 mentioned Subh stanzas follow each other. Here, in V 106 we find the first lines better. In Sdoñ *bya* seems
 to be better than *ñi* and *'o*. Subh is less condensed, 434 may be a free variation of the same idea.

(107) | *'jig-rten 'cho-ba brtan ma yin* |
 | *nor dañ lañ-cho*¹ *brtan ma yin* |
 | *bu dañ čhuñ-ma brtan min-te*² |
 | *čhos dañ bden dañ phan-pa brten*³ |

The duration of the world is not constant,
 wealth and youthfulness are not constant,
 son and wife are not constant —
 religion, truth and good deeds are constant.

107. Cf. Sdoñ 110

¹Sdoñ *loñs-spyod*, D *loñ-cho* (a contamination) ²Sdoñ *-gyis* ³Sdoñ *čhos dañ grags-pa sñan-pa bsten* |
P,N *brtan*

The change in the last line is significant but it is not known whether it is original or has some further source.

(108) | *rgyal-po yun-riñ gson-na*¹ *ruñ* |
| *drañ-sroñ myur-du ši-na'añ*² *ruñ*³ |
| *rñon-pa ši'am gson mi ruñ* |
| *dam-pa ši'am gson-yañ*⁴ *ruñ* |

A king is worthy if he lives long,
an ascetic is worthy, even if he dies early.
A hunter is not worthy, either dead or alive,
a good man is worthy either dead or alive.

108. Cf. Sdoñ 223. (In all the lines *bu ni* words are inserted after a Genitive of the first two-syllable word.)

¹Sdoñ *gson yañ* ²Sdoñ *ši yañ* ³Sdoñ lines (a) and (b) are inverted. ⁴N *gson-bar*

*

Chigs-su bčad-pa brgya-pa žes-bya-ba || *slob-dpon čhen-po Mčhog-sred-kyis*
mjad-pa rjogs-so || || *rgya-gar-gyi mkhan- -po Bi-na-ya-candra dañ* | *bod-kyi lo-*
cā-ba dge-sloñ Čhos-kyi šes-rab-kyis bsgyur-čin žus-te gtan-la phab-pa'o ||

The Hundred Verses, composed by the great teacher, Vararuci is finished here.
It has been translated by the Indian teacher Vinayacandra and the Tibetan translator Ge-long Čhos-kyi šes-rab.

SOME EXTRACTS FROM SH. DAMDIN'S MANUSCRIPT COPY OF THE *HU-LAN DEB-THER*

BY

SH. BIRA (Ulan-Bator)

It was in January 1838 that Alexander Csoma de Kőrös first published his paper on the historical and grammatical literature of Tibet¹ thus marking the beginning of the study of Tibetan historical literature in modern Tibetology. It is true that in his paper he did not mention Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe's *Hu-lan deb-ther* (*Red Annals*) which, I suppose, in his time was not so well known outside Tibet. Nevertheless, one has every reason to believe that the great Tibetologist knew of its existence, because he wrote of those Tibetan chronicles in which the authors made references to the *Red Annals* (For example: *Deb-ther sñon-po*, etc).

As it is well known, Alexander Csoma de Kőrös was the first to propose the classification of Tibetan historical literature into seven groups. In the first group, which he called *Lo-rgyus* («annals, chronicle, history») he included the works that due to their content were of historical character. It is quite obvious that we can ascribe the *Red Annals* to the *Lo-rgyus* group.

The *Red Annals* once enjoyed a high reputation among Tibetan and Mongolian scholars, and served as one of the main sources for those who wrote about the history of Tibet, China and Mongolia. However, up to the present time it has been considered a bibliographical rarity in modern Tibetology. But, fortunately, during the last few years it has become more and more accessible due to its new editions. The Institute of Tibetology of Sikkim first published the *Red Annals* in 1961.²

I already mentioned this edition in my article on this topic.³

The next edition of the *Red Annals* was published quite recently, i. e. in 1981, by the National Minorities Publishing House of the Chinese People's Republic under the double name of *Deb-ther dmar-po* or *Hu-lan deb-ther*.

The new edition is accompanied with a preface, brief information on the author and extensive commentary (all written in modern Tibetan by Duñ-dKar bLo-bZañ 'Phrin-las from the Central Institute of the National Minorities in Peking).

¹ Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, *Enumeration of historical and grammatical works to be met with in Tibet: Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. VII, N. 73, January 1838.

² *Tshal-pa Kun-dGa' rDo-rJes mdzad-pa'i Hu-lan deb-ther bžugs-so*, Part I, Tibetan text, Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, Gangtok, Sikkim, 1961.

³ Sh. Bira, *Some remarks on the Hu-lan deb-ther of Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe: Acta Orientalia Hungarica*, XVII, fasc. 1, 1964.

Compared to the Sikkim edition, the new one has some advantages. It was published on the basis of several different copies — two copies from the library of the National Minorities' Palace and seven copies from the Archives of the Autonomous Region of Tibet.⁴

In his *Information on the author* Duñ-dKar bLo-bZaṅ 'Phrin-las gives some very interesting new data, unknown to modern Tibetologists, about Tshal-pa Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe, the author of the *Red Annals*. The author points out that the data were taken from *Bu-ston Rin-po-ḥe's biography* (*Bu-ston Rin-po-che'i rnam-thar*) compiled by Bu-ston's disciple Rin-chen rNam-rGyal, *Register of Tshal-guñ-thaṅ, a precept of Avalokiteshvara* written by 'Jog-ri ṅag dBaṅ bsTan-'Dzin (*Tṣhal-guñ-thaṅ-gi dkar-ḥag gro-mgon žal-luṅ*), Karma-Tshe dBaṅ-Kun-Khyab's *History of Karma bKa'-brGyud-ba* (*Karma bka'-brgyud-kyi ḥos-'byuṅ*) and stories of Karma-pa Rol-pa'i rDo-rJe.

It is worthwhile briefly summarizing the above-mentioned *Information on the author* written by Duñ-dKar bLo-Zaṅ 'Phrin-las.

Tshal-pa Si-tu Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe or Si-tu dGe-ba'i bLo-gros was born in the Earth-Bird year of the fifth Rab-byuṅ (1309 A.D.) and died in the Wood-Serpent year of the sixth Rab-byuṅ (1364 A.D.). His father was *druñ-chen* («officer») sMon-lam rDo-rJe who occupied the office of *khri-dpon* («officer in charge of ten-thousand families») for 33 years since the Water-Hare year, when he was 20 years old. In the Earth-Dragon year of the fifth Rab-byuṅ (1328 A.D.), when he was 45 years old, sMon-lam rDo-rJe took up the ordination in the presence of jo-gdan khan-chen bSod-nams dPal-pa and yaṅ-dgon mkhan-po Byaṅ-ḥhub dPal-ba. He wrote many books and took great care of the monasteries in Lhasa.

Tshal-pa Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe, the oldest son of druñ-chen sMon Lam rDo-rJe, became famous for his great knowledge of Sūtras and Tantras, and as well as the Doctrine of bKa'-brgyud. He began to learn writing at the age of 5. At the age of 15, in the Water-Hog year of the fifth Rab-byuṅ (1323) he was appointed as *khri-dpon*. In the year of the Wood-Ox (1324), when he was 17 years old, he visited Yesun temur, the emperor of the Yüan (Mongol) dynasty, who bestowed on him a silver seal (*dñul gyi tham-ka*) and an Imperial edict (*'ja'-sa* < Mong. *jasay*) granting rule over all the citizens of the Tshal-pa region and presented him with many luxurious gifts. He retained the office of *khri-dpon* for 28 years. During that period he zealously worked for the welfare and restoration of the monasteries — Tshal-guñ-thaṅ, Lhasa monastery, Potala, etc. At the invitation of Bu-ston Rin-po-ḥe, he thoroughly carried out the correction of the sNar-thaṅ and many other *bKa'-gyurs* existing in Tibet and completed the writing of a *bKa'-gyur* with powder of

⁴ Tshal-pa Kun-dga' rDo-rje's *Deb-ther dmar-po*, preface (in Tibetan), Peking 1981, p. 2.

gold and silver in 260 volumes. The result was the *Tshal-pa bKa'-gyur*, which many Tibetan sages considered to be the best original model for printing the *bKa'-gyur*.

However, later due to a dispute with Ta'i Si-tu Byañ-čhub rGyal-mtshan in the Water-Dragon year of the sixth Rab-byuñ (1352) he left the office and handed over the post to his younger brother Grags-pa Śes-rab. He was ordained and given the name of dGe-ba'i bLo-gros. He learnt many books on Sūtras and Tantras from the fourth Karma-pa Rol-pa'i rDo-rJe and became famous as Si-tu — the All-knower (*Si-tu thams-čad mkhyen-pa*) throughout Tibet. He wrote the following books:

- 1) *White book* — *Index of the Tshal-pa bKa'-gyur* (*Tshal-pa bka'-gyur-gyi dkar-čhag deb-ther dkar-po*),
- 2) *Red Annals* (*Deb-ther dmar-po*),
- 3) its notes, *Book conquering the heart of sages* (*de'i lhan-thabs deb-ther mkhas-pa'i yid 'phrog*),
- 4) *History of kings, multicolour book* (*Rgyal-rabs lo-rgyus deb-ther khra-po*),
- 5) *Biography of Guñ-thañ bla-ma Žañ*⁵ (*Guñ-thañ bla-ma Žañ gi rnam-thar*),
- 6) *Biography of father sMon-lam rDo-rJe* (*yab sMon-lam rDo-rJe'i rnam-thar*) and others.

It is known that scholars — including myself — are of the view that the *Red Annals* was written in 1346.⁶ But Duñ-dKar bLo-bZaṅ 'Phrin-las writes that the author of the *Red Annals* began to write it in the Fire-Dog year of the sixth Rab-byuñ (1346) and completed it in the Water-Hare year of the same Rab-byuñ (1363) when the Fourth Karma-pa Rol-pa'i rDo-rJe came from the Centre to Tibet. At the same time, it should be noted that unfortunately Duñ-dKar bLo-bZaṅ 'Phrin-las did not indicate his reference material from which he took this information. I personally doubt whether Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe wrote his book for such a long time (17 years). The author of the *Red Annals* informs us in the preface of his book that he is going to write the first book or part of the *Deb-ther dmar-po* (*Red Books, Annals*).⁷

Duñ-dKar bLo-bZaṅ 'Phrin-las also gives some more details concerning the other part of the *Red Annals*. He writes that it is not only mentioned in the beginning of the book that it is the first part of the *Deb-ther dmar-po* but 'Jog-ri Ṅag-dBaṅ bsTan-'dZin notes in his *dKar-čhag of Tshal-guñ-thañ* that there exists an Appendix to the *Deb-ther dmar-po* called *Deb-ther mkhas-pa'i yid-'phrog* (*Book conquering the heart of sages*), and that he himself had seen it in Tibet before the cultural revolution.⁸ I therefore suppose that the long period (1346–1363) which Duñ-dKar

⁵ This Biography is mentioned in other Tibetan sources. See: Sh. Bira, *op. cit.* p. 71.

⁶ G. W. Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, Part I, Calcutta 1949, p. VI; Sh. Bira, *op. cit.*, p. 70; Palden Thondup Namgyal, *Foreward* to the Sikkim edition of the *Red Annals*, p.1.

⁷ Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe, *Red Annals*, Sikkim edition, p.1; Peking edition, p. 1.

⁸ Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe, *Red Annals*, Peking edition, p. 3.

bLo-bZaṅ 'Phrin-las gives as the date of compiling the *Red Annals* could refer to all the parts of the work called by Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe *Deb-ther dmar-po-rnams* (*Red Annals or books*). Concerning the *Red Annals*, 1346 could be taken as the exact date of its compilation, because its author at least twice mentions the Fire-Dog year (1346) as the year of the writing of his book.⁹

It is not possible for me to dwell, even briefly, upon Duṅ-dKar bLo-bZaṅ 'Phrin-las' extensive comments (altogether 683) constituting the overwhelming majority of the Peking edition. They are a unique contribution to the study of the *Red Annals* and deserve to be analyzed separately.

It is necessary to say a few words regarding the extracts from the manuscript copy of the *Red Annals* that belonged to Sh. Damdin. I had already pointed out in my above-mentioned paper that up to the modern times the *Red Annals* was very popular among Mongolian historians who wrote partly in Mongolian, and partly in Tibetan.¹⁰ The existence of the book in the personal library of Sh. Damdin¹¹ (1867–1937) confirms the fact that until recent years it was one of the manuscript copies of the *Red Annals* that was well known in Mongolia. Despite my efforts to find the Mongolian manuscript copy of the *Red Annals* I could not discover anything except for nineteen copybook page extracts made from Damdin's manuscript copy by one of his disciples at the request of Erdenipel in the 1920s, the former honorary mkhan-po of Gandan monastery in Ulan-Bator, who kindly permitted me to copy all the extracts bearing the title *Tshal-pa Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe'i deb-ther las ṅe-bar mkho-ba 'ga'-žig btus-so* (*Some brief necessary extracts from Chal-pa Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe's book.*)¹²

Until the new editions of the *Red Annals* appeared I had no possibility to say anything definite about the identity of the extracts in our possession. After having collated them with both the Sikkim and the Peking editions, I can confirm the authenticity of our extracts. It is interesting to note that I could not discover, with the exception of some slight differences in spelling and wording,¹³ any essential deviations between the Sikkim, and Peking editions, on the one hand and the Mongolian manuscript copy that belonged to Sh. Damdin, on the other. At the same time it shows that the archetypal part of the *Red Annals* had been faithfully preserved in the different copies, regardless of where exactly they had been kept, since the time when Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe composed his book. Nevertheless it should

⁹ Kun-dGa' rDo-rJe, *Red Annals*, Sikkim edition, pp. 6, 21a., Peking edition, pp. 12, 45 Cf. Sh. Bira, *op. cit.* p. 70.

¹⁰ Sh. Bira, *op. cit.*, pp. 74–75.

¹¹ About Sh. Damdin see: Ш. Бира «О Золотой книге Ш. Дамдина» Улан-Батор. 1964.

¹² It is kept in the author's personal library.

¹³ The differences are indicated in the footnotes of our extracts annexed below.

be noted that there is one line in our extracts which considerably differs from that of the Peking edition. Here is the line: *'di rnams ye ka thob čan nas gal čhe rim bśus pa nas*. The same line in the Peking edition runs as follows: *'di rnams dpe ka thob čhen nas gal čhe rigs bśus pa nas*.

On the other hand it is interesting to point out that the line given above in our extracts does not at all differ from that in the Sikkim edition (cf. f. 14b). The editor of the Peking publication did not, unfortunately, give any comment on how this line was written in the different copies used by him. It seems to me that the editor took the liberty of rewording the above-cited line according to his own understanding. I still adhere to the opinion that the wording of the line in our extracts and the Sikkim edition seems to be more reliable. In this connection, I would like to remind readers that in my above-mentioned paper on the *Red Annals* I translated this line as follows: «all this is transcribed from the *Ye-ka thob-čan* in order of importance.» At the same time I put forward a hypothesis that *Ye-ka thob-čan* could be a name of a Mongolian historical book (Mongolian: *Yeke*¹⁴ «big, great», *tobčiyān* /read: *tobčān*/ «registration, records») used by the author for writing the history of the genealogy of Mongol khans.¹⁵ Anyhow, this line should be studied more thoroughly on the basis of all the available copies of the *Red Annals*.

Comparing the extracts from Sh. Damdin's copy with the Peking edition, I found that our extracts cover the following paragraphs: 1) Indian way of chronology taken from the *Biography of Buddha* written by Sa-skyā Paṇḍita until the end of the legend about Tsandan Jo-bo;¹⁶ 2) from the Chinese Chou (Tseu) dynasty until the dynasty of Thang¹⁷ (the data were taken, as the author writes, from what had been written in the monastery of Lhasa from an old Chinese book (*rgya'i deb-gter rñiñ-pa*) which were looked through by Jambhala-la sto-śrī-mgon); 3) history of the relations between Tibet and Thang China¹⁸ (data were taken, as the author says, from the history of Tibet and China first compiled by historiographer *Ba Su-khyi* at the time of Tha'i-dzuñ and later made into a short record by *Han gswiu-tsha* translated by Chinese translator *Hu gyañ-ju* and published in Tibetan letters by *bla-ma Rin-čhen Grags gu-śrī*); 4) short history of the Chinese dynasty Liang;¹⁹

¹⁴ The same Mongol word is also transcribed in the next line (*Ye ka tha hu* . . . Cf. our extracts, the Peking ed. p. 30; the Sikkim ed. f. 14b).

¹⁵ Sh. Bira, *op. cit.*, pp. 72–73.

¹⁶ Peking edition, pp. 10–12

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 12–17

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 17–24

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 24–25

5) short genealogy of *Mi-ñag* (Tangut) kings;²⁰ 6) short genealogy of Mongol kings.²¹

Thus, if our extracts are compared to the Peking edition of the *Red Annals*, out of the 26 paragraphs into which its editor and commentator Duñ-dKar bLo-bZaň 'Phrin-las divided the whole book, only 5 paragraphs were word for word copied from the original. Nevertheless the extracts could be interesting for those who are engaged in studying different copies of the *Red Annals* from the point of view of text criticism.

Here are the extracts from Sh. Damdin's manuscript copy of the *Red Annals* arranged in transliteration, for convenience, according to the above listed five paragraphs:

**Tshal-pa Kun dga' rdo rje'i deb ther las
ñe bar mkho ba 'ga' žig btus so**

spyir rgya gar gyi lugs la byi ba lo la sogs pa'i miñ gis btags pa'i bču gñis skor du
brtsi pa ni med | dpal dus kyi 'khor lo²² sogs²³ nas | rab tu skyes pa la sogs pa'i drug
ču²⁴ brtsi ba žig yod de | thams čad la thun moñ du ma grags pa | pal čhe pa la grags
pa rgyal po čhen po dag gis lo bčos pa'i lo tshigs rtses te | de yaň 'di ltas bsod nams
čan du grags pa daň | bsod nams 'dod pa gaň dag gis mña' ris su gtogs so čog gi bu
lon rgyal pos sbyaňs te | sňar zoň du spyod pa rnam bor nas | zoň bsar pa raň gis
miñ btags nas spyod pa'o || de nas bzuň ste rim gyis brtsi ba yin no || 'di'i gtam ni lugs
čhen po žes bya ba las 'byuň te | gyul bstan 'og tu ñis stoň lon | dga' byed 'og tu
brgyad brgya | bzlas bsruňs ñis brgya sum ču²⁵ gčig | brjed laňs bdun brgya ñi šu bži |
bal gnas brgyad brgya bču rtsa bži | go čha ñis brgya bži bču gñis | žes byuň ño (žes sa
skya pañčitas mdzad pa'i rje btsun pa'i rnam thar las gsuňs so)²⁶ rgya nag po'i yig
tshaň las | če'u žes pa'i rgyal rabs bži pa | č'i'u dbaň žes pa rgyal sar bton nas | lo ñi šu
ma lon pa'i dus | šiň pho stag gi lo zla ba bži pa'i tše brgyad la | rgya gar du bčom
ldan 'das sku 'khruňs | de'i 'od daň čho 'phrul rnam rgya'i yul du 'n mthoň bas |
rtsis pa rnam kyi brtsis byas te | saňs rgyas byon par šes | rgyal po don grub lo rtsa
dgu lon pa mñon par byuň | dguň lo sum ču la saňs rgyas | de nas lo brgyad yum la
čhos 'čhad pa'i don du lha'i yul du byon | de'i šul du rgyal po ũ tra ya nas | mo'u gal
gyi bu la bskul te des lha'i yul du bčom ldan 'das kyi sku tsandan las bžeňs nas mi'i

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 26–28

²¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 28–31

²² *Op. cit.*: lo la

²³ *Op. cit.*: sogs pa

²⁴ *Op. cit.*: drug ču rtsa bžir

²⁵ *Op. cit.*: so gčig

²⁶ In the Peking edition this line is written in the beginning of the paragraph.

yul du gdan drañs | bčom ldan 'das lha las *pab* pa'i tshe tsandan gyi sku *des* bžeñs nas bčom ldan 'das la dbu *tud* de | spyi bor phyag bžag nas | mya ñan las 'das nas | lo stoñ lon pa'i tshe | sku 'dis rgya nag gi yul du sems čan gyi don byed par 'gyur žes luñ bstan | de nas lo *ži* bču ža gñis te dguñ lo brgyad bču la mya ñan las 'das | rgyal ba 'das nas čhu mo phag | se čhen rgyal sar bžugs nas lo ño phyed dañ gsum 'gro ba de la *brtsis* pas | de yan čhod la lo ñis stoñ dañ *sum ču*²⁷ soñ | tsandan gyi jo bo bžeñs nas lo ñis stoñ lña bču lña 'gro zer²⁸ *brgya* 'i tsandan jo bo 'i lo rgyus na yod par snañ | 'di la lo rgyus logs na yod pas²⁹ tho tsam du bris pa yin | čhu mo phag phyin čhad | da lta me pho khyi yan čhod la lo brgyad ču *rtsa* bži 'gro bar 'drug | lo rgyus 'di bod yig tu bsgyur mkhan | čhos rje pa'i slob ma byañ ños kyi mkhan po šer yes yin zer bar 'drug |

*

či'u la rgyal po sum ču so drug byuñ lo brgyar srid bzuñ *di* nas tshin hri hañ gi rgyal po gñis byuñ | de nas han ka'o dzuñ žes pa nas bzuñ ste mi rabs *ču* gñis kyi bar du rgyal po byuñ | bču gñis pa'i dus der aň mañ žes *pa* 'i blon po *žig* gis ño log byas nas lo bčo brgyad bzuñ | phyis han gyi brgyud pa gle'u goñ bu zer ba byuñ | aň mañ bsad nas han gyis rgyal srid bzuñ | gle'u goñ bu la bu lña skyes | bu lña pa han min ti rgyal po zer ba 'i rgyal po byuñ | de 'i dus su pañčita dzu ha lañ zer ba bden pa mthoñ ba gñis kyi | rta dkar po gčig la theg pa čhuñ nu 'i čhos *bkal* nas | rgya nag gi yul du 'oñs ho 'nam hur *pa* ma 'i *sa* 'i lha khañ bžeñs | čhos bsgyur | de nas brtsams te deñ sañ gi bar du *sañs*³⁰ kyi bstan pa dar ba yin pañčita de gñis kyi dgra bčom pa thob *nas* | gčig *gis* ma 'i *sa* 'i lha khañ gi 'og tu 'gog pa la sñoms par bžugs nas | byams pa byon pa 'i dus su tiñ *ñi* 'dzin las lañs nas mya ñan las 'das | gčig rdzu 'phrul gyis nam mkha' la 'phur nas | rgya mtsho 'i gliñ *ga* 'u li dkar *po* 'i žes bya ba 'i rgyal khams su soñ nas mya ñan las 'das | de nas han gyi rgyal rabs ñi šu *rtsa* bži pa | han hin ti žes *bya* ba 'i rgyal po 'i dus su | khoñ gi blon po *tsha* bo *tsha* ba zer ba bčig gis rgyal sa phrogs nas | de 'i rgyud pa mi lñas rgyal sa *hzuñs* | de 'i blon po 'umas žes pas yañ rgyal sa phrog pa | de 'i rjes su hi'u tsiñ gi brgyud pa la duñ tsiñ *ga* 'i tsiñ tshan gñis su byuñ ba 'i | *ga* 'i tsiñ rgyal po 'i dus su rgya gar gyi pañčita rgad po *žig* gis rgyal po la | rgya gar dañ '*jañ* yul gyi bar rgyal khams čhuñ du gčig na | sñar sañs rgyas šā kya thub ba sum ču *rtsa* gsum du byon pa 'i dus su bžeñs pa 'i lha | sañs rgyas dguñ lo bču gñis pa 'i sku tshad | jo bo šā kya dañ sañs rgyas kyi riñ *bsrel* dañ | ku mā ra śrī žes pa 'i pañčita mkhas pa gčig yod pa la | der rgyal khams čhuñ pas 'gro *dom* mi 'phel bar 'dug | khyed kyi dmag btañ nas blañs par soñ na sems čan mañ po la phan pa rgya čhen

²⁷ *Op. cit.*: bču gsum

²⁸ *Op. cit.*: ba

²⁹ *Op. cit.*: 'dir

³⁰ *Op. cit.*: rgyas

po 'byuñ zer bas | rgyal po *de'i* blon po *žig* gi čhiñ sañ gčig dañ | ču mi *dbyen* gyi dpon gčig yod bar 'dug pa'i dmag dpon de la dmag khri tsho bži bču *thams čad* pa bskur nas sa čha der btañ | sa čha der sleb pa'i dus su | *sa de'i* rgyal po'i tshig la khyed dañ ñed '*khon* ni med | dmag 'di tsam 'oñ ba či yin zer ba la | jo bo šā kya dañ | sañs rgyas *kyi riñ bsrel* | pañṭita gsum 'dod | mi *bskur* na dmag '*dren* pa yin byas pas | jo bo šā kya dañ riñ sre dños su yod pas bskur | pañṭita de na niñ 'das | de'i bu lo bčo brgyad 'gro pa ku mā ra čhuñ ba zer pa *čig yod pa* bskur ba yin zer nas *bskur* | de rnams khyer nas dmag dpon de phyir log | sañs rgyas *kyi riñ bsrel* yañ ē yin mi šes | byis *pa thams čad* la yañ či yañ mi ñan *bsam* nas | bkur *bsti* čhen po ma byas pa la | ñin gčig khoñ rnams rta žon nas yoñ gin yod pa'i lam du rta rgod ma gčig byuñ *nas* skad *čig gton* pa dañ | dmag dpon gyis žon pa'i rta des kyañ skad *čig bton* | de la pañṭita *bgad* mo sor bas | dmag dpon gyis či yin dris pas | rgot ma 'di'i *rte'u čig rtsa* za ba dañ | čhu 'thuñ ba la 'gor nas lus yod | dmag mañ po'i *mdun* du lam nor dogs yod | ña 'di la soñ bas lam ma nor bar phyi *phyin* par šog zer gyi 'dug byas *pas* | de la'añ dmag dpon de yid ma čhes par yod pa la | yud tsam *gčig* na lam gyi logs *gčig* na *rte'u gčig rtsa* za yin 'dug | dmag dpon gyi rta des skad *čig bton* pa dañ | *rte'u des* kyañ skad *čig bston* nas | de ma thag bañ btañ soñ | de la dmag dpon gyis dmag rnams lam 'byed du bčug | ma'i mdun du *bslebs* pas dmag dpon der yid čhes | de nas ñin čig ri mthon po gčig gi mgul du žag sa byas pa la pañṭita'i tshig gis rañ re 'dir žag tu sdod mi ñan | do nub nam phyed pa la čhu thog byuñ nas dmag rnams čhus khyer ñen yod zer bas | dmag thams čad bteg | *nas*³¹ *le* bar bču *gsum*³² tsam gyi snar babs pa dañ | de nub čhu thog byuñ nas | ri de'i ñe 'khor thams čad čhus non | thams čad mtshor gyur | de nas dmag dpon de | jo bo šā *kya*³³ sañs rgyas *kyi riñ srel* | *pañṭita* gsum la yid čhes siñ dad pa thob | de nas dmag dpon rgyal po'i druñ du 'gro bar čhas ba na | ga'i *tsañ* rgyal po sku gšegs brgyud čhad nas | snar gyi žiñ gi *tshañ* sañ des rgyal po byas 'dug zer *ba thos* nas dmag dpon gyis rañ gi dmag khri tsho bži bču po bsdus nas *sbi* čhon dañ | či'u mkhar ñi šu rtsa bži'i rgyal po byas | dus physis dmag dpon rgyal po de'i brgyud pa'i lag nas | čhiñ sañ rgyal po de'i brgyud pas | jo bo šā kya | riñ *bsrel* | pañṭita rnams kiñ *ča hur* gdan drañs | bkur *bsti* *bsam* gyis mi khyab pa byas | pañṭita de la btsun mo bču yod pas dge 'dun rnams ma mos pa la | ñin gčig *gandhe* brduñs nas³⁴ | pañṭita des dge 'dun rnams la *gro* ma drañ par khab sder ma re *bskye* | der dge 'dun rnams kyis za bar ma nus par | las pa dañ | pañṭita *de* na re khyed dge 'dun gtsañ ma rnams kyis khab za bar mi nus na | ña bslab pa mi gtsan bas *za* bar bya zer nas khab thams čad zos nas 'ju bas | dge 'dun rnams *kyi* ma dad pa bzlog pa | physis pañṭita de'i slob

³¹ *Op. cit.*: *sa* la . . .

³² *Op. cit.*: this word is absent

³³ *Op. cit.*: *pañṭita* . . .

³⁴ The following sentence is absent in our extracts: dge 'dun rnams čhos ston la tshogs pa'i dus su (*op. cit.*: p. 15)

ma *tsi'u* hwa šań žes pa yon tan čan čig byuń ba la | rgyal po ha čań dad čhes nas
 btsun mo'i 'khor *la gyel* bar gyur pas btsun mo čhe ba khros te | mo rań gi lham ya
 gšig če'u hwa šań gi gdan gyi 'og tu bčug nas | rgyal po'i druń du³⁵ phyin te | pańřita
 'di bdag la spyod du byuń *bas la* | bdag gis ma řnan pas | bdag gi lham phrogs te khyer
 byas pas | rgyal po de la yid čhes ma skyes kyań | blon po rnams kyis *bltar* phyin pa
 dań | pańřita'i gdan gyi 'og nas btsun mo'i lham řned de řnes pa čan du byas nas
 pańřita'i mgo bčad pa las | khrag 'o mar gyur | pańřita rań gi lag pas rań gi mgo
 blańs te ske la sbyar nas gtsug lag khań du phyin | 'khor mań po la čhos bšad *de* |
 mgo rań gi *pań* du lhuń nas tshe'i dus byas so || čhiń sań gi rgyal brgyud de čhad nas |
 su'i gyań *di* zer ba'i rgyal po pha bu gńis byuń | de'i mńa' 'og na thań ka'u dzuń žes
 pa | tha'i yań hu'i | gle'u šu byed čin yod pas | řno log byas nas rgyal bas phrogs te | de
 ni thań gi rgyal po la sńa ba'i thog ma yin | *de la* bu gsum yod pa'i 'brań po thań tha'i
 dzuń rgyal *po'i* dus su | thań *dzań* tšań žes pa'i lo *tša* bas rgya gar nas čhos mań po
 bsgyur | de yan čhod la *rgya'i* lo tša ba řnis brgya byuń | thań dzań tšań de rgya gar
 gyi slob dpon dbyig gńen gyi slob ma yin thań gi dus su zon klu sri žes 'dul ba 'dzin
 pa čhen po čig yod pa | ri mthon po'i zur nas gyań du lhuń ba las lha'i bu čig gis bar
 snań nas bzuń bas *bsnad* par ma gyur | lha'i bu de su yin dris pas | bdag rgyal po
 rnam sras kyi bu'i bu řnis pa yin | řned spun bču gńis kyis de bžin gšegs pa'i gsuń rab
 yan lag bču řnis bsruń bar dam bča' pa la | bdag *gis* 'dul ba'i sde snod bsruń ba yin zer
 | zon *klu* sri ná rgyal skyes nas | 'dzam *bu* gliń na řa dań mńam pa'i 'dul ba 'dzin pa ji
 sńed čig yod dris pas | khyod dań mńam pa gań ga'i *kluń* gi bye sńed yod zer | gsań
 sńags kyi čhos 'di *rnams* yań dag pa yin nam ma yin dris *pas* | gsań sńags 'di yań dag
 pa yin žiń | lčań lo čan gyi pho brań *nas* gsań sńags kyi čhos rnams bžugs pa la | řa'i
 phu bo dzambha *lha* nag pos bsruń ma byed čin yod | řa yań pho brań de'i nań du
 'gro bar mi *gnań* | gsań sńags la ma dad na řin tu sdig čhe bas bšags bgyis zer | pańřita
 ku mā ra řri de gań zag ji lta bu yin dris pas | de ni mthon lam³⁶ pa'i byań čhub sems
 dpa' yin | da lta dga' ldan du padma'i sńin po *las brdzus* te skyes nas byams pa la čhos
 řnan gyin yod zer | thań *dzań* tšań ji 'dra yin dris pas | de ni sbyor lam la gnas pa yin
 te³⁷ dga' ldan gyi ra ba'i phyi rol na *byam* pa'i gsuń thos řiń sku mi mthon bar yod
 zer | thań tha'i dzuń *gis* sras mo sru'i glen koń řo | bod skad du mtsho'i nań gi padmo
 žes pa de bod du 'oń ba'i dus su | řo bo šā kya bod du byon | dus de na *da'i* bar la lo
 bdun brgya 'gro žes pa | rgya'i deb gter řiń pa las | dzambha la sto řri mgon gyis
 mthon ba lha sa'i gtsug lag khań du yi ger bris pa yin |

*

³⁵ Here is an omission: řu žiń (*op. cit.*: p. 15)

³⁶ *Op. cit.*: lam *thob*

³⁷ *Op. cit.*: *da lta* . . .

thañ sú thu han žes pa rgya'i deb *ter* las | thañ *ku'u dzañ* rgyal pos sa pho stag gi lo la rgyal sa bzuñ | lo dgur srid bskyañs | bdun ču la 'das | de'i bu thañ tha'i dzuñ gis pha yod dus tsiñ dbaň gi las kha byas *te* | hor bčom nas siň pho rta'i lo la bod kyi rgyal po daň skyes bskur res byas nas grogs po byas | thañ gi sriň mo sloň ba la hor daň thu lu hun gyi mi byuň ba la | rgyal rigs kyi bu mo re byin nas log | bod kyi rgyal pos 'dod du byuň ba la ma byin pas khros nas | bod rgyal pos dmag 'bum phrag ñis khrid nas thu lu hun bčom nas zuň tse'ur sleb | gser gyi khrab bskur nas bu mo blaň *daň* | mi ster na dmag byed zer ba la | rgyas ma byin par gsaň dmag byas pas bod dmag stoň tsam bsad | de nas yun riň nas bod dmag phyr log *te* | blon po *sroň* brtsan la gser sraň stoň tsho lña dan³⁸ rigs maň po bskur nas btaň pa la | tha'i dzun gi sras mo *žun* siň koň jo lčags³⁹ glaň lo la byin | de skyel ba la rgyal brgyud kyaň *ha* dbaň žes pa dmag daň bčas pa btaň | bod kyi rgyal po dmag daň bčas pas pa'i ha nas bsu | rgya rnams čhas bzaň žiň bod rnams *ñas* čuň zad skyeñs par gyur | koň jos rgyal po la žus nas bod kyi yi ge daň yig tshaň rnams bčas | rgya'i rgyal *po* ka'u hi'i rgyal khams blaňs nas log pa'i dus bod kyi rgyal pos gser gyi bya *čhag* siň bdun pa čig čhaň gis bkaň nas | blon po '*gar sroň* btsan yul bzuñs la bskur btaň | blon po '*gar* la tha'i dzuñ rgyal po mñes nas | khoň raň gi tsha mo koň jo *čig* byin | yaň gyi'u gyu tha'i jaň gun žes bya ba'i miň byin tha'i dzuñ gis rgya gar du gser yig pa btaň ba ma *gta tar* bčom pas | bod rgyal *gyis* thos nas dmag btaň ste ma gha *ta* bčom | thañ tha'i dzuñ me pho khyi nas bzuň ste lo ñi sú rtsa gsum rgyal byas nas dguň lo lña bču ña gñis pa sa mo bya'i lo zla ba bži pa la 'das | tha'i dzuñ gi bu dgu pa *čhid*⁴⁰ žes pa rgyal sar bskos | *čhid* ko'u dzuñ rgyal sar bton nas rgyal po sroň btsan sgam po la⁴¹ min theñs gñis bskur ba'i daň po | hu *la du daň lbi pa'i ha'i khyun* dbaň žes pa daň | rtiň pa la tshuň dbaň žes pa byin pa'i skabs su | rgyal po sroň btsan 'das žes pa 'dug | bod kyi yul du dar gyi 'bu daň | 'bras čhaň šes pa daň | šel bzo ba la sogs pa bzo *rigs* maň po btaň | lčags⁴² khyi *lor* bod rgyal sroň btsan sgam po 'das | sras guň sroň sñar nas 'das siň | maň sroň maň btsan *lo* bču gsum lon pa rgyal sar *bton* | blon po '*gar gyis* grogs byas nas rgyal srid lo bčo lñar bskyañs | de nas blon po '*gar* 'das | rgya daň bod kyi rgyal po gñis res mthun⁴³ res dmag *bčas*⁴⁴ sa čha'i *brtsod* pa rgyal pham du ma byas | khyad par du lčags⁴⁵ rta'i lo la bod kyi dmag mis thaň gi rgyal khams la rgyab | yu gur gyi yul thams čad blaňs pas | rgya'i rgyal pos blon *pos gsuň* bžin gu dmag khri tsho bču daň bčas pa btaň nas lha *sa* bar slebs | blon po '*gar* gyi bu čhe bas dmag dbon byas nas

³⁸ Here is an omission: rin po čhe... (*op. cit.*: p. 18)

³⁹ *Op. cit.*: lčags mo ...

⁴⁰ *Op. cit.*: *čhi ka'o dzuň*

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*: *las ka'i miň* ...

⁴² *Op. cit.*: lčags *pho*

⁴³ *Op. cit.*: res 'ga' mthun žiň ...

⁴⁴ *Op. cit.*: daň

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.*: lčags *pho*

rgya'i dmag thams čad pham par byas sa⁴⁶ yos *lor* mañ sroñ'das | de'i sras 'dus sroñ mañ po rje rgyal sar *bton*|mgar gyi bu čhe *ba* blon po byas | de'i dus su bod kyi rgyal po'i sa mtha' bži ni | šar zuñ če'u mu če'u | 'u če'u gsum yin|lho phyogs bram ze'i yul la sleb | nub phyogs 'u *them* la sleb | byaň phyogs hor la sleb | de rnams bskor ba la dpag tšhad mañ po yod la | bod lta *bu'i dba' dbaň* daň *brtul* phod pa | rgya'i rgyal po han daň | gyu daň | če'u la sogs pa'i dus su'aň byuň ba med čes grag go | *žun* šin koň jo bod du lo bži bču *šdad* nas lčags 'brug lo la 'das | *čhid* ko'u dzuň rgyal pos sa bya lo nas lo *gsum* ču so bžir srid bskyaň | dguň lo lña bču ňa drug pa čhu lug *lor* 'das | sňar tha'i dzuň gi btsun mo'i 'khor na yod pa *čig* | tha'i dzuň 'das nas *ban* mor yod pa babs nas | čhi ko'u dzuň gi btsun mo byas | mo la bu *dzuň* dzuň | lbi dzuň | bu mo tha'i *kiň* koň jo gsum yod čin | rgyal pos bu čhe ba la rgyal sa bskos zer ba'i kha čhems yod kyaň ma ňan par | mo raň gis rgyal mo byas te | rus pa'u yin pas 'u dzi then žes bya'o || rgyal mo des dmag byas nas bod la sogs pa rgyal khams mañ po phrogs | bod kyi rgyal po 'dus sroñ mañ po rje gžon dus su naň gi bya ba⁴⁷ thams čad 'gar gyi bu čhe bas byed | phyi'i rnams⁴⁸ čhuň ba daň tsha pos byed pa la khoň la kun *bkrag* | rgyal po dbaň čhuň ba la | phyis rgyal po nar *son* dus 'gar gyi bu rnams | dmag thog tu yod pa la | rgyal pos dmag khrid nas phyin pas | *phun* bo li khyim lčebes te ší | nu bo btsan pos khoň raň gi tsha bo⁴⁹ dmag daň bčas *pas* rgya'i rgyal po la ňo *bltar* phyin | rgyal mos btsan po la *klu'i* de khyun dbaň žes pa'i miň byin nas blon por bskos | mañ po rje la gyon phyogs kyi dpa' bo | *ja'u* lim ta'i *čan* gun *na* gu'i guň žes pa'i min byin | khoň gňis kyi phyis ňes pa byas kyaň skyon med pa'i rtags la lčags kyi byaň bu'i yi ge byin no | de nas *dur* sroñ mañ po rje 'das | khri sde gtsug btsan rgyal sar bskos | rgyal mo 'u *ži* then šin spre'u'i lo nas lo *ňir* gčig rgyal sa byas | dguň lo brgyad ču šin 'brug la 'das so | gtam *brgyud* gžan las rgyal mo 'di la bu boň rna čan gčig skyes *pa* ňo tsha nas | bu čhuň gi dus gsod pa la btaň ba bod kyi blon po čhe ba gčig yod pas ma bsad par phag tu ňa ra byas | phyis mo rgas dus thaň gi brgyud med pas mo'i miň po 'u san žes pa bsko bar byas | mi mañ po tshogs pa la 'u san bsko ba | ē 'thad skad *riň btoň* bas gaň mi 'thad žer ba de gsod pa'i rgyal mo'i 'ja' sa byas pa la | bod kyi blon po des 'u san la skad *riň* byuň dus ňa bsko ba mi 'thad gyis čig byas | skad byuň dus khos de skad byas pa daň | bod kyi blon po des rał *gris* rgyab nas bsad | de či yin byas pas | rgyal mo raň gi luň yin byas pas thabs ma rñed | de nas mya ňan du gyur pa la | blon po des bu boň rna čan de khyer *yoňis* nas rgyal por bskos pas rgyal po *baň* rna čan du grags pa de yin | ma bu de *gňis kyi dur da* lta *čhen je'u* byaň phyogs na yod pa de yin zer | rgyal mo 'di la bod rnams rgya'i 'dzi rgan mo zer bar 'dug | gtam rgyud 'di'i lugs la de rnams mi 'dug *ti* | šin mo sbrul la

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.:* sa mo

⁴⁷ *Op. cit.:* čhe ba . . .

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.:* bu . . .

⁴⁹ *Op. cit.:* mañ po rje . . .

rgyal mo rañ gi bu *dzuñ dzuñ* rgyal sar *bton* | bod kyi rgyal pos bu mo sloñ du byuñ la rgyal po'i nu bo lbi dbañ gi bu mo kim śiñ koñ jo byin | *brdzoñs* la gos dar khri tsho mañ po dañ | bzo rigs sna tshogs dañ | rol mo ba mañ po byin | dza gyu tha'i gyañ gun *gyaň gyu* dmag dañ bčas pa skyel du btañ | physis mi ñag gi yul khams thams čad kyaň koñ jo la byin | dzuñ dzuñ rgyal pos lo drug rgyal sa byas || dguñ lo *ña lña* pa lčags⁵⁰ khyi *lor* 'das | lčags⁵¹ phag la koñ jo'i pha lbi dzuñ rgyal sar bskos | des lo gñis srid bskyañs | lo *ña lña* ba *lčags* byi *lor* 'das | čhu⁵² glaň *lor* lbi dzuñ gi bu gsum pa | hen dzuñ lo ñi śu rtsa dgu pa *čig* bskos | kim śiñ koñ jos bod du lo sum ču rtsa gčig bžugs | lčags⁵³ sbrul *lor* 'das | de yan čhad *la* thañ gi rgyal khams 'jags nas lo brgya dañ *ñer gsam* soñ | śiñ lug *lor* bod kyi rgyal po 'das nas sras khri sroñ lde btsan rgyal sar bton | hen dzuñ rgyal sar lo *bži bču že* gsum bsdad | dguñ lo bdun *bču don* gsum pa *me bya* *lor* 'das | me spre'u *lor* hen dzuñ gi bu gsum pa dzuñ dzuñ rgyal sar bton | de'i lo bod kyi dmag yoñs nas | sman *tshe'i pi byi* 'u la sogs *pa* mañ du blañs nas bzuñ | physis ču' mkhar *ñer bži* thams čad bod lo śor | dzuñ dzuñ rgyal pos srid lo bduñ *byas* nas dguñ lo *ña gñis* pa čhu *stag* la 'das so || lo de la dzuñ dzuñ gi bu čhe ba tha'i dzuñ rgyal sar bton | čhu yos *lor* bod dmag byuñ bas tha'i dzuñ rgyal⁵⁴ šen bčur bros pa'i śul du | rgya'i blon po ka'u *his* bod la ño *bltas byas* | bod dmag kun byaň hur yoñs | thañ gi rgyal po ga'u dbañ žes pa rgyal por bskos | rgya'i lo miň *dpos* | 'ja' sa 'grems su bčug | physis rgyas ka'u hi bsad | bod dmag btons tha'i *juň* gis rgyal sa bzuñ | des rgyal sa lo bču bduñ byas | dguñ lo lña bču pa sa lug la 'das | lčags sprel⁵⁵ *lor* tha'i dzuñ gi bu čhe ba diň dzuñ bskos | diň dzuñ bsam pa čhe bas lo mañ *po* bod daň '*khru*gs pa ma byuñ | lo de la rgyal po khri sroñ lde btsan 'das | sras čhe ba mu ne *btsun* po bskos | de'i dus su rgya bod kyi sa tshigs mi ñag gi ha la *bśan* du byas śiñ | bod kyi rgyal khams kyi sa tshigs ni | nub tu lan *ju* | lbi ji'u | *hi'i* ji'u | śar du śiñ kun | *lhor* śiñ *bye* 'u daň gyaň nam gyi bar | byaň gi man gyi sa čha nas | ta'i *tu'i* ha'i lho nub kyi bar daň | *sma* čhu'i byaň phyogs phan čhad bod kyi sa čhar byas | rgya'i sa mtha' ni | ki ji'u'i phyogs | than jin *ta* | lu ju la śiñ hu |⁵⁶ si čhon la tha'i hu⁵⁷ tshun čhad thaň gi sa čhar byas | sa mtshams bar sug *bču* daň | ji'u daň | ha la śan | tha tha liň⁵⁸ stoň par bžag nas gñis kas mi 'dzin par byas | physis yaň '*khru*gs pa mañ du byuñ žiň | me glaň la bod kyi rgyal po 'das | ju *tshe* btsan po rgyal sar bskos śiñ *sprel* lo la 'das | de'i *lor* khri lde sroñ btsan bskos | din *juň* rgyal pos rgyal sa lo ñi śu rtsa lña bzuñ | dguñ

⁵⁰ *Op. cit.*: lčags *pho*...

⁵¹ *Op. cit.*: lčags *mo*...

⁵² *Op. cit.*: čhu *mo*...

⁵³ *Op. cit.*: lčags *mo*...

⁵⁴ *Op. cit.*: rgyal po

⁵⁵ *Op. cit.*: lčags *pho spre'u*...

⁵⁶ Here is an omission: hun či thaň ku (*op. cit.*: p. 22)

⁵⁷ *Op. cit.*: hu *ha*...

⁵⁸ *Op. cit.*: rñams...

lo drug *bču* rtsa bži pa śiń bya la 'das | lo de la diń *juń* gi bu čhe ba śun dzuń bskos | des rgyal sa lo gčig byas | dguń lo bži bču⁵⁹ rtsa drug pa la 'das | me pho khyi la śun juń gi bu čhe ba hun dzuń bskos | de byi ba'i lo la 'das | glań lo hen dzuń bu mu dzuń bskos | skabs de śed du bod kyi rgyal po 'das | kha li kha čhu bskos | lha sa'i thań du bod kyi blon po 'tshogs ban čhen pos mna' tshigs bton | bden pa *bdar* te thams čad btsigs dań mna čhad byas so || mu dzuń me rta la blon pos *bkrońs* | me lug la mu dzuń gi bu űis pa 'u dzuń bskos | me 'brug la bod kyi rgyal po 'das | lo de űid la gčuń po tha mu žes pa rgyal sar bskos | de čhań la dga' žiń spyod pa űan pas bod kyi rgyal khams thams čad '*srugs* | si ha ča'u la bod dbań pa'i ri brtsigs *pa* yod pa 'gyel | klu čhu žag gsum gyen *sa* log | ltas űan byuń žiń rgyal khams žig yin no | sa lug lo yan čhad la lo űis brgya *ńer gńis* soń | 'un dzuń rgyal pos lo bču űis srid bzuń nas | dguń lo sum ču pa śiń 'brug la 'das | lo de la mu dzuń gi bu lńa pa 'u dzuń bskos | lo drug srid bskyańs | dguń lo so ba śiń glań la 'das | me stag la *hen* dzuń gi bu *bču* gsum pa zon dzuń bskos | de nas bod kyi sa čha thams čad phal čher rgyas blańs | dań po thań gi rgyal khams kin *ja* hu nas bod | kyi bar la sa le bar stoń tsho dgu⁶⁰ dgu rgyad yod | phyis dzuń dzuń nas bzuń ste | bod la mkhar *mig sum rgya* śor | phyis thań *gis* thams čad thob | *zon* dzuń *gis* lo bču bži srid bzuń | lo lńa bču pa *me* yos la 'das | *lčags* 'brug la de'i bu čhe ba ghi dzuń bskos | de phyin čhad bod dań 'brel čhad | de ltar thań gi rgyal po *ki'u* dzuń nas 'di yan čhad la űis brgya dań so dgu soń | ghi dzuń *gis* rgyal srid lo bču bži byas | *ču* sbrul la 'das | *śiń* rta la ghi dzuń gi bu lńa pa hye dzuń bskos | lo bčo lńar srid bzuń | *sa spre* la 'das | de'i bu bdun pa je'u dzuń bskos | srid lo bču bži bzuń | *ču* phag 'das | *śiń* byi la de'i bu dgu pa 'i diń bskos | srid lo bži bzun | *me* yos la 'das | de nas rgyal rabs čhad de | spyir thań gi rgyal po űi śu byuń *ste* rgyal khams lo űis brgya *hdun čur* bdag byas | de'i rjes su *myań* žes pa la rgyal sa 'phos pa yin no | rgya bod kyi lo rgyus 'di tha'i dzuń gi dus kyi yig tshań pa ba su khyi žes pas *brtsis* phyis han *gyi hu* tshas bsdus de *bsdebs* | rgya'i lo *tsa* ba hu gyań jus | *śiń* bya *lor* śiń kun du bsgyur | bla ma rin čhen grags gu śris śiń glań la bod yig tu *par* du btab po || 'di'i lo'i dbań thań nor ba 'ga' re snań | thu *hu* hun hor ser yin | 'u then o thon yin | bod kyi⁶¹ rabs dań phal čher mthun pa la 'di žib bar snań ba *me* loń žig 'dir bris te | rgya bod gńis yań 'khrugs pa dań | res 'ga' mthun žiń skyes dań *dun* gyi mčhod pa bskur res byas pa la sogs žib par thań žu thu hyen *mtshan* űid du *hla bar bya* 'o ||

*

thań gi rgyal po'i dus su | hwań ma'o zer ba gsi'u *tshe gčig* *gis* űo log byas nas rgyal po byas | ju 'un zer bas blon po byas | rtiń la ju 'un gyis thań la űo ltas nas čhu mi dben *gyis* dmag dpon byas | rtiń la űo log ste rgyal sa phrogs nas *myań* rgyal po žes

⁵⁹ *Op. cit.*: dguń lo űi śu rtsa drug gam

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.*: dgu dań . . .

⁶¹ *Op. cit.*: rgyal rabs . . .

pa'i brgyud byuñ | de la sogs rus mi gčig pa'i rgyal *khams* tshan pa lña la rgyal po bčo lña byuñ | lo lña bču *thams* pa rgyal sa byas | de'i rjes su či'u tha'i ju žes pa'i rgyal po la | spen lan gi sa čhar rgyal rabs brgyad byun | rgyal rabs brgyad pa šaň haň pha bu gñis kyi lag nas čhi tan ta'i gle'u žes *pa* spen lan la sogs pa rgyal khams phyed phrogs | rgyal khams de la ta'i gle'u zer | šaň han gyi žwa gon ma'i bu khan dban žes pa sman *tshi'i* yul du 'oňs nas | pha'i yul gyi rgyal khams phyed po bzuñ nas hor *gyi* nam tha'i zer kyen khaň hwaň *ji'ur* sdad | rgyal khams de la gsuñ zer | de nas rgyal po sman *tše* lha btsun gyi bar du rgyal rabs brgyad sman *tšer* byuñ | čhi tan ta'i gle'u'i rgyal rabs bdun brgyad kyi rjes su | blon po čhe ba nu'i *djin* žes bas rgyal sa blaňs | de'i rgyal rabs la Al-tan khan zer | rgyal *khams* la ta'i gin zer | brgyud pa dgu byuñ | rgyal po dgu pa huñ dbaň gi dus su | jiň gi rgyal po *O gu* ta'i rgyal po byuñ nas jiň *gim* gyis rgyal khams blaňs so | se čhen rgyal po rgyal sar bžugs nas | či dben lo bču gsum pa'i dus su sman *tše* 'i rgyal po gyi'u *juň* rgyal sar bsdad nas lo gsum soň ba la ba yan čhiň saň *gi gsuň* *gis* rgyal khams blaňs te rgyal po sa skyar btaň | lha btsun byas rtiň la ge gan rgyal po'i dus su bsad pas khrag o mar byuñ ño | hor gyi rgyal khams la ta dben žer zes pa dzambha la *sto śrī* mgon gyis smras pa bris pa'o

*

snon miňag gi yul thams čad rgya'i rgyal po'i mña'og na yod pa la | byaň nos daň *gha'i* bar mon *na* žes pa'i ri'i gži bdag *gi'u* žes pa yod pa | ñin gčig gi tše byaň nos kyi mkhar naň *na* bud med gčig gi sar | rta pa dkar po dpon gyog bdun byuñ nas | dpon de daň 'grogs pa las | lo gčig *na* bu gčig skyes | de'i dus *na* sñon med pa'i skar ma čig šar bas | rgya'i rtsis pa rnams kyis mkhar 'dir rgyal po'i srid 'phrog pa'i mi gčig skyes 'dug byas pa daň | rgyal pos da dun rtsis gyis la bu tsha de tšhol čes bsgo pas | rgan mos bu tsha de sa *skoň ma čig* tu sbas | *sa* leb kyis kha bčad | de'i sten du čhu phor pa gaň bžag pas | rtsis *pa rnams kyis mtšho* čhen po'i *šin gi sa gži'i 'og na*⁶² 'dug zer bas | *tšhol* ma thub par mkhar gyi *steň nas* lo gñis 'gro ba tšhun *tšhad* gyi bu tsha thams čad *sod* čes luň bsgrags nas bu tsha *thams čad* bsad pa las | rgan mo des bu tsha de ši bar byas | *ro* sgam tu bčug nas ñu žiň phyir khyer *nas* čhu'i dkyil *rtsa 'thug* po'i naň du bskyr pas ñin re bžin bya *rgon čig* byuñ nas bu čhuň de *ma* 'khyags par byas | rgan mo gžan gčig la ba *hžon* ma gčig yod *pas* ñin re bžin bu *čhuň* de'i sar phyin gin'o ma ster pa las | ñin gčig rgan mo des ba'i *phyi* la ltar phyin pas | ba des bu *čhuň* de la'o ma dał bus ster ba mthoň | bu *čhuň* 'di khyad bar čan yin par 'dug zer nas | rgan mos blaňs *te* bu dod byas | rus pa *ñu spu'i* žes pa bod skad du bsgyur na | ba la'o ma 'thuň pa žes zer | byis pa des lo bdun lon nas | na mňam gyi byis drug btsal *te* | byaň nos kyi gaňs ri'i gseb tu bros *nas* ño log brtsams | ri de la šin *thu* ba'i skyes pa thams čad bzuň nas dmag mi byas | bu tsha des byaň nos kyi mkhar naň du | še rab čan gyi mi la ño

⁶² *Op. cit.*: mtšho čhen po'i 'og na šin gi sa gži'i 'og na . . .

log *bčom* pa'i thabs 'dri ru *yoñs* pas | rgya'i rgan mo gčig gis thabs bstan pa | zla ba 'di'i tshes bčo lña'i ñin khyed dmag la śog | rta lčag mañ po dañ rta sbañs mañ po tshol la rma čhu'i nañ du skyur | de nas rgya'i rgyal *po*'i dam kha khyed kyi lag tu 'oñ pa'i *thabs*⁶³ byed zer | tshes bču *bži*'i ñin rgan mo des lčags ri'i steñ du ñu śiñ brañ brtuñ žiñ phyin pa dañ | rgyal pos⁶⁴ či yin 'drir btañ pas | lha'i dbañ po brgya byin gyi luñ gis mi ñag rgyal po gčig bskos yod | rañ re ño ma bstas na rgya'i miñ tsam yañ lus pa mi yoñ | san ñin dmag bsam gyis mi khyab pa *yod* par yod zer | de'i rgyu mtshan či yin dris *pas* | khyed rnams sañ śña mor *sma* čhu la *bstos* dañ | rta sbañs dañ rta lčag lhuñ bas čhu mdog 'gyur ba' *oñ bar yod* | *byas pas* sañ śča mor *bstas* dus de bžin byuñ | da či 'thad dris pas | rgan mos ño *bstas* pa 'thad byas *nas* | rgyal po dpon gyog gsum gyis dam kha skyel du phyin pas mi ñag rgyal po rta ba bdun dañ phrad nas dam kha blañs | rgyal po bsad | de nas rim *gyis* blon po čhe ba rnams kyañ bsad pas | *rgya* yul du grags pa la | rgan mo gčig *gis* kha *yi* ñes pa yis | zur gsum sgo drug yod pa'i rgya mkhar *bśig čes* pa byuñ | mi ñag rgyal po de la pha'i miñ nas *grags* te | ga'i dzuñ rgyal po žes par btags | de nas rgyal rabs drug na mi ñag rgyal rgod byuñ | de'i dus su *gsi* no'i ža | bod skad du bsgyur na | sems nag po'i ri žes pa la skyes pa'i mis | rgyal po'i blon po byas *te* rgyal po gsod par 'gyur žes pa rgyal rgod kyis tshor nas | ri de la yod pa'i mi thams čad bsad na ē 'thad čes tha'i hu la žus pas | tha'i hu čhos la dkar bas ma ñan | de nas rgyal po byañ ños su stod ma nus *pa gha* ru 'phos kyañ | physis *ri*⁶⁵ la skyes pa'i mi čig ma tshor bar blon po thob pas | des mi ñag rgyal rgod bsad | de'i rjes su brgyud čhad nas | *tho* ji žes pa'i rgyal po gžan žig byuñ pa'i dus su | jiñ *gis*⁶⁶ rgyal sa phrogs te | mi ñag rgyal po'i srog me yin | jiñ *gi*⁶⁷ srog čhu yin pa'i don la ji tsam 'thab kyañ ma thub pa yin | mi ñag rgyal rgod kyi skye ba hor rgyal bu go dan yin | khoñ byañ ños su *slebs* dañ | śnar rgyal rgod bsad pa'i sa čha der lha khañ bžeñs | rgyal rgod *bsod*⁶⁸ mi tshañ de brlag par byas | gi gan rgyal po la ñan byed mi čhi gin thi mur yañ *gsi* no'i žan du skyes pa *yin*⁶⁹ | mi ñag *rtsen* tse śes rab ye śes kyis smras pa yi gir bkod pa yin | 'di la rgya'i rgyal po či'u tha'i dzu spun gñis kyis lo sum *bču* rgyal sa bzuñ ba'i rjes su | si hu rgyal po byuñ žes pa dan | si hu rgyal nas mi ñag gi rgyal rabs bču gñis byuñ | lo ñis brgya drug *bčur* srid bzuñ | de nas rgyal sa hor la śor žes pa'añ gтам brgyud 'ga' re na snañ ño |

*

⁶³ *Op. cit.*: thabs *nas* ... p. 27

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.*: de či ... p. 27

⁶⁵ *Op. cit.*: ri de ...

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*: jiñ *gir gyis*

⁶⁷ *Op. cit.*: jiñ *gir gyi*

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.*: pa'i

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.*: žes ba

hor gyi rgyal rabs la | dañ por gnam gyi bu sbor tha che | de'i bu *pa da* čhi gan | de'i bu tham čhag | de'i bu khyi ji mer *mkhan* | des da ltha srin po'i kha gnon byed par grags pas padma 'byuñ gnas yin žer | de'i bu *la'u* byañ sbo ro'ol | de'i bu phas ka ni dun | de'i bu sems *za'o* ji | de'i bu kha čhu | de'i bu do bun mer khan | de 'das rtiñ | nag mo ā lan *khwo* las ñi ma dañ zla ba'i zer las skyes pa bo don čhar muñ *khag* | de'i bu ga'i čhi | de'i bu *sbi* khir | de'i bu ma nan tho don | de'i bu ga'i thu gan | de'i bu ba'i šiñ | de'i bu khor *thog* šiñ | de'i bu dum bi na'i khan | de'i bu ga bu la gan | de'i bu bar than ba dur | de'i bu ye sir *ka* ba dur | de dañ bčun mo *hu* lun gñis kyi sras tha'i *ju* jiñ gi rgyal po čhu stag la 'khruñs | spun lña yod⁷⁰ | jiñ gi rgyal pos rgyal khams dbañ du bsdus nas rgyal sa lo ñi su rtsa gsum mdzad | *me* stag⁷¹ lo'i ston zla dañ po'i tshes bču gñis la dguñ lo drug ču rtsa gčig pa mi ñag *gha ru* gnam du gšegs | de'i sras 'jo čhi | čha ga ta'i | o go ta'i | tho lo no yon la sogs dgu yod | rgyal po rañ bžugs dus sras che ba gñis kyi rgyal sa⁷² mi *brtsod* pa'i yi ge byin nas gyas ru gyon ru la bskos | nu bo o go ta'i rgyal pos rgyal sa lo drug mdzad | 'jo čhi la bu bryad | *ča* ga ta la⁷³ du ba la sogs dgu yod | o go *ta* rgyal po'i sras che ba go yug | rgyal pos rgyal sa zla drug mdzad de'i nu bo go dan *ga* ši | go dan la sogs bdun yod | go dan la bu gsum yod | tho lo no yon gyis sñar yi ge ma byin pas rgyal sa la *brtsod* pa yod čiñ | za yin e *ga* zo rog ta'i sras | mo gan⁷⁴ gyis rgyal sa lo dgu | bži ba go pe la ši *ju* se čhen gan | šiñ⁷⁵ phag la 'khruñs | drug pa hu la hu | bdun pa ā ri sbo kha la sogs bču gčig yod | se čhen rgyal po dañ čha'i sras | rdo rje | jiñ gim | mǎ gha la | no mo gan dañ bži | žwa gon ma'i bu drug ste bču yod | nam bu la bu gčig skyes pa myur du ši | se čhen rgyal pos lčags sprel⁷⁶ lo nas jo thuñ lo lña | či dben lo sum ču ste | lo so lña rgyal sa mdzad | šiñ rta la⁷⁷ gšegs | go dan gyi bu ji big thi mur la sogs gsum yod | kha ši'i bu kha *thu* | gžan *ni* bgrañ gis mi lañ | 'di rnam ye ka thob čan nas gal che rim bšus pa nas se čhen gyi sras rdo rje la sras med | jin gim dañ ye ka tha hu go go čen gyi sras che ba ka ma la | gñis pa dha *rma* pha la *skugs* pa | gsum pa thi mur ol ja du rgyal pos dben čeñ lo gñis | ta'i ti lo bču gčig ste lo bču gsum rgyal sa mdzad | de'i bu ti su myur du 'das | rgyal bu *dharma* pha la dañ | tha hoñ tha'i hu dañ gi'i sras che ba ha'i *šan* gu lug rgyal pos | či *ti'i* lo bži | gñis pa ā yu par pa ta bu yin du rgyal pos hoñ khiñ lo gñis | spen *ye'u* lo bdun te lo dgu | bu yan tu rgyal po'i sras *sid hi* pha la i *dzuñ* gi gan rgyal pos či čiñ lo gsum mdzad | ka ma *la'i* sras | yi sun thi mur *tsi* dbañ gis ta'i tiñ lo bži | či hoñ lo gčig

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*: lo so bryad lon dus

⁷¹ *Op. cit.*: me pha stag gi lo 'kruñs lo lhar na čhu pho spre'u yin par go

⁷² *Op. cit.*: sa la

⁷³ *Op. cit.*: la bu ...

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*: moñ gol gan

⁷⁵ *Op. cit.*: šiñ mo

⁷⁶ *Op. cit.*: lčags po spre'u ...

⁷⁷ *Op. cit.*: šiñ pho rta'i lo

mdzad | de'i sras ra khyi phag gis rgyal sa žag bži bču mdzad | mam gha la'i sras
ānanta | de'i bu ū *tug* thi mur bsad | de'i bu gñis zer | gu *yug* rgyal po'i sras čhe | ku śa
 la gu thug rgyal pos zla ba gčig rgyal sa mdzad | sras gñis pa thoğ thi mur 'ja' ya du
 rgyal pos | *then* li lo gsum | *tsi* śun lo no gñis mdzad | ku śa la'i sras čhuñ ba rin čhen
 dpal | či śun zla ba gčig mdzad | zla ba drug rgyal sa stoñs | rgyal srid ēl *tha* mur tha
 srid bskyañs | sras čhe ba tho gon thi mur gyis | śiñ khyi la lo la⁷⁸ rgyal sar bžugs nas |
 či śun lo gčig | dben thuñ lo gñis | či dben lo drug | či *jiñ lo* sum ču rtsa bži rgyal sa
 byas⁷⁹ [me lug zla ba bži pa la | rgyal sa kyur nas bros pa 'di dag go | hor rgyal po
 rabs bčo lñas tas jiñ gir gan sa yos la rgyal khams bdag byas nas lo brgya bži bdun
 bdag byas so | de ni mi lug the ba yan la'o | de rtiñ spre nas rab byuñ brgyad pa'i me
 phag yan la lo brgya thal lo]⁸⁰ rgyal po tho gan thi mur *gyis* rgyal sa *lo so* bdun
 mdzad | de rteñ ta tu'i mkhar bsgyur nas | hor yul la spre'u lo zla ba drug pa la byon |
 rgyal po tho gon thi mur gyis rgyal sa bskur dus stag tshañ pa'i *dpa' śiñ* kun dga'rin
 čhen *ta'i tu* na yod 'dug pas khoñ zer ba la | no log gi dmag'oñ bar 'dug zer *ha'i* ur
 čhen po byuñ nas *rtab rtob* la *me* lug lo zla ba lña pa'i tshes bču gčig gi ñin hor yul la
 byon pa yin zer | 'di bden ñes par 'dug |

⁷⁸ *Op. cit.*: čhu pho byi ba'i lo

⁷⁹ *Op. cit.*: či byiñ dañ gsum | rgyal po tho gou thi mur gyi rgyal sa lo sum ču so bdun mdzad |

⁸⁰ These lines are absent in both the Peking and the Sikkim editions.

LE « DÉCOUVREUR » DU *MAṆI BKA'-'BUM* ÉTAIT-IL BON-PO?

PAR

ANNE-MARIE BLONDEAU (Paris)

Le *Maṇi bka'-'bum* (*MKB*) est l'une des œuvres de la littérature tibétaine les plus anciennement connues en Occident — il n'est peut-être pas inutile de rappeler ici que Csoma de Kőrös le cite dans sa liste d'ouvrages historiques¹ — celle aussi probablement qui a suscité le plus grand nombre d'études.² Le *MKB* appartient à la littérature des « textes-trésors » (*gter-ma*), cachés au temps de la première diffusion du bouddhisme et remis au jour à partir de la deuxième diffusion par des « découvreurs » (*gter-ston*) prédestinés. L'identification du *gter-ston*, sa date, sa biographie, sont des éléments déterminants pour l'histoire du texte, son contenu doctrinal, etc.

Les travaux concordants de A. Macdonald, M. Aris et M. Kapstein, ont appris que la collection que nous connaissons sous le nom de *Maṇi bka'-'bum* était le fruit de « découvertes » opérées par plusieurs *gter-ston*, les principaux étant Grub-thob dÑos-grub qu'ils situent au XII^e siècle, et Ñaṅ-ral Ñi-ma 'od-zer (1124 ou 1136–1204), celui-ci recevant de Grub-thob les parties qu'il avait mises au jour et en découvrant lui-même de nouvelles.³ Outre les *dkar-čhag* et colophons des éditions de cette volumineuse collection dédiée à Avalokiteśvara et attribuée au roi Sroṅ-bcan sgam-po, les tibétologues ont jusqu'ici utilisé la biographie de Grub-thob dÑos-grub insérée par Koṅ-sprul Blo-gros mtha'-yas dans son *gTer-ston brgya-rca'i rnam-thar*.⁴ Or Koṅ-sprul termine cette biographie par la remarque suivante, que seul M. Aris relève (*op. cit.*, p. 9) mais sans commentaire :

¹ A. Csoma de Kőrös, *Enumeration of Historical and Grammatical Works to be met with in Tibet* : *JASB*, vol. VII, 1838, p. 148.

² Cf. Vostrikov 1970, pp. 52-57. Aux références données par Vostrikov on peut ajouter, dans l'ordre de parution : J. Bacot, *Le mariage chinois du roi tibétain Sroṅ-bcan sgam-po* : *Mélanges Chinois et bouddhiques*, Bruxelles 1935. G. Tucci, *Tibetan painted Scrolls*, Rome 1949, pp. 143-144. Macdonald, *Annuaire*. Aris 1979. Kapstein 1980.

³ Les autres *gter-ston* impliqués dans la découverte du *MKB* sont Čākya bzaṅ-po (ou Čākya 'od) et lHa-rje dGe-ba 'bum. Néanmoins, l'attribution précise à chaque *gter-ston* des différents textes qui composent la collection est loin d'être tirée au clair.

⁴ pp. 113-115. Pour une étude générale du texte, v. Prats 1982, pp. 9-21. La rubrique concernant Grub-thob dÑos-grub est traduite *ibid.*, pp. 29-33. Les notes fournissent une compilation très complète des travaux occidentaux.

« Les Bon-po l'appellent bŽod-ston dÑos-grub, et jusqu'à maintenant il existe des textes qu'il a extraits du dos de la statue de Vairocana à mKho-mthiñ, tels que les *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* et le *rJogs-chen Yañ-rce kloñ-chen* ». ⁵

L'étude que je poursuis des biographies de Padmasambhava a débouché à plusieurs reprises sur des interrogations concernant la personnalité de Grub-thob dÑos-grub : comme maître de Ñañ-ral, le *gter-ston* du premier *bKa'-thañ* connu à ce jour ; comme « découvreur » du *Lo-rgyus chen-mo*, première partie du *MKB* où se trouve un parallèle frappant entre la légende d'Avalokiteśvara et celle de Padmasambhava ; comme tenant éventuel enfin, d'une tradition synchrétique propre à des *gter-ston* « ambivalents », à la fois bouddhistes et bon-po. ⁶ C'est dans cette perspective que l'affirmation de Koñ-sprul relevée plus haut mérite d'être envisagée de plus près, à travers les éléments biographiques que l'on possède sur Grub-thob dÑos-grub (désormais Grub-thob) et bŽod-ston dÑos-grub (désormais bŽod-ston), et leurs *gter-ma* parvenus jusqu'à nous. Pour des raisons qui apparaîtront vite évidentes, il faut analyser séparément les sources bouddhistes consacrées à Grub-thob et les sources bon-po consacrées à bŽod-ston. Elles seront présentées dans un ordre chronologique parfois relatif, du fait de la nature de certaines.

I. Les sources bouddhistes

Le présent travail ne prétend pas à être exhaustif : beaucoup de sources qui seraient utiles à cette étude ne nous sont pas parvenues (v. n. 20). Néanmoins, le caractère récapitulatif et répétitif de la littérature historique tibétaine permet de penser que les ouvrages tardifs qui les ont utilisées en sont le reflet. Il se peut par ailleurs que d'autres informations sur Grub-thob se trouvent dans des sources accessibles que je n'ai pas consultées.

1. La biographie de Grub-thob

La mention de Grub-thob la plus ancienne se rencontre au colophon du *Ñañ-ral čhos-'byuñ* dont l'authenticité ne paraît pas douteuse : énumérant ses sources, Ñañ-ral cite « les textes-trésors extraits par le Maître de gÑag dans le La-ston (= stod), Grub-thob dÑos-grub, de sous [la statue] de Hayagrīva [dans] la chapelle de Thugs-

⁵ p. 115 : *Bon-po rnam-s-kyis bŽod-ston dÑos-grub zer-ziñ mKho-mthiñ rNam-snañ sku rgyab-nas bton-pa'i bsGrags-pa skor-gsum dañ rJogs-chen Yañ-rce kloñ-chen sogs da-lta'i bar yod-par snañ.*

⁶ V. Blondeau, *Annales* : tome LXXXV, 1976-1977, p. 89 ; tome LXXXVI, 1977-1978, pp. 77-88 ; tome LXXXVIII, 1979-1980, pp. 122-123 ; tome LXXXIX, 1980-1981, pp. 163-169.

rje čhen-po [au Jo-khañ].⁷ » Cette brève indication est importante car elle seule fournit le nom de clan ou de lieu d'origine de Grub-thob, ainsi que la province dont il dépend : le La-stod, dans le gCañ.⁸ Toutes les autres sources indiquent seulement qu'il était originaire du gCañ. (C'est dans le gCañ également, à Ri-bo-če, que les *Thañ-yig* du XIV^e siècle, *Čel-brag-ma* et *gSer-phreñ*, dans le chapitre des prophéties annonçant la venue successive des *gter-ston*, placent les découvertes de Grub-thob : ils ne parlent pas de Lhasa, lieu de découverte du *MKB*, mais surtout ils ne qualifient pas Grub-thob de bon-po, comme ils n'hésitent pas à le faire pour plusieurs *gter-ston* anciens. Koñ-sprul a repris cette prophétie en tête de sa biographie de Grub-thob, (v. Prats 1982, p. 9).

On attribue aussi à Ņañ-ral la première compilation des *bKa'-brgyad bde-gčegs 'dus-pa*.⁹ Au premier volume de cette collection est insérée une histoire de ses vies antérieures que lui-même aurait racontée à la demande de ses fils et épouses, de son disciple « intendant » (*ñe-gnas*) Čhos-kyi 'od-zer, et de ses disciples proches.¹⁰ Un bref colophon (p. 211) indique que ce récit a été transmis par le *ñe-gnas* Čhos-kyi 'od-zer à Myañ-ston bSod-nams señ-ge, et par celui-ci au rédacteur du texte le yogin du dBus, Mi-'gyur rdo-rje. Le style même du texte prouve que Ņañ-ral ne peut en être l'auteur. La dernière renaissance est celle de Ņañ-ral lui-même dont la biographie assez détaillée est exposée ; mais sa jeunesse et les maîtres dont il a reçu des enseignements ne sont évoqués que brièvement. Avant sa vingt-cinquième année (1148 ou 1160), il demande des enseignements à Ra-čag gter-ston.¹¹

« Ensuite je demandai au Lama appelé Grub-thob, le Maître de tous les *bka'-ma* et *gter-ma*, l'initiation avec les enseignements et *mantra*, des *bKa'-brgyad*, [la méthode de] réalisation des tantra. Je lui demandai [aussi] beaucoup de *sādhana* de Ži-rjogs (?). Quant à Thugs-rje čhen-po selon la tradition de Sroñ-bcan (c'est-à-dire l'embryon du *MKB*) et beaucoup de prières au Lama que je lui demandai, il me les donna à la manière d'une jarre pleine que l'on renverse. Il me transmit aussi beaucoup de catalogues de textes-trésors (*kha-byañ*). »¹²

⁷ Ņañ-ral čhos-'byuñ, p. 594 : *La-ston gŅag-ston Grub-thob dŅos-grub-kyi[s] Thugs-rje čhen-po'i gcañ-khañ rTa-mgrin-gyi 'og-nas thon-pa . . . gter-yig*. Sur la localisation de cette chapelle du Jo-khañ, appelée généralement *gcañ-khañ byañ-ma*, v. Shakabpa, *Guide*, pp. 39-43. Il faut remarquer que Ņañ-ral ne précise pas quels sont les textes extraits par Grub-thob.

⁸ V. Wylie 1962, p. 129 n. 124.

⁹ Sur les *bKa'-brgyad* et les trois *bKa'-brgyad bde-gčegs 'dus-pa*, v. Prats 1982, pp. 30-31, n. 6, 7, 8, qui fournit les références bibliographiques disponibles à ce jour en langues occidentales.

¹⁰ Ņañ-ral *skyes-rabs*, p. 52.

¹¹ Sur ce *gter-ston* qui aurait aussi trouvé des textes bon-po, v. *Byañ-bdag gsol-'debs*, pp. 42, 77 ; Koñ-sprul, *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, pp. 127-128, 130-131. V. aussi n. 117 *in fine*.

¹² Ņañ-ral *skyes-rabs*, pp. 140-141. Je ne peux pas expliquer l'abréviation *ži-rjogs*. Samten G. Karmay suggère *Ži-hyed* (dont il est question immédiatement après) et *rJogs-čhen*, mais alors *sgrub-*

Ce court passage, s'il ne fait aucune allusion aux possibles activités bon-po de Grub-thob a le mérite, deux générations après Ñaṅ-ral seulement, de fixer la vie de Grub-thob au milieu du XII^e siècle, et d'assurer qu'il était bien détenteur de la tradition de Sroṅ-bcan sgam-po sur Avalokiteśvara.

Ces deux indications sont confirmées par 'Gos Locāva dans le *Deb-sñon* (écrit entre 1476 et 1478).¹³ Dans son chapitre consacré à Avalokiteśvara, 'Gos Locāva n'attribue à Grub-thob que la découverte de la partie *Sādhana* du *MKB*, partie qu'il transmet d'une part à Rog Çes-rab 'od, d'autre part à Ñaṅ-ral. Mais dans les pages consacrées à la biographie de Rog Çes-rab 'od, il est dit que celui-ci « obtint de Grub-thob dÑos-grub les trois cycles du Grand Compatissant (*Thugs-rje čhen-po'i skor-gsum*). »¹⁴ Cette rencontre avec Grub-thob se produit lorsque Rog Çes-rab 'od (1166-1244) avait environ vingt ans, donc entre 1184 (M. Aris) et 1186.

En revanche, on ne trouve nulle mention de Grub-thob dans le *gTer-byuṅ čhen-mo* de Ratna gliṅ-pa (1403-1478). Ce dernier analyse pourtant longuement le *MKB* et le *bKa'-čhems ka-khol-ma*,¹⁵ mais il ne cite que Ñaṅ-ral comme « découvreur » du premier. Peut-être la lecture des dix-neuf volumes des *gTer-čhos* de Ratna gliṅ-pa apporterait-elle une explication à cette omission de Grub-thob : était-ce parce que Ratna gliṅ-pa le considérait comme bon-po? En tout cas, le fait que, approximativement à la même époque, 'Gos Locāva lui attribue la paternité de la découverte du *MKB*, prouve que l'unanimité n'était pas faite sur sa personne.

Au siècle suivant dPa'o gCug-lag 'phreṅ-ba (1503-1565) dans son chapitre consacré aux rÑiṅ-ma-pa, recopiant la liste des *gter-ston* annoncés dans les *Thaṅ-yig* et la prophétie — qu'il résume — concernant chacun, inclut bien entendu Grub-thob dÑos-grub. Puis, dans la vie de Ñaṅ-ral, il le cite uniquement parmi les maîtres dont Ñaṅ-ral a reçu beaucoup d'enseignements gSar-ma-pa et rÑiṅ-ma-pa, mais non lorsqu'il en vient aux *bKa'-brgyad* et aux cycles d'Avalokiteśvara dont Ñaṅ-ral a reçu la transmission révélée (*bka'-babs*).¹⁶

thabs devrait être compris de manière plus imprécise, comme « moyens de réalisation », car, dit-il, il n'existait pas de rituel dans le *rJogs-then* primitif. (Mais cf. les rites de *dbaṅ* dans les *gter-ma* de bZod-ston plus loin). *Dilgo mKhyen-brce Rinpoche* que j'ai pu consulter confirme cette interprétation.

¹³ *Deb-sñon*, pp. 941-942, 1006. Ces passages ont déjà été utilisés par Aris 1979, p. 9.

¹⁴ Ces trois cycles ne peuvent désigner que les trois parties principales du *MKB* : des *sūtra* (*mdo'i skor*), des *sādhana* (*sgrub-thabs-kyi skor*), des instructions [royales] (*žal-gdams-kyi skor*), ce qui représente un anachronisme, la découverte du cycle des instructions étant attribuée à Ñaṅ-ral.

¹⁵ *gTer-byuṅ čhen-mo*, pp. 53-56. Cette analyse soulève de nouveaux problèmes quant à la composition du *MKB* et du *Ka-khol-ma*, dont il faudra tenir compte pour une étude ultérieure du contenu de ces deux textes et de leurs rapports entre eux.

¹⁶ dPa'o, *tha*, pp. 256, 259, 260. La prophétie condensée est identique à celle que cite Koṅ-sprul (Prats 1982, p. 9).

Le Cinquième Dalai-Lama, s'il se rallie finalement à l'opinion couramment admise, se fait néanmoins l'écho de ces incertitudes sur la part exacte qui revient à Grub-thob dans la découverte du *MKB*, en émettant quelques doutes sur l'attribution à Grub-thob de la découverte du *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo*, première partie du Cycle des *sūtra*. Dans son *gSan-yig* en effet, il détaille longuement les initiations du *MKB* qu'il a reçues.¹⁷ A cette occasion il fait l'historique de la collection, en indiquant les différentes parties de cet enseignement de Sroñ-bcan sgam-po, les lieux où le roi les a cachées, la manière dont Padmasambhava les a extraites de leurs cachettes, montrées à Khri-sroñ lde-bcan puis recachées. Ensuite,

« le yogin appelé Grub-thob dÑos-grub qui avait été choisi [comme disciple] par Thugs-rje čhen-po, qui a vécu environ trois cents ans dans le monde des hommes a « invité » (c'est-à-dire extrait) de sous le pied du Hayagrīva de la chapelle nord le Cycle des *sādhana* et il l'a donné à la réincarnation de Chañs-pa lha'i me-tog (= Khri-sroñ lde-bcan), le *mÑa'-bdag* Ñañ. Le *mÑa'-bdag* lui-même a extrait de sous le pied de Hayagrīva le Cycle des instructions [royales]. Le Maître de Lhasa dans le dBu-ru, Čākya 'od *alias* [Čākya] bzañ-po, a sorti de la chapelle du Yakša [Kubera] la partie des *Sūtra*, le *Gab-pa mñon-phyuñ*, etc. Et ainsi, pour cet ensemble de textes, bien qu'il y ait trois *gter-ston*, si on prend en compte le plus important, c'est Grub-thob dÑos-grub : je mets donc ici tout ce qui concerne [le *MKB*] et je n'en écrirai rien dans les cycles d'enseignements religieux (*čhos-skor*) des deux autres *gter-ston*. »¹⁸

Puis le Cinquième Dalai-Lama décrit le contenu du *MKB*. Lorsqu'il en arrive au *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo* du Cycle des *sūtra*, il remarque :

« Bien que le *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo* doive être vraisemblablement un *gter-ma* du *Nirmānakāya* Čākya 'od, maintenant on le considère comme un *gter-ma* de Grub-thob dÑos-grub et, en jugeant par le lieu de sa découverte, je suppose que c'est vrai. »¹⁹

¹⁷ *gSan-yig*, vol. III, pp. 130-153. Ce long passage, important également pour l'analyse du *MKB*, a été utilisé dans la très intéressante communication de M. Kapstein (Kapstein 1980).

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 131. Ce passage est également traduit, avec quelques variantes, dans Kapstein 1980. C'est l'une des sources du *gTer-ston brgya-rca* de Koñ-sprul, qui recopie presque textuellement la phrase concernant la prééminence de Grub-thob, mais en remplaçant Čākya bzañ-po par lHa-rje dGe-ba 'bum (v. Prats 1982, pp. 32-33).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 133 : *Lo-rgyus sprul-sku Čāk-'od-kyi gter-ma yin dgos-rgyu 'dra-žig 'dug kyañ da-lta Grub-thob dÑos-grub-kyi gter-mar mjad-č'in gter-gnas-la dpags kyañ yin-nam sñam-mo*. L'interprétation de ce passage par Kapstein 1980 ne tient pas compte des doutes réels du Cinquième Dalai-Lama : « Speaking of the Great Chronicle [le Dalai-Lama] tells us that the location in which it was concealed (*gter-gnas*, that

Avec la source suivante on aborde un genre littéraire différent, celui des collections de brèves notices biographiques sur les *gter-ston*, connues sous le nom de *gTer-ston brgya-rca'i rnam-thar*, ou plus brièvement *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, « Biographies des cent et quelques découvreurs de trésors » qui se sont succédés depuis le début de la deuxième diffusion de la Doctrine (*phyi-dar*) jusqu'au moment où écrit l'auteur. Ces biographies forment un ouvrage autonome ou bien une partie seulement d'un exposé plus général sur l'histoire de la Doctrine. On est loin de posséder dans ce domaine tous les textes nécessaires dont, pour l'instant, seul le nom nous est parvenu,²⁰ ce qui explique en partie l'incertitude des conclusions.

L'ouvrage de ce type le plus ancien que je connaisse à ce jour est la *Prière votive à la centaine de gter-ston (gTer-ston brgya-rca'i mchan-sdom gsol-'debs)* de *Byañ-bdag bKra-çis stobs-rgyal* (1550?-1602), qui ne nous est parvenue que sous forme de citations introduisant les commentaires écrits par un abbé de *Zab-bu-luñ*, *Karma mi-'gyur dbañ-rgyal* aux environs de 1650.²¹ *Grub-thob* y est brièvement mentionné une première fois dans la vie de *Ñañ-ral* : celui-ci

« dès son jeune âge prit comme divinité tutélaire (*yi-dam*) *Thugs-rje čhen-po* et le rencontra réellement [en vision]. En outre, il rencontra le *gter-ston Grub-thob dÑos-grub* et, après qu'il ait reçu de lui les autorisations (*luñ*) et initiations (*dbañ*) complètes du cycle de *Thugs-rje čhen-po* et des *bKa'-brgyad* dans la tradition *bka'-ma*, il en pratiqua la réalisation... Alors *Padmasambhava* lui apparut en personne et lui confia la mission de révéler ses *gter-ma* ». ²²

Plus loin, son nom apparaît dans la stance de *Byañ-bdag* placée en exergue, parmi les *gter-ston* qui sont plus particulièrement rattachés aux *bKa'-brgyad*. Le commentaire, extrêmement bref, déclare seulement :

« *Grub-thob dÑos-grub* « invita » un nombre infini de textes, tels que le cycle du *Mañi bka'-'bum* de *Thugs-rje čhen-po* [qu'il sortit] de sous le pied du *Hayagrīva* de *Lhasa*, et le cycle de *rTa-mgrin Padma dbañ-čhen*. » ²³

is, under the foot of the *Hayagrīva* image) suggests it to have been among the treasures discovered by *dÑos-grub* ». Cependant l'analyse interne à laquelle s'est livré *M. Kapstein* attribue de manière indubitable la découverte du *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo* à *Grub-thob*.

²⁰ V. par exemple les sources de *Koñ-sprul* citées dans la préface en anglais à son *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, celles du *Nor-bu'i do-čal*, ou les nombreux *gsan-yig* cités par le Cinquième *Dalai-Lama* dans le sien.

²¹ *Byañ-bdag gsol-'debs*, préface en anglais qui reprend les indications du colophon. Sur *Byañ-bdag bKra-çis stobs-rgyal*, réincarnation de *mÑa'-ris pañ-čhen*, sa prophétie concernant le Cinquième *Dalai-Lama* et la haute estime en laquelle le tenait ce dernier, v. *Dargyay* 1977, pp. 160, 171, 173. Sa biographie : *Koñ-sprul, gTer-ston brgya-rca*, pp. 354-353.

²² *Byañ-bdag gsol-'debs*, pp. 18-19.

²³ *Ibid.*, pp. 56 et 57.

Les textes écrits jusqu'au dix-neuvième siècle ne nous étant pas parvenus, l'étape suivante est le *gTer-ston brgya-rca* de Koñ-sprul (1813-1899), dont on trouve un parallèle très résumé dans le *mChan-tho* de mKhyen-brce'i dbaň-po (1820-1892), tandis qu'un de leurs contemporains, Kun-bzaň Nés-don kloň-yaň (né en 1814) écrivait en 1882 un chapitre consacré à la vie des *gter-ston* dans son histoire des rÑiň-ma-pa, le *Nor-bu'i do-çal*.

Prats 1982 ayant traduit intégralement la notice consacrée par Koñ-sprul à Grub-thob, et donné en note le passage de la biographie de Nãň-ral le concernant,²⁴ j'en rappellerai ici seulement les grandes lignes : Grub-thob, réincarnation du grand traducteur Vairocana, est né dans le gCaň. Son apparence extérieure était celle d'un tantriste. Ayant vécu trois cents ans, il fut considéré comme détenteur de la *vidyā* de longue vie.²⁵ Nãň-ral lui ayant dit comment il possédait la tradition *gter-ma* des *bKa'-brgyad*, Grub-thob lui dit à son tour comment il en possédait le *rJoň-'phraň*, tradition *bka'-ma* qui était liée à celle des *gter-ma*. Il transmet cette tradition à Nãň-ral qui fonde en un seul les deux courants. Grub-thob lui donna aussi des catalogues de trésors (*kha-byaň*), ainsi que cinq rouleaux du cycle de Thugs-rje čhen-po qu'il avait extraits de Lhasa, en disant : « C'est vous qui en êtes le propriétaire. » Koñ-sprul indique seulement que Grub-thob a découvert beaucoup de textes à Ri-bo-čhe dans le gCaň — qui correspondent donc à la prophétie des *Thaň-yig* — puis il consacre le reste de sa notice aux découvertes du *MKB* dans des termes similaires à ceux du Cinquième Dalai-Lama.²⁶ Il termine cette notice biographique par l'identification de Grub-thob à bŽod-ston, dans la phrase traduite au début de cet article. Enfin, dans la récapitulation chronologique à la fin de son ouvrage, il place Grub-thob au deuxième cycle sexagénaire, soit entre 1087 et 1146.²⁷

C'est aussi au deuxième *rab-byuň* que mKhyen-brce situe Grub-thob.²⁸ Sa biographie très résumée n'apporte pas d'élément nouveau :

²⁴ V. n. 4. *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, pp. 113-115 pour Grub-thob ; p. 132 pour la biographie de Nãň-ral.

²⁵ *che-yi rig-'jin*, qui dans les textes rñiň-ma-pa et bon-po anciens équivaut à *che-yi dños-grub*. Faut-il faire le rapprochement avec le Sage bon-po Dran-pa nam-mkha' qui possédait aussi cette *vidyā* de longue vie, vécut six cents ans (comme le dit une source plus loin pour Grub-thob), et à qui se rattache la tradition des *gter-ston* « syncrétiques » ? (V. Blondeau, *Annuaire*, tome LXXXVIII, 1979-1980, pp. 121-122).

²⁶ Il précise les deux endroits où Sroň-bean sgam-po a caché les différents cycles du *MKB* au Jo-khaň : la statue ie Hayagrīva dans la chapelle nord (de Thugs-rje čhen-po) et sous la cuisse gauche (de la statue) du *nāga* Kubera ; par ailleurs, le troisième *gter-ston* impliqué dans la découverte est pour lui lHa-rje dGe-ba 'bum et non Čākya 'od. Mais cette question concerne l'histoire du *MKB* et ne peut être poursuivie ici.

²⁷ *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, p. 548.

²⁸ *mChan-tho*, p. 217. Je veux exprimer ici ma reconnaissance à E. Gene Smith qui a attiré mon attention sur ce texte et m'a communiqué avec une grande générosité ses notes personnelles.

« Grub-thob dÑos-grub naquit dans le gCañ. Il demeura trois cents ans dans le monde des hommes. Dans le bas de sa vie (deuxième moitié) il sortit le *rTa-mgrin khro-'dus*, etc. (probablement *rTa-mgrin Padma dbaṅ-chen* ci-dessus), de Ri-bo-čhe dans le gCañ, ainsi que la plupart des cycles du *Maṅi bka'-'bum* de sous le pied du Hayagrīva de la chapelle nord de Lhasa. Il fut aussi le Lama du *mÑa'-bdag ṅaṅ*. »²⁹

Nulle trace d'identification avec un bon-po dans ce texte. En revanche, quelques folios plus loin mKhyen-brce cite de seconde main, à travers la copie qu'en fait un *gsan-tho* (compendium des enseignements reçus), un *Bon-gter brgya-rca'i gter-byuñ*, « Histoire de l'apparition des trésors de la centaine de *gter-ston* bon-po », écrit par le Bon-po Kun-grol-pa. L'identification de ce texte pose quelques problèmes que l'on verra plus loin. On retrouve dans la citation qui en est faite les mêmes identifications de *gter-ston* bon-po à des *gter-ston* bouddhistes que dans le *gTer-ston brgya-rca* de Koṅ-sprul, et en particulier :

« En ce qui concerne Grub-thob dÑos-grub, dans la tradition Bon il est connu comme bŽed- (= bŽod) ston dÑos-grub, réincarnation de Ņom (= Ņam) rTa-ra klu-goṅ. Il a « invité » de la cavité [derrière la statue] de Vairocana à mKho-mthiñ les *rJogs-chen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, et du cœur de Hayagrīva, le dieu-gardien de la porte, le *rJogs-chen Yañ-rce kloṅ-chen* etc. »³⁰

Mais en concluant la citation de cet auteur bon-po, mKhyen-brce émet un jugement nuancé qui laisse dans l'expectative quant à son opinion véritable sur les identifications ci-dessus :

« Dans des *gter-ma* bon-po tels que le *Che-sgrub Bairo'i goṅ-khugs* du Bon-po Saṅs-rgyas gliṅ-pa, le *rCa-rluṅ mkha'-'gro gsaṅ-mjod* de Kun-grol [grags-pa] etc., il y a beaucoup de bouddhisme (*ban-čhos*) ; et d'une manière générale aussi, il y a vraiment beaucoup [de textes] qui n'ont qu'une terminologie bon-po mais qui en réalité apparaissent comme bouddhiques. Quant à [savoir] finalement de façon claire s'ils le sont ou non, comme il est difficile à quiconque de trancher, il semble meilleur de laisser encore quelque temps [la question] dans la voie du milieu (*dbu-ma'i lam*, c'est-à-dire de ne pas prendre parti). »³¹

²⁹ *mChan-tho*, p. 409.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 418. Sur ces lieux de découverte et ces textes, v. plus loin la biographie de bŽod-ston.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 419-420. Saṅs-rgyas gliṅ-pa et Kun-grol grags-pa sont deux *gter-ston* bon-po appartenant à la tradition des « Nouveaux trésors » (*gter-gsar*) qui se développèrent à partir du XVIII^e siècle (V. Karmay 1972, pp. 185 et 191) et qui sont tout à fait syncrétiques. Il sera question de Kun-grol

Dans l'état actuel de mes connaissances, il ne m'est pas possible de déterminer si le *gTer-ston brgya-rca* de Koñ-sprul est antérieur au *mChan-tho* (non daté) de mKhyen-brce ; étant donné les liens étroits qui unissent ces deux maîtres, et le fait que mKhyen-brce a finalement supervisé la rédaction du *gTer-ston brgya-rca* en complétant et clarifiant les sources de Koñ-sprul,³² la question apparaît comme secondaire. Elle ne l'est plus lorsqu'il s'agit du *Nor-bu'i do-çal*, qui utilise des sources partiellement différentes de celles de Koñ-sprul, et ne fait aucune allusion à une identification possible de *gter-ston* bon-po et bouddhistes. Savoir si l'auteur, qui écrivait en 1882 (mais à Padma bkod, il est vrai, et non dans le Khams) avait connaissance de l'ouvrage de Koñ-sprul et a consciemment rejeté ses identifications, renforcerait certaines de nos conclusions.

Adoptant l'ordre des *gter-ston* du *gTer-ston bryga-rca'i gsol-'debs* de Byañ-bdag,³³ il mentionne d'abord dans la biographie de Ñañ-ral la rencontre de celui-ci avec Grub-thob : « Il rencontra le *gter-ston* Grub-thob dÑos-grub et entendit (reçut) de lui les cycles de Thugs-rje čhen-po etc. »³⁴ Lorsqu'il en arrive à la rubrique concernant Grub-thob, il commence par une citation d'une source non identifiée, qui est peut-être le *gTer-ston rgya-mcho'i rnam-thar Nor-bu'i phreñ-ba* du Zab-luñ *gdan-sa-pa* Padma dbaň-rgyal, indiqué comme sa source principale pour les *gter-ston* anciens prophétisés dans les *Padma bka'-thañ* :³⁵

« En ce qui concerne Grub-thob dÑos-grub : Il (?) dit qu'il est apparu très tôt et que, étant demeuré six cents ans dans le monde des hommes, l'année où il atteignit six cents ans, après avoir extrait les trésors, et après avoir transmis ses enseignements religieux aux huit *mÑa'-bdag*,³⁵ il mourut. Dans le *gSan-yig Gaňga'i čhu-rgyun*, [le Cinquième Dalai-Lama dit qu'] il a vécu trois cents ans, je pense que c'est probablement vrai. Il a « invité » la plus grande part du [*Mani*] *bka'-'bum*, cycle de textes de Thugs-rje čhen-po mis par écrit par le Čhos-rgyal Sroň-bcan sgam-po qui les a enseignés aux êtres à convertir munis de bon *karma* et prédestinés. Du Cycle des *sūtra* [il a trouvé] le *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo* ; et [il a trouvé] le Cycle des *sādhana*, le Cycle des instructions [royales, textes] qui étaient cachés

grags-pa plus bas, avec les sources bon-po. Koñ-sprul a inclus dans le *Rin-čhen gter-mjod* des rituels du *rCa-rluñ mkha'-'gro gsaň-mjod* de Kun-grol grags-pa.

³² *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, p. 560.

³³ *Nor-bu'i do-çal*, p. 114.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

³⁵ Ce titre ne peut que s'appliquer au *mÑa'-bdag* Ñañ-ral Ñi-ma 'od-zer. Il a été porté par son fils cadet, *mÑa'-bdag* 'Gro-ba'i mgon-po, continuateur de la lignée, puis par les tenants successifs de la lignée. L'auteur extrapole-t-il en les incluant tous dans la transmission faite par Grub-thob à Ñañ-ral ? Cf. dans *Byañ-bdag gsol-'debs*, p. 24, la lignée de Ñañ-ral : son fils aîné (qui ne porte pas le titre), puis huit *mÑa'-bdag* successifs.

sous le pied du Hayagrīva de la chapelle nord [du Jo-khañ]. De Ri-bo-ĉhe, il a extrait le cycle de [rTa-mgrin] Padma dbaň-ĉhen etc.»³⁶

On constate que, mise à part une variante sur sa longévit , on ne trouve pas ici d' l ment nouveau.

Si l'on r sume les donn es concordantes de la plupart des sources, on peut dire que Grub-thob est n  dans le gCaň, (de clan gÑag dans le La-stod pr cise Ńaň-ral), qu'il y a d couvert des textes, notamment ceux concernant la forme secr te de Hayagrīva : Padma dbaň-ĉhen ; qu'il a mis au jour des parties du *MKB* dont il est consid r  le *gter-ston* principal ; qu'il  tait d tenteur aussi de la tradition *bka'-ma* des *bKa'-brgyad* ; qu'il a eu pour disciples Ńaň-ral et Rog-ban  es-rab 'od, ce qui fixe bien sa date au milieu du XII  si cle. Mais on a relev  les doutes qui planent sur le personnage, les variantes dans les d couvertes qui lui sont attribu es. La long vit  qu'on lui pr te est fabuleuse, l'impr cision des donn es biographiques  tonnante pour un ma tre du XII  si cle qui se trouve   l'origine d'un des enseignements sur Avalokiteŗvara les plus fameux. Son nom m me semble un pseudonyme : Grub-thob dŃos-grub, Siddha-Siddhi, au point qu'au premier abord on ne sait s'il faut comprendre Grub-thob comme faisant partie de son nom ou comme un qualificatif!³⁷ Finalement, l'investigation ne fait que mieux ressortir l'aspect n buleux du personnage, dont on se demande parfois si il a exist .

2. Le Bon dans le Maňi bka'-'bum

Une deuxi me approche pour essayer de r pondre   la question qui nous occupe est de chercher,   travers les *gter-ma* de Grub-thob si on y trouve des  l ments bon-po, et la mani re dont le Bon est trait , si il l'est. Or, exep t  les parties du *MKB* dont la d couverte lui est attribu e, ses autres *gter-ma* ne nous sont pas parvenus. Et comme, dit-on, Ńaň-ral a fondu ensemble les traditions *bka'-ma* et *gter-ma* des *bKa'-brgyad*, on ne poss de pas non plus la version *bka'-ma* de Grub-thob. Il ne

³⁶ *Nor-bu'i do-ĉal*, pp. 137-138. C'est cette biographie qu'il reproduit int gralement qu'a choisie Khetsun Sangpo, *Dictionary*, vol. III, p. 310, au lieu de ses sources les plus habituelles : Koň-sprul, ou Koň-sprul   travers le *rŃiň-ma'i  hos-'byuň* de bDud-'joms Rinpoche. (Il est vrai que celui-ci n'a pas inclus la biographie de Grub-thob dans son ouvrage). Khetsun Sangpo ajoute un petit commentaire personnel : « Si on consid re ce qu'on dit, qu'il a donn  ses *gter-ma*   Ńaň-ral, il est clair qu'il a v cu aussi au XII  si cle ».

³⁷ On a vu que certains textes le citent sous le nom de *slob-dpon* Grub-thob dŃos-grub (par exemple *MKB*, vol. e, 377a), yogin —, *gter-ston* —, ce qui oblige   consid rer que Grub-thob est bien un  l ment de son nom.

reste donc que le *MKB*, avec toutes les réserves qu'imposent les remaniements dûs aux *gter-ston* successifs.

Là aussi l'enquête se révèle négative : les seuls passages où le Bon figure, nommément ou implicitement, se trouvent dans les biographies de Sroñ-bcan sgampo dont l'inclusion dans la collection «est postérieure au XIV^e siècle.»³⁸ H. Hoffmann a déjà relevé les courts passages qui se trouvent dans la première biographie : sur l'origine du premier roi ; le plan des fondations du Jo-khañ ; la conversion au bouddhisme des sujets par le moyen des *bon*, *lde'u*, *sgruñ*, «qui conviennent aux gens ordinaires» ; la cache par le roi en différents endroits du Jo-khañ de textes bouddhiques (*čhos*), de rituels magiques (*mthu*), de rituels bon-po (*bon*), de choses précieuses, et du texte de ses édits.³⁹ Un passage analogue mais un peu plus long (non relevé par Hoffmann), se situe dans la seconde biographie de Sroñ-bcan (*rNam-thar mjad-pa ñi-ču rca-gčig-pa*), au chapitre 18 où «le roi qui est une émanation établit tout le Tibet dans le bouddhisme.» Comme dans le chapitre correspondant de la première biographie, le roi fait faire beaucoup de traductions par les pandits et locāva, lui-même enseigne, et Thon-mi sambhoṭa met par écrit tous les textes religieux énoncés par le roi. Puis,

«pour les gens ordinaires aussi, pour leur rendre plus facile l'enseignement des *āgama*, il enseigna des *sgruñ* tels que *gZugs-kyi sñe-ma* etc. Pour faire comprendre les enseignements de la dialectique, il enseigna des *lde'u*. Il invita du Žañ-žuñ le Bon-po Žañ-žuñ lha-ldem ; il lui fit instruire un Bon-po nommé A-ba rnam-sras et il leur fit faire des consultations de divination pour les malades, la propitiation des dieux, des rituels *bon*, et frapper les démons-*'dre*. Et comme les *bon-yad* (*yas?* effigies placées au pied du *mdos*) étaient enseignés des uns aux autres, ils se diffusèrent et ils furent utiles à tous, hommes, femmes et malades.»⁴⁰

Si ce passage est intéressant par les analogies qui permettent de mieux comprendre ce qu'étaient les *sgruñ*, *bon* et *lde'u*, il est tardif répétons-le, et pour ce qui est du Bon et de ses rituels, il semble inspiré de passages similaires dans les *hKa'-thañ* du XIV^e siècle plutôt que puisé directement à un fonds bon-po. Ce passage est à reconsidérer dans la perspective plus vaste des *gter-ston* «ambivalents» qui fera l'objet d'un autre travail. Remarquons seulement ici que cette intégration du Bon,

³⁸ Macdonald, *Annuaire*, p. 532.

³⁹ Hoffmann 1950, texte p. 361.

⁴⁰ *MKB*, vol. e, ff. 282b-283a : *skye-bo tha-mal-pa rnam-la yañ luñ-gi čhos sla-bar bya-ba'i phyir | gZuñs (sic)-kyi sñe-ma la-sogs-pa'i sgruñ bslabs | rigs-pa'i čhos go-bar bya-ba'i phyir lde'u bslabs-so || Žañ-žuñ yul-nas bon-po Žañ-žuñ lha-ldem spyān-drañs-nas || bon-po A-ba rnam-gsas žes bya-ba-la slob-tu bčug-ste | nad-pa-la mo 'debs-pa dañ | lha gsol-ba dañ | bon byed-pa dañ | 'dre brduñ-ba dañ de-rnams byed-du bčug-ste | bon-yad gčig-la gčig-gis bslabs-pas dar-bar gyur-te | skye-bo pho mo dañ nad-pa thams-čad-la phan thogs-par gyur-to || Les noms des maîtres bon-po sont inconnus.*

pour son utilité au niveau des rituels apotropaiques, se retrouve au long des siècles, jusqu'à Koñ-sprul, mKhyen-brce, Mi-pham . . . La seule conclusion que l'on puisse peut-être tirer de ce passage dans la perspective qui nous occupe, est que son auteur se situe dans la ligne de ces *gter-ston* : étant donné les affinités et les liens qui unissent les différents découvreurs d'un cycle, il n'est pas trop hasardeux sans doute de penser que tous les *gter-ston* du *MKB*, à commencer par Grub-thob, avaient pour le moins une attitude sans parti-pris (*phyogs-med*) à l'égard du Bon.⁴¹

Quant aux parties du *MKB* découvertes par Grub-thob : *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo*, Cycle des *sādhana*, la seule impression que l'on en retire est qu'ils sont imprégnés de *rJogs-čhen*,⁴² mais on n'y trouve nulle trace du Bon. En particulier, les chapitres 17 et 18 du *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo* sont consacrés, le premier à l'origine des tantra du *rJogs-čhen* : révélation au roi Ja . . . , le second à l'histoire des statues d'Avalokiteśvara spontanément apparues. La fin de ce chapitre relate la transmission par dGa'-rab rdo-rje d'enseignements et de tantra à trois jeunes garçons. Au troisième, fils de brahmane, il donne le *gTar-ga gags-sel-gyi rgyud*.⁴³ Un titre similaire : *gTar-kha gags-sel*, figurant parmi les *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston comme texte annexe des *rJogs-čhen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*,⁴⁴ j'ai cru y trouver une preuve de l'identité du bouddhiste et du bon-po. Mais la rencontre du même titre dans la littérature, et les explications données par le Lopön Tenzin Namdak obligent à abandonner cette piste : pour lui,⁴⁵ le fait de rencontrer ce titre dans le *MKB* n'est pas de grande signification car on trouve dans le *rJogs-čhen* beaucoup de *gTar-ga gags-sel*, chez les rÑiñ-ma-pa comme chez les Bon-po. Il s'agit d'un type d'instructions données par les maîtres pour purger (*sel*) à la manière d'une lancette à saignée (*gtar-ga*) les différents empêchements (*gags*) survenant au cours de la pratique de leurs disciples, empêchements résultant de leur nature et de leur *karma*.

On peut donc ajouter aux éléments biographiques déjà réunis que Grub-thob était *rJogs-čhen-pa*. Mais, dans toute la littérature bouddhiste passée en revue, Koñ-sprul est le seul à l'identifier au bon-po bŽod-ston, et le *MKB* ne fournit pas d'évidence interne d'un lien quelconque avec le Bon. On peut donc se demander si Koñ-sprul, bon-po de naissance et d'éducation,⁴⁶ appartenant de surcroît au mouvement « éclectique », n'a pas emprunté cette identification à la tradition bon-po. Il faut alors se tourner vers celle-ci, et examiner ce que l'on sait de bŽod-ston dÑos-grub et de ses *gter-ma*.

⁴¹ En ce qui concerne Ńaṅ-ral, l'absence même du Bon dans le *bKa'-thañ Zaṅs-gliñ-ma* est frappante. Cf. Blondeau, *Annuaire*, tome LXXXV, 1976-1977, pp. 93-94.

⁴² M. Kaptstein a confirmé oralement la coloration *rJogs-čhen-pa* du *MKB*.

⁴³ V. Blondeau, *Annuaire*, tome LXXXVI, 1977-1978, p. 82. Sur le roi Ja, v. Karmay 1981.

⁴⁴ Karmay 1972, p. 316.

⁴⁵ Informations reçues au cours d'un séjour au monastère bon-po de Dolanji, avril 1982.

⁴⁶ Smith 1970, pp. 28-29.

II. Les sources bon-po

Elles sont beaucoup plus abondantes et précises que leurs homologues bouddhistes pour Grub-thob. Mais l'ordre chronologique dans lequel elles sont données ici est également relatif, l'incertitude planant sur la date de plusieurs d'entre elles. La plupart étant manuscrites, elles présentent aussi de nombreuses variations — pour ne pas dire fautes — d'orthographe qui ne rendent pas toujours leur lecture aisée.

1. La biographie de bŽod-ston

Dans les ouvrages historiques bon-po rédigés à partir du XIV^e siècle, les *gter-ston* sont classés selon le lieu de leurs découvertes ; la biographie de bŽod-ston est ainsi donnée sous la rubrique *lHo-brag-ma*, « *gter-ma* du *lHo-brag* », par référence à la province dans laquelle il a exercé ses activités. Mais on possède des données biographiques antérieures, l'une comme source indépendante, les autres à l'intérieur même des collections dont le noyau est formé par les découvertes de bŽod-ston.

La biographie la plus ancienne de bŽod-ston serait passée probablement inaperçue sans Samten G. Karmay : elle a en effet été éditée dans *Sources for a History of Bon (Sources)* à la suite des visions de rMa-ston Ćes-rab seŋ-ge (texte 14) sans séparation textuelle, et l'éditeur amalgamant les deux dans la table des matières : « Visions of Rma-ston Shes-rab-sengge set down by Gzhod-ston Bsod-nams grags-pa. » Dans l'analyse de cette publication, S.G. Karmay indique que les pages 322 à 324 sont occupées par une biographie de gŽod-ston, écrite par gŽod-ston bSod-nams grags-pa.⁴⁷ En effet le texte comporte un court colophon : « La [biographie] établie par gŽod-ston bSod-grags est finie.⁴⁸ » Or, il est possible d'identifier l'auteur, qui est cité dans l'Histoire de la transmission du *Yaŋ-rce kloŋ-ĉhen*, (*dGoŋs-rgyud*), premier texte de la collection dont il sera question plus loin. La descendance de bŽod-ston y est brièvement indiquée : son fils était sMon-lam grags, le fils de celui-ci gŽod-ston bSod-nams grags, son fils gŽod-ston bKra-ĉis rce.⁴⁹ Ainsi, c'est le petit-fils même de bŽod-ston qui a rédigé la biographie dont voici la traduction :

« E-ma-ho! Je loue en me prosternant Kun-tu bzaŋ-po qui a la nature de la Grande Félicité, corps sans naissance, dépourvu d'activité, semblable à l'espace.

⁴⁷ Karmay 1977, p. 116, et Karmay 1975, p. 562 n. 2. Je dois à Samten Karmay, non seulement d'avoir eu connaissance de ce texte, mais aussi une aide constante au cours de ce travail, pour la localisation de certaines sources et leur interprétation. Qu'il en soit remercié ici.

⁴⁸ *Sources*, p. 324 : *gŽod-ston bSod-grags-kyi bkod-pa rjogs-so*.

⁴⁹ *Yaŋ-rce kloŋ-ĉhen*, p. 91, l. 4.

Je loue en me prosternant le *Nirmāṇakāya* dÑos-grub grags, qui a un bon *karma* purifié depuis [ses naissances] précédentes, qui a saisi intuitivement (*rtogs*) le sens de la non-existence de l'Ego (*bdag-med*). Ici j'écrirai la biographie du Lama gŽod-ston dÑos-grub grags qui est une émanation de sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-chen du Žaṅ-žuñ et de sŃa Li-çu stag-riñs.⁵⁰

Parce que s'étaient trouvés réunis le vœu d'autrefois (vœu du *bodhisattva*) et la bonne cause secondaire que sont les êtres vivants (= de bons parents), il naquit là, à Guñ-phu du lHo-brag, des deux : le père bŽon- (= bŽod) ston Grags-' bum et la mère lHa-rgyan sman, un fils appelé bŽon-ston dÑos-grub grags. Ensuite, il apprit auprès de son père jusqu'à en devenir savant les *Drañ-ma'i bon*.⁵¹ Auprès du Lama Gru-chen il apprit les enseignements bon-po des Trésors du Nord (*Byañ-gter*), à savoir *Ga[b-pa]* et *Jod* (= *mJod*).⁵² A Va-chañ brañ (= brag?)-phug, ayant donné à un muet le nom de sGom-chen g.Yuñ-druñ grags, il lui confia [le rôle] de disciple-intendant (*ñe-gnas*) et il eut la charge (? *bčol*) de quelques moines. A cette époque, il lui vint la pensée suivante : "Bien qu'il existe beaucoup d'enseignements bon-po du *Sems-phyogs*,⁵³ tels que *Ga[b-]pa* etc., s'il y avait un enseignement bon-po plus profond encore que ceux-ci, et qui fasse obtenir l'état de *bouddha* en une seule vie?"

Une fois, un oiseau noir parlant le langage humain étant apparu dans le ciel dit : "Il y a un enseignement bon-po du *rJogs-pa čhen-po* qui fait obtenir l'état de *buddha* en une seule vie." Son serviteur de son côté, après que sa langue muette se soit déliée, dit : "Dans les *Luñ-drug* et le *Doñ-sprugs*, on dit ceci...⁵⁴" Mais [bŽod-ston] avait encore des doutes. Au bout d'un moment, après qu'il ait reçu

⁵⁰ sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-chen est un des sages du Žaṅ-žuñ, maître de *Dran-pa nam-mkha'* ; sŃa Li-çu stag-riñs est un tibétain faisant partie des vingt savants du Bon (*Bon mkhas-pa ñi-çu*) ; il a vécu au temps de *Dran-pa nam-mkha'*. Sur ces deux maîtres, v. Karmay 1972, *passim*. Dans les *bKa'-thañ*, Li-çu stag-riñs est invité par Khri-sroñ lde-bcan pour traduire les textes bon-po. Dans les textes bon-po postérieurs, sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-chen ne figure plus comme « antécédent » de bŽod-ston ; seul reste Liçu stag-riñs.

⁵¹ *bKa' Drañ-ma* : Karmay 1975, p. 562 n. 2, pense qu'il s'agit des *bKa' drañ-ña-ma*, nom sous lequel sont connues les découvertes de *Drañ-rje bCun-pa*, dont le *gZer-mig*. Il me paraît difficile de faire remonter le *gZer-mig* si haut dans le temps, mais la question est trop compliquée pour être discutée ici.

⁵² *Gab-pa* est le texte philosophique fondamental du *rJogs-chen* bon-po ; c'est un des premiers *gter-ma* bon-po, puisque découvert par gČen-chen Klu-dga' en 1017 selon le *bsTan-rcis bon-po*. Cf. Karmay 1972, p. 51, n. 8 ; Karmay 1977, p. 99.

mJod est, comme chez les bouddhistes, l'*Abhidharma* ; cf. Karmay 1972, pp. 139 sq.

Gru-chen est probablement à corriger en Bru-chen : v. Karmay 1972, pp. 139-140, la transmission de *mchan-ñid*, dont *mJod*, dans le lignage de Bču. Si l'on accepte la chronologie du *bsTan-rcis bon-go* qui place les découvertes de bŽod-ston en 1088, Bru-chen pourrait être Bru-chen g. Yuñ-druñ bla-ma, fondateur de g. Yas-ru dBen-sa-kha, né en 1040 selon le *bsTan-rcis* (Karmay 1972, p. 139 n. 1).

⁵³ Une subdivision du *rJogs-chen*.

⁵⁴ Ce sont deux parties des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* : c'est une annonce prophétique de leur découverte par bŽod-ston.

une prophétie de Srid-pa'i rgyal-mo,⁵⁵ il décida d'extraire [le trésor qui lui avait été révélé]. Chevauchant une jument blanche, en compagnie de ṣGom-chen Khu-chab, il se rendit à Kho-thiñ.⁵⁶ Après avoir donné le cheval au sacristain, il exhuma un plein manteau de tantriste (*sñags-pa'i phod-kha*) de trésors. Mais comme il les examinait le lendemain matin, ils se révélèrent être des textes bouddhiques (*čhos*) et il fut attristé. Mais ayant adressé une prière à Srid-pa'i lha-mo, elle prophétisa que [les textes bon-po annoncés] se trouvaient un peu plus à l'ouest (ou en haut, *stod*) que ceux-là. Il alla les extraire le lendemain matin, et dans les textes extraits il y avait les quatre *Čhiñs-ma* (liens) et les six tantra (*rgyud*) . . .⁵⁷ [Il y avait aussi] le *rJogs-chen dMar-byañ-gi skor*,⁵⁸ la selle [du cheval] de Khri-sroñ lde-bcan [appelée?] *ber-čhen*, ses entraves (? *sgrog-len*) en laiton incrusté d'or, son *spar-čhañ* (?) etc. Ce trésor qui avait été caché autrefois par Li-ču stag riñs et le roi [Khri-sroñ lde-bcan] ensemble, il le sortit de derrière le dos du Vairocana de Khom-thiñ (*sic*) dans le lHo-brag, le quinzième jour du dernier mois d'automne de l'année du dragon.⁵⁹

Ensuite, il garda [les textes] secrets pendant trois ans ; puis il les examina mais, tandis qu'il comprenait tous les autres, il ne comprit pas le *Thugs gsañ-ba'i 'khor-lo*⁶⁰ : après que Srid-pa'i rgyal-mo en personne lui ait donné "l'autorisation" (*luñ*), il comprit. Alors, comme son père disait aux disciples : "Mon fils est en train d'examiner des [rouleaux de] papier jaune ; si vous lui demandiez?" les disciples lui demandèrent et [bŽod-ston] répondit : "Maintenant, trois ans se sont écoulés. J'ai une doctrine de telle sorte", et il mit par écrit les *Luñ-drug*. Comme il en faisait l'explication, le yogin de Yar-'brog appelé 'U-ru Khri-skyabs devint libéré-de-lui-même, dans la non-activité [intellectuelle]. Par ailleurs, parmi

⁵⁵ « Reine de l'existence phénoménale », autre forme de la Mère primordiale. V. entre autres, Karmay 1972, pp. 9–10, n. 6.

⁵⁶ *mKho-mthiñ* = lHo-brag lha-khañ, cf. Ferrari 1958, p. 57 et n. 373, p. 137 : le temple fait partie des *mtha'-dul*. L'image principale est une énorme statue de Vairocana (celle précisément derrière laquelle bŽod-ston trouvera des textes). C'est aussi de ce temple que Ńañ-ral sortit les *bKa'-brgyad bde-gcęgs 'dus-pa*. Sur la résidence et le fief de Ńañ-ral dans le lHo-brag, v. *ibid.*, p. 56.

⁵⁷ Suit l'énumération des quatre *čhiñs-ma* et des six *rgyud*, qui correspondent respectivement aux n° 6, 45, 28, 46, et 26 (le sixième titre manque) de Karmay 1977, pp. 100–102. Ce sont des parties des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*.

⁵⁸ *Idem*, n° 37 de Karmay 1977, p. 101.

⁵⁹ *'brug-lo*, Bien que bŽod-ston soit censé avoir découvert ensemble les *hsGrags-pa skor-gsum* et le *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*, on trouve à l'intérieur même des collections des dates différentes : *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*, vol. I, p. 445 : *sa-pho-'brug*, soit : 1088, 1148, ou 1208 ; *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, p. 171 (Karmay 1977, p. 102) : *lčags-'brug*, soit : 1100, 1160, ou 1220. Karmay 1977, p. 102, relève les dates choisies par le *bsTanrcis bon-po* : *sa-'brug*, 1088, et un autre *bstan-rcis* : *čhu-'brug*, 1112.

⁶⁰ Karmay 1977, p. 102 : n° 47 des *hsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, dernier texte des *gter-ma* extraits par bŽod-ston.

les disciples qui obtinrent les premiers la délivrance : dans le sTod, il y a le *bya-bral-ba* 'Bum-khri ; dans le Yar-luñs, Thañ-ston dor (ñor?)-re ; dans le Yar-'brog, rGya bla-ma Jo-lde. Il donna à Jo-lde le *rJogs-čhen dMar-byañ* avec les manuscrits. Il eut beaucoup de disciples tels que ceux-ci, et d'autres. Ainsi, comme c'était un être muni des deux biens (*don-gñis* : pour soi-même et pour les autres), c'est le signe qu'il était un *nirmānakāya*. Le précieux Lama gŽod-ston implanta ensuite la doctrine d'enseignement (*ñan-bčad*) et de méditation (*sgom-sgrub*) et à partir de lui, la doctrine du *rJogs-čhen* s'est développée en se diffusant comme [les rayons de] soleil et lune.

Ainsi que par le fait d'écrire pour les générations futures qui viendront, cette Biographie du Lama, condensé de bijoux (*Bla-ma'i rnam-thar rin-čhen bčud-'dus*), toutes les vertus accumulées dans les trois temps soient reversées (*bsño-ba*) en tant que nature du *rJogs-čhen*, Kun-tu bzañ-po. La composition de gŽod-ston bSod-grags est finie. Bénédiction! Vertus! (*bkra-čis. dge'o*).»

Si l'on accepte la chronologie bon-po de bŽod-ston (découvertes en 1088 ou 1100), on peut considérer que ce texte date du XII^e siècle. Ecrite par son petit-fils, cette biographie se situe relativement près des faits et l'on ne voit pas de raison de mettre en doute son authenticité, notamment pour le lieu de naissance de bŽod-ston, le nom de ses parents, etc. Pourtant c'est sur ces points que les biographies plus tardives présentent des divergences, alors que l'ensemble du récit lui-même, s'il est souvent plus détaillé, est d'une remarquable stabilité.

La biographie la plus développée se trouve dans le premier texte du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*,⁶¹ qui appartient au genre des *Bla-ma brgyud-pa'i rnam-thar*, biographies des Lamas successifs d'une lignée de transmission. Selon S.G. Karmay,⁶² ce *dGoñs-rgyud* n'est pas un *gter-ma* mais une composition tardive dont l'auteur est Bon-žig blo-bde. On ne sait rien par ailleurs sur ce personnage ; la lignée de transmission du texte 20 dans le volume II précise son lieu d'origine et son patronyme : dGyes-roñ g.Yo-ston Blo-bde. Il a joué sans doute un rôle important dans la transmission du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen* : lorsque, à la fin des textes qui composent la collection, une lignée de transmission est indiquée, le dernier nom cité est souvent celui de Bon-žig blo-bde. Néanmoins il paraît difficile qu'il soit l'auteur du *dGoñs-rgyud* : on y trouve en effet sa biographie (pp. 94-95) qui le décrit comme un *siddha* capable de réalisations extraordinaires ; il fonda un monastère à sMan-phug (dans le lHo-brag sûrement) où il enseigna. La rubrique le concernant se termine ainsi : « Il avait de nombreux signes de réalisation mais je ne les écris pas ici de manière développée. »

⁶¹ *dGoñs-rgyud drug-gi klad-don ñi-ču rca-bdun ñams-kyi man-ñag gnad-kyi yig-čhuñ*, *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*, vol. I, pp. 1-100. (Abrégé en *dGoñs-rgyud*).

⁶² Karmay 1977, pp. 103-104.

Suivent encore les noms de quatre maîtres de la lignée (v. plus loin). En outre, le texte s'achève par une partie indépendante intitulée « Explication à part de l'histoire de la transmission des Lamas » (*Bla-ma brgyud-pa'i lo-rgyus zur-cam bçad-pa*, pp. 96-100), consacrée aux deux maîtres de l'auteur à mon avis, et le précédant immédiatement dans la lignée. Cette hypothèse est confirmée par la lignée de transmission du texte n° 11 (vol. I) où les deux maîtres ci-dessus, Gu-ru Yon-tan señ-ge et Rañ-grol bla-ma rgyal-mchan, précèdent immédiatement le rédacteur qui se désigne simplement par « moi » (*bdag*), mais qui donne son nom ailleurs : Žaň-žuň Chul-khrims rgyal-mchan, en indiquant qu'il a reçu en outre la transmission révélée (*bka'-babs*) de cet enseignement. Je pense qu'il est à la fois le compilateur de la collection sous sa forme actuelle et l'auteur du *dGoñs-rgyud*. Pour celui-ci, il a sans doute mis par écrit les paroles de l'un de ses maîtres, (ou utilisé une compilation antérieure par Blo-bde?), car tout le *dGoñs-rgyud* se présente comme une citation : il est émaillé de « Il dit » (à la forme honorifique, *gsuñs*), sans que l'auteur de ces paroles soit nommé. Quoi qu'il en soit, tous ces personnages restent malheureusement des inconnus pour les Bon-po actuels, on ne peut donc pas fixer une date précise pour ce texte. On peut seulement déterminer que Bon-žig blo-bde est le sixième détenteur après bŽod-ston de la transmission particulière (*thun-moň ma-yin-pa*) qui ici n'est délivrée par le maître qu'à un disciple (*gčig-brgyud*),⁶³ ce qui le place six générations environ après bŽod-ston, et l'auteur à la treizième génération : il s'agit par conséquent d'un texte tardif. Enfin, la source du *dGoñs-rgyud* paraît être un autre texte de la collection, le *lTa-ba'i stoň-thun*.⁶⁴ S.G. Karmay a noté la parenté des deux textes.⁶⁵ En réalité, le *lTa-ba'i stoň-thun* présente quelques différences puisque, après avoir établi la lignée de transmission depuis les origines, il s'attache à l'histoire d'une « petite » transmission spéciale échue à Jo-lde,⁶⁶ et qui finira par être transformée en bouddhisme, comme on le verra. C'est pourquoi il développe la vie de Jo-lde et sa rencontre avec bŽod-ston, mais non la vie de ce dernier. Ce texte paraît ancien car la lignée s'arrête avec l'histoire des descendants de Jo-lde (troisième génération après lui), et il n'y est pas question du passage de

⁶³ *dGoñs-rgyud*, pp. 91-96.

⁶⁴ *Yaň-rce kloň-čhen*, vol. I, n° 12.

⁶⁵ Karmay 1977, p. 103 : « Text n° 12 is similar in content to n° 1, an account of the spiritual lineage through which the teaching was transmitted ». Le texte n'est pas « signé », et S. G. Karmay considère que ce n'est pas un *gter-ma*. Mais les éditeurs de la collection ont placé en face du titre, dans la table des matières, l'indication « *gter-ma* ». S. G. Karmay signale (*ibid.*, p. 104) les discussions soulevées chez les Bon-po sur le point de savoir quels textes étaient ou n'étaient pas des *gter-ma* dans la collection. En ce qui concerne le *lTa-ba'i stoň-thun*, un élément pourrait accréditer l'idée que c'est un *gter-ma* : il est dit (p. 447) que Jo-lde n'osant pas conserver les manuscrits, les cacha à bDud-'dul lha-khaň (non identifié). Mais nulle mention n'est faite ensuite de celui qui les a sortis de leur cachette.

⁶⁶ Ce qui explique probablement le titre : « petit extrait de [la transmission de] la doctrine ».

l'enseignement chez les bouddhistes. Pour ne pas allonger démesurément cet article, seules les variantes du *lTa-ba'i ston-thun* seront indiquées dans la traduction de la vie de bŽod-ston selon le *dGoñs-rgyud*, ci-dessous.⁶⁷

« Transmission du lHo-brag-ma

Prosternations devant les Lamas qui conduisent les êtres [plongés dans] *samsāra*. Pour la transmission du *lHo-brag-ma*, il y en a deux : la transmission ordinaire et la transmission particulière. (Suit la récapitulation des transmissions depuis le *Bon-sku* Kun-tu bzañ-po, jusqu'à Li-çu stag-riñs qui les transmet à bŽod-ston par l'intermédiaire des Trois sœurs *ḍākiñī*, c'est-à-dire les *Bya-ra-ma gsum*, trois aspects de Srid-pa'i rgyal-mo, à qui Li-çu stag-riñs a confié la garde de ces textes-trésors). Après que les *ḍākiñī* aient donné cette [transmission] à lHa-rje⁶⁸ bŽod-ston émanation du Lama Li-çu stag-riñs, il sortit le trésor du temple de Khom-mthiñ.

Ce *nirmānakāya* lHa-rje bŽod-ston naquit à Bye-luñ de sMan-thañ,⁶⁹ une vallée du lHo-brag. Son clan était bŽod. On dit (*skad*) que son père appelé bŽod-ston Grags-gsum était un savant en Bon et un bon seigneur. On dit que sa mère appelée Phag-mo Čākya lcam était très belle. D'une mère différente, il avait aussi un frère cadet. lHa-rje bŽod-ston est natif d'une année du lièvre (*yo-s-bu*). On dit qu'au moment de sa naissance survinrent beaucoup de sons, lumières et signes. Dès son enfance il se montra intelligent. Lorsqu'il eut treize à quinze ans, on dit qu'il apprit auprès de rGya-ston Khri-mkhar dpal, *Gab-pa* et *mJod*.⁷⁰ Lorsqu'il eut entre douze et dix-huit ans, il apprit la logique auprès de Sru-cha 'Bar-thog⁷¹ à sTag-chal dans le Ñañ-stod. Il demanda à gÑan-theñ re-ñan les enseignements

⁶⁷ *dGoñs-rgyud*, pp. 75–90. Le début du texte est consacré à la transmission mythique aboutissant à Li-çu stag-riñs. Il s'agit des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* puisque Li-çu stag-riñs est l'auteur du *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*.

⁶⁸ Noter le titre *lha-rje* : bŽod-ston était-il médecin ? Le *lTa-ba'i ston-thun*, p. 446, dit que c'était une réincarnation de Nam sTag-ra klu-goñ.

⁶⁹ Non identifié. C'est probablement la vallée dans laquelle Bon-žig Blo-bde construisit un monastère. Le prédécesseur de Blo-bde dans la transmission de un à un (*gčig-brgyud*), Žig-po 'brug-sgra, fonda également un monastère dans cette vallée : sMan-luñ Brag-dkar (p. 93).

⁷⁰ V. n. 52. Dans la première biographie, le maître était Gru (= Bru) -chen. Je n'ai pas identifié ce rGya-ston Khri-mkhar dpal. Est-ce le père de Jo-lde ? V. vie de celui-ci dans le *lTa-ba'i ston-thun* ci-dessus.

⁷¹ Non identifié. Un des *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston démontre par la méthode logique la validité des positions du *rJogs-chen* ; Karmay 1977, p. 142 : texte de base et commentaire. Il est inclus aussi dans les *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, Karmay 1977, p. 101, n° 42 (v. plus loin).

bon-po (*bon*) du *gÑan-'theñ-ma*.⁷² Après avoir demandé à son père les enseignements du *Drañ-ña-ma*,⁷³ alors qu'il demeurait à les pratiquer, au bout de quelques années, des *dākiñī* apparurent venant d'en haut, parfois pour lui faire du mal, parfois lui disant : "Obéis à nos paroles", parfois lui disant : "Tu vas mourir!" Sans attacher à tout cela une pensée de joie ou de déplaisir, on dit qu'il demeura avec la pensée descendue dans la paume de sa main (c'est-à-dire en parfaite équanimité). Il avait un disciple-intendant (*ñe-gnas*) appelé *g.Yuñ-druñ grags* ; les *dākiñī* descendirent sur lui (prirent possession de lui) et le faisant parler,⁷⁴ il dit : "lHa-rje! nous te donnerons une *siddhi*", mais *bŽod-ston* ne répondit rien, ni "je veux" ni "je ne veux pas".

A nouveau, un autre jour, comme elles faisaient entamer une disputation au disciple-intendant, lHa-rje ne fut pas vaincu. Les *dākiñī* furent contentes et, faisant parler le disciple dirent : "Puisque tu es quelqu'un de fortuné, est-ce que nous te donnerons une *siddhi*? Est-ce que tu deviendras le maître de la Doctrine? Est-ce que tu accompliras toute la mesure (*chod*) de l'équanimité?". Alors il répondit : "Je deviendrai le maître de la Doctrine. Et comme j'aurai aussi accompli toute la mesure de l'équanimité (comprendre : comme je veux accomplir?) je dois demander une *siddhi* du Bon". Et comme il questionnait : "Où est-elle?", tantôt elles dirent "Elle est à sMan-thañ", tantôt "Elle est au gTam-čul", tantôt "A Khra-nañ", tantôt "A Goñ-bu",⁷⁵ et il n'eut pas de certitude.

Ensuite, quelques temps après, alors que le grand lHa-rje résidait à Khri-'al zañs-phug, Srid-pa'i rgyal-mo sous la forme des Trois sœurs⁷⁶ vint en personne ; il en eut la vision et elles lui adressèrent une prophétie : "Est-ce que, à toi qui es fortuné, nous donnerons une *siddhi* du Bon, celle qui est pour les autres et celle qui est particulière?"⁷⁷ Comme il répondait : "Je dois la demander", les *dākiñī* dirent : "Extrais-la du trou du milieu des quinze trous avec quinze petites portes

⁷² Cf. Karmay 1972, pp. 153-154 : les textes de ce *gter-ston* sont connus aussi comme *Čel-brag-ma* (les découvertes ont eu lieu dans le Ñañ-stod, en 1067 selon le *bsTan-rcis bon-po*). *gÑan-'theñ re-ñan* meurt de la lèpre parce qu'il avait transformé certains textes en textes bouddhiques. Ses *gter-ma*, très abondants, sont classés en neuf catégories. Dans la première, rituels *bon* pour les vivants (*gson-bon*), se trouve le rituel appelé *ča-ba ru-rgyas*, « le cerf aux bois développés » : c'est ce rituel qui est cité et décrit dans toute la littérature bouddhiste, les *bKa'-thañ* mais aussi les chants de Milarepa, lorsqu'il s'agit de stigmatiser les pratiques bon-po et leurs sacrifices sanglants. (Le rituel de ce nom qui existe de nos jours ne comporte rien de tel). Je reviendrai ailleurs sur cette question.

⁷³ V. n. 51.

⁷⁴ La première biographie était plus claire : ce disciple était muet.

⁷⁵ C'était le lieu de naissance de *bŽod-ston* dans la première biographie. Tous ces lieux doivent se situer au lHo-brag. Pour *gTam-čul*, v. Ferrari 1958, p. 135 n. 351.

⁷⁶ Ce sont les *mkha'-gro-ma mched-gsum*, alias *Bya-ra-ma gsum*, les gardiennes du trésor.

⁷⁷ Allusion aux deux transmissions : *thun-moñ-ba* et *thun-moñ ma-yin-pa*.

[qui se trouvent] derrière le Vairocana de Khom-mthiñ au lHo-brag. La porte du temple fait face à l'ouest. Le sacristain est un moine du gTam-çul. Ce trésor, extrais-le une année du dragon (*'brug-lo*). Extrais-le le dernier mois d'automne. Extrais-le le quinzième jour.⁷⁸ Pendant trois ans garde-le secret". A nouveau, lHa-rje demanda aux *ḍākiñī* : "Quelle raison y a-t-il à l'extraire une année du dragon, le dernier mois d'automne, le quinzième jour, et à le garder secret?". Les *ḍākiñī* répondirent : "En ce qui concerne l'extraction une année du dragon, c'est parce que cette précieuse doctrine deviendra très réputée, telle le son du dragon-tonnerre qui résonne dans le ciel. En ce qui concerne le soir du quinzième jour, c'est parce que cette doctrine se développera telle la pleine lune. De même que dans le dernier mois d'automne les fruits de tous les arbres fruitiers mûrissent, ainsi les fruits de ceux qui pratiqueront le *rJogs-pa čhen-po* ayant mûri, ils deviendront des *bouddha*. En ce qui concerne le fait de la garder secrète pendant trois ans : si tu la gardes secrète, la réalisation est proche ; et comme, si tu ne la gardes pas secrète la réalisation s'évanouira, il est très important de garder le secret". A nouveau il dit : "Le sacristain ne me donnera probablement pas la clé?". Elles répondirent : "Il la donnera. Nous ferons une bénédiction efficiente (*byin*)".

S'étant beaucoup réjoui de cela, il alla pour regarder le temple, et on dit qu'il était comme l'avaient décrit les déesses. Comme il cherchait le sacristain, c'était un moine de *Žañ* (? *Žañ-bcun*) dans le gTam-çul. Alors lHa-rje appela à part le sacristain et lui dit : "J'ai à extraire un trésor de l'intérieur du temple : il faut que tu me donnes la clé. De mon côté je te donnerai un cadeau". L'autre répondit : "Venez au gTam-çul et parlons!". Alors, étant allé au gTam-çul et ayant donné un beau cheval au sacristain, celui-ci lui dit qu'il lui donnerait la clé. Alors il demanda à lHu-bon sKyī-chab⁷⁹ [de l'accompagner] comme serviteur (*žabs-tog*) : "Comme j'ai à extraire un trésor, il faut que tu viennes m'aider. Je te donnerai un cadeau". L'autre répondit : "Quel cadeau me donneras-tu?". Comme [bŽod-ston] disait : "Ou bien je te donnerai la moitié du trésor, mais si on ne le sort pas tu n'auras rien ; ou bien je te donnerai des richesses, ou bien je te donnerai des pouvoirs magiques (*mthu*)", l'autre répondit : "Je ne veux pas de richesses, je ne veux pas du trésor, je veux des pouvoirs magiques. Comme pouvoirs magiques, je veux [ceux qui sont conférés] par la déesse Phrin-las-ma qui est votre divinité protectrice". Alors, après lui avoir donné sans exception tous les pouvoirs magiques de la déesse, l'année du dragon, le dernier mois

⁷⁸ *lTa-ba'i ston-thun*, p. 445 : le quinzième jour du mois médian d'automne de l'année *sa-pho-'brug* : v. n. 59. Il y a divergence de dates, non seulement d'une collection à l'autre, mais à l'intérieur même d'une collection, ce qui montre bien le caractère aléatoire de la chronologie.

⁷⁹ sGom-čhen Khu-chab dans la première biographie.

d'automne, le onzième jour, il partit conduisant lHu-bon sKyī-chab comme serviteur, du haut du pays vers le bas. Le quatorzième jour, étant arrivé au temple de Khom-mthiñ, après avoir pris la clé au sacristain, au crépuscule il ouvrit la porte du temple. Comme les serrures du trésor résonnaient, de grands prodiges [créés par] les *lha-'dre* se produisirent. Comme des bruits terrifiants et du vacarme se produisaient, il sortit et regarda : il n'y avait dans le village aucun bruit d'homme ou de chien. Après être rentré à l'intérieur, comme il verrouillait la serrure, des hurlements se produisirent comme précédemment, qui disaient : "Frappe! Tue!". Après que lHa-rje ait dit aux *dākiñī* : "Si vous n'êtes pas contentes, en faisant de tels vacarmes et bruits terrifiants, moi je ne sors pas le trésor", comme il arrangeait un *gtor-ma* et faisait une prière, les manifestations magiques disparurent d'elles-mêmes et le lieu redevint très calme. C'était parce que le Maître des trésors du temple n'était pas content.

Ensuite, comme il avait ouvert la porte du trou, il trouva une masse de rouleaux. Emportant ces rouleaux, il alla à Khom-mthiñ Bar-gyi bya-thañ ri-zur (nom de lieu?). Etant allé sous un rocher, il examina les rouleaux : ils étaient tous bouddhiques. Ces manuscrits, c'étaient des textes de *Prajñāpāramitā*. Le Saint (*dam-pa*) dit : "Puisque les *dākiñī* ont prophétisé [que je trouverai] des textes bon-po, je dois encore aller regarder". Ayant enveloppé les rouleaux dans un tissu doux (? *ras çad-po*), il les cacha sous un rocher, là où l'eau ne pouvait pas les atteindre. Il pensa : "Si je ne trouve pas de texte du Bon, je les « inviterai » (extraurai)".⁸⁰ Alors, ayant envoyé son serviteur en avant, il l'envoya pour dire au sacristain : "Ce soir, donne une lampe". Le Maître alla à la suite du serviteur. Le serviteur dit au sacristain : "Apporte une lampe". Alors, lorsqu'il alla dans le temple à la nuit noire, il y avait une bonne lampe. Tandis qu'il ouvrait la porte centrale des trois portes supérieures des quinze portes du trésor, il eut la vision claire des trois mondes. Ensuite, quand il regarda les manuscrits, comme ils étaient tous bon-po, il fut très content.

Il ne s'était pas rendu compte que le jour était levé. Alors qu'il disait : "Maintenant, que faire?",⁸¹ le serviteur dit : "J'ai un moyen". Après avoir grimpé sur [la statue de] Vairocana et avoir fait une corde de sa ceinture, il fit monter lHa-rje et le fit installer au dessus du trésor. Le serviteur resta derrière la

⁸⁰ On raconte assez fréquemment, pour les *gtor-ston* les plus anciens, qu'ils ont trouvé des *gtor-ma* bouddhistes, ou que les bouddhistes ont trouvé des textes bon-po. Généralement, ils les donnent à un « confrère », bouddhiste ou bon-po selon le cas. Je n'ai vu mentionné que pour bŽod-ston cette intention d'utiliser les textes bouddhiques s'il n'en trouvait pas de bon-po.

⁸¹ bŽod-ston est inquiet de se laisser prendre par le jour parce que mKho-mthiñ est un temple bouddhique : si les moines voient des Bon-po emporter des manuscrits, ils risquent de leur faire un mauvais parti. V. n. 93.

porte. On dit que ce jour-là, trois ou quatre [personnes] vinrent voir le temple (? la traduction n'est pas sûre). Le sacristain dit : "Ne restez pas [pendant] le jour, il faut partir. Si tous les moines s'aperçoivent [de votre présence], vous, vous serez tués, et moi aussi je serai probablement tué!". Sans l'écouter, la nuit à nouveau, après avoir allumé une lampe, il sortit en les examinant les *kha-byañ*. Alors, après les avoir sortis tous sans exception, pour les nombreuses richesses qui s'y trouvaient, l'aide dit : "Emportons-les!". lHa-rje répondit : "Les textes bon-po qui m'ont été donnés par les *dākiṇī*, je les invite (sors). Comme elles ne m'ont pas dit d'emporter les richesses, je n'emporterai pas les richesses. Même la cassette en or où se trouvaient les manuscrits, elles ne m'ont pas autorisé à l'emporter. Il est dangereux de l'emporter en possession personnelle". Mais sans que lHa-rje s'en aperçoive, le serviteur partit après avoir pris une planchette de cristal (couverture de livre?) d'une paire, dit-on.

Puis, étant sûr (que c'étaient des textes bon-po?), alors qu'ils repartaient à l'aube, comme ils rencontraient des gens qui irriguaient les champs, le maître s'enfuit du côté de Kha-khañ (?). Alors qu'il ne savait pas où était passé le serviteur, au bout d'un moment [il entendit] une voix qui disait : "Accueille-moi!" ; et comme le saint se dirigeait vers l'endroit où résonnait cette voix, il rencontra le serviteur et ils se disputèrent : (la traduction du passage suivant n'est pas sûre ; en particulier on ne sait pas qui parle) "Tout en connaissant le chemin, je suis resté dans la confusion. Ensuite je suis allé vers le bas (je suis descendu de la statue?) mais comme ils ne s'étaient pas aperçus qu'on était entré dans leur temple, . . . je suis resté immobile. Puis, sans savoir si c'était un arbre ou quoi, je suis parti en sautant" ; disant cela, ils se disputèrent.⁸²

Là-dessus, maître et serviteur partirent ensemble vers le haut [de la vallée]. Lorsque le ciel bleuit, au lever du jour, ils arrivèrent dans leur pays. Comme, après s'être reposé, [bŽod-ston] examinait les manuscrits, il les comprit pour la plupart. Comme il ne comprenait pas le *Thugs-gsañ ston-pa'i 'khor-lo*,⁸³ il disposa un grand cercle d'offrandes et adressa une prière aux *dākiṇī* : les *dākiṇī* vinrent en personne et après lui avoir donné l'initiation du Cercle (le *Thugs-gsañ* . . . ci-dessus), on dit qu'elles lui apprirent la méthode pour le lire. Comme lHa-rje lui-même demandait aux *dākiṇī* tout ce qu'il n'avait pas compris, les *dākiṇī* le lui expliquèrent ; et comme lHa-rje les écoutait, la transmission est ininterrompue.

Ensuite, il garda [les textes] secrets pendant trois ans. Trois ans s'étant écoulés, il libéra le sceau de la parole (il rompit le secret) et le dit à son père. On dit qu'il lui

⁸² Ce passage, qui ne se trouve pas dans les autres biographies, est difficile à comprendre, et probablement mal conservé.

⁸³ V. n. 60.

montra le manuscrit du *Dug-lña lam-'khyer*.^{83a} Au bout de quatre ans, le père alla à 'O[r]-thañ.^{83b} Comme il avait de nombreuses conversations avec 'Or-ston dBañ-phyugs grags, lHa-rje Grags-gsum (le père) lui dit : “bŽod-ston dNos-grub grags possède beaucoup de manuscrits dont il dit qu’il les a extraits en trésors du temple de mKho-mthiñ. Il a des tas de manuscrits d’enseignements qui font obtenir l’état de *buddha* en emportant sur le chemin, sans les rejeter, les cinq poisons”.

— Vraiment? [dit l’autre].

— Vraiment.

— Est-il sûr qu’il les a?

— C’est sûr.

Alors 'Or-ston dBañ-phyugs grags, chevauchant le cheval nommé Nñ-pa 'bum-thañ, partit vers le sud en compagnie de lHa-rje Grags-gsum, pour demander les enseignements. lHa-rje Grags-gsum dit : “Ne dis pas que c’est moi qui ai dit : il a des manuscrits. Il m’arriverait du mal”. Les deux s’étant séparés, il partit à sMan-thañ.

Alors, 'Or-ston étant allé à Goñ-bu, il offrit son cheval à lHa-rje et dit : “Comme vous avez dit : Après avoir extrait des trésors, j’ai les enseignements profonds appelés *Dug-lña lam-'khyer*, veuillez réfléchir à me les donner”. Comme il lui faisait cette demande, lHa-rje répondit : “Qui t’a dit que j’ai extrait des trésors? Je n’ai pas extrait de trésor, je n’ai rien de cette sorte”, et il ne les lui donna pas.

Etant resté en haut [de la vallée] quelques jours, comme il lui demandait encore et que [bŽod-ston] ne lui donnait pas, l’autre dit : “Même si vous n’avez pas d’enseignement de trésors, je vous offre ce cheval”. [bŽod-ston] répondit : “Garde ton cheval, je n’en veux pas”. Alors que, en disant : “Si vous avez des enseignements extraits d’un trésor, pensez-y! Si vous n’en avez pas, il n’y a rien à faire!”, laissant son cheval il partit, le Saint partit derrière lui à cheval. [L’ayant rattrapé] il lui dit : “Ne gaspille pas ton cheval, et fais des préparatifs pour le papier et le scribe”. [L’autre] craignant qu’il ne change [d’avis] par la suite dit : “J’irai en chevauchant le cheval de lHa-rje. Comme je vous ai offert Nñ-pa bum-thañ, je le laisse”, et il retourna dans son pays.

Alors, deux mois s’étant écoulés, lHa-rje ayant été invité il fit tourner la roue du Bon. [’Or-ston] lui demanda les textes avec leur sens, tous sans exception. [Ainsi] le premier qui lui demanda fut 'Or-ston dBañ-phyugs grags. »

^{83a} Autre titre, abrégé, du *Thugs-gsañ ston-pa'i 'khor-lo*, ci-dessus. V. le titre complet dans Karmay 1977, p. 102, n° 47.

^{83b} Dans le Yar-'brog d’après la p. 90 du *dGoñs-rgyud*.

La suite du *dGoñs-rgyud* est consacrée aux disciples de bŽod-ston et à la transmission de la lignée, dont on a déjà tiré quelques éléments. En bref, la transmission est la suivante :

a. Transmission ordinaire (*thun-moñ-ba*) :

Quatre fils spirituels (*thugs-kyi sras bži*)

— Les deux frères 'Or-ston du Yar-'brog (dont dBañ-phyugs grags)

— Le Lama du gTam-çul, mÑe-ston, qui lui a servi de *ñe-gnas* pendant dix-huit ans

— Byar-pa 'Bum-khri 'od, du La-stod.

Quatre disciples qui étaient des moines savants (*mkhas-bcun bži*)

— Le Lama du gTam-çul, sÑi-ston

— Byar-pa bKra-çis 'od, du La-stod

— Žaň-ston Nam-mkha', de Çab

— Le Lama Jo-lde, du dBu-ru.

Sa descendance (que l'on a déjà citée)

— Son fils bŽod-ston sMon-lam grags

— Le fils de celui-ci : bŽod-ston bSod-nams grags

— Le fils de celui-ci : bŽod-ston bKra-çis rce.

Le fils spirituel de lHa-rje : lHo-pa Se-bo

Le fils spirituel de celui-ci : Bra-sgom Çes-rab 'bar.

b. Transmission particulière (*thun-moñ ma-yin-pa*) qui est une *gčig-brgyud* :

— bŽod-ston

— rGya-ston Jo-lde (le Lama du dBu-ru, ci-dessus)

— Žig-po snaň-ba seň-ge, *alias* bDe-ba riň-mo, rTog-med žig-po, rNal-'byor rTog-seň

— sKyo-ston sňags-dpal (du Ñaň-stod probablement), qui meurt à cent vingt ans

— g.Yo-ston lHun-grub dpal

— Son fils Žig-po 'brug-sgra. A cinquante ans, il fonde un monastère à sMan-luň Brag-dkar

— Bon-žig blo-bde, fonde un monastère à sMan-phug

— Son fils spirituel (et neveu) rTogs-ldan g.Yuň-druň rin-čhen, né une année du rat (*byi-pa lo-pa*)

— L'*Ācārya* bŽod-pa

— l'*Ācārya* Chul-bkra luň-rigs

— Le *mkhas-bcun* (moine savant) Çes-rab grub.

c. Les deux maîtres de l'auteur du *dGoñs-rgyud* (?), détenteurs de la « petite transmission » de Jo-lde :

— Gu-ru Yon-tan señ-ge

— Rañ-grol bla-ma rgyal-mchan.

Malgré sa longueur j'ai cité cette biographie en entier car on trouve rarement un morceau qui reflète avec tant de verve l'atmosphère dans laquelle se mouvaient les *gter-ston*. Pour la vie de bŽod-ston, si les grandes lignes restent les mêmes par rapport au récit de son petit-fils, le temps a fait son œuvre et la légende s'est glissée dans l'histoire, pour en faire un morceau littéraire rempli de péripéties et de vivacité. Mais en comparaison avec la vie de Grub-thob dÑos-grub, on est frappé par l'abondance des renseignements et leur précision, notamment en ce qui concerne les disciples et la lignée de transmission, détails qui n'ont pu être inventés. Malheureusement ces personnages, on l'a dit, ne sont pas connus en dehors de la vie de bŽod-ston et seuls d'éventuels recoupements ultérieurs permettront de mieux les situer.

Mais l'intérêt de la liste des disciples dressée ci-dessus est de mettre en lumière un absent de taille, si bŽod-ston est Grub-thob dÑos-grub : Ñañ-ral Ñi-ma 'od-zer. On a dit plus haut que la « petite transmission » échue à Jo-lde avait fini transformée en bouddhisme. Il reste donc à voir l'histoire de cette « petite transmission », dont le premier récit se trouve dans le *ITa-ba'i stoñ-thun*.⁸⁴ Après que bŽod-ston ait extrait les trésors,

« il enseigna à tous les textes des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, mais ce *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*, il ne le montra à personne.

Dans un pays du dBus appelé rGya-lde, le Lama de rGya nommé Khri-mkhar avait un fils appelé rGya bla-ma Jo-lde qui, en général vénérât le Bon des tantra et, en particulier, vénérât le *rJogs-chen*. Ce garçon avait un grand-père appelé rGya bla-ma Khri-bcun qui était un bon méditant. Sur le chemin en y allant,⁸⁵ [Jo-lde] eut une prophétie des dBal-mo (= Bya-ra-ma gsum) : « O toi ! Une émanation de sTag-ra klu-goñ appelée dÑos-grub grags, fils de bŽod-ston IHa-tho (*sic*), a extrait d'un trésor un texte du Bon qui fait obtenir l'état de *bouddha* en une vie, appelé *sÑan-brgyud Yañ-rce*. Comme il le garde sans le montrer à quiconque, vas-y : tu as un lien karmique avec ces enseignements. »

Comme il y allait en pensant : « Qu'est-ce que cela ? » et qu'ayant rencontré bŽod-ston il le questionnait, bŽod-ston dit : « Je l'ai, mais je ne l'ai montré à

⁸⁴ *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*, texte n° 12, pp. 445–448. J'indique en note les variantes du *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bcad* de sPa-bcun bsTan-rgyal bzañ-po qui suit de très près la leçon du *ITa-ba'i stoñ-thun*.

⁸⁵ Le *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bcad* est plus clair : « Alors que son grand-père rGya bla-ma Khri-bcun était à Khom-thiñ pour méditer... »

personne.”⁸⁶ Comme Jo-lde regardait onze manuscrits qu’il lui montrait, la connaissance véritable (*ñes-ces*) naquit aussitôt en lui. Il se réjouit et offrit à bŽod-ston deux onces et demi d’or qu’il avait, un vieux cheval chargé de deux charges de sel qu’il possédait, et un vêtement en serge du dBus. Alors bŽod-ston lui donna à copier les manuscrits des Instructions (*žal-gdams*) . . . ,⁸⁷ quatre [rouleaux] en tout.

Après qu’il eut copié les manuscrits [Jo-lde] pensa : “Quelque individu risque de les emporter!” Comme c’était trop dangereux⁸⁸ et qu’il n’osait pas en délivrer l’explication autant qu’il voulait, il (?) dit : “C’est la première petite diffusion.” Alors, en prenant à l’intérieur de la grande transmission [des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*], il fit cette transmission moyenne [du *lTa-ba’i stoñ-thun*] et, avec la plus petite, il diffusa les deux en les enseignant à quelques-uns. Ensuite, n’osant pas conserver les manuscrits, il les cacha à bDud-’dul lha-khañ. Puis le Lama Jo-lde mourut à cinquante-sept ans. Il avait un disciple appelé g.Yuñ-druñ dpal qui prisait les grands textes de base (?),⁸⁹ et qui les emporta. Où il partit, on ne le sut pas ».

La fin du texte est consacrée aux tribulations des descendants de Jo-lde à la recherche de ces textes. Il n’y est pas question de bouddhistes. C’est donc seulement dans les ouvrages historiques bon-po que le « détournement » de la tradition est indiqué. Ce sont eux que l’on examinera maintenant.

De ceux-ci, le plus ancien est le *bsTan-pa’i rnam-bčad* de sPa-bcun bsTan-rgyal bzañ-po — qui est la source principale du *Legs-bčad mjod* pour l’histoire du *lHo-brag-ma* — mais l’établissement de sa date pose des problèmes que je n’ai pu résoudre. L’auteur figure dans le *Legs-bčad mjod* dans la transmission du *Žañ-žuñ sñan-brgyud*. Dans une note à sa traduction S.G. Karmay indique qu’il est l’auteur du *Žañ-žuñ sñan-brgyud-kyi lo-rgyus Bla-ma brgyud-pa’i rnam-thar čhen-mo*, et qu’il était un contemporain de Bru rgyal-ba g.yuñ-druñ (1242-1290 selon le *bsTan-*

⁸⁶ Le *bsTan-pa’i rnam-bčad* ajoute : « Toi tu es quelqu’un muni de bon karma ».

⁸⁷ Texte n° 13, vol. I, du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*; ce sont les instructions de Li-ču-stag-riñs. La suite des textes donnés à copier n’est pas claire. Dans le *bsTan-pa’i rnam-bčad* : bŽod-ston lui donne à copier quatre parts (?) d’enseignements qui étaient sous forme de rouleaux. Il y avait neuf textes : les deux, le grand et le petit, *Yañ-rce sñan-rgyud dmar-byañ*; les trois *Guñ-du phyuñ-ba’i sgron-ma* (cf. colophons du *Yañ-rce* : trois textes différents); les quatre *Man-ñag-gi sgron-ma*.

⁸⁸ A partir d’ici, le *bsTan-pa’i rnam-bčad* résume, et organise dans un ordre différent les lignées de transmission issues de Jo-lde.

⁸⁹ *gžuñ čhe-ba-la bstod-pa’i slob-ma*. Mais le *bsTan-pa’i rnam-bčad* : *Bru La-stod-pa’i slob-ma*, « un disciple de clan Bru dans le La-stod ». C’est un bon exemple de la difficulté d’interprétation de ces textes dont l’orthographe est si instable qu’on ne sait pas quelle leçon est la bonne. Les textes de base du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen* sont les n° 3 et 4 du vol. II : *Drañ-don žes-bya-ba’i gžuñ* et *Ñes-don žes-bya-ba’i gžuñ*.

rcis bon-po).⁹⁰ Dans son *Catalogue of Bonpo publications*,⁹¹ S.G. Karmay reprenant les indications du colophon sur ces bases détermine l'année de la rédaction : *çiñ-bya*, comme 1285 ou 1345. Mais ces dates ne correspondent pas au *bstan-rcis* final (pp. 767-768) établi d'après le comput de l'*Ācārya* rGyal-mchan dpal (?), qui aboutit à l'année 1487. Or cette année est une année *me-mo-lug* et non *çiñ-mo-bya*. Les années *çiñ-mo-bya* les plus proches étant 1465 et 1525 on obtient, semble-t-il, les deux seules dates possibles. Par ailleurs, sPa-ston bsTan-rgyal bzañ-po figure dans l'une des lignées de transmission du *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*, qui est une transmission « singulière » du maître à un seul disciple (*gčig-brgyud*).⁹² C'est une lignée bizarre qui passe directement de bŽod-ston à Gu-ru Yon-tan señ-ge, dont on a vu qu'il était le onzième détenteur de la transmission après bŽod-ston : il faut donc supposer qu'il a reçu la révélation directe de ce texte. Après lui, la lignée passe à 'Gro-mgon Či-par vir-ži (*sic*) dans lequel je suis tentée de reconnaître celui qui incite sPa-bcun à écrire son *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bčad* (p. 769) : Kyi-bcun Kro-ta ver-ži. Puis la lignée passe au *Vidyādhara* grand *nirmānakāya* sPa bsTan-rgyal bzañ-po. Après lui à mKhas-grub bDe-legs bzañ-po, puis Žaň-žuň Chul-khrims rgyal-mchan, scribe d'autres textes de la collection en qui je propose d'en voir le compilateur, et sans doute l'auteur du *dGoñs-rgyud*. Si cela est, le texte de sPa-bcun est antérieur au *dGoñs-rgyud* dont la date peut être fixée au XVI^e siècle.

Dans l'optique de cet article, il n'est peut-être pas sans signification de relever que sPa-bcun figure dans la lignée de transmission d'un texte d'instructions sur le *rGyal-thabs spyi-blugs-kyi dbaň*, que l'on va retrouver chez les rÑiň-ma-pa, et qu'il est le premier à parler de la « petite transmission » égarée chez les bouddhistes. Il le fait en ces termes :⁹³

⁹⁰ Karmay 1972, p. 24 n. 4. Le *rNam-thar chen-mo* a été édité dans les *Śaṭaṭiṭaka Series*, vol. 73.

⁹¹ Karmay 1977, p. 117.

⁹² *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*, vol. I, texte n° 6, pp. 309–332 : *rJogs-pa chen-po Yañ-rce kloñ-chen-gyi man-nag bčud-du phyuň-ba rGyal-thabs dbaň-gi khrid*.

⁹³ *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bčad*, p. 743. L'histoire du *lHo-brag-ma* se trouve pp. 740–744, et le *Legs-bčad mjod* la suit de très près. Je n'en donnerai donc pas la traduction. Comme dans la biographie écrite par le petit-fils de bŽod-ston, le lieu de naissance de celui-ci est Guň-phu au lHo-brag, mais le nom de son père est donné comme gŽod-ston lHa-tho. Le texte ajoute un détail nouveau : bŽod-ston entre dans les ordres à sKyid-mkhar. Il fonde un petit monastère à mKhar-ču'i brag. Comme aide pour extraire le trésor, il emmène avec lui le serviteur sourd sGom-chen g. Yuň-druň skyabs. Il y a deux lieux de cache dans le temple de mKo-mthiň : le cœur de Vairocana pour les *Luň-drug* des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, le trou du nombril de Hayagrīva pour le *sÑan-rgyud*, c'est-à-dire le *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*. Il extrait le trésor le quatrième jour du premier mois de printemps de l'année *sbrul*, serpent (erreur de copiste pour 'brug? de toute manière, le jour et la période de l'année sont différents de ceux donnés dans les autres sources). Il a des démêlés avec le *sde-pa* de mKho-mthiň qui l'accuse d'avoir pillé le trésor mais qui le laisse finalement partir quand il voit qu'il n'a que des textes bon-po. Suit la table des matières des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, avec des variantes par rapport au *Legs-bčad mjod* et à l'édition moderne de la collection. Mais cf.

« La petite transmission orale : comme [Jo-lde] l'enseignait à gÑag ĉhuñ-ba,⁹⁴ celui-ci l'enseigne à Ćhos-ston žig-po [qui était bouddhiste]. Celui-ci la pratiqua sans transformer le texte bon-po. Son disciple lĆe-ston gzuñs-grags le transforma en texte bouddhique ; il lui donna le nom de *rJogs-ĉhen thugs-kyi sñiñ-po* et le donna à A-po sñon-po qui l'offrit en « honoraires » d'initiation (*dbañ-yon*) à Zur Ćag-ĉhuñ⁹⁵. »

Ainsi, même lorsqu'il s'agit d'une tradition partagée avec les bouddhistes, ce n'est pas bŽod-ston qui la leur transmet, et Ñañ-ral ne se trouve pas parmi les disciples qui la reçoivent.

A l'exception de Kun-grol grags-pa dont on va reparler tout de suite, les auteurs bon-po ultérieurs dont les ouvrages historiques sont actuellement connus, ne font que reprendre les sources précédentes.⁹⁶ Il s'agit de Ćar-rja bKra-ĉis rgyal-mchan dont la rubrique consacrée au *lHo-brag-ma*⁹⁷ dans le *Legs-bĉad mjod* écrit à partir de 1922 s'appuie principalement sur le *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bĉad* de sPa-bcun comme dit précédemment, et incorpore des éléments tirés du *lTa-ba'i stoñ-thun* ; de dPal-

Kvaerne 1974 : le Catalogue du *bKa'-gyur* est différent aussi de l'édition moderne, et du manuscrit conservé à Londres. Il existe le même problème pour les *gter-ma* bon-po que pour les bouddhistes en ce qui concerne leur compilation.

Suit l'enseignement de bŽod-ston, la transmission à Jo-lde et l'histoire de celui-ci dont on a vu plus haut les variantes par rapport au *lTa-ba'i stoñ-thun*. Puis le texte décrit les différentes transmissions : la petite transmission orale, celle qui passe aux bouddhistes et celle qui reste de manière ininterrompue chez les Bon-po ; la grande transmission orale : la lignée particulière de Jo-lde (semblable au récit du *lTa-ba'i stoñ-thun*).

⁹⁴ Le *Legs-bĉad mjod* (Karmay 1972, p. 156) l'appelle rGya-ston gÑag-ĉhuñ. On se souvient que gÑag est le nom de clan de Grub-thob dÑos-grub selon Ñañ-ral. Dans le *Deb-sñon*, il y a un gÑags-ĉhuñ locāva à la fin du XI^e siècle (vol. I, p. 318), dans le lignage du *Ži-byed* (vol. II, pp. 872, 911), mais cela semble incompatible avec la date supposée de bŽod-ston. Les autres personnages sont inconnus.

⁹⁵ Zur Ćākya 'byuñ-gnas le Cadet. Le *Legs-bĉad mjod* (*ibid.*) extrapole semble-t-il, en l'appelant Ćākya 'byuñ-gnas de Zur-bo-ĉhe, c'est-à-dire 'Ug-pa luñ-pa, plus ou moins contemporain de Rin-ĉhen bzañ-po (cf. *Deb-sñon*, I, pp. 110–113). Peut-on appliquer l'épithète de « Cadet » à Zur Ćākya 'byuñ-gnas de Yañ-dben-pa et non de 'Ug-pa-luñ ? Il est cité (*Deb-sñon*, I, p. 151) dans une biographie de 'Jam-dbyañs bSam-grub rdo-rje (1295–1376) lequel, dans sa jeunesse, a été placé chez lui, qui était un grand savant réputé. Je n'ai pas trouvé d'autres informations sur lui. Les dates conviendraient mieux.

Le *Legs-bĉad mjod* dit qu'il déguisa son nom en nom de *gter-ston* : rDo-rje bžed-pa (inconnu des traditions bon-po et bouddhiste) et donna au texte transformé le titre *sÑan-brgyud thugs-kyi me-loñ* qui est encore pratiqué par tous les bouddhistes. Néanmoins, sous un titre ou sous l'autre, S. G. Karmay qui en a fait la recherche ne l'a pas trouvé.

⁹⁶ Le *rGyal-rabs bon-po* de 1439 (v. Karmay 1977, p. 118) n'offre pas d'intérêt ici puisqu'il ne consacre qu'un très court paragraphe aux *gter-ma*, dans lequel il ne cite que les premiers *gter-ston* bon-po : les A-ca-ra mi-gsum et gĆen-ĉhen Klu-dga'.

⁹⁷ Karmay 1972, pp. 154–156.

Idan chul-khrims, dont le *Bon-gyi bstan-'byuñ* a été écrit en Inde en 1970, et qui ne consacre que quelques lignes à chaque *gter-ston*. Sa notice sur bŽod-ston⁹⁸ ne fait que résumer les sources antérieures. Aucun de ces deux auteurs ne fait la moindre allusion à l'identification de bŽod-ston à Grub-thob. Or tous deux connaissaient parfaitement l'œuvre de Koñ-sprul : Çar-rja bKra-çis rgyal-mchan a pris part à la polémique soulevée par l'inclusion de *gter-ma* bon-po dans le *Rin-čhen gter-mjod*. Plus significatif encore, dPal-Idan chul-khrims a écrit en 1964 une Histoire du bouddhisme (*Čhos-'byuñ*). Il est évident à la lecture que le chapitre traitant très brièvement des biographies des *gter-ston*⁹⁹ n'est que le résumé du *gTer-ston brgya-rca* de Koñ-sprul, cité comme sa source principale p. 85. Et là, il est dit que Grub-thob dÑos-grub a découvert des *gter-ma* bon-po : *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, etc. Le silence des sources bon-po tardives est par conséquent volontaire. On en tirera les conclusions dans le bilan global.

Tout tendrait à prouver que les identifications de *gter-ston* bon-po et bouddhistes sont le fait de Koñ-sprul, si on ne rencontrait pas les mêmes chez un auteur bon-po du XVIII^e siècle, Kun-grol grags-pa. C'est un *gter-ston* né en 1700 selon le *bsTan-rcis bon-po*, qui appartient à la tradition des « Nouveaux trésors » (*gter-gsar*), totalement synchrétiques.¹⁰⁰ Il se trouve dans la lignée de transmission du *rJogs-čhen A-khrid* et sa biographie est insérée à ce titre dans le *Bla-brgyud* de ce système, écrit par Çar-rja bKar-çis rgyal-mchan¹⁰¹ : elle renvoie pour plus de détails à une biographie développée (*rnam-thar rgyas-pa*) qui ne nous est pas parvenue. Les prophéties l'annonçaient comme une réincarnation de Dran-pa nam-mkha', sous le nom Kun-grol grags-pa 'Ja'-chon sñiñ-po 'čhañ, d'où le deuxième nom sous lequel il est connu, 'Ja'-chon sñiñ-po. Il est entré dans les ordres à sMan-ri, mais il semble avoir vécu comme un yogin, parcourant tout le Tibet central. Il est présenté comme un grand siddha, et on chercherait en vain la moindre allusion à ses activités de découvreur de *gter-gsar*, ni il est vrai, à ses activités de *gter-ston*. Il est par ailleurs l'auteur d'une Histoire de l'origine de la doctrine générale des Bouddha (*Saṅs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuñ-khuñs*) dans laquelle il suit le plan habituel des ouvrages de ce type : origine du monde, des êtres, venue des Bouddha en ce monde, etc., mais en exposant successivement les données bon-po puis les données bouddhiques. L'intention réelle de cet exposé se révèle dans les deux derniers chapitres (40 et 41)

⁹⁸ Vol. II, pp. 201–204.

⁹⁹ *Čhos-'byuñ*, pp. 316–351.

¹⁰⁰ V. n. 31. Une liste incomplète de ses *gter-ma* est donnée dans le *Legs-bçad mjod* (Karmay 1972, p. 185). Une liste beaucoup plus complète se trouve à la fin de son propre *bsTan-pa spyi-yi 'byuñ-khuñs*.

¹⁰¹ *Man-ñag rin-po-čhe A-khrid-kyi bla-ma brgyud-pa'i rnam-thar*, texte n° 1, pp. 1–114, dans *rJogs-pa čhen-po sku-gsum rañ-çar-gyi khrid gdams skor*, Dolanji, 1974. La biographie de Kun-grol grags-pa se trouve pp. 88–93. (Sur ce système de méditation : Kvaerne 1973; Karmay 1977, pp. 178–181).

où il démontre que Bon et bouddhisme sont de même essence (*ño-bo gčig*), et où il explique le sens de l'expression : Bon et bouddhisme ne sont pas distincts (*dbyer-med*). Les chapitres qui nous intéressent ici sont le dix-septième : « La manière dont sont venus les *gter-ston* du Bon », et le dix-huitième qui est son pendant pour les *gter-ston* bouddhistes. Comme dans les œuvres analogues, c'est une succession de courtes notices biographiques avec l'indication des textes découverts par chacun. L'originalité de l'ouvrage réside dans les renvois que l'auteur fait d'un chapitre à l'autre pour identifier certains *gter-ston* bon-po avec des *gter-ston* bouddhistes. Lorsque l'on compare la liste des *gter-ston* bon-po/bouddhistes, et la formulation des rubriques qui leur sont consacrées, il paraît sûr que l'on tient là la source, non indiquée par Koñ-sprul, de ses identifications dans le *gTer-ston brgya-rca*. Néanmoins, certaines identifications avancées par Kun-grol grags-pa, en particulier celle des premiers découvreurs bon-po, les A-ca-ra mi-gsum, avec le premier *gter-ston* bouddhiste, Sañs-rgyas bla-ma, sont si surprenantes que Koñ-sprul a préféré ne pas en parler. Voici ce qu'a écrit Kun-grol grags-pa de bŽod-ston et de Grub-thob :

« bŽod-ston Grub-thob dños-grub grags¹⁰² a mis au jour du dos de la statue de Vairocana dans le lHo-brag beaucoup de textes bon-po de la section *Sems-phyogs*, à savoir : les *rJogs-čhen grags-pa [skor]-gsum* pourvus des écrits et sons célestes (révélation?), le *rJogs-čhen Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*, les textes complets des *Mar-byañ*, le grand et le petit,¹⁰³ les *sādhana* de la forme exotérique, ésotérique et secrète de lHa-mo.¹⁰⁴ Les *gter-ma* bouddhiques qu'il a sortis de sous le pied du Hayagrīva de la chapelle principale (*gcañ-khañ*) au Jo-khañ sont visibles parmi les textes bouddhiques [plus loin] ».

« Grub-thob dÑos-grub drag-po¹⁰⁵ sortit de sous le pied du Hayagrīva de la chapelle principale à Lhasa, différentes parties des enseignements du Roi selon le Dharma Sroñ-bcan sgam-po, qui comportent le Cycle des *sūtra*, le Cycle des *sādhana* et le Cycle des instructions [royales]. Dans le *Lo-rgyus čhen-mo* de la

¹⁰² P. 318. Aucune des autres sources ne donne un tel nom pour bŽod-ston. Elles lui attribuent parfois l'épithète *grub-thob*, mais comme simple qualificatif : *grub-thob 'di*, « ce siddha ». Kun-grol grags-pa en faisant de *grub-thob* une partie du nom du *gter-ston*, intercalée entre bŽod-ston et dÑos-grub, met sur la voie de l'identification qu'il va faire avec le bouddhiste.

¹⁰³ Ces textes font partie de l'édition actuelle du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*.

¹⁰⁴ *Sādhana* de dBal-mo et des Bya-ra-ma gsum, ajoutés dans l'édition actuelle à la suite du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*.

¹⁰⁵ P. 367. A nouveau, on a l'impression que Kun-grol grags-pa arrange le nom de Grub-thob pour le faire coïncider avec celui de bŽod-ston : *drag-po* évoque le *grags* (de même prononciation) qui termine le nom du Bon-po.

partie *Sūtra*, il y avait trente-six chapitres ; dans la partie des *sādhana* il y avait l'introduction, le texte principal et les rituels accessoires (*las-chogs*). Du temple de mKho-mthiñ dans le lHo-brag sont apparus les trésors qui étaient derrière le dos et dans la paume de la main de Vairocana : soixante-douze rituels auxiliaires ordinaires, deux-cent trente-sept enseignements de purification (? *khoñ-sbyaṅs*). La façon dont il a extrait des *gter-ma* bon-po est exposée plus haut ».

Ici encore, aucune source bouddhiste n'a parlé de textes découverts par Grub-thob à mKho-mthiñ. Il faut remarquer d'ailleurs la manière dont Kun-grol grags-pa insère cette information : il n'emploie pas la formule habituelle « il a extrait » ou « il a invité », mais « les trésors sont apparus ». Comme nous, il savait que Ñaṅ-ral, disciple de Grub-thob, avait extrait les *bKa'-brgyad bde-gcegs 'dus-pa* de mKho-mthiñ, plus précisément du pouce de la statue de Vairocana ; d'autres *gter-ston* bouddhistes ont aussi découvert des textes dans ce temple (voir plus loin Gu-ru Ye-ces khyuñ-grags). Par ailleurs, toutes les biographies de bŽod-ston s'accordent pour dire que les premiers textes sortis par lui étaient bouddhiques et qu'il les a remis en place. Alors que nous serions tentés d'imaginer si Grub-thob et bŽod-ston sont le même personnage, que ces textes étaient les *bKa'-brgyad* dont Grub-thob aurait révélé l'existence à Ñaṅ-ral (ce qui n'est attesté nulle part), il semble que Kun-grol grags-pa pour sa part a extrapolé en suggérant que Grub-thob avait mis au jour des textes bouddhiques à mKho-mthiñ.

Il est intéressant de trouver un siècle avant Koñ-sprul un texte qui identifie les *gter-ston* ayant joué un rôle dans les deux traditions, bon-po et bouddhiste, et de déterminer que Koñ-sprul y a puisé ses propres identifications, mais on ne peut l'accepter sans réserve : il cherche trop visiblement à réduire le Bon et le bouddhisme à leurs éléments communs. On aura peut-être noté que, pas plus pour bŽod-ston que pour Grub-thob, il ne donne d'indication biographique précise, en particulier leur lieu de naissance, l'un dans le lHo-brag, l'autre dans le gCañ, précisions qui rendent impossible toute identification de l'un à l'autre. En outre, le silence des historiens bon-po modernes sur ce texte et ses affirmations — comme le remarque S.G. Karmay¹⁰⁶ le *Legs-bčad mjod* ne cite pas le *Saṅs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuñ-khuṅs* parmi les œuvres de Kun-grol grags-pa — bien qu'ils le connaissent à coup sûr, renforce le doute. Il faut tenir compte il est vrai, de la suspicion dans laquelle les Bon-po « orthodoxes » tiennent les « Nouveaux trésors » (*gter-gsar*), encore de nos jours, et qui peut expliquer leur silence.

Quoi qu'il en soit, Kun-grol grags-pa est le seul Bon-po à établir de tels rapprochements entre *gter-ston* bon-po et bouddhistes, et le problème qui se posait pour Koñ-sprul n'a fait que se déplacer sur lui : a-t-il une source, et laquelle? On a

¹⁰⁶ Karmay 1972, p. 185 n. 7.

laissé de côté jusqu'à présent l'ouvrage du Bon-po Kun-grol-pa cité dans le *mChan-tho* de mKhyen-brce'i dbaṅ-po. Cette citation pose un double problème, celui de l'auteur et celui de sa date. Elle débute ainsi : *Bon Kun-grol-pa'i Bon-gter brgya-rca'i gter-'byuṅ Ṅi-ma'i dkyil-'khor don Goṅ-lña'i gsan-tho-las*. . . (« Le sens de l'Histoire de l'apparition de la centaine de *gter-ston* bon-po, appelée Maṅḍala du soleil, du Bon-po Kun-grol-pa, d'après le Compendium des enseignements reçus du Goṅ-lña [est le suivant]. . . »). Suivent les identifications de *gter-ston* bouddhistes à des *gter-ston* bon-po telles qu'on les trouve dans le *Saṅs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuṅ-khuṅs* de Kun-grol grags-pa : Saṅs-rgyas bla-ma est les A-ca-ra mi-gsum, Khu-cha ston-pa des *bKa'-thañ* est Khu-cha zla-'od, *alias* g.Yu-thog Yon-tan mgon-po, Grub-thob dÑos-grub est bŽod-ston dÑos-grub, etc. On pouvait se demander si on ne tenait pas là la source de notre Kun-grol grags-pa, qui aurait été écrite par un représentant antérieur de sa lignée. Mais Kun-grol grags-pa est le premier de ce nom, le Lopön Tenzin Namdak et l'Abbé du monastère bon-po de Dolanji, Saṅs-rgyas bstan-'jin, sont formels sur ce point. Il doit donc être l'auteur de ce *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, bien que le titre et le texte soient inconnus des Bon-po contemporains. Reste le problème de l'auteur du *gSan-tho* qui le cite. Pour E.G. Smith avec qui j'ai discuté de ce passage, Goṅ-lña devait désigner le Cinquième Dalai-Lama (1617-1682). Mais alors la date de naissance de Kun-grol grags-pa donnée par le *bsTan-rcis bon-po* comme 1700 devait être révisée, et placée au minimum un cycle sexagénaire plus tôt, en 1640, pour la faire coïncider avec la vie du Cinquième. A première vue cela paraît difficile à croire : la tendance générale du *bsTan-rcis bon-po* est d'antidater les *gter-ston*, et non le contraire ; de plus, Kun-grol grags-pa s'inscrit dans une époque où la chronologie est beaucoup plus sûre. D'autre part, lorsque mKhyen-brce parle du Cinquième Dalai-Lama en d'autres endroits du *mChan-tho*, il l'appelle rGyal-dbaṅ lña-pa, et non Goṅ-lña (bien que Goṅ-sa lña-pa soit un vocable courant pour désigner le Cinquième Dalai-Lama) ; et le *gSan-yig* du Cinquième pourrait-il être appelé *gSan-tho* ? Enfin, les volumes 3 et 4 du *gSan-yig* où le Cinquième Dalai-Lama traite des *gter-ma* ne renferment pas la citation ci-dessus.¹⁰⁷ De manière plus déterminante encore, le *Saṅs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuṅ-khuṅs* contient un comput qui situe définitivement Kun-grol grags-pa bien après la mort du Cinquième Dalai-Lama : en *me-mo-sbrul* (1017) débute la diffusion médiane de la Doctrine bon-po avec les découvertes de gÇen-chen Klu-dga'. « Ensuite . . . en *me-yos* (1687) le *sDe-srid* Seigneur des hommes [Saṅs-rgyas rgya-mcho] composa ses traités *Vaidūrya*. Ensuite, dix-huit ans après, en *çin-mo-bya* (1705), le [personnage] principal de la diffusion postérieure de la Doctrine, le *nirmāṅakāya* Byañ-čhub rdo-rje (autre nom de Saṅs-rgyas gliṅ-pa, le Bon-po)

¹⁰⁷ J'ai pu analyser ces deux volumes avec l'aide de Yon-tan rgya-mcho que je remercie ici.

naquit. Ensuite, à quarante-neuf années humaines, en l'année *me-khyi* (1766) appelée *rNa-chen*, j'ai composé ce traité». ¹⁰⁸ En conséquence, le personnage que mKhyen-brce appelle Goñ-lña a dû vivre entre 1766 et le temps même de mKhyen-brce (1820-1892), mais il reste à trouver qui il est.

L'idée que l'on tenait une source antérieure à Kun-grol grags-pa est ainsi éliminée. Comme lui-même n'en cite aucune dans son Histoire de la Doctrine, il y a de fortes présomptions — sous réserve de la découverte toujours possible d'une source plus ancienne — pour que les identifications formelles des *gter-ston* bouddhistes à des *gter-ston* bon-po soient le fait de Kun-grol grags-pa. Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que, comme tous les *gter-ston*, qu'ils soient bouddhistes ou bon-po, c'était un visionnaire : son syncrétisme peut l'avoir amené, par le jeu des assimilations et des rapprochements, à avoir la «révélation» de l'identité des personnages. ¹⁰⁹ Il avait pour ce faire des modèles anciens dont on verra deux exemples plus loin, et le précédent des listes de *gter-ston* dans les *bKa'-than*.

On le voit, si les données biographiques sur bŽod-ston sont d'une grande précision par rapport au flou de la vie de Grub-thob, elles n'apportent aucun indice qui vienne étayer l'hypothèse de leur identité. Comme on l'a fait pour Grub-thob, il faut en dernier recours analyser les *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston.

2. Les *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston

Ce sont les deux collections *rJogs-chen-pa* des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* qui sont les textes de base (*gžuñ*) issus de Kun-tu bzañ-po, et du *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen* formé des instructions (*man-ñag*) pour la compréhension et la pratique des premiers,

¹⁰⁸ P. 548 : *de-nas . . . me-yos sDe-srid mi-yi dbañ | de-yi Bāidur bstan-bčos rcom | de-nas bčō-brgyad çin-mo byar | bstan-pa phyi-dar gco-bo-ste | sPrul-sku Byañ-čhub rdo-rje 'khruñs | de-nas mi-lo že-dgu'i dus | rNa-chen zes-pa me-khyi lor | kho-bos bstan-bčos 'di rcom-ste | . . .* 1017 concorde avec la date donnée par le *bsTan-rcis bon-po* pour les découvertes de gÇen-chen Klu-dga' (996–1035 selon lui), mais ici le découpage des périodes de l'histoire du Bon est inhabituelle : généralement la diffusion médiane s'étend de sPu-de guñ-rgyal à Khri-sroñ lde-bcan; la diffusion postérieure coïncide à peu près avec celle du bouddhisme et commence chez les Bon-po avec les découvertes des A-ca-ra mi-gsum et de gÇen-chen Klu-dga'. (Cf. la discussion et le jugement sur ce découpage dans Karmay 1972, p. 118). D'autre part, si *mi-lo že-dgu'i dus* désigne bien l'âge auquel Kun-grol grags-pa a rédigé son ouvrage, cela place sa naissance non pas en 1700, mais en 1718. Quant à 1705, c'est bien la date donnée par le *bsTan-rcis bon-po* pour la naissance de Sañs-rgyas gliñ-pa.

¹⁰⁹ Je compte poursuivre ailleurs la vérification des affirmations de Kun-grol grags-pa concernant les autres *gter-ston* à la fois bon-po et bouddhistes selon lui. L'une de ces affirmations est d'ores et déjà confirmée par le *gter-ston* lui-même : celle de l'identité de rDo-rje gliñ-pa et du bon-po Bon-žig g.yuñ-druñ gliñ-pa. (V. *rDo-rje gliñ-pa'i gter-čhos*, vol. IV, pp. 232, 421, 456, 485, etc., et surtout p. 233 : *čhos-kyi dus-na rDo-rje gliñ-pa ste | bon-gyi dus-na gYuñ-druñ gliñ -pa yin*, « Quand il s'agit de bouddhisme, je suis rDo-rje gliñ-pa; quand il s'agit de Bon, je suis gYuñ-druñ gliñ-pa »).

composées par Li-çu stag-riñs.¹¹⁰ Celui-ci cacha les deux collections dans le temple de mKho-mthiñ où bŽod-ston les remit au jour. Les deux collections sont analysées de manière détaillée dans Karmay 1977,¹¹¹ et la discussion de leur contenu doctrinal est hors de ma compétence : je relèverai ici seulement les points qui peuvent confirmer ou infirmer l'identité de bŽod-ston et de Grub-thob.

Les *rJogs-chen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* font partie de la trilogie de textes révélés qui portent le titre *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* : *Çer-phyin-*, *sPyi-spuñs-*, *rJogs-chen-*. Chacun de ces cycles a été proclamé sous trois formes différentes : en haut au pays des dieux (*steñ lha-yul du bsgrags-pa*), au milieu au pays des hommes (*bar mi-yul-du bsgrags-pa*), en dessous au pays des *klu* (*'og klu-yul-du bsgrags-pa*), d'où leur titre commun de Trois cycles de proclamations.¹¹² D'autres *gter-ston* se sont partagés la découverte de *Çer-phyin-* et *sPyi-spuñs-*, mais celle des *rJogs-chen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* est attribuée au seul bŽod-ston. On a relevé plus haut les contradictions internes et les interprétations différentes quant à la date de la découverte. La lecture des colophons des textes qui composent la collection fournit des détails que n'ont pas retenus les sources tardives : Li-çu stag-riñs est bien partout indiqué comme le dernier détenteur des textes à l'époque ancienne, et celui qui les cache en « trésors » ; les textes portent les signes des *gter-ma* : triple sceau à la fin (*rgya rgya rgya*), etc. Tous sont ponctués des deux cercles superposés : propres aux *gter-ma* rñiñ-ma-pa, mais inhabituels chez les Bon-po ; quelques-uns ont été remis par Li-çu stag-riñs au roi (Khri-sroñ lde-bcan) et au ministre royal (*rgyal-blon* Nam Ta-ra klu-goñ dont bŽod-ston est la réincarnation selon certaines versions?) avant de les cacher. Les « fouilles » de bŽod-ston à mKho-mthiñ ont duré trois jours, au cours desquels il a extrait les différents textes, non seulement de derrière la statue de Vairocana, mais aussi de son trône (*gdan-khri*), de son cœur, de la salle du trésor du sacristain (? *phyag-mjod-kyi dkor-khañ*).

Dans son édition actuelle, c'est une collection hétéroclite dans laquelle se trouvent des tantra, des explications doctrinales et rituelles, des chants mystiques (*mgur*), et même un « Synopsis, avec le texte de base et le commentaire, de la justification logique des enseignements ».¹¹³ Ce texte mérite qu'on s'y arrête un moment car il appartient au genre des *rcod-lan*, ou *dgag-lan*, réponse aux attaques dont une école ou une tradition sont l'objet : c'est une œuvre polémique dans laquelle la position doctrinale ou les objections des opposants sont citées avant de

¹¹⁰ V. la liste des *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston et leur classification dans Karmay 1972, pp. 315–316.

¹¹¹ pp. 100–106.

¹¹² V. Karmay 1972, p. 15 et n. 3.

¹¹³ *Man-nag luñ-gi chad-ma'i sa-gčod rca-'grel dan bčas-pa*, texte n° 42. Ce texte a été publié par ailleurs dans le volume *Gal-mdo*, v. Karmay 1977, pp. 142–143 : le texte de base est attribué à Kun-tu bzañ-po, le commentaire à Li-çu stag-riñs, «This work is concerned with the establishment of the validity of the *rDzogs-chen* theories through logical methods.»

les anéantir par la démonstration logique du bien-fondé de sa propre position. Il porte un titre en langue du *Žaṅ-žuiṅ*, de la Chine, de l'Inde (traduction mot à mot des termes qui forment le titre tibétain : *ūpadeśa-āgama-pramaṇa*), du Tibet. Le thème général, après la définition de ce qu'est le *Bon-sku* (équivalent du *Čhos-sku*, *Dharmakāya*, chez les bouddhistes) pour l'auteur, est l'identité des phénomènes (*snañ-ba*) et de la Vacuité (*stoñ-pa*), du Buddha primordial (*ye sañs-rgyas*) et des phénomènes, des êtres vivants et des *bouddha*, etc., ceci non seulement en vérité ultime (*don dam-pa*), ce qui est la position « orthodoxe » bouddhique et bon-po, mais aussi en vérité relative (*kun-rjob*). L'intérêt ici est de voir à quels adversaires s'adresse l'argumentation : il ne s'agit nullement des bouddhistes mais des « dialecticiens » (*rig-pa-čan*), opposés globalement sous le vocable de *phyi-rol-pa* (ceux qui sont à l'extérieur, hétérodoxes)¹¹⁴ au yogin qui possède par son expérience spirituelle une connaissance qui ne peut être égalée par le raisonnement. La polémique se situe donc dans la même perspective que chez les bouddhistes : c'est la défense du *rJogs-čhen*, sans distinction de Bon ou de bouddhisme, contre les attaques dont il est l'objet. Et de fait, en dehors de la définition de *Bon-sku* au début — mais tout à fait transposable à la définition de *Čhos-sku* chez les *rJogs-čhen-pa rñiñ-ma-pa* — et de la mention de Li-ču stag-riñs à la fin, rien ne permet de rattacher le texte au Bon.

Le premier texte de la collection offre un rapprochement beaucoup plus surprenant : c'est un tantra appelé *rGyud-kyi rgyal-po gser-gyi ru[s]-sbal g.yuñ-druñ thig-pa* (= *theg-pa*) *man-ñag rca-ba'i rgyud*, « Roi des tantra, Tortue d'or, *mūlatantra* des instructions du Véhicule du Svastika ». Il est inclus dans le Kanjur bon-po¹¹⁵, mais non dans l'analyse des *bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* du *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bčad* et du *Legs-bčad mjod*. C'est l'un des textes principaux de la collection selon S. G. Karmay. Or le même tantra se trouve dans le *rÑiñ-ma'i rgyud-'hum* sous le titre : *rGyud-kyi rgyal-po gser-gyi rus-sbal rdo-rje theg-pa rca-ba'i rgyud*, « Roi des tantra, Tortue d'or, *mūlatantra* du Vajrayāna »¹¹⁶. Cette découverte revient à Samten G. Karmay qui m'a généreusement autorisée à l'exploiter ici. Mis à part les invocations initiales, la terminologie (*Bon-sku* pour *Čhos-sku*, *g.yuñ-druñ-sems-dpa'* pour *hyañ-čhub sems-dpa'*, etc.), et les colophons, les deux textes sont mot pour mot identiques. Il s'agit d'un court tantra en trente chapitres qui expose les principes fondamentaux de la doctrine et de la pratique du *rJogs-čhen*.

¹¹⁴ La désignation de l'adversaire est le plus souvent *khyed* et *khyod*, « vous » et « toi », sans qu'il soit possible de déterminer si l'adversaire est collectif, ou si le texte répond à une attaque déterminée. Une fois, il est désigné comme *ča-sna-čan* (*ča-sna-čan na-re*, « ça-sna-čan dit ») : « muni d'un nez de chair », d'une trompe ? On pense à *Diñnāga*, le maître de la logique bouddhique.

¹¹⁵ Karmay 1977, p. 100.

¹¹⁶ *rÑiñ-rgyud*, Thimphu 1975, vol. I (*ka*), pp 598–628.

Le colophon du tantra bon-po n'est pas clair, même pour S. G. Karmay; en voici une tentative de traduction : « Moi, garçon soumis à ses passions, avide de richesses, emportant de l'or, le principal des cinq joyaux, je n'ai pas regardé à ma vie ce joyau, j'ai surmonté les difficultés : j'ai cherché les *rGyud-smad bĕo-lĕa* [du *rJogs-ĕhen*, section] *Sems*, qui sont l'essentiel des instructions de sens certain (absolu). Avec les lamas de gĈen-rab (= bon-po) Li, Mu-khod, sToñ, il a harmonisé les langues (de l'original et de la traduction) et j'ai établi la version sûre du texte. Que celui-ci soit diffusé à l'époque où surviendront au Tibet les trois périodes (?) d'obscurcissement mental. Triple sceau du *gter-ma*. Que les êtres obtiennent le Corps de svastika inaltérable. Bénédiction. Vertus. »¹¹⁷ Le *gter-ston* n'est pas indiqué, mais la tradition attribue la découverte à bĜod-ston. (Voir néanmoins n. 117.)

Le colophon du tantra bouddhique comporte aussi une première phrase dans laquelle on trouve un écho, et peut-être une interprétation, du colophon bon-po, mais qui n'est pas plus claire et que je ne peux pas traduire. La suite semble, par la ponctuation inhabituelle qui isole le verbe *bsgyur*, une interpolation du colophon bon-po : « Le Lama 'Jam-dpal bĕes-gĕnen (l'un des premiers maîtres indiens dans la lignée du *rJogs-ĕhen*) et moi Vairocana, nous avons harmonisé les langues (de l'original et de la traduction) et après avoir établi la version sûre du texte, nous l'avons traduit. Ensuite Khyuñ-grags l'a extrait du trésor au lHo-brag¹¹⁸ ».

Le nom complet de ce *gter-ston* est Gu-ru Ye-ĕes Khyuñ-grags, tel que l'identifie sans erreur possible mKhyen-brce : « Il a extrait le Roi des tantra, Tortue d'or »¹¹⁹; mKhyen-brce le place au premier cycle sexagénaire (1027–1086), parmi les contemporains de rĕNog Locĕva et de Milarepa. Est-ce le Khyuñ-po grags-pa du *Deb-sĕnon* (vol. 1, p. 96), fameux pour sa connaissance de l'école « ancienne » de logique, et qui se mesura à Dags-po dbañ-rgyal, disciple de Khu-ston brCon-'grus

¹¹⁷ L'édition du *Yañ-rce kloñ-ĕhen* que j'ai utilisée est fautive. La traduction est faite d'après une autre édition (Dolanji, sans date, vol. I, p. 50) dont S. G. Karmay m'a indiqué les lectures, signalées entre parenthèses dans le texte ci-dessous : *na- (nor) 'dod bu-pho ĕhags-sdañ bdag 'dra-yis ĩ rin-ĕhen lĕa-yi sĕiñ-po gser khyer-nas ĩ rin-ĕhen srog-la ma-'jem dka'-ba'i las-rnams rgal ĩ man-ĕag ĕes-pa'i sĕiñ-po hyuñ-ba sems rgyud-smad bĕo-pa lĕa (bĕo-lĕa) rcal (brcal = bcal?) ĩ Li Mu-khod sToñ gĈen-rab bla-ma dañ ĩ sgra-skad hstan (= hstun) -te ĕhan (= gtan) -la phab-nas yañ ĩ Bod-kyi yul-du rmoñs-pa chan-gsum hyuñ ĩ dus dar-bar ĕog ĩ rgya rgya rgya ĩ gro-rnams mi-'gyur g. yuñ-druñ sku thob ĕog ĩ bkra-ĕis-so ĩ dge'o ĩ Li mu khod stoñ est inconnu. Je suggère d'y voir le nom de trois traducteurs célèbres : Li-ĕa de l'Inde, Mu-khod du Ŝañ-Ĝuñ (Karmay 1972, p. 17) et sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-ĕhen du Ŝañ-Ĝuñ (*ibid.* p. 27) invité au Tibet par Dran-pa nam-mkha' sous le règne de Khri-sroñ lde-bcan. Le *Legs-bĕad mjod* (Karmay 1972, p. 150, texte pp. 308–309) attribue la découverte du *gSer-gyi rus-sbal* aux *gter-ston* Ra-ĕags et Ra-ljags : il fait partie des *rgyud-smad bĕu-bĕun*, et non *bĕo-lĕa* comme ici, que ces *gter-ston* auraient mis au jour.*

¹¹⁸ P. 628 : *ĕes-pa'i sĕiñ-po byañ-sĕms rgyud-mañ rca-gĕiis hcal* || 'Jal (= 'Jam)-dpal bĕes-gĕnen bla-ma dañ || *bdag 'dra Bai-ro-ca-na-yis* || *sgra-skad stun-te stan (= gtan)-la phab-nas kyañ* || *bsgyur* || *de-nas lHo-brag-nas Khyuñ-grags-kyi[s] gter-nas bton-pa'o* ||

¹¹⁹ mChan-tho, p. 217.

g.yuñ-druñ (1011–1075)? Il est connu aussi des Bon-po : c'est peut-être lui qu'annonce, mais de manière vague, une prophétie du *Srid-rgyud* dans laquelle sTon-rgyuñ mthu-čhen énonce ses dix-huit réincarnations (dont Kubilai!) : « Mon excellente émanation, de clan Khyuñ-po, de nom Grags-pa, ayant obtenu le Fruit parfait, fera résonner la Doctrine partout [comme] l'espace [est partout]. »¹²⁰ De son côté Kun-grol grags-pa lui consacre une rubrique (parmi les *gter-ston* bouddhistes), tout aussi imprécise : « Les initiations réunies qui s'appuient sur le parfum de l'encens des *gter-ma* extraits de La-yag brag (dans le gCañ) par Gu-ru Ye-ces Khyuñ-grags, et toutes les paroles qui s'appuient sur leur miel [ont été transmises par lui] à l'initié (?) le Jīnā Ye-ces rdo-rje¹²¹ ». On connaît déjà le caractère syncrétique de Kun-grol grags-pa, et j'espère montrer ailleurs que le *Srid-rgyud* appartient au même courant.

On trouve sur ce *gter-ston* des informations beaucoup plus complètes dans le *Byañ-bdag gsol-'debs*¹²² : dans la strophe du *gSol-'debs* proprement dit qui cite cinq *gter-ston* réincarnations de sNa-nam rDo-rje bdud-'joms, l'un des vingt-cinq disciples proches de Padmasambhava (*rje-'bañs ñer-lña*), son nom est donné comme dByil-ston Ye-ces Khyuñ-grags sañs-rgyas 'bar, fournissant ainsi son nom de clan, dByil, dans lequel on trouve de très célèbres *gter-ston* bon-po (Cf. par exemple dByil-ston dPon-gsas Khyuñ-rgod rcal, que Kun-grol grags-pa identifie à rGod-ldem). Le commentaire glose :

« Quant à Gu-ru Ye-ces Khyuñ-grags, il est né dans le Myañ-stod. Il a agi grandement pour le bien des êtres. Il rencontra O-rgyan Rin-po-čhe en personne [en vision] et il ouvrit successivement [les trésors] dont il avait reçu les catalogues (*kha-byañ*). Il “invita” des trésors de g. Yag-sñiñ-roñ, Brag-dmar gter-khuñ, rCibs gnas-gsar, Brag rdo-rje che-bstan (*sic*). En particulier, de g. Yag-sñiñ-roñ il sortit le *bKa'-brgyad khro-bo 'bar-ba*, le *Ži-khro don-gyi sñiñ-po* et leurs stages d'achèvement (*rjogs-rim*) ; de Brag-dmar gter-khuñ le cycle de *rDo-rje phur-pa* ; de derrière l'image de Yum čhen-mo à rCibs gnas-gsar, des pilules d'un brahmane sept-fois-né et les cycles (*čhos-skor*) d'Avalokiteśvara traduits à l'époque de la première diffusion de la Doctrine, à l'époque de la diffusion postérieure et à celle de la diffusion médiane.¹²³ Ainsi fit-il le bien des êtres [de

¹²⁰ *Srid-rgyud*, f. 110b : *ña'i mčhogi(s) sprul-pa-la | Khyuñ-po'i gduñ-rig[s] Grags-pa'i mchan | lhun-grub 'bras-bu mthar phyin-č'iñ | bstan-pa yoñsu nam-mkha' sgrogs |*

¹²¹ Je n'ai pas pu identifier ce Ye-ces rdo-rje, et la traduction n'est pas sûre. *Sañs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuñ-khuñs*, p. 376 : *Gu-ru Ye-ces khyuñ-grags-kyis | La-yag brag-nas gter drañs-pa'i | spos-dkar drir brien dbañ-sdud dañ | sbrañ-rcir brien-nas smras-čad rnam | dbañ-gyur rGyal-sras Ye-rdor la'o ||*

¹²² *gSol-'debs*, p. 66 ; commentaire, pp. 76–77.

¹²³ *sña-bsgyur phyi-bsgyur bar-bsgyur*. Cette division de la diffusion de la doctrine en trois périodes est habituellement celle du Bon. On la trouve parfois chez les auteurs rñiñ-ma-pa, mais elle est condamnée par les bouddhistes « orthodoxes ».

manière aussi étendue que] l'espace. De Brag rdo-rje che-brten dans le Çañsmda' il trouva l'*amṛta* de longue vie et le donna à Zur-pa¹²⁴. Zur-pa l'offrit au roi de Chine et fit de manière incommensurable le bien des êtres. Ses descendants demeurent dans le Myañ mais sa lignée spirituelle est éparpillée dans le dBus, le gCañ et le Khams».

Le *gSer-gyi rus-sbal* ne se trouve pas parmi les *gter-ma* énumérés. En revanche le Cinquième Dalai-Lama dans la partie de son *gSan-yig* consacrée aux transmissions *rJogs-chen-pa* qu'il a reçues, dans la section *Sems-sde*, analyse brièvement les trente chapitres du Roi des tantra, Tortue d'or, *mūlatantra* du Vajrayāna. Puis il cite le colophon du texte en ces termes :

« A la fin de ce [tantra] il y a : “Le Lama 'Jam-dpal bces-gñen et moi Vairocana, l'ayant mis en langue facile, avons établi la version sûre. Si l'une des trois grandes périodes d'obscurcissement mental apparaît au Tibet, invitez-le (sortez-le) ici. [Le texte] a été remis entre les mains du Roi souverain lui-même (Khri-sroñ lde-bcan). Qu'il soit diffusé au temps des trois périodes (?) d'obscurcissement mental”. (Fin de citation). Le grand traducteur Vairocana le traduisit, le cacha en trésor dans le temple de mKho-mthiñ au lHo-brag. Gu-ru Ye-çes Khyuñ-grags et sBa Çrī-ratna l'ont “invité” (extrait)». ¹²⁵

La mention de ce sBa Çrī-ratna ne fait qu'ajouter un problème de plus car il ne peut s'agir, sauf confusion de la tradition dont le Cinquième Dalai-Lama est le détenteur, de sBa Ratna, identifié par certains à sBa gSal-snañ, auteur du *sBa-bžed* et conseiller de Khri-sroñ lde-bcan. Mais ce qui est digne d'intérêt ici est que, si la première phrase du colophon copié par le Cinquième Dalai-Lama est semblable à celle du *rÑiñ-rgyud*, la suite est identique au colophon bon-po. En outre, les indications sur le lieu où a été caché le texte et sur le *gter-ston* ne font pas partie du colophon tel qu'il a été copié, mais proviennent d'une autre source. Enfin, le temple de mKho-mthiñ ramène à bŽod-ston. Il est probable que le Cinquième Dalai-Lama utilisait la compilation du *rÑiñ-rgyud* faite par Ratna gliñ-pa, et que le colophon du

¹²⁴ L'identification de ce personnage reste à faire. Est-ce le Ye-çes rdo-rje de Kun-grol grags-pa? En tout cas, la famille Zur semble avoir eu dès l'origine (v. la vie de 'Ug-pa luñ-pa dans le *Deb-sñon*, I, pp. 110–113) des liens avec les Bon-po. V. aussi n. 95.

¹²⁵ *gSan-yig*, vol. IV, pp. 470–471 : 'di'i mjug-tu | 'Jam-dpal bces-gñen bla-ma dañ | bdag-'dra Bai-roca-na-yis | sla-skad bstan-te mchan-la phab || Bod-kyi yul-du rmoñs-pa chen gsum 'byuñ-ba cha mchis-na 'dir drañs mña'-bdag rgyad-po (sic) ñid-kyi phyag-tu phul | rmoñs-pa chan-gsum dus-na dar-bar çog çes snañ-la | Lo-chen Bai-ros bsgyur-te lHo-brag mKho-mthiñ lha-khañ-du gter-du sbas-pa Gu-ru Ye-çes khyuñ-grags dañ sBa Çrī ra-tnas spyan drañs-so || (Je dois à S. G. Karmay la communication de cette référence).

gSer-gyi rus-sbal était alors tel qu'il l'a copié. Ce serait donc 'Jigs-med gliñ-pa qui l'aurait modifié au XVIII^e siècle en éditant le *rÑiñ-ma'i rgyud-'bum*.

Il serait vain d'entrer dans la querelle qui oppose Bon-po et bouddhistes pour savoir de quel côté se trouve le plagiat. Il faudrait d'abord pour cela avoir une chronologie sûre des deux *gter-ston*, et authentifier leurs découvertes. Il est plus intéressant de constater que si Kun-grol grags-pa est l'auteur de l'identification bŽod-ston/Grub-thob, il avait dans ces références qu'il connaissait certainement une autre série d'éléments qui pouvaient l'inciter à assimiler les deux personnages, à condition qu'il commence par rapprocher Grub-thob de Gu-ru Ye-ces Khyuñ-grags. Car, parmi les textes transmis par celui-ci figurent, comme pour Grub-thob, des enseignements des *bKa'-brgyad*, et trois cycles de textes dédiés à Avalokiteśvara. Le fait qu'il soit en même temps bon-po, au moins d'origine, est suggéré par son nom de clan et la prophétie du *Srid-rgyud*, si c'est bien lui qu'elle désigne. Enfin, le fait que pour les bouddhistes il ait découvert le *gSer-gyi rus-sbal* à mKho-mthiñ peut amener un Bon-po, me semble-t-il, à considérer que sous un nom bouddhiste il est le même que bŽod-ston qui, dans sa tradition a découvert le tantra au même endroit. (Le problème des noms multiples des *gter-ston* sera évoqué dans les conclusions).

Il reste à vérifier si la deuxième collection découverte par bŽod-ston, le *rJogs-chen Yañ-rce kloñ-chen* fournit d'autres indices à notre enquête. Son édition moderne en deux volumes (v. n. 111) ajoute un certain nombre de textes apparentés, dédiés à la propitiation de Li-çu stag-riñs ou des Bya-ra-ma gsum, les divinités gardiennes du *gter-ma*. Le rapport du *Yañ-rce kloñ-chen* aux *rJogs-chen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum* ressort du début du *lTa-ba'i stoñ-thun* (vol. I, texte n° 12) dont il a été question plus haut : ce sont des instructions (*man-ñag*) composées par Li-çu stag-riñs dépositaire de la transmission des *rJogs-chen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*, pour la pratique et l'explication de ceux-ci. Ce ne sont pas des commentaires, mais des textes techniques : description des rituels de l'initiation (*dbañ*), exercices de yoga, explication de termes spécifiques, authentification de la tradition par l'histoire de sa transmission (cf. le *dGoñs-rgyud* plus haut) et la répétition de la lignée attachée à chaque texte.

Bien que la découverte de l'ensemble de la collection soit attribuée à bŽod-ston, une lecture attentive permet d'apporter quelques corrections à l'analyse qu'en fait Karmay 1977 et à la table des matières de l'édition moderne. En particulier, plusieurs textes sont très clairement présentés comme des *gter-ma* de Jo-lde, le disciple principal de bŽod-ston. Le contenu du premier texte : l'histoire de la transmission (*dGoñs-rgyud*), et celui du douzième (*lTa-ba'i stoñ-thun*), dans le volume I, ont été précisés dans la biographie de bŽod-ston. Chacun des autres textes présente un grand intérêt car, du fait de leur caractère explicatif, ils fournissent au « profane » nombre de clés pour comprendre la terminologie, les

concepts et les pratiques du *rJogs-chen*. Mais leur exposé est hors du cadre de cet article. Il faut seulement faire la même remarque que pour le tantra *gSer-gyi rus-sbal* : en dehors d'un vernis bon-po (formules invocatoires, noms propres bon-po...) rien ne distingue ces textes de ce qu'ils pourraient être, dans la tradition *rJogs-chen-pa* bouddhiste. Et pour terminer, on examinera seulement le texte n° 2 (pp. 101–157), et les textes n° 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, du volume I qui lui sont apparentés selon S. G. Karmay. (Le texte n° 4 aussi, me semble-t-il).

Le texte n° 2 porte le titre : *rGyal-thabs spyi-blugs-kyi dbaṅ*, «Initiation de l'onction générale, méthode royale (?)». Contrairement à ce que dit Karmay 1977, un passage du texte (p. 114) indique que Li-çu stag-riṅs l'a caché et que dans les derniers cinq cents ans de la Doctrine, par la force de son vœu, le trésor sera ouvert et un disciple excellent le diffusera : c'est donc un *gter-ma*. Le nom du *gter-ston* n'est pas donné mais seulement la lignée de transmission à partir de Jo-lde. Ce *dbaṅ* est celui de l'initiation au *Yaṅ-rce kloṅ-chen* et aux *rJogs-chen bsGrags-pa skor-gsum*. Il peut être conféré à trois niveaux (exotérique, ésotérique, secret), avec ou sans *maṅḍala*. A cause des mauvaises dispositions des êtres à venir, il est fait obligation de le tenir secret. Les qualités des disciples dignes de le recevoir sont exposées, puis commence le rite proprement dit (p. 115). Celui-ci comporte les parties suivantes : prières (*gsol-'debs*) ; invitation (*spyan-draṅs*) de Kun-tu bzaṅ-po et sa parèdre, avec leur entourage ; confession des péchés (*sdig-bçags*) ; offrandes (*mçhod-pa*) qui sont des offrandes mentales, du *mantra* ; louanges (*bstod-pa*). Puis sont décrits les ingrédients nécessaires à la *siddhi* (*dños-grub-kyi rjas*). Après ces préliminaires dont la structure est commune à tous les rituels, vient le rituel d'initiation proprement dit, qui se termine par l'appel de la descente de l'efficiencia du *dbaṅ* (*dbaṅ-byin dbab-pa*) : après avoir conféré l'initiation, le Lama se lève, revêt les vêtements de l'initiation ornés d'ossements et de têtes rouges (fraîches) ; il joue du tambourin fait de calottes crâniennes (*thod-rña*), des petites cymbales (*sil-sñan*) et de la flûte (*gliṅ-bu*) ; il fait des fumigations de *si-la* (?), de graisse humaine (*chil-chen*) et d'encens (*spos-dkar*), et il invite successivement tous les Lamas de la lignée (à commencer par Li-çu stag-riṅs et jusqu'à Bon-žig blo-bde) à faire descendre l'efficiencia du *dbaṅ* sur les impétrants. La même lignée de transmission est reprise lorsque le Lama donne l'initiation de la lignée (*brgyud-pa'i dbaṅ*). Enfin, le texte renferme une série de *mantra* qui ont l'air tout à fait bouddhiques, et l'exposé des mérites de *a-li ka-li* (pp. 150—154) mis dans la bouche de Li-çu stag-riṅs, mais que l'on pourrait trouver de la même façon dans un texte bouddhique.

Quant aux textes subsidiaires, ils précisent certains points de ce *dbaṅ* : visualisation de Li-çu stag-riṅs avec méditation sur le Lama (texte n° 3) ; explication sur les trois sortes de partenaires féminines (*mudrā*, texte n° 4) ; enseignements sur la pratique du *dbaṅ* (texte n° 5) ; enseignements sur l'initiation de *rca-rluṅ* (texte n° 6) ; ce yoga où l'on fait passer le *rluṅ* dans l'artère centrale est l'une des techniques sur

lesquelles s'appuie le *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*. Cf. textes n° 9, 10, 11, du vol. I, qui y sont consacrés); exposé général sur les quatre *dbañ* du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen* (texte n° 7), et instructions secrètes des cinq *Jīna* (*Rigs-lña*, texte n° 8).

La raison pour laquelle ces textes présentent de l'intérêt, outre leur similitude dans la structure et la terminologie avec un texte bouddhique, est que le *rGyal-thabs spyi-blugs-kyi dbañ* est aussi l'initiation suprême du *rJogs-čhen* chez les *rÑiñ-ma-pa*. La première mention que j'en ai trouvé est dans le plus ancien *bKa'-thañ* connu, le *Zaṅs-gliñ-ma* « découvert » par *Ñañ-ral Ñi-ma 'od-zer* : lorsque *Vairocana* se rend en Inde auprès de *Śrī-siṃha* pour obtenir les enseignements du *rJogs-čhen*, *Śrī-siṃha* lui confère ce *dbañ* avant de lui délivrer les enseignements¹²⁶. On le retrouve dans les *bKa'-thañ* du XIV^e siècle, notamment dans le *Blon-po bka'-thañ* qui énumère les différentes initiations dans la tradition *rÑiñ-ma-pa*, et le *Lo-paṅ bka'-thañ* qui reprend ces initiations en leur donnant une tournure plus orthodoxe.¹²⁷ Il est probable qu'une recherche plus approfondie dans la littérature du *rJogs-čhen* *rñiñ-ma-pa* fournirait des « instructions » concernant le *rGyal-thabs spyi-blugs-kyi dbañ* comparables à celles du *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen* et peut-être, comme dans le cas du tantra *gSer-gyi rus-sbal*, identiques.

Enfin, si l'on jette un coup d'œil aux vingt-deux textes apparentés ajoutés dans l'édition moderne au *Yañ-rce kloñ-čhen*, ce sont des *gter-ma* « redécouverts par les *Ban-dhe mi-gsum* (c'est-à-dire *Sum-pa Byañ-chul*, *'Bru Chul-señ*, *gČer-bu dbañ-phyug*, XII^e siècle) à *Yer-pa*, excepté les textes n° 20 et 22 qui appartiennent aux découvertes de *bŽod-ston dNos-grub grags-pa* ».¹²⁸ Or les *Ban-dhe mi-gsum* (les Trois moines bouddhistes) de la tradition *bon-po*, réincarnations de *Vairocana* selon une prophétie du *Srid-rgyud*, sont de manière indubitable (leurs noms sont identiques) les personnages connus dans la tradition bouddhique sous le vocable collectif de *gTer-ston sum-chogs* (le « Groupe de trois *gter-ston* »), que *Koñ-sprul* place au cinquième cycle sexagénaire (1267–1326).¹²⁹ Quant au texte n° 22, qui est un rituel terrible pour exciter les *Bya-ra-ma gsum* et les inciter à tuer (*bsgral*) les ennemis qui créent des vues fausses pendant qu'on pratique la réalisation de *gČen-lha 'od-dkar*, il comporte un court colophon qui a échappé à *S. G. Karmay* : « [Ce] trésor de *sPa-dro* (= *gro*) a été extrait par *Ku-sa sman-pa* ». C'est le nom d'un *gter-*

¹²⁶ *Zaṅs-gliñ-ma*, p. 451 : *rgyal-thabs spyi-blugs-kyi dbañ bskur*.

¹²⁷ *Blon-po bka'-thañ* : chap. 9, *Lo-paṅ bka'-thañ* : chap. 33.

¹²⁸ *Karmay* 1977, p. 105.

¹²⁹ *V. Karmay* 1972, pp. 152–153, et pp. 311–312 pour la liste de leurs *gter-ma*; *Koñ-sprul*, *gTer-ston brgya-rca*, pp. 272–274. D'après les textes à un *Bon-po* qui les aurait transmis dans son école : *Milarepa* figure dans la lignée, ce qui semble incompatible avec la date fournie par *Koñ-sprul*. La fin de ces *gter-ston* dans la version de *Koñ-sprul* est dramatique : parce qu'ils n'ont pas accompli les rituels prescrits pour l'extraction des *gter-ma*, l'un est mort, l'autre atteint de la lèpre, le troisième est devenu fou.

ston bouddhiste, réincarnation lui aussi de Vairocana, que les Bon-po appellent *Khu-cha zla-'od*, toujours selon les identifications de *Kun-grol grags-pa* et *Koñ-sprul*.¹³⁰ Ses découvertes ayant eu lieu à *sPa-gro*, l'ensemble de ses *gter-ma* est connu chez les Bon-po comme *sPa-gro-ma*. Il est curieux de constater que c'est sous son nom bouddhiste qu'il figure dans une collection bon-po.

On peut finalement se demander si ce n'est pas par des *gter-ston* de ce type — dont *bŽod-ston* — considérés comme des réincarnations de Vairocana, lui-même à cheval sur les deux traditions, que l'ensemble de la collection a été constituée. Cela expliquerait qu'elle soit compatible avec le bouddhisme, et peut-être syncrétique. Mais on ne peut négliger que ces textes relèvent du *rJogs-čhen* qui, pour le non-spécialiste, apparaît identique dans le Bon et chez les *rÑiñ-ma-pa*. Il faut espérer que les recherches de S. G. Karmay sur les origines de cette école permettront un jour de reconsidérer l'originalité des *gter-ma* de *bŽod-ston* et des *gter-ston* « ambivalents » par rapport à la tradition *rJogs-čhen-pa* dans son ensemble.

*

Au terme de cette étude qui a parfois entraîné loin de *Grub-thob* et de *bŽod-ston*, peut-on conclure à l'identité des deux personnages, comme l'affirment *Kun-grol grags-pa* et *Koñ-sprul*? Les arguments ou indices permettant de répondre affirmativement ou négativement ont été développés au fur et à mesure. Si l'on en dresse le bilan :

Il y a d'abord des arguments qui plaident contre l'identification, mais qui ne sont pas définitifs :

1. Le silence des autres sources : on ne peut exclure totalement (trop de textes manquent) que *Kun-grol grags-pa* ait eu accès à une source maintenant disparue. Le silence des autres sources, du côté bouddhiste comme du côté bon-po, procède souvent d'un choix délibéré, (les exemples sont nombreux, on en a vu quelques-uns), soit parce que l'auteur ne s'attache qu'à un aspect du personnage, soit pour occulter des événements ou des activités qui ne cadrent pas avec sa propre vision des choses.

2. Les noms différents des personnages, dont seul l'élément *dÑos-grub* est commun : la difficulté engendrée par les noms multiples d'un seul individu, noms généralement reçus au cours des initiations successives, est bien connue quel que soit le genre littéraire abordé, et les *gter-ma* ne font pas exception. Dans le cas précis de *gter-ston* bouddhistes recevant l'initiation de transmissions bon-po et découvrant des textes de cette école, il est normal qu'ils prennent ou reçoivent un

¹³⁰ V. Karmay 1972, pp. 145–148, et n. 1 p. 145, qui donne les références au *gTer-ston brgya-rca* de *Koñ-sprul* et au *bsTan-'byuñ* de *Kun-grol grags-pa*. Selon le *bsTan-rcis bon-po*, ses découvertes auraient eu lieu en 1038; selon *Koñ-sprul*, dans le deuxième cycle sexagénaire (1087–1146).

nom spécifique dans cette tradition. Un exemple qui a le mérite d'être irrécusable est celui de mKhyen-brce'i dbañ-po « signant » ses *gter-ma* bon-po dans le *Rin-chen gter-mjod* du nom Mi-çigs g. yuñ-druñ 'byuñ-gnas rcal. Cela pourrait expliquer les noms différents de nos personnages, (on a noté en outre l'impression de pseudonyme laissée par le nom de Grub-thob dÑos-grub), et le fait que Ñañ-ral, dont le fief et la résidence étaient au lHo-brag (v. n. 56; si ils étaient contemporains, a-t-il pu ne pas rencontrer bŽod-ston?) ne se trouve pas dans les lignées de transmission des *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston.

3. Le problème de la chronologie : l'existence de Grub-thob dans la deuxième moitié du XII^e siècle paraît bien fixée par sa rencontre avec Rog Çes-rab 'od vers 1184–1186, et avec Ñañ-ral. Si l'on écarte la fiction commode de Grub-thob vivant trois cents ou six cents ans, c'est incompatible avec les dates données pour la découverte des *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston : 1088 selon le *bsTan-rcis bon-po*, 1100 selon S. G. Karmay. Mais si il est le plus connu en Occident, le *bsTan-rcis bon-po* n'est pas le seul de son espèce, et on a vu (n. 59) qu'un autre comput proposait la date de 1112 pour ces mêmes découvertes, ce qui rapproche déjà de celle de Grub-thob. De plus, chaque fois que l'on a un point de référence externe, on constate que le *bsTan-rcis bon-po* antidate d'environ un cycle sexagénaire les Bon-po anciens, au moins les *gter-ston* (pour prouver que le phénomène est apparu chez les Bon-po avant qu'il n'apparaisse chez les rÑiñ-ma-pa?). Si on applique cette correction à bŽod-ston, on obtient 1148 ou 1160 pour la date de ses découvertes, ce qui le fait contemporain de Grub-thob.

Il y a par ailleurs des indices qui plaident pour l'identification, mais qui ne sont pas des preuves :

1. bŽod-ston découvre d'abord des textes bouddhiques et, selon sa biographie tardive il est vrai, se propose de les extraire, c'est-à-dire de les utiliser et de pratiquer leurs enseignements, si il ne trouve pas de textes bon-po : la barrière entre Bon et bouddhisme n'était donc pas très étanche pour lui (ou pour la tradition issue de lui). Mais l'argument perd de sa valeur si on replace le fait dans le cadre du *rJogs-chen*.

Un autre détail dont on n'a pas encore tiré les conséquences est sa découverte d'objets ayant appartenu à Khri-sroñ lde-bcan : cela signifie, me semble-t-il, qu'il était lié à l'élaboration de l'histoire légendaire de ce roi dans une perspective bouddhique, histoire que Ñañ-ral va mettre en forme dans le *Zaïs-gliñ-ma*. Dans une perspective bouddhique, parce que dans la même histoire légendaire vue du côté bon-po, Khri-sroñ lde-bcan est un persécuteur (qui a d'ailleurs payé de sa vie sa persécution contre le Bon), et l'on voit mal quelle gloire pourrait tirer un *gter-ston* bon-po de l'extraction d'objets lui ayant appartenu.

Grub-thob lui, dans cette même élaboration légendaire sur l'époque dynastique, était lié non seulement à l'histoire de Sroñ-bcan sgam-po (le *Mañi bka'-hum*) mais aussi à celle de Khri-sroñ lde-bcan et Padmasambhava dont il détenait

les principaux enseignements (les *bKa'-brgyad*) sous leur forme transmise de manière ininterrompue (*bka'-ma*). Ņañ-ral, qui trouve à mKho-mthiñ leur version *gter-ma*, qui développe et la légende de Sroñ-bcan sgam-po et celle de Khri-sroñ lde-bcan, paraît être au confluent des enseignements de ces deux maîtres, ce qui s'expliquerait très bien s'ils ne faisaient qu'un.

2. On ne rappellera que pour mémoire les traits, finalement assez nombreux, qui donnent aux *gter-ma* de bŽod-ston une allure bouddhique, non seulement par leur doctrine – point déjà écarté comme insuffisamment probant — mais jusqu'à leur présentation matérielle.

Pour ou contre l'identité des deux *gter-ston*, les arguments sont faibles : ils reposent sur une interprétation des données, et non sur des faits. Il en est un cependant, totalement irréductible, et qui interdit à mon sens d'identifier bŽod-ston à Grub-thob : c'est leur nom de clan et leur province d'origine, pour lesquels on ne peut pas invoquer les transformations ou déformations dues au temps puisqu'ils nous sont fournis par un contemporain, Ņañ-ral, pour Grub-thob, et par son propre petit-fils pour bŽod-ston. Ce simple détail rend vains tous les autres arguments.

Puisque Grub-thob n'est pas bŽod-ston, il reste à répondre à la question posée dans le titre de cet article : Grub-thob dŅos-grub était-il bon-po? Les éléments rassemblés ne permettent pas de répondre affirmativement. Cependant, un dernier indice paraît suffisamment probant : rDo-rje gliñ-pa, qui se déclare lui-même "ambivalent" (v. n. 109), reconnaît en Grub-thob l'une de ses naissances antérieures (*gTer-čhos*, vol. IV, p. 149). La filiation des enseignements et des doctrines est si contraignante à l'intérieur d'une lignée de réincarnation de *gter-ston*, que cette seule indication permet de ranger Grub-thob parmi ceux qui ont découvert à la fois des textes bouddhiques et des textes bon-po, et qui les ont pratiqués sans ostracisme.

Dans tous les cas que j'ai pu relever à ce jour, ces *gter-ston*, qu'ils soient bon-po ou bouddhistes, appartiennent à la traduction du *rJogs-čhen*. Les écrits d'un maître rJogs-pa čhen-po contemporain, Namkhai Norbu,¹³¹ fournissent un exemple actuel de la perpétuation du syncrétisme, ou plutôt de l'indifférenciation qui, à mes yeux, est à l'œuvre depuis les origines dans cette tradition.

¹³¹ *The Necklace of Gzi. A Cultural History of Tibet*, Dharamsala 1981. *Bod-kyi lo-rgyus-las 'phros-pa'i gtam nor-bu'i do-čal*, Dharamsala 1981.

ABRÉVIATIONS DES SOURCES CITÉES

Dans l'ordre alphabétique français ; les sources tibétaines sont classées sous leur lettre radicale. Pour celles-ci, la référence aux pages désigne la pagination en chiffres arabes ajoutée lors de la reproduction moderne du texte.

- Aris 1979 : M. Aris, *Bhutan. The Early History of a Himalayan Kingdom*, Warminster 1979.
- Blondeau, *Annuaire* : A. M. Blondeau, Comptes rendus de conférences, *Annuaire de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes-Etudes*, V^e section, Paris.
- Byañ-bdag gsol-'debs* : Karma mi-'gyur dbañ-rgyal, *gTer-ston brgya-rca'i mchan-sdom gsol-'debs čhos-rgyal bkra-čis stobs-rgyal-gyi mjad-pa'i 'grel-pa lo-rgyus gter-bton čhos-'byuñ*, Darjeeling 1978.
- Dalai-Lama V, *gSan-yig* : *Records of teachings received : the gSan-yig of the fifth Dalai Lama Ńag-dban blo-bzañ rgya-mtsho*, 4 vol., Delhi 1971.
- Dargyay 1977 : E. M. Dargyay, *The rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet*, Delhi 1977.
- Deb-sñon* : 'Gos Locāva gŽon-nu-dpal, *Deb-ther sñon-po*. Traduit par G. N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, 2 vol., Calcutta 1949.
- Ferrari 1958 : A. Ferrari, *mK'yen brtse's Guide to the Holy Places of Central Tibet*, *Serie Orientale Roma XVI*, Roma 1958.
- rGyal-rabs bon-po* : *rGyal-rabs bon-gyi 'byuñ-gnas*, ed. par S. Ch. Das, Calcutta 1915. Rééd. dans *Three Sources*, q.v.
- Hoffmann 1950 : H. Hoffmann, *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Wiesbaden 1950.
- rJogs-čhen bsgrags-pa skor-gsum* : *idem*, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Delhi 1973.
- Kapstein 1980 : M. Kapstein, «Remarks on the Mañi bka'-'bum and the cult of Avalokitešvara in Tibet», *Proceedings of the North American Tibetological Society*, *Wind Horse*, n° II, Berkeley and New Delhi 1983.
- Karmay 1972 : *The Treasury of Good Sayings : a Tibetan History of Bon*, edited and translated by Samten G. Karmay, London 1972.
- Karmay 1975 : S. G. Karmay, *A gZer-mig version of the interview between Confucius and Phyva Keñ-tse lan-med* : *BSOAS*, vol. XXXVIII, Part 3, 1975, pp. 562-580.
- Karmay 1977 : S. G. Karmay, *A Catalogue of Bonpo Publications*, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo 1977.
- Karmay 1981 : S. G. Karmay, *King Tsa/Dza and Vajrayāna* : in *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R. A. Stein*, ed. by Michel Strickmann, *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* vol. XX, Bruxelles 1981.
- bKa'-thañ Zañs-gliñ-ma* : *gter-ma* de Ńaṅ-ral Ńi-ma 'od-zer, édité dans *The Life of the Lady Ye-shes mtsho-rgyal*, The Sungrab Myamso Gyunphel Parkhang, Tashijong 1972.
- Khetsun Sangpo, *Dictionary* : Khetsun Sangpo, *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism*, vol. III et IV, *The rŃiñ-ma-pa tradition*, Dharamsala 1973.
- mKhyen-brce'i dbañ-po, *mChan-tho* : mKhyen-brce'i dbañ-po, *Gañs-čan-gyi yul-du byon-pa'i lo-paṅ rñams-kyi mchan-tho*, *mKhyen-brce'i bka'-'bum*, vol. 11, 238 ff. Repris dans *mKhyen-brtse. On the History of the Dharma*, (*Smanrtsis Shešrig Spendzod*, vol. 39) Leh 1972 (auquel les références se rapportent).
- Koñ-sprul, *gTer-ston brgya-rca* : Koñ-sprul Blo-gros mtha'-yas, *Zab-mo'i gter dañ gter-ston grub-thob ji-ltar hyon-pa'i lo-rgyus mdor-bsdus bkod-pa rin-čhen bai-dūrya'i 'phreñ-ba žes-bya-ba*, (*Rin-čhen gter-mjod*, vol. ka), édité sous le titre : *gTer-ston brgya-rca'i rnam-thar*, Tibetan Nyingmapa Monastery, Camp n° 5, P. O. Tezu, Dist. Lohit, Arunachal Pradesh 1973.
- Kun-grol grags-pa, *Sañs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuñ-khuñs* : Kun-grol grags-pa, *Sañs-rgyas bstan-pa spyi-yi 'byuñ-khuñs yid-bžin nor-bu 'dod-pa 'Jo-ba'i gter-mjod*, publié dans *Three Sources*, q.v.

- Kvaerne 1973 : P. Kvaerne, *Bon-po Studies. The A-khrid system of meditation : Kailash I*, 1973, n° 1, pp. 19-50 ; n° 2, pp. 248-332.
- Kvaerne 1974 : P. Kvaerne, *The Canon of the Tibetan Bonpos : Indo-Iranian Journal XVI*, 1974, n° 1, pp. 18-56 ; n° 2, pp. 96-144.
- Legs-bçad mjod* : Çar-rja bKra-çis rgyal-mchan, *Legs-bçad rin-po-çhe'i mjod dpyod-ldan dga'-ba'i çhar*, v. Karmay 1972.
- Macdonald, *Annuaire* : A. Macdonald, Extrait des rapports sur les conférences, Histoire et philologie tibétaines, *Annuaire de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études IV^e section*, 1968-1969, pp. 527-535.
- MKB* : *Mañi bka'-'bum* : *Çhos-skyoñ-ba'i rgyal-po Sroñ-bcan sgam-po'i bka'-'bum*, 2 vol. (*e, vam*), éd. de 'Bras-spuñs.
- Ñañ-ral, *Çhos-'byuñ* : Ñañ-ral Ñi-ma 'od-zer, *Çhos-'byuñ me-tog sñiñ-po sbrañ-rci'i bçud*, Ms A et B, vol. 5 et 6 de *Rin-çhen gter-mjod çhen-po'i rgyab-çhos*, Paro 1979.
- Ñañ-ral *skyes-rabs* : *sPrul-sku mÑa'-bdag çhen-po'i skyes-rabs rnam-thar dri-ma med-pa'i bka' rgya-çan*, pp. 49-211 du vol. I des *bKa'-brgyad bde-gçegs 'dus-pa'i mchan-byañ* (17 vol.) ; *Ngagyur Nyingmay Sungrab Series*, vol. 75, Gangtok 1979.
- Nor-bu'i do-çal* : Kun-bzañ ñes-don kloñ-yañs, *History of the Nyingmapa tradition : Bod-du byuñ-ba'i gsañ-sñags sna-'gyur-gyi bstan-'jin skyes-mçhog rim-byon-gyi rnam-thar Nor-bu'i do-çal*, Dalhousie 1976.
- dPa'o : dPa'o gCug-lag phreñ-ba, *mKhas-pa'i dga'-ston, Śaṭapitaka Series*, vol. 9 (1-4), New Delhi 1959.
- dPal-ldan chul-khrims, *Çhos-'byuñ* : dPal-ldan chul-khrims, *Çhos-'byuñ kun-gsal me-loñ, The History of Buddhist Dharma called « The Mirror which Illuminates all Things »*, New Delhi 1971.
- dPal-ldan chul-khrims, *Bon-gyi bstan-'byuñ* : dPal-ldan chul-khrims, *g. Yuñ-druñ Bon-gyi bstan-'byuñ*, 2 vol., Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Delhi 1972.
- Prats 1982 : R. Prats, *Contributo allo studio biografico dei primi gter-ston*, Istituto universitario orientale, Seminario di studi asiatici, *Series Minor XVII*, Napoli 1982.
- Ratna gliñ-pa, *gTer-byuñ çhen-mo : Selected Works of Ratna gliñ-pa*, 2 vol., Tibetan Nyingmapa Monastery, Camp n° 5, P. O. Tezu, Dist. Lohit, Arunachal Pradesh 1973 ; *gTer-'byuñ çhen-mo gsal-ba'i sgron-me*, vol. I, pp. 1-215.
- Shakabpa, *Guide* : Tsepon W. D. Shakabpa, *IHa-ldan Ra-sa 'phrul-snañ gcug-lag-khañ-gi dkar-çhag*, Kalimpong 1982.
- Smith 1970 : E. Gene Smith, Préface à *Kongtrul's Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan culture*, *Śaṭapitaka Series*, vol. 80, New Delhi 1970, pp. 1-87.
- Sources* : *Sources for a History of Bon*, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Dolanji 1972.
- Srid-rgyud* : *Srid-pa rgyud-kyi kha-byañ rnam-thar çhen-mo*, Ms. Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, *Fonds tibétain n° 493*.
- bsTan-pa'i rnam-bçad* : sPa-bcun bsTan-rgyal bzañ-po, *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bçad dar rgyas gsal-ba'i sgron-me*, texte n° 22 de *Sources*, q.v.
- bsTan-rcis bon-po* : P. Kvaerne, *The bsTan-rcis of Ñi-ma bstan-'jin, transcription of the Tibetan text : Acta Orientalia XXXIII*, (1971), pp. 249-282 ; *A chronological table of the Bon-po. The bsTan-rcis of Ñi-ma bstan-'jin : Acta Orientalia XXXIII* (1971), pp. 205-248.
- Thañ-yig Çel-brag-ma* : *U-rgyan gu-ru Padma 'byuñ-gnas-kyi skyes-rabs rnam-thar rgyas-par bkod-pa*, découvert par O-rgyan gliñ-pa, xyl. éd. de sDe-dge.
- Thañ-yig gSer-phreñ* : *O-rgyan gu-ru Padma 'byuñ-gnas-kyi skyes-rabs rnam-par thar-pa rgyas-par bkod-pa Padma bka'i thañ-yig çes bya-ba*, ou : *U-rgyan gu-ru Padma 'byuñ-gnas-kyi rnam-thar rgyas-pa gSer-gyi phreñ-ba thar-lam gsal-byed*, découvert par Sañs-rgyas gliñ-pa, Darjeeling 1970.
- Three Sources* : *Three Sources for a History of Bon*, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Delhi 1972.

- Vostrikov 1970 : A. I. Vostrikov, *Tibetan Historical Literature*, translated from the Russian by Harish Chandra Gupta, *Soviet Indology Series n° 4*, Indian Studies Past and Present, Calcutta 1970.
- Wylie 1962 : T. V. Wylie, *The Geography of Tibet according to the 'Dzam-gling-rgyas-bshad*, *Serie Orientale Roma XXV*, Roma 1962.
- Yañ-rce kloñ-chen* : *rJogs-chen Yañ-rce kloñ-chen*, 2 vol., Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre, Delhi 1973.
- Zaṅs-gliñ-ma* : *V. bKa'-thañ Zaṅs-gliñ-ma*.

A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE SANSKRIT *SUMUKHADHĀRAṆĪ*

BY

G. M. BONGARD-LEVIN (Moscow)

In the Manuscript Fund of the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies (Academy of Sciences, USSR) there are several fragments of the Sanskrit *Sumukhadhāraṇī*, the text of which was previously known to scholars only in its Tibetan,¹ Saka² and Chinese³ translations. The importance of the Leningrad fragments of the *Sumukhadhāraṇī* has already been mentioned in some publications;⁴ two fragments were published⁵ and others have been now prepared for publication.

This publication includes the Sanskrit text and its translation and also the correlation of the Sanskrit text with the text of the Saka translation. The number of the folio (14) is presented on the left part of the recto.

¹ *Kanjur*, Derge ed., *Rgyud-'bum*, ba, f.47 b–52 a, translated by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla and Ye-śes-sde (9th cent. A.D.)

² H. W. Bailey, *Khotanese Buddhist Texts*, London 1951, pp. 135–143.

³ There are five Chinese translations (see *Hōbōgirin*, *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*. Fascicule annexe: N 1137, 1138 a, b, 1139, 1140. The translation by Bodhiruci is very close to our Sanskrit text (N 1140, Taisho, v. XX, c. 585 b (2) — 589).

⁴ G. M. Bongard-Levin, E. N. Tyomkin, *New Buddhist Texts from Central Asia*, Moscow 1967; G. M. Bongard-Levin, *Studies in Ancient India and Central Asia*, Calcutta 1971; G. M. Bongard-Levin, *Buddhist Texts from Central Asia: Actes du XXIX^e Congrès International des Orientalistes* (Paris 1973). *Inde ancienne*. t. I, Paris, 1976; G. M. Bongard-Levin, *New Sanskrit and Prakrit Texts from Central Asia: Indologica Taurinensia*, Vol. III–IV (1975–1976), Torino 1977; G. M. Bongard-Levin, M. I. Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya, E. N. Tyomkin, *The Study of Indian Texts from Central Asia* in: *Materials on the History and Philology of Central Asia*, Vol. 3, Ulan-Ude 1968 (in Russian); G. M. Bongard-Levin, E. N. Tyomkin, *The Works of V. S. Vorobyov-Desyatovsky and the Study of Buddhist Texts from Central Asia* (N. F. Petrovsky Manuscript Collection), in *The Problems of History of Languages and Culture of India*, Moscow 1974.

⁵ G. M. Bongard-Levin, M. I. Vorobyeva-Desyatovskaya, E. N. Tyomkin, *A Fragment of the Sanskrit Sumukhadhāraṇī*: *Indo-Iranian Journal*, Vol. X, N 2–3, 1967; G. M. Bongard-Levin, *A New Fragment of the Sanskrit «Sumukhadhāraṇī» and its Saka Version*: *Indologica Taurinensia*, Vol. VIII–IX (1980–1981), Torino 1981.

RECTO

1. *je. kaṭe. kaṭu kammale.*⁶ *brahme. brahmasvare brahma-*
*siddhe. siddhamanaurathe phu svāhā || va[jra]śamkalā*⁷
mahāde-
2. *vī bhagavantam etad avaucat. aham api bhagavaṃstasya*
kulaputrasya vā kuladuhitur vā rakṣāparipāla-
3. *nārthāya dhāraṇī padāni bhāṣiṣye ya imaṃ sumukhaṃ*
dharmaparyāyaṃ dhārayiṣyati kālyamutthāya
4. *vācayiṣyati. ta[dya]thā vajre vajre vajre.*⁸ *mahāvajre*
*vajremate.*⁹ *buddhavajre. buddhādhiṣṭhitavajre. ubuddhe*¹⁰

VERSO

1. *nibuddhe. sambuddhe.*¹¹ *bahubuddhe. viśiṣṭabuddhe.*
*buddhe*¹² *buddhe buddhe buddhe buddhe*¹³. *diśaṃgame.*¹⁴ *jaṃgame*¹⁵.
*aleme*¹⁶ *tilo-*
2. *me*¹⁷. *tile tile.*¹⁸ *tilele. māрге mārgantaḡāmini*¹⁹ *svāhā ||*
atha vajraseno bodhisatvo bhagavantam etad avo-
3. *cat. aham api bhagavaṃs tasya kulaputrasya vā kuladuhiturvā*
rakṣāṃ kariṣyami ya imaṃ sumukhaṃ dharmapa-
4. *ryāyaṃm āyuṣpālanīm vidyādhārayiṣyati kālyamutthāya vācayiṣyati.*
*tadyathā hi hi vajre*²⁰

⁶ In Tibetan — *kuṭa kuṭa kambale*. Our fragment corresponds to the fol. 51 a(5)–51 b(3) of the Tibetan translation.

⁷ The wrong spelling, *jra* is omitted

⁸ *vajra* is mentioned twice in the Tibetan

⁹ In the Tibetan — *vajradani*

¹⁰ In the Tibetan — *subuddhe*

¹¹ This word is omitted in the Tibetan

¹² In the Tibetan is *śuddhe*

¹³ *buddhe* is mentioned twice in the Tibetan.

¹⁴ In the Tibetan — *nīśaṃgrāmaṇi*

¹⁵ In the Tibetan — *dzaṃgale*

¹⁶ In the Tibetan — *alase*

¹⁷ In the Tibetan — *telime*

¹⁸ In the Tibetan *tile* is mentioned only once

¹⁹ In the Tibetan — *sānta. sānta. gāmīni phu*

²⁰ In the Tibetan there is *hile vajre* before *hi hi vajre*.

Translation

RECTO

1. [The text of the dhāraṇī] Then the mahādevī Vajrasaṃkala
2. said to the Bhagavan: «I also, O Venerable One, to one of the noble youths or that one of the noble maidens for their protecting and guarding
3. proclaim the stanzas of (this) dhāraṇī, who this [text] entitled «Sumukha»- the (method) of study of dharma would deeply remember and having arisen early in the morning
4. would recite (it)». Namely [the text of the dhāraṇī]

VERSO

1. [The text of the dhāraṇī]
2. [The text of the dhāraṇī] Then the bodhistva Vajrasena said to the Bhagavan:
3. «I also, O Venerable One, to one of the noble youths or that one of the noble maidens will protect who this «Sumukha»-
4. the [method] of study of dharma, [the dhāraṇī] guarding life would deeply remember and having arisen early in the morning would recite (it). Namely [the text of the dhāraṇī]

RECTO

1. je. kaṭe. kaṭu kaṃmale. brahme.
brahmasvare brahmasiddhe.
siddhamanurathe phu svāhā || vajrasaṃkalā

mahāde-

2. vī
bhagavantam etad avocat.
aham api bhagavamstasya kulaputrasya
vā kuladuhitur vā rakṣāparipalā-

3. nārthāya
dhāraṇī padāni bhāṣiṣye
ya imam sumukhaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ dhāra-
yiṣyati
kālyamutthāya

4. vācayiṣyati. tadyathā vajre vajre
vajre. mahāvajre vajremate. buddhavajre.
buddhādhiṣṭhitavajre. u buddhe

[vira] je kaṭe. keṭu ketu kaṃbale brrahme
brrahmapure. brrahma-svare brrahmasiddhe
siddha-manaurathe phu svāhā || tī vā
vajrasaṃkala
mistā gyastā kṛma hālai gyastāna gyastā
ba'ysā vye hāṣṭā aṃjalā dastyau jsa gyastānā
gyastā | ba'ysa namasyā
u tta hvā si
midṇi gyasta ba'ysā ttrāmī tte bisivrrāṣai
o vā bisivrrāṣaiṇā rakṣa kiṇa u bisū
hālai ttrāyāme kiṇa hīvyānāme kiṇa u
kṛme kiṇa
dāraṇīṇā pata hvāṇumā.
cu tvā dāyya byāmjā jsīni kākī vijya dijsate.
o vā ysaina panamāte |
vāsī'tī || tad yathā vajre vajre
mahāvajre vajrapati. buddhavajre
buddhādhiṣṭita-vajre u buddhe

VERSO

1. nibuddhe. saṃbuddhe. bahubuddhe.
viṣiṣṭabuddhe buddhe buddhe
buddhe buddhe. dīsaṃgame. jaṃgame
aleme tilo-

2. me. tile tile. tilele. mārgē
mārgātagāmini svāha ||
atha vajraseno bodhisatvo
bhagavantam etad avo-

3. cat. aham api bhagavams
tasya kulaputrasya va kuladuhiturvā
rakṣāṃ kariṣyami ya imam sumukhaṃ
dharmapa-

4. ryāyam āyuspālanīm
vidyādhārayiṣyati
kālyamutthāya vācayiṣyati.
tadyathā hi hi vajre

nibuddhe saṃbuddhe. bahubuddhe
viṣiṣṭe buddhe. buddhe. buddhe
buddhe, deśaṃgāme-nika jaṃgame.
amale tamale.
tile tile tilele mārgē.
mārgātagāmane phu svāhā ||
tī vā vajrasenā baudhisatvā mistā
ba'ysūnavuysai
gyastānā gyastā ba'ysā tta
hve si aysā ttrāmī midṇi gyasta ba'ysa
tte bisivrrāṣai o vā bisivrrāṣaiṇā
āysdarja yanū(mā) cu tvā sumukha nāma
dāya
hyāmjā jsīni kākā
vijya drreṣā dijsate o vā
ysaina panamāte vāsī'tī ||
tad yathā hīhi vajre

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, likely a manuscript page. The text is dense and appears to be a continuous passage of prose or verse.

1. 14a. Recto

Handwritten text in Devanagari script, likely a manuscript page. The text is dense and appears to be a continuous passage of prose or verse.

2. 14b. Verso

THE SPOKEN TIBETAN VERB *kAP*

BY

KUN CHANG and BETTY SHEFTS CHANG (Berkeley)

The verb which has as its alternants *kAP* and *kqà* (written Tibetan *rgyab* and *rgyag*) is one of the most common of all the verbs in the modern spoken dialect of Lhasa.¹ It is perhaps also the most diverse in meaning, though translation may exaggerate this diversity. We shall consider here five aspects of this verb: (1) the development of its relationship, as transitive, with the intransitive *thēè* (WT *'thebs, ihebs*); (2) its relationship to preceding object-verb noun compounds; (3) its use in intransitive constructions; (4) the possibility of its functioning as a verbal auxiliary; and (5) the explanation for the written Tibetan doublets with *-b* and *-g* endings.

1. Transitive *kAP* in relation to *thēè*

It is a tenet of structuralism that linguistic elements do not function, and therefore cannot be understood, in isolation. In its relational network, the transitive *kAP* is closely connected to the intransitive verb *thēè*. Where the causative «to open (to cause to be opened), of e.g. a door», *chē* (WT *phye*, Perfect to *'byed-pa*), has a noncausative counterpart with a cognate base, *chē* (WT *bye*, Perfect to *'bye-ba*) «to open by itself, of e.g. a door», the parallel concepts «to close (to cause to be closed)»

¹ In referring to *kAP*, we tacitly include *kqà*.

Since a discipline of Tibetan dialectology has yet to be established — there has, for example, been no dialect survey of Tibet — no one can make a credible claim regarding just what identifies a dialect as being, or not being that of Lhasa. We must, however, give some label to the dialect on which we have worked; there may be spoken Tibetan dialects in which *kAP* is less common.

To avoid double diacritics here, we have made the following changes in the transcription we introduced in *A Manual of Spoken Tibetan* (Kun Chang and Betty Shefts, with the help of Nawang Nornang and Lhadon Karsip, Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1964). *y* replaces *ü*; *ø* replaces *ö*. The absence of a tone mark for the first syllable of a disyllabic form indicates high tone (*mēpā*, ex. 9.a.), except for *relāā* (ex. 3.a.), with its unstressed first syllable. In other cases, where there is already a diacritic (*é, ó*, nasalized vowels), we replace superscript tone marks with abbreviations in parentheses following a word: H is high level; HF is high falling; LF is low falling. A single notation refers to the immediately preceding syllable (*tṽyṽtūū* [H], ex. 6.a.), with the exception of the *-pa yṽ, pa rēè* construction, where it refers to the first syllable rather than to the unstressed *-pa* (*yḏōpā* [LF], ex. 21.a.). In indicating tones for both syllables of a disyllabic form, we separate the first tone indication from the second by a hyphen (*thēèlūū* [H-H], ex. 24).

and «to close by itself» use verbs that are not cognate with one another, *k_{AP}* and *thèè*: (1.a.) *ηξέ qo chēpa yīī* «I opened the door», (1.b.) *qo che su/chēpa reè* «The door opened by itself», (2.a.) *ηξέ qo k_{AP} yīī* «I closed the door», (2.b.) *qo thèè su/thèèpa reè* «The door closed by itself/accidentally/well». As the range of meanings in example 2.b. shows, the semantic content of *thèè* in relation to the transitive *k_{AP}* is not that merely of intransitive or noncausative; there are also connotations of successful completion or accidental happening.

qo «door» is one of a vast number of nouns that precede *k_{AP}* and, as direct objects, help to specify its meaning. (Nouns that belong to another, smaller set serve as subjects of *k_{AP}* in intransitive constructions.) The use of *k_{AP}* and *thèè* with nouns such as *tq* «arrow» may plausibly be viewed as the point from which there began a spread in meaning, leading from «to aim at» (*k_{AP}*): «to be hit» (*thèè*) and ending in «to do» (*k_{AP}*): «to be done well, completed successfully» (*thèè*). (To say that the *tq k_{AP}* type of construction was the entering wedge implies as one rule of semantic change a shift from concrete to abstract.) *tq k_{AP}* means not «to hit with an arrow» but «to shoot an arrow» (e.g. [3.a.] *tq k_{AP} qhi šu y₂ retāā* [H]? 1.170.4–6 «There’s a bow when you shoot an arrow, is that right?»): (3.b.) *ηξέ qhōō tq k_{AP} yīī* is «I shot an arrow at him», not «I hit him with an arrow»; (3.c.) *qhōō tq thèè su* is «He was hit by an arrow». The transitive notion «to hit with an arrow» has no place in this configuration.

A step away from this concrete usage are examples such as these: *qaqpā k_{AP}* «to criticize, correct, dispute, challenge, condemn»: *qaqpā thèè* «to be rightly or justifiably criticized; to hit the mark/be to the point, of criticism», e.g. (4) *qhōō ηξε tsōm la qaqpā k_{AP}/k_{AM} ni, qaqpā thèè su* «He criticized my poem, and his criticism hit the mark/was to the point»; *lēē k_{AP}* «to reply, answer»: *lēē thèè* «to be to the point of a reply», e.g. (5.a.) *tèè lēē k_{AP} qī y₂ marēè* 4.136.7–8 «He didn’t answer her», (5.b.) *ηξέ lēē thèè chu* «The reply I gave was to the point».²

Examples followed by references of the form 1.170.4–6 (ex. 3.a.) refer to our *Spoken Tibetan Texts* (Kun Chang and Betty Shefts Chang, with the help of Nawang Nornang and Lhadon Karsip, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica. *Special Publications* No. 74. Volumes 1 and 2, 1978; Volume 3, 1980; Volume 4, 1981); the first number refers to the volume, the second to the page, the third to the lines of Tibetan text. Examples without such a citation were supplied to us by Mr. Nawang Nornang and Mrs. Lhadon Karsip; we went over examples of *k_{AP}* and *thèè* most recently with Mr. Nornang, in June, 1982.

Our transliteration of written Tibetan (WT) is that accepted by the American Library Association.

² The *ηξέ . . . chu* intransitive construction is one used, for example, with *thōō* (H) «to see (<to be seen>» and *qhō* «to hear (<to be heard>»), where there is an absence of control. Verbs which occur in this construction do not occur in that transitive construction which has an ergative subject in the instrumental case and, in the first person, the affixed base followed by *yīī* (1.a.) *ηξέ qo chēpa yīī* «I opened the door». In contrast to *thōō* (H) and *qhō*, *tēè* «to look» and *ñēē* «to listen» do use this transitive construction. Replying is, in a sense, like shooting an arrow; one may aim at a target, but hitting it is beyond one’s control.

Finally, there are the many instances where the meaning of *thèè* is «to be done successfully; to be completed successfully»; here the meaning of «to hit» or «to be hit» is remote. For example: *ōtē/ūtī k_{ΔP}* «to iron» : *ōtē/ūtī thèè* «to be ironed smoothly», e.g. (6.a.) *ηξέ τῷτῷ (H) λ ὀτῆ k_{ΔP} λ γῖ* «I ironed the shirt», (6.b.) *ōtē mhātēèp_λ rēè* «It wasn't ironed smoothly»; *qōsā k_{ΔP}* «to share, divide among» : *qōsā thèè* «to be divided well/fairly», e.g. (7.a.) *ηξέ ηῖῖ πῦqōò (H) qōsā k_{ΔP} λ γῖ* «I divided my money among my children», (7.b.) *šiqāl qōsā thèè šaa* «The estate has been divided well/fairly»; *ηξēsō k_{ΔP}* «to rest; to take a rest» : *ηξēsō thèè* «to rest well (as after travelling)», e.g. (8.a.) *ηξέ ηξēsō k_{ΔP} λ γῖ* «I rested/took a rest», (8.b.) *ηq ηξēsō thèè chu* «I rested very well (e.g. after travelling)»; *mōpā k_{ΔP}* «to plow» (*mōpā* [n.] «a plow»): *mōpā thèè* «to be plowed well», e.g. (9.a.) *ηξέ šiqāl mōpā k_{ΔP} λ γῖ* «I plowed the field (with a plow, i.e. I put the plow to the field)», with the dative of indirect object in *šiqāl* («to the field») (as contrasted with [9.b.] *ηξέ šiqāl mōèp_λ γῖ* «I plowed the field», with its absolutive direct object, *šiqāl*, and the verb *mō*, *mōè* «to plow»), (9.c.) *šiqāl mōpā thèè šaa* «The field has been plowed well». In these examples, where the meaning of the *k_{ΔP}* construction includes an element of purpose — «to iron» is always «to (purposely) iron» — *thèè* connotes «well done». Where that which can be done purposely can also happen accidentally, *thèè* is ambiguous: it may mean either «to be done well» or «to happen accidentally»; we have seen this ambiguity in the translations of example 2.b., *qō thèè su/thèèp_λ rēè*.

Even if we accept that something like this was the process by which *k_{ΔP}* and *thèè* entered into such a productive relationship, we still face the question of how *k_{ΔP}* could have, to such a degree, usurped the position of *tāp*, the reflex of written Tibetan *btab* (Perfect to 'debs-pa), to which written Tibetan 'thebs-pa, *thebs* has a cognate relationship.³ And it is not *k_{ΔP}* alone that relates as a transitive to an intransitive *thèè*; a similar relationship, substantially documented, holds between *tā* (H) (WT *btan*, Perfect to *gton-ba*) and *thèè* and, to a lesser extent, *šy*, *šy* (WT *gzū-ba*, *gzus*) and *thèè*. For example: *chūqāà tā* (H) «to block/cut off a water supply»: *chūqāà thèè* «to get blocked, of a water supply», e.g. (10.a.) *ηξέ tq λ chūqāà tāp_λ γῖ* «I cut off the water supply from the enemy», (10.b.) *chūqāà thèèp_λ rēè* «The water supply got blocked»; *tō šy*, *šy* «to hit with a stone» : *tō thèè* «to get hit by a

³ By productive, we mean that there are many examples of this sort, not that for every instance of a noun with *k_{ΔP}* there is a corresponding occurrence of this noun with *thèè*. On the other hand, for hundreds of examples of nouns with *k_{ΔP}* we have just one of *tāp*, with *sōā* as object, meaning «to pray» (*thaqā n_{ΔP}sīi* [H], *šīnèè* [H] *sōsōè che mhātūnèè* . . . *ānī*, *r₂qāpā r_{ΔP}λ šāpèè*, *qūcōò* [HF] *λ yaa*, *sōā tāp nī*, *yāqā tītèè* [HF] *qhi phēpā è yūqī reitāā* [H]? 3.177.5–10 «In the same way, if the one who has died couldn't do it . . . then, when another person helps him and prays to the Supreme Ones, again, in this way it's useful, too, isn't it?»). When we asked Mr. Nornang if he might use *tāp* with *mōlōm* instead of *k_{ΔP}* for «to pray», he replied that it sounded like a written Tibetan combination.

stone», e.g. (11.a.) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ chiũ la tɔ̃ ʂỹpã yĩ̃* «I hit the bird with a stone», (11.b.) *ŋãa tɔ̃ thẽɛ̃ chu* «I got hit by a stone».

The vowel ending of *thẽɛ̃* is further evidence that the bond between *'thebs-pa*, *thebs* and *'debs-pa*, *btab* had been broken. There is undeniably a semantic role in sound change. The verbs for «to know», written Tibetan *śes* and *mkhyen*, have, for example, the same ending in spoken Tibetan *śɛ̃ɛ̃* (HF) and *khɛ̃ɛ̃* (HF), with the *-n* of *mkhyen* contributing nasality, the *-s* of *śes* the falling tone. Written Tibetan *'thebs-pa*, *thebs* could have yielded a modern spoken *-p* ending, as did *btab*, with its *t̃l̃p* reflex, and the verbs for «to cover», *'kheb-pa*, *khebs* and *bkab* (Perfect to *'gebs-pa*), with spoken Tibetan *qhɛ̃p* and *q̃l̃p*; instead, it went the way of the verbs for «to arrive; to come», written Tibetan *sleb-pa*, (*b*)*slebs*, *bsleb* and *phɛb-pa*, *phebs* (spoken Tibetan *lɛ̃ɛ̃* or *lɛ̃ɛ̃* (HF) and *phɛ̃ɛ̃*). We do not mean to imply that *'thebs-pa*, *thebs* was necessarily influenced by these verbs, only that it was not influenced by *'debs-pa*, *btab*. We assume that the loss of a stop ending for *thẽɛ̃* postdated the atrophying of *t̃l̃p*.

2. Transitive *kAP* following object-verb noun compounds

The noun that precedes *kAP* may be a compound whose elements are a verb base and, preceding it, its direct object. The meaning of the compound is, in some cases, equivalent to the sum of the meanings of its members: (12) *ŋātsō̃ð pAqtũũ kAPa yĩ̃/ŋātsō̃ð pāā tũũp̃a yĩ̃* «We shuffled the Mah jongg tiles» (*pAqtũũ* [n.] «the shuffling of Mah jongg tiles»: *pāā* [n.] «Mah jongg; Mah jongg tiles»; *tũũ* [v.; WT *dkrug-pa*, *dkrugs*] «to stir; to shuffle»). (13) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ mɛ̃t̃ɔ̃ kAPa yĩ̃/ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ mɛ̃ɛ̃* (H) *t̃ɔ̃p̃a yĩ̃* «I gathered medicinal herbs/stones (from the fields)» (*mɛ̃t̃ɔ̃* [n.] «the gathering [picking up, collecting] of medicinal herbs or stones»: *mɛ̃ɛ̃* [H] [n.] «medicine; medicinal herbs or stones»; *t̃ɔ̃* [v.; WT *gtog-pa/btog-pa*] «to gather, pick, pick up, collect»). Again, there are instances where the compound has a special meaning: (14.a.) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ mĩqt̃sũm̃ kAPa yĩ̃* is «I winked» (*mĩqt̃sũm̃* [n.] «a wink; winking»: *mũ* [n.] «eye»; *tsũm̃* [**btums*. v.; WT *'dzum-pa*, *btsum/zum*, *gzum*, *tshum*] «to shut, close [with names for parts of the body]), but (14.b.) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ mũ tsũp̃a yĩ̃* is «I closed my eye(s)». (15.a.) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ ʂĩqāā tũũũ kAPa yĩ̃* is «I (a poor man) picked up the leftover barley from the field (during the harvest season)» (*tũũũ* [n.] «picking up leftover barley during the harvest season»: *tũ* [n.] «barley»; *tũũ* [v.; WT *sgrug-pa*, *bsgrugs*, *bsgrug*, *sgrug(s)*] «to pick up»), but (15.b.) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ tũ tũũp̃a yĩ̃* is «I picked up a grain of barley».

In being absorbed into a compound with the verb to which it related as a direct object, a noun may be separated from another noun which stood in a subordinate relation to it. So, in (16.a.) *ŋɛ̀ɛ̃ ñl̃p̃ỹ pũ chā̃ap̃a yĩ̃* «I rubbed off the loose hair of the *ñl̃p̃ũ* (wool)», *ñl̃p̃ỹ* «of the *ñl̃p̃ũ*», in the genitive, is subordinate to *pũ* «hair». The use of the noun compound with *kAP* may have, as one result, the syntactic elevation

of this sort of subordinate element, so that it relates immediately to the verb.⁴ In the case of (16.b.) *ηεε nλpū tée pūcāā kΔpλ yīī* «I rubbed off the loose hair from the *nλpū*», *pūcāā* «rubbing/sweeping hair off» (*pū* [n.] «hair [of the body; on wool]»; *chāā* [v.; WT 'phyag-pa, 'phyags] «to sweep/rub off») functions as direct object, in the absolutive case; *nλpū tée* «from («to») the *nλpū*» relates to the verb as an indirect object, in the dative. (The translation with «from» may be misleading; the Tibetan construction denotes that which is done «to» something.) In (17) *ηεε pāālēē tii qhā šəḍpλ yīī/ηεε pāālēē tée qhāšəḍ kΔpλ yīī* «I smoothed the surface of this board» (*qhāšəḍ* [n.] «the smoothing of a surface»: *qhā* [n.] «surface»; *šəḍ* [v.; WT (*b*)žogs, Perfect to 'jog-pa] «to trim, reduce in size by e.g. cutting or planing; to render smooth in this way»), it is *pāālēē* that, with *tée* forming the dative, now relates to the verb.

Another way in which the subordinate element may be put into syntactic relation with the verb is a direct object. In (18.a.) *ηεε hλqōō (HF) qhi thū cēpλ yīī* «I changed the soles of my shoes», *hλqōō (HF) qhi* «of the shoes» is in the genitive, and *thū* «soles», in the absolutive, is the direct object. In (18.b.) *ηεε hλqōō (HF) thūcēē kΔpλ yīī* «I changed the soles of my shoes», by forming a compound of *thū* (n.) «sole» and *cēē*, the Perfective base of *cē*, *cēē* «to change, exchange» (v.; WT *brjes*, Perfect to *rje-ba*) — *thūcēē* — one is able to put *hλqōō (HF)* «shoes» into the absolutive as direct object. (Once again, the English translation fails to reflect the Tibetan grammatical relationships.) The genitive *tā tīñū qhi* «of these two horses» in example (19.a.) *ηεε tā tīñū qhi təḥ tuupλ yīī* «I compared the gait of these two horses», gives way to the absolutive *tā tīñū* «these two horses» in example (19.b.), *ηεε tā tīñū tγγtūū kΔpλ yīī* «I held a comparison in gait with these two horses», through the formation of a compound *tγγtūū* «a comparison in gait», made up of *təḥ* (n.) «gait» and *tuu* «to compare» (v.; WT *sdur-ba, bsdur, bsdur*). The construction of examples 18.b. and 19.b. has two direct objects, which we refer to as inner and outer, in analogy to our treatment of the two subjects of such intransitive verbs as *nq* «to be sick» in, for example (20) *qhō qo nqλ rēē* «He had a headache», where *qo* «head» is the inner subject, narrowing the scope of the verb *nq* «to be sick», and *qhō* «he» is the outer subject. (See Ergativity in Spoken Tibetan: *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 51, 1980, pp. 15–32, especially page 27.) In examples 18.b. and 19.b., *thūcēē* «changing the sole» and *tγγtūū* «a comparison in gait» would then be the inner objects of *kΔp*, pinpointing the scope of its effect, and *hλqōō (HF)* «shoes» and *tā tīñū* «these two horses» would be the outer objects.

⁴ This is the sort of syntactic change currently referred to in the literature as «raising». Bernard Comrie, for example, discusses subject-to-object and object-to-subject raising in demonstrating the lack of a one-to-one correlation between semantic roles and grammatical relations (*Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Syntax and Morphology*, University of Chicago Press, 1981, pp. 69–70).

3. *k_{AP}* in intransitive constructions

In Ergativity in Spoken Tibetan (*op. cit.*, p. 16), we divided intransitive verbs into two basic groups: controllable — those which could occur in construction with an affixed base followed by *yī* — and noncontrollable — those which could not. (This division was based on R. M. W. Dixon's *Ergativity: Language*, 44, 1979, pp. 49–138.) The subject of noncontrollable verbs is in the absolutive, that of controllable verbs either in the absolutive or ergative. (The possibility of having an ergative subject defines neither transitive nor intransitive. A verb which cannot take an ergative subject is, however, ipso facto intransitive.) So, a noncontrollable intransitive verb like *nq* «to be sick» could have as first-person subject only the absolutive *ηq* ([21] *ηq nap_A reè* («I was sick»)); a controllable intransitive verb could have either *ηq* or the ergative *ηξè*, the latter when purpose is indicated ([21.a.] *ηq qāpā neε tshūū yōōp_A [LF] yī* 1.199.1–2 «I came here from the monastery», [21.b.] *ηξè maq yōō [LF] qho* 2.151.6–7 «I'll come down to you [for your sake]»).

k_{AP} in intransitive constructions belongs to the noncontrollable group. (We shall argue that the contrast of, for example, [22.a.] *ηq lō k_{AP} chu/k_{AP_A} reè* «I coughed [involuntarily]» with [22.b.] *ηξè lō k_{AP_A} yī* «I coughed [on purpose]» is that of a noncontrollable intransitive with a transitive, not a controllable intransitive.) A large number — perhaps a majority — of the subjects that immediately precede *k_{AP}* in the intransitive construction denote natural forces or processes (in which we subsume bodily functions and diseases). For example: *lhāqpā k_{AP}* «to blow (of the wind); to be windy», (23) *lhāqpā tī k_{AP} ni, pāpā, lhāqpēè khīp_A reè* 4.211.7–8 «This wind blew, and the wind carried the father off»; *thèélūū* (H–H) *k_{AP}* «to be/take place, of a windstorm», (24) *ηqā lāqāà l_A thèélūū* (H–H) *k_{AP} chu* «On the way, a windstorm came upon me»; *lōō k_{AP}* «to be, of lightning», (25) *lōō k_{AP_A} reè* «There was lightning».

We have posited two subjects, inner and outer, for such intransitive examples as (20) *qhō qo nap_A reè* «he had a headache», where the verb is preceded by two substantives (nouns or pronouns) in the absolutive. We make the same analysis of intransitive *k_{AP}* preceded by two substantives in the absolutive: in (26) *ηq neēlōō k_{AP} chu* «I relapsed/had a relapse», *neēlōō* (n.) «relapse» is the inner subject, *ηq* «I» the outer; in (27) *ηq hāpī k_{AP} chu/k_{AP_A} reè* «I sneezed», *hāpī* «a sneeze» is the inner subject, *ηq* «I» the outer.

In certain instances, the substantive in the absolutive before an intransitive verb may be preceded by a substantive in the dative. For example: (28) *ηqā tshōō* (H) *qθō chu* «Some paint got on me»; (29) *ηqā chāpā qθō chu* «I caught a cold»; (30) *ηqā tshīqōō* (HF) *rēē chu* «The ring fit me». The substantive in the dative may denote an animate experiencer, that is, one who, rather than acting, passively experiences: (31) *ηqā ηyīnāā k_{AP} chu* «I perspired», (32) *ηqā chāñnēè k_{AP} chu* «I had a hangover»,

(33) *ηεε qāḥpāā saprāà k_{ΔP} chu* «my foot itched», (34) *ηαα chāpā k_{ΔP} chu* «I caught a cold», (35) *ηαα lhāṭūū (H) k_{ΔP} chu* «I got smallpox». Again, the substantive in the dative may denote an inanimate recipient: (36) *chūūrāā hāpū k_{ΔPΛ} rēè* «The cheese got moldy», (37) *qhāṣīī (H) ηεε šā la ṭhīmā k_{ΔP} chu* «a while back, my (rotten) meat became smelly». Occasionally, there is a choice between absolutive and dative: (38) *ηα/ηαα kēpā k_{ΔP} chu* «I menstruated», (39) *ηεε laqpa/laqpāā qhāḥcū k_{ΔP} chu* «my hands got frostbitten».

We consider both the animate experiencer and the inanimate recipient in these constructions to be the subjects of their sentences. (Our understanding of the problems and possibilities in defining a subject has been modified by Comrie's discussion of this complex topic [*ibid.*]) A substantive in the absolutive may be either the subject or direct object of a transitive verb or the subject of an intransitive one. Similarly, a substantive in the dative can be either the indirect object of a transitive verb or the subject of an intransitive. A substantive in the instrumental case can be the subject of either a transitive or an intransitive verb. That is, morphological case is not a criterion for spoken Tibetan subjecthood. Neither is semantic role; the subject can be, for example, an agent, actor, experiencer, or inanimate recipient. (Comrie, *ibid.*, p. 51, gives examples for agent, instrument, and patient as subject: «John opened the door», «The key opened the door», «The door opened».) A subject in modern spoken Tibetan is a function of the relationship of a substantive and either a verb or the rest of the sentence which may, in favorable circumstances, be given formal recognition through agreement with the verb. (Where there are two subjects, agreement is with the outer subject.) In certain intransitive constructions, for example, the first-person subject of a declarative sentence, whether it is in the absolutive, dative, or instrumental case, takes the auxiliary *chūū* (unstressed: *chu*) rather than *sōō* (unstressed: *su*): (40.a.) *ηα qo nā chu* «I had a headache», (40.b.) *qhō qo nā su* «He had a headache»; (41.a.) *ηαα tshīqōō (HF) rēē chu* «The ring fit me», (41.b.) *mḡḡ tshīqōō (HF) rēē su* «The ring fit her»; (42.a.) *ηεè mḡ qhḡ chu* «I heard her», (42.b.) *qhōè mḡ qhḡ su* «He heard her». When there is a *yīī*: *rēè* contrast, in either the transitive or the intransitive constructions, it is agreement with *yīī* that marks the first-person subject: (43.a.) *ηεè qo chēpΛ yīī* «I opened the door», (43.b.) *qhōè qo chēpΛ rēè* «He opened the door»; (44.a.) *ηεè chīpΛ yīī* «I went», (44.b.) *qhōè chīpΛ rēè* «He went».

Constructions in which an intransitive verb can occur may indicate that an animate subject had no control over his actions, that he had control but exercised no purpose, or that he had control and exercised purpose. Example (22.a.), *ηα lō k_{ΔP} chu/k_{ΔPΛ} rēè* «I coughed (involuntarily)», belongs to the first of these three types. But what of example (22.b.), *ηεè lō k_{ΔPΛ} yīī* «I coughed (on purpose)», (or [45] *qhōè ηαα "qhāqāā tḡḡ!" tḡḡtḡḡ chεè ni, lō k_{ΔP} chu* «He coughed [on purpose], giving me a signal to be quiet ["Be quiet!"]»)? Any involuntary act expressed in the *ηα . . . k_{ΔP}*

chu construction which can also be performed voluntarily can appear in the $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} \dots k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$ construction. Another pair of examples: (46.a.) $\eta\bar{a} q_{\Delta} q_{\bar{i}} k_{\Delta P} chu/k_{\Delta P} r\bar{e}\bar{e}$ «I belched (involuntarily)», (46.b.) $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} q_{\Delta} q_{\bar{i}} k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$ «I belched (on purpose)». Examples 22.b. and 46.b. have the same form as such transitive examples as (1.a.) $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} q_{\bar{o}} k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$ «I closed the door», where $q_{\bar{o}}$ «door» is a direct object. Are $l\bar{o}$ «a cough» and $q_{\Delta} q_{\bar{i}}$ «a belch» the direct objects of $k_{\Delta P}$ («I gave a cough/belch»), or can an intransitive verb have an ergative outer subject and an absolutive inner subject, so that (22.b.) $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} l\bar{o} k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$ and (46.b.) $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} q_{\Delta} q_{\bar{i}} k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$ are examples of the controlled, purposeful intransitive? We incline to the former analysis. It may be of significance that there is no (47) $*\eta\bar{a} l\bar{o} k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$, with an absolutive subject and $-p_{\Delta} \gamma\bar{i}$, indicating control but not purpose.

We have discussed above the contrast of transitive $k_{\Delta P}$ and intransitive $th\bar{e}\bar{e}$. The semantic distance between $k_{\Delta P}$ and $th\bar{e}\bar{e}$, of course, narrows when $k_{\Delta P}$ itself is intransitive. For example: (48) $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} q\bar{o}\bar{s} q\bar{o}l\bar{s}\bar{o} k_{\Delta P} chu/th\bar{e}\bar{e} chu$ «My skin boat capsized», (49) $\eta\bar{a} ts\bar{a}\bar{n}\bar{o} k_{\Delta P} chu/th\bar{e}\bar{e} chu$ «I became a nymphomaniac», (50) $\eta\bar{a} n\bar{e}\bar{e}l\bar{s}\bar{o} k_{\Delta P} chu/th\bar{e}\bar{e} chu$ «I relapsed/had a relapse», (51) $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} t\bar{o}\bar{q}\bar{o} l_{\Delta} lh\bar{a}q\bar{p}\bar{a} k_{\Delta P} chu/th\bar{e}\bar{e} chu$ «The wind blew in my face».

4. Can $k_{\Delta P}$ function as a verbal auxiliary?

At best, $k_{\Delta P}$ is not a productive verbal auxiliary, and there are grounds, both semantic and syntactic, for doubting that it ever functions in this way.

An apparent verb base which is followed by $k_{\Delta P}$ often diverges in meaning from the base not followed by $k_{\Delta P}$. There is no consistency in this divergence which would enable us to attribute it to $k_{\Delta P}$ as an auxiliary. For example: $qu\bar{u}$ (WT *sgug-pa*, *bsgugs*, *bsgug*, *sgug[s]*) is «to wait» ([52.a.] $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} qh\bar{o} qu\bar{u}p_{\Delta} \gamma\bar{i}$ «I waited for him»); $qu\bar{u} k_{\Delta P}$ is «to lie in wait; to ambush» ([52.b.] $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} qh\bar{o} qu\bar{u} k_{\Delta P} \gamma\bar{i}$ «I ambushed him», [52.c.] $qh\bar{o}\bar{\theta} \eta\bar{a}/\eta\bar{a}q qu\bar{u} k_{\Delta P} chu$ «He ambushed me»). cip (WT *'jib[s]-pa*, *b'zigs/g'zigs*) is «to suck» ([53.a.] $p\bar{u}q\bar{y}\bar{y} th\bar{e}p\bar{o} cip_{\Delta} r\bar{e}\bar{e}$ «The child sucked his thumb»); $cip k_{\Delta P}$ is «to suck at, with the aim of drawing out something (e.g. poison, blood, a nail)» ([53.b.] $\eta\bar{e}\bar{e} ts\bar{o}m\bar{o}\bar{\theta} th\bar{o}q\bar{s}\bar{o} l_{\Delta} cip k_{\Delta P} ni$, *see t\bar{o}p_{\Delta} \gamma\bar{i} «I [one possessed by a *lh\bar{a}*] sucked at the female *ts\bar{o}*'s stomach, and brought out a nail»).*

In two such cases that we know of, all spoken Tibetan forms of the verb save one derive from a base that has the shape of a Perfect-root reflex. The one exception is the form that appears before $k_{\Delta P}$; this corresponds to the Present root of written Tibetan and has a somewhat different meaning than the other spoken Tibetan forms. $p\bar{i}$ «to make a small hole» takes the place of $*ph\bar{i}$, which would be the normal reflex of *phigs*, the Perfect root of written Tibetan *'big(s)-pa* ([54.a.] $qh\bar{o}\bar{\theta} \eta\bar{e}\bar{e} \bar{a}m\bar{c}\bar{o}\bar{o}$ [HF] $l_{\Delta} \bar{i}q\bar{u}\bar{u}$ [H] $p\bar{i} chu$ «He pierced my ears»). ($p\bar{i} \leftarrow *spigs \leftarrow *sbigs$. Cf.

Betty Shefts Chang, *The Tibetan Causative: Phonology*, *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica*, 42, 1971, pp. 623–765, especially pages 684–5) *p̄ī k_{AP}* «to make a large hole (one that a man might go through), in order to steal things» has in *p̄ī*, with its low tone, the regular reflex of the Present root 'big(*s*)' ([54.b.] *ŋɛ̄ p̄ī k_{AP} ʎ̄ī* «I made a hole [in the wall, so that I could break in and steal things]»). *p̄l̄p* (**spab* ← **sbab*) «to lower, cause to come down, get something down», takes the place of the expected reflex of written Tibetan *phab*, Perfect to 'bebs-*pa*, which would be **phl̄p* ([55.a.] *ŋɛ̄ thep thi p̄ī qhāā* [LF] *nɛ̄ p̄l̄p ʎ̄ī* «I took the book down from the bookshelf»). *pɛp*, the regular reflex of the Present root 'bebs, is used in conjunction with *k_{AP}* in the meaning «to lower by a few lines in writing a letter, i.e. to leave space in order to show respect to the addressee» ([55.b.] *ŋɛ̄ pɛp k_{AP} ʎ̄ī* «I lowered the writing in my letter [say, to show respect to His Holiness]»).

When there is a syntactic difference involving a verb alone and what appears to be the same verb followed by *k_{AP}*, as there frequently is, it is of this sort: before *k_{AP}*, the ostensible verb base takes the place of a direct object, and what is in the absolutive as a direct object when only the verb is used is in the dative case when *k_{AP}* follows it. Both *qār* (WT *bkar-ba*) and *qār k_{AP}* are used in the meaning «to prop up», but the direct object of *qār* becomes the indirect object of *qār k_{AP}* ([56.a.] *ŋɛ̄ qhām̄tōō* [H] *qār p_l ʎ̄ī*/[56.b.] *ŋɛ̄ qhām̄tōō* [H] *l_l qār k_{AP} ʎ̄ī* «I propped up the peach tree»). *ṭhu*, *ṭhȳ* (**gru*, **grus*;⁵ WT *bgrud-pa*, *bgrus*, *bgru*) and *ṭhȳ k_{AP}* are both «to husk». *ṭhȳ* can, however, have an absolutive direct object; *ṭhȳ k_{AP}* cannot: ([57.a.] *qhōō ʎ̄əō ṭhuq̄ rē* «He will husk the popped barley», [57.b.] *qhōō ʎ̄əō* [l_l] *m_Δṭȳ p_l rē* «He didn't husk the popped barley», [57.c.] *ŋɛ̄ ṭu l_l ṭhȳ k_{AP} ʎ̄ī* «I husked the barley»).

In view of the above, we suggest that where a verb base appears to be followed by *k_{AP}* as an auxiliary, *k_{AP}* is in fact the sole verb, once again preceded by a substantive which functions as its direct object. Such a substantive may or may not have been originally homonymous with the verb from which it derived. In one instance, on the basis of spoken Tibetan alone, one might suspect that *k_{AP}* was an auxiliary. *ṭ(h)ū*, *ṭ(h)ṭȳ* (WT 'khrud-*pa*, *bkrus*, *bkru*) is «to wash» ([58.a.] *qhōō ŋɛ̄ n̄l̄p̄c̄ī ṭȳ chu* «He washed my handkerchief»). *ṭhȳ k_{AP}* is «to wash one's face»; (58.b.) *ŋɛ̄ ṭhȳ k_{AP} ʎ̄ī*, without *tōō* «face», is synonymous with (58.c.) *ŋɛ̄ tōō ṭhȳ p_l ʎ̄ī* «I washed my face». Here, however, we know from written Tibetan that what precedes *k_{AP}* is a noun: for *ṭhȳ* «washing», written Tibetan has *khrus*.

⁵ Voiced stops in absolute-initial position yield aspirated stops and the low tone; voiced stops preceded by another consonant yield unaspirated stops and the low tone.

5. The development of the *rgyab*/*rgyag* doublets

Forms corresponding to both of the written Tibetan doublets *rgyab-pa* and *rgyag-pa* are used by the same person, speaking the Lhasa dialect — or one of the Lhasa dialects. Spoken Tibetan *k_Δp*, which occurs in isolation, initially before suffixes (*k_Δp-*), medially (*-k_Δp-*), and finally (*-k_Δp*), derives from *rgyab*. *k_{qà}*, *k_{q̄q-}* (in the Habitual *k_{q̄q}l*), *k_{q̄à-}* (before the sentence-final interrogative *-qaa* and the unstressed suffix *-qo*), *k_{q̄q-}*, *k_{ΔΔ}* (a vowel-harmonic alternant of *k_{q̄q-}* after high vowels), and *-k_{āà}* (*m_{q̄k}āà!*) have the form of *-ag* reflexes.

In some cases, one speaker may use a reflex of *rgyab*, while another uses an apparent reflex of *rgyag*: Mr. Nornang says *k_{qà}* *qoyāà* and *k_{q̄àqo}* where Mrs. Karsip, his niece, has *k_Δp* *qoyāà* and *k_Δpqu*: (59.a.) *ōō*, *th_q rēmōō k_{qà} qoyāà y_{q̄} rē* 1.94.18–19 (N) «Well now, they have to take turns»; (59.b.) . . . *tsīl̄ s_{q̄s}ōō qhēē k_Δp qoyāà r_lp_l tītēē* (HF) *cītāà y_{q̄k}i rē* 1.94.15–17 (K) «. . . I suppose they may have to sweep the classroom and do other such things»; (60.a.) . . . *chāpōō tī nāāōō k_{q̄àqo} rē* 3.219.16–17 (N) «. . . you have to churn the milk while it is sweet»; (60.b.) . . . *ph_lqēē* (H) *qhānpā chi k_Δpqu yōō* 2.264.6–7 (K) «. . . I want to build a house over there». In other environments, these speakers use the same form; Mr. Nornang, too, has the *rgyab* reflex in *k_Δpnl̄* (rather than **k_{q̄q}nā*), and both Mr. Nornang and Mrs. Karsip say *k_{q̄q}nēē* (not **k_Δpñēē* [H]): (61) *metōō tēē mōlōm k_Δpnl̄, l_{q̄}msāā* (H) *lēēqi* (H–H) *rē* 4.216.18–19 (N) «If she prays to this flower, she'll come immediately»; (62.a.) . . . "chāāsā" *señēē thi k_Δpēē qut_y, phāmāā phāā tshūū lōō* (HF) *ni mātōō, k_{q̄q}nēē y_{q̄} m_{q̄}rēpa* 1.290.17–291.2 (N) «. . . when they get «married», unless the parents have asked each other, they don't get married, you know»; (62.b.) *sōpāā k_{q̄q}nēē* 3.155.13–14 (K) «gamblers».

One could argue that *rgyag* was either a Present or a Future root, whose spoken reflexes were, for example, *k_{qà}*, *k_{q̄q-}*, *k_{q̄q-}*, *-k_{āà}*. Evidence for this argument is of three sorts: imperative formation, the Habitual in *-aq_l*, and the occurrence of *k_{qà}* before the auxiliary *qo* «to have to».

1. Imperative formation. Spoken Tibetan verbs with a single base in *-lp* have *-lp* in both the positive and negative imperatives (*l_Δp* «to teach»: [63] *l_Δp!* «Teach it!», *m_Δl̄lp!* «Don't teach it!»). Those with a single base in *-āà* have a negative imperative in *-āà* ([64] *sāà* «to split»: *māsāà!* «Don't split it!»). *k_Δp* has a positive imperative in *-lp* and a negative imperative in *-āà* ([65.a.] *tī k_Δplōō* [HF] *tēē k_Δp!* 2.236.8 «Put it behind here!», [65.b.] *reqōō* [H], *pēērēē m_{q̄k}āà!* 4.38.20, 4.44.3–4 «Rabbit, stop scratching!»). Verbs with contrasting Nonperfective and Perfective bases have a positive imperative which derives from the Perfective; the negative imperative derives from the Nonperfective (*th_u*, *th_y*) [WT *bru*, *brus*] «to dig»: [66] *th_y!* «Dig it!», *m_Δtūū!* «Don't dig it!»). The Nonperfective base derives, in turn, from either

the Present root of written Tibetan or, less commonly, the Future root. (See Betty Shefts Chang and Kun Chang, *The Persistence of Present-tense Reflexes in Modern Spoken Tibetan*. To appear in *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*.)

2. The Habitual in $-aq\Lambda$ (e.g. [67] $qh\bar{e}\bar{e}\ \bar{q}\bar{e}\ kaq\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$ «He usually closes the door»). If we take the argument from the formation of the negative imperative seriously, isn't this Habitual another example of a Nonperfective derivative? Habitual forms, as a type, derive from the Nonperfective base. The qualification «as a type» is needed because there has been a great deal of analogical or back formation with the atrophying of Present and Future roots. ($tsh\bar{u}$ [WT $'tshig-pa$, $tshig$] «to feel hot; to be in heat; to get burned» has, for example, a Perfective $tsh\bar{u}p\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$ and a Habitual $tsh\bar{u}q\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$; the $-q-$ of $tsh\bar{u}q\Lambda$ corresponds to the written Tibetan $-g$. But «to get used to» [WT $'dris-pa$], which has a Perfective $\bar{t}i\bar{u}p\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$ [$-is \rightarrow ii$], also has a Habitual with a $-q-$: $\bar{t}iq\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$. We consider it more reasonable to assume that $\bar{t}iq\Lambda$ was a back formation than to reconstruct a $*'drigs-pa$.) And Habitual forms in $-aq\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$ derive from verbs which in spoken Tibetan have no reflex of, say, a Present root with a vowel or initial differing from that of the Perfect root. We assume that, with a falling tone in the Perfective, there was some new, analogical formation of $-aq\Lambda$ in the Habitual. (There is not, for every Perfective in $-a\bar{a}$, a Habitual $-aq\Lambda$.) Since the Habitual $kaq\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$ could derive from just such a back formation, it cannot by itself be used as evidence in tracing the development of the $rgyab/rgyag$ doublets.

3. $ka\bar{a}$ before the auxiliary $q\bar{e}$ (example 59.a). This is the only auxiliary before which we have $ka\bar{a}$ in taped texts. $k\Delta p$, on the other hand, appears before a wide, apparently unlimited variety of auxiliaries, including $q\bar{e}$, depending on the speaker (example 59.b). When a verb has more than one base, it is the Nonperfective which precedes $q\bar{e}$ (e.g. [68] $che\bar{e}\ ni$, $ts\bar{i}\bar{y}\bar{m}\bar{e}\bar{e}$ [H] $thi\ th\bar{u}\ quq\bar{u}$ 2.280.7–8 «So, we have to dig this foundation» [Nonperfective $th\bar{u}$ (WT bru), Perfective $th\bar{y}\bar{y}$ (WT $brus$) «to dig»]).

The argument for $rgyag$ as a Nonperfective ends with the contemplation of $k\Delta p$: there is no precedent for a verb with $-g$ in the written Tibetan Present or Future leading to a Nonperfective base and with $-b$ in the Perfect yielding a Perfective base. We propose another, basically phonetic approach, taking $rgyab$, not $rgyag$, as primary. The sequence of events might then have been as follows:

1. Among some speakers, $-b$ assimilated to $-g$ before the velar stop of $-qaa$, $-qo$, and the auxiliary $q\bar{e}$: $ab \rightarrow ag$.
2. In final position and before unstressed suffixes, sequences made up of vowels followed by dental or velar stops yielded vowels with falling tones. This is a general change: $ag \rightarrow a\bar{a}$.
3. A pattern of Habitual formation produces $-aq\Lambda$ to verbs in $-a\bar{a}$. $kaq\Lambda\ re\bar{e}$ follows this pattern.

4. Verbs with Habitual forms in *-aqΛ reè* have negative imperatives in *-āà* (e.g. [69] «to split»: Habitual *šāqΛ reè*, negative imperative *māšāà!*). From a Habitual *kāqΛ reè* the next step, then, is a negative imperative *mākāà*.

Such hypotheses do not, of course, constitute proof. (The possibility of disproving them is also limited. Are there, for example, in early texts substantial records documenting the spelling of this verb?) For now, however, we see no way to go beyond such inconclusive proposals.

CSOMA DE KŐRÖS'S LIFE BEFORE HIS ORIENTAL JOURNEY

BY

E. CSETRI (Cluj-Napoca)

In the past decades significant new contributions have been made to the research into Csoma de Kőrös's biography. The results achieved in examining Csoma de Kőrös's life prior to his journey to the East: i. e. his starting in life, are summarized here. First his childhood at Kőrös and his school-years in Nagyenyed and Göttingen are discussed, followed by a survey of his direct preparations for the journey.

1. The inscription «Siculo-Hungarian of Transylvania» follows the author's name on the title page of both Csoma de Kőrös's Tibetan–English dictionary and the Tibetan grammar. «I am a native of the Siculian nation (a tribe of those Hungarians who settled in ancient Dacia in the fourth century of the Christian era) in the great principality of Transylvania, subject to his Majesty the Emperor of Austria,» he declared in his report written to the English Captain Kennedy on January 28, 1825.¹

He was born in the village of Kőrös, which was renamed Csoma-Kőrös in 1904 in honour of its great son. According to the Calvinistic parish register of Kőrös he was born in 1784, some days before April 4, the date of his baptism. This hamlet lies at the foot of a snow-capped peak of the sweep of the Eastern Carpathians. In the specific Székler system of public administration it then belonged to Orbai county, which, together with Sepsi and Kézdi formed Háromszék (today Kovászna County). The inhabitants of the village, numbering some 400 at the time, were accustomed to the privations caused by the adverse natural conditions. They eked out their limited agriculture with some measure of animal husbandry, silviculture, trading and sieve-making in the manner of Székler handymen. The continental climate was especially harsh, being strongly influenced by the «dire gales» of the ice-cold Nemere.²

His father was András Csoma, his mother Krisztina Getse. Out of the seven offsprings of his parents only four survived: Julianna (born 1774), Krisztina (born

¹ Duka, Theodore, *Life and Works of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös*, London 1885, p. 24.

² Cholnoky, Jenő, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*, Budapest 1940, pp. 23–25; Debreczy, Sándor, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor csodálatos élete* (The Wonderful Life of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), 2nd edition, Sepsiszentgyörgy 1942, pp. 13–21; Csetri, Elek, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor indulása* (The Start of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), Bucharest 1979, pp. 12–21; id., *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor születéséről és származásáról* (On the Birth and Parentage of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös): *Korunk* XXXVIII (1979), pp. 557–563.

1778), Alexander (born 1784) and his younger brother Gábor (born 1788). To distinguish himself from the other Csomas living in the village Alexander, who had risen to world fame, used the designation «de Kőrös», which was also due to him as one of the Székler yeomen who were considered noblemen. Bringing up four children confronted András Csoma, a man of reduced means, with many difficulties, but this quick-witted, enterprising, lettered and knowledgeable Székler had risen to become one of the leaders of the village and merited the rank of corporal in the frontier-guard.³

The institution of the frontier-guard stationed in his native village had a decisive impact on the development of de Kőrös's character and attitude, indeed on his whole life. Together with the majority of the villagers, the male members of his family served in the 2nd infantry of the Székler frontier-guard, while the men of means served in the Székler cavalry regiment. In contrast with the troops of the Imperial and Royal line infantry the soldiers of the frontier-guard regiments bore arms in times of peace in their native regions. They spent most of their service in miserable patrols checking mountain defiles, passes and other crossing points under the most adverse circumstances, constantly exposed to danger. They were subject to military discipline in all its rigour: in times of peace they took turns in serving among the frontier zone, and in times of war they were deployed in far-off theatres of hostilities. Csoma's father, for example, served as a corporal; his brother took part in the Napoleonic wars in the same capacity.⁴

Since the Middle Ages, Csoma's ancestors had defended the frontier as soldiers who themselves had deep roots among the population of the border area. Discipline and military regulations had been imprinted upon their minds, becoming their fundamental trait and crystallizing into self-discipline. The impact of the recurrent trials and long marches that Csoma experienced accustomed him to accept them wholeheartedly as customary moments: they inspired him to feats of endurance, while the stories themselves related by old warriors about adventures in battles and camps and about the dangers they faced — they rubbed elbows with death every day — encouraged Csoma to be bold and audacious. This tradition, which enveloped his heart since his early days coupled with his unparalleled strength of mind helps us to understand the sacrifices he undertook among the gigantic mountains of Tibet.

As was the custom in the village, he had his share of communal chores since his childhood: he helped with farming, tending animals and logging. But the child and adolescent Csoma had not only his share of physical labour but of intellectual tests as well. The Calvinistic people of Kőrös had had a school since 1677, which has

³ Debreczy, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–20; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 22–25.

⁴ Duka, *op. cit.*, p. 3; Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, pp. 21–22; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 25–29.

documentary evidence. De Kőrös probably attended school from the age of six but in the last years of the century the growing lad was obviously increasingly used for agricultural labour. The schoolmaster or rector did the teaching in the vernacular. Between 1791 and 1797 (when de Kőrös was at schooling age), Zsigmond Dulló, Mihály Vadasdi and Zsigmond Orbán de Lécfalva took the chair of the Kőrös rector in succession. An ecclesiastic visitor to Kőrös in 1797, referred to the work of the latter in words of appreciation («having inspected the school as well, I saw remarkable progress among the children».⁵

Generally the children went to the dark, confined one-room school from the autumn to the spring, from St Michael's day (September 29th) to St George's day (April 24th). According to the precept of the Calvinistic Consistory of 1786, the purpose of school education in villages was to teach the skills of reading, writing and singing, as well as knowledge of religion and secular subjects («of civil society»). The latter included arithmetic, the science of ethics and some practical– economic subjects (land survey, field economy, and geography). Teaching a knowledge of the country and history was an important element of elementary education. The above-mentioned precept instructed the village schoolmasters to teach their charges «the history of the country (historiam patriae) rather concisely. . .» Wherever the rectors knew German, it was considered advisable to teach the language.⁶ It was general practice in the land of the Széklers that rectors who had continued their college studies in Latin willingly instructed the elder schoolchildren in the Latin language, «the fundamentals of Latin sciences», keeping in view the higher education and office career of their pupils.⁷

Apparently, it was the «history of the country» which was deeply imprinted in Csoma's mind as a schoolboy. The body of traditions of his native land kindled his interest in history. As is well known, among the Székler people the tradition of the Széklers' Hunnish origin has existed since the 13th century. According to Gyula Grexa a possible explanation might be that the Széklers, living in the eastern part of mediaeval Hungary, came into contact with Danubian Hunnish and Bulgarian elements after the Hungarian Conquest and profusely borrowed from the folklore of these peoples.⁸

⁵ Archives of the Calvinist Diocese of Orba. Kovászna. Visitation Records (1677–1800); Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–37.

⁶ General Archives of the Calvinist District of Transylvania. Kolozsvár. Consistory Archives. 305/1786.

⁷ Debreczy, *op. cit.*, pp. 29–30; Fogarasi, Sámuel, *Marosvásárhely és Göttinga* (Marosvásárhely and Göttingen) (ed. I. Juhász), Bucharest 1974, p. 19; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 43–45.

⁸ Grexa, Gyula, *A Csaba-monda és a székely hunhagyomány* (The Csaba Legend and the Hunnish Tradition Among the Széklers), Budapest 1922, pp. 3–52; Dümmerth, Dezső, *Az Árpádok nyomában* (In the Wake of the Árpáds), Budapest 1977, pp. 56–75.

The consciousness of the Székler villagers of de Kőrös's time was still wholly intertwined with the threads of legends and fables, these most sublime productions of folk poetry, and thus they inherited a mythical–historical awareness, which was much more vivid, colourful and luminous than that of today. At the end of the 18th century, the glory of the Hunnish Empire, King Attila, Scourge of God, the triumphal way, and Prince Csaba were all present in the minds of the Székler village people as a living part of the past, complemented by the more scientific facts about the origin of the Huns, Magyars and Széklers which were heard about in school. The stories of the «hoary chroniclers» recalling the life of the forefathers on long winter evenings or by the gulch, reinforced by the explanations of schoolmasters, fused into more trustworthy factual information in young Csoma's ever widening realm of knowledge and imagination.

Presumably, his teachers played a major part in paving his way towards higher education by animating and improving his latent talent for history and his affection for the past. Furthermore, Csoma's talent and steadfastness alone might have proved insufficient, if the noble-minded schoolmasters had not patronized him, stimulating and assisting him in acquiring elementary education. They laid the foundations of his knowledge, on which the solid structure of science — the walls of which were built at the colleges in Nagyenyed and Göttingen — could be securely built.

2. At the age of fifteen and half de Kőrös, who had been seasoned by the harsh climate, strenuous work and monetary stringency, arrived on foot in Nagyenyed accompanied by his father, to reside in the Calvinistic «Bethlen College» for the next sixteen years (1799–1815), which virtually became his home, his Alma Mater or bounteous mother; a workshop to fashion his spiritual and intellectual character. Since its establishment, the College had been willingly attended by the youth of the counties of Háromszék and Udvarhely, for it provided free board and lodging and education for the poor students. Gábor Bethlen, the Prince of Transylvania, had furnished the College with landed property and funds, which provided plentiful assistance for the congregation of about 1,000 students in Csoma's time. The financial position of the college was also assisted by donations from benefactors. The donation raised by English co-religionists («the English money») in 1716 increased the funds of the college by a considerable sum, which later constituted the financial basis for the restoration of the institute in the 18th–19th centuries.⁹

⁹ Váró, Ferenc, *Bethlen Gábor kollégiuma* (The College of Gábor Bethlen), Nagyenyed 1903, pp. 102–103; Hegedűs, Sámuel, *Egy hazafias szó és egy baráti könny Kőrösi Sándor sirja fölött* (A Patriotic Word and a Teardrop from a Friend Over the Grave of Alexander de Kőrös): *Pesti Hírlap*, II, No. 190 of 27/10/1842, pp. 759–761; *Mezőkövesdi Újfalvy Sándor emlékiratai* (Memoirs of Újfalvy Sándor de Mezőkövesd) (ed. Farkas Gyalui), Kolozsvár 1941, pp. 99–100; Németh, Gyula, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*

The institution of the pupil-servants ensured free education for de Kőrös and the pupils in the lower form. Pupil-servants performed communal chores in the college (sweeping, cutting and transporting wood, and laying the fires, etc.), or went into domestic service. In return, they were given free education and lodging, as well as some bread or «the loaf» which was just enough for subsistence. Occasionally, they were allotted some subsidy from the funds. Kőrös was the private servant to the Viski brothers from Retteg, and to the sons of János Borsos, the pastor of Szászváros, who were studying in Nagyenyed. This employment did more than just ensure his subsistence and some extra money; as he could only seldom visit his far-away birthplace, the presbytery of Szászváros became a parental home for him during the vacations.¹⁰ As a «conscript») a man of Háromszék residing in the frontier region he was bound to fulfil military service until the age of 60. However, for the duration of his studies, de Kőrös was granted an exemption by the college.¹¹

The college, which essentially determined de Kőrös's life at the time, was not an institution of scholarship in today's sense of the word; it was much rather an autonomous community with its own code and precepts, or as it was then called, «a learning society», a «republic». On the part of the teachers, it was directed by the professorate, but in the spirit of «republican» democracy. Representatives of the students also participated in the sessions of the school board (*sedria*). The students' body, responsible for observing the internal regulations, was headed by the *senior* and the *contrascriba*. The students had a hard time to eke out their education and subsistence under the given patriarchal circumstances. They dwelled in the small rooms of weather-beaten old buildings. As no canteens were provided by the college, they had to provide their own meals as well as the heating, lighting and cleaning. They were often employed in the tillage of the estate belonging to the college. The college, however, had its own bakehouse, where the loaves were baked for the indigent and the scholarship-holders. The affluent students sent out for food, while the needy subsisted on fruit, vegetables, dry food and alms added to the «loaf».¹²

lelki alkata és fejlődése (The Mental Constitution and Development of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), Kolozsvár 1943, pp. 4–5; Páriz Pápai, Ferenc, *Békességet magamnak, másoknak* (Peace Be with Me and with Others) ed. Géza Nagy), Bucharest 1977, p. 82; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 46–47 etc.

¹⁰ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, p. 100; Hegedüs, *op. cit.*, p. 760; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 75–79; Musnai, László, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor és Nagyenyed* (Alexander Csoma de Kőrös and Nagyenyed): *Magyar Pedagógia*, LXIII (1963) p. 489.

¹¹ Musnai, *op. cit.*, pp. 494–495; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 47–49, pp. 88–89.

¹² Musnai, *op. cit.*, pp. 489–492; Németh, *op. cit.*, pp. 4–5; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 55–62; Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, pp. 96–100; Benkő, Ferenc, *Parnassusi időtöltés* (Parnassian Pastimes), VII, Kolozsvár 1800, pp. 21–22, p. 61; Váró, *op. cit.*, pp. 20–21.

De Kőrös belonged to the latter. Receiving no support whatever from home, he had to live on the garden, the college «loaf» and the duties discharged as a pupil-servant; he even sold the Székler *pogácsa* (crackling cakes) he was sometimes sent from home. He wore handwoven frieze clothes, and whenever possible, he made some living from agricultural labour.¹³ Much later in Göttingen he recalled: a kind-hearted poor old woman who received him into her house and became a second mother to him when he, as a pupil-servant, would go to the fields to earn his food and clothes by reaping.¹⁴

Adolescent Csoma had to adapt himself to this republic of students, the melting-pot that moulded him into a mature person with sympathy for his fellow-students, and with a deep affiliation to his entire nation and the world of science. This is where he was hardened into a man with a powerful frame, a steadfast intellectual researcher who bore work and fatigue to a wonderful degree, which is how he was described by his contemporaries. As Sándor Újfalvy, his closest associate at school, wrote: «He was of middle stature, broad-shouldered, with iron-hard bones and muscles: easily he was the strongest of us all. His finely shaped clear-cut features blended into a manly countenance; the expression of his face was profound, thoughtful and reserved.»¹⁵ In dress he was neat and simple, his conduct was natural, informal and friendly. He had the marvellous trait in his character of inspiring confidence in all who came into contact with him. He always kept his word and performed his duties with exemplary proficiency. His conduct soon made him a well-known and respected student of the college.¹⁶

The educational system in effect during de Kőrös's college years was established during the reign of Maria Theresa. The old schooling system, derived from the late Middle Ages and the Reformation, had gradually changed under the conditions of the Enlightenment and with minor alterations it was still in force at the beginning of the 19th century. In Calvinistic colleges the *Methodus docendi*, drawn up in 1769, constituted the basis of education, laying increasing stress on pragmatism in the whole process of teaching. Transmitting classical erudition always remained a significant task of college education. The prevalence of the Latin language served to prepare students for official, ecclesiastic or scholarly careers. The *Methodus studiorum*, subjoined to the 1769 precept, emphasized the universal feature of Latin and its importance in scientific preparations, with a view to the fact that in most colleges abroad the language of education was Latin. In keeping with the Bell-

¹³ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–101.

¹⁴ Ungi, Márton, *Egy pár töredékvonás Kőrösi Csoma Sándor képéből* (Some Fragmentary Additions to the Picture of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös): *Vasárnapi Újság*, VII, 1860, No. 26, p. 315.

¹⁵ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

¹⁶ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, p. 101; Hegedűs, *op. cit.*, p. 760.

Lancaster theory, instruction in the *classes* of the lower form was performed by the specially appointed students of the upper form (*publici*) under the supervision of the leading pedagogue (*pedagogarcha*). The imparted material was then practised by the pupils with student-tutors.

De Kőrös first accomplished the eight *classes* (the classes of declination, conjugation, grammar, syntax, rhetoric, poetry, Greek and logic). The exclusive object of the preliminary classes was to obtain a good command of Latin including the wordstock, grammar, composition and speaking skills. From the grammatical class on speaking Latin was a requirement; the history, archeology, geography and politics of ancient societies were taught here with some arithmetic added. The next classes centred on the study of classic Roman authors (Cornelius Nepos, Cicero, Ovid, Vergil, and Horace) and set the target of raising the students' competence in Latin to the levels of the literary and rhetoric language. A separate class dealt with the Greek language, and in the last class of the lower form, in the eighth, logic and ontology were the main subjects based on F. Chr. Baumeister's handbook.¹⁷

Already in the lower classes de Kőrös distinguished himself as an eminent pupil and merited the appreciation of his colleagues and fellow-pupils. As Újfalvy wrote, de Kőrös, who had started from a small village school, «was the very best among ninety pupils already in the first year. Only his industry was a match to his power of memory: never did he forget what he had once read.» He spent all the time left after performing his duties as a pupil-servant, studying and reading. When asked at examinations, «he sometimes interrupted the teacher and perplexed him with some scientific discourse».¹⁸ His scholarly progress earned him adequate stipends. His proficiency was most conspicuous in the Latin language and literature. Naturally, the responsible and highly industrious student, who had an amazing flair for languages, made marked progress in the other branches of his favourite subject of philology, namely in geography and history. He also read extensively.

The year 1807, marked the advent of a new stage in his studies, when he was promoted to the higher course of academic studies. He had become a college student and with all solemnity he confirmed by his signature that he would observe the college rules. To ensure further education, he also pledged to go into the Church. His life had taken on a better turn: he was allotted the scholarship of seniors (so-called «principists») and earned the right to wear the respectable toga, the due of college students.¹⁹ Having risen to the status of a collegian student, de Kőrös was elected lecturer on Poetry for the 1811–1815 terms, a commission

¹⁷ Török, István, *A kolozsvári ev. ref. collégium története* (The History of the Calvinist College of Kolozsvár) I, Kolozsvár 1905, pp. 162–182.

¹⁸ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–101.

¹⁹ Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 81–82.

completing his activities as private tutor. The Latin classics had priority in the material he instructed, followed by lessons on geography and the Middle Ages of universal history. His charges were supposed to acquire prosody, the art of making poems. Versification, as well as recalling and translating Latin authors, remained a favourite occupation with him during the years in Göttingen and Asia, consoling his homesick heart in his solitude.

Teaching and communal duties did not in any way divert him from his principal task of studying, self-education, the acquisition of the academic material that this course gave best access to. Under the 1769 curriculum, de Kőrös was supposed to finish the «first class» of studies, during which he must have been mainly engaged with universal history, Greek and Latin literature and archeology, as well as the Hebrew grammar, these subjects being of major importance concerning his preparations. Though the next phase of his studies in the four-year «second class» highlighted theology and other religion-related subjects, he could extensively study Hebrew archeology, the Old Testament and the «historiam patriae» within the «philological subjects» as well as geography, a so-called philosophical concern.²⁰

It needs to be emphasized that Csoma's professors at Enyed were scholars trained in Western universities. Back in their native land, they never ceased cultivating their connections with German, Swiss and English scientific centres; the books they received from there considerably promoted their educational and scientific careers.

De Kőrös entered the hall of fame of Oriental scholars principally as a philologist. This is strongly buttressed by the assumption of Gyula Németh that Csoma's thorough Latin studies at Nagyenyed enabled him to elucidate the grammatical system of Tibetan, a so-far unknown language, of accurately collecting its lexicon and gaining a reliable insight into its literature.²¹ He was guided to his superior mastery of the Latin language by Ádám Herepei, while the bases of his Hebrew and Greek knowledge were laid by János Nemegeyi, the old professor of the college. It should be noted in passing, that Oriental studies had long-standing traditions in the Protestant colleges of Transylvania: apart from Hebrew, various Oriental languages were taught on the basis of appropriate handbooks. De Kőrös's keen linguistic instinct is also confirmed by the fact that he learnt Romanian, and the German and French languages as well.

De Kőrös had free scope to search into geography, admittedly another of his favourite subjects, and this knowledge became vitally important during his sojourn in the East. A prominent scholar of his field, Ferenc Benkő, Csoma's professor at Nagyenyed, was a «corresponding member of the Society for Natural Inquiry at

²⁰ Török, *op. cit.*, pp. 158–161, pp. 179–182.

²¹ Németh, *op. cit.*, p. 7; cf. Tucci, *Giuseppe, Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*, Kolozsvár 1942, p. 13.

Jena», whose works contributed considerably to the study of geography. Benkő's *Oriental Travellers* was of fundamental assistance in de Kőrös's journey. Rightly so, as Nibur's travelogue included therein not only describes the Middle East, but Persia and India as well, while Tavernier's account covers the Arabic countries, Persia and the Mongolian Empire.²² De Kőrös also made good use of Benkő's *Hungarian Geography* (Kolozsvár 1801–1802), which devotes some 250 pages to Asia, including the areas de Kőrös traversed during his peregrinations.

However, in moulding de Kőrös's personality, the greatest credit is due to the professor of his third favourite branch of science, history. Ádám Herepei, the ardent proponent of the enlightenment, the French Revolution and the national spirit in the college, who instructed rhetoric and politics in addition to history, was a «commanding rhetor» and the pedagogarcha of the lower form. Not only was he an advocate of *historia cognitio*, he was also the master of eloquence; he had a unique ability to most vividly describe the roles of historical heroes and ancient events. He taught the spirit of history, and his enthralling lectures always carried away his listeners. He had a tremendous influence on the youth. History, together with its professor, were very popular in the college; the letters of Sámuel Turkoly, which mentioned traces of Hungarians living around the Caspian sea, were widely read among the eager students.²³ In all certainty it was the lectures of Herepei that induced in Csoma's heart the fanciful idea of undertaking a scientific journey, with the object of discovering the original land of the Hungarians. As a childhood reverie at first, this plan, carried over to Nagyenyed, must have grown into firm resolution, to which — once adopted — Csoma subordinated his whole life. His iron will and relentless industry were at his aid in learning diligently, and he trained his body like an ascetic to endure the privations and hardships to come. «Generally he would sleep on the bare earth or floor. He was never ill or indisposed. His diet consisted of the college loaf, some fruit, cottage cheese and tossed salad. Rarely did he eat and never touched delicacies or arousing (alcoholic) drinks. He would abstain from drinking water for days.» He withstood both heat and cold to a wonderful degree. His fellow-student recollected that he kept himself aloof from youthful diversions (courting, revelling, and dancing).²⁴

As a student, Csoma had access to the scientific collections of the college, the library and the museum. The two-room library, arranged as to subjects, contained

²² Benkő, Ferenc, *Parnasszusi időtöltés* (Parnassian Pastimes), III, Kolozsvár 1974.

²³ Hegedűs, *op. cit.*, p. 760; id., *A közhasznú professor és historicus egy halotti beszédben* (The Professor and Historian of Public Commitment in a Funeral Oration), Kolozsvár 1814, pp. 41–44; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 129–130; Musnai, László, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*, Nagyenyed 1943, p. 12; Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

²⁴ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, pp. 100–101.

Arabic, Chinese and Turkish works, dictionaries and grammars alongside the incunabula, and books in Hungarian, Latin, Greek, German, French. The museum had Roman and mediaeval material, as well as a numismatic collection.²⁵

De Kőrös eagerly seized on the opportunity to pore over the exhibits of the historical museum and the valuable books of the library: under Professor Herepei's guidance he devoted a great deal of time to considering historical and geographical problems and studying languages.

Professor Herepei's course on *World History*, extant in lecture notes, gives a good insight into what historical provisions de Kőrös received for his journey, who was tight-lipped when it came to personal matters. The notes took stock of events from the fall of the Western Empire to the French Revolution. The introduction carries a rich bibliography. Herepei drew profusely on sources concerning Hungarian history; regarding world history, he primarily consulted Greek, Roman and Byzantine chroniclers. He also referred to a wide range of Western historians, especially to German and French syntheses. His foreign sources included several works by Edward Gibbon and J. G. Eichhorn. For the section on the prehistory of the Huns, Avars and Magyars Herepei's principal guidebooks were two works by György Pray (*Annales veteres Hunnorum, Avarum et Hungarorum*, Vindobonae 1761; *Dissertationes historico-criticae in annales veteres Hunnorum, Avarum et Hungarorum*, Vindobonae 1774), the monumental work of István Katona (*Historia Critica Regum Hungariae I–XLII*, Pestini 1779–1817) and the opus of the Orientalist Deguignes which also used Chinese sources (*Histoire des Huns, Turcs, des Mongols et des autres Tartares occidentaux*, Paris 1756). The fact that Pray (on the basis of J. E. Fischer's *De origine Ungarorum*) regarded the Hungarians as the offshoot of the Uighurs was instrumental in reinforcing de Kőrös's orientation towards the East. Although Herepei mainly distinguished himself as a pedagogue and not as a historian, the professional bibliography to the handbook testifies that he faithfully conveyed the above scientific results to the students. It can be safely assumed that de Kőrös was acquainted with these ideas through Herepei's mediation.²⁶

In 1814 Herepei was succeeded in the chair by Sámuel Hegedűs, who composed a handbook on Hungarian prehistory (1815). The bibliographic material of his work considerably coincides with that of Herepei's. He also referred to the Oriental scholar J. H. Klaproth, who propounded the notion that the Hungarians and

²⁵ Benkő, *op. cit.*, VII, pp. 26–29; Nagy, Géza, *A Bethlen-kollégium tudományos gyűjteményeinek története* (The History of the Scientific Collections of the Bethlen College), Kolozsvár 1947, pp. 13–14; Vita. Zsigmond, *Tudománnyal és cselekedettel* (With Science and Action), Bucharest 1968, pp. 70–78.

²⁶ Jékéssy, József, *Jékéssy Gyula, Kőrösi Csoma Sándor célja* (The Aim of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), Budapest 1935, pp. 3–9.

Uighurs were identical. De Kőrös was busy preparing for his journey to Göttingen at the time, and possibly was informed of Hegedüs's findings mainly through conversations.²⁷

The historical heritage of the Nagyenyed College, the scientific competence of his professors, and the national and communal spirit of the students were all parts of the motives driving de Kőrös to act on his resolution. His spiritual provisions for the journey to the next station of his life, Göttingen, were indeed substantial.

3. Csoma completed his studies at the Nagyenyed College in 1814 but stayed on for another year as Senior Collegian. He headed the students' delegation which in 1814 invited Hegedüs — then in Kolozsvár — to fill Herepei's chair. Owing to his superior qualities, his professors at Nagyenyed recommended him to «academies outside the country», in Göttingen or Heidelberg. As was customary in the Austrian Empire, he was given the two documents required, the certificate of education and the professorate's references, after he had passed the «*rigorosum*» testifying to his knowledge on June 16, 1815.

De Kőrös's final certificate and references, of which the contents and tone so greatly differ from the average with qualifications like «*eminent*», «*maxima cum laude*», plainly manifest the respect his iron will and heroic disposition had earned him during his college years. This emanates from the laudatory epithets used when referring to his moral conduct, character, his relationship with the professors and students, his industry, accomplishments and scientific inclinations, and from the warm tone his professors recommended him to the university abroad.

De Kőrös's foreign studies were conditional upon the written commitment he signed in the presence of Bishop János Abats, declaring his willingness to enter the Church. By late 1815, it had been decided that he would continue his studies in Göttingen on a British scholarship. Having been granted an imperial passport, in the late winter or early spring of 1816 he set out on foot, with some 300 florins in his pocket, to arrive in Göttingen along the presumable route of Várad–Vienna–Prague–Dresden–Leipzig and Halle.²⁸ He signed the matricula of the Georgia Augusta University of Göttingen on April 11, 1816, thereby becoming an undergraduate of the institution.²⁹

During the period between 1814–1818, some 40 students from Transylvania matriculated in Göttingen, among them 18 from Nagyenyed. Although, in theory,

²⁷ Németh, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor lelki alkata és fejlődése* (The Personality and Development of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), p. 10; Csetri, *op. cit.*, p. 120.

²⁸ Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 135–150; id., *Iratok Kőrösi Csoma Sándor göttingai tanulmányútjához* (Documents on the Grand Tour of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös to Göttingen): *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények*, XII (1968), pp. 134–141; Duka, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

²⁹ Borzsák, István, *Budai Ézsaiás és klasszika-filológiánk kezdetei*, (Ézsaiás Budai and the Beginnings of Our Classical Philology), Budapest 1965, p. 201.

he could have been in contact with all of them, there is written evidence only of his friendly intercourse with Ádám Tompa, together with his friendship with József Szabó de Borgáta and Márton Ungi of Hungary. He mainly boarded with German students in the lodgings offered by J. Rackebrand, a baker in Weender Strasse. During that time, Sámuel Soldos and József Harkányi were his fellow-undergraduates from Nagyenyed. In 1954, the Uralo-Altai Society (*Societas Uralo-Altaiica*) placed a commemorative plaque on the wall of his boarding house in Göttingen.³⁰

Solitary and reserved, de Kőrös devoted all his time to studies in Göttingen, too. He did not communicate with people outside the university and shunned the usual pastimes of students. His affinity to poetry and literature did not diminish. He remained fond of reciting Greek and Latin classics and composing verses both in Latin and in Hungarian, which he left to his colleagues as a token of friendship.³¹

Bound for Göttingen, in Vienna he stayed with Újfalvy his friend from the Nagyenyed school, to whom de Kőrös declared: «It is not my innermost conviction that drives me: I am bound to satisfy the prejudice of the people . . . but I cannot while away my time, because time for me is dearer than for others.»³²

Nevertheless, his two and a half years' stay in Göttingen proved to be most fruitful. It is a well-known fact that the University of Göttingen, located in Hannover but subject to the British crown, played a significant role in Hungarian cultural history. A number of prominent Hungarian scholars, from Sámuel Gyarmathi and Farkas Bolyai to József Budenz and Loránd Eötvös studied there. The prevailing neo-humanistic ideals and the spirit of liberalism, and its orientation towards modern scientific thought, all interacted to raise it to the echelon of European universities and encouraged de Kőrös's endeavours. It had an academic society and published two periodicals. In its four faculties 36 professors, and even more assistants and librarians served the enrolment of over 1,000 students from Europe and overseas.³³

On his way home de Kőrös told Újfalvy that his studies in Göttingen focussed on «the Jewish exegesis, and Arabic and Turkish above all», which were pivotal points

³⁰ Borzsák, *op. cit.*, pp. 200–202; Musnai, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor és Nagyenyed* (Alexander Csoma de Kőrös and Nagyenyed), p. 492; Cholnoky, Jenő, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor Göttingenben* (Alexander Csoma de Kőrös in Göttingen): *Turán XXV* (1942), pp. 14–16; Terjék, József, *Kőrösi Csoma dokumentumok az Akadémiai Könyvtár gyűjteményeiben* (Csoma de Kőrös documents in the collections of the Library of the Academy), Budapest 1976 p. 201; Gissen, Walter, *Göttinger Gedenktafeln*, Göttingen 1962, p. 45; Csetri, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor indulása* (The Start of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), pp. 179–186.

³¹ Szilágyi, Ferenc, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor hazai útja* (Alexander Csoma de Kőrös's Memory at Home), Budapest 1966, pp. 20–27; Duka, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–9; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 188–194.

³² Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

³³ Borzsák, *op. cit.*, pp. 27–51; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 152–158.

in his plan.³⁴ It can be confirmed, however, that he attended Greek and English courses as well as lectures on history, but Oriental studies had a decisive appeal for him. Strangely enough, the library records of the period between August 1816 and June 1817 do not show any borrowings in this field. They list works on literature, history, philosophy and theology in the Greek, Latin, German, French, English and Italian languages. It is noteworthy that he borrowed the works of his professor Eichhorn. He also seemed to have read Barthélemy's political novel *Voyage de jeune Anacharsis en Grèce* several times. One may be justifiably puzzled by the lack of borrowings concerning the Asian topics, which he was most deeply interested in. Why did he not borrow works of inchoate Oriental studies, and books on Hungarian prehistory and language.³⁵ We have to fall back on the supposition that he did not study the works of greatest interest to him, but contemplated them in the silence of reading-rooms with the assistance of helpful librarians and teachers.

The available data suggest that de Kőrös had especially close relationship with his professor Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, who was in charge of handling the English scholarship which the students from Nagyenyed received. He was also a noted scholar of Biblical sciences, Oriental learning and history. He was de Kőrös's teacher of Arabic and it was he who directed the attention of this wandering student from Transylvania to the importance of Arabic sources in the investigation of Hungarian prehistory. He might have also assisted him with his Turkish studies. This illustrious philologist further polished Csoma's linguistic gift that manifested itself so amazingly in his Tibetan research.³⁶ De Kőrös did not neglect classical philology either. He attended the Greek course of Ludwig Disson about Pindar Commentaries and possibly heard lectures on Latin literature by the remarkable authority on Horace, Christoph Wilhelm Mitscherlich. He also took part in French conversational lessons. The dictionaries and books he borrowed intimate that his affinity to languages inspired him to tackle Italian and Spanish as well.³⁷

Arnold Ludwig Hermann Heeren, a celebrated professor of the Göttingen University, was proud of having de Kőrös, «this wonderful man of Transylvanian parentage» as «one of his most industrious students.» Under Heeren, de Kőrös studied history, another subject he was passionately attached to. During his imposing scientific career, Heeren himself widely searched into the history and culture of the Asian peoples, the cornerstone of de Kőrös's interests.³⁸

³⁴ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

³⁵ Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, pp. 8–20; Németh, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

³⁶ Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, pp. 11–12; Németh, *op. cit.*, p. 8; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 163–167.

³⁷ Szabó de Borgáta, József, *Pár adat Kőrösi Csoma Sándorról* (Some Data on Alexander Csoma de Kőrös): *Sopron*, 16/12/1876, No. 50; Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, p. 14; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 167–169.

³⁸ Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, p. 12; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 169–171.

According to Wurzbach, de Kőrös attended the lectures of another distinguished scholar Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, the founder of anthropology, also an eminent researcher of ethnography and a witty lecturer.³⁹ His lectures also contributed to de Kőrös's intellectual development.

Allowing for the supposition that de Kőrös had heard of the Uighurs in Nagyenyed, Eichhorn, Heeren, Blumenbach and his readings in Göttingen concerning Oriental subjects must have merely reinforced the false notion he entertained of the Hungarian–Uighur kinship and strengthened his resolution to visit Central Asia in search of the land of ancient Uighurs.⁴⁰ For de Kőrös this was a scientific as well as a patriotic task.

During the Göttingen years, his connection with his native land remained unbroken. In the spring of 1817, his younger brother Gábor came to his aid with 100 German florins.⁴¹ As a sign of acknowledgement, the professorate of his Alma Mater in Nagyenyed elected him to the professorial chair of the Gymnasium (secondary school) in Szászváros⁴² in the autumn of 1817.

After receiving his university diploma, he considered returning home in the summer of 1818. However, because he had lent some money to a fellow-student from Transylvania, he found himself in pecuniary difficulties, which delayed his start. The bitter aftertaste that this incident left was only slightly attenuated by his invitation to Máramarossziget as pastor and teacher. The prospects of his Oriental trip, however, made him firmly decline the offer. Finally his favourite professor Eichhorn came to his rescue. He set out for home on September 5 that year.⁴³

4. He accomplished the journey on foot in three months; in December 1818 he was back home again. The last stage of his preparations for the journey to the East began: he had to get a passport, raise money and elaborate the itinerary in detail. Agitated by the nearness of departure, de Kőrös spent this time of his life wandering between Nagyenyed, Kolozsvár, Szilágyság, Szászváros, Temesvár and Zagreb.

Upon returning to his native land, he directed his first steps towards his second home, the Alma Mater in Nagyenyed via Kolozsvár, then a flourishing center of Hungarian political and cultural life. A virtual literary circle had evolved around

³⁹ von Wurzbach, Constant, *Biographisches Lexikon*, III, Wien 1858, pp. 65–66; Németh, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor célja* (The Aim of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös), p. 4.

⁴⁰ Németh, *op. cit.*, pp. 3–9; Wurzbach, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 65–66; Terjék, *op. cit.*, p. 7; Szabó T., Attila, *Ábránd és valóság* (Fiction and Fact): *Korunk*, XXVIII (1969), p. 669; Kara, György, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*. Budapest 1970, pp. 40–41; Ligeti, Lajos, *A jugarok földje* (The Land of the Jugars): *Magyar Nyelv* XXVII (1931), p. 314.

⁴¹ Library of the Protestant College at Sárospatak. Manuscripts. No. 2686.

⁴² Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 194–195.

⁴³ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, pp. 102–103; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 195–207; Cholnoky, *op. cit.*, p. 18; Baktay, Ervin, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor*, Budapest 1962, pp. 37–38.

the *Erdélyi Múzeum*, the first scientific periodical of Transylvania in Hungarian language edited by Gábor Döbrentei. This intellectual nucleus anchored his hopes for moral, scientific and financial support. He was most eager to get the backing of Councillor Mihály Kenderesi, an avowed patron of historical research, and of Sámuel Gyarmathi, the celebrated linguist and a pioneer of Finno-Ugric linguistics, who both held the exceptionally gifted and self-sacrificing young man in high esteem. Kenderesi was the only person from whom de Kőrös was ready to accept a loan for his efforts; Gyarmathi imparted valuable advice to him as to the ancient habitat of the Hungarians. As part of his historical preparations, he examined the collections of Councillor Miklós Cserei. During his discussions with Gyarmathi, the subject was also raised that upon completing his tour of Central Asia, de Kőrös might consider exploring the regions of the Finno-Ugric peoples. Interesting enough, there was also talk of Csoma's joining Alexander Humboldt's expedition.⁴⁴

Though his plan drew strong support among his countrymen, there were some people who opposed his journey, among them his professor at Nagyenyed, Sámuel Hegedűs. De Kőrös, however, was tenacious in his resolution. When de Kőrös paid a visit to his friend Újfalvy at the latter's manor in Szilágyság, in 1819, he complained in angry terms about the cynics: «I have been attacked from all sides that I should relinquish my plan, for it might prove unfeasible and a produce of unreason. Am I to give up all the desires I have cherished in my bosom since my early years? For them I mastered thirteen living and dead languages; I trained my body through endless privations and mortifications. I have struggled against their prejudices long enough: my patience is running short.»⁴⁵

At the same time, he set about making up for the lacunae in his preparations. He continued Slavistic studies in Temesvár and Zagreb between February and November 1819. His matchless flair for languages enabled him to master the grammar in 8–9 months and obtain a vocabulary allowing him to read and understand without a dictionary the Old Slavic texts written in Cyrillic script used in the Eastern Church. What is more, he could communicate and read in the colloquial Serbo-Croatian language as well.⁴⁶ He returned to Nagyenyed in mid-November 1819, hoping that his patrons had managed to get an imperial passport for his journey. The Vienna government, however, turned down his application. In

⁴⁴ Hegedűs, *op. cit.*, p. 760; Szilágyi, Ferenc, *Adatok Kőrösi Csoma Sándor életrajzához* (Some Data to the Biography of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös): *MTA Nyelv- és Irodalmi Osztályának Közleményei*, XXI (1964), pp. 268–286; Csetri, *op. cit.*, pp. 208–219.

⁴⁵ Újfalvy, *op. cit.*, pp. 103–104.

⁴⁶ Duka, *op. cit.*, p. 12, pp. 24–25; Vita, Zsigmond, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor levelei Csorja Ferenchez* (The Letters of Alexander Csoma de Kőrös to Ferenc Csorja): *Erdélyi Múzeum*, XLVIII (1943), pp. 541–546.

the end, he had to rest content with a simple frontier pass. Having said farewell to his friends, he started off from Nagyenyed. On November 27th the military authorities of Nagyszeben gave him a visa on his provisional pass. «Lightly clad, with a walking stick» in his hand and 200 florins in his pocket he took to the road, as if «he intended merely taking a walk in the fields. It was written on his pass, that de Kőrös, then 35 years old, departed in black town clothes with merely a mantle thrown over his shoulder and a haversack, and nothing to suggest that he had started on an expedition to explore remote lands.⁴⁷

However, his heart was full of joy, confidence and determination, now that the dream he had entertained since his boyhood was about to materialize. In writing the memento «Omnia deficiant, virtus tamen omnia vincit» to József Szabó de Borgáta, his friend from Göttingen he was to word his own life-philosophy. In his commemorative address at the Academy, József Eötvös reached the core of de Kőrös's endeavours saying that his life was «the glorious example of the perseverance and endurance of a man to whom the science owes all its advancement, and in whose fate these qualities are evidenced much more by his moral strength and firm conviction than by radiant success.»⁴⁸

De Kőrös correctly judged that by defining and exploring the land of origin — what he undertook — was a pivotal task of the research into Hungarian prehistory. Scientific investigation later proved that he started out on the wrong track searching for the original habitat in Central Asia. However, even though Csoma de Kőrös searched there for the home of origin in vain, it is undeniable that Hungarian prehistory, culture and the body of beliefs are interwoven with an intricate pattern of ties linking this people to all those they came into contact with during the past: the common Eurasian origin unites them. The science of Oriental studies, of which de Kőrös was one of the founding fathers, has contributed valuable findings to the unveiling of these connections.

⁴⁷ P. Szathmáry, Károly, *Kőrösi Csoma Sándor hires utazó útlevele* (The Passport of the Renowned Traveller Alexander Csoma de Kőrös): *Hazánk s a Külföld* II (1866), No. 2, pp. 29–30.

⁴⁸ Eötvös, József, *Emlékbeszéd Kőrösi Csoma Sándor lt. felett* (A Commemorative Address on Corresponding Member Alexander Csoma de Kőrös): *Magyar Tudós Társaság Évkönyvei VII* (1842–1844), Buda 1846, p. 33.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE TURFAN UYGHUR KINGDOM

BY

K. CZEGLÉDY (Budapest)

One of the most outstanding events of Inner Asian history is the foundation of the late Uyghur Kingdom in Turfan.¹ Yet, in spite of the fact that we possess a fairly great number of relevant sources, many details of the dissolution of the Orkhon Uyghur Empire and the establishment of the new Uyghur centres in the T'ien-shan and Turfan area are still shrouded in mystery. The Tarim basin together with the rest of the Western regions (called *Anhsi* by the Chinese) was divided from China at the end of the 8th century by the Tibetan possessions in Kansu. Therefore the Chinese lost sight of Anhsi from the end of the 8th century and they provide us for decades only with some meagre bits of information concerning Inner Asia.

The Chinese sources dealing with this period of Uyghur history were thoroughly studied in 1955 by James Russell Hamilton in a seminal work² on the history of the late Uyghur kingdoms in the age of the Five Dynasties. His conclusions, on the whole, are still convincing. Lately Dr. Anatolij Gavrilovich Maljavkin published an important monography³ in which he collected all the Chinese and most of the non-Chinese sources relevant to these problems, and studied them in great detail. His results are disputable on many points but will form a basis for future investigations.

The disastrous defeat which the Uyghurs on the river Orkhon in Central Mongolia suffered from the Qirghiz in 840 A.D. led immediately to the final dissolution of the Uyghur tribal confederation. As they received the fatal blow from the north, they scattered to the east, south and west, to evade complete annihilation. One, comparatively small, Uyghur tribal group fled to the east, to the people of the Shih-wei in north-western Manchuria where they disappeared and did not reappear in the Chinese historical sources any more. Another Uyghur tribe migrated to the Qitay territory in south-western Manchuria. They too had soon to submit to their fate. A third, fairly important, group, consisting of thirteen tribes left their old abodes on the river Orkhon for the border region of the Gobi, where the men of these tribes even chose a qaghan for themselves (841 A.D). Later on they crossed the

¹ The text of this paper was read on the occasion of the XXIXth International Congress of Orientalists in Paris (1973), cf. the Abstracts of Papers. Section 6-7 (Central Asia, India), of the same Congress, p. 30.

² *Les Ouighours à l'époque des Cinq Dynasties*. Paris 1955.

³ A. G. Maljavkin, *Ujgurskie gosudarstva v IX—XII vv.* Novosibirsk, 1983.

desert and settled in the neighbourhood of the great curve of the Huangho river. Yet, they could not long resist the diplomatic and military measures taken against them by the Chinese and were scattered at length within a single decade (848 A.D.).⁴

A less important part of the Uyghur confederation migrated to the west of the Huangho curve, to the Alashan and the Edzin-gól region. Here they passed at first under Tibetan rule. But in 862 A.D. they achieved a victory over the Tibetans and within a few decades they succeeded in establishing the Kanchou Uyghur principality in these eastern regions. Other fleeing Uyghur groups appeared farther in the west in Western-Kansu. They found there shelter against the Qirghiz but, at the same time, they passed under Tibetan overlordship. An important part of the Uyghur confederation consisting of 200,000 men migrated still farther to the west, to the region between the Bar-köl and the northern area of the Bogdo-ola mountains, in Eastern T'ienshan. The main problem about the history of this group is that in the Chinese report concerning its migration there is absolutely no hint at the important Chinese fortification Peit'ing situated on the edge of the territory which had come under the control of this important Uyghur group.

The most important of all fleeing Uyghur groups including 15 tribes went according to our main Chinese source to the west, to the people of the Qarluq. These tribes were lead by the prince P'ang-le te-le. These Chinese words render, as stated convincingly by Dr. Hamilton, a Turkish original *Mänglig-tegin* ('Prince Mänglig'). The Uyghurs left soon the Qarluq territory for Anhsi in Central T'ienshan. *Anhsi* refers in this case to the city of Qarashahr. We do not know why Mänglig-tegin left the Qarluq territory, but we may refer in this regard to the investigations of G.P. Suprunenko. She calls our attention to Chinese reports which refer to some further attacks made by the Qirghiz in 842 and (or?) 843 against Anhsi and Peit'ing. Thus, the Qirghiz at least tried to continue the pursuit of the Uyghurs during the disintegration of the Orkhon Uyghur Empire.

Those parts of Kansu and Hsinchiang which had been held by the Tibetans were reconquered by the Chinese and allied Uyghur troops during the years following 848 A.D. Turfan was won back in 850 A.D., lost again for a while (c. 861–865 A.D.) and finally retaken in 866 A.D. This latter date marks the foundation of the Uyghur kingdom in the T'ienshan. The foundation of the Kansu principality of the Uyghurs followed within a few years, between 866 and 872.

Besides the Chinese sources, however, there is an important Moslem work which may be of good service to us with regard to the aforesaid events, namely the *Zayn al-akhbār* a work of the Persian historian Gardīzī, a native of Afghanistan who worked for the Ghaznevid dynasty about the middle of the 11th century. One of the

⁴ Hamilton, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 8 and n. 3.

most important parts of Gardīzī's work contains the description of the Turkish peoples living on the Eurasian steppe and some other peoples living in their neighbourhood. This chapter is one of the most valuable existing sources of nomad history. The first part of it is a long quotation from the work of the Khorasanian wazir, al-Jayhānī, which goes back to eye-witness-reports on the nomads of south-eastern Europe: the Khazars, the Burtas, the Volga-Bulgarians and the Bulgarians living to the south of the Danube, as well as on the Hungarians, Alans, Caucasian Avars, Slavs, Rus and Moravians.

As to the Asian dwellers of the steppe region, Gardīzī refers to another very early source, namely to the *Kitāb rub' al-dunyā* of Ibn al-Muqaffa' who lived in about the middle of the 8th century. To judge by the extant parts of this curious work, it belonged to the genealogical works of the Moslems. These works contain genealogical tables of the peoples of the Universe patterned after the biblical *Genesis*. The forefathers of the Turkish peoples are eponyms in these legendary tales which are often interrupted by aetiological legends and folk-etymologies, just as we find them in the biblical pattern. However, the last phrases, e.g. those of the report on the Qarluq speak of the migration of the Qarluq tribes to the Western Turkish territory and of their rebellion against the Western Turkish qaghan. We are also told of the assassination of the qaghan and of the shifting of the power into the hands of the Qarluq. It goes without saying that all these details are to be found in well-known Chinese sources too and consequently must be considered as records of real events. The most important observations, however, may be made, with regard to the origin of the Yaghma. This report is quoted by Gardīzī from the work of Ibn al-Muqaffa'. Every detail in this report agrees either with the corresponding report in the *Shine-usu Uyghur Inscriptions*, or with the Chinese *Dynastic Histories* on the same event. The immediate source used by Gardīzī had, at any rate, a surprisingly thorough knowledge of the events between the years 745 and 760 A.D., consequently we must regard his narrative as our most valuable source on the early history of the Yaghma.

Besides this old source, however, Gardīzī also uses two other ones which could not have been recorded before 870 A.D. for chronological reasons. One of them contains the continuation of Jayhānī's Eastern-European descriptions. The other one, against this, as regards its style is identical with the *Kitāb rub' al-dunyā*. This is proved also by its report on the dissolution of the Uyghur Empire. The content of the latter is as follows: There ruled a qaghan over the Toquz-Oghuz «in the old times» who had a younger half-brother, Kūr-tegin by name. Kūr-tegin's mother was a Chinese lady. The qaghan's mother was of less aristocratic birth. The qaghan sought the life of his half-brother. He wounded Kūr-tegin on his throat, and in the belief that he was dead, he threw his body in the graveyard. Yet Kūr-tegin's nurse saved his life and handed him over to the Manicheans who took care of him until he

recovered. He then secretly returned to Arg, the residence of the qaghan and succeeded later in appeasing him. Thus he was nominated by the qaghan commandant of Panjikath (the Sogdian name of Peit'ing). Now it was Kür-tegin's turn to seek the life of his half-brother. He attacked him all of a sudden during a hunt. The qaghan fled to a fortress, which, however, was forced to surrender. The qaghan was then killed. He was succeeded by Kür-tegin in the qaghanship.

This story, at first sight, does not seem to be a reliable historical report either. A thorough study will, however, reveal many features agreeing with the Chinese sources. On some points it is even Gardīzī's narrative which offers more complete information. The name *Toquz-Oghuz* denotes the same Uyghur tribal confederation, as it was the tribe of the Uyghurs which had the leading in the confederation. It is very important that Gardīzī's source which was written about 880 A.D. refers these events to the «old times» when the Toquz-Oghuz qaghan was still residing in the city of Arg. The name of the latter is written *Azal* in the MSS of Gardīzī and the correct form, *Arg* could not be established with complete certainty when W. Barthold, J. Marquart and V. Minorsky published their comments on Gardīzī. Nor was it possible to know at that time that the name *Arg* represents the Iranian variant of the old native name of Qarashahr, which was rendered as *Yen-ki* (Archaic Chinese **Argi*) by the Chinese.

Now it is of paramount importance that there was only one single period in Uyghur history when the qaghan resided in Arg. It was the years following the flight of the 15 tribes first to the Qarluq and then to Arg. This is attested at the very end of the report of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* on the Western Turks which is quite explicit in stating that after his flight the Uyghur ruler resided in Yen-ki (Arg), i.e., Qarashahr.

The Chinese sources leave no doubt about the identity of the qaghan either: as is clearly proved by these sources he was *P'ang-le-tegin*. The Chinese words *P'ang-le*, var. *Mang-le* render, as we have stated in connection with this name a Turkish original **Mänglig*. According to the report of the *Hsin T'ang-shu* on the Qarluq, Mänglig-tegin first assumed in Arg the title *yabghu*, but both T'ang annals maintain that by about 848 A.D. he had already assumed the title *qaghan*. The Chinese reports are fully corroborated by Gardīzī's narrative who also calls the Uyghur ruler of Arg by the title of *qaghan*. As to his residence, according to the Chinese sources Mänglig-qaghan was still residing in Arg in 856. Therefore, the *Hsin T'ang-shu* as well as Hu San-hsing misinterpret the report of the *Kiu T'ang-shu* when they assert that in 856 Mänglig-qaghan was residing in Kanchou. As a matter of fact the *Kiu T'ang-shu* does not speak of Mänglig-qaghan but of his successors who were residing in Kanchou. This is also shown by Gardīzī's narrative who only knows of Mänglig's residence in Arg. It was from Arg, according to Gardīzī, that he appointed his half-brother to be the commandant of Peit'ing.

This is the most important piece of information in Gardīzī's narrative, because it enables us to identify Kūr-tegin, half-brother of Mänglig-qaghan as well. Namely, the Chinese sources state that the commandant of Peit'ing was P'u-ku Tsün, that is to say «Tsün of the Buqu(t) tribe» or possibly «Chief Tsün of the Buqu(t) tribe», who, next to Mänglig-qaghan played the most important part in the events preceding the establishment of the Uyghur principality in Kanchou. At last, as shown by the Chinese sources in 866 A.D. he became Lord of Turfan as well. The last phases of his career are told only by Gardīzī. According to the latter's narrative he rebelled against Mänglig qaghan and deprived him both of his qaghanship and of his life. As suggested by the Chinese data, this must have happened sometime after 866 A.D. The Uyghur residence was then removed from Arg and was established in Turfan and possibly as a summer-residence in Peit'ing. Thus it was as a result of these victories of Buqu(t) Tsün that the foundations of the latter Uyghur kingdom of Turfan were laid.⁵

Last, but not least, cross-checking of the available pieces of information enables us to clarify the family ties between Mänglig-qaghan and Buqu(t) Tsün. We do not possess any evidence for this in the Chinese sources, but Gardīzī's narrative is very explicit in this respect. According to his statements, as we have seen, Buqu(t) Tsün was a younger half-brother of Mänglig-qaghan. As Buqu(t) Tsün's mother was, according to Gardīzī, a Chinese lady, we may identify her as Tai-ho, daughter of the emperor Hsien-tsung. Tai-ho married the 10th, or according to Yamada's calculation, ninth Uyghur-qaghan Tsh'ung-te, who ruled between 821 and 824 A.D. She survived the break-up of the Uyghur Empire in 840 A.D., married possibly, as it was usual, the following qaghans, but she did not accompany her son Buqu(t) Tsün or Mänglig-qaghan in their flight to Qarluq and to Arg. She reached her native land after undergoing sad trials while fleeing together with the 13 Uyghur tribes to the Chinese border. Thus, Mänglig-qaghan's mother was of less aristocratic origin. This explains why Mänglig sought the life of his half-brother. At the same time it may have been the ground for Buqu(t) Tsün's ambitious plans to wrest the qaghanship from his elder half-brother.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 8-18.

NANCHAO: AN ARCHAIC STATE BETWEEN CHINA AND TIBET

BY

ILDIKÓ ECSEDY (Budapest)

The kings' denomination *chao* (and a few other related names, terms, etc.) could show a Thai background of the founding Southern (*nan*) tribe and the five other tribes of 南詔 *Nan-chao*,¹ while the ethnical-cultural diversity of its population may involve affinities to several geographical and historical directions, e.g. to the Burman cultural sphere of the Southern neighbourhood as well.² But as a «country» (國 *kuo*), i.e. concerning the political entity of the Chinese sources — utilized for the conclusions here³ — apparently the two big political neighbours and counterparts, China and Tibet, respectively, must have had decisive imprints on Nanchao's fate. In spite of Nanchao's better connection with the less dangerous

¹ On «The ethnography of the Nan-chao kingdom», summarizing the related research so far — raising increasing doubts concerning a Thai origin of the peoples concerned — see Ch. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom and T'ang China's Southwestern Frontier: Cambridge Studies in Chinese History, Literature and Institutions*, Cambridge 1981, Cambridge Univ. Press, pp. 47–52; p. 53, Map 3: «The Six Chao».

² «... they must have mixed with members of the Tibeto-Burman branch of the Sino-Tibetan family like the Lolo and the Mosso...»: P. Pelliot, *Notes on Marco Polo I. Ouvrage posthume publié sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres et avec le concours du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*. Librairie Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris 1953, p. 176 (under the title CARAGIAN, interpreted as the name of a Lolo tribe *jang*, i.e. *Qara-jang*). Cf. Backus, *loc. cit.*, and see below (Note 11 etc.).

³ The Chinese sources are cited below as follows:

CTS — Liu Hsü, etc., *Chiu T'ang-shu: So-yin po-na-pen erh-shih-ssu shih XII, Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan*, Peking 1958.

HHS — Fan Yeh, *Hou Han-shu: So-yin po-na-pen erh-shih-ssu shih III*.

HS — Pan Ku, *Han-shu: So-yin po-na-pen erh-shih-ssu shih II*.

HTS — Ou-yang Hsiu — Sung Ch'i, *Hsin T'ang-shu: So-yin po-na-pen erh-shih-ssu shih XIII*.

Huai-nan-tzu: 淮南子, with commentaries by Kao Yu 高誘: *Chu-tzu chi-ch'eng 諸子集成 VII* (pp. 1–377), Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1954.

Man-su (MSCC) — 樊綽 Fan Ch'o, 蠻書 *Man-shu* (蠻書校注 *Man-shu chiao-chu*, 10 chapters, 附五種圖三幅 *Fu wu chung t'u san fu*, 今人向覺明校注 *Chin-jen hsiang chiao-ming chiao-chu*: 國學名著珍本彙刊 *Kuo-hsüeh ming-chu chen-pen hui-k'an*, 楊家駱 Yang Chia-lo ed.; 史學彙刊 *Shih-hsüeh hui-k'an* 1, 鼎文書局 Ting-wen shu-chü, T'aipei 1972).

Shih-ching — in: B. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*. Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities, Stockholm 1950.

Shuo-wen — [Han] Hsü Shen [漢]許慎, *Shuo-wen chieh-tzu 說文解字, Fu chien-tzu 附檢字*, Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1963.

rival and «Elder Brother»: Tibet,⁴ it was China's influence that proved to be overwhelming in the regime of administration of the kingdom. An impression to this effect may be strengthened by the fact that — lacking an indigenous script — the earliest and more or less direct extant sources of Nanchao's history were mainly written in Chinese, by Chinese authors,⁵ from the heydays of the kingdom in the T'ang period (618–907 A.D.) to the defeat of its inheritors by the Mongols in the middle of the 13th century.⁶

It seems only natural to suppose that the cultural and administrative model of T'ang-time China can be considered responsible for Nanchao's institutional structure, *i.e.* for its birth and development as a state-like historical formation, or at least an empire.⁷ However, while wondering how a primitive economic mosaic of Nanchao's realm could need and utilize China's governing means and forms — and

SC — Ssu-ma Ch'ien, *Shih-chi: So-yin po-na-pen erh-shih-ssu shih* I.

SS — Wei Cheng, *Sui-shu: So-yin po-na-pen erh-shih-ssu shih* IX.

T'ai-ho Inscription (太和德化碑. *T'ai-ho te-hua pei*) — in: E. Chavannes, *Une inscription du Royaume de Nan-tchao: JAS. XVI, Neuvième Série* (Novembre–Décembre 1900), 381–450 (391–395).

TCTC — Ssu-ma Kuang, *Tzu-chih t'ung-chien*, I–X. Ku-chi ch'u-pan-she, Peking 1956.

THY — Wang P'u, etc., *T'ang-hui-yao* I–III. Chung-hua shu-chü, Peking 1957².

Tso-chuan — in: J. Legge, *The Tch'un Ts'ew with the Tso Chuen* (1885): *The Chinese Classics* V, Hong Kong 1960, Hong Kong Univ. Press reed.; S. Couvreur, *Tsh'ouen Ts'iou et Tso Tchouan. La Chronique de la principauté de Lou: Les Humanités d'Extrême-Orient*. Cathasia, Série Culturelle des Hautes Études de Tien-tsin. Paris 1951².

T'ung-tien — Tu Yu, *T'ung-tien: Chiu-t'ung ch'üan-shu*, Kuan-wu-chai 1901.

TPKC — Li Fang 李昉, *T'ai-p'ing kuang-chi* 太平廣記 I–X. Chung-chua shu-chü, Peking 1961.

Wen-hsüan 文選, *Hu-k'o Sung-pen* 胡刻宋本 —, *Ku-hsiang-ko* 古香閣, Shanghai 1892.

Yüe-ling 月令 — in: Couvreur, S., *Li Ki. Mémoires sur les bienséances et les cérémonies: Textes de la Chine. Les humanités d'Extrême-Orient. Série Culturelle des Hautes Études de Tien-tsin*. Cathasia, Paris 1950.² (Librairie J. Brill, Leiden — Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, Paris.)

As a rule, the Roman numbers — following the abbreviations — mean the chapters, and the Arabic numbers show the pages cited.

⁴ Tibet's king called Nanchao's ruler his «younger brother» (from 752 on, see below Note 26), but this «brotherly» relationship depended on the balance of power in that region, see Th. A. Marks, *Nanchao and Tibet in South-Western China and Central Asia: The Tibet Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Winter 1978), 2–26; Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom . . .*, pp. 40–45: «T'ang policy and Nan-chao's links with Tibet»: pp. 69–100.

⁵ On the related Chinese sources see 向達 Hsiang Ta, *唐代紀載南詔諸書考略 T'ang-tai chi-tsai Nan-chao chu-shu k'ao-lüe: 唐代長安與西域文明 T'ang-tai Ch'ang-an yü hsi-yü wen-ming*. Sheng-huo, tu-shu, hsin-chih san-lien shu-tien, Peking 1957 (1979²), 136–154.

⁶ See the outline of events in Marks, *Nanchao and Tibet . . .*, 18–21.

⁷ E.g. cf. W. Stott, *The expansion of the Nan-chao kingdom between the years A.D. 750–860 and the causes that lay behind it as shown in the T'ai-ho Inscription and the Man-shu: TP L* (1963): 1–3, p. 210: «In its government Nan-chao clearly followed the T'ang model.»

finding a system of *military administration* in Nanchao instead —, the author was induced to remember that China's other pupils, e.g. those arriving from the steppe, adopted the peripheric and even obsolete elements of Chinese institutions rather than their system.⁸ (Unless they adapted themselves so thoroughly to Chinese culture that they finally became Chinese emperors and/or Chinese subjects.)

An attempt is made here to shed light on the way in which Nanchao's people learned to rule over the chronological framework of their universe, i.e. the organization of the year as attested in their calendrical tradition. The roots ramifying from a past culture of their sphere, the tradition concerned may refer — as suggested below — to a heritage prior to T'ang-time China and historical Tibet themselves, say: to a *Sino-Tibetan* period of Nanchao's territory. Naturally this longer period of cultural memory could involve more than one model of state organization, to be considered at least, also for a further appropriate evaluation of Nanchao's inner structure and historical role in its period of political significance.

*

1. The inheritors of Nanchao's territory preserve archaic traits within their New Year's tradition, which was so important in many time-reckoning systems (or even due to the lack of a system), in China, too, in imperial times and nowadays as well. Namely, among the Na-khi ~ *Na-hsi* (納西, etc.) of the 20th century Yünnan — even if not so much their identity than their historical-cultural coexistence can be pointed out with one of Nanchao's leading tribe («kingdom»), the 磨些 *Mo-so*⁹ — a few obscure details of the New Year's ceremony deserve attention. Their own script, i.e. mnemotechnic signs — as interpreted by their priests as late as a few decades ago — reveal a kind of survival of some vague prescriptions about the horoscope made at the New Year's tree.¹⁰

⁸ Cf. Hilda [Ildikó] Ecsedy: *Old Turkic titles of Chinese origin: Acta Orient. Hung. XVIII* (1965): 1–2, pp. 83–91.

⁹ On the neighbouring situation in modern Yünnan of the Mo-so and Na-hsi population — admitting at least an earlier co-existence, too — see J. Rock, *The Life and Culture of the Na-khi Tribe of the China-Tibet Borderland: Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplement 2*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1963, pp. 11, 18. On the problems of *Na-hsi* (*Na-khi*) ~ *Mo-so* identification, the former name appearing comparatively late in the records, see A. Jackson, *Na-khi Religion. An Analytical Appraisal of the Na-khi Ritual Texts: Religion and Society 8*. Mouton Publishers, The Hague-Paris-New York 1979, pp. 275–296.

¹⁰ Cf. Hilda [Ildikó] Ecsedy, *On a few traces of ancient Sino-Tibetan contacts in the early Chinese mythic tradition: Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium, held at Mátrafüred, Hungary, 24–30 September 1976*, ed. by L. Ligeti: *Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica XXIII*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1978, 97–98.

The shamanistic ceremony concerned can be connected with parallel Tibeto-Burmese folkloric tradition;¹¹ the sexagesimal cycle, however, used for deciding the good omen, recalls the Chinese authority in this region, also extending beyond China's political supremacy in space and time. The star(s) considered «propitious» in this ceremony — *i.e.* the nine stars of the constellation known in Europe as Scorpion — can refer to an ancient cult of the Antares (the most brilliant star of that constellation), widespread in pre-Confucian China and in later Chinese popular beliefs.¹² Thus the ritual in question may recall even those ancient times when the «Heavenly Stem» (天干 *T'ien-kan*) and «Earthly Branches» (地支 *Ti-chih*) of the sexagesimal calendrical etc. cycle could fit together into a Cosmic Tree, even if the related concepts must have faded out afterwards (as is also shown by the lack of the graphic sign of «tree/wood» in the above Chinese characters of the «stem» and «branches»¹³).

The connecting link between this remote past of ancient Chinese tradition and modern ritual folklore, respectively, can be found in a 9th century record (of the *Man-shu*) concerning Nanchao's festivals. There a peach-tree is mentioned — apparently for exorcism (see below) —, connected with the New Year, but in a «wrong» time: in spring, in the third month. Incidentally that was the time when the Fire and its Star, the Antares «came out» *i.e.* appeared on the sky, according to China's peasant tradition, to indicate the beginning of the agricultural year and labour;¹⁴ although all this seems to contradict the official Chinese report about Nanchao's calendar, as follows:

2. The acceptance of the Chinese imperial calendar was a token and pledge for the Chinese court of the surrender of a «foreign subject».¹⁵ That is why the *Hsin*

¹¹ On the cult of trees, etc., similar to the *Na-hsi* beliefs, among their Tibeto-Burman neighbours, see R. Rahman, *Remarks on the sacrifice to heaven of the ¹Na-²khi and other tribes in South-West China: Monumenta Serica XIII* (1948), pp. 395–408.

¹² Cf. Ildikó Ecsedy, *Far Eastern sources on the history of the steppe region: BEFEO LXIX* (1981), pp. 267–270.

¹³ Cf. Ildikó Ecsedy, *The New Year's Tree and other traces of ancient shamanistic cults in China: Shamanism in Eurasia (Bibliotheca Uralica), Vilmos Diószegi Memorial Volume*, ed. by M. Hoppál. Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest (in print).

¹⁴ On the «bringing out» of the fire to the fields in spring and the «bringing in» of it to the house in autumn, respectively, connected with a cult of Antares, see H. Maspero, *La Chine antique*, Nouvelle édition: *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études*, Tome soixante et onzième, Paris 1965, Presses Universitaires de France, pp. 196–197.

¹⁵ Even if it was sometimes too early to draw the related conclusions; cf. the case of the Turks, in 586, *i.e.* a small, weak group of theirs, accepting China's «protection» by adopting her calendar, independently from the Turk Empires: Ecsedy, *Trade-and-war relations between the Turks and China in the second half of the 6th century: Acta Orient Hung. XXI* (1968): 3, pp. 167–168 (Note 59).

T'ang-shu mentions at the very beginning of the report on Nanchao's customs (俗 *su*) that «the *yin* (month) is the first (in their calendar)» — similarly to that of contemporary China — and adds: «the four seasons are, as a whole, (only) slightly different from (those of) China» (以寅爲正四時太氏與中國小差).¹⁶ The latter hesitating formula, usually reflecting a lack of direct information, could simply refer to Nanchao's climate, too. But this supposition may be doubted for two reasons; first because of the personal experience of Chinese envoys, troops, and officials, etc., in Nanchao, and second, because of the more detailed official Chinese records about climatic peculiarities of countries beyond Nanchao as well (see below). The lack of striking climatic differences were emphasized in the case of more distant places. However, the possible divergence of the division of the year in Nanchao must have been of no political importance for China, since Nanchao was mentioned as T'ang China's confident ally or «subject», accepting China's calendar as late as in the Ming times (1368–1643), too, long after its peoples had fully become subjects of the Chinese emperor.¹⁷

The above record, however, does not use the term of calendar-donation, equal to the recognition of a defeat,¹⁸ inapplicable to Nanchao in T'ang times. The short phrase could instead mean a calendrical correspondence between China and Nanchao, involving a twelve-month year, the knowledge of the «Earthly Branches» and their usage as indications of the months (or «zodiac» signs) and the way of their contemporary Chinese usage, traditionally beginning the administrative («imperial») year with the third «Branch» of the twelve-part series: 寅 *yin* («tiger»),¹⁹ in about January–February.

This knowledge can be well assumed not only on the part of Nanchao's Chinese official visitors and guests in the royal court, but among Nanchao's high-ranking subjects whose «sons and younger brothers» went to China to have audience, even before Nanchao's political rise, from the first year of the T'ang dynasty (618).²⁰

¹⁶ *HTS*, CCXXII, shang, p. 1562 a.

¹⁷ Cf. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, pp. 41–42.

¹⁸ It was 頒曆 *p'an-li* in 586, cf. Note 15.

¹⁹ This practice, allegedly originating from legendary times, was a subject to several changes (see P. Hoang, *De calendario sinico variae notiones. Calendarii sinici et europaei concordantia*, Zi-Ka-Wei 1885, pp. XII–XIII; cf. below, Note 51); but the T'ang administration followed it as a rule. The only exceptions were a few years during the reign of the «usurper» empress *Wu-hou* (654–704), as she ordered the years from 690 to the end of her rule to begin with the first «astronomic» month, indicated by the «branch» (zodiac sign) 子 *tsu* «rat», i.e. two months earlier; similarly: in the year 762, on the order of the emperor *Su-tsung* (756–762), cf. Hoang, *loc. cit.*; Hoang, *Concordance des chronologies neoméniques chinoise et européenne: Variétés Sinologiques* 29, Chang-hai 1970, Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique, pp. VI–VIII.

²⁰ The chieftains of the 夔 *Ti* and 兗 *Ch'iang* sent hundreds of their young people to audience, «asking that they could surrender» to the emperor Kao-tsung, cf. TCTC, vol. VII, p. 5772.

Nevertheless, this usage must have seemed to be enlarged or to be institutionalized at least after Nanchao's emergence as a power, to be concluded from a Chinese declaration or warning, referring to a time many decades after the middle of the 8th century, to the effect that in Nanchao «the sons and younger brothers should enter high school (大學 *ta-hsio*) in order to learn Chinese customs (華風 *hua-feng*)». ²¹

From this latter period, there is evidence about the knowledge of the «Stem(s)» and «Branches» in the court of Nanchao, at least in connection with divination practices. Namely, according to the so-called *T'ai-ho* Inscription, in 751 before a decisive battle with China's army, Nanchao's first king (蒙)閣羅鳳 (*Meng*) *Ko-lo-feng* 審孤虛 *shen ku-hsü* «examined the orphan and the empty» (signs, respectively), ²² probably to inquire about the chances. This record, made by a Chinese official 鄭回 *Cheng Hui* — a refugee in Nanchao's court at that time —, and inscribed on stone not more than 15 years later, is formulated in correct Chinese; and involves such a specific manipulation with the 10 signs of the Heavenly Stem(s) and 12 signs of Earthly Branches that it cannot be taken in a symbolic sense or as a careless remark. Or not even as a scholar formulation of the educated composer of the *T'ai-ho* Inscription either, since the fortune-telling speculations concerned are far removed from science and scholarship proper. They were at least known from the early Han-times: from the 2nd–1st centuries B. C., having originated allegedly in the legendary times of *Huang-ti*, the «Yellow Emperor». Namely, a decisive or at least magic importance was attributed to the different length of the series of signs of the «Stem(s)» (10) and «Branches» (12), respectively, when they were put in parallel order in the sexagesimal cycle, denominating the days (etc.) with a sign of «Stem» and a sign of «Branch», etc. ²³ Nevertheless, this popular and peripheric element of Chinese literacy was not necessarily connected with the time-reckoning system of Nanchao's royal court.

Nanchao's royal family and court must have taken lessons from the Chinese neighbourhood as early as in the *K'ai-yüan* period (713–741). This can be illustrated by the *T'ai-ho* Inscription, mentioning the Emperor T'ang Hsüan-tsung (713–755) as 開元帝 *K'ai-yüan ti*, naming him upon his first ruling period (when, in 738, he first recognized Nanchao's ruler by conferring titles on him), as late as in the

²¹ HTS, CCXXII, *chung*, p. 1567 a.

²² Cf. E. Chavannes, *Une inscription du royaume de Nan-tchao: JA*, Neuvième série, tome XVI (Novembre–Décembre 1900), p. 393 (V, a); cf. pp. 420–421: «Le roi (de Nan-tchao) examina les combinaisons cycliques»...; *Man-shu: MSCC*, p. 323.

²³ According to this kind of tradition: when the 10 signs of the Stem are over, the 11th and 12th «orphan» signs of the Branches still remain; thus the latter 6 ones, corresponding with the first 6 signs of the Branches, make the last two ones of them (the 5th and 6th) «empty», having an influence on the days indicated with them. Cf. Chavannes, *op. cit.*, 421 (Note 1), with reference to this tradition attested since Ssu-ma Ch'ien (*SC*, CXXVIII, 1172a).

subsequent *T'ien-pao* era (742–755). Thus the T'ang Emperor — called 漢帝 *Han-ti* «Emperor of the Han (Chinese)» in other passages of the Inscription — was called, the Emperor of *K'ai-yüan* in 756, *i.e.* in the fifth year of the «Tibetan» ruling period of Nanchao's royal dynasty.²⁴

Ironically enough, the use of the Chinese calendar in Nanchao is first shown on the occasion of its ruler's recognition by Tibet. In the 11th year of the *T'ien-pao* period, on the first day of the first month (January 21st, 752),²⁵ the ruler of Tibet conferred on *Meng Ko-lo-feng* the title 贊普鍾 *tsan-p'u chung*: «the Younger Brother of the *btsan-po* («king»)». ²⁶ This honour was a direct consequence of Nanchao's recent victory over a huge Chinese army — practically over China in that region — therefore the celebration of the New Year's Day must have been an ambitious political step instead of a manifestation of accepting China's authority, as probably misunderstood — like many similar cases — by the Chinese court. The beginning of the new year was first attested in 752 — characteristically — not by the official Chinese records, but by the *T'ai-ho* Inscription, prepared in Nanchao's court. The case recalls the old Chinese imperial custom of receiving «guests», *i.e.* diplomatic missions with gifts and other signs of honour, since on that day the Tibetan king's envoys arrived to Nanchao — to 鄧川 *Teng-ch'uan*, *i.e.* in the neighbourhood of the royal residence²⁷ —, offering the title mentioned, with the alliance, etc. relationship involved. In the above geographical and historical context, the date of this kind of diplomatic reception could not be fixed like this by mere coincidence.

The year of the *T'ai-ho* Inscription, 756, when the *An Lu-shan* rebellion shook China, was not a suitable time for the fleeing imperial court to gain appropriate information about Nanchao. Similarly, in the subsequent years, during the troubles caused by invading foreign troops, no record seems to have been kept about Nanchao's envoys arriving at the time of the Chinese New Year ceremonies. (When once, in 787 it could be taken into consideration, a request makes it understandable: the author of the *T'ai-ho* Inscription, Nanchao's minister *Cheng Hui* tried in the first month to ask for Chinese protection against the Tibetans, who used their allies from Yünnan as a vanguard, and with their armies caused considerable destruction.)²⁸ Towards the end of the 8th century, however, when in the Chinese

²⁴ Chavannes, pp. 393 (VIa), 427; cf. *MSSC*, 323.

²⁵ Chavannes, 393 (VIb), 423; *MSSC*, 323. The date is given according to Hoang, *Concordance* (cf. Note 19).

²⁶ *Loc. cit.*; Chavannes, 397–398 (Note 3). Cf. Note 4.

²⁷ The district *Teng-ch'uan* was in the neighbourhood of the capital 大理 *Ta-li* (in Yünnan), cf. *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta tz'u-tien, Shang-wu yin-shu-kuan*, Shanghai 1933 (repr.), p. 1200 c.

²⁸ *TCTC*, Vol. VIII, p. 7480. However, this voluntary submission of a number of Nanchao's subjects must have been due to the danger of the moment, without being a submission (of their ruler, etc.) as

court — during the troubles with the Uigurs — the pro-Tibetan party gained ground,²⁹ Nanchao's delegation regularly visited the Chinese court, apparently with due consideration concerning the New Year, in China and in Nanchao, respectively. This can be seen in the Chinese historical records, registering as a rule Nanchao's envoys, if applying for audience only once a year, in the 12th month — several times at the end of it — or at the very beginning of the first month, emphasizing the date that they arrived just on New Year's Day. The latter records, paying attention to this date of «subject» visitors, may also reveal that the Chinese must have again overestimated the regular and well-timed diplomatic missions from Nanchao. The king's court must have known the due time of audience, and, aware of the problems of travel from Yünnan to Ch'angan, sent the envoys in the 12th month. (Only one date concerned having been preserved in each case, it can be considered to be the date of arrival in China.)³⁰

This royal calendar could not be alien or hostile to the allied «Elder Brother» Tibet whose scholars must also have utilized the lesson of China's time-reckoning system, even if only as one of the time-reckoning methods,³¹ perhaps with Inner Asian imprints, and realized as a system not earlier than after the T'ang period.³² Furthermore, being centred on the royal court and on political actions, it did not come into conflict with earlier or contemporary popular customs, e.g. concerning the yearly festivals of the peasant year, either in Tibet³³ or in Nanchao.

3. The «Southern Barbarians» (*Man*) of Nanchao were described in the 860s by a Chinese official *Fan Ch'o* in his *Man-shu*. Despite the vicissitudes of the text,³⁴ this

stated by a few Chinese records, cf. Chavannes, *Une inscription* . . . , p. 396, (Note 1). Nanchao's big conquests began just a few years later.

²⁹ Cf. my papers: *Uigurs and Tibetans in Pei-t'ing (790–791 A.D.): Acta Orient. Hung. XVII* (1964), pp. 83–104; *Trade-and-war relations*, pp. 173–174 (Note 91).

³⁰ See the summary list of «T'ang—Nan-chao diplomatic relations»: Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, Appendix, esp. pp. 196 sqq. Cf. Nanchao's summary chronicle history, the passages of the *Man-shu* being completed by other records (with details of the dates): *MSSC*, Appendix, esp. pp. 366 sqq.

³¹ See D. Schuh, *Grundzüge der tibetischen Kalenderrechnung: ZDMG 1974, Supplement II: XVIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag von 1. bis 5. Oktober 1972 in Lübeck*. Vorträge herausg. v. W. Voigt, pp. 554–566, esp. p. 555. Cf. P. Pelliot, *Le cycle sexagénaire dans la chronologie tibétaine: JAs*, Onzième série, tome I (1913), pp. 633–667.

³² Cf. B. Laufer, *The application of the Tibetan sexagenary cycle* (with reference to [and in dispute with] P. Pelliot, *Le cycle sexagénaire* . . .): *TP XIV* (1913), pp. 569–596, esp. pp. 591–592.

³³ On the popular seasons of the year in Tibet cf. R. Stein, *La civilisation Tibétaine*: Collection SIGMA dirigée par Henri Hierche I. Dunod, Paris 1962, pp. 179 sqq; see below.

³⁴ Cf. Hsiang Ta (Note 3), pp. 151–154; *MAN-SHU (Book of the Southern Barbarians)*. Transl. by G.H. Luce, Ed. by G.P. Oei: *Data Paper 44*. Southeast Asia Program, Department of Far Eastern Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca. New York 1961, Introduction.

eyewitness report preserved valuable details, *e.g.* about the yearly festivals in Nanchao.³⁵

Perhaps because of the fragmentary nature of the *Man-shu*'s extant text — *i.e.* its lost text being reconstructed from quotations in later works — instead of a whole year only the feasts beyond the scope of an agricultural year are to be found: from winter till early springtime. However, the time left after the harvest and before land-cultivating tasks, could be the most suitable period for family and social meetings, and thus perhaps this fragment of Nanchao's customs concerned the most important festivals while merely referring to the turn of the year.

The first feast mentioned was held at the end of the year: on the first day of the 11th month,³⁶ with the participation of relatives (親族 *ch'in-tsu*) and the inhabitants of the neighbouring villages (鄰里 *lin-li*).³⁷ *I.e.*, this meeting was of social size, but of patriarchal character, under the political or administrative level of Nanchao on the one hand; and on the other, it was held by villagers, with a local character.

The following merry feast was held in the third month — as the description continues — and then outside the door (戶 *hu*) peach -(tree) and rushes (桃筴 *t'ao-lie*) were placed, similarly to New Year('s dawn) (歲旦 *sui-tan*).³⁸

If this reminded the author of the official New Year at all, he then remarked that the *yin* («tiger») month was fixed as the change of year (年 *nien*).³⁹ This can make it clear that the above-mentioned (New) Year's morning («dawn») concerned Nanchao, and not *e.g.* the country of the author. (This textual consideration could be justifiable, as will be seen.) Thus we are informed about an official New Year, fixed according to a Chinese usage of the cosmic «Earthly Branches», as stated by the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, too.⁴⁰ Nevertheless this official turn of year — that must have taken place, accordingly, about two months earlier than the «second» merry meeting with «peach (tree) and rushes» — does not seem to be a people's festival, by this strengthening of the political character of the Chinese-type *yin*-calendar.

³⁵ *Man-shu*, VIII: 蠻夷風俗 *Man-i feng-su* «Regional Customs of the (Southern and Eastern) Barbarians» (*MSSC*, p. 211).

³⁶ *Man-shu*, p. 78: «Every year, on the first day of the 11th month, a great festival is held to entertain guests.»

³⁷ *MAN-SHU*, *loc.cit.*: «Relatives and clansmen and neighbouring villagers. . .»

³⁸ *MAN-SHU*, *loc.cit.*: «During the 3rd month they make merry and toast each other. But they must, when in pursuit of pleasure, always set up outside the door (branches of) peachwood and (a broom of) rushes, as if it were the morning of the (new) year». As shown by the parentheses in this translation, the text would permit a whole (alive) tree as well outside the home(s) (*hu*), and the rushes were not necessarily fitted together in the form of broom, openly symbolizing its purificatory function.

³⁹ *MAN-SHU*, *loc.cit.*: «But at the change of the year they fix the *yin* month (as the first of the year)».

⁴⁰ Cf. Note 16.

Finally, Fan Ch'o informed his country (her officials) that Nanchao's other festivals (節日 *chieh-jih*) were similar to (identical with: 同 *t'ung*) those of the Chinese (漢 *Han*), only (the festivals of) Cold Food (寒食 *Han-shih*) — Clear Bright (清明 *Ch'ing-ming*) were not known there.⁴¹ With good reason, a later reader may have doubts about whether the author was well-informed about the «slight differences» of seasons of Nanchao and China respectively — as written by the *Hsin T'ang-shu* — that may cause differences even in the «similar» yearly and seasonable festivals. The only difference mentioned, *i.e.* the missed festivals belonged, by the way, to the same type of patriarchal level people's festivity as Nanchao's above-cited feast on the 1st day of the eleventh month.

However, a key to the separate above passages as well as to their coherence can be found, *i.e.* in the common motive. Namely, the expression *t'ao-lieh* «peach (tree or branches) and rush» recalls an ancient Chinese practice of exorcism, as early as in the Chou period, as attested by the commentary-chronicle *Tso-chuan*. The ceremony itself seems to have been concerned only with expelling evil influences, but even that early occurrence of this practice was connected with the New Year.⁴² Another old ceremony of a purificatory function can also be demonstrated again from the *Tso-chuan*, involving peachwood and datewood, but in a form of a bow and arrow, respectively.⁴³ In that old passage its use refers — again accidentally.

⁴¹ *MAN-SHU*, *loc. cit.*: «Their other festival days are roughly the same as the Chinese. Only they do not know about the *Han-shih* («cold food» day) before *Ch'ing-ming* («clear bright» day, about April 5th, when the Chinese annually worship at tombs of their ancestors)». Naturally the translator's comment (in parentheses) does not necessarily belong to our passage. *Han-shih—Ch'ing-ming* being connected with a 3 days' festival sometimes, perhaps the whole circle of festivity was sought in vain by Fan Ch'o.

⁴² *Tso-chuan*, IX: In the 29th year of the ruler 襄公 *Hsiang-kung* (543 B.C.) of the state 魯 *Lu* (Shantung), in the first month (of the «royal» calendar of Chou, accepted in Lu, too), *Lu Hsiang-kung* went to the state 楚 *Ch'u* (Hupei-Hunan) whose ruler 康王 *K'ang-wang* had died just recently, and for this reason he even missed paying his New Year's visit to the temple of his ancestors (in *Lu*). Being asked by *Ch'u*'s people to bring by his own hands the grave-cloth to the encoffined corpse, he was not only offended, but even endangered to suffer the possible evil influences concerned — having serious consequences in the case of a ruler on his country as well — a court officer helped the situation: «Accordingly a sorcerer was employed who first executed the sprinkling with a branch of a peach tree and some reeds»: Legge, p. 547. Cf. Couvreur, vol. II, p. 520: «Un magicien fut d'abord envoyer chasser, avec des branches de pêcher et un balai d'herbe, les influences néfastes auprès du cadavre». (乃使巫以桃筍祓殯 where only the exorcist function of the *t'ao-lieh* «peach (tree/wood/branch) — rushes» is clear, without further details.) — The plant *lieh*, translated as «reed» by Legge and «herbe» by Couvreur, is «a kind of rush used for making brooms», quoted from the *Li-chi* «Book of Ceremonies», compiled in Han-times: B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa: BMFEA XXIX* (1957), No. 291e. It is told to be 菼 *tao* «reeds» (Karlgren, *op. cit.*, No. 1131d') by the dictionary (from the 1st century A.D.) *Shuo-wen*, I.B. 20a.

⁴³ *Tso-chuan*, X: In the first month of *Lu* 昭公 *Chao-kung*'s 4th year (537 B.C.) there is a warning addressed to the ruler about the proper manners in order to prevent hail and other calamities.

from the point of view of the direct context — to the time when the Fire (-Star) comes out, *i.e.* in springtime, at or before the beginning of the agricultural labour.⁴⁴ Both kinds of «peachwood-exorcism» were later attached to the New Year's tradition, at least among popular beliefs and local festivities, in the Han-period, as can be seen *e.g.* in the famous poem 東京賦 *Tung-ching-fu* «Fu on the Eastern Capital (Loyang)» by 張衡 Chang Heng (78–139 A.D), in the 12th month, *i.e.* before the end of the year,⁴⁵ similarly to the New Year's customs in many further centuries.⁴⁶

threatening the people during the year to come. The words of a high-ranking official to this effect are formulated in the form of a parable, referring to «ancient days» and involving old methods of collecting, preserving and distributing ice (for funerals, and foods, etc.). There we find the prescription that after the due sacrifices «... a bow of peach wood and arrows of thorn were employed to put away calamitous influence»: Legge, p. 596. Cf. Couvreur, vol. III, p. 71: «... on employait un arc de pêcher et des flèches de jujubier sauvage pour chasser les mauvaises influences.» (桃弧棘矢以除其災) The second plant: 棘 *chi* is «jube», «thorns» etc. (Karlgren, *op. cit.*, No. 911a–b.)

⁴⁴ 始用之火出而畢賦. Legge, p. 596: after the depositories of ice, filled in winter, had been opened, «when the (star) *Ho* made its appearance, it was distributed» (*i.e.* the ice). Cf. Couvreur, enlarging his translation by his comment, reflecting our knowledge that the sky was observed in the evening in Chou times, at least from the middle of the 1st millennium B.C.: «Quand l'étoile Houo (Antarès du Scorpion) se levait et que les Hyades disparaissaient le soir après le coucher du soleil, c.-à-d.: au moi de mai ou au moi de juin ...» About the same time: the 4th month meant the lamb-sacrifice (before opening the ice-stores) in the 154th song of the *Shih-ching*, too — indicated by the passage concerned of the *Tso-chuan* as the model of properly treating the ice —, see B. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, pp. 99–100. See the corrected text of Legge's translation, with references to the 154th song of *The Book of Odes*, and with several classical passages that show the practical and ritual use of ice in ancient China: T. Pokora, *A mobile freezer in China in B.C. 99?: Acta Orient. Hung. XXXI* (1977), pp. 315–318 (sqq). But in «ancient days», as mentioned by the parable of the *Tso-chuan* — when dawn was the time of observation, see below (our N. 78) — the rise of the Star of Fire was seen earlier, as we are told by the *Tso-chuan* (X, 17th year of *Lu Chao-kung*: 524 B.C.), in legendary *Hsia* times the (Star of) Fire «came out» in the 3rd month, during the Shang (17th–11th centuries B.C.) in the 4th month, while during the *Chou* (11th–3rd centuries B.C.) in the 5th month — by all probabilities according to the apparent movements of the celestial configurations — see Legge, pp. (666/668); cf. Couvreur, vol. III, p. 280. (In the 154th song of the *Shih-ching*, referred to above, the 7th month is connected with the «declining Fire-star» — Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, 96–97 — in the first line, too, used as its title: 七月 *Ch'i-yüeh* «7th month»; the time of observation, taken «naturally» as in night, is not indicated in the context.) — It should be noticed, however, that at the end of the passage it can be read that it was *Hsia*'s related calculation that corresponded best to Heaven (Nature) (夏數待天). Couvreur: «La manière de compter des Hia est celle qui est le plus en rapport avec les saisons de l'année». Furthermore, it can be recalled that the exorcism with peachwood (and rush) was mentioned in Nanchao at a feast in the 3rd month.

⁴⁵ *Wen-hsüan*, III, 7a. Sorcerers (men and women) are told to «clean by rushes» the city (操蒯 *ts'ao-lieh*, related by the commentaries to mean 桃蒯 *t'ao-lieh*, referring to the above-quoted story of the *Tso-chuan*); and children make «peachwood bows and datewood arrows» to repel demons; cf. D. Bodde, *Festivals in Classical China. New Year and Other Annual Observances during the Han Dynasty*,

Consequently, the placing of «peach-tree/wood and rushes» before the door at the time of Nanchao's feast in the 3rd month is not by mere coincidence similar to a New Year's custom, that of ancient China at least, but it was perhaps adopted by Nanchao, too, since its kings had accepted the beginning of China's imperial year. The objects mentioned, being some means of purification and a precaution for a new year, were utilized as a part of the New Year ceremony, even after fixing the *yin* as the first month, upon the contemporary Chinese model. Thus the feast in the 3rd month must have represented some archaism in Nanchao, *i.e.* a survival of another beginning of the year at the opening of the season of agriculture. This seems to be in harmony with the other people's tradition in East Asia, with the Tibetan related tradition as well as with the archaic Chinese tradition of the villages.⁴⁷

The traditional beginning of the year in China also changed over the centuries. The peachtree itself, probably in blossom, indicated spring in China until modern times: 桃月 *t'ao-yüeh* «peach (tree)-month» meant the 3rd month, while in the «monthly prescriptions» of the *Yüeh-ling* (in the *Li-chi*), perhaps referring to pre-Han times, the peach-tree was said to blossom in the middle of spring, *i.e.* in the 2nd month of the year.⁴⁸ The 3rd month is, however, the time of two other festivals in China, traditionally connected with a meeting of relatives in the open air: the «Cold Food» (*Han-shih*), *i.e.* the day without fire, was to pay homage at the tombs of ancestors, while the «Clear Bright» (*Ch'ing-ming*) was a gay festivity before «bringing out the fire» to the fields,⁴⁹ as a memory of an archaic New Year of the

206 B. C. — A. D. 220. The Chinese University of Hong Kong, 1975, Princeton University Press, pp. 84–85, 127, 134–135.

⁴⁶ Cf. W. Eberhard, *Chinese Festivals*. Henry Schuman, New York 1952, pp. 12–13 (etc.); cf. H. Doré, *Manuel des superstitions ou petit indicateur des superstitions les plus communes en Chine*. Paris–Hong Kong 1970, Centre de Publication de l'U.E.R. Extrême-Orient, pp. 22, 132, 136.

⁴⁷ On the change of the beginning of the year and the related festivities in Tibetan villages, see Stein, *La civilisation tibétaine*, pp. 179 sqq.

⁴⁸ *Yüeh-ling*, II: Couvreur, Vol. I, p. 340. — Among Nanchao's subjects we find a certain people named 桃花蠻 *T'ao-hua-man* «Peach-flower Barbarians», serving «as frontier-guards on the border» in Annam: *Man-shu*, cf. *MAN-SHU*, pp. 45–46. No explanation is given, however, about the origin of the name.

⁴⁹ The traditionally fixed time of these festivals can be quoted from the philosophical work, preserving sparkles of early scientific thought, too, from the end of the 2nd century B.C. It already reflected the discovery of the winter solstice as the starting point of yearly calculations, institutionalized in 104 B.C. (cf. N. Sivin: *Cosmos and computation in early Chinese mathematical astronomy*: TP LV (1969), 1–3, pp. 1–73), with a first month officially fixed as *yin*, *i.e.* the 3rd of the earlier, «astronomic» year (see Note 51): *Huai-nan-tzu*, III, 天訓 *T'ien-hsün* «Explanations of the Heaven (ly Phenomena)», pp. 39, 45. We read there the two week periods of the whole year, beginning with the 冬至 *tung-chih* (the «culmination of winter»): 46 days later «the spring begins» (立春 *li-chun*), 15 days afterwards the «rainwater» comes (雨水 *yü-shui*), 15 days afterwards «the thunder frightens the (sleeping) insects»

village people, surviving in festival forms during the periods of official «royal» calendars as well.⁵⁰

Briefly: in Nanchao the feast mentioned in the 3rd month must have fulfilled the same function as the joint festivals *Han-shih* — *Ch'ing-ming* in China; this might be the reason why the Chinese festivals themselves were not adopted together with the official beginning, etc., of the Chinese official year. The assumption may be ventured that after all the whole passage of the *Man-shu* mentioned above deals with a cycle of New Year's festivities only, thus at least representing a coherent fragment. For this reason, it can be suspected that even the first feast was held on a distinguished day: the first day of every month being a solemn day; and the 11th month was one of the year-beginning months in China.⁵¹

(雷驚蟄 *lei-ching-chih*), 15 days afterwards is the time of the spring equinox (春分 *cs'un-fen*), and 15 days afterwards the day of 清明 *Ch'ing-ming* «Clear Bright» comes: *Huai-nan-tzu*, III, p. 41. *I.e.*, the day of *Ch'ing-ming* arrives 106 days after the winter solstice, and a fortnight after the spring equinox. The «Cold Food» day, not mentioned here, precedes the day of *Ch'ing-ming*; cf. Bodde, *Festivals in Classical China*, p. 28.

⁵⁰ Cf. Morohashi Tetsuji, *Dai kan wa jiten*, Dai-shūkan shoten, Tokyo 1960, Vol. II, p. 3344, No. 7239/217, *Han-shih*, on the festival named «Cold Food», but being a merry feast, allegedly from the time of the Yellow Emperor, or at least since the Chou period; 103 or 106 days after the winter solstice, consisting of three days (etc.). — Morohashi, Vol. VII, p. 6985, No. 17695/759 (760): on the *Ch'ing-ming* feast, 15 days after the spring equinox, 2 days after the «Cold Food», in the 3rd month of the lunar calendar, etc.

⁵¹ See the classical allusions (Morohashi, Vol. VI, pp. 6377–6378, No. 16256/183, 正朔 *cheng-shuo* «On the first days of the first month», *i.e.* New Year's days and months throughout Chinese history) to the effect that the legendary Hsia dynasty fixed the beginning of the year on the *yin* month, in harmony «with the Heaven», see Note 44, and China followed that order from the Han dynasty (206 B.C. — 220 A.D.): from the time of the Emperor Han Wu-ti (140–87). According to traditional records, the first historical dynasty Yin (*i.e.* Shang-Yin from the 14th century B.C.) transferred the beginning of the year to the 丑 *ch'ou* «ox» month; *ch'ou* being the second among the 12 Earthly Branches, the year then began a month earlier. The Chou House fixed it still earlier a month: in the 子 *tsu* «rat» month. (Thus the empress Wu-hou, choosing the dynasty-name of *Chou* for her usurpation, used the time-reckoning of the *Chou*, cf. Note 19.) After a short interval, when the First Emperor Ch'in Shih Huang-ti (221–210 B.C.) held his New Year still earlier: in the month 亥 *hai* «pig» (11th in the series of Branches), the restored Han House first returned to the Chou system, and changed it only about a century later, in accordance with other calendrical changes. From that time on, when the *yin*-month was considered the first, naturally the *tsu*-month was the 11th in a year, still remaining as a first according to its sign of Branches (indicating its zodiac character in imperial times). And thus the 10th month remained the time of *e.g.* the annual reports of the officials, in Han-times, too, cf. Bodde, *Festivals in Classical China*, pp. 146–148). — This tradition of historical transposition of New Year's day and month, perhaps reflects calendrical troubles due to a long observation of the movement of celestial bodies, used as assistance for yearly time-reckoning (*e.g.* the Antares, cf. Note 44) as well as in the use of lunar months (cf. the tradition of a 13-month year, too: see Morohashi, *loc.cit.*). However, the 10th month so naturally ended the agricultural year — with ending festivals sometimes — that the 11th or *tsu* «rat» month

Since a tradition fixing the 子 *tzu* «rat» month — the first of the Branches, *i.e.* zodiac series, being the eleventh when beginning from the *yin*-month — as the first month of a year, originated from the Chou period, a few peculiarities can be recalled concerning the peasant year's length in Chou times. Namely, as a stylistic archaism of the cultivator's view, the years were enumerated as «springs and autumns» only, according to the chronicle *Ch'un-ch'iu* (whose commentary *Tso-chuan* was quoted above). Thus a year must have lasted — at least from a village aspect — from spring to autumn, to be illustrated by the Chinese terms for year 年 *nien* and 歲 *sui*, also meaning «harvest».⁵² The same part of a solar year must have been taken into consideration when speaking about the people's duties or welfare during the year, during the «three seasons» (三時 *san-shih*), *i.e.* in the whole year.⁵³ Finally, the «calendar-song» No. 154 of the *Shih-ching* should be recalled, finishing the work and other events of the year — apparently among villagers — with the 10th month, mentioning no 11th or 12th month at all, as if they were outside the scope of peasant life.⁵⁴ It is, therefore, not surprising that the following month was felt to be the beginning of a new season, thus sometimes disturbing even the official order of the seasons in East Asia. *E.g.* in Tibet, where the changing time of «spring» — even in the official records —, and certain feasts before and after harvest, respectively⁵⁵ can perhaps be explained by the above mentioned time-reckoning traditions.

Nanchao seems to have adopted both possibilities of its historical sphere. As can be seen in the record of the *Man-shu*, the royal court might use the Chinese imperial New Year and yearly order — at least for political purposes — while after the harvest and before the spring works the population could continue to hold the due patriarchal or peasant feasts as well. The latter traditionalism is in harmony with the statement of different Chinese records about Nanchao to the effect that in

remained the beginning of an «astronomical» year — determining the sexagesimal calculations for the whole year until modern times —, without any real astronomical concern, even after the institutional use of solar positions as bases for time-reckoning. Perhaps the origin and survival of a kind of New Year in late autumn can be connected with its coincidence and the beginning of a «new» period after the end of the agricultural year, lasting until the following springtime's works (and representing a starting point for another yearly cycle: from harvest until harvest).

⁵² Cf. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, No. 364a-c: *nien*. — The other term for years (of human age, for instance), *sui* (cf. Karlgren, No. 346a-e) was first related to the 12 phases of Jupiter's cycle (of about 12 solar years).

⁵³ Cf. *e.g.* *Tso-chuan*, II, Lu Huan-kung's 6th year (705 B.C.), referring to the measurements of 武公 *Wu-kung* of the principality *Ch'u*: Couvreur, Vol. I, p. 88; Legge, pp. 47–48.

⁵⁴ Cf. Karlgren, *The Book of Odes*, pp. 96–100.

⁵⁵ See E. Haahr, *The Yar-lun Dynasty*. A study with particular regard to the contribution by myths and legends to the history of ancient Tibet and the origin and nature of its kings. G.E.C. Gad's Forlag, København 1969, 423; cf. Stein, *La civilization tibétaine*, p. 185.

Nanchao «everybody» was involved in agriculture (in spite of records also relating other types of economic activities among the subdued population).

Thus both kinds of yearly order and calendrical traditions mentioned here, whether voluntarily adopted in Nanchao or inherited through a cultural co-existence, may indeed have had Chinese connections: in or prior to T'ang times. They can be traced back to the second half of the Han period, or even to its very beginning, originating from Chou-time traditions. All this, after all, does not contradict the Chinese records that start Nanchao's history with a surrender of its territory to China in Han-times and even earlier, even if first and foremost a cultural «conquest» must be taken into consideration.

4. A further source of time-reckoning customs in Nanchao can be found in two poems, preserved in Chinese and attributed to high-ranking persons of Nanchao. Unfortunately, the interpretation of their text raises serious problems, which also weaken the credibility to be given to them as a source. But as shown below, the non-official Chinese tradition, referred to above, can render them both clearer and more credible, if not otherwise: as a literary source of Nanchao's culture.

The short text in question was preserved in the encyclopedic collection of literary and historical anecdotes *T'ai-p'ing-kuang-chi* (*TPKC*), compiled at the beginning of the Sung dynasty (960–1279), according to its title: during the *T'ai-p'ing* period (or *T'ai-p'ing hsing-kuo*, 978–983). Among various stories about different «Southern Barbarians», there is an item entitled *Nanchao*.⁵⁶ This name alone shows the possible time scope of the text: after the middle of the 8th century, or rather after the beginning of the 9th century, when the Chinese records already reflected the recognition, on the part of China, of Nanchao as a political entity and factor, probably after its conquest.⁵⁷ Although the Meng clan's role and the Nanchao Kingdom proper ended in 902, and after short-lived dynasties the *Ta-li* kingdom held power over Yünnan in the time of compilation of the *TPKC*,⁵⁸ the name

⁵⁶ *TPKC*, CCCCLXXXIII (Vol. 10), 3981.

⁵⁷ The encyclopedia *T'ung-tien*, compiled around 802, recorded Nanchao's contemporary subjects according to their separate territories, peoples or «countries» (chapters CLXXXVII–CLXXXVIII), in a way following the related reports of the *Sui-shu*, finished in the 650s (*SS*, LXXXII), i.e. in a form of the treated sphere preceding Nanchao's rule. The *Chiu T'ang-shu* and *T'ang-hui-yao*, including separate chapters on the «country» *Nanchao*, were written in or around 960 (*CTS*, CXC VII; *THY*, 1763–1766), not to speak about the *Hsin T'ang-shu* (*HTS*, CCXXII, *shang*, *chung*), finished a century later.

⁵⁸ In 902, when 鄭買嗣 *Cheng Mai-ssu* — a late offspring of the author of the *T'ai-ho* Inscription Cheng Hui — took over power, and named his country 大長和(國) *Ta Ch'ang-ho* (-*kuo* «country»), but his family could hold it only till 928. After the rule of other clans, naming their realm 大天興 *Ta-t'ien-hsing* (-*kuo*) (928–929) and 大義寧 *Ta-i-ning* (-*kuo*) (929–937), respectively, and then *Ta-li*, upon the name of Nanchao's old capital district (from 937 on), it would not be surprising

Nanchao could be traditionally used for the territory concerned in the following decades as well.

The poems are quoted from a work 玉谿編事 *Yü-ch'i-pien-shih* — known apparently through this quotation alone —⁵⁹ also containing commentaries on several passages (and informing the reader about the origin of the citation). Perhaps the comments, thought necessary by the compiler(s) of the *TPKC*, and their merely partial success in making it understandable, may be due to the relatively alien or archaic character of the text, perhaps in this way revealing something about the lost work as well.

The Chinese literary form of the text referred to, no matter how unusual in the case of a Barbarian «subject» of China, is not without parallel or precedent. Apart from the possibility of a linguistic vicinity that would make the translation easier from the language of *Nanchao*, to Chinese, for a long period Chinese officials and other educated Chinese persons had been appointed, travelled, and fled, etc. to *Nanchao* including e.g. the Cheng family, assisting and then defeating *Nanchao*'s founders. In a related territory a few centuries earlier Chinese officials recorded the indigenous songs of the population, in a phonetical approach (with Chinese characters) as well as in Chinese translation.⁶⁰ In later centuries, too, the Southern Barbarians lived «mixed with the Chinese (華人 *Hua-jen*)».⁶¹ Due to the many-sided connections of *Nanchao* with China, the poem (詩 *shih*) of *Nanchao*, finishing the chapter on the Southern Barbarians of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*,⁶² could be also composed e.g. by a Chinese who learned their language. But in the first decades of the 10th century, for instance, the members of the ruling family and the high officials of *Nanchao* — the inheritors of *Nanchao*'s territory and power —, were

if the old traditional and respected name *Nanchao* would have been used instead in the 10th century. On «The fall of the Nan-chao dynasty» see Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, pp. 160–164.

⁵⁹ It is mentioned when separate passages, expressions etc. are quoted from the poems in question, the quoted passages being known — it seems — only from this text. A similar title (玉谿篇 *Yü-ch'i-p'ien*) is perhaps a mistake in Morohashi, Vol. V, p. 5437, No. 13837/90. *Yü-ch'i* «Jade-valley» can be found on several places in Honan and Shanhsi, cf. *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta tz'u-tien*, p. 237b.

⁶⁰ In Ssuch'uan, around the middle of the 1st century B.C., when the territory of the 作都 *Tso-tu* Barbarians came under Han administration, there were Chinese officials who understood the alien language of the 白狼 *Pai-lang* population. Their representatives were escorted to the capital in order to present their music and poems to the emperor, as we are informed by the *Hou Han-shu* preserving the three poems both in transcription and translation (*HHS*, LXXXVI: *lieh-chuan* LXXXVI). Cf. W. South Coblin, *A new study of the Pai-lang songs*: 清華學報 *Ch'ing-hua Hsüeh-pao* (*The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, T'aipei) XII, N.S. (1979) 1–2, pp. 179–216.

⁶¹ Recorded so by the introduction to the reports of the *Sui-shu* about Southern Barbarians (*SS*, LXXXII, 818 b).

⁶² On China's wise treatment of the «four directions» and their different Barbarians — a typical topic and stereotype of the Chinese historical records — cf. *HTS*, CCXXII, *hsia*, p. 1579 b.

recorded by the Chinese officials of the imperial court receiving them as being versatile in writing Chinese poems.⁶³

Thus we may also read with a historical interest the text of the *TPKC*, beginning as follows:

«In Nanchao the 16th day of the 12th month is called the «Festival Day of the Star's Return (星回節日 *Hsing-hui chieh-jih*)».

A festival like this was not recorded by Fan Ch'ò in the *Man-shu*, as seen above, and it is attested only by this context concerning Nanchao, too.⁶⁴ Special attention was paid to the return of a star — after a year's time, *i.e.* indicating the beginning of a new yearly cycle — in ancient China, too;⁶⁵ but this is not a time and name of a Chinese festival either.⁶⁶

It is not written in a form of a Chinese historical record of one single event — the day being named by a number, *i.e.* serial number within a month —, it seems to be a usual definition of a festival of changing date, moving according to the place of its month in a year. A foreign popular origin of the date and feast cannot be pointed out either, since the word of foreign origin occurring in the text: 波羅 *po-lo* (*puá-lá*⁶⁷), is apparently a transcription of the word «tiger» — the main reason why this text was quoted so far — that indicates different directions, but there the day in question is not recorded as a feast. Namely, the word used *e.g.* for the tiger-skin given as a sign of recognition and award by the Tibetan king to high-ranking officials of Nanchao,⁶⁸ is generally used — or at least recorded in Chinese — not

⁶³ In 925, when the ruler of the kingdom *Ta-ch'ang-ho*: 鄭旻 *Cheng Min* (910–926) asked for marriage in China, and received the daughter of the Hou T'ang emperor *Chuang-tsung*: *CCTC*, Vol. X, p. 8950. Ssu-ma Kuang adds: «Ch'ang-ho is identical with T'ang's Nanchao», and when commenting on the record — upon the 五代會要 *Wu-tai-hui-yao* —, he praises the vigour of the styluses of the high-ranking officials in *Ta-ch'ang-ho*, who wrote on a kind of thick paper that was as hard as leather. (Cf. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, p. 161.)

⁶⁴ Cf. Morohashi, V, p. 5437, No. 13837.

⁶⁵ An obscure anecdote mentioned another festival of this name (*Hsing-hui chieh*), but on the 25th day of the 6th month, from as early as Han-times, without naming the star that «returned» on that day. The story is quoted from the 雲南通志 *Yün-nan t'ung-chih*, *i.e.* it may concern the territory of later Nanchao as well; cf. *Tz'u-hai*, *Chung-hua shu-chü*, Shanghai 1948, p. 636a.

⁶⁶ As seen in the *Yüeh-ling*, IV; Couvreur, Vol. I, p. 407, among the prescriptions of the last month of the winter, at the time of the preparations to the beginning of agricultural labour of a new year; there, as it seems, the «return of stars» in general is considered. — The Return (of the Star or Stars) is written 回 or 迴 *hui*, cf. Morohashi, V, p. 5437, No. 13837/89–91.

⁶⁷ According to Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*.

⁶⁸ See the references in the *Man-shu*, VIII (describing traditional dresses in Nanchao): *MSSC*, 208–209; cf. *MSSC*, 216 (on the animals in Nanchao, serving as evidence that the animal, too, was called by this name; this latter passage of the *Man-shu* is commented on with references to the text of the *TPKC*).

even in a Tibetan form, but as *bars*: an ancient Turkic word (of Iranian origin).⁶⁹ But the Turks and Uigurs used a correct Chinese dating in their written records, from the foundation of Nanchao at least, in spite of their popular calendar, utilizing the celestial movements of certain stars.⁷⁰

With regard to the content of the poems, instead of winter scenes — to be expected in the case of a 12th month of the Chinese calendar — they give an impression of springtime. We could consider Nanchao's different regions after the conquests, when even the climatic differences could cause problems in the records of names (numbers) of months, of the «ripening» of a plant, etc. (as seen in the *Man-shu*, VII, when referring to the products of certain regions); they might mean even more than «slight differences», compared to the expectations according to China's year order (probably reflected in the month-names of the descriptions).

The importance and validity sphere of our text may, after all, be determined upon the alleged composers and the site of the scenes mentioned by them.

On the given day «excursion was made to the Tower Protecting from Wind (避風臺 *Pi-feng-t'ai*), (and) the chief minister (清平官 *ch'ing-p'ing-kuan*)⁷¹ was obliged (命 *ming*) to write poems (賦詩 *fu-shih*). (But first) the 驃信 *P'iao-hsin* («king») wrote a poem (詩 *shih*): «Tower of 善闡 *Shan-ch'an*, protecting from wind. . . »

P'iao-hsin, standing here as a name, was the title of the king of *P'iao* country (P'yu Kingdom in Northern Burma), conquered by Nanchao — after half a century's dominance in that region — in 802 A.D. The title being adopted by Nanchao's rulers from 808 on,⁷² Nanchao's kings were mentioned in Chinese records with this title alone.⁷³ From that time on, the «Lord of P'yu» or King of

⁶⁹ Cf. G. Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford 1972, Clarendon Press, p. 368, *bars*: «a very early Iranian loan-word, but from which Iranian language it was taken is uncertain. Properly «leopard», but in Turkish apparently also used for other large felines», «. . . used both for the third of the ten «Stems» (*ping* . . .) and for the third of the twelve «Branches» (*yin* . . .)» . . . It is «tiger» in a form *yolbars*, etc. Cf. *Drevnetjurkskiy slovar'*, Izd. Nauka, Leningrad 1969, p. 84, *bars I*: «*tigr*»; *bars jil*: «*god tigr*» . . . — The meaning «tiger» (虎 *hu*) is attested by the commentary in the *TPKC*.

⁷⁰ Cf. L. Bazin, *Les calendriers turcs anciens et médiévaux*. Paris 1972 — Université de Lille III, 1974; e.g. pp. 239, 274 (with dates analyzed in detail), but, chap. XI: «Suiivance d'un calendrier des Pléiades», remembered even in the recent centuries. — The above text of the *TPKC* is referred to as an argument for a Turk ethnic relationship of Nanchao's population, or at least a part of it, by 尙達 Hsiang Ta, 南詔史略論 (南詔史上若干問題的試探) *Nan-chao shih lüeh-lun* (*Nan-chao shih shang jo-kun wen-t'i ti shih-t'an*): *T'ang-tai Ch'ang an yü hsi-yü wen-ming*, Peking 1957, pp. 177–178.

⁷¹ The highest and best known title of Nanchao's court, the «clear and peaceful official» is commented on here as 詞臣 *tz'u-ch'en* «a subject/minister of letters».

⁷² Cf. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, pp. 101–103.

⁷³ Cheng Min, *Ta-ch'ang-ho's ruler* was simply called *P'iao-hsin* in 924 (cf. Note 63).

Nanchao built a new summer residence, too — beside the capital (in *Ta-li*) — *Shan-ch'an* (in the neighbourhood of K'unming, Yünnan). An expression in *P'iao-hsin's* poem (元昶 *yüan, ch'ang*) «I(the ruler) and You (my subject, minister)»,⁷⁴ also shows that the royal sphere and its climate, etc., are concerned in these passages, thus they must refer to an important moment and event.

If only for this reason, the date of the royal excursion of springtime sightseeing — or: «skyseeing», as it turns out — connected with tiger-hunting, is to be explained by a term, apparently misunderstood by the compiler of the *TPKC*, namely: 震旦 *chen-tan*. The comment of the *TPKC* is obviously mistaken: if «it is 天子 *t'ien-tzu* (the emperor, *i.e.* of China)», it does not fit into the line, where the king (*P'iao-hsin*) says: «since I am in (居 *chü*) *chen-tan*. . . » Well, staying in Nanchao's royal residence, he is not in China. It is not clearer in the case of a symbolic interpretation «China» either, as according to Buddhist usage: the name of China, in a transcription perhaps of *Činastān*, suggested by (later) reference works, writing it in several other forms, too.⁷⁵

Remembering that the time of a spring festival in Nanchao could be referred to a «false», *i.e.* obsolete New Year — written there as *sui-tan* «the Dawn of the Year» (cf. Note 38) — we might propose an interpretation of «the dawn of *chen*», with a similar content. *Chen*, in this form, means «thunder», but the written character is just a scholar «etymology» of the ancient name of 辰 *ch'en* — a part of the constellation Scorpion containing the Antares, observed in the morning, to be seen in the character of the «morning» 晨 *ch'en*; its heliac rise indicates the cultivating work in spring, according to the character of 農 *nung* «agriculture», etc.,⁷⁶ that became a meaningless sign of the Branches («dragon» in the zodiac cycle) by Han-times. Its form with 雨 *yü* «rain», *i.e.* 震 *chen* «thunder» could be explained *e.g.* as stormy rains indicating springtime;⁷⁷ but the dictionary *Shuo-wen* explicitly

⁷⁴ These terms, attested as words in Nanchao's language by the official Chinese records, too, are commented by the *TPKC* as 朕 *chen* («I, the Emperor») and 卿 *ch'ing* («(high) official»), respectively.

⁷⁵ Cf. Morohashi, V, pp. 5096–5097, No. 13061/111, 支那 *Chih-na* «China»; cf. *Tz'u-hai*, p. 598d: *Chih-na*, p. 1454e: *chen-tan*.

⁷⁶ Cf. our arguments: *Far Eastern sources on the history of the steppe region*, pp. 267–270 (esp. p. 268, Note 11.); *On the Beginnings of the Chinese State* (in Hungarian; in print), Chapter III, «On 神農 *Shen-nung's* market», with the social, *i.e.* agricultural background of this tradition.

⁷⁷ Cf. *Po Hu Tung* 白虎通. *The Comprehensive Discussions in the White Tiger Hall*, ed. by Tjan Tjoe Som 曾珠森: *Sinica Leidensia* VI, E.J. Brill, Leiden. Vol. II (1952), Chap. IX: «The five elements», p. 433. — This *chen-tan* was connected with the Eastern direction from early times, cf. Morohashi, XII, p. 12650, No. 42 300/70.

⁷⁸ Again from the 1st century A.D. — as the explanation of the *Po-hu-t'ung* (see the above note) — the *Shuo-wen* (XIV. B, 311) says about the item 辰 *ch'en* that it is identic with 震 *chen*, and with «the 3rd month: the time when the bright (陽 *yang*) air moves and the thunder (轟震 *lei-chen*) stimulates the people for agriculture (*nung*)». The following item 耻 *ju* «(to feel) shame» etc. (*loc.cit.*),

identified 震 *chen* with 辰 *ch'en*.⁷⁸ (By the way, the chief minister's poem also mentions the end (last evening) of the year.)⁷⁹

This surprising reminiscence of Han-time philology or scholar literacy at least, also recalls a few other archaisms worthy of attention in a text of the late T'ang period (or perhaps written even somewhat later). The place-names mentioned — apparently as if seen from the tower, although they are not at all so close to *Shan-ch'an* — are called «countries» by the commentaries, similarly to early Han or even earlier times. 藤越 *Teng-yüeh*, said by the commentary to be «a neighbouring country's name», seems to have never been a «country»; *Yüeh* could refer to some southern place (and population), while *Teng* was known in Kuanghsi (as *Teng-chou*) in the T'ang period.⁸⁰ The other alleged country 弄棟 *Lung-tung*⁸¹ was submitted to Chinese administration in Han times (later written as 棟弄棟), and cancelled before T'ang rule; it was established again — under this Han-time name — only during the rule of Nanchao, on its territory.⁸² Furthermore, the name of the «screening tower» (*Pi-feng-t'ai* «Tower, Protecting against Wind») also recalls a Han-time beauty who was given a tower like this, when she became a concubine and even empress; her family name was 趙 *Chao*,⁸³ similarly — by coincidence, as it seems — to the chief minister 趙叔達 *Chao Shu-ta*, who wrote the second poem in question.

representing the «cutting» of the 辰 *ch'en*, is explained as «to miss the due time of ploughing», and *ch'en* is the «time of agriculture». Under the title 震 *chen*, however, explained as «(the sound of) thunder», the above meaning of springtime is not mentioned: *Shuo-wen*, XI, B, 241a. From this inconsequence, not at all unique in this dictionary, it can also be concluded that 辰 *ch'en* must have been explained as the original form, its sense being forgotten in the course of time.

⁷⁹ The above passage of the «Return of Star(s)» of the *Yüeh-ling* (cf. Note 66.) also contains a reference to the *sui-tan* «(New) Year's dawn», but with a misprint (旦 for 旦), revealing that a New Year was not thought timely in the middle of the spring. — Naturally the New Year('s Day) was expressed in several other forms, too, some of them containing the word *tan* «dawn»; and *sui-tan* was alternately used e.g. with 歲辰 *sui-ch'en* too, («the year's *ch'en*»), cf. Morohashi, VI, p. 6427, No. 16326/102, *sui-tan*.

⁸⁰ Cf. Morohashi, IX, p. 10345, No. 32340/30 *Teng-chou*; *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta-tz'u-tien*, p. 1354b (*Teng-chou* 藤州) — (藤縣 *Teng-hsien*).

⁸¹ The character *tung* is misprinted as 棟.

⁸² Cf. *Chung-kuo ku-chin ti-ming ta-tz'u-tien*, p. 384: 弄棟 *Lung-tung*; under T'ang rule it was called 姚州 *Yao-chou*: *op. cit.*, p. 819c (棟弄棟 *Lung-tung*).

⁸³ For a girl of low origin who danced like a «flying swallow»: 趙飛燕 *Chao Fei-yen* («Flying swallow» of *Chao*) was made a tower like this, probably in or near the capital Ch'ang-an, by Han Wu-ti (140–87 B.C.) according to certain sources (cf. Morohashi, XI, p. 11737, No. 39163/69, *Pi-feng-t'ai*). But a beautiful concubine of the same name, similarly sensitive to wind, was «screened» in a similar way; she was a favourite both of Han Ch'eng-ti (32–7 B.C.) and Han Ai-ti (6–2 B.C.), cf. *HS*, XCVIII, *hsia*, 1198a–1202a, esp. p. 1198a.

The poems were written in verses of 5 syllables, probably aiming at an xaxa rhyme-scheme; they do not reveal high poetic talent. The *P'iao-hsin's* poem reads as follows:

«*Shan-ch'an's* Tower, Protecting from Wind!
As far as the eyes (look), (one) sees *Teng-yüeh!*
Alas! (Both) in olden (times) and now
As usual, mist (covers) the moon.
Since I stay (here) in *chen* (*ch'en*)'s dawn,
(I) support and protect (all) kinds of grave bonds,
Those ancient canons and the supreme turning (of fortune),
(Still) I look up in distress to loyalty and truth,
Unnoticed, the year thus (arrives) to the (last) evening,
Highly moved (I wait) the Festival of the Star's Return.
I (the king) and you (my subject), (we) are of the same heart,
(Our) sons and grandsons will be able to leave (this feeling) for posterity»

While the chief minister Chao Shu-ta wrote as follows:

«The law's vehicle protects (from) the Return of the Star,
The tiger (*po-lo*) and the wild horse⁸⁴ are suspicious(ly cruel).
The river is broad, the ice hardly holds together,
The earth is warm, the plum blooms before time.
Orders were proclaimed that the people⁸⁵ should (live) in harmony,
Offering (their) goods (when) coming to Lungtung,
Wishing to be present not only now,
(But) to attend on the excursion to the tower for thousand years.»

Naturally this interpretation could be rendered clearer and more tinged by further details, still to be clarified (by further sources, etc.). Concerning the actual historical background, the allusion of Buddhist tint (法駕 *fa-chia*) «the vehicle of the Law (Doctrine)» may also contribute to a dating from the 9th century and perhaps towards its end (or later),⁸⁶ similarly to the title *P'iao-hsin* «king». The chief minister's name *Chao* was a well-known family (clan) name in Nanchao, given

⁸⁴ From the comment to this passage it can be learnt that *po-lo* is «tiger», and the expression 昆勇 *k'un-yüng* means «wild horses» (野馬 *yeh-ma*), without a reference to their origin. In addition, we read that in olden years the *P'iao-hsin* came there to shoot wild horse and tiger.

⁸⁵ 俚柔 *li-jou* «vulgar and soft», commented as 百姓 *po-hsing* «hundred clans», i.e. «common people».

⁸⁶ Cf. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, pp. 159–160.

to high officials or even a chief minister to Nanchao, some of them staying — in a diplomatic mission — in China.⁸⁷ But neither the king's name nor the person of the chief minister seem to have been referred to in historical records; and this may strengthen the folkloric or semi-folkloric impression of the above passages, *i.e.* the substance of their ritual content.

From the point of view of a calendrical history, the quoted passages involve a twelve-month year, not simultaneous with the Chinese imperial year from the 2nd century B.C. (cf. Note 51): the 12th month is in springtime, and there is a distinguished morning on its 16th day, when the «Return of the Star», *i.e.* of a striking or important star is observed. Concluding from the written form of that dawn,⁸⁸ with an excursion for looking at the sky, etc., all this — entitled as *Nanchao* — may root in an ancient Antares-cult; it could determine the beginning of the year among village people, even at the time of a different official calendar, similarly to ancient China. Naturally the division of a year could be borrowed, *e.g.* from China, without changing the seasons' natural order,⁸⁹ including the beginning of the year. (The two weeks' long ceremony, traditionally beginning the year in China since ancient times, would make it possible that the «first month» could be the first month of the agricultural year.)⁹⁰

⁸⁷ *E.g.* in 878, when 趙宗政 *Chao Tsung-cheng* asked for a Chinese princess for his ruler, cf. TCTC, Vol. IX, pp. 8204, 8209.

⁸⁸ After having found the coherence of the details, and considering that so many peculiarities in these poems are referred to this text alone, one may wonder if the above comment about *chen-tan* (Note 77–78) could not be responsible for the misinformation that *Chen-tan*, interpreted as China meant 'emperor (of China)'.

⁸⁹ See *e.g.* the Turks, who had reckoned the years according to the «(spring) green», learned the Chinese calendar: they used the Chinese dating forms in a detailed and correct way, but kept their earlier customs concerning the seasons of the year. Cf. Bazin, *Les calendrier turc anciens . . .*, pp. 219 (on the ancient Turk year-counting), 239 (on the old-type seasons).

⁹⁰ As mentioned above, the heliac rise of the Antares seems to have meant originally the beginning of spring in China; this is shown by the first appearance of the written characters, around the middle of the 2nd millennium B.C. at least. When the spring (and vernal) equinox became the fixing point of time, probably an attempt was made to harmonize this with the «return» of the Antares. However, as a consequence of the apparent movement of the zodiac constellations — among them Scorpion, including the Antares —, the star began to return later than the spring equinox, and it appeared later and later. Half a month's delay could mean about one thousand years; and the regular astronomical observation really began a millennium later, in the middle of the 1st millennium B.C. (cf. Note 76.). That may be the reason why the springtime feast of Cold Food (*Han-shih*) — Clear Bright (*Ch'ing-ming*) was not an independent date, but fixed as feasts about a fortnight after the «culmination of spring», as summarized by the *Huai-nan-tzu* (cf. Note 49.). Naturally the two weeks' ceremony of the royal (Chou) and then the imperial Chinese New Year was based on and explained by the phases of the moon, since the lunar movements were the subsequent orientating points for the sun's yearly turn in the luni-solar official calendar.

It is the chief minister Chao Shu-ta whose family name can show the place and direction of the supposable early contacts between Yünnan and China's traditional literacy concerned. The clan-name *Chao* was given by the Chinese to different «Southern Barbarian» populations — or it was adopted for prestige reasons — in the territory of future Nanchao from the Han period on; they were reported in the Chinese records to be literate, and this probably meant a knowledge of Chinese script.⁹¹ Finally, in the Chinese sources there are records concerning certain «countries» of the Southern Barbarians to the effect that their year began in this or that month, *i.e.* not simultaneously with the Chinese official year. In these cases the name of the month is given with the aid of their (serial) numbers.⁹² A record like this is also preserved concerning «countries» where the ruling clan was named *Chao*; or at least this clan must have seemed to be so dominant among the other aristocratic clans — bearing the Chinese family names 楊 *Yang*, 李 *Li* and 董 *Tung*, respectively — that the whole territory was named 西趙 *Hsi Chao* «Western *Chao*» (or «*Chao* in the West», *i.e.* west from China).⁹³

The passages on *Hsi Chao* can be found after the history of Nanchao proper in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, while elsewhere — *i.e.* earlier — it was treated as a separate country. Its description is found after the history of the Burmese territories, first of all *P'iao* (*P'yu*), whose conquest could be seen above in the title *P'iao-hsin* (*P'iao's king*) of Nanchao's ruler. One can suppose that *Hsi Chao* was recorded among those «countries», which came under Nanchao's rule only after *P'iao*, *i.e.* after the beginning of the 9th century.

The «Southern Barbarians» (*Man*) of *Hsi Chao* were reported to live in the south of another country of *Mans*: 東謝 *Tung Hsieh*, sharing *Hsi Chao's* customs and the *Chao* as the name of their chiefs. To the east of *Hsi Chao* there were the Eastern Barbarians (夷 *I*), and to the West it belonged to (the) 昆明 *K'un-ming*; to the southwest the river 西洱河 *Hsi-erh-ho* (Western Erh River) was located.⁹⁴ *Hsi Chao's* inhabitants «had towns (城郭 *ch'eng-kuo*) and script (文字 *wen-tzu*), thoroughly knew the (doctrines of) 陰陽 *yin-yang* and the calendrical calculations (歷數 *li-shu*). To the west of 夜郎 *Yeh-lang* and 滇池 *Tien-ch'ih* everybody was

⁹¹ Cf. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, pp. 20, 50, 55.

⁹² *E.g.* in the southernmost 林邑 *Lin-i* of tropic climate, possessing some kind of script and being connected with China, the 11th month was the first one (*cheng-yüeh*); or in the «Eastern Country of Women» (東女國 *Tung-nü-kuo*), said to be inhabited by (*Sino-Tibetan*) Western *Ch'iang-s* (羌) and to have Indian connections, the beginning of the year (歲首 *sui-shou*) was in the 12th month, cf. *CTS*, CXC VII.

⁹³ Cf. *HTS*, CCXXII, *hsia*, 1576a, the only record containing the calendrical reference to be quoted below.

⁹⁴ Cf. the sketches of map of Nanchao: Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, pp. 53, 61.

the offspring of 莊躄 *Chuang Ch'iao*.⁹⁵ (Concerning their products, they) had rice (稻 *iao*), wheat, millet, bean (豆 *t'ou*), silk-hemp (絲麻 *ssu-ma*), shallots, *li*-shrub (蔴), peaches and plums. (There) the 12th month served as the beginning of the year (*sui-shou*)» . . . «In the first month (*cheng-yüeh*) the silkworms are born (bred), in the 2nd month (二月 *erh-yüeh*) (everything is) ripe. . . »

Thus in *Hsi Chao*, allegedly of Chinese origin, but at least preserving some heritage of Chinese culture, including the writing — probably: the Chinese script — a kind of calendrical calculation, and at least the related knowledge concerning the universal basic principles *yin* and *yang* were recorded. (A peripheric Chinese calendrical experience, similar to this, was attributed to Nanchao by the *T'ai-ho* Inscription, cf. Note 22–23.) In addition *Hsi Chao* had a twelve-month calendar, not simultaneous with China's official year, because there the New Year came in the 12th month, but not necessarily on its first day. Furthermore, although the record does not give information about the relationship of the mentioned month to that of China — thus formally it could be the last month of a Chinese year as well — the subsequent passage reveals that *Hsi Chao*'s year must have begun later. Namely, «the silkworm's month» was the 4th lunar month (April–May) in China — until modern times — while in *Hsi Chao* this corresponded to the first; and the second month must have represented summertime in *Hsi Chao*, probably according to the local climate and the related agricultural consideration or tradition.

Consequently, a new subject of Nanchao from a Chao-clan, originating from e.g. *Hsi Chao*, and becoming a high official in *Nanchao*, could well write a poem attributed to Chao Shu-ta. He could represent a tradition hidden in the two poems — analyzed in this paper — with reminiscences of an ancient and popular Chinese Antares cult, too. The passages in question of the *T'ai-p'ing-kuang-chi*, may, therefore, be a link between a Han-period yearly tradition and the related ritual memories of the inheritors of Nanchao's territory, e.g. among the *Na-hsi*, despite the fact that once Nanchao's court officially adopted the «Chinese calendar».

*

The cultural continuity of Nanchao's territory since early Han (or, maybe, since late Chou) times, as suggested by the above vicissitudes of the tracer elements of calendar history, may involve a necessity to reconsider Nanchao's history. Not only the given geographical unit and ecological sphere deserves a written history of its

⁹⁵ This general of the Chou-time state *Ch'u* won this territory in the 4th century B.C. and became its first ruler before it became part of the Chinese Empire (in Han times), cf. Backus, *The Nan-chao Kingdom*, p. 4.

own,⁹⁶ but e.g. the ethnic history of this territory, the presence of more than one Chinese dynasty, or more than one pattern of state and social organization, long before T'ang-time China (and her Tibetan neighbour).

Since, after the instruction and challenge of Chou civilization, Nanchao's peoples or their ancestors were conquered by the *Hsiung-nus* in the course of the Han-period, they lived under rider-nomads' rule or at least under their influence for a while, also preserving their economical-cultural impact. For example, those Southern Barbarians who learned the Chinese language and writing — and probably other cultural qualities as well — from the Chinese officials staying among them, were described with Chinese historiographical *clichés*, first formulated about the *Hsiung-nus*.⁹⁷ Later *Hsi Chao's* neighbours, the 昆明 *K'un-ming* or 昆明 *K'un-mi* were characterized as pastoral nomads, living similarly to the Turks — maybe, in their linguistic vicinity, too, reflected e.g. in borrowings such as *bars* (*po-lo*) in the above mentioned poem —, although the commonplaces in question recall the *Hsiung-nus* in the first rank.⁹⁸ And really, concerning the *K'un-mi* it is written in the *T'ung-tien* — perhaps according to a pre- T'ang or at least pre-Nanchao state of its territory (cf. Note 57) — that «their customs were similar to the Turks, but as a country they were fundamentally (originally) fraternal with the *Hsiung-nu*».⁹⁹

Nanchao's people and territory, in a final analysis, should also be searched and judged as a historical sphere and country «between China and the steppe», too, but this is a subject of another paper.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁶ This method was used — by necessity, outlining the background of a basically ethnographic research — e.g. by J.F. Rock, *The Ancient Na-khi Kingdom of Southwest China: Harvard-Yenching Institute Monograph Series IX*, Vols I-II, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge Mass. 1947. His highly imposing work, however, also reflects the difficulties in composing the general survey, without the details being elaborated or at least searched in partial, but thorough research, attempted e. g. in this paper.

⁹⁷ Cf. E. Chavannes, *Les pays d'Occident d'après le Wei liou: TP, Série II, Vol. VI* (1905), pp. 525–526 (on Barbarians said to be of Hsiung-nu origin, or whose ancestors were servants of the *Hsiung-nu*, in Kansu, wandering southward), 523–524 (on Barbarians whose language is related to that of the *Ch'iang*, living mixed with 胡 *Hu* (Western) Barbarians, well knew China's language, but at home they used their own idiom etc.).

⁹⁸ *HTS*, CCXXII, *hsia*, p. 1575a. Cf. Hsiang Ta (in Note 75), referring to this report, as evidence of Nanchao's 突厥 *T'u-chüeh* ~ Turk connections or relationships; when trying to treat the ethnic history of Nanchao's population, he apparently emphasized the nomadic elements as original ethnic factors (considering, as is usually done, every 夷 *Ti* alien from China, and nomadic, etc.).

⁹⁹ *T'ung-tien*, CLXXXVII, 19b.

¹⁰⁰ My paper *An archaic state between China and the steppe: Nanchao* will be submitted to the *Körösi Csoma Memorial Symposium*, Hungary 1984.

NOTES ON THE ORIGIN OF TIBETAN RELIGIOUS MUSIC

BY

ALICE EGYED (Budapest)

In the last few years, some important studies have been published about Tibetan music; most of them were almost revelatory, because in the field of Tibetan studies music presents an almost unknown territory. Part of the problem is that the attitude of the Tibetans themselves — not so much of the people as of the professional religious practitioners — to music is most ambivalent and by far not as unequivocal as that of the Chinese.

Both in China and in India the divine origin of music is determining¹ and hence its importance; in Tibetan sources we do not find such legends about its origins, from which to deduce any origination of music by Buddha or by some Pre-Buddhic god.

All this is underlined by the fact the Chinese had a ministry for music, but as for the Tibetans, and this is most important in a theocratic state, in the Buddhist canon, the *Bstan -'gyur*, music comes last among the *bzo-rig-pa* (the arts). Even here they rather neglect it: though in the time of Bu-ston (1290–1364) there evidently already existed a common religious musical language, the works written about music did not become parts of the canon.

So there was a musical practice, but — especially taking into account the exceptional richness of the Tibetan literature — there is hardly anything written about music, and those that exist are not available. That is why the work of Nāg-

¹ The basic conception of the Chinese about music is akin to the way Western Culture, following Pythagoras, has seen it: musical harmony reflects the music of the spheres, the harmony of the universe. (I used Xunzi's *Treatise on Music* according to Tōkei, *Kinai filozófia* [Chinese Philosophy] II, Bp. 1980, pp. 228–233; Leo Spitzer, *Classical and Christian Ideas of World Harmony. Prolegomena to an Interpretation of the Word «Stimmung»*, Baltimore 1963.)

«In Indian musical theory it is said that there are two kinds of sound, one a vibration of ether, the other a vibration of air. The vibration of ether, which cannot be perceived in the physical sense, is considered the principle of all manifestation, the basis of substance. It corresponds to what neo-Pythagoreans called «music of the spheres». It forms permanent numerical patterns which are the basis of the world's existence. This kind of vibration is not caused by a physical shock as are audible sounds. It is therefore called *anāhata*, «unstruck». The other kind of sound is an impermanent vibration of air, an image of the ether vibration. It is audible and always produced by a shock. It is therefore called *āhata* or «struck».» A. Daniélou, *The Rāga-s of Northern Indian Music*, London 1968, p. 21.

-dbañ Kun-dga' bsod-nams grags-pa rgyal-mchan² analyzed here has such a source value; as to its genre it is a commentary to the *Rol-mo'i bstan-bčos* of Sa-skya Pañḍita, but apart from this, it is a summary of all knowledge formulated about music up to its date (1624), even supplying a «bibliography»³ at the end, which will evidently serve as the basis of further research. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the author was a monk of the *Sa-skyā* order and this naturally determines his method of approach.⁴

We get most of our information about the author from his work.⁵ After he ascertains the ties of the royal branch of the *Sa-skyā* to the 'Khon family,⁶ known as the reincarnation of 'Jam-dpal-dbyaṅs, at the end of the work he enumerates the masters, from whom the doctrine takes its origin: Bsod-nams dbaṅ-po, who was the reincarnation of Grub-pa'i dpa-bo'i Pad-ma; Grags-pa blo-gros, who was the reincarnation of Śāntarakṣita (Ži-ba-'cho), who, for his part played an important role in the first diffusion; the third chain of reincarnation was Mus-pa čhen-po Rdo-rje-'čaṅ Saṅs-rgyas rgyal-mchan, who was the avatar of Vajrasattva (Rdo-rje sems-pa). The author himself professed to be the lawful successor of the Ņor-pa.⁷

The commentary of Kun-dga' bsod-nams follows the threefold division of the work of Sa-skyā Pañḍita. The first part is about the *dbyaṅs*, the second is about the *chig*, and the third is about the relation of the two. One chapter of the third part is about instrumental music, the playing of the drums and cymbals. Between the work

² On the basis of Ņag-dbañ Kun-dga' bsod-nams grags-pa rgyal-mchan's *Rig-pa'i gnas lña-las bzo-rig-pa'i bye-brag dpal Sa-skyā Pañḍi-ta'i gsuñ Rol-mo'i bstan-bčos-kyi rnam-par bšad-pa 'Jam-dbyaṅs bla-ma dgyes-pa'i sñan-pa'i sgra-dbyaṅs. Blo-gsal yid-'phrog 'phrin-las yoṅs-khyab čes bya-ba bžugs-so. Bod-kyi rdo-rje, Sa-skyā'i gcug-lag khañ čhen-po, Gži-thog bla-brañ, šiñ-pho byi-ba'i lo* [1624]. New Ed. in Dharamsala 1969. [2] 110 p.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 108–110.

⁴ In other orders other classifications and approaches are to be found. «For example, according to one system in use among the *Karma* branch of the *Kargyudpa* religious «method», chants are divided into 'don («recitation-chants»), 'debs (can be taken as corresponding with *Saskyapa-Gelugpa rta* and *gdaṅs* or *dbyaṅs*. An abbot of the *Tšarpa* branch of the *Saskyapa* method divides chant into the categories of 'don, rta and *dbyaṅs* «tone-contour chants»).» Ter Ellingson, *'Don-rta-dbyaṅs gsum. Tibetan chant and melodic categories*, in: *Asian Music* 10 (1979) 2, p. 114.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 18, pp. 104–107; his name is in other form: Ņag-dbañ kun-bsod grags-pa rgyal-mchan, p. 105; Tucci said that his *rnam-thar* is known to him: *Rigs pa rgyai cod pan sa skyā pa c'en po sñags ač'añ ñag dbaṅ kun dga' bsod nams grags pa rgyal mts'an dpal bzañ poi rtogs pa brjod pa ño mts'ar rgya mts'oi rha rlabs kyī ap'ros gleñ pa dad pai c'u rgyun*, pp. 1–68, but it has no historical interest. G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, (*TPS*) Rome 1943, p. 687, Note 97.

⁶ Tucci, *TPS*, pp. 625–628.

⁷ «From the sa skyā pa another school branches off, called *Ņor* after the monastery it is connected with (founded in 1429); in this case the school's individuality is derived not so much from doctrinal differences, which are irrelevant, as from the monastery's importance and the moral prestige of its founder Kun dga' bzañ po.» Tucci, *TPS*, p. 91.

of Sa-skya Paṇḍita and the quotations of the commentary, there are, of course, textual differences. Kun-dga' bsod-nams for the sake of comprehensiveness describes the role of music in the Tibetan canon and culture (beginning of the first chapter), and in the third chapter he tells us three stories about the role of music in Buddhist religious practice: one about Rin-čhen bzañ-po, for the other he takes over a story of Blo-gros rgyal-mchan about Čhos-rje rkyañ-'dur-ba, the third is a legend about Bsod-nams señ-ge.

In all the three chapters, to support his arguments, Kun-dga' bsod-nams cites other authors as well, mainly those mentioned in the «bibliography».⁸ These are:

- Stag-chañ Lo-cā-ba Šes-rab rin-čhen rgyal-mchan's *Rig-gnas kun-šes* and its commentary
- Candra-go-mi(n)'s⁹ *Dbyaṅs-kyi bstan-bčos blo-gsal mgul-rgyan* and *Rol-mo'i bstan-bčos*
- 'Jam-dbyaṅs dbaṅ-po'i mchan-čan's *Rol-mo'i bstan-bčos gčig-šes kun-grol*
- The old *dbyaṅs-yig* and *rol-yig* are often found in Čhos-rje šes-rab and in Ma-ti-ri-tra and others. At the time of the authors these *dbyaṅs-yig* and *rol-yig* were also often present in religious discourse.
- The Sa(-skya) Lo(-cā-ba) known to everyone, *Phur-ba'i dbyaṅs-yig kun-gsal sgra-dbyaṅs*.
- The king of the mystic doctrine Ņag-dbañ Kun-dga' rin-čhen's *Rdo-rje phur-pa'i rña byin dbab-kyi brda sprod mthoñ-ba rañ-grol*
- and the *Čhos-skyoñ skor-gyi dbyaṅs rol-gyi tho-yig* written also by him
- the common work of Bsod-nams dbaṅ-po and Grags-pa'i mchan-čan: *Rdo-rje phur-pa'i dbyaṅs-yig chañs-pa'i dbyaṅs-kyi ña-ro* and the Guardians of Doctrine *Chañs-pa'i dbyaṅs-kyi rña čhen*.
- Moreover 'Jam-dbyaṅs (bsod-nams) dbyaṅ-po's *Guru Drag-po* and in the above-mentioned *Rol-mo'i bstan-bčos gčig šes kun-grol* we find a song, which is on the basis of the upper and the lower parts of the *Vajrakīla*,¹⁰ about the relationship of the protector gods of doctrine in praise of the ceremony to avert the sixty demons.¹¹

⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 108–110.

⁹ About the 5th century; M. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, II, 1972, (repr.) p. 365. In the *Bstan-gyur (TTP)*: No. 2048, 2609, 3363, 3534, 3541–2, 3548, 3551, 3679, 3737, 3879, 3903–6, 3916–7, 3919–25, 3936, 4438, 4443, 4488–94, 4869–71: poems; 5410, 5582, 5653, 5683; 5740: *Rigs-pa grub-pa'i sgron-ma*; 5767: *Luñ-du ston-pa Candra-pa'i mdo žes bya-ba*; 5769: *Yi-ge'i mdo žes bya-ba*; 5890: *Uña-la sog-s-pa* (skr. *unādi*); 5902: *Luñ-ston-pa Candra-pa'i yi-ge'i mdo'i grel-pa*; 5931.

¹⁰ «*Rdo-rje phur-pa*, a religious instrument the upper part of which is of the shape of a *dor-je* and the lower a *phur-pa* or mystic dagger.» Ch. Das, *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Calcutta 1902.

¹¹ *dbyaṅs-kyi yan-lug drug-ču 'i miñ* «Names of the 60 sorts (or divisions) of Melody or of Melodious Voices (or vocal Sound). A. Csoma de Kőrös, *Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary: Mahāvīyupatti*, Part I, Calcutta 1910, pp. 86–88.

— Grags-pa blo-gros's *Guru Drag-po* and the special *rol-gyi yi-ge* composition in praise of *Vajrakīla* and *Mgon-po*.

At the beginning of the work, a unified picture about music is obtained reaching back as far as the 5th century (A.D.), for his earliest texts, extensively quoted, are from Candragomin. The texts later cited are usually from the time of the second Buddhist diffusion, though the author remarks several times that these topoi already existed in the epoch of the first diffusion.

In the following, I will endeavour to show that the Tibetans first avoided music in their religious practice, but later integrated it, and it was this that was for a large part responsible for their ambivalent attitude to music. By way of example, I would like to cite two divergent stories. The first, the legend from the life of Buddha, Kundga' bsod-nams can be traced back to Candragomin, while the last story, from the age of the *phyi-dar* to Padmasambhava, i.e. the 7th century. I quote the first one verbatim and integral, the second, already published in the excellent translation of M. Helffer,¹² only as it fits our needs. Let us see then the Mahāyāna reception of the «canonization» of music:¹³

¹² M. Helffer, Traditions Musicales des Sa-skya-pa relatives au culte de Magon-po, in: *Journal Asiatique*, 264/1976/3-4, pp. 357-405.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 80-81:

gal-te Rgyal-bas bkag-na bčas-ldan rab-tu byuñ-ba rnam-kyis rol-mo sil-khrol dañ | rña brduñ-ba dañ | dbyaṅs 'then-pa sogs gtan-nas mi ruñ-ñam sñam-na |

'di-la so-sor phye-ste čuñ-zad brjod-na |

ñan-thos 'dul-ba-pa rnams-la 'di bkag-pa'i rjes-su gnañ-ba'i bčas-pa yin-pas byar ruñ-par bžed-de | ... Ston-pas glu-gar dañ rol-mo'i sgra sogs byed-pa bkag-pas | Sañs-rgyas bstod-chig-la sogs-pa'i kha-ton-rnams čal-čol ram-rom-du 'gyur | de-la mu-stegs sogs-kyis 'phyas šññ khyim-pa-rnams ma dad-pa-la brten-nas | Khyim-bdag Mgon-med-zas-sbyin-gyis Ston-pa-la žus | de'i che Ston-pas |

Dkon-mčhog mčhod-pa'i don-du dbyaṅs-kyi ña-ro bya-ba rje-su gnañ-ño

žes gnañ-ba-la | dbyaṅs-kyi ña-ro ji-ltar ma šes-par star žus-pas |

bram-ze rig-byed 'don-pa lta-bu'i gdañs-kyis 'don-par ston-pas gsuñ-bas-so

žes bžed-la | theg-pa čhen-po-pa bsam-pa dge-bas zin-na |

bkag-pa lta-bur snañ-ba gañ spyad kyañ ñes-pa med-pa'i khar | yon-tan gañ 'phel-du 'gro-bar gsuñs-te |

Sdom-pa ñi-šu-pa-las |

sñiñ-rje ldan-phyir hyams-phyir dañ |

sems dge-ba-la ñes-pa-med ||

čes-pa-dañ |

Spyod-'jug-las |

| rgyal-sras rnams-kyis mi bslab-pa'i |

dños de gañ yañ yod-ma yin |

| žes rgya-sras byañ-čhub sems-dpa' rnams-kyi bslab bya ma yin-pa'i dños-po de ni yul dus gañ-du yañ yod-pa ma yin-pa gsuñs-pas-so ... |.

«Buddha in his interdictions considered the cymbal music, drumming, singing of monks and things of that effect as not desirable for the order.» (This is told in detail and also concisely:)¹⁴

«The followers of the Śrāvaka¹⁵ school appropriately applied to the disciplinarians for the assertion of the permission after the interdiction: Because Buddha forbade the song, the dance, the sound of music and other such things, the words in praise of Buddha (*Saṅs-rgyas*) and such recitations became meaningless and [mere] merry play. Because the non-Buddhists made fun of this and the faith of the laics wavered, Anāthapiṇḍika,¹⁶ the house-holder appealed to Buddha. Buddha said:

«At the praise of the Three Jewels hereafter I permit the vocal intonation (*dbyaṅs-kyi ṅa-ro*).»

So did he permit it, then [Anāthapiṇḍika] not knowing the way of vocal intonation, asked [him] again.

«I permit the singing indicated in an intoned recitation, like the Veda-recitation of the Brahmins.»

said he; then, after the remembrance of the Mahāyāna follower of virtuous intention:

«It was like forbidding not to do that what not long ago would have been sin.

Virtue in adornment will become yet greater.»

said he. [Quoting] the *Sdom-pa ṅi-ṣu-pa*:¹⁷

«In men of virtuous intentions there is no opposition to compassion and love.» thus it is spoken. [And from] the *Spyod-'jug*:¹⁸

¹⁴ In detail by Kun-dga' bsod-nams and concisely by Sa-skya Paṇḍita:

'di-na kun-du g-yeṅ-ba daṅ |
k'yal-pa'i rgya-phyir Rgyal-bas bkag |
'on-kyañ Dkon-m'chog m'chod-pa daṅ |
g'žan-gyi don-la ṅes-pa med |
des-na Mgon-med zas-sbyin-gyis |
ṅus che dge-sloṅ rñams-la gñañ |
rgyal-sras rñams-kyis mi bslab-pa |
de ni gaṅ yaṅ yod min gsuṅs |.

¹⁵ *Saṅs-rgyas-kyi ṅan-thos daṅ theg-pa čhuṅ-ṅu-pa aṅ* Chos-kyi grags-pa, *Brcams-pa'i brda dag miṅ-chig gsal-ba b'zugs-so*, Peking 1952, p. 304.

¹⁶ Anāthapiṇḍika or Anāthapiṇḍada «giver of alms to the unprotected». Legend in: E. I. Thomas, *The Life of Buddha*, London 1927 (repr: 1975), pp. 104-5; quoted in: Winternitz, *op. cit.*, II. p. 154.

¹⁷ Candragomin, *Byañ-čhub-sems-dpa'i sdom-pa ṅi-ṣu-pa* (skr. *Bodhisattva-saṃvara-viṃśaka*), in: *TTP* 5582, Vol. 114, p. 253.

¹⁸ Sāntideva, *Byañ-čhub-sems-dpa'i spyod-pa-la 'jug-pa* (skr. *Bodhisattva-caryāvatāra*), *TTP* 5272, Vol. 99, pp. 243-261, chapter *Bzod-pa bston-pa*.

«It is not possible for Boddhisatvas not to have an artistic and scientific education.»

And so there is no time and place where Boddhisatvas do not learn the Boddhisatva tenets.»

*

Considering only the written sources about music, the question of the origin is justly raised. From the text cited above, the Indian origin seems likely — at least concerning the *dbyaṅs*, the subject of the present investigation.

On the basis of the following text, however, it seems that the Indian origin of the *dbyaṅs* is at least dubious. We can regard these legends as sources adorned with topoi. Rin-čhen bzañ-po had to go through a rather peculiar course in learning the *dbyaṅs*.

At the beginning of the text, the king of Tibet sends Rin-čhen bzañ-po to India, and — having learnt the *dharma* there — he returned as a defender of the doctrine. Before his return, his master and the visualized protector direct him and smooth his way to become an especially good defender of Buddhism. He could not achieve this with the aid of different holy texts and mantras, only the learning of the various forms of the *dbyaṅs* enabled him to fulfill his role.

The first instruction received from his master was the recitation of the three ślokas of the poem *Srin-po'i gzugs-kyi gdug-pa -čan*. When the person to visualize did not appear and did not give advice for the defence of the faith, his master persuaded him to recite the same verses in a «poetic style» (*sñan-ñag*).¹⁹ (Remember the first text, where Buddha answers the question of Anāthapiṇḍika permitting recitation, which resembles the Veda-recitation of the Brahmins.)

Later, after the instructions of the visualized black man, he had to recite on a fearful rousing sound (*'jigs-pa'i ña-ro*). Having heard this, two roaring tigers appear, devouring a dead body; this vision incites him to compose the first *dbyaṅs* (*Stag-mo'i ñur-dbyaṅs*) to the ślokas of *Srin-gzugs-ma*, which he recites on the roaring voice of the tigers, imitating them (*stag ro ze-ba'i ñar skad-la dpe byas-te*). Because of this, the protector *Mahākala* appears and promises to go with him to Tibet to help him defend the faith. His protector advises him to sing heretofore to *Lha-mo*; after the appearance of the black woman he sang in a way resembling the howling of the wind and the proud bending of the branches of the *paśāru* tree around the Bodhgaya church in the wind (*rluñ phog-pa'i šugs-la dpe-gyis Rdo-rje gdan-gyi bskor-khañ šiñ pā-šā-ru'i yal-ga 'gyiñs-pa-la dpe-gyis*).

When he arrived in Tibet, it is believed, the power of the bonpos and the demons diminished; however, *Putra*, charged by him with the mission, could only defeat the

¹⁹ *sñan-ñag chig-gi rgyan yin zer*, Čhos-kyi grags-pa, p. 322.

bonpos when reciting mantras (*bod*, *rbad*, *bsod*) translated to their *žaň-žuň* language.²⁰ According to Kun-dga' bsod-nams, since then these mantras exist in *žaň-žuň* language.

These mantras turned up later from the *gter-ma* of the *Bsam-yas* cloister of Padmasambhava. According to Kun-dga' bsod-nams they also exist in Sanskrit.

Having defeated the bonpos by learning their own skills, on the side of the great river, on the frontier of India and Tibet, regarding *Lha-mo* he composed the *dbyaňs til-mar-ma*, praising the deeds of Buddha. Getting on the water this *dbyaňs* was taken away from him by the *klus* and carried to the church of *Tho-gliň*.²¹ *Lha-mo* also disappeared for a long time. When, called by Rin-čhen bzaň-po she appeared again, bringing a *śloka* of the «praise», she told him she could not come in the future, for the *klus* were praising her in so sweet a voice (*gdaňs-sňan*) with the stolen *ślokas* that she was quite disturbed. Now Rin-čhen bzaň-po recited the one *śloka* of the «praise» in a voice like the highest treble of the flute (*gliň-bu-ltar sgra-čin gsuň rcer*), and he called back *Lha-mo* in this way.

From the text it seems there was a way of singing, moving more and more away from the Veda recitation of the Brahmins. This singing had increasing power. When the mantra itself was not strong enough, recited according to the method of the adversary it did achieve its effect.

Mentioning the *klus* in this context, I believe, Kun-dga' bsod-nams thinks not only of the *nāgas* defending Buddha (though the presence of the *Tho-gliň* cathedral works in this sense²²); for me it seems more likely that the *klus* here are the legendary indigenous population of Tibet, in the bon religion, and probably of Iranian origin, and «since Buddhism gave a large part to *nāga* worship, through Buddhism a great many Indian ideas about *nāgas* crept into the bon cult of the *klu*. It is therefore not always easy to distinguish what is purely Tibetan and what is due to Buddhist influence.»²³

What Tucci writes about the epoch of the second diffusion, that of the king *Lha bla-ma* *Byaň-čhub-'od*, seems to point in the same direction, with the uncertainty concerning the differentiation of the several existing religions, with the appearance of the *klus* in this age and context: «Since exorcism spread, sheep and goats have no

²⁰ «By the few *bonpos* who know their texts well *bon* is explained as the Tibetan equivalent of the «*Žaň-žuň* term» *gyer* which means «chant».» D. Snellgrove, *The Nine Ways of Bon*, Boulder 1980 (repr), p. 1; *dgyer-ba: gsuň dbyaňs dgyer-bar glu-lta-bu* or *glu len-pa*, Čhos-kyi grags-pa, p. 150; *dgyer-ba*: an expression of the Bon-po, Das, p. 276.

²¹ «The largest of the temples built in Western Tibet at Rin-čhen bzaň-po's time, that of mTho gliň, was erected, according to the tradition, on the model of Otantapura in India», G. Tucci, *The Religions of Tibet*, London 1980, p. 21; and see Helffer, *op. cit.*, p. 392.

²² Helffer, *op. cit.*, p. 393.

²³ Tucci, *TPS*, p. 723, pp. 711–731, 741–50.

more rest; since yoga practices spread, unlawfulness and immorality mingle; since the use of medical ingredients for magic purposes spread, living gogs and boards are killed; since necromancy spread, cemeteries receive no cult; since offerings are made to the *srin-po* and to the *ša za*, diseases of men and cattle develop; since smoke is spread without the proper incantations, gods and *klu* of the country are indigent. . . . Can this kind of behaviour be called the «Great Vehicle»?»²⁴

In relation to the mantra triumphant against the bonpos, as could be seen it seems important for Kun-dga' bsod-nams to note that it exists in the *žan-žun* language since Rin-čhen bzañ-po, and on the other hand, he saw that there is a newly found (about 14th century) variant in the *gter-gnas Bsam-yas* from the time of Padmasambhava that also points to the Indian origin. However, there are historic data that in Tibet, and mainly in its North-Eastern part, there were several common *gter-gnas* (hiding place), where the *Rñin-ma-pas* and the *bonpos* hid their holy scripts. Besides being the two faces of the same religious sincretism, the fact that some sects used the same *gter-gnas*, takes away something of the value of Kun-dga' bsod-nams's arguments.

There might be some likeness between this approach to the origins of music and the legend of the origins of the people and the kingdom. Because the relation with India is more evident, «but with the diffusion of Buddhism another legend spread among the Tibetans and connected . . . the civilization in Tibet with India.» What Tucci wrote about the legend of the origin of the kingship, seems just as valid for us: «The story gave higher prestige to the Tibetans, it enjoyed great popularity and little by little superseded more ancient and aboriginal myths. It is, therefore, not surprising to find it even in the orthodox literature of the Bon.»²⁵

²⁴ Tucci, *TPS*, p. 7.

²⁵ Tucci, *TPS*, p. 731.

ZUR STELLUNG DES NARTHANG-DRUCKES IN DER ÜBERLIEFERUNG DES TIBETISCHEN KANJUR

VON
HELMUT EIMER (Bonn)

Alexander Csoma de Kőrös veröffentlichte 1836 die erste in einer westlichen Sprache verfaßte Übersicht über den tibetischen Kanjur, und zwar in zwei umfangreichen Aufsätzen in der Zeitschrift *Asiatic(k) Researches*, sie trugen als Titel *Analysis of the Dulva, A Portion of the Tibetan Work Entitled the Kah-gyur* und *Analysis of the Sher-chin — Ph'al-ch'en — Dkon-séks — Do -dé — Nyáng-das — and Gyut*.¹ Diese beiden Beiträge, die zu den einzelnen Texten des Kanjur zum Teil recht detaillierte Inhaltsangaben bieten, waren lange Zeit nur in der französischen Bearbeitung durch Leon Feer *Analyse du Kandjour. Recueil des livres sacrés du Tibet, par Alexandre Csoma de Kőrös* (Traduite de l'anglais et augmentée de divers additions et remarques)² zugänglich, da nur in ganz wenigen europäischen Bibliotheken die Originalausgabe vorhanden ist. Seit ein Nachdruck der Zeitschrift *Asiatic Researches* in Indien erschienen ist,³ kann dieses bedeutende Werk von Alexander Csoma de Kőrös wieder in seiner ursprünglichen Fassung von einem weiteren Benutzerkreis herangezogen werden.

Die Grundlage von A. Csoma de Kőrös' *Analyse des Kanjur* war ein Exemplar der Blockdruckausgabe aus Narthang in der Asiatic Society, Calcutta. Der Narthang-Kanjur hat allgemein große Verbreitung gefunden; auch in den Bibliotheken Amerikas, Europas und Japans ist er häufig vertreten, wie man aus der Liste ersehen kann, die Kenneth K. S. Ch'en seinem grundlegenden Aufsatz über den tibetischen Kanon, *The Tibetan Tripitaka*, beifügte.⁴ Der Narthang-Druck ist jetzt auch in einer Mikrofiche-Ausgabe verfügbar.⁵

¹ Vol. XX (1836), 41–93 und 393–552.

² Lyon 1881. (*Annales du Musée Guimet. Grande Bibliothèque. II.*), 131–350 und 379–577.

³ New Delhi 1980; die beiden Beiträge finden sich vol. 22, 41–93, und vol. 23, 393–552; der Nachdruck ist verkleinert. Ein ebenfalls verkleinerter Nachdruck erschien unter dem Titel: Alexander Csoma de Koros [!], *Analysis of the Kanjur*. Preface by J. W. de Jong. (Delhi 1982). (Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica. 2.); dieser Band enthält auch noch *Notices on the Life of Shakyas, Extracted from the Tibetan Authorities* (aus *Asiatic Researches*, Vol. XX, 285–317) und *Abstract of the Contents of the Batan-hgyur* (aus *Asiatic Researches*, XX, 553–585).

⁴ *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 9 (1945–1947), 53–62; die Liste *Distribution of Kanjur and Tanjur* (Seite 60–62) dürfte heute zu ergänzen sein.

⁵ Herausgegeben vom Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, New York.

Bis jetzt scheint kein direkter Katalog des Narthang-Kanjur in einer europäischen Sprache — wenn man von A. Csoma de Körös' *Analyse* absieht — veröffentlicht worden zu sein. Zur ersten Orientierung kann die vervielfältigte Liste des Lhasa-Kanjur von Jikidō Takasaki⁶ oder aber die des Cone-Kanjur von Taishun Mibu⁷ benutzt werden; zwei weitere japanische Arbeiten⁸ sind in Europa nicht ohne weiteres zugänglich.

Der Narthang-Druck des Kanjur ist verschiedentlich zu Textausgaben herangezogen worden, wobei seine Textqualität — so z.B. auch durch Kenneth K. S. Ch'en⁹ — nicht günstig beurteilt wird. Am deutlichsten sagt dies wohl Paul M. Harrison in der Einleitung zu seinem Buch *The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-buddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra*:¹⁰ «In constructing the critical edition I have adopted the Derge edition as my base text. Although it is by no means free of errors, it frequently preserves the correct reading even when the three other editions agree against it. This despite the fact that Narthang is generally regarded as the best edition in Tibet, presumably because of its close relationship to the Old Narthang, the earliest known edition of the Tibetan Canon (13th Century).»¹¹

Die Vermutung, daß der Narthang-Druck dem Archetypus des Kanjur, also der ältesten Handschrift in Narthang, nahe verwandt sei, wird nicht weiter begründet.

Bei der Herausgabe von Texten aus dem tibetischen Kanjur sollte man nicht davon ausgehen, daß die in den heute üblichen Wörterbüchern und Grammatiken verzeichneten — also «korrekten» — Formen immer dem Sprachzustand der ersten Fassung des Kanjur entsprechen. Viele der in den tibetischen kanonischen Sammlungen zusammengefaßten Texte sind im 9. Jahrhundert übersetzt worden, sind also, bevor sie am Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts dem Kanon eingegliedert wurden, bereits ein halbes Jahrtausend lang überliefert worden. Daher ist zu fragen,

⁶ *Tōkyō Daigaku Shozō Rasa-ban Chibetto Daizōkyō Mokuroku* | *A Catalogue of the Lhasa Edition of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, in Comparison with Other Editions*. Tokyo 1965.

⁷ *A Comparative List of the Bkaḥ-hgyur Division in the Co-ne, Peking, Sde-dge and Snar-than Editions, with an Introduction to the Bkaḥ-hgyur Division of the Co-ne Edition: Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* 44 (1959), 1–69.

⁸ So z. B. E. Kawaguchi, *Chibetto daizōkyō kanjū mokuroku — narutan-ban* — (Catalogue du Kanjur tibétain, édition de Narthang), Tokyo 1928, I (Préface), pp. 1–33, II (Catalogue), pp. 1–3, 1–186, III (Index des noms de traducteur), pp. 1–21 et Addenda et Corrigenda, 2 pages. Und ebenso Shōdō Nagashima, *Taishō daigaku shozō chibetto daizōkyō narutan-ban kanjū mokuroku* (Catalogue du Kanjur tibétain de Narthang, conservé à l'Université Taisho), dans *Taishō daigaku kenkyū kiyō*, 61, 1975, 726–760; diese Angaben sind entnommen aus Yoshiro Imaeda, *L'édition du Kanjur tibétain de 'Jang Sa-tham: Journal Asiatique* CCLXX (1982), 173–174 und 183–184, Anm. 15.

⁹ *A Study of the Svāgata Story in the Divyāvadāna in its Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan, and Chinese Versions: Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 9 (1945–47), 207–314.

¹⁰ Tokyo 1978. (*Studia Philologica Buddhica*. Monograph Series. I.).

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, xii–xiii. Die Kompilation des tibetischen Kanons fand Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts statt.

ob sich noch — trotz eventueller Überarbeitungen — Spuren der älteren Sprachformen im Kanjur finden. Auf ein solches Beispiel wurde in anderem Zusammenhang¹² bereits hingewiesen: Die Imperativpartikel, die je nach dem Auslaut des vorangehenden Verbs die Formen *cig*, *žig* oder *šig* hat, erscheint mehrfach in verschiedenen Textzeugen für das tibetische *Pravrajyāvastu* nach auslautendem *g* und auch nach auslautendem *ŋ* in der Form *šig*, obwohl nach den üblichen Regeln *cig* bzw. *žig* stehen müßte. Ein Herausgeber würde also statt *šig* nach den genannten Auslauten die «korrekte» Form aus jüngeren oder stark redigierten Textzeugen¹³ in den Wortlaut aufnehmen. Doch ein Fragment eines Vinayatextes aus Tun-huang zeigt, daß in der frühen Sprachstufe auch *šig* nach *g* und *ŋ* gebraucht wurde, daß also diese Form nicht verworfen werden darf und daß folglich ein Textzeuge, der solche Formen enthält, als dem Archetypus nahe eingeordnet werden muß.

In diesem Beitrag soll nun ein erster Versuch unternommen werden, die Stellung des Narthang-Druckes in der Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur näher zu bestimmen. Der Ausgangspunkt dazu sind Beobachtungen, die bei der Kollation des *Rab tu 'byuñ ba'i gži* nach elf Textzeugen gemacht wurden.¹⁴ Die daraus abgeleiteten Feststellungen gelten also streng genommen nur für diesen Text, der etwa einen halben von den insgesamt hundert Bänden des Narthang-Kanjur einnimmt. Es ist aber anzunehmen, daß sie auf einen weit größeren Teil des Kanjur zu übertragen sind. Wie der tibetische Katalog (*dkar chag*) zum Narthang-Kanjur besagt, geht die Abteilung Vinaya des ältesten Kanjurmanuskriptes in Narthang, also des Archetypus, auf eine als besonders wertvoll erachtete Handschrift zurück, die etwa ein halbes Jahrhundert vor der Kompilation des Kanons in Narthang angefertigt worden war.¹⁵ Da die Mitteilung über diese alte Vinaya-Handschrift mit dem Kanjur überliefert wurde, ist anzunehmen, daß parakanonische Fassungen von Texten des Vinaya im Verlauf der Überlieferung keine Berücksichtigung fanden.

¹² Helmut Eimer, *Zur Beurteilung der Textqualität der Kanjurhandschrift aus dem Palast in Tog/Ladakh: Indological and Buddhist Studies*. Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday. Canberra 1982, 125–126 und Anm. 27–29.

¹³ Hierzu gehören vor allem die Drucke aus Derge und Lhasa sowie die Handschrift aus Tog/Ladakh.

¹⁴ Dies geschah während der Vorarbeiten für *Rab tu 'byuñ ba'i gži. Die tibetische Übersetzung des Pravrajyāvastu im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Nach Vorarbeiten von Frank-Richard Hamm † und weiteren Materialien herausgegeben durch Helmut Eimer. 1.2. Wiesbaden 1983. (*Asiatische Forschungen* 82.).

¹⁵ *Bka' 'gyur rin po che 'i gsuñ par srid gsum rgyan gcig rdzu 'phrul šin rta'i dkar chag ño mtshar bkod pa rgya mtsho'i lde mig*, fol. 25b7–26a1: 'dul ba luñ gi ma dpe mchims nam mkha' grags kyis bžeñs pa dañ | ...

Aus einer Vielzahl von fehlerhaften Lesarten im tibetischen *Pravrajyāvastu*, die im Narthang-Druck und zugleich in der Londoner Handschrift des Kanjur gegen die restliche Tradition stehen, ist zweifelsfrei zu beweisen, daß diese beiden Textzeugen sehr nahe miteinander verwandt sind. Doch da beide zahlreiche Sonderfehler enthalten, kann man nicht zu dem Schluß kommen, die Handschrift sei eine Abschrift des Druckes, wie Ernst Waldschmidt, nach Materialien von Frank-Richard Hamm, in seiner Bearbeitung des *Catuspariṣatsūtra* mitteilt;¹⁶ es ist vielmehr als bewiesen anzusehen, daß der Druck aus Narthang und die Handschrift in London Abkömmlinge einer gemeinsamen Vorlage sind. Diese Vorlage war eine Handschrift im Kloster Šel dkar rdzoñ, wie sich aus Schreiberkolophonen im Londoner Manuskript ersehen läßt. An dem gleichen Ort ist auch der «Narthang»-Druck in den Jahren 1730–1732 entstanden; dies hat Luciano Petech aufgrund des *dkar chag*-zu dieser Ausgabe herausgestellt, die Druckplatten wurden dann 1733 nach Narthang gebracht.¹⁷

In der Textüberlieferung des Kanjur steht der Untergruppe, Londoner Handschrift und Narthang-Druck, eine im vergangenen Jahrhundert entstandene Handschrift aus Gyantse nahe, die sich jetzt in Tokyo befindet.¹⁸ Dieses Manuskript ist — wahrscheinlich über Zwischenabschriften — auf eine frühe Handschrift in Gyantse, die als *Them spañs ma* bekannt war, zurückzuführen. Die *Them spañs ma* ihrerseits gilt als eine direkte Abschrift des Archetypus in Narthang. Doch es ist möglich, daß sie von der ersten Fassung des Kanjur durch eine Zwischenabschrift getrennt ist, da die Überlieferung davon spricht, daß Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364) die *Them spañs ma* überprüft habe¹⁹ — der Auftraggeber zur Herstellung dieser Handschrift, Rab brtan Kun bzañ 'phags, ist aber erst im Jahre 1389 geboren!

Textkritische Untersuchungen zeigten, daß noch zwei weitere Textzeugen mit dem Narthang-Kanjur in eine Überlieferungsgruppe, die der Herkunft ihrer Textzeugen wegen als «westliche» bezeichnet werden kann, einzuordnen sind: Es handelt sich um die Druckausgabe von Lhasa und die kürzlich durch einen

¹⁶ *Das Catuspariṣatsūtra. Eine kanonische Lehrschrift über die Begründung der buddhistischen Gemeinde.* Auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben und bearbeitet. Teil III. Berlin 1962. (*Abh. d. Deutschen Akad. d. Wiss. z. Berlin, Klasse f. Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst*, Jg. 1960. 1.), 375, Anm. 1.

¹⁷ *China and Tibet in the Early XVIIIth Century. History of the Establishment of Chinese Protectorate in Tibet.* Second Revised Edition. Leiden 1972. (*Monographies du T'oung Pao* 1.), 160–161.

¹⁸ Sie wurde beschrieben durch Kōjun Saitō, *Kawaguchi Ekai-shi Shōrai Tōyō Bunko Shozō Shahan Chibetto Daizōkyō Chōsa Bibō: Taishō Daigaku Kenkyū Kiyō* LXIII (1973), 406(1)–345(62).

¹⁹ Hiervon spricht Si tu Pañ chen in seinem Katalog zum Derge-Kanjur, fol. 109b1–2; veröffentlicht und übersetzt von Helmut Eimer, *Some Results of Recent Kanjur Research: Archiv für zentralasiatische Geschichtsforschung*. I. (im Druck).

Nachdruck zugänglich gemachte Handschrift aus dem Palast von Tog/Ladakh.²⁰ Da der Lhasa-Druck auf den aus Narthang zurückgeht — wobei mehrfach Lesungen aus dem Derge-Kanjur übernommen wurden —, kann er als abhängiger Textzeuge bei den weiteren Überlegungen unbeachtet bleiben. Die Handschrift aus Tog zeigt ebenfalls deutlich Spuren der Kontamination; sie ist nicht in direkte Verbindung mit den Manuskripten in London und Tokyo und mit dem Narthang-Druck zu bringen.

Alle anderen derzeit bekannten Textzeugen für den Kanjur gehören einer zweiten großen Überlieferungsgruppe an, sie geht auf das Kanjurmanuskript in Tshal Guñ than zurück. Dieses hat zwar auch Abschriften der ersten Handschrift in Narthang als Vorlage benutzt, aber neben einer Durchsicht des Wortlautes die einzelnen Texte in eine neue Ordnung gebracht, wobei jedoch die Hauptabteilungen weitgehend beibehalten wurden. Diese Redaktion fand kurze Zeit nach der Zusammenstellung des ersten Kanons statt, sie stand unter der Leitung von Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje, alias Si tu Dge ba'i blo gros (1309–1364).²¹ Die Tshal pa-Überlieferungsgruppe, die man der Herkunft ihrer derzeit bekannten Textzeugen wegen als die «östliche» bezeichnen kann, ist in zwei Zweige unterteilt, die beide auf Handschriften in 'Jañ Sa tham zurückgehen. Zum ersten Zweig sind die Blockdrucke und Handschriften aus Peking zu rechnen, die zwar in den späteren Fassungen Zeichen der Kontamination mit anderen Textzeugen aufweisen,²² aber deutlich erkennbar eine eigene Untergruppe bilden.²³ Von dem zweiten Zweig der östlichen Überlieferungsgruppe sind zur Zeit nur die Kanjur-Drucke aus Cone und Derge zugänglich, sie stammen aber von dem allgemein als Lithang-Kanjur bezeichneten Blockdruck aus 'Jañ Sa tham ab, von dem in jüngster Zeit ein Exemplar in Orissa bekannt,²⁴ aber noch nicht zugänglich wurde. Bei der

²⁰ Hierzu siehe H. Eimer, *Zur Beurteilung der Textqualität*

²¹ Diese Daten sind entnommen der Einleitung zu *Deb ther dmar po rnam's kyi dañ po, Hu lan deb ther 'di bñugs so* |. Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rjes brtsams |, Duñ dkar Blo bzañ 'phrin las kyis mtshan 'grel bkod |. *Mi rigs dpe skrun khañ* (Peking 1981), Seite 1; auf diese Angaben machte mich Herr Joachim Karsten aufmerksam.

²² Zur Verwandtschaft der Pekinger Druckausgaben des Kanjur siehe Helmut Eimer, *Einige Hinweise zur Edition tibetischer kanonischer Texte. Beobachtungen zur Überlieferung in Blockdrucken: Zentralasiatische Studien* 14/1 (1980), 195–209.

²³ Man muß wohl die Feststellung von Y. Imaeda, *L'édition du Kanjur tibétain de 'Jang Sa-tham*, 187, die auf eine ähnliche von Shinten Sakai (siehe Y. Imaeda, *Mise au point concernant les éditions chinoises du Kanjur et du Tanjur tibétains: Essais sur l'art du Tibet*, Paris 1977, 24) zurückzuführen ist (« . . . il est vraisemblable que la copie mère utilisée pour l'édition de Pékin de 1410 est une copie faite sur l'édition manuscrite ancienne de Narthang qui fut réalisée vers 1300 . . . »), berichtigen: Zwischen dem ersten Druck aus Peking und dem Archetypus liegen mindestens die Tshal pa-Redaktion, die Zwischenstufe in Form der Handschrift von 'Jañ Sa tham und eine Abschrift von der letzteren Handschrift.

²⁴ Nach Imaeda, *L'édition du Kanjur tibétain de 'Jang Sa-tham*, 175, Anm. 2.

Herstellung des Derge-Kanjur wurde — wie der *dkar chag* dieser Ausgabe sagt²⁵ — neben dem Druck aus 'Jañ Sa tham auch noch eine Handschrift aus der Tradition, die sich von der Them spañs ma herleitet, herangezogen.

Die Narthang-Ausgabe des Kanjur ist — wie gesagt — in ihrem Wortlaut mit zwei Handschriften der westlichen Überlieferungsgruppe — nämlich denen in Tokyo und London — nahe verwandt.²⁶ Diese beiden Handschriften lassen sich nicht auf die redigierte Fassung, den Kanjur aus Tshal pa, zurückführen, sie stammen vielmehr vom ersten Kanjurmanuskript in Narthang ab, selbst wenn mehrere Abschriften dazwischenliegen. Daher kann man vermuten, daß auch ihre Anordnung der Texte die ursprüngliche ist. Die acht Texte der Abteilung Vinaya erscheinen in den Handschriften in Tokyo und London in der Reihenfolge:

1. 'Dul ba rnam par 'byeñ pa
2. Dge sloñ ma'i so sor thar pa'i mdo
3. Dge sloñ ma'i 'dul ba rnam par 'byed pa
4. So sor thar pa'i mdo
5. 'Dul ba gži
6. 'Dul ba phran tshegs kyi gži
7. 'Dul ba gžuñ bla ma
8. 'Dul ba gžuñ dam pa.

Dies ist eine Gliederung der Vinaya-Abteilung, die in keiner der bislang bekannten Druckausgaben des Kanjur zu finden ist. Auch Si tu Pañ chen nennt in seinem *dkar chag* zum Derge-Kanjur diese Anordnung der Vinayatexte nicht, er spricht vielmehr über die von Bu ston Rin chen grub und von Goñ dkar ba eingeführten Gliederungen und sagt dann, daß er dem Tshal pa-Kanjur folgt, der sich in diesem Punkt einem frühen *dkar chag*, der als 'Phañ thañ ma bekannt ist, anschließt.²⁷ Auch der Narthang-Druck des Kanjur übernimmt die Anordnung der Texte aus der redigierten Tshal pa-Fassung. Auf diesen Sachverhalt dürfte sich auch die Mitteilung des *dkar chag* zur Narthang-Ausgabe beziehen, daß diese nach

²⁵ Folio 109b1–4; diese Passage wird veröffentlicht und übersetzt im Appendix zu H. Eimer, *Some Results of Recent Kanjur Research*.

²⁶ Diese Feststellung schließt aber nicht aus, daß einzelne Texte im Narthang-Kanjur auf die Tshal pa-Tradition zurückgehen. Herr Dr. Paul M. Harrison nannte mir als Beispiel das *Lokānuvartanasūtra*.

²⁷ *Dkar chag* zum Derge-Kanjur, fol. 113a1ff.: ... thams cad mkhyen pa bu ston gyis dañ por pha'i so thar dañ rnam 'byed | de nas ma'i so thar dañ rnam 'byed | luñ gži | phran tshegs | luñ zu ba rnam kyi 'grig rim mdzad ciñ | goñ dkar bas | thog mar so thar gñis | de nas luñ gži | rnam 'byed | zu ba | phran tshegs rnam kyi go rims mdzad mod kyi | 'di sñon gyi dkar chag 'phañ thañ ma sogs dañ mthun par byuñ ba'i tshal pa bka' 'gyur sor bžag ltar gyi sgrig rim byas par | ...

dem Vorbild des Kanjur von Tshal pa zusammengestellt worden sei.²⁸ Dennoch lassen Besonderheiten in der Gliederung des Narthang-Kanjur erkennen, daß sie auf die erste Fassung des Kanjur zurückgehen; als Beispiel ist die eigene Abteilung *myañ 'das* zu nennen, die sich auch in den anderen Textzeugen der westlichen Überlieferungsgruppe findet.

²⁸ So deutet Y. Imaeda, *L'édition du Kanjur tibétain de 'Jang Sa-tham*, 188, Anm. 21, eine Mitteilung auf fol. 82a3 des *dkar chag* zum Narthang-Kanjur.

TIBETAN LEXICAL NOTES

BY

R. E. EMMERICK (Hamburg)

In the *Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium held at Mátrafüred, Hungary 24–30 September 1976*, Budapest 1978, 101–108, I wrote about some lexical items from the Rgyud-bži. Some corrections and useful additions to my notes were made by J. W. de Jong in *IJJ*, 23.1, 1981, 75–76. The following notes concern lexical items found in another medical text, Ravigupta's *Siddhasāra*.

1. *taṃ-bal*

This word has not been found in Tibetan dictionaries under any of the spellings listed below.

It is attested in the *Siddhasāra* as a rendering of Sanskrit *kāśmārya* in the following readings:

- Si 2.15 *taṃ-bal* P] *ti-pa-la* D, *ti-pal* N
Si 3.2212 *taṃ-bal* DN] *taṃ-pa* P
Si 5.95 *btāñ-pal* N] *btāñ-pa-la* DP
Si 5.102 *ta-pal* NP] *ta-pa-la* D
Si 7.24 *taṃ-pa* P] *taṃ-pa-la* D, *taṃ-bal* N
Si 27.13 *taṃ-ba-la* D : *taṃ-pal* N : *rtam-pal* P
Si 28.12 *taṃ-pa-la* DNP

As a rendering of Sanskrit *kāśmarī* it is attested as follows:

- Si 2.25 *taṃ-pal* P] *ti-bal* DN
Si 5.34 *taṃ-pal* NP] *taṃ-pa-la* D
Si 5.62 *taṃ-pal* P] *taṃ-pa-la* D, *taṃ-bal* N
Si 6.24 *taṃ-bal* P] *taṃ-pa-la* D, *taṃ-pal* N

Similar renderings of Sanskrit *kāśmārya* are found in the Tibetan version of Vāgbhaṭa's *Ah*:

- Sū. 15.11 *tañ-pal* D 78a2; P 52a3
Utt.34.28 *tañ-pal* D 312a5 : *tañ-bal* P 295b2
Utt.36.60 *tañ-bal* D 318b3 : *taṃ-bal* P 302b7

In the Tibetan version of the *Amarakośa* on the other hand only «etymological» renderings are given. AK 2.4.35 *gsal-byed* (46b1) for *kāśmarī* and AK 2.4.36 *snañ-ldan* (46b1) for *kāśmārya*. *gsal-bar byed-pa* is known to render Sanskrit *prakāśate* (Lokesh Chandra).

The variety of spellings points to this word being a loanword and since *kāśmārya* is generally identified as *Gmelina arborea* Roxb. (Kirtikar and Basu, III, 1932–4; G. J. Meulenbeld, *The Mādhavanidāna*, Leiden 1974, 543) «white teak», a purely Indian tree, an Indian origin should be sought. Unless it is a complete corruption of Sanskrit *gambhārī*, a synonym of *kāśmārya*, no suitable Indian source has yet been found.

The Khotanese version of the Siddhasāra has *kaśmīrye* at all three occurrences: 2.15, 25 3.22.12 (Ch ii.002. 12r4, 14r1 and 19r1). It is remarkable that the Khotanese has *kaśmīrye* also to render Sanskrit *śrī-parṇī*, said by *Siddhasāra-nighaṇṭu* 71 to be synonymous with *kāśmarī*, whereas the Tibetan does not once use *taṃ-bal* but always a transcription of *śrī-parṇī*. In the Siddhasāra *śrī-parṇī* occurs at 2.7,24,28 5.35,53. The last two places are not extant in Khotanese. *śrī-parṇī* seldom occurs in Vāgbhaṭa's Ah. At Utt. 20.12 we find a transcription: *śi-ri parṇi* (D 285a4), *śi-dri-par-ni* (P 264a5).

The use of *kaśmīrye* in Khotanese suggests that Tibetan *bal* may be intended to mean «Nepalese» but one would expect *bal* to be the first element of the compound rather than the second.

2. *ćag-ćag*

ćag-ćag is found in the dictionaries of Chos-kyi grags-pa and Sumatiratna, but it is helpful to draw attention to its use in bilingual texts. It is evidently a derivative of *gćag-pa* «to pierce, prick» recorded by Das. Another derivative is *bćags-bu*, which is described by Jäschke as a «lancet for bleeding», *bćags-bu* (*bćags* N, *gćags* D, *bćag* P) occurs in Si 26.88 as a rendering of Sanskrit *śāstra*, which is used there of an instrument for piercing pimples in the throat. The Khotanese has (156v3) *prriḥqraṃ jsa* «with a *praharaṇa*», the usual Khotanese rendering of Sanskrit *śāstra*.

Si 26.81 concerns the characteristics of tongue disease that has arisen due to bile. They are: *lce rćub-ciñ ćha-ba hur-hur-por hdug-la ćag-ćag ćha-ba* «the tongue is rough, there is gentle warmth, and it has hot pricks». This is a rendering of Sanskrit *sa-dāhaiḥ kaṇṭakaiḥ* «with hot prickles». The Khotanese omits the prickles altogether and has *biśā'-v-ī ysīrrā hame u ttaudā-v-ī va hame* «one's tongue becomes rough and warmth arises for one».

ćag-ćag is attested in the Tibetan version of Vāgbhaṭa's Ah, Sū.10.5. There we find to render

udvejayati jihvāgraṃ kurvaṃś cimicimām kaṭur, which is translated by Hilgenberg and Kirfel: «die scharfe (Geschmacksqualität) lässt dadurch, dass sie Prickeln hervorruft, die Zungenspitze emporzucken», in the Tibetan version

ćha-ba lce-rće skye byed-ciñ

ćag-ćag byed-par hgyur-ba dañ

«the pungent (taste) makes the tip of the tongue extend and pricking is caused (by

it)». Thus, *ćag-ćag* corresponds to Sanskrit *cimicimā* «pricking». Indu comments: *cimicimām agnijvālā-saṃsparśam iva karoti* «it causes pricking like contact with the flame of a fire».

3. *ćañ-śu*

This word I have found only in Sumatiratna (VII. 506 s.v. *ćañ-śu* and VII. 539 s.v. *ćabs*), who glosses it as *ćabs-mo*. The latter is known, for example, from the Tibetan translation of Vāgbhaṭa. Thus, Sanskrit *kāñjika* in Ah, Sū.8.48 is translated as *ćabs-mo* (P 40a5) in accordance with the recommendation of the Mahāvvyutpatti (*ćab-mo = kāñjika* Mvy 5722). *ćabs* by itself is similarly used in the Siddhasāra to render Sanskrit *kāñjika* (Si 5.126 12.18). *ćabs skyur-po* «sour *ćabs*» is common in the *Siddhasāra*. It is used to render Sanskrit *amla-tuṣāmbhas* (5.121), *amla-kāñjika* (5.125), *dhānyāmla* (6.17 9.15), and *sauvīraka* (6.63). These are designations of a kind of sour gruel prepared from unhusked cereals (see Meulenbeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 467–8 s.v. *tuṣodaka*).

ćañ-śu occurs once only in the Siddhasāra, at 19.23, where it renders Sanskrit *amla*. In Si 19.23 a prescription is given for a patient suffering from heart disease due to wind. He is to drink sesame oil mixed with salt and *amla*: *lavaṇāmla-yutaṃ tailaṃ hṛd-roge vātike pibet*. The same prescription for this condition is found in Vāgbhaṭa, Ah, Ci.6.26 with the addition of *mūtra* «(cow) urine». There *amla* is explained by Aruṇadatta as *kāñjika*. The Tibetan rendering has merely the literal equivalent of *amla*, namely *skyur-ba* (P 156a6).

The Khotanese rendering of Si 19.23 provides a more elaborate rendering of *amla* and *ćañ-śu*. There we find: *āhvarā ttīra ā vā suttā . kāṃ *saṃ hamāte āyvaṇā* (124r2–3 KT 1.52) «(herbs that are) sour (*amla-*) (or) bitter (**tikta*) or verjuice (**śukta*), whichever may be appropriate, must be heated».

4. *bćah*

In the Tibetan version of Vāgbhaṭa's Ah the Sanskrit term *mukha-pāka* «inflammation of the mouth» is rendered *kha-yi śu-ba* (Utt.21.59 = P 267a8) «ulcer of the mouth», in abbreviated form *kha-śu* (Utt.22.73 = P 270b8). The term used in the Siddhasāra is *bćah* in a variety of expressions. The clearest phrase is in Si 29.52: *bćah-nad khar hbrum-pa hoñ-ba* «the *bćah* disease (in which) pimples occur in the mouth».

In Si 29.51 we find: *byis-pahi khar hbrum-pa byuñ-ste bćah lañs-pa-la* «in the case of pimples having occurred in the child's mouth and *bćah* having risen».

Si 26.85 has: *bćah ldan-ziñ kha-nas hbrum-pa hbyuñ-ba* «(when) heat is present and pimples arise in the mouth». This is parallel with Si 26.86: *ćha ldan-ziñ khar*

hbrum-pa byuñ-ba «(when) heat is present and pimples have arisen in the mouth». The Khotanese version has in Si 26.85: *cu ttaude jsa khaysmi nirāmīmdā* «when pimples emerge due to heat» and in Si 26.86: *cvai ttaudā hame u eha khaysma sarbīdā* «when for one heat occurs and in the mouth pimples rise». In Si 26.85 H. W. Bailey emends *ttaude* to *ttaure* «mouth» (Ch ii.002.156r3 KT 1.104 all editions), but there can be no justification for that.

The Khotanese rendering of *bcah* and *cha* by *ttaudā* «heat» is no doubt correct. *bcah* is attested also in *me-bcah* «moxa». *bcah* in the sense of Sanskrit *pāka* «ripening» is found also in *bcah-ma* «ripening of corn in autumn in Tibet» (Das).

5. *lvañ-ko*

This word I have not found in Tibetan dictionaries. It occurs a number of times in the *Siddhasāra* in a surprising variety of spellings, which makes it likely that it is a loanword. It is used to translate Sanskrit *āmrāsthī* and its synonym *cūtāsthī* «kernel of the mango fruit». The mango, *Mangifera indica* Linn., is a native of India and the Indian name *āmra* was widely borrowed (see B. Laufer, *Sino-Iranica*, Chicago 1919, 552).

The word is attested in the *Siddhasāra* as follows:

śiñ lvañ-ko (Si 6.21) = *āmrāsthī*

śiñ lvañ-kho (Si 6.28.5) = *āmrāsthī*

śiñ lvañ-kho (Si 6.28.9) = *cūtāsthī*

śiñ log-kog-gi čhig-gu (Si 7.31) = *āmrāsthī*

śiñ lbañ-ko (Si 25.26) = *āmrāsthī*

śiñ la-ko (Si 26.119) = *āmrāsthī*

śiñ loñ-kog (Si 29.44) = *cūtāsthī*

Of these passages only Si 25.26 is available in Khotanese. There we find *ambrāsā* (144r4 KT 1.86), which is merely a defective writing of *ambrāsthā*, which is attested several times in the *Jīvaka-pustaka* as *ambrāsthā* (87r3 [45] KT 1.171). This is ultimately just Sanskrit *āmrāsthī*.

The Tibetan translation of Vāgbhaṭa's *Ah* prefers a more literal rendering of *āmrāsthī* (Utt.25.61) as *'a-mrahi rus-pa* (P 279a5).

The mango was known to the Chinese as 菴羅 *an-lo* < *ām-lā*, a transcription of Sanskrit *āmra*. It is possible that the Tibetan spellings *la*, *lvañ*, *lbañ*, *log*, *loñ* are attempts to render this Chinese *lo*. The modern Chinese term is 芒果 *mang kuo* (Mathews 4354 (with radical 75) + 3732), which is just a transcription of English «mango». However, 果 *kuo* means «fruit», and it is tempting to see in this the second element of Tibetan *lvañ-ko*. Tibetan *kog-pa* «shell, peel, rind» can hardly be involved.

BUDDHAPĀLITA'S *MŪLAMADHYAMAKAVṚTTI* ARRIVAL AND SPREAD OF *PRĀSAṄGIKA-MĀDHYAMIKA* LITERATURE IN TIBET

BY

JUDIT FEHÉR (Budapest)

Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* (*Dbu-ma rca-ba'i 'grel-pa*) is a piece of the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika* literature. It is a commentary on the *Prajñāmūlamadhyamakakārikā* (or *Māhyamikasūtra*, *Mādhyamikaśāstra*, *Prajñāmūla*) which was written by Nāgārjuna in the second century A. D. The original Sanskrit version of the *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti*, dating from the sixth century was lost and it is only its Tibetan version made by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan which is available for us. Concerning the early history of *Mādhyamika* philosophy, the commentary of Buddhapālita is of supreme importance, since it represents the sixth century phase of the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika* school of which we know very little. On the basis of the later historians' information we know that in the sixth century the *Mādhyamika* was split into the *Prāsaṅgika* and *Svātantrika* branches, nevertheless this period before Candrakīrti cannot be seen in its proper light while the works of both Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka, the two representatives of the *Prāsaṅgika* and *Svātantrika* lines respectively, remain untranslated. Up to now a very little part of Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* has been translated and we do not have a critical edition of its chapters 13–27.¹

The importance of Nāgārjuna's *Mādhyamikaśāstra* and its different commentaries cannot be overestimated, since it provides an opportunity to follow the different treatment and development of the basic tenets of *Mādhyamika* philosophy, expounded first by Nāgārjuna.

All the commentaries faithfully follow the structure of Nāgārjuna's kārikās. They consist of 27 chapters, each giving the criticism of a certain early Buddhist or non-Buddhist category. The English translation of the first chapter of Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* is given here, which bears the title «Examination of Causality» (*Pratyayaparīkṣānāma*; *Rkyen-brtag-pa šes bya-ba rab-tu byed-pa*) and some efforts are also made to determine when this work of Buddhapālita was

¹ M. Walleser edited the chapters 1–12 and some part of the chapter 13 (*Bibl. Buddh.* 16.); Tachikawa Musashi partly translated chapter 2 into English (*Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyū Ronshū*, 1974, 63.); Otake Shoshin translated chapter 1 into Japanese (*Mikkyō Kenkyū*, 42, 45); I. Datar gave a Sanskrit reconstruction of its first chapter (*JBOBAS*, 26, 1951).

possibly introduced into Tibet and in which order the great Indian *Mādhyamika ācāryas'* works were translated into Tibetan.

Concerning the history of the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika* school before Rin-chen bzañ-po and Atīśa the difficult question occurs: when did the great personages of this branch begin to be known in Tibet, and when were the great works representative of the *Prāsaṅgika* system first translated into Tibetan. Buddhapālita (Sañs-rgyas bskyañs) who is considered to be the founder of the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika* school, lived in the sixth century A.D. and Bhavya or Bhāvaviveka (Legs-ldan 'byed), the founder of the *Svātantrika-Mādhyamika* school, was his younger contemporary. We have only one single work of Buddhapālita available to us in the *Tanjur*, which fact itself may raise doubt regarding his personality. This treatise of his is the *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti* (*Dbu-ma rca-ba'i 'grel-pa Buddhapālita*)², the above-mentioned commentary upon Nāgārjuna's *kārikās*. Its colophon informs us that it was translated and revised by the Indian *paṇḍita* Jñānagarbha (Ye-śes sñiñ-po) and the Tibetan *locāba* Klu'i rgyal-mchan of Čog-ro,³ but it gives no information regarding the date of the translation. On examining the *Kanjur-Tanjur Dkar-čhag*⁴ with the purpose of gaining an insight into the activity of these two persons, we find that Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan translated a vast number of works of Indian thinkers. Moreover, the Indian *paṇḍita* Jñānagarbha wrote his own independent treatises, too.⁵ According to the list of works, the translation or the revision of which is partly attributed to Klu'i rgyal-mchan by the *Dkar-čhag*, Klu'i rgyal-mchan mostly collaborated with the following *paṇḍits* and *locabas*:

1. Jinamitra
2. Jñānagarbha
3. Sarvajñādeva
4. Dpal-lha bcan-po, Surendrabodhi, Ye-śes-sde

² *The Tibetan Tripitaka*, Peking Edition, Tanjur No. 5242.

³ There are differences in opinion regarding the name Čog-ro. According to G. Uray Čog-ro «is known as both place and clan name but in this case its use as a place name can be proved to be secondary, whereas the clan hails from the north-eastern part of Tibet Proper, from the neighbourhood of the *Sum-pa* areas, or possibly from regions lying farther north-east» in: *Acta Orientalia*, 19. 1966.

⁴ The *Dkar-čhag* of the *Tibetan Tripitaka*, Peking Edition.

⁵ In the *Dkar-čhag* of the Peking Edition the following works of Jñānagarbha are listed:

No. 2404. *Śava-samskāra-vidhi*

No. 2779. *Caturdevatā-paripṛcchā-ṭikā*

No. 3519. *Ārya-anantamukha-nirhāra-dhāraṇī-vyākhyāna-kārikā*

No. 3520. *Ārya-anantamukha-nirhāra-dhāraṇī-vyākhyāna-kārikā-ṭikā*

No. 5305. *Bhāvanā-yoga-mārga*

No. 5452. *Bhāvanā-yoga-patha*

5. Prajñāvarman⁶

He carried out most of his activity under Jinamitra and Jñānagarbha, and it is also interesting to note that both Nāgārjuna's *Mūlamadhyamakārikās* and almost all the commentaries of the *kārikās* are reported to have been translated by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan.⁷ Collaborating with Jñānagarbha the *Dkar-čhag* gives the following names for the most part:

Klu'i rgyal-mchan, Dpal-brcegs, Nam-mkha',
Ye-šes-sde, Klu'i dbaṅ-po, Dharmākara, Prajñā-
varman, Devendrarakṣita, Dharmāloka, Vimala-
mitra, Vidyākaraprabha, Viśuddhasiṃha, and Devacandra.

Accepting the particulars of the colophon one can try to date the translation of Buddhapālita's *vṛtti* by taking the already fixed age of the above mentioned personages into consideration. Moreover, in order to widen the circle of the contemporary translators one must not disregard the most often mentioned collaborators of the pandits and locabas, who are enumerated. In this way, it is possible to draw the following persons into the orbit of the investigation:

Dānaśīla (Dhanaśīla), Śilendrabodhi, Munivarman,
Dharmatāśīla, Mañjuśrīgarbha, Jinaputra, Śākya-
siṃha, Vidyākarasiṃha.

What is known about the Tibetan locaba's Dpal-brcegs' career is noteworthy. Dpal-brcegs of Ska was a well-known compiler and is often mentioned together with Klu'i rgyal-mchan of Čog-ro and Ban-dhe Ye-šes-sde of Žaṅ (Jñānasena) in the form Ska-Čog-Žaṅ.⁸ Ska-Čog-Žaṅ according to several sources are connected with the *skad-gsar-bčad*, i.e. the second period of the Tibetan translations, which is determined as lasting from Ral-pa-čan up to Rin-čhen bzaṅ-po.⁹ For example, Buxton also places the *skad-gsar-bčad*, the great revision and the compilation of the *vyutpattis* at the time of Ral-pa-čan. Speaking of the reign of Ral-pa-čan he says: *Sñar bsgyur-ba-rnams skad-gsar-bčad-kyis [-kyaṅ] gtan-la phab-č'iṅ | bkas-bčad*

⁶ The numbers from 1 to 5 reveal whom Klu'i rgyal-mchan collaborated with most frequently.

⁷ Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan together translated the following works:

Rāja-pari-kathā-ratnāvalī

Nāgārjuna's *Mādhyamikāśāstra*

Nāgārjuna's *Akutohaya*

Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamakavṛtti*

Bhavaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa*

Avalokitavrata's *Prajñāpradīpaṭīkā*

⁸ Nils Simonsson, *Indo-tibetische Studien*, Uppsala 1957, p. 217.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 217-218.

rnam-pa gsum mjad de |.¹⁰ N. Simonsson, giving a more precise translation than Dr. E. Obermiller,¹¹ interprets the passage as follows: «Die früher übersetzten Texte wurden nach den Principien für die neue Sprache geordnet, und drei Instruktionsbücher (über jene Prinzipien) wurden verfasst.»¹² Thus Simonsson supposes that the *bkas-bčad rnam-pa gsum* must have originally signified the three *vyutpattis* and is not to be confused with the later periodical revision of translations, bearing the same name. His translation also implies that the principles of the «new language» had already existed before they were noted down in the *vyutpattis* and this interpretation is supported by the fact that both the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and *Madhyavyutpatti* mention Khri-lde-sroñ-bcan under whom their compilation took place. The introduction of the *Madhyavyutpatti* informs us that it was compiled in *rta'i lo-la* which is identified as 814. According to Tucci: «The year of the horse is exactly 814, just four years before the death of the king; this makes therefore most probable that his design was brought to complete realisation by the board of pandits assembled by him, exactly under his son who was given later on, by the Tibetan historians the full merit of the work.»¹³

Thus, accepting that the great revision, the *skad-gsar-bčad*, the compilation of the *vyutpattis* had already begun at the time of Khri-lde-sroñ-bcan, it can be assumed that the three great Tibetan compilers, namely Dpal-brcegs (Śrīkūṭa), Klu'i rgyal-mchan of Čog-ro, and Ye-šes-sde of Žaň must have lived and worked in the 9th century A.D. during the reign of both Khri-lde-sroñ-bcan and Ral-pa-čan.

This assumption is also supported by other facts. The well-known scholar Dpal-brcegs of Ska, whose contemporaries were surely Klu'i rgyal-mchan and Ye-šes-sde, was the compiler of the *Ldan-dkar-ma* catalogue and also collaborated in the preparation of the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.

Though the later Tibetan historians (Dpa-bo gcug-lag phreñ-ba, Bu-ston¹⁴) ascribe the *Ldan-dkar-ma* catalogue to the reign of Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan, it has already been proved that this *dkar-čhag* must have been prepared during the times of Khri-lde-sroñ-bcan, in 812 A.D.¹⁵

Bu-ston who informs us of the times of Ral-pa-čan remarks:

¹⁰ Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism*, Translated by Dr. E. Obermiller, Part. II. p. 196. Simonsson, *Indo-tibetische Studien*, p. 231.

¹¹ Obermiller's translation: «the texts translated before were re-edited in the new language, 3 different forms of instructions were made.»

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 231.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 240.

¹⁴ Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism*, Translated by Dr. E. Obermiller, Heidelberg 1932. p. 191.

¹⁵ See Marcelle Lalou, *Les textes bouddhiques au temps du Roi Khri-sroñ-lde-bcan*, *JA*, Tome CCXLI, 1953, p. 313 ff.

«Before, in the time of his forefathers, the teacher Boddhisattva, Jñānendra, Žaṅgyal-ñeñ-ña-bzañ, Blon-khri-bžir-saṅ-ši, the translators Jñānadevakośa, Khyi-'brug of Lče, the Brāhmaṇa Ananta and others created a literary language that contained many words unintelligible to the Tibetans. Besides, different translations were made from the Chinese, from the language of Li and Sahor, etc. Owing to this there were many different renderings of words and the study of the Doctrine became very difficult. Seeing this, the king issued the following order: «The Aparāntaka teachers Jinamitra, Surendrabodhi, Śilendrabodhi, and Bodhimitra, the Tibetan teachers Ratnarakṣita and Dharmatāśīla, the skilful translators Jñānasena, Jayarakṣita, Mañjuśrīvarman, Ratnendraśīla and others are to translate the *Hinayanistic* and *Mahayanistic* scriptures into Tibetan directly from the Sanskrit. The titles are to be registered and written down so as to form an index.»¹⁶

So, Bu-ston dates the great revision from the king Ralpa-čan, but interestingly enough his information almost word for word corresponds to some passages of the *Madhyavyutpatti's* introduction.¹⁷ This similarity suggests that he may have used the particulars of the *Madhyavyutpatti*, while composing his *čhos-'byuñ* (a work which definitely states that the scholars enumerated by Bu-ston were summoned together by Khri-lde-sroñ-bcan!). Furthermore, the above enumerated Indian and Tibetan personages almost without exception are the compilers of the *Mahāvyutpatti*, also prepared in 814.

The initial grouping of the contemporary scholars round Klu'i rgyal-mchan and Jñānagarbha is also confirmed by several other sources, where their names also occur together,¹⁸ and which works date either from the time of Khri-lde-sroñ-bcan/ or Ral-pa-čan.

As for Jñānagarbha, the Indian translator of Buddhapālita, on the basis of the *Kanjur-Tanjur dkar-čhag* it is known that each of the three great Tibetan translators (Klu'i rgyal-mchan, Dpal-brcegs, Ye-šes-sde) collaborated with him.

Tāranātha reveals that Jñānagarbha (Ye-šes sñiñ-po) lived before and during the time of the king Gopāla, who ruled in Bhaṅgala and also in Magadha.

«He ruled for forty-five years. During the time of this king, *ācārya* Śākya-prabha, a disciple of Śānti-prabha and Punyakīrti, was born in the west and worked for the

¹⁶ Bu-ston, *History of Buddhism*, p. 196.

¹⁷ Sgra-sbyor. *The Tibetan Tripitaka*, Peking Edition Tanjur Vol. 144. In 2a of the introduction we are informed that «ñi-'og-gi mkhan-po ācārya Ji-na-mi-tra-dañ | Su-rendra-bo-dhi-dañ | śi-lendra-bo-dhi-dañ | Dā-na-ši-la-dañ | Bo-dhi-mi-tra-dañ | bod-kyi mkhan-po Ratna-ra-ksi-ta-dañ | Dharmma-tā-ši-la-dañ lo-ca-ba mkhas-par čhud-pa Jñā-na-se-na-dañ | Ja-ya-rakṣi-ta-dañ | Mañju-šrī-varmma-dañ | Ratnendra-ši-la-la sogs-pas theg-pa čhe-čuñ-las 'byun-ba'i rgya-gar-gyi skad-las bod-kyi skad-du bsgyur-ziñ miñ-du btags-pa-rnams dkar-čhag-tu bris-te »

¹⁸ E.g. the same collaborators are also enumerated in the *Mahāvyutpatti*.

welfare of the living beings in Kashmir. Specially prominent in Kashmir were also the great Dānaśīla, Viṣeṣamitra, Prajñāvarman and ācārya Śūra, an expert in Vinaya. In the east lived ācārya Jñānagarbha.»¹⁹

Lassen places the beginning of Gopāla's reign at about 810, A.D. which date also confirms that Jñānagarbha could work together with the above-mentioned Tibetans.²⁰

As can be seen Tāranātha puts the Kashmirian pandits Dānaśīla and Prajñāvarman at the same time and this fact is in accordance with the initial assumption made earlier on the basis of the *Kanjur-Tanjur dkar-čhag*.

Tāranātha writes about Jñānagarbha's life as follows;

«He was born in Oḍiviṣa and became a great *paṇḍita*. He listened to the Doctrine from ācārya Śrīgupta in Bhaṅgala. He became famous as a great *Mādhyamika* follower of the views of Bhavya. He propitiated for a long time ārya Avalokiteśvara, at last had the vision of him as moving the *Cintāmaṇi-cakra* and attained *abhijñāna*. He recited many sūtras from his memory and defeated the *tīrthikas*.»²¹

The conclusion that Buddhapālita's *Mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti* must have been translated by Jñānagarbha and Čog-ro Klu'i rgyal-mchan in the 9th century A.D. during the reign of either Khri-lde-sroṅ-bcan or, more probably, Ral-pa-čan involves a host of unsolved questions.

If this single work of Buddhapālita was really translated in the 9th century, why is it that Buddhapālita is not mentioned in the treatises dating from the 9th century? For example, Dpal-brcegs and Ye-šes-sde, who are known to have been contemporaries of Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan, mention neither Buddhapālita nor Candrakīrti in their philosophical works *Lta-ba'i rim-pa bšad-pa* and *Lta-ba'i khyad-par* respectively.²² They speak only of the school of Śāntirakṣita, called *Rnal-'byor spyod-pa'i dbu-ma* (*Yogācāra-Madhyamaka*), and of the school of Bhāvaviveka, called *Mdo-sde spyod-pa'i dbu-ma* (*Sautrāntika-Madhyamaka*). This 9th century classification of *Madhyamaka* leads us to believe that at the time of the *śna-dar*, the school of Buddhapālita and Bhāvaviveka was not yet acknowledgedly separated, though there may have been differences between them.

D. Seyfort Ruegg appropriately remarks: «The school of Buddhapālita and Candrakīrti which was to occupy such a prominent place later in the history of

¹⁹ Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism*, trans. from the Tibetan by Lama Chimpa, Alaka Chattopadhyaya. Indian Institute of Advanced Study, Simla 1970. p. 259.

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 258.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 253.

²² D. Seyfort Ruegg. *On the Reception and Early History of the Dbu-ma (Madhyamaka) in Tibet*, in: *Tibetan Studies*, Oxford 1979, pp. 277-9.

Tibetan thought, but was not evidently recognised as a *distinct* (!) doctrinal entity during the early propagation (*snga dar*) of the *dharma* in Tibet.»²³

Ruegg's assumption is well-founded and it is considered that this initial classification of the Tibetans has its roots in India. In connection with the branches of Mahāyāna Buddhism the following can be read in Tāranātha's history: «These two *ācāryas* (Buddhapālita and Bhavya) composed the basic texts on the *Mādhyamika* doctrine of naturelessness (*svabhāva-hīna-vāda*). The number of disciples of Buddhapālita was not very large, while *ācārya* Bhavya had a large number of disciples, and because he had thousands of monks as his followers, his views were more extensively spread. Before the appearance of these two *ācāryas* all the *Mahāyānīs* were under the same Law. But these two *ācāryas* (thought), «The doctrines of ārya Nāgārjuna and of ārya Asaṅga are fundamentally different. The doctrine of Asaṅga is not indicative of the path of the *Mādhyamika*. It is merely the doctrine of *viññāna*. What we uphold is the real view of ārya Nāgārjuna.» Saying this, they refuted the position of the others. As a result, after the passing away of Bhavya, the *Mahāyānīs* were split into two groups and started having controversies among themselves.»²⁴

Though Tāranātha's information is lacking in details it can safely be accepted that in India it was the *Yogācāra* (*Vijñānavāda*) school of Asaṅga and the *Mādhyamika* school of Bhavya and Buddhapālita, which became sharply distinguished from each other. And though the followers of the *Yogācāra* school were also *Śūnyavādas*, *Niḥsvabhāvavādas* they were also considered to have doctrines, different from those of Nāgārjuna. Their acknowledged distinctness primarily resulted from their *viññāna*-doctrine, since they interpreted *śūnya* accordingly, i.e. they accepted consciousness as the sole reality.²⁵

Later on a kind of synthesizing *Yogācāra-Madhyamaka* school emerged in India and it is the doctrines of this very branch of *Mādhyamika* that were first introduced into Tibet in the 8th century by Śāntirakṣita and Kamala-śīla.

According to the information of Dpal-brcegs and Ye-śes-sde, the other *Sautrāntika-Mādhyamika* branch should also have been known by the 9th century or earlier where, it is assumed, Buddhapālita may have been tacitly included.

It is remarkable that the catalogue of the Peking *Kanjur-Tanjur* indicates only one work of Bhāvaviveka that was translated in the 9th century. It is his commentary on Nāgārjuna's *kārikās*, the *Prajñāpradīpa*, translated by Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan, the translators of Buddhapālita's *vṛtti*. All his other

²³ *Op. cit.*, p. 277.

²⁴ Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism*, p. 187.

²⁵ See Murti, *The Central Philosophy of Buddhism: Mandala Books*, Unwin Paperbacks, London 1980.

treatises were translated in the 11th century at the time of Atīṣa. In addition, the Peking Catalogue gives notice of a commentary on Bhāvaviveka's *Prajñāpradīpa* that is also dated from the 9th century, since its translators are the above-mentioned Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan.

Regarding the translations of Candrakīrti's works, on the basis of the Peking Catalogue it can be found that the great *paṇḍits* and *locābas* of the 9th century translated merely one single work of his, the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā-vṛtti*. This information is rather questionable since its basic text (*gžun*), the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā* of Nāgārjuna is said by the same catalogue to have been translated only in the 11th century by Ņi-ma-grags. Moreover, 'Gos lo-cā-ba names Ņi-ma-grags as the translator of the *Yuktiṣaṣṭikā-vṛtti*.²⁶ Consequently, the view has to be adopted that Candrakīrti was introduced into Tibet only in the 11th century by the coming of Atīṣa.

In the line of the Candrakīrti translators the following names are found:²⁷ Rin-čhen bzañ-po, Chul-khrims rgyal-ba (Jayaśīla), Mahāsumati, Ņi-ma-grags (Sūryakīrti), Tilaka, Tilakakalaśa, Atīṣa, Kanakavarman, Śraddhākaravarman, Kṛṣṇapaṇḍita, Tathāgatarakṣita, Gžon-nu 'bar, Čhos-kyi grags-pa, Lhas-bcas, Zla-ba grags-pa, Nag-po, Śrījñānakara, Abhayākara, Sūkṣmajāna etc. . . It is in the first place Pa-chab Ņi-ma-grags who played a very important role in the spread of Candrakīrti's doctrines. 'Gos lo-cā-ba Gžon-nu dpal describes in the Blue Annals his activity in details.²⁸ From 'Gos lo-cā-ba we get to know that the *kalyāṇamitra* Šar-ba-pa was his contemporary: «When he (Ņi-ma-grags) came to 'Phan-yul, he did not have a large following and the *kalyāṇamitra* Šar-ba-pa sent to him many of his own disciples to study the *Madhyamaka* system. Having established the teaching of the *Madhyamaka*, he gathered numerous monks and prepared excellent translations of the Commentaries by the *ācārya* Candra(kīrti) . . .»²⁹ From this it can be concluded that Ņi-ma-grags must have been busy with translating Candrakīrti at the end of the 11th or at the beginning of the 12th centuries, since we know that Šar-ba-pa was born in 1070 and died in 1141.³⁰

It is from the time of Atīṣa that Candrakīrti (and in a more profound manner also Bhāvaviveka) began to be known in Tibet. As already mentioned formerly all the treatises of Bhāvaviveka (with the exception of his *Prajñāpradīpa*) were translated

²⁶ George N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, New Delhi, Varanasi, Patna 1979, Part II. p. 342.

²⁷ Candrakīrti's translators are taken on the basis of the *Tibetan Tripiṭaka*, Peking Edition.

²⁸ Roerich, *The Blue Annals*, pp. 341-3.

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 342.

³⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 271-2.

³¹ Bhāvaviveka's works listed in the *Dkar-čhag* of the *Tibetan Tripiṭaka*:

No. 2657. *Pradīpoddyotana-viṣamapada-pañjikā-nāma*

Tr.: Rgyal-ba mčhog, Dpal Šākyā brcon-'grus

in the 11th century.³¹ Interestingly enough Atīsa, who according to some sources³² held the theory of the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamikas*, mainly dealt with the translations of Bhāvaviveka's works³³ and translated only three treatises of Candrakīrti working together with Rin-čhen bzañ-po and Chul-khrims rgyal-ba respectively.³⁴ In addition, he did not retranslate the sole work of Buddhapālita, although he did revise other 9th century translations. It was the above mentioned Ņi-ma-grags mostly collaborating with Tilakakalaša and Kanakavarman who translated most of Candrakīrti's works.

In the *Peking Catalogue* it is found that the *Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti was translated by Mahāsumati and Ņi-ma-grags i.e. only in the 11th century. If that is really so, it confirms the fact that the early Tibetan authors did not recognize the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamika* branch as a distinct philosophical system. As can be seen, during the first propagation of the *dharma* (*śā-dar*) there were only two schools (the *Yogācāra-Madhyamaka* and the *Sautrāntika-Madhyamaka*) distinguished within the followers of the *Madhyamaka* philosophy. Later during the second propagation (*phyi-dar*) and afterwards, several new view-points emerged, according to which the Tibetan scholars began to make further classifications of the *Mādhyamika*. Why they felt obliged to do so was mainly induced by the knowledge of Candrakīrti's doctrines, which should have made them definitely realize the

No. 5253. *Prajñāpradīpa-mūlamadhyamaka-vṛtti*

Tr.: Jñānagarbha, Klu'i rgyal-mchan

No. 5254. *Madhyamaka-ratna-pradīpa-nāma*

Tr.: Atīsa, Brcon-'grus señ-ge, Chul-khrims rgyal-ba

No. 5255. *Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-kārikā*

Tr.: Atīsa, Chul-khrims rgyal-ba

No. 5256. *Madhyamaka-hṛdaya-vṛtti-tarkajvālā*

Tr.: Atīsa, Chul-khrims rgyal-ba

No. 5258. *Madhyamakārtha-saṃgraha*

Tr.: Chul-khrims rgyal-ba

No. 5640. *Nikāyabheda-vibhaṅga-vyākhyāya*

Tr.: Atīsa, Chul-khrims rgyal-ba

All his translators with the exception of Jñānagarbha and Klu'i rgyal-mchan lived in the 11th century.

³² E.G. according to Thu-bkan-blo-bzañ Čhos-kyi Ņi-ma. See his *Grub-mtha' thams-čad-kyi khun-saṅ-dan dod-chul ston-pa* quoted by Alaka Chattopadhyaya in *Atīsa and Tibet*, p. 396.

³³ See Atīsa's translations of Bhāvaviveka under 31.

³⁴ The treatises of Candrakīrti in the translation of which Atīsa collaborated are as follows:

No. 5267. *Pañcaskandhaprakaraṇa*

Tr.: Atīsa, Chul-khrims rgyal-ba

No. 5366. *Triśaraṇa(gamana)saptati (291a⁷-295a²)*

Tr.: Atīsa, Rin-čhen bzañ-po

No. 5478. *Triśaraṇa(gamana)saptati (242a²-245a⁶)*

Tr.: Atīsa, Rin-čhen bzañ-po

difference between the principles of Bhāvaviveka's and Buddhapālita's line, since it was Candrakīrti who severely criticized the method of Bhāvaviveka, and it was he who through the prestige of his personality could substantiate their difference.

It is not known exactly when the new, *Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka* ('*thal-gyur-pa*'), classification began to be in a general use, but this term is constantly present from the 14th century on. Consequently it was presumably in use much earlier. After Candrakīrti's school had been established and had begun designated as *Prāsaṅgika-Madhyamaka* the school of Śāntirakṣita (up to that time called simply *Yogācāra-Madhyamaka*; *Rnal-'byor spyod-pa'i dbu-ma*) and the school of Bhāvaviveka (until then called *Sautrāntika-Madhyamaka*; *Mdo-sde spyod-pa'i dbu-ma*) also had to be distinguished according to this new point of view, and thus they gained the names *Yogācāra-Svātantrika-Madhyamaka* (*Rnal-'byor spyod-pa'i dbu-ma ran-rgyud-pa*) and *Sautrāntika-Svātantrika-Madhyamaka* (*Mdo-sde spyod-pa'i dbu-ma ran-rgyud pa*).

Nevertheless, the terms *Svātantrika* and *Prāsaṅgika* «refer in the first place to the two different methods of reasoning and achieving understanding of reality that are characteristic of Bhāvaviveka's and Candrakīrti's schools and consist respectively in the use of independent inferences and a kind of apagogic reasoning. And they were then employed as designations for the schools having these two masters at their head.»³⁵

With the passage of time, the *Prāsaṅgika-Mādhyamaka* philosophy began to exert an increasingly greater influence in Tibet, more and more scholars set about emphasizing that it was Candrakīrti and Buddhapālita who correctly interpreted the profound philosophy of Nāgārjuna.

«Those who seek liberation, having seen all the marvels of cyclic existence as being like a whirlwind of fire, should abandon all bad views which are fabricated to look like doctrine and should strive toward the *Mādhyamika-Prāsaṅgikas'* own system, the highest of all systems of tenets.»³⁶

³⁵ D. Seyfort Ruegg, *On the Reception and Early History of the Dbu-ma (Madhyamaka) in Tibet*, pp. 277–9.

³⁶ Sopa-Hopkins, *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism*, London, 1976, p. 144.

**COMMENTARY UPON
THE ROOT VERSES OF THE MIDDLE WAY³⁷
WRITTEN BY BUDDHAPĀLITA**

INTRODUCTION

I bow to the Three Jewels,
I bow to Mañjuśrī Kumārabhūta,
I bow to the noble Master Nāgārjuna,
I bow to the reverend Master Buddhapālita.

- 1.7. The Master, wishing to teach the conditional origination, and beholding its deeper, real meaning as it is, with a mind, marvellous, with an eye, opened wide by the cleansing tears of devotedness, with hairs, erected on his body, with hands, folded stood at the head.
- 2.1. «The Buddhas are the Bodies of the Religion» — he cited this verse, teaching the Absolute Reality, and as if being before him he made his initial salutation to Buddha, the Supreme Teacher:
*I salute the Perfect Buddha,
The most excellent of the Teachers,
Who has taught Conditional Origination,
The blissful, the cessation of the
Phenomenal world of differentiation,
That there is neither annihilation, nor origination,
Neither transient, nor eternal,
Neither motion towards, nor motion away,
Neither difference, nor identity.*
- 2.8. This makes the following. He salutes the Perfect Buddha, the most excellent of the Teachers, who has taught the people, roaming in the dark phenomenal world and believing in God (*Īśvara*), Time (*Kāla*), the Atom (*Aṇu*), Matter (*Prakṛti*), Essential Nature (*Svabhāva*), etc., that the Conditional Origination is the deepest Absolute Reality, the blissful, the cessation of the phenomenal world of differentiation, the direct way to the city of *Nirvāṇa*, [who has taught that] there is neither annihilation, nor origination, neither transient, nor eternal, neither motion towards, nor motion away, neither difference, nor identity.
- 2.17. The Master said [of Buddha]: «the most excellent of the Teachers»; since he fully saw that Buddha, regarding every non-buddhist opponent as a cheated

³⁷ The translation is made on the basis of H. Walleser's edition (*Bibl. Buddh.* 16.). The marginal numbers refer to the pages and lines in this edition.

child, had taught Conditional Origination [to them] as if he had supported with the hand a blind man in walking.

3. «No annihilation» means that there is no annihilation. The remaining part of the verse must be interpreted accordingly. The verses are aphoristic, and the subsequent treatise explains it in detail. What is said in some way or other in this speech is not arranged because of adherence [to the original].

3.6. If you ask why is it necessary to teach the Conditional Origination, we **answer**: The Master, who had a compassionate soul, saw the people tormented by the different miseries. Since for the sake of their deliverance he wanted to teach them the true nature of the entities as they are, he undertook the teaching of the Conditional Origination. And because he said:

False realisation is a fetter,
True realisation is deliverance.

3.13. What is the true nature of the entities as they are? **Answer**. They are unsubstantial. The Eye of Intelligence, covered up by the darkness of delusion [made by] Ignorance, conceives the entities as being substantial. At this time it produces attachment or aversion towards them. When the darkness of delusion is cleared up by the light of the knowledge of the Conditional Origination and the Eye of Wisdom sees the entities unsubstantial, then being deprived of the support, neither attachment, nor aversion will be produced.

4.2. For example, if we judge the reflected image of a woman that it is a woman, it will then produce attachment all the time [later on] and our mind, having become connected with it, will conceive it as [sg] distinct. When we conceive it according to its true nature, as it is, we do not think it to be a woman, and after having got rid of the attachment, we are very much ashamed. As we ourselves ridicule an attachment, appearing without any object, therefore, Buddha has also declared in detail that the monks should not see the woman, captivating the mind, either in lay woman or in nuns.

4.12. Therefore Āryadeva said, too:

The seed of existence is apprehended.
The objects are its spheres of activity.
If we see the objects devoid of self-being,
The seed of existence will be cut off.

4.16. Therefore the Master undertook it [i.e. the teaching of the Conditional Origination] in order to teach that the entities are unsubstantial.

4.18. **Opponent**. If the all-knowing, all-seeing Buddha, possessing Universal Compassion, has [once] already explained and taught the Conditional

Origination then, therefore, and like that, what is the use of teaching it again?

5. **Answer.** It is true that Buddha has already explained and taught the Conditional Origination. Nevertheless, as he has explained and taught [it] for the sake of practical application with such words as «origination», etc., therefore the entities [continue to] really exist for some people, who, concentrating their mind on the mere words [said by Buddha] then and like that, i.e. because of such words as «their origination, annihilation, motion towards, motion away» do not conceive the deeper meaning of the Conditional Origination.
- 5.8. The Master undertook [the writing of] this logical treatise, made [once] already before, in order to teach the essence of the Conditional Origination to those who because of the [supposed] existence of the objects thought of them [in the relation of] «eternal and transient, identical and different», yet thought in their heart that they, in the same way as the horn of the rabbit, cannot exist.
- 5.13. Furthermore it is justified that the Master re-teaches the Conditional Origination for the very reason that Buddha has explained and taught it. But what is the reason for re-teaching something that has [never] been explained and taught? Accordingly the secular treatises, which were [once] explained and taught by the ancient masters, are re-taught by their disciples nowadays, too. Therefore the Master is right when he re-teaches [it].
- 5.20. **Opponent.** Why do you deny the eight-folded, beginning with «annihilation»? Why is the saying «neither annihilation, nor origination, neither transient, nor eternal» not enough [for you]?
- 6.3. **Answer.** Those who believe in [some] essential nature teach that the entities really exist [just] because of the eight expressions such as «annihilation», etc., used [by Buddha] mostly for the sake of practical application. It is because of this that we deny the eight-folded, beginning with «annihilation». Thus, also those who rightly meditate or dispute on «reality» meditate and dispute relying on the meaning of «annihilation», etc.
- 6.9. For example, some people say that each entity is a continuous series of the momentarily appearing and disappearing elements.
- 6.11. Others say that Consciousness and Matter, these two are eternal.
- 6.12. Others say that nine substances, Earth, etc., are eternal.
- 6.13. Others say that six substantial entities, the Element, the Non-element, Space, Time, the Individual, the [personal] Soul, are eternal. Thus a lot of people dispute the identity of or the difference between [Personal] Soul and Body, fire and fuel, cause and effect, attribute and attributed, part and whole.

- 6.19. Thus some people say that the substance of a thing goes together with [its] mark. (?)
- 6.20. Others say that the Atom and the Intellect are immovable.
7. Others say that the [Personal] Soul and the Individual are movable. They also approve that after arriving at perfection they can rise. (?)
- 7.3. Therefore because of [their] meditating and disputing «reality» we deny the eight-folded, beginning with «annihilation».
- 7.4. **Opponent.** Well, why is «annihilation» first and «origination» [only] then denied?
- 7.5. If you think that it is «non-origination» that has to be said first, then we **answer:** This imputation is not correct. Why? Because while it is true that the experts in writing may connect the words, the syllables, and the letters in front and at the back, in other cases this [obligatory front or back-connection] is not true.
- 7.9. **Opponent.** Nevertheless if anything is produced, it will be annihilated. While if it is not [produced], it will not be [annihilated]. Being so, the only right order is to say «non-origination» first.
- 7.11. **Answer.** Fellows, give [us] please such an example which convinces us that there is origination first and [only] then there will be annihilation.
- 7.13. **Opponent.** Everything can serve as an example. Why? Because there is a saying that
- This birth is useless, since if there
is birth,
There will [also] be the enemies like
old age,
Disease, and the other sufferings binding
[us] to death.
- 7.17. **Answer.** If [you assume that] death is inherent in the birth, then too, you must think that death precedes [the birth]. If it were not preceded by death, the absurd consequence would follow that the course of existence has a beginning. But this cannot be approved. As the course of existence has neither a beginning, nor an end, therefore one can say neither that origination precedes, and annihilation follows, nor that annihilation precedes and origination follows.
- 8.4. And furthermore [the absurd consequence would follow that]
If birth comes first
And death follows,
Then birth should be devoid of death
And the immortal should also be born.

- 8.7. **Now then the opponent.** Another example is as follows:
 If there is no fear-inspiring birth,
 There will then be no uselessness [of it].
 As e.g. if there is no tree produced,
 The wind can carry no fire of the forest.
- 8.10. **Answer.** What is the particularity in this?
- 8.11. **Opponent.** The particularity is as follows: In this case production is not preceded by annihilation. Thus the tree will be annihilated [only] in other cases, [when it has already been produced], since in this case there is no (assumed) production [of it].
- 8.13. **Answer.** As in this case, too, [its] production will be preceded by the annihilation of the seed, therefore that will also be a production surely preceded by annihilation.
- 8.15. **Opponent.** It is not so. **Why?** Because the annihilated and the produced are surely different. It is not so, because in this case when the seed is annihilated, the sprout will arise. [i.e.] If the very sprout is annihilated, it is not the sprout that will arise [later].
- 8.19. **Answer.** It is surely so. **Why?** Because both in the case of birth and death, what is really extinguished will not be produced [again]. It is an absurd eternalism if [we suppose that] the same thing that is really extinguished will arise [again].
- 9.2. It is also disapproved [to assume] that he who is a divinity will surely become a divinity [again], and that which is an animal will surely become an animal [again]. Since if it were so, then birth would not be subjected to the Deeds and the passions, and men would not become deluded. Consequently, as you cannot say that the same thing that is really extinguished will arise [again], therefore it is surely so.
- 9.7. To assume hereupon that the annihilated and the produced are different is also [logically] incorrect. If the seed and the sprout, these two were different, then the practical application «cause and effect» could not exist either. Since this practical application exists, these two are not different.
- 9.11. Furthermore in connection with this, there are people who say: «Sowing seeds I have planted this tree, I have begotten this child. This tree is mine, this child is mine.» Well, if the tree or the child were different [from the seed], then these mundane practical applications could not exist. Since they exist, you cannot say that the seed and the sprout, these two are different.
- 9.17. And thus [the case] is as follows:
 The different is [imagined as being] different
 In relation to another thing.
 The non-different is [imagined as being]

Non-different from another thing.
That which is relative to something else
Cannot be different from it.

- 9.20. **Opponent.** Nevertheless if the seed exists it will be annihilated. While if it does not [exist], it will not be [annihilated]. Therefore in this case, too, origination comes first and annihilation follows.
- 10.2. **Answer.** But in the case of this seed, too, the seed's annihilation comes first. Why? Since thus neither the tree is different from the sprout, nor the seed is different from the tree, [it follows that] after the preceding annihilation of the seed [not only] the sprout [but] also the seed is produced.
- 10.7. Accordingly Master Āryadeva has said, too:
In the same way as in the seed-example
There is no [real] beginning,
There is no [real] cause.
Therefore there is no [real] origination.
- 10.10. Since in the case of origination and annihilation there is no real substance preceding or following, the imputation «why is annihilation denied first, and why is origination denied [only] later» is [logically] incorrect.
- 10.12. The Master has apprehended annihilation first and origination [only] thereafter in order to teach that in the case of these two [i.e. origination and annihilation] there is no real substance preceding or following.

EXAMINATION OF CAUSALITY

Chapter I

- 10.14. **Opponent.** Please show [us] first how the expression «production» is a mere practical application.
- 10.16. **Answer.** It is to be shown in the first place.
I. *There are no entities, nowhere and never, that arise either out of themselves, or out of (sg) different (from themselves), or out of both, or without a cause.*
11. I.e. to suppose, if some entity arises, that it has arisen either out of itself, or out of [sg] different [from itself], or out of both, or without a cause is unreasonable from every respect.
- 11.4. **Why?** «Out of itself» means out of its own self. Well, the entities do not arise out of their own selves at all, since [thus] their production would be useless and [their] production would go on ad infinitum. Thus, the entities, existing

already by themselves do not need to be produced again. If an [already] existing thing were to be produced again, then it would never be non-arising. And this is disapproved. Therefore the entities do not arise out of themselves at all.

11.11. Neither do they arise out of [sg] different [from themselves]. Why? Because [thus] the absurd consequence would follow that anything can arise out of anything.

11.13. Neither do they arise out of both [themselves and sg different from themselves], because both [of these suppositions] result in absurd consequences.

11.14. Neither do they arise without a cause, since [thus] the absurd consequence would follow that anything can be permanently arising out of anything and any beginning loses its meaning.

Thus since the production of the entities is disapproved from every respect, there is no production. Consequently the expression «production» is a mere practical application.

12.4. **Opponent.** [We admit that] the entities do not arise out of themselves; as it has already been explained, the sprout cannot arise out of the sprout itself. [We also admit] that if they do not arise out of themselves, then neither is it logically correct [to suppose] that they arise out of both [themselves and sg different from themselves], since one of them is invalidated. To assume because of this that they arise without a cause is very poor, therefore this is not admitted at all.

12.9. You have taken for certain that the entities surely do not arise out of [sg] different [from themselves]. We are to object to this saying.

II. *There are four [kinds of] conditions.*

The cause, the object, the immediately preceding,

And the predominant condition inclusive.

There is no fifth condition.

12.14. There is no fifth condition. Consequently, we take for certain that if any different from these four conditions is applied in practice by some master, then that is to be included in these four conditions. In order to point this out, the four conditions, such as cause condition, etc., are taught to be the conditions of the entities' production. [That is] the entities arise out of these four conditions.

13. Since the entities arise out of the four conditions, which are different [from the entities, produced], it is not correct that the entities surely do not arise out of [sg] different [from themselves].

13.4. **Answer.** If the four conditions such as cause condition, etc., of which you have formed the concept of being different, were [really] different from the

entities [produced], then the entities could also arise out of [sg] different [from themselves]. But it is [logically] impossible that they may be different. Why?

13.8. III. *In the conditions, etc., there is no Self-existence of the entities.*

If there is no entity, having an existence of its own

There can be no entity being different either.

That is, [co-]existing entities, being dependent upon each other, can be found to be different. As for example Gupta is different from Caitra, and Caitra is different from Gupta. [But] in the state when the conditions such as the seed, etc., are in the state of existence, the entities such as the sprout, etc., do not exist. If they do not have an existence of their own, how could the cause and the other conditions be different [from the entities, such as the sprout, not having yet an existence of their own]? Therefore it is impossible that the conditions such as the cause condition, etc., may be different from the entities such as the sprout, etc. Since there is absolutely no entity, being different, it is unreasonable [to say] that the entities arise out of [sg] different [from themselves].

14.4. Since other scriptural texts also consider the saying «in the conditions, etc. . . .» certain, therefore the production of the entities is taught to be impossible in other scriptural texts, too.

14.7. **Opponent.** If such conditions as Matter, etc., exist, sensation will arise, won't it?

Answer. It will not [arise]. Let us examine the production of the entities of this kind. If you approve that sensation, which is not yet produced, arises out of conditions, different [from it], then how could sensation, not yet produced, have an existence of its own? If there is no self-existence, there can be no different [from that] existence either. If there is no different [from that] existence, the matter is the same as with the sprout, etc.

14.13. Besides, there is another signification here. Neither is the self-existence of the entities in the conditions; nor [is it] in sg different from the conditions; nor [is it] in [the combination of] both. Why? Because to assume conditions of production involves the fallacy of purposelessness. Thus, if the entities have [already] self-existence either in the conditions, or in sg different from the conditions, or in [the combination of] both, then what is the use of producing something that [already] exists? To assume production of something that [already] exists by itself also involves purposelessness. What is the use of conditions in the case of an [already] existing thing? To assume conditions of production altogether involves purposelessness.

- 15.5. Consequently. In the conditions, etc., there is no self-existence of the entities.
That which is not in the conditions, etc., can have no existence of its own, since [as it has been proved above in the sprout and sensation example] there can be no assumption of being different from them.
- 15.9. If there is no entity having an existence of its own,
There can be no entity being different either.
If there is no entity having an existence of its own, then it is [logically] correct to ask which are those entities that will arise out of [sg] different [from themselves].
- 15.11. **Opponent.** It is not the point for us whether the entities arise out of themselves, or out of [sg] different [from themselves], etc. Thus, the organ of vision and the others are the causes of the energy, producing sensation. How? In this case the producing energy has a duration(?) and mostly ends in sensation. So, the organ of vision and the others are the creators of the producing energy. Since they are creators [of it], they are causes. As for example the energy of cooking having duration(?) mostly ends in cooked rice. We can see in the case of the cooked rice, too, that the [cooking] man, the pot, the water, the fire, the fireplace and the others, through the energy of their own, are the creators of the cooking energy.
- 16.4. **Answer.**
IV. No energy is inherent in the causes.
Here you say that the organ of vision and the others are the causes of sensation, since they are the creators of the energy, producing sensation. [And you say that] that [this very energy] ends in sensation. Concerning this, the organ of vision and the others cannot be its creators, since to assume an energy is [altogether] unreasonable.
- 16.10. Why? Because we answer [the following]. Here, does the producing energy end in a sensation, being not yet produced, or in a sensation, being already produced?
- 16.12. It cannot end in something that has not yet been produced, at all. Because it [i.e. producing energy] would have no place of rest. Thus, while the producing energy can end in the resting place of sensation, it cannot end in it if there exists no resting place. Consequently, if sensation has not yet been produced, neither can the energy exist. If it doesn't exist [yet], the producing energy cannot have a resting place in it.

- 16.16. Neither can the producing energy end in a sensation, being already produced. Why? Because sensation has already been produced. Thus, if it already exists, it is not to be produced again.
- 16.18. Neither is it possible to think hereupon that the producing energy exists when sensation is just being produced.
- 17.3. The producing energy doesn't exist [at all], since it is pointed out that the producing energy can end neither in anything that has already been produced, nor in anything that has not yet been produced. The [case of the] cooking energy is also elucidated by this. Consequently, it is unreasonable [to say] that the energy is inherent in the causes.
- 17.6. If hereupon you think that the energy exists without causes, we answer
IV. *No energy without causes.*
Thus, there is no energy without causes. If there were [energy without causes], then anything could permanently arise out of anything. And if it were so, any beginning would become meaningless. Neither can this be approved. Consequently, it is not reasonable [to say] that the energy is without causes.
- 17.12. **Opponent.** [Then] the causes exist alone [without energy]. Those [causes] existing, the entities become realized. The entities being realized, production is realized.
- 17.14. **Answer.**
IV. *No causes without energies.*
Those in which there is no energy are not causes. Why? [You have supposed that] the organ of vision and others are the causes of sensation, since they create the producing energy. We have pointed out formerly that in this case the [existence of the] producing energy is impossible. Since it cannot exist [at all], neither can it be created. Since it cannot be created, the organ of vision and the others cannot be the causes of the producing energy [non-existing]. If they are not the causes of the producing energy, how are they causes [at all]? If they were [still causes], then anything could be the cause of anything. And if it were so, then anything could arise out of anything. But it is not so. Consequently, those which are without energy are not causes.
- 18.7. **Opponent.** Do we say [at all] that the causes are without energy? Thus, the causes are surely together with energy.
- 18.9. **Answer.**
IV. *(No causes) together with energy either.*
The negation «no» is to be attached to this [from the previous verse]. There are no causes together with energy. Indeed, it has formerly been pointed out that there are no energies inherent in the causes and that there are no energies without causes. If there is no energy, the causes cannot be together

with energy. Thus, to assume causes is [altogether] useless, since it is impossible for the causes to be either without or together with energy.

18.17. **Opponent.** What is the use of the unnecessary pondering whether the causes are without, or together with energy? Since the entities arise in a dependence upon the four conditions, cause condition, etc., therefore they are the causes of the entities.

19.2. **Answer.** You strike the air with your fists. Surely, no producing energy exists, and since it doesn't exist, the [existence of the] causes is also impossible. If this has already been pointed out formerly, then it is not reasonable to say that the entities arise in co-ordination with them.

19.6. And furthermore,

V. Since in co-ordination with these (the entities) arise,

These are called causes.

How, that these are non-causes

Until (the entities) do not arise.

19.9. If you assume that these are causes, since in co-ordination with these [the entities] arise, then why do not you also assume that these will be non-causes until [the entities] do not arise?

Neither is it reasonable [to suppose] that something which is non-cause first, becomes later a cause. Why? Neither can this be approved, because the absurd consequence follows that anything can become the cause of anything.

19.14. You may think that this doesn't result in the absurd consequence that anything can become the cause of anything, since they, though being first non-causes, after having been co-ordinated with something else, become causes. But the same happens in this case, too. Let a non-cause also become a cause after being co-ordinated with anything, yet also in that very cause [co-ordination] there should be a really existing cause and [thus] in this case, too, one must think like that.

19.18. The fallacy of perpetuity also follows [from your assumption]. If [we suppose that] anything, after being co-ordinated with anything else, can become a cause, then that [co-ordinated cause] again is to be co-ordinated with anything else, and that [doubly co-ordinated cause] again is to be co-ordinated with anything else. Since this would be an absurd perpetuity, neither can this be approved. Consequently, the [the existence of the] causes is impossible.

20.2. And furthermore,

VI. Neither a non-existing thing,

Nor an existing thing can have a cause.

If non-existing, whose will be the cause?

If existing, what is the use of the cause?

20.6. «Being co-ordinated with this, that will arise.» Owing to this connection you say that this is the cause of that thing. [But] what do you suppose? Is the this-that connection the cause of a not [yet] existing thing, or an [already] existing thing? It is not possible for «this» to be the cause either of a non-existing thing, or an existing thing.

20.9. Why?

If non-existing, whose will be
the cause?

If existing, what is the use of
the cause?

If you think that a non-existing entity can have a cause, then [we ask] whose will be this cause? What comment should we offer besides? According to this it would be [logically] correct to say that the threads are the causes of the not [yet] existing cloth.

20.13. **Opponent.** From the threads cloth is produced; therefore, in consequence of its later production, it is possible to point out that the threads are the causes of the cloth.

20.15. **Answer.** Do you accept in anticipation that if a virgin obtains property, the [future] mother obtains it. We say that it is impossible for a non-existing entity to have a cause. Since the [existence of the] cause is impossible, you, while denying the real production of the entities, approve that [a «cause»] becomes a [real] cause [just] by the future production of an entity.

20.18. [But] if the fact is established that there is nowhere and never any [real] production of the entities and that

If non-existing, whose will be
the cause?

then wherefrom does your cause, depending [just] on the future production of the entity, become real? Consequently, this is a very poor [assumption].

21.4. If you hereupon think that it may be the cause of an [already] existing thing, we answer

If existing, what is the use of
the cause?

If an entity [already] exists, the [existence of the] cause is impossible. Thus, if anything [already] exists, what is the use of the cause? It is not correct to say that the threads are the causes of the prepared and existing cloth.

21.9. **Opponent.** We do not say that the energy of the causes is in the thing produced. Nevertheless, you impute us for saying that the threads are the causes of the existing cloth. [But] the causes of the cloth are the threads.

21.12. **Answer.** Do you think of your son's marriage if you have not married a girl? If an entity [already] exists, [to assume] a producing cause is unreasonable. Since the cause [of an existing thing] is unreasonable, you, while denying the real production of the entities, approve to point out [just] a producing cause. And thus, at first it has to be conceived so that it should accomplish the production of the entity. After this it becomes [also] reasonable that it is the cause of that.

Therefore this is also very poor [assumption].

21.17. **Opponent.** Concerning this, when the essence of the entities unfolds itself, it is the cause that accomplishes [this]. Thus, the essence of the cause also having been pointed out, the cause of a real essence exists.

22.3 **Answer.**

VIII. *If neither an existing, nor a non-existing,
Nor an existing — non-existing element unfolds itself at all,
Then to assume a producing cause
Is impossible.*

22.6. Concerning this [the question arises, whether] the element, which is to be produced by the cause, is [already] existing, or not [yet] existing, or existing — non-existing [at the same time] before its production. None of these aspects is reasonable.

22.8. That is it doesn't produce any existing thing at all, since it has [once] already been produced. Thus, if something [already] exists, what is the use of its being produced again? Supposing also an existing thing might be produced again, then it would never become non-arising. Consequently, neither can this be approved.

22.10. Neither is it possible to point out the causes. That is, if something [already] exists, what is the use of the cause? Thus it doesn't produce any existing thing at all.

Well then, neither can it produce any non-existing thing, because it doesn't exist. Supposing also the non-existing thing might have a [producing] cause, then a horn of the rabbit could also be produced.

To suppose that an entity arises out of the cause is impossible. Because the [existence of the] cause is impossible. Thus, if an entity doesn't exist, then whose will be the cause, and what cause [will be]?

22.16. And furthermore, how does a «cause» become a cause? Thus, if there exists no entity at all, then the particularization «this is a cause and that is not a cause» cannot hold truth. Therefore neither can it produce any non-existing thing.

23.2. Now then, neither can it produce any existing — non-existing thing, since the co-existence of the existing and the non-existing is contradictory, and

because [from both of these assumptions] absurd consequences have been deduced above.

Accordingly, it can produce neither an existing, nor a non-existing thing. Therefore if it is altogether unreasonable [to suppose] that an entity unfolds itself.

23.6. Then to assume a producing cause

Is impossible.

Then to assume a cause, which is producing, is impossible.

23.8. **Opponent.** But the object-condition exists, since it is the basis of consciousness and the others.

23.9. **Answer.**

VIII. *Without an object an existing element*

Is spoken of.

Now, «combined with an object» is the opposite of [this] word. It is just because of the object that an existing element can be said to have an object. [So] you arbitrarily state that the existing element has an object, if there is no object.

23.14. Why? Here «combined with an object» means that the object exists. If the element exists it can have an object, while if it doesn't [exist] it cannot have [any object]. Since there is no object before the «combination with the object», the element [then] has no object.

23.18. Thus for example if there is property, there can be «combination with property» and property-owner. If anybody exists he can have property, while if one doesn't [exist] one cannot have [any]. Nobody can have property before «the combination with the property», since [then] there is no property. Therefore you assume according to your own imagination that the element, which is really without an object, has an object.

24.6. We are hereupon to answer

VIII. *If so the element has no object first,*

Then how will it later have an object?

24.8. The word «if so» is for a question. «How will» is for a reason. Thus if an element is real without having an object, then why do you assume the unnecessary object?

24.10. **Opponent.** You wrongly conceive [things], since you have not really understood the Scriptures. We do not say that in the case of an existing object «the combination with the object» is the same as the «combination with property».

24.13. What we mean is the following. When an element arises, it is produced by a support. [And] that [support] is its object. Consequently, we say that it is combined with an object.

- 24.15. **Answer.** It is unreasonable. We are to answer also for this,
 If so the element has no object first,
 Then how will it later have an object?
- 24.18. If so the element cannot exist and cannot be real without an object, then
 wherefrom can the object come to exist? Certainly, neither can the object of
 the element become real. If it doesn't become real and doesn't exist,
 wherefrom will the object come to exist. If the object doesn't exist, how can
 the element be produced by the object? Consequently, if the object doesn't
 exist, surely neither can the element be combined with the object.
- 25.4. **Opponent.** The immediately preceding annihilation of one entity is a
 condition of the production of the other [entity]. This is the immediately
 preceding [condition] of that. This exists.
- 25.6. **Answer.**
*IX. If no entities are produced,
 Neither is it possible for them to pass away.
 Therefore there can be no immediately preceding (cond.).
 If they were still to pass away, what would be the cause?*
- 25.9. Let us see in due order what is fundamental and what is subsequent
 concerning [this verse]:
 It they were still to pass away,
 what would be the cause?
 Therefore there can be no
 immediately preceding [conds].
- 25.11. We must see that the expression «if still . . .» refers to the non-produced.
 And regarding that they are said to be non-produced, [to the verse]
 If they were still to pass away,
 what would be the cause?
 «what would be the cause of something that is not produced» can be
 attached. For the sake of versification these two [fundamental and
 subsequent thoughts] are not arranged in due order.
- 25.16. You say that the immediately preceding annihilation of one entity is a
 condition of the production of the other. This is not reasonable. Why?
 Thus,
- 25.18. If no entities are produced,
 Neither is it possible for them
 to pass away.
 If they were still to pass away,
 what would be the cause?
- 26.3. There is no annihilation. If the seed must be annihilated before the
 production of the sprout, i.e. the seed is annihilated and [therefore] doesn't

exist, then what will be the cause of the sprout, produced? And furthermore, what is the cause of the annihilation of the seed?

If the seed is annihilated and doesn't exist at all, then how can it be the cause of the production of the sprout? And how can the annihilation of the seed be the cause of the non-production of the sprout? Therefore your supposition that the seed having been annihilated, the sprout is produced, results in the absurd consequence that both [annihilation and production] are without a cause. It cannot be approved that anything should be without a cause.

26.10. **Opponent.** Even if the seed has been annihilated immediately when the sprout is produced, the immediately preceding [condition] exists. Since thus the seed's annihilation, immediately following the production of the sprout, becomes the cause.

26.13. **Answer.** Neither can this be approved. Why? Even if it [i.e. the sprout] is produced, how will it [that is the seed's annihilation] be a cause? And what will be the cause of the [seed's] annihilation if [you suppose that] the seed is [immediately] annihilated when the sprout is produced, i.e. when the producing energy has [already] been exhausted. And what will be the cause of the sprout's production? Therefore in this case, too, the absurd consequence follows that as above both [production and annihilation] are without a cause.

26.18. You may think that the absurdity of «without a cause» doesn't follow, since the sprout is produced when the seed is just being annihilated. But neither is this possible. Why? Because both the annihilated and the produced exist [at the same time]. Since the one is not [yet] annihilated, and the other is [already] produced. If both the entities exist, how can there be an immediately preceding condition? [Thus] even if you suppose that both production and annihilation happen at the same time, the immediately preceding condition is impossible. Because it is simultaneity.

27.6. Therefore there can be no
immediately preceding [cond.].

Thus, we have examined the immediately preceding condition in every respect and it [proved to be] impossible. Therefore what you say, that there is an immediately preceding condition, is unreasonable.

27.9. And furthermore, there is some other signification here. That is, it has formerly been proved that no entity is [really] produced; since it is a well-known fact that no entity is [really] produced, we say

If no entities are produced,
Neither is it possible for them to
pass away.

- 27.13. If the entities are not produced, if they do not exist, it is then impossible [for them] to pass away. If they do not exist, what is to pass away?
 Therefore there can be no immediately preceding [cond.].
 Thus, since it is impossible for the entities to pass away, the immediately preceding condition is impossible.
- 27.17. Even if you assume now that they may pass away, the immediately preceding condition is impossible. Why?
 If they were still to pass away, what would be the cause?
- 27.20. Even if they [i.e. the entities] were produced, how would their annihilation be a cause? The meaning of this has already been explained formerly.
28. **Opponent.** But the predominant condition exists. The predominant condition is the entity, dominating. In short:
 This existing, that will [also] arise.
 This not existing, neither will that arise.
 If so, this is the predominant condition of that.
- 28.4. **Answer.**
*X. If being deprived of self-being,
 The entities have no real existence,
 Then (the model) «this being, that (also) arises»
 Is unreasonable.*
- 28.7. Concerning this, we have already given first an overall, and then a detailed explanation about the entities, being deprived of self-existence. Therefore we have taken it as a well-known fact, and say that the entities are deprived of self-being.
 Thus, since the real existence of the entities, i.e. a really existing entity is impossible, there is no entity of which we could say that «this being, that [also] arises». If in this case the «this being» doesn't exist, then it is impossible [to say] that «that [also] arises». If in this case the [model] «this being, that [also] arises» is unreasonable, then what and whose will be the predominant condition? Consequently, neither is the predominant condition possible.
- 28.16. **Opponent.** Though thus it cannot be said that the entities are produced by the causes, nevertheless the causes do exist. Why? Because the effect arises out of them. Concerning this, it can be experienced that such results as the sprout, etc., arise out of such causes as the seed, etc. Since it can be

experienced that the result arises out of them, these are known to be the causes of the result.

29.2. **Answer.**

XI. *Indeed, neither separately in the conditions,
Nor in the whole of them does the result exist.
How can that which is not in the conditions
Arise out of the conditions?*

29.5. The word «indeed» means «surely». Surely neither separately in them does it exist, surely nor in the whole of them does it exist. This is meant.

29.7. You point out that a result arises in order that the conditions be real. But if this is impossible, then wherefrom is the reality of the conditions? Why? Surely neither separately in the conditions, nor in the whole of them does the result [pre-] exist. Consequently, how could that which surely doesn't exist neither separately in them, nor in the whole of them arise out of them? If the result does not arise [at all], wherefrom is then the reality of the causes?

29.12. You may hereupon think that the result surely [pre-]exists in the conditions. But in this case, too, the [existence of the] conditions is impossible. If it thus [pre-]exists [in the conditions] then the conditions are out of action. Since something that has already been produced does not need to be produced again.

29.15. And furthermore, supposing the result [pre-] exists in the causes, there will be two alternatives in the case of a result, having several causes. Does the complete, whole of the result, or only a part of it [pre-]exist in each single [cause]?

29.18. If you hereupon suppose that in each single [cause] the complete, whole of it [pre-]exists, then there will be no several causes. Since in each single [cause] the [complete, whole] result exists, the absurd consequence follows that a [complete, whole] result arises out of each [of the causes] independently [of each other].

30. If you assume that only a part of the result [pre-]exists in [each of] the causes, then, too, the absurd consequence follows that a part of the result arises out of each [of the causes] independently [of each other]. Neither can this be approved. Therefore neither separately in the conditions, nor in the whole of them is it possible for the result to [pre-]exist.

30.5. You may think that even if the result does not [pre-]exist in the causes, it arises out of the causes. If you with regard to the production of the result think that your cause is real, then we are to **answer**:

30.8. XII. *Supposing out of the causes arises
What does not even exist (in them).
Why does it then not arise
Out of non-causes, too?*

- 30.10. That is, if you with regard to the existing result make distinction between causes and non-causes, then [we say that] the result [pre-]exists neither in the causes, nor in the non-causes. If without [pre-]existing in them, the result arises out of the causes, then why does it not arise out of non-causes, too? Thus, since the result [pre-]exists neither in the causes, nor in the non-causes alike, therefore to say that the result arises out of the causes, and does not arise out of the non-causes is nothing else than the fancy of your mind. Consequently, the production of the result is impossible. If no result is produced, wherefrom is the reality of the causes?
- 30.18. **Opponent.** The matter is not that whether [pre-]existing or not [pre-]existing in the causes the result arises out of the causes.
- 30.19. We say that the result is of causes, i.e. it is composed of the causes' [own] selves. And if it is so, the cloth is of threads, i.e. it is composed of the threads' [own] selves. Therefore the threads are the causes of the cloth.
- 31.3. **Answer.**
*XIII. While the result is a composition of the causes,
 The causes are not composed of their own selves.
 How can the result, which is of non-self-composed,
 Be a composition of the causes?*
- 31.6. If you assume that the result is of causes, i.e. it is a composition of the causes' selves, then [we say that] the causes are not of their own selves, they themselves have no ultimate reality, they do not possess their own selves, they are not composed of their own selves, and are devoid of self-nature. If you assume that the result is composed of such causes which are not of their own selves, which themselves have no ultimate reality, which do not possess their own selves, which are not composed of their own selves, which are devoid of self-nature, then how can you form the concept «cause-composed»?
- 31.12. Thus, if the threads themselves had ultimate reality, they could then be self-composed. And if it were so, it would also be possible for the cloth to be composed of the threads. If the threads themselves have no ultimate reality, if they are not composed of their own selves, if they are devoid of self-nature, and if [they themselves] are of warps and are composed of the warps' own selves, then how is it possible for the cloth to be composed of the threads?
- 31.19. It is said by Āryadeva, too:
 If the cloth is made of threads
 And the threads [again] are made of
 something else,

How can that which is not made of
its own self

Produce anything, different
[from «itself»]?

- 32.2. Thus, since the causes themselves have no ultimate reality, and are not composed of their own selves, and are devoid of self-nature,
- 32.4. XIV. *Therefore there is no cause-composed.*
No result is composed of causes.
If you hereupon think that the result may be composed of non-causes, then we answer:
XIV. *There is no result, composed of non-causes.*
- 32.9. [Even] if it is impossible for the cloth to be composed of the threads, how would it be possible [to say] contrary to the general opinion that the cloth is composed [e.g.] of the whitish colour.
Consequently, neither is there any result, composed of non-causes.
- 32.12. **Opponent.** The causes do exist. Why? Because [what is] the non-cause is certain. That is, it can be seen what is certainly a cause or non-cause.
Surely it is oil and never butter that is produced from oleaginous seeds. Surely, it is butter and never oil that is produced from curd, [and] neither of them is produced from the grains of sand.
Since thus the matter is that the oleaginous seeds and the curd are the causes of oil and butter respectively, but they are not the causes of butter and oil respectively, therefore the cause really exists.
- 33.3. **Answer.**
XIV. *If no result exists (at all),
Wherefrom is there then a cause or a non-cause?*
- 33.5. Here you have given the production and the non-production of such results as oil, etc., as reasons for the certainty of what is a cause and what is a non-cause. [But] it has already been pointed out formerly that the production of the result does not exist. If no result exists [at all], wherefrom will there be a cause or a non-cause? Consequently, if the [existence of the] result is those? Both cause and non-cause exist [only] with regard to the result. But the result does not exist. If no result exists[at all], wherefrom will there be a cause or a non-cause? Consequently, if the [existence of the] result is impossible, neither can causes or non-causes then exist.
Since there is neither result, nor cause, nor non-cause, the expression «production» has proved to be a mere application.

THE FORMATION OF TANGUT STATEHOOD AS SEEN BY CHINESE HISTORIOGRAPHERS*

BY

MARY FERENCZY (Budapest)

Sources written in Tangut script and language are undoubtedly the primary means for understanding Hsi Hsia history and culture. However, as the majority of these sources still awaits deciphering, the information gained from them is so far of a partial nature, and it is worthwhile to read and re-read what the Chinese historians had to say on this topic.¹ Despite their way of looking at Hsi Hsia history, at the Hsi Hsia Empire from «above» and from without, these records — so to say — explain many things contained in the Hsi Hsia sources, and are likely to add rewarding ideas regarding their interpretation.

It is known that the outstanding works of Sung and Yüan historiography, which contain the majority of the source materials in question, e.g. the dynastic histories (正史 *chêng shih* — but also encyclopaedias, 類書 *lei shu* and the handbooks for administration, 政書 *chêng shu*) were all compiled with a common purpose: following different schemes they all aimed to pass on to future generations of government officials everything which was considered essential for maintaining order inside and outside the Empire (i.e. in the world) and for the glorification of the ruling dynasty. Their authors had a rich choice of information at their disposal as source material: in addition to the regularly (and secretly) kept records of the imperial court, the written documents of the huge government administration, quantities of reports, memorials, projects, circulars, and rescripts, etc. The methods of compilation were also elaborated by the practice of a thousand years: it was not customary to make abstracts from the documents used, the historians looked for passages considered characteristic and important, and then copied them verbatim one after another in a loose chronological order, distributed according to different

* Based on a paper read at the 1979 Kőrösi Csoma Symposium at Csopak (Hungary).

¹ About the recent standing of researches into Hsi Hsia history and Tangut culture cf. the imposingly rich bibliography by Luc Kwanten and Susan Hesse, *Tangut (Hsi Hsia) Studies: a Bibliography*, in: *Indiana University Uralic and Altaic Series*, Vol. 137., Bloomington 1980. Out of the historical surveys of general nature based on Chinese sources, the pioneering work of E. I. Kychanov should be mentioned: E. И. Кычанов, *Очерк истории тангутского государства*, Москва 1961. On the pre-dynastic phases of Tangut history, 岡崎精郎 Okazaki Seirō's book offers a wealth of information: *Historical Study of Pre-dynastic Tangut* (in Japanese), in: *Tōyōshi kenkyū shōkan* No. 27., Kyōtō 1972. The latest monograph on Hsi Hsia history worthy of attention is 西夏史稿 *Hsi Hsia shih kao* by 吳天墀 Wu T'ien-ch'ih (Ch'engtu 1980).

topics, without any reference to their sources. The last chapters of the dynastic histories in which the barbarian peoples (the Tanguts among them) and their relationships with China are described, were also compiled in this manner.²

Furthermore it is known that while the official history of the Sung dynasty was compiled by the office of historiographers under the direction of 脫脫 T'o-t'o and 歐陽玄. Ou-yang Hsüan, involving work of several decades, at the same time the official histories of both the Liao and the Chin dynasty were compiled by them.³ Each of these official histories contain a chapter — or even two chapters — dealing with the Tanguts and the Hsi Hsia respectively; these chapters are both the first and the longest ones among those dealing with the barbarian peoples.

At the time when these official histories were compiled, the Hsi Hsia state had already ceased to exist. This important neighbour, political rival and enemy of the Sung Empire, nevertheless, left a rich cultural heritage of a people that was certainly known by the historians. How did they assess the Tanguts and the Hsi Hsia Empire? Which aspects of the formation of Tangut statehood did they register? Which criteria and peculiarities did they describe? Upon a closer scrutiny of the relevant passages — first of all the Ch. 485–486 of the 宋史 *Sung shih* entitled 西夏國 *Hsi Hsia kuo*, the following is found:

1. The history of the country, i.e. Hsi Hsia kuo was considered to be identical with the ruling dynasty and its ancestors. (This implies the acknowledgement of Hsi Hsia state sovereignty.) For the time before the foundation of the Empire, this means the history of the leading clan of the tribal aristocracy. This method of presentation is merely a natural outcome of the traditional Chinese manner of thinking, which never made a distinction between a totality and its representative part.

2. This is the reason why Ch. 491 of the *Sung shih* contains an independent 党項傳 *Tang-hsiang chuan* (pp. 12a–24b in the *Po-na* ed.).⁴ This chapter contains all the records of punitive expeditions on the part of the Chinese, and of local

² For a detailed analysis of this procedure cf. E. Balazs, *L'histoire comme guide de la pratique bureaucratique (les monographies, les encyclopédies, les recueils de statuts)*, in: *Historians of China and Japan*, ed. by W. Beasley and E. G. Pulleyblank, London 1961, pp. 78–94, and Lien-sheng Yang, *The Organization of Chinese Official Historiography: Principles and Methods of the Standard Histories from the T'ang through the Ming dynasty*, *ibid.* pp. 44–59.

³ Cf. 四庫全書總目提要 *Ssü-k'u ch'üan shu tsung-mu t'i-yao* II., pp. 1008–1010.; 金毓黻 *Chin Yü-fu*, 中國史學史 *Chung-kuo shih-hsüeh shih*, Shanghai 1957. pp. 106–111.; 范文蘭 *Fan Wen-lan*, 正史考略 *Chêng shih k'ao lüeh*, Peip'ing 1931. pp. 214–241.

⁴ Here and in the following the *Po-na* editions were used. In translating the passages cited below the *Po-na* texts were collated with the Palace editions (*Chung-hua shu-chü* facsimile ed.). I hope to publish an annotated translation of these texts in the near future.

diplomatic actions at the frontiers, which did not fit into the history of the leading clan. Nevertheless, they describe related tribes, the same habitation areas, even the very same events which the main text in the *Hsi Hsia kuo* chapter did, — only this time these are treated from the angle of a rival tribe, which had contacts with China, first exactly at the time of the Tangut tribal quarrels. The last date contained in the *Tang-hsiang chuan* is the 5th year of 天禧 T'ien-hsi (1021)⁵; judging from the data contained in these histories, the Tangut tribes did not ask for individual contacts with China after this date, since then the supremacy of the future imperial dynasty was already firmly established over them.⁶

3. The history of the leading clan as noted down in Ch. 485–486 on closer scrutiny can be seen to be a series of biographies of prominent chieftains following the stereotypes of traditional Chinese biographical writing.⁷ In conformity with this pattern, they start with a concise summary of the family background — in this case relating those ancestors who swore allegiance to the T'ang dynasty, and later came to help the Chinese emperor with their armies against Huang Ch'ao around 880, or who entered Chinese service. The enumeration of the deeds of the individual heroes within these biographies makes them units independent from one another; chronological sequence is observed within these units only. The very same events — tribal quarrels threatening the peace of the borderlands — are described, e.g. both in the biographies of two rival cousins, within one and the same chapter (the biographies of 繼捧 Chi-p'eng and 繼遷 Chi-ch'ien contain at least four parallel passages) — without any reference to a correlation of the respective parts.⁸

⁵ *Sung shih* Ch. 491, 24b.

⁶ This is the very same reason why the name Tang-hsiang is met in the *Liao shih* Ch. 115 at a later date also (cf. 8a–9b); there were certain tribes/clans in the times of Yüan-hao and even of his successor that passed under Khitan rule, then returned to the Hsi Hsia, etc., i.e. they represented a distinct political force, although locally. Cf. K. A. Wittfogel–Fêng Chia-shêng, *History of Chinese Society Liao*, Philadelphia 1949, pp. 97, 104, 589.

⁷ The sequence and size of these biographies might be described as follows: the first person mentioned is 李彝興 Li Yi-hsing (Ch. 485, 2a line 6–3a l. 2: within this a retrospection on the ancestors known from earlier historiographers is contained in 2a l. 6 to 2b l. 2). Then follow two descendants of minor importance (克睿 K'o-jui: 3a l. 2–3a l. 6; 繼均 Chi-yün: 3a l. 6–3b l. 1); then the biography of Chi-p'eng (3b l. 1–5a l. 10; with him the account on the lineage removed to China is ended); Chi-ch'ien, a cousin of Chi-p'eng, his rival and political adversary is presented after him (5a l. 10–9a l. 8; out of this, the first four lines of p. 5b give an account of ancestors considered worthy in Chinese eyes); after the biography of the son of Chi-ch'ien, 德明 Teh-ming (9a l. 8–12b l. 8) there follows the biography of his grandson, the first Tangut emperor (12b l. 8–21b l. 8) in which not only the deeds of the emperor, but also a description of the conditions of the empire is given.

⁸ In the biographies of Chi-p'eng and Chi-ch'ien several episodes run parallel (in addition, the two texts are besides complementary to each other) e.g. the escape of Chi-ch'ien from being transported to China in 982. (Chi-p'eng named here 保忠 Pao-chung was this time on the Chinese side: 4b l. 3–5 and 5a l. 10–6b l. 3 resp.); the raid of 靈州 Lingchou in 994 (4b l. 6–7 and 6b l. 7–8 resp.), etc.

4. A comparison of the *Sung shih* chapters referred to above with Ch. 115 of the 遼史 *Liao shih* and Ch. 134 of the 金史 *Chin shih* shows that, while following the principles described above, the pertaining material is divided among the historical works in such a way as to emphasize the relations to the respective dynasty; they are thus complementary to each other, even regarding political history.

5. In the handling of source materials, certain peculiarities can be noticed: some short records, composed in a chronicle style are sometimes abbreviated beyond recognition. Text parallels in some cases offer a solution for this condensation: dwelling on military or diplomatic failures would not have enhanced the glory of the Sung dynasty. On the other hand, everything related to and connected with the Sung (or with the Liao or Chin resp.) administration activities is amply dealt with, almost beyond proportions (e.g. lists of dignitaries, of gifts, letters of appointment, brevets, imperial edicts, and sometimes the very words of the (Sung) emperor, — these passages are immediately recognizable by their style). The biographies of the Tangut emperors show traces of literary efforts, e.g. in the description of 元昊 Yüan-hao, the ruler who declared the sovereignty of the Tangut Empire.⁹

6. Following a pattern laid down by 司馬遷 Ssü-ma Ch'ien, a comprehensive description of the people, and their customs is also given. However, this descriptive part in the *Sung shih* is placed at the ending of the *Hsi Hsia kuo* chapters, contrary to tradition, before the stereotyped historical appraisal, 論 *lun* (cf. Ch. 486, 23a–25a).¹⁰ This part consists of a loose sequence of data coming apparently from a variety of sources and over a comparatively wide span of time. It deals with the administrative division, the main local products, the methods of warfare, the weapons used, and a variety of customs. Passages similar in content are also scattered throughout the biographical parts; the occurrence of the latter is apparently due to the fact that the historiographers, while describing the activities

⁹ *Sung shih* Ch. 485, 12b–13a, with abbreviations: «(Yüan-hao) was fearless and vigorous, a man of many resources. He was good at painting, and had creative talents (?). His face was round, the nose big, was taller than five feet. As a youngster he preferred to wear red robes with long sleeves with black hats. He wore a bow and arrows at his waist, and was escorted by guardsmen who held a blue canopy over his head. While riding out he was escorted by more than hundred riders with two flags. He was versed in the teaching of Buddha from the beginning and knew both barbarian and Chinese writing. He had books of law on his desk, and these he always took with himself, even while fighting in the wilderness. . . . He often remonstrated with his parents for being subjected to the Sung. His father admonished him at once by saying: 'We spent a long time in wars and are exhausted; nevertheless, our clan wears robes of brocade and silk since thirty years, and this was done by the favours of the Sung. It is impossible for us to become disloyal!' Yüan-hao answered: 'We should better wear skins and furs, and attend to grazing our herds as is befitting to our barbarian character. Why should brocade and silk be needed for living a life of heroes, for becoming a hegemon?'"»

¹⁰ In *Liao shih* Ch. 115, however, this description is to be found in its traditional place (5a–6a); the text is partly identical with that of the *Sung shih*.

of the Tangut emperors were mainly interested in the external phenomena of state organization and administration. Thus the imperial edicts, the appointment of dignitaries, the creation of institutions, the establishment of state ceremony (e.g. in the form of recording the order of robes of state), etc. Although these fragmentary lists are inserted in the text in a rather accidental way, a detailed collation of the respective texts and passages, moreover the clues gained from the analysis of certain unguarded expressions occurring in the description of events, sometimes offer an otherwise unexpected insight into the historical background. To cite a few instances.

1. The political career of the leading clan, i.e. of the future imperial dynasty is described in connection with its relationship with the Sung (or with the Liao resp.) emperors. Therefore this process is reflected in the text mainly by the passages about conferring titles, bestowing grants on the Tangut chieftains or endowing them with the tax revenues of a number of families. The lists of these titles, grants and endowments reflect a tendency to become longer and more complex each year, on each occasion. The lords of 夏州 Hsia-chou are granted titles more and more elevated by the Sung emperors, even titles of court officials. At the same time, it is apparent from these data that these dignities of the Tangut chieftains were in fact hereditary, the Sung emperors expressed their approval only subsequently, the holders of these titles and ranks never appeared before the Sung emperor to be invested with the office. Even the quantity of gifts, with which the «loyalty» of these «officials» was rewarded, increased. These were, in fact, the price paid for the peace year by year. Moreover, although the passages relating to borderland warfare did their best to cover up defeats suffered by the Chinese, they still reveal the fact that the Tangut military ventures become larger and larger. The preponderance of the Tangut victories, compared to the other powers of the area, is registered in each of the sources. The process of the merging of the various Tangut tribes into the future Empire, their alliance to or their subjugation by each other, however, is reflected in the sources only indirectly. Certain conclusions concerning this process can be drawn from the descriptions presented above or by an analysis of the structure of the text (cf. above on the *Tang-hsiang chuan*).

2. From a short passage (the message of which, however, is stressed by its dialogue form) it is apparent that land was regarded by the Tanguts as a basis of power (similarly to nomadic societies in general). The aim of Chi-ch'ien when calling the Tanguts to arms was not to rescue his mother and his wife from captivity, nor did he want to avenge the wrongs done to his people. He wanted to reconquer

the land once possessed by his ancestors.¹¹ — This way of thinking among nomads is referred to in Chinese historiography as early as Ssü-ma Ch'ien.¹²

3. The military organization of the Tangut tribes is not described in the sources, although its efficiency is represented rather impressively in the description of their military successes. Still, the description of Yüan-hao's activities and of his career culminating in ascending the imperial throne, offers a glimpse of the historic event, when the various tribes and clans go to war in detachments showing round numbers of pants warriors participating, and the administrative centres developing into territorial ones.¹³ In any event, these developments were important episodes in the development of statehood. Perhaps it is not too far-fetched to adduce here a (regrettably rather brief) passage, according to which Yüan-hao (while organizing state bureaucracy and military campaigns) «contracted alliance with the aristocracy by performing ceremony of oath (歃 *ch'a*)».¹⁴ I am inclined to interpret this passage as an effort on the part of Yüan-hao to strengthen the elements of statehood with the aid of tribal traditions (already in decay?).

4. From the description of the various measures taken by Yüan-hao between 1032 and 1038, and the enumeration of the various offices, the gradual building up of a state bureaucracy is clearly observable. A parallel evolution of the civil and the military organization is apparent, even to the degree of becoming over-complicated. In the summary judgement of the historiographers «the system of administration and the government of the Hsi Hsia were identical with those of the Sung in many aspects. In court ceremonies, the ceremonies of both the T'ang and

¹¹ *Sung shih* Ch. 485, 6a: (Having been defeated in 984 by 尹憲 Yin Hsien, then Chinese governor of Hsia-chou) «the people of rank [his suite] were addressed by Chi-ch'ien in the following way: 'The land on the West was in the possession of the Li family since many generations, and now it is taken from us. Do you remember the [favours granted by the] Li clan and are you willing to follow me in order to re-establish its power?' — 'Yes!' — was the answer.»

¹² Cf. 史記 *Shi chi* Ch. 110, p. 19, cf. 瀧川 龜太郎 Takigawa Kametarō, 史記會注考證 *Shih chi hui chu k'ao chêng* (T'aipei 1979. ed.) p. 1158.

¹³ At the beginning of the 11th century, Chi-ch'ien, while organizing a raid he still «gathered the barbarian tribes», «the clans living at the frontier» (cf. e.g. *Sung shih* Ch. 485, 6b, 8b). His grandson, Yüan-hao also «led the chieftains in person every time when going to war», but in this latter case the defence of the frontier and the garrisons were organized territorially (following the cardinal points or the regions in danger — twelve military centres (監軍司 *chien-chün-sū*) were established, armies thirty, fifty and seventy thousand strong are mentioned in the text). «Out of the aristocrats, a detachment of guards is organized» (cf. Ch. 485, 15a–15b) in addition to the strong garrison of the capital. According to the same text, the chieftains were called to arms by Yüan-hao with a silver 牌子 *p'ai-tzu*. — The passages cited above are not entirely unequivocal: it is impossible to establish whether the chieftains and the aristocrats mentioned above were identical with the leaders of the detachments organized on a territorial basis or not. Still, a change in organization is clearly perceptible. It is to be hoped that more information can be gathered from inside sources.

¹⁴ Cf. *Sung shih* Ch. 485, 15b.

the Sung were used jointly.»¹⁵ From the descriptions, however, certain differences are not only immediately apparent, but also another interesting fact: it was noticed by the Chinese historiographers themselves that members of the leading Tangut clan, who held high Chinese offices and dignities and lived partly in a Chinese environment, to a large extent made use of the Chinese bureaucracy with the aim to circumventing its supremacy.

There are, unfortunately, no detailed data about the functions of the various offices, however, it can clearly be seen that the highest posts could be held by Tanguts only (at least in the 11th century), the lower offices, on the other hand, could also be held both by the Tangut or Chinese (or Uighur, etc., for that matter) subjects of the Tangut ruler. Whether this duality was a kind of reflection of the population's ethnic structure or not, similarly to the organization of the Chin Empire in its early phase, is still open to question.¹⁶

A list of the offices of the central administration attracts attention by the mere titles contained in it, to the fact that the economic system is different from the Chinese in some aspects (there is, e.g. an office for animal husbandry in the capital, beside that of agriculture). This is rather remarkable, even if it is not possible to gain an insight into the taxation system; this latter would be essential in judging the character of statehood. The taxation system was certainly regarded by the historiographers as one of the natural conditions for the existence of society, and therefore it was not subject to special attention.

5. The description of the appointment of court dignities as well as of certain events, offers some hints as to the formation of a chancery, of a local practice of transacting affairs in writing. By way of a summary and a symbol of this process, a description of the invention of Tangut writing is given by the historiographers. Of course, even this act is connected with the emperor Yüan-hao as the organizer of state administration. It is shown by the wording that it was considered to be a cultural production of some eminence, as suitable to its purposes as Chinese writing itself.¹⁷

¹⁵ Cf. *ibid.* Ch. 486, 23a.

¹⁶ Cf. M. V. Vorobyev (M. B. Воробьев), *Чжурчженя и государство Цзинь (X в.—1234 г.)*. Исторический очерк, Moscow 1975. pp. 152–154.

¹⁷ *Sung shih* Ch. 485, 15b: «The Tangut writing was made by Yüan-hao himself. He ordered 野利仁榮 Yeh-li Jen-jung to work it out in detail: he composed [a book of] 12 *chüan*. Its characters have a rectangular shape, they are similar to the «eight part»-style writing, but are somewhat more complex. The people of the country was ordered to use Tangut writing in recording events and affairs, and the 孝經 *Hsiao ching*, the 爾雅 *Erh-ya* and the 四言雜字 *Ssü-yen tsa tzü* were translated into Tangut language.» — In *Liao shih* Ch. 115, 5a only the invention of writing is related (rather laconically and one-sidedly); it is attributed to Teh-ming there.

6. The historiographers paid special attention to the formal side of state life, its symbols and ritual paraphernalia: in addition to giving an account of the organization of administration, the order of state robes is described, a description of the introduction of writing certain ceremonies and the musical system are recorded, apart from the army, indispensable for maintaining sovereignty, other expressions and outward signs of independence are also enumerated, e.g. their own style of reign (also the making of a calendar), and an imperial throne facing south. In this context, the description of the Tanguts in the *Sung shih* reaches its apex in the passage, which presents a letter by Yüan-hao to the Sung emperor written in 1039, in which the independence of Hsi Hsia is declared. As the present wording of this letter is rather grotesque in certain parts, it has to be left undecided whether it is entirely fictitious and was made by the historiographers, or was in fact based on a genuine document. Still, it enumerates all the factors that made Yüan-hao emperor, e.g. in addition to those mentioned above, the imperial ceremonies performed in the suburbs. In the same way, the wording «we became the centre» clearly indicates Yüan-hao to be an emperor as in Confucian historiography it is always the imperial dynasty that forms the centre of events.¹⁸

¹⁸ *Sung shih* Ch. 485, 16a–16b, with abbreviations: «The ancestors of your servant were offsprings of emperors. At the end of the Eastern Chin rule the beginnings of the Hou Wei dynasty were established by them. Our distant ancestor, 思恭 Ssü-kung during the T'ang dynasty led his armies to help [the T'ang-emperors] in distress. He was then granted land and was adopted by the imperial family. Our grandfather Chi-ch'ien, being aware of the importance of warfare in his mind, holding the insignia given him by the emperor and raising the flag of loyalty, subjugated all the tribes and the five 郡 *chün* along the Huangho; then he returned home in no time. On his way home, the seven 州 *chou* at the frontier all fell in a line and surrendered. Our father Teh-ming, having inherited the basis [of his power handed down by] generations, made strenuous efforts to follow the orders of the court. His royal title was promulgated long ago, the possession of his tiny piece of land having been made public by demarcation. Your servant foolishly made by accident a barbarian script of no importance, and changed the august Chinese ceremonial robes and headwear [into Tangut ones]. The robes and headwear having been changed, the writing having been introduced, the ceremonies and music brought into use, the sacred vessels having been all prepared, then among the Tibetans, the Tatars, the 張掖 Chang-yeh and the 交河 Chiao-ho people there was nobody who has not surrendered to us. Having been called a king we did not rejoice in it; [but] having been courted like an emperor, from that time we became the centre, and were greeted several times like an emperor, everybody standing up and prostrated themselves at once before us. We wished to possess a piece of land with fixed boundaries, and now a country of ten thousand chariots had been founded. We declined it once and again and were uncertain in accepting it, but the people having been gathered together and exerting pressure upon us we could not help but do [as follows]: on the eleventh day of the tenth month [probably 10. XI. 1038.] a sacrifice was held in full ceremony in the suburbs, and our imperial title . . . was proclaimed. Our country received the name

The list of similar instances could be extended. These, however — indicating connections that can be guessed at, with the characteristic features unfolding, together with the textual problems hitherto unsolved — only add to a series of questions that have to be answered by the specialists of inside sources, from the Hsi Hsia documents.

大夏 Ta-hsia and the style . . . was given to our reign. We humbly hope that the wisdom of your august majesty be extended to all men, that your lenient kindness touches all beings, and thus you will grant us the western frontier-land, and grant us a charter to be a ruler facing south [i.e. a sovereign], and accepts our humble services. We shall always hold the friendly relations with you in high esteem; and will report to you — even with the aid of fish and falcons — on the news about the neighbouring countries. [We swear by] Earth being lasting and Heaven eternal that we shall put an end to frontier troubles. . . »

ZU DEN QUELLEN EINIGER STROPHEN
AUS SA SKYA
PAṆḌITAS *SUBHĀṢĪTARATNANIDHI*

VON

MICHAEL HAHN (Bonn)

Alexander Csoma de Kőrös, der Begründer der tibetischen Studien in Europa, hat sich in einem seiner wertvollen Aufsätze mit einem der populärsten Werke der klassischen tibetischen Literatur beschäftigt, mit der von Sa skya Paṇḍita verfaßten Sammlung von 457 Strophen zur Lebensklugheit, welcher er den Sanskrittitel *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, «Ozean wohlformulierter Aussprüche», gegeben hat. In den Bänden XXIV und XXV des *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* (1855 und 1856) veröffentlichte Csoma de Kőrös Text und Übersetzung von 234 Strophen. Näheres hierzu auf den Seiten 10/11 der Einleitung zu James E. Bossons Buch *A Treasury of Aphoristic Jewels*, Bloomington 1969.

Seit der Pionierleistung von Csoma de Kőrös sind zahlreiche Beiträge zur Spruchsammlung des Sa skya Paṇḍita erschienen. Der eigentliche Durchbruch wurde jedoch erst mit der Faksimileveröffentlichung eines aus dem Anfang des 17. Jh. stammenden tibetisch-mongolischen Manuskriptes durch Louis Ligeti (Budapest 1948) und dessen Bearbeitung durch James E. Bosson in seinem obengenannten Buch erzielt. Zur mongolischen Übersetzung der Strophen durch Sonam Gara steuerte Ligeti mit seiner Textausgabe (Budapest 1973) und seinem Wortindex (Budapest 1973) nochmals zwei wertvolle Hilfsmittel zur Erforschung des Werkes bei.

Im Gegensatz zu meinem Prager Kollegen Josef Kolmaš glaube ich zwar nicht, daß die Aufgabe der Textkritik mit dem Erscheinen von Bossons Buch abgeschlossen ist¹ — dazu sind mir noch zu viele Lesungen und auch Übersetzungen unsicher; ich stimme Kolmaš jedoch darin zu, daß der Schwerpunkt künftiger Beschäftigung mit dem Werk auf der Erschließung der zahlreichen tibetischen und mongolischen Kommentare liegen sollte.² Eine notwendige Vorarbeit für die Würdigung der Originalität Sa skya Paṇḍitas ist allerdings bisher immer noch nicht geleistet worden — die Bestimmung des Grades seiner Abhängigkeit von indischen Vorlagen. Es sind bisher recht divergierende Ansichten vertreten worden. Während

¹ Vgl. Josef Kolmaš, *The Aphorisms (Legs-bshad) of Sa skya Paṇḍita: Proceedings of the Csoma de Kőrös Memorial Symposium*, ed. by Louis Ligeti, Budapest 1978 (*Bibliotheca Orientalis Hungarica*, Vol. XXIII), S. 189–203; hier Anm. 9 auf S. 191.

² a. a. O.

Pelliot und Vladimircov Sa skya Paṇḍita jede Originalität absprechen,³ ist der für die Beantwortung dieser Frage zweifellos kompetentere Ludwik Sternbach der folgenden, eher entgegengesetzten Meinung: «His [= Sa skya Paṇḍita's] *subhāṣitas* were, no doubt, inspired by Sanskrit sayings, but were most probably composed by himself in Tibetan; they are not translations from Sanskrit, nor even paraphrases of Sanskrit sayings but independently composed stanzas on Sanskrit patterns.»⁴

Die zugrundeliegende Frage läßt sich so präzisieren:

a) In welchem Maß hat Sa skya Paṇḍita die acht Texte aus der Nīti-Abteilung des tibetischen Tanjur für seine Strophensammlung verwertet, nämlich

- 1) Nāgārjunas *Prajñāsataka* (100 Strophen)
- 2) Nāgārjunas *Prajñādaṇḍa* (260 Strophen)
- 3) Nāgārjunas *Janapoṣaṇabindu* (90 Strophen)
- 4) Raviguptas *Āryakoṣa* (145 Strophen)
- 5) Vararucis **Gāthāsataka* (107 Strophen)
- 6) Amoghavarṣas *Vimalaprasnottaratnamālā* (28 bzw. 40 Strophen)
- 7) *Bālakātyāyanas Redaktion des *Cāṇakyaṛājanītiśāstra* (253 Strophen)
- 8) Masūrākṣas *Nītiśāstra* (134 Strophen)

b) Hat Sa skya Paṇḍita noch andere indische Nīti-Texte außer den auf Tibetisch vorliegenden benutzt?

Ich kenne nur zwei ernstzunehmende Versuche zur Beantwortung dieser beiden Fragen. Anton Schiefner hat in den Anhängen zur ersten Auflage von Otto Böhlingks Anthologie *Indische Sprüche* in 33 Fällen Strophen aus dem *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* als Parallelen zu indischen Sprüchen angeführt.⁵ Diese Strophen hat Sternbach in seinem wertvollen Aufsatz zur Identifizierung einiger Aussprüche des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*⁶ mit ausführlichen Stellenangaben wiederholt und um weitere zehn Strophen ergänzt.

Auch durch Sternbachs Aufsatz ist die Aufgabe der Quellenermittlung zu den Strophen Sa skya Paṇḍitas noch nicht abgeschlossen, obwohl es sicher keinen besseren Kenner der indischen Spruchdichtung als Sternbach gab. Dies hat zwei Ursachen. Zum einen macht es der Umfang der bis jetzt bekannt gewordenen indischen Spruchdichtung — Sternbach schätzt ihn auf 50–60 000 Strophen — unmöglich, einen auch nur annähernden Vergleich mit den 457 Strophen des Sa

³ Vgl. Paul Pelliot's Besprechung von Campbells deutscher Übersetzung des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, *T'oung Pao* (Series 2), Vol. 24, 1926, S. 115–8, und B. J. Vladimircov, *Mongol'skii sbornik razskazov iz Pañcatantra*, Petrograd 1921, S. 6.

⁴ Ludwik Sternbach, *Note on the «Identification» of some sayings in Sa skya Paṇḍita's Subhāṣitaratna-nidhi*: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, XXXIV (1980), S. 249–62, hier S. 2.

⁵ Vgl. Sternbach, a. a. O., S. 150.

⁶ Siehe Anm. 4.

skya Paṇḍita durchzuführen, von der Schwierigkeit der Entscheidung bei Grenzfällen — liegt noch eine ganz lockere Parallele oder aber schon ein selbständiger Gedanke vor — einmal ganz abgesehen. Zum anderen waren Sternbach nur vier der acht oben genannten Nīti-Texte des tibetischen Tanjur zugänglich, nämlich die Texte 2, 6, 7 und 8, und diese auch nicht immer in zuverlässigen Wiedergaben. Die Texte 1, 3, 4 und 5 kannte er nur insoweit, als Schiefner sie in den *Indische(n) Sprüche(n)* auszugsweise übersetzt hat.

Ich möchte nun zeigen, daß es auch jetzt noch möglich ist, bisher nicht angeführte Parallelen zu einzelnen Strophen des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* zu finden; danach möchte ich kurz auf die Nīti-Texte im Tanjur als Quellen von Sa skya Paṇḍita eingehen und insbesondere einen Text näher besprechen.

Bei der Lektüre von Vallabhadevas *Subhāṣitāvalī* — mit ganz anderer Zielsetzung — fand ich ganz zufällig zu zwei Strophen des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* ausgesprochen prägnante Parallelen. Im ersten Fall handelt es sich um Strophe 272 des SRN:

| *spyod dam sbyin par mi nus pa'i* |
 | *nor des phyug por bsgom na ni* |
 | *ri bo gser du bsgom pa yis* |
 | *phyug po sgrub pa śin tu sla* |

«Wenn man sich aufgrund von Besitz, den man weder genießen noch weggeben kann, für reich hält, dann wäre es außerordentlich leicht, sich zu einem Reichen zu machen — indem man an den goldenen Berg (Meru) denkt.»

Man vergleiche hiermit *Subhāṣitāvalī* 479:

dānaṃ bhogaṃ ca vinā
dhanasattāmātrakeṇa ced dhaninaḥ |
vayam api kim iti na dhaninas
tiṣṭhati naḥ kāñcano meruḥ ||

«Wenn man ohne Spenden und ohne Genuß durch das bloße Dasein des Geldes schön reich ist, sind wir dann nicht auch reich, weil der goldene Meru vor uns steht?»

(Böhntlingk, *Indische Sprüche*², Nr. 2756)

Man kann ohne Übertreibung sagen, daß die Strophen bishin zur Formulierung identisch sind. Leider wissen wir nichts Näheres über die Quelle der Sanskritstrophe. Bei Vallabhadeva heißt es nur, sie stamme von «irgendjemandem» (*keṣāṃ api*,

nach Strophe 483), und Böhlingk hat die Strophe aus einer bisher nicht zugänglichen Handschrift eines Werkes mit dem Titel *Subhāṣitārṇava*⁷ entnommen. Eine ähnliche enge Parallele können wir zu Strophe 364 des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* nachweisen, welche folgendermaßen lautet:

| *mkhas pa drañ po gus pas bsten* |
 | *mkhas pa g.yo¹ can² śes na gzab³* |
 | *rmoñs pa drañ po byams pas bskyañ* |
 | *rmoñs pa g.yo can myur du bskyañ* |

1) *yon* Bosson (Ms. A) 2) *tan* Bosson (Ms. A) 3) *bzab* Bosson (Ms. A)

«Einem aufrichtigen Klugen muß man sich mit Ehrerbietung nähern, einen verschlagenen Klugen muß man mit Vorsicht behandeln, (selbst) wenn er wissend ist; einen aufrechten Toren muß man liebevoll beschützen, einen verschlagenen Toren soll man schleunigst meiden.»

Subhāṣitāvalī 2884 lautet folgendermaßen:

vidvān rjur abhigamyo
viduṣi śathe cāpramādinā bhāvvyam |
rjumūrkkhas¹ tv anukampyo
mūrkkhaśaṭhaḥ sarvathā varjyaḥ ||

1) *rju*^o Böhlingk ex coniectura, *rjur mū*^o *Subhāṣitāvalī* 2) *tyājyaḥ* Böhlingk

«Wer klug und ehrlich ist, den soll man aufsuchen; wer klug und falsch ist, vor dem soll man auf seiner Hut sein; wer dumm und ehrlich ist, den soll man bemitleiden; wer dumm und falsch ist, den soll man auf jegliche Art meiden.»

(Böhlingk, *Indische Sprüche*¹ 5003 = *Indische Sprüche*² 6113)

Hier ist die Übereinstimmung noch größer als im ersten Beispiel — bis auf die kleine Divergenz *myur du* «schleunigst» für *sarvathā* «auf jegliche Art» kann man in der tibetischen Strophe eine sehr genaue Wiedergabe des Sanskrittextes sehen. In der *Subhāṣitāvalī* heißt es wiederum, die Strophe stamme von «irgendjemandem» (*kasyāpi*, nach Strophe 2885), während Böhlingk diesmal Strophe I.281 aus

⁷ Näheres zu diesem Text auf S. XV des ersten Bandes der zweiten Ausgabe von *Indische Sprüche*. St. Petersburg 1870.

Benfey's Pañcatantra-Ausgabe als Quelle angibt. Sie findet sich übrigens auch als Strophe 174 im *Tantrākhyāyika*, der ältesten Fassung des *Pañcatantra*.

Keine dieser beiden Strophen — die übrigens bemerkenswerterweise beide im Āryā-Metrum abgefaßt sind — konnte ich in den acht Nīti-Texten des Tanjur nachweisen. Daraus folgt nun nicht notwendigerweise, daß Sa skya Paṇḍita sie aus indischen Originalquellen entnommen haben *muß*. Wir wissen, daß auch nicht-buddhistisches Gedanken- und Literaturgut im Rahmen von übersetzten Kommentaren nach Tibet transportiert worden ist. Die bisher noch nicht edierte *Viśeṣastavaṭīkā* des Prajñāvarman⁸ ist ein gutes Beispiel hierfür, welches uns vor vorschnellen Schlußfolgerungen warnen sollte.

Nun zu den Nīti-Texten des Tanjur als Vorlagen zu den Sprüchen des Sa skya Paṇḍita. In einer früheren Arbeit, die bisher nur mündlich vorgetragen wurde,⁹ habe ich die acht Nīti-Texte des Tanjur in zwei Kategorien eingeteilt:

a) Werke, die aufgrund ihres Alters und ihrer Originalität einen hervorragenden Rang innerhalb der Gattung einnehmen und daher baldmöglichst in zuverlässigen Ausgaben und Analysen vorgelegt werden sollten. Dies sind die Texte 1 bis 4 der obigen Liste.

b) Werke, die entweder voll (Text 6) oder überwiegend (Text 7) auf Sanskrit erhalten und zugänglich oder aber derart kompilatorischen (Text 5)¹⁰ bzw. epigonalen (Text 8) Charakters sind, daß ihr Inhalt als bekannt vorausgesetzt werden kann bzw. von geringer Bedeutung ist.

Sa skya Paṇḍita hat sich bei seinen Entlehnungen nun natürlich nicht an dieser Beurteilung orientiert. Im Prinzip müssen daher alle acht Tanjurtexte bei einem Vergleich mit dem *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* konsultiert werden. Fünf von ihnen können wir jedoch als bereits erledigt betrachten:

1) Amoghavarṣas *Vimalaprasnottaratnamālā*

Dieser kurze jīnistische Text liegt auf Sanskrit, Tibetisch, Deutsch und Französisch vor. Sa skya Paṇḍita hat aus diesem Werk nichts entnommen, wohl hauptsächlich wegen des grundlegenden formalen Unterschiedes — Frage und Antwort versus Maxime und Beispiel.

2) Vararucis *Gāthāśataka*

Die Unselbständigkeit dieses Textes ist von mir kürzlich im Einzelnen dargelegt worden.¹⁰

⁸ Vgl. hierzu Michael Hahn, *Das Saptamaithunasamyuktasūtra, ein Sūtra des Ekottarikāgama: Beiträge zur Indienforschung, Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Berlin 1977, S. 205–24, insbesondere S. 214ff.

⁹ *The Indian Nītiśāstras in Tibet. A preliminary report*. Manuskript, 18 S., vorgetragen in der Ryukoku Universität, Kyoto, 20, 4. 1982.

¹⁰ Vgl. Michael Hahn, *Vararucis Gāthāśataka — eine Analyse: Festschrift Walther Heissig* (im Druck). Dort wird gezeigt, daß von den 107 Strophen dieses Textes lediglich 15 bisher nicht in anderen

3) Nāgārjuna's *Prajñādaṇḍa*

Diesen Text konnte Sternbach anhand von Campbells englischer Übertragung weitgehend auswerten.

4) Bālakātyāyanas Redaktion von Cāṇakya's *Rājanītiśāstra*

Diesen Text hat Suniti Kumar Pathak auf Tibetisch und Sanskrit herausgegeben, wobei der Sanskrittext zum Teil aus originalen Vorlagen bzw. Parallelen, zum Teil aus Pathaks eigenen Rekonstruktionen besteht. Sternbach hat auf der Grundlage von Pathaks Buch eine umfassende Analyse des Werkes vorgelegt.¹¹

5) Masūrākṣas *Nītiśāstra*

Dieses Werk wurde ebenfalls von Pathak auf Sanskrit und Tibetisch nach dem Muster seiner Bearbeitung des *Cāṇakya-rājanītiśāstra* zusammen mit einer englischen Übersetzung herausgegeben. Sternbach lieferte daraufhin wieder eine vorbildliche Analyse der Strophen des Masūrākṣa.¹²

Es bleiben somit nur noch drei Texte, die eingehend mit dem *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* verglichen werden müßten:

6) Nāgārjunas *Prajñāśataka*

7) Nāgārjunas *Janapoṣaṇabindu*

8) Raviguptas *Āryākoṣa*

Aus räumlichen Gründen soll hier nur auf das dritte dieser Werke eingegangen werden; für die beiden Werke Nāgārjunas soll das in Kürze an einem anderen Ort nachgeholt werden.¹³ Raviguptas *Āryākoṣa* ist allerdings von besonderer Bedeutung für einen Vergleich mit dem *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*: es ist der bislang

Primärquellen nachgewiesen werden können und daß vor allem Nāgārjunas *Prajñādaṇḍa* mit 77 Strophen der Hauptlieferant für Vararuci gewesen ist.

¹¹ *The Tibetan Cāṇakya-rāja-nīti-śāstram: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 42 (1963), S. 99–122. — Noch eine Bemerkung zu dieser Rezension von Cāṇakya's Sprüchen. Pathak liest den Namen des Kompilators dieser Sammlung mit dem Blockdruck von Narthang als *dpal ldan pa la ta ka'i bu(s)* und rekonstruiert hierfür *Śrīmat[!]bālatakasya putrah*. vgl. S. 71 und II seines Buches *Cāṇakya-rājanītiśāstram*, Santiniketan 1959. Hier scheint mir jedoch Derge mit *dpal ldan ba la ka tya'i bus = śrīmadbālakātyāyanena* den korrekten Text bewahrt zu haben.

¹² Vgl. Sternbachs Rezension von S. K. Pathaks Buch *Nītiśāstra of Masūrākṣa*, Santiniketan o.J. (1961), aus *Viśva Bharati Annals X*, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 82 (1962), S. 407–11; außerdem Sternbachs Aufsatz *Sanskrit Subhāṣita Saṃgraha-s in Old-Javanese and Tibetan: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 43 (1963), S. 115–58, insbesondere S. 151–8; und schließlich Sternbachs Monographie *The Spreading of Cāṇakya's Aphorisms over «Greater India»*, Calcutta 1969, S. 22–4.

¹³ Für Nāgārjunas *Prajñāśataka* ist diese Aufgabe bereits zur Hälfte geleistet worden, und zwar in der unpublizierten Magisterarbeit *Śes rab brgya pa zes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa. I. Teil*, von Dr. med. Dr. phil. Gerhard Meier, Hamburg 1973. Meier gibt dort folgende Parallelen: PŚ 21 ≅ SRN 152, PŚ 38 ≅ SRN 134, PŚ 45 ≅ SRN 185, PŚ 40 ≅ SRN 125, PŚ 47 ≅ SRN 30. Zu ergänzen wären noch PŚ 6 ≅ SRN 25 und PŚ 64 ≅ SRN 344.

unerschlossenste Text der Nīti-Sektion im Tanjur, es ist das sprachlich und literarisch wertvollste Werk dieser Sammlung, und es ist — wie wir sehen werden — dasjenige Werk, das Sa skya Paṇḍita in formaler Hinsicht am stärksten beeinflußt hat. Während eines Studienaufenthaltes in Japan im Frühjahr 1982 war es mir möglich, diesen Text im Detail zu studieren und eine kritische Ausgabe mit Übersetzung vorzubereiten. Hier ein Kurzporträt des *Āryākoṣa* und seines Verfassers.

Ob der Autor Ravigupta mit dem buddhistischen Logiker, von dem eine *Vṛtti* zu Dharmakīrtis *Pramāṇavārttika* stammt¹⁴ oder mit dem Verfasser des medizinischen Textes *Siddhasāra*¹⁵ identisch ist, läßt sich zur Zeit nicht sagen. Der *Āryākoṣa* weist jedoch in einigen seiner Strophen eindeutig auf die buddhistische Herkunft seines Urhebers hin. Dies ist der einzige Punkt, in dem ich im Gegensatz zu Sternbach — der sich als erster systematisch mit den auf Sanskrit erhaltenen gnomischen Versen des Ravigupta beschäftigt hat¹⁶ — eine Festlegung wage; die Gründe für meine Ansicht habe ich in der Einleitung zu meiner Ausgabe des Textes dargelegt.

Das Werk selbst besteht in seiner von Jñānaśānti und Dpal gyi lhun po'i sde im 9. Jh. angefertigten tibetischen Übersetzung aus 145 Strophen. Bis auf die letzte Strophe, die aus 4×9 Silben besteht, weisen alle übrigen Strophen das tibetische Standardschema von 4×7 Silben auf. In der Übersetzungsliteratur liegt dem Standardschema, dem «tibetischen Śloka», in der Regel eine Anuṣṭubh-Strophe — vulgo Śloka — zugrunde. Hier ist das aber nicht der Fall, sondern das Werk des Ravigupta dürfte durchgängig aus Āryā-Strophen bestanden haben. Dies geht nicht nur aus seinem Titel — *Āryākoṣa* bedeutet «Schatzkammer von Āryā-Strophen» — hervor, sondern auch aus den 42 bisher von mir identifizierten Sanskritvorlagen, die sämtlich in diesem Versmaß abgefaßt sind.¹⁷ Allem Anschein nach sind die Strophen des *Āryākoṣa* überwiegend — wenn nicht sogar ausschließlich — von Ravigupta selbst verfaßt worden. Alle bis jetzt bekannten Sanskritvorlagen stammen aus Werken, die jünger sind als die tibetische Übersetzung des *Āryākoṣa*. Bemerkenswert sind vor allem die geschliffene Sprache und die klaren Gedanken der Strophen des Ravigupta. In ihrer Anordnung konnte

¹⁴ K. H. Potter, *Bibliography of Indian Philosophies*, Delhi 1970, S. 148, setzt den Verfasser der *Vṛtti* zu Dharmakīrtis *Pramāṇavārttika* nach 950 an. Dies dürfte nach mündlicher Mitteilung von Ernst Steinkellner zu spät sein.

¹⁵ Kürzlich vorbildlich von R. E. Emmerick herausgegeben; *The Siddhasāra of Ravigupta*, Wiesbaden 1980.

¹⁶ Vgl. seinen Aufsatz *Ravigupta and his gnostic verses: Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Reserach Institute*, 48 (1968), S. 137–60, der für das Studium des *Āryākoṣa* von größtem Nutzen war.

¹⁷ 37 dieser Vorlagen konnte ich in der Zusammenstellung von Ravigupta zugeschriebenen Strophen identifizieren, welche einen Appendix zu Sternbachs ebengenanntem Aufsatz bildet.

ich allerdings bisher noch keine bestimmten Gliederungsprinzipien entdecken. Dem größten Teil der einzelnen Strophen liegt jedoch ein einheitliches Bildungsprinzip zugrunde — die Zweiteilung in eine generelle Maxime und deren Illustration durch ein praktisches Beispiel aus dem alltäglichen Leben bzw. dem als allgemein bekannt vorausgesetzten Bildungsgut.

Sa skya Paṇḍita hat nun dem *Āryākoṣa* dieses formale Grundprinzip entnommen. Außerdem hat er eine ganze Reihe von einzelnen Strophen des *Āryākoṣa* für sein Werk verwertet, allerdings in einem unterschiedlichen Grad der Abhängigkeit. Ich bediene mich der folgenden Kategorien, um die einzelnen Fälle möglichst gerecht zu klassifizieren:

A Parallelität in Maxime und Illustration

- A₁ Identität
- A₂ Große Ähnlichkeit
- A₃ Geringe Ähnlichkeit

B Parallelität nur in der Maxime

- B₁ Identischer Grundgedanke
- B₂ Ähnlicher Grundgedanke

C Parallelität nur in der Illustration

- C₁ Identisches Beispiel
- C₂ Ähnliches Beispiel

Es liegt in der Natur der Sache, daß die Grenzlinien zwischen einzelnen Kategorien nicht immer eindeutig sind. In tabellarischer Form sieht das Resultat meines Vergleiches im einzelnen folgendermaßen aus:

A Parallelität in Maxime und Illustration

A ₁ Identität		A ₂ Große Ähnlichkeit		A ₃ Geringe Ähnlichkeit	
SRN ¹⁸	ÄK ¹⁹	SRN	ÄK	SRN	ÄK
92	72	61, 85	34	13	65
311	36	62	106	20	4
393	14 (und 82)	120	88	51	134
		139	2	66	28
				106	87
				165	109
				175	79
				197	44

3 + 4 + 8 = 15 Parallelen

¹⁸ Ich zitiere nach Bossons Ausgabe.

¹⁹ Ich zitierte nach meiner noch nicht publizierten Ausgabe.

B Parallelität nur in der Maxime

B ₁ Identischer Grundgedanke		B ₂ Ähnlicher Grundgedanke	
SRN	ÄK	SRN	ÄK
108	108	128	128
195	28	136	76
200	98	152	113
208	14	162	62
		195	126 (und 28)
		207	59
		398	79

4 + 7 = 11 Parallelen

C Parallelität nur in der Illustration

C ₁ Identisches Beispiel		C ₂ Ähnliches Beispiel	
SRN	ÄK	SRN	ÄK
103	42, 89	91	93
113	132		
163	33		
228	35		
264	58		
314	136		

6 + 1 = 7 Parallelen

Gesamtzahl der Parallelen: 15 + 11 + 7 = 33

In 15 Fällen wurde also eine Parallelität konstatiert, die sich auf beide Strophenhälften erstreckt, in 18 Fällen eine solche, die nur für eine der beiden Hälften gilt. Selbst wenn man die zweifache Unsicherheit miteinkalkuliert, die darin besteht, daß einerseits Parallelen übersehen worden sein mögen oder daß andererseits in einzelnen Fällen Parallelen gesehen wurden, die tatsächlich nicht existieren oder nur zufällig sind, so bleibt doch der Befund, daß Sa skya Paṇḍita aus dem *Āryakoṣa* anscheinend ein gutes Fünftel der Strophen für sein eigenes Werk benutzt hat, wenn auch zum größeren Teil nur in verkürzter oder modifizierter Form. Dieser Anteil mag absolut gesehen niedrig erscheinen, er ist aber relativ betrachtet bedeutend größer als der Anteil der Parallelen zu den anderen Nīti-Texten des Tanjur, wo er deutlich unter einem Zehntel liegt.²⁰ Dies zeigt, daß der

²⁰ So fand Sternbach in dem in Anm. 4 genannten Aufsatz unter den 253 Strophen des *Cānakyaṛājanītiśāstra* nur 17 Parallelen, unter den 260 Strophen des *Prajñadaṇḍa* nur 10, im *Nītiśāstra* des Masūrākṣa nur 2 Parallelen. Für das *Prajñāśataka* und den *Janapoṣaṇabindu*, beide ebenfalls Nāgārjuna zugeschrieben, liegt der Prozentsatz der Parallelen ebenfalls unter 10.

Āryākoṣa des Ravigupta für Sa skya Paṇḍita formal wie materiell die wichtigste Quelle gewesen ist. Gleichzeitig ersehen wir aus diesem Befund wie aus dem von Sternbach, daß der Anteil der Strophen im *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*, für die eine indische Vorlage nachgewiesen werden kann, die Zwanzigprozentgrenze wohl nur unwesentlich überschreiten wird, selbst wenn man in Zukunft noch mit einigen weiteren Identifikationen — abgesehen von den noch genauer zu besprechenden Parallelen im *Prajñāsataka* bzw. *Janapoṣaṇabindu* — rechnen muß. Damit können wir den *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* endgültig als ein überwiegend selbständiges und originelles Werk der tibetischen Literatur ansehen, nicht als eine bloße Adaptation oder Imitation indischer Vorlagen.

Da die oben tabellarisch vorgestellten Parallelen aus Platzgründen nicht *in extenso* diskutiert und erläutert werden können, soll wenigstens je ein Beispiel für die einzelnen Kategorien geboten werden. In meiner Bearbeitung des *Āryākoṣa* sollen dann die Parallelen zwischen *Āryākoṣa* und *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* im Kommentar zu den einzelnen Strophen ausführlich behandelt werden.

Aus historisch-chronologischen Erwägungen wird bei der folgenden Strophenauswahl der *Āryākoṣa* stets zuerst genannt.

1) *Āryākoṣa* 72:

prāptān api labhante bhogān bhoktuṃ svakarmabhiḥ kṛpaṇāḥ |
drākṣāpṛapākasamaye mukhapāko bhavati kākānām ||

Nicht einmal die Genußobjekte, die sie erlangt haben, vermögen Geizhalse infolge der Auswirkung ihrer eigenen (früheren) Taten zu genießen; wenn die Weintrauben reifen, bekommen die Krähen eine Entzündung an ihrem Schnabel.

| *loṅs spyod bdog kyañ 'juñs pa dag |*
 | *rañ gi las kyis spyod dbaṅ med |*
 | *rgun gyi 'bras bu smin pa'i tshe |*
 | *khwa la mchu nad 'oñ zēs grags |*

Auch wenn er reich an zu genießenden Dingen ist, hat ein Geizhals aufgrund seines eigenen (schlechten) Karma nicht die Macht, sie zu genießen. Wenn die Trauben reifen, haben die Krähen eine Schnabelkrankheit — so heißt es.²¹

²¹ Der tibetische Text des *Āryākoṣa* stimmt besser zu der Lesart der Strophe in Vallabhadevas *Subhāṣitāvalī* (Nr. 485), wo die zweite Hälfte folgendermaßen lautet: *mukharogaḥ kila bhavati drākṣāpāke balibhujām hi* «Wenn die Weintrauben reifen, bekommen die Krähen ja bekanntlich eine Schnabelkrankheit.»

Man vergleiche hiermit Strophe 92 des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*:

| *loñs spyod yod kyañ las ñan gyis* |
| *'juñs pa[s] spyod pa'i rañ dbaṅ med* |
| *rgun 'brum smin pa za ba'i tshe* |
| *khwa la mchu nad rgyun du 'byuñ* |

Auch wenn (ihm) zu genießende Dinge zur Verfügung stehen, hat ein Geizhals aufgrund seines schlechten Karma nicht die Macht, sie zu genießen. Gerade dann, wenn man die reifen Trauben ißt, bekommt die Krähe eine Schnabelkrankheit.²²

Ein Blick auf die tibetische Version von *Āryākoṣa* 72 zeigt, daß sie sich nur unerheblich von der Strophe Sa skya Paṇḍitas unterscheidet, der sich hier bishin zur Syntax an seine Vorlage angelehnt hat.

2) *Āryākoṣa* 34:

sādhayati yat prayojanam ajñās tat tasya kākatālīyam |
daivāt katham apy akṣaram utkirati ghuṇo 'pi kāṣṭheṣu ||

Wenn ein Unwissender sein Ziel erreicht, so ist das für ihn etwas Unerwartetes. Durch die Macht des Zufalls gräbt der Holzwurm irgendwann einmal einen Buchstaben ins Holz.

| *blun po don grub gañ yin pa* |
| *de yi bya rog ta lar mtshuñs* |
| *srin bus śiñ dag zos pa'i rjes* |
| *stes dbaṅ yi ger 'byuñ ba bzin* |

Wenn ein Dummkopf sein Ziel erreicht, so gelingt ihm das nur rein zufällig, so wie die von einem Wurm ins Holz gefressene Spur nur im Glücksfall zu einem Buchstaben wird.

Dies ist ein besonders interessanter Fall, weil Sa skya Paṇḍita aus dieser Vorlage gleich zwei Strophen nachgebildet hat. Wie weiter unten zu sehen ist, hat

²² Die Übersetzung von Bosson «... one has not the freedom to spend it or to be miserly with it» ist unzutreffend, sie setzt den folgenden Text voraus: *'juñs pa'am spyod pa'i rañ dbaṅ med*. Durch den Vergleich mit *Āryākoṣa* 72 wird es offensichtlich, daß die Instrumentalendung von *'juñs pas* wohl als Dittographie — bedingt durch das folgende anlautende s- — zu betrachten ist.

Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 61 die Maxime einigermaßen getreu übernommen, während das Bild — leicht — modifiziert wurde. In *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* 85 hingegen wurde das Bild nahezu im Wortlaut übernommen, während die Maxime zwar noch ähnlich ist, sich aber im Wortlaut weiter entfernt als die erste Vershälfte von *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* 61. Das Motiv dieser Änderung ist leicht zu ermitteln; Sa skya Paṇḍita wollte den für einen normalen Tibeter sicher nicht verständlichen Sanskritismus *bya rog ta lar* (= *kākatālīyam*) durch einen bekannteren ersetzen, wofür ihm das in der tibetischen Version von *Āryākoṣa* 34 verwendete *stes dbaṅ* «glücklicher Zufall, Glücksfall» sehr gelegen kam.

Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 61:

| *blun pos bya ba legs grub kyaṅ* |
 | *stes dbaṅ yin gyi bsgrubs pas min* |
 | *srin bu'i kha chu dar skud du* |
 | *'gro ba mkhas nas byuṅ ba min* |

Selbst wenn ein Dummkopf (einmal) ein Werk in rechter Weise vollendet, so geschieht dies nur durch einen glücklichen Zufall, nicht durch Können (bewußte Ausführung). (Wenn) der Speichel einer (Seiden)raupe zu einem Seidenfaden wird, so geschieht das nicht etwa aufgrund (irgendeiner besonderen) Kunstfertigkeit.

Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 85:

| *ma dpyad pa las don grub pa* |
 | *byuṅ yaṅ 'dzaṅs par su 'zig rtsis* |
 | *srin bu dag gis zos pa'i rjes* |
 | *yi ger hyuṅ yaṅ yig mkhan min* |

Es mag einer zwar ohne vorherige Überlegung sein Ziel erreichen, aber wer wird ihn dann (gleich) zu den Weisen zählen? Die von einem Wurm (ins Holz) gefressene Spur mag zwar (einmal) einen Buchstaben ergeben, aber er ist (dadurch trotzdem noch) kein Schriftkundiger.

3) *Āryākoṣa* 87:

atikupitā api sujanā yogena mrdū bhavanti na tu nīcāḥ |
hemnaḥ kathinasyāpi dravaṇopāyo 'sti na tṛṇānām ||

Gute Menschen, auch wenn sie auf Äußerste erzürnt sind, werden durch ein (geeignetes) Mittel (wieder) milde, nicht aber Niedrige. Selbst für das harte Gold existiert ein Mittel, es flüssig zu machen, (aber) nicht für das (schon weiche) Gras.

Die tibetische Version dieser Strophe lautet:

| *skye bo dam pa rab khros kyañ* |
| *thabs kyis mñen*¹ *'gyur dmu rgod min*|
| *chab rom sra yañ bzu ba yi* |
| *thabs yod rtsa 'jam ma yin no* |

1) *mñen* ex coniectura, *gñen* CDNP

Auch wenn er (vorher) sehr erzürnt war, wird ein edler Mensch durch (entsprechende) Mittel (wieder) weich, nicht jedoch ein Bösewicht. Für Eis gibt es ein Mittel, es zu schmelzen, wenn es auch noch so hart ist, nicht jedoch für das biegsame (weiche) Gras.

Man vergleiche hiermit *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* 106:

| *dam pa khros kyañ btud na zi* |
| *dman la btud na lhag par reñs* |
| *gser dñul sra yañ bzu nus kyi* |
| *khyi lud bzu na dri ñan 'byuñ* |

Auch wenn ein Edler (einmal) zornig wird, so beruhigt er sich doch, wenn man sich vor ihm verneigt; wenn man sich vor einem Niedrigen verneigt, wird er nur noch starr(sinnig)er. Obwohl Gold und Silber hart sind, lassen sie sich schmelzen; wenn man Hundeködel erhitzt, verbreiten sie (nur) einen üblen Geruch.

Die übereinstimmende Struktur in Gedanken und Bild ist unverkennbar. Die *Maxime* beginnt auch noch mit einem sehr ähnlichen Wortlaut, aber im Vergleich ist das ursprüngliche Gegensatzpaar «Eis» — ein Übersetzungsfehler für *heman* «Gold», das offensichtlich mit *hima* «Schnee, Eis» verwechselt wurde — und «Gras» durch das viel drastischere Gegensatzpaar «Gold und Silber» und «Hundeködel» ersetzt worden. Hier ist es mir unklar, auf welche Weise der Übersetzungsfehler *chab rom* «Eis» für *heman* «Gold» von Sa skya Paṇḍita wieder rückgängig gemacht wurde. Entweder war ihm tatsächlich der originale Sanskrittext zugänglich — wogegen der Befund der anderen Strophen spricht — oder die

tibetische Version des *Āryākoṣa* hatte an dieser Stelle ursprünglich eine korrekt(er)e Wiedergabe, die erst nach den Lebzeiten Sa skya Paṇḍitas verfälscht wurde.

4) Einen identischen Gedanken findet man z. B. in dem folgenden Strophenpaar; *Āryākoṣa* 98 (nur auf Tibetisch erhalten):

| *gañ žig chad pas gcod nus śiñ* |
| *de ñid phan par byed kyañ nus* |
| *ñi mas skems byed char ñid kyañ* |
| *'bebs par byed kyis zla bas min* |

(Nur) wer imstande ist zu strafen, der ist auch imstande zu nützen. Die Sonne trocknet zwar aus, läßt aber auch den Regen herabfallen — der Mond ist (zu beidem) nicht imstande.

Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 200:

| *gañ žig gnod pa byed nus pa* |
| *de yis phan pa byed par nus* |
| *mgo bo gcod par nus pa yi* |
| *rgyal pos rgyal srid sbyin par nus* |

Wer imstande ist, Schaden zu verursachen, der kann auch Nutzen bewirken. Der König, der imstande ist enthaupten (zu lassen), vermag (auch) ein(ganzes) Königreich zu schenken.

5) Nur noch ganz locker ist die folgende Parallele. Zunächst *Āryākoṣa* 59:

| *mi srun mi yis ñan pa dag* |
| *skyon btags rab tu 'tshir ba byed* |
| *ba yis mkha' la rgya btsugs nas* |
| *sbrañ bu bzuñ žiñ gsod par byed* |

Böse Menschen quälen (andere) Schlechte dadurch, daß sie sie eines Fehlers bezichtigen. Nachdem die Spinne ihr Netz in der Luft ausgebreitet hat, fängt sie die Fliege und tötet sie.

Man vergleiche hiermit *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* 209:

| *skye bo phal cher rañ ñid dañ* |
| *mthun pa'i rigs kyis gnod pa skyed* |

| *ñi ma'i 'od zer śar ba na* |
| *'od zer gzan rnams brlag par 'gyur* |

Die Menschen schaden in der Regel solchen, die von gleicher Art sind wie sie selbst. Wenn die Strahlen der Sonne aufgehen, werden (dadurch) die anderen Strahlen überstrahlt ('vernichtet').

6) Bei den zur Illustrationen der Maximen verwandten Bildern finden wir ebenfalls genaue Übereinstimmungen, z. B. in dem folgenden Strophenpaar.

Āryākoṣa 42:

prakhalā eva guṇavatām ākramya dhuraṃ puraḥ prakarśanti |
trṇakāṣṭham eva jaladher upari plavate na ratnāni ||

Gerade die Schlechten drängen die Tugendhaften beiseite und nehmen vor ihnen den Vorrang ein; Strohhalme sind es, die auf dem Wasser schwimmen, nicht die Edelsteine.

Die tibetische Version dieser Strophe lautet folgendermaßen:

| *yon tan can la mi bsrun dag* |
| *thabs non brñas thabs byed par 'gyur* |
| *rtswa śiñ chu yi steñ na 'phyo* |
| *rin po che dag ma yin no* |

Die Schlechten attackieren die Tugendhaften bei (jeder) Gelegenheit und schaffen ihnen Gelegenheiten der Demütigung. Ein Grashalm schwimmt auf dem Wasser, bei einem Edelstein ist das nicht der Fall.

Das Bild dieser Strophe hat Sa skya Paṇḍita für Strophe 103 des *Subhāṣitaratna-nidhi* übernommen:

| *blun po'i yon tan khar 'byin te* |
| *mkhas pa'i yon tan khoñ du shed* |
| *sog ma chu yi steñ na 'phyo* |
| *nor bu steñ du bžag kyañ 'byiñ* |

Die Tugenden eines Toren läßt (dieser) seinem Mund entströmen, die Tugenden eines Klugen sind in (dessen) Innerem verborgen. Stroh schwimmt auf dem Wasser, während ein Edelstein untergeht, auch wenn man ihn auf die (Wasser)oberfläche setzt.

7) Verzerzt erscheint der Gebrauch des Bildes in Strophe 91 des *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi* im Vergleich zu ihrer vermutlichen Vorlage, *Āryākoṣa* 93:

| *rgyal po mi bsrun gtse byed la* |
| *yon tan ldan pa'i go 'phañ min* |
| *khañ pa sbrul gdug can dag tu* |
| *sgron ma legs par gsal mi 'gyur* |

Bei einem böartigen König, der einen peinigt, ist kein Platz für einen Tugendhaften. In einem Haus, in dem es giftige Schlangen gibt, wird eine Lampe nicht recht leuchten.

Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 91:

| *skye bo ñan pa'i tshogs nañ du* |
| *yon tan ldan yañ ga la 'khur* |
| *sbrul gdug gnas pa'i sa phyogs su* |
| *sgron me gsal yañ 'od mi 'byin* |

Wie könnte ein Tugendhafter inmitten von Scharen schlechter Menschen geehrt werden? An der Stätte, wo Schlangen hausen (= unter der Erde) vermag auch die hellste Lampe keinen Glanz zu verbreiten.

Die eben zitierten Beispiele, von denen der größte Teil bewußt aus solchen Strophen des *Āryākoṣa* ausgewählt wurde, zu denen die Sanskritvorlage erhalten ist, zeigen deutlich, daß Sa skya Paṇḍita den *Āryākoṣa* wohl nur in seiner tibetischen Wiedergabe gekannt hat, denn anders lassen sich die teilweise sehr spezifischen Übereinstimmungen im tibetischen Wortlaut beider Werke bei der andererseits freien Behandlung der Gedanken und Bilder nicht erklären. Sa skya Paṇḍita scheint mit dem *Āryākoṣa* derart gut vertraut gewesen zu sein, daß einzelne Verszeilen aus diesem Werk von ihm anscheinend als Versatzstücke in ganz anderen Kontexten verwendet wurden. Ich gebe zum Abschluß noch zwei Beispiele eines solchen «Nachklingens» von Verszeilen aus dem *Āryākoṣa* im *Subhāṣitaratnanidhi*:

Āryakoṣa 93a: | *rgyal po mi bsrun gtse byed la* |
Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 33a: | *rgyal ñan gzan gyis gtse pa na* |

Āryakoṣa 95d: | *bdag ñid chen po che ba'i rtags* |
Subhāṣitaratnanidhi 41d: | *bdag ñid chen po'i che rtags yin* |

STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE *CHAD-MA RIGS-PA'I GTER*, AN EPISTEMOLOGICAL TREATISE OF SASKYA PAṆḌITA

BY

ZOLTÁN HORVÁTH (Budapest)

The first information concerning the existence of epistemology in Tibet was given by the founder of Tibetology, Alexander Csoma de Kőrös. As early as in 1836, in his famous and even in our day much used analysis of the Tibetan canon, he described the epistemological works of Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and other Indian logicians preserved in the *Tanjur*.¹

In view of such a long «prehistory» of research it is rather surprising that after almost 150 years there are still «terrae incognitae» in our knowledge concerning the development of Buddhist epistemology. A large amount of information is available about the sources of its history in India; the works of Stcherbatsky, Frauwallner, Steinkellner and others provide a deep insight into the works and teachings of the first Buddhist logicians and their followers. The other end of the history, the period of flourishing of logical theories in Tibet (in and after the days of Coñ-kha-pa and his pupils), is also well researched. But the link between these two periods (which is longer than 500 years) is still missing, and only few attempts are to be found to fill this gap in recent Western literature.

The period of the Tibetan contributions to the science of epistemology started, quite naturally, with the translation of classical Sanskrit works, those of Dignāga, Dharmakīrti and of the commentaries written to their books by Jinendrabuddhi, Dharmottara and others. Until the twelfth century only translations were made (by translators such as Ka-ba Dpal-brcegs, and Dran-pa Nam-mkha' etc.).

The first independent Tibetan epistemological work is reported to have been written by Phyva-pa Čhos-kyi señ-ge (1109–1169) who, in addition to some commentaries, also wrote the *Bsdus-grva*, which became the model of a whole logical «genre» in Tibet under the same name («Collected Topics»). This work, which consisted of root-verses and an auto-commentary, was lost; we have nothing but later reports about it.²

The next step in the development of Tibetan logical literature was taken shortly after the time of Čhos-kyi señ-ge by the famous Saskya paṇḍita, Kun-dga' rgyal-

¹ See his *Analysis of the Kahgyur and Stangyur: Asiatic Researches* Vol. XX., Calcutta 1836.

² L. W. J. van der Kuijp, *Phya-Pa Chos-Kyi Seng-Ge's Impact on Tibetan Epistemological Theory*, *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, Vol. 5. (1978), pp. 355–69.

mchan (1182–1251). His work, the *Chad-ma rigs-pa'i gter* is the earliest extant example of the independent epistemological literature of Tibet and therefore its value could hardly be overestimated for further investigations of the history of logic.³

In spite of its obvious importance, the book did not receive the attention, which it would deserve, until the present time. The first Western scholar carrying out a systematic work on Buddhist logic, Th. Stcherbatsky knew about the existence of the *Rigs-gter* (or, as he translated it, the «Mine of Logic») and stressed its importance in his pioneering monograph⁴, nevertheless he could not obtain a copy of it. His source of information was a commentary written to the work by Coñ-kha-pa's pupil Rgyal-chab (1364–1462).⁵ Saskya paṇḍita's auto-commentary was also out of Stcherbatsky's reach.

I was also unable to find any detailed analysis of this work in other Western monographs.⁶ There may be several reasons for this. The most obvious one is the fact that Saskya paṇḍita's work was not published in a modern reprint until 1968, when it appeared among the collected works of the Sasyas⁷ making it also generally available in the West. Another possible explanation for the lack of interest in Saskya paṇḍita's work is the predominance of the Dge-lugs-pa school in later logical investigations in Tibet. With regard to their approach Kun-dga' rgyal-mchan's somehow «old-fashioned» views concerning epistemology became less exciting both for Tibetan and Western scholars.⁸ Nevertheless, the study of the

³ Some short Western summaries about the development of the epistemological theory in Tibet: Th. Stcherbatsky, *Buddhist Logic*, Leningrad 1930, Vol. 1. §17. pp. 55–58; L. Tharchin, *The Logic and Debate Tradition of India, Tibet, and Mongolia* (History, reader, resources), Howell 1979, pp. 7–11; E. Napper (tr.) *Mind in Tibetan Buddhism*, London 1980, pp. 12–15.

⁴ The *Rigs-pa'i gter* is «a concise treatise in mnemonic verses . . . held in high esteem by the Tibetans as their oldest original exposition of Buddhist Epistemology» mentioned Stcherbatsky (*op. cit.*, Vol. 2., p. 323, n. 4.) presenting a polemical chapter of the *Blo-rigs* by 'Jam-dbyaṅs bśad-pa 'Nag-dbañ brcon-'grus (1648–1722) written against Saskya paṇḍita's theory concerning the «way of production of mental sensation» (*yid-mñon-gyi skye'i chul*).

⁵ *Chad-ma rigs-gter-gyi rnam-bśad legs-par bśad-pa'i sñiñ-po*.

⁶ Unfortunately I know only as a bibliographical item E. Gene Smith's introduction to the edition of Glo-bo mkhan čhen Bsod-nams lhun-grub's commentary: *Chad-ma rigs-pa'i gter-gyi rnam-par bśad-pa rigs ma lus-pa-la 'jug-pa'i sgo*, Gangtok, n.d.

⁷ *Sa-skya-pa'i bka'-'bum*. The Complete Works of the Great Masters of the Sa-skye Sect of Tibetan Buddhism vol. 5, *Paṇḍita Kun-dga' rgyal-mchan-gyi bka'-'bum*, Works No. 19, 20, pp. 155–167, 167–264. Compiled by Bsod-nams rgya-mcho, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo 1968.

⁸ Saskya paṇḍita «maintained that logic is an utterly profane science, containing nothing Buddhistic at all, just as medicine or mathematics are. The celebrated historian Bu-ston Rin-počhe shares the same opinion. But the now predominant Gelugspa sect rejects these views and acknowledges in Dharmakīrti's logic a sure foundation of Buddhism as a religion» Stcherbatsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1., p. 46.

Rigs-gter, this «milestone» in Tibetan philosophical literature, may help us to fill the gap between early and later logical works and give us a deeper insight into the later developments of Tibetan epistemology, too. After having briefly described the contents of the *Chad-ma'i rigs-gter*, I will endeavour to show its — sometimes very detailed — inner structure, which is naturally at the same time a list of the topics dealt with in the book.

In the fifth volume of the above-mentioned edition we find two texts under the same title: the *Chad-ma'i rigs-gter* (pp. 155–167) which contains the root-verses (cca. 460 by number) and its prose commentary (pp. 167–264). Both are reported to have been originally written in Sanskrit (their Sanskrit title is: *Pramāṇa-yukta-nidha*), which is very likely only a pious tradition. Regarding the contents of the work, the Saskya master closely followed the model of Dignāga and — first of all — that of Dharmakīrti.⁹ The book has a sharp polemical character; the author mainly presents his views by refuting the position of others. His own teachings are described only briefly. Looking closely at the structure of the work, its entirely new form should be noted. Leaving aside the «classical» structure of the logical works (which contained a chapter on perception and another on inference, etc.¹⁰), Saskya paṇḍita set out the main topics of logic and used them as structure-building concepts for his book. Dividing the book into two parts¹¹ in the first he examined the topics of the «object» (*yul*), «mind» (*blo*) and the different ways by which the mind grasps (*rtogs*) its object, describing the concepts of «general and particular» (*spyi dan bye-brag*), the «relations» (*'brel-ba*) and the two kinds of «contradictions» (*'gal-ba*), etc. In the second part, he dealt with the category of «definition» (*mchan-ñid*) and gave a detailed examination of *pramāṇa* (*chad-ma*). Then he turned his attention to the questions of perception (*mñon-sum*) and inference (*rjes-su dpag-pa*). Saskya paṇḍita devoted two chapters to the latter: one for the «inference for oneself» (*rañ-gi don-gyi rjes-su dpag-pa*) where he examined at length the concepts of «mark» (*rtags*) or «reason» (*gtan-chigs*) and «probandum» (*bsgrub-bya*), and another for the «inference for others» or «syllogism» (*gžan-don-gyi rjes-dpag*). This vaguely described «deep-structure» of the work can be reconstructed from the text of the commentary. The root-verse marks only the structure given by the eleven topics. Each of these topics are contained by a whole and independent chapter.

⁹ The work is full with quotations taken from Dignāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya* and Dharmakīrti's treatises. The author himself wrote at the end of his work: *Kun-las btus dan Sde-bdun phyin-či ma log-par khoñ-du thud*.

¹⁰ See Stcherbatsky, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1., §11. *The order of the chapters in Pramāṇa-vārtika*, pp. 38–39.

¹¹ 1. *šes-bya spyi ldog-nas gtan-la dbab-pa* (Ch. I–VII), 2. *šes-byed chad-ma'i rañ-bžin nes-par bya-ba* (Ch. VIII–XI).

The main structure of the work is as follows:

1. <i>šes-bya spyi ldog-nas gtan-la dbab-pa</i>		
1. <i>šes-bya'i yul</i>	Chapter I.,	29 verses
2. <i>šes-byed-kyi blo</i>	Ch. II.	vv. 22
3. <i>blo des yul rtogs-pa'i chul</i>		
1. <i>spyi dañ bye-brag</i>	Ch. III.	vv. 16
2. <i>snañ-ba dañ sel-ba</i>	Ch. IV.	vv. 48
3. <i>brjod-bya dañ rjod-byed</i>	Ch. V.	vv. 27
4. <i>'brel-ba (dañ)</i>	Ch. VI.	vv. 56
<i>'gal-ba</i>	Ch. VII.	vv. 25
2. <i>šes-byed chad-ma'i rañ-bžin nes-par bya-ba</i>		
1. <i>mchan-ñid-kyi gžag</i>	Ch. VIII.	vv. 58
2. <i>mchan-gži so-so'i don</i>		
1. <i>mñon-sum</i>	Ch. IX.	vv. 38
2. <i>rjes-dpag</i>		
1. <i>rañ-gi don rjes-dpag</i>	Ch. X.	vv. 86
2. <i>gžan-gyi don rjes-dpag</i>	Ch. XI.	vv. 50

After this gross structure of the whole work, I shall endeavour to give a more detailed description of the inner structure of the individual chapters. All the items were labelled by the author himself in his auto-commentary, I only collected and arranged them according to the structure, which the text suggested. It is well known that the Tibetan treatises used to have a clear underlying structure which, nevertheless, must be reconstructed from the text in order to be able to see it as an explicit «skeleton» of the whole body of the book. The items are marked by simple numbers in the course of the work and nothing refers to the place taken by the item numbered this way, in the hierarchy of the text. In other words, the item-indices (*dañ-po*, *gñis-pa*, etc.) refer to a well-determined level of the structure, but they appear linearly in the text without any trace of their «dimension». (This once again disproves Joos' thesis that «the text shows its own structure»!) My task largely consisted of the collection of these numbers and establishing their strata in the whole of the text. There are two kinds of such item-markers: a formal one (like «Definition», «Division», and «Dispelling objections», etc.) which does occur in every chapter of the work, and a special one referring to the content of the item titled by it. I translated only the former (formal) ones¹² and usually left the latter

¹² The most important elements of the «formal item-markers» are:

analysis	<i>dp Yad-pa</i>
correct	<i>'thad-pa</i>

untranslated. If the markers of the second kind were translated it was for the benefit of the less informed readers; I wanted to provide some information concerning the content of the work by translating the titles of the chapters and some of the more important subtitles. Doing so I used only the more or less generally used terms of the Western terminology of Buddhist epistemology. In this way I tried to avoid misunderstandings which could be caused by a set of less elaborated terms. A full translation of every item would be reasonable only after establishing a sophisticated terminology. To obtain such a tool, the best, if not the only, approach is the translation of the whole text. A considerable number of difficulties in deciphering Sāsya paṇḍita's carefully constructed system can be overcome by understanding its structure. An attempt in this direction is made here. The first step on a long way . . .

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE STRUCTURE OF THE WORK

(1.1) CHAPTER ONE THE OBJECT (*viśaya, yul*)

PART I Definition¹³

fol, line
167.3.3

PART II Division

First Section Refutation of others' position

§1 Presentation of the theses

3.4

§2 Their refutation

definition	<i>mchan-ñid</i>
dispelling	<i>span-ba</i>
division	<i>dhye-ba</i>
establishing	<i>bzag-pa</i>
explication	<i>rnam-gžag</i>
meaning	<i>don</i>
objection	<i>rcod-pa</i>
own views	<i>rañ (lugs) ('dod-pa)</i> etc.
position	<i>phyogs</i>
presentation	<i>dgod-pa</i>
refutation	<i>dgag-pa</i>

I used the following titles sometimes in short-forms: Def. (definition), Div. (division), Disp. (dispelling objections), Own (own views or answers).

¹³ *yul*_{def} = *blos rig-bya*

	1. <i>blo ma 'khrul-par thal-ba</i>	168.1.1
	2. <i>yul snañ ruñ-du thal-ba</i>	1.4
Second Section	Our statements	3.6
Third Section Dispelling objections concerning:		
§1	<i>'khrul-šes yul-med</i>	
	1. <i>gžal-bya gñis-su gsuñs-pa-dañ 'gal-ba</i>	4.3
	2. <i>don spyi dañ med-pa gsal-ba yul-du mchuñs-pa</i>	4.6
	3. <i>myoñ-ba-dañ 'gal-ba</i>	169.1.6
	4. <i>dgag-pa chad-mas mi rtags-part thal-ba</i>	2.3
§2	<i>gzuñ yul rañ-mchan</i>	
A	Presentation of objections	2.6
B	Our answer to them	
I	The theses of schools in general	3.1
II	Refutation of others' views	3.4
III	Presentation of the Buddhist view	
a	<i>dgoñs-pa don bzuñ-ba</i>	3.5
b	The ways in which <i>don-rig</i> and <i>rnam-rig</i> were presented by several scholars	
1	<i>don-rig</i>	
α	Refutation of others' position:	
	1. Vaiśeṣika	4.2
	2. Tibetan authors	4.4
β	Stating our position	170.1.4
γ	Dispelling objections	2.4
2	<i>rnam-rig</i>	
α	Refutation of others' statements concerning:	
	1. <i>phyi-rol-gyi don-grub</i>	3.1
	2. <i>'jig-rten grags-pa-la brten-pa</i>	3.5
β	Analysis of <i>rnam-par rig-pa</i>	
i	Definition of <i>šes-pa</i> ¹⁴	4.3
ii	<i>lhan-čig dmigs ñes-kyis 'grub</i>	
	1. <i>rtags dgod-pa</i>	4.5
	2. <i>rtags de'i chul bsgrub-pa'añ phyogs-čhos</i>	4.6
γ	Dispelling objections	

¹⁴ *šes-pa*_{def} = *gsal-ziñ rig-pa yin*

1. <i>rtags 'di ma grub</i>	171.1.3
2. <i>rtags 'di 'gal-te</i>	1.4
3. <i>gtan-chigs 'di ma ñes-te</i>	1.6
3 Dispelling objections concerning <i>rnam-rig</i>	
1. <i>rig-pa'i rtags ma grub-pa</i>	2.5
2. <i>rnal-phran-dañ mchuñs-pa</i>	2.6
3. <i>rnam-pa yod med-la brtags-pa</i>	172.1.4

(1.2) CHAPTER TWO
THE MIND (*buddhi, blo*)

PART I Definition ¹⁵	2.2
---------------------------------	-----

PART II Division	2.4
------------------	-----

PART III Explication of the items

First Section Definition of *chad-ma*¹⁶

Second Section *chad-ma ma yin-pa*¹⁷

§1 Refutation of others' positions

A The refuted field in general	3.1
--------------------------------	-----

B Refutation of the false points

I <i>yid-dpyod</i> (assuming)	
a The previous arguments (1.Def., 2.Div.)	3.3

 b Their refutation

 1 General refutation

1. <i>brtags-na mi 'thad-pa</i>	3.5
2. <i>ha-čañ thal-ba</i>	4.4
3. <i>bzlog-pa-dañ mchuñs-pa</i>	173.2.1

¹⁵ *blo-cam-ñid rigs-pa yin* |

¹⁶ See «*og-tu*» i.e. Ch. Eight, Part II and III.

¹⁷ Examining the concept of «*chad-ma ma yin-pa*» (*apramāna*, «non-valid [consciousness]») Sasya pañḍita dispelled the categories *yid-dpyod* (Napper, *op. cit.*: «correctly assuming consciousness») B. I., *snañ-la ma ñes-pa* (Napper, *op. cit.*: «awareness to which the object appears, but is not ascertained») B. II. and *bčad-pa'i yul-čan* (or *bčad-šes*) (Napper, *op. cit.*: «subsequent cognizer») B. III. He affirmed in *chad-ma ma yin-pa* only the *ma rtogs-pa*, *log-rtog* and *the-chom*, see notes 18–20.

2	Particular refutations	
α	<i>rgyu-mchan med-pa</i>	3.1
β	<i>rgyu-mchan phyin-či-log</i>	
	1. <i>ma ñes-pa'i</i> and	3.3
	2. <i>ma grub-pa'i yid-dpyod-du thal-ba</i>	3.4
γ	The Scriptures refuse to state « <i>yid-dpyod</i> »	3.5
II	Refutation of <i>snañ-la ma ñes-pa</i>	
a	The previous arguments (1.Def. 2.Div.)	4.6
b	Their refutation:	
	1. In general	174.1.2
	2. Particularly	1.5
III	Refutation of <i>bčad-pa'i yul-čan</i>	
a	The previous arguments	
1	Definitions	2.3
2	Division:	
	1. <i>mñon-sum bčad-šes</i>	2.3
	2. <i>rtog-pa bčad-šes</i>	2.4
b	Their refutation	
1	In general	2.5
2	Particularly	
α	The actual refutation	
	1. <i>'gal-ba-las gži-mthun</i>	3.4
	2. <i>dbañ-šes rigs-la chad-ma</i>	4.2
β	<i>bkag-pa-la mi 'thad-pa spañ-ba</i>	175.1.6
§2	Own position	
A	Definition of <i>chad-ma ma yin-pa</i> ¹⁸	2.5
B	Its division	2.6
C	Presentation of each item, definitions of:	
	1. <i>ma rtogs-pa</i> ¹⁹	3.6
	2. <i>log-rtog</i> ²⁰	4.5
	3. <i>the-chom</i> ²¹	176.1.1

¹⁸ *chad-ma ma yin-pa*_{def} = *šes-pa gañ-la mi slu-ba ma grub-pa*

¹⁹ *ma rtogs-pa*_{def} = *de dañ de min 'jin-pas stoñ | ma rtogs-pa yin dbye-na gsum | ma žugs-pa dañ ma rjogs dañ | rjogs-par 'gyur kyañ ma rñed-pa'o |*

²⁰ *log-rtog* (Napper, *op. cit.*: «wrong ideas») _{def} = *de 'jin-pa-la de min-gyis | gnod-pa log-šes dbye-na gñis | rtog-pa dañ ni rtog-med-de | so-sor phye-na nram-pa lña |*

²¹ *the-chom* («doubt») _{def} = *der 'jin-na yañ de min srid | the-com-ñid yin dbye-na gñis | mñon-du gyur dañ bag-la ñal | čha mñam-pa dañ šas-čher 'jin |*

(1.3.1) CHAPTER THREE
 THE GENERAL (*sāmānya*, *spyi*) AND THE PARTICULAR (*viśeṣa*, *bye-brag*)

PART I General explication of <i>yul</i> (object) and <i>yul-čan</i> (object-possessor) ²²		
1. Analysis of <i>dños-po'i gnas-lugs</i>		176.2.1
2. The way to settle it		3.3
PART II <i>rjas dan ldog don-la dgag-pa</i>		
1. Refutation of its definition		3.6
2. and of <i>de-la brten-pa'i čhos</i>		4.3
PART III Special analysis of the general and the particular		
First Section Definition ²³		177.1.4
Second Section Detailed Division		1.5
Third Section Explication of the the meaning of items		
§1 Refutation of others' views concerning:		
A <i>rigs-pa</i> (1. The previous arguments, 2. their refutation)		2.3
		2.4
B <i>rjas gčig-pa</i>		
I Refutation of (the thesis of) <i>spyi gčig bye-brag du-ma dan</i> <i>gčig-pa</i>		
a The previous arguments		2.6
b Their refutation		
1 <i>snañ ruñ ma dmigs-pa</i>		3.3
2 <i>rnam-par rtag-pa</i>		3.4
3 <i>ha-čan thal-ba</i>		
1. <i>yan-lag-čan mi khegs-pa</i>		4.1
2. <i>dbañ-pos rtog-bčas</i>		4.5
3. <i>'gal-ba rjas gčig</i>		178.1.1

²² The terms «object» and «object possessor» were taken by me from Geshe L. Sopa, J. Hopkins, *Practice and Theory of Tibetan Buddhism*, London 1976. The term *yul-čan* simply means a consciousness which grasps an object (*yul*).

²³ *spyi dan bye-brag* _{def} = *gžan dan rañ-gi dños-po-las | ldog-par byed-pa spyi bye-brag |*

II	Refutation of (the thesis of) <i>spyi du-ma bye-brag du-ma dañ gčig-pa</i>	
	1. The previous arguments	
	2. their refutation	1.2
III	Refutation of (the thesis of) <i>mchuñs-pa'i spyi</i>	
	1. <i>dor-la mchuñs-pa</i>	1.5
	2. <i>blo dor mchuñs-pa'i spyi</i>	2.4
C	Contradictions with the Scriptures	3.3
§2	Own views	4.3
§3	Dispelling objections	4.5

(1.3.2) CHAPTER FOUR
 THE APPEARING (*avabhāsa*, *snañ-ba*)
 AND THE ELIMINATED (*apoha*, *gžan-sel*)²⁴

PART I	General explication of the method of approach	179.1.4
--------	--	---------

PART II The ascertainment
of the individual items

First Section	The appearing (<i>snañ-ba</i>)	1.5
§1	General definition ²⁵	
§2	Explication of the meaning of its kinds	
A	<i>snañ-ba 'khrul-ba</i> (false appearance) (1. Def. ²⁶ 2. Div)	1.6
B	<i>snañ-ba ma 'khrul-ba</i> (non-false appearance)	

²⁴ The chapter analyses the two kinds of phenomenon; those which appear by themselves and those which can only be known by eliminating from them everything which are others. Frauwallner (*Beiträge zur Apokalehre: WZKM, XXXVII-XLII*) refers to the latter process in German by the term «Sonderung».

²⁵ *snañ-ba* _{def} = *rtog-med-kyi šes-pas mthoñ-ba*

²⁶ *snañ-ba 'khrul-ba* _{def} = *rañ-mchan med-pa mthoñ-ba'o*

I	Definition ²⁷	2.1
II	Division	2.1
III	Ascertaining the definition on its scope	
	a <i>yul-gyi gnas-lugs</i>	2.2
	b <i>blo'i 'jin-saṅs</i>	2.3
	c <i>blo don mthun-pa</i>	
	1 <i>ji- ltar mthun-pa'i chul</i>	2.5
	2 <i>de chad-mas bsgrub-pa</i>	
	α <i>rtogs dgod-pa</i>	3.2
	β <i>de'i chul bsgrub-pa</i>	
	1. <i>phyogs-čhos</i>	3.3
	2. <i>khyab-pa</i>	3.4
	γ Dispelling the incorrectness in <i>grub-pa</i>	
	i In <i>phyogs-čhos</i>	
	1. <i>rtags mi srid-pa</i>	3.6
	2. <i>srid kyaṅ mi dgos-pa</i>	4.1
	ii In <i>khyab-pa</i> 1. <i>yul-čan</i> , (4.2) , 2. <i>yul</i>	4.4
	3 <i>mñon-sum ma ñes-par grub-pa</i>	
	α What is actually correct in that	4.5
	β Dispelling what is not correct being contradictory to:	
	i Scriptures	180.1.1
	ii <i>dños-su ma ñes-na chad-ma</i>	
	A Presentation of objections	1.3
	B Answers to them	
	I Others' answers	1.3
	II Our answer	
	a <i>mñon-sum-gyis dgag sgrub-byed-pa'i chul</i>	1.5
	b <i>ñes-na mñon-sum-du 'gal-ba</i>	
	1. <i>sno ldog ñes-pa rtog-par bsgrub-pa</i>	2.5
	2. <i>ñes-pas sgro-'dogs gčod-pa'i chul</i>	3.3
	3. <i>rjes-su skyes-pa'i ñes-šes sel-bar 'gyur-pa</i>	3.5
	4. <i>slob-dpon-gyis dgoṅs-pa yin-pa</i>	3.6
	γ <i>snaṅ yul-la sgra rtag mi 'jug-pa'i chul</i>	

²⁷ *snaṅ-ba ma 'khrul-ba* _{def} = *raṅ-gi mchan-ñid yod-pa mthoṅ-ba'o*

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. <i>snañ-la dgag sgrub čig-čar rtogs-par thal-ba</i> | 4.2 |
| 2. <i>don gčig-gi miñ thams-čad rnam-graṅs-pa yin-pa</i> | 4.3 |
| 3. <i>ldog-pas 'byed-na sel-bar 'gyur-ba</i> | 4.5 |

Second Section *gžan-sel* (the «eliminated»)

§1 Definition ²⁸	181.1.1
§2 Ascertaining its characteristics	
A Presentation of <i>gžan-sel</i>	
I <i>yul-gyi gnas-lugs</i>	
a <i>tha-dad-la gčig-tu sgro-'dogs-pa'i rgyu-mchan</i>	1.6
b <i>sgro-'dogs-pa'i blo'i rnam-pa</i>	
1. <i>tha-dad-la gčig-tu 'khrul chul</i>	2.1
2. Dispelling the incorrectnesses	2.5
c <i>dgos-pa</i>	3.3
<i>gčig-la tha-dad-du sgro-'dogs-pa</i>	
1. <i>sgro-'dogs-pa'i rgyu-mchan</i>	3.5
2. <i>sgro-'dogs-pa'i blo'i rnam-pa</i>	4.1
3. <i>tha-dad sgro-btags-pa'i dgos-pa</i>	4.2
B Division of <i>gžan-sel</i>	
I Actual division	4.6
II Refutation of <i>don-la gžan-sel</i>	
a Its incorrectness	182.1.3
b The cause of it	
1. <i>sel-ba snañ-bar 'gyur-pa</i>	1.4
2. <i>snañ-ba-la mchuṅs-pa</i>	1.5
III Individual presentations	
a <i>yod-pa'i sgra dañ blo gñis 'jug-chul gčig-pas phyogs gčig-tu brjod</i>	
1 Definition ²⁹	
2 Division of <i>yod-pa'i gžan-sel</i>	
α <i>mñon-gyur-la ñes-pa</i> and	2.5
β <i>lkog-gyur-la ñes-pa'i gžan-sel</i>	
i Definition ³⁰	3.3
ii Division	

²⁸ *gžan-sel*_{def} = *dños 'gal bčad-nas 'jug-pa ni | gžan-sel yul-čan yin-par bžed |*

²⁹ *dños-po'i gžan-sel*_{def} = *don-byed mi nus-pa gčod-pa'o*

³⁰ *lkog-gyur-la ñes-pa'i gžan-sel*_{def} = *rañ-gi mchan-ñid mi snañ-ba sgra rtog-gis ñes-pa'o*

<i>A bden-pa-la 'jug-pa rjes-dpag-gi gžan-sel</i>	
1. Stating our correct view	3.4
2. Refuting others' statements	3.4
3. Dispelling the incorrectnesses	3.6
<i>B log-šes-kyi gžan-sel</i>	4.3
<i>C the-chom yañ rtog-pa yin-pas sel-ba . . .</i>	4.4
3 Individual meanings (of the divided items)	
α Definition ³¹	4.4
β Division	4.5
γ <i>dños-med snañ yul ma yin-pa</i>	
i <i>snañ yul-du mi ruñ-ba'i 'thad-pa spañ-ba</i>	183.1.1
ii Dispelling its incorrectnesses:	
1. <i>dños-po-dañ mchuñs-pa</i>	1.3
2. <i>chad-ma-dañ 'gal-ba</i>	1.6
3. <i>grags-pa-dañ 'gal-ba</i>	2.3
4. <i>luñ-dañ 'gal-ba</i>	3.4

§3 Dispelling objections

1. <i>spyi med-na brda sbyor-ba mi srid-pa</i>	184.2.1
2. <i>gžan-sel yin-na phan-chuñ rten-par thal-ba</i>	185.1.6
3. <i>gčod-bya med-pa-la gžan-sel mi 'dug-pa</i>	4.6
4. <i>sel-ba dños-por grub ma grub brtags-pa</i>	186.1.2
5. <i>sel-ba-la spyi mañ-na gži mthun mi srid-pa</i>	3.5

(1.3.3) CHAPTER FIVE

REFERENT (*vācya*, *brjod-bya*)

AND DENOTATUM (*vācaka*, *brjod-byed*)³²

PART I Refutation of others' position

First Section *rañ-mchan brjod-byar 'dod-pa*

1. <i>phyi-rol-gyi don rañ-mchan</i> and	187.1.5
2. <i>šes-pa rañ-mchan brjod-byar 'dod-pa</i>	4.6

³¹ *med-pa gžan-sel yod-pa gčod* | or: *don-byed nus-pa gčod-pa*.

³² This pair of terms could better be translated, using the Saussurian terminology, by «signifiant» and «signifié».

Second Section	<i>spyi brjod-byar 'dod-pa</i>	
	1. Refutation of <i>don-gyi spyi</i> and	188.1.1
	2. <i>sgra don-gyi spyi brjod-byar 'dod-pa</i>	1.5

PART II Own views

First Section	Definition ³³	3.3
Second Section	Division	3.4
Third Section	Explication of the meaning	
	1. <i>sgra'i dños-kyi brjod-bya med-pa</i>	4.1
	2. <i>gži-med-la 'khrul-nas brda sbyor sbyor-ba'i chul</i>	4.4
	3. <i>'khrul-pa-la sbyar-bas rañ-mchan go-ba'i 'thad-pa</i>	4.5

PART III Dispelling objections concerning:

	1. <i>dños-po'i spyi</i> and	189.1.5
	2. <i>šes-pa rañ-mchan brjod-byar 'dod-pa</i>	3.3
	3. <i>sel-ba-la sbyor-na ldan-pa ma yin-pa'i 'du-byed-dañ mchuñs-pa</i>	4.2
	4. <i>brjod-bya med-na tha-sñad rgyun čhad-par 'gyur-pa</i>	190.1.1
	5. <i>čhad-byas-kyi 'brel-pa go-bas 'khrul-pa mi 'thad-pa</i>	1.3

(1.3.4.1) CHAPTER SIX
THE RELATION (*sambandha*, *'brel-pa*)

PART I Refutation of *don-la 'brel-pa*

First Section	Its general refutation	190.2.6
Second Section	Particular refutations	

³³ *brjod-bya* _{def} = *brdas go-bar bya-ba yin rjod-byed* _{def} = *don go-bar byed-pa'i brda*

§1 of *de-dag gčig-pa*'i 'brel-pa 4.5

§2 (Individual refutations of:)

A *de-las byuñ-ba*'i 'brel-pa don-la dgag-pa-la rgyu-'bras-kyi rjas

I rgyu-'bras rim-gyis-pa

1. *sña phyi-la mi 'thad-pa* 191.2.2

2. *bar-gyi sbyor 'brel mi 'thad* 2.5

II rgyu-'bras rkyañ-pa-la 'phel-ba 3.3

III *ltos-pa-la 'brel-par 'dod-pa*

1. *phan-'dogs-pa-la 'brel-pa* 4.3

2. *med-na mi 'byuñ-ba*'i 'brel-pa 4.3

B rgyu-'bras rigs-la 'brel-pa 192.1.1

§3 'brel-pa gžan bkag-par grub-pa

A The previous arguments 1.5

B Refutation of all arguments together

1. *don-la ma grub-pa* 2.5

2. *blo ñor grub kyañ gžan-du mi 'thad-pa* 3.1

PART II Stating of *blo ñor 'brel-pa*

1. *blos ji-ltar sgrel-ba*'i sgrul 193.3.4

2. Dispelling objections concerning:

(a) *blos bdag gčig-par sgrel-ba* 4.6

(b) *de-las byuñ-ba* 194.1.5

PART III 'brel-pa sgrub-byed-kyi chad-ma

First Section Stating the definition

§1 *bdag gčig-pa*'i 'brel-pa sgrub-byed ldog-pa tha-dad don-la gčig-tu yod-par chad-ma gañ-gis grub

A *tha-sñad bsgrub-kyi 'brel-pa* 194.2.4

B *don bsgrub-kyi 'brel-pa*

I *rca-ba*'i rtags 3.1

II Ascertaining of the meaning of application

a *čhos-čan «sgra»* 3.2

b *bsgrub-bya*'i čhos 3.2

c *gtan-chigs-kyi don*

	1. Identification of <i>rtags-kyi ño-bo</i>	3.3
	2. Refutation of others' ideas	3.5
	3. Own views	4.5
	4. Dispelling the incorrectnesses	4.5
III	Dispelling the uncertain <i>rtags</i>	
a	<i>ltos-med</i>	195.1.1
	1 Presentation of <i>rtags</i>	
	2 Dispelling the false ones	
	i <i>ma grub-pa</i>	1.3
	ii <i>ma ñes-pa</i>	4.4
	iii <i>ha-čan thal-ba spañ-ba</i> (1–3)	196.3.1
b	False <i>gtan-chigs</i>	
	1 The previous statements	197.1.2
	2 Their refutation	
	α <i>brtag-na mi 'thad</i>	1.5
	β <i>de rtags-kyis bsgrub-pa</i>	
	i Presentation of <i>rtags</i>	2.1
	ii Identification of the meaning of application	
	A <i>čhos-čan</i>	
	I Own views	2.3
	II Refutation of its examination by others concerning:	
	1. <i>rañ-mchan</i> and	2.4
	2. <i>sgra don čhos-čan-du 'dod-pa</i>	2.4
	B <i>bsgrub-bya</i>	2.5
	C <i>gtan-chigs</i>	
	I <i>phyogs-čhos</i>	
	a Refutation of others' views concerning:	
	1. <i>mñom-sum-gyi grub-pa</i>	3.1
	2. <i>rañ-rig gčig-pus 'grub-par 'dod-pa</i>	3.3
	b Own view	
	1. Presentation of <i>rtags</i>	4.1
	2. <i>chul bsgrul-ba</i>	
	1. <i>phyogs-čhos</i>	4.1
	2. <i>gyur-med-la rim dañ gčig-čar med-pa'i khyab-pa</i>	4.1
	c Dispelling objections concerning	
	1. the existence,	4.4
	2. the characteristic of <i>rtag-pa</i>	198.1.1

	<i>II don-byed-pas stoñ-pa-la byas-pa'am</i>	
	<i>yod-pas stoñ-pa'i khyab-pa</i>	1.4
	iii Identification of <i>rtags-kyi rigs</i>	
	1. <i>rigs gañ yin-pa</i>	1.5
	2. <i>gñis mi dgos-pa spañ-ba</i>	1.6
§2	<i>de-las byuñ-ba'i 'brel-ba</i>	
	A Refutation of others' views	2.3
	B Own view	
	I <i>rgyu-'bras gñis-la spyi-mchan med-pas so-sor phye-na</i>	3.5
	II <i>rgyu-'bras ñes-par byed-pa'i chad-ma</i>	4.3
	III Dispelling objections	
	a <i>sñar ma dmigs-pas 'bras-bu ldog-pa mi 'grub</i>	199.1.3
	b <i>ha-čan thal-ba</i>	1.5
	c <i>gžan-du 'khrul-ba spañ-ba</i>	
	1. <i>rgyu min-las mi skye (1-2)</i>	2.1
	2. <i>skye-na sña phyi'i rgyu 'bras-su grub-pa</i>	200.1.1
Second Section	<i>'brel-ba de-dag-gi mchan-gži nos bzuñ-ba</i>	
	(1. Ref. 1.5; 2. Own 2.2; 3. Disp. 2.3)	1.5
Third Section	<i>de-dag gañ-gis ñes-pa'i chul</i>	
§1	<i>phyogs res ñes-pa gžan-gyi lugs</i>	
	A <i>dpyod-pas ñes-pa</i>	
	1. <i>sgra don-gyi dpyod-pa</i>	3.2
	2. <i>dños-po'i dpyod-pa</i>	3.3
	B <i>chad-ma ñes-pa</i>	4.3
§2	Own views	4.6
§3	Dispelling objections	201.1.3

CHAPTER SEVEN
CONTRADICTION (*virodha*, 'gal-ba)

PART I General definition³⁴ 201.1.6

³⁴ 'gal-ba_{def} = *čhos gañ-žig gañ-la gnod-byed-pa*. The text makes distinction, as usually, between two kinds of 'gal-ba:

(1) *lhan-čig mi gnas-pa* («mutually exclusiveness», J. Lyons would call it «antonymy» see his *Semantics*, Cambridge U. P. 1977, vol. 1., p. 279.). The Tibetan example for that kind of contradiction

PART II Division

First Section *lhan-čig mi gnas-pa*

§1	Its definition	
A	Refutation of others' views	2.4
B	Own views ³⁵	2.5
C	Dispelling objections:	
	1. <i>ma khyab-pa</i>	3.1
	2. <i>khyab čhes-pa</i>	3.3
§2	<i>'gal-ba gnas-pa'i yul</i>	
A	Identification of <i>'gal-ba</i>	4.1
B ³⁶	Dispelling objections	
I	<i>yul</i>	4.3
II	<i>rjas</i>	
	1. Presentation of objections	4.5
	2. Answers to them (1. Ref. 202.1.1; 2. Own answer)	202.1.4
§3	<i>gnod-bya ldog-pa'i dus</i>	
A	Refutation of others' views	1.5
B	Own view	2.2
C	Dispelling objections concerning:	
I	<i>don-gyi 'gal-ba</i> 1. <i>ča yod med</i>	2.4
	2. <i>nus-pa thogs-med</i>	3.2
II	<i>blo'i 'gal-ba</i>	3.6
§4	<i>'gal-ba nes-par byed-pa'i chad-ma</i>	
	1. Refutation of <i>don-la 'gal-ba</i>	4.2
	2. <i>blo nor chad-mas bsgrub-pa</i>	4.4
	3. Dispelling objections	4.5

Second Section *phan-chun spañ 'gal*

§1	Refutation of others' views	203.1.4
----	-----------------------------	---------

presents us the «hot and cold»; they cannot co-exist, nevertheless, there can be something which is neither the one nor the other. (First Section)

(2) *phan-chun spañ 'gal* («mutually rejecting contradiction» or «complementarity» see Lyons, *op. cit.*) divides everything existing by the given predicate (and its negation). The Buddhist example is the «transitory and eternal»: there cannot be anything which is neither i.e. the denial of the one implies the assentment of the other. (Second Section.)

³⁵ *gnod-bya* def = *rgyu ma gtugs-pa 'byuñ-ba-čan gžan yod-na nus med-du skye-ba'o. gnod-byed* def = *rgyu-ma gtugs-pa 'byuñ-ba-čan de yod-na nus-med-du skyed-byed-do.*

³⁶ Correct *gsum-pa* to *gñis-pa*.

1. <i>ha-čan thal-ba</i>	2.3
2. <i>žes spyod-gi lan dgag-pa</i>	2.5
3. <i>tha-dad-la 'gal-bar gsuñs-pa'i dgoñs-pa</i>	3.3
§2 Own view	
A Explication of <i>gčig dañ tha-dad</i>	3.5
B <i>tha-dad-la 'gal 'brel-du 'jog-pa'i chul</i>	3.6
C <i>phan-chun spañs 'gal-ñid</i>	
1. <i>dños 'gal</i>	4.1
2. <i>des khyad-par-du byas-pa'i 'gyud 'gal</i>	4.3
3. Dispelling objections	4.4

CHAPTER EIGHT

DEFINITION (*lakṣaṇa, mchan-ñid*)

PART I The characteristics of the three *mchan-gži*

First Section <i>šes-bya-la čhos gsum-gyis khyab-pa</i>	204.1.3
Second Section Identification of the characteristics of <i>khyab-byed čhos gsum</i>	
§1 Identification of <i>ño-bo</i>	1.5
§2 <i>der 'jog-pa'i 'thad-pa</i>	2.1
§3 Individual definitions	
A <i>mchan-ñid</i> (the «definition» itself)	
I Refutation of <i>mchan-ñid mi dgos-pa</i> (1.Ref.204.2.4; 2.Own 206.1.3; 3.Disp.)	206.2.5
II Presentation of <i>dgos-pa'i mchan-ñid</i> (1.Ref.3.6; 2.Own)	4.3
III <i>de'i bsal-bya skyon-čan-gyi grañs ñes-pa</i>	
a Refutation of others' views	
1 <i>rañ ldog rjas-su ma grub</i>	4.6
2 <i>don ldog gžan-du 'gyur</i>	
1. <i>mi srid-pa</i>	207.1.1
2. <i>ma khyab-pa</i>	1.3

3.	<i>khyab čhes-pa</i>	1.3
4.	<i>khyab mñam-pa</i>	1.4
3	<i>mchan-gži-la mi gnas-pa'i mchan-ñid</i>	
	α (Division:)	
1.	<i>'gal-nas</i>	1.6
2.	<i>ldog-pa tha-dad med-nas</i>	2.1
3.	<i>don ldog tha-dad med-nas</i>	2.2
4.	<i>mchan-gži'i phyogs gčig-la khyab gnas-pas</i>	2.4
	β Refutation (of the above division)	
1.	<i>rigs-pas mi 'thad-pa</i>	207.3.1
2.	<i>gžuñ-gi dgoñs-pa ma yin-te</i>	4.4
b	Own view	4.5
1	<i>ma khyab-pa</i> (1.Def., ³⁷ 2.Div.)	208.2.1
2	<i>khyab čhes-pa</i> (1.Def., ³⁸ 2.Div.)	2.2
3	<i>mi srid-pa</i>	
	α Definition ³⁹	2.3
	β Division	
i	<i>rañ ldog ma grub-nas mi srid-pa</i> (1–2)	2.4
ii	<i>rañ ldog grub kyañ mchon 'dod-la mi srid-pa</i>	
1.	<i>ño-bo tha-dad-nas</i> and	3.2
2.	<i>rañ ldog tha-dad-med</i> and	3.6
3.	<i>don ldog tha-dad-med-nas mi srid-pa</i>	4.2
c	Dispelling objections	208.4.4
B	<i>mchon-bya</i> (definiendum)	
	(1.Ref. 209.2.1; 2.Own 3.1; ⁴⁰ 3.Disp.)	209.4.1
C	<i>mchan-gži</i> (scope of definition) ⁴¹	4.4

Third Section Individual presentation of *čhos gsum*

§1 Identification of *rañ ldog* (1.Ref.4.6; 2.Own) 210.1.3

§2 *ji-ltar 'brel-pa'i chul*

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 1. | <i>'brel chul dños</i> | 1.4 |
| 2. | <i>'brel-pa ñes-par byed-pa'i chad-ma</i> | 1.6 |

³⁷ *ma khyab-pa'i mchan-ñid* _{def} = *mchan-ñid bkod-pa-la gañ-žig mchan-gži'i phyogs gčig-la ma grub-pa'o*.

³⁸ *khyab čhes-pa'i mchan-ñid* _{def} = *mchan-ñid gañ-žig mchan-gži-la khyab-čičñ mchon 'dod-med-par žugs-pa'o*

³⁹ *mi srid-pa'i mchan-ñid* _{def} = *mchan-ñid gañ-žig mchon 'dod-la ji-ltar dgod-bya ltar ma grub-pa'o*

⁴⁰ *mchon-bya* _{def} = *rgyu-mchan-čan-gyi sgra blo grub-pa*

⁴¹ *mchan-gži* _{def} = *mchan-ñid-kyi rten-byed-pa'o*

§3 Individually presented explanations of items connected with the definition	
A The method of presentation	
I Division	2.4
II Dispelling objections	
a <i>rañ ldog</i> and	3.3
b <i>gžan ldog min-par mchon chul</i>	
1. <i>mchon-bya-la brtags-na mi 'thad-pa</i>	4.1
2. <i>tha-sñad thams-čad khegs-par thal-ba</i>	4.6
3. <i>dños 'gal gži mchon-du thal-ba</i>	211.1.3
c <i>'gal mchuñs-kyi sbyor-ba dper brjod-pa</i>	2.1
B <i>phan-chun (ji-ltar) ñes-pa'i rnam-gžag</i>	
1. Presentation of the general explication	211.2.6
2. Refuting the dissenting conceptions	3.2
3. Dispelling objections	4.3

PART II Detailed ascertaining
of the definition of *chad-ma*

First Section Identification of the definition

§1 Refutation of others' examinations	
1. <i>rgyan mjad-pas don dam-pa'i chad-ma</i>	212.1.4
2. <i>tha-sñad-pa'i chad-ma</i>	1.6
§2 Presentation of our views	4.6
§3 Dispelling objections	213.2.1

Second Section *des sgro-'dogs gčod-pa'i chul*

§1 <i>ji-ltar ñes-pa</i>	3.1
§2 Dispelling objections concerning the incorrectness of:	
A the examination of <i>yul</i> (object)	
I Stating the objections	4.3
II Answers to them	
(1.Ref.4.5; 2.Own 214.1.1; 3.Own)	214.1.4
B the examination of <i>ño-bo</i> (essence)	2.5
C the examination of <i>dus</i> (time)	3.1

**PART III Settling the meaning
of the presented definition**

First Section Detailed division of <i>mchon-bya</i> (definiendum)	
1. The base of the division (1.Ref.4.1; 2.Own)	4.6
2. The meaning of the division (1.Ref.1.3; 2.Own 1.6; 3.Disp.)	215.2.1
3. Ascertaining the number (of items)	2.5
4. The meaning of the titles	3.1
Second Section Refutation of false views about <i>mchan-gži</i> (the scope of the definition of <i>chad-ma</i>) concerning:	
§1 <i>mñon-sum</i>	
1. <i>mñon-sum ma yin-pa-la yin-par rtog-pa</i>	4.4
2. <i>mñon-sum chad-ma yin-pa-la ma yin-par rtog-pa</i>	216.2.6
3. <i>yin min mchuñs-par rtog-pa</i>	3.3
§2 <i>rjes-dpag</i>	
1. <i>yin-pa-la ma yin-par rtog-pa</i>	3.5
2. <i>rjes-dpag ma yin-pa-la yin-par rtog-pa</i>	4.2
Third Section <i>mchan-gži-la mchan-ñid ñes-pa'i chad-ma</i>	
1. Question	217.1.1
2. Answer (1.Ref.1.2; 2.Own 1.2; 3.Disp.)	3.2
Fourth Section The method of assertion (<i>sgrub</i>) and negation (<i>dgag</i>)	
§1 General explication	4.1
§2 Settling the characteristics	
A Definition (1.Ref.4.5; 2.Own 218.1. ⁴² ; 3.Disp.)	218.1.3
B The meaning of it	
I Refutation of others' views (1–3)	2.1
II Own view	
1. <i>bsgrub-pa</i> and	219.1.4
2. <i>dgag-pa rtogs-pa'i chul</i>	1.6
III Dispelling objections	3.3

⁴² *med dgag dag ma yin dgag* _{def} = *rim-pa bžin dgag-bya bčad-nas čhos gžan mi 'phen-pa dan' phen-pa yin*

(2.2.1) CHAPTER NINE
PERCEPTION (*pratyakṣa, mñon-sum*)

PART I *mñon-sum yañ-dag-pa* (valid perception)

First Section	Definition (1.Ref., 2.Own) ⁴³	219.4.1,3
Second Section	Division	220.2.1
Third Section	The meaning of each item	
§1	<i>dbañ-po'i mñon-sum</i> (sense perception)	
A	Definition (1.Ref., 3.3; 2.Own) ⁴⁴	3.6
B	The statements in the definition:	
	1. « <i>dbañ-po-las skyes-pa</i> »	4.1
	2. « <i>rtog-bral ma 'khrul-pa</i> »	4.4
C	Ascertaining of <i>sgra don</i>	4.5
§2	<i>yid-kyi mñon-sum</i> (mental perception)	
A	Identification of the nature of	
	1. the definition ⁴⁵	221.1.5
	2. the definiendum	2.2
B	Settling its characteristics	
	1. <i>skye-ba'i chul</i>	2.4
	2. <i>chad-mar 'gyur-ba'i 'thad-pa</i>	2.6
	3. Analysis of <i>skye-ba'i gnas-skabs</i>	3.4
C	Dispelling objections	4.6
§3	<i>rañ-rig-pa'i mñon-sum</i> («introspective» perception)	
	1. Definition ⁴⁶	222.1.2
	2. Dispelling objections	1.4
	3. Analysis of <i>chad-ma yin min</i>	2.1

⁴³ *mñon-sum rtog-bral ma khrul-ba* |

⁴⁴ *dbañ-po'i mñon-sum* _{def} = *dbañ-po-la brten-nas rig-pa*

⁴⁵ *yid-kyi mñon-sum* _{def} = *yul dañ dbañ-śes rnam-gñis-kyi* | *de ma-thag-las skyes-pa'i yid* | *de-la brten-nas ma 'khrul-ba'i* | *śes-pa yid-kyi mñon-sum yin* |

⁴⁶ *rañ-rig-pa'i mñon-sum* _{def} = *śes-pa rañ-gi ño-bo-la ma 'khrul-pa'o*. The term of Stcherbatsky is simply «introspection» (*op. cit.*, vol. 1., pp. 163–169) that of Napper: «self-knowing direct perceiver».

§4 *rnal-'byor-gyi mñon-sum* (yogic perception)

A Identification of its characters

- I Definition (1.Ref. 2.4; 2.Own⁴⁷) 3.1
 II Division by the way of 1.*rten* 3.2; 2.*no-bo* 4.1
 III Its cause

1. *ye-šes gñis-kyi rgyu* 4.6
 2. *de-dag mthar phyin-pa'i dus* 223.1.4
 3. *thabs-la ltos-nas 'bras-bu'i khyad-par* 2.2

B *yul-la chad-mar 'gyur-ba'i chul*

1. *rnal-'byor-gyi mñon-sum thams-čad chad-ma* 3.2
 2. *chad-ma ñes-'jug ldog-byed-pa'i chul* 3.4
 3. Analysis of *dus gsum mkhyen-pa'i ye-šes* 3.6

C *de sgrub-par byed-pa'i chad-ma*

I *no-bo bsgrub-pa*

- a *'das-pa bsgrub-pa* 4.6
 b *ma 'oñs-pa-na 'byuñ ruñ bsgrub-pa*

- 1 *rtags* 224.1.2

- 2 *de'i chul bsgrub-pa*

α *phyogs-čhos*

i *rten brten-pa*

- A Refutation of others' views 1.6

B Our views

I *'das-pa thug-med-du bsgrub-pa*

- a *rtags dgod-pa* 3.4

- b *de'i chul bsgrub-pa*

1. *phyogs-čhos* 3.5

2. *khyab-pa* 3.5

II *ma 'oñs-pa thug-med-du bsgrub-pa*

- a *bdag-'jin-dañ bčas-pa*

1. *rtags dgod-pa* 225.2.6

2. *chul-bsgrub-pa*

α *phyogs-čhos*

- i *dños* 3.1

- ii *de gtan-la dbab-pa-la*

- 'khor-ba'i 'jug ldog-šes*

- dgos-pas*

⁴⁷ *rnal-'byor-gyi mñon-sum* ^{def} = *bsgoms-pa'i stobs-las snañ-ba yin-no*. Stcherbatsky (*op. cit.*, vol. 1. p. 162) describes it as «the intelligible intuition of the Saint», Napper calls it «yogic direct perceiver».

1. Refutation of others' views	3.2
2. Establishing our system	
(a) 'khor-bar skye-ba'i rgyu (1–2)	4.1
(b) de'i gñen-po (1–2)	226.1.3
3. Dispelling objections	
(a) skye rgyu (1–3)	2.4
(b) gñen-po (1–2)	4.2
β khyab-pa	...
b bdag-'jin med-pa'i gsal-ba thug-med-du bsgrub-pa	227.3.1
ii goms-pa dañ-gis khyab-par-du 'gyur-ba	4.1
iii de bsgom-pa	4.1
β khyab-pa bsgrub-pa	4.1
II mchan-ñid bsgrub-pa	4.2
III Dispelling what is incorrect in grub-pa'i don	
a spañs-pa	4.5
b Dispelling the incorrectness of ye-śes phun-sum chogs-pa:	
1 goms-pa	228.1.4
2 Dispelling the existence of thams-čad mkhyen-pa	3.4
PART II mñion-sum ltar-snañ	
1. Definition ⁴⁸	229.2.3
2. Division	2.4

PART III Analysis of chad-ma'i 'bras-bu

First Section mñion-sum-gyi chad-'bras

1. Refutation of others' view	3.2
2. Own view about chad-'bras	4.3
3. Its relationship to the four schools	4.5

⁴⁸ mñion-sum ltar-snañ («false perception») _{def} = śes-pa 'khrul-pa-la snañ-ba

Second Section *rjes-dpag-gi chad-'bras*

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------|
| 1. <i>don-rig-pa'i lugs</i> | 230.2.3 |
| 2. <i>rnam-rig-pa'i lugs</i> | 2.5 |

(2.2.2.1) CHAPTER TEN

INFERENCE FOR ONESELF (*svārthānumāna, rañ-gi rjes-dpag*)

PART I Definition⁴⁹ 4.1

PART II Ascertaining its characteristics

First Section *rtags* (the reason)

§1 Identification of the base of the reason

A *phyogs* (*chul dañ-po'i ltos-gži*)

I *rjes-su dpag-bya'i sgra don* in general

a *rjes-su dpag-pa'i sgra 'jug-pa'i yul* 4.4

b *gañ-du 'jug-pa'i gnas-skabs* 231.1.3

c Definition of *ji-ltar 'jug-pa'i sgra*

1 The difference of *dños miñ* and *btags miñ* 2.5

2 *dños dañ btags-pa'i čhos*

α *chogs don-la dños čhos* 3.4

β *ya gyal gñis-la btags*

i *'dogs-pa'i rgyu-mchan* 3.5

ii *'brel-ba rgyu-mchan-du byas-pa*

A *rgyu-'bras-kyi 'brel-pa* 3.6

B *btags-pa'i dgos-pa* 4.3

I *čhos-la bsgrub-byar* and 4.4

II *čhos-čan-la btags-pa'i dgos-pa*

1. *btags-pa'i dgos-pa dños* 4.6

2. *btags-pa-la ma btags-pa'i phyogs-
dañ mchuñs-pa spañ-ba* 232.2.5

iii *gnos-la gnod-byed* 4.4

II *skabs-su bab-pa'i don-gyi khyad-par ñes-par bya* 4.5

B *mthun phyogs mi mthun phyogs (rjes-su 'gro-ldog gñis-kyi ltos-
gži)*

⁴⁹ *rañ-gi rjes-dpag* def = *chul gsum-pa'i rtags-las gžal-bya rtoqs-pa'o*

I	Refutation of others' views	
a	Presentation of the previous arguments	233.1.4
b	Their refutation	
1	Incorrectness of <i>phyogs gñis-su kha chon čhod-pa</i>	
α	<i>phyogs gñis-su kha chon mi čhad-pa</i>	3.5
β	Its analysis	
	1. <i>brtags-na mi 'thad-pa</i>	234.1.3
	2. <i>ha-čan thal-ba</i>	1.5
	3. <i>rnam-gžag 'gal-ba</i>	3.5
	4. <i>slob-dpon-gyi dgoñs-pa ma yin</i>	4.3
2	<i>rjas ldog phye-ste bsgrub-pa mi 'thad-pa</i>	235.1.1
3	<i>rañ ldog-la brten-te bsgrub-pa mi 'thad-pa</i>	1.6
c	<i>bkag-pa-la mi 'thad-pa spañ-ba</i>	2.2
II	Own views	
a	<i>gañ ltos-pa'i rjes-su 'gro-ldog</i>	3.3
b	Identification of <i>gañ-la ltos-pa'i ltos-gži</i>	
1	Analysis of <i>mthun phyogs</i> and <i>mi mthun phyogs</i>	
	1. Definition ⁵⁰	3.6
	2. Identification of <i>mthun yul</i>	4.1
	3. Dispelling objections (1–3)	4.5
2	Identification of <i>rtags-kyi dgag sgrub-kyi yul</i>	236.2.1
3	Detailed division of <i>gžan-sel-gyi dgag sgrub</i>	2.4
III	Dispelling objections	
a	<i>rigs-pas mi 'thad-pa</i>	
1	Refutation of <i>phyogs gñis-su dpyad</i>	3.3
2	and of <i>rtags dañ dgag-bya-la brtag</i>	
	(1.Dispute 4.3; 2.Our answer)	237.2.3
b	Dispelling the contradictions to the Scriptures	3.2
C	<i>de-dag ltos-gžir 'jog-pa'i 'thad-pa</i>	3.2

§2 Detailed division of *rtags*

A *yañ-dag* (valid [reason])

I Definition of *gtan-chigs*

a Identification of the definition

(1.Ref.4.3; 2.Own⁵¹ 238.1.6; 3.Disp.) 238.2.2

b The method of elaborating the definition

2.5

1 Others' views

2.6

⁵⁰ *phyogs dañ bsgrub-bya'i čhos-kyi spyis | mchuñs dañ mi mchuñs phyogs gñis yin |*

⁵¹ *phyogs-čhos grub-č'iñ 'brel-pa ñes | gtan-chigs mchan-ñid skyon-med yin |*

2	Stating our view	3.3
3.	Dispelling objections	
α	(no title)	4.1
β	<i>don-gyi čhos-su mi 'thad-pa</i>	4.2
γ	<i>ha-čan thal-ba</i>	
	1. <i>skyes-bu kun-gyis ñes-bya</i>	
	2. <i>rtags-las rtags 'jin mi skye-ba</i>	4.5
	3. <i>yul yul-čan rgyu-'bras phyin-či log</i>	239.1.1
	4. <i>dgag rtags mi rtag-pa</i>	1.3
	5. <i>mchan-ñid-dañ mchuñs-pa</i>	1.4
II	Identification of the defined (1.Ref.2.1; 2.Own 3.4; 3.Disp.)	3.5
III	Its detailed division	
a	The ways of division:	
	1. <i>dños-po'i sgo-nas</i>	4.4
	2. <i>sbyor-ba'i sgo-nas</i>	4.6
	3. Dispelling objections	240.1.1
b	Ascertaining of the types of the divided (<i>rtags</i>)	
1	<i>mi dmigs-pa</i>	
α	Definition ⁵²	1.4
β	Detailed division	
i	<i>ño-bo mi dmigs-pa bži</i>	1.5
ii	<i>gal-ba dmigs-pa rnam-pa gñis</i>	
	<i>A de yañ lhan-čig mi gnas</i>	
	1. Refutation of the number of items divided by others	2.1
	2. Own views	3.3
	<i>B phan-chun spañs 'gal</i>	3.5
γ	<i>dgag rtags-kyi 'brel-pa ñes-pa'i chul</i> (1.Ref.4.6; 2.Own)	241.1.2
2	<i>rañ-bžin-gyi rtags</i>	
α	Definition ⁵³	1.6
β	Division	
i	<i>rtags dños</i>	
	<i>A Division by rtags</i>	
	<i>I without taking in view the differences</i>	2.2

⁵² *mi dmigs-pa'i rtags* def = *dgag-bya 'gog-la chul gsum chad* |

⁵³ *rañ-bžin-gyi rtags* def = *yin-pa bsgrub-la chul gsum chad* |

II	taking them in view	
1.	<i>rañ-gi čhos-kyi bye-brag-la ltos-pa</i>	2.2
2.	<i>'brel-pa gžan-gyi čhos ltos-pa</i>	2.3
B	Division by <i>bsgrub-bya</i>	2.4
ii	<i>khoñs-su 'du-ba</i>	2.4
γ	Dispelling objections	2.6
3	<i>'bras-bu'i rtags</i>	
α	Definition ⁵⁴	3.2
β	Division 1. <i>'bras-bu'i rtags dños</i>	3.2
2.	<i>khoñs-su 'du-ba</i>	3.5
γ	Dispelling objections	3.6
c	<i>de-dag-gi 'brel-pa-la log-rtog dgag-pa</i>	
1.	Presentation of the previous statements	4.5
2.	Their refutation	242.1.5
B	<i>ltar-snañ-ba</i> (fallacious [reason])	
I	Definition ⁵⁵	2.3
II	Division	
a	<i>ma grub-pa</i>	
1	Definition ⁵⁶	2.4
2	Division	
α	<i>don-la ma grub-pa</i>	
i	<i>čhos-čan-gyi ño-bo ma grub-pa</i>	
1.	<i>čhos-čan-gyi ño-bo mi srid-nas ma grub-pa</i>	2.6
2.	<i>srid kyañ rcod-gžir ma grub-pa</i>	2.6
ii	<i>rtags-kyi ño-bo ma grub-pa</i>	
A	<i>mi srid-nas ma grub-pa</i>	3.1
B	<i>srid kyañ šes-'dod-dañ 'brel-par ma grub-pa</i>	
I	<i>ño-bo ma yin-nas ma grub-pa</i>	3.2
II	<i>ldog-pa tha-dad med-nas ma grub-pa</i>	
1.	<i>gži rtags tha-dad med-pa</i>	3.2
2.	<i>čhos rtags tha-dad med-pa</i>	3.2
iii	<i>de-dag-gi phyogs re-las ma grub-pa</i>	
A	<i>rtags čhos-čan-gyi phyogs gčig-la ma grub</i>	
1.	<i>rigs-kyi spyi and</i>	3.5

⁵⁴ *'bras-bu'i rtags* _{def} = *yod-pa bsgrub-pa chul'gsum chad* |

⁵⁵ *ltar-snañ-ba'i rtags* _{def} = *rtags gañ chul'gsum ma grub-pa* |

⁵⁶ *ma grub-pa'i rtags* _{def} = *phyogs dañ rtags-med ma grub-pa* | or: *rtags phyogs-čhos bkod-pa ltar mi gnas-pa'o.*

	2. <i>chogs-pa'i spyi čhos-čan-du gžag-pa</i>	4.1
	<i>B rtags-kyi phyogs gčig čhos-čan-la ma grub-pa</i>	
	1. <i>rigs-kyi spyi and</i>	4.2
	2. <i>chogs-pa'i spyi gži rtags-su byas-pa'i che mchuñs-pa</i>	4.4
β	<i>blo ñor ma grub-pa</i>	
	1. <i>čhos-čan (1–2)</i>	243.1.1
	2. <i>rtags (1–2)</i>	1.1
	3. <i>'brel-pa</i>	1.2
γ	<i>rgol-ba-la ltos-pa'i ma grub-pa</i>	
	1. <i>rgol-ba rañ-ñid-la ma grub-pa</i>	1.3
	2. <i>phyir rgol-ba-la ma grub-pa</i>	1.6
b	<i>ma ñes-pa (uncertain [reason])</i>	
	1 Definition ⁵⁷	2.4
	2 Division	
	α into two	2.5
	β Dispelling objections concerning its cause	2.6
	γ <i>de-la dpe dañ rcod-gžir 'gyur-ba'i chul</i>	
	i <i>ño-bo tha-dad-kyis dpe dañ rcod-gžir 'gyur-ba</i>	3.2
	ii <i>ño-bo gčig-la'añ gžan-sel 'jug chul-gyis 'gyur-ba</i>	
	<i>A tha-sñad grub ma grub-kyi 'gyur-ba</i>	3.3
	<i>B spyi dañ bye-brag-gis 'gyur-ba</i>	
	1. <i>khyab čhe-čhuñ 3.5</i> ; 2. <i>khyab mñam</i>	4.3
	3 Meaning of each item (defined above)	
	α <i>thun-moñ ma yin-pa ('i ma ñes-pa)</i> (1.Def. ⁵⁸ 4.5; 2.Div.)	4.6
	β <i>thun-moñ-gi ma ñes-pa</i>	
	i Definition ⁵⁹	244.1.2
	ii Division	
	<i>A dños-kyi ma ñes-pa (1.Def; 2.Div.)</i>	1.3

⁵⁷ *ma ñes-pa'i rtags* _{def} = *ma ñes the-chom bskyed-pa'i rtags* | or: *phyogs-čhos grub-čin bzlog-pa mi čhod-pa'o.*

⁵⁸ *rtags thun-moñ ma yin-pa'i ma ñes-pa* _{def} = *phyogs-čhos grub gñis-ka-la ma mthoñ-nas bzlog-pa mi mčhod-pa'o.*

⁵⁹ *rtags thun-moñ-gi ma ñes-pa* _{del} = *phyogs-čhos grub mthun-phyogs mi mthun-phyogs gñi-ga-la 'jug-pa'o.*

	<i>B lhag-ldan</i>	
	1. <i>yañ-dag-gi lhag-ldan</i> (1.Def.2.Div.)	1.5
	2. <i>'gal-ba'i lhag-ldan</i> (1.Def.; 2.Div.)	2.1
c	<i>'gal-ba</i>	
	1 Definition ⁶⁰	2.5
	2 Detailed division	
	α by <i>dños-po</i>	
	i into two by <i>'brel-pa</i>	
	A Its method	3.1
	B Dispelling objections concerning the result (<i>'bras-bu</i>)	
	I Presentation of the objections	3.4
	II Answer to them	
	1. <i>ñan-šes sgra mi rtag-pa'i 'bras-bur bsgrub-pa</i>	3.6
	2. <i>dbañ-po-la bskyed-pas sgra'i byed-par 'gyur</i>	4.1
	3. <i>rañ-la mchuñs-pa spañ-ba</i>	4.2
	4. <i>'gyur-med-la de mi mchuñs-pa</i>	4.3
	ii Division into three by <i>sbyor-ba-la ltos</i>	4.6
	β Division by <i>brjod 'dod</i> (1.Ref.245.1.1; 2.Own 2.3; 3.Disp.)	245.3.4
	3 Ascertaining these <i>rtags</i> by that of	
	α <i>mtha' 'gog</i>	4.3
	β <i>de-dag-gi nus-pa</i>	
	i <i>jī-ltar nus-pa'i chul</i>	4.4
	ii Dispelling objections	
	1. <i>ma grub-pa</i>	4.6
	2. <i>'gal-ba</i>	246.1.1

Second Section *hsgrub-bya*

§1 Definition

A	<i>mchan-ñid-kyi rnam-gčad-pa-la ltos-te ltar bstan-pa</i>	1.4
B	<i>yoñs gčod-la ltos-te gčig-tu bsgrub-pa</i>	4.5
C	Dispelling objections	
	1. <i>ma khyab-pa</i>	4.6
	2. <i>khyab čhes-pa</i>	247.1.2
	3. <i>rtags-la mchuñs-pa</i>	1.4

⁶⁰ *rtags 'gal-ba* _{def} = *phyogs-čhos grub-č'iñ bzlog-pas khyab-pa'o*

2	<i>de 'gal-na dam-bčā' 'jig-pa</i>	3.5
3	<i>gžan don-la sgra skyon-du 'gyur-pa</i>	3.6
IV	Clearing by <i>grags-pa</i>	
a	Definition ⁶⁵	4.1
b	Ascertaining its characteristics	
1	describing together	4.2
2	describing individually	
α	<i>de'i chig dgod</i>	
β	Arranging its meaning	
i	First way to describe it	
A	Refutation of others' theses	
I	The previous statements	250.1.1
II	Their refutation	
1.	<i>thun-moñ ma yin-par 'gyur-pa</i>	1.2
2.	<i>'gal-bar 'gyur-pa</i>	1.4
B	Stating our correct view	
I	<i>brjod-du ruñ-ba'i grags-pa</i>	
1.	Its identification	1.5
2.	<i>de thams-čad-la khyab-par bsgrub-pa</i>	2.1
3.	Dispelling objections	2.3
II	<i>sgra-las byuñ-ba'i grags-pa</i>	
1.	Its identification	2.6
2.	<i>de rjes-dpag-tu 'du-ba</i>	3.2
ii	Second way to describe it	
A	<i>rjes-dpag-las grags-pa yul tha-dad-par bsgrub-pa</i>	3.4
B	<i>de-la gžan-gyis brtags-pa dgag-pa</i>	
1.	<i>brda sgrid-pa'i rtags thun-moñ ma yin-par 'gyur-pa</i>	4.2
2.	<i>rañ-gi sde-pa'i čhad chul mi 'thad-pa</i>	4.4
C	The ideas of scholars	
1.	<i>zla-ba'i sgra thun-moñ-bar bsgrub-pa</i>	4.6
2.	<i>de dños-po stobs žugs-su 'gyur-ba</i>	251.1.2
3.	<i>brjod ruñ 'gog-na grags-pa-dañ 'gal-ba</i>	1.4

⁶⁵ *grags-pas hsal-ba* _{def} = *dam-bčas cam-ñid-na 'jig-rten-gyi chul-dañ 'gal-ba grub-pa'o*

iii Analysis of these ideas	
A Refutation of others' views	
1. <i>brda dan̄ tha-sñad-du 'byed-pa</i>	2.1
2. <i>brda-la dños dan̄ žen-par 'byed-pa</i>	2.3
3. <i>ñes-pa bñad chul gñis-pa sbyar-ba</i> <i>'khrul-pa</i>	3.1
B Stating our view	3.2

(2.2.2.2) CHAPTER ELEVEN
 INFERENCE FOR OTHERS (*parārthānumāna, gžan-gyi rjes-dpag*)

PART I Definition⁶⁶ 4.1

PART II *smra-ba-po gañ-zag*

First Section Individual definitions 4.3

Second Section *de-dag pham-rgyal-gyi rnam-bžag*

§1 *de-la dbaṅ-pos ji-ltar bsgrub-pa'i chul* 252.2.2

§2 *bye-brag-tū char gčad-pa'i gnas*

1. Propounding the correct view 2.4

2. Refutation of the mistakes of

(a) the *Sāṃkhya* -, 2.6

(b) the *Nyāya*-system⁶⁷ 4.5

PART III Division of *rcod-pa'i skabs*

First Section Division by *gañ-zag* 259.3.6

Second Section Division by *dgos-pa*

§1 *bsgrub-pa*

A *brjod chul-gyi bsgrub-pa-la yañ-dag-pa*

⁶⁶ *gžan-gyi rjes-dpag* _{def} = *rañ-gis mthoṅ-ba'i rtags gžan-la ston-pa'i ñag-go*

⁶⁷ Note that it is far the longest item in the work!

I	Definition ⁶⁸	4.2
II	<i>ñag dgod-pa'i chul</i>	
a	Refutation the false views of	
	1. the teachings of the predecessors	4.5
	2. and that of the <i>Sāṃkhya</i> -system	160.1.2
b	Own views	
	1. <i>mi mkhas-pa-la</i> and	2.1
	2. <i>mkhas-pa-la sbyar-ba'i chul</i>	2.5
c	Dispelling objections	3.4
III	<i>bsgrub-pa'i ñag-gi byed-pa</i>	3.6
B	<i>bsgrub-pa ltar-snañ-ba</i> (1.Def.; ⁶⁹ 2.Div.)	4.1
§2	<i>sun-'byin-pa'i ñag</i>	
A	<i>sun-'byin-pa yañ-dag</i> (1.Def., ⁷⁰ 2.Div.)	4.5
B	<i>sun-'byin ltar-snañ</i>	
	1. Definition	261.1.1
	2. Division (1.Ref.1.1; 2.Own)	1.4
Third Section Division by <i>brjod-chul</i>		
§0	<i>rañ-rgyud (bšad zin)</i>	(1.6)
§1	<i>thal-'gyur-la thal-ba'i rnam-gžag</i>	
A	Refutation of others' views	
I	The previous arguments	
a	<i>thal-ba'i rtags dañ khyab-pa gñi-ga ma grub-pa</i>	2.2
b	<i>gtan-chigs 'ga'-žig ma grub-pa</i>	2.3
c	<i>khyab-pa 'ga'-žig ma grub-pa</i>	2.4
d	<i>gñis-ka ma grub-pa</i>	
	1. <i>gñi-ga chad-mas</i>	2.5
	2. <i>gñi-ga khas blañs</i>	2.6
	3. <i>rtags chad-mas khyab-pa khas blañs</i>	3.1
	4. <i>rtags khas blañs khyab-pa chad-mas grub-pa</i>	3.2

⁶⁸ *chul gsum ston-pa bsgrub-pa'i ñag* |

⁶⁹ *bsgrub-pa ltar-snañ-ba* («false thesis») _{def} = *bsgrub-pa'i ñag yañ-dag-pa ma yin—pa sgrub-byed-du bkod-pa thams-čad bsgrub-pa ltar snañ yin-te*

⁷⁰ *sun-'byin yañ-dag* _{def} = *skyon-la skyon-du brjod-pas skyon-čun go-ba'o. sun-'byin ltar-snañ* _{def} = *skyon-la skyon-du ma brjod-pas skyon-čun ma go-ba'o.*

II	Their refutation	4.6
B	Own views	
I	<i>thal-'gyur yañ-dag</i>	
a	Definition ⁷¹	262.1.6
b	Division	
1	<i>sgrub-byed 'phen-ba ('i thal-'gyur)</i>	
α	Definition	2.1
β	<i>bzlog-na bsgrub-pa'i ñag-tu 'gyur-pa'i 'thad-pa</i>	2.4
γ	<i>thal-ba'i ñag-las rañ-rgyud 'phen-pa'i chul</i>	
(1.Ref.2.5; 2.Own)		3.6
2	<i>sgrub-byed mi 'phen-ba'i thal-'gyur</i>	4.5
3	Examples of its divisions	
1.	into <i>'phen-ba</i> and <i>mi 'phen-ba</i>	4.6
2.	into <i>rañ-rig</i> and <i>gžan-rig</i>	263.1.3
II	<i>thal-'gyur ltar-snañ</i> (1. Def. 3.2; ⁷² 2. Div. ⁷³)	3.3
C	Dispelling objections	3.3
§2	Answer (1.Ref.4.1; 2.Own)	264.1.1–1.4

Note

I have received van der Kuijp's new book, *Contributions to the Development of Tibetan Buddhist Epistemology*, Wiesbaden 1983, after this paper was submitted to the press. Though his researches cover a much more comprehensive field of Tibetan epistemology and though he pays great attention to the œuvre of Saskya paṇḍita, I hope that the topical outline offered here will still be of use for a better understanding of this important work.

⁷¹ *thal-'gyur yañ-dag* («valid consequence») _{def} = *khas-blañs-kyi rtags-las mi 'dod-pa'i bsgrub-bya phen-pa'o*.

⁷² *thal-'gyur ltar-snañ* («invalid» or «sham consequence») _{def} = *khas-blañs-kyi rtags-la mi 'dod-pa'i bsgrub-bya 'phen-pa med-pa'o*.

⁷³ The «Division» consists of the mere taxation of the four subtypes of invalid consequence:

- (1) *rtags ma grub-pa*
- (2) *'gal-na khyab-pa med-pa*
- (3) *ma ñes khyab-pa med-pa*
- (3) *'dod-pas lan thebs-pa*

MEMENTO CHRONOLOGIQUE (*BSTAN-RTSIS*) DU CALENDRIER BHOUTANAIS

PAR

YOSHIRO IMAEDA (Paris)

ABRÉVIATIONS

- AL*: *Accessions List — India*, The Library of Congress, New Delhi/Karachi.
- Aris: Michael Aris, *The Early History of a Himalayan Kingdom*, Warminster 1979.
- BA*: Georg N. Roerich(tr), *The Blue Annals*, Calcutta 1949–53 (réédition: Delhi 1976).
- Bu-ston, *Dus-'khor-chos-'byung*: Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, *Rgyud sde'i zab don sgo 'byed rin chen gces pa'i sde mig*, gsung-'bum, vol. nga, fol. 1–46 (= Tōhoku 5011, édition *Śatapiṭaka*, vol. 44, pp. 1–92).
- Dargyay: Eva M. Dargyay, *The Rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet*, Delhi 1977.
- Dowman: K. Dowman, *The Divine Madman. The Sublime Life and songs of Drukpa Kunley*, London 1980.
- Kalacakra: Ngawang Dhargyey, *An Introduction to and an Outline of the Kalacakra Initiation*, dans *Tibet Journal*, I, 1, 1975, pp. 72–77.
- LCBS*: Dge-'dun-rin-chen, *Lho phyogs nags mo'i ljongs kyi chos 'byung*, Tango (Rta-mgo) Bhutan 1972.
- Macdonald: Ariane Macdonald, *Préambule à la lecture d'un Rgya-bod yig-chañ*, dans *Journal Asiatique*, 1963, pp. 53–159.
- Schlagintweit: Emil Schlagintweit, *Die Berechnung der Lehre. Eine Streitschrift zur Berichtigung der buddhistischen Chronologie verfasst im Jahre 1951 (pour 1592) von Sureçamatibhadra*, dans *Abh. der K. bayer. Akademie der Wiss. I. Cl. XX. Bd. III, Abth*, München 1896, pp. 1 (591)–82 (670).
- Shambhala: Gar-je K'am-trül Rinpoche, *A Geography and History of Shambhala*, dans *Tibet Journal*, III, 3, 1978, pp. 3–11.
- Snellgrove and Richardson: David Snellgrove and Hugh Richardson, *A Cultural History of Tibet*, London 1968.
- Tōhoku: *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bkañ-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur)*, Sendai (Japan) 1934 (n° 1–4569), et
A Catalogue of the Tōhoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism, Sendai 1953 (n° 5001–7083).
- Yamaguchi: Zuihō Yamaguchi, *Chibetto no rekigaku (Astrologie tibétaine)*, dans *Suzuki gakujutsu zaidan kenkyū nenpō*, vol. 10, 1973, pp. 77–94.

Chaque année la communauté monastique centrale (*gzhung grwa-tshang*) du Bhoutan publie sous la responsabilité du maître d'astrologie (*rtsis-pa'i slob-dpon*) le *zla-tho*, « almanach complet ». Nous en connaissons deux autres du même genre qui sont publiés par les astrologues de la région de Kinnaur (*Khu-nu* en tibétain) à l'est de Simla, Himachal Pradesh, Inde¹. Ceux-ci portent comme titre *lo/le'u-tho*

¹ D'après l'information orale du La-dwags Am-chi, originaire du Khu-nu, qui réside actuellement à Thimphu, c'est Byang-chub-rgyal-mtshan *alias* Deva Ram, originaire du Khu-nu et étudiant au Sman-rtsis-khang à Lhassa, qui a commencé à imprimer à la ronéo le *lo-tho* tibétain en 1912 ou 1922. Avant

« chronique de l'année » par contraste avec le *zla-tho* « chronique des mois (de l'année) » des Bhoutanais.

Dans l'introduction de ces almanachs, on trouve un chapitre consacré au *bstan-rtsis*, ou « chronologie bouddhique » qui diffère d'un almanach à l'autre. C'est le *bstan-rtsis* exposé dans le *zla-tho* bhoutanais qui fait l'objet du présent article.

Le *bstan-rtsis* est une sorte de memento chronologique des événements significatifs qui ont eu lieu au cours du développement et de la transmission de la Doctrine bouddhique et cela depuis l'apparition du Bouddha Shākyamuni en Inde. Or, nous connaissons un autre genre littéraire qui est semblable au *bstan-rtsis*: le

cette date, le *lo-tho* tibétain n'existait que sous forme manuscrite. Dans la collection tibétaine de l'Université de Tokyo, on trouve quatorze *lo-tho* de l'édition imprimée de Khu-nu pour les années 1924/25, 1926/27 — 1931/32, 1934/35 — 1940/41. Bien que nous n'ayons pas eu l'occasion de les examiner, nous supposons que Byang-chub-rgyal-mtshan en est l'auteur-éditeur. Dans la même collection, on trouve deux autres éditions imprimées du *lo-tho*: l'édition du Sman-rtsis-khang, Lhassa, pour les années 1923/24, 1925/26 et 1933/34, et l'édition de Cang-la (localité inconnue) pour l'année 1932/33. Quoi qu'il en soit, l'Université de Tokyo a une collection complète des *lo-tho* pour les dix-huit années tibétaines à partir de 1923/24 jusqu'à 1940/41 (Hajime Kitamura, *Tokyo daigaku shozō Chibetto bunken mokuroku* (Catalogue de la collection tibétaine de l'Université de Tokyo), Tokyo 1965, n° 343-360).

Après la mort de Byang-chub-rgyal-mtshan dont nous ne pouvons pas déterminer la date, son fils Bsod-nams-'brug-rgyas a poursuivi la publication du *lo-tho* jusqu'à sa mort en 1971 ou 1972. En effet, d'après l'*Accessions List — India* (désormais *AL*) de la Library of Congress qui enregistre le *lo-tho* tibétain à partir de celui pour l'année 1970/71, c'est toujours Bsod-nams-'brug-rgyas qui est l'auteur des *lo-tho* pour les années 1970/71, 1971/72 et 1972/73. A partir de celui pour l'année 1973/74, c'est Bstan-'dzin-chos-bzang qui était déjà le co-auteur pour celui de l'année précédente, qui devient l'auteur et le nom de Bsod-nams-'brug-rgyas ne figure plus (*AL*, 1970, p. 301; 1971, pp. 153 et 756; 1973, p. 119). Ceci corrobore donc l'information du La-dwags Am-chi. Bstan-'dzin-chos-bzang, fils de Bsod-nams-'brug-rgyas, continue actuellement la publication du *lo-tho* sous le titre de *Bla-ma Bsod-nams-'brug-rgyas lo-tho*.

Peu après la mort de Bsod-nams-'brug-rgyas en 1971 ou 1972, ses deux autres fils, Mifam Giaccho (Mi-pham-rgya-mtsho) et Sangia Chopel (Sangs-rgyas-chos-'phel, né en 1928 d'après l'*AL*, 1976, p. 317), ont commencé de leur part la publication du *lo-tho*. Au début pendant quelques années, ils ont publié chacun un *lo-tho*. Ainsi l'*AL*, 1975 énumère trois *lo-tho* pour l'année 1975/76, chacun par différent auteur: Bstan-'dzin-chos-bzang (p. 35), Mifam Giaccho (p. 36) et Sangia Chopel (p. 37). Quant à celui de l'année 1976/77, l'*AL* (1976) n'en enregistre que deux: l'un par Bstan-'dzin-chos-bzang (p. 710) et l'autre par Sangia Chopel (p. 317). Pour l'année 1977/78, seul le *lo-tho* par Bstan-'dzin-chos-bzang est enregistré (*AL*, 1978, p. 478). Ensuite, au moins à partir de celui de l'année 1978/79, Mifam Giaccho et Sangia Chopel publient conjointement un *lo-tho* (*AL*, 1978, p. 1213).

L'*AL* mentionne (1979, p. 675) une autre édition du *lo-tho* publié par le Nyingmapa Lama's College. Pour cette édition seul celui de l'année 1968/69 est enregistré et nous n'avons aucune information sur ce qui est advenu par la suite à cette édition.

Outre les *lo-tho* qui sont des almanachs complets, de nombreux calendriers simplifiés tant tibétains que bhoutanais sont publiés chaque année. Dans la plupart des cas, ces calendriers n'indiquent que la correspondance avec le calendrier européen et quelques fêtes de l'année courante.

re'u-mig, table chronologique, dont le plus connu est sans doute celui de Sum-pa mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal-'byor (1704–1788) composé en 1748². La différence entre eux porte à la fois sur le fonds et la forme.

Le *bstan-rtsis* indique le nombre d'années écoulées depuis l'événement en question jusqu'à l'année au cours de laquelle l'auteur compose le *bstan-rtsis*. L'événement le plus important est le nirvāṇa du Bouddha parce qu'il est le point de départ pour le calcul de la période pendant laquelle la Doctrine du Bouddha se perpétue. La durée de cinq mille ans qui a été fixée par Buddhaghosa et son école au VI^e siècle de notre ère à Ceylan, est celle qui a cours, de manière générale, chez les Tibétains et Bhoutanais. Le *bstan-rtsis* est donc composé avant tout dans le cadre de cette théorie sur la durée de la Doctrine et permet aux lecteurs de savoir dans quelle période ils se trouvent.

En revanche, le *re'u-mig* est plus proche de notre table chronologique. Les événements (naissance et/ou mort de moines importants, composition des traités, construction des monastères, etc.) sont arrangés an par an dans l'ordre chronologique.

L'almanach (*lo-tho*, *zla-tho*) n'est pas la seule forme de littérature qui contienne un *bstan-rtsis* et de nombreux traités sur l'histoire du bouddhisme et le comput contiennent chacun un *bstan-rtsis* qui leur est propre. Le *bstan-rtsis* peut même exister en tant que traité indépendant et non pas comme une partie incorporée dans un ouvrage plus global. Nous en verrons ci-après un exemple qui est composé par Lha-dbang-blo-gros.

Csoma de Kőrös a été à notre connaissance le premier à signaler et étudier un de ces *bstan-rtsis*. Dans l'appendice IV. *Chronological Table d'A Grammar of the Tibetan Language in English*, Calcutta 1834, pp. 181–198, il a traduit et annoté le *bstan-rtsis* contenu dans le célèbre *Vaidūrya dkar-po* que Sde-srid Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho (1653–1705) composa en 1687. A l'époque où notre connaissance sur l'histoire du Tibet était des plus maigres, cet appendice se trouvait d'une utilité considérable et a servi de point de départ pour établir une chronologie plus solide et mieux documentée de l'histoire du Tibet. L'appendice qui suit: V. *Epoque of the Death of Shakya, according to different authorities, ibid.*, pp. 199–202, est tiré du *Bstan-rtsis 'dod-sbyin gter-bum*³ qui fut composé en 1592 par Lha-dbang-blo-gros (Sureçamati, 1549–1632), un des principaux maîtres du Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-

² Publié par Lokesh Chandra, New Delhi, 1959, dans le volume 8 du *Śata-piṭaka series*, sous le titre de *Dpag-bsam-ljon-bzang of Sum-pa-mkhan-po Ye-shes-dpal-hbyor, part III, containing a history of Buddhism in China and Mongolia, preceded by the re'u-mig or chronological tables*.

³ Edité et traduit par Emil Schlaginweit, *Die Berechnung der Lehre. Eine Streitschrift zur Berichtigung der buddhistischen Chronologie verfasst im Jahre 1591 (pour 1592) von Sureçamatibhadra*, dans *Abh. der K. bayer. Akademie der Wiss. I. Cl. XX. Bd. III. Abth.*, München 1896, pp. 1 (591)-82(670).

rnam-rgyal (1594–1651). Cet appendice est également une contribution pionnière et significative sur la question complexe de la date du nirvāṇa du Bouddha et de la durée de la Doctrine, question qui n'est pas encore tranchée d'une façon tout à fait satisfaisante. Parmi les contributions faites après Csoma, nous pouvons citer en particulier l'article de Mme Ariane Macdonald⁴ dans lequel elle a longuement étudié cette question (pp. 62–71).

Il y a donc de nombreux *bstan-rtsis* qui diffèrent tous les uns des autres parce que les sectes, le comput, le point de vue de l'auteur, etc. diffèrent. M. Per Kvaerne a contribué pour sa part à une étude sur la chronologie bon-po qui fournit un premier cadre succinct mais général de cette tradition religieuse encore mal connue⁵. Il est donc souhaitable que d'autres *bstan-rtsis* soient étudiés pour nous permettre d'avoir une vue d'ensemble plus large sur l'histoire religieuse dans l'aire culturelle tibétaine. C'est précisément dans cette perspective que nous étudions maintenant le *bstan-rtsis* bhoutanais.

M. Michael Aris est le premier chercheur étranger à nous fournir un cadre historique du Bhoutan, Pays du Dragon. Ce cadre est fondé sur la lecture de nombreuses sources bhoutanaises. Grâce à son travail⁶, notre connaissance sur l'histoire du Bhoutan a progressé d'une façon significative. Dans l'état actuel de notre connaissance, l'intérêt du *bstan-rtsis* bhoutanais qui fait l'objet de notre étude réside donc moins dans ce qu'il nous apporte substantiellement sur le plan historique, que dans le point de vue duquel l'auteur le compose. A bien des égards, le Bhoutan a développé une tradition à part dans l'aire culturelle tibétaine si diverse et si étendue. Cette tradition mérite donc d'être étudiée pour elle-même, dans sa spécificité. Le *bstan-rtsis* bhoutanais nous présente, comme nous allons le voir, une perspective bien bhoutanaise sur le développement du bouddhisme.

D'après l'information orale d'un Bhoutanais qui était chargé de la publication à la ronéo du *zla-tho*, le *zla-tho* bhoutanais fut imprimé pour la première fois en 1962 à Kalimpong et deux cent cinquante exemplaires furent tirés cette année-là mais il ne peut préciser l'année que couvrait ce *zla-tho*. Il s'agirait soit du *zla-tho* pour l'année 1962/63 (chu-pho-stag) soit de celui pour l'année 1963/64 (chu-mo-yos). Avant cette date le *zla-tho* n'existait que sous forme manuscrite et était plus sommaire ne comportant presque pas de texte. A partir du moment où le *zla-tho* a commencé à être imprimé à la ronéo, il est devenu plus complet et comporte un texte dont un *bstan-rtsis* qui est toujours rédigé en vers heptasyllabiques.

⁴ *Préambule à la lecture d'un Rgya-bod yig-chañ*. JA 1963, pp. 53-159.

⁵ *A Chronological Table of the Bon po. The Bstan rcis of Ñi ma bstan 'jin*, Acta Orientalia XXXIII, Copenhagen 1971, pp. 205–282.

⁶ *Bhutan. The Early History of a Himalayan Kingdom*, Warminster, 1979.

Nous avons pu consulter le *zla-tho* des six années suivantes: 1975/76 (shing-moyos), 1977/78 (me-mo-sbrul), 1978/79 (sa-pho-rta), 1979/80 (sa-mo-lug), 1981/82 (lcags-mo-bya) et 1982/83 (chu-pho-khyi). Le *bstan-rtsis* de l'année 1979/80 étant plus complet que les autres, nous le prenons comme base de notre étude.

Chaque entrée du *bstan-rtsis* comporte trois éléments: l'année qui est indiquée par une des soixante combinaisons qui forment le cycle sexagénaire d'un *rab-byung*, l'événement proprement dit et le nombre d'années écoulées depuis l'événement jusqu'à l'année du *zla-tho*. Ce dernier augmente d'un an chaque année parce que l'on s'éloigne chaque année d'un an de plus de l'événement qui a eu lieu dans le passé. Cet ajout est sans doute la raison pour laquelle il y a souvent des erreurs dans le calcul des années écoulées. En revanche, l'indication par une des soixante combinaisons du cycle du *rab-byung* est toujours identique et plus fiable. Nous indiquerons donc l'année de chaque événement suivant le système sexagénaire et entre parenthèses l'année correspondante dans notre calendrier (une année du calendrier bhoutanais chevauche toujours deux années de notre calendrier. Par exemple, l'année chu-pho-khyi dans laquelle nous sommes actuellement commence le 24 février 1982 et termine le 13 février 1983. Pour la commodité de l'exposé, nous n'indiquerons que la première des deux années européennes dans laquelle la majorité de l'année bhoutanaise correspondante se passe).

Les événements mentionnés dans notre *bstan-rtsis* sont tous sans exception d'une importance considérable pour l'histoire du bouddhisme tibétain en général et bhoutanais en particulier. Néanmoins il est hors de question de discuter en détails chaque événement dans cet article. La majorité d'entre eux ont été déjà traités plus longuement dans d'autres ouvrages plus spécialisés que le nôtre. Nous nous référons donc à eux pour les événements bien connus⁷. Nous nous contentons d'ajouter ici de brèves informations supplémentaires à propos de certains événements qui nous sont mal connus, sinon inconnus, jusqu'à présent. Quelques événements nous intéressent plus particulièrement et nous avons l'intention de les étudier séparément au fur et à mesure de l'avancement de nos recherches dans d'autres publications.

Voici donc le memento chronologique rendu en français⁸.

⁷ Tout le long de la rédaction de cet article qui s'est faite à Thimphu, Bhoutan, nous n'avions à notre disposition qu'un nombre extrêmement limité de livres et d'articles de référence. A cause de cette situation, les références sont dans cet article très restreintes.

⁸ Le *bstan-rtsis* est rédigé en vers heptasyllabiques, ce qui est un moyen mnémotechnique. Néanmoins nous n'avons pu garder ce style et notre version française ne rend que l'événement mentionné dans le *bstan-rtsis*. D'autre part, les dates, surtout celles des événements de la période dite « snga-dar » (diffusion antérieure du bouddhisme au Tibet), fournies dans le *bstan-rtsis* bhoutanais diffèrent souvent de celles acceptées par d'autres autorités. Dans ces cas, nous indiquons entre parenthèses ou en notes les dates qui

- 1) *chu-phag* (1138 av. J.-C.), IV^e mois, 15^e jour.
Entrée du Bouddha dans la matrice de sa mère⁹.
- 2) *shing-byi* (1137 av. J.-C.), IV^e mois, 15^e jour.
Naissance du Bouddha à Lumbini.
- 3) *chu-brug* (1109 av. J.-C.)
Renonciation à son royaume et entrée en religion du Bouddha.
- 4) *sa-khyi* (1103 av. J.-C.)
 - a. IV^e mois, 15^e jour: Atteinte de l'Eveil à Bodhgaya.
 - b. VI^e mois, 4^e jour: Premier Sermon à Varanasi (enseignement des Quatre Nobles Vérités).
- 5) *shing-stag* (1087 av. J.-C.)
Second Sermon à Grīdhra-kūṭa-parvata (enseignement de la Perfection de la Sagesse).
- 6) *chu-rtā* (1059 av. J.-C.)
Troisième Sermon à Dhyānyakaṭaka (enseignement tantrique dont le *Kālacakra-tantra*)¹⁰.
- 7) *chu-lug* (1058 av. J.-C.)
 - a. IV^e mois, 15^e jour: Nirvāṇa du Bouddha¹¹.
 - b. XII^e mois: Mort de Chos-rgyal Zla-ba-bzang-po¹² qui composa des

nous semblent plus acceptables. De plus, notre *bstan-rtsis* ne donne que la date de naissance des personnes. Nous fournissons entre parenthèses leur date de mort si celle-ci nous est connue par d'autres sources.

⁹ Les auteurs tibétains et bhoutanais entreprennent d'établir leurs propres chronologies à partir de la date du nirvāṇa du Bouddha et ils envisagent à cet effet plusieurs modes de calcul. Les dates des autres principaux événements de la vie du Bouddha sont fixées en fonction de celle du nirvāṇa. Cf. Ariane Macdonald, pp. 64–71.

Le 15^e jour du IV^e mois est particulièrement saint parce que d'après la légende populaire trois ou quatre événements importants de la vie du Bouddha eurent lieu ce même jour à différents moments de sa vie. Ce sont : l'entrée dans la matrice de sa mère (à être exclue de la liste des trois événements), la naissance, l'atteinte de l'Eveil et le nirvāṇa. Le calendrier bhoutanais officiel de nos jours y ajoute un cinquième événement qui est la victoire sur Mara. Ce jour est donc célébré comme *dus-chen Inga-'dzom* « jour férié des Cinq Événements Cumulés (de la vie du Bouddha) ».

¹⁰ La date de ce serment varie d'après les traditions. D'après Bu-ston, c'est dans l'année même du nirvāṇa que le Bouddha prêcha le *Kālacakra-tantra*, cf. *BA*, p. 754, n.1.

¹¹ Cette chronologie s'accorde avec celle établie par Padma-dkar-po (1527–1592) et suivie par Lhadbang-blo-gros (1549/50–1632). Cf. Ariane Macdonald, p. 69 et Schlangintweit, p. 64.

¹² Il est le premier de la série des sept rois de Shambhala (cf. Shambhala, p. 8 et *Kālacakra*, p. 73). Dans notre *bstan-rtsis*, Zla-ba-bzang-po meurt dans la même année que celle du nirvāṇa du Bouddha. Néanmoins, d'après une tradition tibétaine plus répandue, il meurt trois ans après le nirvāṇa du Bouddha (*Kālacakra*, p. 73 et *Bla-ma Bsod-nams-brug-rgyas lo-tho*, l'année 1982/83, p. 5). En effet, il y a plusieurs computs différents à l'intérieur même du système du *Kālacakra*. Cette question si complexe et

commentaires sur le *Kālacakra-mūla-tantra* (*rtsa-rgyud*) et érigea le grand maṇḍala du Kālacakra.

- 8) *shing-sprel* (1057 av. J.–C.)
Commencement de l'enseignement du Dharma par Rgyal-sras Lha-dbang (au pays de Shambhala)¹³.
- 9) *me-sprel* (1045 av. J.–C.)
Naissance d'O-rgyan-rje (= Padmasambhava).
- 10) *lcags-phag* (1040 av. J.–C.)
Descente des livres tantriques sur la résidence du roi Dza¹⁴.
- 11) *chu-phag* (958 av. J.–C.)
 - a. Naissance du roi Ashoka.
 - b. Diminution du lac et apparition de la forêt d'arbres sa-la (skt. shala) au Tibet (*BA*, pp. 35–36).
- 12) *shing-phag* (956 av. J.–C.)
Naissance de Saraha (c. VIII^e–IX^e siècles, Dowman, Appendix 2).
- 13) *shing-glang* (716 av. J.–C.)
Naissance de sprul-sku Dga'-rab-rdo-rje¹⁵.
- 14) *shing-byi* (657 av. J.–C.)
Naissance de Nāgārjuna.
- 15) *shing-sprel* (457 av. J.–C.)
Arrivée de 'Jam-dpal-grags-pa (au pays de Shambhala)¹⁶.
- 16) (*chu-phag*) (358 av. J.–C.)¹⁷

intéressante qu'elle soit, dépasse le cadre de notre article et nous ne pouvons donner que quelques informations sporadiques à ce sujet.

La version intégrale du *Kālacakra-mūla-tantra* (*rtsa-rgyud*) qui comportait 12.000 śloka a été perdue et la version existante (Tōhoku 362) n'en est qu'un abrégé (*bsdus-rgyud*) comportant soit 1030, soit 1039 soit 1041 śloka (Bu-ston, *Dus-'khor-chos-'byung*, pp. 26-27, 54).

Le nombre de commentaires attribués à Zla-ba-bzang-po varie selon les traditions : 60.000 (Bu-ston, *ibid.*, p. 28), 1.200 (*Kālacakra*, p. 73).

¹³ Rgyal-sras Lha-dbang est le 2^e de la série des sept rois de Shambhala. La durée de son règne ainsi que celui des cinq suivants est de cent ans (Bu-ston, *Dus-'khor-chos-'byung*, p. 53 et Schlagintweit, p. 65).

¹⁴ M. Samten Karmay a récemment étudié ce personnage intéressant: *King Tsa/Dza and Vajrayana, Tantric and Taoist Studies*, Berkeley 1981, pp. 192-211.

¹⁵ Il est considéré comme incarnation de Rdo-rje-sems-dpa' et occupe une place importante dans la transmission de la Doctrine de Rdzogs-chen. Les différentes traditions ne s'accordent pas sur la position exacte de cette personne dont l'existence historique est controversée (Dargyay, pp. 19-20, 59).

¹⁶ C'est le 1^{er} de la série des 25 Rigs-ldan qui maintiennent successivement chacun pendant cent ans (cf. notes 19 et 20) l'enseignement du Bouddha au pays de Shambhala (Shambhala, pp. 8-9).

¹⁷ L'indication de l'année de cet événement d'après le système sexagénaire est absente dans le texte. Nous avons donc restitué l'année de cet événement à partir de l'indication du nombre d'années écoulées depuis cet événement jusqu'à l'année de la composition du *hstan-rtsis*.

Départ de 'Jam-dpal-grags-pa qui rédigea la version abrégée (*bsdus-rgyud*) du *Kālacakra-tantra* (Schlangintweit, p. 65).

17) *shing-byi* (357 av. J.-C.)

Début de l'enseignement du Dharma par (le 2^e) Rigs-ldan Pad-dkar qui composa le grand commentaire (= *Dri-med-'od*, Tōhoku 845) (*Kalacakra*, p. 73).

18) *chu-lug* (158 av. J.-C.)

Naissance d'Asaṅga.

19) *shing-stag* (127 av. J.-C.)

Naissance de Gnya-khri-btsan-po, le premier roi tibétain¹⁸.

20) *shing-khyi* (374 ap. J.-C.)

Naissance de Tho-tho-ri-btsan¹⁸.

21) *chu-bya* (433 ap. J.-C.)

Début de la diffusion du bouddhisme au Tibet.

22) *shing-sprel* (444 ap. J.-C.)

a. Apparition du système religieux des *Kla-klo* et le début de la période de *me-mkha'-rgya-mtsho* (= 403 ans)¹⁹.

b. Arrivée du (10^e) Rigs-ldan Rgya-mtsho-rnam-rgyal (au pays de Shambhala)¹⁹.

23) *me-khyi* (626 ap. J.-C.)

Introduction du système de comput appelé *byed-rtsis* par (le 11^e) Rigs-ldan Rgyal-dka'²⁰.

24) *sa-glang* (629 ap. J.-C.)

Naissance de Srong-btsan-sgam-po (c. 609, Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 275)²¹.

25) *lcags-phag* (651 ap. J.-C.)

Construction du temple du 'Phrul-snang (Jo-khang) à Ra-sa (Lha-sa).²²

¹⁸ Les dates de ces rois mythologiques ne peuvent être déterminées d'une façon certaine.

¹⁹ D'après la tradition standard, cette période de 403 ans commence en 624 ap. J.-C. et termine en 1026 ap. J.-C. (*BA*, p. 405; Yamaguchi, p. 89, n.1 et Shambhala, p. 9). Le premier cycle de rab-byung commence ainsi en 1027 ap. J.-C. Le comput du *bstan-rtsis* bhoutanais diffère sensiblement. D'autre part, d'après Lha-dbang-blo-gros (Schlagintweit, p. 67) et notre *bstan-rtsis* qui suit sa théorie, la durée de l'enseignement de ce rigs-ldan est 182 ans, et non pas cent ans (cf. *supra*, note 16). Il en résulte donc que le début du système *byed-rtsis* coïncide avec celui de l'enseignement du rigs-ldan suivant.

²⁰ Le système du *byed-rtsis* commence 182 ans après le début de la période de 403 ans, ce qui donne, dans la tradition standard, l'année 806 ap. J.-C. comme début de ce système (*BA*, p. 754 et Yamaguchi, p. 89, n.1). D'autre part, la durée de l'enseignement des quatorze rigs-ldan suivants (12^e-25^e) est 96 ans chacun, ce qui constitue un point de différence de plus par rapport au système tibétain standard (cf. *supra*, note 16).

²¹ L'année de naissance de ce roi tibétain n'est pas déterminée d'une façon certaine. Par contre, nous savons d'après les Annales de Touen-houang qu'il est mort en 649 ap. J.-C.

²² La construction de ce célèbre temple est attribuée à Srong-btsan-sgam-po mort en 649 ap. J.-C.

- 26) *chu-rta* (802 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Khri-srong-lde-btsan (742, Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 275).
- 27) *lcags-stag* (810 ap. J.–C.)
Arrivée de Padmasambhava au Bumthang, Bhoutan²³.
- 28) *chu-stag* (822 ap. J.–C.)
Arrivée de Padmasambhava au Tibet pour la construction du monastère de Bsam-yas (la seconde moitié du 8^e siècle)²⁴.
- 29) *me-rta* (826 ap. J.–C.)
Consécration du monastère de Bsam-yas (c. 779, Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 275).
- 30) *me-khyi* (866 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Khri Ral-pa-can (805, Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 275).
- 31) *me-sprul* (876 ap. J.–C.)
Départ de Padmasambhava vers le Rnga-yab-gling.
- 32) *lcags-bya* (901 ap. J.–C.)
Pésecution du bouddhisme par Glang-dar-ma et l'assassinat de celui-ci par Dpal-gyi-rdo-rje (842, Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 275)²⁵.
- 33) *shing-'brug* (944 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Tilopa Shes-rab-bzang-po (988–1069, Dowman, Appendix 2).
- 34) *shing-byi* (964 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Naropa (1016–1100, Dowman, Appendix 2).
- 35) *sa-stag* (978 ap. J.–C.)
Arrivée dans le Dbus-Gtsang de la flamme de la renaissance du bouddhisme commencée au Kham (Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 112).
- 36) *shing-rta* (994 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Rin-chen-bzang-po (958–1055, BA, pp. 68–69).
- 37) *me-rta* (1006 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance d'Atiça (982–1054, BA, pp. 247–261).

²³ Les différentes versions ne s'accordent pas sur la date de cet événement. En effet Rigzin Dorji dans son introduction au livret intitulé *The Guru Rinpoche. The Great Culture Hero*, Thimphu 1982, situe cet événement en 746 ap. J.-C. tandis que Lopon Pemala le situe en 807/8 ap. J.-C. (*Sman-ljongs 'brug rgyal-khab-tu dam-pa'i chos dar-tshul*, dans *'Brug blo-gsal*, II-4/III-4, 1981/82, p. 10). Quoi qu'il en soit, le Bhoutan a sa propre tradition très intéressante sur l'activité de Padmasambhava. Elle est surtout en relation avec la conversion au bouddhisme de Sindhu Raja de Bumthang (Aris, pp. 43-59). Dans la vallée de Bumthang on célèbre l'arrivée de Padmasambhava le 10^e jour soit du IV^e soit du V^e mois. La veille, les gens nettoient leur maison et l'ornent de fleurs appelées *dotse meto*. Nous avons l'intention d'étudier cette tradition bhoutanaise dans un travail ultérieur.

²⁴ La construction de ce premier ensemble monastique tibétain eut lieu dans la seconde moitié du VIII^e siècle sous le règne de Khri-srong-lde-btsan.

²⁵ Cet événement est considéré avoir eu lieu aux alentours de 840 ap. J.-C.

- 38) *lcags-bya* (1021 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Mar-pa (1012–1097, *BA*, p. 404).
- 39) *me-yos* (1027 ap. J.-C.)
Début du 1^{er} cycle de rab-byung.
- 40) *shing-khyi* (1034 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Dkon-mchog-rgyal-po de 'Khon (1034–1102, *BA*, p. 211).
- 41) *sa-stag* (1038 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Gling-rje Ge-sar²⁶.
- 42) *me-phag* (1047 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Rngog-ston Chos-sku-rdo-rje (1036–1102, *BA*, p. 404).
- 43) *chu-'brug* (1052 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Mi-la-ras-pa Bzhad-pa-rdo-rje (1040–1129, *BA*, pp. 427–436).
- 44) *sa-phag* (1059 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Rngog-lo-chen-po Blo-ldan-shes-rab (1059–1109, *BA*, pp. 325–326).
- 45) *me-rtā* (1066 ap. J.-C.)
Arrivée d'Atiça au Tibet (1042, *BA*, p. 247).
- 46) *chu-glang* (1073 ap. J.-C.)
Construction des monastères de Gsang-phu (*BA*, p. 325) et de Sa-skyā (*ibid.*, p. 210).
- 47) *sa-lug* (1079 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Chos-rje Zla-'od-gzhon-nu.
- 48) *shing-byi* (1084 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Ras-chung-pa Rdo-rje-grags-pa (1084–1161, *BA*, pp. 436–439).
- 49) *me-yos* (1087 ap. J.-C.)
Début du 2^e cycle de rab-byung.
- 50) *lcags-stag* (1110 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Phag-mo-gru-pa Rdo-rje-rgyal-po (1110–1170, *BA*, pp. 553–563) et de Dus-gsum-mkhyen-pa (1110–1193, *ibid.*, pp. 473–480).
- 51) *sa-sprel* (1128 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Gling-ras-pa (1128–1188, *BA*, pp. 659–664).
- 52) *chu-phag* (1143 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de 'Bri-gung-chos-rje 'Jig-rten-mgon-po (1143–1217, *BA*, pp. 596–601).
- 53) *me-yos* (1147 ap. J.-C.)
a. Début du 3^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Naissance de Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan (1147–1216, *BA*, p. 211).

²⁶ Cf. *Gleng-brjod* (Tibetan Introduction) par Lupon Pemala, p. 10 dans *The Epic of Gesar*, vol. 1, Thimphu 1979.

- 54) *lcags-sbrul* (1161 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Gtsang-pa-rgya-ras Ye-shes-rdo-rje (1161–1211, *BA*, pp. 664–670).
- 55) *chu-stag* (1162 ap. J.–C.)²⁷
Naissance de Sa-skya paṇḍita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan (1182–1251, *BA*, p. 211).
- 56) *shing-'brug* (1184 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Pha-jo 'Brug-sgom-zhig-po (1208–1276, Aris, pp. 173–174).
- 57) *sa-bya* (1189 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Rgod-tshang-pa Mgon-po-rdo-rje (1189–1258, *BA*, pp. 680–686).
- 58) *me-stag* (1206 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Karma Pakṣi (1204–1283, *BA*, pp. 485–486).
- 59) *me-yos* (1207 ap. J.–C.)
Début du 4^e cycle de rab-byung.
- 60) *chu-sprel* (1212 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Gu-ru-chos-dbang (1212–1270, Dargyay, p. 65).
- 61) *chu-yos* (1243 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Grub-chen Me-long-rdo-rje (1243–1303, *BA*, pp. 196–197).
- 62) *me-stag* (1266 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Rig-'dzin Kamararāja (1266–1343, *BA*, pp. 197–200).
- 63) *me-yos* (1267 ap. J.–C.)
Début du 5^e cycle de rab-byung.
- 64) *lcags-sprel* (1284 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Karma-pa Rang-byung-rdo-rje (1284–1339, *BA*, pp. 488–493).
- 65) *lcags-stag* (1290 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub (1290–1326).
- 66) *sa-sprel* (1308 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Klong-chen-pa (1308–1363, *BA*, pp. 200–202).
- 67) *me-yos* (1327 ap. J.–C.)
a. Début du 6^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Montée sur le trône du (17^e) Rigs-ldan Dpal-skyongs.
- 68) *me-bya* (1357 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Tsong-kha-pa Blo-bzang-grags-pa (1357–1419).
- 69) *shing-glang* (1385 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Thang-stong-rgyal-po (1385–1464, Aris, pp. 185–190).

²⁷ Ici notre texte ainsi que des autres années consultés écrit *chu-lug*. Cependant, d'après le nombre d'années écoulées depuis l'événement jusqu'à l'année de la composition du *bstan-rtsis* qui est indiqué en même temps, *chu-lug* est une faute pour *chu-stag*.

- 70) *me-yos* (1387 ap. J.–C.)
Début du 7^e cycle de rab-byung.
- 71) *lcags-lug* (1391 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance du 1^{er} Dalai Lama Dge-'dun-grub-pa (1391–1475).
- 72) *chu-lug* (1403 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Ratna-gling-pa (1403–1479).
- 73) *sa-glang* (1409 ap. J.–C.)
Construction du monastère de Dga'-ldan.
- 74) *me-sprel* (1416 ap. J.–C.)
Construction du monastère de 'Bras-spungs.
- 75) *sa-phag* (1419 ap. J.–C.)
Construction du monastère de Se-ra.
- 76) *me-yos* (1447 ap. J.–C.)
a. Début du 8^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Composition du *Pad-dkar-zhal-lung*²⁸.
c. Construction du monastère de Bkra-shis-lhun-po (1445, Snellgrove and Richardson, p. 182).
- 77) *lcags-rta* (1450 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Padma-gling-pa (1450–1521, Aris, pp. 160–165).
- 78) *shing-phag* (1455 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de 'Brug-pa Kun-legs (1455–1529)²⁹.
- 79) *shing-bya* (1465 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Ngag-dbang-chos-rgyal (1465–1540, Aris, pp. 179, 211).
- 80) *me-yos* (1507 ap. J.–C.)
a. Début du 9^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Naissance de Karma-pa Mi-bskyod-rdo-rje (1507–1554).
- 81) *me-phag* (1527 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Padma-dkar-po (1527–1592).
- 82) *lcags-khyi* (1550 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Lha-dbang-blo-gros (1549/50–1632, LCBS, fol. 110b1)³⁰.

²⁸ Ce traité composé par Lhun-grub-rgya-mtsho est le texte fondamental pour le système de comput dit *grub-rtsis* (Yamaguchi, p. 91, n. 32).

²⁹ Pour la vie de ce saint « fou » extrêmement vénéré et populaire au Bhoutan, nous pouvons consulter R. A. Stein, *Vie et chants de 'Brug-pa Kun-legs le yogin*, Paris 1972 et K. Dowman, *The Divine Madman, The Sublime Life and Songs of Drukpa Kunley*, London 1980.

³⁰ Il était l'un des principaux maîtres du Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal et il a influencé durablement bien des aspects de la tradition religieuse du Bhoutan que le Zhabs-drung unifié sous son autorité. Nos connaissances sur ce maître restent néanmoins des plus maigres. Il semble qu'une édition imprimée de ses *Œuvres Complètes* existait au monastère de Lcags-ri ou Rta-mgo au nord de la vallée de Thimphu, mais nous n'en avons pas connaissance de nos jours.

- 83) *me-yos* (1567 ap. J.-C.)
 a. Début du 10^e cycle de rab-byung.
 b. Naissance de Mi-pham-bstan-pa'i-nyi-ma (1567–1619, Aris, pp. 205, 214–15).
- 84) *me-khyi* (1586 ap. J.-C.)
 Composition du *Gdan-dus-rtsis-gzhung* par Lha-dbang-blo-gros³¹.
- 85) *lcags-yos* (1591 ap. J.-C.)
 Naissance du 1^{er} sde-srid Dbu-mdzad-chen-mo Bstan-'dzin-'brug-rgyas (1591–1656, règne 1651–1656, Aris, p. 231; pour la liste des sde-srid successifs, voir *ibid.*, pp. 271–273).
- 86) *shing-rta* (1594 ap. J.-C.)
 Naissance du Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal (1594–1651, Aris, pp. 203–232).
- 87) *sa-khyi* (1598 ap. J.-C.)
 Naissance de Pad-gling gsung-sprul Tshul-khrims-rdo-rje (1598–1669)³².
- 88) *shing-'brug* (1604 ap. J.-C.)
 Naissance du 1^{er} rje-mkhan-po Pad-dkar-'byung-gnas (1604–1672, règne ? -

³¹ Il s'agit du *Gdan-dus dgongs-gcig rtsis-gzhung* qui nous est malheureusement inaccessible. D'après Lopon Pemala, Directeur de la Bibliothèque Nationale du Bhoutan, l'auteur a composé ce traité de comput en se fondant à la fois sur le *Kālacakra-tantra* et *Dpal gdan-bzhi-pa'i rnam-par-bshad pa'i rgyud-kyi rgyal-po* (Śricatuḥpithavikhyātantrarāja, Tōhoku, 430). Ce traité qui diffère à bien des égards des autres fournit le fondement du calendrier bhoutanais. Un des points les plus frappants est l'écart d'un jour dans l'appellation des jours de la semaine qui existe entre les deux calendriers tibétain et bhoutanais. Les jours de la semaine bhoutanaise précèdent d'un jour ceux des Tibétains. Par exemple, un jour qui est dimanche (*gza' nyi-ma*) pour les Tibétains est déjà lundi (*gza' zla-ba*) chez les Bhoutanais. Cette différence ainsi que les autres mériteraient une étude à part.

Nous connaissons deux autres traités composés par le même auteur. Ils sont le *Gdan-dus thun-mong-gi rtsis-gzhung* (date de composition inconnue ; 2^e édition imprimée à Lcags-ri, 76 folio, sigle marginal: *tsa*) et le *Bstan-rtsis 'dod-sbyin gter-bum* composé en 1592 (cf. *supra* note 3).

³² La lignée principale de réincarnations de Padma-gling-pa continue sans interruption jusqu'à nos jours:

- 1) Padma-gling-pa, 1450-1521.
- 2) Rgyal-dbang-bstan-'dzin-grags-pa, 1536-1597.
- 3) Kun-mkhyen Tshul-khrims-rdo-rje, 1598-1669.
- 4) Ngag-dbang-kun-bzang-rdo-rje, 1680-1723.
- 5) Bstan-'dzin-grub-mchog-rdo-rje, 1724-1762.
- 6) Kun-bzang-bstan-pa'i-rgyal-mtshan, 1763-1817.
- 7) Ngag-dbang-chos-kyi-blo-gros, 1819-1842.
- 8) Kun-bzang-bstan-pa'i-nyi-ma, 1843-1891.
- 9) Bstan-'dzin-cho-kyi-rgyal-mtshan, 1894-1913.
- 10) Ngag-dbang-chos-kyi-rgyal-mtshan ou Padma-'od-gsal-'gyur-med-rdo-rje, *alias* Thub-bstan-chos-kyi-rdo-rje, 1930-1955.
- 11) Kun-bzang-padma-rin-chen-rnam-rgyal-nges-don-bstan-pa'i-nyi-ma, 1968.

- 1672; pour la liste des rje-mkhan-po successifs, voir Aris, pp. 273–274 et *LCBS*, fol. 138a–168b).
- 89) *chu-glang* (1613 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance du 2^e rje-mkhan-po Bsod-nams-'od-zer (1613–1689, règne 1672–1689, *LCBS*, fol. 139a2–139b4).
- 90) *me-'brug* (1616 ap. J.–C.)
Arrivée du Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal au Bhoutan (Aris, pp. 209–212).
- 91) *me-sbrul* (1617 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance du V^e Dalai-Lama Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho (1617–1682).
- 92) *sa-rtā* (1618 ap. J.–C.)
Première et deuxième attaques de l'armée du sde-srid Gtsang-pa contre le Bhoutan, sans succès (Aris, pp. 212 et 219: la première peu après l'arrivée du Zhabs-drung au Bhoutan en 1616 et la deuxième en 1634).
- 93) *lcags-sprel* (1620 ap. J.–C.)
Construction du monastère de Lcags-ri (Aris, p. 215).
- 94) *me-yos* (1627 ap. J.–C.)
a. Début du 11^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Etablissement du système duel de gouvernement (*lugs-gnyis*) au Bhoutan (1623, Aris, p. 215).
- 95) *sa-sbrul* (1629 ap. J.–C.)
Construction du Gsang-sngags-zab-don-pho-brang (= Simtokha Dzong) (Aris, p. 218).
- 96) *me-glang* (1637 ap. J.–C.)
Construction du Spungs-thang-bde-chen-pho-brang (= Punakha Dzong) (Aris, p. 221).
- 97) *sa-stag* (1638 ap. J.–C.)
a. Naissance du IV^e sde-srid Bstan-'dzin-rab-rgyas (1638–1696, règne 1680–1696, Aris, p. 250).
b. Construction du Dbang-'dus-chos-kyi-pho-brang (= Wangdiphodrang Dzong) (Aris, p. 221).
- 98) *sa-yos* (1639 ap. J.–C.)
a. Troisième et dernière attaque de l'armée du sde-srid Gtsang-pa contre le Bhoutan et sa défaite (Aris, pp. 221–223).
b. Conclusion d'un compromis entre le Zhabs-drung et Dpag-bsam-dbang-po par l'intermédiaire du Karma-pa (Aris, p. 223).
- 99) *lcags-sbrul* (1641 ap. J.–C.)
Prise par le Zhabs-drung du Rdo-rngon-rdzong et changement du nom de celui-ci en Bkra-shis-chos-rdzong (Aris, p. 170). (= Thimphe Dzong)

- 100) *chu-rta* (1642 ap. J.-C.)
Etablissement du pouvoir du V^e Dalai-Lama à l'aide de Gu-shri khan.
- 101) *shing-sprel* (1644 ap. J.-C.)
Première attaque de l'armée des Dge-lugs-pa contre le Bhoutan et leur défaite (Aris, p. 224).
- 102) *shing-bya* (1645 ap. J.-C.)
Construction du Rin-spungs-pho-brang (= Paro Dzong) et institution du rite Dgongs-'dus-sgrub-ril³³.
- 103) *me-khyi* (1646 ap. J.-C.)
a. Naissance de Sming-gling-gter-chen (= Gter-bdag-gling-pa) (1634/46–1714).
b. Construction du Palais du Potala à Lhassa.
- 104) *me-phag* (1647 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Byams-mgon Ngag-dbang-rgyal-mtshan (1647–1732, Aris, p. 271 avec une liste de ses réincarnations successives).
- 105) *sa-byi* (1648 ap. J.-C.)
Défaite de l'armée tibétaine (Aris, p. 227).
- 106) *lcags-yos* (1651 ap. J.-C.), III^e mois, 10^e jour
Entrée en nirvāṇa du Zhabs-drung à l'âge de 58 ans (Aris, pp. 231–242).
- 107) *me-bya* (1657 ap. J.-C.)
Victoire bhoutanaise sur l'armée tibéto-mongole.
- 108) *lcags-bya* (1681 ap. J.-C.)
Composition du *Rtsis-gzhungs-chen-po Nyin-byed-snang-ba* (par Sming-gling-lo-chen Dharmashrī (1654–1717/8).
- 109) *me-yos* (1687 ap. J.-C.)
a. Début du 12^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Composition du *Vaidūrya-dkar-po* (par Sangs-rgyas-rgya-mtsho, 1652–1705)³⁴.
- 110) *lcags-sbrul* (1701 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Bstan-'dzin-chos-rje (pour rgyal) (1700–1767, 10^e rje-mkhan-po, règne 1755–62).
- 111) *lcags-stag* (1710 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de Shākya-rin-chen (1710–1759, 9^e rje-mkhan-po, règne 1744–55).

³³ L'enseignement du *Bla-ma-dgongs-'dus* de Sangs-rgyas-gling-pa (1340-1396) est très populaire au Bhoutan. En effet, Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal a reçu au Tibet même l'enseignement de ce cycle de la part de Rig-'dzin-snying-po, descendant de Sangs-rgyas-gling-pa, et il a ensuite invité ce maître au Bhoutan où il avait établi son pouvoir politique et religieux (Aris, pp. 154 et 226; *LCBS*, fol. 112b).

³⁴ Le comput exposé dans ce célèbre traité devient désormais le comput officiel du Tibet (Yamaguchi, p. 92, n. 40).

- 112) *sa-bya* (1729 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de 'Jigs-med-gling-pa (1729–1798).
- 113) *me-yos* (1747 ap. J.–C.)
Début du 13^e cycle de rab-byung.
- 114) *shing-khyi* (1754 ap. J.–C.)
Composition du *Lhan-thabs-gsol-sgron* (par Ngag-dbang-dpal-ldan-bzang-po).
- 115) *me-yos* (1807 ap. J.–C.)
a. Début du 14^e cycle de rab-byung.
b. Arrivée du (22^e) Rigs-ldan Mi-yi-seng-ge.
- 116) *me-bya* (1837 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de 'Jigs-med-rnam-rgyal (1825/37–1881, père d'U-rgyan-dbang-phyug, le 1^{er} roi du Bhoutan).
- 117) *me-rtā* (1846 ap. J.–C.)
Composition du *Lhan-thabs Me-khyer-snang-ba* par Chos-rgyal-dbang-po.
- 118) *chu-khyi* (1862 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance d'U-rgyan-dbang-phyug (1862–1926, 1^{er} roi du Bhoutan).
- 119) *me-yos* (1867 ap. J.–C.)
Début du 15^e cycle de rab-byung.
- 120) *sa-sbrul* (1869 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Mahatma Gandhi (1869–1948)
- 121) *lcags-sbrul* (1881 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance du maître de l'auteur³⁵.
- 122) *chu-'brug* (1892 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Bstan-pa-rin-chen.
- 123) *chu-yos* (1903 ap. J.–C.)
Arrivée du (23^e) Rigs-ldan Dbang-phyug (au pays de Shambhala) où il habite actuellement.
- 124) *shing-'brug* (1904 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de Bdud-'joms Ye-shes-rdo-rje (= le Bdud-'joms rin-po-che actuel).
- 125) *shing-sbrul* (1905 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de 'Jigs-med-dbang-phyug (1905–1952, le II^e roi du Bhoutan).
- 126) *shing-byi* (1924 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance du XVI^e Karma-pa Rig-pa'i-rdo-rje (1924–1981).
- 127) *sa-'brug* (1928 ap. J.–C.)
Naissance de 'Jigs-med-rdo-rje (1928–1972, le III^e roi du Bhoutan).

³⁵ L'auteur de notre *bstan-rtsis* est Tshe-ring-rdo-rje qui occupe toujours en 1982 le poste de rtsis-pa'i slob-dpon.

- 128) *shing-phag* (1935 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance du (XIV^e) Dalai-Lama Bstan-'dzin-rgya-mtsho.
- 129) *shing-lug* (1955 ap. J.-C.)
Naissance de 'Jigs-med-seng-ge, IV^e roi du Bhoutan (sur le trône depuis 1972).
- 130) *sa-khyi* (1958 ap. J.-C.)
Construction du Zangs-mdog-dpal-ri (à U-rgyan-rtse-mo, Paro Taktsang) par Ashi Phun-tshogs-chos-sgron (née en 1910), mère du III^e roi 'Jigs-med-rdo-rje.
- 131) *lcags-byi* (1960 ap. J.-C.)
Etablissement de l'école Rigs-gzhung-slob-grwa dans le Gsang-sngags-zab-don-rdzong (= Simtokha Dzong).
- 132) *me-lug* (1967 ap. J.-C.)
a. Construction du monastère de Kharbandi à Phuntsholing par Ashi Phun-tshogs-chos-sgron.
b. Etablissement du sgrub-grwa (école de méditation) au monastère de Rtamgo et la consécration de l'image de Padmasambhava par la reine mère Ashi Kesang.
- 133) *sa-sprel* (1968 ap. J.-C.)
Exécution d'une copie en or du Kanjur et du Tenjur ordonnée par 'Jigs-med-rdo-rje, III^e roi du Bhoutan.
- 134) *lcags-khyi* (1970 ap. J.-C.)
Montée de Nyi-zer-sprul-sku Phrin-las-lhun-grub sur le trône du (63^e) rje-mkhan-po du Bhoutan.
- 135) *shing-stag* (1974 ap. J.-C.)
Couronnement du roi actuel.
- 136) *sa-rta* (1978 ap. J.-C.)
Construction du Bde-mchog-lha-khang dans le Punakha Dzong par la reine mère Ashi Kesang.

Ainsi la lecture de ce *bstan-rtsis* confirme les études sur le Bhoutan qui montrent que les Rnying-ma-pa et les 'Brug-pa sont les écoles prédominantes au Bhoutan. Cette double appartenance est illustrée dans le *bstan-rtsis* en particulier par la mention de l'arrivée de Padmasambhava, fondateur de l'école Rnying-ma-pa, au Bumthang, Bhoutan central et de la naissance dans ce même Bumthang de Padma-gling-pa (1450–1521), un des plus grand *gter-ston* « découvreurs des textes cachés » du monde tibétain. Plusieurs lignées de réincarnations de ce saint se sont perpétuées jusqu'à nos jours.

L'influence 'Brug-pa se manifeste par la théorie de comput que suit le calendrier bhoutanais officiel. Cette théorie a été établie par Padma-dkar-po (1527–1592), grand savant de l'école 'Brug-pa, a été suivie par son disciple Lha-dbang-blo-gros (1549/50–1632), et a été introduite au Bhoutan par Zhabs-drung Ngag-dbang-rnam-rgyal (1594–1651). Celui-ci était une des réincarnations de Padma-dkar-po et en même temps disciple de Lha-dbang-blo-gros. Suite à une querelle intestine de l'école 'Brug-pa, le Zhabs-drung dut se réfugier au Bhoutan en 1616 pour y établir la théocratie 'Brug-pa qui a duré jusqu'en 1907. Aujourd'hui encore c'est ce comput qui règle le calendrier bhoutanais qui diffère sensiblement de celui des Tibétains.

A SBRA-NAG GLOSSARY IN GRUM-GRŽIMAJLO'S TRAVELS

BY

G. KARA (Budapest)

This is a tentative decipherment of an Eastern Tibetan dialectal glossary found in G. E. Grum-Gržimajlo's Travels.¹ The glossary containing 242 items, words, phrases and sentences in Banag (Panaka) or Sbra-nag (Black Tent)² dialect was compiled by the Russian geographer and investigator of Central Asia during his visit in the Amdo-Kukunor area in 1889–1890 and was published as Supplement VI to the second volume of his Travels to Western China.³ He collected Sbra-nag words with the help of an interpreter, a Dungan (Chinese Moslem) of Donkir who spent his youth among the «Kukunor Tanguts».⁴ The words are recorded in Russian Cyrillic script, unfortunately not in the phonetical alphabet of the Russian Academy,⁵ but in the Russian orthography used until 1918.⁶ Tibetan words and sentences are provided here with Russian translation and, after the list of the numerals (1°–29°), they are enumerated according to the alphabetical order of the initials of the Russian renderings. Similar to the word-lists published by Prževal'skij and Széchenyi, resp., this glossary reveals some evident inconsistencies in recording Tibetan dialectal words. The inconsequent notation is partly due to the insufficiency of the writing system and orthography used, and partly due to the recorder's unawareness of the phonetic system of the given Tibetan idiom. Here and there the Russian interpretation of the Sbra-nag word or sentence proves to be inexact or, in a few cases, desperately wrong or at least enigmatic. Despite these shortcomings the data in Grum-Gržimajlo's glossary represent one of the otherwise insufficiently investigated Eastern Tibetan dialects with several archaic features and

¹ In a short paper (On Grum-Gržimajlo's Sbra-nag Glossary) read at the 3rd Csoma de Kőrös Symposium, Velm, Austria, 1981, I presented some information concerning this source.

² The «Black Tent Tanguts» live SE from the Kukunor and N from the upper Huangho, see e.g. Roerich's sketch in *Le parler de l'Amdo*.

³ *Putešestvie v Zapadnyj Kitaj*, Vol. 2, pp. 417–420: *Priloženie VI, Spisok slov narečija tangutov panaka*.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 417; Donkir: on his map of Beishan and Nanshan Grum-Gržimajlo marks a monastery called Donkir-sume, SW from Danger i.e. Tangar, Tib. Stoñ-'khor, now Huangyuan (town west from Xining, see Rock, p. 5); Monguor *dōngsuor* (Mostaert).

⁵ Used e.g. in Radloff's *Proben* and *Versuch*, or earlier in Böhrtlingk's *Yakut manual*.

⁶ With *jat'* and *iot* (ѣ, и); hard mark (ъ) is not used here in Tibetan words.

dialectal innovations in the field of phonetics and with areal peculiarities in the field of vocabulary and syntax.

The present attempt to evaluate Grum-Gržimajlo's data aims at their rough phonemic reconstruction and their identification with morphemes, constant morpheme groups or lexemes known from Written Tibetan (either classical or dialectal) and from linguistic, philological and other records of words of living dialects. (In several cases the solution proposed here remains provisional or partial, especially when the comparative material does not provide a firm basis or when I could not overcome my ignorance. On the other hand some compounds found in Grum-Gržimajlo's glossary may affirm the authenticity of certain rare forms attested only in one of our dictionaries.)

In the transcription of the Tibetan dialectal data I mainly preserved the symbols used in my sources. Unfortunately this method makes similar features seem different and conceals real differences, but the highly desirable unification (and simplification) of the various systems involves the risk of a false equalization of records of rather different levels. Attempting the reconstruction of Sbra-nag sounds, I followed a simplified notation, possibly with the same symbols as used in the transliteration of Written Tibetan, but I introduced *z*, *ʃ*, *dʒ*, *tʃ*, *tʃh* for the cacuminals, *x* for the velar spirant differing either from *h* or *ɣ*, extended the usage of *h* as aspiration marker to *s* and *ʃ*, and applied *ś*, *ć*, *ź* for palatalized alveolars. I could not simplify the notation of the vowels in which the glossary proves to be rather capricious, although poor in symbols. I apply Roerich's *ī* for that high-central illabial vowel, which appears to replace Tib. *i* and *u* (except before *s*, *l*, *ñ*), I marked a more labial variety by *û* (when written by Russian *ю*); *ä* renders a front vowel replacing Tib. *a*, e.g. in *lam* ~ *läm* «road» (also in Anduo), *ó* = a front *o* (when marked by Russian *ê*); here and there *û* merely shows the discrepancy between the recorded *u* and the expected *o* (similarly *ã* = a high vowel recorded for an expected *a*); *ɔ* = wider than *o*; *ě* = higher than *e*; *ə* is mid-central; sometimes I risked marking long, half-long and overshoot vowels. Glides are rendered by characters written above the line.

The phonetic notation followed by Roerich, Gō and Sprigg are better known than those applied in the Sino-Amdowa sources I quote, therefore it seems to be useful to reproduce here a key to the symbols of Anduo Romanized as they are given in that manual and with their IPhA equivalents as shown in the introduction to the Amdowa-Chinese glossary, *Anduo*.

Initial consonants

Anduo						Anduo Romanized						
<i>p</i>	<i>ts</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>tʂ</i>	<i>tɕ</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>ds</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>j</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>g</i>	
					(<i>kw</i>)						(<i>gw</i>)	
	<i>hts</i>	<i>ht</i>	<i>htʂ</i>	<i>htɕ</i>	<i>hk</i>		<i>hs</i>	<i>hd</i>	<i>hj</i>	<i>hc</i>	<i>hg</i>	
<i>pʰ</i>	<i>tsʰ</i>	<i>tʰ</i>	<i>tʂʰ</i>	<i>tɕʰ</i>	<i>kʰ</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ts</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>tr</i>	<i>ty</i>	<i>k</i>	
<i>ʰb</i>	<i>ʰdz</i>	<i>ʰd</i>	<i>ʰdʂ</i>	<i>ʰdz</i>	<i>ʰg</i>	<i>bb</i>	<i>dz</i>	<i>dd</i>	<i>jj</i>	<i>cc</i>	<i>gg</i>	
<i>mb</i>	<i>ndz</i>	<i>nd</i>	<i>ndʂ</i>	<i>ndz</i>	<i>ng</i>	<i>mb</i>	<i>nz</i>	<i>nd</i>	<i>nj</i>	<i>nc</i>	<i>ng</i>	
<i>m</i>		<i>n</i>		<i>ɲ</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>m</i>		<i>n</i>		<i>ny</i>	<i>q</i>	
<i>ʰm</i>		<i>ʰn</i>		<i>ʰɲ</i>	<i>ʰŋ</i>	<i>hm</i>		<i>hn</i>		<i>my</i>	<i>hq</i>	
<i>(m̥)</i>		<i>(n̥)</i>		<i>(ɲ̥)</i>	<i>(ŋ̥)</i>							
		<i>(r)</i>										
		<i>l</i>						<i>l</i>				
		<i>.hl</i>						<i>hl</i>				
	<i>s</i>	<i>ʃ</i>	<i>ʂ</i>	<i>ɕ</i>	<i>xw</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>lh</i>	<i>sr</i>	<i>sy</i>	<i>hw</i>	<i>h</i>
	<i>s</i>			(<i>ɕʰ</i>)	<i>xʰ</i>		<i>ss</i>				<i>sh</i>	
	<i>z</i>		<i>ʒ</i>	<i>ʐ</i>	<i>ɣ</i>	<i>ʰ</i>	<i>z</i>		<i>r</i>	<i>zy</i>	<i>rh</i>	
			(<i>r</i>)		(<i>ɣw</i>)						<i>rw</i>	
<i>w</i>				<i>j</i>			<i>w</i>			<i>y</i>		
				<i>ʰj</i>						<i>hy</i>		

Final consonants

<i>k</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>ŋ</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>ʐ</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>q</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>r</i>
(<i>x</i>)	(<i>l</i>)	(<i>b, w</i>)				(<i>r</i>)		(<i>l</i>)					

Vowels

<i>i</i>				(<i>u</i>)	<i>u</i>	<i>i</i>					<i>uu</i>
	<i>e</i>				<i>o</i>		<i>e</i>				<i>o</i>
		<i>ə</i>			<i>ɑ</i>			<i>u</i>			
		(<i>ɐ</i>)									(<i>ae</i>)
				<i>a</i>						<i>a</i>	

v = low pitch
f = high pitch

THE GLOSSARY

1. хычик «1»: *xīčik* or *xčik* «one», Prz Хчикъ (= *xčik*), Anduo *htək* (Romanized *hcigf*, *hcug*); cf. Róna-Tas 648° (Monguor *śd'ziagnā*). — Т *gčig*.

2. они «2»: *yñi* or *a'yñi* «two», Prz Ни, Anduo *hñi* (Romanized *nyif*, *myiv*, the latter, low-pitch form in *myivwaf* «second» and *syevmyi* «42» etc., read *ñi-*), Golok *yñī* (Roerich), Rgyal-roñ *yñis* (Wang); cf. Róna-Tas 394° (Monguor *niwa*). — Т *gñis*.

3. х(у)сум «3»: *x^usum* or *xsum* «three», Prz Сумъ, Rockhill *Rsum*, Anduo *səm* (Romanized *sumv* in *sumvba* «third», *sumf* in *cugvsumf* «thirteen»); cf. Róna-Tas 176° (Monguor *gdzāmba*). — Т *gsum*.

4. уй, уи «4»: *wyⁱ* or *wyi*, read *wzī?*, «four», Prz Бжĕ (= *bžō*), Anduo *zə* (Romanized *zyuv*), Amdowa *žī* (Roerich), *ʋsji* (Go), *wzə* (N), Golok *wži* (Roerich). — Т *bži*.

5. ринго «5»: *rñā* or *rñā* «five», Prz Рна, Amdowa *rñā* (Roerich), *ḡa* (Go), Anduo *hḡa* (Romanized *hqaf*), Golok *rñā* (Roerich). — Т *lñā*.

6. дык, джыг «6»: *dik*, *dziḡ* «six», Prz Чокъ, Amdowa *ṭṭiḡ*, *ṭṭik* (Roerich), *dru* (Go), Anduo *tṣək* (Romanized *jugv*). — Т *drug*.

7. дунь «7»: *dun* «seven», Prz Дюнъ (= *dün*), -абдүн (= *abdun*), Amdowa *din* (Roerich), *vdun* (Go), *wdin* (N), Anduo *dən* (Romanized *ddunv*), Golok *wdōn* (Roerich). — Т *bdun*.

8. жет «8»: *žet*, ?read *j'et*, «eight», Prz Дзятъ (= *j'at*), Amdowa *gjel'* (Roerich), *ʋgyel'* (Go), Anduo *dzat* (Romanized *cedv*), *wj'ed* (N), Golok *wḡiad* (Roerich). — Т *brgyad*.

9. ургу «9»: *urḡu* «nine», Prz Ргю (= *rgū*), Amdowa *gī* (Roerich), *uḡū* (Go), *rḡi* (N), Anduo *gə* (Romanized *gguv*), Golok *rḡu* (Roerich); cf. Róna-Tas, p. 136, n. 185. — Т *dḡu*.

10. джю-таба, джю-тамба «10»: *jū thāba*, *jū thamba* «ten» (lit. «full ten»), Prz Цю-тамбá (= *čū thamba*), Amdowa *čī*, *t'am-pa* (Roerich), *ʋcu* (Go), *wčī thamba* (N), Anduo *tə* (Romanized *cuf*), Golok *wčū* (Roerich). — Т *bčū tham-pa*.

11. чик-чик «11»: *čikčik* (with *i?*) «eleven», Prz Цю-хчикъ, Amdowa *čiyčiy* (Roerich), *ʋcu-h/ciy* (Go), *ʋčikčik* (N), Anduo Romanized *cuvčigf* (= *čəčək*), Golok *cugtsig* (Roerich). — Т *bčū-gčig*.

12. джигни «12»: *jiḡñi* (*čī?*) «twelve», Prz Цю-ни = *čūñi*, Amdowa *čiyñi*, *čiyñī* (Roerich), *čigñī* (N), Anduo Romanized *cugvnyif*, Golok *čugñī* (Roerich). — Т *bčū-gñis*.

13. Джю-хсум «13»: *jū-xsum* «thirteen», Amdowa *čīysim* (Roerich), Anduo Romanized *cugvsumf*, Golok *čugsum* (Roerich). — Т *bčū-gsum*.

14. Джю-жи (рэ) «14»: *jü-ži* (*re*) «fourteen» (and *re* «it is» or «there are» etc.), Amdowa *čī-žī* (Roerich), Anduo Romanized *cuubvzyuf*, *čī^wžē* (N), Golok *čuwži* (Roerich). — Т *bču-bži*, *red* (Amdowa Т also *bčo'i bži = tɕuwzi*).

15. джю-на «15»: *jü-ña* «fifteen», Amdowa *čor'ña* (N), *čō-ña* (Roerich), *co-ŋa* (Go), Anduo Romanized *covhqaf*, Golok *čō-ña* (Roerich). — Т *bčo-lña*.

16. джю-рюк «16»: *jü-rük* «sixteen», Amdowa *čī-rig* (Roerich), *čīdžik* (N), Anduo Romanized *cuvjugf*, *cuvrugf*, Golok *čōdruḡ* (Roerich). — Т *bču-drug*.

17. джю-дунь «17»: *jü-dun* «seventeen», Amdowa *čipdin* (Roerich), *čūbdün* (N), Anduo Romanized *cuuvddunv*, Golok *čuwdün* (Roerich). — Т *bču-bdun* (Amdowa Т also *bčo'i bdun*).

18. джю-жет «18»: *jü-žet* (*-žet?*) «eighteen», Amdowa *čopgiel'* (Roerich), *čū^wjed* (N), Anduo Romanized *cobvccaedf*, Golok *wčorgiad* (Roerich). — Т *bču-brgyad* (Amdowa Т also *bčob-brgyad*).

19. джю-ргу «19»: *jü-rgu* «nineteen», Amdowa *čirgī* (Roerich), *čī'rgī* (N), Anduo Romanized *curvgguf*, Golok *čurgu* (Roerich). — Т *bču-dgu*.

20. нюхи-тамба «20»: *ñuhi thamba* «twenty», Prz Нй-чи-тамбá, Amdowa *ñi-šī t'am-pa* (Roerich), *ni-ču* (Go), *ñihə* (N), Anduo Romanized *nyuvshuf*, Golok *ñi-hō t'am-pa* (Roerich). — Т *ñi-šu tham-pa*.

21. нюх-сакчик «21»: *ñuh' sakčik* «twenty-one», Amdowa *ni-ču-sa-h/cik* (Go), *ñihə htsačik* (N), Anduo Romanized *nyuvshufhsaghcug*; cf. also *nyuvshufhsagfsum* «twenty-three». Roerich's Amdowa *sim-čī soyčig* «thirty-one» shows another pattern, cf. Amdowa *udun-ci-don-hciy* «seventy-one» (Go) which is different from the similarly pleonastic Lhasa Tibetan *ʧa³taŋ/tə³tɕu¹me¹tɕi¹* or *brgya dañ bču-med gčig* «hundred and one» (Jin, p. 159). — Т *ñi-šu rca gčig*.

22. сумчи-тамба «30»: *sumči thamba* «thirty», Prz Сумъ-чи-тамбá, Amdowa *sim-čī t'am-pa* (Roerich), *sum-cu* (Go), Anduo Romanized *sumvcu*, Golok *sum-ču t'am-pa* (Roerich). — Т *sum-ču tham-pa*.

23. юпчи «40»: *žyupči* «forty», Prz Бжэпъ-чи тамба, Amdowa *žibčī* (Roerich), *ujsi-b/cu* (Go), *wžipčī* (N), Anduo Romanized *zyubvcu* (and *syevhcug* «forty-one», Т *že-gčig*), Golok *wžubču t'am-pa* (Roerich). — Т *bži-bču*.

24. напчи «50»: *napči* (?^očī) «fifty», Prz Рнóпъ-чи тамбá, Amdowa *napčī, rnapčī* (Roerich), *ŋa-h/cu* (Go), *rnapčī* (N), Anduo Romanized *hqabf-ccaf* «five hundred», Golok *rñabču* (Roerich). — Т *lña-bču*.

25. джюкчи (джюпчи) «60»: *džúkčī/džúpčī* «sixty», Prz Чокъ-чи-тамбá, Amdowa *drík-čī* (Roerich), *drug-ci* (Go), *džik'wčī* (N), Golok *drug-ču* (Roerich). — Т *drug-bču*.

26. джюпчи(рэ) «70»: read *džúpčī* (*re*) «(it is) sixty», see above 25° and cf. Amdowa *din-čī* (Roerich), *udun-čī* (Go), *wdünčü* (N) «seventy» and here 7° *dun* «seven», Prz Дюнъ-чи-тамбá.

27. джапча(рэ) «80»: *ǰapči (re)* «(it is) eighty», Prz Дзятъ-чи-тамба́, Amdowa *ǰiel'-č'i* (Roerich), *ǰya-cü* (Go), *ǰädwč'i* (N), Golok *wǰia-ču* (Roerich). — Т *brǰyad-bču*.

28. купчи(рэ) «90»: *kupči (re)* «(it is) ninety», Prz Ргюпъ-чи-тамба́, Amdowa *ǰipč'i* (Roerich), *ǰgu-b/cü* (Go), *ǰgi^wč'i* (N), Golok *ǰgubču t'am-pa* (Roerich). — Т *dǰu-bču*.

29. ужа-тамба «100»: *uza [ž=ǰ] thamba* «(full) hundred», Prz Рдзя́-тамба, Rockhill *Rǰya-wa* or *Rya-wa* «the Hundredth», Amdowa *ǰǰia, ǰǰa, ǰǰia-t'am-pa, ǰǰa-t'am-pa* (Roerich), *ǰǰya-thampa* (Go), *wǰǰa thampa* (N), Anduo Romanized *ccav*, Golok *ǰǰia t'am-pa* (Roerich), Rgyal-roñ *βлуа* (Wang). — Т *brǰya tham-pa*.

30. ваганбу-чирэ-моху, ху «аргаль» = «dry cow-dung (used as fuel)»: the eight-syllable Sbra-nag phrase seems to contain more words than the Russian rendering suggests and perhaps it is somewhat distorted. The first unit *waganbu* may be amended to *wañ gambu* (*wañ* or *wa*) and interpreted «dry dung», Т *sbañs skampo* (Amdowa *sb > w*: *sbañs* read *wañ* «soaked»), cf. *sbañs skam* «suchoj navoz (kak toplivo)» (Parfionovič); but *wa* may also represent Т *ba* «cow». If so, then *ganbu* (or *gañbu*) must mean «dung» like the second element in the compound *ba-lči = ba-lañ-gi lči-ba* (ČhGr), *ba-lči = üker-ün aryal, üker-ün bayasu* (Sum II 168), however I was not able to find a Tibetan word similar to *ganbu* and meaning «dung». One may amend *wagan* to *walañ* «cow, horned cattle», but as far as I know, this well-known compound, Т *ba-lañ, ba-glañ* (cf. also Amdowa Written Tibetan *ba-lu*) is not attested with *-bu* or *-po* (although Dag explains «cow-milk» *ba-nu* as *ba-lañ-mo'i nu-ma'i miñ*, «cow» *ba-mo* as *ba-lañ-mo'i miñ* and «bull» *glañ* as *ba-lañ-pho'i miñ*), i.e. the existence of a sequence *ba-glañ-po* here is improbable (despite *glañ-po*). — Otherwise, according to Sum II 349, Т *sbañs* means Mong. *bayasun, aryal* «excrement, (dry) cow-dung», *rta-sbañs = morin-u bayasun* «horse-dung», *sbañs-lud = ötög, aryal* «dung, manure; cow-dung»; cf. Amdowa *htawǰñ* (N), ČhGr *rta-sbañs = rta'i "oñ-ril* 馬糞, 馬屎, *"oñ-ril* and *"oñ-goñ* means *me-šññ lči-ba'am rta-sbañs-la'añ* «fire-wood, dung, horse-dung etc.», cf. also DTLF 729 *sbañs* «fimus; excréments (d'animal)», *rta . . . boñ . . . ba-lañ* ~ «fimus equi, asini, boum; excr. de cheval, d'âne, de bœufs» etc. — The second unit *čire* seems to contain *či*, another term for «dung», Anduo *htæ*, Romanized *hce* «cow-dung», Amdowa Written Tibetan *lče* and *lči-ba* «fresh cow-dung», Amdowa *ščiwa* and *walañgi ščiwa* (N), Dag *lči = lči-ba: nor-gyi gǰañ-lam-nas thon-pa'i sñigs-ma'i miñ; lči-rlon, lči-rug; lči-ba* «bouse» (Gir.-Goré), «dung, esp. of cattle» etc. (Das), *ba-lañ-lči = khur-mañ* (Dagyab), cf. also Peking Bka'-gyur Rgyud Ma 285a5: *mes chig-par gyur-na ba-lañ-gi lči-ba dron-mo-la lan ñi-šū rca gčig sñags-kysis btab-ste rma gar bskus-na 'cho-bar 'gyur-ro* «In the case of burn one has to perform the twenty-one-fold incantation over (a piece of) hot cow-dung; if one smear the wound with it, (the burn) will heal up.» — The syllables °*re* and *mo*° may render *rima*, the name of a

third kind of dung: Amdowa Written Tibetan *ris-ma*, *ril-ma* «dung of sheep or goat», Amdowa *zima* «dung of sheep or camel» (N), *ril-wa* «globular dung» (Go), T *ril-ba*; according to Das *ril-po* = *ril-ma* «dung of sheep, rabbits, mice etc.», Dag *ril-ma* = *ra lug sogs-kyi brun-dbyibs ril-mo'i miñ-ste: lig-gi ril-ma, gla-ba'i ril-ma žes-pa lta-bu; ril-lud; ril-spuñs*; Sum II 926 *ril-ma* = *kibig qoryol*, where the second Mongolian term is the usual word for the droppings in question; the same word is also used in a passage of the Peking Mongolian Kanjur, Vol. 16, f. 359a23: *taulay-yin . . . qoryol* which translates T *ri-boñ-gi rtug-pa'i ril-bu*. — If *re* and *mo* are to be interpreted separately, then *re* = T *red* «to be», and the last three syllables remain for me undeciphered. Grum-Gržimajlo's *x* may correspond to a Tibetan velar or pharyngeal or laryngeal spirant or to an aspirated postpalatal stop; an Amdowa initial *h* may remount to Tibetan *h*, *lh* or *ph*, while a syllable final or intervocalic *x* may remount to *-g*, initial *x* also occurs in words of Chinese origin like *xoxo*, Amdowa Written Tibetan *h'o-h'o*, Chinese 火壺 or 罌壺, a charcoal-burning jar (Anduo), or *xobən*, Written Tibetan *h'o-phun*, Chinese 火盆, a chafing-dish or firepan (Mathews), > Mong. *qobung*, otherwise Amdowa *me-phor* «a fire-tray» (Go). I have no solution for *-xu*, *xu*.

31. тух-ва «аркань, веревка изъ волоса»: *thuxwa* «горе (made of animal hair)», Sz *tahoa*, Amdowa *t'ogua* (Roerich), *thax-wa* «горе» (Go), *thak^kxwa*, *thakkwa* (N), Anduo *t'akwa*, Golok *t'aya* (Roerich). — T *thag-pa* (= Dag *bal-gyi thag-pa*, *bal-thag* etc.).

32. нян «аркаръ (горный барань)»: *ñan* «wild sheep», Prz Рхянь «Аргали», Amdowa *Yñen* (N), Anduo *hñan*, Amdowa Written Tibetan (*ibid.*) *gñan* 一種野羊(卷角), DTLF 383 *gñan* «Nom. cujusdam dami, cujus corpus breve et cornua longa sunt; bouquetin ou élan. — (Jäschke) «Argali, ovis ammon.» With Dag: *gñan* = *ri-dvags gñan-te gzugs-dbyibs lug-dañ čha-mchuñs-šīñ rva čhen-po duñ-'khyil-ltar skyes-pa, spu kha skya-bo yin-žīñ, ša zos čhog*, the Amdowa and Sbra-nag data affirm Jäschke's definition «argali» (according to Das: *Ovis Hodgsoni*). As for Prževal'skiĭ's *rxñan*, its initial must render a cluster of a liquid and a nasal, both voiceless, probably the nasality also covers the following vowel, cf. his data for «heart»: Рхинь = *rxñīñ*, T *sñīñ*, Wayen *xñīñ*, Amdowa *xñīñ*, Golok *sñan* (Roerich), cf. also Róna-Tas, p. 140, notes. — T *gñan*, *rñan* (Das contra Das: «*Ovis ammon*»), *sñan* (Wuti III 4261, 16014° *sñan-mo* = Manchu, Mong. *aryali*, Turki *arqar*, Chin. 母盤羊).

33. лугу «барань» = «ram»: *lugu* «little sheep, lamb», Prz Люкь (= *lúk*) «Барань», Sz *lug* «birka = sheep», Amdowa *lig*, *liḡ* «mouton», *liḡ-yó*, *li-gi* «agneau» (Roerich), *lux* «sheep», *lu-gu* «(one-year-old) sheep» (Go), Anduo *lak*, Golok *lug*, *lu-gu* (Roerich). — T *lug*, *lug-gu*, *lu-gu*.

34. таныгыда «близко»: *thaññigida*, of which *thagñi* or *thagñe* (Russian velar ы is perhaps a misprint for и/i or Ъ/ye) «near», Amdowa *t'ag-ñē* «près» (Roerich),

thay-ne «near» (Go), Anduo T *thag-ñe-mo* «near», Gen. *thag-ñe-mo-ki*; Golok *t'ag-ñe-wo* (Roerich); *gi* may be a locative particle, cf. Amdowa Romanized *duvrhu* in *duvrhu ddov* «sit here!» (Anduo XIV, for Amdowa T *di-ki*, *di* = T *de*), if so, then our sequence may be interpreted as follows: «sit nearby!», where *da* is to be read *do* for T *sdod*, which is, according to Dag, a *byed-med las-chig ma-'oñs-pa dan da-lta-ba skul-chig*, i.e. an intransitive verb, future, present and imperative form, thus we can also translate the above sentence in Present Tense: «(the subject) sits nearby». Prof. Norbu proposed another solution: *thagñēgi hta* with T *lta-* «to look». — T *thag-ñe*.

35. **наammu(рэ) «богъ» = «god»:** *nammu (re)* «(it is) heaven», Prz *Онамъ* («thunder»), Намъ, Sz *nam*, Amdowa *ɣnam*, *ɣnam* «ciel, temps, pluie», *ɣnam non-no* «ciel bleu» (survivance du culte chamanique du ciel bleu) (Roerich), *hnam* «heaven; weather», *nam-kha* «sky», *nam-ño* «weather» (Go), *ɣnam* (N), Anduo *hnam*, Anduo T *gnam* «sky; weather», *gnam-ño* «firmament; ceiling», Amdowa Romanized *hnamvgo* «weather», *namv laqvssogvzug* «it is already dawn» («*nam blañs-soñ-zig*»), Golok *ɣnam* (Roerich). — T *gnam*, *gnam-ño?*.

36. **мом-зоню «больной» = «sick, ill»:** *mabʒɔñnù[ri]* «is not well», Sz *mazange* «jó = good», read «bad», Amdowa *mô-zañ* «pas bon», *mabzañ* «mauvais, pas bon» (Roerich), *me-b/zañ-gi* «not good» (Go), *mabʒɔñ* (= *mabʒági*) «not good», *mabʒigi* «sick» (N), the latter from T *mi-bde-*; cf. also Anduo *zañña*, Amdowa T *bzañ-ña* «good». — T *ma-bzañ*, *mi-bzañ*.

37. **чэ «большой»:** *che* «big, great», Amdowa *č'e-po*, *č'en-bo* «grand» (Roerich), *čhin-po* (Go), *čhigi*, *čhi* (N), Anduo Romanized *tyefwo*, Amdowa T *che*, *che-che-go*, *che-bo*; cf. Róna-Tas 710°, 724°, 725°. — T *che*.

38. **зунгарь-ейчукэ «браниться» = «to curse (and swear)»:** *zuñ(ñ)ar ye(t)čuke* «(they etc.) are quarrelling», **'jiñ-bar yed-rgyu-ki* (*yed* = *byed*), or *-ki-yin*, cf. DTLF 832 *'jiñ* (vulg.), *~ -bar* (*byed-par*), *~ -mo rgyab* «Roxari, pugnare; lutter, combattre» etc., Parfionovič 420 *'jiñ/'jiñs* «sporit', ssořit'sja; sražat'sja; drat'sja = to quarrel; to fight; to exchange blows», Jäschke *'jiñ-ba* to quarrel, to contend, to fight», Csoma *mčhe-*, *sder-*, *rwa-'jiñ byed-pa* «to fight with tusks, claws, horns», Dagyab *'jiñs-pa* = *'khrugs-pa*, *'dres-pa*, *'thab-pa*, *rcod-pa lta-bu-ste 'jiñ-pa'i 'das-chig*, Dag *'jiñ* = *phan-cun chig-rcub bšad res-byas-pa'am 'thab-'jiñ byas-pa'i don-te: 'jiñ-kha byas* etc., ČhGr *'jiñ-ga bkye-ba* = *stobs rcal-ba'am sbe-ga sbyor-ba lta-bu*, Sum II 647 *'jiñ-ga bkye-ba* = *barildun nočolduqu*, *küčülen barilduysan: 'jiñ* = *nočolduqu*, *nuqulalduqu*, *kerüldümüi: ña-la 'jiñ* = *nadur dobtulumui; sder-'jiñ byed-pa* = *kimusu-bar-iyar maɣajilduqu*, *sabardalčaqu; mčhe-'jiñ°* = *soyoɣ-a-bar qaduralčaqu*, *bayilduqu; rva-'jiñ°* = *eher-iyer mörgüldükü*, *bayilduqu; lag-'jiñ°* = *yar-iyar-iyar nočolduqu*, *barilduqu*, *bayilduqu*; etc. — T *zuñ*, *zuñs*, *gzuñ* and *gzuñs* do not fit here; the Amdowa form of *'jiñ* must be *njañ*. — T *'jiñ-bar byed-*, ?.

39. валун(рэ) «быкъ» = «bull» or «ox»: *walun (re)* «(it is) cattle» or «ox», Amdowa *wa-lañ* «vache, bétail» (Roerich), *wa-lañ* «ox» (Go; *chax-lañ* «bull»), forms without the final nasal: Amdowa, Golok *wa-le* «taureau», Wayen *wa-li*, *walō* «bétail, taureau», Amdowa T *ba-lu* or *ba-lu-ma* «cow» (Anduo), while *glañ-nū* «ox» and *glañ-this* «bull» (ibid.); Prz Óлунму «Быкъ» belongs rather to *glañ-* (Amdowa *yalāñ*, *ylañ(ño)* «taureau», Roerich). Cf. also Róna-Tas 754° (Monguor *walāñ* «boeuf domestique»). — T *ba-lañ*, *ba-glañ* (Sum II 173 *ba-lañ* = *šar*, *aytalaysan üker* «ox»).

40. рэма «быстрый»: *rema* «quick», Amdowa *re-ma* «vite, rapidement» (Roerich), Anduo Romanized *revmbef*, Amdowa T *rem*, *rem-pa* (Anduo *zem-*), cf. below 41° and 188°. — T *rem-pa*, *rem-la*.

41. рима-сун «бѣжать» = «to run»: *rema sun* (= *shun*) «to go quickly», cf. 40° and Amdowa *soñ* «Impérative de 'gro-ba» (Roerich), Anduo *s'oñ*, Romanized *ssoqf*, perf. and imperat. to 'gyo (= T 'gro) «to go.» — T *soñ*.

42. гару «бѣлый»: *garu* «white», Banag *ka-rō*, Golok *ka-rwō*, Amdowa *ka-ro*, *kar-wō* «blanc, pur, propre» (Roerich), *kar-wo* (Go), *hkaru* (N), Anduo *hkaz-* and *kaz-*, Romanized *gafrof*, Amdowa T *dkar-po*, *dkar-ro* and *kar-ro*, cf. also Sz *kaka* «fehér = white» (see Uray: *AOH* IV, p. 181) and Róna-Tas 174° (Monguor *garu*). — T *dkar-po*.

43. дацаню(рэ), вама «варить» = «to cook»: *da conū re* (or *ri*), «now (one) has cooked» and *wama* «kettle; tea-cooking pot»; the latter occurs in Anduo *wama*, Amdowa T *ba-ma* 茶鍋, 熟銅鍋; *co* is a member of a large and sophisticated family of words meaning «cooking, boiling, baking, roasting; dyeing, soaking; refining, smelting», T 'cho (Csoma, DLTF, Sum), 'chod ~ 'ched, *bco*, *bco*, *chos* ~ *chod* (Jäschke, DLTF, Parfionović etc.; Goldstein also gives *chas* pronounced *tshōō*), ČhGr *bco-hya* = *ša khog-mar bco-barhya dañ gser bco-barhya-ba'am bzu-barhya*, Sum II 528 *bco-ha*, 'chod-*pa* = *činaqu*, *bolyoqu* etc., 629 'cho-*ba* = *bolyoqu*, *činaqu*, 631 'chod = *qayari* «bake!», *qayur* «roast!», *činaqu* «to cook», *bolyoqu* «to boil (e.g. meat)», *buduqu* «to dye», Dag *bco* = *dños-rjas čhu'i nan-du bžag-nas me sbar-te kholdu hcug-pa'i don* etc., fut., 'chod present, *bco*s perf., *chos* imperat.; Amdowa *tso* «to cook or boil», Amdowa T *bco/bco*s/*chos*, cf. also Amdowa *ts'i*, Amdowa T 'chos in ~*ma* ~ «half-raw, unboiled» (半生不熟, Anduo), *udsoe-wa* «to cook» (Go), *βconūri*, *βcō* (N). Cf. also T *chos-pa* and *bco*s «ripe» (Jäschke, DTLF), *bco*s-*ma* «boiled, broiled, cooked» (Goldstein), *chas-po* «well-cooked» (Goldstein), and here below 211°. — *da*, T id., Anduo *ta*, Romanized *dav*; -*nūri* is Roerich's *passé accompli*, Amdowa -*nō-re(l')*, cf. Anduo Romanized XXII, 2 ... *nagvzugvgu naqvqa ssoqvnufruv* «(they) went into a forest», XVIII, 1 *hqunfnaf avkuf hdonfmbaf zevnufzug yolvnuf ruv* «In former times there lived a (man) called Uncle Htomba.» — T *bco*.

44. чирта «(взять) возьми» = «(to take), take!»: *čhirta* «take!», Amdowa *k'ier-jjo*, ~ *nō* «арпортер», -*ta* imperative, e.g. *ʒk'i-ta* «pose-donc! (Roerich), *khyer-yoŋ-wa* «to bring» (Go), Anduo *tɕ'ez* (T 'khyer) «to take, to carry», Romanized *tyefra syogf* «bring please!», Amdowa *hčhir* «bring/take!» (N). — T 'khyer.

45. дюа(рэ) «вкусно» = «(it is) tasty, savoury»: ? *džōa re*, cf. Amdowa *džōa* «savour, pleasant smell» (N), Anduo *tšo* «to taste (like)», Amdowa T *chva-khu bro-ki* «tasting of salt»; cf. DTLF 691 *bro(-ba)* etc. «Sapor, gustus et etiam odor; saveur, goût, et même odeur», *bro-ba-čan* v. *yod* «sapidus; savoureux», Dag *bro-ba* = *lč'e'i myoŋ-chor-gyi miŋ-ste: zas bro-ba-čan, chod-ma 'di bro-ba čhe lta-bu*. Another case with Russian palatalized *d* instead of the expected cacuminal affricate occurs in 119°. — T *bro-ba*.

46. чё «вода»: *čho* «water», Golok *č'o* (Roerich), Sz *tc̣sü*, *cs'hu* (= *čhü*), Prz Чсю (= *čhü*) Amdowa *č'ō*, *č'i* «eau, rivière» (Roerich), *chi* (Go), Anduo *tɕ'ə*; cf. here 99° and 179°, and Róna-Tas 736°, 739° (Monguor *t's'ü-*). — T *čhu*.

47. шунгу «войлокъ»: *šunŋu* «felt», Amdowa *βšonŋa* (N), *shəŋ-wa* «wollen [= felt] carpet» (Go), *kir-saŋ* «feutre» (Roerich; < *gur-phyiŋ*), Anduo *ɕaŋ* «felt», Amdowa T *byiŋ* = *phyiŋ*; Sum *phyiŋ-ba* = *iskei*, Dag *phyiŋ-ba* = *phyugs-kyi bal daŋ khul sogs gnon- 'čhags byas-nas thags-skud med-par bzos-pa'i dños-rjas-kyi miŋ*. The same word is repeated in 106°. Prz gives Дзюгонь for «felt», maybe a name of something made of felt. — T *phyiŋ*, *phyiŋ-pa*, *phyiŋ-ba*.

48. унгуйдонё «волось» = «hair»: *unguydonyo* ? cf. T *mgo'i skra* = *dbu-skra* (ČhGr), also Giraudeau *mgo-skra*, *dbu-skra* «chevelure» (hon.), Amdowa has, however, *htɕa*, Romanized *hca* which seems to be the main form beside *hkra* «hair of the head» (Go; while «hair» in general is *wa-r/pu*, T *ba-spu*), Roerich gives *škja* «cheveu, poil» and *škja-luŋ*, *ʒkja-luŋ* «parure de tête des femmes Amdo»; Golok *štɕa*, *č'io-to* (Roerich), Prz Хця = *x'ca*, Rgyal-roŋ *skra* (Wang); Amdowa Romanized *hwuvcan* «hair» = T *spu-čan*. A similarly enigmatic sequence for «plaited hair» occurs in 103°. — T ??.

49. луцуню(рэ) «вонючий» = «stinking, malodorous»: *lu(t)-suŋnū (re)* «(it is) stinking like manure»; Anduo *lət* «manure», Dag *lud*, *khyi-lud*, *rta-lud*; Dag *bsuŋ* = *dri žim-po'i miŋ-ste: pad-ma'i dri-bsuŋ žes-pa lta-bu*, but *bsuŋs* = *rul-dri'i miŋ* and *rul-suŋs ni rul-nas dri ŋan bro-ba* (Anduo *zu*, Amdowa T *ro'i-rul* «to putrify, to become putrid»), cf. Jäschke *bsuŋ* «smell, esp. sweet scent» and *ro bsuŋ-ba* «filled with a cadaverous smell» as well as West-Tibetan *mar suŋ soŋ dag* «the butter smells (rancid)». For the grammar see 43°. — T *lud*, *bsuŋ*.

⁷ Our *ungu-* or *uŋu* could render the Sbra-nag form for T *buŋ-ba* «a bright black stone» (Das < Csoma), but this word has little to do with «hair», cf. Dag *buŋ-ba* = *rdo nag-po žig-gi miŋ-ste: skra-buŋ-ba ltar nag lta-bu* (also Sum II 199 *buŋ-ba'i mdog-čan* = *rasivar öngge-tü*).

50. шиса шля(ля)р-дунджу «ворчать» = «to mumble, to snarl» or «to grudge, to moan» and the like: *šisa* read *šdza*, Anduo *dza* «voice», Amdowa *hgra* (Go), the second part, written *šlya* (*lya*)*r*, must be an attribute with terminative *-r*, perhaps to be read *šilar* or *šilalar*; the Russian *š* may represent here either an aspirated *š* (T *š-*) or an unaspirated one (T *-š-*, *ž-*, *by-* or *phy-*) or a cacuminal *š* (T *sr-*, *hr-*), the word seems to belong to the onomatopoeic structures like T *ša-ra-ra* = *čhar rgyun 'bab-pa lta-bu thogs-pa med-pa* (Dagyab), *šur-šur* = *šorčiginan urusqu, šorčiginaqu*, the sound of a stream (Sum II 1074), *šil-li* «a cant word denoting the noise of anything» (Jäschke from Csoma; Dag *šil-li* = *pi-pi'am šug-lu 'bud-pa'i sgra lta-bu'i miñ*, the sound of the whistle, *šugs-pa*), *šil-šil* (Csoma, Jäschke; DTLF 989 *šil* «Imitatio alicujus soni; onomatopée»), *šir-šir 'thon-pa* «to gush out, to stream forth with a noise» (Csoma, Jäschke), Anduo T *šu-ri-ri yed* «to scour very quickly», cf. Uray: АОН III, p. 235 (*lhañ-ñe + r*) and АОН IV, pp. 177–244, further Stein, *Gesar*, Vocabulaires (p. 398 *ša-ra-ra, šar-ra-ra* «... éternuement d'un bœuf ...», p. 377 *phy-la-la* «jeu, vol (?)» etc.); *dunju* (? read *donju*) «to make a noise, to utter a sound, to make one's self heard», Anduo *ndon*, T *'don, bton, thon* «to read, to utter» + *rgyu*, Amdowa Romanized *-ccuf*. — T *sgra*, ?, *'don, rgyu*.

51. нансоно «впереди» = «forwards»: *ñon shoñno* «(one who) went forwards», cf. Anduo *hñon*, Romanized *hqon, hqun* (*hqunfna* «in earlier times; before»), for the second part see 41° and *-no* e.g. in Anduo Romanized *syaedfnof* «that which was told» (T *bsad-*). — T *sñon, soñ*.

52. кача-мавзу(рэ)-магу «врагъ» = «enemy»: it is uncertain whether this seven-syllable sequence denotes «enemy». It seems to contain two sentences, the first ending with (*re*). Neither seems to contain the commonest Tibetan word for «enemy», T *dgra*, Amdowa, *j'a, xđra, đra* «ennemi» (Roerich), *dra* (Go), Anduo *dza*; Russian *č* usually renders Tibetan *čh* here; *kača* may render Sbra-nag *khačha* (or *khača* if second syllable initial aspiration lost, cf. Amdowa Romanized *hweca* = *xweča*, T *dpe-čha*) ~ T *kha-čhag* = *kha-nas gtam mi legs-pa'am bkra ma šis-pa bšad-mkhan-nam dus-rgyan bya-ñan spyod-ñan byed-mkhan-gyi mi-ste, mi kha-čhag čes-pa lta-bu* (Dag) «somebody who tells slanderous and calamitous reports and always does bad deeds and is of bad behaviour, a hostile machinator», cf. Jäschke: «abuse, ill language»; *mawzu* = ? *maβzəñ* «bad» (cf. 36°) or cf. T *mi bzod-pa* «unbearable, intolerable, irresistible» (Jäschke)?; *magu* ~ ? T *ma dgos* «unnecessary, needless; there is no need to», cf. Anduo *go*, Romanized *ggov* (*rhu*), Amdowa T *dgo -dgos*. — T *kha-čhag*, ? *ma-bzañ, ma dgos, red*.

53. чучау-мийманга «вы» = «you»: *čhučhau* «you» (plur.), Amdowa *čhučhau* (N), *k'jel'* (*-nam*) «vous», T *khyed-rnams, k'le-zō* «vous», T *khyed-cho; č'đ-zō* «vous», T *khyod-* (Roerich), Anduo Romanized *tyuvtyavwo* «you», plur., *tyuftyof wolv ruv* «you are Tibetan», Golok *k'je-ča-ga* «vous», T *khyed-čag* (Roerich); *mi mañge* «many people», T *mi* «man», *mañ* «many», cf. 121° (*mañ-*), 127° (*mi, mañ*),

233° (*mi*, *myi*); Amdowa has both *mð* and *nð* (Roerich), Anduo *ñi*, Romanized *nyuv*, T *myi*, but *myuvrug*, *muvrug* ~ T *mi-rigs*. — T *khyod* (-*čhag-po*), *myi*, *mañ*.

54. сум «выдра»: *sum* «otter», Prz Чюхрамъ = *čhürham* (? with voiceless *r*; in several cases Go marks an interdental voiceless spirant for T *sr-*, but here:) ~ Amdowa *sam* (Go), Anduo *šam*, Lhasa *šam*. — T *sram*.

55. ункерин-ажамби «высокий» = «tall»: *wuñk(h)a riñ ažambi* (or *Yžañ-*) «(one) is of tall stature, tall», cf. Sum II 211 *boñs* = *čoyča*, *turuç*, *baruç*, *biy-e bildar*, *činegen*, *kiri*; *boñ-riñ* = *qangqayar*, *biy-e öndür*; 209 *boñ čhe-ba* = *biy-e inu yeke*; *lus boñ-čhe*; *boñ-ga thuñ-ba* = *čegdege* (?) *bey-e-tü*, *boçoni bey-e-tü*, Dag *boñs* = *čhe-čhuñ-gi chad-kyi miñ-ste*: *boñs-čhe*, *boñs-čhod ri ltar čhe lta-bu*, Che *boñs-čhod* «stature»; Sum *boñ-ga* renders *boñ-kha* probable; *riñ* ~ Amdowa *rañ*, *rañ-ña* «long, éloigné» (Roerich), Golok *rañ-wo* (Roerich), *ruñ-wo* «long» (Go), Anduo *zañña*, T *riñ-ña*, «long», Romanized *raqv*, cf. also 65°. For *ažam-* see Amdowa *žañ-no* «se lever» (Roerich), Anduo *zañ* ~ T *bžeñs*, Dag *bžeñ* (*byed-med las-chig ma-'oñs dañ da-lta-ba*) = *yar 'greñ-ba* «to stand up» (honorific), *bzoñ* (perfect), this is, however, a word of action, and no meaning «elevated, high» attested. Dag *'joñ-bo* (*rgyan-chig*) = *rked zlum-žin srid-du čuñ-zad riñ-ba'i dbyibs-te*: *dbyibs 'joñ-bo*, *rdo 'joñ-' joñ* offers another possibility, cf. Jäschke *'joñ-'joñ* and *'joñ-po* «oblong, longish, oval, elliptical, cylindric, bottle-shaped, etc.; col. also applied to stature: tall; . . .», but here we should have to suppose an alternation *'j- ~ gž-* well known in other cases (cf. also *'jam-* and *gžam-*); *-bi* seems to be a contraction of *-bo* (*-po*) and a sentence final particle (< *yin*). — T *boñ-*, *riñ*, ? *bžeñ-*.

56. лун «вѣтеръ»: *luñ* «wind», Sz *lun*, Prz Лунь, Amdowa *χluñ* (Roerich), *əluñ* (Go), Anduo *hloñ*, Golok *rləñ* (Sprigg), Ху *luñ*. — T *rluñ*.

57. аник «глазь»: *añik* «eye», Sz *mukk* (*mek*), Prz Никъ, Amdowa *χñi*, *χñik*, *γñig*, *γñiγ*, *γñix* (Roerich), *mix* (Go), Anduo *hñək*, Romanized *myug*, Amdowa T *rmyig*, *mig*, Golok *γñik* (Roerich), Wassu *temniak* (Rosthorn); cf. Wang Yao, *A study on the ancient pronunciations of the word mig in Tibetan*. — T *mig*, OT *myig*.

58. риньгу «гора»: *riñgu* «mountain», Sz *ri*, Prz Ри́и, Amdowa *rī*, *rð* «montagne, colline, hauteur» (Roerich), *ri* (Go), *zeñgũ* (N), Anduo *zə*, *zəngo*, Romanized *ru*, *ruvngof* 𑄀 and 𑄀 𑄀, Golok *rð rōngo* «hauteur» (Roerich), cf. also Róna-Tas 485° (Monguor *rī-*) and p. 114, n. 48 (*-mgo*). This is one of the numerous cases of the shift of the syllabic boundary in compounds (similar examples in Lhasa, Shigatse and Chamdo Tibetan: see Jin, *passim*). — T *ri-mgo*.

59. ча «горячий»: *ča*, read *cha* «hot», but cf. Sz *csa* = *ča* «höség = heat, hotness», Amdowa *ts'ande*, *ts'a-dik* «chaleur» (Roerich), *sa-wa* «hot» (Go), Anduo *ts'ande*, Amdowa T *cha-'de* «hot», Romanized *tsavndef*, Golok *ts'a-mo* (Roerich). — T *cha*.

60. бру-хсра «громъ»: *bruxsra* «thunder», cf. Sz *tog* «mennydörgés = thunder», Prz Токъ «Молния», but Онамъ «Громъ», T *thog*, *gnam*; Rockhill *Druk-dra* (see Róna-Tas, p. 120, n. 72), Amdowa *đriγ* «tonnerre» (Roerich), *'brux* (Go), Anduo

ndzək «dragon», Romanized *njugfcag* «thunder» (T 'brug grag-), *dzigdzá* (N), Golok *mdrug* (Roerich). — T 'brug-sgra.

61. над «грудь»: *nad* «disease, sickness» and not «breast», but beside Amdowa *nu-ma* «breasts» (Go), Anduo *nəma*, see Dag *nu-ma* = *mi dañ srog-čhags-mo'i 'o-ma 'byuñ-ba'i yan-lag-gi miñ* and *nu-tog* = *nu-ma'i rce-mo'i sa-rdog ril-mo'i miñ*, i.e. «nipple(s)», Dagyab *nu-rdog* = 'o-'jin-gyi rce-mo, Amdowa T *nu-rdo* = *nəhdo* 乳房內的肌肉 «the flesh of the mammary gland».

62. догоин «грязь» = «mud»: *dogoin*, read *dogo yin* «it is mud (or clay)», Amdowa *da^kxwa, dakkwa* (N), Dag 'dag-pa = *sa-'dam dañ "ar-'dam sogs žal žal byed-pa'i dños-rjas-kyi miñ*, Jäschke 'dag-pa «clay . . ., pulp, prob. = *lde-gu*» and 'dag-gu = *skyo-ma* «pap», ČhGr *sa čhu 'dres-pa'i 'dag-pa*; Sz *tambak* «sár = mud» Amdowa T 'dam-pags (Anduo), 'dam-bag (Dag, s.v. 'dam). — T 'dag- and *yin* (cf. next).

63. ин «да» = «yes»: *yin* «to be», Amdowa *jin* «est», *jin-nō* «être, exister» (Roerich), Anduo Romanized *yinv* «to be», Amdowa T *yin-tha* (= *thal*) 對了, 好了, 可以了 «it is right, it's all right!», Anduo Romanized *yav* «that's right; yes», *ovuvuvav* «yes, of course», Amdowa T *ya*. — T *yin*.

64. носошиндо «(давать) дай» = (to give) give!»: *nosō šindo* (read *-dā*?) «give (it to) us!», Amdowa *nozū βšindā* (N), cf. Amdowa *šin-nō, šin-nō* «donner» (Roerich), *u^hbyin-pa* (Go), Anduo *əən*, Romanized *syinv*; *-da*, imperative particle, cf. Amdowa *-ta* and *-ra* (T *-dañ*). — Amdowa *ña-zō* «nous», *ño-zū* «nous; notre», *ñe-ča-wo* «nous» (Roerich), Amdowa Romanized *quvtyof*, (Instrum.) *quvtyuu*. — T *ña-cho, sbyin-*, *-dañ*.

65. тарынчижи «далеко»: *tha(g)riñ či zi* «it is very far», cf. Amdowa *t'ay-rañ* «loin» (Roerich), *thay-ruñ* «far» (Go), Golok *t'ay-rañ-wo* (Roerich); *či* «great, big», see 37°; *zi* = *ri, re*, cf. 35°. T *thag-riñ* (e.g. Dag *sa-kha thag-riñ-bo* s.v. *riñ*).

66. тарьга, гарбо «дерево» = «tree»: *targa* «walnut», Amdowa *tar-ga* «walnut-tree» (Go), Anduo *htar-*, Amdowa T *star-ga* and *-kha*, Romanized *hdarfsga* 桃 = 核桃, Dagyab *star-ka* = *šin-thog šig*, Dag *star-ga* = *star-ka* = *star-ka'i sdoñ-bo ni šin-sdoñ čhen-po skye-žin 'bras-bu chig-gu čhe-ba žig yin. chig-gu dañ chig-gu'i nañ-sñiñ-la'añ* «star-ka» *zer. de ni snum-bčud mañ-žin bzar ruñ. 'di-la* «star-kha» *dañ* «star-ga» *žes 'bri-ba'añ yod*. — *garbo* is perhaps another form of T *dkar-po* «white», see 42°. Cf. also Amdowa *htar-wu* «raspberry», T *star-bu* (Go). — T *star-ga* (Jäschke *dar-sga*), *dkar-po*.

67. урго «джерань (Gaz. subgutturosa)»: *urgo* «gazella», Prz Гоо «Дзерень» (Mong. Khalkha *jēr*, attributive *jëren*, Mong. *jegerere* Procacpra gutturosa), Anduo *go*, Amdowa T *rgo*, Dag *dgo-ba* = *ri-dvags dgo-ba'i miñ*; Lhasa *ko*:³ < *rgo-ba* (Jin), T *dgo, dgo-ba*.

68. рин «длинный»: *riñ* «long», cf. Sz *erange* «hosszú = long» (? = Amdowa T "e *riñ-gi* «is it long?»); cf. 55°. — T *riñ*.

69. набаджи(рэ) «дождь (идеть)»: *na(m) ba(b)ji re* «it is raining», cf. Amdowa *Ynam wabji re* (N), cf. *wab-nō* «s'asseoir, descendre», *wa-nō* «s'arrêter, descendre, s'asseoir», *bab-jō* «tomber (descendre), s'arrêter» (Roerich), *čhar-wa bab-pa* «rain» (Go), Anduo Romanized *hnam wab* «rain», *mbab, wab, wob* «to fall»; *ɣnam bap-sa re*, Golok *ɣnam wab-joñ-sa ja-ke* «il va pleuvoir», Amdowa *ɣnam bap-gō diy* «il pleut» (Roerich) cf. also 35°. Prz Цяръ = T *čhar*. — T *gnam*; 'bab, babs, bob; rgyu; red.

70. раму(рэ) «дорога» = «road»: *ramu(re)* «(it is a) fence», cf. *Sz ra* «falu = village» or «udvar = courtyard», Amdowa *ra* «garden» (Go), T *ra-mo* «fence» (Jäschke), *ra-mo čhe* = *rva-ba čhen-po-la'añ* (ČhGr), or cf. T *rol* «sentier» (Gir.-Goré), *rol* (Cs. also *rol-mo*) «furrow» (Jäschke), *rol* = *žih rmos-pa'i rjes-rol-sul* (ČhGr), = *thoñ-gsol-gyis žih rmos-pa'i miñ-ste, yul-skad-du* «srol» zer (Dag) and read here *romu?* Cf. *Wassu teri* «Weg» (Rosthorn)?.

71. джигджар-джи(рэ) «драться» = «to fight, to brawl»: *džig-žarji re* «(they) are fighting», cf. Dag *dkrug* in *mi-dmañs-kyi nañ-na dkrug-mkhan-gyi mi-ñan-la 'thab-rcod byas-* and Jäschke (Schröter) *dkrugs-ma* «quarrel», but first of all cf. the aspirated cognate word: *'khrug* = *phan-chun 'thab-pa'i don-te: g-yul-'khrug, dmag-'khrug čes-pa lta-bu* (Dag), Rockhill Panakha *Chuk-met* «Peaceful», Amdowa *khrüy-ri-gyab-pa* «fight» (Go), Anduo *tš'ək* in *'khrug-pa* «war» (Dawasamdup: «quarrel»), *'khrugs* 混戰 «to brawl» and *gčar* «to beat» (*byed-'brel las-chig ma-'oñs-pa dañ da-lta-ba, 'das-pa*) = *rduñ-rdeg byed-pa'i don-te: byis-pa-la gčar mi ruñ, mi-la gčar-mkhan* etc. (Dag), ?*bčar-ba* «to pull or force from, to wrest» (Csoma, Jäschke), cf. also Anduo *hteaz*, Amdowa T *skyar-skyor* 追問, 質問 «to examine», but *skyar brduñ gsum yed* 亂打, 亂罵 «to beat or scold recklessly». — T *dkrugs* or *'khrugs, gčar* (?), *rgyu, red*.

72. ноцу-соча-руха «другъ» = «friend»: *nocu shač(h)a[hčik] rux(w)a* «we are fellow-countrymen, friends», cf. 64° *nosō* «to us». T, Amdowa T *sa-čha* «place, country, region» (cf. Róna-Tas 528°); Anduo Romanized *hcigf* «one» (1°), Amdowa *rokka, roxwa* (N), *rokʒa* «ami, -e» (Roerich), *rox-xwa* «friend» (Go), Anduo *zokwa*, Amdowa T *rogs-pa* id., Dag *rogs* = *grogs-po'am zla-bo'i miñ-ste: 'gro-rogs, 'dug-rogs, las-rogs* etc., DLT «socius»: *rogs-po, grogs-po, 'dris-po, zla-bo* etc., ČhGr *rogs-pa* = *grogs-po*, Golok *ro-k'a* (Roerich). — Ti *ño-cho, sa-cha, [gčig], rogs-pa*.

73. гурь «дымъ» = «smoke»: ?; T *gur* «tent» (cf. 147°), Amdowa T *dgur* = *sgur* «crooked, bent», Anduo *gəz*; Amdowa T *go-ra* 灶門前的灰圈 «ash-ring» in front of the hearth; «smoke» is T *du-ba*, Amdowa T *do*, (cf. 214°).

74. уму «дѣвочка» = «little girl»: *umu* (or *wumu*) «daughter; girl», *Sz omo* «leány = girl or daughter», *omo* (*üzmat*) «feleség = wife» (cf. 79°), Amdowa *o-mō* «fille» (Roerich), *wu-mo* «daughter» (Go), Anduo *bu-mo*, read *wəmo* «girl» (in

songs), Golok *pu-mo* (Roerich), cf. also Róna-Tas 761° (Monguor *womu*). — T *bu-mo*.

75. ио-о-кэ «есть» = «there is»: *yō-ke* (-*kə*) «to be, to exist», Sz *jut* «van = there is», Prz Iōтъ, Amdowa *jo-kō* «être; se trouver», *jō-nō* «être» (Roerich), *yot* «be» (Go), Anduo *jot*, Romanized *yolv*, e.g. *qav hwevcəf hcigf yolv* «I have a book», *tyof wuuv ufyolv* «have you a rifle?», *marv tyufmofzug nyev yolv* «how much butter did you buy?». — T *yod*.

76. шаджаб-джи(рэ) «жарить» = «to bake, to roast»: *ša-ǰab-ǰi re* «(one) will roast (it)», in which *ša* is probably for *ša(g)*, Anduo *ǰak*, Amdowa T *sreg*, *srogs* «to roast, to bake, to heat, to stew» and probably not for *šo*, Anduo *šo*, Amdowa T *sro*, *sros*, of similar meaning, but mainly «to burn, to heat, to warm» (Dag: «*ñi-'od dañ me sog-s-la brten-nas dros-su 'jug-pa'i don-te: lag-pa me-la sro-bžin 'dug čes-pa lta-bu*»); for the first cf. also Amdowa *θax-wa* «burn», *me-ob-la θ^əx-wa* «bake» (Go), Western Tib. *srag* (Jäschke); the first two syllables could also be read as *sha-ǰab*, Amdowa *xa ǰab* «to put the meat into the rice» (N), but this would be far from the meaning given in the glossary; *ǰab* ~ Dag *rgyag*, *brgyab*, . . . *yul-skad-la don mañ-bo žig-la 'jug-ste: la brgyab, sgo-la žva rgyag, skad brgyab sog-s lta-bu*; Parfionovič *rgyag, brgyab* «glagol-morfema, obrazuet gl. ot imennoj osnovy», Amdowa *ǰab-nō* «frapper» etc. (Roerich), Anduo *dzap*, Amdowa T *brgyab* «to close, to strike, to cast, to pluck»; *-ǰi re* is Roerich's Amdowa *-ǰō-re*, «deuxième futur», cf. here 69°. — T. *sreg*, (*b*)*sregs*, *bsreg*, (*b*)*sreg(s)*; *rgyag*, *brgyab*; *rgyu*; *red*.

77. шеру «желтый»: *šeru* read *seru* «yellow», Sz *szero* (= *sero*) «sárga = yellow», Amdowa *se-rō* «jaune» (Roerich), cf. *sañ-ǰer* «brass», *sha-ser-wa* «the Yellow Hat sect» (Go), *ᶑcañ-ser* «sap green» (Go), Anduo *s'er* and Amdowa T *ser-ro*, *ser-bo*, Romanized *sserfrof* «yellow», Golok *ser-wo* (Roerich); the initial must be aspirated, *sheru*. — T *ser-po*.

78. шик «жельзо»: *šik* read *ščak* «iron», Sz *stiak* (= *ščak*) Amdowa *ǰčag*, *ǰčay*, *čag* «fer, métal» (Roerich), *hcax* «iron» (Go), Anduo *htčak*, Romanized *hcagf*, Golok *ǰčag*, *ščag* (Roerich), *ɣ(ɛ)teak* (Sprigg). — T *lčags*.

79. (в)ни-у-кэ «женатый» = «married (man)»: *wñi yukə* lit. «having (a) wife», Amdowa *wñel'*, *wñe* «femme» ~ *wirmel'* (Roerich), to this latter: Prz Ёрхмать «Женщина = woman», Sz *ozmat* and *üzmat* «wife» (see 74°), of which Prževal'skij's Sbra-nag form *ōrhmat* is nearer to Roerich's **bud-smad*, while our Sbra-nag word and Amdowa *wñel'* remount to *bud-myed*, cf. also Róna-Tas 323°; both Anduo and Go ignore this word (or these words), «wife» is Anduo Romanized *nagvmo*, Go *naγ-mo*. Cf. 204° and 231°. For *yukə* see 75°. — T *bud-med*, *yod*, *-ki*.

80. капалу-лун «женщина» = «woman»: *kapalu-lun*, read *kapo lolun* «old man», Sz *lola* «öreg = old», Prz Pránму «Жена = wife», in fact «old woman» (cf. the Mongolian usage, Khalkha *xōgšín* «old (woman)» and «wife»), Amdowa *gapo lolón* «old man», *gamo l.* «old woman» (N), *ga-po*, *ga-wo* «vieux» (Roerich), Amdowa T

rgad-po, Anduo *ga-* «old man», *hga^t-po* (Go), Golok *r^ga-ho* (Roerich); Anduo *lolon* «old, old man» (while *lolo* «baby; a small child»), Romanized *lonvlon*, cf. Amdowa *lon-j^o* «prendre, retirer, sortir qqch. de» (Roerich) and T *lon-* «to elapse, to pass», *lo či-cam lon* «how old are you?» (Jäschke), *che-riñ lo brgya lon* «to live a long life, hundred years» (Dag). — T *rgad-*, *lo*, *lon*.

81. нагурлэ «жеребець» = «stallion»: *nagurle?*; this is a dubious word meaning perhaps the colour of the coat of the stallion (T *rta-gseb* and (*rta*) *pho-čhen*) Grum-Gržimajlo investigated. Cf. Amdowa *naxure* (N), T *nag-hur-re* «coal-black, jet-black» (Schmidt, Jäschke), Sum II 173 *ba-lañ nag-sgur* = *bökötür qara šar* «a humpbacked black ox», cf. also *rta hur-po* «a fleet, spirited, fine horse» (Csoma, Jäschke)?.

82. янë(рэ) «жечь» = «to burn»: *yanyo(re)*, read *yo-nò re* or *yi-nò re?* The first, *yo-* could be identified with T *g-yo* = *zas g-yo skol dañ 'dam brji-ba'i don-te: ja-mas zas g-yo lta-bu* «to prepare, to boil food» (hence *g-yos-mkhan* «baker, cook» and *g-yos-khañ* «kitchen», Jäschke; his *g-yo-ba*, *yos* means «to prepare victuals for the table») and «to tread clay». The second, *yi-nò* is parallel to Amdowa *yī-ŋo^t-pa* «parch», T *yis [= yos]-rñod-pa* (Go), Dag *yos* = *brños-nas chos-pa'i 'bru-rdog-gi miñ-ste: gro-yos, nas-yos, yos-brños lta-bu*, ČhGr *'bras-yos dañ nas-yos dañ me-la g-yos-pas-na'o* (where *g-yos-pa* = *bcos-pa'am brños-pa* «to cook, to parch or fry», e.g. in a pan), Jäschke *yos* «slightly roasted corn», Dag *yab yos* = *'bru brños-pa'i yos-la* and *brños* = *yos sogs brños zin-pa*; Amdowa T *ño-len* «to fry (vegetables), to sharpen, to grind (knives)», *rño-len* (read *hño-*) «to fry», *yos* (read *ji*) «roasted vegetables» and *g-yis-chos* (or *-cos*), read *hji-tsi* «food fried in butter or oil (cakes, vegetables)». — T *g-yo*, *g-yos*, *yos*; *rñod*, *brñod*, *brños*, *rños*; *red* (or *g-yo*, *-nu red*, cf. 43°).

83. лиëкэ «живой» = «living, alive»: *li yóka* «living, vivid, active (?)»; here, like in Amdowa, «body» and «deed, destiny» are homophone, *lī* stays both for T *las* and *lus* (cf. Amdowa *lī* «corps, Roerich, and Anduo *li*, T *lus* «body», T *las* «destiny, fate»). Both are attested in compounds, which may be interesting for the meaning of our expression, see e.g. *las-med* «idle, lazy, inactive» (Jäschke), *las-čan* «laborious, industrious; having acquired merit, worthy» (Jäschke, Das), «... *las-skal-lam goskabs yag-por thug-pa'i dpe-ste: mi las-čan ston-mo byed-sar 'phrad lta-bu*» (Dag), i.e. «lucky, fortunate» (cf. Mong. *jayayatu* «having (a good or bad) fate; lucky, happy»), *lus-čan* «having a body, . . . , a living being» (Jäschke, Das), *lus-med* «incorporeal, having no body, ghostlike, ghostly» (Jäschke, ČhGr) etc., but *las* seems to be more fit for our case. Cf. also Monguor *lë* «destin, sort» (Mostaert; Róna-Tas 285°). — T *las*, *yod*, *-ki* (cf. 75°).

84. цамбу «жирный»: *chombu* «fat, stout», Amdowa *ts'ombo*, *tsombo* «gras» (Roerich), Anduo *ts'on*, Romanized *tsovmbu*, Dag *chon-po*: *lus-la ša chil mañ-ba'i don-te: lug chon-po, ša chon-po*. — T *chon-po*.

85. нарка «завтра»: *narka* «tomorrow», Sz *narka* «holnap = tomorrow», Amdowa *nañ-ka* «demain», *ña-ro* «matin», *nañ-ma* «tôt le matin», (Roerich), *nañ-kha-ña-ro* «tomorrow morning» (Go), Amdowa T *nañ-kha*, Romanized *naqvhgaf* «tomorrow», *naqvndif* «tomorrow morning», cf. Dag *nañs* = *ñi-ma šar-dus-kyi miñ-ste*: *nañs-dus*, *nañs-šna-mo* etc., Jäschke *nañ-mo* «morning», *nañs-par* (Csoma, Jäschke), *gnañs* (Roerich) «the day after tomorrow». The strange *-r-* is affirmed by Sz. Cf. T *nañs*, *nañ-*.

86. гарма «звѣзда»: *garma* (or rather: *karma*) «star», Prz *Kárama* «звѣзды = stars», Sz *szkárma*, *kárma* «csillag = star», Amdowa *kar-ma*, *ṡkar-ma* «étoile» (Roerich), *hkar-ma* (Go), Anduo *hkaṡ-ma*, Romanized *hgarvma*, Golok *skar-ma* (Roerich), Ху *skarma*, cf. Róna-Tas 564° (Monguor *sgarma*). — T *skar-ma*.

87. мишаги «здоровый» = «healthy»: *mi šági* «a good man», cf. 53° (T *mi* «man») and Amdowa *šayó* «bien, ça va», *ša-gó-re* «meilleur» (Roerich), Anduo *ša*, Amdowa T *hra* «good» (Dag gives *sra* = *drag-*, which is, according to Roerich, the literary form of this word).

88. унык «зеленый» = «green»: *uniḱ*, read *ñunāk* or *ñonāk* «deep blue», see Anduo *hṡonak*, Romanized *hqovnag*, Amdowa T *šno-nag* 深藍, T *šno* «blue» or «green», *šno-nag* «deep blue» (Jäschke).

89. са «земля»: *sa* (with aspirated *sh*) «earth», Sz *szatuk* (*sa-*), Prz *Cáarюю* (*sá-gži'* = T *sa-gži*), Amdowa *sa* «terre, endroit, terrain» (Roerich), *sa-shi* «land» (Go), Anduo Romanized *ssa*, Golok *sa* (Roerich). T *sa*.

90. мо «змѣя» = «snake, serpent»: *mo* ?. Surely not T *sbrul* «snake», see Róna-Tas, p. 121, n. 74, p. 183; Anduo *zu*, Romanized *jjul* and *ruu*, Amdowa T also *ro'i*, Golok *rbi*: (Sprigg), Sikkim T *'bi'u*, *sbi'u*, Lepcha *sbu* (Dawasamdud), Burm. *mrwe* > *myue* etc. Cf., however, Anduo *hmāk* for *dmigs* «diligence» and Dag *rmigs-pa* = *srog-čhags lto-'gro žig yin-žin*, *yul-skad-du* «*sa-rmigs*» *zer. lus-po sbrul-dañ mchuñs-na'añ rkañ-lag bži yod* etc., Jäschke *rmig(s)-pa* «lizard, of a small kind». ⁸

91. сарэ «зола» = «ashes»: *sa re* or *so re*? For *sa* «earth» see 89°, but *so* is more probable, cf. Sz *szuki* «hamu = ashes», perhaps = Anduo *s'o* in Amdowa T *so-gis* and *-khis* «cinder, the charcoal left from the firewood», *so* = *sol* «charcoal», *so-thal/sol-thal* «charcoal ashes» etc., Amdowa *do-sol* «coal», T *rdo-sol* (Go). — T *sol* ?.

92. хысыр «золото»: *ṡisir* «gold», Amdowa *ṡser* «or» (Roerich), Anduo *səṡ*, Amdowa T *gser*, cf. Róna-Tas 209°, 213°, 523° and esp. 557°. — T *gser*.

93. чи, со «зубъ» = «tooth»: *čhi* «canine tooth», cf. Anduo *te'o* for Amdowa T *mčho*, *mčhe-ba*; *šho* «tooth», Prz *Соо* «зубы = teeth», Amdowa *so* «dent» (Roerich), Anduo *s'o*, Romanized *sof*, Golok *so* (Roerich). — T *mčhe*, *so*.

⁸ Although the glossary gives a Mongolian word for «lizard» (242°), it is highly improbable to have here Mong. *moγai* ~ Monguor *muguṡ*. Baoan *moγui* (Todaeva) and Santa *moγi* (Todaeva) «snake».

94. дачжучжю(рэ) «идти» = «to go»: *da dzu-ju re* «now (one) goes», cf. Amdowa *dʒo-jʒo* «aller», *jʒo-jʒo*, *ʃo-jʒo* (forme parlée; Roerich), *ʳgro-wa* «go» (Go), Anduo Romanized *dav* «now», *ncovccuf* «to go» (future), *ncovccuf* (present), Prž Джéо (= *jʒō*), Sz *dzója* (?), cf. also Róna-Tas 158°. — T *da*, *'gro-*, *rgyu*, *red*.

95. урду, рдо «камень»: *ʳrdu*, *rdo* «stone», cf. Róna-Tas 93° and Sz *szto* «kő = stone» (beside *to-szo*, T *rdo-sol*), Anduo *do*, Golok *rdo* (Sprigg), Xy *rdo*. — T *rdo*.

96. таро «кислое молоко»: *taro*, read *tara* «curdled milk», cf. Róna-Tas 56° and Anduo *taza*, Amdowa T *da-ra*, Dag *dar-ba* = *'o-ma'i nañ-gi mar bton rjes lhag-pa'i gser-khu'i miñ*; *dar* etc., Dagyab *dar-ba* = *da-ra dañ 'phel-žin rgyas-pa*; *da-ra* = *'o-ma-nas mar phyuñ-ba'i lhag*, Jäschke *da-ra*, *dar-ba*, *dar* «buttermilk».

97. ришеракаму «кислый» = «sour»: *rišera-kamu?*; *khamu* «bitter» = Dag *kha-mo* = *tig-ta'i bro-ba lta-bu'i don-te: sman kha-mo yin yañ nad-la phan lta-bu* etc., DLT *kha-mo*, *cha-mo* etc. «amarus», Anduo *k'a* in T *kha-bo* «bitter», *chva-kha* 鹹 «salty»; *rišera* is dubious (*s*, *š*, or *x*; *ri-* or *ʳš-*?): a name of a plant or medicin (cf. 190° «sugar + sweet») or a word for «sour»? *gže-ra* «parsley» seems to be a Central Tibetan word (Jäschke > Das, DTLF); *ri-šo*, a medical plant (used against bile diseases) is said to be *Tragopogon orientalis* (Gammerman—Semičov) which, as far as I know, is sweet.⁹ Maybe *rišera* is a distorted parallel to Anduo *htəz-zo*, Amdowa T *skyur-ro* (*skyur-po*), Romanized *hcurfdo* (*ro*) «sour»; if so, it should be read *ʳčiro*. — T *skyur-* (?), *kha-mo*.

98. ши-ырджа «китаецъ» = «(a) Chinese»: *ši-irja*; *ši-* is obscure, but *irja* ~ Amdowa *jʒa* «Chine; chinois. . .» (Roerich), *gya-mu* «Chinese» (Go), Anduo *dza*, Romanized *quvtyof ccav ruv* «we are Chinese» (*ño-cho rgya red*), *ccavhgadʒ* «Chinese (language)», cf. Monguor *rd'ziämu* and *red'žianag*, Róna-Tas 451°, 462°. This word, T *rgya*, is usually the first element of its compounds, cf. e.g. Amdowa T *rgya-rte'u* «a young Chinese», *rgya-nañ* «Inner China», *rgya-mo* «a Chinese woman», *rgya-ro'i* «a Chinese man», *rgya-hē* «Chinese slippers» etc., therefore a compound like *phyi'i rgyal* «foreign country, abroad» is unlikely here. (Otherwise T *phyi-liñ* or *-gliñ* ~ Amdowa *βsilañ*, N, *eilan* in Anduo.). — T *rgya*.

99. чу-нгу «ключъ (рѣчка)» = «spring (little stream)»: *čhuñgu* «spring, source», Amdowa *č'iñgo* «source», Golok *č'uñgu* (Roerich). — T *čhu-mgo*.

100. гума «кобыла»: *guma* «mare», Sz *gozma*, read *gorma*, Amdowa T *rgon-ma*, *rgod-ma* (Anduo; *gon-*, *got-*), cf. Monguor *rguorma*, *rguodma*, Róna-Tas 481°. — T *rgod-ma*.

⁹ Sum II 914 *ri-šo* = *uula*: *qamquul*: See Mong. *uula*, *ula* «tinder, punk» (Lessing), this is not necessarily a fungus, cf. Khalkha *ul ceceg* «Edelweiss»; *qamquul* «tumble-weed» (Lessing), in US chiefly *Amaranthus albus*, but acc. to Kow. «soljanka (rod polyni [= *Artemisia* sp.], ljubimoi verbljudami); la soude, Marie vulgaire, salicotte (salsola)», T *la-la-phud*; for further botanical confusion see e.g. Wuti 15092°/III 4015 Mong. *qamquul* = T *ldum-g-yer* etc.

101. го «кожа»: *go* (or *ko*) «skin», cf. Amdowa *ko-ɬ'ap* ~ *ko-č'ap* «cuirasse», T *go-khrab* (Roerich), *ɬlan-ko* «hide», *h'tar-ko* «horse-hide» (Go), Anduo *ko*, Dag *ko* = *ko-ba* = *rta nor-gyi pags-pa sogs* . . . *ba-laŋ-gi ko-ba daŋ rta'i ko-ba* etc. — T *ko-ba*.

102. цзумо «корова» = «cow»: *jumo* «a female hybrid between a yak and a cow/bull», Amdowa *dzo-mo* «croisement de yak mâle avec une vache domestique» (Roerich), *ndsō* «a kind of yak» (Go), Anduo *ndzo-mo*, Romanized *nzovmo* «cow» for T *mjo-mo* «a female yak» (Chin. 母犏牛), ČhGr *mjo-mo* = *glaŋ-thug daŋ 'bri gñis-las byuŋ-ba'i phyugs-mo* (i.e. a cross-breed of a bull and a yak), Dag *mjo* = '*bri-g-yag daŋ ba-laŋ bsdebs-pa'i gnag-phyugs pho'i miŋ ste*, '*bri-g-yag daŋ ba-laŋ-gi bzaŋ-čha gñis-ka 'joms-pa'i sgo-phyugs bzaŋ-bo yin*; *mjo-mo* = '*bri-g-yag daŋ ba-laŋ bsdebs-pa'i gnag-phyugs mo'i miŋ* (i.e. without the definition of the paternity), cf. Monguor *musu* «métis d'une vache domestique et d'un yak» (Mostaert; Róna-Tas 339°, but Prz НДЖÉ and Potanin НДжу correspond to T '*bri*, Amdowa *ɬ'i*, *ɬ'ɛ* «femelle du yak», Roerich; *ndzə* in Anduo, and Golok *mɬ'ɛ*, Roerich; hence Monguor *ndzumog* «plante qui donne une couleur violette et que les lamas emploient pour colorier les offrandes», Mostaert, < T '*bri-mog* «a kind of herb the root of which is used in Tibet as a dye for cakes, etc., giving a purple colour to these offerings made to spirits», Das, etc., acc. to Gammerman—Semičov: *Lithospermum erythrorhizon*, or a *Macrotomia* species.). Cf. also Roborovskij's «Tangut» Мцзу and Мцзумо, the male and female hybrid, Russian *čajnyk*'' ~ Mong. *qayinuɣ*. — T. *mjo-mo*.¹⁰

103. иднĕ(рэ) «коса» = «plaited hair, braid, queue»: (*y*)*idnyo(re)*? The ending seems to be the same as in 43°, *-nū re*, while (*y*)*id-* resembles 48° *unguydo*. «Plait» is *ral-ba*, *ral-phrug*, *ral-te* (Amdowa «pigtail», child's word), *la-nu*, *phag-mjug*, *dbu-lo*, *lč'aŋ-lo*, *lan-bu*; «to plait»: *lhag*, *lhas*, *sle*, *bsla* (Amdowa T *la*, *las*); Amdowa *sim-le* «tresse, natte de cheveux», T *sum-lhas* (Roerich), *hsuy-phuɬ* «queue», T *cug-phud* (Go), cf. also T *do-ker*, *thod-cog*, *thod-chugs*, *thar-phan*, etc. (DLT, DTLF, Dag etc.), different hair-dresses, knot of hair, bun, etc. — ?¹¹

104. рюпа «кость»: *rüpa* «bone», cf. Sz *rupsza* «csont = bone», Amdowa *rü-pa*, *rüpsa* «os, squelette» (Roerich), *ri-pa* «bone» (Go), *rüwa* (N), Anduo *zu* e.g. in *zuyŋ* «clan-name», T *rus-myiŋ*. — T *rus-pa*.

105. сий «котелокъ» = «a small kettle or pot» = *sī*, a kind of vessel, cf. Sz *szi* (= *si*) «csöbör = pail», further perhaps Amdowa T *zas-gor* 小木桶 «a small wooden vessel (bucket?)», read *si-*; *rta-bzas* 馬喫料之盆 «a horse-feeding-trough»,

¹⁰ Funnily enough Wuti 18417°/III 4907 only gives *mjo-mo* «female rhinoceros».

¹¹ Cf. 43°, 110° and Rock, Pl. LXV—LXVI, hairdress of a Golok lady; for a possible alternation «hair» ~ «plaited hair» see e.g. Róna-Tas 19°, Monguor *arāwa*, Baoan *rawe* «volosy = hair» (Todaeva) ~ T *ral-ba* «plait(ed hair)». — Another Russian *kosá* means «scythe», but «sickle» is T *zor-ba*.

read *-zi*; *mar-bzas* «a small wooden vessel for butter», read *-zi* (Anduo); Amdowa *sit̥ša* «a kind of vessel» (N); ?Hanniu *zú* «Topf» (Rosthorn).

106. шунгу «кошма, войлокъ» = «felt», see 47°

107. h'мару «красный» = *hmaru* «red», Sz *maro* «vörös = red», Amdowa *ma-rō*, *šma-rō* «rouge» (Roerich), *mar-wo* (Go), Amdowa T *dmar-ro* (~-*po*), Romanized *hmavrof* (and *hmarvhmug*, T *dmar-smug*), Golok *marwo* (Roerich), cf. also Monguor *dzāṅmar* «cuivre rouge» (Mostaert; Róna-Tas 98°). — T *dmar-po*.

108. урджу запчэ «крѣпкий» = «strong, vigorous»: *urju zapčhe* (or *-če*) «brisk, energetic», cf. Amdowa *ǰō* «caractère, nature», T *rgyud* (Roerich), Dag *rgyud* = *mi'i sems-kyi khoṅs-sam dud-'gros myoṅ-chor byed-pa'i nus-pa'i miñ-ste: mi šes-rgyud drañ-po* etc., but Anduo *dza* in *rgyu-ba* «temper, disposition, nature etc.»; Anduo *zap-* in *gzab-gzab yed* «to put forth effort, to help», ČhGr *gzab-gzob byed* = *bag yod-kyis sgrim dgos lta-bu*; *gzob-pa* «sharp, clever, diligent» (Jäschke, Das), «caution, circumspection» (Jäschke, in both cases quoting Schmidt), *gzab(s)*, *gzobs* «to use care, diligence etc.» (Jäschke), Sum II 760 *gzab* = *kičiyekü*, *yekedkekü*, *oladayulqu*, *oladqaqu* «to work hard, to strive» etc. — T *rgyu* or *rgyud*, *gzab*, *čhe* (cf. 37°).

109. цакур «курить» = «to smoke» or «to cense»: *chakur* «the lid of a tobacco-pipe», cf. Anduo *ts'ak* in *chags* «sieve; the sieve-like lid on the bowl of a tobacco-pipe», *chags-gor* «a small sieve, sifter», *chag-mgo* «the bowl of a pipe» etc.; Amdowa *chi-sax* «filter», T *chu-chags* (Go), Jäschke T *chags* «cap», *chag-ma* «sieve, filter». — T *chags-gor*.

110. алха «кутась» = «tassel, ribbon ornament»: ?*alha* or *lha* «tassel», cf. e.g. Dayyab *lhas* = *lhas-ma lhas* and *lhas-ma* = *skra lhas-ma dañ skud-pa lhas-ma sogs*, i.e. plait(ed hair), braid(ed threads); Jäschke *lhas*, *lhes* «braid; wicker-work»; Sum II 1336 *lhas-ma* = *gürümel*, *süljïmel*, etc.; Dag *lhas*, *lhes slas*, *sle* etc.; DTLF *sle-ba/ma* «textura; tresse». Cf. also *lhas* in G. Tucci, *Tibetan Folksongs*, pl. IV, fig. 5, Different ways of hair dressing. — T *lhas*.

111. чжизун «лаять» = «to bark»: *jizun*, ? read *čhi zuñ* «the dog seized», cf. 193° (T *khyi*) and Amdowa *βzũñ* (N; T *bzuñ*), or read *zug* «to bark» (Dag *zug* = *khyis skad 'byin-pa-ste: khyi-zug*; *khyi brgyags nam-mkha'i skar-mar zug* etc.), Anduo *sæk*, but initial **z-* is represented by Sbra-nag *s*, so our *z-* remounts rather to a **-z-*. — T *khyi bzuñ* ?

112. чуха (рэ) «ледь»: *čhuxa (re)* «(it is) ice», cf. Amdowa *khyax-wa* «cold», T *khyag-pa* (Go), Anduo *tə'ak-* in *'khyag-pa* «cold» and *'khyags* «to freeze», Dag *'khyag*; *čhu 'khyags-nas čhab-rom čhags* etc., *'khyags-pa* = *čhu khyags-nas sra'thas-su gyur-pa'i čhab-rom-gyi miñ* etc., Jäschke «ice»: *dar*, *čhab-brom*, *gañs*, *khyag-pa*. — T *khyag(s)-pa*.

113. шита «лошадь»: *šita* (or *šīta*?) «horse, steed», see Róna-Tas 610° (Monguor *šda*) and Anduo *hta*, Romanized *hda*, Golok *rta* (Sprigg). The same word is repeated in 120°. — T *rta*.

114. дабы «луна»: *dabi*, ?read *dawə*,¹² «moon», see Róna-Tas 495° and Anduo *dawa* «month; moon», Prz Дáва «moon» (beside, etc.), Golok *rdza*: (Sprigg), Xy *lawə*. — T *zla-ba*.

115. рхсо «лѣкарство» = «medicine, medicament»: *rhso* «to heal», cf. Amdowa *hso-wa* «repair» (Go), Dag *gso* = *smān-bčos byas-pa'i don-te: nad-gso-mkhan, smān-pas nad-pa'i nad gsos lta-bu*, Jäschke: «to cure» etc. — T *gso* or *gso-ba*.

116. ши «мало»: *ši*, read *šhi* «a few», cf. Dag *šas* = *dum-bu'am khag gčig-gi miñ-ste: . . . mi ñuñ-šas*; Jäschke: «a few, some». — T *šas*.

117. жша иму «мараль (олень)» = «deer (hind)»: *žša imu*, read *šha yimu*, *šha* «deer» and *yimu* «hind»; for *šha* (*šhā*) see Monguor *siā*, Róna-Tas 665°, Prz Шаа? (= *šāá*) «stag», Кауá (= *khašá*), T *kha-ša* «Dama latrans; daim aboyeur» (DTLF), Anduo *x'a* for *šva*, Dag *ša-ba . . . ša-ba-pho-la «ša-bo» dañ ša-ba-mo-la* «*yu-mo*» *zer* etc., Sum II 1048 *šva-mo* = *yu-mo* (*maral em-e, buyu suyu ču kememüi*), Gir.-Goré *šva-ba yu-mo* «jeune biche» (s.v. *cerf*); Prz Имý (= *yimú*) «hind», Anduo *jə*- in *yu-mo*. — T *šva* or *šva-ba, yu-mo*.

118. мар «масло»: *mar* «butter», see Róna-Tas 309° and Anduo *maz*, Romanized *marv* «butter». — T *mar*.

119. дедму (рэ) «медвѣдь»: *dyedmu (re)* (read *džed-?*) «(it is a) bear», Sz *tiemo (tum)* (perhaps *tremo*), Prz Бсюгджэ́тъ (cf. Róna-Tas 180° and Anduo *čək* in *phyugs-dred*), Amdowa *tre-moñ* «l'ours brun» (Roerich), *dret-mo* «a kind of wild bear» (Go), Anduo *tset* in *dred* and *dred-moñ*, Romanized *jel* or *jed* in *nyuvjelf* (T *mi-dred*), Golok *tred-mo* (Roerich). — T *dred-mo, red*.

120. шида «меринъ» = «steed, gelding», see 113°.

121. мана-улун-гусун, манг «много» = «many, much»: *mana-ulun-gusun, mang*, read *mañ(ñ)a* «many, much», Amdowa *mañ-ño* «beaucoup» (Roerich), *mañ-wo* «many» (Go), Anduo *mañ*, Romanized *maq*, Golok *mañ-ña* (Roerich), cf. also Róna-Tas 306°; read *uluñ* for T *blañs*, perf. of *len-* «to take» (?), Amdowa *len-jiō, lañ-nō, lōn-jiō* «prendre, etc.», Anduo Romanized *lennvnguf ssoqfqe* «(one) went to take sg.», *qav hwevtyaf lenvnguf ncovcccef* «I go to get books», Dag, s.v. *blañ*, fut., *dpe-čha lag-tu blañ-bar bya*; *-gusun* is dubious, see also in 128°, *-sun* may be for *soñ*, Anduo *s'oñ*, Romanized *ssoqf* (cf. 51°), perfect and imperative; the last word, *mang* renders *mañgə*, a predicative form, Amdowa T *mañ-gi*, Anduo Romanized *maqvngu*. — T *mañ-*, Amdowa T *mañ-ba, mañ-gi*; ? *blañ-* or *blañs*, ? *soñ*.

122. ломба «мокрый» = «wet»: *lomba* «wet» or «raw», Amdowa *lon-pa* «raw» (Go), Anduo *hlon* in *rlon-pa* «wet; raw, fresh», Romanized *hlonvmba*, cf. also Monguor *arlan*, Róna-Tas 22°. — T *rlon-pa*.

¹² On p. 417, comparing some of his data with those of Prz and Rockhill, Grum-Gržimajlo writes *daba*.

123. мани-дун-джи (рэ) «молитва» = «prayer»: *mani dunji (re)* «(one) recites Tantric formulæ» (Western Tibetan *má-ni tañ-čè* «to mutter prayers», Jäschke; Mong. *māni ungsi-* id.), cf. Amdowa *ma-ne k'an* «temple» (Roerich; cf. also Róna-Tas 304°), *tōn-nō* «prononcer, lire», Т *btōn-* (Roerich), Anduo *ndon* for 'don, Romanized *ndonv*; for *-ji re* see 69°. — Т *ma-ñi*; 'don, *btōn*, *thon*.

124. гума «молоко»: *yuma* «milk», Prz Гóма, Sz *oma*, Amdowa *o-ma* «lait» (Roerich), *o-ma* «cow's milk» (Go), Anduo *oma*, Romanized *ovma*, Golok *yo-ma*, Kham id. (Roerich). — Т 'o-ma.

125. каргоду «молчать»: *kargodu*, read *kharog du* «to be silent» or better: «be silent!», cf. Amdowa Т *kha-rog-ka sdod*, Anduo Romanized *kavrogvrha ddod*, Jäschke *kha-rog (te) dug-pa* «to be silent»; the Sbra-nag term is probably with *sdod*. — Т *kha-rog*, *sdod* (see 180°).

126. сугу «монголь»: *shugu* «a Mongol», see Róna-Tas 590° and Anduo *s'ok*-in *sog-po*, Romanized *ssogfgwo*. — Т *sog-po*.

127. мий-монгэ «мы» = «we»: *miy monge*, read *mí maŋge*¹³ (with labial *a*?) «many people», cf. 53°.

128. аягар-дагусун «мычать» = «to bellow»: *ayag ñir-*, where *ayag* ~ Amdowa *yājay* «yak, Bos grunniens» (Roerich), 'yax (Go), *chax-yax* «male yak» (Go), Anduo *hjak*, Golok *y'ay* (Roerich), and *ñir* ~ Anduo *ḡəz-* for *ñur-* «to grunt», Dag *ñur* = *gnag-gis skad 'byin-pa'i don-te: 'bri ñur, be'u ñur*, etc.; *-dagusun* is obscure, cf. *-gusun* in 121° — Т *g-yag*, *ñur*, ?

129. шаса «мясо» = «flesh»: *šasa*, read *šhasa* or *šhac(h)a*, cf. Prz Шаа «мясо», Sz *shah* (= *šha*), *isa*, Amdowa *ša* «viande, chair» (Roerich), *ča* «flesh, meat» (Go), Anduo *x'a*, Romanized *shaf*, Golok *ša* (Roerich), Т *ša-cha* «hot meat» (or cf. Dag, s.v. *suñs* = *ša-zas sogs rul-ba'i dri'i miñ-ste: suñs-dri* etc.? *zas* is, however, *si* in Anduo). — Т *ša-* (*ša-cha?*).

130. кур «мѣдь» = «copper»: *kur*, read *khur* «bronze, bell-metal», cf. Amdowa *khar-do* «a kind of copper ore», Т *mkhar-rdo* (Go), Anduo *k'az* in *mkhar-zañs* 生銅鍋, *mkhar-rña* 鑊 and *'khar-rja* 銅鑊; Dag *'khar-ba* = *mdog zañs-dmar-dañ mchuñs-pa'i lčags-rigs šig-gi miñ*. — Т *'khar-ba*, *mkhar-ba*.

131. царджи-чсу(рэ) «мѣшокъ» = «bag, small sack»: *cardži-čsu(re)*, read *char-ji, ju re* «it is a small sack for salt (or) a leather-bag», cf. Amdowa *əgye* «wollen-bag, Т *rgye* (Go), Anduo *ts'a* in *chva* «salt» and *dze* in *sgye* «bag» = *sgye-mo*, see DTLF *chva-sgye* «sacculus pro sale; sac pour le sel», *chva-sgyed* «sac de sel» (Gir.-Goré), further Amdowa *ḡo* «sac», Т *sgro* (Roerich), Anduo *dzo* in *sgyo-snod* «leather-bag, a small leather sack», ČhGr *sgro* = *ko-ba'i snod-dam rta-sgro lta-bu dañ rlig-ril-snod-la'añ*, Dag *sgro-ba* = *ko-pags-kyis bzos-pa'i khug-ma-dañ mchuñs-pa'i snod-kyi miñ* (also *sgyo-ba*); while *sgro* is made of leather (including scrotum), *sgye*, *sgye-*

¹³ Todaeva recorded Baoan *mange* «we», but this remounts to Mong. *man-* in *manu*

mo and the smaller *sgye'u* is of textile (Dag *sgye* = *ras dañ phyar-ba sogs-kyis bzos-pa'i zeñ dog-la srid riñ-ba'i snod-kyi miñ* etc.). — T *chva-sgye*, *sgro*, *red*.

132. оюн «налево» = «to the left»: *oyun* «left», Amdowa *γi'ôn* (-*ma*) «côté gauche» (Roerich), *lax-wa uyi-wa* «left hand» (Go), Anduo *hjon*, Romanized *hyon*, Golok *γi'on* (Roerich). — T *g-yon*.

133. ай «направо» = «to the right»: *ai* or *ai* «right (side)», Amdowa *γi'ē*-(*ma*) «le côté droit» (Roerich), Anduo *hje*, Romanized *hye*, Golok *γi'i*, *γi'is-pa*, *γi'ē-nē* «plus à droite» (Roerich). — T *g-yas*.

134. аням «небо»: *anam* «sky, heaven», Amdowa *aγnam* (N), see 35°. — T *gnam*.

135. нандау «невкусно» = «unsavoury, bad tasting»: *nandau*, read *ñan-dáu* (?), cf. Amdowa *nen* «mauvais» (Roerich), *lo-ñen* «a year of poor harvest» (Go), Anduo *γan* and Dag *bda'-ba* in *bro-ba žim-pa-la ro bda'-ba zer-ba* and in *ltogs-pa zas-la bda'-ba* or in *byis-pa mnar-zas-la bda'-ba*, where it means *zas-la sred-pa*. — T *ñan*, *bda'-ba* (?).

136. мочамбу «низкий» = «short, not tall»: *močambu*, read *mó čambu* «a short man» (?), cf. Sum I 621 *čham-me* = *nam kijū* (according to Kow.: «en ami», but Che *čham-me* = *lham-me* «shining, bright»), Sum *ibid.* *čhams-kyis brdal-ba ni kheñs-dregs bcan-pa'i gnas-nas dma'-sar 'bebs-pa'o* = *nam-iyar talbiqu anu omoy degerenggüi batu oron-ača door-a γajar-a bayuqu bolai* and *čham-la dbab-pa* = *nam door-a bayuqu* etc., where T *čham* ~ Mong. *nam* «low; calm; noiseless», but Sum's longer passage seems to verify the meaning «low(er place), down(wards)», cf. also his *čham-la dbab-pa* = *nam door-a bayuqu*, where Mong. *nam* is synonymous to *door-a* «down(wards)». Das has *čham* «headlong, full length» and «completely, utterly», *čham-du* «always, continually», *čhams-bžag* and *čam-bžag* «to be in a tranquil state», *čam* «slow; quietly», DTLF 318 *čham* «vaincre, soumettre, accomplir» (to *ʼjoms-* and *gčom-*), Parfionovič adds *čam* «noiseless», Mvy 6783/CCXLV: 518 *čham-du* (*čam-du*) *'debs-pa* = Skr. *saṃvāhanam* etc. Nevertheless these data proves to be insufficient for us in searching for **čham-* «short, not tall». T *čuñ-ba* «little, small» and *čuñ-bo* (Anduo *tē'oŋ-*, Romanized *tyoq*) «the little one» are semantically possible, but not without some phonetical difficulties: we must change the word into *čhombu*. Cf. also 53°, 127° etc. (T *mi*). — T *mi*, *čham-*, or *čuñ-* (?).

137. гунгари «нога»: *gõñña* (*ri* or *re*) «(it is) foot», see Róna-Tas 641° (Monguor *sgāŋ*, Prz Кýнаа = *kuñā*, Sz *szkunga* = *skuñña* etc.), Anduo *hkaŋ* «marrow», *hkaŋwa*, Romanized *hgaqfwa* «foot», Ху *rkañpa*. — T *rkañ-pa*, Amdowa T *rkañ-ba*.

138. шик «ногайка»: *šik*, read *ščäk*(?) «whip», cf. Amdowa *štarčay* «fouet» (Roerich), *hta-l/cax* «whip» (Go) (T *rta-lčag*), Anduo *htcak*, Sz *dji*. — T *lčag*.

139. чжи «ножикъ» = «small knife, pen-knife»: *čži*, read *dži* or *ji* «knife», cf. Monguor *aradže*, *araji*, Róna-Tas 10° and 109°, Sz *dji*, *lócsi* (= *loči*, Amdowa T *glo-*

gyi or *-gri*) «knife», *rcse* (= *rċe*) «dagger»; Anduo *teə*, Romanized *cuv*, Amdowa T *gyi*, *gri*. — T *gri*.

140. шна, сна «нось»: *šna*, *sna* «nose», Sz *szna* (= *sna*), Prz Хнаа (= *xnā*), Amdowa *šna* «nez» ~ *šna* (Roerich), *na-*, *hna* «nose» (Go), Anduo *hna*, Golok *šna*, *šnā*, (Roerich), Wassu *tešnā* (Rosthorn), Ху *sna-wa*; cf. also Róna-Tas, p. 140, nn. 226–230. — T *sna*.

141. мекес «нѣтъ» = «no; there is no(t)»: *meke-s*, cf. Róna-Tas 323° and Anduo *met* or *mel*, Romanized *mev*; *mevguf* = Amdowa T *med-gi*; for the final *-s* cf. Lhasa *la*, *la sə* «yes, Sir»? — T *med*.

142. мэ, ни «огонь»: *me*, *ñè* or *ñi* «fire», see Róna-Tas 386° (Monguor *niergān*), Prz Мии (= *mī*), Anduo *me*, *je*, Romanized *me*, *mye*, *nyev*. — T *me*, OT *mye*.

143. ца «озеро»: *chə* «lake», Sz *tsó* (= *cō*), Prz Цоо (*chō*), Amdowa *ts'o* «mer, lac» (Roerich), *mtso* «lake» (Go), Anduo *ts'o*, Golok *ts'o* (Roerich). — T *mcho*.

144. мюонэ «они» = «they»: *myuone*, read *mü oñi* «two men» (?), cf. 53°, 127° etc. and 2°. — T *mi*, *gñis*.

145. хийшуню «онь» = «he»: *xiyšunyu*, read *hī-*, cf. Amdowa T *hu-ki* «that over there», Anduo *hə(gə)*, Amdowa *hiy-yi* «là» (Roerich), probably not Amdowa T *khi-dge*, Anduo *k'ə-* «he, etc.», Roerich *k'e-ge* «il, elle»; the rest seems to be something predicative with *-nü* (cf. 36°, 43°, 49° etc.). If Russian *s* renders here Sbranag palatal *ś* without aspiration, *su* may be e.g. for T *žu* «to request, to ask» (cf. Amdowa T *žo yed* for *žu-ba byed*), but I could not find an unambiguous solution. Cf. also 50°. — T ?

146. сука «очагъ» = «hearth, fire-place»: *su-kha*, probably for *shu-khañ* ~ T *sol-khañ* «caminus ad conficiendum carbonis; four pour faire le charbon» (DTLF 1030), cf. also Amdowa T *so-gis* (or *khis*) «cinder» (quoted in 91°) and *so-khuñ* 炭窰 (Anduo). — T *sol-* (?).

147. викер «палатка»: *wiker* «tent», the same word is known in Monguor *īkar* and *bīkar* «tente» (Mostaert) ~ T *dbu-gur* (Jäschke), cf. also Monguor *gur* and Tibetan dialectal forms in Róna-Tas 199°, further Prz Рюкаррь «Палатка», Amdowa *rī-kar*, T *ras-gur* (Roerich), Wuti 12740°/II 3387 *ras-gur*; Das *ru-ba* = *re-gur* «a tent covering made of yak's hair», *re-bo* acc. to some = *sbre-bo* «sackcloth, a kind of cloth of yak's hair, tent» and *re-gur* «goat's hair tent; castle of hope»; cf. also 73°. — T *dbu-gur*.

148. сорму «палець»: *sormu*, read *shormu* «finger», Anduo *s'oz-* in Amdowa T *sor-mo* and *sor* «measure equal to the width of one finger», cf. Amdowa *sor-dub* «finger-ring», T *sor-gdub* (Go). — T *sor-mo*.

149. темун «большой палець»: *themuñ* «thumb», Amdowa *the-woy* (Go), Anduo *t'e-* in *mthe-boñ*, Romanized *tefoq*, cf. DTLF 830 *mthe-boñ* = *mjub-gu thuñ-thuñ* «pollex; le pouce», Gir.-Goré *mthe-mo* and *mthe-dpon* «pouce», YD also *mtheb-mo čhen*, Dag also *mthe-bo*. — T *mthe-boñ*.

150. гунжук «указательный палец»: *gunžuk*, read *gunjuk*, Anduo *koŋ-(n) dzək* in *goñ-mjug* 食指 «index (finger), forefinger», cf. Parfionovič id., but Go Amdowa *goŋ-mo* «the middle finger» (Róna-Tas, p. 114, n. 48, but Rebkong Amdowa *yoñ* «prix», Roerich), DTLF 150 *guñ~dguñ* in *guñ-mo*, *guñ-mjub* «digitus medius; doigt du milieu», 830 also = *bar-mjub* «dig. medius; le grand doigt», Sum et YD *guñ-mo* id., ČhGr *guñ-mo* = *guñ-mjub* = *sor-mo* *dkyil-mjub*. — T *goñ-mjug*, and *goñ-mjub*.

151. джимзук «средний палец»: *jimjuk* (or *-mzuk*) «middle finger», Anduo *htcimdzək*, Romanized *hcifnzug*, Amdowa T *dkyis-mjug* (= *dkyil-*), cf. also Róna-Tas 645° (Monguor *śđ'zi*) and p. 144, nn. 273, 276 (Prz = *mjugō* and Sz = *mzugū*). — T *dkyil-mjug*.

152. джимурынгу «безымянный палец» = «ring finger»: *džimu-riŋgu*?, *riŋgu* is probably for Amdowa T *riñ-bo* «long», see 65°, Anduo *raŋŋa*, Amdowa T *riñ-ña*, but the Sbra-nag value of *dž* is uncertain (palatal, for T *-j-, ĵ-, č-, -gy-, gy-, -gr-, gr-,* or *-ky-* etc., or cacuminal, for T *dr-, -dr-, br-, -br-* etc.?). No similar name is found for «ring finger» in my sources, cf. T *sriñ-mjug*, *sriñ-mjub* «annulaire» (Gir.-Goré), *sriñ-lag* = *lag-pa'i mjub-mo bži-pa'i miñ-ste*: «*sriñ-mjub*» *kyañ zer* (Dag), Amdowa *θin-lax* «the third finger», in Chin. 無名指, cf. T *miñ-med mjub-gu* «the anonymous finger» (Mong. *nere ügei quruγun* id., ~ *idam q.*, lit. «the tutelary deity's finger»; cf. also Russian term above). A case of taboo? — T ?¹⁴

153. шимзук «мизинец» = «the little finger»: *šimjuk* (or *-mzuk*) which in fact is the same as T *sriñ-mjug*, the term quoted in 152°, «ring finger». Anduo Romanized *nzugvtyoq* ~ T *mjug-čhuñ*, cf. Sum III 935 *theb-čhuñ* = *sigči quruγun*, DTLF 467 *mthe-čhuñ*, *mthe'u-čhuñ* «parvus digitus; petit doigt», ČhGr *mtheb-čhuñ* = *sor-mo čhuñ-ñu* = *mthe'u* = *sor-mo čhuñ-ba'am mthe'u-čhuñ*. — T *sriñ-mjug* «ring finger».

154. рилэмчсу(рэ) «переваль» = «mountain pass»: *rilemčsu(re)*, read *rilämčhu re* «it is (a) crooked mountain path», see *ri* in *riŋgu*, 58°; *lamčhu* ~ Amdowa *lam-khyox* «crooked path» (Go), Modern T *lam-kyog* (*lamk.ᅇ*) «zigzag, crooked or curving road» (Goldstein), Sum I 43 *lam-kyog-gis 'khyoñs-pa* = *jam-ača bultaran uduqu*, cf. I 248 *'khyog-bral ni lam-spyi* = *qajaγay-ača qayačaysan anu yerü jam : sayin jam* («the curve in the road» is used here in an ethical sense). — T *lam-kyog, ri, red* (Amdo and Lhasa: *lam-'khyog*).

155. лоса(рэ) «переводчикъ» = «interpreter»: *losā(re)* «(it is a) translator», Amdowa *lo-za-wa* «interpreter» (Go). — T *lo-ca-ba, red*.

156. ажидут «(погодить) погоди»: *ažidut* «wait (a little)!»), cf. T *gžes-pa* (= *bžugs-pa*, yet less used), resp. for «to sit, stay, wait» (Jäschke), *gžes* = *sdod* = *bžugs*; *čhuñ-cam gžes* «paululum sede, expecta; assieds-toi, attends un peu» (DTLF

¹⁴ Another Tibetan name for this «holy» finger is *akama* (Wang).

859), *gžes-šig* = *bžugs-šig* (ČhGr); *-dut* ~ T *sdod*, Anduo *tot*, perfect and imperative, Romanized *ddod*. — T *gžes sdod*.

157. ыргы хано ёки «позади» = «behind»: *irti hano yoki*, probably = *ri ti hana yóki* «it is behind that mountain»; *ti* < *tī*, Anduo *tə*, Amdowa T *di* for T *de* «that», cf. Róna-Tas 65°; *ha-* ~ Anduo *haz* in *har-kha* «that side (over there)», *har-da* (= *phar-la*) «towards that side»; *yoki*, Amdowa T *yod-gi*, see 75°. Nevertheless *irti* may also be interpreted by T *rtiñ* «behind; after», although Anduo only gives *htaŋ* for *gtiñ* «deep» and *rtiñ-ba* «the trunk (of a tree)», for *rtiñ* = *rjes* cf. Jäschke, ČhGr, Goldstein, DTLF (*rtiñ-du*, *-na*, *-la* post, retro, postea; après, derrière, ensuite), Sum, Dawasamdud etc. — The first solution (proposed by Prof. Norbu) is easier. — T *ri de'i phar-* (= *pha-rol*)-*na yod-*.

158. шитогыс «(показать) покажи» = «(to show), show!»: *što-gis* ?, the first syllable ~ T *ltos* «to look at» (cf. *lta*, Róna-Tas 537°, here 164° and Anduo *hta* for *lta*, *bltas*, *ltos*) or T *ston* (in this latter case we have to read Sbra-nag *šton*, cf. Anduo *hton* «to show», Amdowa *šten-nō* «montrer, indiquer», T *bstan-*, Roerich); the second syllable is obscure, cf. 141°. — T *ltos* or *ston*?

159. тычжи «(положить) положи» = «(to place, to lay), lay!»: *tīčži*, read *tī-či* (or *čhi*?) «lay that (there)!\», cf. Anduo *tə'i* for *čhas* (= *hyus*; perfect and imperative from *bča'*) «to put, to make, to do»;¹⁵ otherwise Anduo makes a clear distinction between *tə* «that» and *ndə* «this».

160. ноцу-комерэъ «(помогать) помощи» = «(to aid, to help) help!»: *nocu komyereye*, read *nocu* or *nochu* «we» or «us», cf. 64°, *komye* or *kome* is dubious (*k* renders *kh*, rarely *k*), *reye* is *res-yed* «to do together or mutually» or (phonetically problematical, but semantically better) *ro(γ)-ye* for Amdowa T *rogs-yed* «to help», cf. *'thuñ res-yed* «to keep on drinking (with somebody)», see also Jäschke *res byed-pa*, with verbal root, «to do a thing by turns with another person», further Amdowa T *'gyo-rogs yed* «to go together, to accompany», *za-rogs yed* «to eat together» etc. (Anduo); Anduo *zok-* in *rogs-yed*, Amdowa *roγ-she^l-pa* «help» (Go). As for *kome*, Prof. Norbu proposed *khoa* in *nozū khoa rog-ye* (*ño-cho kho-'a rogs-yed*), «let us help him». Anduo *k'om-* in *khom-pa* «free time» or Anduo *k'a-* in *ka-med*, *kha-med* «without doubt, by all means» (used as predicate) and *k'ak* in *khag-med* «no wonder . . .» (predicate) cannot be a part of our Sbra-nag sentence. — T *ño-cho*, ?, *res byed* or *rogs byed*.

161. нишиги «(понимать) понимаю» = «(to understand) I understand»: *nišigi* read *ni šigi* «I know», cf. Amdowa *šē-jō* «savoir» (Roerich), Anduo *æ-ki* for *gšes-ki* «true» and *x'e* for *šes* «to know, to be able», Anduo Romanized *syif* «to know» and *shifno* «that which is known», cf. also Róna-Tas 685°, 510° and 347°; in fact «I know» must be with the aspirate *sh*, cf. Anduo Romanized *garvro wo du tyuvzug yunvne*

¹⁵ Or *-ji* for *-jī(g)*, cf. Amdowa *šjig-* «mettre, poser, placer», T *sgrig*, *bsgrigs* (Roerich) ?

muvsʃif rhu «I do not know what is that white thing», *tyuu u shivta* «do you know?», but *qev ccavhgedf syedf syif, wolvhgedf syedf muvsyif* «I can speak Chinese, but I cannot speak Tibetan», where the perfect form is used. — T *ñas, bšes/šes*.

162. мишири «(не понимать) не понимаю» = «(not to understand), I do not understand»: *mi šhi ri* «I do not know», cf. Anduo Romanized *muvsʃif, muvsyif-*, the latter e.g. in the sentence *ggevvggenf, yivrhef nduv qev ndonv muvsyifrhu* «Teacher! I cannot read this letter» (*-rhu* renders *-γə* for *-gi*). — T *mi, šes, red*.

163. гманньк «порохъ»: *Ymannək* «(gun)powder», cf. Sz *szmen* (= *smen*) «orvosság = medicine», *men* «puskapor = gunpowder», Amdowa *šmen* «médicament, drogue» (Roerich), *hman-pa-wa, man-tu-wa* «medicinal-herb-collector» (Go), Anduo *hman* «medicine», Golok *řmən* id. (Sprigg), Dag *smān-nag* = *me-rjas, "a-bra gsod-pa'i smān žes-pa lta-bu*. Cf. also Róna-Tas 580° (Monguor *smān*). — T *smān-nag* (*-nag*: cf. 88°).

164. шита «(посмотрѣть) посмотри» = «(to look) look!»: *šta* «look!», cf. 158° and Amdowa *řta-jlō, řta-j'lo* «regarder, voir», *řtē-nō, řtē-nō, tē-nō* «regarder» (Roerich); Prz Хцйркта «Смотрѣть = to look» is probably for *xcik-řta* (? *gzigs-*); Golok *řta* or *řta*, perf. *řti*: (Sprigg). — T *lta*.

165. ононин «послѣ-завтра» = «(the day after tomorrow): *ononin*, read *oñoñ-nñin*, cf. Amdowa *nañ-jñin* id. (Go), Anduo *hnañ-* in *gnañs-nñin* (cf. also Gir.-Goré «après-demain»), Dag *gnañs* = *řjes-kyi nñin gsum-pa'i miñ-ste: sañ-nñin dañ gnañs-nñin žes-pa lta-bu* (Roerich gives Amdowa *šī nñin-kar* «après-demain», *phyi'i nñin-mo-la*, for *nñin-kar* see also Sz *njinker* «at daylight», Anduo *nñan-kaz* for *nñin-dkar*). — T *gnañs-nñin*.

166. санътонши «(поѣсть) поѣшь» = «(to eat up), eat up!»: *san'tonši*, read *san ton ši* «eat and drink», or, according to Prof. Norbu, *sa-ton ši* for *bza'-ston yed/byos*. Cf. Amdowa *san* in *wax-san* «grain flour», T *pag-zan* or *spag-zan, sa-ma* «food», T *za-ma* (Go), Anduo *sa*, T *za, zas, zo*, Romanized *sav, sev, sov; savccuf* «eaten»; cf. also Róna-Tas 502°; Dag *zan* = *'bru-rigs-kyi phyē dañ phyē'i zas-kyi miñ; bza'-btuñ; bza'-ba-ste: btuñ-ba ma yin-pa'i zas-kyi miñ; za-ma = kha-bzas*; Anduo *t'oñ* «to drink», T *'thuñ* (see Roerich's Amdowa *t'uñ-jlō* «boire») seems to be funny with «food», cf. however in some sentences in Anduo Romanized: *tugfgwaf toq ranv ngu* 喫了嗎 «did you eat?» (*toq* ~ T *'thuñ; tugf-gwaf* ~ T *thug-pa* «soup, broth»), *tugfgwaf toqfngu ncov* «go to eat (your broth)!» and *devraqf tenstugf toqfccuf ruv, govrev yolvnuř mavruř* «(to-day (we) eat dough-strips in soup, there is no steamed bread»; but these kinds of food contain something liquid which is not eaten, but drunk, cf. Mong. *šöl ū-* «to drink soup». Anduo *t'oñ*, T *thon*, imperative to *toñ* ~ T *toñ, dañ*, i.e. *gtoñ, btañ*, here a marker of an action being or to be finished (cf. Roerich, pp. 46, 48; Amdowa T *zo-'a thon* «eat up! (finish!)», *byin-na thon* «give (at once)!» would be incompatible with *ši* ~ *byos, byas*. For T *bza'-ston* (and also *bza'-don* «matrimonial affairs») Amdowa should have *z-* or *-z-*, moreover, the final *-n* in *san* would remain without explanation. If the original

sentence is a polite invitation, then *ši* ~ *bžes*, Anduo *zi*, Dag *bžes* in *gsol-ja bžes* etc., but here again *š-* is an irregular representation for T *-ž-*. — T *zan btuñ bžes* (?).

167. нёдоно «(продавать) продай» = «(to sell), sell!»: *nyodono*, read *ño dañ-no* «(one) has bought», cf. Amdowa *ño-jño*, *ño-nō* «acheter» (Roerich), *ño-wa* «buy», *ño-no-ji* «buyer» (Go), Anduo *no* and *ne*, Romanized *nyov* and *nyev*, cf. *tyufzug nyev yolv* «what did you buy?», *tyufraf nyev tyufzug yevcufev?* «why did you buy cheese?». — Amdowa T *ño dañ-no*; T *ño*, *ños*.

168. цзунчжима «(не продавать) не продавай» = «(not to sell), do not sell!»: *czunčžima*, read *cui-ji me* «(it is) not for sale», cf. Róna-Tas 593°, 595°, 596° (*sōñ*, *sōñ-*) and Amdowa *tš'oiñ-jño* «faire le commerce» (Roerich), Anduo *tsoñ*, Amdowa T *bcoñ* (imperf., perf. and fut.), *choñ* (imperat.) «to sell», Romanized *dsoqf* and *tsoqf*, Dag *'choñ* (imperf.), *bcoñs* (perf.), *bcoñ* (fut.), *choñs* (imperat.) which seems to be artificial. — T *bcoñ*, *rgyu*, *med*.

169. галык «птица» = «bird»: *galik*, read *yälak* «eagle», Amdowa *yälaj* «aigle» (Roerich), *Ɂlax* «eagle» (Go), Anduo *hlak*. — T *glag*.

170. чантулэ зысунлэ «пьяный» = «drunken, intoxicated»: *čhañ thuñ-le* (or *tuñ-?*, cf. 166°), *zi-suiñ-le* «(one has) drunk wine (and) got drunk»; wine is of course Tibetan beer, Amdowa *č'añ* «alcohol d'orge» (Roerich), *čhañ* «wine» (Go), for *thuñ* see 166°, *zi* ~ Anduo *zə* ~ T *bzi*, cf. *čhañ-bzi* «s'enivrer» (Gir.-Goré) *čhañ-'thuñ-mkhan* «a beer-drinker» (Jäschke), *-le* is an attributive particle, Dag *le* = *rgyan-chig-gi mthar sbyorchul* «ge»-*la ltos*; but his examples such as *gdoñ nag rog-ge soñ*, *me-tog dmar ldem-me bžad* or *khyi rgan hon-ne hon-ne zug-gin 'dug* show a semantical pattern different from what we need here (cf. 50°). What we have here it is probably the same particle which occurs in the following Čhab-mdo sentences *mi gčig 'o 'gro mi 'dod-le red* «nobody wishes to go» (Jin, p. 280), *ña khyim-pa nañ-la 'oiñ-le yin* «I came home» or «I am back (home)» (Jin, p. 308) and *khyod-gis ča-lag čhe ño-le yin* «what did you buy?» (Jin, p. 302), i.e. the Sbra-nag particle may also be perfective and attributive. — T *čhañ*, *'thuñ*, *bzi*, *soñ* (see 51°), *-le*.

171. лаплун «пѣть» = «to sing»: *laplun*, if not derived from *lab* «talk», read *lu-blañ*, cf. Amdowa *lo* «chanson», *lo-len* «chant», *len-jño* «prendre», *lañ-nō*, thème du passé (Roerich), *lu* «song» (Go), Anduo *hlə*, Romanized *hlu*, also *hlu len* (*len*, *laq*, *loq*); *la yu lan* «chanter une chanson» (Migot 547); Dag s.v. *'jum*: *ño 'jum-ste glu blañs*, thus our *lu-blañ* «(one) sang a song». Yet see also Dag *lab-gleñ* «talk». — T *glu*; *len*, *blañs* etc. (?).

172. шюмо «ребенокъ» = «a small child, baby»: *šyumo*, read *šimo* «girl», Amdowa *šī-mo* «jeune fille» (Roerich), *shi-mo* «girl» (Go), Anduo *šamo*, Romanized *syuvmo*, Amdowa T *byi-mo*; cf. also Róna-Tas 41°, note. Sz *sziai* (*csunga*) = *ša-yi čhuñ-ña* «gyermek = child» and Prz Сязи (probably = *ša-yi*) id. ~ Anduo Romanized *syavyif* «a little child». Dag *byi-mo* = 1. *chul-min-gyi 'khrig-pa spyod-mkhan-mo*, 2. *spyi-chogs rñiñ-bar 'byor-ldan gral-rim-gyis g-yog-tu bkol-ba'i bud-med* and *byis-pa* = *lo-chod bčoiña man-gyi mi-la byis-pa zer*. — T *byis-*(*pa*) and *-mo*.

173. чжонна «ремень»: *džoniŋa* «strap, thong», Amdowa 'braŋ-wa «leather-rope» (Go), Anduo *ndzaŋ-* in 'breŋ-ba, Dag 'breŋ-ba = ko-pags-kyi thag-pa'i miŋ-ste: 'breŋ-leb, 'breŋ-ril žes-pa lta-bu. — T 'breŋ-pa.

174. ко «ротъ»: *ko*, read *kha* «mouth», cf. Róna-Tas 227° and Prz Ka ≅ *kha* id., Kóbcсы = *khobsi* «Усы = moustache», Sz *karszú = khaβsi* (v instead of r) id., *kabszu* id., Amdowa *k'apsi* «moustaches» (Roerich), T *kha-spu*; Anduo *k'a*. — T *kha*.

175. чи «ружье» = «rifle, gun»: *či*, read *čhi?* — *čhi* «what», Anduo Romanized *tyuf*, Amdowa T *čhi*, *či*, homonymous here with T *khyi*, *čhu*, *mčhu* etc., represent only one of the phonetical possibilities, but neither palatal (aspirate or not), nor cacuminal affricates with (short) *i* (Anduo ə for T -i, -u) or (long) *i* for T -as, -is, -us, -os, -il etc. offer a solution. Chinese 槍 *qiang* is improbable. Perhaps our *či* is a distorted form remounting to T *sgyogs* «a warlike engine to shoot darts or fling stones with, catapult, ballista; mortar, cannon, gun» (Jäschke), Dag = *gna'-dus dmag-'khrug rgyag skabs rdo čhen-po sogs dgra'i bcan-rjoŋ-la 'phen-byed-kyi yo-byad čig-gi miŋ-ste: sgyogs-rdo* etc.; *da-lta'i me-sgyogs-kyi miŋ-ste: sgyogs-stegs, sgyogs -mdel žes-pa lta-bu. yul-skad-du* «bo'u-čhen» *yaŋ zer* (where *bo'u* < Sino-Mongolian *buu*, Roerich's Amdowa *ū* «fusil», Sz *uo*, Monguor *pū*, Chin. *pao*). Anduo only has *je-htɕok* for *mye-skyogs* 火鏟子 *huochanzi* «fire-shovel» (cf. Jäschke dial. *me-kyog* «coal shovel», s.v. *skyogs*) and similar, not warlike implements, among them a homonym to *sgyogs*: Anduo *dzok*, Amdowa T *sgyog = sgrog* «fetters». — T *sgyogs* (?).

176. хунгу (хуыгу) «рука» = «hand»: read хунгу = *xuŋgu* «shoulder» or *xuŋgu* «arm», cf. Amdowa *xuŋ* «armée» (Roerich), Anduo *xwoŋŋa* for *dpuŋ-ŋa*, *dpuŋ-ba* «arm, upper arm», Dag *dpuŋ-ba = mi'i lag-pa'i gru-mo-nas sog-pa'i bar-gyi lhu-chigs* etc. — T *dpuŋ-pa*, *dpuŋ-ba*, *dpuŋ-mgo* (ČhGr: *dpuŋ-mgo = phrag-pa'am phrag-mgo*).

177. ня «рыба»: *ña* «fish», Sz *nia* (= *ña*), Amdowa *ña* (Roerich), Anduo *ja*, Romanized *nyav*, Amdowa South *na* (Roerich). — T *ña*.

178. чжирадо «рѣзать» = «to cut»: *čžirado*, perhaps = *dži-*, cf. Amdowa *čʰa-žjo*, *ʧʰe-nō* «couper», T *dra*, *dras* (Roerich), Dag *dra* (fut.), 'dra (imperf.), 'dras (perf.), *dros* (imperat.) = *khe-gris* («by scissors») *gčod-pa daŋ sog-les gčod-pa*, etc., but cf. also Anduo *tšak* for *breg*, Dag *breg*, 'breg, *bregs*, *brogs* = *gri daŋ zor-bas dnos-rjas phra-mo maŋ-bo mñam-du bčad-pa'i don-te: breg-bya'i lo-tog* etc. (Roerich's Amdowa *ččo-žjo*, *čal'-nō* «couper, déchirer» etc., T *gčod*, *bčad*; *čel'-nō* «couper, diviser» etc. and *čkil'-žjo* «couper, scier», T *grud-* are difficult to be accepted here); *dži* (or *ži*) could also be for *gris*, instrumental form (see 139°), but then *ra* should be the word of action (? *za(k)* for *džak*, *tšak* in intervocalic position). Final *-do* maybe = Anduo *ta*, Romanized *dav*, perfective particle. — T 'dras ?.

179. чу «рѣка»: *čhu* «river», see 46°.

180. даттын «садиться» = «to sit down»: *dattiŋ*, read *dat-thuŋ* or *dot-thuŋ* «sit down!», Sz *rdot* «ülni = to sit», Amdowa *uđol'-pa* «sit», *uđal'-pa* «live» (Go), *de-nō*

«s'asseoir etc.» (Roerich), Anduo *dot, dat* in *sdod, bsdad*, cf. Romanized *duvrhu ddov* «sit there!» and 125°; *-thuñ ~ thoñ*, see 166°. — T *sdod thoñ*.

181. хам «сапогъ» = «boot»: *хам*, read *ham*, cf. Róna-Tas 204°, Anduo *ham*, Amdowa T *ham, lham* «footwear» (Dag: *ko-lham, phyiñ-lham, ras-lham* and *rcva-lham*). — T *lham*.

182. шани, шанэ «свинець»: *šaṇi* or *šane* «lead», Sz *sányi* (= *sañi*) «ólom = lead», Amdowa *sha-ne* «lead» (Go), Anduo *ca-* in *ža-ñe* «tin», i.e. *ža-dkar*. — T *ža-ñi, ža-ne* «lead; tin».

183. деренг(ысы) «сегодня» = «to-day»: *d(y)er(y)eng(isi)*, of which *dereñ* «today», cf. Róna-Tas 65° and Anduo *tezarj*, Romanized *devraq*. — T *de-riñ-gi* «of this day» and final particle **so*.¹⁶

184. рню «серебро»: *rñü* or *rñü* «silver», cf. Róna-Tas 785° and Anduo *hñu*, Amdowa T *dño'i*. — T *dñul*.

185. шида адзау(рэ) «сильный» = «strong»: *šida adzau(re)*, read *šhid ajau re* «(it) is strong»,¹⁷ cf. Amdowa *çet'-chin* «strong», T *šed-čhen; çe-can* «strength», T *sed-čan* (Go), Anduo *x'et*, Romanized *shedv ~ T šed; ajau* «good», see 232° and cf. *šed bzañ-po* «strong» (Parfionovič). — T *šed*.

186. умбу «синий»: (*ñ*)*umbu* «blue», cf. Róna-Tas 411° and Anduo *hño, hñombo*, Anduo Romanized *hqovhca* and *hqofmbo ~ T sño-skya* and *sñon-po*; here 88°. — T *sñon-po*.

187. туюкэ «сколько?»: *tu yuke* «how much?», cf. Amdowa *to* «plusieurs, quelques», T *du-* (Roerich), Anduo *tə* «how much, some», Romanized *duv; yuke* = Amdowa T *yod-gi*, see 75°. — T *du*.

188. римашыху «скорѣе» = «quicker, faster»: *rima šixu* «enter quickly!», see 41° (Anduo *zemma > zema*) and Anduo *çək* for Amdowa T *žugs* «to enter, to take part» (?). (Dag's *khyod-kyis rem-žig* seems to be too literary.) — T *rem-pa, žugs* (?), *-go* (final particle). or *dgos* «necessary».

189. химэмэну «слабый» = «weak, feeble»: *ximemenu*, ?read *hme-me-nu*, cf. Anduo *hmək* for *dmigs* «to put forth effort, to be zealous» + *med* (cf. 141) + *no*, attributive particle, i.e. the Sbra-nag sequence may be «spiritless, feeble». A solution with a less spiritual meaning would be here more desirable, but the commonest compound for «feeble», *šhi-me* or *šhed-med* (cf. Amdowa *çet'-meł* «feeble», Go) is not applicable here without phonetical difficulties, although the Amdowa (and probably Sbra-nag) aspirate *š* acoustically is near to a strong voiceless mediopalatal spirant. Cf. *še-moñ* «nature, fate, destiny; power; strength, force», etc. (Jäschke < Schmidt), Dag *šed-moñ-čan* and *šed-čan, rta šed-bzañ* (cf. 185°), ČhGr *šed-mo = stobs* and hence we may interpret «*ximemenu*» as *šhi-mə-me(d)-no* «having no strength; feeble». This latter possibility seems more probable. — T *še-moñ, med, -no* or *dmigs* (?) etc.

¹⁶ From *soñ*, in perfective meaning?

¹⁷ Or *rta "a-rja-bo* «a good horse», *šta* etc. ?

190. гарашимбу «сладко» = «it is sweet»: *garašimbu* (or *kara-*) «sweet like sugar», cf. Róna-Tas 173° (*gara* etc.) and Anduo *kaza* «sugar»; Sz *siambu* (= *śambu?*) «édes = sweet», Amdowa *shim-po* «sweet», *dri shim-po* «fragrant» (Go), Anduo *ǰambo* «tasteful, of delicious taste and smell». — Т *ka-ra žim-po*.

191. чиманѐни «смѣяться» = «to smile; to laugh»: *čimanyoni*, ? read *čhi ma ñan-ni* (*ri*) «what is wrong?» or «what is the matter?» (Prof. Norbu's Amdowa reading). If Russian *č* is an error for *c* (ц), the sentence could be read as *cim-ma ñan-ni*, cf. Amdowa *tsim-* «fermer (les yeux)», Т *bcum* < *'jum* (Roerich): this word meaning «to wink; to smile», etc. is also known in Anduo *ndzəm-* in *'jum-ston* «to smile»; *ñan* ~ Anduo *jan* «(to be) possible» (𑄎𑄂𑄃, 𑄎𑄂𑄄), *ñan-nas* «what can be done (better)?», *ñan* «to become, to change into», e.g. *smyon-pa ñan-soñ* «(one) went mad», but *-kha ñan* in *yoiñ-kha ñan* «(one) is ready to come» etc. Does our sentence mean «(one) begun to smile»? — Т *bcum* (?), *ñan* (?), *-nu*.

192. га «снѣгъ»: *ga*, read *gañ* or *khā* «snow», cf. Amdowa *k'ā* «neige» and *kañ* «neige», Т *kha-ba* and *gañs* (Roerich), Sz *khan*, Prz Кынь, Golok *kañ* (Roerich), Amdowa *khañ* «snow» (Go), Anduo *kañ* for *gañs* «snow (on the mountains)», Ху *khawa*. — Т *gañs* or *kha-ba* ?

193. чи, к'чи «собака»: *čhi* and *kčhi* «dog», cf. Róna-Tas 728° and Anduo *tǰ'a-* in *khyi-ku* and *khyi*. — Т *khyi*.

194. сынтам «солдат» = «soldier»: *sintam*, reading uncertain, the first syllable could correspond to Т *zin*, *zun*, *sun* etc., but hardly to *sr-* which usually gives *š*, as in Anduo *šoyk'or* ~ Т *sruñ-'khor* «amulet», although cf. here *sam*, Amdowa *sam*, Т *sram*. Dag gives *sruñ-ma* = *sruñ-skyob byed-mkhan-gyi dmag-mi sogs-kyi miñ-ste*: *sgo-la sruñ-ma bzag lta-bu*; Dagyaб's *sruñ-sdom* = *chul-khrims sruñ-ziñ dbañ-po'i sgo sdom-pa* is a Buddhist term (but nowadays it also means secular morals, see Dag). — Т ?

195. нима «солнце»: *ñima* «sun», Prz Нима «sun», Нима? «day», Нима? абдунъ «week» (*ñi-ma*, first syllable stressed; ? marks, if not else, a rising tone), Sz *ñima* «sun», Amdowa *ñi-ma*, *ñō-ma* «jour, soleil» (Roerich), Anduo *na-* in *ñi-ma* «sun; day», Golok *ñü-ma* (Roerich). — Т *ñi-ma*.

196. нима шар «солнца восходъ» = «sunrise»: read *ñima šar*, cf. Amdowa *šar* «Est» (Roerich), *čar* «east» (Go), Anduo *x'az*, Romanized *šar* «East», Golok *šar* (Roerich), Ху *ñima šar*. — Т *ñi-ma šar*.

197. нима нур «солнца заходъ» = «sunset» *ñima nur*, cf. Amdowa *niñ* «occident» (Roerich), *nub* «west», *nub h'io'* «night» (Go), Anduo *nəp* «west; sunset», also in *nub-mo* «evening», Romanized *nub*, Golok *nub* (Roerich), Ху *ñima nu[p]*, but Monguor *nursā* «repas du soir, souper», Т *nub-za* (Mostaert), Róna-Tas 407°. — Т *ñi-ma nub*.

198. цаку «соль»: *caku*, read *chakhu*, Sz *tzako* (= *chakhu*) «só = salt», Anduo *tsaku* «salt», Romanized *tsavku*, Amdowa Т *chva-khu*, cf. Amdowa *ts'ā* «sel» (Roerich), *sa* «salt» (Go). — Т *chva*, dial. *chva-khu*.

199. инидю(рэ) «спать» = «(to sleep): *inyidyu(re)*, read *ĩni(d)-ju re* «(one) sleeps (or is sleeping)», Prз Рнить «Спать» = to sleep», Amdowa *ʎñil'-j̄lo* «dormir», *ʎñil'* «sommeil» (Roerich), Anduo *hɣət, hɣəl* for Т *gñid* «to sleep», Romanized *myuf mbabvɣu* ~ Т *gñid 'bab-*. Cf. also Amdowa *ñi-nō* «rever», *ʎñi-lam, ñō-lam* «rêve, songe», Т *rmi-* etc. (Roerich). — Т *gñid, rɣy, red*.

200. цанра «спина» = «back, the hind part»: *canra*, read *chanra*, Prз Цанра «Спина», ČHGr *chan-ra = mchan-ra = rus-pa mchan-ra'i miñ-du snañ*, Sum II 569 *chan-ra = uyuča, kebtesi* (Mong. *uyuča* «the posterior part of an animal's back», etc., Lessing), *'chan-ra* «the neck of the thighbone» (Jäschke < Schmidt), DTLF 822 «соха; l'os сохал» etc., Dag *chan-ra = mi phyugs-kyi lus-po'i phoñs* etc. — Т *chan-ra* etc.

201. ноцон-ника-лахча ландоно «спрятать» = «(to hide, to conceal): *nocon-nyika-laxča landono*, read *nochũ ñika laxča lañdañ-no* «we two have taken the things» (reading proposed by Prof. Norbu); *nochũ*, instrumental, cf. 64°; *ñika*, Anduo *hɣnika*, cf. 2°; *laxča*, Anduo *lakté'a* «weapons, tools», Amdowa *lax-cha* «utensil» (Go); *lañ*, Anduo *lan* ~ Т *blañs*, cf. 81°; *dañ* ~ Amdowa Т *dañ*, Anduo *taɲ*, cf. 166°, 167° (ibid. no). — Т *no-cho, gñis-ka, lag-ča, blañs, dañ = btañ, -no*.

202. хомбуза «старшина» = «chief»: *xombuza*, read *xwombuca* «the chief(tain) (and his retinue)», cf. Amdowa *xɥon-bo* «chef, supérieur» (Roerich), *hon-po, -hon* (Go), Anduo *xwon-* in *dpon-ñan*; Golok *xɥon-po* (Roerich), Ху *xpon* e.g. in *mgo-dpon*; *ca*, Anduo *htsa*, cf. Dag *rca = gñen dañ ñe-du'i miñ-ste: mi-rca* etc. — Т *dpon-po, rca*.

203. ами «старикъ» = «old man»: *ami*, perhaps = *amñi* «grandfather; a reverential term used when speaking to an old man», Amdowa *amñē* «beau-père» (Roerich), Anduo *amye*, Amdowa Т *"am-myes, "a-mes*, Anduo Romanized also *abvnye* 老大爺; Sz *amni* «nagypa = grandfather». — Т *"a-mes, "a-myes*.

204. униры «старуха» = «old woman»: *Wñi ri* «(she) is a woman», cf. 79°, 231°. — Т *bud-med, red*.

205. кун чиик «(стоит) что стоить?» = «(to cost), what does it cost?»: *kun čiyik* (final *k* instead of *n*), read *kuñ* (or *guñ*) *čhi yin* «what is the price», cf. Anduo Romanized *goqɣ tyuftozug ruv*? id., Amdowa *ɣoñ* «prix» (Roerich), *goɲ-thaɲ* «price» (Go). — Т *goñ, či, yin*.

206. доладо «(стоять) стой» = «(to stay, to stop), stop!»: *dolado* «sit down!», or «stop!» Giraudeau «sto» *lañ-sdad, sdad*, etc., Amdowa *yá, dó-la-dañ* (N), cf. also Amdowa *laɲ-do^l-pa* «stand» (Go) and 180°. — Т *sdod-la dañ (= btañ)*.

207. опчин «стремя» = «stirrup»: read *opčhin*, Sz *jobcsin (= yobčhin)* «ken-gyel = stirrup», Amdowa *ob-č'en* «étrier» (Roerich), Anduo *op-té'en*, Golok *job-č'en* (Roerich). — Т *'ob-čhen, yob-čhen*.

208. сдагасун «(ступать) ступай» = «(to step), step!»: *sdagasun*, read *sdaga shuñ* «return!» or «go back!», cf. Anduo *htakwa* «back, the rear», Anduo Romanized *hdagsga (= htaga)* id., and Anduo *s'oɲ*, imperative, cf. 41°. — Т *ltag-pa, soñ*.

209. джапчжи «стучать» = «to knock»: *džapčži*, read *jaǰǰi*, cf. Amdowa *ǰlay-ǰlo*, *ǰlab-nō*, *ǰla-nō* «dévaster, frapper» (Roerich), *gyab-pa* «to close» (Go), Anduo *dzap* «to close, to beat» etc., acc. to Anduo *brgyab* is perfect of *rgyag*, but Dag: *brgyab ni ma--'ons-pa dañ 'das-pa-ste . . . gris brgyab-nas spyañ-ki bsad lta-bu* etc. — T *rgyab-pa*, *brgyab-* (cf. 76°), *rgyu*.

210. гамбу, саро-гамбу «сухой» = «dry»: *gambu*, *saro-gambu* read *gambu* or *kambu* «dry», cf. Sz *kambu* «száraz» id., Amdowa *kambo* «aride, mauvais» (Roerich), *hkam-po* «dry» (Go), Anduo *hkam-* in *skam-po* «dry; lean»; Róna-Tas 560°–561°; *saro* is probably for *cha-ro*, name of a plant, Dag *char-bu* = *šiñ phran žig-gi miñ-ste*, *sdõñ-šiñ sra-mo yin-pas dbyug-pa dañ lčags-khem-gyi yu-ba byed čhog-la*, *šiñ-'bras smin che mdog dmar-žin lug-ril cam-žig yod-pa-la char-'brum zer-žin sman byed čhog*. Sum II 577 *char-'brum ni char-pa'i 'bras-dmar-po* = *iryay-yin ür-e* etc., a kind of bush with red berries, its hard wood is used for sticks and handles of shovels, the berries (of the size of a sheep's dropping) give a kind of medicament; acc. to Lessing, *iryai* is *Cotoneaster melanocarpa*¹⁸ (which is, acc. to Gammerman—Semičov, T *de-drag*, ?), Monguor *yärgē mōdi* «bois de sorbier (?)» (Mostaert), Kalm. *yaryā* in *er y. modñ* «Name eines Baumes od. Strauches (Ölöt., wird zum Peitschenstiel verwendet) etc., y. «irgendein Strauch mit sehr hartem Holz» (Ramstedt), *yaryā* «kizil» = *Cornus* (Muniev); thus *charo gambu* may be for *char-bu skam-po*, a dry, i.e. a dead shrub of the wide family of the *Rosaceae*. (This is anyway more likely than *cha-ru* «lamb-skin», Anduo *char.*) — T *skam-po*, *char-bu* (?; Amdowa T).

211. мацуню «сырой» = «raw, unboiled»: *ma chu-nü* «unboiled, unripe», cf. Anduo *ts'i* «to be boiled, to ripen» Amdowa T *'chos*, e.g. *ša 'chos soñ zig* «the meat got cooked», *nas 'chos*, etc. «the barley grew ripe»; Lhasa T *ma-chos-pa* = *mhā-tsōōpa* «uncooked, raw» (Goldstein; negative *ma* is high, and before aspirates usually semivoiced or voiceless); DTLF 786 *bcos* «coctus, maturus, tinctus, purificatus; cuit, mûr, teint, purifié», 816 *chos* id., < *'cho*; Dag gives *bco*, *'chod*, *bcos*, *chos* transitive (e.g. *sa rlon bco dgos*), but not *'chos* with the meaning marked in Anduo. — T *ma*, *'chos*, and Amdowa T *-nu*.

212. пра «сѣдло»: *rga* «saddle», Prz *-pra* in Pт[a]pra, Sz *sztarga* «nyereg» id., Amdowa *lga* «selle» (Roerich), *hta-r/ga* «saddle of a horse» (Go), Golok *lga* (Roerich), see Róna-Tas, p. 143, n. 258, and Anduo *hta-ga*, Romanized *gga*, Xy *sga*. — T *sga*.

213. габу «сѣдой» = «grey-haired»: *gabu* «old man, a man grey with old age» (Jäschke *rgad-po*), Amdowa *ga-po*, *ga-wo* «vieux», Anduo Romanized *ggabvbof* (Anduo *hka-* in *rka-bo* «emaciated and old», speaking of horse and cattle, but *ggabvbof* = Anduo **gabo* means «an old man»). — T *rga-* and *rgad-po*.

¹⁸ Grum-Gržimajlo II 341 mentions *Cotoneaster* (multiflora ?), see also Rock, pp. 91, 97, *Cotoneaster multiflora*. Cornel (Cornus), the wood of which is of similar use described in Dag is not attested either in Grum-Gržimajlo's Travels or in Rock's monograph.

214. дорэн «табакъ» = «tobacco»: *doren*, of which *do* ~ Anduo *to*, Romanized *dov* (e.g. in *dovtenf* «to smoke»), Amdowa *T do* (= *du-ba*) «smoke; tobacco», Prz Дóоа «Табакъ», Sz *duva* «dohány = tobacco», Amdowa *t'o* «tabac» (Roerich), *do* id., in several compounds. e.g. *do-khux* «tobacco-pouch» (Go), cf. also Róna-Tas, p. 114, n. 48, and DLT *du-ba, dva-ba, dud-pa*, s.v. «tabacum», Dag *du-ba* = *tha-ma-kha* and hence *tha*. The second syllable is ambiguous (*ren?*, *reñ?*, or *re-* T *red?*).¹⁹ — T *du-ba*, ?

215. нивамбу «толстый» = «fat, corpulent»: *ñi wombu* «a fat man», Amdowa *bom-bo* «gros, grosse» (Roerich), *'pom-po* «big» (Go), Anduo *wom-* in *sbom-po* (semantically = *rom-po*) «thick» (Dag *sbom* = *dbyibs zlum-po'i rigs-kyi khor-yug-gi chad che-bu* etc., also *sboms*. — T *mi (myi) sbom-po*.

216. мимцану «тонкий» = «thin»: *mimcanu*, read ? *mi mi* (= *mə*) *cho-nu* «a not fat (= thin) man», cf. Sz *tzuge* «vastag = thick», *mitzuge* «vékony = thin» (in both instances *tz = ch*), Anduo *ts'o*, T *cho, cho-ba* «fat, greasy», Dag *cho* (*rgyan-chig*) = *ša chil sogs rgyas-pa'i don-te: lug 'di ha-čan cho* etc. — T *cho*.

217. шица «трава»: *šica*, read *šca* «grass», Prz Рца «Трава», Sz *rtza* (= *rca*) «szalma = straw» and *tsa* (= *ca*) «fü = grass», Amdowa *tsa, ḡtsa* «herbe, foin» (Roerich), *sa* «grass» (Go), Anduo *htsa*, Romanized *hsa* (also in *hsafsaq*) «grass», Golok *tsa* (Roerich), cf. Róna-Tas 392°, 442°, 545° (392° Monguor *nirdzā = gnas-rcva*). — T *rcva*.

218. гонсы «тропинка», read «трубка»: *gonsi*, read *goñsə* «tobacco-pipe», Amdowa *gañ-sa* «tube, pipe», T *gañ-zag* < Mong. *gansā* (Roerich) < Chin. 杆子 *ganzi*, Monguor *gändze* «tuyau», *ḡaṅsā* «pipe» (Mostaert); Prz Тётхуу «Трубка» (= *tó't-khū?*, perhaps ~ *dud-*)²⁰ and Go's Amdowa *ra-r/si* «tobacco-pipe» (= *rwarces*) are synonyms to *goñsə*. — T *gañ-zag*.

219. лам «трубка», read «тропинка» = «path»: *lam* «road, way», Prz, Amdowa (Roerich, Go) id., see 154°.

220. чо «ты» = «thou»: *čo*, read *čo* «you, thou», Amdowa *č'o*, Golok *č'í'o* «tu» (Roerich), Anduo *té'o*, Romanized *tyof*, cf. 53° — T *khyo, khyod*.

221. минё(рэ) «тухлый» = «rotten, putrid»: *minyō(re)*, read *m'na(g) (re)* «(it is) putrid», cf. Dag *myag* = (*rgyan-chig*) *rul-nas 'dam-dañ 'dra-bar gyur-pa'i rnam-pa-ste: 'dam-myag* etc. *myag-myog* id., *myags* = *rul-nas 'dam-'bad-dañ 'dra-bar gyur-pa* etc., ČhGr *ñag-ñog = ra-ri'i mi gcañ ñal-ñil lta-bu; myag-myog = rjab-doñ nañ-gi mi gcañ lta-bu; myags-pa = ro myags lta-bu'am rjab-doñ nañ-gi khyi-ro 'dam-bag sogs rul-zin-pa; Sum II 465 myag-dri = jabayan* «rank odor» (Lessing) etc.; Jäschke, Das etc. *myag-*, *myags* etc.

¹⁹ Probably not *reñ-bu* «pastil for fumigating», see *spos-reñ* «pastil, long and thin straws being covered with an odoriferous substance. . . .» (Jäschke) = «joss-stick».

²⁰ See Sz *tótkum* «kémény = chimney» ~ T *dod-khuñ*.

222. саданга «убить» = «to kill»: *sadanga*, read *sa(d)daŋa*, or *sa(d)daŋə* (?), cf. Amdowa *ḥsat-pa* «kill» (Go), *sal'-nō* «avoir tué» (Roerich), Anduo *sat*, *sot* for *bsad*, *gsod*, Romanized *sael* (perf.), *sol* (pres., fut.), *ssol* (imperat.), Golok *xsoɿ*, *ḥsɿt* «to kill» (Sprigg); Amdowa T *daŋ* for T *biŋ*: *-gi* or *-ba?* (the first is more probable). — T *bsad* (Dag: *gsod*, *gsad*, *bsad*, *sod*, the latter = Anduo *s'ot* or *s'ol*).

223. шап «уздечка»: *ṣap* «bridle bit», Sz *szap* (= *sap*), Amdowa *ṣlap* «bride» (Roerich), *ḥab* «bridle bit» (Go) etc., see Róna-Tas 15, cf. also Anduo *ṣap*. — T *srab*.

224. ноцоми шицунлу «умирать» = «to die»: *nocomi sicunlu*, read *noc(h)ō mi ṣhi-shuñ-lu* (= *-nu?*) «our man died», cf. Amdowa *ṣi-nō* «mourir» (Roerich), *ḥi-wa* «die» (Go), *ḥi-no-ji* «dead person» (Go), Anduo *x'ə*, Amdowa Romanized *tyumvtsaqf zugvgu ggabvbof shu ssoqnu ru* «an old man of a family died»; Amdowa synonyms: *ṭ'roñ-nō* «mourir», T *bkroñs-* < *'groñs-* (Roerich), T *'ja'*, e.g. *"a-rgya 'ja'-soñ* «father is died». — T *ṣi*, *'ḥi*; *ño-cho*, *soñ*, particle (cf. *-nu*).

225. миша самунаэ «умный» = «clever»: *miša samunayo*, read *miša samno yo(gi)* «a clever man of renown», cf. Dag *mi-drag ni spyi chogs-su thob-thaŋ ñes-čan žig yod-pa'am sñan-grags yod-pa'i mi*; Anduo *hra* = Dag *sra* = *drag-po daŋ stobs-ḥe-ba* etc., cf. 87°; *samno* «intelligence», T *bsam-mno*, cf. Róna-Tas 507° (Monguor *samō*) and Gir.-Goré *bsam-mno* «intelligence», *mi bsam-yod* «raisonnable personne», Amdowa *sam* «pensée, dessein» (Roerich), Anduo *sam*, Romanized *samv*. — T. *mi-drag* (Amdowa T *hra*) *bsam-mno*, *yod*.

226. ырна, рна «ухо»: *ṭrna*, *rna* «ear», Sz *na*, *rna va*, Prz Рна «Уши = ears», Amdowa *ṣna-loñ* «boucle d'oreille» (Roerich), *rna* «ear» (Go), Anduo *hna* in *rna-kuñ* = *rna-khuñ* «aperture of the ear» (cf. Čhab-mdo *na-khuñ* id. and *ṇa-khuñ* «nostril», Jin), Wassu *trná* «Ohr» (Rosthorn), Ху *rnawa*. — T *rna*.

227. дасун «(уходить) уходит» = «(to go away), go away!»: *dasun*, read *da shuñ* «now go!», Sz *taszung* «menni = to go», Anduo *s'oŋ*, Romanized *ssoq*, see 41°; Anduo *ta*, Romanized *dav*, see 43°. — T *da*, *soñ*.

228. зун «хватать» = «to seize, to grasp»: *zun*, read *zuñ*, perfect form, see 111°, Amdowa *zīn-ṣlo*, *zoñ-nō* «saisir, tenir» (Roerich) etc., see Róna-Tas 363°, Anduo *zoŋ*, Romanized *zoq*, *nzun*. — T *bzuñ* (cf. Dag *'jin*, *gzuñ*, *bzuñ*, *zuñs*).

229. гори «хлѣбъ» = «bread»: *gori* «bread», Sz *kuri* «kenyér = bread», Amdowa *k'o-re* «pain» (Roerich), *go-re* «cake» (Go), Anduo *koze* «bread» (饅頭), Amdowa T *go-re*, Golok *k'o-re*, Lhasa *k'ur-ra* (*k'u-ra* «pâtisserie»; Roerich); Dag *go-re* = *khur-ba-ste*, *'bru-rigs-kyi phyeb bcos-pa'i zas bag-leb daŋ coñ-rdog sogs-kyi spyi-miñ* etc. — Amdowa T *go-re*.

230. (к)ран «холодный»: (*k*)*ran*, read *kran* «cold», cf. Amdowa *kiaŋ-go* «froid, gelée», T *grañ-ba* (Roerich), *chi-graŋ* «cold water» (Go), Ху *grañ*. — T *grañ*.

231. внимэкэ «холостой»: read *wñi-mekə* «having no wife; unmarried (man)», see 79° and 141°. — T *bud-med med-*.

232. адзау(рэ) «хороший» = «good»: *adzau(re)*, read *a(r)jau (re)* «(it is a good one)», see Amdowa *ᠰᠲᠠ ardza* «bonne jument» (Roerich), Amdowa Т "a-rja-zig, Romanized *arvdzavzug* «very good», Amdowa Т "a-rjo < "a-rja-bo «a good one», cf. also 185°.

233. ни «человѣкъ»: *ñi* «man», Amdowa *ñò, ñi* «homme» (Roerich), cf. Róna-Tas p. 125, n. 105 and his 390° (Monguor *ni-*), Prz Мни and Sz *mie, mnie* *ibid.*, here 215° etc.

234. наху «черный»: *nax(x)u* «black», cf. Sz *noho* «fekete», *id.*, Amdowa *nax-x^{wo}* (Go), *ba-nay* = Sbra-nag, «les Banag, peuple tibétain (Tangout), vivant en nomades dans la région du Kuku-nor» (Roerich), cf. Róna-Tas 343° (Monguor -nag), Anduo *nakwo* от *naxwo*, Romanized *nagvwo*, also *hnagvhnag*, see also here 88°, 163°. — Т *nag-po*.

235. ана «шерсть» = «wool», read «шея» = «neck»: *ana*, read *aña* «neck», Prz Хня «Шея» (= *xña*), Sz *anya* (= *aña*), Amdowa *ᠰᠨᠠ* (Roerich), Anduo *hna* (the back part of the neck), Romanized *nyav-* in *nyavgoq* (the front part of the neck). — Т *gña'*.

236. ва «шея», read «шерсть» = «wool»: *wa* «wool», cf. Sz *oa* (= *wa*) «gyarjú», *id.*, Amdowa *wa, wal* «laine» (Roerich), *wal* «fur» (Go), *wa-rpu* «hair (on the body)» (Go), Anduo *wa*, Romanized *wav* «wool». — Т *ba, bal*.

237. сыжа «шляпа» = «hat»: *sīža*, read *səža* for *ser-žva* «yellow hat (s' hat)» (in this case *s* must be aspirated), or for *rcva-žva* «straw-hat», or read simply *ša* «hat», cf. Sz *szia* (= *śia*) «сарка = cap», Prz Сяя (= *śiā*) «Шляпа», Amdowa *ser-ž'ò* «chapeau monacal jaune . . .» (Roerich), *šā* «bonnet, casquette» (Roerich), *ser-sha* «sunshade for a priest of high rank», (Go), *sha* «hat» (Go), Anduo *ca*; Т *rcva-žva* «chapeau de paille» (Gir.-Goré). — Т *žva*.

238. тунджи «ѣсть»: *tundži*, read *thuñji* «to eat» (sic!), Sz *tún(ja)* (= *thuñ-*) «inni = to drink», Prz Тунь «Пить» *id.*, Anduo Romanized *cav toq* «to drink tea», *toqf ccuf* «to drink», cf. 166°. — Т *'thuñ, btuñ, 'thuñs* (and *btuñs, thuñs*).

239. шитаман «ѣхать верхомъ» = «to ride a horse»: *šitaman*, ? read шиташан (Russian *š* instead of *m*) = *šitā šon*, cf. Dag *rta-la žon*, Amdowa *ž'on-nō* «se mettre à cheval», Т *bžon* (Roerich), *šon-jjo* «aller a cheval» (*ibid.*), Anduo *šon*, Romanized *syon* «to ride, to mount». Prz Дányджи «ѣхать» ~ *deñs* = *bgron-pa'am soñ-ba'i brda-rñiñ-ste: rañ-rañ so-so'i gnas-su deñs-šig lta-bu* (imperat.), *doñ* (fut., perf.), *'doñ* (present) (Dag). — Т *rta-la žon*.

240. ноцу «я» = «I», read *noc(h)u* «we», cf. 64°.

241. шича «языкъ»: *šiča*, read *š(i)če* «tongue», Prz Хцэ (= *xce*) *id.*, Sz *tie, sztieh* (*tiē, s'tiē*) *id.*, Amdowa *ᠰᠴᠡ* «langue» (Roerich), *hce* «tongue» (Go), Anduo *htee*, Golok *šiče* (Roerich), Ху *šči*. — Т *lče*.

242. гурбуль «ящерица» = «lizard», a Mongolian word, *gürbel* *id.* (Cf. Т *rmigs-pa, 'gas-sub, rcañs, skyin-gor* etc. «lizard»).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND WORKS QUOTED OR USED

- Anduo* v. Long Zhibo
Anduo Romanized — a lithographed Spoken Amdowa Primer with Chin. explanation, s.a.
 Che-tan žabs-druñ, *Dag-yig Thon-mi'i dgos-rgyan* I—II. Zi-liñ (Xining) 1957
 ČhGr = dge-bšes Čhos-kyi grags-pas brcams-pa'i *Brda-dag miñ-chig gsal-ba*. Gexi Quzha Zangwen
 Cidian. Fu hanwen zhujie. Beijing 1957
 Csoma de Kőrös, A., *Essay towards a dictionary Tibetan-English*. Calcutta 1834
 Dag = *Dag-yig gsar-bsgrigs*. Mcho-sñon mi-rigs dpe-skrun-khañ 1979.
 Daygab, Loden Sherab (Blo-ldan šes-rab Brag-g-yab ho-thog-thu), *Bod-brda'i chig-mjod*.
 Dharmsala 1966.
 Das, S. C., *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*. Calcutta 1902
 Dawasamdud = Lama Dawasamdud Kazi alias Kazi Dousamdud, *An English-Tibetan Dictionary*
 containing a vocabulary of approximately twenty thousand words with their Tibetan equivalents.
 Calcutta 1919
 DTLF = *Dictionnaire thibétain-latin-français*. Hongkong 1899.
 Gammerman A. F., B. V. Semičov, *Slovar' tibetsko-latinsko-russkich nazvanij lekarstvennogo*
rastitel'nogo syr'ja, primenjaemogo v tibetskoj medicine. Ulan-Udė 1963
 Giraudeau, *Dictionarium latino-thibetanum*. Hongkong 1916
 Gir.-Gorė = Mgr. Giraudeau et R. Père François Gorė, *Dictionnaire français-tibétain. Tibet oriental*.
 Paris 1956
 Gō, Minoru, Bunkyo Aoki, Hajime Yamamoto and Hajime Kitamura, *An Eastern Tibetan*
Dictionary (Revised) and a study of the Eastern Tibetan language with special reference to the initial
 consonants. Okayama 1954
 Goldstein, Melvyn C., ed., *Tibetan-English Dictionary of Modern Tibetan*. Kathmandu 1975
 Grum-Gržimajlo, G. E., *Opisanie putešestvija v Zapadnyj Kitaj*, tom II: Poperek Bej-šanja i Nan'-
 šanja v dolinu Želtoj reki. StPbg 1899
 Jäschke, H. A., *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with special reference to the prevailing dialects*. London
 1881
 Jin Pong, *Zangyu Lasa Rikeze Changdu hua de bijiao yanjiou*. Beijing 1958
 Kowalewski, J. E., *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français* I—III. Kazan 1844—1849
 Lessing, F. et al., *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. Berkeley and Los Angeles 1960
 Long Zhibo et al., *Zang Han Anduo kouyu cihui. Rgya Bod skad-gñis šan-sbyar-gyi 'A-mdo'i kha-*
skad chig-mjod. Beijing 1956
 Migot, A., *Recherches sur les dialectes tibétains du Si-k'ang (Province de Khams): BEFEO XLVIII*
 (1956), pp. 417—562
 Mong. = Written Mongolian
 Mostaert = A. de Smedt et A. Mostaert, *Dictionnaire monguor-français*. Pei-p'ing 1933
 N = oral communication by Prof. Jigme Norbu (Bloomington)
 Nagano, Yasuhiko, *Amdo Sherpa Dialect. A Material for Tibetan Dialectology (ILCAA Monumenta*
Serindica 7). Tokyo 1980*
 Nishida Tatsuo, *Study on the Translation of the Department of Tibet*. Kyoto 1970
 Nishida Tatsuo, *The Numerals of the Hsi-hsia Language: Memoirs of the Tōyō Bunko* 19. Tokyo 1960
 Parfionovič, Ju. M., B. V. Semičov, B. D. Dandaron, *Kratkij tibetsko-russkij slovar'*. Moskva 1963

* During my work on this glossary I could not yet use Y. Nagano's Amdo Sherpa study.

- Potantin, G. N., *Tangutsko-tibetskaja okraina Kitaja i Central'naja Mongolija I—II*. StPbg 1893
- Prževal'skij, N., *Mongolija i strana tangutov. Trechletnee putešestvie v vostočnoj nagornoj Azii*. Tom I. StPbg 1857. — Perečen' tangutskich slov: pp. 258—263
- Roborovskij, V. I., *Trudy ekspedicii imperatorskogo Russkogo geografičeskogo obščestva po Central'noj Azii, soveršennoj v 1893—1895 gg., Čast' I, vypusk vtoroj*. StPbg 1900
- Rock, J. N., *The Amnye Ma-cchen Range and adjacent regions*. Roma 1956
- Rockhill, W., *The Land of the Lamas*. London 1891. — Sbra-nag words on pp. 362—367
- Roerich, G. de, *Le parler de l'Amdo*. Roma 1958
- Róna-Tas, A., *Tibeto-Mongolica*. Budapest 1966
- Rosthorn, A. v., *Vokabularfragment ost-tibetischer Dialekte: ZDMG LI (1897)*, pp. 524—531
- Sprigg, R. K., *The Golok dialect and Written Tibetan past-tense verb forms: BSOAS XLII (1979)*, pp. 53—60
- Stein, R.-A., *L'épopée tibétaine de Geser dans sa version lamaïque de Ling*. Paris 1956 (pp. 351—399: Vocabulaires)
- Sumatiratna, *Mun-sel sgron-me*. Ulaanbaatar 1959
- Sz = *Gróf Széchenyi Béla keletázsiai útjának tudományos eredménye. 1877—1880. Harmadik kötet. A gyűjtött anyag feldolgozása*. Budapest 1897 (pp. 355—362: Összehasonlító szótár)
- T = Written Tibetan
- Todaeva, B. Ch., *Baoan'skij jazyk*. Moskva 1964
- Todaeva, B. Ch., *Dunsjanskij jazyk*. Moskva 1961
- Tucci, Giuseppe, *Tibetan Folksongs*. Ascona 1966
- Uray, G., review of M. Herrmanns *Tibetische Dialekte: Acta Orient. Hung. IV (1954)*, pp. 308—314
- Uray, G., *Duplication, Geminatio and Triplication in Tibetan: Acta Orient. Hung. IV (1954)*, pp. 177—244
- Wang = oral communication by Prof. Wang Yao (Beijing)
- Wang Yao, *A study on the ancient pronunciations of the word mig in Tibetan*.
Wu-t'i Ch'ing-wên-chien. Translated and explained. I—II. By J. Tamura et al. Kyoto 1966
- Wuti Quingwen jian*. Beijing 1957
- Xy = *Xifangan yiyu*. Ms Hirth
- YD = Ye-šes rdo-rje, *Bod-skad-kyi brda' gsar-rñiñ dka'-ba sog-skad-du kãli sum-ču'i rim-pas gtan-la pheb-pa'i Brda'-yig Mkhas-pa rgya-mcho blo-gsal mgul-rgyan*. Ulaanbaatar 1959

INDEX OF TIBETAN WORDS

ka-ra 190
ko-ba 101
dkar-po 42, 66
dkyil-mjug 151
dkrugs- 71
rkañ-pa 137
skam-po 30?, 210, 210
skar-ma 86
skjur-po 97?

kha 174
kha-čhag 52

kha-mo 97
kha-rog 125
khañ: sol-khañ
khu: chva-khu
khur-ba: go-re
kho 160?
khyag(s)-pa 112
khyi 111, 193
khyo 220
khyod 53
mkhar, 'khar 130
'khyer 44
'khyog 154

gañ-zag 218
gañs 192
gur: dbu-gur
goñ 205
goñ-mjug 150
go-re 229
gor: chags-gor
glag 169
glu 171
grañ 230
gri 139
dgu 9, 19, 28
dgo 67
dgos 52?
mgo: čhu-mgo, ?dpuñ-mgo, ri-mgo,
rga-po 213
rgad-po 80
rgod-ma 100
rgya 98
rgyag: rgyab- 209
rgyu 108
rgyu- 38?, 50, 69, 71, 76, 94, 123, 168, 199, 209
rgyu red 69, 71, 76, 94, 123, 168, 199
sga 212
sgye: chva-sgye
sgyogs 175
sgra 50, 60
sgrigs- 159?
sgro 131
brgya 29
brgyad 8, 18, 27
brgyab- 76

ña: ñas 161
ñan 135
ñur- 128
ño-cho 64, 72, 160, 201, 224, 240
dñul 184
rñod- 82?
lña 5, 15, 24
sño-nag 88
sñon 51
sñon-po 186

či 191?, 205
gčar 71?
gčig 1, 11, 21, 71

bču (ču) 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23,
 24, 25, 26, 27, 28
lčag 138
lčags 78
lči 30
lče 241

čha: lag-čha
čha: sa-čha
čhag: kha-čhag
čhag-po = čha-bo: khyod-čha-bo 53
čhañ 170
čham 136?
čhas (bča') 159?
čhu 46, 179
čhu-mgo 99
čhuñ 136?
čhe 37, 65, 108
mčhe 93

ʼjoñ-bo 55?

ña 177
ñan 191
ñi-ma 195, 196, 197
ñi-su 20, 21
ñin: gñañs-ñin
ñe: thag-ñe
ño- 167
gña' 235
gñan 32
gñid- 199
gñis 2, 12, 144?, 201 (-ka)

tog: nu-tog
btuñ 166
rta 113, 120, 239
lta- 34?, 164
ltag-pa 208
ltoś 158?
star-ka, star-ga 66
sñon- 158?

thag-ñe 34
thag-pa 31
thag-riñ 65
tham-pa 10, 20, 29

thuñ- ('*thuñ*) 170
thoñ (*gtoñ*) 180
mthe-boñ 149
'thuñ- 238

da 43, 94, 227
da-ra, dar, dar-ba 96
dag-pa 62
dañ (*bitañ*) 64, 167, 201, 222
dar-sga: star-ka
du 187
du-ba (*do*) 214
de 157, 159
de-riñ 183
drug 6, 16, 25
dred-mo 119
bda'-ba 135?
bdun 7, 17
'don- 50, 123
'dras- 178?
rdo 95
rdo: nu-rdo
sdod- 125, 180, 156, 180, 206

nag: sño-nag, sman-nag
nag-po 234
nag-hur-re 80
nañ(s) 85
nu-tog, nu-rdo 61
nub 197
gnañs-ñin 165
gnam 69, 134
gnam-ño 35?
mno: hsam-mno
rna 226
sna 140

dpuñ (*-ba* or *-mgo*) 176
dpon-po 202

phar 157
phyiñ-ba 47, 106

ba-lañ 39
bal 236
bu-mo 74
bud-med 79, 204, 231

bom-bo 215
boñ 55 (*-ka* or *-kha*)
boñ: mthe-boñ
byis-mo 172
bro-ba 45
blañs 121?, 171, 201?
dbu-gur 147
'bab- 69
'brug-sgra 60
'breñ-pa 173
sbañs 30?
sbyin- 64

ma 36, 52, 52, 211
mañ(-gi) 53, 121, 127
mañ(-ba) 121
mañi 123
mar 118
mi 53, 87, 127, 136, 144, 215(*myi*),
 216, 224, 225, 233(*myi*)
mi 162, 216
mig 57
me, mye 142, 142
med 79, 141, 189, 231
myed: bud-med 204, 231
myag(s) 221
myes, mes: "a-mes
dmigs 189?
rmig(s)-pa 90?
dmar-po 163
sman-nag 163

bcum- ('*jum*) 191?
bco- 43
bcoñ- (*choñ*) 168
rca 202
rca: ni-šu rca gčig 21
rcva 217

cha 59, 129 (*ša čha*)
chva-khu 198
chva-sgye 131
chags-gor 109
chañ-ra (*mchañ-*, '*chañ-*) 200
char-bu 210?
cho 216
cho: ño-cho

chon-po 84
chos 211
mcho 143

mju-mo 102
mjug 150, 151, 153
'jiñ- 38
'jum: *bcum*

ža-nī, ža-ne 182, 182
žva 237
žim-po 190
žugs 188?
žon 239
gžes 156
bži 4, 14, 23
bžeñ 55?
bžes 166?

zan 166
zla-ba 114
zas (bzās) 105
zug- 111?
gzab-čhe 108
bzañ 36, 52?
bzi 170
bzuñ 111?, 228
bzod 52?

'o-ma 124
'ob-čhen 207

yin 62, 63, 203
yu-mo 117
yed (= byed) 38
yod 75, 79, 83, 157, 187, 225
yob-čhen: *'ob-čhen*
g-yag 128
g-yas 133
g-yon 132

-ra: *ka-ra, chañ-ra*
ra-mo 70
ri 157
ri-mgo 58
ri-lam-'khyog 154
riñ 55, 65, 68
riñ-ba 152

ril-ma 30?
rus-pa 104
-re: *nag-hur-re*
red 27, 28, 30, 35, 36, 39, 43, 45, 65?, 69, 82, 91, 94,
103, 112, 119, 131, 154, 162, 168, 199, 204, 221,
232
rem-pa 40, 41, 188
-rog: *kha-rog*
rogs-pa 72
rogs-byed 160? (*res-byed?*)
rluñ 56
rton-pa 122

lag-cha 201
lam 154, 219
las 83
lu-gu, lug 33
lud 40
lo-ca-ba 155
lo-lon 80

ša-cha 129
šva 117
šas 116
šar- 196
ši- 224
še(d)-mo(ñ) 189?
šed 185
šes 162
bšes 161

sa 89
sa-ča 72
sum-ču 22
ser-po 77
so 93
sog-po 126
soñ- 41, 50, 170, 208, 224, 227

sor-mo 148
sol 91?
sol-khañ 146?
sraḥ 223
sram 54
srin-mjug 153
sreg- 76
gsum 3, 13,
gser 92

gso 115 (*gso-ba?*)
bsad- 222
bsam-mno 225
bsuñ 49

hur-re: nag-hur-re 80
hra 87, 225

lham 181
lhas 110

"a-m(y)es 203
"a-rja-bo 185, 232

UNDECIPHERED (OR PROBLEMATIC) ITEMS

(30) ... ху, ху «dung»
(48) унгуйдонё «hair»
(50) ... шля(ля)р- ... «to mumble»
(52) ... магу «(enemy)»
(55) ... ажамби «tall»
(73) гурь «smoke»
(90) мо «snake»
(91) сарэ «ashes»
(103) иднё(рэ) «plaited hair»
(111) чжизун «to bark»
(121) ...-улун-гусун «(many, much)»
(128) ...-дагусун «(to grunt)»
(145) хийшуню «he»

(146) сука «hearth»
(152) джимурынгу «ring-finger»
(157) ыргты хано ёки «behind»
(158) шитогыс «show!»
(160) ... коме ... «help!»
(175) чжи «gifle»
(183) ... гысы
(188) ... шиху «(quick)»
(191) чиманёни «to smile»
(194) сынтам «soldier»
(210) ... саро- ... «(dry)»
(214) ...рэн «tobacco»

LEXICAL AND GRAMMATICAL PARTICLES, SENTENCE ENDING FORMS, PARTLY DIALECTAL

-ka 55 (*-kha*) 66 (*-ga*) 85, 201
-ki, -gi 34, 38, 53, 75, 79, 83, 87, 121, 141, 157, 161,
187, 231
-gi soñ 121, 128?
-gis 158
-gisī 183
-gu 33
-rgyu red: rgyu, red
-čha-bo/-čhag-po 53
-ta 44
-da- 128
-da/dañ 64
-dañ-no 164, 201 *-dañ-gi* 222
-thon 180
-na 157?
-nu 36, 211, 191?
-nu red (36) 43, 49, 82?, 103?
-no 51, 167, 189, 201
-pa 10, 20, 29, 31, 40, 41, 62, 72, 97, 104, 112, 122,
137, 173, 176 (*mgo?*), 188, (= 41), 208

-po 30?, 42, 66, 77, 80, 84, 107, 126, 136(*bo*), 186,
190, 202, 210, 213 (= 80), 215, 234
-ba 45, 47, 101, (106), 115?, 121, 135?, 155
-bar 38
-bu 136?, 210
-bo 185, (53), 232
-ma 30?, 86, 100, 124, 195—197
-mo 70, 74, 97, 102, 117, 119, 148, 172
-rca- 202
-cho 64, 72, 160, 201
-la 160?, 206
-lu 224, (cf. *-nu?*)
-le 170, 170; *-le* 80, (< *re?*)
-r 50
-ra 178; *čañ-ra* 200 (cf. *ka-ra, da-ra*)
-re: nag hur-re, go-re
-s 141 (cf. 158)

THUS HAVE I SAID
A PRELIMINARY STUDY OF THE TANTRA*

BY

L. S. KAWAMURA (Calgary)

While analyzing the *Dris-lan rin-po-che'i bstan-bcos Lung-gi gter-mdzod*¹ (hereafter *Dris-lan*) written by mKhyen-brtse'i 'od-zer Kun-mkhyen 'Jigs-med-gling-pa² (hereafter 'Jigs-med-gling-pa), who is reported to have lived from 1729/30 to 1798, I came upon the statement, '*di-skad bdag-gis bstan-cing bshad-pa*³, which in its Sanskrit form, if there ever was one, might have been something like, *evaṃ mayā nirdiṣṭam bhāṣitam ca*: «Thus have I pointed out and said». Although the statement itself may not be so novel and unusual, it becomes so when it is seen in the light of how 'Jigs-med-gling-pa used it to show the distinction between those who approached the tantras from their ability to comprehend the words of a text rather than its meaning and those who approached them from an ongoing engagement in the meaningfulness of life. This distinction that can be understood as a distinction in perspective and in foundation led me to query whether such a distinction had anything to do with the reasons why, in the development of Buddhism in Tibet, the «New tradition» (*gSar-ma*) that relied mainly on works originating in India was considered to be more authentic and authoritative than to «Old tradition» (*rNying-ma*).

In accordance with 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's discussion in the *Dris-lan* that argues for the authenticity of the «old» tantras, this paper is an attempt to clarify what

* I would like to thank Dr. H. V. Guenther and Professor Emeritus, G. M. Nagao for their kind suggestions and remarks that helped to improve this paper. For any errors, however, I am responsible.

¹ For the text, *Dris-lan rin-po-che'i bstan-bcos Lung-gi gter-mdzod* (hereafter, *Dris-lan*) see *The Collected Works of Kun-mkhyen 'Jigs-med-gling-pa*, Vol. 3, part 2 in Sonam T. Kazi (ed.), *Ngagyur Nyingmay Sungrab*, Vol. 31, Gangtok 1972.

² E. Gene Smith, «Introduction» in *Kongtrul's Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan Cultures. Parts 1–3*, ed. by Lokesh Candra, New Delhi (International Academy of Indian Culture) 1970, p. 22: «The name of 'Jigs-med gling-pa (1730–1798) is of enormous significance. His fame dominates the 18th century Rñin-ma-pa Renaissance and stands second only to that of Kloñ-chen rab-'byams-pa in the development of Rdzogs-chen thought. His incarnations, the so-called Mkh-yen-brtse «Family», includes many of the greatest names in the Ris-med Movement.» See also, Eva M. Dargyay, *The Rise of Esoteric Buddhism in Tibet*, Delhi (Motilal Banarsidass) 1977, p. 70 where 'Jigs-med-gling-pa is listed as a discoverer of the concealed books (*gter-ston*) and pp. 186–190 where a full account of his life is given. In the *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism*, Vol. IV, *The Rñin-ma-pa Tradition (Part Two)*, compiled by Khetsun Sangpo, Dharmasala, H. P. (Library of Tibetan Works and Archives) 1973, p. 395, 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's dates are given as 1729–1798. His biography can be found on pp. 388–395.

³ *Dris-lan*, p. 168.

significance the statement *'di-skad bdag-gis bstan-cing bshad-pa* had on the interpretation of tantra in the *rNying-ma* system.

'Jigs-med-gling-pa was active in the area of sDe-dge, which became the «... intellectual and artistic heart of Khams...»⁴ and which was the centre for the Ris-med movement that was initiated by him and that represented a reaction against religious rivalry and persecution that marred Tibet's history.

The fervent patronage of the *rNying-ma-pa* (followers of the old), especially of 'Jigs-med-gling-pa and his disciple, *rDo-ba-grub-chen*, by *Tshe-dbang-lha-mo* aroused the jealousy and envy of the *Ngor-pa* lamas, because previous to the honours bestowed upon the *rNying-ma-pas*, they had enjoyed a preferential relationship with the sDe-dge Royal Family. *Tshe-dbang-lha-mo* was widowed in 1790 when her husband, *Sa-dbang-bzang-po*, the then king of sDe-dge, died suddenly while on a pilgrimage to Central Tibet. During her brief eight-year regency, her patronage made it possible not only for the carving of the blocks for the 26 volume *rNying-ma-rgyud-'bum*, the 9 volume *gSung-'bum* of 'Jigs-med-gling-pa, and a number of *Klong-chen-pa*'s (1308–1364) works,⁵ but also for open civil warfare in 1798 in which the *rNying-ma-pa* faction was defeated and a number of *rNying-ma-pa* partisans executed.⁶

This rivalry with and the persecution of the *rNying-ma-pas* was, in all probabilities, re-kindled from the embers of a debate that was first ignited during the period referred to by Tucci as the «first diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet» and that was left unchecked during the «second diffusion».⁷ That famous debate at *bSam-yas* in 755 which established, once and for all, the Indian tradition as orthodoxy and which, as a consequence, sanctioned the «new» tantras (*rgyud-gsar-ma*), newly introduced or revised according to the «tested» Indian tradition, as orthodox, left a bulk of Tibetan works, both indigenous and translated, without foundation. Thus, those works that reflected the Indian tradition have been accepted throughout the ages as orthodox and, traditionally, those scholars who, on that basis, interpreted the tantric texts in accordance with that «tested» Indian tradition, often overlooked the unique Tibetan influence and characteristics of the so-called «inauthentic» or «dubious» tantras that belong to the *rNying-ma-pa* tradition. Hence, Tucci, for example, writes:

⁴ E. Gene Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 24, Note 49.

⁶ The account given in this paragraph is a summary of the discussion found in Gene Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 23–24.

⁷ Giuseppe Tucci, *The Religions of Tibet*, trs. Geoffrey Samuel, Berkeley and Los Angeles (University of California Press) 1980, pp. 1–29.

«With respect to Tantric teachings, a distinction has to be made between the orthodox Tantra and those Tantric texts considered by other schools to be dubious or entirely inauthentic. These latter are the Tantras (*rgyud*) accepted by the rNying-ma-pa school, as contrasted with the «new» *rgyud* (*rgyud-gsar-ma*) newly introduced, or revised, after the second diffusion of the teachings, and which could be validated through recognized Sanskrit originals and interpreted in accordance with a tested Indian tradition.»⁸

This view, in all probabilities, stems from his study of the first *Bhāvanā-krama* in which he notes:

«The progressive method of the Bodhisattva, which Kamalaśīla supports and explains, is considered by them [i.e., the rDzogs-chen] as one of the inferior vehicles; their classification of the Tantras is quite different from that postulated by the Vajrayāna (Kriyā, Caryā, Yoga, Anuttara) and they proclaim that Atiyoga is superior to all other means of salvation. That explains why the rDsogs c'en were considered as in some way heretical, the school more distant than any other from the teaching of Śākyamuni, and why the exponents of Tibetan thought, following the example of their Indian models, start by expounding Tibetan philosophical systems with that of rDsogs c'en as the remotest from the true image of the Buddhist tradition. That is why they base their own doctrine on some books which were excluded from the orthodox canon, as being or supposed to be heretical. Their Tantras are not those included in the bsTan ḡgyur but they are edited separately, in a collection peculiarly rDsogs c'en, the NGB [i.e., *rNying-ma-rgyud-'bum*] already referred to.»⁹

Furthermore, because scholars have attempted to investigate all tantric materials, Buddhist or otherwise, from such an Indian perspective that has been thoroughly coloured by the Hindu tradition of India, their conclusions have been, more often than not, the source of confusion for the readers. This was especially true prior to the introduction of indigenous Tibetan texts for the study of the Buddhist tantric traditions in Tibet and still holds true in many instances, even now, when the study of indigenous Tibetan sources clearly indicate that the various tantric traditions *can be and are* often different from each other. This means that a Buddhist tantric tradition in Tibet can be different from both its indigenous Tibetan counterpart and its Indian ancestor and, further, an Indian Buddhist tantric tradition can prove to be different from its Hindu counterpart that existed by its side. Hence, in the study of

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁹ Giuseppe Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts Part II* in: *Serie Orientale Roma* IX, 2, Roma (Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente) 1958, p. 60.

the tantras, D. L. Snellgrove's comments in the «Preface» to his work on the *Hevajra Tantra* is not only worthy of note but must be heeded. He states:

«To attempt an interpretation of Buddhist tantra is to move into unmapped territory; certain landmarks are clear, a few tracks here and there, and that is all. . . the Buddhism of India from the eighth to the thirteenth century remains relatively unknown. On the other hand, expressions of opinion have not been so slow in forthcoming. These have either been based on the first impressions given by the few texts that have become available, or upon Sir John Woodroffe's series of non-Buddhist *tantras*. This has led to the all too rapid assumption that the Buddhist *tantras* are in all things identifiable with *śakta tantras*, a conclusion which, if indeed justified, should have followed from an examination of the texts and traditions on both sides. The wide divergence that separates them becomes apparent when we consider the later development of tantric Buddhism, particularly in Tibet.»¹⁰

H.V. Guenther also notes that:

«The word Tantra is used differently, and hence does mean different things to Hindus and Buddhists. This is also borne out by the underlying metaphysics so that Buddhist and Hinduist Tantrism are quite distinct from each other, and any similarities are purely accidental, not at all essential. Hinduist Tantrism, due to its association with the Sāṃkhya system, reflects a psychology of subjectivistic dominance, but tempers it by infusing the human with the divine and vice versa; Buddhist Tantrism aims at developing man's cognitive capacities so that he may *be*, here and now, and may enact the harmony of sensuousness and spirituality. . . . Because . . . the word *śakti* «creative energy», frequently used in Hinduist Tantra, but never in Buddhist Tantra, could be understood as «power», the word Tantrism has almost exclusively become synonymous with Hinduist «Tantra,» and more is known about it than about Buddhist «Tantra» which stresses individual growth and tries to realize the uniqueness of being human.»¹¹

These comments suggest that what is of utmost importance in the investigation of the tantras is to examine tantric literature in its proper context. Thus, from the very beginning, the investigation must be guarded against the problem of falling into the rut of tradition that can only prejudice one's perspective and prevent one from seeing what a text has to offer. It would follow from this that, unless the investigator is aware that one and the same word in either Sanskrit or Tibetan can be used in a

¹⁰ D. L. Snellgrove, *The Hevajra Tantra. A Critical Study, Part 1. Introduction and Translation*, London (Oxford University Press) 1959, pp. vii-viii.

¹¹ H. V. Guenther, *The Tantric View of Life*, Berkeley and London (Shambala) 1972, p. 2.

different sense depending upon the context in which it appears, the text under consideration could not be interpreted properly. Therefore, as Agehananda Bharati has pointed out, the Hindu and Buddhist tantric masters were not attempting a unification of their tantric systems in spite of the fact that they used similar terminologies. Bharati states:

« . . . A term frequently and innocuously used, say in the Mādhyamika-kārikās, and translated by one constant term into Tibetan, does not necessarily have the same meaning in Tibetan or Indian tantric texts. The fact that the student sees the term consistently used in the Indian original and in the Tibetan translation might tempt him to assume that they mean the same when they appear in a Sanskrit tantric text and its Tibetan translation. This is dangerous even when the term occurs in Sanskrit Hindu and Buddhist texts alone, where no Tibetan translation is available. . . . The best example is Sanskrit *mudrā*, which means «the female adept» in Buddhist tantric lore, and «parched kidney beans» and other spiced grains in the Hindu Śākta tradition; quite apart from the many tantric and non-tantric passages, Hindu and Buddhist, where *mudrā* means a ritualistic or iconographic gesture.»¹²

In the light of the discussions above, it follows then, first of all, that not all Tibetan tantric texts must be interpreted according to the Indian tradition, and secondly, that not all tantric texts must originate in India to be authentic. 'Jigs-med-gling-pa was aware of these two points and in his discussion on the tantric tradition he has the following comments in his *Dris-lan*:¹³

« . . . Moreover, even the Indian tantras have been brought forth (*spyan-drangs: āvāhana*) by the [Indian] Mahāsiddhas¹⁴ from countries like O-rgyan, Shangrila,

¹² Agehananda Bharati, *The Tantric Tradition*, London (Rider & Company) first published 1965, third edition 1975, pp. 41–42.

¹³ *Dris-lan*, p. 93, lines 3–6: *de'ang rgya gar gyi rgyud rnams kyang O rgyan dang | sha mgri la dang | ma la ya la sogs pa'i yul nas grub thob chen po rnams kyis spyan drangs te | rgyud thams cad ni rgya gar na'ang bzhugs ma yin te gal te bzhugs su bcug kyang kyod gyis lan re tsam phyin pas de thams cad mthong bar mi nus la | gtsug lag khang chung re na bzhugs pa'i mdo rgyud kyi ming byang du ma 'dus pas gzhan rnams min par mi 'gyur ba'i phyir sngon gyi lam ston chen po rnams la smod par mi bya'o || bod 'dir rgya gar na yod pa dang med pa'i mdo rgyud mang du bzhugs te | sngon gyi slob dpon padma la sogs pas O rgyan la sogs pa mkha' 'gro'i gling rnams nas rgyud sde mang du snams nas byon te bsgyur zhing | mdo yang nyi ma dngos grub kyi mes ma tshig gong du rgya nag du 'gyur ba'i mdo rnams las | phal po che dang | mya ngan las 'das pa dang | 'dul ba lung la sogs pa mang po zhiq rgya nag gi pa ndi ta ha shang ma hā yā na'i blo las vair ro tsa na dang 'ba' sangs shis lo tsā byas te bsgyur ba yin no || 'Jigs-med-gling-pa has simply copied verbatim this passage from Klong-chen-rab-'byams-pa. See Klong-chen's *Theg pa mtha' dag gi don gsal bar byed pa grub pa'i mtha' rin po che'i mdzod*, published by Dodrup Chen Rinpoche, Gangtok. (Saraswati Block Makers) N. D., p. 278, line 4 to p. 279, line 2.*

¹⁴ For the Mahāsiddhas, see Chopel Legdan, *Grub Thob Brgyad Bcu rTsa Bzhi'i Chos Skor*, New Delhi 1973.

Malaya¹⁵ and others, and not all tantras have remained in India. Even if they had, insofar as you could not possibly see them all in just a quick glance, you should not reproach the earlier great teachers of the path (*sngon-gyi lam-ston chen-po rnam*), because one cannot conclude, on the basis of having collected all of the name-tags of sūtras and tantras kept in one small temple (*gtsug-lag-khan chung*), that there are no other tantras. Here in Tibet, there are many sūtras and tantras which exist or do not exist in India. Earlier teachers such as Padmasambhava¹⁶ and others brought many tantric works from such Dākini¹⁷ countries as O-rgyan and others and translated them [into Tibetan], and even with respect to the sūtras, before there was the destruction by the sun's blaze,¹⁸ many of them such as *Phal-po-che* (*Vaipulya-Avataṃsaka*), *Mya-ngan-las-'das* (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*), and the *'Dul-ba-lung*¹⁹ were translated from Chinese texts by the lo-tṣā-bas Vairocana and 'Ba'-sangs-shis *via* the interpretation of the Chinese paṇḍita Ha-shang Mahāyāna.»²⁰

Thus, from 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's words, it would seem plausible to infer that even some of the so-called «authentic» tantric texts found in Tibet may not have had their origin in India. This would account for the reason why many Tibetan tantric texts are not known in the Indian tradition and why there are tantric texts in Tibet that cannot be found in India. If the view presented by 'Jigs-med-gling-pa be acceptable, then it would seem meaningless to determine the authenticity of a

¹⁵ Just where, in terms of modern-day geography, these names refer is not clear to me.

¹⁶ The text simply reads *slob-dpon padma*. See Note 13.

¹⁷ In his *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, Calcutta (The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot) 1902. Reprinted by Rinsen Book Company in a compact edition, 1977, p. 258, Sarat Chandra Das gives an account of the Bon cosmography in which there is mentioned a subcontinent named mKa'-'gro-mir-kun-gling. H. A. Jäschke, in his *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, London (Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.) 1958, p. 80, states under *gling*: «...in a more general sense: region, country, so Nepal is frq. denominated *rin-po-c'ei gliñ* the country of jewels and treasures, Urgyan *mk'a-groi gliñ* the country of Dakini, as is also Lahoul, in local chronicles...»

¹⁸ The phrase *nyi-ma dngos-grub-gyi mes* (lit. by the fire which is the efficacy of the sun) is not at all clear and the above translation is tentative.

¹⁹ *'Dul-ba lung* could refer to either *'Dul-ba lung-gi cha-shas yangs-pa'i gron-khyer-du 'jug-pa'i bde-legs-kyi tshigs-su-bcad-pa* or *'Dul-ba lung bla-ma'i bye-brag lung zhu-ba'i 'grel-pa*, but these texts do not belong to the sūtra class. For the first of these texts, see *The Tibetan Tripitaka Peking Edition* (hereafter *TTP.*), D. T. Suzuki, ed., Tokyo-Kyoto Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, 1961, Vol. 45, No. 1045 and for the latter one, see *TTP.* Vol. 123, No. 5619.

²⁰ Ha-shang-ma-hā-yā-na, or alternatively Hva-shang or Ho-shang Mahāyāna, is said to have lost the debate of bSam-yas to his Indian counterpart, Kamalaśīla. For a discussion on the debate, see Paul Demiéville, *Le Concile de Lhasa* Paris (Presses Universitaires de France) 1952; George N. Roerich, *The Blue Annals* Delhi (Motilal Banarsidass) first edition 1949, second edition 1976; Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, *op. cit.*, and others.

tantric text by applying the standards of validation that hold true for canonical texts on a text that may not have even originated in India.²¹ On the contrary, 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's observation should prompt us to look for the differences that these Tibetan texts may have to offer.

However, if it still be held that the earlier rNying-ma tantras are «dubious», «entirely inauthentic», or «identifiable with the śākta tantras», then even the «authenticity» of the later tantras must be questioned, because, tantras, insofar as they stress an individual's growth as a method for realizing the uniqueness of being human, do not differ in their intent from the *sūtras* which are unanimously claimed as being *Buddha-vacana*. Therefore, 'Jigs-med-gling-pa goes on to state:²²

«If those [tantric texts] of the earlier period are not *Buddha-vacana* (*chos-dharma*²³), then what could be the foundation for their beginning? If it were the case [that they were not *Buddha-vacana*], then those [tantric texts] of the later time would not be genuine (*bcos-ma*). [However,] they do not express anything new, because they differ only in terminology and in size, [some being] large and [some being] small. Therefore, among those great tantras — old and new — only the genuine ones on which the Ācāryas and Mahāsiddhas have produced commentaries and instructions are to be trusted, because [they have been authenticated and have endured the test of time] through their continual [use in] the rituals of initiation (*dbang*) and empowerment (*byin-rlabs*). Now, although there are no individual distinctions like «This is old» or «This is new» in India

²¹ E. Gene Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 7: «... Bu-ston and the school of Snar-than excluded from the Tibetan canon (Bka'-gyur) the tantras that the Rñin-ma-pa had treasured through the long period of cultural darkness on the grounds that the Indic original from which they had been translated could no longer be demonstrated.»

²² *Dris-lan*, p. 94, line 5 to p. 95, line 4: ... *sngon gyi dus su byung ba dag bcos ma yin na | brtsam gzhi gang la byas | de ltar na phyis 'byung ba rnams bcos mar 'gyur te | don sngon bas lhag tu ma byung | thigs cung zad mi 'dra ba dang | mang nyung las med pa'i phyir ro || des na gsar rnying gi rgyud chen po 'di dag la slob dpon grub chen mang du byon zhing | dbang dang byin rlabs zam ma chad par 'dug pas yang dag pa 'ba' zhis ste | slob dpon de dag gis 'grel pa dang man ngag mang du mdzad pas yid ches par bzung ngo || de'ang rgya gar na gsang sngags zhes pa tsam las || 'di ni gsar ma'o || 'di ni rnying ma'o || zhes so sor dbye ba med na yang bod 'dir 'gyur snga phyis so sor grags te vai ro tsa na la sogs pa rgyal blon snga dar gyi dus su bsgyur ba nas bzung ste pa ndi ta smr ti'i bar du bsgyur ba'i rgyud la rnying ma zhes 'dod la | lo tsā ba rin chen bzang po man chod bsgyur ba'i rgyud rnams la gsar ma zhes grags so || 'di gnyis la go dka' sla dang | dbyings 'jal ba rlabs che chung ltar 'dug pa ni | sngon gyi lo tsā ba rnams sangs rgyas kyi sprul pa yin pas rang dbang bsgyur nus pa'i phyir rlabs che bar mngon no || dus phyis kyi lo tsā ba rnams gang zag phal pa'i lugs kyi mkhas pa rnams byon pas | tshig grims la go bar dka' ba ste | rgya dpe'i tshig gi rim pa tsam las don 'gyur ma nus pas de ltar byung ba'o ||*

²³ The text reads *bcos-ma yin* but better read *chos ma-yin* because a negation is needed to complete the sense. See also *The Collected Works of Kun mKhyen 'Jigs-med-gling-pa*, Vol. 3, p. 142 for a similar discussion.

where only the term «mantra» (*gsang-sngags*)²⁴ applies, here in Tibet, we speak of the earlier and later ones, and we call the tantras transmitted during the period beginning with the first Kings and Ministers, such as Vairocana, up to the Paṇḍita Smṛti,²⁵ the «old», and those tantras transmitted from Lo-tsa-ba Rin-chen bzang-po on, the «new». Insofar as the ease or difficulty in their being understood or the extent (*dbyings*) of their influence, similar to a large or small wave, are concerned, because the earlier Lo-tsa-bas were able to transmit authoritatively (*rang-dbang*), owing to the fact that they were manifestations on the Buddha-level, they appeared as great waves. The Lo-tsa-bas of the later period, though being scholars, were of the status of ordinary people; therefore, they had difficulties understanding [the meaning of a text] although clever with words and they were just so because they were unable to convey the meaning [of a text] from merely the word order of a Sanskrit text.»²⁶

Here, along with the historical background for the division of the tantras into the «old» and «new» in Tibet, 'Jings-med-gling-pa points out a basic difference between them which implies a difference between them with respect to how the followers of the «old» and the followers of the «new» synthesized their respective tantric systems.²⁷ Here, in this paper, only the system of the followers of the «old» tradition will be discussed, but in short, their distinction, according to H. V. Guenther, is as follows:

«... The latter [i.e., the followers of the «new»], throughout their history, have been extreme traditionalists, paying attention to the words of the texts rather than to their meaning and therefore stressing the «external» features. The «old» tradition, on the other hand, claims that it brings out the spirit of Buddhism and does not cling to dead letters. To judge from textual evidence, their claim is not only well founded, it also reveals the tremendous difference in viewpoint between these two major trends. . . . Thus, whereas the «new» tradition, which believes that the whole truth about the world is already known and that all that is necessary is to repeat the texts proclaiming this truth, is not in a position to

²⁴ *Dris-lan* p. 90, line 1 through p. 95, line 3 suggests that the followers of the 'new' tradition actually follow the *mantra* tradition of India and this tradition is comparable to the rNying-ma tantric tradition.

²⁵ The general consensus is that Lord Smṛti had inaugurated the translations of the 'new' tantras. See *The Blue Annals*, Part I, p. 204.

²⁶ The phrase *tshig grims la go bar dka' ba ste | rgya dpe'i tshig gi rim pa las don 'gyur ma nus pas de ltar byung ba'o* in note 22 above, has been translated tentatively as it appears here. The exact meaning is not clear to me.

²⁷ There is a subtle contempt of the later translators implied. The earlier ones had *rtogs*, an understanding which is operational on the Buddha-level, whereas the later ones had difficulties even with *go-ba*, an elementary grasp of things.

produce original thought and offer moral advice, the «old» tradition constantly tells us that things are not at all what they seem to be and, therefore, instead of leaving everything as it is, it engages in an on-going quest.»²⁸

The system that the rNying-ma-pas established and follow unfolds as the different levels of a spiritual vehicle (*theg-pa: yāna*) or path that is determined according to the capacity possessed by an individual to deal with this growth process. Therefore, in view of the fact that the so-called «path» or «spiritual vehicle» is none other than the growth process itself, within a Buddhist context, a path is never a static link between two points. This means that the growth process which constitutes a «path» or a «spiritual vehicle» is a dynamic structure produced in the «ongoingness» itself. In order to exemplify this dynamic structure in terms of a growth process, 'Jigs-med-gling-pa explicates three groups of instructions (*gsungs*):

1. Instructions by way of aiding (*gnyen-po'i don du gsungs-pa*),
2. Instructions by way of a summary (*bsdu-ba'i don du gsungs-pa*), and
3. Instructions by way of [an individual's intellectual] capacity (*dbang-po'i don du gsungs-pa*).

Here, *instructions by way of aiding* refer to the 84,000 antidotes that counteract passion-lust (*'dod-chags*), aversion-hatred (*zhe-sdang*), and infatuation-dullness (*gti-mug*) — the three poisons — each of which consists equally of 28,000 negative emotions. These are also said to be 84,000 aiding forces, because the *Tripitaka* (Three Baskets of Learning) — *Vinaya* (ethical principles), *Sūtras* (popular discourses), and *Abhidharma* (specific treatises) — each consisting of 28,000 instructions, give specific instructions to those who have started on the path.

Instructions by way of a summary refer to the outer and inner tantras comprising the six division tantra. The three divisions of *kriyā, uba* (or *caryā*), and *yoga* constitute the outer tantras, and the three divisions of *mahā, anu*, and *ati* constitute the inner tantra.

Instructions by way of [an individual's intellectual] capacity outline the progressive steps involved in the growth process which culminates in Great Bliss and those steps are grouped into three units:

1. Spiritual path which is the foundation or cause (*kun-'byung 'dren-pa'i theg-pa*),
2. Spiritual path that makes the practitioner aware of the difficulties involved²⁹ (*dka'-thub rig-byed-kyi theg-pa*), and

²⁸ H. V. Guenther, *Buddhist Philosophy in Theory and Practice*, Baltimore (Penguin Books Inc.) 1972, pp. 195–96.

²⁹ For *dka'-thub*, see the clear presentation by Rong-zom-pa chos-kyi-bzang-po (1012–1088) in his *gsung-thor-bu*, pp. 114 f. For a discussion on his life see, *Blue Annals*, Part I, pp. 160–67 and *Crystal Mirror*, Emeryville (Dharma Publishing) 1977, Vol. V, pp. 237–40.

3. Spiritual path of ethically positive actions that confer autonomy (*dbang- bsgyur thabs-kyi theg-pa*).

The *spiritual path which is the foundation or cause* is threefold in view of the spiritual capacity of an individual. Therefore, there is the spiritual path of a listener (*śrāvaka*), who must be trained in matters pertaining to ethical principles explained in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*. There is the spiritual path of a self-styled Buddha (*pratyeka-buddha*), who must be trained in matters pertaining to mental integration or meditative concentration explained in the *Sūtra-piṭaka*. Finally, there is the spiritual path of a bodhisattva who must be trained in matters pertaining to appreciative-discrimination explained in the *Abhidharma-piṭaka*. The tantric text, *bKod-pa chen-po Yid-bzhin mchog-gi rgyud*, states:

The explanation regarding the three on an inferior level:

When one understands ethical principles, he is a listener.

When one possesses perfect knowledge, he is a self-styled Buddha.

When one possesses critical discursive faculties, he is a bodhisattva.

The *spiritual path that makes the practitioner aware of the difficulties involved* refers to the three divisions of *kriyā*, *upa*, and *yoga* that constitute the outer tantra. The tantric text quoted above states:

The explanation regarding the three on the middle level:

Those who are lowest [practice] *kriyā*.

Those who are next, *caryā*.

Those with understanding, *yoga*.

The importance of these three tantras lie in their capacity to aid one's progress in the growth process. According to H. V. Guenther, *kriyā* which refers to action and «...that initiates the subsequent stages for man's quest for meaning, . . . opens up new perspectives from which man is able to see himself as a living being rather than a theoretical postulate.»³⁰

When man sees himself as a living being, his mode of life becomes sincere to his very existence, and this is *caryā*.³¹

But action and behaviour do not belong to the private domain of man himself, for they express themselves in a temporal world. Therefore, action and behavior must originate in a contemplative mind.³² This is *yoga*.

The *spiritual path of ethically positive actions that confer autonomy* refers to the three divisions of *mahā*, *anu*, and *ati* that constitute the inner tantra. The same text quoted above summarizes this aspect as follows:

³⁰ H. V. Guenther, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 178.

³² *Op. cit.*, p. 179.

The explanation regarding the three higher ones:

As a mind contented, it is the development stage.

As the quintessence of mind, it is the fulfillment stage.

As the profound secret, it is the great completion.

Here, the meaningfulness of life itself, i.e. the message it sends out (*dgongs*), as luminous light (*'od-gsal-ba*) and spontaneous awareness (*rang-shar-ba'i ye-shes*), is now the very foundation of the continuum and expanse of existence itself. It is said to be «inexpressible», because words fail to capture the immediacy of experience. Life is a super-aesthetic experience with all its wonders, enjoyment, and satisfaction.

Therefore, in view of its development stage, it is like a foundation from which all that is becomes manifest as the wonder of an aesthetic experience (*rig-pa'i cho-'phrul*), and this is called *mahāyoga-tantra*.

In view of its fulfillment stage, it is like a path that leads to the experience in which all that is and makes its presence felt (*snang-ba*) is itself the play and creativity of this experience (*rig-pa'i rol-rtsal*), and this is called *anuyoga-tantra*.

In view of the fact that experience guides (*man-ngag*) from within and is perfectly complete (*rdzogs-pa chen-po*), it is the fruit such that all that is is manifested as the aesthetic experience itself (*rig-pa rang-snang*), and this is called *atiyoga-tantra*.

Technically, no discussion of *atiyoga* can be complete without a discussion of its three sub-sections of *sems-sde* (mentalistic/experiential section), *klong-sde* (expansiveness/feeling section), and *man-ngag-gi sde* (guidance section), but let it suffice to say that because both the *sems-sde* section and the *klong-sde* section are still conceptual and therefore imply the need for language, the *man-ngag-gi sde* section is presented so as to allow the individual to be guided by experience-as-such.³³

To be guided by experience as such is to experience life in its dynamic structure, and as such, the aesthetic experience is at once dictated to and dictates its context of time and space. In this twofold activity, the human situation becomes a situation of response and solicitation for a response. In order to explain this interaction, 'Jigs-med-gling-pa explains the distinction between teachers (*ston-pa*) and mediator (*mtshon-pa*). Here, *ston-pa* refers to the teacher, i.e., the whole system (Being *qua* Existence) and *mtshon-pa* refers to the «explicating» sub-system or branch-system of the whole system. These two distinct sources for the tantric tradition are discussed in his explanation of the *Anuttara-yāna* (*bla-na-med-pa'i theg-pa:*

³³ The discussion on the three instructions (*gsungs*) onwards is a summary of 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's systematization found in *Dris-lan* pp. 100–102 and is interpreted by me in accordance with the discussion on Tantra found in H. V. Guenther, *op. cit.*, pp. 155–209. The quotations from *hKod-pa chen-po Yid-bzhin mchog-gi rgyud* are the ones found in 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's discussions on the pages just mentioned.

spiritual path regarding which there is nothing superior). He begins his discussion by explaining the common source for the occurrence of tantra. Having made the case that the source for tantra is twofold, he goes on to discuss why one of the sources expresses itself by the words «Thus have I said», and why the other source expresses itself by the words «Thus have I heard». He begins his discussion by quoting the *Thal-'gyur*³⁴ which states:

«In conformity with other spiritual pursuits,
 In order to gain the confidence of his audience,
 The compiler presents [the teaching]
 From the common [stories of the] *Nidānas*.
 Because the teaching has arisen from
 A basic rule to educate,
 In order to educate [man],
 He makes [the teaching] abide.»

This passage clearly indicates two sources for the origination of the tantras and, as 'Jigs-med-gling-pa has already shown, the two forms, «Thus have I said» and «Thus have I heard», are equally expressions of the Buddha word.

In this context, however, the teacher refers to one who is freed from the restrictions of acceptance and rejection, because he is constant in the intensity of his luminous existence and because the foundation of his life — Akaniṣṭha — is a self-illuminating awareness that radiates from the very core of the meaningfulness of his existence. Therefore, when he communicates, he communicates in the form, «Thus have I said».

In contrast, a mediator who derives his experiences in life by paying attention to the words in the text rather than to meaning, communicate in the form, «Thus have I heard».

However, those who are confused claim that because other sūtras and tantras explicitly state, «Thus have I heard», and do not state, «Thus have I said», the texts that begin with the latter statement could not be tantras. However, this merely indicates that their eyes of the intellect are closed.

'Jigs-med-gling-pa goes on to argue that if those texts that begin, «Thus have I said», cannot be accepted as authentic tantras because they make the claim to

³⁴ *Dris-lan* p. 168: | *theg gzhan rnam* dang *sgo bstun phyir* || *thun mong dag gi gleng gzhi yis* || *sdud po rang gi 'khor rnam* la || *yid ches bya phyir bstan pa ste* || *gdul gzhi las ni 'dul byed du* || *hyung bas bstan pa gnas par byed* | These lines with variant spelling or spelling mistakes which are simply to be ignored can be found in *rNying-ma rgyud-'bum* Vol. 10 (*pod tha*) p. 396. Passages having similar implications can be found in *rNying-ma rgyud-'bum*, Vol. 1 (*pod ka*) p. 17. *gdul-gzhi* above might be better read *'dul-gzhi* although *gdul* can be found in the dictionary. See Chandra Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary*, p. 661.

explain rather than to listen, then those who would so claim would have to face the problem of having texts such as the *Mañjuśrī-sādhana* and the *Abhidhānōttara-tantra*³⁵ turn into non-tantric texts, because the *Mañjuśrī-sādhana* states:

«Because it is the identity-experience of the secret [doctrine],
It must be explained properly by me to you.»

and the *Abhidhānōttara-tantra* states:

«Therefore, the secret [doctrine] is to be explained.»

Thus, from the discussion above, it becomes evident that the novel phrase, «Thus have I said», results from a difference in perspective and in foundation on which the person stands. This difference in perspective and foundation has been the basis from which the distinction between the «new» and the «old» traditions has arisen.

This distinction, however, need not become the basis for alarm. Instead, it can become the basis from which new avenues and new perspectives in life can be found. In discussing the rNying-ma-pa tantras, therefore, what is important to remember is that the rNying-ma-pas «. . . intended first and foremost to be pragmatic, a putting into practice of the insights realized by all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas of the past . . . The achievement of realization through the practice of teaching is the ultimate test of that teaching.»³⁶

³⁵ These texts appear in the *bKa'-gyur* section of the Tripitaka and therefore are Buddha-vacana. The particular passages quoted are taken from 'Jigs-med-gling-pa's *Dris-lan* p. 168.

³⁶ E. Gene Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

FROM THE HISTORY OF THE TANGUT TRANSLATION OF THE BUDDHIST CANON

BY

E. I. KYCHANOV (Leningrad)

The Buddhist Canon began to be translated into Tangut (Hsi Hsia) immediately after the Tanguts had introduced their writing system in 1036. The history of this enormous work, carried out over many years, is reflected in the colophons of sūtras in Tangut, as well as manuscripts and xylographs that belong to the period when the Tangut state Hsi Hsia (982—1227) existed, contained in the Collection of the Leningrad Section of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and also in colophons of texts from the Mongol Yüan Dynasty, examples of which have been preserved in China, Japan and other countries.

Recently Prof. Shih Chin-po published a most important text of the colophon to the Yüan edition of the *Kuo ch'ü chuang yen chieh chien fo ming ching* sūtra, where there is information concerning the beginning of the Tangut translations of the Buddhist Canon. The Emperor of Hsi Hsia, Yüan-hao, who proclaimed himself Emperor, gave an order to set up a special group to translate the Buddhist Canon into Tangut, first headed by a monk with the monastic name Pai Fa-hsin, then by another one with the monastic name Chih Kuang.¹ This is confirmed by the preface to the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra* from the Tangut Collection of the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies: «According to the instructions, given by Emperor Lo-k'ui-wei(1)² in his own country, the Tanguts, having established laws and created their writing system, translated the sūtra».³

The Tanguts translated Buddhist texts from Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan and Uighur. The probability of translations from Uighur is confirmed by Chinese sources. In 1047, in the vicinity of Hsingchou, the capital of the state of Hsi Hsia (the town of Yinch'uan, Ninghsia-Hui Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China today), the Kaot'ai monastery was built. Uighur monks lived there, who translated sūtras.⁴ It may well be that they could make use of the texts of

¹ Shih Chin-po, Hsi Hsia wen «Kuo ch'ü chuang yen chieh chien fo ming ching» fa yüan wen yi cheng, -Shih-chieh tsung-chiao yen-chiu, 1981: 1, p. 72.

² Original Tangut spellings are marked with numbers in brackets given in the Appendix at the end of the article.

³ Preface of *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra*. The Tangut Fund of the Leningrad Section of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR., code numb. Tang. 218, 6253.

⁴ See in details in: E. I. Kychanov, *An Outline of the History of the Tangut State*, Moscow, 1969, pp. 286—287.

the Canon, written in their own language. Although it should be added that there are no references in Tangut colophons to translations from Uighur. Professor Luc Kwanten advanced a view, according to which, the Buddhist Canon was translated into Tangut from Chinese and Uighur, and there is no evidence at all about a translation from Tibetan.⁵ The possibility of having used Uighur texts and the lack of references in Tangut sources to translations from Uighur has already been mentioned. Professor Luc Kwanten's view about the lack of references to translations from Tibetan can be doubted. There are quite a few indications about translations from Tibetan or translators from Tibetan in colophons of Tangut books. For example, «From Tibetan into Tangut translated by (2) translator and expert of the *Tripitaka*, master of the Tangut and Tibetan literatures, tutor of the dharma, śramaṇa Kuo Fa-hui» (Tang. 202), etc. The evidence concerning Sanskrit texts that were translated is much more interesting: «Translation made by collating Sanskrit and Tibetan texts by the śramaṇa of Lanshan, Tê-Hui on 8—13 of June 1168 at Emperor Jen-hsiao's behest on the event of his (the Emperor's) mother's death» (Tang. 68. N. 2829).

As T. Nishida wrote, it is typical of the *Tripitaka* of Hsi Hsia to have before each chüan titles of Emperors and Empresses, and translators or editors, indicated. Thus the introductory parts of chüans provide sufficient material to roughly estimate the period when the text was translated.⁶ It seems that the translation activities of the Buddhists of Hsi Hsia can, at the moment, be divided into three periods:

1. Emperor Yüan-hao's reign, from 1038 up to his death in 1048. Texts translated in this period are not known.

2. The period of the three Tangut Emperors' reign, after Emperor Yüan-hao's death, and that of the Regent Empresses from the clans of Mo-tsang and Liang who ruled by them. This period covers 90 years from 1049 to 1139, from Emperor Liang-tso's ascension to the throne to Emperor Ch'ien-shun's death.

3. The period of Emperor Jen-hsiao's reign, the cultural flourishing peak of Hsi Hsia (1139—1193).

As it has already been stated, we are not in possession of any text from the 1st period, with the exception of an indication to the translation of «*Saddharma-puṇḍarīka sūtra*» made during Yüan-hao's reign.

From the 2nd period there are 3 texts with exact datings. Furthermore, in many texts there are references to the Emperors of those years, as well as to their mothers, Regent Empresses as translators and revisers of translations of sūtras. Judging by

⁵ Luc Kwanten and Susan Hesse, *Tangut (Hsi Hsia) Studies, a Bibliography*, Indiana University, *Uralic and Altaic Series*, Vol. 137, Bloomington 1980, p. 4, 28.

⁶ Nishida, Tatsuo, *Seika go no kenkyū*, Vol. II, Tōkyō 1966, p. 594.

the preface to *Kuo ch'ü chuang yen chie ch'ien fo ming ching*, 3579 chüans of sūtras had been translated into Tangut in Hsi Hsia by 1090.⁷

According to indications to the names of Emperors and Regent Empresses (these are sometimes just a few sporadic hints to 2–3 or 4 characters of their titles), in the 2nd period the following works were translated:

1. *Ārya Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (from Tibetan), Tang. 67.
2. *Jen wang hu kuo po-jo po-lo-mi-tuo ching* (from Chinese), Tang. 104.
3. *Buddha-bhāṣita Amitāyus-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 147.
4. *Ratna-megha-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 153.
5. *Dīrghāgama-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 165.
6. *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa* (from Chinese), Tang. 171.
7. *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 218.
8. *Tz'ü pei tao ch'ang tsui ch'an fa* (from Chinese), Tang. 286.
9. *K'u nan ch'i pa t'o-lo-ni ching* (from Chinese), Tang. 298.
10. *Kuan Mi-lê p'u sa T'u-sheng-t'ou shuai t'ien tsung* (from Chinese), Tang. 320.
11. *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 334.
12. *Mahā-parinirvāṇa-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 335.
13. *Buddhāvataṃsakā-mahāvaiṣṭya-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 349.
14. *Mahāratnakūṭa-sūtra* (from Chinese), Tang. 357.
15. *T'ien hsien jê ch'iu shuo li shih ti yi chi* (from Chinese), Tang. 367.

From the same period, the date of the works can also be assessed with considerable certainty. The scribes either indicated Emperor Jen-hsiao as an editor, not giving the translators' names, or, in the text of the same sūtra in different chüans referred to him either as a translator, or as an editor, not ascribing the time of the translation strictly to the time of his reign. The Collection of the Leningrad Institute of Oriental Studies includes:

16. *Grahamātrkā-dhāraṇī* (from Chinese), Tang. 142.
17. *Fo shuo fo mu en ch'ung ching* (from Chinese), Tang. 150.
18. *Fo shuo ta wei tê chih kuang chu hsing su chi hsiang t'o-lo-ni ching* (from Chinese), Tang. 157.
19. *Daśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* (from Chinese), Tang. 164.
20. *Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī* (from Tibetan), Tang. 61.
21. *Ārya Mahāsahasrapramardanī-nāma mahāyāna-sūtra* (from Tibetan), Tang. 74.
22. *Ārya Mahāpratisarā-vidyārājñī-sūtra* (from Tibetan), Tang. 76.
23. *Mahāśītavāna-sūtra* (from Tibetan), Tang. 343.

In all the above-mentioned cases, the scribes hesitated as to the assessment of the exact nature of Emperor Jen-hsiao's alleged or real participation in the work,

⁷ Shih Chin-po, *Hsi Hsia wen*, . . . p. 72.

whether he really translated the sūtra or just revised its translation. This led to the opinion that there is some sort of proof that the translation of the sūtra, at least its first, original version, was carried out before his ascension to the throne. When characterizing the 2nd period, it is especially difficult to identify the titles of Emperors and Empresses of Liang with the so far known Tangut Emperors Liang-tsoo, Ping-ch'ang and Ch'ien-shun, and their mothers, Regent Empresses. It is fortunate that there is a reference that makes it possible to undertake this work. The sūtra *Amitābha-vyūha*, Tang. 342. Acc. Nos 812, 953, one of the earliest dated xylographs, has a postscript from 1094. In this xylograph (Acc. No. 812) we find titles of Empress Liang (3) and Emperor Ngwemi (Wei-ming) (4). Since the postscript is written in their names and has an exact date, it can be safely said that the title of the Emperor belongs to Ch'ien shun, and the title of Empress Liang to his mother, known from Chinese sources as Empress Chao ch'ien wen mu (died in 1099). Their joint reign began in the autumn of 1086 after the death of Ch'ien-shun's father, Emperor Ping-ch'ang, on August 21, 1086. That these titles belong to Ch'ien-shun and his mother, is also confirmed by the text of the Sino-Tangut bilingual stone inscription from Liangchou, dated 1094, where the last two characters of both the Emperor's and the Empresses' titles are indicated.⁸ Hence, it is certain that the Empress who bore the title (4), often found in Tangut sources, was Emperor Ch'ien-shun's mother and the widow of Emperor Ping-ch'ang, Ch'ien-shun's father. Consequently, the second Empress Liang, who bore the title (5) found in three versions, could only have been Emperor Liang-tsoo's wife and Emperor Ping-ch'ang's mother. She bore the titles 5^a and 5^b, titles of Empress (*huang-t'ai-hou*) when she was Liang-tsoo's wife, i.e. from 1061 to 1068, and title 5^c, the title of Widowed Empress (*huang-ta-t'ai-hou*), from Liang-tsoo's death in 1068 to 1085, the year of her own death. The titles of the Emperor (5) appear always together with title 5^c, that of the Widowed Empress, Liang-tzu's wife. Consequently, this title must have belonged to her son, Emperor Ping-ch'ang, who ruled from 1068 to 1086.

If this judgement is correct, then it can be said that we are not yet in possession of the texts of the 1st period, that of Emperor Yüan-hao's reign, but only of the translational texts of the time of Emperor Liang-tsoo, 1st Emperor of the 2nd period, i.e. texts of translations, made before 1068. (The indication to the translation of *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra* during Yüan hao's reign is an exception.)

Nevertheless, as can be seen from the above given list of the results of translation activities of the 2nd period, by the second half of the 12th century, a considerable

⁸ Nishida, Tatsuo, *Seika go no kenkyū*, Vol. I, Tōkyō 1964, p. 166.

part of the Buddhist Canon had been translated into Tangut — among others — many voluminous sūtras.

The 3rd great period of translation activities began from the time of Emperor Jen-hsiao's rule (1139—1193). Emperor Jen-hsiao is known (appears) in colophons by (with) two titles, but for the time being more exact dating of the books by his titles appears to be a difficult task. On the basis of Chinese sources it can be assumed that title (7) was adopted by Emperor Jen-hsiao in 1141, after the K'itans' uprising, under the leadership of Ho-ta, had been suppressed. Into Jen-hsiao's title the words «*yi chih hsie chü*» were immediately included (8). Before that time, Jen-hsiao must surely have used the title without these words, and such a title can be found in the text of the *Grahamātrkā-dhāraṇī*, Tang. 142, but not in our collection. This is also referred to by Nishida Tatsuo.⁹ The second title found in our texts, actually Jen-hsiao's 3rd title (9), was adopted by him later than 1169, since under title (7) the edition of a Tangut codex is also marked, dating from 1149—1169. Jen-hsiao might have changed title (7) to title (9) at about 1170—1171, after the failure of his dignitary's, Jen-Tê-chin's plan to disrupt the Tangut State and after this rebel's execution. These conjectures are also confirmed by dated texts. If title (7) is found in the texts, written both before and after 1171 (Tang. 109—1149; Tang. 150—5—VI—1152; Tang. 141—1185; Tang. 142—1189; etc.), then title (9) will be found only in books, dating from 1173 (Tang. 164—II—IX—1173; also there — 1189; Tang. 74—1173; etc.). Thus, if this judgement is correct, Jen-hsiao's titles can serve as a basis for dating Tangut books, although title (7), as the title of the 1st translation or publication of the book, could also have appeared later, as was the case with the preceding Emperors' and Empresses' titles, when as in sūtras, translated in their time (era), they were referred to in manuscripts and printed books of the second half of the 12th century.

The earliest of the dated books in the Leningrad Collection, the *Buddha-bhāṣita Amitāyus-sūtra* (Tang. 147, Acc. No. 4773) has the following colophon: «Written down in the 11th year, 8th month of the reign period called *Great Peace (ta-an)* — (September 3, 1085) of the White, High and Great Empire. Distributed as a donation by the translator of sūtras, *wa-lia* (his rank?), commentator on sūtras and preacher of the law (*dharmā*), *rai-siwe* (his post?), the monk called Shia Pu. By the monk-scribe, Liang Chih Hui. By the engravers of wooden blocks for printing of books Li Shie-tie and Chang Nu.» It is noteworthy that here the Tangut State is not called the state of Hsia (the name Hsi Hsia was actually purely Chinese and does not appear in Tangut sources).

The edition of the *Amitābha-vyūha* (Tang. 347, Acc. No. 697) is ascribed to the 11th century. In the postscript, dated 1094, it is noted that the translation of the

⁹ Nishida, Tatsuo, *Seika bunka genkei*, Vol. III, Kyōto 1977, p. 8.

sūtra was made from Tibetan. Wood blocks for printing the sūtra by xylograph method were cut upon the order of Emperor Ch'ien-shun and his mother, the Widowed Empress Liang. Ten thousand copies of the sūtra were printed and distributed among the people. This edition was, most obviously, connected with the palace revolution, which resulted in the collapse of the power of the representative figures of the Liang House, who aimed to usurp the Tangut throne, and who returned the rule over the country to the Imperial Family of Ngwe-mi. The 3rd of the earliest books, also a xylograph, is dated the 6th year of the reign period of Chen-kuan, 9th month, 15th day, that corresponds to October 9, 1106. This is the text of *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*. In the book under Acc. No. 709 Emperor Ch'ien-shun and his mother, Widowed Empress Liang are indicated as translators, while in the book under Acc. No 2311 the real translator is śramaṇa Kuang Hui. Names of the scribe of the texts, «the monk dressed in red», Zhwi'o Phin-ngiu, and of the revisor, «he who checked the meaning of the text», Father Superior, who has entered the path of virtue, Awie Sie Njiwong, have been preserved. As already stated, all the above-mentioned three books are xylographs. In our collection we have no manuscripts directly related to the 2nd period of the translation activities of the Tanguts. The earliest manuscript book is dated 22/11/1151, the latest 1222. There are books that are dated, nevertheless, the dates resist deciphering. These are dates like: «The scribing is completed in the year of the Hare, in the 5th month, on the 25th day» (Tang. 226), or, «Completed in the last winter month on the 5th day» (Tang. 243). To translate such dates into the usual European calendar without any additional information is impossible.

Tangut Buddhist books, as usual, are not provided with extensive forewords, that would provide information about the history of the text of the book or the circumstances of its promulgation (scribing). But sometimes such forewords can also be found, e.g. the śāstra *Sheng fo mu po-jo hsin ching t'ung ch'ih shun yao wen* (Tang. 68) was edited on the event of the death of Emperor Jen-hsiao's mother. The foreword is written in the name of the Emperor. Its first part is about the importance of comprehending the innermost meaning of the teaching, and it is noted — among others — that the Tangut Buddhists «have seized the meaning of the whole sūtra, formed by 600 chüans», which is an obvious hint to the translation of *Mahā-prajñāpāramitā*. Further it says: «As a thanksgiving for her Majesty's charity and merits, who bore her child in throes and nursed him with painstaking care through heavy hardships, in the last (1167) year, on the day of grief, we invited from Lanshan the great enlightened preceptor, śramaṇa Tê Hui, who once again checked and compared the sūtra *Sheng fo mu po-jo hsin ching* with the Sanskrit and Tibetan books, and translated the book into Tangut and Chinese. . . Then the engraving of the text in wood blocks was completed, and 20,000 chüans were printed and distributed among officials and the people. Then the great enlightened

preceptor, Tê Hui was invited, incense for clearing away the filth was burned before the sūtras, and offerings were made. . . . The sūtras *Vajracchedikā-prajñāpāramitā* and *Sheng fo mu po-jo shin ching* were chanted for protecting the Holy and Wise Mother. Let her be reborn in the Pure Land of All Buddhas!»

A good deal can also be quoted from the postscript of the sūtra *Jen wang hu shuo po-jo po-lo-mi-tuo ching* (Tang. 104). The sūtra was edited on the event of the anniversary of Emperor Jen-hsiao's death by his Widowed Empress, Lo, «was reverently offered by Empress Lo on 5/10/1194». «Since among sūtras, so far distributed, there have been very few that contained defects, mistakes or omissions, in the previous year of the reign period «Heavenly Benevolence» under the cyclical characters «ne» and tiger (1194) the Widowed Empress, acting as a patron, invited tutors in the dharma, «explainers of the essence», «able and wise commentators». Educated experts of Tangut and Chinese; with joint efforts commented on and supplemented Chinese books, collated them once again with the Southern (Hīnayāna) and Northern (Mahāyāna) sūtras and made amendments. Texts were engraved in wooden blocks for printing. After all that has been put together is distributed, there will, most surely, not arise any doubts or delusions for those, reading these books. And this is the way one should act! . . . Before, as the Holy and Wise Emperor died, we, suffering from great sorrow, when distributing alms and making offerings, invited, in the previous year on the day of the Emperor's death, masters, and ordered them to engrave in wooden blocks this sūtra: in Tangut 10,000 copies, in Chinese 20,000. After the sūtra had been printed, it was distributed among officials and the people. Then the Preceptor of the Great Chinese Mahāyāna, the Excellent Expert of the Innermost, Tutor in the Rudiments of the Rituals, and the Tutor in Dharma were invited, the Assembly of those serving the All-Embracing and Great Dharma was convened that lasted 7 days and 7 nights. Then the Tutor in Dharma, who revealed the meaning of the teaching, and the Enlightened and Wise Tutor were invited. The Earth and the Waters did not oppose it. A pure and great fast, and the precepts of the dharma were observed during 3 days and 3 nights. That is why a victory could be won! And by good deeds we only wish to secretly contribute to the great benefit of the Protector of towns, the Holy, Wise and Virtuous, Splendid and Supreme Emperor (10), so that he resurrected in the Pure Land and hoisted the banner of the Great Law. . . . We wish the Throne to stand firmly for ever, the happiness of the succeeding sovereign to last boundlessly, the six Ancient Emperors to become like the Heavenly Stronghold and the Earth, the three natural phenomena, cultivating lands, the wind and rain to be in a state of harmony, the land to be rich, the earthly signs, resembling the Great Sea, to be firm, wealth and prosperity to be spread to all cardinal points, 10,000 different good-natured dharmas to flourish, the officials in the World under Heaven to reach

unity and wisdom, people on the Mainland, innumerable in its different regions, to meet the Red Dragon!»

From this text we learn about Emperor Jen-hsiao's posthumous title (10), hitherto unknown to science, that has recently been discovered on a Tangut stone inscription, found in China in the alleged burial ground of the Emperors of Hsi Hsia.¹⁰ Furthermore, from this and other colophons it can be seen that Tangut translators, before translating a certain text to their mother tongue, had covered a real textological work, in the modern sense of the word. For the translations they used not only Chinese and Tibetan texts, but texts in Sanskrit, too, the latter not having come down to us, as well as texts of both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. The Tangut translations are, and always will be, of major importance for the work of researchers and textologists of Buddhist texts.

The postscripts were usually concluded by benedictions. I quote one more benediction from text Tang. 286: «Let the imperial root be for ever strong, the offsprings of the Holy and Wise increase in number and prosper, officials of the country and the people be united, and let gain the dead and every living being a good karma!»

Prefaces to manuscript books with Buddhist texts are extremely rare. This measure can be explained by prefaces and postscripts, made through mass production of printed books by xylographic method in the name of the Emperor and members of the Imperial Family. The right of prefaces and postscripts to canonical books might have been the prerogative of state authority. As far as the manuscripts are concerned, they were multiplied on the spot. Their colophons usually include just a few items of information about the patrons and those who «made» the book, i.e. scribes, revisers, collators and sometimes censors, too. A foreword is found in *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, i.e. the *Lotus Sūtra*, translated already in the time of Yüan-hao. «This sūtra was narrated in India, and was finally handed down to the countries of the East. During the time of the Emperor of the Chin dynasty, Lo-shih translated the sūtra (into Chinese). Postscripts, according to the instructions made by Emperor Le-k'ui-wei in his own country (1), the Tanguts, having established laws and created their writing system, translated the sūtra. . . . The sūtra had been translated by the preceding generations many times before. This time the Emperor, who has inherited the throne of the Holy and Wise Ancestor Emperors, those, abiding by the Three Jewels, appeared as the Great Patron. Before the moon could change its image, the translation, prepared by Holy and Wise Hand, was accomplished from the very beginning to the end, and distributed in the country.» Obviously, the above statement relates to the translation of the sūtra checked again under Jen-hsiao's patronage. The date of this measure is not known.

¹⁰ Pu P'ing, *Hsi Hsia huang-ti ch'eng-hao k'ao: Ning-hsia she-hui K'o-hsüe*, 1981, p. 72.

From the short colophons of the manuscript books an idea can be formed about the circle of translators and scribes of Buddhist texts. Translators, as a rule, were outstanding figures of Buddhist communities, titled monks. Most frequently (7 times) «the public tutor, the Sovereign's Mentor, Wise and Enlightened Śramaṇa of the Lanshan Cloister, Tê Hui» is indicated as a translator, who lived in Emperor Jen-hsiao's time (the names are given in their Chinese equivalents, in Tangut they sounded differently, but the Tanguts bore a standardized set of Chinese monastic names). Śramaṇa Hui Chao, from the Saskya «Five Revelations» monastery, figures in the materials of the Leningrad Section of the Institute of Oriental Studies as a translator of five texts. Five texts were also translated by śramaṇa Chou Hui Hai, a Buddhist official, deputy chief of the managing department in charge of the affairs of the Buddhist sangha. Śramaṇa Hui Ming, also from the «Five Revelations» monastery, was a translator of four texts. His colleague, Fa Hui, known as a translator of four texts, came from the Sacred Cloister «Pillar of the State» that was located in the mountains of Yüyunshan (the whereabouts of these mountains can not be fixed). He was a well-educated monk, bore the title «expert of *Tripitaka*», the degree of master of the Tangut and Chinese Literatures, and was the Sovereign's Mentor. The translator of two texts, śramaṇa Tê Yüan, held the official post of the Head of the Board of Translations and Interpretations of the Meaning of the Sūtras. That such a Board existed within the administrative system of the Tangut State, suggests that the translation of sūtras and other Buddhist texts was not an amateur but an organized activity in Hsi Hsia, performed under the aegis of the state.

An analysis of the social position of the scribes indicates that they were, most naturally, men of a considerably low social position. Very often they were professional scribes, «handlers of the brush», petty officials. Only some of the scribes were monks. One of them had the curious title of «he who looks after the sūtras» (Tang. 218).

Among the engravers of xylographic blocks for the multiplication of these texts by xylographic method, a Tangut called Rashive Twushwe (Tang. 428) had the title of «the Sovereign's scribe of texts for engraving in printing blocks», he was, as a matter of fact, a scribe, too. Engravers, handicraft printers are, in fact, referred to without any titles. Judging by their family names, most of the engravers of texts were Chinese.

The principles of translation, used by the Tangut translators, are questions that has still to be solved. The author, who is responsible for this statement, is, personally, not yet ready for such an assignment. So far it is clear from the colophons that the Tanguts used texts to be translated in at least two or three languages, they had a command of Chinese, Tibetan, Sanskrit (or other Indian languages), and perhaps Uighur. The texts of the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna sūtras

were collated. For the transcription of Sanskrit syllables and Chinese words (characters) special sets of Tangut letters were worked out, for each language separately. We know only about one remark of a translator concerning the work of translation. In Book Tang. 116, Acc. No. 801, the translator explains why he had not translated the word *bodhi* into Tangut, but rendered it in its transcription: «The Sanskrit word has not been translated into Tangut, because of its polysemantic character. The corresponding word to it (in Chinese) sounds *p'u-ti*. It means both «compassionate», «wise» or «body» at the same time, and corresponds to Tangut words «valorous», «worthy», «enlightened», as well as «trunk of a tree».»

We have all reasons to assume that by the end of the 12th century the whole of the *Tripitaka* had been translated into Tangut. There is direct evidence of this in the stamped text of Empress Lo, Jen-hsiao's widow, on the manuscript Tang. 153, Acc. No. 87. «Widowed Empress Lo of the White, High and Great Empire, a devoted disciple, rescribed and supplemented in Tangut one whole chapter of the *Tripitaka* to the sūtras of the *Great Tripitaka*. It is kept in the Repository of Sūtras of the Community of the «T'ien-hsia-ching-yu-sū» to be preserved there for ever, so as to serve as an object of worship and offerings, so that it were read and distributed.» Thus, as seems quite obvious, the big monasteries in Hsi Hsia had libraries, «repositories of sūtras», where printed and manuscript books were stored. With the alms and diligence of the parishioners the books were constantly multiplied. This is exactly how books were multiplied in the region of Hara-Hoto, in the monastery or monasteries, the names of which we do not yet know. An analysis of a large number of the names and posts held by patrons, some of whom are openly mentioned in the colophon that they were dwellers of Edzina (Hara-Hoto), should convince us that the vast majority of the manuscripts, contained in the Tangut Collection of the Leningrad Section of the Institute of Oriental Studies, are of a local character. They must have been made in Edzina (Hara-Hoto) or its vicinity.

After the Mongol invasion, Tangut translations of the Buddhist Canon, despite the extensive destruction, and the ravages caused by the war, were preserved. This made it possible for the Yüan authorities in the 14th century to reissue the *Tripitaka* in Tangut by xylographic method. As it is generally known, only some scattered and miserable relics of them have been preserved. In fact, the Leningrad Collection has also been preserved from the Pre-Mongol Period by chance in a stūpa near Hara-Hoto, but it is a clear and bright confirmation of the enormous creative work of the Tangut Buddhists in the field of translating the Buddhist Canon into their mother tongue over a period of about 150 years. This confirms the high religious culture of a people that set before itself 950 years ago, the difficult task of achieving the same level as its neighbouring cultural giants, China and Tibet. It is admirable that the Tanguts, «people *mi (mi-nag)*» could cope, in fact, with this task. It is very

