

STON PA GSHEN RAB: SIX MARRIAGES
AND MANY MORE FUNERALS

HENK BLEZER
(LEIDEN UNIVERSITY)

**First Part: A Brief Survey of Early Developments
In Narratives on *gShen* and *Bon***

gShen and *Bon* in Dunhuang Sources

As is well known among tibetologists, old Tibetan sources repeatedly mention ritualists, who are variously named or described as (*pha*) *gshen rab(s) (kyi) myi bo*.¹ These old sources are evidently not Buddhist and were found somewhat off-centre to Tibet in the so-called ‘Library’ Cave #17, in Dunhuang, Eastern Turkestan. Many have also noted that these brief references to ritualists relate to the name of the founder of Bon, sTon pa gShen rab mi bo,² which starts appearing systematically in the first self-consciously Bon sources, such as the *Klu ’bum* and *mDo ’dus*. In fact, given the relatively late emergence of Bon literature—starting during the so-called *phyi dar*, the second diffusion of Buddhism in Tibet (from approximately the 10th–11th c. AD)—these stray Dunhuang references may represent the earliest textual evidence for the name. Non-Buddhist, Tibetan-language Dunhuang sources thus seem to have preserved the earliest extant precursors of a *gShen rab(s)* figure, including some narrative context.

The Dunhuang *gShen rab(s)* references and descriptions mostly appear in a context of ritual on death and healing and seem to imply a senior male figure who, considering his name and function, either is the best *gShen* ritual specialist (*gshen rab*), or is a man (*myi bo*) with great ritual expertise, who simply hails from the *gShen* clan (*gshen rabs*). At one point even a tantalisingly brief iconography appears.³

¹ References appear in Karmay (1975) and slightly more extensively, also in Stein (1988), later.

² See amongst many others Karmay (1983) and Stein (1988); see also Chu Junjie (1991).

³ PT1289:612f, a funerary text about animal sacrifice (c.q., *mdzo mo*) describes *gShen rabs* as a type of tantrist: ... *GSHEN RABS KYI MYI BO pha se gshags / [613] gshang dril chen na phyag ma g-yon na snams / gshog the ra ther bu ni phyag ma g-yas na snams / shi ni bdur rlag ni tshol / myi gshIn ni gshen kyis sado *sad *do*. For the mythic embedding of the ritual use of bird wings, see also PT1194:36–55 and Stein (1971:514). See now also the *Mythic Origins of the Bird Wing Liberator* in Bellezza (2008:506ff, cf. 429ff). Here and elsewhere in section III of his Herculean study, Bellezza—quite courageously in fact—presents tentative renderings of often extremely problematic Dunhuang passages. But one wonders why reference to Stein’s and others’ ground-

These texts also mention quite a few other *gshen* ritual specialists by name, in similar contexts, such as, frequently, (Pha) Dur *gshen rma da* (na), but also *sGal gshen tho'u yug*, etc. (these names often appear there in many variants, listed elsewhere: see next note).

The words *gshen* and *bon* are well attested in Dunhuang manuscripts. They mostly appear in non-Buddhist sources as technical terms for ritual specialists. Knowledge of the precise distinction of these ritualistic titles seems to have already been lost at the time of their recording in Dunhuang or elsewhere. The names, the various types of

breaking work on the same passages and to earlier solutions of the same problems is so conspicuously absent. Mainly a posthumously published, equally tentative translation of IOL731 by Thomas (1957) apparently deserves a brief but rather dismissive review (p.529, n.623). Also, the Gendün Chöphel syndrome apparently still plagues Tibetan Studies, alas: certainly since translators from Russian and Chinese are meticulously credited, one also wonders why the learned Triten Norbutse and Menri Geshes who by their own saying have laboured on the translations from the Tibetan remain without credit or mention!

On iconography, also compare a later, rather more exotic description of *Sri bon* 'Dur bon (sic!) rma da that appears in the in the *Dur gsas lha srung bskul shing spyan drangs pa* of the *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* funerary collection (*Bon bKa' 'gyur* III, Vol.6, pp.303.6ff.): p.304.1: .../ *phyag na 'dur gshog ldem pa bsnams/* ... One page earlier (p.302.6ff), Srid *gshen Mu cho ldem drug* is likewise graphically described. The *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* and '*Dur chog* cycles are traditionally attributed to Khu tsa zla 'od (11th c. AD) or to Thog thog lhung lha.

For the wing implement in funerary context, see from the same collection, untitled, pp.197.3ff, and for its mythic origins, see the *gShog rab(s)* also included there, p.213ff. Cf. Bellezza 2008:429ff: Bellezza's very interesting and detailed comparison of the wing origin narrative of the PT1194 and the *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur*, more than anything else perhaps, also highlights the marked differences between these strata of texts and thus underlines the great caution that one should observe when attempting to understand and interpret, in accordance with later historiographical (re)constructions and doctrinal exegesis, earlier Dunhuang-period texts—leaving aside for the moment the involved question how long the rituals, myths and narratives that appear there predate the compilation of individual texts. Based on his ubiquitous, trademark 'exegetically enhanced' readings and reconstruction of Dunhuang funerary sources, Bellezza then tries to reach even greater time-depth and to reconstruct prehistoric mortuary rites. Yet, along this exegetical path even the most intrepid, die-hard explorer may easily fall into the trappings of anachronism, traditional exegesis (cf. p.543, n.697), and apologetics. In the book announcement and introduction (p.12), Bellezza indeed promises (new) *philological* methodology (cf. his methodological prelude to section II, pp.201–5). But philology, methodologically, usually would direct its analyses in the opposite direction: deconstructing later textual elaboration in historical perspective, i.e., in reference to earlier literary strata, rather than reconstructing earlier layers from later historical (re)constructions and attempt exegesis (at the risk of anachronism).

ritual specialists, and their occurrences in sources, will be discussed in more detail somewhere else.⁴

As said, Dunhuang gShen rab(s) narratives usually show a simple paradigm of crisis and crisis management, solving problems relating to illness and death by means of healing rites and funerary service and seem to be used in a context of ritual recitation (e.g. *smrang* or *rabs*) of precedents (and the implied credits) that typically precede ritual.⁵ This story paradigm is also common to a much wider stock of Dunhuang stories relating activities of unnamed *gshen* and *bon* ritual specialists. A similar paradigm also appears in the *Klu 'bum*, the 'hundred thousand' verses on *nāga-s* (snake deities). Partly, this source may be contemporaneous (starting 10th c. AD?) and partly perhaps also later (that is to say, the collection may have developed over some time). The paradigm resurfaces again in later collections, such as among others, briefly in the (probably) 11th c. AD *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* and '*Dur chog* funerary texts.

Dunhuang references to a gShen rab(s) figure most likely pertain to the 9th–10th c. AD, but that is basically just a wild guess, be it one of an educated variety.⁶ The polished narrative structure of

⁴ See forthcoming publication on the 'location' of origin of Bon. This is the second volume in a tripartite publication project based on the Leiden *Three Pillars of Bon* research programme (funded by NWO and Leiden University, 2005–2010). The publishing programme furthermore includes a Ph.D.-thesis by Kalsang Norbu Gurung, which deals specifically with the topic of the founder of Bon (third 'pillar'). Also included is a monograph of a preceding project: *Antecedents of Bon Religion in Tibet*. This deals with continuity and change in Bon doctrine at the turn of the first millennium AD, particularly in death ritual and the so-called 'Aural Transmission from Zhang zhung' (first 'pillar', funded by NWO, 2002–2005). Bellezza (2008) in his section III approximately covers the same ground that I intended to cover in the 2002–05 NWO *Antecedents* project. I of course shared a research outline of this project on continuity and change in death ritual with him early in 2003 and also a more elaborate description by means of a historiographical paper at the Oxford IATS 2003 (cited by him on p.202, n.1, in his historiographical prelude). Under this configuration it is probably necessary to clarify that beyond that early exchange, his present publication was prepared independently from my project, using his own resources and research data. The other two volumes in the Three Pillars project will also give more in-depth discussion of aspects and topics that this survey can only briefly touch upon. For developments of the gShen rab myth in early Bon sources, I particularly refer to the third 'pillar' of the forthcoming publications.

⁵ See, amongst many others, Stein (1971), Lalou (1958), and Karmay (1998).

⁶ Most likely, we have to settle for a relatively late date of most of the Dunhuang documents used for this study (cf. Beckwith PIATS 2006); "most": simply because I haven't studied all yet. We probably should not take the generally presumed antiquity of Dunhuang documents (as dating to the imperial period) for granted. Early dates for some documents, such as for instance proposed by MacDonald (1971), have failed to convince. Rolf Stein in my opinion rightly raised questions

Dunhuang stories involving gShen rab(s) *cum suis* suggests that, by then, they had already become stock narrative tropes, in which a gShen rab(s) (kyi) myi bo and Dur gshen rma da (na) and a few others (the mentioned sGal gshen tho'u yug etc.), by epic concentration, had become the focal points of excellent 'priestly' characteristics. They appear a-historically as ideal-typical ritual agents and story characters. The opaque narrative form of the stories suggests considerable distance to their contexts of origin and to historical and topographical realities connected to the names—if there ever were historical persons underlying them (but cf. Thomas 1957, in his several introductions). This gestation may take us back one or more centuries for the possible historical origins of the names and, less likely: events; say 7th–8th c. AD? What is reflected in Dunhuang sources may thus have been shaped by a considerable period of oral *cum* written transmission and therefore adhere to the logic of narrative, more than that of history and topography. If there ever were concrete historical and geographical contexts connected with the names and stories, it will be difficult to infer those from the late form and shape the stock of story elements that they have become part of has reached us in.

Still, something more can be said about the origins of the narratives. The *gshen* ritual specialists that are mentioned by name may have been particularly famous ritualists, whose 'names' have become legendary. For (Pha) gShen rab(s) (kyi) myi bo it is moreover possible, if not likely, that we are dealing with descriptions of a priestly function (Stein 1988:44) and not with a particular individual or personal name. Could this ritual expertise have been the privileged specialisation of a gShen clan? These are of course not necessarily mutually exclusive: it may be difficult to draw a clear boundary between name and title.

about that in his review of her work in "Tibetica Antiqua" (1985). I presently work on the assumption that the Dunhuang documents that I am dealing with are late imperial at the earliest, but probably mostly post-imperial in their redaction. So far, my working hypothesis has been that the earliest records that I use would fit a date in the 9th-10th century AD. On the other hand, what is recorded in non-Buddhist Dunhuang documents may reflect traditions that reach back one or more centuries before their date of composition. I do not doubt that some Dunhuang sources represent and preserve traditions—historical, ritual, narrative and otherwise—that in any case predate the formation of the first self-consciously Bon documents (the *Klu 'bum* is a bit of a border-line case), which perhaps start forming from the 10th c. AD. That still makes non-Buddhist Dunhuang sources roughly contiguous with the earliest self-consciously Bon sources and in any case contemporaneous with Tibetan Buddhism. Also, to state the bleeding obvious: for practical reasons, consciously non-Buddhist interest groups in the early *phyi dar*, wherever they were, did not relate to the physical documents that are preserved in Dunhuang, but to comparable traditions that may have been around also elsewhere.

The later *sTon pa* gShen rab character may thus have developed from a *primus inter pares* among *gshen* and *bon* ritual specialists, whose historicity we cannot now trace anymore in the opaque story characters that remain in Dunhuang-period narratives. Alternatively, the name may also derive from a ritualistic title that in the early *phyi dar* was read as a personal name, by Tibetan interest groups: newly styled bon po-s, who, consciously or not, allowed their collective memory to coagulate around a respectable non-Buddhist name or person, a suitable perceived founder of their newly invented ‘non-Buddhist’ tradition.

What is important to stress, however, is that in the narratives that remain in Dunhuang sources there is *no evidence whatsoever* to indicate that the gShen rab(s) figure mentioned there was considered to be a founder of a tradition called Bon. There also is no connection whatsoever of Dunhuang gShen rab(s) narratives to Zhang zhung or Ta zig, even though those place names do appear in other contexts: the narratives mostly are securely located more centrally in Tibet. I have argued elsewhere (PIATS 2006) that the connection of the myth of the founder with Zhang zhung and Ta zig significantly postdates even early self-consciously Bon literature: it is conspicuously absent from collections such as the *Klu 'bum*, *mDo 'dus* or the *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur*; all of which, in some form or other, seem to pertain to the inceptive period of Bon: the 10th–11th c. AD.⁷ Dunhuang gShen rab(s) narratives also

⁷ Occasionally, Bellezza (2008) also notes such indications of non-Zhang zhung provenance (e.g. p.369), only to gloss them over forthwith, for unclear reasons. Through circumstantial and occasionally also anachronistic arguments, based on often much later sources and unverifiable traditional attributions, he attributes Zhang zhung provenance to rites such as are described in the *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* and in Dunhuang sources. He subsequently harnesses these ‘exegetically enhanced’ data as circumstantial evidence—a missing link as it were—for arguing that the rather indifferent early and/or pre-historic material data from in the field may also pertain to ‘Zhang zhung’. This argument utterly fails to convince. It is a fragile theoretical edifice that I should not recommend dwelling in. The narratives he discusses mostly *clearly are not* located in Zhang zhung, which moreover otherwise is a well-known entity in this period. Thus the evidence, before exegetical enhancement, in fact appears to argue against the thesis of a cradle of Tibetan culture in Zhang zhung and also to contradict the book’s title. These systematic attempts to project a grand Bon Zhang zhung Empire back into earlier sources by interpolation, and beyond that into Tibetan pre- and proto-history, based on traditional historical constructs and exegesis in later Bon and Buddhist historiography, are a telling example for the fundamental dangers that may lurk in this exegetically tinged methodology. Most of the weight of the arguments now lies in the starting hypotheses and not in unadorned evidence (i.e., before exegetical enhancement). Based on the overwhelming lack of a connection to Zhang zhung in the earliest sources, one should probably advise to rename the book simply to *Foundations of Civilisation in Tibet*, not insisting on identifying Zhang zhung, rather

contain no convincing references to Bon as a self-conscious religious tradition. To clarify this important point we need to discuss very briefly some crucial terms: *bon*, *bon po* and *g-yung drung bon*.

1. A Brief Note on Bon

The most convincing indications so far for an ‘established Bon religion’ in the imperial period have been pointed out by Samten Karmay, as early as 1981.⁸ Informally, we long ago agreed to disagree on this. It is very difficult to find *terra firma* for Bon in the period. Before moving on with our survey, I should like to spend some time with Karmay’s discussion of ‘imperial Bon’ and try to put up some problematic points for further discussion, even though I realise it will not be possible to settle the issue yet. Karmay (1998/1981:166) quotes from PT972:

so so byis pa skye bo rnams/ mu stegs bon la yid ches te/ las kyi don du mtshan ma spyod/

“Ordinary people, have faith in Bon, the ‘non-Buddhist doctrine’. For activity they (i.e., ordinary people who follow Bon) indulge in materials” (ibid. p.163).⁹

We do not need to search very long for the appropriate meaning of the word *bon* in this context, as it is clarified in a following passage: warning people not to have faith in *mo bon* ritual specialists.¹⁰ These *mo bon* here may indeed designate that ubiquitous diviner-type of ritual specialist that meets us so often in Bon sources, also the earliest ones:

mo bon dag la srid ma ltos/ 'dre srin dag la yar ma mchod/ bdud dang bgag (bgegs) la skyab ma tshol/ ... (ibid. p.166).

traditionally, as *the* foundation of that civilization—a thesis as of yet unproven and even flatly contradicted by evidence.

⁸ For discussion of possibly early evidence for Bon in the imperial period see Karmay (1998/1981:157f.); cf. also his article on the *Can lnga* (see esp. pp.289ff.). Much of his work on myth and ritual is in fact geared toward clarifying ancient Tibetan religious culture, e.g., his articles on: the little black-headed man; the soul and the turquoise; *glud* offering; *bsangs*; and *rlung rta* (cf. p.532 & 35). Karmay argues convincingly for the survival of ancient rites and beliefs (much more convincing than some recent, often anachronistically and poorly argued—or even downright nativist—efforts). I still hesitate calling this Bon, but that does not in any way diminish the importance of the discussion (cf. also Stein 1988 and Chu Junjie 1991).

⁹ Alternatively, following a kind hint by Dan Martin one might translate *las kyi don du mtshan ma spyod* as: for their affairs they investigate omens (rely on divination).

¹⁰ Cf. also the use of *mo ba*, in the text on divination (*mo*) PT1047:20 (on this text see MacDonald 1971:272ff). Cf. also ITJ0738:1v12 and 1v62: *mo bab*.

“Do not put your trust in the *mo bon*. Do not worship the *'dre* or the *srin*. Do not seek protection from the *bdud* or the *bgegs*. [Then extols the Buddhist alternative; *ibid.* p.163]”

Therefore *mu stegs bon*, given the context, must apply to the *mo bon* type ritual specialist and does not refer to the general public, which is here admonished to seek refuge in the Buddha and the *saṅgha* rather than in these diviner?-type Bon ritual specialists. The addition of the phrase “ordinary people who follow Bon”, in Karmay’s translation, at the implied subject of the following sentence, while certainly possible, is not really necessary. The interpretation that the text itself suggests is moreover entirely in keeping with other occurrences of personal uses of the term *bon* in Dunhuang sources: they invariably point to ritual specialists of some sort (not necessarily ‘diviners’—if that indeed is the trade that *mo bon* here implies).

Karmay (1998:160) points to another possible indication: *bon yas 'dod smrang*: “The Bon (religion) is the archetypal myth of rituals which require ritual objects of offering” in PT239. In a careful analysis of this cryptic Tibetan passage, Karmay shows that it needs to be contrasted with Buddhist sensibilities also voiced there. Given that wider context, the use of the word *bon* indeed appears ambiguous. Yet, given the full array of usage of the word *bon* for a person in Dunhuang sources, this occurrence too, while indeed more ambiguous than in PT972, fits the meaning of ritual specialists better than that of an organised religion of some sort (or of ordinary adherents of that).¹¹ Given the ritualistic activities implied, it seems to refer specifically to the concrete trade of Bon ritual specialists and not to some abstract entity ‘Bon religion’ (which also is not attested anywhere else in documents of the period).

However remarkable, these passages as such do not warrant or recommend positing an entire self-conscious cluster of traditions with “a firmly established religion embodying a popular system of belief known as Bon”. All we can gather from PT972 is that people put faith in Bon ritual specialists, and that Buddhists should advise against that.

‘Ordinary followers’ are not named in PT972. If there would have been such followers or an implied religious tradition, one would expect (rather numerous) references elsewhere. The issue of self-naming without ‘other’ is of course problematic. But in this case, Buddhism clearly was already established and hence there *would have been* a real need for a distinctive name, in case such an ‘established religion called Bon’ really existed at the time.

¹¹ I am not sure whether one can draw a clear distinction between ‘ritual specialist’ and ‘ordinary adherent’ here.

Karmay quite rightly notes that the term *bon* occasionally (but only very rarely) is also used for something of ‘religious’, probably mainly ritual, content and cites several Dunhuang-period passages in support.¹² On close examination, however, these occurrences do not really affect the above analysis. Sparse references to *bon* ‘religious’ (ritual) content also invariably appear to refer to the specific content of ritual performance of Bon specialists and they do not imply the more abstract notion of some kind of self-conscious, organised, popular or elite Bon religion.¹³

Given the present state of knowledge and evidence, prevalent academic sensibilities—as aptly expressed in ‘Ockham’s razor’—do not recommend assuming an entity such as ‘an established religion called Bon’. Positing, without any additional compelling evidence, that the various ritualistic phenomena that in Dunhuang sources are associated with *bon* and *gshen* imply some kind of organised religion, popular or otherwise (cf. the funerary rites of PT1042), i.e., that they would imply an entity beyond the concrete phenomena described and named, would be superfluous at best and could be confusing and seriously get in the way of the future heuristics at worst.

I readily concede that it is logically impossible to *prove* that a pink elephant does not exist and I therefore do not recommend arguing that there could not possibly have been imperial-period Bon religion. My point is that given the data and pending further evidence, we *need not* hypostasise ‘early Bon’: it is not compellingly mentioned, described, or even suggested in the most closely contemporary sources. Bon may be implied, but we have no way of ascertaining that. At the present state of knowledge, it would simply be an unnecessary assumption.

¹² Karmay (1998:161.n14).

¹³ Karmay refers to what looks like a preamble to the title of the funerary text PT1040.1: [1] \$ /:/ bon 'di gsang ba'i bon gis sul [2] yang bslag pa lo tus gi bro la thogso / [3] \$ /:/ rgyal byin gi rabs /, discussed by Stein 1971:545. The occurrence of *bon* in PT1248.1: (p?)a' bu tsa' bon rabs/ phyag sbal na mchis pa la dpe' blangs pa'ol ('the account of Bon, entitled the Son of the Father. This was copied from the manuscript kept at the official library') is uncertain, as the first one or two syllables are missing. In any case *bon rabs* clearly places *bon* in the context of *rabs*, which is part of what we saw that *bon* ritual specialists do. The word *bon*, as a non-personal reference to the content of ritual appears closely associated with the verb *gyer*, reciting or chanting in a ritual manner: see, for instance, the funerary text PT1134.124: *bon gang gis/ ni/ bgyerd/* and PT1136.56: *nub gsuM bon gshen bon du bsgyerd*. PT443, among all kinds of evil (magic) that the deity invoked there, Ma ha ba la rdo rje mchog, will protect against, are mentioned curses and incantations by *bon* and by (people from) *Yol* (Lalou 1947:222). This reference to *bon* similarly and typically implicates ritual specialists or their repertoire.

The conspicuous lack of imperial-period ‘Bon’ self-references *vis-à-vis* the undeniable presence of Buddhist ‘others’ (that from their side entertain plenty of such references) would in fact rather suggest the contrary, that there was no imperial-period Bon religion. The chances that no clear self-references whatsoever would have remained for a presumably comprehensive and powerful imperial-period ‘Bon’ religion, such as we find described in later Bon and Buddhist sources, would defeat any statistical likelihood of the hypothesis, however well argued (for instance by Karmay).

That leaves us with the burden—a fascinating task in fact—to study how these later narratives on Bon came to be; as I presently propose to do for a sample of stories in the *mDo ’dus*, which refer to sTon pa gShen rab’s marriages.

2. A Brief Note on Bon po

We also need to look into the crucial designation *bon po*. In contrast with the word *bon*, *bon po* only rarely occurs in Dunhuang documents, mainly in that odd funerary document PT1042 and also a few times in PT1285, a true treasure trove for narratives on *bon* and *gshen* and their presumed locations. In these sources the use of *bon po* seems to indicate shifts in usage, perhaps one or more innovations on older schemes of *gshen* and *bon* specialists.

In PT1042, a shift in usage clearly involves or coincides with a specific and distinctly technical use of the term *bon po*, as a ritual title that is combined with other systematic terms that seem to describe a function rather than the usual toponym or patronym (it is then usually followed by a more personal-looking name). This needs to be contrasted with the construction of names in texts such as PT1285. In PT1042, references to *bon po* specialists also often typically cluster together with references to *sku gshen* type specialists.

Even as late as the *phyi dar mDo ’dus*, *bon po* still appears as a designation for ritual specialists only. But, needless to say, by the time of the *mDo ’dus*¹⁴ the word *bon*, signifying all kinds of special teachings, old or reformed, is already ubiquitous.¹⁵

¹⁴ See Blezer 2008, “William of Ockham, Jan van Gorp and Tibetan Studies: Some Notes on Dating the *mDo ’dus*”, forthcoming CNRS: Paris 2008.

¹⁵ While *g-yung drung bon* in the *mDo ’dus*, except for the titles, appears only four times, each time in chapter 12 (*ston pa la bdud kyi cho ’phrul* [added later: *bstan pa*]/*btul pa’i le’u*), which moreover may be later additions.

Together with IOL734 (v. Thomas 1957), a ritualistic narrative on ‘the age of decline’, the mentioned PT1285¹⁶ probably is one of the most important documents for understanding the structure of non-Buddhist Dunhuang-period ritualistic narratives and the character of *bon* and *gshen*. It may well reflect one of the above-mentioned shifts in usage of the term *bon po* for a ritual specialist, which, eventually, became epitomised by the *gShen rab(s)* character, as its ideal type.

In the light of received wisdom, it must appear strange that in texts such as PT1285 all the really competent *gshen* and *bon po* hail from areas near Central Tibet, mainly the Yar klung(s) rtsang po area, while droves of exotic male (*pho* or *pha*) *gshen thod (d)kar* and female *mo gshen* appear ineffective in their methods¹⁷ and almost seem to be ridiculed.¹⁸ Local *bon po*-s are without exception depicted as superior to the exotic male (*pho*) and female (*mo*) *gshen*. That these male and female *gshen* types are associated with foreign origins is explicitly indicated. They are vaguely said to be from *dags ri dkar po* (sunny white mountain; *yang* 陽) and *sribs ri nag po* (shadowy black mountain; *yin* 陰), successively.¹⁹

¹⁶ See Lalou (1958), Stein (1971) and Dotson, “Bon and Gshen in Old Tibetan Ritual Texts”, forthc. in *JAOS*.

¹⁷ PT1285:39–41, 66–68, 86f, 110, 136f, 151f, and 165–76.

¹⁸ See Lalou (1958:162), this mocking quality is also clearly implied in her paraphrase of the passages.

¹⁹ Stein (1971: 510-11) associates these ‘mountains’ or their sides, with *yin* and *yang*. But compare IOL734.175–185, where *bDag[s] ri* (thams cad) are connected to *Pu rMa bo* and *Sribs ri* (thams cad) to what may be his spouse (ICam) *Yul ma*. In ll.46–8 they appear in a configuration more familiar from PT1285 (*pho* & *mo gshen brgya*). Thomas (1957) considers the possibility of the difference in usage of the northern and southern slopes of mountains in Eastern Tibet; he refers to Futterer (1901:I.430) and Tafel (1914:II.170).

Cf. also the use of *phu* (upper) and *mda’* lower parts of a mountain, associated with *gdags* [emend: *dags*] and *srib* [emend: *sribs*], successively, in one of the texts found in the *dGa’ thang ’bum pa* in *gTam shul*, the *rNel dri ’dul ba’i thabs* (*gTam shul dga’ thang ’bum pa che nas gsar rnyed byung ba’i bon gyi gna’ dpe bdams bsgribs*, Lhasa 2007, published by Pasang Wangdu) 2.3f, repeated at many other places. This seems only one of the numerous variants of this narreme that were produced during lengthy transmission. In the same text (23.11f), *gdags shIng pha rgu dang / sribs shing ma rgu* appear. A bit more similar to the Dunhuang form, which probably is more original, is a passage on pp.354ff where at least the male *gshen* are invited: *gdags [dags] ri dkar po las/ pho gnyen thod dkar gnyer/ gdo [gto] dang dpyad bgyis na ’a/ ...*

The non-Buddhist *dGa’ thang ’bum pa* texts seems to retell and rephrase ancient Dunhuang period ritual narratives in slightly adjusted forms. The dating of these texts is uncertain. In any case, it seems improbable that the non-Buddhist section, which Pasang Wangdu identifies as Bon, would physically pertain to the imperial period. But the fact that some of the narratives and rituals continue ritual narrative traditions of the Dunhuang period should be obvious indeed. Equally obvious are the stray odd name and other anachronistic elements that reveal later

Are *pho gshen thod dkar* perhaps outlandish folks from Tokharistan (Tho kar?), those Yüeh-chih or Yuèzhî?²⁰ Are they folks from the region of Bactria, who also happen to wear white turbans (*thod dkar*. cf. Lalou 1958:162)? Or are those *pho gshen thod dkar* merely male ritual specialists of unknown origin who wear white turbans, as opposed female *mo gshen* who wear a *zhu/zhwva bub*?²¹ As said, these *pho* and *mo gshen* come in droves and remain anonymous, while local *bon po*-s, instead, have personal names. But note that many of the named *bon po*-s also feature the *gshen* element in their names: the use of the designation *bon* or *gshen* as such, certainly does not seem to be a relevant divide for these PT1285 figures.

The Myi bo and the even more ubiquitous rMa da-type of *gshen* or *bon po* seem to be the ideal-typical first *bon po*-s, who evolved from those more competent, new-style aboriginal *bon* and *gshen* (whose expertise is extolled in PT1285). The latter are local, central to western Tibetan ritual specialists who are considered more efficient and are mentioned by individual names. The superiority of local *bon po*-s over foreign, possibly far-western, male and female *gshen* again points to some innovation in *bon* expertise, having, at least initially, taken place in the area where the PT1285 narratives, according to their long lists of locations clearly are located: in the upper reaches of the rTsang po River.²² Was this old rTsang (chen) area—which at that time may have reached up to Ma pang and Ti se²³—perhaps the actual historical proto-

redaction of the material. See, for instance, the odd names of a king and his queen in the same *rNel dri 'dul ba'i thabs* p.11.4ff: *da nI rnel dri sha ru gzung ba'I rabs la/ pha dang yab gyI mtshan/ srId pa'i lha rab g-yung drung 'od gyi rgyal po dang / ma dang yum gyi mtshan/ g-yung drung khri 'od gyi rgyal mor bshos pa'I sras/ /bu byung bo mor byung/ /...* The phrases are identical to what also appears in Dunhuang sources, but the names and the use of *g-yung drung* therein look post-imperial. The multiplication of variants of these narremes together with some odd names, argue for a somewhat later (post-imperial) date of the text. It may be more cautious to consider a date no earlier than the eleventh century for all the materials found, and not, as does Pasang Wangdu, only for the Buddhist texts. We all eagerly await Karmay's discussion of these finds.

²⁰ Cf. the identification by Chris Beckwith, in an engaging lecture at the EPHE in Paris, May 29th 2008, where he spoke on Yüeh-chih (Yuèzhî): "On the Name and Identity of the Tokharians".

²¹ Lalou (1958:201) discusses this at length. N.B. in the middle of the 8th c. AD, Tokharistan included Tajikistan. References to exotic ritual specialists of that ilk may later have been resumed in western Ta zig origin myths.

²² See Dotson, "Bon and Gshen in Old Tibetan Ritual Texts", forthc. in *JAOS*.

²³ Thomas (1957) repeatedly points out that rTsang in an older context may refer to a larger area (rTsang chen) than the area presently known as gTsang province. rTsang chen is mentioned in one of the texts discussed by Thomas (1935:4&298) and in early historical documents from the Dunhuang period (Bacot 1940:184). This

heartland of 'Bon', rather than those vague regions to the far West of Tibet, indicated in later sources? The traditional *Come-from-the-West* narrative is indeed remarkably underdeveloped in these and other early texts. Significantly, that master narrative only rises to ascendancy with or in fact shortly after the advent of self-conscious sTon pa gShen rab hagiography. Lists of locations in PT1285 may indeed point to the oldest known proto-heartland, if not of gShen rab and Bon, then at least of the earliest narratives regarding the gShen rab-type of *bon po* and his retrospective trade.²⁴ Most interestingly, they are located in the vicinity of the itinerary of gShen rab when, according to the *mDo 'dus*, he left rKong po and founded Khyung lung rngul mkhar. This passage is discussed at length in an article on the location of that castle, forthcoming in the PIATS 2006.

As indicated, PT1042²⁵ may represent a unique strand within this *bon po* innovation. In an idiosyncratic way, PT1042 employs a wide array of technical terms for *bon* specialists, such as *mjol* or '*jol*, *phangs*, *snyun*, *smag*, *rlad*, and *sman bon*. References to *bon* specialists with personal names (such as often appear in PT1285) are conspicuously absent and it features a frequent and relatively unique occurrence of the *sku gshen* title. It may thus represent an altogether different strand, unrelated to what we see reflected in, for instance, PT1285 and its narratives on efficient local *bon* and *gshen*.

When compared to other such rites in Dunhuang sources, the singular complexity and elaboration of the death rites in PT1042 help underline its relatively unique character (and that of PT239; cf. also S504 and S562). One might try testing the hypothesis that PT1042 and its revisions according to Buddhist standards (PT239 &c.) are not so much an authentic surviving early record of ancient rites but a late

rTsang chen is probably identical to the old rTsang in Bacot (1940), and rTsang bod, also in Bacot (1940). For an elaborate description of rTsang chen, see the geographical introduction in Thomas (1957). The name rTsang for the area is of course determined by the presence of the Ya ru rtsang po (Brahmaputra). That ancient greater rTsang area probably reached all the way from present dBus up to the Ma pang and Ti se area.

²⁴ The opposing circuits of P1285, as described by Dotson in "Bon and Gshen in Old Tibetan Ritual Texts", forthc. in *JAOS*, could also point to such an innovation. The east-west '*bon*' circuit deviates from the regular ones and might suggest a new order of things. The west-east '*gshen*' circuit suggests being the more regular route, as found in P1286 and P1290. But I seriously doubt that the differences in list of localities systematically relate to *bon* and *gshen* as such; they rather point to (ritual) narratives concerning marriage (east-west) and healing or death ritual (west-east). There seems to be no relation between the ordering of localities and *bon* & *gshen*.

²⁵ Discussed by Lalou (1953), Haarh (1969); cf. also Stein (1970) and Chu Junjie (1991).

resume—in any case contemporary with the arrival of Buddhism—of what non-Buddhist funerary rites were remembered, thought, or simply supposed to be like in early Buddhist times, and arranged long after, specifically for the burial of historical Yar klung(s) kings and nobles; perhaps they were even arranged post-imperially;²⁶ possibly a bit like those 'dur type of death rites of the *Khrom 'dur* and 'Dur *chog gter ma* literature, (re)invented somewhere around the 11th c. AD.

The name Bon, as in g-Yung drung Bon, seems to have been coined in the early *phyi dar* period, or shortly before, in explicit reference to earlier *narratives about bon* and *gshen* ritual specialists that survived from the imperial period. As we saw, Dunhuang sources have indeed preserved quite a few of these. Pha gShen rab(s) kyi myi bo is only one of them—and not even the *gshen* most frequently mentioned. Later survivals of these narrative traditions are also extant, e.g. in the *gNag rabs*²⁷ and *rNel dri 'dul ba'i thabs*. In Dunhuang sources, *gshen* specialists are mentioned slightly more frequently than the ones that are explicitly labelled *bon*. But in most Dunhuang sources the distinction between them already appears opaque or confused. The rise of or shift to the designation *bon* instead of *gshen*, for ritual specialists may mark one of, *again perhaps*, a series of innovations. But we of course have to be careful not needlessly to historicise data and create chronologies and innovations where there are none: we may simply be looking at approximately synchronic variability.

So much should be clear: looking, as many have done, for the origins of the name Bon in the earliest roots of the semantics of the syllable/verb/noun “*bon*” in Dunhuang sources by far precedes the relevance of the same for its recycled usage in the early *phyi dar* Bon period. This exercise would only be meaningful if the usage of the word *bon* in the imperial period would relate more directly and more significantly to the way it was engaged by early *phyi dar* groups that appropriated the word for their identity discourse.

Those later *phyi dar* Bon groups are entirely ‘subaltern’ Buddhist in outlook but at the same time are fully entitled to their separate Bon status. Present-day bon po-s o may legitimately claim to be heirs of so-

²⁶ This will be discussed in the first (*Antecedents*) volume of the *Three Pillars* publication project.

²⁷ gShen rab myi bo is one of the *gshen bzhi*: see the *gNag rabs* in Pasang Wangdu (2007), p.19.8f: *gshen bzhi spyang drang 'tshal/ glud bzhi gtang bar bzang // bdud bon dreng nag chu lcags dang / thar bon dru skyol dang // glud bon ngag snyan dang / gshen rab myi bo bzhi/ ...*

called pre-Buddhist Tibetan culture, but *with the same 'genetic' right* they may also claim to be legitimate heirs of pre-*phyi dar* or even pre-*snga dar*—perhaps also Central Asian—varieties of Buddhism. One might push this a bit further and posit that it may be a bit pedantic to argue that Tibetan Buddhists are more rightfully entitled to early Buddhist heritage than are bon po-s. Conversely: while bon po-s clearly have sought, engaged, and (re)invented so-called indigenous heritage, often in adjusted or 'reformed' formats (which clearly reveal shared ethical, soteriological and doctrinal sensibilities), Buddhist traditions carry that Tibetan heritage as well. See, for example, Karmay's (1998) discussion of what are generally presumed to be widely shared continuities from 'indigenous' Tibetan periods, such as, concepts of the soul and the turquoise, *glud* offering, *bsangs*, and the use of *rlung rta*. The main difference lies in how all this is engaged in identity discourse.

3. A Brief Note on g-Yung drung Bon

As is well known, *g-yung drung* first appears in Tibetan inscriptions²⁸ and in early translated Buddhist texts. There it signifies "eternal", but it is also used in the sense of a permanent state of release, a nirvanic category (Buddhist religious context). The earliest occurrences in Dunhuang sources confirm this usage. But the Tibetan semantic fields of *g-yung* and *drung*, taken individually, are surprisingly limited and cannot support the usual meaning "eternal" of the combination *g-yung drung*. See for example what appears in the combined wisdom of the THDL lexical database:

g-yung: **DM** [contributed by Dan Martin] *nges pa*. Gces 587.3. 'bangs mi'am bran g-yog. *nges pa. zhan pa*. A clan. Btsan-lha. *rmu rgod dul ba'i spyod pa gzhan bas g-yung*. Zhi-byed Coll. I 271.2.

JV [contributed by Jim Valby] statue labor, cross between cow and yak, place in Tibet.

drung: **YOGA** [Yogācārabhūmi Glossary] antike.

DM O.T. = *rtsa ba*. Blan 301.1. Stein.

JV his holiness, near to, beside, at, to, title/address of honor, civil officer, official, presence of, near to.

IW [contributed by Ives Waldo] 1) root; 2) near, in front of, in the presence of [h]; 3) attendant.

RY [contributed by Erik Hein Schmidt, Rangjung Yeshe Dictionary] *bla ma'i drung nas* - in the master's presence. beside, next to; attendant, -- *pa* - Sir, reverend; near, before, presence of, near to.

²⁸ E.g., the Zhol inscription, erected approximately 764 AD (Richardson 1985:1–25).

Presumed or real ‘Zhang chung’ lexicon also cannot explain *g-yung drung*. ZZ *Drung mu* (*swastika*) seems to derive from Tib. *g-yung drung* (see Dan Martin’s *Zhang-zhung Dictionary*, e-text July 2007),²⁹ with the productive *Zhang chung* marker *mu* added (cf. Martin 2000:75 on this).

By all appearances the combination *g-yung drung* is a loan word.³⁰ That being so, the most likely option would be a loan from Chinese:³¹ probably some regional form of Chinese from the Tang-period or before. The *Mahāvīyutpatti* relates the Tibetan translation term *g-yung drung* to the Sanskrit *sanātanaḥ*. Sakaki’s edition, at *sanātanaḥ* and *g-yung drung*, gives a straightforward Chinese translation 不動 (*bu⁴ dong⁴*: not changing) but also a more curious, somewhat Tibetan phonetic-looking 永中 (*yong³ zhong^{1/4}*), a combination that I am not familiar with. Mathews does not list it and, apart from personal names, 永中 does not seem to occur frequently in older Chinese texts. According to his introduction, Sakaki’s Chinese renderings derive from perhaps late 13th or at the latest 18th c. AD Chinese equivalents, based on the Tibetan. Often these were not checked against Buddhist sources.

There are numerous combinations with 永 to consider and the problems besetting early Chinese phonology are complex and beyond the competence of a non-specialist. This problem requires serious and methodical linguistic investigation that would lead far beyond the present article. I will nonetheless make a modest start, hopefully for linguists to follow (Appendix I). However plausible the connection based on modern Mandarin pronunciations may seem, I see only tenuous evidence to support derivation from 永中, 永終, or 永常, from older layers of Chinese; and if so, the derivation most likely occurred long before the Tibetan Dunhuang period.

The identity of Bon as we know it now is epitomised by the phrase *g-yung drung bon*, a term has been in use since the earliest self-consciously Bon literature, such as the *mDo ‘dus* and *Klu ‘bum*. The

²⁹ DRUNG MU [1] (*g-yung drung*) *swastika*. ZZH. Zhu, seven times. Humm1, p. 491. Sgra 123. (*g-yung*) ZB. [2] (*rin chen*) jewel, precious substance. Humm1, p. 513. [3] (*shin tu*) Humm1, p. 513. [4] (*gyur med*) unchanging, immutable. Mdzod. Note that all four meanings are attested in Mdzod.

³⁰ The prescript “ga” is not uncommon to loan words (cf., for example Tibetan *g-yu*, turquoise, and Chinese 玉 *yü⁴*, precious stone, especially for jade); e-mail communication by Chris Beckwith (July 11th, 2008).

³¹ Thanks are due to Dorothée Kehren, for kindly pointing out the possibility of a loan from Chinese.

usage in the *mDo 'dus*³² (and *Klu 'bum*)³³ mainly seems to invoke an old sense of *g-yung drung* and refers to an exalted if not transcendent state or realm (also attested in Dunhuang sources);³⁴ shadows of eternalism loom large in between the lines. Something like that is also implied in the frequent phrase *g-yung drung lha'i bon* (exalted or 'high' Bon, 'of the gods'; reminiscent of the Dunhuang phrase *lha'i chos*),³⁵ particularly frequent in self-references.³⁶ Interestingly, this also appears as *g-yung drung dag pa'i bon*: pure Bon.

g-Yung drung bon in the *mDo 'dus*³⁷ (and the *Klu 'bum*)³⁸ is closely related to statement of truth. Generally, truth (*bden*) is considered a key

³² E.g., *g-yung drung mi 'gyur snying po long* (p.60.6), *zad med g-yung drung dbyings su gnas pa'i bon* (p.124.1) and *'gyur med g-yung drung thob* (in a unique enumeration of types of bon on pp.123.3–4.1:

de la bon gyis rnams grang na/

1) *'dus byas 'khor ba'i bon rnams/*

2) *'dus ma byas pa mya ngan la 'das pa'i bon/*

3) *thugs rje rgya chen po bon rnams/*

4) *'phrul ngag bden pa'i bon/*

5) *srid par brgyud pa'i bon/*

6) *dge sdig 'byed pa'i bon/*

ston pa'i bka' ni

1) *gnam bab bon/*

2) *rang shar rig par rang rdol bon/*

3) *rgyu mthun rang lug bon/*

4) *rdo shing rang 'gyur bon/*

5) *skye med gdod nas dag pa'i bon/*

6) *snang med dpe' las 'das pa'i bon/*

7) *tshad med lhun [124] la rdzogs pa'i bon/*

8) *zad med g-yung drung dbyings su gnas pa'i bon/*

9) *brtsal med lhun gyis grub pa'i bon/*

See also *mi ldog g-yung drung sa thob* (p.160.4), *g-yung drung brtan byed* (p.175.5), and *bkra shis g-yung drung sems mchog thob pa'i bkra shis* (p.191.3)

³³ *Klu 'bum dkar po* (the rTags brtan phun tshogs gling edition), pp.18.5f.: *g-yung drung gi bon 'phrul ngag bden pa chu rgyun*.

³⁴ E.g., PT16.34r1: *sku tshe g-yung drung du bzhes te /*; PT239.14r5: *bde skyid g-yung drung gnas su phyln par shog / /*; and PT1287.376: *... skye shi las bsgral to / g-yung drung du bton to / /*. For a more elaborate discussion, see Stein (1983:163,169f; ref. Dan Martin); he speculates that *g-yung drung* might point to Chinese Buddhist vocabulary.

³⁵ See, e.g., Karmay 1998(1981):159.n.7. He believes that in the imperial period *lha'i chos* and *lha la yid ches chos byan* (*bya*) in PT1284 do not refer to Buddhism but to 'Bon'.

³⁶ Cf. also references to presumed linguistic origins: *g-yung drung lha'i skad du*: in the language of ...

³⁷ *g-Yung drung bon* appears synonymous with *bden pa'i bon* (p.94.5, 152.2), *ma 'khrul bden pa'i bon* (98.1) or *'phrul ngag bden pa'i bon* (122.1, pp.123f (123.4), and on p.219.2f).

³⁸ 24.6f: *bon g-yung drung gi dbyings thams cad dang/ ... g-yung drung gi sa bcu thar pa'i bon no//*.

characteristic of Bon, as much as untruth (*rdzun*) is typical for demonic teachings and doings (or for the demon par excellence: *bDud Khyab pa lag ring*). Untruth not merely implies telling lies, but here is used in the sense of mistaken, ineffective, false, unethical (harmful and *therefore* ineffective) teachings. The older quality of *g-yung drung bon*, as eternal and indestructible, is further specified as changeless: *g-yung drung 'gyur med bon*.³⁹ Part of the latter phrase also occurs in a related context of truthfulness, when *gShen rab* defends his non-violent ways (no hunting), against *bDud Khyab pa lag ring*, as the practice (*spyod pa*) of *ma 'khrul bden pa'i bon* (unerring true Bon), which he then, most curiously, explains as protecting the eternal and changeless realm or empire:⁴⁰ apparently true, eternal, and changeless Bon equals defending the eternal empire! This may reveal some of the real-life implications (or aspirations) of truthfulness and effectiveness.⁴¹ Of course, *g-yung drung bon* also frequently appears as a reference to a body of ritual lore (like *gyer*; also attested in Dunhuang sources)⁴² or corpus of teachings, apparently with four gates.⁴³

³⁹ P.97.3; cf. also *g-yung drung mi 'gyur gyur* (sgo), on 146.4.

⁴⁰ P.98.2: *g-yung drung mi 'gyur rgyal srid skyongs*, cf. Karmay.47b.4f: *g-yung drung ma 'gyur rgyal sras spyod*.

⁴¹ Cf. PT16.35r1ff: \$ /: / *thang du gtsigs kyl gtsug lag khang bzhengs par mdo gams kyl kham kyi dbang po rnam kyls dkon mcog gsum la mcod cing yon phul ba 'dI'i bsod nams dang / byin gyl riabs kyis [35r2] lha btsan po rje blon 'khor dang bcas pa'I sdig pa thams cad nI byang / bsod nams dang ye shes kyl tshogs nI yongsu rdzogs nas chab srId mjal dum g-yung drung du brtan sku tse rIng zhing lha dang myl'i bde skyid [35r3] phun sum tshogs pa la gnas te / bla na myed pa yang dag par rdzogs pa'I byang cub lhun gyls grub par smon to / /*

PT16.35v2ff: *'o lde spu rgyal gnam gyl lha las myl'I rjer gshegs pa yong gls sku bla gnyan / chab srId che / chos bzang / gtsug [35v3] lag che bas yul byung sa [ngod (/dod)] tshun cad rje'I gdung ma gyurd te / chab srId g-yung drung du brtan zhIng che ba'I bka' drIn chen pos phyogs bryad du khyab par khebste / ...*

PT16.40v1ff: *thugs sgam dbu rmog brtsan ba'I rje blon thugs la 'phrul dgongs phas rgya drug 'jang las stsogs pha [40v2] bar du bka' myl mnyand pa yang 'bangs gnyug ma dang 'dra bar rnal du phab nas dbu rmog brtsan la chab srId che ba'I 'dab la phyogs par gsol nas / mjal dum gyi gtsigs bcas nas [40v3] rdo rIngs la brIs / gtsIgs kyl gtsug lag khang bzhengs nas so kham kyl khrom nI dal / yul chen po'I dbus skyid cing dar par bgyIs pa 'dI las bka' drIn che ba ma mcis pas srI zhu dang bka' [40v4] drIn dran ba'I mtsan pa tsam du dkon mchog gsum la yon ba'I bsod nams kyls / bod rje blon 'khor dang bcas pha sku tshe dang mnga' thang g-yung drung du grub la bod kham na phas kyl dgra dang 'khrug pa'I myl gragste /*

⁴² PT1136.56ff: *nub gsuM bon gshen bon du bsgyerd na sang 'gi nam nangs na 'geg lug nag po dang 'geg ra rgya bo la bdud dgu ni bdud du bor zhing [57] mchis / / lcam lho rgyal byang mo tsun gi mgul nas / / rtsi dag gnag chig grol ching mchiste zhal mdangs dkar ni sla re 'od de zhal dang [58] bzhad pa lta zhing bzhugs nas / / yab rtsang ho de'i hos bdag gis shid du ni gtang 'tshal 'brang du ni gzugs 'tshal zhes gsung nas [59] rgyal thag bryad bas*

Present-day bon po-s take care to distinguish g-Yung drung bon from so-called unreformed 'old Bon' and, since approximately the 18th c. AD, also from gSar bon; while stressing the point that the latter *au fond* also are Bon. The distinction specifically of gSar bon obviously is a more recent concern (and one which also is not on the forefront of explanations shared with an outsider). But in reference to the distinction of contemporary Bon from 'unreformed' varieties of Bon, such as may still be preserved in its lower vehicles, bon po-s seem to have retained memories of developments of early *phyi dar* Bon identity discourse. There is a fair chance that the term *g-yung drung bon* in early Bon discourse was originally coined precisely to set it apart from this-worldly goals and apotropaic rites of 'unreformed' Bon, such as that mentioned nebulous (and probably (re)invented) pre-imperial entity '*dur bon*', which, even though it is referred to in Dunhuang sources, we mainly know from later historiography on earlier periods and from later *gter ma* literature such as the *Dur chog* and *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* rites. g-Yung drung bon thus sets itself apart as a reformed and nirvanic variety of Bon, which instead strives toward (a state of) release or liberation, here apparently characterised as *g-yung drung*. Needless to say, these are goals that accord well with *phyi dar* Buddhist sensibilities, but it is interesting that *phyi dar* bon po-s elected a term so obviously associated with 'vile' eternalism.

When it appears in an old context, we therefore may have to translate g-Yung drung bon as 'Nirvanic Bon' rather than as 'Eternal Bon'. Thus an old (i.e., older than Bon) Tibetan translation term for the Buddhist *summum bonum* was elected as *the* Bon shibboleth, which may even be a phonetical rendering of a Chinese loanword!

Continuing the Discussion:
gShen and Bon in Early Bon Sources

Back to our brief survey of the early history of gShen rab stories: the Dunhuang gShen rab(s) character, who in many stories does indeed appear slightly senior (Stein 1988:44), for understandable reasons makes it into the role of founder, while his colleagues in narrative, such as the Dur gshen rma da (na)-type of *gshen*, seem all but forgotten.

la bchas se gru bzhi lung du brtsiste / yab kyis do ma ra ni bkra la bya drangso / |. Cf. PT1134.124: *bon gang gis / ni / bgyerd / ...*

⁴³ P.109.2f: *g-yung drung bon sgo bzhi* (Karmay.52b.2 omits *bzhi*), at the mention of the *ma brtag pa'i dgra bzhi*.

Quite contrary to later usage, the *Dur gshen* type even occurs slightly more frequently in old ritualistic Dunhuang-period sources than does the *gShen rab(s)* type of ritual specialist. Considering the great importance of healing and death ritual in that literature, this should hardly come as a surprise. '*Dur*' refers to tombs and funerary rites after all, associated with controversial blood sacrifices, a Buddhist anathema. It is probably for this reason that the old '*dur gshen*' funerary type ritual specialist was eventually marginalised; for example: banished, in a most telling way, to the specific contexts of the exceptional funerary rites of those somewhat eccentric '*dur gter ma*' cycles, such as the *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* and '*Dur chog*', which are attributed to Ku tsha zla 'od (sPa ro find, perhaps of the 11th c. AD) or to Thog thog lhung lha. It is telling indeed that the *rMa da*-type *gshen* should rise to prominence once again precisely in these self-proclaimed '*dur*' rites.

These late '*dur*' death ritual cycles consciously seem to court—and perhaps also to a certain extent reinvent—that good old & powerful, but controversial '*dur*' funerary expertise, to be used, eccentrically, especially for cases of violent, sudden, or accidental death (*gri 'dur*). I was told—in fact by the very recipient of this felicitation volume—that '*dur*' rites would not be considered appropriate for ordinary deaths.⁴⁴

Dur gshen rma da (na) also occasionally reappears in other, later Bon sources, such as, the *mDo chen po bzhi* (in all three titles), in the *Srid pa rgyud kyi kha byang*⁴⁵ and the *Kun 'bum*.⁴⁶ In the *mDo chen po bzhi* we incidentally encounter very interesting spelling variants: instead of *rma da* we also find *rma lo*⁴⁷ and *rma bo* (more on these elsewhere).⁴⁸

⁴⁴ More on this follows in my forthcoming volume on *Antecedents of Bon Religion in Tibet*, which deals with continuity and change in Bon funerary doctrine at the turn of the first millennium. See now also Bellezza, 2008 and cf. n.4 above: he makes extensive use of these *Mu cho'i khrom 'dur* and attempts to embed his findings of material remains in (north-)western Tibet, particularly those pertaining to funerary culture, in this and other Bon sources via his trade-mark 'exegetically enhanced' readings of non-Buddhist Dunhuang funerary texts.

⁴⁵ E.g., p.31.7 of the Dolanji MS (cf. p.314.6 in the *Bon bKa' 'gyur* III version of the *mDo 'dus*).

⁴⁶ In the *Kun 'dul lcags lha*, p.353, the name '*dur gshen rmad da*' appears as one of the eight great protectors (*skyobs pa chen po*). All of these will be discussed in detail elsewhere ('Location' volume).

⁴⁷ *sNod rten 'byung ba chags 'jig pa'i mdo*, p.144.2, and *Srid pa kham s gum sems can skye mchi'i mdo*, p.124.5: '*dur gsas rma lo*.

⁴⁸ *Bla med go phang sgrub thabs*, p.486.3, and *sNod rten 'byung ba chags 'jig pa'i mdo*, p.60.6 and 148.5: '*dur gsas rma bo*. These clusters of names will also be discussed in the forthcoming monograph on the 'location' of origin of Bon and the significance of the *rMa* name in its history of ideas.

These first oblique Dunhuang references to a gShen rab(s) character—in a sense of course unfortunately⁴⁹—appear rather off-centre, compared to the opposite far western corners where the heartland of Bon is usually visualised.⁵⁰ Thomas (1957) feels that he has good reason to believe that, language-wise and narratologically, some Dunhuang sources are of local origin and he therefore assumes that some passages may in fact have originated in that very north-eastern quarter of the Tibetan empire. It should indeed be obvious that Dunhuang narratives and their elements partly may not only have been *recorded* in north-eastern Buddhist Dunhuang, but may in fact also have *originated* there and not in a traditionally presumed western heartland of Bon. I now emphatically refer to the origins of individual narremes and not to the early locations in which these narremes later were incorporated into the narratives that eventually fed into Bon master narratives and *phyi dar* Bon identity discourse.

Some narrative content of Dunhuang sources may indeed gravitate on north-eastern Tibet for the simple reason that the narratives were around in that area. While, because of its proximity and availability, local cultures thus may have left a more significant stamp on the library than those from other quarters of what was then becoming Tibet, and while the first narremes on gShen rab(s) were preserved somewhat off-centre, we nonetheless have reason to believe that what was collected in the Tibetan Dunhuang caves reflects narrative traditions that were prominent in wider Tibet, also for instance in southern

⁴⁹ Imagine finding such caches in areas where Bon later was most prominent!

⁵⁰ As I will argue in the 'Location' volume, through examination of narratives and by tracing individual narremes through various non-Buddhist Dunhuang and early Bon sources, we are able to localise a proto-heartland of 'Bon' (if there ever was such an entity beyond its literary tropes) much closer to Central Tibet than has generally been assumed. Analysis of Dunhuang sources yields a cluster of names and narremes, the central elements of which, quite serendipitously, receive surprising independent confirmation from later Bon sources, which are usually overlooked. The exact topographical locations that go with the names are still unclear; the descriptive parts are not entirely consistent and also not completely inconsistent. This may be because, as the master narrative developed, the location moved westward. In any case, the heartland 'trajectory' seems to lie mainly within the ancient rTsang chen river area, probably somewhere between rKong po and the Kailas area. But what look like the earliest layers in Dunhuang narratives may even put it squarely in present-day dBus.

The deliberations on the (personal) use of the word *bon po* in Dunhuang Tibetan and early Bon sources also already anticipate on that conclusion: this is where the really good *bon* and *gshen* ritual specialists are from!

quarters.⁵¹ Important evidence testifying to the presence or survival of narratives of that ilk in other areas of Tibet does occasionally surface, such as in the *Klu 'bum* (cf. Stein 1971), in some of the texts that were recently recovered from dGa' thang 'bum pa in southern Tibet (Pasang Wangdu 2007), and in other Bon sources as well.

The scattered narrative relics from Dunhuang most likely reflect wider narrative traditions, which formed the point of origin of later, self-consciously Bon legends about a *ston pa* called gShen rab mi bo.⁵² The *ston pa* variety of the name of the founder is first attested in the *Klu 'bum* and thus starts developing no earlier than the early Buddhist *phyi dar*. This is the time that non-Buddhist interest groups felt challenged to show to the world a suitable founder who could outshine that other famous *ston pa*, the historical Buddha of successfully emerging *phyi dar* Buddhist sects. Work within the *Three Pillars of Bon* research scheme on the available sources confirms the obvious and ubiquitous observation that, like for other pillars of identity, also for narratives on the founder we cannot but observe that the quantum leap into self-consciously Bon narratives takes place at the turn of the first millennium AD.⁵³

From that turning point onward, stories not only gain narrative weight and complexity, but also acquire a distinct identity vector. Ritualistic narrative traditions evolve into the type of teaching hagiography and identity discourse that we still find reflected in extant recensions of the 'biography' of the founder of Bon, the *mDo 'dus*⁵⁴ and, in a more developed manner, in the *gZer myig*⁵⁵ (and *gZi brjid*). A good starting hypothesis would therefore be that the *mDo 'dus* and *gZer myig* use a comparable matrix of oral and written traditions of narratives regarding a gShen rab(s) figure, the earliest written records of which we find in Dunhuang sources.⁵⁶

⁵¹ In any case, I am far from arguing that the heartland of Bon would be anywhere near Dunhuang (cf. Beckwith, PIATS 2006). The fact that about the only pre-tenth c. AD non-Buddhist Tibetan sources that we have, hail from the Dunhuang area and the fact that obviously much material of local relevance ended up in those caches, should not seduce us to conflate the two, and assume that the haphazard preservation of references to non-Buddhist culture in an eccentric location recommends that eccentric location as the centre of that non-Buddhist culture.

⁵² See Stein 1988, cf. Karmay 1975 and Spanien/MacDonald 1978–79.

⁵³ See the 'Location' volume of the *Three Pillars of Bon* programme.

⁵⁴ In one volume, Karmay (1975:176f) presumes parts may date back to the 10th c. AD or before. See Blezer 2008, "William of Ockham, Jan van Gorp and Tibetan Studies" and Gurung, forthc. PIATS 2006.

⁵⁵ Usually in two volumes; according to Karmay (1975:177) to be dated around the 11th c. AD or earlier.

⁵⁶ See, e.g., Blezer 2008, "William of Ockham, Jan van Gorp and Tibetan Studies". More elaborate discussion will appear in a forthcoming Ph.D. thesis on the creation

It is at this point in time that the grand narratives on gShen rab and Bon really take off. They start to 'get organised' and develop, they breed and split like amoebas, in conjunction with the formation of Bon as a cluster of more or less consciously non-Buddhist interest groups in Tibet. As far as the structure and complexity of the stories goes, there is a considerable gap between narratives reflected in Dunhuang sources and those contained in hagiographical sources of the turn of the first millennium.⁵⁷ But, as said, the older paradigm also remains productive in later times, e.g., in then still developing *Klu 'bum* collections, which continue the older Dunhuang narrative paradigm and develop it further (as is clearly indicated by the mentioned use of the title *ston pa*, "teacher"), but also in other, later (often ritualistic) texts.

Later hagiographical collections made use of narratives that were 'around'. The main narratives of later hagiography, such as the *mDo 'dus*, still are of the crisis management type, but the paradigm appears more elaborate now and also includes elopement (nb. of gShen rab), occasional construction work, and the like as stock elements. The typical elaborated story paradigm features gShen rab, now styled sTon pa, going or being invited abroad, resolving a crisis, teaching, and bringing home a bride as a prize. The Dunhuang layer of narratives barely carries a vector of (collective) identity, while, on the other hand, the later *phyi dar* hagiographical layer is clearly and consciously narrating towards a religious founder and a separate Bon cultural and religious identity and thus clearly reflects the emergence of an 'organised' form of Bon religion (however factionally and regionally disjointed and apparently disorganised).

The narrative develops further into the humongous 14th-c. AD *gter ma gZi brjid*.⁵⁸ And as legends grow, the date of birth of the founder seems to move back in time and even out of time, to the preternatural, eventually ending up in the Indian Palaeolithic; thus 'out-originating' the historical Buddha by a landslide. mKhan chen Nyi ma bstan 'dzin (b. 1813) in his *Chronology of the Teachings (bsTan rtsis)* dates gShen rab to 16.016 BC (see Kværne 1971)!

of the myth of the founder of Bon, by Kalsang Norbu, within the *Three Pillars* research and publication scheme.

⁵⁷ Which are styled *Dus gsum* [founder] *'byung khungs kyi mdo*, with varying indications for the "founder": *sangs rgyas*, *ston pa*, *bde gshegs*, cf. Blezer 2008, "William of Ockham, Jan van Gorp and Tibetan Studies".

⁵⁸ Up to 12 volumes, traditionally believed to have been 'dictated' in vision to Blo ldan snying po (b.1360).

**Second Part: The gShen rab Marriage Stories in the *mDo 'dus*:
The Expanded 'Expedition Abroad' Narrative**

Now let us look at some samples for the gShen rab narrative paradigm of the extended type in the *mDo 'dus* and examine how these relate to the more limited Dunhuang paradigm and to each other. As said, the later, more developed sTon pa gShen rab mi bo narrative paradigm is also of the crisis management type. It typically takes the form of an 'expedition abroad'-narrative. It occurs in several stencilled variants, which, because of their topographical implications, I will discuss in more detail elsewhere ('Location' volume).⁵⁹ Those expanded narratives have been preserved in the *mDo 'dus* and also in the larger hagiographical collections, the *gZer myig* and *gZi brjid*. I will here only briefly discuss these stories in their briefest and presumably (read: apparently) least edited form, such as they appear in the *mDo 'dus*. Six expeditions and marriages are mentioned here (see Appendix II), involving the daughters of:

1. the King of Hos (Dang ba yid ring;⁶⁰ main narrative in *mDo 'dus* chapter 9);
2. the King of dPo' (main narrative in chapter 10);
3. the lHa (only brief mention in chpt. 6 and 18);
4. the gSas (only brief mention in chpt. 6 and 18);
5. the King of rKong po (Central Tibet; main narrative in chpt. 12);
6. Kong tse (main narrative in chpt. 11).⁶¹

⁵⁹ One reason to look more deeply into the possibility of cloning of the expedition abroad narratives in early Bon hagiography and summarily include that discussion in the 'Location' volume is because those excursions abroad also map out the topographical environment of the narrative centre of the gShen rab myth and thus also reflect back on the narrated heartland of Bon, *casu quo*, 'Ol mo lung ring, Khyung lung dngul mkhar, and indirectly also on Ta zig and Zhang zhung. The likelihood of a stencilling of the marriage stories is prone to have consequences for the perceptions of the topographical and political realities that are referred to in the stories as well.

⁶⁰ This probably is a fictional character. Note that a *rgyal chen po hos dang ba yid ring* is also mentioned in one of the *mDo chen po bzhi*: the *Bla med go 'phang bsgrub thabs*, on p.365A: *Bla med go 'phang bsgrub thabs*, on pp.364.7ff: *sngon gyi skal pa dang po la/ yul mchog 'dzam bu gling gi snying pa/ stag gzig gi yul/ 'ol mo lung ring gi lho phyogs/ gshin rje'i gling khrod ba ma che'i mtsho gling nal dur bya dang / dur seng dang / dur stag dang / zhags pa can dang / gnam la 'chong ba dang / nag la skem pa dang / lcags ri la nye ba rnams/ gdug par byed pa'i yul de nal ri gtsug rum 'bar ba bya ba yod do/ grong khyer lang ling chen pa bya ba yod do/ rgyal po chen po hos dang ba yid ring gi bya ba yod do/ slob dpon chen po drang srong gtsug gshen rgyal ba bya ba/ rgyal po chen po la btsun mo phyza 'gu ling ma ting bya ba/ sras rgyal buy id de ring mo dang/ gsal ba ring mo bya ba/ bu mo gsal dga' yid gtong shes bya / ... See also the discussion of Ho de'i hos bdag later.*

The Lha and gSas merely occur in listings of marital alliances and their contexts are not narrated in the *mDo 'dus*; the others are fully narrated 'expeditions abroad'. Another early source, the *bsGrags pa rin chen gling grags* (Dolanji MS, Khedup Gyatso, p.29:1) does not even mention the Lha, gSas, and Kong tse episodes. It only mentions marriages with the Hos, dPo', and rKong za. The basic plot and main character types of the episodes are very similar and are entirely comparable to the simpler Dunhuang paradigm. It may be interesting to note that in the *mDo 'dus* the pairs of offspring or relatives show remarkably little individuality. The cardboard pair of rMa lo & g-Yu lo (relatives), for instance, usually acts as one entity and is of uncertain, if not confused, descent (more on that in the 'Location' volume). Their artificiality is clearly apparent and so is that of the Lung 'dren & rGyud 'dren (dPo') or the gTo bu & dPyad bu (Hos) pair (offspring), whose names refer to familiar pairs of doctrinal and ritual elements. They may even have entered the respectable gShen family tree as textual corruptions. In any case, all appear the artificially construed, ideal-typical, male kin and offspring of a great man. Comparison of the four main stories suggests that all may be calques from one of two prototypes: either the brief story of rKong po provided the prototype or, perhaps, the typologically similar Hos story (which in its narremes eventually might relate to old rTsang instead).

gShen rab in rKong po

Among the successful marriage exploits of the great man and teacher gShen rab, the rKong po prototype certainly stands out because in some of its referents—even though not in its plot!—it could possibly be (partly) historical. The rKong po story provides the briefest version of an expedition-abroad narrative with little elaboration, embellishments and inserts. In its referents, it also appears most securely seated in history. The historicity of the King of rKong po, rKong rje dKar po rmang po rje, is relatively firm: he already meets us in early written

⁶¹ Note that the '*Dul ba gling grags* (p.117.7ff), attributed to rMa (ston shes rab seng ge) 12th c. AD?, mentions some of the above kings: (in a long list ...) *de nas rgya pa'i dus gsang [118] ba 'dus pas ston pa mdzad/ de dus khri shes dkar po thugs kyi sprul pa las! rgyal po drug sprul pa las! gdung rgyud kyi rgyal po drug gang zhe na/ dmu gshen lha'i dung rgyud/ shag gar gsas kyi bdung rgyud/ hos nam gsas kyi rdung rgyud/ dpon [dpo'] gsas kyi rdung rgyud/ rgya dgod gsas kyi rdung rgyud/ gnyan kha 'gying gi rdung rgyud/ ...* Namgyal Nyima Dagkar in his Graz article connects these kings with Ta zig, it is not sure what that deduction is founded on (as far as this passage is concerned): it is not at all apparent from the context in the '*Dul ba gling grags*. Also the *Srid pa rgyud kyi kha byang*, p.307.4, refers to six kings, in connection with the *yab bdal drug*.

sources, such as the rKong po inscription (Richardson, 1985:64ff) and Dunhuang sources (e.g., PT1060, PT1285–87 and ITJ0734). It is interesting to contemplate that this reference to a rKong rje dKar po might incidentally preserve the same trace of a date for the narrative origins of the gShen rab character as does the narrative outlook of relevant Dunhuang sources: it also points to approximately the 8th c. AD, for the matrix from which narrative elements were drawn.

The Confucius or Kong tse story may have been incorporated into this cycle of ‘expedition abroad’ and marriage stories merely because of (structural) similarities with the rKong po story. That marriage episode, too, is not listed in the *Gling grags* text (Dolanji 29:1); it therefore looks like a later addition. (rGya) Kong tse ‘phrul gyi rgyal po (rGya = China), as a name, seems to be a conflation of a transliteration and a translation. The Chinese (rGya) Kong or Keng tse is a story character known from similar narratives preserved in Dunhuang, in Tibetan and Chinese,⁶² but also from a later Mongol version,⁶³ and from other Chinese versions that surfaced more recently in China (19th c. AD; for the latter see Soymié, 1954). The Tibetan name obviously transliterates the Chinese name Confucius (Kong Fuzi, 孔夫子), but it here denotes a king (*rgyal po*) and story character without significant Confucian associations. The character Kong (孔) is rendered by Kong or Keng. Stein argues that it has to be read as “sage or divine being, possessing supernatural powers” and that this in turn has been translated into Tibetan as ‘*phrul* or *sprul*’ (Stein, 1973:417). In the Tibetan version of the Chinese name Confucius: Kong tse ‘phrul gyi rgyal po, a phonetic rendering (Kong tse) thus appears to have been joined to a translation of the same (‘*phrul*).

In the process of assimilation of the Kong tse story, Tibetans may however have read “Kong” as a toponym, similar to “rKong” or rKong po in rKong rje dKar po. It is very well possible that the main reasons for including this particular narrative in the *mDo ‘dus* are the match in ‘toponymical’ (r)Kong names and some other, more structural similarities in the narratives as well. The form in which the story eventually appears in the *mDo ‘dus*, definitely shows similarities with

⁶² See Karmay’s (2000:169ff.) article: “The Interview between Phyva Keng-tse lan med and Confucius”; who bases himself on the *gZer myig* version of the story and studies its relation to the older Dunhuang versions. Cf. now also Shen yu-lin in RET 12, 2007 and Kalsang Norbu in the proceedings of the first *International Seminar for Young Tibetologists* in London (2008).

⁶³ That Mongol version apparently derives from a Tibetan one that probably was not earlier than the 13th c. AD, which suggests that there may have been other Tibetan versions around.

the rKong po story, such as the crisis paradigm, important construction work (temple in the sea and the central caste called Khyung lung rngul mkhar—its founding is in fact *only* mentioned in these two stories), and, of course the marriage exploit. There also is a more subtle associative, somewhat tangled fabric of motifs perceptible in the narrative and in references elsewhere, which somehow involve the Kong or Keng tse name. In Tibet, the Kong or Keng tse name is connected with astrological and other practical skills or wisdom.

In this light, a description of Yid kyi khye'u chung in *mDo 'dus* (p.59.6): *Yid kyi khye'u chung rdzu 'phrul can* [60] *yi ge 'phrul slag sku la gyon/* deserves comparison to the attempted explanation of the name of Kong tse 'phrul gyi rgyal po on the basis of *gab tse* astrology in the *gZer myig* and *gZi brjid*. In the *gZer myig* Kong tse 'phrul gyi rgyal po is said to have been born with special signs.⁶⁴ In the *mDo 'dus*, *rdzu 'phrul can yi ge 'phrul slag*—a magical (*rdzu 'phrul can*) fur coat (*slag pa*) with magical ('*phrul*) letters (*yi ge*)—may derive from a phrase used elsewhere: '*phrul gyi yi ge 'phrul* and *lag* (hand), in reference to astrology:⁶⁵ the magical letters of *gab tse* astrology on the palm of the hand (*lag*) of Kong tse, in the Yid kyi khye'u chung narrative, in transmission, changed into a coat (*slag*) with magical letters.

The Kong tse or Confucius story may have been 'just one of those narratives that were around' at the north-eastern borders of Tibet, at the time that the sTon pa gShen rab hagiography started to develop: probably simply too good a story to ignore. In spite of the somewhat serendipitous nature of the inclusion of the Chinese Kong tse story into the *mDo 'dus* gShen rab repertoire, its presence should also alert us that for understanding the gShen rab character, Chinese connections may occasionally also need to be pursued.

⁶⁴ See the edition of the *gZer m(y)ig* Tsering Thar, Beijing 1998 (1991), chapter 13, p.536.11ff: ... *lag pa g-yas g-yon gyi mthil la/ gab rtse'i 'phrul gyi yi ge sum cu rgyal rtags su 'khor bar bris nas chags pa/ de la yab kyang shin tu spro ba skyes nas/ mtshan gsol pa nil rgyal po rgya'i rigs la 'phrul gyi yi ge gab tse sum cus 'khor bar bris pas/ rgya kong tse 'phrul gyi rgyal por ming btags so.*

⁶⁵ Cf. also the *gZi brjid*, Dolanji *dpe cha* edition, vol.11, chapter 50, p.1891ff, which apparently does not locate the letters on the palms of the hands (in fact it is not clear from the text where exactly they are supposed to manifest): ... *rkang mthil na 'gyur ba med pa'i g-yung drung shar ba/ ...* [189.3] ... *shin tu yang mtshan dang ldan pa lags na/ 'phrul gyi yi ge sum cu bris pa zhig snang ba/ mtshan yang rgyal po rgya yi rigs kong rtse 'phrul gyi dbang yig can zhes bya bar btags so/ ...*

gShen rab(s) in rTsang:

Hos dang ba yid ring, rTsang Ho de'i hos bdag and His po his bdag?

Already in Dunhuang sources, a Lord of Hos appears in the immediate narrative environment of a gShen rab(s) myi bo figure. Here too, gShen rab(s) myi bo comes to the aid of a Lord of Hos (and his son). In the second part of PT1136 we find a 'healing/funeral' narrative in which a lord from rTsang (chen), Jo bo rTsang Ho de'i hos bdag, and his son, variously called sMa bu, rMa bu, and Smra bon zing ba'i zing skyes, are involved in securing proper funerary service for their unfortunate daughter and sister. This story also involves a marital alliance with a Lord from Gu ge (rkang phran), which apparently is not entirely successful and leads to the lady's misfortune. The similar clustering of narremes in the simpler Dunhuang version of the story may therefore render it a very likely candidate for the construction of the expanded Hos-story in the *mDo 'dus* or for the other marriage stories.

We therefore need to look into the Jo bo (Lord) of rTsang, called Ho de'i hos bdag, of PT1136. There appear to be problems, particularly concerning names. These problems seem to be the result of conflation and condensation of story elements over time, so typical of orality. The name Hos bdag, 'Master of (the) Hos', clearly suggests a ruler of an area or people called Hos, such as indeed also meets us later in *mDo 'dus* chapter nine. But if his son is named sMa, rMa or sMra bu (zing ba'i zing skyes) and if rMa would have to be understood as a toponym, then the reading of his name could be problematic. One would rather expect something like rTsang or Hos bu. Compare, for instance Hos za, for the name of the married daughter of the King Hos (Dang ba yid ring), in the *mDo 'dus*, where all this appears in more polished form.

As has become evident in a detailed study of the uses of *smra/rma/sma* in Dunhuang sources (forthc. 'Location' volume), the fact that *rma* might also function as a toponym, at least elsewhere, is not at all unlikely.⁶⁶ As such the name may have migrated from stories originating in the rMa chu (river) area in far north-eastern Tibet to other narrative contexts. Yet, most likely, the name sMa/rMa bu in PT1136 does not specifically mean son of a man from the rMa chu area anymore, but in this narrative, in a different geographical context, the name may have assumed the meaning of *myi bu*, son of man, more or less in a mythical sense, as also invoked in ritual recitation, such as in

⁶⁶ The uses of *rma* of course do not necessarily need to match in all text locations.

smrang and *rabs*, a genre that the stories under discussion definitely pertain to. This argument is developed in greater detail elsewhere, the middle-length version (*'bring po*) of which will appear in an edited volume on *Emerging Religions, Breaking the Paradigm* (of traditional historiography) and a full-length version (*rgyas pa*) in the 'Location' volume. The main conclusions of that research, I have resumed in Oxford, for an invited lecture, which may come on-line soon.⁶⁷ PT1136 and a couple of other Dunhuang sources are very important for our understanding of the development of gShen rab(s) and its narrative environment, including visualisations of a heartland of Bon.

Coming back to the name *hos*. Based on its occurrences in Dunhuang sources, it seems very unlikely that *hos* in Hos bdag is to be taken as a toponym. PT1136 and IOL734, suggests that Ho de'i hos bdag is a narrative variant of the name His de chen po (father and king) and the deity's (or king's) name His po his bdag, both of which appear in IOL734 (cf. Thomas 1957:IV:52ff.); or *vice versa*. In IOL734 meets us another group of stories that involve similar 'rMa' characters. *Hos* there appears a variant of *his* and I therefore should advise against digging into *hos* for further realia. But this orthographic manoeuvre of course merely shifts the burden of a 'breathless' (*his*) exercise in toponymy from *hos* to *his* (or *vice versa*). The narreme may have been around for a while. This is a fine example for how clusters of names (central Tibetan Hos and originally Eastern Tibetan rMa) migrate and are transmuted.

The migration did not stop here. The *mDo chen po bzhi* and *mDo 'dus* may erroneously derive *hos*, as if it were a toponym, from older narratives about a Hos bdag in rTsang, as are preserved in Dunhuang texts. The reading of *hos* as a toponym in the name of the king that in the *mDo 'dus* is called Dang ba yid ring, creates the need for to a locality called Hos and thus gave rise to a novel narrative entity: six Hos mo islands: Hos mo gling drug.⁶⁸ But here too, we see that 'new' often merely implies 'newly recycled' in accordance with pre-existing names and sensibilities. The *mDo 'dus* Hos mo gling reconstruction of Dunhuang-period *hos* narremes, incidentally, also seems to indicate that the rTsang area, where the Hos bdag in the Dunhuang precursor hails from, relates to Hos mo gling and perhaps to the nearly homophonous 'Ol mo gling!

⁶⁷ Oxford University Faculty of Oriental Studies, *Numata Distinguished Guest Speaker Series: The Advent of Buddhism in Tibet*, March 7th 2008: "Narrating the Centre of Bon: Narrating Bon out of the Centre".

⁶⁸ Cf. the *Kun 'bum khra bo bzhus pa'i dbu phyogs* (tentative dating 13th c. AD or younger), p.30.6, where these six islands are located in the north-eastern direction of gShen yul 'Ol mo lung ring (p.28.3f).

This is a conclusion that we also reached independently, in the above-mentioned middling and long versions of our discussion of the topographical implications of narrative elements. Early indications for a proto-heartland of Bon are more centrally in Tibet. Hos mo gling and 'Ol mo gling originally may have been related narrative entities that both were associated with a proto-heartland of Bon, but that at some point went separate ways. The *mDo 'dus* king of Hos, like gShen rab, in its literary construction might thus also refer to a fictional character.

A 'great king' Hos dang ba yid ring also appears in one of the *mDo chen po bzhi*.⁶⁹ In an elaborate geographical layout he is placed in the city Lang ling, south of sTag gzig gi yul 'Ol mo lung ring,⁷⁰ located in the heart of Yul mchog 'Dzam bu gling. Incidentally, that is also the place where, according to the *gZer myig*, gShen rab's father, rGyal bon thod dkar, first spotted his lovely wife rGyal bzhad ma, gShen rab's mother. It is well known that the *mDo chen po bzhi* live from the same fount of stories as the *mDo 'dus* (Blezer 2008, "Ockham").

The Open Ends of *Hos* and *Bon*

But the Hos story does not end with the narrativisation of Dunhuang-period precedents into the expanded expedition abroad narratives of Bon hagiography on its founder. In fact, it seems that later tradition, in its narrative reconstructions of pre-tenth century themes from 'non-Buddhist' founts that it considered suitable for this purpose, has very closely followed the leads—say: native narrative vectors—that the original contexts provided or suggested, not only to these later, increasingly self-conscious bon po-s in the early *phyi dar*, but to us still. Thus, not only do we see the new major narrative vectors of Bon identity-discourse arise, together with those, we also see minor vectors appear, which look like vestiges as it were, of original contexts of the recycled narrative elements, which were retained as significant.

If we carefully study later perceptions and connotations of *hos*, we have reason to believe that emerging bon po-s perceived the Hos narratives on gShen rab(s) myi bo—as they presently are still reflected in PT1136—as being inextricably close to gShen rab(s) and the origins of their own tradition and identity.

⁶⁹ See the *Bla med go 'phang bsgrub thabs*, chapter one: 'Chi bdag zlog byed kyi mdo las Gling bzhi'i le'u, pp.363–6, esp. p.365.4. The passage is quoted above at the expedition abroad narratives (see the King of Hos).

⁷⁰ The *Kun 'bum* also locates Lang (ma) ling to the south of 'Ol mo lung ring: p.30.5 and p.59.3f. (Lang ling).

Besides the inclusion of *hos* narremes into later sTon pa gShen rab hagiography, another telling sign is that, perhaps already shortly after its incorporation into the first Bon legends and myths on a founder—at least from the twelfth century AD—the word *hos* even moved to the very centre of Bon, as a general, abstract, and presumably Zhang chung term for a bon ritual specialist,⁷¹ which was also believed to cover many of the other meanings of *bon*.⁷² The connection between the Lord of Hos and gShen rab(s) apparently was perceived to be so close—as in narratological analyses they indeed turn out to be—that later traditional scholars have had to conclude that *hos* and *bon* are

⁷¹ Already in the 12th c. AD, Hos started to shift from its original and specific ‘location’ in narrative, of a clan name or toponym, a usage also still reflected in the *mDo ‘dus*, to a more generic qualification for Bon. See for example the *rGyud thugs rje nyi ma’i man ngag ye shes zang thal*, a text included in the *bKa’ ‘gyur rgyud sde’i skor*, vol.VI, pp.455-560, Dolanji 1972. This text was discovered by Gu ru rnon rtse (b. 1136 AD), whose Buddhist name according to the volume introduction is supposed to be A ya bon po lha ‘bum. In an interesting list of lexical equations (pp.500f), on p.500.2 there appears lists for *bon* and *gshen*: *zhang chung skad du hos/ me nyag skad du rog rog/ bru zha’i skad du rung smar / bod skad du bon/ zhang chung skad du u pa ya/ me nyag skad du ni lde hrangs/ bru zha’i skad du zang zang lha/ bod skad du gshen/*.

⁷² Another possibly relatively early reference we find in the highly interesting *Ka ba gling dgu*, collection, of nine volumes in Vol.Ca, Vol.50 of the Mongyal Lhasay (III) edition (this is Vol.53 of the Bon *bKa’ ‘gyur*, 203ff. in the 1991 edition, arranged by Ayong Rinpoche). According to the *dKar chag* of Bla ming g-Yung drung tshul khriims dbang grags (b.1868), this cycle of nine texts was extracted from the red *mchod rten* at bSam yas by two A tsa ra (p.108: *a tsa ra rnam gnyis kyis bsam yas mchod rten dmar po nas thon pa’i ka ba gling dgu las ...*). On pp.33.1ff: (Ayong ed.: ff.17r.1ff) we read that the ‘Bar ba’i klong gyi ston pa answers and teaches Rin po chen snyan gyi khye’u chung po on the spontaneously arising *hos* teachings from the vast expanse of the primordial dimension: *spyir na hos bya ba ni/ bon gyi bye brag shes pa yin/ bon gyi bye brag ma ‘gag pa yin/ dung phur [millions] bya ba rnam drangs yin/ rdol ba’i rdol thabs bsam mi khyab/ rig pa rdol nas shar tsam na/ hos rdol ces kyi de la bya/ g-yung drung hos kyi sgom bu ni/ lta ba rang ‘byung la zer/ lta ba rang ‘byung klong chen ni ...* This passage is revealing for later uses and constructions of *hos* but also for the contested issue of *rdol bon*.

A late digest of these developing sensibilities appears in the *rNam bshad dka’ gnad rab gsal*, by the abbot of sMan ri, mKhan chen Nyi ma bstan ‘dzin (b. 1813 AD), published in the *Shes rab kyi bla na med par phyin pa mngon par rtogs pa’i rgyan las skabs dang po’i rnam bshad tshig don dka’ gnad rab gsal*, *The Bonpo Approach to Prajnaparamita*, pp.57-406, Vol.I, Dolanji 1985. On p.92.5 Nyi ma bstan ‘dzin writes: *hos zhes bya ba ni/ ye srid g-yung drung bon gyi gsang mtshan lta bu yin te/ ston pa’i phyag mtshan/ bla gur/ rten rdzas rnam la/ hos ru dang/ hos gur/ hos cha zhes sogs gsung pa dang /*. Not only is *hos* equivalent with *bon*, with *g-yung drung bon* even, it also lends its name to sTon pa gShen rab’s attributes, his staff tent etc. (quote from Dagkar’s contextual ZZ dictionary). The Hos ru is discussed in chpt.26 of the ‘*Dul ba yongs rdzogs rnam dag sdom byed kyi rgyud* (in ‘*Dul ba rgyud drug*, *Bon bKa’ ‘gyur* III, Vol.3, pp.425.5–28.3, reference by Dan Martin).

near-synonyms, be they perceived as words from different languages: presumably from Zhang zhung and Tibetan.⁷³

The Hos clan of Hos mo ling drug is then construed as being associated with Zhang zhung as one of its ancient priestly tribes, in analogy to the way that the dMu and gShen clan eventually become associated with 'Ol mo lung ring: Hos apparently was perceived as being so central to gShen rabs and 'Ol mo lung ring that, with the passage of time and after many recastings of Bon origins—and *after* Zhang zhung had moved to the centre of Bon identity—it almost became a multiform of the Bon master narrative. Apparently this could happen in spite of the fact that the Ho de'i hos bdag, in his original context, was marked as a Lord of rTsang. Discussion of his location should also be tied in with my analysis of the location of *yul chab kyi ya bgo*, also mentioned in PT1136 (and PT1060), discussed elsewhere.⁷⁴

⁷³ It is interesting that while *hos* is visualised as a Zhang zhung word, *bon* is considered a Tibetan exonym!!

⁷⁴ I first presented these ideas during the Bonn 2006 IATS (paper forthcoming). While Bellezza then still passionately disagreed with me, I may have been more convincing then, than I surmised. I proposed to read *yul chab kyi ya bgo* and *yar chab rtsang po* (probably a comparable entity, that appears in the *mDo 'dus*, p.102.2ff., Khedup Gyatso edition) as the area defined by the upper divide or headwaters of the (Yar lung rTsang po) river in old rTsang chen. Bellezza interrupted the proceedings of the panel and pointed out that, in his view, *yul chab kyi ya bgo* could not possibly mean that. He strongly felt that it is abundantly clear from the following passage in PT1136: the mention of the marriage of a Lord of Gu ge (rkang phran), that *yul chab kyi ya bgo* should be located in Guge, in western Tibet. During the discussion session, the next day, he explained that, certainly considering the mention of a large marriage party, the wedding should be visualised as taking place in Guge, and that *yul chab kyi ya bgo* therefore should also be located in western Tibet, probably even west of Kailas, near Guge (likewise PT1136 and its rituals).

I use that passage in the forthcoming IATS paper together with some other, related passages, notably PT1060, to argue for a more central location of the Khyung lung castle. The reference to the headwaters of the Yar lung rTsang po curiously seems to place matters in the upper reaches of that river, in old rTsang chen, broadly conceived—as it has to be in the imperial period: somewhere along the rTsang po, between central Tibet and Kailas & Tise. In my reading of PT1136, the Lord of Gu ge came to *yul chab kyi ya bgo* to woo a local lady, lCam lho rgyal byang mo tsun, so the scene setting of the events and hence *yul chab kyi ya bgo* are somewhere in rTsang (chen), where the Lord of rTsang and his daughter are from.

While Bellezza and I did not manage to come to an agreement there and then, I am both honoured and surprised to read that he chose to publish my Bonn thesis after all, and not to pursue his own opinion on the matter. Bellezza now also cites the same PT1060 passage in support. But, alas, he subsequently forgot to disambiguate his translation sufficiently (p.528 reads: “Well then, [her parents] elected to betroth lCam lho-rgyal byang-mo tsun to the lord of the people of Gu-ge, in the river country of the upper headwaters”). What is worse, he does not draw the

Within the current narratological analyses, these kind of literary appropriations and recastings of 'Bon's' perceived past may provide revealing insights into the construction and genealogy of religious historical knowledge. Reflection on the construction of the narratives reveals some of the sensibilities according to which older narremes are reassembled into new narrative structures and contribute to new master narratives: it shows which traditional links are respected and eventually even cultivated, such as Hos-gShen rab(s), and which associations later authors feel obliged or at liberty to ignore, such as the connection Hos-rTsang. The rise of Ti se-centred Zhang zhung sacred geography, in which, probably somewhere around the time of construction of the *Gling grags* narratives, matters Bon become connected to Zhang zhung, Ta zig etc., does not allow the Hos name to remain attached to its early rTsang origins. This is not so much topographical negligence but the simple logic of religious narrative that prioritises expression of particular structures and potentials for meaning over historical and geographical fact. It certainly constitutes a problem or even contradiction to modern sensibilities of space and time, but it may simply be 'the right thing to do' in terms of logic of religious myth.

Conclusions

Considering the narrative proximity of the Dunhuang and *mDo 'dus* Hos stories, their general proximity to the *mDo chen po bzhi*, and the perceived importance of the Hos name and the *hos* type, I should

logical conclusion from that new insight into the *yul chab kyi ya bgo* location and does not adjust his argument accordingly, as would definitely be needed! If the main plot of that section of PT1136 is really in rTsang, it cannot, as Bellezza (2008:522) argues, be adduced as important evidence for the Zhang zhung associations of death rituals engaged in that passage.

This is not an isolated incident, it holds for most of the evidence Bellezza adduces in his section III. The cosmetic redecoration of evidence and exegetical interpolation and enhancement mark that whole section. The main early sources adduced, mostly do not compellingly require—or even allow—being associated with Zhang zhung; in fact, most do not even mention it (which Bellezza occasionally duly notes, but then quickly glosses over). Elsewhere he goropises the argument by invoking as a supporting hypothesis a stark conspiracy theory: references to Zhang zhung were systematically left out in sPu rgyal Buddhist dominated literary production (2008:203f). Even apart from the fact that one should be extremely cautious engaging auxiliary hypotheses, considering that he mainly deals with Bon and non-Buddhist Dunhuang sources, this is also not a very plausible scenario! This assumption seems to resonate with markedly partisan, anti-Buddhist sentiments that regularly crop up in the book.

indicate the Hos story as the most likely prototype for the marriage exploits in the *mDo 'dus*. PT1136 even involves an arranged marriage! After all, the earliest gShen rab hagiography is traditionally classified under the *mDo chen po bzhi!* Even though the rKong po story arguably presents the briefest form of a later expedition abroad paradigm, for the reasons mentioned, I should still prefer to identify the Hos story.

Because of preceding publication and ongoing research (Stein 1988 and Kalsang Norbu) it would probably be both unnecessary and premature to write into the conclusions that sTon pa gShen rab is a *phyi dar* literary invention that goes back to non-Buddhist ritualistic narratives of the end of the first millennium AD; but here it is, just in case someone might have missed that.

What probably intrigues me most is that we are actually able to observe how, at the beginning of the *phyi dar*, old narremes and names are recycled into new narrative contexts that self-consciously reflect emerging Bon identity. The master narratives and identity vectors are new but the narrative elements, more often than not, are not.

It is also clear that a smattering of context and various religious, historical, and literary sensibilities remain connected to migrating narremes and determine whether and how they eventually are incorporated into new contexts and master narratives. A clear example for this is the vicissitudes of the controversial *Dur gShen rma da* name.

Generally, we get a sense of how Bon narratives emerge at the turn of the first millennium AD and also start to appreciate which traditional sensibilities rule historiographic (re)constructions of identity narratives of that ilk, simply by studying how early Bon identity discourse is consciously assembled from pre-existing antecedents, which are genuinely believed to belong to a pre- or in any case non-Buddhist and 'indigenous' past—to use that despicable "i"-word, at least once. Clearly not everything that could fit the story frame goes.

There also is a notion that the literary void from which Bon emerges as a writing tradition at the beginning of the second millennium in Buddhist Tibet may not be that empty after all. To some that is perhaps reassuring. The sparse disparate reflexes and relics of the preceding period that are preserved in Dunhuang sources present an off-centre, fragmentary, but at least relevant and real record. This allows one to extrapolate to a more complete matrix of rituals and narratives that may have existed at the time, in oral and written forms, and may have informed emerging Bon, perhaps in a manner quite similar to the dynamics of construction that we have analysed here, for the *mDo 'dus* expedition-abroad narratives and their Dunhuang precursors.

Abbreviated Bibliography

- Bacot, Thomas, and Toussaint (1940–46), *Documents de Touen-Houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*, in *Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque des études*, Vol.LI, Paris 1940–46.
- Baxter, W.H. (1992), *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, in *Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs* 64, Berlin/New York 1992.
- Bellezza, J.V. (2008), *Zhang zhung: Foundations of Civilisation in Tibet*, in *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Denkschriften*, 386. Band, Wien 2008.
- Bielmeier, *Das Märchen vom Prinzen Čobzaň*, 1985 Sankt Augustin.
- Blezer, H.W.A. (forthc.), *The Three Pillars of Bon: Doctrine, 'Location' & Founder, Volume I: Doctrine*, Part I: **Antecedents of Bon Religion in Tibet** and Part II: *Tibetan Texts*, in *Brill's Tibetan Studies Library*; volume I of a series of three, forthc. Leiden 2009;
- (forthc.), *The Three Pillars of Bon: Doctrine, 'Location' & Founder, Volume II*, Part I: **Location of Origin** and Part II: *Apparatus*, in *BTSL*; volume II/III, forthcoming Leiden 2009;
- (forthc.), *Breaking the Paradigm: Emerging Religions*, forthc. Leiden: Brill 2009;
- (forthc.), "The Bon of Bon: Forever Old", in *PIATS 2003: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Oxford 2003, forthc. Bonn 2009;
- (forthc.), "Creation of a Myth: The Zhang zhung Empire of the Bon po-s: Khyung lung dngul mkhar" in *Emerging Bon (PIATS 2006)*, forthc. 2009;
- (2008), "William of Ockham, Jan van Gorp and Tibetan Studies: Some Notes on Dating the *mDo 'dus*", in ... edited by Jean-Luc Achard, forthcoming CNRS: Paris 2008;
- (2007), "Heaven my Blanket, Earth my Pillow—Wherever Rin po che Lays his Head down to Rest is the Original Place of Bon", in *Acta Orientalia*, Vol.68(2007):75–112, Havniae: Munksgaard.
- Gong, Hwang-cherng (2002), *Selected Works in Academia Sinica, Language and Linguistics Monograph Series No. C2-2*, pp.379-99, Nan-kang, 2002.
- Chu Junjie (1991), "A Study of Bon-po Funeral Ritual in Ancient Tibet: Deciphering the Pelliot Tibetan Mss 1042", in *Theses on Tibetology in China*, pp.91–159, ed. by Hu Tan, Beijing 1991.
- Dotson, B. (forthc.), "Bon and Gshen in Old Tibetan Ritual Texts", forthcoming in *JAOS*.

- Futterer, K.J. (1901), *Durch Asien: Erfahrungen, Forschungen und Sammlungen, während der von Dr. Holderer unternommenen Reise*, in three volumes, Berlin 1901.
- Haarh, E., *The Yar-lun Dynasty, A study with special regards to the contribution by myths and legends to the history of Ancient Tibet and the origin and nature of its kings*, København 1969.
- Haller, F. (2004), *Dialekt und Erzählungen von Themchen: sprachwissenschaftliche Beschreibung eines Nomadendialektes aus Nord-Amdo*, Bonn 2004.
- Horlemann, B. 2002, "A Re-evaluation of the Tibetan Conquest of Eighth-Century Shazhou/Dunhuang," in H. (ed.) & Zadoks, A. (ass. ed.), *Tibet, Past and Present: Tibetan Studies I (in PIATS 2000: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Leiden 2000, pt.1)* in BTSL, vol.2, pt.1, pp.49–65, Leiden 2002
- Kalsang Norbu Gurung, (forthc.), "The Role of Confucius in Bon Sources", in the proceedings of *The First International Seminar for Young Tibetologists* in London (2008).
- Karmay, S.G. (1975), "A gZer-mig version of the Interview between Confucius and Phyva Keñ-tse lan-med", in *The Arrow and the Spindle*, pp.169–89, Kathmandu 1998 (first in *Bulletin of the School of African and Oriental Studies*, XXXVIII.3 (1975), pp.562–80, London 1975);
- (1983), "Un témoignage sur le Bon face au bouddhisme à l'époque des rois tibétains", in *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy, Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Symposium held at Velm-Vienna, Austria, 13–19 Sept. 1981*, Vol.2, Wien 1983;
- (1998), *The Arrow and the Spindle: Studies in History, Myths, Rituals and Beliefs in Tibet*, Kathmandu 1998.
- Kværne, P. (1971), "A Chronological Table of the Bon po the bsTan rtsis of Ñi ma bstan 'jin", *Acta Orientalia*, Vol.XXXIII, pp.203–82, Havniæ 1971.
- Lalou, M. (1947), "Documents de Touen-huoang", in *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques*, Vol.VIII (1946–47), pp.217–26, Bruxelles 1947;
- (1953) ed. & trsl., "Rituel Bon-po des funérailles royales (PT 1042)", *Société Asiatique, Manuscrits de haute Asie conservés à la bibliothèque nationale de Paris (Fonds Pelliot) I*, Paris 1953;
- (1958), "Fiefs, poisons et guérisseurs", in *Journal Asiatique*, Vol.CCXLVI :157–201, Paris.

- MacDonald, A. (1971), "Une lecture des Pelliot Tibétain 1286, 1287, 1038, 1047, et 1290, essai sur la formation et l'emploi des mythes politiques dans la religion royale de Sron-bcan sgam-po", in *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, pp.190–391, Paris 1971 ;
- Spanien (Macdonald), A. and Imaeda, Y. (1978f), *Choix de documents tibétains conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris 1978f.
- Mathews, R.H. (1931), *Chinese-English Dictionary*, Cambridge 1943(1931).
- Martin, D.P. (2000), "Comparing Treasuries: Mental States and Other *mDzod phug* lists and passages with parallels in Abhidharma works by Vasubandhu and Asaṅga, or in Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras, A Progress Report", in *New Horizons in Bon Studies*, edited by S.G. Karmay and Y. Nagano, *Bon Studies* 2, *Senri Ethnological Reports* 15, pp.21–88, Osaka 2000.
- Pan Wuyun (1997), Hou Yin Kao, *Minzu Yuwen* 5:10–24.
- Pulleyblank E.G. (1991), *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver 1991.
- Richardson, H.E. (1985), *A Corpus of Early Tibetan Inscriptions*, in the James G. Forlong Series, No.XXIX, Royal Asiatic Society: London 1985.
- Sagart 2007, L. "Reconstructing Old Chinese uvulars in the Baxter-Sagart system", version 0.97 of a paper presented at the 40th ICSTLL, Haerbin, 27th–29th of September, 2007.
- Shen yu-lin (2007), "The Tibetan Image of Confucius", in *Revue d'études tibétaines* 12:105–29, Paris.
- South Coblin, Weldon (1986). *A Sinologist's Handlist of Sino-Tibetan Lexical Comparisons*, in *Monumenta Serica monograph series* 18, Steyler Verlag: Nettetal (Tyskland) 1986;
- (1991), "Studies in old Northwest Chinese", in *Journal of Chinese Linguistics, Monograph Series*, No.4, Iowa;
- (1994), "A compendium of phonetics in Northwest Chinese", in *Journal of Chinese Linguistics, Monograph Series*, No.7. Iowa;
- (2007), *A Handbook of 'Phags pa Chinese*, Honolulu 2007.
- Soymié, M. (1954), "L'entrevue de Confucius et de Hiang T'o", in *Journal Asiatique*, Vol.CCXLII (1954), pp.311–92, Paris 1954 .
- Stein, R.A., (1970), "Un document ancien relatif aux rites funéraires des Bon-po tibétains", *Journal Asiatique*, Vol.CCLVII, pp.155–85, Paris 1970;
- (1971), "Du récit au rituel dans les manuscrits tibétains de Touen-houang", in *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, pp.479–547, Paris 1971;

- (1973), “Un ensemble sémantique tibétain, créer et procréer, être et devenir, vivre et guérir”, in *Bulletin of the School of African and Oriental Studies*, XXXVI.2:412–23, London 1973;
- (1983–92), “Tibetica Antiqua I–VI, Part I: Les deux vocabulaires des traductions indo-tibétaine et sino-tibétaine dans les manuscrits de Touen-Houang (1983:149–236); Part II: L’usage de métaphores pour distinctions honorifiques à l’époque des rois tibétains (1984:257–72); Part III: A propos du mot *gcug lag* et la religion indigène (1985:83–133); Part IV: la tradition relative au début du bouddhisme au Tibet (1986:169–96); Part V: La religion indigène et les *bon-po* dans les manuscrits de Touen Huang (1988:27–56); Part VI: Maximes confucianistes dans deux manuscrits de Touen-houang (1992:9–17), in *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême orient*, vols LXXII–V, LXXVII, LXXIX.1, Paris 1983–92.
- Tafel (1914), *Meine Tibetreise: eine Studienfahrt durch das nordwestliche China und durch die innere Mongolei in das östliche Tibet*, Stuttgart 1914.
- Takata (1988), 敦煌資料による中國語史の研究：九・十世紀の河西方言 / 高田時雄 著 | トンコウ シリョウ ニ ヨル チュウゴクゴシ ノ ケンキユウ : キユウジュ ッセイキ ノ カセイ ホウゲン (*A Historical Study of the Chinese Language Based on Dunhuang Materials: the Hexi (河西) Dialect of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*), 東京: 創文社, 1988.
- Tsering Thar, *gZer mig*, Beijing 1998 (1991).
- Thomas, F.W. (1935–63) ed. & trsl., *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Part I: Literary Texts (1935); Part II: Documents (1951); Part III: Addenda and Corrigenda, with Tibetan Vocabulary, Concordance of Document Numbers and Plates (1955); Part IV: Indices (edited by Edward Conze 1963); London 1935–63;
- (1957) ed. & trsl., *Ancient Folk-Literature from North-Eastern Tibet, Introduction, Texts, Translations and Notes*, in *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst*, 1952, no.3, ed. by R. Hartmann, Berlin 1957.
- Pasang Wangdu (2007) ed., *gTam shul dga’ thang ’bum pa che nas gsar rnyed byung ba’i bon gyi gna’ dpe bdams bsgrigs*, Lhasa 2007.



Appendix I: *g-Yung* and 永, and on *Drung* and 中, 終 or 常

This appendix is meant to facilitate those who would like to pursue the hypothesis of possible early borrowing of Tibetan *g-yung drung* from Chinese. There are several combinations with 永, *yong*³, that we need to consider for tracing *g-yung drung* to Chinese vocabulary; not all are equally likely, however. Phonetically, the most eligible candidates are:⁷⁵

- 永中 *yong*³ *zhong*^{1/4}, a combination of Mathews 7589: *yung*³ and 1504: *chung*^{1/4}: the middle;⁷⁶
- 永終 *yong*³ *zhong*¹: = 永久 and 永远终止,⁷⁷ combination of Mathews 7589: *yung*³ and 1500: *chung*¹: the end, finally; death; the whole of; after all; still;
- 永常 *yong*³ *chang*², 7589.26: constantly: 永 *yong*³ (7589, *yung*³: perpetual; eternal; long; far-reaching) combined with 常 *chang*² (221, *ch'ang*²: constantly); and perhaps
- 永存 *yong*³ *cun*²: perpetual existence, cf. 永存性 *yong*³ *cun*² *xing*⁴ (7589.22: permanency, continuance): 永 and 存 *cun*² (6891, *ts'un*²: to be in existence).

But also see some semantically and partly also phonetically related combinations, such as:

- 永生 *yong*³ *sheng*^{1/5}, 7589.35 eternal life: 永 and 生 *sheng*^{1/5} (5738, *shêng*¹: life);
- 永遠 *yong*³ *yuan*³, 7589.44: perpetually, eternally, forever: 永 and 遠 *yuan*³ (7734, *yüan*³: distant in time & place);
- 永久 *yong*³ *jiu*³, 7589.7: perpetually; eternally: 永 and 久 *jiu*³ (1188, *chiu*³: finally, a long time).

Considering its semantics and even morphology, Tibetan *g-yung drung* may be a loan word. Chinese recommends itself as a likely source. But we should appreciate the timeframe and trace which phonetical values pertain to the periods in which borrowing is most likely to have occurred: probably at the end of the first millennium or before. Plausible-

⁷⁵ My thanks go to Bill Baxter, Chris Beckwith, Wolfgang Behr, Roland Bielmeier, George van Driem, Guo Hui, Felix Haller, Weldon South Coblin, Tsuguhito Takeuchi, and Jeroen Wiedenhof, who all in the best of academic tradition provided advice and important further leads. These preliminary notes could not have been extended without their expert help. I nonetheless assume full responsibility for any shortcomings and oversights.

⁷⁶ Perhaps 中 is here used phonetically?

⁷⁷ 永远终止, *yǒngyuǎn zhōngzhǐ*: "end forever", from *Hànyǔ dà cídiǎn* 漢語大詞典; reference and translation kindly provided by Bill Baxter.

looking phonetical values of modern Mandarin would first need to be related to (reconstructions for) Late or Early Middle and Old Chinese.

This is where the first problems for the hypothesis arise. Non-linguists cannot critically discuss Late Middle Chinese presentations as they appear in Pulleyblank (1991), but we should at least note their provisional nature and appreciate that there is considerable disagreement among specialists. Pulleyblank (1991) presents the following:

p.377: *yǒng*, 永, 85:5, M17088: Yuan *yŋ̊*, *juŋ̊*, Late MCh. *yajŋ̊*, Early MCh. *wiajŋ̊*, K764a: for a long time; perpetually, forever;

Cf. Baxter (1992:804): 永 *yǒng* < *hjwæŋX* (MCh) < **wraŋ?* (OCh) (764a): 9.1B, 9.2B, 9.3B;

Please note that Baxter's proposed OCh initial **wr* meanwhile has been hypothesised as **G^w(r)* (adapted from Pan Wuyun (1997:19), now also accepted by Baxter & Sagart);⁷⁸

Cf. Takata (1988:404f), based on Old Tibetan transcriptions of the 9th–10th c. AD Hexi dialect in north-western China, finds *weng*(2), *we*, *wen* and 'u';⁷⁹ he lists 切韻 (*Qie⁴ yun⁴*) transcription *x^wüŋ̊*, and for 河西 (*he² xi¹*), for the late mediaeval period, he reconstructs *ji^wü̃²*,⁸⁰

p.410: *zhōng*, 中, 2:3, M00073A, Y. *t_suŋ*, L. *triwŋ*, E. *truwŋ*, K1007a: middle, center; see also *zhòng*;

p.410: *zhōng*, 終, 120:5, M27372, Y. *t_suŋ*, L. *t_siwŋ*, E. *t_ɕuwŋ*, K1002e: end, finish; the end, forever;

p.50: *cháng*, 常, 50:8, M08955, Y. *t_s^haŋ̊*, L. *ʃjiaŋ*, E. *dziaŋ*, K725e: constant, usual;

And see also less likely formations (most of which need not be discussed any further):

p.67: *cún*, 存, 39:3, M06943, Y. *t^huŋ*, L. *t^huŋ*, E. *t^hwəŋ*, K432a: exist, remain survive;

p.280: *shēng*, 生, 100:0, M21670, Y. *ʃəŋ*, L. *ʃa:jŋ*, E. *ʃiajŋ/ʃe:jŋ*, K812a: be born; life; living, alive; fresh; raw;

p.387: *yuǎn*, 遠, 162:10, M39047A, Y. *qen̊*, L. *yan̊*, E. *wuan̊*, K256f: distant, far; see also *yuàn*;

p.161: *jiū*, 久, 4:2, M00118, Y. *kiẘ*, L. *kiẘ*, E. *kuẘ*, K993a: for a long time.

⁷⁸ Thanks to Wolfgang Behr for this reference.

⁷⁹ Cited by Takata from the TD, *Tiandi bayang shenzhoujing*. Thanks to Weldon South Coblin for clarifying this.

⁸⁰ Takata (1988) seems to support Pulleyblank's EMCh *wiajŋ̊*. Thanks to Chris Beckwith for this reference.

| 文言 | Modern, Pinyin | Early Mandarin | LMCh | EMCh | OCh | (Source) |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 永常 | yong ³ chang ² | juŋ ^ˊ tʂʰaŋ ^ˊ | yajj ^ˊ ʂfjaŋ | wiajj ^ˊ dziaŋ | | Pulleyblank 1991 |
| | | | hjwæŋX dzɣaŋ | | *wraŋgʔ dʒaŋ | Baxter 1992 |
| 永中 | yong ³ zhong ^{1/4} | juŋ ^ˊ tʂuŋ | yajj ^ˊ triwŋ | wiajj ^ˊ truwiŋ | | Pulleyblank 1991 |
| | | | hjwæŋX trjuwŋ | | *wraŋgʔ*k-ljuŋ | Baxter 1992 |
| 永終 | yong ³ zhong ¹ | juŋ ^ˊ tʂuŋ | yajj ^ˊ tʂiwŋ | wiajj ^ˊ tawŋ | | Pulleyblank 1991 |
| | | | hjwæŋX tʂjuwŋ | | *wraŋgʔ*tjuŋ | Baxter 1992 |
| 永存 | yong ³ cun ² | juŋ ^ˊ tʂʰuŋ | yajj ^ˊ tʂʰuŋ | wiajj ^ˊ tʂʰwəŋ | | Pulleyblank 1991 |

There clearly are problems with the hypothesis:

- 1) 中: *zhong*^{1/4}, L *triwŋ* and E *truwiŋ*, while phonologically close to Tib. *drung*, lexically is off, while 永中 is poorly attested in literary evidence and therefore is an unlikely source.
- 2) 終: *zhong*¹, while very similar in Mandarin, in L *tʂiwŋ* and in E *tawŋ*, does not relate well to *drung*. Lexically, the core of its semantic field (“end”) also seems less on the mark.
- 3) 存: The palatal affricate *cun*², L *tʂʰuŋ* and E *tʂʰwəŋ*, for quite similar reasons as in the previous option, phonologically is difficult to reconcile with *drung* (but perhaps only more so).
- 4) 常: *chang*², in spite of its vowel quality, may be the most likely candidate of all. The vowel discrepancy between L *ʂfjaŋ* or E *dziaŋ* and *drung* might be accounted for: one would ‘merely’ need to accommodate a vowel change from *a* to *u*. Depending on regional phonetic values of Tibetan *-u-*, which at least in modern eastern Tibet may approach *-a-*, this problem may well resolve itself on the receiving end; but that is of course not recommended procedure! Weldon South Coblin informs me that in very late medieval Chinese dialects of the Gansu corridor, the vowel of words like 常 became rounded and in Tibetan transcriptions were spelled *-o-*. Also noting that Old Tibetan made a sharp distinction between the vowels *-o-* and *-u-* in the finals *-ung* and *-ong*. Also, these late transcriptions postdate the pertinent period of ca. 600 AD by about 400 years. So South Coblin feels this may be a blind alley.⁸¹

There also are problems with 永. Baxter’s representation in ‘Qieyun’ Middle Chinese: *hjwæŋX* (pronounce: *wəŋ?* or *yəŋ?*) would seem to allow borrowing into what is later written as Tib. *g-yung* (*yuŋ* or *yəŋ*).⁸²

⁸¹ E-mail communication, July 19th 2008.

⁸² E-mail communication, July 18th 2008.

But Pulleyblank's bilabial *wiaŋʹ* and Baxter's OCh reconstruction **wraŋʹ?* contradict this (cf. his *wəŋʹ?* for *hɟwæŋʹX*). South Coblin, from his expertise on old north-western Chinese, also represents 永 as *ueŋ* (Qieyun *jwəŋʹ:*), in the relevant period of around 600 AD, i.e. the Qieyun period in the history of Chinese phonology.⁸³ Baxter and he moreover are in agreement with the important data procured by Takata, based on Old Tibetan transcriptional data: *weng(2)*, *we*, *wen*, and *'u* (see his Hexi reconstruction *ji^wäi[~]2*). Baxter and South Coblin in this context also both point to (*jyutping*) *wiŋ⁵*, in modern Cantonese.

South Coblin (*ibid.*) underlines that the pronunciations of *yong³*: *joŋ* or *juŋ*, for 永, where the main vowel is rounded and matches present Lhasa pronunciation of *g-yung* (*juŋ*), do indeed not appear in varieties of standard Chinese until later. The earliest orthographically attested one known is in 'Phags-pa Chinese.⁸⁴ Then one finds them in Ming and Qing times in Korean sinological and European missionary transcriptions of Guanhua from central & north China. This is of course rather (too) late for our concern. He therefore feels that the vowel similarity between modern standard Chinese pronunciation of 永 and (Old) Tibetan *g-yung* may be coincidental. Baxter also believes that the present-day Mandarin phonetics *yong³* (*juŋ*) for 永 may be relatively late: *yeŋ* > *yəŋ* > *juŋ*—*yəŋ* is what many Mandarin dialects have.⁸⁵

But apparently *weng* (and *wiŋ*) is not the only avenue open. Wolfgang Behr informs me that the MCh initial **hj*, which Baxter derives from OCh labiolaryngeal **wr*, following Pan Wuyun (1997), meanwhile is generally believed to derive from a labialized OCh uvular **G^w(r)*.⁸⁶ Laurent Sagart gives a list of reconstructions based on that initial **G^w*, which in his view indeed must have been inherently labial or labialised and in MCh thus primarily occurs in words with a rounded vowel or with a medial *-w-*.⁸⁷ The OCh initial **G^w* of 永

⁸³ E-mail communication, July 19th 2008; cf. South Coblin (1994), the Geng group, entry1062.

⁸⁴ South Coblin (2007:111), entry 38: *x̣yung* [*hyuŋ*]; 永 is listed at the tone *shǎng* (上).

⁸⁵ E-mail communication, July 18th 2008.

⁸⁶ This has been adopted into the Baxter-Sagart system, occasionally with slight modifications.

⁸⁷ In "Reconstructing Old Chinese uvulars in the Baxter-Sagart system", a paper read at the 40th ICSTLL, Haerbin, 27th–29th of September, 2007 (reference thanks to Behr), Sagart gives (OCh > MCh > Mandarin):

王 **G^waŋ* > *hɟwəŋ* > *wáŋ* "king" (WT *gong* "a superior one");

胃 **[G^w]ə[t]-s* > *hɟw+jH* > *wèi* "stomach" (WT *grod-pa* "stomach");

于 **G^w(r)a* > *hju* > *yu²* "go; at" (WT *'gro* "go");

preferably fed into Tib. *ga* and could not result in *ya* (in Tib. *g-yung*, pronounced as *juŋ*).

South Coblin (1986:105)⁸⁸ thus, based on such sensibilities, connects 永 to Tib: *rgyang* “distance” and the related *rkyong* “to extend, stretch, spread” (cf. Starostin).⁸⁹ Thus other connotations of 永: “long, far reaching” have fed into Tib. “distance” and “to stretch, extend”.

This may appear confusing: while, in reference to work in a relevant period in north-western China by Takata, South Coblin and Baxter propose that 永, **G^wrang?* through the Middle Chinese representation *hwæŋX*, fed into late mediaeval Hexi *weng*(2) and eventually into modern Cantonese *wing*⁵, there apparently also exists another possible avenue for 永, which leads from *G^wrang?* into Tib. *rgyang*. Would that perhaps open new possibilities for derivation of Tib. *g-yung* in the Qieyun period? But, needless to say, we took care to historicise Chinese phonology properly, but we should of course also be on guard against anachronisms in the pronunciation of Tibetan!

Probably since at least the 9th c. AD,⁹⁰ the prescript *ga*- in *g-yung* is not articulated anymore in Central Tibetan (it merely causes a shift to a high tone). But in Proto- and Early Old Tibetan, *g-yung* was still pronounced *xjuŋ* or *gjuŋ*. The ancient pronunciation has been preserved in eastern (e.g. Amdo-region)⁹¹ and western Tibetan (e.g. Balti)⁹² dialects,

越 *[G]at > *hwot* > *yuè* “transgress” (WT ‘*grod-pa* “to go, to travel”);

袁 *[G]a[n] > *hwon* > *yuán* “long robe” (WT *gon* “garment”).

Quoted from version 0.97.

⁸⁸ **Long/stretch (1):**

**gwljjang* -> + -x (Pre Chinese **gwljjangx* >) 永 OCh **gwjiangx* > *hwæŋ*;

Tib. *rgyong-ba brgyangs brgyang*: extend, stretch; *rgyang ma*: distance;

**gwljjang* -> stem: (Proto Tib. **gryang* >) *rgyang*.

⁸⁹ See now also on-line resources (Copyright 1998-2003 by S. Starostin) at the URL: http://starling.rinet.ru/cgi-bin/response.cgi?single=1&basename=/data/sintib/stibet&text_number=2557&root=config:

Proto-Sino-Tibetan: **q^wǎŋH* (r-).

Meaning: distant, stretch.

Chinese: 永 **wraŋ?* long, distant.

Tib.: *rgjaŋ*: distance; *rgjoŋ* (p. *brgjaŋs*, f. *brgjaŋ*): to extend, stretch, spread; *rkjoŋ* (p., f. *brkjaŋ*): to stretch, extend.

Comments: Coblin 105.

Cf. **q^wǎŋH*, **K^wǎn*.

⁹⁰ The earliest Old Tibetan inscriptions and written documents indicate that the prescript *ga* was not pronounced anymore in 9th c. AD Central Tibetan. Thanks to Tsuguhito Takeuchi for clarifying this (e-mail July 19th, 2008).

⁹¹ For examples for this cluster in the Themchen dialect from Northern Amdo, see Haller (2004:240):

which have remained largely oblivious to Central Tibetan reforms. One might therefore still attempt to connect OCh **G*^w to Tib. *g-yu* (note the labial (*u*) onset in both!) and thus relate OCh **gwjiangx* or **G*^w*rang?* to Proto or early OT *g-yung*: *xjuŋ* or *gjuŋ*. For *g-yung drung*:⁹³

| 文言 | (Old) Tibetan | (E) Mandarin | MCh | OCh | (Source) |
|----|---------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 永常 | <i>gjuŋ druŋ</i> > <i>juŋ druŋ</i> | <i>yǒng cháng</i> | <i>hwæŋX dzɿyɑŋ</i> | * <i>G</i> ^w <i>rang?</i> * <i>djang</i> | Baxter's with * <i>G</i> ^w |
| 永中 | <i>gjuŋ druŋ</i> etc. | <i>jwǎng tjuŋ</i> | | <i>gwjiangx</i> * <i>k-ljuŋ</i> | South Coblin 1985 |
| | | <i>yǒng zhōng</i> | <i>hwæŋX trjuwŋ</i> | * <i>G</i> ^w <i>rang?</i> * <i>k-ljuŋ</i> | Baxter's with * <i>G</i> ^w |
| 永終 | <i>gjuŋ druŋ</i> etc. | <i>yǒng zhōng</i> | <i>hwæŋX tsjuwŋ</i> | * <i>G</i> ^w <i>rang?</i> * <i>tjuŋ</i> | Baxter's with * <i>G</i> ^w |

Common sense would recommend lending considerable weight to Takata's conclusions on the phonetic value *weng*(2) of 永, found in transliterations pertaining to the in 9th-10th c. AD, relating to the 河西 (*he² xi¹*) dialect (cf. *ji^w ai⁻²*). This indeed is a corner of north-western China where Tibetan and Chinese intensively met, roughly in a relevant period. But, on second thought, one should also appreciate that any borrowing ought to be dated significantly before the earliest occurrences of *g-yung drung* in Tibetan inscriptions etc. The Zhol inscription already dates to approximately 764 AD. Dunhuang was not

NOUNS:

g-yag, Themchen *xjaχ*: castrated yak;

g-yu, Themchen *xjɔ*: turquoise;

g-yog po, Themchen *xjoχku*: servant;

VERBS:

g-yar, Themchen *xjar*: to borrow;

g-yug, Themchen *xjɔɕ*: to throw;

g-yol, Themchen *xju*: to keep off (sunlight).

⁹² For examples from Western Tibetan Balti (*xju*) see Bielmeier (1985:181). He kindly shared some examples by e-mail communication (July 22nd 2008):

hjaq beside *xjaq*—WT *g-yag*: yak;

xju—WT *g-yu*: turquoise;

hjoq beside *xjoq*: cover, quilt, WT *g-yogs*, and the verb *xjoq*: to cover, WT *g-yog*.

Bielmeier also points to a different development for the word for "lynx", which is simply *i* in WAT (Western Archaic Tibetan). The WT background is not clear, as we find the two spellings *g-yi* and *dbyi* in WT. Felix Haller (2004) noted that in Themchen WT *dby-* and *g-y-* seem to merge into *ghj-* (*gh* for the voiced velar fricative "ghamma"). Thus Themchen *ghjarkha*: summer < WT *dbyar kha* (cf. Haller (2004), Themchen 38), but cf. Balti *ghbjar*: summer < WT *dbyar* vs. *xja*: rust < WT *g-ya'*.

⁹³ Gong Hwang-cherng (2002) wrote on Old Tibetan *g-y-* and related questions. See esp. pp. 383ff: Tib. *g-y-* in his reconstruction represents a glottal stop onset plus glide: *?j-* (thanks to South Coblin for this reference).

conquered by Tibetans until 781 AD, or, at the earliest, in the 60s of that century: being besieged perhaps in the 50s and 60s (Horlemann 2002). Historical data, like phonetical data (shift *gjuŋ* to *juŋ*), therefore also make a loan as late as the Tibetan Dunhuang period seem unlikely. If *g-yung drung* was borrowed at all, it must have happened earlier, probably before the rise of literary Tibetan.

PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

1) Available historical linguistic and phonological data do not encourage derivation of the modern Lhasa pronunciation (*juŋ*) of the first syllable of Tib. *g-yung drung* from Modern Mandarin pronunciations of 永, *yong*³. Instead, most linguists, starting from a hypothetical Old Chinese reconstruction **G^wrang?*, prefer a phonological development that prioritises the bilabial quality of the reconstructed bilabialised uvular stop **G^w* into something that closely resembles Baxter's representation of the position of the syllable in the Middle Chinese system as *hɟwæŋX* and emphasise a development through a mid to lower-mid front unrounded vowel into something that may have sounded like *ueŋ*. This is a development that moreover is entirely compatible with the data acquired by Tanaka for the late mediaeval Hexi: *weng*(2). It can also be followed into modern Cantonese *wing*⁵.

At the same time, South Coblin and Starostin have formulated a possible loan of the syllable represented by 永 into Tib. *rgyang* etc. This seems to represent an entirely separate route, which prioritises another main quality of the reconstructed **G^w*: its quality as a uvular stop **G^(w)*. This alternate route would allow connecting 永 to a Proto Tibetan or Early OT pronunciation of *g-yung* as *ɟjuŋ* or *gjuŋ*, especially if the inherent bilabiality would later manifest as the vowel colour *-u-*. Following Sagart (2007), we have reason to believe it did. See, for example, his reconstructions for the arising of the *-u-* vowel following a *G^w(r)* initial:

于 OCh **G^w(r)a* > MCh *hju* > *yu*² "go; at" (WT 'gro "go");
 越 **[G]^wat* > *hɟwot* > *yuè* "transgress" (WT 'grod-pa "to go, to travel");
 袁 **[G]^wa[n]* > *hɟwon* > *yuán* "long robe" (WT gon "garment").

But note that on the Tibetan side this invariably results in a rounded *-o-* and *not* in a Tib. *-u-*. Perhaps this is comparable to the shift that South Coblin observed for *-ang* to *-ong*, but not to *-ung*, in late mediaeval dialects of the Gansu corridor. Perhaps we should visualise this second phonological route elsewhere, and not in north-western China?

2) The second character for a possible loan from Chinese remains even more uncertain. Even the most likely matches for Tib. *drung* in *g-yung drung*, such as: (永)常, (永)中, or perhaps also (永)終, all appear problematic in some way. Still, derivation of *g-yung drung* from 永常, even though it poses problems in the lack of bilabial colouring of its vowel and therefore is not deemed very likely, also cannot be ruled out completely. We should note that while the rise of a rounded *-o-* is in some situations attested for later periods, a Tib. *-u-* remains tenuous and hypothetical. Therefore, if borrowing from Chinese is tenable at all, given the available options, a loan from 永常, through (Baxter) **G^wrang?* *djang* seems the most likely scenario. But in any case, we would then be looking at a loan from Old Chinese into Proto or Early OT rather than a loan from some Tang-period Chinese into early literary OT.

More textual support on both sides would be needed to confirm anything at this point; but that would lead too far beyond our present concern. I nonetheless hope that these few notes may inspire more thorough and methodical investigations by specialists.



| APPENDIX II: THE MARRIAGE STORIES OF STON PA GSHEN RAB according to the <i>mDo 'dus</i> (Mongyal Lhasay's <i>Bonpo bKa' 'gyur</i> (III) edition = Khedup Gyatso MS edition, Dolanji 1985) | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Hos za rGyal med ma | dPo'u za Thang mo | lHa za Gung drug | gSas za Ngang drug | rKong za Khri lcam | Kong tse'i bu mo |
| hos za rgyal med 42.4, 203.4f hos za rgyal med ma 67.2, 179.6 hos za 192.5 | dpo' za thang mo 42.5f, 81.3, 100.6 dpo'u za thang mo 80.2f sring mo dpo'u zang thang mo 81.2f dpa'o za thang mo 100.1,3 dpa'o za 100.6, 101.2 dos za thang mo 179.6 dpo za 192.5f dpo za thang mo 203.6 dpon za thang mo 217.6 | lha za gung drug 43.1 lha za bzang drug 179.6 | gsas za ngang drug 43.2, 179.6 | rkongs za khri lcam 43.4 rkang za khri lcam 102.2 rkong lcam 108.3 , 218.2 kong za khri lcam 180.1 | 'phrul sgyur 43.6, 89.1 kong za 'phrul bsgyur 179.6f |
| (rtsang ho de'i) hcs (bdag): P1136.31-58 | | cf. Lha za gung (mo) tshun : IOL TIB J 731:44,47f = Thomas (1957:11&23): Text IA | | rkong rje dkar po: P1285.1094, P1060.88; rkong de dkar po: P1285.1019; rkong yul: P1285.1018, 1093, 1174, 1181, 1188, 2016, 2024, P.1060.88; rkong lha: P1285.1181f; (lha) rkong lha: P1060.88; rkong [g]shen: P1285.1094, 1181 rkong shin bu mo: P1285.1009; rkong brag: P.1285.2017; rkong?: P1285.2085; rKong po inscription: see Richardson 1985:64-71 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| A Chapter 6:36.5–45.2 #1 B Chapter 9:59.3–70.5 C - D - E - F Chapter 18:153.3–186.2 #4 G Chapter 20:190.6–195.2 H Chapter 22:200.6–212.4 I - | Chapter 6:36.5–45.2 #2 - Chapter 10:70.5–82.2 - Chapter 12:89–109.4 Chapter 18:153.3–186.2 #3 Chapter 20:190.6–195.2 Chapter 22:200.6–212.4 Chapter 23:212.4–220.1 | Chapter 6:36.5–45.2 #3 - - - - Chapter 18:153.3–186.2 #1 - - - - | Chapter 6:36.5–45.2 #4 - - - - Chapter 18:153.3–186.2 #2 - - - - | Chapter 6:36.5–45.2 #5 - - - Chapter 12:89–109.4 Chapter 18:153.3–186.2 #6 - - Chapter 23:212.4–220.1 | Chapter 6:36.5–45.2 #6 - - Chapter 11:82.3–89.4 - Chapter 18:153.3–186.2 #5 - - - |
| [A 6:42.4] hos za rgyal med khab tu bzhes/ sras ni gto bu 'bum sangs dang/ dpyad bu khri shes gnyis 'khrungs so/ bu mo gshen za ne'u chen 'khrung/ [42.5] | [A 6:42.5] dpa'o za thang mo khab bzhes pa/ sras ni lung 'dren rgyud 'dren dang/ bu mo gshen khye'u chung 'khrungs/ [42.6] | [A 6:42.6] de nas mgon gsum phya phul [yul] du/ gshen rab thugs kyis [kyi] [43] dgyes sde mo/ lha za gung drug khab tu bzhes/ mu cho ldem drug sras su 'khrungs/ de yang mu med bon la mkhas pas/ grang med cho rab shes/ dung gis ldem shing 'dzin/ mngon shes drug ldan no/ [43.2] | [A 6:43.2] gsas za ngang drug leg pa'i khab/ sras cig (... 'ol drug thang po 'khrung/) 'ol mo lung rings su/ sde drug bon la mkhas (... srid pa'i thang chod mkhas/) pa'o// [43.3] | [A 6:43.3] shes rab lam gyis dgyes sde mo/ bdud kyi rta phrog pa'i cham/ rkongs za khri lcam blang/ gshen bu rkang [sic!] tsha 'khrung/ mi rgyud de la grol/ ya ngal gyis gang lags/ [43.5] | [A 6:43.5] mu khyud bdal pa'i mtsho gling du/ kong tse 'phrul gyi rgyal po yis/ dge' skos an tse phyas byas de/ ston pa gshen rab mi bo'i/ bstan pa rnam gsum rjes bzhags mdzad/ kong tses bu mo 'phrul sgyur phul/ gshen bu [44] 'phrul bu thung 'khrungs ste/ 'phrul bsgyur rtsis la mkhas pa'o// [44.1] |
| [B 9] de nas ston pa gshen rab la/ hos dang pa [sic!] yid ring kyis zhus pa'i mdo'// de nas ston pa gshen rab nyid yab rgyal bon thod dkar la/ rin po che'i na bza' phul/ lha'i zhal zas phul byas ste/ yab myes rgyud gyis bon rnam nyon/ smrang rgyud 'bum la mkhas par gyur/ de nas gcung po | [C 10] de nas shes rab phul du byung ba'i/ ston pa gshen rab mi bo dang/ dpo [sic!] rgyal 'bar sgron zhu don mdo/ sdig can mi rgu drangs pa'i le'u/ ston pa gshen rab mi bo dang/ gnas mchog 'ol mo lung rings su/ me rtog tshal du bzhugs cing/ sras ni gto [71] bu 'bum sangs dang/ yab sras mjal cing | - | - | [E 12:101.5] de nas khyab pa lag ring gyis/ gshen rab dkor la cho 'phrul bstan/ bdud phrug shar ba rkya bdun gyis/ gshen rab rta bdun khyer nas song/ rkong po yul du rta rjes bstan/ kha ba sub mas rta rjes bcad/ nyi ma dgu shar kha ba bzhus/ [102] bdud ri nag po bon rir bsgyur/ la dor brag 'phrang rta lam | [D 11:82.3] de nas ston pa gshen rab la/ gsang ba mdo rgyud [sic!] kyi zhus pa/ e ma shes rab phul phyung ba'i/ ston pa thams cad mkhyen pa nyid/ kong tse 'phrul gyis rgyal po'i/ dgongs pa yongs su grub pa'i/ rgyu dang rkyen rnam ci ltar lags/ ces zhus/ ston pas bka' rtsal pa// kye ma |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>rma lo g-yu lo 'khrung/ bkra shis zhal sros mdzad pa la/ shar phyogs gling nas skyes bu cig/ sangs po 'bum khri'i sprul pa ste/ gshen za ngang ring ma'i sras/ yid kyis khye'u chung rdzu 'phrul can [60] yi ge 'phrul slag sku la gyon/ skos gyis chags [phyag] shing phyag na bsnams/ 'brug rta sngon po chibs su bcib/ ston pa'i mdun du shar gyis byung/ lha phyag 'tshal nas chags shing phul/ e ma ston pa thams cad mkhyen/ mi shes mun sel ye shes sgron// gsal ba'i 'od ldan ye shes spyan/ 'gro don gzigis la phyag 'tshal lo/ bdag ni yid kyis khye'u chung yin/ gshen rab tshang pa? bya'i [sic!] rgyud/ sangs po 'bum khri'i sprul pa ste/ 'gro ba 'dren pa'i thar lam can/ bdag la thar pa'i lam ston zhu/ ces zhus/ ston pas bka' rtsal pa/ yid kyis khye'u chung thugs rje can/ thabs kyis sprul pa'i rdzu 'phrul ldan/ 'gro ba 'dren pa thar pa'i bon/ g-yung drung mi 'gyur snying po long/ theg pa chen po'i bon la spyod/ lung 'dren rgyud 'dren? grol bar gyis/ [61] rgyal po hos kyis 'gro don spyod/ 'gu ling ma ti sgribs pa sbyangs/ de nas thog med</p> | <p>bon bshad tshe/ lho phyogs gling nas sgra snyan grags/ de tshe rgyal po 'khor tshogs cig/ ston pa'i spyan sngar shar kyis phyin/ 'dod pa dgu 'gyur nor bu phul/ lha phyag dgu 'tshal 'di skad zhus/ 'gro ba'i dpal ngon gshen rab mchog/ 'jig rten sgron ma skyes bu'i phul/ rnam pa thams cad mkhyen pa'i thugs/ / cir yang sa le sprul pa'i sku/ zhal mthong zhus pa'i don ched ni/ bdag ni rgyal po dpo'i [sic!] rigs/ dos [sic!] rgyal 'bar ba'i sgron ma can/ yul ni khri tang 'byams pa'i gling/ dge ba sha stag spyod pa'i sa/ de'i nub gling khri bu chung/ rgyal po 'phra mo khri 'od dang/ btsun mo khri btsun gsal mo la/ rgyal bu khri shang bya ba skyes/ rgyal bu khri shang glud du ni/ bran phrug khri shes bsad dgos skad/ spa gyim shang gong po[?] bon por bsnyags/ [72] ha 'da nag po bsad mi byas/ rgyal bu nad pas smras pa ni/ pha ma ngan pas bdag la phan du re ba dang/ mo bon rdzun mas za 'dod byas pa dang/ ha dha nag po shin tu glen pa dang/ bran phrug dag la rang dbang med pa yis/ 'di lta bu las ngan spyad pa yi ri mug/ ma rig gti mug mun pa'i rgyu/ mo bon cig rdzun mam</p> | | | <p>gtod/ lcag phub dgu phud brag ris phugs/ mda' drangs chu mig dkar po'i mkhar sgor slebs/ brag 'brang chu dor mda' lam btod/ rta brkus le lon rkong rje yis/ rkang za khri lcam gshen la phul/ shul lam yar chab rtsang po phyung// lha ri gyang dor zhal bdun bzhugs// shul dkar rtsang bya g-yung drung khar/ ston pa'i zhabs rjes btod/ khyung lung rngul mkhar brtsigs/ gshen bu rkong tsha de ru 'khrungs/ de nas ma pang mtsho la chags/ klu'i ston pa lo cig mdzad/ ti tse gang gi rtse mo ru/ ma sangs lha'i zhal dro drangs/ de nas slar yang 'ol mo gling/ khri smon lam rgyal bzher dag tu byon/ ston pas khyim spangs rab tu byung/ [102.6]</p> | <p>'dus pa'i 'khor rnams nyon// gang du 'dzam gling lho tshogs [sic!] nas/ rgyal po sa'i snying po la/ bu ni che ba rtag blo gsal/ de'i pha'i mgo bo bcad/ 'bring ba sdang sdems mchog/ de'i ma'i nu ma bcad/ bu chung [83] gsol [sic!] mchog dge ba spyad/ sngun [sic!] du pho bo gnyis che [sic!] 'phos te/ bdag ni rgyal bu sdig pa can/ klu srin nag por skye gyur nas/ gcung po dge ba spyod pa'i/ grogs cig byed pa'i smon lam btabs/ rgyal po gsal mchog tshe 'phos pas/ 'ol mo gling gis nub phyogs su/ yul na [sic!] rgyal lag 'od ma'i gling// mkhar ni khri sgo rtse brgya nas/ grong khyer 'phrul bsgyur bkod pa ru/ yab ka 'da ma gser 'od dang/ btsun mo mu tri gas 'od ma'i/ sras kong tse 'phrul gyis rgyal por skyes/ de dad pa bsod names dge stobs kyis/ mu khyud bdal pa'i mtsho gling du/ srin po stag gis [sic!] grog byed de/ gsas khang chen chen bzhing pa'i/ rlung rdor rje rgya gram gzhi la rmang [sic!] bris/ mtsho khar rming thon grub la nye ba la/ btsun mo gnyen lcam [84] 'od ma gsal/ g-yag [sic!] 'khor bcas pas tshor nas mthong/ gsang tshig yum la shor ba'i</p> |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>mngon sangs rgyas/ ces gsung lung bstan rab du thob/ re [sic!] rjes nub phyogs gling nas nas/ rgyal po 'khor tshogs mngon du byon/ lha rta dkar po ston pa la phul/ lha phyag 'tshal nas zhus pa'i mdo// e ma ston pa lha mis gto// bdag ni rgyal po hos kyis rigs/ dang ba yid ring bya ba lags/ yul hos mo gling drug dag nas 'ong// rgyu [sic!] las dang [sic!] pas sems bskyed de/ lam du tshogs bsags sgrib sbyangs phyir/ bston pa gshen rab gdan 'dren 'ongs/ yunkyis mchod gnas dag dus zhus/ ston pas thugs rje 'dzin par zhu/ ces zhus ston pas bka' rtsal pa// kye ma rgyal po dad pa can// bdag ni bar po so brgyad du/ bkra shis zhal sros byed pa'i/ nga dang 'dra ba'i slob [62] bu cig/ rgyal po'i mchod nas lo gsum gyis/ ces gsungs/ yid kyis khye'u chung/ tshu [sic!] bzang smra mkhan khye'u chung khyod/ g-yung drung gtsug gshen rgyal ba ste/ hos rgyal dang ba yid rang gyis/ lo gsum tshogs bsags mchod gnas gyis/ ces gsung/ khye'u chung zhal nas ni/ slob dpon lha'i bka' byung na/ dmyal bar gtong yang cha sems med/ bden pa'i</p> | <p>smin gyis/ rgyal bu khri shang shi rgyu la/ sdig can mi dgu ro dgu byung/ dmag mi sum stong las dbang gyur/ e ma las ngan mun byas yi ri mug/ ces smras yi mug skyes ste ngus/ bran phrug dag gis 'di skad do// // kye ma sems can skyes nas shi ba la/ ci ste me [sic!] bon bden 'gyur nas/ rgyal bu'i glud du nga 'gro nas/ rgyal bu mi shi sos pa na/ brag [sic!] phrug sdug pa shi ba rung/ ces pa'i tshig kyang brjod de 'dug/ de la rgyal bu dag gis pha ma yis/ brag [sic!] phrug sdug pa snying rje ste/ rgyal bu shi nas rgyal rab chad/ [73] rgyal bu sos pa'i thabs yod nas/ brag [sic!] phrug glud du gtong bas leg/ ces smras bran phrug glud du btangs/ brag [sic!] phrug sha btsen bzhin du bzungs/ mog pa rkang pa g-yas la 'then/ bon pos lag pa g-yas pa then/ ha 'da nag po snying phyung ste/ sha rnams glud du phyogs bzhir gtor/ mo bon khyim du phyin tsa rgyal bu shi nas 'dug/ mo bon skyeng ste lceb nas shi/ de rje bran phrug dag gis pha ma'i// ha 'da nag po'i snying phyung bsad/ de nas bran phrug a ma des// rgyal po 'phra mo khri 'od kyis// mkhar dang rtse mthon dag la zhugs/</p> | | | | <p>nyes pa yis/ srin po'i dmag stong the les btabs nas khyer/ de tshe mgon btsun phyi'i [sic!] grong khyer nas/ phyen [sic!] tse len [sic!] med thugs rje skyes/ kong tse 'phrul gyis rgyal po yis/ dge skos mtha' ru phyin bya'i phyir/ khye'u chung tsi ber dung 'phring [sic!] can du byon/ lha srin 'tshams kyis gzu'o [sic!] mdzad/ dge dang mi dge'i shen [sic!] phrag phyces// dge ba'i skos thebs lha mi rgyal gyur te// kong tse rgyal po yid rang rab tu thob/ dge ba'i skos mkhan an tse phyia la zhus/ de tshe lha bu yid ni smon lam skyes/ skyin gyi ral ga gyon zhing gser gyis ral gri thogs// klu'i bu tsa dung sprul thor gtsug can/ gsas khang brtsigs pa'i las ni nged kyis byed do zer/ de tshe srin po mya ngan dmod pa skyes gyis [85] ni/ srin gyis gsas khang brtsigs du/ rgyal nyid gsang tshig mnyam/ khye'u chung tsi ber can khyod/ slob dpon dgo'am ci/ ces pas/ a tse lan gsungs pas// lus rin po che 'od kyis dpe'i gzhi bting te/ thugs 'phrul gyis bang mdzod kyis don khog phub te/ dbang po nyi ma'i zer la bden lam drang/ rig pa gar spyin 'dra</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>bka' rtsal ston pa'i bka' / bdud dang srin pos mi gcogs nas / rang gis srog la bab gyur kyang / slob dpon bka' bcag mi srid pas / bdag ni ston pa'i gsung ltar bgyi / ces gsung // 'brug rta ston pa la 'bul / shing rta 'khor lo chibs su bcib / // khye'u chung hos mo gling la gshogs / chu bo gyim shang bya ltar rgal / yul ni hos mo gling drug byon / mkhar ni 'bar ba tse rgu nas / rgyal po'i 'khor kyis [63] bsu ba byas / tshogs bsags bsnyen bkur rga [sic] ston byas / de nas g-yung drung gtsug gshen rgyal ba des / ka 'da shel kyis brag phugs du / lo gsum hos gyis bla mchod byas / hos 'khor khrims dmag song ba'i tshe / btsun mo 'gu ming [sic] ma ti mas / slob dpon cig bu dro la drang / dro gsol bsngo ba byas pa ni / bdag g-yung drung gtsugs gshen rgyal ba nges // dpang po med par gro mi gsol / de ring dpang med tro [sic] gsol ba'i / dbang [sic] po drang strong ne tsos kyis / 'dod chags dug gis ru ma yin / 'khor ba'i sdug bsngal skyed shing ste / sgyu ma'i lus kyis chags pa spang / ces brjod slob dpon bron [sic] nas song / btsun mos rang gis skra bal nas /</p> | <p>der bran gyis rgyal sa bzung ba la / bdag rgyal po 'bar sgron 'phrag dog skyes / 'khor gyi dmag mi sum stong bsdus / mkhar phags bran 'phrug pha ma bsad / sdig pa dmags mi spyi'i khur / de 'dra'i las ngan byung [74] byung ba 'di / ci yi rgyu dang ci'i rgyu rkyen / 'bras bu ngan pa ci lta bu 'byung / drang na drangs thabs ci ltar lag / gshen rab ston pa nyid la zhu / ces zhus ston pa nyid la zhu / ces zhus ston pas gsang lam / rgyal po 'bar ba'i sgron ma can / khyod ni zhu don thab la mkhas / 'gro don mdzad pa'i bsam pa can / dge ldan sems la sdig mi 'gyur / de la nam yang ngan song med / ci ltar sdig cin [sic] mi dgu yang / sngon dus las spyod ngan pa las / smon lam ma dag rgyud las byung / rkyen ni sdig pa'i mams smin tshogs / 'bras bu ngan pa smin pa ni / de la rgyal bu khri shang ni / bsam pa bzang po'i gtan dag gis / sum bcu rtsa gsum lha ru skyes / lha bu dri ma med par skyes / bran phrug khri shes bsam bzang ste / dga' ldan lhar [75] skyes / khri shang ma ni bsam ba 'bring tsam ste / lceb pas chu bur can gyis dmyal bar skyes / khri shang ma ni bsam ngan ste / lcags kyis sog les lus</p> | | | | <p>ba'i tshig gis 'bru sbyar te / blo rig pa'i yeshes thams cad mkhyen bar shar / ljag 'phrul ldes phyas pas slob dpon dgos sam ci / ces pas srin poskyeng de song / der lha glu lha ma yin gyis brtsigs / de rming rtsal ldan srin gyis gyis brtsigs pas brten / bar gnyen po lhas btags pas brjid / nang rdzu 'phrul klus bris pas bkra / skos sgam po phyas mdzad pas legs / lag bsod ldan mis bla bas grub / byin bder gshogs lhas brlabs pas rgyas / [86] bstan pa rnames gsum rjes bzhag mdzad pas ni ngo mtshar ro / / de yang gas khang zhal sros su / ston pa gshen rab 'khor 'das spyan drong nas / sku yon gser gyi ban glang la / rin chen sna tshogs bstad dang / dar mtshon mdzes pa'i rmad gos phul / bkra gsal mdzes pa'i mchod sprin bsham // kar nag bkra gsal zhal sros mdzad // de tshe bdud ni gdug pa'i tshogs / phyogs bzhi dag nas bar chod brtsams / de'i tshe mtshan ldan khye'u bzhi yang / rmgams pa'i 'khro chen ru bzhi sprul / shar nas zo bo dbu dgu byung / byang na gze ma dbu dgu byung / nub na ru tso dbu dgu byung / lho nas rom po dbu dgu byung / 'jigs pa'i dbu dang</p> |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| <p>rgyal po la ni 'phra ma smras/ khyod kyis bla mchod tsod yod de/ dro drangs dus la nga la 'jus/ skyigs nas kho bdag bros so zer/ rgyal pos slob dpon bzhed pa nas/ 'gu ling ma ti [64] 'bul dgongs tshe/ drang srong ne tses [sic!] smras pa ni/ he he dang ba yid ring kye/ hos khang nang du hos ru can/ btsun mos dro ni drang dus su/ nga la 'bras can byin nas ni/ bdag g-yung drung gtsug gshen rgyal ba ni/ dpang po med par dro gsol ba ni/ dpang po drang srong ne ne tsos gyis zer na/ cig pur gshegs kyis thal/ btsun mo cig pur skra bal cing/ gcs ni rang gis ben [sic!] mos bkral/ ma nyes dpang po ne tso yod/ rgyal po btsun mo rdzun la bden pa med/ drang po 'jig rten kun du bden/ g-yo sgyu gya gyus mdza' bshes bslu/ ces zer ne tso 'phur nas song// de rgyal po slob dpon gtsug rum 'bar 'tshal gshegs// lam du gser mgar zhigh dro bslang tshe/ gser sbram rgan mos brkus de bskungs/ da ci dro gsol btsun pas khyer ro zhes/ slob dpon dag la klong btang ste/ mgar ba mgar dri phyung nas blang/ [65] mgar ba'i dmig la ho ru drud/ mgar bas mig</p> | <p>po gtub par skyes/ mo ma sding nga sding mi ni/ yang shi yang sos myal ba ru/ bud med lus la dred mong mgo can cig tu skyes// sbrul gyis mig za/ sdig pas sna nas za// rtsangs pas lce la za/ sdom nag pos snying la za/ sbal pas lte ba za zhing/ me ma mur la 'bog/ de 'dra'i dmyal bar skyes/ bon pos za 'dod dbang gis mi shes shes byas rdzun du smras/ lceb pas dmyal ba thig nag gnas su skyes/ de yang sbrul nag mgo gsum pa cig tu skyes/ mgo cig sog les gcod cing/ mgo cig tho bas brdung/ mgo cig sta re can kyis gsas/ mjug [76] ma chur btsu/ rked pa me ru sreg/ yang shi yang sos der skyes/ gha ha dha nag po ni/ byol song mun nag gling chen du/ lus ni phag nag cig tu skyes/ sdug bsngal ni lcags kyis phur bzhi gnan nas/ lcags kyis sdig pa bran phrug dag gis pha ma ni/ bsha gtub byed ma'i dmyal bar skyes/ mi lus ra lug mgo can la/ srin po pho mos spu gri rnon po yis/ srog khung kha phyas snying phyung za bar skyes/ rgyal po dmags mi stong dang chas// da lta shi nas lha ma yin/ dang 'thab rtsod chen po byed bar skyes/ sdig sbyangs dge ba spyad nas/ dga' ldan lha'i gnas</p> | | | | <p>zhal gyis bswo sgra yin/ bdud srin bar chod dmags rnams rgyangs 'tshams bcad/ mtha'i lcag ri rgyab tu thams cad ma lus bdas/ bswo rag sheg zhi thun/ ge [87] rlung myal thum/ ces brjod bdud dang srin po btul/ de rjes gtso bzhi bder gshegs stong rtsa brgyad/ mkha' la sprin dpung gtib ba ltar byon/ byin rlabs rmad byung cho 'phrul bstan/ sa yang rnams pa drug du g-yos/ de tshe kong tse 'phrul rgyal gyis/ ston pa la ni nges zhus pa/ shes rab phul 'byung ston pa'i mchog/ pho brang lhun gyis grub pa dang/ gtso bzhi bder gshegs stong rtsa brgyad/ mkha' la sprin gtib nas kyang// byin brlab cher du bab pa dang/ mchod pa sprin dpung 'byung ba'i/ rgyu dang rkyen rnams ci ltar lags/ ston pas 'khor la bka' rtsal pa/ pho brang lhun gyis grub pa ni/ rgyal po dad pa skyes pa dang/ bsod nams bsags pa'i rgyu las byung/ rkyen ni kun bzang thugs sprul pa'i/ en tse lan med phya'i byas/ mkha' la bder gshegs sprin ltar 'dus/ thugs rje [88] 'gron don gzigs pa ste/ rgyal po dag pa'i snang ba yin/ bde bar gshegs pa gtso bzhi ni/ dbyings dang ye shes</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p>gis mngon shes grub/ mgar mos gser sbram brkus pa mthong/ hos rus mgar dri la rug byas/ nga ni gtsug gshen rgyal ba yin/ ngas btsun mo 'gu ling ma ti la/ mi gtsangs par yang ma spyad nas/ mgar ba khyod kyi gser sbram la/ ma byin par yang ma blang nas/ mgar dri gye bo gser du shog// // ces brjod mgar dri gser du gyur// mgar bas phyi phyag 'tshal nas log/ 'phrul mgar gung chu khyod nyid ni/ rgyal po hos ni nga bda' dang 'phrad pa nas/ slob dpon gtsug gshen rgyal ba ni/ ri gtsug rum 'bar ba'i nag tshal du/ bya khra gzan la 'dzums bzhin ni thal/ gyim sham chu la bya ltar lding nas thal/ thal mo zhes ci 'phrin smras so gsung/ ces gyis gsang nas de byas pas/ chu bo gyim shang 'gram nas ni [66] rgyal po 'khor tshoms phyir la log/ btsun mos klong btag nyes pa'i/ 'gu ling mdze'i ma ti klu/ zin de la gtsug gshen snying po thugs ije skyes/ drang srong ne tso'i rnams 'phrul de/ mo ma kun shes thang po btangs/ btsun mo 'gu ling mdzes zin pas/ g-yung drung gtsug gshen rgyal ba la/ klong btab nyes pas klu'i zin/ mdze nad</p> | <p>su skyes/ drang na drangs thabs 'di lta ste/ rgyal bu bran phrug pha ma dang/ mo bon ha 'da nag po dgu/ rgyal po dmag mi sum stong rnams/ sdig sgrib dus cig sbyangs par 'gyur/ ces gsungs/ rgyal po dga' ba [77] skyes/ u du 'bar ba'i me tog phul/ 'jig rten sgron ma gshen rab lag/ sngar byas sdig la 'gyod tshad 'gyi/ phyin chad dge ba gzhung bzhin srang/ ci ltar bgyis na sgrib sbyangs zhus/ ces zhus/ ston pas bka' rtsal pa/ rgyal po 'bar sgron rdul shug can/ dge' spyod myur du brtsams nas 'grub// bsam brtan gzhu brdung shes rab mda' 'phangs nas/ rnams shes yul brgyad nyon monggs dgra bsod rgos/ bder gshegs lha gshen srid pa la/ mtshan byang phyag 'tshal nas myur du 'byong/ 'gro la sbyin gtong rtul shug bskyed/ bdun du mi thog sgrib pa 'byong/ ces gsung/ rgyal pos yang zhus pa/ lha mi'i ston pa sgron ma'i mchog/ sa le gsal ba'i ye shes spyang/ snang srid bkra ba'i mkhyen rgya can/ bdag dang bdag 'dra'i sgrib sbyangs phyir/ bdag gis gnas su 'byon par zhu/ [78] ces zhus/ ston pa gshen rab nyid// gser gyis chags shing phyag tu 'dzin// gser gyi shing rta'i khri</p> | | | | <p>mkha' la mnyam/ thabs dang shes rab zung du 'brel/ tshad med bzhi yis thugs rje byung/ deng 'dir yon bdag byed pa ni/ sngon du rgyal po gsal mtshog [sic!] gis/ bdag la dge tshogs bsags pa'i/ snga ma'i las 'brel bzhag pa'i/ bstan pa mnam gsum rjes bzhag ni/ 'gro don mtha' ru phyin pa'o// // ces gsungs bkra shis zhal sros dang/ ding dir rgyu sbyor yon gyi bdag/ sgos btsan kong tse 'khrul rgyal dang/ spyi btsan ris drug sems can rnams/ gsas khang chen po bzheng pa dang/ bder gshegs stong gis mtshan brjod cing/ bstan pa rnams gsum rgyas 'gyur nas/ dge ba mtha' ru rgyas 'gyur te/ kun kyis bla med 'bras bu thob par shog/ ces gsungs so/ kong tse las sog [sic!] 'khor rga mgu [sic!] rjes su [89] yid rang nas/ rga [sic!] ston mchod pa cher byas so/ de nas kong tse 'phrul rgyal gyis bu mo 'phrul bsgyur khab tu phul/ sras bu 'phrul bu chungs 'khrungs ste/ gtsug lag rtsis gyis bon la mkhas/ de la ston pa gshen rab kyis/ rdzu 'phrul rkang pa bzhi ldan pas/ khri smon rgyal bzhad dag tu byon/ bkra shis zhal sros cher byas so/ /g-yung drung dag pa'i bon/</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p>rab tu mi bzad pa/ de la phan cing bsod [sic!] pa'i thabs/ ston pa gshen rab gdan drangs nas/ tshogs bsags sgrib pa sbyangs nas phan zer/ / der ston pa 'khor bcas gdan drang nas/ ston pas 'gu ling ma ti la/ khyod kyis gtsug gshen rgyal ba ni/ spyang drangs tshogs bsags lha phyag 'tshal lo/ spyang sngar nyes pa bshags nas byang/ de lan [sic!] klu'i gtong mi 'gyur ces gsungs/ kun shes thang po yin [sic!]/ gtsug gshen rgyal ba spyang drangs te/ nyes [67] pa bshags byang byas shin du/ lha mo sum brgya phyag 'tshal te/ tshogs bsags las ngan mdze nad sos/ der btsun mo rin chen gcal bkram phul/ hos rgyal dang pa [sic!] dga' dgu nas/ bu mo hos za rgyal med ma/ rin chen rgyan kyis btas nas ni/ / ston pa gshen rab khab tu phul/ / bram ze blo gsal? mtshan bltas nas/ mtshan bzang bkra shis legs so brjod/ khri smon rgyal bzhad dag tu byon/ rga ston lha gsol che ru byas/ sras ni gto bu 'bum sangs dang/ spyad bu de ni khri shes 'khrungs/ bu mo gshen za ne'u chen 'khrungs/ de nas yid kyis khye'u chung gis/ [67.2]</p> | <p>la bzhugs/ g-yung drung sems dpa' stong dang lnga brgya dang/ 'khor bcas khri thang 'byams pa'i gling/ grong khyer lhun grub 'dus pa byon/ phyag dang rim 'gro bsu ba bgyis/ mkhar ni shod pa gcegs [sic!] pa ru/ sras bu rma lo g-yul lo yis/ nyi zla gnyis kyis gur yang phub/ gsang ba (mdo sdud)? yid kyis khye'u chung yis/ pad ma ris kyis gdan yang bting/ rgyal po 'bar ba'i sgron ma'i/ gsol zas ro mchog brgya dang ldan/ nor bu gzi 'bar phul/ kye ma ston pa thugs rje can/ rnam pa thams cad mkhyen pa'i gshen rab mi bo sgron ma'i mchog/ rgyal phran khri shang nad kyis zin/ nad de cis kyang ma sos par/ pha ma mo bon bran phrug ha 'da dang/ dmag mi tshu ched sdig la gnas pa 'di/ ci'i rgyu dang ci'i rkyen/ ston pa'i sgron ma bdag la bshad du gsol/ ces zhus/ ston [79] pas bka' brtsal pa/ sngon tshe snga ma rgyal bu de/ tshe stod dpon bsad bcad byas/ tshe smad gto rgyal ye mkhyen la/ srog gcod spang ba'i ston pa blangs/ dge bcu tshad mar spyod pa yis/ 'dir ni rgyal bur skyes pa'o/ tshe thung sngon gyi srog bcad rnam smin yin/ pha ma mo bon had 'da rnam/</p> | | | | <p>mdo 'dus pa rin po che'i rgyud las/ bstan pa rnam gsum rjes bzhag mdzad pa'i le'u ste bcu cig pa'o// // [89.4]</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>('brug rta sngon po chibs su bcib/ myur mgyog rdzu 'phrul lcag gis brabs/ klog 'gyu skad cig ci bzhi bar/ gsas chen ru bzhi gdan yang drangs/ shar nas gar gsas btsan po byon/ [68] byang na rgod gsas kham pa byon/ nub nas gsas rje rmang po byon/ lho nas gnam gsas khyung rum byon/ bar po so brgyad phyogs bzhi ru/ bka' rtags rnga gshang dung slang [sic!] bzhi/ rang bzhi mkha' nas mams bab byung/ sa gdug bla res rgyal mtshan bzhi/ 'khor lo dpal bye'u dung dang nya/ pad ma bum pa rgyal mtshan gdug/ rin chen sna bdun gter dang brgyad/ me tog 'dze dgu char du bab/ sgo bzhi mdzod lnga klog bshad mdzad/ de nas gsas chen ru bzhi yis// gar dha [sic!] 'phyo ba dung gis mdog/ rgod rta lding ba gser lo dang/ gsas rta bang chen mtshal bu dang/ gnam rta gyi ling 'gros po che/ ston pa gshen rab bcib par phul/ de tshe ston pa'i zhal nas ni/ bon ni sgo bzhi mdzod dang lnga/ chab dkar sngags rgyud phyi nang dang/ chab nag srid rgyud che chung dang/ dpon gsas lung rgyud che chung dang/ [69] 'phan yul 'bum sde rgyas</p> | <p>rgyal bus dge ba spyod pa la// mo mas sdig spyod 'khor ba yin// rgyal po khyod ni snga ma 'dur gshen skyes/ dmag mi rnams ni ltad mo ba/ bdag ni 'dur gsas yin zhes byas/ de rnams rnam smin yam du 'dir 'tshogs/ de bas sgrub pa dus 'dir sbyangs/ ces gsung/ rgyal po 'khor bcas gyis/ ston pa'i zhabs la phyag 'tshal te/ bder gshegs stong gis mchod pa bsham/ snying po brjod cing bstod pa byas/ 'khor ba dong sprug snying po brjod/ ris drug glud kyis tshim par byas/ bden [80] pa'i don yang bstan pa yin/ lta dang cho 'phrul chen po byung/ rgyal po dmag mi sum stong bcas/ mkha' la 'od bzhi mngon sangs rgyas/ 'jig rten 'khams ni bde la bkod/ slad nas rgyal po 'bar sgron sras/ dpo'u lag ngan bya ba dang/ dpo'u lag ngan bya ba dang/ dpo'u za thang mo shul du lus/ de la mtshan ldan khye'u bzhi yis// gshen rab dag la slar zhus pas/ e ma yab cig gshen rab mchog/ 'jig rten stong par gyur tsam kyis/ 'gro ba lhag med sangs rgyas nas/ rgyal bu lcam dral lus pa 'di/ ci'i rgyu dang ci'i rkyen/ dbyings dang ye shes thabs kyi sku/ sku gsum kha' la yab pa cig/ ces zhus/ ston pas bka'</p> | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>bsdus dang/ gtsang ma mtho thogs zas don mdzod/ gzungs so dag la 'dzin shes gyis/ bdag sgo dag la ming ying thog/ go lam dag la don snyed mdzod/ ces brjod/ sgo bzhi mdzod lnga gtan la phabs/ de nas gung la brag seng ge brgya [sic!] bsnol su/ bdud ma tang ru rings btul/ / mtho ris khri smon rgyal bzhad rtser/ rgyal po hos kyis 'gro don rdzogs so/ de nas mgon btsun phyai phul [sic!] du/ snang ldan g-yu rtse bya ba ru/ ye shes lha'i ston pa la [=gshen lha 'od dkar] / 'gro ba 'dul ba'i bon rnam zhus/ de nas shar lho nub byang phyogs bzhi ru/ ston pas 'brug rta sngon po bcibs/ lha rta ke ru snyan kar la/ gto sgro spyad sgro rtsis sgro smansgro dang/ lho sgro gshen sgro zung gsum ma drug bkal/ rnga gshang dung slang bzhi dang chas/ gsas chen bzhi ru 'dren ston byas/ yid kyis khye'u chung gis [70] sna 'dren byas/ sras bu zung gsum ya drug dang/ mo ma kun shes thang po dang/ bon gyis 'khor lo phyogs bzhir bskor/ gto spyad 'bum sde gtan la phabs/ de nas 'dzam bu gling bzhi ru/ skad rigs mi cig sum brgya drug bcu las/</p> | <p>brtsal pa/ dpo' rgyal sngun dus sangs rgyas pa/ tshogs bsags sgrib pa byang ba yin/ rgyal bu ming sring lus pa 'di/ rgyal bu skye ba lnga brgya ru/ 'tshams med sdig pa spyod pa [81] yin/ dus 'dir rgyal bu skeyes pa ste/ da rung lhag ma ma dag pas/ bdag nyid mya ngan 'das tsam nas// thar pa'i go 'phong bzod thob bo/ sring mo dpo' zang thang mo ni/ sngon nas bdag dang me tog 'thor/ smon lam lhan cig btab pa'i/ bdag gis grogs su phran [sic!] pa yin/ / de phyr rgyal pos phul ba legs/ ces gsung dpo' za thang mo ni/ / ston pa gshen rab khab tu bzhes/ kho ma ne'u chung dag tu bsus/ dga' ston bkra shis lha gsol byas/ nor sbyin dag gis g-yang yang blangs/ sras bu lung 'dren rgyud 'dren 'khrungs/ bu mo gshen za ne'u chung bltams/ mi nor sna dgu phogs su byin/ gto sgro spyad sgro bka' ru gtad/ de nas phyi rol tshal bzhi ru/ lha rgyud gshen rgyud srid rgyud dang/ don rgyud rgyud sde bzhi rnam dang/ don mdo bcu bon gyi [82] 'khor lo bskor/ lung 'dren rgyud 'dren dag la gtad/ rgyal po dpo'i [sic!] 'gro don mthar phyin no/ g-yung drung lha'i bon/ mdo 'dus pa rin po</p> | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>bon skad 'gyur mi cigs pa re re bzhags/ slar yang 'ol mo gling du byon/ bar po so brgyad mkhar du thams cad kun 'dus/ g-yung drung lha'i bon/ mdo 'dus pa rin po che'i rgyud las/ ston pa gshen rab mi bo dang/ rgyal po hos dang ba yid ring zhu don kyis mdo/ hos za rgyal med khab tu bzhes nas/ sras 'khrungs pa'i le'u ste dgu pa'o // // [70.5])</p> | <p>che'i rgyud las/ rgyal po dpo'i [sic!] 'gro don mdzad cing dpo' [sic!] za thang mo khab tu khab tu bzhes pa'i le'u ste bcu pa'o // // [82.2]</p> | | | | |
| - | <p>[E 12:98.4] gshen rab sgo bzhi mdzod 'chad dus/ khyab pa gsas chen ru bzhi sprul/ kye ma ston pa gshen rab nyid/ nged gsas chen ru bzhi bya ba yin/ nyi ma phyogs bzhi'i dpon gsas lags/ gshen rab mi bo 'di ltar gyi/ bon ni 'dod pa dgu 'gyur lags/ go mtshon dmag gis dpung chos la/ nyi ma phyogs bzhi'i rgyal sde thul/ gling bzhi'i [99] nor la rgyal gor gyis/ ces smras/ gshen rab lan btab pas/ kye ma khyab pa lag ring po // gsas bzhi ma yin 'jig rten skyongs/ 'khor ba zo chu'i rgyun ltar 'khor/ gshen rab mi ru ma 'gyur med/ drin chen ma la sdang ba de/ bdud men gzhan la ga la yod/ nga zhe sdong [sic!] spangs pas dmag dpon len/ 'dod chags spangs pas nor ming len/ nga rgyal spangs pa sde mi 'jom/ rgyal sa</p> | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>[sic!] sde bzhi rang gi rang gi sde/ khyab pa rmongs pa'i bslu tshig za/ ces gsung sras bzhi mnga' 'od chud/ gshen rab phyai' sku 'tsho tshe/ khyab pa lha'i bu 'dra sprul/ btsun mo rnams la bslu tshig smras/ gshen rab phya'i sku 'tsho tshe/ ngo phya'i bu mo gtsug [sic!] mor blang/ de gto sgro dpyad sgro zhug la [100] srog/ du ba phyai' yul du 'gro/ gshen rab mi bo 'dir dgong nges/ ces pas dpa'o [sic!] zang thang mo slongs [sic!] bsgyur nas/ gto sgro dpyad sgro zhugs la bsregs/ gto bu spyad bus spar do zin/ yi ge dpa'o 'bru lnga dang/ gto'i byang bu sum brgya dang/ gto gyis byang bu dgu bkra zin/ gto spyad 'bum ste zhugs la song/ dpa'o [sic!] za thang mo khyab pas bslus/ bu ni bdud bu go bo chung/ yul ni bra ma khri 'od dang// sems can bsod nams sogs pa byung/ mo ma sding nga sding lom smras/ bslu ba'i bon gyis bslu byas ste/ snga dro gshen la me tog 'thor/ phyi dri ying brgab spu dri brgyad/ bslu ba'i bdud bu gong chung gum/ dpa'o [sic!] za de la mya ngan smre/ de la gshen rab kyis smras/ dpo' [sic!] za thang mo smre cig/ bu 'di bdud kyis bslu [101]</p> | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>ba'i bu/ la la srin kyis dmod pa'i bu/ la la bgegs kyis bar chod bu/ la la lan chags snyags pa'i bu/ lha'i thugs rje'i bu rka'o/ / ces gsungs/ dpo' [sic!] zas dran ba rnyed/ / gshen ne'u chung khyab pas bslus/ bdud phrug stag bu thung dang gzigs bu thung/ sha la rmgam zhing khrag la 'thung/ ne'u chung de la blo'gyur nas/ nu ma bcad nas gzan du sgyur/ mo gling kho ma ne'u slob/ / lung 'dren rgyud 'dren dral dang mjal/ sras su yum gshen rab dga' spro skeyes/ [101.5]</p> | | | | |
| [F 18:179.6] hos za rgyal med ma/ | [F 18:179.6] dos [sic!] za thang mo | [F 18:179.6] lha za bzang [sic!] drug | [F 18:179.6] gsas za ngang drug dang/ | [F 18:180.1] kong [sic!] za khri lcam dang/ bder gshegs 'byung ba'i yum la phyag 'tshal bstod/ dang/ | [F 18:179.6f] kong za [180] 'phrul bsgyur [sic!] |
| [G 20:192.4] gzhon nur gyur tshe rtsal dang yig rtsis stob ldan zhing/ gzhon nur kun gyi rab tu gyur lha mi kun gyis bstod/ rgyal rigs rgyal srid skyong phyir hos za dpo [sic!] za khab tu bzhes/ rma lo g-yu lo gto bu spyad bu sprul pa'i sras bu bltam/ gto sgro dpyad sgro rtsi sgro sman sgro 'gro ba'i [193] phan yon mdzad/ sgo bzhi mdzod lnga bon sgo dbye ba'i bkra shis shog/ [193.1] | [G 20:192.4] gzhon nur gyur tshe rtsal dang yig rtsis stob ldan zhing/ gzhon nur kun gyi rab tu gyur lha mi kun gyis bstod/ rgyal rigs rgyal srid skyong phyir hos za dpo [sic!] za khab tu bzhes/ rma lo g-yu lo gto bu spyad bu sprul pa'i sras bu bltam/ gto sgro dpyad sgro rtsi sgro sman sgro 'gro ba'i [193] phan yon mdzad/ sgo bzhi mdzod lnga bon sgo dbye ba'i bkra shis shog/ [193.1] | - | - | - | - |
| [H 22:203.4]: nub ni khri smon | [H 22:203.5] byang nas kho ma | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|---|
| <p>rgyal bzhad ni/ pad ma rag ga zangs las grub/ rin chen bzhi bkra dpag tshad bdun/ hos za rgyal med de'i khab/ gto bu spyad bu 'khrungs pa'i/ [203.5]</p> | <p>ne'u chung ni/ in tra ni li g-yu las grub/ rin chen gser gyi sa gzhi bkra/ lcags ri dpag tshad bdun gyis bskor/ dpo [sic!] za thang mo'i gling ste/ bras [sic!] ni lung 'dren [204] rgyud 'dren dang/ gshen za ne'u chung 'khrungs pa'o/ [204.1]</p> | | | | |
| - | <p>[I 23:217.5] (bdag phywa'i ston par gshegs dus su/ khyod kyi btsun mor rnam kyang bslus/) gto sgro spyod sgro bsregs tu bcug/ dpon za thang mo slus pa'i/ bdud bu gong bo chung yang sprul/ mo bon sdig to bdud las byas/ [218] khyod gshen za ne [sic!] chung bslus nas khyed/ bu stag bu thung dang gzig bu thung tsha bo bcas pa bslus par sems/ [218.1]</p> | - | - | <p>[I 23:218.1]: (khyod dkor la cho 'phrul bstan dus su/ khyod rta bdun khyer nas rkong po yul la khyer/) bdag rkong lcam khab tu bzhes tsam na/ khyod rkong rje bcas ste bar chod byas/ [218.3]</p> | - |

NB. This text was mainly typed by Dan Martin and proof read by Kalsang Norbu and also by me. Kalsang Norbu is working on a critical edition of the *mDo 'dus* based on all three presently manuscripts available and also envisions translation. This comparative table will not anticipate on this work and merely attempts to render the text of the Khedup Gyatso Dolanji edition as accurately as possible. While gratefully acknowledging the work and generosity of the mentioned colleagues, I assume full responsibility for any mistakes in this rendering of the original manuscript.