

# Zhangzhung Dictionary

by Dan Martin

(Jerusalem)

Dedicated to the newly dedicated Ning network, "International Network for Bon Studies," founded and administrated by Henk Blezer (Leiden). This goes with the hope that it will prevail against all *bar chad*, 'interferences,' and succeed as a vehicle for communication about Bon and Zhangzhung studies.

## *Introduction*

**T**he making of this 'dictionary,' if I may be allowed to call it that, has a long history. A primitive version was posted at the Ligmincha website during the early 1990's, although it apparently is there no longer. A fairly recent version, dated 2004, was and probably still is posted at the Zhangzhung Studies Forum (Yahoo, for members only), in what is there known as the "files section." The present version not only includes more entries,<sup>1</sup> those entries have now been arranged in a more rational manner, while the introductory sections that you see before your eyes have been rearranged and considerably expanded. I imagine most of the people reading this introduction, while they may have a mild or passing interest in lexicographical history, would rather hear about Zhangzhung history. So I suppose I should spare a few words on that subject.

Zhangzhung was or is the name of a nation, a state, a language with its own scripts, and a territory. While its borders must have changed through time, I believe it was basically confined to the south-western sector of the Tibet Plateau. Many extend its territories through the north-central parts of the Plateau as far as what would eventually be known as Amdo.<sup>2</sup> The state evidently came to an end, or continued on in a weakened condition of vassalage, when conquered by the central Tibetan empire in the middle of the 7th century. The Zhangzhung language, our concern here, is usually believed to have slowly given way over the next generations to Tibetan. It is

---

<sup>1</sup> For those who find significance in such things, the total number of entries is slightly over 3,500, although many are simply cross-references.

<sup>2</sup> Some think Zhangzhung was coterminous with the entire plateau in ancient times. This theory would necessitate a historical cover-up conspiracy, since none of the early Tibetan-language histories, including those of Bon, know of it. Still, it is popular with some Tibetan intelligentsia today, the most prominent and influential of its advocates being Namkhai Norbu. For an interesting attempt to find for the two syllables of the name "Zhang-zhung" an etymology that works in Zhangzhung language itself, see Namgyal Nyima's dictionary, pp. 10-16. For a discussion, one very well grounded in the literature, on the territorial extent of the Zhangzhung kingdom and its regional dialects, see the same work, pp. 18-20.

often regarded as a dead or extinct language, and although there may be some truth to this assessment, I will bring forward evidence that it has survived in a small way, in a group of less than three thousand speakers who today know their language by the very same name as that of a Zhangzhung dialect mentioned in a 12th-century Tibetan Bon text. One factor that kept the language alive, and indeed the reason we have any written evidence for it at all, is its use as a sacred language by the religion of Tibet known as Bon.<sup>3</sup> In a very real sense, Zhangzhung belongs to the Bonpos. They are its caretakers, and they merit our respect.

Since there is so little literature existing in Zhangzhung (ZZ), one may wonder why it is important that it be better known. There are several reasons, but foremost for persons with linguistic interests is the fact that ZZ was among the earliest languages of the wider Tibeto-Burman group — leaving written Tibetan aside for the moment — to be written down. Among these early written languages, besides Zhangzhung, we might also mention here some Dunhuang documents written in a language that has often been called Zhangzhung, although this identity has not been well established since the documents are silent about the name of the language in which they are written and they have not yet been deciphered,<sup>4</sup> or in the language called by one scholar Nam,<sup>5</sup> Old Newar, Manipuri,<sup>6</sup> and surely Tangut (Mi-nyag)

<sup>3</sup> For the best-written introduction to Bon religion, I recommend Per Kværne's introduction to his book *The Bon Religion of Tibet: The Iconography of a Living Tradition*, Serindia (London 1995). For a general bibliography of Bon, see Part Two of my *Unearthing Bon Treasures*, Brill (Leiden 2001), pp. 287-442, with additional items listed in an article — Bon Bibliography: An Annotated List of Recent Publications, *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines* [Paris], vol. 4 (2003), pp. 61-77. The latter is available in the form of a freely downloadable PDF file at the following URL: [http://www.thdl.org/texts/reprints/ret/ret\\_4.pdf](http://www.thdl.org/texts/reprints/ret/ret_4.pdf). A combined listing has also been made available (in November 2009), but without the annotations that formed part of the 2001 bibliography. See this URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/tibetological/bon-bibliography>. This combined bibliography contains 1,230 items.

<sup>4</sup> A decipherment project has been underway in Japan for some years now. See Tsuguhito Takeuchi, Yasuhiko Nagano, & Sumie Ueda, Preliminary Analysis of the Old Zhangzhung Language and Manuscripts, which is contained in: Y. Nagano & R. LaPolla, eds., *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2001), pp. 45-96. See also Tsuguhito Takeuchi, The Old Zhangzhung Manuscript Stein OR 8212/188, contained in: Christopher I. Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*, Brill (Leiden 2002), pp. 1-11. For the latest, see Tsuguhito Takeuchi & Ai Nishida, The Present Stage of Deciphering Old Zhangzhung, contained in: Yasuhiko Nagano, ed., *Issues in Tibeto-Burman Historical Linguistics*, Senri Ethnological Studies series no. 75, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2009), pp. 151-165.

<sup>5</sup> Frederick Thomas, *Nam: An Ancient Language of the Sino-Tibetan Borderland*, Oxford University Press (London 1948), making note of the doubts well expressed by Robert Shafer in his review in *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 13 (1950), pp. 244-249. Despite Thomas' efforts, I do not believe it has been adequately established that this set of text fragments belongs to a Tibeto-Burman language. It could also transcribe some old regional form of Chinese, for example. The actual language name as it is found in the Old Tibetan documents is Rgyal-nam-pa'i Skad, 'Language of the People of Rgyal-nam.' Unlike Thomas, I do not think the syllable *rgyal* can be removed from the proper name any more than can the *rgyal* of Rgyal-thang or Rgyal-rtse.

<sup>6</sup> On Old Newar, see Kansakar and Tamot in the bibliography. The oldest complete texts in Newar are said to date to the 12th century. The eastern Assam language known as Manipuri, the language of the Meithei people, is another TB language that goes back many centuries in written form. On this literary language, see Shobhana Chelliah & Sohini Ray, Early Meithei Manuscripts, as contained in: Christopher I. Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*, Brill (Leiden 2002), pp. 59-71.

as well. We also have the old Burmese represented in the Pyu inscriptions. The oldest of all Tibeto-Burman languages in a written form is Bailang.<sup>7</sup> Although I may not have succeeded in making a complete list of the earliest written texts in Tibeto-Burman languages, I hope it will at least be clear that Zhangzhung is very evidently one of them, and this point will not be lost on linguists working in the field of Tibeto-Burman.

One more simple reason for interest in Zhangzhung language is because knowledge of it is essential for those with other, non-linguistic interests involving the western parts of Tibet. Although still not sufficiently appreciated, Zhangzhung language terms still live in these areas, not only in place names (this much is obvious in such names as Pu-hrang, Kh[w]a-tse, Gu-ge, Ti-[t]se and so forth<sup>8</sup>), but in vocabularies of areal dialects and languages as well. And considerations on Zhangzhung as a cultural and political entity can and do have large and weighty consequences for a whole range of ideas about Tibetan history as a whole.

The *Mdzod phug*, in its largely bilingual form, for all we know was, as Bon tradition has it, excavated by Shenchen Luga (Gshen-chen Klu-dga') in 1017 CE.<sup>9</sup> For details, see my book *Unearthing Bon Treasures*, Brill (Leiden 2001).

<sup>7</sup> Bailang was preserved in Chinese transcription, and for this reason primarily there are some problems connected with its reconstruction that are not easily solved. It is probably an early language of the Lolo-Burmese type. See the bibliography under "Beckwith." For the Pyu inscriptions, see Christopher I. Beckwith, Two Pyu-Tibetan Isoglosses, and, A Glossary of Pyu, as contained in: Christopher I. Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*, Brill (Leiden 2002), pp. 27-38, 159-61.

<sup>8</sup> For a longer list of place names that appear to be in Zhangzhung language, see Namgyal Nyima's dictionary, p. 35: Gu-ge, Spu-hrangs, Ru-thog, Ma-dmig, Dang-ra, Sta-rgo or Rta-rgo, Da-roq, Gu-rib or Gu-rub, Dmu-rdo, Dmu-ri, Gyim-shod, etc.

<sup>9</sup> For my preliminary attempt to understand the overall content of the cosmological text called the *Mdzod phug*, see the bibliography that follows under CT. I take the Tibetan-language title of this text, *Srid pa'i mdzod phug[s]*, to mean 'Innermost Treasury of Existence.' Although it is true that *phug* means 'cave,' the reading *phugs* is the more common one, and I take the latter seriously. In geographical contexts, also, we find Zhang-zhung Phug[s], which I interpret as 'Innermost Zhangzhung,' the least accessible of the three areas called Sgo, 'Doorway' or 'Gateway'; Bar, 'Intermediate'; and Phugs, 'Innermost.' Here, too, the translation 'cave' would be inappropriate and misleading. Although this is not the place to go into the problem in detail, *phugs* is no more identical to *phug*, 'cave,' than *phug* is to *phu*, 'innermost part of a valley' (the opposite end being called the *mda'*, a word that also means 'arrow'), although all three words are indeed related. (And as is well known, the presence or absence of 's' in syllable-final position following a consonant is a problem in Tibetan manuscripts; although grammatical rules ought to govern its usage, as far as most scribes are concerned the rules are entirely their own, leaving it up to readers to intuit which form was intended by the author.) *Phugs* is often used in time expressions to mean the point furthest back in time, and therefore the ultimate origin [of something]. Sometimes it has the sense of 'for all time, for a long time, [in the] long run.' Sometimes it seems synonymous with *khungs*, '[the ultimate] source [of something].' It may mean 'distant future,' and has been translated 'eventually' (Jamspal 159). I believe *phu*, *phug* and *phugs* all belong with the verbal root *'bigs pa*, 'to pierce, penetrate.' *Rdzun phugs* means 'the ultimate source of the falsehood.' Indeed, I believe that *phugs* is used for remote and inaccessible *loci* in both time and space, for which the translation 'cave' would be inappropriate. Imagine translating *rdzun phugs* as 'lie cave' or 'cave of lies.' A fuller discussion would simply have to take account of the wonderfully complex but revealing discussion of the meanings of the title in the 14th-century *Mdzod phug* commentary by Sga-ston Tshul-khrims-rgyal-mtshan, *Kun las btus pa srid pa'i mdzod phug gi gzhung 'grel* (Dolanji 1974), vol. 1, pp. 147-153, the opening words of the *Sgra 'grel*, and so on. That the time-element of the word *phugs* is not reflected in the English

Bon religion largely locates its background in Zhangzhung, although I do not believe this is the place to go into this very interesting issue in all its depths and complexities.<sup>10</sup>

While this is called a “Zhangzhung Dictionary,” I hope users will not expect a dictionary in the strict or even the usual sense of the word. The dictionary maker is at the mercy of his evidence, and some of the reasons why this is so should become clear by reading a little further into this introduction. Given the rather sad state of the evidence, I have been particularly reluctant to worsen what is already a difficult situation for those idealists, like myself, who aspire to one day in some sense ‘know’ Zhangzhung. The quest for original Zhangzhung entails reading through its past transformations. These transformations must first of all be seen before they may be seen through. There are no shortcuts, no ‘magic bullets’ ... Well, a manuscript of the *Mdzod phug* that could be securely dated prior to the 18th century would definitely improve matters, perhaps greatly. ‘Knowing Zhangzhung’ has always, and will always, entail hard work. Some may regard this as discouraging. Others may take it as a challenge.

Why are there so many given meanings for particular Zhangzhung words? I believe this is in some large part an artifact of the idea of some that ZZ syntax ought to exactly mirror the Tibetan syntax syllable-for-syllable. The fact is it does not. It is also an effect of ‘regularization’ processes at work in manuscript transmissions. I do not think it should be taken as a proof that ZZ was a tonal language, as Hummel has suggested.<sup>11</sup> So when you see a dozen meanings listed for a single Zhangzhung word, you simply must not assume that all these meanings are equally valid ones, or even equal possibilities. Some are more probable than others. Some are just errors that remain to be eliminated, eventually, after close study. Documenting errors both recognized and unrecognized is important to us here. I would even say that the identification and understanding of errors, including errors ‘showcased’ here in this dictionary, is the main task for the Zhangzhung language studies of the near future.

While there are a few brief bilingual *gzungs* (Skt. *dhāraṇī*) texts that have hardly received any notice,<sup>12</sup> a tiny bit of epigraphic evidence,<sup>13</sup> and of

---

translation ‘innermost,’ may be intended, might make us lean toward a translation such as ‘earliest source,’ or if it is used spatially, ‘furthest source,’ or ‘least accessible source.’ Rudely subtracting all the poetry, the title would simply mean the origins and development of biological and environmental worlds, which, together with psychology and its evolution, constitute the main subject-matter.

<sup>10</sup> I must make mention of forthcoming studies on Zhangzhung as a historical and geographic entity by Henk Blezer (Leiden) and in particular, among his published papers, *Heaven My Blanket, Earth My Pillow -- Wherever Rin po che Lays His Head Down to Rest Is the Original Place of Bon*, *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 68 (2007), pp. 75-112.

<sup>11</sup> *OZZ* 95 n. 5. Perhaps it was to R.A. Stein that it first occurred that tone might have been used to distinguish the large number of words that would otherwise be homophones in ZZ. This idea is discussed further in *Matisoff* 160. As Matisoff says, there is “no evidence at all that ZZ was tonal.” Of course, this begs the question of what conceivable sort of evidence might prove that it was.

<sup>12</sup> *Mantras* may also be rich sources of Zhangzhung vocabulary. For a good example see Chapter 3 of the Bon Mother Tantra entitled *Lam mngon sangs rgyas pa'i rgyud* (*Ma* 95-104). Some of these *dhāraṇī* and *mantra* sources have been utilized in Namgyal Nyima's dictionary.

course Zhangzhung titles to texts otherwise entirely in Tibetan,<sup>14</sup> the *Mdzod phug* is the only bilingual Zhangzhung-Tibetan text of a significant length that is available. The present work might, in fact, be considered to be primarily a dictionary of the language of the *Mdzod phug*, even if there are in fact very many words drawn from other sources. In any case, the *Mdzod phug* served as the most important source of the available ZZ-Tib. glossaries. Indeed, most information found in those glossaries does come ultimately from the *Mdzod phug*. The *Mdzod phug* therefore ought to take priority over the glossaries. This dictionary was in part made with the assistance of my own electronic version of the *Mdzod phug* text (*Mdzod*), a critical edition incorporating variant lines. I constantly consulted *Mdzod* using ordinary computer search functions, in order to test different ideas about vocabulary, grammatical affixes and so forth. The truth is that some parts of the Zhangzhung text are still resistant to my understanding, which helps explain why this dictionary cannot be considered to be even nearly an exhaustive dictionary of that text.

Zhangzhung words from other Bon sources are well represented in a recently published dictionary by Dagkar Geshé Namgyal Nyima, which is longer,<sup>15</sup> covers a much broader range of terminology, and is in yet other ways different from this one. Perhaps most amazing of all, the Geshé's dictionary covers a vast amount of Bon literature, citing page numbers for word usages in nearly 500 different publications listed in its bibliography. Given their differences, I believe researchers will often find it worthwhile and at times necessary to consult both Zhangzhung dictionaries. I only rarely give references here to entries in the Geshé's lexicon. It is your responsibility to acquire this book and consult with it directly (see the bibliography under "Namgyal Nyima's dictionary").

In 2008, a new Bon lexicon, one with a large percentage of the entries marked as being Zhangzhung, was published in Osaka (see the bibliography under "LZ"). I have not reproduced its Zhangzhung entries here, but have given page references to the original publication. Serious students of Bon (and not only of ZZ) need to have their own copy of this important reference work on hand. It covers precisely those vocabulary items of Bon texts that are most liable to prove opaque to those fluent in other realms of Tibetan literature.

---

<sup>13</sup> There has so far been little of an epigraphic nature that could serve as evidence for Zhangzhung language, and what we do have seems to be difficult to date. One example is a seal, believed to be the seal of the Zhangzhung kings, in the possession of the Sman-ri Monastery's abbots. It has been reproduced several times. For a study of it, see the January 1, 2008 Babelstone blog at the following URL: <http://babelstone.blogspot.com/2008/01/zhang-zhung-royal-seal.html>, accessed on Nov. 10, 2009. For an undoubtedly Zhangzhung inscription on a conch, see the entry for "*un*," below.

<sup>14</sup> In my opinion Tibetanists have been far too quick in dismissing titles of Bon texts as being 'made up.' These titles are themselves texts, and deserve the same close textual study as other texts, being subject to the same historic forces of transformation. When we encounter the rare book title in Burushaski (Bru-sha Skad) at the head of a Tibetan text, we ought to entertain the idea that regardless of its present form, it may be possible to find textual evidence, perhaps an older manuscript, that would demonstrate that its words once more closely resembled Burushaski. At the very least we need to entertain the possibilities with some seriousness of effort at decipherment for quite some time before the dismissal phase sets in.

<sup>15</sup> It has 3,875 entries, and there are hardly any entries that are merely cross-references.

It would be desirable to have a complete history of Zhangzhung studies, but I will not be writing one here.<sup>16</sup> Although the list of academic scholars would be rather long if we included them all, we may reduce them for present purposes to the “three H’s and the one S.” By that I mean, placing them in chronological order of their main contributions: Hoffmann,<sup>17</sup> Haarh, Stein and Hummel. Some may want to add Thomas even though the texts he called Zhangzhung were not the true Zhangzhung, but an otherwise unknown and unnamed language that still largely resists decipherment. Laufer, too, took note of a few Zhangzhung language titles already at the turn of the 20th century. All these works may be seen in the bibliography below.

The most significant occasion in the entire history of modern Zhangzhung studies is without the least doubt the 1965 publication of the Zhangzhung-Tibetan glossary by the Zhu clan Yogi named Nyi-ma-grags-pa. Unfortunately, this work cannot be dated with any precision or certainty.<sup>18</sup> Meanwhile, another similar work of the same type has appeared, although little is known about its provenance or its dating (see the bibliography under Sgra).

One problem with the Haarh glossary (ZZH) is that it took the Zhangzhung words (from Zhu) with their Tibetan equivalents out of their context, and only then applied the English meanings on the basis of the Tibetan. This procedure means that the meanings given are not all entirely appropriate (and on occasion entirely inappropriate) to the original contexts. By “original contexts” I mean, besides Zhu itself, all the texts it used as its

---

<sup>16</sup> Such a historical sketch has already been written by Orofino (see the bibliography) although naturally it only covers developments up to the time of its writing in 1990.

<sup>17</sup> Helmut Hoffmann announced in a publication of 1967 (Hoff1) that he intended to make a dictionary of Zhangzhung. This was just one year before Haarh’s (ZZH) dictionary appeared, and in fact, it was never published, although he did keep a long box of file cards in his office. I have never had access to this box or its content, although I understand it still exists in a collection in Germany.

<sup>18</sup> See the bibliography under Zhu. The latest word on the dating of its author, by Samten Karmay who has probably paid the most attention to the problem so far, is that he was “a Bonpo scholar of an unknown date” (see LZ iii). I recall at a conference in Osaka in 1999, Samten Karmay commented that it is a mistake to identify the author of the glossary with the abbot named Nyi-ma-grags-pa with the dates 1616-1670, since the latter did not belong to the Zhu family. (These dates have been sanctified by the U.S. Library of Congress system, so they are frequently repeated, which of course does not necessarily make them correct.) We might assign him to somewhere around the first decades of the 18th century, if he is to be identified as the Zhu Nyi-ma-grags-pa who served as sixth abbot of Khra-rgan Monastery, which was founded in 1699 (see SBM 209). I have also located a person with the virtually identical name Zhu-yas Nyi-ma-grags-pa in a transmission lineage for the *Gzi brjid* scripture, which according to my rough calculations would appear to locate him much earlier, in the vicinity of 1530 CE, although it is difficult to be sure. While it does not help us immediately with the dating problem, we should note that we do have one other brief work that is very definitely the work of the same author. It is entitled *Dbal khyung nag po’i mngon rtogs*, and the author’s name is given as Zhu’i Rnal-byor Nyi-ri-u[n]-zhi. When the Zhangzhung name is translated into Tibetan, it reads Nyi-ma-grags-pa (see CBK 38). The good news is that one day we may be able to solve this problem, since we know from a bibliographical resource that a biography of one Zhu Nyi-ma-grags-pa once existed and, so, might one day become available (see YTKC 1109: *zhu nyi ma grags pa dang mkhan po bsod nams blo gros dbang gi rgyal po’i skyes rabs le’u gcig*).

main sources, the most important one being the *Mdzod phug* (meaning Mdzod).

*Zhangzhung's textual transformations*

Despite the existence of 18th-century and still more recent woodblock prints, the transmission of Bon scriptures in general, not just the *Mdzod phug*, has always remained primarily manuscript-based, and these manuscripts were nearly all in cursive rather than 'block' letters. The graphic similarities of certain cursive Tibetan letters and ligatures, which cause ambiguities, hence mistakes, in the readings will not at all be apparent to those without experience reading cursive manuscripts. One has to imagine the sorts of misconstruals that might well occur when scribes recopy texts in a language they do not know, even when they know the script perfectly well. Recognition of what sorts of misreadings are likely is essential for Zhangzhung studies. Non-Tibetanists in particular are likely to be perplexed by the 'equivalence,' which is to say *confusion*, of *na* with *zha*, *zha* with *kha*, *sa* with *pa*, *na* with *ca*, *la* with *ma*, and so forth, but they will have to learn to tolerate these ambiguities or take them on faith. Otherwise they will just have to learn the cursive writing system for themselves and make their own judgements. Cursive letter permutations took place. That much is clear from observing the textual variants.

Both the *Mdzod phug* text and glossaries that made use of manuscripts of the *Mdzod phug* underwent recopying many times by persons who did not know ZZ. Apart from (and in addition to) these just-mentioned graphic [re/mis]interpretations of letters and ligatures, which were many, I see basically four tendencies at work in the historical transformation of the ZZ vocabulary:

1. Homogenization

This process would reflect a scribal desire to impose internal consistency on the ZZ text, a type of hypercorrection, but also a tendency to lose vowel markers, or simplify in other ways. I believe that this desire to impose consistency has led to inconsistency, especially in the numeric system (*pace* Hummel, in OZZ 58, who thinks this resulted from conglomeration of numeric systems from different languages). I think it very probable that no scribe during the last millennium actually understood any more than a few of the words they were copying. Part of the problem was that they thought they could understand a thing or two here and there, and on that basis would introduce changes that they regarded as improvements.

2. Tibetanization

This occurs due to an effort to 'understand' ZZ syllables and make them more familiar. Recognizing instances of this is necessarily somewhat problematic, since after all Tib. and ZZ belong to the same family of languages and may very well have had closely similar vocabulary. Examples of words with same meaning and usually identical spelling: *dug*, 'poison';

*mig*, 'eye'; *stong*, 'thousand'; *khri*, 'ten thousand.' The word *dug*, at least, would seem to be one of the most widespread words in Tibeto-Burman, with a closely similar Chinese word.

### 3. Sanskritization

A process not at work in the *Mdzod phug* itself (where there are only about half a dozen words that are even remotely Indic, apparent loans), but seems to occur later in some Bon revelations, and especially in glossaries like that of *Zhu*. In the *Mdzod phug*, we have the example of initial consonant-cluster 'dh' instead of 'hr', which I see as an example of a Sanskritizing way of writing ('dh' as in 'Dharma' being a common Indic letter transcribed into Tibetan as a consonant cluster; 'hr' being the more original, unexpected, and therefore correct reading, a correctness borne out by the most closely related TB language evidence). As time went by, more and more Indic words began to be 'recovered' or 'rehabilitated' as ZZ words. Or at least that is my opinion at the moment.<sup>19</sup>

### 4. Differentiation

Although it is my impression that this is relatively rare, there may be instances where the Zhangzhung was thought to be too similar to the Tibetan, and so was made to look different. This might also in some part be explained as an attempt to 'correct' the process of Tibetanization.

#### *Cognates or loans (or 'false cousins'?)*

Notice that the Zhangzhung words *hrib* (var. *dhib*) and *lung* have the same meanings as the English body-part words 'rib' and 'lung.' *Ha-pi* means 'happy' (Tib. *dga' ba*). ZZ *klang* has the same meaning as German *Klang*.<sup>20</sup> *Ku ra* means 'dog,' just like the English word 'cur.'<sup>21</sup> Of course, serious comparative linguists will likely view these impressively 'obvious' language connections with a degree of distrust, which they will justify using the sophisticated tools of their trade. The rest of us will continue to be impressed by these remarkable coincidences.

<sup>19</sup> So one might therefore also speak of the Zhangzhungization of Sanskrit. In practice I usually refer to these reputedly Zhangzhung words as Indic or Sanskritic in nature. There are some well-known Tibetanizations of Sanskrit loanwords like *bskal pa* for Skt. *kalpa*, 'eon,' and the like. There are some not-so-well-known examples, like Tib. *kha cig* for Skt. *kaścid*; or the words for 'omen,' in Tib. *than* and in Skt. *tandri*; the so-called 'water-knife,' in Tib. *chu gri*, from *chūri[kā]*, which in Skt. just means 'knife.' Such things might also be called 'disguised borrowings,' so long as we do not take this to indicate that even the least conscious motive of deception was involved.

<sup>20</sup> These have been pointed out in the preface to Namgyal Nyima's dictionary, which cites *Matisoff* 178: "The resemblance of this root to German *Klang*, 'sound' is amusing, but entirely fortuitous!"

<sup>21</sup> This word was discussed in some detail by Hoffmann (see *Hoff2* 196-7), although he ends by saying it as an Indic loan, "a haplogenic form of *kukkura*."



There are a few particular Zhangzhung words which, in comparison to their Tibetan counterparts, fit more closely with the Tibeto-Burman evidence. For examples, the word for ‘horse’ is in ZZ *hrang* (variant spelling *dhang*), while it is in Tibetan *rta* (but note also, Tib. *rkyang*, ‘the wild ass’). The word for ‘breath’ is in ZZ *seg* or *sag*; in Tibetan, *dbugs*. (See the appropriate entries below.) I hope this work will be useful for Tibeto-Burmanists, although I have only done a bit of desultory comparison here and there. If comparative work is what you are looking for, I must say, you are bound to be somewhat disappointed. My main interest is in locating and recovering the vocabulary of the Zhangzhung language itself. To this end, I even reach out to other languages.

### *Problems of grammar*

Some may wonder, and in fact these questions have often been asked, Why do you find no, or nearly no, verbs in Zhangzhung? What are the personal pronouns? What are the grammatical affixes? The main and simplest answer to the first two questions is that you find few verbs and apparently no personal pronouns because the main source of ZZ vocabulary is the *Mdzod phug*. Since the *Mdzod phug* is an expository cosmological text, there is little if any occasion for the use of verbs beyond those that mean ‘to be, to live, to become, and to procreate.’<sup>22</sup> Since there is not the least sense of dialog to be found in the entire work, personal pronouns are not likely to be found there.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Actually, the verbal form ‘*gi gar ju* (see the entry below), repeated many times in the first chapter of *Mdzod*, while it is equivalent in the bilingual text to Tib. *bshos*, ‘to have sex,’ may be analyzed with the ‘*gi gar* meaning ‘innumerable,’ while the *ju* does elsewhere in the bilingual text correspond to Tib. ‘*byungl ba*], meaning ‘to arise, emerge, happen occur.’ I take the whole expression to mean ‘to proliferate’ or ‘to multiply’ in the Biblical sense. The verb *ju* is very well attested in *Mdzod*, and if for this reason alone, the idea that there are no verbs in Zhangzhung has already been disproven. Still, there may be alternative ways to understand the grammar of ‘*gi gar ju*, especially since the syllable *ju* is in Darma a verbal suffix used to make the third-person past (YN 33). The use of Tib. *srid [pa]*, ‘to come into being, evolve,’ as a verb corresponding to ZZ *lig* is interesting, since in Tibetan it is normally a noun meaning ‘life’ (the verbal usage has been remarked upon based on other contexts in Haahr, *Yar-lun* 269; it is in fact used as a verb in modern Tibetan, but with the meaning ‘to be possible’). There is also ZZ *khrun* for Tib. *brdol*, ‘popped out, emerged.’ In ZZ *smar* is generally just an adjective meaning ‘good,’ but in the text of *Mdzod* it has additional verbal usages. Of these latter, the spelling *smar* occurs without any variant readings as equiv. to Tib. *smin*, ‘to ripen.’ But it also appears as one of a few variant readings of Zhangzhung verb[s] equivalent to Tibetan *gsal*, ‘to make clear, clarify,’ and *ston*, ‘to show, teach.’ There are indeed verbs in Zhangzhung, just not very many. All these examples are taken from *Mdzod*, and may be located instantly and with ease in the digital text edition (recording line variants) I have made and made available. For this reason I have not given the page references here.

<sup>23</sup> I suppose that, as in other languages, demonstratives might be used in lieu of and treated as equivalent to third-person pronouns, as Haahr says (ZZH 17). I did search through the Tibetan text of *Mdzod* for the more common forms of the Tibetan personal pronouns, and none were found.

As for the grammatical affixes, which might be supposed to be entirely made up of suffixes,<sup>24</sup> see the attempts to identify them by Haarh (ZZH 20-21) and Hummel (OZZ 19-21 or Humm1 506). The basic problem with Haarh's attempt is that he evidently based himself primarily on Zhu's glossary, and not on the *Mdzod phug* itself. But then, on account of the complexities in the scribal transmission of the text, it will be a very difficult task to see one's way through past the sometimes Tibetanizing readings to the original forms of the suffixes. At the moment, with the resources available to us, I think we cannot make the attempt with hope of very great success.

What I will do is try to interpret and test a grammatical sketch in an introduction to a Zhangzhung-Tibetan glossary that I believe to be a product of modern times. This work (Sgra) has the passage that we will discuss.

Before beginning its bilingual vocabulary list, it provides this extremely brief grammar of the grammatical affixes (*tshig phrad*):

*de yang gu ge'i phal skad la rnam dbye dang tshig 'phrad tsam gyi sgra sbyar yod de / ci [gyi] / ci [la] / zhis [gyi] / cis [kyi] / ni [nas, las] / ci [sprul] / ci [ni] / bstan [ni] 'brel sgra yang ci ni pi ci ri si ti gi gyi 'i yi sogs dang / la don cu ru du na la le lu su sur sogs tshig sbyor la stos nas sbyor.*

This says that its case grammar is based on the vulgar language of Gu-ge (Gu-ge'i Phal-skad). I suppose this statement might be found meaningful. Here are the suffixes:

*ci* ~ Tib. *gyi*, meaning 'of' (genitive case).

*ci* ~ Tib. *la*, 'to' (terminative case).

*zhis* ~ Tib. *gyi*, 'of' (genitive case).<sup>25</sup>

*cis* ~ Tib. *kyi*, 'of' (genitive case).<sup>26</sup>

*ni* ~ Tib. *nas* or *las*, 'from' (ablative).

*ci* ~ Tib. *sprul*, 'emanation' (?).<sup>27</sup>

*ci* ~ Tib. *ni* (enclitic, copula marker).

*bstan* ~ *ni* (ditto?).<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> We ought to note the possible exception of *ta-*, *ti-*, and similar prefixes, which *could* represent definite articles or demonstratives, and therefore might not be correctly understood as prefixes.

<sup>25</sup> This syllable *zhis* may be eliminated since it does not occur as such in Mdzod, where we find it only once as a part of a word, and even then only one variant reading among others.

<sup>26</sup> I believe that this, too, may be eliminated, since the syllable *cis* only occurs in Mdzod as second element of the word *pa cis*, var. *sa cis*, equiv. to Tib. *lcam dral* or *ming sring*, 'brother-sister pair,' or '[group of] brothers & sisters.'

<sup>27</sup> This looks very odd, and is very likely based in a mistaken reading of the following line from Mdzod, chapter 1. First the line in Zhangzhung with its variants: *mu tsug bing nga sa slig ji / [mu tsug bing nga za slig ji /] [S: mu cug bing nga zla slig ci /] [K: mu tshug bing nga za slig ji /]*. And now the line in Tibetan with its variants: *skye ba bzhi las yong kyang sprul / [S: skye ba bzhi yis yongs su sbrul /] [K: skye ba bzhi las yongs su sprul /] [M: skye ba bzhi las thams cad bsrul /]*. The Tibetan line means, 'They all/entirely emanate by means of the four [modes of] birth.' The Zhangzhung word corresponding to Tib. *sprul* [*pa/ba*] is variously spelled *za slig*, *zla slig*, and *dzan slig*. Even with this understanding, it is not evident what the function of the syllable *ci/ji* might be here. What *is* clear is that it is not being used in the meaning of Tib. *sprul*.

The genitive suffix (Tib. *'brel sgra*) may take forms including *ci, ni, pi, ci [-bi?], ri, si, ti, gi, gyi, 'i, & yi*.

The terminative (Tib. *la-don*) case may take forms including *cu, ru, du, na, la, lu, su, & sur*.

Now, when we try to make sense of this while reading the *Mdzod phug*, we instantly encounter numerous problems. For one thing, the ending *zhi* is common, but is not among those offered here — it ought to be a genitive ending, apparently, as should *shi* — and neither *zhi* nor *shi* is listed by Haarh. The *ni* and *ci* have been confused so often in the text transmission that there is little hope of ever being able to distinguish which was meant if, indeed, they have any difference at all in their usage, this being impossible to tell with any certainty.

The syllable *ni* is perhaps the most complex syllable in ZZ for our thinking. Have a look at its entry below. It appears to bear far too great a number of grammatical functions and in fact appears in nearly every line, very often at the ends of lines. It would seem that a ‘homogenizing’ and perhaps at the same time a ‘Tibetanizing’ trend is to blame for its frequency. I think that originally distinctive syllables were collapsed [through an internal correction process] into a single one. Some people, employing ‘Tibetanizing’ ways of reading, might think “*ni*” was simply meant to set off the ZZ lines from the Tibetan lines that follow. I suggest that this is just the sort of thing that has happened in the past, resulting in a major block to our contemporary comprehension.

Still, I believe we can see through part of this confusion. We may see many of the line-final usages of *ni* as in fact clause-final usages. In other words, the *ni* is standing in the position of the verb in simple or declarative clauses or sentences. And ZZ is not alone in this particular usage of the *ni*, although some may need reminding that this usage is not known in Written Tibetan language. See the following for a mapping of TB languages that make use of “*ni*” as copula: Gwendolyn Lowes, *Some Comparative Notes on Tibeto-Burman Copulas*.<sup>29</sup> Although neglected in the mapping of Lowes, the Mi-nyag language of Khams also has sentence-final *ni* with a declarative meaning.<sup>30</sup> In brief, the clause-final use of *ni* as copula is by no means limited to Zhangzhung, there is really nothing unusual about it, and in the

<sup>28</sup> This must be eliminated (after observing that it footnotes the Tib. with the ZZ instead of the other way around), since it comes from reading the line-final syllable *ni* as holding a significant correspondence with the Tib. *bstan*, ‘to show, teach,’ but there is no such correspondence in these lines of *Mdzod* (there is nothing in the ZZ to correspond with the Tibetan verb, simply the *ni* which I am inclined to understand as a clause-final copula, as in Darma language).

<sup>29</sup> This is a conference handout, made available for internet download as a PDF here: [http://depts.washington.edu/icstll39/abstracts/icstll39\\_lowes\\_hdt.pdf](http://depts.washington.edu/icstll39/abstracts/icstll39_lowes_hdt.pdf). A map included in this handout (figure 4) shows in a graphic way that the use of *ni* as copula characterizes languages such as Lushai, Meithei, as well as Darmiya (i.e. Darma).

<sup>30</sup> See Takumi Ikeda, 200 Example Sentences in the Mu-nya Language (Tanggu Dialect), *Zinbun*, vol. 40 (2007), pp. 71-140, where there are very many examples. The Tibetan spelling used for this language spoken in Eastern Tibet is Mi-nyag, which is also the ethnonym for the Tanguts. There is some further interesting discussion in *OZZ* 66 n.32.

future it should be simply accepted. This understanding actually assists us in our argument that the rarity, or supposed 'absence,' of verbs in ZZ is not the problem it has sometimes been made out to be.

I believe we may with some confidence remove the series *gi*, *gyi*, 'i & yi' (along with the missing *kyi* form) from the realm of genuinely ZZ genitive endings. When they do occur in the ZZ of the *Mdzod phug*, they may be explained as Tibetanizing corrections. The genitive ending *bi*, although supported by Haarh (ZZH 20), is attested only once in Zhu's glossary. It is not attested at all in the *Mdzod phug*, where even the passage on which Zhu is based translates ZZ *bi* as Tib. *bzhi*, 'four.' This particular genitive ending, finding its basis in more than one level of misreading and misspelling, may not be said to exist in any meaningful sense of the word. It can be eliminated, with certainty, from future discussions.

Haarh (ZZH 20) constructed a set of rules to govern when each of the different forms is to be used.<sup>31</sup> These rules, evidently based on the rather limited, and in my view contaminated, evidence in Zhu's glossary, need to be worked out freshly on the basis of the *Mdzod phug*, taking textual variants into account. To use the same example, Haarh makes a rule, based on a single instance in Zhu's glossary, that the genitive ending *bi* is to be used following syllables ending in 'e'. Not to belabor the point, but not only is it based on a single instance, but that instance is *le bi*, glossed by Tib. *rlung gi*, where *le* is a much less frequent spelling for ZZ *li*, 'wind.' This is insufficient basis for rule construction, to say the least.

The ZZ final stop, described by Haarh (ZZH 21) as closely resembling the Tibetan final stop in that the vowel 'o' is added to a duplicated final consonant to create it, does not actually occur even once in the ZZ text of Mdzod (while occurring hundreds of times in its Tibetan text). Haarh's examples all come from Zhu's glossary. Even there it is a result of a Tibetanizing process, with only four occurrences.

In a similar manner, we can say with some certainty that the Tibetan ablative suffix *nas* is not used in ZZ. Haarh believed it was (ZZH 21-21), on the basis of Zhu, but this is mistaken.<sup>32</sup> There is only one line in Mdzod, near the end of its chapter 2, but here ZZ *de nas*, corresponding to Tib. *de ltar*, is not acting as an ablative at all, and is very likely a result of a scribal Tibetanizing move. In all other cases, Tib. *nas* is represented in the corresponding ZZ text by nothing, by zero. It is quite a similar case with the Tibetan ablative ending *las*, except that here we do have *something* in that Zhangzhung that corresponds with it. Whatever that *something* may have been, it is represented in our existing *Mdzod phug* texts in the forms *ci*, *ni*, *zhi*, & *zi* [ze?]. You may want to object that these look far too much like forms of the genitive, and I will not disagree with you. I will just conclude that, for

<sup>31</sup> One problem is that, given the different syntax of Zhangzhung, it is often the case that no genitive is needed in the ZZ texts of Mdzod in places where it is required in the corresponding Tibetan text.

<sup>32</sup> As such, the ending *nas* only occurs once in Zhu, in the final part which seems to have been the author's own composition. Here the corresponding Tibetan ending is *na*, which follows a verb and has a conditional meaning, 'if, when.' The ending *las* also occurs only once, as equivalent to the identical ending in the Tibetan parallel. This is in a so-far unidentified passage that certainly had as its source a Mother Tantra text. By itself it hardly justifies the construction of a grammatical rule.

now, we really do not know what any ablative ending actually looked like in Zhangzhung.

As for the terminative case endings, Haarh supplies a different list: *gu, cu, da, du, tu, tur, 'u, sur*. I believe we can accept that the ZZ syllables *gu, cu, tu, du, ru, lu, su* probably have this usage. Perhaps whatever rules apply to the genitive would govern the terminative suffixes as well. This would seem logical. Very likely the *tur* and most definitely the *sur*,<sup>33</sup> may be removed from the list of terminative endings. I am not sure what to say about the *na* and *la* endings yet. I guess by this point the reader will be expecting me to say that they are just more examples of Tibetanizations. I am not entirely sure of that. But yes, they probably are what they seem to be. There are further areas of Zhangzhung grammar that could bear exploring, but we will desist from going into them for the time being.<sup>34</sup>

#### *Zhangzhung's connections with neighboring languages*

In general, I believe Zhangzhung linguistic connections with the lush green valley of Kinnaur are very well known and require little comment by me.<sup>35</sup> Hummel, while not explicitly minimalizing the significance of Kinnauri and other western Tibetan languages, locates ZZ historically in the far northeast of the Tibetan plateau, at the same time placing it with languages of the Yunnan area, which despite their current southeastern location he gives northeastern origins.

Quite the contrary of Hummel, I have come to believe in the importance of those western Tibetan languages, and more specifically of the Darma language. Darma is spoken in Uttar Pradesh, now renamed Uttarakhand,

<sup>33</sup> The syllable *tur* is extremely common in *Mdzod* as a second element in ZZ words, but not as a terminative ending. The idea that *sur* might be such an ending is evidently based on a single occurrence, and even then only a variant, in *Mdzod*, where it is not serving as an ending at all. It appears in this line, or rather in one of the variant readings: *mu pur ma mig sum pa'i gyin* / [S: *mu par mi mig sum pa'i gyin* /] [K: *mu sur ma mig sum pa'i gyin* /], corresponding to the Tibetan, *bsrung du med pa'i dam tshig ni*. The Tibetan means 'The vows not for keeping [i.e. unkeepable vows] are [as follows].' The ZZ *ma mig* generally means 'without focussing' or 'without limit,' but here it must mean 'without keeping' and hence standing for the entire phrase *bsrung du med pa*. The first word of the ZZ, *mu pur* or *mu sur*, stands for Tib. *dam tshig*, 'vow.' ZZ *sum pa'i* is a slightly Tibetanized form of ZZ *sum pi*, meaning 'three' (it appears in the following line in the text of the Tib.). So the ZZ translates, following the syntax, "The vows not-for-keeping three are." This is an excellent example, by the way, to show that the word order of the Tibetan and the Zhangzhung often differs.

<sup>34</sup> Seeing the vocabulary commonalities that link Zhangzhung with other western Tibetan languages of the so-called 'complex pronominalization' type, we may expect that Zhangzhung also would have had its own system of verbal suffixes incorporating pronouns that indicate the recipient of the action, and the like. Since each language has its own way of doing this, we might expect the same of Zhangzhung also. For a very interesting survey, see the article by Yoshiharu Takahashi (YT in the bibliography). The main discouragement is of course the limited number of verbs in the ZZ evidence. Still, the idea that ZZ may be a 'complex pronominalizing' language may have consequence for how we try to interpret the evidence.

<sup>35</sup> See the following article specifically on the subject of Zhangzhung-Kinnauri language connections: Chos-'khor-tshang Nyi-ma-'od-zer, Zhang zhung dang 'brel ba'i khu nu'i skad rig, *Bon sgo*, vol. 20 (2007), pp. 113-125.

quite close to the westernmost border of Nepal, with some speakers falling on the Nepalese side of the border.<sup>36</sup> While it may make just as much sense to focus on Old Newar, Kinnauri, or perhaps Thakali among others, I think there are very good reasons to see Darma as more interesting than the others just mentioned.

The Darma language terms in the list just below are based mainly on Shree Krishan's Darma-English glossary (see the bibliography under Krishan). I myself am responsible for adding the Zhangzhung words that are similar in sound and meaning.

The order is always like this: Darma // English // Zhangzhung. I have added the Tibetan in parentheses just to show how, most often, in places where the Darma and Zhangzhung closely correspond, the Tibetan contrasts with both.

Although I have reservations about a few (such as *phu*), almost all of the Zhangzhung forms that I have included in this list I believe to be well established. These words are also among the everyday terms, including numbers and body parts, linguists are likely to label as belonging to 'basic' vocabulary (which may make us *tend* to regard them as local and not imported words).

Darma // English // Zhangzhung (Tibetan):

*ba* // father // *ba* (Tib. *pha*).

*be* // skin // *pad* [perhaps pronounced something like Eng. 'bay'] (Tib. *lpags*).

*ching-cha* // liver // *shin* (Tib. *mchin pa*).

*khagaco* // stomach // *khog tse* (Tib. *grod pa*).

*gunda-la* // finger (middle) // *kan* (Tib. *kan ma, gung mo?*).

*hrang* // horse // *hrang* (Tib. *rta*).

*hre* // field // *rig* or *tig* (Tib. *zhing*).

*hrup* // rib // *hrub* (Tib. *rtsib*).

*je, tsema* // barley // *zag* or *zad* ['zay?'] (Tib. *nas*).

*phu* // copper // *phu* (Tib. *zangs*).

*mangnu* // red // *mang* (Tib. *dmag po*).

*reju* // nose // *ra tse* (Tib. *rna ba*), noting Chaudangsi *ratse* & Byangsi *hrace*, both meaning 'ear.'

<sup>36</sup> This language name has sometimes also been spelled Darmiya. For an early work on Darma, see G.A. Grierson, *Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 490-502. Note also the more recent work of Devidatta Sharma, *Tibeto-Himalayan Languages of the Uttara Khand*, Mittal Publications (New Delhi 1989), in 2 vols. There has been a very recent publication, evidently in 2007, of a dictionary of Darma together with Bangba (i.e., Chaudangsi) language, with Hindi glosses. The entire work, here cited as MSE, is in Devanagari script. According to its title, *Śabdakoṣa Raṃ-lvū*, it is a dictionary of Raṃ-lvū, i.e., Rung Lo, which means 'language[s] of the valleys.' I received this, as well as a dictionary of Byangsi (GSB), just in time to make use of them, thanks to the kindness and efforts of Christoph Cüppers (Lumbini). The most important recent and reliable source on Darma is surely the dissertation of Christina Willis (DGD). Byangsi and Chaudangsi kinship terms were specially studied by Nicholas J. Allen in his article *Byansi Kinship Terminology: A Study in Symmetry*, *Man*, n.s. vol. 10, no. 1 (March 1975), pp. 80-94, and his study was preceded by P. Lall, *An Enquiry into the Birth and Marriage Customs of the Khasias and the Bhotias of Almora District, U.P.*, *Indian Antiquary*, vol. 40 (1911), pp. 190-198. Zhangzhung kinship terminology deserves a special study.

*re-nani* // west // *ra* (Tib. *nub*).  
*sak* // breath // *sag* or *seg* (Tib. *dbug*s).  
*shi-no* // white // *shi nom* (Tib. *dkar po*).  
*shiri* // boy // *hri tsa* (Tib. *bu, phru gu*).  
*shya* // king // *rkya* (Tib. *rje*, 'lord').  
*ti* // water // *ti* (Tib. *chu*), but note that *ti* for 'water' is rather ubiquitous.  
*tsame* // daughter, girl // *tsa med* (Tib. *bu mo*).  
*tshé* // fat (grease) // *tshas* (Tib. *snum*).  
*tshum* // hair // *con* or *tson* (Tib. *skra*).

#### Numbers:

*nisu* // seven // *snis* (Tib. *bdun*)  
*pi* // four // *bi* or *bing* (Tib. *bzhi*)  
*ra* [or *se*] // hundred // *ra* (Tib. *brgya*)  
*tako-go* // first // *ti ga* (Tib. *dang po*)

I think it notable that the Darma language shares with ZZ the *hr-* initial (including the word *hrang* for 'horse') as well as the syntactical similarity of placing unmarked adjectives directly before the substantives they modify (just the opposite of Tibetan, which places unmarked adjectives after their substantives<sup>37</sup>). However, Darma does *not* have the initial 'n' in its words for 'fire' and 'human' like ZZ does. Darma also has pre-aspirated nasals *hn-* and *hm-*, which are apparently lacking in ZZ (see [Krishan](#)).

There is one interesting fact that makes this comparison with Darma all the more significant. The Darma (Dar-ma) language was known in what I have argued to be a 12th-century Bon work, the preface to the *Meditation Commentary* (see my book *Mandala Cosmogony*, p. 16). In fact, it is listed among several types of speech or 'dialects' of Zhangzhung. I translated this passage with lengthy added footnotes long ago in my master's thesis, but at the time I had only some rough and rudimentary ideas how the language names ought to be understood, and made some conjectures that I would now consider inadequate.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> See Matthew S. Dryer, *Word Order in Tibeto-Burman Languages*, a paper forthcoming in *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* made available on the internet, pp. 35 & 36, for remarkable maps showing the distribution of adjective-noun and noun-adjective languages. Noun-adjective languages strongly predominate in Southeast Asia, including the islands and much of southern China, the areas north of the main Himalayan chain (with some exceptions in southern slopes and foothills of the Himalayas), and most of the languages of Assam in the southern and eastern parts. Adjective-noun languages are concentrated along the main range of the Himalayas while including the entire Indian sub-continent to its south. Of the group called "West Himalayish," to which Kinnauri, Darma, and presumably Zhangzhung belong, all except Gahri (or Bunan) Dryer finds to be adjective-noun languages.

<sup>38</sup> It first occurred to me that the Dar-ma of the Mother Tantra text that I had studied as part of my master's thesis (completed in 1986), might very well be the language known today as Darma only after the appearance George van Driem's two-volume book, published by Brill (Leiden 2001), entitled *Languages of the Himalayas*. Breathtaking in the breadth of its coverage, I somehow happened to read its brief discussions of Darma, and drew the connection (see the survey of the West Himalayish languages and Zhangzhung on pp. 934-57). And in 2005, I had a very brief opportunity to discuss this problem with the author in Leiden.

*zhang zhung las kyang skad rigs 'thun pa du ma yod pa las / 'di ni zhang  
zhung smar gyis sgra ste / 'chun [-gcun, 'jun] che brjod bde sgra ngag  
tshig gsal ba'o // des na gzhan dar ma'i sgra dang / dar ba'i sgra dang / dar  
ma dir gyis sgra dang / gu ge'i sgra dang / phal po che'i glang gi sgra dang /  
ldem ma yin no // — Ma 211.*

“Within Zhangzhung are several similar types of languages (or dialects), and among them what we have here [in the title of the *Mother Tantra* text] is the speech of Zhangzhung Smar, a very refined language, easily pronounced, with clear grammar, vocabulary and expressions. Apart from Smar we have the speech of Dar-ma, the speech of Dar-ba, the speech of Dar-ma-dir, the speech of Gu-ge, and the speech of the Common Cattle<sup>39</sup> and Ldem-ma.” [explanation of the Zhangzhung title of the *Mother Tantra* text follows]

Before discussing how I understand the meaning of this early passage, I would like to give a modern writer's version of the same material, since it is entirely possible that his manuscript resources are superior to ours (Ga-tsha 24-25):

*yul de'i nang gses kyi skad rigs la / smar gyi skad dang / [25] dar ma'i skad  
/ dir ma'i skad / dar ma dir gyi skad / gu ge'i skad / phal po glang gi skad  
sogs yod / smar skad ni zhang zhung sgo pa spyi yi mchog skad dang / gu  
ge'i skad ni yig skad / dar ma'i skad ni lho skad / dir ma'i skad kyang byang  
skad / dar ma dir gyi skad ni stod smad phal spyi'i skad ces 'grel bshad byas  
yod ...*

Among the types of languages included within that region are: [1] Smar language, [2] Dar-ma language, [3] Dir-ma language, [4] Dar-ma-dir language, [5] Gu-ge language, [6] Ordinary Cattle language [ordinary speech language?] and so on. [1] Smar language means the supreme language of the general area of Doorway Zhangzhung. [5] Gu-ge language means the language of letters. [2] Dar-ma language is the southern language. [3] Dir-ma language, similarly, is the language of the north. [4] Dar-ma-dir language is the general and common language of the upper and lower parts. There are commentarial explanations like that.

I detect a descending social order to the original *Mother Tantra* list of Zhangzhung 'dialects,' starting with the most refined, courtly and literary (*smar*, in Zhangzhung, simply means 'good') and ending with the most

<sup>39</sup> Another way to understand *phal po che'i glang gi skad*, as suggested to me by Jean-Luc Achard (Paris), might be 'the language of Glang[-gi Gyim-shod] for the most part.' The larger version of this place name, which is often encountered in Bon works, is Sum-pa Glang-gi Gyim-shod. Nowadays it is usual to identify it with the region of Steng-chen in northeastern Tibet, where there is still an important Bon monastery also named Steng-chen. It is also possible that by *glang* is intended the Zhangzhung word. See its entry below.



vulgar, the ‘Ordinary Cattle’ language. Therefore I differ with the modern author in interpreting Gu-ge language as meaning literary language.<sup>40</sup> He is reading it as a Zhangzhung word, which of course it is, but I believe it makes better sense to understand it as just the name of the Gugé district that was then used for the language spoken there. However, it could be preferable, even, to allow a partially-Zhangzhung understanding of the “speech of the Common Cattle.” The word *glang* (alternative spelling *klang*) which we have translated in the Tibetan understanding as ‘cattle’ could be taken as ZZ for ‘speech, word, declaration.’<sup>41</sup>

I understand *dar ma dir* to be one of those interesting constructions known to the written Tibetan language in which the medial syllable *ma* serves to make an expression that covers either both or neither of the two entities. Thus *ra ma lug* means ‘neither goat nor sheep,’ with a significance similar to the English expression ‘neither fish nor fowl,’ but in practice it can, interestingly for us, mean a mixture of Chinese and Tibetan languages, or what is nowadays often called ‘code switching.’ A second type, represented by *lha ma srin*, means ‘all the entities in a class ranging from divinities (*lha*) to ogres (*srin*) with everything in between.’<sup>42</sup> Probably the meaning of *Dar-ma-dir* is more like the first type, and ought to then be understood to mean ‘belonging neither to the category of *Dar-ma* nor to the category of *Dir-ma*’ or perhaps a mixture of the two types of speech.

Clearly there are still some mysteries to work out. All the more so since, as if the collusion between the 12th-century Bon text and modern language classification were not enough, we also have to point out a mention of “Zhang-zhung *Dar-ma*” in an Old Tibetan manuscript from Dunhuang.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Haarh (ZZH 9) has briefly discussed these same language names on the basis of the much later preface to the glossary of Zhu (Zhu 65a, line 3), “*Phal-pa* is divided into five dialects, called *Dal-ma*, *Dir-ma*, *Dar-ma-dir*, *Gu-ge* and *Phal-po-gLang*. Among these Gu-ge is immediately identified as the present day district of Guge in the upper valleys of the River Sotlej, to the west of Lake Manasarowar. Possibly the other four are to be placed in the same region.” There is nothing to quibble about here, except that it makes no reference to the Mother Tantra source used by Zhu, and does not go very far in its explanations. Sgra 122 gives the language names as *Dar-ma*, *Der-ma*, *Gu-ge*. The longer passage reads: *sgo ba'i skad ni zhang zhung smar skad de ye srid lha las chad / phal pa'i skad ni / dar ma / der ma / gu ge'i sgra'o // de nas 'dir gu ge'i sgra dang smar skad la sbyar nas chab [-khyab] che ba rnams bsrigs par bya ste*. The final statement might be translated, “I am going to edit together here the most widespread [terms], joining the speech of Gu-ge with the Smar (‘good’) language.”

<sup>41</sup> I owe thanks to Jean-Luc Achard for suggesting this solution to the problem. I have no idea what to do with the *Ldem-ma* of the Mother Tantra preface, and I suppose for a similar reason the modern writer also ignored it (as did Zhu, even though it is clear he based himself on this very same passage). Of course *ldem* generally has meanings in Tibetan of ‘flexibility,’ as the flexibility of a feather for example. *Ldem* also occurs as a Zhangzhung word with the meaning of ‘wood.’ It is possible that *Ldem-ma* is not intended to be part of the list of language names, and that *ldem ma yin* means something like ‘is not flexible,’ although I doubt this.

<sup>42</sup> For an example of usage of *ra ma lug*, see Tsering Shakya, *The Development of Modern Tibetan Literature in the People's Republic of China in the 1980s*, contained in: Luran R. Hartley & P. Schiaffini-Vedani, eds., *Modern Tibetan Literature and Social Change*, Duke University Press (Durham 2008), p. 66. On the usage of *lha ma srin*, see R.A. Stein's article *Tibetica Antiqua I*, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, vol. 72 (1983), p. 192.

<sup>43</sup> The following passage may be found in Pelliot Tibétain no. 1290 at the *Old Tibetan Documents Online* website, more specifically at the following webpage: [otdo.aatf.ac.jp/archives.cgi?p=Pt\\_1290](http://otdo.aatf.ac.jp/archives.cgi?p=Pt_1290) — *rgyal phan yul na / mkhar bu re re dang mchiste /*

The most remarkable thing here is just that we have still today a language that calls itself by the name of a Zhangzhung dialect, one that does indeed continue to share a number of features with Zhangzhung.<sup>44</sup>

Moving on to other neighboring languages, I think there is a possibility, one someone ought to look into more deeply, that the Indo-Iranic cluster of tongues known as the Shina languages,<sup>45</sup> today mainly spoken in northern Pakistan, might have more than the several possible word correspondences with Zhangzhung that I have timidly proposed here (for more details, see the relevant entries).

*kun (rog po)* black color [used for animals only]. The Shina word for 'black' is *kino*, an Indo-Iranic word that is of course distantly related to Skt. *kr̥ṣṇa*, 'black.'

*tsa*, or, *tsa mo (nya)* fish. This Zhang-zhung word does not seem to sit easily with any of the TB evidence, which makes it all the more interesting that a similar word for 'fish' is found in Shina languages: *chumu*, *chubo*, *chimi*, *chumo*, *chimo*. Note that the *ch* > *ts* and *ts* > *ch* sound shifts are very common in the Himalayan region.

*yu ti (chang)* barley beer. This often appears in Bon ritual literature, and it is not especially clear whether we ought to regard it as Tibetan or as Zhang-zhung. The syllable *yu* by itself may be explained by the Shina languages' word for 'barley,' which is *yoo*. The syllable *ti* is ZZ for 'water, liquid.' I know of no other reasonable way of explaining this unusual word *yu ti*.<sup>46</sup>

*ag sho (kha)* mouth. This might be compared with Shina languages' words of like meaning: *aay*, *aazi*, *aazu*, and *aazo*; in Brokskat, 'uzi.

I would imagine these to be borrowings based on long proximity. It may or may not be significant that only one of these, *ag sho*, is actually attested in

---

*rgyal ph[r]lan bgyid pa dang / / rgyal phran gyi blon po / su sum bgyis par zhang zhung dar ma'i rje bo lag snya shur / / blon po khyung po ra sangse rje / stong lam rma rtse ...* For more discussion on this passage by Namgyal Nyima, who believes it pertains to the Khyunglung area, see ZZT 431.

<sup>44</sup> Given that Zhangzhung is not even mentioned as a possible factor, Sharma's dividing of Darma words into only three origins — Tibetan, Indo-Aryan and indigenous — will require considerable reorganization, especially since words with clear Zhangzhung correspondences may be found in both the Tibetan and the indigenous categories. See TH1, p. 22.

<sup>45</sup> All my information on the Shina languages comes from an examination of S&K, although I am aware of another recent publication that I have not yet seen: Ruth Laila Schmidt & Razal Kohistani, *A Grammar of the Shina Language of Indus Kohistan*, Harrassowitz (Wiesbaden 2008).

<sup>46</sup> For a dozen examples of usage of the term *yu ti*, see Namgyal Nyima's dictionary, pp. 343-4. Hindi has a word *yuti* defined as 'connection, union,' which must descend from Skt. *yukti*. I suppose it could have to do with Yu-ti, the 'Jade Emperor' of Chinese Daoism. Still, I have not discovered any special connections these just-mentioned terms might have with beverages, so I doubt their relevance for understanding the Zhangzhung word.

the *Mdzod phug*, and there it has a wide range of meanings reflected in different equivalents in Tibetan, most pertaining in some way to the mouth, face and speech.

Khotanese Saka, too, was spoken in an area neighboring western Tibet, and I believe that possible Khotanese, or more generally Iranian, loans in ZZ need to be seriously considered in the future. Only a few such suggestions — and they are *only* suggestions of an exploratory nature — are put forward here.

Surely ZZ as well as Tibetan language connections with such languages as Khotanese and Shina are far more likely to have occurred in recent millennia than those much more ancient — in my estimation tenuous, highly speculative and even dubious — connections, suggested by Siegbert Hummel, with the Canary Islands, not to mention Basque, Etruscan, Meroitic, Sumerian...<sup>47</sup>

#### *On the use of the dictionary*

Entries are arranged in the usual Tibetan alphabetic order. Those who do not know Tibetan alphabetic order should still be able to locate words by using ‘search’ functions of their personal computers. The heading of each entry gives the Zhangzhung word in all-capitals, followed by the Tibetan-language translation enclosed in parentheses, immediately followed by a rendering of the Tibetan into English. I have generally supplied the English translations suggested by Haarh, but added corrections or ideas of my own in curled brackets { } immediately after (or later on in the entry without the curled brackets). When you do see something enclosed in curled brackets, it means I consider it more true or accurate or more justifiable than any conflicting information that might have been given just before. It means it reflects my own best ideas. We might say that Haarh forms the main starting-point, with further information added from other available sources, most importantly the *Mdzod phug* itself.

I should say that, while I do try to be strict about giving some kind of translation immediately after every Tibetan word, I do not give the same translation at every occurrence. I hope nobody will find this bothersome. Words do not always have to have the same translation equivalents. And while I have generally attempted to make translation choices roughly ‘context-sensitive,’ I know I cannot claim complete success.

As mentioned before, I have been rather obsessive, perhaps even irritatingly so, about marking each Zhangzhung word with “ZZ” and each Tibetan word with “Tib.” when these words appear in English sentences. This was done out of a desire to prevent precisely the same types of confusions that have entered into the Zhangzhung evidence in the past.

---

<sup>47</sup> But it may be that in the 21st century the search for global linguistic connections is becoming more widely accepted. Witness the publication of Tóth, a work that finds Tibeto-Burman connections with both Hungarian and Sumerian, largely based on another recent work comparing Tibetan and Sumerian vocabularies — Jan Braun, *Sumerian and Tibeto-Burman*, Agade (Warsaw 2001). I occasionally make references to this work by Tóth, but I am incapable of endorsing it.

I suppose it would have been good to mark the parts of speech. I decided against marking ZZ words as verbs, nouns, adjectives or adverbs, since anyway the Tibetan equivalents have often been supplied without context, or with insufficient context, to allow certainty. In actual practice, I have marked some verbs as verbs, just in order to emphasize their existence, which some have doubted.

I have done my best to impose on the entries a rational internal structure. I place different meanings in numbered sections. More general discussions and referrals to other entries, are generally given at the end of the entry.

Occasionally you may notice in one of the dictionary entries a comment such as, "This entry ought to be removed." This is my way of saying that I am fairly certain that the head word is not Zhangzhung, which would mean it does not belong in a Zhangzhung dictionary. Of course in a sense these entries *do* belong here, just because someone somewhere did, and probably still does, think that they must be Zhangzhung.

I would like to remind users of this dictionary that, even though I have spent some time in this introduction suggesting relations of Zhangzhung with neighboring languages, this was not my main purpose while making it. My aim has been to supply the available materials necessary for persons with a desire to understand words and texts in Zhangzhung language, and to do so in a way that is not misleading. By that I mean that it ought not be adding any more errors, but rather signalling and exposing some of the errors that have been made in the past. If I have succeeded in this task even somewhat, I think my work has been successful enough. I apologize for presenting, in lieu of a proper dictionary, a set of problems that are largely still in need of solutions. All I can do at this point is wish you the best of luck as an encouragement for the journey ahead. *Sarva maṅgalaṃ! Mu tsugs smar ro! Lha rgyal lo!*

\* \* \*

#### *A Note of Thanks*

I make no claims to be a linguist, or, to put it in a better way: However much some of my interests may lean toward matters that might be termed 'linguistic,' I am not predisposed to spend my days in historical reconstructions of unrecorded proto-languages. Still, I received help from several people, included among them some prominent linguists in the field of Tibeto-Burman studies. I have accepted some of their ideas and suggestions, while they undoubtedly helped me eliminate some of my more egregious errors, for which I thank them even as I lay the remaining errors at the feet of my own limitations and misunderstandings. I would especially like to express my gratitude to Christopher I. Beckwith, Christoph Cüppers, Nathan Hill, Dagkar Namgyal Nyima, Andras Róna-Tas, and Christina Willis. Remind me if I have neglected anyone. Special debts are owed to Christoph Cüppers who went to special lengths to procure copies of newly published but nevertheless rare dictionaries in Kathmandu, and to Nathan Hill, for sending me his electronic glossary of Byangsi, which he took pains to put into a digital searchable format, making it especially useful. And last

but not least I would like to acknowledge Jean-Luc Achard, the editor of *Revue d'Etudes Tibétaines*, not only for accepting this document for publication, but also for offering suggestions for improvement that were gratefully accepted.

*More Resources*

The edition of the *Srid pa'i mdzod phug* bilingual text (Mdzod), with line variants based on four published versions, will soon be made available once again for download on the internet. An older version was posted with the Zhangzhung Studies Forum several years ago. The Zhu glossary will at the same time be made available in a digital format. With these two files as resources, the entries in this Zhangzhung dictionary may be checked and researchers will be able to come to their own independent and original conclusions about their validity.



Published sources

(and key to abbreviated references)

Please note that Bibliographical references, including bibliographical abbreviations, are always underlined, immediately followed by the page number reference where relevant.

Beckwith:

Christopher I. Beckwith, *The Pai-lang Songs: The Earliest Texts in a Tibeto-Burman Language and Their Late Old Chinese Transcriptions*. Contained in: Christopher Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages III*, International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies (Halle 2008), pp. 87-110.

Beckwith, OC Loans:

Christopher I. Beckwith, *Old Chinese Loans in Tibetan and the Non-uniqueness of "Sino-Tibetan."* Contained in: Christopher Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages III* (Proceedings of the 11th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies), International Institute for Tibetan and Buddhist Studies (Halle 2008), pp. 161-201.

Beyer, CT Lang:

Stephan V. Beyer, *The Classical Tibetan Language*, SUNY Press (Albany 1992).

Bon Dag:

*Five Bonpo Texts for the Study of Grammar, Poetics & Lexicography* by Kun-bzang-rgyal-mtshan (b. 1837), Tshul-khrims-phun-tshogs (b. 1783) and Tshul-khrims-rgyal-mtshan (b. 1898), "reproduced from manuscripts copied from G.yung-drung-gling prints," Khedup Gyatso, Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre (Dolanji 1985).

Btsan-lha:

Btsan-lha Ngag-dbang-tshul-khrims, *Brda dkrol gser gyi me long*, Mi rigs dpe skrun khang (Beijing 1997). This is perhaps the most useful Tibetan-Tibetan dictionary based on mainly older Tibetan glossaries, from which it quotes extensively.

CBK:

Tseyang Changngoba, Namgyal Nyima Dagkar, Per Kværne, Dondrup Lhagyal, Dan Martin, Donatella Rossi & Tsering Thar, *A Catalogue of the Bon Kanjur*, National Museum of Ethnology, Senri Ethnological Reports series no. 40, series editor

Yasuhiko Nagano (Osaka 2003). A catalogue of the 192-volume 2nd edition of the Bon scriptures.

Chang, Kun

On Zhang Zhung. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology*, Academia Sinica, vol. 4 (1960), pp. 137-154. This is about Zhangzhung history and geography, not the language. The author's name is actually spelled "Kung Chang" in the publication.

Cobl:

Weldon South Coblin, *A Sinologist's Handlist of Sino-Tibetan Lexical Comparisons*, Steyler (Nettetal 1986).

CT:

Dan Martin, Comparing Treasures: 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. Contained in: Samten G. Karmay and Yosuhiko Nagano, eds., *New Horizons in Bon Studies*, The National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2000), pp. 21-88.

DGD:

Christina Marie Willis, *A Descriptive Grammar of Darma: An Endangered Tibeto-Burman Language*, doctoral dissertation, University of Texas (Austin 2007). A PDF file was placed on the internet for free download. I have mainly made use of the Glossary on pp. 576-587, which is arranged in English alphabetic order.

Ga-tsha:

Ga-tsha Dge-bshes Blo-gros-rab-gsal, *Gna' bo'i lo rgyus las 'phros pa'i dpyad rtsom dus rabs gsar pa'i gzhon nu rnams la bskul ba'i cong brda*, Mu khri btsad po zhang bod rig gzhung zhib 'jug khang (Khotla-Panjola 2002).

GSB:

Gopāla Simha Boharā & Balarāma Prasāi, *Byāṃsi (Ram)-Nepālī-Amgrejī Ādhārabhūta Śābdakosa (Byansi [Rang]-Nepali-English Basic Dictionary)*, Gopāla Simha Boharā (Lalitpur 2008). All Byangsi words drawn from this dictionary are my Romanizations of the Devanāgarī. Byangsi verbs are given in their actual infinitive forms, which regularly end in *-mo*.

Haarh, Erik

See ZZH.

Haarh, Yar-luñ:

Erik Haarh, *The Yar-luñ Dynasty*, G.E.C. Gad (Copenhagen 1969).

Hoffmann, Helmut

Hoff1: *Žaṅ-žuñ*, the Holy Language of the Tibetan Bonpo. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, vol. 117, no. 2 (1967), pp. 376-381.

Hoff2: Several *Žaṅ-žuñ* Etymologies. *Oriens Extremus*, vol. 19, nos. 1-2 (December 1972), pp. 193-201.

Honda:

Isao Honda, Some Notes on 'Gold' and 'Road' in Zhangzhung and Tamangic. Contained in: Yasuhiko Nagano, ed., *Issues in Tibeto-Burman Historical Linguistics*, Senri Ethnological Studies series no. 75, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2009), pp. 99-120.

Hummel, Siegbert

Humm1: Materialien zu einem Wörterbuch der *Žaṅ-žuñ*-Sprache. *Monumenta Serica*, vol. 31 (1974-5), pp. 488-520.

Humm2: Der Ursprung der Sprache von Zhang-zhung. *Journal of the Tibet Society*, vol. 6 (1986), pp. 3-16. Available online.

Neues Material zur Sprache von Zhang-zhung. *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 59 (1995), pp. 162-168.

Note that all of Hummel's works on Zhangzhung have been translated into English and handily gathered together into a single volume: Siegbert Hummel, *On Zhang-zhung*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives (Dharamsala 2000), translated by Guido Vogliotti. Strangely enough, this volume is equipped with indices for every language *except* Zhang-zhung. This work is abbreviated as OZZ (listed below).

Jamspal:

*Treasury of Good Sayings of Sa-skya Paṇḍita the Eminent Tibetan Lama, 1182-1251: Development of Awareness and Conduct (Rje-btsun Sa-skya Paṇḍi-ta'i Legs-par Bshad-pa Rin-po-che'i Gter zhes bya-ba'i Bstan-bcos)*, ed. by Lozang Jamspal, tr. by Lozang Jamspal & Ngawang Sonam Tenzin (Jared Douglas Rhoton, 1941-1993), Ladakhratnashridipika (Leh 2003).

Kansakar:

Tej Ratna Kansakar, The Tibeto-Burman Languages of Nepal: A General Survey. *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, vol. 20, no. 2 (July 1993), pp. 165-173.

Khro:

Skyabs-ston Rin-chen-'od-zer, *Spyi spungs khro bo dbang chen gyi 'grel pa* (and the *Dbal phur spyi don* rediscovered by Khu-tsha Zla-'od), Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre (New Thobgyal 1973).

Khyung-sprul:

Khyung-sprul Rin-po-che (1897-1955), *Gangs can bod kyi brda skad ming gzhi gsal bar ston pa'i bstan bcos dgos 'byung nor bu'i gter chen*, G.yung drung bon gyi bshad sgrub 'dus sde [Bon Dialectic School] (Dolanji 2004).

Krishan:

Shree Krishan, A Sketch of Darma Grammar. Contained in: Y. Nagano & R. LaPolla, *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages* (Osaka 2001), pp. 347-400.

Laufer, Berthold

1. Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft der Tibeter. *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. hist. Classe der bayerl. Akad. d. Wiss., München* (1898), pp. 590-591. On the title in Zhangzhung: *Dal ling a he gu ge bya*.

2. Die Bru-za Sprache und die historische Stellung des Padmasambhava. *T'oung Pao* (1908), pp. 3, 7. On the Zhangzhung title: *Kong tse ling tse mer ma rol ma*.

LZ:

Pasar Tsultrim Tenzin, Changru Tritsuk Namdak Nyima & Gatsa Lodroe Rabsal, *A Lexicon of Zhangzhung and Bonpo Terms*, ed. by Yasuhiko Nagano & Samten G. Karmay, *Senri Ethnological Reports* no. 76, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2008). It may be possible to gain internet to access this publication in PDF format by going to this URL: <http://hdl.handle.net/10502/2038>. If that does not work, go to the main website of the National Museum of Ethnology Repository in Osaka, <http://ir.minpaku.ac.jp/>, and make use of its indigenous search facility.

Ma:

*Ma rgyud sangs rgyas rgyud gsum*, with the added English title: "The Three Basic Mother Tantras with Commentaries," Bonpo Monastic Centre (Dolanji 1971).

Martin, Mandala Cosmogony:

Dan Martin, *Mandala Cosmogony: Human Body Good Thought and the Revelation of the Secret Mother Tantras of Bon*, Harrassowitz (Wiesbaden 1994).

Martin, Unearthing:

Dan Martin, *Unearthing Bon Treasures: The Life and Contested Legacy of an Eleventh-Century Tibetan Scripture Revealer, with a General Annotated Bibliography of the Bon Religion*, E.J. Brill (Leiden 2001). Reprinted by Vajra Publications (Kathmandu 2009).

Matisoff:

James A. Matisoff, The Interest of Zhangzhung for Comparative Tibeto-Burman. Contained in: Y. Nagano & R. LaPolla, *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages* (Osaka 2001), pp. 155-180.

Mdo-phran:

*Mdo phran nyi shu rtsa gcig pa*, "a collection of hitherto unpublished Bonpo canonical works from the sutra section of the Bonpo Kanjur, reproduced from a rare ms. from Hor Ba-chen Klu-phug Bde-chen-g.yung-drung-gling," Tibetan Bonpo Monastic Centre (Dolanji 1985).

Mdzod:

This refers to a computerized version of the *Mdzod phug* in its 1965 publication, together with variant readings from the 18th-century Khro-chen print and other published versions. No page references are supplied here, since the words may be located with ease in the computer file.

Mnyam:

Mnyam med Shes rab rgyal mtshan, *Srang srid mdzod phugs kyi gzhung dang 'grel ba 'phrul gyi sgron me*. Contained in: *The Bonpo Approach to Abhidharma: Texts from the Sman ri Yiḡ cha*, Khedup Gyatso (Dolanji 1982), pp. 1-548.

MSB:

Mohan Simha Banagyāl, *Śabdakoṣa Raṃ-lvū: Kailāśa Vāsiyoṃ kī Bolī*, Aṃkita Prakāśan (Haldvānī 2007). I give my own transcriptions of the Devanagari script, in the Sanskrit manner, on those occasions when I do make reference to this quadrilingual dictionary. It has not been used very systematically, except to verify or supply variants for spellings found in other sources. Each page of the dictionary has seven columns: [1] Dāramā [i.e. Darma]. [2] Hindī śabda [i.e. Hindi 'sound' or word]. [3-5] the three tenses of the Darma verbs. [6] Byamkho [i.e. Bhyanku, meaning Byangsi]. [7] Bamba [i.e. Bungba Lo, which means Chaudangsi].

Namgyal Nyima's dictionary:

Dagkar Namgyal Nyima, *Zhang-zhung — Tibetan — English Contextual Dictionary*, Selbstverlag (Bonn 2003). This book may be difficult to acquire. I believe that, as of 2008, it was made available from the online bookstore of the Ligmincha Institute. One might also try doing an internet search for the author and title.

Namkhai Norbu, Drung Deu & Bon:

Namkhai Norbu, *Drung, Deu and Bon: Narrations, Symbolic Languages and the Bon Tradition in Ancient Tibet*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives (Dharamsala 1995), translated by Adrian Clemente & Andrew Lukianowicz.

Nine Ways:

David L. Snellgrove, *The Nine Ways of Bon: Excerpts from gZi-brjid*, Prajñā Press (Boulder 1980). References here are to the glossary at the end of the book. No entry is really marked as Zhangzhung, although there are a few that should have been.

Nishi:

Yoshio Nishi & Yasuhiko Nagano, A General Review of the Zhangzhung Studies. Contained in: Y. Nagano & R. LaPolla, *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages* (Osaka 2001), pp. 1-30.



Orofino:

Giacomella Orofino, The State of the Art in the Study on the Zhang zhung Language. *Annali, Istituto Universitario Orientale*, vol. 50, fascicle 1 (1990), pp. 83-85.

OTDO:

Old Tibetan Documents Online. A website with the following URL: <http://otdo.aa.tufs.ac.jp/>

OZL:

Tsuguhito Takeuchi, Yasuhiko Nagano & Sumie Ueda, Preliminary Analysis of the Old Zhangzhung Language and Manuscripts. Contained in: Yasuhiko Nagano & Randy J. LaPolla, eds., *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages (Bon Studies 3)*, Senri Ethnological Reports series no. 19, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2001), pp. 45-96.

OZZ:

Siegbert Hummel, *On Zhang-zhung*, Library of Tibetan Works & Archives (Dharamsala 2000), tr. by Guido Vogliotti.

PSD:

Tsuguhito Takeuchi & Ai Nishida, The Present Stage of Deciphering Old Zhangzhung. Contained in: Yasuhiko Nagano, ed., *Issues in Tibeto-Burman Historical Linguistics*, Senri Ethnological Studies series no. 75, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2009), pp. 151-165.

S&K:

Ruth Laila Schmidt & Vijay Kumar Kaul, A Comparative Analysis of Shina and Kashmiri Vocabularies, *Acta Orientalia*, vol. 69 (2008), pp. 231-301.

SBM:

Dondrup Lhagyal, Phuntso Tsering Sharyul, Tsering Thar, Charles Ramble & Marietta Kind, *A Survey of Bonpo Monasteries and Temples in Tibet and the Himalayas*, ed. by Samten G. Karmay & Yasuhiko Nagano, Senri Ethnological Reports no. 38, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2003).

Sgra:

Kun-bzang-blo-gros, *Zhang bod kyi skad gnyis shan sbyar sgra yi rtogs brjod*. Reprint of ms. with added Arabic page nos. 122-137. The colophon reads: *dbang ldan mchog dang shes rab blo gros kun dga' blo gros sogs kyis bskul ngor slob dpon 'dzin pa kun bzang blo gros kyis bsgrigs pa dge'o // mdzod sgra 'grel sogs las btus so*. The Zhang zhung equivalent of the same is: *gyer zhi con ci gu ge jir gu zhin tshu mi zhang zhung wang yang ta ni sa trig ma ti ka ga me dha nes sum da zhi gu zhin nye lo ku smar ma tis ti la smar ro / gung glang ta gyin ni khung*. The author is Kun-bzang-blo-gros, who composed it at the behest of Dpon-slob Tshul-khrims-dbang-ldan, as well as Shes-rab-blo-gros (this last is a name for two different abbots of Sman-ri, one born in 1677, the other living from 1935 to 1963), Kun-dga'-blo-gros and others. The author used quite a variety of Bon sources, and there is considerable internal duplication. The final folio, no. 137, supplies script examples for the Large Zhang-zhung Smar letters, and the Large Spungs letters of Stag-gzigs (drawn by one named Tshedbang-rig-'dzin, evidently).

Sgra 'grel:

This is the commentary vocabulary published together with the *Mdzod phug*. Often the most relevant section of it, the passage listing ZZ-Tib. equivalences, has been referred to here as simply "the comm. vocab."

Stein:

R.A. Stein, La langue Žaň-žui du Bon organisé. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, vol. 58 (1971), pp. 231-254.

Tamot:

Kashinath Tamot, Some Characteristics of the Tibeto-Burman Stock of Early Classical Newari, and, A Glossary of Early Classical Tibeto-Burman Newari. Contained in: Christopher I. Beckwith, ed., *Medieval Tibeto-Burman Languages*, Brill (Leiden 2002), pp. 13-26, 169-184.

TH1:

Devidatta Sharma, *Tibeto-Himalayan Languages of the Uttara Khand*, Mittal Publications (New Delhi 1989), Part One [i.e. vol. 1].

## Thomas, F.W.

1. Two Languages from Central Asia. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1926), pp. 505-507. [See also *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. 13 (1967), pp. 211-17, with 4 plates.]
2. The Zhang zhung Language. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1933), pp. 405-410. On the phrase: 'u ya 'ag tham.
3. The Zhang zhung Language. *Asia Major*, vol. 13 (1967), pp. 211-217.

## T.N.

Tenzin Namdak (Bstan-'dzin-rnam-dag).

Tóth:

Alfréd Tóth, Tibeto-Burman and Hungarian, *Central Asiatic Journal*, vol. 53, no. 1 (2009), pp. 80-104.

YN:

Yasuhiko Nagano, Zhangzhung and Gyarong. Contained in: Y. Nagano, ed., *Issues in Tibeto-Burman Historical Linguistics*, Senri Ethnological Studies series no. 75, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2009), pp. 131-149.

YT:

Yoshiharu Takahashi, On the Verbal Affixes in West Himalayan. Contained in: Yasuhiko Nagano, ed., *Issues in Tibeto-Burman Historical Linguistics*, Senri Ethnological Studies series no. 75, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2009), pp. 21-49.

YTKC:

G.yung-drung-tshul-khrims-dbang-drag, *Rgyal ba'i bka' dang bka' rten rmad 'byung dgos 'dod bzhin gter gyi bang mdzod la dkar chags blo'i tha ram 'grol byed 'phrul gyi lde mig go*, Palace of National Minorities (Beijing 1995). I could make use of a digital version of this very huge bibliographical work made by the authors same authors as BKC.

ZB:

*Zhang bod skad dod nyung bsdu*s. Published in: *Zhang zhung rig gnas*, inaugural issue (circa 2003?), pp. 49-57, 84. A Zhangzhung-Tibetan glossary compiled by the editors of the journal from various sources. Some of these are listed, including the *Srid pa'i mdzod phug*, the *Rgyud nyi sgron* and the *Sgra yi don sdeb snang gsal sgron me*. The entries are sorted under 'root letters,' but not otherwise alphabetized. I believe this source has been compromised or contaminated by the introduction of words taken from modern western Tibetan dialects and languages, apparently on the assumption that the survivals from Zhangzhung are Zhangzhung, which anyway is a risky assumption. Therefore it is my opinion that the "Zhangzhung-hood" of many of the words should be regarded as suspect until proven innocent.

Zhu:

Zhu-yi Rnal-'byor Nyi-ma-grags-pa, *Sgra yi don brdeb snang gsal sgron me*. Contained in: Lokesh Chandra, *Indian Scripts in Tibet*, "reproduced by Lokesh Chandra from the collection of Prof. Raghuvira," Sata-piṭaka Series vol. 297 (New Delhi 1982), pp.

62-70. This is a reproduction of a cursive manuscript that had served as the basis for the publication ZZD. A separate computer file, containing an edition of this text, is available. Note, too, the following version, which has not been used here: Nepal-German Research Center's Reel no. E3381/11 (running no. E55790): Zhu-yas Nyi-ma-grags-pa, Zhangzhung dictionary in 24 leaves, possessed by Geshe Yungdrung Gyaltzen at Bonpo Gonpa; 9.5 X 51 cm., lithograph.

ZZD:

Zhu-yi Rnal-'byor Nyi-ma-grags-pa, *Sgra yi don sdeb snang gsal sgron me* — added English title: *Tibetan Zang Zung Dictionary*, n.p.(Delhi 1965), pp. 1-22. This publication represents a direct recopying of the manuscript reprinted as Zhu. It subsequently served as the basis for ZZH.

ZZFC:

John Vincent Bellezza, *Zhang-zhung: Foundations of Civilization in Tibet, a Historical and Ethnoarchaeological Study of the Monuments, Rock Art, Texts, and Oral Tradition of the Ancient Tibetan Upland*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Vienna 2008).

ZZH:

Erik Haarh, The Zhang-zhung Language. *Acta Jutlandica*, vol. 40, no. 1 (1968), pp. 7-43. Based on the work of Nyi-ma-bstan-'dzin, as found in ZZD.

ZZQ:

Guillaume Jacques, Zhang-zhung and Qiangic Languages, a paper given at the conference "Linguistic Substrata in Tibet," National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka (September 9-11, 2008). Pre-published version (November 17, 2008) from internet. It has now been published in Yasuhiko Nagano, ed., *Issues in Tibeto-Burman Historical Linguistics*, Senri Ethnological Studies series no. 75, National Museum of Ethnology (Osaka 2009), pp. 121-130. Still, the page numbers are those of the internet version.

ZZT:

Namgyal Nyima Dagkar, Concise Analysis of Zhang-zhung Terms in the Documents of Dunhuang. Contained in: Henk Blezer, ed., *Tibet, Past and Present (Tibetan Studies I)*, Brill (Leiden 2002), pp. 429-439.



## Abbreviations and Symbols

## Abbreviations:

Apart from bibliographical abbreviations (given above), I have used these occasional abbreviations for English and Latin words:

acc.	>	according.
ch.	>	chapter.
corresp.	>	correspond[s/ing].
equiv.	>	equivalent.
equivs.	>	equivalents.
ff.	>	and following.
hon.	>	honorific.
i.e.	>	<i>id est</i> , 'which is to say...'
n.	>	note.
no.	>	number.
p.	>	page.
pp.	>	pages.
q.v.	>	<i>quod vide</i> , 'which you ought to have a look at.'
var.	>	variant.
vars.	>	variants.

Note: "Comm. vocab." refers to the ZZ-Tib. vocabulary contained in the Sgra 'grel.

IE	>	Indo-European.
OC	>	Old Chinese.
OT	>	Old Tibetan (this ought to mean the Tibetan found in Dunhuang documents).
PIE	>	Proto-Indo-European.
Skt.	>	Sanskrit.
TB	>	Tibeto-Burman.
Tib.	>	Tibetan (Classical Written Tibetan, except when otherwise specified).
ZZ	>	Zhangzhung.

## Symbols

Haarh's dictionary included entries for syllables that probably cannot stand alone as words, and while these have been preserved here, we have placed an asterisk [\*] before them. Syllabic entries are not really necessary in a digital environment, and so we have not added very many new ones. It has sometimes proven difficult to decide whether grammatical endings (case endings, gerundial endings, etc.) might not rather be integral parts of words, but we have done our best to make this a dictionary of *words*, not of syllables or phrases or sentences.

Some main entries are preceded by the symbol "~" known as the *tilde*. The *tilde* marks words that I have cautiously suggested, in hope of being proven wrong, might be 'constructions' made on the basis of the Tibetan words. (On this point, see CT at pp. 71-80.)

