

# THE CANON OF THE TIBETAN BONPOS\*

by  
PER KVÆRNE  
*Bergen*

This work is dedicated to  
my friend and teacher  
Sañs-rgyas bstan-'jin lĴoñ-ldoñ,  
the Thirty-third Abbot of sMan-ri

## PART ONE. INTRODUCTION

### I. *The Existence of a Bonpo Canon*

During his expedition to the Horpa States in North-Eastern Tibet in 1928, the Russian explorer and tibetologist George Roerich visited the Bonpo monastery of Sharugön, four days northeast of Nagchu Dzong. In the library of this monastery, he discovered a complete and carefully preserved set of a Bonpo *Kanjur* and *Tenjur*, consisting of 140 and 160 volumes respectively. The whole collection was in manuscript “and had an exceptionally beautiful cursive script. . . . The front pages bearing the title of the text were invariably painted black and written in gold”.<sup>1</sup>

The discovery of a Bonpo collection of canonical texts, corresponding to that of the Buddhists (or, more properly speaking, to that of the *čhos-pa*),<sup>2</sup> was not altogether surprising. In fact, as early as 1881, S. C. Das had published chapter 8 of the *Crystal Mirror of Doctrinal Systems*<sup>3</sup> composed by Thu-bkvan Čhos-kyi ñi-ma (1737-1802) in 1802 where the

\* The Index of the Canon will be published in one of the forthcoming issues.

<sup>1</sup> Extract from *Trails to Inmost Asia* (Newhaven, 1931) published in *Izbrannye Trudy* (Moscow, 1967), p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of the terms *bon-po čhos-pa*, “Buddhist”, “lamaist”, etc., see my article “Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet”, *Numen* 19 (Leyden, 1972), 22-40, and Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, pp. 1-2 and 20-21. By “Bonpo” we mean – here and in the following – the lamaist tradition traceable to the 10th and the 11th centuries; and by “Buddhist” we mean the other lamaist schools.

<sup>3</sup> The full title is: *Grub-mtha' thams-čad-kyi khuñs dan 'dod-chul ston-pa legs-bšad šel-gyi me-loñ*. See Bibliography.

learned but not altogether impartial Gelugpa scholar gives a short account of the Bonpos, stating *inter alia* that “the Bon religion has a general equivalent to the Kanjur”.<sup>4</sup> It is doubtful whether Čhos-kyi ñi-ma had ever seen a complete copy of the Bonpo Canon, for the list of titles which he proceeds to give is, to say the least, extremely incomplete. – Beyond this, nothing definite was known concerning a Bonpo Canon, and from the whole corpus of Bonpo literature – canonical as well as non-canonical – only one major text – the *kLu-'bum dkar-po* translated by Schiefner in 1881<sup>5</sup> – and fragments of others had been published at the time of Roerich's expedition.

The following year – in 1929 – the American scholar J. F. Rock discovered another copy of the Bonpo Canon, this time in the extreme southeastern part of Tibet. In the main temple of the predominantly Bonpo Tso-so district, situated between Lithang and Li-chiang in the south, he found “piled up in a corner of their Lha-khang a manuscript copy of the Bön bKa-hgyur and bsTan-hgyur written on stiff black paper”. Unfortunately, Rock was unable to salvage it: “It was an enormous pile, and I could have bought it the time, but communications were cut, extra transport unavailable, the ferry boats over the Yangtze had been destroyed ...”.<sup>6</sup>

The abbot of Sharugön told Roerich that no printed copies of the Bonpo scriptures existed.<sup>7</sup> This is not correct. Printing blocks to the entire Bonpo Canon were kept in the palace of the king of Khro-bču,<sup>8</sup> one of the principalities of rGya-roñ in the extreme east of Tibet. The king of Khro-bču was a Bonpo, and copies of the scriptures were printed regularly on order. As late as 1954-55 the Bonpo monastery of sKyañ-chañ in Amdo had a complete set of scriptures printed there.<sup>9</sup> The xylograph blocks were apparently carved during the 1840's. When Koñsprul bLo-gros mtha'-yas (1813-99) passed through the principality in 1846, he reported that “over a hundred volumes of the Kanjur had already been completed”.<sup>10</sup> The edition of the scriptures which the

<sup>4</sup> “bon-gyi čhos-la bka'-'gyur byiñ-gyi chab yod-č'iñ” (Das, 1970: 5, 1. 11).

<sup>5</sup> A. Schiefner, “Über das Bonpo-Sūtra: Das weisse Nāga-Hunderttausend”, *Mémoires de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg*, VIIe Série, 28:1 (St. Petersburg, 1881).

<sup>6</sup> J. F. Rock, *The Na-khi Nāga Cult and Related Ceremonies*, Part I (= *Serie Orientale Roma IV*, Part 1) (Rome, 1952), p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> *Izbrannye Trudy*, 62.

<sup>8</sup> Also spelt *Khro-čhen* and °-*skyabs*.

<sup>9</sup> I am indebted to S. G. Karmay, and the Abbot S. T. Jongdong for this information.

<sup>10</sup> E. Gene Smith, Introduction to *Kongtrul's Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan Culture*, (= *Śatapiṭaka Series* 80), ed. by Lokesh Chandra (New Delhi, 1970), 32.

Khro-bču blocks reproduce was prepared by the well-known Bonpo scholar Kun-grol grags-pa (b. STNN 1700).<sup>11</sup>

There does not appear to be any copy of the Bonpo Canon outside Tibet; nor is it known whether any of those copies which actually existed in the 1950's inside Tibet have survived the subsequent disruption of the traditional social and cultural order. However, in the following pages we shall endeavour to analyse the contents of the Bonpo Canon as far as they are known, and as will be seen, a not inconsiderable part of this vast corpus has in fact been preserved and even published in recent years.

## II. *The dkar-čhag of Ņi-ma bstan-'jin*

The influx of Tibetan refugees in India and Nepal following the events of 1959 has – ironically – radically improved our access to Bonpo literature. The presence of numerous Bonpos in India has had two important results. In the first place, Bonpo monks have in recent years built a small monastery near the town of Solan in Himachal Pradesh, where monastic life is carried on along traditional lines. The monastery possesses a fairly large collection of books, partly brought from Tibet itself, partly deposited as a permanent loan from the Bonpo monastery of Samling in Dolpo in Northern Nepal.<sup>12</sup> Many of these texts have been published by the Bonpos themselves.

Equally important, perhaps, is the close collaboration – extending over many years and still continuing – between learned Bonpo monks and a small number of Western scholars. As a first result of this collaboration, D. L. Snellgrove published, in 1967, a collection of excerpts from the 14th century Bonpo text *gZi-brjid*, presenting for the first time a systematic and coherent exposition of the Bonpo religion.<sup>13</sup> The present author, besides a study of Bonpo yoga, published in 1971 a short chronological table (*bstan-rcis*) drawn up in 1842 by the famous Bonpo scholar Ņi-ma

<sup>11</sup> I have heard the opinion expressed by Bonpos that other printed editions also existed, but I have not been able to verify this. The biography of Kun-grol grags-pa is to be found in *Man-ñag rin-po-čhe a-khrid-kyi bla-ma brgyud-pa'i rnam-thar pad-ma dkar-po'i 'phren-ba*, xyl. fol. 33b3-35b3, by Šar-rja bKra-šis rgyal-mchan, T 0306 of the Tibetan Collection of École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris.

<sup>12</sup> Regarding this small but old and extremely important Bonpo monastery, see Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, p. 4, n. 4, and *idem*, *Himalayan Pilgrimage* (Oxford, 1961), p. 110ff.

<sup>13</sup> Snellgrove *Nine Ways*. See Bibliography.

bstan-'jin (b. STNN 1813).<sup>14</sup> The publication of this chronological table enables us to assign definite dates to the principal events and persons in the history of the Bonpos, at least from the 10th century onwards. Finally, in 1972 S. G. Karmay, himself a Tibetan with a Bonpo background, published a translation of the extremely important *History of Bon* by Šar-rja Šes-rab rgyal-mchan (1859-1935), thus providing a wealth of new information.<sup>15</sup>

In 1965 a short text was published in the *Śatapiṭaka Series*<sup>16</sup> bearing the following title (my translation): "The Classification of the Divisions of the *bKa'-'gyur* and the *brTen-'gyur*, Being the Fanning of the Wind which Causes the Extinguished Fire of the Doctrine to Flame up, the Light of the Sun which Causes the Lotus of Bon to Blossom". As the title indicates, this text gives nothing less than a complete inventory (*dkar-čhag*) of the contents of the two great sections of the Canon of the Bonpos. It will therefore provide the basis for a description of this literature, presented on the following pages.

The author of this work presents himself in the colophon as "the twenty-second of the abbots called to occupy the abbatial seat of the Peerless Jina, the monk of *sKam-žig* called *Ñi-ri šel-žin pa-šaṅ wer-ro*, of the clan of *sGo*".<sup>17</sup> The "abbatial seat" in question is that of *sMan-ri*, the famous Bonpo monastery in Tsang, founded in 1405 by "the Peerless Jina", viz. *mÑam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan*.<sup>18</sup> If one does not count Šes-rab rgyal-mchan himself, the 22nd abbot of *sMan-ri* is *Ñi-ma bstan-'jin*, i.e. the author of our previously published chronological table.<sup>19</sup> However, in the present case he gives his name in the *Žaṅ-žun* language, and moreover, he gives a name which, when translated back into Tibetan, differs from his usual one, *Ñi-ri* etc. becoming *Ñi-ma bstan-'jin dbaṅ-sdud rgyal-po*.<sup>20</sup> In the absence of biographical material,

<sup>14</sup> P. Kvaerne "Bonpo Studies"; *idem*, "A Chronological Table of the Bonpos". See Bibliography.

<sup>15</sup> S. G. Karmay, *The Treasury of Good Sayings*. See Bibliography.

<sup>16</sup> Vol. 37, Part II, 31 pp. See Bibliography.

<sup>17</sup> The colophon (p. 30) runs as follows: "rgyal-ba mñam-med-pa'i gdan-sa skyoṅ-khul-gyi mkhan-rabs ñer-gñis-pa/ sgo-rigs skam-žig-gi draṅ-sroṅ ñi-ri šel-žin pa-šaṅ wer-ro 'bod-pas g.yas ru'i ri-khrod mkhar-sna'i bde-gsal gsaṅ-phug-tu brcams-pa".

<sup>18</sup> For further information on *sMan-ri*, see P. Kvaerne, "Remarques sur l'administration d'un monastère bon-po", *Journal Asiatique* CCLVIII (Paris, 1970), 187-92.

<sup>19</sup> For a complete list of all the abbots of *sMan-ri*, see Appendix I (pp. 246-48) of "A Chronological Table".

<sup>20</sup> The reconstruction is based on the vocabulary published by E. Haarh, "The Zhang-zhung Language", *Acta Jutlandica* XL:1 (= *Humanities Series* 47) (Aarhus/Copenhagen, 1968).

I cannot throw any further light on this name (probably given in connection with an initiation) beyond pointing out that Ńi-ma bstan-'jin styles himself in a similar way elsewhere; in a collection of ritual texts connected with the deity Byams-ma and composed by him,<sup>21</sup> he gives his name as Ńi-ri šel-bžin (three times), and Ńi-ma bstan-'jin dbaṅ(-gi) rgyal(-po) (twice). He also uses the latter name in the colophon of a ritual text connected with the tantric deity Ma-rgyud.<sup>22</sup>

From the colophon of the *dkar-čhag* we also learn that Ńi-ma bstan-'jin came from the clan (*rigs*) of sGo and that he belonged to the family of sKam. A number of other Bonpo lamas belonging to this family are known: sKam-žig Ńi-ma lhun-grub (b. STNN 1691), sKam-rigs g.Yuñ-druñ ñi-rgyal who was Ńi-ma bstan-'jin's uncle,<sup>23</sup> and sKam-žig Ńi-ma rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1877).<sup>24</sup> As to Ńi-ma bstan-'jin's origin, the clan-name sGo points to Eastern Tibet.<sup>25</sup> We learn that he was a fully ordained monk, a *drañ-sron*; this title corresponds to that of *dge-slon* (*bhikṣu*) of the other lamaist schools. Finally, the colophon informs us that the work was composed in 'The Secret Cave of Luminous Bliss' at the hermitage (*ri-khrod*) of mKhar-sna in g.Yas-ru, a small monastery situated a few miles south of sMan-ri.<sup>26</sup> No date for the work is given, but as Ńi-ma bstan-'jin refers to himself as abbot, it must have been written after STNN 1836, the year in which the abbacy was conferred on him.

Several other *dkar-čhag* of the Bonpo Canon have been written, but are, unfortunately, no longer available. Ńi-ma bstan-'jin mentions (*KTDG*, 11) "the two previous authors of inventories of the Kanjur",<sup>27</sup> without giving further details. One of these is Kun-grol grags-pa, the

<sup>21</sup> *Kun-gsal byams-ma'i sgrub-thabs*, published by the Bonpo Foundation (Delhi, 1966), 378 fols. One of the texts is dated *sa phag*, i.e. 1839.

<sup>22</sup> The first text in: *g.Saṅ-sṅags ma-rgyud sgrub-skor*, a ritual anthology published by the Bonpo Foundation (Delhi, 1964), 383 fols.

<sup>23</sup> Mentioned in *LŚJ* (p. 188) as the disciple of bSod-nams blo-gros (STNN 1784-1835) who was also Ńi-ma bstan-'jin's guru and predecessor at sMan-ri. In Ńi-ma bstan-'jin's collection of *Byams-ma* ritual texts, one is attributed to sKam-rigs Drun-mu ñi-wer (= °g.Yuñ-druñ ñi-rgyal).

<sup>24</sup> One notes the recurrence of the personal name Ńi-ma.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. R. A. Stein, *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines* (= *Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises XV*) (Paris, 1961), p. 40 and p. 74.

<sup>26</sup> mKhar-sna was originally the hermitage of the Bonpo monastery g.Yas-ru dBensa-kha (founded STNN 1072, destroyed by a flood soon after 1386, see *LŚJ*, 139, n. 1). At Ńi-ma bstan-'jin's time mKhar-sna was still a small monastery, but later it became a fairly large establishment, being, with sMan-ri and g.Yuñ-druñ gliñ, one of the three main Bonpo monastic centres in Central Tibet.

<sup>27</sup> "sñon-du bka'-'gyur sgrig-mi dkar-čhag byed-pa gñis".

editor of the Khro-bču edition of the Canon.<sup>28</sup> Moreover, on p. 30 Ńi-ma bstan-'jin mentions, besides the present *Classification of the Divisions of the Kanjur and the Tenjur*, another work, *The Separation of the Authentic Word from that which Depends Thereon*.<sup>29</sup> The title is self-explanatory. Both works are referred to by *LŚJ*, the latter under the title *The Bright Light of the Sun of the Explanation of the Authentic Word and that which Depends Thereon*.<sup>30</sup> If it had been available, this text would, needless to say, have thrown much light on the subject of the present study.

### III. Formal Structure of the Canon

The Bonpo Canon, as we have seen, has two main divisions corresponding to those adopted by other Tibetan schools. The *bKa'-'gyur* (*Kanjur*) contains those texts which are considered to have been proclaimed<sup>31</sup> by the Buddha himself, i.e., as far as the Bonpos are concerned, by sTon-pa gŠen-rab. These texts are accordingly referred to as *bKa'* "the Word". This is not always to be understood in an absolutely literal sense; the *gZer-mig*, for instance, is the biography – not autobiography – of sTon-pa gŠen-rab, but as it nevertheless contains numerous sermons and prayers uttered by the Buddha, it is classed as *bKa'*. Similarly, the Bonpo tantras were proclaimed by 'Čhi-med gcug-phud, but as he was born as sTon-pa gŠen-rab in his subsequent rebirth,<sup>32</sup> these, too, are counted as *bKa'*.

As for the title of the second section of the Canon, it is not, as is the case with other schools, spelled *bsTan-'gyur*, but *brTen-'gyur* (the pronunciation is the same in both cases). Frequently the synonym *bka'-brten* is employed, which is explained as follows: "As it has been composed in dependence (*rten*) on the Word (*bka'*) of the Teacher, (it is called) 'That which depends on the Word' (*bka'-rten*)".<sup>33</sup> Having this definition in mind, the Bonpos are careful to point out that their *Tenjur* does not, like that of the Buddhists, contain *śāstras*, for "As it tampers (*bčos*) with

<sup>28</sup> I am indebted to S. G. Karmay for this information.

<sup>29</sup> *bka' dañ bka'-brten-gyi rnam-dbye*.

<sup>30</sup> *bka' dañ bka'-brten-gyi rnam-bšad Ńi-'od rab-gsal*; *LŚJ*, 192; 348, 33 (i.e. translation: p. 192, text: p. 348, 1. 33 – thus also in the following).

<sup>31</sup> *KTDG*, 2, 1. 9: "žal-nas gsuñs-pa".

<sup>32</sup> See *LŚJ*, xxi.

<sup>33</sup> *bsTan-pa bon-gyi klad-don-gyi rañ-'grel*, fol. 4b, MS belonging to the Abbot S. T. Jongdong. By sGa-ston Chul-khriims rgyal-mchan (14th cent.).

the Doctrine (*bstan*) of the Sugata, (it is called) *śāstra* (*bstan-bčos*)”.<sup>34</sup>

Bonpo texts conventionally state that there are thirteen ways of classifying the Word.<sup>35</sup> *KT DG* gives a number of examples: the Threefold Word (*bka’-gsum*), the Nine Vehicles (*theg-pa rim-dgu*), the Four Portals and the Treasury as the Fifth (*sgo-bži mjod-lña*), and Outer, Inner, and Secret (*phyi nañ gsañ gsum*). However, a passage in the *mDo’-dus* is quoted<sup>36</sup> where sTon-pa gŠen-rab ordains that “After my entrance into Nirvāṇa, classify, o attendants! my Word, dividing it into *mDo*, *’Bum*, *rGyud*, and *mJod!*”.<sup>37</sup> It is this classification which is adopted by Ņi-ma *bstan’-jin*.

In a comparatively recent work, the *bKa’-luñ rgya-mcho* by Šar-rja bKra-šis rgyal-mchan, the division of the Word of the Buddha into *mDo*, *’Bum*, *rGyud*, and *mJod* is discussed as follows (fol. 239b-240b):

The Sūtra<sup>38</sup> says: “Corresponding to the 84 000 hindrances, 84 000 Doors of Bon have been proclaimed”. As for how the 84 000 Doors of Bon are said to be the remedies of the 84 000 hindrances, the *mDo’-dus* says: ‘The 84 000 Doors of Bon<sup>39</sup> are divided into four (groups of) 21 000, in accordance with the four sections *mDo*, *’Bum*, *rGyud*, and *mJod*’.

(1) Thus the remedy for the 21 000 hindrances arising from desire-passion is said to be the 21 000 Doors of Bon of the disciplinary Sūtras (*’dul-ba’i mdo*), namely: the Discipline teaching what should be avoided – ten thousand; the Discipline teaching what should be seized – ten thousand; the Discipline teaching the identity of avoiding and seizing is said to be one thousand.

(2) The remedy for the 21 000 hindrances arising from ill-will is said to be the 21 000 Doors of Bon of the copious Pāramitā (*rgyas-pa ’bum*), namely: the section of the Pāramitā teaching contemplation – ten thousand; the section of the Pāramitā teaching action – ten thousand; the section of the Pāramitā teaching the identity of contemplation and action is said to be one thousand.

(3) The remedy for the 21 000 hindrances arising from ignorance is said to be 21 000 Doors of Bon of the Treasury of the Abhidharma (*mñon-pa mjod*), namely: the Abhidharma teaching Skillful Means – ten thousand; the Abhidharma teaching Wisdom – ten thousand; the Abhidharma teaching the identity of Skillful Means and Wisdom is said to be one thousand.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* The whole passage is as follows: “ston-pa’i bka’-la rten-nas sdeb-pas bka’-brten/ bde-bar gšegs-pa’i bstan-pa-la bčos-pas bstan-bčos/”. *KT DG*, 28 1. 20 gives the same etymology: “sañs-rgyas bstan-pa-la rañ’-dod-kyis bzo bčos-su soñ-bas bstan-bčos-su miñ btags-pa yin/”.

<sup>35</sup> *LŠJ*, 191; *KT DG*, 2, 1. 10.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> “ña ni mya-ñan’-das ’og-tu/ mdo ’bum rgyud mjod bžir phyes-la/ ’khor-rnams bka’-yi bsdu-ba gyis/.”

<sup>38</sup> Perhaps the *gZer-mig*.

<sup>39</sup> *hos-sgo*. Cf. *Gaṅs-čan bod-kyi brda-skad miñ-gži gsal-bar ston-pa’i bstan-bčos*

(4) The remedy of the 21 000 (hindrances) of the three poisons taken together is said to be the 21 000 Doors of Bon of the Tantras of meditation on mantras (*śhags-sems rgyud*), namely: the section of the Tantras teaching principally *utpattikrama* – ten thousand; the section of the Tantras teaching principally *niṣpannakrama* – ten thousand; the section of the Tantras teaching the identity of *utpattikrama* and *niṣpannakrama* is said to be one thousand.

*mDo*, of course, corresponds to *sūtra*; however, in the context of the present classification, it also includes *'dul-ba*, i.e. *vinaya*. *'Bum* contains the Bonpo *prajñāpāramitā* literature. Together these two sections are called “The Vehicle of Cause” (*rgyu'i theg-pa*). *rGyud* (*tantra*) is described as *gsaṅ-śhags* (“secret spells” i.e. *mantras*), or as *śhags-sems* (lit. “mantra-mind”). *mJod* “Treasury”, is “the highest, (consisting of) teachings dealing with the Mind” (*bla-med sems-don*) — in other words, it contains the “Great Perfection” (*rjogs-chen*) teachings of the Bonpos. The latter two sections are styles “The Vehicle of Result” (*'bras-bu'i theg-pa*). It is interesting that in the *bKa'-luṅ rgya-mcho*, the Treasury is given as the third and styled *mñon-pa* i.e. *abhidharma*, thus achieving a formal conformity with the traditional scheme of the Tripiṭaka.

Roerich reported, as we have seen, that the *Kanjur* consisted of 140 volumes, the *Tenjur* of 160. Different editions of the Canon may of course have existed; but in any case, the Canon as described by *KTDG* (p. 31) consists of 306 volumes, the *Kanjur* totalling 175, the *Tenjur* 131. The distribution of the volumes of the *Kanjur* are stated to be as follows: *mdo* 62 vols., *'bum* 91, *rgyud* 18, and *mjod* 4.

We shall now briefly survey the alternative classifications of the Canon. Except scheme (e), they all refer to the *Kanjur*.

(a) The simplest division is that of *pāramitā-naya* and *mantra-naya*, which is also well-known from Buddhist sources. *KTDG* (p. 2) defines these as follows:

“The Word of *pāramitā* is the Cause, teaching chiefly the Way of Renunciation; the Word of the Eternal Vehicle of Secret Spells is the Result, teaching chiefly [the Ways of] Transformation and Liberation”.<sup>40</sup>

Although only *'bum* and *rgyud* are mentioned explicitly in this passage, *KTDG* goes on to explain that *pāramitā* includes both *mdo* and *'bum*, and the *mantra* both *rgyud* and *mjod*.

(b) The “Four Portals and the Treasury as the Fifth” is a purely Bonpo

*dgos-'byuṅ nor-bu'i gter-chen* (Delhi, 1966). By 'Jig-med nam-mkha'i rdo-rje b. STNN 1897. P. 146 under *ho*: “hos žes bon daṅ hos-khaṅ lha-khaṅ mchuṅs/.”

<sup>40</sup> “spoṅ-lam gco-bor bstan-pa rgyu pha-rol-tu phyin-pa'i bka' daṅ/sgyur-grol gco-bor bstan-pa 'bras-bu gsaṅ-śhags g.yuṅ-druṅ theg-pa'i bka' gñis”.

classification. It has been fully described by Snellgrove in *Nine Ways* (pp. 16-19), to which the reader is referred.

(c) The “Nine Ways” is likewise a Bonpo scheme. The reader is referred to Snellgrove’s analysis in *Nine Ways*, pp. 9-11.<sup>41</sup> However, it should be pointed out that the Nyingmapas, too, present the Doctrine in the form of “Nine Ways”; but while the scheme of the Bonpos “resume the whole range of Tibetan religious practices”,<sup>42</sup> the “Nine Ways” of the Nyingmapas do not include the beliefs and practices found in the first four Ways of the Bonpos, and are mainly concerned with tantric ritual and meditation.<sup>43</sup>

(d) In *LŠJ*<sup>44</sup> we find a division of the Word into ‘Four Supreme’ *Bum* (*’bum bla-med sde-bži*):

- (1) the *’bum* of *dhāraṇīs* (*gzuñs-kyi ’bum*)
- (2) „ „ „ *sūtras* (*mdo-’bum*)
- (3) „ „ „ *mantras* (*gsaṅ-sñags-kyi ’bum*)
- (4) „ „ „ *prajñā* (*pāramitā*) (*šes-rab ’bum*)

Here (1) and (3) correspond to *rgyud*, (4) to *’bum*, and (2) to *mdo*; *mjod* is missing.

(e) The division of the Word into Outer, Inner, and Secret (*phyi nañ gsaṅ*) is adopted by *KTDG* with reference to the *Tenjur*, i.e., strictly speaking, it is adopted with reference to the basic texts of the *Kanjur* which are commented on by the *Tenjur*. “Outer Texts” comprise the traditional Tripiṭaka, in the following order: *vinaya*, *abhidharma*, and *sūtra*. In the *Kanjur*, this corresponds to *mdo* and *’bum*. “Inner Texts” consist of tantric rituals of all kinds (thus corresponding to *rgyud*) while “Secret Texts” deal with meditation, i.e. with the subject-matter of *mjod*. This scheme thus corresponds to the division into three groups – “Outer”, “Inner”, and “Secret” – followed by the Nyingmapas with regard to their “Nine Ways”.<sup>45</sup>

(f) As we have seen, the existence of a Bonpo *Kanjur* is mentioned by the Gelugpa scholar Čhos-kyi ñi-ma, who gives a survey of the contents of the Bonpo scriptures, analysed in the following way:<sup>46</sup>

<sup>41</sup> On the translation of *theg-pa* by “Way”, see Snellgrove, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

<sup>42</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 11.

<sup>43</sup> For the “Nine Ways” of the Nyingmapas, see H. Hoffmann, *The Religions of Tibet* (London, 1961), p. 65.

<sup>44</sup> *LŠJ*, 95.

<sup>45</sup> Li An-che “Rñiñ-ma-pa: the Early Form of Lamaism”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1948), 142-63; see pp. 145-46.

<sup>46</sup> S. C. Das “Contributions” (1970), 13-15; Hoffmann “Quellen”, 332-33.

- (1) “works teaching right views” (*lta-ba ston-pa'i gž'uñ*)
- (2) “works on meditation” (*sgom-pa'i gž'uñ*)
- (3) “the cycle of right practice” (*spyod-pa'i skor*)
- (4) “the cycle of rituals” (*'phrin-las-kyi skor*)
- (5) “the cycle of *utpatti*- and *niṣpannakrama*, i.e., the Result” (*bksyed-rjogs 'bras-bu'i skor*)
- (6) “the cycle of protective deities” (*sruñ-ma'i skor*)”

It is evident that Čhos-kyi ñi-ma had no first-hand knowledge of Bonpo literature, much less of the Bonpo *Kanjur*. His analysis does not agree with any known classification used by the Bonpos themselves, and it by no means covers the entire range of canonical scriptures. In particular, one notes the total absence of Bonpo sūtras. A rapid examination of the titles quoted by Čhos-kyi ñi-ma under each heading shows that sections 1 and 2 correspond to *mjod*, section 3 to *'bum*, and sections 4, 5 and 6 to *rgyud*.

#### IV. *Origins of the Canon*

As far as the Bonpos are concerned, the *Kanjur* contains the Word of the Buddha – at least to the extent that this Word has been either preserved or revealed up to the present day. For the Bonpos, then, there is no problem in answering the question of the origin of the texts contained in the *Kanjur* – they were proclaimed by sTon-pa gšen-rab in 'Ol-mo luñ-riñ and elsewhere, and collected one year after his death by his chief disciples.<sup>47</sup> The subsequent history of the Doctrine, as conceived by the Bonpos, will be found conveniently presented in S. G. Karmay's translation of *LŠJ*, and need not, therefore, be dealt with in detail here;<sup>48</sup>

<sup>47</sup> *bsTan-scis* 25.

<sup>48</sup> A number of texts dealing with the history of Bon are available:

- (a) *Bon-čhos-kyi dar-nub-kyi lo-rgyus bsgrags-pa rin-čhen glin-grags*, Oslo University Library Öst.as. TT 14, MS 95 fols. Discovered by mTha'-bži Ye-šes blo-gros (10th-11th cent.).
- (b) *bsTan-pa'i rnam-bšad dar-rgyas gsal-ba'i sgron-ma*, MS from Samling in Dolpo, 137 fols., published as fol. 498-769 in *Sources for a History of Bon*, ed. by Tenzin Namdak (Dolanji, 1972) Tibetan Monastic Centre. By sPa-ston bsTan-rgyal bzañ-po (14th cent.).
- (c) *Srid-pa rgyud-kyi kha-byañ čhen-mo*, Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris) Fonds Tib. n° 493, MS 199 fols. Discovered by Gyer Thogs-med in 1310 (*LŠJ*, 339, 31).
- (d) *rGyal-rabs bon-gyi 'byuñ-gnas*, ed. by S. C. Das (Darjeeling 1900 [?] and Calcutta, 1915), 61 pp. By Khyuñ-po bLo-gros rgyal-mchan (14th-15th cent.). Reviewed and

for our purposes, it will be sufficient to point out the broad outlines of this history, as understood by later Bonpo tradition.<sup>49</sup>

The Doctrine, then, was taught by sTon-pa gŠen-rab, chiefly in 'Ol-mo luñ-riñ, from whence it spread to the various countries surrounding Tibet, disseminated by a succession of supernatural beings of the bodhisattva as well as the siddha type. From these countries, and in particular from India, Žaň-žuň, and China, Bon spread to Tibet. Certain texts, it is true, reached Tibet directly from 'Ol-mo luñ-riñ,<sup>50</sup> and certain practices had even been taught in Tibet by sTon-pa gŠen-rab himself when he on one occasion passed through that country;<sup>51</sup> but above all it is via Žaň-žuň that Bon is considered to have reached Tibet.<sup>52</sup> In this process of transmission, siddhas from Žaň-žuň disseminated the Doctrine in Tibet, aided by Tibetan scholars who translated numerous texts from the language of Žaň-žuň. Various lists of these siddhas and scholars are known; in general, the siddhas connected with this initial spread of the Doctrine (*śna-dar*) are said to be eighty<sup>53</sup> – a clear parallel to the eighty-four siddhas of the Buddhist tradition.<sup>54</sup>

This initial dissemination of Bon in Tibet is supposed to have taken place during the reign of the first Tibetan king, gÑa'-khri bean-po. Having flourished in Tibet during the reigns of seven successive kings, Bon was persecuted by king Gri-gum bean-po, and the Bonpos driven out of Tibet. Taking their texts with them, they hid many of them in various places before leaving for areas beyond the reach of the king. Ńi-ma bstan-'jin informs us that "the Five King-Treasures and Four

---

partly translated by B. Laufer, *Über ein tibetisches Geschichtswerk der Bonpo* (= *T'oung Pao*, Série II, vol. 2) (Leyden, 1901), pp. 24-44.

(e) *bsTan-pa'i spyi'i 'byuñ-khuñs yid-bžin nor-bu 'dod-pa 'jo-ba'i gter-mjod*, British Museum Oriental MS 13100, MS 176 fols. By Kun-grol grags-pa (b. STNN 1700), composed 1766. One chapter edited and translated by H. Hoffmann, "An Account of the Bon Religion in Gilgit", *Central Asian Journal* (1971), 137-45.

(f) *Legs-bšad rin-po che'i mjod dpyod-ldan dga'-ba'i čhar* (*LŠJ*), see Bibliography.

(g) *g.Yuñ-druñ bon-gyi bstan-'byuñ*, 2 vols. (Dolanji, 1972). Bonpo Monastic Centre By dPal-ldan chul-khriims (died 1972).

<sup>49</sup> The following summary is based on *LŠJ*. As far as the history of Bon before the 10th-11th century is concerned, we will not undertake a critical examination, but on the whole simply adopt the perspective of the Bonpos themselves. This does not, of course, imply that we accept this perspective as the historically valid one.

<sup>50</sup> *LŠJ*, 19-21.

<sup>51</sup> *gZer-mig* II, chap. 12. The passage in question is translated by Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, 14-15.

<sup>52</sup> For a discussion of Žaň-žuň and 'Ol-mo luñ-riñ, see *LŠJ*, xxvii-xxxiii.

<sup>53</sup> *KTGD*, 20 1. 22.

<sup>54</sup> Once more it must be stressed that we do not in this connection propose to discuss or evaluate the historical authenticity of this Bonpo tradition.

Minister-Treasures, as well as the 360 Profound Treasures, were hidden".<sup>55</sup> In other words, the teachings of the Buddha (i.e., sTon-pa gŠen-rab) were preserved for future generations in the form of "Treasures" (*gter-ma*) – and, as we shall see, the discovery of such "Treasures" was in later times considered the normal procedure of re-assembling those teachings.

After this initial rise and decline of Bon, Gri-gum bcan-po was killed by his minister Lo-ñam; after the death of the latter, the king's son, sPu-lde Guñ-rgyal, invited the Bonpos to return to Tibet, and the Doctrine flourished during the reign of his successors.

However, during the reign of Khri-sroñ lde-bcan (742-797 A.D.), Bon was persecuted once again. We shall not go into the details of the extremely confused and complicated traditions concerning the religious struggles during his reign. We have now entered historical time (and must henceforth adopt a critical attitude to our sources), but the dramatic events of that century, the complicated pattern of shifting loyalties and religious and dynastic rivalries, are obscured by the guarded reticence of contemporary sources and the partiality and confusion of later epic narratives. One fact, however, should be mentioned: the same scholars and siddhas that the later Bonpo tradition associates with the FIRST spread and decline of Bon, are also associated with the SECOND; and together with the fact that the texts which had been hidden during the first decline were not taken out of their concealment during the second spread of the Doctrine,<sup>56</sup> certainly leads us, as Karmay suggests, to suspect that "later Bonpo historians have made two persecutions out of what was in fact only one"<sup>57</sup> – i.e., the persecution of Bon during the reign of Khri-sroñ lde-bcan.

This much, at least, is certain: the Buddhist masters invited to Tibet by Khri-sroñ lde-bcan met with the opposition not only of a section of the powerful aristocracy, but also of an organised religious body representing the established, traditional (but NOT necessarily INDIGENOUS) religion. In the course of the struggle with the partisans of the new religion from India, the members of the sacerdotal class of the old religion, known (*inter alia*) as *bon-po*, were either banished or forcibly converted. The later Bonpo tradition maintains that these *bon-pos* were precisely those teachers of Bon whose activities during legendary dynasties we have noted above. Be this as it may, the Bonpo sources relate that the Bonpo teachers and siddhas were forced to leave Tibet for the second

<sup>55</sup> *bsTan-rcis* 46.

<sup>56</sup> *LŠJ.*, 73.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, xxxiii.

time. Once more the texts were hidden in numerous places in Tibet and along its borders, and the Bonpos left the central part of the country. Ņi-ma bstan-'jin places this event in 749 A.D.,<sup>58</sup> while Karmay, having examined all available sources, fixes it at c. 784.<sup>59</sup>

It is this third spread of the Doctrine, known as the "Later Propagation" (*phyi-dar*), which is of particular interest to us, and it is with this that the formation of a Bonpo Canon is connected. The century and a half following the break-up of central power (c. 842 A.D.) is a dark and troubled one in the history of Tibet. Little is known about these years. And yet they must have been of fundamental importance for subsequent religious developments. When we once more, in the 11th century, hear of Bonpos, we are confronted with what is in fact another lamaist school, distinguished from other schools not so much by ritual or doctrine as by the claim, noted above, of representing the traditional religion of Tibet. The problem of giving an exact definition of the relation of this lamaist Bonpo tradition to the other Buddhist schools as well as to the pre-Buddhist *bon-pos* has by no means been finally solved;<sup>60</sup> but it is at least certain that we cannot simply speak of a "transformed Bon" or an "assimilated Bon". Certainly the lamaist Bonpo tradition of the 11th century was heavily penetrated by popular, essentially non-Buddhist elements – but so was every other form of Tibetan Buddhism, and has so remained to this day. The difficulty, it seems to me, is that doctrines and meditational practices, manifestly Buddhist in character but passing under the name of Bon, are definitely traceable to the 11th century; and even at that stage, they must have passed through a period of considerable length of experimentation, adaptation, and codification.<sup>61</sup> There is no question of a more or less perfect synthesis of Buddhist and non-Buddhist (the term "shamanist" is still sometimes employed!) beliefs and practices in this connection (although, as R. A. Stein has recently shown, such syntheses were, in fact, attempted),<sup>62</sup> but of a religion which, however composite, is nevertheless coherent and essentially Buddhist.

With this perspective in mind, a start, at least, has been made by the present author in the study of that system of meditation known as "The Great Perfection" (*rjogs-pa čhen-po*). As is well known, this system is found not only within the Bonpo tradition, but also with the Nying-

<sup>58</sup> *bsTan-rcis* § 55.

<sup>59</sup> *LŚJ*, 94, n. 2.

<sup>60</sup> See Kvaerne, "Aspects of the Origin", and Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, Introduction.

<sup>61</sup> See Kvaerne, "Bonpo Studies".

<sup>62</sup> R.A.Stein, "Un document ancien relatif aux rites funéraires des bon-po tibétains", *Journal Asiatique* CCLVIII (Paris, 1970), 155-85, particularly p. 157.

mapas. A comparative study of the earliest “Great Perfection” texts of the two schools might well furnish a clue to the solution of the entire problem of the Bonpos, as several Tibetologists have recently pointed out.<sup>63</sup> The same, it might be added, would be equally true of a study of the Bonpo and Nyingmapa tantras – a vast collection of tantric texts hitherto virtually unexplored.

The Bonpos and the Nyingmapas appear to be two parallel developments from one and the same source, viz. the religious struggles during the reign of Khri-sron lde-bcan and the subsequent two hundred years. Both traditions trace their lineages and textual transmissions back to the same confused scene; the “religious epic” of Padmasambhava is paralleled by that of sTon-pa gŠen-rab or Dran-pa Nam-mkha’; their literature appears to be of essentially the same type, rediscovered over a period of several centuries in the form of “Treasures”, sometimes, as we shall see, even by the same “Treasure-Discoverers” (*gter-ston*).

Although the *gter-ma* literature of the Nyingmapas has by no means been explored in its entirety, it appears that the first *gter-mas* were discovered in the middle of the 11th century;<sup>64</sup> a particularly fertile period seems to have been the 14th century, a period of national resurgence and religious renewal. The question of priority inevitably arises when dealing with Bonpo and Nyingmapa literature. It was long taken for granted that the Bonpos were, on the whole, mere plagiarists. This has been the traditional view among other Tibetan schools – for instance, it is stated very forcefully by Čhos-kyi ŋi-ma, who even gives detailed lists of texts which he claims have been “transformed” by the Bonpos.<sup>65</sup> The general unreliability of Čhos-kyi ŋi-ma regarding Bon would in itself be sufficient to cast doubt on this assertion; and in an important study, A.-M. Blondeau has recently convincingly shown that in one case, at least, it is not the Buddhist, but the Bonpo text which is the earlier one.<sup>66</sup> Using the only method which can give definite results, viz. a detailed textual criticism, certain chapters of the Bonpo *gZer-mig* are

<sup>63</sup> Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, 15; G. Tucci “Die Religionen Tibets”, in: *Die Religionen Tibets und der Mongolei*, Tucci and Heissig (Stuttgart, 1970), 19.

<sup>64</sup> Tucci, *TPS* I, 109. For short biographies of the major Nyingmapas *gter-stons*, see *TTGL*, *passim* (Bibliography) and *Bod sna-rabs-pa gsañ-chen rñün-ma’i čhos’byuñ legs-bšad gzar-pa’i dga’-ston* (Kalimpong, 1964), 398 fols., by bDud-’joms sprul-sku rin-po-čhe (still active), fol. 244a-337b.

<sup>65</sup> Das, 1970: 13; Hoffmann “Quellen”, 206-07. The assertions of Čhos-kyi ŋi-ma are repudiated by *LŠJ*, 130. *KTDG* reverses the accusation in the case of K 44 and T 29.

<sup>66</sup> A.-M. Blondeau, “Le Lha-dre bka’-than”, in: *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou* (Paris, 1971), 29-126. I have reviewed this article in *Journal Asiatique* CCLIX (1971), 391-94.

shown to be the source of large parts of the 14th century Buddhist *gter-ma Lha-'dre bka'-thañ*, thus proving that the whole question of the relationship between Bonpo and Nyingmapa literature is much more complicated than has previously generally been thought.

Turning to the Bonpo *gter-mas*, the texts which were discovered were not all, of course, the Word of the Buddha. Many were commentaries and subsidiary texts, composed by the siddhas and scholars of Žaň-žuň and Tibet of whom we have spoken above. Together with similar texts composed by Bonpo scholars from the 11th century onwards, many of these texts were later collected in the *Tenjur*. We now propose to attempt an analysis of this vast literature. In the absence of previous studies of a comprehensive nature, it goes without saying that our conclusions will have to be subject to future revision when more detailed studies have, hopefully, been undertaken. However, a start must be made.

Two sources have been utilised. Firstly Ńi-ma bstan-'jin's *dkar-čhag (KTDG)*, where he normally indicates to what *gter-ma* a text belongs, or whether it has been transmitted in any other way. Dealing with the *Tenjur*, he lists the commentaris to a given text in chronological order. The second source is the *Legs-bšad mjod (LŠJ)* of Šar-rja bKra-šis rgyal-mchan. In Section VII (pp. 105-92) he deals with the Later Propagation of the Doctrine (*phyi-dar*), mentioning each individual *gter-ston* (often with fairly extensive biographical information), and giving detailed lists of the texts discovered by each.<sup>67</sup> For questions of dates and chronology, we are practically entirely dependent on the *bstan-rcis* of Ńi-ma bstan-'jin (STNN); however, the biographies of the various *gter-stons* in *LŠJ* are arranged in an approximatively chronological order, thus indicating in a general way when a given *gter-ston* flourished.

The Later Propagation of the Doctrine is considered to have commenced with the discovery in STNN 913 A.D. of texts at bSam-yas by three errant monks from Nepal. In this connection there are two facts which invite further reflection. The first is that the discovery was made at bSam-yas. The pivotal position, in the later religious epics centering round Padmasambhava and the establishment of Buddhism in Tibet, of the founding of bSam-yas during the reign of Khri-sroñ lde-bcan, is too well known to require further mention. However, the tradition recorded by these later texts informs us that at bSam-yas Buddhist AS WELL AS

<sup>67</sup> The lists are not translated, but are found in the romanized version of the text, pp. 271-348.

Bonpo texts were translated; thus the Biography of Padmasambhava<sup>68</sup> states that the king invited a number of Bonpo masters from Žaṅ-žuṅ to bSam-yas where they translated Bon-texts in the Temple of Avalokiteśvara.<sup>69</sup> It further states that the Tibetan *lo-cā-ba* Vairocana translated Bonpo as well as Buddhist texts.<sup>70</sup>

The second point of interest is that the three monks from Nepal had no intention of bringing to light hidden texts. According to *LŚJ*,<sup>71</sup> at least, their purpose in going to bSam-yas was to obtain gold – by fair means or foul, for the box containing the texts was stolen by them in the belief that it contained gold, and the contents, on being discovered to be books, were later exchanged for food. In this connection it is interesting to note that one set of texts was given to a group of Tibetans on their way to bSam-yas to look for BUDDHIST textual Treasures; in other words, bSam-yas must already have had the reputation of being a depository of “Treasures”. The Bonpos thus do not claim to possess the EARLIEST “Treasures”, nor do they claim to have initiated their discovery.

A number of the earliest *gter-mas* appear to have been discovered by accident. In particular, this seems to have been the case with the discoveries made at bSam-yas which are placed by STNN in the 10th century. We have already mentioned the discovery made in 913 by the three Nepalese “*ācāryas*” (*a-ca-ra*); two of them are reputed to have made further discoveries in 961, under similar circumstances.<sup>72</sup> Again, a crack in a pillar at bSam-yas led rKo-bo Yon-sgom Thar-mo to discover texts in 962.<sup>73</sup> We also hear of texts buried in the ground being discovered by hunters “digging for a stone” (perhaps to make a fireplace); having no interest in the texts, they simply gave them away.<sup>74</sup> Likewise, from the 11th century, we are told of a group of Buddhists looking for Buddhist texts in Yer-ba’i rjoṅ near Lhasa; finding only Bonpo texts, they gave them away.<sup>75</sup>

We also find several cases of texts being discovered with the help of a “guide” (*kha-byañ*), i.e. a written description of how to find a particular

<sup>68</sup> Translated by G. C. Toussaint *Le dict de Padma* (= *Bibliothèque de l’Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises* III) (Paris, 1933). The passages in question have also been translated by Hoffmann, “Quellen”, 253-65.

<sup>69</sup> Toussaint, 1933: 317; Hoffmann, 1950: 260.

<sup>70</sup> Toussaint, 1933: 330; Hoffmann, 1950: 264.

<sup>71</sup> *LŚJ*, 118-19.

<sup>72</sup> *LŚJ*, 160-61.

<sup>73</sup> *LŚJ*, 122-23.

<sup>74</sup> *LŚJ*, 124.

<sup>75</sup> *LŚJ*, 152.

*gter-ma*. Such guides were often come across by chance, and we cannot exclude the possibility that authentic “guides” were in fact found. *Klu-cha Zla-'od 'bar* (b. STNN 1024) discovered a Treasure in STNN 1038 following the directions of a guide;<sup>76</sup> *gÑan Ra-ston 'Bum-rje* did the same in STNN 1137.<sup>77</sup> In other cases there existed an oral tradition as to where a text was hidden; this seems to have been the case with the *gZer-mig* which was discovered at *bSam-yas*<sup>78</sup> – according to its *dkar-čhag* in 893 (or 913),<sup>79</sup> but probably in the 11th century. In such cases, the *gter-stons* simply acted on the information they received.

There is nothing intrinsically improbable about these accounts. We have already noted that the 11th century saw the emergence of a corresponding literature among the Nyingmapas. In fact, the 11th century appears to be the crucial period in the formation of the Bonpo literature as well, and as we shall see, a number of important textual discoveries, assigned by tradition to the 10th century, have in reality probably taken place in the 11th.

It is true that in the case of more than half (45 of 84) of the “Treasure-Discoverers” mentioned by *LŚJ*, it is simply stated that “texts were discovered”, without further details concerning the circumstances of the discovery being offered. This is true of all periods. Only future research may perhaps reveal how these discoveries were made. However, this much is clear: after an initial period in which there usually is nothing of the supernatural in connection with the textual discoveries, such discoveries tend to be surrounded with increasing frequency by supernatural phenomena, such as dreams, visions, prophecies, etc. Thus a new pattern is established – in the course of the 11th century – which maintains itself right down to our own times.

Although we hear of one instance of a premonitory dream in connection with the discoveries at *bSam-yas* in the 10th century,<sup>80</sup> it is only with *gŠen-čhen kLu-dga'* (STNN 996-1035) that we meet with a completely new type of Treasure-Discoverer.<sup>81</sup> He is in many ways a key figure in the formation of Bonpo literature; his discovery (STNN 1017) included numerous extremely important texts. What, however, distinguishes him from his predecessors, is that this discovery was preceded by several years of initiatory preparations culminating in a series of visions in which

<sup>76</sup> *LŚJ*, 145-48.

<sup>77</sup> *LŚJ*, 151.

<sup>78</sup> *LŚJ*, 162-65.

<sup>79</sup> *mDo gZer-mig-gi dkar-čhag* by Tenzin Namdak (New Delhi, 1965), fol. 6.

<sup>80</sup> *LŚJ*, 123.

<sup>81</sup> *LŚJ*, 126-32.

supernatural beings of various kinds revealed the place where the Treasure was hidden.

At other times, of course, the part played by the supernatural was more discreet. Thus a shepherd later known as gÑan-ston Šes-rab rdo-rje discovered, in STNN 1067, “a cave full of volumes of books all round the walls” by following a ray of white light which led to a crack in a rock.<sup>82</sup> It is not necessary to enumerate all the subsequent *gter-stons*; two points, however, should be mentioned. In the first place, often only a certain part of the Treasure in question was actually taken out; thus the remainder must, or so Bonpo tradition implies, still be left intact, awaiting discovery at a suitable time. The re-discovery – which in fact amounts to the revelation – of the Word is therefore not yet a completed process. Secondly, the guardian deities often prevented the original Treasure from being removed, only permitting its being copied out by the discoverer; thus the possibility of rediscovery was ensured.

A third stage in the history of the *gter-stons* was initiated in the beginning of the 12th century by the appearance of texts which were said to have been “orally transmitted” (*sñan-du brgyud-pa*), i.e. dictated to the adept by supernatural beings in the course of a vision. Obviously, this represents not only a quantitative, but above all, a qualitative increase of the supernatural element in the process of revelation. We hear of texts being transmitted orally for the first time in the case of Gyer-mi Ńi-'od to whom they were transmitted by Dran-pa Nam-mkha';<sup>83</sup> the exact year is unknown, but it must have been around the beginning of the 12th century, as he discovered an important Treasure in STNN 1108. Equally early, perhaps, is the oral transmission bestowed by Che-dbañ rig-'jin<sup>84</sup> on Luñ-bon Lha-gñen, who was born in STNN 1088. There follows an unbroken series of other visionaries – for the 12th century alone, *LŠJ* mentions at least six, among them the important figure of dByil-ston dPon-gsas Khyuñ-rgod rcal (b. STNN 1175),<sup>85</sup> who, under the name of Rig-'jin rGod-kyi ldem-phru-čan, also played an important role as *gter-ston* in the Nyingmapa tradition.<sup>86</sup> In the second half of the 14th century we find a group of particularly important visionaries, the chief one being Khyuñ-po bLo-ldan sñiñ-po (b. STNN 1360),<sup>87</sup> to whose

<sup>82</sup> *LŠJ*, 153.

<sup>83</sup> *LŠJ*, 159.

<sup>84</sup> *KTDG*, 21 1. 7.

<sup>85</sup> *LŠJ*, 173-74.

<sup>86</sup> *TTGL*, fol. 50a6-51a4.

<sup>87</sup> *LŠJ*, 182.

prodigious output (he died at the age of twenty-five) not only the twelve-volume *gZi-brjid*, but also numerous other texts are ascribed. Visionaries of this type have continued to be active right up to our own century;<sup>88</sup> *LŠJ* mentions twenty-two (including several women), among them bKra-šis rgyal-mchan's own guru, bDe-čhen gliñ-pa (b. STNN 1833).

We find, among these visionaries, a gradual diversification in the type of vision received. Originally they took the form, as we have stated, of visions of supernatural beings who dictated texts to the adept. These beings were either siddhas associated with the Early Propagation such as Dran-pa Nam-mkha',<sup>89</sup> Che-dbañ rig-'jin,<sup>90</sup> sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-čhen,<sup>91</sup> or sTañ-čhen dMu-cha gyer-med;<sup>92</sup> or else *dākiñis* (sPyan-gčigma),<sup>93</sup> goddesses (Srid-pa rgyal-mo),<sup>94</sup> or divinities (gSañmčhog mthar-thug).<sup>95</sup> It is interesting to note that in one case we hear of a Tibetan lama, dGoñs-mjad Ri-khrod-pa (STNN 1038-1096) transmitting texts orally three hundred years later.<sup>96</sup> However, in the 14th century we also hear of revelations in the form of *dgoñs-gter*, lit. "mental Treasures", i.e., texts which through the "blessing" (*byin-rlabs*) of supernatural beings arise spontaneously in the mind of the adept. Needless to say, the "authenticity" of such texts would always be open to question, and in fact we only find two instances of *dgoñs-gter* mentioned in *LŠJ*.<sup>97</sup> In two other cases, the expression is employed by *KTDG* while *LŠJ* states that the texts were passed on orally,<sup>98</sup> while in another the reverse is the case.<sup>99</sup> Hence it is probably impracticable to draw a clear line of demarcation between *sñan-brgyud* (auditive revelation) and *dgoñs-gter* ("mental" revelation). In another case,<sup>100</sup> we hear of a purely visual revelation, a text appearing in the form of "luminous letters".<sup>101</sup> Finally, from the last century we hear of

<sup>88</sup> A vision which took place in 1956 (*me-sprel*) has been recorded by the visionary himself, lDoñ-bcun bZod-pa rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1866), in Drañ-sroñ bZod-pa rgyal-mchan-gyi luñ-yig, MS 4 fols. (private collection of the Abbot S. T. Jongdong) which I plan to publish in the near future.

<sup>89</sup> B 14 – this and the following numbers refer to the list of *gter-stons* given below (pp. 42ff.) where full references will be found.

<sup>90</sup> B 11, B 29, B 32, B 42, B 45.

<sup>91</sup> B 33, B 39.

<sup>92</sup> B 44.

<sup>93</sup> B 26.

<sup>94</sup> B 19.

<sup>95</sup> B 46.

<sup>96</sup> B 45.

<sup>97</sup> *LŠJ*, 182 (B 46) and 185 (Kun-grol grags-pa b. STNN 1700).

<sup>98</sup> B 19 and B 47.

<sup>99</sup> B 46.

<sup>100</sup> B 50.

<sup>101</sup> 'od-kyi yi-ger babs-pa. However, *KTDG*, 23 1.21 simply states: *dgoñs-par šar-ba*

extatic journeys to supernatural regions like Uḍḍiyāna – here the Nying-mapa influence is evident.<sup>102</sup>

A final variant of the supernatural type of revelation may be mentioned: the discovery of texts written in “mystic letters” (*brda-yig*) which are deciphered (*bkrol-ba*) by a competent adept,<sup>103</sup> or of texts written “in the script of the Pure Gods” (*dag-pa lha'i yi-ge*) which are duly rendered into Tibetan script (*bod-yig-tu bsgyur*).<sup>104</sup>

In general, we may follow *TTGL*<sup>105</sup> in dividing all *gter-mas* into two main groups: *sa-gter* (“earth-Treasure”) and *dgoñs-gter*. The former category includes all *gter-mas* which are “discovered”, whether by accident or otherwise; the latter would, as far as the Bonpos are concerned, include “oral transmissions” as well as “mental treasures” in the strict sense.<sup>106</sup>

Summing up, we may conclude that certain texts, hidden during the 8th century, were, no doubt, actually discovered during the 10th and particularly during the 11th century, and possibly also from time to time in later centuries. It is hardly possible to state definitely today which texts might in fact date from the 8th century; only careful and extensive textual criticism can disclose this. Later tradition naturally tended to assign the earliest possible date to the discovery of a text; and famous text-discoverers would in time inevitably become associated with texts which in fact had been discovered later. It is therefore extremely hazardous to attempt to establish, at the present moment, a relative chronology within the Canon itself.

However, as the tradition of treasure-discoverers became established and accidental (and presumably authentic) finds became rarer, the process of revelation could only be carried on by relying on the aid of supernatural beings; and dreams, visions, and signs became the normal accompaniments of textual discoveries; and yet later the necessity of an actual “discovery” (i.e., of a *sa-gter*, an “earth-Treasure”) was often dispensed with altogether, and texts were “transmitted orally” etc. Such, at least, the external pattern appears to be; the inner dynamics of this process are not known to us.

We have stressed the importance of the 11th century. In fact, the Bonpo tradition claims, as we have seen, that important discoveries were

---

(‘arose as a mental sensation’).

<sup>102</sup> *LŚJ*, 188-89.

<sup>103</sup> *LŚJ*, 178.

<sup>104</sup> *LŚJ*, 175.

<sup>105</sup> *TTGL*, 34b4.

<sup>106</sup> While 160 *gter-stons* are listed by *TTGL* under the heading *sa-gter*, only 29 are given for *dgoñs-gter*.

made in the 10th century, particularly at bSam-yas. However, this is open to a certain amount of doubt, and I believe that at least two cases may be safely assigned to the 11th. The first concerns the three, later two, “*ācāryas*” from Nepal. After their second discovery at bSam-yas (STNN 961), they offered the texts to a disciple of Lha-ri gñen po.<sup>107</sup> The latter, however, lived STNN 1024-1091. This event can therefore have taken place at the earliest around 1050. The second concerns Drañ-rje gSer-mig, the discoverer, likewise at bSam-yas, of the *gZer-mig*. According to the *dkar-čhag* of the *gZer-mig*, this took place in 893 (or 913); however, *LŠJ* states that Drañ-rje transmitted the text to Lha-ri gñen-po, which, once more, places the discovery some time between c. 1051 and 1091.<sup>108</sup>

We may, therefore, conclude that the literature of the Bonpos – though certainly not without a prehistory linking it with the religious life of the 8th century – emerges, for the first time, in systematic form in the 11th century; and, although the lines of connection can only, on the whole, be vaguely discerned at present, one cannot but see this within the wider perspective of the general religious renaissance in Tibet in that century, which saw the formation of all the major schools of Tibetan Buddhism.

While this conclusion seems to be fairly certain, the question of the date of the formation of the Bonpo Canon remains to be discussed. We must admit that we cannot at present give a definite answer. However, a fairly exact *terminus a quo* may be established. The youngest text in the *Kanjur* appears to be the *sKal-bzañ*, one version of which was transmitted to Khro-gñen rGyal-mchan in STNN 1386.<sup>109</sup> The *Kanjur* consequently cannot have been finally assembled before this date. It is true that texts included by *KTDG* in the *Kanjur* were discovered or transmitted even after that year, but never for the first time – we frequently find that the same text is discovered at various times and places.<sup>110</sup>

If we turn to the *Tenjur*, our conclusion is supported – it does not seem to contain texts transmitted later than Khro-gñen rgyal-mchan (1386) and bLo-ldan sñiñ-po (b. STNN 1360, d. 1385).<sup>111</sup> In addition, it also

<sup>107</sup> *LŠJ*, 161.

<sup>108</sup> *LŠJ*, 165.

<sup>109</sup> *LŠJ*, 182.

<sup>110</sup> An example of this is the *Ma-rgyud* which, although discovered by Gu-ru rnon-rce (b. STNN 1136), was subsequently transmitted orally to sTag-za Rin-chen mcho-mo (14th cent.?), and discovered by sPa-ston Lhun-grub dpal-bzañ in STNN 1486 – almost certainly after the formation of the Canon.

<sup>111</sup> There are two possible exceptions: T 194 and T 283, transmitted to B 50 and B 48 respectively, to whom definite dates cannot be assigned.

contains many commentaries and liturgies which were composed after the beginning of the Later Propagation by scholars whose dates, and occasionally even biographies, we possess. As pointed out above, these texts are always arranged in chronological order by *KTDG*; and the latest texts to be included are invariably those composed by the great organiser of monastic Bon, Šes-rab rgyal-mchan (STNN 1356-1415),<sup>112</sup> or, in one case,<sup>113</sup> by the latter's disciple and successor, Rin-čhen rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1360).<sup>114</sup> Thus the *Tenjur* can hardly have been assembled before the death of Šes-rab rgyal-mchan in 1415; on the other hand, in view of his unparalleled authority, it is not likely that much time elapsed after his death before the Canon received its final form. It may therefore well have been finally assembled by c. 1450, which allows ample time for the Bonpos to have felt the need of assembling a Canon of their own following the final editing, by Bu-ston and others, of a Buddhist Canon in the beginning of the preceding century. However, this remains an hypothesis as the *terminus ad quem* cannot at present be fixed with absolute certainty.

We have already emphasized the close connection between the Bonpos and the Nyingmapas. This is illustrated by *LŠJ*, which more than once mentions that Buddhist and Bonpo texts were found together.<sup>115</sup> The same is true of Nyingmapa sources. A survey of *TTGL* discloses that not less than six *gter-stons* accepted by the Nyingmapa tradition are identical with well-known Bonpo *gter-stons*;<sup>116</sup> and of another five it is said that they discovered Bonpo texts.<sup>117</sup> Several of the texts which are specified are in fact included in the Bonpo Canon.<sup>118</sup> It is interesting to note that of these eleven, none are considered by *TTGL* to have lived later than the 5th *rab-byuñ* which ended in 1326. In other words, the period of continual reciprocal influence, in which both traditions could not only lay claim to the same Treasure-Discoverers, but also acknowledge their ambiguous status, came to an end in the first half of the 14th century – i.e. in a period in which the Bonpos had already assembled the greater

<sup>112</sup> *LŠJ*, 140-45; *A-khrid*, 50-52.

<sup>113</sup> T 28.

<sup>114</sup> *LŠJ*, 143-144; *A-khrid*, 53.

<sup>115</sup> *LŠJ*, 305, 7 and 331, 33.

<sup>116</sup> *Grub-thob dÑos-grub*, fol. 41a4-41b6, (see B 13 below); *Ku-sa sman-pa*, fol. 42a6-43a4 (B 8); *A-ya bon-po Lha-'bum*, fol. 43a4-43b3 (B 20); *dPon-gsas Khyuñ-thog*, fol. 50a6-51a4 (B 32); *gter-ston gsum-chogs*, fol. 106b3-108a3 (B 10); *rDo-rje gliñ-pa*, fol. 78a5-82a1 (B 36).

<sup>117</sup> *Khyun-po dPal-dge*, fol. 43b3-44a2; *Ra-šag čhen-po*, 45b4-46a6; *Rakši ston-pa*, fol. 57a4-57b3; *g.Yag-phyar sÑon-mo*, 58b6-59b5; *Ya-gyal gter-ston dÑos-grub rgyal-mchan*, 121b4-123a5.

<sup>118</sup> E.g. the *Ma-rgyud* discovered by A-ya bon-po Lha-'bum.

part of their Canon and would therefore be more disposed to reject texts which were felt to be of Buddhist origin.

The Bonpo Canon being the result of a slow process of continual revelation, it was inevitable that numerous *gter-mas* should be claimed to be “authentic” which were, at least ultimately, rejected as apocryphical. The problem of ascertaining the “authenticity” of a text was always a very real one, and *LŠJ* quotes a verse warning us that “The country is full of false, lying, and specious textual treasures, and such as have no knowledge of doctrine and are fond of arguing and women”; and we are told that false textual Treasures are numerous among Bonpos as well as Buddhists.<sup>119</sup>

Thus *KTDG*, dealing with the tantric section of the *Tenjur*, is only willing to recognize those texts as canonical which have been discovered before dMu-gšen Ńi-ma rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1360, hence a contemporary of mŃam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan STNN 1360-1415): *KTDG* considers his texts to bring “the cycle of Old Treasures of the Word”<sup>120</sup> to an end. The textual Treasures beginning with those of Šel-žig g.Yuñdruñ rgyal-po<sup>121</sup> (“New Treasures”), are not accepted by *KTDG*.<sup>122</sup>

Ńi-ma bstan-’jin also admits that there are some who include the biography and writings of Padmasambhava, “the Religious Instructor (*slob-dpon*) of those who founded the Buddhists’ *bSam-yas* and caused Bon to decline”,<sup>123</sup> in the Word, but this he categorically rejects,<sup>124</sup> pointing out that even the Buddhists themselves do not include these texts in their *Kanjur*. We cannot undertake a study of the syncretistic movements within the Bonpo and Nyingmapa traditions, but may at present at least note that there clearly was no absolute consensus as to what might or might not be included in the Canon.

## V. *Transmission and Authorship*

### A. *Uninterrupted Transmission*

A small number of texts are believed to have been transmitted down to the times of the Later Propagation without having been hidden as

<sup>119</sup> *LŠJ*, 190.

<sup>120</sup> *bka’-gter rñiñ-ma’i skor*.

<sup>121</sup> *LŠJ*, 185.

<sup>122</sup> *KTDG*, 24, 1. 24-27.

<sup>123</sup> *KTDG*, 28, bottom.

<sup>124</sup> *KTDG*, 28, bottom – p. 29, 1. 1: “čhos-pa’i bsam-yas btab-te bon nub-par byed-mi’i slob-dpon pad-’byuñ-du grags-pa’i rnam-thar dañ mjad-byañ kha-šas bka’-ru gžugs-pa ni šin-tu mi ’thad-par sems-te/.”

Treasures (*gter-du ma-soñ*). Such uninterrupted transmission renders the texts in question particularly authoritative; of 'Dul-ba rgyud-drug *KTDG* says that it is "like molten gold", i.e. entirely above the suspicion of being alloyed or corrupted.<sup>125</sup>

In this category come the following texts:

K 3, 80, 87, 108.

T 82, 158, 178, 245

### B. *Revealed Texts*

This category includes practically the whole of the *Kanjur* and a large part of the *Tenjur*.

In *LŚJ* the text-discoverers and visionaries are listed in a roughly chronological order. For B 1-51, we shall therefore retain the order of *LŚJ*; those names (B 51-56) which do not occur in *LŚJ* are listed alphabetically. Information is given in the following order:

1. References
2. Chronological data
3. Place of discovery (a place-name thus implies that the Treasures connected with the person in question constitute a *sa-gter*, "earth-Treasure"); or other mode of transmission
4. Texts listed in *KTDG*
5. Additional notes.

### C. *Non-revealed Texts*

A number of texts are composed by authors belonging to the period of the Later Propagation. These texts, found in the *Tenjur* only, are not regarded as "revealed", but nevertheless as particularly authoritative.<sup>126</sup> The list of authors is alphabetical, based on the PERSONAL NAME; an asterisc signifies that no personal name is known. References and chronological data are given where available. Divine beings as well as siddhas belonging to the Early Propagation are listed separately (D); if a text composed by a siddha forms part of a Treasure, it will be given two references.

<sup>125</sup> *KTDG*, 3 1. 4: *gser-gyi žun-ma dañ mchuñs-pa*. However, besides being transmitted uninterruptedly, a text may ALSO have been discovered as a *gter-ma*, as is the case of 'Dul-ba rgyud-drug.

<sup>126</sup> By this we do not, of course, imply that many of the "revealed" texts may not, in fact, have been composed or at least arranged by the *gter-ston* in question.

B. *Revealed Texts*B 1 **A-tsa-ra mi-gsum**

1. *LŠJ*, 118-22; 281,13-285,23
2. Discovery STNN 913 (but cf. B 17)
3. bSam-yas lha-khañ
4. K 3, 45, 47, 48, 69  
T 86, 87

B 2 **Sa-ston 'Brug-lha**

1. *LŠJ*, 122; 285,24-36
2. —
3. Yar-luñ brag-dmar
4. K 69

B 3 **mTha'-bži Ye-šes blo-gros**

1. *LŠJ*, 123; 286,18-287,2
2. Disciple of Yon-sgom thar-mo who discovers texts STNN 962; texts written down in *sa-pho-byi*, i.e. 988 (*LŠJ*, 123).
3. The pinnacle of the bSam-yas lha-khañ
4. T 222

B 4 **Ňa 'Phrañ-lha'i dbañ-phyug**

1. *LŠJ*, 123; 287,3-16
2. —
3. Gañs Ti-se
4. K 69

B 5 **Šu-bon dGe-bšñen**

1. *LŠJ*, 124; 287,17-24
2. —
3. (i) Šel-mcho Mu-le-had in sPu-hrañs (*KT DG*: at sKya-ra brag by three hunters: Mar-pa 'phan- (*LŠJ* 'phen) bzañ, sKyes-'phan dar-ya-čan, and sKyid-po), given to Šu-bon.  
(ii) Discovered by Šu-bon at:  
(a) gSer-thañ ša-ba-čan  
(b) Šel-gyi pha-boñ g.yu-ris-čan
4. K 45 (i)  
T 88-90 (i)

B 6 **Khro-chañ 'Brug-lha**

1. *LŠJ*, 124-26; 287,32-289,18
2. STNN 956-1077
3. (i) Khyuñ-ldiñ brag in the North  
(ii) Zar-gyi stag-sna
4. K 30, 80  
T 58, 282

B 7 **gŠen-čhen kLu-dga'**

1. *LŠJ*, 126-32; 289,19-294,28. *Sources*, 238-44

2. STNN 996-1035, discovery STNN 1017 (but acc. to *GRB*, 57 in 1089, see *LŚJ*, 129 n. 1)
3. 'Bri-mchams (*KTDG*: 'Brig-'chams) mtha'-dkar
4. K 2, 18, 45, 47-49, 51, 53, 67, 69, 70, 72, 98, 109  
T 66, 121, 232, 257

**B 8 Khu-cha Zla-'od 'bar**

1. *LŚJ*, 145-48; 303,38-307,8
2. b. STNN 1024, discovery STNN 1038 (but *LŚJ* states that the discovery was when he was eighteen).
3. sPa-gro gčal-gyi brag
4. K 20, 28, 53, 72, 86, 88  
T 94, 112, 120, 123, 139-149, 159, 187
5. *LŚJ*, 306,26: also called Khu-cha sman-pa and g.Yu-thog mkhas-pa. *TTGL* 42a6-43a4: Ku-sa sman-pa, acc. to Bonpos called Khu-cha'i Phur-nag 'gar-ston; although contemporary with g.Yu-thog-pa, he was not, as some Bonpo *gter-'byuñ* assert, identical with him. Fol. 227b6: 2nd *rab-byuñ* (1087-1146).

**B 9 Ra-ston dÑos-grub 'bar**

1. *LŚJ*, 149-51; 308,5-310,21
2. —
3. Texts given to Ra-ston at Yar-'brog by Ra-šag 'Dre-čuñ and Dad-pa chul-khrims who had discovered them at bSam-yas (cf. *LŚJ*, 165).
4. K 109

**B 10 gCañ-gi ban-de gsum**

1. *LŚJ*, 152-53; 311,4-312,16
2. Textual transmission: Luñ-ston 'Od-'bar > Gyer-ston Khro-gsas > Luñ-bon Lha-gñan (b. STNN 1088).
3. Lha-sa'i Yer-ba'i rjoñ
4. K 56-57, 66
5. *TTGL*, 106b-108a3: *gTer-ston gsum-chogs* (see *LŚJ*, 152, n. 2) 227b6: 5th *rab-byuñ* (1267-1326)

**B 11 Luñ-bon Lha-gñan (*KTDG*: °gñen)**

1. *LŚJ*, 152-53; 311,4-312,16. *Sources*, 276-86.
2. b. STNN 1088
3. sñan-brgyud (Che-dbañ rig-'jin)
4. K 57, 58  
T 157, 271, 272

**B 12 gÑan-ston Šes-rab rdo-rje (*KTDG*: gÑen°)**

1. *LŚJ*, 153-54; 312,17-314,36
2. Discovered STNN 1067
3. *LŚJ*: gÑa'-luñ brag-ra in Ñañ-stod  
*KTDG*: gCañ-'phrañ Nu-ma'i brag
4. K 2, 3, 15-17, 20-22, 37, 41, 47, 50-52, 54, 55, 64,  
T 18
5. *LŚJ*: also known as *gÑan-'theñ* (*KTDG*: °*thin*, STNN: °*mithin*) *re-ñan* and *gÑan-ston Šes-rab señ-ge*.

**B 13 bŽod-ston dÑos-grub grags-pa (KTDG: gŽod°)**

1. *LŠJ*, 154-56; 314-37-317,5
2. Discovered STNN 1088
3. The Treasury of the Temple of Khom-mthiñ in Lho-brag (STNN: from the back of the statue of Vairocana)
4. K 111-13
5. *TTGL* 41a4-b6: known as *Grub-thob dÑos-grub*. Fol. 222b: 2nd *rab-byuñ* (1087-1146).

**B 14 Gyer-mi Ńi-'od**

1. *LŠJ*, 156-60; 317,6-320,15. *Sources*, 288-308.
2. Discovered STNN 1108
3. (i) Dañ-ra Khyuñ-rjoñ (*KTDG*: Dvañ°) in the North  
(ii) sñan-brgyud (Dran-pa Nam-mkha')
4. K 1, 67, 73
5. Most of the texts found at Dvañ-ra were left for rMa-ston Srid-'jin to take out; the orally transmitted ones were given to Se-ka ston-pa.

**B 15 rMa-ston Srid-'jin (*LŠJ*: Srol°)**

1. *LŠJ*, 167-68; 326,4-327,6. *Sources*, 288-308.
2. b. STNN 1092; discovery STNN 1108
3. Dañ-ra Khyuñ-rjoñ (see B 14)
4. K 2, 67, 74, 104, 109  
T 19, 67, 113-116, 118, 120, 129, 130, 133, 233, 235

**B 16 Se-gar ston-pa Khri-thuñ**

1. *LŠJ*, 160; 320, 3-15
2. Texts imparted by Gyer-mi Ńi-'od, see B 14
3. sñan-brgyud
4. K 65  
T 125

**B 17 A-ca-ra mi-gñis**

1. *LŠJ*, 160-62; 320,16-322,28
2. Discovery STNN 961; however, they are said (*LŠJ*, 161 n. 1) to have met Sum-pa gTo-ston, a disciple of Gur-žog-pa Lha-ri gñen-po (STNN 1024-1091).
3. *LŠJ*: the Ča-ti sgo-mañ at the Khri-dañ Cemetery in the SW of bSam-yas.  
STNN: the Red Stūpa (ča-ti dmar-po) at bSam-yas.
4. K 7, 11-14, 47  
T 177, 293

**B 18 Drañ-rje gSer-mig**

1. *LŠJ*, 162-65; 322,34-324,27
2. Discovery (bSam-yas) in 893 (or 913) acc. to the *gZer-mig dkar-čhag*; however, *LŠJ* states that he transmitted texts to rMe'u Lha-ri gñen-po (STNN 1024-1091).
3. (i) bSam-yas (see *LŠJ*, 163-64 for discussion of the exact location)  
(ii) Ńañ-smad, beside the river of Ńañ-po. Discovery made together with Dad-pa Chul-khriims and Ra-šag 'Dre-čuñ, cf. B 9.
4. K 6

**B 19 Bon-žig Khyuñ-nag**

1. *LŠJ*, 168-69; 327,7-13
2. b. STNN 1103
3. *LŠJ*: sñan-brgyud (Srid-pa rgyal-mo)  
*KTGD*: dgoñs-gter
4. T 274

**B 20 Gu-ru rnon-rce**

1. *LŠJ*, 166-67; 325,4-326,3
2. b. STNN 1136
3. rTa-nag Duñ-phor brag in gCañ
4. K 81, 83  
T 137, 138, 153
5. *TTGL*, 43a4-b3: A-ya bon-po Lha-'bum; fol. 43a5: contemporary with 'Brom-ston (1008-1064). Fol. 227bl: before 1st *rab-byuñ* (1027).

**B 21 gÑal-ston gŽon-nu 'bum**

1. *LŠJ*, 125-26; p. 167 (referred to as *bLa-ma gŽon-nu*)
2. Disciple of Gu-ru rnon-rce, b. STNN 1136
3. —
4. K 62, 63, 101-103

**B 22 Bal-žo sGom-čhen**

1. *LŠJ*, 170: 328,9-21
2. —
3. Šam-po'i g.Ya-ma dmar-po
4. K 70, 71

**B 23 Bu-mcho Srid-pa'i rgyal-po (*KTGD*: °cho)**

1. *LŠJ*, 170; 328,35-38
2. *LŠJ*: contemporary with sPa-ston dPal-mčhog (b. STNN 1014)
3. rDo-rje gsañ-phug in gCañ-stod
4. K 44

**B 24 rMa-ston Šes-rab señ-ge**

1. *LŠJ*, 170-71; 329,1-10. *Sources*, 310-25.
2. *LŠJ*: grandson of rMa-ston Srid-'jin (b. STNN 1092).
3. Yar-lha Šam-po
4. K 21, 42, 43, 71  
T 117, 198, 237

**B 25 'Ĵad-dol 'Or-sgom Phug-pa**

1. *LŠJ*, 171; 329,11-18
2. —
3. rGyuñ-srub gsañ-ba brag-phug
4. T 234 (*KTGD*: Šer-señ-gi gter-las byon-žin/ 'Or-sgom Phug-pas dños-grub-tu nod-pa)

**B 26 Mar-ston rGyal-legs**

1. *LŠJ*, 171; 329,27-30. *Sources*, 374-88.

2. b. STNN 1123
  3. sñan-brgyud (mkha'-'gro dkar-mo sPyan-gčig-ma)
  4. T 219
- B 27 mCho-bon Khyuñ-gsas (KTDG: dPon-gsas Che-ma)**
1. *LŠJ*, 171-72; 329,31-36
  2. —
  3. sKyid-mkhar sño-phug
  4. T 179, 180
- B 28 sKyañ-'phags Mu-la druñ-mu**
1. *LŠJ*, 172; 329,37-330,3
  2. —
  3. Brag-dkar bya-rgod in Theb-čhu
  4. K 27  
T 227, 277
- B 29 Dam-pa rañ-grol Ye-šes rgyal-mchan**
1. *LŠJ*, 172; 330,4-16
  2. b. STNN 1149
  3. sñan-brgyud (Che-dbañ rig-'jin)
  4. T 92, 124, 134, 204
- B 30 g.Yu-lo dkar-po (KTDG: Rig-'jin g.Yul-dkar)**
1. *LŠJ*, 172; 330,20-22
  2. —
  3. rMa-rgyal gyal-ga (KTDG: °gya-ga)
  4. K 19
- B 31 Lha-bžer g.Yuñ-druñ bla-ma and Bra-bo rGyal-ba grags pa**
1. *LŠJ*, 173; 330,23-33
  2. Before 1310 (SG 95b6)
  3. (i) mTho-la rmog-mgo  
(ii) sKabs-gñen mcho-nag in gCoñ-kha
  4. K 19 (ii)  
T 97 (ii)
- B 32 dByil-ston dPon-gsas Khyuñ-rgod rcal**
1. *LŠJ*, 173-74; 330,34-332,29. *Sources*, 245-75.
  2. b. STNN 1175
  3. (a) ( i ) Žal-bzañ brag (STNN 1198)  
( ii ) the heart of the statue of Hayagrīva in the temple of rGyañ  
( iii ) rGyañ Yon-po luñ  
( iv ) Zañ-zañ lha-brag  
( v ) Mañ-mkhar lčags-'phrañ  
( vi ) the belly of the statue of Hayagrīva at Pra-dun  
(vii) Yañ-bu-la'i gañs  
(viii) Ti-se gañs  
(b) sñan-brgyud (Che-dbañ rig-'jin)
  4. K 43 (iv), 82 (iv), 89, 96 97, 99, 100 (i), 105, 106, 107 (iv)  
T 83, 118, 122, 151, 156 (iv), 173, 188 (i), 189, 192, 196 (iv), 201, 202, 203 (iv),

224, 229, 230, 232, 236, 240, 246, 247, 269, 273

5. *TTGL* 50a6-51a4: *dPon-gsas Khyuñ-thog rcal*, also known as *Rig-'jin rGod-ldem* (*rGod-kyi ldem-phru-čan*). Discovered texts (*čhos, bon, sman, reis*) in the temple of rGyañ. Fol. 227a6: before the 1st *rab-byuñ* (1027).

**B 33 mChan-ldan Druñ-mu ha-ra**

1. *LŠJ*, 174: 332,30-333,6
2. —
3. *sñan-brgyud* (*sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-čhen*)
4. K 4, 38, 39  
T 220, 239

**B 34 Go-lde 'phags-pa g.Yuñ-druñ ye-šes**

1. *LŠJ*, 174-75; 333,7-37
2. Before 1310 (SG 95b7)
3. (i) *rDo-di gañs-dkar* in Khams  
(ii) *Rag-phrom*  
(iii) *rGya'i mčhod-rten ka-ru*  
(iv) *g.Yuñ-druñ señ-mčhoñ-gi brag* in Northern gCañ  
(v) *Go-yi pa-woñ g.yag-ro* (*KTGD*)
4. K 4, 31  
T 84 (v), 261, 285
5. *LŠJ*: also known as *dBañ-ldan* (*KTGD*: °*čhen*) *gŠen-sras* and *gÑos Ñi-ma Šes-rab*

**B 35 sPrul-sku Kyu-ra bLo-gros rgyal-mchan** (*KTGD*: *Kyu-ra rnal-'byor*)

1. *LŠJ*, 175; 334,1-23
2. —
3. *g.Yas-zur bka'-rtags čan-gyi brag* at rMa Pom-ra *KTGD*: Pom-ra'i *gsañ-phug*
4. K 91-94  
T 181-86, 193

**B 36 Bon-žig g.Yuñ-druñ gliñ-pa**

1. *LŠJ*, 175-76; 334,24-335,4
2. b. 1228 (*LŠJ*, 175, n. 6)
3. (i) *sPa-gro sTag-čañ* (STNN 1250)  
(ii) *Phyug-mo dpal-ri* in *Ñañ-stod* (STNN 1269)  
STNN: *bKra-šis Phyug-mo*; *KTGD*: *g.Yas-ru bKra°*  
(iii) *Ša-ba ri* in the North  
(iv) *Re-kyañ šañ-mtha'*  
(v) the temple at *gCañ-'phrañ*
4. T 206 (ii), 208 (i), 267 (ii), 275, 276
5. *TTGL* 78a5-82a1: known as *Padma Che-dbañ rgyal-po*, also as *rDo-rje gliñ-pa*. Fol. 228a: 5th *rab-byuñ* (1267-1326).

**B 37 Koñ-po Guñ-grags**

1. *LŠJ*, 177; 335,25-27
2. —
3. *sKu-bla gañs-brag*
4. K 4

**B 38 rGya-roñ Se-gñan žig-po (KTDG: Se-gñen°)**

1. *LŠJ*, 179; 336,26-337,13
2. —
3. dMu-rdo g.Yuñ-druñ spuñs-rce in rGya-roñ
4. K 3, 34, 69, 109

**B 39 gLiñ-gñen Mu-la thogs-med**

1. *LŠJ*, 179; 337, 14-16
2. —
3. sñan-brgyud (sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-čhen)
4. K 4, 40

**B 40 Gu-ru Ban-čuñ**

1. *LŠJ*, 179; 337,17-23
2. —
3. (i) Zañs-'brug 'khyil-ba (KTDG: Tho-la rmog-mtho Zañ-'brug)
- (ii) 'Brug-ri khuñ-mgo in rGya-roñ
- (iii) gñan-čuñs in Khams
- (iv) rMa Pom-ra
4. K 23 (iii)
- T 93 (i)

**B 41 Lhun-grub thogs-med**

1. *LŠJ*, 179; 337,24-27
2. —
3. rDo-di gañs-dkar (KTDG: rGya(m) rDo-ti)
4. K 35

**B 42 rJa-bo Rig-pa rañ-šar (KTDG: rJi'u°)**

1. *LŠJ*, 179-80; 337,28-33
2. —
3. sñan-brgyud (Che-dbañ rig-'jin), to the west of dMu-rdo in rGya-roñ
4. T 279

**B 43 Khod-po bLo gros thogs-med (STNN: Khod-spo°)**

1. *LŠJ*, 180-182; 337,34-340,7
2. b. 1280 (*LŠJ*, 180 n. 2)
3. (a) (i) sBar-žabs brag-dkar in mDo-smad (STNN 1301)
- (ii) rTa-gñan pha-boñ bon-mo (1310, see *LŠJ*, 180, n. 2)
- (b) sñan-brgyud
4. K 4 (b)
- T 207 (b), 223
5. *LŠJ*: also known as *dBra-gyer Thogs-med*

**B 44 sPrul-sku Khyuñ-po bLo-ldan sñiñ-po**

1. *LŠJ*, 182; 340,8-34
2. b. STNN 1360; d. 1385 (Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, 3)
3. sñan-brgyud (vidyādhara and dākiñis such as sTañ-čhen dMu-cha gyer-med)
4. K 5, 8-10, 32, 33, 36, 68, 84, 85, 95
- T 136, 152, 191, 195, 199, 205, 209-211, 228, 231, 270

- B 45 mÑam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan = C 21**
1. *LŠJ*, 141-45; 300,27-303,37. *A-khrid*, 50-52
  2. STNN 1356-1415
  3. sñan-brgyud (i) dGoñs-mjad Ri-khrod-pa (STNN 1038-1096)  
(ii) Che-dbañ rig-'jin (žal-gzigs)
  4. T 214 (ii), 215 (ii), 216 (i)
- B 46 dMu-gšen Ńi-ma rgyal-mchan = C 5**
1. *LŠJ*, 182; 340,25-29
  2. b. STNN 1360
  3. dgoñs-gter (gSañ-mčhog mthar-thug-gis byin-gyis brlabs-pa)  
*KTGD*: sñan-brgyud
  4. T 78
- B 47 sPrul-sku Khro-gñen (*KTGD*: °gñer, STNN: °gñan)**
1. *LŠJ*, 182; 340-30-32
  2. sñan-brgyud STNN 1386
  3. sñan-brgyud (*KTGD*: dgoñs-gter)
  4. K 4  
T 221
- B 48 Gar-cha bSod-nams rgyal-mchan**
1. *LŠJ*, 183; 341,6-11
  2. —
  3. (i) Pha-boñ gru-bži in 'Jiñ  
(ii) *KTGD*: dgoñs-ñams-la dños-su šar-ba
  4. T 283 (ii)
- B 49 Ńu-za Ńi-ma**
1. *LŠJ*, 184; 341,17-22
  2. —
  3. Brag-dkar yañ-dben
  4. K 4
- B 50 Roñ-bon g.Yuñ-druñ 'od-zer**
1. *LŠJ*, 184, 341,28-31
  2. —
  3. 'od-kyi yi-ger babs-pa; *KTGD*: dgoñs-par šar-ba
  4. T 194
- B 51 sTag-za Rin-čhen mcho-mo**
1. *LŠJ*, 184; 341,32-35
  2. —
  3. sñan-brgyud
  4. K 81
- B 52 \*bLa-ma Jo-sras**
1. *KTGD*, 23 1. 16
  2. —
  3. gCañ Bye-ma g.yuñ-druñ

4. T 190

**B 53 \*gCañ-gšen sñan-ñag mkhan**

1. *KTDG*, 28 1. 7
2. —
3. sñan-brgyud
4. T 292

**B 54 sGo-bcum Dar-ma**

1. *KTDG*, 25 1. 10
2. —
3. sñan-brgyud
4. T 238

**B 55 Drañ-sroñ 'Od-zer rgyal-mchan**

1. *KTDG*, 24 1. 20
2. —
3. sñan brgyud
4. T 217

**B 56 Grub-thob Šes-rab rgyal**

1. *KTDG*, 16, 1. 21
2. —
3. gÑan-rje gab-tog
4. T 91

**B 57 sPa-ston Lhun-grub dpal-bzañ**

1. STNN (139)
2. Discovery STNN 1486
3. Zañ-zañ brag
4. K 81

*C. Non-revealed Texts*

**C 1 \*sKyabs-ston Rin-čhen 'od-zer (°Rin-po-čhe)**

1. *LŠJ*, 126 n. 2
2. —
4. T 57, 102, 107

**C 2 \*rGyal-sras Khyuñ-po ri-pa**

1. *KTDG*, 16 1. 3
2. —
4. T 69-76

**C 3 Bru-ston rGyal-ba g.yuñ-druñ**

1. *A-khrid*, 39-42 (translated "Bonpo Studies", 33-37)
2. STNN 1242-1290
4. T 23, 66, 266, 278, 282, 284

- C 4 **mKhas-grub rGyal-mchan mchog-legs**  
 1. *KTDG*, 15 1. 12  
 2. —  
 3. T 45
- C 5 **dMu-gšen Ņi-ma rgyal-mchan = B 46**  
 1. and 2. – see B 45  
 4. T 56, 154, 157, 254
- C 6 **'Gro-mgon bDud-rci rgyal-mchan**  
 1. *A-khrid*, 28-30  
 2. Uncle of 'Gro-mgon bLo-gros rgyal-mchan (STNN 1198-1263)  
 4. T 48, 49, 282
- C 7 **Bru-rje ston-pa 'Dul-ba rgyal-mchan (Bru-sgom 'Dul°)**  
 1. *A-khrid*, 35-39. *LŠJ*, 174  
 2. *KTDG*, 24 1. 16-17: T 212 composed at the death of 'Gro-mgon bLo-gros rgyal-mchan in STNN 1263  
 4. T 81, 212, 282
- C 8 **gŠen-ston Nam-mkha' rgyal-mchan**  
 1. *KTDG*, 15, 1. 13. *LŠJ*, 132.  
 2. *A-khrid*, 24 1. 10: teacher of g.Yor-po Me-dpal (STNN 1134-1168)  
 4. T 46
- C 9 **'Gro-mgon bLo-gros rgyal-mchan**  
 1. *A-khrid*, 31-35  
 2. STNN 1198-1263  
 4. T 22, 98, 101, 106, 110, 111, 125, 225, 282, 289
- C 10 **dBra-bcun Mu-la**  
 1. *KTDG*, 15, 1. 21  
 2. —  
 4. T 55
- C 11 **mKhas-grub Mu-la rin-chen**  
 1. *KTDG*, 27 1. 16  
 2. A contemporary of mŅam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan (B 45)  
 4. T 282
- C 12 **sGa-ston Chul-khrims rgyal-mchan**  
 1. *LŠJ*, 65 n. 6  
 2. *ibid.*: 14th century.  
 4. T 25, 26, 43
- C 13 **gŅos-ston Chul-khrims rgyal-mchan**  
 1. *LŠJ*, 140  
 2. b. STNN 1144  
 4. T 20, 21, 99, 119, 282

- C 14 rMe'u mkhas-pa Chul-khrims dpal-chen**
1. *LŠJ*, xxxvi
  2. b. STNN 1052
  4. T 24, 32, 33
- C 15 Žaň-ston Chul-khrims blo-ldan**
1. *KTDG*, 15, 1. 14
  2. *LŠJ*, 4, n. 1: 14th cent.
  4. T 44, 47, 265
- C 16 Draň-sroň Ye-šes rgyal-mchan**
1. *KTDG*, 14, 1. 7
  2. —
  4. T 10, 11, 31
- C 17 Kun-mkhyen Ye-šes blo-gros**
1. *KTDG*, 26 1. 14
  2. Founded Dar-ldiň gser-sgo in STNN 1173
  4. T 259, 282
- C 18 \*g.Yor-po Me-dpal**
1. *A-khrid*, 24-28
  2. STNN 1134-1168
  4. T 42
- C 19 rGyal-chab Rin-čen rgyal-mchan**
1. *A-khrid*, 53. *LŠJ*, 143-44.
  2. b. STNN 1360, abbot STNN 1415
  4. T 28
- C 20 mKhas-grub Rin-čen blo-gros**
1. *A-khrid*, 48-50
  2. Middle of the 14th cent.
  4. T 40
- C 21 mŇam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan (rĴe rin-po-če) = B 45**
1. and 2. – see B 49
  4. T 12-17, 27, 38, 39, 41, 53, 80, 100, 108, 109, 171, 197, 214, 215, 259, 282, 285, 291
- C 22 Yar-'brog Me-ston Šes-rab 'od-zer (\*rĴe-bcun Yar-me-ba)**
1. *Sources*, 346-73
  2. STNN 1058-1132
  4. T 7-9, 12, 34-37, 77, 282
- C 23 Khyuň-po hSod-nams rgyal-mchan**
1. *KTDG*, 15, 1. 20
  2. *LŠJ*, 175: transmission > Khyuň-po Naň-čen Grags-pa > Go-ldo 'phags-pa (B 34), hence 13th cent. (?)
  4. T 54

**C 24 Bru-ston mchuñs-med bSod-nams blo-gros**

1. *KTDG*, 25, 1. 13
2. STNN 1277-1341
4. T 213, 243, 253

*D. Supernatural Beings*

- D 1 Koñ-rce 'phrul-rgyal**  
T 51, 85
- D 2 Klu-sgrub (Ye-šes sñiñ-po)**  
T 131, 135
- D 3 mKhas-pa bži** (= D 11, D 27, D 16, and lČa-cha mKhar-bu)  
T 226, 257
- D 4 Gu-rub snañ-bžer lod-po**  
T 169, 170
- D 5 Gyer-spuñ mkhas-pa gsum** (= Gyer-spuñs snañ bžer lod-po, Hris-pa gyer-med,  
and D 9)  
T 165
- D 6 Čo-bza'**  
T 256, 280
- D 7 sNa-čhen Li-šu stag-riñs**  
T 128, 255; together with D 6: 256, 280
- D 8 sTag-lha**  
T 141
- D 9 sTañ-čhen dMu-cha Gyer-med**  
T 209
- D 10 sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-čhen**  
T 79, 95, 96
- D 11 sTon-pa Thañ-ma me-sgron**  
T 1, 29
- D 12 Thañ-ba yid-riñ**  
T 5
- D 13 Thugs-dkar ye-šes**  
T 6
- D 14 Drañ-sroñ rgyal-ba**  
T 30
- D 15 Dran-pa Nam-mkha'**  
T 19, 67, 97, 124, 129, 130, 196, 261, 272, 281, 287

- D 16 **lDe-bon Gyim-cha rMa-čhuñ**  
T 2, 52
- D 17 **dPon-gsas gsum**  
T 168
- D 18 **dPyad-bu khri-šes**  
T 293
- D 19 **(gŠen) Ma-ñor pra-phud**  
T 68
- D 20 **(rGyal-gšen) Mi-lus bsam-legs**  
T 153
- D 21 **Mu-čho ldem-drug**  
T 3
- D 22 **Žu-gšen brgyad<sup>127</sup>**  
T 59, 60
- D 23 **(Lha-gšen) Yoñs-su dag-pa**  
T 18, 242
- D 24 **(rGya-nag) Legs-tañ rmañ-po**  
T 50
- D 25 **Ša-ri dbu-čhen**  
T 286, 288
- D 26 **Lha klu mi-yi gšen-gsum (= D 23, D 2, and D 20 respectively)**  
T 103-105
- D 27 **Lhañ-lhañ gcug-phud**  
T 4

## VI. *Bibliography and Abbreviations*

### a. *Bibliography*

Blondeau, A.-M.

1971 "Le Lha-'dre bka'-thañ", *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou* (Paris), 29-126.

Das, S. C.

1893 "A Brief Sketch of the Bon Religion of Tibet", *Journal of the Buddhist Text Society* 1.

<sup>127</sup> According to Yum-gyi sñiñ-po, fol. 1b, they are as follows: Yid-kyi khye'u-čhuñ, gTo-bu 'bum-sañs, gSal-ba 'od-ldan, Med-khams stoñ-pa-rje, Chañs-pa gcug-phud, gCug-gšen rgyal-ba, Kiu-mo ma-ma-te, and gSañ-ba ñañ-riñ. I am indebted to S. G. Karmay for this information.

- Francke, A. H.  
 1922 "Die Frage der Bon-Religion", *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* (Gütersloh), 321-31.  
 1925 "Geistesleben in Tibet", *Allgemeine Missionsstudien* 2 (Gütersloh), 39ff.  
 1927 "Die Zufluchtsformel der Bon-Religion der Tibeter", *Neue Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift* (Gütersloh), 150-58.  
 1928 "Das Christentum und die tibetische Bon-Religion", *Deutsche Forschung* 5 (Berlin), 100-11.
- Haarh, E.  
 1968 "The Zhang-zhung Language", *Acta Jutlandica* XL:1 (= *Humanities Series* 47) (Aarhus-Copenhagen).
- Hermanns, M.  
 1965 *Das National-Epos der Tibeter: Gling König Ge Sar* (Regensburg).
- Hoffmann, H.  
 1938 "Probleme und Aufgaben der tibetischen Philologie", *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 92 (Leipzig), 1345-68.  
 1940 "Zur Literatur der Bonpo", *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 94 (Leipzig), 182.  
 1950 "Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion", *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* (Wiesbaden).  
 1961 *The Religions of Tibet* (London).
- Karmay, S. G.  
 1972 *The Treasury of Good Sayings: A Tibetan History of Bon* (= *London Oriental Series* 26) (London).
- Kvaerne, P.  
 1973 "Bonpo Studies: The A-khrid System of Meditation", *Kailash* 1 (New Delhi).  
 1970 "Remarques sur l'administration d'un monastère bonpo", *Journal Asiatique* CCLVII (Paris), 187-92.  
 1971 "A Chronological Table of the Bon po: The *bstan rcis* of *Ñi-ma bstan-'jin*", *Acta Orientalia* XXXIII (openhagen), 205-82.  
 1972 "Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet", *Numen* XIX (Leyden), 22-40.
- Lauf, D. I.  
 1971 "Zur Ikonographie einiger Gottheiten der tibetischen Bon-Religion", *Ethnologische Zeitschrift Zürich* I (Zürich), 27-39.
- Meisezahl, R. O.  
 1957 "Die tibetischen Handschriften und Drucke des Linden-Museums in Stuttgart", *Tribus: Zeitschrift für Ethnologie und ihre Nachbarwissenschaften*, N.F. 7 (Heidelberg), 56-57.
- Namdak, T. (ed.)  
 1972 *Sources for a Tibetan History of Bon* (Dolanji, Tibetan Monastic Centre).
- Rock, J. F.  
 1952 *The Na-khi Nāga Cult and Related Ceremonies*, Part I (= *Serie Orientale Roma* IV, Part 1) (Rome).
- Roerich, George  
 1967 Extract from *Trails to Inmost Asia* (Newhaven, 1931), in: *Izbrannye Trudy* (Moscow).
- Schiefner, A.  
 1881 "Über das Bonpo-Sūtra: Das weisse Nāga-Hunderttausend", *Mémoires de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg*, VIIe série, 28:1 (St. Petersburg).
- Smith, Gene E.  
 1970 Introduction to *Kongtrul's Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan Culture* (= *Śata-piṭaka Series* 80), ed. by Lokesh Chandra (New Delhi).

Snellgrove, D.

1967 *The Nine Ways of Bon: Excerpts from gZi-brjid* (= *London Oriental Series* 18) (London).

Snellgrove, D., and Richardson, H.

1968 *A Cultural History of Tibet* (London).

Stein, R. A.

1961 *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines* (= *Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises* XV) (Paris).

1971 "La langue Žaṅ-žuṅ du Bon organisé", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* LVIII (Paris), 231-54.

1970 "Un document ancien relatif aux rites funéraires des bon-po tibétains", *Journal Asiatique* CCLVIII (Paris), 155-85.

Toussaint, G. C.

1933 *Le dict de Padma* (= *Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises* III) (Paris).

Tucci, G.

1949 *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, 3 vols. (Rome).

1970 "Die Religionen Tibets", in: *Die Religionen Tibets und der Mongolei* (= *Religionen der Menschheit* 20) (Stuttgart), 1-291.

### *Tibetan Sources*

*bKa'-gyur brten-gyur-gyi sde-chan sgrigs-chul bstan-pa'i me-ro spar-ba'i rluṅ-g.yab bon-gyi pad-mo rgyas-byed ṅi-'od* (= *Śatapitaka Series* 37, Part II), by ṅi-ma bstan-'jin (b. STNN 1813) (New Delhi, 1965).

*Grub-mtha 'thams-čad-kyi khuṅs dan 'dod-chul ston-pa legs-bšad šel-gyi me-loṅ*, by Thu-bkvan Čhos-kyi ṅi-ma (1737-1802), composed 1802. (Varanasi, 1963). Section TA published and translated by S. C. Das, "Contributions on the Religion and History of Tibet", *The Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* L (Calcutta, 1881), 187-251; reprinted as Vol. I of Series III of *Bibliotheca Himalayica* (New Delhi, 1970). Translated into German by H. Hoffmann, "Quellen", 203-14.

*rTogs-ldan ṅams-brgyud-kyi rnam-thar rin-chen phreṅ-ba*, in: A-tri thun-tsham cho-na dan cha-lak che (Delhi, Tibetan Bonpo Foundation, 1967), 5-64.

*Zab-mo gter dan gter-ston grub-thob ji-ltar byon-pa'i lo-rgyus mdor-bsdus bkod-pa rin-chen vaiḍūrya'i phreṅ-ba*, by Koṅ-sprul Yon-tan rgya-mcho (1813-99). Vol. KA of *Rin-chen gter-mjod*.

### b. Abbreviations

<i>A-khrid</i>	"rTogs-ldan"
"Bonpo Studies"	Kvaerne, 1973
" <i>bsTan-rcis</i> "	Kvaerne, 1971
<i>KTDG</i>	<i>bKa'-gyur</i>
<i>LŠJ</i>	Karmay, 1972
<i>Nine Ways</i>	Snellgrove, 1967
"Quellen"	Hoffmann, 1950
<i>Sources</i>	Namdak (ed.), 1972
STNN	Kvaerne, 1971
<i>TPS</i>	Tucci, 1948
<i>TTGL</i>	<i>Zab-mo gter</i>