

Several Žaň-žuň Etymologies

by Helmut Hoffmann
(Indiana University)

Since I submitted for the first time some considerations about the Žaň-žuň language to the scholars in Sino-Tibetan or rather Tibeto-Burmese studies¹, there appeared a careful study of the Žaň-žuň material contained in the so-called *Tibetan Žang žung Dictionary* (published by the Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi 1961) written by Erik HAARH². After I had perused in detail this valuable contribution I felt my announced further studies dealing with all "Lower Žaň žuň" (*žaň žuň smar gyi skad*) material would not be useless, although we possess the useful study mentioned above. I think that necessity is based on two facts: Dr. Haarh's work is based exclusively on the *Tibetan Žang žung Dictionary* whilst I have adduced in my studies all material published meanwhile by the Bon-po Foundation which furnishes us with additional material³. That material is valuable because using it we are enabled to correct some of the data given by Ž. We have to realize that the knowledge of the Žaň-žuň language, based only on one source, is a rather uncertain and restricted one so that the examination of the readings of the existing manuscripts which are reproduced by the available editions will prove useful and remove doubts in not a few cases. I shall quote here in the beginning of these observations two instructive examples.

¹ "Žaň-žuň: the Holy Language of the Tibetan Bon-po", ZDMG 117 (1967), p. 376—381, an article which is based on a paper I read at the International Congress of Orientalists, Ann Arbor, Mich.

² Erik HAARH, *The Zhang-zhung Language, A Grammar and Dictionary of the Unexplored Language of the Tibetan Bonpos*, Acta Jutlandica XL, 1; København 1968 (cited as Haarh).

³ In the present study there will be used the following materials quoted by the abbreviations given in the following list:

Bon = *dgos 'byuň nor bu'i gter č'en*, Delhi 1966, used with the explanations which I owe to my friend Tenzin Namdak (T.N.).

Byams 1 = *kun gsal byams ma č'en mo mdo snags sgrub pa'i glegs bam*, Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi.

Byams 2 = *byams ma c'e yi 'jigs skyobs kyi lag len 'k'rul med gter gyi bum bzañ*, Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi.

Dr. = *Dran-pa nam-mk'a's commentary on the Srid pa'i mjad p'ugs (M)*. Edited by Tenzin NAMDAK, Delhi 1966, 240 pages, and bound together with M. According to Tenzin NAMDAK, *Dran-pa nam-mk'a* was a famous Bon-po scholar of the 8th century. He belonged to those Bon-po priests invited by the Emperor K'ri-sroñ lde-bcan during the earlier time of his reign for translating Bon-po texts from the Žž. language into Tibetan. He is mentioned in the *Padma t'aň-yig* under the name *Dran-pa k'od-spuňš*. *K'od-spuňš* is Žaň-žuň language, and denotes a high teacher of the doctrine, cp. H. HOFFMANN, *Quellen zur Geschichte der tibetischen Bon-Religion*, Wiesbaden 1950, p. 260, where the reading k'oň should be corrected.

Ma = *ma rgyud t'ugs tje ñi ma rgyud*, Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi.

M. = *srid pa'i mjad p'ugs*, ed Tenzin NAMDAK, Delhi 1966. Of the Žž. fragments contained in this work better readings are found very often in *Dr.*, where *M.* is elucidated. This "Treasure" (Žž. *mu-guň*) is known already by several quotations of *bon sgo bži mjad lña*, which certainly has to be translated by "The four Bon-gates which make five with the treasure". No doubt is justified any longer as it has been maintained by Professor G. Tucci in his new excellent book *Die Religionen Tibets (Die Religionen der Menschheit, Band 20)*, Stuttgart 1970, p. 252 with note 15. The adequate translation has been published by me already in ZDMG 92 (1938), p. 363.

1. In Ž. 21,5 we read:

Zaň-zuň: 'č'ig gu t'ul ñag sma ma ag ne ya ba ho
 Tibetan: raň t'ag la bab pa gšin rje me lha rluň lha mc'ar

Dealing with this clause Dr. Haarh throughout follows the Tibetan interpretation, giving thus *sma-ma* as equivalent for Tib. *me-lha* (allegedly "god of wind"), and *ag-ne* for Tib. *rluň-lha* ("god of fire"), cp. Haarh, l. c., pp. 38 and 43). But it seems obvious that the Tibetan translation represents itself in a state of confusion. *Ag-ne* cannot be something else than a loan word from India, meaning "Fire, god of fire". The usual equivalent of *rluň-lha* "god of wind", not to be found elsewhere in Ž. but in *Byams 1*, $\frac{7}{21}/3$, is *li-sad*, and the four elements are given by Ž. 7,4 as 1. *mu la*, 2. *li*, 3. *ne*, 4. *tiň*, 5. *slas* (the Tibetan has in the same order *nam-mk'a'* "ether", *rluň* "wind", *me* "fire", *č'u* "water", *sa* "earth". So the whole translation viz. the connecting lines of Ž. 21,5 prove to be in disorder and need further inquiry. *Ag-ne* = *me-lha* is followed by *ya ba ho* which should mean according to the arrangement "god of wind". As a matter of fact we can prove that *ya-ba* is given as an equivalent for *rluň-lha* in *Byams 3*, p. 668,5 instead of the usual *li-sad* (vide supra). Consequently *ho* remains for the representation of Tib. *mc'ar* meaning "how wonderful!", for which should be compared Ž. 7,3 *de-ba-ho* (Haarh reads *da-ba-ho*, due to bad printing), meaning Tib. *dgyes-par mjod* "let us rejoice", where *ho* has a similar function, being connected with *de-ba* "joy, happiness".

Going back from *ag-ne* to *sma ma*, this word should represent Tib. *gšin-rje* "god of the dead" the usual name of that god in the Žž. language being *šim-rce* (*Byams 1*, $\frac{7}{21/2}$, 1). So I am inclined to take *sma-ma* as a corrupt writing for *Ya-ma*, so that the god is denoted here, like *Ag-ne*, by his Indian name.

The beginning of the whole clause 'č'ig gu (Tib. *raň t'ag la*) t'ul ñag (Tib. *bab pa*) has been translated by Haarh very reasonably by "settled in their own way" (l. c., p. 31). As a result we get, therefore, the following translation:

'č'ig gu t'ul ñag *ya ma ag ne ya ba ho
 raň t'ag la bab pa gšin rje me lha rluň lha mc'ar

"How wonderful are settled in their own way Yama, Agni and the God of Wind!"

2. A very instructive example for the fact that it is not possible to trust blindly in the meaning given by the Tibetan translation and just to register it as it has been done in Haarh's glossary may be displayed by examination of two Žž. words *lgyu* and *lgyum* with their respective equivalents. The two words certainly are confounded because it seems not likely that *lgyum* has the meaning of "nose" as well as "road"⁴. In this case the whole material should be produced as it is to be found in Ž. and in other sources adduced here for the first time.

⁴ HAARH, glossary, p. 30.

a. Ž. 7,7	mar ži	tiñ ži	k'a rlon	spre 'u	lgyu ⁵
	gser zlum	g-yu zlum	nag po	gliñ du	lam
b. M. 122,1	ru trod		lgyu ži	ña drug	či
	rañ bžin	rgyu ba'i	lam	lña	ni
c. M 122,6	ti k'or		lgyu ži	ña drug	ni
	'k'or ba	rgyud pa'i	lam	lña	ston
d. M 122,12	mu	tor	lgyu ži	ña drug	ni
	mt'o ris	t'ar pa'i	lam	lña	ni
e. M 122,17	ti k'or	ma min	(lgyu) ⁶	ña drug	ni
	'k'or ba	med pa'i	lam	lña	ston
f. Ž. 12,2	lgyu ži ne	k'ri rce	sni gyad		
	rgyun žugs	'bras bu	brgyad		
g. Dr. 11,14	mig ra	lgyum	lkye rko	seg ni	
	mig rna	sna	lče lus	vid de	
h. Ž. 9,8	cañ ri	pur lañ	rka dur	lgyum ži	
	rca	mgo bo	mk'al ma	sna ba	
i. Ž. 10,11	lgyum ži				
	sna				
j. Ž 12,1	t'a tu	lgyum ži	sni gyad		
	t'ar pa'i	lam	brgyad		
k. Ž. 12,5	lgyum ži	de rgyal	še rkya		
	rgyun du	gnas pa'i	t'ugs rje		
l. Ž. 15,2	lgyum ži	ga min	da drod	žin	
	lam ni	'gag med	rañ bžin	ñid	
m. M. 121,20	k'ru ži	lgyum ži	bi(ñ) ña	ni	
	'gro ba'i	lam	bži	bstan pa la	
n. Bon 39,13	lgyum ri				
	šañs miñ				
o. Ž. 18,8	bžu či	hrañ ti	lgyum la	yug	
	'og gi	rta po	lam la	mgyogs.	

To sum up our material we may gather from it that *lgyu* in the examples a, b, c, d, e has been rendered by Tibetan *lam* "road"; in f the phrase *lgyu ži ne k'ri rce sni gyad* according to the Tibetan has the meaning *rgyun žugs 'bras bu* "the seven fruits of the entrance into the stream". We meet here with the Buddhist term *srotāpatti* which has been adopted by the Bon-po theology. We cannot, therefore, translate here *lgyu ži ne* just by "continuously" as it has been done by Haahr (p. 30).

On the other hand *lgyum* occurs in the meaning of "nose" (Tib. *sna* and *šañs*) in the instances g, h, i, n, but is translated in the Tibetan version by *lam* "road" in j, l, m, o. The example k gives for *Žž lgyum ži* the equivalent *rgyun du* "continuously".

The best means to settle the *lgyu-lgyum* controversy proves to be the method of comparative linguistics. The fact should be registered, that for

⁵ l. c., p. 21.

⁶ *lgyu* has been added according to the whole context, because there is missing an equivalent of Tib. *lam*.

nose there is listed for the Bunán language of Lahul gyum⁷, and for Digāru Mishmi (according to Robertson and Needham respectively) *hnyā-gom* and *hā-nāgam*. There cannot be any further doubt, that Žž. *Igyum* means "nose"; as for the examples j, l, m, o we have to replace *Igyum* by *Igyu* "road". Digāru-Mishmi *hnyā-gom* is a synonym compound, the first part of it (*hnyā*) corresponding to Tibetan *sna* "nose", and the second one (*gom*) to Žž. *Igyum* "nose". Bunán *gyum* is distinguished from the Žž. word only by the lack of the l-prefix.

After settling the meaning "nose" for *Igyum*, no prove seems to be necessary any more, that *Igyu* means "road", for which the examples b, c, d, e might be consulted. Haahr translates^{7a} *spre'u-Igyu* (Tib. *gliñ du lam*) just by "the road to the island". He apparently is not aware of the fact, that the whole passage the end of which is formed by *spre'u-Igyu* proves to be an enumeration of the minor world continents (skr. *upadvīpa*), the idea of which the Bon-po have in common with the Mahāyāna Buddhists⁸. Because the representation in Snellgrove's book cited in the previous note gives the names of the Bon-po *dvīpa* and *upadvīpa* only in an abbreviated form it may be useful to reproduce the whole scheme of the Bon-po in Žaň-žuň and Tibetan language (see the plate).

Etymologically *Igyu* "road" should evidently be linked with Tibetan *rgyu-ba* "to walk, to wander", and the idea of a continuous following a line can be traced also in words of the same stem like *rgyud* "string" (secondary meaning: system, Tantra) and *rgyun* "current, stream". The latter is especially frequently used in the adverb *rgyun-du* "continuously", and this meaning can be traced in the Žž. instance *k.Igyu-ži* = Tibetan *rgyun-du*, which proved to be the right reading instead of *Igyum-ži* as we have pointed out supra p. 195.

3. In a short linguistic table Dr. Haahr derives also the Žž. word for "dog" from Tibeto-Burmese (Ž. 14,6 *ku-ra*, Tibetan *k'yi*)⁹. That means he connects the Žž. word with Tibetan *k'yi* linguistically, too. In the table there are given six instances adduced to prove that the respective West Himalayish languages are related to Žž. and Tibetan.: Kanawri *khui*, Manchatī *khui*, Chamba Lahuli *khui*, Bunán *khyu*, Rangkas *khvi*, Dārmīyā *khi*. The list of related words for "dog" can easily be increased, if we make use of the extensive material offered by Robert SHAFER (Sh.)¹⁰. In a list which links Middle Burmese *k'we* "dog" with respective words in East Himalayish languages he has listed¹¹: Bahing *k'li-*, Thulung *k'le-*, Tśaurasya *tśali*, Dumi *k'li-*, Rhaling *k'le*, Rai *k'i*, Khambu *k'e-*, Kulung *k'e-*, Rodong *k'li*. In Newarish we meet with *k'i-tśā*, in Kukish with *yui*¹². What concerns the Northern Assamese group mention

⁷ *Linguistic Survey of India*, Vol. III, Part 1 (LSI) Calcutta 1903, p. 537.

^{7a} HAARH, p. 21.

⁸ D.L. SNELGROVE, *The Nine Ways of Bon*, London 1967, p. 288. As W. KIRFEL has pointed out (*Die Kosmographie der Inder*, reprint Hildesheim 1967, p. 189) each of the four main world continents (*dvīpa*) is flanked according to the Mahāyāna texts by two minor continents, whilst the Theravāda school knows not less than 2000 minor *dvīpa*.

⁹ HAARH, p. 26.

¹⁰ Robert SHAFER, *Introduction to Sino-Tibetan*, Wiesbaden 1966 seqq.

¹¹ I. c., p. 146.

¹² I. c., p. 159.

should be made of Taying *n-kwi*¹³, Mišing *i-ki*, Abor *e-kki*, Yano *i-ki*, E. Nyising *i-ki*, Tagen *i-ki*¹⁴. Moreover Tibetan *k'yi* has its equivalent in Chinese *k'üan*¹⁵, in the ancient pronunciation of T'ang times *ki^{wo}on*¹⁵. Taking into consideration the whole material specified above it seems to me that Žž. *ku-ra* has nothing to do with Tibetan *k'yi* and the related words. All of them show a palatal element after the aspirated velar, but that is not the case with *ku-ra*. I prefer, therefore to explain Žž. *ku-ra* as an Indian loan word, a haplogologic form of *kukkura* "dog".

4. The Žž. word for "tongue" the equivalent of which is Tibetan *lče* occurs in a more ancient and not palatalized form: Ž. 10,11 and 17,2 *lke-ri*¹⁶; but there are already instances which prove a beginning of a process of palatalization: Ž. 14,11 *rkyel*, Ž. 18,3 *skyel*, Dr. 11,15 *lkye*. There is a vast representation of that word in Sino-Tibetan¹⁷: Burmese *hlya*, Kukish *m-lei*; (Western Himalayisch) Bunán *hle*, Thebor *le*, Kanawri *le*, Mantšati *lhe*, Tšamba L *lhe*, Almora Languages *džab-le*; West Central Himalayisch (p. 144) Magari *let*, Vayu *li*; East Himalayish (pp. 153,156) Bahing *lyam*, Sunwari *le*, Rai *-lem*, Khambu *lem*, Yakha *lem*; Newarish (p. 159) *me*; Hruso (p. 173) *džab-la*, *džeb-le*, *e-seb-la* (according to different informants); Midžuiš (p. 182.184): Midžu *mb-lai*, Meyöl *b-ro*; Digarish (p. 190): Taying *l'a-liñ-na*, Midu *li-na*; Mišingish (p. 195): Mišing *a-řá*, Abor *a-řyö*, Tagen *aye*, Yano *a-ye*, E. Nyising *ař-lyi*. Besides mention should be made of Chinese *shé*¹⁸, ancient pronunciation *d'žjät*¹⁸.

5. For Žž. *rko* several meanings and several compounds can be traced. The basic meaning seems to be "body": Ž. 14,5, Dr. 11,3, Dr. 11,15 have the Tibetan equivalent *lus* = body, likewise Ž. 7,7 *rko l'uñ* and *rko riñ* (Tibetan *lus riñ*, *lus l'uñ*), the names of the two upadvīpa of the east (cp. p. 196), the name of the main eastern continent Ž. 7,5 *rko-sañs* (Tib. *lus-p'ags*) and Ž. 7,9 *rko has-pi rcal* "pleasure garden" (Tibetan *lus dga' ba'i rcal*). But besides we may trace the meaning "shape, outer form" for *rko*: Dr. 11,16 (Tib. *gzugs*), *rko-p'uñ* Ž. 10,10 "shape" (Tib. *gzugs*), in Ž. 10,10 *rko-p'uñ* in the meaning of *rūpas-kandha* (*gzugs-p'uñ*) like in Buddhist literature, Ž. 10,3 *rko-dug* (Tib. *p'uñ-po* = skr. *skandha*) means "the heaps which form the individuality". In Dr. 11,21 *rko* is rendered by Tib. *pags* "skin", i. e. the outer cover of the body. Considering that the basic meaning of *rko* is "body" it should be compared etymologically with Tibetan *sku* "body", now used in the respect-

¹³ I. c., p. 189.

¹⁴ I. c., p. 194.

¹⁵ B. KARLGREN, *Analytic Dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, Paris 1923, p. 166, no. 498; compare also Walter SIMON, *Tibetisch-Chinesische Wortgleichungen*, Berlin 1930, p. 20, no. 210.

¹⁶ HAARH, p. 15 takes *-ri* as a second part of a compound in the meaning of "kind, sort" (= Tib. *rigs*), but does not mention *lke-ri*.

¹⁷ SHAFER, *Introduction*, p. 136.

¹⁸ KARLGREN, p. 254, no. 862. This Chinese word is also mentioned by W. SIMON, I. c., p. 26, no. 292, where he gives as Tibetan equivalent *ljags* "tongue" which is the word for tongue in the že-sa language. I would prefer the comparison with *lče*, but, of course, *lče* and *ljags* are related words.

ful language, and with Chinese *k'ü*¹⁹ with the ancient pronunciation, *K'ju*, meaning "body, person", and probably also with Burmese 'a-koñ^{19a}.

6. For "kidneys" the Žañ-žun language has the words *rka* (Ž. 14,4) and *rka-dur* (Ž. 9,8). The *-dur* of the compound seems to have the meaning "organs of the lower part of the body", as is shown by the reference Ž. 15,1 *kon-dur* (Tib. *k'a-gliñ*) which means "above and below". The Tibetan version gives for *rka* as well as for *rka-dur*: *mk'al-ma* "kidneys" which word seems to be etymologically related to *rka*, too. Furthermore there should be adduced the word for "kidney" in the Sandoway dialect of the Šo language which is a branch of Southern Kukish²⁰: L. *kal*, Šo (ǎ-ga, both forms being derived by Shafer from **m-kal*. Compare also Middle Burmese *k'a*/, Lušei *kal* (Shafer, p. 75).

7. Special attention should be paid to Žž. *kluñ-se* "young man" (Tib. *gžon nu*) in Ž. 13,11; 17,9; *Bon* 20,11; "young man" (Tib. *gžon nu p'o*) Ž. 11,4. Besides we find the word with a different prefix: *sluñs-se* in Ž. 10,9 *sluñ-se gyin* (Tib. *bu p'o'dra*) "like a boy" and *Dr.* 12,8

sluñs se yo ze
bu dañ bu mo

Ž. 13,11 provides with valuable information due to its context:

ñañ se yo se kluñ se hri ca (should be hsi-ce, ca med
rgas po rgan mo qžon nu k'ye'u cp. Ž. 17,10) bu(d) med.

It does not seem far-fetched to connect Žž. *kluñ-se* and *sluñs-se* with a rather enigmatic word which is found in the Tibetan documents from Chinese Turkestan published by F. W. THOMAS²¹ and in the Tibetan annals from Tunhuang edited by J. BACOT²². Thomas²³ states that the word "occurs usually in connection with, but somehow distinguished from, soldiers (*so*): we have the expression "soldier *Sluñs*" (p. 376), but also "*Sluñs* and soldiers" (p. 52). "That they were organized appears from the term "*Sluñs*-commander" (*Sluñs-dpon*, p. 189); and the general inference is (see *infra*, p. 423), that they were companies of military police, campfollowers, or the like". If compared with this interpretation the reader will be rather surprised to meet with the following statement in Professor Thomas' book on page 423: "Here also we should revert to the question of the *Sluñs*. That *Sluñs* was a tribal designation is, as we have seen, certain (pp. 52,296/7)". Faced with this discrepancy we had better to reconsider all occurrences of the word *sluñs* in the documents and the annals:

Thomas, I. c., p. 51/52 (in a letter addressed to two Tibetan officials mC'o-bžer and Lha-bžer and others, Mirān Document XXVIII, 0036, line 5): '*brog sluñs la bya na gson lod spel ma'i bka' rims p'ye p'ul*, which I propose to translate: „If they (some persons mentioned before) will work at the *Sluñs* of the

¹⁹ KARLGRÉN, p. 165, no. 494; W. SIMON, p. 13, no. 78, SHAFER, p. 44, no. 18: Chinese *k'ü*-

^{19a} SHAFER, p. 46.

²⁰ SHAFER, p. 215.

²¹ F. W. THOMAS, *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan*, Vol. II, London 1951.

²² J. BACOT, Ch. TOUSSAINT, F. W. THOMAS, *Documents de Touen-houang relatifs à l'histoire du Tibet*, Paris 1940/46.

²³ THOMAS, p. 296.

pasture-lands, present (to them) a separate order of commandment for increase of relaxation and (present to them) flour." ²⁴

The same document offers the following sentence: *sluñs dañ so pa ma mč'is te* "Sluñs and soldiers did not come".

Thrice *sluñs* appears connected with *rgya* "China, Chinese"; because large parts of the Heavenly Empire were occupied at that time by the Tibetans. I would translate *rgya sluñs* rather by "Sluñs in China" but not by "Chinese Sluñs" according to F. W. Thomas: the *rgya-sluñs* apparently worked for the Tibetans:

Mazār Tāgh a IV, 0092 (wood) ²⁵: *rgya sluñs 'bog lañ* "Bog-lañ of the Sluñs in China". Thomas believes 'Bog-lañ is a tribal name rather than a personal one, he may be right.

Mazār Tāgh a. VI, 003 (wood) ²⁶: *rgya sluñs su li gč[i]g čad 'o'o* "Amongst the Sluñs in China one Khotanese has been punished" ²⁷.

Furthermore Mirān XV, 0020 (wood) ²⁸: *slu[ñ]su 'o] ma luñ gi rj] [e la]* "To the ruler of 'O-ma-luñ amongst the Sluñs"; compare the Sluñs 'o-ma bu-luñ in Mirān VII, 32 (wood) ²⁹: *sluñs 'o ma bu luñ dañ / sñiñ coms kyi 'bañs* "The subjects of Sñiñ-coms and 'O-ma-bu-luñ of the Sluñs".

Mazār Tāgh b, I, 0092 (paper) ³⁰: *mđo lo'i .[s]l] . . . mk'ar gyi [s]luñs pon 'dir mč'is na žal mč'u'i slad na* „If the commander of the Sluñs of the castle of Mđo-lo ³¹ had come here, and on account of the counsel ³²———. From this document we learn that the Sluñs had also commanders.

The most important entry for our purpose proves to be that one which is found in the Tibetan Tun-huang Annals, year 72 (A.D. 721) ³³: *stod p'yogs gyi p'o ña mañ po p'yag 'c'ald/ . . . sluñs stod smad gyi t'añ k'ram č'en po btab*. "Many messengers from the Upper Region ³⁴ paid their respects.——— The registration ³⁵ of the Sluñs of the Upper and Lower Country was carried out".

If we consider firstly the existence of a Žž. word *sluñs-se* or *kluñ-se* "young, young man", and read secondly about Sluñs of the Upper and Lower Country which might be well the upper (*stod*) and lower (*smad*) part of Žaň-žuň ³⁶, it

²⁴ *bka'-rim(s)* = "separate order of commandment"; *gson-lod* "relaxation" is a synonym compound: *gson* = "restoring of health", *lod* = "relaxation"; THOMAS' translation for *bka' rims p'ye* "circular-order flour" seems highly improbable to me.

²⁵ THOMAS, p. 296.

²⁶ THOMAS, p. 296.

²⁷ *čad 'o'o* perhaps for *č'ad pas bčad do*.

²⁸ THOMAS, p. 296.

²⁹ THOMAS, p. 64.

³⁰ THOMAS, p. 186.

³¹ According to R. E. EMMERICK, *Tibetan Texts concerning Khotan*, London 1967, p. 97 *Mđo-lo* is a name of a region of Khotan.

³² H. A. JÄSCHKE, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary* p. 165.

³³ J. BACOT, p. 22, translation p. 46.

³⁴ *Stod-p'yogs* is the usual denotation of the Kailās-Mānasarovar area and adjacent regions.

³⁵ *t'añ-k'ram*.

³⁶ G. TUCCI, "Preliminary Report on two Scientific Expeditions in Nepal", *Serie Orientale Roma X*, 1, Roma 1956, p. 83. The language we are studying in this essay is *žaň-žuň smar-gyi skad* (ZDMG 94, p. 185). The information used in that article was taken from the Bon-po text *Klu-'bum*. But compare now also Ž. 6, 18/19: *žaň-žuň-gi pañ ſi ta č'en-po/ sad-ne-ga'u la sogs kyis bsgyur ba'i* (read: *bas*) *žaň-žuň smar-gyi skad ston te*. "The great Žaň-žuň Pañđit Sad-ne-ga'u and others taught by their translations the language of Lower Žaň-žuň."

seems to be very probable, that *sluñs* in the Tibetan documents from Chinese Turkestan and *sluñs-se* in Žž. are the same word, meaning not "military police" but just "corps d'élite of young men" who were recruited from the tributary Žaň-žuň people. Tibetan *sluñs* which occurs only in the 8th and 9th centuries' documents should, therefore, be interpreted as a Žaň-žuň loan word.

The remaining occurrences of *Sluñs* in the Tibetan documents may be easily reconciled with the interpretation just given above and are, by no means, contradictory.

Mazār Tāgh c, III, 0022 (wood)³⁷: *t'ag bar mes c'ab kyi so la/byañ sluñs smar*³⁸ *pa'i 'bañs rgya sdug skyes bžag bar*³⁹ *gsol*// "To the soldier *Mes-c'ab* at the intermediate distance⁴⁰: a request to locate the subject *Rgya-sdug-skyes*, a *Sluñs* of the 'Lower Country' in the north".

Mazār Tāgh c, III, 0043 (wood)⁴¹: *rgya sluñs yan č'ad dañ dru gu 'jon man č'ad kyi p'ur myi stag rñams la'* / "to the 'man-tiger on the alert'⁴² upwards from the *Sluñs* in China and downwards from the district⁴³ of the Turks"⁴⁴.

Mazār Tāgh 0442 (wood)⁴⁵: *'bu šaň gi Sluñs cun č'ad bya rig skugsu hor čig* // "As far as the *Sluñs* of *Bu-šaň* (there is) an *Uighur*⁴⁶ for waiting⁴⁷ at *Bya-rig*". *Bu-šaň* seems to be a place in the Khotan region⁴⁸.

The particle *-se* in *kluñ-se* and *sluñs se*, written also *-ze* and *-ce* (*yo-ze Dr.* 12, 9 "girl", Tib. *bu-mo*; *yo-se Ž.* 13,11 "old woman"; *Ž.* 17,9 *yo-se* "old woman"; *Ž.* 11,4 *yog-ze* "old woman"; *Ž.* 11,4 and *Dr.* 12,8 *šaň-ze* "old man"; *Ž.* 13,11 and 17,9 *šaň-se* "old man"; *Ž.* 10,8 *šaň-ze* "old woman" (certainly a mistake for "old man"); *Ž.* 17,10 *hri-ce*, which is the better reading for *hri-ca* "boy") seems to be a particle attached rather often to humans of different age and sex⁴⁹.

(to be concluded).

³⁷ THOMAS, p. 431.

³⁸ The text reads only *sma* which THOMAS would like to read *smra*; but after all it is more likely that mention has been made here of a *Sluñs* of the "Lower Country" (*sluñs smar-pa*) in the north.

³⁹ I accept THOMAS' emendation *bžag bar* for *bžag ba'* in the text.

⁴⁰ I do not think the "mid-rope soldier" of THOMAS' translation makes any sense here.

⁴¹ THOMAS, p. 276 seq.

⁴² *p'ur(-bu)* does not mean "sword" as it has been translated by THOMAS ("swordsmen") but means "peg" or in religious language the threesided dagger the Lamas use when struggling against evil spirits; in the present case *p'ur* may be well derived from *p'ur-ba* "to fly", so that in a military document *p'ur-myi* might mean "troops on the alert".

⁴³ *'jon* seems to be an old form of *Ijoñs* "district", because for the classical suffix *-ñ* we often find *-n* in the old documents; cp. the name of king *Mañ-sroñ mañ-bcan* which is written there *Mañ-slon mañ-rcan* (BACOT, p. 88).

⁴⁴ Concerning *Dru-gu* = "Turks" vide *Oriens III* (1950), p. 194.

⁴⁵ THOMAS, p. 236.

⁴⁶ *Hor* = *Uighur*. Cp. *Oriens III* (1950), p. 195.

⁴⁷ *skugsu* might be *sgugs-su* "for waiting".

⁴⁸ For references see THOMAS, l. c., Vol. IV, p. 66.

⁴⁹ The interpretation of HAARH, l. c., p. 16/17 seems not to be very informative.

