Since I submitted for the first time some considerations about the Žan-žun language to the scholars in Sino-Tibetan or rather Tibeto-Burmese studies, there appeared a careful study of the Žan-žun material contained in the so-called Tibetan Zang zhung Dictionary (published by the Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi 1961) written by Erik Haarh. After I had perused in detail this valuable contribution I felt my announced further studies dealing with all "Lower Žan-žun" (žan žun 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 Zang zhung Dictionary whilst I have adduced in my studies all material published meanwhile by the Bon-po Foundation which furnishes us with additional material. 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 Žan-žun 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 "Žan-žun: 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.
3 In the present study there will be used the following materials quoted by the abbreviations given in the following list:
   Bon = dgos byun nor bu'i gter 'chen, Delhi 1966, used with the explanations which I owe to my friend Tenzin Namdak (T.N.).
   Byams 1 = kun gsal byams ma 'chen ma mdo shags sgrub pa'i glegs bsm, Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi.
   Byams 2 = byams ma 'c'e yi 'jigs skyobs kyi lag len 'kiri med gter gyi bum bzan, Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi.
   Dr. = Dran-pa nam mk'a's commentary on the Srid pa'i mjod 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'i-snor Ide-bcan during the earlier time of his reign for translating Bon-po texts from the Žz. language into Tibetan. He is mentioned in the Padma tan-yig under the name Dran-pa k'odspuns. K'od-spuns is Žan-žun 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'on should be corrected.
   Ma = ma rgyud t'ugs rje ni ma rgyud, Bon-po Foundation, New Delhi.
   M. = srid pa'i mjod p'ugs, ed Tenzin NAMDak, Delhi 1966, Of the Žz. fragments contained in this work better readings are found very often in Dr., where M. is elucidated. This "Treasure" (Žz. mu-gun) is known already by several quotations of bon sgo bzi mjod lha, 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:

Žan-žun: 'c'ig gu t'ul ņag sma ma ag ne ya bahο
Tibetan: ran t'ag la bab pa gšin rje me lha rlun 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. rlun-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 rlun-lha "god of wind", not to be found elsewhere in Ž. but in Byams 1, 7/3, is li-sad, and the four elements are given by Ž. 7,4 as 1. mu la, 2. li, 3. ne, 4. tiñ, 5. sles (the Tibetan has in the same order nam-mk'a "ether", rlun "wind", me "fire", ču "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 rlun-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, 7/2, 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 'c'ig gu (Tib. rañ t'ag la) t'ul ņag (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:

'c'ig gu t'ul ņag ya ma ag ne ya ba ho
rañ t'ag la bab pa gšin rje me lha rlun 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". 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.

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

On the other hand *Igyum* occurs in the meaning of "nose" (Tib. *sna* and *sangs*) 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 *Zz Igyum zi* the equivalent *rgyud du* "continuously".

The best means to settle the Igyu-Igyum controversy proves to be the method of comparative linguistics. The fact should be registrated, that for
nose there is listed for the Bunán language of Lahul gyum, and for Digåru Mishmi (according to Robertson and Needham respectively) hnyä-gom and hä-nägam. There cannot be any further doubt, that ZZ. lgyum means "nose"; as for the examples j, l, m, o we have to replace lgyum by lgyu "road". Digåru-Mishmi hnyä-gom is a synonym compound, the first part of it (hnyä) corresponding to Tibetan sna "nose", and the second one (gom) to ZZ. lgyum "nose". Bunán gyum is distinguished from the ZZ. word only by the lack of the l-prefix.

After settling the meaning "nose" for lgyum, no prove seems to be necessary any more, that lgyu means "road", for which the examples b, c, d, e might be consulted. Haarh translates spre'u-lgyu (Tib. glin 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-lgyu proves to be an enumeration of the minor world continents (skr. upadv'ipa), the idea of which the Bon-po have in common with the Mahāyāna Buddhists. Because the representation in Snellgrove's book cited in the previous note gives the names of the Bon-po dvipa and upadvipa only in an abbreviated form it may be useful to reproduce the whole scheme of the Bon-po in Zan-zuil and Tibetan language (see the plate).

Etymologically lgyu "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 ZZ. instance k.lgyu-zi = Tibetan rgyun-du, which proved to be the right reading instead of lgyum-zi as we have pointed out supra p. 195.

3. In a short linguistic table Dr. Haarh derives also the ZZ. word for "dog" from Tibeto-Burmese (ZZ. 14,6 ku-ra, Tibetan k'yi). That means he connects the ZZ. 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 ZZ. and Tibetan.: Kanawri khui, Manchati khui, Chamba Lahuli khui, Bunán khyu, Rangkas khvi, Därmiyä khí. The list of related words for "dog" can easily be increased, if we make use of the extensive material offered by Robert Shafer (Sh.) at a list which links Middle Burmese k'we/ "dog" with respective words in East Himalayish languages he has listed: Bahing k'li-, Thulung k'le-, Tsaurasya tšali, Dumi k'li-, Rhaling k'le, Rai k'i, Khabmu k'e-, Kulung k'e-, Rodong k'li. In Newarish we meet with k'i-tšä, in Kukish with yui. What concerns the Northern Assamese group mention

---

7a HAARH, p. 21.
8 D.L. SNELLGROVE, The Nine Ways of Bon, London 1967, p. 288. As W. KIRFEL has pointed out (Die Kosmographie der Inder, reprint Hildesheim 1967, p. 185) each of the four main world continents (dvipa) is flanked according to the Mahāyāna texts by two minor continents, whilst the Theravāda school knows not less than 2000 minor dvipa.
11 l. c., p. 145.
12 l. c., p. 159.
should be made of Taying n-kwi, Miśing i-ki, Abor e-kki, Yano i-ki, E. Nyising i-ki, Tagen i-ki. Moreover Tibetan k'yi has its equivalent in Chinese k’üan[14], in the ancient pronunciation of T’ang times ki'wön[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 haplologic form of kukkura "dog".

4. The Žž. word for “tongue” the equivalent of which is Tibetan lce occurs in a more ancient and not palatalized form: Žž. 10,11 and 17,2 lke-ri[16]; but there are already instances which prove a beginning of a process of palatalization: Žž. 14,11 rkyel, Žž. 18,3 skyeł, Dr. 11,15 lkye. There is a vast representation of that word in Sino-Tibetan[17]: Burmese hlya, Kukish m-lei; (Western Himalayisch) Bunán hle, Thebor le, Kanawri le, Mantśati lhe, Tśamba l lhe, Almora Languages dzab-le; West Central Himalayisch (p. 144) Magari lel, Vayu li; East Himalayisch (pp. 153,156) Bahing lyam, Sunwari le, Rāi -lem, Khambu lem, Yakha lem; Newarish (p. 159) me; Hruso (p. 173) dzab-la, dżeb-le, e-seb-la (according to different informants); Midżin (p. 182.184): Midzū mb-lai, Meyöl b-ro; Digarish (p. 190): Taying t’a-liñ-na, Midu ll- na; Miśingish (p. 195): Miśing a-lā, Abor a-lyō, Tagen a-ye, Yano a-ye, E. Nyising a'1-Jyi. Besides mention should be made of Chinese she[19], ancient pronunciation d’žiāt[18].

5. For Žž. rKo several meanings and several compounds can be traced. The basic meaning seems to be “body”: Žž. 14,5, Dr. 11,3, Dr. 11,15 have the Tibetan equivalent lus = body, likewise Žž. 7,7 rko t‘un and rko rīn (Tibetan lus rīn, lus t‘un), the names of the two upadvipa of the east (cp. p. 196), the name of the main eastern continent Žž. 7,5 rko-saṅs (Tib. lus-p’ags) and Žž. 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‘uṅ Žž. 10,10 “shape” (Tib. gzugs), in Žž. 10,10 rko-p‘uṅ in the meaning of rūpas-kandha (gzugs-p‘uṅ) like in Buddhist literature, Žž. 10,3 rko-dug (Tib. p‘uṅ-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 l. c., p. 194.
16 HaARB, 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.
18 KARLGREN, p. 254, no. 862. This Chinese word is also mentioned by W. SIMON, l. c., p. 26, no. 292, where he gives as Tibetan equivalent lJags "tongue" which is the word for tongue in the 2e-sa language. I would prefer the comparison with lce, but, of course, lce and lJags are related words.
ful language, and with Chinese *kū* with the ancient pronunciation, K'ju, meaning "body, person", and probably also with Burmese ‘a-kə’.  

6. For "kidneys" the Zhān-zun language has the words rka (Zh. 14,4) and rka-dur (Zh. 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 Zh. 15,1 kon-dur (Tib. k'a-gtiiz) 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 So language which is a branch of Southern Kukish: L. kal, So (ā)-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 Zh. kluiz-se "young man" (Tib. gzon nu) in Zh. 13,11; 17,9; Bon 20,11; "young man" (Tib. gzon nu p’o) Zh. 11,4. Besides we find the word with a different prefix: sluiz-se in Zh. 10,9 sluiz-se gyin (Tib. bu p’o ’dra) "like a boy" and Dr. 12,8 sluiz-se yo ze bu dañ bu mo Zh. 13,11 provides with valuable information due to its context:

It does not seem far-fetched to connect Zh. kluiz-se and sluiz-se with a rather enigmatic word which is found in the Tibetan documents from Chinese Turkestan published by F. W. Thomas and in the Tibetan annals from Tun-huang edited by J. Bacot. Thomas states that the word "occurs usually in connection with, but somehow distinguished from, soldiers (so); we have the expression "soldier *Sluizs" (p. 376), but also "Sluizs and soldiers" (p. 52). "That they were organized appears from the term "Sluizs-commander" (*Sluizs-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 *Sluizs*. That Sluizs 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 *Sluizs* 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 sluizs 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 *Sluizs* of the

---

20* Shafer, p. 46.
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."  

The same document offers the following sentence: "Sluris dañ so pa ma mčis te "Sluris and soldiers did not come".

Mazār Tāgh a IV, 0092 (wood): *rgya sluĩs 'bog lañ "Bog-lañ of the Sluris 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): *rgya sluĩs su li gči[g čad 'o'o "Amongst the Sluris in China one Khotanese has been punished".

Furthermore Mirān XV, 0020 (wood): *sluĩs su li ma luñ gi ri [e la] "To the ruler of 'O-ma-luñ amongst the Sluris"; compare the Sluris 'o ma bu-luñ in Mirān VII, 32 (wood): *sluĩs 'o ma bu luñ dañ / sīni coms kyi 'bañs "The subjects of Sīni-coms and 'O-ma-bu-lun of the Sluris".

Mazār Tāgh b, I, 0092 (paper): *mdo lo'i, [s] ... mk'ar gyi [s]luuts pon 'dir mčis na žal mču'i slad na "If the commander of the Sluris of the castle of Mdo-lo had come here, and on account of the counsel". From this document we learn that the Sluris 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): *stod p'yogs gyi p'o fia mari po p'yag 'c'ald/ ... sluĩs stad smad gyi t'ari k'ram c'en po / t'an-k'ram. Many messengers from the Upper Region paid their respects. The registration of the Sluris of the Upper and Lower Country was carried out".

If we consider firstly the existence of a Žž. word sluũs-se or klun-se "young, young man", and read secondly about Sluris of the Upper and Lower Country which might be well the upper (stod) and lower (smad) part of Žan-žuũ, it

---

24 *bka'-rim(s) = "separate order of commandment"; *gsan-lod "relaxation" is a synonym compound: *gsan = "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 THOMAS, p. 296.
28 THOMAS, p. 64.
29 THOMAS, p. 186.
32 J. BACOT, p. 22, translation p. 46.
33 *Stod-p'yoga is the usual denotion of the Kailäs-Mānasarover area and adjacent regions.
34 *t'ani-k'ram.
35 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 Žan-žuũ 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: Žan-žuũ gi pañ fī la č'en-po/ sad-ne-ga'u la soogs kyi bsgyur ba'i (read: bas) Žan-žuũ smar-gyi skad ston te. "The great Žan-žuũ Pandit Sad-ne-ga'u and others taught by their translations the language of Lower Žan-žuũ."
seems to be very probable, that *sluṅs* in the Tibetan documents from Chinese Turkestan and *sluṅs-se* in 22. are the same word, meaning not "military police" but just "corps d'élite of young men" who were recruited from the tributary 2an-žuñ people. Tibetan *sluṅs* which occurs only in the 8th and 9th centuries' documents should, therefore, be interpreted as a 2an-žuñ loan word.

The remaining occurrences of *Sluṅs* 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/byaṅ sluṅs smar* pa'i *baṅs rgya sāg skyes bzag bar* 38 gsal// "To the soldier Mes-c'ab at the intermediate distance: a request to locate the subject Rgya-sāg-skyes, a Sluṅs of the 'Lower Country' in the north."

Mazār Tāgh c, III, 0043 (wood) 41: *rgya sluṅs yan ē'ad daṅ dru gu* 'jon man c'ad kyi p'ur myi stag nams la'/ "to the 'man-tiger on the alert' upwards from the Sluṅs in China and downwards from the district of the Turks" 42 43.

Mazār Tāgh 0442 (wood) 45: *'bu sāṅ gi Sluṅs cun c'ad bya rig skugs hor cig// "As far as the Sluṅs of Bu-sāṅ (there is) an Uighur for waiting" at Bya-rig*. 'Bu-sāṅ seems to be a place in the Khotan region 45.

The particle -se in *klun-se* and *sluṅs 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 šāṅ-ze "old man"; Ž. 13,11 and 17,9 šāṅ-se "old man"; Ž. 10,8 šāṅ-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 sex 49.

(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 Sluṅs of the "Lower Country" (*sluṅs smar-pa*) in the north.
39 I accept Thomas' emendation *bzag ba* for *bzag bar* 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 *loṅs* "district", because for the classical suffix -n we often find -n in the old documents; cp. the name of king *Man-stroṅ man-bcan* which is written there Maṅ-slon maṅ-can (Bacot, p. 88).
45 Thomas, p. 236.
47 Skugsu might be sgugs-su "for waiting".
48 For references see Thomas, l. c., Vol. IV, p. 66.
49 The interpretation of Haahr, l. c., p. 16/17 seems not to be very informative.