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EDITORIAL

It is appropriate that new beginnings should take note of past accomplishments. One hundred years ago, the German scholar H. A. Jäschke published his *Tibetan-English Dictionary*, the fundamental scientific basis of modern Tibetology. Other dictionaries, notably those of the first western Tibetologist, Alexander Csoma de Körös, had prepared the way; many others have followed. Yet no other independent lexicographical work has been so carefully and conscientiously compiled. "The Jäschke" is truly a landmark work of honest scholarship, and its centenary is a suitable occasion for celebration by Tibetologists. The editor would like to thank Professor Friedrich Bischoff of Indiana University for so kindly writing an appreciation of Jäschke as an introductory essay for this volume.

The Tibet Society, founded and incorporated as a non-profit organization in 1966, has from its inception published a periodical. The Society began with Volume 1 of *The Tibet Society Newsletter* in 1967. The name of the periodical was changed to *The Tibet Society Bulletin* beginning with Volume 3 in 1969. (Volume 1 of *The Tibet Society Newsletter, New Series* appeared in July, 1972 and continues to be published.) In 1980, the Officers and Board of Directors of the Tibet Society decided to replace the *Bulletin*, which had been publishing a mixture of scholarly and popular articles, reports, and book reviews, with a purely scholarly refereed periodical. The new publication, *The Journal of the Tibet Society*, is intended to answer the long felt need for a specialized periodical devoted to the highest standards of scholarship in the field of Tibetan Studies.

Thanks in no small part to the cooperation of the scholars whose work appears on these pages, the *Journal* is now a reality. The editor wishes to acknowledge, in addition, the contributions made by the Assistant Editor, Elliot Sperling, by Barbara Gardner, Secretary of the Department of Uralic and Altaic Studies at Indiana University, and by James Canary of Cold Mountain Bindery; all of them donated their time to this effort. It is the editor's belief that with the continued cooperation of the Tibetological community worldwide *The Journal of the Tibet Society* will be an unqualified success.

C.I.B.
JÄSCHKE
SA VIE ET SON OEUVRE

F. A. Bischoff


Il est surprenant qu’un homme composât un dictionnaire de toute première qualité sans jamais publier quelque autre livre d’érudition. C’est que Jäschke, tout grand lettré qu’il était, était avant tout un Frère morave, voire un missionnaire de la Commune des Frères. Piéistes à l’extrême, les Frères moraves (ou bohémiens) entendent dépasser les barrières confessionnelles et se veulent “la centrale religieuse pour la réanimation de la Chrétienté”. Ils considèrent Jean Huss (brûlé en 1415) comme leur ancêtre spirituel. Nous les rencontrerons dès la fin du XVème siècle; en 1609 l’empereur Rodolphe II sanctionne leur Confessio Bohemica et leur permet le libre exercice de leur religion. En 1722 un rejeton de cette secte, dix familles “d’Exilés”, fonde une communauté d’artisans à Herrnhut, non loin de Dresde, sur les terres du Comte de Zinzendorf. Parmi ces Exilés se trouvait un jeune boulanger, Michael Jäschke, l’arrière-grand-père de Heinrich August.¹

Actifs dès la première heure dans leurs efforts missionnaires, les Frères de Herrnhut fondent en 1732 une mission dans les Indes occidentales; une autre, en 1733, au Groenland; en 1740, en Amérique du nord. Cette dernière a connu un succès durable: la Moravian Church fait partie intégrante du patrioine spirituel et culturel des États-Unis. La mission orientale fut fondée au début du XIXème siècle. Son importance, si on la mesure au nombre des conversions, fut assurément modeste; mais elle illustre l’Orientalisme de deux grands noms: Jakob Isaak Schmidt (1779-1847), le Mongoliste, et Heinrich August Jäschke, le Tibétologue.

Friedrich August, le père de Heinrich August, s’était ruiné pour s’être porté garant d’un parent. Il dut vendre la boulangerie, et finit ses jours comme veilleur de nuit. La Commune des Frères se chargea de l’éducation du jeune Heinrich August. Prenant en considération les dispositions de l’enfant aussi bien que la piété de sa famille, elle l’accepta dans l’équivalent morave du petit séminaire.
Jäschke était un élève brillant, mais il se distinguait particulièrement par son talent musical, et surtout par un talent prodigieux pour les langues. Ce fut d'abord le latin et le grec; puis, au grand séminaire, ce fut l'hébreu et le polonais; le tchèque (le "bohémien"), le français et l'anglais vinrent s'y ajouter comme par hasard; le suédois fut une de ses langues préférées; il apprit le danois durant un séjour en terre danoise, et le hongrois par simple curiosité. Puis, ce fut le tour des langues orientales: l'arabe, le persan, le sanscrit. Quatorze langues pour commencer. Plus tard, durant son séjour en Orient, il se familiarisa avec plusieurs idiomes tibétains, en plus du bounanais, du tinanais, du hindi et de l'ourdou. Les notices de son journal sont rédigées en allemand, anglais, français, latin, grec, danois, polonais et suédois — pour le plaisir de s'en servir. Un grand talent pour les langues n'est point chose rare dans notre profession; mais rares sont ceux qui y trouvent tant de plaisir.

A vingt ans, en 1837, Jäschke est instituteur à Christianfeld dans le Slesvig; mais dès 1842 nous le retrouvons à Niesky, enseignant dans l'école même qui l'avait formé. Ce furent des années heureuses. Cependant, le lendemain de son trente-neuvième anniversaire, le 18 mai 1856, la Commune des Frères envoya aux confins du Tibet cet homme si doué pour les langues: il fut chargé de la direction de la mission himalayenne, et reçut la consigne d'explorer la langue tibétaine en vue de la traduction de la Bible.

La mission himalayenne était le fruit du projet avorté d'une mission mongole. La Commune des Frères avait une mission kalmouque sur les bords de la Volga, à Serepta. J. I. Schmidt y avait formé deux missionnaires, A. W. Heyde et H. Pagell, mais les autorités russes leur avaient refusé le passage en Asie centrale. Ces deux hommes décidèrent alors de prendre la route de l'Inde, mais le passage leur fut encore barré, cette fois-ci par les autorités tibétaines. Ils s'installèrent donc dans le Lahoul, province située aux confins du Cachemire, entre Lahore et le Ladak, et gouvernée par la Grande-Bretagne.

Jäschke avait un caractère difficile: pointilleux et austère, il semble avoir été proprement maniaque de la ponctualité et de l'économie. Ces qualités, même portées à l'extrême, font honneur au lexicographe; mais lorsqu'elles s'épanouissent dans la personne d'un administrateur, elles sont bien fâcheuses. Jäschke s'en rendait compte et en souffrait. Aussi la collaboration des trois missionnaires aurait-elle pris fin prématurément si Herrnhut ne leur avait dépêché des fiancées. Dûment choisies par la Commune, elles s'étaient assurées de la volonté divine en consultant le sort, et partirent en janvier 1858. Le 30 août elles touchèrent Calcutta (où personne ne les attendait: la lettre qui aurait dû les annoncer s'était égarée) et arrivèrent à Kyelang le 10 novembre. Le mariage fut célébré le 18. Ces trois femmes, courageuses au delà de tout ce qu'on peut imaginer de nos jours et d'une intelligence supérieure, réussirent à rétablir la paix en adoucissant leurs époux. Aussi Jäschke demeura-t-il en Orient jusqu'en automne 1868, lorsque des rhumatismes l'obligèrent à rentrer dans sa patrie.
A Herrnhut, Jäschke se voua à la rédaction finale et à la publication des deux versions de son dictionnaire, l'une allemande et l'autre anglaise, et, en même temps, à la traduction du Nouveau Testament. Il enseignait aussi la classe de 6ème à l'école de Niesky. Son mariage était resté sans enfants. En septembre 1882 il dut s'aliter pour ce qui semble avoir été un cancer généralisé. Il mourut un an plus tard, âgé de 66 ans.

Par la date de sa parution et, plus encore, par sa qualité, "le Jäschke" est le premier dictionnaire tibétain. Avant lui, un missionnaire catholique dont le nom fut oublié avait glané des mots et expressions tibétains aux frontières du Bhoutan. Son guide initial n'avait été autant que le fameux Alphabetum tibeticum de A. A. Grigori (1759); mais bientôt le saint homme fut capable de lire la Grande légende de Padmasambhava (Padma thangyig) qui, au jugement de Jäschke, est "une oeuvre dont la qualité littéraire est médiocre, mais qui, par ce fait même, se recommande au débutant comme un bon spécimen de littérature narrative." (Jäschke a dépouillé la Grande légende pour son dictionnaire.) Les notes de ce missionnaire furent publiées à Serampore en 1826, non sans avoir été au préalable classées et traduites de l'italien en anglais. Carnets et fiches remplis au hasard des lectures et des conversations, leur auteur ne s'était pas douté qu'ils seraient publiés un jour.

Le mérite de la première tentative consciente de compilation d'un dictionnaire tibétain revient à l'illustre Csoma de Kôrs où, par une initiative inouïe à son époque, vécut en lama dans une lamaserie du Ladak. Son dictionnaire parut à Calcutta en 1834: Essay towards a dictionary, Tibetan and English. L'oeuvre trahit sa source: elle ne se préoccupe que de la langue savante des lamas.

Ce dictionnaire fut traduit de l'anglais en allemand par J. I. Schmidt: Tibetisch-deutsches Wörterbuch, Saint-Pétersbourg 1841. Schmidt changea l'ordre alphabétique de l'original au profit du système alphabétique tibétain; il l'augmenta également de notes glanées dans des dictionnaires mongols.

Jäschke, pour sa part, s'inspira de l'admirable Sanskritwörterbuch de Böhtlingk et Roth (paru à Saint-Pétersbourg entre 1855 et 1875): il procéda au dépouillement systématique d'un choix d’ouvrages importants. Jäschke accompagne ses notes de références bibliographiques. Cependant il ne se limite pas aux œuvres littéraires, mais prête une attention égale à la langue parlée; et surtout, son dictionnaire n'est pas simplement un vocabulaire: il montre le fonctionnement des mots dans leur contexte, documente leurs changements de sens, donne une profusion de phrases et d'expressions. Depuis, on a su faire des dictionnaires plus épais, mais on n'en a pas fait de meilleurs. "Le Jäschke" demeure l'instrument de travail indispensable du tibétologue.

Le matériel fut rassemblé au Lahoul d'abord, puis à Darjeeling. Car on ne parle pas le tibétain à Kyelang, mais le bounanais; les affaires, d'autre part, se traitent en ladakhi; et c'est à peine si l'on trouve quelques villages tibétains aux confins de la province — et c'est là que Jäschke alla vivre
durant trois mois chez les parents de Sodnam Stobsgyes, un lama qui s’était converti à la foi morave et qui faisait fonction de maître d’informateur et de collaborateur au dictionnaire.

Sa bonne oreille prédisposait Jäschke à la phonétique et à la dialectologie: le tableau phonétique au début du dictionnaire compare l’orthographe des mots avec leur prononciation dans les divers patois. Le grand mérite de Jäschke est d’avoir trouvé la loi qui règle la phonétique tibétaine, et surtout le lien entre certains préfixes et suffixes avec le système des tons hauts ou bas.

"L’exploration de la langue tibétaine en vue de la traduction de la Bible" comprenait aussi la grammaire. Jäschke en composa une, mais elle laisse beaucoup à désirer. Son auteur connaissait d’ailleurs ses défauts, mais prit la mort comme une excuse pour ne pas la refaire. C’est que la lexicographie et la grammaire sont des disciplines distinctes, voire opposées: la première étant analytique, la seconde synthétique. Aussi le talent pour l’une ne garantit pas un talent égal pour l’autre. Peu importe. La simplicité lucide de la Grammaire du tibétain littéraire de Jaques Bacot (Paris 1946-1948), complétée de façon commode par la méthode empirique du Manuel élémentaire de tibétain classique de Marcelle Lalou (Paris 1950), est un guide sûr et pratique. Le grand défaut de la grammaire de Jäschke est qu’elle "explore", c’est-à-dire reconstruit, décrit la langue tibétaine, plutôt que d’en saisir le mécanisme intérieur. Or, le tibétain n’est pas une langue à explorer: les moindres détails en sont connus des grammairiens tibétains dont les traités, nombreux et volumineux, ont valeur normative. C’est pour avoir su rendre l’essence des "Slokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa" que la grammaire de Bacot est valable.

Je ne saurais décider si la grammaire de Jäschke contient des erreurs ou seulement des maladresses de méthode. Personnellement, je ne m’en soucie que peu: qui donc se sert encore de cette œuvre de dilettante, périmée déjà du vivant de son auteur? Et puisque je ne peux faire disparaître le livre de la bibliothèque, j’en interdis formellement l’usage à mes élèves: elle leur brouillerait l’entendement (celle de Das aussi, d’ailleurs.)

La pierre de touche pour la justesse de la grammaire de Jäschke est évidemment sa traduction du Nouveau Testament. Cependant je ne me hasarderai pas à juger de la qualité de celle-ci et préfère laisser la parole à mon estimé collègue P. Klaflkowski, d’Oslo, le spécialiste des traductions tibétaines de la Bible.

Bibliographie des écrits de Jäschke:

a) philologie:


8. Dissertations concernant la traduction des Épitres de St Jean, Magdeburg. (Il fallait en effet que Jäschke créât un vocabulaire chrétien, tout comme les locchawas d’antan créèrent un vocabulaire bouddhique.)

b) traductions:
Chaus parmi les Cent mille chants de Milaraspa, ZDMG XXIII.

c) botanique:

d) traduction de la Bible:

e) livres d’instruction pour les Chrétiens tibétains:
2. Kakhai dpe: abécédaire tibétain en lettres cursivees.
3. bodchos skadkyi glogthabs: premier livre de lecture tibétain.
4. bodnas phyiglingdu agrobai lorgyus: rapport d’un voyage du Tibet en Europe.
11. Sa chenpo melong: éléments de géographie.
12. phyiglingpa zhiggis hindula chos bshadpa: méthode pour prêcher aux Indiens (traduction d’un traité hindi).
Il se trouvait, en outre, à la Direction des missions à Herrnhut, un certain nombre de manuscrits de Jäschke: traductions de cantiques, de sermons et d'instructions pastorales moraves.

NOTES


2. À ces femmes revient aussi le mérite d’avoir initié leurs soeurs tibétaines au tricotage. Cet art s’est récemment révélé une importante source de revenu pour les réfugiés, les Indiens étant avides de lainages tibétains.

3. La première édition, en allemand, est la lithographie d’un manuscrit (1871) A l’occasion de son centenaire, cette édition rarissime fit l’objet d’une reproduction photostatique par les soins du Biblio Verlag Osnabrück 1971 (Cette information nous vient de M. Eimer.) Cependant, elle ne semble avoir été suivie que d’une seule réimpression typographique (1876). Au contraire, l’édition anglaise connut de nombreuses réimpressions et elle sera réimprimée tant que des hommes s’adonneront aux études tibétaines.

4. Pour l’histoire de la lexicographie pré-jäschkéenne, cf. la préface du dictionnaire, p. IV-VI.


Articles

A LIST OF ABBOTS OF KAḤ-THOG MONASTERY ACCORDING TO HANDWRITTEN NOTES BY THE LATE KATOK ONTUL

Helmut Eimer and Pema Tsering

In his article "A Tibetan Antiquarian in the XVIIIth Century," Bulletin of Tibetology, IV, No. 3 (Gangtok), 1967 (hereafter "Antiquarian"), p. 7, Hugh E. Richardson refers, amongst other things, to some written information by the present Kaḥ-thog Dbron-sprul-skū (Katok Ontul, died before 1970). When he heard that we were preparing a paper on the abbots and teachers of Kaḥ-thog monastery, he sent us these notes, which were most probably composed in 1967, and kindly permitted us to use them for publication. We express our deep gratitude for this generosity.

The notes are written in dbu-can on five sheets of approx. 17.8 to 22.6 cm; two of them (numbered 1 and 2, hereafter T 1 and T 2) deal with the life of Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbañ-nor-bu, the other three (numbered 1 to 3, hereafter H 1, H 2 and H 3) give a brief survey of the history of Kaḥ-thog monastery including a list of 41 names of abbots. This list attracted our special interest, because it contains a number of names that are not found in the materials used in preparing our paper "Aebte und Lehrer von Kaḥ-thog. Eine erste Ubersonicht zur Geschichte eines Rhih ma-pa-Kloster in Derge/Khams", Zentralasiatische Studien, 13 (1979), pp. 457-509 (hereafter "Aebte").

The following paper is intended to give the 41 names from the handwritten notes of Katok Ontul in comparison with the materials already known. The notes represent a tradition divergent from that in the other accessible sources. This can be seen from the different dates assigned to the foundation of Kaḥ-thog monastery: Kaḥ-dam-pa Bde-gšegs was born in the year chu-stag, i.e. the 36th year of the second cycle; he founded the monastery in the year sa-mo-yos, i.e. the 13th year of the third rab-byun, namely in 1159 (see e.g. "Aebte", p. 489), whereas Katok Ontul puts the year sa-yos in the second cycle (H 1, lines 6-7), thus dating the foundation sixty years earlier, namely in 1099. Since—according to the notes (T 1, lines 6-8)—600 years elapsed from the foundation of the monastery down to the birth of Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbañ-nor-bu, we cannot attribute this difference to a simple mistake made by Katok Ontul, we must consider it a part of the—presumably oral—tradition he wrote down.

The list of names opens with the words:

kaḥ-thog raṅ-gi gdan-sar, gts'o-che-ba'i bla-ma ŋuṅ-bsdus-ṣig žu-na... (H 2, lines 5-6)

"[Now follows]—if it is permitted—a comprehensive [list of] the foremost Lamas on the see of Kaḥ-thog proper..."
The position of the names in the list is indicated by numerals appearing above the first letters of each name; the name of Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbaṅ-nor-bu is marked by a canopy above it. No further information is enclosed in this list (H 2, line 6-H 3, line 1). In the following we give the names from the list with their respective numbers; additional notes are drawn from other sources as indicated in parentheses.

1. Kaḥ-dam-pa Bde-gšegs
   Sga-dam-pa, Sga-dam-pa Bder-gšegs, Dam-pa Bder-gšegs Šes-rab (-šeṅ-ge), Bde(r)-gšegs, Šes-rab(-šeṅ-ge) (“Aebte”, pp. 499-509, s.vv.); 1122-1192, founded Kaḥ-thog in 1159 (“Aebte”, pp. 489 and 463-470); a sketch of his life is given by Katok Ontul (H 1, lines 1-15); on the different dates for the foundation of Kaḥ-thog monastery see above.

2. Chos-rje Btsaṅ-bston
   Rje, Rgyal-tshab Chos-rje Gtsaṅ-ston Rdo-rje-rgyal-mtshan (“Aebte”, pp. 466 [note 3] and 489); 1126-1215, met Kaḥ-dam-pa Bde-gšegs about 1142 (“Aebte”, p. 470); his birth-place is known as Gtsaṅ-ʒal (loc. cit.).

3. Byams-pa-’bum
   Rgyal-tshab Byams-pa-’bum-pa (“Aebte”, p. 489); 1179-1252, entered office as abbot in 1226; between the second and third abbots the see may have been vacant for about a dozen years (“Aebte”, p. 463).

4. Spyan-sba Rin-chen

5. Žaṅ-ston-pa

6. Ye-šes-’bum-pa


7. Yon-tan Ye-šes-’bum

8. Byaṅ-chub-rdo-rje

9. Seṅha-gu-ru

10. Badra-śṛṅ

This name could refer to Rmog-ston Rdo-rje-dpal-bzaṅ (“Aebte”, p. 475), who was a pupil of Ye-šes-rgyal-mtshan, i.e. number 13 of the list.

11. Bhu-ddha-bha-tra

A faulty transliteration of Sanskrit Buddhahadra.

12. Bkra-(š)is-bla-ma

13. Ye-šes-rgyal-mtshan


14. Nam-mkha’-rgyal-mtshan

This name could refer to Lab-ston Nam-mkha’-rin-chen, the second abbot of the druṭ lineage of Kaḥ-thog (“Aebte”, p. 476), or to Nam-mkha’-rgyal-mtsho, a pupil of Ye-šes-rgyal-mtshan (“Aebte”, p. 475).

15. Kun-dga’-zla-ba


16. Bsdod-rnam-rgyal-mtshan

17. Chos-dbaṅ-pa
18. Bsod-rnam-rdo-rje
20. Bkra-(š)is-rin-chen
21. Rin-chen-rdo-rje
22. Nam-mkha’-mkhan
23. [Nam-mkha’-]slob (rnams gniṅs)
24. Rig’-dzin Bdu’-dul-rdo-rje
25. Kloṅ-gsal-sṅiṅ-po
26. Bsod-rnam-lde’u-btsan
27. Dri-med Žiṅ-skyoṅ-mgon-po
Born 1722 or 1723; his next incarnation was Rig’-dzin-mgon-po, i.e. number 31 of this list ("Aebte", p. 485).
28. ’Gyur-med Tshe-dbaṅ-mchog-grub
29. Kun-bzah-nes-don-dbaṅ-po
30. Rig’-dzin Tshe-dbaṅ-nor-bu
31. Rig’-dzin ’Jigs-med-mgon-po
32. ’Jigs-bral Chos-dbyin-rdo-rje
33. ’Gyur-med Chos-dbyin-raṅ-grol
34. Kun-mkhyen Chos-kyi-blo-gros
Si-tu-mchog-sprul Chos-kyi-blo-gros, died c. 1880 ("Aebte", p. 486).
35. ’Jigs-med-yon-tan-mgon-po
36. Rig’-dzin Jam-dpal-rdo-rje
37. Si-tu Chos-kyi-rgya-ṃtsho
38. Mkhan-chen Nag-gi-dbaṅ-po
Nag-dbaṅ-dpal-bzaṅ, 1879-1941 ("Aebte", pp. 487-488), his autobiography
has been published as *The Autobiographical Reminiscences of Ngag-dbang-dpal-bzang, Late Abbot of Kah-thog Monastery*. Gangtok 1969. (The Ngagyur Nyingmay Sungrab, I.).

39. Dge-tse 'Gyur-med-bstan-pa-rnam-rgyal
40. Rje DBon Padma-rgyal-mtshan
41. Mkhan-chen Legs-bsad-'byor-ldan

He participated in a *luṅ* and *dbaṅ* of the *Rin-chen-ger-mdzod* presided over by the Dpal-yul-mchog-sprul Rin-po-che in the presence of important abbots and incarnations from the neighbouring monasteries; this was observed by Pema Tsering—a young monk at that time—in Dpal-yul monastery.

It is obvious that the list—or at least the latter portion of it—is not arranged in chronological order: as number 28 figures 'Gyur-med Tshe-dbaṅ-mchog-grub' (born about 1764); as number 30 appears Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbaṅ-nor-bu, who was born 1696, i.e. more than sixty-five years earlier. This leads us to the question of the organizing principle behind the list of the 41 names. According to the notes of Katok Ontul, in the first six centuries of Kah-thog monastery there were three lineages of important teachers (T 1, lines 5-6): the thirteen members of the *bla-rabs*—presumably identical with the *rgyal-tshab* line (“Aebte”, p. 462)—, the thirteen members of the *druin-rabs* and the thirteen members of the *rmog-rabs*. If all the members of these three lineages had been recorded, the list covering the first 600 years—i.e. up to number 30, Rig-'dzin Tshe-dbaṅ-nor-bu—would contain at least 39 names and not 29. The thirteen *rgyal-tshab* of the literary tradition are known by name, but the personal dates are given for the first six members of this line only (“Aebte”, pp. 463 and 489-490); the *druin* line is counted up to its ninth member; a list of the *rmog* teachers is not known to us. We have to wait for further material to solve the problem.
INDEX TO ARTICLES IN THE
K'ANG-TSANG YEN-CHIU YÜEH-K'AN
(A CONTRIBUTION TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF TIBET)*

Josef Kolmaš

Inspired by the presentation of the publishers of the Bulletin of the Csoma de Kőrösi Symposium of retrospective bibliographies of Tibetological articles published in selected Orientological periodicals,¹ I should like to contribute to the proceedings of this symposium with an index of articles printed in the not little known and almost inaccessible Chinese Tibetological magazine K'ang-Tsang Yen-Chiu Yüeh-K'ant [1] or "Hsik'ang-Tibet Research Monthly" (hereinafter referred to as KYY), published in China from 1946 to 1949.² For Tibetologists with a knowledge of Chinese (the articles are all in Chinese) and with access to this bibliographically valuable magazine a new source of knowledge and inspiration will thus be opened up, since the articles published in the magazine, whether in the form of original studies or translations, all concern Tibet: its geography (expeditions, exploration, description, travel, rivers, lakes, mountains, place-names, maps, economic geography); history (including historiography and biography); government and politics; population and social conditions; folklore and customs, myths and legends, festivals; magic and popular religion, Buddhism (history, sects, institutions, monasteries); language (including transcriptions) and literature, etc.

I should be very glad if the Index of Articles (or the Main Index, listing authors and/or translators, titles of articles with number of issue and pages), complemented with two Supplementary Indexes, i.e. an Index of Authors (arranged under authors, translators, editors, etc., showing the Serial Nos. in the Main Index under which each reference can be found) and an Index of Subjects (arranged according to subject matter and including names of persons, places, institutions, historical events, etc., also located by means of Serial Nos. in the Main Index), which I am presenting proves to be a reliable key to this rich material, enabling researchers to identify and localize and perhaps also exploit it easily in their own work. The present study is not concerned with annotating or critically appraising these works, but aims at being merely a tool, a reference work intended to assist scholars in the location of articles in the KYY which could be of interest to them in some way. From the present viewpoint we should undoubtedly regard some of them as being obsolete and out-dated by

*This paper was read at the 2nd Csoma de Kőrösi Symposium held in Csonpok-Balatonfüred, Hungary, 19-25 September, 1979.
further development. However, there is nothing strange in this. On the contrary, it is wholly natural and unavoidable, especially when bearing in mind by whom, at what time and on what level of knowledge these articles were written and published thirty years ago and for what public they were intended and with what mission. In my own defence as the compiler of this Index I should like to say something that is certainly common knowledge, namely that between the work of an author and a compiler there exists one basic difference, this consisting in the fact that while the author can, as a rule, choose the material he wants or needs for his book or article, the compiler of an index can and, in fact, must only set out the material he intends to index without trying to change or “improve” it in any way.

When the war in the Far East came to an end and China (Kuomintang China) could once again concentrate to a greater extent on its internal problems, the ripe questions of the so-called marginal territories, in North China (Outer and Inner Mongolia), North East China (Tung-san-sheng or the Three Eastern Provinces, i.e. Manchuria), North West China (East or Chinese Turkestan) and South West China (Hsik’ang and Tibet) were also gradually addressed. However, while the majority of problems concerning the first three regions were solved shortly after the war, problems connected with the integration of Hsik’ang and Tibet into the state organism of China remained open.

The need perceived by the Chinese to foster a quick solution of the problems of Hsik’ang and Tibet in the conditions of post-war China led in certain intellectual circles in South West China to the decision to found a special “Study Society for Hsik’ang and Tibet”—K’ang-Tsang yen-chiu-shé [7]—which, as a voluntary, non-profit-making and non-governmental institution “would help to solve topical questions concerning Hsik’ang and Hsitsang (Tibet).” The initiators and first members of this society, which began to be formed at Szuch’uan from the middle of 1946, included certain outstanding personalities in public, political, scientific and cultural life—university teachers, scientists, travellers, Buddhists and so on, living and working at that time in Ch’eng-tu, the capital of this province. Their number included, for example, Blo-gros-chos-mtsho, Hsieh Kuo-an [8] (alias Paul Sherab), Huang Fen-sheng [9], Jen Nai-ch’i’ang [10] (alias Jen Hsiao-chuang [11]), Ku Chieh-kang [12], Li Che-sheng [13], Liu Chia-chü [14] (alias Skal-bzang-chos-byor), Liu Li-ch’ien [15], Liu Po-liang [16], Lü Ch’eng [17], Ou-yang Wu-wei [18], Ting Shih-ts’un [19] and many others.¹

The constituting meeting of this society took place in Ch’eng-tu on Sunday, 6 October, 1946, with the participation of 41 delegates. In his opening speech Mr. Shao Ming-shu [20] stated on behalf of the preparatory committee that the study of Hsik’ang and Tibet touched on political, economic, cultural and defence questions and was to be oriented mainly towards the securing of China’s sovereignty over Tibet. Mr. Jen Nai-ch’i’ang, the spiritus movens of the whole enterprise, who was the next to take the floor, delivered a report on the course of the preparatory work connected with the founding of the society and spoke about questions of
the financial securing of the work of the society and also about the need for publishing a magazine of the society in which its members could publish their findings, state their viewpoints and compare opinions. Following the introduction of all members present, a two-hour discussion on the statutes of the society took place and a “Board of Directors” (li-shih-hui [21]) was established whose task was to supervise the work of the two departments of the society, viz. the department concerned with general matters of the society (she-uu-pu [22]), headed by an “Executive Secretary General” (tsung-kan-shih [23]) with several “Assistant Secretaries” (ku-kan-shih [24]) and a research department (yen-chiu-pu [25]), whose members were researchers (yen-chiu-yüan [26]) of various grades. The member-base of the society was to be formed of honorary members recruited mainly from the ranks of supporters and patrons of the society on one hand and regular member-researchers on the other hand. In all 9 “Directors” (li-shih [27]) and 5 “Comptrollers” (chien-shih [28]) were elected for the first functional period and the first working meeting of the Board of Directors was fixed for Sunday, 13 October, 1946.

At this meeting Jen Nai-ch’iang, the leading figure of the society throughout its existence, was elected President of the Board of Directors (li-shih-chang [29]). A decision was also taken on the name of the magazine of the society, which was to be K’ang-Tsang Yen-Chiu Yüeh-Pao [30] (not Yüeh-K’an [31]). It was also decided that it should be published as a monthly as from October 1946 and sent to members of the society only.

At the first general assembly of the society on Sunday, 17 November, 1946, attended by 10 members only, Jen Nai-ch’iang delivered a report on the activity of the society in the past month, including a financial report, and, with regard to the society’s magazine, informed those present that in future it would be published in the extent of 32 pages (issue No. 1 had only 16 pages and complaints were received with respect to printing errors, the use of paper of bad quality, non-adherence to negotiated terms and so on), that it would not be placed on free sale, but would be sent in one exemplar solely to members and patrons of the society and that remaining copies would be bound, always in six numbers, in one independent volume intended for free sale. Matters connected with the printing of the magazine (often of a considerably stringent nature, as we shall see later), proof-reading and so on were entrusted to Mr. Cheng Ling-ts’ang [34].

* * *

Some Basic Data on the K’ang-Tsang Yen-Chiu Yüeh-K’an


Publishing House and its seat: K’ang-Tsang yen-chiu-she [2] (Hsik’ang-Tibet Research Society), 36 Fan-shu [35] Street, Ch’eng-tu, Szuch’uan. — Although it is not specifically stated in the magazine, it can be taken as
certain that the function of the chief or responsible editor of the magazine was held by Jen Nai-ch’iang throughout the period of its existence.

*Period throughout which the magazine was published:* from 30 October, 1946 (No. 1) to August-September 1949 (Nos. 28 and 29). The individual issues were numbered successively from 1 to 29.

*Periodicity:* The magazine was published once a month and as a rule appeared on the last day of the month. In all twelve numbers were published per year. This system was adhered to, however, only from October 1946 to July 1948, when the magazine appeared regularly at monthly intervals (Nos. 1-22). After July 1948 the irregular publication of the magazine was undoubtedly influenced by the military-political events taking place in China at that time (the civil war between the Kuomintang and forces led by the Communist Party of China). In the remaining five months (August-December) of 1948 only one issue, No. 23 of 30 September, 1948, appeared so that instead of the planned 12 numbers only 8 (Nos. 16-23) were published in 1948. The situation worsened in this respect in 1949. In that year only 6 numbers were published, namely No. 24 in January, No. 25 in February, No. 26 in April, No. 27 in July and, finally, the last double number (Nos. 28 and 29) in August-September 1949. After this date, which by chance coincided with the founding of the People’s Republic of China, the magazine ceased to be published as far as I know.

*Size and number of pages:* Approximately 12.5 x 18 cm. With the exception of the first issue, which had (2)+16 pages, and the last double number containing a total number of 64 pages, the magazine always had 32 pages.

*Price:* The original annual subscription for twelve issues of the magazine was fixed at 2,000 yuan [36] and the price of an individual issue at 300 yuan (as from No. 2 of 30 November, 1946, however, it was announced that the free sale of the individual issues was not possible). In the course of the three years during which the magazine was published the annual subscription price for 12 issues increased precipitately, this being documented by the following data:

From 1 February, 1947 (No. 5 of 28 February, 1947) the original annual subscription (2,000 yuan) was raised to 4,000 yuan. From No. 10 of 31 July, 1947, another increase, this time to 6,000 yuan, was made and from No. 13 of 31 October, 1947 the subscription rose to 10,000 yuan.

As from January 1948 (No. 16 of 31 January, 1948) the annual subscription for twelve issues was increased to 20,000 yuan and four months later, on 1 April, 1948 (No. 19 of 30 April, 1948), it was raised to 100,000 yuan. Only two months later (No. 21 of 30 June, 1948) it was announced that as from 1 July, 1948, the annual subscription would be further adjusted (as well as the price of the first 12 issues of the magazine
bound in one volume), this time to 300,000 yuan. However, in the following month (No. 22 of 30 July, 1948) we read the announcement that as of September, 1948, the annual subscription for twelve issues of the magazine (as well as the price of the first twelve issues bound in one volume) was to be 500,000 yuan!

In the meantime a currency reform was carried out in China in August 1948, so that in No. 23 of 30 September, 1948, we can read that the annual subscription for 12 issues was to be 1 Gold Yuan (chin-yuan [37]). As a result of another currency reform realized shortly afterwards the Silver Yuan (yin-yuan [38]) was introduced, so that in the remaining five issues of the magazine (Nos. 24-29) we find that the annual subscription for 12 issues was to be 1 Silver Yuan.

It is thus clear that the generally unstable and distressing situation prevailing in China—the result of the civil war then under way—also confronted the publishers of a regional scientific magazine with numerous daily problems. Moreover, this magazine—as it is clear, for example, from the heartfelt statement of the chief editor, Jen Nai-ch’iang, “I Want to Aid the Further Existence of This Magazine” (KYY 23, pp. 28-32; Index of Articles No. 119)—was constantly confronted with difficulties of a financial nature, inadequate supplies of paper, problems connected with the printing of the magazine, and so on. Thus it was a small (or rather a great) miracle that the magazine survived and maintained its standard through those three stormy years.

I bought the KYY exemplar used as a base for this paper at the Tung-an shih-ch’ang [39] or “East Tranquillity Market” book bazaar (renamed Tung-feng shih-ch’ang [40] or “East Wind Market” in the years of the so-called Cultural Revolution) in Peking on 14 October, 1957. On that occasion I paid 15 yuan in the new Chinese currency for it.

*   *   *

Preliminary Notes to the Indexes

1. Partial orientation in the individual KYY issues (with the sole exception of issues Nos. 1, 5 and 6) is enabled by the Table of Contents—Pen-ch’i ko-wen t’i-yao [41] (in issues Nos. 2 and 3), or Pen-ch’i nei-jung [42] t’i-yao (in all other cases)—which is always published on the first, i.e. title page. As a rule the name of the article and the name of the author or translator are supplemented with a brief and realistic characterization of the contents of the article. In some cases, however, the data contained in the Table of Contents are at variance with the data presented in the heading of the respective article (in exceptional cases this concerns the names of the authors or translators as well). In compiling my Index I set out consistently from the data contained not in the Table of Contents, but in the headings of the articles themselves.
A comprehensive Table of Contents for all 29 KYY issues does not exist. An incomplete list of authors and their contributions exists only in the case of issues Nos. 1-12. This list can be found in KYY 14, pp. 31-32 (Index of Articles No. 72) and, in a somewhat modified form, also in KYY 19, p. 32 (Index of Articles No. 100).

2. The indexed articles are listed in chronological order and are arranged according to their authors or translators (according to their titles in the case of anonymous works).

3. The indexing of each article comprises the following items:
   —serial number (1 to 140),
   —name of author or translator,
   —title of article; in the Wade-Giles system of romanization of the Chinese characters; in Chinese characters (square brackets); with an English translation in round brackets,
   —number of issue (1-29),
   —page numbers,
   —remarks.

4. The Main Index nominally contains 140 items (Serial Nos. 1-140). In actual fact, however, the contributions proper amount to about only one half of this number, the other half representing a direct or free continuation of lengthier contributions. In all the magazine contains 13 lengthy contributions (Serial Nos. 4, 5, 22, 26, 34, 39, 65, 74, 91, 116, 122, 127 and 133) which are published in a large or small number of parts, or as a series of articles. The following contributions have the largest number of parts: Liu Li-ch’ien’s translation of Marpa’s biography (Ser. No. 5)—22 parts in all; Tai Hsin-san’s Notes from a Journey Through Ulterior Tibet (Ser. No. 39)—12 parts in all; Li Che-sheng’s translation of F. Goré’s study on the Szuch’uan-Tibetan and Yünnan-Tibetan marches (Ser. No. 74)—12 parts in all; P’eng Kung-hou’s translation of A. H. Francke’s work on Ge-sar (Ser. No. 22)—9 parts in all; Hsieh Kuo-an’s serial on Mon-yul (Ser. No. 34)—7 parts in all, and others.

5. In principle all articles, by known authors and anonymous ones, as well as all important or otherwise interesting editorial information concerning the life of the Hsik’ang-Tibet Research Society and its magazine are indexed. On the other hand, the Index does not contain various formal announcements or statements made by the publisher, for example, expressions of thanks for financial support, announcements concerning the issues of new books and so on, usually published on the rear cover of a number. In all there are 16 such cases.

*   *   *
NOTES


2. This magazine escaped the attention even of such indisputably specialized and authoritative bibliographies of Chinese magazine articles as *Chung-kuo shih-hsüeh lun-wen so-yin* [2] (Index of Chinese Historiographic Articles), 2 vols., Peking: K’o-hsüeh ch’u-pan-she 1957; and Ping-kuen Yu’s (Yü Ping-kuan [3]) *Chinese History: Index to Learned Articles 1902-1962*, Hong Kong: East Asia Institute 1963. Apart, naturally, from numerous other factors, this fact alone justifies my indexing of the *KYY*.—Similar indexing would be deserved also by other Chinese magazines devoted to the problems of Hsik’ang or Tibet which are little known in Europe, for example, *K’ang-Tao Yüeh-K’an* [4] (Hsik’ang Guide Monthly) and *Pien-Cheng Kung-Lun* [5] (Public Opinion on Frontier Policies) published in Ch’eng-tu or Ch’ung-ch’ing during World War II, or the even older monthly *K’ang-Tsang Ch’ien-Feng* [6] (Advanced Guard of Hsik’ang and Tibet) published in Nanking in the Thirties.

3. A list of the founding members of the Hsik’ang-Tibet Research Society—126 names in all—is presented in *KYY* 1 (30 October, 1946), p. 2. See Index of Articles No. 2.

4. See Index of Articles No. 7.

5. The mistake in the last character of the name of the magazine is a printing error. In the very first issue of 30 October, 1946, a printer set *k’an* [32] (publication) instead of *pao* [33] (announcement, communication, information, report) and from then on it remained in the name of the magazine. Cf. Liu Shih-ts’an, Pen-yüeh she-wu hui-i chi-yao, *KYY* 2 (30 November, 1946), p. 32 (Index of Articles No. 13), and Jen Nai-ch’iang, Wo yao chih-ch’ih pen-k’an-ti sheng-ming, *KYY* 23 (30 September, 1948), p. 30 (Index of Articles No. 119).


7. I do not know the total number of copies in which the *KYY* was published. From data published on different occasions in this magazine (cf. *KYY* 14, pp. 31-32, and *KYY* 21, p. 24) it is known that, apart from the copies distributed to members and friends of the society, at least 200 copies of every number were kept aside. Once a year (and not once every six months as originally planned) these copies were bound into separate volumes intended for free sale. As far as is known, the first of these volumes, containing issues Nos. 1-12, was made available for sale in November 1947 (cf. Index of Articles No. 72). The second volume, supposed to contain issues Nos. 13-24 and announced for October or November 1948 (cf. Index of Articles No. 100), was probably never issued.
independently, because No. 24 itself appeared as late as on 30 January, 1949. As mentioned further on, the magazine appeared regularly every month only up to No. 22 (30 July, 1948) inclusive. No. 23 appeared in September 1948 and No. 24 as late as in January 1949.


INDEX OF ARTICLES

Listing in chronological order (Issue Nos. 1-29, Serial Nos. 1-140) of:
—authors and/or translators,
—titles: i. Wade-Giles romanization; ii. Chinese characters; iii. English translation (in parentheses),
—issue number (figures preceding the colon),
—pages (figures following the colon),
—notes and references.

NO. 1 (30 October, 1946)

1. Fa-k'an hsiao-ch'i [43] (A Short Announcement of the Beginning of the Publication of the Magazine [i.e. Kang-Tsang Yen-Chiu Yüeh-K' an]), 1:1.


NO. 2 (30 November, 1946)

12. LIU LI-CH'IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 2:17-29.—See No. 5.
13. LIU SHIH-TS'AN, Pen-yüeh she-wu hui-i chi-yao [56] (Minutes of a Meeting on Affairs of the Society Held in This Month [i.e. in November 1946]), 2:29-32.

NO. 3 (31 December, 1946)

16. LIU LI-CH'IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 3:13-24.—See No. 5.

NO. 4 (31 January, 1947)

20. JEN NAI-CH'IANG, Fu-kuo fei T'u-fan chih Ts'en Chung-mien hsiensheng [62] (Fu-kuo Is Not T'u-fan: Addressed to Mr. Ts'en Chung-mien), 4:11-18.—Cf. No. 47.
21. LIU LI-CH'IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 4:18-27.—See No. 5.
23. Chieh-shao Liu Li-ch'ien hsien-sheng [65] (A Brief Characterization of Mr. Liu Li-ch'ien), 4:32.
NO. 5 (28 February, 1947)

25. HSIEH KUO-AN, Tsai-t’an Ch’iang-t’ang feng-su [67] (Once Again About the Customs and Habits of Byang-thang), 5:6-12.
27. LIU LI-CH’IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 5:27-31.—See No. 5.

NO. 6 (31 March, 1947)

29. LIU LI-CH’IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 6:17-27.—See No. 5.
30. P’ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), “Man san kuo” pen-shih, 6:27-32.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to “The Story of Kesar’s Birth,” pp. 64-68.

NO. 7 (30 April, 1947)

32. JEN NAI-CH’IANG, Ch’ien-wen pu-chu [54] (Additional Notes to the Preceding Article. [It contains: 1. A brief characterization of Mr. Tai Hsing-san; 2. The founding of the Bkra-shis-lhun-po monastery by the First Dalai Lama]), 7:11-13.
33. LING KUANG-TIEN, Lo-su kai-shu [70] (A General Description of the Lo-su People), 7:13-17.
34. HSIEH KUO-AN, Chi Hsi-tsong-ti Men-yü [71] (Notes on the Tibetan Mon-yul Territory), 7:18-22.
35. LIU LI-CH’IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 7:23-28.—See No. 5.

NO. 8 (30 May, 1947)

37. JEN NAI-CH’IANG, Hsi-tsang-ti tzu-jan ch’ü-hua [72] (The Natural Territorial Divisions of Tibet), 8:2-11.
38. HSIEH KUO-AN, Ni-po-erh—Men-yü-chih i pu [73] (Nepal—a Part of Mon-yul), 8:12-17.
40. LIU LI-CH’IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 8:21-27.—See No. 5.
41. P'ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), 'Man san kuo' pen-shih, 8:28-32.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to 'The Story of 'aBruguma's Marriage to Kesar,' pp. 122-125.

NO. 9 (30 June, 1947)

42. JEN NAI-CH'IANG, To K'ang-ti tsu-juan ch'ü-hua [75] (The Natural Territorial Divisions of A-mdo [Ch'inghai] and Khams [Hsik'ang]), 9:2-10.
43. TAI HSIN-SAN, Hou Tsang huan-yu chi, 9:10-17.—See No. 39.
44. LIU LI-CH'TEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 9:17-27.—See No. 5.
45. P'ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), Man san kuo pen-shih, 9:27-32.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to 'The Story of 'aBruguma's Marriage to Kesar,' pp. 125-129.

NO. 10 (31 July, 1947)

48. LIU LI-CH'TEN, Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 10:22-24.—See No. 5.
49. TAI HSIN-SAN, Hou Tsang huan-yu chi, 10:25-31.—See No. 39.

NO. 11 (31 August, 1947)

50. JEN NAI-CH'IANG, Huang-ho ju Ch'uan yü O-lo chieh-wu [78] (The Entry of the River Huang-ho into Szuch'uan and the Question of the Mgodlog Boundaries), 11:2-13.
52. LIU LI-CH'TEN, Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 11:20-24.—See No. 5.
54. LING KUANG-TIEN, Wo tui Lei-po i-jen-ti kuan-kan [80] (Observations and Impressions from My Sojourn Among the Natives at Lei-po [Szuch'uan]), 11:27-32.

NO. 12 (30 September, 1947)

55. HSIEH KUO-AN, Men-yü-chih san—Pu-tan (BHOTAN) [81] (The Mon-yul Territory, Part III—Bhutan), 12:2-7.
56. LIU LI-P'ING (recte-CH'IEN), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 12:7-12.—See No. 5.
58. JEN NAI-CH'IANG, Chi tsui-chin Hsi-tsang cheng-pien [82] (The Most Recent Coup d'état in Tibet), 12:16-22.
59. P'ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), Man san kuo pen-shih, 12:22-26.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to "Kesar's Journey to China and Marriage to gYui dKon mChogmo," pp. 154-157.

NO. 13 (31 October, 1947)

63. TAI HSIN-SAN, Hou Tsang huan-yu chi, 13:7-10.—See No. 39.
64. LIU LI-CH'IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 13:10-15.—See No. 5.
66. P'ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), Man san kuo pen-shih, 13:23-26.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to "Kesar's Victory over the Giant of the North," pp. 189-194.

NO. 14 (30 November, 1947)

69. TAI HSIN-SAN, Hou Tsang huan-yu chi, 14:6-10.—See No. 39.
70. LIU LI-CH'IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 14:11-18.—See No. 5.
71. JEN NAI-CH'IANG, Te-ke Sde-dge t'u-szu shih-p'u, 14:19-30.—See No. 65.
72. Pen-k'an i chih shih-erh ch'i ho-ting-pen ch'u-shou [89] (Numbers 1 to 12 of This Magazine Are Available in One Volume. [It contains, among other things, a list of the contributions of Hsieh Kuo-an, Jen Nai-ch'iang, Liu Li-ch'ien, P'eng Kung-hou, Tai Hsin-san, Ling Kuang-tien, Wang En-yang, Chang Chih-yüan, Li Chien-ming and Ts'en Chung-mien, published in the KYY, Nos. 1-12, and certain financial matters of the Society. Cf. also No. 100]), 14:31-32.
73. HSIEH KUO-AN, Men-yü-ti ch‘i-tien—La-ta-k‘e [90] (Ladakh—the Starting Point of the Mon-yul Territory), 15:2-5.
74. Ch‘uan Tien-chih Tsang-pien [91] (The Tibetan Marches of Szuch‘uan and Yün-nan). Written by the French missionary KU CH‘UN-JEN (= F. GORÈ) and translated by LI CHE-SHENG, professor at Szuch‘uan University. 15:5-13.—This article is the first of a series of translations (for the following parts see Nos. 78, 87, 94, 99, 104, 108, 112, 118, 130, 135 and 139) of F. Gor‘e’s lengthy study called “Notes sur les Marches tibétaines du Sseu-tch‘ouan et du Yun-nan” published in the Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient, Tome XXIII, 1923 (Hanoi 1924), pp. 319-399. In the French original it corresponds to “Part I, Les Marches tibétaines du Sseu-tch‘ouan (Tch‘ouan-pien). A.—Généralités (Notes historiques; Limites actuelles; Configuration générale; Routes; Population; Agriculture; Langue; Religion; Mines; Commerce; Administration et situation économique),” pp. 319-325.
75. LIU LI-CH‘IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 15:13-19.—See No. 5.
76. JEN NAI-CH‘IANG, Te-ke shih-p‘u [92] (Derge Genealogy), 15:19-25.—See No. 65.
77. P‘ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), Man san kuo pen-shih, 15:26-30.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to “Capture of ‘aBruguma by the King of Hor,” pp. 243-247.

NO. 16 (31 January, 1948)

79. JEN NAI-CH‘IANG, Te-ke shih-p‘u, 16:11-18.—See No. 65.
80. LIU LI-CH‘IEN (tr.), Ma-pa i-shih chuan, 16:18-25.—See No. 5.
82. P‘ENG KUNG-HOU (tr.), Man san kuo pen-shih, 16:30-32.—See No. 22. In the original text it corresponds to “Capture of ‘aBruguma by the King of Hor,” pp. 247-249.

NO. 17 (29 February, 1948)

84. Lun ju-ho sui-fu Kuo-lo-k‘e Tsang-min (I yü Hsi-fang jih-pao fa-piao) [95] (How to Pacify Mgo-log Tibetans; printed in the Hsi-fang jih-
pao or "Western Daily"), 17:11-13.
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117. Chou Fu-sheng ju Tsang lü-ch’eng che-chi [118] (Excerpts from Chou Fu-sheng’s Notes on His Journey to Tibet). Edited by TAI HSIN-SAN. Continuation of No. 106. 23:8-21.
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131. KUNG TE-HAI (i.e. YON-TAN-RGYA-MTSHO) (author), LIU LI-CH‘IEN (translator), Hsi-tang tsung-chiao yüan-liu chien-shih, 27:2-9.—See No. 127.
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Georg Morgenstierne
GEORG MORGENSTIERNE AND TIBETAN STUDIES

Per Kvaerne

Due to Georg Morgenstierne’s great fame as an Iranian scholar, it is probably less well-known that during the early years of his academic career he devoted considerable time and effort to the study of Tibetan texts.¹ It is likely that this interest in Tibet can be traced back to his early youth, when, in his own words, “I was a passionate reader of books of travel...in particular Hedin, on whom I became quite an expert.”² After studying Latin and Greek for some years at the University of Oslo (he commenced work on a thesis, never completed, on “The Role of the Matron in Roman Drama”), he decided, in 1914, to concentrate on Indology which he studied in Bonn with H. Jacobi, and, from the autumn of 1915, with H. Lüders in Berlin. While in Berlin he also started studying Tibetan with Herman Beck, under whose guidance he read the Tibetan versions of the Lalitavistara and the Udānavarga. For the study of Sanskrit poetry in Tibetan translation, Beck was undoubtedly the leading expert in Europe at the time. “I also made an attempt at studying Beck’s edition of the Tibetan translation of the Meghadūta. But it was tough going.”³

In 1917 Morgenstierne returned to Oslo (or Kristiania, as it was still called) as a Research Fellow at the University. He gave courses in Sanskrit, completed his doctoral thesis which he sent to Lüders, and continued his Tibetan studies on his own. He returned to Berlin in October 1918 in order to pass his doctoral examination. The University was closed, but his teacher Beck, who in the meantime had become a high official in the Ministry of Education, was able to obtain for him special permission to appear before the board of examiners in private. Beck himself examined him in Tibetan. “I was the first candidate he had ever had, so he was just as anxious as I. But he was most amiable, and all went well.”⁴

Morgenstierne’s doctoral thesis was a study of classical Sanskrit drama.⁵ Accordingly it was in this direction that he pursued his Tibetan studies. “I was still interested in Tibetan, and in the autumn of 1920 I copied in London Candragomin’s drama Lokānanda, which only exists in Tibetan translation.”⁶ It is clear that Morgenstierne prepared an edition and translation of this play, the interest and importance of which he was fully aware. The words of Professor Michael Hahn, who has, more than fifty years later, published the first critical edition and translation of the Lokānanda,⁷ testify to the discernment of Georg Morgenstierne: “Candragomin’s Lokānanda enriches our knowledge of the Indian
theatre in two ways: in the first place, it increases with a further piece the limited number of complete dramatic works consisting of several scenes from the early classic period; secondly, being the oldest Buddhist play preserved in its entirety it represents a link between the works dating from the 2nd century A.D., of which only fragments are preserved, and the Nagānanda of Harṣadeva from the 7th century.\textsuperscript{75}

Among his papers, Morgenstierne left a complete transcription of the Tibetan text of the Lokānānda (68 foolscap pp.) on the basis of the copies of the Tanjur preserved in the British Museum and the Bibliothèque Nationale respectively.\textsuperscript{6} He also wrote a synopsis of the entire play, partly in English but mainly in Norwegian (10 pp.), a translation of the prose parts of the play with notes, likewise mainly in Norwegian (99 pp.), and an extensive card-index of all Tibetan words, with Sanskrit equivalents.

In order to provide a firm basis for this edition and translation, he made a complete transcription of the Nāgānanda (115 pp.), of which the Sanskrit text has been preserved, and this resulted in the article “The Tibetan Version of the Nāgānanda” (Acta Orientalia II [1924], pp. 39-54). This was the only Tibetological article he published, but it was of the same high philological standard which characterised all his later work.

He also turned his attention to the Jātaka-literature as preserved in Tibetan. In particular, he transcribed the first, second and part of the fourth jātaka of the Haribhaṭṭajātakamālā, and made an index of titles of all 35 jātakas of that collection (in all, 45 pp.). Presumably he was encouraged to proceed with this work by F.W. Thomas, with whom he was in contact and who had published an article on the Haribhaṭṭajātakamālā as early as 1904.\textsuperscript{7} Once again, one can only admire Morgenstierne’s sure sense in finding worth-while and important tasks, and once again it has been left to Professor Michael Hahn to open up the Haribhaṭṭajātakamālā, of which he has recently published the Tibetan text and translation of two stories.\textsuperscript{8}

A Tibetologist may be permitted to regret that Morgenstierne’s interest gradually turned towards other fields. However, by 1920 he was already moving towards Iranian studies. Nevertheless, he did not abandon his interest in Tibet. While in Berlin, he had read Laufer’s edition of some of the songs of Milarepa. “I was deeply impressed by his description of the mountain scenery of Tibet.” No doubt Milarepa’s love of the mountain solitudes of Tibet struck a familiar chord, for Morgenstierne had from his earliest childhood been accustomed to spending his holidays in the high Norwegian mountains. In later years he translated three of Milarepa’s songs into Norwegian.\textsuperscript{9}

NOTES

1. Georg Valentin von Munthe af Morgenstierne (1892-1978), Norwegian Indologist and Iranist, professor in Göteborg (Sweden) in 1930, thereafter in Oslo 1937-1962. Among his most important publications
are *Report on a linguistic mission to Afghanistan* (1926), *Etymological vocabulary of Pashto* (1927), *Report on a linguistic mission to North-Western India* (1932), and especially the monumental *Indo-Iranian frontier languages* (1929-1967, reprinted in six volumes 1973). Further publications are *Orthography and sound system of the Avesta* (1942) and *Etymological vocabulary of the Shughni group* (1974). Morgenstierne provided the first descriptions of several local languages of Afghanistan and Pakistan, including some which have now virtually disappeared. He also collected much oral literature in the course of fieldwork spanning more than fifty years. Of Morgenstierne Sir Olaf Caroe once said, 'The candle of his tent burns as clearly as the lamp of his study.'

2. Here and in the following I refer to and quote from an unpublished autobiographical ms., written in Norwegian, now in the possession of the Indo-Iranian Institute of the University of Oslo.


5. P. 35. Translated from German.

6. This and the following mss. are all deposited at the Indo-Iranian Institute of the University of Oslo.


PHONEMIC THEORY AND ORTHOGRAPHIC PRACTICE
IN OLD TIBETAN

Roy Andrew Miller

While it is unquestionably true that the Tibetan grammarians’ tradition\(^1\) was more generally interested in phonemics than in phonetics, this observation ought not to be taken to imply that the purely articulatory level of linguistic description was neglected in their work, or even that this important, and essentially practical, level of linguistic analysis and theory was unknown in Tibet. To be sure, the Tibetan grammarians’ principal concern everywhere on the level of phonology was with the phoneme, a fundamental concept of linguistic analysis with which they were notably well acquainted, if only because their own entire linguistic tradition was so completely grounded in the Indic sources of all linguistic science. The phoneme as a theoretical concept is found documented as early as the second century B.C. in the work of the Indic school represented by Patañjali; the same concept underlies all subsequent systems of Indic grammatical analysis; and in these Indic systems the concept of the phoneme is quite independent of any script or writing-system—even though in fact practical scripts or writing systems have all, to one extent or another, been based upon the phonemic principle\(^2\)—if only for the reason that the earliest Indic systems of linguistic analysis themselves were all evolved prior to and independently of writing systems and script. The concept of the phoneme, like almost every other major idea in linguistic analysis and grammatical description, is an immensely old and important invention of the analytic genius of the ancient Indic civilization, a lasting tribute to the early flowering of the scientific method in that particular part of the world.

Plain as these facts are, they unfortunately are not even today apparently always understood in contexts where they are of basic importance. R.K. Sprigg, for example, has recently suggested that “...translating yi-ge...by ‘phoneme’...[is] a significant infidelity [and an] anachronistic habit”; then, warning to his subject, he further writes that, “This has the effect of giving what is meant as a phonetic interpretation of the script the appearance of a phonemic analysis. It can hardly be that the painstaking and considered labours of Bloomfield, Sapir, Swadesh, Twaddell, and Bloch, to name only a few of the pioneers who strove to make the phoneme concept safe for linguistics, should have been anticipated by an eighteenth-century Tibetan orthoepist.”\(^3\) These groundless slurs, showing as they do their author to be equally uninformed about the Tibetan grammarians’ tradition, its Indic origins, and the history of linguistic science in the West, need not detain us longer here, except to note that they give new evidence for the impossibility
of doing justice to any portion of the Tibetan cultural heritage so long as one insists on treating it as if it had necessarily existed in a historical and intellectual vacuum. Of course, the theory and concept behind the term phoneme are no more a contemporary American concoction than is the term itself (English ‘phoneme’ simply reproduces French phonème, itself a neologism proposed by Dufriche-Desgenettes in 1873 as a handy equivalent for German Sprachlaut, which until then French scholars had calqued as son du langage); to attempt, with Sprigg, to lay it to the charge of a handful of American scholars of the present century would be risible were it not so flagrantly egregious.

But at the same time, and even as we acknowledge the longstanding Tibetan familiarity with the phoneme, we must always also keep in mind that for the Tibetans to have totally neglected phonetics, and to have concentrated instead almost entirely upon phonemics, would have been to show themselves but poor disciples of their Indic masters; and we know that they were not. One can hardly forget, or overlook, the categorization of the Indic tradition as one of homo foneticus indicus; he was not solely homo fonemicus indicus, after all. But then the question becomes one of where, in the Tibetan materials, do we find evidence for this homo foneticus as distinct from a Tibetan homo fonemicus? And once we begin to consider the fuller implications of this particular question, we find ourselves confronted by an apparent paradox, almost a virtual enigma that probably must remain unresolved pending the intensive study of rather more of the corpus of the Tibetan grammarians and their tradition than has yet been explored, even in a preliminary fashion. It may well be that this paradox is only apparent, not real; but for the moment at least, it seems to be quite real enough to interpose serious obstacles in the path of our work.

Most briefly stated, the paradox is that in the Tibetan grammarians' tradition, we find very little mention of phonetics per se, and relatively little attention paid to the phonetic level of linguistic observation and theory as distinct from and as contrasting with the phonemic, at least in so far as we may at present judge the case from what we know of the expository writings of the grammarians themselves.

A significant exception—but probably only a case of the well-known principle of the "exception that proves the rule"—is represented by the fragment from the work of Bsod-rnams Rtse-mo (1142-1182) (SGTT, pp. 56-69), where, inter alia, his phonological observations are conflated with more than one fascinating, if always difficult, reference to language on the essentially phonetic level, e.g., his statement that consonant clusters in initial g- are "articulated first of all from the palate," which must indicate a phonetic realization of phonemic /gs/ as something along the lines of phonetic [xser], or the like.

But against the exception represented by this remarkable text, we must balance the general expository silence of the grammarians on the phonetic level. The heart of the paradox is that despite this rather overwhelming silence of the texts, we do indeed find plenty of overt evidence for Tibetan
observation and analysis on the phonetic level—but it is to be found, not in
the expositions of the grammarians, but in the epigraphical data of the
script itself. Furthermore, and to further heighten the paradox, the
evidence for Tibetan observation and analysis on the phonetic level is
chiefly to be identified in elements of the script that are known, at least to
us, only from Old Tibetan Mss. and other epigraphical sources—sources
with which, again to the best of our present conventional wisdom, the
Tibetan grammarians were unacquainted, and to which, at any rate, they
have not yet been detected at the work of describing. A puzzling paradox
indeed—one that we may hope future studies will somehow resolve, but
one that is, for the moment at least, truly a paradox.

What we have in mind in this connection is of course the evidence now
available to us from Old Tibetan epigraphical sources for the employment
of different, or at least altered, vowel signs of the Tibetan script in order to
write different allophones of the vowels of the language, particularly in the
case of the two vowel phonemes /u/ and /i/. The overt graphic symboliza-
tion of allophones presupposes their identification, at least on some level or
another of linguistic analysis and sophistication; one cannot write what
one does not hear, or what one does not recognize when one hears it. Such
allophonic writings diverge, it is true, from the overall phonemic principle
that underlies all practical and workable orthographies established on the
alphabetic principle; but at the same time that they diverge from that prin-
ciple, and by the very fact of their divergence, they also provide us with
concrete evidence for the phonetic observation and awareness that must
necessarily underlie any overt graphic symbolization, i.e., any "writing,"
of allophones. This is where we find the most impressive evidence for the
study, observation, and sophisticated recognition of the phonetic aspects
of the language on the level of la parole within the Tibetan tradition—not
in the overt statements of the grammarians, but in the covert manipulation
of the orthography as we now know it from chance finds of precious
fragments of non-canonical materials.

For writing an allophone of the vowel phoneme /u/, a phone that was
probably both fronted and unrounded, and for which the cover-symbol [ü]
may serve as a convenient transcription, we have overt epigraphical
evidence from the Tun-huang Ch'ien-tzu-wen in Chinese script with
Tibetan phonetic glosses, a manuscript in which

the scribe makes consistent use of not one but two subscript u-graphs... One of his two u-graphs is of course the normal symbol for u in the
Tibetan script—a subscript hook initially descending to the right, then
curving smoothly around and ascending farther up to the left. The second
of his two u-graphs, and the one which he uses for those cases where the
pronunciation ü was involved (with its secondary, assimilatory fronting
effect upon the previous vowel, or on occasion, with this fronting already
indicated in the vocalization of the prior syllable) is identical with the first
except that at the end of the left-ascending completion of the graph the
line is abruptly terminated, and ended off either with a distinct downward
thrust, or with a heavier (and hence blacker) "pressure point" somewhat reminiscent of similar techniques in Chinese calligraphy.⁹

And for the writing of an acoustically distinctive allophone of the vowel phoneme /i/, a large number of early Mss. and other epigraphic sources employ the so-called "reverse i-graph" (known to our various colleagues as "le gi-gu inversé"; or "das umgekehrte gi-gu"; it is surely significant that we know no old Tibetan name for this striking anomaly of the older script, nor to the best of my knowledge have the grammarians ever commented upon it). This is a graphic mirror-image of the usual i-graph, which arches up and to the right instead of up and to the left, as does the normal i-graph with which we are familiar from the later xylographs and from modern Tibetan orthography. The deviant u-graph for the î allophone of /uî/ is rare, and even when it is found, its employment appears to have been restricted to the graphic representation of non-Tibetan, particularly Chinese words; but the "inversed i" is extremely common in a very wide range of early Tibetan epigraphic materials, where it is used in the orthography of hundreds, even thousands, of purely Tibetan forms. If for no other reason than this, the "inversed i," which hereafter we shall transcribe as ĭ, must surely be reckoned with in any serious account of phonetics, phonemics, and graphs in early Tibetan.

Earlier attempts at correlating the epigraphic evidence for two differentiated u-graphs in certain early Tibetan transcriptions of Chinese have apparently been accepted in the field; at any rate, those attempts have been greeted with silence in the literature ever since they were first proposed in 1967, and under such circumstances one can do little but yield to the natural temptation to interpret silence as consent.

But this has scarcely been the case with attempts made a year earlier, in 1966,¹⁰ to marshal evidence that would allow a phonetic, and specifically an allophonic, interpretation of a significant number of the cases in which we find the ĭ-graph in our early Tibetan sources, interpreting this ĭ-graph as a writing for an allophone of /iî/, speculated in 1966 typically to have been found "in the context of an immediately preceding or following a-vocalization," where the graph in question apparently was "used to write an allophone of /iî/ partially assimilated to the position of articulation of the /a/...In these terms we might well speculate that the resulting 'harmonized' vowel written with the ĭ-graph was something like a high open unrounded [I] in contrast to the 'unharmonized' /iî/, probably a high close unrounded [i]...." (p. 263). But in this formulation of 1966, the key expressions were, and are, such carefully delimited goals as the aim to "do much to bring order into their otherwise apparently random usage" (p. 263), i.e., of the two i-graphs; and the boldest claim that was made at the time had to do simply with it now being "possible to observe a large measure of order" (loc. cit.). In other words, the search then (and now) is only for a phonetic interpretation of a significantly large number of the cases. It was stressed at the outset that "in [one and] the same document it is easy to see the copyist
waver between using and not using the \[i\] notation,\" and also that the
most one could reasonably hope for in this connection was to identify \"the
dominant patterns involving the use of \[i\] (both loc. cit.). The goal was clearly
not to state some iron-clad rule or to discover a \"final solution\" that
would then somehow admit of application to each and every notation of \[i\]
in each and every early Tibetan text, whether now known and edited or
still unknown and awaiting publication; and it certainly was not to for-
mulate rules that would somehow explain why the \[i\]-graph was \textit{not} used on
any given occasion in a given document, since the entire concept of the for-
mulation of negative rules that would cover the non-occurrence of
evidence is one that is at best far removed from the usual limits of linguistic
theory.

Above all, one would hardly expect to find here—nor did one so expect
in 1966—a rigorously codified, absolutely exceptionless rule; and indeed,
none was found. Again, it must be stressed that the chief concern of the
1966 study was the identification of \"dominant patterns,\" nothing
more—and by the same token, nothing less. This follows directly from the
nature of the allophone, or phone, \textit{vis-à-vis} the theory and definition of the
phoneme. Phonemes are significant contrastive units of a language, on the
level of \textit{la langue}. They are fixed, finite in number, definite, and a matter of
linguistic fact; if you know the language, you are able to recognize the con-
trasts and oppositions that operate within its phonemic system. Alphabetic
writing systems are phonemic in principle, otherwise they would not be
able to \"work.\" (One must of course except from this general statement
such writing systems as that of English, where the alphabetic, i.e., the
phonemic, principle, has gone berserk, and where as a result the entire or-
thography, in a sense, hardly \"works\" at all.)

Allophones, or phones, are something quite different. They exist on the
level of \textit{la parole}; they are not a matter of fact, they are a matter of opi-
nion, in the sense that their identification depends upon our keeness of
ear. We cannot ask how many allophones or phones there are in a given
language, only how keen or well-trained our ear is, and hence how many
we will probably be able to detect. And even an ear that is keen one day
may be dull the next. Allophones or phones are not fixed, finite in number,
or definite matters of linguistic fact. Any writing system that begins to note
them in anything approaching an even moderately exhaustive manner,
down to and including the IPA, almost immediately finds itself with more
symbols than anyone concerned with the whole operation can convenient-
lly remember, much less employ. All allophonic notation, by its very nature
and also within the terms of the definition of the phoneme itself, can never
be expected to be totally rigorous, absolutely rigid, thoroughly exhaustive,
or uniformly regular. Any and all such criteria would be within the realm
of the phoneme, not the phone.

What was done in 1966 was rather to attempt to apply the theory of a
phonetic, allophonic interpretation of the \[i\]-graph as a writing at some times
and in some texts for an allophone of \(/i/\). In the process of that attempt it
was found that such application made it possible to establish a significant hierarchy of categories within the Old Tibetan epigraphical materials then available to us: we found that, as we might expect from the nature of the matter, "the i was not always used when it might have been: ...sometimes ... a scribe begins to use it and then apparently grows tired or bored with the whole process as the manuscript continues" (p. 264), while in other texts, "the scribe ... clearly remembers he prefers the vowel-harmony role of the i-graph" (p. 273), and in still others, the scribe had become a victim of what we called "graphic mannerism," and eventually "lost all interest in recording the distinction" (ibid.). From this there followed in turn certain tentative conclusions concerning what these correlations of writing and language might possibly have to tell us about which texts were earlier, and which were later, within the confines of that large body of Old Tibetan epigraphical materials for which we have no other means for establishing datings.

Particularly in consideration of the extremely tentative nature of these early approaches to the question of the i, it is gratifying in the extreme to learn that they have now been substantially supported by—and what is even more important, that they have proven themselves to be useful in explaining the epigraphical evidence of—a large number of early Tibetan documents that were still unpublished and largely unavailable in 1966. In particular one is pleased to learn that Dr. Manfred Taube has, in his painstaking studies of ca. 263 fragments of early Tibetan texts now to be found in the Turfan-Sammlung of the Academy of Sciences in Berlin, DDR, found the 1966 formulation on the allophonic role of the i to be of utility in bringing "a large measure of order" to the data: "In der Tat ist auffällig, daß auch bei diesen Texten unterschiedlichster Provenienz das nach rechts eingerollte i-Zeichen in über Hälfte aller vorkommenden Fälle (28 von 50) in engem Zusammenhang steht mit einer Silbe, die den Stammvokal a enthält: dge ba'i (Tib 129), bdag (Tu 91), lhan čig (Tib 110), č'ab srjä (Tib 117) usw." (p. 132).—in a word, in precisely the phonological contexts of occurrence predicted by the 1966 formulation. At the same time, the occurrence in these same Turfan-Sammlung documents of instances of i that are not covered by the 1966 allophonic formulation should occasion no surprise, since as already pointed out, this in and of itself fits in quite well with the nature of the allophone, and indeed only serves to underscore the essentially sporadic, impressionistic, and unpredictable nature of all allophonic notation.

But at the same time that one is gratified to be able to point out the way in which the 1966 formulation for the allophonic role of i in Old Tibetan texts has been validated by Dr. Taube's work with the fragments in the Turfan-Sammlung in the DDR, one is also regretfully compelled to comment on certain aspects of other work along these same lines, of fairly recent date, for which we are in debt to Dr. Tor Ulving (hereafter U).

U reaches the conclusion that "we have to resign to the view that the 'reversed i-sign' is merely a graphical variant of the ordinary i-graph, con-
ditioned [sic—understand as ‘influenced by,’ in the sense of ‘in imitation of’—RAM] by the employment of two i-graphs in the Indic prototype of the Tibetan script” (p. 215). But the key passage in U’s conclusions, and the line that indeed fortunately obviates the necessity for refuting most of his 1972 contribution, is found immediately preceding the line just cited: “I do not see that the i-graph writings can be reduced to any system based on the assumption of their symbolizing a special vowel quality” (loc. cit.). By writing “...reduced to any system...,” U clearly demonstrated that he has missed the point, and at the same time conveniently identifies for us just what the point is that he has missed. There never was, nor is there now, in all of this, any question of “reduction to a system.” Systems are matters of phonemes, not of allophones or phones. With a notation, particularly with a partial and sporadic notation, reflecting and based upon allophones, we do not expect to encounter thoroughly consistent, wholly predictable systems toward which we may “reduce” our data—nor do we find one here. Any allophonic notation, ancient or modern alike, is a question of the keenness of the ear of the recorder, and is subject to the limitations imposed by the constant necessity for making hard choices between whether to note a feature of pronunciation—assuming that one has really heard it—or not to note it, in which case one sincerely hopes that one has not. The entire process is well described as an infinitely intertwined set of connected continuities and gradual gradations that constantly shade and fade into one another; it is the variety of linguistic problem for which we expect multiple, non-unique solutions; and in this last in particular, we are hardly disappointed in the evidence available from our early Tibetan documentary and epigraphical sources. U has missed the point of all this.

At the same time, one cannot help but admit that in a certain limited sense, it is indeed fortunate that U’s paper provides us with such clear evidence of his misunderstanding of the theoretical basis for this entire question, since otherwise his arguments would be difficult to refute. They would otherwise be difficult to refute for two reasons; one, his arguments are much belabored by a number of internal contradictions; two, he proceeds on the basis of a set of private assumptions concerning details of the pronunciation of early Tibetan that are clearly and obviously gratuitous.

Under the first of these two rubrics, a full inventory of U’s internal contradictions would not only tax our readers’ patience but also far exceed our own limits of energy, time, and publication-space; fortunately, a representative sample of the evidence will suffice.

Internal contradictions of argumentation and methodology severely limit the utility of U’s remarks from their outset. Thus, at the very same time that he stresses “the fact [sic!] that we know next to nothing about the Tibetan dialects of the early times,” (p. 208, note 1), U simultaneously scores us in the following terms: “Miller reveals the astonishing fact that he evidently takes no account at all of the spoken language hiding between the text...” (p. 212). Similarly, we are charged with studying “simply juxtapositions of syllables without the slightest consideration of their func-
tioning in the living spoken language" (p. 215). Now as a general rule of thumb, in philology as well as in life, either one can do something, or at least attempt to do it, or one cannot; but it hardly seems fair thus to be scored for not attempting what U first of all points out (p. 208, note 1) is in his own view impossible. All this seems not only internally contradictory but also rather less than fair, particularly since the 1966 formulation was based in its methodology upon just what U mistakenly claims was not "taken...account of at all," i.e., upon an attempt in so far as our sources and knowledge today allow it, to study the orthographical idiosyncracies of Old Tibetan texts in the light of the evidence that we do have available for what the nature was of the spoken language that must lay behind them. Nor were many such attempts made in the literature generally, prior to 1966. Even the metaphor of "spoken language hiding behind the text" with which U assails us (p. 212) is taken over directly from our own 1966 formulation, where we noted how "the facts of the living language have more than once broken through [the] best-intentioned orthographic defenses" (p. 257).

Nor are the internal contradictions of U's rebuttal limited to his approach to our 1966 formulation; they literally stud every passage of his own new contribution as well. First we are told that "in the modern Lhasa dialect...vowel assimilation takes place only when there is a close connection between the syllables involved, as between base and suffix, or the constituents of a disyllabic compound word" (p. 209). But shortly thereafter it is categorically claimed, but with no supporting evidence advanced at all, that "Iha myi 'gods and men' [is] hardly the type of collocation where vowel assimilation operates" (p. 213). As we shall note further below, the precise nature of this "connection," resp. "close connection" that U professes to be able to identify intuitively within the morphology and syntax of early forms of Tibetan is extremely nebulous; but at the very least, and giving the entire issue all possible and due benefit of doubt, if we are looking for "a close connection between the syllables involved, as between...the constituents of a disyllabic compound word," might not a word such as Iha myi, Iha myi, Iha mi be a likely candidate? On what grounds has it simply been excommunicated, and why is it "hardly the type of collocation where vowel assimilation operates"? Little more need be said, and nothing more need be added, in the face of arguments as capricious and volatile as these.

Second, there is the rather more serious issue of U's gratuitous assumption of concrete details concerning the pronunciation of Old Tibetan. Fresh from having warned us that "next to nothing is known about the Tibetan dialects of the early times from which his [i.e., RAM's] documents stem" (p. 208, note 1), U next proceeds himself to a wholly amazing display of data concerning intimate internal details of the pronunciation of just those same dialects—data to which he alone appears to be privy, and data presented without a shred of philological evidence. The detail that most of U's unwarranted claims and statements in this connection are disarmed, if not defused, by a judicious sprinkling of qualifying "probable"s and "pro-
bably’s, and similar disclaimers throughout his contribution, is sadly offset by his penchant for advancing other claims not so qualified with the most emphatic terms available, e.g. “surely,” “out of the question,” and “inconceivable,” to list some of his favorite epithets. Again, only a sampling of this egregious gratuitousness is possible, but it will suffice.

Thus, U writes, “it surely makes a great deal of difference to our interpretation of a collocation of morphemes whether we have to do with mi the negative or mi ‘man,’ or la the particle or la ‘mountain pass’” (p. 212): but how can we be this “sure”? “It is not probable that a numeral was so closely bound to this preceding noun that its vowel was affected” (p. 212): who established these probabilities, and on what grounds? “Iha myi...[is] hardly the type of collocation where vowel assimilation operates” (p. 213): how do we know this? “It is out of the question that the a-vowel of the unstressed particle la—there is no reason to believe that it was otherwise at the period concerned—should influence the vowel of a following word with which it is not in any respect closely connected” (p. 213): why is it “out of the question,” how can anyone be this certain about stress in a language none of us has ever heard (or ever will!), and what is meant or implied by “connection”? “It is inconceivable that the vowel of the negation was assimilated to the preceding particle...” (p. 213): inconceivable to whom, and upon what grounds? “...the ‘ablative’ particle nas, itself an unstressed morpheme hardly capable of influencing the vowel of the following particle” (p. 214): how do we know it was unstressed, and who can tell what it was or was not capable of in Old Tibetan? “This particle was in all probability unstressed then as it is now, and it is very unlikely that its weak vowel would have assimilated the i to i...” (p. 214): no comment necessary. “...the few instances...where vowel change would be theoretically possible—a few closely knit constructions...lose their power of conviction” (p. 215): who knows what is or is not “theoretically possible” in any language, and what precisely defines a “closely knit construction,” also how are the constructions cited in this connection a whit different from Iha mi which is “hardly the type of collocation where vowel assimilation operates”? “...it is out of the question...” (p. 216): no comment.

Collation of U’s many references to “connection,” resp. “close connection” or “closeness” as a quality or linguistic criterion obtaining between forms in Old Tibetan throws but little light upon what he intends to mean by these terms. The criterion he thus invokes is apparently yet another of those several intimate details about Old Tibetan to which U alone in all the world is privy. About the only coherent pattern that identifies itself under this rubric appears to be rooted in translation into English: Old Tibetan forms that may end up being translated as English nouns (la ‘mountain pass,’ mi ‘man’) seem in U’s system automatically to be assigned to a linguistic category that is somehow differently weighted from the category to which belong forms that must be translated otherwise, or forms that being “particles” do not translate very well into English, or into any Indo-
European language, in the first place. One wonders what the Old Tibetan speakers responsible for our texts would have made of this nice distinction.

Still, it would hardly be correct to leave the impression that there is nothing to admire in U’s contribution. One cannot, for example, help but admire the confidence that U exudes in his own privy sources for information concerning the details of the pronunciation of Old Tibetan. After U has, for example, told us flatly that he can point to “syllables which in the living speech of the time cannot in any way have constituted such closely knit entities as are the condition for vowel assimilation to operate” (p. 217), how can one possibly reply, except to offer what must necessarily appear to be, particularly in the face of such aplomb, the entirely lame excuse that unlike U, one has not heard “the living speech of the time,” and so one cannot say nearly as much about its details as U apparently can, and surely does. Most of us would count ourselves fortunate to have at our disposal descriptions of living Tibetan languages encompassing phonetic descriptions of the order of precision, particularly with respect to stressed and unstressed syllables, that U seems to have at his command for the “living speech” of the Old Tibetan period. Nor can one cease to envy U for controlling an ancient language so securely that he is able to state flatly and firmly what is and is not “out of the question” or “inconceivable” for occurrence in that language; few of us can say as much for any language, even modern languages we know, speak, and use daily.

Buddhism teaches us that all outer appearances are illusory, that everything having forms is impermanent. No one doubts that this is so; still, this noble doctrine can only cause practical difficulties if we apply it quite literally to certain mundane encounters, and on its strength, e.g., refuse to remove ourselves from out of the path of a speeding train or motor-car. Illusory and impermanent though the vehicle in question may be, we had still better get out of the way when we see it coming. Linguistics teaches us that terminology is essentially trivial, nothing more than names that the linguist assigns arbitrarily, and that as a consequence one linguistic term is always quite as good, or as suitable, as another, so that it does not really matter just what a given linguistic entity or phenomenon is called; and there is also little point in arguments about whether something ought properly to be called this or that in linguistic discourse. Again, no one doubts the truth of this, but that still does not mean that it is a very good idea to push the principle involved to its fullest limits, e.g., to refer to as ‘nouns’ words in a given language that have inflections for tense, aspect, or voice, or as ‘verbs’ words involved in genitive, accusative, or ablative case-relations, etc.

Reading U teaches us that in many respects, the question of the arbitrary nature of linguistic terminology is rather like the question of the reality of the speeding motor-car bearing down upon us in the road: again, experience shows that an important gap must here be recognized to exist between theory—or belief, if one wishes to put it that way—and practice. Though linguists are supposed to understand that all linguistic terminology
is arbitrary, often they either do not so understand, or even understanding it, they forget it, and as a result draw misleading conclusions simply on the basis of their over-literal understanding or interpretation of an arbitrary term that someone else has happened to employ. This is always unfortunate.

In the present instance, serious misunderstanding appears to have occurred on U's part simply because the 1966 formulation of the allophonic role of the Old Tibetan i-graph was then expressed using the term "vowel harmony." It is now clear that the introduction of that term in order to categorize the evidence available for a number of rather varied sets of assimilatory shifts within the vocalisation of Old Tibetan, at least in so far as we (who lack U’s privy sources for the intimate details of Old Tibetan pronunciation, alas!) have evidence for these assimilatory changes at work in the texts, has proved to be the quite innocent source for much misunderstanding, and even the origin of serious scandal. All this has been as unfortunate as it has been unnecessary. Even as we move ourselves out of the path of the speeding motor-car, we ought never to forget, this is not real: no forms are permanent, no linguistic terms are absolute.

Another, related, and equally unfortunate misunderstanding has centered about the relevance of citing non-Tibetan forms as somehow providing what U most recently refers to as "illustration [of] the general principle..." of this or that historical linguistic change (e.g., U. p. 204, footnote 2). Earlier U had objected most strongly to our citing Middle Chinese forms, as possibly exhibiting significant historical parallels for developments within Tibetan, preferring instead to illustrate the same point himself with citations from Old Nordic. To this a likely reply seemed to be that while "[t]he dangers of citing Chinese or for that matter any non-Tibetan evidence in this connection are only too apparent through all the discussion of the problem...the controlled introduction of Chinese evidence...attempted in 1955 still seems to be preferable both as theory and as practice to the only model for these developments which [U] offers, 'the a-umlaut of the type well known from Indo-European, e.g. Old Nordic horma < 'huma'. Surely Chinese is at least as much to the point here as Germanic." U has now replied that we "quite overlook[ed] the fact that these IE forms were not compared with any forms in Tibetan, but were only meant to illustrate the general principle of a-umlaut." (U, p. 204, footnote 2).

The gratuitous assumption that there exists, somewhere in the world, a "general principle of a-umlaut," apparently to be understood, from U's lines, as a natural tendency of human speech, is one fraught with so many theoretical and methodological perils that it would be impossible even to begin to list them here. For the present, it must suffice to point out that calling a given phenomenon in a given language a "general principle," even if the language is Indo-European, does not necessarily make it so.

Second, and more importantly, we have here to face up somehow to the entire issue of whether or not superficial historical parallels from non-
related languages are ever relevant in the type of discussion here underway. Linguistic history is still history. Simply because something may be shown to have happened once, somewhere, to someone, at some time in history, does this really make it any more (or for that matter, any less) probable that the same thing also happened independently elsewhere, at another time and place, to others? One wonders. It has been suggested that "Chinese is at least as much to the point here as Germanic;" why? Because of the existence of a considerable body of evidence that points to the validity of the assumption that, even though not genetically related, Chinese and Tibetan are nevertheless still both languages that belong to a common "linguistic area," and also because of the secondary assumption that parallels in details of linguistic development shared between members of a common linguistic area are indeed significant for the consideration of the history of the languages in question. This is why Chinese data is probably relevant to the history of Old Tibetan phonology, and vice versa; it is also why data from Old Nordic and other Indo-European languages is not—unless we are prepared to put Indo-European also into the same "linguistic area" with Chinese and Tibetan.

Third, there is the problem of linguistic terminology, which need not detain us much longer, and has already confused the total issue far more than was ever necessary. Since "vowel harmony" apparently is so prone to such serious misunderstanding, e.g. by U, it was an innocent but apparently also a bad choice of terms. We ought rather to look for a less misleading term, even though no linguistic term is ever so perfect that someone somewhere will not be misled by its employment. But particularly keeping in mind the importance of the concept of the linguistic area in advancing a discussion such as the present one, we might now suggest replacing "vowel harmony" in the 1966 formulation with the term "i-breaking," thus identifying, in terms of a common linguistic area, the Tibetan phenomenon in question with the generally thus-designated and well-attested phenomenon known to us from most of the Altaic languages, particularly (but by no means exclusively) from Mongolian. The term "i-breaking" is quite accurately descriptive of what was at the heart of the 1966 formulation that has caused U such difficulties: an assimilatory shift of an [i] allophone of /i/ in the direction of [I] when found in the immediate phonological context of a preceding or following /a/. Of course it remains to be seen whether thus changing the name of the thing helps to reduce the misunderstanding that has surrounded it; but one may hope so.

The familiar and often-cited examples of this "i-breaking" as it is observed, e.g. in the Mongolian languages are not only, without serious question, rather more to the point in all this than examples from Old Nordic ever can be; they also provide significant and useful parallels for the Old Tibetan data, and at the same time they are especially valuable for the light that they incidentally throw upon the unrealistic nature of many of U’s assumptions, particularly upon his often reiterated pronouncements to the effect that this or that sequence is "hardly the type of collocation where
vowel assimilation occurs," or that "it is out of the question that the a-vowel of the unstressed particle...should influence the vowel of a following word," or that "an unstressed morpheme [is] hardly capable of influencing the vowel," etc., etc. As already pointed out above, none of these ex cathedra rulings may be questioned, much less fairly criticized, because we are never told upon what data they are based; only U knows, and he does not tell us. But essentially underlying all these claims it is not difficult to identify the a priori assumption that in any language, including Tibetan, an unstressed vowel cannot, and never could, have been "responsible" for assimilatory shifts of the "vowel harmony" variety.

How does this assumption fare when measured alongside the established facts of the history of the Mongolian languages? Not very well. The Mongolian languages always have their stress (which Poppe calls exspiratorische Druck or Akzent) on the first syllable, unless the second syllable is long or a diphthong; and this is a feature that they inherited directly from the Proto-Altaic linguistic unity. Nevertheless, it is exactly and precisely an unstressed a in the second syllable that triggers the "i-breaking." In other words, if we apply U's a priori assumption, his "general principle," to the Mongolian languages, then we would be able to "prove" that the "i-breaking" seen in such sets as Khalkha mαxhε 'flesh, meat,' = Mo. miqan 'id.,' or Urdu sαrα 'yellow' = Mo. sira 'id.,' along with hundreds of other examples, could not and never did take place; but they did. So U's "general principle" and his a priori assumptions about what an "unstressed vowel" can or cannot do simply do not hold up against the evidence of the history of languages from the same linguistic area, no matter how neatly they may fit into the history of certain of the Indo-European languages.

Similarly, and this time restricting ourselves solely to Tibetan materials, one could, by applying U's a priori assumptions, "prove" that there never took place the fronting of the stem vocalisation before the addition of the diminutive morpheme in -Cu, changes studied and documented two decades ago in painstaking detail by our colleague Uray. But these shifts also certainly did occur; we have the evidence in the texts that they did. In other words, it is really very risky to postulate what is "unlikely" or "inconceivable" in linguistic history. Just as in all history, so also in the history of languages, it is sometimes apparently just the most unlikely, the most inconceivable things that actually do turn out to happen.

Further it might be noted that, quite like the Old Tibetan allophone sometimes written in our texts with the i-graph, the Mongolian (and other Altaic) "i-breaking" is a phenomenon that also began as a peculiarity of pronunciation, an allophonic, sub-phonemic feature of the languages in question. Sometimes the assimilatory shifts involved "went all the way," resulting finally in phonemic, i.e. in genuine "linguistic change," but sometimes they did not. And this in turn is why Poppe writes of the "i-breaking," that it "is a peculiar feature of spoken [Mongolian] languages. This does not mean, however, that it occurs there in all cases. On the con-
trary, there are numerous cases in which the vowel "i" regularly remains as such and, when becoming another vowel, it does so independently of the vocalism of the following syllable... In numerous cases the 'breaking' occurs, ... but there are numerous inconsistencies."23

Here we have an excellent account of what is exactly the same situation as the one that we observe in the epigraphic evidence for the Old Tibetan allophonic pronunciation of /i/ as something like [l], and sometimes written with the i-graph; we can also understand from this passage, and from the parallels with the "i-breaking" suggested above, why it is fatuous to continue to look for absolute rules, or total consistency, in the scribal employment of this graph in our Old Tibetan texts. Consistency is of the nature of the phonemic principle, and of writing systems based on that principle; inconsistency is of the nature of phonetic writing, with its sporadic, always less-than-rigorous notation of auditory differences on the sub-phonemic level. Once this is clear, then it also becomes clear just how and why scribal inconsistencies may themselves be of value, providing as they do a means for dating more than one text, at least within terms of a relative chronological sequence;24 but even more important, perhaps, is the conclusion that they do not, in and of themselves, invalidate the 1966 formulation for the allophonic role of the Old Tibetan i-graph.

With this, we have done more than simply attempt to explore, at least in a preliminary fashion, some of the major implications of the concepts of phone and phoneme, and particularly some of the ways in which these essential—and essentially—Indic concepts of linguistic science relate to the problems of the orthography of our Old Tibetan texts, even though that alone, to be sure, is quite worth doing, and hence has here been worth our time to undertake. Nevertheless, quite over and above this immediate consideration of enhancing our understanding of the phonological dimensions of Old Tibetan and its orthography, there remains another quite separate but intimately related domain of problems: the eventual development of a more rigorously methodological approach to the question of Tibetan text-criticism than anything that has been up to now at our disposal. The exploitation of our newly enhanced understanding of the principles upon which the Old Tibetan orthography was based, in particular of its sporadic employment of allophonic writings for certain of the vowels, toward the ultimate ends of text-criticism remains one of the most important of all possible applications of these studies, and as such ought not to be lost sight of, even if the purely linguistic aspects of these problems were not of themselves of value and interest. Well over two decades ago, Li Fang-kuei remarked quite accurately that "a critical apparatus for the edition of ancient Tibetan texts has not been available."25 Nor may we expect that one will ever become available, until we ourselves become better equipped to operate in the realms of Old Tibetan phonology, phonetics, and orthography. Viewing the question in this way, we soon perceive that whether Sprigg mistakenly believes that the Tibetans were ignorant of the phoneme, or even if he erroneously suggests that the phoneme is a modern
American invention, or whether or not Ulving understands the difference between a phonetic and a phonemic approach to orthography, or recognizes the guises in which both of these are likely to reveal themselves in a given text, are all actually matters of but little moment, except in as far as such positions interfere with the progress of Tibetan studies, particularly by interposing quite unnecessary blocks of stumbling into our path of progress toward the ultimate development of a rigorous methodology of text-criticism for early Tibetan texts and documents. When they do this, then regretfully it becomes necessary to remove such obstacles from the path of our science as expeditiously as possible. For until at least the preliminary steps of this work of clearing away such misunderstandings of the relationship between linguistic entities and orthographic realities have been accomplished, Tibetan studies will remain, as they already have too long been, quite at the mercy of the most naive approach imaginable to the nature of these texts, and to the solution of their problems—even culminating at times in the genial suggestion that what one should do with a difficult text is simply to rewrite it into something easier to understand, on the grounds that “the printing blocks have frequently worn out and been remade, offering opportunities for mistakes to creep in.”

When in 1808 Friederich von Schlegel wrote what has been called “[t]he manifesto of the Romantic tradition in Indian studies,” he published it under the impressive title of Über die Sprache und Weisheit der Inder. Such a resounding title would surely not be in favor today, but it may nevertheless give us pause for thought; perhaps, in studying all these things, we today are too quick to separate Sprache from Weisheit; but the Indians did not, and neither did the Tibetans. We need not necessarily propose the restoration of the Romantic tradition in Indic studies, or in Tibetan studies, in order to be reminded that, after all, one of the essential reasons for studying any of these things, Indic or Tibetan alike, can only derive from a conviction that they do in one manner or another embody Weisheit. The Tibetans, like their Indic masters, knew much that we today can only slowly and painstakingly recover, and probably never master. But the way to begin is hardly to assume, out of hand, that they knew less than we do about all these matters, especially when there is so much concrete evidence to the contrary. The Tibetan grammarians did know and understand the concept of the phoneme: it is only in London today that the same idea seems poorly comprehended. The scribes responsible for the Old Tibetan documents embodied in their orthographic practice not only the phonemic principle but also a certain degree of sub-phonemic notation of pronunciation variations: again, what was apparently clear enough to them seems obscure only in certain European academic circles. In linguistics, as in all other fields of Tibetan studies, we will do well to begin from an initial assumption for the prior existence of Weisheit on the part of those whose cultural traditions and monuments we are bold enough to attempt to study, rather than gratuitously masking the achievements of others in our own ignorance. “As Bhartrhari himself puts it, the Goddess of Learning does not
smile on those who neglect the ancients."²⁸

NOTES


2. This is even true, mutatis mutandis, of the Chinese writing system, though a demonstration of this claim would unfortunately take us too far afield here.


4. Likely to be overlooked, but in its own way a most useful contribution to the history both of the concept and of the term phoneme is Youn-han Kim, 'The Origin of the Phoneme Theory,' Eoneohag, Journal of the Linguistic Society of Korea 3.47-60 (1978), a valuable article that will repay the search necessary to locate it in most libraries. It would, for example, have spared Sprigg not only his mistaken assumptions but also his embarrassingly inaccurate generalizations.

5. These issues are treated fully elsewhere; see my paper 'Phone, Phoneme and Graph in the Old Tibetan Grammarians,' AOH 34.153-162 (1980).

6. As we have shown elsewhere ('The Far East,' in Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., Current Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 13, Historiography of Linguistics. Mouton, The Hague & Paris 1975 pp. 1213-64), the case of China provides evidence for a tradition of linguistic science also growing out of Indic origins but less closely associated with them than was that of Tibet—but the case of China was also, as it happened, one in which phonemics was pursued and refined to the eventual (and unfortunate) total neglect of phonetics.

7. Quoted in RSG, p. xiii.


as much as we did not, in 1966, undertake to study the evidence on this question preserved in the Tun-huang versions of the Tibetan Rāmāyaṇa, not then having the necessary materials conveniently at hand. Recently these texts have been most carefully edited by J. W. de Jong, 'The Tun-Huang Manuscripts of the Tibetan Rāmāyaṇa Story,' *Indo-Iranian Journal* 19.37-88 (1977), where at last all the relevant epigraphical evidence is marshaled, and only waiting for someone to investigate.

12. Tor Ulving, 'Tibetan Vowel Harmony Reexamined,' *T'oung Pao* 58.203-17 (1972).

13. We are also accused by U, p. 215, of having "ransacked a number of early manuscripts, largely of the 9th and 10th centuries, discovered in the Tun-huang caves and other Central Asian sites." But English 'ransack' means two different things, and it is not clear which of these two is the sense of U's allegation. If he meant 'ransack' in the sense of 'to search through and carry away all valuables in, to pillage,' the charge is false; if he meant 'ransack' in the sense of 'to search every part of,' then one can only ask, what in the world is wrong with that?


16. We take this position here and for the present simply as the working hypothesis that appears to us best to reflect the present state of comparative research in this area.


21. Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, p. 39 ff. There is also a considerable literature on a parallel "i-breaking" phenomenon in the other Altaic languages, including Japanese and Korean, some of the more important items from which are cited in *ZDMG* 126.*69*, note 13 (1976).


23. Poppe, *Introduction to Mongolian Comparative Studies*, p. 34.

24. See *Language* 42.273 (1966) for specific examples.

25. *T'oung Pao* 44.5 (1956).


27. Thus, *RSG*, p. 49.

402. Bhartṛhari (ca. 7th century AD), is the author of "the earliest extant work specifically devoted to the philosophy of grammar," his Vākyapadīya.
ARMENIANS IN INDIA AND TIBET

H. E. Richardson

An article which is probably not so well known as it deserves to be is "The Ledger of the Merchant Hovhannes Joughayetsi" by Levon Khachikian of Soviet Armenia, communicated by Professor Suniti Kumar Chatterji in the Journal of the Asiatic Society VII 1966.

Hovhannes was an Armenian merchant of Jougha (Julfa), a suburb of Isfahan, who in 1682 entered into partnership with a leading Armenian company in India trading in the Levant, China, and many other parts of the world. They had a branch in Lhasa and the article contains extracts from the ledger dealing with Tibet, Nepal and India. Publication of the complete ledger with a comprehensive analysis is foreshadowed in the article but I do not know whether it has yet been achieved.

Hovhannes joined the firm's branch at Lhasa in 1686 and his journal gives meticulous details of his merchandize and its prices, his borrowings and transmission of funds and so on. He describes the route by which he travelled by way of Nepal, Kuti and Shigatse. The goods he took with him were of many kinds including pearls, amber and piece goods. At Lhasa, where he stayed for nearly six years, he found Armenian employees of his principals already well established with their families, apparently for some years, and accustomed to trade as far afield as Sining. Hovhannes had many business dealings—and some disputes—with his fellow countrymen and with Newars, and Kashmiris as well as Tibetans including lamas, nobles and traders. During his stay he learnt Tibetan and when he left in June 1692 he took a large consignment of musk.

There is in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, Bengal, 1833 an article by Csona de Kórös about a Tibetan passport recorded in Hyde's Historia Religionis Veterum Persarum (1760), as having been granted by the governor of Lhasa to an Armenian Joannes (the name in Tibetan is represented as I-wang-na) on his departure from the city; but as the year is 1688 it cannot relate to Hovhannes of the ledger.

The extracts from that ledger tell little about the social and political life of Tibet; perhaps publication of the complete document will shed more light on such matters. But the insights Hovhannes gives on the business world draw attention to the important part the Armenians played in Asian trade.

This is not the place to follow all the vicissitudes of their history which goes back to the seventh century B.C. and includes a probable trading connection with China as early as the fifth century A.D. We may take as a start-
ting point for their connection with India and Central Asia the establishment of the New Kingdom of Cilicia at the beginning of the 12th century. Its king Heythum formed an alliance with the Mongols and went himself to visit Ogotai at Karakoram in the then fashionable hope of finding in Asia a champion to deliver the Holy Land from the infidel. Armenians, both monk and lay, were met at the court of Ogotai’s successor Kuyuk by the Franciscan friar William of Rubruck.

The Armenians in Cilicia controlled the great entrepot port of Ayas (Lajazzo) on the gulf of Alexandretta which had long been a channel of trade between the East and West and which under them thrived greatly and developed links all over Europe, especially through Venice. The Polo family passed through Ayas on their way to the Far East. Armenian merchants had probably preceded them along the trade routes through Central Asia. But what set on foot a great commercial diaspora throughout the whole known world was a series of conquests of Cilician Armenia by one neighbouring power after another—Egyptian, Ottoman Turk, and Persian. Armenians emigrated to many parts of Europe and to China, where as early as the 13th century an Armenian lady had built a church at Zaitun, and to India where they are reported by 1497. A great commercial centre was established in Persia when in 1602 the ruler Shah Abbas, having lost control of Cilicia to the Ottomans, transferred 50,000 Armenians to a new city he made for them at Julfa, a suburb of Isfahan. From there their trade branched out even more strongly. They became international bankers and money was transferred through their branches all over Asia and Europe.

In India they rapidly settled in the more important business centres where they became known as courageous, honest and charitable and won the reputation of the hardest and most reliable masters of caravans through Central Asia. Bento de Goes on his great journey in 1603 from Agra to China travelled in disguise as an Armenian and was accompanied by a faithful and resolute Armenian servant Ishaq. Some Armenians in their wide-ranging activities found employment early in the 16th century as bodyguards to the king of Martaban.

Their status in India was greatly enhanced when Akbar married an Armenian Christian lady whose influence won for her community permission to build a church at Agra. Other churches with their accompanying graveyards duly followed at other Armenian settlements at Surat, Delhi, Patna, Calcutta, Bombay and Madras. Akbar’s esteem for the Armenians led him to appoint as Chief Judge, Khwaja Abdul Hai who was then converted to Islam. But the most famous was Mirza Zulkarnain. The titles Khwaja, Mirza, Beg, and Mukhtear borne by distinguished Armenians reflect their Persian connection. Zulkarnain’s father Mirza Sikander who arrived in India in 1590 found favour with Akbar. He married Juliana, a daughter of the Chief Judge Abdul Hai; she retained her Christian faith and was apparently related to Akbar’s Christian wife Mariam. By her Mirza Sikander had two sons, Sikander and Zulkarnain born in 1592 and 1595 respectively. Later, on Juliana’s death, he married her sister and had two
more sons.

Juliana’s sons were brought up by Akbar’s wife Mariam in the imperial harem and there Zulkarnain became a favourite of the prince Jahangir. In 1606, after he had become Emperor, Jahangir, who had given Zulkarnain a huge jagir, had the boy circumcised and tried to persuade him to embrace Islam; but Zulkarnain steadfastly refused to give up his faith. Although Jahangir was displeased he did not withdraw his favour and continued to employ Zulkarnain in his service. But when Shah Jahan succeeded to the throne in 1627 his fervid commitment to Islam led him to persecute Zulkarnain, even though the two had been close boyhood friends, and to mulct him of his great wealth. In face of threats Zulkarnain’s two half-brothers were converted but he, although reduced almost to poverty, stood firm in his faith and continued to protect so far as he could the interests of his community and of the Portuguese Jesuit missionaries. In 1640 he was restored to favour and was appointed to a succession of important posts in Bengal and Kashmir until he retired to Delhi in 1654 where he was granted a pension of Rs. 100/ a day. Contemporary Jesuit records describe him as a great and devoted champion and benefactor of the faith. Among his acts was the founding of a college at Agra and it appears that he had ideas of establishing another in West Tibet, presumably as a result of the mission there of the Jesuits Antonio de Andrade and Francis of Azevedo.

Another Armenian who made a mark was Sikander Beg who served, somewhat equivocally, as surgeon of the ill-fated Sulaiman Shikoh, son of the equally ill-fated Dara Shikoh. Yet another member of the community was helped by the Venetian adventurer Niccolao Manucci to rescue a Hindu girl from being burnt alive as a Suttee. The Armenian converted her to Christianity and married her.

The generally discreet influence and the reliability of these leading Armenians was such that in 1690 Khoja Isral Sarhat was invited from Delhi to negotiate the purchase of three villages which eventually became Calcutta. There had been Armenians in that part of Bengal long before Job Charnock as memorials in their cemetery dating from 1630 make clear; and they had a dock and gardens on the Howrah bank of the Hooghly. Not long after the building of Fort William at Calcutta, Armenians were being recruited there to the East India Company’s army.

From this enterprising people several westerners in India and also in China came to learn something about Tibet. Ralph Fitch (1580) and Peter Mundy (1630) both met Armenians in India and the former made enquiries about the trade in silk and musk from Tibet of which he saw evidence in Behar. Armenians gave information about Tibet to Manucci who also had long talks about the country with the Jesuits Grueber and D’Orville after their great journey from China to India in 1661/62. When they passed through Lhasa there must have been Armenians there but their account, which Father Hosten sadly records is “arid as the Himalayan uplands”, makes no mention of them. Manucci reports the good treatment of the few merchants who found their way to Tibet in search of trade in gold, perfect
musk, and rubies. Among Tibetan customs he mentions are the cutting up of the bodies of the dead and the keeping in small boxes of the dried excrement of lamas which was a prized medicine. That information perhaps came from Grueber who includes it in his account.

A systematic investigator of Tibetan trade was John Marshall, the English agent at Patna from 1667 to 1671, who heard about the country from an Armenian, Batista de Johan, who had been in “Lossa” and also from Mukhtear Ishaq who had been three times to Sining. He recounts a lot of sound information about Tibet and its customs, and details of the trade. The French doctor and philosopher Baron Jean Baptiste Tavernier, writing about the same time mentions Armenian merchants at Patna who had brought amber images to take to “Bootan” which his description clearly identifies as Tibet. At Patna he actually saw Tibetan traders wearing boxes containing “the dried ordure of their King”.

News of Tibet was relayed from China by Father Verbiest who reports what was told to a Persian Jesuit in 1688 by an Armenian at Sining. His information about the government of the country is generally accurate, though slight; but he indulges in the fancy that the Grand Lama was certainly Prester John; and the statement that there were statues of Adam and Eve in a temple at Lhasa is well wide of the mark.

The great attraction of the Tibetan trade was musk. This substance, secreted by a gland in the belly of the male of a species of deer—a jaunty little creature with ugly long canine tusks and harsh hair useful for stuffing cushions—which is found from the Tibetan Himalaya to eastern Siberia, Szechwan, Yunnan and Korea in scrub and thin forest at elevations of about 9000 to 11,000 feet, was in great demand in ancient Greece, Rome and China as a valuable base for perfumes. During the T’ang era it was an important item of tribute from the Sining region; and it would be no surprise if the Chinese were the first to discover its valuable properties. As mentioned earlier, it was the main item of merchandise taken from Tibet by the Armenian Hovhannes on his return to India. The demand continued in India and Nepal, at least up to 1950.

With the considerable information available to them in Patna, which was their starting point, the Capuchin missionaries to Tibet in 1707 must have expected to find Armenians at Lhasa and, indeed, they relied greatly on Khwaja Dawith, a favorite merchant of the king, as interpreter and banker. It might, however, have been a surprise to them to discover a number of Russian Christians there for contemporary accounts in India do not appear to mention them although Tavernier heard of a Russian embassy passing through Tibet on the way to China. This was, perhaps, a confused echo of Bayakov’s mission in 1655/1656. The Jesuit Father Ippolito Desideri also mentions Armenians at Lhasa, and doubtless enjoyed their help. But the looting and devastation caused by the Dzungar occupation of the city in 1717 seem to have seen the end of regular Armenian and Russian settlement at Lhasa and the new Chinese influence in Tibet after 1720 and the Gorkha domination of Nepal may have militated against its
restoration. Nevertheless some connection continued for in 1811 Thomas Manning met an Armenian at Lhasa who wanted to accompany him on his return to India.

I can find no reference to Armenian trade with Tibet after that time but an Armenian community continues in Calcutta although its numbers are decreasing. There is an Armenian church, college and girls school; and the community is about 300 strong. There are small numbers of Armenians in Bombay and Madras but I understand that since 1947 many of the less prosperous have emigrated to the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia. The old connection with Tibet and its trade is now only a distant memory.
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EINE KURZE ABHANDLUNG DES
PHA-BOÑ-KHA-PA (1878-1941) ÜBER MUMIFIZIERUNG

Helga Uebach

Mumifizierung war in Tibet als eine der Formen der Leichenbestattung gebräuchlich.\(^1\) Dies wissen wir zum einen aus den Berichten von Tibetreisenden und Gelehrten, die Mumien gesehen haben, wie z. B. Sir Charles Bell\(^2\) oder David Snellgrove, der das Vorhandensein von Mumien durch ein Foto eindrucksvoll dokumentierte.\(^3\) Zum anderen stammt unsere Kenntnis aus Forschungen, die sich auf mündliche Informationen tibetischer Gelehrter stützen, wie die Untersuchung von Turrell Wylie\(^4\) über "Mortuary customs at Sa-skya, Tibet".

Das daraus bisher über Mumifizierung in Tibet Bekannte lässt sich kurz folgendermassen zusammenfassen:
—Daneben wird auch über Mumifizierung von Kleinkindern berichtet. Die Austrocknung des Leichnams erfolgt in diesem Fall mit Hilfe von Salz, sie kann aber auch nur durch die Luft bewirkt werden. Die Kleinkindermumien werden in der Mumifizierungurne belassen oder sie werden verbrannt, wobei die anfallende Asche zu tsha-tsha geformt wird.

Diese knappe Zusammenfassung zeigt schon, dass wir im Grunde nur sehr wenig über die Mumifizierung, so wie sie in Tibet üblich war, wissen. Aussagen über ihr Alter, ihre Art und Verbreitung verbieten sich von selbst, solange nicht archäologische Befunde sowie eine Auswertung der schriftlichen Quellen vorliegen.


Nun ist nicht von vorherein zu bezweifeln, dass Depositorien von Mumien als dmar-gduṅ bezeichnet wurden, wenngleich auch ohne


Zunächst lassen sich die einzelnen Phasen der umfangreichen und langwierigen Prozedur der Mumifizierung wie folgt festhalten.


b) Durch ein Purgativ (*sku-sbyoh*) wird der Leichnam gleichzeitig von innen her gereinigt. Als Purgativ wird Quecksilber in grosser Menge durch den Mund eingeführt. Der Vorgang wird so lange wiederholt, bis eine Probe mit Milch, die unverändert ausfliesen muss, zeigt, dass die innerliche Reinigung beendet ist. Es erfolgt dann eine
abschliessende Spülung mit Salzwasser und Kampfer.
2. Nach der völligen Austrocknung und innerlichen Reinigung wird der Leichnam mit Seidenbinden umwickelt und zwar wird jedes Glied einzeln bandagiert.
4. Der Leichnam wird in eine gewünschte Haltung gebracht.
5. Auf die Lehmsschicht wird flüssiges Gold aufgetragen.12
6. Zum Schluss werden die Augen ausgemalt.13

Pha-bohn-kha-pa führt abschliessend noch an, dass die Mumie sodann in einem gduin-rten, einem Grabmal, zu deponieren sei. Im Falle der Dalai Lamas, wie hier, sind darunter reich verzierte, goldene Mchod-rten zu verstehen, die sich im Bereich des Potala befinden.14

Was die Terminologie betrifft, so zeigt sich, dass Pha-bohn-kha-pa die respektvolle Bezeichnung für Leichnam pur und die respektvolle Bezeichnung für Knochen, Gebeine gduin gleichsetzt. So erscheint im Text für Leichensalz pur-tsha pa auch gduin-tsha pa.15

Der Vorgang der Mumifizierung wird mit sku gduin ril por 'jog tshul,16 die Art und Weise die Gebeine (oder den Leichnam) vollständig zu erhalten oder mit dmar gduin 'jog tshul,17 die Art und Weise dmar-gduin zu erhalten, bezeichnet. Es ist daher meines Erachtens nicht möglich, dmar-gduin mit 'Red Tomb' oder 'red bone' zu übersetzen, wie Bell und Wylie es auffassen,18 sondern es ist vielmehr als "Das Rote und die Gebeine" zu verstehen. Dabei ist dmar im Sinne von dmar gsum,19 die drei roten Bestandteile, nämlich Fleisch, Blut und Mark zu verstehen. Allenfalls könnte dmar-gduin, noch als dmar gyi gduin, ein Leichnam aus Fleisch, Knochen und Mark, aufgefasst werden. In jedem Fall aber wird klar ersichtlich, dass im Tibetischen dmar-gduin in anderen Worten das bezeichnet, was wir mit dem Lehnwort Mumie benennen.

Übersetzung des tibetischen Textes


Jedem vollständig zu erhaltendem Leichnam muss circa ein Jahr lang Leichensalz und Purgativ verabreicht werden, bevor man ihn in ein Grabmal bringt, damit das Blut und die Gewebeflüssigkeit völlig trocken werden.

Wie nun ein Purgativ zu verabreichen ist: Man fülle mit Hilfe eines neu angefertigten Trichters aus Edelmetall20 eine grosse Menge Quecksilber durch den Mund in den Körper ein.


2. Ch. Bell, The people of Tibet, Oxford 1928, S. 285-300, besonders S. 294-298


4. T. Wylie, Mortuary customs at Sa-skya, Tibet, in HJAS 25, S. 229-242

5. Bell, op. cit. S. 296


11. op. cit. S. 21,4-6

12. Flüssiges Gold wird meist nur auf Gesicht, Hände und Füße aufgetragen.


14. Besonders gross und reich verziert sollen die Mchod-rtsen des 5. und

15. op. cit. S.21,2
16. op. cit. S. 19,5
17. op. cit. S. 19,6
18. Bell, op. cit. S. 296; Wylie, op. cit. S. 236, Anm. 24
23. gnas-yig ist in den Wörterbüchern nicht in dieser Bedeutung belegt. Hier handelt es sich um die aus dem Yoga bekannten cakras, die auf dem Körper des Verstorbenen mit den mystischen Silben gekennzeichnet werden.
24. Pha-boñ-kha-pa nimmt hier auf etwas Bezug, das er vorher nicht gesagt hatte.
25. sil oder sil-la ist unklar. Es könnte sich um eine Verschreibung von sol-ba = Kohle handeln oder um bsil = kühlende [Ingredienzien]
26. s. oben, Anm. 13
27. Titel des Dalai Lama
28. das heisst verstarb
29. zum Namen des Pha-boñ-kha-pa vgl. auch Anm. 8. Bde-chen-sñiñ-po ist sein tantrischer Name.
30. Dies ist der Name des Lehrers des 14 Dalai Lamas und jetzigen Dga’-ldan Khri-pa.
31. lies ril por
32. lies gduñ
33. lies tshva
34. Der folgende Nachtrag ist in kleiner Schrift, yig-chuñ, geschrieben.
35. Mit Z bezeichne ich ein Respektzeichen im tibetischen Text.
36. lies lcags
37. lies lor
[19, 5] 1 འབྲལ་ཕྲི་ཆེན་པོ་ལྡེ་བཞི་བགྲུབ་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་
གཙོ་བོ་བདེན་འབུ་བ་ལ་སོགས་པར་བདག་པའི་བཞི་
སྤུ་མ་[19, 6] འགྲུག་པ་བཤད་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་བཞི་
དབང་ཕྲོ་གྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་གི་དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་གི་
ཞེས་ཞེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་
དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་གི་དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་གི་
ཞེས་ཞེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་ཤེས་

d.མ.ལ.1 31  འབྲུ་ "བ་གྲུབ་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་" དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་
གི་དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་

d.མ.ལ.2 32  འབྲུ་ "བ་གྲུབ་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་" བཞི་
གི་དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་

d.མ.ལ.3 33  འབྲུ་ "བ་གྲུབ་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་" བཞི་
གི་དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་

d.མ.ལ.4 34  འབྲུ་ "བ་གྲུབ་པོ་ཆེན་པོ་" བཞི་
གི་དབང་ཕྲོ་ལ་ཁྲག་
དུས་དཀར་གཞི་གཞིཝུང་དུན་དེ་དུང་དུང་། ་བོས་ལེན་
དུགས་| འསང་ཐགས་བསྙན་ཏེ་གྲལ་བཤད་བངོས་སུ་
[21, 1] གཞན་ཐོག་དག

དཔོན་ཐོག་ལུང་ལེགས་པས་འོ་སྐྱེི་། འོ་སྐྱེི་

[21, 2] ཆེ་འཐོམ་དཔལ་བཤད་ཕྲག་པས་ལེགས་པས་

[21, 3] ཆེ་འཐོམ་དཔལ་བཤད་ཕྲག་པས་ལེགས་པས་

[21, 4]
NOTES ON THE PHUR-BU

Alex Wayman

The Tibetan ritual object called phur bu or phur pa—a kind of dagger—has been the topic of some learned articles and a beautifully illustrated book. But so far I do not notice a satisfactory solution for the term phur bu itself. Let me consider the entry in a native Tibetan dictionary based on syllables, namely, Jampa Chogyal’s Dag yig ma nor lam bzain (Jayyed Press, Delhi, 1969), p. 301, phur: lcags kyi phur bu / gza’ phur bu / phyema phur ma /. He illustrates the Tibetan syllable phur by “iron phur bu” (i.e. the dagger), “planet phur bu” (i.e. the planet Jupiter), and “powder phur ma” (i.e. powder, possibly medicinal). Of course, the entries do not exhaust the possibilities. For example, the dagger form does not have to be made of iron. Now, it is known that the dagger phur bu regularly translates the Sanskrit kīla (‘nail’), while the planet phur bu translates the proper name Āṅgirasā (in the dictionary Amarakośa and its Tibetan translation, verse 1, 91). The Vedic name Āṅgirasā is a derivative word, ‘descendent of Āṅgiras;’ so this helps explain the bu of phur bu, because bu means ‘son (of)’. Now Dowson (A Classical Dictionary of Hindu Mythology, p. 16) points out the ‘Āṅgi’ (of Āṅgiras), possibly because it sounds like Agni (the Fire God), was associated with fire; this forces the ras to be construed as rasa, the juice or motive force, so what keeps the fire going. To see this as the reason for the Tibetan translation, we must go to the parallel Tibetan word sbur; so in the Sanskrit-Tibetan Buddhist dictionary Mahāvyutpatti (Sakaki ed., no. 6703), the entry S. paritta-sākalikāgnih; T. sbur ma’i me chun inu ‘slow fire kept up by tiny pieces of wood’. Besides, Jampa Chogyal’s dictionary, p. 324, gives for sbur the noun sbur ma for tiny creatures like ants, and also the fungus-dust afflicting fruit trees. There is no doubt that this sbur ma like phur ma means tiny things, particles, ants, etc., and that phur in the name of the planet Jupiter means the small pieces of fuel to keep a slow fire going, and that bu was added in the sense of ‘son’. This shows that the phur in phur bu used for the dagger must be a different word, but a homonym of the phur that means particles. To determine the other phur that translates Sanskrit kīla, one should observe that nailing here means binding or tying down, as will be shown below. Hence, we go to the parallel Tibetan word bur (see Sarat Chandras Das’ Tibetan dictionary, p. 874) which means ‘bolt or fastening to a door.’ This suggests that the correct form of the term is phur pa rather than phur bu, and that the switch to the bu syllable came through confusion with the name of the planet Jupiter. However, since the term phur bu is frequently used to
translate kila, we can say it has the correctness of usage.

An article by Meredith on the Tibetan magic dagger introduces the reader to the theories of Siegbert Hummel, Giuseppe Tucci, and others; and has some photographs of the phur bu by courtesy of the Field Museum of Natural History in Chicago. I suppose this author did not originate the association with an arrow, but this should be rejected, since the arrow symbolizes alien penetration or temptation (confer: Kāmadeva’s flowery arrows); and in the Tibetan Wheel of Life, the seventh member, feelings (vedanā) (as the bondage of karma) is illustrated by an eye struck with an arrow. Besides, as will be shown below, the phur bu dagger represents a downward force, which is implied by the information which Meredith supplies from Hummel that Padmasambhava consecrated the ground of the Tibetan monastery Samye (Bsam-yas) “by stabbing a phur bu into the earth.”

For the Indian Buddhist use of the term, with phur bu equivalent to kila, I refer to Asaṅga’s Yogācārabhūmi in the exegesis section called Vastusangrahāṇi (Japanese photo. edition of Kanjur-Tanjur, Vol. 111, p. 131-4-4), in a discussion of ‘bondage’ (bciṃs): “Here the bondage of suguṭi-karma (karma of good destiny) is like the post (stamba) of sugati; the bondage of durgati-karma (karma of bad destiny) is like the dagger (kila) of durgati.” [1] Notice that the movement to good destiny is upward, like a post; and that the movement to bad destiny is downward, like a dagger plunged into the ground. Of course, the early use of the term is quite independent of the later ritual phur bu, except for the ‘downward’ and the ‘binding’ connotations.

A useful article by Stein mentions various tantric sources; but not the one I know about, in the Kriyā Tantra cycle of Vajrapāṇi, namely, the Vajravidarāṇa-dhāraṇī with a number of ritual commentaries in the Tanjur. I long ago translated the rather brief Dhāraṇī with the help of the commentary by Buddhaguhya (eighth century) called Ratnabhāsvārā-nāma in the Derge Kanjur-Tanjur versions. The point is that there are four deities in Vajrapāṇi’s immediate retinue, Vajrakila, Vajradaṇḍa, Vajramudgara, and Vajracaṇḍa. The well-known formula kilikila is employed in the mantras of the first two, to wit, mantra of Vajrakila: curu curu candakilikilāya svāhā; and mantra of Vajradaṇḍa: trāsaya trāsaya vajrakilikilāya svāhā. For translating these, one may notice that kilāya would be taken in Classical Sanskrit as a dative, but may be taken in Middle Indic (cf. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar, p. 52, para. 8.42) if the context demands it, as an instrumental. So construing these, we may translate Vajrakila’s mantra: “Steal (it), steal (it), with the furious kilikila (magic fetter), Svāhā.” And Vajradaṇḍa’s mantra: “Frighten (them), frighten (them), with the diamond kilikila, Svāhā.” Later, for the four magical acts (for appeasing, prosperity, controlling, and overpowering), the Dhāraṇī gives Vajrakila’s prosperity upahṛdaya: hulu hulu; and Vajradaṇḍa’s appealing upahṛdaya: tiṣṭha tiṣṭha vajra. We note that in Sanskrit the word hula is a kind of dagger, so Vajrakila’s mantra for prosperity magic can be
translated "Transfix (it), transfix (it)". Also noting that daṇḍa is the retribution rod. Vajra-daṇḍa's mantra for appeasing magic can be translated "Stand up, stand up, O Vajra!" Notice how this accords with the two movements mentioned by Asaṅga: prosperity magic is directed downward toward earth; appeasing the gods requires an upward movement. As to the expression upahṛdaya, this is a mantra that is next to the shortest length, the syllable, referred to as a hṛdayā.

Now the Buddhist master Asaṅga also has a long list of similes for 'insight' (prajñā, Tib. sês rab), wherein he mentions the "stake of insight" used against the four Māras, from the defilement kind, to the Son-of-the-Gods kind. The Tibetan for 'stake' is mtshon cha (=Skt. śastra, 'dagger') in the text at Photo. ed of Tanjur, Vol. 111 p. 232-3-2,3. This shows that even at his early date (4th-5th A.D.) the notion was there, applied to the evil deity called Māra or his messengers, but not in this case using the term kila. In tantric rituals this is part of the manḍala rite called "protecting and blessing the site;" it requires the hierophant to identify himself with a certain wrathful deity (krodha) and command the obstructing demons to depart; the remaining ones are nailed down with the magic nail (kila). "Nailing down" we have come to see, by suggestion of Asaṅga's writings, is associated with "binding." This is confirmed in the article by Bischoff and Hartman, including in their translation of the Pelliot Ms, "as for the proper nature (svabhāva) of the Dagger, (visualize) the slip knot."

These considerations should serve a conclusion that the basic theories of this phur bu were developed in India, and came into Tibet by way of both non-tantric and tantric Buddhism, as was alluded to above. However, there is no doubt that the theory underwent a further and rich development in Tibet, starting with the ritual objects. The tradition says that Padmasambhava invented the phur bu. This means the phur bu or phur pa as an object of which we can now take photographs. When there are three faces on the phur bu they remind us of the khaṭvaṅga, Padmasambhava's magic wand. In contrast, the Tibetan daṇḍa (Tib. dbyug pa or chad pa), the retribution wand, is surmounted by a single (possibly grinning) face, the lower end possibly having a vajra.

Part of this Tibetan development was the association of the deity Hayagrīva, or Tamdin in Tibetan pronunciation, with the phur bu. Mahāyānists worshipped Hayagrīva ('horse-necked') about 500 A.D. This is a horse-headed form of Avalokiteśvara in which role he is called "best of all horses" (paramāśva). The word for horse (aśva) lends itself for (false) etymological connection with aś- 'to eat,' so Hayagrīva devours his enemies, the demons. In Tibet, the form with wings of the Garuḍa bird was popular among the Rñīn-ma-pa; and the Fifth Dalai Lama, who combined Rñīn-ma-pa with Gelugpa lineages, wrote treatises on the Yañ-gsaṅ (atiguhya) form of Hayagrīva, whose history is related in a gter-ma book said to have been discovered at the rock of Yer-pa in Lha-sa.

Besides, the planet Jupiter deserves a comparison mention. His Sanskrit name is Bṛhaspati (master of the ritual formulas), and in classical times he
was the "guru of the gods" while the planet Venus (Śukra) was guru of the Daityas, demonic enemies of the gods; cf. Amarakośa (Sanskrit-Tibetan edition, I, 91-92). Now, Hayagrīva is lord of spells (vidyā-rāja) and animator of the large three-edged dagger (vajrakīla) which nails down the demons. This is merely a surface similarity, but may help explain why the phur bu translation of Jupiter's alternate name largely pushed out the more correct phur pa for kīla.

It should be mentioned that Hayagrīva is not the only deity identified with the phur bu. Stein's article shows his considerable interest in the identification of Amṛtakunḍali with Vajrakīla in the Guhyasamājatantra lineage of its Chap. 13 and 14, and the connection with the ten krodha deities, including Amṛtakunḍali; and he has also gone into this matter in his Bonn lecture. While I also treated the ten krodha of the Guhyasamāja in terms of their directions, position in the body, and the kinds of demons respectively destroyed by each, I did not go into the matter of the phur bu. The tantric commentator Bhavyakirti has much to say about this in the introductory section to his commentary on the Pradīpoddhotana, itself a commentary on the Guhyasamājatantra by the tantric Candrakirti. Bhavyakirti presumably refers to the section toward the end of Guhyasamāja, Chap. 14, by his remarks in Photo ed. of Kanjur-Tanjur, Vol. 61, p. 71. Here (p. 71-3-4) he says: "At the time of fastening (demons) with the magic dagger (phur bu), one should contemplate the ten fury deities (krodha) like Bhagavat Amṛtakunḍali, i.e. like the blue lotus, because Amṛtakunḍali is all the ritual acts (karma, i.e. for magical results)." [2] And he says (p. 71-4-2): "One should contemplate Vajrakīla as the nature (svabhāva) of the ten krodha kings." [3] Again (p. 71-4-7): "When one restrains (them) with the vajrakīla, the bodies of the demons are said to be motionless." [4] Since maṇḍala theory requires the maṇḍala in the mind to precede the outer maṇḍala made of powdered colors, etc., it follows that the subjective maṇḍala ritual should be taken for granted to understand his remark (p. 71-5-6): "holding down with the magic dagger dispels all constructive thought." [5] While explaining the mantras that precede Guhyasamāja, 14, k. 59, Bhavyakirti says (p. 71-5-3) that kīlaya, (the first one) is the imperative "May (they) attain with the kīla at the crown of the head!" [6] He says (p. 71-5-4) that the next kīlaya, but in compound with vajra, is the vocative "O ten krodha." [7] He says (p. 71-5-5) that the last kīlaya, also in compound with vajra, is the imperative 'May they differentiate (i.e. body, speech, and mind)." [8] Soon this author says (p.71-5-8): "Besides, it is the precept called 'nature of Hayagrīva'."[9]

It remains to speak briefly about the book on the topic by Huntington. This is invaluable for its wealth of illustrations. The discussion covers such scholarly sources as Wojkowitz, Oracles and Demons of Tibet. It was of course correct for the author to use generally the term phur pa, although admittedly the usual Tanjur passages containing the translation of kīla (dagger, nail) or kīlana (holding down with the dagger, nail) exhibit the
form phur bu. Huntington's illustrations are a corrective for seeing a particular phur bu (or, phur pa) in a museum and thinking that now we know what it looks like, because he has a remarkable variety in his figures. I suppose there is a danger of including too many different objects under the phur pa heading; but he of course knows that the phur pa is different from the khatvânga, the danda, and the sword (T. ral gri). I should prefer to conclude, on the basis of the findings in these notes, that the phur pa has a down-pointing three-edged blade and is necessarily down-pointing due to the orientation of the face or faces of a head on top.

For the Rñiṅ-ma-pa to have subjected this notion and its ritual implementation to such a flourishing native Tibetan development, suggests that we have in this phur bu one of those sensitive points of Indo-Tibetan religious practice and symbolism that warrants the scholarly treatment here and elsewhere.

NOTES


3. So far I have not published my studies on this Dhāraṇī; however, I made a long note from the material for Ferdinand D. Lessing and Alex Wayman, Mkhas grub rje's Fundamentals of the Buddhist Tantras (The Hague, 1968), pp. 116-118, within which I gave Vajrakila's individual mantra, repeated in the present paper.


10. A. Wayman, Yoga of the Guhyasamājatantra; the Arcane Lore of Forty Verses (Delhi, 1977), pp. 243-4.

11. A. Wayman, The Buddhist Tantras; Light on Indo-Tibetan
Esotericism (New York, 1973), p. 83, citing from the Sarvārāhasya-nāma-tantrarāja the verse “Where the maṇḍala is explained is the sublime mental maṇḍala. The palace is knowledge (jñāna), erection of an edifice of consciousness.”


13. Huntington, The Phur-pa, shows many convincing examples of the phur-pa, some surmounted with a single face, some with multiple faces, some with upper torso of body, and some with whole body of deity on top. In some cases, there is a simple design without a deity face or faces. We find it held, e.g. in Fig. 6, Phur-pa yab-yum. An impressive depiction of the deity Phur-pa is in Fig. 70, “The tutelary of the rNying-ma-pa,” also said to be Padmasambhava as “Fierce Guru with Phur-pa.”

14. Hence, Huntington, The Phur-pa, Fig. 68, with the upward-pointing blade, is not a phur pa. Indeed, the author himself, p. 45, includes it with reservations, suggesting that it is a fake.

[1] Դེ་བཞིན་བཞི་བདེ་བཞིན་བཟོ་པོ་དེ་བཞིན་བཞི་བདེ་བཞིན་བཟོ་པོ་

[2] བུད་པོ་བཞི་བདེ་བཞིན་བཟོ་པོ་དེ་བཞིན་བཞི་བདེ་བཞིན་བཟོ་པོ་

[3] དེ་བཞིན་བཞི་བདེ་བཞིན་བཟོ་པོ་དེ་བཞིན་བཞི་བདེ་བཞིན་བཟོ་པོ་
[4] ཚེ་ཤིས་ལུང་ཐུབ་བོད་ལྟེན་པའི་བཤད་པའི་ནི་ཐོན་པ་མཐུར་བྱེད་

[5] སྲོང་བོས་སུ་[sic, for སྲོང་] ནམ་ཐོང་བཤེས་

[6] བོད་ལྟེན་པའི་ཐོག་མཆི་ཤིང་བོད་ལྟེན་པའི་ཐོག་མཆི་

[7] བོད་ལྟེན་པའི་ཐོག་མཆི་བཤེས་

[8] བོད་ལྟེན་པའི་ཐོག་མཆི་བཤེས་

[9] བོད་ལྟེན་པའི་ཐོག་མཆི་བཤེས་བཤེས་བཤེས་
Book Reviews


This book deals in 232 pages with a very wide range of cultures both in space and in time. Its nine chapters, all written by highly competent specialists, cover Tibet, China, Japan, the Classical World, the Germanic world, the Babylonians and Hittites, Ancient Egypt, Ancient Israel and Islam. The editors mean by divination “the attempt to elicit from some higher power or supernatural being the answers to questions beyond the range of ordinary human understanding” (p.1). They did not aim at comprehensiveness, nor were they concerned primarily to compare and to contrast. Each contributor was encouraged to deal with the subject “on its own merits...as it appeared in his own field”. The result is a learned, thought-provoking and highly readable book. It is indeed something of a relief to dip into an anthology of this kind where authors have obviously felt completely free to go their own way and to do their own thing without being hampered by theoretical shackles.

The only chapter dealing with matters of which I have some direct knowledge is that concerning Tibet and it is the chapter most likely to interest readers of this *Journal*; so I will confine my comments to it. The author is Lama Chime Radha, Rinpoche, who is Head of the Tibetan Section, at the British Library. He gives (p.1-37) a good, general account of the role of divination and the parts played by oracles in Tibetan culture. The particular methods of divination discussed are: *pra* (interpretation of signs or visions); *mda'-mo* (divination by means of arrows); *phreng-ba* (the use of Buddhist rosaries); *sho-mo* (dice-throwing); *sman-gsal mar-me brtag-pa ldebs* (the use of butter-lamps); *bya-rog-kyi skad brtag-pa* (interpretations of bird behavior). The use of the ball of the thumb (*the-bon*) in *pra* is well described; and some interesting information, which will probably be new to most readers, concerning *Pe har* and the rise to prominence of Rdo-rje shugs-idan, a Dge-lugs-pa protective deity, is discussed in the section on oracles. Altogether this chapter is a contribution which will be read with profit both by the general reader and by the specialist.

Laufer and Nebesky-Wojkowitz are the only western authors who have written on Tibetan divination who are mentioned. Perhaps it may be useful, in this context, to draw attention to a few other western studies:

A useful index to the whole volume completes this fascinating little book which grew out of a series of lectures delivered at Cambridge University in 1979.

A.W. Macdonald
Université de Paris


This lavishly illustrated volume appears in the format of a "coffee-table book" but it is far more interesting and surprising than such books usually are. The photographs alone are worth the price of the book ($60.00) for they constitute one of the finest collections of color photographs taken in Tibet and available to the general public. The photographs were taken by Chinese photographers and so there are a number of obviously posed pictures in the book, but the majority are candid shots that provide glimpses of everyday scenes in present-day Tibet as well as somewhat embarrassing contradictions of the posed shots. In many ways the text parallels the photographic portion of the book: much of it follows the standard Chinese line on Tibetan culture and political history, but a significant portion of it presents views that are much at variance with that line and far more realistic than anything yet written in Chinese or pro-Chinese works about Tibet. The Chinese authorities responsible for the book have, as a result, declared that the book was tampered with and that it is an "illegal" publication.

According to the book's credits, the volume was produced by Yugoslavenska Revija, Belgrade, and the Shanghai People's Art Publishing House. A New China News Agency dispatch of October 19, 1981 stated that under the terms of the agreement between the Yugoslav publishing house and the Shanghai publishing house, the Yugoslavs were to be responsible "only for such matters as book designing, binding, printing and publishing." In actual fact, however, the Yugoslav publishing house sent master copies of the book—originally entitled "Xizang" (the Chinese name for Tibet)—to
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McGraw-Hill in New York so as to prepare it for publication. The editors at McGraw-Hill consulted various Tibetan authorities in the United States (among them, this reviewer is told, Tsepon W. D. Shakabpa) concerning the veracity of many of the book's statements, and accordingly made changes in some of the captions for the photographs. The Chinese news dispatch claims that the book's text was also altered and that the new editors added "content slandering and vilifying the People's Republic of China." This is rather strong language indeed, and try as one might, it is rather impossible to find anything in the book that vilifies China. Nevertheless, the strength of the Chinese protest makes it difficult for one to know just to what extent the book reflects Chinese ideas about Tibet and Tibetan civilization in the post-Mao era. Tibet certainly seems to represent a great departure from previous Chinese productions about Tibet. It is a handsome book with many unique photographs printed and bound with a quality that the Foreign Languages Press in Peking has never been able to equal. Prior to the release of the New China News Agency dispatch concerning it, it appeared to be a welcome step away from the stilted propaganda periodically published in China, a welcome step by the very authorities who were producing this propaganda replete with denunciations of the "man-eating serf system" and images of liberated serfs dancing for their new lives. The most recent example of this is the book Tibet: No Longer Mediaeval (Peking, 1981), which includes many of the same photographs found in Tibet, but which is a very inferior production. It is poorly printed on low quality paper, badly bound, and flowing with propagandistic inductive. It can be surmised that the Chinese authorities had originally hoped to bring out a book with the physical qualify of Tibet and the textual content of Tibet: No Longer Mediaeval.

Having said this much about the book's background, attention may now be directed towards the book itself. The most striking feature of it consists of the photographs. Aside from the beauty of many of them, there are a few that contain surprises for Tibetologists, and some should be mentioned here. On p. 33 an edict of Ming T'ai-tsu praising the meditational activities of the "Karma Lama" at Mtshur-phu (in Chinese, Tsu-erh-p'u) is reproduced. The edict is dated 1375, and the Karma Lama can be none other than Karma Rol-pa'i rdo-rje. What makes this document so valuable is the fact that it is not contained in the Ming shih-lu and has not been published previously. Moreover this document is the first piece of evidence from Chinese sources demonstrating direct knowledge on the part of the Ming court of the existence and activities of the Karma-pa and their monastic center at Mtshur-phu at such an early date in the dynasty's history.

Two paintings of the Manchu emperor Ch'ien-lung (pp. 38 and 40) are also very interesting, for they portray the emperor dressed in the robes of a monk, as in the portrait that formed the point of departure for the article of David M. Farquhar, "Emperor As Bodhisattva in the Governance of the Ch'ing Empire," in Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies, 38 (1978), pp. 5-24.
The photograph on p. 38 has been printed backwards, as a glance at the inscription tablet in front of the thangka portrait reveals. There are other instances of sloppiness also: an embroidered thangka on p. 247, for example, is noted as having been presented to Shakya ye-shes by the emperor Ming Hsüan-tsung (reigned 1426-1435) even though its borders contain inscriptions in Tibetan, Chinese, Mongol, and Manchu, as well as clearly written dates showing that it was finished in 1777, the ting-yu year of Ch’ien-lung and the Tibetan fire-bird year.

Among the photographs of “everyday scenes” there are, as mentioned, a number of posed shots. One can clearly deduce this in looking at the pictures of groups visiting the Potala dressed in fine chubas, blouses, and hats on pp. 209 and 214, as well as the one of a small Tibetan family dressed up to have a sumptuous meal all by themselves on p. 106. However, compare these photos with those of the ragged pilgrim praying in front of the Potala on p. 196, and the devout group visiting the Potala on p. 197, dressed in a mix of old and dirty Chinese and Tibetan garments without the nice boots, hats, or shoes of those in the posed pictures, but wearing instead worn cheap Chinese sneakers and here and there a Chinese army cap.

The descriptions of some of the photographs contain omissions that are understandable from the Chinese point of view. The base of the otherwise destroyed fortress of Yum-bu bla-sgang is shown on pp. 28-29, but the description on p. 30 is apt to give readers the impression that the building is in such a ruined state because of the passage of the ages; the tragic fact that the structure had stood intact from at least the seventh century (and most likely from a much earlier time) until red guards destroyed it during the Cultural Revolution is never mentioned. Another intriguing omission of sorts concerns the monastery of Bsam-yas. Its state is never directly discussed in the text, but there are photographs on pp. 250-251 of one of the courtyard gatehouses of the monastery, the interior of one of the halls, and carved wooden decorations from a corbel. Within the text of the book (pp. 201-202) Bsam-yas is described in the present tense. This is most interesting in view of the fact that almost all of the recent reports of Tibetan visitors to Tibet have stated that the monastery was destroyed. The only full picture of it is that found in a beautiful painted fresco (the location of which is not given) on pp. 248-249; there are no photographs of the entire monastery complex.

A final word on the photographs is appropriate. An inordinate number of those showing objects, documents, or paintings of an historical nature are presented to stress the fact that Tibet has had relations with China over many centuries. Almost nothing is shown that would give the reader the impression that Tibet has also had relations with any other country. The object of this is naturally to strengthen the notion that Tibet is, and has been, an unquestioned part of China. This is not stated in the text in as rigid a fashion as in previous Chinese writings, as may be seen below.

The text is divided into seven chapters, each one supposedly written by one of the seven authors listed at the beginning of the book and given short
biographical notes on pp. 290-291. (There is also a two page preface by Harrison Salisbury on pp. 14-15.) This reviewer uses the term "supposedly" because it is sometimes hard to believe that certain individuals have written the words ascribed to them. The first chapter, on Tibet's history, has been written by Ngapo Ngawang Jigme who, as the highest ranking figure of the old Tibetan establishment holding power in Tibet today, is known to quite a few people. At the beginning of his chapter he refers to James Hilton's Lost Horizon and the concept of an idyllic Shangri-la that it describes. This reviewer has been told by people who have met him that Ngapo does not know any English. Furthermore, it does not seem likely that Chinese translations of Lost Horizon circulated freely in China after the early years of the People's Republic. One cannot help suspecting then that references such as this are more likely to have been produced by propaganda authorities in Peking than by people such as Ngapo, who furthermore refers to Garma C. C. Chang's translation of the poetry of Mi-la ras-pa on p. 23 as "A translation into English with extremely informative notes...."

On pp. 21-23 Ngapo discusses "three frescoes of outstanding historical and artistic interest." The three frescoes depict the marriage of Srong-btsan sgam-po to the T'ang princess Wen Ch'eng, the meeting between 'Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan and the Mongol Yüan emperor Qubilai, and the meeting between the Fifth Dalai Lama and the Manchu Ch'ing emperor Shun-chih. With reference to the last person named he erroneously calls him a Mongolian emperor of China (!; p. 22) and refers to the "Qing (i.e. Ch'ing) dynasty, established in 1644 by Mongolian conquerors" (!; p. 23). The aim in using all three of these examples is, once more, to stress China's historic relationship with Tibet. Still, one statement is made by Ngapo in direct contradiction to all writings emanating from China concerning Sino-Tibetan relations. He notes, on p. 22, that after the fall of the Yüan dynasty (1367) "Tibet regained independence and maintained it for over 200 years." Chinese writers have uniformly come to date Tibet's formal transformation into an inalienable part of China from the Mongol Yüan dynasty and this statement by Ngapo, then, is quite a departure from that position.

If there are some doubts as to who really composed some of the statements attributed to Ngapo in the first chapter, they are small in comparison with those one may entertain with regard to chapter six, concerning Tibetan Buddhism, written by Jampei Chínlei, described on p. 291, as a 'High Incarnation Lama in the Drepung Monastery of Lhasa.' This high-ranking figure from 'Bras-spungs maintains that the system of succession through incarnation in Tibetan Buddhist sects is unique to the Dge-legs-pa (rendered as Gelug-pa), and states on p. 169:

A principal of great consequence for its (i.e. the Dge-legs-pa sect's) future development came into operation shortly after the time of Tsongkhapa; this was the tulku, 'living Buddha,' system, according to which the pontiffs of the Gelug-pa sect were believed to be successive incarnations of the Bodhisattva Chenresi, or Avalokitesvara, patron and protector of Tibet. The pontiffs of the once powerful Sakya sect
had solved the problem of succession through marriage and family inheritance, those of the Kagyu-pa through transmission of secret doctrines to chosen disciples. The Gelug-pa sect, having adopted celibacy and given more importance to rational thought and open teaching than to esoteric lore, would have found transmission of supreme authority from generation to generation a real problem, especially in a society unaccustomed to elections, had its leaders not relied on a system of succession by reincarnation."

It is hard to imagine any Tibetan brought up in traditional Tibetan surroundings, of any level of education, declaring succession by incarnation to be a method used solely by the Dge-lugs-pa sect. It is ludicrous to think that an educated monk from 'Bras-spungs could be unaware of the use of this system by the Karma-pa sub-sect of the Bka'-brgyud-pa lineage prior to the time of Tsong-kha-pa. Once more the reader may suspect a bureaucratic hand in the composition of large parts of the book. Nevertheless, one finds another diversion from previous Chinese pronouncements in the statement on p. 172 of chapter six that "the majority of Tibetans today are still devout Buddhists."

A considerable number of errors are found throughout this chapter and throughout most of the book's text. It would be far too time consuming to explore all of them in this review, and not terribly worthwhile, since Tibet was not conceived of as a work putting forth new scientific information in the field of Tibetology. It is annoying, however, when statements in the book ignore or contradict such information in order to make a propaganda point. A good example of this is found in chapter three, on Tibetan customs and rituals, by Chapel Tsetan Phuntso, when the author discusses Tibetan marriage customs. On p. 91 the writer states that Tibetans "had little right to choose their partners and often did not know what they looked like until the marriage." It is well known that there were quite a few arranged marriages in Tibet as in most countries, but almost all travellers to Tibet and social scientists who have been able to conduct research in Tibetan-inhabited regions concur in the opinion that Tibetans still had great leeway in choosing their own marriage partners or in vetoing prospective matches. These findings have been verified by Tibetans presently living outside of Tibet and those researchers who have studied them. The writer's contention on pp. 91-92 that interclass marriages were not allowed in Tibet is also directly contradicted by modern scholarly findings; cf., for example, Barbara Nimri Aziz, *Tibetan Frontier Families* (Durham, N.C., 1978), pp. 161-167, for a discussion of interclass marriage as it has occurred in the village of Ding-ri.

The section on women in chapter four, by Na Zhen, is likewise extremely misleading and erroneous in its presentation of the status of women in traditional Tibetan society, asserting on p. 96 that "...in many ways they were hardly treated as human beings at all." It is no secret that the high degree of freedom women had in traditional Tibetan society has seemed particularly striking to many observers over the centuries. The description
of the position of women contained in the text, however, differs little from Chinese descriptions of the pre-1949 condition of any oppressed group within the borders of the present People’s Republic of China.

There is one last factor in the text that is somewhat disturbing and again indicative of the Chinese hand in its composition. Here and there Chinese terms crop up in places where there ought to be Tibetan ones. On p. 92, for example, in describing the factors that must be taken into account in selecting a proper bride it is stated that the groom’s family will ask about the bride’s “shengxiao,” i.e., sheng- hsiao, the Chinese term for the animal that presides over the year of one’s birth. The full year sign in Tibet consists of an animal, an element, and often a gender. In Tibetan it is called lo-rtags, a term that is more accurate, if not to say far more appropriate. However, the authorities charged with compiling the text for this book seem to have their own reasons for using a Chinese term in this instance. In another, a white Sherpa garment is referred to, on p. 135, as a “baiduo,” again an example of a Chinese term used in substitution for a Tibetan one.

At the end of the book, on p. 293, there is a chronological table of Tibetan history compiled by Jampei Chinelai, the author of the chapter on Tibetan religion, and edited by Bosco Maraini, who also edited the latter chapter. Of interest is the fact that the table notes that in 1728 Tibet fell under the suzerainty of China—not Chinese sovereignty. Again, this statement has never before been made by communist Chinese writers, and one may assume that this is likely to have been edited into the text after the master copies had left Yugoslavia. In any event the curious background of the book and its composition should be borne in mind as one reads through it. The final pages (pp. 294-296) contain a general bibliography on Tibet, listing several items (such as the autobiography of the Fourteenth Dalai Lama) that were probably also appended to it after the book was out of Chinese hands.

In conclusion it can be said that Tibet is a rather curious book. It is beautifully illustrated with fascinating color photographs of Tibet, Tibetans, and important Tibetan sites and objects. The photographs are an interesting mix, in places, of candid shots of the Tibetan people as many of them now are, as well as of posed shots, the former sometimes calling embarrassing attention to the latter. Although the photographs were all taken by Chinese photographers, the text has been disowned by the Chinese authorities, who claim that it was tampered with by anti-China elements. It seems not to be the sole work of the authors listed at the beginning of the book; in that regard one may surmise that the text was altered or amended by others, both inside and outside of China. Nevertheless, as stated at the start of this review, the nature and quality of the photographs impart a unique value to this book, in spite of the often erroneous and misleading nature of the text.

Elliot Sperling
Indiana University
This book is a reprint of the edition first published in 1968. It contains a short new chapter entitled "Aftermath" dealing with new developments in the history of the Tibetans (inside and outside of their homeland) and in scientific research since the appearance of the first edition. (On its back cover the book is advertised as a "revised edition," but nevertheless the main text of the book is identical with that of the 1968 edition.)

Writing a comprehensive "handbook" on the development of the political history, religious and cultural traditions, archaeology and ethnography, etc., of a particular country is a most difficult task. Let me add that it is even an impossible one, because on the one hand no scholar would claim to be equally well-versed in all branches of scholarship, and on the other hand no reader would be able to read through such a comprehensive volume containing, let us say, 2,000 pages. Therefore, the major requirements which such a handbook ought to have are: 1. a well-balanced presentation of the material (one may frequently observe that individual scholars give too much emphasis to subjects in which they are particularly expert while other topics tend to be almost totally disregarded); 2. exactness (loose handling of data in the case of popular books is well-known); and 3. clarity (i.e., a style easily understood by non-specialists.)

This last item is especially important, because handbooks are generally written for non-experts or, for example, to facilitate the preparation of university students. Now, among the few handbooks dealing with Tibet, the book of the two well-known authors under review here still deserves special attention, even though it was first published twelve years ago. In my opinion the book is still the best one of this genre, although this does not mean that it has no mistakes. The greatest merit of the book is its clarity. It is quite another matter that, for instance, Professor Stein's *Tibetan Civilization* is a real "gter-mzdod" for Tibetologists and that it is, in my opinion, the best summary description of Tibet that has ever been written. Nevertheless, Stein's merits and achievements can be appreciated primarily by Tibetologists or by advanced students. I remember that a freshman student once asked a question of me and that I told him that he could find some data and bibliographic information on the problem in Stein's book. He came back, disappointed, saying that book was of little value to him because it referred only to some Tibetan sources and not to any secondary literature. (Obviously he could not read Tibetan fluently at the time, so he needed a more "intelligible" language.)

From the viewpoint of clarity, there is no doubt that *A Cultural History of Tibet* is one of the best books of its genre. This statement is not limited solely to its presentation of various subjects, but also refers to its excellent and vivid translations of poems and prose. Another great merit of the book is its lack of over-simplification. Even if a given subject is treated very
briefly, the information concerning the problem is vital and precise.

Some errors, however, must be mentioned. For example, Qubilai met his
death in 1294 and not in 1265 (p. 208). A more correct spelling of the name
Pho-lha is Pho-lha-nas and Kang-chen is generally mentioned in Tibetan
sources as Khang-chen-nas. It is true that the name of the Qośot khan
derives from Tibetan ("lHa-bzang"), nevertheless, his name is Lajang (or
Lājang). The system of reincarnation is a typical Tibetan invention, and
one of primary importance. The book omits the problem of the origin of
this concept, although it is well-established that the idea of reincarnated
lamas was first developed among the Karma-pa (see Turrell Wylie's recent
article on the topic in the Proceedings of the Csoma de Korös Memorial
Symposium). One could enumerate other mistakes or omissions, especially
if one wanted to compare the statements in the book with the results of
recent research. Nevertheless, due to the approach and methodology of the
book and, moreover, to its basic information and data, it is still to be
recommended to everyone interested in Tibetology.

János Szerb
Budapest University
The Tibet Society

MINUTES

The Tibet Society's
Annual Membership Meeting
September 25, 1981.

The 1981 Annual Membership Meeting of the Tibet Society was held in the Persimmon Room of the Indiana Memorial Union, Bloomington, Indiana on September 25th, 1981 at 5:00 p.m.

Officers present were Thubten Jigme Norbu—Vice-President & Executive Director, John R. Krueger—Treasurer, and John Feuille—Secretary.

The Vice-President called the meeting to order and welcomed the members and guests present. He conveyed greetings and best wishes from Dr. Hoffmann along with Dr. Hoffmann's regrets that he could not attend the meeting, since he has retired from Indiana University and returned to his native Germany to live.

The Treasurer introduced the Agenda and appointed Elliot Sperling, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, to count the ballots for the Board of Directors election. He called for a Board of Directors Meeting directly after the General Membership Meeting and then called for Officers' reports.

The Treasurer gave the financial report (see the following page). He mentioned that the biggest expenditures were for printing and postage; grants to the Vice-President and Editor to help pay their expenses to the Csoma de Kóros Tibetan Studies Symposium in Austria; and outlays for books for the Tibet Society Book Service.

The Secretary reported on the activities of the Tibet Society over the last year. The officers and local members of the Tibet Society were very active working in conjunction with the formation and activities of the Tibetan Cultural Center. On-going programs of the Tibetan Cultural Center include a Tibetan Fair in the Fall, a Tibetan Feast to mark Tibetan New Year, and a cultural or religious event in the summer.

The Editor, Dr. Christopher Beckwith, gave a report on progress with the Tibet Society Journal, and a brief summary of events at the Tibetan Studies Symposium in Vienna. He mentioned the need for a grant to publish a previously unpublished manuscript as an occasional paper.

The Vice-President gave a brief report on the purposes and foundation of the Tibetan Cultural Center, which has been given 22 acres of land on the
outskirts of Bloomington. He stressed that the aim of the Tibetan Cultural Center is to promote all aspects of Tibetan culture.

Mr. Elliot Sperling reported that Mssrs. Gard, Norwick, and Ruegg had received the most votes in the Board of Directors election.

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

After a short break, Mr. George D. Smith of Indianapolis gave a slide presentation on his recent trip to Lhasa.

John Feuille,
Secretary

The Tibet Society, Inc.

FINANCIAL REPORT

January-December, 1980

Beginning Balance Savings (Jan. 1, 1980) ....................... $3,696.23
Interest .................................................................. 229.16
Transferred in from Checking Deposits ....................... 1,000.00
Balance in Savings (Dec. 31st, 1980) ....................... +4,925.39

Checking:
Beginning Balance (Jan. 1, 1980) ....................... 1,521.77
Income Deposits, # 813-821 ................................ 4,381.50
Total .................................................................. +5,903.27

Expenditures; checks # 527-596
Postage and Petty Cash ........................................... 985.72
Travel ................................................................ 870.78
Salaries ............................................................... 534.00
Printing ................................................................ 1,403.75
Book Purchase ..................................................... 319.78
Office Supplies .................................................... 145.00
Meetings ................................................................ 50.00
Miscellaneous ...................................................... 288.16
Donations to Specific Organizations ...................... 90.00
Total Expense ..................................................... −4,695.90
Transferred to Savings ........................................ −1,000.00
Erroneous Addback (check counted as expended twice) ............................................. +28.60

Balance in Checking (Dec. 31st, 1980) ....................... +244.68

John R. Krueger
Treasurer
Manuscripts for publication, books for review, and all correspondence regarding editorial matters should be sent to

The Editor
The Journal of the Tibet Society
Goodbody Hall
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47405, USA.

The Journal of the Tibet Society is a scholarly periodical devoted to all areas of research on Tibet and regions influenced by Tibetan culture, including the arts, astronomy, geography, history, linguistics, medicine, philosophy, religion, the social sciences, and other subjects. Publication in the Journal is open to scholars of all countries. The languages of the Journal are English, French, German, and Tibetan. The editor welcomes the submission of articles, brief communications, and books for review, which deal with Tibet or the Tibetan cultural realm.

Tibetan may be transliterated by contributors in accordance with any of the standard scientific transliteration systems generally accepted. The following rules must be observed, however:

1) Absolute consistency must be maintained, except when quoting previous writers' works, in which case the system found in the quoted original must be retained in the quotation.

2) If any capitalization is necessary, only the first letter of any word may be capitalized, e.g. Dpal-lidan, and not DPal-lidan, the exception being that in words beginning (in transliteration) with a non-alphabetic diacritical mark—such as the apostrophe—the following letter is to be capitalized, e.g. 'Jam-dpal.

3) The type font currently available to us includes the following diacritical marks and special letters: ʰ ᵛ ʷ .tbl ʰ /owl. (A complete Greek font is also available.) It is therefore desirable for all transliteration, whatever the system, to restrict itself accordingly.

Transcription of other commonly used languages with non-Latin scripts is to be done according to the following systems:

Arabic: ٌ ب ٠ ذ ٠ ث ٠ ح ٠ د ٠ ذ ٠ ر ٠ ز ٠ ش ٠ ض ٠ ط ٠ ظ ٠ غ ٠ ف ٠ ق ٠ ك ٠ ل ٠ م ٠ ن ٠ ه ٠ و ٠ ي ٠ ٠ (The article should always be transcribed al- or Al-, and diphthongs should employ w and y (instead of u and i) as second elements.

Chinese: The Wade-Giles system.


Mongol: The system found in N. Poppe, Grammar of Written Mongolian, Wiesbaden, 1954.

Russian: a b v g d e zh z i y k l m n o p r s t u f kh ts ch sh chh 'i' 'e' 'yu' ya.

Sanskrit: The system adopted by the 10th International Congress of Orientalists (Geneva, 1894).

Manuscripts should be typed on white bond paper, double-spaced, with wide margins on all sides. Notes must also be typed double-spaced, consecutively numbered, on a separate page or pages at the end of the manuscript (not at the bottom of the page). Please submit a neat, finished, manuscript. The original copy should be submitted. Authors must retain at least one copy of their manuscript. It is necessary that all errors be corrected on the galleys, which should be returned immediately.

All quoted passages of Tibetan more than a few words in length must be noted in the article text with a number (such as a line-reference to the original source) in square brackets—e.g.: [8,1]—and then written or typed out in Tibetan print-style script (dbucan) on a separate page or pages. These passages will be printed in Tibetan at the end of the article. In other words, the original Tibetan of long quoted passages will not appear in transliteration in the body or notes of an article, but will appear in Tibetan script alone, at the end of the article. (For examples, please see the articles by H. Uebach and A. Wayman in Volume 1. The same method is to be followed for citations of Chinese words or of Japanese words containing ideograms, which unless very well known should generally be provided. For an example, please see the article by J. Kolmaš in Volume 1. For certain kinds of studies, this procedure may not be feasible, in which case exceptions might be made. The Journal is expecting to have the capability of typesetting Tibetan in the near future, and a more flexible editorial policy may then be developed.