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EDITORIAL

It is a great pleasure to report that the first number of the Journal of the Tibet Society was very well received. I would like to thank all of you who wrote with your comments and constructive criticism. One error that somehow slipped by me, but was noticed by many others, concerns the date of publication. Please note that Volume One is dated 1981 (not 1982), as stated everywhere except on the "Contents" page. A few suggestions on various aspects of the printing format have been taken up in the present issue. Again, thank you for communicating them to me; you are helping to make a better Journal.

Since Volume One consisted purely of solicited articles, it did not include a "Brief Communications" section. This is now introduced in the present issue. I hope that it will become an active forum for Tibetological debate on the burning issues of our field, as well as a convenient place to publish short notes on obscure problems.

Once more I would like to encourage all Tibetologists to submit their articles and brief communications to be considered for publication in the Journal, reminding everyone that this is a refereed periodical. Each piece, the author's name removed, is sent to one of the Editorial Consultants (unless it happens to be in the specific field of either the Editor or the Assistant Editor), or another specialist, for a written opinion, in order to assist in making the decision on whether or not to publish it. Again, I would like to remind you that the Journal is committed to printing in English, French, German, and Tibetan. Please see the inside back cover for details on manuscript form.

Finally, I encourage you to ask your libraries to subscribe to the Journal. If the membership/subscription base grows a little, it may soon be possible to publish two issues per year. The present issue—in its editing and design—is, I hope, an improvement over the first.

C.I.B.
Articles

DOES TIBETAN HERMENEUTICS THROW ANY LIGHT ON SANDHĀBHĀṢA*

Michael Brodido

The importance of hermeneutics as "a philosophical discipline of rational interpretation of a traditional canon of Sacred Scriptures" within Buddhism has been pointed out by Thurman.¹ Buddhist texts frequently contain detailed and sophisticated arguments about the interpretation of texts (even themselves). This hermeneutical self-consciousness applies also to the scriptures (both sūtras and tantras) traditionally thought of as uttered by the Buddha himself, regarded as a historical person. Accordingly, there are two different senses in which a Western work which is to count as a worthwhile interpretation of Buddhist texts may be concerned with hermeneutics. First, the Western interpreter must be aware of himself as an interpreter, as bringing hermeneutic techniques to bear on his materials; in this respect he will of course be in a position similar to that of any other scholar dealing with religious texts. But secondly, he has to take into account the fact that, on the whole, the texts themselves were written with a certain degree of hermeneutical self-consciousness, in the expectation that they would be subject to, or would even require, interpretation. As Thurman points out, this was the case with the earliest Buddhist texts, most of which have a fairly straightforward "literal" sense. It will be all the more true of later texts such as the tantras, of which many passages do not seem "literally" to mean very much at all, while others contain admonitions, such as that to kill one's fellow-creatures, which seem to run counter to everything which Buddhism has otherwise (and on good grounds) been held to stand for. Now in India and Tibet the tantras were taken seriously as Buddhist religious documents, and so it is not surprising that a substantial corpus of interpretative literature grew up alongside them.

From this alone it will not follow that, when interpreting the tantras, we must follow Buddhist hermeneutical tradition. But it does seem plausible that an understanding of Buddhist hermeneutics will help us; and this point seems especially important in view of the fact that most Buddhist tantric texts now available are in Tibetan, either translated from the Sanskrit or written by natives. For it would be remarkable if, in so translating and

* The form of this paper has been greatly improved as a result of suggestions made by Dr. Nathan Katz. On specific points, my indebtedness to Mr. Alexis Sanderson and to Dr. Brian Loar have been recorded in the text and notes. Conversations with Mr. Gördan Sundholm (on the theory of meaning) and Mr. Edward Henning (on some of the Tibetan materials used) have also influenced what is written here in various places. My grateful thanks are due to all these people.
writing, the Tibetans were not influenced by their own hermeneutical views. Accordingly, if we wish to use these Tibetan materials in our search for an understanding of the tantras as they were seen either in India or in Tibet, we should try to understand the hermeneutical views which the Tibetans displayed in them.

Both in India\(^2\) and Tibet\(^3\), attempts were made to systematize the explanatory methods used in the voluminous commentatorial literature. The methods of explanation themselves are called \textit{bshad-thabs} in Tibetan, and the \textit{systematic} treatment of these methods was considerably developed in Tibet by such distinguished writers as Bsod-nams rtse-mo (1142-82), Bston (1290-1364), Btsong-kha-pa (1357-1419), and Padma dkar-po (1527-92).

* * *

The tantric form of Buddhism is often called Vajrayāna (in contrast to the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna, often lumped together and called Laksanayāna). The role of \textit{yāna} as a hermeneutic strategy has been discussed recently by Katz (see note 1), and need not concern us here. Now, among students of the Vajrayāna there is a long-standing controversy over a group of Sanskrit terms such as \textit{sandhā-bhāsa}, \textit{sandhyā-bhāsa}, \textit{sandhyā-bhāṣita}, etc. Do these Sanskrit terms mean something like "twilight language"\(^5\) or "ambiguous use of language"\(^8\)? Or something like "esoteric meaning"\(^9\) or "secret language"\(^10\)? Or something like "intentional speech"\(^11,12\) or "intentional language"\(^13\)?

Looking at a wide range of primary sources, I find this lexical view of the matter rather artificial. The words have been used in a variety of ways, in many different contexts, and at different historical periods. Each of these translations tells us something about the way the words were used, but none tells us more than a small part. So we need to disentangle the different strands of usage; and when we do this, we find that, in spite of the lexical similarity, our group of words is much more heterogeneous than has sometimes been supposed. Because of the complexity of the issues raised and the need to examine many sources, I will here consider one main problem: the term \textit{sandhyā-bhāsa} as used in the \textit{Hevajra-tantra}.

As is well-known, this word is used there of a kind of "secret language" or "code," for instance: "passion" stands for "wine," "strength" stands for "meat." Is there any sense in which this use of language is \textit{intentional}? Why call it \textit{twilight language}? The central point of my paper is quite simple. It is this: in discussing these questions, we may wish to take into account what Indian and Tibetan commentaries on the \textit{Hevajra-tantra} say about the "code." If we choose to do this, we are committed to using, or at least taking seriously, the principles of interpretation actually applied in those commentaries. And this is possible only if we know what those principles were. So we have two things to do. We have to identify the principles of interpretation actually used, and we have to understand those principles.
The suggestion that Tibetan texts on interpreting the tantras (bsPad-thabs) may throw light onto the controversy over sandhya-bhāsa and its relatives has been made, somewhat implicitly, by Wayman. In those texts, we find the technical term dgon-pa-bsPad (explanation by “intention); and the Sanskrit for this is perhaps14 sandhyā-bhāṣitaṁ. This last word seems very similar to the word used in the Hevajra-tantra, viz. sandhyā-bhāṣa; and this word, one might think, is just the sort of thing that bsPad-thabs is there to explain.

*   *   *

In the phrase bsPad-thabs, “thabs” means “method” or “technique” or “means.” The primary sense of the word bsPad-pa is certainly “to explain,” and yet there are places where it is appropriate to translate it by “to say” or “to assert”; and it has even been translated by “to express.”15 Let us see why, both in “bsPad-thabs” and in bsPad-thabs, there are reasons for preferring “to explain” to “to express.” The primary use of “to express” is one where the (logical) subject is a sentence, and the object—what is expressed—is a thought, idea, question etc. A sentence (or its utterance) expresses a certain content. In the primary use of “to explain,” the object is still some thought, etc., but the subject is now the person who explains. A sentence does not, as such, explain anything; and even a proposition explains another proposition only in a secondary and derived sense. Confusion in the use of these two words in translation seems to occur mainly when they appear in the passive voice, with the proposition (or whatever) as the grammatical subject, for a proposition may be both expressed and explained. But if the object-language sentence says that an account is given of some sentence, proposition etc., then we need the verb “to explain.” This is the most common case in bsPad-thabs; and “to express” is then inappropriate. In my view, Tibetan bsPad-thabs texts signal this distinction clearly by using the verb rjod-pa (vac-, abhidhā-)16 where “to express” is the notion expressed.

*   *   *

Bshad-thabs, then, is concerned with the explanation, and more generally with the interpretation, of Vajrayāna texts. Now hermeneutics is perhaps the interpretation of texts, and the subject-matter of the study of hermeneutics is perhaps the techniques which, in a particular religious tradition, may have been used for the interpretation of its texts. Commonsense suggests that in a culture very different from ours, such as that of Tibet, the hermeneutical methods may well have been very different from ours. On the other hand, if for a moment we abstract away from the particular texts under investigation and the particular tradition they represent, we are left with nothing more than the theory of interpretation in general. And this is, broadly speaking, just what philosophers17 of language call the theory of meaning.
This very general methodological consideration may be reinforced by another which is more specific. If we broadly review\(^{18}\) the explanatory methods (bshad-thabs) used in Tibet, we see that some of them are linguistic in a rather natural sense of that word, that is, they turn on analysis either of the sentences of the text itself or of the connection between those sentences and the purposes ascribed by the commentator to their utterance. And now if we examine the linguistic methods in detail\(^{19}\) we find that some of them do concern distinctions of just those sorts found in the West in the theory of meaning and the theory of speech-acts. The method of explanation by "intention (dgongs-bshad) turns out to concern just such distinctions. This considerably simplifies our task, for it means that we have, in the theory of meaning, a source of relevant and carefully worked out concepts expressed in the language of interpretation (here, English, of course).

* * *

As we remarked before, in the Hevajra-tantra, "sandhyā-bhāsa" is used in referring to a kind of code, for instance\(^{20}\) "madana" (lit. passion) stands for "madya" (lit. wine). In order to avoid taking sides in the controversy, I shall not in this context translate "sandhyā-bhāsa," but shall instead use "Hevajra code" to refer just to this particular code. (Similarly, "Guhyasamāja code."\(^{21}\) Thus no attempt is made here to preserve sense, but reference is carefully preserved. It is necessary to introduce some such device now, because as Wayman has shown, the Pradipoddhotana ms. uses, in some places, the almost identical form sandhyā bhāsa. Now: is the use of this word in PPD the same as, or similar to, the use of the corresponding word in the Hevajra-tantra? Since this is one of the main questions to be investigated in this paper, we need some clear way of signalling the distinction.

In order to find out just what the Hevajra code was, one may use commentaries on the tantra in two (related) ways. First, much of the commentatorial material explains the tantra directly, without using the technical language of bshad-thabs. Second, we can see what technical methods, what bshad-thabs, were used in those commentaries. At the risk of tedium I shall stress again that the code (sandhyā-bhāsa) is treated in both these cases as something to be explained, and not as something which explains something else. In contrast to all this, we have the explanatory or perhaps hermeneutical technique, certainly part of bshad-thabs, called "explanation by "intention" (dgongs-bshad, perhaps sandhyā-bhāsitam). Among other things, we have to find out whether the hermeneutical technique (sandhyā-bhāsitam) was in fact used to explain the code (sandhyā-bhāsa). Bearing this contrast in mind, we may set out the phases of this comparison, which will be the heart of the paper, under the following seven headings:

1. The Hevajra code: sandhyā-bhāsa (dgongs-skad)
2. The hermeneutic technique: dgongs-bshad (sandhyā-bhāsitam?)
3. The connection between sandhyā-bhāsa and sandhyā-bhāṣitāṃ: evidence from Sanskrit sources
4. The connection between dgongs-skad and dgongs-bshad: evidence from Tibetan sources
5. Proceeding from evidence based on Tibetan sources to conclusions about the Sanskrit terms
6. Consequences for the controversy on sandhyā-bhāsa
7. Some conclusions for interpretation technique in English.

It will be necessary to go into some of these points at rather tedious length, because of the many mistakes in the literature. These mistakes are largely mistakes of interpretation, and surprisingly many of them (see section 7) are assertions unsupported by argument or evidence. Accordingly, I shall argue for my conclusions. The general structure of this argument may perhaps be made clearer by the following summary of the topics to be discussed under these seven headings.

1. The Hevajra code: (sandhyā-bhāsa) (sometimes: dgongs-skad)
   1.1: the codewords grouped
   1.2: the Tibetan terms for sandhyā-bhāsa correlated with these groups
   1.3: the uses of the code in the vajra-song and elsewhere call for explanation of the secret signs (chomā, brda) found in HT I.vii
   1.4: Padma dkar-po on secret signs: their unconventionality; their secrecy and the reasons for it
   1.5: Kong-sprul on the individual code-words (brda-skad-rnams)
   1.6: Preliminary conclusions on sandhyā-bhāsa: the exact sense in which the Tibetan commentaries say it is a code (independently of bshad-thabs arguments)

2. The hermeneutic technique: dgongs-bshad (sometimes: sandhyā-bhāṣita)
   2.1: the phrase dgongs-pas bshad-pa: the importance of the instrumental suffix (cf. sec.3)
   2.2: dgongs-bshad in the Pradipoddyotana: analysis of the definition there, and its deficiency
   2.3: Btsong-kha-pa on dgongs-bshad: this deficiency made up; an illustration
   2.4: various interpretations of "dgongs-bshad," but their differences are not too important
   2.5: Kumāra's comparisons of dgongs-bshad with other methods already makes it clear why dgongs-bshad is irrelevant to dgongs-skad.

3. Sandhyā-bhāsa and sandhyā-bhāṣita: evidence from Sanskrit sources
   The question framed carefully. On the bshad-thabs (hermeneutic) side, the exact form of the Sanskrit is not too important, nor do the Tibetan case-endings tell us much about the Sanskrit (but see sec. 2.1). The Sanskrit sources tell us that there is opposition, but not between what. On the Hevajra side, the Sanskrit texts are more helpful, but they do not make up the deficiency.
4. **dgongs-skad and dgongs-bshad: evidence from Tibetan sources**

Here the available definitions of "dgongs-bshad" are much fuller, and it is evident that the Hevajra code does not fall within it. The hermeneutic (bshad-thabs) techniques (of the code) which are used by Tibetan authors are summarized; these techniques are incompatible with the use of dgongs-bshad.

5. What conclusions about the Sanskrit terms might we hope to draw from the Tibetan texts? Obviously the main plank of such an argument, insofar as it rests on bshad-thabs, has already collapsed; but the other necessary steps are pretty doubtful too. Consider the following:

5(a) The Tibetan for sandhyā-bhāṣa is dgongs-skad.
5(b) The Tibetan for sandhyā-bhāṣita is dgongs-bshad.
5(c) In a certain Tibetan context, the terms dgongs-skad and dgongs-bshad are used in certain clearly related ways.
5(d) Therefore, in the corresponding Sanskrit context, the terms sandhyā-bhāṣa and sandhyā-bhāṣita are used in similarly related ways.

*Not one of these four points 5(a) - 5(d) is even approximately right.* (a) is just factually wrong: the Sanskrit term mentioned in (b) is poorly established, and it is not easy to see how to make up the deficiency: in the Hevajra context, (c) is hopeless (this was section 4); the Sanskrit context mentioned in (d) does not seem to exist.

6. **Results for the controversy on sandhyā-bhāṣa**

We are to consider the group of terms sandhā-bhāṣa, sandhyā-bhāṣa etc. First, the assumption that this group is homogeneous is untenable. The word sandhyā-bhāṣita (etc.) does not belong with the others. Looking more carefully, we obtain two groups of (perhaps) related terms, but no longer with any lexical similarity. It seems possible that at a period earlier than that of our bshad-thabs texts, these two groups of terms were not, in fact, carefully distinguished. But to make use of this is to abandon any attempt to make use of bshad-thabs. On the other hand, the Tibetan (later) texts indicate what bshad-thabs methods were used of the code. But this information is available from the commentaries without much specific use of bshad-thabs, which has now become irrelevant in a quite different way. If there is any general conclusion, it is that the use of these terms must be understood first in specific contexts. When this has been done, we may perhaps be able to find a uniform interpretation. But there can be no a priori ground for assuming this.

7. **Some conclusions for interpretation technique in English.**

We need a clear adequacy criterion for our interpretations. A criterion is suggested, taken from the theory of meaning. This criterion enables us to understand in a systematic way why some current interpretations of the technical terms of bshad-thabs, even of such basic terms as sgra (śabda) and don (artha), are so badly wrong.
1. The HEVAJRA CODE: SANDHYĀ-BHĀṢA (sometimes: dgongs-skad)

1.1 The word sandhya-bhāṣa occurs nine times in HT II.iii22; there are no variations of spelling, other than those related to inflection.23 Though the sandhya-bhāṣa words have been listed many times24 we must say something about their organization. Having regard to the Tibetan commentatorial tradition, it is convenient to group them into three groups as follows:

A. vv.56a-60a. Here a typical example is the first Pāda:

madanaṃ madyaṃ balaṃ māṃsaṃ...

\[/ma da na chang ba la sha/\]

This means: “madana” (passion) stands for “madya”25 (wine26); “bala” (strength) stands for māṃsa” (flesh, meat).

B. v.60bcd. We have:

dvīndriyayogam kundurum /
vajraṃ bolakṣaṃ khyātāṃ padma kakkolakṣaṃ mataṃ //
\[/dbang-po gnyis sbyor kun-du-rum/\]

\[/rdo-rje bo-la zhes bshad-de//padma kakkola zhes-zer/\]

This means: “kundurum” stands for “the union of two organs;” “bola” stands for “vajra,” “kakkol” for “padma.” (Though of course “vajra” and “padma” are used as euphemisms, the commentators also frequently take them in other senses.)

C. vv.62-63, which concern the five Buddha-families. Typically:

Ḍombi vajrakuli khyāta Naṭī padmakuli tathā/
\[/g.yung-mo rdo-je/i rigs-su bshad//gar-ma de-bzhin padma/i rigs/\]

This means: “Ḍombi” stands for the vajra-family, “Naṭī” stands for the padma-family.

All three groups of usages A - C are clearly called “sandhya-bhāṣa”.

Groups A and B are used as a code, e.g. in the vajra-song27. In the case of group C this is not obvious in the tantra itself. But as we shall see, the Tibetan commentaries describe the usages of all three groups explicitly in ways which strongly invite translation by “code”. Further, groups B and C are described similarly in the quoted passages by the use of the word khyāta (bshad). A literal translation of this word as here used might be “explained as meaning,” where “as meaning” is carried by the case-endings. But these case-endings are different in groups B and C. This difference is reflected in my translation in the absence of quotation-marks around “vajra-family,” “padma-family,” as compared with their presence around “vajra,” “padma.” For “Ḍombi” does not stand for “vajrakula,” while “bola” does stand for “vajra,” this difference of function is fairly clear in the case-endings, both in Sanskrit and Tibetan.

Strictly speaking, a code is the substitution of one word for another word, and is not a kind of naming. So strictly speaking, group C should not be described by the word “code.” As we will see, the Tibetan texts do
attempt to record this distinction by translating "sandhya-bhāṣa" in two
different ways, but their usage is not uniform, and so with this caveat I
hope the reader will permit me to continue the use of "code" for all three
groups. Let us then see how the Tibetans did translate "sandhya-bhāṣa"
here, and what they did with the results.

1.2 The Tibetan for "sandhya-bhāṣa"

In HT II,iii we find the following words:

dgongs-pa'i skad: vv. 1, 53, 54, 55

gsang-ba'i skad: vv. 61, 64, 65, 66, colophon.

These phrases contain the morphological feature -pa'i, -ba'i, which is often
described syntactically as a genitive case-ending, but which in cases like
this has the function of indicating that the preceding words are attributive
adjectives. Thus gsang-ba'i skad does mean, absolutely literally, "secret
language," and if dgongs-pa means "intention," dgongs-pa'i skad means,
absolutely literally, "intentional language." (There can, of course, be no
question of "gsang-ba" or "dgongs-pa" meaning "twilight.") Clearly, then,
the Tibetans did not see the ending in sandhya as instrumental in this con-
text. So if we find instrumental endings used in translating sandhya-bhāṣita,
we may feel that this use is deliberate.

Our two Tibetan words are directly associated with the three groups A
-C in the tantra thus:

A: three occurrences of "dgongs-pa'i skad," vv. 53, 54, 55

B: none

C: one occurrence of "gsang-ba'i skad," v. 61.

The remaining five occurrences ("dgongs-pa'i skad" once, v.1; "gsang-ba'i
skad" four times, vv. 64, 65, 66 and colophon) seem most plausibly taken
in connection with the passage as a whole, and not with any particular
portion of it.

Clearly, there is here a case for saying that "gsang-ba'i skad" refers to
these usages (the code) in general and possibly to group C, while "dgongs-
pa'i skad" refers to group A and probably group B, and is a particular kind
of gsang-ba'i skad. This possibility is not only interesting in itself (as under-
mining the 1-1 connection between "sandhya" and "dgongs-pa"), but is also
part (only) of the case for translating "sandhya-bhāṣa," as used of the
Hevajra code, by "secret language," as Snellgrove has done; we shall see
that there are other grounds for taking this translation seriously.

This feature of the Tibetan translation of the Hevajra-tantra has been ex-
plained by commentators along (at least) two different lines. These differ-
ent lines of explanation make use of the fact that, in the tantra, there is no
occurrence of "sandhya-bhāṣa" specifically associated with group B.

Bkra-shis rnam-rgyal makes use of this to associate groups B and C to-
gether. His account emphasizes the purpose for which the locutions are used.
He discusses group A under the heading of "language suitable for the crowd
of yogins," and this phrase corresponds, in a very loose sense, to dgongs-
skad. Groups B and C are taken together under the heading of "language
suitable for the maṇḍala-cakra,” and this corresponds in the same loose sense to gsang-skad.

In contrast, Kong-sprul[^31] takes the distinction in a linguistic sense. He includes both groups A and B under dgongs-skad, which he describes as “normally using the name of the effect to stand for the cause.”[^32] Only group C comes under gsang-skad. If we were going to rely solely on Kong-sprul’s version, then, we would have a stronger case for abandoning the description of group C as “code.” When we come to discuss Kong-sprul’s use of the term “brda-skad” (section 1.5), we will see this view reinforced.

Kong-sprul has thus abandoned all attempt to bring the use of sandhyā-bhāṣa even in this one context under one sense. But Bkra-shis rnam-rgyal’s version, by taking group B with group C, leaves the possibility still open to say that both dgongs-skad and gsang-skad are some kind of code. I am not asking the reader to make a choice between these two versions. They are exhibited in order to show that the writings of well-known Tibetan authors contain a variety of views which will have to be taken carefully into account if our interpretation of “sandhyā-bhāṣa” is in the end going to be claimed to have the sanction of the Tibetan commentatorial tradition as a whole.

1.3 Uses of the Hevajra code

The main use of the code is in the vajra-song, which has been discussed by several Western authors[^33],[^34] and has received a great deal of attention in Tibet.[^35] The code is also used in other passages of the tantra, such as that on feasting.[^36]

Now an outstanding feature of the vajra-song is that many of the unusual words found in it are not in the sandhyā-bhāṣa chapter. The first line of the song runs[^37]

Kollaire ūṭhia bolā Mummuṇire kakkolā

In their version of the tantra, the Tibetans wisely did not translate this; nor shall I. The two capitalized words are place-names of a sort, and do not appear in HT II.iii. But at least “Mummuṇi” appears in the list of “places” in HT I.vii. Though the vocabulary of the tantra does thus suggest some kind of connection between the three chapters I.vii, II.iii and II.iv, we have to appeal to the commentaries to find out what this connection was taken to be.

The whole commentatorial tradition makes it clear that the Hevajra code (sandhyā-bhāṣa) is part of something more general, viz. “signs” (chomā, brda). These appear in HT I.vii; and the “places” of that chapter are examples of such “signs.” What we now have to do, then, is to consider the relation between the “signs” of I.vii and the “code” of II.iii-iv.

1.4 Padma dkar-po on signs (brda)

Padma dkar-po (1527-92), possibly the greatest Tibetan scholar of the Vajrayāna and certainly a celebrated mystic, wrote a study on the Hevajra-tantra[^38] which, without going into much detail, groups the various themes
of that rather disorderly work in a way which makes them much more coherent than do most commentaries. Like many of his other works, it is written in a cryptic, awkward style and assumes that the reader already has a good knowledge of the subject. So some of his sparse observations may usefully be filled in with the more detailed but less incisive comments of Kong-sprul. With Padma dkar-po, we may wish to distinguish between the following matters:

The notion of a sign (brda) in general
The notion and purposes of signs (brda) in the Hevajra-tantra
Particular types of sign (brda) used in the Hevajra-tantra:
   Bodily signs (lus-kyi brda): HT I.vii
   Speech-signs (ngag-gi brda): HT II.iii

Normally in Tibetan texts translated from the Sanskrit, brda translates sainketa, and in Buddhist Sanskrit this word basically means sign. It is not really necessary to specify that these signs are conventional, for no sign can designate something unless its use is governed by rules. But the rules may be well and generally known, or less well-known. In the Hevajra-tantra the signs are called chomā, and though this word is also translated by brda, Padma dkar-po makes it clear that not any sign counts, in this context, as brda:

The essence of brda is that communicative intention is indicated by speech or gesture not following normal conventions.

This definition is analyzed in note 41; my interpretation is founded on the points made there about Padma dkar-po’s vocabulary. He continues with a sham-etymology (nges-tshig, nirukta) of brda:

(Chomā) is (here) said to be brda, because it is like the language of the barbarians (kla-klo), by means of which the yogins recognise each other but cannot be recognized by outsiders.

Thus chomā (signs) are related to the secrecy of the tradition; and Padma dkar-po even says that this is the point (dgos-pa) of brda. Such facts give support to the translation of brda by “secret signs,” and I shall so translate it. Later we will see that “brda” is used (via the phrase brda-skad, lit. sign-language) to explain the terms dgongs-skad and gsang-skad. This view about “brda” (by no means confined to Padma dkar-po) lends further weight to the translation of “gsang-skad” by “secret language.”

Secret signs (chomā, brda) are associated with vows and secrecy in two slightly different ways. First, they help the yogin to recognize those initiates with whom he may have congress, in a situation (a gaṇa-cakra) where uninitiated people may be present. Second, the use of secret signs helps him preserve his vows and avoids the wrath of the guardian deities. (Of course these points are related.)

The secret gestures (lus-kyi brda) are dealt with in detail in HT I.vii. However, only part of the secret speech-signs are dealt with there, namely
the names of the “places” (pithas etc.). The general account of how the secret speech-signs are used is given with the explanation of the rest of the individual speech-signs, i.e. the sandhyā-bhāsa words, in HT II.iii.48 The effect of all this is that the code-words do fall under the explanations of II.iii, but that these explanations have to be seen in the light of the more general notion of secret sign (chomā, brda) in I.vii. And this is reflected in Kong-sprul’s terminology where, even in commenting on I.vii, he refers to the language of secret signs in general by using the word dgongs-skad.

Now that we are clear what brda means in the present context, we can go back to HT II.iii. Here, the commentaries explain the individual words in a way which really does make the idea of a code rather explicit. The word used by Kong-sprul (and others) is brda-skad; let us see how this word is used.

1.5 Kong-sprul on code-words (brda-skad)

In the following passage, Kong-sprul49 sets out the connection between code (dgongs-skad) and code-words (brda-skad):50

That which is called dgongs-skad is a passage accompanied by *intention (dgongs-pa-dang-bcas-pa). What kind of language (skad) is this? It is the code (brda-skad) of the unsurpassed vows made in the yoginī-tantras. This (code) is not known to those who definitely belong to the types (rigs) of the śrāvakas and pratyekabuddhas and who have entered the Hinayāna. Nor is it known to those who, having entered the Mahāyāna, (adopt) the other, incomplete divisions of the tantra, that is, the kriyā-tantra of those who desire to smile at each other, the cārya-tantra of those who desire to gaze at each other, the yoga-tantra of those who desire to embrace and kiss each other, and the anuttarayogatantra51 of those who, as a result of their karman, desire to engage in the union of the male and female organs. Even these four classes of tantra do not say52 that the dgongs-skad is such-and-such.

Shortly after, Kong-sprul begins his explanation of the details53:

Having told his questioner Vajragarbha to listen with fixed and undistracted mind, the Buddha sets out to instruct him on the items of the code (dgongs-skad-rnams) in proper order. These symbol-items (brda ’di-dag-rnams) usually refer to the cause by the name of the effect54. Thus “madana” means “intoxication” (myos-byed), and brings about drunkenness (bzi-ba), so it is used to refer to beer (chang), since when one drinks beer, one gets drunk.

There follow numerous explanations on this pattern. Now at least eleven of these explanations55 all follow the following scheme:

/rus-pa’i rgyan mtshon-pa’i brda-skad ni/ ni-ram-shu’o/

This means: As for the brda-skad standing for “rus-pa’i rgyan” (bone-ornament), it is “niramṣu.” It is hard to think of more convincing evidence
that at least here in Kong-sprul, “brda-skad” is being used with the sense (and not merely the reference) of “code-word.”

1.6 Preliminary conclusions on the Hevajra code (sandhyā-bhāṣa)

We have seen that there have been serious attempts to make a distinction in sense between “dgongs-skad” and “gsang-skad;” this is important, but let us ignore it for the moment. The whole tradition brings the code (sandhyā-bhāṣa, i.e. both dgongs-skad and gsang-skad, if these are different), under secret signs (chomā, brda). Kong-sprul says that the individual terms, sometimes called e.g. dgongs-skad-rnams⁵⁷ or gsang-skad-rnams, are all “code-words”—brda-skad-rnams. And these conclusions may be reached without any reliance on bshad-thabs materials, from Tibetan writings on the Hevajra-tantra. Knowing independently, then, what the Hevajra-code is, and knowing also its basic purpose, viz. secrecy and the guarding of vows, we have a solid foundation for assessing and understanding what bshad-thabs tells us about this code.

This discussion has made use of only a very small part of the immense range of writings available on the Hevajra-tantra. It is of course perfectly possible that other sources will express other views. There is no harm in this; of course the results are relative to the sources on which they are based. The writers on whom I mainly rely for the Hevajra-tantra, viz. Bka-shis rnam-rgyal, Padma dkar-po and Kong-sprul, also wrote on bshad-thabs and had roughly compatible views in that area too. Again, there will be other writers of whom this can be said. For instance, the Sakya-pa school had a very vigorous tradition of commentary⁵⁸ on the Hevajra-tantra, and used a system of bshad-thabs called “six instructions”⁵⁹ different from the “seven ornaments” ⁶⁰ system favored by our Bka-brgyud-pa writers and also by the Dge-lugs-pas, such as Btsong-kha-pa. Now, the term sandhyā-bhāṣitaḥ belongs to the “seven ornaments” and not to the “six instructions.” This is why we concentrate on Hevajra works from those traditions which, in bshad-thabs, use the “seven ornaments.”

2. THE HERMENEUTIC TECHNIQUE: DGONGS-BSHAD
(sandhyā-bhāṣitaḥ?)

2.1 The phrase “dgongs-pas bshad-pa”

It is, I fear, a tedious feature of this paper that so many Sanskrit and Tibetan phrases appear without a straightforward English equivalent; but if the words sandhi, sandhā, sandhyā, sandhyāya etc. possessed such equivalents, the controversy over “sandhyā-bhāṣa” would probably never have arisen. “Sandhi” etc. derive from the root sam + dhā-, meaning to place together, to associate. When rendered in Tibetan by “dgongs-pa,” these words usually carry the notions of referring to, meaning, intending, and sometimes intending deceptively. The weight, as it were, of these factors varies greatly. Since the use of all these words tends to carry the notion of purposive action, purely as a slogan I have represented “dgongs-pa” by
"*intention." Then the literal representation of the full phrase *dgongs-pa bshad-pa* is "explanation by "intention," or "to explain by "intention."" This full phrase is used quite regularly in some important sources, including JVS and D. The ending on *dgongs-pa* is always -pas in this context (never -pa'i, -nas, etc.) The most natural way to take the ending -pas is as an instrumental case-ending, and this suggests that *intention* (*dgongs-pa*) is the means or instrument by which the explanation is made. This suggestion is basically bright, and it is valuable, because, as we shall see in section 3, the corresponding situation in the Sanskrit is far less clear. In any case, as observed in section 1.2, we may be sure that the use of the ending -pas by the Tibetans was the result of deliberate choice; for in the case of the Hevajra code, *sandhyā-bhāsa*, the typographically identical word *sandhyā* was translated by *dgongs-pa'i*.

2.2. *dgongs-bshad in the Pradipoddyotana*

Steinkellner(2) has rightly drawn the attention of scholars to the importance of the *Pradipoddyotana* in the historical development of Vajrayāna hermeneutics (*bshad-thabs*). The verse in which *dgongs-bshad* is defined is quoted in Sanskrit by Wayman(6,7) and runs thus(8):

\[
\text{viśiṣṭa-ruci-sattvānāṃ dharma-tattva-prakāśanām /}
\text{viruddha-ālāpa-yogena yat tat sandhyāya-bhāsitam,} \]

Some of the details of the Sanskrit will be discussed in section 3. For the moment, it is enough to observe that the verse must mean something like this: "Whatever is to be explained *intentionally* is spoken by means of contradictory (viruddha) discourse, revealing the suchness of things to beings desiring the best." The Tibetan translation(9) is perfectly straightforward:

\[
/\text{mchog 'dod sems-can-rnams-kyi phyir//chos-kyi de-nyid rab-ston-pa/}
/\text{'gal-ba'i tshig-gi sbyor-ba yis//gsungs-pa gang yin dgongs-bshad-do/}. \]

*Bhāṣitam* = *bshad* here means explained and not expressed, not only on the grounds given in the Introduction, but because nothing can be expressed by means of a connection (yogena, sbyor-ba-yis). Viruddha = 'gal-ba means "opposed" or "opposing" or "contradicting," etc. This much is (or ought to be) obvious. The real problem is about the phrase viruddha-ālāpa-yogena = 'gal-ba'i tshig-gi sbyor-ba-yis. The word ālāpa normally means "discourse" all by itself; what then is ālāpa-yoga? It seems plausible to suppose that the connection (yoga) is with the content of the discourse; the phrase then means *exactly* an opposition between discourse and content, such as we find in metaphors and deceptive utterances. This conclusion has been reached elsewhere (see note 3) by analysis of Tibetan *bshad-thabs* texts; but here of course it rests on the merely plausible supposition about the connection. The Tibetan version of the verse yields, by itself, nothing further, and I believe that this is the best that can be done
with the verse itself (without assistance, say, from commentaries). Let us now see how this common-sense interpretation of the opposition (viruddha) just offered squares up with the fuller and more detailed account of Btsong-kha-pa.

2.3 Btsong-kha-pa on dgongs-bshad

In his commentary (rgya-cher bshad-pa, lit. "extended explanation") on the Jñānavārasamuccaya, Btsong-kha-pa takes his definition of dgongs-pas bshad-pa from the Pradhānottaratantra because JVS does not provide adequate definitions of the "six alternatives" (mtha'-drug), and he glosses the verse thus:67

For the benefit of those sentient beings of sharp intellect who desire the highest attainment (siddhi), whatever is spoken in discourse whose conventions (sgra) oppose the intention (don) (of the utterance), is explained intentionally.

Elsewhere it has been shown in great detail that the pair sgra (šabda) and don (arthā), which are contrasted throughout the topic of bshad-thabs, are related broadly in the following way:

\[
\text{sgra: words, phrases, sentences; linguistic convention, linguistic meaning}
\]

\[
\text{don: content of a saying, proposition asserted (etc.), purpose or intention of a speech-act; reference, referent}
\]

There is no need to repeat those arguments here. But we may note that if sgra meant simply "word(s)," the passage would immediately give nonsense, for words without linguistic meaning cannot oppose anything. Similarly if don meant "meaning," the passage would again give nonsense, because there would be nothing left in sgra which could be opposed by don. Because it is so important to avoid the temptation to translate sgra/don by word/meaning in this context, I will try to support the general arguments of ref.3 by giving some specific ones.

There can be no doubt that Btsong-kha-pa intended us to take the opposition (gal-ba) of convention (sgra) and intention (don) seriously, since he expressed himself in almost the same way in several other places.69

In order to illustrate this theme, Btsong-kha-pa also gives a rather extended example. To follow it, we must note that the difference between dgongs-bshad and its opposite dgongs-min is never exemplified by two interpretations of one and the same passage (this is the province of drang-don and nges-don”), but always by two different passages having roughly the same purpose (don).70 Btsong-kha-pa’s example contrasts, then, two remarks. The first says:

The purpose of purifying the three poisons (snag-ba gsum) is to show the radiant light (od-gsal).
This remark is to be taken straightforwardly, it is *dgongs-min*. By contrast, the remark\textsuperscript{74}

No desire, no lack of desire, and nothing is seen in between

is said to repudiate (*bka-g-pa\textsuperscript{75}) the previous remark, inasmuch as if there is neither desire nor non-desire etc., how can there be anything to purify? Taken literally, the two remarks are in *opposition*; but since the second (like the first) is explained as showing the radiant light, the two remarks have the same purpose (as ascribed by the commentator). In the first, the linguistic meaning is in harmony with that purpose, in the second, they are in opposition. (Obviously my two uses of "opposition" are essentially identical.)

From the point of view of religious experience, the Zen-like flavour of the remark "No desire, no non-desire, and nothing is seen in between" gives us a valuable clue. For the *purpose* of these strange utterances, in which the sense of the words contradicts the utterer's intention, is said in *JVS*\textsuperscript{76} and elsewhere to be to demonstrate the ultimate (*mthar-thug-pa*) which, being a wordless experience, cannot directly be conveyed by words.

Another famous example with this flavour is that of "killing living beings."\textsuperscript{77} The normal buddha-intention (of compassion towards all beings) is opposed to the literal sense of the words. That is *all* that is meant here by *dgongs-bshad*.

In both cases it is obvious that the difference is not merely one of *words* (as opposed to *meaning*). For if we abstract the meaning away from the words, we are left with nothing but strings of marks on paper (or sequences of sounds) which cannot by themselves account for any difference in modes of interpretation.

2.4 *dgongs-bshad: other interpretations*

It has seemed worthwhile quoting and explaining Btsong-kha-pa on *dgongs-bshad* because his work D has been used by various Western authors.\textsuperscript{78} Bu-ston\textsuperscript{78} and Padma dkar-po\textsuperscript{80} both gloss the PPD verse by saying that the normal sense of the words opposes worldly attitudes. But Bkra-shis rnam-rgyal\textsuperscript{81} and Kong-sprul\textsuperscript{82} both agree broadly with Btsong-kha-pa. These differences are important, but they do not affect the present arguments. Elsewhere\textsuperscript{83}, Padma dkar-po has given a deeper analysis of *dgongs-bshad*, not based on PPD, which implies some criticism of the earlier writers. His arguments are partly derived from ideas in the non-tantric literature (e.g. MSL); but I cannot go into this here\textsuperscript{84}.

2.5 *Kumāra’s comparison*

In his PPD-based analysis in F, Padma dkar-po quotes a passage from the Indian author Kumāra, who compares *dgongs-bshad* with other explanatory methods from the "six alternatives":

Whereas *dgongs-bshad* rests on differences of *sgra* (words and linguistic meaning), *drang-don* rests on differences of *don* (purposes
ascribed).
Whereas *dgongs-bshad* opposes, *sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa* is a matter of
unknown signs (*brda*).
Whereas *dgongs-bshad* opposes, *sgra ji-bzhin* does not oppose.

Already the second of these remarks tells us why *dgongs-bshad* is irrelevant
to the Hevajra code. For we know that this is just a matter of signs (*brda*)
and of *sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa*. The language of secret signs (*brda*), of code
(*brda-skad*) does not oppose anything, either the purpose of utterance
(Btsong-kha-pa, Bkra-shis rnam-rgyal, Kong-sprul), or wordly usage (Buston, Padma dkar-po). It is unknown in the world, it conceals its purpose;
and these are just the province of *sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa*.

3. SANDHYA-BHASA AND SANDHYA-BHASITA:
EVIDENCE FROM SANSKRIT SOURCES

What, then, if any, is the evidence from Sanskrit sources alone that the
two terms *sandhya-bhasa*, used of the Hevajra code, and *sandhya-bhasita*
(or its variants), used of a certain method of explaining texts, are similar or
connected? Here it may be accepted that the first term is indeed the name of
a kind of text or passage or use of words which is to be explained, while the
second is the name of a method of explaining texts, etc. This important
distinction is not what is now at issue. The question before us is this: are the
passages, for instance in the *Hevajra-tantra*, called *sandhya-bhasa*, in fact
explained, say in the commentaries on that tantra, by means of the explanatory
technique called *sandhya-bhasita*? Let us see what the Sanskrit
sources offer us.

On the *sandhya-bhasita* (hermeneutical) side, the first thing to do is to
establish precise forms of the Sanskrit under examination; for although it
will turn out that this is not certain, unless we can limit the extent of the
uncertainty there will be no basis for discussion. Here, Wayman seems to
have done most of what is necessary in ref.6 (and it is a pity that this, the
most useful part of that paper, is omitted in his otherwise very similar
paper, ref.7). Wayman shows that in the Bihar ms. of PPD, the normal
form is *sandhya bhasa* (two words), but that in the critical verse defining the
term (quoted above) we have *sandhya-bhāsita*. Given the predominance of forms in *sandhya-*, it seems reasonable to modify this to
*sandhya-bhāsita*. (By contrast the inflection on the second part of the
compound has a clear function and must be left). The normal Tibetan
forms are *dgongs-pas bshad-pa* and *dgongs-bshad*. Let us review the
arguments about the case-endings in these phrases. First, the Sanskrit. I shall let
"bhāsa" stand for the different forms of the second part of the word, since
they will not need to be discussed. Since *sandhya bhāsa* is uncompounded
while *sandhya-bhāsita* is a compound, we must consider both com-
pound and uncompounded forms. The possibilities seem to be:

(a) *sandhi* in instr. + *bhāsa* (two separate words)
(b) *sandhya* in nom. + *bhāsa* (compound)
(c) sandhyā as indeclinable participle + bhāsa (compound)
(d) sandhā + bhāsa (compound)

Here, (d) takes into account the possibility that -dhy- is a Nepalese orthographic variation for -dh-. Other combinations seem implausible because there is no way of accounting for the connection of the two words. Wayman’s treatment in this area is somewhat inexplicit, but it seems he wants to assimilate these cases. His argument seems to be that the (a)-like form at Pañcakrama II.31 is glossed by Śrī-Lakṣmī with an instrumental (in Tibetan), and the standard Tibetan form in bshad-thabs also has the instrumental. So in the end it does not matter which of the forms (a) - (d) we adopt, as far as morphology is concerned (his adoption of “twilight language” presumably favours (b) on other grounds). So far so good. But the Tibetan instrumental88 does not mean, as he takes it, in the manner of (which would normally be tshul-gyis, acting as a postposition with the genitive). It means by means of. Because of this, the Śrī-Lakṣmī example does not help Wayman. Her phrase (ref.6, p.790) “dgongs-pas bshad-pas bstan-pa’i don-dam-pa’i byang-chub sems” means “the paramārtha-bodhicitta which is taught by explanation by means of sandhi (etc.).” (I don’t at all think the Sanskrit in the Pañcakrama does mean this, but that is another matter.) In the Hevajra-tantra, the situation with sandhyā-bhāsa is also not favourable for Wayman’s argument, for as we have already pointed out, that phrase is there always translated by a form attributive adjective + noun (or morphologically, by a genitive ending). In any case, in Pañcakrama II.31 we also have a genitive (dgongs-pa’i byang-chub).

These arguments revolving around the detailed forms of the Sanskrit words, then, tell against the conclusion which Wayman has tried to draw from them. But I too find I can get only rather wavering support from them. So I will not rely on these arguments at all, but will return to the form appearing in the critical verse, viz. sandhyāya-bhaṣitam, merely accepting that Wayman has made a good case for modifying it to sandhyā-bhaṣitam; and I shall use this form as a cipher for the Sanskrit term in the PPD which is now under examination, bearing in mind that the ms. contains also the form sandhyā bhāṣā (uncompounded). On bhāsa/bhāṣita the Tibetan is no help, since bshad-pa can be noun, infinitive or past participle (“explanation,” “to explain,” “explained”).

Let us then return to the PPD verse itself. All this seems to tell us (section 2.2) is that the words or the text or the discourse (ālāpa) is opposed (viruddha) to something. To what? The guess that we have opposition between discourse and purpose or content is only plausible, not more.

On the sandhyā-bhāsa (code) side, the situation is not quite so frustrating. Common sense suggests the connection between HT I.vii (on chomā), II.iii (on sandhyābhaṣa) and II.iv (the vajragīti), for it is obvious that the vocabulary for the latter is drawn from the two former. And the purpose of secret signs (chomā) in general and of the Hevajra code (sandhyā-bhāsa) in particular is made clear enough by HT I.vii.1 and the
Yogaratnamāla on it: the initiates use a barbarous (miliccha) form of communication so that they will recognise each other and not be recognized by outsiders, etc. (YRM and also the Tibetan commentaries are surprisingly vague on whether the word “chomā” itself is barbarous, or its referent. However, Mr. Alexis Sanderson kindly tells me that “chomā” is Middle Indo-Aryan from Sanskrit “chadman,” “disguise.” If this is right, then surely it is the referent, the secret signs themselves, that are barbarous.) Now obviously there is an opposition here. It is the opposition between the natural sense of the words used (say) in the vajragītī and the non-natural sense in which they were intended to be understood by the yogins and yoginis (a sense explained both in the tantra itself, say at II.iii.56 ff., and in YRM [on the vajragītī]). And this opposition is of course just the opposition which we find in sgra’i-bzhin ma-yin-pa, and not that in dgongs-bshad.

But this last step cannot be taken on the basis of the Sanskrit texts alone. For in the last analysis, the deficiency already noted in the PPD definition of dgongs-bshad does not allow us to make the distinction which is here at issue, between an opposition within ālāpa (discourse) or an opposition between ālāpa and something else.

We could argue from the first line of the Sanskrit verse: sandhyā-bhāsa is for those who desire the highest. But bereft of Btsong-kha-pa’s gloss, that these people are those of sharp intellect (dbang-po rnon-po), this does not tell us enough. For those the code can be learnt by anybody, however stupid, such persons are not necessarily devoid of ambition.

So we conclude that the Sanskrit texts presently available are not enough, at least on the bshad-thabs side. We must turn to Tibetan texts.

4. DGONGS-SKAD AND DGONGS-BSHAD:
EVIDENCE FROM TIBETAN SOURCES

Enough has already been done to show that, when indigenous Tibetan sources are taken into account, the connection between the Hevajra code (sandhyā-bhāsa) and the similarly-named hermeneutic technique is very problematic. Now I want to go further than this, and to show that the Tibetan texts decisively repudiate such a connection.

The question now before us is this: are the passages in the Hevajra-tantra called e.g. dgongs-skad in fact explained by means of the explanatory method called dgongs-bshad? The answer is unequivocal: in the texts which I have examined, the dgongs-skad passages are never explained by dgongs-bshad. They are explained by other methods; and the general structure of these explanatory methods (bshad-thabs) is such that, given the methods actually in use, the use of dgongs-bshad is impossible, it is incompatible with them.

First, the methods actually in use. The linguistic conventions are non-standard. Even the Sa-skya-pa tradition, which does not use the category sgra’i-bzhin ma-yin, makes this very clear. And all the Bka’-brgyud authors whom I have quoted say quite explicitly, in reference to dgongs-
skad, gsang-skad and brda-skad, in the Hevajra context, that all of these are sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa* (na-yathārūta, not according to normal convention). And as regards the interpretation of passages using the codewords, all our authors agree* that these passages possess both drang-don and nges-don (neyārtha and nīṭārtha) interpretations. And as Padma dkar-po has particularly emphasized (though we know it also from Kumara and Btsong-kha-pa) these methods, the ones that are actually used, can be used only if there is at least rough compatibility between the normal use of the sentence and its use in the passage under examination, whereas dgongs-bshad can be used only if there is incompatibility. Here, we clearly have compatibility; for the chomā (brda, secret signs) are used with the basic intention of keeping the tradition secret; and this is precisely in accordance with the use of a code.

Indeed, once we thus understand the difference between the two terms, many arguments become available. Btsong-kha-pa says that dgongs-bshad is for the intelligent; but it is obvious that the code can be used by anybody who knows it, however stupid. JVS and PPD both say that dgongs-bshad is closely connected with mthar-thug-don; but it is obvious that the purposes (guarding vows etc.) of the code have nothing whatever to do with mthar-thug-don (pace Kāṇha on HT II.iii.1). One could go on indefinitely.

Let us abstract for a moment from the fact that we deal with lexically similar pairs of terms: sandhyā-bhāsa/bhāṣita, dgongs-skad/bshad. We can easily do this, for instance, by thinking of those many passages in the Tibetan commentaries which use the terms gsang-skad and brda-skad. None of these Hevajra passages so much as mentions dgongs-bshad. Why, then, other than because of the lexical similarity, should it ever have occurred to anybody that the terms might be related?

5. PROCEEDING FROM EVIDENCE BASED ON TIBETAN SOURCES TO CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE SANSKRIT TERMS

In the review we mentioned four stages of this argument. The main point, 5(c), is hopeless, and need not be discussed further. Let us consider the other points, however.

5(a) is simply wrong. Sandhyā-bhāsa, as used in HT II.iii, corresponds to the two Tibetan words dgongs-skad and gsang-skad. It is a matter of controversy whether these two words are synonymous or not, even relative to this limited context. Further, if there is a single Tibetan term which is used of sandhyā-bhāsa generally in HT II.iii, that term is gsang-skad and not dgongs-skad. What these two have in common is that they are certainly varieties of brda-skad; but this word cannot support any comparison with "sandhyā-bhāṣita."

5(b) is precarious. Here it is the Sanskrit word sandhyā-bhāsa which is poorly established. It is hard to ignore the occurrence of a whole range of similar Sanskrit phrases in such sources as the Lāṅkāvatāra," the Saddharma-pundarīka* and the Mahāyānasūtrālāṅkāra." If we are going to take the Tibetan tradition of bshad-thabs seriously, we cannot ignore
these non-tantric texts, since Padma dkar-po’s account of dgongs-bhāsad, the best one known to me, is largely based on them. But as we shall see, in these texts there is no straightforward one-to-one relationship between “dgongs-bshad” and “sandhyā-bhāsa” (or any other pair of similar terms). In relation to these sources, the Pradīpoddyotana (with its few occurrences of our terms) does not carry very much weight. (This situation might change, if for instance Sanskrit mss. of subcommentaries on PPD or of the Sandhi-vyākarana were discovered.)

Similarly, the Tibetan term dgongs-bshad suffers competition. For a number of important Tibetan authors abandoned it and used instead “dgongs-pa-can.” This is not just a matter of synonymy; a change of meaning is involved.

The inference 5(d) is also precarious. Suppose the facts under 5(a)–(c) were all in favour of the suggested hypotheses, rather than against them. What conclusion would follow? One could conclude only that the Tibetans interpreted “sandhyā-bhāsa” and “sandhyā-bhāṣita” in certain closely related ways, the relation being that set out in the beginning of section 3. If this were true (which it is not), it would be interesting. But nothing would follow about how these words were understood or used in India. Conclusions about their use in India might be drawn from bstan-’gyur texts on bshad-thabs and on the Hevajra-tantra. Nobody has ever claimed to be able to do this. My impression (no more!) is that dgongs-bshad, which is important in the Guhyasamāja system, was not used in India in the Hevajra system. If this is correct, the basis for the comparison, insofar as it related to India, is non-existent. On the other hand, we have already seen how the Hevajra-tantra itself claims that its sandhyābhāsa cannot be understood by those who practice the father-tantras (such as the Guhyasamāja). Some weight must clearly be attached to this claim.

In my opinion, this line of argument can hope to succeed only if one abandons Guhyasamāja-based bshad-thabs altogether, and looks at the bshad-thabs actually used in Indian commentaries on the Hevajra-tantra. The notion of dgongs-bshad, and the whole programme discussed in this paper, then probably become irrelevant. Obviously, then, one will expect quite different results. I shall sketch one such proposal, which has some attractive features, in section 6.

6. CONCLUSIONS FOR THE CONTROVERSY ON SANDHĀ-BHĀṢA

Of the group of words sandhā-bhāṣa etc., some, such as sandhyā-bhāsa, are undoubtedly used (e.g. in HT) to refer to kinds of language. Some, such as sandhyā-bhāṣita or sandhyā-bhāsa (both as used in PPD), seem to be names of methods of explaining tantra passages.

However, the method sometimes called sandhyā-bhāsa never seems to be used to explain the language-form called sandhyā-bhāsa. So our group is heterogeneous, in a rather strong sense of that word. Such heterogeneity in our group may, indeed, extend further.

If further investigation is to be based on Tibetan texts on bshad-thabs,
then the heterogeneity just noted will force us to consider separately at least the following groups of terms:

(a) sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin, gsang-skad, dgongs-skad, brda-skad, brda &c.
(b) dgongs-bshad, dgongs-pa-can, ldem-por dgongs-pa, ldem-po'i ngag.\(^2\)

There will also be words whose uses straddle the two groups, principally the word dgongs-pa itself.

Correspondingly, there will be at least two separate groups of Sanskrit words:

(a') na-yathārūta, sandhyā-ṣa (in HT), sandhi-bhāṣa (in connection with GST), chomā, possibly sanketa (e.g. in HT)
(b') sandhyā-bhāṣita and sandhyā bhāṣa (both in PPD); abhisandhi and abhiprāya (both as interpreted by Padma dkar-po)

Again, there will be terms which straddle the two groups, such as certain uses of sandhi, sandhāya. And obviously this whole line of discussion is directly relevant only to the uses of these words in the tantras. Obviously too the purely lexical motivation for the analysis has now disappeared. But I cannot imagine any worthwhile conception of philology in which this motivation is any but the most tentative possible suggestion of meaning. In our division, the motivation will be the difference between words used in accounts of the linguistic conventions governing some rather unusual ways of using language (a,a'), and words used in partly "intention-based accounts of some rather different ways in which language has, on certain occasions, been used (b,b').

Now this distinction has been taken seriously in bshad-thabs; for, as has been shown in so many different ways, it is the basic distinction between sgra ji-bzhin ma yin-pa and dgongs-bshad. But to say this is not to say that the distinction was made or recognized or presupposed, or that it would be useful to make it, in other contexts.

The present study is based mainly on Tibetan texts written with the distinctions of bshad-thabs in mind. No attempt has here been made to trace the historical evolution of these distinctions.\(^3\) But it seems at least plausible that there was a period when the group of notions, just discussed as separated in Tibetan accounts of bshad-thabs, was not so separated, and when explanations of sandhyā-bhāṣa and other terms in the tantras did not separate these notions. Let me briefly sketch this line of treatment of the problem, so different from that followed elsewhere in this paper.

In the Mahāyānasūtrabālākaṇṭha on XII.16-18\(^4\) and Sthiramati\(^5\) on it, we find a lengthy treatment of linguistic usages which are not literal. The key terms here are abhisandhi and abhiprāya, translated in the Tibetan text of the Sthiramati commentary by dgongs-pa and ldem-po'i ngag respectively. Sthiramati's numerous examples include many which in bshad-thabs would clearly fall under either dgongs-bshad or sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa. The latter
term is in fact used by Vasubandhu and Sthiramati of the type of *abhīprāya* called *arthāntarābhīprāya* (*don-gzan-gyi ldem-po'i ngag*). The treatment is organized in a way which makes it clear that this case is not to be thought of as something separate from the cases of *abhisandhi* (*dgongs-pa*) which are discussed. On the other hand, the examples given make it clear that the notion of *arthāntarābhīprāya* covers such cases as the parable of the sands of the river Ganges, which in the *Lainkāvatāra* is also described as *ayathārūta* (*sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin*; not according to the literal sense) and *upāmamātra* (merely by way of comparison). So here, the two notions, later separated under *dgongs-bshad* and *sgra ji-bzhin ma yin-pa*, seem not to be separated or distinguished systematically.

The only available Sanskrit commentary on the *Hevajra-tantra* is the *Yogaratnamālā*. On the very word *sandhya-bhāsa* at II.iii.53, this work comments:

> sandhir abhiprāyaḥ : abhiprāya-pradhānam bhāṣaṇam :
> nākṣara-pradhānam ity arthaḥ :

Thus in "sandhya-bhāsa", Kāṇha is taking "sandhya" as "sandhi", and of this latter word he says that it means "implicit", that it is speech which is mainly implicit, and not explicit.

The resemblance with the MSL vocabulary is obvious. (One might have expected *na-yathārūta* instead of *na-akṣara*; but whereas "na-yathārūta" plays only a small part in the MSL discussion, *akṣarārtha* is important in YRM). The general tone of YRM is Yogācāra, and Kāṇha must have been thoroughly familiar with MSL and its literature. This line of discussion also provides us with an explanation of the remark at YRM on II.iii.1: *abhisambodhi-bhāṣaṇam sandhya-abhāṣaṇam*.

Padma dkar-po's account of *dgongs-pa-can* depends heavily on MSL or some similar source. His vocabulary and examples are very similar to those of Sthiramati. However he appears to translate *abhisandhi* by "*ldem-por dgongs-pa*" (not simply "*dgongs-pa*"), and *abhiprāya* by "*dgongs-pa*" (and not "*ldem-po'i ngag*"). These points and their implications will be dealt with elsewhere (see note 84).

The fact that this line of treatment of the "problem" of *sandhya-bhāsa* is available and *has been used in Tibet* shows us again the need for caution in the use of Tibetan texts: specifically, for restriction of our claims to the context in which our analysis was made. And it is largely for this reason that I do not want to add my voice to those urging the adoption of one of the lexical views of "sandhabhāsa" etc. mentioned in the Introduction.

7. SOME SUGGESTIONS ON INTERPRETATION TECHNIQUE
IN ENGLISH

If (as the *O.E.D.* suggests) philology is the study of language in general, the methods of this paper have been in great part philological. At the same time, the conclusions are very different from those of the few other articles which have used *bshad-thabs*. It may be worth sketching the methodolog-
ical basis of these differences.

As far as the analysis of texts is concerned, we may distinguish (at least) three kinds of philological activity. There is the structural analysis of sentences in terms of morphological, grammatical and syntactic notions. Then there is lexicography, the attempt to give an account of the linguistic meanings of words and phrases. Third, there is the process of interpretation: the attempt to furnish an interpretative description of the text in the language used for analysis.

This paper has been concerned with what is, on the face of it, a controversy in lexicography: what does "sandhyā-bhāsa" mean? My conclusions, though rejecting the particular terms in which the controversy has been carried on, are still largely lexicographic. But lexicography proceeds in relation to the other disciplines; for the evidence as to the linguistic meanings of words can be found only in their use in utterances, including texts. Now it seems fairly clear that evidence of how a word was in fact used in a particular utterance can be founded only on some kind of putative description of that utterance, together with some kind of evidence or argument that the utterer intended by means of his utterance to convey to his audience a content specified in the description. The vagueness of this is deliberate; what else could count as evidence on which to base lexicography?

To refine this account, we may ask: what is to count as an acceptable interpretative description, in English, of a passage in a foreign language? The notion of translation is not much help here; for that notion, if it is capable of clear definition at all, remains on the level which we need to get below, as it were. Recent work in the theory of meaning has however provided us with a notion of interpretation which does not depend on the slippery notions of meaning, sense, reference or translation and can indeed be used to explain those notions, yet is also not too behaviouristic to be useful for philology. Let me quote McDowell:

For that systematic imposing of descriptions to be acceptable, it would have to be the case that speakers' performances of the (linguistic) actions thus ascribed to them were, for the most part, intelligible in the light of propositional attitudes: their possession of which, in turn, would have to be intelligible in the light of their behavior—including, of course, their linguistic behavior—and their environment.

Weighty philosophical questions turn on whether this test is sufficient for acceptability. But we need not beg those questions here: for here it will be enough to use the test in the very much weaker form of a necessary condition.

Though in this paper I have not, on the whole, expressed my own conclusions by offering translations, for the purpose of comparison with other writers it will be convenient to explain McDowell's test in the case where the description is a translation, or at least near enough to speak of a translation of individual words.
Among the propositional attitudes in question are the beliefs held by the
native writer about what is done in his writing-act. Perhaps he will believe
that his sentence forms part of an argument, or that he illustrates or applies
it later in the passage, etc. Our translation of the sentence must relate to
our translation of its context in such a way as to make these beliefs intelli-
gible. And this will impose constraints on our translation of the individual
words of that sentence. For example if we translate what is thought on
some ground or other to be an argument, so that we are ascribing to the
writer a belief that his writing expresses an argument, our choice of words
must make it appear at least intelligible that the writer also believed that his
argument led to the conclusion which (we claim) he believed that it did lead
to. To say this is not, of course, to say that the argument, as translated,
must actually lead to that conclusion. Similarly, if we translate what is
thought to be intended by our writer as an explanation of some locution or
argument, then it must appear intelligible, from our translation, that he so
thought; this is not to say that the translation has to constitute such an
explanation; and so forth.

Put in this modest form, the point is related to one familiar in
philosophy. W. V. O. Quine has said\(^{106}\)

> The maxim of translation underlying all this is that assertions
> startlingly false on the face of them are likely to turn on hidden dif-
> ferences of language.... The common sense behind the maxim is that
> one's interlocutor's silliness, beyond a certain point, is less likely than
> bad translation....

However, McDowell's intelligibility condition, even in the weak form in
which I am using it, provides a far clearer criterion than does Quine's
remark.

It is just this test of intelligibility which so often fails in the quoted
papers. Over and over again, the translations of the technical terms are
inconsistent with the claims made (or implied), under translation, about
the content of the passages in which those terms occur. The effect is that,
under translation, the natives authors' claims become unintelligible in the
sense just sketched. I shall list systematically some examples related to the
"six alternatives" (\textit{mtha'-drug}\(^ {107}\)).

(a) The translation of \textit{sgra} (\textit{sabda}) by "word" or "words," and of \textit{don}
(\textit{artha}) by "meaning".\(^ {108}\) In section 2.3 it was shown that each of these
separately makes a number of observations by Btsong-kha-pa on \textit{dgongs-
bshad} unintelligible: it becomes \textit{unintelligible} that he believed that his
explanation should have the explanatory power he ascribed to it, or that
his example should have the illustrative power he ascribed to it. Con-
cerning \textit{don}, the same applies to his description and illustration of the dif-
ference between \textit{drang-don} (\textit{neyārtha}) and \textit{nges-don} (\textit{nītartha}) in the same
work.\(^ {109}\)

(b) The translation of \textit{viruddha} (\textit{gal-ba}) by "ambiguous"\(^ {110}\) makes
Btsong-kha-pa's claim in the same \textit{dgongs-bskad} context that there is
repudiation (‘geg-pa) unintelligible (note 69); for ambiguous discourse cannot repudiate anything.

(c) Separately from point (a) on don, the translation of nges-don by “evident meaning”\textsuperscript{111} and drang-don by “hinted meaning” make unintelligible Btsong-kha-pa’s (perfect correct) claim that they are used in the tantras of one and the same passage.\textsuperscript{112} They also make unintelligible his illustration mentioned under (a), in which nges-don is not in any way more “evident,” nor drang-don more “hinted” (quite the opposite in fact). They also make unintelligible those many cases where drang-don is based on a completely explicit code, while precisely nges-don interpretations are hidden (sbas-te) and, as it were, hinted. Such cases are common in the Hevajra-tantra and have been mentioned earlier.\textsuperscript{113}

Further, the term “explicit meaning” is incoherent. (What is said may be explicit, not what is meant.) So the claim\textsuperscript{114} that nītārtha means “explicit meaning” is unintelligible (regardless of context) unless it is seen as a claim that “nītārtha” is incoherent. But no such claim is there made or could be seriously entertained. In particular, there is no claim, nor could there be one, that “nītārtha” is a metaphor.

(d) The translation of sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa (na-yathārata) by “coined term”\textsuperscript{115} makes unintelligible our Tibetan authors’ repeated claims that the sandhyā-bhāsa of the Hevajra-tantra is sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin. For the sandhyā-bhāsa words are mostly just ordinary words, in no way “coined”.\textsuperscript{116} Further, sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin can be (as there) combined either with drang-don or with nges-don, but it is unintelligible how the meaning of a coined term could be “hinted,” and it is pointless to describe it as “evident” (let alone “explicit”).

The phrase “non-literal word” is incoherent. The claim\textsuperscript{117} that na-yathārata means “non-literal (words)” is therefore unintelligible unless seen as a claim that “na-yathārata” is incoherent; but no such claim has ever been made or could be seriously entertained, especially as regards the Tibetan “sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin;” for given what we already know about “sgra”, this phrase translates literally as “not according to a convention” and this is almost exactly right. It is useless to claim that “non-literal word” is a metaphor. This metaphor conveys nothing to me. If it is claimed that it ought to convey something, one might well reply with the remark attributed to Wittgenstein “Was sich überhaupt erklären lässt, lässt sich klar erklären.” Enough on this theme.

These points might serve as contrast with some of those made earlier about Snellgrove’s work on the Hevajra-tantra. Admirably, Snellgrove there undertook a large and risky project. He, too, makes questionable observations\textsuperscript{118} on drang-don and nges-don (inter alia). But those observations are based on the texts, they do tell us something about their content. The translations just discussed under (a)-(d) are advanced without argument or other evidential backing and seem to me to have simply no foundation in the texts at all. If philology is a science, such translations add nothing to philology.
There can, of course, be no claim that my interpretations or the theoretical considerations behind them are final or immutable. On the contrary, my interpretations are sure in due course to be replaced by better ones, capable of accounting for the Sanskrit and Tibetan terms in a wider range of contexts. It is equally likely that the theoretical background will be replaced by something better. But the facts about the texts which are explained by and which become intelligible to English speakers under these interpretations, will remain, and will have to be explained and rendered intelligible by any improvement on them. And in this sense (only) any improvement will have to be based on what is done here. And so it is in all scientific work.

NOTES


4. Occasionally one sees the full phrase “rgyud-kyi bsPad-thabs,” “methods of explaining the tantras.” But even the short phrase bsPad-thabs “methods of explanation” seems to be used only of the tantras.

5. H. P. Śāstrī, quoted in refs. 6, 7.


8. Though this phrase is not offered in refs. 6-7 as a translation, it figures importantly in the discussion.


10. D. Snellgrove, HTT on HT II.iii, passim.

13. Steinkellner, see ref. 2.
14. See refs. 6, 7; the force of "perhaps" will appear below, especially in sections 3 and 5.
15. Ref. 6, 791 (twice); ref. 7, 129 (twice). See also ref. 9.
16. On the terms *rjod-byed*/*brjod-byā* and *'chad-byed*/*bshad-byā* as used in *bshad-thabs* texts, see sections 2-3 of ref. 3; cf. also note 68.
17. I owe the germ of this observation to Dr. Brian Loar.
18. See Table 1 of ref. 3.
19. See sections 3-4 of ref. 3.
20. HT II.iii.56.
21. JVS 293a2. See also refs. 6, 7.
22. HT II.iii, vv. 1, 53, 54, 55, 61, 64, 65, 66, and colophon.
23. Apart from *sandhyā*/*sandhyā*.
24. Refs. 6, 7, 34; HT II.iii.56 f. and HTT on it. None of these lists makes it clear what stands for what (and note 49 of ref. 34 seems muddled on this).
25. "Madhya" in HTT is a misprint.
26. The Tib. *chang* means, in the first instance, "beer", but here the difference is unimportant.
27. HT II.iv.6-8.
28. (omitted).
29. E, 204a2.
30. Cf. E, 204a2, b1, b4.
31. M, 229a6, 231a3.
32. M, 229b3; the Tib. is given in note 54.
33. HTT 101; ref. 7, 134.
35. E, 207b3; M, 234b6; the whole of L is devoted to this song.
36. HT II.vii.5-13.
37. HT II.iv.6a.
38. See K.
39. See J and M.
40. "Conventional" has two senses which can easily become confused. I am using it just in the sense of "governed by rules" (see note 68). But it also has the metaphorical sense of "ordinary, everyday," which is often used to translate *vyavahāra* (*tha-snyad*). The connection of *sāṅketa* with *vyavahāra* is well-known (cf. BHSD); but with *brda* it is the sense of "governed by rules" which is uppermost, for instance in the translation of *vyākarāṇa* by "*brda-sprod." Snellgrove’s translation of *brda* by "conventional sign" at HT II.iii.55 is confusing just because of this ambiguity of "convention." In spite of the Skt. *sāṅketa* (instead of *choma*) it would be better to translate with "secret sign" as in HT I.vii. If "conventional" means here "governed by rules," then the qualification is redundant, for any *brda* is conventional in this sense. The question is: are the conventions known to everybody? And here, of course, they are not. Hence, "secret."
41. K, 63b5: (brda'i ngo-bo) ni/ don sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa mtson-pa'i lus sa'am ngag-gi rnam-par-'gyur-ro/. This quotation of course refers to the distinction between signs of body and of speech made in HT I.vii (most commentaries take this either in the introduction to the chapter, or with v.1). Apart from that, it is useful to have a definition of brda related specifically to HT I.vii, because the Sanskrit is chomā and not saîketa. Now, sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa (Skt. na-yathārūta) is a term of bshad-thabs (see ref.3). In the bshad-thabs sections of G and H, Padma dkar-po gives definitions of brda which, though free from the contextual constraints of the Hevajra-tantra, are remarkably similar to the one just quoted, especially in their relation to sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa. In G (11b6) he defines the latter and then says that it has two types, viz. brda and yi-ge. Of these, brda is defined thus: brda zhes-bya-ba ni, dgongs-pa'i skad-nyid-kyis gsung-pa'i 'jig-rten dang bstan-bcos phal-la ma-grags-pa'o/: “brda is something expressed precisely in sandhyā-bhāṣa not generally known in the world or in śāstras.” The context of this remark (I cannot give full details here) helps us to see that in the remark quoted from K, don stands for brjod-don, the communicative intention of the passage; while the contrast between the two types of sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin (and especially Padma dkar-po’s examples) helps us to see that what is here intended is not the complete absence of convention (which falls under yi-ge in G and H), but unusual, non-standard conventions; of course a code falls just into this category. The parallel passage in H (16b4) used not only the phrase (“dgongs-pa'i skad-kyis” but also “brda'i skad-kyis.” This reinforces (in respect of Padma dkar-po) the remarks on brda-skad in section 1.5. (Padma dkar-po is generally reliable in respect of the consistency of his terminology from one work to another.)

42. K, 63b5-6: (brda'i nges-tshig) ni/ rnal-'byor-pa nang-gis ngo shes-shing, gzhed-gyi gsod-go-ba kla-klo'i skad lta-bu yin-pa'i phyir, brda zhes brtags-so/. The reference to the barbarians (kla-klo, mleccha) is found in YRM on HT I.vii.1 and in the Vajragarbhaḥtikā (HTT 66n.1); also E, 99a6, J, 72a7. On the YRM on chomā, see also section 3.

43. HTT I.vii, passim.

44. The locus classicus is HT I.vii.1; but see E, 99ab; J, 72b1; M, 104b3.

45. (Omitted.)

46. J. 104b2: ...tshogs-kyi 'khor-lor... dam-tshig mi-ldan-pa-rnams-kyi nang-du. See refs. in n.44, also K, 63a5 and b5.

47. This theme falls under HT II.iii.65-7; J, 231b6.

48. The pithas etc. are listed at HT I.vii.10, and their connection with the bodhisattva-bhūmis mentioned at vii.11; they are then explained in vv. 12-18. The general explanation of brda etc. is connected with I.vii.1 and II.iii.53-4, after which come the individual items of the dgongs-skad (vv.55-60, using the classification of Kong-sprul, who calls them dgongs-skad-rnams) and of the gsang-skad (vv.61-3). The purpose of all this is explained in connection with either I.vii.1 or II.iii.64-7. Most commentators follow this scheme.
49. M, 228b6.
50. In this passage, the many occurrences of "brda-skad" oscillate between reference to the code in general and to the code-words as a collection of individuals (elsewhere: brda-skad-rnams). It is sometimes rather arbitrary whether we translate by "code" or "code-word". But later in the passage the reference is unambiguously to the words.
51. Cf. HT II.iii.54cd. The reference is to the father-section of the anuttar-ayogatantras. Kong-sprul here amplifies an idea which seems to lie behind Snellgrove's translation of v.54 (HTT 99 and fn.3). But there is an important difference. According to Kong-sprul, the secret language is not a (or the) language of smile, gaze etc.; it is the language of vows, as the tantra itself indeed makes clear (samaya-saṅketa = dam-tshig brda, 55b; dam-tshig brda-skad, M, 229b2). This does seem to be a difference between the Hevajra and Guhyasamāja codes.
52. Thus Kong-sprul. But HT II.iii.54cd, lit.: even by the four classes of tantras the sandhyā-bhāsa is not expressed (śabdita; Tib. bsgrags-pa, made known).
53. M, 229b2.
54. M, 229b3: dgongs-pa'i skad-rnams rim-par gsungs-te/ de'ang brda 'di-dag-rnams ni, phal-cher 'bras-bu'i ming rgyu-la btags-pa yin-no/
55. M, 229b6-230a6. In the same passage "brda-skad" is used of the kṣetras and upakṣetras as standing for the bodhisattva-bhūmis, from pramudita to the buddha-bhūmi. This use of brda-skad confirms the connection between I.vii and II.iii in a rather specific way.
56. But also in Bkra-shis rnam-rgyal in this context: E, 204a5 (twice); and in Padma dkar-po (see note 41).
57. The terms dgongs-skad, gsang-skad and brda-skad are all feature-universals (they are kinds of language). But the plural forms in -rnams are all used of items of language, i.e. words, phrases etc.
58. See the bibliography (works S1-S5).
59. Ref. 3, section 3; A, 62b-67b; E, 12a7. They also used other systems of bshad-thabs: A, 68a-69b.
60. See refs. 2 and 3 and the sources there quoted (especially B, D, E, F, J).
61. This is not a commitment to the phrase "intentional language" for dgongs-skad (even as a slogan); I shall continue to use "Hevajra code" or whatever.
62. The verse is printed as given by Wayman (6,7) except that some compounds have been undone.
63. As given by Btsong-kha-pa: D, 208b3. Other authors quote slightly different forms.
64. This word is very well-known in pramāṇa, where it means "contrary." One can also see directly by analysis of Btsong-kha-pa's and other texts that it means "contrary" or "opposed" etc. and not "ambiguous."
65. The Jñāna-vajra-samuccaya is an explanatory (ākhyā-) tantra of Guhya-samāja, as Steinkellner correctly remarks (ref. 2, p.448-9). Elder (ref. 34, p.236) confuses this work with D, which is Btsong-kha-pa's
commentary on it.

66. The “six alternatives” (*mtha’-drug) form an important part of the system of “seven ornaments” (*rgyan-bdon). The word *mtha’ (*Skt. koṭī) is here not very naturally translated by “alternative” but I have no better suggestion. The six are usually thought of as forming three pairs of opposites:

*nitārtha (nger-gsön) and *neyārtha (drog-gsön)
*sandhyā and *nasandhyā-bhāṣita (dgongs-bshad and -min)
*yathārtha and *nayathārtha (sgra ji-bzhin and -min).

Roughly speaking, *drog-gsön and *nger-gsön are different interpretations of a single passage, the *nger-gsön one being the more advanced in the sense of the Buddhist path to liberation; *dgongs-bshad and *dgongs-min are explained in the text; and *sgra ji-bzhin and -min are passages understood (or not) in accordance with normal linguistic conventions. All six, and the attempts to systematize them in terms of the *sgra/don distinction (Bu-ston’s principle) are discussed at length in ref. 3. Some current translations of these six terms are reviewed below in section 7.

67. D, 208b3.

68. See ref. 3. The whole analytic thrust of that paper is in the direction of showing that, in *bshad-thabs, the *sgra/don distinction is the one described. But other authors have held similar views related to other contexts. For instance, in K. K. Rāja, Indian Theories of Meaning, we find the remark (p.11): “In India all the schools of thought have assumed a direct relationship between śabda and artha, which correspond to the signifiant and signifié of de Saussure.” Though the latter distinction is not clear enough for my purposes, it is an excellent start. A related distinction is made by P. M. Williams in translating rjod-byed(vācaka) and brjod-byea (vācya) by “language” and “referents of language” (in “Some Aspects of Language and Construction in the Madhyamka”, Journal of Indian Philosophy 8 [1980], 1-45; see the passages quoted in notes 1 and 138-141 of that paper). The exact distinction varies from context to context and, because of its great importance, needs careful investigation for each context. But underlying all distinctions of this kind is a general point which may be worth stating explicitly. No item can function as a sign or symbol of any kind in the complete absence of any rules as to its so functioning. For what cannot be interpreted cannot be a sign or symbol; and interpretation presupposes rules, without which it becomes arbitrary imputation on the part of the interpreter. Now if meaning is held to include the rules whereby a sign is to be interpreted, then there can be no talk of a sign being a separate item from its meaning; for, shorn of those rules, it no longer is a sign. For this reason, any analytical claim based on an opposition between words and meaning, in which meaning is held to include linguistic meaning, is unintelligible. For the linguistic meaning of a word is just the rules governing its use in the language of which it is a part; and shorn of those rules, it no longer is a part of that language. My account of the *sgra/don distinction in *bshad-thabs, Rāja’s identification of śabda/artha with signifiant and
signifique, and Williams’ relation of *rjod-byed/*brjod-bya to language and its referents, all satisfy this fundamental principle. To oppose words and meaning is to flout the principle.

69. D, e.g. 209a5, 218a3, 209b6. The last of these is the example, where the opposition (*gal-ba) is strengthened by the use of the verb *geg-pa (perf. *bkag): to deny, to repudiate. See notes 74-76.

70. D, 218a4 (quoted at ref. 3, note 83).
71. D, 218a2 (quoted at ref. 3, note 77).
72. D, 209b7 (quoted at ref. 3, note 81).

73. They are desire (*rāga, ‘dod-chags); anger (*dveṣa, zhe-sdang); and bewilderment (*moḥa, gti-mug). The use of the Sanskrit terms together in this way probably antedates Buddhism.

74. D, ibid.
75. See note 69.
76. JVS, 292b8.

77. B, 24b5 (here taken from GST ch.5); E, 10a3 and J, 39a3 (in both cases taken from HT II.iii.29).
78. See refs. 2, 3, 6, 7, 34.
80. F, 36a1.
81. E, 10a2.
82. J, 39a3.
83. G, 9ab; H, 16ab.

84. But see section 6 below, and my “Abhiprāya and implication in Tibetan linguistics,” to appear in the Journal of Indian Philosophy.

85. Morphologically, we do have an instrumental case-ending. What other syntactic possibilities are there? *dgongs-pas could be an adverb, after the model of rang-gi ngo-bos grub-pa (svartapasidha). This would give “explained “intentionally,” which in the end amounts to much the same as “explained by “intention.” (But it is not compatible with “in the manner of (dgongs-pa).”) On the other hand, -pas cannot be temporal; for if it were, there would be no explanation of the fact that the basically temporal (and not instrumental) form *dgongs-nas, which is very common elsewhere, never appears in bshad-thabs: we never find there *dgongs-nas bshad-pa.

86. Padma dkar-po does this in many places (see quotations and references in note 41). See also E, 10b2; J, 39b1.

On the vajra-song, Bkra-shis rnam-rgyal makes a subtle distinction of level in his use of sgra ji-bzhin. The code itself is, of course, sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin (E, 10b2). Once this unusual convention is fixed, however, its normal use (relative to this context) is a higher-order sgra ji-bzhin: E, 208b6: /'di-dag ni, sgra ji-bzhin-pa'i yig-don-gi bshad-pa ste, drang-ba'i don-to/. A variation on this unusual convention, interpreting the words in terms of the sampanna-krama, constitutes a (higher-order) sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin-pa; this interpretation is said to be due to Sarorhua and others (E, 208b7: /'di-dag ni, grub-chen Mtsho-skyes-sogs-kyis rgyas-par bshad-pa'i don'te/ sgra ji-bzhin-pa ma-yin-pa dang nges-don dang sbas-pa'i don-to/.
However Kong-sprul (M, 234b7 ff.) abandons this complication and relies more on the tshul-bzhi (but see 236b4). A proper analysis of his treatment will have to take into account his use of the zab-mo nang-gi-don (for this is the point of the words "Thams-cad mkhyen-pa Rang'-byung zhabs-kyis gneg-ba ltar-na" at 235b5). It is not clear to me whether the zab-mo nang-gi-don is authoritative for bkra-shis rnam-rgyal (it is not so for Padma dkar-po).

87. On the drang-don/nges-don distinction for the code in general, see E, 204b7; M, 230b4, 231b4, 233a2. Two of our authors give drang-don and nges-don interpretations separately for the entire vajra-song: bkra-shis rnam-rgyal, E 207b3 and 208a7 (see note 86), and Padma dkar-po, L 2a4 and 6b1. Kong-sprul gives two similarly related interpretations, but he classifies them as spyi'i don (M, 234b7) and sbas-don (based on Naropa, M 236a6). Our authors' hermeneutical strategies on this song deserve much more detailed attention. But for present purposes the vital fact is that none of them used dgongs-bshad.

88. In the Lankaavatara a typical form is sandhāya = dgongs-te, sometimes ldem-por dgongs-te, often meaning "meaning" as a ground (not as a noun). The form sandhāya = dgongs-te in this use is also found in the Uttaratantra on 1.29 and elsewhere (see also BHSD).

89. In the Saddharma-pundarika, BHSD gives as typical forms sanḍhāna-bhāṣya = ldem-por dgongs-te bshad-pa. See also the quotation in ref. 6.

90. In MSL, the important forms are abhisandhi and abhiprāya (see sec. 6 for remarks on the corresponding Tibetan terms).

91. The term dgongs-pa-can, used by bkra-shis rnam-ygal, Padma dkar-po, Kong-sprul and others, attributes *intention to the passage (while dgongs-bshad is a mode of explanation in terms of *intention).

92. The Tibetan word ldem-po (non-literal; riddle; misleading, indirect) is very commonly used in sūtra contexts and those relating to the sūtras; I have never seen it in PPD-based bshad-thabs contexts.

93. But see Steinkellner (ref. 2).

94. MSL: Levi ed., 82-3; Bagchi ed., 80-1.

95. Mdo-sde-rgyan-gyi 'grel-bshad, Sde-dge, sems-tsam: mi and tsi. The author's name is given as Blo-brtan (short form of Blo-gros brtan-pa). The Sanskrit title is given as Śūtrālaṃkāra-vṛtti-bhāṣyam. The vṛtti on which it comments is different from (and on the whole more detailed than) the existing Sanskrit bhāṣya often attributed to Vasubandhu. The section on MSL XII. 16-18 is at mi, 240b4-243a5 and does contain a translation of most of the existing Sanskrit bhāṣya on these verses (but not of the ślokas).

96. MSL, Bagchi ed. 80.28.

97. Ref. 95, mi 242b3.

98. For instance there is the passage about the interpretation of the parables on the sands of the river Ganges and on the udumbara flower (between Lanka. VI.6 and 7); the words a-yathārūta and upānamātra are each used twice in the opening sentence of this passage; in other respects too it is of
great hermeneutic interest.
99. Elder’s note on this gloss (40 of ref. 34) seems to miss the point of the distinction between abhiprāya and aksarārtha.
100. YRM, e.g. 110.13, 117.6 (both times aksarārtha-vyākhya). The word aksarārṭija (Tib. often tshig-don) is the name of one of the tshul-bzhi (see ref. 2, p.453). YRM seems to have had a simplified system of bshad-thabs consisting of the following pairs: bāhya/ādhyātmikārtha; nītartha/neyārtha; aksarārtha/samanyārtha. The first two pairs are well known; the third is probably the first two of the tshul-bzhi. I do not know whether the internal evidence of YRM alone is enough to enable us to work out what Kāṇha himself understood by these terms. He seems not to use the other tshul-bzhi terms (ref. 2, ibid.) garbhī and kolikam.
101. See note 83.
104. John McDowell, (a) “On the sense and reference of a proper name”, Mind 86 159 (1977) (see also the editors’ introduction to Evans and McDowell, ref. 102); (b) “Meaning, communication and knowledge”, in van Straaten (ed.): Philosophical Subjects (Oxford 1980), p. 117 (also Strawson’s reply, p. 282).
105. See ref. 104(a), p.160.
107. See note 66. One might wish to restrict the context to the mtha’-drug as interpreted by Bu-ston (B) and Btsong-kha-pa (D), since these writers are quoted by the authors discussed here. But this restriction is pointless because many other Tibetan writers held roughly the same view on mtha’-drug (see E, F, J). On the other hand the restriction to bshad-thabs (or at least to tantric) contexts must not be lifted without due care. Especially the terms drang-don (neyārtha) and nges-don (nītartha) are used quite differently in the sūtra literature (for the hermeneutics of this use, see Thurman, ref. 1).
108. Ref. 6, 792; ref. 7, 129, 133; ref. 2, 451-6 (about 20 times!); ref. 34, 236-8 (about 10 times).
109. The description is at D, 218a3, and the illustration at D, 210a3; both are quoted and discussed in ref. 3, section 4.3.2.
110. Ref. 6, 791-2; ref. 7, 129.
111. Ref. 2, 451; ref. 34, 236 ff. Quite apart from the unintelligibility (in the special sense!) of these translations, they have no explanatory power. For the drang-don explanations of the vajra-song are literal, while the nges-don explanations are figurative (see the references in note 87; Snellgrove’s use of the underlined terms in connection with explanations of the vajra-song at HTT 101-2 is not offered as a translation of anything and seems perfectly reasonable; but he drifts into error on the same point at HTT 134).
112. D 218a3: gzhung gcig-la 'jug-pas.
113. see note 87.
115. Ref. 6, 796; ref. 7, 134; ref. 2, 452; ref. 34, 236. The cautious phrasing ("When the term is coined . . . it is na-yathārūta") and the restriction to PPD in the first two of these references takes them somewhat away from the full force of my remarks. No such caution and no such restriction are found in the third and fourth references, however.
116. There is nothing coined about the words madana, bala. What is na-yathārūta (sgra ji-bzhin ma-yin) is not, of course, these words, but a certain feature of their use (viz. the convention that "madana" is to stand for "madya", "bala" for "māmsa", etc.). And of course to say that this use or this convention is coined is unintelligible.
117. Ref. 2, 452.
118. HTT pp.17 and 134.
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THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE BIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION CONCERNING ATIŚA
(DĪPAṂKARAŚRĪJÑĀNA)

Helmut Eimer

Within this year the first millennium since the birth of Atiśa1 will come to an end. This may be the opportunity to consider the biographical tradition about Dipamkaraśrījñāna. In India proper no literary sources relating to the life of this learned monk from Bengal have survived; we have only Tibetan source material on which to depend. There are few Tibetan historiographical works not containing at least a short note on Atiśa’s life.2 We may mention here the comprehensive histories of the growth of Buddhism in Tibet with their passages on Dipamkaraśrījñāna, e.g. the Śba bzhed3, Bu ston Rin po che’s Bde bar gsregs pa’i bstan pa’i gsal byed chos kyi ‘byuṅ gnas gsuṅ rab rin po che’i mdzod4, the Rgyal rabs gsal ba’i me loṅ5, the Deb ther sion po6 and the ‘Phags yul rgya nag chen po bod dain sog yul du dam pa’i chos ‘byuṅ dpag bsam ljon bzaṅ’ (hereafter Dpag bsam ljon bzaṅ) by Sum pa mkhan po Ye śes dpal ‘byor. It is obvious that the older of the commonly known chos ‘byuṅ or rgyal rabs give only the main facts of the biography7; from the end of the 15th century onward there appear in general historical works more detailed descriptions of Atiśa’s life8. The two extensive biographies of Dipamkaraśrījñāna are not dated, namely the Jo bo rje dpal ldan mar me mdzad ye śes kyi rnam thar rgyas pa9 (hereafter Rnam thar rgyas pa) and the Jo bo rin po che rje dpal ldan a ti śa’i rnam thar rgyas pa yoins grags10 (hereafter Rnam thar yoins grags).

It may be asked if there was an autobiography of Dipamkaraśrījñāna or a biography written by one of his direct disciples. From the Rnam thar rgyas pa we learn that Atiśa did not like to be praised by ‘Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ‘byuṅ gnas in a hymn of praise12. Another episode in the same biographical work tells us that some of Atiśa’s pupils asked the master to write about his former and later existences and about his way to salvation—this would have become an autobiography—but on this occasion too Dipamkaraśrījñāna refused to do so13. In the biographical tradition dealing with Atiśa there is a book that claims in its title to have been composed by ‘Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ‘byuṅ gnas (1005-1064 A.D.), namely the Jo bo rje’i rnam thar lam yig chos kyi ‘byuṅ gnas śes bya ba ‘Brom ston pa Rgyal ba’i ‘byuṅ gnas kyis mdzad pa14 (hereafter Rnam thar lam yig). In the colophon to this work15 the name of the author is given as ‘Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ‘byuṅ gnas and in the body of the book we read that the upāsaka—i.e. one of the often used names for ‘Brom ston pa16—bears the name ‘Brum and not ‘Brom17. We cannot solve here the problems arising from these different names, but we find proof that the book was not
written by the mentioned disciple of Atiśa in another passage of the *Rnam thar lam yig* referring to the conquest of Eastern India by Muslim armies—an event which happened about 1200 A.D., i.e. about 140 years after the death of Brom ston Rgyal ba'i 'byun gnas.

Since there exists neither an autobiography nor a biography written by a direct disciple of Atiśa we may pose the question: what are the sources for the biography of Dipamkararṣīṇāśa? An answer could be deduced from a detailed episode which appears in the *Deb ther sгон po*¹⁹, the *Bka' gdam rin po che'i chos 'byun rnam thar 'nin more byed pa'i 'od ston*²⁰ (hereafter *Bka' gdam chos 'byun rnam thar*), the *Bka' gdam kyi rnam par thar pa bka' gdam chos 'byun gsal ba'i sgron me*²¹ (hereafter *Bka' gdam chos 'byun sgron me*), the *Rnam thar rgya's pa*²² and the *Rnam thar yons grags*²³. We quote here, translated from the *Bka' gdam chos 'byun sgron me*, the two main parts²⁴ of the episode relating the beginning of the biographical tradition²⁵:

After he (namely Roṅ pa Lag sor pa²⁶) had asked seven direct pupils of the master, [namely] Dge bṣes Ston pa²⁷, Rnal 'byor pa chen po²⁸, Dgon pa ba²⁹, the former Mkha' ru ba, Žaṅ btsun Yer pa [ba], Sgom pa dad pa from Yer pa rtsibs sgaṅ [and] Jo bo legs, and two indirect pupils, [namely] the later Mkha' ru ba and Yuan ba pa, about the precepts for meditation and about the reports³⁰ about the master, the direct pupils agreed in their words. Since the words of the two indirect pupils disagreed, [Lag sor pa] thought, “Since the Dge bṣes Lo tshsha ba³¹, who was a direct follower of the master for 19 years, is now living at Khab Guṅ than³², it is necessary to meet him personally.” [Thinking this] he went to Maṅ [yul]. He met him (i.e. the Dge bṣes Lo tshsha ba) residing in the temple of Yaṅ thog³³. He asked first for extensive [instruction on] the precepts of the mantras and stayed for three years. In the last year³³ he requested to be told the stages of the way of the pāramitās, the [special] virtues of the greatness of the physical [existence] of this great master and the report of how [the master] had been invited to Tibet. To this the Dge bṣes Lo tshsha ba answered, “I followed the master for 19 years; since I invited him to Tibet too, I know the report on the master very [well]. Except for you, nobody has come to pose these questions.” After saying this he (i.e. the Dge bṣes Lo tshsha ba) gave this extensive report...

At this [time] four religious [adepts] from the retinue of Rma tsho³⁴ went over to him (i.e. Roṅ pa Lag sor pa) and became known as the four [spiritual] sons of Roṅ pa [later on]. These were the four: Bya 'Dul ba 'dzin pa³⁵, Rog Mch'i phu ba, Gnam par ba³⁶ [and] Dge bṣes Žu len pa. Since Rgya ra Ston brjed was an upāsaka, he was not counted as [one of the spiritual] sons. Gnam par ba founded Gnam par and Ram pa lha sdiṅs. He acted as an abbot of Gsaṅ phu for eight years too. Regarding the notes the four [spiritual] sons made of the words of Lag sor pa—it is said—Bya 'Dul ba 'dzin pa condensed the precepts and the report, Rog condensed the report but gave a great deal of the precepts, Gnam par ba, in not writing the report, wrote down the precepts only, Dge bṣes Žu len pa [made] extensive [notes
of both the precepts and the report, but he especially made the report accurate. Rgya ra Ston brjid had [notes on] the precepts for the mantras, but apparently no [notes] at all on the precepts for the pāramitās. After all these written notes had come into the hands of Zul phu ba Bya-'Dul chen po—since he himself put this extensive report on the master into letters, it filled all quarters.

This episode could be considered a later invention, since it is given in books composed at the end of the 15th century or later—if we disregard the two undated rnam thar37. But the Hu lan deb ther, composed by 'Tshal pa Kun dga' rdo rje in 1346 A.D., already gives the frame of the above quoted report in a very short form38. By this it is proved that the report of the beginning of the biographical tradition concerning Atiśa existed already in the first half of the 14th century39.

There are four main points in the quoted report of special interest for our considerations: 1. Up to the time he came to Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba40 the student Roṅ pa Lag sor pa looked in vain for a biography of Atiśa. This shows that a biographical work on Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna did not exist at that time41. 2. The teachings of Atiśa, his special virtues and the report of his life were taught to Roṅ pa Lag sor pa by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba. 3. The oral tradition on Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna extends from Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba to Dge bṣes Zul phu ba Bya-'Dul chen po, and the latter prepared the first written biography. 4. The old reports on Atiśa are referred to under the title of lo rgyus, i.e. "report."

The dates of the lives of the persons who participated in the oral tradition on Dipaṃkaraśrījñāna are only partially known; Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba was born 1011 A.D.42, but the year of his death is not given. We may deduce that Roṅ pa Lag sor pa, who had been a disciple of 'Brom ston Rgyal ba'i 'byuṅ gnas, was born not much later than 1044 A.D.43; he had not seen Atiśa personally, i.e. he was presumably not an adult at the time of the master's death in 1054 A.D. For Bya-'Dul ba 'dzin pa chen po, alias Zul phu ba, we have different dates, according to the Bka' gdam chos 'byuṅ sgron me 1100-1174 A.D.44 and according to the Deb ther sion po 1091-1166 A.D.45 His fellow student Gnam par ba was abbot of Gsaṅ phu in the years 1143-1151 A.D. It seems possible that after the death of Rog Mchir phu ba, Gnam par ba and Dge bṣes Žu len pa, their notes were given to Zul phu ba; in this case the first written biography was composed after 1150 A.D. We may exclude the possibility that this form of the biography originated much earlier than 1120 A.D., at the time when Zul phu ba reached the age of 20 years or, according to the Deb ther sion po, 29 years.

Before we can try to establish a connection between the facts in the passage quoted above and the extant biographical tradition we have to investigate the available texts concerning the life of Atiśa. The analytical considerations46 begin with the two extensive biographies, the Rnam thar rgyas pa and the Rnam thar yongs grags, because it can be assumed that the
greatest amount of material for comparison can be found there. We may mention the fact that the *Rnam thar yoins grags* is contained in the official collection of the Bka’ gdamgs pa School, the *Bka’ gdamgs glegs bam*; therefore it can be concluded that the Tibetans regarded this form of the biography as being authoritative. A comparison of the two extensive biographies shows that they are closely related. This relationship can be seen not only in the agreement of the contents, but also in extensive identical passages.\(^{48}\) In view of this great similarity it is especially conspicuous that these two biographies differ in structure and in the arrangement of single episodes. This can serve as an argument for the determination of the relationship between the two works. The clear structure of the extensive Atiśa-biography in the *Bka’ gdamgs glegs bam* shows this presentation to be the more modern. A further argument for this is the well-standardized form of the language in this biography, while in the *Rnam thar rgyas pa* we find remnants of colloquial or dialect forms. However, the *Rnam thar yoins grags* is not derived from the *Rnam thar rgyas pa*; both works are descended from a common ancestor.

When comparison of the other available sources for the life of Atiśa is brought into consideration, we find a great deal of agreement between the reports. These points of agreement—depending upon the completeness of the sources in question—are of different kinds. Works with a very detailed presentation show passages with identical formulations, while the shorter biographical sketches on Atiśa have descriptions of the main facts which are identical in contents only. It is certain that there is an established tradition about Atiśa’s life.\(^{50}\) This tradition can be seen as an example of a biographical tradition in Tibet, and we could use it to investigate how the transmitted material has changed in the course of time. In Sum pa mkhan po’s *Dpag bsam ljon bzai* we read e.g. that Atiśa in taking refuge left five wives and nine sons. The older tradition reports that Atiśa’s elder brother, being the heir of his father’s realm, had five wives and nine sons. Sum pa mkhan po combines the portraits of the two persons, thereby enlarging the scale of renunciation: Atiśa, like Śākyamuni, left both wife and child in order to become a monk. This changing of the materials handed down classifies the *Dpag bsam ljon bzai*; it is a source of secondary rank, in spite of its remarks regarding the reliability of some older sources.\(^{52}\) An example of literary transformation is to be found in the *Chos ’byün bstan pa’i padma rgyas pa’i ŋin byed* (hereafter *Padma rgyas pa’i ŋin byed*) by Padma dkar po, the author, in depicting the imprisonment and the death of the monk Ye śes ’od, the former king of Western Tibet, uses passages from four different books, namely the *Deb ther shion po*, the *Rnam thar yoins grags*, the *Rnam thar lam yig* and the *Rgyal rabs gsal ba’i me loin*. Padma dkar po joins fragments which have the same function in their own context from the four texts and thereby achieves an integrated treatment with a correspondingly dramatic result.\(^{56}\) This shows that the *Padma rgyas pa’i ŋin byed* also cannot be regarded as a primary source for the life of Atiśa. We have to take into account that during the course of time the
tradition about Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna's life may have changed and that the most recent biographies do not preserve all the facts of the original version unaltered.

Therefore we go back again to the Rnam thar rgyas pa as the more archaic of the two extensive biographies; but since the Rnam thar rgyas pa does not contain some passages given in the Rnam thar yoins grags, we may conclude that it does not comprise all the biographical material given by its sources. This is clearly shown by an example: the Rnam thar rgyas pa announces, but does not contain, a passage on the guru-paramparās of the teachings of the Kriyāyoga and on Yamāri; the missing passages, however, do appear in the corresponding context of the Rnam thar yoins grags. The extant version of the Rnam thar rgyas pa is to be regarded as defective; it should be used together with the Rnam thar yoins grags in order to have at hand the full amount of biographical material contained in the common ancestor of these two texts. But we have to include the chapters on the life of Atiśa as given in the Deb ther snon po, the Bka' gdtams chos 'byun rnam thar and the Bka' gdtams chos 'byun sgron me as well; these pictures of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna's life stand next in tradition to the extensive biographies. This is already indicated by the fact that these three books also contain the report of the beginning of the tradition about Atiśa's life.

The remnants of the spoken language as contained in the Rnam thar rgyas pa can be regarded as a first link connecting the report of the beginning of the biographical tradition concerning Atiśa's life and the extant biographies. We see the second one in the fact that in the Rnam thar rgyas pa there appears, in at least five places, the word lo rgyus to denote a passage or a chapter, as we have found it in the Tibetan text of the episode quoted above in translation. Since the colloquial forms of language and the word lo rgyus in its special meaning are only met with in exceptionally few cases in the Rnam thar yoins grags, the Bka' gdtams chos 'byun sgron me and the Bka' gdtams chos 'byun rnam thar, these texts rank in the tradition about Atiśa below the Rnam thar rgyas pa, but far above all the other works composed in more recent times. In view of these old biographical pictures of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna's life belonging to an established tradition, one could try to reconstruct the original version; this could be done with the aim of recovering the text written by Zul phu ba. But this experiment would not be successful, because we do not know to what extent the original text used the colloquial forms of language. The second reason lies in the arrangement of the material handed down; especially the description of Atiśa's special virtues, which could have had fully another structure than that in the versions now at hand. The goal to be reached with the available old forms of the biography is to discern the picture of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna as it was seen in an early time; some aspects could be those of Zul phu ba as well. The basis for such investigations would be given by a synoptic edition of the archaic texts of this established tradition.
Besides the tradition as given in the biographies and the common histories there are a few hymns of praise to Atiśa containing some facts about his life. In the Rnam thar rgyas pa, the Rnam thar yongs grags, the Bka’ gdams chos ’byün nram thar and especially in the Bka’ gdams chos ’byün sgron me there are verses quoted from two such hymns, namely the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and the bstod pa written by Pandit Sa’i snyin po⁶⁶. The full edition of the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa as given in the Legs par bsad pa backed that it was composed its beginning 25 lines which the Rnam thar rgyas pa, the Bka’ gdams chos ’byün nram thar and the Bka’ gdams chos ’byün sgron me attribute to Pandit Sa’i snyin po. Tson kha pa Blo bzaṅ grags pa, in quoting verses from the two hymns of praise⁶⁸, does not distinguish between Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and Sa’i snyin po; he refers to the lo tshtha ba only. This could be regarded as a hint that these lines became an integral part of the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa very early⁶⁹. The Bka’ gdams chos ’byün nram thar and the Bka’ gdams chos ’byün sgron me contain just a few lines from a stotra composed by Rin chen bzaṅ po, but these verses do not give historical data at all⁷⁰. In the Bka’ gdams chos ’byün sgron me there appear the earliest known quotations from the Bstdod pa sum cu pa attributed to ‘Brom ston Rgyal ba’i ’byün gnas; but since it mentions Po to ba (1031-1105 A.D.), Spyan sha ba (1038-1103 A.D.) and Phu chuṅ ba (1031-1106 A.D.), the extant version cannot have been composed before the end of the 11th century—i.e. after the death of ‘Brom ston pa—and we suppose that it is far more recent.

The Rnam thar rgyas pa and to some extent the Rnam thar yongs grags as well, present, together with the quotations from the Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa and from Sa’i snyin po’s bstod pa, a prose version of the verses quoted using the same expressions and formulations. The prose text is somewhat longer and contains more information than the verses⁷¹. This fact shows us the close relation between the tradition in verse and that in prose; both traditions come to us through Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba, who used the formulations of the verses in teaching the master’s biography to Roṅ pa Lag sor pa. The Bstdod pa brgyad cu pa—according to the tradition as preserved in the two extensive biographies⁷²—was compiled by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba after Atiśa’s death—i.e. in 1054 A.D. or in the following year—in preparing a picture of the master and of the main events of his life; the eighty verses of praise were written on the back of the scroll⁷².

The tradition concerning the biography of Atiśa originates from Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and—to a lesser extent⁷³—from Pandit Sa’i snyin po. The extant verses of the two hymns of praise are the oldest testimony for Dipaṃkaraśrīrāja’s life. The extensive tradition would have come to an end if Roṅ pa Lag sor pa had not searched for the biography of the
master and had not obtained it by asking Nag tsho Lo tshsha ba. About a century after Atiśa’s death the oral reports were gathered by Zul phu ba and put into the first written version. This literary biography was to become the main source for all the following descriptions of Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna’s life. There are a few events from the master’s life handed down outside this tradition; we can mention here one attested case: in the description of Atiśa’s studies with Avadhūtipa the Rnam thar rgyas pa and the Rnam thar yoins grags²⁴ distinguish between the information as given by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba and two other sources²⁵. Probably some material handed down by other traditions was included in the literary biographies in an early stage as well. The sketch of the life of Atiśa as presented by Tsoṅ kha pa Blo bzān grags pa contains a more archaic structure in the arrangement of some points, but it does not mention Sa’i sīn po as the author of some of the verses quoted; the former fact being a hint that very old sources were used, the latter point indicating a great distance from the original tradition. The most archaic of the extensive biographies at hand, the Rnam thar rgyas pa, together with its modern version, the Rnam thar yoins grags, seems to comprise almost all the material about Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna handed down in the first centuries after the death of the master, including some facts not reported by Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba but gathered from other sources. All the portraits of Atiśa as drawn by later authors— i.e. after 1500 A.D.—are based on the same tradition, although perhaps somewhat changed or combined with reports not known to the old biographies.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. This name is not to be understood as being composed of ati and īśa; this is shown by Vārttika to II.2.18, see Śrīśa Chandra Vasu, The Ashṭadhyāyī of Pāṇini. Edited and translated . . . (Reprint) Delhi, Varanasi, Patna 1962, 1, 264: “The word ati etc. when the thing denoted has the sense of ‘gone beyond’ or the like, combine with what ends with the second case affix . . .” Therefore we have to etymologize the name Atiśa with atiśaya “eminent, superior” (the Tibetan equivalent to this is phul (du) byuṅ (ba)!) taking into account that the change from -aya to -a is not easily explained, see H. Eimer, Berichte über das Leben des Atiśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna). Eine Untersuchung der Quellen [Reports on the Life of Atiśa (Dīpaṃkaraśrījñāna). An investigation of the Sources.]. Wiesbaden 1977. (Asiatische Forschungen. 51.), 21-22.

2. At present we know of more than 40 books with remarks on Atiśa’s life, see Eimer, Berichte, 41-154.


9. E.g. the Deb ther shion po.

10. Blockprint (108 fol.), prepared in Dga' ldan phun tshogs giṅ, not dated, probably beginning of the 18th century.

11. Contained in the Pha chos, the first part of the Bka' gdamgs glegs bams (blockprint from the new Žol printing house, after 1940 A.D.), fascicle kha (2), fol. 1b1-95a5. In the colophon Mchims Thams cad mkhyen pa is mentioned as author; if we follow this information the book could be dated circa 1250-1280 A.D. or 1340-1375 A.D. This seems improbable since the table of contents of the Mchims chen mo—the Atiṣa-biography written by the great abbot Mchims—as given in the Bka' gdamgs chos 'byun sgron me (fol. 27b5-6) does not correspond to the Rnam thar yongs grags.

12. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 84b5-85a3.

13. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 21a5-b3.

14. The second part of the fascicle kha (fol. 95a5-125a4) in the Pha chos, the first part of the Bka' gdamgs glegs bams, see note 11 above.

15. Rnam thar lam yig fol. 125a3-4.

16. See e.g. Eimer, Berichte, 4-5 note 17.

17. Rnam thar lam yig fol. 104a6-b1: 'brom min 'brum yin u pa si ka de yin.

18. Rnam thar lam yig fol. 106b6-107a1.

19. Deb ther shion po, ca, fol. 35b7-36a7.

20. Composed 1484 by Bsdod nams lha'i dbaṅ po; from a microfilm copy (manuscript in the library of Mr. T.D. Densapa)—the episode is found on fol. 81b6-83a7.

21. Composed 1494-1496 by Las chen Kun dga' rgyal mtshan; blockprint (419 fol.) prepared at 'Bras spuṅs.

22. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 106b4-108a4.

23. Rnam thar yongs grags fol. 94a2-95a1.

24. Bka' gdamgs chos 'byun sgron me fol. 336a6-337a1 and 337b1-5 (the gloss fol. 336b2-5 is not given here).

25. A comparative text of the different versions of this episode is given by Eimer, Berichte, 280-290.
26. Alias Lag sor pa or Roṅ pa Phyag sor pa; the dates for his life are not known.
27. Often-used name for 'Brom ston Rgyal ba'i 'byuṅ gnas.
29. 1016-1082 A.D., see Roerich, Blue Annals, I, 266.
30. Lo rgyus.
31. Often-used title for Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba, one of the principal lo tshcha bas working together with Atiśā.
32. Place in Maṅ yul.
33. The translation here follows the text of the *Deb ther shon po*.
35. Also known as Zul phu ba Bya 'Dul ba 'dzin pa chen po; for the dates of his life see below.
37. Namely the *Rnam thar rgyas pa* and the *Rnam thar yoins grags*.
38. See *The Red Annals*, Gangtok 1961, fol. 27b5-7 (page 54), and Eimer, *Berichte*, 280 note 1 and 286-287.
39. That this report is far older is shown by some facts given below in this paper.
40. The date of this meeting is not given. Presumably it took place in the last decade of the 11th century.
41. There could have been other reports on Atiśā hidden in non-biographical traditions.
42. See Roerich, *Blue Annals*, I, 247.
43. 'Brom ston pa died 1064 A.D.
44. Bka' gdam chos 'byuṅ sgron me fol. 337b5 and 338a5.
47. See above note 11.
50. This central tradition is studied in detail by Eimer, *Berichte*, 256-272.
53. Composed 1575-1580, blockprint of the gsun 'bum (prepared in Se ba Byaṅ chub gliṅ between 1920 and 1928), volume ka (1), part cha (6), the life of Atiśā is given fol. 140b1-142a3 and 177b2-187b2.
54. Padma rgyas pa'i ŋin byed fol. 178b2-181a5.
55. The passages used from these sources can be seen in H. Eimer, “Die Gar
log-Episode bei Padma dkar po und ihre Quellen”. [The Gar log-Episode (as
depicted) by Padma dkar po and its sources.]. Orientalia Suecana, XXIII-
57. See Eimer, Berichte, 210-211.
58. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 4a2-4.
59. Rnam thar yongs grags fol. 15b4-5.
60. There is some younger material contained in these works as well, see
  e.g. Bka’ gda mschos ’byun sgron me fol. 53a4: Atiśa travelling in Gtsaṅ
  made the prophecy that at Sa skya there would appear seven incarnations
  of Mañjughoṣa. Since the last of these incarnations was ‘Gro mgon ’Phags
  pa (1235-1280 A.D.), this passage cannot have existed before the end of
  the 13th century.
61. See Eimer, Berichte, 196-201.
62. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 28b2, 38b2, 43b3, 43b5. 57b1.
63. Rnam thar yongs grags fol. 47b5 e.g. corresponds to Rnam thar rgyas pa
fol. 57b1.
64. From the biographical sketch presented by Tsöṅ kha pa Blo bzaṅ grags
pa in his Rim pa thams cad tshaṅ bar ston pa’i byaṅ chub lam gyi rim pa we
see that at about 1400 A.D. there existed a classification of the different
guru-paramparās which is not as elaborate as that in the Rnam thar rgyas
pa—the same applies to the arrangement of the subjects studied by Atiśa.
Tsöṅ kha pa had access to a form of tradition which seems to stand nearer
to the first written biography. But since the biographical sketch by Blo
bzaṅ grags pa contains only a few details, it is not of much help in
discerning the original source.
65. Such a synoptic edition of the texts concerned is under preparation.
66. An Indian pandit in the retinue of Atiśa.
67. Microfilm copy taken from the blockprint in the possession of H.H.
Yongdzin Trijang Rinpoche.
68. In the sketch of Atiśa’s life as given in the Rim pa thams cad tshaṅ bar
ston pa’i byaṅ chub lam gyi rim pa.
69. Probably Nag tsho Tshul khrims rgyal ba incorporated these lines into
his bstod pa.
70. There are preserved fragments from other old bstod pas, namely of
those composed by Gro luṅ pa Blo gros ’byun gnas, Phag mo gru pa Rdo
rje rgyal po (1110-1170) and Khro phu Lo tsā ba Byams pa’i dpal
(1173-1225); see Eimer, Berichte, 146-150.
71. Line 282 of the Bstod pa brgyad cu pa runs:
  rab byuṅ dge bṣien lha yan bsdad
  “Even of the monks [and] the upāsakas [he] killed five.”
The corresponding sentence in the Rnam thar yongs grags (fol. 32b1) gives a
further detail: four monks and one upāsaka were killed—altogether five
persons.
72. See Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 103a4-6 and Rnam thar yoins grags fol. 91a2-6; this is given as well in Bka’ gdamgs chos ’byiin sgron me fol. 67b6-68a2.
73. Limited to the report on the family and the home of Atiśa.
74. Rnam thar rgyas pa fol. 24b3-4 and Rnam thar yoins grags fol. 4b5.
75. One of them is the Be’u bum shon po; see Eimer, Berichte, 269-270.

ADDITIONAL NOTE


The second of these two books gives a synoptic edition of the biographical texts as announced above in note 65.

THE EARLY EDUCATION OF MILAREPA*

Dan Martin

In Tibetan historical literature, conflicting accounts are often placed side by side with no attempt to harmonize them. At best, the author will cast a vote for the one he believes to have greater authority. This has advantages and disadvantages for the modern interpreter, who often can do little better. The problem is how to make a way through the differing traditions to come to a probable conclusion. The particular problem I set out to tackle is the historical identity of the pre-Marpa teachers of Milarepa. Most of them will remain unknown outside the Milarepa corpus and, as it turns out, only in two cases has it been possible to reach any kind of solution. The pursuit leads through the border areas of Ancient (Rnying-ma) and Reintroduced (Gsar-ma) Buddhism; of Buddhism (Chos) and Bon. While we are tracking our phantom snail-trail through some of the darker swamps of Tibetan history, it may be possible to stop from time to time to examine some interesting sidelights, points of departure for other unexplored countries. If quicksands and snakepits abound, the more intrepid investigators will be all the more eager to get on with it.

THE READING TEACHER

Milarepa was aged thirty-eight when he met his guru Marpa.1 According to his own words, he had "about ten Lamas" before then.2 The first was undoubtedly his reading teacher Klu-brgyad-pa.3 He appears to have been an ordinary village priest. His name signifies that he specialized in the propitiation of the Eight Great Nāga.4 Milarepa's own grandfather was an exorcist versed in the rites of the Eight Great Nāga, and it was an exorcistic exploit of his great-grandfather that explains the family name Mila.5 Padma Dkar-po is the only source which gives us a more informative account of Klu-brgyad-pa under the name Lo-tsā-ba Glan-chung or Glan-lo.6 He tells us that Milarepa received from him, in addition to reading and writing, instruction in Vajra-pāni according to the usage of Karmavajra.7 Many years later, Milarepa would hand on these same teachings to his own disciple Rechungpa.8 About Glan-chung, I can only say that Glan is a well known clan (gdung-rus) and Rechungpa is said to have had a teacher called

---

*I bear a heavy burden of debts to Dr. Michael L. Walter, Tibetan Language Cataloguer at Indiana University Library, who helped with sources and offered several comments resulting in substantial revisions in my final draft; and especially to Prof. T. J. Norbu, who had immeasurable patience with my arguments and with me. Both of them will disagree with much that is said in this paper.
Glan-chung Dar-ma-tshul-khrims. Whoever this person may have been, Milarepa was soon to leave him for much more dangerous studies.

THE MAGIC TEACHER

The story of Milarepa's involvement with black magic is well known. In short, Milarepa's immediate family was deprived of its inheritance and mistreated by his aunt and uncle. His mother persuaded him to seek vengeance through the black arts. So, Milarepa left his home in Lower Gung-thang (near the northern border of central Nepal) for the faraway valley of Yarlung and a hamlet called Skyor-po, where he met a teacher of the Gnyags clan named G.yung-ston Khro-rgyal. Khro-rgyal wasn't at all eager to teach real coercive magic (mthu or drag-sngags) but he was impressed by Milarepa's devotion. Milarepa finally said to him, "I'm not just a cute kid (gce-s-phrug) learning magic for a pastime. If I go back home without learning magic, my aging mother will kill herself!" After verifying Milarepa's story, Khro-rgyal said, "I have a magical method and coercive spell called the Red and Black Faced Za (Gza'-gdong-dmar-nag). However, I gave it to Doctor (Lha-rje) Snubs-chung of Phu-lung in Snubs. In return, he gave me a recipe for hailmaking. We have an agreement that if anyone comes to me for coercive magic, I am to refer them to him." Later, Milarepa was to return to Khro-rgyal; but it is the second magic teacher who shows the greatest potential for historical investigation. To begin with, I will restrict myself to what can be learned about him in the Milarepa corpus, the Blue Annals and the Chos-'byung of Padma Dkar-po.

Available biographies of Milarepa give different forms for the name of the magic teacher. In the Blue Annals, he is called Doctor Hüm-chung. By Padma Dkar-po he is called Doctor Ye-shes-gzung of Gtsang-rong. Most often, he is called Doctor Gnubs-chung, but frequently he is said to be Gnubs Khu-lung-pa or even Gnubs Khu-lung-pa Yon-tan-rgya-mtsho. He is a well known figure in Nyingma history. In order to reach a more positive identification of this teacher, however, it will be necessary to resort to a study of lineages. Gnubs Khu-lung-pa belonged to an important lineage for the oral tradition (bka'-ma) of the Nyingma which transmitted the Guhyagarbha and other teachings. The following reconstruction of information supplied by Padma Dkar-po (p. 387) and the Blue Annals (pp. 108-109) will be important for this discussion, since it supplies a rough chronology and many of the persons involved will reappear later on. [See Figure 1.]

While Padma Dkar-po and the Blue Annals differ on the lineages passing through the two sons of Gnubs Khu-lung-pa, both agree that the magic teacher was a spiritual (and, in other sources, physical) descendent of Gnubs Khu-lung-pa. [See Figure 2.]

How can these conflicting reports on the identity of the magic teacher be reconciled? Only by forming the hypothesis that the Doctor Gnubs-chung of the biographies was someone other than Gnubs Khu-lung-pa. First of all, most members of the Guhyagarbha transmission are occasionally given the
Figure 1—Gühyagarbha Lineage
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title of Doctor (Lha-rje). This doesn't help narrow our choices. That he is
called Gnubs-chung only lends credence to the idea that it really was Gnubs
Khu-lung-pa since he was the most important successor of Gnubs-chen
and, generally speaking, the 'lesser' master of a tradition follows on
the heels of the 'greater'. If it is true that Gnubs-chen Sangs-rgyas-ye-shes
died in 962 A. D., it is improbable that his disciple could have been a con-
temporary of Milarepa (1040-1123). Also, if the Blue Annals is correct
when it says that Milarepa was age thirty-eight at the time of his first
meeting with Marpa, then the date of the magic teacher's death could not
be before 1078 A. D.

As I was looking at the preface of the twenty-sixth volume of the Rin-
chen Gter-mdzo, I noticed with some excitement a work called the Fiery
Razor of Magical Redeflection (Yang-bzhag Me'i Spu- gri) by none other
than our Doctor Gnubs-chung. The text is all magical 'shop talk' but it is
prefaced by a story (lo-rgyas) which I would like to paraphrase. The story
begins with a lineage: 1) Gtsug-lag-dpal-dge, 2) Padmasambhava,
3) Vasudhāra, a Nepalese, and 4) Gnubs-chen Sangs-rgyas-ye-shes.
Gnubs-chen hid the text in the upper temple of Mkho-mthong in Lho-brag.
Later, Doctor Gnubs-chung took it from its place of concealment.
Suddenly, the story shifts to first person narration by one Mtshur-ston Rin-
chen-rdo-rje. He describes a magical process by which he sent a curse.
The curse was deflected back on him by a man of Dolpo called Mes-ston. At a
loss for a means to retaliate, he was referred to Doctor Gnubs-chung of
Gtsang-rong who granted him the complete precepts of Magical Redeflec-
tion. Together with his elder sons Mtshur-ston 'Jam-dpal, age eighteen, and
Mtshur-ston Dbang-nge, age fifteen, he performed the incantations. Mes-
ston coughed up blood and died.

This story is valuable because it not only connects the magic teacher of
Milarepa with an obviously black magic story outside the Milarepa corpus,
it also implicates Mtshur-ston Dbang-nge, one of the four chief disciples of
Marpa about whom little is known.

This discovery led me to investigate the Yamāntaka lineages of different
cycles with positive results. In a lengthy collection of texts connected with
the Fiery Razor of Magical Redeflection is a lineage prayer which names
Doctor Gnubs-chung as a successor of the Terton Rgya Zhang-khrom. This
Zhang-khrom can be placed in the eleventh century. He was born in
Gtsang-rong in a place called Dum-bu-lung. He was considered a reem-
bodiment of Gnubs-chen, whose Yamāntaka cycles he recovered from
Phung-po Ri-bo-che, Samye, etc. Kong-sprul has this to say about
Zhang-khrom:

This great Terton appears to have come before Jetsun Milarepa by
about one generation. Among his descendents came many who
achieved the coercive spells. To this day, they continue in the area of
Gtsang-rong.
There is a reference to him in the words of the father of Guru Chos-dbang. Referring to the dubious ethical worth of previous Tertons, he says,

Rgya Zhang-khrom destroyed the welfare of beings because he had propagated evil spells.²⁵

It was from Zhang-khrom that Doctor Gnubs-chung first received the Fiery Razor.²⁶ Later, he found an identical test at Mkho-mthing in Lho-brag.²⁷ Later still, he transmitted it to Mṭshur-ston Rin-chen-rdo-rje as mentioned. In the biographical notice of Kong-sprul we find:

Doctor Gnubs-chung was born in Khu-lung of Gtsang-rong as a son of Gnubs Ye-shes-rgya-mtsho.²⁸ He was a Mantradhāra known for the very great potency of his coercive spells. He withdrew the cycles of the Fiery Razor of Magical Redeflection from concealment in Lho-brag Mkho-mthing. He gave them to Zhang-khrom and they were gradually transmitted. They remain to this day a tool of the Vajradhāras who protect the Ancient Doctrine. Relying chiefly on these cycles, 'Brigung Chos-kyi-grags-pa,²⁹ under the personal guidance of Yamāntaka, spread the teaching which is known as the Redeflection of the 'Bri School. I received the complete transmission of this school.³⁰

By piecing together the preceding evidence, we can be fairly sure that the Gnubs-chung of the Nyingma belonged to the eleventh century, somewhat older than Milarepa. Also, in the introduction to a version of the story paraphrased above, the Fiery Razor and the Red and Black Faced Za seem to be given as alternative names for the same teaching.³¹ Another source lists the Red and Black Faced Za as an “extremely secret” auxiliary to the Fiery Razor.³²

This conclusion, however, is not final. All the Nyingma sources utilized to this point have been connected with the ‘rediscovered’ (gter-ma) tradition. Another picture emerges from the ‘oral tradition’ of the Nyingma, the bka’-ma. In a short work called the Story of the Lamas Who Transmitted the Red Yamāntaka,³³ which I tentatively take to belong to the fifteenth century,³⁴ we find a lineage for the magic teacher which matches perfectly the one given by Padma Dkar-po above. The teaching passed from father to son in the following manner: 1) Gnubs Khu-lung-pa, 2) Padma-dbang-rgyal, 3) Jam-dpal, and 4) Ye-shes-gzungs. Upon reaching the latter, the author tells us,

This is the person also known as Doctor Gnubs-chung under whom Milarepa studied the coercive spells. When Milarepa reached age twenty-nine, Rma-ban Chos-bar³⁵ was twenty-five. Since Rma-ban was a ‘heart disciple’ of Ye-shes-gzungs, the chronology agrees.³⁶

Now we know why the author of the Blue Annals and Padma Dkar-po disagree on the lineage for Doctor Gnubs-chung. It seems they were following traditions already established by the Nyingma. I am still at a loss to har-
monize the two traditions. In any case, most of the conclusions reached so far are unaffected by this new source.

'BLACK MAGIC' IN CONTEXT

There are yet other unresolved dilemmas. Why, for example, do the biographies confuse the sectarian affiliations of the two magic teachers? I can only say that I think the distinction between Buddhist (chos-pa) and Bonpo in early post-imperial times a dubious one. The most basic determinant of a Buddhist community, the monkhood, had been successfully abolished. There is little evidence that the Bodhisattva vow, the ethical life-source of Mahāyāna Buddhism (including Mahāyāna Bon!), had significantly survived Glang-dar-ma. On the contrary, it seems that black magic was common and some favored a literal interpretation of "liberation and union" as a license for murder and rape.37 One gang of eighteen robbers called the Ar-tsho Bande, like the Thuggee of India, roamed about murdering people with a self-righteous piety.38 The custom of extending the tongue as a greeting for high officials is said to have originated in those dark ages when officials formed the chief targets for magical curses. A dark spot on the tongue was supposed to betray black magicians.39 It is no wonder that the kings of Western Tibet regarded the reintroduction of normative Buddhism as an imperative.40 This is the picture as painted by the Tibetan histories. No doubt there was some real basis behind their characterization of those times. That Tibet was in a state of disquiet, both socially and spiritually, is absolutely certain.

I should have already clarified my use of the term 'black magic' since, as such, it doesn't appear in the Tibetan language, although the expression 'black side' (nag-phyogs) is used to refer to 'divinities' or spirits inimical to Buddhism. In my own lexicon, 'black magic' refers to the subversion of what might otherwise be 'spiritual techniques' to the end of harming others. The substance of meaning is no different from 'evil spells' (ngan-sngags, above). In short, it means making curses and casting spells (mthu gtong-ba, dmod-pa, thun-brab-pa, etc.). Of course, there are gradations of blackness according to the seriousness of the magically committed crime. That the magic practiced by Milarepa and his teachers was black (in this sense) is indicated by the fact that so many works connected with the Fiery Razor are classified in the Rin-chen Gter-mdzod under Drag-po Mgon-spyod, 'Coercive Witchcraft'.41 From the title of one of these works, it is possible to surmise that the objectives of this magical system are fourfold: to protect, deflect, kill and oppress.42

To bring this discussion even closer to our context, the horrible images connected with Za, the 'deity' of eclipse, will be seen by most in an entirely negative light (see note 31). It seems plausible that Za was a native draconian spirit of the Tibetans later homologized to the Indian Rāhu, just as the
Tibetan Klu spirits were homologized to the Nāga. What will be more difficult to explain is the fact that Za, while greatly feared, is mainly made to fill the positive role of a Protector (Dharmapāla).\textsuperscript{43} This points to an attitude toward the spiritual life which has countless parallels elsewhere, but was nowhere so developed as in Tibetan religion. This attitude, which one could almost call kind of spiritual machismo (vīrya), leads aspirants to leave the slow grades of ascent to face the crags and sheer cliffs of the Direct Path (nye-lam) with all its difficulties and dangers.\textsuperscript{44} In this light, it should not be any cause for surprise that the most complete sources for the magical teachings of Rgya Zhang-khrom and Doctor Gnubs-chung, with their lineages and associated texts, are found in the Records of Received Teachings of two of Tibet's greatest saints, Gter-bdag-gling-pa (1646-1714 A.D.) and the Great Fifth Dalai Lama (1617-1682).\textsuperscript{45} What would be a stumbling block to one person can become the stepping stone of another. Strength of compassion (Bodhicitta) precludes the usual motivations like greed, envy, hatred, etc. that lie behind magical curses. Tantricism in general has a long tradition of turning the vilest of poisons into nectar. The danger, of course, is that through lack of Bodhicitta and Skillful Means, the poison may remain poison. Tantricism subverts evil to the cause of good where conventional wisdom counsels avoidance. The same destructive magic which proved the downfall of Milarepa could later serve to eclipse negative forces as, for instance, the negative emotions that drive people to indulge in the black arts in the first place.

**THE HAILMAKING TEACHER**

If it seems we've already fallen into the aforementioned swamp of complications, in what follows there is good chance of getting swallowed. But we will proceed cautiously and return, like Milarepa did, to the hailteacher, G.yung-ston Khro-rgyal. In order to reach him, it will be necessary to start with the history of a particular rediscovery of a cache of Bonpo scriptures and treatises called the Yer-rdzong-ma.\textsuperscript{46}

The story goes that three Buddhists from Gtsang province went to Samye to look for hidden treasures (gter-ma). While Samye was the most common site of such rediscoveries, they didn't find anything and headed back emptyhanded for their homes. On their way, they happened upon a cache of Bonpo books at a fort in Yer (hence the name Yer-rdzong-ma). Not being of the Bon persuasion, they gave the books to a Bonpo called, in some Bonpo sources, Gnyan-ston Lha-'bar\textsuperscript{47} or Lung-ston 'Od-'bar\textsuperscript{48} and, in other Bonpo and one Buddhist source, Gnyags-ston Lha-'bar of Bru-tshang.\textsuperscript{49} Incidentally, the Buddhist source adds that the three Tertons came to grief on account of their rediscovery. This was no doubt due to the ire of the three Bonpo "Treasure Protectors." One got leprosy. One died. One went insane. By comparing different accounts, the early Yer-rdzong-ma transmission takes approximately the course shown in Figure 3.
The name for the hailteacher, Gyer-ston Khro-gsas, may very well be an equivalent of G.yung-ston Khro-rgyal. It contains two words from the Zhang-zhung language, Gyer and Gsas. The first means ‘chant’ or ‘chanter’ (gyer-pa), but it may also mean ‘Bonpo teacher’ and G.yung-drung Ston-pa may mean ‘Bonpo teacher’ as well. The meaning of Gsas is vaguely ‘royalty’ or ‘divinity’ and both ideas may be expressed by the Tibetan word Rgyal (as in Rgyal-po or Rgyal-ba).

Biographical information for members of the Yer-rdzong-ma lineage seems scarce, but we do have a separate biography for Lung-bon Lha-gnyan. From it we learn that his father, Lung-ston ’Od-bar (!), died when he was eleven years old. At ages fourteen through sixteen, he studied Bonpo tantras under a teacher “G.yer-pa.” In the following years he got married and had two sons. At age twenty-seven, he felt an aversion for the vicious circle and abandoned his family for a life of religion. By putting this information together with another source, we may conclude that he practiced hailmaking before age twenty-seven and probably while he was studying under “G.yer-pa” (whom I take to be G.yer-ston Khro-gsas). If this is so, and if it is true that he learned hailmaking together with Milarepa, then the date given for his birth (1088 A.D.) can hardly be correct. This would place the date of the hailmaking episode in about 1104 A.D., several years after Marpa’s death. In the Milarepa biographies, the hailmaking accomplice is an unnamed “strong servant” of the hailmaker. As more Bonpo sources become available, it may be possible to straighten all this out.

**THE DZOGCHEN TEACHER**

After the hailmaking episode, Milarepa returned to stay with G.yung-ston for some time. Later, G.yung-ston and, according to come, Gnubs-chung, repented of their lives of magical crime and urged Milarepa to follow the pure Dharma while he was still young. G.yung-ston sent him to
Rong-ston (or 'Bre-ston) Lha-dga', a specialist in the Dzogchen teachings of the Nyingma (or Bonpo?). Milarepa found him in Upper Nyang at a place called Ri-snang. His customary place of residence was in Rong. Rong and Nyang are branches of the river system which includes the trading centre of Gyangtse in Tsang province. The 'Bre family is known to have been centered in Tsang.\textsuperscript{56}

Rather than going into a long comparison of different stories about the Dzogchen teacher, I will merely give a close paraphrase of the story as told by the Third Karmapa Hierarch, Rang-byung-rdo-rje (1284-1339 A.D.), which has only recently been made available. It should be no surprise that he has more to say on the subject than the Mad Saint of Tsang (1452-1507 A.D.). The Third Karmapa spearheaded the acceptance of Nying-ma doctrines by the Kargyudpa (he was a kind of Terton himself!) while the Mad Saint was more interested in reviving the earliest esoteric systems of the Kargyudpa. The story begins as the Bon hailteacher gives Milarepa a donkey loaded with food and a bolt of cloth as gifts for the Dzogchen teacher.

"There is a Lama in Nyang-stod named Rong-ston Lha-dga'. He is a Siddha who teaches the Holy Dharma called the Great Perfection. You must go to him."

So, Milarepa went to meet the Lama. After he had presented the donkey and its load, he said, "I am a sinful man of La-stod. I ask that you tie to my heart a teaching."

The Lama Rong-ston replied, "It is good that you have come. I have unerring precepts called Great Perfection, teachings which purify and awaken even the greatest of sinners in a forceful way. It is victorious in the roots, the sprout, the trunk and leaves. Those who learn it in the morning are purified and awakened in the morning. Those who learn it in the evening are purified and awakened in the evening.

Part is gold and part is turquoise.
The fowler's net is followed by the slingshot.
The towering clouds are scattered by a whirlwind.
The dark room is lighted with a butterlamp.
The encompassing Gnosis (jñāna) produces itself.
The Buddha is encountered within.

This teaching I have leads to liberation by merely hearing it. Those blessed with sharp faculties have no need to meditate."

Milarepa thought to himself, "While the black magic and hail-making each took many days of preparation, this teaching is certainly an easy one, to judge from his examples. I am so lucky to encounter something like this where meditation isn't even necessary." So, he asked for Great Perfection teachings and practiced them with determination, not moving at all morning or night. The Lama saw him in his meditation and became fearful, "One like this who has so much determination... if obstacles arise, there is nothing I can do about it. But then he does have faith."

One day, with nothing in mind, he summoned him. To one side of the room the Lama seated himself on a cushion Milarepa had put
down for him. Then, Milarepa seated himself in front. “Look around inside the skull with the closed mouth and tell me what you see.”

Milarepa looked but couldn’t see anything.

“We two will have a talk. I have worked for several days now. This Great Perfection teaching of mine is lofty as the sky. How is it that the meditative experiences have not taken hold? The several dark methods for practice may be attractive, but even I myself have no cause for confidence. I will apply myself to the recitation of the Lady Angry Brow (Bhrkut). Still, if you are to gain practical experience in the Dharma, a Lama with a lineage, blessing and spiritual realization seems to be essential. This is a teaching for the sinless. Your sins are frightfully great.

“In the region of Lho-brag is a Lord named Marpa, a disciple of the Indian Lamas Naropa and Maitripa. His precepts of the Spiritus (prāṇa), its Channels (nādi), and Thoughtdrop (bindu) put Buddhism in the palm of the hand. These are methods patterned after the body which purify and awaken the Mind (citta). These are the Six Doctrines of Naropa, the essence of all Tantras. His special teachings on ‘Mixed Transference’ (bsre-pho) lead to the attainment of the ordinary and supreme Siddhi. His learning is full of stories of saints and their songs. His limbs are full of dancing. His mind is filled with contemplative absorption. The Clear Light constantly appears to him both in and out of meditation. I also have thought of going to him…”57

THE OTHER TEACHERS

Near the beginning of the paper, I said there were about ten teachers before Marpa. So far, there have only been four. Who are the missing teachers? Some names are supplied in a song of Milarepa to his disciple Zhi-ba’-od. This is the only reference to these extra teachers found in the biographies and there are only two new names: Dgyes-ston and Rngog-mi.58 The same song is quoted in the Blue Annals (p. 432) but the two names are Ngar-ston and Ngab-mi. Padma Dkar-po also has the song and gives Sgyer-ston and Ngab-mi.59 A Ngab-mi Byang-chub-rgyal-mtshan is known from the Gūhyagarbha lineage.60 Otherwise I can find no probable identities for them.

Padma Dkar-po gives the most material on the missing teachers, placing them between the magic teachers and Lha-dga’:

“There was a Sgyer-ston Dbang-nge in Rgyang-khar of Upper Myang. Milarepa asked to go to him for Rdzogs-chen teachings. He went and received all of his precepts. Sgyer-ston sent him to Khor-re where there was one learned in the Sgyu-ḥrul, Yang-dag and Bbudṛtṣi (Nyingma cycles) named Ngab-mi Byang-chub-rgyal-po. He, in turn, sent Milarepa to Do in Yar-brog and to the feet of a Ma-mo expert named Mar-pa’ Byung-nge. In this way, he studied under nine Lamas. Then Mar-pa’ Byung-nge entrusted him to ‘Dre-ston Lha-dga’ of Gtsang-rong, under whom he studied Rdzogs-chen. He stayed with each Lama about one or two years, altogether around fifteen years.”61
Since I have been unable to come up with any clear-cut identities for any of these teachers, I won’t plague my readers with dubious possibilities. If this paper has been inconclusive and debatable on many points, I hope that it will at least show the continuing vitality of those Lamas who have, in retrospect, been called Ancient Ones (Nyingma) and Bonpo; teachers of great spiritual magnitude among whom there were, nevertheless, some abusers of the powers invested in them. I have focused far too much attention on the abusers. Above all, I hope that the Milarepa who was a man among men will cast a slightly sharper image in the minds of those who love Tibetan literature and history. At least I may have given some indication of the territory that needs to be traversed on the way to that end.

As I reflect on the place of Milarepa in the context of Tibetan history, I begin to see him more and more as an expression, even an ideal embodiment, of the aspirations of the Tibetan people in the time of Buddhism’s rekindling from the fading embers of the post-imperial times when “Tibet went to pieces” (the image of eclipse), a rekindling which culminated in a blaze of religious and cultural activity. I like to imagine that a part of Milarepa’s great appeal for Tibetans today lies in an unspoken awareness that his struggle away from the self-serving technology of the black arts to a spirituality unequivocally white was not a mere personal struggle.
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22. Jam-dpal Gshin-rje’i Gshed Yang-bzlog... (vol. II, p. 68.5, ff.). His full name was Dum-pa (after his birthplace) Rgya (the family name) Zhang-khrom Rdo-rje’od-bar.
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26. In the following I base myself on: Rin-chen Gter-mdzod (vol. I, pp. 487
and vol. XXVI, pp. 517-8); ‘Jam-dpal Gshin-rje’i Gshed Yang-bzlog… (vol. III, pp. 22-3).

27. There was a Mkho-mthing Lha-khang in Lho-brag (Das, p. 151). It was an ancient temple built in order to press down the left elbow of a mythic she-demon (Padma Dkar-po, Chos-’byung, p. 318.1).  

28. Note the position of this Gnubs Ye-shes-rgya-mtsho in the Guhyagar-bha lineage. This statement substantiates the Blue Annals account, but doesn’t exclude that of Padma Dkar-po. See below.

29. =’Bri-gung Rig-'dzin, born in 1595. He was the 21st abbot of ’Bri-gung and a Terton.

30. Rin-chen Gter-mdzod (vol. I, p. 487.4 ff.).

31. Rin-chen Gter-mdzod (vol. I, p. 487.4 ff.). One may only speculate that the Yamāntaka cycle known as Lcags-sdigs (note 23 above) is involved. Lcags-sdigs may be translated ‘Iron Scorpion’ and it was a huge scorpion that precipitated the killing of 35 persons attending the wedding party of Milarepa’s cousin (Lhalungpa. p. 26). We learn from the biography of Gnubs-chen (Padma Phrin-las, Bka’-ma Mdo Dbang-gi Bla-ma…, p. 173.5) that he got a coercive spell (‘evil spell’ according to Karma Mi’gyur-dbang-rgyal, Gter-bton Brgya-rtsa, p. 162.2) called Spu-gri Reg-chod from the Nepali Vasudhāra with the intention of magically killing the emperor Glang-dar-ma. On his return to Tibet, he found that the deed had been done. So, having no use for the spell, he hid it. Elsewhere (Bdud-’joms Rin-po-che, Rnying-ma Chos-’byung, p. 297.2), Gnubs-chen is said to have displayed his magical powers to Glang-dar-ma by making a black iron scorpion, big as nine yaks stacked up, appear on his fingertips.

As for the Red and Black Faced Za, Gza’ means ‘planet’ and, in a more specific sense, Rāhu. The colors red and black are often associated with Yamāntaka and his attendants. One finds the expressions Gshin-rje-gshed Dmar-nag and King-kang Dmar-nag quite frequently. I cannot explain the Gru-gu Dmar-nag teaching granted to Gnubs Khu-lung-pa (Padma Dkar-po, Chos-’byung, p. 388.3) except to say that Gru-gu (which is a frequent spelling for Dru-gu, ‘Turk’), is a ‘thread-ball’ (Nebesky, Oracles and Demons, pp. 18, 270) and black and red threads are said to have some magical application (Jaeschke, Tibetan-English Dictionary, p. 422).

It seems possible that the following explanation of the name as given by Professor Norbu is the right one. The Gza’ stands for Rāhu. The Gdong-dmar here stands for Gdong-dmar-ma. The Nag stands for Nag-mo (=Kali). For these, see the index to Nebesky, Oracles and Demons. None of the three seem especially connected with Yamāntaka cycles (which Nebesky mostly ignores). The Gza’-gdong-dmar-nag is mentioned as a Phur-pa cycle in Sog-bzlog-pa, Collected Writings (vol. I, pp. 134.3, 144.6). It may be significant that a form of Gza’ appears as a messenger of Yama in a grimoire attributed to Gnubs-chen (Zla-gsang Be’u-bum, p. 231).

It is a Bonpo source which gives what could be an explanation of the name.
In a long list of the rediscoveries of Zhang-khrom (here called Dum Rgya Zhang-phram), most of them known from Buddhist sources (note 23), are these three teachings: 1) the Magical Shovel which Tears Things Down from the Top, 2) the Crowbar which Demolishes from the Foundation, 3) the Eight Precepts for Directing the Planetary (ecliptic) Hook (ṭ Gza’ Gdang Gtad Man-ngag Brgyad). Experienced readers of Tibetan will have no trouble condensing the last-mentioned name to Gza’-gdang Man-ngag. If we remember that we are dealing with the literary outcroppings of an oral tradition, it is not difficult to relate this to Gza’-dong-dmar-nag. See also Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho, Thob-yig (vol. III, pp. 81-2).

Those interested in pursuing the subject of Rāhu as a protective deity should begin with his ‘biography’ in the Bstan-srung Rgya-mtsho’i Rnam-thar of Bzhad-pa’i Rdo-rje (p. 340.2, ff.) and the index to Nebesky, Oracles and Demons. In general, Rāhu is a causer of eclipses (nyi zla gza’ dzin) and eclipses have definite connotations, in world literature, of “all hell breaking loose.” The connection with epilepsy (in a loose sense) is interesting. Epilepsy may be expressed in Tibetan as the ‘shadow of Rāhu’ (gza’ grib), the ‘Rāhu disease’ (gza’ nad), ‘increased blood in the brain disease’ (kla skrags bgyas nad), or ‘sky/space derangement’ (gnyan skyon). European parallels are not hard to find and the connection of eclipses with changes in the political order, pestilences, possession, seizures and black magic goes as far back as recorded history, no doubt further.

Finally, an astronomical textbook provides what is certainly the most concrete and defensible explanation. It is a well-known fact that the moon’s path alternates north and south of the ecliptic in what appears to be a wavy line. When the moon approaches the ecliptic from the south, it is called the Ascending or North Node and when it approaches from the north, it is called the Descending or South Node. Western tradition also calls these respectively the Head and Tail of the Dragon. In Indian astronomy, the Head and Tail are called Rāhu and Ketu. In a Tibetan astronomy book (Mkhyen-rab Nor-bu, Rtsis Gzhi’i Man-ngag Rigs-ldan Snying-thing, p. 43.2) the Tail (Mjug) is said to be light red coloured. The Head (Gdong) is dark red (dmar nag). Therefore, rather than Red and Black Faced Za, we should translate Dark Red Head of Eclipse. The association of colors with the various types and degrees of eclipses is very thoroughly explained by Petri, Colours of Lunar Eclipses According to Indian Tradition. It is interesting that he derives the name Rāhu from the verbal root rabh, ‘to grasp or seize’. This would explain why the Tibetans translated both Rāhu and the word for planet (graḥa, ‘sizing, grasping’) by the same word gza’. Tibetans often use names like Gza’-chen or Gza’-rgod when they want to refer unambiguously to Rāhu.

32. Gter-bdag-gling-pa, Gsas-yig (p. 257.1).
33. “Gshin-rje Dmar-po’i Bla-ma Brgyud-pa’i Lo-rgyus,” by Rngog Bsdun-nams-shes-rab, found in Bka’-ma (vol. VI, pp. 3-19). This text has much material on the early members of the Guhyagarbha lineage not found else-
where. For a similar Yamāntaka lineage, see Bka’-ma (vol. V, p. 509.4, especially).
34. I base this on the following: 1) The author puts twelve generations between himself and Ye-shes-gzungs. 2) The author’s teacher is called Kun-dga’-bkra-shis. The only person I find by this name is the teacher of a Stag-lung abbot (who lived 1359-1424—Blue Annals, p. 641) who visited China in 1413 (Dhongthog, Important Events, p. 124).
35. This person (b. 1044) is also known as Rma Lo-tsā-ba Dge-ba’i Blo-gros. See Blue Annals (pp. 219-20, 405, 857); Padma Dkar-po, Chos-byung (p. 419.2).
36. Bka’-ma (vol. VI, p. 13.5).
37. Tibetans trace the intellectual background for this perverse tantricism to two Indians who appeared in Tibet during the interval following the suppression of Buddhism by Glang-dar-ma. They were called the Red Ācārya (A-hta-sha Dmar-po) and the Blue-skirt Pundit (Paṇḍi-ta Sham-thabs Sngon-po-can). In order to gain money and honor in the villages, they spread a vulgarized version of ‘liberation and union’ (sbyor sgrol) and many Tibetans followed them. It was a revulsion against these Tibetan followers that prompted the Later Spread of Buddhism. See Bsdud-’joms Rin-po-’che, Rnying-ma Chos-byung (p. 771.1, ff.); Sog-bzlog-’pa, Collected Works (vol. I, p. 463.4, ff.).

It is evident that what most early Nyingma (and Bonpo) teachers intended by the term sbyor-sgral was something akin to ‘pha-ba: joining with the spirit of a deceased being in order to liberate it from an unfortunate karmic destiny. Nebesky, Oracles and Demons (p. 492) makes a connection between the Red Ācārya and Marpa which I have not been able to substantiate.
38. For the Ar-hta Bande, see: Roerich, Blue Annals (pp. 696-697); Padma Dkar-po, Chos-byung (p. 348.5); Zla-ba-seng-ge, Grub-chen O-rgyan-pa’i Rnam-thar (p. 7.3, ff.); Stein, Tibetan Civilization (pp. 71, 152). 39. See, for example, the stories in Bsdud-’joms Rin-po-’che, Rnying-ma Chos-byung (p. 168.3 ff.) where the Blue-skirt Pundit is connected with a Phur-ba cycle. The following quote is from the same section (p. 169.3, ff.):

“The Geshe Rwa Lo-tsā-ba waxed great in wealth and influence. The many great Lamas and officials (bla dpon) of Tibet had no choice but to bow to him. It was known that those who wouldn’t be ‘liberated’ by the coercive spells of Yamāntaka.

“Then Dum-pa Rgya Zhang-khrom uncovered a clay milk cannister full of Yamāntaka cycles. After removing about half of the Tshe-bdag Sdigs-pa Snying-dzings, he went to Rwa Lo-tsā-ba to extend his own Yamāntaka cycles and made up Indian originals and translations [NOTE: a “statement of Guru Chos-dbang” according to Rin-chendpal-bzang-po, Chos-byung Bstan-pa’i Sgron-me, p. 147.5]. Likewise, from the many treasure caches of Bum-thang, he uncovered profound precepts of Jambhala, Guhyapati; as well as coercive magic,
hailmaking and maledictions (*mthu* *ser* *gtad* *gsum*).

"Many came to swift ends through the Yamāntaka cycles of the New Translations. Thirteen bodhisattvas including Dar-ma-mdo-sde, the son of Marpa; thirteen who were, like himself, translators, including Gnyan Lo-tsa-ba were 'liberated' by his (Rwa Lo-tsa-ba's) skill in spells."

One comment: This Gnyan Lo-tsa-ba accompanied Rwa Lo-tsa-ba to India and took part in the religious council of 1076 A.D. His full name was Gnyan Lo-tsa-ba Dar-ma-grags (Ferrari, p. 105). The father of Rechungpa, who died when the latter was in his eighth year (circa 1092 A.D.) was coincidentally (?) named Gnyan Dar-ma-grags (Padma Dkar-po, Chos-'byung, pp. 499-500).

40. For 'black tongues', see also Shakabpa, Tibet (p. 53). I want to mollify this 'too black' interpretation of the Tibetan dark ages a little. It was a 'dark' age precisely because we are pretty much in the dark about its historical and especially religious developments. My own impressions will sound heretical to many, both Tibetologists and Tibetan, but my contention (which finds some support in Snellgrove, Nine Ways, pp. 15-16) is that Indian ideas had already been adapted in Western Tibet from Shaivite and Buddhist peoples further to the West before the official introduction of Buddhism in the seventh century. These currents coalesced, over the course of time, with Bon which is itself a selfconsciously foreign religion from the West with a marked tendency (like Chos) for syncretism and/or assimilation. Upon the collapse of the Tibetan Empire, the newly and rather superficially (in numbers) introduced Buddhism became indistinguishable in the minds of ordinary believers from the already buddhistic Bon. Mutual and, for the most part, unconscious assimilation resulted in the amazing doctrinal similarities of the later Bon and Nyingma schools. The word 'plagiarism' should be avoided like the plague in this context. It unjustly undermines the spiritual integrity of the religious peoples concerned. If some so-far unidentified Bonpo appropriated the Prajñāparamitā literature, it was probably because of similar tendencies already in Bon. I am personally very happy if he did. Hopefully the other religions of the world will follow suit. Bon and Chos both mean Dharma and therefore 'Buddhism'. It is time to stop identifying Bon with the 'primitive animism' of Tibet and face the facts. Almost every criticism against Bon could equally be levelled against Chos. There are, as yet, no final answers to these questions.

41. Drag-po Mgon-spyod (Rin-chen Gter-mdzod, vols. LXXXIII & LXXXIV). Mgon-spyod means 'cruel or violent action' (according to Tibetan-Tibetan dictionaries) but may stand for the Sanskrit word it translates, *abhicāra*, which definitely refers to the use of spells for evil purposes and therefore black magic or witchcraft.

42. Rin-chen Gter-mdzod (vol XXXIII, p. 479, etc.). The ethical, philosophical and even legal dilemmas involved in magical violence require treat-
ment by a specialist in magical criminology. Crimes both magical and mundane were punishable under the Tibetan legal system, and Buddhist teachings, emphasizing motivation, would hardly condone any such acts performed out of selfishness or attachment. So much is clear. The causes and motives of physical violence and crime are no different than the causes and motives of magical crime and violence. Only the medium of action differentiates them, and, according to Buddhist ideas, the weight of the resulting karma.

43. Consult Combe, A Tibetan on Tibet (pp. 107, 151-3). Iconographic representations of Gza' may be found in Chandra, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary (p. 1079); Beyer, Cult of Tārā (p. 51); Pott, Art of Tibet (pp. 234-235, plate 28, lower left hand corner); Olschak, Mystic Art (p. 104). For a primitive (or degenerated?) vision of Gza', see Rock, Nāga Cult (vol. I, p. 88). I hope that someone more qualified for cross cultural studies will investigate what I believe is a connection between the Tibetan iconography of Rāhu and ancient Middle Eastern conceptions. The Indian representations (as in the Navagraha) bear little resemblance to their Tibetan counterparts.

I base what follows entirely on material found in Hartner, The Pseudo-planetary Nodes of the Moon's Orbit in Hindu and Islamic Iconographies. In Persian, Jawzahr stood for both the Head and the Tail of the eclipse. Could this be the source of the Tibetan word Gza'? Probably not. Later on, al-Jawzahr was used for the Head and the word al-Nawbahr was used for the Tail. The word al-Nawbahr means 'ninth part' and is frequently used in astronomical texts for the nine parts of a zodiacal sign. Could this explain why Gza' has nine heads? On a twelfth century bridge over the Tigris there are reliefs of the planets together with the constellations in which they have their 'exaltation' (place of maximum astrological influence). The 'planet' with its exaltation in Sagittarius is called al-Jawzahr and Sagittarius is pictured as a centaur with a bow and arrow. Could this explain why Gza' has a bow and arrow? A picture dated 1200 B.C. shows Sagittarius as a winged centaur archer with a scorpion tail. A scorpion is often pictured with Sagittarius (Scorpio is the neighboring zodiacal sign). Could this explain the 'scorpion connection'? Sagittarius sometimes has a head at the end of his tail which stands for the 'head' of the eclipse. Does this explain the Makara banner, which is, after all, a head on a stick? Thus every aspect of the iconography of Gza' has a possible explanation with the exception of the raven's head. I am sure that this too will find its reason.

After all I've said, I should like to add contradiction to confusion and say that Gza' does have one truly positive aspect. According to Mkhyen-rabnor-bu (Rtis-kyi Man-ngag, p. 44), the external Gza' swallows the sun and moon while the internal Gza' is the Central Vein (risa dbu-ma) which swallows the solar and lunar veins (ro-ma and rkyang-ma). The swallowing in this context refers to the overcoming of conventional dualities, the unio mystica. Gampopa, when he was practising meditation under
Milarepa, had a vision of the sun and moon swallowed by Rāhu. This was the deciding sign of his spiritual achievement and he soon left Milarepa to meditate in solitude (Roerich, Blue Annals, p. 456). The recent ‘Universalist’ (ris-med) saint Rlangs-darn Shakya-srhī (d. 1919) had the same vision. See Kah-thog Si-tu, Grub-dbang Shakya-srhī Rnam-thar Me-tog Phreng-ba (pp. 204.6–205.1) where it is stated that this vision accompanied the entrance of the solar and lunar veins into the Central Vein. See also Wayman, The Buddhist Tantras (p. 151, ff.). The ninth chapter of the Vaidūrya Dkar-po has similar statements and also retells the traditional Indian story of how Rāhu stole the nectar of the gods.

44. A common proverb is, “The poison that nourishes the peacock brings ruin to all others.” Also, Tilopa’s statements (loosely), “What is medicine to the gradualist is the instantanealist’s poison. The medicine of the instantanealist becomes poison to the gradualist.” Note: Nye-lam (Short Path) may be expressed as Myur-lam (Quick Path). These ideas are not meant to rationalize libertinism or willfulness. In fact, it is my own belief that they are a direct development of the ‘ascetic theology’ of monastic traditions where pride is the ultimate component of the sinful nature. I refer readers to the fifth century Latin father St. Gregory, his comments on compunctio in particular. There are no easy answers.


46. Sources for Yer-rdzong: Three Sources (pp. 316.2, 366.3, 382.1); Karmay, Treasury (pp. 152-3); Dpal-lldan-tshul-khrims, G.yung-drung Bon-gyi Bstan-byung (vol. II, pp. 181-3); Sources (p. 746.6). Dpal-lldan-tshul-khrims, G.yung-drung Bon-gyi Bstan-byung (vol. II, p. 182).

47. Karmay, Treasury (p. 152). I disagree with Karmay’s translation on only one point. Other sources make it clear that Lung-ston ‘Od-bar and Gnyan-ston Gzi-brjig are two different persons. It is interesting that Karmay’s text provides a name for the hailmaking text behind Milarepa’s practice. It is there called Thog Smad Dgu ‘Grol (p. 153, n. 1). The Fifth Dalai Lama names one of the scrolls of the Gnubs Family Heirlooms (Gnubs-kyi Gong-khug), the Thundering Snowstorm (Thog-gi Bu-yug) as the Hail Teaching transmitted to Milarepa. This would make it one of the rediscoveries of Rgya Zhang-khrom. See Ngag-dbang-blo-bzang-rgya-mtsho, Thob-yig (vol. III, p. 83.5, ff.).

49. Gnyag-ston Lha-bar in Three Sources (p. 366.3) and Sources (p. 746.6). Note that the hailteacher of the Milarepa corpus is almost always a member of the Gnyags clan. For the Buddhist source, see Khetsun Sangpo, Biographical Dictionary (vol. III, pp. 311-2).

As a side note, it is interesting that at least one of the rediscoveries at Yer-rdzong was transmitted in Buddhist circles and reached one named Darphyar Ru-pa Rin-chen-bzang-po whose ritual dagger was preserved until modern times at Sera Monastery. Most of the cycles connected with Darphyar deal with Gza’ and Rāhu (Ra-hu, see Three Sources, p. 382). My re-
searches lead me toward the conclusion that the cycle of teachings thus transmitted is a rare example of an ultimately Bonpo teaching which was appropriated, finally, by the Gelukpa. My defence is beyond the bounds of a footnote and is certainly beyong the bounds of certainty.

50. The Bonpo preserve this word in compounds like Dpon-gsas and Gsas-mkhar. Gsas-mkhar is the 'divine palace' of the Bonpo, a functional equivalent of the mandala used by other Buddhists (Sangs-rgyas-pa). It will not be by chance that the final tower built by Milarepa in the famous story, which remains standing today, was called Sras- (or Gsas-)mkhar Dgu-thog. The tower building episode has been plausibly explained as a political move by Marpa (Stein, p. 150), but the name and the appearance of the tower lead me to wonder if it weren't associated with similar towers used as 'observatories' by weathermakers (as well as for defense). This suspicion puts the motives of Marpa under a slightly different light. This is no more than a suggestion. The Mad Saint and others explain the word Sras-mkhar as meaning 'Fort of the Son' because Marpa wanted it built for his son Darma-mdo-sde. But the homonym Gsas-mkhar occurs frequently, and it will be no accident that the tower has nine stories (dgu-thog). The name of the tower bears a suspicious similarity to the name of the hailmaking teaching (note 48). No definite conclusions can be drawn from this, but Tibetanists will agree that, if my intuitions are correct, Marpa had a very cutting sense of humor.

51. Sources (pp. 276-86).
52. Karmay, Treasury (p. 113).
54. Karmay, Treasury (p. 152, n. 4).
56. See Tucci, Preliminary Report (p. 80).
57. The story of Lha-dga' is found in Rang-byung-rdo-rje, Mdzod-nag-ma (vol. I, p. 30.4, ff.). At first I thought that the Mdzod-nag-ma version of the story was unique. However, some of the same narrative elements are present in the work of Kun-dga'rin-chen (1475-1527), Miscellaneous Writings (pp. 44, ff.) and also in the Milarepa biography by the Second Red Hat Karmapa (1350-1405).
58. Gtsang-smyon, Mi-la Mgur-'bum (folio 70r.4, ff.).
59. Padma Dkar-po, Chos-'byung (p. 481.3).
60. See above for his position in the Guhyagarbha lineage. He was a disciple of Khug-pa Lha-btsas. See Roerich, Blue Annals (pp. 109, 364-5, 432). For the Dgyer clan see Blue Annals (p. 890).
61. Padma Dkar-po, Chos-'byung (p. 478.3).
62. Except in a footnote. The Sgyer-ston Dbang-ge could be the Gyer Dbang-grub of the Yer-rdzong-ma transmission, and therefore a Bonpo Rdzogs-chen teacher (see his position in the lineage tree above). The Mar-pa 'Byung-nge could be Mar-pa Do-pa Chos-kyi-dbang-phyug.
This Mar-pa from Do (in the Yamdo area) was at the head of a specific Cakrasaṃvara lineage and a disciple of the famous Nyingma Lama Rongzom-pa. Since he was born when Marpa (the teacher of Milarepa) was 31 and lived to the age of 95, he must have lived circa 1012-1106 A.D. Their identity cannot be definitely established on the basis of their common family name, era and locale, but I find no contrary evidence. See Padma Dkar-po, Cho-sbyung (pp. 408.6, ff., 457.1); Roerich, Blue Annals (pp. 383, ff., etc.).

63. Karmay, Treasury (p. 104).
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CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE ANGLO-TIBETAN WAR OF 1888*

N.L. Nornang & L. Epstein

The name of Bka’-drung Nor-nang Dbang-dus-tshe-ring is well known to Tibetologists as the author of the *Yig bskur rnam gzhag*, the famous manual of Tibetan letter writing style. He is less well known as an excellent poet, since very few of his works have come down to us. Bka’-drung Nor-nang was born probably in the 1850’s and died around 1910. He held the post of Secretary (*bka’-drung*) to the Tibetan Cabinet (*bka’-shag*) for more than twenty years, so long, in fact, that his title seemed to have become part of his very name.

In the late 1940’s, the Nor-nang family lent the original manuscript of the *Yig bskur rnam gzhag* to the late Zur-khang zhabs-pad. Mr. Zurkhang returned a copy of this work, which also contained Nor-nang’s various notes and correspondence, to the Nor-nang family, intending to keep the original for examination. Unfortunately, during the confusion of events which occurred in Lhasa in 1959, the original was left in Tibet, and it is from the copy that the following texts are taken.

The three texts presented here are all headed *sa-byi* (*lo*), 1888, and they refer to the Anglo-Tibetan confrontations of that year in March, May, and September. The first two texts (I and II), letters to the Regent (*sde-srid*) and the Krong-dpon of Bhutan, are the official correspondence of the Tibetan cabinet, drafted by Bka’-drung Nor-nang in his capacity as Secretary. The letter to the Krong-dpon has been referred to by such authorities as Rahul (1978: 88), who writes that the Bhutanese ignored the Tibetan plea for assistance, and Lamb (1960: 187), who quotes British Foreign Office correspondence to the effect that the Krong-dpon chose not to respond to the Tibetan request inasmuch as he feared losing his British subsidy. The texts of the letters, which have not been published previously, also refer to the little known Galing conference, which followed in the wake of the Bhutanese Civil War of 1885 (see Lamb 1960: 179, Rahul, *ibid.*, Shakabpa 1967: 198). The Tibetan government apparently tried to use the Galing accords as a legal means of involving Bhutan in the Anglo-Tibetan controversy, as well as appealing to Bhutan’s moral obligations to Tibet as a soul-mate in the protection of the Dharma, which they truly perceived to be threatened by the British invasion.

The third text (III), a letter to a Mr. Snyan-grong, reveals Bka’-drung

---

* We gratefully acknowledge the kind assistance of E.V. Daniel, Kent Guy, J. Norman and T.V. Wylie.
Nor-nang as a poet rather than a bureaucrat. The letter refers to the events of September, 1888, in which the English forces chased the Tibetans as far as Gro-mo (Yatung) into what was indisputably Tibetan territory. It reveals, in a manner both poetical and humorous, the utter confusion that prevailed in Lhasa during these events.

Translations

Title to Texts I and II

Copies of letters sent by the Cabinet to both the Regent of Bhutan and the Krong-dpon when the foreigners called the English, enemies of the Buddhist doctrine at large, attacked with their army the fortifications at Lung-thur facing Phag-ri, even though the National Assembly had given its customary orders for steps such as beginning with a military draft.¹

Text I: The letter to the Bhutanese Regent

To the Regent who peacefully protects the prosperity of the Southern Region:²

Those called foreigners, such as these, do not tolerate the perfect wealth of others. Hence, except for whatever lands and peoples they can conquer in all neighboring nations through deceit and coercion, they are widely known to be evil deceivers, not of the sort that have learned contentment to their desires and the good customs of shame, modesty and prudence which are suitable as the mark of a great nation.

Especially, because they have perversely insulted our Buddhist doctrines and mores,³ and since they continually have tormented us with pretexts of having intended to come here to this field of religion beginning from the time of the Hsien-feng Emperor until now,⁴ last year the Tibetan General Assembly met and discussed the matter and sent as representative the Minister of Finance Lchang-can Srás in advance to inspect the construction of a new wall for defending our own land by ourselves at the place called Lung-thur. Thereupon, the foreigner’s bandit army unexpectedly and without reason attacked the few officers and soldiers that were at that border in the meantime in an unfair fight and did various things, such as occupying it.⁵ There is absolutely no way we can bear this defeat without responding appropriately, no matter what the consequences. According to what all of Tibet has decided, we are preparing to drive them out in fierce battle.

Hence, since Bhutan is united with us in the Buddhist religion, the teaching lineage of Narotāpa, the Dalai Lama and the Emperor have looked after the succession of Bhutanese Regents boundlessly with gifts and respect, and it is clear in Chinese and Tibetan records that the Bhutanese government and people have done such good things as offering service, in former and later times, in fighting for the Buddhist doctrine as well. Especially, because of the civil war in your area in 1885, in addition to China’s and Tibet’s having discussed it, the Emperor appointed and dispatched with orders to
Bhutan Chinese and Tibetan officials as investigators. Hence, through their resolution of the roots of the controversy and their having obtained successive agreements to their verdicts, the joint investigators made their recommendations to the Dalai Lama and the Emperor. However, at that time, the two resident Ambans, Se-leng-eh and Ch’ung-kang, were engaged in such things as a transfer of post, and we just had not yet sent you a communication notifying you of the final circumstances. Other than that, you know that you were about to issue the seal of success to keep the accords unchanged, issue documents, appoint positions and so forth; and that Bhutan had given final agreement, accepting to abide by the orders of the Dalai Lama and the Emperor thereafter.

Furthermore, because the Tibetan and the Bhutanese governments are united in the mores of the Buddhist doctrine, if the precious, victorious teachings, the foundation and the root of benefit and happiness, were to be heretically misruled by non-Buddhists, not only would it be of no use to all beings, even though they live upon the earth, but, in the future, we could not avert the Emperor’s displeasure; who of us could countenance this?

Because as you, the Regent, as chief, and all those under you, such as O-rgyan- dbang-phyug, the Krong-gsar Dpon-slob, who acts as governor-general of Bhutan, who are inclined toward the Buddhist religion, clearly know, until these present disputes between Tibet and the foreigners are peacefully settled, the National Assembly has sent separately to you and the Krong-gsar Dpon-slob O-rgyan-dbang-phyug each complete and clearly detailed letters with particulars about Bhutan’s defense of its own lands by itself, etc., and acting in absolute unity for the sake of the doctrine. We request you to discuss these matters with the Krong-dpon and you must also remember to announce your strictest orders everywhere to all—your officials, governors, estate stewards, headmen and commoners.

Sent on ? month, ? day, with official presentations.

Notes to Text I
1. This implies that the Cabinet took an extraordinary step in writing these special appeals, inasmuch as the usual military and diplomatic steps had already been undertaken.
2. The expression ‘bul-bras (I,1) is more literally rendered “the results of what we want to say in the letter sent to . . . “
3. Doctrines and mores = bstan lar (-rgya). Lar-rgya is usually translated as “integrity” or “accord,” but it has wider connotations. While someone not born into a Buddhist way of life may have sympathy towards or an understanding of Buddhism and its customs, one cannot have lar-rgya. One must be born to it.
4. Hsien-feng reigned 1851-1861. The reference may be to the Tientsin Treaties of 1858, which gave the English the freedom to travel and engage in missionary activities in China, or to the Anglo-French march on Peking in 1860 which caused the Emperor to flee.
5. Shakabpa (1967: 199) mentions that Lcang-can (Changlochen) behaved
more provocatively than this letter would allow.
7. See Lamb 1960: 166, on the change of Ambans. It seems, thus, that the accords reached at the Galing convention were never fully ratified.

Notes to Text II
We have not translated the letter to Krong-gsar Dpon-slob O-rgyan-dbang-phyug, as it is virtually the same as the one to the Regent. Despite the fact that the Tibetans certainly knew the Krong-dpon was the most important political figure in Bhutan, the language of the letter is somewhat less formal than the first, since his actual position in the Bhutanese political hierarchy was still lower than the Regent's. The letter mentions that he holds the offices of Krong-dpon and regent chamberlain (sde-gzim) simultaneously (II, 1). Hence, the letter is somewhat briefer, and we find such less lofty terms as: \textit{rin po cher} (II, 1) versus \textit{rin po che'i drung du} (I,1); \textit{skrun} and \textit{don gcod} (I,5) versus the less honorific \textit{rgyag} and \textit{byed mi} (II, 3); \textit{zhu rgyu} (II,9) versus \textit{mdzad rgyu} (I, 11); and \textit{kha btags} (II,13) versus \textit{lha rdzad} (I, 16).

Title to Text III
A letter in verse, telling news of how I am faring, sent to Mr. Snyan-grong, staff member of the Rgyal-rsi Office of Military Food Supply, harried by the foreign army in Tibet.\footnote{1}

Text of the letter
When I read your letter, saying everything is well,\footnote{2} I was sure the Buddha Amitāyus, who releases another day’s life,\footnote{3} had poured out everywhere the nectar of the vase he keeps in his hand, which established for you the pillar of adamantine life.

By shooting the reinforced arrow of the appearance of mental wisdom you nocked upon the string of hard space—Emptiness, completely exhausting the obstinate attachment to the belief that all which exists is real unto itself, you hit the target of pure knowledge.
And in the same instant cut off at the root the life of the Ten-necked Demon, named Ignorance.\footnote{4}

Actually, although you have a wealth of freedom in the great kingdom of the bodhi-mind, you have of your own will taken responsibility for just a border land: pretending to be ordinary.
Much-sullied worms, born of the filth of super-ignorance, have stolen my chance to gain pure qualities from you.\footnote{5}
Who are a certain hero, the likes of whom has never come before; who are a second Rāma, the fallen dust of whose feet confers good fortune.

But I, who am like a pool in spring, having not forgotten your kindness, which approximates the size of the moon, write you thus:\footnote{6}
Nowadays, though known as the sun that joins day's glorious light to earth, 
You still endeavor to work for the common people. 
I am especially thankful for the grace of your continual teachings. 
The rays of your elegant sayings have lit the swampy forest of my mind. 

Though the arrow of imbalanced elements from which it is difficult to be 
free? 
Has pricked me often, my health is unimpaired. 
Even now I pass from pass to valley everyday; 
I feel like some imaginary antelope here. 

As to the main point: In saying a word of what comes to my mind, 
I compose this with a quivering tongue, saying I am embarrassed. 
But though the words I utter before my sacred teacher are rough, 
How can a scholar obstruct and blame genuine news as false?

The great beneficent shade tree, whose wide limbs 
Bestow the coolness made perfect by the offerings appointed by Heaven, 
Is as high as the Tree of Paradise, the entire ensemble of the Buddha's 
teachings. 
It nurtures with all necessities the central spot on earth, the kingdom of 
religious and secular law.

But the demon army, which from the past has held the ax 
Of perverse desire—seeking to cut down this tree, 
For long has kept nightwatch secretly in all kinds of ways. 
Finally, their clamoring in open exuberance belies what they have done 
until now. 

Our generals have the courage of their hot-tempered rage. 
Their fiercely angry hate against the hateful enemy 
Is like smoke from the burning of inborn tongues of flame. 
It transforms their qualities; they have become familiar with knitted brows 
furrowed in anger. 

Their army surrounds us with all the military treasures, many bearing 
Weapons, sharp and strong, each one perfect in its own way, 
Capable of making powder of beings' lives. 
And yet they aim at military strategies to make the enemy tremble. 

Through the power of our champions, their ordinary skills 
And the extraordinary final decisions of the four deeds, 
Everyone hopes to wear upon his ear the ornament which says "It will come," 
The golden earring of that which is good to hear: That our army has won.

But in the meantime, beyond this manifest wish, it is very much a secret 
What will happen in the future to postpone this news. 
Upon the broad canvas of his mind everyone 
Limns in a hundred colors all kinds of pictures of his apprehensions.
Worrying for that reason, some monks
Expert in the practice of prognostication and profound, fierce mantras,
Endeavor to direct upon the heads of the enemy host
The thunderbolts which reduce to dust whatever they touch.

Some, focussing upon peaceful meditations,
Are busy, moistening, then drenching,
Carefully cooling down the continuous consuming fires of the enemy’s hatred
With the nectarine liquid which comes of their yearning for immeasurable compassion.

The rest, monks in name and title only,
Say the doctrine is the only thing worth defending.
Together with making a vow, saying it is bad to enjoy being alive,
They voluntarily prepare to go to war.

When one thinks about the duties of the laity,
They are of two kinds only; everyone is busy,
Aboil, with whatever one does best in body, speech or mind.\footnote{13}
It is like having opened the door of an anthill.

Alas! Thoughts of the five arrows of suffering, the accomplished facts,
These devils have emanated\footnote{14}
Are difficult to bear; the painful rain of weapons
Pierces beings’ hearts without making wounds. But still we are trying
to defeat them.

Even the elders say they do not know who will finally win or lose,\footnote{15}
And their uncertainty makes everybody suffer.
We trust only our heart’s love, who suckles us with the breast\footnote{16}
Of the power of oceanic truth, the Three Refuges.

In former times, Padmasambhava and those
Several ones, who, directly and indirectly, hold his lineage
Placed emblematic vajras upon the peaks of the braids
And installed as hot-tempered protectors of the virtuous dharma
The vast army of Vow-holders who were difficult to make take orders.
The Protectors gained the force of undertaking this agreement
Which made them vow to protect, as though they were as dear as their
own eyes,
The dharma and the government together as their duty.

Whereupon I pray that when the Protectors destroy the enemy’s torn-out hearts in sacrifice, there will be a fire storm,\footnote{17} and by this action afterwards a blanket of cloud will completely obscure the sun.
Having built up strong, clear thoughts about the pledge the Protectors have not the courage to break, the time has certainly come for them to drive away the English army, which, drunk on pride, has broken its promises.
May the thousand sparks of the Protectors’ red, round, gaping-open wisdom eyes, now, entirely and simultaneously, burn to motes of ash the firewood of the enemy’s breath!

May their sharp, snow-white, half moon-shaped fangs feed upon the unbroken red cloud of the continuous flow of the enemy’s heart-blood, that is suitable to be arranged as gifts for a water offering.18

As a result of this, there then will appear a newly risen pleasure garden Of springtime’s glorious peace. We should not be impatient: Time will certainly liberate us From the unendurable cold touch of winter’s war.

Unable to bear such general circumstances as these, I am powerless to stop my mouth from talking. Even the god of water would tire of my situation: I cannot tell you everything. Though I can do very little of significance, Officials are concentrating on defeating the enemy. Hence, they endeavor to discuss peaceful and fierce means, And from amongst their rosary of non-stop servants, they are pleased to make me serve, So that now the thread betwixt my mind and body is almost severed.19 Whereas men sleep through night’s watch uninterrupted, I pass the time doing things bereft of sleep. It seems as though it were always day, As if the government gave me especially things to do. In sum, I hope you will not weary of my telling you. I just mention this as an aside; I do not think you would mind. So, these things above make meaningful our calling them enemies of the doctrine, And it is our chance to defeat the foreigners. Time’s illusionary powers sport to conjure up a dance Whose dancers we do not recognize as our own minds. The foolish mind perceives it as misery and is very much pained; But for heroes who know the dharma itself, it is theater.

Such evil circumstances clearly establish the world as empty as the heart of the plantain tree. But now I rely on those futile actions I must do anyhow to cool my mind, Those new leaves brought to completion by the springtime, so to speak.20 The poetry above is not the Ganges of elegant sayings that flows down from Śiva’s virile locks; What I write is ordinary stuff that will put you to sleep, But it may cause to refresh the ocean of your mind.

Once again, don the hard, adamantine armour of ceremony To protect your body against the weapons of adverse circumstance. To counteract my burning sadness, I pray you send a hundred times Your elegant sayings, which are a whirling whisk.
What I want to tell you has passed out as the sounds of my throat. The touch of the beautiful-haired god creates white forms. May my appeal to you, through the auspicious things I have said be clear And find favor in your eyes, o great one, who commands my thoughts!

Notes to Text III
1. Mr. (jo-lags) Snyan-grong’s identity is uncertain. He was apparently a minor lay official, and, quite possibly, the author’s kinsman. What is clear from the letter, however, is that the author considered him a learned scholar, and, at some time in the past, had studied with him briefly. The Phog-khang, Office of Military Food Supply, was located in Lhasa Zhok. Normally, Rgyal-rtsa would not have such a post, but one must have been set up in 1888 in order to be closer to the front.
2. The expression snyan pa mtshan (III,1), literally “name which is good to hear,” is a standard poetic phrase meaning “good news,” “your affairs are prospering,” etc.
3. Bcom-ldan Tshe-bdag-Lha (III,2) is a synonym for Tshed-pa-meg.
4. Mgrin-bcu (III,6) is a synonym for Rāvaṇa, king of the Rākṣasas.
5. The worms are a metaphor for bar-chad, the interruption in life circumstances which prevented the author from continuing his studies with Snyan-grong. The foot (III,9) is incomplete, containing only nineteen instead of twenty-three syllables. We believe this is a copyist’s error. As our text is somewhat illegible here, we offer this only as a tentative translation.
6. The author depicts himself as a placid pool filled by the moon’s reflected image, i.e., his correspondent’s learning and grace.
7. This refers to the four elements as constituents of health. The phrase thar dka’ (III,16) might be rendered “difficult to cure.”
8. La klung (III,18), literally translated here, means “everywhere,” “all over the place.”
9. “A quivering tongue,” ro ’dzin ’dar (III,21) meaning “a shaking voice.”
10. This entire expression designates the government and all its sanctified activities.
11. That is, sa yi thig le (III,26), meaning Lhasa, or more generally, Central Tibet.
12. That is, the four modes of action, zhi, rgyas, dbang, drag.
13. The two kinds of duty are not stated here. They are either serving as a soldier or supporting the army. Sgo gsum mkhar rje (III,61) is literally “the master (consciousness) of the castle (physical form) with three gates (body, speech and mind).
14. Sdgs bdag byed po (III,64) is a synonym for the bdud Māra.
16. The Three Refuges are here depicted as a mother, a dearly beloved woman with breasts (III,71).
17. That is, the storm of fire and wind, released by the sacrificial act.
18. A rghaṅ (III,83), an offering of water to an honored guest.
19. That is, “I am almost dead with overwork.”
20. That is, "All is Emptiness, but I still try to do things, hoping for peace."
21. Snyan-grong's elegant poetry is here compared to a fly whisk of yak-tail hair, which, when waved, sets flying in all directions the individual strands that usually lie together in a mass (III,118).
22. The beautiful-haired god refers to the fringed scarf (kha-btags), normally enclosed with letters, whose auspiciousness brings good luck ("creates white things").
23. Ga ma ka (III,122), means that which makes things clear for someone.
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Texts I and II: Title

Text I

1) རྟོན་ངོ་བོ་རྔོ་བོ་ཛི་ཨེ་བཙུན་དོན་དང་།

2) རྗེ་བཙུན་དོན་འཛིན་ཁྱེད་བཙུན་དོན་དང་།

3) རྗེ་བཙུན་འབྲས་བྲེལ་བརྟན་འཛིན་ཁྱེད་བཙུན་དོན་དང་།

4) རྗེ་བཙུན་འབྲས་བྲེལ་བརྟན་འཛིན་ཁྱེད་བཙུན་དོན་དང་།
5) དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་

"དུས་དུ་དངོས་པོ་དུ་དུས་དུས་ཤུག་པོ་བོ་བོས་པོ་
དུས་དུ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་བོ་པོ་
6) དེ་དུས་ཟིང་ཤིང་དུ་མེ་དོད་པ་ཤིང་དུ་མེ་དོད་པ་ཤིང་
དུ་མེ་དོད་པ་ཤིང་དུ་མེ་དོད་པ་ཤིང་

7) བདུན་པ་ཤིང་ལ་བདུན་པ་ཤིང་ལ་བདུན་པ་ཤིང་

8) བདུན་པ་ཤིང་ལ་བདུན་པ་ཤིང་ལ་བདུན་པ་ཤིང་
9) ཞུལ། རུལ། བཅོམ་བོར་དྲོག་པའི་ོན་ཏི་ོལ་བོ།

10) རུལ་རུལ།

11) རྟོགས་ཆོས་དབྱིངས་ངོ་དབྱེས་པའི་མདོ་ལྡན་ོན་འོ།

12) རྟོགས་པོ་དབྱིངས་པའི་ོན་ཏི་ོལ་བོ་བོམ་བོར་ོད་པོ་ོད་པོ་

13) རྟོགས་འོད་པོ་བོར་བོམ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་

14) རྟོགས་སོ་བོར་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་
Text I

15) བོད་ལ་གིས་འདིན་མཚན་བཞིན་གཅིག་བཞིན་དབང་པོ་

16) བོད་ལ་གིས་འདིན་མཚན་བཞིན་དབང་པོ་

Text II

1) འཇིག་བཞིན་གཞིན་ས་དེ་བཞིན་གཞིན་གཞིན་གཞིན་

2) བོད་ལ་

3) ཡུལ་བཞིན་གཞིན་ས་ནི་བཞིན་གཞིན་གཞིན་གཞིན་

THE JOURNAL OF THE TIBET SOCIETY
4) ཨེ་ཐང་དང་བོད་ལུགས་སྟོང་པ་ཡི་ཤེས་བ་མེད་པར་ཞིང་

5) ཀྲུན་པོ་གཙོ་བོ་དང་འགྲུབ་ནི་དེ་བོད་ལུགས་གཞི་ལྡན་

6) དུས་པ་སྟོན་པ་ནི་བོད་དང་ཆུང་ལུགས་གཞི་ལྡན་
7) བོད་དོན་དགོས་བཞིན་བཤད་བ་ཉིད་དེན་པའི་ཐོན་མར་ཡིན་པོ་
རེམ་ལོང་བཞིན་ལུང་པོ་ལེན་པ་ཐོན་མོ་སོ་བོ་རྩོམ་ཅན་ཏེ།

8) བོད་དོན་

9) སྤྱོད་པ་ཕྱེངས་པ་ཕོ་སོ་ལྡེ་འབད་བཞིན་

10) སྤྱོད་པ་ཕྱེངས་པ་ཕོ་སོ་ལྡེ་འབད་བཞིན་

11) སྨུན་པོད་པའི་ཉིད་ཀྱིས་དེའི་དབེན་པ་ཐོན་ཏོ་མེད

12) རྣམ་པོད་པའི་ཉིད་ཀྱི་དབྱིང་ནང་ལེན་ཞི་དེ་བས

13) སྦྱོ་བེ་ཐིག་དེ་དབང་མཐུར་དཔེར་བའི་ཚེ་ག་སྟོང་
Text III: Title

"བོད་གཉིས་ཀྲི་ངེས་པ་བཤེས་པ་རིམ་བཞི་ཕྲུལ་ལོ།"

耽误

1) "ཨྲི་བྲོ་བཤེས་པ་ཁྱུམ་ལྷ་སྲོོང་།"

耽误

5) "རྒྱ་གཉིས་ཀྲི་ངེས་པ་བཤེས་པ་རིམ་བཞི་ཕྲུལ་ལོ།"

耽误
10) རུ་རྩི་ིབྱེ་ཕྱི་བྲིས་ཕབ་དཔེ་བོ་བོ་
འདི་འི་ལྡེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་
དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་
རི་རི་རི་རི་རི་རི་རི་རི་
ུ་ུ་ུ་ུ་ུ་ུ་ུ་ུ་ུ་
མི་མི་མི་མི་མི་མི་མི་
ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་ཨ་
ཨི་ཨི་ཨི་ཨི་ཨི་ཨི་ཨི་ཨི་

15) ལྷ་ི་མི་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་དེ་

སངས་སངས་སངས་སངས་སངས་

པས་པས་པས་པས་པས་པས་པས་
ཨེ་བོ་ཕུན་ཚུན་བཞི་བསྡུ་ས་བརྒྱ་ནུས་སྔོན།

20) འཕྲིན་ལོག་ཕུན་ཚུན་བཞི་བསྡུ་ས་གཞན།

ཆོས་དོན་ལོག་གི་སྤེལ་དོན་མི་ལེན་པ།

དཔལ་སྭེང་བསྡུ་གྲུབ་ཕྲུར་བཅུ་བཟང་པོ།

དཀར་པོ་རྗེ་ཐོབ་པའི་བཤེས་དང་ཤེས་དཔེབ།

དབང་ཕྲོད་པེ་བཞི་བསྡུ་སྒྲུབ་པོ་ནུས་སྔོན།

25) འཕྲིན་ལོག་ཕུན་ཚུན་བཞི་བསྡུ་ས་པ།

ནོ་དོན་གཉེན་པོ་གྲུབ་པོ་ཞི་ལེབ་དོན།

དབང་ཕྲོད་པེ་བཞི་བསྡུ་སྒྲུབ་པོ་ནུས་སྔོན།

དྲ་བོད་ལོག་ཕུན་ཚུན་བཞི་བསྡུ་ས་བརྒྱ་ནུས།

30) འཕྲིན་ལོག་ཕུན་ཚུན་བཞི་བསྡུ་སྒྲུབ་པོ་ནུས་སྔོན།
35) ཀན་བཟང་དེ་བོད་བཞི་ཞེས་བསོད་ནམས།

40) སེམས་དཔོན་དབང་པོ་ལམ་ཉི་མོ་ལྡན་པར་བཞི་།

དབང་རྒྱལ་མ་རྒྱལ་བསྒྲིར་བཞི་བདུན་གཅིག་།

གསུམ་གླེགས་བཞི་དབང་རྒྱལ་མ་ཙོ་བར་བཞི་།

བོད་དཔོན་ནེ་གཅིག་བཞི་ལྡན་པར་བཞི་།

དབང་རྒྱལ་མ་ཙོ་བར་བཞི་བདུན་གཅིག་།
45) བོད་ལྡོན་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་

50) བོད་ལྡོན་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་

55) བོད་ལྡོན་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་བོད་ཀྱི་
70) བས་ཐོད་ཕྲུག་ཕྲུག་བཀོད་པའི་དབེན་བཞི།
བློ་བཟང་སྤྱིི་ཤིི་ཤི་བདག་རོལ་ན།
དེ་ཁོ་གོ་ཤིི་རྩོད་དཀར་ལྕགས་རོལ།
དཔལ་ཙྰ་ཤིི་བོར་དུ་ལ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་
དེ་ཁོ་གོ་སེམས་ཤིི་ཆོས་ཤིི་བོ་བོ་

75) སྟྱོང་དཔོན་དགོས་གྱིས་དབང་བཞི་བཀོད་པའི་དབེན་བཞི།
དཀར་པོ་འོག་ཤིི་ཤི་ཤི་ལ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་བོ་
དེ་ཁོ་གོ་ཤིི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི་ཤི́}
བོད་ལོངས་ཤྱིས་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར་དར་པའི་སྐད་དབང་དགུ་གནོད་པར་ཡོད་མི་འཐོབ་སྐྱིད་པར་བྱེད་པ་

ངོ་དེ་བཤད་དགུ་དོན་ཤིག་གི་སྐབས་བཞི་ཐབས་ཐབས་འཇིག་ཐམས་ཅད་འདྲ་བ།

ཐེག་པ་བཟང་པོ་བཤད་དགུ་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར་དར་པའི་སྐད་དབང་དགུ་གནོད་པར་ཡོད་མི་འཐོབ་སྐྱིད་

འཐོབ་སྐྱིད་པར་བྱེད་པ་

85) མི་ཚེ་བོ།

ཞེས་བཤད་དགུ་བཤད་པའི་ཕྱིར་དར་པའི་སྐད་དབང་དགུ་གནོད་པར་ཡོད་མི་འཐོབ་སྐྱིད་

དུག་གཤེགས་པོ་སྡེ་བོ་བཤད་པ་

དེ་ལ་བཤད་པ་
90) ཉེས་པ་ལྡན་པ་དེ་གཞི་གཏན་བཤད་ལ།

དཔལ་ནི་ལུང་མི་དེ་བཤད་དུས་བཏང་།

བོད་རིག་པ་བརྟགས་ཐེ་ཨ་མེད་དུ་བཤད།

ིབ་ལ་བཙན་དེ་བསྟུང་བཤད་ལ་དོན་ཐུན་།

ན་པར་གཞི་དེ་བསྟོན་དུ་བཅོས་པས།

95) ཌྷེས་དུ་སྔོན་པོ་གཞི་དུ་བཅོས་པས།

ིས་བཅས་བཞིན་ནས་གཏོགས་པ་དི་བཞིན་པས།

བོད་ཡིག་སྐད་ཕྲག་ཐོབ་པར་དུས་བཅོས།

དུས་ཕྲག་ཐོབ་པར་བཤད་དུ་ཤུལ་ཤུལ་བཞིན་།

ཤེས་བཅས་པ་བཞིན་ལས་གཏོགས་པས།

100) ༄ོ་བོད་ཀྱིས་ཞུང་དུ་དབང་ཕྲིན་ཐས་ལ།

ཤེས་བཅས་པ་བཞིན་ལས་གཏོགས་པས་དུས་བཅོས།
ཐུབ་མཐོང་དབུགས་ལུང་བོད་ཐོས་བོད་།

ཤིང་བོ་དགོན་པར་ཁུ་ཤིང་པོོ་སོགས་།

དུས་དགའ་སུམ་ཅིན་ཐོན་མི་འི་དབེན་སྐྱེལ།

105) རྩོམ་རྩོམ་ཐོགས་པོ་དཔེར་བོའི་ཕྲུག

རྩོམ་ཚུལ་ཐོབས་བུམ་བོད་བོད་གི་དོན་ལྔ་

ཆུས་ཆེན་པོ་བཐུན་པར་དང་ཆུས་ཆེན་ཆུས་ཅན་

རྩོམ་རྩོམ་ཐོགས་པོ་དཔེར་བོའི་ཕྲུག

110) དཔོན་དཔོན་དབུགས་ལུང་བོད་ཐོས་བོད་།

རྩོམ་འཛིན་པོའི་ཆོས་ལྔ་དུས་ཤིང་།

དུས་དགའ་སུམ་ཅིན་ཐོན་མི་འི་དབེན་སྐྱེལ།

བན་པའི་ཐོགས་པོ་དཔེར་བོ་སྨི་གར་

འི་བོད་དེར་ཞིང་ལུང་བོད་ཐོས་བོད་།
115) བོད་དོན་གླུ། སྤྲོལ་མི་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།
ོ་བོན་པའི་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན། འཕོ་བོ་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།
ཁེ་ནོ་རོ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན། འཕོ་བོ་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།
ོ་བོན་པའི་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན། འཕོ་བོ་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།

120) ཡོད་པ་ལྷ་བོ་ཐ་དབྲོད་དབུང་གུང་ལྷ་བོ་ཐ་
རླུང་ལྷེ་ཆེན་ལྷ་བོ་ཐ་
ོ་བོན་པའི་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།
། འཕོ་བོ་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།

དུ་བོད་དོན་གླུ། སྤྲོལ་མི་བུ་མི་ལེགས་པོ་ན།
Brief Communications

THE 1413 MING EMBASSY TO TSONG-KHA-PA AND THE ARRIVAL OF BYAMS-CHEN CHOS-RJE SHĀKYA YE-SHES AT THE MING COURT

Elliot Sperling

The Ming mission which approached Tsong-kha-pa just prior to or during the year 1408 has become well known, thanks first of all to the writings of Yū Tao-ch’üan, and more recently those of Rudolf Kaschewsky and Heather Karmay. The letters which Tsong-kha-pa wrote as a result of this mission—to Ming Ch’eng-tsu, the Chinese emperor, and to an unknown Chinese official—have been variously translated by these scholars.

By contrast, much less is known about the mission which Ch’eng-tsu dispatched to Tsong-kha-pa in 1413, and to which Tsong-kha-pa responded by sending his disciple Shākya ye-shes to the Ming court. Yū Tao-ch’üan (p. 939) states that a Ming mission was dispatched to Tsong-kha-pa in the eleventh year of Yung-lo (1413-1414), but supports this only with a reference to a passage in the biography of Tsong-kha-pa by Cha-har dge-bshes Blo-bzang tshul-khrims (cha, ff. 41r-41v) which discusses the mission but does not give a date for it. Heather Karmay (pp. 81 and 102, note 89) dates this mission to the “2nd [Chinese] month of the 11th year of Yongle [March 2-31, 1413],” on the basis of a Ming shih-lu entry for March 11, 1413, which records the dispatch of a mission to Central Tibet led by the eunuch Yang San-pao. Karmay cites the reference to the mission in the compilation of Ming shih-lu notices dealing with Tibet published in Japan as Mindai Seizō shiryō (p. 62), and remarks that the mission’s “main aim was probably to invite Tsong-kha-pa.”

In 1977 a transliteration of the Tibetan text of the letter from Ch’eng-tsu which the 1413 embassy carried to Tsong-kha-pa, inviting him to visit the Ming court, was published by Dieter Schuh (pp. 181-182). Schuh discovered the letter in Dar-han mkhan-sprul Blo-bzang ’phrin-las’ biography of Tsong-kha-pa (pp. 288-289), a nineteenth century work that was published in a type-set edition in Varanasi in 1967. According to the description of Blo-bzang ’phrin-las, the original letter carried Tibetan and Chinese texts and was kept at Dga’-ldan, while an exact copy was stored in the collection of books and documents held by the Tibetan government (gzhung-sla’i phyag-dpe’i khrod-na ’dug-pa). The author further states that the version of the letter which he inserted in his biography of Tsong-kha-pa was copied without mistakes from the government copy. The letter is dated the 11th day of the second month of the eleventh year of Yung-lo, which is March 12, 1413, only one day after Yang San-pao had been ordered to undertake his mission to Tibet. In the text of the letter, however, the envoy designated by Ch’eng-tsu to carry his missive to Tsong-kha-pa is identified
not as Yang San-pao, but as Hou Hsien (in Tibetan, Ho' u Hyen), Ch'eng-
tsu's premier envoy to Tibet and, like Yang San-pao, a eunuch. If we now
turn to the complete version of Ch'eng-tsu's shih-lu, the Ming T’ai-tsong
shih-lu (chüan 137, p. 3a), we see that on the chi-wei day of the second
month of the eleventh year of Yung-lo, which is March 11, 1413, the day of
Yang San-pao's dispatch to Tibet, Hou Hsien was ordered to undertake a
mission to Nepal. Although it is likely that the embassies of Yang San-pao
and Hou Hsien travelled together part of the way, their missions were dis-
tinctly different ones. In view of the identification of Hou Hsien as the
envoy who carried Ch'eng-tsu's letter of March 12, 1413, to Tsong-kha-pa,
and his appointment one day earlier to lead a Ming embassy to Nepal, we
must conclude that Hou Hsien travelled via Tibet to Nepal and that his
itinerary included an audience with Tsong-kha-pa and the delivery of
Ch'eng-tsu's letter. We should note that the shih-lu entry recording Hou
Hsien's dispatch on this mission is not included in Mindai Seizō shiryō, no
doubt because it appears to deal with Nepal and not Tibet. Only a
knowledge of the contents of Ch'eng-tsu's 1413 invitation to Tsong-kha-pa
shows this to be otherwise.

Tsong-kha-pa was not the only hierarch whom Hou Hsien visited while
travelling through Tibet in 1413. In the November, 1981, issue of Wen-wu
the "Board of Management for Cultural Relics of the Autonomous Region
of Tibet" (in Chinese, Hsi-tsang tsu-chih-ch’ü wen-wu kuan-li wei-yüan-
hui) published a photograph of a bilingual letter in Tibetan and Chinese
which Ming Ch'eng-tsu had sent to the 5th Karma-pa, De-bzhin gshegs-pa.
The letter is dated the 10th day of the second month of the eleventh year of
Yung-lo, i.e., March 11, 1413. The text of this letter too identifies Hou
Hsien as the envoy appointed to deliver it. Thus, we now know that Hou
Hsien visited the Karma-pa as well as Tsong-kha-pa while en route to
Nepal. It was also Hou Hsien whom Ch'eng-tsu sent to Tibet in 1403 to
invite De-bzhin gshegs-pa to the Ming court, and who accompanied the
hierarch on his journey to China in 1406-1407. The original text of Ch'eng-
tsu's 1413 letter to the Karma-pa, as shown in the photograph, is unfortu-
ately unreadable, due to the scale to which it was reduced in printing. An
accompanying article gives the Chinese text of the letter (in simplified
characters), however, but not the Tibetan text.

It is fortunate that Ch'eng-tsu's letter to the Karma-pa survived the
ravages visited upon Tibet by the Chinese authorities in the 1960's. Accord-
ing to Wang Yao (pp. 185-186), both Mtshur-phu, the seat of the Karma-
pa, and Dga’-ldan, where Ch'eng-tsu's letters to Tsong-kha-pa was kept,
were leveled during this period. Let us hope that the original copy of Ming
Ch-eng-tsu's 1413 letter to Tsong-kha-pa, as well as other priceless docu-
ments and books, may yet survive in Tibet, as has turned out to be the case
with the emperor's 1413 letter to the Karma-pa.

* * *

It is a well-known fact that Tsong-kha-pa declined Ming Ch'eng-tsu's
invitation to visit the Ming court and instead dispatched his disciple Byams-chen chos-rje Shākyā ye-shes to court in his place. Shākyā ye-shes' arrival at court is not mentioned in any of the Ming shih-lu notices contained in Mindai Seizō shiryo. As a result, Satō Hisashi (p. 205) has assumed that references to his arrival were not included in the shih-lu. Karmay (pp. 81-82) remarks that Shākyā ye-shes' 'arrival is not mentioned in XZSL [i.e., Mindai Seizō shiryo] and he appears abruptly in the 4th month of the 13th year of Yongle (May 9 - June 6), 1415 [in Mindai Seizō shiryo] p. 65...’ The shih-lu entry to which Karmay refers is for May 11, 1415, and deals with Ch'eng-tsu's bestowal of a title on the hierarch after he had already been at court for some time.

Surprisingly, however, if we turn to T' an Ch'ien's renowned private history of the Ming period, the Kuo-ch'üeh (chüan 16, p. 1111), we find a brief entry stating that on the kuei-ssu day of the twelfth month of the twelfth year of Yung-lo, which is February 3, 1415, Shākyā ye-shes had come to court. Even more surprisingly, if we check the same date in the Ming Tai-tsung shih-lu (chüan 159, p. 3a), we find an identical entry. We can only assume that this shih-lu entry was overlooked in the compilation of Mindai Seizō shiryo.

Therefore, it is now possible for us to establish that Shākyā ye-shes arrived at Ming Ch'eng-tsu's court in Peking on February 3, 1415. Furthermore, his arrival was in response to the letter of invitation brought to Tsong-kha-pa by Hou Hsien, whom the emperor had placed at the head of a Ming embassy that travelled to Nepal via Tibet.
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Book Reviews


Le Bhoutan est le moins connu des pays himalayens. Contrée fermée depuis des siècles aux voyageurs comme aux chercheurs, le Bhoutan a rarement fait l’objet d’ouvrages de qualité. Un livre tel que *Views of Medieval Bhutan* publié par Michael Aris qui allie la qualité artistique à l’érudition est donc le bienvenu. Il est inutile de présenter ici Michael Aris qui après avoir séjourné plusieurs années au Bhoutan publia l’œuvre pionnière intitulée *Bhutan, the Early History of a Himalayan Kingdom* en 1979.

Comme l’indique le sous-titre du livre *The Diary and Drawings of Samuel Davis, 1783*, le sujet du livre porte sur le journal de voyage et la série de peintures et de dessins faits par Samuel Davis (1760-1819) lors de sa mission au Bhoutan en 1783 avec Turner. Nous trouvons aussi inclus quelques gravures de William Daniell exécutées d’après des dessins de Davis. Ces dessins et peintures (pp. 64 à 167) constituent la troisième partie du livre. Ils sont agrémentés de longues notes qui donnent, lorsqu’ils sont connus, le titre du dessin, le type de peinture employée, la date de composition, les dimensions et le lieu de dépôt actuel. Ces données brutes sont suivies dans la plupart des cas d’une explication de Michael Aris et/ou d’un extrait du journal de voyage de Samuel Davis relatif au sujet du dessin ou de la peinture.

De larges extraits (pp. 40 à 63) du journal de voyage de Samuel Davis constituent la deuxième partie du livre. Ils concernent les différents aspects de la vie au Bhoutan en cette fin de 18ème siècle, la religion, la flore, la faune etc... Un titre donné par Michael Aris en marge introduit le sujet des différents extraits sans déranger l’ordonnance originale du journal. Bien plus, de nombreuses notes ajoutées par Michael Aris, également en marge du texte, éclairent et précisent de nombreux points historiques, linguistiques et ethnologiques. Les extraits qui sont illustrés par des dessins sont signalés avec références aux planches.

La première partie du livre, l’introduction (pp. 10 à 39) a été totalement rédigée par Michael Aris qui explique la nécessité de cette introduction dans une de ses premières phrases: “To appreciate the work of Davis it is necessary to see it not only in the context of these extraordinary missions but also against the political and cultural backcloth of Bhutan itself in his
period and in the setting of the scholarly and artistic world in the east in the late 18th century.” (p.10)

Dès les premières lignes, Michael Aris annonce ainsi les thèmes principaux de l’introduction et il commence par brosser le tableau de la société bhoutanaise et par esquisser l’histoire du pays à partir du 17e siècle. Puis il replace la mission de Davis qui accompagne Turner comme “draftsman and surveyor” dans le contexte politique de l’Inde britannique du 18ème siècle en relatant l’histoire et la raison de la première mission britannique au Bhoutan en 1774 et en illustrant cette mission par des portraits et gravures représentant les principaux personnages de cette première mission: Warren Hastings, George Bogle and the third Panchen Lama. La mission de Turner et Davis en 1783 apparait donc comme une suite logique à la mission de Bogle et aux deux missions de moindre importance qui eurent lieu en 1776 et 1777 et qui furent conduites par Hamilton. Les Britanniques cherchaient en effet à cette époque à établir à tous prix des relations avec le Bhoutan et au-delà avec le Tibet et saisissaient toutes les occasions pour envoyer des missions “de bonne volonté”. Le prétexte de la mission de Turner et de Davis en 1783 fut que la nouvelle incarnation du Panchen Lama avec lequel Bogle avait établi des relations très amicales avait été retrouvée et que les Britanniques désireraient féliciter la nouvelle incarnation. Michael Aris relate l’histoire de cette mission et comment Davis ne put entrer au Tibet, nous privant ainsi de témoignages picturaux aussi importants que ceux qu’il nous a laissés sur le Bhoutan. Dans le souci de replacer les dessins et le journal de Davis dans un contexte plus général, Michael Aris fait un rapide compte-rendu de la mission de Turner au Tibet et décrit la réaction de l’Europe à la publication de Account of an embassy… en 1798 ainsi que le premier contact du monde occidental avec les yaks dont certains spécimens avaient été envoyés en Angleterre.

Après avoir ainsi décrit l’époque de Samuel Davis, Michael Aris nous présente sa biographie. La carrière de Samuel Davis pourrait être celle de n’importe quel brillant fonctionnaire des Indes britanniques allant d’affectation en affectation et de promotion en promotion et terminant sa vie comme un des directeurs de l’East India Company. Cependant deux passions distinguaient Samuel Davis des autres fonctionnaires: l’astronomie hindoue et le dessin. Ce sont elles et en particulier la seconde qui le feront passer à la postérité. Michael Aris dégagent très bien ces deux points qui sont aussi l’histoire de deux amitiés qui le lièrent à Sir William Jones (1746-1794), l’orientaliste, fondateur de l’Asiatic Society of Bengal et aux deux artistes Thomas Daniell (1749-1840) et son neveu William (1769-1837).

Après la mort de Samuel Davis en Angleterre en 1819, la majorité de ses dessins et peintures devinrent la propriété de son fils aîné Sir John Francis Davis qui fut le premier Gouverneur de Hong-Kong. Les autres dessins avaient été offerts à diverses personnes durant la vie de Davis. Au fil des ans les dessins conviennent des propriétaires différents et sont aujourd’hui dispersés sur trois continents. Toutefois les plus importantes collections se
trouvent au Victoria Memorial de Calcutta et dans la collection Paul Mellon du Yale Center for British Art.

L'histoire du sort des dessins termine cette introduction érudite bien documentée et que le style limpide de Michael Aris rend extrêmement agréable à lire. Trois appendices sont placés à la fin du livre: l'un est un extrait (un folio et demi) d'une biographie non-datée de Yon-tan mtha'-yas (1724-1783), — le 13ème Chef Abbé du Bhoutan— et intitulée Ye-shes 'od-stong 'phro-ba'i nyi-ma. Cet extrait comporte la seule allusion à la mission de Turner et Davis que l'on peut trouver à ce jour dans la littérature bhoutanaise. Michael Aris reproduit le texte original et en donne la traduction. Yon-tan mtha'-yas y met en garde le régent 'Jigs-med Se'i-ge (1742-1789) contre "the Barbarian demons (who) have disturbed your mind, holy being, to the extent that you are enamoured of the goods of the English" (p.20). Cette simple phrase annonce de façon saisissante les sentiments d'attirance et de méfiance que les Bhoutanais éprouveront à l'égard des étrangers et en particulier des Britanniques dans les siècles à venir. Les deux autres appendices sont un choix de livres centrés sur l'histoire du Bhoutan et des Indes britanniques à la fin du 18ème siècle, et un index des noms propres. L'ouvrage comporte également une carte très simple du Bhoutan et une carte-itinéraire tracée par Samuel Davis.

S'il nous faut résumer l'opinion que nous avons de cet ouvrage, nous ferons d'abord quelques critiques. La première concerne la présentation du livre qui dans l'ensemble aurait gagnée à être plus aérée. Des séparations plus nettes entre les différentes parties et en particulier entre la deuxième partie "le journal de voyage" et la troisième partie les dessins et peintures, auraient été nécessaires afin de rendre la manipulation du livre plus aisée.

D'autre part, le nom de la ville de Thimphu est orthographié de façon assez incompréhensible Thimphu (passim). Rien ne justifie cette orthographe puisque la translittération de Thimphu est Thin-phug et que l'orthographe officielle est Thimphu. Il s'agit probablement d'une erreur d'impression qui n'a pas été corrigée.


Les quelques points que nous avons relevés ne sont que des critiques bien
mineures en regard de la qualité de ce livre et aux renseignements de 
première importance qu'il contient. L'érudition de Michael Aris, l'intérêt du 
journal de voyage de Samuel Davis, la qualité artistique de son oeuvre sans 
parler de la valeur inestimable de son témoignage sur le Bhoutan de la fin 
du 18ème siècle font de Views of Medieval Bhutan non seulement un "beau 
livre d'images", ce que les Anglo-Saxons appellent un "coffee-table book", 
mais aussi un outil de travail et un ouvrage de référence pour tous ceux qui 
s'intéressent au Bhoutan et à l'histoire de la peinture anglaise du 18ème 
siècle.

Note: Nous aurions aimé analyser davantage le style pictural de Samuel 
Davis. Malheureusement nous écrivons ce compte-rendu de Thimphu où 
Nous ne possédons aucun ouvrage sur la peinture anglaise des 18ème et 
19ème siècles. Les références exactes nous font donc défaut.

Françoise Pommaret-Imaeda
Thimphu

Kingdom beyond the Himalayas* (Garden City, Anchor Press/Doubleday, 

This welcome, well-organized and diligent study promises all of the re-
quises for a definitive treatment of the enchanting legend of Shambhala. 
Said to be located somewhere to the north of Tibet and known in the west 
as "Shangri-la," the Shambhala legend has captivated the human imagina-
tion not only in Tibet, but from Hollywood to Berlin to Moscow to Beijing. 

First popularized in the west through James Hilton's novel, *Lost Horizon*, 
which was made into a major Hollywood film featuring Sam Jaffee as the 
High Lama, this legend has touched such diverse careers as those of 
Franklin D. Roosevelt (who called his Maryland retreat, now known as 
Camp David, "Shangri-la"), Adolph Hitler (who fuelled his madness with 
some of the apocalyptic-prophetic elements of the legend), Albert Einstein, 
Henry Wallace, and the Thrones of England and Russia, as recounted by 
Mr. Bernbaum. Virtually every one of the early Tibetologists—Csoma de 
Körös, B. Lauffer, S.C. Das, the Theosophists, the explorer-Nazi Sven 
Heden—tried to unravel this haunting, perplexing legend, and a new, 
synthetic approach by Mr. Bernbaum, who spent years trekking across 
Nepal researching Shambhala, is most welcome.

There are many valuable features to this study. The legend is situated in 
the context of related mythologies from Iran, India, China and western 
Asia in the philological hope of uncovering the "ur-myth" from which the 
Shambhala legend derived. The legend is also related to the "hidden valley" 
tradition of Tibet and the Himalayan borderlands in particular, a tradition
begun by Padma-sambhava wherein his devotees could be led to a hidden refuge in troubled times by one possessing the mystical keys to unlock the entrances to these valleys. The adducing of this connection, a most unique and valuable contribution to the study of Shambhala, has been heretofore unknown in western scholarship. The legend is also innately connected to the Kalacakra cycle of tantric teachings, which were said to have been hidden in Shambhala by the Indian yogi, Tsilupa, and safeguarded in the inner sanctum of the Kālapa court. Finally, the quest for Shambhala is identified with the tantric quest for Buddhahood, completing the esoteric hermeneutical circle.

This multi-perspectival approach employed by Mr. Bernbaum is most fruitful in uncovering the legend as he employs approaches and connects materials in a manner never before done. For this reason, Tibetologists, Buddhologists and religionists are indeed indebted to the author for his thorough research and diverse presentation. However, just this diversity of approach raises some problems. It is as though each chapter operates under different methodological presuppositions, making for a cacophonous interpretation. No one would deny that the legend is composed of many layers, that it is a bewildering story. But precisely for this reason, it is the task of an interpreter to cultivate sufficient methodological self-awareness so as to render a cacophony into a harmony. Mr. Bernbaum’s failure on this account detracts from an otherwise rich and valuable work. As a suggestion, I’d offer that there are indigenous interpretative approaches within Tibetan tantric traditions that could have been employed to uncover the legend more harmoniously, and the book would have been strengthened by their utilization.

There is also one theme in Mr. Bernbaum’s analysis of the “inner journey” which I find perplexing. It seems that the author understands Buddhahood, the final destination of the journey, as some sort of inner layer of the mind. According to this approach, one progresses “deeper and deeper” into mind to find Buddhahood as mind’s deepest core. This Theosophist-like interpretation is at odds with contemporary interpretations of Buddhism, as well as the texts themselves. Rather than seeking the inner core of mind, Buddhism advocates an analytic-meditative understanding of the mind so that the world may be appreciatively known without the interpretative filters projected by a deluded mind.

Despite its methodological naïvete, Mr. Bernbaum’s work is an important contribution to our understanding of Tibetan culture and religion. Diligence in field research, when matched with methodological sophistication, should be a scholar’s aim. In this present work, the former is evident but the latter is lacking; therefore, the work is recommended with reservations.

Nathan Katz
Williams College

The book under review is divided into three major chapters: Introduction (pp. 1-67); Chronology of Historical Events (pp. 68-108); and Bibliography (pp. 109-248). It also has an index to chapter 3. The author, according to the dust jacket, specializes in compiling bibliographies, and only the bibliographical section of the present work may prove useful to readers.

I cannot help but view the first two chapters as the work of someone who is totally ignorant of the subject with which he is dealing. The first chapter is a sort of introduction to the history, geography, and religion, etc., of Tibet. In this section it becomes clear that the author does not know a word of Tibetan. The most disappointing fact is that Mr. Chand, who seems to be a professional bibliographer, did not go to the trouble of reading even the standard handbooks on Tibet which might have enabled him to obtain some reliable information on the country. See, for instance, his passage on the word bod, i.e., “Tibet,” (pp. 1-2): “Early writings of Tibetan scholars show that the name ‘Bod’ originated from the name Pugyal.” This is simply a misinterpretation of Gedun Choepel’s statement on the subject in *The White Annals* (p. 23).

It is also fascinating to see how the author handles dates. According to him Nya-khri btsan-po was enthroned in 127 B.C. Since he was certainly a mythical character, it would be interesting to know how Mr. Chand fixed the date of his enthronement. The entire book abounds with a variety of mistakes. There are many misspellings and inconsistencies within the author’s transcription system, one that appears to be based on the pronunciation of modern Tibetan. One comes across Yambhu Ihagang (p. 2), Songsten Gampo (p. 3), Langderma (p. 8), Landarma (p. 69), Ralpachen and Palpachen (p. 69), and many others. As a rule, no diacritical marks whatever are used in the book, which produces Sanskrit transcriptions such as Atisa Dipankara (p. 69), Mahavyapatti (p. 69), and others. Many further errors, misspellings, and erroneous data in the book could be cited.

In the second chapter of the book (“Chronology of Historical Events”) the author devotes only six pages to the period from 127 B.C. to 1876. He deals with the events between 1876 and 1980 in thirty-five pages, however. The years 1979 and 1980 alone are discussed in twenty-five pages! One is forced to conclude that the author’s chronology is not at all well-balanced.

The third chapter of the book, the bibliography, includes 2311 entries, although some of them occur more than once. It contains only articles and books written in English. The material is arranged thematically, under various headings. This type of bibliography would be welcome if the author had actually read the works he classifies. This is evidently not the case here. For instance, he places H.E. Richardson’s article “A Tibetan Antiquarian of the XVIIIth Century” in the section of the bibliography dealing with anthropology. While Richardson’s article on Tshe-dbang nor-
bu is useful for those interested in ancient edicts, it has nothing whatever to
do with anthropology.

One may ask why there are so many names unmentioned in the bibli-
ography, as well as why there are only incomplete references to the works of
Tucci, Conze, Csoma, Obermiller, Hoffmann, and others. It is not the
purpose of this review to amend and complete the present bibliography,
however. That would require a new book, one that has yet to be written.

János Szerb
Budapest

Geshe Kelsang Gyatso (Tenzin Norbu, trans., Jonathan Landaw, ed.),
Meaningful to Behold: View, Meditation and Action in Mahayana Bud-
dhism: An Oral Commentary to Shantideva’s A Guide to the Bodhisattva’s
Way of Life (Bodhisattvācāryāvatāra) (Cumbria, England, Wisdom Pub-

Śāntideva’s Bodhisattvācāryāvatāra has become one of the most popular
instruments of teaching among Western Buddhists, and rightly so. The text
is deeply moving, passionate and personal, and at the same time articulates
the Prasaṅgika viewpoint favored by Dge lugs pa teachers. The current
book is typical of Dge lugs pa teaching methodology, and is a transcrip-
tion/translation of a series of lectures on Śāntideva’s text given by Geshe
Kelsang Gyatso at the Manjusri Institute in England in 1977-78. It seems to
be capably and faithfully translated.

The book is clearly intended for western Buddhists engaged in the prac-
tice of the bodhisattvayāna. The lack of a systematic discussion of the
book’s aims, purposes, contexts and history, and a clear indication of the
Geshe’s interpretative and philosophic contributions to our understanding
of the text, limit its readership to those already committed.

Nathan Katz
Williams College
The Tibet Society

MINUTES
The Tibet Society's
Annual Membership Meeting
July 25, 1982

The 1982 Annual Membership Meeting of the Tibet Society was held in the lecture hall of the Newark Museum, Newark, New Jersey, on July 25, 1982, at 2:00 p.m.

Professor Christopher Beckwith called the meeting to order and welcomed the members and guests present. He conveyed best wishes from Professors Thubten Jigme Norbu, Executive Director, and John R. Krueger, Treasurer, as well as their apologies for being unable to attend.

A motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting was seconded and passed.

Professor Beckwith introduced the agenda and appointed Elliot Sperling, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, to count the ballots for the Board of Directors election, with the assistance of Kathleen Conners and Denys Voaden.

Professor Beckwith presented the financial report, noting that the large publication expense included the costs of printing and distributing the Newsletter and the Journal. A motion to approve the financial report was passed.

Professor Beckwith, Editor of the Journal of the Tibet Society, reported on the Journal's progress, stating that it is planned to go to press at the end of 1982 and that publication is not far behind schedule. He also passed around sample copies of the Journal and encouraged everybody to subscribe to it and to contribute to the Tibet Society.

Denys Voaden reported that Professors Beckwith, Wylie, and Katz had received the most votes in the Board of Directors election.

Dr. Braham Norwick reported that he had spoken with Dr. Barbara Aziz about the need for a bibliographic center for Tibetan Studies. Since the field of Tibetology is such a wide one, an information exchange would, he stated, be most helpful.

Mrs. Robinson of the Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions reported that the Institute is currently developing a computer program for Tibetan Studies. They are now programming locally produced tapes of Tibetan language materials. Dr. Richard Gard, of the Institute, suggested that the Tibet Society could perhaps work with I.B.M. on computerizing the Tibetan script. Professor Beckwith stated that past efforts with I.B.M. have not been successful, but that organized efforts were clearly needed.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. After a short break, Tenzin
Tethong of the Office of Tibet, New York, showed a video tape on the current situation in Tibet.

Karla Saperstein Karkhang  
Secretary Pro Tempore

The Tibet Society, Inc.  
FINANCIAL REPORT  
January - December, 1981

Beginning Balance Savings (Jan. 1, 1981) ................ $4,925.39  
Interest Earned ............................................... 107.46  
Transferred to Checking ...................................... − 4,000.00  
Balance in Savings (Dec. 31st, 1981) ..................... + 1,032.85  

Checking:  
Beginning Balance (Jan. 1, 1981) ......................... 244.68  
Deposits, #822-833 ............................................. 5,340.70  
Transferred from Savings .................................... 4,000.00  
Total .......................................................... + 9,675.38

Expenditures; Checks #597-659  
Printing of Publications ....................................... 2,990.82  
Book Purchases for Re-sale ................................... 1,054.70  
Office Supplies ................................................ 478.00  
Donations to Specific Organizations ....................... 275.00  
Miscellaneous and Money Exchange ......................... 298.06  
Postage and Petty Cash ....................................... 1,099.60  
Travel Authorized by the Board ............................. 900.00  
Salaries, part-time clerical .................................. 672.25  
Total Expense ................................................ − 7,768.43  
Balance in Checking (Dec. 31st, 1981) ................. + 1,906.95

John R. Krueger  
Treasurer
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: ‘’ ’, ‘’, ’, ’, ’, ć. (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: ’b t h j (or ġ) h k d dh r z s sh s ā t z ā g h f q k l m n h w y.
The article should always be transcribed al- (or Al-), and diphthongs should employ o 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 Mongol, Wiesbaden, 1954.

Russian: a b v g d e zh zi y k l m n o p r s t u f kh ts ch sh shch ’i ’é 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 manuscripts (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 (bdus can) 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 I. 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 I. For certain kinds of studies, this procedure may not be feasible, in which case exceptions might be made.