PART ONE. INTRODUCTION

I. The Existence of a Bonpo Canon

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

The discovery of a Bonpo collection of canonical texts, corresponding to that of the Buddhists (or, more properly speaking, to that of the chos-pa),2 was not altogether surprising. In fact, as early as 1881, S. C. Das had published chapter 8 of the Crystal Mirror of Doctrinal Systems3 composed by Thu-bkvan Čhos-kyi ēni-mā (1737-1802) in 1802 where the

* The Index of the Canon will be published in one of the forthcoming issues.
1 Extract from Trails to Inmost Asia (Newhaven, 1931) published in Izbrannye Trudy (Moscow, 1967), p. 62.
2 For a discussion of the terms bon-po chos-pa, "Buddhist", "lamaist", etc., see my article "Aspects of the Origin of the Buddhist Tradition in Tibet", Numen 19 (Leyden, 1972), 22-40, and Snellgrove, Nine Ways, pp. 1-2 and 20-21. By "Bonpo" we mean – here and in the following – the lamaist tradition traceable to the 10th and the 11th centuries; and by "Buddhist" we mean the other lamaist schools.
3 The full title is: Grub-mtha’ thams-čad-kyi kluṣa dban ’dod-chul ston-pa legs-bṣad sel-gyi me-lon. See Bibliography.
learned but not altogether impartial Gelugpa scholar gives a short account of the Bonpos, stating inter alia that "the Bon religion has a general equivalent to the Kanjur". It is doubtful whether Čhos-kyi ņi-ma had ever seen a complete copy of the Bonpo Canon, for the list of titles which he proceeds to give is, to say the least, extremely incomplete. Beyond this, nothing definite was known concerning a Bonpo Canon, and from the whole corpus of Bonpo literature – canonical as well as non-canonical – only one major text – the kLu’-bum dkar-po translated by Schiefner in 1881 and fragments of others had been published at the time of Roerich’s expedition.

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

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

---

4 "bon-gyi čhos-la bka’-gyur byiṅ-gyi chab yod-čiṅ" (Das, 1970: 5, 1. 11).
7 Izbrannye Trudy, 62.
8 Also spelt Khro-čhen and ḵ-soyabs.
9 I am indebted to S. G. Karmay, and the Abbot S. T. Jongdong for this information.
10 E. Gene Smith, Introduction to Kongtrul’s Encyclopaedia of Indi-Tibetan Culture, (= Satapitaka Series 80), ed. by Lokesh Chandra (New Delhi, 1970), 32.
Khro-bču blocks reproduce was prepared by the well-known Bonpo scholar Kun-grol grags-pa (b. STNN 1700).11

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

II. The dkar-čhag of Ñi-ma bstan-'jìn

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

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

11 I have heard the opinion expressed by Bonpos that other printed editions also existed, but I have not been able to verify this. The biography of Kun-grol grags-pa is to be found in Man-nag rin-po-che a-khrid-kyi bla-ma bgryu-d-pa'i rnam-thar pad-ma dkar-po'i 'phren-ba, xyl. fol. 33b3-35b3, by Šar-rgya bKrabs-si rgyal-mchan, T 0306 of the Tibetan Collection of École Francaise d'Extrême-Orient, Paris.
12 Regarding this small but old and extremely important Bonpo monastery, see Snellgrove, Nine Ways, p. 4, n. 4, and idem, Himalayan Pilgrimage (Oxford, 1961), p. 110ff.
13 Snellgrove Nine Ways. See Bibliography.
bstan-'jin (b. STNN 1813). The publication of this chronological table enables us to assign definite dates to the principal events and persons in the history of the Bonpos, at least from the 10th century onwards. Finally, in 1972 S. G. Karmay, himself a Tibetan with a Bonpo background, published a translation of the extremely important History of Bon by Sar-rgya Ses-rab rgyal-mchan (1859-1935), thus providing a wealth of new information.

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

The author of this work presents himself in the colophon as “the twenty-second of the abbots called to occupy the abbatial seat of the Peerless Jina, the monk of sKam-ig called Ňi-ri šel-žin pa-šan wer-ro, of the clan of sGo”. The “abbatial seat” in question is that of sMan-ri, the famous Bonpo monastery in Tsang, founded in 1405 by “the Peerless Jina”, viz. mNām-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan. If one does not count Šes-rab rgyal-mchan himself, the 22nd abbot of sMan-ri is Ňi-ma bstan-'jin, i.e. the author of our previously published chronological table. However, in the present case he gives his name in the Žan-žuň language, and moreover, he gives a name which, when translated back into Tibetan, differs from his usual one, Ňi-ri etc. becoming Ňi-ma bstan-'jin dbaň-sdud rgyal-po. In the absence of biographical material,

---

14 P. Kvaerne “Bonpo Studies”; idem, “A Chronological Table of the Bonpos”. See Bibliography.
15 S. G. Karmay, The Treasury of Good Sayings. See Bibliography.
16 Vol. 37, Part II, 31 pp. See Bibliography.
17 The colophon (p. 30) runs as follows: “rgyal-ba mNām-med-pa’i gdan-sa skyo-khul-gyi mkhan-rabs šer-gnis-pa/ sgo-rigs skam-žig-gi draň-sroň Ňi-ri šel-žin pa-šan wer-ro ’bod-pas g.yas ru’i ri-khrod mkhar-sna’i bde-gsal gṣaň-phug-tu brcams-pa”.
19 For a complete list of all the abbots of sMan-ri, see Appendix I (pp. 246-48) of “A Chronological Table”.
I cannot throw any further light on this name (probably given in connection with an initiation) beyond pointing out that ŉi-ma bstan-'jin styles himself in a similar way elsewhere; in a collection of ritual texts connected with the deity Byams-ma and composed by him,\(^{21}\) he gives his name as ŉi-ri šel-bžin (three times), and ŉi-ma bstan-'jin dbañ(-gi) rgyal(-po) (twice). He also uses the latter name in the colophon of a ritual text connected with the tantric deity Ma-rgyud.\(^{22}\)

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

Several other dkar-čhad of the Bonpo Canon have been written, but are, unfortunately, no longer available. ŉi-ma bstan-'jin mentions (KTDG, 11) “the two previous authors of inventories of the Kanjur”,\(^{27}\) without giving further details. One of these is Kun-grol grags-pa, the

---

\(^{21}\) Kun-gsal byams-ma’i sgrub-thabs, published by the Bonpo Foundation (Delhi, 1966), 378 fols. One of the texts is dated sa phag, i.e. 1839.

\(^{22}\) The first text in: gSan-sliags ma-rgyud sgrub-skor, a ritual anthology published by the Bonpo Foundation (Delhi, 1964), 383 fols.

\(^{23}\) Mentioned in LŞJ (p. 188) as the disciple of bSod-nams blo-gros (STNN 1784-1835) who was also ŉi-ma bstan-'jin’s guru and predecessor at sMan-ri. In ŉi-ma bstan-'jin’s collection of Byams-ma ritual texts, one is attributed to sKam-rigs Drun-mu ŉi-wer (= g.Yuñ-druñ ŉi-rgyal).

\(^{24}\) One notes the recurrence of the personal name ŉi-ma.


\(^{26}\) mKhar-sna was originally the hermitage of the Bonpo monastery g.Yas-ru dBen-sa-kha (founded STNN 1072, destroyed by a flood soon after 1386, see LŞJ, 139, n. 1). At ŉi-ma bstan-'jin’s time mKhar-sna was still a small monastery, but later it became a fairly large establishment, being, with sMan-ri and g.Yuñ-druñ gliñ, one of the three main Bonpo monastic centres in Central Tibet.

\(^{27}\) “shon-du bka’-’gyur sgrig-mi dkar-čhad byed-pa gñis".
THE CANON OF THE TIBETAN BONPOS

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

III. Formal Structure of the Canon

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

As for the title of the second section of the Canon, it is not, as is the case with other schools, spelled bsTan-'gyur, but brTen-'gyur (the pronunciation is the same in both cases). Frequently the synonym bka'-brten is employed, which is explained as follows: “As it has been composed in dependence (rten) on the Word (bka’) of the Teacher, (it is called) ‘That which depends on the Word’ (bka’-rten).” Having this definition in mind, the Bonpos are careful to point out that their Tenjur does not, like that of the Buddhists, contain śāstras, for “As it tampers (běos) with...
the Doctrine (bstan) of the Sugata, (it is called) śāstra (bstan-bčos). KTDG gives a number of examples: the Threefold Word (bka'-gsum), the Nine Vehicles (theg-pa rim-dgu), the Four Portals and the Treasury as the Fifth (sgo-bzi mjod-hła), and Outer, Inner, and Secret (phyi naṅ gsaṅ gsum). However, a passage in the mDo-'dus is quoted where sTon-pa gShen-rab ordains that “After my entrance into Nirvāṇa, classify, o attendants! my Word, dividing it into mDo, 'Bum, rGyud, and mJod!” It is this classification which is adopted by Ni-ma bstan-'jen.

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

The Sūtra says: “Corresponding to the 84 000 hindrances, 84 000 Doors of Bon have been proclaimed”. As for how the 84 000 Doors of Bon are said to be the remedies of the 84 000 hindrances, the mDo-'dus says: ‘The 84 000 Doors of Bon are divided into four (groups of) 21 000, in accordance with the four sections mDo, 'Bum, rGyud, and mJod’. (1) Thus the remedy for the 21 000 hindrances arising from desire-passion is said to be the 21 000 Doors of Bon of the disciplinary Sūtras (‘dul-ba’i mdo), namely: the Discipline teaching what should be avoided – ten thousand; the Discipline teaching what should be seized – ten thousand; the Discipline teaching the identity of avoiding and seizing is said to be one thousand.

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

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

Ibid. The whole passage is as follows: “ston-pa’i bka’-la rten-nas sdeb-pas bka’-brten/ bde-bar gšegs-pa’i bstan-pa-la bčos-pas bstan-bčos/”. KTDG, 28 1. 20 gives the same etymology: “sangs-rgyas bstan-pa-la raṅ-dod-kyis bzo bčos-su soṅ-bas bstan-bčos-su miṅ btags-pa yin/”.

LŠI, 191; KTDG, 2, 1. 10.

Ibid.

Perhaps the gZer-mig.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

dgos-'byun nor-bu'i gter-chen (Delhi, 1966). By 'Jig-med nam-mkha'i rdo-rje b. STNN 1897. P. 146 under ho: “hos 'zes bon daň hós-khna lha-khna mchuña/.”

40 “społ-lam gco-bor bstan-pa rgyu pha-rol-tu phyin-pa'i bka‘ daň/ sgyur-grol gco-bor bstan-pa 'bras-bu gsan-shags g.yuň-druň theg-pa'i bka‘ gños".
classification. It has been fully described by Snellgrove in *Nine Ways* (pp. 16-19), to which the reader is referred.

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


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

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

---

44 *Li An*, 95.
(1) "works teaching right views" (ita-ba ston-pa'i gźuṅ)
(2) "works on meditation" (sgom-pa'i gźuṅ)
(3) "the cycle of right practice" (spyod-pa'i skor)
(4) "the cycle of rituals" ('phrin-las-kyi skor)
(5) "the cycle of upatti- and nispannakrama, i.e., the Result" (bskyed-rjogs 'bras-bu'i skor)
(6) "the cycle of protective deities' (sruṅ-ma'i skor)"

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

IV. Origins of the Canon

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

47 bsTan-seis 25.
48 A number of texts dealing with the history of Bon are available:
(a) Bon-čhos-kyi dar-nub-kyi lo-rgyus bsgrags-pa rin-čhen gлин-grags, Oslo University Library Öst.as. TT 14, MS 95 fols. Discovered by mTha’-bzi Ye-šes blo-gros (10th-11th cent.).
(b) bsTan-pa'i rnam-bšad dar-rgyas gsal-ba'i sgron-ma, MS from Samling in Dolpo, 137 fols., published as fol. 498-769 in Sources for a History of Bon, ed. by Tenzin Namdak (Dolanji, 1972) Tibetan Monastic Centre. By sPa-ston bsTan-rgyal bzaṅ-po (14th cent.).
(d) rGyal-rabs bon-gyi 'byun-gnas, ed. by S. C. Das (Darjeeling 1900 [?]) and Calcutta, 1915), 61 pp. By Khyuṅ-po bLo-gros rgyal-mchan (14th-15th cent.). Reviewed and
for our purposes, it will be sufficient to point out the broad outlines of this history, as understood by later Bonpo tradition.\textsuperscript{49}

The Doctrine, then, was taught by sTon-pa gšen-rab, chiefly in 'Ol-mo luñ-riñ, from whence it spread to the various countries surrounding Tibet, disseminated by a succession of supernatural beings of the bodhisattva as well as the siddha type. From these countries, and in particular from India, Žañ-žuñ, and China, Bon spread to Tibet. Certain texts, it is true, reached Tibet directly from 'Ol-mo luñ-riñ,\textsuperscript{50} and certain practices had even been taught in Tibet by sTon-pa gšen-rab himself when he on one occasion passed through that country;\textsuperscript{51} but above all it is via Žañ-žuñ that Bon is considered to have reached Tibet.\textsuperscript{52} In this process of transmission, siddhas from Žañ-žuñ disseminated the Doctrine in Tibet, aided by Tibetan scholars who translated numerous texts from the language of Žañ-žuñ. Various lists of these siddhas and scholars are known; in general, the siddhas connected with this initial spread of the Doctrine (\textit{sna-dar}) are said to be eighty\textsuperscript{53} – a clear parallel to the eighty-four siddhas of the Buddhist tradition.\textsuperscript{64}

This initial dissemination of Bon in Tibet is supposed to have taken place during the reign of the first Tibetan king, gṉa'-khri bcan-po. Having flourished in Tibet during the reigns of seven successive kings, Bon was persecuted by king Gri-gum bcan-po, and the Bonpos driven out of Tibet. Taking their texts with them, they hid many of them in various places before leaving for areas beyond the reach of the king. Ñi-ma bstan-'jin informs us that “the Five King-Treasures and Four...
Minister-Treasures, as well as the 360 Profound Treasures, were hidden".\textsuperscript{55} In other words, the teachings of the Buddha (i.e., sTon-pa gShen-rab) were preserved for future generations in the form of "Treasures" (gter-ma) — and, as we shall see, the discovery of such "Treasures" was in later times considered the normal procedure of re-assembling those teachings.

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{55} bsTan-reis 46.  
\textsuperscript{56} LSI., 73.  
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., xxxiii.
time. Once more the texts were hidden in numerous places in Tibet and along its borders, and the Bonpos left the central part of the country. Ñi-ma bstan-'jin places this event in 749 A.D., while Karmay, having examined all available sources, fixes it at c. 784.

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

With this perspective in mind, a start, at least, has been made by the present author in the study of that system of meditation known as “The Great Perfection” (rjogs-pa dhen-po). As is well known, this system is found not only within the Bonpo tradition, but also with the Nying-
mapas. A comparative study of the earliest “Great Perfection” texts of the two schools might well furnish a clue to the solution of the entire problem of the Bonpos, as several Tibetologists have recently pointed out. The same, it might be added, would be equally true of a study of the Bonpo and Nyingmapa tantras – a vast collection of tantric texts hitherto virtually unexplored.

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

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

---

64 Tucci, *TPS I*, 109. For short biographies of the major Nyingmapas gter-stons, see *TTGL*, passim (Bibliography) and *Bod sia-rabs-pa gsal-chen rin-ma’i chos’byun legs-bsad gsar-pa’i dga’-ston* (Kalimpong, 1964), 398 fols., by bDud-joms sprul-sku rin-po-che (still active), fol. 244a-337b.
shown to be the source of large parts of the 14th century Buddhist gter-ma Lha-'dre bka'-than, thus proving that the whole question of the relationship between Bonpo and Nyingmapa literature is much more complicated than has previously generally been thought.

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

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

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

---

87 The lists are not translated, but are found in the romanized version of the text, pp. 271-348.
Bonpo texts were translated; thus the Biography of Padmasambhava\(^{68}\) states that the king invited a number of Bonpo masters from Zañ-žuñ to bSam-yas where they translated Bon-texts in the Temple of Avalokiteśvara.\(^{69}\) It further states that the Tibetan lo-cá-ba Vairocana translated Bonpo as well as Buddhist texts.\(^{70}\)

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

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

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

\(^{68}\) Translated by G. C. Toussaint \textit{Le dict de Padma (= Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises III)} (Paris, 1933). The passages in question have also been translated by Hoffmann, “Quellen”, 253-65.

\(^{69}\) Toussaint, 1933: 317; Hoffmann, 1950: 260.

\(^{70}\) Toussaint, 1933: 330; Hoffmann, 1950: 264.

\(^{71}\) \(LŚJ,\) 118-19.

\(^{72}\) \(LŚJ,\) 160-61.

\(^{73}\) \(LŚJ,\) 122-23.

\(^{74}\) \(LŚJ,\) 124.

\(^{75}\) \(LŚJ,\) 152.
gter-ma. Such guides were often come across by chance, and we cannot exclude the possibility that authentic "guides" were in fact found. Khun-cha Zla-od 'bar (b. STNN 1024) discovered a Treasure in STNN 1038 following the directions of a guide;76 gNy an Ra-ston 'Bum-rje did the same in STNN 1137.77 In other cases there existed an oral tradition as to where a text was hidden; this seems to have been the case with the gZer-mig which was discovered at bSam-yas78 – according to its dkar-čdag in 893 (or 913),79 but probably in the 11th century. In such cases, the gter-stons simply acted on the information they received.

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

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

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

76 LŚJ, 145-48.
77 LŚJ, 151.
78 LŚJ, 162-65.
79 mDo gZer-mig-gi dkar-čdag by Tenzin Namdak (New Delhi, 1965), fol. 6.
80 LŚJ, 123.
81 LŚJ, 126-32.
supernatural beings of various kinds revealed the place where the Treasure was hidden.

At other times, of course, the part played by the supernatural was more discreet. Thus a shepherd later known as gNan-ston Šes-rab rdo-rje discovered, in STNN 1067, “a cave full of volumes of books all round the walls” by following a ray of white light which led to a crack in a rock.\(^8\)

It is not necessary to enumerate all the subsequent gter-stons; two points, however, should be mentioned. In the first place, often only a certain part of the Treasure in question was actually taken out; thus the remainder must, or so Bonpo tradition implies, still be left intact, awaiting discovery at a suitable time. The re-discovery — which in fact amounts to the revelation — of the Word is therefore not yet a completed process. Secondly, the guardian deities often prevented the original Treasure from being removed, only permitting its being copied out by the discoverer; thus the possibility of rediscovery was ensured.

A third stage in the history of the gter-stons was initiated in the beginning of the 12th century by the appearance of texts which were said to have been “orally transmitted” (shän-du brgyud-pa), i.e. dictated to the adept by supernatural beings in the course of a vision. Obviously, this represents not only a quantitative, but above all, a qualitative increase of the supernatural element in the process of revelation. We hear of texts being transmitted orally for the first time in the case of Gyer-mi Ňi-'od to whom they were transmitted by Dran-pa Nam-mkha’;\(^8\) the exact year is unknown, but it must have been around the beginning of the 12th century, as he discovered an important Treasure in STNN 1108. Equally early, perhaps, is the oral transmission bestowed by Che-dbañ rig-'jin\(^8\) on Luñ-bon Lha-gñen, who was born in STNN 1088. There follows an unbroken series of other visionaries — for the 12th century alone, LŠJ mentions at least six, among them the important figure of dByil-ston dPon-gsas Khyuñ-rgod real (b. STNN 1175),\(^8\) who, under the name of Rig-'jin rGod-kyi ldem-phru-čan, also played an important role as gter-ston in the Nyingmapa tradition.\(^8\) In the second half of the 14th century we find a group of particularly important visionaries, the chief one being Khyuñ-po bLo-lidan sñin-po (b. STNN 1360),\(^8\) to whose

\(^{8\text{a}}}^8 \text{LŠJ, 153.}
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\(^{8\text{d}}}^8 \text{LŠJ, 173-74.}
\(^{8\text{e}}}^8 \text{TTGL, fol. 50a6-51a4.}
\(^{8\text{f}}}^8 \text{LŠJ, 182.}
prodigious output (he died at the age of twenty-five) not only the twelve-volume gZi-brjūd, but also numerous other texts are ascribed. Visionaries of this type have continued to be active right up to our own century; the LSH mentions twenty-two (including several women), among them bkra-sis rgyal-mchan's own guru, bDe-chen giṅ-pa (b. STNN 1833).

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

---

88 A vision which took place in 1956 (me-sprel) has been recorded by the visionary himself, IDoṅ-bcun bZod-pa rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1866), in Draṅ-sroṅ bZod-pa rgyal-mchan-gyi lūn-yig, MS 4 fols. (private collection of the Abbot S. T. Jongdong) which I plan to publish in the near future.
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101 'od-kyi yi-ger babs-pa. However, KTDG, 23.1.21 simply states: dgoṅs-par šar-ba.
extatic journeys to supernatural regions like Udātīyāna – here the Nying-mapa influence is evident.102

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

In general, we may follow TTGL105 in dividing all gter-mas into two main groups: sa-gter (“earth-Treasure”) and dgoñs-gter. The former category includes all gter-mas which are “discovered”, whether by accident or otherwise; the latter would, as far as the Bonpos are concerned, include “oral transmissions” as well as “mental treasures” in the strict sense.106

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

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

We have stressed the importance of the 11th century. In fact, the Bonpo tradition claims, as we have seen, that important discoveries were
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102 LSJ, 188-89.
103 LSJ, 178.
104 LSJ, 175.
105 TTGL, 34b4.
106 While 160 gter-stons are listed by TTGL under the heading sa-gter, only 29 are given for dgoñs-gter.
made in the 10th century, particularly at bSam-yas. However, this is open to a certain amount of doubt, and I believe that at least two cases may be safely assigned to the 11th. The first concerns the three, later two, "ācāryas" from Nepal. After their second discovery at bSam-yas (STNN 961), they offered the texts to a disciple of Lha-ri gñen po.\textsuperscript{107}

The latter, however, lived STNN 1024-1091. This event can therefore have taken place at the earliest around 1050. The second concerns Drañ-rje gSer-mig, the discoverer, likewise at bSam-yas, of the gZer-mig. According to the dkar-čhag of the gZer-mig, this took place in 893 (or 913); however, LŠJ states that Drañ-rje transmitted the text to Lha-ri gñen-po, which, once more, places the discovery some time between c. 1051 and 1091.\textsuperscript{108}

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

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

If we turn to the Tenjur, our conclusion is supported – it does not seem to contain texts transmitted later than Khro-gñen rgyal-mchan (1386) and bLo-ldan sfiñ-po (b. STNN 1360, d. 1385).\textsuperscript{111} In addition, it also

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{107} LŠJ, 161.
\item \textsuperscript{108} LŠJ, 165.
\item \textsuperscript{109} LŠJ, 182.
\item \textsuperscript{110} An example of this is the Ma-rgyud which, although discovered by Gu-ru rnon-rce (b. STNN 1136), was subsequently transmitted orally to sTag-za Rin-čhen mcho-mo (14th cent.?), and discovered by sPa-ston Lhun-grub dpal-bzan in STNN 1486 – almost certainly after the formation of the Canon.
\item \textsuperscript{111} There are two possible exceptions: T 194 and T 283, transmitted to B 50 and B 48 respectively, to whom definite dates cannot be assigned.
\end{itemize}
contains many commentaries and liturgies which were composed after the beginning of the Later Propagation by scholars whose dates, and occasionally even biographies, we possess. As pointed out above, these texts are always arranged in chronological order by KTDG; and the latest texts to be included are invariably those composed by the great organiser of monastic Bon, Žes-rab rgyal-mchan (STNN 1356-1415),\textsuperscript{118} or, in one case,\textsuperscript{118} by the latter's disciple and successor, Rin-čhen rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1360).\textsuperscript{114} Thus the Tenjur can hardly have been assembled before the death of Žes-rab rgyal-mchan in 1415; on the other hand, in view of his unparalleled authority, it is not likely that much time elapsed after his death before the Canon received its final form. It may therefore well have been finally assembled by c. 1450, which allows ample time for the Bonpos to have felt the need of assembling a Canon of their own following the final editing, by Bu-ston and others, of a Buddhist Canon in the beginning of the preceding century. However, this remains an hypothesis as the \textit{terminus ad quem} cannot at present be fixed with absolute certainty.

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

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{LŠJ}, 140-45; \textit{A-khrid}, 50-52.
\textsuperscript{118} T 28.
\textsuperscript{114} \textit{LŠJ}, 143-144; \textit{A-khrid}, 53.
\textsuperscript{116} \textit{LŠJ}, 305, 7 and 331, 33.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Grub-thob dNos-grub}, fol. 41a4-41b6, (see B 13 below); \textit{Ku-sa sman-pa}, fol. 42a6-43a4 (B 8); \textit{A-ya bon-po Lha'-bum}, fol. 43a4-43b3 (B 20); \textit{dPon-gsas Khyui-thog}, fol. 50a6-51a4 (B 32); \textit{gter-ston gsum-chogs}, fol. 106b3-108a3 (B 10); \textit{rDo-rje gliś-pa}, fol. 78a5-82al (B 36).
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Khyuí-po dPal-dge}, fol. 43b3-44a2; \textit{Ra-sag čhen-po}, 45b4-46a6; \textit{Rakši ston-pa}, fol. 57a4-57b3; \textit{g.Yag-phyar sNön-mo}, 58b6-59b5; \textit{Ya-gyal gter-ston dNos-grub rgyal-mchan}, 121b4-123a5.
\textsuperscript{118} E.g. the \textit{Ma-rgyud} discovered by A-ya bon-po Lha-'bum.
part of their Canon and would therefore be more disposed to reject texts which were felt to be of Buddhist origin.

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

Thus KTDG, dealing with the tantric section of the Tenjur, is only willing to recognize those texts as canonical which have been discovered before dMu-gšen ņi-ma rgyal-mchan (b. STNN 1360, hence a contemporary of mNam-med šes-rab rgyal-mchan STNN 1360-1415): KTDG considers his texts to bring "the cycle of Old Treasures of the Word"120 to an end. The textual Treasures beginning with those of Šel-žig g.Yun-druñ rgyal-po121 ("New Treasures"), are not accepted by KTDG.122

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

V. Transmission and Authorship

A. Uninterrupted Transmission

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

119 LŚJ, 190.
120 bka'-gter rhiin-ma'i skor.
121 LŚJ, 185.
122 KTDG, 24, 1. 24-27.
123 KTDG, 28, bottom.
124 KTDG, 28, bottom – p. 29, 1. 1: "čhos-pa'i bsam-yas btab-te bon nub-par byed-mi'i slob-dpon pad-'byun-du grags-pa'i rnam-thar dañ mjad-byan kha-'sas bka'-ru gšugs-pa ni šin-tu mi 'thad-par sems-te/.”
Treasures (gter-du ma-soṅ). Such uninterrupted transmission renders the texts in question particularly authoritative; of 'Dul-ba rgyud-drug KTDG says that it is "like molten gold", i.e. entirely above the suspicion of being alloyed or corrupted.\(^{125}\)

In this category come the following texts:
K 3, 80, 87, 108.
T 82, 158, 178, 245

B. Revealed Texts
This category includes practically the whole of the Kanjur and a large part of the Tenjur.

In LŠJ the text-discoverers and visionaries are listed in a roughly chronological order. For B 1-51, we shall therefore retain the order of LŠJ; those names (B 51-56) which do not occur in LŠJ are listed alphabetically. Information is given in the following order:
1. References
2. Chronological data
3. Place of discovery (a place-name thus implies that the Treasures connected with the person in question constitute a sa-gter, "earth-Treasure"); or other mode of transmission
4. Texts listed in KTDG
5. Additional notes.

C. Non-revealed Texts
A number of texts are composed by authors belonging to the period of the Later Propagation. These texts, found in the Tenjur only, are not regarded as "revealed", but nevertheless as particularly authoritative.\(^{126}\)

The list of authors is alphabetical, based on the PERSONAL NAME; an asterisc signifies that no personal name is known. References and chronological data are given where available. Divine beings as well as siddhas belonging to the Early Propagation are listed separately (D); if a text composed by a siddha forms part of a Treasure, it will be given two references.

\(^{125}\) KTDG, 3 1. 4: gser-gyi žun-ma daṅ mchus-pa. However, besides being transmitted uninterruptedly, a text may also have been discovered as a gter-ma, as is the case of 'Dul-ba rgyud-drug.

\(^{126}\) By this we do not, of course, imply that many of the "revealed" texts may not, in fact, have been composed or at least arranged by the gter-ston in question.
B. *Revealed Texts*

**B 1** A-tsa-ra mi-gsum
2. Discovery STNN 913 (but cf. B 17)
3. bSam-yas lha-kañ
4. K 3, 45, 47, 48, 69
   T 86, 87

**B 2** Sa-ston 'Brug-lha
1. *LSJ*, 122; 285,24-36
2. —
3. Yar-luñ brag-dmar
4. K 69

**B 3** mTha'-bži Ye-šes blo-gros
1. *LSJ*, 123; 286,18-287,2
2. Disciple of Yong-sgom thar-mo who discovers texts STNN 962; texts written down in *sa-pho-byi*, i.e. 988 (*LSJ*, 123).
3. The pinnacle of the bSam-yas lha-kañ
4. T 222

**B 4** Ña 'Phrañ-lha'i dbañ-phyug
1. *LSJ*, 123; 287,3-16
2. —
3. Gañs Ti-se
4. K 69

**B 5** Šu-bon dGe-bsañ
1. *LSJ*, 124; 287,17-24
2. —
3. (i) Šel-mcho Mu-le-had in sPu-hrañs (*KTDG*): at sKy-a-ra brag by three hunters: Mar-pa 'phan- (*LSJ* 'phen) bzañ, sKyes-'phan dar-ya-čan, and sKyid-po, given to Šu-bon.
   (ii) Discovered by Šu-bon at:
      (a) gSer-thañ ša-ba-čan
      (b) Šel-gyi pha-boñ g.yu-ris-čan
4. K 45 (i)
   T 88-90 (i)

**B 6** Khro-chañ 'Brug-lha
1. *LSJ*, 124-26; 287,32-289,18
2. STNN 956-1077
3. (i) Khyuñ-Ildñ brag in the North
   (ii) Zar-gyi stag-sna
4. K 30, 80
   T 58, 282

**B 7** gŠen-čhen kLu-dga'
THE CANON OF THE TIBETAN BONPOS

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

B 8 Khu-cha Zla-'od 'bar
1. LŠJ, 145-48; 303,38-307,8
2. b. STNN 1024, discovery STNN 1038 (but LŠJ states that the discovery was when he was eighteen).
3. sPa-gro gčal-gyi brag
4. K 20, 28, 53, 72, 86, 88
T 94, 112, 120, 123, 139-149, 159, 187
5. LŠJ, 306,26: also called Khu-cha sman-pa and g.Yu-thog mkhas-pa.

B 9 Ra-ston d'Nos-grub 'bar
1. LŠJ, 149-51; 308,5-310,21
2. —
3. Texts given to Ra-ston at Yar-'brog by Ra-šag 'Dre-chuñ and Dad-pa chukhrims who had discovered them at bSam-yas (cf. LŠJ, 165).
4. K 109

B 10 gCañ-gi ban-de gsum
1. LŠJ, 152-53; 311,4-312,16
3. Lha-sa'i Yer-ba'i rjon
4. K 56-57, 66
5. TTGL, 106b-108a3: gTer-ston gsum-chogs (see LŠJ, 152, n. 2) 227b6: 5th rab-byun (1267-1326)

B 11 Luñ-bon Lha-gfian (KTDG: ґgñen)
1. LŠJ, 152-53; 311,4-312,16. Sources, 276-86.
2. b. STNN 1088
3. sñan-brgyud (Che-dbañ rig-jin)
4. K 57, 58
T 157, 271, 272

B 12 gNan-ston Šes-rab rdo-rje (KTDG: gNen")
1. LŠJ, 153-54; 312,17-314,36
2. Discovered STNN 1067
3. LŠJ: gNäs-lun,ch brag-ra in Nañ-stod
KTDG: gCañ-'phrañ Nu-ma'i brag
4. K 2, 3, 15-17, 20-22, 37, 41, 47, 50-52, 54, 55, 64,
T 18
5. LŠJ: also known as gNan-'theñ (KTDG: ґthiñ, STNN: "mthiñ) re-nan and gNan-ston Šes-rab sen-ge.
B 13 b\textsuperscript{2}zod-ston d\textsuperscript{2}nos-grub grags-pa (\textit{KTDG}: g\textsuperscript{2}zod\textsuperscript{2})

1. \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}, 154-56; 314-37-317,5
2. Discovered STNN 1088
3. The Treasury of the Temple of Khom-mthiṅ in Lho-brag (STNN: from the back of the statue of Vairocana)
4. K 111-13
5. \textit{TTGL} 41a4-b6: known as \textit{Grub-thob d\textsuperscript{2}nos-grub}. Fol. 222b: 2nd \textit{rab-byun} (1087-1146).

B 14 Gyer-mi Ñi\textsuperscript{3}od

1. \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}, 156-60; 317,6-320,15. \textit{Sources}, 288-308.
2. Discovered STNN 1108
3. (i) Daṅ-ra Khyun-rjøṅ (\textit{KTDG}: Dvaṅ\textsuperscript{3}) in the North
   (ii) sfin-brgyud (Dran-pa Nam-mkha\textsuperscript{4})
4. K 1, 67, 73
5. Most of the texts found at Dvaṅ-ra were left for rMā-ston Srid-\textsuperscript{5}jin to take out; the orally transmitted ones were given to Se-ka ston-pa.

B 15 rMā-ston Srid-\textsuperscript{5}jin (\textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}: Srol\textsuperscript{5})

1. \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}, 167-68; 326,4-327,6. \textit{Sources}, 288-308.
2. b. STNN 1092; discovery STNN 1108
3. Daṅ-ra Khyun-rjøṅ (see B 14)
   T 19, 67, 113-116, 118, 120, 129, 130, 133, 233, 235

B 16 Se-gar ston-pa Khri-thuṅ

1. \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}, 160; 320, 3-15
2. Texts imparted by Gyer-mi Ñi\textsuperscript{3}od, see B 14
3. sfin-brgyud
4. K 65
   T 125

B 17 A-ca-ra mi-gūls

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

B 18 Draṅ-rje gSer-mig

1. \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}, 162-65; 322,34-324,27
2. Discovery (bSam-yas) in 893 (or 913) acc. to the gzer-mig dkar-chag; however, \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J} states that he transmitted texts to rMe\textsuperscript{9}u Lha-ri gñen-po (STNN 1024-1091).
3. (i) bSam-yas (see \textit{L\textsuperscript{2}S\textsuperscript{2}J}, 163-64 for discussion of the exact location)
4. K 6
B 19 Bon-žig Khyuṅ-nag

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

B 20 Gu-ru rnon-rce

1. *LṢJ*, 166-67; 325,4-326,3
2. b. STNN 1136
3. rTa-nag Duṅ-phor brag in gCañ
4. K 81, 83
   T 137, 138, 153

B 21 gNam-ston gZon-nu 'bum

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

B 22 Bal-žo sGom-chen

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

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

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

B 24 rMa-ston Šes-rab sen-ge

2. *LṢJ*: grandson of rMa-ston Srid-jin (b. STNN 1092).
3. Yar-lha Šam-po
4. K 21, 42, 43, 71
   T 117, 198, 237

B 25 'Jad-dol 'Or-sgom Phug-pa

1. *LṢJ*, 171; 329,11-18
2. —
3. rGyuñ-srub gsañ-ba brag-phug

B 26 Mar-ston rGyal-legs

2. b. STNN 1123
3. sphan-brgyud (mkha’-’gro dkar-mo sPyan-g’gig-ma)
4. T 219

B 27 mCho-bon Khyuṅ-gsas (KTDG: dPon-gsas Che-ma)
1. LŠJ, 171-72; 329,31-36
2. —
3. sKyid-mkhar sny-o-phug
4. T 179, 180

B 28 sKyaw-phags Mu-la druṅ-mu
1. LŠJ, 172; 329,37-330,3
2. —
3. Brag-dkar bya-rgod in Theb-ᶜḥu
4. K 27
   T 227, 277

B 29 Dam-pa raṅ-grol Ye-ses rgyal-mchan
1. LŠJ, 172; 330,4-16
2. b. STNN 1149
3. sphan-brgyud (Che-dbaṅ rig-’jin)
4. T 92, 124, 134, 204

B 30 g.Yu-lo dkar-po (KTDG: Rig-’jin g.Yul-dkar)
1. LŠJ, 172; 330,20-22
2. —
3. rMa-rgyal gyal-ga (KTDG: ṭeya-ga)
4. K 19

B 31 Lha-bzer g.Yu-druṅ bla-ma and Bra-bo rGyal-ba grags pa
1. LŠJ, 173; 330,23-33
2. Before 1310 (SG 95b6)
3. (i) mTho-la rmog-mgo
   (ii) sKabs-gšen mcho-nag in gCoṅ-kha
4. K 19 (ii)
   T 97 (ii)

B 32 dByil-ston dPon-gsas Khyuṅ-rgod real
2. b. STNN 1175
3. (a) (i) Žal-bzaṅ brag (STNN 1198)
   (ii) the heart of the statue of Hayagriva in the temple of rGyaṅ
   (iii) rGyaṅ Yon-po luṅ
   (iv) Zaṅ-zaṅ lha-brag
   (v) Maṅ-mkhar Kags-p’braṅ
   (vi) the belly of the statue of Hayagriva at Pra-dun
   (vii) Yaṅ-bu-la’i gaṅs
   (viii) Ti-se gaṅs
   (b) sphan-brgyud (Che-dbaṅ rig-’jin)
4. K 43 (iv), 82 (iv), 89, 96 97, 99, 100 (i), 105, 106, 107 (iv)
   T 83, 118, 122, 151, 156 (iv), 173, 188 (i), 189, 192, 196 (iv),
   201, 202, 203 (iv),
5. *TTGL* 50a6-51a4: *dpOn-gsas Khym-thog rcal*, also known as *Rig-'jin rGod-ldem (rGod-kyi ldem-phru-can)*. Discovered texts (*čhos, bon, sman, rcis*) in the temple of rGyaṅ. Fol. 227a6: before the 1st *rab-byun* (1027).

B 33 *mChan-ldan* Druñ-mu ha-ra

1. *LŚJ*, 174: 332,30-333,6
2. —
3. sNi-rgyud (*sToṅ-rgyun mthu-čhen*)
4. *K* 4, 38, 39
   T 220, 239

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

1. *LŚJ*, 174-75; 333,7-37
2. Before 1310 (*SG 95b7*)
3. (i) *rDo-di gaṅs-dkar* in Khams
   (ii) *Rag-phrom*
   (iii) *rGyaṅ’i mchod-rten ka-ru*
   (iv) *g.Yuñ-druñ seṅ-mchod- gi brag* in Northern gCañ
   (v) *Go-yi pa-woñ g.yag-ro* (*KTDG*)
4. *K* 4, 31
   T 84 (v), 261, 285
5. *LŚJ*: also known as *dBa-ldan* (*KTDG*: ṛčhen) *gŠen-sras* and *gNos ṅi-ma Šes-rab*

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

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

B 36 *Bon-žig* g.Yuñ-druñ gliṅ-pa

1. *LŚJ*, 175-76; 334,24-335,4
2. b. 1228 (*LŚJ*, 175, n. 6)
3. (i) *spA-gro sTag-čaṅ* (*STNN 1250*)
   (ii) *Phyug-mo dpal-ri* in Naṅ-stod (*STNN 1269*)
   *STNN*: bKra-sis Phyug-mo; *KTDG*: *g.Yas-ru bKra*⁵
   (iii) * Şa-ba ri* in the North
   (iv) *Re-kyan šaṅ-mtha*’
   (v) *the temple at gCañ-’phraṅ*
4. T 206 (ii), 208 (i), 267 (ii), 275, 276
5. *TTGL* 78a5-82a1: known as *Padma Che-dbaṅ rgyal-po*, also as *rDo-rje gliṅ-pa*.
   Fol. 228a: 5th *rab-byun* (1267-1326).

B 37 *Koṅ-po* Guṅ-grags

1. *LŚJ*, 177; 335,25-27
2. —
3. sKu-bla gansa-brag
4. *K* 4
B 38 rGya-roṅ Se-gñaṅ žig-po (*KTDG*: Se-gñaṅ°)
1. *LŚJ*, 179; 336,26-337,13
2. —
3. dMu-rdo g.Yuṅ-drpañ spuṅs-rce in rGya-roṅ
4. K 3, 34, 69, 109

B 39 gLiṅ-gña Mu-la thogs-med
1. *LŚJ*, 179; 337, 14-16
2. —
3. sñaṅ-brgyud (sToṅ-rgyuṅ mthu-čhen)
4. K 4, 40

B 40 Gu-ru Ban-čhuṅ
1. *LŚJ*, 179; 337,17-23
2. —
3. (i) Zaṅs-'brug 'khyil-ba (*KTDG*: Tho-la rmog-mtho Zaṅs-'brug)
   (ii) 'Brug-ri khuṅ-mgo in rGya-roṅ
   (iii) gNaṅ-čhuṅs in Khams
   (iv) rMa Pom-ra
4. K 23 (iii)
   T 93 (i)

B 41 Lhun-grub thogs-med
1. *LŚJ*, 179; 337,24-27
2. —
3. rDo-di gaṅs-dkar (*KTDG*: rGya(m) rDo-ti)
4. K 35

B 42 rJa-bo Rig-pa raṅ-šar (*KTDG*: rJi'u°)
1. *LŚJ*, 179-80; 337,28-33
2. —
3. sñaṅ-brgyud (Che-dbaṅ rig-'jin), to the west of dMu-rdo in rGya-roṅ
4. T 279

B 43 Khod-po bLo gros thogs-med (*STNN*: Khod-spo°)
1. *LŚJ*, 180-182; 337,34-340,7
2. b. 1280 (*LŚJ*, 180 n. 2)
3. (a) (i) sBar-žabs brag-dkar in mDo-smad (*STNN* 1301)
   (ii) rTa-gña pha-boṅ bon-mo (1310, see *LŚJ*, 180, n. 2)
   (b) sñaṅ-brgyud
4. K 4 (b)
   T 207 (b), 223
5. *LŚJ*: also known as dBra-gyer Thogs-med

B 44 sPrul-sku Khymi-po bLo-idan sshiṅ-po
1. *LŚJ*, 182; 340,8-34
2. b. *STNN* 1360; d. 1385 (Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, 3)
3. sñaṅ-brgyud (vidyādhāras and dākinis such as sTaṅ-čhen dMu-cha gyer-med)
4. K 5, 8-10, 32, 33, 36, 68, 84, 85, 95
   T 136, 152, 191, 195, 199, 205, 209-211, 228, 231, 270
B 45 mNam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan = C 21
1. LŚJ, 141-45; 300,27-303,37. A-khrid, 50-52
2. STNN 1356-1415
3. slian-brgyud (i) dGoñs-mjad Ri-khrod-pa (STNN 1038-1096)
   (ii) Che-dbañ rig-'jin (ţal-gzigs)
4. T 214 (ii), 215 (ii), 216 (i)

B 46 dMu-gšen Ňi-ma rgyal-mchan = C 5
1. LŚJ, 182; 340,25-29
2. b. STNN 1360
3. dgoñs-gter (gSañ-mchog mthar-thug-gis byin-gyis brlabs-pa)
   KTDG: sñan-brgyud
4. T 78

B 47 sPrul-sku Khro-gšen (KTDG: 6gšer, STNN: 6gñan)
1. LŚJ, 182; 340-30-32
2. sñan-brgyud STNN 1386
3. sñan-brgyud (KTDG: dgoñs-gter)
4. K 4
   T 221

B 48 Gar-cha bSod-nams rgyal-mchan
1. LŚJ, 183; 341,6-11
2. —
3. (i) Pha-boñ gru-bzi in 'Jin
   (ii) KTDG: dgoñs-hams-la dhos-su šar-ba
4. T 283 (ii)

B 49 Ňu-za Ňi-ma
1. LŚJ, 184; 341,17-22
2. —
3. Brag-dkar yañ-dbñen
4. K 4

B 50 Roñ-bon g.Yuñ-druñ 'od-zer
1. LŚJ, 184, 341,28-31
2. —
3. 'od-kyi yi-ger babs-pa; KTDG: dgoñs-par šar-ba
4. T 194

B 51 sTag-za Rin-čhen mcho-mo
1. LŚJ, 184; 341,32-35
2. —
3. sñan-brgyud
4. K 81

B 52 *bLa-ma Žo-sras
1. KTDG, 23 1. 16
2. —
3. gCañ Bye-ma g.yuñ-druñ
4. T 190

B 53 *gCañ-gšen sPhan-ṅag mkhan
1. KTDG, 28 1. 7
2. —
3. sPhan-brgyud
4. T 292

B 54 sGo-bcun Dar-ma
1. KTDG, 25 1. 10
2. —
3. sPhan-brgyud
4. T 238

B 55 Drañ-sroñ 'Od-zer rgyal-mchan
1. KTDG, 24 1. 20
2. —
3. sPhan brgyud
4. T 217

B 56 Grub-thob šes-rab rgyal
1. KTDG, 16, 1. 21
2. —
3. gNan-rje gab-tog
4. T 91

B 57 sPa-ston Lhun-grub dpal-bzañ
1. STNN (139)
2. Discovery STNN 1486
3. Zañ-zañ brag
4. K 81

C. Non-revealed Texts

C 1 *sKyabs-ston Rin-čhen 'od-zer ("Rin-po-čhe")
1. LSJ, 126 n. 2
2. —
4. T 57, 102, 107

C 2 *rGyal-sras Khymü-po ri-pa
1. KTDG, 16 1. 3
2. —
4. T 69-76

C 3 Bru-ston rGyal-ba g.yuñ-druñ
2. STNN 1242-1290
4. T 23, 66, 266, 278, 282, 284
C 4 mKhas-grub rGyal-mchan mchog-legs
   1. *KTDG*, 15 1. 12
   2. —
   3. T 45

C 5 dMu-gšen Ňi-ma rgyal-mchan = B 46
   1. and 2. – see B 45
   4. T 56, 154, 157, 254

C 6 'Gro-mgon bDud-rcl rgyal-mchan
   1. *A-khrid*, 28-30
   2. Uncle of 'Gro-mgon bLo-gros rgyal-mchan (STNN 1198-1263)
   4. T 48, 49, 282

C 7 Bru-rje ston-pa 'Dul-ba rgyal-mchan (Bru-sgom 'Dul')
   2. *KTDG*, 24 1. 16-17: T 212 composed at the death of 'Gro-mgon bLo-gros
      rgyal-mchan in STNN 1263
   4. T 81, 212, 282

C 8 gšen-ston Nam-mkha' rgyal-mchan
   2. *A-khrid*, 24 1. 10: teacher of g.Yor-po Me-dpal (STNN 1134-1168)
   4. T 46

C 9 'Gro-mgon bLo-gros rgyal-mchan
   1. *A-khrid*, 31-35
   2. STNN 1198-1263
   4. T 22, 98, 101, 106, 110, 111, 125, 225, 282, 289

C 10 dBra-bcun Mu-la
   1. *KTDG*, 15, 1. 21
   2. —
   4. T 55

C 11 mKhas-grub Mu-la rin-čhen
   1. *KTDG*, 27 1. 16
   2. A contemporary of mNam-med Şes-rab rgyal-mchan (B 45)
   4. T 282

C 12 sGa-ston Chul-khrims rgyal-mchan
   1. *LSJ*, 65 n. 6
   2. *ibid.*: 14th century.
   4. T 25, 26, 43

C 13 gNOS-ston Chul-khrims rgyal-mchan
   1. *LSJ*, 140
   2. b. STNN 1144
   4. T 20, 21, 99, 119, 282
C 14 rMe' u mkhas-pa Chul-khrims dpal-chen
   1. LŠJ, xxxvi
   2. b. STNN 1052
   4. T 24, 32, 33

C 15 Žan-ston Chul-khrims blo-Idan
   1. KTDG, 15, 1. 14
   2. LŠJ, 4, n. 1: 14th cent.
   4. T 44, 47, 265

C 16 Draš-sroñ Ye-ses rgyal-mchan
   1. KTDG, 14, 1. 7
   2. —
   4. T 10, 11, 31

C 17 Kun-mkhyen Ye-ses blo-gros
   1. KTDG, 26 1. 14
   2. Founded Dar-lldiñ gser-sgo in STNN 1173
   4. T 259, 282

C 18 *g.Yor-po Me-dpal
   1. A-khrid, 24-28
   2. STNN 1134-1168
   4. T 42

C 19 rGyal-chab Rin-chen rgyal-mchan
   1. A-khrid, 53. LŠJ, 143-44.
   2. b. STNN 1360, abbot STNN 1415
   4. T 28

C 20 mKhas-grub Rin-chen blo-gros
   1. A-khrid, 48-50
   2. Middle of the 14th cent.
   4. T 40

C 21 mNam-med Šes-rab rgyal-mchan (rJe rin-po-che) = B 45
   1. and 2. – see B 49

C 22 Yar-brog Me-ston Šes-rab 'od-zer (*rJe-bcun Yar-me-ba)
   1. Sources, 346-73
   2. STNN 1058-1132
   4. T 7-9, 12, 34-37, 77, 282

C 23 Khyuñ-po bSod-nams rgyal-mchan
   1. KTDG, 15, 1. 20
   2. LŠJ, 175: transmission > Khyuñ-po Nañ-chen Grags-pa > Go-lde 'phags-pa
      (B 34), hence 13th cent. (?)
   4. T 54
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C 24 Bru-ston mchu-n-med bSod-nams blo-gros
   1. KTDG, 25, 1. 13
   2. STNN 1277-1341
   4. T 213, 243, 253

D. Supernatural Beings

D 1 Koñ-rce 'phrul-rgyal
   T 51, 85

D 2 Klu-sgrub (Ye-šes sliñ-po)
   T 131, 135

D 3 mKhas-pa bZi ( = D 11, D 27, D 16, and iČa-cha mKhar-bu)
   T 226, 257

D 4 Gu-rub snañ-bžer lod-po
   T 169, 170

D 5 Gyer-spuñ mkhas-pa gsum ( = Gyer-spuñs snañ bžer lod-po, Hris-pa gyer-med, and D 9)
   T 165

D 6 Čo-hza’
   T 256, 280

D 7 sNa-čen Li-šu stag-rinis
   T 128, 255; together with D 6: 256, 280

D 8 sTag-lha
   T 141

D 9 sTañ-čen dMu-cha Gyer-med
   T 209

D 10 sToñ-rgyuñ mthu-čhen
   T 79, 95, 96

D 11 sTon-pa Thah-ma me-sgron
   T 1, 29

D 12 Thañ-ba yid-riñ
   T 5

D 13 Thugs-dkar ye-šes
   T 6

D 14 Drañ-sroñ rgyal-ba
   T 30

D 15 Dran-pa Nam-mkha’
   T 19, 67, 97, 124, 129, 130, 196, 261, 272, 281, 287
54 PER KVÆRNE

VI. Bibliography and Abbreviations

a. Bibliography

Blondeau, A.-M.

Das, S. C.

137 According to Yum-gyi sňia-po, fol. 1b, they are as follows: Yid-kyi khye'u-čuñ, gTo-bu 'bum-sa6s, gSal-ba 'od-idan, Med-khams ston-pa-rje, Cha6s-pa gcug-phud, gCug-gšen rgyal-ba, Klu-mo ma-ma-te, and gSa6-ba ŋa6-rin. I am indebted to S. G. Karmay for this information.
Francke, A. H.
1922 "Die Frage der Bon-Religion", Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift (Gütersloh), 321-31.
1925 "Geistesleben in Tibet", Allgemeine Missionsstudien 2 (Gütersloh), 39ff.
1927 "Die Zufluchtsformel der Bon-Religion der Tibeter", Neue Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift (Gütersloh), 150-58.
1928 "Das Christentum und die tibetische Bon-Religion", Deutsche Forschung 5 (Berlin), 100-11.

Haarh, E.

Hermanns, M.
1965 Das National-Epos der Tibeter: Gling König Ge Sar (Regensburg).

Hoffmann, H.
1938 "Probleme und Aufgaben der tibetischen Philologie", Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 92 (Leipzig), 1345-68.
1940 "Zur Literatur der Bonpo", Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft 94 (Leipzig), 182.
1961 The Religions of Tibet (London).

Karmay, S. G.

Kvaerne, P.

Lauf, D. I.

Meisezahl, R. O.

Namdak, T. (ed.)
1972 Sources for a Tibetan History of Bon (Dolanji, Tibetan Monastic Centre).

Rock, J. F.
1952 The Na-khi Nāga Cult and Related Ceremonies, Part I (= Serie Orientale Roma IV, Part 1) (Rome).

Roerich, George
1967 Extract from Trails to Inmost Asia (Newhaven, 1931), in: Izbrannye Trudy (Moscow).

Schiefner, A.

Smith, Gene E.
1970 Introduction to Kongtrul's Encyclopaedia of Indo-Tibetan Culture (= Satta-pitaka Series 80), ed. by Lokesh Chandra (New Delhi).
Snellgrove, D.
Snellgrove, D., and Richardson, H.
1968 A Cultural History of Tibet (London).
Stein, R. A.
Toussaint, G. C.
1933 Le dict de Padma (= Bibliothèque de l'Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises III) (Paris).
Tucci, G.
1970 "Die Religionen Tibets", in: Die Religionen Tibets und der Mongolei (= Religiomen der Menschheit 20) (Stuttgart), 1-291.

Tibetan Sources

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


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

b. Abbreviations

Akhrid “rTogs-ladan’
“Bonpo Studies” Kvaerne, 1973
“btTan-rcis” Kvaerne, 1971
KTDG bKa'-'gyur
LSJ Karmay, 1972
Nine Ways Snellgrove, 1967
“Quellen” Hoffmann, 1950
Sources Namdak (ed.), 1972
STNN Kvaerne, 1971
TPS Tucci, 1948
TTGL Zab-mo gter