

みんなくりポジトリ

国立民族学博物館学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

SER no.040; Introduction

メタデータ	言語: eng 出版者: 公開日: 2009-04-28 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: Martin, Dan メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://doi.org/10.15021/00001902

Introduction

Dan Martin

Part One: Bon Canons and Their Catalogues

In the western as well as some parts of the eastern world, mainly if not entirely in academic circles, a great deal of romance and speculation once reigned over the very idea of the Bon Kanjur and what it might contain. Before the year 1974, when a list of its titles was introduced and made accessible to the world at large,¹ there was little more to go by apart from brief and intriguing travellers' accounts of a Bon Kanjur seen here and there: The report of the 1928 visit by George Roerich to Sharugön (Sharu Monastery), where he saw a Bon Kanjur in 140 volumes and a Bon Tenjur in 160 volumes. Then there is the story of Joseph Rock's finding, in 1929, of a Bon Kanjur and Tenjur manuscript written on paper with black sizing in a temple in Tso-so in the southeastern border regions of cultural Tibet.² There is brief notice in a 1932 publication of David MacDonald³ of a Kanjur set, which he was not able to see, at "Ra-lag Yung-trung," which I believe means Ra-lag g.Yung-drung Gling, the largest Bon monastery in Central Tibet, founded by Zla-ba rgyal-mtshan (b. 1796) in about 1835. Finally, in an article published in 1954 is a report of a complete set in about 300 volumes of the Bon Kanjur and Tenjur that was then in the collection of the University of Chengdu.⁴ Perhaps needless to say, this huge body of sacred literature, existing, surely, yet out of reach, excited much interest. It was almost as if the first person to smuggle a copy out of Tibet would be a great hero, the romantic 'discoverer' of a hitherto unknown world. Depending on the perspective, the romance may now be considered to be over, with availability of Bon scriptures to the world starting as a mere trickle in the 1960's, building into a raging glacial stream coming out of India in

1 I am referring, of course, to Kværne, 'Canon.' This article was, it is true, based primarily on a Tibetan-language work that had already been published in 1965 in Delhi, although the latter publication received little if any academic attention before the publication of the journal article based on it. A brief general discussion of the Bon Canon appeared in 1975 (Karmay, 'General Introduction,' pp. 187-190). Another article based primarily on the Canon catalogue (NTKC) of the sMan-ri abbot mKhan-chen Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin (1813-1875) was written by the late Bya-'phur Nam-mkha' rgyal-mtshan: g.Yung drung bon gyi bka' 'gyur chen mo ngo sprod che long tsam zhu ba, *Bod ljongs zhib 'jug*, issue 3 of 1994 (general series no. 51), pp. 151-159. For a description of Bon cataloging projects both old and new, including the present one, see Samten G. Karmay, 'Cataloguing Canonical Texts of the Tibetan Bon Religion' and 'The Bonpo Katen Cataloguing Project' (Tibetological Collections & Archives Series, Parts 1 and 2), *IILAS Newsletter* (International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden), no. 28 (August 2002), pp. 17-18.

2 On these last two accounts, see Kværne, 'Canon,' pp. 18-19; 'Literature,' p. 142.

3 *Twenty Years in Tibet*, Vintage Books, Gurgaon, 1991 [1st edition, 1932], pp. 124-126. Namgyal Nyima has informed me that Ra-lag, not Rab-legs, is the most authentic and original spelling for the name of the Bon monastery mentioned here. Ra-lag (or Ra-la, or Ra-lug), was the name of the locality prior to the monastery's founding.

4 René de Nebesky-Wojkowitz, 'Bon: The Buddhist Religion of Tibet, Part One,' *The Aryan Path* [Bombay], vol. 23, no. 11, November 1952, pp. 509-513, at p. 512.

the following decades, until now when we are practically drowning in the ocean of Bon scriptures published in the 1980's and '90's. Now the difficult tasks of studying, understanding and analysis must be undertaken in earnest.

One predictable question for which we can provide a fairly simple answer: 'Which edition of the Bon Kanjur do we have in our library?' Assuming you live outside Tibet, the chances that your library possesses an original xylograph or manuscript of the Bon Kanjur must be considered practically nil.⁵ What you have is one of three (or four, if we were to count the one in three volumes) reprint editions. To find out which of the three it is, simply check the number of volumes.

If there are only three volumes, you have the 1984-1985 Indian reprint of a very small part of the Khro-chen xylographic edition, on which more will be said below.

If there are 154 volumes,⁶ you have the first edition, published by Ayong Rinpoche⁷ in 1985, with an initial print run, done in Chengdu, of 130 copies, but eventually it seems as many as 500 were printed. This edition comes with a table of contents which will be referred to henceforth as AYKC.

If there are 192 volumes, it is the second edition — the one catalogued here — which was done in northwestern Sichuan Province in around 1987, with perhaps as few as 100 sets printed. The publishers' names are Ha-san-yon and Bon-slob Nam-mkha' bstan-'dzin (born in 1932, he has served as abbot of g.Yung-drung Lha-steng Monastery in rNga-ba). It was published without any kind of list of its contents. Whenever the words 'our Kanjur' or 'second edition' appear in this book, this is the one intended. To complicate the picture a bit, in 1991 a complete photocopy of the second edition was made available from Chengdu (evidently made by an Amdo businessman named Surufa, a former Muslim). It is not entirely clear if the photocopy of the second edition is exactly identical to the second edition, although this does seem likely.

If there are 178 volumes (plus one unnumbered volume), you have the third edition printed by Mongyal Lhasey Rinpoche (sMon-rgyal Lha-sras Rin-po-che aka Kun-grol Lha-sras Mi-pham rnam-rgyal) and Shense Namkha Wangden (gShen-sras Nam-mkha' dbang-ldan) in Chengdu (but note that the publishing house is listed as Bod-ljongs Bod-yig Dpe-rnying Dpe-skrun-khang, located in Lhasa). This edition has the English words on the front cover board for each volume: "Bonpo Kanjur, Buddha's Solid Mahayana, The Native Religion (An Encyclopedia of Tibetans)." It was planned to print an initial run of 300 sets, although in fact 500 were first printed in 1995 or 1996, then the number was raised to 600, and a second print-run of 500 copies was made in late 1999. Still more copies might have been printed. It is this edition which

5 This statement might need slight qualification, since numerous individual volumes and pages of more common scriptures, especially the *Khams brgyad*, do exist in library and museum collections all over the world.

6 It may be possible to count the number of volumes as 156 or 157; the publisher himself, in a letter, states the number of volumes to be 157.

7 I.e., A-g.yung Rin-po-che. He also has the names g.Yung-drung bstan-pa'i rgyal-mtshan and gShen-bstan mtha'-rgyas. He lived from 1922 to 1996. For a brief biography and references to unpublished biographical material, see Tsering Thar, 'Shar-rdza,' p. 167.

most closely represents the actual content of the dBal-khyung manuscript Kanjur (on this point, more below). The lineage account compiled by dBra-btsun was published as an unnumbered volume (which might be referred to as volume zero). A basic and provisional listing of volumes and titles has been made for the third edition (see Khyung-nag-pa, *g. Yung drung*, pp. 69-85, or Appendix B, below).

Finally, if your reprint edition has more than 300 volumes, what you have is not the Bon Kanjur, but rather the Bon Tenjur (correctly called the Katen, or *bKa' brten*, '[Works which] Relied on the Word'), published in 1998. The publisher is Sogde Tulku Tenpai Nima (Sog-sde sPrul-sku bsTan-pa'i nyi-ma) Rinpoche from Nag-chu-kha. The original prospectus announced that there would be 380 volumes in total. An extensive catalogue has been published (for which, see bibliography under *Katen*). More will be said about these various reprint editions later on.

One mystery to which we can only propose tentative solutions is the date when the Bon collection of scriptures took on an identity as a 'Canon.' Perhaps the question would be better if more carefully phrased. When we use the words 'Kanjur' and 'Tenjur' we are simply borrowing into English (via Mongolian) the Tibetan terms *bKa' gyur* and *bsTan gyur*, which mean 'translation[s] of the Word,' and 'translation[s] of the Treatises,' and applying them to comparable, surely, but at the same time quite different, sets of Bon scriptures. Bon works do not employ these terms for their scriptures (even if a few recent exceptions may be noted). They say simply *Ka* (*bKa'*), which means the authoritative 'Word' of the Buddha (*Sangs-rgyas*, in this case meaning Teacher Shenrab in one of His myriad manifestations), and *Katen* (*bKa' brten*), 'that which relied on the Word.' There is evidence these terms were in use in the 12th century.⁸ It is very likely that the formation of the Bon Canon was a gradual process, as old as the Bon religion itself. It is at the very least quite definite that, in the early 15th century, a Gelukpa writer could comment, "Generally speaking, they [Bonpos] have the equivalent of the Kanjur of Chos."⁹ But for still earlier centuries, we may do more than assume that the descendents, both physical and spiritual, of gShen-chen Klu-dga' (996-1035), who founded their family-based lineages and built

8 According to Karmay ('General Introduction,' p. 189) the two terms are used in the works of Me-ston Shes-rab 'od-zer (1055-1132), but unfortunately no exact reference is supplied. His dates might have to be moved forward by one 60-year cycle to 1118-1192 (argument in Martin 2001: 75-76). The term *bKa' brten* was indeed used to describe a set of five works (called the *bKa' brten sde lnga*) composed by Me-ston (or Yar-me, or Yar-'brog Me-ston) Shes-rab 'od-zer. It could, however, have been used to describe these works retroactively. See Me-ston Shes-rab 'od-zer, *bKa' rten sum brgya pa dang lam rim chung ba bcas kyi rnam 'grel lhan cig bsdus pa'i gsung pod*, Khedup Gyatso, TBMC, 1973, pp. 1-83, and especially p. 83, for the words *bKa' brten sde lnga* found in the context of a colophon. Although I haven't yet been able to verify any usage of the pair of terms *bKa'* and *bKa' brten* in the body of this particular work by Me-ston, his *Sum brgya pa*, I noticed that he does use the terms *bKa' lung* ('authoritative Word') and *sDe snod* ('Basket[s]') to refer to bodies of scriptures (see pp. 3-5). The *Sum brgya pa* is a well-known text in later Bon tradition, several times cited in sPa-ston, *History* (as contained in SFHB, pp. 533, 534, 537, 538, 540, 628). This question needs more research, especially since still other works by Me-ston have been published.

9 Martin, *Unearthing*, p. 133.

temples and monastic educational centers, also kept collections of scriptures, but perhaps only of particular sub-sets of the scriptures.¹⁰ There is a rather legendary-sounding account of a collection of scriptures by one sNang-zhig Do-phags (born in 1028, his names are numerous) in Amdo,¹¹ and even more legendary-sounding stories about a Kanjur in Rab-brtan in the 14th century.¹² There may be some history behind these legends.

In the third earliest (composed soon after 1836) and more 'conservative' of the available Canon catalogues, one by mKhan-chen Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin (see NTKC in the bibliography), we do not find texts which were revealed after the 14th century. The huge 14th-century aural transmissions to Blo-ldan snying-po were pivotal, in the sense that many Bonpos see his revelations as a kind of summation of prior revelations. At the same time, other Bonpos, following what is often called New Bon (*bon gsar*), see in Blo-ldan snying-po the beginnings of, or at least an important inspiration for, their movement[s], which seems to have had its real origins in the 17th century, as a devotional fusion of Bon cultural heroes with the principal rNying-ma cultural hero Padmasambhava. The sMan-ri abbot's Canon catalogue (NTKC) omits all New Bon revelations, quite consciously so. However, all other available Canon catalogues do include them. Academic scholars may be tempted to follow the more conservative abbot, and ignore the rest, but in this they would be allying themselves with only one segment, even if a large one, of the contemporary Bonpo population. Among Bonpos the discussion about the extent of sTon-pa gShen-rab's Word is a lively one, and it appears that the outcome of this debate will not be decided in our lifetimes. At a certain level, it may be more logical to admit that now, as always, the Bon Canon remains to be finally and unequivocally canonized, that Bon was — and for many continues to be — a religion of continuing revelation. But this is not to say that we should stop speaking of the Word of sTon-pa gShen-rab as being, in some real sense, a 'Canon.' We could say that the canonization process has gone through various phases in Bon history, with particular landmark events, and that we do not know enough about them yet to make very clear statements. Indeed, there may be cause to wonder whether or not the present publication might have some small effect on 21st-century Bon Canon formation.

Many are of the impression, and there may be some truth to it, that the most archaic way of classifying Bon scriptures is summed up in the formula of the 'Four Bon Doors [and one] Treasury [making] Five' (*bon sgo bzhi mdzod lnga*). This has been discussed in detail elsewhere,¹³ and so we will not repeat it here. In a work on the Bon Canon by the sMan-ri Abbot Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin (1813-1875), this is only one of

10 See especially Martin, *Unearthing*, p. 97, which tells the story of the early transmissions, primarily through the Zhu and gShen family lineages, of collections of the *gter ma* scriptures of gShen-chen Klu-dga' which he had found in 1017 CE. Although surely in some sense these could be called Canons, there is no indication that, at this point, scriptures found by other *gter stons* would have been included in them.

11 See Khyung-nag-pa, *g.Yung drung*, p. 56; Rossi, 'Monastic.'

12 Khyung-nag-pa, *g.Yung drung*, pp. 57-58.

13 Snellgrove, *Nine Ways*, pp. 16-19.

thirteen possible ways to divide up the Word, and precedents are found for these classifications from Bon authors of the 13th and 14th centuries. This is not an appropriate context for a full discussion.¹⁴ Instead, we should concentrate on the more immediate and pragmatic problem of the four-fold division that is actually in use for the Kanjur. This is the well-known division into four parts: 1. mDo. 2. 'Bum. 3. rGyud (or sNgags). 4. mDzod (or Sems).¹⁵

According to long established Bon tradition, the arrangement of the Bon scriptures began immediately after the death of sTon-pa gShen-rab, when a 'gathering of the Word' (*bka' bsdu*) took place under the direction of a figure known as 'A-zha gSang-ba mdo-sdud. Before his death, sTon-pa gShen-rab predicted this himself as written in the one-volume biographical scripture known as the *mDo 'dus* (p. 151):

"Well, then, gather the scriptures. Now, after my passing beyond suffering, divide them up into these four: mDo, 'Bum, rGyud and mDzod. My followers will accomplish the collecting of the Bon [scriptures]. Teach according to the Five Perfections [which are] the perfections of Teacher, Place, Audience, Time and Bon [teachings]. Take confidence in the Bon [scriptures] of the mDo collection. The Bon [scriptures] that have been collected in 'Ol-mo Gling [and their] explanations inscribe in *pothi* (*po ti*) volumes."¹⁶

The discovery of this scripture probably took place in around the 11th century. In other scriptures revealed in later centuries, we may occasionally come across much more detailed ways of organizing the scriptures that include titles of specific scriptures, for example in the *rNam rgyal gzungs chen*¹⁷ and in Chapter 50 of the *gZi brjid*.¹⁸

14 The only significant discussion I know of in any language other than Tibetan is to be found in Kværne, 'Canon,' pp. 23-27. Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin appears to have drawn some of his discussion directly from the work by sGa-ston cited in footnote 16, below.

15 Naturally, those who are, like most people, more familiar with the classical division of Buddha Word into the Three Baskets (*Tripitaka*) — originally called so, it is said, because it took three elephant-back baskets to carry it all — will be curious about the differences. The Three Baskets are, in Pāli, the Sutta, Vinaya and Abhidhamma or, in Tibetan, *mDo*, *Dul ba* and *mNgon pa*. In the Bon version of the Word, texts corresponding to Vinaya and Abhidhamma are included in the mDo Section, while scriptures corresponding to Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras form a class of their own, the 'Bum Section. We might also note that the Bon Canon generally includes certain confessional and consecrational texts in the mDo Section. At some point we simply must admit the right of Bon religion to its own systems of scriptural classification without making constant reference to a Canon that is not its own.

16 *e ma mdo sdus nga ni mya ngan 'das 'og tu / mdo 'bum rgyud seng [-dang? ~sde?] mdzod bzhir kha phyas la / 'khor mams bon gyis bsdu ba gyis / ston pa gnas dang 'khor dus dang / bon mams phun 'tshogs lnga'i shod cig / mdo sdud bon las spob par gyis / 'ol mo gling du bon mams 'dus mams [-rnam] bshad po ti gleg[s] bam bris*. Among many other places, this passage is cited in Shar-rdza, *History* (Beijing edition), p. 323: *nga ni mya ngan 'das 'og tu / mdo 'bum rgyud mdzod bzhir phyas la / 'khor mams bka' yi bsdu ba gyis*. We find it quoted in a fuller form, at fol. 3r, in a work by sGa-ston Tshul-khrims rgyal-mtshan, *bsTan pa bon gyi klad don gyi rang 'grel*, a difficult cursive manuscript in the possession of the Bonpo Monastic Centre, Dolanji (photocopy courtesy of Per Kværne). sGa-ston lived in the 14th century.

17 See our Bon Kanjur at vol. 129, pp. 59-61.

18 See our Bon Kanjur at vol. 11, pp. 149-152.

The first of these has a basic division into four: 1. 'Bum. 2. Lung. 3. gNas. 4. mDo. Each of the four has five subdivisions. The *gZi brjid* passage has instead these divisions: 1. mDo. 2. 'Bum. 3. gZungs. 4. Man ngag, each of these having three subdivisions. It is the second scheme, rather than the first, that bears the closest resemblance to the now generally accepted divisions. A commentary devoted to the *Gab pa dgu skor*, a *rDzogs chen* text, found by gShen-chen Klu-dga' in 1017 C.E., and composed by four ancient sages, bearing the title *Gab pa'i 'grel gzhi* (i.e., *Gab pa 'grel bzhi*), is cited by Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin (see our Kanjur, vol. 142, p. 142) as the source of a classification into "the 120 divine mansions of the philosophic [scriptures], the 120 divine mansions of the secret mantra, and the 120 divine mansions of the mind perspective."¹⁹ This three-fold division (in which we may easily detect the general three-fold division into 'outer, inner and secret' — *phyi nang gsang gsum*) corresponds entirely with the usual four-fold model, except that the mDo and 'Bum sections are combined together under the rubric of the 'philosophic.' These seem to constitute scriptural canon classifications (some accompanied by lists of titles) within particular scriptures which themselves belong to the Canon (Kanjur and Tenjur). In effect, they would seem to be relatively old attempts to draw categories of scriptural texts, and so they will certainly be useful in future studies of canon formation.

Most of the Bon Kanjurs that have existed in the past were manuscript versions kept in individual monasteries. It may be assumed that every Bon monastery of significant size in old Tibet had its collection of Bon scriptures.²⁰ Since only one of these, the dBal-khyung manuscript Kanjur, has with complete certainty survived in a complete form, we will discuss this particular manuscript in more detail presently. First, we would like to say a few words about the two known xylographic versions,²¹

19 *mtshan nyid kyi gsas mkhar brgya dang nyi shu / gsang sngags kyi gsas mkhar brgya dang nyi shu / sems phyogs kyi gsas mkhar brgya dang nyi shu'o*. For the *Gab pa dgu skor* and '*Grel bzhi*', see our Kanjur, vol. 99.

20 In a brief anonymous article on the Bon Kanjur, G.yung drung bon gyi bka' 'gyur, *Bon sgo* (Dolanji, H.P.), vol. 1 (1987, also reprinted in 1994), pp. 24-25 (with accompanying photographs on p. 23), we find a list of Bon monasteries in Tibet that had Kanjur collections: bKra-shis sMan-ri Monastery in gTsang province, Rab-legs g.Yung-drung Gling, mKhar-sna, gShen Dar-lding, sPa La-phug, Zhu Ri-zhing, bZang-ri (also spelled Zangs-ri) rMe'u-tshang, Khyung-lung dNgul-mkhar in western Tibet, Khyung-po Ri rTse-drug, as well as monasteries located in the regions of Nyag-rong, sDe-dge, rDza-khog and Khyung-po. Karmay ('General Introduction,' p. 189) says that manuscript editions of the Canon existed in at least twenty-eight Bon monasteries. Numerous other references could be culled from biographies of more recent Bonpo leaders, some of which are only now being made available.

21 A monastery in Amdo called sKyang-tshang is said to have supplied woodblock prints of the Bon Canon up until the 1950's. The blocks were apparently carved in the 1840's, although I have never seen or heard of any presently existing prints from these blocks (see Kværne, 'Canon,' p. 19). There are three Amdo monasteries known as "rKyang-tshang," evidently close to each other, listed in dPal-tshul, *History* (TBMC edition), vol. 2, p. 636: rKyang-tshang Phun-tshogs Dar-rgyas Gling, with 400 monks, rKyang-tshang Nub-grong dGon with 200 monks, and rKyang-tshang Shar-ma'i dGon with 100 monks (the numbers referring to the period before 1950). An article by Tsering Thar contains some more information on the larger monastery, as well as a reference to an unpublished manuscript on its history. See Tsering Thar, 'The Bla-ma

the Rab-brtan and the Khro-skyabs (Khro-chen) editions, both produced in small principalities of Rgyal-mo-rong, an area which is included in the presentday Apa (rNga-ba) Tibetan Autonomous Region, which covers a large part of the mountainous northwestern area of Sichuan Province. Both were made at about the same time, in the 1760's. Both were sponsored by the local kings and with the active involvement of a New Bon (*bon gsar*) leader named Kun-grol grags-pa (b. 1700). In fact, the two Canon catalogues by Kun-grol grags-pa that are available to us do not describe either of the two xylographs, but rather two manuscript editions of the Kanjur: [1] a catalogue made in 1740 at the request of his teacher g.Yung-drung bstan-'dzin (published in KGKC, pp. 259-370), and [2] a catalogue made in Rab-brtan, in 1751 (see KGKC, pp. 1-258, and Karmay, 'Decree,' p. 143), for a manuscript (or so we assume) with 244 volumes.²² Our second edition of the Bon Kanjur contains no xylographs from the Rab-brtan,²³ but does have five major (most of them multi-volumed) works, plus some of the volumes of a sixth scripture, so that altogether 41 out of our 192 volumes were reprinted from woodblock prints done under the Khro-chen King. A table of contents of the Rab-brtan king's Kanjur is said to exist in Tibet, although it hasn't yet been made available.²⁴ It is said, too, that all of the original woodblocks were destroyed during the Cultural Revolution, but many prints that had been made from them prior to that time do survive. There is rumor of a Kanjur reading authorization (*lung*) given in recent years in eastern Tibet on the basis of an unspecified xylographic edition. The only information I have seen in print about the existence of complete sets of xylograph Kanjurs is a report that sets of the Khro-chen printing exist today in three monasteries: sNang-zhig Monastery (in the Bya-phur Bla-brang), rMe'u-tshang rGyal-po'i Blon-po Phyug-tshang-sang (?), and rTogs-ldan Monastery.²⁵

in the Bon Religion in Amdo and Kham,' contained in: Samten Karmay & Yasuhiko Nagano, eds., *New Horizons in Bon Studies*, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, 2000, pp. 417-427, at pp. 420 and 426. An account of an attempt to make a new xylograph Kanjur by the founder of mKhar-spungs Monastery named 'Gru-sgom Tshul-khrims ye-shes dbang-gi rgyal-mtshan, who died in 1961, is told by A-lcags g.Yung-drung bstan-'dzin (Lo rgyus gzi yi thang ma / bya btang 'gru sgom rin po che'i nram thar dad pa'i pad dkar, *bGres po'i 'bel gnam* [Kathmandu], vol. 2 (2002), pp. 13-19). Only a few scriptures were completed: [1] *rNam dag padma klong yang*, [2] *mDo g.yung drung klong rgyas*, [3] *rNam rgyal rgya nag ma*, [4] *rNam par rgyal ba'i gzungs chen*, [4] *mKha' 'gro gsang gcod*, [5] *Dre'u dmar*, and [6] *Tshe dbang bod yul ma*.

22 The breakdown, at p. 246, says that the mDo Section had 55 parts, the 'Bum Section 108, the sNgags Section 88 and the Sems Section 30, for a total of 281 parts.

23 The Rab-brtan xylograph Kanjur is relatively rare and we know less about its history. This is surely due to the defeat of Rab-brtan in its war with the Manchus. For historical sources, we have to turn to the colophons of existing prints. See Karmay, 'Xylographic Editions,' pp. 149-50 and Martin, 'Bonpo Canons,' pp. 20-21, for colophons dated 1767 and 1764. As we may see in the illustrations to Karmay's just-mentioned article, the Rab-brtan prints were more beautifully done.

24 Letter of Ayong Rinpoche dated January 10, 1996.

25 Khyung-nag-pa, g. *Yung drung*, p. 60. This is, for the time being, difficult to verify.

The Khro-chen xylographs reproduced in our Kanjur are the *gZi brjid*, in twelve volumes (with a lengthy colophon with considerable historical material); the *Dus gsum nub pa med pa'i mdo*, in six volumes; the *Drung mu bskal bzang*, in two volumes; all belonging to the mDo Section. In the 'Bum Section are the following Khro-chen xylographs: the 16 volumes of the *Khams brgyad stong phrag brgya pa* (with its own lengthy colophon with considerable historical material), the single volume of the *bDal 'bum rtsa ba*, and four out of the ten volumes of the *bDal 'bum*. The only other xylographs found in our Kanjur are three large biographical works in the Unclassified Section. The woodblocks for all three of these were done at dBal-khyung Bla-brang. These are the *Dran pa bka' thang*, in eight volumes, the *Tshe dbang rnam thar*, in four volumes, the *mKha' 'gro rgya mtsho'i rnam thar* in one volume.

The Khro-chen xylograph Kanjur is said to have never been completed, although it had over 100 volumes when work on it stopped in 1768.²⁶ A print of this collection was probably seen by the famous Tibetan encyclopaedist Kong-sprul Blo-gros mtha'-yas in 1846, during his travels in the area,²⁷ even if he does not explicitly state that these Bon books were belonging to the Kanjur:

"With long and short receptions by the Sog-mo [So-mo, So-mang] King, I made my dwelling in mKhar-shod Pho-brang. There were there about a hundred volumes of Bon books, woodblock prints of the Khro-skyabs King. A few were quite remarkable, and when I inspected them there were clear signs of the protectors hovering about. Then, on the way to Khro-chu..."²⁸

The first three volumes of the Khro-chen xylograph Kanjur are available in a reprint edition: *g.Yung drung bon gyi bka' 'gyur rin po che (The Bonpo Canon)*, "reproduced from the surviving prints from the Khro-chen blocks," Khedup Gyatso, TBMC, Dolanji, 1984-85, in three volumes, as already mentioned.

Thanks to photocopies of a cursive manuscript made available by Tsering Thar, we have two chapters, chapters four and five, from a five-chapter work detailing the history of the Khro-chen xylograph (see the bibliography under *Khro chen dkar chag*). It was composed by a disciple of Kun-grol grags-pa named dKa'-bcu g.Yung-drung phun-tshogs in 1773, "18,107 years after the birth of Lord Shenrab," at Drug-zur rNam-par rGyal-ba'i Pho-brang, the site of the Kanjur printing house. It is highly probable that one of the other chapters would have listed the titles that were actually included,²⁹ so it is all the more unfortunate that the complete text is unavailable. The

26 See the anonymous article mentioned in an earlier note, but see, too, the evidence for work continuing up until 1774 given below.

27 Compare Smith, *Among Tibetan Texts*, p. 248 and the observations in Kværne, 'Literature,' p. 144.

28 *sog mo rgyal po'i bsu ba ring thung bcas mkhar shod pho brang du sdod mal byas / der khro skyabs rgyal po'i spar ma bon dpe glegs bam brgya skor 'dug pa 'ga' zhid nyams mtshar bltas pas srung ma 'khor ba'i rtags gsal bar byung / de nas khro chur bgrod ...* Kong-sprul Blo-gros mtha'-yas, *The Autobiography of 'Jam-mgon Kong-sprul Blo-gros mtha'-yas*, Kandro, Bir, 1973, p. 190.

29 Which would make it the third oldest available Bon Canon catalogue after the two by Kun-grol grags-pa.

chapter four is especially rich in information,³⁰ but here only a few details have been culled from it. In it, we learn that the complete Kanjur, if it had been completed, would have consisted of 113 volumes (including the *dkar chag* volume itself), with the breakdown as follows:

mDo Section: 56 parts in 43 volumes.

'Bum Section: 118 parts in 49 volumes.

sNgags Section: 88 parts in 15 volumes.

Sems Section: 30 parts in 5 volumes.

Immediately after this, the author mentions, with at least an approximate accuracy, that the Derge Kanjur had 101, and the Tenjur 208, volumes. That he mentions the Derge xylograph Canon, made in 1733, in this context does suggest that a sense of competition with the Derge royal family might have inspired or contributed to the idea of making the Khro-chen xylographs.³¹ The work lasted 16 years, from 1758 through 1774 (the sponsoring king, Khro-chen Kun-dga' nor-bu, apparently died in 1773), and at this point only 103 volumes (to which we might add the index volume as vol. 104) of the projected 113 had been completed, but they were nevertheless ceremonially consecrated. Among the other expenses, which must have been considerable, the Khro-chen king gave to the workers goods equivalent to 112,272 *srang* of silver. Considering, too, that the Manchu army was for much or all of this time fighting a war in the region, the king's sponsorship of this huge project is all the more impressive. The Manchu army had their final victory in 1776, but at a considerable cost in silver *taels*, so much so that the Manchu imperial treasury was nearly exhausted, and it seems this is one of the main reasons for the decline of Manchu power in subsequent decades.³²

Although there are some xylographs reproduced in the second edition of the Bon Kanjur, by far the greater part of the mDo and 'Bum sections was taken from the dBal-khyung Canon. This manuscript Kanjur was made in the nomadic and semi-nomadic area of Nag-chu-kha, inhabited by the 39 Hor clans. There is an account of an

30 It even gives the names of the woodblock carvers and, on fol. 22, discusses the editing principles employed. The author was himself one of the editors. The artist who did the front and back folio illustrations was Phur-pa thar.

31 Of course, as such, royal sponsorship of Buddhist Canon printings has a very long history. Witness for example two lengthy projects in which Buddhist Canons of more than 81,000 woodblocks were carved, beginning in 1011 and 1236 CE, by Korean kings, a history succinctly told in Robert Young, 'The Tripitaka Koreana,' *Tricycle*, vol. 4 (1995), no. 4 (Summer), pp. 66-69. There are some interesting theoretical discussions about the relevance of Canon formation (both 'closed' and 'open') to state and sub-state social formations in Robert Mayer, *A Scripture of the Ancient Tantra Collection: The Phur-pa bcu-gnyis*, Kiscadale Publications, Oxford, 1996, pp. 44 ff. In any case, the religious merit resulting from propagating collections of scriptures might very well contribute to a king's ability to rule.

32 Arguments for this are made in Martin, 'Bonpo Canons.' See now also Yingcong Dai, 'Qing State, Merchants, and the Military Labor Force in the Jinchuan Campaigns,' *Late Imperial China*, vol. 22, no. 2 (2001), pp. 35-90, where there is detailed description of the Manchu wartime logistics that involved the mobilization of more than 129,500 military personnel and an additional non-military labor force of 462,000.

old — but just how old? — manuscript Kanjur in about 380 volumes made by one Khri-dbang rab-brtan, at his capital (called Hor Ba-chen [=sBra-chen] rGyal-sa), said to be the first complete Kanjur set in Nag-chu-kha.³³ Apparently it was this version that underwent editing by mChog-sprul bsTan-'dzin dbang-grags and Lha-bla bsTan-pa dar-rgyas of Klu-phug Monastery. The sMan-ri abbot Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin visited Klu-phug in 1837 and founded an assembly hall.³⁴ There he saw the Kanjur edition, and it is said that this is what inspired him to write his Kanjur catalogue.³⁵ It seems fairly certain that this particular Nag-chu-kha manuscript Kanjur would later on serve as the basis for the dBal-khyung manuscript.

The most important figure in the story of the origins of the dBal-khyung manuscript Kanjur is one Nyag-gter (or dBal-gter) gSang-sngags gling-pa.³⁶ He was born in 1864 into the dBal-khyung clan. It seems that he may have been the founder of dBal-khyung Monastery in Nyag-rong (the gorge of the Nyag-chu river in Khams), one of quite a few Bon monasteries that once existed in that area. He was an avid collector of the 'scriptural authorizations' that Tibetans generally call *lung*, and, starting in about 1908, he travelled considerably in search of them, with the blessings and encouragement of most of the important Bonpo teachers of his time, since they wished to see the tradition of receiving complete Kanjur reading authorizations revived. While in Nag-chu-kha in the 1930's(?), the high nomadic (or semi-nomadic) area at the edge

33 dPal-tshul, *History* [TBMC edition], vol. 2, p. 626. Given the number of volumes, this 'Kanjur' must have included the Tenjur.

34 See the biography of Nyi-ma-bstan-'dzin as catalogued in *Katen*, p. 720 (vol. 90, pp. 228-861 of the actual volume), at p. 551 ff. for the story of his visit to Klu-phug Monastery.

35 Or it could have been the very version that he catalogued. See Khyung-nag-pa, *g.Yung drung*, pp. 61-62. Although I do not at present have the 1965 Tibetan-language version at my disposal (mentioned in note 1, above), I understand that the manuscript Kanjur on which the sMan-ri abbot's Kanjur catalogue is based contained the following numbers of volumes: the mDo Section contained 62 vols., and the 'Bum Section contained 91 volumes, the rGyud Section 18 volumes, and the mDzod Section 4, totalling 175 volumes in all. The Tenjur had 131 volumes (see Kværne, 'Literature,' p. 144, but compare Karmay, 'General Introduction,' p. 190, which says the Kanjur had 113, the Tenjur 293 volumes, however Karmay clearly based these figures on the number of main titles, and not on 'volumes' *per se*). The biography of Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin (for which, see the preceding note, at p. 786), in an account of his travels in Rgyal-mo-rong (the land of his birth), lists the numbers of volumes of a Kanjur which he received as a donation (together with the book wrappers and the yaks for transporting them) from the Khro-chen Nang-so as follows: mDo Section with 42 volumes, 'Bum Section with 48, sNgags Section with 15, and Sems Section with 7, altogether 112 volumes (and this rather closely resembles the numbers of volumes in the Khro-chen print). He had sent his request for this Kanjur with two messengers long in advance, during his stay in Nag-chu-kha (*Ibid.*, p. 757.1). The Kanjur arrived early in 1847 at sMan-ri Monastery, where a procession of monks performed welcoming ceremonies in its honour. Soon afterwards, a special temple was built for its enshrinement.

36 The longer form of his name is 'Chi-med gar-dbang yon-tan rgya-ntsho 'gro-'dul gsang-sngags gling-pa. For his full biography, not at present available to me, see *Katen*, pp. 974-975; no. 149-4.

of the vast Byang-thang plateau,³⁷ he was promised, with the patronage of the noble of the Ga-rgya clan by the name of bsTan-dar, a complete set of the Kanjur.³⁸ This Kanjur, when completed, was brought to Nyag-rong by a monk named bsTan-'dzin phun-tshogs and installed in dBal-khyung Monastery.³⁹

After the wife of gSangs-sngags gling-pa died, her rebirth was recognized in the youngest of five children of Kun-grol VI Hü-m-chen 'gro-'dul gling-pa (1901-1956), a daughter by the name of mKha'-spyod dbang-mo. During the years of the Cultural Revolution, when the Kanjur was concealed in a cave, she and a select group of other persons guarded the secret of the dBal-khyung manuscript's whereabouts. It is even said that several people submitted to death rather than reveal the secret. She died in about 1987 (1989?). After that, the Kanjur remained in the hands of her brother, Mongyal Lhasey, the publisher of the third edition. Sometimes it is said that it is the only complete Bon Kanjur that survived the anti-cultural furies of the Cultural Revolution, although this belief requires verification and is, I believe, likely to be proven inaccurate in some degree. There is a fascinating account of a pilgrimage to the holy mountain Bon-ri in Kong-po in which mKha'-spyod dbang-mo, in the company of her brother Mongyal Lhasey, found sacred objects concealed in a rock,⁴⁰ which is to say, she found what is known as a 'treasure' (*gter ma*). Most of the texts of the Bon Kanjur were revealed in a similar manner.

gSang-sngags gling-pa was not the only one to receive a Kanjur manuscript from Nag-chu-kha. Among the most well-known of early 20th century Bonpo lamas was one Khyung-sprul 'Jigs-med nam-mkha' g.yung-drung rgyal-mtshan (1897-1955), a native of Nag-chu-kha. After his founding in 1935 of Gu-ru-rgyam Monastery, in Western Tibet near Mt. Kailash, he received, with the help of his father Ga-rgya bSod-nams bstan-dar,⁴¹ complete sets of the Kanjur and Tenjur which arrived after a four month journey on the backs of thirty-five yaks. For the story of what happened to these books in 1940, when about 800 refugee Kazakhs pillaged the monastery, see Kværne, 'Khyung-sprul,' p. 80. They burned every scrap of wood they could lay their hands on, including the wooden binding-boards used for the scriptures, which then had to be sorted out and restored with great pains.⁴²

37 Nag-chu-kha was also an important stage of the journey for nearly every Amdo traveller who visited Central Tibet. Today one may reach it from Lhasa by driving north for the better part of a day.

38 According to one source, this Kanjur had 158 volumes; Khyung-nag-pa, *g.Yung drung*, pp. 67, 89.

39 For brief biographies, see dPal-tshul, *History* (TBMC edition), vol. 2, pp. 241-242, 504-505. See also the introductory parts of *brGyud rim*, and Khyung-nag-pa, *g.Yung drung*, pp. 65-67.

40 Span Hanna, 'Vast as the Sky: The Terma Tradition in Modern Tibet,' in Geoffrey Samuel *et al.*, eds., *Tantra and Popular Religion in Tibet*, Aditya Prakashan, New Delhi, 1994, pp. 1-13.

41 I assume that this is the same as the Ga-rgya bsTan-dar (these last two syllables might also abbreviate bsTan-pa dar-rgyas) that was mentioned above. Hence, the sponsor of the dBal-khyung Kanjur was Khyung-sprul's father.

42 Dr. Elliot Sperling (Bloomington) informed me of an interesting article about the Kazakh refugees: Milton J. Clark, 'How the Kazakhs Fled to Freedom,' *National Geographic Magazine*, vol. 106, no. 5 (November 1954), pp. 621-644. Thousands of Kazakhs crossed Sinkiang and

There was another 'sister' manuscript to the dBal-khyung which, together with the Khyung-sprul manuscript, very likely stemmed from the same Nag-chu-kha original. The story of the Nyi-ma 'bum-gsal manuscript may be told, based on the biography,⁴³ as follows: sPa-ston Nyi-ma 'bum-gsal was born in 1854 in Nag-chu-kha. He became abbot of the sPa family monastery which under his leadership became the largest Bon monastery in the region, with 400 monks. Khyung-sprul considered him to be his 'root lama' (Kværne, 'Khyung-sprul,' p. 73). In the biography we learn that in 1883 he had a dream vision of a huge divine palace filled with celestial beings, among them his teacher bDe-chen gling-pa who prophesied that he would fulfill his idea to construct a Kanjur (here, quite remarkably, we find a Bonpo author using the word *bKa'* 'gyur). In 1885 he actually began work on both a Kanjur and a Tenjur. The work was done at his monastery in the Ye-tha area called sPa-dgon g. Yung-drung Rab-brtan Gling (founded in 1847 by g. Yung-drung-nam-bzang). After many digressions about the history of Bon, we are finally told how his sets of Kanjur and Tenjur were arranged and completed before the year 1889. The mDo Section was in 55 volumes (*po ti*), the 'Bum Section in 77, the sNgags Section in 21, and the Sems Section in 3, altogether 156 volumes. The Tenjur had in its Outer Section (commentaries on mDo and 'Bum sections) 34 volumes, Inner Section (commentaries on sNgags Section) 171 volumes, and Secret Section (commentaries on Sems Section) 30 volumes, and in addition 40 volumes of New Bon teachings, 8 volumes on sciences and one volume containing prayers and indices, altogether making 284 volumes. He ends with a very interesting reference to two different Bon Canon catalogues: one by O-rgyan bde-chen gling-pa, his teacher, entitled *dKar chag srid pa'i sgron me gzhon nu'i 'khri shing phyogs las rnam rgyal*, and one by a person with a name given in a form that makes him difficult to identify, sPa-ston Drung-mu [dmur-mun?], but whom I take to be sPa-ston g. Yung-drung nam-bzang, the founder in 1847 of g. Yung-drung Rab-brtan Gling,⁴⁴ entitled *bsGrigs rim rta bdun dbang po*. Only the first of the two, composed in 1887, has been published, but more about this later on.

I owe to Tsering Thar a reference to a Kanjur set made by the famous Shar-rdza bKra-shis rgyal-mtshan (1859-1934) when he built a meditation hermitage below his retreat cave at dGe-thang, not too far from Derge, which was equipped with a printery (*par khang*).⁴⁵ He had a manuscript Kanjur made, with more than 60 volumes of his own copies of scriptures at its core, other volumes brought from elsewhere.

Western Tibet, ending up in Kashmir. The hundreds of survivors who made it to Kashmir were eventually resettled in Turkey.

43 Rig-'dzin Ka-dag mthong-grol, *sKyes bu chen po nyi ma 'bum gsal dbang gi rgyal po'i rnam thar nor bu'i phreng ba*, "reproduced from a rare manuscript from sPa-tshang dGon in Yi-tha [Ye-tha]," Patsang Lama Sonam Gyaltzen, TBMC, Dolanji, 1984, pp. 215, 233, 281-283.

44 dPal-tshul, *History* (TBMC edition), vol. 2, p. 606. On the monastery, see Dondrup Lhagyal, 'Bonpo Family Lineages in Central Tibet,' contained in: Samten Karmay & Yasuhiko Nagano, eds., *New Horizons in Bon Studies*, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, 2000, pp. 429-508, at p. 460. Here the founder's name is given as sPa-ston Nam-mkha' bzang-po (of which our "nam-bzang" is the abbreviated form).

45 The full name of this hermitage (*sgrub sde*), given at its consecration, was mDo-sngags bsTan-pa'i 'Byung-gnas dGe-thang bShad-sgrub Padma rGyas-pa'i dGa'-tshal.

When completed, the mDo Section had 50 volumes, the 'Bum Section 62, the rGyud Section 11, and the Sems Section 4 volumes (so we may calculate a total of 127 volumes). His Tenjur (*bKa' brten*) had 340 volumes, among which the collected works of various Tibetan Lamas accounted for all but about 100 volumes.⁴⁶ All this was accomplished when Shar-rdza was 74 years old, in about 1933, shortly before his manifestation of the Rainbow Body (*'ja' lus*).

In the heart of Amdo, south of Blue Lake (mTsho-sngon), there are numerous Bon temples and monasteries, and consequently many Bon texts. So far it has proven possible to locate only a few references to Bon Kanjurs among the 'speech receptacles' (*gsung rten*) in central Amdo temples, but there must be [or, at least, must have been] many Kanjurs there, and future publications will surely have something to say about this. For the time being, we should try to determine something about the several sources for our 192-volume Bon Kanjur.⁴⁷

Although the dBal-khyung manuscript is by far the most important source of the volumes reproduced in the second edition, a small number of volumes came from the collection of rTogs-ldan Monastery. Since one of the main persons responsible for the publishing of the second edition belonged to this monastery, it would seem only natural that it would be a source for many of the volumes reproduced in our Kanjur. The longer name of rTogs-ldan Monastery is actually rTogs-ldan sMin-grol bKra-shis 'Khyil, and it is located in rNga-ba. A brief history of its abbots may be found in a history composed very recently.⁴⁸ Among the texts that are in one way or another marked as coming from rTogs-ldan Monastery are the following:

46 See dBra-btsun bsKal-bzang bstan-pa'i rgyal-mtshan (1897-1959), *rJe btsun bla ma dam pa nges pa don gyi g.yung drung 'chang dbang dpal shar rdza pa chen po bkra shis rgyal mtshan dpal bzang po'i rnam par thar pa ngo mtshar nor bu'i 'phreng ba thar 'dod mkhas pa'i mgul rgyan*, "reproduced from a print from the rDza-khog Shar-rdza Monastery," Tinley Jatso, Minling Yungdrung Ling Bon Monastery, Dehra Dun, 1985, pp. 540-542 (i.e., fols. 269-270). See also the brief English-language biography of Shar-rdza in Shardza Tashi Gyaltzen, *Heart Drops of Dharmakaya: Dzogchen Practice of the Bön Tradition*, Snow Lion, Ithaca, 1993, pp. 16-29. In the shorter biography of Shar-rdza (Su-la bsKal-bzang bstan-pa'i rgyal-mtshan [1897-1959], *Shar rdza ba bkra shis rgyal mtshan gyi rnam thar*, Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khang, Chengdu, 1985, p. 65), there is a brief note about how Shar-rdza furnished his newly founded hermitage with a full set of the Kanjur and Tenjur in more than 300 volumes.

47 See *mTsho lho*, pp. 316 and 443. In the latter case there is mention of a Kanjur in 200 and a Tenjur in 300 volumes in the monastery named Dung-dkar dGon gShen-bstan Dar-rgyas-gling.

48 *yang rtogs ldan smin grol bkra shis 'khyil ni bslab gsum ldan pa'i 'dus grwa sum brgya lhag bzhugs shing / thog mar dgon gzhi 'dzin pa'i bla ma bon slob rin po che yin la / de nas skyabs mgon bsod nams phun tshogs kyis 'dul ba'i dgon sder bsgyur nas / phyis su rtogs ldan g.yung drung tshul khrims pas bskyangs / de nas rim par bsod nams dar rgyas rin po che dang / dkon mchog sang / sdom bu sang / skyabs mchog tshul khrims ye shes / khri gtsug blo gros rin po che / mkhan chen tshul khrims bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan / bstan 'dzin 'chi med dbang po / yongs 'dzin yon tan rgya mtsho / yongs 'dzin bzod pa rgyal mtshan / khri ba 'jam dbyangs mkhyen rab rgya mtsho / tshul chen yang srid theg mchog bstan pa'i nyi ma'i bar gdan rabs rim par byon pa bcu gsum dang / dge bshes nges don mthong ba don yod sogs mkhas grub gnyis ldan gyi skyes bu dam pa du mas sgrub grwa btsugs te / bshad sgrub zung 'brel gyi sgo nas bon bstan dar rgyas*

- [1] The set of texts in our vol. 151, belonging to the mDo Section. But note that this volume seems to be directly reprinted from the first edition.
- [2] *'Phyong 'bum*, in 8 volumes in our vols. 157-164. 'Bum Section.
- [3] *rTse 'bum*, in our vols. 73, 75, 180, 175, 177, 181, 169, 167, 178, and 171. 'Bum Section.
- [4] It would seem that all the *bDal 'bum* volumes, some in manuscript and some in xylographic form, once belonged to rTogs-Idan Monastery. But note that the manuscript volumes would seem to be directly reprinted from the first edition. 'Bum Section.
- [5] The *Ju thig* texts in vol. 149. 'Bum Section.
- [6] The *Kun 'bum* texts in vol. 152.1-152.2 (and perhaps the remainder of vol. 152 as well?). rGyud Section. The *Kun 'bum* is absent from both the first and third editions, making it one of the texts found uniquely in the second edition.
- [7] The *dkar chag* texts in our vol. 142. Unclassified Section.

As far as the preceding material allows us to summarize the information about what texts went into making our second edition of the Kanjur: The first and second editions had only the mDo and 'Bum sections from the dBal-khyung manuscript with which to work (the sNgags and mDzod sections were not available to their publishers). Much of the second edition was apparently produced by directly reproducing some volumes from the first edition. The first and, especially, the second editions made use of several texts that were in the possession of rTogs-Idan Monastery. The second edition added a number of xylographic prints, mainly from the Khro-chen, but also from dBal-khyung. Another fact, perhaps rather surprising, is that some of the volumes in the second edition that were reproduced from the first edition were ultimately reproduced from reprints already published in India. Examples of this are found in vol. 99 (mDzod Section), vol. 110 (mDzod Section), vol. 115 (sNgags Section), and there are probably more. In brief, the publishers of both the first and second editions were forced to search for material to fill out the sNgags and mDzod sections by every possible means. The third edition, said to be based entirely on the dBal-khyung manuscript, is the only one arranged in an orderly fashion. Although this is in no way meant to detract from the value of the many texts they made available, one has the impression that the first and second editions were put together in a great hurry, perhaps, as Samten Karmay has suggested (*Katen*, p. x), because they felt it was urgent to make copies of the unique material available so that it would be preserved.

At this point, we would like to present a chronological listing of the available and unavailable Canon catalogues. It ought to be remembered that in every case where we have a Canon catalogue, we also have a description of a particular version of the Canon, whether in manuscript or xylograph form. The inverse is not necessarily true. If we have a particular version of the Canon there is not necessarily any catalogue

su spel bzhin mchis so. See Shing-bza' sKal-bzang chos-kyi rgyal-mtshan, *Bod sog chos 'byung*, Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, Beijing, 1992, pp. 863-864.

(even if it is very likely).⁴⁹ There are certainly more catalogues besides the ones we have listed, but this list represents our best efforts for the time being.

1740: Rig-'dzin Kun-grol grags-pa (b. 1700), *bsTan pa'i ka bzhi shar phyogs kyi // gdan sa bkra shis smin grol khrod // bka' rgyud mdo 'bum gzungs sngags kyi // dpe rtsis mun sel sgron ma*, contained in KTKC, pp. 259-370. There are hints that earlier catalogues were made, but this is the earliest one that has been published to the best of our knowledge. Nevertheless, we very rarely made use of it when making our own catalogue, since we considered the longer 1751 catalogue the more detailed one.

1751: Rig-'dzin Kun-grol grags-pa, *Zab dang rgya che g.yung drung bon gyi bka' 'gyur gyi dkar chag nyi ma 'bum gyi 'od zer*, contained in KTKC, pp. 1-258. I have seen photographs of an original manuscript in 197 fols. in the possession of TBMC. Our committee attempted to make thorough use of this catalogue by entering all the main titles into a computer file (without the chapter titles).

1773: Chapters four and five of a catalogue to the Khro-chen xylograph Kanjur. See discussion above, as well as the bibliography under *Khro chen dkar chag*.

1836 or later: [mKhan-chen] Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin, *bKa' 'gyur brten 'gyur gyi sde tshan sgrigs tshul bstan pa'i me ro spar ba'i rlung g.yab bon gyi pad mo rgyas byed nyi 'od*, Śatapiṭaka series no. 37, pt. 2, New Delhi, 1965 (see also our text no. 142.1). We made use of this work indirectly by entering all the titles contained in Kværne, 'Canon,' into a computer file. The same author wrote a companion piece with the title *Srid pa'i sgron me rgyal ba'i bka' bten gyi rnam bshad nyung thus rab gsal nyi 'od ngo mtshar 'bum ldan*, which is available under a slightly different title in our Kanjur, no. 142.2. The latter title is not a catalogue, but it does have valuable discussions about the nature and classifications of scripture. Both of these texts have been published in vol. 93 of the Bon Tenjur.

mid-to-late 19th century: sPa-ston Drung-mu [dmur-mun?] (=sPa-ston g.Yung-drung nam-bzang?), *bsGrigs rim rta bdun dbang po*, mentioned above. Known only from a citation.

1876-1880: Bla-ming g.Yung-drung tshul-khrims dbang-drag, *rGyal ba'i bka' dang bka' rten rmad 'byung dgos 'dod yid bzhin gter gyi bang mdzod la dkar chags blo'i tha ram bkrol byed 'phrul gyi lde mig*, Palace of National Minorities, Beijing, 1995, in 1392 pages, in the format of a traditional Tibetan book with long loose leaves. See the bibliography under YTKC. It was also published as

49 Our Kanjur, for example, is not accompanied by any listing of its contents, and it is even uncertain whether any such list was ever made. Still, the *brGyud rim* (see the bibliography), although mainly a collection of lineage accounts, might fill this function in some degree.

vol. 234 of the Tenjur (see *Katen*, p. 1321, no. 234-1). Our committee typed nearly the entire text (excluding the brief Tenjur section at the end) into the computer to enable word-searches. Although the date of composition is quite certain (the author lists a *gter ma* of bDe-chen gling-pa that was found in 1870, and he lists no *gter mas* of gSang-sngags gling-pa, who was born in 1864, so this resolves all problems that might be involved in converting the Tibetan-style dates in the colophon), the identity of the author poses a number of problems. According to a letter from Ayong Rinpoche, the author is more popularly known as Bla-ma bDud-'dul or bDud-'dul sPrul-sku. In the brief colophon, we may see that he was associated with 'Phar-chen. 'Phar-chen is name of a lama's residence (*bla brang*) that formed a part of the old sTeng-chen Monastery. The author himself, we are informed, served as abbot at Khyung-dkar g.Yung-drung bsTan-rgyas Gling. He was a native of Khyung-po.⁵⁰ dPal-tshul tells how the old monastery sTeng-chen, unified under the leadership of both sPyang-sprul Tshe-dbang bstan-rgyal (known to have been a disciple of bDe-chen gling-pa in the late 19th century) and bDud-'dul sPrul-sku, thrived for about 67 years until Chinese soldiers occupied it, whereupon it was burned down by the Tibetan army completely destroying it together with all it contained. Li An-che,⁵¹ who visited sTeng-chen in 1944, says that the old monastery was razed to the ground in a dispute with a nearby dGe-lugs-pa monastery. There is, in any case, no chance that the collection of scriptures catalogued here might exist any longer. Indeed, Ayong Rinpoche stated in his letter that he visited the area and found nothing.

- 1887: O-rgyan bde-chen gling-pa (1833-1893?), *dKar chag srid pa'i sgron me gzhon nu'i 'khri shing phyogs las rnam rgyal*, mentioned above. This has now been published as vol. 147 (in 496 pp.) of the Tenjur (see *Katen*, p. 969), with a slightly longer title (*gShen rab bka' 'bum chen po'i dkar chags srid pa'i sgron me gzhon nu'i 'khril shing phyogs las rnam par rgyal ba'i rgyal mtshan*). Two of the author's names are given in the colophon: [1] Mi-'gyur tshe-dbang gsang-sngags grags-pa and [2] Rig-'dzin Kun-grol gsang-ba rtsal, and Nyi-ma 'bum-gsal (b. 1854) is mentioned there. Although this work is very long, the actual listing of canonical titles begins only on p. 392. Since this work came to our attention too late, it was not possible to utilize its contents in the present catalogue.

50 These and more details are found in Khyung-nag-pa, *g.Yung drung*, p. 64; *Katen*, p. ix; and dPal-tshul, *History* (TBMC edition), pp. 609-611.

51 *History of Tibetan Religion: A Study in the Field*, New World Press, Beijing, 1994, pp. 42-44. According to Tsering Thar, 'Shar-rdza,' pp. 157-8, sTeng-chen Monastery was burned down by monks of the dGe-lugs-pa monastery dGon-chen in 1902 and then rebuilt beginning in 1908.

1945: g.Yung-drung Gling-gi dPon-slob Tshul-khrims rgyal-mtshan (late 19th to 20th centuries), *g.Yung drung bon gyi bstan pa'i dkar chag rmad byung nor bu'i mgul rgyan*.⁵²

Part Two: Remarks on the Norway Canon Catalogue

In Norway in 1995 to 1996, our committee had the idea to make something more than just a table of contents to a particular Bon Kanjur. We decided to make one with as many references as possible to other bodies of literature, not just to the usual journal and monographic studies, but to Tibetan-language publications as well. This we felt would be important not only for our own research, but for Tibetan studies in general. The researcher who turns to this catalogue for guidance should, if all goes well, be enabled to discover if the text in which they have an interest has been studied or published about in other contexts. It should be a useful tool for students of Bon regardless of whether or not they have immediate access to the second edition of the Bon Kanjur which, since so few sets were published, must be considered quite rare.

Since the volumes are in considerable disarray, and since so much of the second edition clearly does not belong to the Kanjur, we were immediately presented with the problem of classifying the individual texts. As part of this effort, we did our very best to determine what classifications were applied to each title in four different Canon catalogues. We were at first surprised to find that, even if there is considerable agreement, there are cases where the Canon catalogues disagree about whether a text belongs in the Kanjur or Tenjur, and even more cases where they disagree as to which of the four sections of the Kanjur it ought to belong.

In our catalogue, texts that by no account belong to the Kanjur have (with few exceptions) been placed in the last and largest section called the "Unclassified Section." In all other cases, we have tried to follow the Tibetan catalogues, giving special but not exclusive weight to that of the sMan-ri abbot (NTKC). Within each section, the volumes have generally been kept in their original order, except that separated volumes belonging to the same set or cycle have been placed together. The 'Bum Section as a whole has been rearranged to suit a generally accepted order. For those who possess the original publication and who want to quickly know what is in any particular volume, an appendix has been made which correlates the volume numbers with our added 'running numbers' (these latter are centered in the page and marked off with 'bullets'). Users of this catalogue will notice that there are a number of cases where Tenjur texts have been left together with closely related texts in the Kanjur sections. We feel that it is neither our right nor our responsibility to make a perfect

52 My only source for the existence of this catalogue is Tsering Thar, "Bod rgyal gnam gyi khri bdun skabs thub pa'i bstan pa bod du phebs myong ba'i skor gyi dpyad pa," contained in: Per Kværne, ed., *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes 1992*, The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, Oslo, 1994, pp. 906-912, at p. 906.

Kanjur out of the second edition. We simply felt that it would be better to provide the collection with a more rational arrangement, one consonant with tradition.

The order of the paragraphs within each catalogue entry is as follows (if no information is available, then in order to save space we simply eliminate the paragraph rather than using words like "none" or "not available"). This arrangement was adopted after mutual discussion and agreement by committee members:

1. The volume number and section number of the text within the volume, divided by a decimal point. For example, 100.10 means the tenth section within the volume 100.
2. The title. Please note that we have generally given the Tibetan in the exact spellings found in the texts, only occasionally suggesting better readings in square brackets. All the short-hand abbreviations used in the cursive manuscripts have been resolved without comment.⁵³
3. The marginal title and/or other short titles by which the text is known.
4. Number of volumes / number of chapters.
5. Author or *gter ston* / place of writing or revealing / time of writing or revealing. Author's or *gter ston*'s scribe.
6. Volume number / number of pages / statement on completeness or orderly arrangement of the pages / statement on whether it is a xylograph or a manuscript / number of folios. Note here that 'page number' always refers to the added Arabic numbers, while 'folio number' always refers to the original Tibetan-language numeration of the individual leaves (this means the page number or folio number found on the last page of the text, with any problems with pagination discussed in the 'notes' section at the end of the entry). Note that in other paragraphs some supply the page numbers, while others give folio numbers, and some even supply both (sometimes folio numbers were illegible, forcing reference to the page numbers).
7. Printing patron, printer or scribe / place / time. Names of 'original' scribes working with the author or *gter ston* are placed together with the names of the latter (see '5' above).
8. *dKar chag*. Here the references to occurrences of the title in four different *dkar chag* texts are given. If titles in these sources vary, this ought to be noted.

53 At some point one must simply become accustomed to spelling peculiarities of Bon manuscripts, in particular the presence or absence of final 's', and such spellings as *gling bzhi* [which apparently ought to mean 'four continents'] for *gleng-gzhi* ['introduction, scene setting'] and so forth. For an introduction to the abbreviation practices of Bonpo scribes, see Ramon Prats, 'On "Contracted Words" and a List of Them Collected from a Bon-po Work,' *East and West*, vol. 41 (1991), pp. 231-238. Advanced students will benefit from Nor-brang O-rgyan, "Bod kyi skung yig gi rnam gzhas chung ngu," contained in: *Bod rig pa'i ched rtsom gces bsdus*, ed. by Ngag-dbang, Bod ljongs mi dmangs dpe skrun khang (Lhasa 1987), pp. 413-483, where the rules and rationales behind manuscript abbreviations (*skung yig*, meaning 'letter concealment[s]') are explained. See also the rather basic discussion in Martin, *Mandala Cosmogony*, pp. 100-101.

9. Chapter titles. An attempt was made, in every instance, to supply complete listings of the chapter titles. Generally these are based on titles actually located in the pages of our Kanjur, but in some cases the listing of titles is taken from a reference work, primarily KGKC or YTKC (due to difficulty in locating or reading the chapter titles). Quite often, variant lists of chapter titles have been supplied so that they might be compared with the list of titles located. This is often essential for determining the correct readings, for locating *lacunae* that have emerged in course of the text-transmissions and so forth. Sometimes it helps to determine the identity of the text, since texts with basically the same title may have different numbers of chapters. The value for research of having access to the individual chapters ought to be obvious.
10. Colophon. Here we have provided the complete text of informative parts of the colophon[s] of each text (omissions are marked with "...").
11. Collections. Indicates if a copy is known by us to exist in any museum, library or other public or private collection (we were not very zealous in searching for these).
12. Publications.
13. Translations. Existing translations of the Tibetan texts into other languages. Brief translated extracts are usually not noted.
14. Studies and/or commentaries.
15. Notes. Here we put comments of all kinds, including discussions about interesting or problematic aspects of content, authorship, pagination and so forth.

Sometimes it made better sense to discuss a whole set or cycle of texts found in one or more volumes (like, for example, the *Ma rgyud* cycle). These general discussions are found at the heads of volumes, or more generally, immediately following the 'running numbers.'

On behalf of both myself and committee I would only like to express a hope that our work will prove useful for the evolution of Bon studies, of course, but even more so for a future Tibetan studies that will finally come to fully include Bon studies.

A few final notes: After the members of the committee prepared entries, these were gone over once more by a different member in order to ensure greater accuracy and completeness. This was truly a cooperative and collective effort accomplished with zest and abundant good cheer. While this introduction may bear my name, it owes much to other members of the Norway committee. Even if it is true that some of the material for it emerged in the course of my own personal research, much of it did result from the constant exchange of texts, information and ideas in Oslo. Especially warm and heartfelt thanks to the chair of our committee, Per Kvaerne, who initiated the project, and of course served as one of its members, but had the added burden of making sure everything worked out perfectly for the rest of us. Although not members of the committee, Jean-Luc Achard (Paris) and Henk Blezer (Leiden), out of the goodness of their hearts, freely offered valuable information, discussions and comments via electronic mail.