

Bonpo Abhidharma Theory of the Aggregate of Form (*rūpaskandha*)*

KUMAGAI Seiji

1. Introduction

After the death of Gauthama Buddha, the various Buddhist schools developed their own canons called the “Three Collections” (*tripiṭaka*): the Collection of Discourses (*sūtrapiṭaka*), the Collection of Monastic Discipline (*vinayapiṭaka*), and the Collection of Metaphysics (*abhidharmapiṭaka*). These schools particularly devoted themselves to refining their metaphysics, known as Buddhist Abhidharma and also called “Buddhist scholastic philosophy” in imitation of Western “scholasticism”, developed in the period of medieval Christianity on the basis of Ancient Greek philosophy. Both Buddhism and Greek philosophy might have been destined to highly sophisticate their philosophical theories because both of them flourished in cultures belonging to the Indo-European language family.

While prospering in India, Buddhist Abhidharma spread into other countries along with the propagation of Buddhism and had a strong influence on their culture and society, and even on the doctrinal development of indigenous religions in each region.

The eastward advance of Buddhism was completed by its introduction into Japan in the sixth century (552 or 538 CE). Thereafter, Buddhism spread from India into Himalayan regions such as Tibet and Bhutan and also into Northeast Asia, namely Mongolia. Buddhism was introduced into Tibet, northeast of India, in the seventh century, during the reign of the king of the Tibetan Empire Songtsen Gampo (*Srong btsan sgam po*, 581/618–649). There had been no unified dynasty before him, so the empire accepted Buddhism in full scale relatively late in comparison with the other Buddhist countries which had older dynasties. Mādhyamika Buddhism became the state religion during the reign of Trisong Detsen (*Khri srong lde brtsan*, 742–797) and has been a major religion in both Tibet and Himalayan regions in general. However, the indigenous religion called Bon has not disappeared and is still practiced in the present time.¹⁾

Bon is still active in Tibet and its surrounding countries. For example,

there are two Bonpo head monasteries which have a great influence on Bonpo communities in Tibet and the Himalayas: the Menri Monastery (*bKra shis sman ri dgon pa*), which moved from Tibet to Dolanji in Himachal Pradesh in India, and the Triten Norbutse Monastery (*Khri brtan nor bu rtse*), which was established in Kathmandu, Nepal. Those who visit such Bonpo monasteries might easily mistake them for Buddhist monasteries if they lack specialized knowledge. Bonpo saint statues, volumes of scriptures and monks' habits they all look Buddhist, therefore it is difficult to tell them apart. For example, the accomplished Bonpo scholar Nyamme Sherab Gyeltsen (*mNyam med Shes rab rgyal mtshan*, 1356–1415) is represented holding both a sword and a *pecha* (loose-leaf book) in his *thangka* iconography, therefore he is easily mistaken for the Buddhist bodhisattva Mañjuśrī if careful attention is not paid.²⁾

1-1. Bonpo Doctrine

We can also find similarities between Buddhism and Bon regarding their doctrines. In recent Bonpo monasteries, novice monks start their study with Logics (*bsdus grwa*), progress towards *Sūtrayāna* philosophies, such as Madhyamaka and Abhidharma, then they address *Vajrayāna* and finally Dzogchen (*rdzogs chen*). Their educational curriculum is similar to that of the Nyingma school. We often find Bonpo monks studying in Buddhist monasteries in India but such an educational exchange did not just begin recently. For example, Nyamme, mentioned above, studied with the Buddhist Sakyapa monk Rongtön Shecha Kunrig (*Rong ston Shes bya kun rig*, 1367–1449).³⁾ Buddhism and Bon thus have always had an active academic relationship and have long influenced each other.⁴⁾

In the period of early spread of Buddhism to Tibet (*bstan pa snga dar*), Buddhist monks tried to convert Bonpos using basic Buddhist concepts such as *saṃsāra* and *nirvāṇa*. At that time Bon practitioners did not engage in philosophical elaboration but they mainly conducted primitive rituals including animal sacrifice, as attested in old Dunhuang manuscripts.

The *Dedication* (*bsNgo ba*, Pt.⁵⁾ 239), an ancient Buddhist text found in the Pelliot collection, offers a good example: its author prohibited the sacrifice of sheep, horse, and yak inspired by Buddhist ethics and recommended virtuous ways of life to reach *nirvāṇa*.⁶⁾ The author thus presented basic Buddhist guidelines for practice but did not give any complicated theory, as those developed in later periods.

In the period of later spread of Buddhism to Tibet (*bstan pa phyi dar*), Bonpos highly developed their metaphysics achieving a level of complexity

comparable to Buddhist formulations. For example, Tretön Gyeltsenpel (*Tre ston rGyal mtshan dpal*, 14th cen.), in his *Bon sgo gsal byed*, outlined such a sophisticated Bonpo doctrine as the one known as the “nine ways” (*theg pa dgu*), including elements from Abhidharma, Yogācāra, and Madhyamaka, up to Dzogchen.⁷⁾

We must also acknowledge the fact that Bonpos incorporated the latest developments of Indian Buddhism in Tibet in order to compose highly philosophical treatises. For example, the *dBu ma bden gnyis kyi gzhung* (*bDen gnyis* hereinafter), composed by Metön Sherab Özer (*Me ston Shes rab 'od zer*, 1058–1132 or 1118–1192), reminds us of the *Satyadvayavibhaṅga* (Tib. *bDen pa gnyis rnam par 'byed pa'i tshig le'ur byas pa*, generally called *dBu ma bden gnyis*) composed by Buddhist master Jñānagarbha (eighth cen.) because of their similar titles, but actually its strongest influence comes from the theory of Candrakīrti (ca. 600–650), who belonged to a different sub-school of Mādhyamika from Jñānagarbha.⁸⁾ We also need to acknowledge that the *bDen gnyis* cites Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvātārabhāṣya* (*MAvBh*),⁹⁾ which was first translated into Tibetan and introduced to Tibet by the translator Patsap Nyima Drak (*Pa tshab Nyi ma grags*, b. 1055) in the 11th century. Metön cited *MAvBh* just after its introduction to Tibet and composed the *bDen gnyis* including Bonpo peculiar theories which became the basis of Bonpo Madhyamaka philosophy in later periods.

1-2. Bonpo Abhidharma

While Indian Buddhist Abhidharma treatises were translated into Tibetan in the period of early spread of Buddhism, Bonpo Abhidharma texts emerged in the period of late spread of Buddhism. The fundamental Bonpo Abhidharma scripture is the *mDzod phug* (*ZZ. Ti ka rgya se lig min rkya*; Tib. *Srid pa'i mDzod phug*).

Dan Martin conducted detailed research on this scripture.¹⁰⁾ According to its colophon, its original version was composed by the founder of Bon, Shenrab Miwo (*gShen rab mi bo*, *16016–7816 BCE according to Bonpo chronology) and was translated into Zhangzhung and Tibetan by the Zhangzhung translator Tonggyung Thuchen (*sTong rgyung mthu chen*) and the Tibetan translator Shari Wuche (*Sha ri dbu che*) in a place called Chemala Yungdrung (*Bye ma la gyung drung*) situated in the border between Zhangzhung and Tibet.¹¹⁾ Martin (2000: 23) presumes that the Tibetan version would have been composed on the basis of its original text written in Zhangzhung. The *mDzod phug* is said to have been rediscovered by the Bonpo treasure revealer Shenchen Luga (*gShen chen Klu*

dga', 996–1035) in 1017.¹²⁾ Namely, the scripture became officially accessible in 1017.¹³⁾

The *mDzod phug* is composed of 17 chapters: 1) existence (*srid pa*), 2) aeons (*bskal pa*), 3) realms (*dbyings*), 4) wisdom (*ye shes*), 5) vessel world (*snod*), 6) vital world (*bcud*), 7) sense faculties (*dbang po*), 8) subtle increaser of affliction (*phra rgyas*), 9) interdependence (*rten 'brel*), 10) aggregates (*phung po*), 11) sense fields (*skye mched*), 12) realms of elements (*khams*), 13) marks (*mtshan nyid*), 14) activity (*las spyod*), 15) paths (*lam*), 16) levels (*sa gnas*), and 17) results (*'bras bu*).

1-3. Objective and Methodology of this Paper

Abhidharma philosophy is indispensable to understand basic Bonpo and Buddhist theories. The author of this paper outlined the Bonpo theory of the five aggregates (*pañcaskandha*, *phung po lnga*) in another paper.¹⁴⁾

Dan Martin (2000) presented an outline of the *mDzod phug* and pointed out its multiple citations from the *Abhidharmasamuccaya* (hearinafter *AS*) and the *Abhidharmakośa* (hearinafter *AK*). Martin's reference to the citations from Buddhist texts is a great achievement from the perspective of comparative religious studies. The author of this paper proved that the *Pañcaskandhaka* (hearinafter *PS*) composed by Vasubandhu has a stronger influence on the theory of the five aggregates (especially on the theories of the aggregate of perception (*saṃjñāskandha*) and the aggregate of formation (*samskāraśkandha*)) than *AS* and *AK*.¹⁵⁾

I plan to conduct further analysis of each of the five aggregates, while I already examined the Bonpo theory of the aggregate of perception in another paper.¹⁶⁾ Among the remaining four aggregates, this paper aims to particularly clarify the Bonpo theory of the aggregate of form (*rūpaskandha*).

This paper mainly focuses on chapter 10 (on the five aggregates) of the *mDzod phug*. In order to compensate the lack of information in the verses of *mDzod phug*, the paper also refers to its commentary *mDzod 'grel* composed by Nyamme Sherab Gyeltsen and the section of Abhidharma in the Bonpo doxography *Bon sgo gsal byed* composed by Tretön Gyeltsenpel, who was a contemporary of Nyamme.¹⁷⁾ The paper will also clarify the similarities and differences between Bonpo and Buddhist theories of the aggregate of form in reference to related Buddhist texts.

1-4. Treatment of the Zhangzhung Language

The *mDzod phug* is a rare scripture which contains Zhangzhung language.

Around 20% of this scripture contains a bilingual text in both Zhangzhung and Tibetan, but the rest of the text lacks the Zhangzhung and only the Tibetan remains. How can we consider and interpret this situation? There are two possibilities. The first possibility is that there were originally both Zhangzhung and Tibetan versions of the whole text but most parts of the Zhangzhung version were lost. The second possibility is that the only parts remaining in both Zhangzhung and Tibetan existed originally, but the rest part remaining only in Tibetan was composed and added in a later period. In the second case, the *mDzod phug* would have both an old and a new layer. The author of this paper cannot judge which interpretation is more probable for the moment. This paper refers to the parts remaining in both Zhangzhung and Tibetan as “*mDzod phug* (Z&T)” and the part remaining only in Tibetan as “*mDzod phug* (T)” in order to differentiate them. This paper will just use “*mDzod phug*” when referring to the scripture itself.

We also need to be careful when we examine *mDzod phug* (Z&T) because it is uncertain whether the relevant parts in the Zhangzhung and Tibetan versions always accord literally with each other, even if they seem to accord in many parts.¹⁸⁾ If its Tibetan version does not completely accord with the Zhangzhung version literally, we need to interpret the text primarily according to the Zhangzhung version and use its Tibetan version as a secondary source to understand the Zhangzhung version more accurately. However, in the present time when the grammar of the Zhangzhung language has yet to be comprehensively clarified,¹⁹⁾ it is absolutely unfeasible to comprehend the literal meaning of the scripture by reading only the Zhangzhung version.

For the moment, we have no way other than reading the *mDzod phug* in its Tibetan version and refer to the only understandable parts of its Zhangzhung version as a secondary source to fully make sense of this text.

For all these reasons, this paper adopts the methodology to primarily use its Tibetan version to comprehend the outline of the theory of the aggregate of form, while referring to its Zhangzhung version only when we can clearly understand the text. We welcome future criticism and re-examination by experts in Zhangzhung grammar.

2. Mapping of the Aggregate of Form

Before the analysis of the concept of the “aggregate of form” itself, I would like to map it within the structure of all phenomena. In his *Bon sgo gsal byed*, Tretön classifies “elements” (*bon*, **dharma*) into “conditioned [elements]” (*‘du byas*) and “unconditioned [elements]” (*‘du ma byas*).²⁰⁾ “Unconditioned

[elements]” are defined as “that which are not produced from either causes or conditions” (*rgyu rkyen las ma skyes pa*).²¹⁾ On the other hand, “conditioned [elements]” are defined as “that which are produced from causes and conditions” (*rgyu rkyen las skyes pa*).²²⁾ The five aggregates are regarded to include all conditioned elements.²³⁾ These explanations mostly accord with Buddhist theories.²⁴⁾ We also need to note that the above explanation is not given either in the *mDzod phug* or *mDzod 'grel*.

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the five aggregates into “five undefiled aggregates” (*zag pa med pa'i phung po lnga*) and “five defiled aggregates” (*zag pa'i phung po lnga*).²⁵⁾ The *Bon sgo gsal byed* cites the *mDzod phug* in this regard.²⁶⁾ The five undefiled aggregates are: the 250 monastic disciplinary rules (*tshul khrims*),²⁷⁾ the 16 types of meditative concentration (*ting 'dzin*),²⁸⁾ the nine types of wisdom (*shes rab*),²⁹⁾ the eight types of liberation (*rnam grol*),³⁰⁾ and the six types of wisdom for liberation (*rnam grol ye shes*).³¹⁾ On the other hand, the five defiled aggregates are the aggregates of form (*gzugs, *rūpa*), sensation (*tshor ba, *vedanā*), perception (*'du shes, *saṃjñā*), formation (*'du byed, *saṃskāra*), and consciousness (*rnam par shes pa, *vijñāna*) in correspondence to Buddhist theory.³²⁾

Here we examine the definition and classification of the aggregate of form. The *mDzod phug* does not give a clear definition of the aggregate of form, but explains it as “that which appears” (*snang yor*).³³⁾ The *mDzod 'grel* explains it as “that which contains many forms” (*gzugs du ma 'dus pa*).³⁴⁾ The *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which is a thing and has parts” (*dngos po gang zhig phyogs cha dang bcas pa*).³⁵⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) enumerates 15 types of form in total.³⁶⁾ Many Buddhist Abhidharma treatises enumerate 11 types of form: five sense faculties, five cognitive objects, and imperceptible form. As will be shown later, Bon adds the four primary elements (earth, water, fire, and air) to the 11 types of form and gives 15 types of form in total. Buddhism generally includes the four primary elements as tangible objects (*reg bya, *spraṣṭavya*) and does not regard them as independent elements, but Bonpo thinkers do not consider them as a subdivision of tangible objects but regard them as independent elements.

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) only enumerates the 15 types of form, while the *mDzod 'grel* and the *Bon sgo gsal byed* classify the 15 types of the aggregate of form into: four primary elements, five sense faculties, five cognitive objects, and imperceptible form.³⁷⁾

3. Fifteen Types of Form

We here examine 15 types of form in the following order: four primary

elements, five sense faculties, five cognitive objects, and imperceptible form.

3-1. Four Primary Elements

3-1-1. Element of Air

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the element of air (*rlung*, **vāyu*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which is light and movable” (*yang zhing g-yo ba*).³⁸⁾ The definition is also found in Buddhism.³⁹⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the element of air into five types, but it does not mention their names.⁴⁰⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of air with their corresponding explanation:

- air of air (*rlung gi rlung*): that which is light and movable (*yang zhing g-yo ba*);⁴¹⁾
- fire of air (*rlung gi me*): that which pushes up and heats [objects by the power of air] (*degs byed drod 'bebs*);⁴²⁾
- water of air (*rlung gi chu*): that which is cool and stretches (*bsil zhing gdang ba*);⁴³⁾
- earth of air (*rlung gi sa*): [that which is like movable and solid] wheel of a large vehicle (*theg chen 'khor lo*);⁴⁴⁾ and
- space of air (*rlung gi nam mkha'*): that which does not appear and is like non-thing (*mi snang dngos med*).⁴⁵⁾

Among them, air of air substantially means the element of air, that is to say that “that which is light and movable” is the definition of the element of air. Fire of air has the function of moving warmth and warming things. Water of air has the function of coldness and moving coldness. Earth of air has the function of moving firmness and solid things. Space of air has the function of moving invisible things similar to non-thing.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not present the above five subdivisions. Instead, it classifies the element of air into three: exterior air (*phyi rlung*), interior air (*nang gi rlung*), and intermediate air (*bar gi rlung*).⁴⁶⁾ The exterior air is further subdivided into air [of aeon] of creation (*chags pa srid pa'i rlung*) and air of aeon of destruction (*'jig pa bskal pa'i rlung*).⁴⁷⁾ The interior air is subdivided into air of impelling karma (*'phen byed las kyi rlung*) and air of breath of sentient beings (*sems can dbugs kyi rlung*).⁴⁸⁾ The intermediate air is subdivided into air cleaning *nādi* (*sbug gu sel ba'i rlung*) and *prāṇa* rotating sun and moon (*nyi zla bskor ba'i rlung*).⁴⁸⁾

3-1-2. Element of Fire

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the element of fire (*me*, **tejas*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which is hot and burns” (*tsha zhing sreg pa*).⁵⁰⁾ A similar definition is found in Buddhism.⁵¹⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the element of fire into five types, but it does not mention their names.⁵²⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of fire with their corresponding explanation:

- fire of fire (*me yi me*): that which is hot and burns (*tsha zhing sreg pa*);⁵³⁾
- air of fire (*me yi rlung*): that which functions as a wave [of fire like a flame] (*rlabs kyi spyod pa*);⁵⁴⁾
- water of fire (*me yi chu*): that which moves fluidly [like lava] (*mnyen lcugs 'khril pa*);⁵⁵⁾
- earth of fire (*me yi sa*): that which is like a recently cast [iron] wheel (*chags pa'i 'khor lo*);⁵⁶⁾ and
- space of fire (*me yi nam mkha'*): that which is like an immaterial light (*dngos med 'od*).⁵⁷⁾

Among them, fire of fire substantially means the element of fire, that is to say that “that which is hot and burns” is the definition of the element of fire. Air of fire has the function of moving heat. Water of fire has the characteristic of hot liquids. Earth of fire means hard and hot state. Space of fire refers to immaterial brightness.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not present the above five subdivisions. Instead, it classifies the element of fire into three: exterior fire (*phyi'i me*), interior fire (*nang gi me*), and intermediate fire (*bar gyi me*).⁵⁸⁾ The exterior fire is further subdivided into fire [of aeon] of creation (*chags pa srid pa'i me*) and fire of aeon of destruction (*'jig pa bskal pa'i me*).⁵⁹⁾ The interior fire is subdivided into purifying fire (*sbyong byed las kyi me*) and fire [i.e. heat] of temperature of sentient beings (*sems can drod kyi me*).⁶⁰⁾ The intermediate fire is subdivided into stove fire which boils [water] (*khol byung thab kyi me*) and fire of sunlight (*nyi ma mdangs kyi me*).⁶¹⁾

3-1-3. Element of Water

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the element of water (*chu*, **ap*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which is originally wet” (*ye nas gsher ba*).⁶²⁾ A similar definition is found in Buddhism.⁶³⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the element of water into five types, but it does not mention their names.⁶⁴⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of water with their corresponding explanation:

- water of water (*chu yi chu*): that which is liquid and wet (*gsher zhing rlan pa*);⁶⁵⁾
- air of water (*chu yi rlung*): that which is like a strong and powerful wave (*rba drag shugs can*);⁶⁶⁾
- fire of water (*chu yi me*): that which vaporises everything (*bag la kun sdud*);⁶⁷⁾
- earth of water (*chu yi sa*): that which is like a [water] wheel which subdues [opponents] (*dbang sdud 'khor lo*);⁶⁸⁾ and
- space of water (*chu yi nam mkha'*): water dried out by the wind [leaving free space] (*chu rlung skam*).⁶⁹⁾

Among them, water of water substantially means the element of water, that is to say that “that which is liquid and wet” is the definition of the element of water. Air of water has the function of moving water. Fire of water has the function to vaporise everything. Earth of water refers to hard quality that liquids have. Space of water is the space left after water has dried out with wind.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not present the above five subdivisions. Instead, it classifies the element of water into three: exterior water (*phyi'i chu*), interior water (*nang gi chu*), and intermediate water (*bar gyi chu*).⁷⁰⁾ The exterior water is further subdivided into water [of aeon] of creation (*chags pa srid pa'i chu*) and water of aeon of destruction (*jig pa bskal pa'i chu*).⁷¹⁾ The interior water is subdivided into nurturing milk (*gso byed 'o ma'i chu*) and blood of sentient beings (*sems can khrag gi chu*).⁷²⁾ The intermediate water is subdivided into water floating in the air like snow and rain (*kha char gnam gyi chu*) and water on the ground like a river (*chu klung sa gzhi'i chu*).⁷³⁾

3-1-4. Element of Earth

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the element of earth (*sa*, **prthivī*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which is hard and solid” (*sra zhing 'khtag pa*).⁷⁴⁾ A similar definition is found in Buddhism.⁷⁵⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the element of earth into five types, but it does not mention their names.⁷⁶⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of earth with their corresponding explanation:

- earth of earth (*sa yi sa*): that which is solid and changeless (*sra brtan mi 'gyur*);⁷⁷⁾

- air of earth (*sa yi rlung*): that which moves and shakes [like an earthquake] (*g-yo zhing 'gul ba*);⁷⁸⁾
- fire of earth (*sa yi me*): that which protects everything with hot energy (*drod kyis kun skyob*);⁷⁹⁾
- water of earth (*sa yi chu*): that which is produced from gold-color [earth] (*ser las kun bskyed*);⁸⁰⁾ and
- space of earth (*sa yi nam mkha'*): invisible molecules (*rdul phran mi snang*).⁸¹⁾

Among them, earth of earth substantially means the element of earth, that is to say that “that which is solid and changeless” is the definition of the element of earth. Air of earth has the function of moving solid things. Fire of earth is the condition of hot and solid things. Water of earth refers to liquids produced from solid things such as gold. Space of earth is the invisible condition of molecules.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not present the above five subdivisions. Instead, it classifies the element of earth into three: exterior earth (*phyi'i sa*), interior earth (*nang gi sa*), and intermediate earth (*bar gyi sa*).⁸²⁾ The exterior earth is the gold existing underneath each of the three one-thousand-fold universes.⁸³⁾ The interior earth is gold, silver, copper, and iron.⁸⁴⁾ On the other hand, there is no reference to the intermediate earth, but it can be deduced that it refers to bodily solid matters such as skin and bones.

3-2. Five Sense Faculties

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies each sense faculty into five types, but it does not mention their names. The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of each of sense faculty with their corresponding explanation. Among the five, the first two subdivisions refer to object and subject. The last three subdivisions are postulated according to the three levels of the agents: ordinary beings, saints and Buddhas.

3-2-1. Visual Sense Faculty

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the visual sense faculty (*mig gi dbang po*, **cakṣurindriya*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which is produced from its causes, which are the [four primary] elements, and produces its result, which is the object of the visual consciousness” (*rang rgyu 'byung ba las skyes pa gang zhig / rang 'bras mig shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa*).⁸⁵⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the visual sense faculty into five types,

but it does not mention their names.⁸⁶⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of visual sense faculty with their corresponding explanation:

- [visual sense faculty which recognises] visible color (*kha dog de nyid gsal ba*);⁸⁷⁾
- pure [visual sense faculty which] combines with visible forms (*gzugs gsal dwangs pas mnyam sbyor*);⁸⁸⁾
- [visual sense faculty of ordinary beings which perceives objects] to be either near or far sharply and clearly (*gam rgyang lta bur rno gsal*);⁸⁹⁾
- [visual sense faculty of bodhisattvas which] comprehends all [forms] and perceives visible objects as an all-pervading light (*kun rtogs mthong khyab 'od gsal*);⁹⁰⁾ and
- [visual sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] all forms to be pure like the sky (*gzugs kun mkha' 'dra dag pa*).⁹¹⁾

Among them, the first two subdivisions of visual sense faculty refer to object and subject. The last three subdivisions of visual sense faculty are postulated according to the three levels of the agents: ordinary beings, saints, and Buddhas.

3-2-2. Auditory Sense Faculty

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the auditory sense faculty (*rna ba'i dbang po*, *śrotrendriya), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the auditory consciousness” (*de gang zhig / rang 'bras nyan shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa*).⁹²⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the auditory sense faculty into five types, but it does not mention their names.⁹³⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of auditory sense faculty with their corresponding explanation:

- [auditory sense faculty which perceives] greatly secret [sounds of] all things heard everywhere (*snang srid kun grags gsang chen*);⁹⁴⁾
- pure [auditory sense faculty which] combines with sounds (*sgra la dang dwangs pas mnyam sbyor*);⁹⁵⁾
- [auditory sense faculty of ordinary beings which perceives the sound] circling around the ten directions and so [auditory consciousness] appears (*phyogs bcu 'khor lo gnas bsgyur*);⁹⁶⁾
- [auditory sense faculty of] divine ear [which perceives even the small sound of] a silk cloth from a distance of one krośa (*rgyang grags lha snyan dar bu*);⁹⁷⁾ and
- [auditory sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] all groups of words to

be dhāraṇī (*tshig gi tshogs rnam s gzungs dag*).⁹⁸⁾

Among them, the first two subdivisions of auditory sense faculty refer to object and subject. The last three subdivisions of auditory sense faculty are postulated according to the three levels of the agents: ordinary beings, saints or gods, and Buddhas.

3-2-3. Olfactory Sense Faculty

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the olfactory sense faculty (*sna'i dbang po*, **ghrāṇendriya*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the olfactory consciousness” (*de gang zhig / rang 'bras sna shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa*).⁹⁹⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the olfactory sense faculty into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹⁰⁰⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of olfactory sense faculty with their corresponding explanation:

- [olfactory] sense faculty [which perceives] clearly all [olfactory objects] with good fragrance (*ngad ldan kun gsal dbang po*);¹⁰¹⁾
- pure [olfactory sense faculty which] combines with smells (*dri la dwangs pas mnyam sbyor*);¹⁰²⁾
- [olfactory sense faculty of ordinary beings which] combines with the stream [of smell] and controls all olfaction (*rgyun 'jug kun snom dbang skur*);¹⁰³⁾
- [olfactory sense faculty of bodhisattvas which] perceives smell everywhere and feels comfortable (*kun la dri tshor yid 'ong*);¹⁰⁴⁾ and
- [olfactory sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] all types of smell to be pure like the sky (*dri kun mkha' 'dra dag po*).¹⁰⁵⁾

Among them, the first two subdivisions of olfactory sense faculty refer to object and subject. The last three subdivisions of olfactory sense faculty are postulated according to the three levels of the agents: ordinary beings, saints, and Buddhas.

3-2-4. Gustatory Sense Faculty

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the gustatory sense faculty (*lce'i dbang po*, **jihvendriya*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the gustatory consciousness” (*de gang*

zhig / rang 'bras lce shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa).¹⁰⁶⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the gustatory sense faculty into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹⁰⁷⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of gustatory sense faculty with their corresponding explanation:

- gustatory sense faculty which is entirely liberated [from conceptions] like a circling [sword which cuts conceptual ignorance] (*kun grol dbang po 'khor lo*);¹⁰⁸⁾
- pure [gustatory sense faculty which] combines with tastes (*ro la dwangs pas mnyam sbyor*);¹⁰⁹⁾
- [gustatory sense faculty of ordinary beings which] perceives the tastes of nourishing, all-building, and life-supporting substances (*gso byed kun bskyed srog 'dzin*);¹¹⁰⁾
- clear [gustatory sense faculty of bodhisattvas] which blissfully perceives all [tastes] to be empty (*kun la bde stong khyab gsal*);¹¹¹⁾ and
- [gustatory sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] tastes to be [pure] like the sky as they wish (*yid bzhin ro spyod mkha' 'dra*).¹¹²⁾

Among them, the first two subdivisions of gustatory sense faculty refer to object and subject. The last three subdivisions of gustatory sense faculty are postulated according to the three levels of the agents: ordinary beings, saints, and Buddhas.

3-2-5. Tactile Sense Faculty

While the *mDzod phug* does not provide a definition for the tactile sense faculty (*lus kyi dbang po, *kāyendriya*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the tactile consciousness” (*de gang zhig / rang 'bras lus shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa*).¹¹³⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the tactile sense faculty into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹¹⁴⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of tactile sense faculty with their corresponding explanation:

- [tactile sense faculty which perceives objects and which] perceives and controls all appearing objects (*kun sdud dbang chen snang yor*);¹¹⁵⁾
- pure [tactile sense faculty which] combines with tangible objects (*reg la dwangs pas mnyam sbyor*);¹¹⁶⁾
- [tactile sense faculty of ordinary beings] the self-nature of which is to perform an action [of touching] (*bya ba byed pa'i bdag nyid*);¹¹⁷⁾

- [tactile sense faculty of bodhisattvas] which enhances bliss as they wish (*bsam pa'i bdag nyid bde 'degs*),¹¹⁸⁾ and
- [tactile sense faculty of Buddhas, endowed with the eight types of] freedom and [the ten types of] favor, which blissfully [recognizes tangible objects to be pure] like the sky (*dal 'byor bde ldan mkha' 'dra*).¹¹⁹⁾

Among them, the first two subdivisions of tactile sense faculty refer to object and subject. The last three subdivisions of tactile sense faculty are postulated according to the three levels of the agents: ordinary beings, saints, and Buddhas.

3-3. Five Cognitive Objects

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies each cognitive object into five types, but it does not mention their names. The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of cognitive objects with their corresponding explanation. Among the five, the first three have no classification with unity. The last two subdivisions are formulated in regard to action.

3-3-1. Visible Form

While the *mDzod phug* does not give a definition of the visible form (*gzugs*, **rūpa*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which has substantial causes, that are the [four primary] elements, and becomes an object factor of visual consciousness which perceives the [visible form]” (*'byung ba'i nyer len can gang zhig / rang 'dzin mig shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa*).¹²⁰⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the visible form into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹²¹⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of visible form with their corresponding explanation:

- five types of color and the mixed color as the sixth color (*kha dog rnam lnga 'dres 'chol drug*),¹²²⁾
- shapes (*dbyibs*);¹²³⁾
- [colors and shapes that have] causes of composition such as atoms and letters (*rgyu spros rdul yig*), and are composed of the four [primary] elements (*'byung ba bzhi las kun sdud*),¹²⁴⁾
- [the visible object factor] which makes a person perceive physical objects (*gzugs can rnam pa rig byed*),¹²⁵⁾ and
- [that which] combines visible forms and [visual] sense faculty (*gzugs dang dbang po mnyam sbyor*).¹²⁶⁾

Among them, the first two are “color” and “shape”. The *mDzod phug* (T) insists that there are six types of color including the mixed color. According to the *mDzod 'grel*, the five types of color are white, black, red, blue, and yellow, while the mixed color is orange.¹²⁷⁾ The *Bon sgo gsal byed* gives a different list of six types of color: white, yellow, blue, red, black, and green (instead of orange).¹²⁸⁾ Thus, Bon gives a color typology different from the one proposed in Buddhism, which gives only four types of color: blue, white, red, and yellow.¹²⁹⁾ Even within the Bon tradition, there were different traditions about the classification of the mixed color.

The *mDzod 'grel* explains that “shape” comprehends circle (*zlum po*), square (*gru bzhi*), and others,¹³⁰⁾ but the other shapes are not mentioned. The *Bon sgo gsal byed* classifies “shape” into 20 divisions,¹³¹⁾ mentioning half-circle (*zla gam*), square (*gru bzhi*), triangle (*gru gsum*), rectangle (*nar mo*), and circle (*ril mo*) as the only examples without any reference to the other shapes.¹³²⁾

The third visible form is the explanation, from a causal perspective, that form is composed of the four primary elements and so on. The last two visible forms are the explanation about action: the fourth is about its function of enabling the acknowledgement of physical forms; the fifth is about its function of combining the visible forms and visual sense faculty.

3-3-2. Sound

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of sound (*sgra*, **śabda*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of auditory consciousness which perceives the [sound]” (*de gang zhig rang 'dzin nyan shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa*).¹³³⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the sound into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹³⁴⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of sound with their corresponding explanation:

- interior sounds created by sentient beings (*shes pas zin pa nang gi sgra*),¹³⁵⁾
- exterior sounds produced by causal resemblance by non-sentient things (*ma zin rgyu mthun phyi yi sgra*);¹³⁶⁾
- sounds produced by their agents, [sounds] produced at the request [of other people], and [sounds] produced by both [their agents and requests from other people] (*byed pas byas bskul gnyis ka'i sgra*),¹³⁷⁾
- [the object factor] which makes a person perceive auditory objects (*sgra can*)

nam pa rig byed);¹³⁸⁾ and
 –[that which] combines sounds and [auditory] sense faculty (*sgra dang dbang po mnyam sbyor*).¹³⁹⁾

Among them, the first two are sounds created by sentient beings and non-sentient beings. The third is the explanation about its agent. The last two are about action: the fourth is about its function of enabling the acknowledgement of auditory objects; the fifth is about its function of combining sounds and auditory sense faculty.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not adopt the above five-fold classification but explains as follows: the sound is divided into four: the sound created by sentient beings, such as a footstep (*sems kyis zin pa'i sgra nges gom lta bu*); the sound produced by non-sentient things, such as the sound of the wind (*sems kyis ma zin pa'i sgra rlung sgra lta bu*); the sound which expresses [any meaning], such as a language (*sems su ston pa'i sgra rjod byed kyi tshig*); and the sound which does not express [any meaning], like the [sound of the wind] mentioned above (*sems su mi ston pa'i sgra gong ma*).¹⁴⁰⁾ They are further subdivided into external and internal sounds.¹⁴¹⁾ There are thus eight types of sound in total.

However, the “external sound” and the “internal sound” substantially accord with the “sound produced by non-sentient things, such as the sound of the wind” and the “sound created by sentient beings, such as a footstep”. Therefore, there are substantially four types of sounds which are different from the eight types of sound identified in Buddhism.¹⁴²⁾ Actually, pleasing [sounds] (*manojña, yid du 'ong ba*) and unpleasing [sounds] (*amanojña, yid du mi 'ong ba*) are not given in the *Bon sgo gsal byed*.

3-3-3. Smell

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of smell (*dri, *gandha*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of olfactory consciousness which perceives [smell]” (*de gang zhig rang 'dzin sna shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa*).¹⁴³⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the smell into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹⁴⁴⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of smell with their corresponding explanation:

- sweet smell with pleasing fragrance (*yid 'ong ngad ldan dri zhim*);¹⁴⁵⁾
- non-sweet smell with unpleasing smell (*yid 'dzur ngad mnam dri mi zhim*);¹⁴⁶⁾

- smell [which is] neither [sweet nor non-sweet] (*de las gzhan pa'i dri dag*);¹⁴⁷⁾
- [the object factor] which makes a person perceive olfactory objects (*dri can rnam pa rig byed*);¹⁴⁸⁾ and
- [that which] combines smells and [olfactory] sense faculty (*dri dang dbang po mnyam sbyor*).¹⁴⁹⁾

Among them, the first three are three types of smell: pleasing, unpleasing, and neither pleasing nor unpleasing smells. The last two are about action: the fourth is about its function of enabling the acknowledgement of olfactory objects; the fifth is about its function of combining smells and the olfactory sense faculty.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not adopt the above five-fold classification but classifies the smell into four: sweet (*zhim*), non-sweet (*mi zhim*), appropriate (*mnyam pa*), and bad (*ngan pa*).¹⁵⁰⁾

In Buddhism, smell is classified into good smell (*sugandha, dri zhim pa*) and bad smell (*durgandha, dri nga ba*), and further subdivided into appropriate smell (*samagandha, dri mnyam pa*) and inappropriate smell (*viṣamagandha, dri mi mnyam pa*).¹⁵¹⁾ Thus, Bon and Buddhism have partially different names for types of smell but they are almost identical.

3-3-4. Taste

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of taste (*ro, *rasa*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of gustatory consciousness which perceives [taste]” (*de gang zhig rang 'dzin lce shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa*).¹⁵²⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the taste into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹⁵³⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of taste with their corresponding explanation:

- tasty (*bda'*), sweet (*mngar*), bitter (*kha*), and hot (*khyug*) tastes;¹⁵⁴⁾
- sour (*skyr*), harsh (*rtsub*), and salty (*lan tsha*) tastes;¹⁵⁵⁾
- strong (*ska*), weak (*sla*), and bad (*zhan pa*) tastes;¹⁵⁶⁾
- [the object factor] which makes a person perceive gustatory objects (*ro can rnam pa rig byed*);¹⁵⁷⁾ and
- [that which combines] tastes and [gustatory] sense faculty (*ro dang dbang po mnyam sbyor*).¹⁵⁸⁾

Among them, the first three enumerate 10 types of taste in total. The last two

are about action: the fourth is about its function of enabling the acknowledgement of gustatory objects; the fifth is about its function of combining tastes and gustatory sense faculty.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not adopt the above classification into five but classifies tastes into six: bitter (*kha*), sweet (*mngar*), strong (*ska ba*), hot (*tsha ba*), sour (*skyur ba*), and salty (*lan tshwa*).¹⁵⁹⁾ Buddhism also postulates six types of taste: sweet (*madhura*, *mngar ba*), sour (*amla*, *skyur ba*), salty (*lavāṇa*, *lan tshwa*), hot (*kaṭuka*, *tsha ba*), bitter (*tikta*, *kha ba*), and strong (*kaṣāya*, *bska ba*).¹⁶⁰⁾ Here we can find its similarity with the Buddhist classification. The *Bon sgo gsal byed* also introduces another tradition of seven types of taste adding a rotten taste (*myags pa*).¹⁶¹⁾

3-3-5. Tangible Object

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of tangible objects (*reg bya*, **spraṣṭavya*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as “that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of tactile consciousness which perceives [a tangible object]” (*de gang zhig rang ‘dzin lus shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa*).¹⁶²⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies tangible objects into five types, but it does not mention their names.¹⁶³⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of tangible objects with their corresponding explanation:

- cold (*grang*), hot (*dro*), smooth (*‘jam*), and rough (*rtsub*) feelings;¹⁶⁴⁾
- full (*‘grangs*), hungry (*bkres*), thirsty (*skom*), and satiation (*ngoms*) feelings;¹⁶⁵⁾
- heavy (*lci*), light (*yang*), ill (*na*), and painful (*tsha*) feelings;¹⁶⁶⁾
- [the object factor] which makes a person perceive tangible objects (*reg bya rnam par rig byed*),¹⁶⁷⁾ and
- [that which combines] tangible objects and [tactile] sense faculty (*reg dang dbang po mnyam sbyor*).¹⁶⁸⁾

Among them, the first three enumerate 12 types of tangible objects in total. The last two are about action: the fourth is about its function of enabling the acknowledgement of tangible objects; the fifth is about its function of combining tastes and tactile sense faculty.

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not adopt the above classification into five but classifies tangible objects into eight: smooth (*‘jam*), rough (*rtsum*), light (*yang*), heavy (*lci*), hot (*tsha*), cold (*grang*), hungry (*bkres*), and thirsty (*skoms*) feelings.¹⁶⁹⁾

Buddhism generally enumerates 11 types of tangible objects: four primary

elements and smooth (*slakṣṇatva*, *'jam pa*), rough (*karkaśatva*, *rtsub pa*), heavy (*gurutva*, *lei ba*), light (*laghutva*, *yang ba*), cold (*sīta*, *grang ba*), hungry (*jighatsā*, *bkres pa*), and thirsty (*pipāsā*, *skom pa*) feelings, but the hot feeling is omitted.¹⁷⁰⁾ The author of this paper presumes that Buddhism omits the hot feeling because tangible objects include the fire element, which possesses the heat factor. On the other hand, Bon excludes the fire element from tangible objects, so they need to add the hot feeling (*tsha*) into the list.

We need to note that Buddhism includes the four primary elements: fire, water, earth, and air into tangible objects, while Bon considers they are different from tangible objects, being independent factors which belong to the 15 subdivisions of the aggregate of form.¹⁷¹⁾

3-4. Imperceptible Form

While the *mDzod phug* does not give the definition of the imperceptible form (*rig byed min pa'i gzugs*, **avijñaptirūpa*), the *Bon sgo gsal byed* defines it as the “form which is not perceived as material [by the five types of sense faculty] but appears as a form which is the object of the mind” (*gzugs dngos su ma grub cing yid yul du gzugs su snang ba*).¹⁷²⁾

The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies the imperceptible form into five types but it does not mention their names.¹⁷³⁾ The *mDzod phug* (T) presents five types of imperceptible form with their corresponding explanation:

- [im]perceptible form produced from a meditative state (*rig byed ting 'dzin 'byung gzugs*);¹⁷⁴⁾
- invisible and unobstructed [imperceptible form] (*bstan du med pa thogs med*);¹⁷⁵⁾
- [the form] which is still imperceptible even after being produced [through meditation] (*zin kyang rig par mi byed*);¹⁷⁶⁾
- imperceptible [form] produced through the four states of meditative concentration (*bsam gtan bzhis bskyed rig mi byed*);¹⁷⁷⁾ and
- [imperceptible] form which is emanated from the mind, which controls all [sense faculties] (*kun 'dus yid las sprul gzugs*).¹⁷⁸⁾

The *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not adopt the above five-fold classification but explains the concept of imperceptible form from the point of the two vehicles: Hīnayāna regards imperceptible form as possessing a real existence, while Mahāyāna regards it in conceptual and non-substantial terms. Hīnayāna regards monastic precepts (*sdom pa*) [in the desire realm], [the four states of] meditative concentration (*ting nge 'dzin*) [in the form realm], and the four

perception spheres (*skye mched mu bzhi*) [in the formless realm] to be imperceptible forms, while Mahāyāna regards them as non-substantial and conceptual.¹⁷⁹⁾

4. Conclusions

This paper outlined the theory of the aggregate of form in Bon. The peculiar characteristic of Bon is that it postulates 15 sub-categories of the aggregate of form. Both Bon and Buddhism admit the same 11 sub-categories (five sense faculties, five cognitive objects, and imperceptible form). Bon further adds the four primary elements (earth, water, fire, and air) to the 11 sub-categories and postulates 15 types of aggregates of form in total. Unlike Bon, Buddhist Abhidharma treatises such as *AK*, *AS*, and *PS* include the four primary elements among tangible objects (*spraṣṭavya*).

Which Buddhist treatises had an influence on Bon regarding this inclusion of the four primary elements into the aggregate of form? Here we would like to focus on *PS*, which presents similarities with Bonpo theories of the aggregates of perception (*saṃjñā*) and formation (*samskāra*).¹⁸⁰⁾

Like the Bonpo tradition, *PS* also adopts a structure which divides the aggregate of form into the “four primary elements” (*caturmahābhūta*, ‘*byung ba chen po bzhi*) and “those which are caused by the four primary elements” (*upādāyarūpa*, *rgyur byas pa’i gzugs*). The latter includes the five sense faculties, the five cognitive objects, and imperceptible form. Among them, we need to focus on tangible objects. In the section of “those which are caused by the four primary elements”, *PS* does not explain the whole list of tangible objects but “only a part of the list of tangible objects” (*spraṣṭavyaikadeśa*, *reg bya’i phyogs gcig*)¹⁸¹⁾ which excludes the four primary elements.¹⁸²⁾ Thus, the sum of the four primary elements and a part of the list of tangible objects is equivalent to the whole classification of tangible objects. *PS* substantially includes the four primary elements into tangible objects unlike Bon, which separates the four primary elements from tangible objects and includes them into the aggregate of form.

PS’s structure of division is attested in old Abhidharma treatises. For example, in his *Prakaranapāda* (*Apidamo pinlei zu lun* 阿毘達磨品類足論), one of the “Six Abhidharma Treatises” (六足論) of the Sarvāstivādin school, Vasumitra (世友, ca. second cen. BCE) divided the aggregate of form into the “four primary elements” and the “forms caused by the four primary elements” (i.e., the 11 sub-categories of the aggregate of form).¹⁸³⁾ As a matter of course, Tibetan thinkers seem unlikely to have referred to the *Prakaranapāda*, which has a similar structure of explanation of the aggregate of form but was not

translated into Tibetan. Presumably the *PS* is quite likely to have had an influence on the Bonpo theory of the aggregate of form in consideration of the similarity with the other aggregates.

We also need to note that there are different traditions about the theory of form within Bon. The *mDzod phug* (Z&T) classifies each of the 15 sub-categories of the aggregate of form into five but it does not explain each item in detail. The *mDzod phug* (T) systematically explains the five subdivisions in detail. On the other hand, the *Bon sgo gsal byed* does not give these five subdivisions.

As seen above, Bon presents a theory of the aggregate of form which has a similar structure to the Buddhist theory, especially that of *PS*. However, they have differences regarding the treatment of the four primary elements. We also found that Bon itself has different traditions regarding matters such as the classification of each 15 subdivisions of the aggregate of form.

Notes

- * I would like to express my gratitude to Geshe Thupten Gawa and Geshe Dangsang Namgyel, who helped my interpretation of Buddhist and Bonpo philosophical points of view respectively.
- 1) Regarding whether the indigenous religion Bon had really existed before the introduction of Buddhism into Tibet, Mimaki (2014: xi–xii) elaborately examined the previous research. Bon was regarded as an indigenous religion already existing in Tibet before the introduction of Buddhism. However, Western scholars such as David Snellgrove (1987 among others) and Ariane Macdonald denied the theory. Macdonald (1971 among others) insisted there was no religion called Bon but there existed one called *gTsug* or *gTsug lag*. Thereafter, Samtem Karmay (1983) found the passage: *mu stegs bon la yid ches ste* ([ordinary beings] believe in Bon, which is another religion) in an old Dunghuang manuscript and stated that Bon was regarded as a different religion by Buddhists. Then, Bon regained its position as an indigenous religion in Tibet.
 - 2) See Bon brgya dge legs lhun grub rgya mtsho, et al. (2011: No. 38).
 - 3) See Miyake (2002: 3) and Arguillère (2006: 253–258). Nyamme studied the “other group” (*gzhan sde*) that is Buddhist doctrine with Rontön in his Nalendra Monastery in Tibet.
 - 4) See Mimaki (2014: xi–x, notes 8–9). Among Tibetan Buddhist schools, the Nyingma chiefly had an influence on the Bon. In most cases Nyingma had an influence on the Bon, while we can find some cases in which it was the Bon that influenced Nyingma.
 - 5) “P.t.” is an abbreviation for Pelliot tibétain, that is the Pelliot Tibetan collection preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale de France.
 - 6) The *Dedication* (*bsNgo ba*, P.t. 239) is composed of the six sections: 1) tent preserving a dead body (*ring gur*), 2) [offerings given by] relatives (*dbon slob*), 3) pure grains (*phru sangs*), 4) sheep, 5) horse, and 6) yak. In the first three sections, the author forbids traditional goods related to funerals and encourages the readers to practice Buddhist virtuous conduct. In the last three sections, the author prohibits animal sacrifice and

encourages readers to practice Buddhist virtuous conduct.

- 7) Regarding the texts and general introduction of the *Bon sgo gsal byed*, see Mimaki and Karmay (2007).
- 8) Regarding the influence of the theory of Candrakīrti, see Kumagai (2011: 44–46).
- 9) *bDen gnyis rang 'grel* (6a6–b2): 'Jug 'grel las / de la so so skye bo rnams kyi don dam pa gang yin pa de'i 'phags pa'i snang ba bcas pa'i spyod yul rnams kyi kun rdzob tsam yin la / de'i rang bzhin stong pa nyid gang yin pa de ni de rnams kyi don dam pa yin pa'o / zhes gsungs so / (In his *MAvBh*, [Candrakīrti] says “Among them, that which is the absolute truth for ordinary beings, for saints it is only an object which appears conventionally. Its essential emptiness is the absolute truth for the [saints].”)

MAvBh (Tohoku, No. 3862, 'A, 255a5): de la so so'i skye bo rnams kyi don dam pa gang yin pa de nyid 'phags pa snang ba dang bcas pa'i spyod yul can rnams kyi kun rdzob tsam yin la / de'i rang bzhin stong pa nyid gang yin pa de ni de rnams kyi don dam pa'o //
- 10) Martin (2000) introduces bibliography and general outline of the *mDzod phug*.
- 11) *mDzod phug* (93.24–94.3): Zhang zhung sTong rgyung mthu chen dang / Bod Sha ri dbu che gnyis kyi / yul Bod dang Zhang zhung gi ru mtshams / Bye ma la g-yung drung chu mig brgyad cu rtsa gnyis kyi mgo bor / gShen rab mi bo'i bka' gzhung las / Bod dang Zhang zhung gi tshig gi tshom bdebs (sic. tshoms bsdebs) nas / snang srid gtan la phab pa rdzogs so // (I have completed [the edition of the *mDzod phug*], which is the teaching of Shenrab Miwo, whose chapters were composed in Zhangzhung and Tibetan, in order to determine the [meaning of] phenomena, by both the Zhangzhung master Tonggyung Thuchen and the Tibetan master Shari Wuche on the top of Chemala Yungdrung with 82 springs situated at the border between Tibet and Zhangzhung.)
- 12) See Martin (2000: 23).
- 13) This paper does not examine the authenticity of the *mDzod phug* or whether it was really written by Shenrab Miwo himself because we lack philological proofs and have no need to offend current adherents of Bon without any specific purpose. It is enough for the author of this paper to prove the fact that the *mDzod phug* became formally available in Tibet in 1017 regardless of whether the scripture had been composed by Shenrab Miwo or others.
- 14) See Kumagai (2016).
- 15) According to Kumagai (2016), the *mDzod phug* has a similarity with *PS* in that it classifies the aggregate of perception into three: small perception (ZZ. *de rmhe tha tse*, Tib. *rgya chung 'du shes*, Skt. **parīṭṭa-saṃjñā*), great perception (ZZ. *de rmhe ca ce*, Tib. *rgya che'i 'du shes*, Skt. **mahāgata-saṃjñā*), and boundless perception (ZZ. *de rmhe dzad min*, Tib. *dpag med 'du shes*, Skt. **apramāṇa-saṃjñā*). The *mDzod phug* accords with both *AS* and *PS* in that they enumerate 51 types of mental factor, but has more similarities with *PS* in that it enumerates 14 types of non-concurrent formation including the state of an ordinary being (*so skye'i 'du byed*, **prthagjana[ṭva]samskāra*) while *AK* enumerates 14 types of non-concurrent formation excluding the concept of state of an ordinary being.
- 16) Kumagai (2017) outlined the Bonpo theory of the aggregate of perception.
- 17) Mimaki and Karmay (2007) published a critical edition of the whole text of the *Bon sgo gsal byed*, and an exhaustive synopsis (ibid, 2007: xxxiv–xl).
- 18) We examine the following cases when the Tibetan version is not a literal translation from the Zhangzhung version.

(1) The section of the five aggregates in the *mDzod phug* (47.17–20) remains in both Zhangzhung and Tibetan:

- rko phung sog ra cung nga drug* // *gzugs kyi phung po bco lngas ston* // “the aggregate of form is explained from fifteen points of view”,
- zhim zhal sum pa'i rko phung ni* // *tshor ba'i phung po gsum gyis ston* // “the aggregate of sensation is explained from three points of view”,
- de rmhe ko phung sum pa'i gyin* // *'du shes phung po gsum gyis ston* // “the aggregate of perception is explained from three points of view”,
- gu ra nga drug ci tog ri* // *'du byed lnga bcu rtsa gnyis (sic. gcig) ston* // “the aggregate of formation is explained from 51 points of view”, and
- khing zhi shi shen sni gyad ni* // *rnam shes phung po bryad kysis ston* // “the aggregate of consciousness is explained from eight points of view”.

The Tibetan word “*phung po*” (aggregate, **skandha*) is equivalent to the Zhangzhung word “*rko phung*”. Both Tibetan and Zhangzhung versions have the word “aggregate” in the explanation of the three aggregates of form, sensation, and perception. On the other hand, neither the Tibetan nor the Zhangzhung version have the word “aggregate” in the explanation of the aggregate of formation. However, in the explanation of the aggregate of consciousness, the Tibetan version has the word “aggregate” but the Zhangzhung version does not have the word: the Zhangzhung words “*khing zhi*” and “*shi shen*” mean the Tibetan words “*rnam shes*” and “*shes pa*” respectively. Therefore, the Zhangzhung phrase “*khing zhi shi shen*” can be translated as “*rnam shes kyi shes pa*” or just “*rnam shes*” in Tibetan. We need to note that the Zhangzhung version omits the word “*rko phung*” (corresponding to the Tibetan word “*phung po*”). Thus, we can understand that the Zhangzhung and the Tibetan versions are not always literally identical.

(2) The *mDzod phug* (47.23–24) explains the visible form: “Five self-natures of visible form are explained” (ZZ. *rko seg nam zhi nga drug ni*; Tib. *gzugs kyi rang bzhin lnga bstan pa*). In this explanation, the Zhangzhung words “*rko seg*”, “*nam zhi*”, and “*nga drug*” respectively correspond to the Tibetan words “*gzugs*”, “*rang bzhin*”, and “*lnga*”. The *mDzod phug* (48.2–3) explains the sound: “Five self-natures of sound are explained” (ZZ. *'u klung rko phung nga drug ni*; Tib. *sgra yi rang bzhin lnga bstan pa*). In this explanation, the Zhangzhung words “*'u klung*” and “*nga drug*” respectively correspond to the Tibetan words “*sgra*” and “*lnga*” but there is no Zhangzhung word “*nam zhi*” (or “*ru drod*”, “*ru trod*”, or “*da dod*”) which corresponds to the Tibetan word “*rang bzhin*”. Instead, there is a Zhangzhung word “*rko phung*” corresponding to the Tibetan word “*phung po*” (**skandha*) or “*khams*” (**dhātu*), which means group or category but does not mean self-nature (*rang bzhin*, **svabhāva*). This example also proves that Zhangzhung and Tibetan versions are not always literally identical.

- 19) Haarh (1968) briefly outlined Zhangzhung grammar. Takeuchi, et al. (2001) examined and compared the old and new Zhangzhung languages as a preliminary analysis. Martin (2013) also elaborated a glossary of Zhangzhung words. There are also dictionaries of Zhangzhung language such as Tsultrim Tenzin, et al. (2008) and Martin (2010). Thus, Zhangzhung is a partially deciphered language and its grammatical system has not been completely clarified.
- 20) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 2.21): *dang po la 'dus ma byas dang 'dus byas gnyis te* / (Regarding the first, there are two: conditioned [elements] and unconditioned

- [elements].)
- 21) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 3.5–6): ‘*dus ma byas kyi mtshan nyid / rgyu rkyen las ma skyes pa yin te* / (The definition of unconditioned [elements] is that which are not produced from either causes or conditions.)
 - 22) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 5.1): *gnyis pa ‘dus byas kyi mtshan nyid / rgyu rkyen las skyes pa* / (Secondly, the definition of conditioned [elements] is that which are produced from causes and conditions.)
 - 23) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 6.6): ‘*dus byas thams cad phung po lngar ‘dus te* / (All conditioned elements are included in the five aggregates.)
 - 24) *AKBh* (chap.1, v.7-ab; Ejima 1989: 6.2–4; Pradhan 1967: 5.22–23): *rūpaskandho vedanāskandhaḥ saṃjñāskandhaḥ saṃskāraskandho vijñānaskandhaś cety ete saṃskṛtā dharmāḥ / sametya saṃbhūya pratyayaiḥ kṛtā iti saṃskṛtāḥ* / (The conditioned elements are the aggregate of form, the aggregate of sensation, the aggregate of perception, the aggregate of formation, and the aggregate of consciousness. The conditioned elements are those which are produced from conditions which gather and combine with each other.)
AKBh (chap.1, v.18; Ejima 1989: 18.17; Pradhan 1967: 12.4): *tatra skandhaiḥ sarva-saṃskṛtānāṃ saṃgrahaḥ* / (All conditioned [elements] are included in [the five] aggregates.)
 - 25) *mDzod phug* (46.12–13): *zag pa med pa’i phung po lnga bstan pa’o // (ZZ. zag ci rko phung nga drug ni //) zag pa’i phung po lnga bstan pa’o //* (The five undefiled aggregates were explained [above]. The five defiled aggregates will be explained [as follows].)
 - 26) The *Bon sgo gsal byed* postulates both five undefiled aggregates and five defiled aggregates by citing the *mDzod phug*. See Mimaki and Karmay (2007: 6.10–13): *phung po la dbye na / mDzod las / ‘dus pa phung po gnyis kyi mdzod / ces pas / zag med yon tan gyi phung po dang zag bcas skyon gyi phung po’o //* (The *mDzod phug* said “[all phenomena] are contained in either one of the two types of aggregates”, thus aggregates are classified into the “undefiled aggregate of merit” (*zag med yon tan gyi phung po*) and the “defiled aggregate of error” (*zag bcas skyon gyi phung po*.)
 - 27) *mDzod phug* (46:7–8): *tshul khrims nyis brgya lnga bcu dag // zag med phung po gcig la ‘dus //* (The 250 monastic disciplines are included into one single undefiled aggregate.)
 - 28) *mDzod phug* (46:8–9): *ting ‘dzin yan lag bcu drug dag // zag med phung po gcig tu ‘dus //* (The 16 types of meditative concentration are included into one single undefiled aggregate.)
 - 29) *mDzod phug* (46:9–10): *dmigs med shes rab yan lag dgu // zag med phung po gcig tu ‘dus //* (The nine types of wisdom without cognitive objects are included into one single undefiled aggregate.)
 - 30) *mDzod phug* (46:10–11): *nam grol yan lag brgyad po dag // zag med phung po gcig tu ‘dus //* (The eight types of liberation are included into one single undefiled aggregate.)
 - 31) *mDzod phug* (46:11–12): *nam grol ye shes gsal mthong drug (sic. lnga) // zag med phung po gcig tu ‘dus //* (The five types of clearly perceptive wisdom for liberation are included into one single undefiled aggregate.)

According to the Zhangzhung word “*nga drug*”, Tibetan word “*drug*” (six) needs to be modified to “*lnga*” (five). The Zhangzhung version gives “*rnyu khor ye mig nga drug ci*” while Tibetan version gives “*nam grol ye shes gsal mthong drug*”. That is to say, the Zhangzhung word “*nga drug*” is translated as “*drug*” (six) in Tibetan. However, we need to note that the Zhangzhung word “*nga drug*” is translated as “*lnga*” (five) in

Tibetan in the rest of the cases as follows, that is the above translation as “*drug*” (six) seems to be a mistranslation:

- mDzod phug* (46.6): *ti pung nga drug 'gi cu gyin / phung po lnga yi bye brag ston*;
- mDzod phug* (46.13): *zag ci rko phung nga drug ni / zag pa'i phung po lnga bstan pa*;
- mDzod phug* (46.17): *rko phung sog ra cung nga drug / gzugs kyi phung po bco lngas ston*;
- mDzod phug* (46.6): *la phud rko phung nga drug ni / rlung gi khams la lnga bstan pa*;
- mDzod phug* (46.6): *na ri rko pung nga drug ni / me yi khams la lnga bstan pa'o*.

Actually, the *Bon sgo gsal byed* postulates five (but not six) types of wisdom. See Mimaki & Karmay (2007: 27.11–12): *dbye na ye shes chen po lnga ste / stong nyid / me long / mnyam nyid / sor rtogs / bya grub ye shes dang lnga ru lung mtha' dag las gsungs so* // (If we classify [wisdom], there are five types of wisdom: [wisdom of] emptiness, mirror-like [wisdom], [wisdom of] equality, discriminating [wisdom], and all-accomplishing wisdom.)

On the other hand, the *mDzod 'grel* (527.2–5) postulates six types of wisdom: *rnam grol ye shes drug ni / zhe sdang rnam par grol ba stong pa nyid kyi ye shes dang / gti mug me long dang / nga rgyal mnyam pa nyid dang / 'dod chags so sor rtogs pa dang / phrag dog bya grub dang / ma rig pa rig pa'i ye shes su'o* // (Six types of wisdom of liberation are wisdom of emptiness (*stong pa nyid kyi ye shes*) which liberates from aversion (*zhe sdang*), mirror-like [wisdom] (*me long*) [which liberates from] ignorance (*gti mug*), [wisdom of] equality (*mnyam pa nyid*) [which liberates from] arrogance (*nga rgyal*), discriminating [wisdom] (*so sor rtogs pa*) [which liberates from] attachment ('*dod chags*), all-accomplishing [wisdom] (*bya grub*) [which liberates from] jealousy (*phrag dog*), and wisdom which recognizes ignorance (*ma rig pa rig pa'i ye shes*). However, there is no further detailed explanation about “wisdom which recognizes ignorance”. The sixth wisdom seems to have been added in order to accurately annotate the six types of wisdom for liberation (*rnam grol ye shes gsal mthong drug*) which might be a mistranslation from Zhangzhung language. Actually, the fifth chapter of the *mDzod phug* is an explanation of wisdom (*ye shes bstan pa*), and its commentary *mDzod 'grel* (417.20–418.6) explains the five types of wisdom excluding the “wisdom which recognizes ignorance”.

- 32) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 32.9–12): *dang po ni mDzod las / zag pa'i phung po lnga bstan pa ces pas / gzugs dang / tshor ba dang / 'du shes dang / 'du byed dang / rnam par shes pa dang lnga'o* // (Regarding the first, there are five [aggregates] of form, sensation, perception, formation, and consciousness because the *mDzod phug* says “five defiled aggregates are explained”.)
- 33) *mDzod phug* (46.14): *snang yor gzugs kyi phung po dang* // (The aggregate of form which appears.) The *mDzod phug* explains that the aggregate of sensation is that which supports blood (*khrag 'dzin*), the aggregate of perception is that which supports heat (*drod 'dzin*), the aggregate of formation is that which supports breath (*dbugs 'dzin*), the aggregate of consciousness is that which supports mind (*gid 'dzin*).
- 34) *mDzod 'grel* (529.24–530.1): *gzugs du ma 'dus pa ni gzugs kyi phung po'i don no* // (That which includes many forms is the meaning of the aggregate of form.)
- 35) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 32.17–18): *dang po gzugs kyi phung po'i mtshan nyid / dngos po gang zhig phyogs cha dang bcas pa* / (First, the definition of the aggregate of form is that which is a thing and has parts.)
- 36) *mDzod phug* (46.17): *gzugs kyi phung po bco lngas ston* // (The aggregate of form is explained with 15 [subdivisions].)
- 37) *mDzod 'grel* (530.1–2): *bco lnga ni rgyu gzugs bzhi dang / 'bras gzugs bcu dang / rig byed ma yin*

pa'i gzugs dang bco lnga'i sgo nas bstan par bya ba la / (The 15 [types of form] are four types of form of cause (*rgyu gzugs*), ten types of form of result (*'bras gzugs*), and the imperceptible form (*rig byed ma yin pa'i gzugs*.)

Bon sgo gsal byed (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 32.22–23): *dbye na gsum ste / rgyu 'byung ba'i gzugs dang / 'bras bu 'byung 'gyur gyi gzugs dang / btags pa rig byed ma yin pa'i gzugs so* // ([The aggregate of form] is classified into three: form which is the [four primary] causal elements, form which is the result originated [from the four primary elements], and conceptualized imperceptible form.)

- 38) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 33.5): *rung gi mtshan nyid / yang zhing g-yo ba* // (The definition of air is that which is light and movable.)
- 39) *PS* (2.2): Skt. *vāyudhātuḥ katamaḥ / laghu-samudiraṇatvam* / Tib. *rlung gi khams gang zhe na / yang zhing g-yo ba nyid do* // (What is the air [element]? It is light and movable.)
- 40) *mDzod phug* (46.22–47.1): *rlung gi khams la lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of air element are explained.)
- 41) *mDzod phug* (47.1): *yang zhing g-yo bar lung (sic. rlung) gi rlung* // (Air of air is that which is light and movable.)
- 42) *mDzod phug* (47.1–2): *'degs byed drod 'bebs rlung gi me* // (Fire of air is that which pushes up and heats [objects by the power of air].)
- 43) *mDzod phug* (47.2): *bsil zhing gdang bar lung (sic. rlung) gi chu* // (Water of air is that which is cool and stretches.)
- 44) *mDzod phug* (47.2): *theg chen 'khor lo rlung gi sa* // (Earth of air is [that which is like movable and solid] wheel of a large vehicle.)
- 45) *mDzod phug* (47.2–3): *mi snang dngos med nam mkha'o* // (Space [of air] is that which does not appear and is similar to non-thing.)
- 46) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 33.11): *rlung la phyi nang bar dang gsum mo* // (There are three [subdivisions] in the air [element]: exterior [air], interior [air], and intermediate [air].)
- 47) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 33.11–12): *phyi rlung la chags pa srid pa'i rlung dang / 'jig pa bskal pa'i rlung gnyis so* // (There are two [subdivisions] in the exterior air: air [of aeon] of creation and air of aeon of destruction.)
- 48) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 33.17–18): *nang gi rlung la 'phen byed las kyi rlung dang / sems can dbugs kyi rlung dang gnyis so* // (There are two [subdivisions] in the interior air: air of impelling karma and air of breath of sentient beings.)
- 49) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 34.3): *bar gyi rlung la / sbug gu sel ba'i rlung dang / nyi zla bskor ba'i rlung dang gnyis so* // (There are two [subdivisions] in the intermediate air: air cleaning *nādi* and *prāṇa* rotating sun and moon.)
- 50) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 34.9): *me'i mtshan nyid / tsha zhing / sreg pa* / (The definition of the element of fire is that which is hot and burns.)
- 51) *PS* (2.1): Skt. *tejodhātuḥ katamaḥ / uṣmā* / Tib. *me'i khams gang zhe na / tsha ba nyid do* // (What is the fire element? It is heat.)
- 52) *mDzod phug* (47.3): *me yi khams la lnga bstan pa'o* // (Five types of fire element are explained.)
- 53) *mDzod phug* (47.3): *tsha zhing sreg pa me yi me* // (Fire of fire is that which is hot and burns.)
- 54) *mDzod phug* (47.4): *rlabs kyi gcod (sic. kyis spyod) pa me yi rlung* // (Air of fire is that which functions as a wave [of fire like a flame].)

- 55) *mDzod phug* (47.4): *mnyen lcugs 'khril pa me yi chu* // (Water of fire is that which moves fluidly [like lava].)
- 56) *mDzod phug* (47.4–5): *chags pa'i 'khor lo me yi sa* // (Earth of fire is that which is like a recently cast [iron] wheel.)
- 57) *mDzod phug* (47.5): *dngos med 'od ni nam mkha'o* (Space [of fire] is that which is like an immaterial light.)
- 58) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 34.13): *dbye na phyi'i me dang nang gi me dang bar gyi me dang gsum mo* // ([Fire is] classified into three: exterior fire, interior fire, and intermediate fire.)
- 59) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 34.14): *phyi'i me la chags pa srid pa'i me dang / 'jig pa bskal pa'i me dang gnyis te* / (There are two [subdivisions] in the exterior fire: fire [of aeon] of creation and fire of aeon of destruction.)
- 60) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 35.1–2): *nang gi me la sbyor byed las kyi me dang / sems can drod kyi me dang gnyis te* / (There are two [subdivisions] in the interior fire: purifying fire and fire [i.e. heat] of temperature of sentient beings.)
- 61) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 35.7): *bar gyi me la khol byung thab kyi me dang nyi ma mdangs kyi me dang gnyis te* / (There are two [subdivisions] in the intermediate fire: stove fire which boils [water] and fire of sunlight.)
- 62) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 35.13): *chu'i mtshan nyid ye nas gsher ba'o* (The definition of water is that which is originally wet.)
- 63) *PS* (1.11): Skt. *abdhātuḥ katamaḥ / snehaḥ* / Tib. *chu'i kham gang zhe na / gsher ba nyid do* // (What is the water element? It is wetness.)
- 64) *mDzod phug* (47.5): *chu yi kham la lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of water element are explained.)
- 65) *mDzod phug* (47.6): *gsher zhing rlan pa chu yi chu* // (Water of water is that which is liquid and wet.)
- 66) *mDzod phug* (47.6): *rba drag shugs can chu yi rlung* // (Air of water is that which is like a strong and powerful wave.)
- 67) *mDzod phug* (47.6): *bag la kun sdud chu yi me* // (Fire of water is that which vaporises everything.)
- 68) *mDzod phug* (47.7): *dbang sdud 'khor lo chu yi sa* // (Earth of water is that which is like a [water] wheel which subdues [opponents].)
- 69) *mDzod phug* (47.7): *chu rlung skam dang nam mkha'i tshul* // (Space [of water] is water dried out by the wind [leaving free space].)
- 70) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 35.16): *dbye na gsum*. ([Water is] classified into three [: exterior water, interior water, and intermediate water].)
- 71) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 35.16–17): *phyi'i chu la chags pa srid pa'i chu dang / 'jig pa bskal pa'i chu gnyis te* / (Exterior water is further subdivided into water [of aeon] of creation and water of aeon of destruction.)
- 72) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 36.5): *nang gi chu la gso byed 'o ma'i chu dang / sems can khrag gi chu gnyis te* / (Interior water is subdivided into nurturing milk and blood of sentient beings.)
- 73) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 36.11): *bar gyi chu la kha char gnam gyi chu dang / chu klung sa gzhi'i chu gnyis te* / (Intermediate water is subdivided into water in the air like snow and rain and water on the ground like a river.)
- 74) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 36.21): *sa'i mtshan nyid sra zhing 'khrag pa /*

- (The definition of the element of earth is that which is hard and solid.)
- 75) *PS* (1.10): Skt. *tatra pṛthivīdhātuḥ katamaḥ / khakkhaṭatvaṃ / Tib. de la sa'i khamṣ gang zhe na / sra ba nyid do // gsher ba nyid do //* (What is the earth element? It is solidness.)
- 76) *mDzod phug* (47.8): *sa yi khamṣ la lnga bstan pa //* (Five types of earth element are explained.)
- 77) *mDzod phug* (47.8): *sra brtan mi 'gyur sa yi sa //* (Earth of earth is that which is solid and changeless.)
- 78) *mDzod phug* (47.8–9): *gyo zhing 'gul ba sa yi rlung //* (Air of earth is that which moves and shakes [like an earthquake].)
- 79) *mDzod phug* (47.9): *drod kyis kun skyob sa yi me //* (Fire of earth is that which protects everything by hot energy.)
- 80) *mDzod phug* (47.9): *ser las kun bskyed sa yi chu //* (Water of earth is that which is produced from gold-color [earth].)
- 81) *mDzod phug* (47.9–10): *rdul phran mi snang nam mkha'o //* (Space [of earth] is invisible molecules.)
- 82) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.4): *dbye na gsum.* ([The earth element] is divided into three: exterior earth, interior earth, and intermediate earth.)
- 83) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.4): *phyi'i sa ni 'og gi gser sa stong gsum dang bcas pa ste /* (Exterior earth is the gold existing underground of each of three one-thousand-fold universes.)
- 84) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.7–11): *bar gyi sa ni zhing khamṣ thams cad gser gyi sa gzhi ces dang / mKha' klong las / de nas sa la btsal ba / gser dngul zangs lcags rin chen gter ces so //* (Regarding the interior earth, it is said “All pure lands have golden ground”. The mKha' klong says “Among them, that which are looked for are hidden treasures such as gold, silver, copper, and iron”.)
- 85) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.13–15): *mig gi dbang po'i mtshan nyid / rang rgyu 'byung ba las skyes pa gang zhig / rang 'bras mig shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa /* (The definition of the visual sense faculty is that which is produced from its causes, which are the [four primary] elements, and produces its result, which is the object of the visual consciousness.)
- 86) *mDzod phug* (47.10): *mig gi dbang po lnga bstan pa //* (Five types of visual sense faculty are explained.)
- 87) *mDzod phug* (47.10–11): *kha dog de nyid gsal ba dang //* ([Visual sense faculty which recognizes] visible color, and...)
- 88) *mDzod phug* (47.11): *gzugs gsal dang (sic. dwangs) pas mnyam sbyor dang //* (Pure [visual sense faculty which] combines with visible forms, and...)
- 89) *mDzod phug* (47.11): *gam rgyang lta bur nyur (sic. rno) gsal dang //* ([Visual sense faculty of ordinary being which perceives objects] to be either near or far sharply and clearly, and...)
- 90) *mDzod phug* (47.12): *kun rtogs mthong khyab 'od gsal dang //* ([Visual sense faculty of bodhisattvas which] comprehends all [forms] and which perceives visible objects as an all-pervading light, and...)
- 91) *mDzod phug* (47.12): *gzugs kun mkha' 'dra dag pa lnga'o //* ([Visual sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] all forms to be pure like the sky. [They] are five [types of visual sense faculty].)
- 92) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.15–16): *rna ba'i dbang po'i mtshan nyid de*

- gang zhid rang 'bras nyan shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa* / (The definition of the auditory sense faculty is that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the auditory consciousness.)
- 93) *mDzod phug* (47.13): *rna ba'i dbang po lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of auditory sense faculty are explained.)
- 94) *mDzod phug* (47.13): *snang srid kun grags gsang chen dang* // ([Auditory sense faculty perceives] greatly secret [sounds of] all things heard everywhere, and...)
- 95) *mDzod phug* (47.13–14): *sgra las (sic. la) dang (sic. dwangs) pas mnyam sbyor dang* // (Pure [auditory sense faculty which] combines with sounds, and...)
- 96) *mDzod phug* (47.14): *phyogs bcu 'khor lo gnas bsgyur dang* // ([Auditory sense faculty of ordinary being which perceives the sound] circling among ten directions and [auditory consciousness which] transforms [as its function], and...)
- 97) *mDzod phug* (47.14–15): *rgyang grags lha snyan dar bu dang* // ([Auditory sense faculty of] divine ear [which perceives even small sound of] a silk cloth from a distance of one krośa, and...)
- 98) *mDzod phug* (47.15): *tshig gi tshogs rnam gzungs dag lnga'o* // ([Auditory sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] all groups of words to be dhāraṇī. [They] are five [types of auditory sense faculty].)
- 99) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.16–17): *sna dbang mtshan nyid / de gang zhid rang 'bras sna shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa* / (The definition of the olfactory sense faculty is that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the olfactory consciousness.)
- 100) *mDzod phug* (47.16): *sna yi dbang po lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of olfactory sense faculty are explained.)
- 101) *mDzod phug* (47.16): *ngad ldan kun gsal dbang po dang* // ([Olfactory] sense faculty [which perceives] all [olfactory objects] with good fragrance, and...)
- 102) *mDzod phug* (47.16–17): *dri las (sic. la) dang (sic. dwangs) pas mnyam sbyor dang* // (Pure [olfactory sense faculty which] combines with smells, and...)
- 103) *mDzod phug* (47.17): *rgyun 'jug kun snom dbang skur dang* // ([Olfactory sense faculty of ordinary beings which] combines with the stream [of smell] and controls all olfaction, and...)
- 104) *mDzod phug* (47.17–18): *kun la dri tshor yid 'ong dang* // ([Olfactory sense faculty of bodhisattvas which] perceives smell everywhere and feels comfortable, and...)
- 105) *mDzod phug* (47.18): *dri kun mkha' 'dra dag po lnga* // ([Olfactory sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] all types of smell to be pure like the sky. [They] are five [types of olfactory sense faculty].)
- 106) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 37.17–38.1): *lce dbang mtshan nyid / de gang zhid rang 'bras lce shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa* / (The definition of the gustatory sense faculty is that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the gustatory consciousness.)
- 107) *mDzod phug* (47.18–19): *lce yi dbang po lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of gustatory sense faculty are explained.)
- 108) *mDzod phug* (47.19): *kun grol dbang po 'khor lo dang* // (Gustatory sense faculty which is entirely liberated [from conceptions] like a circling [sword which cuts conceptual ignorance], and...)
- 109) *mDzod phug* (47.19): *ro la dang (sic. dwangs) pas mnyam sbyor dang* // (Pure [gustatory sense

- faculty which] combines with tastes, and...)
- 110) *mDzod phug* (47.19–20): *gso byed kun bskyed srog 'dzin dang* // ([gustatory sense faculty of ordinary beings which] perceives the tastes of nourishing, all-building, and life-supporting substances, and...)
- 111) *mDzod phug* (47.20): *kun la bde stong khyab gsal la (sic. dang)* // (Clear [gustatory sense faculty of bodhisattvas] which blissfully perceives all [tastes] to be empty, and...)
- 112) *mDzod phug* (47.20–21): *yid bzhin ro gcod (sic. spyod) mkha' 'dra lnga'o* // ([Gustatory sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes] tastes to be [pure] like the sky just as they wish. [They] are five [types of gustatory sense faculty].)
- 113) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.1–2): *lus dbang mtshan nyid de gang zhig rang 'bras lus shes yul 'dzin nus su skyed pa* / (The definition of the tactile sense faculty is that which [is produced from its causes, which are the four primary elements], and produces its result, which is the object of the tactile consciousness.)
- 114) *mDzod phug* (47.21): *lus kyi dbang po lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of tactile sense faculty are explained.)
- 115) *mDzod phug* (47.21): *kun sdud dbang chen snang yor dang* // ([Tactile sense faculty which perceives objects and which] perceives and controls all appearing objects, and...)
- 116) *mDzod phug* (47.22): *rig (sic. reg) la dang (sic. dwangs) pas mnyam sbyor dang* // (Pure [tactile sense faculty which] combines with tangible objects, and...)
- 117) *mDzod phug* (47.22): *bya ba byed pa'i bdag nyid dang* // ([Tactile sense faculty of ordinary beings which has] the self-nature of which is to act an action [of touching], and...)
- 118) *mDzod phug* (47.22–23): *bsam pa'i bdag nyid bde 'dags dang* // ([Tactile sense faculty of bodhisattvas] which enhances bliss as they wish, and...)
- 119) *mDzod phug* (47.23): *dal 'byor bde ldan mkha' 'dra lnga'o* // ([Tactile sense faculty of Buddhas which recognizes tangible objects to be pure] like the sky with the freedoms and favors and to be equipped with bliss. [They] are five [types of tactile sense faculty].)
- 120) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.3–4): *gzugs kyi mtshan nyid / 'byung ba'i nyer len can gang zhig / rang 'dzin mig shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa* / (The definition of the visible form is that which has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements, and becomes an object factor of visual consciousness which perceives the [visible form].)
- 121) *mDzod phug* (47.24): *gzugs kyi rang bzhin lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of self-nature of visible form are explained.)
- 122) *mDzod phug* (47.24): *kha dog rnam lnga 'dres 'chol drug* // (Five types of color and the mixed color as the sixth color, and...)
- 123) *mDzod phug* (47.24–48.1): *dbyibs ni*. ([Colors and] Shapes [have...])
- 124) *mDzod phug* (47.24–48.1): *rgyu spros rdul yig dang* // 'byung ba bzhi las kun sdud dang // ([Colors and shapes have their] causes of composition such as atoms and letters, and are composed of the four [primary] elements.)
- 125) *mDzod phug* (48.1–2): *gzugs can rnam par (sic. pa) rig byed dang* // ([The visible object factor] which makes a person perceive physical object, and...)
- 126) *mDzod phug* (48.2): *gzugs dang dbang po mnyam sbyor lnga* // ([That which] combines visible forms and [visual] sense faculty. [They] are five [types of visible form].)
- 127) *mDzod phug* (534.8–9): *kha dog rnam lnga ni dkar po dang nag po dang dmar po dang sngon po dang ser po'o* // *dmar ser la sogs 'dres pa dang* / (Five types of color are white, black, red, blue, and yellow. On the other hand, the mixed color is orange and so on.)

- 128) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.5–6): *kha dog la dkar ser sngon dmar nag ljang drug du mDo las gsungs so* // (The sutra says that there are six types of color: white, yellow, blue, red, black, and green.)
- 129) *AKBh* (Ejima 1989: 8.11; Pradhan 1967: 6.8): *tatra varṇas̄ catur-vidho nīlādīḥ* / (Among them, there are four types of color such as blue[, white, red, and yellow].)
- 130) *mDzod 'grel* (534.9): *dbyibs ni zlum po dang gru bzhi la sogs so* // (The shape is circle, square, and others.)
- 131) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.4): *dbye na nyi shu*. ([The shape] is classified into 20.)
- 132) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.8): *dbyibs la zla gam gru bzhi gru gsum nar mo ril mo rnams so* // (There are shapes of half-circle, square, triangle, rectangle, and circle.)
- 133) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.9): *sgra'i mtshan nyid de gang zhig rang 'dzin nyan shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa* / (The definition of the sound is that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of auditory consciousness which perceives the [sound].)
- 134) *mDzod phug* (48.2–3): *sgra yi rang bzhi lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of sound are explained.)
- 135) *mDzod phug* (48.3): *shes pas zin pa nang gi sgra* // (Interior sounds created by sentient beings, and...)
- 136) *mDzod phug* (48.3): *ma zin rgyu mthun phyi yi sgra* // (Exterior sounds produced by causal resemblance by non-sentient things, and...)
- 137) *mDzod phug* (48.3–4): *byed pas byas bskul gnyis ka'i sgra* // (Sounds produced by their agents, [sounds] produced at the request [of other people], and [sounds] produced by both [their agents and requests from other people], and...)
- 138) *mDzod phug* (48.4): *sgra can rnam par (sic. pa) rig byed dang* // ([The object factor] which makes a person perceive auditory objects, and...)
- 139) *mDzod phug* (48.4): *sgra dang dbang po mnyam sbyor lnga'o* // ([That which] combines sounds and [auditory] sense faculty. [They] are five [types of sound].)
- 140) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.10): *dbye na bzhi ste / sems kysis zin pa'i sgra nges gom lta bu dang / sems kysis ma zin pa'i sgra rlung sgra lta bu / sems su ston pa'i sgra rjod byed kyi tshig dang / sems su mi ston pa'i sgra gong ma rnams so* // (The sound is classified into four: the sound created by sentient beings such as a footstep, the sound produced by non-sentient things such as the sound of wind, the sound which expresses [any meanings] such as a language, and the sound which does not express [any meaning] like the [sound of wind] mentioned above.)
- 141) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.13): *yang na phyi'i sgra nang gi sgra gnyis ka'i sgra'o* // (There are two types of sound: the external sound and the internal sound.)
- 142) *AKBh* (Ejima 1989: 9.9–10; Pradhan 1967: 6.22–23): *upātānupātā-mahā-bhūta-hetukaḥ sattvāsattvākhyas̄ cēti catur-vidhaḥ / sa punar mano-jñāmano-jña-bhedād aṣṭavidho bhavati* / (There are four types [of sound]: the internal and external [sounds] whose causes are four primary elements, and [the sounds] which are produced by sentient beings and non-sentient things. There are also pleasing and unpleasing [sounds], therefore there are eight types [of sound] in total.)
- 143) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.14): *dri'i mtshan nyid de gang zhig rang 'dzin sna shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa* / (The definition of the smell is that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor

- of olfactory consciousness which perceives [smell].)
- 144) *mDzod phug* (48.5): *dri yi rang bzhin lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of smell are explained.)
- 145) *mDzod phug* (48.5): *yid 'ong ngad ldan dri zhim dang* // (Sweet smell with a pleasing fragrance, and...)
- 146) *mDzod phug* (48.6): *yid 'dzur ngad mmam dri mi zhim* // (Non-sweet smell with unpleasing smell, and...)
- 147) *mDzod phug* (48.6): *de la (sic. las) gzhan pa'i dri dag dang* // (Smell [which is] neither [sweet nor non-sweet], and...)
- 148) *mDzod phug* (48.6–7): *dri can rnam par (sic. pa) rig byed dang* // ([The object factor] which makes a person perceive olfactory object, and...)
- 149) *mDzod phug* (48.7): *dri dang dbang po mnyam sbyor lnga'o* // ([That which] combines smells and [olfactory] sense faculty. [They] are five [types of smell].)
- 150) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.15): *dbye na zhim dang mi zhim mnyam pa dang dri ngan pa dang bzhi'o* // ([The smell] is classified into four: sweet one, non-sweet one, appropriate one, and bad one.)
- 151) *AKBh* (Ejima 1989: 9.22–23; Pradhan 1967: 7.5–6): *caturvidho gandhaḥ / (I-10c) sugandha-durgandhayoh sama-viṣama-gandhatvāt* / (**There are four types of smell**: good smell, bad smell, appropriate [smell], and inappropriate smell.)
- 152) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.16): *ro'i mtshan nyid / de gang zhig rang 'dzin lce shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa* / (The definition of the taste is that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of gustatory consciousness which perceives [taste].)
- 153) *mDzod phug* (48.7–8): *ro mchog rang bzhin lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of ultimate taste are explained.)
- 154) *mDzod phug* (48.8): *ba' mngar kha 'khyug ro bcud dang* // (Tasty, sweet, bitter, and hot tastes, and...)
- 155) *mDzod phug* (48.8): *skyur rtsub lan tsha'i ro bcud dang* // (Sour, harsh, and salty tastes, and...)
- 156) *mDzod phug* (48.8–9): *ska sla gzhan (sic. zhan) pa'i ro nyid dang* // (Strong, weak, and bad tastes, and...)
- 157) *mDzod phug* (48.9): *ro can rnam par (sic. pa) rig byed dang* // ([The object factor] which makes a person perceive gustatory object, and...)
- 158) *mDzod phug* (48.9–10): *ro dang dbang po mnyam sbyor lnga'o* // ([That which combines] tastes and [gustatory] sense faculty. [They] are five [types of taste].)
- 159) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.17–18): *dbye na rtsa ba'i ro drug ste / kha mngar gnyis / ska ba tsha ba gnyis / skyur ba lan tshwa gnyis te drug go* // (The taste is classified into six: both bitter and sweet, both strong and hot, and both sour and salty tastes.)
- 160) *AKBh* (Ejima 1989: 9.19–21; Pradhan 1967: 7.2–4): *rasaḥ ṣoḍhā / madhurāmla-lavaṇa-kaṭuka-tikta-kaṣāya-bhedāt* // (**There are six types of taste**, because there is classification of sweet, sour, salty, hot, bitter, and strong.)
- 161) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.18): *Dang ra ma nas myags pa dang bdun du gsungs so* // (Dang ra ma says “There are seven [types of taste] including rotten taste.”)
- 162) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 38.19–39.1): *reg bya'i mtshan nyid / de gang zhig rang 'dzin lus shes kyi dmigs rkyen du gyur pa* / (The definition of the tangible object is

- that which [has substantial causes, that are the four primary elements], and becomes an object factor of tactile consciousness which perceives [a tangible object].)
- 163) *mDzod phug* (48.10–11): *reg bya'i rang bzhin lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of tangible object are explained.)
- 164) *mDzod phug* (48.10–11): *grang dro 'jam rtsub reg bya dang* // (Cold, hot, smooth, and rough feelings, and...)
- 165) *mDzod phug* (48.11): *'grangs bkres skom ngoms reg bya dang* // (Full, hungry, thirsty, and satiation feelings, and...)
- 166) *mDzod phug* (48.11): *lci yang na tsha'i reg bya dang* // (Heavy, light, ill, and painful feelings, and...)
- 167) *mDzod phug* (48.11–12): *reg bya rnam par (sic. pa) rig byed dang* // ([The object factor] which makes a person perceive tangible object, and...)
- 168) *mDzod phug* (48.12): *reg dang dbang po mnyam sbyor lnga'o* // ([That which combines] tangible object and [tactile] sense faculty. [They] are five [types of tangible object].)
- 169) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 39.1): *dbye na 'jam rtsub yang lci tsha grang bkres skoms gnyis te bryad do* // (The tangible object is classified into eight: smooth, rough, light, heavy, hot, cold, hungry, and thirsty feelings.)
- 170) *AKBh* (Ejima 1989: 10.2–4; Pradhan 1967: 7.7–9): *sprśyam ekādaśātmakam* // (I-10d) *spraṣṭavyam ekādaśa-dravya-svabhāvam / catvāri mahā-bhūtāni ślakṣṇatvaṃ karkaśatvaṃ gurutvaṃ laghutvaṃ sītāṃ jighatsā pipāsā cēti* // (The tangible object has eleven types of self-nature. The tangible object has eleven types of self-nature of substance: four primary elements and smooth, rough, heavy, light, cold, hungry, and thirsty [feelings].)
- 171) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 39.2): *gzhan sde nas me chu sa rlung bzhi yang reg byar 'dod* // (The other group (that is Buddhism) admits the four [primary elements]: fire, water, earth, and air to be the tangible object.) We need to know that the Bon does not include the four primary elements into the tangible object but include them into the aggregate of form.
- 172) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 39.3–4): *rig byed min pa'i gzugs kyi mtshan nyid / gzugs dngos su ma grub cing yid yul du gzugs su snang ba*. (The definition of the imperceptible form is the form which is not perceived as material [by five types of sense faculty] but appears as a form which is the object of mind.)
- 173) *mDzod phug* (48.12–13): *rig byed ma yin lnga bstan pa* // (Five types of imperceptible form are explained.)
- 174) *mDzod phug* (48.13): *rig byed ting 'dzin 'byung gzugs dang* // ([Im]perceptible form produced from meditative state, and...)
- 175) *mDzod phug* (48.13–14): *bstan du med pa thogs med dang* // (Invisible and unobstructed [imperceptible form], and...)
- 176) *mDzod phug* (48.14): *zin kyang rig par mi byed dang* // ([The form] which is still imperceptible even after being produced [through meditation], and...)
- 177) *mDzod phug* (48.14): *bsam gtan bzhis bskyed rig mi byed* // (Imperceptible [form] produced through the four states of meditative concentration, and...)
- 178) *mDzod phug* (48.14–15): *kun 'dus yid las sprul gzugs lnga'o* // ([Imperceptible] form which is emanated from mind which controls all [sense faculties]. [They] are five [types of imperceptible form].)
- 179) *Bon sgo gsal byed* (Mimaki and Karmay 2007: 39.4–6): *theg pa chung bas sdom pa dang / ting nge 'dzin la snang ba dang skye mched mu bzhi la sogs rig byed min par 'dod do* // *theg chen pas*

- gzugs mtshan nyid pa min te / btags par 'dod do //* (Hīnayāna regard monastic disciplines [in desire realm], [four states of] meditative concentration [in form realm], and four perception spheres [in formless realm] to be imperceptible form, on the other hand Mahāyāna regard the [imperceptible] form as non-substantial and conceptual.)
- 180) Kumagai (2016) insisted that the Bon gives more similar theories of the aggregates of perception and formation to *PS* than to *AK* and *AS*.
- 181) *PS* (2.3–5): *upādāya-rūpaṃ katamat / cakṣur-indriyaṃ śrotvīndriyaṃ ghrāṇēndriyaṃ jihvēndriyaṃ kāyēndriyaṃ rūpaṃ śabda gandho rasaḥ spraṣṭavyāikadeśo 'vijñaptiś ca /* (What is the form arisen [from the four primary elements]? It is visual sense faculty, auditory sense faculty, olfactory sense faculty, gustatory sense faculty, tactile sense faculty, visible form, sound, smell, taste, a part of tangible object, and imperceptible form.
- 182) *PS* (3.5–7): *spraṣṭavyāikadeśaḥ katamaḥ / kāyasya viśayo mahābhūtāni sthāpayitvā ślakṣṇatvaṃ karkasatvaṃ gurutvaṃ laghutvaṃ śītaṃ jighatsā pīpāsā ca /* (What is a part of tangible object? It is the object of tactile sense faculty: smooth, rough, heavy, light, cold, hungry, and thirsty feelings except for the [four] primary elements.)
- 183) 品類足論 (T26, No.1542, 692b24–27): 色云何。謂諸所有色，一切四大種及四大種所造色。四大種者，謂地界水界火界風界。所造色者，謂眼根耳根鼻根舌根身根，色聲香味，所觸一分，及無表色。

Abbreviations

- CBK** Martin, Dan, Per Kværne, and Yasuhiko Nagano, eds. 2003. *A Catalogue of the Bon Kanjur*. Bon Studies 8 (Senri Ethnological Reports 40). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- CBKT** Karmay, Samten G., and Yasuhiko Nagano, eds. 2001. *A Catalogue of the New Collection of Bonpo Katen Texts*. Bon Studies 4 (Senri Ethnological Reports 24). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- D** Tōkyō Daigaku bungakubu Indo tetsugaku Indo bungaku kenkyūshitsu 東京大学文学部印度哲学印度文学研究室, ed. 1977–1984. *Tibetan Tripitaka*, sDe dge Edition. Tokyo: Sekai seiten kankō kyōkai.
- JIBS** *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies).
- Otani** Suzuki, Daisetz T., ed. 1961. *The Tibetan Tripitaka Catalogue and Index*. 4 vols. Tokyo: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute. (repr. The Tibetan Tripitaka Catalogue and Index. Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 1985.)
- P** Suzuki, Daisetz T., ed. 1961. *The Tibetan Tripitaka: Peking Edition*. 164 vols. Tokyo: Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute.
- Tohoku** Hakuju Ui, Munetada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura, and Tōkan Tada, eds. 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons*. 2 vols. Sendai: Tohoku Imperial University.

1. Indian Sources

- AK** Vasubandhu: *Abhidharmakośa*; *Chos mngon pa'i mdzod kyi tshig le'ur byas pa*. **Skt. ed.** Pradan [1967]; Ejima [1989]. **Tib. D:** *Tohoku* No. 4089; **P:** *Otani* No. 5590.

- AKBh** Vasubandhu: *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya*; *Chos mngon pa'i mdzod kyi bshad pa*.
Skt. ed. Pradan [1967]; Ejima [1989]. **Tib. D.** *Tohoku* No. 4090; **P.** *Otani* No. 5591.
- AS** Asaṅga: *Abhidharmasamuccaya*; *Chos mngon pa kun las btus pa*.
Skt. ed. Gokhale [1947]. **Tib. D.** *Tohoku* No. 4049; **P.** *Otani* No. 5550.
- Mav** Candrakīrti: *Madhyamakāvatāra*; *dBu ma la 'jug pa*.
D. *Tohoku* No. 3861; **P.** *Otani* No. 5261. **Tib. ed.** La Vallée Poussin [1912].
- MAvBh** Candrakīrti: *Madhyamakāvatārabhāṣya*; *dBu ma la 'jug pa'i bshad pa*.
D. *Tohoku* No. 3862; **P.** *Otani* No. 5263. **Tib. ed.** La Vallée Poussin [1912].
- PS** Vasubandhu: *Pañcaskandhaka*; *Phung po lnga'i rab tu byed pa*. **Skt./Tib./Chi. ed.** Li and Steinkellner [2008]. **Tib. D.** *Tohoku* No. 4059; **P.** *Otani* No. 5560.
- PSV** Sthiramati: *Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*; *Phung po lnga'i rab tu byed pa bye brag tu bshad pa*.
Skt. ed. Kramer [2013]. **Tib. D.** *Tohoku* No. 4066; **P.** *Otani* No. 5567.

2. Tibetan Sources

bDen gnyis

Me ston Sher rab 'od zer (1058–1132 or 1118–1192):

[A] *dBu ma bden gnyis kyi gzhung* in *Sa lam rnam 'byed 'phrul sgron rtsa 'grel theg chen gzhi lam 'bras bu rtsa 'grel dbu ma rtsa 'grel skor gyi gsungs pod bzhungs*, Vol. 2 Kha, Kathumandu, 1991, No. Cha. (10 p.)

[B] *dBu ma bden gnyis kyi gzhung*, edited by Yam Lama and Samtin Jansin, Delhi, 1961. (12 p.)

bDen gnyis 'grel ba

mNyam med Shes rab rgyal mtshan (1356–1415): *Theg pa chen po'i dbu ma bden gnyis kyi 'grel ba* in *Sa lam rnam 'byed 'phrul sgron rtsa 'grel theg chen gzhi lam 'bras bu rtsa 'grel dbu ma rtsa 'grel skor gyi gsungs pod bzhungs*, Vol. 2 Kha, Kathumandu, 1991, No. Ja. (45 p.)

bDen gnyis rang 'grel

Me ston Sher rab 'od zer (1058–1132 or 1118–1192): *Theg pa chen po dbu ma'i rang 'grel gsal byed sgron ma legs par bshad pa*. *CBKT* [201–1]. (94 p.) This treatise is listed in the catalogue of Nyi-ma bstan-'dzin, cf. Kværne [1974: 117 (T35-2)].

Bon sgo gsal byed

Tre ston rGyal mtshan dpal (14th cen.): *bKa' lung spyi yi 'grel ba Bon sgo gsal byed*. (Critical edition) Mimaki and Karmay [2007].

mDzod 'grel

mNyam med Shes rab rgyal mtshan (1356–1415): *Srid pa'i mdzod phug kyi 'grel ba 'Phrul gyi sgron me. sNang srid mdzod phugs kyi skor (gSang ti se bon gzhung rig mdzod dpe tshogs*, Vol. 12), Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2010, pp. 369–657.

mDzod phug

Rediscovered by gShen chen Klu dga' (996–1035): *Srid pa'i mdzod phug kyi gzhung. sNang srid mdzod phugs kyi skor (gSang ti se bon gzhung rig mdzod dpe tshogs*, Vol. 12), Beijing: Mi rigs dpe skrun khang, 2010, pp. 1–94.

Secondary Sources

Arai Hiroaki 荒井裕明. 1999. “Jōjitsuron’ ni okeru shikiun no teigi” 「成実論」における

- 色蘊の定義 (Definition of *Rūpa-skandha* in the **Satyasiddhiprakaraṇa*). Komazawa Tanki Daigaku bukkyō ronshū 駒澤短期大學佛教論集 (Journal of Buddhism) 5: pp. 55–67.
- Arguillère, Stéphane. 2006. “*mNyam med Shes rab rgyal mtshan* et la scolastique *bon* au tournant du XIV^e et du XV^e siècles: Présentation de la *Prodigieuse lampe des terres et des voies*”. *Acta Orientalia* 67: pp. 243–323.
- Bon brgya dge legs lhun grub rgya mtsho, Shin’ichi Tsumagari, Musashi Tachikawa, and Yasuhiko Nagano. 2011. *Bonpo Thangkas from Rebkong*. Bon Studies 13 (Senri Ethnological Reports 95). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Dás, Sarat Chandra. 1881. “The Bon (Pon) Religion.” *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 50-1: pp. 187–205.
- Ejima Yasunori, ed. 1989. *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Chap. 1. Tokyo: Sankibo Press.
- Gokhale, V.V. 1947. “Fragments from the Abhidharmasamuccaya of Asaṅga”. *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society New Series* 23: pp. 13–38.
- Haarh, Erik. 1968. *The Zhang-zhung Language: A Grammar and Dictionary of the Unexplored Language of the Tibetan Bonpos* (Acta Jutlandica 40-1). København: Universitetsforlaget i Aarhus.
- Karmay, Samten. 1983. “Un témoignage sur le bon face au bouddhisme à l’époque des rois tibétains”. In *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy*, ed. Ernst Steinkellner and Helmut Tauscher, Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Symposium held at Velm-Vienna, Austria, 13–19 September 1981. 2 vols., vol. 2: pp. 89–116. (Repr. Eng. “Early Evidence for the Existence of Bon as a Religion in the Royal Period”, in *Arrow and the Spindle, Studies in History, Myths, Rituals and Beliefs in Tibet*, Kathmandu: Mandala Book Point, pp. 157–168.)
- Kramer, Jowita, ed. 2013. *Sthiramati’s Pañcaskandhakavibhāṣā*. Part 1: Critical edition. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House/Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Kumagai Seiji. 2011. *The Two Truths in Bon*. Kathmandu: Vajra Publications.
- _____. 2016. “Bonpo Abhidharma Theory of Five Aggregates”. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 64-3: pp. 1192–1199.
- _____. 2017. “The Bonpo Abhidharma Theory of Perception (*Saṃjñā*)”. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 65-3: pp. 1185–1192.
- Kværne, Per. 1971. “A Chronological Table of the Bon po: The Bstan rcis of Nyi ma bstan ‘jin”. *Acta Orientalia* 33: pp. 205–248.
- _____. 1974. “The Canon of the Tibetan Bonpos, Part Two: Index of the Canon”. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 16-2: pp. 96–144.
- La Vallée Poussin, Luis de. 1912. *Madhyamakāvātāra par Candrakīrti*. St.-Petersbourg: Impr. de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- Li Xuezhong and Ernst Steinkellner, eds. 2008. *Vasubandhu’s Pañcaskandhaka*. Beijing: China Tibetology Publishing House/Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.
- Macdonald, Ariane. 1971. “Une lecture des Pelliot Tibétain 1286, 1287, 1038, 1047, et 1290: Essai sur la formation et l’emploi des mythes politiques dans la religion royale de Sroṅ-bcan sgam-po”. In *Études tibétaines dédiées à la mémoire de Marcelle Lalou*, ed. Marcelle Lalou. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient: pp. 190–391.
- Martin, Dan. 2000. “Comparing Treasuries: Mental States and Other mDzod phug Lists and Passages with Parallels in Abhidharma Works by Vasubandhu and Asaṅga or in

- Prajñāpāramitā Sūtras: A Progress Report”. In *New Horizons in Bon Studies*, ed. Samten G. Karmay and Yasuhiko Nagano, Bon Studies 2 (Senri Ethnological Reports 15), Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology: pp. 21–88.
- _____. 2001. *Unearthing Bon Treasures: Life and Contested Legacy of a Tibetan Scripture Revealer, with a General Bibliography of Bon*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 2010. “Zhang-zhung Dictionary”. *Revue d'études tibétaines* 18: pp. 5–253.
- _____. 2013. “Knowing Zhang-zhung: The Very Idea”. *Journal of the International Association for Bon Research* 1: pp. 175–197.
- Mimaki Katsumi. 1994. “A Fourteenth Century Bon po Doxography, the *Bon sgo gsal byed* by Tre ston rGyal mtshan dpal: A Preliminary Report toward a Critical Edition”. In *Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies (Fagernes 1992)*, ed. Per Kværne. 2 vols., Vol. 2. Oslo: Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture: pp. 570–579.
- _____. (御牧克己). 2014. *Tukan “Issai Shūgi” ‘Bonkyō no shō’ トウカン 『一切宗義』 「ボン教の章」* (A Study of the Grub mtha’ of Tibetan Buddhism, The Chapter on Bon in Thu’bkwan’s Grub mtha’ śel gyi me loñ). *Studia Tibetica* 47. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.
- Mimaki Katsumi and Samten Karmay. 2007. *Bon sgo gsal byed (Clarification of the Gates of Bon): A Fourteenth Century Bon po Doxographical Treatise*. Kyoto: Graduate School of Letters, Kyoto University.
- Miyake Sinichirō 三宅伸一郎. 2002. “Shērapu Gyentsen no denki ‘Mukashi no oshie’ ni tsuite” シェーラブ・ギエンツェンの伝記『昔の教え』について (Biography of Sherab Gyaltzen, the *Past Doctrine*). *Ōtani gakuhō* 大谷學報 81-4: pp. 1–15.
- Pradhan, Prahalad, ed. 1967. *Abhidharmakośa-Bhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. 4 vols. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Rossi, Donatella. 1999. *The Philosophical View of the Great Perfection in the Tibetan Bon Religion*. Ithaca; New York: Snow Lion Publications.
- Snellgrove, David, ed. 1967. *The Nine Ways of Bon: Excerpts from gZi-brjid*. London; New York; Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1987. *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism: Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*. Boston: Shambhala Publications.
- Stein, Rolf Alfred. 1962. *La civilisation tibétaine*. Paris: Dunod.
- Takeuchi Tsuguhito, Yasuhiko Nagano, and Sumie Ueda. 2001. “Preliminary Analysis of the Old Zhangzhung Language and Manuscripts”. In *New Research on Zhangzhung and Related Himalayan Languages*, ed. Yasuhiko Nagano, and Randy John LaPolla. Bon Studies 3 (Senri Ethnological Reports 19), Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology: pp. 45–96.
- Tsultrim Tenzin, Pasar, Changru Tritsuk Namdak Nyima, and Gatsa Lodro Rabsal. (ed. Yasuhiko Nagano and Samten G. Karmay). 2008. *A Lexicon of Zhangzhung and Bonpo Terms*. Bon Studies 11 (Senri Ethnological Reports 76). Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- Tucci, Giuseppe. (trans. from the German and Italian Geoffrey Samuel). 1980. *The Religions of Tibet*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.