

the borders of Syrian territories belonging to the Assassins³⁶.

³⁶ The most important point in the document of William of Tyre — alleged efforts of the sect leader in order to convert the Assassins to Christianity — thus found its way in a similar form in the work of Jacob of Vitry, the papal legate in the Holy Land. The latter writes as follows — „*Ita tamen, quod ejusdem essent conditionis et libertatis, ut alii Christianorum legi subiecti. Erant enim tunc temporis fratribus militiae Templi tributarii, duo millia byzantium eisdem annuatim persoluentes pro securitate cujusdam terrae suae, quae in confinio terrae praedictorum fratrum sita erat, qui multas eis molestias occasione vicinitatis inferre consueverant. Praefatus autem Assassinorum magister unum de familiaribus suis, virum eloquentem, prudentem et strenuum, de quo plurimum confidebat, misit ad regem Hierosolymitanum. Rex autem intellecta causa legationis, pro tanti populi visitatione, et tot animarum a laqueis diaboli liberatione Deo gratias agens, nuntium Senis cum summo gaudio et honore magno recepit; et ipsum ad propria revertentem, ut domino suo bonam regis et Christianorum voluntatem, et magnum desiderium nuntiaret, usque ad fines terrae suae deduci praecepit. Qui dum fines suos jam fere ungressurus Tripolim pertransisset, quidam ex nostris, vir Belial et iniquus, Dei timorem ante oculos suos non proponens, hominem de regio ducatu, et fidei Christianorum sinceritate confidentem, improvisum et nil tale sibi metuentem, in detrimentum Christiani nominis, et maxime Ecclesiae Orientalis, occidit*”, *Hist. Hierosolymitana* (lib. I, c. 14), ed. F. Mosch, Duaci 1597, pp. 42—43; reproduced in „*Gesta Dei per Francos*” of Bongars, tomus I, Hannoveriae 1611, p. 1063.

IRENEUSZ KANIA

THE SEVENTH CHAPTER OF THE *rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long* AND A PROBLEM OF TIBETAN ETYMOLOGY *

INTRODUCTION

The present translation of the Chapter 7 of the famous Tibetan Chronicle *rGyal rabs gsal ba'i me long* („The Clear Mirror of Royal Genealogies”) is based upon the critical edition of its text, established by B. I. Kuznetsov and published by E. J. Brill, Leiden,

* I wish to express here my sincere thanks to Dr. B. I. Kuznetsov from the University of Leningrad and to Dr. Géza Uray from the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, for having kindly read through, and pronounced their opinions about, the manuscript of the below translation.

I am also greatly indebted to Dr. T. Marszewski from the Jagellonian University of Cracow; indeed, it was he who has called my attention to the problem of the maize designations to be presumedly found in the *rGyal rabs*, and, on the basis of the precious information he had gathered during his journey to Assam and Himalaya in 1960, has suggested to me the possibility of *so ba's* meaning ‘maize’ in the text of the Chronicle.

To Mr. Verschoor, General Secretary of the E. J. Brill Publishing House, Leiden, Holland, I am obliged very much for the permission to publish this translation.

Last, but surely not least, I express my deep gratitude to Mr. Gyatsho Tshering, Acting Director of the Central Tibetan Library, Headquarters of H. H. the Dalai Lama, Dharamsala, India, for his constant and disinterested assistance throughout my Tibetan studies.

in 1966 as the 1st volume of the Series „Scripta Tibetana”. The Chronicle itself, dated by Kuznetsov for approximately 1368, had been compiled by Sa skya pa bSod nams rgyal mtshan, abbot of the famous bSam yas monastery in dbUs, and enjoyed during many centuries great notoriety in Central Asia.

The object of this paper is by no means haphazard-choosen one. As a matter of fact, the contents of the chapter translated here will surely be of interest for specialists of various branches of science, above all ethnologists and ethnobotanists. Therefore, the main object of this publication is to make the text accessible to those specialists, probably only rarely familiar with Tibetan language and religions. On the other hand, until now there exists no full translation of the Chronicle into any European language whatsoever, though, since I. J. Schmidt's time, some chapters of it (4, 5, 8, 18) were sporadically translated. Chapter 7 hadn't yet had that luck, (when not taking into account a detailed résumé of it, given by Kuznetsov)¹ and I wonder why. As a matter of fact, it belongs, beyond any doubt, to the most interesting parts of that Chronicle, although its character is almost exclusively mythological.

I think it would be out of place here to trace a detailed historical and philological background of the subject. This has been already done by Kuznetsov in his Introduction to the critical edition of the *rGyal rabs*. It may be added only to the numerous and precious informations to be found therein that the problem of chronology of the Chronicle would need perhaps some words of explanation more, e.g. the Tucci's hypothesis searching its origin in the beginning of the 16th century². It seems also useful to remind here some details about the legend which forms the kernel of the chapter translated. This legend, alleging that the descent of Tibetan race was due to the union of the monkey and a mountain witch (or ogress, Tib. *brag srin mo*, skr. *rākṣasī*), is widely spread among Tibetan people. It is to be found as well

¹ B. I. Kuznetsov, *Tibetskaja legenda o proischoždenii čeloveka ot obez'jany* (Tibetan Legend About the Descent of Man from a Monkey), Geogr. Obščestvo SSSR, Doklady po Etnografii, Vyp. 6, Leningrad 1963

² G. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, 2 vols, Rome 1949.

in some other monuments of medieval Tibetan literature, as for example *Maṇi bka' 'bum*, *Padmai bka' thang sde lnga* (see Das)³, *bKa' chems ka khol ma* (attributed to the king Srong btsan sgam po), and so on. Since all of them enjoy great authority with many learned Tibetans and in the Tibetan tradition⁴ (*Maṇi* belongs to the so-called *gTer ma* books, highly esteemed; its authorship was attributed to Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara himself, then to the king Srong sgam), such legends are held to be orthodox, while those naming the Klu (skr. *Nāga*) as Tibetans' ancestors are not, belonging to Bon po mythology.

Our legend has two main morphological variants: the first mentions four children of the monkey; they were to be ancestors of the four chief Tibetan tribes, all named after ancient tribal demons⁵. The second variant mentions six descendants of the married couple, and seems to be younger on account of its being related to the Buddhist doctrine of transmigration (number six corresponding with six spheres of Saṃsāra, see note 26)⁶.

It was, until quite lately, commonly thought that the legend

³ S. Ch. Das, *Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, 2nd reprint, New Delhi, 1970.

⁴ With some exceptions. For example, the famous Bu ston Rin po che (XIVth cent.), author of the *Chos 'byung* (History of Buddhism in Tibet and Mongolia, transl. by E. Obermiller) makes but a mention of this legend when discussing the problem of the origin of Tibetan race. Another illustrious Tibetan scholar, 'Gos lo tsā ba gZon nu dpal (XIV—XVth cent.), author of the „Blue Annals” (*Deb ther sngon po*, transl. by G. M. Roerich) is still more reticent in this respect, writing thus: „Without contradicting scriptures and reason, one may safely state that the country of Tibet was similar to that of India in regard to country and people [...]” (Book i).

⁵ The role played by the number four in Bon po deserves attention. We have for example four classes (*ru*) of Bon po deities, propitiated by priests divided into four classes (cf. Tucci, *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, vol. 1, p. 713).

⁶ This difference is due, in R.-A. Stein's opinion, only to the intricate system of relationship in ancient Tibet: „L'hésitation entre la classification par quatre et celle par six s'explique par une hiérarchie selon laquelle deux éléments du groupe (sc. frères cadets — I. K.) sont classés à part”. — R. A. Stein, *Les tribus anciennes des marches sino-tibétaines*, Paris 1959, p. 8.

had been of Indian origin⁷, albeit Tucci⁸ doesn't consider such a possibility as unique. No matter how it may be, the pattern of our legend fits well the morphology of a wide-spread archetype consisting in tracing the origin of mankind back to a mythic animal or union of an animal and a primordial man, being an incarnation of a deity.

Now I would like to dwell here a little upon that extremely interesting passage of the below translation where different kinds of cultivated plants are mentioned. I mean the one named *so ba* in Tibetan text, and rendered by me, after Das, as 'thick-shelled barley'. As a matter of fact, its meaning is far from being absolutely clear. In dictionaries we have: 'thick-shelled barley' (Jäschke, after Das), 'unhusked grain' (Semičov)⁹, 'Roggen' (Richter)¹⁰. Therefore we see that this meaning is subject to changes in function of time and, perhaps, space (e.g. dialectal areas).

I am of opinion that in the text we are dealing with, *so ba* can signify 'maize', if there is any question of maize whatever in a text dating from the 14th century. In fact *so ba* (also *so'a*) and, above all, the Bhutanese *se bu* 'maize'¹¹ seem to be derived

⁷ B. I. Kuznetsov has advanced an interesting theory on this point (Kuznetsov, *Tibetskaja...*). As regards the place of birth of this legend, Stein maintains that it is to be searched in Eastern Tibet rather than in southern regions. He means especially the K'iang, an ancient tribe dwelling on the Sino-Tibetan borderland. Indeed, there exists in their folk-lore a similar legend, attested already in the 1st half of the 7th century (Stein, *Les tribus...*, p. 65). Further, the names of the chief Tibetan tribes, allegedly descendants of the monkey and the mountain witch, are of eastern origin (*ibid.*).

⁸ Tucci, *Tibetan...*

⁹ B. V. Semičov, Yu. M. Parfionovič, B. D. Dandaron, *Kratkij tibetsko-russkij slovar'* (A Short Tibetan-Russian Dictionary), Moscow 1963.

¹⁰ E. Richter, *Tibetisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig 1966.

¹¹ „*Se bu* — a Bhutanese name applied to designate one of the maize races cultivated by the Bhutanese inhabiting a small village Payung, about 1,5 km to the south-east of Algorah (to the north of Kalimpong) in the Darjeeling district, West Bengal” — according to a personal communication by Dr. T. Marszewski and his paper *The Age of Maize Cultivation in Asia (A Review of Hypotheses and New Ethnographical, Linguistic and Historical Data)*, *Folia Orientalia*, IV, 1962, Kraków 1963, p. 273.

from *so* 'tooth'; lh. *se'u* 'pomegranate' has probably also to be associated, to a certain extent, with *so*¹². The semantic and morphological similarity of these words is striking; indeed both *se bu* and *se'u* denote tooth-shaped grains. It is curious to observe that e.g. the Polish name of a kind of maize (*Zea mays*, flint corn) is 'koński ząb', literally 'a horse's tooth'.

With all this being so we have nevertheless *ma rmos* (*pa'i*) *lo t(h)og* for 'maize' in to-day Tibetan. This rather lengthy periphrasis we do find thrice in our text. Yet, unlike Marszewski¹³, I am convinced it cannot mean here 'maize' nor any defined sort of cereals. The analysis of the few passages of the below chapter and of Chapter 1 where that (and similar)¹⁴ expression occurs, clearly shows this. As a matter of fact, everywhere in our chronicle *ma smos pa'i lo thog* or *ma smos pa'i 'bras* simply means 'uncultivated crops' or 'fruits', 'crops (fruits) grown up without being sown [by the hand of man]', and stresses in this way their supernatural origin. Indeed, they were sown by the Sublime Avalokiteśvara himself, after he had retired them from a cleft in the fabulous Mount Sumeru.

The data furnished by the dictionaries now in my disposal seem to corroborate this hypothesis: in fact, Semičov and Das give as the first meaning of *ma rmos pa'i lo t(h)og* 'uncultivated crops, wild-growing rice' and so on; then comes 'maize'. Only Richter quotes 'maize' as the unique meaning of the above expression.

Now, why do we have only *ma rmos pa'i lo tog* for 'maize' in to-day literary Tibetan? Where this meaning of *so ba* is gone?

Well, it seems that *se bu* 'maize' is an archaism, since it has been found on a peripheral area (a Bhutanese village). The primi-

¹² In spite of its being linked with Ancient Tibetan *se* (cf. R. Shafer, *The Vocalism of Sino-Tibetan*, JAOS, Vol. 60, 1940). However, a possibility of phonetic „assimilation” of *se* (which in Anc. Tib. signified 'fruit') denoting the pomegranate to *so* 'tooth' and its derivatives cannot be excluded since the kernels of that fruit really resemble the teeth.

¹³ Cf. T. Marszewski, *The Age of Maize Cultivation in Asia (Further Investigations)*, *Folia Orientalia*, t. X, 1963, Kraków 1969, pp. 129/130 and 180.

¹⁴ ... *ma smos 'bras sa lu, ma smos pa'i 'bras* (*rGyal rabs*, Chapt. 1, p. 4).

tive distinctness of its prototype (**so bu* or *so ba*)¹⁵ could have been blurred on account of the phonetical development and polysemy in central areas (cf. *supra*), what made it necessary to replace it by another word, for example *ma rmos pa'i lo thog*, longer and by far more expressive.

This attempt to explain the semantic evolution of *so ba*, purely linguistical, is, curiously enough, corroborated by another circumstance of a quite different nature. We find indeed in Waddell (his *Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism*, 2nd ed., Cambridge 1934) some mentions about *ma rmos pa'i lo thog*, tantamount to „self-sprung crops”, and representative of one of 4 wordly treasures, in traditional Tibetan drawings and paintings, e.g. the image of the Universe (p. 81, footnote 5), the Wheel of Life (p. 87), and the Maṇḍala (p. 399, item N° 17). Everywhere in these representations *ma rmos pa'i lo thog* is used to designate *all kinds* of the self-sprung crops, taken together. Since these symbolical crops are „usually painted as Indian corn or maize” (*ibid.*, p. 87) (probably on behalf of its conspicuous and distinct shape), it can be taken for granted, I think, that in the course of time this general denomination of the self-sprung crops was — naturally enough — associated with *the* maize.

A thorough research of Tibetan iconography would permit perhaps to establish, with a certain degree of accuracy, the epoch in which this semantic shift took place. Such research, combined

¹⁵ With *ba* difficult to explain, unless we accept one or both of the following possibilities:

- a) the grammatical-semantic relation *so ba* : **so bu* (*se bu*) can be the same as *rtar ka*, *star kha*, *star ga* ‘*Diaspyror embryopteris aglutinosa*, walnut’: *star bu* ‘the berries of *Hippophae rhamnoides*’, or *smyug ma* ‘bamboo’; *myu gu* ‘shoot, sprig, branch’, *ril ba* ‘a round or globular object’: *ril bu* ‘ball, pillule’ (see G. Uray, *A Tibetan Diminutive Suffix*, Acta Or. Hung., vol. 2, 1952, p. 207); in other words, a relation of the generic plant name to its produce — fruits or shoots, etc.;
- b) *ba* seems to have, among many other functions, also that of an augmentative suffix (Uray, *ibid.*, p. 216); in such case an opposition of *ba* and *bu* for augmentative/diminutive would appear.

Besides this, we must always account for an „alternance perpetuelle des voyelles”, referred to by Stein (*op. cit.*, p. 65).

with further dialectological, historical, ethnobotanical etc. investigations of Tibet and adjacent areas will surely shed more light upon this interesting problem. Its solution is likely to have far-reaching consequences, especially for scholars dealing with the history of Tibetan agriculture.

TRANSLATION

„Then the Sublime Avalokiteśvara¹⁶, having ordained as upāsaka¹⁷ a monkey working miracles, sent him in Tibet, the Snowy Kingdom, for meditation. There this monkey was meditating on a reddish rock. And, just when he directed his thoughts to compassion, mercy [towards sentient beings] and enlightenment and when, in adoration, he contemplated the deep Dharma and experienced the all-pervading Void¹⁸ — an ogress of rocks¹⁹, tormented by karmic effects, arrived there. After having made many wanton gestures, she went away. Then, having assumed the shape of a woman, she told the monkey: „Let us be husband and wife, you and I”. Whereupon the monkey replied: „If I become your husband, I must break my vows, since the Sublime Avalokiteśvara had ordained me as upāsaka”, and the ogress said: „If you don’t become my husband, my life is over” and she lay down near the monkey. Then, having arisen, thus spoke to him:

¹⁶ The Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara (Tib. *sPyan ras gzigs*), believed by Tibetan Buddhists to be taking special care of their country and its inhabitants.

¹⁷ *Upāsaka* (skr.) ‘follower, worshipper’, synonymous to *śrāvaka* ‘listener’, a lay Buddhist devotee „with only eight vows to observe” (Das Dict.).

¹⁸ Skr. *Śūnyatā* ‘void, emptiness’ — the ultimate nature of all manifested reality, not accessible to positive definition, the most important philosophical category of Mahayanic Buddhism. „*Śūnyatā* is a principle that negates all contradictions in «self» existence. *Śūnyatā* only negates but does not affirm”. (XIVth Dalai Lama, *An Introduction to Buddhism*, N. Delhi, 1965). The experience of *Śūnyatā* is one of the most important aims of Buddhist meditation.

¹⁹ Skr. *rākṣasī*, demoness in Indian mythology, subsisting on dead bodies and drinking blood.

„O great king of monkeys, hearken to me and reflect a little!
It is on account of my bad Karman that I was reborn as an
[ogress.

Because of my great lust I desire and love you!
By the force of this love I follow you and beg your mercy!
If we, you and I, are not to live together,
I will finally become wife of some rākṣasa
(And we will kill 10000 sentient beings every day,
While, in the evening, we will eat up one thousand of living
[creatures.)

Then, after an immense quantity of little rākṣasas will be born,
This very Snowy Kingdom of Tibet will become a rākṣasas'
town, and every sentient being which is in it will be devoured
[by them.

Therefore reflect a little and be merciful towards me!”

When she uttered these words in a despaired voice and with
tears in her eyes, the monkey-Bodhisattva thought: „If I become
husband of this ogress, I must part with my upāsaka vows. If
not, the sin will be great”²⁰. And, in a twinkling of the eye, he
fled away to the Mount Potala²¹, where he stood before the
Sublime Avalokiteśvara and [with reverence] thus spoke to Him:

„O Merciful One, Protector of all living beings!

Here I am, who guarded my upāsaka vows like my own life;
Notwithstanding this, a certain ogress of the *bdud*²² lineage,
[seized by desire,

And following me, has induced me to abandon my upāsaka
[vows.

²⁰ The monkey is about to make a choice between his own benefit
and that of the others. To choose this latter possibility is to make the
Bodhisattva's vow.

²¹ Legendary mountain somewhere in southern India, considered
to be the abode of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara and Āryā Tārā.
The famous residence of the Dalai Lamas in Lhasa (Potala) was named
after it.

²² One of the numerous kinds of Tibetan demons, dwelling on black
rocks (M. Lalou, *Les religions du Tibet*, Paris 1957).

How, then, am I to observe them further, what have I to do!
Pray, be so good, o Merciful Protector, and ponder over the
[matter!”

After he has uttered this prayer, the Sublime One spoke thus:
„Be the husband of that ogress!” And both the Mistress Āryā
Tārā²³ and Bhṛkuṭī²⁴ said from the heaven: „This will be very
good!” Then the Sublime One, having given His benediction to
both [the monkey and the ogress] as married couple, granted the
Snowy Kingdom the three graces and blessed it so that the Bud-
dha's Teaching may in the future spread over it and remain long
therein, and that uninterruptedly Masters learned in the Doctrine
[Kalyānamitra] may appear in it.

Then, having opened the precious treasure He sent forth, by
power of His benediction, Bliss and Happiness to the ten quarters²⁵.

After that the monkey and the ogress married and, from the
six states of transmigrating²⁶ [in the wheel of Saṃsāra] sentient
beings six little monkeys of different minds were born: the black-

²³ Tib. *sGrol ma*, one of the feminine tutelary deities of Tibetan
Buddhism and Avalokiteśvara's spouse. After a Tibetan legend (see
rGyal rabs, chapt. 5) she was born out of Avalokiteśvara's tears.

²⁴ Tib. *Khro gnyer can*; Waddell (cf. his *Tibetan Buddhism or La-
maism*) holds her to be another form of Tārā.

²⁵ In Indian (hence Tibetan) cosmography eight chief quarters on
horizontal plane plus zenith and nadir. Synonymous with „universe”.

²⁶ The structure of the wheel of existence (Saṃsāra) as represented
in Tibetan iconography is the following (from the top in clockwise
direction):

1. Humans (Tib. *mi*),
2. Pretas („ *yi dvags*),
3. Hell („ *dmyal ba*),
4. Animals („ *dud 'gro*),
5. Asuras („ *lha ma yin*), often referred to as demi-gods
6. Gods („ *lha*).

The wheel is held by gŚin rje (Yāma); in its nave three symbols of
the three karmic forces setting the wheel in motion can be seen: a cock
(symbolizing craving and greed), a hog (standing for ignorance and
delusion) and a snake (wrath and passion).

faced one, transmigrating from the hell²⁷ of living beings became very resistant against sufferings; that coming from the pretas'²⁸ state was less long-suffering; it was moderate at eating. The monkey-child transmigrating from the abode of animals was stupid and exceedingly stuck-up, whereas that who came from the state of men was wise and timid; the one descended from the Asuras'²⁹ state controlled well its envy. That which came from the gods' abode had an unflinching temper and soul serene.

Then the monkey-Bodhisattva their father carried them over onto a tree full of fruits, called Nagma Djatshok, where he abandoned them for three years. After this time the monkey-Bodhisattva went there and saw that, by the force of Karman, they have multiplied up to 500. They were becoming short of fruits, so that they [finally] got nothing to feed on. Father and mother didn't eat anything. And the little cried: „Father, mother, what have we to eat?“. And raised the hands in a gesture of despair, poor and miserable. Then the monkey-Bodhisattva thought: „I am not fallen into the power of misery; only these little monkeys — by my having observed the commandments of the Sublime One — are!“ — he thought and in a twinkling of the eye he stood on the Mount Potala before the Sublime One, and thus spoke to Him with reverence:

„O [Sublime One]!

Having not known that home and family are the existence's [prison,

and, similarly, unaware of having been deluded by the [demoness,

I stuck in the mud of Samsāra, thrown into it by [my own] [progeny;

Unaware of the desire's ghee being empoisoned,

Moved by compassion, I fell in love and went astray.

²⁷ Tib. *dm̄yal ba*, which is usually rendered as 'hell'. The Buddhist hell nevertheless has little to do with e.g. the Christians', since the sojourn therein is not eternal, ending up when the bad Karman, responsible for this punishment, has ripened and got exhausted.

²⁸ Cf. foot-note 26.

²⁹ Cf. foot-note 26.

Desire-bound, I am crushed by a mountain of pains;
Despaired, feeding on poison, tormented by the plagues of bad
[Karman

I suffer, beaten down by a heap of toils.

Poor me! Compassionate Protector, what can I do to nourish
[my children?

Whatever counsel you give me, I'll do accordingly,

Now I am like in the pretas' town;

Then, undoubtedly, I will be reborn in hell.

Therefore I beg you, o Compassionate One, take me under
[your protection!"]

After he has uttered this prayer, the Sublime One deigned to say: „I will protect your kin!“ Afterwards he rose and, having drawn from a cleft in the Mount Sumeru³⁰ some seeds of barley, wheat, peas, buckwheat and thick-shelled barley³¹, threw them onto the earth. And the spot, without being ploughed, became filled with crops. Then the monkey-Bodhisattva conducted thither his children and, having shown them the crops, said: „Eat up, this is the High Mount's eating!“³². When the little monkeys ate that food and became satiated, their hair grew shorter, so their tails; they learnt to speak and were transformed in humans. They lived on what had been born by the unploughed soil, and dressed in tree leaves. So the inhabitants of the Snowy Tibet descend from the father — monkey and the mother — ogress of rocks; they differentiated in two lineages: namely those who took after the father monkey-Bodhisattva were long-suffering, very merciful and diligent; they had predilection for virtue; their words were soft and speech fluent. Such was the father's lineage, whereas those belonging to that of the mother, the ogress of rocks, were lustful, very irritable, addicted to trading and gain, self-willed and passionate. They liked to laugh and were very strong of body and

³⁰ In Indian cosmography, the centre of the Earth, through which the *axis mundi* passed. Abode of the chief deities of Indian pantheon.

³¹ See Introduction. That the cereals' culture in Tibet is old, it results also from the „Old Tibetan Chronicle“, where six kinds of cereals are mentioned. Cf. G. Uray, *Acta Or. Hungarica*, Vol. XXV, Fasc. 1—3, 1972, his translation of the Queen's Songs.

³² Sc. Mount Sumeru.

soul. Incapable of stopping their activities even for a while, heads always filled with different thoughts at a time, dexterous at work and precipitate, fostering the five poisons³³, rejoiced at hearing of the others' sins — that was the mother's lineage —; irascible and hot-tempered.

Afterwards the mountains were covered with forests, and the river-beds were filled with water; a hole had opened in the earth whereto all the waters streamed together and ran into the abyss, whereafter all the plains became fields and numerous towns have arisen. Soon after this gNya khri btsan po became king of Tibet. [And] it is said that such was the origin of the king and the subjects.

Chapter seven about the descent of the Tibetans from a monkey and and ogress of rocks".

³³ It is curious to observe that we have to do here with an enumeration of 5 moral poisons (Bon theory), whereas Buddhists think them, as a rule, to be three. These poisons are: lust, hatred, ignorance (Buddhists) plus pride and jealousy (Bon). See Das Dict., p. 626—627.

DOCUMENTS ET COMMUNICATIONS

J. CH. BÜRCEL

LÜGE UND WAHRHEIT IN DER KLASSISCHEN ISLAMISCHEN DICHTUNG

Ein Beitrag zur Wesensbestimmung der arabischen und persischen Poesie.

In seiner bekannten Untersuchung „Die Bildersprache Nizamis“ hat Helmut Ritter eine unterscheidende Wesensbestimmung der arabischen und persischen Poesie mit den Worten „Ohren-Mensch“ (Araber) und „Augen-Mensch“ (Perser) unternommen. G. E. von Grunebaum hat in einem der in „Kritik und Dichtkunst“ vereinigten Aufsätze die Fragwürdigkeit dieser Unterscheidung angedeutet und demgegenüber, in einem andern Aufsatz der gleichen Sammlung, eine aristotelisch-kunsthandwerkliche von einer platonisch-inspirativen Richtung unterschieden, wobei er die Trennungslinie weniger zwischen Arabern und Persern, als zwischen sufischen und nicht-sufischen Dichtern zieht.

Unsere Ueberlegung geht demgegenüber von der Wahrheitsfrage aus, wie sie von Dichtern und Poetikern des islamischen Mittelalters selbst gestellt und beantwortet wurde, und stösst von ihr aus zu einer Wesensbestimmung vor, die versucht, die einzelnen Unterschiede einer jeweils anderen Weltansicht zuzuordnen, wobei kaum gesagt zu werden braucht, dass diese Unterschiede erst in der Masse greifbar werden, wie sich die persische Poesie von dem arabischen Leitbild befreit und zu sich selber, d. h. zu ihrer islamisch-persischen Form, findet (das Schahnamah bildet