

STUDY OF SANSKRIT GRAMMAR IN TIBET

—BHĀJAGOVINDA GHOSH

Cultivation of Sanskrit literature in Tibet, for more than a thousand years, commencing with the great religious kings is a well known fact. Lost treasures of Sanskrit literature are recovered from the most faithful and yet idiomatic translations in Tibetan language. To sustain the cultivation of Sanskrit literature study of grammar became an obligatory discipline and Tibetan scholars made several worthy contributions in this matter. We intend to write on one such work described below and now an important accession in Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, Sikkim.

Title of the work: SGRAHI-BSTAN-BCHOS-RNAM-BSHAD-HOD-ZER-BRGYA-PA; 131 leaves measuring 20"x4" each; author: HGYUR-MED-TSHE-DBANG-MCHHOG-GRÜB-NGES-DON-BSTAN-HPHEL; place of composition: KAH-THOG-RDO-RJE-GDAN; composed in 14th RAB-BYUNG.

Of all the Indo-Iranian linguistic records the oldest is the Rgveda. From the language of the Rgveda we can trace a steady development to classical Sanskrit through the later Samhitas and Brahmanas. For the classical form of the old language the native grammarians used the name Sanskrit, meaning—polished, cultured, correct (according to the rules of grammar), in contradistinction to Prakṛta the speech of the uneducated masses. (Burrow: *The Sanskrit Language*) The process of development was accentuated by the remarkable achievements of early Indian grammarians, whose analytical skill far surpassed any achieved until much later in the western world. The influence of the ancient grammarians, was fully acknowledged in Panini's *Ashtadhyāyī*. The date of Panini is most commonly fixed in the fourth-fifth century B.C. The native tradition connects him with the Nanda King of Magadha. He was born in the north-west of India at a village called Salatura near the modern Atak.

Yuan Chuang saw a statue of Panini near Atak. Panini's grammar consists of some 4,000 aphorisms. These were supplemented and to some extent corrected by Katyayana. An extensive commentary was written by Patanjali on Panini's aphorisms. In later period grammati-

cal works of diverse schools existed in abundance. But none of them have any independent authority, being derivatives completely from Panini.

The earliest among them was Katantra which was composed by Sarvavarman a contemporary of Satavahana dynasty of the Deccan. Of later works here mention may be made of the grammar of Candra (6th century A.D.) which achieved great popularity among the Buddhists (Burrow) as Jainendra Vyakarana (c.678) among the Jains. Later the Polymath Hemacandra produced also for the Jains the *Haima Vyakarana*.

Other works which won local acceptance were mostly of later date. The *Samkshiptasara* of Kramadisvara—was composed after 1150 A.D. and was popular in western Bengal. Vopadeva's *Mugdha-bodha* and *Kavikalpadruma* won great popularity in Bengal and were written after 1250 A.D. Padmanabhadatta's *Supadma Vyakarana* written about 1375 A.D. was popular in Vangala. *Sarasvati Prakriya* along with its commentary by Anubhutiśvarupacarya was popular in Magadha and Varanasi.

Here it is interesting to refer to a Tibetan grammarian like བཟུན་འཛིན་གྲལ་སའོན་ (alias: བཟུན་མ་དག) the compiler of lexicon-cum-grammar entitled རིགས་པར་སྦྱར་བ་རྩེའི་སྐད་དང་གངས་ཅན་པའི་

བདེའ་ཤན་སྦྱར་བ་བྱི་བུལ་ནོར་བུ་བཞུགས་སོ།།

(same as *Prajna* of 1771 A.D. published by Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, *Lexicon-Dictionary Portions* 1961 and *Xylograph Reproduction* 1962). This eminent scholar categorically affirms the celebrity of Kalapa and Candra in introduction of the XIVth and last book ཀ་ལ་པའི་

སའོན་པས་སྦྱོར་དང་མིང་ལའུར་ལག་ལེན་ or rules from Kalapa Vyakarana for euphonic combination (*Sandhi*) and declension (*Vibhakti*) of words (pages, 271-319), in the following words : རིགས་པར་སྦྱར་བའི་གཞུང་ལུགས་སྟོན་

པའི་སྐུ་མ་དོ་ཆེན་པོ་བཟུང་ལ་སོགས་པའི་བརྗོད་བྱའི་སྟེང་པོ་བསྐྱུས་པ། འཕགས་པོ་དོ་གྱི་སྦྱོངས་སུ་བདེའ་སྟོན་ག་ཅན་གཉིས་ཞེས་ཉི་ཟླ་རྩུང་བུགས་པའི་ཡ་གྲལ།

“The *Kalapa* and *Candra Vyakaranas* famous in Aryadesa and Tibet are the two solitary stars like the sun and moon respectively and

are actually compiled with indispensable elements from great grammars like *Ashtadhyayi* (Paninian grammar) etc.”

The author of the Sanskrit grammar under discussion also observes almost same in the following passage: ………

བཀའ་ལྟར་སྐུ་ལ་དབུས་སོགས་སུ་དར་སྲིལ་ཆེ་ཞིང་། བོག་མར་གཞུང་འདི་ལ་ཞུགས་
ནས་གཞེད་ཀ་ཙན་སོགས་ལ་འཇུག་པ་ཡིན་ཞེས་བྲགས་ཤིང་།

“This text was much favoured in central and other parts of Aryadesa. It was the tradition to study at first *Sarasvati vyakarana* and then to introduce *Kalapa* and *Candra Vyakaranas*”.

Keith observes “The oldest among the later grammars probably Katantra (also called Kaumara or Kalapa) certainly had much influence in Kashmir and Bengal. Originally of four books, it appears with supplements both Tibetan translation and in Durgasimha’s commentary fragments have been found in Central Asia and the Dhatupatha is extant only in the Tibetan version” (*A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 431). Tibetan tradition ascribes to Sarvavarman the use of the grammar of Indragomin, and the work seems to have been popular among the Buddhists in Nepal. The *Candra-vyakarana* was popular in the Buddhist countries Kashmir, Tibet and Nepal and had reached Ceylon (Ibid. p.431).

The above mentioned facts and the author’s observance, such as that, *Anubhavisvarupacarya* made use of the Vyakarana Sutra of Ka-Tsan (i.e. Kalapa and Candra) in composing *Sarasvati-Prakriya* also shows that, this grammar is of third category. The author states that, Acarya wrote this grammar under goddess Sarasvati’s special favour, that though concise in form it is vast in meaning, and deals with grammatical questions, such as, gender, case, etc.

In spite of its being classed in third category, due to its compactness and easy comprehensibility it was favoured by the ancient scholars of Magadha and Varanasi. In ancient time Magadha was the western adjunct of Vangala and therefore we may guess its popularity in Vangala also. It invariably found its way to Tibet via Nepal, through the disciples and followers of the Three Panditas from Aryadesa, referred to in the work under discussion.

Before we set out to speculate on the merits of this work
 སྐུའི་བཟུན་བཅོས་ནས་བཤད་འདོད་ཟེར་བརྒྱ་བ། it would be appropriate to
 notice the observations made by the author himself.

Just after Prologue the author states that Acarya Anubhuti-
 varupa was a Brahmin born in the country of Maharashtra in south of
 Aryadesa. The goddess Sarasvati herself favoured him with the instruc-
 tion on the system of grammar celebrated after her name. Though
 this is abridged in form yet is profound in meaning and deals with such
 subjects as gender and case section by section. So this grammar is
 flawless, thickly-set and unobscure. This contains the grammatical
 rules in special and general aspects and easily understandable; so it was
 favoured in central as well as other parts of the Land of Enlightenment.
 The tradition was to break the ground with Sarasvat grammar and then
 proceed to study of Kalapa and Candra-vyakaranas.

According to this work Pandita Balabhadra and Krishnamisra
 met Taranatha and rendered both the aphorisms and the dissertation
 of Sarasvat into Tibetan language, Taranatha also completed his commentary
 on Sarasvata Vyakarana;

ེ་ལས་པོད་ཀྱི་རྫོངས་འདིར་བམ་ཟེ་པ་རྒྱ་ཏ་བ་ལ་བ་དུ་
 དང་གྱི་ལྷ་མི་ཤ་དག་གིས་ཟེ་ནང་རྩེ་བཙུན་ལ་འཇལ་ནས་མ་དོ་དང་རབ་བྱེད་པོད་སྐད་
 དུ་བསྟར་ཅིང་རྩེ་བཙུན་དམ་པས་འབྲེལ་བའང་མཐའ་ཚོད་པར་མཇོད།

Later during the period of the Fifth Dala Lama (ཕུག་ན་པདྨ་ལྷ་པ་
 ཚེན་པོའི་དུས་) hDarva Lotsava (the translator hailing from Darva,) with

the aid of the same two Pandita s translated the aphorisms and the
 dissertation into Tibetan. Againsin later period hJam-mgon Situ-rin-
 po-che studied difficult topic of this grammar with the aid
 of འཕྲིན་ལྷན་པའི་བཤེན་པོ་ or རྒྱ་བ་འཇུག་བཤེན་པོ་ and it is said a new rendering
 of the dissertation of this grammar into Tibetan was written by him.

“Although these early and later translations were elegant and
 excellent, those were too vast and deep, so it is very difficult for the
 people of current time to comprehend the same. Besides these books
 have now become rare. As in the later dissertations only declensions
 are given, but no formulae for deriving words are included. Those
 are so concise and difficult to comprehend that even a reader of such
 precious dissertations is very rare in Tibet”.

“Some would still prefer the short treatise of Anubhūtiśvarūpa-
cārya because this will help them to enter into the vast literature on the
subject, like Kalapa and Candra-vyākaraṇa. I myself utilized a later
translation of aphorisms and its dissertation, and for the obscure points
I looked up the commentary of Taranātha. I have adapted several
principal words from the book entitled’ *ལྷུ་མཐའ་རིན་ཆེན་འབྲུང་* deal-
ing with declension for the utilization of the beginners, necessary
cross references, above and below, are made for convenience as tradi-
tional. In short, I have endeavoured to make this commentary lucid
and useful”.

At the end acknowledgement is thus made, “Here ends the
Sarasvatī-Prakriyā composed by the illustrious Parivrajaka Paramahansa
Acārya Anubhūtiśvarūpa”.

Then there are verses at length discussing and eulogising, the
science of grammar.

The concluding Folio (131 a) says. “Thus as the copies of
commentary by omniscient Taranātha on Sarasvatī grammar is rare and
as this has much been fragmented in Tibet, so it has become difficult
to introduce this grammar to the beginners. The dissertation *प्रक्रिया-*
(*རབ་དུ་བྱེད་པ་*) by Situ Rinpoche is a concise comment and difficult
to understand, and the text was somewhat corrupted through the fault of
scribes. Therefore it was thought that a more lucid as well as simple
commentary could be made available for the future”.

“While I was contemplating this commentary and was proceeding
on my slow wit I had the ever persistent encouragement at the hands
of Bhikṣhu *དགེ་སྤྱོད་རྩོམ་པ་འགྲུ་མཚོ་* who was vastly
learned in both *Kalapa* and *Candra-vyākaraṇa* systems. Myself hGyur-med
tshe-dbang-mchog-grub-nges-don-bstan-hphel being a loyal elder monk
of Kah-Thog am consciously devoted to the great Acārya of Orgyan—
Padmasambhava. The name bestowed upon me by my Acārya on
the completion of my study was, *རྩོམ་པ་འགྲུ་མཚོ་ལྷུ་མཐའ་རིན་ཆེན་*
མེད་ལེན་འགྲུ་མཚོ་འཇམ་, I wrote in 14th Rabbyung, in the phase of full-
moon of twenty-second or twenty-third constellation (Sraṇa) corres-
ponding to July-August at Kahthog Dorjedan (*ཀམ་ཐོག་དོར་ཇེད་ནང་*) in a

forest retreat for meditation known as Yang-dben-byang-chub-shing (ཡང་དབེན་བྱང་ཚུབ་ཤིང་) in the hours of break. The scribes were the inspirers, Dorje Zinpa himself and རབ་འབྲུམ་སེང་གེ་མཚོ་ལྷ་མོ་

The customary invocation for “happiness and welfare in all directions” is made in Sanskrit transcribed in Tibetan thus:

ས་པོ་རི་ཀླུ་ལེ་ཏུ་ འུ་ལྷོ་མཛུ་ལ་ རྒྱ་ལྷོ་སེང་ལྷོ་
 सर्वदिक्कालेषु शुभंमङ्गलनाभासापनुतु ।

“Although there are many obscure points in the text, my pupil འུ་ལྷོ་ལྷོ་ རབ་འབྲུམ་སེང་གེ་མཚོ་ལྷ་མོ་ has thoroughly checked the text on the basis of *Kalapa* and *Candra-Vyakarana* and *Amarakosa* and so on.”

སྤྲེལ་སྤྲེལ་ལོ།།

A synopsis of the work

The foregoing is a free translation of the introductory and conclusive portions of the work under discussion. We now present its many interesting points for the utilization by the scholars and discuss some of them. Those are as follow:—

- (i) Acarya Anubhutiśvarūpa the author of *Sarasvati-Prakriya*; its utility and local celebrity.
- (ii) Brahmin Pandita Balabhadra and Krishnamisra meeting Taranatha and translation of Anubhutiśvarūpa’s grammar.
- (iii) Taranatha’s completion of the commentary on this grammar.
- (iv) hDar-ba-lo-tsva-ba’s translation of the grammar with the aid of the two Panditas during the time of Fifth Dalai Lama.
- (v) Situ Rinpoche’s study of this grammar with Pandita Vishnupati.
- (vi) Author’s acknowledgements of new translations besides recourse to Taranatha’s commentary.

(vii) Adaptation of words of genders from **सुधा-सप्तद-**

संज्ञा-सूत्रम् ।

viii) The utility and value of translation of this grammar.

(ix) Author's encouragement by Gelong dorje Zinpa erudite scholar in *Kalapa* and *Candra Vyakarana*.

(x) The author's title as master of grammar.

(xi) Place and date of compilation.

Now we propose to discuss the following points:—

(i) The authorship of the original (Sanskrit) work.

The Indian grammarians of Sarasvat school, Harshakirti (16th century), the author of “ **सारस्वत धातुपाठ** ” (vide. *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS*, Adyar Library, Vol. VI, No. 678) a pupil of Candrakirti, who was honoured by Sahu Salem of Delhi (1543-1553 A.D.); and Ramchandrasrama (1655 A.D.), the author of **सारस्वत-सूत्र-व्याख्या : सिद्धान्त-चन्द्रिका** (Ibid, No. 680); and the Tibetan grammarian Taranatha (1575. A.D.) Darva Lotsava (contemporaneous with Fifth Dalai Lama), Situ Rinpoche and Gyurme tshewang chogdup the present translator all testify to **अनुभूतिस्वरूपाचार्य** as the author of **सारस्वत-प्रक्रिया**. As the tradition ascribes the original sutras to the divine authorship of the goddess Sarasvati; the sutras are named **सारस्वतसूत्र** just as the 14 sutras in Panini's grammar attributed to Siva are called **माहेश्वरसूत्र**. Thus Anubhutiśvarupacarya became the founder of Sarasvata school. This assertion is further supported by the colophons found in the MSS of the work deposited in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, viz:—

इति वार्णाप्रणीतसूत्राणामष्टाध्यायी समाप्ता ।

इति सरस्वतीप्रोक्तसूत्रसप्ततं समाप्तम् ।

(vide. Nos. 4419 and 4421 of the *Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS* of the Society Vol. vi) and by the introductory verse of the commentary called *Siddhanta-Candrika* (No.680 of *Adyar Catalogue* Vol.VI). The gloss contained in the *Sarasvata-Prakriya* has been ascribed to Anubhutiśvarupacarya to whom the original sutras are said to have been revealed by the goddess Sarasvati. This has been ascertained by the statement of Darva Lotsava and the the present translator. **दे-डु-र-द-म-गी-द-म-**

ལྷ་ལ་འཕགས་མ་དབྱངས་ཅན་མས་གནས་ལུ་རིག་པའི་སྣོད་དཔོན་ཚེན་པོ་ཨ་ལུ་བྱུ་ཉི་
 ས་རྒྱུ་ཡ་ཕྱི་རྗེས་སྣ་འབྱོར་པ་རང་བཞིན་བཟང་པོ་ལ་དངོས་སྣ་ལྷ་ཡ་བའི་བད་སྣོད་པའི་
 བཟུན་བཅེས་ཚེན་པོ་དབྱངས་ཅན་གྱ་ཀ་ར་ཏེ་ཞེས་གྲགས་པའི་གཞུང་།

(འདྲེན་བ། དབྱངས་ཅན་སྣ་རྒྱ་ཀ་ Fol. 1. NIT)

ལྷོ་དཔོན་ཨ་ལུ་བྱུ་ཉི་སྣ་རྒྱུ་ཡ་ཞེས་རྗེས་སྣ་འབྱོར་པ་རང་བཞིན་ལ་འཕགས་མ་
 དབྱངས་ཅན་མས་དངོས་སྣ་བཟུང་བའི་ལེ་ར་པར་སྣུར་བའི་སྣོད་པཟུན་བཅེས་འདི།

(འགྲུར་ལེ་ར་ཚེ་དབང་མཚོ་གྲགས། ལྷ་མ་དོ། Fol. 2bNIT)

Main contention of both of them is that, Anubhutisvarupacarya was personally favoured by goddess Sarasvati in the composition of this grammar. As Darva Lotsava described the Acarya's name as

རྗེས་སྣ་འབྱོར་པ་རང་

བཞིན་བཟང་པོ་ in Sanskrit the name should be rendered as अनुभूतिस्वरूप-भद्र ;

Bhadra may be honorific suffix to the Acarya's name by a Tibetan grammarian, as Sambhota was honorific suffixed to Thonmi's name by his Indian Gurus.

Sarasvata Prakriya is in the form of a text with commentary, the text being in sutra form and the commentary in ordinary prose. The total number of sutras comes to above 1,000 of which 700 are said to be original and the rest additions made by the commentators. The number of the sutras in different Tibetan translations of Krishnabhata and Taranatha (Tanjur Catalogue No.4423, Vol.

རོ་) Darva's

Da Tika and Gyurme's *Da-Do*, have yet to be investigated from several versions reportedly extant. The work is divided into two parts namely the *Purvardha* and the *Uttarardha*, the first dealing with *Subanta* or declension, and second *Tinanta* or conjugation, *Krdanta* or verbal prefixes. The author Govindacarya in his *Sarasvata-Bhashya-Tika: Padacandrika* divides the work into five *Adhyayas*, each containing four *padas* and gives the contents of each of the 20 *padas* thus:- 1. Sanjna, 2-5, Sandhi, 6-8. Subvibhakti and Stripratyaya, 9. Karaka, 10 Samasa, 11 Taddhita, 12-19. Akhyata and 20. Krt (vide.No. 4443 of the *Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit MSS*, in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol.VI.

The date of composition of *Sarasvat Prakriya* ranges over a century from 1250 AD to 1350 AD. Sanskrit scholars like Surendra Das Gupta and Kunhan Raja do not mention at all the name of Anubhutiśvarupacarya. Keith while discussing the chronology of Sanskrit grammars merely states Anubhutiśvarupa was the author of *Sarasvati Prakriya* with commentary (Keith: *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p.432) but does not mention the Acarya's birth place. The Adyar Catalogue (Vol.VI) presumes Anubhutiśvarupacarya as an ascetic and a resident of Benaras. But we are not informed about the source of this presumption. The present translator Gyurmed Tshewang Chogdup (19th century) states དེ་ཡང་

འབགས་ ལྷམ་རྩོམ་གས་ མ་ར་ཏའི་ལྷམ་ ཏུ་བྲམ་ རི་གཙང་མའི་ རིགས་ སུ་འབྱུངས་
བའི་སློབ་དཔོན་ཨ་རུ་བློ་ཏེ་ས་རུ་བ་ཞེས་རྗེས་སུ་འབྱོར་བ་རང་བཞིན་

(སྐམ་དོ; Fol. 2 b.) i.e.

“Acarya Anubhutiśvarupa a high Brahmin by caste was born in the country of Maharashtra in the south of Aryadesa”. The colophon (Fol. 130 a) reading ཞེས་དཔལ་ལྷན་ཡོངས་སུ་གྱུ་བའི་བ་ར་ མ་རྩོམ་སློབ་དཔོན་རྗེས་སུ་

འབྱོར་བ་རང་བཞིན་གྱི་སྐྱེར་བའི་མཚོ་ལྷན་མའི་རབ་ཏུ་བྱེད་པ་རྗེས་སོ་

is clear that the author was श्रीमत्-परिव्राजक-परमहंस-अनुभूतिस्वरूपाचार्य (as we restore from Tibetan). The term Paramahansa occurring in Tibetan transcription confirms the statement of Adyar Catalogue that the author was an ascetic.

As regards his works and disciples we know from T.M. Tripathi's introduction to *Tarkasamgraha* of Anandajana (No.3. Caekward's Oriental Series).

1) That Anubhutiśvarupacarya was the same as the preceptor of Anandajana, the author of the *Tarkasamgraha*.

2) That he had besides Anandajana, another disciple called Narendrapuri alias Narendranagari a commentator on the *Sarasvata-prakriya*.

3) That he was the author of some more works, namely-
1. *GaudapadarikaBhashyaTika*, 2. *Nyayamakaranda Samgraha*, 3. *Nyayadipavali Vyakhya Candrika*, and 4. *PramanamalaNibandha*.

4) That he was a contemporary of Vopadeva (1260AD), the author of *Mugdhobodha-vyakarana*. As regards Narendrapuri mentioned above, he is said to be the author of the *Sarasvata-Prakriya* in No. 793 of the I.O. Catalogue, Part I, (Adyar Catalogue, P.211). But the statement has been refuted by T.M. Tripathi in the introduction to the *Tarkasamgraha*, as the fact is not supported by Tibetan sources.

Besides the works mentioned above one more work namely *Bhagavadgita Bhashya Tippani* goes by Anubhutiśvarupa's name. A copy is available in the Adyar Library (Ibid. Vol. VI). There are various MSS on *Sarasvata Vyakarana* (Nos 660-676 and its different sections. One in Oriya script and in Palm leaf, others in Devanagari script on paper. Evidently this school of grammarians represent an attempt to simplify the grammar of Panini.

(ii) Authorship of the Tibetan text.

Nothing much is known about the composer of this work, besides his short autobiographical account and his note about his patron monk towards the end of the work.

His personal name འགྲུང་མེད་ཚོ་དབང་མཚོ་གྲུབ་ངེས་དོན་པལ་ལྷན་ འཕེལ་ and the name he received from his Acarya ཚངས་སྤྲུལ་བཞན་ པའི་ལྷོ་ལྷན་འཛིགས་མེད་ལེགས་བཤད་ཀྱི་མཚོ་འོ་ལྷོ་ are already described. The author describes himself and his patron thus: འདི་ཉིད་ལྷ་མོ་ ལས་བྱེད་འདོད་ཀྱི་ལྷ་ཙམ་ཡིད་ལ་བཞགས་པའི་ཁར་ཉེ་ཆར་ཀ་ཙན་ལ་སྦྱངས་བ་མཐར་ སོན་པའི་དགོ་སྤོང་དོ་རྗེ་འཛིན་པ་ངག་དབང་ཀྱི་མཚོ་ནན་དན་ཚེན་ངེས་བརྒྱལ་པས་ ཀྱིན་བུས་དེ། དུས་གསུམ་མཆོད་པ་ཙམ་ཀྱིན་གྱི་སྤོབ་དཔོན་ཚེན་པོ་བརྒྱ་སྐྱེ་ལྷ་ལྷ་ལྷ་ མཚོན་ཤེས་ནས་དང་པ་ཕྱོབ་པ་ཚོས་ཀྱི་རྗེ་ཀམ་ཕོག་པའི་འབངས་ཀྱི་ཡང་ཕ་རྒྱུང་བན་ ལྷན་པོ་ཨ་འགྲུང་མེད་ཚོ་དབང་མཚོ་གྲུབ་ངེས་དོན་པལ་ལྷན་འཕེལ་ ལས་ཨ་ལྷོ་བ་དཔོན་ ཀྱིས་བཏགས་པའི་ཕ་རྒྱུད་དུ་ཚངས་སྤྲུལ་བཞན་པའི་ལྷོ་ལྷན་འཛིགས་མེད་ལེགས་ བཤད་ཀྱི་མཚོ་འོ་ལྷོ་ཞེས་བཤད་པས་སྤྲུལ་ཚོར་ཀྱི་ལོ་གོ་བཞེན་ཙན་གྱི་ཡར་ཚོས་ལ་དཔལ་ ཀམ་ཕོག་དོ་རྗེ་གདན་གྱི་ཡང་དཔོན་བྱང་ལྷུ་ཤིང་གི་ནགས་ཁྲོད་ཀྱི་བྱུ་ཁང་དུ་བྱུན་

མཚོ་མས་ རྣམས་ སུ་ གྲུབ་ པར་ བཤྱིས་ པའི་ ཡི་ ལོ་ པ་ རི་ བརྒྱལ་ པ་ པོ་ ཉིད་ རང་ རབ་
 འབྲུམས་ པ་ བསོད་ རྣམས་ མཚོ་ ལོ་ ལྷན་ ལཱ་ ཉིས་ ཀྱི་ འདུས་ བཤྱིས་ པས་

He makes an acknowledgement to his own pupil: ཐེ་ ཚོས་ གྱི་ ལཱ་ རྣམས་

མང་ ཏུ་ འདུག་ པ་ རྣམས་ ཀྱི་ ཚན་ དང་ འཚི་ མེད་ མཚོ་ རི་ སོ་ ཏུ་ གཞུང་ ལ་ བཏེན་ རྣམས་ རང་
 ལོ་ སྤོ་ ལོ་ མ་ བཏེ་ སྤོ་ རབ་ འབྲུམས་ སྐྱེ་ པ་ འཇམ་ དབྱངས་ ལྡོ་ གྲོས་ མཚོ་ ལོ་ འཛིན་ གྱིས་
 རྣམས་ དག་ རེ་ ལས་ པར་ བཤྱིས་ པས་ སུ་ མཛུགས། It is interesting to note that

the celebrated author of *Prajna* (1771 A.D.) acknowledges his own meeting with the author of the work under discussion. Thus: སྤྱར་

རབ་ བྱང་ བཅུ་ ལཱ་ མས་ པའི་ རྩོམ་ ལྷན་ ལཱ་ ལཱ་ ལོ་ ལས་ རྣམས་ ཡ་ ལྷུ་ ལ་ ལ་ ཀའོ་ ལོ་ ལོ་
 མཚོ་ ལོ་ ལྷུ་ ལ་ འབྲུང་ མེད་ ཚོ་ རབ་ མཚོ་ ལོ་ ལྷུ་ ལ་ ལྷན་ ལཱ་ ཀྱི་ ལཱ་ ལཱ་ མས་ པའི་ ཚོ་ རི་ ལྷུ་ ལ་
 བསྐྱེ་ ལྷུ་ ལ་ ལ་ ལྷུ་ ལ་ ལོ་ ལོ་ ལོ་ ལོ་ ལོ་ (Prajna, Fol, 319a NIT)

hGyur-med-tshe-dbang composed this text in 14th Rab Byung which corresponds to 1807-1867. He is known as dge-rtse-rin-po-che, ge-tse being the name of his clan. His disciple is Ze-chen-dbon-sprul mthu-stobs-rnam-rgyal—Namgayal's disciple is mkhyen-rtse-kong-sprul and his disciple is h|u-mi-pham. According to some Lama scholars further information might be available from a Namther called Rig-dzin-tshe-dbang-nor-bui-rnam-thar.

(iii) The place and date of composition.

The prologue of the book clearly states: In this country of Tibet Brahmin Pandita Balabhadra and Krishnamisra met Taranatha and translated both Sutra and its Prakriya of Sarasvat Vyakarana. It seems that Balabhadra and Krishnamisra first introduced this grammar into Tibet, while Taranatha made a commentary on it. The place of translation was obviously Jonang Monastery in Central Tibet. Then later on during the Fifth Dalai Lama's time Darva Lotsava translated the grammar with the aid of two Panditas, Balabhadra and Gokulanathamisra. Here the present author states that two Panditas collaborated with Darva Lotsava but does not mention their names. But circumstantial evidence, confirms that they are the same Panditas. So we can place both the translations in the same century beginning with the second half of the seventeenth.

Present work was undertaken by the author, when he was blessed by his Acarya Gelong dorje Zinpa, with the name of grammarian Tshang-sai Zadpai Lododan, in the 14 h Rab Byung (1807-1867 of Christain era), in the phase of full-moon of twenty-second or twenty-third constellation (Sravana) corresponding to July-August) (སྤྲུལ་རྩེ་གྱི་ལོ་གོ་བཅུ་ཅུ་ཚེས་ལྔ་པ་) at dPal-kah-thog-rdo-rje gdan monastery in Kham in a forest retreat known as Yang dben(wen) byang-chub-shing.

We have already stated the fact, that the author of Prajna completed his composition of the text during the New Year-days of 13th cycle. (Vide under (ii)), while the work was seen by ཀུན་གྲོགས་མཚོ་གསལ་ལྷུང་འགྲུར་མེད་ཚེ་དབང་མཚོ་གསལ་བློ་བཟང་། But he has not exactly mentioned in which particular year of 13th cycle he completed his work. But the accepted date of Prajna (1771 A.D.V. *Prajna*. NIT. Pub. 1961, p. Foreword. IX) and present author's reference of date སྤྲུལ་རྩེ་གསལ་གྱི་ལོ་ 14th Rab Byang, can place the date of composition of present work in the beginning of 19th century.

(iv) Utilization of Buddhist and non-Buddhist works.

We have already made reference to Sanskrit and Tibetan works that our author thus utilized in translation. Darva Lotsava who translated this grammar under the instruction of the Fifth Dalai Lama (1617-1682), contended that first full translation was Darva's own. However, the Fifth Dalai Lama, who had another name as grammarian འཇིག་མེད་གོ་ཚུ་བྱུང་བ་ལྷན་ལང་ཚོའི་སྤྲེ། knew a half composed but authentic and terse translation by ལྷ་མཐོང་ལོ་ཙ་བ་ and other translations of the work. His reference to other translations may denote the translation of Taranatha who was almost an elderly contemporary of the Fifth Dalai Lama.

According to our author Gyurmed tshewang Chogdup, Pandita Balabhadra and Krishnamisra first introduced and translated this work after having met Taranatha. Then again under the Fifth Dalai Lama with the aid of aforestated two Panditas Darva rendered this work. Again in later times འཇམ་མགོན་མི་དུ་རིན་པོ་ཆེ་ after having discussed

difficult points of the grammar with Pandita Khyab-hJug-bdag-po made the new translation.

In spite of so many good translations by celebrated scholars being available value of the present one according to its author is due to its abridged form and easy comprehensibility.

The author clearly states that he has utilized the Sutra (aphorism) and the Prakriya (dissertation), the new translation and the commentary by Taranatha, and the genders from a book entitled སྲུབ་མཐུན་རིན་ཆེན་
ལྷུང་།

There is no doubt, that the present author was aware of two big grammars—Kalapa and Candra Vyakaranas, which is referred to by the compound formation Ka-Tsan (Ka and Tsan standing for Kalapa and Candra respectively) and local acceptance of *Sarasvat* in central and other parts of Aryadesa. So the fact that the author in the first half of 19th century probably utilized these two grammars goes without saying. This is evidenced by his reference to his direct disciple brda-sprod-Rab-hbyams-smra-ba-hJam-dbyangs-blo-gros-mchog-hdzin, who made final revision of his translation with the aid of the Ka-Tsan and so on.

Among those two major grammars Kalapa was undoubtedly a work of non-Buddhist author Sarvavarman, under Siva's special favour. The legend brings him into contact with Satavahana. This work was popular in Kashmir and Bengal (Keith: *A History of Sanskrit Literature*). But the founder of Candra school of Sanskrit grammar, Candragomin, flourished probably in the period between 465 and 544 A.D. His authorship and date have been established on firmer grounds in the *Vakyapadiya*. Bhartrihari mentions Bajji, Sauva and Haryaksha as grammarians, who went before Candracarya and who by their uncritical method contributed not a little to the neglect of the Mahabhashya of Patanjali. As this observation accords well with Kalhana's account of the fate of Mahabhashya as well as with the curious legend recorded in a late Tibetan work, Sumpa's Pag-sam-zon-zang (Pt.i, pp. 95-96), the story is reproduced in S.C. Vidyabhusan: *History of Indian Logic*, pp. 334-35 (vide. S.K. De, *Bengal's Contribution to Sanskrit Literature, Indian Studies Past & Present*, Vol. 1. No. 4, pp. 575-576). Regarding Sumpa's censure of Patanjali having plagiarised on Candracarya it has been assumed that this Candracarya is no other than Candragomin. B. Liebich, who has recovered and edited from Skt. MSS, as well as from Tibetan version, with full indices in 1890s is of opinion that Candra

flourished probably in the period between 465 and 544 A.D. The *Candravyakarana* is certainly earlier than the *Kashika* of Jayaditya and Vamana; for *Kashika* appropriates without acknowledgement thirty-five original Sutras of Candra's grammar which had no parallel in Panini, but which Kayyata distinctly repudiated as un-Paninian. All accounts agree that Candragomin was a Buddhist, and this is supported not only by his honorific Buddhist title-Gomin, but also by the *Mangalasloka* of Vritti which pays homage to Sarvajna. S. Levi relying on the mention by I-tsing of a great man named Candra Kouan (official) or Candradasa, who lived like a Bodhisattva, in his time in central India and composed a musical play on the Visvantara would identify this Candra with Candragomin. A Tibetan source, Taranatha, in making Candra a contemporary of Sila, son of Harshavardhana, would place him at about 700 A.D. Tibetan tradition does not distinguish the grammarian Candragomin from the philosopher Candragomin; Vidyabhusan however distinguishes a grammarian from a philosopher; while Taranatha states 'born in Varendra in the east', the *Codier Catalogue* states 'inhabitant of Barendi' in eastern India; Sumpa says 'born in Bangala'. S.K. Chatterji believes that the surname Gomin corresponds to the modern Bengali cognomen "gui". For further information vide S.K. De's article "Bengal's Contribution to Sanskrit Literature", *Indian Studies Past & Present*, Vol. I. No. 4. July, 1960, pp. 575-577. The tradition of Candragomin is supposed to have been maintained in Bengal by two well-known Buddhist grammarians Jinendrabuddhi and Maitreyarakshita. Bengal had admittedly been the ultimate place of refuge of most major and minor systems of Sanskrit grammars, including the Katantra (Kalapa), the Mugdhabodha, the Samksiptasara and the Sarasvata (*Ibid*, pp. 591-593). According to S.K. De the Candra Vyakarana however is a much more remarkable work, which had currency at one time in Kashmir, Nepal, Tibet and Ceylon (*Ibid*. p. 578).

It is a well-known fact that all the major post-Paninian grammars were influenced by and improved upon the rules of Panini. We thus find a Tibetan translation of later Paninian work *Prakriya-kaumudi* of Ramachandra.

But in Tibet Kalapa and Chandra were favoured in the beginning while later Tibetan grammarians and translators preferred the Sarasvata. Obvious cause of its popularity have been discussed by the present author. We find that Taranatha and Sumpa Khenpo and other Tibetan scholars have discussed at length the life and works of Candragomin because of his being a Buddhist and the celebrated composer of hymns of Tara

and Manjusri, (on Candragomin's *Arya-Tara-Antaravalividhi*, see S.C. Vidyabhusan's Introduction to Sarvajnamitra's *Sragdharastotra-samgraha* (Bib. Ind., Calcutta, 1908 pp. XX f) Later the Sarasvat grammar came to be adorned for its having originated from goddess Sarasvati. In Tibetan pantheon Sarasvati is supposed to be the emanation of *Tara-Sita*. These sentiments accounted for the celebrity of Anubhutisvarupa's work in Tibet down to the nineteenth century. The present author's eulogy identifies Sarasvati with Sher-phyin-yum or Prajnaparamita.

དུས་གསུམ་རྒྱལ་ཀུན་བསྐྱེད་མཚན་ཤིང་ཕྱིན་ཕུམ།

སྣ་དབྱངས་རྒྱ་མཚོ་ལས་འབྲུངས་དབྱངས་ཅན་རྩ།

Taranatha in his Chos-hbyung states, "Although Indra-vyakarana is famous in Tibet as the most ancient grammar and having originated in Lha-yul—Heaven, this was not originated in Aryadesa. The Candra-vyakarana, which is translated in Tibetan, concurs with that of Pani-pa (Panini's grammar) whereas Kalapa Vyakarana coincides with that of Indrahi-lugs (Indra vyakarana system.)"

ཨིན་ཏུ་ཀར་ཅེ་སྐ་བ་ཡིན་པར་བཤོ་བ་གྲགས་ཀྱང་ལྷ་ཡུལ་དུ་བྱུང་སྐ་བ་ཡིན་པར་
 བོ་སྤོང་ཀྱང་། འཕགས་པའི་ཡུལ་དུ་བྱུང་བ་སྐ་བ་ནི་མ་ཡིན་ཏེ་འོག་དུ་འཆད་དོ།
 བཤོ་སྐལ་དུ་འབྱུང་བའི་ཨིན་ཏུ་ཀར་ཅེ་པའི་བ་དང་མཐུན་ལ། ཀུལ་པ་བྱུ་ཀར་ཅེ་
 བོ་ཨིན་ཏུ་ཀར་ཅེ་སྐལ་དང་མཐུན་ལོ།

The Aindra tradition being prior to Panini (5th century B.C.) is also strong in Sanskrit literature. It is found in the *Taittiriya Samhita*, where it is said that, gods approached Indra to elucidate speech (*vacam vyakaru*). Patanjali speaks of Brihaspati, the teacher of the gods, expounding to the king of gods the science of grammar. The legendary account of *Katha-sarit-sagara* and the *Birhaspati manjari* that it was the Aindra school which was supplanted by Panini's work is strongly supported by Yuan-chuang's allusion to the establishment of grammatical rules by Indra. The existence of Aindra system has been dealt with in detail by Burnell in his paper *On the Aindra System of Sanskrit Grammarians* (V.S. Agrawala, *India as Known to Panini*, p. 16). The Tibetan historians clearly suggest two parallel systems of grammars. In Tibetan view, like Panini and Kalapa, Sarasvata also has divine origin. Its divine origin and its orthodox lineage with Panini through Buddhist grammarian Candragomin inspired so many Tibetan grammarians to collaborate with

the custodians of the homeland tradition to bring out many profound and faithful dissertations, commentaries and translations. We have already referred to the fact that three Brahmin panditas collaborated in the translation of the text in different dates.

(v) Contacts between Pandita Balabhadra and Krishnamisra and Taranatha, the Great Fifth and two Panditas, Situ Rinpoche and Pandita Vishnupati.

Here we discuss each contact following the chronological sequence adopted by the author of the present text.

The author does not state anything beyond that Pandita Balabhadra and Krishnamisra met Taranatha and that Taranatha completed his commentary on this grammar. But Darva Lotsava of 17th century throws some further light.

Darva states that Fifth Dalai Lama found the authentic but incomplete translation by one Lha-mthong Lotsava, and commanded Darva to translate this grammar according to instructions of these two Pandita brothers. So under the patronage of the Fifth Dalai Lama Darva studied Sarasvata along with other grammatical works under Mahapandita Balabhadra and Pandita Gokulanathamisra, Brahmin residents of Kurukshetra. Here we have to note 'Mahapandita' attribute in case of Balabhadra, and that Darva, who hailed from upper valley of gTsang belonged to Nor-hdzin-yangs-se family. His full name is Ngag-dbang-phun-tshogs lhung-grub and his name as grammarian is Tshe-dbang-rab-brtan-rdo-rje, and that he completed translation in a period of six months living at Potatla Palace. Whether Darva visited Aryadesa, as both the Panditas visited Tibet, and if so when, are matters to be yet investigated. But in Derge Catalogue of Tanjur, in Sna-Tshogs (miscellaneous section) we find one Krishnabhata is collaborating with Taranatha in translating brDa-sprod-dbyangs-can, but the name of the author is missing. May be Krishnabhata, Krishnamisra and Gokulanathamisra are the same person. Confirmation awaits till further investigation.

One fact is firm that author of present book hGyur-med-tshe-dbang-mchog-grub, Pandita Balabhadra, Krishnamisra, Taranatha, Darva and the Fifth Dalai Lama, all are contemporaneous.

The only obscurity is about the second pandita. While Darva names him as Gokulanathamisra, the present author mentions him as

Krishnamisra. In the Fifth Dalai's work there the name occurs as Gokula "who along with Pandita Balabhadra taught Panini in Tibet".

In the earlier Indian tradition we come across a Krishnamisra, the author of famous allegorical drama *Prabodha-candrodaya* or "The moon-rise of true knowledge". The date of dramatist Krishnamisra is fixed with some certainty from his own reference in the prologue to one Gopala, at whose command the play was written to commemorate the victory of his friend King Kirtivarman over the Cedi King Karna. As Karna is mentioned in an inscription dated 1042 A.D., and as an inscription of the Candella King Kirtivarman is also dated 1098 A.D., it has been concluded that Krishnamisra belonged to the second half of the 11th century (DasGupta: *A History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 48). Therefore, Krishnamisra the dramatist and Krishnamisra (or Gokulanathamisra) the Indian pandit in Tibet, are separate from each other by a gap of more than five centuries.

We know of Gokulanatha Upadhyaya, the illustrious Neo-Logician and Vedantist born in the decade of 1640-50, in Mithila (Dinash Chandra Bhattacharya: *History of Navya Nyaya in Mithila*, p. 193). We quote here the following from Gokulanatha's commentary (*Pradipa*) on Vacaspati's *Dvaita Nirnaya* "अतएव जीवनाथद्वैतनिर्णये इतिपदसमभिव्याहारात्म-पदाभ्यां बाधितत्वादित्युत्वम्"

Jivanatha is dated about 1400 A.D., he was evidently not alive when Sankaramisra took lesson from his younger brother and pupil Bhavanatha (about 1425 A.D., *Ibid*, pp. 113-114). Mangroni near Madhubani the native village of Gokulanatha Upadhyaya became as famous as Navadvipa or Varanasi because of Gokulanatha (*Ibid*, p. 195). It is said that Gokulanatha left Mithila in his early life and was a courtier of a Muhamedan (?) Fateh Sah of Garhwal at the foot of the Himalayas (Sinha's *History of Tirhut*, p. 133, cited in Bhattacharya's, *History of Navya Nyaya in Mithila*, p. 195). He must have gone there in the last quarter of the century as Fateh Sah died in 1699 A.D. There he wrote seven works. Then he adorned the court of Maharaja Madhava Simha of Mithila (1700-1739, A.D.). According to tradition Gokulanatha died at Varanasi, when he was 90 years old. The date of his death is surmised to be in the decade 1730-40 A.D. (*Ibid*, p. 195). Although in Bhattacharya's work we do not find Gokulanatha to be a grammarian, yet he states that his cousin and pupil Jivanatha Misra of Mithila author of *Vibhaktiyartha-nirnaya* (Chowkh. Ed 1902, p. 477). treated the subject in such a masterly way both from grammarian's and logician's

point of view that even Gokulanatha must have yielded his palm to him in many places. (Ibid, p. 197).

Therefore, Gokulanatha who was born in 1640 A.D. and was a courtier of King of Garhwal in western Himalayas, might have visited eastern Himalaya (Nepal) and had contact with Tibetan scholars like Taranatha and Situ. It is important to note that Mithila (Tirhut) is geographically contiguous to Nepal Himalayas. So we may place Gokulanatha Upadhyaya as elder contemporary of Taranatha and the Fifth Dalai. While Darva speaks of Gokulanathamisra as Brahmin from Kurukshetra the Fifth Dalai clearly states that the same was from Varanasi, (vide. rgya-bod-hor-sog-gi-mchog-dman-bar-pa-rnams-la-hphring-yig-snyan-ngag-tu-bkod-pa-rab-snyan-rgyud-mang-shes-bya-ba-bsuhgs, Vol. ❸ Fol. 127 a).

Generally Misra is a well-known title of Maithili Brahmin and is alternately known as Upadhyaya. So this Gokulanatha Upadhyaya might have been for sometime at Kurukshetra.

We know from Darva that Pandita Balabhadra was the brother of Gokulanathamisra and that the brothers met Taranatha. But it is not known where the meeting took place, while Taranatha in the Chos Byung does not mention these names, the Fifth Dalai in his works (Vol ❸, Fol. 127 a) affirms that the two brothers visited Tibet, expounded Panini and returned to India.

In Indian traditional literature we find the name of Balabhadra. One Balabhadra is a character in Dandin's *Dasa-kumara carita* (7th century, Das Gupta). Another Balabhadra was one of the brothers of Govardhana a contemporary of Jayadeva, the famous lyric poet of Bengal towards the end of 12th century.

Another Balabhadra, the profound scholar of Navya-Nyaya, from Varanasi belonged to 15th century (Bhattacharya: *History of Navya Nyaya*, p. 102). So the Balabhadra of Tibetan tradition (17th century) was among the last to have this popular name.

We know from the introductory page of the book that, hJam-mgon-si-tu studied some obscure points of this grammar through the aid of one Pandita Khyab-hJug-bdag-po. “དུས་ཕྱིས་འཇམ་མགོན་མི་དུ་

རིན་པོ་ཆེས་པ་རྗེ་ཏུ་བྱུང་བ་འདྲེན་བཤད་པོ་ལས་དཀའ་གནས་རྣམས་གསལ་བྱེད་”

Here the author does not give the Indian name of the scholar. But as the Tibetan tradition prefixes the title Pandita denoting a scholar from Aryadesa, the Indian name was rendered into Tibetan probably because the Indian Pandita was better known by this Tibetan form. The original form was विष्णुस्वामिन् or विष्णुपति. In the famous Sanskrit-Tibetan Lexicons and translated scriptures we find Sanskrit equivalents of *བདག་པོ་* as *མཐིམ་པའི་* (*Mahavyutpatti*, etc) *འམིམ་པའི་*,

ལཱ་ཡཱ་དེ་པའི་ also *སྐུ་མའི་* *Dasabhumi Sutra-སྐུ་མའི་* ,*Nyayavindu*, etc),

In our investigation with Jamgon Situ's works the exact equivalent for Khyab-hjug bdag-po is found to be *འམིམ་པའི་*

In a recent edition of Ta'i-si-tu Rinpoche's work entitled *ཏའི་སི་དུ་འབེད་པ་ ཀམ་བཟུན་པའི་རྟོན་གྱི་རང་རྒྱལ་དྲངས་པོར་བརྗོད་པ་དྲི་བུ་ལཱ་ཡཱ་གྱི་མེ་ལོང་ཞེས་བྱ་བ་བརྒྱུགས་སོ།* or the autobiography and diaries of Situ Rinpoche (Ed. Lokesh Chandra and with a foreword by E. Gene Smith, New Delhi, 1968), we find Situ states his meeting with Vishnupati.

Situ met Vishnupati many times during king Jagajjaya Malla whose reign according to Regmi covered 1722-1736 A.D. (*Medieval Nepal*, Pt. II, Calcutta, 1966. p.178). Situ's first visit to Nepal was in 1723 in a place called Kyin-Tol (*ཀྱིན་ཏེལ་*) (in a temple dedicated to hJig-rten-dbang phyug (Lokesvara). The personal name (*དངོས་མིང་*) of illustrious old Brahmin Pandita from Tirahuti (*དི་ར་ཏུ་དྲིའི་*) was Bacchur Oja, and his name as a Vedic scholar (*དེ་ག་གྱི་མིང་*) was Vishnupati (*བྱི་ཐུ་པ་དྲི་*) *སྐབས་འདི་ཤེད་དུ་དེ་ར་ཏུ་དྲིའི་བུ་ཟེ་པའི་ཏུ་གན་པོ་ཆེས་གྲུ་བ་དངོས་མིང་བཅ་ར་ཨོ་མ། དེ་ག་གྱི་མིང་བྱི་ཐུ་པ་དྲི་ཟེར་བ་དེ་ཡང་ཡང་ཁོ་བོ་ཅན་དུ་བྱུང་།། (ནྐ་ཐར་ , བཀའ་འབྲུག་ Fol, 65-66, 67 a).*

Situ also states that, he talked with this Pandita in Sanskrit but at first he was facing difficulties- the Pandita regularly rectified his pronunciation and then he talked with ease. Then the Pandita certified Situ for his apt pronunciation. Situ had manifold discussions on grammar and logic. He attained proficiency in Indian

literature in general and specially in grammar. For this purpose he investigated in the commentary made by Klu (ཀླུ་མ་བཙུག་མཁེ་པ་)

This Naga was most probably Nagojibhatta, the famous grammarian of 7th century A.D. Situ also read Brahmin Pandita Bhattoji-dikshita's

(འཇིག་རྟེན་གྱི་ཀེ་ཏམ་) commentary on *Amarakosha*, Subhucandra's commentary on *Amarakosha*, *Nanarthakosha* of Medinikara (དེཙེ་མང་

གི་མངོན་མཚན་མེ་དེ་ཉི་ཀར་) and so on.

In conclusion we may say that the beginnings of Sanskrit studies were made in the seventh century (632-650 AD) by Royal scholar Thonmi-Sambhota. A thorough knowledge of Sanskrit grammar and vocabulary was the sine qua non for the work of translation of Sanskrit texts into Tibetan (See N. Dutt's foreword *Prajna*, NIT, 1961). As the inventor of science of expression, ལྷ་འཇིག་རྟེན་མཚན་མེ་ Panini was almost

apotheosized in Tibetan tradition. As Professor Nalinaksha Dutt says: "Regarding Panini the texts mention that he was born at Bhirukavana in the west (probably north-west) and that though he was a brahamana, he was strongly inclined to the Buddhist faith, and that he attained proficiency in grammar (sabdasas ra) through the grace of Avalokitesvara. He composed the well-known Panini-vyakarana and ultimately attained Sravakabodhi" Vide Dutt. *Buddhist Sects in India* (Calcutta 1970, p.8)

Long after India ceased to be the homeland of the priests and preachers Sanskrit studies continued to flourish and thrive in the Land of Snows, thanks to scholars and pilgrims from the Himalayas.

