TIBETAN EXPERTISE IN SANSKRIT GRAMMAR –
A CASE-STUDY: GRAMMATICAL ANALYSIS
OF THE TERM *PRATĪTYA-SAMUTPĀDA*

Pieter C. Verhagen

1. Sanskrit grammar in Tibet: general introduction.

The Tibetan Buddhist canonical literature as we know it—i.e. the two text-collections commonly referred to as *Bka'-'gyur* and *Bstan-'gyur*—consists of a huge corpus[1] of texts, the majority of which has been translated from Sanskrit. These translations were mainly the result of a joint effort of one (or more) Tibetan translator(s) and one (or more) Indian pandit(s). These translation-activities peaked in two major periods: firstly the end of the eighth and the first half of the ninth century (during the first spread of Buddhism in Tibet) and secondly the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (during the second spread of Buddhism in Tibet from the eleventh century onwards).[2]

In order to bring about such an impressive translated literature, thorough acquaintance with and competence in Sanskrit grammar must have been essential among the Tibetan translators. Not only had the translators studied Sanskrit grammar, they also produced translations of Sanskrit grammatical works. These grammatical treatises were ultimately incorporated into the *Bstan-'gyur* in the section on the so-called auxiliary sciences. In the eighteenth-century blockprint editions of the canon some forty-seven treatises on Sanskrit grammar can be found.[3]

There are no Tibetan translations of Sanskrit grammatical treatises known to us now that can be dated to the first period of translation activities. The oldest known catalogue of translations, the so-called *Ldan-dkar-ma* list,[4] compiled around 800 A.D. and containing 736 titles, does not mention a grammatical text. Nevertheless, we must assume that the Tibetan translators and linguists occupied themselves with Sanskrit grammar to a certain extent in this earliest period of translation. Evidence of this can be found in the Tibetan canon; for instance, in treatises on certain aspects of Sanskrit grammar attributed to Lce-khyi-'brug, an eighth- or ninth-century Tibetan translator,[5] and in the grammatical passages in the *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa*, a ninth-century partial commentary on the *Mahāvyutpatti*, the latter being a contemporaneous Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon. (See below, paragraph 2.1.)

The earliest datable Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit grammatical treatise is a commentary on *Kātantra* grammar translated in Tho-liṅ in western Tibet by Royal Lama Źi-ba-'qd (second half of the eleventh century).[6] The catalogues[7] of the earliest version of the *Bstan-'gyur*, dating from the first half of the fourteenth century, contain twenty-three titles of Sanskrit grammatical treatises.[8] The majority of these grammatical translations can be dated to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the most prominent translators in the field of grammar being *Thar-pa-lo-tsā-ba* Ñi-ma-rgyal-mtshan (c. 1300),[9] *Soṅ-ston* Rdo-rje-rgyal-mtshan (late thirteenth/early fourteenth century),[10] *Dpaṅ-lo-tsā-ba* Blo-gros-brtan-pa (1276–1342)[11] and *Bu-ston* Rin-chen-grub (1290–1364).[12]

It is apparent from the texts translated in this period that the *Cāndra* and the *Kātantra* grammars were the most popular ones in Tibet at the time.[13] It is remarkable that treatises of the most important of all Sanskrit grammatical traditions, scil. the *Pāṇinīya* system, on which all other systems are more or less based, were translated into Tibetan only at a much later date. This took place as recently as the seventeenth century, when, mainly under the auspices of the Fifth Dalai Lama (1617–1682), a second flowering of Sanskrit studies in Tibet took place. This culminated in the first translation of Pāṇini's *sūtra*-text, a translation-adaptation of Rāmacandra's *Prakriyākaumudī* (a commentary on Pāṇini) and two translations of *Sārasvata* grammar.[14]

In order to illustrate the progress of the knowledge of, and competence in, Sanskrit grammar of the Tibetan translators between the earliest period (ninth century) and the later "classical" period (thirteenth/fourteenth century), two short excerpts from the Tibetan canon will be dealt with here, both giving a grammatical analysis of one Buddhist Sanskrit term, scil. *pratītya-samutpāda*.[15] Both passages were

written in Tibetan. As such, they may serve to shed light upon the grammatical competence of the Tibetans in two different periods; the first definitely dates from the ninth century, the other in all probability from the fourteenth.

2.1 The Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa: introduction.

The *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa*, "(Treatise on) the Formation of Words, Consisting of Two Volumes," also titled *Madhyavyutpatti*, Tib. *Bye-brag-tu-rtogs-byed-'briñ-po*, "The Middle (Treatise on) Analytical Instruction (on Words)",[16] is a partial commentary dealing with 414 of the 9565 entries found in the Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon *Mahāvyutpatti*, Tib. *Bye-brag-tu-rtogs-byed-chen-po*, "The Great (Treatise on) Analytical Instruction (on Words)."[17]

The *Mahāvyutpatti* and *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa* were compiled and written by a group of Indian and Tibetan scholars[18] during the reign of the Tibetan king Khri-lde-sroñ-btsan, *alias* Sad-na-legs (799–815), and perhaps finished during the reign of his successor Khri-gtsug-lde-btsan, *alias* Ral-pa-can (815–838).[19] These lexicographical works were intended to standardize a Tibetan terminology to be used in the translation of Sanskrit Buddhist literature. The former text, providing the standard lexicon, and the latter, a handbook for translators, played a crucial role in the creation of Indo-Tibetan literature.

In the *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa* Sanskrit phrases are often quoted as explanations of Sanskrit terms; here various forms of grammatical analysis[20] are met with, ranging from (popular-)etymological paraphrases to phrases of a more technical grammatical nature—for instance, on forty occasions an entry from a Sanskrit *Dhātupāṭha* is quoted.[21]

In the next paragraph one entry from the *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa* will be focused on, viz. its commentary on the Sanskrit term *pratītya-samutpāda*.

2.2.1. Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa: entry on "pratītya-samutpāda" - text.

P = Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel* NO 29r4–6,
C = Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel* CO 152v7–153rl:[22]

rten-ciñ-'brel-bar-'byuñ-ba-la-pra-tī[23]-tya-sa-mutpā[24]-da-źes-bya-ba-pra-ti-ta-ni-rten-pa-'am-rkyen-du-'gyur-ba[25]-la-bya/ sam-ni-sam-[26]bha- (P 29r5:)dhi-ste[26]-'brel-pa-la-bya/ ud-patta[27]-ni-skye-ba'i-[28]tshig-ste-phyi[28]-nañ-gi-chos-rnams-rañ-dbañ-du-mi-skye'i-(C:/)rgyu-dañ-rkyen-tshogs-pa-las-skye-ste-sña-ma-sña'i[29]-rgyu-la-rten[30]-nas-phyi-ma-phyi-ma'i[31]-gźan-(C 153rl:)gyi[32]-bar-ma-chod-par-'byuñ-bas-na-(P 29r6:)rten-ciñ-'brel-bar-'byuñ-ba-źes-bya/

2.2.2. Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa: entry on "pratītya-samutpāda" - translation.

(The term) *pratītya-samutpāda*, (meaning) "origination (*'byuṅ-ba*) in connection (*'brel-bar*) by (causal) dependence (*rten-ciṅ*)": *pratīt(y)a*[33] is to be translated as (*la-bya*) "to depend on" (*rten-pa*) or "to (have) become the cause" (*rkyen-du-'gyur-ba/gyur-pa*).
sam, i.e., (*ste*) *sambandhin*[34] is to be translated as "connected (with)" (*'brel-pa*).
utpāda[35] is a word (denoting) "origination" (*skye-ba*).

The external and internal elements (*chos*) do not arise independently, but (*'i*) they arise from accumulated (*tshogs-pa*) primary and secondary causes, that is (*ste*), there is origination (*'byuṅ-ba*) of every following (*phyi-ma-phyi-ma['i]*) (element in the chain of causation) causally dependent (*rgyu-la-[b]rten-nas*) on the (respective) preceding (*sṅa-ma-sṅa[-ma]'i*) (element) without the intervention (*bar-ma-chod-par*) of another (*gźan-gyi[s]*) (element). Therefore (the accepted translation is) "origination in connection by (causal) dependence."

2.3 Discussion of the passage.

It is evident that in the preceding excerpt the grammatical analysis of the Sanskrit term is quite limited. The first step in analyzing the term *pratītya-samutpāda* consists of dividing the term into three elements, viz. *pra-ti-ta* (i.e., *pratīta* or *pratītya*), *sam* (i.e., *sam*) and *utpatta* (i.e., *utpāda*).

The first elements could be read as *pratīta* or *pratītya* (cf. note 33). In the former case this form is not simply a constituent element separated from the compound term, but another form derived from the same verbal root *i* with the preposition *prati*. One could surmise a passive denotation in this term, as *pratīta* can mean "having been depended on" (in other words: "having functioned as cause");[36] *pratītya*, the form as it occurs in the term discussed here, generally has an active denotation: "after having depended on" (i.e., "dependent on", "based on").[37]

It lies beyond the scope of this article to enlarge upon the possible philosophical implications of the intentional use of *pratīta* as a paraphrase of *pratītya*. I merely want to call attention to the reading, whether it is intentional or not, especially as both *Bstan-'gyur* editions consulted have the form here, while at the head of the entry in the introduction of the whole term *pratītya-samutpāda* both clearly spell the form with *-tya-*.

The second element, *sam*, a verbal preposition, is given a Sanskrit gloss *sambandhin* (cf. note 34) "connected." It is in fact this gloss which is translated into Tibetan (*'brel-pa*) and eventually is presented as part

of the translation of the whole term *pratītya-samutpāda* (scil. *'brel-bar*).
It is significant that the standard Tibetan translation for the Sanskrit
preposition *sam*, scil. *yan-dag(-par*),[38] is not chosen here, but instead
the translation is based on the semantic interpretation of *sam* in this
context, represented by the Sanskrit gloss *sambandhin*.

The third element, *utpatta* (*udpatta* is phonetically impossible in
Sanskrit), should be emended to either *utpatti* or (as in the compound
term) *utpāda*, "origination" (cf. note 35).

It is a general feature of the *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa* that the infor-
mation derived from the grammatical analysis of the Sanskrit term is
almost exclusively of a semantic nature. This also holds for the more
technical grammatical passages, such as those quoted from the
Dhātupāṭha-sūtras, where the meaning-entries in these *sūtras* are used
to determine the appropriate Tibetan translation for the verb; further
information that could be derived from the *Dhātupāṭha* concerning the
morphology or phonology of the root in question is not found or put
to use in the *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa* commentary.[39] It need not amaze
us that the Tibetan translators were primarily interested in semantics,
as their task consisted of producing translations conveying the mean-
ing of the Buddhist sacred texts as faithfully as possible, rather than
giving an exact rendering of the morphology or the syntax of the
original language.

This restriction to semantics should perhaps be seen in the light of
one of the thumb-rules for translators given in the introduction to the
Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa itself, viz., that if the choice presents itself, a
translation that faithfully expresses the *meaning*, i.e., the semantics of
a Sanskrit term, is preferable to a translation that fully corresponds to
the *form*, i.e., the morphology of the original term.[40]

After the summary analysis of the Sanskrit term and the translation
of the constituent elements, c.q. paraphrases of the constituents into
Tibetan, the subsequent discussion pertains to the denotation of the
term and its place in the context of Buddhist ideas and beliefs, as is the
general pattern in the *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa*. This latter part of the
commentary—exclusively in Tibetan—offers no material that is rel-
evant to Sanskrit grammatical analysis.

3.1. *Blo-gros-brtan-pa's excursus on "pratītya-samutpāda": introduction.*

In the linguistic section of *Bstan-'gyur* a short text on the grammati-
cal derivation of the term *pratītya-samutpāda* can be found.[41] It does
not bear a title and it is presented as a kind of appendix or excursus,
added to the colophon of a translation of a grammatical treatise
entitled *Vibhakti-kārikā*, Tib. *Rnam-dbye'i-tshig-le'ur-byas-pa*.[42] It is not

clear whether it is actually intended as a separate text.[43] That this small treatise is not a translation, but was written originally in Tibetan, can be inferred not only from the mention of a Tibetan author at the end (see below), but especially from the reference to 'Tibetan grammarians' (bod-kyi-yig-mkhan; P 82r8, C 70v6) in the text itself.

As author, one Blo-gros-brtan-pa is mentioned.[44] His exact identity is uncertain. Two persons of this name are the most likely candidates as the author of this excursus, viz., Dpaṅ(-lo-tsā-ba) Blo-gros-brtan-pa (1276–1342)[45] and Śoṅ Blo-gros-brtan-pa (late thirteenth-early fourteenth century).[46] Both scholars were prominent figures in the field of Sanskrit grammar, so both could be supposed to have written an extremely technical grammatical treatise such as the one under consideration.

In the colophon of the preceding text Śoṅ Blo-gros-brtan-pa is mentioned as translator,[47] so we could assume this same scholar to be the author of the excursus apparently appended to that colophon. On the other hand, we should not rule out the possibility of Dpaṅ Blo-gros-brtan-pa being the author, as he was probably the most prominent exponent of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition in Tibet at that time. In either case, the text could be dated to the late thirteenth or first half of the fourteenth century.

It might seem tempting to identify the excursus under consideration with a treatise on Sanskrit grammar known as Dpaṅ-lo'i-śog-gcig-ma, "(treatise) consisting of one folio, of Dpaṅ-lo(-tsā-ba Blo-gros-brtan-pa)," which is referred to in A-khu-tho-yig, the well-known nineteenth-century Tibetan catalogue of books then already rare or extraordinarily valuable. The present excursus does indeed cover circa one folio in the various canonical editions. However, in a treatise on difficult points in Sanskrit grammar by 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bžad-pa Ṅag-dbaṅ-brtson-'grus (1648–1721) we find a quotation from Dpaṅ-lo'i-śog-gcig-ma,[48] which is not to be found in the excursus on pratītya-samutpāda. Therefore the identification of this excursus with Dpaṅ-lo'i-śog-gcig-ma is untenable.

Aside from the two scholars called Blo-gros-brtan-pa mentioned above, two more scholars of the same name, sometimes referred to as "the third Blo-gros-brtan-pa" and "the fourth Blo-gros-brtan-pa," appear in translators' colophons. The proposed identification of the third Blo-gros-brtan-pa with Yar-kluṅs-lo-tsā-ba Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan (b. c. 1285/1295-d. after 1378) seems far from certain. The fourth Blo-gros-brtan-pa is generally identified as Śñe-thaṅ-lo-tsā-ba Blo-gros-brtan-pa (mid-fifteenth century).[49]

In this excursus, the grammatical derivation of the term pratītya-samutpāda is described strictly according to the Cāndra system of

grammar: first, the derivational procedure for the element *pratītya* is discussed, then that of *samutpāda*. In the first part of the text, the author refers to a misconception apparently current among Tibetan grammarians at that time. In this text, ten rules from the *sūtra*-text of the *Cāndra* system of grammar and two entries from the *Dhātupāṭha* of the same system are quoted in Tibetan translation.

In the following paragraphs the text of this treatise according to the Peking and Co-ne editions of the *Bstan-'gyur* will be presented together with a translation and discussion of the contents. For easy reference between text and translation I have numbered the sentences.

3.2.1. *Blo-gros-brtan-pa's excursus on "pratītya-samutpāda": text.*

P = Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE* 82r4–83r3,
C = Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel RE* 70v3–71v1 (C variant readings given in the notes):

//'*di-la-rtags-ma-phyed-pa-la-sogs-pa*-(C 70v4:)*bstan-bcos-la'ań-mi-legs-pa-'ga'-re-yod-ciń-/ /'gyur-ma-dag-*[50]*pa'ań-'ga'*[50]*-re-snań-yań-las*[51]*-dań-po*-
(P 82r5:)*la-phan-pa-che-bar-snań-bas-bris-pa'o/*
/'*gro-ba-mań-po-la-phan-par-gyur-cig/*
//*oṁ-swa-sti/ sańs-rgyas-bcom-ldan-'das-dań-/*
'*phags-pa-klu-sgrub-la-phyag-'tshal-lo/*

(1) /*byiṅs*-(C 70v5:)*ad-sogs-las*-(P 82r6:)*iṇ*[52]*-dań-wī-dań-wā-'gro-ba-la-žes-pa-iṇ-byiṅs-su-'gyur-ro/*

(2) *de'i-ṇa-rtag*[53]*-kyi-don-yin-pas-phyis-te*-(C:/)*i-bžag*[54]*-go(/)*

(3) *de-la-tshig-gsal-dań-mdzod-'grel-du/ /*[55]*i-te*[55]*-ni-'gro-ba'i-don-to/* žes-(P 82r7:)*gsuńs-pa-ni-byiṅs-su-mtshon-pa-la-štip'i*[56]*-rkyen-sbyar-ba-ste/ tsandra'i*-(C 70v6:)*mdo-le'u-gsum-par-rań-gi-ńo-bo-la-i-dań-/ ki-dań*-(C: /) *štip*(P:.)*'o-žes-gsuńs-pas-štip.'o*[57]/

(4) /*de'i-śa-dań*-(C:/)*pa-rtags-kyi-don-yin-pas*-(P 82r8:)*dbyi'o/*

(5) /*le'u-ñi-śu-gñis-par-ṇya*[58]*-ba'i-don-gyi-ik.'i*[59]*-at*(P:.)*-eń*(P:.)*'o-žes-pas-i-er-'gyur-te/ e-ti'o/*

(6) /*de-bod-kyi-yig-mkhan-gyis-i-ti-ru-nor-snań*-(C 70v7:)*ńo/*

(7) /*byiṅs-su-'gyur-*[60]*rgyu-i*[60]*-yin-no/*

(8) (P 82v1:)*de'i-sńon-du-ñer*[61]*-bsgyur-pra-ti-te*[62]*/de-la-rnam-dbye-gań-sbyar-yań-mi-zad-pa'i-tshig-sdud-byas-te-dbyi'o/*

(9) /*le'u-gsum-par/ byed-pa-po-gcig-pa-dag-gi-sńa-ma-las-so-žes-pa-goń*[63]*-gi-ktwā*[64]*-žes-pa-la-bsñegs*-(P 82v2:)*pas-ktwā'i-rkyen-sbyar-ro/*

(10) /*le'u-ñi-śu*-(C 71r1:)*par-nań.*[65]*-min-pa'i-tshig-sdud-la-*[66]*ktwā'i-le-pa'o*[66]*-žes-pas-ktwā-lyap-ru-bsgyur-ro//*

(11) //*de'i-la-yig-dbyańs*[67]*-kyi-don-yin-žiń-/pa-yig-*[68]*-tu-ka*[68]*-'byuń-ba'i-ched-du*-
(P 82v3:)*rtags-kyi-don-yin-pas-phyis-la-ya-yig-bžag*[69]*-go(/)*

(12) /*le'u*[70]*-bcu-bdun-par/ thuń-ńu'i*-(C 71r2:)*tiń-ma-yin-pa-la-*[71]*pit.-la-tuk.'o*[71]*(P:/ /)žes-pas-i-dań-ya'i-bar-du-tuk*(P:.)*'o/*

(13)/*de-i-ka-yig-rtags-kyi-don-dań-/u*-(P 82v4:)*yig-brjod-pa'i-don-yin-pas-phyis-te-ta-bžag-pas-ya-dań-brtsegs-pa-tya'o/*

(14) /*le'u-bcu-bdun-par/ak*(P:.)*-ni-ak*(P:.)*-la-riń-po'o-žes-pas-pra-ti'i*[72]*-i-yig-dań-byiṅs*-(C 71r3:)*kyi-i-yig-gñis-dag-riń-por-byas*-(P 82v5:)*te/ pra-tī-tya'o/*

(15) /le'u-bži-par-don-tsam-la-dan-po'o//žes-pa[73]-rnam-dbye-dan-po-su-sbyar-ro/

(16) /lyap.[74]-ni-grans-med-dam-mi-zad-[75]pa-bži-[75]-par-grans-med-las-sup.'i[76]-'jig-go-(/)/žes-pas[77]-su-dbyi'o/

(17) /(P 82v6:)yan-byins-dib.[78]-(C 71r4:)sogs-su-pad(P:.)-'gro-ba-la'o-žes-pas-[79]pa-da[79]-byins-so/

(18) /de'i-snon-du-sam.[80]-dan-/ ud(P:.)-ñer-bsgyur-ro/

(19) /'gro-ba'i-don-can-gyi-byins-yan-ñer[81]-bsgyur-de-dag-dan-sbrel[82]-bas-'byun-ba-(P 82v7:)la-'jug-ste/ skad-kyi-byins-ni-stobs-ldan-yan-žes-sogs-so/

(20) /le'u-gsum-(C 71r5:)par-(C:/)byed-pa-la'an-ghañ(P:.)'o-žes-pas-ghañ(P:.)'i-rkyen-sbyar-ro/

(21) /gha'i-srog-a-yig-bžag-la//gha-dan-ña-yig-rtags-kyi-don-to/

(22) /(P 82v8:)le'u-ñer-gcig-par-(C:/)ñid-la'o-žes-pa-de-gon-gi-āt(P:.)-žes[83]-pa-la-bsñegs-pas-pā[84]-žes-par-sbyar-ro/

(23) /sgra-pa-rnams-kyi-nag(?;=dag?)-la/(C 71r6:)dbyans-med-dbyans-dan-sbyar-ro-žes-'don-pas/ sam(P:.)-gyi-ma-la-u-srog-(P 83r1:)tu-sbyar-žin-da-la-ghañ'i[85]-a-yig-sbyar-te/ sa-mutpā-da[86]-žes-pa'o/

(24) /'di-na-śin-tu-mkhas-par-khas-'che-yan-/
/'di-tsam-gyis-kyan-mgo-bo-rmons-'gyur-ba/
/thos-pa-ñun-nus-tshim-pa-[87]de-(P 83r2; C 71r7:)kyan[87]-/
/myur-du-rten-'byun-mnon-sum-rtogs-par-śog/

(25) //rten-cin-'brel-par-'byun-žes-pa/
/chos-rnams-kun-gyi-chos-ñid-kyis/
/chos-kun-spros-bral-ñid-gsuns-pa/
/gñis-med-gsun-(P 83r3:)ba-sras-bcas-mchod/

(26) /ces-pa-dpal-ldan-blo-gros-brtan-(C 71v1:)pas-bar-skabs-su-smras-pa'o//

N.B.: . = the transcription of the equivalent of the Devanagari *virāma*-sign in Tibetan script (the Tibetan sign is very similar to the Devanagari *virāma* and is sometimes hard to distinguish from Tibetan subscript grapheme r).

3.2.2. *Blo-gros-brtan-pa's excursus on "pratītya-samutpāda": translation.*

(Introduction:) Because on this (subject) even in the scientific treatises some defects occur, such as unanalyzed definitions etc., (and because) moreover (*yan*) even ('an) some incorrect translations appear (as a result of that), (I) have written (the following) as it seems (to me) to be of great benefit for beginners.[88]

May it be for the benefit of many living beings.

(*Mangala:*) *Oṁ svasti.* (I) pay homage to the *Bhagavat Buddha* and to *Ārya* Nāgārjuna.

(1)According to (*Cāndra Dhātupāṭha* II.12), *iN vī vā gatau* [89] (from i.e.) in the (group of) verbal roots *ad* etc.,[90] *iN* occurs as a verbal root.[91]

(2) Of this (root *iN*) the (letter) *N* is elided,[92] as it is intended as a marker,[93] and *i* remains (as the actual root).

(3) (In) the phrase *etir gaty-arthaḥ*[94] (occurring) in the *Prasannapadā*[95] and the commentaries on the (*Abhidharma-*)*Kośa*[96] (when dealing) with this (*de-la*) (root *iN*), where the verbal root is quoted in an example-form (*mtshon-pa*), the suffix[97] *ŚtiP* has been affixed; *ŚtiP* (is prescribed) in the third chapter of the *sūtra*(-text) of *Cāndra*(-*vyākaraṇa*) by (the *sūtra*) *i-Ki-ŚtiPaḥ svarūpe* (*Cāndra* 1.3.96).[98]

(4) Of this (suffix *StiP*) the (letters) *S* and *P* are elided, as they are intended as markers.

(5) According to (the *sūtra*), *iKo 'D-eN kriyārthāyāh* (*Cāndra* 6.2.1)[99] in the twenty-second chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), *i* should be changed into *e*, (resulting in the form): *eti*.

(6) The Tibetan grammarians erroneously consider this (combination of root *iN*, i.e., *i* and suffix *StiP* i.e. *ti*, properly resulting in the form *eti*) as (identical to) *iti*.

(7) When it (i.e., *iN*) has to occur as a root, it(s form) is *i*.

(8) Before this (root *i*) verbal preposition[100] *prati* (occurs), and whatever case-ending[101] is affixed to this (verbal preposition *prati*) will be elided, as a compound[102] with an indeclinable[103] (as first member) is formed.

(9) As according to (the *sūtra*), *eka-kartṛkayoḥ pūrvāt* (*Cāndra* 1.3.131)[104] in the third chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), (the suffix) *Ktvā* is required, the suffix *Ktvā* is affixed (to *prati* + *i*).

(10) According to (the *sūtra*), *a-naÑ-samāse Ktvo LyaP* (*Cāndra* 5.4.6)[105] in the twentieth chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), (the suffix) *Ktvā* is changed into *LyaP*.

(11) As of this (suffix *LyaP*) the letter *L* (is intended as a marker) with a function concerning accent,[106] and the letter *P* is intended as a marker resulting in the occurrence of (augment) *tUK*, (the letters *L* and *P*) are elided and morpheme *ya* remains.

(12) According to (the *sūtra*), *hrasvasyātiÑi piti tUK* (*Cāndra* 5.1.69)[107] in the seventeenth chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), (augment) *tUK* occurs in between (the root) *i* and (the suffix) *ya*.

(13) As of this (augment *tUK*) the letter *K* is intended as a marker, and the letter *U* is intended for (the facilitation of) the pronunciation (of the combination *t* + *K*), (the letters *U* and *K*) are elided and (letter) *t* remains, which is combined with *ya*, (resulting in the form) *tya*.

(14) According to (the *sūtra*), *aKo 'Ki dīrghaḥ* (*Cāndra* 5.1.106)[108] in the seventeenth chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), the letter *i* of (the verbal preposition) *prati* and the letter *i* of the verbal root (*i*) are both combined into a long (vowel *ī*), (resulting in the form) *pratītya*.

(15) According to (the *sūtra*), *arthamātre prathamā* (*Cāndra* 2.1.93)[109] in the fourth chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), the first case-ending *sU*[110] should be affixed.

(16) (However, as a form ending with the suffix) *LyaP* is an indeclinable (*asaṁkhya* or *avyaya*),[111] according to (the *sūtra*) *sUPo 'saṁkhyāl luk* (*Cāndra* 2.1.38)[112] in the fourth (chapter of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), (the suffix) *sU* is elided.

(17) Further (i.e. concerning the term *samutpāda*) according to (*Cāndra Dhātupāṭha* IV.107), *padA gatau*[113] in the (group of) verbal roots *div* etc.,[114] the verbal root *padA* (occurs).

(18) Before this (root *padA*) the verbal prepositions *sam* and *ud* (occur).

(19) Although (*padA*) is a root with the meaning "to go", because of the combination with these two verbal prepositions (viz. *sam* and *ud*), it functions (here) in (the sense of) "to arise"; (this occurs) according to (the maxim) "Although the verbal roots have (certain) forces (i.e. de- and connotations) etc."[115]

(20) According to (the *sūtra*), *GHaÑ kārake ca* (*Cāndra* 1.3.7)[116] in the third chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), the suffix *GHaÑ* is affixed.

(21) The vowel[117] of *GHaÑ*[118] i.e. the letter *a* remains, but the letters *GH* and *Ñ* are intended as markers (and hence are elided).

(22) As according to (the *sūtra*), *ñṇiti ca* (*Cāndra* 6.1.9)[119] in the twenty-first chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*), *āT* (i.e. long vowel *ā*) is required in this above(-mentioned form *padA* before *GHaÑ*), the form *pā* is applied.

(23) In the words of the grammarians, according to the maxim "The accent-less (consonant) must be combined with the accent(ed vowel),"[120] the (letter) *m* of *sam* will be connected with the vowel (*srog*) *u* and the (letter) *d* (of *pād*) will be connected with the letter *a* of *GHaÑ*, (resulting in the form) *samutpāda*.

(24) May not only those who assure that they are very learned in this (matter), but who are confused merely by this (derivation of the term *pratītya-samutpāda*), but also those who are content with slight learning, quickly come to a thorough understanding of causality.

(25) To the unequalled teacher,[121] who has taught (*gsuṅs-pa*) the non-plurality (*spros-bral-ñid*) of all elements (*chos-kun*) on the basis of the nature (*chos-ñid*) of all elements (*chos-rnams-kun*), which is called "origination in connection by (causal) dependence", and to his (spiritual) sons (I) pay homage.

(26) (Colophon:) The foregoing (derivation of *pratītya-samutpāda*) has been expounded (as an excursus) in the interval (between two texts) by the noble Blo-gros-brtan-pa.

3.3 Discussion of the excursus.

In this highly technical excursus the author Blo-gros-brtan-pa follows *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*, the grammatical system of Candra(gomin).[122] Not only is the *Cāndra* grammar explicitly mentioned in the text (*tsandra('i-mdo*) P 82r7, C70v5–6), but all quoted *sūtras* could be identified as rules in the *Cāndra* grammar. Also, the two *Dhātupāṭha*-entries that are quoted correspond to entries in the *Cāndra Dhātupāṭha*.[123] As for the phrases, apparently quoted as maxims (in [3], [19] and [23]; cf. notes 94–96, 115 and 120), other than with regard to the actual *sūtras*, they are of general validity in the Indian grammatical traditions and can very well be applied within the *Cāndra* system.

The author's indirect reference to a rule on accent, which does not occur in the *Cāndra* grammar (cf. note 106), is only a seeming incongruity. Although the section on accent has not been preserved in the original version of the *Cāndra sūtra*-text[124] or in Tibetan translation,[125] reference to accent-rules is also found elsewhere in the *Cāndra* literature.[126] It should be noted that mention is made twice of a *sūtra* "in the fourth chapter (of the *sūtra*-text of *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*)," viz. in (15) and (16), and that in both cases the *sūtra* is actually found in the fifth

chapter—i.e. 2.1— of the *Cāndra sūtra* text as we now know it. Perhaps the author knew a slightly different redaction; all other references to chapter-numbers of the *sūtra*-text correspond to the known division of the *Cāndra* grammar. As mentioned earlier, the derivation of the term *pratītya-samutpāda* is presented in two parts here: first the derivation of *pratītya* in (1)–(16), then that of *samutpāda* in (17)–(23). In both cases the step-by-step application of the rules is conscientiously executed; in this context rule-ordering is important too; for instance the author rightly applies *Cāndra* 5.1.69 before 5.1.106, as a bleeding-relation exists between the latter and the former rule.[127]

It is not quite clear exactly what mistake of the Tibetan grammarians the author is referring to in connection with the phrase *etir gatyarthaḥ* (in (3)–(6)). I see two possibilities: either the mistake consists of identifying the element *eti*, which is a citation-form of the verbal root *i* "to go," with the Sanskrit particle *iti*, "thus,"[128] or the mistake consists of using the form *iti* as the citation-form of the root *i*, whereas the correct form is *eti*.[129] If the latter mistake is intended by the author, it seems he is not right to attribute this error to Tibetan grammarians only, as this incorrect citation-form *iti* for the root *i* is also found in the original Sanskrit of some of the Buddhist commentaries mentioned earlier containing etymological explanations of the term *pratītya-samutpāda*.[130]

On the whole, in this text the author displays his excellent competence in all aspects of the Sanskrit grammatical tradition of *Cāndra*. The derivation presented here is proof of the high degree of sophistication that was attained by the specialized Tibetan translators in their study of Sanskrit grammar in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

4. Conclusions.

When comparing the two canonical passages presented above two differences in their handling of Sanskrit grammatical analysis immediately become apparent.

The first is a difference in attitude: the ninth-century Tibetan translator-grammarians were primarily interested in creating Tibetan translations that faithfully reflected the meaning or intention(s) of the Sanskrit Buddhist text-material as understood in their time, so they restricted their grammatical analysis of Sanskrit to semantical data. Later, in the fourteenth century, when the Tibetan translation-techniques had long been established, Sanskrit grammatical studies in Tibet encompassed the whole of the grammatical science as traditionally practised in India. No longer was only the semantically correct Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit term or phrase of paramount impor-

tance, but the original Sanskrit was studied more from an Indian point of view, so to speak: the autochthonous Indian grammatical traditions were closely followed by the Tibetan linguists.

The second difference is one of quality: obviously, as a result of this limited scope in the earliest period of translations, various facets of the grammar of Sanskrit forms—words and phrases—were ignored and remained unspecified and unexplained. On the other hand, the fourteenth-century excursus presented above excels in thoroughness and gives a sophisticated description of the complete derivation. The two passages from the Tibetan canon studied here seem to suggest that between the earliest period of translations (eighth/ninth century) and the "classical" period (thirteenth / fourteenth century) Sanskrit studies in Tibet underwent a remarkable development and reached an impressive degree of sophistication in the latter period.

NOTES

1. For instance the Peking edition of *Bka'-'gyur* and *Bstan-'gyur* contains as many as 5962 titles according to the classification in the Otani reprint, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958).

2. Cf., e.g., Hoffmann (1975: 202–203) and Grönbold (1984: 13–14).

3. Cf. Verhagen (1991).

4. The full title is *Pho-braṅ-stod-thaṅ-ldan-dkar-gyi-bka'-daṅ-bstan-bcos-'gyur-ro-cog-gi-dkar-chag*, Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CHO* 325v5–373r8, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5851; editions: S. Yoshimura, *The Denkar-ma, an oldest catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons*, Kyoto 1950 and M. Lalou, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroṅ-lde-bcan. Contribution à la bibliographie du Kanjur et du Tanjur", *Journal Asiatique* 241 (1953): 313–353.

5. Lce-khyi-'brug (alias Ce-khyi-'brug or Ci-khyi-'brug) is a Tibetan translator datable to the end of the eighth or early ninth century; cf. Simonsson (1957: 243–244) and Miller (1963: 486–487)(= repr. 1975: 2–3). He was the author of two (or three) texts on Sanskrit grammar, viz. *Gnas-brgyad-chen-po'i-rtsa-ba*, "Root-text on the eight (grammatical) topics", Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel ÑO* 40v6–43v7, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5836, Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO* 163r1–165r5, and an autocommentary on this text entitled *Sgra'i-bstan-bcos*, "Linguistic treatise" or *Gnas-brgyad-kyi-'grel-pa*, "Commentary on (the root-text on) the eight (grammatical) topics", Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel ÑO* 43v8–54r6, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5837; Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO* 165r5–173v4; the third grammatical treatise attributed to him—though his authorship is not certain—is entitled *Sgra'i-*

rnam-par-dbye-ba-bstan-pa, "Exposé of the nominal cases", Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel ÑO* 54r6–64r4, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5838. (N.B.: this treatise is not extant in the Sde-dge and Co-ne editions of the canon). On the three texts, cf. Inaba (1954: 24–28) and Katsura (1965: 10 note 19).

6. This commentary is entitled *Kalāpa-laghu-vṛtti-śiṣyahitā*, Tib. *Ka-lā-pa'i-'grel-pa-ñuṅ-ṅu-las-slob-ma-la-phan-pa*, Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE* 125v5–163v5, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5777; Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE* 31r3–62v5. It is an excerpt, in fact the first four chapters on verbal morphology, from an extensive commentary on *Kalāpa* (or *Kātantra*) grammar entitled *Śiṣyahitā*.

7. The first catalogue, entitled *Bstan-'gyur-gyi-dkar-chag-yid-bžin-nor-bu-dbaṅ-gi-rgyal-po'i-'phreṅ-ba*, was written by *Bu-ston* Rin-chen-grub (1290–1364) in 1335; cf. Ruegg (1966: 30 note 2) and Grönbold (1984: 14–15, 32 nr. 115); edition: Chandra (1965–1971 vol. 26: 401–643).

The second catalogue, entitled *Bstan-bcos-'gyur-ro-'tshal-gyi-dkar-chag-yid-bžin-gyi-nor-bu-rin-po-che'i-za-ma-tog*, was written in 1362 by one of *Bu-ston*'s pupils, *Sgra-tshad-pa* Rin-chen-rnam-rgyal (1318–1388); edition: Chandra (1965–1971 vol. 28: 343–574).

8. V. ed. Chandra (1965–1971 vol. 26: 626.5–627.6) and ed. Chandra (1965–1971 vol. 28: 557.4–558.4); cf. Verhagen (1991).

9. Teacher of *Bu-ston* (1290–1364); abbot of Snar-thaṅ from 1305 to 1312, cf. *Deb-ther-sṅon-po* trl. Roerich (1949: 282–283, 793, 800) and Ruegg (1966: 80 note 2, 81); and translator of four texts on Sanskrit grammar, viz. Peking canon ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nrs. 5767–5770.

10. Pupil of *Stag-sde-ba* Seṅ-ge-rgyal-mtshan (1212–1294), he played an important role in the study of a number of "auxiliary sciences" in Tibet, such as rhetorics and grammar; cf. *Deb-ther-sṅon-po* trl. Roerich (1949: 784–785), Tucci (1949: 135) and Hahn (1971: 8–10). He was the translator of two texts on Sanskrit grammar, viz. Peking canon ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nrs. 5793 and 5889.

11. Probably the leading figure in the development of Sanskrit grammatical studies in Tibet at that time; cf. *Deb-ther-sṅon-po* trl. Roerich (1949: 785–786), Miller (1965: 331–332)(= repr. 1975: 75–76), Hahn (1971: 10–11), De Jong (1972: 509) and Taube (1978: 171 note 11). He was the translator of the following Sanskrit grammatical treatises, Peking canon ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nrs. 5771, 5773, 5774, 5778 and probably also 5775, 5776, 5887.

12. Famous polymath scholar, cf., e.g., Tucci (1949: 104–106) and Hoffmann (1975: 158, 208). He was the main compiler of the first

version of *Bstan-'gyur*, cf. Vogel (1965: 25) and Ruegg (1966: 25–30, 32–35). In the field of Sanskrit grammar he was a translator of the Peking canon ed. Suzuki (1955–1958) title nrs. 5892, 5893.

13. Elsewhere in the Buddhist world preference for these two grammars as instruction manuals is also encountered; cf. Scharfe (1977: 164–166) and H. Bechert, "Sanskrit-Grammatiken in singhalesischer Überlieferung", *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14 (Festschrift Wilhelm Rau) (1987): 6–8.

14. Cf. S.K. Mukhopadhyaya, "Tibetan translations of Prakriyā-kaumudī and the mention of Siddhānta-kaumudī therein", *Indian Historical Quarterly* 20 (1944): 63–69, Tucci (1949: 74–75) and Verhagen (1991).

15. For a useful synopsis of the various etymologies put forward for the term *pratītya-samutpāda* in Indian Buddhist exegetical literature, q. v. La Vallée Poussin (1913: 48–49).

16. Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel ÑO* 1v1–38r3, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5833, Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO* 131v1–160r7. A description of the contents of this text is given in an article by Sakai Shirō, "Honyagu-myōgidaishū no nangoshaku - Pañjikā-madhyavyutpatti ni tsuite", *Mikkyō Bunka* 29–30 (1955): 66–57; the introduction and a selection of entries have been translated by Simonsson (1957: 238–280).

Simonsson (1957: 215 note 4, 238 note 1) does not commit himself to any translation of the title *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa*, but rejects the translation of G. Tucci, "The Validity of Tibetan historical tradition", *India Antiqua - J.Ph. Vogel Memorial Volume*, Leiden 1947, p. 320 (= repr. in *Opera Minora P. II*, Roma 1971, p. 464): "second chapter of the sgra-sbyor" and G. Tucci, *The Tombs of the Tibetan Kings*, Roma 1950 (= S.O.R. 1), p. 11: "the second chapter of MVP" (MVP = *Mahāvyutpatti*), preferring that of B. Laufer, "Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft der Tibeter. Zamatog", *Sitzungsberichte der philosoph.-philolog. u. hist. Classe der k.b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München* I (1898): 550: "Sprachwissenschaft in zwei Abteilungen" and especially that of G. Huth, 'Verzeichniss der im tibetischen Tanjur, Abtheilung mDo (Sūtra), Band 117–124, enthaltenen Werke', *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* XV, philos.-historischen Classe (1895): 277: "Die Herstellung des sprachlichen Ausdrucks: zwei Abtheilungen". Snellgrove (1987: 442) translates it as: "Word-Combination, a two-part work".

17. Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel GO* 204v7–310r8, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5832, Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO* 1r1–131r7; editions: *Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary, being an edition and transla-*

tion of the Mahāvyutpatti by A. Csoma de Körös, part I (1910) and part II (1916), edited by E. D. Ross and S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa; part III (1944) edited by D. C. Chatterjee, Calcutta (= Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Memoirs 4:1–3); N. D. Mironoff (ed.), *Mahāvyutpatti*, St. Petersburg 1911 (= Bibliotheca Buddhica 13), and R. Sakaki (ed.), *Mahāvyutpatti*, 2 parts, Kyōto 1916–1925 (= Kyoto Imperial University Series 3).

References to this lexicon in the present article are based on the Sakaki edition.

18. The compilers are mentioned in the introduction to *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa*, Cf. Simonsson (1957: 241–244), N. Simonsson, "A Note on the Knowledge of Indian Grammar Among the Tibetan Translators of the Ninth Century", *Orientalia Suecana* 33–35 (1984–1986): 385–386 and Snellgrove (1987: 441–442).

19. Cf. Simonsson (1957: 212–213, 239–241, 263–264).

20. The doctoral thesis I am currently writing will contain a chapter on these elements of Sanskrit grammatical analysis in *Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gñis-pa*.

21. *Dhātupāṭha* is the term for the lexica of verbal roots, which form part of the autochthonous Indian grammatical traditions, cf. G.B. Palsule, *The Sanskrit Dhātupāṭhas - A Critical Study*, Poona 1961 (= Deccan College Dissertation Series 23) and Scharfe (1977: 101–102 and passim).

22. From now on P refers to the relevant text in the Peking edition of the canon (based on the edition by Suzuki, 1955–1958) and C to that in the Co-ne edition (based on the microfilm edition of Library of Congress). In the body of the article the text according to P will be given; variant readings in C are to be found in the notes.

23. C: *ti*

24. C: *mu-tpa*

25. C: *gyur-pa*

26. C: *ba-ndha-sta*

27. C: *utpatta*

28. C: *tshig-phyi*

29. C: *sna-ma'i*

30. C: *brten*

31. C: *ma*

32. C: *gyis*

33. It should be noted that both editions consulted read *pra-ti-ta* here. The short vowel *i* must surely be emended to long *ī*; we can go one step further and read *tya* instead of *ta*, which would make this form identical to the form occurring in the compound term *pratītya-samutpāda*, the form *pratītya* being the so-called absolutive or gerund

form of compound verb *prati* + *i*. However, this second emendation is not all that self-evident, as *pratīta* is a correct Sanskrit form too, viz. the so-called verbal adjective or past passive participle of the same verb.

34. *saṁbandhin* seems the most plausible reconstruction; *saṁbandha* is a second possibility. P has *saṁ-bha-dhi*, C *saṁ-ba-ndha*.

35. The form *utpatta* is not a correct Sanskrit form. The most similar form is a noun *utpatti*, "origination". However, I consider it most likely that the form *utpāda*, as it occurs in the term discussed here, is intended. Note that the meaning "birth, origin," etc. for *utpatti* occurs in classical Sanskrit (cf. M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899, p. 180), while in Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit the denotation "occasion" seems to be predominant, a meaning derived from the basic meaning "occurrence;" cf. Edgerton (1953: 125).

36. Cf. *rkyen-du-'gyur-ba/ gyur-pa*, P 29r4, C 152v7.

37. Cf. *rten-pa*, P 29r4, C 152v7; and Edgerton (1953: 373).

38. Cf. S.C. Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit synonyms*, Calcutta 1902 (repr. Delhi etc. 1970), p. 1126 s.v. *yaṅ-dag* where the author gives *samyak* as a Sanskrit equivalent, while in the following examples *yaṅ-dag* obviously translates the Sanskrit prefix *sam*. It seems correct to consider *yaṅ-dag(-par)* as a stock translation for both *sam* and *samyak*; cf. M. Hahn, *Lehrbuch der klassischen tibetischen Schriftsprache*, Bonn 1974, p. 329.

39. This is one of the conclusions of the chapter on this subject in the doctoral thesis I am currently preparing. The dissertation will be entitled *Sanskrit grammatical literature in Tibet*.

40. Cf. Simonsson (1957: 245–246, 269–270), where I take *sgra-bžin-du* to mean "according to the word(-form)," i.e. according to the morphology; Simonsson (1957: 245) translates: "dem Laut gemäss."

41. Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE* 82r4–83r3; Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel RE* 70v3–71v1.

42. Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE* 58v8–82r4, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5772; Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel RE* 51v2–70v3. This is a treatise by a certain *Siṁhabhadra* on the declension of Sanskrit nouns according to the *Cāndra* system of Sanskrit grammar; the translation was made by *Śoṅ* Blo-gros-brtan-pa; cf. Liebich (1895: 18–20).

43. Liebich (1895: 20) has described it as a separate text; other scholars, such as A. Schiefner ("Ueber die logischen und grammatischen Werke im Tandjur", *Bulletin de la Classe historico-philologique de l'Acad. Imp. des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg* t. IV, p. 284–302, nr. 3609), the compilers of the catalogue of the Peking canon reprint ed. Suzuki (1955–1958),and the so-called Tōhoku catalogue of

the Sde-dge canon (H. Ui, M. Suzuki, Y. Kanakura & T. Tada, *A complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*, Sendai 1934, p. 653) do not mention it as a separate text. Cordier (1915: 459) has: "suivi, fol. 82<a>, 4–83<a>, 3, d'un Appendice explicatif, dû à Dpal-ldan Blo-gros brtan-pa (Çrīmat Sthiramati)."

Most of the Tibetan canon-catalogues consulted (viz. *Bu-ston* Rin-chen-grub's and *Sgra-tshad-pa* Rin-chen-rnam-rgyal's catalogues of the Źa-lu *Bstan-'gyur* and the fifth Dalai Lama's catalogue of the Peking edition) do not mention this treatise. However, the Co-ne catalogue does refer to it; immediately after the entry on the above-mentioned *Vibhakti-kārikā* (sixth title in vol. *RE*) the first sentence of this excursus is quoted (and partly paraphrased): *'di-la-rtags-kyi-bye-brag-ma-phyed-pa-la-sogs-pa(=la?)-bstan-bcos-la-mi-legs-pa-'ga'-re-yod-pa-daṅ-/'gyur-ma-dag-pa'aṅ-bag(?,='ga?)-re-snaṅ-yaṅ-las-daṅ-po-(296v6:)pa-rnams-la-phan-par-bsams-nas-bris-pa-yin-no* (Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Dkar-chag* 296v5–6). Note that not only the location, following the colophon, separates the present excursus from the preceding text, but also the subject-matter; the excursus on *pratītya-samutpāda* deals with the whole of the derivational procedure, starting from the verbal roots, while *Vibhakti-kārikā* deals only with nominal declension, starting from nominal bases that are themselves already primary (or even secondary) derivations.

44. P 83r3, C 71r7–v1.

45. Cf. note 11 above.

46. He is the younger brother and pupil of *Śoṅ-ston* Rdo-rje-rgyal-mtshan (cf. note 10 above) and he is known to have met 'Phags-pa (1235–1280), so he can be dated to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century; cf. Hahn (1971: 10–11), De Jong (1972: 509, where presumably "treizième siècle" should be read instead of "douzième"), and Taube (1978: 194 note 146).

47. P 82r2–3, C 70v2–3.

48. *Dpaṅ-lo'i-śog-gcig-ma* is entry 17.4 in *A-khu-tho-yig*, section on Sanskrit grammar, ed. L. Chandra, *Materials for a History of Tibetan Literature, Part 3*, New Delhi 1963, p. 577, nr. 12874. The quotation from this text is to be found in *Legs-sbyar-gces-pa'i-gnad-bsdus-mgrin-pa'i-lcags-sgrogs-raṅ-'grol-źes-bya-ba*, 8 ff. in vol. *KA* of the *Gsuṅ-'bum* of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa Ṅag-dbaṅ-brtson-'grus, ed. N. G. Demo, *The Collected Works of 'Jam-dbyaṅs-bźad-pa'i-rdo-rje, reproduced from prints from the Bkra-śis-'khyil blocks, vol. 1*, New Delhi 1974, pp. 523–538. The quoted passage is a verse dealing with the notion of augment (Sanskrit *āgama*):

raṅ-bžin-rkyen-gyi-bar-du-'am /
/raṅ-bžin-dbyaṅs-mtha'i-gžan-du-'aṅ-/
/ji-ltar-bśad-bžin-ā-ga-ma /
/dkyus-min-dgos-ldan-rtags-kyi-don /, ed. Demo op. cit., p. 534–535, f. 6v6–7r1.

49. For the four Blo-gros-brtan-pa in general, cf. Cordier (1915: 117–118, 461) and De Jong (1972: 509). For the identification of "the third Blo-gros-brtan-pa" with Grags-pa-rgyal-mtshan see M. Lalou, *Répertoire du Tanjur d'après le catalogue de P. Cordier*, Paris 1933, p. 200. On *Sñe-thaṅ-lo-tsā-ba* Blo-gros-brtan-pa, cf. D.P. Jackson, "Commentaries on the Writings of Sa-skya Pandita: A Bibliographical Sketch," *Tibet Journal* VIII.3 (1983): 7. For a different identification of the four, cf. Khetsun Sangpo, *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism*, vol. XI, Dharamsala 1979, p. 473. The matter of the four Blo-gros-brtan-pa will also be dealt with in the doctoral dissertation I am currently writing.

50. C: *pa-yaṅ-bag*
51. C: *lam*
52. C: *i-na*
53. C: *rtags*, which is the correct reading. P's *rtag* must be erroneous considering the following allomorph of the genitive particle, scil. *kyi.*
54. C: *gžag*
55. C: *e-ti*, which is certainly preferable to *i-te* (in P), cf. note 94.
56. C: *śti-pa'i*
57. C: *śti-pa'o*
58. C: *bya*
59. C: *ig'i*
60. C: *rgyu-li*(sic)-*i*
61. C: *ñe*
62. C: *ste/*
63. C: *gaṅ*
64. C: *ktwa*
65. C: *na-ña*
66. C: *ktwa'i-lya-pa'o*
67. C: *dbyiṅs* (sic)
68. C: *tuk*
69. C: *gžag*
70. C: *le'ur*
71. C: *pi-ta-la-tu-ka'o*
72. C: *ti'i* (sic)
73. C: *pas*
74. C: *lya-pa*
75. C: *pa-yin-pas-na/ bži*

76. C: *su-pa'i*
77. C: *pa*
78. C: *diw*
79. C: *pad*
80. C: *sa-ma*
81. C: *ñe*
82. C: *sgrel*(?)
83. C: *ces*
84. C: *rā*(?)
85. C: *ghañi'i*
86. C: *ra*(?)
87. C: *de-rnams-*(C 71r7:)*kyañ*
88. *las-dañ-po,* the reading in P, is preferable to C *lam-dañ-po;* cf. also *las-dañ-po-pa-rnams-la* in the passage from the Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Dkar-chag* quoted in note 43.
89. Transl.: "(The verbal roots) *iN* (viz. *i*), *vī* and *vā* (occur) in the meaning 'to go.'"
90. This is the so-called second conjugational class of Sanskrit verbs, of which the root *ad* is the first in order in all major *Dhātupāṭhas.*
91. Tibetan *byiñs* (P 82r5, r6, r7, r8, v4, v6; *skad-kyi-byiñs* P 82v7) translates Sanskrit *dhātu* (cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 4707), the technical term for the verbal root; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 207–208).
92. In a grammatical context, forms of the verb *'phyi-ba,* such as *phyis* (P 82r6, v3, v4) and *dbyi* (P 82r8, v1, v5) denote "to be elided" or "elision," as an equivalent to derivations from the root *lup* (esp. *lopa*) in Sanskrit grammatical idiom; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 335 s.v. *lupta,* 337 s.v. *lopa*).
93. Emend *rtag* (P 82r6) to *rtags,* cf. note 53.
Rtags (P 82r7, v3, v7), "marker," refers to the technical device of *it* or *anubandha,* the letters (transliterated as capital letters in the present article, a fairly common practice in Indological literature) that—in a grammatical context—can be joined to roots or suffixes to indicate certain morphological or phonological properties of the element in question; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 25 s.v. *anubandha,* 69–70 s.v. *it*[1]).
94. Transl.: "(The verbal root) *i* denotes 'to go.' The reading in C, *e-ti-ni-'gro-ba'i-don-to,* is preferable to P *i-te-ni....,* as the rest of this passage (3–5) describes the derivation of precisely the citation-form *eti* to refer to the root *i;* cf. notes 95 and 96.
95. Scil. *etir gaty-arthaḥ,* in *Prasannapadā,* Candrakīrti's commentary on Nāgārjuna's *Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā* (in fact in the passage dealing with the term *pratītya-samutpāda*), ed. L. de la Vallée Poussin, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 5 line 1; cf. also note 115.

96. E.g. *eti gaty-arthaḥ* in Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya*, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1975, p. 138 line 2; cf. also *itir gatāv* and (*ayam*) *itir gaty-artham* (*ujjhitvā*) in Yaśomitra's *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā*, a commentary on Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa*, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932–1936, part III, p. 294 line 21 and 23 respectively. In either case, the phrase is found in a passage dealing with the term *pratītya-samutpāda*. Cf. also note 115.

97. Tibetan *rkyen* (P 82r7, v2, v7) translates Sanskrit *pratyaya* (cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 1197, 2266–2270), here a technical grammatical term for "suffix"; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 264–265).

98. Transl.: "When the own form (of a verb is to be expressed the suffixes) *i*, *Ki* and *ŚtiP* (occur behind the verbal root in question);" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 1.3.96: *kriyārthasya svarūpe 'bhidheye kriyārthāt pare i-Ki-ŚtiPo bhavanti*, Liebich (1918: 63).

In a grammatical context reference to the *svarūpa*, the "own form," implies reference to the mentioned root only, not to other roots with the same meaning; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 441–442 s.v. *svarūpagrahana* and *svarūpavidhi*), cf. also *vārttika iK-ŚtiPau dhātunirdeśe* ad Pāṇini 3.3.108. The suffix *ŚtiP* occurs together with the *vikarana*, i.e. the thematic suffix, typical for the conjugational class to which the root in question belongs; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 395).

99. Transl.: *aT* (i.e. short *a*) or *eN* (i.e. *e* or *o*; *guna*-vowels occur as substitutes) instead of (the final morpheme of) a verbal root ending in a (vowel from the group) *iK* (i.e. *i*, *u*, *ṛ* or *ḷ*, when a suffix follows);" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 6.2.1: *iG-antāyāḥ prakṛteh kriyārthāyā aD-eNo bhavanti*, Liebich (1918: 446); cf. Pāṇini 7.3.84.

100. Tibetan *ñer-bsgyur* (P 82v1, v6), i.e. *ñe-bar-(b)sgyur-ba*, translates Sanskrit *upasarga*, the technical grammatical term for the verbal prepositions; cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 4710, Abhyankar (1977: 88–89), Pāṇini 1.4.58–59.

In fact the *Cāndra* system of grammar in its basic texts avoids the use of technical grammatical terms; for instance, it refers to the group of verbal prepositions as *prādi*, "(the group) *pra* etc.;" cf. *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra*1.1.109. On the semantical role of verbal prepositions, cf. note 115.

101. Tibetan *rnam-dbye* (P 82v1, v5), i.e. *rnam-par-dbye-ba*, translates Sanskrit *vibhakti*, a technical grammatical term for the nominal case-endings; cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 4737, Abhyankar (1977: 357).

102. Tibetan *tshig-sdud* (P 82v1, v2) translates Sanskrit *samāsa*, a technical grammatical term for the nominal compound; cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 4713, Abhyankar (1977: 416).

103. Cf. note 111.

104. Transl.: "When two (actions) have one and the same agent (*kartṛ*), (the suffix) *Ktvā* (occurs) after the (verb which expresses the action taking place) earlier;" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra*1.3.131: *ekakartṛkayor vyāpārayor madhye yaḥ pūrvavyāpāras tadarthāt Ktvā bhavati*, Liebich (1918: 72); cf. Pāṇini 3.4.21. *Ktvā* is the so-called gerund or absolutive suffix *tvā;* cf. Abhyankar (1977: 131 s.v. *Ktvā*(3)).

105. Transl.: "(Suffix) *LyaP* (occurs) instead of *Ktvā* when (the element ending in *Ktvā* forms) a compound with (an element that is) not *naÑ;*" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 5.4.6: *naÑo 'nyasya Ktvāntena samāse Ktvo LyaB bhavati*, Liebich (1918: 402); cf. Pāṇini 7.1.37. *LyaP* is the gerund or absolutive suffix for composite verbs, scil. *ya; naÑ* is the negative particle *na* that, when used prepositionally, takes the form *a(n);* cf. Pāṇini 6.3.73–77, *Cāndra* 5.2.91–96.

106. Here Tibetan *dbyaṅs* (P 82v2) is equivalent to Sanskrit *svara*, in a grammatical context the technical term for "accent;" cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 248, 684, 3385, 3418, 3427, 3433, Abhyankar (1977: 439 s.v. *svara*[2]). This refers to Pāṇini 6.1.193, according to which an acute accent falls on the syllable preceding a suffix with *L* as a marker. This rule cannot be found in *Cāndra*, as the whole section on accent is missing in the *Cāndra sūtra*-text as we know it now; cf. also the discussion in 3.3., third paragraph, and notes 124–126.

107. Transl.: "(Augment) *tUK* (occurs as part) of a (verbal root ending in a) short vowel when (a suffix that is) not a personal ending (*tiÑ*) (and) that bears marker *P* follows;" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 5.1.69: *atiÑi piti parato hrasvāntasya dhātos tUGāgamo bhavati*, Liebich (1918: 336); cf. Pāṇini 6.1.71.

108. Transl.: "When a (vowel from the group) *aK* (i.e. *a, i, u, ṛ* or *ḷ*) precedes a (similar vowel from the group) *aK* a (single) long vowel (occurs as substitute instead of both);" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 5.1.106: *aKo 'Ki parato dvayor eko dīrgho bhavati*, Liebich (1918: 342); cf. Pāṇini 6.1.101.

109. Transl.: "When the mere (undifferentiated) meaning (of the noun itself) is intended the first (i.e. nominative case occurs);" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 2.1.93: *avyatirikte śabdārthamātre prathamā vibhaktir bhavati*, Liebich (1918: 113); cf. Pāṇini 2.3.46. For a discussion of the semantics of the nominative case in autochthonous Indian grammar and the adoption of that description in Tibetan grammar, cf. P.C. Verhagen, "A ninth-century Tibetan summary of the Indo-Tibetan model of case-semantics," in Ihara, S. and Yamaguchi, Z. (eds.), *Tibetan Studies. Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies Narita 1989*, Narita 1992, pp. 833–844.

110. *sU* (viz. *s*) is the technical form of the nominative singular case-ending; cf. *Cāndra* 2.1.1, Pāṇini 4.1.2, Abhyankar (1977: 430 s.v. *sU*[1]).

111. Tibetan *graṅs-med* (P 82v5) is equivalent to Sanskrit *asaṁkhya* (cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 8040), and *mi-zad-pa* (P 82v1, v5) is equivalent to *avyaya* (as generally used in grammatical literature, cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* 4730). Both are technical terms referring to the indeclinables; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 47 s.v. *avyaya*, 49 s.v. *asaṁkhya*).

112. Transl.: "Elision (*luk*) of the nominal case-ending (*sUP*) (occurs) after an indeclinable;" *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 2.1.38: *avidyamānasaṁkhyāt parasya sUPo lug bhavati*, Liebich (1918: 102); cf. Pāṇini 1.1.38.

113. Transl.: "(The verbal root) *padA* (occurs) in the meaning 'to go.'"

114. This is the so-called fourth conjugational class of Sanskrit verbs, of which the root *div* is the first in order in all major *Dhātupāṭha* traditions.

115. According to the Indian grammatical traditions the verbal prepositions (*upasarga*) are instrumental in changing the meaning of the root they are combined with. This is expressed in a well-known mnemotechnic verse:

> *upasargeṇa dhātvartho balād anyatra nīyate/*
> *gaṅgāsalilamādhuryaṁ sāgareṇa yathāmbhasā//*
> The meaning of the verbal root can be necessarily (lit.: by force, *balād*) changed into another (meaning) because of a verbal preposition (combined with that root), just like the sweetness of the water of the Ganges (is changed) by the ocean water (when the Ganges reaches the ocean).

Cf. Abhyankar (1977: 88 s.v. *upasarga*); this stanza is quoted in *Prasannapadā loc. cit.* (cf. note 95) p. 5 line 2–3. For the Tibetan translation of this verse see note 129. The *Cāndra* system prescribes this influence of the verbal preposition on the meaning of the root in *paribhāṣā-sūtra* 81: *prādīnāṁ kriyāyogitvaṁ viśeṣadyotitve svabhāvāt,* Liebich (1928: 51). Neither the mnemotechnic verse nor the *Cāndra paribhāṣā* seem to be the exact Sanskrit original of the (verse?) phrase partly quoted here in Blo-gros-brtan-pa's excursus, but a close similarity is apparent. In fact, when dealing with the term *pratītya-samutpāda*, various Buddhist commentaries (e.g. the passages in the *Prasannapadā* and the commentaries on the *Abhidharmakośa* mentioned in notes 95 and 96) enlarge upon this semantical influence of the verbal prepositions on the root in connection with both *pratītya* and *samutpāda*.

On *pratītya*, see e.g.: the *Prasannapadā, loc. cit.* (cf. note 95), p. 5 line 1 and 4:

> *etir gatyarthaḥ pratiḥ prāptyarthaḥ/ upasargavaśena dhātvartha-vipariṇāmāt/* (. . .)
> *pratītyaśabdo 'tra LyaBantaḥ prāptāv apekṣāyāṁ vartate,* (The verbal root) *i* denotes "to go;" and (verbal preposition) *prati* denotes "to attain." On account of the verbal preposition a change in the meaning of the verbal root

takes place; . . . so the word *pratītya*, ending in (suffix) *LyaP*, here functions
with the meaning "to attain" (*prāpti*) (or) "to depend (on)" (*apekṣā*).

Cf. the similar passage: *pratiḥ prāptyartha eti gatyarthaḥ/ upasar-
gavaśena dhātvarthavipariṇāmāt prāpyeti yo 'rthaḥ pratītyeti/*, in the
Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya loc. cit. (cf. note 96) p. 138, line 1–2. Cf. also the
Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā loc. cit. (cf. note 96) p. 294, line 22–
23:

> *pratiś copasargaḥ prāptidyotaka ity ayam itir gatyartham ujjhitvā prāptyartham
> āpadyate.* And verbal preposition *prati* indicates "to attain," so (in the com-
> bination *prati* + the root *i* (citation form *iti*) loses (its) meaning 'to go' and
> adopts the meaning 'to attain' (viz. on account of the verbal preposition *prati*).

On *samutpāda*, see e.g. the *Prasannapadā, loc. cit.* p. 5, line 4–5 (cf. also
variant interpretations given there on pp. 5–10):

> *samutpūrvaḥ padīh prādurbhāvārtha iti samutpādaśabdaḥ prādurbhāve vartate.*
> "(The verbal root) *padī* preceded by (verbal prepositions) *sam* and *ud* de-
> notes 'to arise', so the word *samutpāda* functions in the meaning 'to arise;'"
> and the *Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya loc. cit.* p. 138, line 3: *padīh sattārthaḥ
> samutpūrvaḥ prādurbhāvārthaḥ,* "(The verbal root) *padī* denotes 'to exist';
> (however,) preceded by (verbal prepositions) *sam* and *ud* it denotes 'to
> arise.'"

Cf. also the synopsis of the various semantical and etymological
interpretations of the term *pratītya-samutpāda* in La Vallée Poussin
(1913: 48–49).

116. Transl.: "(Suffix) *GHaÑ* (occurs variously in the meaning 'ac-
tion') or when expressing a *kāraka* (i.e. a case-relation) (after a verbal
root)." *Vṛtti* on *Cāndra* 1.3.7: *bhāve kārake ca kriyārthād bahulaṁ GHaÑ
bhavati,* Liebich (1918: 53); cf. Pāṇini 3.3.16–19.

117. I haven taken *srog* (P 82v7, v8) to mean "vowel;" cf. J. Bacot, *Les
Slokas grammaticaux de Thonmi Sambhoṭa avec leurs commentaires traduits
du Tibétain et annotés,* Paris 1928 (Annales du Musée Guimet.
Bibliothèque d'Etudes 37) p. 91: "*srog (yi-ge'i-srog)* = La vie des Lettres.
Les voyelles."

118. Emend *gha'i* to: *ghañ'i.*

119. Transl.: "(Long vowel *ā*—i.e. *āT*—occurs as a substitute in-
stead of short vowel *a*—i.e. *aT*—which is the penultimate letter of an
element) when (an element) with marker *Ñ* or *Ṇ* follows." *Vṛtti* on
Cāndra 6.1.9: *ñiti ṇiti ca parata upāntasyāTa āD bhavati,* Liebich (1918:
427); cf. Pāṇini 7.2.116. Emend *ñid* (P 82v8) to *ñ(a-)ṇid;* perhaps this is
an error caused by the similarity to the Tibetan word *ñid,* 'self'?

120. So far I have not been able to identify exactly the Sanskrit
original of this maxim, partially quoted here. The same phrase, in a
slightly different translation, is repeatedly referred to in an "instruc-

tion manual" on certain grammatical points in the exegesis of the *Kālacakra-tantra* written by *Bu-ston* Rin-chen-grub, entitled *Dpal-dus-kyi-'khor-lo'i-bśad-thabs-sgra-rig-mkhas-pa'i-rgyan*, ed. Chandra (1965–1971 vol. 4: 599–614) in the following terms: *a-swa-ra-swa-ra-saṁ-yo-ga* (i.e. *a-svara[ḥ?]svara-saṁyoga[ḥ?]*, Tib. *dbyaṅs-med-la-dbyaṅs-yaṅ-dag-par-sbyar-ro* (v. fol. 2v2–3, 4r1, 4r2, cf. 4r5, 4r7, 5v1, 5v3, 5v4, 6r6, 6r7). *Loc. cit.* fol. 2v2 terms it a so-called *uṆ-ādi(-sūtra)*; however I have not been able to trace this phrase in the *uṆ-ādi-sūtra*s of the *Cāndra* or *Pāṇinīya* system. For *dbyaṅs* as equivalent of Sanskrit *svara*, "accent," cf. note 106.

121. I.e., perhaps Nāgārjuna or the Buddha. Both are mentioned in the *maṅgala* at the beginning of the text.

122. Cf. Scharfe (1977: 164) and Abhyankar (1977: 152 s.v. Candrācārya or Candragomin, 154 s.v. *Cāndra*).

123. In fact, the second quoted entry, *padA gatau*, also occurs in the *Dhātupāṭha* of Pāṇini's grammar, scil. IV.60. The first, however, does not; the *Pāṇinīya Dhātupāṭha* has three separate entries for roots *iṆ, vī* and *vā*, scil. II.36, 39 and 41, with more elaborate meaning-entries for the latter two roots.

124. Cf. Liebich (1895: 39–44); cf. also note 126.

125. Cf. Liebich (1895: 9–12); cf. also note 126.

126. Cf. Liebich (1928: 47).

127. The application of 5.1.106 (here: *prati + i ... = pratī ...*) results in the disappearance of one of the conditions for applying 5.1.69, viz. a short vowel, and so would prevent the subsequent application of 5.1.69. I know of no separate studies on rule ordering in *Cāndra*; an important study on rule ordering in Pāṇini is P. Kiparsky, "Lecture III. The Ordering of rules in Pāṇini's grammar," in *Some Theoretical Problems in Pāṇini's Grammar*, Poona 1982, pp. 77–121.

128. This is indeed a grave error as—according to traditional Sanskrit grammar—*iti*, "thus," is an indeclinable particle (introduced usually in a group of particles in which *ca*, "and," is the first in order; e.g. Pāṇini 1.4.57) in no way related to verbal root *i*.

129. E.g. in the Tibetan translation of the passages in the *Prasannapadā* referred to and quoted above (notes 95 and 115) and below (note 130), according to the Peking *Bstan-'gyur* (*Mdo-'grel 'A*, ed. Suzuki 1955–1958 title nr. 5260), the incorrect citation-form *iti* of the root *i* can be found in two instances: first in the passage on the first interpretation of the term *pratītya*, also containing the mnemotechnic verse on the semantic influence of verbal prepositions (cf. note 115):

('A 2v8:) *de-la-pra-ti-ni-*(3r1:)*phrad-pa'i-don-to/*
/i-ti-(sic)*ni-'gro-ba'i-don-to/*
/lyap-kyi-mtha'-can-pra-tī-tya'i-sgra-ni-phrad-pa-ste-bltos-pa-la-'jug-pa-yin-te/

skad-kyi-byiṅs-ni-ñe-bar-bsgyur-bas-yoṅs-su-bsgyur-ba'i-phyir-ro//(3r2:)*ñe-bar-bsgyur-ba'i-dbaṅ-gis-ni/*
/skad-byiṅs-don-ni-yoṅs-bsgyur-te/
/gaṅgā'i-chu-ni-mṅar-mod-kyi/
rgya-mtsho-chu-yis-ji-bźin-no-źes-bśad-do/

It is found again in the second interpretation of *pratītya* (where the Sanskrit text apparently also has *iti*; cf. note 130):

('*A* 3r3:) */gźan-dag-ni-(pra-ti-ni-zlos-pa'i-don-to/) /i-ti-*(sic)*ni-'gro-*(3r4:)*ba'i-ste-chas-pa-daṅ-'jig-pa'o/.*

For the sake of completeness, the Tibetan translation of the passage on *samutpāda* from the *Prasannapadā*, quoted in note 115, reads: (Peking, ibid. 3r2:) *sa-mud-goṅ-na-yod-pa'i-pa-ta-*(sic)*-ni-'byuṅ-ba'i-don-can-yin-* (3r3:)*pas-sa-mud-pa-ta'i-*(sic)*sgra-ni-'byuṅ-ba-la-'jug-go(/).*

130. E.g. *Prasannapadā loc. cit.* (cf. note 95) p.5, line 7: *apare tu bruvate/ itir* (sic) *gamanaṁ vināśaḥ;* "However, others say (that the verbal root) *i* (citation-form *iti!*) (denotes) 'to go' (i.e.) 'to perish.'" Cf. also the passages from Yaśomitra's *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā* quoted in notes 96 and 115.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abhyankar, K.V. (& Shukla, J.M.) (1977). *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, Baroda, second revised edition (= Gaekwad's Oriental Series 134).

Chandra, L. (ed.) (1965–1971). *The Collected Works of Bu-ston*, 28 volumes, New Delhi (= Śata-Piṭaka Series vol. 41–68).

Cordier, P. (1915). *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale, P. 3: Index du Bstan-ḥgyur (Tibétain 180–332)*, Paris.

De Jong, J.W. (1972). "Notes à propos des colophons du Kanjur", *Zentral Asiatische Studien* 6: 505–560 (repr. in J.W. De Jong, *Buddhist Studies*, Berkeley 1979: 149–203).

Edgerton, F. (1953). *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary. 2: Dictionary*, New Haven.

Grönbold, G. (1984). *Der buddhistische Kanon. Eine Bibliographie*, Wiesbaden.

Hahn, M. (1971). *Jñānaśrīmitras Vṛttamālāstuti. Eine Beispielsammlung zur altindischen Metrik. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur zusammen mit der mongolischen Version herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert*, Wiesbaden (= Asiatische Forschungen 33).

Hoffmann, H. (1975). *Tibet. A Handbook*, Bloomington (= Indiana University Asian Studies Research Institute, Oriental Series vol. 5).

Inaba, S. (1954). *Chibetto-go Koten Bunpōgaku*, Kyōto.

Katsura, S. (1965). "R.A. Miller on Classical Tibetan", *Indological Review* 1: 1–14.

La Vallée Poussin, L. de (1913). *Bouddhisme. Etudes et Matériaux: Théorie des douze causes*, Gand (= Receuil de Travaux publ. par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres - Université de Gand, 40me fasc.).

Liebich, B. (1895). "Das Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa", *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Heft 3: 272–321 (references according to page-numbering of offprint).

Liebich, B. (ed.) (1918). *Candra-Vṛtti, Der Original-Kommentar Candragomin's zu seinem grammatischen Sutra*, Leipzig (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 14).

Liebich, B. (1928). *Konkordanz Panini-Candra*, Breslau (= Indische Forschungen 6).

Miller, R.A. (1963). "Thon-mi Sambhoṭa and his Grammatical Treatises", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 83: 485–502 (repr. in Miller 1976: 1–18).

Miller, R.A. (1965). "Some Minor Tibetan Grammatical Fragments", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 115: 327–340 (repr. in Miller 1976: 71–84).

Miller, R.A. (1976). *Studies in the Grammatical Tradition in Tibet*, Amsterdam (= Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science III).

Roerich, G.N. (transl.) (1949). *The Blue Annals of Gzhon-nu-dpal*, 2 parts, Calcutta 1949–1953.

Ruegg, D.S. (1966). *The life of Bu ston Rin po che. With the Tibetan Text of the Bu ston rNam thar*, Roma (= Serie Orientale Roma XXXIV).

Scharfe, H. (1977). *Grammatical Literature*, Wiesbaden (= A History of Indian Literature, vol. V: scientific and technical literature fasc. 2).

Simonsson, N. (1957). *Indo-tibetische Studien. Die Methoden der tibetischen Übersetzer, untersucht im Hinblick auf die Bedeutung ihrer Übersetzungen für die Sanskritphilologie I*, Uppsala.

Snellgrove, D.L. (1987). *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism - Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*, London.

Suzuki, D.T. (ed.) (1955–1958). *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking edition, kept in the Library of the Otani University, Kyoto*, Tokyo-Kyoto, 168 vols.

Taube, M. (1978). "Zu einigen Texten der tibetischen brda-gsar-rñiṅ-Literatur", in E. Richter & M. Taube (eds.), *Asienwissenschaftliche Beiträge - Johannes Schubert in memoriam*, Berlin, (= Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Völkerkunde zu Leipzig Heft 32) pp. 169–201.

Tucci, G. (1949). *Tibetan Painted Scrolls*, 3 vols., Roma.

Verhagen, P. C. (1991) "Sanskrit grammatical literature in Tibet: a first survey", in J. G. de Casparis (ed.), *Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference – Kern Institute, Leiden: August 23–29, 1987 (gen. ed. J. Bronkhorst), vol. VII. Sanskrit Outside India*, Leiden, pp. 47–63.

Vogel, C. (1965). *Vāgbhaṭa's Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasaṃhitā. The first five chapters of its Tibetan version. Edited and rendered into English along with the original Sanskrit. Accompanied by a literary introduction and a running commentary on the Tibetan translating-technique*, Wiesbaden (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XXXVII, 2).

Quoted Tibetan passages
2.2.1:
Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel* ŃO 29r4–6, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958) vol. 144, 83–5–4 to 83–5–6:

3.2.1:
Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel* LE 82r4–83r3, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958) vol. 140, 35–1–4 to 35–3–3:

in: note 43:
Co-ne *Bstan-'gyur Dkar-chag* 296v5–6:

in: note 129:
Peking *Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel* 'A 2v8–3r4, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958) vol. 98, 3–2–2 to 3–3–4:

APPENDIX

Scheme of derivational procedure in 3.2

1) C.D. 2.12   : $i\dot{N}$
      C. 1.3.96   : $i\dot{N}$ + $\acute{S}tiP$
      C.V. ad 1.1.5 : i + $\varnothing$ + $\varnothing$ + ti + $\varnothing$
      C. 6.2.1   : e + ti
                eti-

2) C.D. 2.12   : $i\dot{N}$
      C.V. ad 1.1.5 : i + $\varnothing$
                 : $prati$ + i
      C. 2.1.93   :$(prati + sU)$ + i
      C. 2.1.38   :$(prati + \varnothing)$ + i
      C. 1.3.131 : $prati$ + i + $Ktv\bar{a}$
      C. 5.4.6   : $prati$ + i + $LyaP$
      C. 5.1.69   : $prati$ + $(i + tUK)$ + $LyaP$
      C.V. ad 1.1.5 : $prati$ + $(i + t + \varnothing)$ + $\varnothing$ + $ya + \varnothing$
      C. 5.1.106 : $prat + \bar{\imath}$ + t + ya
      C. 2.1.93   : $prat + \bar{\imath}$ + t + $ya + sU$
      C. 2.1.38   : $prat + \bar{\imath}$ + t + $ya + \varnothing$
                $prat\bar{\imath}tya$

3) C.D. 4.107 : $padA$
      C.V. ad 1.1.5 : $pad + \varnothing$
                 : sam + ud + pad
      C. 2.1.93   : $(sam + sU) + (ud + sU) + pad$
      C. 2.1.38   : $(sam + \varnothing) + (ud + \varnothing) + pad$
      C. 1.3.7   : $sam +$ $ud +$ pad + $GHa\tilde{N}$
      C. 6.1.9   : $sam +$ $ud +$ $p + \bar{a} + d$ + $GHa\tilde{N}$
      C.V. ad 1.1.5 : $sam +$ $ud +$ $p\bar{a}d$ + $\varnothing + a + \varnothing$
      C. 6.4.148 : $sam +$ u + $t +$ $p\bar{a}d$ + a
      C. 2.1.93   : $sam +$ $ut +$ $p\bar{a}d$ + $a + sU$
      C. 6.3.98   : $sam +$ $ut +$ $p\bar{a}d$ + $a + rU$
      C. 6.4.20   : $sam +$ $ut +$ $p\bar{a}d$ + $a + \d{h}$
                $samutp\bar{a}da\d{h}$

C.= *Cāndra(vyākaraṇa) sūtra*-text, ed. B. Liebich (1902), *Cāndra-Vyākaraṇa,
    die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Uṇādi, Dhātupāṭha*, Leipzig
    (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XI), also Liebich
    (1918).
C.D. = *Cāndra Dhātupāṭha*, ed. Liebich (1902).
C.V. = *Cāndra Vṛtti*, ed. Liebich (1918).