Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (7): Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Mkhas 'jug* on the Sanskrit-Tibetan Interface: Synthesis, Comparison and Translation[1]

Pieter Cornelis Verhagen
(Leiden Institute of Area Studies, Leiden University)

(1) Introduction: The *Mkhas pa 'jug pa'i sgo* by Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan

This is the second article in the present series[2] which focuses on the important manual on scholastics by Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182-1251; henceforth Sa paṇ), one of the founding masters of the scholastic traditions in Tibetan Buddhism, entitled *Mkhas pa* (*rnams*)*'jug pa'i sgo*, lit. the 'Introduction for Scholars' (henceforth *MJ*).[3] Kapstein has argued recently that *MJ* promotes an ideal of *pāṇḍitya*, of scholastic sophistication, which is based specifically on the rich classical Indian traditions.[4]

MJ constitutes a manual on Buddhist scholastics, covering the three aspects of 'composition', 'exposition' and 'debate', which correspond to the three chapters of the text:

(I)   'Composition' (*rtsom pa*): *MJ* f. 163v1-190r1
(II)   'Exposition' (*'chad pa*): *MJ* f. 190r2-205r1

---

[2]   The first is SIBH 5.

[3]   All references for *MJ* in this article are to the version of this text in the Sde dge xylographic edition of the collected works of Sa paṇ contained in the *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum* volume *tha* (10), ff. 163r1-224r6, available in the facsimile reprint Bsod nams rgya mtsho (ed.) (1968.5: 81-111). Various editions accessible in TBRC: W1KG17446; W29898: 111-224; W2DB4570_4: 33-153; W00EGS1017151_10: 355-484. The groundbreaking elaborate study of this text is Jackson (1987), which offers an edition and annotated translation of the third chapter. Cordial thanks are due to prof. Jackson for kindly providing me with a draft version of his as yet unpublished annotated translation of the second chapter of *MJ*. The present article was written initially (as a paper for the International Association of Tibetan Studies seminar in Oxford, 2003) before the publication of Gold (2007), which explores the first two chapters of *MJ*. I have added references to Gold's study where relevant.

[4]   Kapstein (2003: 776-782).

(III)   'Debate' (*rtsod pa*): *MJ* f. 205r1-223v4
Postscript and colophon: *MJ* f. 223v4-224r6

For my present purposes only the first and second chapter are specifically relevant.

The first chapter,[5] entitled 'introduction to composition' (*rtsom pa la 'jug pa*), which opens with a general introduction to the text (I.1-6, 163v1-165r6), is primarily devoted to various aspects of linguistics, first discussing the elements required in the introductory parts of a scholastic treatise (I.7-12, 165r6-167r6), then addressing a variety of topics in the fields of grammar (I.13-51, 167r6-173v2) and poetics (I.52-end, 173v2-189v6).

The second chapter[6] deals with the principles of expounding (Tib. *'chad* pa) the Buddhist doctrine, in particular 'exposés' in the form of explaining and commenting on doctrinal scripture, which involve the analysis and interpretation of such scripture. In it Sa paṇ also addresses certain aspects of these matters which are specific for communicating to a Tibetan audience. The structure of this chapter is based on the five hermeneutical 'categories' as formulated in Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*:[7]

(1)   'Intention', 'purpose' (Skt. *prayojana*, Tib. *dgos pa*): *MJ* sub II.3, f. 191r5-191r6
(2)   'Summarized meaning' (Skt. *piṇḍārtha*, Tib. *bsdus don*): *MJ* II.4-5, f. 191r6-192v2
(3)   'Meaning of the words' (Skt. *padārtha*, Tib. *tshig don*): *MJ* II.6-30, f. 192v2-203r3
(4)   'Connection' (Skt. *anusaṃdhi*, Tib. *mtshams sbyor*): *MJ* II.31-32, f. 203r3-203v2
(5)   'Objections and rebuttals' (Skt. *codya-parihāra*, Tib. *brgal lan*): *MJ* II.33-34, f. 203v2-204v5

We will now turn to a number of passages in the first and second chapters that are germane to the interface between the Sanskrit and Tibetan languages.

---

[5]   For a brief survey of the contents of the first chapter of *MJ*, cf. Jackson (1987: 193-194), SIBH 5, and Gold (2007:152). For a translation of much of this chapter, see Gold (2007: 153-183).
[6]   For a brief survey of the contents of the second chapter of *MJ*, cf. Jackson (1987: 195-196), SIBH 5, and Gold (2007: 152).
[7]   Cf. SIBH 4 and SIBH 5.

(2.1) Indic and Tibetan: Synthesis and Comparison

A striking feature of this work by Sa paṇ is its commitment to integrating Indian and Tibetan aspects and points of view concerning the topics at hand. This is perhaps a more general characteristic of Sa paṇ's approach, often aiming at a synthesis of the Indian and Tibetan sides of the matter.[8]

In the field of linguistics this involves in *MJ* not only the introduction of Indian models for the description of Tibetan linguistic phenomena --a tendency which is common in indigenous Tibetan linguistics[9]-- but also the juxtaposition and comparison of linguistic phenomena in both languages. The latter is exemplified by Sa paṇ's comparison of case-grammar and word formation in Sanskrit and Tibetan in chapter I and—in a way—by his elaboration on Tibetan translation techniques in chapter II.

It is nonetheless evident that Sa paṇ was perfectly aware of the limitations pertaining to the adoption of Indian models for linguistic description of Tibetan, as for instance verse I.41 from his discussion of Sanskrit case grammar clearly shows. He stresses there that a great many of the complex details of nominal declension in Sanskrit are different from the case morphology of Tibetan, and are therefore not applicable in—or even adaptable to—the description of Tibetan case grammar:[10]

> '[Description of case-grammar in precise accordance with the Sanskrit model] is not possible for this [Tibetan language], [nor] is it necessary:
> as regards the case-suffixes, [the two languages] do not correspond,
> and also the [various word-]formations are different;
> therefore only little of the diverse complexities of that subject [i.e. Sanskrit nominal declension] remains [in (the description of) Tibetan case grammar].'

In his commentary on this verse he adds:[11]

---

8   Cf. e.g. Kapstein (2003: 776-782).

9   Cf. e.g. HSGLT 2 chapter 2.

10   *'dir ni mi nus mi dgos la / / rnam par dbye la rang gnas min / / sbyor ba dag kyang tha dad pas // don de'i spros pa re zhig bzhag /*, MJ I.41, f. 171v5-171v6. Translated: Gold (2007: 169).

11   *saṃ skṛ ta la rtags gsum la rnam dbye tha dad yod pa de bod kyi rtags so so'i gnas su mi 'jug cing / legs par sbyar ba la ā li'i mtha' can la sgra sbyor tha dad pa yod pa la bod la de lta bu'i sgra sbyor mi rung ba*, MJ 171v6-172r1. Translated: Gold (2007: 169).

'The [morphological] peculiarities (*tha dad*) in nominal declension for the three genders that exist in Sanskrit, do not coincide with [those for] the various Tibetan genders (*rtags*), and [numerous] peculiarities (*tha dad*) in word-formation (*sgra sbyor*) for the [nominal stems] ending in [different] vowels (*ā li*) exist in Sanskrit, whereas such [peculiarities in] word-formation do not apply to Tibetan.'

A similar statement with regard to verbal morphology can be found slightly later in the same chapter, in the comments on I.50.

It is interesting to note at this point that a text has been preserved in the *Sa skya pa* literary traditions, which is—albeit not very convincingly—attributed to Sa paṇ, and which attempts to take the adoption of Indian models for Tibetan linguistic description considerably further than the indigenous Tibetan grammatical traditions centered around *Sum cu pa* and *Rtags kyi ʼjug pa* did. I am referring here to the *Mkhas paʼi kha rgyan*, which is contained in Sa paṇ's collected works, but which is of disputed authorship. In this work, composed in the typically terse *sūtra*-style of Sanskrit indigenous grammar, we find an even stronger imitation of the methods and devices of Sanskrit *vyākaraṇa* than is common within the *Sum rtags* tradition of Tibetan indigenous grammar.[12]

(2.2) Indic and Tibetan: Translation

In the second chapter also, one can point out a number of interesting passages which show Sa paṇ's preoccupation with the Indian-Tibetan interfaces in language and literature. Especially when he deals with the practicalities of translating into Tibetan and of setting forth this Indian body of thought to a Tibetan audience, Sa paṇ goes into considerable detail occasionally, offering salient observations on translation technique and practical advices in this matter.

For instance, in verse II.23 he stresses the importance of the Indian lexicographical treatises for the Tibetan interpreters:[13]

'The formation [or: use] of words in Sanskrit which are not [generally] current [may] be difficult to understand.
Therefore, if one is well acquainted with [lexicons] such as *Amarakośa*, one will not be in doubt [concerning such terms].'

---

[12]   Cf. Verhagen eslewhere in this issue, pp. 217-245.
[13]   */ legs par sbyar la ma grags paʼi / / sgra yi sbyor ba rtogs par dkaʼ / / de phyir ʼchi med mdzod la sogs / / legs par shes na the tshom med /*, MJ II.23, f. 198v3-198v4.

In his commentary on this verse,[14] Sa paṇ recommends, in addition to *Amarakośa*, a Sanskrit lexicon entitled *Viśvaprakāśa* as a source of information in these matters, and he refers similarly to his own lexicographical work entitled *Tshig gi gter*.[15]

A salient aspect of this advice is the fact that—in all probability—no Tibetan translations of Sanskrit lexicographical works (such as *Amarakośa* and *Viśvaprakāśa*) were available during the lifetime of Sa paṇ. In fact, Sa paṇ's own *Tshig gi gter* appears to be the first work in Tibetan introducing materials from *Amarakośa* to the Tibetan readership.

For the famous Sanskrit lexicon *Amarakośa*—of uncertain date, perhaps sixth cent. CE[16]—the first integral Tibetan translation that we know of was produced in the fourteenth century,[17] with later revisions in the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries.[18]

As regards the reference to *Viśvaprakāśa*, there seem to be two possibilities. It most probably refers to the twelfth-century Sanskrit lexicon of that same title, compiled by Maheśvara Kavi.[19] No Tibetan translation of this work seems to have been made, although it is referred to by Tibetan scholars such as Sa bzang Mati Paṇ chen (1291-1376)[20] and Si tu Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1699?-1774).[21]

There is a second, far less likely possibility that it refers to the *Viśvalocanā* lexicon, by Śrīdharasena, which would become well-known in the Tibetan world through the translation by Zha lu Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1527)—again considerably later than Sa paṇ.[22]

---

[14] / *legs par sbyar ba'i skad la mdzes pa byung na* / *'jig rten phal cher la ma grags pa'i saṃ skri tas sbyar ba yin pas* / *a ma ra ko shā dang* / *bi shwa pra kā sha la sogs pa ming gi mngon brjod rnams legs par shes pa tshig gi don thams cad la the tshom chod pa yin no* / / *'di'i phyogs tsam kho bos tshig gi gter du bshad pa ltar shes par bya'o*, MJ 198v4-198v5. Translated: Gold (2007: 28 & n. 17-18).

[15] Sde dge xylograph *Sa skya bka' 'bum* vol. *tha* 253r-265v, facs. ed. Bsod nams rgya mtsho (1968.5: title no. 14); TBRC: W22271_10: 513-538; W30279_1: 585-616; W2DB4570_4: 210-235 etc.; cf. Jackson (1987: 52), HSGLT 2: 72 n. 264.

[16] Cf. Vogel (1979: 309-313).

[17] By Kīrticandra and Yar klungs Grags pa rgyal mtshan, Peking *Bstan 'gyur* vol. *she* 1v1-63v1, title no. 5787.

[18] By Zha lu Chos skyong bzang po (1441-1527) and Si tu Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1699?-1774) respectively; on the reception of this work in Tibet, cf. Ruegg (1995: 128-130).

[19] Dated 1111/1112; cf. Vogel (1979: 329-331).

[20] In his *Kātantra* commentary; cf. HSGLT 2: 94; N.B. delete the text of note 384 there (which --probably erroneously-- suggests that *Viśvaprakāśa* is a variant title of *Viśvalocanā*) and substitute by the data provided here.

[21] In his extensive commentary on *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa*; cf. HSGLT 2: 175.

[22] Full title: *Abhidhānaśāstra Viśvalocanā ity aparābhidhāna Muktāvalī nāma*, Tib.: *Mngon brjod kyi bstan bcos sna tshogs gsal ba zhes pa ming gzhan mu tig phreng ba zhes bya ba*, Peking *Bstan 'gyur* vol. *po* 78r6-179r3, title no. 5898; cf. Vogel (1976), (1979: 348-350),

Due to the similarity of the titles, confusion of the two may have occurred, which may have been strengthened by the circumstance that *Viśvalocanā* is in fact based on *Viśvaprakāśa* in the second, homonymic part of the lexicon.[23] In an enumeration of sources earlier in *MJ*, Sa paṇ had listed two Sanskrit lexicons, namely *Amarakośa* and *Sna tshogs gsal ba*.[24] The latter Tibetan title is used as the translation for *Viśvalocanā* but could also reflect Sanskrit *Viśvaprakāśa*. One might note here that the accepted approximate dates for both *Viśvaprakāśa* and *Viśvalocanā* lexicons are sufficiently early for Sa paṇ to have known them.[25]

In any case, as no Tibetan translations of such Sanskrit lexicographical works antedating Sa paṇ's own efforts are known, it would seem, therefore, that Sa paṇ's advice actually implies the consultation of the Sanskrit originals of these works.[26]

A recurring issue of some importance in the Tibetan translation technique is the distinction between *sgra 'gyur*, lit. 'translation [according to the] word', and *don 'gyur*, lit. 'translation [according to the] meaning'. These two forms of translation and the principles underlying them were already formulated in the earliest discourse on these matters that has come down to us, *in casu* the royal edict on the translation activities preserved in the introductory section of *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*. In the section on the principles for the standardization of the translation idiom, we find the following passage dealing with this dichotomy:[27]

> 'On the one hand, [in the case of] single [i.e. uncompounded] [Sanskrit] words that do not require explanation and for which it is proper to translate them in accordance with the 'word', the [translating] term has been established taking the 'word' as the main criterion, whereas on the other hand, [in the case of] certain words for which it is proper to translate

---

Ruegg (1995: 130).

[23] Cf. Vogel (1976: 319-321), Vogel (1979: 349-350), Wayman (1994: x-xi).

[24] In his comments ad I.3, f. 164v4; cf. Kapstein (2003: 779-780), SIBH 5: paragraph 2.

[25] *Viśvaprakāśa* dates from 1111/1112, cf. supra; *Viśvalocanā*: not earlier than the mid-twelfth century, not later than 1261 (date of the Nepalese manuscript underlying the canonical translation), cf. Vogel (1976: 311-312), (1979: 348-349), Ruegg (1995: 130).

[26] Cf. Kapstein (2003: 780 note 94, sub 5).

[27] *skad rkyang pa bshad mi 'tshal ba sgra bzhin du bsgyur bar rigs pa rnams kyang sgra btsan par bgyis te ming du btags / skad kha cig don bzhin du gdags par rigs pa rnams kyang don btsan par bgyis te ming du btags*, ed. Ishikawa (1990: 2), cf. Simonsson (1957: 245), Scherrer-Schaub (1999: 72), HSGLT 1: 21-22. In an earlier article in the present series I investigated a paraphrase of this principle by Si tu Chos kyi 'byung gnas (1699?-1774), see Verhagen (2001B: 69, 73-75).

them in accordance with the 'meaning', the [translating] term
has been established taking the 'meaning' as the main cri-
terion.'

Within this dichotomy, *sgra 'gyur* refers to translations that attempt
to be as literal as possible, that aim to present an explicit and
unambiguous—preferably standardized—reflection of every term
and, in the case of more complex terms, of the constituents of the
terms, based on the grammatical analysis of the morphology
involved. *Don 'gyur*, on the other hand, amounts to translations
which are less literal, i.e. which take more liberty with regard to the
morphology of the original term, but instead emphasize the
representation of its semantical aspects. Typically it is in case of a *don
'gyur* translation that we find that the grammatically non-standard
type of 'etymology' (Skt. *nirukti*) which has been dubbed
'hermeneutical' underlies the translation.

This is clearly exemplified by the application of the *sgra 'gyur /
don 'gyur* contrast in the section of *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*
commenting on the Tibetan rendering of Skt. *arhat*, a *sgra 'gyur*
translation being [*mchod*] *'os pa*, 'deserving [veneration]' and a *don
'gyur* translation *dgra bcom pa*, 'who has defeated the enemies'.[28] The
'hermeneutical etymology' which is reflected in the latter translation
is actually quoted by the commentary: *kleśārīn hatavān ity arhan*,
'because he has killed [Skt. *hata (vān)*] the enemies [Skt. *ari-*], namely
the defilements, he is [called] *Arhat*'.[29] It is noteworthy here that it is
in fact this latter translation which became accepted as the standard
Tibetan translation for the Indian Buddhist term *arhat*.

In the 1980s, Prof. Broido has published a series of perceptive
articles on hermeneutics in later Buddhist traditions. One of the

---

[28]   Cf. Simonsson (1957: 269-270), Ishikawa (ed.) (1990: 7-8), Ruegg (1998: 120), Scherrer-
Schaub (1999: 71), HSGLT 1: 21-22, Verhagen (2001B: 75). In fact both analyses of the
term *arhat* are represented among the five 'etymologies' for the corresponding Pāli
term *arahant* in Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga* 7.4, respectively as the fourth
(*paccayādīnaṃ arahattā*, ed. Rhys Davids 1920: 198; "because of his worthiness (*araha*)
of requisites, etc.", trl. Ñāṇamoli 1956: 206, 210; cf. trl. Pe Maung Tin 1971: 227, 231;
cf. also *Visuddhimagga* 7.23) and the second (*arīnaṃ* (...) *hatattā*, ed. Rhys Davids 1920:
198; "because of his enemies (*ari*) (...) having been destroyed (*hata*)", trl. Ñāṇamoli
1956: 206; cf. trl. Pe Maung Tin 1971: 227; cf. also *Visuddhimagga* 7.6).

[29]   Cf., e.g., in the Pāli tradition *Visuddhimagga* 7.6: *Te ca anena kilesārayo maggena hatā
ti arīnaṃ hatattā pi arahaṃ: // yasmā rāgādisankhātā sabbe pi arayo hatā //
paññāsatthena nāthena, tasmā pi arahaṃ mato ti //*, ed Rhys Davids (1920: 198), and
in the Sanskrit traditions of the Mahāyāna, Haribhadra's *Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka*:
*Tatra arīn hatavān arhann ity anena prahāṇasampad uktā / arayaś ca rāgādayaḥ kleśāḥ
sarvakuśaladharmopaghātārthena*, ed. Wogihara (1934: 183), cf. Simonsson (1957:
270).

important points that Broido made in a number of these articles,[30] was that in this connection it might be useful to follow a distinction commonly made in modern speech-act theory, namely that "[I]n speaking of the meaning of words and sentences, one must distinguish carefully between the general rules or conventions governing the use of an utterance-type on all the occasions when it is used, and the particular purpose or intention with which tokens of that type are uttered, or their particular semantic functions, on distinct particular occasions of use."[31]

Broido then proceeded to associate this opposition with the Buddhist hermeneuticians' distinction of *śabda* (Tib. *sgra*) and *artha* (Tib. *don*). In certain contexts, Broido argued, the terms *śabda* and *artha* did not have their standard designations of 'word' and 'meaning' respectively, but in certain forms of hermeneutical manipulation they referred to precisely this opposition, specifically *śabda* (Tib. *sgra*) for 'general, conventional meaning' or 'sense' and *artha* (Tib. *don*) for 'particular intention' or 'reference'.

Returning now to the *sgra 'gyur* / *don 'gyur* opposition, in the light of the convincing arguments for Broido's hypothesis, I would now propose to render *sgra 'gyur* as 'convention-based translation' or 'sense-based translation', and *don 'gyur* as 'intention-based translation' or 'reference-based translation'.[32]

On the basis of this I would therefore propose to read the above-cited passage from *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa* as:

> 'On the one hand, [in the case of] single [i.e. uncompounded] [Sanskrit] words that do not require explanation and for which it is proper to translate them in accordance with the general conventional meaning, or sense, the [translating] term has been established taking the general conventional meaning, or sense, as the main criterion, whereas on the other hand, [in the case of] certain words for which it is proper to translate them in accordance with the particular intention, or reference, the [translating] term has been established taking the particular intention, or reference, as the main criterion.'

Linking this to the above-mentioned translations for Skt. *arhat*, we find that indeed the 'convention-based [or sense-based] translation'

---

[30]   Broido (1982: 18), (1983: 36), (1984: 10-11), (1988: 83-84).
[31]   Broido (1988: 83-84).
[32]   Jackson, in his draft translation of this chapter, renders these two terms as "calque-translation" (or, "translated by calque") and "translation according to sense" respectively.

[*mchod*]*'os pa* reflects the Sanskrit morphology and the general, conventional semantics associated with that morphology (*arhat* being an active present participle from the root *arh*, indeed generally meaning 'deserving'), whereas the 'intention-based [or reference-based] translation' *dgra bcom pa* more emphatically reflects the particular usage of that term in Buddhist contexts.[33]

It may be useful to point out some possible correspondences with Chinese translating practices in this typology of translations. In a recent study on the work of the third-century Chinese translator Zhi Qian, Nattier has shown the occurrence of a number of different types of rendering in his work.[34] The first two of these are reminiscent of the *sgra 'gyur / don 'gyur* opposition up to a point. Nattier characterizes the first as: "straightforward etymological renderings, e.g. the rendition of *sugata* as [Chinese characters omitted] "well departed"."[35] This is contrasted with a second type: "Others, such as the translation of *arhat* as [Chinese characters omitted] "perfected one", are best described as cultural calques—that is, expressions which attempt to convey the significance rather than the literal etymological meaning of the underlying word, using terminology already current in the recipient culture. In some cases—as in the rendering of *bhagavat* as [Chinese characters omitted] "god among gods"—we have evidence of a special sub-category which we might label "third-party cultural calques", where the translation term is based not upon that of the recipient culture but upon the terminology of an intermediary language."[36]

The Tibetan rendering *dgra bcom pa* does not seem to qualify as Nattier's second main type of the "cultural calque" as it does not, as far as I can tell, use "terminology already current in the recipient culture". It is, however, an interesting question whether Tibetan *dgra bcom pa* could be regarded as corresponding to Nattier's sub-type of

---

[33]   Note here that *dgra bcom pa* was (and is) the generally current Tibetan translation for the Buddhist Indian term *arhat*, as sanctioned by the normative documents of *Mahāvyutpatti* and *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, and is indeed found throughout the canonical literature as the standard translation for that term. So, one should take care to avoid a possible terminological confusion here: although *dgra bcom pa* is the "conventional" Tibetan translation for *arhat* (in the sense that it is the standardized commonly used rendering for that term), in the dichotomy discussed here it is a translation of the 'intention-based' type, not 'convention-based'. The two usages of the term 'convention' here are of a different order, the one pertaining to the level of translating Sanskrit into Tibetan ("conventional translation"), the other to the interpretation of the Indian term *c.q.* text per se which underlies the rendering ("convention-based translation").

[34]   Nattier (2003).
[35]   Nattier (2003: 239).
[36]   Nattier (2003: 239).

the "third-party calque".[37] It is obvious that Middle-Indic forms corresponding to Sanskrit *arhat*, such as *araha*[*n*]*t* (or perhaps even *ariha*[*n*]*t*[38]?), almost certainly have played a role in the origination and the popularity of the "defeater of the enemies" etymology which forms the basis for this particular translation. It is, for instance, the second of the five 'etymologies' which Buddhaghosa quotes in his *Visuddhimagga* for the Pāli term *arahant*: 'because he has slain (*hata*) the enemies (*ari*)', i.e. the defilements.[39] And the vast majority of the Buddhist scriptures which the Tibetans have translated were in Sanskrit. However, the 'hermeneutical' etymology underlying the translation can also be traced to Sanskrit sources (*Kleśārīn hatavān ity arhan*, cf. supra). And then again, what precisely is second- or third-party here, what is "intermediary" here? The early strata of Buddhist literature started out in Middle-Indic languages and these texts were subsequently Sanskritized. The matter is quite convoluted and far from clear, but it is tempting to see a parallel between the Tibetan *lo tsā ba*s' handling of the translating of the term *arhat*, and comparable instances, and the cited typology of translation vocabulary identified by Nattier in the work of Zhi Qian.[40]

The examples for these two types of translation which I have been able to trace in *MJ* are perhaps not as compelling as one might wish for, yet they merit closer inspection. For the first passage relevant to this dichotomy we turn to verse II.24.[41] In his discourse on the Tibetan translation techniques, we find Sa paṇ addressing some

---

[37]   As suggested by Nattier herself (2003: 219).

[38]   Cf. e.g. Trenckner etc. (1924-1948: 418 l. 38-39) "the anaptyctic –*a*- (Amg [= Ārdhamāgadhī] mostly –*i*-".

[39]   *Visuddhimagga* 7.4 and 7.6, trl. Ñāṇamoli (1956: 206), trl. Pe Maung Tin (1971: 227); cf. Nattier (2003: 218-219), who associates the first of these etymologies with one particular of Zhi Qian's renderings of *arhat*.

[40]   Note also Nattier's interesting observation, warning us who wish to "understand how Indian Buddhists interpreted the key terms of their own tradition: Buddhist preachers were not constrained by historically accurate etymologies or linguistically permissible sound shifts. On the contrary, they clearly felt free to indulge in word-play using "spurious" etymologies and "impossible" sound-shifts –spurious and impossible, that is, according to the strict rules of historical linguistics—in order to make an exegetical or didactic point. (...) it is clear that he is not interested in establishing the single "correct" meaning of the word, nor is he concerned with tracking its historical etymology. On the contrary, he is interested in what the word can *do*, and he deliberately adds layer upon layer of interpretation, making it resonate for his audience in a multitude of ways" (Nattier 2003: 218-219), and, indeed, we find that such 'etymologies' quite frequently played a significant role particularly in the early development of the translation terminology in the Tibetan traditions as well.

[41]   *MJ* verse II.24: / *bod kyi skad la mi shes pa* // *phal cher thos pa chung ba'i skyon* // *'ga' zhig 'gyur gyi bye brag dang* // *yul skad dag gis bsgribs pa yod* /, f. 198v5.

possible causes for the erroneous translation of Sanskrit terminology. In the auto-commentary on verse II.24, discussing various forms of confusion which may arise, he observes that: 'Some [translators] have also made intention-based translations for [terms elsewhere translated by] convention-based translations'.[42]

In the examples which Sa paṇ adduces[43] we find the juxtaposition of two alternative translations for one single Sanskrit term in three instances. For Skt. *sītātapatra* he mentions the convention-based translation *gdugs dkar*, 'white parasol', and the intention-based translation *tshad skyob dkar po*, 'white heat-protector'. One might say that the latter translation is a-typical for a *don 'gyur* translation as it is in fact quite accurate (actually in a sense even more so than the alternative translation) in its representation of the Sanskrit morphology: the term *ātapatra*, 'parasol', indeed consists of the constituents *ātapa* 'heat' and *tra* (from root *trā*) 'protecting'. Secondly, the convention-based translation *smon lam*, 'prayer', versus the intention-based translation *yongs su bsgyur ba*, 'transformation' for Skt. *praṇidhāna*[44] and finally, the most clear-cut example of the three, for Skt. *kuśala* the convention-based translation *dge ba*, 'virtue', as opposed to the intention-based translation *ngan 'byol*, 'avoiding evil', where the latter translation is evidently based on a 'hermeneutical etymology' deriving it from *ku* 'evil' + *śal* 'to move [away from]'.[45]

In the same chapter, under verse II.26, the *sgra 'gyur / don 'gyur* distinction is referred to again. The verse states that acquaintance with legendary and mythological lore is required for a correct interpretation (and hence translation) of Indian names. A number of examples are given, two of which are relevant at this point. The first concerns the rendering of the Sanskrit name Bhagīratha:[46]

> 'Although [the name] Bhagīratha[47] [can] certainly be [translated as] 'rubbed vulva' because, according to the *Purāṇa*s, he was born from the rubbed vulvas of the [grand]daughters of

---

[42] *la las sgra 'gyur la don 'gyur du byas pa'ang yod*, 198v6-199r1.

[43] *gzhan yang gdugs dkar la tshad skyob dkar po / smon lam la yongs su bsgyur ba / dge ba la ngan 'byol la sogs pa lta bu sgra'i khams mi shes na go dka'*, 119r3-4.

[44] Cf. Gold (2007: 29 & note 25).

[45] Cf. Gold (2007: 29 & note 25-26).

[46] *bha gi ra tha zhes bya ba sngon rabs las bdag nyid chen po dug can pa'i bu mo dag gi bha ga bsrubs pa las skyes pas bha ga srub ces bya ba yin mod kyi / sgra 'gyur du skal ldan shing rta zhes bsgyur ba*, 200r2-200r3.

[47] Monier-Williams (1899: 744): "*Bhagīratha*, m. (prob. fr. *bhagin* + *ratha*, 'having a glorious chariot'), N. of an ancient king (son of Dilīpa and great-grandfather [Verhagen, read: great-grandson] of Sagara, king of Ayodhyā; he brought down the sacred Gaṅgā from heaven to earth and then conducted this river to the ocean in order to purify the ashes of his ancestors, the 60.000 sons of Sagara".

the noble Sagara,[48] it should be translated as '[having? a] glorious chariot', which is a convention-based translation.'

Here two translations for the name Bhagīratha are juxtaposed: *Bha ga srub*, 'rubbed vulva' (or perhaps, more literally, 'vulva rubbing'?), and *Skal ldan shing rta*, '[having? a] glorious chariot'.[49] Much remains unclear in this passage, such as: What is the analysis of (*ī*?)*ratha* underlying the translation *srub*, 'to rub'? Is the translation *bha ga srub* of the intention-based type? etc. Nonetheless there can be no doubt that the translation '[having? a] glorious chariot' is identified as a *sgra 'gyur* type of rendering. And indeed it is precisely this one of the two translations which reflects the morphology of the original term more faithfully. The name Bhagīratha can, in all probability, be derived from *bhagin* 'glorious' + *ratha* 'chariot'.

Moreover, the validity of the point which Sa paṇ is making in verse II.26, namely the importance of acquaintance with the Purāṇic lore for translating Sanskrit names,[50] is emphatically corroborated if we have a look at the entries on the names Bhagīratha and Sagara in the Sanskrit-English dictionary by Monier-Williams (quoted in the notes above), where quite detailed mythological information is supplied, especially in the latter case, serving to make sense of the name.

The commentary then continues with a discussion of two Tibetan renderings for Skt. Godāvarī,[51] name of one of the major rivers in the South of India. Even more opaque than the previous passage --the analysis underlying the first translation which Sa paṇ introduces has remained quite obscure to me anyway-- it is nonetheless interesting to find there that the second, apparently preferred, translation is identified as an 'intention-based translation':[52]

---

[48] Monier-Williams (1899: 1125): "2. *sa-gara*, mfn. (fr. 7. *sa* + *gara*, 'poison', root 2.*gṛ*; ...) containing poison, poisonous (...); N. of a king of the solar race, sovereign of Ayodhyā (son of Bāhu; he is said to have been called Sa-gara, as born together with a poison given to his mother by the other wife of his father; he was father of Asam-añja by Keśinī and of sixty-thousand sons by Su-mati; the latter were turned into a heap of ashes by the sage Kapila [see *bhagīratha*], and their funeral ceremonies could only be performed by the waters of Gaṅgā to be brought from heaven for the purpose of purifying their remains; this was finally accomplished by the devotion of Bhagīratha, who having led the river to the sea, called it Sāgara in honour of his ancestor: Sagara is described as having subdued the Śakas, Yavanas and other barbarous tribes". Note that the usual translation for *sāgara*, 'ocean', is Tib. *rgya mtsho* (cf. *Mahāvyutpatti* ed. Sakaki 1916-1925: nos. 36, 527, 752, 825, 1357, 3238, 3408, 3412), but *Mahāvyutpatti* gives *dug can* twice (nos. 3264 and 4162).

[49] Cf. Das (1902: 87) s.v. *Skal ldan shing rta* and *Skal ldan shing rta'i bu mo*.

[50] Cf. Gold (2007: 35).

[51] Monier-Williams (1899: 364): "*Go-dāvarī*, f. (= -*dā*, s.v. I. -*da*) 'granting water or kine', N. of a river in the Dekhan"

[52] *go dā wa ri zhes bya ba drang srong zhig gis ba lang bsad pa'i sdig sbyong gi chu*

'Although [the name] Godāvarī [can] certainly be translated as 'river of the slaughtered cow' because it is the river by means of which a *ṛṣi* cleansed himself of the sin of having killed a cow, a [preferable?] intention-based translation has been fashioned, [namely] 'supreme gift of the cow'.'

It is quite problematic to pinpoint precisely why the latter translation is characterized as a *don 'gyur* type.[53] A crucial obstacle in this respect is the opacity of the morphology of the term Godāvarī in the first place. In all probability it should be traced to *go*, 'cow', and a (probably *upapada*) form **dāvara* from root *dā*, 'giving': the river (hence the feminine gender) 'giving cattle'. The (hermeneutical?) etymology on which the second translation is based appears to involve an additional, third element, namely **vara* 'supreme', reflected in Tib. *mchog*, thus: *go + dā + vara / varī* (or, following the order of the elements in the Tibetan translation, *go + vara / varī + dā*?) = *Ba'i mchog sbyin*.

In verse II.27 Sa paṇ addresses the problem of additional elements in Tibetan translations:[54]

'In order to make it [more] easily understandable for the Tibetans, [occasionally] a translation [introduces] a slight additional element, although [this element] is not present in the Sanskrit [original]; a learned scholar should not give a [separate] explanation for these.'

In his commentary, Sa paṇ first deals with a type of 'additional element' which had been identified already in the royal edict concerning the standardization of translation techniques laid down in *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*,[55] scil. the addition of a generic designation in Tibetan when a Sanskrit name for a place, living being, plant or the like is left untranslated. This accounts for Tibetan renderings such as

yin pas / *ba lang bsad pa'i chu zhes bya bar 'gyur mod kyi* / *ba'i mchog sbyin zhes don 'gyur byas pa*, 200r3-200r4.

[53] And does this imply that *Ba lang bsad pa'i chu* is a *sgra 'gyur* type of translation?

[54] *'ga' zhig bod la go bde'i phyir* // *legs par sbyar la med na yang* // *cung zad lhag par bsgyur ba yod* // *de la mkhas pas bshad mi dgos*, 200v3.

[55] *yul dang* / *sems can dang* / *me tog dang* / *rtsi shing la sogs pa'i mi bsgyur na yid gol zhing tshig ni bde ba dang* / *'ol spyir* [var.: *phyir*] *bsgyur du rung ba* [var.: *rung yang*] *don du de ltar yin nam ma yin gtol med pa rnams la* / *mgo la yul zhe'am* / *me tog ces pa la sogs pa gang la bya ba'i ming gcig bla thabs su snon* [var.: (*b*)*snol*] *la rgya gar skad so na zhog cig*, ed. Ishikawa (1990: 3), Simonsson (1957: 253-254), Scherrer-Schaub (1999: 72-730); cf. also the parallel passage in Lcang skya Rol pa'i rdo rje's *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byung gnas*, Ruegg (1973: 254, 260).

yul ma ga dha, 'the country Magadha', where the original Sanskrit only reads *Magadha*, or *rtswa ku sha*, 'Kuśa grass' for Sanskrit *kuśa*. Sa paṇ enumerates examples for a number of categories of name: the addition of the explicatory designation 'jewel' (*rin po che*) before the untranslated Sanskrit terms *vaiḍūrya* 'cat's eye gem' or *padmarāga* 'ruby', the addition of 'flower' (*me tog*) before untranslated terms such as *utpala* 'blue lotus' or *saugandhika* 'water-lily', and similar applications of the elements 'tree' (*shing*), 'animal' (*ri dags*) and 'fish' (*nya*).[56] It is noteworthy that such an additional element in the translation is termed *bla thabs* in *Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa*, whereas Sa paṇ terms it *tshig gi rgyan* here.

Sa paṇ argues that it is wholly justified to introduce such additional elements into the translation, but that the Tibetan commentator / exegete should not make the mistake of commenting on these additional elements as if they were terms actually present in the original Sanskrit texts.

Let us, finally, have a look at Sa paṇ's discussion of one more type of such 'additional elements' in the translation:[57]

> 'Moreover, there are also [cases of] the addition of small additional elements (*tshig gi lhad*) for the sake of making that form easily understandable for Tibetans. Knowing [that] these [are additional elements], one should not introduce them into the standard (*dkyus ma*) [scil. word-by-word] explanation (or: the explanation proper). If one does introduce [these elements into the exposé] the grammarians will disagree. For instance, if one glosses *ye shes* as *gdod ma'i shes pa*, or (*bcom ldan*)*'das* as *mya ngan las 'das pa*, or *phyag rgya* (*chen po*) as *lag pa'i rgya*,

---

[56] *legs par sbyar ba'i skad la med kyang bod kyis go bde bar bya ba'i phyir tshig gi rgyan cung zad bsnan nas bsgyur ba yod de / rgya gar la sgra med kyang rin po che baiḍurya dang / rin po che padma rā ga zhes bya ba la sogs pa dang / rgya gar la me tog gi sgra med kyang me tog utpa la dang / me tog padma rā / me tog sau gandhi ka zhes bya ba la sogs pa bsnan pa dang / rgya gar la shing gi sgra med kyang shing nya gro dha dang / a shwa ka dang / shing pa la sha zhes bya ba la sogs pa bsnan pa dang / rgya gar la ri dags kyi sgra med kyang 'ga' zhig gis ri dags khri snyan sa le dang / ri dags eṇa ya zhes bya ba la sogs pa bsnan pa dang / rgya gar la nya'i sgra med kyang nya ti mi la sogs pa de dag bsnan pa'i rgyu mtshan gang yin snyam na / bod brda mi shes pa dag gis / rin po che dang / me tog dang / shing dang / ri dags dang / gos dang / srog chags kyi bye brag la sogs pa'i ming gang yin zhes dogs pa skye bas / de gcad pa'i don du rin po che dang / me tog dang / shing la sogs pa bsnan pa'o*, 200v3-201r1. Cf. Gold (2007: 30).

[57] *de bzhin du / gzhan yang bod kyis go bde ba'i don du tshig gi lhad bag re bsnan pa yod mod / de shes par byas la bshad pa dkyus ma'i nang du mi gzhug / gal te bcug na sgra shes pa rnams kyis khrel bar 'gyur te / dper na ye shes la gdod ma'i shes pa dang / bcom ldan 'das la mya ngan las 'das pa dang / phyag rgya chen po la lag pa'i rgyar bshad pa la sogs pa bod la bshad du rung yang / sgra shes pas mthong na bzhad gad kyi gnas su 'gyur ba'i phyir ro*, 201r5-201v1. Cf. Gold (2007: 30).

although these explanations are [strictly speaking] correct within Tibetan [proper], they will present occasions for ridicule in the eyes of those who know [Sanskrit] grammar.'

(3) Typology of Summaries

Widening the perspective somewhat, finally, I would like briefly to address one element in *MJ*, which may perhaps derive from the Indic-Tibetan interface, but may require us to take another inter-cultural interface into consideration as well.

In chapter II, second section, on 'summarized meaning' (Skt. *piṇḍārtha*, Tib. *bsdus don*) Sa paṇ discusses two types of summary an exegete may offer: the first a general overall summary of a text, the second a summary which enumerates the individual topics dealt with within a text, or within the chapters of a text.[58] Sa paṇ describes the second type of summary as follows:[59]

> 'Taking into consideration the entire basic text, from the beginning to the end, one should establish the main general sections [in the basic text] each separately on the basis of an analysis of the various topics discussed [in that text] that are categorically similar or dissimilar. [Doing this] one should parse [the text] in such a manner that the internal subdivisions are consistent [with one another].'

This second type may correspond to the commentarial device of the *sa bcad* or 'topical outline' which is widely used throughout the Tibetan scholastic literature. The question of the origin of the *sa bcad* format is, as far as I have been able to determine, still unanswered. It is, as yet, unclear whether this device was modelled after an Indic or Chinese model, or if it was a Tibetan innovation which did not have an antecedent in either tradition.[60]

I have not yet come across a clear-cut unmistakable model for the *sa bcad* device in the Indic Buddhist literature. One might have hoped to find one in the second section of Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*, on summarization, or in the fourth section which deals with textual structure and the ordering of topics. Unfortunately, neither the rather

---

[58] I refer to SIBH 5, par. 3.2 for a more detailed treatment of the contents of this section of *MJ*; cf. Gold (2007: 104-107).

[59] *gzhung gi thog mtha' ma lus pa blo yul du byas te / brjod bya rigs mthun mi mthun blos phye nas spyi 'i sdom chen po rnams so sor bzhag / nang gi dbye ba rnams mi 'gal bar phye*, f. 191v2.

[60] Cf. Steinkellner (1989: 235).

terse discussions of these topics in *Vyākhyāyukti*[61] proper nor the relevant comments in the *Vyākhyāyukti-ṭīkā*[62] by Guṇamati offer anything approaching a model for the *sa bcad* format.

The term *sa bcad pa* (var. *sa gcad pa*) is given in *Mahāvyutpatti*, along with *mdor bshad pa*, 'explanation in brief', as the translation for Skt. *ṭippiṭaka*, which I take to be erroneous for *ṭippaṇī* (or *ṭippaṇaka*, or *ṭippaṇikā*?).[63] The *ṭippaṇī* type of commentary appears usually to be a brief set of notes or glosses. Further investigation would be required to determine if the *sa bcad* device may be traced to this class of Indic commentary.

A modelling after examples in the Chinese literary culture should certainly not be ruled out either. Firstly, it stands to reason to search for an origin there in the light of the fact that the earliest attestation of a commentary with a fully developed *sa bcad* system traced thus far in the Tibetan canon is in fact a translation from Chinese, namely the famous seventh-century commentary on *Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra* by Wen tsheg, as had already been noticed by Prof. Steinkellner.[64]

Moreover, on reading Hiroshi Kanno's study on 'Chinese Buddhist Sūtra Commentaries of the Early Period'[65] one is tempted to speculate on possible associations with the technique of 'analytic division' or 'parsing' (Chin. *fenke*) which is a core element in the 'exposition of the meaning' or, briefly, 'expository' type of commentary—as opposed to the 'interlinear' type—found in Chinese Buddhist literature from the earliest periods onwards and which can ultimately be traced back to similar devices in early Confucianist scholastics.[66] In the earliest extant 'expository' type of commentary, the fifth-century Lotus Sūtra commentary by Daosheng, one finds already a highly elaborate system of analytic division involving several levels of parsing.[67]

The precise term *sa bcad* appears not to be used by Sa paṇ, however at the very end of his comments in this section, sub II.5, the term *sa gcod* does occur. He may be referring to the second type of

---

[61]   Peking *Bstan 'gyur* 36v5-37r2 and 99r1-100v3; cf. SIBH 4 par. 5.2 and 5.4.
[62]   Peking *Bstan 'gyur* 9r7-10r7 and 126r1-129r1.
[63]   *Mahāvyutpatti* ed. Sakaki (1916-1925: no.1448), ed. Ishihama (1989: no. 1453). Cf. Edgerton (1953-2: 246), Monier-Williams (1899: 439) s.v. *ṭippaṇa, ṭippaṇaka, ṭippaṇī, ṭippaṇikā*.
[64]   Cf. Steinkellner (1989: 235), Powers (1993: 19), Schoening (1996: 119-120).
[65]   Kanno (2003).
[66]   Cf. Kanno (2003: 303 etc.).
[67]   Cf. Kanno (2003: 308-312).

summary specifically here; it is, however, also conceivable that he is speaking about a summary in general:[68]

> 'I have seen numerous such summaries, superior and inferior ones; some such [inferior] topical outlines (*sa gcod*) may even corrupt the meaning [of the basic text], and, even if they do not corrupt the meaning, they are hard to expound for the master, and hard to memorize for the pupil, therefore I set them aside.'

In any case, the second type of *bsdus don* which Sa paṇ discusses here in *MJ* seems to describe the *sa bcad* or 'topical outline' device, this hugely "successful and influential technique of literary analysis"[69] so widespread within the Tibetan commentarial traditions. Sa paṇ's description is, in any case, very reminiscent of the *sa bcad* device as it is actually used. If indeed the hypothesis of the origin of this *sa bcad* technique lying in the Chinese literary traditions is correct, then perhaps the second type of summary introduced here in *MJ* may in fact be regarded as a trace of influence of Chinese scholastics. This would also imply that the ideal of *pāṇḍitya* as set forth in *MJ* is not based exclusively on classical Sanskrit scholasticism, as one might expect at first sight.[70]

(4) Concluding Observations

Winding up, we can conclude that Sa paṇ's *MJ* is a veritable treasure-mine for the investigation of the linguistic and literary interface between the Tibetan and Sanskrit domains in the thirteenth century. Building on foundations such as Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti* and Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, in *MJ* Sa paṇ sets up a model for the scholastic enterprise for the then budding scholastic traditions of Tibet. In this treatise, as well as in much of his work in general, Sa paṇ aims at a synthesis between the two cultural domains, for instance in linguistic description, but in full awareness of the limitations that pertain here. In the handling of the *sgra 'gyur / don 'gyur* typology, the sophistication with regard to the hermeneutical processes involved in translating a body of literature speaks volumes. We have seen how *MJ* promotes what appears to be a strictly Indian ideal of *pāṇḍitya* –

---

[68] *'di lta bu'i bsdus don mtho dman can mang po mthong ste / de lta bu'i sa gcod 'ga' zhig don yang 'chug nus don ma 'chugs kyang slob dpon gyis brjod dka' / slob mas gzung dka' ba'i phyir kho bos btang snyoms su bzhag go*, 192v1-192v2.

[69] Steinkellner (1989: 235).

[70] Cf. Kapstein (2003: 776-778, 782).

and, of course, the source of much of Sa skya Paṇḍita's scholastic agenda lay in the classical Sanskrit culture—yet it also betrays influence from another neighbouring literary culture, *in casu* the Chinese scholastic traditions. It is precisely this versatility, this ability to adopt various exogenous cultural elements, and through processes of adaptation and amalgamation to arrive at a cultural identity unmistakably distinct from its sources of inspiration, which I find one of the most striking features of the Tibetan culture.

Abbreviations

HSGLT 1   = Verhagen (1994)
HSGLT 2   = Verhagen (2001A)
MJ   = *Mkhas pa ʼjug paʼi sgo* [see note 3]
Sa paṇ   = Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182-1251)
SIBH 4   = Verhagen (2005A)
SIBH 5   = Verhagen (2005B)
SIBH 6   = Verhagen (2008)

Bibliography

Broido, M. (1982). 'Does Tibetan hermeneutics throw any light on *Sandhābhāṣā*?', *Journal of the Tibet Society*, 2, 5-39.

Broido, M. (1983). *'Bshad thabs*: Some Tibetan Methods of Explaining the Tantras', in: Steinkellner, E. & Tauscher, H. (eds.) (1983). *Contributions on Tibetan and Buddhist Religion and Philosophy. Proceedings of the Csoma de Körös Symposium held at Velm-Vienna, Austria, 13-19 September 1981, vol. 2*, Wien (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 11), 15-45.

Broido, M. (1984). '*Abhiprāya* and Implication in Tibetan Linguistics', *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 12, 1-33.

Broido, M. (1988). 'Killing, Lying, Stealing and Adultery: A Problem of Interpretation in the Tantras', in: Lopez, D.S., jr. (ed.) (1988). *Buddhist Hermeneutics*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 71-118.

Bsod nams rgya mtsho (ed.) (1968). *Sa skya pa'i bka' 'bum. The complete works of the great masters of the Sa skya sect of the Tibetan Buddhism*, 15 vols, Tokyo (= Bibliotheca Tibetica I, 1-15).

Das, S.C. (1902). *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, Calcutta. (repr. Delhi 1972)

Edgerton, F. (1953). *Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary. 2: Dictionary*, New Haven.

Franco, E. (1984). 'On the interpretation of Pramāṇasamuccaya(vṛtti) I, 3d', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 12, 389-400.

Gold, J.C. (2007). *The Dharma's Gatekeepers: Sakya Paṇḍita on Buddhist Scholarship in Tibet*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hinüber, O. von (1996). *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin-New York (= Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2).

Ishihama, Y. & Fukuda, Y. (eds.) (1989). *A New Critical Edition of the Mahāvyutpatti. Sanskrit-Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionary of Buddhist Terminology*, Tokyo (= Studia Tibetica 16, Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries vol. 1).

Ishikawa, M. (ed.) (1990). *A Critical Edition of the Sgra sbyor bam po gnyis pa. An Old and Basic Commentary on the Mahāvyutpatti*, Tokyo (= Studia Tibetica 18, Materials for Tibetan-Mongolian Dictionaries vol. 2).

Jackson, D.P. (1987). *The Entrance Gate for the Wise (Section III). Sa-skya Paṇḍita on Indian and Tibetan Traditions for Pramāṇa and Philosophical Debate*, 2 vols., Wien (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 17).

Kanno, H. (2003). 'Chinese Buddhist Sūtra Commentaries of the Early Period', *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University [Academic Year 2002]* 6, 301-320.

Kapstein, M.T. (2003). 'The Indian Literary Identity in Tibet', in: S. Pollock (ed.), *Literary Cultures in History. Reconstructions from South Asia*, Berkeley etc.: University of California Press, 747-802.

Monier-Williams, M. (1899). *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Etymologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*, Oxford.

Ñāṇamoli (trl.) (1956). *The Path of Purification (Visuddhimagga) by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa*, Colombo: Semage.

Nattier, J. (2003). 'The Ten Epithets of the Buddha in the Translations of Zhi Qian', *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University [Academic Year 2002]* 6, 207-250.

Pe Maung Tin (trl.) (1971). *The Path of Purity, being a Translation of Buddhaghosa's Visuddhimagga*, London: Pali Text Society (= Pali Text Society Translation Series Nos. 11, 17, 21).

Powers, J. (1993). *Hermeneutics and Tradition in the Saṃdhinirmocana-sūtra*, Leiden etc.: E.J. Brill (= Indian Thought 5).

Rhys Davids, C.A.F. (ed.) (1920). *The Visuddhi-Magga of Buddhaghosa*, London: Pali Text Society.

Ruegg, D.S. (1973). 'On Translating the Buddhist Canon (a dictionary of Indo-Tibetan terminology in Tibetan and Mongolian: the *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byuṅ gnas* of Rol.pa'i.rdo.rje)', in: P. Ratnam (ed.), *Studies in Indo-Asian Art and Culture, Commemoration volume on the 71st birthday of Acarya Raghu Vira, vol 3*, New Delhi 1973, (= Śata-Piṭaka Series 209), 243-261.

Ruegg, D.S. (1995). *Ordre spirituel et ordre temporel dans la pensée Bouddhique de l'Inde et du Tibet. Quatre conférences au Collège de France*, Paris: Boccard. (= Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8o, Fasc. 64).

Ruegg, D.S. (1998). 'Sanskrit-Tibetan and Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionaries and Some Problems in Indo-Tibetan philosophical lexicography', in: B. Oguibénine (ed.), *Lexicography in the Indian and Buddhist Cultural Field. Proceedings of the Conference at the University of Strasbourg 25 to 27 April 1996*, München: Kommission für Zentralasiatische Studien, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 115-142.

Sakaki, R. (ed.) (1916-1925). *Mahāvyutpatti*, part 1 & 2, Kyoto (= Kyoto Imperial University Series 3).

Scherrer-Schaub, C.A. (1999). 'Translation, Transmission, Tradition: Suggestions from Ninth-century Tibet', *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27, 67-77.

Schoening, J.D. (1996). ʼ*Sūtra* Commentaries in Tibetan Translation', in: Cabezón, J.I. & Jackson, R.R. (eds.) (1996). *Tibetan Literature. Studies in Genre. Essays in Honor of Geshe Lhundup Sopa*, Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion (Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism), 111-124.

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

Steinkellner, E. (1989). 'Who is Byaṅ chub rdzu 'phrul? Tibetan and non-Tibetan Commentaries on the *Saṃdhinirmocanasūtra* - A survey of the literature.', *Berliner Indologische Studien* 4/5, 229-249.

Trenckner, V., Andersen, D., Smith, H. & Hendriksen, H. (1924-1948). *A Critical Pāli Dictionary, Begun by V. Trenckner, Revised, Continued and Edited by D. Andersen, H. Smith and H. Hendriksen*, Copenhagen: Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.

Verhagen, P.C. (1994). *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Volume 1: Transmission of the Canonical Literature*, Leiden - New York - Köln: E.J. Brill (= Handbuch der Orientalistik Abt. 2 Bd. 8).

Verhagen, P.C. (2001A). *A History of Sanskrit Grammatical Literature in Tibet. Volume 2: Assimilation into Indigenous Scholarship*, Leiden - Boston - Köln: E.J. Brill (= Handbuch der Orientalistik Abt. 2 Bd. 8.2).

Verhagen, P.C. (2001B). 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (1): Issues of Interpretation and Translation in the Minor Works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byung-gnas (1699?-1774)', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 24.1 (2001), 61-88.

Verhagen, P.C. (2005A). 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (4): The *Vyākhyāyukti* by Vasubandhu', *Journal Asiatique*, 293.2 (2005), 559-602.

Verhagen, P.C. (2005B). 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (5): The *Mkhas-pa-rnams-ʼjug-paʼi-sgo* by Sa-skya Pandita Kun-dga'-rgyal-mtshan', *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 28.1 (2005), 183-219.

Verhagen, P.C. (2008). 'Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (6): Validity and Valid Interpretation of Scripture

according to Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*', in: R. Gombrich & C. Scherrer-Schaub (eds.), *Buddhist Studies (Papers of the 12ᵗʰ World Sanskrit Conference, vol. 8)*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 233-258.

Verhagen, P.C. (2017). 'Studies in Tibetan Indigenous Grammar (4): A Sixteenth-century Survey of *Sum-rtags* and Related Literature (Appendix: Description of Sa skya Paṇḍita's *Mkhas-pa'i-kha-rgyan*)', elsewhere in this issue of *Revue des Études Tibétaines*, pp. 217-245.

Vogel, C. (1976). *Śrīdharasenas Viśvalocana. Ein Jaina-Wörterbuch des Sanskrit im lamaistischen Kanon*, Göttingen (= Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Jhg. 1976, Nr. 8).

Vogel, C. (1979). *Indian Lexicography*, Wiesbaden (= *A History of Indian Literature*, ed. J. Gonda, vol. V fasc. 4).

Wayman, A. (transl.) (1994). *Abhidhānaviśvalocanam of Śrīdharasena*, Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji (= Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies, Monograph Series III-2).

Wogihara, U. (ed.) (1934). *Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka Prajñāpāramitā-vyākhyā*, Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.

❖