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The term \textit{svarabhakti} is familiar to Sanskrit scholars, and to students of linguistics in general, as a means of accounting for a ‘vowel fragment’ or vowel glide, a feature of the transition, in Sanskrit, from \textit{r}, and sometimes also \textit{l}, to another consonant, commonly a fricative (or spirant) consonant; following in the footsteps of ‘the earliest phoneticians’ I wish to introduce the complementary term \textit{svayjanabhakti} to account for a consonant fragment, or consonant glide, as a feature of the transition from a liquid consonant to another consonant, commonly a fricative (or spirant) consonant.

Though it is in origin a Sanskrit phonological term, \textit{svarabhakti} has been applied to comparable phenomena in other languages, as, for example, in the following passage from a grammar of Scots Gaelic: ‘\textit{THE PARASITIC OR (IN SANSKRIT) THE SVARABHAKTI VOWEL} (i.e. The “voice-attachment”, “vowel portion”, or glide vowel).\textit{Svarabhakti is the development in the spoken language of a non-radical or inorganic vowel from the voiced sound of the preceding consonant, resulting in a repetition of the preceding vowel.}\textit{Tullich gorn m. Green hill, is in Scottish C.S. (Common Speech) spoken and written as Tullochgorum (more correctly Tullochgorom).}\n
A close parallel to the Scots-Gaelic pronunciation of \textit{gorn} ‘green’ as though it were ‘gorum’ or ‘gorim’ is provided by the well-known cry of the \textit{di-vaid} in Hindi ‘\textit{də-gəm -- gəm}’, in which \textit{gorn} will in all probability, at least in its first occurrence in this small quotation, be pronounced with a \textit{svarabhakti}, as though it were ‘\textit{gərm}’, with two syllables to the ear though only one appears to the eye; for the \textit{svarabhakti} here has not achieved recognition in Hindi spelling.

For \textit{svayjanabhakti}, on the other hand, English readily provides examples in pronunciation, and, unlike my Hindi example, even admits them into the spelling. Thus, where some speakers (including myself) pronounce \textit{Hampan} and \textit{Hampana}d with a sequence of two medial consonant sounds [\textit{m-}] and [\textit{ms-}] respectively, others pronounce them with a sequence of three consonants, [\textit{mpm-}] and [\textit{mpns-}]. the [\textit{p-}] being \textit{svayjanabhakti}, sharing the labial feature with the [\textit{m-}] but the voicelessness
feature with the f.t.] or [a].1. Etymology favours the former type of speaker, and requires such spellings as *Hamten* and *Hamstead*, compounded from Old English *ham* 'dwelling' cf. *home* with Old English *fæn*, 'enclosure', *farm*, 'town', and Old English *steal* 'place', but the latter type of speaker has triumphed over the etymology, for the established spelling has clearly given orthographic status to the *yu* < *yut* (stem) - *n*t - *b*ak.1 In this paper I shall suggest that in Tibetan too *yut* < *yut* - *n*t - *b*ak has triumphed, and that the incorporation of *yut* < *yut* - *n*t - *b*ak into the spelling of certain Tibetan verb forms has introduced an unnecessary air of irregularity into their paradigms.

Alternation in the spelling of the initial consonants of a considerable number of Tibetan verbs, especially between the present form and the past form, has long been something of a puzzle, and, probably, also something of an irritant to students of Tibetan: 'Verb root remain constant in most Sino-Tibetan languages. But diversity of form reaches the extreme in Old British (classical Tibetan), where so positional phonemes of the verb is necessarily constant—whether consonantal prefix, consonantal initial, medial vowel, 'final' consonant, or 'suffixal' consonant.'2 Shaffer takes up this challenge by attempting to provide both the comparative grammarian and the beginning student in Old British' with 'something like 'conjugations' instead of the apparently endless confusion of verbal forms with which he is confronted in most of the dictionaries and grammars of the language', in the course of which he refers to an alternation of 'affricate initials in the present and corresponding sibilant initials in the perfect—*tshur* for *tshu*'; *shi, ti* "di"'; *tslor, for "escape"; *dzhig, szi* "be ruined"; *dzhug, szi* in. *dzhug* "go-in"; *zhah, wu* in. *wu* "live"; *dzhad, and "be on" the decline"; and probably 'cher, see *say".3 It is verbs of this type, in which affricate initials alternate with fricative initials (Shaffer's 'sibilant initials'), that I wish to analyze in terms of *yut* < *yut* - *n*t - *b*ak. Indeed, I have already made a beginning elsewhere, though without using the term *yut* < *yut* - *n*t - *b*ak, taking as my example the following four verbs, the upper line comprising the present form, and the lower line the perfect forms, of the same four verbs, except that according to Pecchier, *zung* is also an 'alternative present form':4

1 *dzhug* 'drip', *dzhug* 'destroy', *dzhug* 'plant', *dzhug* 'enter' (ginam bzing, bzing, bzing, bzing)

In the article in which I gave these examples limitations of time and space prevented me from illustrating *yut* < *yut* - *n*t - *b*ak in Tibetan with more examples than those four, which exemplify only the following two out of a total of five types: 6
a. "dr. alternating with (dr)g. (dr)g. (dr)g.
b. "dr. alternating with (dr)g. (dr)g. (dr)g.
the three additional types that I need to recognize are:
c. "dr. alternating with (dr)g. (dr)g. (dr)g.
d. "dr. alternating with (dr)g. (dr)g. (dr)g.
e. "dr. alternating with (dr)g. (dr)g. (dr)g.
f. "dr. alternating with (dr)g. (dr)g. (dr)g.
In Flechke's Dictionary I find nine verbs in which a present form in the initial two-letter group, "dr. alternates with other forms, past, future, and imperative, in which the initial either is the single letter z- or contains the letter s in the groups go and be (3-3, 3-3); e.g.

i. present: 'dreg akn drip
other: (g)regi, grei (g)regi, grei
ii. present: 'dreg akn decline, be spent
other: 'ad akn
iii. present: 'dreg akn put out
other: greg akn akn

iv. present: 'dreg akn make way
other: 'zur gur, zur akn; akn, akn.
In the case of one of these verbs the alternation of 'dr- with z- is in the present form itself; 'dregi and zugi (zug) 'plant'; this same verb, and two others, alternate with forms in be- in the perfect; bregi, zugi (zug) 'plant', bred, zud akn, 3-3 'put into', bnum, zur akn, 3-3 'shut'; and the two last also alternate with zhe-
3-3 in the imperative: thu.d, thu.dum (3-3, 3-3). There is, in addition, another form, apparently not a verb, in which 'dr- alternates with gr-: 'dregi, grei, akn, akn 'bressy'.
At the time when the orthography was devised, I take "dr- as to have had the phonetic value of a nasal followed by an affricate, with the nasal having the same tongue position as the affricate (3-3); thus, both sounds have in common the feature of complete closure in the mouth by the tongue. I take z- as on the other hand, whether alone, as z-, or in the initial groups go and be- (3-3, 3-3), to have had the value of a fricative (3-3), and therefore no closure in the mouth. From a comparison of the nasal-and-affricate group (3-3) with the fricative (3-3) or groups containing the fricative (3-3), I conclude
that the non-nasal closure [t] of the [næː] group is a syllophonabhati, a glide, sharing the closure feature with the preceding nasal [ŋ] and the non-nasal feature with the following fricative [ʃ], i.e., [ŋ(ðʃ)ə].

Accordingly, I should have preferred to see initial ‘dz–’, which is a syllophonabhati spelling, replaced, at least for the nine verbs with alternating forms in ‘dz-’ and (g)h-je, by *‘d*t*-’, with the result that, for example, ‘dog’ and ‘dei’ (‘*d*ng, *d*ng), would be spelt *‘d*z*ng* and *‘d*zin (‘*d*z*ng, *‘d*z*ng’), and that their initial letters would cease to alternate. Their forms would then appear as follows:

*‘d*z*ng (g)h*je*   g*zin   *‘d*z*ng*   grung*   mung*ng(I).

In my analysis I have attributed a nasal-and-fricative value to the initial group ‘dz–’; but I am obliged to admit that, whatever the pronunciation may have been at the time when the spelling became established, my Research Assistant Rinnig Wangpo (tig: ‘dizin bshang-po), a well-educated speaker from Lhasa, regularly pronounced this initial group of letters when spelling and reading not as a sequence of nasal and fricative ([d-z-]), e.g., ‘dei’ not as [‘dizin] but as [‘dizin], without a syllophonabhati. This pronunciation conflicts with the interpretation of the orthography that I gave at the beginning of this paragraph, and is therefore, at first sight, something of an embarrassment to me; but I take it to be an alternative pronunciation without syllophonabhati, and therefore as supporting my interpretation of orthographic ‘dz–’ as the syllophonabhati form of what is to be regarded structurally as *‘d*t*-*. For such an interpretation I am obliged to assume that *‘t*- was pronounced in former times as a voiced consonant [*t*-]; but this assumption presents no great difficulty, for the *t* of the orthography corresponds to the voiced consonant [*t*–] of the more conservative Tibetan dialects, e.g., ran-pu ‘bridge’, dzang ‘copper’, Bakti ‘t-], zang ‘eat’, *g*po ‘planet’, Golek [*c*] in the Lhasa dialect and in the pronunciation used in spelling and reading written Tibetan *c*– corresponds to the voiceless consonant [*c*] in a low-tone syllable).10

Rinnig Wangpo’s pronunciation of initial ‘dz–’ not as [næː] but as [næː] in reading and spelling written Tibetan does not
go un-supported, the Khaza dialect has /me/ corresponding to the /r/ of the spelling, though only in certain types of syllable junction within the word, e.g. shen 'dein 'eclipse', ef "elnoun 'smile', shen 'zeg 'ladder' (ένεθεν, έκειο, έκεινο, έκείνο); so too does Golok, but with the difference that in Golok the [n] features are not confined to a medial position but occur initially in such words as m:n:nu-mo (for m:n:nu-mo) 'fnger', m:non 'assemble', and (') dsm:gly 'world'.

Consistently with this nasal- and fricative pronunciation corresponding to /t-/m-. Golok has a nasal-and-fricative pronunciation [me], not nasal-and-fricative (*[me]), corresponding to the initial group m:n- of the spelling; e.g. [me]- mno *x- 'talk' (hybrid).

It may be that syllables spelt with *d: or (and m:n- or) fluctuate in pronunciation from [me] to [mne] (and [me] to [mne]) from speaker to speaker, and have done so since the early days of the orthography, is something like the way in which English words ending in -th such as lunch, branch, and sting fluctuate between a syllable-shruti pronunciation with nasal and fricative (*[n:d]) and a pronunciation with nasal and fricative ([nd]), as though spelt *lunch, *branch, etc.

Whatever the likelihood of a fluctuation in the pronunciation of /d: or/ between nasal and affricate and nasal and fricative, it is evident that adapting an abjad-like scheme of the Sanskrit type, the varna samâdhi, for Yedeta has had the effect of widely separating the affricate [d:] from the fricative [z]; for dze & in that scheme is grouped with tu and tua (έντ, έντα), and separated from ze & which is grouped with za,za, and yo (έντ, έντα). As I hope I have been able to show, the morphology of the verbs considered in this section (a) requires them at least to be closely associated, or, preferably, unified through the representation of /d: or/ as вз, вз.

The same sort of symbolism could be extended to forms currently written with initial groups m:z-, and re*-z-, e.g. m:zud 'dze', m:zud*love, m:zud 'press', m:zud*be finished (έντ, έπτ, έπτα) which would therefore spelt *m:zud, m:zud, re*: and re: (έντ, έπτ, έπτα, έπτα). I am not, however, able to advocate this change of symbolism on the same grounds as for /d: or/ (g/zh)-, because verbs with initial m:z- and re*: do not show any alternation in form as between m:z- or re*: and (g/zh) con the contrary, verbs with initial m:z- or re*: in one form are spelt with that same initial group in all forms. The only reasons, then, for making a parallel change from m:z- and re*: to *m:z-
and **er** respectively are those of consistency with the proposed change from "de-" to "de-", and economy; for it would then be very nearly possible to dispense with the letter de- altogether: words spelt with the single initial letter de- number, in Flochle's "Dictionary", only nineteen. They alone would remain.

Although the initial group *ide-* occurs in Tibetan orthography, and is by no means rare, and although both *ide- and *ide- (i-*, *) occur (section 6), e.g. *ide-'forget', *ide-'valley', "region* (*di*, *dy-*), there is no such initial group of letters *ide-. *ide-. A corresponding initial sound group to this non-existent group of letters, *ide-, does, however, occur in the Baltic dialect; it corresponds to the existing initial group of letters *le-*, e.g. *lida-*: *le-"month", *lidoaz"cause to return". This Baltic initial sound group I should analyze exactly as for *[ak]-*, in terms of *vandjanabhakti, the closure [e] being related to the partial closure of the preceding [1]. The appropriate spelling for this sound group would, therefore, be not the *vandjanabhakti* spelling *mde-", but *mde-. The above two Baltic examples would, accordingly, be spelt *lida-* "better, prefer", *vi(*)-", and *mde-.

Since, however, the corresponding spelling to this Baltic initial sound group is not *mde-", but *mde-*, the Baltic sound group has generally been treated as an example of metathesis, a reversal of what is taken, on the basis of the spelling order, to have been earlier *[ak]-*. The spelling order *mde-* is itself, though, anomalous, and barely a satisfactory basis for the postulated metathesis: while there is indeed an initial group *d-*, which therefore contrasts with *mde-*, nowhere else in Tibetan orthography is there a corresponding contrast.

The letter *e* is comprised in the initial groups *p*, *c*, *k*, *b*, *m*, *n*, *r*, etc. (*r*, *g*, *g*, *g*, *g*, *g*); but there are no corresponding, and contrasting, initial groups *ep*, *cb-, *km-, *mn-, *cn-, *mr-, *d-, etc. The initial group *mde-* is, clearly, without parallel in Tibetan orthography; it is not, therefore, surprising that in none of the spoken dialects is there a corresponding pronunciation *[ak]-* (or, with *vandjanabhakti, *[all]-*).

The word-initial features corresponding to *mde-* in the Baltic, Golok, and Lhasa dialects, are in the reading and spelling styles of pronouncing written Tibetan as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baltic</th>
<th>Golok</th>
<th>Lhasa</th>
<th>Reading-style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[lde-]</td>
<td>[ldz-]</td>
<td>d (low tone)</td>
<td>m- (low tone)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are two explanations that occur to me for what is, orthographically speaking, a break. They are (i) that əl- might have been adopted as a digraph to symbolize voice such initial sound group as [bts], as in the corresponding forms in Balto, a remarkably conservative dialect, and that, accordingly, əl- was regarded as a single pronunciation unit, like the Greek letter a (for [s] as in [θ] and π as in [s]), and not as a succession of the two units ə and l in that order; or (ii) that əl- represents an early compromise symbolization of widely different pronunciation features from different dialects, is in the current phonetic diversity of the Balto and other forms given above, and was therefore intended at the outset to symbolize more than one pronunciation, but in the same way as the Oxford English Dictionary uses a special phonetic symbol to indicate that such words as graa, paas, and case are pronounced by North-country speakers with a short vowel, the same vowel as in laa, but by other speakers with a long vowel, the same vowel as in guard.

The same explanation might also stand for the corresponding voiceless Balto initial group [blts] ([bl] is here used as a digraph for a single sound, a voiceless lateral, as including a yuftsanacht [s], where this sound group corresponds to the spelling *PL-* (cf. *PL*), e.g. tolv/olvok *PL-* 'reach', slang *PL-* 'raise', sbb *PL-* 'reach'. *] should then wish to treat these and other examples of əl- as a letter split with əl, e.g. *plab, *plong, *plab (vuv, wuv, wab). Although at first sight *pab* *pab-* might seem a more appropriate symbolization of such forms as these, especially since əl- occurs in the orthography as an initial group, e.g. plaks *vuv-* 'tear'; for which the corresponding Balto initial in [blts], a close parallel to [blts], the proposed initial group *bls-* avoids symbolizing the yuftsanacht [s] and therefore seems to me to be preferable (cf. the corresponding analysis of */nsh-* as */s-* in sections (d)).

b. *pl-* alternating with *pL-, *pl-, and *pl-

\[\text{A detailed account of the relations of } \text{dx- and } \text{dz- and df-} \] (and a potential *dx-1) with *pl-, *pl-, and *pl- (as *vuv-) has been given in order that it may serve as a model for corresponding alternations in sections (b)-(c); these sections are, in consequence, somewhat less detailed.

Jachke gives fourteen verbs as showing an alternation in spelling between a present form in *pl-* and some other form, past,
future, or imperative, with initial a-stem containing a in an initial group ge or he (畜, 縊); e.g.

i. present: 'dago  xia establish
other:  bg  xia
ii. present: 'dhu (imp. 'dhua) xia (畜) milk
other:  bh  xia
iii. present: 'dhul (imp. 'dhula)  xia (畜) weigh, etc.
other:  ghul  xia
iv. present: 'dhug  xse  destroy
other:  bhug, ghug  xse
v. present: 'dhug  xse  put
other:  bhug, ghug, bg  xse

For some of their forms other of the fourteen verbs go outside the four types of initial considered here, 'dhu, 'dhu, bhul, and ghul, and have forms in bhul, bhug, and (b)hug (畜, 縊, 縊) . Six have a perfect form in bhul, three have imperatives in bhul, and one has an imperative in (b)hug. All of these spellings except (a) suggest affricate initials for these ten forms, either as simple sounds or as part of a group; but I shall restrict myself here to the spelling alternations exemplified at (i) - (v) above, and their phonetic implications. I might add to them a nuance that shows the same type of alternation: 'dheg/ghug  xse/畜 xse 'horse'.

I take 'adh- to represent a homorganic nasal- and affricate group, just as I did in the case of 'dhu; but I am on firmer phonetic ground here, for that is the invariable pronunciation of this initial group in the current spelling-style and reading-style pronunciations; e.g. 'adhul  xse/畜 xse 'soft'. I have never observed an alternative sequence comprising homorganic nasal and fricative (*[bh]* [gh]) for initial 'adh (but compare section (b), (d)h), though such a sequence would not be unwelcome.

Initial -a. I interpret as fricative, whether single or grouped, in he- and ge- (畜, 縊); and, as in the case of -a-. In section (a), I take it to have been formerly voiced. Whether single or prefixed it is current pronunciation in spelling and in reading is with voicelessness (f-), in low-tone syllables; but voicing (f-), in former times, is supported by [f] in the Skardu dialect of Balti in such words as 'request,'
I analyse the ḍ[.] ṅi - initials as containing a vaṣṭanāṅkhati. My grounds for doing so are the same as they were for the ḍ[.] ṅi- initial group of section (a): the vaṣṭanāṅkhati [ḍ-] of the initial group [ḍṭd[.] ] shares a lingual, or tongue, closure feature with the preceding nasal sound (ṅ[.]) and non-nasality with the following fricative ([dz]).

It seems to me unlikely, therefore, that I could have been Thонми Sambhota in a previous incarnation; for, if I had had his opportunity of pioneering the Tibetan spelling, I should have wanted to spell the initials of the present forms of the verb shown at the beginning of this section not as ḍṭ[.] ṅi- but as ṅṭ[.] ṅi-. The verbs shown there at (i) and (iv), for example, would then be regularized in spelling, as far as initial consonant symbols are concerned, though not the vowel symbols of the second example, as:

*ṭag; ṅag ṅag ṅag ṅag ṅag

If, then, I had been Thонми Sambhota, I should certainly have considered instituting the spellings that I have illustrated in these two examples for all the fourteen similar verbs given by Jāskhe, and mighi well have applied it generally to all syllables, whether noun, verb, adjective, or particle, that are at present spelt with ḍṭ-.[.] In that case ḍṭ- would never, of course, have appeared in Tibetan writing at all; for all syllables now spelt with this initial group of letters would have been spelt *ṭ from the outset.

Again assuming that I were Thонми Sambhota, with a free hand to follow my feeling for the pronunciation and grammar of Tibetan wherever it might lead me, I might have gone further, and symbolized all words that at present have initial mṭ-, ṇṭ-, or ṇṭ-[.]- respectively (mṭ-, ṇṭ-, ṇṭ-), though here again, as I stated for ṇṭ- and ṇṭ– ([.]- [.]-) in section (a) above, there are no grammatical grounds that require this. That is to say, there is no alternation of symbols in grammatically different forms of the same verb in their case; and the only argument for treating them in this way is that of identifying the [ḍ-] features of the initial groups *[mṭ-], [ṛṭ-], and [ṭṭ-] as vaṣṭanāṅkhati, and symbolizing such syllables as, for example, mṭol 'meet', ṇṭa 'barter', and ṇṭṭi 'weight'.
If I had taken this course, there would no longer be any syllables spelt with the initial groups m:\textit{h}, s:\textit{h} or s:\textit{h}d, but only those now spelt with the single initial letter s:\textit{h}, e.g. s:\textit{ha} 'tea', s:\textit{h}o-be s:\textit{n} 'elder brother', s:\textit{h}o-pa s:\textit{n} 'robber'

c. 's\textit{h}o'-alternating with s, s\textit{u}, and (b)-

Jeschke gives only two verbs as alternating an initial group 's\textit{h}o'- for the present form with the single initial s:\textit{h}, or the groups s:\textit{h} and s:\textit{h}u-

(i) present: 's\textit{h}o-a  s:\textit{h}o-repay other: s\textit{h}o-bub, bub

(ii) present: 's\textit{h}u  s:\textit{h}o-live other: s\textit{h}u

(iii) present: 's\textit{h}a  s:\textit{n}-nourish other: (b)s\textit{n}, s\textit{n}-

I take 's\textit{h}o-\textit{a} to represent a sound-group comprising homorganic nasal and affricate of the same type as s:\textit{h}o-. considered in section (a), except that where 's:\textit{h}o-symbalized voice and non-aspiration t:\textit{h}-symbalized voicelessness and aspiration. My only support for this assumption comes from the second syllable of Goñok [britつ] 'horses', corresponding to re-s\textit{h}o, though a spelling 's\textit{h}o- would, in my opinion, be more appropriate than s\textit{h}o; nasality [\textit{fn}] is an initial feature of this syllable not only in Goñok but also, medially, in such a different dialect as the Lhasa; e.g. [\textit{bn}m] in n\textit{u-s\textit{h}o 'we': 'u-pa-s\textit{h}o 'the Buntanese'. The pronunciation of s:\textit{h}- as [\textit{f}] is not controversial; the spelling-style pronunciation of s\textit{n}- 'ground', for example, is [\textit{sa}], and that of grum s\textit{u} 'three' is [\textit{sum}] (Balti, and Goñok [\textit{xiul}]).

The reader, by now familiar with my s\textit{ya\textsuperscript{m}a\textsuperscript{n}a\textsuperscript{b}a\textsuperscript{h}a\textsuperscript{t} approach to alternation in the initial groups of symbols in the verb, will not be surprised to find that I analyse the initial s:\textit{h}-as including a s\textit{ya\textsuperscript{m}a\textsuperscript{n}a\textsuperscript{b}a\textsuperscript{h}a\textsuperscript{t} [\textit{t}]-, whence the s of the initial group of symbols 's\textit{h}-, which I should therefore interpret as s\textit{n}. The aspiration feature [\textit{b}] of the initial sound group [\textit{sb}-], symbolized by the \textit{h} component of the group of symbols s\textit{h}, co-occurs with the nasality, and is therefore in a close relationship with it; being
automatic, it presents no difficulty to my analysis; if nasality, then also aspiration (the converse does not quite hold, because of the alternative form *tabbat (5)). This related nasality is, in the case of *tāb-, homorganic (cf. also sections (a) and (b)); but it is worth remarking in passing that an initial group *māh-. also occurs, and that the nasality in such groups is non-homorganic and labial (*māh-). Such a pronunciation is supported by the Golok [māh] 'take' māhā māh.

The case for analysing the initial group *māh-. as incorporating *vaṃva, is precisely the same as the case presented in sections (a) and (b) for treating it as *mā-. *mā-. is precisely the same as the case presented in sections (a) and (b) for treating *su-mā- and *su-mā-. (and *va-. *rā-, *lā-; *rā-, *lā-, *nā-) as *vaṃva variants of *ma-. and *mā-. (8) *mā-, *mā-.), except that in their case it is not aspiration but non-aspiration that automatically accompanies the nasality.

Given the *vaṃva type of analysis, then, verbs (i) and (ii) of this section, for example, could be regularized as:

(i) *sāh *tāhīsāh sāh; *sāh *māh sāh.
(ii) *sāh *tāhīsāh sāh; *sāh *sāh sāh.

fāchke gives five verbs in which a present form in *tāh-. alternates with forms in *sāh and *sāh (9); e.g.

i. present: *tāhā *sāhā rise
other: *sāh
ii. present: *tāhā *sāhā explain
other: *bādā, *bādā *

There is also a verb in which *tāh-. alternates not with *sāh, but with *bādā and *sāh (9, 9); though fāchke queries the latter:

present: *tāhā *sāhā entrust
other: *bādā, *bādā 'tāhā'

I have no wish to repeat ad nauseam the details of my approach to this problem of variation. In the initial letter groups of different forms of verbs, and with consent myself here with noting that (a) and (b) *tāh-. alternation (9) is parallel to that of *māh-. and *māh. (section (c), even to the alternation of aspiration *māh-. in the present form with no-aspiration (b) *māh- in the other form, the aspiration secure being bound to nasality here too. I therefore take
to be a स्वरूपसन्धि initial group and treat it as a स्वरूपसन्धि; this 
again enables me to regularize examples (i) and (ii) of जेश्चिके’s 
five verbs of this type as:

\[ \text{स्वरूपसन्धि: स्वरूपसन्धि} \]

 punched  जेश्चिके grounds for analysing धुर-स्वरूपसन्धि too as a स्वरूपसन्धि variant of धुर-स्वरूपसन्धि are precisely the same as those stated for महिम-स्वरूपसन्धि in section (c).

e. धुर- alternating with धुर- (�ुर-):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>प्रभुमेद्ध</th>
<th>धुर-</th>
<th>धुर-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\[ \text{धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि: स्वरूपसन्धि} \]

Ješčíkě gives only one verb as having a present form in धुर-स्वरूपसन्धि, 
alternating with other forms in धुर-:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>प्रभुमेद्ध</th>
<th>धुर-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\[ \text{धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि: स्वरूपसन्धि} \]

He states that धुर- is the form in general use.

The spelling-style and reading-style pronunciations of धुर-स्वरूपसन्धि are alike [धुर-], the place of articulation being not the teeth but the alveolar ridge, further back in the mouth; the corresponding pronunciation of धुर- [�ुर-] is also alveolar, and with much friction. Analysed on the same 
basis as the variant verb धुर- in sections (a) - (d), धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि is treated 
as incorporating a स्वरूपसन्धि [�ुर-], symbolized as धुर-; I 
should therefore wish to regularize this verb as with present धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि and past form धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि (also धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि). It must be admitted, though, 
that this one example is a very slender basis on which to apply the 
स्वरूपसन्धि concept, it has, however, some support from an association 
of धुर- स्वरूपसन्धि with धुर- of a rather different type from that used in 
sections (a) - (d).

In those four earlier sections present forms in धुर-, धुर-, धुर-, and धुर- (धुर-), were associated with some other form, past, future, or 
 imperative, spelt with either a single initial धुर-, धुर-, or धुर- and, in this 
section, धुर- (धुर-, धुर-, धुर-) or an initial group of letters containing one or other of these five; but such an association 
of धुर- with धुर- can be supported by more than the single example shown at 
(i) above only if one assumes not different grammatical forms of a 
single verb but the same grammatical forms of two related but independent 
verbs, one transitive and the other intransitive.
present perfect present perfect

i. 'dral  \\\ndral  \\
retrans.

ii. 'de  \\
be torn trans.

iii. 'de  \\
be mixed intrans.

are bares  \\
mix trans.

Such other words, apart from pairs of verbs, as 'dril 'pe 'roll' (trans.) and nil-ku 'round', also support a relationship between 'de' and 't', (-e, -k). If this small list of forms in section (i) seems sufficient to warrant it, initial 'de', when associated with r-, could again be treated as incorporating a syllabographic, and therefore structurally equivalent to *r- **; the verb forms in (ii) and (iii) above would then appear as:

i. trans. *dral *de*; intrans. dral *de*

ii. intrans. *rdr*; trans. (i) sme* (ii) (iii) (iv)

and 'dril would appear as *dril ( *dr* *dil* )

These examples complete the exercise in which I have usurped the role of Thonmi Sambhota, and considered how greater attention to grammar, balanced by less attention to phonetic features, might have removed at least some irregularities from the thirty-three Tibetan verbs studied here.

Notes

1. W. S. Allen cites four different accounts of *pābbhāti from Sanskrit sources (Phonetics in ancient India, a guide to the appreciation of the earliest phonologists, Oxford University Press, 1951, pp. 714-86).


3. Symbols in square brackets are in the International Phonetic Alphabet, but with certain modifications that make for easier printing; these modifications are:

| (t): | voiceless alveolo-palatal affricate |
| (s): | voiceless sibilant |
| (*): | voiceless fricative |
| (f): | voiceless fricative |
| (d): | voiceless affricate |
| (b): | voiced alveolar |
| (n): | voiced nasal |
| (r): | rolled |

(in the English examples [t]and [s] have not alveolo-palatal but palato-alveolar values).

5. Shaffer, id., pp. 702, 704. I have re-Romanized Shaffer's Tibetan examples in the following respects in order to have a uniform system of Romanization throughout this article: st', st', st to th-, th-, and t' respectively (ṣ, ṣ, ṭ).  
7. R.K. Sprigg, 'A tibeti művelődés- és találkozás fonetikai problémái', Magyar Tudományos Akadémiai Országos Kutató Intézet, 15, 1968, pp. 161-9 (trans. A. Roma-Tas), the text of a paper read before the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in Budapest in May, 1967, on which occasion I learnt that the analysis I have pro-posed in the present article had also occurred to, and had the support of, G. Urany, author of 'Kelet-Tibet nyelvjezűségek osztályozása', Dissertationes Sodalium Bunaniae Asiae Interioris 4, Budapest, 1949. For the reason given in note 4, uniformity of symbolization, and also to emphasize the relationship between certain Tibetan initial letters that is essential to my argument, I have here re-Romanized the examples given there out of the Hungarian system of Romanization as follows: for Hungarian j, f, and s, respectively, dz, ds, and t. (ṣ, ṣ, ṭ).  
8. Such an interpretation is supported, as far as the homorganic nasal is concerned, by the Golok and the Lhasa dialects of spoken Tibetan (R.K. Sprigg, 'The role of ṇ in the development of the modern spoken Tibetan dialects', Asia Orientalis Hungaricae, XXI, 3 (1964), pp. 310-11) as well as that of the spelling-style pronunciation of written Tibetan, examples of which are given later in this section.  
9. Such an interpretation has the support of the Balti, Sikkimese, and Golok dialects: e.g. za 'eat', Balti and Golok [zː]; khang-ba 'good', Balti [baː]; ov-an-za gezi 'Avavokitevura', Golok [gjeː] Sikkimese [ذا].  
10. In this respect the Sikkimese dialect forms something of a bridge between the more conservative Balti and Golok dialects and the less conservative Lhasa dialect: it has both [zː] and [sː] in k-s-tone syllables, the former corresponding to the initial group gi- and da-, and the latter to the single initial letter z(: e.g. [zː] in gi-za 'sleep', bas 'make'; [sː] in sam-pa 'bridge', zeng 'copper', za 'eat'.  
11. See also 'The role of ṇ', p. 311. My research assistant for Golok, Dedrup Rinpoche, of the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology, preferred the spelling 'dan-na' to Jlachke's dzaub-mo.
and his pronunciation of this word, with initial [ms] rather than [ms], which occurs in Golok (cf. above later in this paragraph), supports his preference.

13. Shaffer, op. cit., p. 211: 'the common Shalti invention of spirants and affricates in combination with [s]'.

14. On the pronunciation of the Greek letters see W. S. Allen, 

15. For examples from the spoken dialects Golok and Usho that support this conjecture see 'The role of [R]' p. 311.

16. Cf. note 10; Sikkimese, [s] in b'lag 'put'; b'lagi 'sit', but [s] in la, 'request'; la 'ride'.

16. I have avoided [mdf] as being conjectural only, this is because, in spite of the occurrence of md in spelling, I have never in fact observed an initial sound group such as this in any dialect; the only relevant example in ms Golok material is mdral 'meet', pronounced not with labial nasality ([mmdrf]) but with labiodental nasality ([mdf]). The other two examples here, though, are supported by Golok [mef] and Balti [ldf], in each of which I take the [-l-] to be yuddumshvadhi.
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STUDY OF SANSKRIT GRAMMAR IN TIBET

—BHAGAVINDA GHOSH

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


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

Yuan Choung saw a statue of Panini near Atak. Panini’s grammar consists of some 4,000 aphorisms. These were supplemented and to some extent corrected by Katyayana. An extensive commentary was written by Patanjali on Panini’s aphorisms. In later period grammari-
cal works of diverse schools existed in abundance. But none of them have any independent authority, being derivatives completely from Pali.

The earliest among them was Kanṭṭutra which was composed by Sarvarman a contemporary of Satavahana dynasty of the Orson. Of later works here mention may be made of the grammar of Candrala (6th century A.D.) which achieved great popularity among the Buddhists (Bhavas) as Jñānendra Vyakaran (c. 659) among the Jains. Later the Polnath Hernandez produced also for the Jain the Hāva Vyakaran.

Other works which won local acceptance were mostly of later date. The Sankalolidra of Kramasivara—was composed after 1152 A.D. and was popular in western Bengal, Yopattra’s Sāgyabhāṣa and Kusbalpadrama won great popularity in Bengal and were written after 1250 A.D., Cūlamahabhatta’s Sāgara Vyakaran written about 1375 A.D. was popular in Vanga, Sambhata Jāhnya along with its commentary by Amirthavacapacara was popular in Māgha and Vārana.

Here it is interesting to refer to a Tibetan grammarian like लुस्त्रीम्निम्नलिपिग्रहणं (also लुस्त्रीलिपिग्रहणं) the compiler of lexicogrammar entitled फळस्फळोदयाक्षरसमग्रं (same as Prajna of 1371 A.D., published by Namgyal Institute of Tiberology, Lexicon-Dictionary Fortios 1984 and Xylograph Reproduction 1983). This eminent scholar categorically affirms the celebrity of Kalpa and Candra in introduction of the Alvar and last book कालप्पस्रवविद्यापन्धितम् or rules from Kalpa Vyakaran for euphonic combination (Sanhī) and declension (Vibhūti) of words (pages 171-179), in the following works.

The Kalpa and Candra Vyakaranas famous in Aryantra and Tibet are the two star symbols like the sun and moon respectively and
The author of the Sanskrit grammar under discussion also observes almost same in the following passage:

"This text was much favoured in central and outer parts of Aryavela. It was the tradition to study at first Saranati vyakaranam and then to introduce Kalana and Candra Vyakaranam".

Keith observes "The oldest among the later grammars probably Katantra (also called Kaumara or Kalapa) certainly had much influence in Kashmir and Bengal. Originally of four books, it appears with supplements both Tibetan translation and in Durgasindha's commentary fragments have been found in Central Asia and the Dhutupatha is extant only in the Tibetan version" (A History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 45). Tibetan tradition attributes to Sarvarman the use of the grammar of Indragomin, and the work seems to have been popular among the Buddhists in Nepal. The Candra-Vyakaranam was popular in the Buddhist countries Kashmir, Tibet and Nepal and had reached Ceylon (ibid, p. 45).

The above mentioned facts and the author's observance, such as that, Aṇḍhatantrarupacārya made use of the Vyakaran Sutra of Ka-Tian (i.e. Kalana and Candra) in composing Saranati-Prāthiya also shows that, this grammar is of third category. The author states that, Aṣṭāvaṇī wrote this grammar under goddess Sarasvatī's special favour, that though concise in form it is vast in meaning, and deals with grammatical questions, such as, gender, case, etc.

Inspite of its being classed in third category, due to its compactness and ease comprehensibility it was favoured by the ancient scholars of Magadha and Varnasā. In ancient time Magadha was the western adjacent of Vangala and therefore we may guess its popularity in Vangala also. It invariably found its way to Tibet via Nepal, through the disciples and followers of the Three Pandits from Aryavela, referred to in the work under discussion.
Before we set out to speculate on the merits of this work, it would be appropriate to notice the observations made by the author himself.

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

According to this work Pandita Bhishabheda and Krishnapriya met Tarantaka and rendered both the aphorisms and the dissection of Saravati into Tibetan language, Tarantaka also completed his commentary on Saravati Vyakaranas.

Later during the period of the Fifth Dala Lama, Dharpa Lotsava (the translator having from Darva,) with the aid of the same two Pandita translated the aphorisms and the dissertation into Tibetan. Again in later period Jamgon Situ-rinpoche studied difficult topic of this grammar with the aid of Shvatrayamala and its omination and it is said a new rendering of the dissertation of this grammar into Tibetan was written by him.

"Although these early and later translations were elegant and excellent, those were too vast and deep, so it is very difficult for the people of current time to comprehend the same. Besides these books have now become rare. As in the later dissertations only declensions are given, but no formulaic for deriving words are included. Those are so concise and difficult to comprehend even a reader of such precious dissertations is very rare in Tibet."
"Some would still prefer the short treatise of Anubhutisvargacararya because this will help them to enter into the vast literature on this subject, like Kalapa and Candra-vakara. I myself utilized a later translation of aphorisms and its dissertation, and for the obscure points I looked up the commentary of Taranatha. I have adapted several principal words from the book entitled 'śānti-siddhi', dealing with declension for the utilization of the beginners, necessary cross-references, above and below, are made for convenience as traditional. In short, I have endeavoured to make this commentary lucid and useful".

At the end acknowledgment is thus made, "Here ends the Saranati-Trakhya composed by the illustrious Farirajaka Paramahamsa Acarya Anubhutisvargacaraya".

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

The concluding folio (171) says, "Thus as the copies of commentary by renowned Taranatha on Saranat grammar is rare and as this has much been fragmented in Tibet, so it becomes difficult to introduce this grammar to the beginners. The dissertation 'śānti-siddhi' by Tsho Rigs-pa is concise comment and difficult to understand, and the text was somewhat corrupted through the fault of scribes. Therefore it was thought that a more lucid as well as simple commentary could be made available for the future".

"While I was contemplating this commentary and was proceeding on my slow wit I had the ever persistent encouragement at the hands of Buktur dron-pa, the lama who was vastly learned in both Kalapa and Candrabaktavatsala systems. Myself lbyur-tsen Neg-dbang-mchog-grub-rjes don-bstan-bshad being a loyal elder monk of Kab-Thong am consciously devoted to the great Acarya of Orgyan--Padmasambhava. The name bestowed upon me by my Acarya on the completion of my study was, 'ngag-mdzad-pa'. I wrote in 14th Rabbyung, in the phase of full-moon of twenty-second or twenty-third constellation (Gravana) corresponding to July-August at Kabding Dorjedan (ngag-mdzad-pa) in a
Forest retreat for meditation known as Yung-dchen-yang-chu-shing (ཡུང་དྲིང་གཅིག་གླུ་གཤེགས་) in the hours of break. The scribes were the inspirers, Dorje Zampa himself and ཁོ་བོ་སྣང་བའི་གླུ་གཤེགས་

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

"Although there are many obscure points in the text, my pupil གོ་བོ་སྣང་བའི་གླུ་གཤེགས་ has thoroughly checked the text on the basis of Kāśyapa and Candraghoṣa and Anurahula and so on."

A synopsis of the work

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

(i) Acarya Aksobhyatvattra, the author of Saranatalakṣyam, as utile and local celebrity;
(ii) Brahmin Pandita, Babhadvya and Krishnastra meeting Tarada and translation of Aksobhyatvattra’s grammar;
(iii) Tarada’s completion of the commentary on this grammar;
(iv) hDar-thu-tso-ba’s translation of the grammar with the aid of the two Pandita during the time of 19th Dalai Lama;
(v) Sino Rinpoche’s study of this grammar with Pandita Yishaupati;
(vi) Author’s acknowledgements of new translations besides recourse to Tarada’s commentary.
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(vii) Adaptation of words of genders from 

(viii) The utility and value of translation of this grammar.
(ix) Author's encouragement by Gelong Dorje Zinpa eminently scholar in Kelupa and Ganda Vajrapani.
(x) The author's title as master of grammar.
(xi) Place and date of compilation.
Now we propose to discuss the following points:
(i) The authorship of the original (Sanskrit) work.

The Indian grammarians of Sarasvati school, Harshakirti (16th century), the author of "कर्त्तव्यः भूमिलोक" (vide Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS, Adyar Library, Vol. VI, No. 678) a pupil of Caudakirti, who was honoured by Sahu Salem of Deoli (1542-1553 A.D.); and Ramanarendra (1645 A.D.), the author of श्रावण-सूत्र-आवरण (ibid, No. 689), and the Tibetan grammarians Taranatha (1555 A.D.) Dura Lotsava (contemporaries with Fifth Dalai Lamas), Sita Rinpoche and Gyatso chowang chugdup the present translator also testifies to अनुवादः कर्त्तव्यः as the author of शास्त्र-विद्या. As the tradition ascribes the original suttas to the divine authorship of the goddess Sarasvati; the suttas are named महाराजान्त्रिक just as the 14 suttas in Panini's grammar attributed to Siva are called गौरवसूत्र. Thus Amalavishvanarayaka became the founder of Saraswati school. This assertion is further supported by the colophons found in the MSS of the work deposited in the Library of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, viz.:

(vide. Nos. 4419 and 4471 in the Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS of the Society Vol. vi) and by the introductory verse of the commentary called Siddhavas-Candra (No. 4420 of Adyar Catalogue Vol. VI). The gloss contained in the Sarasvata-Pakravina has been ascribed to Amalavishvanarayaka to whom the original sutras are said to have been revealed by the goddess Sarasvati. This has been ascertained by the statement of Dura Lotsava and the present translator.
Main contention of both of them is that, Anubhutiivaroopacarya was personally favoured by goddess Saraswati in the composition of this grammar. As Darva Lotsava described the Acarya's name as 

\[
\text{सारस्वत कार्यन्ति ज्ञानोत्सवश्री}
\]

which in Sanskrit the name should be rendered as **Sarasvatīkaraṇa-praṇava**.

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

*Sarasvatīkaraṇa* is the form of a text with commentary, the text being in sanskrit form and the commentary in ordinary prose. The total number of sutras comes to above 1,000 of which 900 are said to be original and the rest additions made by the commentators. The number of the sutras in different Tibetan translations of Kramaḥbatta and Taranatha (Tanjur Catalogue No. 444), Vol. 13 Darva's

Do Tak and Gyurme's Do-De, have yet to be investigated from several versions reportedly extant. The work is divided into two parts namely the *Patañjala* and the *Uttarādhyāya*, the first dealing with *sāntam* or declension, and second *Tasanta* or conjugation, *Kramaṇa* or verbal prefixes. The author Govindaacarya in his *Sarasvatī-Shastirokha*: Padacaritaka divides the work into five *Adhyayas*, each containing four *padas* and gives the contents of each of the 50 *padas* thus:- 1. *Sanjña*, 2-5, *Sandhi*, 6-5. *Subhābha* and *Srīnātāraya* 9, *Karaka*, 10 *Sanāa*, 11 *Tadhāla*, 12-9. *Akhāra* and 10. *Krt* (vide No. 444) of the Descriptive *Catalogue of the Sanskrit 385*, in the collection of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Vol.VI.
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The date of composition of Sarasvatī Prakṛti ranges over a century from 1250 AD to 1350 AD. Sanskrit scholars like Surendra Das Gupta and Koushan Raja do not mention at all the name of Anubhutiavarapacarya. Keith while discussing the chronology of Sanskrit gymnastics merely states Anubhutiavarap was the author of Sarasvatī Prakṛti with commentary (Keith: A History of Sanskrit Literature, p.413) but does not mention the Acarya’s birth place. The Adyar Catalogue (Vol.6) presumes Anubhutiavarapacarya as an ascetic and a resident of Benares, but we are not informed about the source of this presumption. The present translator Gyurmed Tshewang Chogyal (19th century) states:}

"As regards his works and disciples we know from T.M. Tripathy’s introduction to Tarkasamgraha of Anandapajna (No.3, Cackward’s Oriental Series).

1) That Anubhutiavarap was the same as the preceptor of Anandapajna, the author of the Tarkasamgraha.

2) That he had besides Anandapajna, another disciple called Narendraprapi alias Narendraansvari a commentator on the Sarasvatīprakṛti.

3) That he was the author of some more works, namely:
4) That he was a contemporary of Vopadeva (1200 AD), the author of Madhuban-da-vyakhyā. As regards Narendrapur mentioned above, he is said to be the author of the Sararūṣa-Paṇḍita in No. 793 of the I.O. Catalogue, Part I, (Adyar Catalogue, P. 211). But the statement has been refuted by T. M. Tripathi in the introduction to the Tarkasaṃgraha, as the fact is not supported by Tibetan sources.

Besides the works mentioned above one more work namely Bhavaratāda Bhāhāya Tippaṇa goes by Anubhūtaśvaruṇa’s name. A copy is available in the Adyar Library (Ind. Vol. VII). There are various MS on Sararūṣa Šyālawana (Nos. 465-466 and its different sections. One in Oriya script and in Palm leaf, others in Devangari script on paper. Evidently this school of grammarians represent an attempt to simplify the grammar of Panini.

(iii) Authorship of the Tibetan text.

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

His personal name and the name he received from his Acarya are already described. The author describes himself and his patron thus:

Nothing can be found about the school of the grammarian or about his place of origin or about the region to which this work is dedicated. It seems that the work is written in the Lhasa school of Panini's grammar. The name of the patron monk and the date of the work are not known. The language of the text is not clearly defined, and it is not certain whether it is written in Sanskrit or Tibetan.
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He makes an acknowledgement to his own pupil, Gyur-med-bshe-dbang composed this text in 14th Rab Brng which corresponds to 1857-1867. He is known as dge-'ris-rim-po-che, go-te being the name of his clan, his disciple is Za-chua-dbyon-sgrub, mtsho-stobs-mam-rgyal—Namgyal's disciple is migs-mtn-byed-kong-sgrub and his disciple S-klu-mi-phan. According to some Lama scholars further information might be available from a Nambtor called Rig-bshad-bshe-dbang-nor-ba-ma-thar.

(iii) The place and date of composition.

The prologue of the book clearly states: In this country of Tibet Brusmin Pandita Balabhadrā and Kshrananiva met Taránthā and translated both Sutra and às Prakriya of Sarvāsa Vyakran. It seems that Balabhadrā and Kshrananiva first introduced the grammar into Tibet, while Tarānakṣa made a commentary on it. The place of translation was obviously Jang Muctars in Central Tibet. Then later on during the Fifth Dalai Lama's time Darva Lobsawa translated the grammar with the aid of two Panditās, Balabhadrā and Gokālanāthāvā. Here the present author states that the two Panditās collaborated with Darva Lobsava but does not mention their names. But circumstantial evidence, confirms that they are the same Panditās. So we can place both the translations in the same century beginning with the second half of the seventeenth.
Present work was undertaken by the author, when he was blessed by his Acaarya Gelong Derge Zimpa, with the name of grammarian Tshangdai Zelpa Lodolza, in the 14th Rab Brung (1867-1867 of Christian era), in the phase of full-moon of twenty-second or twenty-third constellation (Sawu) corresponding to July-August (कु म हिङ्ग) at Dralikah-chog-oro-ri glyn monastery in Khram in a forest retreat known as Yang dhen(ven) byang-chub-shing.

We have already stated the fact, that the author of Prajna completed his composition of the text during the New Year-days of 13th cycle. (Vide under (ii)), while the work was seen by Dr. B.B. But he has not exactly mentioned in which particular year of 13th cycle he completed his work. But the accepted date of Prajna (1377) A.D. By Rajor, N.I.T., P. 1961, p. Foreword, IX and present author's reference of date 14th Rab Brung can place the date of composition of present work in the beginning of 15th century.

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

We have already made reference to Sanskrit and Tibetan works that our author then utilized in translation. Dawa Lobsang who translated this grammar under the instruction of the Fifth Dalai Lama (1617-1682), contended that first full translation was Darsa own. However, the Fifth Dalai Lama, who had another name as grammarians La Lobsang knew a full composed but authentic and terse translation by Dr. B.B. and other translations of the work. His reference to other translations may denote the translation of Tarzanatha who was almost an elderly contemporary of the Fifth Dalai Lama.

According to our author Gyurme Dongchogrup, Pandit Balabhadra and Krishnamurthi first introduced and translated this work after having met Tarzanatha. Then again under the Fifth Dalai Lama with the aid of aforestated two Panditas Darsa rendered this work, Again in later times after having discussed 32
difficult points of the grammar with Pandita Khyab-kjog-bug-po made the new translation.

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

The author clearly states that he has utilized the Sutra aphorism and the Vyakhyā (dissertation), the new translation and the commentary by Taranatha, and the gāyānā of a book entitled ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ.

There is no doubt, that the present author was aware of two big grammars—Kalapa and Candrā Vaśikrama, which is referred to by the compound formation Ka-Tsan (Ka and Tsan standing for Kalapa and Candrā respectively) and local acceptance of Sarvarā in central and other parts of Aṛyadēśa. So the fact that the author in the first half of the 13th century probably utilized these two grammars goes without saying. This is evidenced by his reference to his direct disciple bka-spyod-khab-brags-pa-ba-bkra-shis-bcuh-ba, who made final revision of his translation with the aid of the Ka-Tsan and so on.

Among those two major grammars Kalapa was undoubtedly a work of non-Buddhist author Sarvarā, under Svā’s special favour. The legend brings him into contact with Satavahana. This work was popular in Kashmir and Bengal (Keith: A History of Sanskrit Literature), but the founder of Candrā school of Sanskrit grammar, Candragynyāna, flourished probably in the period between 403 and 544 AD. His authorship and date have been established on firmer grounds in the Fājīyopādhyāya, abhāsīthāsī vaśīnaḥ Bāja, Saiva and Various Sāṃskāra Grammar, who went before Candrācārya and who by their uncritical method contributed not a little to the neglect of the Mahabhasya of Patanjali. As this observation accords well with Kalhana’s account of the fate of Mahabhasya as well as with the curious legend recorded in a late Tibetan work Sumpa’s Pāgan-sun-zung (Pt.i.p. pp. 95-96), the story is reproduced in S.C. Vidyabhusan: History of Indian Logic, pp. 344-45 (vide, S.K. De, Bengal’s Contribution to Sanskrit Literature, Indian Studies Past & Present, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 575-576). Regarding Sumpa’s censure of Patanjali having plagiarised on Candrācārya it has been assumed that this Candrācārya is no other than Candragynyāna.

B. Liebich, who has recovered and edited from MS, MSS, as well as from Tibetan version, with full indices in 1846 is of opinion that Candra
flourished probably in the period between 500 and 544 A.D. The Chandravyana is certainly earlier than the Kālika of Jayaditya and Varanasi; for kālika appropriates without acknowledgment thirty-five original Satyas of Candrā's grammar which had no parallel in Panini, but which Kayata distinctly represented as un-Paninian. All accounts agree that Chandragomin was a Buddhist, and this is supported not only by his hortatory Buddhist title-Gomin, but also by the Mongalad才 or Vritti which pays homage to Saravapa. S. Levi relying on the mention by Layings of a great man named Candra Koush (official) or Chandrara, who lived like a Bodhisattva, in his time in central India and composed a musical play on the Visvanata would identify this Candra with Chandragomin. A Tibetan source, Taranatha, in making Candra a contemporary of Sila, son of Harisvardhana, would place him at about 700 A.D. Tibetan tradition does not distinguish the grammarians Candragomin from the philosopher Chandragomin; Vidarbhadha however distinguishes a grammarians from a philosopher; while Taranatha states 'born in Varendra in the east', the Collet Catalogue states 'inhabitant of Sarendal in eastern India; Sumpa says 'born in Bengal'. S.K. Chatterji believes that the surname Gomin corresponds to the modern Bengali cognomen "guli". For further information vide S.K. De's article "Bengali's Contribution to Sanskrit Literature", Indian Studies Past & Present, Vol. 1, No. 4, July, 1966, pp. 575-577. The tradition of Chandragomin is supposed to have been maintained in Bengal by two well-known Buddhist grammarians Jinendra-bodhi and Maitreya-bodhi. Bengal had admittedly been the ultimate place of refuge of most major and minor systems of Sanskrit grammars, including the Kathantra (Kalpadu, the Vidyākadhāra, the Smaksabhāraka, and the Sarvārtha (ibid., pp. 921-593). According to S.K. De the Candra Vidyākadhāra however is a much more remarkably work, which had currency at one time in Kashmir, Nepal, Tibet and Ceylon (ibid., p. 578).

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

But in Tibet Kalpa and Chandra were favoured in the beginning while later Tibetan grammarians and translators preferred the Saravāra. Obvious cause of its popularity have been discussed by the present author. We find that Taranatha and Sutapa Khenpo and other Tibetan scholars have discussed at length the life and works of Chandragomin because of his being a Buddhist and the celebrated composer of hymns of Tara
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and Manjushri, (on Candragomin’s Arya-Tata-Anurataniti, see S.C. Vidyalabhuni’s introduction to Saravajnottara’s Sugdhatalottodata-sangraha (Bibl. Ind., Colcutta, 1948 pp. XX f) Later the Saravati grammar came to be adorned for its having originated from goddess Saravati. In Tibetan pantheon Saravati is supposed to be the emanation of Tara-Sita. These sentiments accounted for the celebrity of Anubhukti-vanupa’s work in Tibet down to the nineteenth century. The present author’s eulogy identifies Saravati with Sherbhyin-yum or Praparamanita.

Taranatha in his Chos-bh淤ung states, “Although Indra-vyakara is famous in Tibet as the most ancient grammar and having originated in Lha-yul—Heaven, this was not originated in Aryadeva. The Candra-vyakara, which is translated in Tibetan, coincides with that of Panini’s grammar whereas Kalapa Vakaran coincides with that of Indro-hgs (Indra vyakrama system).”

The Arya tradition being prior to Panini (4th. century B.C.) is also strong in Sanskrit literature. It is found in the Tatinva Samhita, where it is said that, gods approached Indra to elucidate speech (vyakrama). Patanjali speaks of Brahmapati, the teacher of the gods, expounding to the king of gods the science of grammar. The legendary account of Kaha-sastra and the Brahmapati prajna that it was the Arya school which was supplanted by Panini’s work is strongly supported by Yuan-chuang’s allusion to the establishment of grammatical rules by Indra. The existence of Arya system has been dealt with in detail by Barnell in his paper On the Indo System of Sanskrit Grammarians (V.S. Agrawala, Indra as Known to Panini, p. 16). The Tibetan historians clearly suggest two parallel systems of grammars. In Tibetan view, like Panini and Kalapa, Saravati also has divine origin. Its divine origin and its orthodox lineage with Panini through Buddhist grammarians Candragomin inspired so many Tibetan grammarians to collaborate with
the custodians of the homeland tradition to bring out many profound and faithful dissertations, commentaries and translations. We have already referred to the fact that three Brahmin pandits collaborated in the translation of the text in different dates.

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

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

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

Darva states that Fifth Dalai Lama found the authentic but incomplete translation by one Jha-smthong Lotsava, and commanded Darva to translate this grammar according to instructions of these two Pandita brothers. So under the patronage of the Fifth Dalai Lama Darva studied Sārasvatī along with other grammatical works under Mahapandita Balabhadrā and Pandita Gokulanathamisrā, Brahmin residents of Kurukshetra. Here we have to note 'Mahapandita' attribute in case of Balabhadrā, and that Darva, who hailed from upper valley of gTsang belonged to Nor-khris-yang-se family. His full name is Ngag-dbang-phan-tsogs Phung-grub and his name as grammarian is Tshed-dbang-rab-brtan-rdo-rije, so that he completed translation in a period of six months living at Potala Palace. Whether Darva visited Aryadeva, as both the Panditas visited Tibet, and it so when, are matters to be yet investigated. But in Derge Catalogue of Tanjur, in Sma-Tshogs (miscellaneous section) we find one Krishnabhatta is collaborating with Taranatha in translating tīrtha-sprod-dbyangs-can, but the name of the author is missing. May be Krishnabhatta, Krishnamisrā and Gokulanathamisrā are the same person. Confirmation awaits till farther investigation.

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

The only obscurity is about the second pandita. While Darva names him as Gokulanathamisrā, the present author mentions him as
Krishnamisra. In the Fifth Dalai’s work there the name occurs as Gokula “who along with Pandita Balbhadra taught Panini in Tibet”.

In the earlier Indian tradition we come across a Krishnamisra, the author of famous allegorical drama Yakshas-candrapada or “The moon-rise of true knowledge”. The date of dramatics Krishnamisra is fixed with some certainty from his own reference in the prologue to his Chopala, at whose command the play was written to commemorate the victory of his friend King Kirtivarman over the Celi King Karu. As Karu is mentioned in an inscription dated 1042 A.D., and as an inscription of the Candella King Kiritivarman is also dated 1048 A.D., it has been concluded that Krishnamisra belonged to the second half of the 11th century (Da Cunha: A History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 48). Therefore, Krishnamisra the dramatist and Krishnavantra (or Gokulanatha) the Indian pandit in Tibet, are separate from each other by a gap of more than five centuries.

We know of Gokulanatha Upadhyaya, the illustrious Nayo- logician and Vedantin born in the decade of 1642-50, in Mithila (Dinsh Chandra Bhattacharya: History of Naya Yoga in Mithila, p. 193). We quote here the following from Gokulanatha’s commentary (Pudhyap) on Vasamati’s Dwitita Niyoga: “तन्त्रं विद्वान्यो विद्वान् क्रियासमावेश्यस्येन द्वितीयां नियोज्याय म”

Jvanata is dated about 1400 A.D., he was evidently not alive when Shankaracarya took lesson from his younger brother and pupil Bhavanath (about 1425 A.D., ibid, pp. 113-114). Mangori near Maujtabani the native village of Gokulanatha Upadhyaya became as famous as Varanasi or Varanasi because of Gokulanatha (ibid, p. 193). It is said that Gokulanatha left Mithila in his early life and was a courtier of a Muhammadan (7) Fateh Sahib of Garhwal at the foot of the Himalayas (Sinha’s History of Tibet, p. 113, cited in Bhattacharya’s, History of Naya Yoga in Mithila, p. 193). He must have gone there in the last quarter of the century as Fateh Sahib died in 1669 A.D. There he wrote seven works. Then he adored the court of Maharaj Mahabir Sinha of Mithila (1709-1732, A.D.). According to tradition Gokulanatha died at Varanasi, when he was 90 years old. The date of his death is surmised to be in the decade 1730-40 A.D. (ibid, p. 195). Although in Bhattacharya’s work we do not find Gokulanatha to be a grammarian, yet he states that his cousin and pupil Jvanata Misra of Mithila, author of Eshthiyamahamirya (Cherwell, Ed 1907, p. 477), treated the subject in such a masterly way both from grammarian’s and logician’s
point of view that even Gokulanatha must have yielded his palm to him in many places. (Ibid., p. 197).

Therefore, Gokulanatha who was born in 1640 A.D. and was a courtier of King of Garhwal in western Himalayas, might have visited eastern Himalaya (Nepal) and had contact with Tibetan scholars like Taranatha and Situ. It is important to note that Mithila (Tirhut) is geographically contiguous to Nepal Himalaya. So we may place Gokulanatha Upadhya as elder contemporary of Taranatha and the Fifth Dalai, while Darva speaks of Gokulanathamitra as Brahmin from Kurukshetra the Fifth Dalai clearly states that the same was from Varanasi, vide, rgya-bod-bor-sog-gi-ma-thon-brtan-bar-pa-ma-mus-la-brh-ing-yig-cri-nyan-sNgag-gTibod-pa-rab-nyan-yug-cre-mang-shes-tha-bu-bzhig, Vol. 4, Fol. 177 a).

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

We know from Darva that Pandita Balabhadra was the brother of Gokulanathamitra and that the brothers met Taranatha. But it is not known where the meeting took place, while Taranatha in the Chos Bumg does not mention these names, the Fifth Dalai in his works (Vol. 4, Fol. 177 a) abbreviates that the two brothers visited Tibet, expanded Panini and returned to India.

In Indian traditional literature we find the name of Balabhadra. One Balabhadra is a character in Dandin's Deva-kumara carita (1st century, Das Gupta). Another Balabhadra was one of the brothers of Govardhana a contemporary of Jayadeva, the famous lyric poet of Bengal towards the end of 12th century.

Another Balabhadra, the profound scholar of Nava-Nayaka, from Varanasi belonged to 17th century (Bhattacharya History of Nava-Nayaka, p. 192). So the Balabhadra of Tibetan tradition (13th century) was among the last to have this popular name.

We know from the introductory page of the book that, lha-mgon-si-tu studied some obscure points of this grammar through the aid of one Pandita Khyab-hdug-bdag-po. "Ja Khyab-hdug-sgra-bo-rtsul gnyis la bzhin lha-mgon-si-tu brtan bstan-bzhed ma "
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Here the author does not give the Indian name of the scholar. But as the Tibetan tradition preserves the title Pandita denoting a scholar from Aryadesa, the Indian name was rendered into Tibetan probably because the Indian Pandita was better known by this Tibetan form.

The original form was विनाश्चारिणी or विनाश्चारिन. In the famous Sanskrit Tibetan Lexicon and translated scriptures we find Sanskrit equivalents of विनाश्चारिणी as विनाश्चारिणी (Mahayogapatti, etc) विनाश्चारिणी.

In our investigation with Jangchub Situ's works the exact equivalent for Khyab-hjay bsdg-po is found to be विनाश्चारिणी.

In a recent edition of Tal-si-tu Rinpocche's work entitled विनाश्चारिणी ते रिन्पोचे रिंपोचे जी का रिंपोचे जी का रिंपोचे जी का रिंपोचे " or the autobiography and diaries of Situ Rinpoche (Ed. Lokesh Chandra and with a foreword by E. Gene Smith, New Delhi, 1968), we find Situ states his meeting with Vishnupati.

Situ met Vishnupati many times during king Jagdishya Malla whose reign according to Regmi covered 1727-1736 A.D. (Mediaeval Nepal, Pt. II, Calcutta, 1966, p.178). Situ's first visit to Nepal was in 1727 in a place called Kyim Tol (कुम्भलो) in a temple dedicated to Bhig-rten-dbang phyug (Lokesvara). The personal name of illustrious old Brahmin Pandita from Tirhuti (टिरहुटी) was Bachur Oja and his name as a Vedica scholar was Vishnupati (विनाश्चारिणी). Situ also states that, he talked with this Pandita in Sanskrit but at first he was facing difficulties - the Pandita regularly rectified his pronunciation and then he talked with ease. Then the Pandita certified Situ for his apt pronunciation. Situ had manifold discussions on grammar and logic. He attained proficiency in Indian
literature in general and specially in grammar. For this purpose he
investigated in the commentary made by Klu (कलू)

Thin Nagi was most probably Nagajibhatta, the famous grammarian
of 15th century A.D. Situ also read Brualna Pañiita Bhattoji-dikshita’s
(वृत्तनाम पञ्चतिता) commentary on Amarakosha, Subhuticandra’s
commentary on Amarakosha, Naradhakshita of Madanikara
(नाराधक्षिक) and so on.

In conclusion we may say that the beginnings of Sanskrit studies were
made in the seventh century (612-630 A.D.) by royal scholar Thronmi-
Sanbshoita. A thorough knowledge of Sanskrit grammar and vocabulary
was the sine qua non for the work of translation of Sanskrit texts into
Tibetan (See N. Dutt’s foreword Pragya, NIT, 1961). As the
inventor of science of expression, Panini was almost
applied in Tibetan tradition. As Professor Nalakshita
Dutt says: “Regarding Panini the texts mention that he
was born at Bhirukavara in the west (probably north-west) and that
though he was a brahmanana, he was strongly inclined to the Buddhist
faith, and that he attained proficiency in grammar eshala (2) through the grace of Avalokitesvara. He composed the well-known
Pan-ni-syakarama and ultimately attained Svakabodhi” Vide Dutt,
Buddhist Soots in India (Calcutta 1970, p.8)

Long after India ceased to be the homeland of the priests and pre-
achers Sanskrit studies continued to flourish and thrive in the Land of
Snows, thanks to scholars and pilgrims from the Himalayas.
The eulogy which prefaces the book deserves reproduction in extenso. A few words in the beginning are now illegible.

The eulogy is composed in Sanskrit metre. The Sanskrit is transcribed at first in "Rajana" and "Vartula" scripts and then transcribed in Tibetan. Each line is followed by Tibetan meaning. We give below the Sanskrit version in Devanagari as well as Tibetan script followed by Tibetan rendering.
PRAINA or the famous Sanskrit-Tibetan Thesaurus-cum-Grammar was compiled by Tenzing Gyaltse, a Khampa scholar educated in Nyingma and Sakya schools of Derge, in 1771 A.C. Though this book was preserved in xylograph few copies of the block-prints are found outside Tibet. The lexicon portions are now presented in modern format with Tibetan words in Tibetan script and Sanskrit words in Sanskrit script with an elaborate foreword by Professor Nalinaksha Dutt.

October 1961.

The entire xylograph (637 pp: 21 inches x 4 inches) containing both lexicon and grammar parts is now presented by offset (photo-mechanic); most clear reproduction of any Tibetan xylograph ever made anywhere. A table of typographical errors etc., found in the original (xylograph), compiled by late larnented Gegan Palden Gyarzen (Mentsikhang: Lhasa and Enchay : Gangtok) makes the present publication an improvement upon the original.

November 1962.
Notes & Topics

OBITUARY: བྱུང་གནས་པའི་ཐོབ་མཆིའི་བསྡུན་བཞི།

Gyatson Tulkhu was born 65 years ago near Khymg-Po in Kham. Recognized as the incarnation of Gyatson, he entered the Dza-thel Gompa while a child yet. The child was the inholder of a very ancient lineage of Kargu sect. The lineage began with the celebrated Yogi Khymg-Po who preceded by a generation, the celebrated schollar Gamopan (Drag-Po Lhaje ངོ་བྱེད་འབྲང་པོ་) of Christian Era. The first Tulkhu Sal-Tong Shva-Gom was one of the three principal disciples of Gamopan, known as Three Men of Kham (Khampa Misum). The deceased was also the incarnation of jam-PaShewa-nyen (Manjuri Mitra, the Indian Siddha), SangyoYeshes (a Tantrik Siddha of the House of Nub Rgya) and Tahondou Senge among others.

After his early schooling with Palpong Situ, Gyatson Tulkhu distinguished himself as a foremost disciple of Khentse Rimpochhe who also passed away in 1975 in the same temple—the Royal Tseul-la-khang. For years Gyatson Tulkhu practised meditation and retreated into the hermitage of Ma-Ling. He was Dab-Pa (Master of Dab-Oa) of the Yoga school in Khymg-Po. The serene and kind appearance on his face reflected the experience of the meditation of the Dhyan Buddha Amitabha (Opame), for he had accomplished in his own solitude Dung-Chur (that is, one hundred million meditation of Opame). Opame is the Dhyan Buddha of Limitless Light leading to Life Eternal. Gyatson Tulkhu had indeed tasted the nectar of Eternity (Amrita) for he entered into the Final or Absolute meditation on March 22 morning with absolute though quiet preparedness for the journey hereafter. His figure in the posture of Vajra Dhara remained in meditation for 48 hours or more before he was embalmed.

Gyatson Tulkhu had come to Sikkim following the trail of Khentse Rimpochhe and the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology was fortune in enlisting his scholarship for the then new project. The project was undoubtedly new for the whole world for it was an exclusive assignment.
for Northern Buddhist studies recorded in Tibetan language. His services were readily forthcoming not only for scholarly dissertations but also for routine cataloguing of collections. He was of great help in the matter of publication, though with his true modesty he desired his name not to be publicised. One such publication which does not bear his name but which earned credit for the Namgyal Institute of Tibetology was the verification of the original version of RFED ANNALS. Besides research scholars interested in Khampa dialect as well as Kargyu tradition much profited from his advice.

In 1966 he fell ill rather seriously. Modern medical diagnosis was that it was the effect of excessive breathing exercises and inadequate nourishment forced by the diet habits and fasting of the Yogi. He was very ill indeed and he was apprehensive whether his vow to do a pilgrimage to ancient shrines of Nepal would be possible. That desire was fulfilled in December 1969—February 1970. He made extensive rounds of pilgrimage and performed Tongcho (Sakya Puja) in which he made charities which clearly suggested that he was renouncing all the desires and treasures of this mundane world. On the eve of entering the Final Meditation he expressed to the Chogyal Chempo his last desire, that is, how the body should be cremated and where cremated, who would perform the cremation rites and how his scriptures, images and such objects be distributed and among whom? In compliance with his Testament, the body was taken to Thubchling for cremation and for the enshrinement of the relics into a Chorten in the neighbourhood of the Chorten containing the relics of Khentse Rinpoche.

Gyatso Tulku’s passing away is mourned by innumerable admirers who found in him a good friend in their own lives. The Namgyal Institute of Tibetology has lost a friend and a counsellor. The President and members of the General Council mourn an irreparable loss. I take this opportunity to record my own acknowledgements to a saintly teacher.

Nirmal C. Sinha
WHAT IS VAJRA?

The Sanskrit form Vajra (or its Tibetan form Bdo-rje) has been all along rendered as Thunderbolt in English. That Thunderbolt is not a fully satisfactory translation has been however admitted and as explanatory the word Adamant has been used. Vele Anagirika Gevinda: Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism (London 1959) and D.L. Snellgrove: Hevajranisna (London 1959). As Vajra is an object as adamantine as Adamant this explanatory has been found satisfactory by Sanskritists. Recently an eminent scholar has introduced a coinage, namely, Powerbolt. Several English reading Lamas object to the construction Powerbolt since Thunder, and not Bolt, is the essence of Thunderbolt. Some contributions from Tibetan context are expected for Bulletin of Tibetology. For the non-specialist reader of this Bulletin I seek to preface the discussion with a historical note from Sanskrit/Indian context.

The concept of Vajra is early Vedic. It is the weapon of Indra which could prevail upon or destroy the mightiest adversary of the Devas. It was described to be made of stone and alternately of iron. Kalyan Kumar Ganguly, Calcutta University, suggests that this mark- the transition from stone to metal. The essence of the weapon was thus its hardness, that is, its adamantine attribute. The shape or form of the weapon is obscure. The wonder of Vajra being in its attribute, the image did not matter in rituals. So in iconography the weapon of the Weather God, as Indra was in a stage of evolution, was thunder or thunderbolt as in current imagery. The missile was drawn in various forms: discus, bar, two transverse bars, spike or spear with three or five prongs. Gopinatha Rao: Elements of Hindu Iconography (Madras 1914/Delhi 1968) and J.N. Banerjea: Development of Hindu Iconography (Calcutta 1966) may be seen.

Originating as a weapon for destruction Vajra came to be prized as a talisman for protection e.g., a stone which baffled evaluation or adequate description. This imagery was carried into stipulations about Brahman or Absolute. In Kaarna Upasned (2.3.2) Brahman is likened to Vajra. The relevant words may be rendered into English as "a thunderbolt uplifted" (Aurobindo), "the uplifted thunderbolt" (Radhakrishnan), or "a poised thunderbolt" (Nikhilananda).

In Buddhism, the attainment of Bodhi by Sakya Prince, Gautama Siddhartha, was described as attainment of Vajra which is same as Ratna or Mani. The seat under the Bodhi Tree came to be called Vajrasana. Meanwhile the Mani or shining stone, which can cut asunder similar
shining objects but cannot itself be cut, was found; this was diamond. Thus in Buddhism Vajra came to be equated with diamond. In Tibet, diamond is described in hybrid phrase as Pdo-rje Phalam (fruit of thunder). In Buddhism also the shape of Vajra was not so important as its import, that is, its adamantine attribute. The form which Vajra took in Mahayana iconography beats, in my submission, distinct Greek-Roman imprint. I would not press this point as the description ‘bolt’ is wide enough to apply to any of the known shapes of Vajra as weapon. Besides, bolt is not the essence of thunderbolt as Rupa is not the essence of Vajra.

Secondly, the attribute symbolized by Vajra is not Power. Power may be Sakti or Bala, each Sanskrit word having its equivalent in Tibetan. In Tibetan Vajra is Pdo-rje, that is, the lord of stone or precious stone. In Tibetan, as in Sanskrit, Sakti or Bala is used in special restricted sense and is not used as the attribute of Vajra.

In Buddhism, that is, in Mahayana, Vajra symbolized the attribute Samyata. The treatise Abhayavajraprajnagaha says:

“Samyata is designated as Vajra because it is firm and sound, and cannot be changed, cannot be pierced, cannot be penetrated, cannot be burnt and cannot be destroyed”. (trans. Bhattacharjya)
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