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Articles

TWO EARLY SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF SDE-DGE

Leonard W. J. van der Kuijp

Much of the history of the royal house of Sde-dge, which ruled over what was arguably one of the most prestigious kingdoms in Khams, now included in Sichuan Province, is still little understood. To be sure, a great step forward was the publication of the Tibetan text-intransliteration of the Sde-dge’i rgyal-rabs, the Royal Annals of Sde-dge, in Kolmaš (1968), which also included a brief study of this work that was completed in 1828.¹ Tshe-dbang rdo-rje rig-’dzin (1786–1842), its author, belonged to the family’s forty-third or forty-fifth generation.² Both the colophon and the considerations of the origins of this family in Kolmaš (1968:81, 3a; 162, 55a–b) inform us that he had made use of a number of sources. These included the index-volume (dkar-chag) of the Šatasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitāsūtra (‘Bum), and those of the Kanjur (1733) by Si-tu Pan-chen Chos-kyi ‘byung-gnas (1699–1774) and the Tanjur (1743–1744) by Zhu-chen Tshul-khrims rin-chen (1697–1774).³ Of course, all three go back to sources that still need to be ascertained. Worthy of mention is that he does not draw attention to the existence of family chronicles.

The first thing one observes while perusing the last two is that while ZHU 324ff. is substantially based on the former, SI 201ff., it nonetheless contains a number of details that are not found in Si-tu
Pan-chen. Si-tu Pan-chen, in turn, apparently took as his point of departure the account of the family that had been compiled from what he calls ‘authentic documents’ (yig-tshang khungs-ma) by a certain ‘Jam-dbyangs Dga’-ba’i blo-gros who is styled as a secretary (drung-yig) of Bstan-pa tshe-ring. ‘Jam-dbyangs—he is followed in this by Si-tu Pan-chen and Zhu-chen—apparently began his chronicle [?] by placing his employer’s family within the clan structure of “greater Tibet” (bod chen-po), that is, eastern and north-eastern Tibet. SI 201 [ZHU 324] writes that, from among the five “patrilineal lines (rigs) of man”—this includes the four great-clans (rus-chen) of Sbra, ‘Bru, Sdong and Sga, and the patrilineal line of Sgo Lha-sde-dkar-po—the origin of the house of Sde-dge should be sought in the ‘Gar sub-rigs’ which appertains to the Sgo Lha-sde dkar-po. ‘Gar itself is one of the eighteen tribes (tsho) of Rngu-chen rgyal-mo which Stein (1961:21) has identified as referring to the Sino-Tibetan frontier in and around Rgyal-rong/Jinchuan. Instead of Si-tu Pan-chen’s bare “the patrilineal line of the Lha-sde dkar-po [of] Sgo” (sgo lha-sde dkar-po’i-rigs), Zhu-chen writes “the Sgo Lha-sde dkar-po patrilineal line suitable to be ‘maternal uncle’ of all these four [great clans]” (de-rnams kun-gyi zhang-por ’os-pa sgo lha-sde-dkar-po’i rigs), the reading of which returns in the Royal Annals [Kolmaš 1968:81, 2b–3a].

Tshe-dbang provides several other scenarios on the origins of his family,7 the first of which, by Zhe-chen Drung-yig, is omitted by Stein (1961:21) in his survey of the Royal Annals’ introductory matter. Both he and Sangs-rgyas rgya-mtsho may bear ultimate responsibility for explicitly linking the king’s ancestors to the famous minister Mgar Stong-btsan/rtсан yul-bzun (?–667) and several of his forefathers, a notion not found in either SI or ZHU, and this no doubt accounts for Tshe-dbang tracing the history of his family to Tibet’s imperial (and pre-imperial) period by taking his progenitors to belong to the famous Mgar/’Gar sub-rigs. For, in contradistinction to the Royal Annals, Si-tu Pan-chen [SI 201–202] and Zhu-chen [ZHU 324–325] commence their genealogies with the two brothers ‘Gar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po and ‘Gar Dam-pa (1180–?1240)8 [or: Dam-pa ‘Gar], alias Dam-pa ‘Gar Gzhon-nu rdo-rje, alias Chos-sding-pa, alias Shākyadpal, whom the Royal Annals hold to be representatives of the twenty-third generation, and therefore, curiously, refrain from tracing the family of these two men to such prominent and more ancient origins. Fortunately, two early biographies have precisely done this.

The year 1972 saw the publication of a prototype of “golden rosary” (gser-’phreng) hagiographical writing, a genre apparently peculiar to
the Bka'-brgyud-pa school, together with a few other texts. The first collection of handwritten manuscripts deals with a branch of the Bri-gung-pa sect of this school, from among which the editor-publisher mistakenly attributes at least two works to U-rgyan-pa Rin-chen-dpal (1230–1309) who, if for anything at all, is best known for his affiliation with two other lines of transmission within this school, namely those of the [upper/western] 'Brug-pa and the Kam-tshang or Karma sects. It is true that at the end of both hagiographies, at U 561–562 and U1 634, the author's name is given as "U-rgyan-pa", and that Rin-chendpal is frequently styled in this manner. However, an "U/O-rgyan-pa" who is not identical with the former is registered as a nephew of Dam-pa 'Gar' so that at least two individuals can be provisionally considered as likely candidates for the authorship of the two works in question. Aside from the problem of doctrinal and transmissional affiliation, there is another fact that argues strongly, if not convincingly, against identifying him with Rin-chendpal, inasmuch as neither Chos-sdings monastery nor Dam-pa 'Gar are mentioned in his extant biographies. Indeed, the most detailed biography of Rin-chendpal, by his student Bsdod-nams 'od-zer, does not even locate him in the vicinity of Chos-sdings for the years 1295 and 1304, whereas the colophons of the two hagiographies in question quite explicitly indicate that they were written in that monastery in those years.

These handwritten manuscripts provide rather essential information on the kinds of sources Tshe-dbang or, more likely, Jam-dbyangs may have been working with, and for this reason deserve our close attention. Although the "Preface" to the volume in which these appeared observes that the two works are "a two-part life of Dam-pa 'Gar", this is manifestly the case for only the first of these." Its title page names it as the Hagiography of the Great Lord Chos-lding-pa (sic) (Rje-btsun chen-po chos-lding-pa'i rnam-thar). It is divided into thirty-three chapters, and the final remarks of the author's colophon state at U 561 that it:

"... was composed by U-rgyan-pa, a monk of the highest [tantric] vehicle on the fifteenth day of fourth [or: fifth] month (dbyar-zla ra-ba) of the woodfemale-sheep year [May 1295] in the monastery (dgon-pa) of Chos-sdings rin-chen-spungs-pa, the religious institution (chos-grwa) of the illustrious Chos-sdings-pa."

Chos-lding[-sding]-pa is of course none other than Dam-pa 'Gar. Of great significance, therefore, is the second chapter of this work, U 414–416, which is entitled "family descent" (gdung-brgyud); for, as it
turns out, it is a crucial source for the early history of Sde-dge’s royal family, inasmuch as the Royal Annals [Kolmaš 1968:82–83, 3b–4a] is either partly based, directly or indirectly, on U-rgyan-pa’s work or else its genealogical tables derive from a source common to both. The text of U 414–416 is reproduced below, orthographic warts and all, for the sake of convenience. In it we learn inter alia that the Mgar/‘Gar clan let itself be divided into four different sub-clans, each of which had the following progenitor:


The first were found in Yangs-pa-can, Dol-zor, and Li-yul Khotan; the second throughout central Tibet, Mon and Dol-po; the third in Rgya and ‘Dzang [or: Rgya-‘dzang] up to Sa-mda’; and the fourth in Brag-ra gling-chen, upper and lower/western and eastern (stod-smad) Mu [Mi]-nyag. The ancestors of Dam-pa ‘Gar belong to the first subclan.

On the other hand, the second work, penned by the same U-rgyan-pa, which is divided into twenty-one chapters, has no title page and its colophon reads in U1 633:

“This hagiography of the lama who includes [in himself] all the Victorious Ones was compiled by U-rgyan-pa on the twenty-fifth day of the fifth [or: sixth] month (dbyar-zla ‘bring-po) of the wood-male-dragon year [May/June 1304] in the monastery of Dpal Rin-chen-spungs.”

The postscript in U1 634 essentially restates this but adds that “the hagiography of the precious lama [whose] nature [is] inclusive of all the Victorious Ones” was compiled in the retreat of Dpal Rin-chen-spungs-pa which, too, is another way of referring to Chos-sdings. Of course, the subject of this work cannot be Chos-sdings-pa, whose biography is briefly alluded to in U1 567, since it mentions ‘Phags-pa Blo-gros rgyal-mtshan (1235–1280) as residing in Shing-kun [Lintao or Taozhou]. We know from the colophons of ‘Phags-pa’s writings that he sojourned in this border town in present-day Gansu province from 1271 to 1273; he himself styles the area as “the Sino-Tibetan border”. In actual fact, it is simply a hagiography of Dar-ma-bum (1222–1293), also known as Dar-ma yon-tan, Chos-sdings-pa’s nephew and an erstwhile inkeeper of the abbatial throne of Chos-sdings. His
father was Sgom-ston Gtsug-tor-'bum (?-ca.1235), the first son of Sgom-ston Dpal-gyi-rtses-mo and Rko-bo-za Dge'-ma-thar, and his mother Lha-mgon-za Dge'-ma-sprang-lod, for whom he was the youngest of eight children; see below, U1 567. Presumably, he was born in the ancestral home at Dme[or: Rme]-’dor, which is located not far from Gnas-drug.

Kolmaš (1968:28–29, 84–85, 5a) indicates that Tshe-dbang signals a point of conflict between [or among] his sources regarding the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth generations; he states:

\begin{align*}
de'i \text{ gcung 'gar chen ye shes bzang po dang} & \text{ //} 
gsom ston gtsug tor 'bum zhes bya ba gnyis & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em}
gtsug tor 'bum sras dar ma yon tan zhes & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} . . . de'i gcung & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} ston gsom dpal gyi rgyal mtschan... & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} de la sras gsum byon pa'i o rgyan par & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em}
de'i gcung dge slong bsod nams rin chen dang & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} yang ni 'gar chen ye shes bzang po der & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} sras gnyis byung ba dge slong rdo rje 'dzin & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} sgm ston bsod nams rin chen dpal bzang po & \text{ //} 
\vspace{1em} rnu pa sgu ru mched gnyis yin par gsungs & \text{ //} 
\end{align*}


The son[s] of Gtsug-tor-'bum were Dar-ma yon-tan . . . his younger brother [was] Ston-sgom Dpal-gyi rgyal-mtshan.. He [had] three sons; to O-rgyan-pa . . .

His [O-rgyan-pa’s] younger brothers are said to have been the monk Bsod-nams rin-chen and Rngu-pa Sgu-ru.

However, it is said [in a reliable source] (gsungs) that two sons accrued to ‘Gar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po, the two brothers Bsod-nams rin-chen dpal-bzang-po, the tantric practitioner-monk, and Rngu-pa Sgu-ru.”

We thus obtain:

[23] ‘Gar Gzhon-nu rdo-rje
Gar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po
Sgom-ston Gtsug-tor-'bum
Si-tu Pan-chen relates in SI 202 that U[or: O]-rgyan-pa was ‘Gar Gzhon-nu rdo-rje’s nephew, and that when the latter passed away after he had laid the foundation for Rin-chen-gling, a monastery in Phu-lung in Spo/Spu-bo, his nephew and others took charge, beginning thereby a line of uncle-nephew hierarchs at this religious institution which continued at least well into the eighteenth century.\(^6\) He then says that Bsod-nams rin-chen, major domo (gsol-dpon) of ‘Phags-pa, was one of ‘Gar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po’s two sons, and that emperor Qubilai had granted him an important posting (chen-po’i gosa) which, to be sure, was accompanied by an imperial decree (‘ja’-sa < Mongol: jasay) and a seal of office (dam-ga < Mongol: tamya). Towards the end of his life, he “cared for" about a thousand people in the branch monastery (yang-dgon) of Sa-dmar.\(^7\) Without mentioning the other son, he goes on by saying that the major domo’s nephew was Rngu R[or: S]gu-ru, who had nine sons, one of whom was Zla-ba bzang-po, the chiliarch (stong-dpon) of Sa-dmar and the direct ancestor of Bstan-pa tshe-ring. We therefore arrive at the following table:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘Gar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?2a</td>
<td>U-rgyan-pa [= O-rgyan-pa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Bsod-nams rin-chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Rngu R/Sgu-ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Zla-ba bzang-po</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a lot of gaps in Si-tu Pan-chen’s scenario. Fortunately, Zhu-chen is a trifle more clear on this score, as can be ascertained from the table below. Like Tshe-dbang, he too already attributes the post of stong-dpon to Bsod-nams rin-chen, adding that the seal of office was one with(!) a triple-bejewelled tiger’s head (stag-mgo nor-bu gsum dang dam-ga).\(^8\) Moreover, he writes that Zla-ba bzang-po, alias Rngu-rje, was appointed stong-dpon of [or better: within] the territory from Sa-dmar to the boundary with Ljang.\(^9\) His genealogy can be tabulated as follows:
Whereas Tshe-dbang’s second alternative is thus in part corroborated by Zhu-chen,20 neither scenario is alluded to by Si-tu Pan-chen. Another earlier source not explicitly referred to by Tshe-dbang is the rather lengthy discourse on the house of Sde-dge in Gu-ru Bkra-shis’ aforementioned history which, woven around a succinct and uninformative biography of king Bstan-pa tshe-ring [GU 351–355], does not differ substantially from those by Si-tu Pan-chen [SI 205 ff.] and Zhu-chen [ZHU 339ff.] He places him within the forty-third generation, but there are some problems with his account. While he does not articulate the sources he was working from, a significant portion of his genealogy of the early generation of the Sde-dge family does in the main, albeit with several departures, correspond to what we find in the two chapters in U and U1. However, unlike the latter and unlike SI and ZHU, but like Tshe-dbang, the Gu-ru begins his genealogy in GU 343 with a description of the family’s divine ancestry which parallels the one Tshe-dbang attributes to Sangs-rgyas rgya-mtsho:

“Since, after a Luminous-on-High (steng-‘od-gsal) deity descended from Heaven to atop Mount Bzhag-ra dkar-po in Mi-nyag [in] the East, people called him “Mgar-gnam-tsha-‘brug”; it is well-known that in his line [there appeared] Mgar Bla-ma Mkhyen-chen-po, his son Mgar Stong-mes khri-chags, his son Mgar Stong-btsan yul-bzung . . .”

Moreover, in his opinion, it was only with Lha-rje Dpal-gyi-byams that the family migrated to Khams proper, setting themselves up at Brag-ra gling-chen in Ldan/’Dan. With Mgar Dpal-gyi rtse-mo, the family shifted to Me-shod Dme-mdo, and Mgar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po, whom both U and U1 know only as Ye-shes-’bum, settled in Mdo-drug, a scenario also met with in SI 202 and ZHU 325. GU 346 writes that he had two sons, but only mentions Bsod-nams rin-chen and his nephew (dbon-po) “Rngu-rgu-ru” from whom issued the subsequent line of the rulers of Sde-dge.

It is widely rumored that the archives of Sde-dge have been preserved in their entirety, and are now located in or near Chengdu. In
addition, an indeterminate number of official documents sent by the Sde-dge court to Beijing, *via* Chengdu, are also extant in the Beijing libraries, which go to show that Sde-dge was very much involved in supporting the Manchu suppression of the Sichuan borderlands.21

APPENDIX

The Text of U 414–416

da ni bod kha can gyi rgyal kham's 'dir / ji ltar byon pa'i tshul ni / mang du gsungs pa yod de gzhan rnam's res cig bzhag la / tshu rol mthong gi snang ba dang bstun pa gdul bya skor cig la lhos na / dpal ldan Pad-ma-'byung-gnas / ra tsa Khri-srong ld'e-btsan gyis gdan drangs / bsam yas lhun gyis grub pa bzhengs / bod mun pa'i smug rum du / chos kyi sgron ma chen po bltams / sangs rgyas kyi bstan pa'i rgyal mtshan chen po tshugs ste / de'i lo rgyus zhib [415] pa ni / sprul sku pad-ma la slob ma mang du byung ba'i nang nas / nye ba'i sras brgyad / de'i nang nas / sprul sku Rgyal-mchog-dbyangs dang / Khon Na-ga-bho-rdi dang / Gyu'-sgra snying-po dang gsum / grub pa thob pa dang / mkhas pa g.yer thon rtsod pa dang bral ba gsum byon / de gsum la dbra kar kyi dangs ma / 'ghar Lha-rje-dpal-gyi-byams-pas gthugs so / 'gar la'ang rgyud bzhi' ste / Lha-rje-dpal-byams kyi chos rgyud / srungs-btsan-yul-bzung gi 'phrul rgyud / btsan-ba dred-po'i dpal rgyud / snye rang phag mdzug gi kal rgyud / dang bzhi'o / 'phrul rgyud ni / dbus rtsang / mon / dol po tshun la byung / dpal rgyud ni rgya 'dzang nas / sa mda' rnam's su / kal rgyud ni brag ra gling chen / mu nyag stod smad kun las byung / chos rgyud ni yangs pa can nas / dol zer nas / li yul kun la byung la /

{ [1] Lha-rje Dpal-gyi-byams-pa }

khyad par du Lha-rje ni / 'dan du byon sgrub pa byas pas / yi dam lha'i zhal mthong / mgon po byams pas byin rlabs / byams pa'i chos lnga gsan / mtshan yang / 'Gar A-mye-dpal-gyi-byams-pa zhes bya bar thogs / 'jig rten gi drag byed thams cad bran du bkol / rigs 'dzin gyi sруngs ma gser khrab can gyis bran byed / dri nu ser po rta skad 'tsher bskrol ba'i dus na / zhi khro'i dkyil 'khor mdun du 'byon / dril bu nag po hüm sgra bsgrogs pa bskrol ba tsam gyis / dgra sdong gi mig thang la 'brul ba tsam byung / byin rlabs dang nus pa / mthu dang rdzu 'phrul phyag na rdo rje la 'gran ba cig byon ste / dgung brgyad dang brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi lon pa na / dril bu ser po rta skad 'tsher 'a snams nas / phung po lhag med du mkha' 'ro spyod du bzhud do //

[2] de'i sras Dpal-gyi yon-tan / a
[6] de’i sras Dpal-gyi bkra-shis dang Inga’o //
dpal lnga’i tshe / dril bu nag po hum sgros kyang yod do // mthu dang nus pa’ang gong dang ‘dra / de nas Dpal-gyi-bkra-shis kyis / dril bu nag po hum sgra sgros bsrams nas / lcang lo can du bzhud do //

[8] de’i sras Bkra-shis-bla-ma /c
[9] de’i sras Yon-tan-bla-ma /
[10] de’i sras Shes-rab-bla-ma /
[12] de’i sras Grags-pa’i-rgyal-mtshan /
[14] de’i sras Dge’-dun-rgyal-mtshan /
[15] de’i sras Byams-pa’i-rgyal-mtshan /
[16] de’i sras Ye-shes-rgyal-mtshan dang Inga’o //
[17] de’i sras Dpal-gyi-byams-pa ni

bya rgod kyi thul ba mnabs nas / dgung rgya’ dang bcu lon pa ni / dga’ ldan du bzhud zer ro //

[18] de’i sras Dpal-bum /
[19] de’i sras Dpal-grags /
[20] de’i sras Dpal-gdor /d
[21] de’i sras Dpal-ltan-ma dang Inga’o //e
[22] de’i sras Dpal-gyi rtse-mo /

de’i sras bzhi’ /

[23a] Gtsug-tor-’bum /t
[23b] Ye-shes-’bum /
[23c] Bsod-nams-’bum /g
[23d] Phur-bu-’bum dang bzhi’o //h
de la Ye-shes-’bum ni gnas drug tu shi skad / Bsod-nams-’bum ni rje btsun pa nyid do //i

(a) He should probably not be identified with his well-known namesake, the minister-monk of Khri-gtsug lde-brtsan.
(b) He is omitted by mistake in U; U1 566 lists him as does GU 344.
(c) GU 344 reads here “Dpal-gyi bkra-shis bla-ma”.
(d) GU 345 reads here “Dpal-gyi rdo-rje”.
(e) GU 345 has instead “Dpal-gyi bsod-nams”.
(f) GU 345 omits him.
(g) A note at the bottom of the page states that he was “also called Klu’-brug”, but this should refer to Phur-bu-’bum, who is styled “Sgom Phur” at U1 567.
(h) GU 345 omits Phur-bu-'bum.
(i) “Ye-shes-'bum died in Gnas-drug”, a locality which some sources place in Stod-smad. Bsod-nams-'bum was the original lay-name of Dam-pa ‘Gar.

Text of U1 567–568

[22] Dpal-rtse
[23a] Sgom-ston [Gtsug-tor-'bum]
[24a] Sangs-rgyas-'bum
[24b] Rdo-rges-'bum
[24c] Sangs-rgyas-skyab[s]
[24d] Dkon-mchog-'bum
[24e] Phur-bu-'bum
[24f] Dar-ma-'bum
[24g] Phur-bu-lcam (daughter)
[24h] Nags-'dzib (daughter)
[23b] Sgom-phur
[23c] Klu-brug or Bsod-nams-'bum

NOTES

1. For a survey of earlier research done on this text, see Kolmaš (1968:18–19), and for a brief analysis Smith (1969:48–50). It was also recently used by Gele (1984:81 ff.). Chinese sources invariably refer to the kings (rgyal-po) of Sde-dge by the rather derogatory tusi. Unknown during the period when the Tibetan cultural area was dominated by the Mongols, it raised its head as a loan word under the Ming. Stag-tshang-pa Dpal-'byor bzang-po writes in his compilation of 1434 that the [first] Ming emperor granted the position (las-kha) of du-si (<tusi) to Rin-chen ’phags-pa, a scion of a branch of the family which ruled over Rgyal-mkhar-rtse from the second half of the fourteenth century onward; see RGYA 384 [RGYA(t)2 116, Chen 1986:237]. To my knowledge, this is the earliest attestation of this title in written Tibetan. Another “early” instance of tusi is found in the biography of Thang-stong rgyal-po (?1364–?1485), for which see ‘Gyur-med bde-chen, Thang-rgyal rnam-thar [Dpal grub-pa’i dbang-phyug brtson-’grus bzang-po’i rnam-par thar-pa kun-gsal nor-bu’i me-long], Chengdu, 1982, 254. There it is used as an epithet of one referred to as “Bdag-po du-si” whom Thang-ston met in Rtsa-chen. Indeed, it is not mentioned in Tibetan biographical and historical documents that date from the period of Mongol domination, i.e., from 1240 to 1368, and it is at least equally unmentioned in the official annals of the Yüan period when they speak of the Tibetans.
2. He is also known as Byams-pa kun-dga’ sangs-rgyas bstan-pa’i rgyal-mtshan, the name that was given to him after he had taken his monk’s vows in 1826 and had become the tenth abbot (khri-chen) of Lhun-grub-steng monastery in Sde-dge. The year of his death is given as the year previous to the water-female-hare year [1843] in Byams-pa kun-dga’ bstan-pa’i rgyal-mtshan (1820–1870), Byams-pa kun-dga’ bstan-'dzin bkra-shis grags-pa’i rgyal-mtshan [1776–1862] rnam-thar, in The Slob-bshad Tradition of the Sa-skya Lam-'bras, Vol. VII, Dehra Dun, 1983, 271. While Kolmaš counts him as a representative of the forty-third generation, the phenomenal four-volume work on the history of the Rnying-ma school of Ngag-dbang blo-gros, alias Gu-ru Bkra-shis, written between 1807 and 1809, describes him as being of the forty-fifth generation; see GU 345. The genealogy of the house of Sde-dge in ‘Jam-dbyangs mkhyen-brtse’i dbang-po’s (1820–1892) Dam-pa’i chos-kyi ‘byung-ba brjod-pa-las gtso-bor brtsems-pa’i-gtam skal-bzang rna-ba’i bcud-len, in Collected Works, Vol. DA, Gangtok, 1977, 524–531, adds virtually nothing to the earlier dossier. It does add, in an interlinear note on 530, anent Dam-tshig brtan-pa’i rdo-rje, Tshe-dbang’s son, that he belongs to the forty-sixth generation, counting from the “religious minister” (chos-blon) ‘Gar Dam-pa onwards. On 524, he writes, taking the latter as a representative of the first generation, that ‘Gar-chen Ye-shes bzang-po belonged to the twenty-eighth generation. Its phrasing strongly suggests dependence on GU.

3. The index to this separate edition of the ‘Bum is not available to me. It may be “the catalogue by Drung-yig U-rgyan ye-shes” to which Tshe-dbang refers in his concluding remarks in Kolmaš (1968:162, 55b). The origins of the House of Sde-dge are discussed by Si-tu Pan-chen in SI 201–202 and by Zhu-chen in ZHU 323. Kolmaš (1968:24, 3a) has misunderstood the passage which reads: “... a statement of the genealogy from Ye-bzang-pa onwards is made in ...” (. . . ye bzang pa //man chad rim smros . . . su gsung . . . ), for he conjectures that man chad rim smros ’bum could be the title of a book. “Ye-bzang-pa” should be interpreted as “Ye-shes bzang-po”, the name of the individual with whom the genealogical considerations of Si-tu Pan-chen, Zhu-chen and the catalogue of the ‘Bum commence.

Tshe-dbang also mentions three other authors in connection with the diffusion of Tibetan clans and the place occupied by the ruling house of Sde-dge, namely, a certain Zhe-drung-pa, Tsho-byed Mkhas-dbang Gu-ru-phel and Grub-dbang Sangs-rgyas rgya-mtsho. The first of these is Zhe-chen Drung-yig Bstan-'dzin rgyal-mtshan, who is mentioned elsewhere by Tshe-dbang [Kolmaš 1968:162, 55b] and sev-
eral times in Zhu-chen’s autobiography; see for instance his Chos-smra-ba’i bande tshul-khrims rin-chen-du bod-pa’i skye-ba phal-pa’i r Kang-thung dge-sdigs ‘dres-ma’i las-kyi yal-ga phan-tshun-du ‘dzings-par bde-sdug-gi lo’dab dus-kyi rgyal-mos re-mos-su bsgyur-ba [The Autobiography of Tshul-khrims rin-chen], New Delhi, 1971, 548, 584. ‘Jam-dbyangs mkhyen-brtse’i dbang-po considers Zhe-chen Drung-yig to have been a disciple of Zhu-chen which, to be sure, does not necessarily imply that he was his junior in years; see his Gongs-can-gyi yul-du byon-pa’i lo-pan rnams-kyi mtshan-tho rags-rim tshigs-bcad-du bsdebs-pa [1851], in Collected Works, Vol. DA, Gangtok, 1977, 461. Tibetan drung-yig means something like “secretary to a VIP”. The VIP in question may very well have been ‘Gyur-med kun-bzang rnam-rgyal blo-gsal rgya-mtsho (1712/1713–1769), who founded the new Zhe-chen bstan-gnyis dar-rgyas-gling monastery in 1734, and who was the reembodiment of Rdzogs-chen Rab’byams-pa Bstan-pa’i rgyal-mtshan (1652–1709). Accounts of the succession of the abbots can be found at GU 323–341, and in ‘Jam-dbyangs mkhyen-brtse’i dbang-po’s useful Gongs-can bod-kyi yul-du byon-pa’i gsang-sngags gsar-nying-gi gdan-rabs mdor-bs dus ngo-mtshar padmo’i dga’-tshal, in Collected Works, Vol. DA, Gangtok, 1977, 349–351. The latter evidently knew (and made use of) GU, for he refers to it on p. 358 of this work. (Zhe-chen Drung-yig is the author of the well-known Prajñā lexicon.)

A “Tsho-byed Mkhas-dbang” is mentioned by Kolmaš (1968:144, 43b) as having been Tshe-dbang’s tutor from 1806 to 1808. Kolmaš (1968:24), presumably following Stein (1961:21), suggests that Sangs-rgyas rgya-mtsho was “a celebrated Lama of the Sa-skyapa monastery at Ngors”. The latter reappears in Kolmaš (1968:113, 23b; 126, 32b) as a contemporary of the most famous son of the House of Sde-dge, king Bstan-pa tshe-ring (1678–1738), himself the sixth abbot of Lhun-grub-steng. Smith (1969:49) correctly writes that he was the first “Shar bla-ma of Sde-dge dgon-chen”.

4. For Sgo and its host of variants, see Stein (1961:Index, 95) and also Yamaguchi (1971:8ff.). On the Tibetan clans in general see now also, aside from Stein (1961), Ma-grong Mi’gyur rdo-rje, “Bod-rigs-kyi rus-kyi ming dang mi ming skor-bshad-pa”, in Bod-rig-pa’i cheds-rtsom gces-btus, ed. Ngag-dbang, Lhasa, 1987, 36–85, which on p. 42 enumerates a number of prominent sons of the Mgarr clan. On pp. 63–64 Mi’gyur rdo-rje draws attention to the fact that the districts (rdzongs-khongs) of Khang-dmar and Rgyal-rtse are respectively called “Mgar valley” and “Mgar country”, but he conjectures that this was not because members of the Mgar clan lived there, but rather because one of them was either the birth place of Mgar Stong-btsan, or because
these were localities that had stood under his protection. He also indicates a passage in Brag-dgon-pa Dkon-mchog bstan-pa rab-rgyas’ (1801–?) religious history of Amdo to the effect that Nyang Ting-nged-zin bzang-po issued from the gdung-brgyud of Mgar dam-pa, the minister under Srong-btsan sgam-po [BRAG 592, BRAGnd 105]. These questions need to be looked into in detail.


6. The remaining seventeen are: Ke and ‘Gol/[r], the three of Gsung, Gser and ‘Brom, the three of Ci, ‘Bu and Gzhag, the three of Shol, Stag and ‘[r]Phyang, the three of Gce, Sing and Ram, and the three Phyug-po bu. For further details, see especially BRAG 771 ff. [BRAGnd 520 ff.].

7. Gu-ru-’phel linked the family to the great Sbra clan. For Sbra, see Stein (1961:25–31)—via the ‘Phen[’Phan]-po Rlangs (for the latter, see, again, Yamaguchi [1971:3ff., 8ff.])—and maintained that they descended from Stong-dge. Stein (1961:21) refers to the chronicle of Dalai Lama V as quoted in Tucci (1949:643), where we read that Stong-dge was the fifth descendant of the Rlangs subclan. The *Lha-rigs rlangs-kyi rnam-thar tshig-rgyud, a brief genealogy of the Rlangs written by Grags-pa rgyal-mtshan (1374–1440), himself a Rlangs scion, considers him to be a representative of the fifth generation from Mang-Idom stag-btsan, but of the eleventh generation from Bse-khyung-’bras and his wife Btsan-za Gel-Idan-ma; see RL 100, Kha-rag gnyos-kyi gdung-rabs and Rlangs-kyi po-ti bse-ru bs dus-pa, Dolanji, 1978, 368. Stong-dge’s father and mother were Rgod-lding and Ye-za Rgyal-ne-ma, and his [principal] sons Stong-khri and Stong-kham. In fact, his descendants spread throughout the Mdo-Kham area; see the *Lha-rigs rlangs-kyi skye-rgyud [RL 18, 21, 28 and RL1 40, 46]. In the eulogies to members of the Rlangs who distinguished themselves by their military prowess, the Rlangs-kyi po-ti bse-ru [RL 31, RL1 62–63, RL2 164–165] writes anent Stong-dge:

“After Rlangs Stong-dge had worshiped Lha-ru Gnyan-chen thang-lha, [he], by going to war with the ruler [of ‘Bro] during a struggle with the ruler [in question], conquered the ‘Bro kingdom (rgyal-khams). As an emblem of his bravery (dpa’-rtags), [he] obtained the silver head ornament of Li-rje Thod-dkar.<+> [He] confiscated the food and wealth of the ‘Bro ruler. [He] reduced the four brothers [of] the ruler to slavery. As for Shel-thig-ma, the ruler’s daughter, [he] committed [her as his] junior wife (chung-ma).”

This passage is also translated in R. A. Stein, “Une source ancienne sur l’histoire de l’épopée tibétaine le Rlangs Po-ti bse-ru”, in Journal Asiatique CCL (1962), 96. For the mountain god [Lha-ru] Gnyan-chen thang-lha, see R. de Nebesky-Wojkowitz, Oracles and Demons of Tibet, The Cult and Iconography of the Tibetan Protective Deities, s’Gravenhage, 1956, 203ff. This divinity presides over the mountain range that stretches across northern Tibet. The “emblem of bravery” is an interesting expression with an ancient history, for which, see R.A. Stein, “Tibetica Antiqua II”, in Bulletin de l’École d’Extême-Orient LXXIII (1984), 258, 267. Very important notes on such emblems and related affairs are also found in Mkhás-pa Lde’u, Rgya-bod-kyi chos-b‘yung rgyas-pa, Lhasa, 1987, 269ff.

8. The date of his birth is uncontroversial. As for the year of his death, U-rgyan-pa states in his biography in U 557 that he died at the Ldong river in Spu[Spol]-bo aged sixty in the wood-male-hen year; that is, 1264! On the other hand, a postscript in U 562 provides the following chronology: “The Lord Dam-pa: One hundred and seventeen years have passed from [his] birth in the iron-male-monkey [year, 1180] up to the present fire-male-monkey year [1296]. It has been fifty-seven years from his death in the iron-male-hen [year, 1240] up to the fire-monkey [year]. One hundred and two years have passed since he met with Jig-rten mgon-po [1143–1217] . . .” Hence, “wood-male-hen” is undoubtedly a mistake for “iron-male-hen.” See also the notes below for further comments on this work. Dpa’-bo Gtsug-lag phreng-
ba (1504–1556) relates a brief biographical note on him in DPA’(p)l 843
[DPA’828]; see also below note 10.

9. See the Grub-chen O-rgyan-pa’i rnam-par thar-pa byin-brlabs-kyi
chu-rgyun, Gangtok, 1976, 1–211. The publisher wrongly attributed
this work to Zla-ba seng-ge, another one of his students. On him and
his oeuvre, see my forthcoming “U-rgyan-pa Rin-chen-dpal and His
Audiences with Qubilai Qayan in 1292”.

10. See ‘Gos-Lo-tsâ-ba Gzhon-nu-dpal’s (1392–1481) Deb-ther sngon-
po, New Delhi, 1976, 525 [G. Roerich, The Blue Annals, New Delhi,
1976, 603].

11. The text was used in L. Petech, “Tibetan Relations with Sung
China and with the Mongols”, in China Among Equals, ed. M. Rossabi,
Berkeley, 1983, and cited on p. 198, note 37, which refers to U 553 in
connection with the unsuccessful military campaigns in Sichuan by
the Mongol prince Köden in 1236. However, the passage in question
deals with events of the year 1239. The other reference in his note also
requires modification. The subject of the biography that is cited is not
generally known as Stag-lung-pa—this seems to have been largely
reserved for Bkra-shis-dpal (1142–1210), the founder of Stag-lung
monastery who is also known as “the great Stag-lung-pa”—but rather
Rin-chen mgon-po (1190–1236). Tibetan New Year’s day (?) (lo-tshes <
lo-gsar tshes-gcig[?] ) of 11 January 1236 witnessed several events such
as an earthquake and a rainbow appearing in the sky. Rin-chen mgon-
po was asked whether these portended the coming of the Mongols, to
which he replied: “[They] will not come during my lifetime.” He died
less than a half a year later! For this, see Stag-lung-pa Ngag-dbang
rnam-rgyal (1571–1626), Chos’byung ngo-mtshar rgya-mtsho, Vol. 1,
Tashijong, 1972, 371–372. The biographical sketch of Rin-chen mgon-
po was based on an earlier work by ‘Ga’-pa Blo-Idan shes-rab. Dampa
‘Gar’s hagiography is of immense importance for the information it
provides on the Xixia and the movements of the Mongols on the
Sino-Tibetan frontier.

12. Another branch of the ‘Gar family is briefly alluded to in U 423–
424 by way of a line of precept transmission anent Vajrabhairava
(Rdo-rje’jigs-byed):

Rwa Rdo-rje grags (11th cent.)
‘Gar-ston Ra’bos-pa
‘Gar Sgom Spen-thar
‘Gar Sgom Cug [= ?Gom-ston Gtsug-tor’bum]
‘Gar Sgom-ston Sangs-rgyas rnal’byor-pa

13. The only ‘Gar mentioned in connection with Khotan is the ‘Gar minister Btsan-nyen-gung-ston; see F.W. Thomas, Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan, Part I: Literary Texts, London, 1935, 125, and R. Emmerick, Tibetan Texts Concerning Khotan, London, 1967, 39. Outside confirmation of the presence of the Mgar in Li-yul is provided by way of the genealogy of Sangs-rgyas dngos-grub, the fourth governor of the Tshal-pa estates and himself a Mgar, in the anonymous Rgyal-rabs sogs bod-kyi yig-tshang gsal-ba’i me-long, in Sngon-gyi-gtam me-tod-gi phreng-ba . . ., Dharamsala, 1985, 110. The genealogy is found in the chronicle of Dalai Lama V that is quoted in Tucci (1949:629) and Table Two between 706 and 709; Tucci once has “Sangs-rgyas dngos-grub” but twice the wrong “Sangs-rgyas don-grub”! This branch of the family may have to be included in the so-called ‘phrul-rgyud. According to GU 344, it issued from Khri-gnyen khri-lcags, the brother of A-myes Dga-ba-dpal. The comment of Kolmaš (1968:26) that “Khri-gnyer khri-lcags is said to have held the office of tshal-pa khri-dpon . . .” is an oversight.

14. In his chronicle of 1376, Yar-lung Jo-bo Shākya-rin-chen-sde writes that the line of rulers of Ya-tshe (= Semja) derives from ‘Gar/ Mgar Srong-btsan; see the Yar-lung jo-bo’i chos-’byung, ed. Dbyangs-can, Chengdu, 1988, 72. This line terminated with Pratamallā, after which Bsdod-nams-lde, alias Chos-rgyal chen-po, the ruler of Spurangs, was invited to Ya-tshe and then ruled as king under the name of Punyamalla sometime around the 1330’s. His son was Prthvimallā whose minister was Dpal-Ildan grags-pa; see also L. Petech, “Ya-tshe, Gu-ge, Pu-rang: A New Study”, in Papers on Asian History, Rome, 1988, 379 ff. He cannot he identified as the Bsdod-nams-sde of Kaḥ-thog Rig-dzin Tshe-dbang nor-bu (1698–1755), whose dates are the “iron-pig year” (lcags-phag lo), 1371, and the “wood-monkey year” (shing-sprel lo), 1404; see his recently published genealogy of the descendants of the imperial family in western Tibet via the House of Gung-thang, the Bod-rje lha-btsad-po’i gdung-rabs mnga’-ris-smad gung-thang-du ji-ltar byung-ba’i tshul deb-gter dwangs-she’ phrul-gyi me-long, in Sngon-gyi-gtam me-tog-gi phreng-ba . . ., Dharamsala, 1986, 648, 651. See also D. P. Jackson, The Mollas of Mustang, Dharamsala, 1984, 114. His father was Khri Phun-tshogs-sde dpal-bzang-po, born in 1338,
who met with a violent end in 1370, and his grandfather was Khri Bkra-shis-Ide, for whom the only date given is the year of his death, 1365 (shing-sbrul).

15. U 423 states that his parents died when he was ten years old, that is, in 1190. The date given in a preceding note glosses the year as mye-pho-khyi, "fire-male-dog" (1166, 1226), which presumably is an error for "iron-male-dog". Sgom-ston Gtsug-tor-bum himself died shortly before Dar-ma yon-tan had taken his first set of vows at the age of thirteen under Dpal-lidan Dmang-phu-ba and Dge-bshes Kam-pa Grags-pa seng-ge, upon which occasion he received the name of "Dar-ma yon-tan"; see U1 577–579.

16. Dpa’-bo relates in DPA’(p)1 843 [DPA’828] and DPA’(p)2 200 [DPA’1047] that Phu-lung monastery was the [principal?] see of ‘Gar Dam-pa. He writes this in connection with the visit of the young Karma-pa VII Chos-grags rgya-mtsho (1454–1506) in a “dragon year” which must be the year 1460.

17. We may have to reckon with several places called Sa-dmar ("Red Earth"). An interlinear note in the biography of Rab-brtan kun-bzang ‘phags-pa (1389–1442), governor of Rgyal-mkhar-rtses, suggests that Sa-dmar is located in the Ldan/’Dan country; see Rab-brtan kun-bzang ‘phags-kyi nmam-thar, Lhasa, 1987, 6 [Dharmasala ed., 1978, 12]. According to R.A. Stein, Recherches sur l’épopée et le barde au Tibet, Paris, 1959, 238, note 20, the monastery of Sa-dmar is located south of Dpal-yul on the Ba-thang frontier. P. Kessler, Die Historische Königreiche Ling und Derge, in Laufende Arbeiten zu einem Ethnologischen Atlas Tibets (EAT), Lieferung 40. I, Rikon, 1983[?], map, Blatt XXVII, places it about one hundred and fifty kilometers south-south-west of Sde-dge and about sixty kilometers north of Ba-thang. Gele (1984:83), who obviously used the Annals [Kolmaš 1968:85, 5b], writes that Bsod-nams rin-chen “…made Sa-dmar monastery his official palace-cum-temple (guandian)”, adding that some unnamed scholars ventured that the Yuanshi’s “military-civilian myriarchy (junmin wanhufu) of Yisima’ergan” may indicate Sa-dmar; see Yuanshi, Vol. 7, Beijing, 1976, 87:2198. This is the only place in the Yuan annals to record the name “Yisima’ergan”. It has it that at some unspecified time, this office was staffed by one “government agent” (daruqači) and two myriarchs—for various meanings of “daruqači”, see E. Endicott-West, Mongolian Rule in China. Local Administration in the Yuan Dynasty, Cambridge, Mass., 1989, 17ff. This passage was also briefly addressed in L. Petech, “Yüan Organization of the Tibetan Border Areas”, Tibetan Studies, eds. H. Uebach and Jampa L. Panglung, München, 1988,
375, note 28. He suggests its “theoretical reconstruction” as “Smar-gam” (< Smar-khams) “which, however, seems to lie too far West to suit our context.” Kolmaš (1968:66, note 34) writes that “Sima’ergan junmin wanhuifu . . . used in the Yuan period to denote an officer in charge of [the] Amdo region . . . [which] suggests that this post was named after the monastery (sima’ergan = sa-dmar-dgon).” Dgon[-pa] means “monastery”, but "Sima’ergan" does not occur in the Yüanshi; “Yisima’ergan” would indicate the presence of the prothetic vowel “i”, so common with Mongolized Tibetan. Lha-rje Dpal-gyi-byams-pa, on whom see below, is also associated with this place. For other local rulers, descendants of the union of a local “pretty girl” and a “Mongol prince”, see Hor Chos-rje Dbyangs-can snyems-pa’i lang-tsho’s (1797–?), Hor chos-rje sku-’phreng gong-ma rnam-kyi rnam-thar mdor-bsdus ‘dzam-bu’i gser-gyi snye-ma [1849], New Delhi, 1983, 33ff.

18. Of course, the reading of dang in this passage is rather curious. The Royal Annals [Kolmaš 1968:85, 5b] is grammatically more apt in having rtag’go [read: stag-mgo] nor-bu gsum-pa, and Tshe-dbang adds to Zhu-chen that he was also given a jade seal (shel-tham) characterized by “having nine tshe” (tshe-dgu-pa), and that he was a stong-dpon of (i.e., within) Mdo-smad. The second phrase may very well be a corruption of rtse-dgu-pa–tshe and rtse can be easily confused in certain types of cursive dbu-med scripts—where rtse may have the same meaning as gling, namely “edge”; for an instance of the latter, see RGYA 272 [RGYA(t)1 387–388, Chen 1986:166]. Except for his being a stong-dpon, none of these items are recorded in the paraphrase by Ren Naichang, “Genealogy of the Chieftains of Sde-dge” [in Chinese], in Chinese Studies on Tibetan Culture, comp. J. Kolmaš, New Delhi, 1983, 390. Gele (1984:83) also omits this.


20. In his catalogue of the Sde-dge print of the collected works of the five patriarchs of the Sa-skya school, Zhu-chen simply has it that king Bstan-pa tshe-ring, the patron for this undertaking, was a descendant of the chiliarch (stong-dpon) Zla-ba bzang-po; see his Dpal sa-skya’i rje-btson gong-ma lnga’i gsung-rab rin-po-che’i par-gyi-sgo ‘phar-byed-pa’i dkar-chag ‘phrul-gyi lde-mig, in Sa-skya-pa’i bka’-’bum, Vol. 7, ed. Bsod-nams rgya-mtsho, Tokyo, 1968, 340/3/4.
21. I am thinking here of, among other things, a letter requesting a
title (and other honors) as a *quid pro quo* for services rendered against
the “Rjes-rong, Lcags-mdud, Mgo-log and Sa-ngan”, which Blo-gros
rgyal-mtshan, the commissioner of the Pacification Office (*bsan-yu-si*
< *xuanweishi*) of Sde-dge, sent to the Qianlong emperor. This docu-
ment, replete with the scorpion seal of Sde-dge, was brought to my
attention by Wu Shuhui. The official document is dated “the eighth
day of the third lunar month of the thirty-eighth year of Qianlong”.
(The text reads: *chen-lung dgung-lo so-brgyad zla tshes.*

**CHINESE EXPRESSIONS**

Dali guo 大理国

guardian 官殿

Jinchuan 金川

junmin wanhufu 軍民萬戶府

Lintao 臨洮

Sima’ergan junmin wanhufu 思馬兒甘軍民萬戶府

Taozhou 泰州

tusi 土司

Yisima’ergan 亦思馬兒甘

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

In order to bring about such an impressive translated literature, thorough acquaintance with and competence in Sanskrit grammar must have been essential among the Tibetan translators. Not only had the translators studied Sanskrit grammar, they also produced translations of Sanskrit grammatical works. These grammatical treatises were ultimately incorporated into the Bstan-'gyur in the section on the so-called auxiliary sciences. In the eighteenth-century blockprint editions of the canon some forty-seven treatises on Sanskrit grammar can be found.\(^3\)
There are no Tibetan translations of Sanskrit grammatical treatises known to us now that can be dated to the first period of translation activities. The oldest known catalogue of translations, the so-called Ldan-dkar-ma list, compiled around 800 A.D. and containing 736 titles, does not mention a grammatical text. Nevertheless, we must assume that the Tibetan translators and linguists occupied themselves with Sanskrit grammar to a certain extent in this earliest period of translation. Evidence of this can be found in the Tibetan canon; for instance, in treatises on certain aspects of Sanskrit grammar attributed to Lce-khyi-brug, an eighth- or ninth-century Tibetan translator, and in the grammatical passages in the Sgra-sbyor-bam-po-gris-pa, a ninth-century partial commentary on the Mahāvyutpatti, the latter being a contemporaneous Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon. (See below, paragraph 2.1.)

The earliest datable Tibetan translation of a Sanskrit grammatical treatise is a commentary on Kātantra grammar translated in Tho-lin in western Tibet by Royal Lama Ži-ba-’od (second half of the eleventh century). The catalogues of the earliest version of the Bstan-’gyur, dating from the first half of the fourteenth century, contain twenty-three titles of Sanskrit grammatical treatises. The majority of these grammatical translations can be dated to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the most prominent translators in the field of grammar being Thar-pa-lo-tsā-ba Ni-ma-rgyal-mltshan (c. 1300), Šon-ston Rdo-rje-rgyal-mltshan (late thirteenth/early fourteenth century), Dpañ-lo-tsā-ba Blo-gros-brtan-pa (1276–1342) and Bu-ston Rin-cheng-grub (1290–1364).

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

In order to illustrate the progress of the knowledge of, and competence in, Sanskrit grammar of the Tibetan translators between the earliest period (ninth century) and the later “classical” period (thirteenth/fourteenth century), two short excerpts from the Tibetan canon will be dealt with here, both giving a grammatical analysis of one Buddhist Sanskrit term, scil. pratītya-samutpāda. Both passages were
written in Tibetan. As such, they may serve to shed light upon the grammatical competence of the Tibetans in two different periods; the first definitely dates from the ninth century, the other in all probability from the fourteenth.


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

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

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


P = Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel ņO 29r4–6,
C = Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO 152v7–153r1:


(The term) pratitya-samutpāda, (meaning) “origination (byun-ba) in connection (bral-bar) by (causal) dependence (rten-cin)”: pratit(y)a\(^{35}\) is to be translated as (la-bya) “to depend on” (rten-pa) or “to (have) become the cause” (rkyen-du-‘gyur-bal/gyur-pa).

sam, i.e., (ste) *sambandhin\(^{34}\) is to be translated as “connected (with)” (‘brel-pa).

*utpāda\(^{36}\) is a word (denoting) “origination” (skye-ba).

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

2.3 Discussion of the passage.

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

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

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

The second element, sam, a verbal preposition, is given a Sanskrit gloss sambandhin (cf. note 34) “connected.” It is in fact this gloss which is translated into Tibetan (‘brel-pa) and eventually is presented as part
of the translation of the whole term *pratītya-samutpāda* (scil. 'brel-bar). It is significant that the standard Tibetan translation for the Sanskrit preposition *sam*, scil. *yan-dag(-par)*, is not chosen here, but instead the translation is based on the semantic interpretation of *sam* in this context, represented by the Sanskrit gloss *saṁbandhin*.

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

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

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

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

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

In the linguistic section of *Bstan-'gyur* a short text on the grammatical derivation of the term *pratītya-samutpāda* can be found. It does not bear a title and it is presented as a kind of appendix or excursus, added to the colophon of a translation of a grammatical treatise entitled *Vibhakti-kārikā*, Tib. *Rnam-dbye’i-tshig-le’ur-byas-pa*. It is not
clear whether it is actually intended as a separate text.⁴³ That this small treatise is not a translation, but was written originally in Tibetan, can be inferred not only from the mention of a Tibetan author at the end (see below), but especially from the reference to 'Tibetan grammarians' (bod-kyi-yig-nkhan, P 82r8, C 70v6) in the text itself.

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

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

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

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

In this excursus, the grammatical derivation of the term pratītya-samutpāda is described strictly according to the Cāndra system of
3.2.1. Blo-gros-brtan-pa’s excursus on “pratītya-samutpāda”: text.
P = Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE 82r4–83r3,
C = Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel RE 70v3–71v1 (C variant readings given in the notes):
/gro-ba-man-po-la-phan-par-gyur-cig/
//om-swa-sti/sans-rgyas-bcom-ldan-’das-dan-’/phags-pa-ktu-sgrub-la-phyag-’tshal-lo/
(1) /byins-(C 70v5):ja-sogs-las-(P 82r6):ji’5-dan-wi-dan-wa’-gro-ba-la-’zes-pa-in-byins-su’-byi’ro/ 
(2) de’i-na-rtags53-kyi-don-’yin-pas-phyis-te-(C:/i=)-bzag54-go/ 
(3) de-la-tshig-gsal-dan-mdzod-’grel-du/ /55-te-’gro-ba’i-don-to/ ’zes-(P 82r7):gsun-pa-ni-byins-su-mtshon-pa-la-stit’i’56-rkyen-sbyar-ba-ste/
/’tshandru’i-(C 70v6):myo-le’u-gsum-par-ran-gi-no-bo-la-i-dan-/’ki-dan-(C:/)’stit(S:’)/o’-zes-gsuns-pas-stit.’o’/ 
(4) /de’i-sa-dan-(C:/pa-rtags-kyi-don-’yin-pas-(P 82r8):)dyi’o/ 
(5) /le’u’-ni-su-gnis-par-nya58-ba’i-don-’gyi-ik.’i’59-at(P:’):en(P:’):o’-zes-pa-i-er-
’gyur-te-e’ti’/ 
(6) /de-bod-kyi-yig-mkhan-gyis-i-ti-ru-nor-snan-(C 70v7):no/ 
(7) /byins-su-’gyur-’goryu’/60-yin-no/ 
(8) (P 82v1):de’i-snong-du-’ner51-bsgyur-pra-ti-te62/de-la-rnam-dbyan-sbyan-yam-
mi-zad-pa’i-tshig-sdud-byas-te-dbyi’o/ 
(9) /le’u-gsum-par/ byed-pa-po-gcig-pa-dag-gi-sna-ma-las-so-’zes-pa-gon63-gi-
ktwa’64-’zes-pa-la-bste’gs-(P 82v2):pas-ktw’a’-rkyen-sbyar-ro’/ 
(10) /le’u’-ni-su-(C 71r1):par-na’n.55-min-pa’i-tshig-sdud-la-’gktwa’i-le-pa’o’66-’zes-
’pas-ktw’a-lyap-ru-bsgyur-ro’/ 
(11) /de’i-la-yig-dbyans67-kyi-don-’yin-’zin-/pa-yig-’tu’-ka69-’byun-ba’i-ched-du-
(P 82v3):rtags-kyi-don-’yin-pas-phyis-la-ya-yig-bzag69-go/ 
(12) /le’u’50-bcu-bdun-par/thun-nu’i-(C 71r2):tshin-ma-yin-pa-la-’pit-la-tuk.’o71(P:/)’oles-pa-i-dan-ya’i-bar-du-tuk(P:’):o’/ 
(13) /de-i-ka-yig-rtags-kyi-don-dan-/u-(P 82v4):yig-brjod-pa’i-don-’yin-pas-phyis-
’te-bzag-pa-yan-brtsegs-pa-tya’o/ 
(14) /te’u-bcu-bdun-par’ak(P:’):ni-ak(P:’):la-ri-po’o-’zes-pas-pra-ti’i’72-i-yig-dan-
byins-’(C 71r3):kyi-i-yig-gnis-dag-rin-por-byas-(P 82v5):te’/pra-ti-tya’o/
(15) /le’u-bzi-par-don-tsam-la-dan-po’o//zes-pa’rams-dbyer-dan-po-su-sbyar-ro/
(16) /lyap.84-ni-grans-med-dam-mi-zad.82-pa-bzi-84-grans-med-las-sup/ ‘i7-go-(6)/zes-pa’rams-dbyer/’o/
(17) /P 82v6:/yan-byins-dib.79-(C 71r4):sogs-su-pad(P:’)-’gro-ba-la’o-zes-pas-79-pa-dang.79-byins-so/’
(18) /de’i-snon-du-sam.80-dan/-ud(P:’)-’ner-bsgyur-ro/’
(19) /’gro-ba’i-don-can-gyi-byins-yan-ner.81-bsgyur-de-dag-dan-sbre.82-ba’-byun-.7b-la/-jig-ste/skad-kyi-byins-ni-stobs-ladan-yan-zes-sogs-so/
(20) /le’u-gsum-(C 71r5):par-(C:’)-byed-pa-la’an-gsha.79-n(P:’)-’o-zes-pas-gsha.79-n(P:’)-i-rkyen-sbyar-ro/
(21) /gha’i-srog-a-yig-bdag-la//gha-dan-nya-yig-rtags-kyi-don-to/
(22) /P 82v8:/le’u-’ner-gcig-par-(C:’)/niid-la’o-zes-pa-de-gon-gi-ati(P:’)-’zes-83-pa-la-bsnegs-pas-pa’-zes-par-sbyar-ro/
(24) /di-na-sin-tu-mkhas-par-khas-’che-yan’/-
/’di-tsam-gyis-kyan-mgo-bo-rmon-stus-gyur-ba/
/thos-pa-’nun-nus-’tshim-pa’-de-(P 83r2; C 71r7):kyan87/-
/myur-du-rten’byun-mnon-sum-rtogs-par-sog/
(25) /rten-cin’-brel-par’-byun-zes-pa/
/chos-nams-kun-gyi-chos-nid-khyis/
/chos-kun-spros-bral-nid-gsuns-pa/
/’ghis-med-gei-t(P 83r3):y-a-sras-bcas-mchod/
(26) /zes-pa-dpal-ladan-blo-gros-bt-pan-(C 71v1):pas-bar-skabs-su-smra-se-pa’o’/

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

3.2.2. Blo-gros-bt-pan Pa’s excursus on “pratītya-samutpāda”: translation. (Introduction:) Because on this (subject) even in the scientific treatises some defects occur, such as unanalyzed definitions etc., (and because) moreover (yan) even (‘an) some incorrect translations appear (as a result of that), (I) have written (the following) as it seems (to me) to be of great benefit for beginners.88

May it be for the benefit of many living beings.

(Māngala:) Om svasti. (I) pay homage to the Bhagavat Buddha and to Ārya Nāgārjuna.

(1) According to (Cāndrā Dhātupātha II.12), iN vi va gatau 89 (from i.e.) in the (group of) verbal roots ad etc., 90 iN occurs as a verbal root.91
(2) Of this (root iN) the (letter) N is elided,92 as it is intended as a marker,93 and i remains (as the actual root).
(3) In the phrase etir gaty-arihah94 (occurring) in the Prasannapada95 and the commentaries on the (Abhidharmaka-) Kośa96 (when dealing) with this (de-la) (root iN), where the verbal root is quoted in an example-form (mishon-pa), the suffix97 StīP has been affixed; StīP (is prescribed) in the third chapter of the sūtra-(text) of Cāndrā- (vyākaraṇa) by (the sūtra) i-Ki-StīPaḥ svartāpe (Cāndrā 1.3.96).98
(4) Of this (suffix ŚtiP) the (letters) Ś and P are elided, as they are intended as markers.

(5) According to (the sūtra), iKo ‘D-eNy kriyārthaḥ (Cāndra 6.2.1) in the twenty-second chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), i should be changed into e, (resulting in the form): eti.

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

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

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

(9) As according to (the sūtra), eka-kartṛkayoh pūrvā (Cāndra 1.3.131) in the third chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), (the suffix) Ktvā is required, the suffix Ktvā is affixed (to prati + i).

(10) According to (the sūtra), a-naNy-samāse Ktvo Lyap (Cāndra 5.4.6) in the twentieth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), (the suffix) Ktvā is changed into Lyap.

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

(12) According to (the sūtra), hravaśasyatiNi piti tuki (Cāndra 5.1.69) in the seventeenth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), (augment) tuki occurs in between (the root) i and (the suffix) ya.

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

(14) According to (the sūtra), aKo ‘Ki dirghah (Cāndra 5.1.106) in the seventeenth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), the letter i of (the verbal preposition) prati and the letter i of the verbal root (i) are both combined into a long (vowel i), (resulting in the form) pratiya.

(15) According to (the sūtra), arthamātre prathamā (Cāndra 2.1.93) in the fourth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), the first case-ending sūti should be affixed.

(16) (However, as a form ending with the suffix) Lyap is an indeclinable (asamkhya or avyaya), according to (the sūtra) sūtiPo ‘samkhyaḥ luk (Cāndra 2.1.38) in the fourth (chapter of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), (the suffix) sūti is elided.

(17) Further (i.e. concerning the term samotpāda) according to (Cāndra Dhātupātha IV.107), padA gatau in the (group of) verbal roots dīv etc., the verbal root padA (occurs).

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

(19) Although (padA) is a root with the meaning “to go”, because of the combination with these two verbal prepositions (viz. sam and ud), it functions (here) in (the sense of) “to arise”; (this occurs) according to (the maxim) “Although the verbal roots have (certain) forces (i.e. de- and connotations) etc.”
(20) According to (the sūtra), GHaṅ kārake ca (Cāndra 1.3.7)\textsuperscript{116} in the third chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), the suffix GHaṅ is affixed.

(21) The vowel\textsuperscript{117} of GHaṅ\textsuperscript{118} i.e. the letter a remains, but the letters GH and ā are intended as markers (and hence are elided).

(22) As according to (the sūtra), īñītī ca (Cāndra 6.1.9)\textsuperscript{119} in the twenty-first chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa), āT (i.e. long vowel ā) is required in this above-mentioned form padA before GHaṅ, the form pā is applied.

(23) In the words of the grammarians, according to the maxim “The accentless (consonant) must be combined with the accent(ed vowel),”\textsuperscript{120} the (letter) m of sam will be connected with the vowel (srog) u and the (letter) d (of pād) will be connected with the letter a of GHaṅ, (resulting in the form) samutpāda.

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

(25) To the unequalled teacher,\textsuperscript{121} who has taught (gsunspa) the non-plurality (spros-bral-ḥid) of all elements (chos-kun) on the basis of the nature (chos-ḥid) of all elements (chos-nams-kun), which is called “origination in connection (by causal) dependence”, and to his (spiritual) sons (I) pay homage.

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

3.3 Discussion of the excursus.

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

The author’s indirect reference to a rule on accent, which does not occur in the Cāndra grammar (cf. note 106), is only a seeming incongruity. Although the section on accent has not been preserved in the original version of the Cāndra sūtra-text\textsuperscript{124} or in Tibetan translation,\textsuperscript{125} reference to accent-rules is also found elsewhere in the Cāndra literature.\textsuperscript{126} It should be noted that mention is made twice of a sūtra “in the fourth chapter (of the sūtra-text of Cāndra-vyākaraṇa),” viz. in (15) and (16), and that in both cases the sūtra is actually found in the fifth
chapter—i.e. 2.1—of the Cāndra sūtra text as we now know it. Perhaps the author knew a slightly different redaction; all other references to chapter-numbers of the sūtra-text correspond to the known division of the Cāndra grammar. As mentioned earlier, the derivation of the term pratītya-samutpāda is presented in two parts here: first the derivation of pratītya in (1)–(16), then that of samutpāda in (17)–(23). In both cases the step-by-step application of the rules is conscientiously executed; in this context rule-ordering is important too; for instance the author rightly applies Cāndra 5.1.69 before 5.1.106, as a bleeding-relation exists between the latter and the former rule.\textsuperscript{127}

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

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

\textbf{4. Conclusions.}
When comparing the two canonical passages presented above two differences in their handling of Sanskrit grammatical analysis immediately become apparent.

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

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

NOTES

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


5. Lce-khyi-’brug (alias Ce-khyi-’brug or Ci-khyi-’brug) is a Tibetan translator datable to the end of the eighth or early ninth century; cf. Simonsson (1957: 243–244) and Miller (1963: 486–487)(= repr. 1975: 2–3). He was the author of two (or three) texts on Sanskrit grammar, viz. Gnas-brgyad-chen-po’i-rtsa-ba, “Root-text on the eight (grammatical) topics”, Peking Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel NO 40v6–43v7, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5836, Co-ne Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel CO 163r1–165r5, and an auto commentary on this text entitled Sgra’i-bstan-bcos, “Linguistic treatise” or Gnas-brgyad-kyi-’grel-pa, “Commentary on (the root-text on) the eight (grammatical) topics”, Peking Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel NO 43v8–54r6, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5837; Co-ne Bstan-’gyur Mdo-’grel CO 165r5–173v4; the third grammatical treatise attributed to him—though his authorship is not certain—is entitled Sgra’i-
6. This commentary is entitled Kalapa-laghu-vṛtti-śiṣyāhita, Tib. Ka-lā-pa'i-ṛgrel-pa-ñuñ-ñu-las-slob-ma-la-phan-pa, Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE 125v5-163v5, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5777; Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel LE 31r3-62v5. It is an excerpt, in fact the first four chapters on verbal morphology, from an extensive commentary on Kalapa (or Kātantra) grammar entitled Śiṣyāhita.


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


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


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


17. Peking Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel GO 204v7–310r8, ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), title nr. 5832, Co-ne Bstan-'gyur Mdo-'grel CO 1r1–131r7; editions: Sanskrit-Tibetan-English Vocabulary, being an edition and transla-
tion of the Mahāvyutpatti by A. Csoma de Körös, part I (1910) and part II (1916), edited by E. D. Ross and S. C. Vidyābhūṣan; part III (1944) edited by D. C. Chatterjee, Calcutta (= Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Memoirs 4:1-3); N. D. Mironoff (ed.), Mahāvyutpatti, St. Petersburg 1911 (= Bibliotheca Buddhica 13), and R. Sakaki (ed.), Mahāvyutpatti, 2 parts, Kyōto 1916–1925 (= Kyoto Imperial University Series 3).

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


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


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

23. C: ti
24. C: mu-tpa
25. C: gyur-pa
26. C: ba-ndha-sta
27. C: utpatta
28. C: tshig-phyi
29. C: sña-ma’i
30. C: brt’en
31. C: ma
32. C: gyis

33. It should be noted that both editions consulted read pra-ti-ta here. The short vowel i must surely be emended to long i; we can go one step further and read tya instead of ta, which would make this form identical to the form occurring in the compound term pratitya-samutpāda, the form pratitya being the so-called absolutive or gerund
form of compound verb prati + i. However, this second emendation is not all that self-evident, as pratiita is a correct Sanskrit form too, viz. the so-called verbal adjective or past passive participle of the same verb.

34. sambandhin seems the most plausible reconstruction; sambandha is a second possibility. P has sam-bha-dhi, C sam-ba-ndha.

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

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

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

40. Cf. Simonsson (1957: 245–246, 269–270), where I take sgrab-’zin-du to mean “according to the word(-form),” i.e. according to the morphology; Simonsson (1957: 245) translates: “dem Laut gemäss.”

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

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

43. Liebich (1895: 20) has described it as a separate text; other scholars, such as A. Schiefner (“Ueber die logischen und grammatischen Werke im Tandjur”, Bulletin de la Classe historico-philologique de l’Acad. Imp. des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg t. IV, p. 284–302, nr. 3609), the compilers of the catalogue of the Peking canon reprint ed. Suzuki (1955–1958), and the so-called Tôhoku catalogue of
the Sde-dge canon (H. Ui, M. Suzuki, Y. Kanakura & T. Tada, *A complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons (Bkah-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur)*, Sendai 1934, p. 653) do not mention it as a separate text. Cordier (1915: 459) has: “suivi, fol. 82<a>, 4–83<a>, 3, d’un Appendice explicatif, dû à Dpal-lidan Blo-gros brtan-pa (Chrmat Shhiramati).”

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

44. P 83r3, C 71r7–v1.
45. Cf. note 11 above.
46. He is the younger brother and pupil of Šoṅ-ston Rdo-rje-rgyal-mtshan (cf. note 10 above) and he is known to have met ‘Phags-pa (1235–1280), so he can be dated to the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century; cf. Hahn (1971: 10–11), De Jong (1972: 209, where presumably “treizième siècle” should be read instead of “douzième”), and Taube (1978: 194 note 146).
47. P 82r2–3, C 70v2–3.

50. C: pa-yam-ba
51. C: lam
52. C: i-na
53. C: rtags, which is the correct reading. P’s rtag must be erroneous considering the following allomorph of the genitive particle, scil. kyi.
54. C: gžag
55. C: e-li, which is certainly preferable to i-te (in P), cf. note 94.
56. C: śti-pa’i
57. C: śti-pa’o
58. C: bya
59. C: ig’i
60. C: rgyu-li(sic)-i
61. C: ñe
62. C: ste/
63. C: gan
64. C: ktwa
65. C: na-ña
66. C: ktwa’i-lya-pa’o
67. C: dbyin (sic)
68. C: tuk
69. C: gžag
70. C: le’ur
71. C: pi-ta-la-tu-ka’o
72. C: ti’i (sic)
73. C: pas
74. C: lya-pa
75. C: pa-yin-pas-na/ bži
76. C: su-pa’i
77. C: pa
78. C: diw
79. C: pad
80. C: sa-ma
81. C: ņe
82. C: sgrel(?)
83. C: ces
84. C: rā(?)
85. C: ghañiʿi
86. C: ra(?)
87. C: de-rnams-(C 71r7:)kyan
88. las-dan-po, the reading in P, is preferable to C lam-dan-po; cf. also las-dan-po-pa-rnams-la in the passage from the Co-ne Bstan-’gyur Dkar-chag quoted in note 43.
89. Transl.: “(The verbal roots) iN (viz. i), vī and vā (occur) in the meaning ‘to go.’”
90. This is the so-called second conjugational class of Sanskrit verbs, of which the root ad is the first in order in all major Dhātupāthas.
91. Tibetan byiṅs (P 82r5, r6, r7, r8, v4, v6; skad-kyi-byiṅs P 82v7) translates Sanskrit dhātu (cf. Mahāvyutpatti 4707), the technical term for the verbal root; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 207–208).
92. In a grammatical context, forms of the verb ‘phyi-ba, such as phyis (P 82r6, v3, v4) and dbyi (P 82r8, v1, v5) denote “to be elided” or “elision,” as an equivalent to derivations from the root lup (esp. lopa) in Sanskrit grammatical idiom; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 335 s.v. lupta, 337 s.v. lopa).
93. Emend rtag (P 82r6) to rtags, cf. note 53. Rtags (P 82r7, v3, v7), “marker,” refers to the technical device of it or anubandha, the letters (transliterated as capital letters in the present article, a fairly common practice in Indological literature) that—in a grammatical context—can be joined to roots or suffixes to indicate certain morphological or phonological properties of the element in question; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 25 s.v. anubandha, 69–70 s.v. it[1]).
94. Transl.: “(The verbal root) i denotes ‘to go.’ The reading in C, eti-ni-‘gro-ba’i-don-to, is preferable to P i-te-ni. . . , as the rest of this passage (3–5) describes the derivation of precisely the citation-form eti to refer to the root i; cf. notes 95 and 96.
95. Scil. etir gaty-arthaḥ, in Prasannapadā, Candrakīrti’s commentary on Nāgārjuna’s Mūla-madhyamaka-kārikā (in fact in the passage dealing with the term pratītya-samutpāda), ed. L. de la Vallée Poussin, St. Petersburg 1913, p. 5 line 1; cf. also note 115.
96. E.g. eti gaty-arthaḥ in Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya, ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1975, p. 138 line 2; cf. also iti gotāv and (ayam) iti gaty-arthaṃ (ujjhitvā) in Yaśomitra’s Sphūṭārtha Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā, a commentary on Vasubandhu’s Abhidharmakośa, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932–1936, part III, p. 294 line 21 and 23 respectively. In either case, the phrase is found in a passage dealing with the term pratītya-samutpāda. Cf. also note 115.


98. Transl.: “When the own form (of a verb is to be expressed the suffixes) i, Ki and ŚtīP (occur behind the verbal root in question);” Vyrtti on Cāndra 1.3.96: kriyārthaśya svarūpe ‘bhidheyā kriyārthāt pare i-Ki-ŚtīPo bhavanti, Liebich (1918: 63).

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

99. Transl.: aT (i.e. short a) or eN (i.e. e or o; guṇa-vowels occur as substitutes) instead of (the final morpheme of) a verbal root ending in a (vowel from the group) iK (i.e. i, u, ū or I, when a suffix follows);” Vyrtti on Cāndra 6.2.1: iG-antāyāh prakṛteḥ kriyārthāyā ad-eNo bhavanti, Liebich (1918: 446); cf. Pāṇini 7.3.84.

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

In fact the Cāndra system of grammar in its basic texts avoids the use of technical grammatical terms; for instance, it refers to the group of verbal prepositions as prādi, “(the group) pra etc.;” cf. Vyrtti on Cāndra1.1.109. On the semantical role of verbal prepositions, cf. note 115.

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


103. Cf. note 111.
104. Transl.: “When two (actions) have one and the same agent (kartṛ), (the suffix) Ktvā (occurs) after the (verb which expresses the action taking place) earlier;” Vṛtti on Cāndrab.3.131: ekākartyakyor vyāpārayor maḍhye yaḥ pūrvavyāpāras tadarthāḥ Ktvā bhavati, Liebich (1918: 72); cf. Pāṇini 3.4.21. Ktvā is the so-called gerund or absolutive suffix tvā; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 131 s.v. Ktvā(3)).

105. Transl.: “(Suffix) LyāP (occurs) instead of Ktvā when (the element ending in Ktvā forms) a compound with (an element that is) not naN;” Vṛtti on Cāndra 5.4.6: naNo ‘nyasya Ktvāntena samāse Ktvō LyāB bhavati, Liebich (1918: 402); cf. Pāṇini 7.1.37. LyāP is the gerund or absolutive suffix for composite verbs, scil. ya; naN is the negative particle na that, when used prepositionally, takes the form ā(n); cf. Pāṇini 6.3.73–77, Cāndra 5.2.91–96.

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

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

108. Transl.: “When a (vowel from the group) aK (i.e. a, i, u, r or l) precedes a (similar vowel from the group) aK a (single) long vowel (occurs as substitute instead of both);” Vṛtti on Cāndra 5.1.106: aKo ‘Ki parato dvayor eko dirgho bhavati, Liebich (1918: 342); cf. Pāṇini 6.1.101.


110. sU (viz. s) is the technical form of the nominative singular case-ending; cf. Cāndra 2.1.1, Pāṇini 4.1.2, Abhyankar (1977: 430 s.v. sU[1]).
111. Tibetan graṁ-med (P 82v5) is equivalent to Sanskrit asaṁkhya (cf. Mahāvyutpatti 8040), and mi-zad-pa (P 82v1, v5) is equivalent to avyaya (as generally used in grammatical literature, cf. Mahāvyutpatti 4730). Both are technical terms referring to the indeclinables; cf. Abhyankar (1977: 47 s.v. avyaya, 49 s.v. asaṁkhya).

112. Transl.: "Elision (luk) of the nominal case-ending (sU) occurs after an indeclinable;"Vyṛti on Čāndra 2.1.38: avidyamānasamkhyaṁ parasya sU po lug bhavati, Liebich (1918: 102); cf. Pāṇini 1.1.38.

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

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upasarga } & \text{dhātvartho balād anyatra niyate/} \\
\text{gangāsālivamādhuryamā } & \text{sāgarena yathāmbhasā/}
\end{align*}
\]

The meaning of the verbal root can be necessarily (lit.: by force, balād) changed into another (meaning) because of a verbal preposition (combined with that root), just like the sweetness of the water of the Ganges (is changed) by the ocean water (when the Ganges reaches the ocean).

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

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

\[
\begin{align*}
etir gatyarthah pratiśrh prāptyarthah/ & \text{upasargavośena dhātvartha-vipariṇāmāt/ (…) pratītyasābdo 'tra LyaBantah prāptāv apeksāyāṁ varitāte, (The verbal root) i denotes "to go," and (verbal preposition) prati denotes "to attain." On the account of the verbal preposition a change in the meaning of the verbal root}
\end{align*}
\]
takes place; . . . so the word pratitya, ending in (suffix) LyaP, here functions with the meaning “to attain” (prāpti) (or) “to depend (on)” (apeksā).

Cf. the similar passage: pratiḥ prāpyartheteti gatyarthah/ upasargavāsaṇa dhātvarthaviparināmait prāpyeti yo ’rthaḥ prātyeti/, in the Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya loc. cit. (cf. note 96) p. 138, line 1–2. Cf. also the Sphuṭārtha Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā loc. cit. (cf. note 96) p. 294, line 22–23:

pratīṣ copasargah prāptidytotaka ity ayam itirt gatyartham ujjhitvā prāpyartham āpadyate. And verbal preposition prati indicates “to attain,” so (in the combination prati + the root i (citation form iti) loses (its) meaning ‘to go’ and adopts the meaning ‘to attain’ (viz. on account of the verbal preposition prati).

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

samutpūrvah padhī prādūrbhāvaḥ ṣaṁutpādasabdāḥ prādūrbhāve vartate.
“(The verbal root) padī preceded by (verbal prepositions) sam and ud denotes ‘to arise’, so the word samutpāda functions in the meaning ‘to arise’;” and the Abhidharmakośa-bhāṣya loc. cit. p. 138, line 3: padhī sattāṛthaḥ samutpūrvah prādūrbhāvaḥ, “(The verbal root) padhī denotes ‘to exist’; (however,) preceded by (verbal prepositions) sam and ud it denotes ‘to arise.’”

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

116. Transl.: “(Suffix) GHaN (occurs variously in the meaning ‘action’) or when expressing a kāraka (i.e. a case-relation) (after a verbal root).” Vṛtti on Cāndra 1.3.7: bhāve kārake ca kriyārthaḥ bahulaṃ GHaN bhavati, Liebich (1918: 53); cf. Pāṇini 3.3.16–19.


118. Emend gha’i to: ghañi’i.

119. Transl.: “(Long vowel ŏ—i.e. āT—occurs as a substitute instead of short vowel a—i.e. aT—which is the penultimate letter of an element) when (an element) with marker N or ṇ follows.” Vṛtti on Cāndra 6.1.9: niṭti niṭti ca parata upāntasyāTa āD bhavati, Liebich (1918: 427); cf. Pāṇini 7.2.116. Emend ŏd (P 82v8) to ŏ(ā)-nd; perhaps this is an error caused by the similarity to the Tibetan word ńid, ‘self’?

120. So far I have not been able to identify exactly the Sanskrit original of this maxim, partially quoted here. The same phrase, in a slightly different translation, is repeatedly referred to in an “instruct-
tion manual” on certain grammatical points in the exegesis of the Kālacakra-tantra written by Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub, entitled Dpal-dus-
kyi-'khor-lo'i-bsdad-thabs-sgra-rig-mkhas-pa'i-rgyan, ed. Chandra (1965–
1971 vol. 4: 599–614) in the following terms: a-swa-ra-swa-ra-sam-yo-ga
(i.e. *a-svara[h? ]svara-samyoga[h? ], Tib. dbyan-mded-la-dbyan-yan-dag-
par-sbyar-ro (v. fol. 2v2–3, 4r1, 4r2, cf. 4r5, 4r7, 5v1, 5v3, 5v4, 6r6, 6r7).
Loc. cit. fol. 2v2 terms it a so-called uN-ādi(-sūtra); however I have not been able to trace this phrase in the uN-ādi-sūtras of the Cāndra or Pāṇiniya system. For dbyan as equivalent of Sanskrit svara, “accent,”
cf. note 106.

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

Candrācārya or Candragomin, 154 s.v. Cāndra).

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

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

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


127. The application of 5.1.106 (here: prati + i ... = prati ...) results in the disappearance of one of the conditions for applying 5.1.69, viz. a short vowel, and so would prevent the subsequent application of 5.1.69. I know of no separate studies on rule ordering in Cāndra; an important study on rule ordering in Pāṇini is P. Kiparsky, “Lecture III.
The Ordering of rules in Pāṇini’s grammar,” in Some Theoretical

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

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

('A 2v8:) de-la-pra-ti-ni-(3r1:)phrad-pa'i-don-to/
/i-ti-(sic)ni-'gro-ba'i-don-to/
/lyap-kyi-mtha'-can-pra-ti-tya'i-sgra-ni-phrad-pa-ste-bltos-pa-la-'jug-pa-yin-te/
It is found again in the second interpretation of pratītya (where the Sanskrit text apparently also has iti; cf. note 130):

‘(A 3r3:)/gzan-dag-ni-(pra-ti-ni-zlos-pa’i-don-to/)/i-ti-(sic)ni-’gro-(3r4:)/ba’i-stechas-pa-dan-’jig-pa’o/.

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

130. E.g. Prasannapadā loc. cit. (cf. note 95) p.5, line 7: apare tu bruvate/ itir (sic) gamanam vināśat; “However, others say (that the verbal root) i (citation-form iti!) (denotes) ‘to go’ (i.e.) ‘to perish.’” Cf. also the passages from Yaśomitra’s Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośa-vyākhyā quoted in notes 96 and 115.
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Quoted Tibetan passages
2.2.1:

3.2.1:

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

in: note 129:
APPENDIX

Scheme of derivational procedure in 3.2

1) C.D. 2.12 : iN
   C. 1.3.96 : iN + \text{StiP}
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : i + \emptyset + \emptyset + ti + \emptyset
   C. 6.2.1 : eti- + ti

2) C.D. 2.12 : iN
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : i + \emptyset
   C. 2.1.93 : (prati + sU) + i
   C. 2.1.38 : (prati + \emptyset) + i
   C. 1.3.131 : prati + i + Ktvā
   C. 5.4.6 : prati + i + LyaP
   C. 5.1.69 : prati + (i + tUK) + LyaP
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : prati + (i + t + \emptyset) + \emptyset + ya + \emptyset
   C. 5.1.106 : prat + i + t + ya
   C. 2.1.93 : prat + i + t + ya + sU
   C. 2.1.38 : prat + i + t + ya + \emptyset

pratitya

3) C.D. 4.107 : padA
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : pad + \emptyset
   C. 2.1.93 : (sam + sU) + (ud + sU) + pad
   C. 2.1.38 : (sam + \emptyset) + (ud + \emptyset) + pad
   C. 1.3.7 : sam + ud + pad + GHaN
   C. 6.1.9 : sam + ud + p + ā + d + GHaN
   C.V. ad 1.1.5 : sam + ud + pād + \emptyset + a + \emptyset
   C. 6.4.148 : sam + u + t + pād + a
   C. 2.1.93 : sam + ut + pād + a + sU
   C. 6.3.98 : sam + ut + pād + a + rU
   C. 6.4.20 : sam + ut + pād + a + h

samutpādah

C. = Cāndra(vyākarana) sūtra-text, ed. B. Liebich (1902), Cāndra-Vyākarana, die Grammatik des Candragomin. Sūtra, Unādi, Dhātupātha, Leipzig (= Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes XI), also Liebich (1918).
C.V. = Cāndra Vyṛtti, ed. Liebich (1918).
Book Reviews


Certains terrains sont l’objet d’un grand engouement. On a souvent noté le nombre élevé d’ethnologues qui travaillent chez les Yanomani du Vénézuela. Mais s’il y avait un record homologué, c’est sûrement le Ladakh qui le détiendrait. On a rarement vu autant d’écologistes, de linguistes, de géographes humains, de médecins, d’historiens et surtout d’ethnologues se pencher sur une région. Prolongement géographique du Tibet occidental, Etat indépendent jusqu’en 1834, le Ladakh a eu, à partir de 1974, le privilège d’être une région lamaïste largement ouverte aux chercheurs alors que les portes du Tibet, du Mustang, du Bhoutan, du Sikkim, etc. étaient sinon hermétiquement closes, du moins à peine entr’ouvertes. Ceci n’explique pas cela car d’autres régions comme le Lahoul, aussi parfaitement ouvertes, ne semblent pas attirer grand monde.


Avant 1947 on trouvera beaucoup de récits de voyages (Desideri, Moorcroft, Vigne, Cunningham, etc.) la plupart en anglais. Leurs descriptions sont plus souvent orientées vers la géographie, l’économie, les sciences naturelles, voire la démographie, que vers l’ethnographie, la langue, la religion. Un deuxième groupe d’avant 1947 s’était par contre intéressé à ces derniers points: les missionnaires moraves dont l’oeuvre est considérable: Francke, Marx, Heber et Ribbach dont le livre publié en 1940 peut être considéré comme le couronnement de cette première période.
La seconde période est marquée par l’incursion de premiers ethnologues dès l’ouverture. Un groupe d’étudiants de Cambridge m’avait rejoint pour publier les deux premiers rapports qui furent suivis par les travaux de M. Brauen, E. Dargay, etc. A partir du premier colloque sur le Ladakh, le nombre de publications augmente en même temps que les sujets se diversifient. À chaque colloque le nombre de disciplines représentées croît : écologie, développement, médecine, etc. La linguistique est surtout représentée par S. Koshal, tandis que les japonais s’intéressent avant tout aux rituels bouddhiques. Les tibétologues (D. Shuh, H. Uebach) s’ancrent dans l’histoire et font la chasse aux manuscrits.

Cet aspect multidisciplinaire ressort de la Bibliographie de J. Bray. Et si la plupart des travaux concernent les Ladakh bouddhistes, les musulmans et les Dardes bouddhistes (étudiés par R. Vohra) ne sont pas oubliés.

Par sa richesse et sa complétude (il y a plus de 700 entrées, et sur les sciences humaines seulement) la bibliographie de John Bray sera désormais un instrument de travail indispensable pour tout étudiant travaillant de près ou de loin sur l’Himalaya ou le Tibet. L’auteur a pisté le moindre petit article de trois pages datant du XIXe siècle. Large d’esprit, il n’a pas voulu faire de sélection. Tout y figure y compris les ouvrages partiellement consacrés au Ladakh (dans ce cas les chapitres ou les numéros de pages sont indiqués). Chaque titre fait l’objet d’un commentaire de quelques phrases permettant au chercheur de situer l’intérêt de l’ouvrage. Le tout est complété d’un solide index. On aimerait que l’auteur fasse école. À quand des bibliographies détaillées sur les Newars, les Sherpas, et tous les autres peuples qui font l’objet d’études intensives?

P. Kaplanian
Paris

NOTE


It was certainly a pleasure to learn that two books in English devoted to one of the least known traditions of Tibetan Buddhism had appeared. As if to show that the fullness of time has come for 'Bri-gung Bka'-brgyud-pa studies, two learned articles on 'Bri-gung-pa philosophy and history have also been published recently (Leonard van der Kuijip, “An Early Tibetan View of the Soteriology of Buddhist Epistemology: The Case of 'Bri-gung 'Jig-rt'en-Mgon-po,” Journal of Indian Philosophy, vol. 15 [1987], no. 1 [March], pp. 57-70; Elliot Sperling, “Some Notes on the Early 'Bri-gung-pa Sgom-pa,” contained in Christopher Beckwith (ed.), Silver on Lapis, The Tibet Society, Bloomington [1987], pp. 33-53). Although the fortunes of this sect have varied during different phases of Tibetan religious and political history, we may hope that this sudden surge in interest will be sustained by more translations and close studies in the near future.

Since the two works under review are translations, I intend to treat them as such. I will concentrate particularly on questions of clarity and accuracy. Arrogating to myself the position of a “consumers advocate,” I will consider how well these translations fulfill their promise to “deliver the goods” to us as English readers. I will have less to say about Prayer Flags, simply because the short texts of 'Jig-rt'en-mgon-po which form the bulk of it are very difficult to locate in the five volumes of his Collected Works, and the translator has not helped us by indicating his sources. The abbreviated retelling of the life of 'Jig-rt'en-mgon-po (pp. 29-46), extracted from the 'Bri-gung history (written in 1800 A.D.) by the Fourth Che-tshang Rin-po-che (b. 1770 A.D.) is a valuable addition to the knowledge of his life. One might note that the song of 'Jig-rt'en-mgon-po entitled “The Song of the Five Profound Paths of Mahamudra” (on pp. 55-6) is entirely cited by Kun-dga'-rin-chen in The Garland of Mahamudra Practices (pp. 39, 49, 59, 72, 97). It would have been helpful if the translator had supplied some references to show this. The short text on pp. 72-86 of Prayer Flags should be read together with The Garland, since the former (besides being older) provides a concise summary of the material covered in much more detail in the latter.

I reserve the bulk of my comments for The Garland of Mahamudra Teachings since it was possible (although not especially easy) to locate a Tibetan text. The Tibetan title of this work by Kun-dga'-rin-chen is Lnga-ldan Nor-bu'i Phreng-ba'i Gsal-byed. It is found reproduced in a volume with the cover title 'Bri-gung Bka'-brgyud-pa Exegesis of Mahāmudrā and Nā-ro Chos Drug Practice by Kun-dga'-rin-chen and Rin-chen-phun-tshogs (D. Tsondu Senghe, The Bir Tibetan Society, Bir [1982], pp. 1-105). The following notes are the result of a close comparison of that same Tibetan text with the English translation. As will become clear presently,
The translators of *The Garland* did not use this same publication as the basis for their English version, and this creates problems for criticism, since one cannot be certain which problems might have been occasioned by variants in their Tibetan source (which they do not identify). Quotations below from *The Garland* will be given in double quote marks, while my own suggested readings and translations will be enclosed in single quotes. Page and line references to my text (following Arabic, rather than Tibetan, pagination) are enclosed in square brackets.

On the first page of the translation, p. 21, the "nine graceful states" have no footnote, and are not explained until p. 52, where they are even less correctly called the "nine gestures":

"He makes the nine gestures: the three of body—graceful, heroic, and ugly; the three of speech—laughing, fierce, and frightening; the three of mind—compassionate, frightful and peaceful."

The Tibetan expression is *gar dgu'i nyams* (=*gar-gyi nyams dgu*), and sometimes only eight are given (*nyams brgyad*), in which case the last two are replaced by 'marvelling' (*rmad-byung*). The translations "graceful states" and "gestures" fail to tell us something significant about the nature of the visualized deities and their iconography, and that is that their expressions and gestures must have been consciously stylized to accord with categories shared with Indo-Tibetan traditions of dramatic and poetic 'science' and criticism. These translations are also unsuccessful in conveying a sense of what the "Victorious Complete Enjoyment Body" which possesses these 'dramatic attitudes' (which is certainly a preferable translation) is supposed to be. It is the level where the richness and power (*longs-spyod*) of the Buddhaspeech (Gsung) finds its fullest expression, and it is on this level of (pre-)manifestation that the Buddhas are represented with 'adornments' (*rgyan*—the word may also be drawn from literary science, meaning 'poetic device', and as such inclusive of the 'dramatic attitudes') of the royal type. The Buddhas/deities of the "Enjoyment Body" (which I would prefer to render 'Perfect Assets Body', or 'Complete Resources Body') are the most richly represented in Tibetan art and, I think not incidentally, the most diversified 'dramatically' speaking.

On p. 22, the author was *not* saying, "The essence of the Buddha's teaching can be shown by the delineation of these four validities." (emphasis mine) What he says is that he (the author) himself 'will teach by establishing [the teachings] through the four truth tests.'

Also on p. 22, the "grey wings of the fivefold path" (*Lnga-ldan Shog-khra-ma*) is, to the contrary, a reference to a manuscript of the *Fivefold Path* which was written on 'multicolored paper' (*shog khra*).
The “Drukyamo” (Gru-skya-mo) quoted on p. 22 and again on the following page is another of the many names of Zhe-sdang-rdo-rje (=Ngo-rje-ras-pa/Bal-bu-gongs-pa), credited with authorship of one of the most important early texts of the ‘Bri-gung tradition, the *Theg-chen Bstan-pa’i Snying-po* (=Bstan Snying). This Zhe-sdang-rdo-rje was a direct disciple of ‘Jig-rten-mgon-po. See “Dru Kyamo” in *Prayer Flags*, pp. 39-40.


“Individual liberation” on p. 24 will puzzle readers who do not know that monastic vows of the *Pratimokṣa* are being indicated. This is perhaps not even a very accurate rendering of the book title, which could just as well mean ‘against being tied up’ or, simply, ‘renunciation’ (more to the point, although this remains a scholarly conundrum).

On p. 27, for “sevenfold posture of concentration”, my text has *bsam-gtan-gyi yan-lag Inga* [8.3], which must be, contrary to the explanation on p. 79 (to which the footnote refers us), the five ‘limbs’ of the first (of four) meditative absorptions: conceptualizing, analyzing, happiness, comfort and single pointedness. Of course, the text used by the translators may have read differently here, but we have no way of knowing this.

On p. 27, “created things” is an unfortunate choice of words for ‘compounded things’ (‘dus-byas). See my comments on p. 99 below. The quote on p. 27 is given without rendering the name of the sūtra, which is *Mishan-ma Bzang-po’i Mdo* [8.3-4], Tohoku nos. 313, 617, 974(?). My text reads ‘great wellbeing’ (or ‘comfort,’ *bde-chen*) where the translators’ text must have read ‘jigs-chen (“great fear”), and this put their translation of the final two lines in great doubt. Without consulting the quote in its proper context in the sūtra (which is generally advisable), I would provisionally translate, ‘The lord of death is no helper [no respecter] of either your great well-being or of you yourself.’

On p. 28, again, the name of the cited scripture (beginning, “Hell beings are tortured . . .”) is omitted. It is the *Mdo-sde Dran-pa Nyer-bzhag* [9.2]. In the quote itself, I would read ‘worn out’ instead of “tortured” (for *nyams*), and lines 6 to 7 I would translate:

‘Humans are wearied by shortages in (means and goods for) livelihood.
Divinities are wearied with luxurious living.’

instead of,

“Human beings [are tortured] by dissatisfaction. Gods are tortured by nonawareness.”
On p. 29, the “16 virtues” would seem to be referring explicitly to the sixteen laws (mi chos bcu-drug) which form the basis (the constitution?) of the traditional Tibetan legal system, but the contents of the two lists differ. The statement refers back to the quotation and does not belong at the head of the following paragraph. ‘One must meditate on the 16 virtues’ which are listed in the quotation.

On p. 29, “The verbal expression of this is” should instead be read, ‘One must pronounce the following words out loud.’

The passage on p. 32, “Through ignorance, I fall away . . .” is a ‘prayer’ (gsol-debs), not just a “thought” and it is supposed to be said ‘between meditation sessions’ (thun-gyi bar-du), an expression mysteriously dropped from the translators translation (or was it missing from their text?).

“Precious jewels” on p. 32, is not an accurate translation for rin-po-che since this word includes also gold and silver (most likely intended here). A sor is not exactly an “inch” and a khru-gang is a ‘full cubit,’ somewhat more than a “foot.”

On p. 33, between “all the wealth of gods and human beings is piled up” and “Then say,” two lines of text [19.5–6] were dropped.

On p. 34, read for “the Buddha,” the ‘Mother of (all) Buddhas’ (Rgyal-ba’i Yum), a common name of the Prajñāpāramitā text which is the source for the quote which follows. After that, to my embarrassment, my text is missing the entire section on Guru-yoga which begins on p. 34 and ends on p. 38 [which should be inserted in my text at p. 21.3].

On p. 39, the text cited as “The Song of Realization of the Fivefold Path” should, according to my text, be the Lnga-ldan Dper-brjod-ma, which was rendered on p. 22 as “setting an example of the fivefold path.” Also on this page, read ‘seven’ for “several” (the seven topics are then listed and discussed one by one).

The quote from Nāgārjuna on p. 41 is from his Dbu-ma Rin-chen ‘Phreng-ba. The “eight qualities of love” should, but do not, add up to eight.

On p. 44, for “the Buddha said,” read, ‘It says in the Sūtra Requested by Maitreya’ (Byams-pas Zhus-pa’i Mdo), Tohoku nos. 85, 86, 149(?).

A few lines of my text [30.2–5] are missing in the translation on p. 45 following the line of quote at the top of the page.

On p. 49, “Element of qualities” does not carry much conviction as a translation of Chos-dbyings (Dharmadhātu). It is better translated ‘Realm of Knowable Objects’ or something similar. On p. 98, it is rendered “Sphere of reality.”

The long quote in the middle of p. 50 should end with the words “generate the five perfections.” The remainder is Kun-dga’-rin-chen’s explanation [34.1]. The “perfections” (byang-chub-pa) are the five ‘visible
modes of enlightenment' (mgon-byang, =mgon-par byang-chub-pa) and should be translated in this or a similar manner, otherwise we might confuse these five "perfections" with another, quite different 'five perfections', the phun-tshogs lnga (=phun-sum-tshogs-pa lnga). The 'visible modes of enlightenment' concern the gradually more complex visualizations of the yi-dam in generation stage meditations.

On p. 51, for "On top of this is a five-spoke vajra" read instead, 'On the right is a double (i.e., crossed) vajra.'

On p. 52, read 'grunting' for "rumbling" (do pigs rumble?). The translators deliberately avoid a polite expression for 'sexual congress' (snyoms-par zhugs-pa) twice on this page. This word is also used for the peaceful coexistence of subject and object in contemplation. Footnote 51 obfuscates the distinction (which of course needs to lead to nondistinction) between the wisdom and pledge entities.

On p. 53, for "dissolve within you," read 'while they are dissolving within you, self-empowerment is necessary.'

On p. 54, "sources" is too weak and general a translation for skye-mched, the internal and external sensory potentialities, those factors which 'give rise to' (skyé) and 'intensify' (mched) sensory experience. "Three of 12" should read 'three or twelve.' "Composite" would be better translated 'having weight' (brdosh-bcas, =gdosh-bcas) or 'material, substantial.' "Composite" should be reserved for translating 'dus-byas (see comments on p. 99 below).

On p. 55, my text reads Lta-ba Mdon-bsdus [43.3], where the translation reads "Naropa said." Quotes from the same text, again without supplying the title, are found at the top of p. 73 [65.3] and on following pages.

On p. 56, my text is lacking the entire sentence beginning, "This is an unswerving attention . . ." [43.5] The metaphor of "mist on a mirror" would be more clearly (and literally) translated 'breath on a mirror' (dbugs ni me-long-la).

On p. 57, the fish 'emerge' (ldang-ba) just as the illusion net 'emerges' (for the image, see Per Kvaerne, An Anthology of Tantric Songs [Bangkok 1986], p. 32).

On p. 58, the quote from the Hevajra Tantra may be traced at pt. I, chap. 8, verse 36 (David Snellgrove, Hevajra Tantra, Oxford 1980).

On p. 61, the set of verses beginning, "I offer praise to you . . ." omissions about half of the verses in my text [50.1--2]. The arrangement of this and the following page could have been clarified by more explicitly stating in the beginning that prostration (with its three branches) and offering (with its three branches) are the first two of the 'seven limbs' (as listed later on p. 62) which, to add to our confusion, are called "seven-branched offering" at the same time that one of these seven is "offering" as well.
The ‘seven limbs’ (yan-lag bdun) are seven sections included in the body of almost every Buddhist ritual performed in Tibet (source: Samantabhadra-pranidhāna-rāja?). My text follows the seven one by one without awkwardly placing a list in the middle, as does the translation (without always indicating with which of the seven limbs any particular passage might be concerned). ‘Limb’ is preferable to “branch” as a translation for yan-lag, since human ‘limbs’ form the concrete basis for the derived categorical abstraction. Similar to the English word ‘limb,’ it may also (but secondarily) be applied to the main appendages of trees (more properly, yal-ga).

On p. 63, the translation “natural state without having any thought at all” sounds like the controversial teachings of the Chinese master Hwashang Ma-ho-yen, while my text [53.3] has only one word, ma-bcos-par: ‘without tampering or conscious interference, settle the mind.’ Later, on p. 70, the same word is better rendered, “natural, unartificial state.”

The Anglicized, Tibetanized Sanskrit of the lengthy lineage prayer on pp. 64–66 is perhaps useful for chanting, but at least my text gives an interlinear Tibetan translation so that it is easier to identify the Tibetan teachers who are named there. [55.3–57.1] The translation omits the directions following the lineage prayer, that one should offer a mandal with the seven-limbed worship.

On p. 67, “Set your mind in the nonduality of the mahamudra state” is replaced in my text with ‘Be mindful. Keep an even-toned attitude. Keep a distance from anxieties’ (dran-pa rgya/ ro-snyoms byed/ re-dogs phral-la bzhag/).

On p. 68, the “great bliss and emptiness” is ‘great bliss [deriving from] embracing’ (kha-shyor bde-chen) in my text [58.5].

On p. 70, “conditioned” should be ‘unconditioned’ [61.5].

On p. 71, “unceasing” should be ‘unobstructed’ [63.6]. “Without duality” should be ‘without added conceptualization’ (rtog-med). The “three spheres of conceptuality” are not explained here. They are the action, the thing acted on, and the actor. They do make an appearance later on—pp. 98, 100, and note 110.

On p. 76 to 77, I would have preferred a more literal rendering of shor-sa as ‘places where one might get lost’ instead of “ways of misunderstanding” and of gol-sa as ‘side-routes’ rather than “places of possible error.” These go with an extended Path metaphor in Buddhism which is better if kept. “Mistaking the nature of emptiness” should be ‘getting lost thinking that emptiness has the same nature as knowable objects (shes-byas),’ and thus the general point of this paragraph is missed. It ironically falls into the same error that is warned against: “the nature of the object to be known—emptiness.” The point is that emptiness is not just another
knowable object. "Mistaking the antidote" should be 'getting lost thinking of emptiness as an antidote.'

The quote from the work of Naropa started on p. 77 does not end until the words "free from the conventional nature" on p. 78. The quote following "As the Buddha said" on p. 78 is from the Lankâvatâra Sûtra (Tohoku no. 107).

On p. 79, "The Technique of Time of Practice" paragraph is found in my text [75.3] as the third, not the second, subsection. Still, this apparent rearrangement may have been intended to give the translation a more logical order than is actually found in the text (although this cannot be known without consulting the translators' text).

On p. 80, "pay no attention to it" is better if made more literal—'do not follow after it' or 'do not pursue it' (rjes-su mi 'brang-bar [76.5]). On the top of p. 87, it is better translated. "Forehead" should be 'top of the head' (spyi-bo).

The story about 'Jig-rten-mgon-po's mother on p. 82 is rather remarkable in that it has clearly undergone some changes in the retelling since the version in the biography by Sher-'byung, the nephew of 'Jig-rten-mgon-po. In our text it is said that a neighbor woman's husband died, while in the biography the problem was that the neighbor woman had no children (see The Collected Works of 'Bri-gung Chos-rje 'Jig-rten-mgon-po [N. Delhi 1969], vol. 1, p. 46.5 ff.). The two stories are identical otherwise, although not entirely identical in wording; the moral remains the same.

Replace "no method" on p. 83 with 'no way to do it' (bya thabs med [80.4]).

'Diligence' seems a better translation for brtson-'grus (on p. 84) than does "effort," especially since the emphasis is on the long term and "effort" as such is counterindicated in Mahâmudrâ works. Lta-stangs in the quote from Tilopa means the 'fixed gaze' cultivated by yogins, not "attaining the view." This is proven also by the explanation following the quote.

On p. 86, "accepting some and rejecting others" should more accurately be 'promoting some and hindering others' [84.5]. One wishes that the "text called Seven Ways of Settling the Mind" could have been identified. One might suspect that in actuality seven different texts are being referred to (just as the 'seven texts,' sde-bdun, in logical works refers to seven books considered essential to the understanding of logic). My text reads ma-bcos-pa-la grub-pa sde bdun [84.6]. Kun-dga'-rin-chen would seem to be saying that these texts form the basis for his discussion of 'untampered' (ma-bcos-pa). It is more likely, however, that it is not a question of texts at all; he is referring to the 'seven types of attainments,' the seven topics just discussed by him, and that 'untampered,' among
the seven, forms the basis (gzhi), while, as he says in what follows, the first topic ("not taking things to mind") subsumes the other six.

On p. 87, "seeing faults in conceptual thought and seeing good qualities in nonconceptual thought" should read 'Do not view mental conceptions as faults and do not view nonconceptuality as a positive quality.' [86.2] The work by Tilopa quoted here is his Phyang-chen Gang-ga-ma [86.4], his precepts to Naropa given on the banks of the Ganges. "One’s own birth and death" is a mistake. This line should translate, ‘They [thoughts, conceptions] produce and dissolve themselves like water waves,' (rang-byung rang-zhi chu’i pa-tra 'dra), but my text for this entire quotation is quite different from the translation, leading us to suspect textual disparities.

On p. 88, "the Buddha said" refers to the Nanda Staying in the Womb Sutra (Dga'-bo Mngal Gnas), Tohoku no. 57. The passage beginning, "The teachings of the Buddha" and ending "will be liberated" is a quotation masquerading as the words of Kun-dga'-rin-chen. The sūtra source is the Meeting of Father and Son (Yab Sras Mjal-ba) [88.2], Tohoku no. 60.

The quote introduced by "The Buddha said" on p. 89 is from the Sūtra on Meditating Well on Faith in Mahāyāna (Theg-pa-chen-po-la Dad-pa Rab-tu Bsgoms-pa’i Mdo), Tohoku no. 144.

The quote from Gampopa (Sgam-po-pa) on p. 91 should be translated

‘The mind as it actually is, naturally-arrived-at, is the light of dharmas (knowable objects).
Therefore appearances and mind are an inseparable pair.’ [92.2]

instead of

"Mind is the innate Truth Body;
Form is the light of the innate Truth Body.
Thus, form and mind are inseparably united."

The final quote on p. 94 is from the Sūtra Assuaging the Grief of the Great King Ajātaśatru (Rgyal-po Chen-po Ma-skyes-dgras ’Gyod-pa Bsal-ba’i Mdo) [97.3], Tohoku no. 216.

On p. 97, the quote from the "Prajñaparamita Sutra" is, to be more exact, from the Ratnagunasaṃcayagāthā (Mdo Sdud-pa). The quote beginning, "Dedication in which . . ." on p. 98 is also from this sūtra.

The quote at the very end of p. 98 beginning, “the innate root . . .” is from the Bodhisattva Confession (Byang-chub Llung-bsags).

On p. 99, ‘caused phenomenon’ should be ‘compounded thing’ (dus-byas) [100.2]. "Cannot produce an effect" should be ‘is meaningless’ (don-med yin). "Noncreated object" should be ‘uncompounded thing’ (dus ma byas). "Nonproduct" should also be ‘uncompounded thing’ (dus ma byas). Translating what amounts to the same term three different ways on the same page makes it difficult to follow the argument, and creation
is a very problematic concept for Buddhist philosophers. “The Buddha said” refers to the Bhadracaryāprāṇiddhānārāja (Bzang Spyod) [101.1], Tohoku nos. 1095, 44 (pt. 4), 4377.

“The Buddha says” on p. 100 refers to a tantra, the Secret Moon Spot (Zla Gsang Thig-le) [102.6], Tohoku no. 477.

The “female water-sheep” year is 1523 A.D. Thus we know that it is a work of Kun-dga’-rin-chen’s mature years. Few readers will know how to transform Tibetan years into Christian era years, so it is important to translate this as well.

If we consider all these observations together, most of them are questions of clarity rather than of accuracy. Serious inaccuracies are few and far between, but I hope they will be carefully reconsidered in the second edition. I believe that this translation is one of the best of its genre to appear so far. Given a small amount of interest and patience, it is remarkably readable, and the reading will certainly prove its worth to anyone who is interested in Buddhism and its tantric component in Tibetan Buddhism. In fact, if I did not believe that it was both a good translation and a good book to translate, I would not have taken the effort to examine it so closely.

My main criticism, which is not specifically aimed at this book, is that translators should show more respect for the Tibetan texts on which their translations are based. If the text cannot be reproduced, at least a very clear bibliographical reference with the original Tibetan language title (including a description of the text in the case of manuscripts or blockprints) must be given. This information is important not only to librarians and bibliographers, but to the growing number of people who might want or need to consult the original Tibetan text. Needless to say, this is also important for criticizing translation work, and there has never been a translation that could not benefit from criticism. I hope that in the future those publishers such as Snow Lion who are giving the most support to translations from Tibetan will make full bibliographic details a prerequisite for publication.

I hope those same publishers will begin showing the respect due to the Tibetan authors and start putting their names in a prominent place on the front cover. Hiding the names of Tibetan authors has become a publishing tradition, but it is a wrong tradition. Could anyone imagine giving Voltaire or Lévi-Strauss such shabby treatment? Finally, it will be important for future students of these books to be able to fully identify the sūtras and tantras quoted within their pages rather than disguising them, as this book so often does, under so many vague references to what “The Buddha said.”

Dan Martin
Jerusalem

This volume gives a useful compilation of ethnographic observations on the Indo-Aryan speaking groups of the Dah and Hau Valleys of the north-eastern Pakistan Karakoram. Vohra here is to be complemented on his assiduous descriptions of festivals, which in detail fully match those of Francke. The book makes the point that since these groups have been only marginally Islamicized or influenced by Buddhism and might be held to represent a clue to the past, they are of major anthropological interest.

Some might regard the bibliography as making omissions, but this is not such a critical matter for a volume perhaps primarily intended as an ethnographic and historical monograph. However, the linguistic gaps on common Tibetan terms should be corrected: for example, while we are told that 'brog-pa' is an occupational name used for some Dard as if it could help clarify the matter of ethnic identity, the fact that it is the common and widely-known Tibetan term for pastoral people is omitted; similarly the fact that 'go' is the Tibetan *mgo* does not seem to be noted.

The major conceptual problems of speculative reconstruction are well-known to the comparativist and sociologist, but the present work does not face the same squarely. Instead of critical analysis, the closest of detailed material descriptions goes hand in hand with the most speculative of cultural and evolutionary reconstructions and comparisons. In practice, the work moves around cultural material by connections at times variously genetic, historical, contiguous and structural, amplified by references to 19th century literature; the theoretical background appears to be some historical idea of ethnicity, but neither this nor the 19th century literature is treated critically. For example, while in one place Vohra notes that one has to differentiate between the term "dard" as it is used in modern literature and the folklore on "the Daradas", the book does not follow this distinction.

In this volume the advances of twentieth century anthropological theory and ethnographic method (especially the more recent critical literature on ethnicity and its relation to state formation), are not fully taken advantage of. While the presentation here exacerbates this shortcoming, overall this is not so much the problem of Vohra alone as with this school of German Ethnology, in which not only the subject matter but also at times the very style of analysis are reminiscent of a bygone era. In a subsequent publication it is to be hoped that the analysis and presentation might be refined both for clarity and to make the work of
more general interest than to specialists on north-west Himalayan peoples and Indo-Aryan mythology alone.

Graham E. Clarke
Oxford


D. Schuh fungiert dabei nicht nur als Herausgeber der gesamten Serie, sondern auch der Abteilung I (Scriptores) sowie der Abteilung III (Diplomata et Epistolae), der die beiden vorliegenden Bände zugehören.


In Band 2 dieser Abteilung, Urkunden und Sendschreiben aus Zentraltibet, Ladakh und Zanskar, 1. Teil: Faksimiles, publiziert Schuh 96 Dokumente


Die Urkunden umfassen den Zeitraum von 1642 (Dokument 50) bis zum Beginn des 20. Jhs und sind ihrem Fundort nach geordnet: Herrscher- und Privat-“Urkunden der Kirchenadelssfamile ‘Gro-mgon bla-bran’, die insbesondere als Quellen für die Sozialgeschichte des Sa-skya Fürstentumes von Interesse sind (Dokumente 1–38);
“Urkunden der Bauernfamilie ‘Kra-sis rtse’ aus Darjeeling (Dokumente 39–41);
“Urkunden der ‘Library of Tibetan Works and Archives’ in Dharamsala” (Dokumente 42–46);
“Urkunden aus Ladakh” (Dokumente 47–80);
“Urkunden aus Zanskar” (Dokumente 81–96).


Die Urkunden sind thematisch nach folgenden Gesichtspunkten zusammengestellt:
“Herrscherurkunden zur Überantwortung von Ländereien und Privilegien, Erlässe (Dokumente 1–14);
“Ernennungsurkunden” (Dokumente 15–19);
“Sendschreiben von Herrschern” (Dokumente 20–23);
“Private Sendschreiben” (Urkunden 24–33);
“Klosterurkunden” (Dokumente 34–35);
“Spendenauftrufe” (Dokumente 36–37);
“Unkostenaufstellungen und Quittungen” (Dokumente 38–53);
“Sonstiges”, i.e. eine Eidesleistung der verschiedenen Adelshäuser Sik-kims zur Wiederherstellung der alten Rechtsordnung (Dokument 54).


*Helmut Tauscher, Wien*


One aspect of Tibet even debunkers find hard to downplay is its geography. Others are those stories of courage, danger and espionage in Tibet's exploration by foreigners. There is comedy, tragedy and fascination in the 19th century tales of imperialist machinations.

Derek Waller has combined these aspects in a well researched and referenced yet fast reading summary. He has emphasized the activities of the non-European explorers employed by the British Raj. He has clearly pictured the contrasting ideas and attitudes of the participants on the British side. There were those interested solely for the sake of science or excitement. Others were concerned primarily with prestige or cost/payoff questions.

Waller has not watered down the dramatic aspects of espionage and explorations. But he has focussed more narrowly than some specialists would prefer, citing almost solely British views and references. Other references, all but exclusively European, are almost entirely in English. But while others, whom Waller cites, have written about the pundits, this book is the first to draw together and index the major portion of all published details. Much of this material is not readily found. So the volume serves its purpose.

Serious Tibetologists know that the study of the geography of Tibet did not begin with the British. Vasilieva, beginning about 1840, trans-
lated the Tibetan geography of Smin-grol-sprul-sku. When this was published in Russian, the names of places were given not only in Russian phonetic transcriptions but also with Tibetan characters. In 1792, Lu Hua-chi published a geography of Tibet (Wei-tsong t'u-shih). In 1831, Father Hyacinth Bitchourin published a map with his geographical memoirs in Russian (Istorija Tibeta i Khukhunora). Prior to the first work of the Pundits, the Abbe Huc and Pere Auguste Desgodins had already made and published their travels. Their works are referenced only in English.

But it is probably unfair to fault an author for not doing what he never intended. His memoir does present a fairly complete picture of the activities of the Pundits, the so-called “native” (i.e. Hindu, Muslim and Buddhist) explorers. The only legitimate complaint has to do with the quality of the maps. Unfortunately, the best map with the book is on the dust cover. One has only to compare the area of Yamdrok-tso there and in the inside maps to see what is missing. There are many better maps available, and the serious reader might prefer having at hand one of Edward Stanfords International maps. South-Central Tibet is available in a 2nd edition, published in 1989.

It is instructive to follow the conflicts in thinking of the various participants in the explorations. Captain Thomas George Montgomerie, who master minded many of the British efforts, had noted the Chinese geographical successes using Jesuits. So he felt the British might “get at least as good work out of some of the natives of Hindostan.” John Hudson sent a Brahmin posing as a physician “with medicine for those who are so unfortunate as to become his patients.”

Few agents proved unreliable. Most, like Abdul Hamid, Nain Singh, Hari Ram, Ugyen Gyatso (U. G.), Kishen Singh (A. K.), Abdul Subhan (the Munshi), Rinzig Namgyal (R. N., actually Kunlay Gyatso Laden La), Sarat Chandra Das and Hari Ram did remarkable work under trying and perilous conditions. Not all survived.

The furor about espionage charges, involved with the release and exchange of geographical information involving the Russians, is well covered by Waller, at least from the British side. Questions of leaks and secrecy continue to plague the world when developments in knowledge involve the safety or death of people and organizations. Facts are durable and the truth will out, express possibly a too optimistic view of reality in an imperfect world. So it is instructive to read about “publish and perish” problems in the past.

A final word is to express pleasure that the book is printed on acid free paper, and the price a relatively modest $30.

Braham Norwich
New York

It may be unfair for one unrewarded by strong mystical experiences to review this biography. For Govinda and his biographer belong to that significant coterie of western Tibetologists who not only consider themselves as Buddhists, but appear to accept the reality of aspects others consider dubious. This book will surely appeal to those who share such beliefs. It has value also for those who met and admired Govinda’s charismatic character.

Ken Winkler has done a reasonable job for one who, like his protagonist, gives indications of floating through the air. He seems to have made many trips and checked the records where his own recollections of Govinda did not suffice. But even he has had to face the fact that Govinda remains a somewhat mysterious figure.

Govinda was a mystic. Though he worked with Sanskrit and Tibetan documents, he felt that any “philologically objective and correct translation” wasn’t sufficient to express their essentials. So some of his work seems onirocritical rather than objective. His published diagrams and structures seem at times to resemble Boolean geometry as much as the underlying Buddhist philosophy.

Govinda’s credos went beyond those of the average scholar. For example, he claimed that “for me, rebirth is neither a theory, nor a belief, but an experience.” He then went on to write that his known (but unnamed) precursor had passed away about 100 years before. Could he have meant his namesake, the Ernst Hoffman famous for the *Tales of Hoffman*? For Govinda had been born Ernst Lothar Hoffman, in Kassel, some time about the beginning of this century. It is perhaps significant that no exact date of birth is given, though it must have appeared on official documents which burden all world travellers.

One finds in this biography a series of fascinating details of the international travels and friendships Govinda, and his wife, Li Gotami (nee Rati Petit), made in their active lives. Govinda himself had studied art in Italy, worked for the International Buddhist Union, and taught in various places in India. He had travelled in Ceylon and Burma.

Just prior to WW II, in the area of Almora, he and Li Gotami had been guests of the Boshi Sens and of Walter Evans-Wentz. Shortly after the war, Govinda and Li Gotami went on prolonged pilgrimages into Tibet. The resultant books, *The Way of the White Clouds* (Shabала Publications), by Govinda, and *Tibet in Pictures*, by Li Gotami, are both of value. The two volumes of *Tibet in Pictures* (Dharma Publishing) have unusually clear photographs of people, monasteries and images destroyed not long after.
Also of interest are some of the stories of Govinda’s contacts with the Hippies, the Zen groups, and others who were in those multidimensional consciousness movements so strong in the post WW II period. The biography indicates the problems faced by a contemplative with a successful desire to spread the doctrine. The book has about two dozen illustrations and photographs which give a visual clarity to the passage of years and the varied encounters of Govinda and his wife.

Braham Norwich
New York
Addendum

The following Tibetan text was omitted from Alex Wayman’s article “A Problem of ‘Synonyms’ in the Tibetan Language: Bsgom Pa and Goms Pa” in Volume 7 of The Journal of the Tibet Society. We extend our apologies to the author for this oversight.

[a]

[b]

[c]

[d]

[e]
Announcement

The following announcement was received from Dr. Henry Osmaston.

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR LADAKH STUDIES

Only in the last decade has Ladakh (northwest India, once known as Little Tibet) been readily accessible for study, but in that short time it has been the focus of much attention by students in many disciplines. These have been attracted by the interest of its physical situation at high altitude in the rain-shadow of the geologically active Himalaya; by the natural ecology of this rugged desert and the skillful adaptations of pastoralism and agriculture; by the sociology, history and cultural tradition, especially as a surviving example of Tibetan Buddhism; and by the problems presented by modern development and conservation. Informal study groups organized international colloquia on Ladakh in 1981 at Konstanz (Federal Republic of Germany), in 1985 at Pau (France) and in 1987 at Herrnhut (German Democratic Republic). The proceedings of these have been published. The 4th IALS Colloquium was at Bristol (UK) in 1989 and the 5th at SOAS in London in June 1992.

At Herrnhut the International Association for Ladakh Studies (IALS) was formed with an international committee of distinguished scholars. The functions of the IALS are to provide contacts between all who are interested in the study of Ladakh, and to disseminate information about proposed and completed research and publications. To do this the IALS organizes colloquia, arranges publication of the proceedings, and publishes an occasional newsletter, "Ladakh Studies." This includes information about conferences, planned and current studies, requests for specific information and help, short reports, publications and general information about Ladakh. The close integration of resources, culture and religion in Ladakh demands a holistic approach, and members of the IALS are concerned with a wide variety of topics. Membership is open to all who are interested in Ladakh; for further information apply to the Hon. Sec.: Dr. Henry Osmaston, Department of Geography, University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1SS, U.K.; tel 0272-303750, fax 0272-303746, telex 445938 (BSUNIV G).
The Tibet Society

MINUTES

21st Annual Membership Meeting of the Tibet Society, Inc.
March 26, 1988, 8:00 P.M.
San Francisco Hilton & Towers, San Francisco, California

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Professor Elliot Sperling. Twenty-seven members were present. Kathleen Connors was appointed secretary for the meeting, and a ballot committee was named to count ballots for the Board of Directors election. Ballots were counted during the meeting, with Prof. Christopher Beckwith, Prof. Elliot Sperling, and Prof. Alex Wayman being elected as the new Board of Directors.

Minutes from the 1987 Tibet Society meeting in Boston were read and accepted by those in attendance by a voice vote.

Professor Sperling, as editor of The Journal of the Tibet Society, announced that the 1985 edition had been published, and expressed regret that further publications of the Journal had been temporarily delayed due to printing problems. He also stated that Silver on Lapis, a volume of Tibetan Studies papers presented in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Csoma de Koros was published and is available.

In reading the treasurer's report, Professor Sperling outlined 1987 expenses and balances, with the balance on hand as of December, 1987, $945.84, as reported in the Society's annual Financial Report. The Financial Report was accepted by the attending membership.

Prof. Sperling described the Tibet Society's 1987 special activities in commemoration of its 20th anniversary, highlighted by the visit of His Holiness the Dalai Lama to Bloomington, Indiana in September. The Tibet Society hosted a banquet for His Holiness, the evening of his arrival. On the following day, His Holiness consecrated the Chorten at the Tibetan Cultural Center and addressed an overflow crowd at the Indiana University Auditorium.

Professor Norbu reported that paying membership numbered approximately 300, with 1,000 newsletters sent to subscribers.

Professor Sperling called for questions on old or new business. Professor John Huntington announced a new Tibetan script font he had designed for Macintosh computer was now available. Samples of the script were shown, and a short discussion ensued on computer systems and Tibetan fonts.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Connors
Tibet Society, Inc.
FINANCIAL REPORT
January – December, 1988

Balance 12-31-87 .......................................................... $ 945.84
Investment checking interest ........................................... 235.78
Certificate of deposit interest ......................................... 281.77
Membership .................................................................. 2,395.00
Library Subscriptions .................................................... 420.00
Sales: Books, Journals, Bulletin, etc. .............................. 1,052.00
Ad Bulletin .................................................................. 75.00
Donations ................................................................... 17.00
Sponsorship ................................................................ 357.00
Repayments .................................................................. 1,000.00
C.D. ........................................................................... 4,000.00
Tibetan Relief ............................................................... 221.28
MacArthur Foundation ................................................... $2,000.00
TOTAL ...................................................................... $13,000.67

EXPENSES:
Postage ...................................................................... $1,035.39
Sponsorship ................................................................. 357.00
Printing ...................................................................... 7,268.13
Post Office Box Fee ..................................................... 72.00
Office Supplies ........................................................... 77.48
Payroll ....................................................................... 500.00
Refund ....................................................................... 100.00
Petty Cash ................................................................. 150.00
Bob Royer (C.P.A.) ....................................................... 185.00
Uralic and Altaic Research Incentive (I.U.) ...................... 1,833.22
Tibet Society #29-340-82 Continuation of Operating account 700.00
Advertising .................................................................. 40.00
TOTAL .................................................................... $12,318.22

Balance as of December 31, 1988 ................................. $ 682.45
The *Journal of the Tibet Society* is a scholarly periodical devoted to all areas of research on Tibet and regions influenced by Tibetan culture, including the arts, astronomy, geography, history, linguistics, medicine, philosophy, religion, the social sciences, and other subjects. Publication in the *Journal* is open to scholars of all countries. The languages of the *Journal* are English, French, German, and Tibetan. The editor welcomes the submission of articles, brief communications, and books for review, which deal with Tibet or the Tibetan cultural realm.

Tibetan may be transliterated by contributors in accordance with any of the standard scientific transliteration systems generally accepted. The following rules must be observed, however:

1) Absolute consistency must be maintained, except when quoting previous writers' works, in which case the system found in the quoted original must be retained in the quotation.

2) If any capitalization is necessary, only the first letter of any word may be capitalized, e.g., Dpal-Ildan, and not dPal-Ildan, the exception being that in words beginning (in transliteration) with a non-alphabetic diacritical mark—such as the apostrophe—the following letter is to be capitalized, e.g. 'Jam-dpal.

3) The type font currently available to us includes the following diacritical marks and special letters: "'""."", ",. A (A complete Greek font is also available.) It is therefore desirable for all translation, whatever the system, to restrict itself accordingly.

Transcription of other commonly used languages with non-Latin scripts is to be done according to the following systems:

Arabic: 'b th j (or g) h kh d dh r z s sh s d t z' gh f q k l m n h w y.

The article should always be transcribed al- (or Al-), and diphthongs should employ w and y (instead of u and i) as second elements.

Chinese: The Wade-Giles or Pinyin systems.


Russian: a b v g d e zh zi y k l m n o p r s t u f kh ts ch sh shch 'i' e yu ya.

Sanskrit: The system adopted by the 10th International Congress of Orientalists (Geneva, 1894).

Manuscripts should be typed on white bond paper, *double-spaced*, with *wide* margins on *all* sides. Notes must also be typed double-spaced, consecutively numbered, on a separate page or pages at the end of the manuscripts (not at the bottom of the page). Please submit a neat, finished manuscript. The *original* copy should be submitted. Authors must retain at least one copy of their manuscript. It is necessary that all errors be corrected on the galleys, which should be returned immediately.

All quoted passages of Tibetan more than a few words in length can be noted in the article text with a number (such as a line-reference to the original source) in square brackets—e.g.: [8.1]—and then written or typed out in a Tibetan print-style script (*dbucan*) on a *separate* page or pages. These passages will be printed in Tibetan at the end of the article. In other words, the original Tibetan of such passages will not appear in translation in the body or notes of the article, but will appear in Tibetan script alone, at the end of the article. (For examples, please see the articles H. Uebach and A. Wayman in Volume I. The same method is to be followed for citations of Chinese words or Japanese words containing ideograms, which unless very well known should generally be provided. For example, please see the article by J. Kolmaš in Volume I. For certain kinds of studies, this procedure may not be feasible, in which case exceptions might be made.)