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1.1 The contemporary worker in Tibetan studies will surely have no difficulty in associating his or her field of specialization with one of the areas in our subject first explored, or in some way or another significantly touched upon, by the Hungarian pioneer whose bicentenary we have come together to celebrate during these meetings here in Bloomington. Many of the papers to be read today and tomorrow will—as for example even the titles of several of the scheduled contributions indicate—have specific reference to one or another of Csoma de Kőrösi’s early studies. The absence of an overt reference to Csoma or to his work in the title of our own paper should, however, by no means be taken to indicate a lack of specific relation to the Hungarian pioneer’s accomplishments; we have here to deal with the beginnings of grammatical analysis and description, and indeed with the beginnings of linguistic science itself within the Tibetan culture; and in such a context a gathering such as this hardly needs, we believe, an overt reminder that Europe’s, and the West’s, first important introduction to the texts with which we are here concerned is also to be found among Csoma’s first accounts of what he dubbed “the historical and grammatical works to be encountered in Tibet.”

1.2. By the ‘First (and Second) Tibetan Grammatical Treatises’ we make specific reference to the Sum-cu-pa (=SCP) and Rtags-kyi hjug-pa (=RKHP), resp., two early linguistic texts that have already been the subject of considerable study in the West and in Japan, and that in Tibetan scholastic tradition have universally been attributed to ‘Thon-mi sambhota’ in his quasi-mythic role as inventor of the Tibetan script and founder of Tibetan literary culture. For our part, it is probably useful to sum up at the outset our present position on the question of the historicity of these two texts, even without going into the details of the question, in order to provide the gist of the historical-philological background necessary for the remainder of this paper.

In short, we presently hold that (a) both the SCP and the RKHP are, exactly as the Tibetan tradition has always asserted, extremely old, even ancient texts, although we can no longer associate ourselves with that same tradition in ascribing both to a single historical individual or to a single point in historical time; (b) the SCP and the RKHP, although both old, are in part at least
originally of different dates, a fact obscured but not completely concealed by editorial work to which both of our received texts have been subjected with a view to harmonizing the details of the two; from this effort at editorial harmonization also date the several cross-references that today appear to link together our received texts of these two treatises; (e) compared with the SCP, the RKHP is the more homogenous of the two, its content and linguistic-descriptive approach showing that, even in the somewhat late harmonized form in which we now have this text, it is nevertheless the product more or less of a single fairly narrow time span; but within the SCP the survivals of several chronologically disparate text strata are still plainly visible, particularly SCP sl. 8, which describes an early form of Old Tibetan somewhat prior to the later canonical Written Tibetan.4

In this fashion, our present view of the SCP and RKHP, growing out of recent Western and Japanese scholarship on these two texts, does not at all contradict the principal elements of the Tibetan historical tradition concerning these texts; in particular it affirms that tradition's cardinal allegation of the texts' antiquity; but it does go over and beyond the tradition in its reconstruction of the pre-history of these texts, and in its recovery of at least a portion of their subsequent vicissitudes, both topics that were for one reason or another closed books to the Tibetan tradition, including, oddly enough, the tradition of the historians, who must in all candor today be admitted to have known rather less about these things than we might otherwise have expected.5

1.3.1 The present contribution takes as givens a number of preliminary findings relating to the structure and the descriptive-analytic, i.e. the linguistic techniques of the SCP initially sketched in LDT; this was the first occasion in the literature for attention to be drawn to any of the issues that will be elaborated in the present paper. LDT is particularly relevant for its suggestion that the SCP essentially consists of three major parts (I', II', and III', cf. LDT passim., but especially at §3.1.2), a basic proposition that underlies most of the treatment of this text in the present contribution.

1.3.2 The study of these two early Tibetan grammatical treatises has hardly been distinguished, in recent years, either by the frequency or by the quality of the secondary literature devoted to it; indeed, much precious time and effort have necessarily had to be lavished on refuting uninformed and misleading contributions that otherwise have threatened to set our field back, rather than to advance it (e.g., Yamaguchi Zuihō 1976, refuted in GTR and LDT).

Useful and positive contributions to our understanding of the early grammatical tradition in Tibet, particularly contributions that genuinely facilitate our study of the SCP and RKHP, are therefore always more than welcome if only because, ever since the short-lived flurry of activity in this field initiated by Jacques Bacot and Johannes Schubert in the late 1920s, they remain so exceedingly rare: but such contributions are due a particularly warm welcome.
when, as in the case of two recent papers by Nils Simonsson 1982a, 1982b, they not only add greatly to our comprehension of these always cryptic and enigmatic texts, but at the same time also point the way toward new methods and approaches for our study that will surely contribute greatly to the future solution of still other, perhaps today even still unformulated, problems in these texts.

Quite apart from those specific issues in the interpretation of *RKHP* sl. 32 upon which his contributions throw significant light, Simonsson’s two recent papers are of great importance for our studies because of the attention that they focus upon a number of methodological issues in the study—not to mention in the translation!—of these texts, and particularly because of the clarity with which their author first identifies, then expresses himself upon, a number of these questions.

First place among these points we would assign to Simonsson’s succinct evaluation of the dangers inherent in blindly following the later interpretations of the Tibetan schools in our own readings of these two early texts. No one, of course, is ever about to suggest that unilaterally turning our backs upon everything that the accumulative weight of the Tibetan scholastic tradition has to teach us about the meaning of these or of any other early texts would be other than sheer, fruitless folly. We must always acquaint ourselves with what the culture itself out of which our texts grew, and the culture which in turn these same texts themselves fructified, has to tell us about what our texts mean. But to do this is by no means the same as to treat the *SCP* and *RKHP* as if they were mere code-books or darkly enciphered messages, i.e. not really texts at all but puzzles or ciphers, meaningless sequences of linguistic xs and ys that could only be decoded by consulting the deciphering lore of the later lamas.

For all the difficulty of their terse, enigmatic style of statement, the *SCP* and *RKHP* are both texts; and texts can, moreover must, be read as texts. Simonsson scores this first point with admirable brevity: “Like Pāṇini’s sūtras the Tibetan sūtras are written in an extremely laconic style which makes them very difficult to interpret, but easy to distort by commentators who cherish opinions of their own” (1982b.286). Put in another way, at the same time that we consult the later commentators, we must always be on guard against the distortions that they may have introduced in the course of “cherish[ing] opinions of their own”. Nor need it be pointed out at length that such distortions generally make themselves most obvious when, as so frequently proves to be the case, accommodation of the “cherished opinions” of the later commentators would require us to fly directly in the face of the plain sense, and especially of the grammar, syntax, and lexical meanings, of the original early texts themselves.

Second, Simonsson demonstrates, both by the example of his own careful exegesis of *SCP* sl. 1 and of *RKHP* sl. 32, as well as by his critical evaluation
of previous renderings of these passages, the almost awesome responsibility necessarily involved in any attempt to translate either selections from, or the entire text of, either work.

Most important to understand in this connection is that no lack of gratitude for the enormous labors of pioneers in this field, such as Bacot or Schubert, is involved in our critical evaluation of their early efforts. We could hardly work at all without the benefit of the earlier studies, and yet, as Simonsson deftly points out, too often one or another of the early translators has simply “not cared to translate this [or that] word, this resulting in his interpretation of the whole grammar turning out practically meaningless” (1982b.288). So much for sins of omission; one scarcely need dwell upon the even more disastrous results obtained when, as frequently, the earlier translators have not avoided difficult words and terms, but instead have replaced them outright with quite incongruent, when not totally irrelevant, Western school-grammar categories.

Third, not only in precept but also by example Simonsson has clearly demonstrated the only method actually available to us for solving the problems presented by these two early grammatical treatises from Tibet—not the uncritical rote replication of the “cherished opinions” of the later commentators, but the painstaking philological exploration *ab initio* of virtually every technical term in the *SCP* and the *RKHP*—in the course of which we must constantly balance the considerations of “the Buddhist philosophical speculation” on the one hand with “the Pāñinian tradition” of the Indic *vyākaraṇa* on the other (1982a.537, but also passim.). This point is hardly a new one in Simonsson’s work: it was originally made with equal force in his *ITS*, p. 242 (cf. 1982a.543); but the passage of nearly three decades has not in the least diminished its impact.

Fourth, and finally, Simonsson puts us even further in his debt by deftly placing into a rational and reasonable scientific perspective the still vexing question of the historicity of Thon-mi Sambhoṇa, the putative author of these texts: “Whether Thon-mi Sambhoṇa lived in the seventh century A.D. or earlier, or even is legendary, is scarcely of importance for us here. It is important, however, that two grammatical treatises do exist, attributed to a person of that name, and that these treatises, the sūtras, have been in the center of Tibetan grammatical thinking for many hundreds of years” (1982b.286). This point is extremely well taken; but at the same time, it ought not discourage us from continuing to seek out, whenever possible, documentable text-parallels, if not text-sources, in both the Indic and the Tibetan grammatical tradition, for specific *SCP* and *RKHP* passages, particularly for a number of especially enigmatic passages in these two texts: frequently (as e.g. in the case of *SCP* šl. 12, see §3.3.5 *infra*) the identification of such independent textual testimony not only throws light upon the dating of one or more passages in the grammatical treatises, but also provides a reliable method for penetrating the
veil of distortions with which the later commentators have clouded over our comprehension of many important elements in the early Tibetan grammatical tradition.

1.3.3 Heartening also to those concerned with the study of these early texts from Tibet are the many indications, increasingly to hand, showing how our studies, in their own and necessarily limited fashion, frequently recapitulate not only much of the practical method but also a good deal of the intellectual impetus that presently propels the van for Indic grammatical studies proper, especially Pāṇinian researches. This is a development that was only to be anticipated, particularly in view of the intimate relationship between the early Tibetan grammatical works and the *vyākaraṇa* that has, *inter alia*, most recently been emphasized *de novo* in both of Simonsson’s new contributions (but particularly 1982a *passim*, and 544), where he demonstrates that even “in spite of the fact that [a specific] illustrating example . . . is a typically Buddhist one, we shall have to turn to the Pāṇinian tradition in order to understand” it.

It would be folly to assert, or even to imply, that anything in the Tibetan grammatical tradition ever approached Pāṇinian standards of subtlety and sophistication. But even though the tradition is thus, in a sense, far from Pāṇinian, it is still indubitably Indic, and so it must always be approached from the point of view of the Indic grammarians and their views.

We have already had occasion to explore one aspect of this Tibetan recapitulation of the trend of Pāṇinian studies: the denigration that the *SCP* (and its author[s]) have had to endure on the part of certain modern students of this text is neatly paralleled by the abuse that e.g. Whitney once was short-sighted enough to heap upon Pāṇini himself: but “before we . . . similarly make the mistake of assuming that the author(s) of the *SCP* were not sensible, and that this text abounds in errors, and that we are entitled to reject it outright merely because it does not agree with our concept of what it should be or say, we will do well to remember how absurd Whitney’s imprecations strike the Indologist—as well as any serious linguist—today” (*LDT* §3.3).

Another of the several directions along which our Tibetan linguistic studies frequently display almost startling parallels with the path of recent Pāṇinian researches concerns the manner in which much of the later Tibetan tradition for reading our texts has long been characterized, to an overgenerous degree, by what we may term ‘the unwarranted presumption of synonymity’; it was only to be expected that when, in the late 1920’s, Western scholarship first fitfully directed its energies toward these sources, it too would inherit a large amount of this gratuitous postulation. The technique involved in this presumption of synonymity is highly seductive: unfortunately also it is almost always misleading, when it is not simply incorrect.
When one or the other of these two ancient grammatical texts opts for two (or more) distinct terms or expressions for a linguistic entity that appears to us today (or even to the lamas of the schools a few hundred or so years ago) to be pretty much one and the same, the gratuitous presumption of synonymity urges us simply to sweep all this under the rug, by assuming that terms \( x, y, z \ldots n \) are, in such cases, nothing more than redundant synonyms employed in elegant variation, i.e. that they ‘all mean the same thing’.

Even on the face of the matter, this is generally highly unlikely, particularly when we keep in mind the terse, succinct style of both the *SCP* and the *RKHP*. One can hardly imagine a literary form less hospitable to elegant variation than the spare, concise language of these two texts. Synonymity also becomes increasingly improbable when we consider the issue in the light of recent developments in Pāṇinian studies, to which this portion of our remarks has immediate reference—developments usefully summed up in Deshpande 1984, reviewing Kiparsky 1979. As Deshpande describes the situation, ‘‘[w]ith some 2500 years of Pāṇinian commentators and their modern followers believing that [terms \( x, y, \) and \( z \)] are synonyms, one must admire K/iparsky’s\’ courage in starting with the hypothesis that each term may denote a different kind of option, and also appreciate his originality in seeking valid methods to prove his hypothesis. . . . if one is to disagree with [the commentators], then one cannot rely on the same old ways of justifying one’s interpretations. One must find ways which are totally independent of the tradition, and at the same time these must be convincing and ingenious.’’ In a word, Kiparsky has sought to detect—and to document!—differences in Pāṇini’s description and analysis in cases ‘‘where the entire tradition of Pāṇinian grammarians has been able to find no difference in meaning’’. In the process he has not only evolved ‘‘significant methodological, historical, and substantive implications for future research,’’ he has also documented that ‘‘his basic claim seems to be better justified than the alternatives of blindly clinging to the traditional belief that these [lexically different] terms mean the same’’ (Deshpande 1984.162, 161, 163).

In other words, by abandoning the gratuitous assumption of synonymity, Kiparsky has gotten us closer to the original sense of his texts. Our texts too, though much later in time, and originating in quite a different country and language, and also based upon linguistic description and analysis of far less sophistication and intricacy than those underlying Kiparsky’s corpus, are nevertheless part and parcel of the same overall Indic tradition as that in which Kiparsky works. Not only does it thus behoove us to turn constantly to the Pāṇinian, resp. the Indic, grammatical tradition in order to understand our texts, as Simonsson stresses; we are also generally well advised to approach that tradition, and our texts, whenever possible in terms of the methodological approach exemplified by Kiparsky on putative synonymity.
Above everything else, this means constantly being on the alert against the gratuitous assumption of synonymity: whenever the Tibetan commentators (or Western scholars uncritically parroting their views) insist that terminological diversity in the SCP and RKHP is meaningless ("x, y, z . . . n all merely mean the same thing"), we must always be prepared at least to consider the possibility that each different term in the original may instead well have meant something different. And, as we hope to illustrate in the present contribution through specific illustrations drawn from the SCP, considering the issue in this fashion frequently throws new light on the sense as well as on the implications of this ancient linguistic text, light that is as welcome as it is long overdue.

Also displaying impressive parallels to many of the questions raised by these Tibetan grammatical studies are a number of the issues treated with impressive power of conviction by Cardona in his account of the method of description of the Indic grammarians as reflected in the so-called Śiva-sūtras of Pāṇini's grammar (Cardona 1969). The first six slokas (in the conventional numbering?) of the SCP also constitute, in effect, a śiva-sūtra-like preliminary to the grammar-proper of this treatise (LDT §3.1.2 with note 44); and as a consequence there is much for our studies to learn from Cardona's explication of these fourteen preliminary Pāṇinian sūtras, particularly in his stress on the apparently diverse but actually unitary function of the various aspects of these passages, i.e. for "the formation of prayāhāras to be used in rules", his emphasis upon the way in which "Pāṇini's grammar is thematically divisible into several main parts", and especially his identification and reconstruction of his so-called L-Pāṇini as "a classification of sound which must be considered pre-Pāṇinian" (Cardona 1969.12, 3, 9). Each of these parts of Cardona's study has much to teach us about how we may most usefully approach our own texts, and in what follows we shall have more than one occasion for implementing his method and approach in terms of our rather less involved materials.

2. To sum up, then, our point of departure for the present study of the SCP, it is actually necessary to recapitulate only two basic facts that by now have been established about this text. Both are exceedingly simple, but by the same token, both also are exceedingly important. The SCP is old, and it is a text, i.e. it is an old text.

Upon each of these two discrete terms, as well as upon the sum total implied in their collocation above, depend a number of working hypotheses that we shall attempt to implement in §3 infra; but first it is necessary to elaborate upon some of the principal implications of these categorizations.

2.1 The SCP is old. This holds valid and remains significant almost without regard for the still partly unresolved questions of its date and authorship, cf. Simonsson 1982b.286 (already cited supra, 1.3.2). Indeed, one wonders if
we actually possess any original Tibetan literary composition, i.e. texts not
translations from Indic or other originals, that are older than the SCP, or at
least older than the now partially lost Old Tibetan Urtext that may be demon-
strated to underlie certain portions of the received-text SCP (cf. the discus-
sions of SCP sl. 8 in LDT and GTR, passim.).

Because the SCP is old, it naturally follows that we must approach the
problems of its meaning (not to mention those of its translation) with all due
regard for the views of the later Tibetan scholastic tradition in which this treat-
ise has been continually transmitted and studied, probably for ca. a thousand
years. In the same way, students of Pāṇini must necessarily work carefully
through the vast body of lore and learning of which Kātyāyana and Patañjali
represent only the peak of a great mountain of erudition. But because the SCP
is old, far older without question than any of the subsequent commentators
upon it, we must not repeat the fatal methodological error of confusing the re-
spect and attention that are properly due the lore of the later lamas with the
equally proper critical philological scrutiny that are due this text by reason of
its antiquity. It would be absurd to claim that we “know more than the
lamas” on this or any other Tibetological topic; but it would be equally absurd
not to be willing to recognize, and to admit, that we may very well know dif-
f erent things than they did, and do, particularly when text-critical techniques
unknown to them permit us to work in the light of earlier, recovered (resp. re-
stored) stages of text history not at their disposal. Cardona has put this point
too extremely well; ‘‘ . . . I am obviously indebted to the Indian commen-
tators . . . . One cannot help but have great admiration for the erudition and
acumen of commentators . . . . , and their comments have served both to help
in understanding the grammar and to point up problems. Careful attention to
commentatorial statements does not, of course, imply blind acceptance of
them all’’ (1969.3).

Previous studies of the SCP and RKHP have in fact all too frequently con-
fused “careful attention to commentatorial statements” such as those to be
found in the magisterial work of the Mahāpañḍita of Situ with blind accept-
ance of them all. The great Situ commentary on the first two grammatical
treatises is, it hardly need be stressed, the most comprehensive and thorough-
going guide that we possess for our study of these texts; it is also by that same
token liable to be the most dangerous, because of its author’s overpowering
compulsion to explain everything in the texts in terms of a single and
unilinear, if not simplistic, system. In the process, as we shall see in particular
detail at §3.1.3 infra, the Mahāpañḍita of Situ effectively erases much of the
overt philological evidence for more than a few significant distinctive cate-
gories that the SCP original establishes in terms of its own linguistic analysis and
descriptive techniques; and this tendency of this all-important commentator
was one that almost literally snowballed in the hands of the Western students
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and translators. When, as frequently, we find the Tibetan commentators violating the grammar of the language itself in the process of ’explaining’ the statements of the SCP (e.g. on sl. 12, §3.3.5 infra), or even at times making unsupported claims for lexical meanings otherwise totally unattested (e.g. §3.3.5 infra on tshig), it is incumbent upon us to look at their statements with more than ordinary caution—all the more so when, as also all too frequently is the case, we detect them effectively rewriting the original in order to make it say something that it plainly does not, and never did, say (e.g. anent SCP 8, in LDT and GTR, passim.). This we can accomplish only by looking carefully once more at the text itself: what the later commentators claim that it says is never irrelevant, but in the final analysis only what the text itself actually proves to say, in and of itself, is actually significant. When all is said and done, the text must—and almost always can—speak for itself.

2.2 The SCP is a text. From this fact also there depend a number of imperatives that are virtually categorical for its study. Most of these considerations are closely interrelated with those just discussed: once we determine to let the SCP speak by, of, and for itself, by reason of its antiquity, we will no longer be tempted toward overreliance upon the traditional scholastics who have all too frequently regarded it, not as a text, but as a code or a cipher—a series of intrinsically meaningless, or at the least always obscure, statements into which we must somehow insert meaning, as one inserts meaning in the process of deciphering or decoding an arbitrary system of secret writing. To follow the Tibetan commentators blindly into this gambit is to do them and their erudition less justice than their often considerable achievements and commendable energy normally deserve.

Over and above these considerations, the basic fact of the essential textuality of the SCP in its turn imposes at least three consequential contingencies upon our studies. Since the SCP is a text, it has internal structure—by definition, since all texts do. Since it is a text, it not only has structure, it also has rule ordering, of which we shall have more to say below, but which for the moment may adequately be understood as directing attention to the fact that the statements of the SCP occur in a certain and fixed, but not necessarily arbitrary order vis-à-vis one another. Part and parcel of the fact of textual structure is that, as a consequence, individual parts of the whole stand in a fore or aft relation to one another; and it will be one of the particular tasks of §3 infra to study and if possible explain the implications of this ordering of its rules for a better understanding of the linguistic analysis inherent in the SCP. Finally, since the SCP is a text, it has its own history. A text is not an abstraction (though it may of course deal with more than one variety of abstraction): it is an entity that exists in time, and hence it has history—but this lasts brings us back full circle to §2.1 supra, i.e. to the essential fact that the SCP is old.
2.2.1. The internal structure of the SCP is a concept carefully to be distinguished from the various varieties of extrinsic structures, or structurings, that the later commentators have frequently imposed upon it, in their well-intentioned but not always equally well-informed attempts at explication. A parallel may very well be drawn with the concept of ‘grammar’ in the abstract. The internal structure of the text is the only relevant framework in terms of which the text may either be described or explained, even though that framework is frequently anything but obvious, and hence frequently must itself be discovered in the process of our analytic study of the text. In this it provides a precise parallel to the grammar of any language, in the larger sense of that term, understanding grammar as that which exists in and as part of any given language, where it awaits discovery by the linguist. In these same terms, the generally irrelevant extrinsic structuring that the commentators would impose upon the text from the outside parallels, e.g., the Greek- and Latin-based European grammars that inept linguists still frequently attempt to foist off upon languages of totally different structures. If our understanding of either is to advance, the structure of a text, like the structure of a language, must always be left to speak for itself.

Probably the most striking examples of this variety of largely irrelevant extrinsically-imposed structuring are provided by the two commentaries translated by Schubert, the late recasting by Rol-pa’hri rdo-rje (1717-1786) of the relatively early work by Dharmapālabhadra, Chos-skyoṅ-bzaṅ-po (1441-1528),8 and the very late commentary of Dbyaṅs-can grub-pa’hri rdo-rje.9 In both instances, the extrinsic structurings that these commentators imposed upon the SCP have if anything been thrown into larger-than-life relief by Schubert’s painstakingly literal translations, which leave most of the technical terminology in Tibetan, while at the same time maneuvering the commentators’ systems of number-marked extrinsic structurings into a position of even greater visibility than that which they enjoy in the originals that Schubert was rendering. The result is that the student of Schubert’s translations, valuable though they still are, and indeed the remarkable accomplishments that they were for their time, will most likely be inclined to believe that the extrinsic structurings which he elevated to such a prominent place in his versions are of cardinal importance for an understanding of the SCP itself (which is true enough, but not in the sense in which the reader of Schubert’s translations will take it), and also that these extrinsic structurings somehow reflect the internal structure of the SCP itself (which is not true at all, in any sense).

The net of extrinsic structurings that the great commentary of the Mahāpaṇḍita of Situ throws about both these two early treatises is at once rather more sophisticated than anything known until his time, and by that same token rather more difficult to evaluate; it also has, as we might expect from its author’s enormous evidence of erudition, much to teach us today, de-
spite the equally obvious necessity for never following it blindly. Most convenient for inspecting the extrinsic structurings involved in the Situ commentary is the form in which its schema is recast in the concise epitome of Dharmabhadra; and the schema of this epitome may in turn most usefully be consulted in the meticulous and always conscientious translation of Inaba, especially in his overall presentation of pp. 314-16. This, along with Inaba’s Japanese translation, p. 317 ff., is particularly convenient for confronting with Inaba’s critically edited text of the Dharmabhadra epitome of the SCP, in his *Furoku*, pp. 1-44; the reader will wish to compare both with the proposal in §2.3 *infra* for a thematic division of the SCP (in the sense of Cardona 1969.3) into several parts according to the text’s internal marking of its own internal structure. These, it will be found, do not always or necessarily differ too strikingly from the extrinsic structurings imposed by the Situ commentary; but by the same taken, the two also do not always coincide by any means; and when they do not, their lack of congruence is frequently of critical value for an understanding of our text.

For example, we shall see below (and we have already discussed in *LDT* in some detail) how SCP śls. 1-6 constitute a śiva-sūtra-like prolegomenon to the SCP, and we have also touched upon the internal relationship of these six ślokas among themselves (a relationship further detailed in §2.3 *infra*). This is to be contrasted with the Situ commentary’s ordering of these six: the Mahāpaṇḍita takes śls. 1-6 together as a set, to be sure, but he also places śl. 1 on one level as coeval with śls. 2-6 on another, an arrangement that seriously compromises our understanding of the grammatical-analytic functions of the statements concerned. Similarly with the second major portion of the SCP (our ‘II’); here the Mahāpaṇḍita resolutely imposes an extrinsic ordering on śls. 7-23 that would see in śls. 7-17 “eight particles and case suffixes undergoing morphophonemic alternation” (*rjes-hṣug la bshos-pahi phrad rnam-dbyes bgyad*, text ed. Inaba, p. 14, §II.A.2a, translation Inaba, p. 329, §233), as against, in śls. 19-23, “six free particles not undergoing morphophonemic alternation” (*rjes-hṣug la ma bshos-pahi phrad rañ-dbañ-can* . . . *drug*, text p. 26, § II.A.2b, translation. p. 345, §260). But unexplained, indeed unmentioned, in this variety of extrinsic structuring is why, e.g., śl. 17, which treats the morphophonemically invariable vocative case marker, is found in the particular location within the SCP where it is, or why the terminal enclitic *-Qo* of śl. 7 (*LDT* §3.1.1 with note 42) is taught at the beginning of this section, not to mention a host of parallel problems.

2.2.2 The grammar of the SCP, like all grammars taking shape within the Indic tradition, is in effect a set of rules that teach the morphological formation and syntactic meanings of specific linguistic forms; but as a consequence of its structure (§2.2.1) it also follows that the statements of the text possess rule order, i.e. there are principles of basic significance to the text’s descrip-
tion and analysis that determine how different parts of the grammar are interrelated and also why certain rules appear where they do. These principles are not always, indeed only rarely, set forth explicitly within the grammar itself; like ‘grammar’ in the larger sense, these too are mostly designed in such a fashion as to await discovery by the user of the text.

In the case of Pāṇini, the extremely covert presentation of the grammar’s rule ordering has tended to obscure much of the system until fairly recently; even such exemplary students of the text as “Renou . . . did not discuss in detail how different sections of the grammar are related and why certain rules appear where they do” (Cardona 1976.188, §II.1.5.2a), while as late as Fowler 1965 less informed students of the problem could still call into question the very existence of rule order in the grammar. Now we know better. We realize that Pāṇinian grammar not only involves order in its application of rules, but also is built upon an extremely sophisticated system of decision-making procedures that permit the user to select the proper rules and apply them correctly when the order of rule application is not the same as the external order of the rules in the grammar, while a given rule can require for its interpretation information available only from rules appearing later (Cardona 1976.191; 1970 passim.; Sag 1974). So subtle indeed is this particular aspect of the Pāṇinian grammatical tradition that even the major later Indic commentators, Patañjali included, appear to have become involved in early misunderstandings of the subject, particularly in their explanations of the proper procedure to be adopted by the user where two rules in a grammar appear to conflict, eventually even proposing that in such a situation one must apply the rule that will yield the desired results, i.e. that only prior knowledge of the correct results will allow one to apply the rules correctly in the first place (Cardona 1970, passim. but especially p.61)—hardly a high recommendation for any grammar. Fortunately, our Tibetan treatises by no means approach their Indic models on the score of the complexity and subtlety of their rule ordering; nevertheless, the concept as a whole is important to keep in mind while reading our texts, since if even in a somewhat attenuated form it nevertheless does play a significant role in their structure and presentation.

2.2.3 Finally, because the SCP is a text, and because it is old, it embodies history along with its structure and rule order. Our present text does not represent a unitary composition executed by a single hand at a single point in history: the complex background that may be recovered for our received version of SCP śl. 8 (already explored in detail in LDT and GTR) is a representative case in point. To read śl. 8 correctly, i.e. as it was intended to be understood at the time of the incorporation of its now-lost Urtext into our received version of the SCP, it is necessary to take cognizance of the historicity of this fragment. This historicity was necessarily a closed book to the traditional Tibetan commentators. In part this was because they lacked access to material now
available to us, e.g. in the case of śl. 8, to the Old Tibetan MSS explored in our previous contributions cited supra; in part also this was because they believed that both the SCP and RKHP were the product of a single hand at a single point in history. In part also it derives from the essentially different view of the nature of time and history that they inherited from the Indic world view. We shall see below (§3.3.5) how, when we are fortunate enough to have documentary attestation for what must be close to the first source for a given SCP statement—a statement that otherwise we now have only in a later, re-worked form—divergent and misleading readings are all that can result so long as we approach the SCP without the benefit of historical perspective. Questions of internal historicity are also involved in the necessary restoration of received śl. 20 from its traditional location within the text (§ 2.3). All these issues depend upon the fact that the SCP has its own history, which in turn comes back full circle to the issue of the SCP’s textuality.

2.3 At this point it is appropriate and useful to summarize the discussion thus far by means of a highly abbreviated but otherwise complete schematic breakdown of the internal structure of the SCP, correlating the traditional śloka numbers, which are of virtually no analytic or linguistic significance, with the several major and minor subordinate segments into which the text itself divides. These traditional śloka numbers appear at the extreme left of the schema in §2.3.1. Arabic superscripts on śloka numbers indicate the first, second, third etc. lines of each traditional śloka. Roman ‘I’, ‘II’, and ‘III’, immediately to the right of the traditional śloka numbers, and connected to them with right-handed curved brackets (]), are the major subordinate segments already described in broad outline (LDT §3.1.1). Next, to the right of these I, II, and III, is a three-fold breakdown of each of these major segments. For both I and II, (a) cites the overt internal syntactic indicators that provide the primary structural markings within the text itself identifying these elements. ‘The earlier translators [and it might be added, sometimes also (though less frequently) the Tibetan commentators as well] customarily ignored these indications of internal structure, even though they are essential to identifying the rule-ordered presentation that is central to the text’s analysis’ (LDT §3.1.1 and note 42). These markers are generally examples of the terminal enclitic -Qo, but not exclusively, since yin, min, and mi srid also play their parts in the system.

For both I and II, (b) further breaks down the major segment, marking subsections with arabic numbers (I1, I2, etc., cf. LDT §3.1.2 and note 47). Left- and right-directed arrows (←, →) mark non-contiguous rule ordering where, for reasons to be discussed later, directly associated referant and referrand statements (e.g. śls. 13 and 8) are structurally displaced from one another.

For I, (c) briefly describes the content, resp. the linguistic function of the portions marked with right-handed curved brackets (]). For II, (c) serves a dif-
ferent function: here it rewrites the morphophonemic-process statements of the text in succinct form, to permit easy reference to and convenient identification of the forms taught in each section except for śls. 24 and 25 where (c) is again, as with I, content-explanatory. In these rewritings the symbols + and \( \rightarrow \) have their usual linguistic values; on the processes that they indicate, cf. LDT passim., but especially §3.1.3. The reordering proposed for the position of traditional śl. 20 to follow instead śl. 23, indicated by the vertical arrow (\( \downarrow \)), has textual as well as internal-structural authority; see Inaba, ed. Dharmabhādra, p. 28 note 7.

Finally, for III no further subdivision is at present possible, and accordingly none is here suggested. Earlier (SGTT, p. 8b) we held that these ślokas constituted "a late non-grammatical accretion to the SCP," now it rather appears that III, while to be sure essentially non-grammatical and non-descriptive, is nevertheless not necessarily any later than the rest of that text, and even though "this largely didactic III is thus not intimately concerned with the technical-linguistic concerns of I and II, it nevertheless contains cross-references to I (in śl. 283), and to II (in śl. 283)" (LDT p. 188, §§3.1.2 with notes 46 and 47). III is essentially concerned with the tantristic view of the non-identity of sgra and don, roughly 'words, phrases, linguistic convention, linguistic meaning' versus 'propositional content, reference, referent; purpose of a speech-act, utterer’s intention, etc.' — in brief, 'convention' as against 'intention' (Steinkellner 1978; Broido 1983); it remains to be studied in the necessary detail, in the light of the recent studies just cited. In the meantime, it is to be noted that this same sgra-don dichotomy is relevant to the reading of śl. 8 (LDT note 15), another indication that while III is in one sense or another an accretion to the SCP, it is by no means either irrelevant to or unintegrated into the remainder of the text. See table 2.3.1.

3. Of particular significance for revealing many of the critical aspects of text structure and rule ordering in the SCP is this treatise’s presentation of the case-suffix system for the Tibetan noun, a topic that can only be approached in the light of the preliminary considerations already explored in §1 and §2 supra. This is also a topic that can, for the present at least, only be treated in broad outline, since its fuller exploration will eventually involve many more details than the present study can possibly introduce; accordingly, §3 will emphasize in particular those problems in the SCP’s presentation of case that especially focus around questions of terminology in the original and of translation in later Western and Japanese studies.

3.1 Mhvyt., CCXI, ed. Sakaki 4738 sqq. introduces the canonical Tibetan translations for the seven Indic cases, presenting the forms in question in the usual Indic order (I, nom., II, acc., III, instr., IV, dat., V, abl., VI, gen., VII, loc.). But unlike the SCP, the Mhvyt. does not propose Tibetan translations for the names of the cases, another of the several indications that these
2.3.1 Schema of the SCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>śl. 1</td>
<td>... ho /\</td>
<td>I(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>... ho /</td>
<td>I(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>I(^3\rightarrow)śl. 2(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>I(^4\rightarrow)śl. 2(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>... min /</td>
<td>I(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>... šes par bya /</td>
<td>II(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>... yin /</td>
<td>II(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>II(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>II(^3)(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>II(^3)(^3)(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>II(^3)(^3)(^3)(^3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>... ho /</td>
<td>II(^3)→śl. 8(^1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>... yin /</td>
<td>II(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>II(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>... no /</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>... yin /</td>
<td>II(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>II(^7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>... ho /</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>... no /</td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>II(^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>... mi srid /</td>
<td>II(^9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>}</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
two texts are hardly representative of a unitary tradition (cf. SGTT, p. 45-6 on the āli, kāli question). Also unlike the SCP is the Mhvyt.'s overt listing of the nominative, where the SCP hews more closely to the Indic norm on this score, making no particular provision for teaching the specific forms and functions of the nominative as such (Cardona 1974 passim. on the silence of the Indic tradition on the notion of grammatical subjects).

The SCP names for the cases, or rather more precisely, the SCP translations of the Indic designations for the case functions that it adopts for its descriptions of the semantic-syntactic functions of the Tibetan case-suffixes, have been studied in admirable detail by Inaba, Excursus to §5, pp. 14-15, where he contrasts the SCP terms with their Indic originals as reflected, even if at second-hand, in Pāṇini, the Kāraṇa, and the Candra-vṛtti. Inaba's study, with its convenient table (p. 15), shows dramatically the way in which the SCP draws eclectically from diverse horizons of the Indic tradition: unfortunately however it does not address the cardinal issue of the absence of the SCP case terms from the Mhvyt., nor does it concern itself with those cases where translations in the Mhvyt. suggest equivalents for the SCP terms that at least ostensibly are difficult to account for within the materials that Inaba does cite (e.g., śl. 11 byed pa po = kāraka, at Mhvyt. 4677, cf. §3.3.3 infra).

The SCP begins its account of the case-suffixes at śl. 8. This portion of the text, as already explored in considerable detail (cf. GTR, LDT), is an early fragment that described pre-Written Tibetan forms for the acc., dat., and loc. It is noteworthy, however, that while this fragment is pre-WT, it is not of course pre-Indic, i.e. it hews precisely to the Indic order for the Tibetan case-suffixes that it teaches. In other words, śl. 8 is not only old, it is also an old pre-SCP treatment of the Indic cases vis-à-vis the Tibetan case-suffixes. Most of the special problems and issues confronted in this sūkha have been explored in the previous work cited, and may as a consequence be passed over here, except for some necessary consideration (§3.3.1) of the term la sgra = *la šabda under which the text subsumes the five suffixes for the three cases that it teaches. With Indic cases II, acc., IV, dat., and VII, loc., taken care of in śl. 8, cases III, instr., V., abl., and VI, gen., are left (still in Indic order) to be treated. But now the SCP departs from that Indic order, and for good reason. To have taken up III, instr., in śl. 9 would have violated the principle of economy of statement. If the inst. had been presented immediately, and following the Indic order, it then would not have been possible for the description to exploit the partial formal similarity between the Tibetan gen. and instr. case-suffixes. But neither the gen. nor the instr. could have been incorporated into śl. 8 (either in the form in which we now have this early fragment, or in its putative original redaction), because later on both would require statements for the alternations sustained by their initials that are impossible elegantly to incorporate into the patterns of śl. 8. But once the gen. has been described, then the
instr. is compendiously dealt with in terms of simple affixation of -s (LDT, note 6), hence sls. 9,10 (where the traditional numbering into two ślokas is without meaning), and sl. 11. The interpolation of sl. 12 into the treatment at this point also follows directly from considerations of morphophonemic descriptive economy, because of its initial alternation (on the other problems of sl. 12, §3.3.5 infra). Similar considerations of descriptive economy explain both the interpolation and ordering of sl. 13 and sl. 14; the treatment of case resumes with sl. 15,16 (again the traditional numbering for these two is without meaning), which deal with V., abl., now the sole remaining canonical Indic case to be treated. The SCP presentation of case thus concludes with sl. 17 on the voc., a passage that at the same time provides a transition to the next thematic subject of SCP II, where from sl. 18 on the text deals with larger syntactic relationships marked by such particles as ni, etc.

In order to survey the data concerned in the SCP presentation of case in terms of the principal concerns of the present paper, the schema immediately following, which displays relevant materials from SCP sl. 8 through sl. 18, will be useful, particularly because it shows the original terminology employed by the SCP in these matters as well as how that terminology has frequently been overlooked by the Western translators, or altered and skewed by the Tibetan commentators. In this schema the → restatements are to be understood as already described for the schema of the entire SCP displayed supra. In the (partial) citations of the SCP in the left column, small capitals direct particular attention to the case terminology of this portion of the treatise, which will be further discussed in §3.3. The original Indic case-system congruities of this portion of the SCP are indicated in the middle column, enclosed in curved brackets ({}). The right column displays two types of data: samples of the ways in which the SCP’s original statements on the Tibetan case-suffixes are recast in a sample from the more important Tibetan commentaries, with S = the commentary of the Mahāpyāṇṭa of Situ, as found in the epitome by Dharmabhadra (ed. Inaba), Z = Za ma tog by Dharmapāla (1441-1526), ed. Laüer, Sitzungsberichten der philos.-philolo. u. hist. Classe der kgl. bayer. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, 1898, 519-94, and R = Dbyaṅs-can grub-paṭi rdo-rje, ed. Schubert, MSOS Jhg. 31, 1928, plus translations cited from Baco’s version of the SCP ślokas isolated from their commentary, in his Les ślokas grammaticaux . . . , pp. 76-79. See table 3.2.

3.3 From this second schema we are at once able to see (a) that the SCP employs three different terminological constructs in its presentation of Tibetan case, and (b) that the later commentators, as well as the Western translators following them, have consistently obscured this originally differentiated system, the former by misleading (or at the very least, unauthorized, because undocumented) paraphrases, the latter most frequently by simply lumping to-
3.2 Schema of the SCP on case

8.1-3: $\rightarrow (s)ju$
4-5: $\rightarrow (r)ju$
6-7: $\rightarrow (d)ju$
8: $\rightarrow na, -la$
9: las dañ ched dañ rten gnas dañ
10: de ñid tshe skabs LA SGRA yin

9.1-2: \{ → -k(y)/gi \} VI gen.
10.1-4.5½: \} → -k(y)/gi \} VI gen.
.5½: . . . ḥbelum ḥañ sa

11.1: *s*$\rightarrow$k(y)/gi$ \} III, instr.
.2: byed pa po ru šeses par bya

12.1: \(-i + n → k(y)/g/añ\)
.2: tshig rgyan gñis dañ sdud par ḥgyur

13.1-3: la sgra - u + te → ste
.4: de ni lhag dañ bcas paho

14.1-2½: -Ca + m → Cam
.2½: ḥbyed sdud yin

15.1-3½: na, la + s → nas, las \} V, abl.
.3½: ḥbyuñ kuñöüs sa yin te

16.1: dgar dañ sdud pahan de bžin no

17.: gañ miñ brjod pañi dañ po ru kye shyar ba ni bod pa yin

18.1-2: $n + i → ni$
.3: dgar dañ bsnam pañi TSHIG tu ḥgyur

II acc.
IV dat.
VII loc. place
time

S: *id. B: . . . Sont les particules de
l'accusatif, du datif, du locatif, Du
déterminatif et du locatif du temps.
S: . . gyi sgra yin pas rnam dbye drug . . .
Z: . . . ḥrel bañi sgra
R: . . . rnam dbye drug pa ḥrel sgra
B: . . . En leur ajoutant i, on exprime
la relation.
S: . . . byed pa poñi sgra bṣad pa . . .
~ . . . sa . . .
R: . . . rnam dbye gsum pa byed sgra . . .
B: (En ajoutant le dixième suffix à ces
particules,) On saura que l'on exprime l'agent.
S: . . . Ø. B: . . . On a les deux
particules ornementales et l'augmentatif.

S: . . . lhag ma dañ bcas pañi sgra.
B: . . . On obtient la particule continutive.
S: . . . sdud pañi sgrañ hjug pa yin no.
B: . . . On a la particule alternative.
S: . . . kyi sa yin. B: . . . On a les
de provenance, Pour comparer et pour inclure.

S: . . . bod pañi sgra. B: La
particule kye est vocative.
S: . . . ni sgra. B: . . . Devient
particule d'opposition et d'intensité.
gether all the terminological refinements of the original under the all-purpose rendering ‘particle(s)’. Just as we now take seriously the terminological variations in Pāṇini (cf. §1.3.3 supra), so also must we be prepared to take seriously the analytic-descriptive categories of the SCP presentation of case, in the form in which these specific categories are exemplified in the lexical differentiation of its original terminology.

3.3.1 As in so many other aspects, śl. 8 again shows its older historical status qua text in its employment of the term sgra = śabda in order to designate the four Tibetan case relations, equivalent to three Indic cases, and the five Tibetan case-suffixes, that this śloka teaches. The Situ commentary does not tamper with this terminology, and (probably as a result) Baco’s translation is unexceptionable.

3.3.2 But the same can hardly be said of śl. 10 and śl. 15. These passages preserve another, and a different, and also almost surely an ancient, Tibetan grammatical term sa, which appears to have fallen out of use almost immediately after the period of composition of the SCP. As a consequence this term sa soon baffled the commentators, who universally resort to unauthorized and unsubstantiated paraphrase in order to explain it. The Za ma tog’s substitution of sgra for this difficult term in śl. 10 is early testimony to the difficulty of the problems that the scholastics encountered with this word; S and R pass on the same bold paraphrase in their turns. At śl. 15 the Situ commentary appears to keep the original form, without gloss or explanation, but it is significant that the var. lects. noted in the critical edition by Inaba of the Dharmabhadra epitome to this passage in effect reduce the reading to zero. We must also note in passing that S and R generally introduce the Indic case-numbers, e.g. rnam dbye drug, etc., even though these play no part in the SCP case presentation as such, and are also surely anachronistic, since they reflect the late commentators’ secondary acquaintance with the Indic grammatical tradition; this system of case-numbers is also a representative example of an entirely extrinsic set of rule ordering externally imposed upon the text, and hence essentially irrelevant to its explication.

It is not particularly difficult to understand why the commentators have thus obviously had to struggle with this term sa, or why it so quickly dropped from their purview—this thanks in large measure to their efforts—within the Tibetan grammarians’ tradition. Overriding all other difficulties was that of its meaning. Tib. sa generally translates Buddhist Skt. bhumi ‘step, degree, stage’ (Edgerton, BHS Dict., pp. 410b-411a), or sthāna ‘point, matter, subject’ (ibid., p. 610a); but neither of these words appears to be attested as a grammatical term with reference to case forms or case relationships anywhere in the Indic tradition (while at the same time the phonetic sense of sthāna as ‘position of articulation’ is also surely irrelevant to the SCP’s employment of sa).
Among the translators, only Inaba has attempted to grapple with this *sa*, rendering it regularly with Japanese *arikata* ‘the way (it, something) is, ought, or should be’ (Inaba p. 335 to ōl. 10, and p. 342 to ōl. 15). As a translation, this rendering is by no means clear, nor does Inaba ever share with us his reasons for settling upon it; and *arikata* does not actually appear to have anything in common with the sense of *sa*. Nevertheless, his rendering does at least have the virtue of consistency, as well as signalling that the Tibetan original here employs a distinctive if difficult term. Perhaps Inaba’s fairly obscure rendering of *sa* in these *SCP* passages is to be viewed in the light of his elsewhere (§ 11, p. 25 ff.) translating *gnas*, which he takes to be equivalent to *sthāna*, also with Japanese *arikata*, notably in the title of a still virtually unstudied grammatical treatise apparently dating from the second half of the eighth century, where the eight case relationships are called *gnas brgyad*. Bacot totally avoids the issue, and *sa* has no overt reading or equivalent in his version of either ōl. 9-10 or ōl. 15. Accordingly, it is small wonder that *sa* as a term finds no place in Bacot’s *Index des termes grammaticaux*, where it should (but does not) appear at p. 91; nor is it to be found in Inaba’s *Chibetto-go sakün*, p. 9 (ff. p. 4 of his edition of Dharmaśrī’s epitome), even though he regularly translates it as *arikata*; similarly it is missing from Schubert, *Anhang. Verzeichnis der tibetischen grammatischen Fachausdrücke* (*Gleichzeitig grammatishes Sachregister*), pp. 52b-53a, *MSOS* Bd. XXXII.

But fortunately, we are able to make considerable headway in explaining this largely neglected and otherwise fairly obscure *sa* by means of reference to the Pāṇinian terminology, which proves directly to clarify ōl. 15 and at the same time, if only by indirect implication, also to throw light on ōl. 10. For its description of the syntactic-semantic relationship of the ablative case-suffixes, *SCP* ōl. 15 uses the expression *hbyun khuṅs* *sa* ‘an original, or source-place (*khuṅs*-sa) out of which something emerges, is taken, or is withdrawn (*hbyun*-ba),’ cf. *hbyun-khuṅs* = chu-mig ‘a well, spring’ and *hbyun-khuṅs-kyi khams* ‘a mineral’, Jäscke, *Dict.*, p. 398a, with the last entry cited from Csoma! Given the context of the passage in which it is found, this *hbyun khuṅs* *sa* may hardly be understood as other than a Tibetan calque upon the Pāṇinian description of the relationships of the ablative case forms of Sanskrit that employs *apādāna* ‘taking away, removal, ablation’, so that *apādāna* is the technical term ‘chez P de la rection casuelle (kāraśa) représentée par un point fixe (dhruva) duquel on s’écarte (apāya)’ (Renou, *Terminologie grammaticale du sanskrit*, p.48, with more on *dhruva* at p.169). (Unfortunately the Sakaki index to the *Mhvyt.* appears to have a misprint at p. 12 for its entry *apādāna*).

This equivalence has in part already been noticed in general terms (e.g. Inaba, p. 15, where the term *hbyun-khuṅ* of *SCP* ōl. 15 is aligned with *apādāna* from Pāṇ. 1, 4,24 and 2,3,28 together also with *Kātantra* 2,4,19);
what has not been accounted for until now (and what is missing from Inaba’s
table, loc. cit.) is the role of the SCP’s sa in rendering Pāñinian dhruva; ‘the
fixed point (from which the ‘departure’ of the ablative takes place)’ (Monier-
Williams, Dict., p. 521c). Especially when we understand that dhruva is
‘fixed, firm, constant, immovable (e.g. the earth)’ (ibid., p. 521b), we are
able to understand both how and why it has found itself rendered in the SCP
by Tibetan sa. (On dhruva see also Chakravarti 1930.270-74; ‘the word . . .
does not necessarily mean an absolutely motionless thing, but generally what
remains more or less unaffected in the course of separation’.) Mhvyt. 7285
has dhruva = bstan-pa ‘firm, steadfast’, but without any hint of the term’s lin-
guistic applications; nor do any of its translations for sa point in that direction.
Nevertheless, in view of the extraordinary correspondence in all items of
detail between hbyun khus sa on the one hand and the Pāñinian description
of the ablative relationship in terms of apādāna and dhruva on the other, there
can remain little question of the correctness of the confrontation here pro-
posed: SCP hbyun khus = apādāna, and SCP sa = dhruva. This proposal is
additionally substantiated by a significant passage in the commentary of Blo-
bzang tshul-khrims (1845-1915), ed. Bējing 1957 (SGTT, p. 40); his
paraphrase of SCP sl. 15 as hbyun ba hi gnas sam khus gogs sa (p. 79) indi-
cates that he too recognized the Pāñinian apādāna and dhruva in the Tibetan
expression at issue.

In turn, it also appears fairly safe to speculate that it was from this origi-
nally quite literal rendering of Pāñinian dhruva that, later in time but earlier in
the received text of the SCP, the term sa found its way into the description
of the genitive in sl. 10.11 By means of this terminological employment, our
received text of the SCP now in effect hints at one of the special features of rule
order in Indic grammars as understood and explained by the post-Pāñinians:
when two rules conflict, that one takes precedence that is stated later in the
grammar (Cardona 1970). Here the issue is less one of rule-conflict than of
rule-intelligibility; and the principle may itself be rephrased to require that
when two obscure statements follow in sequence, that one is to be used as the
basis for exegesis that comes later in the grammar. For a full understanding
of SCP sl. 9-10, it is necessary to let the language of the later sl. 15 take prece-
dence over the otherwise obscure language of the earlier passages. This rule
order feature serves to integrate sl. 9-10 closely with sl. 15, and this in turn
additionally benefits the user of the grammar since it thus emphasizes the es-
tentially interpolative character of sls. 12, 13, and 14, which interrupt the
SCP’s presentation of case for the reasons already clarified supra.

In effect, then, we find only one overt term for case forms in the SCP, in
the oldest textual stratum as reflected in sl. 8 which has sgra = šabda. Another
surely ancient (but clearly subsequent) stratum, seen in sl. 9-10 and sl. 15, has
sa, but this is not a term for specific case forms, but rather an equivalent for
*dhruva*, as employed in Pāṇinian descriptions of specific case relationships. The later Tibetan scholastic tradition conflated these two, losing sight of *sa* in the process, and also obscuring the original differentiation that obtains between these two in the *SCP* itself; the Western translators have incorporated this conflation, further obscuring the issue in the process. All this is particularly unfortunate because it has had the net effect of concealing one of the most characteristically Indic features of the linguistic analysis and description of the *SCP*, i.e. its fairly meticulous differentiation between specific semantic characterizations associated with individual case-form usages, and the so-called *kāraka* categories, a topic of wide implications for the understanding of both these two early Tibetan grammatical treatises, and one to which we are now in a position to turn our attention.\(^{12}\)

3.3.3 No topic in their systems and theories is more involved, nor has any been more subtly elaborated by the Indic grammarians, than that of the *kārakas*; none also has been the subject of as much misunderstanding and controversy—much of both continuing even today—on the part of modern, and especially Western, students of these texts. Under the circumstances, we can here hardly aim to do more than touch upon the broadest outlines of the topic, hoping (even if perhaps in vain) that in the process we will at least demonstrate the overall relevance of the *kārakas* and their rules to a satisfactory reading of this particular portion of the *SCP*, and in particular for the recognition of the special role that *kāraka* formularizations play in this portion of our text.

The most useful general introduction to the topic and its bibliography is to be found in Cardona 1976 (III.1.5.sc.1, pp. 215-22), which contains, *inter alia*, the following key descriptions and definitions: "[in Pāṇini’s grammar] some affixes are introduced on condition that *kārakas* are to be denoted . . . . The notion of *kāraka* is basic to Pāṇini’s derivational system. *A kāraka is a thing viewed in relation to an action, in the accomplishment of which it plays a given role’ (215). Further, ‘there has been considerable discussion regarding the precise status of these *kāraka* categories. In 1893, Whitney . . . reacting to Liebich’s dissertation (1886-87) in a typically acerbic manner, nevertheless made an important comment. Though Whitney could not fathom why Pāṇini proceeded as he did, still he noted appositely that the *kāraka* categories ‘are not an independent product of his [Pāṇini’s] logical faculty, but simply a reflection of case forms’ . . . .’ (216-7). This last is a reference to Whitney 1893.166 (in the reprint in *RSG*, pp. 166-84), and in particular to the following opinionated passage: ‘Pāṇini does not take up the cases as forms of nouns, setting forth the various uses of each, after our manner; he adopts the vastly more difficult and dangerous method of establishing a theoretical list of modes of verb-modification by case, or of ideal case-relations (he calls them *kāraka*, ‘factor’ or ‘adjunct’), to which he then distributes the cases . . . Any-
thing more crude or unphilosophical than this could not well be imagined.’’ Cardona argues convincingly that those who would advance the view that ‘‘the position held by some modern theorists, that grammatical relations are universal, is Pāṇini’s position too’’, are actually misrepresenting the notion of the kāraka: instead, ‘‘Pāṇini set up his kāraka categories in order to set up conditions under which affixes—both post-verbal and post-nominal—would be introduced, so that, far from having nothing to do with syntax or the derivation of correct Sanskrit utterances derived by Pāṇinian rules, the kāraka rules are intimately related to Pāṇini’s syntactic rules’’ (Cardona 1976.218).

Even in 1893, the same year as Whitney’s remarks, and in a reply to the same, Böhtlingk had put the same point quite neatly: ‘‘Kāraka ist nicht jede <case-relation>, sondern nur die Beziehung eines Nomens zu einem Verbum . . . ’’ (1893.186 in the reprint in RSG, pp. 185-92), adding as a dramatic aside, ‘‘Mit dieser kāraka-Theorie, die schwierig und gefährlich genannt wird, ist Wh. nicht einverstanden. Die Schwierigkeit und Gefährlichkeit derselben hat aber den kühnen, originellen und genialen P. nicht abgeschreckt’’ (loc.cit.). In a word, ‘‘Pāṇini’s kāraka . . . categorization serves as an intermediary between semantics and grammatical expressions derived by rules of the grammar’’ (Cardona 1976.220).

All this holds quite as valid for Tibetan, as we find the language treated in the first grammatical treatise, as it does for Sanskrit as reflected within the system of Pāṇini. Just as in Pāṇini, so also in the SCP (and as we hope to show later elsewhere, in the RKHP as well), we have to reckon with the fact that the theme of one of the ‘‘several main parts’’ of the grammar is ‘‘the syntactic rules which serve to derive verbal and nominal forms through affixation conditioned in part by the expression of defined syntactico-semantic categories’’ (Cardona 1969.3). But in order usefully to explore the full implications of these syntactico-semantic categories for a reading of the SCP, we must first concern ourselves with the way in which the later scholastic tradition that has grown up about this text has all too frequently obscured an important third terminological category that the SCP employs, along with sgra and sa, in its presentation of case. This third category is the zero (‘Ø’) that the text utilizes in lieu of either sgra or sa, hence the Ø of sls. 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Like the overall concept of the mathematical zero itself, the employment of zero elements in linguistic analysis and description is of course to be recognized as a hallmark of the Indic intellectual tradition; that the employment of the zero in the SCP presentation of case is involved and subtle is, accordingly, less surprising than the way in which the original employment of this well-known descriptive device in the text has generally been overlooked by the later tradition. Indeed, in their treatments of the ślokas cited, the commentators have generally been even more misleading than in the cases where they have, e.g., paraphrased sa by sgra, etc., since in supplying overt terms (e.g.,
the Situ commentary, using both sgra and sa for śl. 11, R using sgra for id., etc.) they are not merely paraphrasing something found in the original, they are instead actually mutilating the text as they (and we) have it, since in effect they replace nothing (Ø) with something (sa or sgra).

Bacot’s translation is admirable at śl. 11, where his impersonal “On saura que l’on exprime l’agent” deftly renders, at least by implication, the Ø of the original. But unfortunately Bacot immediately thereafter totally abandoned this careful (and correct) approach to his text, and from śl. 12 through śl. 14 he regularly renders all the Øs of the SCP by interpolating “la particule, les particules”, even though nothing overt corresponding to these renderings is to be found in the text. Inaba is rather more meticulous on this point. His Japanese translation of śl. 11 (Inaba p.336) is less literal than Bacot’s, but it has the virtue (along with his śl. 13 (p.339) and his śl. 14 (p.341)) of avoiding the unauthorized interpolation of words meaning ‘particle’ or of any other overt, and here extraneous, grammatical terms. Inaba’s translations of the ślokas are sometimes heavy with questionable bracketed additions, but at least they avoid overt mutilation of the original on the present score. Even at śl. 12, where Inaba unfortunately falls victim to reproducing Bacot’s reading more or less intact, he manages to avoid the “les [deux] particules” of the French version that he is placing under contribution (Inaba, p. 337).

What is actually at issue in the four Øs of SCP śls. 11-14, and as a consequence what has also until now been obscured by the Tibetan tradition and the Western and Japanese translators alike, is that single refinement of grammatical analysis and description that is of cardinal importance for a reading, much less for a translation, of the SCP. This same refinement being a commonplace of all the Indic grammars, it is hardly unexpected to find it in the first Tibetan grammatical treatise; in a word, we have here to reckon with the general categories of the kārakas and the kāraka rules. In essence, it is for the kārakas, as opposed to and contrasted with the nominal case-suffix forms proper, that the SCP here employs its Øs.

3.3.4 In the examples that they cull in order to gloss śl. 11, the later commentaries make it clear that they have always understood the fashion in which the kāraka relationship of karāna ‘instrumental’ taught in this passage applies equally to the two well-known WT constructions with -k(g)y/is that are quite obviously different both semantically and syntactically, i.e. those in which a noun with this case suffix appears as agent (in the sense of ‘instrument’) of an intransitive verb, and those in which a noun with the same case suffix appears as the (so-called ‘logical’) subject of a transitive verb, where however it is still always in a sense also instrumental (thus, Dharmapala, in Inaba, text p. 20, translation p. 336).13 The intricate intersections that obtain between the originally Indic, Pāṇinian-based teachings of the instrumental kāraka relationships on the one hand and those evolved by the Tibetan grammarians on the other,
in order to make it possible for them to accommodate the WT constructions with -k(g)/yis, are too extensive to be treated here: they are exemplified in the similarities, but also in the differences, between e.g. paraśur vrksāṁ chinatti (Cardona 1976.219) on the one hand and gris geod-pa (Jäschke, Dict., p. 76b) on the other; and inter alia they will eventually provide materials for the future investigation of yet another enormous area of linguistic analysis and description where the Tibetan masters brought to bear upon their borrowed Indic intellectual heritage the full force of their frequently surprising powers of invention and innovation. To paraphrase Böhtlingk, for all its difficulties and dangers, the kāraṇa theory terrified the intrepid, original and brilliant author(s) of the SCP no more than it had Pāṇini and his school: both were willing to undertake the risks to which Whitney alluded in order to explore the complexities of this system, because of the compendious fashion in which this same scheme ultimately facilitated and refined their linguistic analysis and description. Under the circumstances, surely we today can at least dare to be equally brave.

3.3.5 The rationale for the textual, resp. structural interpolation of śl. 12, which teaches the forms and meanings of kyañ, hañ, yañ, so that it immediately follows śl. 11, is easily understood in terms of descriptive economy: by this particular ordering of the rules of its grammar, the SCP is able to discharge its duties with respect to the forms in question without the necessity for otherwise and in some other place recapitulating the morphophonemic statements required to account for their initial alternation. This then explains why the account of kyañ etc. intrudes into the text’s presentation of the case suffixes and of their grammar at this particular point in the treatise; but exactly what it is that the SCP has to say about the syntactic meaning of these particular forms, once they have been taught, is somewhat less easy to comprehend.

The difficulties of this sloka have given rise to a considerable amount of largely irresponsible exegesis in the Tibetan schools, most of it no more than sheer speculation; see the careful and useful accounts of the views of the various commentators in Inaba, pp. 215-9, §148.2. What is most significant in all this is that, e.g., the Mahāpañeta of Situ and his epitomist (in Inaba, p. 21), uncharacteristically do not interpolate any extraneous grammatical terms into their paraphrases of the SCP at this point, for once remaining faithful—if only after their fashion—to the Ø of the original’s tshig rgyan gnis dañ sdud par hgyur.

Unfortunately, the translators, Inaba included, have not been equally fastidious. Inaba here writes joji (‘particle, suffix’, p. 337), uncritically following Bacot, who had earlier rendered this with ‘On a les deux particules ornementales et l’augmentatif’ (p.77). With the usual advantages of hindsight, we now can see that much damage has been done by an otherwise innocent note by Bacot, who wrote, “tshig rgyan ornement du discours, est à peu
près synonyme de *tshig phrad* morphème’” (p. 27, note 1). This is yet another
equally unwarranted assumption of specious synonymity which so fre-
quent, as here, plays havoc with the precise terminological distinctions
of the original text; and indeed, Inaba (p. 216) cites this same passage by Bacot
as his source and sole authority.

Together with this problem of specious synonymity, the reading and inter-
pretation of this śloka also confront us with two other questions earlier alluded
to (§1.3.2), both involved with the reasons why the highly elaborated views
of the later Tibetan scholastic authorities are difficult to entertain intact, for all
their evidence of wide reading and retentive memories, for the simple reason
that their opinions fly in the face not only of the grammar but also of the at-
tested lexical meanings of the forms as they appear in the text concerned. In-
deed, the problems of śl. 12 are so numerous as to merit compendious treat-
ment elsewhere; for the time being we can here do no more than point out the
gist of the problem.

In its syntax, the general reading of the schools, reflected also in the avail-
able translations, is unlikely in the extreme, particularly in its treatment of both
gniś and danē. Just as there is no word in the original that would correspond to,
or account for, the translators’ ‘particules’. resp. joji, so also the gniś in this
śloka can hardly, from its location within the syntactic structure of the origi-
nal, have been intended (as all the commentators would have it) to qualify
tshig-rgyan (with the ‘-’ sic) ‘and’ sdu-par.

On the lexical level, we here confront one of the most difficult of the Ti-
betan grammatical terms, *tshig*. Bacot’s note (cited above), with tshig rgyan
as ‘ornement du discours’, surely pointed in the correct direction; but unfortu-
nately, after this good beginning, he then immediately departed from that ap-
proach and unwarrantedly assumed synonymity with tshig-phrad. On tshig,
an important beginning has now been made in Simonsson 1982a.537, where
he discusses ‘whether it corresponds to the pada of the Buddhist philosophical
speculation or to the verb-centered vākya . . . of the Paninian tradition.’

Here Simonsson is returning to an earlier concern, first expressed in his ITS,
p. 242 (cited SGT, p. 14, note 87), relating to the overall problem of the pre-
cise meaning of tshig, along with a number of other basic but still most im-
perfectly understood Tibetan grammatical terms.

At any rate, and despite the Herculean efforts of the schools, the text of śl.
12 remains a laconic enigma. But as we pointed out two decades ago (now in
SGIT, pp. 15-16), it is an enigma that is rendered at least somewhat less enig-
matic when we compare the received text of this śloka in the SCP with §20 of
the Sgra-sbyor bam-po gniś-pa, ITS p. 255. This comparison (full details of
which are available in the works cited) does not solve all the problems of this
text; but at least it makes it clear that the SCP passage is best, indeed, solely,
to be understood as a highly condensed paraphrase of the content of the Sgra-
sbyor bam-po gñis-pa passage, “or of some other third and presently unknown text affiliated with the SSBP passage or closely resembling it, and that as might have been expected, what the text gained in elegance and conciseness in the course of being restated it lost in clarity” (SGTT, p. 16). The comparison also demonstrates the sense in which the tshig rgyan gñis (sic! and not tshig-rgyan, gñis . . . , as the commentators would have it) is to be taken: the ‘two’ elements or entities being described are, in Simonsson’s terms, tshig (gi phrad) ‘the particles of discourse’, and rgyan (lta bu) ‘the so-called ornamentals’, i.e. the syntactic or lexical situations in which it is necessary to understand (or, for the SSBP, to translate) a combination of two or more morphemes literally but also with full attention to the semantic role of each of the constituent elements, as against those other situations where this is unnecessary: “man begnügt sich damit, den Sinn des Kernwortes wiederzugeben” (ITS, p. 256). In other words, as we might well have guessed, the SCP after all is a text; and as such, it has its own history, qua text.

4. “The interpretation of Pāṇini is possible only with the help of commentaries, which does not mean that one should not make special efforts, as difficult as that may be, to get away at times from those commentaries” (Renou 1969.486, §9). Similarly, the interpretation of the SCP is possible only with the help of the later commentaries; but nevertheless—and as we have hoped to demonstrate in the present contribution—this hardly entitles us to overlook the language, grammar, and structure of our text if or when doing so becomes the price of following the later commentators.

Not the least of the many exciting future prospects for these studies now opened up for us by Simonsson are his suggestion that “the Tibetan theory of grammar is founded on two sources, the Pāṇinian vyākaraṇa and the speculations on language as they are to be found in the buddhistic texts on dogmatics (e.g. Abhidharmakośa by Vasubandhu)”, as well as his hint that “[t]his duality proves to be the reason for certain difficulties in the Tibetan arsenal of grammatical concepts” (1982b.287). The entire question of the precise nature and exact dimensions of the innovations that were surely wrought upon the massive structure of Indic grammatical science and linguistic speculation in the course of its transmission within the Buddhist schools is one that today is anything but well understood. Renou claimed to be able to detect but few genuine ‘innovations’ in the grammar of Candragomin (1936, §3); nevertheless, even this long-standing, well-known study hardly rules Simonsson’s far-reaching speculations on this topic out of question, it simply shows us once more how much still remains to be done along the lines of assessing the ultimate impact of Buddhist thought upon Indic grammatical science: this also (to borrow Renou’s own words) “does not mean that one should not make special efforts, as difficult as that may be . . . .”
In the course of such an assessment, an account (still largely to be written) of the linguistic description and grammatical techniques of the SCP and RKHP must necessarily play a major role; and before the more narrowly Buddhist aspects of this question can adequately be grasped, we must first of all place our control of the larger Indic facets of these texts on a more stable philological ground than that upon which it has until now reposed: hence our present concern with text structure and rule ordering in the SCP, the two being without question the most essentially Indic aspects of this or any other grammatical treatise.

We have already had occasion to cite Whitney 1893 supra, but there within a context that might well leave the impression that the master Indologist of New Haven had nothing of value on these questions to teach us today: that would be both unfair and misleading. Even given all his difficulty in grasping the essential spirit of Indic grammatical science, Whitney was nevertheless able to write in conclusion, "I am fully persuaded that anyone who should master the Hindu grammatical science without losing his head, who should become thoroughly familiar with Pāṇini and escape being Pāṇini-bitten, would be able to make exposures of the weaknesses and shortcomings and needless obscurities of the grammar on a scale hitherto unknown" (Whitney 1893, cited RSG, p.184). Mutatis mutandis, this may even serve as an epitome of our present goal, and of the aim of this paper: we are fully persuaded that anyone who should master the Tibetan grammarians and their science without losing his head, who should become thoroughly familiar with these texts and escape being bitten by the later commentators, will be able to make exposures of the strengths and merits and many still only partially comprehended subtleties of their grammars, on a scale hitherto unknown.

NOTES

1. Alexander Csoma de Körös, Enumeration of historical and grammatical works to be met with in Tibet, Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, 7 (1838), Part II, pp. 147-152.

2. Other abbreviations for frequently cited works:
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