# PETER VERHAGEN

# Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics (1) Issues of Interpretation and Translation in the Minor Works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas (1699?-1774)*

**1.** *The historical figure Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas.*

The religious erudite whose work will be the focus of this paper, was a man of many talents. Usually known as Si-tu Paṇ-chen, the 'Great Scholar [*paṇḍita*] [of the] Si-tu [lineage]', he was one of the key figures in the cultural life of Tibet in the eighteenth century. Let me begin with a few remarks on the life and times of this remarkable personage.[1]

He was born towards the end of 1699 or early 1700 (depending on which calendar we follow) in the area of the town of Sde-dge in the Eastern Tibetan province of Khams, his mother, Gaṅ-bzaṅ Khra-'gu-ma, hailing from the family of A-gro Tā-dben Gu-śri. In his early youth he was recognized as the eighth, or according to a different calculation, the twelfth reincarnation in the Ta'i Si-tu lineage of (then) Lho Karma-dgon within the Karma-pa Bka'-brgyud-pa tradition, and duly installed by the eighth 'Red Hat' Karma-pa hierarch Dpal-chen Chos-kyi-don-'grub (1695-1732). He received the ordination names Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas Phrin-las-kun-khyab Ye-śes-dpal-bzaṅ-po in 1707, and Karma Bstan-pa'i-ñin-byed Gtsug-lag-chos-kyi-snaṅ-ba when taking his *upāsaka* vows in 1708.[2]

1. This biographical notice is primarily based on Smith's introduction ad CHANDRA (ed.) 1968 and on KHETSUN SANGPO 1973-1980, 7: 589-617.

2. He continued using both names, or, in most cases, detachable parts of both names, throughout his life. Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas may very well be the most

After his studies in Central Tibet (1712-1715) and Khams (1715-1721) his "star" rose quickly. He quickly acquired great fame as a religious scholar and spiritual authority. He also stood on the best of terms with important secular leaders of the time, most notably with Bstan-pa-tshe-riṅ, the king of Sde-dge (1678-1738), who founded Dpal-spuṅs monastery as a new seat for the Si-tu lineage, but also with rulers from Central Tibet such as Pho-lha-nas and Mdo-mkhar źabs-druṅ Tshe-riṅ-dbaṅ-rgyal (1697-1763), by whom he was received in Lha-sa in 1738.

Of great significance was also his association with Kaḥ-thog Tshe-dba-nor-bu (1698-1755),[3] a Rñiṅ-ma-pa spiritual master and scholar with close ties with the Bka'-brgyud-pa as well, who since their meeting in 1720 became a close friend and influential associate of Si-tu until Kaḥ-thog's demise in 1755. Most notable perhaps was Kaḥ-thog's role in Si-tu's conversion to the *gźan-stoṅ* doctrine of the Jo-naṅ-pas.

In addition to his importance as a religious and political[4] figure, he was a man associated with great intellectual and artistic achievements. Perhaps his traditional fame in Tibet lies mainly in his work as a grammarian and linguist. His most important single work as a scholar probably is his extensive commentary on the two seminal treatises of Tibetan grammar, *Sum cu pa* and *Rtags kyi 'jug pa*, which constitutes a landmark in the history of Tibetan indigenous linguistics, and which, parenthetically, was written at the behest of Mdo-mkhar źabs-dru in 1744.[5] Perhaps more broadly significant was his involvement in editorial projects at the printing house of Derge, paramount of which was his supervision of the editing of *Bka' 'gyur*, between 1731 and 1733, which by modern scholarship is considered as the generally most reliable and accurate of the canonical blockprint editions.

---

frequent form of his name; Bstan-pa'i-ñin-byed and (Gtsug-lag-) Chos-kyi-snaṅ-ba are used quite frequently as well.

3. Cf. e.g. RICHARDSON 1967: 7-8.

4. Note for instance his possible role as an ambassador from the Tibetan government during his second journey to Nepal in 1748, cf. Smith introd. CHANDRA 1968: 11.

5. *Yul gaṅs can pa'i brda yaṅ dag par sbyor ba'i bstan bcos kyi bye brag sum cu pa daṅ rtags kyi 'jug pa'i gźuṅ gi rnam par bśad pa mkhas pa'i mgul rgyan mu tig phreṅ mdzes*, coll. works vol. 6 title no. 4, 85 ff., facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-6: 447-617.

His prime scholarly interest evidently lay in linguistics, covering several fields such as grammar, prosody, poetics and lexicography.[6] However, he also developed considerable expertise in other fields of secular learning. He was famous for his medical skills even in the highest circles in Khams. I should also mention his unique position in the field of the visual arts, particularly painting, where he not only functioned as a tremendously important patron, but was also an artist of brilliant genius himself.[7]

## 2. Collected works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen.

The xylograph edition of the collected works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen was produced in Sde-dge, in his home monastery Dpal-spuṅs, some years after the master's demise.[8] The *Bka'-'bum*, consisting of fourteen volumes, have become accessible to the academic world in a facsimile reprint, published by Sherab Gyaltsen in 1990.

The great diversity in talents and interests of Si-tu Paṇ-chen is clearly reflected in his collected writings. All in all, linguistics and historiography are the predominant genres, occupying more than six[9] and three[10] volumes respectively. But, in addition to that, his collected works offer an impressive and occasionally surprising array of genres and topics. In view of Si-tu's affiliation with the Karma-pa Bka'-brgyud tradition, it stands to reason that we find a considerable number of his works dealing with the lore of Tantric Buddhism, in the form of liturgical and medita-

6. Cf. RUEGG 1995: 119-124, 126, 128-130, 135, 147, HSGLT 1: 174, 176, 192-193, 199, 201, 215-216, HSGLT 2: 107-136, 161-180, 204-207, 212.

7. Cf. the chapter on Si-tu Paṇ-chen in the outstanding study on the history of Tibetan painting, JACKSON 1996: 259-287.

8. Cf. Smith introd. ad CHANDRA (ed.) 1968: 10.

9. The volumes 1-6 are completely devoted to linguistical materials, and we find individual titles on this topic in vols. 7 (title nos. 11 and 12) and 10 (title nos. 7, 8, 10, 11); thirteen texts on Sanskrit grammar are described in HSGLT 2: 106-136, 161-180.

10. Volumes 11 and 12 being entirely devoted to a collection of biographies of major Karma-pa masters, and volume 14 containing the master's autobiography, edited posthumously by his disciple Ba'i-lo (or 'Be-lo) Tshe-dbaṅ-kun-khyab on the basis of Si-tu's diaries (also in facs. ed. CHANDRA 1968); further historiographical materials in vol. 8 (title no. 5), vol. 9 (certains sections of the *Bka' 'gyur dkar-chag*) and vol. 10 (title no. 1).

tional manuals,[11] commentaries,[12] hymns and prayers,[13] *mantra*-collec-
tions,[14] and such like.

Almost the entire ninth volume of his collected works is taken up by
the 'catalogue' (*dkar chag*) that Si-tu wrote for the Sde-dge xylograph
edition of *Bka' 'gyur*, the editing of which he himself had supervised in
the years 1731-1733.[15] This version of the *dkar chag*, in eight chapters,
filling 260 folios, is different from the one as contained in the Sde-dge
edition of the canon which consists of five chapters, occupying some
170 folios.[16] It is in fact the version which Si-tu had written initially,
but had been deemed too long by certain authorities involved in the
project, and had consequently been reduced to the five-chapter version
which was actually included in the canon.[17] Finally, a last major work
that should be mentioned here is Si-tu's commentary on the
*Abhidharma-kośa*.[18]

Among his minor works we also find materials of considerable interest
on a wide range of topics.[19] Among these I might mention collections of
answers to questions (*dris lan*),[20] works on astrology,[21] a translation of a
*Svayambhū-purāṇā*,[22] an inventory description of a reliquary *stūpa*,

11. Vol. 7 title no. 4, vol. 8 title nos. 3, 12, 13 and 16, vol. 10 title nos. 3, 12-14.

12. Vol. 7 title nos. 2 and 3, vol. 8 title nos. 1 and 2.

13. Vol. 7 title no. 10, vol. 8 title nos. 4, 9, 11, 17 and 18.

14. Vol. 7 title no. 9, and many minor works.

15. *Bde bar gśegs pa'i bka' gaṅs can gyi brdas draṅs pa'i phyi mo'i tshogs ji sñed
    pa par du bsgrubs pa'i tshul las ñe bar brtsams pa'i gtam bzaṅ po blo ldan mos
    pa'i kunda yoṅs su kha bye ba'i zla 'od gźon nu'i 'khri śiṅ źes bya ba*, vol. 9 f.
    1-260r5, facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-9: 1-523/524.

16. Cf. VOSTRIKOV 1970: 210-212.

17. Cf. EIMER 1985; for the mention of the earlier, longer version, cf. autobiography,
    f. 77r2-3, ed. CHANDRA 1968: 153, IMAEDA 1981: 229.

18. *Chos mṅon pa mdzod kyi tshig don rnam par 'grel pa brgya byin thog pa'i nor
    bu'i 'od snaṅ*, vol. 13, title no. 1, 341 ff., facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-13:
    1-683.

19. Especially in vols. 7 and 8 we find miscellaneous shorter works.

20. Vol. 8, title no. 6, 7 and 8.

21. Vol. 7 title no. 6, 7 and 8.

22. *Bal yul raṅ byuṅ mchod rten chen po'i lo rgyus*, 14 ff., facs. ed. SHERAB
    GYALTSEN 1990-7: 229-257; referred to in his autobiography, under the year
    1748, mentioning that he acquired a manuscript of a concise *Svayaṃbhū-purāṇa*
    by Samantabhadra in Nepal, and commenced a translation of it, (ed. CHANDRA

possibly that of Kaḥ-thog Tshe-dbaṅ-nor-bu (1698-1755)[23] and a description of Si-tu Paṇ-chen's *stūpa* by his pupil Ba'i-lo Tshe-dbaṅ-kun-khyab.[24]

## 3. *Hermeneutical issues.*

In the minor works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen we find that a number of what might be called "hermeneutical" topics, that is issues related to the interpretation of texts, come to the fore. In this paper I will limit myself to a few observations on two such issues, namely the use of etymologies (3.1) including also the type of hermeneutical etymologies (3.2) and the practice and principles of translating (3.3), and in that connection, of textual criticism (3.4).

## 3.1. Etymology.

In one of three compilations of answers to questions (*dris lan*) in his collected works, the one briefly entitled *Nor bu'i me loṅ*,[25] Si-tu Paṇ-chen addresses some etymological issues. In particular in his reply to the ninth question in the first section, he provides etymologies for a number of problematic terms.[26]

In this connection he distinguishes two types of words: on the one hand, what he calls "random words" ('*dod rgyal gyi sgra*), terms which are not grammatically analyzable, but which have an ultimately arbitrary form and are purely conventionally associated with a specific meaning.

---

1968: 267): *sa manta bha dras swa yaṃ bhu pu rā ṇa bsdus pa de khyer byuṅ / bod skad du bsgyur ba'i dbu tshugs*, cf. Smith introd. ed. CHANDRA 1968: 11.

23. *Dpal mchog reg pa med pa'i mchod rten gyi snaṅ brñan dge legs 'dod rgu'i char 'bebs kyi dkar chag utpa la'i phreṅ ba*, 7 ff., facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-13: 725-738.

24. *Byams mgon bstan pa'i ñin byed kyi chos sku'i mchod rten mthoṅ grol chen mo'i dkar chag rdzogs ldan gyi bskal bzaṅ 'dren pa'i 'khor lo rin po che*, 20 ff., facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-13: 685-724.

25. Full title *Rje btsun mchog gi sprul pa'i sku dgyes par byed pa'i dri lan nor bu'i me loṅ žes bya ba, Bka'-'bum* vol. 8, 31 ff.; N.B. correct the order of folios in facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-8: 377-384, 323-326, 389-394, 333-334, 397-436, 375/376; I have discussed other passages from the same text in Verhagen 1997.

26. *Op. cit.*, f. 3r3-4r2, *inter alia* dealing with the terms *rgya-gar, rgya-nag, Bhoṭa, Magadha* and *Oḍḍiyāna*.

The second type he terms "derivative word" (*rjes sgrub kyi sgra*),[27] or "conditioned word" [?] (*rgyu mtshan gyi sgra*), that is a term which through linguistic analysis can be shown to derive from other lexemes or grammatical elements.

This dichotomy is used – in various ramifications and often integrated into a more complex paradigm – in several other Indo-Tibetan linguistic sources, for instance in *Smra sgo*, the eleventh-century grammatical treatise by Smṛtijñānakīrti and its *vṛtti*,[28] and in works by Sa-skya Paṇḍita, namely his *Sgra la 'jug pa*,[29] a text which is for the most part based on *Smra sgo*,[30] and his scholastic manual *Mkhas pa rnams 'jug pa'i sgo*.[31]

It seems possible, to a certain extent, to connect the Tibetan term *'dod rgyal gyi sgra* with the Sanskrit *yad-ṛcchā-śabda* also referring to an arbitrary term for which no analysis or etymology can be provided. The term is found in the restricted sense of "proper name" in Indic linguistics,[32] but also in Buddhist contexts, for instance in Dignāga's *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti*. Dignāga introduces the notion in connection with the concept of *kalpanā* "conceptual construction", as one of five categories of words.[33]

---

27. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*: *'dod rgyal (-gyi sgra, -gyi miṅ)* = *ṅes tshig gi 'grel bśad daṅ rgyu mtshan gaṅ yaṅ brjod rgyu med par raṅ 'dod kho nas thog mar sbyar ba'i brda.*

28. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo*: *rjes grub* = *miṅ brda 'dogs tshul źig ste / dṅos po byuṅ ba'i rjes su 'dra 'brel gaṅ ruṅ gi rgyu mtshan la brten nas btags pa'i miṅ / dper na / khyi gu kha che sna ñag la seṅ ge źes btags pa lta bu 'dra ba rgyu mtshan du byas nas btags pa daṅ / ñi ma'i 'od zer la ñi ma źes btags pa lta bu 'brel ba rgyu mtshan du byas nas btags pa'o*, and *rjes grub kyi miṅ* (with synonym *rjes grub sgra*) = *ṅes tshig gam rgyu mtshan la brten nas btags pa'i miṅ.*

29. *Smra sgo mtshon cha*, ll. 177-198, and *vṛtti ad idem*; on these texts, cf. HSGLT 2: 37-57.

30. *Sa skya bka' 'bum, tha* f. 227r2-228r3; on this text, cf. HSGLT 2: 64-65.

31. *Sub* I.17, *Sa skya bka' 'bum, tha* 168r3-4 and *sub* II.10, *Sa skya bka' 'bum, tha* 194v5; on this text, cf. JACKSON 1987: 39-42, 191-248.

32. *Mahābhāṣya ad Pāṇini* 1.1.2, *catuṣṭayī śabdānāṃ pravṛttiḥ: jātiśabdā guṇaśabdā kriyāśabdā yadṛcchāśabdāś caturthāḥ*; cf. e.g. HATTORI 1968: 83-84, ABHYANKAR 1977: 313, BRONKHORST 1998: 249).

33. *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti ad kārikā* I3d: *yadṛcchāśabdeṣu hi nāmnā viśiṣṭo 'rtha ucyate ḍittheti* (HATTORI 1968: 83), "In the case of arbitrary words (*yadṛcchā-śabda*, proper nouns), a thing (*artha*) distinguished by a name (*nāman*) is expressed by a word [such as] "Ḍittha"." (HATTORI 1968: 25); the

The distinction of analyzable versus unanalyzable lexemes is applied in the first excerpt from Si-tu's *dris lan*:

> [The term] *Bhoṭa* is well-known and established in all of Āryadeśa as the name for Tibet. Nevertheless, as I do not know the verbal root [from which the form *Bhoṭa* is derived], I do not know in what meaning it occurs here. Similarly, one cannot discern whether it is a "random" [= unanalyzable] [word] or a "derivative" [word].
>
> In general it appears to be what is known as a "random" [word], and [the Tibetan word] *bod*, in its turn, appears to be a corruption of that [Sanskrit term *Bhoṭa*].[34]

We see here that Si-tu Paṇ-chen is at a loss to find an etymology for *Bhoṭa*, the Sanskrit word for Tibet. Not being able to trace a Sanskrit verbal root for the term, he – provisionally – assigns it to the category of "random" or unanalyzable lexemes. Another interesting aspect of his treatment of this term, is his conception of the Tibetan name of Tibet, *bod*, as a corruption of Sanskrit *Bhoṭa*, in other words apparently as a loanword from Sanskrit. He apparently does not take into consideration the possibility of the reverse derivation being the case, namely that the Sanskrit term is based on the Tibetan.

## 3.2. Hermeneutical etymology.

In a recent publication Prof. RUEGG formulated an apt description of a type of etymology that is frequently found in Buddhist textual interpretation and that could properly be termed "hermeneutical etymologies." He defines this type of etymologies, which he also dubs *nirukta*-type etymologies, as follows:

> non-historical - i.e. "synchronic" as opposed to historical-linguistic or diachronic – quasi etymological explanations which, although not founded on the linguist's

---

other four categories: (2) *jāti-śabda* "genus-words" "common nouns", example *go* 'cow', (3) *guṇa-śabda* "quality-words", "adjectives", ex. *śukla* 'white', (4) *kriyā-śabda* "action-words", "verbal nouns", ex. *pācaka* 'cook[ing]' and (5) *dravya-śabda* "substance-words", ex. *daṇḍin* 'staff-bearer' (HATTORI 1968: 25, 83). The two canonical translations of *Pramāṇa-samuccaya-vṛtti* (Peking no. 5700 & 5702) have *'dod rgyal ba'i sgra* for *yad-ṛcchā-śabda*, cf. HATTORI 1968: 176, 14a4 & 177, 94b4; I owe this reference to a personal communication of Prof. Jackson, Hamburg, December 1996.

34. *Dris lan Nor bu'i me loṅ*, excerpt question no. 9, f. 3v5-6: / *bod kyi skad dod du* / *bho ṭa źes pa 'phags yul thams cad du yoṅs su grags śiṅ grub pa yin na'aṅ skad kyi byiṅs ma 'tshal bas don gaṅ du 'gyur ma śes śiṅ* / *de bźin du 'dod rgyal daṅ rjes sgrub kyi miṅ gaṅ yin yaṅ ma phyed mod* / *phal cher 'dod rgyal du grags pa yin 'dra ste* / *bod ces pa'aṅ de zur chag par snaṅ ba'i phyir ro* /

strict morphological-historical derivation, are meant to convey a value (or, indeed, the true but perhaps hidden sense) of the word being explained.[35]

This type of etymology[36] does indeed occur with considerable frequency in the Buddhist commentarial literature. For instance, among the 413 Sanskrit entries discussed in the eighth-century *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* (to which I shall return shortly), I have counted fourteen unmistakable cases of this type of etymology.[37]

A very well-known example is the association of the term *Bhagavat*[38] with the verb *bhañj* 'to defeat', usually in a phrase such as "he who has defeated the defilements etc." (*kleśādikam bhagnavān*),[39] or "he who has defeated the four Maras" (*bhagna-māra-catuṣṭaya*).[40]

Even though the hermeneutical etymology does not reflect the analysis of the grammarians of a given form, and the science of grammar is held in the highest esteem, both in the Indic culture in general, as well as in the Buddhist context in India and Tibet, this does not imply a depreciation of the hermeneutical etymology as such. On the contrary, the hermeneutical etymology serves a purpose, which is, from the viewpoint of the Buddhist exegetes, at least as important as, if not more important than the grammatically well-founded analysis of the word: it brings out the contextually determined semantics and the functional aspects of the term far more than mere grammatical analysis can.

In fact, at quite a few occasions the analyses provided by *vyākaraṇa* and *nirukta* can be found together, in the same context, providing two

35. RUEGG 1998: 118-119.

36. Occurring also in pre- and non-Buddhist contexts in Sanskrit literature, from *Nirukta* and *Brāhmaṇa*s onwards; cf. e.g. BRONKHORST: "Les éléments linguistiques porteurs de sens dans la tradition grammaticale du Sanskrit," *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, 20.1 (1998): 30-32.

37. HSGLT 1: 21-22; to these may also be added the entry *tāyin*, cf. RUEGG (1998: 120).

38. Which should of course according to grammatical conventions be derived from a noun *bhaga* 'share', 'fortune', etc., with secondary suffix *vat* (in Pāṇinian technical terms *matUP*) with possessive function.

39. E.g. *Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka* 7.25ff, SIMONSSON 1957: 267; cf. also Prajñā-varman's commentary ad Udbhaṭasvāmin's *Viśeṣastava* verse 1, ed. SCHNEIDER 1993: 80-81.

40. E.g. *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* entry 2, ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 6; cf. HSGLT 1: 26, RUEGG 1998: 120; both etymologies are referred to e.g. in Buddhaguhya's commentary on the *Mahā-vairocanābhisaṃbodhi Tantra*, cf. ed. MIYASAKA 1995: 37.

perspectives on the term at hand, and viewed more as complementary, not as mutually exclusive. Examples of this combining of viewpoints are the entries dealing with the terms *Bhagavat* and *Arhat* in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*.[41] In both treatments a grammatically sound and a hermeneutical etymology are juxtaposed, and it is most telling that in both instances the ultimately adopted Tibetan translation was based on the hermeneutical and not on the grammatical analysis.

A fine example of the relationship of complementarity existing between the two disciplines of *vyākaraṇa* and *nirukta* can be found in another passage from Si-tu's *dris lan*, discussing the etymology of the name Magadha.[42]

> As regards [the name] Magadha, this is a contraction, with elision of certain phonemes [or: syllables?], of *\*madhya-gata-dhara*, in correspondence with the [so-called] *pṛṣodara* [formations]. Therefore it is proper [for the translation] to be *dbus 'gyur 'chaṅ*, and this [translation] is proper, as it accords with the statements in the basic texts of Āryadeśa. Moreover, [this translation is proper] on account of the fact that [Magadha] is the centre of [all] countries.[43]

The etymology that Si-tu proposes here, involves the derivation of the three syllables of the term *Ma-ga-dha* from the initial syllables of the constituents of the compound term *madhya-gata-dhara* 'holding what occurs [?] in the centre' or 'holding what moves in the centre'. At first sight this would seem to be a purely hermeneutical etymology, with no connection with grammatical derivation whatsoever. However, we see that Si-tu does call upon a grammatical rule to account for this formation in terms of a *vyutpatti*, a 'grammatical derivation', rather than a *nirukta*-type etymology. He refers to the so-called *pṛṣodara*, or more

---

41. For the grammatical analysis of *Bhagavat*, cf. HSGLT 1: 24-26, for the 'hermeneutical etymology' of that term cf. *supra*; on the analyses of *Arhat*, cf. *infra*, *sub* 3.3. Note also the juxtaposition of the two analyses of the term *Bhagavat* in Buddhaśānti's commentary on Candragomin's *Deśanāstava* 40ab, cf. HAHN 1993: 54-55.

42. This passage I have also studied in the third title in the present series "Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhist Hermeneutics," bearing the subtitle "Grammatical Models in Buddhist Formulas," to be published in the Proceedings of the ninth Seminar of the International Association of Tibetan Studies, Leiden, June 24-30, 2000.

43. *Dris lan Nor bu'i me loṅ*, excerpt question no. 9, f. 3v6-4r1: */ ma ga dha źes pa / ma dhya ga ta dha ra rnams pṛ ṣo da ra bźin du yi ge gźan phyis nas bsdus pas / dbus 'gyur 'chaṅ yin par 'phags yul gyi gźuṅ rnams las 'byuṅ bas de ñid ltar 'thad ciṅ / de yaṅ yul dbus yin pa'i rgyu mtshan gyis so /.*

precisely the *prṣodarādi* rule[44] which provides for an open-ended *gaṇa* of compound formations involving morphological irregularities such as elision, augmentation or substitution. The rule has *prṣodara* (from *prṣad* + *udara*[45]) as the heading term. Taking resource to precisely this *prṣoda-rādi sūtra* to account for all kinds of irregular formations involving elision of parts of stems, is not unusual in *Mahāyāna* commentarial literature. We find it for instance in Candrakīrti's *Madhyamakāvatāra*.[46] I have thus far not been able to trace any Sanskrit sources for this or a comparable etymology for the toponym Magadha.

We find that the Tibetan translators have followed two approaches vis-à-vis the term *Magadha*. One option was to leave the name untranslated, usually prefixing the Tibetan categoric term[47] *yul*, 'country', as is the case in the *Mahāvyutpatti* lexicon.[48] Alternatively, when the term WAS translated, it is apparent that the present etymology lies at the basis of the usual Tibetan translation of the term *Magadha* that Si-tu cites here, namely *dbus 'gyur 'chan* lit. 'holding what occurs [or: changes ?] in the centre'.[49]

So here we have again a clear example of the complementary nature of the relationship between grammatical derivation and hermeneutical

---

44. Pāṇini 6.3.109: *prṣodarādīni yathopadiṣṭam* (*Kāśikā: prṣodarādīni śabdarūpāṇi yeṣu lopāgamavarṇavikārāḥ śāstreṇa na vihitā dṛśyante ca tāni yathopadiṣṭāni sādhūni bhavanti*) and Candra 5.2.127: *prṣodarādīni* (*vṛtti: prṣodarādīni śabda-rūpāṇi sādhūni bhavanti*), no parallel *sūtra* in *Kātantra*; cf. CARDONA 1988: 639-643, OBERLIES 1989: 255-257.

45. In fact analyzed as a *bahuvrīhi* compound, *prṣad udaraṃ yasya sa* 'he whose belly [*udara*] is spotted [*prṣad*]'.

46. Ad the term *Mahāyāna*, cf. SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1994: 262-263.

47. Note that the precepts on translating technique in the introductory section of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* stipulate the prefixing with a Tibetan term indicating the semantical category, when an Indic term or name is left untranslated, which is specifically allowed for the names of countries, persons, flowers, trees etc.; ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 3, SIMONSSON 1957: 253-254, VERHAGEN 1996: 285.

48. *Mahāvyutpatti* 3594 (*sub Cakra-varti-rājas:*) *\*Magadhā-rāja = ma ga dha'i rgyal po*; 4121 (*sub yul gyi mi*) *Magadhā = yul ma ga dha*.

49. Attested as translation for Magadha (and some derivations from that name) in the Tibetan version (by Źa-lu Chos-skyoṅ-bzaṅ-po, 1441-1528) of the *Viśva-locana* lexicon, ed. Lozang JAMSPAL 1992: no. 451, 767, 953, 1063; cf. also CHOS-GRAGS (n.d): 499 *dbus 'gyur 'chan = rdo rje gdan rgya gar yul dbus, bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo: dbus 'gyur 'chan = rgya gar gyi yul dbus rdo rje gdan.*

etymology. The point well made by Prof. RUEGG recently[50] namely that such an interpretative and synchronic etymology should not necessarily be regarded as a popular or naïve, and therefore less valid one opposed to the linguistic etymology, is corroborated here once more. With its non- or para-grammatical techniques of association through assonance or paronomasia and through conceptual connections, the hermeneutical etymology emphasizes and elucidates aspects of function and meaning that remain largely hidden from the eye when merely a strictly grammatical analysis is applied to the term.

### 3.3. Translating.

As rightly observed by Prof. RUEGG in a 1973 article,[51] the Tibetan scholarly world offers remarkably little theoretical treatment of the principles and techniques of translating. This is perhaps somewhat surprising in the light of the enormous corpora of translated literature which were produced by the Tibetan Buddhists in the course of the centuries. The oldest and by far most significant treatment of the principles relevant for the work of the translator is found in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*,[52] the eighth-century commentary on a selection of entries in *Mahāvyutpatti*, the normative Sanskrit-Tibetan lexicon for the translators.[53] The introductory section of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* consists mainly of the protocol of a royal edict regulating the translating activities.[54] In it a number of principles and rules-of-thumb are set forth, which the translators are required to follow.

An interesting later paraphrase of the gist of these principles can be found in a work attributed to the fifth Dalai Lama Ṅag-dbaṅ Blo-bzaṅ-rgya-mtsho (1617-1682).[55] A third important source on this topic that should be mentioned here, is *Dag yig mkhas pa'i 'byuṅ gnas*, a Tibetan-Mongol lexicon by Lcaṅ-skya Rol-pa'i-rdo-rje (1717-1786). In the 1973 article mentioned above, Prof. RUEGG edited and translated sections

---

50. RUEGG 1998: 119 note 9.

51. RUEGG 1973: 257f..

52. Critical ed. ISHIKAWA 1990, cf. SIMONSSON 1957: 238-280, HSGLT 1: 15-45, VERHAGEN 1992-1993, 1996: 283-286.

53. For *Mahāvyutpatti* I refer to ed. SAKAKI 1916-1925, following the entry numbering of that edition; ISHIHAMA & FUKUDA (1989) is a critical edition.

54. Ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 1-5, cf. SIMONSSON 1957: 239-262, VERHAGEN 1996: 283-286; for an earlier version of this edict, cf. PANGLUNG 1994.

55. Cf. SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1999: 69, 76 n. 17.

from this treatise, which outline principles of translation that correspond closely to and are evidently based on the regulations set forth in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*.

We can now add to these few sources, a brief discussion and explanation of some of the principles outlined in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* which are given by Si-tu Paṇ-chen in the *dris lan* quoted above. This passage is interesting, inter alia, for its adducing specific concrete examples for principles that are abstractly stated in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*. I refer to question no. 26 in the *Dri lan Nor bu'i me loṅ*,[56] which requests explanation of three passages from the introductory section of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*.[57]

The first passage, dealing with some general circumstances leading to the inclusion of lexical items in, and the formation of, the codified lexicon, is explained by means of a paraphrase:

> [As regards the first passage:] The Brahmin Ananta[58] etc. had fixed [Tibetan] terms for [specific Indic] terms from the Dharma which were unknown before in Tibet, when they had translated [texts] from Sanskrit.
>
> Because some [of these Tibetan terms] were not in accordance with the meaning of the Word [of the Buddha] or the basic texts of grammar, they were corrected in this period [or section?] of the later edict [i.e. later than the translators Brahmin Ananta etc.] and the important [terms] that needed to be fixed in new Tibetan terms were also added [to the register].[59]

56. Full title *Rje btsun mchog gi sprul pa'i sku dgyes par byed pa'i dri lan nor bu'i me loṅ źes bya ba, Bka'-'bum* vol. 8, 31 ff.; question 26 = f. 10v6-11v5.

57. (1) *bram ze ā nanda (...) gces so 'tshal gyis bsnan nas* (= ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 1.20-2.2), (2) *'jal dka' ba rnams (...) miṅ du btags nas* (= ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 2.6-10), (3) *rnam graṅs su (...) so sor btags pa bźin du thogs śig* (= ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 3.22-24.

58. I follow here the reading of this name by SCHERRER-SCHAUB (1999: 69); another possible reading is 'Ānanda', cf. e.g. SIMONSSON 1957: 243.

59. *Dris lan Nor bu'i me loṅ*, excerpt question no. 26, f. 11r3-5: *bram ze ā nanda la sogs pas bod du chos skad sṅar ma grags pa rnams la legs sbyar gyi skad las bsgyur te miṅ gsar du btags pa 'ga' źig gsuṅ rab kyi don daṅ brda sprod kyi gźuṅ daṅ mi mthun pa yod par 'dug pas de rnams bkas bcad phyi ma'i skabs 'dir bcos śiṅ bod skad gsar du gdags 'os gal che ba rnams kyaṅ bsnan /*; paraphrasing *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 1-2; SIMONSSON 1957: 243-244: *bram ze ā na nta la sogs pas chos kyi skad bod la ma grags pa las miṅ du btags pa maṅ dag mchis pa'i naṅ nas kha cig chos kyi gźuṅ daṅ / byā ka ra ṇa'i lugs daṅ mi mthun te / mi bcos su mi ruṅ ba rnams kyaṅ bcos / skad kyi miṅ gces so 'tshal gyis kyaṅ bsnan*; cf. also SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1999: 69.

The second passage formulates some general principles which were followed in establishing the Tibetan translation terminology.

> [As regards the second passage:] [A] For Sanskrit terms the meaning of which is difficult to comprehend, after separation into the [constituent] words,[60] and along with an explanation of[61] the basic constituents,[62] [Tibetan translating terms] are fixed [or: entered (into the register)].
> [B] For [Sanskrit terms which are] easy to comprehend, after having been translated according to the [literal] meaning of the [Sanskrit] terms, [Tibetan] terms have been fixed, and further explanation is not necessary.
> [C] For some [Sanskrit] terms [Tibetan] terms have been fixed that are primarily based on the meaning, which follows from [i.e.: is determined by] the [contextual] use (Tib. *'jug pa*) of the term.[63]
> These [terms] have been fixed [in?] the Great, Middle and Small *Vyutpatti*.[64]

Si-tu paraphrases the passage and then quotes specific instances in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* itself where the principle at hand is applied.

---

60. *tshig*, usually = 'bound, syntactic word form'.

61. N.B. genitive particle *kyi*, where *Sgra sbyor* has instrumental, *gtan tshigs kyis bśad*, ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 2 line 6-7.

62. *gtan tshigs*; or 'argument' (Skt. *hetu*)?

63. An alternative, I think less plausible translation would be: "(...) have been fixed for which the meaning has been made to prevail over the analysis of the term," here particle *las* is taken as an *ablativus comparationis*, and the verb *'jug pa* is interpreted as 'understanding', 'comprehension', i.e. '[grammatical] analysis'.

64. *Dris lan Nor bu'i me loñ*, excerpt question no. 26, f. 11r5-6: [A] *legs sbyar gyi sgra don blos gźal dka' ba rnams la tshig so sor phral nas gtan tshigs kyi bśad pa dañ bcas te bkod pa dañ /* [B] *rtogs sla ba rnams sgra don bźin bsgyur nas miñ btags pa bśad pa mi dgos pa dañ /* [C] *skad kha cig la sgra 'jug pa las don gtso bar byas nas miñ du btags te /* bye brag rtogs byed che *'briñ chuñ ñu 'di rnams bkod pa yin 'dug pa*; paraphrasing *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 2; SIMONSSON 1957: 244-246: [A] *mjal dka' ba rnams kyañ tshig so sor phral nas gtan tshigs kyis bśad de gźuñ du bris /* [B] *skad rkyañ pa bśad mi 'tshal ba sgra bźin du bsgyur bar rigs pa rnams kyañ sgra btsan par bgyis te miñ du btags /* [C] *skad kha cig don bźin du gdags par rigs pa rnams kyañ don btsan par bgyis te miñ du btags*; cf. also SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1999: 72. Note that SIMONSSON's rendering of this passage differs occasionally from Si-tu's interpretation, esp. *sub* (B) where SIMONSSON (1957: 245) has: "Einfache Wörter dagegen, die sich nicht [auf die eben erwähnte Weise] erklären liessen, aber die dem Laut gemäss übersetzt werden konnten, wurden als Termini festgelegt, indem die lautliche Gestalt zum festen [Ausgangspunkt] gemacht wurde." I must admit I cannot really fathom SIMONSSON's interpretation here. It is hard to see how the "lautliche Gestalt" (phonetic aspect?) of a term can be used as the basis of a translation, unless the introduction as a loanword, leaving the foreign term untranslated, were meant here, which clearly is not the case.

It is noteworthy also that Si-tu still refers explicitly to three *Vyutpatti* treatises here. Of course, it is well-known that the colophon of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* mentions the three *Vyutpatti*s, characterizing them as 'Great', 'Middle' and 'Small'.[65] Modern scholarship has – I think with good reason – assumed that the 'Great' *Vyutpatti* can be identified as the *Mahāvyutpatti* lexicon, and the 'Middle' one with its commentary, *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* itself. The third, 'Small' *Vyutpatti*, would then refer to a document which is no longer extant.[66] Si-tu's reference to the three does not necessarily indicate that the third was still available to Si-tu: he might simply be echoing the words of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* itself. But, it is conceivable that he still had access to this third *Vyutpatti*.

Three procedures leading to inclusion in the standardized lexicon are briefly outlined:

(A) For more difficult composite terms, an analysis into constituents and an explanation of these constituents is provided.

(B) For less abstruse terms a literal translation, a rendering following the '[literal] meaning of the term'[67] is appropriate.

(C) For some specific terms, however, a translation based on the specific usage, is required. This amounts to the type of translations that are based on what may be called a "hermeneutical etymology", the usage- or function-based quasi etymologies that I have briefly discussed earlier.

For each of the three procedures, Si-tu Paṇ-chen quotes an example from the entries in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*. The example of the first method is the treatment of the entry *Samyak-sambuddha*,[68] which indeed involves the division into constituent elements (*samyak, sam* and *buddha*) as well as the explanation of one of the constituents (namely the preposition *sam*) in this case by means of two glosses (*samantam* 'totally' and *sampūrṇam* 'fully'). I have counted 24 entries in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* where this procedure is followed.[69]

The second method is exemplified by the treatment of the term *dānamaya-puṇya-kriyā-vastu* 'abiding substance of meritorious deeds

65. Ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 127, SIMONSSON 1957: 263.

66. Cf. SIMONSSON 1957: 227, URAY 1989: 3.

67. *sgra don bźin*, f. 11r5.

68. *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* entry 5, ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 8, cf. HSGLT 1: 23.

69. Cf. HSGLT 1: 23.

consisting of giving',[70] which indeed – at least for the part that Si-tu quotes – consists of nothing but the one-by-one translation of the constituent elements into Tibetan. The procedure of separation of constituents and direct translation is very frequent in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*; I have tallied 89 instances.[71]

The third method – possibly the most interesting in the present context – Si-tu refers to as the translation which is "semantically-oriented" (*don btsan par byas pa*),[72] in other words a translation based on a hermeneutical etymology, of which, as mentioned above, at least fourteen examples can be found in *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*. The example here is the entry on *Arhat*.[73] In it, as mentioned earlier, two derivations are introduced, one linguistically accurate, the other hermeneutical. The first associates *Arhat* with the verb *arh*, 'to deserve', 'to be worthy', with the phrase 'Because he deserves praise, he [is called] *Arhat*' (*pūjām arhatīty arhan*). This reflects the grammatically accurate relation, as *arhat* is ultimately of course an active present participle of that verb, literally meaning 'deserving'. The alternative derivation is represented in the phrase *kleśārīn hatavān ity arhan* 'Because he has killed the enemies, namely the defilements, he is [called] *Arhat*'. It links the word *Arhat* with Sanskrit nominals *ari* 'enemy' and *hata-* 'killed'. This association has no grammatical foundation, of course, and can therefore be considered a hermeneutical etymology. As stated earlier, it is most significant to note here that the authors of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* explicitly chose for the Tibetan translation based on the latter, hermeneutical etymology, namely *dgra bcom pa*, 'who has defeated his enemies' for use in the Buddhist context, and not *mchod 'os pa* 'worthy of praise', which is based on the morphological analysis, but which is only allowed in non-Buddhist usage. Once more, this shows the considerable significance that the Buddhist scholastics attributed to this form of etymology.

70. *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* entry 281, ed. Ishikawa 1990: 94, cf. also HSGLT 1: 30-31.
71. Cf. HSGLT 1: 22.
72. *Op. cit.* f. 11v2; cf. *sgra 'jug pa las don gtso bar byas, op. cit.* f. 11r5.
73. *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* entry no. 4, ed. ISHIKAWA 1990: 7-8, cf. SIMONSSON 1957: 269-270, HSGLT 1: 21-22, RUEGG 1998: 120, SCHERRER-SCHAUB 1999: 71.

Finally, the third passage from *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* is con-
cerned with one of the approaches of dealing with redundancy due to
synonymy in the practice of translating.

> Moreover, [as regards the third passage,] the meaning of the passage "*rnam
> grans su gtogs pa'i*" etc., in [the precepts on] the methods of translation, is
> exemplified in [*Mahā-*]*vyutpatti* by the entries "[Skt.] *pariskāra* ['equipment'] =
> [Tib.] *yo byad* ['tools / necessaries']" [i.e *Mahāvyutpatti* entry no. 5887] and
> "[Skt.] *upakaraṇa* ['instrument / commodity'] when not combined [with the
> above synonym] = [Tib.] *yo byad*, but when combined [with the above synonym]
> = [Tib.] *'tsho chas* ['tools / necessaries']" [i.e. *Mahāvyutpatti* entry no. 5888].
>
>   The meaning of this is that when the terms *pariskāra* and *upakaraṇa* occur
> together and are combined, it would lead to the defect of repetition if one trans-
> lated as "*yo byad yo byad*" ['tool-tool']. Therefore it is necessary to translate
> [such a combination] as "*yo byad kyi 'tsho chas*" ['the necessaries of the tools']
> or "*yo byad dan 'tsho chas*" ['the necessaries and the tools'].[74]

The lexicographical convention intended here, is that where the lexicon
supplies alternative translations for (more or less) synonymous Sanskrit
terms, so as to avoid repetition of terms in passages where the synonyms
are used contiguously. Such contextually determined alternative transla-
tions are usually marked by the provisional phrase 'when combined' or
'when not combined' ('*dom na* or *ma 'dom na*), scil. combined or not
with the synonymous entry which precedes in the lexicon.

Si-tu offers two entries from *Mahāvyutpatti* as an example of this
convention:

> *Mahāvyutpatti* 5887: [Skt.] *pariskāra* ('equipment')[75] = [Tib.] *yo byad* ('tools /
> necessaries')
> *Mahāvyutpatti* 5888: [Skt.] *upakaraṇa* ('instrument / commodity')[76] = [Tib.] *yo
> byad* [or] *'tsho(g) chas* ('tools / necessaries'); 'when not combined [with the

---

74. *Dris lan Nor bu'i me lon*, excerpt question no. 26, f. 11v3-5: / *yan 'gyur byed
    pa'i tshul la rnam grans su gtogs pa'i zes sogs kyi don ni / bye rtogs las / pa ri
    skā rah yo byad / u pa ka ra ṇam / ma 'dom na yo byad / 'dom na 'tsho chas zes
    'byun ba bzin te / de'i don yan pa ri skā ra dan / u pa ka ra ṇa'i sgra dag lhan
    cig tu 'dug cin 'dom pa'i tshe yo byad yo byad ces par bsgyur na zlos pa'i skyon
    yon bas yo byad kyi 'tsho chas sam / yo byad dan 'tsho chas zes par bsgyur
    dgos pa lta bu /*; paraphrasing *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, ed. ISHIKAWA
    1990: 3, SIMONSSON 1957: 256-257: *rnam grans su gtogs pa'i tshig rnams ni
    ma 'dom na min gan bod skad du spyir grags sin tshig tu gar bde bar gdags
    so / 'dom na so sor btags pa bzin du thogs sig /*.
75. *pariskāra* for class. Skt. *pariṣkāra*, cf. EDGERTON 1953-2: 332.
76. *upakaraṇa*: cf. MONIER-WILLIAMS 1899: 195, EDGERTON 1953-2: 133.

above synonym]' = [Tib.] *yo byad*, 'but when combined [with the above synonym]' = [Tib.] *'tsho chas*.[77]

Prof. SIMONSSON, in the first serious western investigation of this section of *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, had already drawn attention to the fact that *Mahāvyutpatti* availed itself of this device in several parts of the lexicographical register. The example that Si-tu mentions here, *Mahāvyutpatti* 5887 and 5888, had escaped SIMONSSON's notice; we can therefore add it to the latter's listing of instances where we find this convention applied in *Mahāvyutpatti*.[78]

### 3.4. Textual criticism

The final item of hermeneutical interest that we will look at presently is the practice of textual criticism with regard to Indo-Tibetan translations continuing after the canonization of these translations. We know, for instance, of text-critical work on certain *Pañca-rakṣā* manuscripts by the sixteenth-century scholar Skyogs-ston Lo-tsā-ba Rin-chen-bkra-śis (ca. 1495-after 1577)[79] who is best known as the author of the *Li śi 'i gur khaṅ* dictionary.

Throughout the works of Si-tu Paṇ-chen we also find evidence of his personal indefatigable efforts aimed at establishing reliable readings for the numerous texts he has worked on. By collating different manuscript versions and comparing different interpretations, he approached this in a manner very similar to the techniques of modern day philology and textual criticism.

We are granted a fascinating glimpse into the translator's workshop in Si-tu's annotation to his translation of the *Vajra-Mahākāla-aṣṭaka-stotra*, a hymn to the Tantric deity Mahākala.[80] This *stotra*, attributed to the Tāntrika Nāgārjuna, consisting of the hymn proper in eight stanzas

---

77. SAKAKI (ed.) 1916-1925: 383: [5887] *pariṣkāraḥ* [=] *yo byad / yo spyad* [5888] *upakaraṇam* [=] *yo byad 'tshog chas / ma 'dom na yo byad / ('dom na) 'tshog chas.*

78. SIMONSSON 1957: 256-257.

79. Based on thus far unpublished materials by prof. Van der Kuijp, cf. VERHAGEN 1996: 279-280; for more data from these materials, of which it is as yet uncertain where they will be published, cf. HSGLT 2: 102-104, 408-409.

80. *Rdo rje nag po chen po'i bstod pa brgyad pa*, Collected works vol. 7, title no. 10, margin title *rgya*, f. 1-4v4; ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-7: 431-438. The Sanskrit text of this *stotra* is edited in PANDEY 1994: 206-207; I am grateful to Dr. Martin Boord for this reference, personal communication, London, October 2000.

(hence *aṣṭaka*, 'octad' scil. of stanzas, in the title) with a ninth con-
cluding verse enumerating the merits associated with the application of
this hymn, is included in a bilingual Sanskrit-Tibetan version in Si-tu's
collected works.[81] In the elaborate annotation included in this edition,
we see Si-tu weighing arguments pro and con certain readings or ren-
derings, very much like a modern scholar would do, involving as many
Sanskrit manuscripts as he could trace, as well as the Tibetan translations
of this text that had been made before him.

Interestingly, he remarks in the colophon that the manuscripts he could
find in Nepal, notably in Svayaṃbhū and Patan, were generally very
corrupt (cf. *infra*). From his annotations it is clear that he oftentimes
preferred the reading of older Indic manuscripts that were already in
Tibet to that of the Nepalese manuscripts that he himself had acquired
more recently. That he worked with a considerable number of manu-
scripts is demonstrated, for instance, by his reference to a variant in
"many Nepalese manuscripts and two old Tibetan manuscripts".[82] The
term 'Tibetan manuscript' here refers to Sanskrit manuscripts kept in
Tibet, not to Tibetan translations, for which a different designation is
used. In the colophon Si-tu remarks that he based his rendering 'on a
comparison of (an?) actual Indian manuscript(s?) that had come to Tibet
in earlier times, and some bilingual[83] copies, along with numerous
corrupt manuscripts from Svayaṃbhū and Patan [in] Nepal'.[84]

Evidently Si-tu had at least two, possibly several different Tibetan
renderings at his disposal. He refers to *'gyur rñiṅ*, i.e. one (or more)
'old translation(s)',[85] and *gsar 'gyur*, one (or more) 'new transla-
tion(s)'.[86] The distinction may be seen as purely historical/chrono-
logical, which I consider the most likely, or it may be of a more
sectarian nature, distinguishing between versions belonging to the Rñiṅ-
ma-pa canon or to the translation literature of the *gsar pa*, 'new' schools

---

81. The Sanskrit text here in Si-tu's *Gsuṅ 'bum* is slightly different from the one
    available in PANDEY (ed.) 1994.

82. *bal po'i dpe maṅ po daṅ bod dpe rñiṅ pa gñis rnams, op. cit.* f. 3r6.

83. Tentative translation for *ñis bid can*.

84. *Op. cit.*, f. 4v3: *bod du sṅar byuṅ ba'i rgya dpe dṅos daṅ źal bśus ñis bid can
    'ga' re / bal yul yam bu daṅ ye raṅ gi dpe dag min maṅ po bcas go bsdur nas.*

85. *Op. cit.* f. 2r6, 3v6: on f. 3r6 reference to *sṅa 'gyur*, 'early translation(s)'.

86. *Op. cit.* f. 4r6; *'gyur gsar* f. 3v6.

i.e. basically all schools of Tibetan Buddhism other than the Rñiṅ-ma-pa, *in casu* the *Bstan 'gyur* canon.

Moreover, he refers to *ża lu*,[87] in all probability a rendering by Ża-lu, that is, most likely, Ża-lu lo-tsā-ba Chos-skyoṅ-bzaṅ-po (1441-1528) or another scholar associated with Ża-lu monastery. It is evident that the version by Ża-lu is not a (or the) 'old translation'.[88] It seems plausible that the 'Ża-lu' and 'new' version are one and the same: in the passage translated *infra*, the term *gsar 'gyur* is used contiguously with 'Ża-lu'. I take this as 'the new translation, namely [the one by] Ża-lu',[89] but we could also read this as an asyndetic construction meaning 'the new translation and [the one by] Ża-lu'.

Setting aside whether or not the Ża-lu version and the 'new' version are the same, it seems quite likely that Si-tu had more than two Tibetan translations at his disposal.[90] It certainly was possible, taking into account the fact that in the xylographic editions of *Bstan 'gyur* at least four distinct translations of this hymn have been included.[91] Information on the translator(s) is available for only one of the four (Peking title

87. *Op. cit.* f. 1v6, 3r3, 3r6, 3v3, 4r6.

88. Note the reference to the 'early translation(s) and [the one by] Ża-lu', *op. cit.* f. 3r6: *sṅa 'gyur daṅ ża lu*.

89. Compare in this connection also a passage in the colophon which could be interpreted as 'translation corrected by Ża-lu' (*ża lu lo tsas 'gyur bcos pa, op. cit.* f. 4v3), which could indicate that the Ża-lu version is a later revision of (an) earlier translation(s). Note, however, that a different interpretation of this passage is also possible, cf. *infra*.

90. Note in this connection the reference to 'all new and old translations'(*op. cit.* f. 3v6: *'gyur gsar rñiṅ thams cad la*), where the use of the quantifier *thams cad* seems to point to a higher total number than two.

91. (1) *Dpal nag po chen po'i bstod pa rkaṅ pa brgyad pa żes bya ba* (*\*Śrī-mahākālasya stotra-aṣṭa-mantra-nāma / \*Śrī-mahākāla-aṣṭa-pada-stotra-nāma*; Derge *Bstan 'gyur, Rgyud 'grel*, vol. *śa* f. 268v1-269r7, Tohoku catalogue title no. 1773; Peking *Bstan 'gyur, Rgyud 'grel*, vol. *la* f. 293v2-294v3, Otani repr. title no. 2639), (2) *Dpal nag po chen po'i bstod pa rkaṅ pa brgyad pa żes bya ba* (*\*Śrī-mahākāla-stotra-padāṣṭaka-nāma*; Derge *ibid.* f. 272r7-273r6, title no. 1778; Peking *ibid.* f. 298r4-299r6, title no. 2644), (3) *Dpal nag po chen po la bstod pa rkaṅ pa brgyad pa żes bya ba* (*\*Śrī-mahākālasyāṣṭa-mantra-stotra-nāma*; Derge *ibid.* f. 273r6-274r6, title no. 1779; Peking *ibid.* f. 299r6-300v1, title no. 2645) and (4) *Rdo rje nag po chen po'i bstod pa brgyad pa* (*\*Vajra-mahākālāṣṭaka-stotra*; Derge *ibid.* f. 274r6-275r5, title no. 1780; Peking *ibid.* f. 300v2-301v4, title no. 2646). In all four versions \*Nāgārjuna is given as the author.

no. 2645, Derge title no. 1779), which was prepared by the Indian yogin
Śrī-vairocana-vajra and the Tibetan translator Diṅ-ri Chos-grags.[92] I
have not been able to trace precise dates for these translators, who have
collaborated on one other translation in *Bstan 'gyur*,[93] whereas the
Indian master, also known as Vairocana-vajra or Avadhūti-vairocana-
vajra, has single-handedly produced seven further translations, all con-
tained in the *Bstan 'gyur* canon.[94] Both masters are included in one of
the historiographical sections of Si-tu's *dkar chag* to the Sde-dge *Bka'*
*'gyur*, namely in the lists of scholars active in the *Phyi dar* period,[95] the
former as no. 39 in the listing of Indian paṇḍits,[96] the latter as no. 47 in
the list of Tibetan translators.[97] So, we can only say they belong to the
*Phyi dar* period, starting from the eleventh century, and judging by their
place in this approximately chronological listing, they would appear not
to have belonged to the very first part of that period. A more detailed
investigation of the correlations between the variants mentioned by Si-tu
and the corresponding passages in the extant canonical versions would

92. Colophon Peking 2645: *rgya gar gyi mkhan po go sa la 'i rnal 'byor pa śri bai
ro tsa na badzra daṅ / bod kyi lo tsa ba bande diṅ ri chos grags kyis bsgyur ciṅ
źus te gtan la phab pa'o //*, f. 300v1.

93. *Dpal ṅan soṅ thams cad yoṅs su sbyoṅ ba'i rgyud las phyuṅ ba spyan ma'i ṅan
soṅ sbyoṅ ba'i cho ga*, *\*Śrī-sarva-durgati-pariśodhana-tantroddhṛta-locanā-
durgati-śodhana-vidhi*, Peking *Bstan-'gyur*, Rgyud 'grel vol. *di* f. 29v2-33v5,
Otani repr. title no. 2771.

94. *Do ha mdzod kyi 'grel pa*, *\*Doha-koṣa-pañjikā*, Peking *Bstan 'gyur*, Rgyud
'grel vol. *mi* f. 199r7-231r5, Otani repr. title no. 3101; *Ka kha'i do ha źes bya
ba*, *\*Kakhasya doha-nāma*, Peking *ibid.* vol. *tsi* f. 66r8-68v4, title no. 3113; *Ka
kha'i do ha'i bśad pa bris pa*, *\*Kakhasya doha-ṭippaṇa*, Peking *ibid.* f. 68v4-
78r2, title no. 3114; *Tshigs su bcad pa lṅa pa*, *\*Pañca-sarga-nāma*, Peking *ibid.*
f. 147r4-147v1, title no. 3127; *Dpal birba pa'i tshigs rkaṅ brgyad cu rtsa bźi pa*,
*\*Śrī-virūpa-pada-caturaśiti*, Peking *ibid.* f. 149r1-150r4, title no. 3129; *Do ha
mdzod*, *\*Doha-koṣa*, Peking *ibid.* f. 250v8-252v2, title no. 3150 and *'Jig rten
gsum las rnam par rgyal ba 'phags ma sgrol ma bsgrub pa'i thabs źes bya ba*,
*\*Trailokya-vijayārya-tārā-sādhana-nāma*, Peking *ibid.* vol. *phu* f. 214r1-217v1,
title no. 4710.

95. Collected works, vol. 9, f. 191v4-191v5: *de lta bu'i bde bar gśegs pa'i bka' srol
chen po bod kyi yul du 'dren źiṅ skyoṅ bar mdzad pa'i lo paṇ gyi tshogs ci tsam
źig byon pa yin ce na* (...) *bstan pa phyi dar gyi dus su rgya gar gyi paṇḍi ta*
[192r1-192r6] (...), f. 192r6: *de bźin du lo tsā ba yaṅ* (...), f. 192v4: *phyi dar la*
[192v4-193v6] (...).

96. *Op. cit.* f. 192r3: *bai ro tsa na ba dzra*.

97. *Op. cit.* f. 193r3: *diṅ ri chos grags*.

undoubtedly be of considerable interest, yet would go far beyond the scope of the present article.

Si-tu Paṇ-chen is very dismissive of the translation by Źa-lu, stating at one point that it "seems to deviate to a great extent from the meaning".[98] A critical attitude with regard to the work of predecessors is typical for Si-tu Paṇ-chen in general. We find him critizing well-known translators and scholars such as Śoṅ-ston Rdo-rje-rgyal-mtshan (born c. 1235 / 1245),[99] Bu-ston Rin-chen-grub (1290-1364),[100] Thugs-rje-dpal (late fourteenth / early fifteenth century),[101] Źa-lu Chos-skyoṅ-bzaṅ-po (1441-1528),[102] Tāranātha Kun-dga'-sñiṅ-po (1575-?)[103] and 'Dar-lo-tsā-ba Ṅag-dbaṅ-phun-tshogs-lhun-grub (1633?-?),[104] usually in connection with Si-tu's own revision of, or improvement on their earlier efforts.

By way of a telling example of Si-tu's approach, compare the annotation Si-tu supplies in connection with the final *śloka* of the hymn:

> After I had carefully considered the structure [lit. course] and appropriate meaning of the words and cases in the verse, which expounds the benefits of the recitation of this hymn, I translated it thus.
>
> However, [the translation of] that [verse] of [= in] the [more] recent translation, namely[105] the [one by] Źa-lu, seems to [lit. be very unrelated] deviate to a great extent from the meaning [of the verse].
>
> Upon examination of the old[er] translation(s), it appeared that [in the manuscript(s) on which this / these translation(s) was / were based] instead of the

98.  *Op. cit.*, f. 4v6: *gsar 'gyur źa lu'i de ni don śin tu mi 'brel bar snaṅ*; for context, cf. passage *infra*. A passage in the colophon could be read as a statement that Si-tu's translation contains 'corrections on the translation by Źa-lu', *op. cit.*, f. 4v3: *źa lu lo tsas 'gyur bcos pa*.

 99.  Cf. HSGLT 2: 110; on Śoṅ-ston in general, cf. HSGLT 1: 87.

100.  Cf. HSGLT 2: 107-108, 110, 178; on Bu-ston in general, cf. e.g. HSGLT 1: 94-96.

101.  Cf. HSGLT 2: 173, 177-178; on Thugs-rje-dpal in general, cf. HSGLT 1: 145-146.

102.  Cf. HSGLT 2: 173, 177-178; on Źa-lu lo-tsā-ba in general, cf. HSGLT 1: 146-151.

103.  Cf. HSGLT 2: 178; on Tāranātha in general, cf. e.g. HSGLT 1: 152-154.

104.  Cf. HSGLT 2: 120-122, 178; on 'Dar-lo-tsā-ba in general, cf. HSGLT 1: 154-157.

105.  Alternative translation: "(...) the [more] recent translation(s) and the [one by] Źa-lu seem to (...)".

passage *sarvajñaṃ tasya*[106] there was a different [reading], but I have not found [this reading in] a manuscript.

    Elsewhere [in the text], in some Nepalese manuscripts there appear to be minor variations in parts [lit. corners] of words, but as the reading according to the Tibetan manuscripts [i.e. the manuscripts kept in Tibet] makes good sense, I have [followed] the reading according to these [Tibetan manuscripts].[107]

First of all, we note his critique of the translation by Źa-lu lo-tsā-ba. He then concludes that the "older" Tibetan translation(s) in this particular verse must be based on a version with a different reading for two words, which he has not found attested in the Sanskrit manuscripts available to him. Finally, he reports disregarding minor variations in Nepalese manuscripts in favour of the reading found in the older manuscripts kept in Tibet, on account of the latter reading making the best sense. This one brief example demonstrates quite clearly how Si-tu approached his editorial task with a degree of objectivity and accuracy surprisingly close to our modern standards.

## 4. *Concluding observations.*

The huge personal experience which the eighteenth-century polymath Si-tu Paṇ-chen Chos-kyi-'byuṅ-gnas had gained in his tireless efforts to perfect the craft of translating made him acutely aware of hermeneutical issues. A few of these have passed in review.

    First we considered some instances where etymology was used as a means for the interpretation and analysis of terms. We have seen two distinct trajectories there, one strictly according to the traditions of grammar, the other the approach of the 'hermeneutical etymology'. We have seen evidence how these two modes of analysis were considered as

---

106. The final *pāda* of the concluding, ninth verse reads in Si-tu's edition: *sarvajñaṃ tasya nityaṃ dina-niśi matulaṃ nāśayed vighna-jālam (op. cit.* f. 4v1); with some variants in ed. PANDEY (1994: 207): *sarvajña-tvaṃ ca nityaṃ dina-niśa-matulaṃ naśyate vighna-jātam.* The variant reading which Si-tu may have had in mind here is the one reflected in two canonical versions as *sa steṅ(s) daṅ ni mtho ris su,* 'on earth and in the heavens' (Peking no. 2644, f. 299r5 and Peking no. 2645, f. 300r8) for which no equivalents can be found in Si-tu's Sanskrit, or in ed. PANDEY (1994: 207) for that matter.

107. *Op. cit.,* f. 4r6-4v1: *bstod pa bklag pa'i phan yon bstan pa'i tshigs bcad 'di rnam dbye daṅ tshig gi 'gros daṅ don thob la legs par brtags nas 'di ltar bsgyur ba yin gyi / gsar 'gyur źa lu'i de ni don śin tu mi 'brel bar snaṅ / 'gyur rñiṅ la brtags nas sarba dzñaṃ ta sya źes pa'i thad 'dir gźan źig yod 'dra yaṅ dpe ma rñed / gźan bal dpe 'gar tshig zur 'dra min phran bu snaṅ yaṅ / bod dpe ltar byas pa legs par rtog pas de bźin byas pa lags.*

complementary methods, not as mutually exclusive, and how they were frequently used contiguously. Considerable value was attached to the 'hermeneutical etymology' within the traditional scholastical interpretations of the Buddhist sacred scriptures, in particular as this type of etymology brings to light contextual semantical aspects of the Buddhist idiom, which will not be elucidated through mere grammatical morphological analysis.

In his investigation of parts of the edict regarding the Sanskrit-Tibetan translating activities in the eighth-century *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa*, Si-tu Paṇ-chen inter alia discussed three approaches vis-à-vis the translating of individual terms, one of which is again based on the so-called 'hermeneutical' or *nirukta*-type etymology.

Finally, we have observed evidence of Si-tu Paṇ-chen continuing the practice of textual criticism, even at such a late date when an extensive translated literature had been well-established and long since canonized in Tibetan Buddhism. His rigorous well-considered handling of these matters is a fine demonstration of Si-tu's linguistic expertise.

I might add here that a number of bilingual Sanskrit-Tibetan versions are contained in Si-tu's collected works.[108] Bilingual editions were not unknown in Tibet, both within as well as outside of the Buddhist canon.[109] They are in general of course useful sources for the textual study of Indic Buddhism. Notwithstanding the intrusion of errors due to

108. E.g. (1) the *Cāndra-vyākaraṇa sūtra* text (*Gsuṅ 'bum* vol. 1, 61 ff.; facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-1: 201-323; cf. HSGLT 2: 129-132), (2) The *Kātantra dhātupāṭha* (*Gsuṅ 'bum* vol. 1, 28 ff.; facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-1: 2-55; cf. HSGLT 2: 106-109), (3) Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa*, (*Gsuṅ 'bum* vol. 6, 51 ff.; facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-6: 629-731), (4) the Tārā hymn *Mṛtyu-vañcanopadeśa* (*Gsuṅ 'bum* vol. 7, 31 ff.; facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-7: 1-62), (5) the *Vajra-mahākālāṣṭaka-stotra* mentioned above (*Gsuṅ 'bum* vol. 7, 4 ff.; facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-7: 432-438), (6) the *Śruta-bodha* treatise on prosody (*Gsuṅ 'bum* vol. 7; 9 ff.; facs. ed. SHERAB GYALTSEN 1990-7: 465-481, *śloka*s bilingual).

109. By way of random examples one might mention, within the canon, Tāranātha's incomplete version of *Prakriyā-caturā* (cf. HSGLT 1: 117-118), Kṣemendra's *Bodhisattvāvadāna-kalpalatā* (cf. VAN DER KUIJP 1996: 401) and the *Bali-mālikā* translation by Źa-lu lo-tsā-ba in *Bstan 'gyuur* (with partial intralinear Tibetan translations of the *mantra*s, Peking *Bstan 'gyur Mdo 'grel* vol. *po* f. 279v1-288v4, title no. 5901), and outside of the canon, Tāranātha's bilingual version of the *Sārasvata sūtra*s (HSGLT 2: 104-106), and extra-canonical prints of popular *dhāraṇī* or mantric materials such as the *Mañjuśrī-nāma-saṃgīti*, often containing the Indic text in some form of ornamental script.

the xylographical transmission, I would say that, taking into consideration Si-tu Paṇ-chen's philological acumen and the wealth of sources available to him, the bilingual materials in Si-tu's collected works constitute particularly valuable documents for the present-day Buddhologist-philologist.

*Abbreviations*

HSGLT 1 = VERHAGEN 1994

HSGLT 2 = VERHAGEN 2001

*Bibliography.*

Abhyankar, K.V.

    1977    *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*, second revised edition (1: 1961), Baroda (= Gaekwad's Oriental Series 134).

Bronkhorst, J.

    1998    "Patañjali", in E. Craig (ed.): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 7, London & New York, pp. 248-250.

Cardona, G.

    1988    *Pāṇini. His Work and its Traditions, Volume One: Background and Introduction*, Delhi.

Chandra, L. (ed.)

    1968    *The Autobiography and Diaries of Si-tu Paṇ-chen.* With an introduction by E. Gene Smith, New Delhi (= Śata-Piṭaka Series 77).

Chos-grags

    (n.d.)    *Brda dag miṅ tshig gsal ba. Tibetan Dictionary*, n.p. (ed. with Chinese translation: Peking 1957).

Edgerton, F.

    1953    *Buddhist hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary*, 2: Dictionary, New Haven.

Eimer, H.

    1985    "Die beiden Fassungen des *dkar chag* zum Derge-Kanjur", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 28: 281-286. [Reprint: Eimer, H. 1992: *Ein Jahrzehnt Studien zur Überlieferung des tibetischen Kanjur*, Wien 1992 (= Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 28), pp. 115-120.]

Hahn, M.

    1993    "A Difficult Beginning. Comments on an English translation of Candragomin's *Deśanāstava*," in Sharma, R.K. (ed.): *Researches in Indian and Buddhist Philosophy, Essays in Honour of Professor Alex Wayman*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, pp. 31-60.

Hattori, M.

    1968    *Dignāga, On Perception, being the Pratyakṣapariccheda of Dignāga's Pramāṇasamuccaya from the Sanskrit fragments and the Tibetan versions translated and annotated*, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press (= Harvard Oriental Series 47).

Ishihama, Yumiko & Fukuda, Yoichi (eds.)

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

Ishikawa, Mie (ed.)

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

Imaeda, Y.

    1981    "Note sur le Kanjur de Derge", in M. Strickmann (ed.): *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* XX: *Tantric and Taoist Studies in honour of R.A. Stein*, vol. 1, Bruxelles, pp. 227-236.

Jackson, D.P.

    1996    *A History of Tibetan Painting: The Great Tibetan Painters and Their Traditions*, Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften (= Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 15).

Jamspal, L. (ed.)

    1992    *Abhidhānaviśvalocana of Śrīdharasena*, Narita: Naritasan Shinshoji (= Monograph Series of the Naritasan Institute for Buddhist Studies III.1).

Kuijp, L.W.J. van der

    1996    "Tibetan Belles-Lettres: The Influence of Daṇḍin and Kṣemendra," in Cabezón, J.I. & Jackson, R.R. (eds.) 1996: *Tibetan Literature. Studies in Genre. Essays in Honor of Geshe Lhundup Sopa*, Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion (Studies in Indo-Tibetan Buddhism), pp. 393-410.

Khetsun Sangpo [Mkhas-btsun-bzaṅ-po]

    1973-1980    *Biographical Dictionary of Tibet and Tibetan Buddhism*, 11 vols, Dharamsala.

Miyasaka, Y.

    1995    *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi-vikurvitādhiṣṭhāna-vaipulyasūtrendra-rāja-nāma-dharmaparyāya. Bam po daṅ po* (Tibetan), Narita. (= Acta Indologica 7)

Monier-Williams, M.

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

Oberlies, T.

    1989    *Studie zum Cāndravyākaraṇa. Eine kritische Bearbeitung von Candra IV.4.52-148 und V.2*, Stuttgart (= Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien 38).

Pandey, J.S. (ed.)

    1994    *Bauddha-stotra-saṃgraha*, Delhi.

Panglung, J.L.
> 1994    "New Fragments of the *sGra-sbyor bam-po gñis-pa*," *East and West* 44-1: 161-192.

Richardson, H.E.
> 1967    "A Tibetan Antiquarian in the XVIIIth Century," *Bulletin of Tibetology* IV.2: 5-8.

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

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

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

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

Scherrer-Schaub, C.A.
> 1994    "Tendance de la pensée de Candrakīrti, Buddhajñāna et Jinakriyā," in Skorupski, T. & Pagel, U. (ed.) 1994: *The Buddhist Forum*. Volume III 1991-1993. *Papers in honour and appreciation of Professor David Seyfort Ruegg's contribution to Indological, Buddhist and Tibetan Studies*, London, pp. 249-272.

> 1999    "Translation, Transmission, Tradition: Suggestions from Ninth-century Tibet," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 27: 67-77.

Schneider, J.
> 1993    *Der Lobpreis der Vorzüglichkeit des Buddha. Udbhaṭasiddhasvāmins Viśeṣastava mit Prajñāvarmans Kommentar. Nach dem tibetischen Tanjur herausgegeben und übersetzt*, Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag (= Indica et Tibetica 23).

Sherab Gyaltsen (publ.)

    1990    *Collected Works of the Great Ta'i si tu pa kun mkhyen chos kyi byun gnas bstan pa'i nyin byed*, published by Sherab Gyaltsen for Palpung Sungrab Nyamso Khang Sherab-ling Institute of Buddhist Studies, P.O. Sansal, 176125, Dist. Kangra, HP, India, and printed at Jayyed Press 5228, Ballimaran Delhi-6.

Simonsson, N.

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

Uray, G.

    1989    "Contributions to the date of the *Vyutpatti*-treatises", *AOH* XLIII (1): 3-21.

Verhagen, P.C.

    1992-1993    "*Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* on the Term Maṇḍala: "Seizing the Essence"" [N.B. title erroneously printed as: The *Sgra sbyor bam po gñis pa* on the *Maṇḍala*: "Seeing the Essence"], *Studies in Central & East Asian Religions*, vol. 5/6: 134-138.

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

    1996    "Tibetan Expertise in Sanskrit Grammar [2]: Ideology, Status and other Extra-linguistic Factors," in Houben, J.E.M. (ed.): *Ideology and Status of Sanskrit: Contributions to the History of the Sanskrit Language*, Leiden – New York – København – Köln: E.J. Brill (= Brill's Indological Library XIII), pp. 275-287.

    1997    "Tibetan Expertise in Sanskrit Grammar (3): On the Correct Pronunciation of the Ineffable," in D. van der Meij (ed.): *India and Beyond, Aspects of Literature, Meaning, Ritual and Thought: Essays in Honour of Frits Staal*, London & New York, Leiden & Amsterdam: Kegan Paul Int. in association with International Institute for Asian Studies (= Studies from the International Institute for Asian Studies [2]), pp. 598-619.

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

Vostrikov, A.I.

    1970    *Tibetan Historical Literature*, translated from the Russian by H.C. Gupta, Calcutta. (= Soviet Indology Series 4)